UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 90th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 113—PART 21

OCTOBER 4, 1967, TO OCTOBER 17, 1967
(PAGES 27725 TO 29208)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1967

J
11
.R
V. 113
pt 21

United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 90th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 4, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord; and thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might.—Deuteronomy 6: 4, 5.

O Lord, our God, and God of our fathers, who hast been the dwelling place of Thy people in all generations and who in Thy gracious mercy hast brought us to the close of another year—we thank Thee for the way by which Thou hast led us and we pray that as we look forward we may continue to grow in grace and in the knowledge of Thy law. Lead us step by step, and from strength to strength, that we may serve Thee more perfectly and love our fellow man more sincerely.

Increase our faith as Thou dost increase our years and the longer we live on earth the better may our service be, the more willing our obedience, the more consistent our daily lives, the more loving our hearts, and the more complete our devotion to Thee.

Be Thou with us, O God, and receive us in Thy boundless love, for Thou art our hope and our support. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1320) entitled "An act to provide for the acquisition of career status by certain temporary employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House, with amendments to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

> S. 1933. An act to provide for the disposition of judgment funds now on deposit to the credit of the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma.

ENDING THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I have the deepest respect for the opinions of all of my colleagues with regard to the war in Vietnam and what should be done about it, but I think that every person who doubts the wisdom of our policies in Vietnam and the effectiveness of those policies would do well to read two articles which have appeared in the Washington press in the last 24 hours. The first of these articles appeared in the Washington Star yesterday evening written by Mr. Crosby Noyes. The second article appeared in the Washington Post this morning written by Mr. Joseph Alsop. In both instances I think it is very clearly documented that the policies which are being followed are policies that are in our national interest and that are yielding positive results. Those critics, however well intentioned they may be, who publicly and unfairly question the effectiveness of our Government's policies are probably giving as much help to the Vietcong as any artillery bombardment leveled at Conthien. I hope those who doubt the long-term wisdom of our Vietnam policy will carefully read the speech delivered yesterday in the other body by the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois, the minority leader of that body, Senator DIRKSEN. To my way of thinking, we are making real headway in Vietnam. We are succeeding in our policies there. The principal failures we have today are failures of heart among Americans here on the homefront.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we can have more solid support among our own people, the kind of support for our troops and our fighting forces in Vietnam to which they are fully entitled.

A BILL TO PROTECT AMERICAN FISHERMEN

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, admittedly the U.S. Government has encouraged the American canning industry to move their operations from the west coast to American Samoa, a U.S. possession in the central Pacific. However, the Samoans did not have an aptitude for fishing, so the Japanese, Koreans, and other foreign fishing vessels moved in to sell their catches, plainly in violation of U.S. law, and the effect has been that foreign-caught canned tuna has been imported into the United States without payment of duty, resulting in the loss of jobs and an economic hardship on smaller American fishing operators.

Mr. Speaker, present law prohibits foreign fishing vessels from landing their catches of fish in ports of the United States, however, U.S. customs interprets the law as not affecting American Samoa because of its claim that:

> American Samoa is an unorganized, unincorporated territory . . . (and not) . . . a port of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which would close the loophole and ban the landing of foreign fishing vessels in the ports of possessions of the United States.

Unless some control can be established, some of the smaller operators and canning industries of the United States will be forced out of business.

IT IS A LITTLE LATE

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I note that a Mr. Charles J. Zwick, Assistant Director of the Bureau of the Budget, has castigated Congress for taking a dim view of some of the President's spending plans. He charges us with demanding the withholding of funds "even before they are appropriated." He further charges that Congress is being fiscally irresponsible for seeking spending cuts before considering loading a tax increase on the overburdened taxpayers. Hearing anyone connected with this administration talk of fiscal responsibility is an about-face of monumental proportions.

It is a little late. This administration should have been concerned with fiscal responsibility when it was racking up $60 billion in added public debt.

It should have considered fiscal responsibility when it made up this year's overstuffed budget, despite knowledge that the war in Vietnam was getting bigger and more costly.

It should have thought about fiscal responsibility when it insisted on foreign aid as usual, beautification as usual, and inflation as usual. My friends, hearing this administration talk of fiscal responsibility is reminiscent of the example set by the enormously wealthy French madam who in her retirement years set up a school for wayward girls.

HAPPY NEW YEAR

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, sunset tonight ushers in the New Year 5728 in accordance with the Hebrew calendar. I take this opportunity to extend to you, Mr. Speaker, and to all of our colleagues as well as the staff members who work so harmoniously and closely with us, the traditional "Loshona Tova Tikosevu" which means "May you be inscribed in the book of life for a good year, a year of health, happiness, and prosperity in peace."

I cannot let this moment pass without extending a special word of thanks to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the leadership on both sides of the aisle for cooperating with our colleagues of the Jewish faith in so arranging the Legislative Calendar that we can spend these high holy days with our families in performing our religious duties.

WORLD SERIES

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Their was no objection.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, a challenge was issued by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] in regard to the upcoming baseball superiority contest. He was asking whether we in Missouri could put anything to match the lobsters that they have in Massachusetts.

As one who comes from Missouri, of course, I must say that we in Missouri feature Missouri country ham and if you eat enough of it, you will think like Harry Truman. I might say some of my distinguished colleagues might never get enough of this wonderful product.

We also feature catfish and beer and we welcome this World Series because it will be the first opportunity that the people of Boston will have to see major league baseball since Tommy Holmes quit playing, and since the Atlanta Braves moved from Boston to Milwaukee.

BURDENSOME FEE STRUCTURE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, legislation is now pending before the House Committee on Public Works which would remove the burdensome fee structure that has been imposed at our Federal reservoirs. A similar measure was approved by the Public Works Committee last year, but was never cleared by the Rules Committee. It is hoped that action will be taken this year. I have sought removal of these fees from the moment they were first imposed by the Great Society.

Petitions containing the signatures of 28,000 persons have been submitted to the Public Works Committee urging removal of these fees. I suggest that the mood of these petitioners, and many others as well, is reflected in a copy of a letter I recently received addressed to the Corps of Engineers. If the administration will check its election calendar it will note that the time for responding to the public's demand for action is growing short. The letter follows:

> SPRINGFIELD, MO.,
> *September 11, 1967.*
>
> RESIDENT ENGINEER,
> *Table Rock-Beaver Resident Office,*
> *Corps of Engineers,*
> *Branson, Mo.*
>
> GENTLEMEN: Enclosed find a photostatic copy of my Golden Eagle Permit for 1967 purchased by myself at the beginning of the season. Also, I purchased one last year at Cape Fair for 1966.
>
> Now, on the date I received this "Notice of Violation", Saturday, September 9, 1967, I parked my car within 60 feet of your "agent's" black pickup with the swastikas on the side at 11:30 a.m. (same day). Where he was would be anyone's guess! There were very few people in the "compound" as you have harassed about everyone visiting this lake until there are very few people there. However, this is making the fishing much better!
>
> I am reluctant to leave my Fee Permit, "Stripped Eagle," in the windshield of the car. I prefer to carry it (the Permit) on my person because I travel about the lake (as I did on this above date) and approach another recreation area and find it necessary to go ashore—you know? Like eat lunch, use rest rooms, etc., and am approached by one of your S.S. men, I would need my credentials.
>
> It appears to one, your great society has a lot of problems.
>
> This thing is like everything else the administration has started and doesn't know how to run or how to finish; and the sad part about it is you have so little time left—because next year, we are going to have an election. Any way, I will feel sorry at that time for the *New* administration. Just about anything you see is in one indescribable mess as of now.
>
> A fisherman,
> LAWRENCE WAGEMANN.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 295]

Ashley
Bolling
Brock
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Button
Cederberg
Celler
Dent
Diggs
Donohue
Dow
Edwards, La.
Esch
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Findley
Flynt
Fountain
Fulton, Tenn.
Goodell
Holland
Howard
Kluczynski
Landrum
Lukens
Macdonald, Mass.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
O'Neill, Mass.
Philbin
Pike
Pool
Rarick
Rooney, Pa.
Sandman
Taft
Teague, Calif.
Tiernan
Tunney
Ullman
Utt
Walker
Watkins
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Wright

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 385 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 853. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 853) entitled "A joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HILL, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. MUNDT, and Mrs. SMITH to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11722) entitled "An act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes."

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 536, CERTAIN CHILOCCO INDIAN SCHOOL LANDS

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 536) to provide that the United States shall hold certain Chilocco Indian School lands at Chilocco, Okla., in trust for the Cherokee Nation upon payment by the Cherokee Nation of $3.75 per acre to the Federal Government, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. HALEY, TAYLOR, EDMONDSON, BERRY, and MCCLURE.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 853) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

On page 1, line 5, strike out "October 10, 1967", and insert in lieu thereof "October 23, 1967".

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it is the feeling on the part of the Members on this side of the House that the date of October 23 should be approved for the continuing resolution.

We have had several interesting and beneficial battles on the floor of the House in the last week or 10 days involving a very serious and a very important principle. We on this side of the aisle still believe that the efforts we made were constructive, and I am sure in the long run will be beneficial.

On the other hand, we do not wish to be picayunish. The substance of what we are trying to do is a matter of grave importance to this country, and we feel that by accepting the date of October 23 we will be giving the House Committee on Appropriations an adequate amount of time to do some of the things the distinguished chairman of that committee has indicated his committee will do.

A date of October 10 would not give the committee a sufficient amount of time to carry out the promises that were made by the chairman. We do feel that by extending the date to the 23d, the great Committee on Appropriations on the House side can consider and, I hope, take some action on some of the items involving some of the agencies where the chairman has indicated action can be expected.

But I do want to add this: If there is no action by October 23 or in the days preceding October 23, then we on this side will continue at that time to do what we have sought to do on two previous occasions in the last week; namely, impose a spending limitation.

I am sure the gentleman from Texas will fully understand that there will be a need and a necessity for a continuing resolution by that date inasmuch as all of the appropriation bills for the fiscal year 1968 will not have been considered and approved.

So on the basis that we will have another opportunity, and inasmuch as we do not wish to be picayunish about the issue today, we are not going to object to the consideration of the House joint resolution, as amended by the Senate action.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOW. I agree with our distinguished minority leader, and we are not going to object to the 23d of October, to give the committee an opportunity to make further reductions.

But I should like to suggest that I hope we will not wait until the last minute to bring in a continuing resolution as we did this time, and that there will be plenty of time because we are serving notice now that we will again make an effort to put a spending limitation on the continuing resolution unless a substantial reduction has been made by the committee.

I would hope, and that is the reason I take this time, simply to say I hope a continuing resolution will come in sufficient time so that both the House and Senate will have a chance to work their will.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, consistent with the remarks I made on the floor here yesterday, it is my feeling and my position that simply a review of fiscal year 1968 appropriations will not be adequate in order to control the expenditures of this Government. It is the expenditures that are responsible for the deficit and not necessarily the appropriations that are made in 1968.

While I gather from the tenor of the proceedings here that it would not be worthwhile to object to this proceeding, I certainly do not feel that we are adequately protecting the people of this country by passing this resolution without a spending limitation. I certainly would hope that the chairman of this committee would attempt to reflect the tenor of the feelings of the House here as expressed last week when the continuing resolution was defeated, and would seriously consider an expenditure limitation as well as a reconsideration of appropriations before the next continuing resolution is brought to the floor of the House sometime prior to the 23d of October.

Mr. Speaker, I did not want this to go by, leaving the impression that I concur in the proceedings that are now going on.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AND RELATED AGENCIES, 1968—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 10196) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes; and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 729)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10196) "making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 12, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 28, 47, 49, 50, 59, 60, and 71.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 4, 15, 16, 26, 51, 53, 62, 63, 65, 66, 67, 68, 70, and 72, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,677,907,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$82,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$79,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert: ": *Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation for payments to local educational agencies for the maintenance and operation of schools shall be available to carry out the provisions of legislation for this purpose enacted after June 30, 1967"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "$13,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$55,400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$63,937,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$164,663,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House

recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert: "including $35,000,000 for dental facilities as authorized by subsections (2) and (3) of said section"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$27,942,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$41,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$54,234,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$18,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$63,230,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$186,056,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$172,454,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$31,607,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "144,954,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$129,633,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$96,422,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$162,284,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$70,621,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$58,814,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$53,900,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$82,891,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$100,168,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 57: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$19,912,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 58: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$5,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 18, 35, 52, 55, 56, 61, 64, and 69.

DANIEL J. FLOOD,
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
NEAL SMITH,
W. R. HULL, Jr.,
BOB CASEY,
GEORGE MAHON,
MELVIN R. LAIRD,
ROBERT H. MICHEL,
GARNER E. SHRIVER (except as to Nos. 11 and 12),
Managers on the Part of the House.

LISTER HILL,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
JOHN STENNIS,
ALAN BIBLE,
ROBERT C. BYRD,
JACOB K. JAVITS,
NORRIS COTTON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10196) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Manpower administration

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates $365,497,000 for "Manpower development and training activities" as proposed by the Senate instead of $394,997,000 as proposed by the House. It was not the intention of the conferees, in agreeing to the lower figure, to ban the use of this appropriation for the training of prison inmates.

Wage and labor standards

Amendments Nos. 2 and 3: Appropriate $4,429,000 for "Bureau of Labor Standards, salaries and expenses" as proposed by the House instead of $4,467,000 as proposed by the Senate, and provide that $500,000 of the appropriation be for the work of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped as proposed by the Senate instead of $462,000 as proposed by the House.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Food and Drug Administration

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates $66,000,000 for "Salaries and expenses" as proposed by the Senate instead of $66,225,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 5: Inserts language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate pertaining to the location of a laboratory.

Office of Education

Amendments Nos. 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10: Appropriates $1,677,907,000 for "Elementary and secondary educational activities" instead of $1,645,707,000 as proposed by the House and $1,696,707,000 as proposed by the Senate; provide that $208,750,000 of the appropriation be for supplementary educational centers and services as proposed by the House instead of $213,750,000 as proposed by the Senate; provide that $82,200,000 of the appropriation be for grants to States and loans to non-profit private schools for equipment and minor remodeling under title III of the National Defense Education Act instead of $50,000,000 as proposed by the House and $96,000,000 as proposed by the Senate; provide that allotments under sections 302(a) and 305 for equipment and minor remodeling shall be made on the basis of $79,200,000 for grants to States instead of $47,000,000 as proposed by the House and $88,000,000 as proposed by the Senate; and strike language proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 11, 12 and 13: Appropriate $439,137,000 for "School assistance in federally affected areas" as proposed by the House instead of $472,937,000 as proposed by the Senate; provide that $416,200,000 of the appropriation shall be for payments to local educational agencies for the maintenance and operation of schools as authorized by the Act of September 30, 1950, as amended, as proposed by the House instead of $450,000,000 as proposed by the Senate; and insert language proposed by the Senate with a technical amendment.

Amendment No. 14: Appropriates $13,500,000 for the Teacher Corps instead of $18,100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 15 and 16: Appropriate $156,500,000 for "Libraries and community services" as proposed by the Senate instead of $155,500,000 as proposed by the House, and provide that $5,000,000 of the appropriation shall be for transfer to the Librarian of Congress for the acquisition and cataloging of library materials as proposed by the Senate instead of $4,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 17: Appropriates $55,400,000 for "Educational improvement for the handicapped" instead of $53,400,000 as proposed by the House and $58,400,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 18: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which provides that funds made available in the 1967 "Salaries and expenses" appropriation for a comprehensive study of training programs financed in whole or in part with Federal funds shall remain available until June 30, 1968.

Amendment No. 19: Authorizes $100,000,000 for "Participation sales authorizations" and appropriates $925,000 for "Payment of participation sales insufficiencies" as proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate.

Vocational Rehabilitation Administration

Amendments Nos. 20 through 26: Appropriate $311,550,000 for "Grants for rehabilitation services and facilities" as proposed by the House instead of $312,550,000 as proposed by the Senate; delete the earmarking of $1,000,000 for State plannning for the development of comprehensive vocational rehabilitation programs proposed by the Senate; and provide that $3,850,000 of the appropriation is for grants with respect to workshops and rehabilitation facilities under Section 12 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act as proposed by the House instead of $4,850,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are agreed that planning for a research and training center in the Chicago area should not be delayed and will expect that not to exceed $200,000 of these funds be utilized for that purpose.

Amendment No. 27: Appropriates $63,937,000 for "Research and training" instead of $62,440,000 as proposed by the House and $65,484,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 28: Appropriates $5,319,000 for "Salaries and expenses" as proposed by the House instead of $5,469,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Public Health Service

Amendment No. 29: Appropriates $164,663,000 for "Health manpower education and utilization" instead of $164,163,000 as proposed by the House and $164,913,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 30: Provides that $35,000,000 of the appropriation for "Construction of health educational facilities," shall be for construction and modernization of teaching facilities for the training of dentists as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 31: Appropriates $27,942,000 for "Chronic diseases" instead of $27,504,000 as proposed by the House and $32,692,000 as proposed by the Senate. In general, the conferees are agreed on the desirability of the purposes of the Senate increase but are also agreed that a large part of the activities for which the increase of over $5,000,000 was earmarked is so closely related to activities financed under "Regional medical programs" that they would more properly be administered by the National Institutes of Health under that appropriation. With this in mind, the managers on the part of the House agreed to $4,500,000 of the Senate increase for "Regional medical programs". It will be expected that the activities for which the Senate increase for "Chronic diseases" was earmarked be performed under the appropriation "Regional medical programs" to the maximum extent determined to be feasible by the National Institutes of Health.

Amendment No. 32: Appropriates $41,750,000 for "Urban and industrial health" instead of $41,594,000 as proposed by the House and $42,194,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase of $156,000 over the amount proposed by the House is earmarked for the Arctic Health Research Center.

Amendments Nos. 33 and 34: Appropriate $54,234,000 for "Community health services" instead of $51,234,000 as proposed by the House and $61,234,000 as proposed by the Senate, and provide that $18,000,000 of this appropriation shall be available for grants for facilities pursuant to Part C of the Mental Retardation Facilities Construction Act instead of $15,000,000 as proposed by the House and $25,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 35: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which provides language authorizing transfers of funds to the appropriation "Community health services" from the appropriation "Community mental health resource support" pursuant to Section 202(c) of the Community Mental Health Centers Act.

Amendment No. 36: Appropriates $63,230,000 for "Hospitals and medical care" instead of $62,830,000 as proposed by the House and $63,633,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 37: Appropriates $186,056,000 for the "National Cancer Institute" instead of $183,356,000 as proposed by the House and $192,356,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are agreed that the increase above the sum proposed by the House will be used for the establishment of additional cancer research centers.

Amendment No. 38: Appropriates $172,454,000 for the "National Heart Institute" instead of $167,954,000 as proposed by the House and $177,954,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are agreed that the increase above the sum proposed by the House will be applied as follows: $1,300,000 for cardiovascular research centers, $1,200,000 for the artificial heart and myocardial infarction program, and $2,000,000 for the drug research program.

Amendment No. 39: Appropriates $31,607,000 for the "National Institute of Dental Research" instead of $30,307,000 as proposed by the House and $32,307,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are agreed that the increase above the sum proposed by the House will be used to establish university based research institutions in the dental sciences.

Amendment No. 40: Appropriates $144,954,000 for the "National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases" instead of $143,954,000 as proposed by the House and $147,204,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are agreed that the increase above the sum proposed by the House will be used as follows: $500,000 for additional research in basic and clinical problems in the area of chronic kidney disease, and $500,000 for additional research on arthritis.

Amendment No. 41: Appropriates $129,633,000 for the "National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness" instead of $128,633,000 as proposed by the House and $135,633,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are agreed that the increase above the sum proposed by the House will be used as follows: $500,000 for additional work on the problem of brain damage due to accidents, and $500,000 for additional research on multiple sclerosis and closely related diseases.

Amendment No. 42: Appropriates $96,422,000 for the "National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases" instead of $94,422,000 as proposed by the House and $98,922,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are agreed that the increase above the sum proposed by the House will be used as follows: $1,000,000 for expansion of the research program on organ transplantation and the immunological aspects of fatal kidney diseases, and $1,000,000 for additional research on chronic bronchitis and emphysema.

Amendment No. 43: Appropriates $162,284,000 for the "National Institute of General Medical Sciences" instead of $160,284,000 as proposed by the House and $164,284,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are agreed that the increase above the sum proposed by the House will be used for expansion of the pharmacology-toxicology program.

Amendment No. 44: Appropriates $70,621,000 for the "National Institute of Child Health and Human Development" instead of $68,621,000 as proposed by the House and $74,621,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are agreed that the increase above the sum proposed by the House will be used for the research grant activities in connection with mental retardation research centers.

Amendments Nos. 45 and 46: Appropriate $58,814,000 for "Regional medical programs" instead of $54,314,000 as proposed by the House and $64,314,000 as proposed by the Senate, and provide that $53,900,000 shall remain available until June 30, 1969 instead of $49,400,000 as proposed by the House and $59,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 47: Appropriates $17,289,000 for "Environmental health sciences" as proposed by the House instead of $20,615,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 48: Appropriates $82,891,000 for "General research and services, National Institutes of Health" instead of $81,141,000 as proposed by the House and $84,641,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 49: Appropriates $35,000,000 for "Grants for construction of health research facilities" as proposed by the House instead of $50,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 50: Provides for the transfer to "General research support grants" of $61,700,000 of appropriations available to the National Institutes of Health as proposed by the House instead of $75,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 51: Appropriates $725,000 for the "John E. Fogarty International Center for Advanced Study in the Health Sciences" as proposed by the Senate instead of $500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 52: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which proposes language to make the funds appropriated to the "John E. Fogarty International Center for Advanced Study in the Health Sciences" available until December 31, 1968.

Amendments Nos. 53 and 54: Update citation to enabling legislation as proposed by the Senate, and appropriate $100,168,000 for "Community mental health resource support" instead of $50,168,000 as proposed by the House and $110,168,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 55: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment which will earmark $45,000,000, instead of $50,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, for construction to remain available until June 30, 1969.

Amendment No. 56: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which provides language authorizing transfers of funds to "Community mental health resource support" from "Community health services" pursuant to section 132(c) of the Mental Retardation Facilities Construction Act.

Amendments Nos. 57 and 58: Appropriate $19,912,000 for "National Library of Medicine" instead of $18,662,000 as proposed by the House and $21,162,000 as proposed by the Senate, and provides that $5,250,000 of the amount appropriated shall remain available until June 30, 1969 instead of $4,000,000 as proposed by the House and $6,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 59: Appropriates $10,715,000 for "Buildings and facilities" as proposed by the House instead of $15,075,000 as proposed by the Senate. Funds for the Appalachian Health Field Station were not agreed to. However, this action was without prejudice to the project; in fact, it is recognized as a No. 1 priority item for the 1969 budget, and if firm assurances can be given that the architectural-engineering plans for the government facility on leased land will be finished prior to June, 1968, the conferees are agreed that a supplemental request for 1968 will be given favorable consideration.

Amendment No. 60: Restores "Participation sales authorization" of $15,000,000 and appropriation of $250,000 for "Payment of sales insufficiencies" as proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate.

Amendment No. 61: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which provides technical language determined to be necessary for the effective use of the revolving funds "Health professions education fund" and the "Nurse training fund" under which student loans are made.

Welfare Administration

Amendments Nos. 62 and 63: Appropriate $525,000 for "Assistance for repatriated United States nationals" as proposed by the Senate instead of $432,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 64: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which strikes language proposed by the House and inserts similar language proposed by the Senate regarding payments to States under certain titles of the Social Security Act.

Administration on Aging

Amendment No. 65: Appropriates $18,450,000 for "Coordination and development of programs for the aging" as proposed by the Senate.

Special institutions

Amendments Nos. 66 and 67: Correct printing error, and appropriate $2,948,000 for "Gallaudet College, salaries and expenses" as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,878,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 68: Appropriates $2,312,000 for "Gallaudet College, construction" as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,196,000 as proposed by the House.

Office of the Secretary

Amendment No. 69: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment which will have the effect of appropriating $7,139,000 for "Salaries and expenses" as proposed by the Senate instead of $6,739,000 as proposed by the House, and including language providing for a comprehensive study of all authorized Federal programs that have to do with educational activities aimed at improved international understanding and cooperation, with the objective of determining the extent of adjustment and consolidation of these programs that is desirable in order that their objectives may be more efficiently and expeditiously accomplished.

Amendment No. 70: Appropriates $2,209,000 for "Office of Field Coordination, salaries and expenses" as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 71: Appropriates $15,700,000 for "Foreign language training and area programs" as proposed by the House instead of $16,300,000 as proposed by the Senate and deletes authorization for carrying out the purposes of Public Law 89-698, the International Education Act of 1966. The conferees will expect that the cost of administering the other programs provided for by this appropriation be borne, as it has in the past, by the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Office of Education."

General provisions

There has been fear on the part of some that the variable cost sharing required of research grantees under the Department's application of section 203 might result in the allocation of these funds on some standard other than the competence and distinction of the research scholar or scientist concerned, and the adequacy of facilities available to him and his coworkers for a proposed project, all weighed solely in relation to the potential benefit of the research to the American people. The House and Senate Committees on Appropriations have been assured that variable cost sharing has not resulted in any other standard, and all information on the subject available to the Committees confirms these assurances. However, there is a potential danger that the conferees caution the Department to be vigilant in avoiding.

TITLE VII—UNITED STATES SOLDIERS' HOME

The bill as it passed both the House and Senate provides the sum of $90,000 for a revision of the current Master Plan of the U.S. Soldiers' Home. It has come to the conferees' attention that the National Capital Planning Commission's "Proposed Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital", dated February 1967, would take two parcels of land from the U.S. Soldiers' Home.

It is the view of the conferees that no land should be taken from the Soldiers' Home pending completion and study of the revision of the U.S. Soldiers' Home Master Plan provided for in the bill.

TITLE IX—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 72: Inserts language proposed by the Senate in lieu of similar language proposed by the House.

DANIEL J. FLOOD,
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
NEAL SMITH,
W. R. HULL, Jr.,
BOB CASEY,
GEORGE MAHON,
MELVIN R. LAIRD,
ROBERT H. MICHEL,
GARNER E. SHRIVER (except as to Nos. 11 and 12),
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. FLOOD (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the balance of the statement be considered as read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, this is the first time—and you will recall that when I reported the bill to the House, the House very kindly supported this committee—this is the first time, I repeat for the purposes of emphasis, that the Senate did not run this show and the Senate did not command this conference. As spokesman for the managers on the part of the House, I point out that, in view of the present atmosphere in the House, this is the best bill, as far as the House is concerned, that your managers have ever brought back to you vis-a-vis the budget requests, the Senate increases, and the saving of money. It is the very best.

And I assure you that every dime your managers could possibly save was saved. I think you should know, as I said on the floor when we passed the House bill, in response to a question by the gentleman from Iowa, that we will stand by our guns, and your managers did. No one could have done more than your managers did man by man.

Mr. Speaker, I did not ask the gentleman's permission to make this statement. I do not think I have to. But I want to pay this tribute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD], the ranking Republican member of this managing group. This is a good report. This is a very, very, very good report. But it could never have been achieved without the experience and the cooperation given to me by Mr. LAIRD.

He has been with this committee for many, many years. He knows this bill like the back of his hand. This was my first year as chairman, and the gentleman from Wisconsin, one of the great Republican leaders of this House—I suppose of the country also, I do not know—was my strong right arm. I think the managers on both sides will agree. They have asked me not to name them. I was going to ask them to stand up and take a bow, but the Parliamentarian, Mr. Deschler, indicates that is not very good manners. But they are sitting here and, Mr. Speaker, we should be proud of them.

The conference agreement produces this result. We are under the budget. Imagine—on this bill which is mostly HEW, we are under the budget by $148,129,000. It is unheard of.

We are under the Senate by $145,643,000. That is under the Senate, for HEW. Did the Members ever think they would live long enough to hear that? But we are.

I want to add this. The Senate considered requests totaling $101,540,000 not considered by the House. That is over $101 million not considered by the House but considered by the Senate, because we lacked authorization when these items were before us but these authorizations have since been enacted.

With regard to those items that were carried in the original House bill, the Senate increased the House figures by a total of $185 million. And this is what I want the House to know, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the managers. The House conferees gave in to the extent of $61 million, but the Senate gave in to the extent of $125 million. We are proud of our managers.

Mr. Speaker, I direct the attention of the Members to the National Institutes of Health. This is one thing that people are really concerned about and want to know about. There is not a man or woman or child in the Nation who is not touched by one of the institutes of the National Institutes of Health. Everybody is touched by them. But some people think we have been too liberal in this conference. I would like to point out that the total Senate increase in the programs of NIH was just under $78 million. We yielded $23 million, and the Senate yielded $55 million. That was almost 2.5 times as much. That is unheard of. That is a "sacred cow"—NIH.

Now with regard to the items that had no authorization at the time the House acted but were added by the Senate after the authorizations were enacted.

The largest item with which we were concerned was the construction of community mental health centers. The budget request was $50 million. The Senate allowed $50 million. We compromised at $45 million.

It is my opinion, for what it is worth, that this House would have undoubtedly included the $50 million for this purpose if it had been authorized when the House first acted on the bill. We could not touch it, because we had no law at the time.

Now, there is also the Teacher Corps. Frankly, I do not know what the House would have done about the Teacher Corps. I believe the House would certainly have voted at least what the managers placed in this bill. The request was for $33 million. The Senate allowed $18.1 million. Your managers agreed to $13.5 million. Mr. Speaker that is a cut of 60 percent below the budget.

The only other item in this category of programs unauthorized at the time the House passed the bill is the Older Americans Act. The request was for $18,450,000, which the Senate approved. Your managers accepted. In this case I have absolutely no doubt. It is my opinion, for what it is worth, with respect to the program under the Older Americans Act, that the House most certainly would have approved every penny. Your managers unanimously agreed.

Mr. Speaker, a conference is for the purpose of compromise. This was a conference with the Senate. The purpose was compromise. We know we are going to have to compromise when we go to a conference. Mr. Speaker, you and the Members who have been on conferences know that. A conference is for compromise. One does not run it his way altogether.

I do not believe we could have come back with a conference agreement closer to the House bill if we had had 17 conferences with the Senate. As a matter of fact, we had seven. We have been in conference since the 15th of August. This bill is a can of worms. This was a hard, rough, tough fight on this conference, and every one of your managers was present at every conference. At every conference every one of your managers was present.

I repeat, we could have sat 17 times and never have come back with a bill like we bring to you today.

I am proud of your managers, and I believe the House should be. I just cannot imagine that this report will not be adopted unanimously, with the flag of the House flying high.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to my friend from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman tell us how much this is above or below spending for the same general purposes last year?

Mr. FLOOD. For this bill?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. FLOOD. Yes. I have that here.

For 1967 it is $13,016,564,000.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. The figure that the gentleman from Iowa is requesting I think has to do with the expenditure level as compared to the budget figure.

Mr. FLOOD. Then I do not have the figure that the gentleman wants. That figure I do not have, but we could get it.

Mr. GROSS. No. The figure I am trying to get is how much are we spending for the same general purposes as compared with a year ago and with last year's bill.

Mr. FLOOD. Let me answer it in this way. Last year's bill was $13,016,564,000. This year, as of now, before you, it is $13,267,017,000. That is the difference, and that is a miracle.

Mr. GROSS. That is a miracle?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. It is about $250 million more. Is that correct?

Mr. FLOOD. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. And this conference is $138 million more than the House approved in this bill. Is that not correct?

Mr. FLOOD. Let me say to my friend from Iowa, make no mistake about it, even you, sir, could never have done better than your managers did on this bill. Even you, sir.

Mr. GROSS. I never had a crack at it, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. FLOOD. This is good.

Mr. GROSS. That may be. It just may be.

Mr. FLOOD. Indeed.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman one other question if he will yield. Is there any money for so-called rat extermination in this bill?

Mr. FLOOD. There are certain very limited funds, as the gentleman knows, for rat extermination, in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, sure, but they are not major programs, and during debate on that subject a few weeks ago the Record shows every dollar. It is not very much.

Mr. GROSS. Thank you.

Mr. FLOOD. I thank you. I would have been disappointed if my friend from Iowa had not risen to the occasion. He always does.

Mr. Speaker, I will place in the Record, at this point a table showing a summary of the action on this bill at each step with pertinent comparisons:

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1968

	Appropriation, 1967	Budget, 1968	Passed House, 1968	Passed Senate, 1968	Conference action, 1968	Conference action compared with—			
						Appropriation, 1967	Budget estimate	House	Senate
Department of Labor	$638,220,000	$652,973,000	$635,024,000	$625,562,000	$625,524,000	−$12,696,000	−$27,449,000	−$9,500,000	−$38,000
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:									
Office of Education	3,890,002,700	3,944,466,000	3,834,115,000	3,942,090,000	3,882,815,000	−7,187,700	−61,651,000	+48,700,000	−59,275,000
National Institutes of Health	1,123,162,000	1,187,750,000	1,174,424,000	1,252,225,000	1,197,399,000	+74,237,000	−9,649,000	+22,975,000	−54,826,000
Other HEW	7,307,522,500	7,579,074,000	7,434,092,000	7,541,950,000	7,510,446,000	+202,923,500	−49,330,000	+76,354,000	−31,504,000
Total, HEW	12,320,687,200	12,711,290,000	12,442,631,000	12,736,265,000	12,590,660,000	+269,972,800	−120,630,000	+148,029,000	−145,605,000
Related agencies	57,657,000	59,883,000	59,833,000	59,833,000	59,833,000	+2,176,000	−50,000		
Total, Labor-HEW bill	13,016,564,200	13,424,146,000	13,137,488,000	13,421,660,000	13,276,017,000	+259,452,800	−148,129,000	+138,529,000	−145,643,000

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Laird] as much time as he commands and requires.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, first I would like to state that the managers on the part of the House in this conference I believe did an excellent job under the leadership of our chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood]. We had more conferences on this appropriation bill than we have ever had on an appropriation bill for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in the entire history of the Department. We started the conferences on the 15th of August. We met on the 17th, again on the 22d of August. We met on the 12th of September—all day, both morning and afternoon, on the 14th of September, 2d of October, and 3d of October.

Mr. Speaker, the managers on the part of the House were attentive in maintaining the House position on every item. And, it was only after considerable discussion that we came to some compromise on the items that are above the House figure.

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] was the toughest conference chairman with whom I have ever served. The gentleman from Pennsylvania was firm in maintaining the position of the House of Representatives. This report as it comes back to you today is a good report.

Mr. Speaker, the other day we heard some discussion about rescissions. Certainly, there can be rescissions made. But a rescission will have to be made, as the chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations stated in his testimony before the Committee on Rules yesterday—a rescission in this bill would have to occur in the largest controllable portion thereof, which would be title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Further, the chairman of the full committee at that time recommended that, perhaps, we could consider a rescission in the amount of $400 million, in his appearance before the Committee on Rules.

And, Mr. Speaker, I say to the distinguished chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations that I certainly would support the gentleman should he make that suggestion.

But I want the Members of this House to know that title I was not in conference. The figure contained in title I, as it passed the House of Representatives, granted less than 50 percent of the entitlements under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The figure of the other body carries less than 50 percent of the entitlements under title I. In other words, the figure of the House of Representatives and the figure of the other body were the same under title I. These were the figures of the budget, as considered by the House and as accepted by the other body. Therefore, the title I figure was not a subject that we discussed in this conference. There is no way of making that recision without having separate legislation. The recision to which I refer is the recision suggested by the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], before the Committee on Rules. That, however, was not in this conference.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin yield to me at this point?

Mr. LAIRD. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. I believe in my appearance before the Committee on Rules, when we were seeking a rule on the continuing resolution, I stated that if we should adopt the Bow amendment which provided for a $5 billion expenditure cut, we would have to consider slashing the Elementary and Secondary Education fund by approximately $400 million in order to achieve Mr. Bow's goal. However, I do not believe I was opposing Mr. Bow's proposal, the figure would have been sufficient in this area. It was not a figure which I had advocated. It was a figure which I pointed out in order to explain the intent and purpose of the Bow amendment.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I say to the distinguished gentleman from Texas that several Members have come to me and have asked me why we did not carry out that particular recommendation. In answering them I pointed out the fact that insofar as the entitlements and provisions under title I were concerned, they were not a subject this conference could consider under the rules of the House.

Mr. Speaker, there are four items involved here that make up a major portion of the increases as contained in this conference report, increases over and above the House figure. The distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] went into them in some detail. However, there is the Teacher Corps, which was authorized at $33 million, and which was adopted here on a rollcall vote, the Community Mental Health Center Program, which was authorized after we considered this bill, the Assistance for Repatriated U.S. Nationals and the programs involving the aged, all of these programs were authorized after the bill passed the House of Representatives.

So, Mr. Speaker, when one looks at the total overall figure, one will see programs totaling $101 million which were authorized after this bill had passed the House of Representatives. Of the $101 million in authorizations, the President requested every dollar. In this conference report we bring those newly authorized programs back to you totaling $77 million, or $24 million below the budget figure as requested for those four programs that were passed after the appropriation bill had been acted upon by the House of Representatives.

Mr. GROSS. We had a lot of discussion here in recent days about the obligation and the responsibility of Congress and of the Committee on Appropriations. Is it mandatory for the committee to follow the authorization?

Mr. LAIRD. I would like to state to the gentleman I am one who does not feel that we are committed by an authorization. Take, for example, one of these new programs, take the Teacher Corps program, for example. The Teacher Corps program passed the House 2 months ago with an authorization figure of $33 million. It was agreed to by the House and agreed to by the Senate. The conference report on this appropriation bill brings this figure back not at $33 million, as in the authorization, we bring it back at $13.5 million.

Also take, for instance, in the area of community mental health centers, a very popular program. On a rollcall vote in the House of Representatives it passed unanimously.

We reduced even that budget figure by $5 million in this conference report. The gentleman from Iowa supported that community mental health center program at a larger figure on the rollcall vote in the House, but we came back with a figure even below the budget figure in this community mental health center program.

Mr. GROSS. The fact remains that this bill is $259 billion higher than last year.

Mr. LAIRD. The appropriation level is $259 million above last year.

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. LAIRD. But these four programs that I am talking about are only the new programs that were adopted since this bill passed the House, the appropriation bill.

So I would like to say to the gentleman from Iowa I believe our committee did a good job in this conference, and I am surprised that the appropriation level is not higher than this.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, it will be most helpful to some of the Members who are not conversant with all that goes on, all the wheels that turn within the Committee on Appropriations, and in, of course, the hearings on the part of the legislative committee with respect to Health, Education, and Welfare, as with other committees, if the gentleman would tell us when he brings the bill to the floor that this is too much money, that we are going to cut it in conference, or make an attempt to cut it in conference, it would be most helpful if we could get that kind of information from the gentleman so that we would not be voting for the figure that the gentleman just said I voted for in one bill.

Mr. LAIRD. I was not criticizing——

Mr. GROSS. Tell us these things.

Mr. LAIRD. I was not criticizing the gentleman's vote.

Mr. GROSS. We will help you to cut them if you tell us about it.

Mr. LAIRD. This was an authorization bill, and I was not criticizing or questioning the gentleman's vote. I voted with the gentleman.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise as chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee's Subcommittee on Public Health and Welfare to congratulate both the House and the Senate conferees who think well enough of the importance of medical science research to include in their report some suggestions to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for his handling of this multimillion-dollar responsibility.

Although the two bodies were in general agreement on how this vital program should be administered, they took pains not to handcuff the medical research being carried on by some of our great universities by restrictive geographical clauses. Such limitations could cause the overall program to falter and halt at a time when it should, if anything, be accelerated.

Since the Federal Government, shortly after World War I, began taking an interest in scientific research to the extent of making funds available to qualified universities, much great work has been accomplished. The Government agencies, all of them, Mr. Speaker, should be very proud of their record. Since we are today concerning ourselves with HEW appropriations, a word of praise to Secretary Gardner and his staff who study the medical research project involved, and make the funds available only on the basis of the project's worthiness, would not be out of order.

If it appears to some that there has been a concentration of these research grants to schools in varying geographical locations, it is a coincidence and not a conspiracy. Distributing grants geographically for the sake of accommodating certain sections of the country for accommodation's sake alone is unthinkable. Mr. Speaker. We are still in the midst of a population explosion and more, not less, advanced medical research is necessary. To penalize an institution equipped with expertise and laboratory equipment to allow another school to "catch up" would strike at the very heart of the purposes of the whole program of medical research.

Certainly universities which have not in the past received as many research grants as some of their contemporaries should be encouraged to add to their brain power and their laboratories and come forward with ideas which can be embraced with enthusiasm by agencies within our Government in need of new ideas and new techniques for the public good. But, Mr. Speaker, we do not suggest that these schools should be placed in a favored position for the duration of the catching up process.

There have been suggestions, Mr. Speaker, that any real or imagined concentration of Federal funds may have been encouraged because the larger and more endowed universities in certain areas from time to time offer larger contributions to research grants than can smaller institutions with lesser endowments in other areas. These inducements, presumably, would be for larger professorial salaries or greater participation by the universities in overall cost sharing.

Cost sharing, as it pertains to indirect costs, has been a popularly misunderstood item when discussing research grants during the past several years.

In the first session of the 89th Congress, in an attempt to alleviate some of the confusion resulting from the elimination of the fixed percentage on reimbursement for indirect costs, our late, beloved colleague, John Fogarty, the modern father of medical research grants, took to the floor. During the debate on the House floor on the HEW report—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 111, part 7, page 9367—Mr. Fogarty engaged in a colloquy with the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN] who was inquiring whether he understood correctly that the committee was removing the 20-percent limitation on indirect costs with the understanding that grantee institutions must share in the full costs, both direct and indirect, of supported research. To which Mr. Fogarty replied:

> That is correct up to maybe an average of 5 per cent.

In a still further attempt at clarification, the able and distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] who has been an active and devoted minority member of his particular subcommittee for a number of years, expressed his understanding of Congress intent in the matter of cost sharing. During the debate on the conference report on the Defense appropriation bill, 1966—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 111, part 18, page 24259—Mr. LAIRD reiterated an earlier colloquy with Mr. Fogarty to state:

> This language contemplates, I believe, not only that cost sharing by the grantee, in no event, be more than 5 per cent but that on the average the cost sharing under all such grants should be but 1 or 1½ per cent.

In order to insure that grants are awarded only on the basis of merit and that the non-Federal share under section 203 was not offered to obtain the grant when competent researchers with adequate facilities were available elsewhere, we hope that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare personally reviews any grant in which the non-Federal share of the entire cost of the project, including direct and indirect cost, could exceed 10 percent.

Mr. Speaker, it has been predicted by responsible persons beyond the pale of the Congress and Government service that the cost of higher education in the United States will more than double over the next 7 years. Trustees of universities, men in the business world charged with the responsibility of keeping the doors of private institutions open, need to carry on their work confident that they have an understanding government and an understanding Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that this legislation will give them that confidence. I feel that what has been accomplished here today is a written guarantee—not a blank check—but a written guarantee to these dedicated citizens that we should all go forward with the thought that if we have more public health we will have less public welfare.

Mr. LAIRD. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JARMAN].

We have language in the conference report that I believe will adequately protect this program.

I know of the gentleman's interest in this and in the conference report.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee handling this bill and their conference report thereon, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], and also the distinguished minority member of that subcommittee, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD], and their comanagers on this conference.

I do have two questions in mind which I would like to address to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin and to the chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

The first question is with regard to amendment No. 31.

Do I understand correctly that in the appropriation for the Public Health Service, Bureau of Disease Prevention and Environmental Control, Chronic Diseases, $438,000 may be used for pediatric pulmonary centers?

The gentleman is shaking his head in agreement, but I would rather have something more forceful on the record in this regard.

Mr. LAIRD. I will yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania to answer the question and, of course, on my part the answer is "Yes."

Mr. FLOOD. The answer on my part is "Yes."

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Very good—I appreciate the cooperation of the gentlemen.

Mr. FLOOD. I am not saying "yes" because the gentleman from Wisconsin said "yes." I am saying "yes" for myself.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I am overwhelmed by the fact that both the gentlemen agree. If they only agree on my next question, then I am through for the day.

With regard to amendment No. 42 which appropriates $96,422,000 for the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, do I understand correctly that $500,000 of that sum may be used for a collaboration research program on immuno-therapy?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. The answer is "Yes."

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I thank the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. LAIRD. There is the authority to carry out that kind of a program.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Yes; that is a cancer program, a skin cancer program.

Mr. FLOOD. That is correct. It occurs to me that the gentleman from New York—the gentleman from Brooklyn, I beg pardon—has had a very good day.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I believe so and am grateful. I shall now see what happens this afternoon in Boston on television.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SHRIVER].

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, as one of the conferees on this legislation, I have taken exception to amendments 11 and 12 of the conference report.

These amendments reduce the funds available for school assistance in federally affected areas from $472,937,000 or 97 percent of the amount entitled by law, to $439,173,000, or 90 percent of entitlement, and reduce from $450,000,000 to $416,200,000 the amount available for payments to local educational agencies for the maintenance and operation of schools as authorized by Public Law 874, as amended.

I feel that I should call to the attention of the House, especially those Members who represent congressional districts which participate in the provisions of Public Law 874 and Public Law 815, that the amount appropriated in this bill is $37,772,000 below the amount necessary for full entitlement of these statutory obligations.

I am well aware of the tremendous growth of this program over the past 16 years. Since enactment, the net entitlements have shown steady growth from $54 million to $461 million last year. This growth is attributable to increases in school population, increases in school enrollment, increases in school expenditures, broadened interest in the program by State and local officials, amendments liberalizing the basic legislation, and expanded Federal activity in all areas of the country.

In regard to expanded Federal activity, I think we should recognize our responsibility which follows the growth of the Federal Government. We should not force local school districts to pay for this growth. They are already overburdened with their inherent local obligations. If Congress is going to expand the activities, and thus employees, of the Federal Government, then Congress should accept the obligation to provide assistance to the local school districts for expenses which result from such expansion. By cutting $37.7 million from the full entitlements under these laws, we are not meeting that responsibility.

During our subcommittee hearings the matter of providing full entitlement under both of these laws was discussed with Administration witnesses. In response to my questions, Mr. Norman Karsh, Assistant Commissioner for Administration, advised me that the Department had asked the Bureau of the Budget for full entitlement of $476,909,000. However, the Bureau reduced the request to the $439,137,000, which is the figure in this conference report. Following is an excerpt of my discussion with Mr. Karsh:

APPROPRIATION REQUESTED OF THE BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

Mr. SHRIVER. How much did you ask the Budget Bureau for?

Mr. KARSH. The total amount we asked the Bureau of the Budget for this appropriation was $476,909,000.

Mr. SHRIVER. That would be your estimate of full entitlement?

Mr. KARSH. At this time that is right.

Mr. SHRIVER. And that is where the reduction was made by the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. KARSH. This was somewhat less than full entitlement. This was pretty much related to the continuing level we had last year.

Mr. SHRIVER. I am wondering why the Department did not ask for full entitlement.

Mr. CARDWELL. Mr. Shriver, as you will recall, in our testimony last year we indicated that following the Stanford study and other reviews of this program, and in light of the increased attention now being given to elementary and secondary education through other programs, we thought the time had come to slow this one down, and the Department's action follows the concept that we carried to this committee last year.

You will also recall the committee increased the request last year.

Mr. Shriver. I do.

Mr. Speaker, in the committee report of the House Appropriations Committee on this legislation, dated May 22, 1967, there is the following statement in regard to the reason for appropriating less than full entitlement:

> While there appears to be little doubt that the estimates in the budget are less than full entitlement, this is the only official request before the committee. When a budget amendment is received the committee will take prompt action on it.

As of now, there has been no such budget amendment from the administration. The administration is saying, in effect, that the local school districts are expected to pay for the burgeoning growth in the Federal Government and the resulting increase in educational expenses, for which this administration is largely responsible.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the gentleman from Pennsylvania how much time he has yielded to me?

Mr. FLOOD. We have 1 hour. We started at 1 o'clock and we have used up 33 minutes.

Mr. LAIRD. I would ask that the gentleman yield me 4 or 5 minutes.

If the gentleman would make 5 minutes available for me, I would appreciate it.

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman can have anything I have including the 5 minutes—and from an old hand that is quite a gesture.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman such time as he may require.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McClory].

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I concur with the remarks just made by my colleague from Kansas [Mr. Shriver] and, in my own behalf, I want to comment concerning that part of the conference committee report relating to "school assistance in federally affected areas." Mr. Speaker, as many Members of this body know, the schools in my 12th District of Illinois are adversely affected by the presence of large Federal installations, including the Naval Training Center at Great Lakes, the Veterans' Administration Hospital at Downey, the Navy Electronic Supply Office, in North Chicago, and the Army installation at Fort Sheridan, Ill.

The public schools have prepared their budgets in reliance upon continued Federal assistance under Public Law 874 for the maintenance and operation of schools which are economically affected by such Federal installations.

Mr. Speaker, I fear that the sum of $416,200,000 appropriated to local educational agencies under the conference committee report will be inadequate to permit the affected schools to carry out their educational programs as budgeted.

Mr. Speaker, the effect on the public schools of Lake County, Ill., will be quite substantial, resulting in a projected estimated loss of revenues for education totaling $200,000. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that a number of the schools affected serve communities with a large biracial population. Many of the students from these areas deserve the best possible educational advantages, and it seems both unfair and shortsighted to cut back on funds for such purposes and upon which the school authorities have relied for educational planning.

Mr. Speaker, it is possible that this deficiency may be cured by a supplemental appropriation early next year. In any event, I hope that the Appropriations Committees will reexamine the results of this year's decisions and will appropriate amounts in the ensuing year to more accurately reflect the impact of these Federal institutions on our affected public schools.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois, one of our hard-working managers [Mr. Michel].

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, while I could make a number of points with respect to some of my reservations about what has been done, I think I would be remiss if I did not at the very outset pay a most especial tribute to our chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood]. Those of us who served with his predecessor, Mr. Fogarty, were well aware of his attitude relative to this bill. The sky was the limit. We also had some idea of the philosophy of the gentleman from Pennsylvania in relation to many of these programs which he has espoused. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] and I have been on opposite sides of the fence on many of these programs, but I will tell you no one was more pleasantly surprised than I was to see the gentleman from Pennsylvania perform in the fashion in which he did in the conference.

You who are well aware of the position I have taken in opposition to many of these authorizations for spending programs should know that I am most proud of the manner and fashion in which our subcommittee chairman acquitted himself against some pretty big odds in the other body. We owe a debt of gratitude to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who is, himself, afflicted with one of the maladies for which millions are going for research and we seem to know so little about. Normally one would expect him, of all people, to "shoot the moon" so to speak in any request for additional money for cancer research at NIH, but he knows there is a limit to the extent that we can go and has tried his darndest to hold the House position.

As ever Member knows, these are very sensitive items and if we opened the door on them on the floor of this House, the sky would be the limit, with everyone trying to outdo everyone else in sponsoring amendments to increase the figure for cancer research, heart, arthritis, crippled children, mental retardation, and you name it.

So I say again that it was a real pleasure for us to see the posture our subcommittee chairman took in those deliberations.

Another point I should like to make is that when we had the debate on the appropriations continuing resolution last week, I made the point that it was quite obvious that the figures in the other body would be above ours on practically every appropriation bill considered during this session of the Congress, and that while we would do our best to hold to the House figure, chances were slim that we could force the Senate to abide by the House figures. As the chairman said, the art of compromise has to come into play in these conferences to get agreement and so I signed this report although having serious reservations on those items particularly which are above the budget figure.

Even though our total figure is above that passed by the House, the significant figure here is that it is still in total $148 million below the budget figure.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad I came today. I am most grateful to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Michel]—most grateful. I am only sorry that Mrs. Flood is not in the gallery to hear that accolade.

Mr. MICHEL. I plan to send her a copy of the Congressional Record.

Mr. FLOOD. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations, the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. Mahon], as much time as he will consume.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

THE ECONOMY BATTLE

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I find myself quite bruised from the economy battles of recent days. When I recall that this conference bill calls for $13.2 billion, and I look about me and see so few Members on the floor, I am inclined to ask, "Where are the economy warriors of yesterday?"

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have been in the vortex of this economy storm—and I think it is good, healthy, and fine that we sharply debate our fiscal situation. I have been in the very eye of the fiscal hurricane, and I know how the economy lash feels. I felt it when the minority leader pointed his long, lean, and muscular index finger at me a few moments ago and said in effect, "We demand those recisions be brought out of the Committee on Appropriations under your leadership"—under my chairmanship.

But has the economy wave gone? Has peace and calm returned? I find peace in the House. Indeed, I find myself propelled forward and upward by a spending tornado in the pending bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have before me the Record of yesterday, October 3, 1967, in which the conference report is printed.

I note that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], did not sign the report. I note that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Laird], did sign. I signed. I note that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Shriver] signed, but with reservations as to amendments Nos. 11 and 12.

I suspect the gentleman from Ohio did not sign because this conference report, my fellow economizers, in 13 instances is above the President's budget—and if I may say so, Mr. Speaker, I think even the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] would agree that the President's budget was high enough.

No, I am not speaking disparagingly of the members of the conference committee. I want to say that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] has done a remarkably fine job in handling the conference on behalf of the House. I want to say that, in my judgment, he was positively brilliant in his handling of the negotiations. I want to commend him for his tremendous effort and for his great success.

I also want to commend the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Laird] for his good work. And I want to commend the other conferees.

So I am disparaging no one. I am talking only about spending, which was the No. 1 subject here on the floor yesterday. And when the roll is called on this conference report, we will, of course, record for posterity the way we feel on this Labor-HEW conference total, which is a quarter of a billion dollars—$259,452,000—above last year's appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, I speak with deep feeling about this matter because I am the man who is supposed to be the leader in bringing in a bill rescinding appropriations, not increasing them. How can I bring in a resolution to rescind if I do not have the recision troops? I need to know, really, whether the economy drive is skindeep or bonedeep. That is the question now puzzling me.

Now, with respect to the able gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Shriver]—and he is one of the ablest and kindest Members of the House and a star for economy in the Committee on Appropriations—I would assume the reason he did not sign the conference report is that in one respect it was too low, because he reserved on amendments Nos. 11 and 12, which relate to the House position on Federal school aid in so-called impacted areas. The House conferees, under the gallant leadership of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood], refused to go along with $33.8 million above the House figure for so-called impacted areas school aid. So I assume the gentleman from Kansas did not sign because we did not put in the additional $33.8 million; I assume he reserved for that reason.

This makes me begin to wonder how far we will be able to move on resolutions and motions for rescission of appropriations. This disturbs me, because I have been importuned, as chairman of Appropriations, to lead the effort to bring in rescission of previous appropriations to achieve further economies as we approach the end of the session.

When on tomorrow I read the Record of today's proceedings, and today's vote, I dare say we shall be interested as to the proper conclusions to draw.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Texas yield?

Mr. MAHON. I should like to complete, if I may.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, there are 13 instances where this conference report is above the President's budget requests.

There are 29 instances where this conference report is above the House allowance.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, that it would have been much higher except for the efficient labors of the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the fine work of the gentleman from Wisconsin and each and every other Member of the House conference. I had not thought in advance that they could have done so well in lowering the higher figures of the other body.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, there are about 66 instances where this conference report is above last year's appropriation—$259 million above. Sixty-six instances where this bill is above last year.

The precise number of instances above last year depends on just how they are counted because of technical reasons. I use the number 66.

We are going forward and upward on a very broad front, I would say.

I would remark, in calmness, that this is escalation, not recision, my colleagues.

Where and when does the minority propose that we begin to cut to achieve the $5 billion nondefense expenditure cut, which, as we have pointed out repeatedly, will require appropriation cuts in the total sum of perhaps $10 billion? Maybe even more. The House has already cut, or is expecting to cut, $5 billion or more from the President's budget requests. But the proposal of yesterday is that we at least double that sum.

Does the minority propose that tomorrow we rescind the increases that we approve today? I hold my hands aloft and say, Mr. Speaker, what direction? What direction?

Mr. Speaker, I regret to have to make these remarks, but Members must not sit by and vote for increases and expect the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to rescind their actions.

I am not urging Members to vote against the conference report. I shall vote for the conference report. I believe it was the best that could be done under all the circumstances.

But I just want to point to the fact that the trend is upward. How can I, standing alone, brook this situation?

I yield to the able minority leader, who told me earlier in the day, almost in words to this effect, "Bring in those recisions."

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I am glad to yield to the minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I am glad the gentleman from Texas has been impressed by our desire to have proposed rescissions brought to the floor of the House after initial affirmative action by the Committee on Appropriations. I can assure him that I will be glad to support them.

Let me quickly review some of the observations and comments the gentleman has just made.

I came here convinced that the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the gentleman from Wisconsin, and others on the conference committee representing the House had done a fine job. I still think they have done an excellent job, because they have brought back to the House a conference report which is, according to figures supplied to me, $148 million less than what the President in his budget for fiscal 1968 recommended in new obligational authority.

Mr. MAHON. I decline to yield further at the moment.

I say it is true they have done a very good job under the circumstances, but nevertheless the conference report in 13 instances is above the budget in this bill; in 29 instances it is above the House allowance; and in some 66 items it is above the appropriation of last year. And several members of the minority signed the conference report containing those increases. Yet they have solidly insisted that we bring in rescissions to help bring about a $5 billion expenditure reduction—not appropriations or obligational authority, but expenditures—in nondefense spending areas with less than 9 months of the fiscal year remaining.

The conference report is $259 million, plus, above last year's total of appropriations. I must say that President Eisenhower's "Federal Budget in Brief" for 1958 was right when it said:

> Because obligational authority foreruns expenditures, it is necessary to exercise control over the amount of new authority voted for Government agencies in order to keep expenditures within receipts. If in any year the Government obligates itself to pay more money than it is receiving, it is courting future deficits.

So I just want to point out that it is neither receipts nor expenditures but appropriations which are the genesis of Government spending and deficits. Yes, President Eisenhower was right in the statement just quoted.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman again.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. As I said earlier, I came to the floor of the House believing that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Laird] and the other House conferees had done a good job.

Mr. MAHON. That is right. You have made that fact clear.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. But the gentleman from Texas has undermined my confidence in this conclusion. I am sorry to hear that, and I am now prepared, based on the speech just made by the gentleman from Texas, to vote to recommit the bill or to vote against the conference report. The reason is the persuasiveness of the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. I would regret that the minority leader would have had such a superficial knowledge of what is contained in the conference report that I could have persuaded him so quickly.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The gentleman from Texas knows I have respect for his views although we may differ on occasion. The conference report, as he knows, does not contain some of the important and helpful comparisons he has just set forth in his remarks. On the basis of the persuasiveness of the gentleman from Texas with these rather dramatic statistics, I am overwhelmed. He makes an excellent case for the recommittal of the conference report so we can reduce appropriations and expenditures.

Mr. MAHON. It overwhelms you. The gentleman from Michigan must be very easily persuaded. If the gentleman from Michigan 3 or 4 or 5 minutes ago was in favor of the conference report and has changed so quickly, this is a sudden about-face that is quite inexplicable—at least insofar as I am able to see.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. It seems to me that the gentleman from Texas has been on both sides of the issue. He signed the conference report and then condemns it. Just which side are you on?

Mr. MAHON. I do not condemn the report. I am going to vote for the conference report, because I think it is the best job that can be done at the moment. I am, however, telling the House that we are escalating spending and it is going to make it more and more difficult to lead the fight to rescind.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The gentleman from Texas, then, is joining the big spenders. I am really sorry that he appears to agree with them.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I am glad to yield to the able gentleman from Wisconsin, who has done a very good job.

I must say that the several conference meetings were somewhat reminiscent of the conferences at Panmunjom—in one way, that is. We sat and we sat and we sat. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] cajoled and begged and pleaded. He did the best job that could be done under the circumstances, I think, and the gentleman from Wisconsin certainly aided and abetted him in doing a magnificent job.

Mr. LAIRD. I would like to say to the gentleman from Texas that your speech here today has undercut the conference committee more than any speech I have ever heard on the floor of the House, because you have not stated one place where we did not do a good economy job for the House of Representatives on any specific item that was in disagreement between the House and the Senate.

And when the gentleman from Texas goes before the Committee on Rules and talks about recisions on the Department of HEW appropriation bill, the place that you talked about was in title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. That was not even in this conference. The House and Senate figures were the same. Now the gentleman is pleading that this report be recommitted by the speech he has made here today and is trying to make this into an economy issue.

I think the statement which has been made by the gentleman from Texas is misleading.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield further.

I simply wanted to read the facts and to lay them before the membership of this body. However, if I have made one error of any kind, I stand ready to be corrected at this time.

Of course, it is true that title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act money was not subject to the conference. I am saying that we ought to adopt the conference report. Further, I am saying that this bill was voted overwhelmingly when it passed the House of Representatives.

I just want to impress upon all of us the fact that we ought to take stock as to whither we are going. Today we are escalating upward very rapidly, to the tune of one-quarter billion dollars over last year's appropriations.

I see the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Shriver] here, my able and good friend, who was unhappy because we did not go to the extent of $33.8 million higher in one of the items in which the gentleman was interested. His is the side of the aisle that voted overwhelmingly, however, for economy a couple of days ago, if my memory serves me correctly.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SHRIVER. The gentleman from Texas is referring to impacted areas, sections 815 and 874; is that correct?

Mr. MAHON. That is right.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Texas will yield further, in the congressional district which it is my honor to represent in the State of Kansas—for the period of 17 years—certain installations of the Federal Government have been supported, in part, by our school funds and through the local tax structure of the area. I felt that it was taking a step backward when we did not discuss the facts with reference to this situation as they apply to Leavenworth and other areas as well as many other school districts that are affected by the impact of Federal activity in those areas.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Boggs). The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield one-half additional minute to the chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Mahon].

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman from Kansas is correct. Ninety percent of the entitlement for impacted areas was in the House version of the bill, and we brought it back that way. However, the gentleman from Kansas wanted to achieve economy, but not at the expense of his own district. But I must say that most all of us are a lot alike in that respect. There was great concern in most of our districts, including my own, about the impacted aid item.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished ranking minority member of the full Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

Mr. BOW. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] for yielding to me this time.

Mr. Speaker, it is easily noted that I did not sign this conference report. I want to say, before I tell you why I did not sign it, that the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania performed a magnificent job on the part of the House of Representatives at this conference. I further want to say that I have never seen a conference where someone who did not agree with everything contained therein and under discussion in the conference, had to fight so hard and who in the ultimate performed such a valiant job. I say this also with respect to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Laird] who also has made a great contribution in the action of the conference on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, there are some reasons here as to why I did not sign the conference report. I did not sign the conference report because there are instances where we went above the budget for example, to the extent of $20,661,000; whereas, if we had not gone above the budget on certain items, the situation would have been different and, for that reason, I did not sign the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the statement which has just been made by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, I shall offer a motion to recommit this conference report.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Machen].

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the Members of the House that it distressed me a great deal when reference was made to the fact that the other body was the "big spender." Yet, Mr. Speaker, when the House conferees insisted upon its 50-mile rider forcing the Food and Drug Administration to build a laboratory in Wisconsin instead of Beltsville, Md., 5 miles from here, they raised the cost $5.4 million. The members of the conference could have saved the taxpayers $5.4 million had they accepted the language of the bill as it was passed by the other body.

From what I read, with the 50-mile rider, this FDA laboratory No. 2 is going to be built in Wisconsin according to the amendment put on by the ranking minority leader of this subcommittee, which will cost the taxpayers an estimated $20,000 a year in transportation costs back and forth, and $338,000 in relocation expenses, according to the FDA. I guess the $5.4 million extra to build in Wisconsin does not mean a whole lot to the so-called economists across the aisle when we are talking in terms of $100 million, not to mention lack of efficiency because this lab must be adjacent to existing facilities. I am certainly amazed, after hearing all of the economy talk last week, particularly from the ranking minority member of the subcommittee—of course, an uneconomical $5.4 million extra is going out there to his State—that the Republicans can be so two-faced and hypocritical.

I cannot understand why you all would not agree to the Senate amendment to strike that 50-mile rider, especially in light of the FDA's own cost analysis for the Appropriations Committee, which I insert now:

COMPARATIVE COST ANALYSIS

[Dollars in thousands]

	All facilities at Beltsville	Pharmacology at Beltsville plus				
		1 combined facility in—			1 facility in Southeast plus 1 facility in—	
		Southeast	Midwest	Northwest	Midwest	Northwest
Complete, Beltsville	$845	$3,210	$3,210	$3,210	$3,210	$3,210
Laboratory construction and planning	16,665	12,000	17,500	18,150	16,000	16,500
Land acquisition	----------	1,200	1,700	1,800	1,600	1,600
Moving and related	----------	400	500	900	400	700
Total	17,510	16,810	22,910	24,060	22,210	22,010
Difference (plus or minus)	----------	−700	+5,400	+6,550	+3,700	+4,500

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I now reserve half a minute for myself, I am not sure why, but right now I yield everything but that half a minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin. I cannot imagine what he has got to say.

Mr. LAIRD. First I would like to respond to the statement made by the gentleman from Maryland. His facts and figures are incorrect, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the construction costs for the food and drug laboratory. His statement that those costs would be $5.1 million more than if it were built at Beltsville, Md. is incorrect. The cost of building the laboratory at the site picked by the Food and Drug Administration—which is not in my district—is $400,000 less than the construction costs would be at Beltsville, Md.

But let us get back to this conference report. I support this conference report because it is the best job of compromise that could be accomplished. It does not escalate spending. By returning this conference report to the conference again we could come back here with separate votes on many of these items. And you gentlemen on the floor of this House will be voting separately on aid to the impacted areas, on aid to the mental retardation program area, on aid to the mental health centers, on aid to the handicapped and many other programs. If you want to take that route that is all right with me. But the kind of speech that was made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] undercutting this conference committee has invited people to recommit this report to the conference committee for their further study and consideration. I am sure that after the Mahon speech a majority of the Members will recommit this conference report.

I sat on the conference committee for 7 weeks and we worked hard to maintain the position of the House. The gentleman from Texas has misled us here today by accusing us in this report of escalating spending.

Mr. Speaker, the motion to recommit of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] instructs the conferees to reduce this bill by $20 million. That is what we are talking about, a reduction of $20 million out of a $13.27 billion appropriation.

Mr. Speaker, that $20 million reduction is made up of the following items: Educational improvement for the handicapped, $2 million; Gallaudet College for the deaf, $186 thousand; cancer research, $2.7 million; heart research, $4.5 million; dental research, $1.3 million; arthritis and metabolic diseases, $1 million; research for neurological diseases and blindness, $1 million; research funds for infectious diseases and allergies, $2 million; research in the general medical sciences, $2 million; child health and human development research, $2 million; general research at NIH, $1.7 million; and the John E. Fogarty International Center for Health research, $225,000.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I have less than 1 minute, and I will move the previous question, but let me say this: The only items in this conference report that are over the budget are in the National Institutes of Health, educational assistance for the handicapped, and Gallaudet College. Let us not get off the track on any motion to recommit this bill for health, education, and welfare. This is not the battleground. Let us live to fight another day, but not on this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOGGS). Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the conference report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. Bow moves to recommit the conference report on H.R. 10196 to the committee on conference with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to insist upon its disagreement to Senate amendments which exceed the budget request therefor.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOGGS). The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 226, nays 174, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 296]

YEAS—226

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, Ala.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ayres
Baring
Bates
Battin
Belcher
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bevill
Biester
Blackburn
Blanton
Bow
Bray
Brinkley
Brock
Brotzman
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burleson
Burton, Utah
Bush
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cahill
Carter
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Corbett
Cowger
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtis
Davis, Wis.
Dellenback
Denney
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Duncan
Dwyer
Edwards, Ala.
Erlenborn
Eshleman
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Gardner
Gathings
Giaimo
Goodell
Goodling
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Hammerschmidt
Hansen, Idaho
Hardy
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey
Hébert
Henderson
Herlong
Hosmer
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Keith
King, N.Y.
Kleppe
Kornegay
Kuykendall
Kyl
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, La.
Lukens
McClory
McClure
McCulloch
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
McMillan
MacGregor
Machen
Marsh
Martin
Mathias, Calif.
May
Mayne
Meskill
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Minshall
Mize
Monagan
Montgomery
Morris, N. Mex.
Morton
Mosher
Myers
Nelsen
Nichols
O'Neal, Ga.
Ottinger
Passman
Pelly
Pettis
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pollock
Pool
Price, Tex.
Pryor
Pucinski
Quie
Quillen
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rivers
Roberts
Robison
Rogers, Fla.
Roth
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
Ruppe
Satterfield
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherle
Schneebeli
Schwengel
Scott
Selden
Sikes
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Okla.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Stanton
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stratton
Stuckey
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, Ga.
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Vander Jagt
Waggonner
Walker
Wampler
Watson
Watts
Whalley
White
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams, Miss.
Williams, Pa.
Wilson, Bob
Winn
Wyatt
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—174

Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Ashley
Aspinall
Barrett
Bell
Bingham
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Brademas
Brasco
Brooks
Burke, Mass.
Burton, Calif.
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Carey
Casey
Celler
Conte
Conyers
Corman
Culver
Daddario
Daniels
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dingell
Dulski
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Eilberg
Esch
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Flood
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Friedel
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Gude
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Wash.
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Helstoski
Hicks
Holifield
Horton
Hull
Hungate
Irwin
Jacobs
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kee
Kelly
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kupferman
Kyros
Laird
Leggett
Long, Md.
McCarthy
McFall
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Mathias, Md.
Matsunaga
Meeds
Michel

Miller, Calif.
Minish
Mink
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morse, Mass.
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Pickle
Pike
Price, Ill.
Purcell
Railsback
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Riegle
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ryan
St Germain
St. Onge
Scheuer
Schweiker
Shipley
Shriver
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Tunney
Udall
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Waldie
Whalen
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Yates
Young
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—32

Ashmore
Bolton
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Clark
Cohelan
Davis, Ga.
Dent
Diggs
Donohue
Dow
Edwards, La.
Everett
Flynt
Fountain
Gettys
Holland
Howard
Kluczynski
Landrum
Macdonald, Mass.
O'Konski
O'Neill, Mass.
Philbin
Rarick
Rooney, Pa.
Sandman
Tiernan
Ullman
Utt
Watkins
Willis

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Fountain, for, with Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts, against.

Mr. Utt for, with Mr. Howard against.

Mr. Watkins for, with Mr. Dent against.

Mr. Sandman for, with Mr. Philbin against.

Mr. Rarick for, with Mr. Donohue against.

Mr. Ashmore for, with Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Tiernan with Mrs. Bolton.

Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Broomfield.

Mr. Brown of California with Mr. O'Konski.

Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Flynt.

Mr. Gettys with Mr. Edwards of Louisiana.

Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Clark.

Mr. Everett with Mr. Cohelan.

Mr. Dow with Mr. Diggs.

Mr. Willis with Mr. Ullman.

Mr. Landrum with Mr. Holland.

Mr. RAILSBACK changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 3 days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report on H.R. 10196.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE CERTAIN PRIVILEGED REPORTS

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FALSE REPRESENTATIONS BY MAIL

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1411) to amend title 39, United States Code, with respect to the use of the mails to obtain money or property under false representations, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 1411, with Mr. STEED in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule (H. Res. 932), the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. NIX] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. NIX].

Mr. NIX. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1411 has been worked out carefully and brought to the floor for action in the belief that its enactment into law will serve the public interest in a most critical field.

A similar bill by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] was unanimously passed by the House of Representatives in the 89th Congress, but was not acted upon by the other body.

H.R. 1411 has been recommended by the Post Office Department and the National Association of Real Estate Boards, representing 90 percent of the real estate business in the United States. This bill is favored because it is designed to reduce and, hopefully, to eliminate the unprecedented number of fraudulent land sales as well as numerous other fraudulent transactions presently carried on through the use of the U.S. mail.

Mr. Chairman, in this connection it is informative to note that the Postmaster General recently stated that complaints by the public of alleged mail fraud activities are currently running ahead of the 1966 fiscal year record of 130,457. Mr. O'Brien continued by saying that the swindler uses the sealed envelope as a cloak for his confidence games and each year costs the public hundreds of millions of dollars; in fact, it has been conclusively established that crooked real estate schemes alone have resulted in losses to the public of $50 million during the last 5 years in cases involving 50 criminal convictions. In the last 6 years, 300,000 persons have been left without insurance and $600 million in unpaid claims in fraudulent insurance mail frauds.

Mr. Chairman, the imaginative fertility of these human leeches who use the U.S. mail to prey upon the unsuspecting and credulous public cover a wide variety of criminal schemes. Most of us know something about the glowing descriptions of prize lots high and dry in Florida, the land of perpetual sunshine, only the lots if found at all were in the swamp and covered by 6 feet of water. Some of us know about the drug phenobarbital advertised and sold through the U.S. mail to the pitiful sufferers of epilepsy as a new wonder drug, and found to be not only ineffective, but habit forming.

Consider the countless number of our older citizens, lonely and depressed, who are bombarded through the mail by quacks who guarantee instant sex rejuvenation.

There are many other examples of mail fraud quackery that could be mentioned here, but in the interest of brevity, I will record only one more—truly a tragic example of mail fraud—it was called a "Voluptuizer." It was advertised as capable of transforming a flat-chested girl into a girl with a lovely bosom, free from fears of inferiority. This gadget consisted of a plastic cup, a rubber tube, and a rubber bulb to pump air into the chest; needless to say the device did not work, yet the promoters pocketed an estimated $1 million.

Mr. Chairman, under present law the Postmaster General can only issue a mail stop order when he finds that the crook is conducting a scheme or device for obtaining money or property through the mail by means of "false and fraudulent pretenses, representations, or promises."

The U.S. Supreme Court in the case of *Reilly* v. *Pincus* (338 U.S. 269) has held that the use of the word fraudulent in the existing statue (39 U.S.C. 4005) compels the Postmaster General to find proof of intent to deceive before he may administratively issue a mail stop order.

This requirement places an onerous burden on the Postmaster General, and, thereby, provides the loophole through which the crook walks free. In these circumstances the Postmaster General often is powerless to act against the promoter until after indictment, trial, and conviction—while the dishonest promoter continues to cheat the public in the interim.

H.R. 1411 makes one substantive change—it deletes from subsection (a) of section 4005 the words "false and fraudulent pretenses, representations or promises."

It substitutes two words—false representations. When this change is made the Postmaster General may administratively issue a mail stop order without proof of—intent to deceive—as required under the ruling by the U.S. Supreme Court in *Reilly* v. *Pincus* (338 U.S. 269).

The public will be protected.

The promoter will remain protected under the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 551), he may appeal any ruling against him to the U.S. District Court (28 U.S.C. 1339), and then to the U.S. Supreme Court.

The promoter may show that the false representations is no longer a part of his promotion, and resume business.

The promoter or his representative will be present at the opening and examination of any mail claimed to be a promotion based on false representation.

There is ample precedent for this change in the law:

First. The Food and Drug and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 33).

Second. The Securities and Exchange Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 77 (a) and following).

Third. The Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 52a), all of which empower Government agencies to act in false representation cases without proof of intent.

Mr. Chairman, the public need is great—time is short if the Congress is to prevent the loss of hundreds of millions of dollars by the public.

I urge the passage of H.R. 1411.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NIX. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, first, I compliment the gentleman on the statement he has made, which I think explains the effect of this.

Second, there is one point I would like to make. If I understand the proposition, it is that, in effect, a change would be made from a fraudulent misrepresentation, that is one that is known consciously by the sender to be fraudulent, to one that is, in fact, fraudulent but may not so be known by the sender in fact to be fraudulent.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the change that is suggested is that we delete "fraudulent," and that is done for the reason that the word "fraudulent" has been construed by the courts to require proof of specific intent. This is an administrative procedure. This does not change the basic law. This is the procedure utilized by the Postmaster General in an effort to aid the public, to stop the deception. It is not a method of prosecution by the Postmaster General.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, in other words, this would be confined to the stop order and would not involve any criminal prosecution?

Mr. NIX. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, he is absolutely correct.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NIX. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the committee, I would like to join in complimenting the gentleman in the well for his presentation. I know the sincerity with which he supports this legislation.

As one of the members of the committee who wrote dissenting views on this matter, I would like to ask the gentleman in the well if it is not true that in addition to the power of the Postmaster General to stop mail upon a determination by him made administratively and prior to any formal legal proceedings, he not only stops the mail being received by the person whom he believes to be advertising in the manner prescribed by this statute, but orders that all mail received by the post office where he is located, addressed to him, may be returned to the sender with a stamped indication on it that the Post Office Department has found it to be false and misleading?

Second, he directs that the several postmasters cannot cash any postal money order that is made out to the businessman who has put out the advertisement.

All these consequences would begin to occur prior to any determination of guilt or innocence of the advertiser either by a formal administrative proceeding or by action of a court of law.

Mr. NIX. The gentleman is correct to some extent. That authority is vested in the Postmaster General.

However, the promoter is not without remedy. As I have indicated before, he has the right to be present during the examination. He has the right to appeal from the ruling of the Postmaster General to the U.S. district court.

I say to the gentleman that in advocating the change I have enunciated here, what I seek to do and what the committee sought to do, was to balance the equities, those of the general public against those of a dishonest promoter. We were firm in our conviction that in balancing those equities we certainly were serving the ends of justice.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. I agree wholeheartedly with what the gentleman just said, but I do not believe we ever balance the equities in our zeal to protect some member of or the general public when we deprive businessmen of due process of law.

In my humble opinion, as a lawyer with some experience in administrative law, we clearly would do something here that has been struck down numerous times in the States across this country when attempted by other levels of government. In my opinion, this legislation will be subject to an attack on a constitutional basis.

More importantly, what we are here doing is conferring on the Postmaster General the authority to be the trier of fact and law, who is not held accountable by the administrative code at the point at which he can, in effect, stop a businessman from a whole series of transactions.

The appeal is available, but by the time the appeal occurs the damage will have been done.

If the court finds the businessman was, in fact, innocent of any fraud or intent to deceive the public there is no way to make him whole. He cannot sue the Postmaster General for making a mistake, and he has not had a hearing in advance of the action by the Postmaster General. After this action is taken, when the gentleman in the well points out that the recipient is privileged to be present, that is not a hearing. He is only privileged to be present at the time the mail is marked and returned. There is no hearing and no way for him to present any evidence of his good faith.

Mr. NIX. May I suggest to the gentleman, he has a right at that point to initiate proceedings in the U.S. district court.

Let me say further that I would be the last person ever to consent to any erosion of constitutional rights. When the gentleman raises the question of constitutionality, I suggest to him that the same question has been raised with respect to comparable sections of law, and the Supreme Court has repeatedly and uniformly decreed that those provisions of law were constitutional. I believe the gentleman need not have any misgivings on that point.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NIX. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SCOTT. I am concerned about the Postmaster General issuing a stop order, at his discretion finding there is false representation, and then later, when the customer gets in court, the court finding contrary to the determination of the Postmaster General.

What provision is there in this law to indemnify the mailer from damages due to the action of the Postmaster General?

Mr. NIX. There is no more provision in this law to indemnify the person you have mentioned than there is to indemnify a person who is arrested in criminal proceedings and found not guilty by a jury. He has been exonerated. That is the indemnification here.

Mr. SCOTT. If the gentleman will yield further, Mr. Chairman, in that criminal case that the gentleman speaks of a court has made the determination rather than an administrative agency. There is that difference.

Mr. NIX. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NIX. I will be happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CAHILL. I share the gentleman's concern about the number of companies that are fraudulently operating in our society these days. I was interested in reading in the report on page 5 this statement:

> As a result, some short-lived and fraudulent insurance firms have sprung up, catering to the high-risk market. One source says that 73 companies have folded in this field in the last 6 years, leaving 300,000 persons without insurance and $600 million in unpaid claims.

I am sure, as the gentleman knows, along with several other Members of the House, I have been attempting to bring to the attention of the House the great need for some congressional survey in relation to insurance companies. I wonder if the gentleman can tell me whether the Post Office Department or the gentleman's committee have made any investigation for the purpose of determining how these 73 companies in the first instance were authorized to do business in the various States in which they were and, second, whether the Post Office Department or the gentleman's committee have brought to the attention of the respective commissioners of the individual States the shortcomings of these companies.

Mr. NIX. If the gentleman will yield, as the gentleman knows, the authorization to do business in the individual States would not be a matter to come before the committee. However, I can assure the gentleman that the subcommittee is contemplating hearings in regard to the relationship of the Postmaster General of the United States to the operation of the economy.

Mr. CAHILL. I thank the gentleman for the excellence of his statement.

Mr. NIX. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make one final statement that clearly points up one of the classic examples. There is a company, the Lake Mead Land & Water Co. In October 1963 an indictment was returned against this company. There was a conviction obtained in June of 1965, but in the interim payments continued to flow to the promoters during the 20-month period before conviction, that is, between indictment and conviction. Three thousand persons lost an estimated $100 million before these dishonest promoters were put in jail.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NIX. I yield to the distinguished gentleman, a member of the committee.

Mr. OLSEN. I thank the gentleman, the chairman of our Subcommittee on Postal Operations. I want to congratulate him on this legislation. I very strongly support this bill. I think it is a real step forward and a fair and reasonable step forward concerning these kinds of fraud. It is a much needed protection for the general public.

Every year the American public loses millions of its hard-earned dollars to swindlers and thieves who prey on their sickness, on their desire for retirement in a warm climate, and their need for the wonderful goods and services that are promised them in the mail. This is a matter that has reached the proportions of the hundred millions. For example, from 1962 until the present, $600 million in unpaid insurance claims are outstanding against mail order insurance companies. There have been some criminal convictions in mail fraud cases. Very few. But these few cases have involved $50 million in the last 5 years, and the percentage of convictions is very small in comparison to the number of investigations.

The reason for this is that the courts have insisted that, as the present law is worded, the Post Office Department prove intent to defraud on the part of promoters when they use false representations in their advertising. This is all right in a criminal case because the issue is a man's freedom and punishment. But where the only question is whether, after lengthy proceedings, a mail stop order requiring the return of money to mail patrons is involved, the only proof should be that of misrepresentation. It does not make any difference when our objective is public protection, whether a medical promoter intended to hoodwink people with his gadget or not. If the issue is protection of the public, all we have to know is whether the product is dangerous to health, and whether it has been represented to the public as a cure.

Before a mail stop order can be issued under this bill, the promoter will receive the same protection he receives now. That is, there will be proceedings under the Administrative Procedure Act, which provide notice and the right to present a case by the promoter. If the order is issued against a promoter, he may appeal through the U.S. district court to the U.S. Supreme Court.

The important point here is that the public needs, and has the right to ask for, protection from swindlers by the U.S. mail service. Who else, what other agency can or will provide this protection? If you admit that the public should receive protection from crooks, you must say what alternative you believe to be the correct one.

This bill changes one word—"fraudulent"—to two words—"false representations." It changes proceedings from one which examines the conscience of promoters to one which establishes the facts as to the truth or falsity of mail promotions. I believe that the American people have the right to rely on the integrity of the mail system. If this bill is not a good one, then none of the protections of the mail system by the Post Office Department is any good, and the services provided now by the Postal Inspection Service of the Post Office, one of the finest police organizations in the country according to Reader's Digest, should be abolished.

I ask for your support of H.R. 1411.

Mr. NIX. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NIX. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1411. It is a good bill. I urge all Members of the House to support it.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1411, which bill provides that the U.S. Government in the future can protect the innocent from crooked mail schemes by obtaining a mail stop order which will direct that mail be returned to mail patrons who have relied on the false representations of the mailer.

There is a great deal at stake in this bill. From 1962 until the present there were $600 million worth of unpaid insurance claims outstanding in this country, many of them owed by fly-by-night insurance companies who did their advertising through the mails.

Crooked junk mail real estate schemes that seek out the elderly through the purchasing and trading of mailing lists, and result in the loss of a lifetime of savings for many old people who plan to retire to a cottage in the country during their declining years, must be ended. People have been bilked out of millions. The Lake Mead Co., which operated in Arizona, sold desert property as developed land when, in fact, it could not be watered, maintained, or developed. That scheme cost the general public over a million dollars in savings. The fact that unscrupulous promoters fix their sights on the elderly should move us to enact legislation such as this bill before us today.

H.R. 1411 simply takes the position that in order to protect the public the Post Office Department, after proper hearings, should be allowed to issue a mail stop order which will prevent money falling into the hands of crooked promoters by seeing to it that the mail is returned, after it is proven the mailer has used false representations.

I urge the adoption of this bill.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the chairman of the Postal Operations Subcommittee of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. NIX].

Mr. Chairman, I have had the privilege and pleasure of serving as the ranking minority member on that subcommittee for many years. Further, I wish to compliment the author of the bill, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

In my opinion this legislation is certainly long overdue.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that we should promptly enact this legislation and pass this bill in substantially the same form as it was passed during the last session of the Congress but was not acted upon by the other body.

I know of no real objection to this bill, other than the procedural questions that were asked earlier.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1411 will establish a new burden of proof in mail stop order cases involving shady promotions. A mail stop order is an order by the Postmaster General to a local postmaster requiring him to intercept mail to a particular promoter. The intercepted mail will, according to H.R. 1411, be opened in the presence of a representative of the promoter. Only mail in response to a promotion based on false representations will be returned to the sender. This bill substitutes the term "false representations" for language in 39 United States Code 4005 "by means of false or fraudulent pretenses." This change is necessary because the use of the word fraudulent, according to the courts, implies that a criminal standard of proof is necessary for a conviction. This means that intent to defraud must be proved. It is impossible to prove whether or not a "quack doctor" intended to harm his customers with some dangerous contraption or patent medicine. In fact, the standard of fraudulence is so severe that criminal charges may as well be brought and an unscrupulous promoter convicted before the mail stop order remedy is applied. It took 2 years for the case against the Lake Mead Land and Water Co. in Arizona to be completed. In the meantime, payments continued to pour into the company and the remedy of the mail stop order which was intended to protect the public could not be used. The total loss to the public through the operations of that company came to over a million dollars.

The new standard of false representation protects the public without depriving promoters of any legal rights. They are still entitled to demand the application of the Administrative Procedure Act. They are still entitled to appeal to a U.S. district court and the U.S. Supreme Court if necessary. The Postmaster General will have to establish that false representations have been used in the mail advertising of the promotion. Since the promoter does not suffer criminal penalties under this statute he should not be in a position of being able to frustrate protection of the public by insisting that the Postmaster General prove what his intent was.

This is a serious problem. In a 5-year period from 1962 to 1967, there were $600 million in unpaid insurance claims by companies who obtained their customers by means of mail advertising. Premiums were collected and little or nothing was paid out to the insured.

There have been convictions of promoters, 49 out of an investigation of 481. These 49 promoters, from 1962 to the present, had bilked the public out of $50 million. Of the remaining 440 cases, the defect in proof was chiefly the inability of proving the intention of the promoter when he contacted the retired, the elderly, and the sick through the mail, deprived them of their life savings on the basis of false representations which the promoter or the quack may have believed to be true. Intentional or not, people from every State have been victimized by false claims through the mail. The wonderful State of Nebraska, part of which I represent, is no exception.

On April 8 of last year three promoters were sentenced to a total of 9½ years in a Federal penitentiary at Topeka, Kans., after operating a $1 million swindle in the sale of "fancy Hereford beef calves." Blocks of animals were ordered by purchasers, including seven from the State of Nebraska, only to find that the animals were totally inferior, had not been inoculated or vaccinated against disease, and were delivered at night when it was impossible for the purchasers to examine the stock. It is probable that mail to these promoters could have been halted some time before the criminal case terminated in court had it not been necessary to prove fraudulent intent under the civil statute.

In another case a number of Nebraskans and citizens from all over the country were paying weekly "donations" to a man named Dr. Abn Donahji, a so-called yogi and clairvoyant healer. Dr. Donahji, who turned out to be plain Don Wilson, of Des Moines, Iowa, used the mail to tell people he could cure cancer, multiple sclerosis, and heart disease by "setting up vibrations" with copper bracelets with health-giving properties. The prices ranged from $18 to $76 a bracelet. The wholesale price of the bracelets was 37½ cents each. He was convicted and sent to jail, but this bill, H.R. 1411, probably could have stopped him from hauling in $400,000 from desperate sick people.

The public must be protected. All this bill does is delay the receipt of money by a promoter until the matter of false representations can be cleaned up. This is not a wholly different step. The Federal Trade Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission take action in false representation cases, and if the mail is to be cleaned up this bill must be passed.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Derwinski].

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, while I have reservations about this legislation, H.R. 1411, and did not favor it in committee, I want, nevertheless, to compliment the sponsor of this bill, my colleague from Arizona, for his genuine effort to curb the practices of unscrupulous promoters who use the U.S. mails to bilk the public.

I appreciate the objective of this legislation and agree that the unwilling partnership between the U.S. postal service and the promoter of worthless wares is deserving of congressional attention and investigation.

Therefore, my disagreement with my friend from Arizona goes only to the scope of the bill and the powers which it would confer on the Postmaster General. It is my own opinion, based on testimony presented, that the Postmaster General is not without the tools or unable to track down and prosecute mail fraud under the current provisions of law.

As a case in point, I include at the close of my remarks the Post Office Department general press release No. 139, which details the recent conviction of Southern Classified Directory Co., of Atlanta, Ga. Through the diligent efforts of the Post Office Department, two promoters of this company were convicted on eight counts of fraud in a jury trial before the U.S. district court in Atlanta.

The Post Office Department vigorously supports H.R. 1411 because, in their words:

> In 1949 the U.S. Supreme Court in Reilly v. Pinkus, as a collateral finding in a medical postal fraud case, construed the phrase "false or fraudulent" as meaning "false and fraudulent," and since that decision we have been shackled with the burden of establishing the intent to deceive.

In another hearing, before our Subcommittee on Postal Operations, the General Counsel of the Post Office Department, Mr. Timothy May, said:

> I do not think, however, there is any answer in trying to change the Supreme Court's definition of obscenity. The Supreme Court has stated it, what it is, and they are not going to let it be legislatively changed.

It is curious to me that the Department comes to Congress seeking legislative remedy to circumvent the Supreme Court's interpretation of "false or fraudulent" representations, but at the same time declines to propose a similar challenge in the case of obscenity in the mails.

I would hope that the Department would exert the same zeal toward protecting young minds from promoters of pornography.

The release, above mentioned, follows:

> Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien said today that the conviction of Southern Classified Directory Co. of Atlanta, Ga., was an "important break in our drive to protect businessmen from solicitations sent through the mails by fraudulent business directory companies."
>
> Found guilty on Sept. 22 of defrauding businessmen and others listed in the Yellow Pages of telephone directories were Southern Directory's two promoters, William O. Hudgens, 40, and Mrs. Marion E. Bishop, 55, both of Azusa, Calif. They were convicted on eight counts in a jury trial before U.S. District Judge Newell Edenfield in Atlanta, Ga.
>
> Mr. O'Brien said that Southern Classified Directory's operation is similar to those conducted by a number of other so-called directory companies operating in the United States. Postal Inspectors have 34 such companies under investigation, with the findings in four of these cases already in the hands of U.S. Attorneys.
>
> Postal Inspectors found that Southern Directory, whose local "office" consisted only of a post office box in Atlanta, mailed approximately 1 million solicitations in 1964, its first year of operation, to businesses, large and small, hospitals, churches, doctors, attorneys and other groups listed in the Yellow Pages of telephone directories. While the company actually printed a directory, only 3,971 copies were distributed over the entire Southeast, one copy being sent to each businessman paying $45 for a listing. The Directory had little or no advertising value, according to the indictment upon which they were tried.
>
> "In the past it has been difficult to convict such promoters," the Chief of the Postal Inspection Service, H. B. Montague said, "partly because the misrepresentations are made by inference and innuendo."
>
> In Atlanta, however, the jury found the promoters guilty of fraudulently claiming:
>
> That the Southern Directory Co. operated a directory company at Atlanta.
>
> That Southern Directory Co. would get results for advertisers by distributing its directory to a sufficient number of individuals and businesses.
>
> That Southern Classified Directory offered subscribers greater advantages than if they advertised in many separate directories.
>
> On the basis of the indictment the promoters were also found guilty of sending solicitations to firms listed in the Yellow Pages, copying accurately the listing in the classified sections as to make it appear that the mailing was from the telephone company.
>
> Post Office Department investigations indicate that the fraudulent directory companies generally charge fees ranging from $35 to $85 per listing. They appear to flourish if they can snare only a few listings per 1,000 solicitations.
>
> Mr. Montague said "the overworked or careless businessman is usually tricked into thinking such an invoice must be paid. In a series of 400 interviews with business and professional men an Inspector found that in every instance payment had been made in the belief that it was for listings previously ordered in Yellow Pages or similar legitimate directories."
>
> Assistant U.S. Attorney Robert L. Smith handled the prosecution at Atlanta.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona [Mr. Udall].

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, this bill is a long-overdue step in my judgment to protect the American consumer and particularly to protect the older people of this country.

Mr. Chairman, the situation which brought about my sponsorship of this bill occurred primarily in the Southwest, to extend protection to these people along this line, as the result of certain operations in an area where unscrupulous real estate promoters were publishing through mass advertisements, advertisement directed largely at the big cities in the East, promoting the sale of this great desert subdivision, where for $10 down and $10 whenever you can catch me, this supposedly desirable land could be purchased. In other words, the advertisements portrayed the fact that one could buy a beautiful homesite in this area—and many pictures were printed carrying photographs of numerous trees, wildlife such as deer being abundant, and other enticing pictures designed to lure purchasers of property such as this.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion this represents serious and misleading facts as contained in such advertisements. For instance, the real estate brokers in our area felt that their profession had been damaged as a result of this type of advertising and by this type of solicitation.

Further, Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to say that the national organization of real estate people of this country support this bill. The National Association of Real Estate Boards has endorsed this bill. I feel it represents sound legislation and is directed toward a problem that deserves and will extend some protection to consumers in a wide number of fields, in addition to the field of real estate.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I am delighted to yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. William D. Ford].

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Arizona for his concern over the subject matter of this legislation and to again reiterate the fact that I agree with all of the objectives sought in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I only wish to go back to an admonition which I received while in Sunday school, a lesson which I learned at a very early age in life, "The end seldom justifies whatever the means."

Mr. UDALL. Certainly not.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Now, with regard to the Postmaster General's determination that a matter does contain false representation, is it the understanding of the author of this bill that that determination would only be made after an administrative hearing at which time there would be adequate notice and opportunity to be heard and present evidence by all parties concerned?

Mr. UDALL. I want to make the legislative intent clear, at least, that of the author, and I thank the gentleman, who is a noted and able constitutional lawyer, and our colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. Waldie], and others who raised the fundamental question of due process. It is certainly my intention that the language of the bill is, in replying to the point the gentleman has raised, that it should be very clear that no stop order is to be made, no determination by the Postmaster General is to be made until there is this administrative hearing so that the person against whom the order would be made would have opportunity to appear at that administrative hearing before that stop order went into effect. I want to make that very clear.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I trust that this bill will be adopted by the House.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. Olsen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, every year the American public loses millions of its hard-earned dollars to swindlers and thieves who prey on their sickness, on their desire for retirement in a warm climate, and their need for the wonderful goods and services that are promised them in the mail. This is a matter that has reached the proportions of the hundred millions. For example, from 1962 until the present $600 million in unpaid insurance claims are outstanding against mail-order insurance companies. There have been some criminal convictions in mail fraud cases. Very few. But these few cases have involved $50 million in the last 5 years and the percentage of convictions is very small in comparison to the number of investigations.

The reason for this is that the courts have insisted that, as the present law is worded, the Post Office Department prove intent to defraud on the part of promoters when they use false representations in their advertising. This is all right in a criminal case because the issue is a man's freedom and punishment. But where the only question is whether, after lengthy proceedings, a mail stop order requiring the return of money to mail patrons is involved, the only proof should be that of misrepresentation.

It does not make any difference when our objective is public protection, whether a medical promoter intended to hoodwink people with his gadget or not. If the issue is protection of the public all we have to know is whether the product is dangerous to health, and whether it has been represented to the public as a cure.

Before a mail stop order can be issued under this bill, the promoter will receive the same protection he receives now; that is, there will be proceedings under the Administrative Procedure Act, which provide notice and the right to present a case by the promoter. If the order is issued against a promoter, he may appeal through the U.S. district court to the U.S. Supreme Court.

The important point here is that the public needs and has the right to ask for protection from swindlers by the U.S. mail service. Who else, what other agency can or will provide this protection? If you admit that the public should receive protection from crooks, you must say what alternative you believe to be the correct one.

This bill changes one word—"fraudulent"—to two words "false representations." It changes proceedings from one which examines the conscience of promoters to one which establishes the facts as to the truth or falsity of mail promotions. I believe that the American people have the right to rely on the integrity of the mail system. If this bill is not a good one, then none of the protections of the mail system by the Post Office Department is any good, and the services provided now by the postal inspection service of the Post Office, one of the finest police organizations in the country according to Reader's Digest, should be abolished.

I ask for your support of H.R. 1411.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Fulton] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I would like to rise in support of this legislation which is much needed and long overdue. It was my pleasure to join in cosponsorship of the bill and it is my hope the House will pass it with an overwhelming vote of approval.

The bill will assist the Post Office Department in combating a wide range of abuses of the postal system. In particular, it will assist in eradicating the practice of using the mail for the circulating of unsolicited advertisements for items and materials which can only be considered as offensive filth which is blatantly disgusting.

The Post Office Department has informed me by letter that passage of this bill would provide them with a potent weapon to combat the purveyors of unsolicited obscene material.

We passed similar legislation in the 89th Congress in the House but it was not brought before the other body. It is now time to act again and I hope all of my colleagues will join in support of this bill.

I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. Waldie].

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the bill, but before doing so let me join with my colleagues on the committee in extending my compliments to the chairman for the most effective manner in which he handles the committee, and for his great zeal in advocating this particular piece of legislation for which he has a deep conviction.

Let me, however, consider a question that I believe has not been properly presented. It has always been presented to the House thus far in this debate that the man who is being subjected to a stop order is a guilty man, that he is issuing materials that are specifically prohibited under this act, and if you presuppose this fact there can hardly be little disagreement with any conclusion at which you might arrive.

If, however, you presuppose what is legitimately the case under American law—that the man is innocent until proven guilty, you come up with a different conclusion.

Despite the assurances of my very able and astute colleague, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. Udall], that an administrative hearing is held prior to the issuance of a stop order, the testimony before the committee to my recollection did not so enlighten us, and as a matter of fact the report that accompanied the bill does not make that at all clear. There was the direct response to a question that I asked of the Postmaster General's representative as to whether there was an administrative hearing prior to the issuance of the stop order, and my recollection is that the answer was "No."

I then asked, "What is the remedy to the innocent businessman?" The representative of the Postmaster General said the innocent businessman has an opportunity to discontinue mailing the materials—which is hardly a remedy of any significance.

The second reason I oppose the bill is perhaps more philosophical. I fear, and I believe more strenuously since I have been on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, that we are moving the Post Office Department far afield in giving them the very sensitive task of examining and passing upon, in their sole judgment, the contents of the mail. Their primary mission and their one concern which they have thus far been unable to do too good a job at, for reasons I do not intend to go into, is to deliver the mail.

We are assigning to them an area and additional responsibilities which is an extremely sensitive one, and that is to make a determination amounting to a value judgment, as to the desirability or undesirability of content and substance of particular mail. I believe that this is a mistake, and we should not do so. The Post Office Department is simply not qualified to perform such an important and sensitive task. Those judgments should be made by the Justice Department, not the Post Office.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SCOTT].

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the bill. There is no question that the intended purpose of the bill is a good one. We do not want people to use the mails to defraud citizens of our country. However, the word "fraud" does not appear in the bill. As a matter of fact, it would eliminate both the word "fraud" and the need to establish any intent to misrepresent.

The bill indicates that upon evidence, satisfactory to the Postmaster General, that there has been false representations, he can issue an order directing all postmasters to return mail to the sender, and to mark on the cover of the mail that it is in violation of this provision and contains "false representation."

Mr. Chairman, I am not at all pacified by the fact that a representative of the sender of the mail can be present when the mail is opened. It does not say that he is entitled to any hearing at that time. The Postmaster General still has complete discretion in this matter regardless of what the sender may or may not say. It is an administration determination to be made entirely by the Postmaster General.

I would call the attention of the Members of the House to a letter from the Attorney General which appears on page 30 of the report of the subcommittee.

The letter indicates that the Justice Department does not recommend this legislation. That Department defers to the Post Office Department and to the Congress. It quotes from the case of *Reilly* v. *Pinkus*, 338 U.S. 269, in which the Supreme Court expressed its concern and stated that an order which could wholly destroy a business might be issued.

Mr. Chairman, I am concerned about giving this discretion to an administrative agency, eliminating necessity of proving any intent to misrepresent or defraud on the part of the sender and to authorize the Postmaster General to hold up any mail and return it to the sender if he determines, in his wisdom, without any administrative or judicial hearing, that there is false representation. This legislation gives too much discretion to any one man whoever the occupant of the position may be at a given time.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1411, a bill that will cost the Federal Government next to nothing but will save the general public millions.

The consumer public needs protection from Government generally, but especially in the use of the mails by unscrupulous promoters.

The public feels that it has the right to rely on the integrity of the U.S. mail system. They are indignant when they receive pandering advertising and obscenity in the mail and many Americans do not realize the large numbers of dishonest promotional schemes that are carried on through the use of the U.S. mails.

The reason for the growth and success of such schemes is that the Post Office Department must demonstrate and prove that the promoter knows that his product is worthless. Proving the state of mind of people who have every reason to hide it, is almost impossible. This bill would permit the Post Office Department to take action upon proving that the promoter has used false representations without bothering to prove that the promoter himself knew one way or the other.

No Government can continue to do its job if there is not meaningful action taken at some point. In the Lake Mead case in Arizona it took 2 years to get a criminal conviction. No other action could be taken because the standard of proof was the same in both cases; that is, proof of intent to defraud. But the important point is that the promoters who eventually went to jail collected money from the public for 2 years while the U.S. mail service stood helplessly by. The proof needed for criminal punishment should not be the same as the proof needed for the civil protection of the public.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the members of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee who have brought to the floor today a most practical and necessary measure.

Commendations are due the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] for his sponsorship of this amendment to the United States Code which would help deny the use of the U.S. mails to those who hope to obtain money or property under false pretenses.

I also want to extend due recognition to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. NIX] for the fine and lucid presentation of this legislation. As chairman of the Postal Operations Subcommittee, he has proved himself to be an energetic and dedicated opponent of those who would use Federal mails for dishonest and dishonorable purposes.

Under his direction, the Postal Operations Subcommittee has held a number of hearings on present loopholes in the mail regulations—loopholes which presently allow the unscrupulous and perverse to operate almost without interference.

The legislation before us today, H.R. 1411, closes one of those loopholes. It will help protect the public against those promoters who use mail advertising as the basis for swindles and the sale of worthless or dangerous products.

Another problem which I have been actively working to remedy is the vast amount of pornographic and pandering advertising materials which are sent, unsolicited, each year to schoolchildren. The Post Office Department has estimated that 1 million boys and girls receive such items each year.

Although the bill before the House today would touch on this problem only tangentially, the new postal rate and pay bill, H.R. 7977, does contain measures to combat this illicit traffic. Although the approach taken is somewhat different than that which I have sponsored for the past several years, I am hopeful that this provision will stand the test of constitutionality. If it does, it will prove very effective in ending another abuse of the mailing privilege.

If the provision does not prove to be constitutional, it is my hope that the Post Office and Civil Service Committee will consider once again the approach to this problem embodied in my bill, H.R. 2382.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. NIX] has played a key role in promoting this much-needed legislation to curb abuses of the mail patron services. He and his fellow committee members may find reward in the knowledge that they are working to prevent heartache and financial loss for potentially thousands of Americans.

At the same time, I urge the support of this body for the practical remedies prescribed in H.R. 1141.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this measure which will strengthen the hand of the Post Office Department in its efforts to protect the consumer from fraudulent merchandising schemes which operate through the mails. I am hopeful that this legislation, which has been before the Congress since 1960, will be favorably acted upon by both the House and the Senate and signed by the President in the very near future.

The public is bilked of untold millions of dollars every year by an array of mail fraud schemes which staggers the imagination. This situation is particularly alarming because a large proportion of the victims of these vicious schemes are the aged, the blind, and the infirm. Even before being victimized by these frauds, the majority of these innocent people were in dire economic circumstances. Only last week I attended a meeting of the Task Force on the Aging which considered this most pressing problem of our senior citizens.

The committee report documents many of the more common schemes that have netted their perpetrators many millions of dollars. In recent days all of us have also read in the Washington Post of the several exceptionally cruel frauds which have operated here in the District of Columbia. In my own State of New York the attorney general, Louis Lefkowitz, has been exceptionally diligent and effective in his efforts to prevent fraudulent merchandising schemes, but he has found it most difficult to combat those frauds which operate through the mails. By increasing the effectiveness of the Post Office Department in the area this bill will do much to relieve the enforcement problems which presently confront State and local law officers.

Real estate and home improvement schemes have traditionally been among the most prevalent swindles, probably because they present the best opportunity to defraud people of very large sums of money. The victims of such schemes are frequently the aged and infirm who are confined to their homes. Thus they are particularly vulnerable to the unscrupulous salesmen who seek to exploit their understandable desires for improved living conditions.

These homeowners are typically charged exorbitant prices, bled by excessive interest rates and financing charges, and many have even unwittingly signed second mortgages on their homes. Unfortunately, it will be impossible for most of these people to recover any of the money they have lost to "fast-buck" operators, for most of these criminals have closed shop and moved to another town in search of new victims.

To effectively protect the consumer we must prevent him from surrendering any money to these fraudulent merchandisers. The civil postal fraud statute has long sought to achieve this purpose by permitting the Postmaster General, after a thorough investigation which is conducted in compliance with the requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act, to order that all mail addressed to the fraudulent merchandiser and containing remittances to him be returned to the sender.

As presently written, however, this statute limits the invocation of this procedure to those circumstances where the Post Office can prove not only that the merchandiser's solicitations are both material and false but also that they were falsified with the intent to commit fraud. This last requirement has made the protection of the consumer most difficult.

The bill we have before us today would amend the postal fraud statute by eliminating this last requirement. I emphasize that in evaluating the wisdom of this measure we should keep in mind that we are dealing here with only a civil action: this law does not impose any criminal penalties on the merchandiser. Further, the Administrative Procedure Act will continue to apply with full force to any proceedings in which he is involved. I therefore believe that we are not eroding constitutional rights of the merchandiser.

This bill is supported by most organizations representing the legitimate merchandisers in those types of businesses which are most frequently penetrated by fraudulent operators. For example, the National Association of Real Estate Boards, which represents 88,000 of the real estate firms in this Nation, has endorsed this legislation. The ethics and business practices of the vast majority of real estate agents in this country are completely above reproach. Realtors, more than any other group of businessmen, realize the incredible damage that a limited number of fraudulent operators can do the stature of an industry as well as the victims of their fraud.

I urge my colleagues to again join with me in supporting this much needed legislation which was previously approved by the House in the 89th Congress.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4005 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 4005. False representations; lotteries

"(a) Upon evidence satisfactory to the Postmaster General that any person is engaged in conducting a scheme or device for obtaining money or property through the mail by means of false representations; or engaged in conducting a lottery, gift enterprise, or scheme for the distribution of money or of real or personal property by lottery, chance, or drawing of any kind; the Postmaster General may issue an order which—

"(1) directs any postmaster at an office at which registered or certified letters or other letters or mail arrive, addressed to such a person or to his representative, to return such letters or mail to the sender appropriately marked as in violation of this section; and

"(2) forbids the payment by a postmaster to such a person or his representative of any money order or postal note drawn to the order of either and provide for the return to the remitters of the sum named in the money order or postal note.

"(b) The public advertisement by a person engaged in activities covered by subsection (a) of this section, that remittances may be made by mail to a person named in the advertisement, is prima facie evidence that the latter is the agent or representative of the advertiser for the receipt of remittances on behalf of the advertiser. The Postmaster General is not precluded from ascertaining the existence of the agency in any other legal way satisfactory to him.

"(c) As used in this section and section 4006 of this title the term 'representative' includes an agent or representative acting as an individual or as a firm, bank, corporation, or association of any kind.".

SEC. 2. The table of contents of chapter 51 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out—

"4005. Fraudulent and lottery mail matter."

and inserting in lieu thereof—

"4005. False representation; lotteries.".

Mr. NIX (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 1, line 9, strike out "representations;" and insert in lieu thereof "representations,";

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 1, line 10, insert the word "is" immediately before the word "engaged".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 1, strike out "property" and insert in lieu thereof "property,".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 2, strike out "kind;" and insert in lieu thereof "kind,".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 8, insert after "section" and before the semicolon the following: if such person, or his representative, is first notified and given reasonable opportunity to be present at the receiving post office to survey such letter or mail before the postmaster returns such letters or mail to the sender.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT) having assumed the chair, Mr. STEED, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1411) to amend title 39, United States Code, with respect to use of the mails to obtain money or property under false representations, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 932, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro temopre. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 353, nays 32, not voting 47, as follows:

[Roll No. 297]

YEAS—353

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Ashbrook
Ashley
Aspinall
Ayres
Baring
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bevill
Biester
Blackburn
Blanton
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton
Brademas
Brasco
Brinkley
Brock
Brooks
Brotzman
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson
Burton, Utah
Bush
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cahill
Carey
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Corbett
Corman
Cowger
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtis
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dellenback
Denney
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Erlenborn
Esch
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Gallagher
Gardner
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gray
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gude
Gurney
Hagan
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey
Hathaway
Hays
Hébert
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Henderson
Herlong
Hicks
Holifield
Horton
Hosmer
Hull
Hungate
Hunt
Hutchinson
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Karsten
Karth
Kazen
Kee
Keith
Kelly
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kleppe
Kornegay
Kuykendall
Kyl
Kyros
Laird
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, Md.
Lukens
McCarthy
McClory
McClure
McCulloch
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
McFall
McMillan
MacGregor
Machen
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin
Mathias, Calif.
Mathias, Md.
Matsunaga
May
Mayne
Meskill
Michel
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Minish
Minshall
Mize
Monagan
Montgomery
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris, N. Mex.
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Myers
Natcher
Nelsen
Nichols
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
Olsen
O'Neal, Ga.
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pollock
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Pryor
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Railsback
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Reinecke
Resnick
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Riegle
Rivers
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roudebush
Roush
Rumsfeld
Ruppe
St Germain
St. Onge
Satterfield
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherle
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Selden
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Okla.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, Ga.
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Udall
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Walker
Wampler
Watson
Watts
Whalen
Whalley
White
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams, Miss.
Williams, Pa.
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Winn
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Young
Zablocki
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—32

Bingham
Burton, Calif.
Cohelan
Conyers
Culver
Derwinski
Dingell
Eckhardt
Edwards, Calif.
Ford, William D.
Hawkins
Helstoski
Kastenmeier
Kupferman
Miller, Calif.
Mink
Morse, Mass.
Nedzi
O'Hara, Mich.
Ottinger
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Reuss
Rosenthal
Roybal
Ryan
Scheuer
Scott
Thompson, N.J.
Tunney
Van Deerlin
Waldie

NOT VOTING—47

Arends
Ashmore
Blatnik
Bow
Bray
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Celler
Clark
Dent
Diggs
Donohue
Dow
Edwards, La.
Eilberg
Farbstein
Flynt
Fountain
Garmatz
Gilbert
Goodell
Green, Oreg.
Holland
Howard
Ichord
Kluczynski
Landrum
Long, La.
Macdonald, Mass.
Meeds
Multer
O'Konski
O'Neill, Mass.
Philbin
Pool
Rarick
Rooney, Pa.
Sandman
Stephens
Stuckey
Tenzer
Tiernan
Ullman
Utt
Watkins
Willis
Yates

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts with Mr. Arends.

Mr. Donohue with Mr. Bow.

Mr. Philbin with Mr. Utt.

Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. Broomfield.

Mr. Eilberg with Mr. Goodell.

Mr. Multer with Mr. O'Konski.

Mr. Tenzer with Mr. Bray.

Mr. Holland with Mr. Watkins.

Mr. Tiernan with Mr. Brown of California.

Mr. Gilbert with Mr. Long of Louisiana.

Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Dow.

Mr. Howard with Mr. Pool.

Mr. Dent with Mr. Meeds.

Mr. Fountain with Mr. Kluczynski.

Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Yates.

Mr. Celler with Mr. Willis.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Diggs.

Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Stuckey.

Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Rarick.

Mr. Landrum with Mr. Clark.

Mr. Ashmore with Mr. Ullman.

Mr. Ichord with Mr. Stephens.

Mr. Flynt with Mr. Sandman.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill H.R. 1411.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

VIETNAM

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson is receiving a great deal of advice these days respecting the conduct of the war in Vietnam. In the other body, Senators in both parties are urging the President to seek to persuade Hanoi to come to the negotiating table by stopping our bombing to the north, a viewpoint which I share.

Our closest friends in the free world—Great Britain, Canada, Denmark, and the Netherlands, all of whom are members of NATO—have made the same recommendation.

France and Soviet Russia, which retain friendly relations with Ho Chi Minh, have declared that the bombing must be halted before negotiations looking to a cease-fire can begin.

Secretary General U Thant who has had several discussion with North Vietnamese leaders says this is a condition precedent to discussions.

In his latest statement the President has indicated our official position is still to require a reciprocal action from Hanoi before we will agree to stop the bombing. Secretary Rusk has asked, "What assurance have we that they will agree to negotiate if we stop the bombing?" And the war goes on.

Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States, and of the world, too, for that matter wonder why the United Nations has not taken a more active role in settlement of the war. The matter has been pending before the Security Council for more than a year, where it now lies dormant. Upon inquiry we are told there is little possibility of obtaining Security Council action now or in the near future because of opposition by the Soviet Union and France on the Council, and because of the refusal by our adversaries to cooperate with the United Nations.

Nor is it likely that taking the matter from the Security Council and turning it over to the General Assembly would serve any useful purpose under present circumstances.

What then should be done? I have a suggestion, Mr. Speaker, for taking the matter off of dead center at the United Nations and hopefully moving it toward settlement.

I would suggest to President Johnson that he appear in person before the General Assembly of the United Nations to speak in the cause of peace. The matter is of such great importance as to warrant his appearing personally to rally support for a peaceful settlement of the Vietnam war. The President has not spoken to the General Assembly since 1963.

I believe the President ought to try a new and constructive approach by calling upon the assembled nations to convene a special conference for the purpose of ending the war. If the great nations remain stalemated as they seem to be at the present time, the President could call upon the unalined small nations to take the initiative for calling the conference as they have done on a number of occasions in the past to bring the warring parties together.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest the President may want to make the following points:

First. Let the conference be organized, he might say to the delegates. Invite whatever parties you consider appropriate. We will be there.

Second. If the NLF and the Government of North Vietnam object to meeting at the United Nations, as they probably will, let the meeting be held in Geneva or in any neutral world capital.

Third. As soon as it has been announced that the conference has been organized and the parties invited, the President of the United States will order that the bombing of North Vietnam be halted.

Mr. Speaker, presumably the sponsoring nations would invite both the National Liberation Front and the Government of South Vietnam. Thus the meeting would offer the opportunity for the direct belligerents to meet and negotiate with each other, as well as the governments of the United States and North Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, the appearance of the President of the United States in the cause of peace would be a dramatic and powerful event. I recall the tremendous impression upon the assembled delegates made by President John F. Kennedy in 1963 and shortly after Mr. Kennedy's death, by President Johnson. But 4 years have gone by since his last appearance, years in which the United States has become embroiled to an ever-increasing degree in the Vietnam war.

The President's initiative for a peaceful solution in Vietnam by offering to halt the bombing would have an enormous impact for good throughout the world. It is conceivable that it might be the first step in bringing the war to an end. We would furnish solid support for the Charter of the United Nations and for the principle that international disputes should be settled peaceably. His proposal at the United Nations would help restore the flagging prestige of the United Nations and the cause of international cooperation. The burden of seeking settlement of the Vietnam dispute by peaceful means would be shifted to Hanoi, for we will have taken the first affirmative and tangible step for peace.

SENSE OF CONGRESS RESOLUTION ON THE COAST GUARD CLOSING

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a sense of Congress resolution which I hope will alert Congress to plans by the Department of Transportation to replace the Coast Guard rescue units with shore-based helicopters.

Such a plan is underway for a Coast Guard installation in my district, Mr. Speaker; and if successful, I can envision it proliferating from shoreline to shoreline throughout the Great Lakes region.

At Racine, Wis., a Coast Guard rescue unit has for years been protecting people and shipping on Lake Michigan, in fair weather or foul, to the comfort and safety of those who use the lake for pleasure as well as for essential commerce.

Under the guise of economy, we now have this newest agency of a vastly bloated Federal bureaucracy proposing to replace lakeshore rescue units with helicopters based in Chicago, Ill.

Useful as helicopters are, Mr. Speaker, in the fog and sleet and rain and wind that sweeps our inland seaways, they can only be fair-weather friends to those in dire need of help in rough waters.

No cost comparisons are offered, Mr. Speaker, as to Federal expenditures for this untried aerial rescue service, neither as to the price tag on the aircraft, the heliport, or the crews and the expenses of maintaining them and their own services and shelter. Yet, Mr. Speaker, the Department of Transportation cites economy as the sole factor in its plans to eliminate this Coast Guard unit—a statement from the agency which flatly says that economic considerations must dictate rescue activities when undertaking efforts to save human lives.

I reject this attitude and response to my own efforts to prevent the closing of a Coast Guard installation, whether it is in my district or in the district of any one of my colleagues. I am certain, Mr. Speaker, that the same attitude would be reflected by every Member of this body once alerted to the facts.

Response time in any disaster or near-disaster is vital. The Coast Guard with seamen well trained in instant reaction to alerts, knowing every rock and rill in the lakes and waterways under their jurisdiction, can respond in fair weather or foul. A helicopter, far away in a distant city, subject to the hazards of communication delays, poor visibility, and a limited capacity to stow endangered sailors or passengers on board, cannot match the ceaseless services we already rely on now provided by the U.S. Coast Guard.

There are many ways for the Federal Government to economize, Mr. Speaker. I hope that soon some steps are taken to do so. When they are, I will support them; but within this limitation. I will not do so when such action perils a single human life, as the proposal does that is now put forward by the Department of Transportation.

Economic factors are of no consequence in providing for our fighting men in Vietnam. Not a Member here would rise to say so. Nor should economic factors prejudice other efforts where humans are subject to peril, as they are on the Great Lakes—humans, in many instances, carrying the commerce and arms that sustain our men in Vietnam.

If we can afford to spend billions in foreign aid; to plant pansies along our roadways for highway beautification programs; certainly, Mr. Speaker, we can find a few dollars to provide safety measures and rescue installations for those who toil on our waterways or seek their relaxation there.

Let us cease this overwhelming spending by Federal agencies, by all means. But in God's name, let us not do so when human safety is involved, particularly when there are greener pastures for budget-trimming all about us.

GREECE DESERVING OF AID

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from a weeklong visit to Greece. I spent 5 days in Athens and 2 days touring the rural areas.

While in Athens I conferred with the Prime Minister, Constantine Kollias, numerous other Cabinet Ministers, former Members of Parliament, businessmen, and individual citizens.

On the basis of my conversations with both government officials and their critics, I am convinced that the Government of Greece will meet all of its responsibilities to our NATO defense structure and, therefore, should receive all support which has previously been committed by our Government.

The growing and evidently permanent Soviet foothold in Egypt, Syria, and other Arab nations magnifies the strategic location of Greece as our ally. Therefore, despite any reservations we might have over the present Government of Greece, complete support and cooperation between the United States and this key NATO ally is essential to the defense of the Western World.

The Prime Minister and other Government officials with whom I spoke all emphasized their commitment to produce a new Constitution to be submitted to the voters for approval. They would then move onward to reestablish an elected Government.

May I emphasize that in my visits with Greek officials there was complete frankness and willingness on their part to answer any questions pertaining to their domestic and foreign policies. I was able to meet freely with former Government officials and individual citizens who discussed their viewpoints without any reservations.

I did not detect any sign of a "police" or "military" state. There were no observable military patrols and the atmosphere was completely natural.

The individual citizens to whom I spoke, even those members of previous Governments who were critical of the military coup, acknowledged that the officials of the present Government are honest, conscientious men, sincere in their desire to properly serve the Greek people. People in the rural areas were especially intense in stating that the present Government has produced stability in Greece.

The involvement of the Greek Communist Party in the political maneuvering which was taking place during the election campaign had caused great concern throughout the country and the military coup clearly eased fears of Communist takeover of the country. The Greek people have painful recollections of the brutal civil war waged by the Communists in the late 1940's. They recognize that their country remains a prime Communist target and thus are willing to have their government cooperate fully in the NATO alliance, which they know is essential to the maintenance of their freedom.

The ruling officials in Greece recognize their responsibility to restore procedures that will return government to the people and they view their action as a necessary positive step. I believe they are men of high principles who deserve to be taken at their word.

I recognize that some Members have honest doubts and differences of opinion over the situation in Greece. We in the United States can not imagine a military coup ever taking place here and so it is difficult for us to understand circumstances that made the move by the military necessary in Greece.

I conveyed my views to Ambassador Talbot before I left Greece and I am submitting a memorandum to Secretary Rusk and the State Department officials who are reviewing the situation in Greece. As I have stated to the Members of the House, I strongly recommend to the Department of State the complete restoration of our aid to Greece, this action being in the best interest of the United States, Greece, and the free world.

In view of the great interest the Members have in the situation in Greece, I am preparing a more extensive report on my observations and will present it to you as soon as I condense the notes I compiled in the course of my interviews and discussions.

FEDERAL FUNDS USED BY POVERTY OFFICIALS TO CREATE POLITICAL MACHINE

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have firm desire to aid the poor in this country and, indeed, in my own district, and my record in the State senate, and I feel also here in Congress, clearly substantiates this point.

However, Mr. Speaker, I am appalled and astounded by the actions of some of our local poverty officials in Atlanta, particularly where they are attempting to create for themselves, with Federal funds, a political organization through which they can establish a controlled vote, and with this controlled vote threaten their Congressman.

Mr. Speaker, I refer specifically to a threat which was conveyed to me through my aide in Atlanta made by a Mr. J. C. Calhoun, a local poverty official. He told my aide that they were organizing block by block in Atlanta, had over 66 local poverty workers engaged in voter registration. Mr. Speaker, I support voter registration, but I am at a loss to understand how this is fighting poverty. This poverty official claimed he would be able to control this vote. This is, of course, an attempt by the local poverty official to replace the traditional counsel which the elected officials, the ministers and the other leaders of the community have exercised in this area, and an attempt to supplant this leadership.

Mr. Speaker, this is being done with Federal funds. This is not combating poverty. This is simply an effort to create a political machine for the use of certain local individuals.

Mr. Speaker, I am including a letter I wrote to Mr. T. M. Parham, the director of Economic Opportunity in Atlanta which clearly states this problem and ask for an investigation:

OCTOBER 3, 1967.

Mr. T. M. PARHAM,
Director, Economic Opportunity-Atlanta, Inc., Atlanta, Ga.

DEAR JIM: The Congress will soon consider funding OEO for the coming year. As you know, I have been concerned about some things that have happened and desire corrective changes, but have been favorably inclined toward supporting the program in general.

Last week, however, I had something occur which I would be less than honest were I not to tell you disturbs me deeply. My aide in Atlanta told me of a conversation he had with J. C. Calhoun, one of your officials, wherein Mr. Calhoun, in a loud and boisterous manner, proclaimed that the poverty personnel in Atlanta are being used to register, recruit and organize new voters and that they, the poverty officials, are going to, in effect, control these votes. He said further, that I had either better vote the way they want me to, or else this power would be used to elect someone else to Congress next year.

Jim, I don't know how well you know me, but there is no way that Economic Opportunity Atlanta can lose the support of their Congressman faster than by such threatening tactics than this. I simply will not succumb to threats, nor tolerate them, even though it may mean my defeat in the next election.

After talking with my aide, I called Mr. Calhoun on the telephone. He flatly denied having said that he would engage in any political activities whatsoever nor having said that he would attempt to influence any voters. However, he did very clearly state that Economic Opportunity, Atlanta has over 66 people registering persons to vote and, in fact, has registered more than one thousand persons in the last month. In addition, he said EOA is organizing on a block by block basis, electing block captain, and that this obviously would be a powerful and effective force in the election, but that he, Mr. Calhoun, would never consider trying to influence anyone's vote.

After talking with Mr. Calhoun, I reconfirmed with my aide what had been told me and learned that Mr. Calhoun expected his threat to be passed on to me. I have complete confidence in my aide. I am convinced that he gave me a truthful account and that when confronted by me, Mr. Calhoun simply altered the facts to what he considered to be in his best interest.

Jim, I have always been proud of the fact that we in Fulton County have led in voter registration throughout the entire South. In fact, it was my father as a Voter Registrar and Tax Commissioner in Fulton County who did away with the separate yellow slips used for Negroes. We have constantly encouraged voter registration and I intend to further encourage it at every opportunity.

However, I ask if it is right for persons whose employment is due to federally appropriated funds to do this, particularly when an official of the poverty program states they are organizing a political force.

I frankly feel all persons should have equal opportunity to vote and I support this. However, it is unfair to deprive the person in the suburban area of a similar convenience in voter registration simply because they do not have poverty workers, convenient to register them to vote.

I don't know how I can spell out this situation any clearer than I have in this letter. One of the regrettable problems, from my standpoint, is that here I am, a person who would like to objectively view and consider the poverty program, and who has a genuine desire to help the poor but I have been threatened with a mass, controlled vote which will be organized and financed by funds I am being asked to vote to appropriate.

With this threat having been made, I am placed in a position that if I do vote for the program, some people may think I am doing so out of fear and not because I feel the program is worthwhile. Further, because of the political aspects of the organization, if I do vote for OEO funding, I will help supply tax payer's dollars to organize, block by block, a political organization—if what Mr. Calhoun told my aide is true.

If I do not vote for this program, you could charge that I did so out of vengeance and am not concerned about the poor. I could state that I am concerned about the poor but I am not going to submit to threats.

This development has made it extremely difficult for me to be objective and my reason for writing this letter is simply to point out to you both sides of the coin. In conclusion, I intend to study this matter carefully and thoroughly. Regardless of how I vote, the vote which I cast will be one which I feel will be in the best interest of the people and our district.

I would appreciate your checking into this matter at once and give me the true facts about any plans to organize a block by block political force.

With kindest personal regards, I am,
Yours very truly,
FLETCHER THOMPSON,
Member of Congress.

H.R. 1110—LIMITATION ON SONIC BOOMS

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have today asked the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for a public hearing on legislation which I have introduced to place a limitation on the size of sonic booms that would be permitted over the continental United States. We have ample evidence from scientists and engineers that people can tolerate sonic booms to within 1.5 pounds overpressure per square foot at ground level, but anything over this volume creates serious damage to property and serious damage to people all over this country. We are quite sure of the adverse effect the supersonic transport will have on American citizens by the experiments that are being conducted by the Air Force. There is no question in my mind that engineers can develop an airfoil and powerplants which will not create more than 1.5 pounds overpressure per square foot in a sonic boom. The important thing, though, is to serve notice on them now, so that they will know what they will be up against when they develop these supersonic aircraft by 1970.

It would be in my judgment the height of folly to go ahead and invest more than $2 billion in a supersonic transport with no consideration to the problem of sonic booms in the middle and late seventies.

For this reason, I hope the committee will have hearings on H.R. 1110 and that we will have an opportunity to explore this whole subject very thoroughly and then I hope the Congress will set some standards on tolerable limits of sonic booms over the continental United States.

I recently attended the conference on jet noise in London. That conference recommended that every nation adopt legislation to set limitations on the amount of jet noise produced by the next generation of jet aircraft. I have introduced such legislation. I met with Congressman Friedel, of Maryland, today and obtained an assurance he will hold hearings on this legislation. Indeed, if that can be done, it does not seem unreasonable to me that we should set limits on sonic booms that will be imposed upon millions of people in this country when supersonic transports become a reality.

I hope this Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will hold these meetings to discuss this entire subject and it should be done now and not after $2 billion are squandered on a transport.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I have asked the Air Force to place Washington, D.C., on its list of cities currently being exposed to sonic booms by Air Force aircraft. The Air Force says it has to fly over some 20 major American cities in order to train crews in the new supersonic bombers.

I want this aircraft to fly over Washington so that the President; all Members of Congress, all those in the Pentagon, and those in the FAA and Transportation Department will be able to see what America will be like when supersonic transports begin criss crossing this Nation.

We here in Congress can complain all we want about the hardships our people are suffering only from the current rash of sonic booms but until the top officials of our Government personally see what it is like to be startled by a sonic boom, they will continue to refuse to recognize the problem sonic booms will pose for this Nation in the near future.

MORE LUNCHES FOR NEEDY YOUNGSTERS—A NATIONWIDE CHALLENGE

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, in proclaiming the week of October 8 as National School Lunch Week, the President called the Nation's attention to the 9 million children attending schools that have no lunch program. And he noted that about 1 million of them are from poor families and will require lunches at little or no cost if they are to receive the nourishment they need.

National School Lunch Week, in its 5th year of observance in accordance with a joint resolution of Congress, recognizes the role of the 21-year-old national school lunch program in making nutritious, low-cost lunches available in some 72,000 schools in which roughly 75 percent of the Nation's elementary and secondary school population is enrolled. About 20 million of these youngsters actually get lunches, paying a substantial share of the cost. However, about 11 percent of the children get lunches free because they come from needy families.

We all recognize the vigorous efforts made in recent years by Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman and dedicated school officials across the Nation to extend the lunch program to hundreds of schools and thousands of children who previously had not enjoyed its benefits. Truly, the national school lunch program is an outstanding example of effective teamwork by Federal, State, and local governments.

But there are still gaps—nutrition gaps recognized by the President and the Secretary of Agriculture in calling for renewed efforts by this Federal-State-local team. There is a nutrition gap when so many children who can easily afford a balanced lunch at school do not buy it. There is a nutrition gap when, in schools that have programs, at least another half million needy children should be getting lunches free. And, of course, there is a most serious nutrition gap for the 9 million youngsters that cannot get either paid or free lunches at their schools. The schools they attend are for the most part either those in remote areas of rural America or those in the older sections of crowded cities. Local resources have so far been unable to build kitchens and cafeterias, pay school lunch personnel, and finance free lunches for the high percentage of needy students.

But these barriers can be overcome. For example: More than 142,000 children are getting nourishing school lunches through a special $32 million appropriation providing for above normal food and cash assistance, through the national school lunch program, to needy-area schools. State and local officials are making effective use of this special aid to help start and maintain lunch programs that could not otherwise operate. More money is needed for this special assistance.

About 100,000 children in selected schools are now getting nutritious breakfasts at school under a pilot program authorized by the Child Nutrition Act of 1966. The breakfast program, which began last January, is for children who come to school hungry either because of need or because they are bused a long distance to school.

USDA's Consumer and Marketing Service is currently working with State and local governments to help lay the groundwork for expanding school lunch programs in the Nation's largest cities where many older, overcrowded schools are still without any food service at all. Progress is already being made. This fall, for example, Providence, Rochester, and Salt Lake City have begun school lunch programs in low-income neighborhoods which had none before. Other cities are exploring ways to expand present programs. This parallels successful efforts of recent years to start lunch programs in hundreds of small schools of rural America—many in one-room buildings in remote areas.

We should also note outstanding progress in five States—Louisiana, Hawaii, Georgia, and North and South Carolina—which report school lunch service in all but a dozen or less schools, as a result of statewide drives to make lunch available to every child in school.

I join with the President and the Secretary of Agriculture in urging all State and local governments to support the USDA in a nationwide campaign to close the nutrition gap, to help give all of our children a fair start in life. This is the best investment we can make in our Nation's future.

SECOND ANNUAL REPORT ON THE HIGH-SPEED GROUND TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1965

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to call to the attention of my collegues the second annual report on the High-Speed Ground Transportation Act of 1965. The report was transmitted this morning to the President and the Congress by the Secretary of Transportation.

The High-Speed Ground Transportation Act of 1965 authorized three programs: First, to undertake research and development of high-speed ground transportation; second to demonstrate the contributions that high-speed ground transportation could make to more efficient and economical intercity transportation systems and to measure public response to new equipment and other changes in service; and third, to collect data, statistics, and other information to improve the national transportation system.

Over the past year, the overall program proceeded essentially in accord with the initial plans set forth at the time the legislation became law. A sampling of the accomplishments shows:

First. Completion of the first of two gas turbine trains to be used in a Boston-to-New York demonstration.

Second. Initiation of a comprehensive

high-speed test program using four fully-instrumented rail research cars. These cars have operated frequently at speeds of 150 miles per hour.

Third. Near completion of 50 new railroad cars for use in the Washington-to-New York demonstration with the Pennsylvania Railroad, now scheduled to begin the service in early 1968.

Fourth. Discovery that lasers can be used as a possible tool in tunnel excavation and construction.

Fifth. Advanced design studies for a tracked air cushion vehicle.

The list could go on. But I think my colleagues can see the highly significant value of the activities being conducted under the high-speed program.

In the limited time and with the limited budget available, the Office of High Speed Transportation has already advanced rail technology. And the program has been highly successful in an equally important area: The stimulation of new optimism and interest in the future of railroad transportation, and interest which in the long run will benefit the American public in the form of improved railroad transportation service.

WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY'S JIM CARLEN

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, Jim Carlen coaches football at West Virginia University. J. Suter Kegg writes a sports column which he calls "Tapping the Keg," and which appears in the Cumberland Evening Times, Cumberland, Md. In the September 26, 1967, number of the Evening Times, Mr. Kegg gives his opinion of Jim Carlen.

West Virginia University consistently puts strong, aggressive teams on the field. Those teams are ranked nationally in football and basketball. They meet the foremost members of their own conference, as well as outstanding teams from the East, Midwest, and South. No "sissy" stuff.

Mr. Kegg explains what sort of coach he thinks our State university has. It is the kind of coach I feel we should all approve. It is the kind of coach to whom I would like to entrust my own boys, when and if they play college football.

Today's athlete is the popular hero, especially in the eyes of the young. Those who lead and guide the school athlete have a grave responsibility in the matter of inculcating ideals which will serve our young men well in the adult world which they will soon enter. How fortunate we would be if all coaches believed and practiced the philosophy which moves Jim Carlen.

Mr. Kegg's article speaks for itself. I feel that a good many of this Nation's problems would solve themselves if more of our college students could get a vivid perspective of the kind of life that makes a society great. I hope the article will come to the attention of other educators, as well as the Members of this assembly, and insert it, in part, in the Record:

West Virginia University Team Prays as Well as Plays

(By J. Suter Kegg)

A strange picture appeared on my television screen last Saturday afternoon. Shortly before the kickoff in the West Virginia University-VMI football game, all of the WVU players assembled on the field, forming a gigantic huddle around their youthful coach, Jim Carlen.

They weren't discussing strategy because all of that had been rehashed a number of times in practice and again in the dressing room prior to taking the field. Nor were they giving it that last-minute rah-rah-rah business, used sometimes by coaches to fire their players into a fevered pitch.

They were—believe it or not—praying.

Big, tough football players on a state university team praying? Isn't that a bit passe in an era which has found the United States Supreme Court ruling against prayers in public elementary and high schools?

Surely, then, this old-fashioned demonstration had to be some kind of a publicity gag for a coach determined to gain a nationwide image at any price. Deep-thinking people don't pray any more; young people in college are too smart for that.

Try to convince yourself of this, if that's the way you believe. But you're wrong, dead wrong. Jim Carlen, 34, one of the youngest major-college coaches in the country, thinks in terms of prayer. And we say, thank God for Jim Carlen. We need more like him.

Other members of Carlen's coaching staff think the same way. Cumberlanders learned this in May when Bill Hicks came here to speak at the Bishop Walsh High awards dinner. Hicks, a Carlen aide, outlined West Virginia's "New Frontier" football program, going into detail of what the coaches expect of the Mountaineer players.

When Carlen went to West Virginia, he didn't exactly hit it off spectacularly well with the sportswriters at their first meeting. The school hosted a press party for the area writers to meet the new coach, but many were dismayed by the fare served up at the informal get-together.

"Punch and cookies!" cried one old-timer, the words alone wounding his tongue as he uttered them.

Another veteran scribe, who likes a stiff drink now and then, winced when he recalled how he sampled the stuff, just to be sociable.

"That almost ruined him from the start," he recalled. "Socially, we thought he was a real washout. But we got to like him, and while I still wouldn't want to spend a night-on-the-town with him, I do think he's doing a fine job, and I believe he's sincere in his ways. He's—and it's one word that I just hate to even say—dedicated. It's just a darn shame that most guys who are dedicated are also prohibitionists."

That's young Jim Carlen, not exactly an Elliot Ness, but, quietly, in his own fashion, he would have shut down Al Capone's speakeasies. Nowadays WVU doesn't even host press parties on the eve of a football game. Carlen doesn't believe in them.

If you've ever seen the mascot of the West Virginia Mountaineers, you'd know that Carlen's arrival at Morgantown had to cause a bit of a stir. The Mountaineer always carried a rifle and a jug of "mountain dew" as he strolled the sidelines.

But no more. It's a bad image. The hard-drinking hillbilly is out at West Virginia University.

Carlen doesn't drink, smoke, or cuss and he doesn't expect any of his assistant coaches or players to do so either. They don't as Hicks emphasized in his talk at BW.

"I think athletes have a responsibility to be something above others," he says. "They should be clean-living. I'm sorry to see athletes advertising drinks and cigarettes. You go back to the Greeks and you'll find that the athlete was a symbol of all that was good and pure. People tell me it's old fashioned, but I don't think so.

"Our boys also go to church," Carlen went on. "We don't care what church they go to, as long as they attend services somewhere. You have to have faith in God. Without it it's a tough life."

LONG-RANGE PLAN FOR UPGRADING AIR SAFETY

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, the President recently wrote a letter to Transportation Secretary Alan Boyd which I believe we all can applaud. His letter calls for a long-range plan for upgrading air safety, and advises of a budget amendment that will start to meet the need immediately.

President Johnson deserves commendation for this timely move. At this point, I would like to insert his letter to Secretary Boyd and Budget Bureau Director Schultze's letter to the President in the Record:

The White House,
Washington, September 20, 1967.

Hon. Alan S. Boyd,
Secretary of Transportation,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Secretary: It is apparent that the rapid growth of commercial and private flying is creating demands for substantial expansion and improvement in the Nation's air traffic control system. The Federal Government is the manager of this system. System improvement will, therefore, require large additional outlays of Federal funds for investment and operations. Those who will benefit most from such expenditures, the aviation industry and the flying public, should pay their fair share of the costs of the system needed to handle the increase in air traffic while maintaining a high level of safety. I do not believe the general taxpayer should be asked to shoulder this burden.

I am, therefore, asking you to develop a long-range comprehensive plan for the facilities, equipment, and personnel required to meet these needs. This plan should be accompanied by a proposal for financing the improvements through a system of charges by which the users of the Nation's airways bear their fair share of its costs.

Looking toward the immediate future, I am today submitting to the Congress a budgetary amendment designed to provide a more effective use of Federal Aviation Administration funds in the operation of the air traffic control system. I am also requesting you to direct the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to conduct a review of current air traffic regulations, flight rules, and standards with a view toward making such changes as he considers necessary to maintain air safety. Should this review indicate that the maintenance of safety requires changes which involve some traffic delays, the Administrator should nevertheless make such changes.

This Nation has an enviable record of air safety. I know that you and your associates can maintain this record.

Sincerely yours,
Lyndon B. Johnson.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., September 19, 1967.
THE PRESIDENT,
The White House.

SIR: I have the honor to submit herewith for your consideration amendments to the request for appropriations transmitted in the budget for the fiscal year 1968 for the Department of Transportation, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

Heading	Request pending	Proposed amendment	Revised request
Operations	$598,400,000	+$7,000,000	$605,400,000
Facilities and equipment	35,400,000	−7,000,000	28,400,000

The revised request under the heading "Operations" can be made without any increase in new obligational authority through an offsetting reduction in the request for "Facilities and equipment." This is possible through the utilization of unobligated balances from 1967 in the latter appropriation and can be accomplished without impairment of the budgeted program.

The revised "Operations" request is to provide the Federal Aviation Administration with the capability of effectively handling increased levels of aviation activity at air traffic facilities through additional personnel and overtime.

The amendment is occasioned by a projected increase in the level of aviation activity in 1968 which is higher than estimated when the budget was submitted.

I recommend that the foregoing amendments to the budget for the fiscal year 1968 be transmitted to the Congress.

Respectfully yours,
CHARLES L. SCHULTZE,
Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

VIRGIN ISLANDS SHOW ESTEEM AND AFFECTION FOR CONGRESSMAN KIRWAN

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, for years our distinguished colleague from Ohio, the Honorable MICHAEL KIRWAN, has been the stout and influential friend of the Virgin Islands. No land ever had a better friend than the Virgin Islands has had in Congressman KIRWAN. The following news article from the Home Journal of St. Thomas of September 7, 1967, bespeaks the esteem and affection in which he is held by the people of the Virgin Islands:

HONOR REPRESENTATIVE KIRWAN

The 138-unit, low-cost housing project at Lindbergh Bay, St. Thomas, for which a contract was signed last week, will be named in honor of Rep. Michael Kirwan, (D-Ohio).

Kirwan, Chairman of a House Public Works Subcommittee, was responsible for the appropriation of millions of dollars for Virgin Islands projects dating back to the Knud-Hansen Memorial Hospital, Charlotte Amalie High School and the waterfront highway.

Rep. Kirwan is expected to visit the V.I. next month, arriving with the Governors who will hold their annual conference here.

SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY OF BUSINESS

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WYATT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, in recent years business and industry have taken a position in the vanguard of those leading this country toward a greater acceptance of social responsibility.

This leadership is both remarkable and necessary. The corporate conscience is an inevitable outgrowth of the times and the men in the forefront of business today.

Edward Smith, group vice president of Omark Industries, recently gave a significant speech on this very subject before an audience of Milwaukie, Oreg., Kiwanis. His perspective on the strides business has taken in the realm of social responsibility and the gains it must still make are so effectively pointed out in this address that I herewith present it for the perusal of my colleagues in the Congress:

THE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY OF BUSINESS

(Address by Edward S. Smith)

I welcome this opportunity to meet with you during Free Enterprise Week and share some thoughts on The Social Responsibility of Business in a free enterprise system.

To begin with, the very idea that a business which is organized to make a profit also has social responsibilities is of fairly recent origin. Yet, while the corporate conscience as we know it today is a product of this generation of businessmen, it does seem a long time since businessmen fought child labor laws, since an industrialist could with impunity "damn" the public.

Though we have come a long way in a short time, we still have a way to go.

And time is short for us.

I am reminded of an anecdote attributed to Marshal Lyautey, the great French commander, who one afternoon instructed his gardener to plant a tree. The gardener asked: "why plant it now? It will not flower for a hundred years." To which the marshal replied: "In that case, plant it this afternoon."

We in business have accepted our responsibilities to society—often quite admirably, sometimes minimally, and occasionally only when forced to do so.

But mere acceptance is not enough in today's fermenting world. American corporations are American institutions—not just legally chartered organizations—and as such they must become *leaders* in America's struggle to survive in a world that is as competitive socially as it is competitive militarily and economically.

We in business are well-suited to the task; we have the brainpower, we have the talent of leadership—and we have, thanks to the American free enterprise system, the financial resources. I am sure also that we have the heart, despite the uninformed insinuations of certain elements of our populace.

What, then, are these responsibilities?

Some are obvious and have long been recognized by business. For instance, the responsibility to our customers. This is a duty which requires us to market a product that is dependable, a product that will perform or serve according to our claims. It must be sold for a price fairly arrived at—a price not made after collusion with other producers of the same product.

And we have a responsibility to our stockholders—first, to make a profit; second to keep them accurately informed of the progress of the company in which they have invested, and finally, as managers privy to much inside information, to treat that information as a trust.

We have learned also that we have a responsibility to our employees to pay them fair wages, provide them with safe and pleasant working conditions and treat them with a dignity which is the right of the American worker.

If there is any businessman to whom these obligations are not obvious today, he will not be in business too much longer, for he soon will lose his customers, his stockholders and his employees. And worse, he likely will find himself in trouble with the law.

Today, business is socially responsible to the total public in many areas undreamed of by Henry Ford in his day. And in carrying out those responsibilities an increasing number of businessmen are learning that good corporate citizenship also can turn a good profit, that company conscience can enhance a balance sheet.

Let me cite an example. A certain company, which I shall not name, has processing facilities in many dozen communities throughout the United States. These facilities are of a type that constantly dirty the air of the communities where they are located. A few years ago when the public was just becoming concerned about air pollution, this company was suddenly besieged by irate citizens in many towns who demanded that the company either stop polluting the air, or move out.

Now this particular firm, during its one hundred years of existence, had developed a high degree of social responsibility and this social conscience had manifested itself in many ways in each of these communities. Naturally, top management was concerned. But to provide pollution control measures at all of these facilities would require a great deal of money. Nevertheless, after much soul-searching, management made the decision to install air-cleaning equipment at each of its processing plants. This was a proper, though costly, response to public wishes and it was being made *before* the clamor could result in repressive legal measures.

Before the pollution control program was very far along, the company learned that the control equipment it was installing made its plants eligible for a drastic reduction in fire insurance rates. After a bit of figuring the accounting department discovered that, in a very few years, the reduced insurance costs would pay for the equipment. And in at least one city, the company won a handsome plaque for its pollution control program.

The exercise by business of its public responsibilities in communities in which it operates is a casting of bread upon waters that will return many times the investment in time, effort and money.

For instance, when we contribute financially to a civic center for the arts or when we save a symphony orchestra—as did the corporations of Detroit when they raised two hundred and sixty thousand dollars to reactivate the Detroit Symphony Orchestra—we help ourselves while helping society. Why? Because it is good business for a company trying to recruit managers to help provide the community with a cultural atmosphere that will appeal to these prospects. And additionally, there is the increased stature and improved image from which the company can draw upon in bad times as well as good times.

What about urban slums? Is it the responsibility of business to get involved in this most vexing problem of Megalopolis? I think we do have a duty here. I do not suggest that we use our profits to tear down the slums and get into the low-rent housing business. To attempt such would be to shirk our responsibility to our stockholders.

But I do believe—and believe strongly—that we in business have not only the responsibility, but also the talent, to provide leadership in attacking this problem. We businessmen are great organizers. The world of business competition has made creative thinkers of many of us. Who, then, is better equipped than the American businessman to find solutions to the problem of urban blight?

Why should you take the time from your heavy executive responsibilities to meddle in things that are better left to social scientists and the government?

If your instinct for doing good is not overpowering, then perhaps John Harper, President of Aluminum Company of America, has an answer. He suggests that none of the bright young men we want for future executive jobs are going to beat a path through slums to get to our door, and he adds that none of them will want to live in a deteriorating city in order just to work for us.

To that I might add that anything we can do to kill the bitter fruits of slum culture—crime, delinquency, illiteracy and economic dependency—will both reduce the taxes we pay and also open up a new supply of productive workers.

We have a stake. We want productive employees who are educated to *their* responsibilities. We want customers who can discern the superiority of our products and who have the money to pay for them. We want more people who can afford to invest their money and who have reason to invest their faith in our business. We will find none of these in slum tenements.

We cannot mention the problem of slums without considering the most frightening thing the slum has fostered in our century: the Negro Revolution.

I frankly cannot suggest how we in business can best respond to this. It would be trite to say that we should be careful not to discriminate by color when we hire, fire or promote. Besides, the law requires that we do not. I can only say that we businessmen, like the other segments of our society, must first learn to understand. And we have precious too little time to get understanding, for "the hour is late; the matter is urgent."

What must we understand?

I think we must first understand, and accept, that the yearnings of Negroes, whether expressed in a Supreme Court brief or on the streets of Watts or Newark, are constitutional, are reasonable, are just.

If we cannot understand and accept this, we had better well understand the black mood. It was perhaps best expressed by Negro author James Baldwin, when he said that it is impossible to be black and not be in a constant state of rage.

Once we understand, and appreciate, the dark frustrations that have seeded the Negro revolt, I am confident that we in business—or, at least, the majority of us—will discharge our responsibilities intelligently and fairly—and profitably both to our businesses and to society.

We can begin by recalling something Lincoln said over a century ago, quote: "The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present . . . let us now disenthrall ourselves."

I turn now to the subject of business' responsibility to the state—or, if you will, the government.

It seems to me a bit strange that we here in the twentieth century should, when we speak of government, refer to it in the third person—as "they", rather than "we". It is as though government, and the men and women who administer government, were forced upon us by some oppressive race from another planet, and that we here on earth have nothing to say about who shall hold our proxies in Washington and Salem.

I say this is strange in a country where businessmen have so long served government—from the merchant, Salomon, who financed General Washington's campaign from Valley Forge to Yorktown, to McNamara, the industrialist, who is so ably serving government almost two hundred years later.

It should be clear by now, after a hundred and ninety-one years of American democracy—or, if you prefer, American republicanism—that this record of nineteen decades would not have been possible without the contributions and cooperation of most of our society, including business.

Business has—and is—properly discharging its responsibility to government.

Yet, there remain problems—problems primarily of communicating and understanding. Government—and its Caesars both large and small—tends to suspect business—and its Caesars—of conspiring against the public will. And business is too often prone to view government as it would a traffic cop with a daily arrest quota.

I would not suppose that anything I could say tonight—or on a thousand nights—could show us how to end this adversary relationship between the two.

I would suggest, however, that there is a responsibility which business has that, if carried out, would result in at least a detente of sorts between the two.

That responsibility involves first, and most obviously, an allegiance to government—the kind of allegiance required of all citizens. Secondly, it requires on the part of business a *rational* dissent whenever assent is not possible. All too often our disagreement with government policy or edict has been unreasoned. Finally, our responsibility to government requires that we extend our participation in government beyond the ballot box and the lobbyist's office. When business refuses to participate, then we have little reason for complaint when solutions not to our liking are proposed.

This does not mean that we should leave our jobs and run for congress. There are other ways more helpful to business and to government. We can, for instance, stop being outraged when we are confronted with a government policy we don't like, and instead, offer a constructive alternative. We can do a little more proposing and a little less opposing, for the opportunities to initiate change in our society are many. Business has the resources—if not the will—to *lead* changes that benefit society. It need not forever limit itself to reluctantly following changes that often are of dubious value.

This brings me to the point I made in the beginning: That it is no longer enough for business to accept its social responsibilities; it must lead the way in making investments in national welfare. It is in this manner that we can provide an environment for free enterprise which will make it even more dynamic than it now is.

Finally, I would like to touch upon the most vital obligation business knows in a free enterprise system—that of making a profit. For it is profits that make jobs, that fill the national treasury and make all progress possible. And certainly business must make money if it is to discharge all its other social responsibilities. The bankruptcy court offers little opportunity for serving society.

Yes, we have come a long way since the days when the force of law was needed to free little children from factory labor. That the business of America is business is even more true now than it was in Coolidge's day.

But we still have a distance to go, and for the rest of the way business must provide more leadership than it has in the past.

It would be swell, wouldn't it, if we could just let all those other people out there find peace, remove slums, promote Negroes, balance the budget, clear away the smog, and beautify America.

But it can't be done without the participation, the resources, the talent—and above all—the leadership which business is capable of providing.

RICKENBACKER

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the faith, fortitude, and initiative which was so characteristic of the founders of the Nation is exemplified in one of our contemporaries, Eddie Rickenbacker. His love of God and country, along with his self-reliance carried him through extraordinary experiences dating back to the First World War. With the policy of Federal-fund panaceas so rampant today, examples such as the Rickenbacker story are sorely needed to accentuate the area of private responsibility which must be realized and practiced by American citizens today.

The New York Daily News of October 9 carried an excellent editorial on "Rickenbacker," the autobiography of this outstanding American. I insert the editorial, "A Summing-Up," at this point in the RECORD:

[From the New York Daily News, Oct. 9, 1967]

A SUMMING-UP

Few men are privileged to live as long, as excitingly or as fruitfully as Edward V. Rickenbacker, the son of Swiss immigrants who became a national hero and a legend in his lifetime. All of it, the struggles and the triumphs, have been captured in an autobiography, entitled simply "Rickenbacker." (Prentice Hall; 443 pages; $7.95).

More than a life's tale, it is also a testament to the author's faith in God, love of country, and belief that one must give before he can hope to get.

Long before he became an auto racing champion, America's flying ace of aces in World War I, or a pioneer in commercial aviation, Rickenbacker learned the value of self-reliance, initiative, and placing opportunity and challenge above security.

He came to manhood as a spindly 13-year-old boy, forced by the death of his father to work killing hours in glass factories and metal foundries so that the Rickenbacker family could keep going. That was the start for the man who today is one of the most outspoken champions and examples of the rugged individualism so long deemed an essential part of the American character.

What kind of man is Captain Eddie? Peek at a few vignettes from his story.

Here is a young man in his 20s scraping together every cent of savings to field his own race car team with little to fall back on but his faith in himself.

You see him again in the cockpit of a Spad over France, his guns jammed and Germans on his tail, coolly refusing to seek safety for fear of panicking the younger fliers with him.

In the depth of the depression he takes charge of a weak-winged bird, Eastern Air Lines, breathes life into it and watches with pride as it becomes the first commercial airline to cast away the crutch of government subsidies.

His body horribly broken in a 1941 airline crash, he lies in a Georgia hospital and refuses drugs, lest in easing his pain they might make acceptance of death easier.

Sprawled in a tiny raft in the Pacific

Ocean in 1943, he prays, pleads, sings and tongue-lashes his fellow survivors from another air crash, winning life for seven of them almost through sheer will power.

It may be, however, that the essential Rickenbacker shows best not in an hour of victory, but at a time of failure. It was the 1920s and the auto company he helped found had floundered in the postwar depression. His share of the debt: $250,000.

There would have been no dishonor in taking refuge in bankruptcy. But Rickenbacker didn't see it that way.

Without a whine or a backward look, he struck out into new ventures. It took years, but he repaid every cent.

The act of a "square"? We'd say it was the mark of a man—which Capt. Edward V. Rickenbacker was, and is.

L. B. J.'S PROPOSED JOB PLAN IN SLUMS—AN ATTEMPTED LANDING IN THE DARK WITHOUT INSTRUMENTS?

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I read with great interest a Washington Post news article of October 3, reporting on the President's job plan in slums. This article states that—

> President Johnson announced a $40 million major test program to enlist private industry in the attack on hard core unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this effort is most worthy, let there be no doubt about that. Perhaps the most basic problem of the slum dweller is immobility which can be interpreted as lack of job training and economic skills. However, I have serious reservations of the effectiveness of "crash programs" of this nature, no matter how valuable their goals, and I shall express these reservations for the purpose of hopefully stimulating discussion on the proper direction for vocational training in slum areas.

We must realize that no technical training program for the unemployed can be successful if unrelated to available jobs. This was one of the firm provisions of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, and I believe was one of the basic reasons for what success that program has had. Training unrelated to available jobs is not only economically wasteful from the standpoint of the government or employer, but psychologically as well as economically damaging to the trainee.

Although the President's proposal calls for donation of land to businesses, loans from the Small Business Administration, funds to provide the underprivileged individual with medical and dental care, no attention seems to be being paid to what types of jobs are available and what type of training should be undertaken. Because private industry will pay for the job training, it is assumed that it will be job related.

Indeed, this assumption that private industry knows best what jobs are available is to a large degree as valid as we can presently get. It is one of the basic premises of the Human Investment Act introduced early this spring by over 130 Republican Congressmen and 29 Republican Senators. It is by far better to leave this discretion with private industry than with a Government agency. Nevertheless, any training program, whether conducted by private industry or Government, can be immeasurably better if directed in accord with job available statistics. Without such basic data we are attempting to metaphorically land an airplane in the dark without instruments.

One of the ironic notes of the President's proposal is that while he was willing to spend $40 million for his plan, he has been notably unwilling to spend the relatively small amounts necessary to develop the basic data which forms the groundwork for technical training programs of all kinds.

The data I refer to is collection of the job vacancy statistics recommended unanimously by the Subcommittee on Economic Statistics following the hearings on this subject in 1966. In fact, the demand for this data was not new with the joint committee but embodied in the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 was a mandate to establish a statistical series of jobs available on a comprehensive basis.

Basic to the development of proper job vacancy statistics is updating of the "Dictionary of Occupational Titles" prepared by the Manpower Administration of the Department of Labor. Current updating of these volumes in a looseleaf form is essential as this is the nomenclature used in comprehensive job vacancy statistics.

The Subcommittee on Economic Statistics of the Joint Economic Committee concluded that the statistics would be most useful in raising the efficiency of the Nation's manpower programs and urged that the Department of Labor spend an initial $2.5 million for this purpose.

Despite the unanimous recommendation of the Joint Economic Committee subcommittee no request for funds was made by the Johnson administration and no appropriations were forthcoming from the Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee. Significantly, the only voice opposing the development of job vacancy statistics is that of big labor. Mr. Nathaniel Goldfinger, director of research for the AFL–CIO, was the lone dissenter appearing before the subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee in 1966 and he argued against the compilation of the data solely from the standpoint of its possible misuse. However, also obvious to most economists was labor's vested interest in keeping control of jobs within the established guidelines of unions in being. Some of the theorists in the Research Digest of AFL–CIO also are seeking to protect the assumption of the "new economists" that unemployment is entirely "cyclical" and a result of "inadequate aggregate demand" which would then call for "heavy Federal expenditure programs" to correct. If unemployment is largely frictional and "structural" then its underlying cause is essentially a lack of training in skills in demand. Inside the House Appropriations Subcommittee, as well as in the Department of Labor pressure was brought to bear by AFL–CIO to defeat the appropriation for the collection of job vacancy data. Now the administration has silently dropped the request.

I raise these matters again to air them and to afford again an opportunity for rebuttal, if rebuttal is possible. I also would like to commend the administration's healthy desire to extend job training, but ask, How long must this be done in the dark?

TIME OFF FOR RELIGION

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KUPFERMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation to allow Federal employees time off for the observance of religious holidays that fall on days that are not already recognized as legal holidays.

Presently, Federal Government employees must be available for work on any day of the year, except, of course, on those days recognized as legal holidays. Although some religious holidays, such as Christmas, are legal holidays as well, the holy days of other religions are not so recognized. This situation places an unfair burden on the members of some faiths who wish to follow the tenets of their religion while employed by the Federal Government.

Orthodox Jews, for example, are obliged to refrain from work between sundown Friday and sundown Saturday. Consequently, they normally charge off against their annual leave, or leave without pay, the time taken off for religious observances. There are persons with other religious backgrounds, such as Seventh-day Adventists, that are faced with similar restrictions against working on Saturdays. Often, members of some faiths decide against Government service primarily because of this inequity in Federal employment practices.

I believe the solution to this problem is a relatively simple one at no expense to the public. The legislation that I have introduced today will allow a Federal employee, when he takes time off to comply with religious obligations imposed by his religion, to make up for lost time through an arrangement with the agency or department by which he is employed.

The Federal employee who is Jewish may then observe Rosh Hashana, the Jewish New Year, which begins this Wednesday, and Yom Kippur, the Day of Atonement, in exchange for working on a legal holiday or after hours, to make up for this time taken off to observe a religious holiday. This flexibility of working hours is particularly important in those areas of Federal employment that operate on a 7-day week basis, as for example does the Post Office Department. My bill provides for this flexibility, but only "to the extent compatible with the exigencies of the public business and the performance of essential services," of the employee's agency or department. However, to prevent any indiscriminate rejection of requests for time off, this legislation requires that any denials shall be predicated on a written answer of the authority concerned, stating the reasons for the denial.

Guidelines adopted on July 10, 1967, by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission state:

> (b) The Commission believes that the duty not to discriminate on religious grounds, required by section 703(a)(1) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, includes an obligation on the part of the employer to make reasonable accommodation to the religious needs of employees and prospective employees where such an accommodation can be made without undue hardship on the conduct of the employer's business. Such undue hardship, for example, may exist where the employee's needed work cannot be performed by another employee of substantially similar qualifications during the period of absence of the Sabbath observer.
>
> (c) Because of the particularly sensitive nature of discharging or refusing to hire an employee or applicant on account of his religious beliefs, the employer has the burden of proving that an undue hardship renders the required accommodation to the religious needs of the employee unreasonable.[1]

In the light of the guideline recently adopted by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission stating that the employer has an obligation to make reasonable accommodation to the religious beliefs and needs of its employees, the Federal Government can hardly do less for its employees than it asks for employees of private industry.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and thus allow the Federal Government to lead with action, as well as words, the private business community in the establishment of fair employment practices.

THE CENSUS: PREPARING THE QUESTIONS FOR 1970

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BETTS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, according to the Bureau of the Census, 67 subject items are currently proposed for inclusion in the 1970 decennial Census of Population and Housing. This list was prepared July 31, 1967, and I have the impression any revisions by the Census Bureau will be to expand the number of inquiries rather than omit any questions. Sixty-seven subjects, however, are translated into many more particular questions when they actually appear on the official questionnaire. The sample form used in New Haven in April contained 120 items for citizens to check or fill in where applicable, and the North Philadelphia form, distributed only last week, raised 94 inquiries.

I have been advised that the Subcommittee on Census and Statistics of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee this month will consider subjects proposed for the 1970 census, the justification for each question, as well as the format to be used in the questionnaires. If no formal committee recommendations are made or legislation reported, in all likelihood the Director of the Bureau of the Census will go forward with plans for such an extensive, compulsory public interrogation in 1970. I have introduced a bill, H.R. 10952, to limit the mandatory questions to seven: name and address; relationship to head of household; sex; date of birth; race or color; marital status; and visitors in home at time of census. A separate form, marked voluntary, could accompany the required census questionnaire for citizens to complete. Questions not essential to the basic enumeration of population as provided in the Constitution to determine congressional districting but deemed useful to Government agencies could be included on this second form. I do not propose to set aside 50 or more of the questions currently planned for the 1970 census without good reasons which I shall present in this statement.

Mr. Speaker, it is not my wish to engage in a battle with the Bureau of the Census, the Bureau of the Budget, or statistic users organizations, numerous businesses or Federal agencies which utilize data gathered through the decennial census. If cast in that role, may I state for the record that my overriding interest is that Congress should scrupulously examine the questions to be asked all Americans in 1970 and take a formal position on this list. Further, I feel that the Director of the Census should be required to give more convincing justifications, if there be such, for the excessive number of questions he proposes to present in 1970. Let me again set forth criteria I feel should guide the preparation of decennial censuses.

Each proposed subject item or specific question should be evaluated in terms of these paramount considerations:

First, is this question of prime importance to compiling facts on the basic characteristics about residents in the United States?

Second, does this question invade the privacy, harass, or will it tend to result in noncompliance by the respondent?

Third, could this question be deferred to a smaller sample, an annual sample survey or omitted so private research organizations can compile such data?

The overall questionnaire should be evaluated as to the likelihood of maximum response, the cost benefit ratio of questions asked, priorities of principal Federal information needs, and the possible extension of Federal authority into citizen rights of privacy.

In applying these criteria to determine which questions are proper subjects for the decennial census, I have concluded that the number of questions should be cut drastically. I have tried to avoid oversimplifying an analysis of the proposed decennial census questions by placing each inquiry in one of four categories: Complete count; omit; drop to smaller sample; or defer to a later survey. The following table provides the subjects which have been proposed by the census, the percent of households to be canvassed for each question, a capsule summary of their justification, the year the subject was first collected and my recommendations as to the disposition of the question in 1970.

1970 CENSUS OF POPULATION AND HOUSING SUBJECT ITEMS PROPOSED FOR INCLUSION IN 1970 COMPARED WITH 1960 CONTENT

	1960 (percent)	1970 (percent)	Census justification	1st collected	Betts recommendation			
					Complete count	Omit	Drop to smaller sample	Defer
POPULATION ITEMS								
Relationship to head of household	100	100	Classify population	1880	X	--------	--------	
Sex	100	100	do	1790	X	--------	--------	
Color or race	100	100	do	1790	X	--------	--------	
Month and year of birth	100	100	do	--------	X	--------	--------	
Marital status	100	100	do	1890	X	--------	--------	
State or country of birth	25	25	Internal migration	1850	--------	X	--------	
Years of school completed	25	25	Education planning	1850	--------	--------	X	
Number of children ever born	25	25	Fertility measure	1890	--------	X	--------	
Activity 5 years ago	--------	25	Employment survey	1970	--------	X	--------	
Employment status	25	25	Supplement work data	1880	--------	--------	X	
Hours worked last year	25	25	do	--------	--------	X	--------	
Weeks worked last year	25	25	do	--------	--------	X	--------	
Last year in which worked	25	25	do	--------	--------	X	--------	
Occupation, industry, and class of worker	25	25	do	--------	--------	X	--------	
Wage and salary income last year	25	25	Economic development	1840	--------	--------	X	
Self-employment income last year:								
Single item	25	--------	do	1940	--------	--------	X	
Farm and nonfarm separately	--------	25	do	1940	--------	--------	X	
Country of birth of parents	25	20	National origins	1850	--------	X	--------	
Mother tongue (or language now spoken in home)	25	20	Bilingual groups	1910	--------	X	--------	

---

[1] 29 C.F.R. § 1605.1(b)(c)(1967).

1970 CENSUS OF POPULATION AND HOUSING SUBJECT ITEMS PROPOSED FOR INCLUSION IN 1970 COMPARED WITH 1960 CONTENT—Continued

	1960 (percent)	1970 (percent)	Census justification	1st collected	Betts recommendation			
					Complete count	Omit	Drop to smaller sample	Defer
POPULATION ITEMS—Continued								
Year moved into this house	25	20	Migration	1940	--------	X	--------	
Place of residence 5 years ago	25	20	Measure mobility	--------	--------	X	--------	
School enrollment (and public or private)	25	20	Education planning	1850	--------	--------	X	
Veteran status	25	20	VA date	1930	--------	--------	X	
Place of work	25	[1] 20	Highway planning	1950	--------	X	--------	
Means of transportation to work	25	20	do	1950	--------	X	--------	
Other income last year:								
Single item	25	20	Poverty data	1940	--------	X	--------	
Some detail	--------	5	do	1940	--------	X	--------	
Whether married more than once	25	5	(?)	1910	--------	X	--------	
Date of 1st marriage	25	5	(?)	1910	--------	X	--------	
Presence and duration of disability	--------	5	Number and kinds	1970	--------	--------	X	
Vocational training	--------	5	Check occupation	1970	--------	--------	X	
Occupational-industry 5 years ago	--------	5	do	1970	--------	--------	X	
Citizenship and year of immigration	--------	5	Basic data	1890	--------	X	--------	
HOUSING								
Number of units at this address	--------	[2] 100	Identify unit	1940	--------	X	--------	
Access to unit	100	100	do	1970	--------	--------	X	
Kitchen or cooking facilities	100	--------	Housing inventory	1970	--------	--------	X	
Complete kitchen facilities	--------	100	do	1970	--------	--------	X	
Condition of housing unit	100	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	
Rooms	100	100	Livable space	1940	--------	--------	X	
Basement	25	[3] 100	Emergency planning	--------	--------	--------	X	
Water supply	100	100	Housing quality	1940	--------	X	--------	
Flush toilet	100	100	do	1940	--------	X	--------	
Bathtub or shower	100	100	(?)	1940	--------	X	--------	
Heating equipment	25	100	Housing quality	1940	--------	X	--------	
Telephone	25	[4] 100	Enumerator check	1960	--------	X	--------	
Tenure	100	100	Measure homeownership	1890	--------	X	--------	
Vacancy status	100	100	For builders	1940	--------	X	--------	
Months vacant	25	100	Housing marketers	1940	--------	X	--------	
Commercial establishment on property	[5] 100	100	(?)	1940	--------	--------	X	
Value	[5] 100	100	National wealth	1930	--------	X	--------	
Contract rent	[5] 100	100	Housing market demand	1930	--------	X	--------	
Number of units in structure	25	25	Type of unit	1940	--------	--------	X	--------
Components of gross rent	25	25	(?)	1940	--------	X	--------	
Year structure built	25	25	Assessing replacement	1940	--------	--------	X	
Farm residence	[6] 25	25	Classified rural homes	1890	--------	--------	X	
Land used for farming	[7] 25	--------	do	1890	--------	X	--------	
Bathrooms	20	20	Adequate housing	1960	--------	X	--------	
Automobiles	[8] 20	20	Highway planning	1960	--------	X	--------	
Source of water	[6] 20	20	State, local needs	1960	--------	X	--------	
Sewage disposal	[6] 20	20	do	1960	--------	X	--------	
Air conditioning	5	20	Level of living	1960	--------	X	--------	
Bedrooms	5	5	Sleeping space	1960	--------	X	--------	
Stories, elevator in structure	[9] 20	5	(?)	1960	--------	X	--------	
Fuel: Heating, cooking, water heating	5	5	Industry studies	1940	--------	--------	X	
Television	5	5	FCC needs	1950	--------	X	--------	
Radio	5	5	(?)	1930	--------	X	--------	
Clothes washing machine	5	5	Level of living	1960	--------	X	--------	
Clothes dryer	5	5	do	1960	--------	X	--------	
Home food freezer	5	5	do	1960	--------	X	--------	
Dishwasher	--------	5	do	1960	--------	X	--------	
2d home	--------	5	do	1960	--------	X	--------	

---

[1] Item will be expanded to include street address in most metropolitan areas if technical and financial questions are resolved satisfactorily.

[2] To be collected only in mail areas for coverage check purposes; will not be tabulated.

[3] Tentatively on 100 percent pending agreement with Office of Civil Defense; otherwise on 25 percent.

[4] Required on 100 percent for field followup purposes in mail areas.

[5] 100 percent in places of 50,000 or more, 25 percent elsewhere.

[6] Omitted in places of 50,000 or more.

[7] For renter-occupied and vacant-for-rent units outside places of 50,000 or more.

[8] 20 percent in places of 50,000 or more, 5 percent elsewhere.

[9] Collected only in places of 50,000 or more.

Sources: Subjects provided by U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, July 31, 1967; justification, Bureau of the Census, population, July 25, 1967; housing, July 18, 1967. (Table compiled by Congressman Jackson E. Betts.)

Let me comment on each category in which I would place some of the proposed census questions.

COMPLETE COUNT

The complete, mandatory population count should include seven subjects: Name and address, relationship to head of household, sex, date of birth, race or color, marital status, and visitors in home at the time of census. The bill I have introduced would assure these as compulsory subjects for decennial or mid-decade censuses. All other questions would be voluntary and listed on a separate form.

QUESTIONS TO OMIT

I would recommend the omission of questions which fall into the following categories: Information of principal use to local communities having little Federal relevance, subjects which are already contained on questionnaires used by other Federal agencies making the need to ask them on a decennial census minimal, questions simply nonessential to a decennial census, and types of information private market research firms should gather because it is primarily of business or commercial interest. A good hard look and each question will reveal that many, if not most, subjects which have been proposed for 1970 fit into these categories. When the long list of questions is separated into smaller units along the lines I have outlined, I believe their omission becomes clearly justified.

Here are the four principal reasons for dropping a large number of questions together with the exact subjects I would omit:

First, questions essentially of local interest: Place of work, means of transportation to work, number of units at this address, sewage disposal, and source of water.

Second, questions for other Federal agencies to provide statistics: Self-employment and income last year, farm income, other income, citizenship and year of immigration hours worked last week, hours worked last year, and last year in which worked.

Third, questions not significant to merit inclusion on a decennial census: State or country of birth, activity 5 years ago, number of children ever born, mother tongue, year moved to this house, place of residence 5 years ago, married more than once, and date of first marriage.

Fourth, questions of a commercial nature referred to private research organizations for collection of data: Heating equipment, telephone, tenure, vacancy status, months vacant, value, contract rent, trailer, bedrooms, automobile, air conditioning, television, radio, clothes dryer, washing machine, bathroom, dishwasher, and second home.

DROP TO SMALLER SAMPLE

The Census Bureau believes it must obtain extensive population and housing data providing benchmark statistics on a block-by-block basis, for municipalities, metropolitan areas, States and the Nation. For this reason, the decennial census long form is prescribed for 25 percent or 20 percent of the households. The necessity for this proliferation of detail is debatable. Personally, I feel the decennial census should not attempt to amass extensive data on individuals other than to provide State and National totals. Localities and metropolitan area governments may conduct their own census or contract such a project from the Bureau of the Census, but this should not be a function of a compulsory decennial census. This reasoning leads me to recommend that several proposed questions be dropped from a 25-percent or 20-percent sample to a much more limited number of households. The Census Bureau conducts numerous sample surveys in which some of the decennial census questions could be listed. A special household survey covering 3 million homes has been proposed by the Bureau of the Census which might be suitable for gathering State and National benchmark statistics on several items.

A concurrent household survey could be planned for 1970 to collect data on a number of items now proposed for the 100-percent or 20-percent compulsory census program. This would provide overall profiles of the citizenry and household characteristics useful to the Census Bureau as well as give State and National benchmark statistics on a variety of subjects. I would recommend the following items be included in such a voluntary sample survey: School years completed, school enrollment, employment status, hours worked last week, occupation, wage and salary last year, veterans status, presence or duration of disability, vocational training, occupation or industry 5 years ago, access to unit, rooms, basement, number of units in structure, land used for farming, fuel, and commercial establishments.

QUESTIONS TO DEFER

I have not listed any items in this category because the determination as to which subjects can be separated from the other questions on a decennial census and not asked concurrent with this national census is a technical matter about which the Bureau of the Census should comment. There are several topics within the two preceding categories, questions to be omitted or dropped to a smaller sample, which might be better placed here. An analysis of which items could be deferred successfully might bear study by the Congress in an effort to assure that a streamlined, maximum response census is conducted in 1970.

Mr. Speaker, this has been an attempt to examine the questions proposed for the 1970 decennial census and place all subjects in categories according to their merits. I hope it will serve as a working paper for my colleagues, especially those members of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee directly concerned with this subject. The Census Bureau no doubt will have its reactions to this analysis. I look to the hearings by the Subcommittee on Census and Statistics to be a form where all concerned parties may contribute to a sound census policy for 1970 and beyond.

J. EDGAR HOOVER: SYMBOL OF LAW AND ORDER

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DEVINE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, in the FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin last April, the very able J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, very firmly and properly spelled out the basic need and urgency of maintaining law and order in this Nation. His statement follows:

> Morality, integrity, law and order, and other cherished principles of our great heritage are battling for survival in many communities today. They are under constant attack from degrading and corrupting influences which, if not halted, will sweep away every vestige of decency and orderliness remaining in our society.
>
> Certain groups, numerically weak but vociferously strong, appear determined to destroy all acceptable standards of personal conduct and sane behavior patterns. They seem bent on eliminating all ethical practices relating to our established order.
>
> For instance, most citizens would be horrified to think that someday it might be legally permissible for a person to rise in a courtroom and hurl four-letter invectives at the judge without fear of punishment. "This cannot be," we say, "the court is inviolable. It administers justice under the laws by which we live." Law enforcement is an arm of the same laws. It is charged with the responsibility under these laws of taking certain action which ultimately is resolved in court. However, a move is underway demanding that profane verbal abuse directed at police officers be legally recognized as a constitutional right. If it can be argued that such preposterous action is legally permissible at the enforcement level of the law, could it not be also be argued that it is permissible at all levels of our legal system?
>
> History proves that the best interests of our Nation lie in a law-abiding, decent, and orderly society. We cannot live with lawlessness, unbridled vulgarity, obscenity, blasphemy, perversion, and public desecration of every sacred and just symbol. We should be alarmed when widespread recognition and monetary awards go to a person who writes a "satirical" piece of trash which maliciously defames the President of our country and insinuates he murdered his predecessor. We should be alarmed when some groups, under the guise of academic freedom and constitutional privilege, flood our college campuses with obscene four-letter-word campaigns and pornographic publications which violate all codes of ethics. And we should be equally alarmed when an enforcement officer making an arrest must fight for his life against assaults from onlookers who scoff and ridicule him for doing his duty.
>
> Why do these conditions exist? Certainly, an overwhelmingly majority of Americans do not want their families exposed to indecent, immoral, and unlawful practices which plague our communities. But unorganized protesters carry little weight against organized crusaders of filth, immorality, and crime. If this is not the legacy we want to pass on to our youth, then it is high time we took action to improve conditions.
>
> Let us stop persecuting enforcement officers when we should be prosecuting criminals. Let us stop deifying offbeat dolts whose ability is measured only by how deep they can dip their poisonous pens into the pots of blasphemy, filth, and falsehood. Let us stop listening to half-truths and criticisms of time-tested ideals and start telling and selling the true story of democracy as we know it. In short, let us stop being led blindly toward the cavern of self-destruction by bogus Pied Pipers and get on with the perpetuation of the self-evident truths which, with Divine guidance, have served our Nation so well over the years.

This month, Mr. Hoover made some further pertinent and timely comments on this subject, and more specifically relating to recent riots and agitators.

All Members of Congress, as well as the general public, should have the benefit of the thinking of the greatest and most knowledgeable law enforcement expert in the world, J. Edgar Hoover, the national symbol of law and order.

Mr. Hoover's statement in the October 1967 FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin, follows:

> In a riot there are no victors. The losers include everybody—the rioters, the victims, law enforcement, the community, the State, and the Nation.
>
> Causes of riots can be counted by the score. A study of the overall problem indicates, however, that the widespread violence in our country to some degree is a direct outgrowth of the civil disobedience movement. In recent years, some leaders of dubious stature have made a grandiose gesture of willfully violating laws they deem to be unjust. For the most part, these individuals, although admittedly guilty of breaking the law, have gone unpunished. Young thugs and misguided teenagers, seeing others defy authority and the courts with impunity, have been led to believe that any crime under a banner of complaints is justified. Consequently, they ignore the law and roam through their communities creating violence and terror. Certainly, those who espouse the theory of civil disobedience and authorities who free guilty violators must share a portion of the blame and responsibility for the turmoil in our streets. It should be abundantly clear that the doctrine of civil disobedience is a doctrine of self-destruction.
>
> Stern, decisive action is needed when a street disturbance begins. Justice is not served when a growing horde of vandals and looters is appeased and their pillage overlooked lest "a show of force might provoke them to greater violence." Quiescence does not satisfy rioters. Procrastination or uncertainty on the part of authorities denotes weakness or concession to a mob. Thus, the offenders are encouraged, and their violence gains momentum.
>
> A judicial self-appraisal by the news media of their riot coverage might also be in order. Some media have already taken action in this regard. There can be no quarrel with the all-important role of keeping the public informed as quickly and as completely as possible. No one rightfully expects riots to be played down or salient facts withheld.
>
> On the other hand, militant agitators, hatemongers, and publicity-seeking rabble rousers who incite riots have no fear of overexposure. They know that television, radio, and front-page news stories are the best and quickest means of getting their views before the public. Thus, they seek attention from the news media. In riot reporting, objectivity and balance, always key factors of responsible journalism, help expose distortion and reduce the special treatment of those who advocate violence. Strict adherence to high journalistic principles is a valuable public service in matters affecting public safety.
>
> Many proposals have been advanced to help eliminate the causes of riots. Just as there is no single cause, there is no single remedy.

I do know, however, that the answer will not be found in sociological remedies alone. If our system of law is to survive, then the law must be enforced. Those who break the law, acting alone or in concert, must be detected and arrested, promptly prosecuted, and given proper, substantial punishment. In halting riots and removing crime from our Nation's streets, this should be the first order of business.

WILL CONGRESS RAISE TAXES?

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the action taken by the House Ways and Means Committee yesterday in voting to postpone indefinitely consideration of the President's request for increased taxes represents a courageous stand for fiscal responsibility. Because of the broad interest in the debate relating to the tax increase issue, the interview appearing in the October 9, 1967, issue of the U.S. News & World Report with the distinguished chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], is especially significant and, in my opinion, deserving of careful study.

I include it at this point in the RECORD:

WILL CONGRESS RAISE TAXES?

(Interview With Representative WILBUR MILLS)

The key man in Congress on tax policy, in this interview, serves notice on the White House: No tax increase without a "substantial" cut in federal spending.

How big a reduction in the budget will be necessary? Will President Johnson agree to it? With such a trim in expenditures, will higher taxes then be a sure thing?

Representative Wilbur D. Mills (Dem.), of Arkansas, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, answers these and other questions related to an issue that is developing into an impasse between Congress and the White House.

Q Mr. Mills, has the time come to put a damper on the rise in federal spending?

A Yes, it has.

We thought the time had come back in 1964, when Congress passed a bill to reduce federal income tax rates. Section I of that tax-reduction bill said it was the sense of Congress that, over the long run, a tax cut would raise revenues rather than lower them, and that the increased revenues should be used to eliminate the budget deficit and then to reduce the public debt.

The statement also said that Congress considered it important "to take all reasonable means to restrain Government spending."

Q How did that work out?

A The lower tax rates did, in fact, generate increased total revenues—and in fiscal year 1965, which ended in mid-1965, federal spending was at a rate of 96.5 billion dollars, compared with projected expenditures of 97.9 billion. So we were under our spending projections for that year.

Q Then what happened?

A You have to remember that an election occurred in 1964. Apparently those who were elected felt that their campaign promises contributed to their election, and that these promises should be carried out. In 1965, Congress enacted quite a number of new programs and enlarged existing ones. That was a departure—and we can't deny it—from our stated purpose of holding down expenditures.

Q What's behind this more recent surge of spending?

A It's a combination of two things—big new domestic programs and the war in Vietnam.

I'm convinced that had we known in 1965 what we know now about the acceleration of the war in Vietnam, there would have been fewer of these new programs passed. We were not advised anywhere along the line that we could expect acceleration of the war, with all that additional cost.

Q What has been the result?

A The combination of new federal programs plus Vietnam spending has pushed up federal expenditures from 96.5 billion dollars in fiscal year 1965 to an estimated level of more than 140 billion for the current fiscal year that ends next June 30.

Q How much of that rise is accounted for by Vietnam?

A You get various estimates. Most say that the war is costing us about 2 billion dollars a month, or 24 billion a year. My own feeling is that it is higher than that.

Q And it's going on up—

A Yes, it's still rising. The one thing we know about a war is that if you continue it from one fiscal year to another, it will always cost more in the new fiscal year than in the prior one. That has been the history of the money cost of fighting a war—not to mention the worst cost of all, the increased cost in terms of casualties.

Q So the outlook is for higher war costs in the current fiscal year—

A Yes. The Vietnam effort will cost more this year even if we should do no more than we did in the year that ended last June 30. But you always do more. And, certainly, if the war is to be brought to the conclusion that the American people seek, the cost could rise by as much as 4 billion dollars over the estimates made last January.

ECONOMIES VERSUS CONTROLS

Q Do you agree with those who say the U.S. is rich enough to fight a war and to continue normal spending on projects at home?

A No. I have said frequently that I do not think we can have both "guns and butter" in 1968 without running a deficit that would do this country a great deal of harm.

Q Is some belt-tightening necessary, then?

A We have never yet engaged in a war without having to cut back severely on activities at home. This is the first time I can recall that we have been in a war and haven't had price controls, wage controls, excess-profits taxes, and things like that.

We have been trying to carry on heavy expenditures in Vietnam without cutting back or imposing any controls on ourselves. Our economy, under our present tax system, just will not generate revenues quickly enough to let us go forward on a guns-and-butter basis without giving us very serious deficits.

Q What does the budget deficit look like for this fiscal year?

A My own figures at the moment show this: Barring any contingencies, we are likely to have total spending this year of about 140 billion dollars, and receipts of around 117 billion, at existing tax rates. That would leave a deficit of about 23 billion.

That compares with an official Administration estimate of up to a 29-billion-dollar deficit. But a deficit of either 29 billion or 23 billion is entirely too much to allow at this time.

CONDITIONS FOR A TAX RISE

Q Is the answer to increase taxes, as the Administration has requested?

A There is not going to be a tax bill passed by this Congress so long as there is a prospect for a rate of spending totaling well above 140 billion dollars. It's just not going to be done.

Q Suppose spending is trimmed—

A If we can get the American people to see the danger of a big budget deficit right now, and be willing to pay a bit more in taxes on the understanding that expenditures will be cut, we might get the deficit down to a more reasonable level.

Q Are you saying that the atmosphere for a tax increase would be improved if federal spending were to be cut substantially?

A Let me answer this way: I've had a heavy volume of mail from people all over the United States. I have detected in this mail a desire, first of all, that expenditures be reduced. People have not said in their letters that, if spending were cut, they would then be willing to accept an increase in taxes, but I am led to believe that is the case. People are willing to accept burdens when they know they are necessary.

Q Does the White House seem inclined to make the spending cuts that members of your Committee are asking?

A The White House is most anxious to get a tax increase. They have assured us that they will cut expenditures. The problem is that we believe the cuts should be much more substantial than the 2 billion dollars they are talking about. I am sure that they will have to agree to larger cuts before we will even consider reporting a bill out of our Committee.

Q Will you personally support a tax increase if there are no cuts in spending?

A At this time I will not. The only way I can support a tax bill will be for us in Government to join the American people in belt-tightening, not force them to go it alone.

I have suggested we cut 1 billion dollars from spending for each billion-dollar increase in taxes. My point is this: If we ask taxpayers to pull in their belts to the extent of, say, 5 billion dollars, the amount of additional revenue involved in fiscal 1968, then I think those taxpayers have a right to demand that the Federal Government pull in its belt to the same extent.

Now, I don't know that the American people will be willing to accept any tax increase. I am saying that I think they would be more willing to do so if some reductions in spending were contemplated.

IF CONGRESS ORDERS CUTS

Q Is it time for Congress to vote a flat cut in spending?

A It seems to me that is about the only thing left for Congress to do. I think we should try to limit spending for fiscal 1968 either by cutting back on specific programs, or by placing a limitation on what all departments of Government can spend.

Q Would you do that by cutting back each agency's proposed spending by a certain percentage?

A No. It would be better to ask the President to cut expenditures by selecting the lower-priority items. I don't mean expenditures which are needed for the poor, and, on the other hand, I don't believe military expenditures, other than those for Vietnam, should be eliminated from those being reviewed for reduction.

Q How much do you consider to be controllable?

A The President on several occasions has said that the whole area of controllable expenditures might be 20 billion dollars, more or less. It depends on your interpretation of what is controllable and what is uncontrollable. The figure might go as high as 30 million. I'm not certain in my own mind.

Q Do you have an over-all target figure of your own?

A Yes, but I'd rather not state it at the moment.

Q Could you give it in general terms?

A In general terms, I'd say this: Suppose we face a deficit for the 1968 fiscal year in the order of 23 to 29 billion dollars. I'd like, of course, to see that deficit eliminated. But since, as a practical matter, it won't be eliminated, I think under present conditions it should be no more than 10 to 15 billion dollars. Even this is a large deficit.

Q The President has called for action by Congress on pending appropriations bills before he makes any recommendations for holding down spending—

A Here is the weakness in that argument: Congress has completed action on only three appropriations bills up to now. We are already through the first three months of the 1968 fiscal year. Now, if we wait until the first of next January to begin economizing within the departments of Government, then in order to get, for example, a 10 per cent saving for the whole fiscal year, we'd have to reduce spending by 20 per cent for the January-June period. That would be real hard to do.

Q So what is the answer?

A I think the first order of business, even though action on appropriations bills hasn't been completed, is to relay to the Government departments instructions that they must reduce spending by a fixed amount.

Now, I would feel much better about it if we could have some advice from downtown—from the Budget Bureau and the White House—with respect to where each individual program might be trimmed.

The executive branch, in my opinion, has a lot better idea of where there may be excesses in the budget—excesses over what is really needed, or what somebody thinks is needed—than does Congress. If any of these excesses can be eliminated, we should be told.

Q Some people argue that we shouldn't cut federal spending sharply, because the cuts would come out of social programs the country needs—

A It may be there are some programs that are more important than others. If that is the case, the essential ones should not be cut as much as the less essential ones.

Frankly, I don't know how to evaluate all of them. I have some opinions. But we often get fixations in our own minds about the importance of this or that program. That is why I am suggesting we need some help from people outside of Congress.

Q To decide where immediate cuts should be made?

A Yes. But the presently needed cutback in federal spending, to my mind, doesn't mean that any particular program has to be sacrificed. I have been saying, and I am repeating, that there is enough fat in practically every program of Government that we can cut back on every one of them and they can still render a satisfactory service.

DANGERS IN BUDGET

Q Suppose we just let spending run, and piled up a 29-billion-dollar deficit—

A I have raised the question of whether, perhaps, we shouldn't do just that—let the deficit occur, along with the adverse conditions that probably would follow. That might awaken all of us to the dangers of this high level of spending. On the other hand, one can well question the advisability of incurring such a risk just for the lesson.

Q Do you have a list of priorities of your own on where spending might be cut?

A Yes, I do. I would prefer not to discuss my own views, because they may be colored by the part of the country I come from, and by my personal assessment of different programs. I would want all these programs studied—every Government program reviewed, including the military. Nothing would be sacrosanct.

Q Is any study of this sort under way now?

A The Budget Bureau is continually reviewing programs.

Q I meant studies by Congress—

A No, not at this time. We are so busy legislating that we have little time to review programs we have passed.

I have suggested this: that it might be well to set up a commission, somewhat similar to the former Hoover Commission, that would study, analyze and review every single program of Government.

My concern is not simply with reviewing wholly new programs. Every time a President is elected, you can expect him to come forward with new spending plans, and Congress probably will pass some of them. The trouble is we seldom see them terminated once they've served the purpose for which they were established.

Sometimes, for example, we carry over into an inflationary period programs that were calculated to help us through a depression.

Q But getting a commission such as you propose set up and operating would be a pretty slow process, wouldn't it?

A That's true. This is a long-range proposal. It would not answer our short-range problems. I did not propose it for that purpose. We are not thinking just in terms of the 1968 fiscal year.

ADJUSTING AFTER A WAR

Q Suppose the Vietnam war were to end suddenly. Wouldn't there be a clamor to take the money saved from military spending and put it into big new programs to develop cities, wipe out poverty, do other things that have been urged?

A I've thought about that a great deal. There would, of course, be demands for expenditures in the type of program you mention. But if you mean, wouldn't these expenditures be demanded to prevent a recession. I don't think they would.

For example, I'm not convinced that this country ever has to run at a continual deficit in order to enjoy what we call full employment.

I'm mindful of a bit of history. We were told that when World War II ended we'd have some 8 million people unemployed, walking the streets in idleness. Well, we didn't.

We had the same clamor with respect to the end of hostilities in Korea.

I'm not convinced that we necessarily are going to have a depression if we don't continue to spend the equivalent amount of money we are spending on the Vietnam war.

Q Could private business, perhaps, take over a part of the burden of social programs?

A Yes. I can't get away from the thought I had in 1964, when we passed the tax-reduction bill, that if we don't put too many strains and stresses on it, the private sector will find answers to many of these problems. Private business often can accomplish things better than can Government planning and spending. That is the whole basis of what we had in mind a few years ago. But we've stumbled off that track. I'm hopeful we can get back on.

Q Many businesses are training the unskilled, and trying to find jobs for minority groups—

A Yes, and that is certainly a desirable step. If business doesn't do things such as that, the demand will be made that Government do them. Similar problems will arise in the future, and we'd much prefer that private business resolve them wherever possible than to have to appropriate federal money to do them.

Q Would special tax incentives encourage business to take more risks in these new programs?

A That is always a possible vehicle, but I consider it a form of backdoor spending. I don't think business needs special incentives so much as it needs a reduction in the share of profit the Government taxes away. I'd feel much more secure about the role of the private individual and the businessmen in our society if Government were not quite so large a partner.

Q Over the years, there has been proliferation of federal programs that require a matching of funds by States and localities. Does that mean that, in a sense, the Federal Government has been forcing State and local governments to raise taxes?

A I don't see that. We do not require local agencies to join in these programs. They can take them or leave them.

For instance, we make money available to the States for developing their roads. We don't require them to spend any specific number of dollars. We merely say: "We'll match in a certain way the dollars you spend."

Q Do you detect any change in attitude among members of Congress about authorizing expensive new programs?

A I think there has been a change since it became clear that we may be facing up to a 29-billion-dollar deficit. Even so, pressures are always here to enact just about any program that is suggested. It is not the easiest thing in the world to vote against some of these new programs. Many have broad appeal. It often takes a lot more courage to vote against such a program than to vote for it.

RISK OF A TAILSPIN

Q Is there a limit to how far Congress can go in voting new programs that require increased spending?

A There is a limit to the amount of money that the Federal Government can raise through a fair and equitable tax system. If you try to overdo it, you will run the risk of throwing the economy into a tailspin.

Q Do you get the feeling there is sentiment among people generally that taxes cannot or should not go above a certain level?

A I don't think there's any doubt about it.

What we have to keep in mind here in Washington is that we are only one of several levels of government hitting the same taxpayer.

Now, we have reduced some of the federal tax burdens, as you know. We reduced them in 1962, again in 1964, and again in 1965. But, as we reduced federal taxes, local governments and State governments have increased their own taxes. As a result, the taxpayer often believes he is paying more to all branches of government than he was before federal taxes were reduced.

Q Do you sense that there are places in this country where a taxpayer revolt is simmering just beneath the surface?

A Yes, I've often thought that if taxpayers ever were as well organized as some other groups, they might want to revolt against their rising tax burdens—Social Security taxes, federal income taxes, property taxes at State and local levels, State income taxes, State sales taxes.

I am sure, too, that many taxpayers would want to do away with what some of them call giveaway programs.

Q Are people getting impatient over the heavy load the U.S. is carrying to defend the free world?

A Yes, I see signs of that. People want to know: "Why do we have to police the whole world at our exclusive cost? Why is it more important to us than it is to the free countries of Europe and Asia and the other large and growing industrial areas of the world?

Q Is all that putting too much of a strain on our taxing system?

A As I have noted, I don't believe our tax structure is geared to produce enough revenues for us to police the world and make it safe, have everything we want at home, go to the moon, and do all the other things that some people seem to want done.

In place of tax policy being the tail of the dog, and expenditures the body, we've got to reverse that. Spending has got to become contingent on tax policy, not the other way around.

AS DEBT GOES UP AND UP

Q The federal debt is now about 336 billion dollars. As a practical matter, is there any limit to how high that debt can go?

A I think there is. I don't agree with the philosophy that the public debt is not necessarily too high because it is a smaller percentage of the gross national product today than it was back in 1945 or 1955 or some other prior date, I look at the total amount of the debt.

What disturbs me is this: Though practically all of us have gotten away from the idea that the federal budget has to be balanced every year, many of us still cling to the notion that it ought to be balanced during the course of a business cycle. But these days, it is not even balanced on that basis.

If we can't operate within a balanced budget when we are enjoying the highest level of prosperity the American people have ever known, then I question quite frankly when we will ever have balanced budgets.

Q Would you hazard a guess as to how high the debt can go?

A I don't want to say the debt couldn't go higher than it is now. I don't like it this high. But my main concern is with our ability to handle the debt. I am thinking in terms of the nearly 15 billion dollars a year that is required just to pay interest on it. That's far more than it cost to operate the whole Federal Government when I came to Congress.

Q How many years ago was that?

A That was 29 years ago. The first year I was in Congress—the year starting July 1, 1939—the federal budget was about 8.8 billion dollars.

Q The way things are going, would you expect a similar rise in the next 29 years?

A I'd certainly hope we could avoid that. I read one study recently that indicated that within the next 20 years we would be spending two thirds of a trillion dollars—that's 667 billion—at the federal level.

MONEY: NO CURE-ALL

Q Do you find a growing notion in official circles that money will solve all our problems?

A I'm sure there has been a feeling by some within Government that if you just spend enough money on a problem, the problem will disappear.

We certainly have not been niggardly in the past on spending money to try to solve major problems. But many of those same problems are not only still with us, they are bigger than ever—despite all the money we've spent. I don't think the spending of money by the Federal Government tends to eliminate many of these problems.

DILEMMA CONFRONTING FLORIDA EVERGLADES PORTRAYED IN NATIONAL JOURNAL—CONGRESS TAKES ACTION

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, the Florida Everglades have long captured the imagination and have long enchanted the sportsmen, naturalists, conservations, and vacationers of our land, particularly those in the Sunshine State.

The everglades are among the few genuinely wilderness areas of America that have been carefully preserved and protected by Federal and State laws. Yet the adequate control of the waters of Lake Okeechobee, the main source from which water dispurses out to the thousands of square miles which comprise the great everglades swamp, has posed a substantial threat to the economic development of Florida and the subsequent well-being of its people for almost half a century.

Lake Okeechobee is America's largest inland lake which lies wholly within the confines of the United States. Yet it is one of the shallowest lakes in the world, often averaging a depth of less than 1 foot.

The disastrous hurricane of September 1928 caused Lake Okeechobee to pour billions of gallons of water into surrounding areas. Some 2,500 people subsequently died from the flooding caused by this devastating storm, the greatest loss of life from a storm in our Nations' history. Much of this death and destruction was caused directly by the lack of any works of improvement to retard the flood waters of Lake Okeechobee.

Recognizing the great danger to the safety and well-being of residents of southern Florida posed by an uncontrolled Lake Okeechobee, the Federal Government, through the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and at the insistence of President Hoover, began work in 1930 on the first flood control work of improvement. The Hoover Dike, which resulted from this initial construction, is one of the most extensive flood control retaining walls in the world. In 1930, however, this was but a modest beginning of an undertaking that everyone realized would take decades and millions of dollars. The Government's recognition of the problems posed by Lake Okeechobee was the initial step in the development of one of the most comprehensive flood control projects in the world, the central and southern Florida flood control project.

The central and southern Florida flood control project was authorized by act of Congress on June 30, 1948. The estimated cost of completing this project is $269 million, yet the total annual benefits from the project—including flood damage prevention, increased land use, local benefits, and so forth—total some $73,968,000. Thus, one can readily see the tremendous benefits which will be derived over the years from the expenditures for this project. On the basis of this information, the cumulative annual benefits surpass the total estimated cost of the entire project in less than 4 years.

The nature of some of the flood control works of the Corps of Engineers has been questioned by some well-meaning parties. On the one hand, the Corps justifies its work in the interest of protecting the people and the economic development of Florida against ravaging floodwaters, stemming from Lake Okeechobee. On the other hand, the conservationists and naturalists seek to protect the wildlife and to preserve the wilderness environment of the area. Both of these objectives are worthy of praise and of consideration. Yet the dispute has often been heated, and it has been extended. Investigations of the Corps of Engineers and of the National Park Service are presently underway as the activities of these two important agencies relate to the Everglades National Park, which lies on the southernmost tip of the Florida mainland. It is hoped by all concerned parties in Florida, and here in Washington also, that a reasonable agreement can be worked out by all the concerned parties—Federal, State, and local—which will realistically protect the people and economic development of Florida and at the same time preserve and protect this great wilderness environment. By a reasonable agreement, concerned parties hope that it will not be a compromise, a little bit of the people and economic development being sacrificed on one hand and a little bit of conservation being sacrificed on the other, but rather that it will be one which protects all interests.

Having led the successful fight in the Public Works Committee to add $4 million to the central and southern flood control 1968 authorization, largely to cover the cost of protecting the Everglades National Park and the Senate having added $1.6 million in appropriations to do emergency work on this project, I believe real headway is being made toward resolving this problem.

Mr. Speaker, the October issue of the Journal of the National Geographic Society features an article coauthorized by Frederick Kent Truslow and Frederick G. Vosburgh, editor of National Geographic, both eminently distinguished in conservation and naturalist activities. The article is excellently written and vividly portrays the dilemma posed in trying to reach a reasonable solution to the problems of the everglades. It is unfortunate that the striking, colorful, creative illustrations of Florida's natural beauty, prepared for the article by Frederick Kent Truslow and Staff Photographer Otis Imboden, cannot be reprinted in the RECORD. I am confident that it would result in a rush of tourists to the Sunshine State.

Mr. Speaker, while there are some points in the article with which I might take exception, in light of the needed works of improvement in the area to protect the people and economic development of the State, the article is a significant contribution to the developing literature on this complex problem.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, at this point in my remarks, I include the text of this timely article, "Threatened Glories of Everglades National Park," and commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

The article follows:

THREATENED GLORIES OF EVERGLADES NATIONAL PARK

(By Frederick Kent Truslow and Frederick G. Vosburgh)

Under a hot and steamy sun, the shallow soup-warm waters teemed and crawled with languid life. Dense schools of foot-long garfish drifted like clouds above the rank bottom growth and ooze of pond and slough. Water snakes and turtles lay in the weeds, and primitive-looking birds stalked the shallows, scurried over the lily pads, or clung in the trees.

A water bird with a neck like a snake cruised past a knobby log half submerged at the water's edge.

The log opened a cold eye and for an instant regarded the bird; one sudden rush and a snap would do it. Then the eye closed again; for the moment, the alligator wasn't hungry.

Cruising on, the anhinga slowly sank until even his snaky neck and head disappeared. He emerged with a bream impaled on his beak, tossed the little fish aloft, deftly caught it, and swallowed it headfirst.

Unaware how close he had come to going down a gullet himself, he flew up into a pond-apple tree and spread his inelegant wings to dry.

Against a green riot of tree, fern, and vine, this snakebird made a grotesque picture—calling to mind the world's first birds, when the scales of crawlers were turning to feathers and earthbound reptiles were learning to fly.

"It seems like a scene from the Age of Reptiles," exclaimed a visitor from the North. "It's like stepping back ages to a time when the great coal deposits were being laid down."

"That's so," said the friend beside him. "But unless we all do something about it, this park will be as dead as the pterodactyl."

The scene was the Anhinga Trail in Everglades National Park. The man who made the grim pronouncement was my friend and co-author Frederick Kent Truslow, the retired New York business executive who has built an ulcer-free second career as one of the world's great naturalist-photographers.

Fred has infinite patience with birds. He will spend fourteen hours on a soggy seat in a swamp, or on a swaying perch high in the air, to record the crimson glory of the roseate spoonbill, the home life of the bald eagle, or the wide-winged majesty of the wood ibis, the country's only stork. But he grows impatient of any delay in taking steps to save them.

"People aren't blessed with bright colors or wings, but they do have the brains God gave them," he says, "and they ought to use them to save this place before it's too late."

"But," you probably answer, as I did at first, "we made this vast area a national park twenty years ago. Nobody is allowed to shoot a bird here, or a deer (or pick a single flower. What more can we do? Why is this in danger?"

"You'll see," said Fred, not one to waste words.

Day by day, as I explored the park, I saw ever more clearly the problem—water—and, beyond that, busy man himself, ever multiplying, altering his earth.

RIVER 50 MILES WIDE, 9 INCHES DEEP

Most people think of the Everglades as a swamp. Actually its heart is a river—a "river of grass," in the apt phrase coined by Florida writer Marjory Stoneman Douglas.

"Pa-hay-okee," the Seminole Indians called it, meaning "grassy water."

"This is the greatest expanse of saw grass in the world," said a park ranger when we stopped to walk the Pa-hay-okee Trail and gaze out over the true Everglades—a billowing ever-ever land.

The waving saw grass reminded a Middle Westerner of the seas of wheat on our Great Plains. To me it recalled the grassy plains of East Africa, with their herds of antelope and lazy, well-fed lions.

But only when seen from a distance does the saw grass resemble either one. This is not a grass but a sedge, its long, thin leaves triple-edged with fine saw teeth that can cruelly rake your clothes and skin. Although usually not as tall as a man, it sometimes reaches twice that height. And it likes to have its feet in water most of the year.

Look closely now, and you will see our river—a few inches of water around the roots.

"You are looking at the widest, shallowest, and strangest river in America," the ranger is saying. "It is fifty miles wide in places and flows at most a third of a mile a day. Even in fall, the wettest season, its average depth is rarely over nine inches; most of it is often bone dry for weeks in spring, the dry season."

The river's source, in simpler times, was occasional spillover from Lake Okeechobee, 66 miles to the north, and seasonal rains over the Everglades. But draining of mucklands south of the lake to grow crops altered the age-old pattern of runoff, and much of the water that used to flow south was channeled directly to the sea.

Then in mid-September, 1928, a hurricane roared in from the Caribbean and scored a direct hit on big, shallow Lake Okeechobee. Fill a saucer with water, then sweep your hand through it and you will have some idea of the effect. The resulting flood killed at least 1,500 people; some estimates put the toll as high as 2,500. No accurate count was possible, in some places, bodies were heaped in piles and burned.

In faraway Washington an appalled Government took action, and in 1930 the Army Corps of Engineers began work on what was to become known as the Herbert Hoover Dike to end spillover from the lake forever. From the south side this great embankment was continued around the lake. It has been under construction ever since, and the Engineers say they expect to complete it within the next three years, increasing the lake's safe storage capacity by more than a million acre-feet.

Meanwhile, over the years, they have designed and built an elaborate system of levees and canals to keep Lake Okeechobee from ever reaching danger depth. Before the hurricane season each year, billions of gallons are drained to the Atlantic and the Gulf of Mexico.

Working closely with the Engineers is an energetic state agency, the Central and Southern Florida Flood Control District, created in 1949. Besides helping to control floods, its duties include assuring all hands an ample supply of fresh water.

As resort cities burgeoned along the coast, demand for water had grown enormously. Some Miami area residents a few years before had had a startling experience. When they turned on their faucets, the water from their wells came out salty—undrinkable.

What had happened? Miami and much of this coast lies on a series of rocks composed mostly of porous limestone. Geologists call the formation the Biscayne aquifer—literally, "water carrier." Fresh water flows through it as if through a sponge. But the sea presses in from the other side, and if the sweet water has too little force, salt water will invade the aquifer. That's what had happened when the taps flowed salty.

DAM-BORNE ROAD CUTS RIVER OF GRASS

To keep this vital sponge full of sweet water and to store reserves for unrainy days, the Corps of Engineers and the Flood Control District have created a vast system of shallow, grassy reservoirs, called conservation areas, north of the park.

Open to the public, these areas preserve thousands of acres of glades country for hunting, fishing, camping, boating, and other recreational use. But inevitably they interrupt the natural flow of the river of grass southward into the national park.

This became agonizingly apparent after 1962, when completion of Conservation Area 3, just north of the famous Tamiami Trail, resulted in the building of an earthen dam along the park's northern boundary. The dam, or levee, with the road on top, replaced a nine-mile section of the old Trail. The Engineers built six sets of gates in the levee—four to release water into the park and two as emergency outlets from the conservation area.

During the years that followed, the gates were kept closed much of the time, and the park found itself gasping for water, especially in the tragically dry spring of 1965. Last spring drought again stalked the Everglades, but this time the state requested that the gates be kept open. Result: a greatly reduced kill of fish and other wildlife.

Recurring cycles of drought and flood are nothing new to the Everglades. June and July usually bring rains which reach a climax in the autumn hurricane season. In late winter and spring the Glades dry up. All creatures dependent upon fresh water congregate in ever-shrinking sloughs and water holes.

Rainfall directly upon the park has always provided about 85 percent of its water supply, but virtually all of this is lost by evaporation and by transpiration through the foliage of plants. Especially in a prolonged drought, the flow from the north and east can be crucial. Under natural conditions, excess water from up Okeechobee way used to arrive when needed most. Taking weeks to filter southward, it extended the wet season here, shortening the draught and cushioning its effects.

A SLOW, THIRSTY DEATH FOR MILLIONS

Without this flow from the north, a long rainless season that would have been bearable may become excruciatingly severe and bring slow death to millions of creatures.

"Everglades Life Periled by Drought," proclaimed newspaper headlines as I flew to Miami and drove to the park under an unrelenting May sun in '65. "Fourth Straight Year of Drought."

Where the road crossed Taylor Slough, near the turn-off to the Anhinga Trail, a National Park Service sign still said, "Fishing in this area reserved for the birds." But there were no fish, no birds—and no water. I walked dry-shod across the slough.

At Royal Palm Pond, where the Anhinga Trail begins, Park Naturalist Sam Mendlen looked tragic. Around the edge of the shrunken pond lay hundreds of dead and dying garfish.

"They're not the weakest species, but the strongest," the naturalist said. "The bass and bream are gone long ago. Fish can't live when the water gets stagnant and there's no oxygen left in it. See 'em pulling into the bank? Those fish are dying. We're pumping oxygen into the water, it helps some. Pumping water in too, from a 30-foot-deep well.

"You don't see many small gators now. When food's in short supply, the bigger gators eat the smaller ones, and so on down the line."

That night I dreamed of a gator pool. At first it was full of happy little gators. The pool got smaller and just before I woke up, I saw that it held a single gator—a nightmare beast as big as all the others put together.

Reality was bad enough. Pools that once supported hordes of fish, turtles, gators, and wading birds had disappeared entirely, leaving only a cracked expanse of dried mud. From one the track of a big alligator wandered off into the dusty distance.

Rangers were roping homeless gators and trucking them to distant water holes. Others had enlisted technical aid from demolition experts at nearby Homestead Air Force Base.

"We've been making artificial gator holes," said Ranger Erwin Winte, "blasting down to the water table with dynamite. But these are only stopgap measures. Until it rains we've got to try to do *something*."

That very night the heavens opened. The rains of June had come at last, and the Everglades' worst drought was broken.

I remember the delight of 9-year-old Eddie, the Wintes' son.

"Look," he said, "this was dry mud last week. You can still see the cracks on the bottom. But now there's two feet of water already. And see, there's a little fish. I wonder how it got there." I wondered too.

Thus quickly the Everglades recover, in the age-old pattern of famine and feast. But each time the toll of wildlife runs high. We are living on capital.

OTTERS FALL PREY TO ALLIGATORS

With not enough food and water, alligators die or eat each other. Mammals suffer too, especially such water-dependent creatures as the playful otter. Half-starved alligators lie in wait for them at the few remaining water holes.

"I saw gators wipe out what I took to be a whole family of otters one dry year," Fred Truslow told me. "Caught six in the same pool, one after another."

Birds can fly elsewhere in search of water, but often at the cost of a new generation. Consider, for example, the wood ibis.

Every winter for as long as anybody knows, these storks of our southern United States coasts have been coming to south Florida to breed in great rookeries in the Everglades.

Under the fecund Florida sun, the shallow waters of the river of grass breed unimaginable quantities of organic life, and with the seasonal drying at the end of the rains in October or early November, the pools that remain become bowls of fish soup. It's this living soup that draws the wood storks here, coming in by the hundreds on broad wings with a spread of fully five feet.

BOTH PARENTS FEED HUNGRY STORKLETS

The wood stork is a grope feeder; he gulps anything fishy that his big beak hits as he swings it around in the ponds. But there had better be plenty of fish in this stew. Both papa and mama are eating for two—or three or four—for they feed the young by regurgitation. If the soup is too thin or the pond too distant, it will be impossible to gorge and deliver the outlandish quantities needed to raise a nestful of hungry storklets. Sometimes hundreds will build nests, lay eggs, hatch young—and abandon them.

"What happens then," says Fred, who has seen it, "I'd rather not be asked to describe. But vultures like it a lot."

This year, for the first time since 1961, the storks did well, nesting off and on from December to June and raising 3,000 babies.

"I'm convinced that the storks can nest successfully only if rainfall is supplemented by a substantial flow of water through the gates on the Trail," said Dr. William B. Robertson, Jr., National Park Service Research Biologist.

Under the present federal-state agreement, the park gets water "when lake levels permit"—specifically, when the level of Lake Okeechobee stands at least 12½ feet above mean sea level. To speed movement of the water southward, the canal system is being improved at a cost of more than $3,000,000, four-fifths federal and one-fifth state funds.

The difficulty is that, in a widespread drought, lake levels might *not* permit. Last spring, Florida's Governor Claude R. Kirk, Jr., personally requested that releases of water to the park be continued throughout the drought, even though the Lake Okeechobee reserve had sunk below the 12½-foot minimum. But there is no guarantee that this will always be done.

This fall a four-year study of the Florida water problem is due for completion by the Army's Corps of Engineers, and conservationists hope it will propose a means of reducing the present waste of fresh water.

As Park Superintendent Roger W. Allin has said: "Many feel that the dumping of this important natural resource to the Atlantic or the Gulf of Mexico should not be permitted, and plans to reroute these surplus waters back to their historic watersheds and through Everglades National Park should be given early attention."

"Whatever the cost proves to be," said Park Service Director George B. Hartzog, Jr., "I am sure that our conservation-minded country will not hesitate to save Everglades National Park, the only unit in our entire system where unique natural-history values are seriously threatened with destruction. The only question is whether action can come before it is too late."

"We didn't acquire this subtropical wonderland twenty years ago to let it go by default," declared conservationist Conrad Wirth, Director of the National Park Service from 1951 to 1964 and father of Mission 66. "But if we don't act promptly and wisely, we'll have a dried-up mud flat on our hands."

WATER SHORTAGE AFFECTS ALL

Army Engineers and the Flood Control District reply that they aren't anti-park or anti-animal, but that the needs of farmers, cities, and their own conservation areas, too, must be met. They point out the difficulty of storing water in a land almost as flat as your hand, where most of the rain falls within the five months from June 1 to November 1, and where nature's only reservoir, Lake Okeechobee, must be kept no more than two-thirds full at that very season lest another hurricane drown thousands. But they agree that modern engineering genius can improve the present situation—at a price.

Says Brig. Gen. H. G. Woodbury, Jr., Director of Civil Works, Army Corps of Engineers: "Since the Central and Southern Florida Flood Control Project began, the park has received more water—probably double the amount—than it would have received otherwise under identical conditions of rainfall. Though this partly completed project is beginning to function well, to the benefit of all south Florida, including Everglades Park, we are now restudying the area's comprehensive needs to ascertain how the program can be made even more effective in meeting the critical and difficult water problems there."

Even from a practical and local viewpoint, the issue can no longer be regarded as people versus animals. Their interests are much too closely bound together. Biologists point out that the multimillion-dollar shrimp industry, as well as south Florida's lucrative sport and commercial fisheries in Florida Bay and off its southern Gulf Coast, depend on the flow of fresh water through the park. Brackish "nursery" waters are in danger of becoming too salty to support baby shrimp and the myriad lowly shallow-water creatures that form the base of the fish-food pyramid.

A MILLION VISITORS A YEAR

More and more Floridians are coming to appreciate, too, the importance of the park's fate to their vital industry—tourism. Each year the haunting beauty of the Everglades, and their incredible richness in wildlife, bring more visitors to this unique corner of the country. Last year, for the first time, Everglades joined the list of national parks attracting more than a million visitors annually. The total has risen half a million in seven years.

As the visitor from the North approaches the park in winter, it seems as if all the bird life from home has been shaken down into this toe of the Nation, like goodies in a Christmas stocking. Except for the thin line of the Florida Keys, this is as far south as birds can get without a long overwater hop. There are robins, catbirds, goldfinches, and a host of other small summertime friends, as well as many birds of prey.

Here, too, as we drove to the park last spring, were more reminders of how man is closing in upon his remaining wilderness areas: a big rocket-engine plant only a mile from the park entrance and nearby the controversial Canal 111, which park officials feared would drain off sorely needed fresh water and allow salt water to invade the land. The rocket tests, however, terminated with the third firing last June, and, in the battle of C–111, park officials and conservationists have won a partial victory—agreement to provide gates to prevent salt-water intrusion, and openings in the canal wall to shunt fresh water into the park.

At the Visitor Center just inside the park entrance, you stand at the dizzy elevation of 5½ feet above sea level. Driving from here to Florida Bay at Flamingo—a little less than forty miles—you go downhill at an average rate of an inch and three-quarters per mile. But in a region so low and flat, a few inches can alter land and nature as much as thousands of feet in the Rockies. Altitudes, slight though it is, divides this Delaware-size park into three different worlds—the pinelands, the saw grass, and the mangrove coast.

First because highest is the pinelands world, a beguiling place of wind soughing through long needles, of calling bobwhite and hammering woodpecker. By night the woods stir with unsuspected life as raccoons and opossums come forth to feed, bobcats and gray foxes prowl, and white-tailed deer, by some miracle, avoid breaking their dainty, fragile legs in nature-made booby traps—holes dissolved in the porous limestone.

PINES YIELD TO SAW-GRASS GLADES

From these rocky, pine-clad five-foot "mountains" you descend a few inperceptible inches and enter the true glade country—the world of saw grass, hammock, and slough.

What an adventure this must have been in the days when early explorers braved the Everglades—men like Maj. A. P. Williams in 1883 and Hugh L. Willoughby, "Ex-Lieutenant Commanding Rhode Island Naval Reserve," in '97. Even then, only 70 years ago and well within the memory of men now living, all the area south of Lake Okeechobee and west of a thin strip of pineland facing the Atlantic was a watery wilderness known only to the secretive Seminole. Even the Williams expedition had probed no more than a wavering north-south line as far as the Harney River.

As Willoughby wrote in *Across the Everglades*, "in our very midst, as it were, in one of our Atlantic coast States, we have a tract of land one hundred and thirty miles long and seventy miles wide that is as much unknown to the white man as the heart of Africa."

He and a companion crossed by canoe, from the mangrove swamps of the Gulf Coast near the Harney's mouth to the infant town of Miami. "What a change," he wrote, "had been made in this place since the same time last year!—from two houses it has been made a town of two thousand inhabitants. Of course, its splendid big hotel, with every modern convenience, will prove a great boom to the tourist, but for me the picturesqueness seemed to have gone; its wilderness has been rudely marred by the hand of civilization."

In the Everglades this lover of wildness surely found it. He and a companion bucked the saw grass in two canvas canoes, with a bicycle-wheel cyclometer mounted on one to measure distance. Some days they were able to pole and push their way eastward only two or three miles and once they had to backtrack 13 miles.

The saw grass, Willoughby wrote, "is the great barrier to Everglade travel; it pays better to go twenty-five miles around than half a mile through. What makes this grass so formidable and so much to be dreaded is the saw-like edge with which it is armed on three sides. . . . The nose and face suffer much."

Yet Willoughby found much to admire: "The popular impression has always been that the Everglades is a huge swamp, full of malaria and disease germs. There was certainly nothing in our surroundings that would remind one of a swamp. Around the shores of the little islands the mud may be a trifle soft, but pure water is running over it, and no stagnant pools can be found. In the daytime the cool breeze has an undisturbed sweep, and the water is protected from overheating by the shade the grass affords. Water-plants of various kinds and several varieties of fish and reptiles keep the balance of life, as in a self-sustaining aquarium."

After a flight over the park, I had to agree that except by plane this would be about the worst journey in the world. At the little amphibian's controls was Ranger-pilot Ralph

Miele, and with us went our biologist friend Bill Robertson.

My first impression was of a land part water, part weeds, flat and wholly deserted. Then I saw dust rising from the "Hole in the Doughnut"—privately owned farmland still within the park—and picked out the long road running generally southwest to Florida Bay at Flamingo.

A WORLD FOR THE BIRDS

Yes, there were some signs of man, but most of the scene seemed to be for the birds—too wet for walking, too dry for a boat. Near ponds where wading birds were feeding, the watery land was ashimmer with wings. A few showed the black and white of the wood storks; and over turquoise Florida Bay, other large white birds with black wing tips flapped along in dignified flight.

"White pelicans," Bill shouted above the drumming of the engine. "They come here in winter from the northern Great Plains.

"We're going to check for spoonbills and eagles now."

As we swung lower and turned, I saw an island frosted with white and pink.

"Tern Key," said Bill. "Roseate spoonbill rookery. About 200 nesting pairs. Not bad."

Now we were over another island, and in the top of a hurricane-ravaged black mangrove I saw an untidy-looking nest with a white-headed bird of prey in it.

"Not yet," Bill said. "That's only an osprey. You'll see the difference."

Another island swung into view, another tree, and a nest like a small haystack, but no eagle that I could see.

"Two young," announced Bill, and with the glasses I made out two bits of fluff.

And now on majestic wings came the mother. (Or was it the father?) No osprey this; she looked twice its size and so lordly of mien that she might have flown right off the national coat of arms. But instead of arrows and an olive branch, she gripped a small, anticlimactic fish.

We left the little ones mobbing their mother for the catfish, and in an hour's flight Bill counted 20 active eagle nests. On some sat a great white-headed bird; in others we saw eggs or eaglets.

"There's no other place in the country outside Alaska," said Ralph, "where you can see as many bald eagle nests in an hour's flying."

All the eagle nests were close to salt water, most of them in dead trees in the all but inaccessible mangrove realm along the park's west rim, a maze of islands and channels.

In one long, placid channel I saw what I thought at first was a boat; then I realized it was a manatee, or sea cow, its flat tail stirring up a wake of mud as it churned along near the bottom. Biggest animal in the park, the manatee measures up to 15 feet and weighs as much as 1,200 pounds. Now strictly protected in Florida, it helps man by eating aquatic plants that clog canals and streams.

Finally we sighted civilization again—a few scattered houses on an island gleaming strangely white.

"That's Chokoloskee Island," the pilot said, "just outside the park boundary. It's built up largely of the shells of oysters the Indians ate."

These were the long-vanished Calusa and their predecessors, who lived here perhaps as long ago as the time of Christ.

Gliding in over the white wooden houses of the fishing village that stands today upon this monument to vanished gourmands, we landed at nearby Everglades City, where Ranger Dick Stokes greeted us grimly. Alligator poaching hereabouts was rife, and even when the rangers could catch the culprits, getting a conviction was like pulling gator teeth.

But Dick brightened as he showed us an ancient pottery bowl and conch-shell tools he had recently found and added to the National Park Services' collection of Calusa relics.

ONLY A REMNANT OF INDIANS NOW

Today the Indian is gone from the park, except for a narrow strip just inside its north boundary along the Tamiami Trail. There dwell some 190 members of the Miccosukee tribe, usually considered a branch of the Seminole. From the air, we glimpsed their palm-thatched *chickees* beside the busy Trail.

Some saw-grass areas outside the park were crisscrossed by great curving tracks, as if dinosaurs had been playing tag.

"Tracks of swamp buggies and airboats used by hunters," the pilot explained.

Deer hunting here has become big business, with elaborate camps, airplanes, and two-way radio as well as huge-tired swamp buggies and high-speed airboats. In the park, such vehicles are not allowed, except for patrol and emergency use by rangers.

I remembered some notes National Geographic photographer Otis Imboden made after a roaring ride with Ranger Winte in an airboat, an almost-flying machine with a 150-horsepower airplane engine and propeller.

"Noise like something out of Hades and exciting blast of wind in your face. High saw grass parts and bushes fly past as you glide over a dew-deep streak of watery grass and lily pads.

"Secret of steering is to throw the craft into a fast 'drift,' like a powerful racing car making a curve. You have to step on the gas and send the boat into a broad sideslip at every turn. Twin air-rudders moved by joy stick. Foot-pedal accelerator like automobile. Biggest difference—*no brakes!* Only way to stop suddenly is to make a skidding about-face.

"Machine is perfectly adapted to the limited geography of the Glades. High seat for driver puts him above grass-top level. Latest adaptation is slick vinyl plastic coating on flat hull bottom; reduces friction for an extra five or ten miles per hour. Usually boats cruise from 30 to 40 mph. Capable of 60 to 70 mph—when there's water in the Glades."

Now from the air we see a skyscraper. At least it seems like one in this flat landscape—a concrete tower rising 65 feet above the saw grass and underbrush. The Park Service completed it three years ago to provide a fire lookout and give visitors a view of the all but invisible, inches-deep Shark Slough—the heart of the river of grass. In the pool at the tower's base we can see dozens of gators, tails swinging from side to side like sculling oars.

This Shark Valley Observation Tower draws increasing numbers of tourists from the Tamiami Trail, seven miles away. Oil prospectors built the original road, but the Park Service has made it a 15-mile loop to assure visitors new sights in both directions.

"GLOWS AND GLORIES" OF A TEARDROP ISLE

More miles of saw grass dotted with hammocks, and from their distinctive shape I realized fully for the first time that these are indeed islands in a stream.

"Each hammock is an elongated teardrop of greener hardwood vegetation," Bill Robertson pointed out, "with its streamlined comet-tail pointing downriver. See how each is aligned with the water flow in a sweeping curve south and then west?

"Some hammocks have a sort of natural moat where the organic acids have etched away the adjoining rock. This helps to protect the hammocks from glades fires, but in times of drought they can be destroyed—not only the vegetation but the soil itself."

I wondered how dirt could burn—till later I walked over a typical hammock. Here is botany gone mad. I thought of Robinson Crusoe's tropic isle and remembered lines from Tennyson's *Enoch Arden*:

"The lightning flash of insect and of bird,
The lustre of the long convolvuluses
That coil'd around the stately stems, and ran
Ev'n to the limit of the land, the glows
And glories of the broad belt of the world."

Here the very earth seems living. Wholly organic, the hammock peat itself falls prey to a really determined fire. In a dry year even the peat of the saw-grass plains may burn.

But now the pinelands reappeared, and the red-and-white amphibian planed to earth at the little strip near park headquarters.

Having seen the park as the eagle—or the eagle-counter—sees it, we joined the hundreds coming by car to this tropic wonderland.

"In the course of a walk through a hammock in the Park," biologist Bill Robertson has writen, "you might observe, say, a raccoon, a blue jay, and a black snake—nothing tropical about any of these creatures; they could be seen as readily in Illinois or Connecticut. However, the tree that the raccoon climbs, the insect the blue jay catches and the lizard that the black snake has just eaten are likely to be the tropical species not found elsewhere in the United States."

This paragraph in his book *Everglades—The Park Story* sums up for me much of the park's appeal, its combination of the familiar with the bizarre and exotic. Here are many immigrants from the tropics. Most arrived by wave or wind, but some plants doubtless came as seeds in the stomachs of birds.

At Royal Palm, once a Florida state park and nucleus of the national preserve, two of the finest nature walks begin—the Anhinga Trail and Gumbo Limbo Trail. The tropical hardwood called gumbo limbo is also known as the sunburn tree because its reddish peeling bark suggests an appalling case of Florida's commonest beach indiscretion.

Within thirty feet of the winding boardwalk that carries the Anhinga Trail over water and mud, a pair of anhingas had built a nest and the mother snakebird was feeding her young.

"That's one of those anaconda birds," said a lady.

"She'll learn a lot before she leaves this place," said Fred with a grin.

"See that great blue heron over there?" He pointed to a four-foot bird with an ideal build for a basketball player. The heron stood so still I had missed him.

"Well," Fred continued, "I was here one day making pictures when a party of city people came through. The man who did most of the talking spied a great blue heron standing there like something somebody had painted.

"'Look!' he said. 'Artificial bids! The Park Service ought to be ashamed of itself.'

"Just then the old heron spied what he had been waiting for. That beak and neck shot out like a snake striking. He missed, gave out with an angry squak, and stalked off around the bend like a center who had just been sent to the showers for too many fouls.

"The city man, I noticed, was a little quieter after that."

Mrs. Ruth Mendlen, a park naturalist like her husband Sam, came along with a party of Cub Scouts in tow.

"What would you do if a mosquito started to bite you?" one boy asked another.

"I'd slap it."

"Well, you'd be destroying wildlife. I'd just let it bite."

"Then you'd be feeding the animals, and that's against the park rules, too."

BIRDS BECOME PEOPLE-WATCHERS

In twenty minutes along this wooden trail we saw uncountable numbers of creatures, from soft-shelled turtles in the lily pads and banded water snakes coiled in clumps of grass to big and little alligators and a host of swimming and wading birds. Here some of the country's most elusive and striking herons, egrets, grebes, and bitterns become so accustomed to people-watching that you can approach them within a few feet. Among them were a wood ibis and a limpkin. But I looked in vain for roseate spoonbills.

"We'll see them later," Fred said. "They're ordinarily coastal, but I hear there's a great show right now at a brackish pond down the road."

Sure enough. By gracing an insignificant little pond with their presence, the spoonbills had piled up traffic like a bear jam in Yellowstone.

"They're coming farther inland to feed now, and you see them here in larger numbers," said District Naturalist Vince Mrazek.

In this one small pond and its backdrop of trees we counted 67 "pinks," as Fred calls them, the adults as radiant as a tropical sunset. Every now and then one would go into action, fluttering its wings, hopping from spot to spot, and swinging its great horn spoon through the fishy water.

Visitors from the North often confuse the spoonbill with the flamingo, today all but gone from Florida except for captive birds.

Although there is no record of wild flamingos ever nesting in the United States, large flocks of these brilliant West Indian birds used to visit south Florida—so many and so often at the turn of the century that they gave their name to the little settlement on Florida Bay that now is the Mecca of park visitors. Today one rarely sees a free-flying flamingo in Florida. The last group seems to have been a flight of six photographed by National Geographic President-Editor Melville Grosvenor seven years ago.

On the way to Flamingo we passed almost unknowing from the saw-grass world to the world of the mangrove. But first we walked through Mahogany Hammock, where the country's largest mahogany has withstood innumerable hurricanes.

A "SNAKE" THAT STRANGLES TREES

In this green shade it is easy to imagine a cougar lurking to pounce out at the deer we had seen splashing through the Glades. But even in the safety of the park, very few of these great cats remain, and many of those "seen" by tourists turn out to be bobcats.

To me the most eerie and unrelenting predator in this tropic gloom is not an animal but a plant—the strangler fig. It begins life as an air plant in the top of a tree, where the seeds are often dropped by birds. It sends roots dangling down to the ground, and as it grows it becomes a writhing, seeking snake, ever extending and ever tightening its great gray constrictor coils around its victim tree, like the serpents of Greek legend around Laocoön and his sons. Cut it off and it lives again as an air plant until it can put down new roots. This botanical snake has no mercy and finally squeezes its host to death.

There are real snakes, too, including rattlers, though visitors rarely see them.

"Usually a rattler will try to keep out of your way," said Fred as we drove along, "but I once met one that followed me.

"I was making pictures on the Anhinga Trail when Park Naturalist Malcolm Ross came along with a party of visitors. It was up at the end where the boardwalk loop trail meets the old road, and just at the edge of the road he had seen a big diamondback rattler.

" 'Hey, Fred,' he said, behind his hand, 'keep your eye on this snake till I finish with these people and can catch him.' 'Sure,' I said. Then I strolled back toward my equipment, thinking I might get a picture of the snake—and the snake came right along with me.

" 'That's funny,' I thought. 'Is that snake following me? Or does he just happen to be going the same way I'm going?' I walked across to the other side of the road—and the rattler crossed the road too. I crossed back—and he did the same.

"Just then an elderly couple came along and the man said, 'Do you know there's a snake following you?' 'Yes,' I said. 'I suppose it's a pet snake,' he said. 'No,' I had to tell him, 'I never saw him in my life before—and I recommend you get outa here!' They did.

"By that time the snake and I had come about 75 yards, and he was right behind me. So I got up on the wooden fence at the nearer end of the boardwalk loop and tucked my feet up. I didn't feel any too secure, because the snake came and coiled up right under me, looking up, and a two-and-a-half-foot fence didn't seem any too high because it was a six-foot snake.

"Pretty soon Malcolm and his party came around the loop and he looked where the snake had been. Then he saw me 75 yards away on the fence, and when he got close enough, he called, again behind his hand: 'where's the snake?' 'Right here,' I said with a gesture, not caring to speak loud. Then he saw it, right at my feet.

" 'How did it get there?' he asked, surprised.

" 'It followed me,' I said. 'How else do you suppose it would get there?'

" 'Well,' he said, 'you stay right on that fence.'

" 'What you think I'm going to do, get down?' I asked.

"He went and got a snake stick and caught it, and he and Sam Mendlen put it in a bag. It didn't put up any fuss. In fact, it hadn't tried to hurt anybody, just followed me.

"If Malcolm and Sam hadn't been there, I wouldn't expect you to believe it, but that's what happened, and I can't explain it."

On the Mangrove Trail at West Lake we saw vivid signs of hurricane fury. Flamingo itself, in September, 1960, felt the full force of Donna, which deroofed and gutted the newly completed Visitor Center. Hurricane-driven tides reached its second story and left malodorous mud and seaweed on the dining-room floor to prove it.

Year by year, such storm tides build new land by piling up mud inshore. But the busiest land builder is the mangrove, which begins its terrestrial life on these mudbanks. As your car descends a few crucial inches on the long road to Flamingo, fresh water gives way to brackish and the first small outposts of the "walking forest" appear. Each mile they gain in numbers and size, red mangroves atop their long curving stilts, called prop roots.

"By means of such roots," said a trailside marker, "this tree 'walks' farther and farther out into the water. . . ."

This tree not only walks; it swims. Its fruit stays on the tree till it grows an eight-inch seedling. When it falls it floats, often for many miles and weeks, till eventually it lodges on a mudbank and a new mangrove begins. Debris and mud pile up in the roots and new land comes into being.

If you jump up and down on some of these mangrove islands—Banana Patch, for example—the land all around you shakes.

"Two-thirds of the park's land area has been built up from the sea bottom in the past 4,000 years," we were told by Dr. Frank Cooper Craighead, retired Department of Agriculture scientist and authority on Everglades plants.

A National Park Service Research Collaborator, he still ranges this forbidding terrain at the age of 76 in pursuit of his botanical researches, now supported in part by the National Geographic Society. This indomitable scientist is the father of Drs. Frank and John Craighead, whose articles and photographs on nature subjects from eagles to grizzlies have informed and entranced Society members for three decades.

"Florida Bay," he observed, "which makes up nearly one-third of the park's area, is a curious arena where new land is constantly being built. Banks of mud precipitated by marine plants and shells reach the surface and are colonized by red mangrove seedlings. Here such colonization has resulted in the Florida Bay keys, now built up one to three feet above mean tide."

If you were 12 feet tall—and didn't sink in the muddy bottom—you could walk anywhere in this broad bay. Depths in the park's portion at mean low tide range from a few inches to rarely more than 4 or 5 feet, and a maximum of 11.

People who go boating on Florida Bay without careful briefing on depths and channels often spend hot, sunburned hours waiting for rangers to tow them off a mudbank, or wading and pushing waist-deep in water and knee-deep in sticky marl. Park rules require boating parties to file a trip plan in advance.

On a map at the Flamingo Visitor Center, one extremely shallow area bears an unofficial name, The Wet Lawn. Perhaps the same joker named First National Bank—the first mud-bank a boat would encounter in approaching Cape Sable from south or west.

This white sandy cape abounds in exquisite shells, and tour boats bring loads of visitors from Flamingo to collect and picnic on the sands. Here on Cape Sable you stand at the southernmost mainland point in the United States—53 miles farther south than Brownsville, Texas.

On sandy Cape Sable, on spring and summer nights, huge loggerhead turtles swim in from the sea and drag themselves over the sand to lay eggs beyond reach of the waves. But the eggs are not beyond the reach of the humanlike hands of hungry raccoons, and most of them disappear inside these black-masked brigands. The rapacious coons almost put an end to the hatching of loggerheads on these sands. Perhaps this was the way the mammals brought doom to the dinosaurs millions of years ago.

Recently the rangers have been trapping coons here and exiling them to distant parts of the park. Result: Egg destruction, formerly 80 percent, has dropped to 20 percent.

Rounding Cape Sable in a ranger patrol boat one day, we wound among the mangrove islands of Whitewater Bay, so called because its surface is often streaked with foam.

At Oyster Bay we stopped to watch an eagle on her nest in a tall blighted tree. Suddenly the boat shook, then again. Something was striking our hull.

"Porpoises," said the ranger at the helm. "They want us to come out and play."

Obligingly he started the engine, and immediately two porpoises appeared at our bow. For 30 minutes they sported along at 10 miles an hour as we sped down a channel called Joe River, their great gray glistening backs often clear of the water and almost within arm's reach. Once they vanished; then, as if pleased with their joke, came rocketing back from opposite sides of the channel, to vie with us for another 10 minutes before disappearing with a final flip of the tail. We knew they were the same two because both had recognizable scars on their backs, one a long, deep old wound that was possibly inflicted by a shark.

Sightseeing boats from Flamingo make similar trips, and these are wonderful fishing waters. The brackish shallows make ideal nurseries for shrimp, marine worms, and small fish that feed larger fish, such as sea trout, snook, and tarpon.

NATION'S ONLY CROCODILE NEARLY EXTINCT

By boat from Flamingo one can readily cross Florida Bay to Key Largo, where a resident ranger watches over the breeding roseate spoonbills and the few remaining crocodiles. In the United States these big saltwater saurians now survive only in extreme southern Florida waters.

"The other day, in the hope of making some pictures, we went to a place just outside the park where I've sometimes seen crocodiles," said Fred. "There were none to be found, and a man living nearby told us he saw some fellows with a rifle shoot three.

"A crocodile isn't pretty," he mused, "and he's like the alligator but more so—he'll eat anything that moves, not caring whether it's your pet dog, or you, for that matter. But these are the last crocs in the United States. It took Mother Nature a long time to make them, and once gone they are gone forever. If they'd stay in the park they might have a chance, but they don't—and their future doesn't look good."

From Flamingo in the southwest to Everglades City in the northwest means a drive of 140 miles, counterclockwise around the park. By water it is about 70 miles, and perhaps some day sightseeing boats will make regular trips between the two. I hope so, because it would be a memorable ride, threading the labyrinthine channels of the Ten Thousand Islands region.

Everglades City (population 552) calls itself the park's western water gateway. From here and Chokoloskee, charter and concession boat captains take visitors to the nearer rookeries, ancient Indian sites, and mangrove islands. On such a ride a couple of years ago Otis Imboden jotted these graphic notes:

"Our guide and helmsman has a good Florida Cracker accent—'arristers' for oysters, 'hewrikin' for hurricane, 'hearin' for heron—and a rhythmic patter as colorful as it is original.

"Shows us the breather tubes from the roots of the black mangrove. 'This here mangrove makes tannic acid, and some folk says the tree makes the water so acid the roots has to turn up fer air.'

"Points out oyster bars like sand bars. 'These is eatable arristers.'

"Signs mark boundary of park as it crosses Chokoloskee Bay. "The park is kind of spotted here, and there's parts that's in and parts that's out."

"Pileated woodpecker on telephone pole. 'He hears those wires hummin' an' thinks it's a worm inside that pole.'

" 'The mullet is the onliest fish that's got a gizzard just like a chicken.' "

CHOKOLOSKEE KEEPS ITS EARLY WAYS

Ornithologists don't know what a woodpecker on a telephone pole thinks about, and ichthyologists say they never saw a mullet with a gizzard, though this mud-scooping bottom feeder does have an unusually long digestive tract—seven feet of intestine in a 13-inch fish.

But the gizzard belief is firmly rooted hereabouts. Dick Stokes later told of a slick country lawyer who tried to have a case of illegal stop-netting thrown out of court on the ground that the mullet, since it has a gizzard, must be a fowl instead of a fish.

Today the tour-boat spiel is less colorful, and a new marina, visitor center, and ranger office have been built on the waterfront.

All this newness contrasts sharply with Chokoloskee now linked with Everglades City by a causeway but still a world apart.

Unchanged since Seminole trading-post days, a barn-red building stands on stilts in a palm-fringed clearing at the water's edge, This is Smallwood's Store and the U.S. Post Office, surely one of the quaintest under the flag. On the shelves or hanging overhead are all the wares of an old-time general store—dark bottles of patent medicine, machetes, halters, oil lamps with ornate reflector plates.

Miss Thelma Smallwood presides over all this, as postmistress and heir to her father's emporium. She sees no reason to change things. The barnlike building on its pine piles has withstood many a hurricane, and Miss Smallwood herself seemed to me to embody the same immovability.

PARK'S INDIANS ADOPT A CONSTITUTION

Driving back toward Miami on the Tamiami Trail, we stopped at the Indian village on the edge of the park.

"Don't call us Seminole," we were told. "Call us Miccosukee."

They claim to be a separate tribe whose ancestors lived and hunted in northern Florida where the town of Miccosukee now stands and were driven south in the early 19th century.

When the park was established in 1947, all the Indians within its boundaries were offered land farther north, near Dania, Big Cypress, and Brighton. Many, however, preferred to stay, and the U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs arranged with the National Park Service to have a slice of the park 5½ miles long and 500 feet deep along the Tamiami Trail set aside for their residence and use.

With the encouragement and help of state and federal agencies, this group formally organized the Miccosukee Tribe of Indians of Florida on January 11, 1962, and adopted a constitution forbidding anyone to try to change its tribal beliefs and religion.

The tribe runs a filling station, grocery store, and the finest restaurant for many miles. Private enterprise offers Indian-versus-alligator wrestling matches and colorful products of the Florida Indian's inevitable Singer sewing machine.

Near the restaurant, brown-faced Indian boys were playing a wild version of touch football. Younger children had bright plastic toys, one an imitation automobile dashboard and steering wheel.

These are hardly vanishing Americans, we decided, especially after meeting Council Chairman Buffalo Tiger, with seven children, and his brother, Tommy Tiger, with twelve.

Buffalo Tiger, a slender, youthful-seeming man in his forties, wore a blue shirt with bright panels of Indian patchwork and a beaded tie claps. He showed particular pride in the restaurant and took personal responsibility for hunting down a fly that had entered with us.

The Miccosukee also seemed proud of their school, with 40 pupils, ages 6 to 18, and were beginning to get used to the new "modern chickees" designed by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. With electric lights, hot water, electric ranges, and flush toilets, they made quite a contrast to the palm-roofed chickees that survive nearby—little more than a roof of palm thatch on four poles. But one concession to yesterday has been made in designing the modern chickee: Over the regular roof is laid an old-style roof of palm fronds.

At the nearby Shark Valley Observation Tower, we found Ranger Winte concerned about overbold alligators.

"In spite of everything we can do, some visitors feed them," he said. "Old Snaggletooth there is getting the bad habit of crawling halfway up the bank to beg for handouts. Big gators should always be treated with respect, but they get particularly dangerous if people feed them."

"Once I was photographing a nine-footer in the pond here," said Fred, "trying for a shot of just the nose and eye out of water.

"The gator went past, then turned around toward shore. I thought that was strange.

"Then he started up the bank and headed for me. Must have thought I had some food for him.

"I lit out for a quonset hut that was here then. Luckily the door was open. I went through and slammed it, and the next instant big George hit it with a bang.

"When I looked out, I saw that my normally gentle little wife had appeared on the scene and grabbed up a two-by-four to come to my rescue. But by that time George had decided there was nothing in it for him and gone back to the water. I don't know why that alligator didn't get me, because a big gator can move awfully fast for a short distance."

When an alligator grows too bold, the rangers rope him and haul him away to a less-frequented part of the park—like a nuisance bear in Yellowstone.

All along the roadside, as we drove on eastward, lay grim reminders of careless slaughter. Motorists dash along this stretch of the Tamiami Trail—named for Tampa and Miami, its terminal cities—at an often illegal and deadly pace, deadly sometimes to themselves and more often to the innocent. Often the road's shoulders are littered with bodies of raccoons and possums, turtles, water snakes, even hawks and other birds.

Beside me Fred was silent, but I knew he was thinking of other roads where the same careless killing takes place every night—and of the multiple deaths that result when parents can never return to their young.

Then we saw a new highway sign that made us take heart. "Slow. Use Caution. Save Our Animals."

When we stopped at the big steel gates in the levee that dams the river of grass, we saw that the level of water on both sides was the same. Precious water was still being released into the park from the conservation area to the north.

But the price of wildlife, we knew—like the price of liberty—is eternal vigilance. Headed homeward beside the Tamiami Canal and the long row of casuarina trees, we both were wondering the same thing: Will man always make provision for nature's wild creatures in the world of tomorrow? Or will multiplying man and his machines crowd more and more animals off the earth forever?

Remembering the delight I had seen on the faces of visitors to Everglades National Park, I thought I knew the answer, at least so far as America is concerned. Anyway, I fervently hoped so.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I encourage all America to come see the natural beauty of America's greatest State, the land of sunshine and flowers, Florida.

THE NEW YORK CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Murphy] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise on this occasion to report to you on an act of historic significance for the people of my constituency and of the great Empire State of New York: the completion by their delegates, assembled in convention for nearly 6 months, of a proposed new constitution whereby they may as a free people be enabled to govern themselves now and in the future. I am proud to say that I was a participant in these events, having been elected by the residents of New York's 23d senatorial district as their delegate to this convention.

As time passes, a people must pause to consider whether their constitution acts as a straitjacket which inhibits their ability to cope with a changing environment, or whether it serves as a foundation from which to mount their efforts to solve new problems and realize their full human potential.

It was more than 6 months ago that the people of New York State determined that if their constitution were to serve rather than frustrate their needs and desires, it must be rewritten. They were governed by a 73-year-old charter of more than 50,000 words last revised in 1938, a constitution which no longer served the purpose for which it had been intended. The State, and the Nation, have changed considerably since then, and in those 29 years far more than 100 separate amendments to the New York State constitution have been submitted to the people for ratification.

Early in the 1950's the need for a complete review of the scope of the 1938 constitution as amended became evident and the call for a new constitutional convention went forth from such diverse groups as the State bar association, the League of Women Voters, and numerous interested citizen groups. A temporary State commission was established in 1956. The commission in its final form consisted of 18 outstanding citizens of the State of whom six were appointed by the Governor, six by the temporary president of the senate, and six by the speaker of the assembly. This commission's research and legal staffs held hearings throughout the State, and reviewed an enormous number of documents and reports.

It divided its work into six areas, which it considered the basic issues facing the convention: individual rights and liberties, State government, local government, public finance, social and economic policies, and constitutional revision and simplification. It produced 15 separate reports in such areas as the right to vote; the administration of criminal justice, housing, labor, and natural resources; welfare and mental health; to name only a few.

The 1967 constitutional convention represents an event of critical importance in the State's social, economic, and political history. It was an occasion for reviewing past decisions, current problems, and future needs. The delegates were faced with a number of tasks. The document which they considered was in fact the 1894 constitution—73 years old, with a dragon's tail of amendments. It was thought by many to be cumbersome, full of unnecessary statutory details, and lacking in the flexibility to deal with the problems of a technological era.

Studies and discussions on the subject of revision and simplification had brought to light several methods by which the delegates might proceed. These are in brief, an entirely new constitution starting afresh, eliminating all accumulated detail and laying down in broad terms the structure and powers of government and the rights of citizens. Or a two-part constitution—in which the part laying down the general powers and structure of government and the rights of citizens would be amended by referendum while the part containing the detailed technical specifications could be amended by some other process guaranteeing stability and continuity. Or still another method, the transfer of a large mass of technical specification and detail out of the constitution and into statute law.

There was much to be said in favor of an entirely new constitution. Such a document had been adopted in our neighboring State of New Jersey, which like New York had historic and sentimental attachments to an old constitution dating back to Revolutionary times. Nevertheless the new constitution in New Jersey has been widely praised by students of constitutional law and by the people of the State.

One of the most compelling arguments for example, advanced in favor of a two-part constitution, was that it would relieve the people of the frustrating task of judging the merits of numerous complex amendments and at the same time reserve for their judgment important policy changes. Revision and simplification were issues of pressing and paramount importance, because the frequency with which our basic charter has been amended was in itself an indicator of objectional particularity to many of the delegates.

It may be of interest to note here that Vermont, with a constitution of less than 6,000 words, has adopted only 40 amendments although its constitution has been in force since 1795. Massachusetts, which has also preserved its original charter, has managed for 180 years with less than twice the number of amendments found to be necessary in New York since only 1938. Thus, the question inevitably arose whether the constitution might not be a more effective document if it contained fewer—and more carefully selected words. For there can be little doubt that few of the more than 100 amendments added since 1938 to which I referred earlier would have been necessary if the framers of that constitution had limited its contents to what can be called genuine constitutional material.

The subject matter of the great majority of those amendments could more appropriately have been disposed of by the State legislature and in some cases by local legislative bodies. This was only one of the widely debated issues that thickened the atmosphere in which the delegates campaigned for election and in which they finally convened.

Another hotly disputed issue concerned the so-called Blaine amendment, article 11, section 3, which restricts the "use of public property or money in aid to denominational schools"; but which had been amended to authorize the use of public transportation for all students regardless of what school they attend. On the issue of this 73-year-old article, in the midst of what would seem to be hysteria on both sides of the problem, a number of level-headed experts on constitutional law pointed out that this prohibition was excessive beyond the guarantees for the separation of church and state clearly stipulated in the Federal Constitution. These same, sane commentators reasoned that the new Constitution would be a more enduring document if on that issue as well as some others its language echoed that of the basic law of the land.

As a matter of fact, among the delegates there was considerable urgency to rephrase the separation-of-church-and-state amendment in keeping with article 1 of the Federal Bill of Rights. Assembly minority leader, Perry B. Duryea, Jr., of Montauk, vice president of the convention, stated publicly to newsmen that delegates with whom he had spoken "did not favor a rollback of the recent New York State Court of Appeals decision supporting the loan of textbooks to private and parochial school students or a repeal of the scholarship incentive award."

While Duryea did not overtly call for repeal, his utterances can certainly be construed as pointing in that direction. Other issues may not have generated as much passion as the two I have mentioned, yet there were enough special interest groups seeking to have their views prevail to make the early months of the convention one in which delegates spent many hours sifting the presentation of these groups, probing their own philosophies of government, and then availing themselves of the reactions of their constituents to the issues.

This was the emotionally charged political climate under which the 186 delegates to the ninth constitutional convention in the history of the State of New York, finally convened on Tuesday, April 4, 1967, in the historic chamber of the New York State Assembly in Albany.

I should like to pause in my narrative for a few moments to tell you something about these delegates. Mere statistics reveal little, but follow me if you will beyond the numbers and behind the nomenclature to where the great diversity of backgrounds and interest is revealed, and you will have some idea of the enormous vitality of this heterogeneous group, of the great talent it contained, and of how truly representative it was of the population of the State whose charter it had been mandated to modernize.

There were 98 delegates elected as Democrats, 84 Republicans, three Liberals, and one Conservative. One hundred and seventy-six delegates were men and 10 were women. One hundred and seventy-one had been elected to represent 57 senatorial districts in the State, while 15 had been chosen at large; 114 delegates came from New York City and its suburbs while 72 came from upstate. The oldest delegate was past 75 years of age while the youngest was under 30. Two of the delegates had served in that same capacity in the 1938 convention.

Their professional background varied also. Although the largest number, well over 100, were attorneys, there were also five labor leaders, nine real estate and insurance brokers, 14 businessmen, five bankers, two engineers, four professors, one farmer, one bookkeeper, one former United Nations Ambassador, one member of the clergy, one ex-Chicago White Sox player, a novelist, and one funeral director. Nine of the delegates had been born outside of the United States, come to this great Nation, and made distinguished careers for themselves.

Among the delegates there were also a considerable number who had spent their lives in public service. There was a former Lieutenant Governor, a former mayor of the city of New York, one borough president and one former borough president, three mayors, six State senators, six assemblymen, and one former speaker of the assembly, a former comptroller of the city of New York, one Member of Congress as well as one former longtime, distinguished Member of this House, four district attorneys, three county attorneys, 19 judges representing nearly every level of the judiciary from the civil court of the city of New York, the State supreme court, to the court of appeals, and a former chief judge of the State of New York.

As I have said, the convention began April 4, and it has been estimated that the final cost to the people of the State of New York will reach $10 million. It is my firm conviction that the document produced by the delegates more than justifies this expense because it is a better constitution than that which now exists in a number of ways. In most cases, the language in which the guarantee, or mandate, is phrased is more simple and direct than in any previous constitution the State has had in modern times. A large amount of material which had cluttered previous constitutions has been deferred to legislative decision, where it can be dealt with more specifically and with greater flexibility.

Before discussing the constitution in detail let me give you some idea of how the convention's functions were delineated. Its work was divided among 14 standing committees, which were: bill of rights and suffrage; economic development; education; executive branch; health, housing, and social services; intergovernmental relations; judiciary; labor, civil service and public pensions; legislature; local government and home rule; natural resources and agriculture; rules; State finances, taxation and expenditures; style and arrangement.

These 14 committees were further divided into 43 subcommittees to deal with such special problems as court structure; church and state; job development; consumer protection and Indian affairs; and canals and waterways; to mention only a few. In addition to the standing committees, two select committees were appointed to deal with problems of ethics and lobbying, the latter having been necessitated by the incredible number of special interests which sought to influence the delegates before and during the convention. The select committee on lobbying had the task of dealing with the more than 150 groups or individuals registered as lobbyists with the secretary of state.

The rules under which the convention operated although somewhat different from those with which Members of Congress are familiar, were the same as those of its three recent predecessors. The rules were based on existing New York legislative practice. Proposed constitutional amendments were introduced by delegates and referred to appropriate committees, where they were approved as introduced, approved with changes, or allowed to die. If reported to the convention floor, a proposed amendment was subject to further change before a final vote on submission to the people.

In the nearly 6 months of its existence, the convention considered more than 1,400 propositions, more than 100 resolutions, and a host of amendments of minor and major significance.

I believe that it is not unfair to say that in this period of time these 186 men and women from every walk of life and every corner of the State gained expertise in subjects with which they had previously had only a passing familiarity. They labored long hours and with all the skills at their command and they produced a document which transcends partisan interests in its letter and spirit to a heartening degree.

I shall now speak in some greater detail about the charter to which I have been alluding; the proposed constitution of the State of New York.

Article 1, the bill of rights, specifies in greater detail than before the procedures that may be permitted in wiretapping or eavesdropping. It also provides for freedom of religion, speech, press, assembly, and petition—in the exact language of the first amendment to the Federal Constitution. In this respect I am proud to say that the language finally adopted is nearly completely that of a proposition which I offered before the convention on June 12, 1967, and which was intended to replace the Blaine amendment to which I have already referred. In order to understand the various complex factors which motivated my decision to offer this amendment, some basic facts must be brought into view.

At the present time in the State of New York there are approximately 4,150,000 kindergarten through high school pupils of whom 900,000 or about 20 percent are receiving their education outside the public system. Of this number of nonpublic school students nearly 50,000 are in secular private schools and 850,000 in parochial schools of various religious denominations.

A student in the public schools has about $1,000 spent on him each year whereas the annual per pupil expenditure in the parochial and private schools is anywhere from $125 per year to $650 per year. Now it should seem clear from this fact that the students who for one reason or another attend nonpublic schools are woefully shortchanged under the excessive restrictions now in force. In addition, there is no denying that many private and parochial schools suffer from financial difficulties. Combine this with the fact that conservative estimates have been produced to show that New York State would have to spend $800,000,000 more each year were the public schools forced to absorb all of the parochial pupils. This may not seem an excessive amount to parents in areas where the commitment to public education is high enough so that residents are willing to sustain a considerably raised tax burden. But in the urban areas of our State where people are already overtaxed, the commitment to public education is very likely stretched to the breaking point. And it is in those areas that the bulk of the State's parochial schools exist. And I can add here something of significance in this connection; namely, that in Manhattan, for example, the parochial schools are by and large better racially integrated and offer more free places to deprived children from minority groups than is generally realized.

Thus, I, as did many other delegates, felt that the repeal of an amendment which is unreasonably prohibitive was a necessity, particularly if that repeal could be effected by recourse to the spirit and the language of the Federal Constitution's provision guaranteeing the separation of church and state. Another feature of the article, one for which I voted, and which incorporated the language of a proposition I introduced before the convention early in its session, guarantees employees the right to organize and bargain collectively, prohibits discrimination in employment, grants equal protection of the laws, and prohibits discrimination on grounds of race, color, creed, religion, national origin, age, sex, or physical or mental handicap.

Article 2, which relates to suffrage, prohibits property qualifications or other tests for voting. A principal provision of this article grants to the State legislature the power to reduce the minimum voting age by statute to not less than 18.

Article 3, on the legislature, proposes the establishment of a five-member commission to realine legislative and congressional districts following every 10-year Federal census. The article will also expand the State senate to 60 members and will eliminate the present practice of giving the controversial lump sums of money to legislators for expenses.

In article 4, the major change in the powers of the executive proposes the removal of the Governor's seldom-exercised power of pocket veto. Under present rules, any bill not signed within 30 days of the legislature's adjournment is considered vetoed. Under the proposed provisions the reverse would pertain, thereby making it necessary for the Governor to act publicly on all bills.

Article 5, on the judiciary, was one of the most debated and controversial articles in the constitution. One of the most important changes it would establish is that the court of appeals, the State's highest tribunal, would become the main supervisory body for all courts in the State, replacing the present nonuniform procedures which exist in the judicial conference which is made up of the presiding justices of the appellate division of the State's supreme court and the chief judge of the court of appeals. In addition, the article calls for the State to finance the statewide court system which will include the supreme court, the surrogate's court, the family court, and the district courts when they are approved by voters in countywide elections.

I am pleased to say that the language of my proposition No. 941, which stipulated that judges of the family court both within and outside the city of New York shall be residents of the counties in which they serve, was incorporated into the final judiciary article.

This article contains numerous improvements that are clearly lacking in the existing one. However, this is not my opinion alone. It is shared by no less distinguished a jurist than the retired chief judge of the State of New York and third vice president of the convention, the Honorable Charles S. Desmond, the only delegate to the convention to have been endorsed by both major political parties. I should like as a matter of record to record his opinion:

> With the completion of its work of the judiciary article, the 1967 New York state constitutional convention now has placed

> before the people of our state at least 14 major improvements, some of which have been sought for years, in the organization and functioning of the courts and in the protection by the courts of personal and property rights.
>
> These are:
>
> 1. The courts will be centrally administered—in the best modern manner—by the state's highest court, the court of appeals.
> 2. For efficiency, uniformity and economy, the statewide court system will be financed by the state under a state-wide budget prepared by the court of appeals.
> 3. The people of each county will have the opportunity to vote on setting up a modern network of district courts.
> 4. Citizens charged with serious crimes will, before trial, be fully informed of the charges against them, either by preliminary court hearings or inspections of grand jury minutes.
> 5. A grave inequity is removed by giving New York City residents charged with misdemeanors the right to jury trials, just as they are available throughout the rest of the State.
> 6. To end political pulling and hauling, determinations as to whether additional judges are needed will be made by the court of appeals.
> 7. Any lawsuits concerning the validity of future legislative reapportionments will be heard directly and in the first instance by the court of appeals, the State's highest court.
> 8. A more effective means of deciding whether judges should be removed is set up in a new kind of court on the judiciary, with appropriate provisions for appeal.
> 9. A more enlightened rule has been written as to religious preference in adoption cases.
> 10. There will be a simple, modern, efficient State-wide administrative body to handle minor offenses, such as parking violations.
> 11. To relieve the court of appeals of excessive burdens, the jurisdiction of the court has been reduced, with provision for further change, if needed.
> 12. The legislature is empowered to eliminate county courts where no longer needed.
> 13. To end fragmentation and delay, the court of claims is given jurisdiction to decide all phases of cases coming before it.
> 14. For the first time in New York State history, any citizen can sue in our courts to restrain unconstitutional expenditures of public money.
>
> In my considered judgment, this new constitution's judiciary proposals are the most enlightened ever to be written into a New York State constitution. Not every needed change is included, but so many advances are made that every interested person and organization, including those who have worked so hard and long and unselfishly for better courts, should support it enthusiastically. It will further improve the performance of what is everywhere conceded to be one of the world's finest groups of judges and non-judicial employees."

With these sentiments, Mr. Speaker, so fervently and clearly expressed I most heartily and gratefully concur.

Article 6, which regulates State departments, officers, and public authorities, also introduces a number of much-needed reforms: the article empowers the legislature to specify what governmental records including those of public authorities should be opened to public inspection. The article also provides constitutionally for the reorganization of the public service commission that regulates utilities. Under the mandates of this article such a commission would consist of seven members, four of whom are to be appointed by the Governor while three shall be elected by the legislature.

This provision which encountered some difficulty on its route to final passage is clearly one of the brilliant reforms this charter contains since it will insure that the public service commission will be bipartisan, free of political influence, and able to fully discharge its responsibility to the people of the State.

Article 7, which sets forth the rights and responsibilities of public officers and employees, contains a provision that should provide genuine satisfaction to blue-collar workers throughout the Empire State. The article requires and guarantees constitutionally that laborers, workmen, or mechanics engaged in the performance of public work shall be paid no less than the rate of wages prevailing in the same trade in the locality of the public project. This proposal will guarantee an equitable wage to many who now work on temporary or seasonal public works so that their standard of living will reach the level of their fellow workers on nonpublic projects.

Perhaps the one article which met with little debate and overwhelming approval from all factions is article 8. On natural resources and conservation. The widespread reception of its provisions among the delegates is not difficult to explain when one considers such facts as the following:

In the State of New York there are almost 90 public camping grounds which last year handled over 3½ million visitor-days. The State also maintains over 1,200 miles of foot trails and 271 lean-to shelters. Hunters and fishermen are also justifiably attracted by the State's natural resources. In 1966 more than one-half million residents applied for and received hunting licenses and an even greater number were issued fishing licenses. One must also take into account the thousands of unlicensed salt water fishermen who used some portion of the State's vast coastal recreation areas. In the last year $92 million was spent on hunting and fishing in New York State and the public revenue from licenses for these sports was well over $5 million.

Thus it should be easy to understand the great public sentiment to leave untouched the basic concept of "forever wild" forest preserves. This article also contains another historic innovation in its conservation bill of rights which, I believe, is one of the most enlightened to be found in any State of this Union and which mandates that the legislature shall attack water and air pollution and preserve scenic and natural beauty. Article 9, on education is another article which drew heated words from delegates holding opposing viewpoints.

It is sometimes forgotten that education in the State of New York is at one and the same time a public trust and a $4-billion industry. I can, from my own experience, attest to the great pressure which delegates were subjected to by one or another special interest group that sought to write an article expressing its views. The article which was finally written specifically bans discrimination based on religion, creed, or national origin, guarantees constitutionally the integrity of the free City University of New York, and requires that State aid to school districts will be computed on the number of registered pupils rather than, as has been the case heretofore, the number of pupils in daily attendance. It seems clear to me that this revised formula will be of enormous benefit to those school districts in urban and rural centers which experience problems in attendance.

Two examples which immediately come to mind are those of the school in the farming community which experiences a decline in attendance during the planting and harvest seasons and the school in the slum neighborhood which faces attendance problems because of other and sadder reasons. This formula should do much to insure that both schools will receive a fairer share of State aid than they have in the past, and to which they have always been entitled.

Article 10 governs the financial management of the State. A key provision would replace the uncertain system of public referendum on State debt with its varying fortunes by substituting for it the right of the State to contract indebtedness by law when enacted by two successive sessions of the legislature. Proponents of this measure have argued that this procedure would insure financing for many worthy public interest projects. The article also establishes a ceiling on the fiscal debt that the State may contract to offset the excision of the referendum.

Another of its provisions directs the legislature to provide for the transfer of responsibility for all programs of public assistance and care from local governments to the State. I expect that the unification of social services under the aegis of New York State will produce major administrative gains. No matter how the legislature assigns responsibility for welfare services, there are notable opportunities for making the system more effective. Techniques of modern management can be applied to minimize costly paperwork duplicated and multiplied in 64 separate welfare districts. The possibility of using electronic data processing effectively is greatly enhanced by statewide coordination.

And furthermore, the increasing financial role of the Federal Government in the social services field has tended to increase the importance of the States as fiscal managers of such expenditures: Consequently, State government must be equipped to play the role of partner in the design and administration of social service policy rather than the role of a passive pipeline for money.

It is estimated local contribution to welfare programs in 1967 will amount to $528 million, of which New York City alone contributes $371 million. Under the new provision, municipalities will experience enormous benefits resulting from the release of funds for other projects. For instance, in the 28th Congressional District of New York, the seat of my distinguished colleague, the Honorable JOSEPH RESNICK, the amount saved by local governments would amount to $970,000 in Dutchess County and $717,000 in Ulster County. No expert knowledge is needed, Mr. Speaker, to imagine what a community might be able to accomplish with even a portion of such sums. In addition, another key provision will prove of enormous benefit to economically blighted areas in the State. This section permits the loan or outright grant of public moneys for the purposes of economic and community development.

Article 11 will help abolish the many conflict-of-interest situations that now exist in communities throughout our State by providing that town officers may not serve on county supervisory and legislative bodies. This provision, in its broadest sense, will prevent the holding of two elective offices simultaneously. The article would also require local governments to reapportion according to the principle defined by the U.S. Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote decision. The necessity for the important reforms this article would initiate can be appreciated if one considers the staggering extent of local government in our State. In addition to the 62 counties in New York, there are 62 cities, 931 towns, 935 school districts, 809 fire districts, 554 villages, and innumerable sewer, water, and health districts. A genuine, though indirect, benefit of this article would be the streamlining of many local governmental units resulting in their increased efficiency.

A number of other great improvements are found in the remaining articles. Article 12, on local finances, removes the limits on the debt city school districts in cities with less than 125,000 inhabitants may incur. This provision shall be of enormous aid to the fiscal problems of such school districts as those in Utica, Binghamton, and Niagara Falls, among others. Another key provision of this article would change the base of the tax and debt limits from a 5-year to a 3-year average. While this would aid homeowners generally, it would specifically benefit localities in financing public housing for senior citizens and similar renewal undertakings.

Article 14 establishes for the first time the qualifications for constitutional convention delegates and bars judges of the court of appeals from serving in a convention, a highly sensible provision when one realizes that these same judges would be expected to render bench opinions on the legality of the constitutional issues.

This, in brief, Mr. Speaker, is the charter which was passed by the delegates after much thought, much debate, and great effort by the dramatically close vote of 94 to 91 in the final hours of the convention after 9 straight days of sessions lasting well into the morning hours. The final decision which had faced the delegates was the question of presentation to the voters. Two alternative methods had been suggested, a single package, and a handful of separate questions, but only one was really possible.

Because of the closely interlocking provisions of many articles, the convention had produced a fully integrated and tightly cross-referenced charter. The proposed constitution is a streamlined document of 23,000 words and 15 articles; broad enough to deal with the future problems of the State, yet clear and firm enough to provide a framework for the present. It was my sincere belief in the closing hours of the convention, as it is at this very moment, that the proposed constitution had to be offered to the voters in one, complete question, not, as hasty critics have claimed, to put it on a take-it-or-leave-it basis, for that would be irresponsible and a contradiction of the dedication of the 186 delegates, but because a single package is the most logical form of the question for a number of reasons.

Had the constitution been offered as a melange of articles it is almost certain that some would have passed and others failed with the result that the voters would have been left with an amended 1894 constitution, already previously much amended in 1938 and since, which is clearly incapable of dealing with a rapidly changing State as it rushes into the space age. And as I have already said, the compactness of the charter would have been destroyed and many of its finest reforms mutilated beyond recognition. But even more importantly, the presentation of the constitution as one package, which includes the powerful and lasting words of the Federal Constitution guaranteeing the separation of church and state by which the Blaine amendment was repealed, will prevent a religious war of the roses from breaking out in New York State, for had the question of the repeal of Blaine been separated from the rest of the charter, the forces of bigotry and intolerance would have raised their ugly banners in every community in the State.

I can say with the greatest conviction and the utmost certainty that the principle of separation of church and state which was so wisely written into our Federal Charter by its authors has not been compromised one whit in the proposed new constitution which the voters of the State of New York will be asked to vote on November 7.

I hope the voters approve the new charter overwhelmingly. It deserves their support. It was written with their best interests in mind. And although this charter does not have in it every last thing that every last group in the State wished to have included, it is star studded with necessary changes. A cursory glance at the recommendations for constitutional improvements made by the temporary State commission in their brilliant 15-volume report, shows that an unbelievably high percentage of their recommendations, I believe more than 90 percent, were incorporated in the new State charter. I would say that this is a most eloquent testimonial to its thoroughness. I am proud to have been a delegate, to have represented the people of my district, and to have had a part in its authorship. The charter now enters the stream of history. Only the voice of people is left to determine whether it will become the basic law of the State.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include a short history of the New York State constitutional convention from 1777 on and also a document which was submitted to the secretary of state of New York by the convention, which is a resolution approving the abstract of the proposed new constitution.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The material referred to follows:

A HISTORY OF THE NEW YORK STATE CONSTITUTION

The process of constitutional revision by states in our great nation is in itself an interesting study. Of the original founding states of our nation, New Hampshire has led the rest with thirteen constitutional conventions since its original charter went into effect in 1775. In my state of New York since 1777, when in the midst of a common struggle for independence, the founding fathers of the state found time and spiritual guidance to fashion the first organic law of the state, there have been eight constitutional conventions—1 constitutional commission and two judiciary conventions or commissions. New York's first delegates convened in White Plains on July 9, 1776, and finally adopted a constitution in Kingston on April 20, 1777. Between these two dates the delegates met at seven different locations in order to avoid capture by the British. The Revolutionary War prevented more than half the delegates from ever getting together at any one time and the convention had no less than ten presiding officers in nine months. It was at Kingston, the seventh and last meeting place, that the convention, on Sunday, April 20, 1777, with only minor changes in the original draft, adopted the first constitution of the State of New York by a vote of thirty-two to one.

The only dissenting vote was cast by Peter R. Livingston of Albany. The original charter unlike its successors was not submitted to the people for ratification. It is worth noting here that the original New York constitution of 1777 contained approximately 6,600 words; the constitution of 1846 nearly 14,600 words; that of 1894 about 20,000 words; and the constitution now in force contains more than 50,000 words.

The proposed charter just completed, however, is less than 23,000 words long which is not even half the verbiage of the present constitution. It also has five fewer articles than the present total of twenty.

But let me return briefly to that first constitution which continued in force without any change until 1801 when a second constitutional convention was called upon the initiative of the legislature to deal with the number and methods of apportionment of members of the assembly and the Senate and to settle a controversy over the powers of the council of appointment. Its delegates met in Albany on October 13, 1801, and on October 27, 1801, adopted amendments which gave the power to nominate persons to office to the council of appointment and to the Governor concurrently.

Perhaps the shortest convention on record, the third, met on October 28, 1821 and closed its proceedings on November 10 of that same year. The entire constitution was considered and the delegates abrogated many provisions, modified others, and continued some without change. This constitution was submitted to the people and approved by them. Thus a pattern of popular ratification was established in the State of New York which has continued to the present day.

As the Greek philosopher Heraclitus said "You can never step into the same river twice". Thus as time passes, the exigencies of change make themselves felt and the laws by which a people govern themselves must be brought up to date so that both their spirit and their particulars reflect the fundamental nature of these changes. Thus by 1845 it had become apparent to many people in the Empire State that the constitution would once more have to be modernized. Scholars of the period have attributed the urgency for change to the industrialization of the intervening years, the growth of population and other social and economic reasons.

It is my belief that in addition to these, we must take into account no less strong a factor than the ideological impulse to self-government which has always animated the people of this great Nation . . . For when the people govern themselves they are able to and desirous of changing the organic law by which that government exists as the times change, as conditions change, and as the pressures and needs of successive generations make themselves felt. Thus on June 1, 1946 the 4th Constitutional Convention of the State of New York met in Albany. The debates and decisions of this convention reflected the aroused public interest in popular election of most of the higher officers of State government, short terms of office to guarantee public responsibility and a greater participation of the people in their government.

The 1846 convention came forward with a new constitution which included much from the constitution of 1822, but it made many radical changes.

Limitations were placed on the financial power of the legislature, the judiciary was reorganized and judges made elective, and the elective principal was extended to a host of other State officers. The next constitutional convention met in Albany on June 4, 1867 and adjourned on February 28, 1868. Its most notable and lasting achievement was that its delegates were elected on a new plan of representation, the same plan which is still in effect today; namely, representation partly from Senate districts and partly from the Sate at large.

Another noteworthy event in New York's constitutional history occurred in 1872 when a constitutional commission met on December 4 of that year and remained in session until March 15, 1873. The creation of the commission was an innovation which would serve as a guide for the establishment of the temporary State commission for the constitutional convention of which I shall have more to say. No genuinely significant changes occurred or seemed necessary in the State charter until 1894 when on May 8 of that year a constitutional convention began to sit until its adjournment on September 29th.

This convention wrote a constitution incorporating most of the constitution of 1846 as amended. However, some of our most significant and far reaching constitutional guarantees originated with that document. In it were initiated the protection of the State's forest preserve and the cause of public education was for the first time given constitutional status. There was a constitutional convention in the year 1915 and a judiciary convention in the year 1921, the latter necessitated to a large extent by the failure of the 1915 convention to adopt a new judiciary article. But no really significant changes occurred in the State's charter until on November 3, 1936, when the voters of the State approved a call for a constitutional convention which met in Albany from April 5, 1938 until August 26 of that year.

The delegates considered 694 proposals for changes—a total of 76 proposals were reported out of committee and 58 were adopted by the convention. These proposals were submitted to the people in 9 parts—six of which were approved by substantial margins. Those approved included local housing, the use of State money and credit for social welfare purposes, and the broadening of the bill of rights.

I think it is hardly necessary to point out that the State of New York, the nation, indeed the entire world has undergone nearly incredible change since 1938. Perhaps the best indication of the extent of these changes is the fact that since 1938 considerably more than 100 separate amendments to the constitution have been submitted to the people.

RESOLUTION 114

(Resolution of the constitutional convention approving the abstract of the proposed new Constitution, Albany, September 26, 1967)

Resolved, That the abstract of the text of the proposed new Constitution to be submitted to the electors of the State for their approval or rejection at the general election to be held on Tuesday, November 7, 1967, shall be as follows:

PREAMBLE

We, the people of the State of New York, grateful to Almighty God for our Freedom, in order to provide for the health, safety and welfare of the people, maintain a representative and orderly government, eliminate inequality and poverty, assure legal, social and economic justice, provide opportunity for the fullest development of the individual, and to secure the blessings of Freedom and Liberty, do ordain and establish this constitution.

ARTICLE I

Bill of rights

This article is the New York State constitution's bill of rights. It provides for freedom of religion, speech, press, assembly and petition in the exact language of the first amendment to the federal constitution. Citizens' suits are authorized to restrain unconstitutional acts.

The article grants equal protection of the laws, and prohibits discrimination in civil rights on grounds of race, color, creed, religion, national origin, age, sex or physical or mental handicap. Unreasonable searches and seizures and unreasonable interception of telephone and other communications are forbidden, except that statutes may permit the interception of such communications upon court orders under conditions specified. Such article forbids deprivation of life, liberty or property without due process of law and sets forth basic procedural rights in criminal proceedings.

It continues the right of trial by jury in all criminal and civil cases as heretofore provided and extends the right by guaranteeing trial by jury in all criminal cases where the punishment may be in excess of six months imprisonment. Every defendant is guaranteed the right to counsel at all stages of a criminal proceeding. In cases of felony, the defendant is entitled to a preliminary examination and may not be tried except by indictment of a grand jury. Excessive bail may not be required and the court may dispense with bail if reasonably satisfied that the defendant will appear.

No private property may be taken or damaged by condemnation except after a public hearing and upon the payment of just compensation, including the fair value of the good will of retail businesses.

The privilege of habeas corpus may not be suspended and ex post facto laws are prohibited.

The article guarantees employees the right to organize and bargain collectively and prohibits discrimination in employment and in the right to join a labor union. The legislature is authorized to provide a system of workmen's compensation, unemployment and disability insurance, and against the loss or inadequacy of income and employment opportunities.

The legislature is authorized to provide for the protection and education of the people of the state against unfair, inequitable or dishonest sales, marketing and financing practices. The citizens of the state are granted the right to inspect the records of the state, local governments, and public authorities.

ARTICLE II

Suffrage

This article defines the right of citizens to vote. Any citizen who is domiciled in a county, city, or village of the state for at least three months, and in his election district for at least thirty days prior to the date of an election is entitled to vote in such election. In elections for president of the United States or statewide offices, domicile in the state for three months and in the election district for thirty days is sufficient. For school or special district elections, the only requirement is domicile in the district for three months.

Property qualifications or other tests for voting are prohibited except that statutes may be enacted establishing property qualifications for voting in special district elections and requiring party enrollment for voting in a primary election. All voting must be in secret. The minimum voting age is 21 years except that statutes may reduce the voting age to not less than 18. If so reduced, the voting age may not be thereafter increased by statute.

Domicile is defined as the fixed, permanent and principal home to which a person always intends to return. Provision is made for the enactment of statutes for the conduct of elections, the nomination of candidates, permanent personnel registration and voting, including absentee registration and voting. All boards of election, except for school district and nonpartisan village and special district elections, are to have equal representation of the two political parties receiving the highest number of votes in the last gubernatorial election.

ARTICLE III

Legislature

This article vests the legislative power of the state in the senate and the assembly. Upon the redistricting provided for by this article, the senate is to consist of sixty members and the assembly of one hundred fifty members, to be elected for two year terms, from single member districts, in even-numbered years. Until such redistricting the present fifty-seven senate and one-hundred-fifty assembly districts are continued. Members of both houses of the legislature must be at least twenty-one years of age and be eligible voters and must have been domiciled in the state for three years preceding the election.

Following each federal decennial census, senate and assembly district lines and congressional district lines are to be redrawn by a five member commission appointed as follows: one each by the temporary president of the senate, the speaker of the assembly, the minority leader of the senate, the minority leader of the assembly and the chairman by the court of appeals. Senate and assembly districts shall be as equal as practicable in total population, compact and contiguous, and shall wherever practicable utilize the boundaries of existing governmental units and natural geographic boundaries. Such standards shall also govern congressional districting to the extent permitted by federal law. Gerrymandering for any purpose is prohibited.

The article directs the legislature to provide the same annual salaries for all its members, and reimbursement for their actual and necessary expenses. Allowances for officers and other members serving in a special capacity are permitted, but no salaries or allowances may be increased during the term for which members are elected. Legislators are prohibited from holding other public offices, with certain exceptions.

For any speech or debate in either house of the legislature, a member shall not be questioned in any other place.

The article includes provisions for the organization and procedures of the legislature. The assent of a majority of the members elected to each house is required to pass a bill except that a bill appropriating public money or property for private or local purposes requires the assent of two-thirds of such membership.

The article prescribes the procedures for the impeachment of the governor, lieutenant governor, comptroller, attorney general or a judge of the court of appeals, and for the trial of any such impeachment.

ARTICLE IV

Executive

This article vests in the governor the executive power of the state. It confers on the governor, among other powers, the power to grant reprieves and pardons for all offenses except impeachments, to convene extraordinary sessions of the legislature or of the senate, and to approve and disapprove legislative bills. He may disapprove one or more items in an appropriations bill and approve others, and his disapproval may be overridden by a two-thirds vote of each house of the legislature.

The governor shall be at least 30 years of age and an eligible voter domiciled in the state for at least five years preceding his election. He shall be elected for a term of four years. The same qualifications are required of the lieutenant governor, who shall be chosen jointly with the governor, for the same term. The lieutenant governor serves as president of the senate but has no vote except in the case of a tie.

The lieutenant governor becomes governor for the remainder of the term if the governor dies, resigns or is removed from office and becomes governor for a full term if the governor-elect dies or declines to serve. Certain other contingencies of vacancies in the offices of governor and lieutenant governor are provided for by the article.

ARTICLE V

Judiciary

This article vests the judicial power of the state in a unified state-wide court system, consisting of the court of appeals, the supreme court and its appellate divisions, the court on the judiciary, the court of claims, the surrogate's court, the family court, the civil and criminal courts of the city of New York and the district court system. It also includes county, town, city and village courts now existing until they may be superseded and abolished by the adoption of the district court system in any county outside the city of New York. The legislature is authorized to establish an administrative body as part of the unified court system to hear and determine such minor infractions of law as may be provided by statute.

The article includes provisions relating to the qualifications, manner of selection, assignment, compensation, terms of office and retirement of judges.

The cost of operating the court of appeals, the court of claims, and the district court system are to be paid by the state. In addition, the state will, over a ten-year period, assume the costs of operating the supreme court, appellate divisions of the supreme court, the surrogate's court, the county court, the family court, and the civil and criminal courts of the city of New York.

The article provides for a mandatory referendum in every county of the state, except those comprising New York city and those counties in which a district court presently exists, on the question of whether a district court system should be established. Upon establishment of a district court in any county, provision is made whereby inferior courts therein may be abolished.

The authority and responsibility for administrative supervision of the unified court system is vested in the court of appeals. The court shall appoint an administrator to be chief executive officer of the court system. The court of appeals may certify the need for additional judges in a judicial district subject to disapproval by concurrent resolution of the legislature.

ARTICLE VI

State departments and officers and public authorities

This article describes the organization of state departments and other agencies, including the two which are headed by elected officials; the department of audit and control, headed by the comptroller, and the department of law, headed by the attorney general. Their qualifications are the same as those of the governor and the attorney general must be admitted to the practice of law in the state. They are to be elected at the same general election and for the same term as the governor.

The heads of all other departments and permanent boards and commissions are to be appointed by the governor with the advice and consent of the senate, except as otherwise provided by the constitution.

The article also describes the powers of the governor and the legislature to reorganize departments and agencies of the state. The governor may submit a reorganization plan which takes effect unless disapproved by either house of the legislature. The state board of social welfare is continued, with its name and powers to be determined by the legislature. A reorganized public service commission is constitutionally established for the regulation of utilities. It is to consist of seven members, four of whom are to be appointed by the governor and three of whom are to be elected by the legislature.

The article requires the advance filing of rules and regulations of agencies of the state and of political subdivisions before they become effective, with certain exceptions. The legislature is directed to provide for notice of all rules and regulations and to enact a code of administrative procedure, which may include provisions for judicial review, to apply to agencies of the state and, to the extent practicable, to its subdivisions.

The article governs the creation of public authorities, and defines certain aspects of their powers and their relationships to the state and local governments. Authorities may be created and their powers altered only by special act, after public hearing, and with a provision for their termination. They may not levy taxes. The state or an appropriate political subdivision may acquire all of the properties and pay all of the indebtedness of any public authority. The accounts of public authorities are made subject to supervision by the state comptroller and his report and recommendations thereon are made public.

ARTICLE VII

Public officers and employees

This article governs the conduct of public officers and employees. It sets forth the oath of office to be taken by members of the legislature, elected state officers and such other public officers and employees as may be provided by state or local law. It bars any other test of belief, oath or declaration, as well as ownership of property, as a qualification for public office or employment.

A public officer or employee who refuses to sign a waiver of immunity against criminal prosecution or to testify before a grand jury with respect to his official conduct at any time within five years prior to such refusal, may, after a hearing, be dismissed if it is determined that such refusal substantially impairs his fitness to serve in public office or employment.

Civil service appointments and promotions shall be on the basis of merit and fitness, to be ascertained, as far as practicable, by competitive examinations. The article defines the preferences granted to certain veterans of the armed forces of the United States. Membership after July 1, 1940, in any pension or retirement system of the state or any local government, is continued as a contractual relationship, the benefits of which may be increased but may not be diminished or impaired. Pensions paid by the state or any local government to officers and employees thereof shall not be subject to state income taxes.

The article requires that laborers, workmen or mechanics engaged in the performance of public work shall be paid no less than the rate of wages prevailing in the same trade in the locality of the public work.

ARTICLE VIII

Natural resources and conservation

This article provides for the conservation and protection of the state's natural resources and scenic beauty. It continues the present constitutional requirement that the lands constituting the state forest preserve "shall be forever kept as wild forest lands," and shortens and simplifies the statement of the several exceptions to that provision. It provides that future exceptions may be made only by concurrent resolution of the legislature adopted at two regular sessions of succeeding terms of the legislature and thereafter approved by the people.

The article also provides that it shall be the public policy of the state to conserve and protect its natural resources and scenic beauty and to encourage the improvement of its agricultural lands. The article creates a state nature and historical preserve of properties of natural and historical significance. Properties so dedicated and placed within the nature and historical preserve may not be taken or otherwise disposed of except by statute enacted by two successive regular sessions of the legislature.

ARTICLE IX

Education

This article continues the present system of free public education below the college level and requires the legislature to make annual appropriations therefor. It requires the legislature to establish and define a system of higher education, encompassing both public and private institutions, by programs which may include free tuition, grants, fellowships and scholarships.

This article provides that if the state relieves students at public institutions of higher learning from the present requirement of paying tuition and other fees, the contractual obligations of any such institution or instrumentality of the state which have as their security directly or indirectly, student tuition and other fees and which remain unpaid as the result of such state action, will be assumed by the state.

Equality of educational opportunity is guaranteed to all the people of the state and discrimination in admission to any school which receives public funds is prohibited.

The article requires that in any law apportioning state aid to school districts, the basis of computing the number of pupils shall be the registration thereof, and that there be taken into account the special educational needs of students in each district and the total local tax burden of the taxpayers of each district.

The board of regents is continued as the head of the university of the state of New York and its organization and functions are prescribed. The article grants constitutional recognition to the state university of New York and the city university of New York and makes each responsible for the control and administration of the institutions and facilities therein.

ARTICLE X

State taxation and finance

This article governs the financial management of the state. In the field of taxation, it prohibits the surrender, suspension or contracting away of the state's power to tax, and contiuues the present limitation on the state's power to alter or repeal exemptions granted to religious, educational and charitable institutions. It retains the prohibitions against excise or ad valorem taxation of intangible personal property, taxation of undistributed profits, and discriminatory taxation of banking corporations.

The article sets forth the procedure for the submission by the governor of budgets to the legislature and its action thereupon.

The article establishes a fiscal limitation on the amount of debt that the state may contract. The state may not contract debt unless authorized by law enacted by two regular sessions of the legislature separated by an intervening election and unless the total debt service shall not exceed twelve percent of the average state revenues in the two preceding fiscal years. The twelve percent limitation may be increased, not to exceed fifteen percent, by statute approved at referendum.

The proceeds from the creation of the indebtedness may be used only for capital construction purposes as defined in the article. The article also makes provisions for the issuance of bonds and the maturity and payment thereof. No debt may be issued by the state or any instrumentality thereof unless approved by the governor.

The article directs the legislature to provide for the transfer to the state of responsibility for all programs of public assistance and care now administered by local governments. It provides for the allocation of the costs of such programs not paid or reimbursed by the federal government and requires that, within ten years, local governments be entirely relieved of all such costs.

The article permits public moneys to be granted or loaned for economic and community development purposes. Economic and community development purposes include the renewal and rebuilding of communities, the devolpment of new communities, and programs and facilities to enhance the physical environment, health and social well-being of, and to encourage the expansion of economic opportunity for, the people of the state.

The state is prohibited from granting or lending its moneys to or guaranteeing the obligations of any person, association, or private corporation except for a public purpose. However, if the state borrows money, it may lend such borrowed money only for capital construction purposes.

The article authorizes the legislature to create a public corporation for the purpose of insuring and guaranteeing loans of persons, associations, and public and private corporations for economic and community development purposes. Local governments are also authorized to guarantee the obligations of any public corporation for such purposes.

Further provision is made to allow the state to borrow money in anticipation of taxes and revenues and to authorize the creation of a tax stabilization fund.

Other provisions allow the creation of debt for the purposes of, and to the extent authorized by, the prior constitution and by laws approved by the people at referenda.

ARTICLE XI

Local governments

This article describes the powers and other aspects of the operations of local governments, which are defined as counties, cities, towns and villages.

This article retains existing powers of local governments and enlarges these powers by granting to them all legislative and administrative power which the legislature has power to confer, subject to a statute of restrictions to be enacted.

In addition every local government is granted power to adopt local laws, not inconsistent with general law, relating to matters of local concern and local aspects of matters of state concern. The legislature, with certain limited exceptions, may act in these matters only on request from each local government affected or by general law or (except for New York City) on message of necessity from the governor and a two-thirds vote in each house.

This general grant is supplemented by a detailed grant of specific powers, including the right to adopt local laws, not inconsistent with general law, relating to "the government, protection, order, conduct, safety, health and well-being of persons or property therein." The legislature is authorized to incorporate other specific grants of local government rights in a statute of local governments which may be amended to reduce such rights only by action of the legislature with the governor's approval in two successive years.

The right of counties to adopt county charters by a dual or triple referendum is continued, but if only the government of the county is involved in the reorganization this may now be done by a single countywide referendum approval instead of separate approvals in the cities and in the county outside of cities. The right to transfer functions from one unit of government to another with appropriate referendum approvals is continued and extended to counties which have not adopted charters.

Two or more counties, or one or more with New York City, are empowered to create regional agencies to which they may transfer one or more of their functions.

Every local legislative body is required to redistrict its area for its own elections in the year following each federal decennial census. Members of local legislative bodies are prohibited from holding public office in any other local government or any other elective office except delegate to a constitutional convention.

The legislature is required to provide for the supervision, review and equalization of assessments for purposes of taxation and may authorize counties to perform assessment or tax collection functions for units of government within them.

ARTICLE XII

Local finances

This article governs the financial management of local governments and school districts.

Existing debt and tax limits are continued except that: (1) such limits are deleted with respect to city school districts in cities under 125,000 population, (2) the two-percent limit set forth for cities and villages over five thousand population in Article XVIII in the present constitution has been transferred to the general debt limit of such local governments, (3) the legislature is required to establish tax limits for towns by January 1, 1972, (4) the five-year average of full valuation of taxable real property as the base on which the percentage limits are calculated may be changed to three years by statute and local referendum, and (5) the percentage debt or tax limit of any local government may be changed in the same way.

The article continues the exclusion of certain types of debt from the debt limit, including revenue-producing debt to the extent that its revenues support the carrying charges. It permits the costs of capital projects financed by current revenues to be excluded from the debt and tax limits.

The article also continues, with existing exceptions, the basic principles of debt regulation: that debts shall not be contracted for longer than the period of probable usefulness, that the full faith and credit of a local government shall be pledged for all its borrowing, that serial bonds shall be used for long-term borrowing, and that debt service payments must always be made, with precedence over other obligations.

Special provisions are made for cooperative financing of local enterprises by local governments and other public corporations.

ARTICLE XIII

Defense and the organized militia

This article provides that the defense of the state and the United States is an obligation of all persons within the state, and that the legislature shall provide for the discharge of this obligation and for the maintenance of a militia of which the governor is the commander-in-chief. It directs the legislature to provide for the continuity of state and local governmental offices and activities when such offices and activities are jeopardized in time of disaster or enemy attack.

ARTICLE XIV

Amendments to the constitution

This article provides for amendment of the constitution by the legislature or by a constitutional convention. An amendment may become part of the constitution by adoption by two regular sessions of succeeding terms of the legislature and approval thereafter by a majority of the electors voting thereon at a general election. A new constitution may also be adopted or amendments made to the existing constitution by a constitutional convention, and approval by majority vote of the people at an election held not less than six weeks after adjournment of the convention.

The article provides the question of whether to hold a constitutional convention shall be submitted to the people in 1992, every twentieth year thereafter, and at such other times as the legislature may provide. The article prescribes the number, manner of election, qualifications and compensation of delegates to future constitutional conventions, and certain aspects of the conduct of such conventions.

Any amendment proposed by a constitutional convention inconsistent with an amendment proposed by the legislature and coincidentally submitted for approval of the people shall, if approved, supersede the latter to the extent of the inconsistency.

ARTICLE XV

Miscellaneous

The article contains several provisions not appropriate for inclusion in any of the first fourteen articles.

It reserves to the state all powers not expressly denied to it by either this constitution or the federal constitution.

The article provides that whenever the constitution authorizes the legislature to act, unless expressly provided otherwise, such action must be by statute, requiring the approval of the governor.

It authorizes the state or any local government or public corporation to acquire by purchase, gift or eminent domain such property as may be necessary for economic and community development purposes, including property required in excess of such purpose, and such property as may be ultimately required for such purpose, although temporarily not so required.

The article requires corporations and associations for banking purposes to be formed under and be subject to general laws. Savings banks are not permitted to have any capital stock. Local governments and school districts are not permitted to own any stock in or hold bonds of any private corporation or association, except that such provision does not prevent them from making deposits in savings and loan associations and savings banks.

It prohibits gambling in the state, except for the conduct of bingo by non-profit organizations, state-operated lotteries, the proceeds of which are to be applied exclusively for educational purposes, and pari-mutuel betting on horse racing from which the state shall derive revenue for the support of government.

The article guarantees freedom of speech and of the press to every citizen, holding each citizen responsible for any abuses of that right.

It fixes the operative date of the constitution as January 1, 1969 except that (1) for the purposes of contracting state debt a statute may be passed for the first time in the year 1968, and (2) for purposes of making a gift or loan of public money to private enterprise for economic and community development purposes, statutes, not inconsistent with the existing constitution, may be enacted in the year 1968.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY of New York. I am happy to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from California.

Mr. MOSS. I, as a Californian, do not want to presume to advise the people of the State of New York as to the merits of the constitution that has been written for the State of New York. But I do want to take cognizance of the fact that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MURPHY], notwithstanding a very heavy obligation to participate in the deliberations of the constitutional convention in New York, has been most faithful and diligent in his attendance in the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and in the meetings of the Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance which I am privileged to chair.

I think many times it has placed an onerous climate upon his time but he has always responded to our requests for his attendance at meetings and he has contributed constructively to the work of the committee throughout the many months of the constitutional convention.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. I thank my colleague from California.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY of New York. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Mr. McCORMACK. A constitutional convention is a body of great importance. It happens that my first public office to which I was elected was as a member of the constitutional convention of Massachusetts in 1917–18.

It was the fourth constitutional convention in the history of our State, the original convention, the convention of 1820, and subsequent conventions of 1851 and 1917.

As I say, it is a matter of paramount importance because it concerns the fundamental law of a State.

The constitutional convention in the State of New York labored long and hard and very faithfully in the performance of their duties to achieve the results they did at the convention in terms of the fundamental law of the State of New York.

The gentleman from New York was a delegate to that convention. Every time I or the majority leader called him, he responded. With two responsible duties, as a Member of the House of Representatives and as a member of the constitutional convention of the State of New York, he performed the two duties he had. On every occasion the leadership called the gentleman, he responded and came to the House of Representatives. He was always present when important votes were taken.

The people of his district are justified in feeling proud of the outstanding manner in which he performed the duties of the two offices he held, one as a Member of the House of Representatives in Congress, and the other as a delegate to the constitutional convention.

I congratulate the people of his district for electing him to this body and as a delegate to the convention, and I wish to convey to them the faithfulness with which my distinguished friend from New York performed the duties of both offices. He was always available to the leadership when we called upon him, and we could always rely upon him. He always responded by being present whenever important votes were taken, and he was always available when the leadership got in touch with him.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. I thank the distinguished Speaker.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York, my colleague, a member of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I applaud the gentleman for taking this time as a delegate to the State constitutional convention to address the House on matters which I believe have national significance.

At this point let me join enthusiastically in the comments about the gentleman in the well which were made by the distinguished Speaker of the House and by the chairman of the subcommittee on which he serves, the gentleman from California [Mr. MOSS], of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

I believe the performance in the constitutional convention of the gentleman from New York, from the 16th District, reflects well not only on him and his constituency, but on our entire New York delegation. It was extremely important to us that we in the House be in communication with the delegates convened at Albany in our State for a very basic reason. One of the important measures dealt with was an appropriate and workable way to handle reapportionment of legislative districts. I think the convention in choosing a new method, which is away from the arena of politics and puts in in the hands of knowledgeable experts, made great progress in this regard, among other things.

As to the performance of the gentleman from New York himself, I want to second, as a witness, the comment that was made, that despite the heavy burden entrusted to him by reason of the deliberations of the constitutional convention, he was ever at hand when he was needed here in the House to carry on the programs that were being addressed through legislation, whether it be in committee work, delegation activity, or anything that was of interest to the people of the State of New York. He was on hand to make his enormous contribution, as he always has been. So in that sense, when the people of his district saw fit to place their confidence in him as a delegate, they got, in truth, a double reward. He was able to take his advocacy and his knowledge and his loyalty and his fidelity to the constitutional principles of the great Constitution of the United States and place those at the availability of the convention, in the context of constitutional deliberations in Albany, to the great reward of that convention and to the reward of the people of our State.

Much has been said in public print, if the gentleman will yield further, about some of the developments of the constitutional convention.

Because the gentleman is so well informed on this subject and because it is of such great importance to the other States which are considering these same matters, I would ask him to join with me in answering some questions which I believe logically are to be raised at this time on the matter of the presentation of this particular document.

I would ask the gentleman to agree, looking backward at history, that whenever a document of this importance or wherever a charter of this kind has been placed before the people and has required that tough decisions and firm decisions be made by the delegate assembly, it is then handed to the people so that they can ratify these decisions in a block, because as soon as one separates one decision from the others it is starved with emotional and all sorts of aleatory issues not properly addressed to it. In many instances it suffers a fate it would not suffer if it were placed in a proper context in the whole document in support of its purposes.

I would ask the gentleman to comment on the following: Is it not true that the great charter under which we live in the United States, the Constitution itself and the Bill of Rights, was not handed out to the Colonies or the Confederation at that time for ratification in a piecemeal fashion? Is it not true that Jefferson, the great architect of the Constitution, and the delegates then sitting in the writing of this immortal document, so set to hand the Bill of Rights en bloc, and the Constitution, to be delivered to the people in one package? Is that not true?

Mr. MURPHY of New York. That is true.

I believe that some humorists have stated that if they had separated the Bill of Rights and put those items in a package of ten succinct and different articles, to the 13 States, we probably never would have become the great 50 States we are. In fact, at that time of history, we might have remained a colony of the British Empire.

Mr. CAREY. So there definitely is a firm precedent for the placing of an entire package before the people.

Is it not also true, looking around the Chamber in which we are today, we see the great givers of law emblazoned on the Chamber walls in plaques, to remind us constantly of the contributions by Suleiman, by Napoleon, by the great Justinian, and by the great giver of law, who can possibly be called the giver of the law of our faith, the great faith of our spiritual law under which we live, the Ten Commandments? Is it not true that Moses did not hand down the Ten Commandments at one time and say to the people, "Take as many as you wish?" They had to take the tablets themselves all at once; or not be followers of Moses; is that not correct?

Mr. MURPHY of New York. That is correct. The gentleman's statement as to historical significance has certainly well brought out the point that our original laws were handed down as one document.

Mr. CAREY. In this connection let me also state that the people's delegates met, and the people chose in New York to rest their trust and their confidence in the political system under which they elected a majority of delegates from the great Democratic Party; is that not true?

Mr. MURPHY of New York. That is true.

Mr. CAREY. I might say, this is the best thing the people can do whenever their interests are in the balance, because the Democratic Party has served them well.

Is it not also true that the people sent delegates there to do something, to do something different; that they did not want handed back the same old document of 53,000 words which had been amended over and over again so many times that it looked like a worn sock?

Mr. MURPHY of New York. The only way the convention could have been called was by a referendum of the people, and the people chose the constitutional convention for the specific purpose of rewriting the charter.

Mr. CAREY. Is it not true also, since the gentleman attended all of the meetings and observed quite intimately the deliberations of the convention, in the presentation of the president of the convention, the Honorable Anthony J. Travia, of New York, a leader of great ability, of outstanding talent, a man par excellence, there was brought forth a document with legislative pride in every line?

Mr. MURPHY of New York. I would say, in response to that statement about the president of that convention, the success of the 6 months of deliberations hung more on his shoulders than on those of anyone else, and he more than anyone else was responsible for the skillful job done. It was his ability which brought together the many diverse elements not only within the convention but also within the different parties themselves, so that we finally had a consensus and were able to write a single document.

Mr. CAREY. Speaking to the substance of the document itself, is it not true that some critics and early opponents, who really have not taken the time to study and to understand this document, have indicated by its measures it would set in motion a movement toward freewheeling high-spending programs? Is it not true that in this document there is not one cent to be appropriated, not one cent for any expenditure, unless that receives the full consideration of the elected Legislature of the State of New York?

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Sitting in session on two separate occasions. Not just one legislature, but two legislatures.

Mr. CAREY. Is it not true that in vital areas of concern to New York this document does more than has ever been done to place New York in the forefront of the great 50 States? Now, is it not true, also, the conservation fight in which we preserve forever the primitive and open lands, the great legacy of the people of the State of New York, is now placed in the law in a lithograph fashion so that it is unassailable by any future body that might attempt to turn the lands away from the heritage through which they belong to the State of New York?

Mr. MURPHY of New York. That is right. And there is a safeguard for those lands in perpetuity.

Mr. CAREY. Is it not true that the strings and hobbles placed on the Legislature of the State of New York are now removed in these areas and the legislature is now free to look at the matter of community development and decide how they can best help themselves to rebuild, particularly in the urban portions of the area? This is truly a step forward, is it not?

Mr. MURPHY of New York. That is true not only in this regard but, in virtually every area, responsibility was given to the State legislature to act and not bind and restrict it for 30 years in this document.

Mr. CAREY. Is it not correct, also, on the matter that I spoke of before, that is, the matter of reapportionment of legislative districts which would absolutely guarantee one-man, one-vote types of bodies in the State assembly and in the Congress, is placed in the law now and is taken away from politics with a commission which would be truly bipartisan and not reflect the will or the design of any party?

Mr. MURPHY of New York. That is correct. The chairman and the controlling interest in that reapportionment both will be appointed by the court of appeals of the State and completely take out of politics the question of the reapportionment of the State legislature and the congressional districts.

Mr. CAREY. As one who has been admitted to the bar of the State of New York and the Supreme Court of the United States, I take a tremendous interest in preserving that cornerstone principle of the law; namely, that the people should be tried by their peers and should have a voice in the selection of those who will judge them. Does not this Constitution provide that we will continue to determine it and provide that the people will elect those who are fit in the judiciary of their State? Is this not something which the people of the State of New York have long determined as their will?

Mr. MURPHY of New York. It is one of the great accomplishments of the convention. I will go into detail on the rewriting of the judiciary, which was one of the most important in the convention. Many of the forces would have liked to have taken away from the people the selection of the judges. In the wisdom of the convention the election of the judiciary of our State was maintained.

Mr. CAREY. In the matter that the gentleman raised in his discussion I would hail the gentleman and many others of my colleagues who have voted again and again with progressive ideas to assist in the education of all of the children of this Nation. I would state in this Congress and in the predecessor Congress under this administration we have been able to do more and for more children than all of the previous legislative bodies in history. Of course, I refer to the great Elementary and Secondary Education Act and I refer to programs like Operation Headstart and the Higher Education Facilities Act and the Medical Professions Act.

All of these are things under which we attempted to place our national resources at the disposal of the growing population of young people who will really have their destiny determined by the amount of education they receive. Is it not true we were able to do this because under our Constitution we have a most ingenious article which governs us, that is, the great first amendment, which provides ironclad guarantees for the separation of church and State? It makes certain that within their realm the States shall move and with freedom to carry out their jobs and in doing so they are no enemy of the church. Correspondingly the church may move in a spiritual world in the guidance of its followers without any encroachment on the affairs of the State. We have lived for 178 years under this principle and have been able to establish areas of mutual concern for the people of the United States and do this with the utmost fidelity to the principle of separation which always has looked to aid people and not make the first amendment a barrier to progress. Has this not been the history of this body and of this Nation?

Mr. MURPHY of New York. It has been. And the very fact which you raise was one of the very controversial issues in this convention. It was resolved by taking the exact language from the Federal Constitution and substituting that language declaring the separation of church and state right in the Bill of Rights article of the new State constitution which we so strongly recommend. So we, therefore, have an ironclad commitment to do so to the people of the State, not only in this particular Federal language, but through the rewriting of certain Federal language right in the State constitution.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I agree that there is a double warranty of protection in the two clauses of the first amendment to the people of our State. I think it is sound constitutional principle also to state that in the exercise of the Federal powers under the Constitution, if the antiquated Blaine amendment, were to remain in the Constitution, in a true sense this is a constitutional anathema, and it would not be more than that, and it would have no more impact or binding operation in the State than was ever envisioned by the Federal Government? Further, if I know constitutional law, when the Federal Government legislates in a particular field, it preempts the right of the State system to legislate in antipathy to the Federal position.

Therefore, I think that the distinguished gentleman did no more than anyone else should do in carrying out his constitutional responsibilities both here in the Congress of the United States and in the State, to place in the constitution of the State of New York the true guarantee in the field of religion, particularly as it is stated in the first amendment.

Let me suggest, since this has been my field of interest since long before I came to Congress, the important thing here was to do the right thing at the right time for the education of all the children of the great State of New York.

Further, I believe it is fair to state that the fair-mindedness of the convention exercised itself when in all fairness and good will the representatives thereof sat down and saw that this article was truly a barrier to the exercise of judgment on the part of the legislature in those areas in which the child might be educated, regardless of the school which that child attended. I think they saw, as history will record, that the so-called Blaine amendment is an encrusted barnacle, born in inequity, addressing itself to the former immigrants coming into this great country of ours, who were supposed to work in fear and stand trembling, insofar as these immigrants from Poland, Germany, Ireland, and Italy were concerned, in their efforts to enjoy religious freedom would try to bring into this country some form of religious interference in the affairs of state, such practices that hark back to the holy wars of Europe.

And, Mr. Speaker, for this reason that position which was taken at that time with reference to the school system and with reference to the school which the child could attend, represented a fettering and impairment upon the school system which existed at that time, schools that were so-called public schools.

Now, it is true that despite this there has grown up in the great State of New York a true partnership, the extension of quality of education. In other words, one in every four children goes to a nonpublic school. The public schools of our State are supported by all the citizens of the State of New York with devotion. More importantly, they are supported by funds that exceed the commitment to education that we find in any other State or like locality in the world. This has only been possible because those who were paying for the support of the nonpublic schools, also in every case gave full and wholesome, wholehearted support to all of the programs in the public school system. We, therefore, achieved this true partnership of equality.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman whether under the wording of the Constitution, is it not true that no money will be devoted by the State to the support of any church or religious field?

Mr. MURPHY of New York. There is an ironclad guarantee to that effect.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, with this guarantee, is it not true that the only money that could be voted by any future legislature would have to be for the benefit of the individual child and not to the school which he attends?

Mr. MURPHY of New York. It would have to be voted for the benefit of the education of the individual child.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, let me say that this article, as well as all the other provisions of the Constitution, will enable our State to make a tremendous stride forward. In other words, we have been fond of having our State called the Empire State.

If we can only lead in the empire of the material world and if we contribute nothing to the empire of the mind, then we have not made our full contribution. Our State has built up a tremendous complex of great educational institutions. We are working upon an economy that should at least lead the country. We are working upon an environmental system to take the pollutants from our water, to clean the air, and build the best communications system that exists in any place of the civilized world.

In all of these things to really guide the legislature in the future you took the action that was needed. I believe this document of 1967 to be a cornerstone, and to be a charter for this kind of organization.

I believe the very fact that you have replaced this antiquated document of 53,000 words with one of less than half that length speaks well for your deliberations, since it is much harder to be short than long when you are writing good law on this point.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, because I have been too long, indeed, and I am detracting from the great presentation that the gentleman is making, and has made as a delegate to a tremendously historic convention in which his activities contributed in an immeasurably great way to bring forth a document that will help this generation and generations to come to live in justice and freedom and liberty in the great State of New York.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. I thank my colleague from Brooklyn.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 296, I was absent from the Chamber on official business, in conference with Senator METCALF in the Senate, and I failed to answer to my name. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce that, had I been present, I would have voted "no" on the motion to recommit.

VICIOUS ATTACK BY NATIONAL OFFICERS OF WOMAN'S CHRISTIAN TEMPERANCE UNION

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, during my seven terms in Congress, I have seen all forms of false accusations, political misrepresentations, and innuendo leveled at Members of the Congress but am sorry to report to you, Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues in the House, that a nationally prominent organization of reputable people have launched upon a vicious campaign of misrepresentation that is very disheartening to me as a person and threatens our very foundation of freedom and legislative processes.

I refer to a vicious attack being made upon me and Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, by the national officers of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union in several WCTU publications, including the national publication, Union Signal, and the Illinois Ribboner. The statements are in connection with H.R. 7415, which I introduced, by request of the Department of State, that would provide space in the District of Columbia for a headquarters building for the Organization of American States and other foreign chanceries who are badly in need of office space. Mrs. Mildred B. Harmon, national legislative representative for the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and others have seen fit to brand this proposed legislation as an "International Drinking Club."

Poison pen letters have been sent to practically every church in my congressional district, stirring up thousands of letters of protest over this cruel hoax perpetrated by Mrs. Harmon and the WCTU national officers.

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds, I introduced legislation early this year at the request of the Department of State. As you know, only Members of Congress can introduce proposals for consideration of the Congress. I did not then and I do not now have any personal interest in H.R. 7415 other than carrying out my responsibility as a subcommittee chairman of this House. When Ambassador James Symington, Chief of Protocol of the United States, who, incidentally, is the illustrious son of the senior Senator from Missouri, STUART SYMINGTON, came to me and informed me that the U.S. Government was being requested by many foreign governments to provide adequate space in our Nation's Capital on which to construct their own chanceries, I asked the State Department to send us legislative recommendations and I agreed that we would consider these recommendations.

Early this year, the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds held extensive hearings concerning the need for a site for a headquarters building for the Organization of American States and certain chanceries for foreign governments. During these entire hearings, which were publicized in all three Washington newspapers and printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, neither Mrs. Harmon, the legislative representative of the Women's Christian Temperance Union, nor any other officer or member of this organization saw fit to testify or send a statement. During these hearings, not one word was mentioned concerning the serving of liquor. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, you can read H.R. 7415 backward and forward and you will see that the bill does not authorize 1 penny for liquor. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the entire legislation refers to land, not an "International Drinking Club."

Although I will have printed in the RECORD, following my remarks, the complete statement sent to local churches in my congressional district by the WCTU, I want to, at this time, just quote some of the false accusations made by Mrs. Harmon and ask how any responsible person could make such public statements without first checking the facts. Mrs. Harmon has not called me to get the facts. Neither has she contacted our committee for the facts. Therefore, I can only come to the conclusion that the decent, Christian-minded people are being duped by their national officers in order to create hysteria and turn people against the Johnson administration under the guise of righteousness. I resent very much anyone playing politics under the guise of religion, particularly, where the political statements are wholly untrue.

Mrs. Harmon states, in part, in her editorial in the September 9, 1967, issue of the Union Signal, in referring to the need for a headquarters site for the Organization of American States and chanceries:

> The figure cited for the International Center, which the State Department and the President have requested, is a mere $8 billion. It is proposed as a cooperative effort of the White House, the State Department, and the National Capital Planning Commission. It would also include subsidized hotels, restaurants, and office buildings.
>
> One feature envisioned is a facility which would serve as an International Center. There are 113 nations with embassies and chancelleries in Washington, so this would be a very cosmopolitan club. It would undoubtedly be even more de luxe than the entertainment quarters atop the State Department building, and undoubtedly more liquor and greater varieties would flow—all at taxpayers expense, of course.
>
> To make it all legal-like, Senator J. W. Fulbright of Arkansas introduced S. 1301 in the Senate, and Representative Kenneth J. Gray of Illinois introduced H.R. 7415 in the House. (Of course they do not mention liquor per se.)

You will notice, Mr. Speaker, that Mrs. Harmon herself admits that there is no mention of liquor in the bill. Why, then, does she write such an article accusing Senator FULBRIGHT and me of promoting a "drinking club"? The answer is very simple. Certain real estate people in Washington are promoting a particular site for the headquarters building for the Organization of American States and other chanceries and they are using demagogic means with which to do it and I am sorry to say that Mrs. Harmon and the Women's Christian Temperance Union are being used as a tool for this purpose. It is unfortunate, indeed. As an example, Mrs. Harmon quotes my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Iowa, Representative H. R. GROSS, in stirring up enough unfavorable sentiment on the proposed legislation to cause inaction. Mr. GROSS had also called this bill an "International Drinking Club" bill. However, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show that on April 10, 1967, Mr. GROSS and other Members of this House passed H.R. 6638 setting up exactly the same type of enclave as proposed in H.R. 7415. I do not suppose Mrs. Harmon was interested enough in telling the members of the WCTU about this action of Congress, particularly, since it would cost at least $4½ million of the taxpayers' money.

The bill, H.R. 6638, that Mr. GROSS supported and the bill that I introduced by request, H.R. 7415, will do exactly the same thing—provide space for the Organization of American States and foreign governments to build their headquarters building and chanceries in the District of Columbia in an enclave where they can work together. The only difference in the two bills, I repeat, is the location and the cost. The bill Mr. GROSS supports, by admission of the chairman of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, Mr. DOWDY, would be approximately $4½ million to taxpayers of this country, just for the land.

If the Organization of American States and the various foreign governments wanted to serve liquor on the site authorized by the bill that Mr. GROSS supports, they certainly could do so. The Organization of American States and the foreign chanceries in Washington can serve liquor where they are presently located; so, what makes the WCTU, or anyone else, think that by merely finding a suitable site where larger quarters can be constructed will be an inducement for more liquor to be served or an "International Drinking Club" to be established. Washington is full of clubs where liquor is served and I am sure that, if any foreign diplomat wants to get a drink, he would need only to walk a few steps in any direction and find it now. I resent very much the accusation that to provide land in the District of Columbia for the purpose of utilizing more office space for our neighbors to the south and other countries is in any way going to alter the drinking habits of people or promote an "International Drinking Club." This is pure and simple hogwash.

Mr. Speaker, all of us are accustomed to criticism and false charges now and then; but the thing that disturbs me very much in this instance is the fact that seemingly responsible people such as Mrs. Harmon and the national officers of the Women's Christian Temperance Union would not attempt to obtain the facts on proposed legislation before making nationwide accusations. In the first place, I am against spending any Federal funds at this time for the purchase of property in the District of Columbia, regardless of how meritorious, due to our high war expenditures. Congress passed a bill I sponsored last year authorizing a much needed home for the Vice President of the United States, a bill that would cost less than $1 million, but construction has been held up because of the war. We also considered the establishment of a National Visitors Center which is badly needed to accommodate the 15 million visitors coming to Washington each year and, because of tight budget considerations, our Committee on Public Works is recommending the leasing of Union Station without any taxpayers' funds involved at the present time. The lease payments will be amortized through parking fees, and the sale of goods and services.

I have been trying in every way possible to help the District of Columbia, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and I am certainly sympathetic to the needs for a new headquarters building for the Organization of American States and ample space for the foreign governments who need more working room. Therefore, I believe that neither H.R. 7415, which I introduced by request, nor H.R. 6638, which passed the House and is pending in the Senate, which will cost several million dollars of taxpayers' money if it should become law at this time should be passed. Our Committee on Public Works is studying the possibility of making available land now owned by the Federal Government that could be utilized for this purpose with no Federal funds needed. In any event, no action will be taken without full hearings by our committee. Therefore, I hope to lay to rest once and for all this vicious false argument that $8 billion is going to be spent in Washington for a so-called "International Drinking Club." Nothing could be further from the truth.

After a consultation with Ambassador Symington and other officials, I can assure you that if we develop a legislative proposal and hearings are held, officials of the Womens Christian Temperance Union will be invited to testify so they can be informed fully as to what Congress proposes, instead of running in all directions with false rumors.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to point out that the Organization of American States holds the best promise for peace in Central and South America. We need only to look at Castro's Cuba to see what communism and subversion can do in the Western Hemisphere. Just last week, the Organization of American States passed a resolution condemning communism and urging all freedom-loving countries in the hemisphere to stop trading with the enemy. This organization needs more space, other foreign governments friendly to America need additional office space. All they are asking us to do is provide land for them to build their own buildings. The recent attack by the Women's Christian Temperance Union upon me and friendly nations who are headquartered in Washington is a good indication of how we can lose our friends around the world. To obscure the good work of organizations such as the Organization of American States with false innuendo only hurts our relations with these friendly countries. You would think that a Christian oriented organization such as the Women's Christian Temperance Union that has done so much good work, would be trying to build instead of wreck, would be trying to enunciate a Christian policy instead of spreading malicious falsehoods.

For 13 years, I have had the privilege of guiding thousands of people through the Capitol Building personally, and standing in the Statuary Hall of Congress is a monument placed there by my beloved State of Illinois. The statue is one of Frances E. Willard, founder of the Women's Christian Temperance Union. I am sure if she could speak today she would be ashamed of some of the actions of the national officers of the WCTU.

There are thousands of wonderful people who belong to the Women's Christian Temperance Union in my congressional district, including members of my own family, and throughout the Nation, and I know how much good work this organization has done and it is a shame that the name of the organization is marred by such tactics.

Mr. Speaker, I am including with my remarks the full printed copy of H.R. 7415, which clearly shows that there is not one word in this legislative proposal that would authorize the establishment of an "International Drinking Club" in Washington. I am including also with my remarks the scandal sheet sent to local

churches in my district by the Women's Christian Temperance Union urging people to write letters of opposition. I am also including with my remarks a letter dated October 3, 1967, from Ambassador James Symington, Chief of Protocol of the United States, pointing out that there is no intent in the legislative proposal H.R. 7415 or any intent administratively to establish an "International Drinking Club" or anything of the kind. I hope this will lay to rest this vicious smear campaign and Congress can go on about its business of trying to assist the Organization of American States and other foreign governments to do their official duties in Washington without being accused of corrupt practices.

The material referred to follows:

[90th Congress, First Session]

H.R. 7415

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

March 16, 1967

(Mr. Gray (by request) introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Public Works:)

A bill to authorize the acquisition, transfer, conveyance, lease, and improvement of, and construction on, certain property in the District of Columbia for use as a headquarters site for the Organization of American States, as sites for governments of foreign countries, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to facilitate the conduct of foreign relations by the Department of State in Washington, District of Columbia, through the creation of a more propitious atmosphere for the establishment of foreign government and international organization offices and other facilities, the Administrator of General Services is authorized to acquire by purchase, condemnation, donation, exchange, or otherwise, such lands and any buildings and improvements (including property owned by the District of Columbia) thereon within an area in the Northwest section of the District of Columbia bounded by the Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway, Pennsylvania Avenue, "L" Street, New Hampshire Avenue, Twenty-first Street, "N" Street, and Twenty-second Street, as the Secretary of State shall determine to be necessary to provide (1) a headquarters building site for the Organization of American States, (2) sites for buildings and supporting facilities for international organizations, (3) sites for buildings and supporting facilities for governments of foreign countries, and to improve any such sites.

Sec. 2. (a) The Administrator of General Services is hereby authorized to transfer or convey to the Organization of American States, without consideration, all right, title, and interest to a parcel of land not to exceed six acres of the land acquired under section 1 of this Act or otherwise owned by the United States within the area described in section 1 of this Act subject to (1) such terms and conditions as the Secretary of State shall prescribe, and (2) commitment by the Organization of American States to transfer or convey without consideration, all right, title, and interest of the Organization of American States in the buildings and other improvements on the property known as lot 802 in square south of square 147 in the District of Columbia to the United States as soon as the land transferred or conveyed to the Organization of American States is developed for use as a headquarters. The deed to the Organization of American States shall provide that the property transferred or conveyed to it under the authority of this section shall be used as a headquarters site for the Organization of American States.

(b) The Administrator of General Services is hereby authorized to transfer or convey to the Organization of American States, without consideration, all right, title, and interest to the property known as lot 800 in square south of square 173 in the District of Columbia and the buildings and other improvements on the property for use by the Organization of American States.

Sec. 3. If so requested by the Organization of American States, and with funds provided in advance or to be provided as reimbursement from the Organization of American States, the Administrator of General Services is hereby authorized to design, construct, furnish, and equip the headquarters for the Organization of American States to be constructed on the property transferred or conveyed to the Organization of American States pursuant to section 2(a) of this Act.

Sec. 4. (a) The Administrator of General Services is hereby authorized to sell, lease, or otherwise transfer property acquired under section 1 of this Act and other property owned by the United States within the area described in section 1 of this Act to foreign governments and international organizations, including the Organization of American States, upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary of State, after consultation with the Administrator of General Services, shall prescribe. Every lease, contract of sale, deed, and other document of transfer shall provide (a) that the foreign government shall devote the property transferred to use for legation purposes, as defined under section 1a(c) of the Act of December 24, 1942, as amended (D.C. Code, 1961 edition, 47–801 (a)(e)) or (b) at the international organization shall devote the property transferred to its official uses, including supporting facilities.

(b) The Administrator of General Services is also authorized with the concurrence of the Secretary of State to transfer title to or jurisdiction over any property or part thereof acquired pursuant to the first section of this Act to the District of Columbia for public purposes, including, but not limited to, streets.

(c) The Administrator of General Services will not acquire any property situated within the area described in section 1 of this Act and owned by the District of Columbia without the express consent of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

(d) No lands, buildings, or other property shall be acquired unless (1) the Administrator of General Services determines that there is a need therefor to provide for an orderly and economical development of the above-described area; and (2) the Commissioners of the District of Columbia have made for such property the same finding as is required in section 3 of the Act approved October 6, 1964 (78 Stat. 1004; Public Law 88–629).

(e) Where lands are acquired on which there are buildings or other improvements, any occupants of such property shall be allowed to remain in possession, subject to appropriate contractual arrangements, until the Administrator of General Services determines that the property is needed to meet the development schedule for the area.

Sec. 5 (a) The Act of June 20, 1938 (52 Stat. 802; D.C. Code, 1961 edition, 5–413 to 5–428) shall not apply to buildings constructed on property transferred or conveyed pursuant to this Act: *Provided,* That the plans showing the location, height, bulk, number of stories, and size of, and the provisions for open space and off-street parking in and around, such buildings shall be approved by the National Capital Planning Commission and plans showing the height and appearances, color, and texture of the materials of exterior construction of such buildings shall be approved by the Commission of Fine Arts prior to the construction thereof.

(b) The District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency shall provide relocation assistance and relocation payments in accordance with the provisions of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, and as it may be amended, and any regulations promulgated pursuant thereto to any families, individuals, business concerns, and nonprofit organizations which may be displaced from real property after the acquisition of such property by the United States in accordance with the provisions of this Act. Families, individuals, business concerns, and nonprofit organizations occupying property determined by the Administrator of General Services to be necessary for acquisition pursuant to section 4(d) of this Act on the date of such determination shall also be eligible for relocation payments provided they do not move until after the date of the findings required in section 4(d) of this Act.

(c) The Administrator of General Services shall advance necessary funds to the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency for the costs of administering the relocation assistance program and for making the relocation payments authorized in section 5(b).

(d) Individuals and families displaced in accordance with the provisions of this Act shall be given the same preference with respect to vacancies occurring in housing owned or operated within the District of Columbia by Federal or District of Columbia government agencies as is provided in section 8(b) of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 (D.C. Code, sec. 5–707(a)).

(e) The street, alley, and sidewalk closings, constructions, and reconstructions, and the rerouting, relocating, and rebuilding of (1) the public sewers and their appurtenances, (2) the water mains, fire hydrants, and other parts of the public water supply and distribution system, and (3) the fire alarm system, which are occasioned in carrying out the provisions of this Act shall be without cost to the District of Columbia.

(f) The Administrator of General Services is authorized at the time he transfers or conveys property to the Organization of American States pursuant to section 2 of this Act, or at the time he sells, leases, or otherwise transfers property acquired under section 1 of this Act or sells, leases, or otherwise transfers other property owned by the United States within the area described in section 1 of this Act, to incorporate, with the approval of the Secretary of State, in the document making such transfer or conveyance a covenant requiring the transferee or the grantee to conform to Federal Government standards and codes governing building construction and equipment therein, and requiring said transferee or grantee to conform to Federal Government standards and codes governing building construction and equipment therein, and requiring said transferee or grantee to maintain any building constructed on said property in accordance with said Federal standards and codes.

(g) The Administrator of General Services is authorized, in coordination and cooperation with the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, to construct such roads, walks, sewers, water supply, and distribution systems, parking facilities, plazas, and parks as are necessary to provide adequate service to and from the proposed highway system for the high-density embassy, business, and residential complex in the northwest portion of the central area of the District of Columbia: *Provided,* That the cost of constructing the necessary roadways to provide such service shall be borne by the District of Columbia, subject to the provisions of title 23, United States Code, and regulations adopted pursuant thereto.

Sec. 6. The authority vested in the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to acquire for public purposes, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, property within the area described in the first section of this Act may not be exercised without the approval of the Administrator of General Services and the Secretary of State.

SEC. 7. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of State for transfer to the Administrator of General Services such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

A GREAT SOCIETY?

Every United States citizen who pays taxes should have some knowledge of where his money will be used. Does the average taxpayer want to support an International Drinking Club? Congress is asked to subsidize an International Drinking Club proposed in S.B. 1301 by Senator Fulbright and H.R. 7415 by Rep. Kenneth J. Gray. The club will attract most of the Great Society's national hard-drinking set as well as the State Department's international drinking crowd and the international jet-set drinking crowd. Not only is the taxpayer asked to support the club, but an International Center, under the plan President Johnson sent to Congress. There is little doubt that all of the exotic drinks of the 113 nations with embassies and chanceries in Washington will insist that their national drinks be served there, probably with their national flags flying.

The State Department has been asking with its hands out, for "representational" funds for free drinks for foreign nationals in our American embassies overseas. Our President thinks the American taxpayer should provide this Drinking Club for the lonesome international drinking set, the international jet-set and the 'go-go', and body-stocking types, which hang out around town looking for free drinks.

There seems to be no limit to which the administration and the Great Society is prepared to go to refurbish its sagging image, but this proposed plan will make it sag even lower.

The club is included in the proposed 8 billion dollar plan for an International Center developed as a cooperative effort by the White House, the State Department and the National Capitol Planning Commission.

John R. Immer, president of the Federation of Citizens Associations of the District of Columbia has stated in part, "This Administration Proposal, which President Johnson sent to Congress recently, would displace 300 low and moderate income Negro and white families, cause the loss of 5,000 well-paid jobs, cause the displacement and ruination of forty small and medium-sized businesses and cause the loss of many millions of dollars in taxes to the Federal and District of Columbia Governments—at the very time President Johnson has called for 20,000 jobs in private employment to head off violence and prevent crime, and increase from $40 million to $60 million in the Federal payment of the District of Columbia."

If you are opposed to this, write to: Hon. Kenneth Gray, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C., and refer to bill H.R. 7415; or to Senator Charles Percy, Senate, Washington, D.C., S. 1301; or to Senator Everett Dirksen, Senate, Washington, D.C., S. 1301.

Context of your letter may be along this line:

We do not agree with bill ———, as we do not think it is right to use taxpayer's money for an International Drinking Club.

We respectfully request you to exert your influence, and the power of your vote (representing your constituency) in opposition to this.

Did you know? Alcoholism is a major health problem in America. Only mental illness, heart disease, and cancer affect more people than alcoholism.

THE CHIEF OF PROTOCOL,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., October 3, 1967.

Hon. KENNETH J. GRAY,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GRAY: In response to your inquiry concerning the plans of the State Department to secure a location for chanceries of foreign governments in Washington, I wish to report that the Department does indeed hope to secure such a location at the earliest practicable time to accommodate chanceries of foreign governments in addition to the Organization of American States, which need greater office space.

There is nothing in the legislation pending toward that object, to wit, H.R. 7415, nor is there any intent on the part of the Department of State or the interested embassies or international organizations themselves to establish a "drinking club" or anything of the kind. Indeed the area needed is one to accommodate space for offices not for entertainment. I cannot understand why the question would be raised inasmuch as we carefully explained our intentions at the outset of the effort to secure passage of H.R. 7415.

Naturally, therefore, I welcome this opportunity to answer directly and finally any lingering suspicion there might be that our intent has changed and the State Department appreciates your initiative not only in assisting us to secure the necessary acreage to accommodate chanceries, but also to explain with precision the purposes of any such requested legislation.

Respectfully,

JAMES W. SYMINGTON.

START THE PEACE IN VIETNAM

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, recent developments on the battlegrounds of Vietnam and in Government and military circles at home have intensified the many causes for deep concern felt by millions of Americans.

We have seen our military leaders and high civilians in the administration involved in contradictions about the value of continuing escalation of the conflict in Southeast Asia.

Then, just a few days ago, we heard from the President himself a reasonable argument in favor of a cessation of bombing in North Vietnam and an end to escalation—only to hear him turn that argument into an unreasonable conclusion in favor of continuing all-out military action with its attendant dangers of bringing new combatants into the war.

The President, you recall, said:

> We recognize and always have recognized that there can be no military solution to the problems of Southeast Asia.

Then, twisting that thought in an incomprehensible U-turn, he concluded:

> Only military power can bar aggression and make political solution possible.

A little over a month ago, the Secretary of Defense testified before a preparedness subcommittee in the other body that he had no reason to believe that North Vietnam "can be bombed to the negotiating table."

Mr. Speaker, I simply ask this: If there can be no military solution, and if bombing cannot bring a political solution, then why in the name of reason and humanity do we not only continue bombing, but expand it to greater extremes?

From the reactions to bombing pauses, frequent peace feelers, invitations directly to Hanoi and through assorted third parties, it has become apparent that Ho Chi Minh will not come to the conference table while our bombing continues.

Yet, the President has admitted that bringing him to the conference table is our basic aim. I hope that this final clarification of our objective does not come too late. It may well be that our Government's failure to put full emphasis on this purpose may already have put a political solution out of reach. Surely, a continuation of our misguided efforts cannot make it easier to reach.

Nobody in the free world can seriously doubt our purpose for being in Vietnam. We are there to protect a society of freedom from a threat of enslavement. Yet, by our misdirection, we may be destroying the very society we are determined to save.

There can be little doubt that the people of Vietnam want peace. Who can say that any men, women, and children who have undergone the pain, destruction, and chaos of war for so many years can want anything but to end it?

We must maintain the conviction among the people of Vietnam that our purpose is to end the death and destruction, and to bring peace and freedom to their land. If we cannot do this, then we risk the result of seeing the people we are trying to save rushing blindly to enslavement because they have lost faith in the reasonableness of our aims and purposes.

We must not risk the chance that whatever we may win in Vietnam, we will lose the war by losing the people to those against whom we are waging a bloody, costly conflict.

Certainly, a first step toward achievement of any part of our goal is to put an immediate halt to further escalation. But that is only a first step, and it is surely not enough, for without second and third steps, it is an effort toward continuing a status quo which we cannot accept indefinitely, and which the people of Vietnam certainly do not want.

I am strongly convinced by all that has been said—by both the hawks and the doves, by the administration and its opponents—that there remains but one possible course of action if we are to achieve our good purpose in Vietnam.

We must do whatever has to be done to bring the only possible solution—a political solution—closer, if we are ever to hope for a just and honorable peace, and an end to the bloodletting and destruction.

We know that bombing "pauses" won't work, because they are outright invitations to the adversaries to hurry more supplies and more infiltrators, in preparation for the resumption guaranteed by the very idea of a "pause."

We know that invitations, urgings, and dares to negotiation, while the bombers continue to roar over Haiphong, can have little result, and no gain.

We now have one course open to us, and I am convinced that if we do not take it at once, we can gain little but risk a great deal. We must cease all bombing of North Vietnam at once.

The President should immediately announce a date on which such bombing will cease completely. His announcement must not be merely an intention of halting the bombing, nor a vague statement of purpose. He should state it in no uncertain terms—the date, hour, and minute on which all bombing of the North will stop.

I have repeatedly spoken on this floor during the past year or more to urge the administration to take such a step. I have also appealed directly to the President for such specific action.

For example, on September 22, 1966, in the second session of the 89th Congress, I said this:

> The President has repeatedly made clear the Nation's basic commitment to peace. But, unfortunately, these well-intentioned expressions have not been convincing to the other combatants and much of the nonalined world.
>
> That is why I feel that instead of constantly repeating our general willingness to negotiate at any time and anywhere, we should set forth a format in specific terms. In effect, the United States would seize the initiative in a very dramatic way, challenging the other belligerents to lay down their arms and confer at a stated time and place.
>
> The President should set a specific date, time and place for peace talks. At the same time, he should dispatch invitations to all interested parties, including the National Liberation Front, and announce a cessation of bombing to take effect 24 hours in advance of the conference.

I still see this as the only means of bringing about a direct confrontation. Let us place Ho Chi Minh in the position of having to "put up or shut up." With the bombing ended, there can be no other steps but those leading to the conference table.

At the same time, we must recast our military approach in the south, aiming toward a concentration of our power to secure the coastal areas and population centers where a vast majority of the people live. Let us draw in our troops to stronger defensive positions, protecting friendly enclaves. This would result in a substantial reduction of American troop strength, and greater security for most of the people of South Vietnam.

We must end the costly search-and-destroy missions, which have gained little, and concentrate our influence on the Saigon government to bring to its people now—and not at some distant time of hoped-for peace—the reforms and improvements in living conditions they need and deserve.

Eventually, the only real peace in Vietnam can come through understandings among all of the peoples of Southeast Asia. Peace cannot be permanently negotiated from the outside, not even by great powers. The people of North and South Vietnam, of Laos, and Cambodia, of all of the involved nations of Southeast Asia must come to mutual understandings. This we must stress in using our influence on Saigon.

As for the peace talks themselves, if they finally come about, let us have less concern for protocol and more for achievement. If there can be no immediate confrontation between the United States and Ho Chi Minh, then let us have a meeting of neutral nations as a forerunner to real peace talks. Ho would then have no choice but to move toward peace.

Let us by any means, and by all means open to us, strive toward the goal of ending the death and bloodletting, and establishing a peace of honor and justice. This is our stated purpose; let it be the only guideline for purposeful action to bring it about.

UNITED STATES SHOULD REVISE ITS MIDDLE EAST POLICY: PARTICULARLY THE POLICY OF RESTRICTING ARMS SALES TO ISRAEL.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to preface my remarks by saying that I do not pretend to be an expert on the Middle East or on American policy toward the Arab States and Israel. I nevertheless feel compelled to make some observations on U.S. policy in that part of the world.

Last month I had an opportunity, as a member of the House Armed Services Committee, to visit Israel and the Israel-occupied sectors of Syria and Jordan. If I were asked to recall one central, lasting impression of my trip, I would say that it is the remarkable spirit of the Israeli people. I need not remind my distinguished colleagues of Israel's accomplishments since her birth as a nation only two decades ago. Were we to list and describe them all, we could probably fill many volumes of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

My speech today, however, is not a salute to Israel. It is instead a challenge to those who formulate our Middle East policy, to those who execute that policy, and to Members of Congress, who, under our Constitution, are charged with the responsibility of overseeing our foreign policy.

Mr. Speaker, I find myself in agreement with Theodore Draper of Yale, who, in the August issue of Commentary, argued that the recent Arab-Israeli war clearly demonstrated the utter "bankruptcy" of our policy in the Middle East.

The American people were generally delighted with Israel's lightning military victory. They were also relieved by the outcome. I say "relieved" because thoughtful Americans realized that their Government had virtually no leverage, either political or military, over the situation. It became apparent to all that the administration was neither willing nor able to come to the defense of America's only true ally in the Middle East. A combination of forces, notably a disproportionate commitment in Vietnam and a counterproductive Middle East policy, drastically curtailed our options. In addition, it can be argued that our policy of supplying vast quantities of military aid to the Arabs—while denying Israel the opportunity to buy American-made military equipment—contributed to the outbreak of hostilities.

There is a tendency, I think, to overlook this tragic failure of American policy because of the Israel victory. Most people say, "Everything turned out all right for the United States, didn't it?" At the risk of shattering our euphoria, I would like to remind my colleagues of the administration's confusion and indecision during those days of crisis in May and June. I would like to remind my colleagues of the foot-dragging at the White House and the verbal gyrations at the State Department. I would like to remind my colleagues of the diplomatic circus in Cairo, where our Ambassador, when asked about the impending crisis, replied—as quoted in the Washington Star and the Baltimore Sun, June 15:

> What crisis? There is no crisis in the Middle East. This thing will not amount to much.

I am not searching for a scapegoat, although several names do come to mind. Individuals are not solely responsible for an inadequate foreign policy. Our failure in the Middle East stems from an all-too-familiar cycle. A policy is conceived, implemented, and perpetuated despite changing conditions and in spite of calls for realism and reappraisal. The policy acquires a momentum of its own and soon the policymakers become the captives of the policy. The policy, by now not consistent with and probably contrary to America's best interests, traps us by limiting us to a few equally distasteful alternatives.

Our policy toward the Middle East has been two-headed from the start. In his memoirs, President Harry S Truman pointedly explains that on the question of Israel, the State Department was "more concerned about the Arab reaction than the sufferings of the Jews." He cites memorandums from the State Department which indicate that Foggy Bottom was preoccupied with thoughts of Arab oil. According to President Truman:

> The State Department's specialists on the Near East were, almost without exception, unfriendly to the idea of a Jewish state.

Mr. Truman summarizes State Department policy as follows:

> Their thinking went along this line: Great Britain has maintained her position in the area by cultivating the Arabs; now that she seems no longer able to hold this position, the United States must take over, and it must be done by exactly the same formula; *if the Arabs are antagonized, they will go over into the Soviet Camp.* (Emphasis mine.)

Well, we have been very careful not to antagonize the Arabs. We have given them substantial economic and military aid. And yet today the Arabs stand squarely in the Soviet camp. Because of foggy thinking at Foggy Bottom, this "policy" of ours has cost the American taxpayer billions of dollars.

Mr. Speaker, the United States has given over $1 billion to Egypt and over one-half billion dollars to Jordan in the past two decades. These estimates, of course, do not include Central Intelligence Agency aid to the Arabs, which, I understand, has been substantial. What is worse, we have been suckered into providing massive military aid to Jordan. According to the New York Times of January 26, American dollars have permitted King Hussein—who at this very hour is in Moscow soliciting Soviet aid—to increase his army from 4,000 men in 1948 to 55,000 men today. Thanks to American largesse, Hussein now has a $56 million defense budget, and before the war had 11 infantry brigades, five fighter squadrons, and about 300 modern tanks—250 of which were American-made Patton T-48's.

Our policy toward Jordan was designed to make her strong and self-sufficient. But this belief, so dearly held at State, was shattered by recent events. When the chips were down, Jordan declared war on Israel and broke diplomatic relations with us. Americans had to watch the spectacle of Jordan, armed to the teeth with American weapons, waging war against our best friend in the Middle East. Jordan's Patton tanks went up in flames, and so did U.S. foreign policy.

I have already alluded to the chaos in Cairo and State Department Press Officer Robert McCloskey's unbelievable comment that the United States was "neutral in thought, word, and deed." Even more alarming, however, was the administration's failure to state precisely this Nation's position. The White House was quick to dissociate itself from the McCloskey fiasco, but no forthright statement was issued. A major war was raging in the Middle East, but our leaders were silent. According to Theodore Draper, U.S. officials were not at all sure what our commitment to Israel was. Mr. Draper claims that the administration had to telephone former President Eisenhower to determine the nature of the commitment.

The fact of the matter is that our commitment to Israel is clear and longstanding. The Eisenhower administration persuaded Israel to withdraw from Sharm el-Sheikh in 1957 in return for a pledge that our 6th Fleet would, if necessary, come to her defense. Prime Minister Levi Eshkol dealt with this very point in an interview with U.S. News & World Report, April 17, 1967:

> But I would surely expect such help, especially if I take into consideration all the solemn promises that have been made to Israel. We get these promises when we ask the United States for arms and are told: "Don't spend your money. We are here. The Sixth Fleet is here."

Prime Minister Eshkol's remarks lead me to still another criticism of our Middle East policy: namely the corollary policy of restricting arms sales to Israel. The latest example of this is the State Department's refusal to permit American firms to sell jet aircraft to Israel. The Israel Government is eager to purchase Skyhawk fighter-bombers from Douglas, but the State Department, which has already supplied Jordan with Lockheed F-104's, is dragging its feet, claiming that the whole question is under "intensive review."

American equipment makes up a very small fraction of Israel's military capability. The Israel Air Force is French, her tanks mainly British, and her small arms her own.

Mr. Speaker, in light of the French decision to end its support of the Israel Air Force, the Soviet program of reequipping the Arabs with arms, and the British sale of Hunter jet fighters and other equipment to Jordan, I think it is imperative that we junk our policy of restricting arms sales to Israel. A good first step would be to approve the sale of Skyhawks. Israel is not begging for military aid; she is simply asking our Government to sanction arms sales. If Israel cannot count on us, who can she count on?

Because of the favorable outcome of the recent Arab-Israel war and our preoccupation with Southeast Asia, little has been said about our policy toward the Near East. What I have tried to do today is examine our strategy in that part of the world and the consequences of that policy.

Mr. Speaker, to use a favorite State Department cliche, the time has come for an "agonizing reappraisal" of our whole Middle East policy. And I think that the legislative branch should conduct its own thorough review of that policy.

THE HARD TRUTH ABOUT TRUTH IN LENDING

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HANNA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, distortions abound concerning the realities of the truth-in-lending legislation now being considered by the House Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs. The House of Representatives has a very specific responsibility to pass a meaningful credit disclosure measure this year, but in order to do so it must sort the fact from the fiction permeating the prevailing proliferating dialog on this issue.

Fiction No. 1: We are being told that the House's choices in this legislative area have been narrowed to either a very strong bill or a very weak one. Pure fiction. The Consumer Affairs Subcommittee has before it three substantive measures.

The first approach is the one passed by the Senate. No one should summarily push aside as unacceptable the Senate-passed version. The Senate was able to muster a unanimous 92–0 vote on S. 5 after more than 6 years of frustration. The carefully constructed compromises that combined to gain the support of every element in the Senate should clearly suggest to a responsible House the requirements for a bill this year. And I do not feel anyone would suggest that there is a fine principle more important at this moment than a meaningful, door-opening, truth-in-lending statute on the law books of the United States by the end of this year.

The second approach before the subcommittee is embodied in H.R. 11601. A great deal of what is included in this bill has merit, and I have been consistent in publicly stating that position. However, there are two striking elements of H.R. 11601 which cause me great concern.

First, the bill is carrying too much extra weight. In an attempt for too much we may ultimately wind up with nothing at all. There is an additional consideration, and that is whether or not the 1967 truth-in-lending measure is the appropriate vehicle for provisions that are really a different part of the law, and are more legitimately within the jurisdiction of other House committees. This consideration is a real one since it may serve the interests of those who would prefer no truth-in-lending legislation at all.

Second, H.R. 11601 suggests that the carefully worked compromises of the Senate carry little if any credence either on merit, or, at this juncture in time, political practicality. In fact, the Senate language differentiating between various credit transactions, and excepting first mortgages, has foundations in both merit and practicality to which the House must pay attention if we are to have a bill in 1967. To upset the delicate balance on these issues, at this time, may serve to defeat the whole program, and I maintain this prospect is substantially more onerous than agreeing to the Senate compromises.

The third approach before the subcommittee is one which I have offered. Anyone comparing it to the Senate passed legislation quickly realizes H.R. 12904 substantially strengthens the work of the Senate. I believe H.R. 12904 is a reasonably strong measure, and more important, it is a strong measure upon which this Congress can agree in 1967. Our immediate and overriding concern is the 10 months of 1967 should and must be providing the consumer with reasonably strong legislation now.

The House must bend every effort in coming to grips with the essential realities of the moment. Those immediate realities pointedly indicate we can pass a strong bill which is acceptable to the Senate and which can be law by the end of this year. To scuttle the program now would be catastrophic in its implications. Unless we face up to what can honestly be accomplished in the waning days of this first session we may find ourselves in the untenable position of having made a lot of noise with no accomplishment.

Fiction No. 2: We are being led to believe that the present administration feels that if somehow the House adopts a measure totally unacceptable to a unanimous Senate, things will work out well. Pure fiction. If this is the administration position, and I have not heard it expressed from any official authority, they are badly misreading the mood of this Congress.

The point is that there are reasonable grounds upon which the House can strengthen the work of the Senate. There are, however, certain elements of the Senate measure which cannot be tampered with. To do so would mean no bill. If this is the administration's sentiment I ask that it be expressed clearly so all might know without doubt the position.

My own thinking is that it would be far more advantageous to the consumer if there is some law on the books this year. I believe that it is the responsibility of the House to insure just that, especially when there is knowledge that it can be done, and done in an improved fashion.

After 6 years, and with a vote of 92-0, I am afraid we will be wallowing in the mire of self-delusion if we allow ourselves to believe in the fiction that there can be any real change in the Senate position.

Fiction No. 3: For some reason there is the glaring misunderstanding that revolving credit escapes disclosure under the Senate plan. Pure fiction. I dealt with this issue at length in my statement of September 14, and will not belabor it again. But for the record I will once again list all the items that must be disclosed to the user of a revolving plan. Interestingly enough, neither in the Senate nor House record on this issue has any demonstration been made that revolving credit has been the cause of material abuse. Be that as it may, the list of disclosure items follows:

(1) "the conditions under which a finance charge may be imposed, including the time period, if any, within which any credit extended may be repaid without incurring a finance charge;"

(2) "the method of determining the balance upon which the finance charge will be imposed;"

(3) "the method of determining the amount of the finance charge . . ., (and) the percentage rate per period of the finance charge to be imposed if any . . ."

(4) "the conditions under which any other charges may be imposed, and the method by which they will be determined."

During each billing period the creditor must disclose:

(5) "the outstanding balance in the account at the beginning of the billing period;"

(6) "the amount and date of each extension of credit during the (billing) period;"

(7) "the total amount credited to the account during the period;"

(8) "the amount of finance charge added to the account . . . due to the application of a percentage rate . . . ;"

(9) "the balance (and method) on which the finance charge was computed . . . ;"

(10) "the rate . . . used in computing the . . . charge;"

(11) "the outstanding balance in the account . . ."

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION BILL

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Bingham] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I was one of 33 who yesterday voted against accepting the conference report on the military construction authorization bill.

This bill carries an authorization of $2.3 billion, or more than twice the amount of last year's military construction bill. It is the largest such bill in 7 years. The distinguished gentleman from New York's First District [Mr. Pike] who is a member of the Armed Services Committee, but who also voted against the conference report, has indicated that there are many items in the bill which are nonessential and which could have been deferred.

The President's proposal for a 10 percent income tax surcharge has in recent weeks underlined the necessity of cutting back on Government expenditures whenever possible. I am not in favor of making cuts in essential Federal programs which are needed for the survival and development of our cities, but I am in favor of deferring expenditures which are not vital, either for that purpose or for our national security.

H.R. 6418, PARTNERSHIP FOR HEALTH AMENDMENTS

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. Mink] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to cite the leadership of the President and the enlightened action of the House in passing the Partnership for Health Amendments.

The rapid growth of our population, the mobile character of our ever-changing society, and the many complexities of modern living have given rise to a multitude of problems. Not the least of these is the fundamental problem of how to maintain the physical well-being of our citizens.

H.R. 6418 is an extension of the milestone legislation, enacted into law less than a year ago, whose grand design is directed toward encouraging the States and localities in their efforts to insure the availability of high quality health services to every individual. With assistance from Federal grants, mechanisms are being developed at the State and local levels for planning the most effective use of health resources, facilities, and manpower in meeting health problems in the communities. States and communities have been given the opportunity and challenge of displaying their best initiative in identifying local health needs and setting priorities for their resolution.

As my colleagues are well aware, this legislation has provoked truly wide interest and support from State and local officials, national organizations, and members of the health profession. I believe there is no question of the importance and significance of this measure.

While its full impact may not be felt for some time, the partnership for health provides the means for achieving meaningful results in public health programs and the delivery of improved health services to the people.

A RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH NATIONAL VOCATIONAL GUIDANCE WEEK

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. Mink] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a joint resolution designed to authorize the President to declare the last week in October of each year as "National Vocational Guidance Week."

This resolution has the enthusiastic backing of the National Vocational Guidance Association, and has also been sponsored by the senior Senator from Oregon, the Honorable Wayne Morse, in recognition of the importance of job counseling in assisting young and old people in our rapidly evolving society to make meaningful and appropriate career choices.

Our accelerating scientific advances and technology have made the world of work a highly specialized one, posing considerable problems for so many individuals in choosing vocations that will expand their horizons and insure their continuing ability to play productive and self-supportive roles throughout their lives. The modern flexibility of industry and the obsolescence of certain types of jobs pose the ongoing necessity for the maximum of informed guidance and counseling in the choice of careers, and in line with our growing Federal commitment to providing financial assistance for higher education and postsecondary vocational training, it is fitting that we pay due recognition to the skilled and dedicated specialists who serve society by pointing the way to pertinent career choices for those about to enter our economic life for the first time and also for those who have been displaced by the forces of technology and automation. The abundant need for properly prepared individuals for the jobs and professions of the future places a demanding responsibility on those who must be knowledgeable as to the future directions our society will take, and I urge the House to evidence its recognition of the importance of vocational counseling by passing this resolution to declare an annual National Vocational Guidance Week.

CONGRESSMAN ANNUNZIO EXPRESSES SUPPORT FOR COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH PLANNING AND PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICES AMENDMENTS

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Annunzio] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, less than a year ago the Congress enacted one of the most important pieces of health legislation ever brought before it, the Comprehensive Health Planning and Public Health Services Amendments of 1966, better known as the Partnership for Health Act. Two weeks ago the House acted overwhelmingly to approve amendments to expand and extend this legislation and I am proud to have been associated with this bill.

The partnership for health redirects and revitalizes Federal grant support of State and local health projects. Until enactment of this program, States had been restricted in their use of Federal funds by being required to apply the funds only in rigidly defined categories. Over the past 30 years this country has experienced great and distinct shifts in populations and other factors that characterize health patterns.

Under the partnership for health, States and local areas are now free to apply Federal grant funds in the critical areas that have specific local significance. The wisdom and foresight of the members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and members of the administration who spent long and careful hours in drafting this legislation deserve our commendation.

When the President submitted his message on health and education to the Congress last February he noted that the partnership for health program gave the States newly realized flexibility in the use of Federal funds by freeing them from compartmentalized programs. I feel sure that the innovative spirit which this program engenders will produce meaningful and far-reaching applications in our society, in health and other programs as well.

HIGH HOLIDAYS, 5728

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Annunzio] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, October 4 and 5, 1967, mark the festival of the New Year in the Jewish religious calendar, Rosh Hashanah, the opening of the year 5728, and the commencement of the 10-day period called the high holidays. This period concludes with Yom Kippur, the Day of Atonement, which this year falls on October 14.

This is, for the Jewish people, a time for solemnity, joy, and hope. It is a time for spiritual renewal, of repentance, of affirmation, and renewal of hope and joy in the future.

Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur evoke in the Jewish people a sense of awe, high seriousness, and especially obedience to God's law. The meaningful practice of the Jewish faith, I believe, has influenced Jewish moral law far beyond the confines of practicing Judaism.

The historic Jewish concepts of social justice and individual human dignity have done much to guide the course of Western democracy and, in particular, to shape the philosophical system of government created by the American Founding Fathers. It is perhaps not too much to hope that in time the conduct of international affairs will be influenced, in spirit, by the principles of common concern which have molded the destiny of world Judaism.

On Rosh Hashanah the Jewish people look to the universal establishment of the principles of compassion and tolerance for which Judaism has so long and painfully fought. Unfortunately, the Jews have not been treated with this same compassion and tolerance, but instead, under Nazi persecution, have suffered incomprehensible brutality and have been the subject of mass murders.

In Russia today there is evidence that the Government is persecuting Jewish citizens by curtailing religious observances and discriminating against the Jews in their traditional cultural and educational activities.

On January 31, 1967, I introduced in the Congress House Concurrent Resolution 114 urging that the Congress make it clear to the Government of the Soviet Union that we condemn the persecution of the Jews and indicating that we expect Russia to live up to its own constitutional guarantees of freedom of religion.

I do hope it will be possible for this Congress to take favorable action on House Concurrent Resolution 114 in order that the Soviet Union may at least understand and receive the full force of our official position in the interest of human justice and decency.

I should like, on this occasion, to extend my greetings and best wishes for the holiday season to my many friends of the Jewish faith and to express my appreciation for the great contributions the Jewish people have made to the advancement of Western civilization.

In the coming year, may the Jewish people know freedom from persecution, from which they have particularly suffered, and may they experience peace and well being, and prosperity and spiritual enlightenment.

At this point in the Record, I would like to include a listing of the 16 Jewish holidays, the days on which they fall in the new year 5728, and their significance.

The list follows:

High Holidays, 5728

ROSH HASHANAH 5728

October 5 and 6, 1967: This is the Jewish New Year, Jews assemble in the synagogue to reaffirm their faith, examine their past conduct and pray for forgiveness. The Shofar (ram's horn) is blown to reawaken their responsibility to the Lord and call them to repentance.

TZOM G'DALYAH

October 7, 1967: On this fast day, Jews mourn for G'dalyah, a Jew whom the conquering Babylonians unexpectedly appointed Governor of Palestine. The Jews saw in this a sign that their nation would rise again, but G'dalyah was ruthlessly assassinated.

YOM KIPPUR

October 14, 1967: On this Day of Atonement, the holiest day of the year, the Lord judges each individual. Jews fast all day, confess and repent, and ask pardon from the Lord and from their fellow men. In turn, they freely forgive their neighbors. At night, with a cleansed heart, they look forward to a good new life.

SUKKOT

October 19 through 25, 1967: The Feast of Tabernacles celebrates the ancient fruit harvest in the Holy Land. Jews everywhere build Sukkot (temporary booths) hung with fruits and flowers, remembering that the Israelites lived in flimsy booths during their desert wanderings—yet felt secure in the Lord's protection.

SH'MINI ATZERET

October 26, 1967: This day is designated in the Bible as a day of Holy Assembly. Jews gather in the synagogue to celebrate this last festival of the harvest season, and to offer a fervent prayer for rain to bring full crops in the coming year.

SIMCHAT TORAH

October 27, 1967: The Torah (Five Books of Moses) is read in its entirety each year. On this happy day, the reading is completed and begun anew. The sacred scrolls are carried around the synagogue in procession. The children participate and receive gifts of sweets.

CHANUKAH

December 27, 1967 through Jan. 3, 1968: On Chanukah the Maccabees freed the Temple from the Syrian conquerors. At its rededication only enough pure oil was found to light the Holy Lamp for one day. Miraculously it burned eight days. Thus, on the first day of Chanukah, Jews light one candle on the Nenorah, adding another each day.

ASARAH B'TEVET

January 10, 1968: This is the anniversary of the day the Babylonians began their siege of Jerusalem. Soon after, the city was taken, the Temple destroyed, and the first Hebrew Commonwealth was no more. Thus, Asarah B'tevet is a day of fasting and mourning.

CHAMISHA ASAR BISH'VAT

February 14, 1968: On this Arbor Day Jews observe the Bible's commandment: "When ye shall come into the land ye shall plant all manner of trees." In Israel, children spend the day joyfully planting young trees. And because this is the 15th day of the Jewish month Sh'vat, Jews everywhere eat fifteen kinds of fruit.

TAANIT ESTHER

March 13, 1968: The Megillah (Book of Esther) tells how the scheming Haman persuaded King Ahasuerus to destroy the Jews, and how Jewish Queen Esther and her people fasted three days before she dared to plead with the King to save them. This fast day, known as the Fast of Esther, commemorates her heroism.

PURIM

March 14, 1968: This gayest of all Jewish holidays celebrates King Ahasuerus' decision to save the Jews and destroy their enemy Haman, instead. During the synagogue service the Book of Esther is read, and children twirl their gragers (noisemakers) every time Haman is mentioned, to drown out his name.

PESACH

April 13 through 20, 1968: Pesach (Passover) recalls the deliverance of the Jews from Egyptian slavery. At the traditional Seder meal, Jewish families read the Haggadah (a book containing the story of the liberation) and eat Matzoh (unleavened bread) and other symbolic foods—thereby reliving their ancestors' experiences.

LAG B'OMER

May 16, 1968: A plague among Rabbi Akiba's students ended on the 33rd day of "Counting the Omer," i.e., bringing an omer (measure) of new grain to the Temple. Jews happily recall this event, and honor the efforts of Rabbis Akiba and Bar Yochai and the brave Bar Kochba to re-establish the Jewish nation.

SHAVUOT

June 2 and 3, 1968: This holiday commemorates the sacred moment at Mount Sinai when Moses received from the Lord the Torah with its Ten Commandments. Shavuot also celebrates the early wheat harvest in Palestine. Jews throughout the world decorate their homes and synagogues with greens and flowers.

SHIV'AH ASAR B'TAMMUZ

July 14, 1968: On this day the Babylonian army made the first breach in the wall of Jerusalem. This led to the tragic end of the Jewish homeland and to exile for its people.

Shiv'ah Asar B'tammuz is a fast day, followed by three weeks of mourning.

TISH'AH B'AV

August 4, 1968: On this fast day, Jews grieve for the destruction of the first and second Temples. They mourn at the Wailing Wall in Jerusalem and in synagogues all over the world. Tish'ah B'av climaxes a nine-day period in which no meat may be eaten.

DETROIT'S NEGRO WOMEN SPEAK

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Michigan [Mrs. Griffiths] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the Record the second part of a two-part article written by Jane Schermerhorn, "The Unheard Voice of the Negro Woman." The article appeared in the Detroit News Sunday magazine on October 1, 1967:

The Unheard Voice of the Negro Woman

(By Jane Schermerhorn)

Private boarding schools and college educations are still the exception among most modern Negro women.

From that background comes Mrs. Wendell Cox, daughter of a prosperous Detroit dentist, Dr. Haley Bell, who now—with Dr. Cox, also a dentist, and another son-in-law, Dr. Robert Bass—owns the Detroit Negro radio station WCHB.

Extremely fair-skinned, with her dark hair fashionably frosted, Mrs. Cox has the striking beauty of a cover girl and she likes to wear vividly colored slacks and silk blouses at home.

Home is a large, tastefully appointed residence on West Chicago boulevard where many of the neighbors are white—and congenial. Their Boston-Edison Association, to maintain certain standards for the neighborhood, feels the city is slipping in garbage pickups, in seeding the grass islands that run down the center of the streets.

Mrs. Cox was invited to be on the women's committee of Detroit's Grand Opera Association—"Largely for reasons of visibility, I guess," she good-naturedly observes. She's on the board of Detroit Planned Parenthood and was the first cochairman of Operations Understanding.

The OU group works with children from homes in the Brewster Douglass Housing project, taking them for visits to the museum, airports, downtown, concerts. Mrs. Romney and Mrs. Cavanagh are honorary chairmen and, Mrs. Cox says, "Both have been far more than just names in our work—they've been wonderful."

She finds herself going to Parent-Teacher Association meetings and other organizations that work with children although her own, Wendell Jr., a student at Boston University, and Iris Marie, 18, entering Fisk University this fall, are away at school now.

"I have involved myself not only for my own children," she said, "but just in case my presence may help some other Negro child to a fuller life."

Mrs. Cox, who attended Detroit public schools "and the white children all come to the graduation parties at our home," went to Palmer Memorial Institute in Sedalia, N.C., before entering Fisk where she met and married Dr. Cox.

"Sedalia was a rewarding experience," she feels, "and in addition to our regular studies we took a course in social deportment which taught proper dress, manners and further interested us in the various cultures such as art, music, entertaining.

"My paternal grandfather died when my father was only four and his mother was a midwife in the South. Nevertheless he went to college and became a dentist. My mother's parents both were schoolteachers.

"I remember when my sister and I were quite young, my father wanted us to see the South where he grew up. By this time he had a successful practice and the family car was a Pierce Arrow.

"When we got to Savannah, Ga., we took a river boat and, because we were Negroes, we had to drive onto a deck reserved for colored.

"It was funny. For just about that time Marie Dressler had died and left a sizable fortune to her chauffeur and maid. All the white people thought we were the Dressler servants," Mrs. Cox reminisced.

Wistfully she remarked that sometimes she's wondered how it would feel to be born white, yet she's proud she's a Negro and blesses discerning parents for always making sure she and her sister had Negro friends as well as white.

But there are rebuffs even for the privileged Negro.

"Recently I was stopped by the police for driving a little over the speed limit and the officer's first question was, 'Where did you get this car?' (Mrs. Cox drives a pale blue Cadillac convertible.)

"When my husband plays golf he plays on public courses and his 'locker' is in the trunk of the car. It would be nice to have a private club where the children and I could join him for dinner after he's finished playing.

"But I would prefer it to be a Negro golf club. I'm not interested in being an exception, in being one of the few Negroes to belong to a white club.

"Sometimes I wonder if we're doing the right thing for our son—sending him to Boston University where he not only earns fine marks but must also prove himself as a person because he's Negro. His fellow students are marvelous to him but I'd like him to feel a complete human being just as he is instead of worrying about acceptability in addition to his studies."

The Coxes have traveled in Europe with their children. "In a way it's an easier atmosphere where there's less of the heads turning around with that look of, 'Wonder if they're Negroes?' "

Once on a Caribbean cruise, Mrs. Cox went down to the ship's store to buy a toothbrush. Her careful selection made the white man next to her say, "You buy a toothbrush as if you were a dentist's wife."

It developed the white man was a dentist also and he expressed a wish to meet Dr. Cox. That night at dinner, the white doctor and his wife stopped by the Coxes' table and Mrs. Cox introduced them.

"The white dentist was always friendly when we saw him but we didn't see his wife again the rest of the cruise," she smiled.

Marcelle Jeffers came here from Heidelberg, Miss., 30 years ago to "get another job." She married a career army technical sergeant during the war. "He had the time to qualify for master sergeant but never made it because he was a Negro," she believes.

Mrs. Jeffers traveled in Europe and Africa with her husband.

When he went to Alaska, she went along and worked in the army laundry. Upon their return to this country, her husband brought her back to Detroit and then drifted away. She hasn't heard from him since, with the exception of a couple of Christmas cards.

Now she's the cashier at a downtown parking lot. She's managed to buy her own home which happens to be near one of the areas hit in the August riots.

"I've insured my house with the same company for 22 years," she mentioned, "and I've never paid over $100 for my policy. But because of all the burning and looting, the insurance people are going to cancel my policy unless I'm willing to pay $600 for it. I can't afford that.

"I don't see why the innocent people have to suffer because of what irresponsible hoodlums did. I've never burned or rioted or looted in my life.

"I go where I want and I try to look nice. I haven't any resentments against anyone but I do feel bad that most Negro children haven't even decent clothes to go to school. That's why there are so many dropouts.

"The government, which lends older students tuition now—that didn't happen when I was coming up or no telling what kind of a job I'd be holding today—should aid the younger students. And then when they've been educated, Negro children should be given jobs for which they can qualify, the same as anyone else."

Mrs. Nicholas Hood is the wife of the minister-councilman. She's a pretty woman, softly spoken, keen-minded, the mother of four children: Nicholas III, 15, a student at Cass Tech; Emory, 13, who attends Mettetal High School; Steven, 4, who'll begin Roper Town and Country School in Bloomfield this fall; and the baby, Sarah, just 14 months.

Her people came from the West Indies. Her grandfather was a college graduate in 1894. She was born in Madison, Ga., and grew up in Branford, Conn.

She attended public high schools, Albertus Magnus College for Women (one of the first two Negro students) and graduated from Dillard. She has her master's from Wayne State in counseling and guidance and teaches at Northwestern High School.

Councilman Hood is a graduate of Purdue and received his doctor of theology from Yale University.

"White people have been very kind to me," she says, "but then because of family background I have no excuse to be greatly different from them in terms of education and culture.

"Personally I see no reason to challenge the whites on every little thing, but historically, I resent the treatment of Negroes through the institution of slavery.

"And I resent whites now when they deny Negroes opportunity and are unkind because, you know, no man is an island; when you damage one member of a group you damage the others."

The Hood maid with the musical name—Miss Muse—brought smiling Sarah from her afternoon nap and placed her in her mother's lap as we talked.

She continued:

"I could never say that I get a bad feeling every time I see a white person.

"When my brother died in Connecticut he was buried from a white funeral home and, being Catholic, his requiem mass took place in the white Catholic church. All the white people were wonderfully kind.

"My other brother is a doctor and has a heavenly white clientele. He's married to a white girl. She was a nurse there in the Bridgeport hospital where he had his residency.

"My sister-in-law has always been kind to me. In a way she's been alienated from her people—her family has not been happy. But she and my brother have had a good life. Being human, I suppose there must have been times when she's had pangs.

"My mother is a Southerner and, although she's never spoken of it, I think she wishes my brother had married a colored girl. But she appreciates his wife and how good she was to my other brother before he died."

She spoke of private clubs:

"I've never felt any resentment about white people having closed social organizations—unless, of course, they happen to be on city-owned property. I feel strongly that people have a right to choose their friends.

"Still, to be told a Negro may not be taken to a private white club as a guest is galling. This, I cannot condone, yet I am too busy to take time to expose a group for this kind of discrimination.

"However, where the discrimination interferes with opportunities for Negroes or Negro youngsters I will fight.

"Say it interfered with education or employment opportunities or if we were denied access to such cultural institutions as the art museum—I'd fight immediately."

Mrs. Hood cited an instance in her own life when she and Councilman Hood were invited to his Purdue alumni banquet at Carl's Chop House. They went and had a fine time.

"Both of us remarked, though," she added, "that when the next Purdue gathering was held at a private club in Bloomfield Hills no one sought us out to attend.

"And while my husband is a member of the Yale Alumni, the Whiffenpoofs come and go and we're never asked to attend."

Mrs. Hood said she wouldn't make an issue of not being able to lunch at the Women's City Club, however she regrets the de facto segregation of some YMCAs and Girl and Boy Scout groups.

"These organizations are on a neighborhood basis, therefore, if you live in our area, it's de facto segregation because we're practically 100 percent Negro here.

"When we moved here our two older boys were Cub Scouts and they belonged to an integrated group but now the white neighbors have moved away.

"Our last Jewish mother is moving soon. It's pressure from her family and friends who accuse her of living in a Negro neighborhood because she can't afford to live elsewhere.

"I often sympathize with honest young white couples with children who don't want to move away from us. Again it's their relatives and friends who insist they move out before the children go to the nearby schools—where whites would be a minority—and there would be socializing."

For a time the Hoods lived in New Orleans where stores did not permit colored to try on clothes before buying. "If you were 'very nice Negroes,' the store would send the clothes to your house to be tried on," she explained.

Here in the North she expected different treatment. Still she remembers a fellow schoolteacher's attitude when she remarked on a newspaper series which mentioned the high scholastic averages of school children in Birmingham and Grosse Pointe High Schools.

"I said to her, 'No wonder these children do well. They have well-educated parents and we know that high achievement goes along with money and trained parents,' " Mrs. Hood recalls.

The teacher replied, "Yes, and part of it is hereditary, too."

Mrs. Hood said she doesn't know exactly what the teacher meant but she told her, "Intelligence is evenly distributed among all groups of people, except our group (the Negro) has sometimes lacked opportunity, which masks it.

"She was telling me that those children had higher inherited intelligence than Negroes but I don't believe that genetically we're different.

"She had always been very fair but I think she sincerely believed more whites are born with higher intelligence than Negroes. Natively, the chances of a Negro family having a gifted child are just as great as a white family's."

Her own sons have attended white schools where they were in the minority and although they adapted well they prefer more integrated situations.

"We like more soul brothers around," they told their parents.

As a teacher at Northwestern she smarts when Black Nationalists accuse, "You middle-class Negroes support the white power structure."

"We're the ones," rebuts Mrs. Hood, "who teach the children in the inner-city schools."

These children, many from the ghetto, are the ones who are so badly abused, Mrs. Hood says.

"They don't have decent clothing and they don't keep their hair neat and some are very dark-skinned and perhaps to the white child, very, very ugly.

"You know, when people love you it's easy to love them back.

"But this poor, deprived Negro child hates the whites from the beginning. He associates the white race with his father's lack of a job, his mother's inability to get along, his ghetto home.

"He's been called a savage by white children all his life.

"But I can't hate nor can my husband. He's a minister and we've always known our lives were to be dedicated to service. So I serve the ghetto child as a teacher and try to help his parents understand that he cannot achieve with a record of absenteeism and tardiness and I hope I show them the ways to implement at home what the child learns in school.

"In my heart I wish white people would be as Christian. I think of the ads showing the white girl, who is going to have a baby, walking away from the clinic. There is so much sympathy for her emotions, her fears, her concerns. I've seen Negro girls walk away from clinics with the same feelings although so many white people just don't think of us as people.

"But Negroes do have ambitions and dreams and sensitivities just as white people do."

The wood is rotting on the steps of the multi-family frame dwelling in the ghetto where Mrs. Frankie Nowlin, 36, and her six children live.

Mrs. Nowlin receives her five-room apartment in exchange for her services as caretaker.

She was born in Nashville, Tenn., one of 18 children born to her preacher father and mother. She married at 18, continued to work in the laundry of Nashville Linen Supply Co., only taking time off to have her babies.

She separated from her husband, Amos, who was chauffeur for a Nashville family, because:

"Oh, well—I didn't drink and he did. I was raised up in a Christian family and I didn't approve of his drinking. So there was nothing for us to do but separate."

So she came to Detroit where a sister lived and where she hoped there would be a better life for her children.

All the children—aged 17 to seven years—attend school and are "real fine students, the oldest, Alice, a straight-A student."

In addition to her caretaking duties, Mrs. Nowlin got a job at an overall factory and left it recently to study as a practical nurse at Harper Hospital.

She's actually afraid living in her neighborhood but she keeps her children off the streets and is grateful she has free rent.

Mrs. Nowlin is a good mother with a happy nature. She says her children are content with the little they have and she even has to coax them to go to a movie once in a while.

"At night, I'm afraid," she confesses. "They have the girls on the street and the men—they call them pimps. Yes, I'm afraid. I don't go out."

On a table in her small, windowless living room is a set of encyclopedias she bought for the children to help with their school work. The family takes a weekly newsmagazine as well as a news picture magazine. These came as the result of daughter Amy's filling out coupons in one of the magazines.

"Amy's always sending off those coupons and we never know what will arrive next," laughed the indulgent mother.

There is no resentment of white people in the Nowlin home. If there's any fear it is for teen-agers in the schools the children attend.

"Some of them carry weapons to school and my kids have never seen anything like that before."

Mrs. Nowlin, whose dream is to own her own home in a nice neighborhood and see her children educated, has her heroes in both the Negro and white races.

"Booker T. Washington is the Negro leader I love. I always wrote my essays at school about him. Great living men, I'd say, are the Rev. Hood and Dr. Martin Luther King.

"And then the Kennedy family. I really love them. All of them. I read everything I can get my hands on about them."

Mrs. Marian Burton, now retired after a brilliant career in social work—Juvenile Court was her last assignment—wonders how any Negro person today can be complacent, can say he is satisfied with what the Negro is offered.

She really boils at the thought.

She is downtown daily at the City-County Building or attending various civic meetings to protest injustices against the Negro, to fight for the oppressed.

She's one of 21 directors of the Virginia Park Redevelopment Committee determined that when 12th Street is built up once again, after the recent riots, it won't be a promenade of saloons, pawn shops, cheap furniture stores and gouging grocery stores.

A devoted follower of the Rev. Albert B. Cleage Jr., and a tireless worker in his Central United Church of Christ, Mrs. Burton seems to favor the philosophy of the Black Nationalists group. However she does not belong to any particular sect except for a "small membership" she holds in NAACP.

A widow, she lives in a comfortable upstairs flat on Virginia Park, the silken traditional furniture plumped to the nth degree with down pillows.

With her are her son, William E. Poole, a widower, and her granddaughter, Ernestine, 23, "the love" of her life.

"There's a photograph of Ernestine over there," said Mrs. Burton the other day as she sat in her pretty living room. "She was hired at the Children's Hospital on the telephone.

"I took her there myself. As you can see she's a dark girl and when she walked in the hospital people said, 'Are you Ernestine Poole?' She said she was and that she was reporting for work. 'Well, we don't have any openings,' they said.

"So when we talk about racial problems and the numerous insults we have to take in the course of a day—not for any reason except that we are black—this, I say, is why people rebel as Negroes now are doing.

"During my generation I think Negroes were more accepting of the situation, didn't do anything to correct it.

"But in my own social work for instance I've had fellow Negro social workers say, 'Why do you work with those people?' meaning the disadvantaged of our race. They told me to get smart and not to talk so much.

"But I've always worked for the underprivileged and I will until I die."

Mrs. Burton, a graduate of Butler College and Wayne State where she received her B.A. in sociology, has worked for the underprivileged white, too. With little thanks, she adds.

She remembers one white family in particular who live in a filthy hovel and whose daughter didn't have clothes to wear to school. As a welfare worker, at the time, Mrs. Burton saw that the girl got clothes and urged her to bathe and keep herself neat and clean.

Not long after that she called at the home and the parents told her they had sent their daughter down South to go to school.

"We didn't want her going to school here with niggers," they announced.

She scorns all politicians, feeling they have used her people to reach office and then failed them by doing nothing to give the Negro full citizenship.

A lot of Negroes don't vote, saying, "Why should we?—the white people are going to do what they want anyhow."

But this isn't the attitude Mrs. Burton takes. She's urging and organizing Negroes to stick together, to take an interest in their governmental representatives.

"You can't call that hate," she says, "that's survival."

Mrs. Burton says that her greatest ambition was to build a home for Negro working girls, girls who made such paltry salaries they couldn't afford a decent place to live.

"The meager salaries of the past have made girls stoop to prostitution and once they've started that, they're hooked."

But a Negro prostitute, Cele, munched on a midmorning hamburger in her home on the east side just a few days later and said she had chosen her profession because she "likes sex" and:

"Besides owning my own fully furnished home, I now have three TV sets, two black and white and a color set; clothes, furs and jewels.

"How else could I afford all this? Before I started walking the streets I worked with the Department of Parks and Recreation and after that was a clerk in a record shop."

Cele was born in Gloucester, Miss. She's 20 years old and the mother of a four-year-old son. She became pregnant in school, stayed out long enough to have her child and then went back but didn't graduate.

Her husband, 26, married her after the baby was born. They lived together six weeks and then separated.

"But he says I can come back whenever I want to," Cele said with assurance.

She says she makes from $70 to $120 a night on "her corner" and doesn't have trouble with the police when they arrest her because "I pay them the proper respect."

Some of the other girls use foul language and get themselves slapped around by the police, she adds.

She's been picked up for streetwalking about 25 times since she started a year ago. Her longest detention was 45 days in Detroit House of Correction where she got a chance to cook, which she enjoys.

Cele says her mother doesn't mind what she's doing; in fact she wished her well when she left home.

And she looked off into space a moment when asked what she hoped her four-year-old son would grow up to be.

Then, she answered, "Well, everybody says he's going to be either a preacher or a pimp."

She has no race hostilities.

However, the neat, bright-eyed girl in white uniform and the pert cap of a Harlem Hospital graduate nurse, Brenda Turner, 23, said, without too much rancor:

"I'm sure that somewhere there must be a lot of nice white people but I've never met them.

"I resent being called 'girl' instead of nurse when hailed by white patients in the hospital and as a Negro I know I have to be just a little better in everything I do than my white counterpart.

"Probably I could be a professor of nursing but I'd still first be a Negro in most hospitals."

This isn't necessarily true of the hospital where Brenda now works. In fact, she's had the satisfaction of having white doctors look down a line of nurses, many of whom were white, and select her for the job at hand.

"It isn't that I'm so great but the doctors here are more concerned with getting the job done than the color of a nurse's skin," she added.

Brenda's a native Detroiter, her father is a DSR guard. When the family moved to a new home in the Northeast section of Detroit, white children on the block printed unpleasant words in the snow in front of their house.

While she respects the performances of Stokely Carmichael, H. Rap Brown and Rev. Cleage, Miss Turner also admires Martin Luther King, "the perfect example of a true Christian."

"The others," she said, "are more violent and perhaps violence is the way the Negro must take to win equality. You see we're not asking white people to love us or to live next door to us. We simply want full citizenship.

"I don't believe in separation, going back to Africa or living on a small strip of land off the coast of Mexico.

"I just want to buy the same home the white man can, at the same price he pays for it. I don't want to be gouged because I'm black."

She grew even more serious:

"I'm for Black Nationalism and Black Power but I'm even more for the Black Dollar. I think the black man should establish more businesses and employ black workers so we wouldn't be so dependent upon the white man.

"I also believe more in boycotts than riots. But I knew in my heart the riots would come to Detroit because of the dissatisfaction over housing, employment, police brutality.

"I won't say they were conducted in the right way with Negroes burning their own homes. If you are angry at the white man then it's the white man you should hurt."

She was asked if she didn't think laws should be respected by Negroes as well as white people.

"Laws? What laws?" was her response. "The white man has been making laws for hundreds of years that he doesn't enforce.

"We aren't about to kill people but the white man must realize that we're no longer content with talk. I also believe that the main responsibility in this present crisis falls on the Negro. I think my generation and my parents' generation must instill a pride of race in the generation now growing up.

"I am proud—terribly proud—to be a Negro. I wouldn't want to be white. The only time I ever, even momentarily, thought I might consider marrying a white man—for I'm more attracted to Negro men—was when I visited my cousin in New York.

"She's married to an Italian and he's one of the sweetest persons I've ever known. Because they are so happy together it made me wonder if I ever could . . ."

But Miss Turner travels primarily in Negro society, having the occasional Coke and sandwich with a white intern or a fellow nurse from the hospital.

Tranquil — passionate — secure — unsure — friendly — hostile — patient — anxious — outspoken — reserved — intelligent and cultured — polite — rude — bitter — hopeful.

A study of the Negro woman's mystique reveals all these qualities.

Only in one way is she totally and historically different from her white sister who never wakes up mornings wondering what indignity she'll suffer this day because her skin is white.

THE ARAB REFUGEES AND COMMUNIST HYPOCRISY

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Multer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, blatant hypocrisy is nothing new in the Communist world, but their encouragement of the Arabs to continue to use the plight of refugees resulting from the conflicts in the Middle East as a political football is disgraceful. Most of the nations of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union are certainly among the worst offenders in creating refugees.

In case anyone has forgotten, Czechoslovakia expelled 3 million Germans from homes where they had lived for many generations when the Communists took over that country; Communist Poland expelled about 7 million Germans from Pomerania and Silesia. Similarly, Soviet Russia has long been known for its ruthless uprooting of peoples. One blatant example was their expelling of millions of Poles and Germans from the frontier areas in Eastern Prussia.

How can these countries now condemn Israel for not solving a problem which in the first instance is not one that Israel created? It must never be forgotten that those Arabs who have become refugees did so at the urging of their leaders. This is true of the Middle East war this year just as it was true of the war of 1948.

It is interesting to note that so far neither the Arab world nor the Communist world has done anything whatever to aid the Arab refugees, while Israel has now assumed the responsibility for most of them and invited those displaced by the 1967 war to return to their homes. This is, of course, at great risk to the internal security of Israel and clearly demonstrates its willingness to express its humaneness with deeds instead of words.

ROSH HASHANA, 5728

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. Kelly] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, the festival of Rosh Hashanah, the Jewish New Year, comes each year in September or October. This year it falls on October 5, and Orthodox and Conservative Jews observe the occasion for a 2-day period, October 5 and 6. This turning of the year is, for the Jewish people, a time of repentance, but not of sadness; a time of joyful worship and hopeful prayer. Typical of the spirit of this time is the pleasant custom, whose symbolism is plain to the youngest child, of eating an apple or other fruit dipped in honey, as a foretaste of the sweetness hoped for in the coming year. To all my Jewish friends, to the Jewish people of all the world, and especially to the people of Israel, who are so triumphantly surviving a fierce and bitter test, I wish all the sweetness and happiness promised by this symbolic taste; and I join in the ancient prayer that God may hasten the time when all the people of the earth shall be brothers, and wickedness and tyranny shall pass away like smoke into the sky.

VICTORY FOR THE CITIES

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Barrett] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, the press of the country has been loud in its praise of congressional action that looks to the establishment of meaningful model cities, rent supplements, and rat control programs. All of them are needed, and editorials in the New York Times and the Philadelphia Bulletin have urged favorable outcome for these programs which are considered essential for the health of our cities. So that my colleagues may know the content of the editorial, I insert them in the Record at this point:

[From the New York Times, Sept. 22, 1967]

Victory for the Cities

The Senate's votes in favor of adequate funds to start the model cities and rent subsidy programs add up to an important victory for the nation's cities. These two new programs are urgently needed if the nation is to make headway against the slums.

It is particularly encouraging that Senator Dirksen, the minority leader, and sixteen other Republicans voted for rent subsidies. Last year only five Republican Senators supported this program. If Representative Ford, the G.O.P. leader in the House, and his senior colleagues would similarly alter their position, the House conferees would have little difficulty accepting the amounts voted by the Senate.

The shift of more than forty House Republicans on the rat-control bill the other day helped get their party off the hook on what had proved to be an embarrassing vote. These changes of position on rent subsidies and rat control show that at least some Republicans recognize that in an increasingly urbanized nation there is no future for a party that turns its back on the harsh problems of the cities.

[From the Sunday Bulletin, Sept. 24, 1967]

Second Thoughts on the Cities

The Congress these days is a fascinating study. The House is having what appears to be a latter-day attack of conscience. The Senate is doing what it can to remind the conservative coalition in the House of their collective responsibilities to the cities.

It was in May that the House conservatives—Republicans and Southern Democrats—fed President Johnson's $662 million request for the Model Cities program into the shredder and came out with $237 million. Then they went on to eliminate the $40 million asked for rent supplements altogether.

Summer and the agony and uproar in the cities seemed to make little difference. It was toward the end of July that the House voted down the rat control bill amid derisive laughter and bad plays on words. The fact that the bill might not have been in the best possible form got scant attention or proposals for a better alternative.

The reaction was vivid. The cities have protested bitterly against the violent amputation of Model Cities funds and destruction of rent supplements. On rat control, President Johnson called the House action a "cruel blow to the poor children," and 112 private organizations, in a joint declaration, said it was "an act of shocking irresponsibility.

The reaction, evidently, has been effective. And it is some comfort that it is being acted upon. The House, on sober and reflective second thought, has now reversed itself on the rat bill, this time putting more control over spending the $40 million in local hands. But that should not hurt, provided the cities diligently ensure that the funds do, indeed, go for rat extermination.

The second thoughts in the House did not extend to restoration of the Model Cities and rent supplement funds.

But the Senate may accomplish this. It has now voted $537 million for the cities bill and the full $40 million asked for the rent measure. And if the House members of the Senate-House conference committee still have the ear they have lately turned attuned to urban noises, the story may yet have a happy and constructive ending.

NEW YORK TIMES APPLAUDS PRESIDENT'S SELECTION OF WASHINGTON CITY COUNCIL

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Rosenthal] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has named a distinguished City Council to assist Mayor Walter Washington in governing our Capital City.

This capable group of dedicated Washingtonians will, in the words of a New York Times editorial, "win the confidence of Congress" and the entire country.

As the editorial notes, President Johnson's thoughtful selection is another step in the dawn of a new era in Washington government. With the President's modernization of the District's antiquated governmental structure, his proposal for an elected school board, and the possibility of congressional representation, the District is, in President Johnson's phrase, emerging "into the world of 20th century government."

I join the New York Times in praising the administration's selection of Council members for our Nation's Capital. Their choice gives pride to Washington and to the Nation.

I include the New York Times editorial of September 29 in the Record at this point:

[From the New York Times, Friday, September 29, 1967]

. . . and Progress in Washington

President Johnson has appointed nine capable, well-qualified citizens to serve on the new City Council to run the municipal government of Washington, D.C. He has suitably recognized the Negro majority in the city by choosing Negroes for five of the nine places.

The avowedly militant Negroes are disappointed that President Johnson did not select one of them for the council. But if home rule is ever to become a reality, the new board's primary task is to win the confidence of Congress and of elements of the business community that have resisted self-government in the District. For that reason, the President wisely decided to err on the side of caution.

Progress is also being made on two other important fronts. The House has passed a bill to provide for an elected school board, and early Senate approval is expected. The anomalous situation in which Federal District judges choose Washington's school board by arcane methods will thus happily come to an end.

The House Judiciary Committee yesterday redrafted a proposed constitutional amendment to give the District of Columbia full equality with the states in Congress. Instead of merely enabling Congress to give the District one seat in the House, the amendment would now provide for two seats in the Senate and as many seats in the House as its population entitles it to have. This is a vast improvement which we hope Congress and the states will speedily ratify.

RICH AND POOR BOTH SUFFER WHEN CONSUMER IS NEGLECTED

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Rosenthal] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, lest anyone believe that recent congressional enactment of several major consumer protection bills has been adequate to the problems faced daily by America's 200 million consumers, I refer them to these unsettling events of the last week:

First. In Washington, the Washington Post disclosed widespread fraud in the home improvement field which has victimized the unsuspecting poor for several years;

Second. Also in Washington, the Democratic Central Committee offered convincing evidence that one of the Nation's largest food chains charges the poor urban consumer, more than his suburban neighbor particularly when welfare checks are mailed;

Third. In New York City, a citizens' committee revealed inefficiency and fraud among some mechanics in the repair of automobiles.

As chairman of the special consumer inquiry of the House Committee on Government Operations, I believe three comments can be made on these shocking disclosures:

First, these examples are actually part of a widespread pattern of consumer injustices—and not isolated incidents;

Second, producer fraud and deception and consumer ignorance or apathy respect no economic barriers. Rich and poor, educated and uneducated consumer alike, are frequently victimized;

Third, Federal and State governments are inadequately structured and often inadequately motivated to protect and represent consumers on a continuing basis.

More than 1 year ago, during hearings on my bill to establish a Department of Consumer Affairs, the attorneys general of the States of New York and Wisconsin stated that one of the most useful functions of such a centralized agency would be the compilation and publication of "fly-in-night" business firms which move from State to State perpetrating their frauds.

We do not have a Department of Consumer Affairs but we do have reports of hundreds of families victimized by home improvement firms who went about their shoddy business undetected for several years because no central agency kept tract of their operations.

Our special consumer inquiry heard 1 year ago from the Office of Economic Opportunity that exploiting the poor consumer is a way of life in the ghetto—and yet, in OEO's backyard, the poor still pay more for food than the well-to-do in the suburbs.

Our special consumer inquiry has been charged with examining consumer protection programs, practices, and procedures of the Federal Establishment.

I am increasingly skeptical of a consumer protection system which is diluted among 33 Federal departments and agencies and which suffers from a lack of coordination and a confusion of purpose.

NLRA REMEDIES

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in a recent issue of the AFL–CIO News called attention to an important enforcement problem in the National Labor Relations Act, one that works a most serious injustice on workers who wish to exercise their legal right to join a union.

Since amendments to the National Labor Relations Act are now being studied by the Special Subcommittee on Labor of the House Committee on Education and Labor, on which I serve, I am inserting this timely editorial at this point in the RECORD:

THE LAW'S DELAY

A worker cannot be fired for the simple act of joining a union or becoming actively involved in union activity. The United States Congress has said so. It's the law of the land.

But not for the giant J. P. Stevens textile chain. This outpost of feudalism in the South operates under its own laws. If a worker is found wearing a union button or reported as signing a union card, he is fired.

For the fourth time in 17 months the National Labor Relations Board has found the Stevens company guilty of violating the law by firing workers for union membership or activity. The company has appealed the earlier decisions to the courts and will probably follow the same path for the latest pair of NLRB rulings.

Meanwhile, the fired workers are without jobs. And given the pervasive influence of the giant textile chain, many of them are blacklisted and prevented from securing a decent job in the communities in which they live.

The NLRB has used up all the remedies at its disposal to stem this planned and premeditated union-busting campaign. The company apparently views lightly the cease and desist orders and continues on its way perfectly aware that when it exhausts all its legal appeals years from now and the decision goes against it, the penalties assessed will be much lighter than recognition of a union of its workers and a contract assuring decent wages and working conditions.

With every new NLRB order against Stevens it is becoming clearer and clearer that legislation is necessary to provide the board additional remedies so that it can put a quick and effective stop to Stevens-style union busting.

A worker's right to join a union must be inviolate in a democratic system.

HIGH SPEED GROUND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to note the second report on the High Speed Ground Transportation Act of 1965 prepared by the Secretary of Transportation and submitted to the President and the Congress.

The work of the Department of Transportation and its Office of High Speed Ground Transportation is of special interest to me as a Congressman from Maryland.

The Pennsylvania Railroad, in cooperation with the Department, will soon formally inaugurate a demonstration of improved rail passenger service between Washington and New York. As part of this important project, a new suburban station will be constructed in Prince Georges County, Md., at the Capital Beltway.

Although the services will not begin on October 29, as scheduled, I understand that every effort is being made to have it start as soon as possible. Also of particular interest to me is the fact that the Department has under study a proposal to inaugurate a shuttle service between Washington and Baltimore via Friendship International Airport, which could greatly improve the usefulness of Friendship Airport to both the Baltimore and Washington areas.

But the work of the Department in this vital area should be of keen interest to every Member of this House.

The congestion and slowdowns in transportation which have begun to occur all too frequently in the northeast corridor will soon be found in other urbanized regions in the country. I am glad to say that the administration with congressional support has made an intelligent and constructive start on these problems through the high-speed ground transportation program.

LOAN OF NAVAL VESSELS

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 9796, which is a measure to provide military assistance to eight countries—Greece, Spain, Portugal, Chile, Brazil, Korea, Germany, and China. In particular, the distinctions made in the committee report between Korea and China should be kept in mind.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this bill because I can no longer support military assistance of this kind to countries which have repeatedly misused military equipment in order to sustain monarchical elites or outright military dictatorships.

Where gross national products are relatively small and the amounts allocated for education, health improvement, public administration, revenue reforms, and the like are so insufficient to their needs, it would seem clear that any additional expenditure or burden for the operation and maintenance of outmoded equipment is unpardonable. This is a very serious problem, Mr. Speaker. These countries simply cannot afford to operate and maintain what we admit to be obsolete naval ships. By the standards of their economies and their own internal stability they cannot afford the luxury of borrowing outmoded naval equipment.

Mr. Speaker, specifically on the subject of military assistance to Greece, in light of recent events, I consider any proposal that continues such questionable aid as an embarrassment bordering on indifference to the process of representative political democracy.

Mr. Speaker, the committee admits an expenditure of $15 million for refitting but they have completely avoided the subject of operations and maintenance for the recipient countries. The fact of the matter is that all too often these costs appear in the U.S. military assistance budget.

At a time when fiscal economy is so important, I think it most urgent that we spend our resources for highest priority tasks.

The countries receiving these ships need economic aid in all too many cases, not destroyers and submarines. The best all-around interest of this country, it seems to me, will be served by concentrating on these needs instead of burdening the society with obsolete prestige equipment which they can ill afford.

PROTECTION FOR POSTMASTERS AND OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE POST OFFICE

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to extend to postmasters and any other officer or employee of the post office the same protection now afforded Federal judges, U.S. attorneys, and U.S. marshals.

My bill would amend section 1114 of title 18, United States Code, to provide that assaults on these additional employees would carry with them a fine of $5,000 and/or 3 years in prison and in the case of assaults with a deadly weapon a fine of $10,000 and/or 10 years in prison.

The problem of safety of postal employees has been brought home sharply with an assault upon an employee in the

Syracuse Post Office, whom, incidentally, is a good friend of mine, Howard Brooks, and the recent murder of a postal supervisor in Philadelphia.

I have already written to Chairman Celler to request that he initiate hearings on this vital matter. May I also take the liberty of requesting that my colleagues offer companion legislation and likewise call upon the chairman to hold hearings.

COLUMBUS DAY

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Hanley] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, this morning I had the privilege of submitting testimony to the House Judiciary Committee on behalf of my bill and related measures which would declare Columbus Day, October 12, a national holiday.

For many years, Mr. Speaker, Columbus Day has been celebrated throughout the United States with appropriate ceremony. Unofficially, it is recognized in several States as a holiday. The unfortunate fact is, however, that the Congress of the United States has never seen fit to declare this as an officially recognized national holiday. I submit that the time has come for us to correct this situation.

A recent survey conducted in a number of our elementary schools across the Nation showed that two dates of historical significance were most easily recognized by the participating students. The first was 1066, the year of the Battle of Hastings. The second was 1492, the year of the landing in the New World by Christopher Columbus.

Mr. Speaker, thousands of streets, cities, schools, parks, and public buildings throughout the United States have been named in honor of Christopher Columbus. His name is as much a part of the warp and woof of American society as the revolution and George Washington; yet we have never taken the ultimate step in declaring officially a day in his honor. It would be timely now for the Congress to declare formally that October 12 is a national holiday, and that the President is directed to issue a proclamation to that effect.

The mere act of honoring a man dead over 400 years is not, in and of itself, particularly important. The symbolic gesture is, however, for it provides us, as a society, with another link to our past. We all know that history courses are mandatory in every school in the United States and for a very good reason. They enable our young people to gain a sense of perspective and a sense of identification. What could be more important to that perspective than a formal commemoration of the grand voyage which gave root to our society in 1492?

There are broader implications which intrude themselves here, however. For in a very real sense, we remember each October 12 not a man but a dream, not a trip but a venture. We commemorate a spirit and a zeal upon which this Nation was founded and for which so many of our brave young men have fought and died, and for which, indeed, they are fighting and dying today. I submit also, Mr. Speaker, that a formal remembrance of the deeds of Christopher Columbus brings into sharp focus the many rich contributions made to this Nation by Americans of Italian heritage. Their names and their deeds are legion, and I feel this formal observation will serve a good purpose in underscoring both.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope the committee will take prompt action on this matter and will report the measure to the floor as quickly as possible.

J. E. GREINER CO.

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Fallon] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, on recent occasions my colleague from the Second District of Maryland [Mr. Long] has risen to present information to the House derogatory to the J. E. Greiner Co. of Baltimore and, in particular, one of the members of that firm, E. J. Donnelly.

The Greiner Co. is a large, international engineering firm which is extremely active in the engineering of public works projects, including projects financed with Federal and Federal-aid funds. It is appropriate, therefore, that my constituent should present to me valid information about the Greiner Co. relevant to the firm's reliability and the quality of its work when such has been questioned by a Member of Congress.

Unfortunately, my colleague, Mr. Long, is not in possession of all of the pertinent facts. Nevertheless, his statements have been misleading to the extent that they have cast a shadow on the professional ethics and capability of the Greiner Co., as well as Mr. Donnelly personally.

Mr. Donnelly is a resident of my district, the Fourth District of Maryland, and I have know him personally for 25 years, both businesswise and socially. Knowing the excellent reputation he enjoys in the Fourth District and elsewhere in Maryland and being also aware of his generous and intense religious, charitable, and civic activities, I was surprised and dismayed at the statements made about him by my colleague.

The outstanding record of Mr. Donnelly as a professional engineer and the worldwide accomplishments of his firm, the J. E. Greiner Co., need no documentation by me. The reputation and excellence of work of this organization is internationally recognized. Volumewise, it is one of the largest and most successful engineering firms in the world.

Mr. Donnelly is well known not only in Baltimore, but throughout the State of Maryland for his generous and effective charitable work. He is a member of the executive committee of the Catholic Charities, Inc., and is most prominent in many other charitable activities.

He is a member of the board of advisers of Bon Secours Hospital in Baltimore and a member of the board of managers of the Maryland General Hospital. He is chairman of the president's board of Loyola College in Baltimore; a member of the board of directors of the Engineering Society of Baltimore; a member of the board of directors of the American Road Builders' Association and a past president of its engineering division. Mr. Donnelly is a registered professional engineer having received his engineering degree from Johns Hopkins University in 1937, and is currently on the board of visitors of that university. This year he received an honorary degree of doctor of science from Loyola College in Baltimore.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Donnelly has written me a letter simply and clearly setting forth the true facts concerning allegations raised by my colleague, Mr. Long. I ask permission to include this letter as a part of my remarks so that Members of the House will be accurately apprised concerning this unfortunate matter. Also, I submit for the Record a copy of an article over the signature of Jerome B. Wolff, chairman-director of the Maryland State Roads Commission which recently appeared in the Baltimore News American which further establishes the facts regarding the charges in question.

I have taken the floor for the primary purpose of setting the record straight. It should be apparent to all that my good friend and constituent, E. J. Donnelly, and his outstanding engineering organization, the J. E. Greiner Co., are, beyond a shadow of a doubt, unquestionable as to integrity, honesty, and ability.

The letter and article follow:

J. E. Greiner Co.,
Baltimore, Md., September 29, 1967.

Hon. George H. Fallon,
House of Representatives,
Baltimore, Md.

Dear Congressman Fallon: As a constituent, the writer wishes to protest the attack made upon the competence and integrity of J. E. Greiner Company and the writer personally in the speech by Congressman Clarence D. Long on the floor of the House of Representatives on Thursday, September 14, 1967.

Congressman Long insinuates that there is a sinister relationship between J. E. Greiner Company and the State Roads Commission of Maryland and goes on further to quote a phrase out of context contained in our Report of January, 1964. The truth of the matter is that Congressman Long has consistently misrepresented the role played by J. E. Greiner Company in the matter of Chesapeake Bay Crossings. J. E. Greiner Company, based on its vast prior experience in the planning of toll facilities, not only in the State of Maryland but throughout the United States, was awarded a legal and binding contract by the State Roads Commission of Maryland to prepare a comprehensive feasibility report for a second Bay Bridge covering three specific locations. The purpose of the studies was to ascertain, with respect to each of the three locations, whether the bridges, together with approaches thereto, would be feasible of financing through revenue bonds and to determine the sequence of construction for the bridges and their approaches. J. E. Greiner Company did complete its study in full compliance with the terms of its agreement, and, based upon its studies, conducted strictly in accordance with universally recognized and accepted engineering principles, concluded in its Report to the State Roads Commission of Maryland, dated January, 1964:

"The above tabulations show that the combination of the Sandy Point to Kent Island Crossings with the existing Bay Bridge will provide annual average net revenues $762,445 greater than will be produced by the combination of the Miller Island to Tolchester Crossing with the existing Bay Bridge. When this fact is taken in conjunction with the fact that the new bridge at Sandy Point is only $62,700,000 as compared to the initial cost of $143,000,000 for the Miller Island Crossing, we can without reservation recommend that first priority be given to the construction of a second bridge adjacent to the existing Bay Bridge at Sandy Point."

Congressman Long further stated, "The parallel bridge will be so costly that it will use up, possibly to the year 2000, any money or borrowing capacity that might have been available to build a bay bridge in another location, such as in Baltimore or in Southern Maryland." Revenue studies disclose that if the parallel bridge were built as a first priority, the State Roads Commission could proceed with the construction of an additional bay bridge at another location within ten years. However, if the bridge championed by Congressman Long were built first, it would preclude any further toll construction in Maryland for from twenty to thirty years.

In his attack on the Greiner Company, Congressman Long infers that the professional service connected with the design of the parallel bridge would be minimized by the existence of designs and plans for the existing structure. The fact is that the designs and plans for the existing bridge will be of no value in the design of the adjacent structure. The so-called parallel structure is not and could not be a duplicate structure in the true sense of the word. Variances in water depths at the pier locations, degrees of curvature, and rates of climb, utilization of the existing causeway on the eastern approach and the toll plaza area on the western approach, currently available construction materials and other similar and associated variances preclude a simple revision of the design and plans of the existing structure to construct the adjacent bridge. It is a fact that if the old plans could be revised, the cost of the adjacent structure would be appreciably increased. Since the time that the existing bridge was designed nearly twenty years ago, there have been great technological advancements in the development of high tensile strength metals and in the methods of connection of steel members. To build a new structure and not take full advantage of these technological advances would be extremely poor engineering by today's standards and a waste of funds.

In his speech, the Congressman infers that the Greiner Company endorsed an erroneous program for drilling and slushing mine cavities beneath the highway in question. J. E. Greiner Company considered this to be an engineering foundation design problem and not a mining problem. We were and are still of the opinion, based on engineering judgement, that the method of procedure endorsed by us provided the most practical solution to the problem. It is of significance that when the Pennsylvania Department of Mines assumed control of the stabilization program, they employed the same method of drilling and slushing. It is of further interest, that in the very area in question, the Department of Mines of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has now in progress six contracts aggregating millions of dollars for the correction of mine subsidence and surface caving conditions by the drill and slush method (Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Department of Mines and Mineral Industries, Secretary's Report, August, 1967.)

Although J. E. Greiner Company and the writer are entirely capable of and will defend our competence and character outside the Congress of the United States, we will greatly appreciate whatever efforts you undertake to set the record straight on our behalf within the House of Representatives.

Very truly yours,

E. J. DONNELLY.

[From the Baltimore News and American, Oct. 1, 1967]

For the past several months, Congressman Long has leveled a number of charges against the State Roads Commission and certain of its consulting engineers.

The innuendo and character assassination contained in the statements made by Mr. Long behind his cloak of congressional immunity are revolting, outrageous and without any real basis in fact. They demand a responsible answer.

Mr. Long charges the State Roads Commission is subverting the will of the people in proceeding with the financing and construction of toll facilities including the parallel Chesapeake Bay Bridge.

A newly apportioned Legislature, elected for the first time by the people on a statewide population basis, made the decision this year to allow the State Roads Commission to determine the priorities of construction of its toll facilities. Three-fifths of the members of each house, or 60 percent, had to vote for this legislation (House Bill 348) for it to pass.

Mr. Long could have petitioned this latest act of the people's representative to a referendum, but he wisely ascertained there was no public appetite for it and the people were willing for a newly elected administration to make the decision based on the facts available.

Next, Mr. Long sought to destroy public confidence in the consulting engineering firm of Cloverdale and Colpits that makes projections on which bonds are sold. This firm made the previous revenue and feasibility studies for all of Maryland's highly successful toll facilities and it has an outstanding national reputation. With more than 120 successful underwritings of projects exceeding $5 billion in value, it has done more work in this field than the other three traffic engineering firms combined.

Mr. Long's more recent attacks on the J. E. Greiner Co., consulting engineers employed for the engineering design and supervision of the parallel bay bridge, have been even more reprehensible. He chose the forum of Congress to make these attacks on Greiner's past activities, and published them in the Congressional Record in an effort to assure immunity.

He repeatedly suggests the design the Greiner Co. had earlier used on the Chesapeake Bay Bridge can be used again on the parallel bridge. This I categorically deny. If the Greiner Co. even suggested using the old design, I, as an experienced professional engineer, would be the first to oppose it. The second structure cannot duplicate the first as to location of piers, specific treatment of each footing, construction materials and methods. The designs of 20 years ago cannot reflect technological advancements that must go into the new bridge, and there is the strong possibility it will be three lanes instead of two.

He also seeks to undermine public confidence in this firm by stating it was indicted but "not convicted" in a case involving a construction inspection assignment on the Pennsylvania Turnpike 10 years ago. It is basic to American jurisprudence that when a man is acquitted he is found innocent of the crime charged. It is of interest to note the J. E. Greiner Co. has been assigned eight projects for the State of Pennsylvania since that time, with a construction value of approximately $150 million.

Mr. Long also inserted in the Congressional Record a statement to the effect that the J. E. Greiner Co. had been cited in a Florida Grand Jury report in December, 1965 for charging an excessive fee in construction of the Tampa Airport. What Mr. Long did not say for the Congressional Record was in February, 1966 a blue-ribbon panel of nationally-known engineers, acting for the Florida Engineering Society, found the fees charged by J. E. Greiner Co. "entirely reasonable" and the firm fully "competent to provide the services assigned to them."

When I accepted the position of Chairman-Director of the State Roads Commission last January, the future of the toll facilities was up in the air. I studied the problem carefully and conscientiously. I understood the political implications involved. I went before the State Legislative Committees and argued the entire problem should be taken out of the political arena and put back in the hands of these professionals who know how to solve it.

I know more about the financing, engineering and construction of toll facilities than Mr. Long does. And I think I can prove it. If Mr. Long would care to engage me in a debate on the merits of the parallel Bay Bridge or of the second Harbor Tunnel or of the Northern Bay Bridge, I will be more than happy to do so. He may be an expert in economics but he has shown an abysmal ignorance of toll facilities.

It is also interesting to note that of Maryland's eight Congressmen and two U.S. Senators, not one has joined Mr. Long in his opposition. Further, although vigorously opposed by Mr. Long, the House Committee on Public Works last week acted favorably by a vote of 34 to 0 on H.R. 11627, which would give Congressional authority for the construction of the proposed new toll facilities.

JEROME B. WOLFF,
Chairman-Director.

RONALD REAGAN—REACTION RIDES AGAIN

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, Gov. Ronald Reagan, a much talked about Republican Presidential hopeful, has opened the eyes of the American people—and especially organized labor—to the real flavor of his reactionary policies.

Wire service reports yesterday told of Governor Reagan's use of convict labor to help harvest California crops. This is redolent of the worst kind of feudal anti-labor practice ever employed by an elected official in recent years.

This is the kind of mentality we associate with a controlled State, not a free State.

The same anti-labor Governor Reagan is the man who recently advocated using the atomic bomb in Vietnam.

This same Ronald Reagan has tried repeatedly to gut the justly famous State University of California, and is driving the best minds out of his State.

This same Gov. Ronald Reagan has severely cut funds for mental health centers and State mental institutions of California.

This same Ronald Reagan wants to give away the great California Redwoods to the highest bidding lumber company.

This same Governor Reagan is being called the No. 1 antipoverty Governor in the country. He has blocked nine antipoverty programs for his State so far, and he is intent on keeping the poor in their place.

His actions are even reactionary by 19th century standards.

Is this the kind of irresponsible folk philosopher Republicans want as their presidential candidate?

The man whom the Sacramento Bee said would be a "national disaster" if he ever rose to national position.

Americans long ago rejected the know-nothingism that Governor Reagan represents.

They rejected it in 1964.

And they reject it again today.

THE PARTNERSHIP FOR HEALTH AMENDMENTS OF 1967

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Partnership for Health Amendments of 1967, one of the most exciting pieces of legislation in the history of society this body, was approved by an overwhelming vote. This legislation immediately concerns itself with the delivery of the best possible quality of health and health services to our citizens, but the innovative thrust of the program carries the total significance of this bill far beyond the program specifics to which it pertains. It was my distinct pleasure to join my colleagues in the House and members of the administration, under the leadership of President Johnson, in the support of these amendments.

Principally, this bill addresses itself to what is our most important natural resource: our people and their health. Our society of wealth and abundance tends to create an atmosphere that is benevolently critical of the way in which the established order of society rewards them as individuals. It has long been wanting a mechanism that will assure the delivery of the high quality of health care and medical services that the present state of medical science can afford. The partnership for health aspires to this goal.

By removing the categorical restrictions for which Federal grant funds for the support of health projects may be applied, and replacing this concept with block funds under which individual States and local units apply these funds to locally existing priorities, the partnership for health provides a severely needed modernization of the direction of federally provided health funds.

It additionally introduces a new and improved era of cooperation between the States and the Federal Government. This new concept promises an exciting and truly bold period of innovation and will be well worth watching for possible adaptation in other areas.

THE READER'S DIGEST AND SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the Reader's Digest has published in its October issue a misleading and unfair attack on the social security program. It is filled with half-truths, mistruths, and statements taken out of context.

It is a skillfully written article designed to sow anxiety and fear among the 23 million beneficiaries of social security. A more diabolical scheme to unnecessarily worry our senior citizens could not have been conceived.

Now, the Reader's Digest has taken an even more scandalous and reprehensible step. In its advertising for the article in the newspapers there is shown a social security card torn in three parts. What is the purpose of showing a torn social security card? It is clearly calculated to give the impression that your social security is insecure, unsafe, unsound, and on the verge of bankruptcy. Yet there is not a shadow of truth in this impression.

The newspaper advertisement says that your social security is not "guaranteed income." This is just a lot of misleading words. The social security program is safe and sound. Our distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee who knows the financing of the program inside and out has said in the September 27, 1967, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page 27026, the social security program is "actuarially and financially sound." Chairman MILLS has said the Reader's Digest article "contains a number of half-truths that lead to misleading conclusions." If the article is misleading, the newspaper advertisement is designed to have the effect of circulating the big lie against the integrity of the social security program.

The Reader's Digest has stooped to a new low in its unprincipled and vicious attack on the social security program. For those who wish to know the truth I urge them to read the rebuttal to the Reader's Digest article which Chairman MILLS included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on September 27, pages 27028 to 27029.

A statement by Wilbur J. Cohen, Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, follows:

STATEMENT BY WILBUR J. COHEN, UNDER SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Mr. Charles Stevenson's article on "How Secure is Your Social Security?" in the October issue of the *Reader's Digest* is misleading, and, in my opinion, creates anxiety and fear about the financing of our social security system that are groundless.

I state categorically that:

The social security system is soundly financed.

Present and potential future beneficiaries of social security will get the benefits provided by the social security law.

I

Mr. Stevenson begins his article by saying our "social security insurance is in trouble." This is not so.

The subtitle of Mr. Stevenson's article says that "Recent disclosures are raising grave doubts as to how much—if anything—today's taxpayer will get back when his time for retirement comes." Use of the words "disclosures," "grave doubts" and "if anything" can only result in worry to millions of people who are now drawing social security benefits or expect to draw them in the future. This worry is wholly without factual basis.

The article seeks to depict Chairman Wilbur D. Mills and the ranking minority member, Representative John W. Byrnes, of the House Committee on Ways and Means as profoundly alarmed about the basic design and fiscal integrity of the social security program and about the course that the program is taking. The facts, however, are that as recently as 5 weeks ago these men jointly supported legislation in the House of Representatives, the Social Security Amendments of 1967 (H.R. 12080), which builds upon the present social security program and, with careful attention to actuarial soundness, makes needed improvements in the benefits of the program.

The implication that Representative Byrnes, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, agrees with the charges made by Mr. Stevenson flies in the face of the fact that Mr. Byrnes was a co-sponsor of the social security bill now before Congress and is contradicted by his remarks on the floor of the House of Representatives during the debate on the bill. At that time he stated:

"I personally do not feel that the burdens imposed by this bill are greater than the taxpayers will be willing to pay. After all, today's taxpayer is tomorrow's beneficiary. I was very glad to join the chairman of our committee in sponsoring the social security bill—a bill which gives due consideration to the needs of our elderly citizens as well as those who are called upon to pay the taxes."

Representative Byrnes went on to say that:

"Everyone paying taxes today can do so with the knowledge that he is participating in a sound program of social insurance which will provide commensurate benefits in the event of his death or disability."

The House Committee report on H.R. 12080, which was signed by 24 out of 25 of the members of the Committee on Ways and Means, bears ample witness to the care and thoroughness which the Committee has devoted to assuring the continued soundness of the social security program.

The proposals contained in H.R. 12080 were considered during 18 days of public hearings over a period of 6 weeks, and during 64 executive sessions over a period of 16 weeks. Following debate, the House approved the bill by the overwhelming non-partisan vote of 415 to 3. The bill reaffirms the soundness of the contributory, wage-related social security program.

The soundness of the social security system has been examined a number of times by groups of independent, nongovernmental representatives of business, insurance, labor, and the public.

In 1957, under the Eisenhower Administration, an Advisory Council on Social Security Financing was appointed by Secretary Flemming. It reported as follows:

"The Council finds that the present method of financing the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program is sound, practical, and appropriate for this program. It is our judgment, based on the best available cost estimates, that the contribution schedule enacted into law in the last session of Congress makes adequate provision for financing the program on a sound actuarial basis."

Among the members of the Council who made this statement were the President of a Federal Reserve bank, two actuaries—one from a private insurance company and one from a university—and representatives of business, labor and professional groups.

The most recent Advisory Council on Social Security, again made up of outstanding experts in the field, examined thoroughly all of the issues connected with the "security" of social security. Like the preceding council they concluded, in their report of January 1965, that the social security program is soundly financed and that its income—out into the long range future—will be sufficient to meet its obligations.

Both Advisory Councils took note of such charges as those made in the article to the effect that social security taxes are used for purposes other than social security, that the trust funds contain only IOU's, and that the system is "in the red" by hundreds of billions of dollars. Both Councils found these charges to be without foundation.

II

The article says that the social security program puts a "squeeze on the young." This is not so. The fact is that even without taking into account that social security benefits have been and will continue to be increased from time to time as changes occur in wage levels and cost of living, young workers as a group will get social security protection worth 20 to 25 percent more than they will pay in social security contributions. This is the case under present law and would be the case under the House-passed bill and under the Administration's proposal.

Young workers could not buy comparable insurance protection from private insurance companies at anywhere near the amount they pay for their social security protection.

The article takes no account of the fact that the benefits provided by the present social security law are very much lower than the benefits that will actually be paid when today's young workers reach retirement age. As wages rise—as they have throughout the history of the country—benefits can be increased *without increasing the contribution rates.* This is because the contributions are a percentage of covered payroll and because, as wages go up, income to the system increases more than the corresponding liabilities.

As a matter of fact, if benefits were *not* increased as wage levels rise over the years, the contribution rates scheduled in present law would be too high, and they could be reduced. Whether benefits are increased or contribution rates are reduced the result would be the same, namely, more protection in relation to contributions than is shown by analyses that assume no change in wage levels and in benefits.

The calculations referred to in the article assume that the covered employee would have within his control an amount of contributions paid by his employers equal to the amount of his own social security contribution. This assumption rests on a misconception of the nature of the social insurance program and indeed the nature of private group insurance. If such an assumption were used, the whole fabric of private group life insurance, annuity insurance, and other forms of group insurance in this country would have to be regarded as inequitable.

As a general rule, under private group insurance plans the employer contribution is not allocated to each employee in an amount related to the employee's own contribution. On the contrary the employer contribution, as in the case of social security, is what makes it possible to pay larger benefits to workers and their survivors who are in the upper age brackets when the group insurance plan goes into effect than could be paid only on the basis of the worker's own contributions.

I believe it bears repeating that even without taking into account the fact that benefits will be increased in future years, even young workers covered under social security will get insurance protection worth 20 to 25 percent more than the value of their contributions, and moreover, they will actually do much better than that when account is taken of the fact that social security benefits can and will be increased as wage levels go up without any need to increase the contribution rate.

In deciding whether younger people get their money's worth it must be kept in mind that social security provides not only retirement protection but also survivors and disability insurance protection. While Mr. Stevenson's figures do take into consideration the fact that social security provides protection against loss of income due to death and disability and also provides hospital insurance protection at age 65, most of his discussion ignores the importance of these parts of the program. That importance may be illustrated by an example: The value of the social security survivors insurance protection provided under the House-passed bill in the case of the worker whose earnings are about the median earnings of regularly employed men ($550 per month) who dies at age 35 leaving a wife aged 32 and two small children is about $56,000. Were this worker to become disabled at age 35, the value of the disability insurance protection to him and his family would be about $59,000.

Social security is a sound and equitable program for the young and the old.

III

Mr. Stevenson's article contains nearly two columns on the so-called *Nestor case,* decided by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1960 (pp. 76–77). Mr. Stevenson distorts the legal issues. He has several quotes which to a lawyer and a general reader would appear to be from the Court's decision. But they are *not.* He not only does not quote from the Court's decision but fails to mention that the Court decision reversed the contention of the Justice Department brief (prepared in the Eisenhower Administration) that the program is not an insurance program. What the U.S. Supreme Court actually said was:

"The Social Security system may be accurately described as a form of social insurance, enacted pursuant to Congress' power to 'spend money in aid of the general welfare,' whereby persons gainfully employed, and those who employ them, are taxed to permit the payment of benefits to the retired and disabled, and their dependents."

The fact is that the Supreme Court decision rejected many of the contentions made in the brief and stated that:

"The interest of a covered employee under the [Social Security] Act is of sufficient substance to fall within the protection from arbitrary governmental action afforded by the due process clause."

Thus, as the Supreme Court stated, although the Congress can modify rights granted under the statute, it cannot do so in an arbitrary way. The right to benefits under social security, as the Court has said, is protected under the due process clause of the United States Constitution against denial or diminution by arbitrary Government action.

IV

The article attempts to show that social security is unsound by referring to "unfunded outstanding obligations" of $350 billion and stating that under the Administration bill this amount will rise to $417 billion. (pp. 79–80). The $350 billion referred to is the amount that would be needed—if social security were a private, voluntary insurance program—to pay off all obligations on the assumption that there would be no new entrants into the system. The idea of there being a huge unfunded liability in the social security system is wholly meaningless and irrelevant for any practical purposes. There is no need in a Government program such as social security for funding on the basis referred to in the article. It would not only be unnecessary but also unwise to build up such a huge accumulation of social security funds. No life insurance expert nor social security expert, nor business nor labor organization, and no Advisory Council or Committee of the Congress has ever recommended such funding.

The most recent Advisory Council on Social Security—an independent group of experts in the field which reviewed all aspects of the social security program over a period of 18 months—stated in its 1965 report:

"The Council is in agreement with the previous groups that have studied the financing of the program that it is unnecessary and would be unwise to keep on hand a huge accumulation of funds sufficient, without regard to income from new entrants, to pay all future benefits to past and present contributors. A compulsory social insurance program is correctly considered soundly financed if, on the basis of actuarial estimates, current assets plus future income are expected to be sufficient to cover all the obligations of the program; the present system meets this test. The claim sometimes made that the system is financially unsound, with an unfunded liability of some $300 billion, grows out of a false analogy with private insurance, which because of its voluntary character cannot count on income from new entrants to meet a part of future obligations for the present covered group."

V

The article is in error in saying that the social security changes recommended by President Johnson would take persons out of poverty "partly by raising the Federal income taxes" of other people over 65. (p. 79). Under the President's proposal, over 2 million persons would be removed from poverty (1.6 million aged 65 and over and 0.5 million under age 65) by the increase in the amount of the social security benefits—especially the increase in the minimum benefit from the present $44 a month to $70. There is no truth in the statement in the article that the method of removing these people from poverty would be through raising income taxes.

The article speaks disparagingly of the improvement of social security benefits for the purpose of reducing the number of persons on assistance or relief. But this has been the objective of the social security program since it was enacted in 1935! This was the original congressional intent. In fact, the carrying out of this intent has been one of social security's great achievements. The proportion of the aged on welfare has decreased from about 22 percent in 1950 to about 10 percent today. We hope to decrease the proportion to 5 percent. Increasing the level of social security benefits will aid in this objective.

VI

One more of the many inaccuracies contained in the article is the allegation in the article that social security contributions are put into the "Treasury's general fund." (p. 76). The fact is that the contributions are automatically appropriated by law to the social security trust funds, which are kept separate from one another and from the general funds of the Treasury and can be used only for the payment of the benefits and administrative expenses under the social security program.

VII

Mr. Stevenson says that the Government is discouraging beneficiaries from augmenting their incomes by collecting social security contributions with no comparable increase in benefits and by withholding benefits from those beneficiaries who earn over $1500 a year. (p. 79)

The purpose of the social security program as determined by the Congress is to pay benefits when there is a loss of earnings because of death, disability, or retirement. The law prescribes a test—generally referred to as the retirement test—for determining whether such loss of earnings has occurred. The amount of the retirement test and whether there should be any retirement test is certainly a question which warrants discussion.

What Mr. Stevenson didn't say in his article is that eliminating the retirement test would increase the cost of the program by $2 billion a year. The additional cost would be incurred to pay benefits to about 2 million people, many of whom are fully employed and earning as much as they ever did. The vast majority of social security beneficiaries—some 20 million other persons—either are unable to work or cannot find a job and therefore would not be helped one iota by the elimination of the retirement test. Would this be an intelligent and equitable way to spend $2 billion a year additional?

The author's statement that beneficiaries who work and pay social security contributions get "no comparable increase" in benefits may give the impression that this work cannot increase their benefits or that, if it can, the benefit increases are insignificant. The fact is that the beneficiary who works can get a benefit increase if he has even just a single year in which his earnings are more than his earnings in any one of the past years that were used in computing his benefits.

In short, Mr. Stevenson didn't tell a full or fair story on the retirement test.

VIII

The article concludes that further study of and basic changes in social security are called for. Some of the concluding remarks are repetitions of misleading assertions made earlier and some go further.

The article raises a number of questions about what will happen to the social security program in the future after whatever "temporary tinkering the House and Senate may do regarding the President's program"—as if the House and Senate are not comprised of the elected representatives of the American people and as if the President is not responsible to the American people. It is through such processes as the article calls "tinkering"—studied proposals such as those made by the President, and congressional deliberation and debates—that this Nation builds its public programs, orders its economy, and carries on the affairs of Government, and this will doubtless be true in the future.

The article goes on to suggest, on the basis of the increases in social security contribution rates that have been enacted over the years, that private pensions may not be able to remain "afloat." Such scaremongering ignores the fact that social security has not prevented the rapid growth of private pensions. Private pensions have made tremendous strides since the 1930's, when social security began. There were only about 400 private pension plans in 1935 when social security was enacted. Today there are over 60,000!

With regard to Mr. Stevenson's proposal to establish a "blue ribbon commission," over the years since the Committee on Economic Security submitted its report to President Roosevelt and the original Social Security Act was enacted in 1935, there have been numerous independent studies of social security by advisory councils composed of highly respected and knowledgeable citizens. For instance there was an Advisory Council Report in 1939, 1948, 1959, and 1965. Since 1956, studies by advisory councils have been provided for in the social security law itself, and there have been periodic studies by these councils. Through the councils, consisting of representatives of employees, employers, the self-employed, and the general public, the social security program has had the benefit of a great deal of intelligent and thoughtful examination. Under the law, the next advisory council, scheduled to be appointed in 1968 (under the bill recently passed by the House, it would be appointed in 1969), will review all aspects of the social security program, including the status of the social security trust funds in relation to the long-range commitments of the program and will make a report of its findings and recommendations to the Board of Trustees of each of the social security trust funds and to the Congress.

IX

Mr. Stevenson has not clarified any fundamental issues. He has not pointed out the great unmet social needs. What he has done has been a great disservice to the millions of social security beneficiaries and the millions who are counting on social security benefits in the future. He has obfuscated and confused the major policy issues in social security. A critical and constructive review of social security would be welcome. A glib and superficial attack on a program so important to millions of Americans is not a contribution to the American people.

COMMITMENT TO THE WAR ON POVERTY

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, we are now at a critical point in the history of our Nation. The American people are being asked to decide hard questions about the development of social and economic programs which effect every American directly or indirectly as taxpayers and as voters and as citizens of this great country of ours. These questions relate to foreign and domestic issues of great import and are as significant as any confronting the people of this Nation of ours.

Serious questions are being posed by the people of my district and many others as to the importance of the priority of foreign policy needs and the issue of Vietnam spending as opposed to the vital and critical needs of our own people at home. For example, many of my colleagues have stated clearly that, by definition, the education of our people and the need for eradicating poverty in this country are "nonessential" and are therefore most easily cut when decisions of budgetary priority are in question.

As a matter of fact, at the present moment, with the budget requests for the war against poverty at a level of $2 billion, the total commitment is equal to about 3 weeks of spending in the war in Vietnam. The total monetary commitment by the Federal Government for all of the Elementary-Secondary Education Act is $1.6 billion or at a rate of spending in Vietnam of 20 days. And yet, the overall success generated by these vital programs are clearly known to those of us who represent districts so deeply affected by the community efforts which these Federal measures have generated.

There are so many examples of the successes which have resulted solely because of the availability of these funds that they are too numerous to mention. However, I can point out the fact that the Federal Government, in the absence of evident willingness of the private sector, has, in my city alone, provided numerous meaningful jobs for unemployed young people and young people who require gainful employment to maintain themselves during their schooling. As I have often noted in the past months, the Federal Government was responsible for over 6,000 young people having gainful employment during this past summer alone through the efforts of the Neighborhood Youth Corps in their in- and out-of-school programs, special community action programs under title II, and through direct hiring by the Federal Government agencies in Cleveland.

NASA hired 200 young people at their Lewis Flight Research Center in Cleveland. One might have expected, under the circumstances, that NASA, with its highly technical work, could not have absorbed as many young people as it did. Yet, it is because of the availability of a great number of highly skilled personnel who obviously cared a great deal about solving the unemployment among young people that NASA did not simply employ these young people but provided a series of extensive programs of education during off hours of the young people who worked among the regular personnel.

In addition, 300 young people served as assistants in the now nationally recognized Cleveland Summer Arts Festival. In this example, these young people assisted in publicity, traffic control, and all other activities relating to each of the 80 performances which took place in the streets of 10 neighborhoods in the city of Cleveland during the last summer. These young people had this opportunity made available to them because of the Neighborhood Youth Corps. Each audience averaged over 1,800 people and soared over 8,000 when Duke Ellington appeared, performing in a torential rainstorm in the streets of Cleveland.

With a small sum of OEO money of $70,000, over 1,900 young people from Cleveland, many of whom had never been out of their neighborhood, had the opportunity to have from 1 to 4 weeks of residential summer camping or a whole summer of day camp. The cooperation between the local officials of the poverty program, the camping officials of 18 Cleveland organizations, and the Federal Government's OEO is but another example of the vitality and critical importance of our war against poverty.

Numerous other programs in the area of health with our new OEO-sponsored health facility, Headstart and child development, which affects thousands of Cleveland's young children, adult education, and many, many other innovative efforts which have resulted from the stimulation provided by the OEO legislation have proved the worth of the war against poverty in Cleveland to the people of Cleveland.

It is my judgment, Mr. Speaker, it is high time that we forcefully counter the presumptions which exist in so many quarters that these programs are "nonessential" and therefore can be cut most easily among all of the programs on the long list of legislative appropriations. Mr. Speaker, these OEO programs are essential.

The problem with people-oriented, innovative programs, like Office of Economic Opportunity programs, is that they result from the action and cooperation of ordinary people in the streets of Cleveland and other cities. Such programing which is so highly personalized and people-oriented is not like many many others with which those of us in Congress have to deal.

The problems of the success or failure of community action programs, for example, cannot be measured in the same terms with which we measure the success or failure of the wheat-cotton subsidy program or the success of a water project in Nebraska or California or space ventures. In these examples, like agriculture, water, or missile projects, the Federal money is paid and we can anticipate specific results. Obviously, a certain number of dollars in a project to build a dam or causeway will, for the most part, result in the production of that project to the architectural or engineering specifications as presented. The personnel involved in these specific kinds of projects can control and are ultimately controlled by scientific in-puts required to achieve the desired results.

However, the results of programs dealing with human misery and poverty in this country cannot be scientifically controlled. It is true, indeed, that money alone, Federal or otherwise, will not necessarily produce the results which we anticipate on a schedule we can plan. Yet, Mr. Speaker, the absence of this financial assistance and the moral support which this commitment represents only discourages vast numbers of people who are otherwise discouraged and unaided in their attempts to determine solutions for their own critical problems.

We know it is not possible, under these circumstances, to guarantee that expenditure of the dollars alone will result in known and predictable results or solutions to human problems as we can with water, space, or agriculture support programs. The human factors of the people-oriented projects of OEO which are highly innovative cannot and should not be required to guarantee results on a scientific basis. These poverty programs must be tailored by the needs of the local community and its people. These programs cannot and should not be dictated by what Congress thinks should be the results from such programs as they do with nonpeople space, agriculture, or water projects.

Therefore, it becomes more difficult for many to support such programs as the Office of Economic Opportunity's war against poverty in comparison to public works water projects or the Nation's space program. Yet to make a decision not to support these social programs is in my judgment shortsighted and unconscionable at a time when great numbers of people of our own country are so clearly in need of this vital assistance which has succeeded so well.

I wish, Mr. Speaker, at this point to insert in the Record a fine editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer entitled "Keep Faith in Poverty War," and an editorial which appeared in the New York Times entitled "Beyond the Poverty Vote," which lend further support to the thesis I have outlined.

I wish also to insert an editorial from the Cincinnati Enquirer which is aptly entitled "Poverty is Everyone's Problem." This editorial was prompted by a recent visit of a Republican Party task force which fully anticipated being able to criticize Cincinnati's community action effort as a result of its brief visit. As the editorial indicated:

> There were no substantial allegations of fraud or mismanagement or malevolence, no allegations of widespread waste or corruption.

As had been anticipated by the Republican Party task force and that—

> Contrary to what many Americans continue to believe, the war on poverty is essentially a local rather than a federal program. The substantial public interest in the war against poverty is perhaps the most hopeful aspect of the entire effort to mitigate poverty in the Queen City, for it is at least a glimmer of hope that Cincinnatians have begun to imagine that poverty is, in a real sense, everyone's problem.

And finally, the Enquirer's editorial rightly states that it is "becoming increasingly clear, we think, that the problem of poverty belongs on the doorstep of every Cincinnatian—rich and poor, white and black, young and old."

It is equally clear, Mr. Speaker, that many Americans throughout the Nation are now feeling the same way: That the problem of poverty does indeed belong on the doorstep of every American—rich and poor, black and white, young and old.

Mr. Speaker, the solutions to the problems of poverty, when conducted in good faith and with honesty and with innovation and with the recognition of the human character of the problems of poverty, cannot be dismissed as "nonessential." These vital programs of OEO cannot be cut in favor of non-people-oriented programing. These are not nonessential programs because the people, and the problems for which these programs have been developed, are not nonessential.

I wish, Mr. Speaker, to insert the editorials from the Plain Dealer, the Times, and the Enquirer at this point in the Record:

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer,
Sept. 27, 1967]

KEEP FAITH IN POVERTY WAR

The Plain Dealer continued to have hope for the war on poverty, even when its failures were being trumpeted abroad and its opponents were crowding over every bungle.

Now the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee has just finished hearing 401 witnesses say whatever they knew through 144 hours of testimony in 33 days of public hearings.

Of the 401 witnesses, only two advocated that the Office of Economic Opportunity be abolished, or that its programs be taken over by other federal agencies, or that those programs be ended.

The 10-Democrat, 6-Republican committee reports: "OEO is necessary. It should not be abolished. Its programs should not be 'spun off.' "

This bears out The Plain Dealer's judgments in the early trial-and error battles of the poverty war. The OEO made mistakes. It got scorched for troubles that were inescapable. No agency trying to reshape poverty-toughened youth into cooperative young citizens could avoid the rough stuff. And not every Job Corp unit can instantly run as successfully as the one here on Ansel Road.

This week the Senate will get the OEO legislation as touched up by the committee. It will probably vote on it in a few days.

We are for Head Start and a followthrough to clinch what gains it offers. We are for more job-producing, more child day care, more person-to-person guidance for families and elderly poor.

We are for OEO's acceleration of all rehabilitative services in contrast to cold handouts like "negative income tax." The latter make mere low-grade consumers out of the poor. But rehabilitating a person in poverty—while giving him a decent stipend—gives him his chance to earn self-respect, climbing out of poverty on his own steam.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 27, 1967]

BEYOND THE POVERTY VOTE

The antipoverty program now nearing a vote in the Senate is a complicated measure. There are several different programs because there are several kinds of people who are poor.

Most pathetic, perhaps, are the five million old men and women living out their last years in meager, sometimes harrowing, circumstances. Most challenging are the 12.5 million children under the age of eighteen growing up in families whose incomes are below $3,000 a year. The nation has to extend a helping hand to these children or face the probability that out of their constricted lives, blighted hopes and disordered emotions will come tomorrow's terrifying tornado of hate and violence.

But the faces of poverty include more than the very old and the very young. There are the youths unprepared for jobs, the high school dropouts, the unskilled. There are the mothers, deserted or divorced, who are rearing small children. There are, too, the families where the breadwinner does not earn enough to meet the family needs.

The Senate Labor Committee, after a sympathetic but searching re-examination of existing programs by its Poverty subcommittee, has drafted a bill that strengthens and extends the basic law. It adds funds to help the aged, to expand family planning and to establish more day-care centers. The committee report recognizes that both the community action program and the Job Corps have encountered administrative difficulties, as was inevitable, but it recommends carrying these programs forward. A willingness to experiment is essential if answers are to be found to the stubborn, many-sided problems of persistent poverty.

An essential feature of the bill is the two-year emergency program to provide jobs for the unskilled and the semi-skilled. The Administration is showing poor judgment in resisting this proposal. In a society so rich as the United States, the Government can afford to act as employer of last resort for those who are willing to work and cannot find jobs. This emergency program is a modest start in a necessary campaign against hopelessness and for individual self-respect.

In casting their votes on the antipoverty bill, the members of the Senate have an obligation to look beyond statistics and beyond partisanship. As Gov. Nelson Rockefeller observed the other day, the "poverty program will go down in history as one of the truly significant programs." It can achieve its full potential if the Senators remember the faces of the poor. Beyond budgets, beyond technicalities, their faces tell poverty's story.

[From the Cincinnati Enquirer]

Poverty Is Everyone's Problem

In this space three weeks ago, as Cincinnati's poverty program was about to undergo a day of scrutiny by two visiting Republican congressmen, we remarked: "If Cincinnati's poverty program is as good as its defenders argue it is, a day or more of investigation will make it look all the better."

The Community Action Commission, the broadly representative agency responsible for directing the war on poverty in the Cincinnati area, seemingly feels that the program has passed the test with its stature notably enhanced. And there is much evidence that the commission's assessment is correct.

Not everyone who appeared before the congressional panel, to be sure, endorsed all that has been undertaken in the name of combating poverty in Cincinnati. Some, indeed, didn't endorse any part of it.

But the differences of opinion that came to light, it seems to us, were differences of philosophy, differences of emphasis and technique.

There were no substantial allegations of fraud or mismanagement or malevolence, no allegations of widespread waste or corruption.

And from the absence of any indictment of its work, the Community Action Commission, whose members rallied to its support in advance of the investigation, has drawn considerable encouragement. From the same set of circumstances, we think, the community can derive a substantial measure of pride.

For no comparable program was ever launched with greater opportunities for ineptness, confusion and waste.

Contrary to what many Americans continue to believe, the war on poverty is essentially a local, rather than a Federal, program. The funding, to be sure, comes largely from the Federal level. But to survey the list of agencies responsible for carrying the Cincinnati war on poverty into action is to see that they are, in the main, long-established and highly regarded parts of the community scene.

The Cincinnati Board of Education, for example, has been the largest single beneficiary in the distribution of poverty funds. Others have been the Hamilton County Board of Education, the Planned Parenthood Association, the Archdiocese of Cincinnati, the Clermont County Board of Commissioners, the Legal Aid Society, the Salvation Army, Talbert House, Inc., and nearly a dozen neighborhood organizations affiliated with the Cincinnati Federation of Settlement and Neighborhood Centers.

The utilization of local agencies to carry forward the war on poverty has both its good and bad features. In Cleveland, they have been all good because virtually all of the local agencies involved have been manned over the years by conscientious volunteers and competent staff personnel.

Had it been otherwise—had the existing agencies labored in a tradition of wastefulness and ineptness—the poverty program itself would have bogged down in incompetence and futility.

That such is not the case has been amply established in the last few weeks. And the result has not been lost upon the community.

When the Community Action Commission, as an example, sponsored a day-long colloquium to discuss various aspects of the poverty program on September 17, its members were frankly amazed at the public interest and support. The colloquium itself established the needs for additional public inquiries into a number of specialized fields—police-community relations, employment opportunities and job training, the role of the poor in shaping official policies aimed at lessening their plight.

This substantial public interest is perhaps the most hopeful aspect of the entire effort to mitigate poverty in the Queen City, for it is at least a glimmer of hope that Cincinnatians have begun to imagine that poverty is, in a real sense, everyone's problem.

It has been easy in the past to imagine that poverty is the problem of politicians who have ridden into office on a magic carpet of promises.

Or that it is the problem of the community's employers who alone have the power to create job opportunities.

Or that it is the problem of the civil rights organizations, which have asked for and received the most sweeping legislative enactments in the nation's history.

Or that it is simply a problem of our city officials, charged, as they are, with the maintenance of law and order.

Each of these imaginings contains an element of correctness. But it is becoming increasingly clear, we think, that the problem of poverty belongs on the doorstep of every Cincinnatian—rich and poor, white and black, young and old.

We happen to harbor deep philosophical differences with many of those active in directing the war on poverty—differences that make us doubt whether this generation or any future generation can actually drive poverty from the land.

But these differences do not mean that we condemn the effort, or that life in Cincinnati does not stand to be enhanced by programs calculated to convert today's tax consumers into tomorrow's taxpayers.

We believe that Cincinnati—and every other community—must bend every effort to create opportunity where there has been none in the past. We believe this because we do not want to see Cincinnati become an annual battlefield. We do not want to see Cincinnati inhabited almost exclusively by welfare beneficiaries.

We want instead to see Cincinnati continue to be a city of substantial home owners who hold a genuine, personal stake in what happens to the entire Ohio Valley. We want Cincinnati to be a community in which young people of all races, all talents, all economic circumstances can find rewarding work compatible with their aptitudes and preparation. And we want Cincinnati to be a community in which men and women of all political and religious and ethnic persuasions can continue to work together to identify and solve common problems.

Every time Cincinnatians can sit down and air their differences and give voice to their aspirations, that day draws nearer.

THE FAA STUDIES AIR SAFETY—TO DEATH

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ottinger] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, last week I made 20 recommendations for action by the Federal Aviation Administration to improve air safety. Among them was a requirement for all domestic aircraft, commercial and private, to carry an automatic signaling device which would enable searchers to quickly pinpoint the site of a crash. As is so often, and so tragically the case, the FAA's response is that they are studying it.

A device similar to the one I demonstrated for the press this morning was brought to the FAA's attention about 8 years ago. The FAA said then that they would study it. Since that time there have been thousands of crashes in which the planes involved were not found for days or months. In many instances, passengers and pilots survived the crash but perished ultimately because of injuries, exposure or starvation—or a combination of these—because searchers could not spot the wreckage.

In Colorado, for example, there were 43 crashes in 1964 which had not been located by September. In one tragic accident, Dr. Randolph Lovelace, senior flight surgeon with the Space Agency, took off from Aspen, Colo., in an air taxi with his wife and their pilot. Shortly after takeoff, the plane went into a stall and crashed in a canyon. The occupants were injured but alive. Searchers came within a mile of the crash but never spotted it. Dr. Lovelace, his wife, and their pilot were frozen to death 5 days after the crash.

I am sure my colleagues read press accounts of the tragic deaths of the Oien family of Oregon, whose light plane crashed on a northern California mountain last March. The family, which included a 16-year-old girl, survived the crash and managed to stay alive for 2 full months before succumbing to exposure and starvation. The young girl's diary told of the frustration they felt hearing search planes overhead—planes which could not see them because of bad weather and had no other means of pinpointing the crash site.

It is appalling to me that the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines have been using successfully for 3 full years a simple little device that would clearly have saved the Oiens and the Lovelaces, and countless others. This automatic crash locating unit, developed and manufactured by ACR Electronics Corp., of New York City, has already saved the lives of more than 1,000 aircrews who crashed in Vietnam. The military unit is inexpensive, costing only $285 each. I understand that a similar unit could be adapted for civilian use for under $100. Even if the cost were far higher, the price would be minimal in terms of the lives this device could save. The FAA must be aware of the use being made of it by the military. Yet, it takes no action. It continues to study.

Mr. Speaker, I am calling upon the FAA to immediately certify an automatic crash locator and to issue a regulation requiring its use on all commercial and private aircraft in the United States. The FAA is studying air safety to death—literally. It is time to stop studying and start acting.

MILITARY DICTATORS ARE RUINING GREECE

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Fraser] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times magazine recently published a penetrating article about the terrible events occurring in Greece under the military officers who revolted and seized power last spring.

Dictatorship in its shabbiest dress now rules Greece, the land which gave birth to many of our most precious ideas of democracy and liberty. Surely our Nation and the other democracies of the West cannot consider doing business as usual with this band of men until constitutional government and freedom is restored.

I have unanimous consent to place in the RECORD the sad story of what this military junta is doing to the people and their freedoms in Greece.

The story follows:

AFTER THE ARRESTS—HOW THE MILITARY RULES 8 MILLION GREEKS

(By Maurice Goldbloom)

The military junta which seized power in Greece last April 21 is still nervous, but with each passing day it is less and less vulnerable. By now, neither a decision by King Constantine to break with it, nor a decision by the United States to cut off military aid would automatically topple it, though either would undoubtedly weaken it.

The attitude of most Greeks toward the King's role is summed up in a mot that has been going the rounds in Athens: "In the process of seduction, there is a point at which a girl must decide whether she is going to remain a virgin. The King has passed that point with the junta." In his recent appearances in the United States—in Washington with the President, in Newport for the America's Cup races—Constantine has apparently been acting as the regime's envoy. For its part, the United States, through its initial acquiescence, has given the junta the time it needed to dig in.

In other words, the junta, though not noticeably more popular, does seem to be more solidly entrenched. The coup was staged by no more than 200 to 400 officers—out of some 10,000 in the Greek Army. The ability of such a small group to seize power without significant opposition was largely the result of mistaken identity. Greeks had long been expecting—and right-wing Greeks had been hoping for—a coup by a large, nominally secret, but in fact well-known, organization dominated by senior officers known as IDEA. But over the years a small, rival organization of junior officers, called EENA, had been growing up almost unnoticed. At the time of the coup its leadership included only one general—Stylianos Patakos, now Minister of the Interior—and he had been made a brigadier only three months before. The group's most important leader was Col. George Papadopoulos—who happened also to be the man assigned by IDEA to transmit the orders for its coup to its followers throughout the army.

It was EENA that struck, but when Papadopoulos gave the signal its recipients thought they were obeying IDEA. Because there was no organized democratic group in the army, there was no military resistance. Because civilian political groups—including the weak and demoralized Communists—were prepared only for electoral activity, there was no popular resistance.

Once in, the junta lost no time in broadening its base of military support. Increasing the officer corps by approximately 10 per cent has enabled it to win the support of perhaps twice that many officers through promotions and new appointments. Key officers on whose loyalty it could not count were forced to retire. In the army, this purge for the most part took place immediately after the coup; in the navy, where the coup had received almost no support, the junta moved more slowly. Still, by mid-August more than 60 naval officers, mostly of high rank, were said to have been removed, and 11 to have been arrested.

Arrests, indeed, have been the junta's most conspicuous activity. The cases of former Premier George Papandreou of the Center Union, his son, Andreas Papandreou, and Mikis Theodorakis, composer of the score for "Zorba the Greek," have attracted worldwide attention, but there are thousands more, and the arrests show no signs of abating.

The original wave of arrests was based largely on an army list of suspects prepared nearly 20 years ago; the conspirators had been afraid to ask for more recent lists for fear of tipping their hand. Thus, many of those arrested in the first sweep were people who, whatever they might have been in the turbulent nineteen-forties, had long since ceased to be politically active.

Later arrests—which by now certainly outnumber those of the first wave—have been more selective. They affect all sections of the political spectrum, including parliamentary deputies, former Government ministers and several of the country's leading journalists. They also include a man who criticized the King in a telephone conversation with his sister, a bus driver who objected to letting a soldier ride free and numerous persons accused of such offenses as having five or more guests in their home or possessing a mimeograph and not registering it with the police.

Of those arrested at the time of the coup, more than 6,000 were sent to a hastily opened concentration camp on the island of Yiaros. (Some 1,500, most of whom had been arrested because of their official positions rather than for their politics, were soon released, though many remained under house arrest.) The Government has now announced the opening of a second major concentration camp on the island of Leros, to which prisoners are being transferred from Yiaros. This should be an improvement.

Yiaros is a completely waterless and barren island, swept by high winds. Before the coup it had an old and unused prison, with cells for a few hundred persons. When the detainees were dumped on the island, the prison was used to house some of the women. The other prisoners were housed in tents, 25 to a tent, grouped in three camps.

Some weeks later, at a time when the Government claimed to have released about a third of the prisoners originally there, it announced plans to construct reservoirs on the island which would make it possible for each prisoner to receive 15 liters (a little less than 4 gallons) of water a day. Clearly, the water supply during the first several weeks must have been barely enough for drinking, let alone sanitation.

Later, other ameliorations were promised. These included an improvement in the diet, which was said to have consisted mainly of beans, and the opening of a canteen at which prisoners could purchase additional food and other small necessities. Some of these improvements may have taken place. It at least appears reasonably certain that the canteen was opened—since underground channels reported a few weeks later that it had been closed again.

There are inevitable gaps and time lags in information on conditions in the various places of detention, since Yiaros and most of the others have been barred to journalists and foreigners. A representative of the International Red Cross has, to be sure, been permitted to visit them. But in accordance with the normal practice of that organization, his report was submitted only to the Greek Government, which never made it public.

The Government did, however, release a letter in which the Red Cross representative asked on humanitarian grounds that the 250 women confined in the old prison on Yiaros be transferred elsewhere, to accommodations more appropriate to their sex. (The circumstances of this release were such that one is impelled to wonder if the Government really desired to give it wide publicity. In the Greek Government press office, official releases are normally laid out on tables, arranged in the order of the numbers which they bear. They are available in Greek, English and French. This release had no number, it was not with the others, and it was available only in Greek.) I have seen no report indicating that such a transfer has in fact taken place, although the women may be among those now being moved to Leros.

If conditions on Yiaros have improved in some elementary physical respects, it appears that they have recently become worse in other ways. Some 250 of the "most dangerous" prisoners are said to have been segregated from the others, and to be confined to their quarters 20 hours a day. During the four hours in which they are allowed out, the other prisoners are confined, in order to prevent any contact between the two groups. And the three camps on the island are kept isolated from one another.

These changes probably result from the regime's disappointment at the failure of the prisoners to break down under its pressure. A condition for release is that the detainee sign a pledge to refrain from "antinational and anti-Governmental activity." Few politically significant prisoners have been willing to sign, regarding it as dishonorable.

Interior Minister Patakos complained to me: "Some of them are getting more hardened instead of reforming. They have organized by tents; a leader for each tent, and a group leader for each 8 or 10 tents. They have a president for each of the camps, and a general commander for the whole island. They have collected 250,000 drachmas [a little more than $8,000] among themselves, for what purpose I do not know, but I am sure it is not a good one."

As one of the "Communist" leaders of the hardened prisoners, Patakos mentioned Dimitrios Stratis. When I remarked that the 78-year-old Stratis, a veteran trade-union leader and leftwing parliamentary deputy whom I know well, was not a Communist, Patakos replied: "He calls himself a Socialist, but he is a Communist. In Greece, we have right people and wrong people. All those who are against the country are Communists. Stratis is a Communist in his heart and his works. They are all liars."

Yiaros and the courts-martial which hand out sentences of five years for writing slogans on walls and eight years for *lèse-majesté* are not the Government's only instruments of intimidation. Some Greeks beyond the borders have had their citizenship revoked—most notably, the actress Melina Mercouri, who seems to have come out ahead on the exchange.

Many persons regarded as potential troublemakers have been taken to police stations and badly beaten, as a warning, without being formally arrested; this treatment has been most often used on students and other young people. The security police have visited private employers with lists of "unreliable" individuals who are to be discharged. Many people have had their telephones removed because of their political views; all have been discouraged from talking politics on the phone or writing about it to friends by the knowledge that phones are likely to be tapped and letters opened.

But the junta has not relied on terror alone to consolidate its position. Rather, it has systematically endeavored to entrench itself in every aspect of Greek life. On the national level, despite the existence of a nominally civilian Government, an army officer plays a key role in every ministry—in some cases as minister, in others as secretary general, in still others as a political commissar without official title.

The tenure of civil servants has been

abolished; many have been removed for their ideas, and all have been ordered to pledge their loyalty to the regime on pain of dismissal. The purge has not been confined to such politically sensitive departments as the police, where 118 high-ranking officials and police doctors were dismissed in mid-August. (Others had been ousted previously, individually or in smaller batches.) It has even affected the director of the Byzantine Museum, an internationally known scholar.

Locally, the regime has destroyed the system of nonpolitical nomarchs or district administrators, whose establishment American advisers once regarded as one of their major achievements. More than half the nomarchs have been removed; most of their replacements are army officers. While asserting its belief in the decentralization of authority, the Government has removed large numbers of elected mayors and local councils and replaced them with appointees chosen in Athens.

Nor has it confined itself to the governmental sphere. It has seized control of the Orthodox Church. It has dissolved hundreds of private organizations and removed the officers of numerous others, including bar associations, agricultural cooperatives and the Jewish community.

The United States Embassy in Athens clearly does not like the regime, though most Greeks regard it as responsible for the coup—an opinion the junta assiduously encourages. (A skeptcal friend remarked to me, after seeing one of the coup leaders in action, "Now I believe what you say about the Americans not being behind the coup; they'd never have chosen these people!") But the Embassy also regards the present Government as a lesser evil than a revolt against it, and has therefore placed its hope in persuading the junta to practice self-denial and restore democracy voluntarily. Its influence is limited, since the junta now feels certain that the United States will continue military aid whatever happens. (Some weeks after the coup, the U.S. did cut off certain items, estimated by the Defense Department at 10 percent of the total.)

Nevertheless, the Embassy and State Department see great cause for optimism in the appointment of a committee of jurists to draw up a revised Constitution by the end of the year for submission to a plebiscite. This is supposed to lead to a speedy and orderly restoration of constitutional government.

This assessment appears to contain a large measure of wishful thinking. The group named to draw up the new Constitution included a few persons of some distinction, several conservative nonentities and a few with rather unpleasant reputations. But the members were not consulted before their appointments were announced, and some of the best-known have refused to serve.

The Government's influence on the deliberations of the committee is not likely to be cast on the side of democratic institutions. While Premier Constantine V. Kollias has said the new Constitution will be only slightly changed from the present one, journalists close to the junta have called for much more drastic alterations. Among the suggestions offered are a ban on political activity by anyone who has ever cooperated with the extreme left, a requirement that all candidates have loyalty certificates from the security police, and the exclusion from office of anyone who has ever held foreign citizenship.

The first of these provisions would not only bar all those in the United Democratic Left (EDA), a party which contains some hard-core Communists but also a wide range of non-Communists. It would also ban most members of Papandreou's Center Union and a number of people now on the right—including some ex-Communists who hold office under the junta or are among its advisers. (For example, Theophylaktos Papaconstantinou, whom the Government has placed in charge of the press, is a former Communist theoretician. So is the editor of Eleftheros Kosmos, the newspaper widely regarded as closest to the junta.)

The significance of the second is shown by a story told by a friend who had served as an officer attached to the general staff. One of his duties was to investigate the qualifications of officer candidates. In the dossier of one he found a report from the Security Police: "A. is a dangerous subversive, being closely associated with the politician Constantine Rendis." At the time of the report, Rendis, who belonged to the right-center, was Minister of Public Order and the superior of the police official who wrote it.

The third proposal is aimed primarily at Andreas Papandreou, a former American citizen and the man on whom millions of Greeks rest their hopes for their country's future.

When I asked Patakos what constitutional changes the Government would propose to the committee, he mentioned none of these specific points, although he referred in a general way to changes in the qualifications of deputies. In response to a question, he added that the Premier named by the King would still have to receive the support of a majority in Parliament. He added that these ideas were merely being considered very tentatively; the one point on which the Government was determined was that the new Constitution must cure all the faults of the existing system. Apprised of this statement, one diplomat remarked: "That's easy; all he has to do is change eight million Greeks."

Whatever kind of Constitution may emerge from the committee, the problem of implementation will still remain. The embassy appears to rely on the King and Patakos—the member of the junta who is regarded as most susceptible to the influence of the palace—to promote the restoration of a constitutional regime. Patakos, however, does not seem to have any such intention. He told me: "We are not interested in elections; if we were, we wouldn't have made a revolution. This system we have now is the best system, because what we have now we have achieved with the people's support, so there is no need for elections. We have more serious problems than elections. What we have done we did in order to achieve certain aims, and when we have achieved these aims, then we will have time for elections . . . We are frank people. We are not liars and we do not want to make false elections, the way they do in Russia with 98 per cent; therefore there will be no elections."

But even if Patakos could be induced to support a prompt return to constitutionality, it is unlikely that he could accomplish it. Unlike Colonel Papadopoulos, who organized the coup, Patakos appears to have little talent for conspiracy or political infighting. He seems a basically decent if insensitive man, whose political naiveté is almost incredible. (He is responsible for most of the pronouncements which have brought ridicule on the junta—the bans on miniskirts, beards, long hair, etc.) A soldier of peasant origin (a brother is said to be still working on the roads in Crete), he rose slowly through the ranks for 37 years, becoming a brigadier general and commander of the tank school three months before the coup. Only then does he seem to have been brought into the conspiracy—because the tanks he controlled were necessary to its success. One suspects that he joined partly because of resentment at the establishment—civil and military—on which he blamed his slow promotion (he talks with obvious bitterness of the 10 years he lingered as a lieutenant colonel), and partly because he really believes the moralistic slogans to which others in the Government pay lip service.

In any showdown between Patakos and Papadopoulos, the latter seems far more likely to be the victor. Indeed, the other members of the junta may in any case drop Patakos when they feel strong enough to do so. He might even end up on Yiaros. If he should, I would not expect him to sign a declaration in order to obtain his release.

But if the junta does not seem likely to give up power voluntarily, there are factors which may eventually lead to its downfall. One is the difficulty of getting competent personnel to work for it. The population of Greece is about the same as that of New York City, and the proportion of trained personnel is much lower. If one eliminates a majority of the population—and a much larger majority of the well educated—on political grounds, it becomes difficult to find competent people for important positions. Moreover, many whom the junta might be willing to appoint do not want to serve under present conditions; in one instance, it has had to draft a retired official into the army in order to make him assume a top post in a ministry.

This difficulty may explain some of the peculiar appointments the Government has made. One, particularly strange for a regime which talks in terms of moral regeneration, is that of Constantine Thanos as Secretary General of the Ministry of Coordination and Alternate Governor of the World Bank, two of the most important economic posts it had to fill. Mr. Thanos was, a few years back, rejected for a teaching post at the University of Athens because it was discovered that the thesis he submitted in support of his application was a verbatim plagiarism from a memorandum by Prof. Benjamin Beckhart of Columbia. The incident is not the only one of its type in Mr. Thanos's career.

But the Government may well feel that it cannot look too closely into the moral credentials of anyone who can help it solve its economic problems, for these are very great, and almost certain to increase. At the beginning of June, Greece had short-term debts of about $20-million more than its official gold and foreign-exchange reserves. (Some $100-million in gold sovereigns, the purchase and sale of which were used to stabilize the currency internally, did not appear in the official reserves. The exact amount in this fund was secret.) And Greece's three principal sources of foreign exchange—emigrant remittances (about one Greek worker in five is employed abroad), tourism and shipping—all seem likely to drop sharply this year, as does foreign investment.

In addition, it is almost certain that a loan of about $100-million which had been promised by the European Economic Community will now be postponed, if not canceled. Nor have the financial prospects been improved by the resignation of the internationally known economists Xenophon Zolotas and Michael Pesmazoglou as Governor and First Deputy Governor of the Bank of Greece.

No wonder that a former minister says of Col. Nicholas Makarezos, who as Minister of Coordination is in charge of economic policy: "He's the only one of them who thinks seriously about problems; that's why he always looks worried." The colonel's worries seem likely to come to a head within the next six months. By that time, the Government is widely expected to run out of cash. (It is already asking for U.S. economic aid.) It may be able to renew credits as they come due, simply because creditors will prefer to keep their loans on the books instead of pushing them into default. But without new credits, which seem unlikely, there will have to be drastic import restrictions and currency controls; there may be a devaluation of the drachma and a sharp reduction in the standard of living.

The political repercussions of such a development are unpredictable. It may be that the opposition will still be too disorganized to take advantage of the situation, and that the Government will be able to ride out the crisis. But it is also possible that students—

who are difficult to control because their leadership is always being renewed—and workers returning from northern Europe, where many of them have already organized against the junta, will by then form the basis of an effective resistance movement. And if the regime is not able to keep up the standard of living of the armed forces—particularly the officer corps—trouble could come from that quarter.

Such a situation could conceivably result in a countercoup. Or the junta might turn to a foreign adventure, particularly in Cyprus. This past summer, there were sounds from Athens of a new drive for *enosis,* the union of Cyprus with Greece. (They produced no sympathetic echoes among Greek Cypriotes.)

Or the regime might seek to rally popular support by swinging in a Peronist or National Bolshevist direction. There are already some signs that it is considering this option. One is a decree prohibiting any Greek, including employes of foreign companies and international organizations in Greece, from getting more in salaries, allowance and pensions than the Premier receives—about $18,000 a year. (The junta issued a decree raising the salaries of Cabinet ministers substantially, but forbade the press to mention it. Some days later another decree was issued reducing the salaries—but to a point well above their previous levels. The reduction was then publicized, without mentioning the previous raise.) It has also raised pensions for peasants by about two-thirds. And Agriculture Minister Alexander Matthaiou's first radio address was not only filled with leftist phrases, but was couched in a form of the *Demotiki* (the popular language, traditionally championed by the left as against the *Katherevousa* or "pure" language backed by the right) so extreme that it is regarded as the trademark of the Communist party and shunned by everybody else. A move in this direction might also take on an anti-monarchical aspect; not all the members of the junta regard the King as indispensable.

It might seem strange for a rightist government to move in this direction. But the junta does not represent the traditional Greek right, rooted largely in property and birth. Its leaders are men of lower and middle-class background. They may hate the left, but they have no love for the conservative establishment.

INSURANCE COMPANIES PLAN SLUM INVESTMENT THROUGH RENT SUPPLEMENT PROGRAM

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's efforts to develop creative cooperation between private industry and Government is bearing fruit. A major breakthrough in this effort is the recent announcement by the chairman of the board of Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. that the life insurance companies of the country have pledged a special effort to work toward alleviation of the problems of the central cities. Their pledge takes the form of a $1 billion investment in improving housing conditions largely through the Rent Supplement program which the President is urging Congress to extend.

The Minneapolis Tribune of September 17 commented favorably on the insurance companies' commitment to the improvement of life in the Nation's cities, and with permission granted I include the Tribune editorial in the RECORD:

A One-Billion-Dollar Commitment To Better Cities

"There is a great feeling that the attempts to do something about the urban problem have been mainly speeches, programs and committees," said John S. Pillsbury Jr., president of Northwestern National Life Insurance Co. "The people who are suffering say, 'Let's see some action.'"

The life insurance industry announced last week a $1-billion commitment to action. The money will be invested in housing and job-producing industries in the poverty areas of the cities. Twin Cities-based Northwestern National Life and Minnesota Mutual Life Insurance Co. each has agreed to invest up to $5 million in this way. Other companies that do business in Minnesota probably will add to the slum-investment cash.

The industry action is an example of the enlightened self-interest we have been urging to help solve the problems of our urban society. In the short run, in this period of tight money and high interest rates, the insurance industry could find more lucrative investment opportunities. In the long run, however, that industry and the economy will benefit from the uplift of the poor.

The action also is an example of how the government can encourage private business to become involved in such problems. In this case, the federal government can take some of the risk out of the investments through rent supplements, mortgage guarantees and other measures. We hope Congress comes through with rent supplement appropriations.

For Minneapolis, the additional money should provide more financing to buy or rehabilitate inner-city homes. It might furnish capital for landlords to fix up their property to lease to the city for scattered-site public housing under a rent subsidy program. It could speed up development of new housing in the Grant renewal area on the North Side.

We applaud the insurance industry and look for more examples of such major involvement in the great urban crisis of our times.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S TAX PROGRAM BENEFITS THE AMERICAN FARMER

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, in the current debate on fiscal policy, one of the main issues in the debate—the actual effects of the surtax proposal—is being buried by a smokescreen of charge and countercharge.

Coming from Minnesota, a State where agriculture is an important part of the economy, I have been interested in the effects which the surtax would have on the American farmer—a mainstay of American society.

I would recall that the administration's surtax proposal falls least heavily on those in the lowest income brackets. For example, 60 percent of all farm families in the United States fall below the adjusted gross income of $5,000 a year, and are therefore completely exempt from paying the surcharge. But, without the passage of the surtax, aggravated inflation will cause interest rates on credit to go up. The credit market will contract. Government agencies which offer credit to farmers for a multitude of purposes will be forced to curtail their activities, and millions of farm families could suffer.

In addition, there are other compelling reasons why the American farmer should support this surtax proposal. It will mean stable prices. It will mean a good supply of credit.

And it will help sustain almost 7 years of prosperity the Nation has enjoyed under Democratic administrations.

I urge the House to approve the President's 1968 budget, and the 10-percent surtax along with it.

Each day of hesitation increases our Government's financial problems.

COMPULSORY LOAN PROPOSAL

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, on September 20, I addressed this body on the desirability of an involuntary loan from each taxpayer of 10 percent of his tax liability instead of the proposed 10 percent surtax. I said that the surcharge idea was advanced by Economist Harold M. Somers, of the University of California at Los Angeles.

I was pleased to note in today's letters to the editor section of the Washington Post that Professor Melville J. Ulmer, of the University of Maryland, has also endorsed the surcharge as an effective way to halt inflation.

Professor Ulmer points to the dangers of the present stalemate on anti-inflation legislation, and to the inherent flexibility of the surcharge as a tool to combat both upturns and downturns in the economy.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to include Professor Ulmer's letter at this point, and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

Compulsory Loan Proposal

Recent price increases could be only a modest beginning to a sharp inflation in the year ahead, if the official forecast of the Council of Economic Advisers is correct. Yet, despite abundant debate, decisive action of some kind to counter the upward trend of prices does not seem imminent. In fact for a year and a half, while the consumers' price index climbed by fully five per cent, the Nation's economic policy has called to mind nothing so much as a mesmerized bird, frozen in the glare of an onrushing snake.

Underlying the recent indecision, however, are three formidable obstacles that are not easily surmounted. First, only the blissfully innocent place unqualified faith in economic forecasts, official or otherwise. There are crosscurrents on the horizon and six months from now, by the time a promptly enacted tax increase could take effect, economic activity could be moving downward. The tax change, in that event, would just deepen the recession.

Secondly, the heavily taxed American public has been less than enthusiatic about the Administration's proposal for a 10 per cent increase in the levy on incomes—a fact not lost on members of Congress. Thirdly, those who eye with proper skepticism the space program, the huge public investment in supersonic aircraft, the superfluous troops maintained in Europe, and some similar items in the Federal budget, wonder why public expenditures cannot be reduced so that a tax increase would be unnecessary.

But meanwhile, *nothing* is done. And the probability that the official forecast is right cannot be discounted, and ought not to be ignored.

To break the stalemate, the present writer wishes to offer a proposal that would block inflation promptly, if it develops, and yet meet the objections of those who oppose the administration's tax increase. The proposal is that each taxpayer be required to *lend* the government an amount equal to 10 per cent of his tax liability, the sum to be repaid with five per cent cumulative interest at the end of three years. The loan would appear, initially, as a surcharge on tax liability, and would have much the same deflationary impact on the Nation's spending as an outright increase in taxes. As a loan with interest, however, it would be less punishing to the taxpayer. It should also, therefore, be more palatable to Congress.

The use of this compulsory loan technique has one other highly important advantage. It must be acknowledged that the forecast for further inflation could be wrong, and the present proposal can easily allow for this possibility. Although the taxpayer's loan is nominally for three years, the President should be empowered to repay the loan in full at any earlier date, if desirable. Hence, if business activity turned down, the loan would be promptly refunded with all the effects of an expansionary tax cut—but without the interminable debates and delays that ordinarily attend changes in tax rates.

The plan proposed here is based on the "forced savings" theory of John Maynard Keynes, offered as a means for financing World War II, and a similar scheme suggested by Harold M. Somers of the University of California at Los Angeles. The plan is not meant as a substitute for cutting low priority items from the Nation's budget. These should be reduced or eliminated regardless of what is done to taxes. The plan is not designed as a substitute for ending oil depletion allowances or for closing other tax loopholes. Nevertheless, we may be waiting for some time for such commendable achievements. Meanwhile, the present economic situation requires prompt and forthright action. Adoption of the compulsory loan plan would enable us to take it.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON AND PROGRESS

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I want to take a moment to congratulate the President of the United States, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Commerce, and others who have come up with what I regard as a most imaginative program in our constant struggle in the the war against poverty.

What I refer to, of course, is the announced plan to mobilize the vast resources of private industry so that it might work, along with our Federal Government, to assist in finding jobs and to provide the proper training for the many thousands of what we call our hard-core unemployed.

As Secretary of Labor Wirtz said the other day, "jobs are the live ammunition in the war on poverty, and the right kind of jobs are jobs in private employment." He made a distinction between on-the-job training as compared with institutional training, pointing out that on-the-job training is the best kind of training for the hard-core unemployed. And of course this on-the-job training can only come through the cooperation and participation of private enterprise.

The Federal Government will increase its assistance to the private sector of our economy in order to generate a large-scale response from this sector in creating new job opportunities either in existing plants already located near the central cities, or in plants to be built with some form of Government assistance. In other words, the Government will help relieve the private enterprise firm of the extra expenses it will incur in the process of training and placement of the hard-core unemployed.

I will not attempt to go into all the technicalities of the new plan but I would like to make two points:

First, I don't think this is a radical departure from the Government's pattern of efforts to help solve the hard-core unemployment problems. Rather it is a natural extension of the overall concentrated employment programs of the major cities which has been so successful in enlisting the cooperation of private employers.

Second, I am fully confident that American private enterprise can lick just about any problem and in partnership with the Federal Government under such an imaginative program, I am confident that this pressing problem of the hard-core unemployed will at last be solved.

I am proud to note that San Antonio is one of the cities selected for this pilot program.

I look forward to seeing this program implemented and I hope that our private sector will rally to the call and give it all it has got.

SAN ANTONIO YOUTH FAIR

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, on September 19 and 20, a distinguished group of San Antonio citizens once again staged a tremendous Youth Opportunities Fair in the historic Villita Assembly Hall.

It was our community's way of helping its young to find their way, to discover their "niche" in life, if possible.

I would like to share with you and my colleagues the report of Mr. Roy A. Broussard, the fair's manager.

I want to salute Mr. Broussard and members of the advisory council which planned the fair for the wonderful work and dedication which they gave to this unique and outstanding event. They are: Ben Singleton, A. V. Macaluso, Neil Ohrt, Eugene Salmon, Gilbert de la Cruz, George Purvis, Ismael Landez, Francis B. Roser, Alvino Perez, Ann Van Griner, Augusto Vidales, Jack P. Muirell, Al Abrego, Harry Burns, S. L. Deckard, Rudy Guerrero, Manuel Ruiz Ibanez, Rev. A. C. Sutton, Ann Whitehead, Joe V. Alvarado, Guadalupe Gibson, William Bently, Mitchel L. Ammons, Clarkson Gross, Bill Henderson, Louis Alvarez, Bill Bailey, Dudley McEvoy, Dr. William Elizondo, S. A. Robinson, Rev. Henry Casso, Judge James A. McKay, Jr., James Martin, Jr., Olan LeBaron, Johnnie Johnson, D. R. Bolton, Joseph A. Freire, Jr., W. L. Flatt, Dallas Clark, B. J. Nichol, Dolores Bradley, Jake Roariguez, Clyde Smith, and Charles Cueller.

Mr. Broussard's report is as follows:

YOUTH OPPORTUNITY FAIR: BRINGING CAREERS WITHIN REACH

At 2:30 on the afternoon of September 19, 1967, Mayor Walter W. McAllister opened the Second Annual Youth Opportunity Fair in San Antonio, Texas. At the opening ceremony were a number of local and state dignitaries, approximately 400 young people, and the majority of school superintendents representing San Antonio's fourteen (14) independent school districts.

It was a typical, warm and sunny day as the mayor "busted" the ceremonial ribbon made of newspaper want ads on job opportunities. Little did the audience realize that hurricane Beulah was to play a major role during this second annual career information program.

In spite of the rain, wind, and general turmoil instigated by the fierce old gal, the second annual Youth Opportunity Fair was, nonetheless, tremendously successful.

In spite of the constant rainfall and severe weather news bulletins, some fifty-five organizations had exhibits assembled in the Villita Assembly Hall—an excellent indication of the committed concern of the community of Bexar County for its population of young people.

To not list each of these exhibitors in this report would certainly be an injustice; to list every single exhibitor is definitely justifiable, as well as a number indication of the gratitude felt by the Advisory Council of the Youth Opportunity Fair, Inc.

Hence, the council salutes and commends each of the following exhibitors who played a magnificent role in bringing careers within reach.

EXHIBITORS 1967 YOUTH OPPORTUNITY FAIR

BUSINESS

IBM Corporation.
Braniff International.
Southwestern Bell Telephone Company.
Friedrich Refrigerators, Inc.
Precision Manufacturing Company.
Sears, Roebuck and Company.
Joske's of Texas.
Coca-Cola Bottling Company.
Travelers Insurance Company.
United Services Automobile Association.
Frost National Bank.
National Bank of Commerce.
Handy-Andy, Inc.
Texas Insurance Field Men's Association.
San Antonio Hotel and Motel Association.

MEDICAL

Baptist Memorial Hospital.
Robert B. Green Hospital.
Santa Rosa Medical Center.
Southwest Texas Methodist Hospital.
San Antonio District Dental Hygienist Society.

GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

City of San Antonio.
City Public Service Board.
Office of Economic Opportunity—VISTA.
San Antonio River Authority.
State Department of Public Welfare.
Texas Employment Commission.
U.S. Civil Service Commission.

U.S. ARMED FORCES

Armed Forces Recruiting Stations.
Aerospace Medical Division, Brooks AFB.
Brooke Army Medical Center, Ft. Sam Houston.
San Antonio Air Material Area, Kelly AFB.
U.S. Army Medical Training Center, Ft. Sam Houston.

EDUCATIONAL & TRAINING INSTITUTIONS

St. Mary's University.
Incarnate Word College.
San Antonio College.
St. Philip's College.
Harlandale Independent School District.
Community College.
Durham Colleges.
Ogtell's Academy of Beauty Culture.
Strauch Beauty College.
Texas Vocational Schools, Inc.
Gary Job Corps Training Center.
San Antonio Neighborhood Youth Organization.
Texas Educational Service Center.
Victor Better Business Service.
Hick's Beauty School.

MISCELLANEOUS

Congressman Henry B. Gonzalez' Office.
March of Dimes.
San Antonio Association for Retarded Children.
KAPE Radio Station.

The tremendous participation of the foregoing organizations can only be appreciated when one visualizes the thousands upon thousands of handouts on career information distributed during the two days of the Fair; by visualizing hundreds of young people being given first-hand information on the opportunities offered by being a police officer, a fireman, a soldier, sailor, airman, Wac, Waf, a VISTA volunteer, a cosmetologist, a Job Corp trainee, a plumber, a bank teller, a telephone operator, a sales person, an LVN, a registered nurse, an x-ray technician, a medical orderly and 20,000 other careers in the medical field, an unlimited number of careers in civil service, a multitude of jobs offered by the Texas Employment Commission—name the job and/or career and a young person attending the Fair could obtain all the information needed concerning his or her particular interest.

Imagine all medical institutions in Bexar County—the Baptist Memorial Hospital, Santa Rosa Medical Center, Robert B. Green County Hospital, the University of Texas Medical Complex, Brooke Army Medical Center, and the Aerospace Medical Division, Brooks A.F.B.—distributing information on the unlimited opportunities in Health careers.

And, moreover, consider the fact that the Coca-Cola booth handed out some 18,000 free "Coke" samples during the first half day of the Fair. Interest and generosity were tremendous during the Fair, one vocational school even gave out a free course in plumbing to a lucky young man, some exhibitors gave cookies and cake; Ogtell's Academy of Beauty Culture, Inc., Straunch's Beauty College and Hick's Beauty School, a school to train Negro beauty operators, were offering free beauty services to young ladies and female adults who had coiffures ruined by a constant rain.

The fair participants, both exhibitors and youths, were handicapped by Beulah; however, the exhibitors' desire to contribute and the youths' eagerness to be informed both prevailed, and the two day program was a success.

Many school districts were bringing high school students to the Fair in buses even though these districts are limited in available transportation. The superintendents of these districts are to be commended for their desire in having the students in each respective district take full advantage of this career information program.

Others who are to be commended for sincere cooperation, at the national level, by endorsing and sponsoring the Youth Opportunity Fair of 1967 are: Senators Ralph W. Yarborough and John G. Tower, and Congressman Henry B. Gonzalez; a special commendation is also afforded the honorable Hubert H. Humphrey, vice-president of the United States, who, as chairman of the President's Council on Youth Opportunity, endorsed the Fair and sent a personal letter of invitation to the youth of Bexar County, requesting that they take advantage of this program.

STATISTICS AND OBJECTIVES OF YOF

In order to serve both the in-school junior and senior high school students and the school dropouts, certain steps were taken by the Advisory Council of Youth Opportunity Fair. One was a survey on the number of junior and senior high school students in all school districts in San Antonio—the survey follows:

SURVEY ON NUMBER OF JUNIOR AND SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS IN BEXAR COUNTY

School district	Junior high school students	Senior high school students	Total
Alamo Heights Independent School District, 7101 Broadway	940	1,846	2,786
East Central School District, Stuart Rd	406	621	1,027
Edgewood Independent School District, 6458 West Commerce	3,396	4,260	7,656
Fort Sam Houston Independent School District, Winans Rd	320	446	766
Harlandale Independent School District, 102 Genevieve	3,600	3,650	7,250
Judson Rural School District, Old Seguin Rd	245	350	595
North East Independent School District, 10214 Sommers	2,837	2,256	5,093
Northside Independent School District, Evers Rd	3,946	6,681	10,627
San Antonio Independent School District, Lavaca at Matagorda	18,385	15,192	33,577
Special Education Enrollment, SAISD	239	169	408
Schertz-Cibolo Independent School District, Schertz	428	572	1,000
South San Antonio Independent School District, 2515 Navajo	950	1,200	2,150
Southside School District, Martinez Rd	505	398	903
Southwest Independent School District, Macdona Rd	287	339	626
San Antonio Catholic Archdiocese School	1,444	1,386	2,830
Total	37,928	39,366	77,294

The Advisory Council then knew that there were approximately 77,294 junior and senior high school students who could utilize the Youth Opportunity Fair resource.

The second step undertaken was that of getting the school drop outs to attend the Fair.

Included in this group were the dropouts, delinquents, youth on probation, and youth with other problems. Contacts were made with the many community centers in the city, the Juvenile Probation Office, Federal Housing Units, Economic Opportunity Development Corporation, EODC, and other organizations thereunder, such as Project FREE and the San Antonio Neighborhood Youth Organizations, SANYO.

During these contacts, moreover, pictures were taken of young people holding the Youth Opportunity Fair theme poster and inviting all youths (in accompanying newspaper stories) to attend the Fair. The newspapers, radio and TV media responded by giving the Fair their full cooperation. The three San Antonio TV stations each alloted six twenty second spot announcements, in color, by youth of all three ethnic groups in San Antonio. The radio stations also offered spot announcements. Youth was used to deliver the message on the Fair to other young people whereby there could be an identification concept.

Another tremendous boost was the San Antonio Bus Card Agency allowing the Youth Opportunity Fair some 265 free bus card spaces on the city buses.

In order to arrive at some conclusions as to the response made in youth attendance, a registration form was developed to be completed by all youths who attended the Fair—this form identified the youths in school, in employment, in college, out of school, and youth looking for work.

A sampling was made on the morning of the second day of the Fair. The results of this sampling, taken from the number of youth who attended the Fair between the hours of 9:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m., at the aforementioned time follows:

Statistics on youths attending Youth Opportunity Fair, Sept. 20, 1967, between the hours of 9 a.m. to 11 a.m.

Group name	*Number of youths*
Alamo Heights School District	308
East Central School District	22
Edgewood School District	467
Fort Sam Houston School District	308
Harlandale School District	114
Judson Rural School District	22
North East School District	57
Northside School District	46
San Antonio Catholic Archdiocese School	71
San Antonio Independent School District	96
Schertz-Cibolo School District	17
South San Antonio School District	16
Southside School District	27
Southwest School District	14
Total number of in-school youths attending during sampling	1,379
Students in college	11
Dropouts	131
Youths looking for work	6
Students in vocational schools	14
Status unidentified	2

Total number of out of public school youths attending during sampling 164.

Total number of all youths attending during 3 hour sampling 1,543.

Approximate total attendance during both days of Fair 6,000 to 8,000.

Because of severe weather conditions some youths forgot their registration slips at home or never got to register at the entrance—it was raining constantly during the three hours of this sampling.

In conclusion, the Youth Opportunity Fair Advisory Council wishes to report that in spite of the weather, the Second Annual Youth Opportunity Fair was a tremendous success; in spite of the weather all exhibitors stood their ground; in spite of the tornado warnings the youth of San Antonio turned out for the Fair; and, that the entire Bexar County community should be commended for a job well done in behalf of its future citizens—everyone is now looking forward to the Youth Opportunity Fair of 1968.

IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 1411

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Eilberg] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I wish to go on record today as supporting H.R. 1411 introduced by the Congressman from Arizona [Mr. Udall] and related bills which are designed to tighten up the existing postal laws to prevent the U.S. mails from being used as an instrument to defraud.

The proposed legislation which I support would amend one of the provisions of the existing law, the purpose of which is to protect the consuming public. However, experience shows the present provisions need strengthening if they are to be really effective in their purpose to prevent the use of the mails to obtain property or money under false representations.

The provisions which I would amend are to be found at section 4005 of title 39 of the United States Code. The present provisions are already designed to protect a consumer to some extent from false representations when sent through the U.S. mail. The present provisions authorize the Post Office Department to return to the customer mail containing remittances, generally in the form of checks or money orders, which the potential customer has sent to the unscrupulous promoter.

In order to establish a basis to issue a mail-stop order under the present statute, the Post Office is required to prove: First, that advertising is being used by a promoter who seeks money or property through the mail; second, the advertising contains representations which are material and false as a matter of fact; and third, the false representations were made with intent to deceive.

Before issuing a mail-stop order, the Post Office Department gives an advertiser alleged to be violating the statute an opportunity to discontinue the objectionable representations and to return the mail he receives as a result of such representations. If he does not, and a violation is established, the Postmaster General issues a mail-stop order requiring the postmaster at the promoter's post office of delivery to return to the sender any mail addressed to the promoter which contains remittances or relates to the objectionable representations.

The Postmaster General's mail-stop orders merely deprive the unscrupulous operators of their right to receive remittances through the mails which they have solicited through false representations. The operators' rights would continue to be protected under the Administrative Procedure Act and in the courts.

As the law is presently written, the Post Office Department is not usually troubled with proving the use of the advertising, or that the advertising contains representations which are material and false as a matter of fact, but it is seriously hampered by the necessity of meeting the burden of proof as to intent. The courts have held that the word "fraudulent" as used in the statute requires a proof of intent. As the Postmaster General has observed, the operation of a man's mind is a most difficult thing to prove.

It is especially difficult for the Post Office Department to prove because that Department does not have subpoena power to build certain pertinent evidence bearing on the element of intent. Moreover, since the promoters rarely take the stand to testify, they cannot be cross-examined. There are frequently situations where the falsity of the claims are clearly apparent but where fraud orders are denied simply because intent to deceive could not be established.

There is precedent for the change which I support. There are other statutes applying to other regulatory agencies which are operative against false advertising and where intent is not an element of required proof. For example, the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act imposes criminal penalties for misbranding through deceptive packaging and neither intent to defraud nor awareness of violation need be proved for the imposition of a criminal penalty under the deceptive packaging section of that act. The Securities Exchange Commission is also authorized to proceed against the false stock prospectus without the burden of establishing intent.

The proposal which I support would, if enacted, change the present law in that it would eliminate the necessity for establishing the intent to deceive. Proof of falsity of advertising claims would be made a sufficient basis for a civil action.

H.R. 1411 is designed to close one of the existing loopholes now being utilized by unscrupulous promoters to defraud. It will eliminate the present burden of proving that the unscrupulous promoter actually had the intent to deceive when he sent the false representation through the mail.

The areas of greatest abuse under the present law appear to involve fraudulent real estate development schemes, phony franchise distributorships, phony medical apparatuses, insurance swindles, and chain referral plans whereby housewives are led to believe that they will recoup the cost of overpriced merchandise such as vacuum cleaners, food freezers, and the like if they supply the names of friends who might be potential customers.

The proposed legislation has the support of the National Association of Real Estate Boards which represents 88,000 realtors who do about 90 percent of the real estate business in the United States. In testifying before the committee, their representative stated that he would like to see the Post Office Department equipped with legislation such as that embodied in H.R. 1411 to afford the Department an opportunity to minimize the fraudulent sale of land through the use of the U.S. mails.

The need for legislation of the type I favor has been recognized for some time. The Post Office Department has recommended that the law be amended and a number of bills have been introduced in both the House and Senate since 1960 to bring this about. In the 89th Congress, a bill similar to the one I support was passed by the House but no action was taken on it by the other body. In this Congress, H.R. 1411 has been favorably reported by the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service on May 10, 1967.

It might be mentioned that the President, in his message to the Congress dated February 16, 1967, on "Consumer Protection" (H. Doc. No. 57) made reference to the need for Federal legislation which would protect both the buyer and the legitimate seller in interstate mail order transactions. Only the Federal Government, in other words, the Congress has the power to amend the postal laws.

The Postmaster General, following his appointment as a member of the Committee on Consumer Interests recently established by the President, referred to the fact that the current prosperity of the country has "whetted the appetite of the mail fraud swindler." Complaints received by the Post Office Department indicate that instances of alleged mail fraud are ever increasing. It is estimated that more than 130,000 are expected to be received by the Post Office Department in 1967 and this will be double the number of complaints received 5 years ago.

In my opinion, the need for the amendment has been amply demonstrated and the proposals incorporated in H.R. 1411 appear to me to be sound. I urge my colleagues to join with me in enacting legislation which will reform the law in this respect.

CERTAIN EFFORTS WOULD WEAKEN OEO

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Fulton] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, recently, I received a letter from Mr. Charles E. Scripps, chairman of the board, Scripps-Howard newspapers, Cincinnati, Ohio, writing to me as a member of the Business Leadership Advisory Council of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Mr. Scripps, in his letter, presented as lucid and as levelheaded an appeal in behalf of the Office of Economic Opportunity and its programs as I have encountered to date, and I include his letter in the RECORD at this point:

SCRIPPS-HOWARD NEWSPAPERS,
Cincinnati, Ohio, September 7, 1967.
Hon. RICHARD H. FULTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FULTON: I am a member of the Business Leadership Advisory Council of the Office of Economic Opportunity. In this capacity, I would like to express my personal concern about certain efforts in Congress that would tend to weaken the O.E.O.

I believe a strong O.E.O. is needed *for the time being*, for the following reasons:

An aggressive and immediate effort to deal with the problems of poverty continues to be essential to the welfare of the country. A centralized management of programs to this end should rest in a single agency until considerably more progress has been made.

Any dismantling of O.E.O. would result in increased frustration and agitation in our cities. Efforts to this end would provide effective propaganda for the extremist agitators.

There is no escaping the fact that over the past four decades poverty has become increasingly a part of the everyday working economy of the nation. This condition is here to stay. It is a negative part, and extremely expensive.

At one time, the poor were relatively isolated physically and economically, but public welfare and migration to the cities have greatly changed the picture. This condition isn't likely to change. The only economic answer is a major effort to eliminate the causes of poverty wherever possible.

It seems evident that the traditional local public and private programs and institutions have not been equal to the task. Migration to the cities, and increasing public acceptance of responsibility for the poor, and a number of other contributing factors have overwhelmed the capacity of the local agencies to deal with the jobs they were designed to do.

I am encouraged to note that O.E.O. has made it a point to work through local and private agencies wherever possible. This has resulted in some cases of poor judgment, poor management, and errors. These can be corrected. In the long run, I would hope that the local agencies would become fully competent to handle local problems.

I am encouraged also to note that O.E.O. has been able, at the Federal level, to spin off certain programs to H.E.W., Small Business Administration, the Department of Labor, and perhaps other agencies.

It seems to me that this is the kind of progress that O.E.O. should make. Ideally, I would hope that O.E.O. could be so successful that eventually there would be no need for it.

As for now, we need a strong O.E.O. to develop programs to meet critical present needs, and to help local agencies develop the capability to do what is needed. At the Federal level, a centralized responsibility in O.E.O. is best able to create and initiate.

The most important thing that the United States of America can say for our form of government and way of life is that every citizen enjoys freedom, has a useful job, and enjoys decent health services and living conditions. Words cannot communicate this, but the visible existence of the condition would be most eloquent.

Peoples around the world must wonder how the richest and most powerful nation can tolerate conditions that breed deep poverty, substandard housing, substandard education, and finally riots.

What we can demonstrate now is that our society and our form of government can recognize our problems and deal with them quickly and effectively.

I have not attempted to discuss the merits or lack thereof of any specific O.E.O. programs. You are closer to the situation than I. What O.E.O. programs are doing in your own community will be more significant than my comments.

I'm sure you and your staff have plenty to do. I have already burdened you with the above communication, so please don't trouble to acknowledge.

Sincerely,

CHARLES E. SCRIPPS.

TIPPLERS AND THE LAW

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to an editorial which appeared in the Birmingham News on September 23, 1967. Entitled "Tipplers and the Law," this editorial is an excellent summary of action currently underway to deal with America's fourth major health problem, the disease of chronic alcoholism.

With unanimous consent, I include this excellent Birmingham News editorial in the RECORD:

TIPPLERS AND THE LAW

Back in 1846 a Maine physician, Dr. J. Edward Turner, suggested that heavy drinkers should get treatment and rehabilitation in institutions and not be subject to the moral exhortations then common. The doctor's proposal did nothing but anger the public and his colleagues, and the courts continued to throw drunks in the tank to "dry out."

Dr. Turner must have been more than a century ahead of his time, for his treatment-rehabilitation philosophy nowadays would be in tenor with what many authorities have said recently: Alcoholism is a disease and should be recognized as such by public officials.

In January, 1966, the courts began to accept this philosophy. The U.S. Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals ruled that chronic alcoholic suffers from a sickness and therefore may not be prosecuted for public drunkenness. A state, said the court, "cannot stamp an unpretending chronic alcoholic as a criminal if his drunken public display is involuntary as a result of the disease." As long as the chronic alcoholic "is not marked a criminal," however, he may still be detained for treatment and rehabilitation. Related cases are pending in other courts. One now before the U.S. Supreme Court would affect Alabamians.

The problem this ruling presents is that it is a departure from traditional American experience and thus finds most local facilities inadequate for "treatment and rehabilitation." Recognizing the situation Congress included in the Community Mental Health Centers Act of 1963 funds to defray from one-third to two-thirds of the costs of constructing local facilities.

Other assistance might come through the enactment of the National Alcoholism Care and Control Bill, sponsored by U.S. Senator Frank Moss of Utah. The measure, endorsed this year in a joint resolution of the Alabama Legislature, now awaits hearings before the Labor and Public Welfare Committee. It would authorize $20 million in fiscal 1968 for grants for detoxification centers, court-supervised programs for alcoholics and alcohol-related offenders, programs in correctional institutions for alcoholics, and after-care programs for alcoholics. Also, it would provide $500,000 for the study of personnel practices and projected needs in the field of alcoholism control.

This bill, and the effects and implications of the court rulings on alcoholism, were discussed by Senator Moss Friday at a meeting of the Junior Bar Section, Birmingham Bar Association.

These treatment and rehabilitation measures, while showing an enlightened attitude toward alcoholism-as-disease, do not consider fully the preventative aspect of this health problem. There are many cases on the books of persons who have been arrested scores and even hundreds of times for drunkenness. Admonishing, jailing, beating, ducking, lashing and threatening with eternal damnation and other of the old methods simply have not kept a person from drinking heavily once he has started.

The psychological and other, unknown reasons for a person starting to drink to excess consistently must, then, be met too. Counseling and guidance programs to spot and alleviate personal difficulties are equally as important as after-the-fact treatment.

Public officials in most places still throw chronic alcoholics in jail and book them on public drunkenness charge. But as more states come under court rulings forbidding this, the officials will have to correct themselves. Unless they have made prior preparations, they will be holding intoxicated persons with no place to put them. Alabama's Division of Alcoholism is hoping to avert widespread confusion by strengthening their system of detoxification centers and outpatient clinics. Those communities unable to use such facilities must make other arrangements, for example, with a local hospital. All public officials should be aware of the implications of the current court proceedings and of the aid which would be available under Sen. Moss' bill.

CHEMICAL FIRMS FIND ROLE IN POVERTY WAR

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am continually heartened by the evergrowing signs of a crucial role being played by private industry in our total national effort against poverty. I was recently reminded of this extremely significant trend by an article appearing in the August 28 issue of Chemical & Engineering magazine, entitled "Chemical Firms Find Roles in Poverty War." In particular, Mr. Speaker, I was interested to read of the pioneering role of Thiokol Chemical Corp. as a Job Corps contractor. Thiokol operated the Clearfield, Utah, Job Corps center for men, which has won increasing praise in that area of the country.

Mr. Speaker, as I know this article will be of interest to my distinguished colleagues, I insert it at this point in the RECORD:

CHEMICAL FIRMS FIND ROLES IN POVERTY WAR

Several chemical company-directed skirmishes in the war against poverty are now beginning to show results, and may even foreshadow things to come in that "other war." For as the long, hot, rioting summer wanes and the nation struggles to find the way out of its main domestic predicament, private industry's talents and resources are being called upon to help pave the way.

Nationally, the chemical industry may appear to be standing aloof from the poverty fight. Its trade associations, whether or not they should, have not taken positions on what the industry can do to help. But there is involvement at the plant and community level, where several chemical companies are making imaginative, constructive efforts to crack local poverty cycles. Some examples of the action:

Thiokol Chemical runs a Job Corps camp in Clearfield, Utah. And it has a contract from the Bureau of Indian Affairs to upgrade the living conditions and vocational resources of impoverished Indian tribes in New Mexico.

In Philadelphia, Smith Kline & French is nearing the 18th month of its $40,000-a-year effort. It is the only company managing the total rehabilitation of an urban slum (a neighborhood named, with appropriate irony, "Spring Garden").

Du Pont, under a contract with the Board for Fundamental Education in Indianapolis, this month graduated the last of three classes of formerly undereducated general services employees. In 20 weeks, many acquired the verbal and arithmetical skills of 10 grades. Some showed so much leadership potential that they seem headed for jobs of higher responsibility.

In Cleveland, business can take much of the credit for a summer that has been remarkably free of rioting thus far. Through the local Plans for Progress Council, companies such as Sohio, Harshaw, and Diamond Alkali have shown the community that young slum dwellers, hired and trained with a little patience, can become reliable workers.

There are dozens of other examples of company efforts. Aerojet, for one, was the first company to open a plant in the Watts area of Los Angeles after the 1965 riots—Watts Mfg. Co., maker of military tents. Allied Chemical, American Cyanamid, and a number of other companies have taken deliberate efforts to assist Negro colleges with equipment and recruitment programs. Eastman Kodak, its unfortunate misunderstanding with Rochester civil rights groups resolved, is stepping up what already was a model program of recruiting and training minority workers.

And Dow Chemical has just started a drive to recruit Negroes in Saginaw, Mich. (which is 20% Negro), for work in its Midland plant. Dow has donated equipment to vocational training programs in Saginaw, sent its own employees as counselors and lecturers into Saginaw schools, and has brought several busloads of students to Midland for a workday introduction to a manufacturing company.

Hoffmann-La Roche for the past several months has been teaching underprivileged girls in Newark, N.J., a variety of clerical and secretarial skills, using the newest audio-visual techniques. The goal is to produce stenographers who can take shorthand at 80 words per minute and type at least 50 words per minute.

THIOKOL CAMP

The company with probably the biggest corporate commitment to the poverty war is Thiokol, whose shares were one of the glamour stocks of the early sixties. Since loss of the contract for development of big solid-fuel booster rockets, Thiokol has branched into many new areas. One is economic development, headed by vice president Robert L. Marquardt. The hub of its efforts is the Job Corps camp located about 30 miles north of Salt Lake City along the Wasatch Range at the old Naval distribution center in Clearfield. Its director is Charles J. Moxley.

About 1350 boys, 16 to 21 years old, are enrolled at the Clearfield camp, which received the first enrollees last October. At the outset, their academic achievement level averages at about the fifth grade. They depart with ninth grade skills. Almost all come from families whose income falls below that imperfect measuring point the Social Security Administration uses to define poverty—$3,000 a year.

Sociological studies haven't been made to back up this contention, but the fate of many of the youngsters, without some such effort, would probably be the welfare rolls.

Negroes are the biggest single group at Clearfield, with about 55% of the enrollment. Whites come next, followed about equally by Indians and Spanish-Americans. (Few of the other Job Corps camps have such a mix.) Each corpsman has his choice of seven occupations to train for: plastics technology, automotive repair, food processing, air conditioning and refrigeration, agriculture, metalworking, and hospital work. About 200 are enrolled in the plastics program. Since October, 12 have graduated and, of them, six have been placed in jobs. The other six are waiting to hear from prospects.

"People say the Job Corps is too expensive," Mr. Marquardt acknowledges. "Public schools educate youngsters for $500 to $800 a year per pupil, while Job Corps costs run around $600 each. Sure, conventional education works for the average middleclass youngster, but for the other 20%—the deprived 20%—it just plain doesn't. The regular school system is not adequate for kids without the right functional and intelligence quotients. Industry and OEO can take a boy any day of the week and put that boy through a progress program and succeed—if he's willing to stick it out. We're doing it. So is Litton, Avco, and RCA."

Thiokol is really the only chemical company with a Job Corps contract. As a profitable venture it's fair but not outstanding. The return is 48% on the $11.2 million OEO contract.

Mr. Marquardt says many companies have complimented Thiokol for going into such a "risky" program, because the Job Corps is one of the most criticized OEO enterprises. "They tell me," he says, "that they will hire our graduates but they wouldn't get into the program themselves. I felt the same way before we got into this, and now I'm surprised at how emotionally involved I've become. I'm surprised, too, at how committed other people from industry have become once they got involved. For ourselves the costs would have been 10% higher if our staff didn't give such enthusiasm and free time to their work."

Thiokol plans to stay in the business of human development. Its contract with the Bureau of Indian Affairs will combine the Job Corps concept of training youth with the wider problems of rehabilitating whole families to a modern economy. Part of Thiokol's future as a diversified company rides along with what it learns about education through running these programs. New teaching techniques combining electronics, psychology, and individual attention are to emerge from such endeavors. Thiokol is racing, along with Litton, RCA, Avco, and IBM, for a piece of that future special education market.

SPRING GARDEN SLUM

From Clearfield, Utah, to Philadelphia, Pa., is a long way between companies—as well as between approaches to fighting poverty. Smith Kline & French is doing it without a federal contract, but with a total approach for its across-the-street neighbor, the Spring Garden slum. This is a neighborhood of about 24,000 Negroes and Puerto Ricans.

The company's attack on Spring Garden blight is quadruple. First—and this is the key to its remarkable success—is the Neighborhood Services Center set up in the abandoned Swedish Lutheran Church. There, residents of the area get help in solving a whole range of problems—from acquiring pediatric care to steps to take when the landlord turns the gas off. Since it opened last summer the center has handled about 1200 cases to completion.

The second element is improved housing. Nearly all the dwellings in the Spring Garden district are now decrepit mansion-town houses. Many now house five to six families. SK&F realized that the most immediate physical need was to improve the surroundings. For this, it enlisted the Philadelphia Housing Authority and developer Hertzfeld and Horowitz Associates.

SK&F asked the housing developer to purchase a number of deteriorating houses from slum owners, convert each into three-unit apartment houses, and sell them back to the housing authority. The public agency then rents the apartments to Spring Garden residents for about $65 a month. So far 20 buildings have been renovated (room now for 60 families with all the modern conveniences), and by the end of next year the goal of 70 buildings and 200 units will be met. SK&F's contribution to this plan is that it agreed to pay 40% of the interest on the loan taken by Hertzfeld and Horowitz to buy the houses. (Mark a few points, too, for the lady who comes around the neighborhood adorning windowsills with flowers.)

The third aspect in the Spring Garden project is job opportunity. For that, a neighborhood unit of Philadelphia's famed Opportunities Industrialization Center has been brought into the district. OIC is a highly successful vocational training center for the hardcore unemployable. It has 63 centers nationwide. It teaches basic education, spurs personal development, and encourages pride in one's race. It trains enrollees in a wide range of jobs, including bricklaying, plumbing, and machining. It even offers laboratory technician training to those willing to pursue the lengthy course. Potential OIC trainees in the SK&F area are recruited through the Spring Garden center and given information on what's available to them at the main OIC center.

The final and economically impressive point is the low cost to SK&F—$40,000 a year, not including the $10,000 to $20,000 involved in the Hertzfeld and Horowitz agreement. The company assigned one public relations department man, college drama major Roger E. Celler, as full-time manager of the project.

"We took a flyer on this and really didn't know how it was going to turn out," Mr. Celler says. "Looking back, I'd say my biggest personal problem was right at the beginning—getting over being scared when the company told me to take charge after I presented the idea."

One of the real fights, however, was integrating the project with the city's established welfare agencies—a problem which the war on poverty encounters all over the country since the approach is to upend outmoded techniques. "We went through three stages with Philadelphia's welfare agencies," recalls Mr. Celler, "First was the ho-ho-ho phase, then came the hostility stage when they thought we were trying to take over their job, and finally came the stage we enjoy now, complete cooperation. I think they've found that we've helped them do a more thorough job in Spring Garden."

Mr. Celler's corporate boss, Robert Haakinsen, who heads SK&F's community relations department, says:

"One of the greatest things in this life is to help a person develop himself, and for that person to find that someone cares for him. There have been tremendous results in this area, and there are opportunities in neighborhoods all over the city and nation to do this sort of thing. I think it's the responsibility of industry to help a community develop pride in itself."

DU PONT SCHOOL

The next urban center south of Philadelphia along the East Coast megalopolis is Wilmington, Del., site of megacorporation Du Pont, whose poverty war campaign features two endeavors: raising the job skills of present employees and eliminating unwitting discrimination in hiring.

Says Du Pont's assistant director of employment John Oliver: "Du Pont rarely hires already qualified technicians, operators, or mechanics. Instead, we try to detect the trainable candidates and train them ourselves. Our biggest advance was in improving the detection of trainables by dropping artificial barriers from pre-employment exams."

But Du Pont's major groundbreaker is its still modest and experimental effort to detect its underemployed—the worker more qualified through intelligence and native ability to run a general services department than to push a broom. Du Pont has them, as do thousands of other companies. But such persons often are grammar school dropouts and haven't been back to school since.

Du Pont's method of developing the gifted and enhancing their job levels involves teaching them basic grammar school skills. The actual teaching is done by the nonprofit Board for Fundamental Education of Indianapolis. The board guarantees to advance the pupils at least four grade levels within at least 20 weeks. It goes almost without saying that the technique ignores all traditional methods of teaching basic skills. So far, Du Pont is pleased with the results and, now that three classes of BFE pupils have graduated, is deciding the extent to which it will continue the course. (BFE has similar contracts with Eastman Kodak, Olin Mathieson, and Diamond Alkali.)

Elsewhere in the community, Du Pont and several other Wilmington companies have formed a Greater Wilmington Development Council, whose purpose is to identify, counsel, and hire the unemployed in that region of about 800,000 people. One skeptic in the community calls GWDC a ploy for keeping the antipoverty fight in the hands of industry and the established institutions and away from the federal poverty effort in the state. No doubt, there is some competition.

At any rate, GWDC works closely with the industrial services committee of the local YMCA in a four-phase program of placing the hard-core poor in jobs, getting the unions to join in, searching for poor people with salable skills, and developing training programs for those with no skills.

One plant that leads all others in the Wilmington area in hiring the untrained is Koppers' creosoting operation in Newark, Del. Most of the work there involves sheer manual strength and mechanical skills. Perhaps GWDC's main payoff will come from its effort at coordinating the 50 or so separate agencies in Wilmington that are training the poor for various jobs. Required here is simply a lot of personal contact work combined with the persuasive power industry can exert in a community when the motivation is high enough.

CLEVELAND STORY

For the story of how an entire metropolis pulls its resources together and attacks poverty, Cleveland's effort would be hard to match. Except for one brief flareup this summer, Cleveland has been free of riots—in contrast to last July when the Hough section rampaged. What Cleveland industry is trying to do, through such corporate leaders as Sohio's Charles E. Spahr and Thomas Shirreffs and Cleveland Gas and Illuminating's Ralph Besse, is enlist the whole city to upgrade both education and job opportunities for the city's 300,000 Negroes and Puerto Ricans. The organizational force behind the effort is the Cleveland Council of Plans for Progress.

Nationally, Plans for Progress totals 367 companies. It came into being in 1961 to ease the integration of the American Negro into U.S. industry. Since then it has expanded to include all races. Its headquarters is in Washington and its current director is J. C. Penney's Eugene Rowan.

In Cleveland, the PFP council puts its concepts to work by cajoling businessmen and blue-collar workers to donate their own time to talk to high school classes on job opportunities. Vocational guidance institutes have been set up so that high school teachers and counselors can hear straight from the businessmen themselves what the needs of industry are. In the six-week courses, the counselor gets an inside view of plant work, which he can communicate realistically to students.

Cleveland's Plans for Progress council has been so successful that since 1965 Negroes have entered some 450 new job categories previously closed to them. The city also has one of the country's best coordinated programs involving federal money, industrial ideas, and community spirit. The name of the program is AIM-Jobs. Funded by a $5.5 million Labor Department-OEO contract, its goal is to get at least 2000 hard-core unemployable youths into jobs by next June.

Sohio's Franklin A. Black, on loan to AIM-Jobs as job development and placement director, says that the way the program is going (150 placed in the private sector since June), the figure could exceed the goal by 500 jobs. Most are low-paying maintenance jobs. Tests have shown that most of the graduates of AIM-Jobs—and they are the products of the worst slums—have limited potential. But they do have jobs, with the result that instead of becoming welfare cases, they're being turned into producers, even taxpayers.

Mr. Black thinks that federal aid is a must for the project to be a continuing success. "The number of ghetto unemployed, 12,000 in Cleveland, is not going to go down in a hurry," he says. "Even if we do get 2000 to work by next June, the total will still stay around 12,000 because 2000 more will drop out of school."

Mr. Black hopes the city's effort will be a model. His own job with AIM-Jobs is to steer the right boy to the right job. This means keeping contact with every potential employer in the city and prodding them to give graduates a chance. Recruitment from the slums is done by former slum dwellers, who have contact with both the ghetto and the work worlds, and by poverty and welfare personnel.

Once in, the prospect is given two weeks of coaching on basic grooming and behavior. In most cases he has no concept of the importance the work world puts on getting to the job on time, for instance. This is why the coaching program is so important. Until the time he shows enough work habit momentum, the graduate is guided by a coach whose job it is not only to prod the new worker to persist in disciplining himself but also to keep contact with the company over the youth's progress.

Thomas Shirreffs, Sohio vice president for employee relations and president of Cleveland's Plans for Progress council, gives his philosophy: "We at Sohio feel that we can't divorce ourselves from the problems of our community. I think there's been a change in community attitudes towards businessmen. For a number of years, the businessman was looked on as a person with two things: jobs and finances. But overlooked was the fact that businessmen have a great deal of know-how. I think now we're seeing that communities more and more are looking for business representation in their programs. This is why Plans for Progress has been so successful here. As a resource group we can apply know-how to community efforts."

Thus, it is becoming clear that if the U.S. is serious about licking poverty, private enterprise involvement is inescapable.

DROP-IN CENTERS MAKE EARLY GAINS

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, not enough attention has been paid to the very great progress made by OEO in many areas. For example, the case of the riots that did not happen is one of the many striking accomplishments of the war on poverty.

The State Journal of Lansing, Mich., recently printed a long feature article, backed by a strongly favorable editorial, on "Operation Cool," a program for underprivileged youngsters launched in that city this past summer.

Under this federally-funded project, two "drop-in" community centers were set up for the summer for young people from 13 to 25. The centers provided recreational facilities, dances, trips, and other group activities. They were open every day of their 2-month operation, and youths of the area were free to "drop in" whenever they wished.

The State Journal was high in praise of "Operation Cool." It declared that—

> The project was planned with careful attention to that rare commodity, common sense.

And added:

> It has provided the opportunity for many youths to take part in activities . . . that some have never before sampled.

And, in closing, emphasized that—

> It is a program well worth the consideration of local agencies, public or private, for continuation in some form through the fall and winter months. It shouldn't be allowed to die as a mere federally-funded program to "get the kids off the streets" during the hot summer evenings. Indications of its broad and diverse benefits to many persons, but especially to those who need it most, make it far too valuable a community asset to be allowed to fade away.

Mr. Speaker, Operation Cool and other OEO programs throughout the country did much to help prevent rioting this summer. What is called for are more—not fewer—programs, designed with the practical, down-to-earth approach that has characterized the greater part of the OEO program. Programs that help those in need to become contributing, self-respecting members of their community.

For the benefit of my colleagues I include the editorial in the RECORD at this point in my remarks:

DROP-IN CENTERS MAKE EARLY GAINS

Pool tables, card games.

Open until 2 a.m.

Smoking permitted.

What goes on here?

The style of two drop-in centers in disadvantaged Lansing neighborhoods, at first glance, might seem to raise a few eyebrows. Indeed, they have brought wondering inquiries from some parents.

They are one phase—and so far a remarkably successful phase—of Operation Cool, designed to provide recreational facilities and broader opportunities to restless city youths.

The center program takes on a strange form when compared to the usual recreational activity. "Unstructured" is the word used by its developers, the Capitol Area Economic Opportunity Committee. Youngsters, they say, have had enough of timetables and rules in school. They need the chance to develop their own timetables and rules—within limits. In this manner, it becomes the kind of program the youths want, not what someone else thinks they should want.

The hours themselves are remarkable, but indicate a common sense approach that carries out the theme—it's their program.

How successful the program has been has yet to be established in precise terms. Suffice to say, the two centers have received active and continued use.

Underway now for a month, the program has one more month to go before present funds run out. It was financed under a summer Office of Economic Opportunity appropriation by Congress, and as such is regarded by federal officials as a "one shot" venture. Another phase of the program, financed by the Community Chest and administered by the YMCA, has sent six "detached workers" into the disadvantaged neighborhoods to talk with youths and find out their needs and aspirations. The third phase, financed by the Michigan Employment Security Commission, has opened a job finding office for youths which has been receiving increased support and assistance from community businessmen.

The drop-in center plan was set up with the idea that once the detached workers began asking questions about recreational needs, expectations would be raised. The centers, then, became at least a partial answer to the expectations.

However, the centers will be without financial backing after Sept. 4. There are currently no federal funding plans to continue them into the school year. Those who have worked with the program are convinced the progress made so far warrants community support to keep them going. The cost would be between $10,000 and $20,000 a month if the centers are to be continued at the present level of activity or on a somewhat expanded basis.

Local OEO officials and drop-in center staff members are hoping something can be worked out on a local basis.

Basically the program is for the youths and is especially aimed at the 13–25 age group and at those who in many cases are dropouts or near drop-outs. It has involved in the responsibilities of leadership some who have previously had brushes with police.

Through the program police officers, out of uniform and off duty, have been brought into contact with youths, perhaps offering one of its biggest bonuses—at least making a start on breaking down traditional animosities between police and young men with time on their hands.

It has provided the opportunity for many youths to take part in activities—such as horseback riding, canoeing, a trip to a ball game—that some have never before sampled. A recent hayride brought out 96 youngsters for an evening activity.

It has encouraged youngsters to take part in regular city programs of which they have not previously been aware. Others were aware, but needed the encouragement to participate. It has provided an opportunity for cross communication. In short, the program has worked in several directions.

The apparent success has not come by accident. It was planned with careful attention to that rare commodity, commonsense. It has received time and effort from local OEO and city officials and from volunteers. It has in a large measure begun to accomplish what it set out to do—developing a broad, flexible activity that would attract many of the youths in areas where few or no recreational facilities were available.

It is a program well worth the consideration of local agencies, public or private, for continuation in some form through the fall and winter months. It shouldn't be allowed to die as a mere federally-funded program to "get the kids off the streets" during hot summer evenings. Indications of its broad and diverse benefits to many persons, but especially to those who need it most, make it far too valuable a community asset to be allowed to fade away.

HENRY TIMROD, THE GREAT SOUTHERN POET

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Rivers] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, October 7, 1967, marks the 100th anniversary of the death of South Carolina's great poet, the leader of the remarkable Charleston Poets, Henry Timrod.

Henry Timrod was, literally and figuratively, a victim of the War Between the States. His chance for literary fame in his own time and his opportunities for writing poetry were circumscribed by the conditions of war. His subject matter, too, was often dictated by the war.

A native of Charleston, Timrod was born to be a lyric poet of nature as shown in such fine lines as these:

> Spring, with that nameless pathos in the air
> Which dwells with all things fair,
> Spring with her golden suns and silver rain,
> Is with us once again.

But he lived in a time of trial and his poems sometimes became a call to arms. His martial poetry is some of the finest of the genre and it had a stirring effect on the South of his day. It is said that when his poem, "Carolina," was read to an audience, the people stood and cheered. The lines have the ring of battle to them:

> Thy ancient fame is growing dim,
> A spot is on thy garment's rim;
> Give to the winds thy battle hymn, Carolina!

The poet, John Greenleaf Whittier, himself an abolitionist, said of Timrod's war poetry:

> Some of his later poems—notwithstanding their hostility to my own section—were very powerful and impressive. He had the true fire within.

A 19th century writer referred to Henry Timrod as—

> The poet of the lost cause, the finest interpreter of the feelings and traditions of the splendid heroism of a brave people.

Timrod died from tuberculosis in Columbia, S.C., in 1867, while still a comparatively young man of 37. Accounts of his last years confirm that his sickness was hastened by the desperate conditions under which he had to live, sometimes actually near starvation. His anguished friends were powerless to help him as they were in almost as desperate straits themselves.

Henry Timrod's roots went deep in the soil of South Carolina. Before the American Revolution, a Heinrich Dimroth came to Charleston from Germany and changed his name to Henry Timrod. He was the poet's grandfather and a prominent citizen of Charleston and served as president of that historic association, the German Friendly Society. That society is still going strong today and its existence has been unbroken during the entire course of American history.

The first Henry Timrod was one of the volunteers, who, in May 1775, after hearing of the Battle of Lexington, formed the German Fusiliers of Charleston to fight in the American Revolution.

William Henry Timrod, the poet's father, commanded the Fusiliers as a captain in the Seminole War, and he later died of a disease originally contracted in that war. William Henry was something of a literary talent himself, publishing a volume of poems in the early 19th century and for a time serving as editor of a literary periodical published in Charleston.

The poet's mother was the daughter of Mr. Charles Prince, a prominent citizen of Charleston whose parents had come to America from England just before the Revolutionary War. The poet's grandmother on his mother's side was the daughter of an officer in the Revolution whose family had come from Switzerland.

When William Henry Timrod died in 1838, young Henry was only 10. The family was in difficult circumstances, but the poet received a fine education at one of Charleston's best schools, that of Christopher Coates. From there he went to the University of Georgia where he early showed his talent for poetry, but his studies were interrupted by sickness and by lack of means. Though he did not complete his studies, Timrod was a fine scholar, widely read, and accomplished in Latin and Greek.

A colleague of the poets from that period has left a physical description of him:

> Timrod was far below the medium height. He had always excelled in boyish sports and as he grew to manhood, his unusual breadth of shoulders still seemed to indicate a physical vigor which the slender wrists, thin, transparent hands, and habitually lax attitude but too plainly contradicted.
>
> The square jaw was almost stern in its strongly pronounced lines, the mouth large, the lips exquisitely sensitive, the grey eyes deeply set under massive brows, and full of a melancholy and pleading tenderness, which attracted attention to his face at once, as the face of one who had thought and suffered much.

For a time, Timrod attempted to practice law. But he found the work alien and gave it up to devote himself to literature. He helped support himself by employment as a private teacher.

He had a few pleasant years of working at his art and contributing to Russell's magazine in Charleston. In 1859, he published his first book of poems which was the only volume published in his lifetime. While the few critics who paid attention praised the work and the New York Tribune called it "a welcome offering to the common literature of our country," the volume went largely unnoticed, lost in the rumblings of the coming war.

Timrod opposed secession but when it came, he volunteered in the Army as a private. But his health was not sufficient for the rigors of life in the field and doctors forced him to leave the ranks. He served in the West for a time as a war correspondent and, caught in the disastrous retreat from Shiloh, saw the horrors of war. He was neither physically nor emotionally suited to the task and soon returned home sick in body and saddened in spirit.

He took over the editorship of the South Carolinian, at Columbia, the State capital, and married Kate Goodwin, the English girl who was the inspiration for one of his best poems, "Katie." His sister, Emily, was married to Miss Goodwin's brother.

During the war, he wrote such memorable works as "Carolina," "Ethnogenesis," "Charleston," "Ripley," and "The Cotton Boll." His name became known through the South and an effort was launched to publish an illustrated edition of his poems in London. But the project fell through as all of the energies of the people were sapped in the terrible struggle of the war. After he had learned something of the true horror of warfare, Timrod's poems were filled with a call for peace and an end to the bloodshed.

As a poet, Timrod's great strength is in the mellifluousness of his lines, the sure and unfaltering music of his verse. While his language is sometimes weakened by the poetic stereotypes of his day, his best lines have extraordinary emotional power which retain their moving quality.

Emerson, Longfellow, and Oliver Wendell Holmes were all admirers of Timrod's verse.

In the years after the war, he lived in great deprivation, only intermittently able to find employment. As one writer of the last century put it:

> The suffering he endured was the common suffering of those around him—actual physical want and lack of the commonest comforts of life, felt more keenly by his sensitive nature and delicate constitution.

He was living at that time in Columbia, the ruined capital of the State. His household consisted of his wife, his sister, his wife's mother, and several nephews and nieces. He described his plight this way in a letter to his great friend, the poet Paul Hamilton Hayne:

> Both my sister and myself are completely impoverished. We have lived for a long time and are still living on the gradual sale of furniture and plate. We have eaten two silver pitchers, one of two dozen forks, several sofas, innumerable chairs and a bedstead.

In this circumstance, a greater tragedy struck him—the death of his infant son, Willie.

Dying of tuberculosis, Timrod wanted more than anything else to see his poems collected and published. But all his hopes were disappointed.

Till the end, he worked on his poems and it is said that he was making corrections during his last illness, the manuscript stained with his blood. He died in the autumn of 1867 and was buried in Trinity Churchyard, Columbia, by his son, Willie, in a grave that remained without a stone or marker for many years.

Even after Timrod died, it was 6 years before a Northern publisher could be found for his poems because of lingering resentment about his war verse. By that time his wife, who lived until 1913, was in Washington, D.C., having found a job paying $50 a month with the Treasury Department, and in a plaintive letter asked that her employment not be mentioned in the book for fear the poet's rebel views would be used as an excuse to dismiss her.

Perhaps Timrod's best known poem, one of the last he wrote, is the moving "Ode on the Occasion of Decorating the Graves of the Confederate Dead, at Magnolia Cemetery, Charleston":

I

Sleep sweetly in your humble graves,
  Sleep, martyrs of a fallen cause;
Though yet no marble column craves
  The pilgrim here to pause.

II

In seeds of laurel in the earth
  The blossom of your fame is blown,
And somewhere, waiting for its birth,
  The shaft is in the stone!

III

Meanwhile, behalf the tardy years
  Which keep in trust your storied tombs,
Behold! your sisters bring their tears,
  And these memorial blooms.

IV

Small tributes! but your shades will smile
  More proudly on these wreaths today,
Than when some cannon-moulded pile
  Shall overlook this bay.

V

Stoop, angels, hither from the skies!
  There is no holier spot of ground
Than where defeated valor lies,
  By mourning beauty crowned!

PULASKI DAY

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, many of us in this body had the privilege last Sunday of seeing the annual Pulaski Day Parade on Fifth Avenue in New York City and participating in events related to the honoring of this great Polish-American patriot.

I have been privileged to observe more than 20 of these parades. Each one gives me great inspiration and renews my faith in my fellow Americans.

I am justly proud of the fine participation of Brooklyn organizations, and I am equally proud of my close friendship not only with so many of those who are responsible for arranging the impressive ceremony but of my personal friendship with so many of the marchers in the parade.

Each year as I pause with thousands upon thousands of fellow Americans to pay honor to that brave soldier and patriot whose name has been immortalized all over America, my personal admiration for him has an upward surge. On each occasion such as the one to which I am directing your attention, I cannot help but associate with the brilliant and gallant Casimir Pulaski the names of a host of other heroes and statesmen of Polish extraction to whom this Nation is everlastingly indebted.

Fortunate, indeed, are we Americans as we drive over bridges and highways or through beautiful parks which bear the name of Pulaski, to be reminded daily of his heroic deeds in our behalf. Unfortunately, sometimes such daily exposure to a name develops a callousness and we tend to forget the important meaning of the name.

How fortunate then are Americans that the great Polish-American organizations see to it that at least once each year we have occasion to remember Casimir Pulaski and to hear and read again what he did personally for Gen. George Washington and for our country in its most trying days of the American Revolution.

Each year it is truly fitting that the President of the United States officially proclaims a memorial day in honor of General Pulaski. It is also fitting that upon orders of the President himself, all appropriate Government officials assure that all Government buildings display Old Glory in honor of the memory of this dauntless Revolutionary hero. And it is equally fitting that the Chief of State invites all the people of this land to observe this day with appropriate ceremonies in honor of Pulaski and in recognition of his dedication to the defense of liberty.

This defense of liberty for which Pulaski fought and died in battle is just as important to everyone of us today as it was to our struggling colonial forebears who were trying to rid themselves of the yoke of tyranny and gain their independence.

Mr. Speaker, President Johnson emphasized this point in his Pulaski Day Memorial proclamation of September 26, when he said:

> General Pulaski held the conviction that freedom is a nation's most cherished possession—that erosion of freedom anywhere weakens freedom everywhere. Americans have fought many times for that conviction. We are fighting for it today in Vietnam.

When George Washington was facing bitter opposition in the very hours when he should have had maximum support of all Americans at the very moment when a domestic battle raged between the colonial "hawks" and the "doves," there came to his aid a brilliant young officer—this Pole passionately dedicated to the cause of freedom in which Washington was so deeply engaged. How tremendously heartening must have been the help and friendship of Pulaski to the oft-discouraged American Commander in Chief in the conduct of his unappreciated task of fighting a war not only against a powerful enemy military force but a war against the complacency and open hostility of many of the Americans in whose behalf the war was being fought.

I wish that today a score of Casimir Pulaskis could come to the aid of our President as he leads our economic and military forces in combat against serious threats to "freedom everywhere."

I refer not only to the conduct of the war in Vietnam which he inherited from predecessors, but the war which he has launched to free Americans from the bonds of hunger, privation, illness, illiteracy, and insecurity—all enemies, each capable of destroying the long-cherished independence of our own citizens.

Let us turn again to our President's own words when referring to Pulaski. He said:

> In memory of a gallant defender of our Nation, let us rededicate ourselves to the principles for which he gave his life—principles which millions of Polish immigrants to America have defended and strengthened over the years.

The President had each of us here in mind when he penned those words. He had in mind every man, woman, and child throughout this land. I think he had in mind particularly every one of those Polish Americans who participated in the Pulaski Day ceremonies. I know that in issuing his proclamation he had in mind the great Polish American leadership, many of whom I have personally come to know and admire.

Mr. Speaker, this is the leadership of America upon whom he calls to join all America in rededicating ourselves to the principles for which Casimir Pulaski—a foreign Good Samaritan—fought and died in battle.

My long and intimate association with the leaders of the many loyal and patriotic Polish American organizations does much to allay any fears I might have of an adverse outcome of our war today against the impairment or loss of our independence and any of our freedoms. Knowing these fine Polish American leaders and knowing of the long record of significant accomplishments of their organizations in behalf of this Nation, I am confident that they will be among the first to rededicate themselves to the cause of freedom and to present themselves for service to their nation and to their President as did young Casimir Pulaski who paid the supreme sacrifice of his life 188 years ago.

The full proclamation of President Johnson reads as follows:

General Pulaski's Memorial Day, 1967

(A proclamation by the President of the United States of America)

> One hundred and eighty-eight years ago, Casimir Pulaski gave his life so that a young and valiant nation might live in freedom.
>
> Barely thirty years old when, as a Polish patriot in exile, he came to fight with George Washington's Revolutionary Army, General Pulaski was richly endowed with the qualities of dedication and courage that have been the source of America's greatest strength.
>
> He organized the first American cavalry unit, known as the Pulaski Legion, and served with great distinction at Brandywine and Germantown. He was mortally wounded on October 9, 1779 while leading his cavalry unit in a daring charge during the Battle of Savannah.
>
> General Pulaski held the conviction that freedom is a nation's most cherished possession—that the erosion of freedom anywhere weakens freedom everywhere. Americans have fought many times for that conviction. We are fighting for it today in Vietnam.
>
> In memory of a gallant defender of our Nation, let us rededicate ourselves to the principles for which he gave his life—principles which millions of Polish immigrants to America have defended and strengthened over the years.
>
> Now, therefore, I, Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate Wednesday, October 11, 1967, as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; and I direct the appropriate Government officials to display the flag of the United States on all Government buildings on that day. I also invite the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies in honor of the memory of General Pulaski and his dedication to the defense of liberty.
>
> In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand, this twenty-sixth day of September, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and sixty-seven, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and ninety-second.
>
> LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. REES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, during the period September 23 to 30, I had the honor of serving, at the request of the Secretary of the Treasury, as one of the congressional advisers at the annual meeting of the Board of Governors of the International Bank and the International Monetary Fund in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.

I am sure that my colleagues have followed the reports on the meetings and know how constructive the discussions were in helping reach an understanding on international monetary matters.

Because it was necessary for me to be away when the House took action on several measures, I am not recorded as voting on this legislation. So that my constituents and colleagues will know my position, I wish to state how I would have voted, had I been present.

On rollcall No. 273, to provide for the local election of a nonpartisan school board for the District of Columbia, I would have voted "yea."

On rollcall No. 274, to permit the new District of Columbia government to issue rules and regulations regarding the sale of alcoholic beverages, I would have voted "yea."

On rollcall No. 277, the Railsback amendment to the juvenile delinquency bill, requiring block grants to the States in place of the present, more flexible formula, I was paired against and would have voted "nay" had I been present.

On rollcall No. 278, the Waggonner amendment to the juvenile delinquency bill, to prohibit receipt of funds under the act by the Office of Economic Opportunity, I was paired against and, if present, would have voted "nay."

On rollcall No. 282, the recommital motion on continuing appropriations for Federal nondefense agencies, I was paired against and would have voted "nay."

On rollcall No. 285, relative to domestic industries and workers as affected by imports from low-wage areas, I would have voted "nay."

On rollcall No. 287, the amendment to the Packers and Stockyards Act, I would have voted "yea."

THE OCEANS AND HUMAN AFFAIRS: AN ADDRESS

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. LENNON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Oceanography of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee has been holding hearings on this Nation's oceanographic activities. As chairman of the subcommittee, I, as well as its members from both sides of the aisle, have been deeply impressed with the caliber of work and interest and concern and time and dedication that all members of the Cabinet-level Council—and particularly Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY—are showing in its work. For example, the Council has held eight meetings in the past year, and the Vice President has chaired every meeting. The list of Cabinet members attending these meetings also testifies to the importance the administration places on the marine sciences in reaching our national goals.

The Congress can take particular pride in its role in establishing the marine sciences program. Between 1959 and 1966, the Congress studied the challenge offered to this Nation by the sea and the apparent disparity between our research needs and technological performance. After many hearings and many trial pieces of legislation—virtually none supported by the executive branch, incidentally—the 89th Congress finally enacted, in 1966, the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act. This story has seldom been told, but I am happy that it was related, in a speech recently by Dr. Edward Wenk, Jr., the executive secretary of the Marine Sciences Council. He spoke, incidentally, in my home State, at Asheville, N.C., before the 21st National Conference on the Administration of Research. Because his subject, "Oceans and Human Affairs," is of vital importance to all of us in our society, I insert an abstract of the text in the RECORD:

Oceans and Human Affairs

(By Edward Wenk, Jr., executive secretary, National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development)

> The oceans constitute a unique case study in the blending of need and discovery. Occasionally, in the course of human events, man looks at his world and himself, and thoughtfully and deliberately charts his course. That is what this Nation is now doing with regard to the marine sciences. And it is happening now because of a specific landmark of impetus—a collective national decision expressed through legislation passed by the Congress last year—the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act.
>
> In one sense, the marine sciences story began at this Nation's infancy. The oceans

have had a profound influence on our economic and political development—an influence that reflects a curious contradiction: The sea has served us as a buffer against aggression, and behind this moat on both coasts, it was possible to develop the continent's rich natural—and human—resources. We were thus geographically isolated from pressures of neighbors less well endowed. The sea has simultaneously acted as a medium of communication, facilitating exchange of both merchandise and culture that fostered both our strength at home and our prestige abroad.

Despite these ocean-oriented beginnings, our natural awareness of the importance of the sea waxed and waned. Our peacetime merchant marine reached a peak in tonnage in 1810, declined, and grew back only by 1845. The subsequent peak of 1860 was not matched until 1920 when the Nation put to good advantage the freighters hastily built for World War I. We are now in a new period of turmoil of unresolved debate over our present decline in shipping.

Our indifference to the sea has been reflected in other ways. One is that our study of the ocean has lagged behind most of our other scientific pursuits.

We achieved some notable firsts with charts of the tides, currents, winds, and shoals; the systematic research of Matthew Fontaine Maury in 1855 is a classic.

But American oceanography did not fulfill its early promise. With the advent of the brute force of steam propulsion, after which environmental data seemed less necessary than in the sailing era, ocean sciences drifted and declined.

The decline was so conspicuous that it took three studies by the National Academy of Sciences to stimulate this field to a durable activity that also gained acceptance by the scientific community as more than a hobby of a few wealthy yachtsmen.

The first study, in 1927, led to private endowments of Scripps and Woods Hole, two institutions of oceanography that have provided vital leadership to this field ever since. Yet even after the importance of submarine warfare was amply demonstrated in World War II, a second Academy study was felt needed. The resulting report, released in 1951, called for new Federal sponsorship of research at an additional rate of only one million dollars annually!

In 1956, when a number of Federal agencies felt that they could not accomplish their statutory missions with the feeble base of ocean science then extant, the Academy was asked to undertake a third study. This one, guided by Dr. Harrison Brown, emerged with a clear set of goals and recommendations. What has given meaning to the Brown panel's recommendations is the catalytic effect of Congressional interest that began to unite the ocean sciences with public policy, the coupling of science and society, the suction of social need and the pressure of scientific discovery.

There are a number of heroes of this era. First, we should cite Senator Warren G. Magnuson, Congressmen George P. Miller, John D. Dingell, and Alton Lennon. Congressman Lennon, a distinguished representative of the State of North Carolina, is Chairman of the Subcommittee on Oceanography of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

NEW MARINE SCIENCES LEGISLATION

Between 1959 and 1966, the Congress studied the challenge offered to this Nation by the sea and the apparent disparity between our research needs and technological performance. After many hearings and many trial pieces of legislation—virtually none supported by the Executive Branch, incidentally—the 89th Congress finally enacted, in 1966, the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act . . .

New legislation is a mandate to relate old problems and new solutions. Through its statement of purpose, it became the policy of the United States, for the first time in history, "to develop, encourage and maintain a coordinated, comprehensive, and long-range program in marine science for the benefit of mankind."

The range of activities encompassed by marine sciences is indeed broad: national security; fisheries development and seafood technology; transportation; recreation; pollution abatement and control; international cooperation; marine minerals, chemicals, and energy resources; health; shore and harbor engineering; weather prediction and control; and the romance of pure science, too. Underlying and cutting across those functions are basic oceanographic research, mapping, ocean observation and prediction, general purpose engineering, data collection and analysis, and specialized education.

Excluding oil and gas exploration, the Federal Government has been the sponsor of roughly 85% of the Nation's marine science activities. The bulk of these funds has been expended through grants and contracts with private industrial and academic organizations. Yet an explicit provision of the mandate calls on marine science activities to focus, among other things, on "encouragement of private investment enterprise in exploration, technological development, marine commerce and economic utilization of resources of the marine environment."

Unlike exploration of outer space, which is almost exclusively a Federal responsibility, this Act anticipates national leadership at the Governmental level, but in close partnership with industry so as to engage its entrepreneurship, management, and capital.

Numerous State, regional, and international organizations also are engaged in marine activities. In the private sector, participants include many universities, and the maritime, chemical, electronics, aerospace, mineral, oil, fishing, recreational, and other industries. How then, to foster a coherent sense of purpose and direction in an expanded program through a creative and cooperative partnership of Government, business, academic, and scientific communities?

While a number of new laws in marine sciences had been enacted since 1959, all strengthened the existing statutory authority in the present family of Federal agencies but did not create any new ones or consolidate the old. Marine sciences activities of the Federal Government now fall in 29 bureaus of 11 departments and agencies and with 33 committees and subcommittees of the Congress.

To implement the far-reaching mandate of the new legislation, it became clear that existing oceanographic activities would have to be unified at the Presidential level. The Marine Sciences Act established that unity.

MARINE SCIENCES COUNCIL AND COMMISSIONS

To assist and advise the President, a policy planning and coordinating council was created at the Cabinet level and chaired by the Vice President. The Secretaries of State, Navy, Interior, Commerce, Health, Education, and Welfare, and Transportation, and the heads of AEC and the National Science Foundation serve as members. Since the Council was established, the Vice President has appointed as observers the heads of NASA, AID, Smithsonian, Budget Bureau, Council of Economic Advisers, and the Office of Science and Technology. The Council is already remedying the fragmentation characteristic of a field in which responsibility is divided.

The legislation also created a second body—a Presidential Advisory Commission of 15 eminent citizens from industry, universities, and state and Federal Governments, with four Congressional advisors, appointed by the President in January. The Commission is chaired by Dr. Julius Stratton, the distinguished former President of MIT and currently Chairman of the Board of the Ford Foundation.

Although independent, these two organizations are working together toward common goals. The Council has day-to-day responsibilities to advise and assist the President, to foster and coordinate policies and programs of the existing array of Federal agencies, and to prepare an annual report for the President to transmit to Congress. The Commission has an explicit charge to submit a report no later than July 1968 on long range plans, especially with recommendations for possible realignment of the present Federal structure of marine activities.

This Administration has moved to implement the mandate promptly. In eight meetings since the Council was activated, the Vice President recently reported that it has begun to: delineate marine science activities in relation to national goals; develop a comprehensive program to be conducted by eleven Federal departments independently or in cooperation with States, academic institutions and industry; designate and fix agency responsibilities and facilitate cooperation among Federal agencies; examine appropriate roles for public and private investment; undertake legal studies of problems arising out of the management, recovery, and control of marine resources; initiate long-range studies of the potential benefits of marine science activities to the U.S. economy, security, health, and welfare.

Implementation is entirely the responsibility of the operating agencies, but the Council seeks to assist them to build on existing strengths in every way possible. When missions cross agency lines, however, the Council may designate a lead agency to assume responsibility for interagency planning and coordination.

The President's first major assignment to the Council was to request recommendations for the FY 1968 budget. Nine areas were isolated for special emphasis and set forth in the President's first report on marine sciences.

They concern:

A new "food-from-the-sea" program as part of the war on hunger, including overseas demonstration projects utilizing fish protein concentrate;

Immediate implementation of the Sea Grant program to strengthen education, applied research and information transfer;

A new study for improved collection and dissemination of oceanographic data;

Designation of the Chesapeake Bay as a model to study the effects of estuarine pollution and remedial measures;

A pilot plan for offshore minerals exploration;

An expanded ocean observation system to improve near-shore weather prediction for small boats and oil facilities and accuracy of long-range forecasting;

A strengthened program of deep ocean technology especially to develop a future capability to recover lost equipment;

A new ship to accelerate research in sub-Arctic waters; and

Programs for international cooperation to promote peaceful use of the oceans.

The Federal Government's program can be regarded as the sum of its parts. But with Presidential and Vice Presidential leadership to develop goals and provide a new momentum to the over-all effort, to minimize effects of duplication and especially to take advantage of fresh ideas that may have in the past fallen in the gaps between agencies, we are striving to make the total effort more than the previous sum of the parts.

To this end, we seek to expand knowledge of the marine environment and intensify development of its resources, by drawing together as partners Government, industry and the academic community that have proven such a strong, vibrant team in the development of this Nation's present status as a world power.

At the same time, we are earnestly considering how intensified studies and use of the sea may serve as bridges for cooperation and for understanding among all nations.

Within this matrix of oceanic activities, let me narrow discussion to one particular case, the sea as a source of food. The problem of social need here is chronic protein deficiency among half the people of the world, particularly those in the equatorial zone who subsist largely on a one-crop diet. At the same time, we have the promise of scientific discovery, for we know that the sea is a renewable source of food at least 5 to 10 times more productive than the present world catch. What makes this a classic case of need and discovery is the development of a chemical processing technology by which whole fish can be converted into a dry flour-like substance called fish protein concentrate. Tasteless and odorless, this product appears to be the least expensive source of protein we have. It could meet the vital needs of children in less developed countries as a food additive that could be tuned to indigenous eating habits and tastes.

Our intent here is to wage the world war on hunger by the use of American technology and managerial know-how. The project we have developed is one that couples the problem and the solution.

One of the new initiatives mentioned earlier is a pilot program concerning the entire system from fish in the sea to protein in some child's diet—a project involving fish mapping, fish-catching technology, chemical processing, and marketing. The program makes the U.S. a partner with some less developed nations. It also involves public seed capital and private entrepreneurship.

Last March, the President transmitted his first report to the Congress required by terms of the new legislation. The title of the report, "Marine Science Affairs—A Year of Transition," was carefully selected to suggest the close relationship of marine science and technology on the one hand and public affairs on the other. "The Year of Transition" refers not only to the activation of a new Council, but enlargement of perspective—not only a widening to involve economists, lawyers, specialists in foreign affairs, business administration, etc., as well as scientists and engineers, but also a deepening to involve policy-makers, statesmen, and other citizens.

The transition defined by the Act itself is from an activity that has been largely focused on comprehension of the sea to one that now anticipates its effective utilization.

THE MARINE SCIENCE LESSON FOR HUMAN AFFAIRS

The role of the Marine Sciences Council is to some extent an information switching system that connects human needs with scientific opportunities. It is also a form of research administration that is concerned with the full spectrum of research and development—from basic through applied, all the way through pilot technology. Our concept deems Federal support of basic research as necessary but not sufficient. There must be deliberate transfer of the fruits of scientific discovery to meet society's problems, even in the absence of dramatic crises that so often are the only way such activities become energized.

Although the Federal Government is designated by the legislation to provide leadership, there has been recognition from the very outset that advances in marine sciences critically depend on the well-known triad of cooperating institutions—Government, industry, and universities.

If we are to have the vision to assume that science serves man, we must look to scientists in the university, the engineers in industry, the lawyers, the economists, and the public administrators. We must look both ways, at the problem and at the scientific potential; we must facilitate the tapping of specialists' knowledge.

I have faith in this prospect—whether people are motivated by the spirit of public service, or the prospect of profit, or the thrill of new scientific understanding. I have confidence that this Nation can—and will—achieve its highest goals.

THE CRITICS' STRANGE SILENCE ON HANOI'S ROLE IN THE VIETNAM CONFLICT

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, we have all heard a lot of criticism these days about the administration's conduct of the war in Vietnam. But what about Hanoi? None of our armchair generals seem to realize that Hanoi has a role to play in this war.

As the Wyoming Eagle editorialized recently:

> Will the critics never realize that it takes two—two—to negotiate. And, so far, Hanoi has shown no inclination to talk about peace.

How true. But I do not hear any of these administration critics lashing out at Hanoi's conduct of the war.

They said nothing when the Vietcong tried to disrupt the recent election campaign in the South by using terrorist tactics that included murder, kidnaping, and intimidation.

They said nothing when Hanoi rebuffed each and every attempt by this Government—as well as scores of other governments—to initiate peace talks.

They said nothing when Hanoi used the bombing pauses to resupply their forces in the South.

What a strange double standard these critics imply. And what an image of a supposedly divided country they present to the world.

As the Wyoming Eagle notes:

> It should be clear to anyone willing to look at the facts that Hanoi's price for peace talks still is for the United States to surrender South Vietnam to the Communists, and get out. That the United States will not do and should not do.

The paper concludes that the final responsibility for our policies in Vietnam rests with the President

"The rest of us," says the Eagle, "can help most by presenting a united front behind our war effort, thus removing the Communists' greatest hope that, because of what appears to them to be widespread disagreement among ourselves, we will get tired and pull out."

I insert into the RECORD this excellent editorial:

CRITICIZE HANOI

It's about time critics of this nation's efforts in Vietnam—both at home and abroad—started aiming their criticism at Hanoi.

Day after day, newspaper readers are treated to the opinions of armchair experts—escalate the bombing, stop the bombing, win the war, quit fighting the war, and so on and on and on.

Will the critics never realize that it takes two—two—to negotiate. And, so far, Hanoi has shown no inclination to talk about peace.

For instance, only yesterday newspapers carried the story of the latest rejection from Hanoi.

The story said North Vietnam Tuesday rejected U.S. Ambassador Arthur J. Goldberg's appeal in the United Nations for a negotiated settlement in Vietnam.

It will be recalled that, last spring, President Johnson made a personal appeal to Ho Chi Minh for direct peace talks between the United States and North Vietnam. The President's appeal also was flatly rejected.

Then UN Secretary General U Thant offered a peace plan calling for an immediate cease-fire and preliminary talks aimed at reconvening the 1954 Geneva conference.

The United States immediately announced its acceptance and said it was "willing to enter into discussions without preconditions with Hanoi at any time." Hanoi did not accept.

And so it has gone.

It should be clear to anyone willing to look at the facts, that Hanoi's price for peace talks still is for the United States to surrender South Vietnam to the Communists, and get out. That the United States will not do and should not do.

It also should be clear that the United States cannot ease the pressure on the enemy for any long period of time. That would simply give the Communists a chance to regroup and rebuild.

The answer to those who would have us plunge forward, blindly in escalation of the war, disregarding the risk of broadening the war far beyond the boundaries of Vietnam, should be obvious.

The critics, notwithstanding, it boils down to the fact that it is the President of the United States who must make the important decisions. The heavy responsibility is his. He has the assistance of the best experts available and access to the most complete information available.

The rest of us can help most by presenting a united front behind our war effort, thus removing the Communists' greatest hope that, because of what appears to them to be widespread disagreement among ourselves, we will get tired of fighting and pull out.

MAGAZINE RECOGNIZES POSTAL SUBSIDY

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, in recent months we have seen a barrage of accusations by users in one category of mail charging responsibility for our postal deficit to the users of another category of mail. In nearly every case the accusation was made against a competitor for America's advertising dollar

In an atmosphere in which the postal-deficit buck has been passed again and again, I found it refreshing to read a column by Milton Friedman, entitled "The Post Office," in the current issue of Newsweek.

In his column, Mr. Friedman and Newsweek take a large step forward in objectivity by honestly recognizing the fact that users of second class mail—by which Newsweek is distributed—receive preferential rates from our postal service.

Equally refreshing was Mr. Friedman's assertion that publishers of periodicals and newspapers prefer the status quo to a situation in which they would be forced to defend the subsidy they receive directly and openly. Such factual statements are commendable.

Mr. Speaker, for the information of all of the Members of the House, I include a part of Mr. Friedman's column at this point in the RECORD:

THE POST OFFICE

(By Milton Friedman)

". . . The tyranny of the status quo leads most of us to take it for granted that the postal service must be a government monopoly. The facts are very different. There have been many private ventures—including the storied Pony Express, which failed when the telegraph line (also private) reached California and provided an even faster service. Many others succeeded—which was precisely what led postal officials to foster, over many decades, a succession of Congressional enactments to outlaw private mail delivery.

"It would be objected that private firms would skim the cream by concentrating on first-class mail and especially local urban delivery—on which the Post Office makes a substantial profit—while leaving to the Post Office the mail on which it loses money.

"But this is an argument for, not against, competition. Users of first-class mail are now being overcharged (taxed is the word we use in other contexts) to subsidize the distribution of newspapers, periodicals and junk mail. Similarly, local delivery subsidizes mail for remote areas.

"If we want to subsidize the distribution of such material, we should do so openly and directly—by giving the originators of such mail a subsidy and letting them buy the services of distributing it as best they can. And we should finance the subsidy in accordance with the general canons of taxation, not by a special levy on the users of first-class mail.

"Nonetheless, the argument is politically powerful. It explains why many a newspaper and periodical—even some staunch defenders of free markets in other connections—will defend the Post Office's monopoly. They will defend it because they favor subsidizing dissemination of information and educational matter—but doubt that they can persuade the public to do so directly and openly. . . .

"In any event, I see no reason myself why readers of newspapers and periodicals, and distributors of junk mail, should not bear the full cost of distribution, whatever it may turn out to be—and I, for one, hope that it does not turn out be so low as to encourage still more junk mail."

ACTIONS BY THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSUMER AFFAIRS ON H.R. 11601, THE CONSUMER CREDIT PROTECTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURPHY of New York). Under previous order of the House the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs of the House Committee on Banking and Currency met this morning in executive session to work on H.R. 11601, the Consumer Credit Protection Act, which I introduced in behalf of myself and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MINISH], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO], the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN]. An identical bill, H.R. 11806, was introduced by the ranking member of the full committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER], for himself and numerous other Members of the House.

H.R. 11601 contains many, many provisions dealing with consumer credit which are not included in S. 5, the "truth-in-lending" bill passed by the Senate on July 11. Among these provisions are a requirement for disclosure of the annual rate on finance charges on revolving credit, on first mortgages, and on credit transactions where the finance charge is less than $10. All three of the categories were exempted from the annual rate requirement of the Senate bill applying to other forms of consumer credit.

As everyone knows who has followed the history of this legislation since former Senator Douglas first introduced his truth-in-lending bill 7 years ago, the applicability of an annual percentage rate disclosure requirement on revolving credit has always been the most bitterly fought provision. The Senate resolved the controversy by exempting revolving credit from this requirement. The Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs, of which I am chairman, appears to be completely deadlocked on this issue by a division of 6 to 6.

UNDER SECRETARY BARR STRONGLY REEMPHASIZES ADMINISTRATION POSITION THAT ANNUAL RATE BE DISCLOSED ON REVOLVING CREDIT

Mr. Speaker, as I told the House last Thursday, I have been hearing second- and third-hand reports to the effect that President Johnson and his administration are not seriously concerned over the need to require an annual percentage rate disclosure on open end credit transactions. That is why I felt it was important to relay to the House last Thursday the repeated admonitions I received from the President to fight for a strong bill which provided for uniform methods in the disclosure of credit costs on an annual rate basis.

Last night I received from the Honorable Joseph W. Barr, Under Secretary of the Treasury, and the official who has been assigned the responsibility in the Johnson administration of coordinating the executive department efforts in behalf of meaningful "truth in lending" legislation, a letter which firmly reiterates and vigorously reemphasizes administration support for an annual percentage rate disclosure requirement on all consumer credit, including revolving credit. Otherwise, this letter states, the legislation would unfairly discriminate against those lenders and credit sellers who use installment contracts rather than revolving credit. This is the point which has been stressed to us over and over again by the furniture dealers, the appliance dealers, the hardware stores, the banks, and the small loan firms.

Mr. Barr stated:

I wish, therefore, to repeat and re-emphasize the position that all creditors, without exception, should be required to disclose the cost of credit on an annual rate basis if there is to be effective truth-in-lending legislation, which is so badly needed.

The full text of Under Secretary Barr's letter to me last night is as follows:

THE UNDER SECRETARY
OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D.C., October 3, 1967.

Hon. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
Chairman, Consumer Affairs Subcommittee, Committee on Banking and Currency, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MADAM CHAIRMAN: Your Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs of the House Banking and Currency Committee has under consideration H.R. 11601 which would require lenders and credit sellers to disclose the true cost of credit to potential customers. The provisions of that bill are applicable both to installment credit sales and to revolving credit transactions.

In my testimony before your Subcommittee on August 7, 1967, I expressed the Administration's strong support for the inclusion of revolving credit in the requirement that among other items of credit information, the annual percentage rate of finance charge be disclosed. Since that testimony, it has become increasingly clear that the exclusion of revolving credit from this requirement would unfairly discriminate against those lenders and credit sellers who rely primarily on installment contracts in their credit sales or lending transactions. Also the average consumer can only make a sound decision about incurring debt by comparing the varying costs of credit available from different sources which are quoted on a comparable basis. If annual rates are not disclosed across the board, there can be no meaningful basis for general credit cost comparison by the consumer.

I wish, therefore, to repeat and re-emphasize the position that all creditors, without exception, should be required to disclose the cost of credit on an annual rate basis if there is to be effective truth-in-lending legislation, which is so badly needed.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH W. BARR.

Obviously, this issue eventually is going to have to be resolved in the full Committee on Banking and Currency and on the House floor. The subcommittee, as I said, seems to be deadlocked on the question of amending my bill to exempt revolving credit from an annual rate disclosure requirement, as was done in S. 5 as it passed the Senate. Therefore, I think it is extremely important that all of the Members of the full committee and of the House are fully apprised of the issue.

In the meantime, a number of tentative decisions were made in the subcommittee on H.R. 11601, and we will continue working on the bill a week from today at our next meeting.

AMENDMENTS ADOPTED IN SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. Speaker, when the subcommittee met this morning we took the following tentative actions:

On my motion, we deleted from H.R. 11601 four controversial sections. These included section 203(1) which would have set a maximum figure of 18 percent for any finance charge in connection with the extension of consumer credit;

section 203(m) to outlaw confession of judgment notes; section 207 providing for regulation of margins in commodity futures trading; and section 208 providing authority on a standby basis for the regulation and control of consumer credit terms during a national emergency.

We received some very good testimony on most of these proposals during our hearings but there was no administration backing for them and it was obvious that they would not be approved at this time, particularly as part of a bill directed primarily toward full disclosure of credit costs. I think it was worthwhile including these provisions in the bill for the purpose of holding hearings but there was never any doubt that they would be removed when it came time to reduce the bill to workable proportions.

Numerous technical amendments which I offered were tentatively approved in the subcommittee—one recommended by the New York State Bankers Association dealing with the treatment of fees for insurance, comparable to filing fees in filing a security interest. Another perfecting amendment, suggested by the National Automobile Dealers Association, modifies the civil penalties provided in the bill, but only as these penalties relate to violations involving the advertising of credit terms. The criminal penalties would not be affected, however, by this change.

BINGHAM AMENDMENT ON REVOLVING CREDIT

A significant amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM], was approved, requiring that in open-end credit transactions, popularly known as revolving charge, the creditor must disclose, for each billing period at the end of which there is an outstanding balance on which a finance charge is to be made, the balance on which the finance charge was computed and a statement of how the balance was determined. If such a balance is determined without first deducting all payments during the period, that fact and the amount of such payments shall also be disclosed.

This amendment strikes at one of the main sources of consumer complaint about the practices of some retailers, particularly some of the large chains, in basing the 1½ percent monthly service charge not on the overdue balance but on the balance at the start of the billing cycle, disregarding any payments made during the month unless the entire balance is paid off during the month. Thus, if the debt is $100 at the start of the month, and every cent of it is not paid off during the month, the service charge would be $1.50 regardless of whether the customer paid $10 or $90 on the account during the month.

H.R. 11601 STILL A STRONG AND EFFECTIVE BILL

I have listed the major deletions which we tentatively made this morning, on my motion, in H.R. 11601. I do not want to leave the impression that by taking four controversial provisions out of the bill it was in any way damagingly weakened. The provisions which were tentatively deleted went far beyond disclosure requirements. At the time I introduced the bill, I made it clear that some of these provisions were intended as a basis for hearings, and I said I would not permit controversy over them to prevent action on basic "truth-in-lending" legislation.

Thus, even with these proposed changes agreed to this morning, H.R. 11601 is a very strong bill which goes well beyond S. 5, the bill which passed the Senate.

It includes revolving credit on an annual rate basis, which the Senate bill does not.

It includes first mortgages, which the Senate bill does not.

It requires an annual rate disclosure on all consumer credit transactions, and does not exempt, as the Senate bill does, those on which the credit charge is less than $10.

It applies "truth" requirements to the advertising of credit terms, which the Senate bill does not do.

It sets an effective date of July 1, 1968, compared to July 1, 1969, in the Senate bill, and eliminates a provision of the Senate bill which permits sellers or vendors of credit to express a rate in terms of dollars per hundred per year until January 1, 1972.

It provides for administrative enforcement, which the Senate bill does not do.

It prohibits the garnishment of wages for salary due an employee and, in an amendment this morning, extends this protection also to those whose compensation is in the form of commission or bonus. The Senate bill has no provisions dealing with garnishment.

It establishes a National Commission on Consumer Finance to investigate consumer credit practices, et cetera. There is no comparable provision in the Senate bill.

In other words, H.R. 11601 still remains strong and effective legislation in its basic objectives.

WASHINGTON POST SERIES CONTINUES TO DOCUMENT MORTGAGE IRREGULARITIES

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as part of my remarks on the floor, the first three articles in a series by Washington Post reporters Leonard Downie, Jr., and David A. Jewell, on the victimization of many low-income homeowners in Washington by schemes involving the extension of credit ending with the surreptitious placement of mortgages against the properties. These articles underscore the need for effective truth-in-lending legislation such as H.R. 11601, including coverage of first mortgages. First mortgages are exempt from the credit disclosure requirements of S. 5 and of the companion bills introduced by six of the 12 members of the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs—the six who are not sponsors of H.R. 11601.

I think it is urgent that first mortgages be covered by the legislation because, in numerous instances, what we generally regard as second mortgages are, in fact, first mortages if there is no existing mortgage on the property. This occurs particularly in those instances where an elderly couple or a widow owns a home free and clear but the home needs extensive or expensive repairs.

Today's article in the Downie-Jewell series in the Washinton Post discusses the well-known referral device in which customers are promised substantial or complete rebates of the cost of the work if they demonstrate the product to friends and neighbors or refer possible customers. The frightening thing brought to light in this article is the manner in which certain firms obtained mortgages on the properties without the customers' knowledge or understanding. This must be stopped. Following my remarks today, I will place the article, "Intercom Buyers Expected Prizes, but Got Mortgages," in the RECORD.

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF CONSUMER CREDIT BILLS

First, however, I want to share with the Members a comprehensive staff analysis prepared in the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs of the three different approaches in legislation introduced in the House. This analysis does not show the disposition of amendments offered in the subcommittee this morning since, of course, all decisions this morning were tentative. From the report I have given of the amendments which were adopted, it is not too difficult to see how H.R. 11601, the bill on which we are working, would be changed by the amendments so far adopted.

More importantly, the analysis shows the major points of difference between H.R. 11601, and S. 5 as it passed the Senate—introduced by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] and other Republican Members as H.R. 11602—and as it would be modified by H.R. 12904, by the gentleman from California [Mr. HANNA] who was recognized this morning to offer his bill as a substitute for H.R. 11601. Mr. HANNA is planning to revise his bill but I think the basic provisions will not be different.

The analysis follows:

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSUMER AFFAIRS, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, STAFF COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF H.R. 11601 (SULLIVAN), S. 5 (SENATE BILL), AND H.R. 12904 (HANNA)

H.R. 11601 (SULLIVAN)	S. 5 (SENATE BILL)	H.R. 12904 (HANNA)
Sec. 1. Title: Consumer Credit Protection Act.	Sec. 1. Title: Truth-in-Lending Act.	Sec. 1. Title: Truth-in-Lending Act.
Title I—Credit transactions. (Title I of H.R. 11601 is in the form of an amendment to the Federal Reserve Act redesignating the existing Federal Reserve Act as title I—the Federal Reserve System and adding to that Act title II—Credit transactions.)		

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSUMER AFFAIRS, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, STAFF COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF H.R. 11601 (SULLIVAN), S. 5 (SENATE BILL), AND H.R. 12904 (HANNA)—Continued

H.R. 11601 (SULLIVAN)	S. 5 (SENATE BILL)	H.R. 12904 (HANNA)
Sec. 201. Declaration of Purpose.	Sec. 2. Declaration of Purpose.	Sec. 2. Declaration of Purpose.
(a) Economic stabilization and competition among financial institutions will be improved and strengthened by the informed use of consumer credit. Consumers are misled by the manner in which credit is offered and advertised. This failure of adequate disclosure leads to the uninformed use of credit "adversely affecting economic stabilization, increasing inflationary pressures, and decreasing the stability of the value of our currency." The purpose of this title is to ensure full disclosure of credit terms to permit consumer to compare credit terms available and avoid uninformed use of credit.	Economic stabilization and competition among financial institutions will be improved and strengthened by the informed use of consumer credit. Informed use of credit results from an awareness of credit costs. Its purpose is to achieve full disclosure to permit informed use of credit to the benefit of the national economy.	(Identical to S 5.)
(b) Stabilization of consumer prices would be enhanced through the regulation of commodity futures contracts and establishment of standby emergency control over consumer credit.		
Sec. 202. Definitions.	Sec. 3. Definitions.	Sec. 3. Definitions.
(a) *Board.* "Board" refers to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.	(a) *Board.* (Identical)	(a) *Board.* (Identical)
(b) *Credit.* "Credit" is defined as "The right granted by a creditor to defer payment of debt or to incur debt and defer its payment."	(b) *Credit.* (Identical)	(e) *Creditor.* (Identical)
(c) *Consumer Credit Sales.* "Consumer credit sales" defines consumer credit purchases as opposed to consumer loans.	(c) *Consumer Credit Sales.* (Identical)	(c) *Consumer Credit Sales.* (Identical)
(d) *Finance Charge.* "Finance charge" is defined as the sum of all the charges imposed by a creditor and payable by the debtor as incident to the extension of credit. However, official fees and taxes are not included in the definition under H.R. 11601.	(d) *Finance Charge.* The definition of "finance charge" contained in S. 5 is the same as the definition in H.R. 11601 except that charges imposed by the creditor for credit life, property, and casualty insurance are not to be included in the finance charge.	(d) *Finance Charge.* (Identical to S. 5.)
(e) *Creditor.* "Creditor" is defined as an individual or other legal entity regularly engaged in credit transactions.	(e) *Creditor.* (Identical)	(e) *Creditor.* (Identical)
(f) *Annual Percentage Rate.* "Annual percentage rate" is defined as the nominal percentage rate determined by the actuarial method.	(f) *Annual Percentage Rate.* (Identical)	(f) *Annual Percentage Rate.* (Identical)
(g) *Open-End Credit Plan.* "Open-end credit plan" or revolving credit plan defines plans permitting credit transactions from time to time, such as charge accounts and credit card accounts.	(g) *Open-End Credit Plan.* (Identical)	(g) *Open-End Credit Plan.* (Identical)
	(h) *Installment Open-End Credit Plan.* "Installment open-end credit plan" is defined as an open-end credit plan which: (1) creates a security interest in property; or (2) provides for payment of 60 percent or less of the amount of credit within one year; or (3) provides that accelerated payments shall be applied to future payments. (Under S. 5, open-end or revolving credit plans are exempt from the annual rate disclosure requirement, except for "installment open-end credit plans.")	(h) *Installment Open-End Credit Plan.* (Identical to S. 5.)
	(i) *First Mortgage.* "First mortgage" is defined as first liens on real estate under the applicable State law. (First mortgages are exempt from coverage under the Senate bill.)	(i) *First Mortgages.* (Identical to S. 5.)
(h) *Organization.* "Organization" is defined as a corporation, government or governmental subdivision or agency, business or other trust, estate, partnership, or association. (The extension of credit to an "organization" is exempt from the provisions of Title I of this bill.)	(j) *Organization.* (Identical to "(h) 'Organization' " of H.R. 11601.)	(j) *Organization.* (Identical to S. 5.)
(i) *Advertisement in Interstate Commerce or Affecting Interstate Commerce.* "Advertisement" is defined as including the advertising of goods, services, loans, or open-end credit plans.		(k) *Advertisement in Interstate Commerce or Affecting Interstate Commerce.* (Identical to H.R. 11601.)
(j) *State.* "State" is defined as any State, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or the District of Columbia.		
Sec. 203. Disclosure of Finance Charges; Advertising.	Sec. 4. Disclosure of Finance Charges.	Sec. 4. Disclosure of Finance Charges.
(a) Establishes basic principle that disclosure must be made to persons "upon whom a finance charge is or may be imposed pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Board."	(a) (Identical)	(a) (Identical)

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSUMER AFFAIRS, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, STAFF COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF H.R. 11601 (SULLIVAN), S. 5 (SENATE BILL), AND H.R. 12904 (HANNA)—Continued

H.R. 11601 (SULLIVAN)	S. 5 (SENATE BILL)	H.R. 12904 (HANNA)
(b) Establishes the disclosure requirements for a consumer credit sale, *other than* sales under an open-end credit plan. It requires the disclosure of (1) The cash price. (2) Amounts credited as downpayments. (3) The difference between (1) and (2). (4) Itemization of all charges included in the amount of credit extended but *not* part of the finance charge. (5) The total amount to be financed. (6) The amount of the finance charge. (7) The finance charge expressed as an annual percentage rate. (8) The payment schedule. (9) Default or delinquency charges.	(b) This section is the same as the provisions of H.R. 11601, *except that* the Senate bill contains an exemption of the disclosure of the finance charge as an annual percentage rate where the finance charge is less than $10.	(b) This provision of H.R. 12904 is the same as the comparable provision of the Senate bill, *except that* the finance charge need not be expressed as an annual percentage rate if: (1) the finance charge is $5 or less and the amount financed is $25 or less; (2) if the finance charge is $7.50 or less and the amount financed exceeds $25 but does not exceed $50; or (3) if the finance charge is $10 or less and the amount financed exceeds $50. In applying the aforementioned schedule, "a creditor may not divide a consumer credit sale into two or more sales to avoid the disclosure of an annual percentage rate." This section of H.R. 12904 further provides that where an unsolicited mail or telephone order is received by a seller, full disclosure of credit terms must be made prior to the date that the first payment is due. (H.R. 11601 and S. 5 require that such disclosure must be made on or before the date that first payment is due.) Similarly, H.R. 12904 provides that where additional transactions are added to an existing account, the disclosure of additional information shall be made prior to the date that first payment is required to be made.
(c) Establishes disclosure requirements for lender credit and would cover transactions by financial institutions, such as banks, credit unions, savings banks, savings and loan institutions, industrial banks, and consumer finance companies.	(c) This section is the same as the provision of H.R. 11601, *except that* the Senate bill contains an exemption of the disclosure of the finance charge as an annual percentage rate where the finance charge is less than $10.	(c) This provision of H.R. 12904 is the same as the comparable provision of S. 5 *but see* comment above *re* finance charge expressed as an annual percentage rate and unsolicited mail or telephone order.
(d) (1) This subsection establishes the disclosure requirements under open-end or revolving credit plans.	(d) (1) (Identical)	(d) (Identical to Section 4(d) of S. 5.)
(d) (2) Prior to opening an account under an open-end credit plan, the creditor must disclose: (A) The conditions under which a finance charge may be imposed. (B) The method of determining the balance upon which a finance charge will be imposed. (C) The method of determining the amount of the finance charge and the annual percentage rate of the finance charge. (D) The conditions under which other charges may be imposed.	(d) (2) This subsection of the Senate bill is the same as H.R. 11601 *except that* it does not require the disclosure of an *annual* percentage rate, but requires instead the disclosure of the rate per period (e.g., monthly rate).	
(d) (3) This subsection establishes the criteria of disclosure for each billing cycle under an open-end credit plan. The creditor is required to disclose: (A) the outstanding balance in the account at the beginning of the billing period; (B) the amount and date of each extension of credit during the period; (C) the total amount credited to the account during the period; (D) the amount of any finance charge added to the account during the period; (E) the finance charge expressed as an annual percentage rate; (F) the balance on which the finance charge was computed; (G) the outstanding balance in the account at the end of the period; (H) the date by which payment must be made to avoid additional finance charges.	(d) (3) This subsection of the Senate bill is the same as the comparable section of H.R. 11601, *except that* the Senate bill does *not* require the disclosure of finance charges as an annual percentage rate.	
(e) Acknowledgment of disclosure.	(e) (Identical)	(e) (Identical)
(f) Method of Disclosure. Specific provision is made in this subsection to permit the creditor to provide any additional information or explanation as he may choose in addition to the information for which disclosure is required.	(f) (Identical)	(f) (Identical)
(g) Compliance with comparable State law constitutes compliance with this title.	(g) (Identical)	(g) (Identical)
(h) Adjustments in payment after the contract will not constitute violation of law.	(h) (Identical)	(h) (Identical)

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSUMER AFFAIRS, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, STAFF COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF H.R. 11601 (SULLIVAN), S. 5 (SENATE BILL), AND H.R. 12904 (HANNA)—Continued

H.R. 11601 (SULLIVAN)	S. 5 (SENATE BILL)	H.R. 12904 (HANNA)
(i) After June 30, 1968, all rates required to be disclosed pursuant to this section must be expressed as percentage rates.	(i)(1)(A) S. 5 requires that whenever annual rate disclosure is called for under this section, it may be expressed either as a percentage rate per year or as dollars per hundred per year, or as a dollars per year rate of the average unpaid balance. (B) Whenever a rate other than an annual rate is to be disclosed under this section of S. 5, such rate may be expressed either as percentage rate per period or as a dollars per hundred per period rate of the balance upon which the finance charge is computed. (i)(2) After January 1, 1972, rates required to be disclosed under his section of the Senate bill must be expressed as percentage rates.	(i) (Identical to Section 4(i) of S. 5.)
(j)(1) Truth-in-credit Advertising Provision. This subsection requires that where specific credit terms are advertised, the advertisement must set forth the cash sale price, the payment schedule, the downpayment, if any, the time balance price, and the finance charge expressed as an annual percentage rate. (2) Specific periodic credit amounts or installment amounts cannot be advertised unless the creditor usually and customarily arranges credit payments or installments for such periods or amounts. (3) Specific downpayment requirements may not be advertised unless the creditor usually and customarily arranges downpayments in such amounts.		(j) This section contains truth-in-credit advertising provision of H.R. 12904. (j)(1) If a creditor advertises the dollar amount or rate of finance charge and if disclosure of the rate of the advertised finance charge would be required if credit were extended, the advertisement must state the rate of the finance charge in the manner prescribed under Section 4(b)(7) or Section 4(c)(5). (2) If the creditor advertises the number of installment payments or the amount of an installment payment, and if the number or amount of such payments would be required to be disclosed under Sections 4(b)(8) or Section 4(c)(6), the advertisement must further state: (A) the cash price or the amount of the loan. (B) the downpayment. (C) the payment schedule. (D) the rate of the finance charge as required by Section 4(b)(7) or Section 4(c)(5).
(k) Advertisement of credit terms under an open-end credit plan.		(k) This subsection states the requirements of disclosure in advertising concerning the extension of credit under an open-end credit plan. If specific terms of such a plan are advertised, the advertisement must disclose: (1) the conditions under which a finance charge may be imposed. (2) the method of determining the balance upon which a finance charge will be imposed. (3) the method of determining the amount of the finance charge, the percentage rate of period of the finance charge and, in the case of an installment open-end credit plan, the equivalent annual percentage rate. (4) the conditions under which other charges may be imposed.
(l) 18 percent maximum finance charge in extension of consumer credit.		(l) The creditor may not represent in an advertisement that a specific credit amount or installment payment can be arranged unless the creditor in the usual and ordinary course of business is prepared to arrange credit payments or installments for the advertised period or amount or that a specific downpayment is required unless the creditor is prepared in the usual and ordinary course of business to accept downpayments in such amount.
(m) Prohibition of the use of confession of judgment notes.		(m) Catalog and multiple-page advertisements shall be considered as a single advertisement for the purpose of the application of subsections (j), (k), and (l). (See Sec. 8.)
(n) Exemptions to disclosure requirements of Section 203. (1) Extension of credit for business or commercial purposes, to government or governmental agencies or instrumentalities or to organizations; (2) Transactions in securities and commodities in accounts by a broker-dealer registered with the SEC, or	(See Sec. 8 below, for exemption provisions of S. 5 and H.R. 12904.)	(n)(1) Violations of Subsections (j), (k), (l), and (m) shall constitute violations of Section 5(a) of the Federal Trade Commission Act. (2) Incorporates the administrative enforcement provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act by reference and to H.R. 12904.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSUMER AFFAIRS, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, STAFF COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF H.R. 11601 (SULLIVAN), S. 5 (SENATE BILL), AND H.R. 12904 (HANNA)—Continued

H.R. 11601 (SULLIVAN)	S. 5 (SENATE BILL)	H.R. 12904 (HANNA)
(3) Credit transactions, other than real property transactions, in which the total amount to be financed exceeds $25,000.		(3) For the purpose of enforcing subsections (j), (k), (l), and (m), the exception contained in Section 5(a)(6) of the Federal Trade Commission Act with regard to Federal Trade Commission jurisdiction of banks, common carriers, air carriers, foreign air carriers, persons, partnership, or corporations subject to the Packers and Stockyards Act shall not be applicable. (4) Authorizes the Federal Trade Commission to make rules and regulations with regard to subsections (j), (k), (l), and (m). (5) Authorizes the Federal Trade Commission to bring actions in U.S. District Courts to enjoin the dissemination of advertisement in violation of subsections (j), (k), (l), and (m).
Sec. 204. Regulations. (a)(1) The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System are given authority to prescribe regulations concerning disclosure requirements under the Act. Section 204(a)(1) deals specifically with the prescription of regulations concerning the methods for determining the annual percentage rate. (a)(2) This subsection is concerned with the prescription of procedures concerning the disclosure of information. (a)(3) This subsection gives the Board authority to prescribe reasonable tolerances. (b) Provides the Board with guidelines in the establishing of reasonable tolerances concerning disclosure. (c) Authorizes the Board by regulation to prescribe "classifications, differentiations and . . . adjustments and exceptions." (d) Authorizes the Board to consult with other agencies concerning particular classes of creditors. (3) Requires the Board to establish an advisory committee to advise and consult in the exercise of its responsibilities under the disclosure provisions of the Act.	Sec. 5. Regulations. (Identical except for minor technical differences.)	Sec. 5. Regulations. (Identical to S. 5.)
Sec. 205. Effect on State Laws. (a) This section states that the disclosure requirements of the Act shall not be construed "to annul, alter or affect or to exempt any creditor from complying with the laws of any State relating to the disclosure information in connection with credit transactions, except to the extent that such laws are inconsistent" with the disclosure requirements of the Act. (b) Requires the Board to exempt any class of credit transactions from the requirements of the Federal law which it determines are subject to State law or regulation.	Sec. 6. Effect on State Laws. (Identical except for minor technical differences.)	**Sec. 6. Effect on State Laws.** (Identical to S. 5.)
Sec. 206. Civil and Criminal Penalties. (a) Civil Penalties. This section sets forth the civil penalties for violation of the finance charge, with a minimum of $100 and a maximum of $1,000. It provides that a creditor, as a defense to a civil action, may prove that the failure to disclose was unintentional. (b) Criminal Penalties. Criminal Penalties of $5,000 or one year imprisonment or both, are called for. Responsibility for enforcing this section is given to the Attorney General. (c) Exempts the Federal Government and State and local governments from civil and criminal liabilities. (d) Exempts creditors from civil or criminal penalties by reason of overstating the annual percentage rate.	Sec. 7. Civil and Criminal Penalties. (Identical except for minor technical differences.)	**Sec. 7. Civil and Criminal Penalties.** (Identical to S. 5.)
Sec. 207. Regulation of Credit Commodity Futures Trading. This section authorizes the Board of Governors to prescribe regulations governing the amount of credit that may be extended or maintained in the use of credit for the creation, carrying or trading in commodity futures contracts.	(No comparable provision.)	(No comparable provision.)
Sec. 208. Emergency Control of Consumer Credit.	(No comparable provision.)	(No comparable provision.)

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSUMER AFFAIRS, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, STAFF COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF H.R. 11601 (SULLIVAN), S. 5 (SENATE BILL), AND H.R. 12904 (HANNA)—Continued

H.R. 11601 (SULLIVAN)	S. 5 (SENATE BILL)	H.R. 12904 (HANNA)
This section authorizes the Board to issue regulations with regard to the extension of consumer credit controls whenever the President determines that a national emergency exists requiring such action.		
Sec. 209. Administrative Enforcement. This section authorizes the Board to initiate administrative proceedings against any person who is engaged or is about to engage in a violation of the disclosure provisions of the Act and to issue such orders as the Board deems necessary to stop such violation. The section provides for judicial review of administrative orders so issued by the Board.	(No comparable provision.)	(No comparable provision.)
(See Section 203(n)).	Sec. 8. Exceptions. This section provides for exceptions from the coverage of the Act to: (1) credit transactions involving business or commercial purposes, governments or governmental agencies or organizations; (2) transactions in securities or commodities in accounts by a broker-dealer registered with the SEC; (3) credit transactions, other than real property, in which the amount financed exceeds $25,000; or (4) transactions involving extensions of credit secured by first mortgages.	Sec. 8. Exceptions. (Identical to S. 5.)
Sec. 210. Reports. This section requires the Board and the Attorney General to make annual reports to the Congress concerning their respective functions under the Act. The Board is further required to report on the extent to which compliance with the Act and regulations are being misused.	Sec. 9. Reports. (Identical)	Sec. 9. Reports. (Identical)
Sec. 211. Effective Date. The provisions of Title I of H.R. 11601 take effect on July 1, 1968.	Sec. 10. Effective Date. The provisions of S. 5 take effect on July 1, 1969, except that Section 5 takes effect upon enactment.	Sec. 10. Effective Date. (Identical to S. 5.)
Title II. Prohibition of garnishment of wages. Sec. 201. This section expresses the Congressional findings that the "garnishment of wages is frequently an essential element in predatory extensions of credit and that the resulting disruptions of employment, production, and consumption constitutes a substantial burden upon interstate commerce." (a) Prohibits the garnishment of wages for salary due an employee. (b) Provides a criminal penalty of a maximum of $1,000 or one year in jail, or both, for violation of Section 202(a).	(No comparable provision.)	(No comparable provision.)
Title III. Commission on Consumer Finance. Sec. 301. This section establishes a bipartisan National Commission on Consumer Finance. Sec. 302. Membership for the Commission. This section provides for the establishment of a 9-member Commission—3 members of the Senate, 3 members of the House, and 3 public members. Sec. 303. This section provides for the compensation of members of the Commission. Sec. 304. This section provides that the "Commission shall study and appraise the functioning and structure of the consumer finance industry", reporting its findings and recommendations to the President and to the Congress by December 31, 1969. Sec. 305. This section describes the powers of the Commission. Sec. 306. This section describes the administrative arrangements under which the Commission may operate. Sec. 307. This section authorizes the appropriation of $1.5 million for the Commission.	(No comparable provision.)	(No comparable provision.)
Title IV. Severability. Sec. 401. This section provides that the judicial finding that any provision of the Act is invalid shall not affect the validity of any other provision of the Act.	(No comparable provision.)	(No comparable provision.)

HOW HOMEOWNERS PURCHASED IMPROVEMENTS AND DISCOVERED THEY HAD ACQUIRED NEW MORTGAGES

Mr. Speaker, I cannot speak too highly of the investigative work of the two reporters on the Washington Post whose articles on home improvement rackets have been so revealing. These articles provide additional evidence of the need for effective consumer credit protection legislation. Following is the article which appeared in this series this morning:

INTERCOM BUYERS EXPECTED PRIZES, BUT GOT MORTGAGES

(By Leonard Downie Jr. and David A. Jewell)

"The salesman made it seem so nice," one housewife remembered. "It looked as though we could cut the total price way down—maybe even make a profit."

She did not make a profit. Instead, she is paying more than she expected for a very special kind of status symbol—a home intercom system. And she had a second mortgage on her home that she never knew she signed.

She is one of scores of customers of six local firms who sold intercoms and water softeners during the past five years and whose sales practices are now under investigation by Federal authorities.

There are many reputable electrical firms in Washington that sell such equipment without questionable sales methods and without obtaining second mortgages to secure payment of the sales price.

The salesmen of the six firms under investigation went door-to-door in ghetto and other inner-city neighborhoods where the intercoms and water softeners are surprisingly big sellers.

The six firms used "chain referral" sales schemes in which salesmen offered homeowners a chance to get large amounts of their money back by referring new customers to the firm.

Their customers have complained, in court suits and interviews with reporters of The Washington Post, that they did not get much or any money back and that they wound up with second mortgages on their homes—mortgages they didn't know they had signed.

The six firms are among a dozen under investigation by local and Federal authorities for their second-mortgage practices.

Reporters went through real estate records and called homeowner after homeowner listed as having $1389 second mortgages on their homes. Time after time, it turned out that the homeowner was a customer of one of the firms, Allied Enterprizes, Inc.

Many said they had not known that the mortgages existed. Those who did know about them said they had not found out until they were contacted by police or Federal investigators, or called the finance company that was collecting their payments.

The homeowners all told the same story:

An Allied salesman came to their home to tell them about the intercom system—complete with am-fm radio, and burglar and fire "panic" alarms.

The $1389 price seemed high to the homeowner. (One electrical contractor told reporters that a maximum for this type of job would be $600, without financing charges.)

PROMISED PRIZES

But the Allied salesman told them they could get money back in "prizes" for referring friends to Allied as customers, according to the homeowners.

The homeowner was told he would become an "equipment-owning representative" and receive $100 for each person referred who bought an intercom. And he could receive up to $1000 in additional prizes for making 45 "qualified demonstrations" of his intercom system to prospective customers.

But a Federal Trade Commission examiner found earlier this year that "few, if any" of Allied's customers received "enough referral commissions to obtain their intercom at little or no cost."

Allied's salesmen made "false, misleading and deceptive" statements to customers that the intercom was "being sold at a reduced price as an introductory or advertising plan," the FTC examiner ruled.

And, he added, Allied's salesmen, "for the purpose of inducing the sale" of its product, failed to inform customers that they were signing a second mortgage on their home.

The FTC examiner ordered Allied, and its president, William R. Marion Sr., to "cease and desist" from using chain-referral selling schemes or any "false, misleading or deceptive" statements in trying to get names of more prospective customers.

WENT OUT OF BUSINESS

At about this time, when the FTC order was issued last January, Allied went out of business. It left behind more than 200 homeowners with nearly $300,000 worth of second mortgages, according to District real estate records.

Five homeowners have brought suit against Allied in U.S. District Court charging that the firm defrauded them through misleading chain referral sales schemes, and obtained their signatures on second mortgages without their knowledge.

Marion, who lives at 211 Dorset rd., Laurel, Md., could not be reached for comment yesterday. Mrs. Marion told a reporter that her husband had been in the home-improvement field for 15 years "and this (the FTC order) is the only time he has been in any trouble."

One homeowner who has filed suit against Allied, Lugenure Talbert, of 1224 Farraday pl., ne., said in her suit that an Allied salesman, Samuel C. Cratch Jr., persuaded her to buy an intercom after he explained the sales referral plan.

After the intercom was installed, she said, Cratch returned with more papers to sign. "You signed the contract improperly," Mrs. Talbert quoted Cratch in her court complaint. She signed again.

She said she did not realize that she must have a signed a mortgage at that time until she got a letter from the Atlas Credit Corp. in Philadelphia informing her that it had bought her note, secured by a second mortgage. Her note was for $1389, the price of the intercom plus financing charges.

Cratch, in his answer to Mrs. Talbert's complaint, denied any wrongdoing. Atlas answered that it bought the note without knowledge of any fraud. Allied has not yet answered the suit.

Mrs. Talbert also charged that no notary public was present when she signed the papers in her home. The other four homeowners who sued Allied also said that they never appeared before a notary public during their dealings with Allied.

Yet in all five cases, the name and seal of the same notary public in Prince George's County, Md., appears on second mortgage in favor of Allied filed in the D.C. Recorder of Deeds office.

Several Allied customers interviewed by reporters said they would not have bought the intercoms if they had realized they were signing second mortgages to secure the notes for them. They also said they would have rejected the deal if they had known they wouldn't get any referral "prizes."

FEW GOT PRIZES

Only a few of the Allied customers interviewed said, they got any money back from Allied at all. No one interviewed said they received more than $100.

Allied broke down its $1389 price for the intercom into $992 for the equipment and installation and $397 financing charges. The system included the intercom master panel with an am-fm radio, six speakers and fire and burglar alarm devices.

The same brand of intercom system was sold by yet another firm operating here until late last year. This firm was called United Home Enterprises Corp., which also sold water softeners. United did at least $120,000 worth of business here in two years, real estate records show.

In February, two of its officers, Robert M. Cederloff and Adrian J. Barba, were indicted by a U.S. grand jury, which charged them with forging the names of eight Washington homeowners on eight mortgages in favor of United Home Enterprises. Their case is still pending and they are free in custody of their counsel.

Three of the homeowners named as complaining witnesses in the criminal case have filed suit against United Home Enterprises, claiming that their signatures were obtained on second mortgages by "fraud, trick and device" or by forgery.

They charge that they were talked into buying intercoms or water softeners at prices "in excess of the fair value of the equipment," again through the device of being offered money "prizes" for customer referrals.

In all three cases, the homeowners also charged that they never appeared before a notary public while signing papers for the United salesman.

In two cases, the seal and signature of a Prince George's County notary appears on the mortgage filed with the D.C. Recorder of Deeds. In the third case, the notarization is by a D.C. notary public.

NOTARIZATION DISPUTED

Other United Home Enterprises customers whose mortgage signatures were notarized by these two notaries told reporters that they never appeared before a notary public.

Cederloff said he told all the homeowners that they were signing "a second trust," although he added that he did not explain what it meant. "If you are a property owner, you should know what that means," Cederloff said.

When asked about the use of a chain referral sales method that homeowners have claimed is fraudulent, Cederloff said that "my firm is not being accused of this in the indictments."

Cederloff said the firm stopped doing business last year. "I don't feel that I misrepresented anything to the people," he says.

Besides Allied and United, at least four other firms have sold intercoms or water softeners to Washington homeowners using the chain referral sales method and obtaining signatures unknowingly in second mortgages, according to homeowners' court complaints.

According to court suits, interviews with homeowners, and information in the D.C. Recorder of Deeds office, the majority of the notes and mortgages generated by Allied Enterprizes and United Home Enterprises was bought by the Atlas Credit Corporation of Philadelphia (since merged into Sunasco, Inc.), through a Washington mortgage broker.

Atlas is named as a defendant in seven of the eight courts suits by homeowners against the two intercom firms. In each case, Atlas answered by saying that it bought the notes as a third party "without knowledge of any fraud" in the obtaining of the notes.

The law generally presumes that the third party—the "holder in due course"—has bought the note in good faith and has the right to collect on the note it paid for.

REV. MARTIN LUTHER KING: MAN OF PEACE OR APOSTLE OF VIOLENCE

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, one of the most incredible cases of American naivety can be found in the strange story of Rev. Martin Luther King. While alert Americans generally seem intent on discovering the facts, discussing the issues, and developing a dialog in scores of social, economic, political, and religious areas and debating the pros and cons of the Bishop Pikes, the Rap Browns, and the George Lincoln Rockwells, there is a strange silence and lack of debate when it comes to Martin Luther King.

It is almost as if he is being consciously protected by the press which normally accepts accolades for presenting both sides of a story and piercing with rays of informative reportorial light all proper facets of national life. King is a national figure, this cannot be denied. He is one of the only men who can go from jail cell to a conference with the President of the United States. His name is known; his cause is said to be civil rights. For one reason or another, however, very little is known about the real Martin Luther King. I believe that if his true character were known, he would not be able to command a corporal's guard to follow him.

While preaching nonviolence, I believe the record clearly shows him to be an apostle of violence. While gaining major support from clergymen, I believe he has preached an expedient, totally materialistic line which is the antithesis of religious teachings. He has openly associated with the most radical elements in our society. I believe he has done more for the Communist Party than any other person of this decade.

These may sound like strong words, Mr. Speaker, but the facts are even harsher. I have heard Reverend King speak. On one occasion he may have a soulful melancholy that is, without doubt, most impressive. On another, he can rant with the best of the demagogs; and while more sophisticated than Stokley Carmichael or Rap Brown, he says, in effect, the same thing. He makes no pretense at keeping his skirts clean or his house in order. He does not have to because the past 10 years have demonstrated that the liberal community and the news media of our country will either not note or meekly forgive his indiscretions.

Take the year 1967 alone. At a time when Detroit and Newark had just witnessed a virtual guerrilla war and a chaotic lawlessness without equal in modern times, King was urging a massive dislocation of northern cities. Instead of intervening as a moderating influence he took up the cause of the rabble-rousers and threatened these dislocations which, he averred, would force the Congress to provide financial assistance for slum Negroes. Yes, he would force us. Force us in this free society. Force is a word he understands well. He added:

> This is something like a last plea to the nation to respond to nonviolence. There is a great deal of bitterness (in the slums). If there is not provided a channel of constructive action, this bitterness will lead to desperation riots and social disruption.

At a time when the incendiary statements of Brown and Carmichael were sparking the riot-prone tensions, did King emerge as a national leader seeking to soothe these passions? No, he attended as keynote speaker the most radical assemblage of anti-Americans ever put together, and as the Communist Daily Worker approvingly and glowingly reported:

> He described vividly the racism that can praise in its history books a white Patrick Henry who sounded the call against the British redcoats while it condemns H. Rap Brown who insists that black victims of oppression in America should fight for their freedom.

Imagine that—comparing the rabble-rousers, the looters, the social misfits in America to patriots like Patrick Henry. He was further quoted as saying "Maybe the bluecoats in the ghetto are our redcoats."

The convention, the National Conference for New Politics—NCNP—heard chantings of "Kill Whitey, Kill Whitey" and the most revolutionary anti-American doctrine that could be imagined and yet the August 29–September 4, 1967, confab had the supposed "man of peace" Mr. King as their keynoter. It represented a major breakthrough for the Communist Party and King helped. For years, the Communists have chafed at the doctrine of separation which tended to keep them out of respectable liberal gatherings. In the 1930's, the liberals worked hand in hand with the Reds but the growth of anticommunism in the Nation has brought about a change in the 1950's and 1960's. Except for the more radical groups, liberals in general have tried to keep Communists from participating in their causes and at their conventions. King has consistently worked with Communists and has helped give them a respectability they do not deserve. The NCNP in Chicago represented such a breakthrough in the Red's goal of "nonexclusion" that they editorialized gleefully in their organ, the Daily Worker, on August 22, 1967.

Reverend King is the hero of many militant Negro leaders although denounced by others in the black power structure. He has allied with Cassius Clay. When you study his speeches closely you are struck by the obvious fact that while ostensibly condemning racism, he himself preaches a black racism. One of the leading black racists in the country is Rev. Albert C. Cleage, Jr., who just after the terrible riot told his Central United Church of Christ in Detroit:

> There is no escape for you and when white people try to tell that good niggers can get through this golden door of integration, don't believe it. We don't even want that door because that's destroying us.

Cleage went on to say:

> We are dealing with an enemy who is not going to accept us into American life.

In extolling King, he noted:

> Dr. King led black people to understand that integration could never come to pass. He helped black men understand that "the man" is an enemy.

In his flagrant disregard for law and order, Reverend King has given credibility to one of the most dangerous dogmas that can be promoted in an orderly society. He simply arrogates to his own inspiration the whim to disobey any law which he loosely terms unjust. Court orders, State, and Federal laws, municipal ordinances—they must all fall in front of his supposition that he has a divine right to break the law. His conduct is clearly criminal in this regard and certainly has helped develop the idea among rioters and looters that they can obey their own concepts of good and bad laws and act accordingly.

Like most power-hungry tyrants, he has gone one step too far. In disobeying a court order, he was sentenced to jail. On appeal to the Supreme Court, he was surprised to find that a usually supine and hopelessly liberal Court rose up in indignation and slapped his wrists in a strong indictment of his illegal activity. Said the Court in affirming his jail sentence on June 12, 1967:

> This Court cannot hold that the petitioners were constitutionally free to ignore all the procedures of the law and carry their battle to the streets. One may sympathize with the petitioners' impatient commitment to their cause. But respect for judicial process is a small price to pay for the civilizing hand of law, which alone can give abiding meaning to constitutional freedom.

Mr. Speaker, this succinct statement should be burned into the consciousness of all of those who have at one time or another fallen for the pious pronouncements of Martin Luther King. Carrying the battles to the streets, as the Court phrases it, is not a constitutional right. It is, in reality, criminal conduct and should not be condoned by any thinking American. I repeat again the Court's most emphatic statement:

> But respect for judicial process is a small price to pay for the civilizing hand of law, which alone can give abiding meaning to constitutional freedom.

At the height of the rioting fury which was sweeping the country, King joined three other civil rights leaders in issuing a cautious call for an end to violence because, among other things, it is self-destructive to the Negroes' interest. This was on July 26, 1967. Two days later King was visiting Cleveland, Ohio, on an inspection tour. He tersely expanded on his theme of violence being self-destructive when he said:

> I can't recommend burning down Cleveland. We end up getting killed more than anyone else and our businesses get burned.

No statement, Mr. Speaker, could more clearly expose the irresponsible, cynical nature of the subject of these remarks. This is typical of the manner in which he advocates "nonviolence." Burning, looting, and killing are not immoral or wrong, it would seem. Merely destructive to the self-interest of this particular minority group.

Reverend King expresses indignation over Vietnam. In this he is joined by many millions of Americans. Few of us are pleased at what is happening there but we are not disloyal to our Nation. Reverend King showed his true colors in April of this year in a major speech he delivered on Vietnam. I believe that any thinking American who will study his words must conclude as I have that he is disloyal to the United States. He maligned his country with lies and accusations that come straight from the Communist Party line. A strong statement you say. Listen to what he said. He praised Ho Chi Minh as the only true leader of the Vietnamese people. He condemned the United States as the "greatest purveyor of violence in the world today," and likened our Nation to Hitler's Germany. He condemned the late President Diem as "one of the most vicious modern dictators" and threw out wild charges like the United States may have killed 1 million children in Vietnam. He conjured up an American napalm war in Peru so he could denounce it. He said we have no honorable intentions in Vietnam and our minimal expectation is to occupy it as an American colony. These are but a few of the wild accusations of the Nobel Prize winner many people have been led to believe is a man of peace.

Even the ultraliberal Washington Post could not stomach King's blatant lies and propaganda. In an editorial entitled "A Tragedy," they roundly condemned King by saying, in part:

> A TRAGEDY
>
> Dr. Martin Luther King's Vietnam speech was not a sober and responsible comment on the war but a reflection of his disappointment at the slow progress of civil rights and the war on poverty.
>
> It was filled with bitter and damaging allegations and inferences that he did not and could not document. He flatly charged the Government with sending Negroes to fight and die in extraordinarily high proportions relative to the rest of the population. But Negro troops constitute 11 per cent of the enlisted personnel in Vietnam (10.5 per cent of the population was Negro in 1960). Negro casualties are higher than this (22.5 per cent of killed in action) because of higher Negro enlistment for elite corps and higher rate of Negro re-enlistment. No doubt these figures reflect in part the fact that civilian employment opportunities are not as great for the Negro. But they also reflect, in part, the zeal and courage of Negro soldiers. And they reflect the fact that in this war the Negro in uniform is not limited to work battalions.
>
> Dr. King says the United States may have caused a million civilian casualties in Vietnam—mostly children—but he did not give any supporting authority for this statement.
>
> He stated flatly that "our officials know" that less than 25 per cent of the members of the National Liberation Front are Communist—but he neglected to say what officials or where they said it.
>
> He contends that Ho Chi Minh knows that the bombing and shelling we are doing is "part of traditional preinvasion strategy," but gives no credence to our express declaration that no invasion is intended.
>
> He has no doubts that we have no honorable intentions in Vietnam and thinks it will become clear that our "minimal expectation is to occupy it as an American colony." He feels that men will "not refrain from thinking" that our "maximum hope is to goad China into a war so that we may bomb her nuclear installations." It is one thing to reproach a government for what it has done and said; it is quite another to attribute to it policies it has never avowed and purposes it has never entertained and then to rebuke it for these sheer inventions of unsupported fantasy.
>
> He has even conjured up an American napalm war in Peru so that he could denounce it.
>
> Dr. King is right to reproach America for not ending discrimination and poverty. But these are failure for which every Administration in the history of the United States deserves more reproach than this one. It is strange irony indeed that the Government which has labored the hardest to right these ancient wrongs is the object of the most savage denunciation, the most unreserved criticism and the most unfair blame.
>
> Dr. King has done a grave injury to those who are his natural allies in a great struggle to remove ancient abuses from our public life; and he has done an even graver injury to himself. Many who have listened to him with respect will never again accord him the same confidence. He has diminished his usefulness to his cause, to his country and to his people. And that is a great tragedy.

To those liberal and bleeding hearts who have not intelligently discerned what King has been saying and doing, during his decade of prominence, this may have come as a tragedy. To those of us who have followed him closely and have been aware, by both public and confidential documentation, of his questionable activity, it comes as no surprise at all. In 1967 the real King surfaced and yet where is the criticism he should be getting?

These are but a few highlights, Mr. Speaker, in the disappointing story of Martin Luther King. I say disappointing because he has had a rare opportunity to aline himself with an important cause and work for solution to social ills through our democratic process. This he has not done. He has had the opportunity to work with men of good will but all too often he has alined himself with the most radical and un-American elements in our country. I now present in detail some of the background of Martin Luther King.

THE VIOLENT NONVIOLENCE OF DR. KING

"I have a deep commitment to non-violence"—Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

On May 4, 1963, police dogs and firehoses were used to quell a demonstration by lawbreakers in Birmingham, Ala. There had been violence plain and simple. Martin Luther King and his right-hand man, Rev. Fred L. Shuttlesworth, threatened that these demonstrations would continue until there were not only promises of an end to segregation but "action." There was, they said, "no intention of relaxing pressure without such action. We negotiate from strength" and "will consider" calling off the demonstrations after the action. This was the mood of the well-known nonviolence of Dr. King.

The day following action by police dogs and firehoses, the New York Times reported that residents of Birmingham heard from the lips of King, the man who preached peace in the streets but led the lawless bands:

> Today was D-Day. Tomorrow will be double D-Day.

One seldom hears Martin Luther King's name without the "nonviolent" slogans coming in successive breaths. But quite often the nonviolence of King leads to violence of riot proportions. The big lie technique is clearly used. Repeat "nonviolence" over and over so the public will believe it and then practice violence or the encouraging of violence.

Violence accompanied King during his early days in Birmingham. It was present during the death of a fellow pastor at, of all places, a Baptist convention. It was with him in Albany, Ga. It returned with him to Birmingham and Albany. It followed him to St. Augustine, and they were together in Chicago. It is not an exaggeration to say he leaves a trail of violence in his wake.

In addition to the physical presence of Martin Luther King in flammable cities, there is the presence of King's words and ideas in every tension area across the United States. The power of Dr. King to promote violence was recognized early. Arrested for loitering in 1958, King was charged with irresponsibility by a judge who said:

> It is regrettable that this case arose . . . there was serious danger of an incident.

On many occasions, like Chicago in 1966, he goes to the scene of violence and instead of trying to settle troubled waters, he adds to the riot-producing tension.

Early statements of King reveal continued use of the phrase "direct action programs." His philosophy and purpose as outlined in his book, "Why We Can't Wait," amount to this. Note his forked tongue semantics. He admits that there is an effort to create a "crisis packed situation" but he concludes he is not a "creator of tension." He stated:

> The purpose of our direct-action program is to create a situation so crisis-packed that it will inevitably open the door to negotiation. . . . Actually, we who engage in nonviolent direct action are not the creators of tension. We merely bring to the surface the hidden tension that is already alive. We bring it out in the open, where it can be seen and dealt with.

In August of this year, at a time of serious racial tension, he said virtually the same thing—again with a certain amount of double talk. King said:

> Negroes will be mentally healthier if they do not suppress rage but vent it constructively and its energy peacefully but forcefully to cripple the operations of an oppressive society.

Read that one over several times and try to tie together the words "rage" which somehow is to be "vented" to "cripple" an "oppressive society."

Louis Waldman, a leading Negro labor lawyer in Chicago, answered King's statement this way:

> The philosophy and purpose of Dr. King's program . . . is to produce "crisis-packed" situations and "tension." Such a purpose is the very opposite of nonviolence, for the atmosphere-of-crisis policy leads to violence by provoking violence. *And the provocation of violence is violence.* To describe such provocation as "nonviolent" is to trifle with the plain meaning of words.
>
> The perpetual crisis technique has been used by the Communist movement throughout the world, both Communist governments and parties follow it. . . . It was used by Hitler in Germany, both on his road to power and after power came to him . . . It is disruptive of democratic society and institutions.
>
> Whether Dr. King knows it or not, or wills it or not, the policy of perpetual crisis, of provoking "tensions" as he calls it, and of civil disobedience, are disastrous to the Negro people themselves, to civil liberties

> and to constitutional government. Such a policy flies in the teeth of the very purpose of our Constitution, which is clearly stated in the Preamble to be, among other things, "to insure domestic tranquillity."

This is a damning indictment from a man who praises nonviolent approaches to problems of civil rights, and it comes not from a racist, but from a Negro who has been a champion of civil rights for decades.

Most Americans call the bloodshed, looting, fire bombing, and vandalism by its true name, violence, and to argue that these results of the King-led, -organized, and -backed marches, demonstrations, sit-ins, lie-ins, and the like are the fault of those who react against them is to argue not only against logic but also the law. The Supreme Court, in Hague against CIO, 1939, said:

> The privilege of a citizen to use the streets and parks for the communication of views on national questions must be regulated in the interests of all . . . and must be exercised in subordination to the general comfort and convenience, and in consonance with peace and good order."

This opinion of the Court was reaffirmed as late as 1966. Former Supreme Court Justice Charles E. Whittaker makes the point that it is an "ancient and honored legal maxim that all men are presumed to intend the natural consequences of their acts." From this maxim comes severe condemnation of Dr. King for the broad areas of unrest and lawlessness which he promotes under the title of civil rights. Largely through the connivance of the liberal community, King has generally escaped the responsibility he deserves for the logical consequences of his civil disobedience pronouncements.

THE UNJUST LAWS

King explained his ideas on civil disobedience in terms of just and unjust laws, and how they are to be broken, during an interview on the March 28, 1965, "Meet the Press":

> I do feel that there are two types of laws. One is a just law and one is an unjust law. I think we all have moral obligations to disobey unjust laws.
>
> I think that the distinction here is that when one breaks a law that conscience tells him is unjust, he must do it openly, he must do it cheerfully, he must do it lovingly, he must do it civilly, not uncivilly, and he must do it with a willingness to accept the penalty.

To King the only guide whether or not to violate the law is his own particular whim or caprice. He and he alone will decide. Note that there is no mention of the fact that following one's conscience may violate the conscious obedience to the law by many other citizens. To King it makes no difference, if one accepts the penalty.

In the recent Birmingham decision, already cited, which upheld fines and jail terms for King and others who defied a court injunction against a civil rights march, the majority of the Supreme Court agreed that:

> Civil liberties, as guaranteed by the Constitution, imply the existence of an organized society maintaining public order without which liberty itself would be lost in the excesses of unrestrained abuses . . . Respect for the judicial process is a small price to pay for the civilizing hand of law, *which alone can give meaning to constitutional freedom*. (Emphasis added.)

As usual, Reverend King tried to equate his own illegal contempt of court to Negro injustice. Appearing on the nationwide June 18, 1967, ABC program "Issues and Answers" he found the prospect of his 5-day jail sentence and the U.S. Supreme Court decision which ordered it upsetting to all Negroes. He warned the decision would "encourage riots and violence in the sense that it all but said that Negroes cannot redress their grievances through peaceful means without facing the kind of decision that we face."

This is directly false. In addition to his usual "invitation" to riots and violence, he tries to evade the real issue. He was not engaging in "peaceful means." He was engaging in illegal means, flouting the judicial process. The court decision was not saying anything to Negroes, it was a statement the law of the land which was clearly applicable to every American. The true King can be seen in this twisting of the facts, his effort at personal martyrdom and the veiled threat of riots and violence which he uses in virtually every situation.

The value of committing acts of civil disobedience "openly," "lovingly," as it were, is commented on by Attorney Waldman, previously cited:

> Apparently, Dr. King thinks that in violating laws "openly" he and his followers are more virtuous than those who violate laws secretly. As a matter of fact, the reverse is true. The open violation of law is an open invitation to others to join in such violation. Disobedience to law is bad enough when done secretly, but it is far worse when done openly, especially when accompanied by clothing such acts in the mantle of virtue and organizing well advertised and financed plans to carry out such violations. The secret violator of law recognizes his act for what it is: an antisocial act; he may even be ashamed of what he is doing and seek to avoid disapprobation of his neighbors. But the open violator, the agitating violator, acts shamelessly, in defiance of his neighbor's judgment and his fellow man's disapproval.

Dr. King defines unjust laws as "those in which people are required to obey a code that they had no part in making because they were denied the right to vote."

When pinned down about communities where Negroes have the right to vote, and asked whether there was still the "right" to disobey, King expanded his code for lawlessness even more:

> There may be a community where Negroes have the right to vote, but there are still unjust laws in that community. There may be unjust laws in a community where people in large numbers are voting, and I think wherever unjust laws exist people have a right to disobey these laws.

Here King jumped from Negroes to all people and from people without voting privileges to even those who do have the constitutional methods of change open to them. To him, the majority might always be wrong, the minority always right. Acceptance and promotion of this philosophy can only lead to the disintegration of American society. From it follows the chaotic situation where any one who believes, or even feels, that a law is unjust merely disobeys. The denial of freedom to the majority of Americans who obey the law is proportional to the number of persons who set themselves up as final judge and then disobey. While professing Christianity and humility, King strikes a harder blow at fundamental concepts of justice than any would-be dictator or other demagog in contemporary American history.

On the same "Meet the Press" program referred to earlier, Tom Wicker of the New York Times asked:

> How are we to enforce law when a doctrine is preached that one man's conscience may tell him that the law is unjust, when other men's consciences don't tell him that?

King responded:

> I think you enforce it, and I think you deal with it by not allowing anarchy to develop. I think the chief norm for guiding the situation is the willingness to accept the penalty, and I don't think any society can call an individual irresponsible who breaks a law and willingly accepts the penalty.

This is more King jibberish and feigned piety. To commit murder, for example, and then willingly go to prison to pay the penalty cannot change the nature of the transgression—it is still wrong.

Willingly or not, the question is still, in Judge Whittaker's words:

> Can anyone reasonably believe that a disorderly society can survive? In all recorded history none ever has. . . . History also shows that, in each instance, the first evidence of the society's decay appeared in its toleration of disrespect for, and violation of, its law. There is no good reason to believe that similar toleration will serve us differently.

WHEN CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE BECOMES NECESSARY

Inflammatory statements, threats and actual instances of civil disobedience are evident throughout the career of Martin Luther King. In December 1959, King called on southern Negroes to practice civil disobedience, if necessary, and to break, openly, any State or local law "not in harmony with Federal law. This," he continued, "is the creative moment for a full scale assault on the system of segregation. We must practice open, civil disobedience."

In the fall of 1961 King spoke on the role of the Negro student, stated his hollow call for nonviolence and in the next breath called for "disobeying the unjust laws."

Two years later in Birmingham, King warned that city of more massive demonstrations:

> I hope civil disobedience will not be necessary but, if something is not done quickly, if Congress filibusters the civil rights bill and does not pass the public accommodation section, Negroes will have to engage in massive civil disobedience.

Ten days later he said he feared violence and warned again that if the civil rights bill did not pass it "may lead to a night of darkness and violence."

I personally heard his threats at Howard University in 1964 during the time when Congress was debating the civil rights program, and I can assure you that he spoke not as a man of peace but as a man of violence.

In February of 1966, King and his men decided to assume "trusteeships" of a six-flat tenement in Chicago as part of a campaign to improve living conditions for the residents. King had no authority; his power was only that which is derived from police-state tactics. He simply took over. His reasoning: "morality" is more important than the law and property rights, the action was "supralegal," above the law.

In early April 1966, a circuit court judge enjoined King and his associates from entering the building, interfering, or collecting rent from the tenants, all of which they had done. There can be no denial of King's influence and the results of his "nonviolent" demonstrations and "direct action" programs.

The New York Times of July 16, 1962, stated that Reverend King "threatened a new drive for Negro rights" in Albany, Ga. Ten days later, leader King, according to the Times, set a day of penance following a night of rioting during which Negroes were arrested as they marched on city hall, hooting, laughing, and throwing bottles, bricks, and rocks at law officials. August 11, the police chief of Albany testified that the situation had been under control until King returned to the city to be tried for an illegal demonstration.

Another example of the "nonviolent direct-action" programs of Dr. King was exposed in July 1966 in the syndicated column by respected columnists, Robert Allen and Paul Scott. Their exposé reported that King and company were contacting, and enlisting, Chicago street gangs and "bringing them into the civil rights movement to fight 'the power structure'."

From a report said to be circulating through the U.S. Department of Justice, the columnists quoted these statements: King's lieutenants telling gang leaders that "the real foes are Mayor Daley, policemen, slumlords, bankers, businessmen, and school administrators"; or haranguing that this is an "unjust society"; and that "the gang members are being incited to violence instead of being taught nonviolence"; that "gang leaders have little or no understanding of civil rights, but do know how to use force." King, they said, had personally met several times with gang leaders who have a combined following of 1,000.

During the same month that King was reported to be enlisting the gangs, Chicago police battled some 300 Negroes for 2 straight hours of rioting. During the looting, gunfire, rock throwing, Molotov cocktail barrage, King reportedly sped from one trouble spot to another, ostensibly to quiet things, but reporters noted that he seldom got out of the car.

Some time later, August 9, the Chicago Tribune reported that:

> The Chicago Lawn area was the scene Friday night of civil rights disorder as the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., led Chicago marchers into the community to promote open housing for Negroes.

The Chicago riots of July 1966 deserve elaboration. Here is a selected sequence of events: The July 12 riot broke out just 2 days after King's mass civil rights rally. The Baltimore Sun, July 10, 1966, reported:

> In an interview . . . Dr. King acknowledged that his "end slums campaign in Chicago is an implementation program for the concept of 'black power'," but under a more palatable name.
>
> Dr. King acknowledged that his presence in Chicago, the street rallies, sit-ins, marches, and door-to-door campaign to sign up members of protesting [units] have more far-reaching aims than the immediate dramatization of problems of impoverished Negroes.

The next day King and Mayor Daley held a "showdown" meeting in the mayor's office. On July 14 the New York Times reported that the near West Side was tense after a police car was stoned by more than 100 Negro youths. Martin Luther King attributed the disturbance to the Mayor's refusal to make concessions to his civil rights program. This is his typical style. Rarely has Reverend King chastized looters, arsonists, and conspirators for violence. He always justifies their actions and, directly or indirectly, encourages them.

The report continued:

> Dr. King . . . spoke at the headquarters of the West Side Organization, where a sign on the wall said: "Burn, baby, burn, boycott, baby, boycott." Roving bands of youths and some adults . . . broke windows, looted stores, and stoned police cars and small police vans.

During the weekend of the 16th, 17th, and 18th, Governor Kerner called out the National Guard when police could not control rioting that in 3 nights included burning, looting, two deaths, 100 injuries, 300 arrests, and extensive property damage.

A few days before the riot, King stated that disrupting the flow of Chicago's traffic—a tactic of Dr. King's—would be "rough" on city officials "when they have to get 200 people off the Dan Ryan (expressway) but the only thing I can tell them is: Which do you prefer, this or a riot?" Another "nonviolent" pilot project was thus in action.

It is doubtful that the city officials made the final choice.

Chicago's Mayor Daley, as reported in the New York Times, "asserted angrily that the strife was 'planned!' Dr. King's aides were in here for no other reason than to bring disorder to the streets of Chicago," he concluded.

Following contact with the gangs mentioned earlier, it is disturbing to note that press accounts of the riots stated that Negro street gangs fanned the flames in the riot and were given credit for spreading violence to greater limits.

The Chicago Tribune reported that prior to the riots, King had showed films detailing the violence of Watts. Asked by the Tribune about this, King replied:

> The films showing the Watts riots were to demonstrate the negative effect of riots.

The films add another dimension to the activities of King that are well known by law enforcement officials. Their general reaction to King is summed up by FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover in this statement:

> Unfortunately, some civil rights leaders in the past have condoned what they describe as civil disobedience in civil rights demonstrations.
>
> Martin Luther King, Jr., for example, after arriving in Chicago, Ill., early in 1966 in connection with the civil rights drive there, commented about the use of so-called civil disobedience in civil rights demonstrations and said:
>
> "It may be necessary to engage in such acts. . . . Often an individual has to break a particular law in order to obey a higher law."
>
> Such a course of action is fraught with danger for if everyone took it upon himself to break any law that he believed was morally unjust, it is readily apparent there would soon be complete chaos in this country.

When the riots broke out on July 12, did Martin Luther King enter the scene as a moderating influence? Absolutely not. On the second day of the riot, July 13, a rally was held at a local church and King appeared with one Chester Robinson, executive director of the West Side Organization, who made highly flammatory accusations about the Chicago police. King's respectability added to the occasion. Robinson, incidentally, is an ex-convict with an extensive arrest record dating back to 1949. Such are the men King finds himself with time and time again.

The first amendment guarantees the right to assemble peaceably and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances, but it does not allow any latitude for disobedience. It is absurd to even imagine a situation where a law protects the right to disobey a law. To say this is to say that law is not law.

Throughout, the actions of Dr. King have been termed "civil" disobediences, but Justice Whittaker makes this point:

> What we are confronted by, and must deal with, are active, overt, willful mass violations of our *criminal* laws. That conduct is not "civil disobedience" in any dictionary or acceptable sense of those words. The understandable desire to avoid openly admitting advocation and commission of *crime* cannot excuse us from calling that conduct what it is. Active and overt acts willfully committed in violation of our *criminal* laws are criminal violations and not *"civil disobedience."*

The final result of disobedience is not only gross violations of law during riots and marches, but in the opinon of Justice Whittaker, encompasses a general furthering of lawlessness throughout the country. "Toleration and appeasements" of the "many misguided preachments and activities of Dr. King are heavily contributing causes of the general disrespect for law and hence of the crime that is now rampant throughout our Nation."

I believe it is fair to conclude that Martin Luther King has been an apostle of violence and lawlessness, not peace and nonviolence. His method has been criminal conduct and conspiracy, not civil disobedience. To call it anything else would be the same perversion of the truth that King has engaged in for years.

A MINISTER BUT OF WHAT?

Although Dr. King asks the world to believe that he is a man of God and appeals to "higher laws" in justifying his acts of law breaking, it is incredible that he should expect the people of the United States to be so gullible as to accept the

Biblical and historical precedents he conjures up as valid. They are not.

To use Biblical passages as a pretext for his call to lawlessness, King must first deny the context in which the Apostles lived and preached. They had no system of appeals. There was no guarantee of freedom. There was no free speech. The parallel is invalid.

In the opinion of the dean of Talbot Theological Seminary, Rev. Dr. Charles L. Feinberg:

> Those who point to Biblical examples of resistance to authority forget the spiritual principles involved there, and are unmindful that they in that day had no such legal provisions for redress for their grievances such as we have today.

That Dr. King should disregard the total context of the New Testament, and the Book of Acts in particular, can hardly be believed.

It is also incredible that King would attempt to compare the civil disobedience of today with the Boston Tea Party. To make this comparison is, again, to forget that there were no channels of appeal or meaningful democratic remedy available to those American patriots. It is interesting to note that the Boston Tea Party and other acts against authority by the colonists were the beginnings of the overthrowing of a foreign government. We must assume that Dr. King knows this basic historic fact. His views and tactics on this point are hardly American.

Dr. King uses these methods to push into areas and communities where the residents, from mayor to fellow clergyman, say he is not wanted or needed. Some of the greatest condemnation of Martin Luther King has come from men of the church.

In 1964, delegates to the American Council of Christian Churches passed a resolution, "noting with regret that the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., civil rights leader and Nobel Peace Prize winner, had been represented before the world as a peace-loving Christian minister crusading in the interest of Negro life."

In 1966, Dr. J. H. Jackson, Negro leader of the National Baptist Convention, said that civil disobedience and nonviolence would not carry the civil rights movement any higher and might even lead to disrespect for law and order and to possible violence.

In 1965, a Negro alderman in Chicago, Ralph H. Metcalf, criticized King and his group, said King had "ulterior motives" in moving into Chicago with his programs and leveled the blast at King that:

> This is no hick town. The leaders can handle the situation. We have adequate leadership here.

Metcalf said that King would not be "objective."

The Chicago Tribune of June 30, 1967 reported:

> The Chicago chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, long critical of the civil rights tactics of the Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., has formally split with Dr. King's group. . . .

The article added that King's group and the NAACP have been at odds over King's tactics last year in the open housing march.

Episcopal minister, Dr. Robert B. Watts, of La Jolla, Calif., is another clergyman who has scored King's disobedience stand and his apparent belief that the end justifies the means. Dr. Watts declared that no one, "however exalted he may be or regard himself, has the right to say that what was wrong before becomes morally right if the acting party is willing to be punished if caught." The doctrine of morally justified civil disobedience should be rejected, he added.

Dr. King's disregard for the law is deplorable, but his disregard for the laws of God is almost inconceivable. Rather than merely serving to justify the ends of Martin Luther King, the laws of God are in great part incorporated for the benefit of all into the laws of our Nation. To flout one is to flout the other. As Justice Whittaker sums it up:

> It is highly important carefully to note and explain that our Constitution and laws embody many of the concepts of the divine laws, including the Ten Commandments. . . .
>
> Many who have hurled assaults against our laws do not know what they are . . . do not know or realize that many of the laws they so condemn, and often flout, actually are embodiments of the laws of God, such as, Thou shalt not kill; Thou shalt love, not injure, thy neighbor; Thou shalt not steal; Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's property or possessions; and Thou shalt not bear false witness; to mention but a few of the divine laws that are embodied into our criminal laws. To say that our laws, which condemn the violation of those concepts, are "unjust" or "unfair" is, of course, to say also that the divine laws are "unjust" or "unfair." Do those who advocate violation of, and violate, these of our laws understand this? I doubt that they do, and giving them the benefit of the doubt, I prefer to believe that they do not. Nor should we overlook, as is so often done, the Biblical admonition that Thou shalt obey the civil authorities. I wonder how those who advocate violation of, and violate, our laws—civil or criminal—can square their conduct with the Biblical admonition.

Perhaps one of the strongest statements from a fellow clergyman came in April of this year. The blunt, descriptive attack on King came from the Rev. Henry Mitchell, leader of a group of West Side Chicago ministers. Here is the account as reported by the Chicago Tribune:

> The leader of a group of west side Negro ministers declared yesterday that Dr. Martin Luther King should "get the hell out of here" because his civil rights marching in Chicago last summer (1966) "created hate."
>
> "If he wants to march on the west side, let him march with rakes, brooms, and grass seed," said Rev. Henry Mitchell. . . .
>
> He said the ministers represented the sentiments of 50,000 Chicago Negroes who want "peace, love, and harmony," don't approve of civil rights marches, and "just want to live in their communities and upgrade them."

Justin E. Walsh wrote in the monthly magazine, Rally, about those who use the pulpit for their strange social and political pronouncements. It seems to fit Martin Luther King, Walsh said:

> Thus the pulpit becomes a political rostrum from whence God Himself directs the defeat of Barry Goldwater, the march on Selma, or a teach-in protesting American involvement in Viet Nam. The sacral and profane become confused, religion is reduced to an adjunct of political agitation, and church attendance falls because Americans do not indorse such schemes, will not listen to preachers who do.

Possibly the answer can be found in I Corinthians 1:27. It quite prophetically says:

> But God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise; and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty.

In his constant preaching that the ends justify the means, King is not speaking in the Judeo-Christian heritage belief. This is crass materialism and Marxism. It is expediency not principle. It is frightening to contemplate the many leading clergymen that consciously join his cause or acquiesce by their silence. Even worse, he is being currently depicted as a modern Christian hero by a Catholic catechism series. The total picture of Martin Luther King brings one fundamental question to mind: He says he is a minister. A minister of what?

SOME KING ASSOCIATIONS AND CAUSES

Over 20 years ago the Brookings Institution, a respected social science institution, in response to a request from the House Committee on Un-American Activities, outlined five areas which comprised the definition of "Un-American Activities." One classification was the denial of constitutional rights or privileges by force, fraud, bribery, etc. Another definition encompassed activities which seek to advance the interests of a foreign power which are clearly against the interests of the United States. The Communist Party, U.S.A., has been found repeatedly by voluminous evidence to belong to this category. Neither of these organizations are truly friends of the American Negro. Yet, while one would be shocked to find Martin Luther King consistently cooperating with the KKK, his history regarding pro-Communist persons, causes, and organizations is a matter of record.

Despite the fact that a number of Negro ex-Communists, some of whom had worked for the FBI, have warned American Negroes in testimony before the House Committee on Un-American Activities that the Communist Party seeks to exploit them, King, in contrast, sponsors a Communist front, the National Committee to Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee. While these patriotic Negroes cooperated with HCUA, King rarely misses an opportunity to discredit HCUA.

Would King have associated himself in any way with the Committee To Secure Justice for Morton Sobell, the National Lawyers Guild, or the Spring Mobilization Committee if they were KKK fronts instead of Communist?

Could Martin Luther King have sent a congratulatory message to a union convention if that union, the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, had been expelled from the CIO for domination by the KKK instead of being Communist-dominated?

Must white hoods adorn the heads of the Bradens or Frank Wilkinson—

identified Communist Party members, or James Dombrowski and Myles Horton—long-time advocators of Communist causes, before King realizes that they are bad news for the civil rights movement? Or that their organizations, the Highlander Center, formerly the Highlander Folk School, and the Southern Conference Educational Fund place a pro-Communist stigma on any undertaking associated with them?

If some of King's associates showed an affinity for KKK causes instead of those of a pro-Communist nature, would they remain in his organization for long?

With regard to communism Martin Luther King has written in "Stride Toward Freedom" that "almost anything—force, violence, murder, lying—is a justifiable means to the 'millennial' end." It is evident that King is aware of the treacherous nature of the International Communist Movement and its American branch, the Communist Party, U.S.A. Moreover, there is ample evidence to prove that the CPUSA and some of its various fronts seek to exploit the legitimate civil rights aims and aspirations of the Negro people in the United States.

Director J. Edgar Hoover of the FBI first began studying the activities of the Communist movement in 1919 and is today the most knowledgeable source of Communist machinations in the United States. In February 1966, before a House subcommittee, Mr. Hoover stated:

> Historically, the Communist Party U.S.A. has never overlooked the potential inherent in any of our country's problems, be they domestic or foreign. Every crisis is grasped in an effort to exploit the situation for the advancement of Communist objectives. Similarly, the party has always aimed its biggest "guns" from its propaganda arsenal and used its major efforts and functionaries to exploit minority groups, especially the Negro people.

The exploitation of the Negro people by the Communist Party U.S.A. has been graphically detailed by various Negro people who have appeared before the House Committee on Un-American Activities in recent years. Mrs. Julia Brown, a Negro housewife, who unwittingly joined the Communist Party, left shortly thereafter and later rejoined at the request of the FBI, described the fate of a Communist front comprised of Communist and nonparty Negro women. When the party found that the non-Communist Negro women, in sincerely striving to further the cause of civil rights, could not be manipulated by the party, the organization was disbanded. Said Mrs. Brown:

> You see, the Negro women were truly trying to fight for civil rights. And the Communists only had civil rights for propaganda.

A Negro resident of Chicago, Miss Lola Belle Holmes, who also joined the Communist Party at the request of the FBI, also learned firsthand of Communist duplicity toward the Negro people.

Miss Holmes stated before the House Committee on Un-American Activities:

> They are not concerned with the success of the civil rights movement. They wish oppression and depression of the Negro people to continue so they can have something to drive on, to work on. The Communist Party cannot be successful without oppression and depression.

Mr. Lucius Armstrong, for many years a Negro member of the Communist Party in Chicago, reentered the Communist Party at the request of the FBI in 1953 and continued in the party as an undercover agent until 1963. Mr. Armstrong told the committee:

> The Communist Party is trying to fulfill an objective aim of basic communism that is world domination, and to me a godless concept of humanity.

The foregoing are but a few examples of firsthand experiences of Negroes who learned the hard way just how sincere the Communist Party is in pursuit of civil rights. Information of this nature which alerts those concerned about the progress of civil rights is public information and should be studied by those working in the civil rights field. In 1954, for instance, the House Committee on Un-American Activities issued a report entitled, "The American Negro in the Communist Party," which included the testimony of half a dozen Negroes who had held official positions in the Communist Party and who had broken with it. They had confirmed the fact that the Communist Party does all in its power to promote race hatred and tension—rather than racial equality—in the United States.

One would think that a civil rights leader such as Reverend King would have carefully avoided persons, organizations and causes under the influence of the Communist Party. Unfortunately, the record does not so indicate. Here are some of the organizations and causes in which Communist influence is or was to be found and which elicited from Reverend King more than passing interest.

The Committee to Secure Justice for Morton Sobell was cited by HCUA as a Communist front. Reverend King was listed as a sponsor of the committee's National Appeal for Freedom, held in Washington, D.C., November 19–21, 1960.

The United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America union was expelled by the CIO in 1949 on grounds of Communist domination. In 1962 Reverend King sent a message to the 27th convention of the UE which was read at the convention by Rev. Morris Dawkins. Reverend King was unable to be present because of activities in Albany, Ga., where he had just been released from jail.

Reverend King was a speaker at a luncheon meeting of a conference held under the sponsorship of the National Lawyers Guild's Committee To Assist Southern Lawyers on November 30 and December 1, 1962, in Atlanta. The National Lawyers Guild has been cited by HCUA as a Communist front.

Another organization which was cited by HCUA in 1961 and to which Reverend King has lent his sponsorship is the National Committee To Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee.

The most recent effort which has been cited by HCUA as a Communist front and which Reverend King has assisted is the Spring Mobilization Committee. This committee, along with the Student Mobilization Committee, were the two groups which planned and organized the Vietnam Week demonstrations in April of this year. Reverend King spoke at the U.N. Plaza at the culmination of Vietnam Week on April 15. On the same day, it will be remembered, other participants in the demonstration burned the American flag in Central Park.

On other occasions Reverend King has exhibited an affinity for causes or persons influenced by the Communist Party. Carl Braden, identified under oath as a Communist Party member, was convicted of sedition in Kentucky and sentenced to a term of 15 years. After serving several months, Braden was released when the U.S. Supreme Court voided State sedition laws in the Steve Nelson case. In 1961 Braden was convicted of contempt of Congress and the conviction was upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court. One of a number of initiators of a petition to President Kennedy for executive clemency was Dr. King.

In 1962 Martin Luther King signed a petition to the President asking pardon for Junius Scales. Scales was sentenced to a 6-year term for violation of the Smith Act. He had joined the party in 1940 and in 1947 was made the chairman of the party's North Carolina-South Carolina district. The juries in two court cases had found that Scales knowingly had belonged to an organization which advocated the overthrow of the U.S. Government by the use of force and violence. He had been a high party functionary and a knowledgeable authority on Communist doctrine. In addition, on at least one occasion at a secret Communist training school, of which Scales was a director and with Scales watching, an instructor taught and demonstrated how a person on a picket line could kill an opponent by stabbing a pencil point into his heart or throat.

The Scales petition signed by Dr. King opposed jail sentences for "men who have sincerely and honestly broken with communism." Scales had claimed that he had left the party in 1957 and cited a letter to that effect which had been published in the Greensboro Daily News on December 18, 1957, 4 years before he began serving his prison term. The sincerity of Scales was certainly open to question when, in the 1940's he insisted publicly that the Communist Party is not dominated by the Soviet Union when the judgments of Congress, the Executive, and the Judiciary had made findings to the contrary. Nor could one be blamed for doubting his sincerity in 1955 when he said that "my party has never advocated force and violence," when again all three branches of the Federal Government had found otherwise. In 1961, just before beginning his prison sentence, Scales told an interviewer from the National Guardian that "I can't say that I regret any of it. We did a lot of good things." Presumably, Mr. Scales did not regret the teaching of how to murder with a pencil point.

It is certainly possible that Reverend King was not fully aware of the nature of the organizations and causes listed above. Were he responsible, he would know. However, his endorsement of such efforts, even unwittingly, does not lessen the respectability accruing to these endeavors by the approval of a national figure. Prudence would seem to demand that before a figure of national prominence sponsors a committee or signs a petition, the nature of the cause and those behind it should be investigated.

It would not take extensive investigation, for instance, to find out the nature of the National Committee To Abolish the Un-American Activities Committee—NCAUAC, already mentioned, with which King is associated. One of its founding members, Richard—Dick—Criley, has been identified, as a member of the Communist Party by no less than four former Communists in testimony before HCUA. Another founding member of the NCAUAC, Russell Arthur—Russ—Nixon, goes Criley one better. Nixon has been identified as a member of the party by five former Communists who testified before congressional committees. In all, seven of the 13 founding members of the committee have been identified before congressional committees or by an executive agency as Communists. One of the seven, Reverend William Howard Melish denied under oath that he was a party member. However, the Subversive Activities Control Board found Melish, during the period of his tenure with the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, was a member of the Communist Party. Still another member of the committee, Frank Wilkinson, was identified as a party member by an undercover agent for the FBI, Anita Schneider. He was convicted of contempt of Congress and was sent to prison when the Supreme Court denied his appeal.

Instead of supporting fronts such as the NCAUAC, Martin Luther King would do well to follow the example of another Negro minister, Rev. James H. Robinson, pastor emeritus of the Presbyterian Church of the Master, New York City, who later became director of Operation Crossroads Africa, Inc. At one time Robinson had determined that he could work along with the Communists to advance the cause of the American Negro without joining the CPUSA. He joined various Communist front efforts when their objectives ostensibly coincided with his own. Eventually, he learned that he was no match for the better organized and disciplined Communist operations and that he could possibly do his cause more harm than good by such associations. In an appearance before the House Committee on Un-American Activities which he himself requested, Robinson was asked if he would allow Communists in his organization, Operation Crossroads Africa. He stated:

> I would say the same thing about Communists. I would not let Communists in either. Now, would I let them cooperate with us on anything? No, I would not take that old position of cooperating any more. I would not get involved with people with ulterior motives who really end up trying to use you to make capital for their ends.

The record of Martin Luther King strongly indicates that King has either been grossly irresponsible in learning the backgrounds of some of his associates and associations or that he chooses to use them, as James Robinson did in the past, for his own ends. In any event the up-to-date record of King's activities shows that he still has a vital lesson to learn. The only other conclusion that a reasonable person can come to is that Martin Luther King has covertly and consciously attempted to promote the cause of the Communist Party.

THE HIGHLANDER FOLK SCHOOL

On the television program, "Meet The Press," on March 28, 1965, the producer and permanent panel member of the show, Lawrence Spivak, referred to a picture taken of King at the Highlander Folk School in 1957 with the accompanying caption, "Martin Luther King at a Communist Training School."

> Will you tell us whether that was a Communist training school and what you were doing there?

King replied:

> Well, number one I don't think it was a Communist training school. In fact, I know it wasn't. The Highlander Folk School, which was referred to in that particular article, was a school that pioneered in bringing Negroes and whites together at a time when it was very unpopular, to train them for leadership all over the South, and I think they did an able job in doing it. This school was supported by some of the great Americans such as Eleanor Roosevelt, Reinhold Niebuhr, Harry Golden, and many others that I could name.

King went on to say:

> Secondly, the fact is that I never attended the school, as far as training goes. I was there about one hour back in 1957 or '8. I went to deliver an address for the 25th Anniversary of the Highlander Folk School. I got there about 15 minutes before I was to speak. I spoke about 45 minutes, and then I left immediately after my speech. I think that is a pretty short period to get any training.

In stating that the school brought Negroes and whites together to train them for leadership, Reverend King overlooked one important consideration—leadership for what? The record shows that Highlander was a safe bet never to win a prize for its Americanism programs.

This well-circulated picture places Martin Luther King at a subversive training school. Four well-known leftists are shown and identified by number.

No. 1. Martin Luther King, Jr.

No. 2. Abner W. Berry, long-time Communist Party functionary; as early as 1938 he gave the report of the Negro Commission of the CP at the 10th National Convention of the Communist Party; later was Negro affairs editor of Daily Worker. His column in the Daily Worker of September 10, 1957, page 5, described the seminar which both he and King attended.

No. 3. Aubrey Williams, board member of Southern Conference for Human Welfare—SCHW—a cited Communist front and president of Southern Conference Educational Fund, Inc.—SCEF—which replaced SCHW. Senate report found that SCEF had substantially same leadership and purposes of predecessor organization, SCHW. Also affiliated with Highlander Folk School. Identified as a Communist Party member by one witness before Senate Internal Security Subcommittee; another witness identified him as one who accepted the discipline of Communist Party. He denied both charges but admitted that he had been connected with a member of Communist-front organizations.

No. 4. Myles Horton takes credit for starting Highlander Folk School. Like Williams, was a board member of SCHW and became a director of SCEF. One former Communist organizer testified before congressional committee that Horton once remarked, "I am doing you just as much good now as I would if I were a member of the Communist Party."

On February 23, 1961, the New York Times reported that—

> The Southern Christian Leadership Conference (King's organization) and the Highlander Folk School have joined forces to train Negro leaders for the civil rights struggle.

According to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee's report, "Southern Conference Educational Fund, Inc.," released in 1954, Myles Horton, long active in Socialist activities, "identified himself as a teacher at the Highlander Folk School, at Monteagle, Tenn., and said that he assumed the full responsibility for having conceived the idea of the Highlander Folk School and having come down to the Tennessee mountains for the purpose of starting this school."

The Internal Security Subcommittee's report added:

> A witness who had been a member of the Communist Party testified that when he was Tennessee district organizer of the Communist Party he made arrangements with Myles Horton and others for the Communist Daily Worker to be sent regularly to the Highlander Folk School, and for a Communist student to go to the Highlander Folk School to recruit students into the Communist Party. The witness further testified that the Highlander Folk School cooperated closely with the Communist Party, and that when he asked Myles Horton to become a member of the Communist Party, Horton replied, *"I am doing you just as much good now as I would if I were a member of the Communist Party. I am often asked if I am a Communist Party member and I always say 'No.' I feel much safer in having no fear that evidence might be uncovered to link me with the Communist Party, and therefore I prefer not to become a member of the Communist Party."*

Horton was making news even in the 1930's. The Chattanooga Times of January 28, 1935, reported that Myles Horton of "the executive committee of the Socialist Party" was one of those who, "with other Socialists," signed a letter "calling upon State executive committees of all Southern States to hold meetings to effect a united front between Socialists, Communists, and other working class groups and suggesting a revolutionary campaign."

Mr. John P. Frey, president of the Metal Trades Department of the American Federal of Labor, submitted a report in connection with his public testimony on August 13, 1938, printed in volume 1 of the public hearings of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in which he makes reference to the Highlander Folk School as follows:

> . . . Elizabeth Hawes, Alton Lawrence, Myles Horton: these three people have been in the past, and probably are now, paid organizers for the Textile Workers Organization Committee. They have been active in radical work in the South and a few years ago attended a secret convention in North Carolina, at which time plans were made for spreading

the revolutionary theories throughout the South.

Regarding Highlander, Mr. Frey stated:

> In connection with this we might mention that the Highlander Folk School, Monteagle, Tennessee, was mixed up in this secret convention, in which these three CIO organizers took a very prominent part.

Another person prominent in the Highlander operation was James Dombrowski, who has denied under oath that he was a member of the Communist Party. The "Report on the Southern Conference for Human Welfare" which was issued by HCUA in 1947 states:

> Dombrowski, together with Myles Horton, a member of the present board of Representatives of the conference, helped launch a joint Socialist-Communist united-front movement in the South in 1935.

In 1949 Paul Crouch, testifying before HCUA, was asked if he knew Dombrowski as a member of the Communist Party. He replied:

> Not as a member of the Communist Party. I do not know whether he is or is not a member of the Communist Party. He professes to be a left Socialist. I have met officially with him on a number of occasions as head of the Communist District Bureau of Tennessee. He and Myles Horton were present at the conference as Socialists and as representatives of the Highlander Folk School at Monteagle, Tenn. At this conference Mr. Dombrowski gave me the impression of being completely pro-Communist and anxious to collaborate with the Communist Party and follow its leadership without taking the risk of actual Party membership.

The above-mentioned report, "Southern Conference Educational Fund, Inc." also mentioned Dombrowski:

> . . . Dr. Dombrowski was identified by a witness as one who, to the witness's certain knowledge, had been a member of the Communist Party. He was also identified by another witness as one who had accepted Communist Party discipline. Dr. Dombrowski denied that he had ever been a member of the Communist Party or that he had ever been under Communist discipline, but he admitted that he had been connected with a number of Communist-front organizations. . . .

Also affiliated with the Highlander Folk School was Aubrey W. Williams, also identified in the foregoing Senate subcommittee report as follows:

> Aubrey W. Williams was identified as president of the Southern Conference Educational Fund, Inc., who had been a member of the board of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare. He also identified himself as editor and publisher of the Southern Farm and Home, a farm publication. Mr. Williams was identified by a witness as one who had been a member of the Communist Party. He was also identified by another witness as one who accepted the discipline of the Communist Party. Mr. Williams denied that he had ever been a member of the Communist Party or that he had ever accepted Communist Party discipline, but he admitted that he had been connected with a number of Communist-front organizations.

Williams, according to the Senate subcommittee report, admitted also that on September 11, 1947, he made the following remarks in an address at Madison Square Garden, New York City, with reference to the Government's loyalty program:

> What they demand is that any man who admits to being a member of the Communist Party be fired immediately on the grounds that no man can be loyal to the United States and be a Communist. It is my belief that it is precisely at this point that we take our stand and defend the right of any Communist to maintain his position as a employee of the Government of the United States. To take any less position than this is to throw overboard such primary rights as the freedom to think and to hold whatever beliefs one chooses.

In 1963 the Joint Legislative Committee on Un-American Activities of the State of Louisiana issued a report entitled "Activities of the Southern Conference Educational Fund, Inc., in Louisiana," part 1, in which the Highlander Folk School was a subject of inquiry. According to Rev. C. H. Kilby who testified before the joint committee that the forerunner of Highlander was a college called Commonwealth College in Arkansas which was confiscated by the State for nonpayment of fines levied for teaching and advocating communism. According to Rev. Kilby both Horton and Dombrowski were connected with the Arkansas venture, and along with three other individuals founded the Highlander Folk School in Tennessee. The joint committee inserted into the record of its hearings affidavits of three individuals familiar with the Highlander operation who claimed that students were taught that the Russian form of government was to be preferred to our own, Young Communist League membership was solicited and that hammer and sickle insignia were prominently displayed.

According to Reverend Kilby, in 1960 a Tennessee State investigating committee found that the Highlander Folk School was engaging in subversive activities but the statutes of the State of Tennessee contained no laws which would apply. Reverend Kilby testified that a raid was staged on the school by the county sheriff and the Tennessee State Highway Patrol, "and they found that liquor was being sold there without a license, lewdness was being carried out promiscuously, and it was present when they made the raid." The charter of the school was revoked and the property sold at public auction.

The Highlander Folk School was cited as subversive by the Georgia Commission on Education in a special report. Although the school has not been officially cited as a Communist front by any Federal agency, this does not reflect on the Georgia Commission's report in any way.

On May 2, 1962, the Highlander Center, 1625 Riverside Drive, Knoxville, Tenn., issued a press release announcing the opening of the center. Listed among the board of directors is a familiar name—Myles Horton. Concerning the new undertaking, Horton was quoted in The Southern Patriot of January 1963 as saying:

> They can confiscate our property, but they can't confiscate our ideas or liquidate our program.

One of the sponsors of the center listed on its letterhead and dated December 12, 1962, is Rev. Martin Luther King.

On October 5, 1963, the offices of the Southern Conference Education Fund in New Orleans, La., were raided by local and State police who seized a quantity of SCEF's records. The Joint Legislative Committee on Un-American Activities of Louisiana, already mentioned, prepared a two-volume report on the SCEF after 11 months of investigation and included in the report was material taken from the SCEF files. On page 99, part 1, of the report Jack N. Rogers, committee counsel for the committee, states:

> The next document I want to place into evidence, Mr. Chairman, is a copy of the front and back of a photograph found in the files of James A. Dombrowski on October 4. The photograph is a picture of Martin Luther King, Anne Braden, Carl Braden, and James A. Dombrowski, and on the back of the photograph are handwritten notes in the handwriting of James A. Dombrowski as follows: "The 6th Annual Conference of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, Birmingham, Alabama, September 25 to 28, 1962." Then the people who are in the picture are identified as follows: "Martin Luther King, Jr., responding to Anne Braden's speech; in background, A. B. (Anne Braden), Carl Braden, J.A.D. (James A. Dombrowski.)"

According to the Southern Patriot, published by the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, a cited Communist front, of March 1963, Martin Luther King "paid high tribute to SCEF" in the course of his remarks at the annual reception of New York Friends of SCEF. The UE News, of October 21, 1963, the publication of the United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers of America which was expelled from the CIO on grounds of Communist domination, quoted King as protesting the seizure of SCEF's records in Louisiana and the arrest of two of its top leaders and an attorney.

According to the UE News, King "denounced the attack on the civil rights organization," charging "that there has been a growing effort on the part of opponents of civil rights to charge Communist influence to the movement."

The National Guardian of December 12, 1963, reported that SCEF's attorneys attacked the constitutionality of Louisiana's Communist Control Act and that King was one of five civil rights leaders who filed affidavits in behalf of SCEF in Federal court.

A word of background on the SCEF will put this organization in proper perspective.

The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee held hearings on the SCEF in 1954 and outlined its close relationship with a cited Communist front, the Southern Conference for Human Welfare. The report of the subcommittee stated that the Southern Conference for Human Welfare was conceived, financed, and set up by the Communist Party in 1938 as a mass organization to promote communism throughout the Southern States.

Earl Browder, former general secretary of the Communist Party in the United States, in a public hearing, identified the Southern Conference for Human Welfare as one of the Communist Party's "transmission belts." On March 29, 1944, the Southern Conference for Human Welfare was cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities as a Communist front and, on June

12, 1947, by the congressional Committee on Un-American Activities as a Communist-front organization "which seeks to attract southern liberals on the basis of its seeming interest in the problems of the South," although its "professed interest in southern welfare is simply an expedient for larger aims serving the Soviet Union and its subservient Communist Party in the United States."

The SCEF was initially an adjunct of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare. After the exposure of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare as a Communist front, it began to wither and was finally dissolved, but the Southern Conference Educational Fund, Inc., continued. The official paper, the Southern Patriot, was taken over by the SCEF which professes the same ostensible purpose. The Internal Security Subcommittee in its report on the SCEF found that—

> An objective study of the entire record compels the conclusion that the Southern Conference Educational Fund, Inc., is operating with substantially the same leadership and purposes as its predecessor organization, the Southern Conference for Human Welfare.

And who was included among the leadership? Why, Myles Horton and James Dombrowski, of course. Horton was listed as a board member of SCHW and became a director of SCEF. Dombrowski was the "administrator" of SCHW and assumed the office of executive director with SCEF. As previously stated, Aubrey Williams, who had been a board member of SCHW, became the president of the Southern Conference Educational Fund, Inc.

On page 52, part 2, of the Louisiana Joint Committee's report on the SCEF, there is reproduced a letter by Aubrey Williams dated January 21, 1960, in which he takes credit for bringing Carl Braden and his wife Anne into the SCEF. The pertinent paragraph reads:

> I would like to say also, that I was responsible for bringing Carl and Anne Braden into the work of the Southern Conference Educational Fund, and that I was then and am now fully informed of their background, previous connections and basic attitudes.

The Bradens are of special interest for 6 years after the above letter by Williams the SCEF announced that James Dombrowski would retire as executive director but remain on the staff as a special consultant while Carl and Anne Braden would take over the work of the executive director. Here are their backgrounds and previous connections which Williams in the above-cited letter stated he was fully informed of.

Anne Braden was identified as a member of the Communist Party U.S.A., by an informant for the FBI, Mrs. Alberta Ahearn, during Carl Braden's sedition case trial in Louisville, Ky., in 1954. Mrs. Braden was also under indictment for sedition in the same case. When the conviction against her husband was nullified by a U.S. Supreme Court decision in the Nelson case in 1956, the sedition charges against Anne Braden were dropped.

Mrs. Ahearn appeared before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee on October 28, 1957, and testified that Anne Braden and her husband, Carl, recruited her into the Communist Party, and that both were members of most of her Communist Party cells.

Anne Braden has been affiliated with a number of Communist fronts. Among them are the American Peace Crusade, American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, Citizens Committee for Constitutional Liberties, Citizens Committee To Preserve American Freedoms, National Committee To Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee, the Progressive Party, the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, and the Civil Rights Congress.

Issues of the Daily Worker in 1954 named Mrs. Braden as a correspondent for Federated Press which has been cited as a Communist-controlled organization.

Articles by Mrs. Braden appeared in the June 1951 and August 1954 issues of March of Labor, also cited as an instrument of the Communist Party.

In the past Anne Braden has edited the Southern Patriot.

The Worker, the Communist Party publication, on January 24, 1965, reported that Anne Braden sent greetings to the 40th anniversary dinner of the International Publishers, the official Communist Party publishing house.

Carl Braden was also identified by Mrs. Alberta Ahearn, the informant for the FBI, as one of those who recruited her into the Communist Party at their home in Louisville, Ky. Mrs. Ahearn appeared before the grand jury in Louisville as a rebuttal witness in the sedition trial of Carl Braden. Braden denied that he was a Communist or that he collected money for the party. The grand jury took over 1,000 pages of testimony from 53 witnesses, the result being that the Bradens, along with one Vernon Bown and others were indicted.

Carl Braden was tried and convicted of sedition, received a 15-year prison sentence and was fined $5,000. As previously stated, the U.S. Supreme Court decision in the Nelson case invalidated all State sedition laws and Braden, then in prison awaiting an appeal of his conviction, was freed. Thus, he was freed—not on the merits of his guilt or innocence—but on a Federal-State constitutional question.

The indictment of Braden and the others grew out of a dynamite explosion under a house in a Louisville suburb on Sunday, June 27, 1954. The house at the time was owned and occupied by a man named Andrew Wade IV, a Negro, and his family. On May 10, 1954, the Bradens at Wade's request and with his money, had bought the house in which he was living at the time of the explosion, informing the seller of the house that they intended using it for their own residence. The Wades began moving into the house the next day.

In September of that year a grand jury indicted Vernon Bown, later to be expelled from the Communist Party in 1959, for contempt of court and for placing explosives under a house.

A month later the same grand jury indicted him for sedition. In November a new grand jury indicted Bown for sedition, on the charge of damaging property to achieve a political end. Also indicted with Bown on this charge were the Bradens, I. O. Ford, and Louis Lubka. Bown and the others were to be tried in November 1956, but the Supreme Court Nelsen decision ruled out the pending trial.

Carl Braden appeared as a witness in public hearings before the House Committee on Un-American Activities on July 30, 1958, and pleaded the first amendment in refusing to answer questions relating to Communist Party membership and other matters. Braden was convicted of contempt of the House of Representatives on January 30, 1959, and was sentenced to 1 year in jail. On March 16, 1959, his motion for a new trial was denied by the U.S. district court in Atlanta. On February 27, 1961, the U.S. Supreme Court affirmed the contempt conviction of Braden. On May 1, 1961, Braden surrendered to begin serving his 1-year prison term.

It was because of this sentence that a number of initiators directed a petition to President Kennedy seeking Executive clemency. As previously stated, one of the initiators was Martin Luther King.

Like his wife, Carl Braden has a copious supply of Communist-front associations to his credit. He too sent 40th anniversary greetings to the International Publishers, the official Communist Party publishing house. Some of his fronts are: Federated Press, Louisville Peace Crusade, Progressive Party, Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, Youth To Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee, National Assembly for Democratic Rights, National Committee To Abolish the Un-American Activities Committee, Citizens Committee for Constitutional Liberties, American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born.

On September 14 of this year, four members of the SCEF were dismissed from sedition charges when the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Kentucky ruled 2 to 1 that Kentucky's sedition law was both vague and unconstitutional and that sedition was strictly a matter for Federal prosecution. Two of the four SCEF members involved were Carl and Anne Braden. In response to questions, the Bradens denied they had ever been "card-carrying members of the Communist Party," but declined to say whether they had belonged to the party unless the phrase "Communist party membership" was defined.

When one reviews the background of the above-mentioned organizations and individuals and King's willingness to associate with them, it is not surprising that earlier this year, Martin Luther King played a major role in joining the civil rights and peace issues—a vital strategy which the Communist Party has been pursuing here in the United States for some time.

SOME OF KING'S ADVISERS AND ASSOCIATES

When one considers the backgrounds of some of Martin Luther King's advisers and associates, it is hardly surprising that some of King's activities work to the detriment of true civil rights progress and that he ends up mounting the Communist line.

A UPI release of October 10, 1965, reported a meeting which King had with U.N. Ambassador Arthur Goldberg concerning the war in Vietnam. The release stated that "King was accompanied to the meeting by Bayard Rustin, his special consultant," and others.

On February 10, 1966, Director Hoover of the FBI had this to say about Rustin:

> At the University of Maryland last year, at a law enforcement institute held for police officers of Maryland, Virginia, and Washington, D.C., the university invited Bayard Rustin to be one of the speakers. Bayard Rustin was convicted for sodomy, a violation of the Selective Service Act and was an admitted member of the Young Communist League.

In response to a question, Hoover stated that Rustin had admitted sodomy and had been apprehended in Pasadena, Calif. Director Hoover then made this observation:

> If they wanted a man to speak on civil rights they could have invited Roy Wilkins of the NAACP, who is a reputable man, or some other responsible racial leader. But to pick out a man who has such a bad background was wrong.

Unfortunately, this is not the only case where the backgrounds and/or activities of some of those close to King certainly harm the civil rights movement in the eyes of the public.

Rev. James L. Bevel, one of King's assistants in the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, is another of King's cohorts whose activities certainly do not reflect the sentiments of sincere civil rights exponents. Bevel was a sponsor of Vietnam Week, mentioned above, and was given leave by King to serve as national director of the Spring Mobilization Committee To End the War in Vietnam, one of two committees which planned and organized Vietnam Week. The House Committee on Un-American Activities stated that "Communists are playing dominant roles" in the Spring Mobilization Committee.

Bevel was the signer of a public appeal for funds to furnish the DuBois Clubs "Freedom Center" clubhouse in Chicago and has joined as coplaintiff with the DuBois Clubs in their suit to restrain the Subversive Activities Control Board from holding hearings on the DCA as petitioned by the Attorney General. FBI Director Hoover has publicly stated that the W.E.B. DuBois Clubs were started by the Communist Party U.S.A. as a youth front.

In addition, Bevel was a sponsor of the Chicago conference on December 28 to 30, 1966, to discuss the idea of a nationwide student strike and other forms of demonstrations protesting the U.S. effort to resist Communist aggression in South Vietnam. According to the HCUA report, "Communist Origin and Manipulation of Vietnam Week":

> Organizers of the conference have openly admitted that representatives of the following Communist organizations took part in the conference: Communist Party U.S.A.; W.E.B. DuBois Clubs of America; Progressive Labor Party (the Peking-oriented faction of the U.S. Communist movement); Socialist Workers Party (the Trotskyist Communists); Young Socialist Alliance (youth branch of the Socialist Workers Party); Youth Against War and Fascism (youth arm of the Workers World Party, a Trotskyist splinter group); National Guardian (published by Weekly Guardian Associates).

To make matters worse, Bevel's wife, Diane Nash Bevel, according to the above-cited HCUA report, recently made an illegal trip to Hanoi, capital of North Vietnam, a fact that Negro American soldiers in Vietnam would find hard to reconcile with the civil rights movement.

Rev. Fred L. Shuttlesworth, according to the Cincinnati Enquirer of June 9, 1963, was elected to the presidency of the Southern Conference Educational Fund, Inc., and when contacted by the Enquirer in Birmingham, Ala., concerning the nature of the SCEF, stated:

> I have the highest regard for this organization (SCEF) for the work it has done since I have been a member of the board, and I have seen nothing on the part of any persons, with whom I have been associated, to give any substantiation to these charges.

Shuttlesworth has been a close associate of Martin Luther King and the New York Times of January 11, 1966, lists him as secretary of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference. Like King, he has been associated with a number of cited Communist fronts. He was a speaker at the 25th annual convention of the United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers of America which, as indicated before, was expelled from the CIO by the 1949 convention on grounds of Communist domination.

When unable to attend, he sent a statement to be read at the rally held by the New York Council To Abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities, a cited Communist front.

He was one of 200 guests at the National Guardian's 15th aniversary dinner on November 26, 1964. The Guardian is a cited Communist publication.

It is not surprising that Shuttlesworth is a sponsor of the National Committee To Abolish the Un-American Activities Committee and was a speaker at a rally held in Chicago, May 23, 1965, by the Chicago Committee to Defend the Bill of Rights, the midwest regional office of the National Committee To Abolish.

According to the Mine-Mill Union of July 1965, the official publication of the International Union of Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers, Shuttlesworth was scheduled to speak at the 59th Mine-Mill International Convention, August 16, 1965, in Denver, Colo. This union was expelled by the CIO in 1950 on grounds of Communist domination.

In April 1961, Shuttlesworth took over as pastor of the Negro Revelation Baptist Church in Cincinnati, Ohio. In 1965, 200 members of the 1,100-member church charged that Reverend Shuttlesworth had "conducted the internal affairs of our congregation in an unreasonable and arbitrary manner," according to the New York Times of October 16, 1965. The Washington Post of January 17, 1966, later reported that the Reverend Fred L. Shuttlesworth resigned as pastor of the church after months of bickering. Some members left with him and set up a new church with Mr. Shuttlesworth as its pastor.

The Post item, which was an Associated Press story of January 16, added that:

> Mr. Shuttleworth, a civil-rights leader, was accused by his opponents of being dictatorial and of misusing church funds. Both sides went to court last fall and the minister's foes obtained an injunction to keep him from handling church money.

Reverend Wyatt T. Walker, another of Martin Luther King's associates, also has several Communist fronts listed in his name. In 1962 he was cochairman in charge of conference facilities for a lawyers' conference on civil rights held in Atlanta, under the sponsorship of the National Lawyers Guild's Committee To Assist Southern Lawyers, and the National Bar Association's Civil Rights Committee in cooperation with King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference. The National Lawyers' Guild, as previously stated, has been cited as a Communist front.

Walker was a sponsor of the Yasui Welcoming Committee which in turn was sponsored by the National Guardian, a Communist front.

As in the case of Shuttlesworth, Walker was a sponsor of the National Committee To Abolish the Un-American Activities Committee, a Communist front.

Of all those associated with Martin Luther King and the SCLC, perhaps none have had such a close relationship with the Communist Party as Hunter Pitts O'Dell. A UPI release which appeared in the New York Times of July 27, 1963, reported that King stated that O'Dell had worked twice for the SCLC. King acknowledged that O'Dell "may have had some connections in the past" with communism but King added that:

> We were convinced that he had renounced them and had become committed to the Christian philosophy of nonviolence in dealing with America's social injustices.

King said O'Dell left the movement on June 26 by "mutual agreement" because of concern that his affiliation with the integration movement would be used by "segregationists and race-baiters."

The surest indication of O'Dell's break with the Communist Party would be, of course, his willingness to appear before a congressional committee and give the U.S. Government the benefit of his party experience. Indications are that O'Dell could be of immense help in disclosing the identities of 20th-century Benedict Arnolds biding their time for the downfall of the United States.

In 1956 O'Dell testified before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. He invoked the fifth amendment and refused to say if he was a southern district organizer for the Communist Party. Robert Morris, counsel for the subcommittee, said information had been received that O'Dell was, in fact, a district organizer for the Communist Party in New Orleans, and that O'Dell gave "directives to the professional group" in that city and that he operated under three different names—the other two being John Vesey and Ben Jones.

On July 30, 1958, O'Dell appeared before the House Committee on Un-American Activities, this time invoking both the first and fifth amendments in refusing to answer questions about his Communist activities.

THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE FOR NEW POLITICS

The latest venture to which Martin Luther King lent his name was the National Conference for New Politics which held its convention at the Palmer House in Chicago, August 29 through September 4. King was listed as a member of its national council, and on August 31 he gave the keynote speech. In attendance were those against the war in Vietnam, black power advocates, some civil rights workers, the new left, observers from the Communist Party and representatives from a number of other leftist organizations. The purpose of the convention was to coordinate the efforts of liberal and radical groups in political action. There had been talk that a King-Spock ticket would head a third-party movement in 1968. What happened to this proposal was described by Chesly Manly in the Chicago Tribune, August 27, 1967:

> The N.C.N.P. steering committee had decided to permit a free convention decision on the question of running King and Spock on a third party ticket. Preliminary soundings had disclosed majority support in the various components of the so-called "new politics" movement for a third party effort in 1968. At the request of the Communist party, however, the steering committee reconsidered the question, at a meeting attended by Johnson (Arnold Johnson, member of national board of Communist Party) in the Palmer House, July 29 and 30 and agreed on parliamentary maneuvers which are expected to prevent a decision by the convention in favor of a third party.

The New York Daily News of August 31 carried an article by Chesly Manly which also referred to the NCNP. An excerpt from this article comments on Communist Party participation:

> Federal and local security officers, who are closely watching proceedings of the convention, said several hundred other known Communists will attend as delegates or observers of Communist "front" groups and other far left organizations affiliated with the conference.

From all appearances the convention turned out to be a colossal flop. The Chicago Tribune of September 6 commented that the convention "turned out to be an assembly of crackpots and innocent dogooders who meekly did the bidding of a handful of black power fanatics and Communists." Even Norman Thomas, a radical of long standing, described the convention as "black apartheid" and said he wanted nothing to do with it.

The Palmer House, where many of the delegates to the convention stayed, suffered more than $10,000 in damages as a result of the convention. The Chicago Tribune, September 7, carried the story of the vandalism which was told to the Tribune by informed sources. Not only were furnishings and fittings of the historic hotel damaged, but items ranging from linens to public address system microphones were plundered.

At least two marihuana parties were staged as well as several gatherings in which sex orgies were held before audiences of delegates. Some delegates skipped out on room service and other bills, while others wrote the words "black power" and obscenities on the walls of hallways and rooms. The words "black power" and obscenities were carved into expensive bronze doors on virtually all of the 15 elevators in the hotel.

At elevator entrances on various upper floors, observers reported heavy ash tray urns had been smashed and the legs of tables and other furnishings broken. Light fixtures on the walls of corridors had been torn free or bent. Carpeting in some rooms was gashed. According to the Tribune account one representative was slugged on the head with an empty whisky bottle by a colleague, and "two other out-of-town delegates—one of them the son of a top Communist Party leader—were robbed at knife point." One sentence from NCNP literature perhaps explains best the excesses mentioned above:

> The National Conference for New Politics (N.C.N.P.) will serve and reinforce the *autonomous local expressions* of the New Politics.

RIGHT DOWN THE COMMIE LINE

April 4, 1967, Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., rose to the speaker's platform in New York City's Riverside Church and delivered what must surely be the greatest condemnation of American policy and involvement in Vietnam ever to come from a well-known citizen. His attack was ruthless, packed with misleading innuendoes and distortions. A Presidential aide was later quoted: "a speech on Vietnam that goes right down the Commie line."

More and more, King has been branching out from civil rights into the field of foreign affairs. More and more he parrots the far left, pro-Communist line.

In mid-1966, King announced that he would write to Ho Chi Minh, leaders of the U.S.S.R., South Vietnam, and the United States in an effort to bring the war to the conference table. This in itself would seem to be another violation of law. Later that year he called for admission of Red China to the United Nations and negotiations with the Vietcong. At that time, columnist Max Freedman asked:

> Is he casting about for a role in Vietnam because the civil rights struggle is no longer adequate to his own estimate of his talents.

If there was any doubt, the April 4 speech washed it away. In this speech, King lashed out at the United States, called our Nation "the greatest purveyor of violence in the world today," charged the Nation with "cruel manipulation of the poor" and, as if written by the Daily Worker, said that U.S. troops "may have killed a million South Vietnamese civilians—mostly children." Keep in mind that these are only selections from the speech.

This speech and his involvement with the Vietnam Week protests brought down on King's head an abundance of denunciations, from civil rights leaders, legislators, military men, journalists and many Negroes who believe King has gone way, way too far.

King's Riverside speech is a hideous perversion of fact, a perversion nearly without limits. He said that Americans "poison the water" of the South Vietnamese. He stated that "we kill a million acres of their crops" and that American bulldozers "destroy their precious trees" and that "they wander into the hospitals with at least 20 casualties from American firepower for each Vietcong-inflicted injury." These are King's words. To this array of absurdities he added:

> We test out our latest weapons on them, just as the Germans tested out new medicine and new tortures in the concentration camps of Europe.

These are a few of the Communist-line invectives which King delivered on April 4. Since they were spoken, various "transcripts" of the speech have appeared "cleansed" versions brought forward in an apparent attempt to soothe the irate response of the great majority of Americans.

Some of the "clean" texts have omitted the statement about killing a million South Vietnamese, "mostly children." Some of the texts have footnotes by King denying that he meant to compare the United States and Nazi Germany. But the true speech has been torn apart, and King with it, by all who care for fact rather than fiction and by those who deplore King's linking anti-Vietnam and civil rights.

For all his vocal attempts to keep his anti-Vietnam stand and civil rights separate, and on a "personal" basis, these attempts have not worked. There is a joining of the two and King has helped direct it.

At the 1966 annual meeting of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, the group condemned the war, called it mass murder and authorized King to "throw the resources" of the organization behind efforts to end the war. It was at this time that King said he would write to the leaders of the governments involved. Doubtless, he dropped the idea when someone told him that the Logan Act, which he would have violated, forbids an individual from dealing in this way with a foreign government.

King maintains that he has never advocated a "mechanical merger" of the civil rights and peace organizations—which at other times he says are inextricably bound together—but, mechanical or not, he did release the Reverend James Bevel from the SCLC to head the Spring Mobilization Committee To End the War in Vietnam, Incidentally, Bevel's wife, Diane, not long ago got back from a Hanoi pilgrimage, so that helps understand the Bevels. And he did have the backing and resources of the SCLC—at one time, at least, a civil rights group—and he did state that he expected to be able to use a "trained field staff" of about 200 persons, mostly "experienced civil rights and peace organizers" in an attempt to get 10,000 volunteers and spread his "Vietnam Summer" throughout the Nation. Add to this the fact that the SCLC called on President Johnson to abandon the Ky government early in 1966.

The key word here is "mechanical," but it is not relevant. The example points up the typical semantic maneuvering of Dr. King. While he maintains that there should be no "mechanical merger," he achieves a merger in actuality of the parts he controls by grabbing off selected civil rights participants and resources and directing them to his new crusade.

The results of this linking has been the loss of whatever prestige King had, but more importantly, the loss to legitimate Negro aspirations for equal rights.

AFTERMATH OF A "TACTICAL ERROR"

The statements on Vietnam by Dr. King have been refuted to a degree unseen before. The NAACP board of directors termed King's movement into the vocal antiwar camp as "a serious tactical mistake." The directors said the effort to fuse the two "will serve the cause neither of civil rights nor of peace."

> Civil rights battles will have to be fought on their own merits, irrespective of the state of war or peace in the world. We are not a peace organization nor a foreign policy association. We are a civil rights organization. . . . We are, of course for a just peace. But there already exist dedicated organizations whose number one task is to work for peace just as our number one job is to work for civil rights.

Criticism has also come from other civil rights-conscious Negro leaders. Dr. Ralph J. Bunche stated:

> Right now, I am convinced he is making a very serious tactical error which will do much harm to the civil rights struggle.

Thurgood Marshall said King had a right to criticize the war, but "not as a civil rights leader. If he is trying to line the civil rights struggle with Vietnam he is leading the movement in the wrong direction. I do not believe he speaks for the majority of civil rights leaders or the majority of Negroes."

Dean Joseph O'Meara of the University of Notre Dame Law School was reported to have said, referring to Dr. King, among others, that they are "either Communists or traitors or cowards. Or they are persons of large good will but little insight who have been euchered into being stooges, or who are seeking some end of their own—ambition, revenge or whatever—at the expense of their counrty. Such persons are doing irreparable harm to the cause of civil rights by seeking to link the civil rights movement with their own criminal attempts to persuade young men to avoid military service."

The Reverend Matthew L. Winters says of King's stand:

> When Dr. Martin Luther King says "the United States is the greatest purveyor of violence in the world," I take issue with him . . . China, Hungary, Korea, the Baltic countries . . . Communism cannot be stopped by guns alone. I believe that. But there are times, when, God help us, it is the only way.

NEITHER HAWK NOR DOVE, BUT PIGEON

The New York Times reported May 21, 1967:

> Freedom House severely criticized King for lending his "mantle or respectability" to an anti-Vietnam war coalition that included "well-known Communist allies and luminaries of the hate-America left." The position paper said King "emerged as the public spear-carrier of a civil disobedience program that is demagogic and irresponsible in its attacks on our government.

In his retort to Freedom House, King told the Associated Press:

> It is totally untrue and unwarranted for anyone to give the impression that the (peace) mobilization was dominated by Communists or inspired by Communists.

Contrast this to the conclusion of the House Committee on Un-American Activities on the Vietnam Week demonstrations where King was a main speaker in front of the U.N. Plaza on the 15th of April, and to which he refers:

> The committee . . . charged today that Communists are the principal organizing force behind extensive demonstrations to take place during Vietnam Week, April 8–15.

Dr. King says that "we cannot separate the two," meaning separate civil rights and peace movements. If this is true, and it is what he appears to be striving for, I turn to the House Committee for clarification of what this means. From its lengthy, factual report on Vietnam Week the committee reports:

> Dr. Martin Luther King's agreement to play a leading role in the April 15 demonstrations in New York City, and his freeing Rev. James Bevel from his key position in the Southern Christian Leadership Conference to head up the Spring Mobilization Committee, are evidence that the Communists have succeeded, at least partially, in implementing their strategy of fusing the Vietnam and Civil Rights issues in order to strengthen their chances of bringing about a reversal of U.S. policy in Vietnam.

The House committee documents that Spring Mobilization Committee locked arms with the Student Mobilization Committee which "grew out of a conference in Chicago last December, called by Bettina Aptheker of the Communist Party's National Committee." This Chicago conference was studded with luminaries from the Communist Party in the United States.

King stated to the assembled at Riverside Church:

> We are taking black young men who have been crippled by our society and sending them 8,000 miles away to guarantee liberties in Southeast Asia which they have not found in Southwest Georgia and East Harlem.

Negro Columnist Carl T. Rowan answers that a "recent Harris survey showed that almost one of every two Negroes believes that King is wrong—and another 27 percent reserved judgment."

To the charges by Dr. King that Negroes in South Vietnam are mercenaries and the charges against U.S. policy, Capt. Earle McCaskill, as assistant judge advocate in Vietnam, and as a 29-year-old Negro lawyer, replies:

> I think what they (King and other war protesters) have done is unfortunate. They demonstrated their lack of understanding of what we're doing here. King talks about a civil war, but anyone who's fought in Vietnam knows that the whole thing is being run by Hanoi.
>
> He says that King and others in the antiwar faction have missed the point, "a critically important point. . . . In a way, the war puts the movement in focus. What we are trying to accomplish here is to guarantee personal liberty, economic opportunities and educational opportunities for everyone—the peasants and the sons of bankers—and that is what we Negroes need in the States.

In an interview with the New York Times, King started the buildup for the day when he may have to condone civil disobedience in the antiwar forces. He has already told young men to examine their draft status and think about conscientious objection. Here is King's lead-in to full-scale disobedience.

> Now if our nation insists on escalating the war and if we don't see any changes it may be necessary to engage in civil disobedience to further arouse the consciences of the nation and make it clear we feel this is hurting our country.

Possibly one of the most ridiculous of King's statement came when he talked about the diversion of "attention" from civil rights to the war in Vietnam. He said:

> The U.S. involvement in Vietnam has diverted attention from civil rights and excited violence and hatred among our people.

And what has King done with his malicious speeches, his threats and his talk of civil disobedience?

Roy Wilkins, respected leader of the NAACP, gives an answer:

> I don't believe Dr. King . . . as a leader in the civil rights movement, has the right to mix up the civil rights fight with the Viet Nam fight. . . .
>
> By involving himself in the peace movement, King indicates that Viet Nam is number one on his agenda and civil rights is either number three, four or five.
>
> I feel civil rights is number one.
>
> I don't speak as a hawk or a dove. I speak as a civil rights person and I don't want anyone to get in the way whether it be Martin Luther King or Lurleen Wallace. But is it wrong for people to be patriotic? Is it wrong for us to back up our boys in the field?
>
> They're dying while we're knifing them in the back at home.
>
> Maybe I'm a bit old fashioned. Maybe we are wrong, maybe we shouldn't be in Vietnam. But when you're out there in the trenches being fired at, you have to fight back.

CONCLUSIONS

In November 1964, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover called Reverend King "the most notorious liar in the country." Mr. Hoover spoke with no small amount of authority or knowledge. King has avoided a direct encounter with the famed public servant because the record is clearly unfavorable to the civil rights leader. Mr. Hoover is privy to many confidential reports on Mr. King's activities just as I am, and while their nature cannot be disclosed, I can say without equivocation that Martin Luther King does not want nor can he stand a public airing of his record. I can rest my case against King with the public utterances and actions of this man and any revelation of confidential matters is entirely unnecessary.

Why has he been immune for so many years and, in the parlance of the day, "allowed to get by with murder?" There is a peculiar double standard which the liberal community consistently applies. If any prominent person, particularly a conservative, were to identify with or share a speakers' platform with a member of the John Birch Society or some group the liberals might currently be attacking, he would be maligned forever. Let Martin Luther King openly identify with Communists and radicals, have a Communist as an adviser, engage in criminal activity, appear at the most way-out meetings in the Nation and advocate racism, revolution or civil disobedience and these same people look the other way.

In the long run, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that we do not have to worry that much about the Martin Luther Kings.

Our society is open enough, free enough, and resilient enough that it can withstand demagoguery. What is frightening, however, is to see the usual guardians of the public interest, ranging from the press to the Justice Department, look the other way and virtually assure such people a green light in their operations.

The press has repeatedly referred to Reverend King as a moderate. He is not. While he is not telling Negroes to arm themselves with guns or to "burn, baby, burn" like the Rap Browns and Stokely Carmichaels, he is, in a sophisticated way, agitating for the same thing. He is going to have a massive dislocation of northern cities but no violence. He says that upsetting a city without destroying it can be more effective than a riot, whatever that means. This is the enigma of Martin Luther King. He preaches nonviolence but somehow this can end up in illegal or violent actions. Then he says he is not responsible, although he himself has often participated in illegal acts.

He has thrust himself into community after community where even the Negro leaders have asked him to stay away. Only this year, King again foisted himself into the Chicago turmoil and announced his own brand of solutions to their ills. Rev. Henry Mitchell, a leader in the area King chose as a "target" asked him to leave and charged that King "created hate." King has thrust himself onto the Cleveland, Ohio, scene and promoted a boycott of a local dairy. In that particular case, he cited as some demands on that firm actions which could be a violation of the civil rights law. He also said the firm must advertise in Negro newspapers and put money in Negro savings and loan associations to avoid a Negro boycott. All in all, this is the blackmail tactic of a would-be dictator and power-hungry demagog, not a responsible leader.

By word and deed, he has been a potent force for lawlessness in our country. He has been a scofflaw. He has arrogated to himself the right to pick and choose the laws he will obey. He has set a poor example for others to emulate. He has countenanced draft evasion. He has been disloyal to his own country.

In an age when our country needs statesmen and builders, he has been a demagog and wrecker. Many of his ideas are alien to our way of life. In America, he can constitutionally say virtually anything he wants and command any following that he can muster for legitimate pursuits. It is important, however, that he be understood in his true perspective so honest and well-meaning Americans will not be duped because they did not fully understand the man, his mission, and his tactics.

LEAVES OF ABSENCES

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. EILBERG, for October 4 after 3 p.m. and October 5 and 6, on account of observance of Jewish High Holy Days, Rosh Hashanah.

Mr. MULTER, for October 4 after 3 p.m., and October 5 and 6, on account of observance of Jewish High Holy Days, Rosh Hashanah.

Mr. TENZER, for October 4 after 3 p.m., and October 5 and 6, on account of observance of Jewish High Holy Days, Rosh Hashanah.

Mr. FLYNT (at the request of Mr. BOGGS) for today, on account of official business.

Mr. REINECKE (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for the week of October 9, 1967, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. RYAN, for 20 minutes, tomorrow, October 5; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CONTE (at the request of Mr. POLLOCK), for 60 minutes, on October 10; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mrs. SULLIVAN (at the request of Mr. WALDIE), for 20 minutes, today; to revise and extend her remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. MADDEN.

Mr. FLOOD to revise and extend his remarks made on conference report on H.R. 10196 and to include certain tables.

Mr. MACHEN to revise and extend his remarks on H.R. 10196 and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GRAY to include extraneous matter during his special order today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WALDIE) and to include extaneous matter:)

Mr. KEE.

Mr. NIX.

Mr. FRASER.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.J. Res. 853. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 117. An act for the relief of Martha Blankenship;

S. 534. An act for the relief of Setsuko Wilson (nee Hiranaka); and

S. 1320. An act to provide for the acquisition of career status by certain temporary employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 5, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1141. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting listings of Army, Navy, Air Force, and Defense Supply Agency contracts negotiated under sections 2304(a)(11) and 2304(a)(16) for the period January–June 1967, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2304(e); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1142. A letter from the Acting Director of Civil Defense, Department of the Army, transmitting a report of Federal contributions program, equipment, and facilities, for the quarter ending June 30, 1967, pursuant to subsection 201(i) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1143. A letter from the Acting Director of Civil Defense, Department of the Army, transmitting a report of Federal contributions, personnel, and administration, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, pursuant to subsection 205 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1144. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend for a temporary period the existing provisions of law relating to the duty-free entry of gifts, not exceeding $50 in retail value, from members of the Armed Forces serving in combat zones; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 730. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. EDMONDSON: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 3274. A bill to preserve the domestic gold mining industry and to increase the domestic production of gold (Rept. No. 731). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. EDMONDSON: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 10583. A bill to extend the provisions of the act of October 23, 1962, relating to relief for occupants of certain unpatented mining claims (Rept. No. 732). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on Un-American Activities. H.R. 12601. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Internal Security Act of 1950 relating to the registration of Communist organizations, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 733). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 939. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 7977, a bill to adjust certain postage rates, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 734). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 13302. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make it unlawful to assault or kill any member of the armed services engaged in the performance of his official duties while on duty under orders of the President under chapter 15 of title 10 of the United States Code or paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 3500 of title 10 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 13303. A bill to extend the period during which Secret Service protection may be furnished to a widow and minor children of a former President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. de la GARZA:

H.R. 13304. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 13305. A bill to require reports to Congress of certain actions of the Federal Power Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 13306. A bill to amend paragraph (1) of section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act so as to authorize certain common carriers to furnish transportation to students at reduced rates; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEE:

H.R. 13307. A bill to require reports to Congress of certain actions of the Federal Power Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.R. 13308. A bill to provide time off duty for Government employees to comply with religious obligations prescribed by religious denominations of which such employees are bona fide members; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 13309. A bill to require reports to Congress of certain actions of the Federal Power Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.R. 13310. A bill to require reports to Congress of certain actions of the Federal Power Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 13311. A bill to prevent certain foreign-flag vessels to land their catches of fish in ports of the United States, its territories and possessions, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin:

H.R. 13312. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to authorize a program of research and demonstration for the control of pollution in lakes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 13313. A bill to amend the Nurse Training Act of 1964 to provide for increased assistance to hospital diploma schools of nursing; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 13314. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers Compensation Act to improve its benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 13315. A bill to amend section 127 of title 28, United States Code, to define more precisely the territory included in the two judicial districts of Virginia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 13316. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, with respect to the development of cargo container vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 13317. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense to make price adjustments in certain contracts for the procurement of silver military insignias for the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 13318. A bill to require reports to Congress of certain actions of the Federal Power Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 13319. A bill to amend section 1401a of title 10, United States Code, relating to adjustments of retired pay and retainer pay of members and former members of the Armed Forces to reflect changes in the Consumer Price Index; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 13320. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 13321. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for an American Hero Award Medal to be awarded to the next of kin of members of the Armed Forces who lose their lives as a direct result of injuries or disease incurred in armed conflict; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 13322. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding of the American Legion; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 13323. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to obscene or harassing telephone calls in interstate or foreign commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 13324. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the protection of the public health from radiation emissions from electronic products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 13325. A bill to amend the Nurse Training Act of 1964 to provide for increased assistance to hospital diploma schools of nursing; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 13326. A bill to amend section 1114 of title 18, United States Code, so as to extend its protection to postmasters, officers, and employees of the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SLACK:

H.R. 13327. A bill to require reports to Congress of certain actions of the Federal Power Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 13328. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 13329. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make it unlawful to assault or kill any member of the armed services engaged in the performance of his official duties while on duty under orders of the President under chapter 15 of title 10 of the United States Code or paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 3500 of title 10 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZWACH:

H.R. 13330. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to include a definition of food supplements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EILBERG (for himself, Mr. Eshleman, Mr. Rarick, Mr. Pettis, Mr. Ruppe, Mr. Williams of Pennsylvania, Mr. Wyman, and Mr. Button):

H.J. Res. 867. Resolution to authorize and direct the Public Printer to supply each new Member of Congress with five copies of the Annotated U.S. Constitution; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.J. Res. 868. Joint resolution creating a Federal Committee on Nuclear Development to review and reevaluate the existing civilian nuclear program of the United States; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.J. Res. 869. Joint resolution to establish a National Commission on Product Safety; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEE:

H.J. Res. 870. Joint resolution creating a Federal Committee on Nuclear Development to review and reevaluate the existing civilian nuclear program of the United States; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.J. Res. 871. Joint resolution to designate the last calendar week entirely in October in each year as National Vocational Guidance Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.J. Res. 872. Joint resolution creating a Federal Committee on Nuclear Development to review and reevaluate the existing civilian nuclear program of the United States; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.J. Res. 873. Joint resolution creating a Federal Committee on Nuclear Development to review and reevaluate the existing civilian nuclear program in the United States; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. SLACK:

H.J. Res. 874. Joint resolution creating a Federal Committee on Nuclear Development to review and reevaluate the existing civilian nuclear program of the United States; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. SCHADEBERG:

H. Con. Res. 520. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the continued operation of the U.S. Coast Guard Station at Racine, Wis.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS:

H.R. 13331. A bill for the relief of Phebe A. Acena; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13332. A bill for the relief of Alejandra S. Calica; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13333. A bill for the relief of Lina A. Pena; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 13334. A bill for the relief of Amelia I. Lopez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 13335. A bill for the relief of Dora Vasile; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 13336. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mauricia A. Buensalido and her minor children, Raymond A. Buensalido and Jacqueline A. Buensalido; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.R. 13337. A bill for the relief of Dr. Miriam Ehrenkranz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 4, 1967

(Legislative day of Monday, October 2, 1967)

The Senate met at 10 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Vice President.

Rev. Father Alexander George, pastor of the St. John's Eastern Orthodox Church, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, offered the following prayer:

Almighty Father, in an era of trial, confusion, and anxiety, we turn to You, as an ever-present help in time of trouble.

You have blessed us and we are grateful. We thank You for this land, for its material resources and spiritual blessings, but one more thing we require of You—the vision, the courage, and the determination to build the kind of world in which You would have Your children live—a world of universal freedom, justice, and peace.

We thank You for this Senate which was called to establish such a world. Undergird our spirits and strengthen our faith that we may remain tireless in our efforts, loyalty unwavering, courage unfaltering, and hope invincible that our dream may be translated into a blessed reality. For this we pray through the One who turned people into followers and caused the revolution, Christ Jesus our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, October 3, 1967, be approved.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions of the Committee on Banking and Currency and the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, in accordance with the previous agreement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 274 Leg.]

Aiken
Anderson
Brewster
Brooke
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Carlson
Church
Clark
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Ellender
Gruening
Hansen
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hickenlooper
Hill
Kennedy, N.Y.
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Monroney
Morton
Nelson
Pearson
Pell
Percy
Prouty
Proxmire
Ribicoff
Scott
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Williams, Del.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are necessarily absent.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of Virginia in the chair). A quorum is not present.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, the following Senators entered the Chamber and answered to their names:

Allott
Bartlett
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Cooper
Dodd
Eastland
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Griffin
Hatfield
Hayden
Holland
Hollings
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kuchel
Magnuson
McClellan
Miller
Mondale
Morse
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Randolph
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Spong
Thurmond
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, No. 371, offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY]. The time for debate is under the control of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], each Senator being allotted 10 minutes.

Who yields time?

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I would like to review briefly for the benefit of my colleagues the provisions of the Prouty-Scott amendment in the nature of a substitute for the Emergency Employment Act contained in title II of this bill.

Under our version, priority will be given to heads of families who are unemployed or low-income persons living in poverty in filling all positions created under title II.

We have added a part B to title II called the Human Investment Training Act. This is patterned in many respects on the Human Investment Act approach which I have sponsored for the last 3 years and which is supported by most of my Republican colleagues. Under this provision, the Secretary of Labor is authorized to make financial grants covering job-training costs to employers in private industry who institute training programs for the disadvantaged poor under plans approved by the Secretary of Labor.

Up to 37½ percent of title II funds may be used by the Secretary for implementing this type of creative job training. The Secretary of Labor may also spend an additional 20 percent of title II money for making further training programs available under the highly regarded on-the-job training and other MDTA programs.

Some of my colleagues sincerely believe that make-work programs provide an answer to our poverty problems. In my opinion, however, such an approach constitutes no real long-range solution to the war on poverty and is warranted only to the extent that some of our people are at a point in life where further education and training cannot qualify them for productive jobs.

Our proposal also contains much more realistic provisions with respect to funding of title II programs which should appeal to many who are concerned about increasing the fiscal deficit through excessive spending on nonmilitary programs.

There is presently a $2.8 billion authorization for title II of the bill. The Prouty-Scott substitute amendment reduces this authorization to $875 million plus $50 million for interest-free loans which will eventually be repaid to the Treasury.

This substantial saving is accomplished by eliminating all authorizations for fiscal 1969 and by substantially reducing the authorizations for fiscal 1968 which will have but 6 or 7 months remaining by the time this bill becomes law.

Mr. President, the concept that poverty can be substantially reduced only by the involvement of the private sector of our economy in meaningful training programs has received support from many and diverse sources.

Secretary of Labor Wirtz, in testimony before our committee, commented:

> The most underdeveloped aspect of the manpower program (and possibly the poverty program as well) involves the potential for increased private participation.

The 1967 manpower report to the President concluded that a basic issue in the occupational training task confronting us was "the possibility and desirability of financial assistance to employers to help them continue to carry the largest share of the training burden."

General President Hutcheson of the

Carpenters' Union wrote in his organization's newspaper last year that—

> Any program undertaken ought to be based on a reasonable assumption that there will be a place for a youngster when he has completed his training. Any other approach is neither fair to the youngster, to the industry, or to the nation.

Nationally syndicated financial columnist Sylvia Porter wrote early this year:

> The basic, long term answer to skill shortages can only be drastically improved and increased vocational education and job training by private industry as well as by government agencies.

And, a well-known authority in the field of manpower programs recently told me that a survey which he had conducted around the country showed that MDTA had the capability to expand very rapidly and that participants in such programs could easily be doubled, but that "nobody has made that kind of proposal for MDTA."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Vermont has expired.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, involvement by private enterprise is the direction emphasized by the Prouty-Scott amendment, rather than the making of thousands of unmeaningful WPA-type jobs. Under our proposal, upon which you will shortly vote, more than $500 million of the $875 million authorized for title II will be available to the Secretary of Labor for implementing human investment and MDTA on-the-job training programs by private employers, and for other vocational and institutional training programs under MDTA. Of course, as I have already pointed out, priority in filling these positions will be given to unemployed and low-income persons in the poverty category who are heads of families.

Our substitute amendment also includes the amendment proposed by the junior Senator from South Dakota, which expands the definition of "eligible areas" for these programs to include rural areas which have problems of outmigration.

Mr. President, facing the issues squarely, I hope that the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee will find it possible to support the Prouty-Scott amendment, together with a majority of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], I ask unanimous consent to suggest the absence of a quorum, with the time to be charged to neither side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

How much time does the Senator from West Virginia yield himself?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. President, the Prouty-Scott amendment would substitute for the present title II of S. 2388 a modified version of that title, which would include both the Clark-Javits Emergency Employment Act—part A—and the Prouty Human Investment Act—part B—with a total authorization of $925 million for fiscal 1968. The amendment would thus authorize $375 million less than would be authorized for the Emergency Employment Act under the present title II in this fiscal year.

The amendment contains no fiscal 1969 authorization. The present title II would authorize $1.5 billion in fiscal 1969.

Under this amendment, at least 12½ percent of $875 million—$109,375,000—and up to 37½ percent of that sum—$327,125,000—would support part B projects, under which the Secretary of Labor would, pursuant to employer-submitted plans, make grants to employers to cover the costs of training and employing eligible persons.

Section 215 would extend tax advantages to employers receiving such assistance.

The remainder of $875 million would support part A, the Clark-Javits program. Fifty million dollars—instead of $300 million proposed by the committee—would be available for loans to support part A projects which, it is thought, would induce businesses to relocate in the ghettoes.

Mr. President, with all due respect to my distinguished colleagues from Vermont and Pennsylvania, I am compelled to state my opposition to the amendment which they have proposed to my motion to recommit.

The Senators propose the expenditure of just under a billion dollars to support virtually the same extremely dubious employment program approved by the committee, as well as to further the laudable purpose of getting business involved in training the poor. But the war on poverty is already involving business in training the poor—on an experimental basis—because neither OEO nor business yet knows for certain what will work best. No new legislative authority is needed and, until the experiments are evaluated, it would be the height of fiscal irresponsibility to pour in almost another billion dollars at the same time we are being asked to increase taxes.

The war on poverty is in trouble now because it has been trying to do too much too fast. What is needed now is a shakedown of current programs, not a hasty new beginning in a number of new directions.

There is plenty of authority in current legislation to do what is proposed by the Senator from Vermont. There are new pilot programs in these directions currently being begun or recently announced—all under current authorities.

For example, just the day before yesterday, President Johnson announced a $40-million pilot program under authority currently possessed by the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Department of Labor, the Department of Commerce, and other Government agencies to get private enterprise even more heavily involved in the war on poverty. The President made clear that these programs would be experimental in nature—that no one in or out of Government knew precisely which ones would work nor how they would work.

In the past few years, other programs of this general nature have been begun. In his speech yesterday, the Senator from Vermont was high in his praise of the Labor Department's on-the-job training program. But on-the-job training already exists under current legislation, and the Department of Labor has not requested additional authority nor does it need such authority.

In addition, OEO is currently experimenting with new approaches to the involvement of private business. If they work, their cost to the Federal budget and to the U.S. economy will be substantially less than the cost of the program proposed by the Senator from Vermont. An example is the success insurance program, which is designed to induce private employers to take the poor into training slots by reimbursing business only for those poor trainees who did not work out in these new jobs. It is quite clear that title I of the bill reported by the committee contains plenty of authority to continue and expand these approaches. Section 123 alone allows many new and experimental training programs, whether public or private. It allows ample authority for programs originally proposed by the Senator from Pennsylvania as well as authority for these now proposed by the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. President, let us think for a moment of the American taxpayer who makes the war on poverty possible. The amendment offered by the Senators from Vermont and Pennsylvania would add $925 million to the President's budget in this fiscal year. I have heard it said that this would be an improvement upon the committee-reported version of title II because it would involve $1.875 billion less than the committee version. However, the cost to the taxpayer in this fiscal year would be only $375 million less than the committee-approved version. If it is the intention or hope of our distinguished colleagues from Vermont and Pennsylvania to sweeten the taste of title II in this fashion, I am compelled to say that few, if any, of our taxpaying constituents can hope to find the taste of an additional $925 million, on top of an absolutely unprecedented peacetime deficit, to be sweet.

To approve any version of title II which I have yet heard suggested would be to make the entire war on poverty even more vulnerable than it already is with both the American public and with Congress. It is simply no answer, Mr. President, to the extravagance proposed in the committee-reported version of title II to instead propose to break the administration's budget ceiling by $925 million at precisely the moment we are urging the administration to cut back on nondefense expenditures. In other words, this amendment is no cure to the committee version of title II.

Finally, Mr. President, it is clear that both the committee version of title II and that preferred by the sponsors of the pending amendment must be rejected on the grounds that neither version has been the subject of the thorough hearings traditionally required in this body prior to a commitment to a vast new domestic program. In fact, they have not been subject to any hearings at all. We have no clear idea of exactly how the so-called emergency employment program will work or exactly how it would related to—or perhaps duplicate and confuse—existing employment programs. We have no evidence that the so-called Human Investment Act would really be effective in reaching and benefiting those most in need of employment assistance. In any event, it would be unthinkable to commit ourselves to either of these alternative versions of title II without the benefit of the most extensive hearings and the most careful deliberation at the committee level.

Mr. President, for all the reasons which commend themselves to me, and I am sure to most of my distinguished colleagues, with great force, I urge that the pending amendment be rejected.

If the Prouty amendment is agreed to, then the motion which I have offered—the effect of which would be to delete title II—would be out of the question, because the question would then recur on my motion as amended by Senator PROUTY's substitute. My motion would no longer be amendable.

Therefore, I hope Senators will support me in rejecting the Prouty amendment to my motion so that we can reach a clear-cut final vote on my motion to recommit with instructions to delete title II in its entirety.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. As I understand it, if the Prouty amendment is defeated, the question will recur on the motion of the Senator from West Virginia to strike title II.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. MUNDT. The purpose of the Senator's amendment to strike title II is to enable the war on poverty to continue without making it an all-out war on the American taxpayer.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Yes, and may I reiterate that, if the Prouty amendment is rejected, the vote will recur on my motion to recommit with instructions to report back forthwith with title II deleted.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. May I ask the Senator if it might not be possible to obtain some sort of agreement that we would vote on the Byrd motion first? My thought is that it would be logical to permit Senators who would simply like to vote for the big reduction provided in the Byrd motion to do so. If it does not carry, then we can vote on motions that would provide for lesser reductions. I wonder if it might be possible to arrange votes in that order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time of the Senator from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have 30 seconds.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, there is no time left.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 30 seconds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, both sides get 30 seconds, then.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Fine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Could it be agreed that we would have an opportunity to vote for the larger reduction first, and then, if that fails to carry, that we could vote for lesser reduction?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I believe that the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont would have precedence over the vote on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Would the Senator from Vermont be willing to let us vote on the Byrd motion first, and then vote on the Prouty motion, in the event the Byrd motion fails?

Mr. PROUTY. No; if the Senator will yield, I think we have a clear-cut issue here, and should just follow through on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? The Senator from Vermont has 6 minutes remaining. The time of the Senator from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I recognize we are not likely to convince anybody of anything in 1 minute. I am the coauthor, with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] of the basic measure, but I believe that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] has now sharpened and refined it in a way which is satisfactory to me, and I hope to Senator CLARK, and we support it.

Mr. President, the essence of the finding being made by the Senate, if it agrees to this amendment, is twofold:

First, we would be finding, by our vote, that jobs are the basis for dealing with the major national crisis in the slums and ghettos, and that there is no other basic and direct way to meet it; that the slums and ghettos need this application of help—which is sustained by three high-level commissions of the President appointed in 1966 and 1967, as well as, in my judgment, by every whit of the evidence before the committee on which I have the honor to serve with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], and others.

Second, Mr. President, the Senate would be finding that the crisis of the cities deserves, in the interests of the tranquillity and morale of the country, the priority which we would thus be giving it.

For those reasons, I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I hope that all Senators who intended to vote for the original Emergency Employment Act will support the unanimous view of the Democratic members of the subcommittee by voting for the Prouty amendment.

The Prouty amendment is the result of some intensive discussion between members of the subcommittee on both sides of the aisle. In my opinion, if Senators wish to do something for the poor in the cities, they will vote for the Prouty amendment, and not throw their votes away on a futile effort to pass the Emergency Employment Act as it came to the floor.

With the support of those on this side of the aisle who supported the committee on the Emergency Employment Act, I have some confidence that the Prouty amendment can be adopted.

I believe the Prouty amendment would do almost as much as can realistically be expected to be done in this fiscal year to get jobs for those in the cities who so badly need them. A vote for the Prouty amendment is a vote for an effective program in the war against poverty.

In conclusion, I point out that this is an authorization bill, not an appropriation bill. No one can tell how much it will cost the taxpayers of America, if anything, until the appropriating process has been completed. The rural part of this bill is just as important as the urban part. The rural ghettos, the delta counties, will receive their share of benefits.

I hope that the Prouty amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, how much time is remaining on each side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont has 2 minutes remaining. The time of the Senator from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I have put on each Senator's desk a thumbnail sketch of what my amendment will accomplish.

First, it would reduce the $2.8 billion authorization in title II of the bill to $875 million, plus $50 million for interest-free loans which is repayable. That is a reduction of about $1.875 billion.

It would permit the Secretary of Labor to use up to $328,125,000 for human investment training programs run by private industry, which have been demonstrated to be the most effective type of job-training programs conducted thus far.

It would also permit the Secretary to use up to $175 million for on-the-job training and other vocational and institutional training programs under the Manpower Development and Training Act.

It would require the Secretary of Labor to give priority in filling all employment and job training openings created by title II programs to unemployed and low-income persons in the poverty category who are heads of families. Thus, a total of $503,125,000 can be used by the Secretary for on-the-job and institutional training, designed to enable these people to acquire the skills to become productive.

This is a proposal which solicits the cooperation of industry; and under this proposal, I am sure that management and labor will cooperate with the Secretary of Labor to make this a successful program.

I realize that some people are unemployable, and that the Government, as the employer of last resort, will have to take care of them through job creation. I agree that it is far better to make some kind of jobs for them than to keep them on the welfare rolls. However, the main emphasis and thrust of my amendment is on training such people when and where they are trainable so that they can obtain the necessary skills to fill productive jobs in the private sector of our economy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 2 minutes have expired.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that each side be allowed 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I call attention again to these facts:

First. The activities that the Senators seek to have performed may largely be performed under present authority.

Second. No hearings have been held on this amendment or on title II of the bill.

Third. Title II was not requested by the administration.

Fourth. The shortcomings of the already-existing poverty programs should be corrected before we engage upon a new and costly venture.

Fifth. Even though the Prouty amendment purports to cut the authorization under title II, in reality it would only be reduced from $1.3 billion in fiscal year 1968 to $925 million—a reduction of only $325 million.

If we agree to the Prouty amendment, we will be saddling the taxpayers with a program which will cost at least $925 million and which has not been requested by the administration. So while the amendment appears to be making a cut, in reality it is authorizing $925 million that has not been requested by the administration and which will further increase the budget deficit if moneys are later appropriated.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, if we agree to the Prouty amendment, we shall be making it possible for a good many people who are now unemployable to receive training which will take them off the relief rolls. If that is not saving money for the taxpayers, I do not know what is. My amendment would cut by nearly $2 billion the authorization as proposed when the measure first came to the Senate floor.

I yield such time as I have remaining to the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I spent all of yesterday morning at a poverty conference, where I heard leaders of the poverty-stricken people of this country. I believe that the adoption of this amendment would save the taxpayers many times the initial cost of the Prouty amendment, because I know the poverty-stricken people of this country are looking to Congress to give them the program the Prouty amendment proposes. Certainly they recognize it is not in the administration bill; that is why this great effort is being made by the poverty-stricken people of this country to call attention to their plight and to seek to obtain the help for which they plead.

Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the committee report on the Emergency Employment Act includes ample documentation of the fact that its goal—jobs—is an absolute necessity in any solution to what we have come to recognize as the crisis of the cities.

The suggestion by Mayor Lindsay of New York last year that his city will need a 10-year Federal outlay of some $50 billion, and the interpolation of that figure into a $1,000 billion national requirement, shocked many of us into a new awareness of the crushing problems of decaying housing, woefully inadequate public facilities and services, and human despair that are plaguing our urban areas.

The availability of meaningful employment can attack these problems at all levels. A job can change dependency into dignity, and can build toward a lifetime of self-sufficiency for people who might alternatively spend all of their days on public assistance. Moreover, under the provisions of this bill, the jobs will be in the fulfillment of important public needs that would otherwise not be met.

At the same time, I think it is highly important to pay attention to the location of the jobs that will be created. Employment is needed in the cities by people who are there now. But we should also consider this legislation in light of the fact that some 600,000 Americans are migrating from the countryside to urban areas each year in search of work opportunities. The limited number of jobs it will create will clearly accomplish little in remedying existing urban unemployment if that heavy migration continues at the present rate.

Some 47 percent of the native South Dakotans who were living in 1960, for example, were residing in other States—a total of 430,194 people. By far, the largest proportionate share of them went to urban areas such as Los Angeles and San Francisco in California, which received 98,854 native South Dakotans, or Minneapolis-St. Paul in Minnesota, which was the destination of 53,749 people who left my State.

These people sought opportunities elsewhere primarily because of decreasing agricultural opportunities and corresponding business declines in small towns and cities. The process is continuing today.

These people may have found jobs. If so, they took the place of people who made up the internal population growth of the cities. If not, they and others like them from all parts of rural America are among the urban unemployed. In either case, they compounded both the physical and human problems of the cities that have their roots in overcrowding.

I do not believe that the Emergency Employment Act of 1967 can have its maximum beneficial impact unless some of the assistance it provides is directed toward stemming migration from the rural States to urban centers. I believe we need to do what we can to prevent further population shifts that add to the congestion of our cities.

The bill does recognize this need by calling for new jobs in both rural and urban areas. However, precisely because outmigration occurs, most rural areas would probably not be able to qualify under the criteria it uses for establishing areas that are eligible for assistance—chiefly unemployment and underemployment. A slow rate of economic growth, or even an actual drop in employment such as occurred in my State between 1950 and 1960, is usually not reflected by higher unemployment rates because those who cannot find work migrate to the cities.

To overcome this problem, I have offered an amendment which would add "problems of outmigration" as a factor to be considered along with unemployment, underemployment, and a high proportion of low-income people as a factor to be considered by the Secretary of Labor. This would have the effect of extending the benefits of the bill to rural States such as South Dakota. I am pleased that Senator Prouty, of Vermont, a senior Republican member of the committee, is incorporating my amendment in his proposed revision of the bill.

Let me stress that, since migration is recognized as a problem that aggravates urban unemployment in the bill, my amendment in effect would merely bring the operative provisions of the bill more in line with its findings and declarations.

Mr. President, a job training program of this kind is in the interest of the American taxpayer because it will take people off the welfare rolls and train them for private industry. It will also take idle men off the streets where they provide the grist for costly violence, riots, and crime. The present system which relies so heavily on the welfare dole, is costly and ineffective. I want to see these financial and human costs reduced and the best way to do that is through good job training efforts. I also want the rural and small-town youth who are now leaving my State to be encouraged instead to stay with us. That can only be possible if we step up the job training and job opportunities in our rural States, which this program as revised by my amendment would help to do.

Senator Prouty's version of the bill is considerably more modest than the committee version. I support it as a prudent, less costly version of the job training bill. I support it because it relies more heavily on private industry to carry out job training. I support it because it takes into consideration rural States as well as urban areas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having expired, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] to the motion of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARTLETT (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. INOUYE (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withdraw my vote.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea" and the Senator from Texas would vote "nay."

The result was announced as follows—yeas 42, nays 47:

[No. 275 Leg.]

YEAS—42

Aiken
Boggs
Brewster
Brooke
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Dirksen
Fong
Griffin
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hatfield
Jackson
Javits
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
Metcalf
Mondale
Morse
Morton
Muskie
Nelson
Pearson
Pell
Percy
Prouty
Randolph
Ribicoff
Scott
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NAYS—47

Allott
Anderson
Bennett
Bible
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Cotton
Curtis
Dodd
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Fannin
Fulbright
Hansen
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hollings
Hruska
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Lausche
Long, La.
Mansfield
McClellan
McIntyre
Miller
Monroney
Mundt
Murphy
Proxmire
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Spong
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—11

Baker
Bartlett
Bayh
Ervin
Gore
Inouye
Montoya
Moss
Pastore
Russell
Tower

So Mr. PROUTY's amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Arizona.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Appropriations, with an amendment:

H.J. Res. 853. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 580).

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1968

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed immediately to consideration of House Joint Resolution 853, which is an amendment to the continuing resolution for fiscal year 1968.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 853) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. HAYDEN. This amendment, as it passed the House Tuesday, October 3, 1967, merely provides for the extension until October 10, 1967, of the existing provision of the first continuing resolution under which governmental activities without their regular annual appropriation have operated since June 30, 1967.

The committee recommends that the House resolution be amended to extend the termination date of the continuing resolution to October 23, 1967. The date provided for in the House-passed version is October 10, which is only 4 working days from today.

Four of the fiscal year 1968 appropriation bills, Interior, Treasury-Post Office, Legislative, and Defense, have been enacted into law. In addition, two fiscal year 1967 appropriation bills have been signed into law: the second supplemental and the Defense supplemental. The Agriculture and Independent Offices appropriation bills are in conference while the Labor-HEW conference report has been agreed to and filed.

The State, Justice, Commerce, and judiciary appropriation bill, the Transportation appropriation bill, the Public Works appropriation bill, and the NASA appropriation bill are on the Senate Calendar.

There is one appropriation bill in the Committee on Appropriations—the District of Columbia bill. Hearings have been virtually completed on this bill. The remaining three appropriation bills, foreign aid, military construction, and the supplemental, are in the House Committee on Appropriations awaiting authorization.

I urge the adoption of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DODD in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In line 5, after the word "thereof", strike out "October 10, 1967" and insert "October 23, 1967".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I believe that a joint resolution of this nature should be considered in a little less hubbub, so that Senators will know what they are voting on.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. MUNDT. This is the joint resolution which was passed by the House of Representatives to continue the appropriations at present levels until October 10. The Senate should be aware that this is a most unusual step. Normally, in traditional times, when we are not flirting with bankruptcy, we pass such joint resolutions——

Mr. DOMINICK. May we have order, Mr. President? I cannot hear the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The attachés will please take their seats. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. MUNDT. Normally, when we are not flirting with bankruptcy and courting financial disaster, we merely pass continuing resolutions a month or so at a time, when dilatory tactics in one body or the other delay the timely passage of appropriations bills and when meeting only from Tuesdays to Thursdays in the month of October tends to keep us here forever to get little business done. But these are not normal times, except that we still continue with our abbreviated workweeks, which I believe is wrong. Except for that, there is nothing normal about these times. We are in war.

Our financial problem is very serious. The administration is now trying to impose another 10-percent levy on the taxpayers. We are confronted with a $29 billion deficit, perhaps more.

So there was a reason why the House, in a rollcall vote, extended the present level of appropriations for only 10 days; and there is a reason why a collateral action was taken by the Ways and Means Committee, when it said, in effect, "We are not going to consider tax increases at all or have another committee meeting unless and until either the President or Congress, or both, show us where some cuts can be made in the expenditures." That is the unusual feature of this matter as it comes before us today.

So when the resolution came to the Senate committee, it did not seem quite right merely to keep the same 10-day level approved by the House because by the time the joint resolution gets through and is on the President's desk, only 4 or 5 days might be left. But it did seem to many of us that it was entirely wrong to consider the resolution as just an ordinary extension of expenditures; because if we are to effectuate some economies, we should be working on them this week, right now, and not continue to spend until the end of October at the same old reckless level.

We had quite a little discussion in the committee. It was proposed by the President, and recommended by the President's spokesman on the committee, that the extension be continued until November 10. That would be normal, in normal times. It was finally suggested that the time be shortened a little, to the end of October. Some of us felt that it should be October 10, but that such action today might be a little unrealistic in getting the desired results.

Finally, as a substitute for the longer extension which was before us, I suggested that we extend the time only to Monday, October 23, because Sunday is the 22d and Saturday is the 21st, and unless Congress changes its habits—it does not meet much on Friday any more; and if it does, it does not usually vote—we would have only until the 20th, which would allow only 10 days beyond the House action. So my motion was adopted, I believe unanimously, but certainly without any dissenting votes, and the Senate should approve it here today. But I believe we should approve it with the recognition that it commits us and supports the House and applauds the move in the direction of some additional economizing.

We nearly voted almost a billion additional dollars this morning on a proposal that had never even had a hearing. No Senator who voted for it—except perhaps the author—knows exactly what was in it, and yet in the recent rollcall it was narrowly defeated.

We say we do not want tax increases; we do not want to belabor the poor taxpayer. But the Senate nearly said, "Here goes a billion dollars more." Actually, had we failed to defeat that proposal, the consequent upsurge of inflation would have oppressed and harassed the poverty stricken much more than they would have been aided by the near billion dollar new expenditures for untried programs.

Let us get serious about this matter of inflation. The time has come for some belt tightening, for some rescission measures; and the time has come for the watchdogs of the Treasury, if any remain, to remember, every time we now pass an appropriation bill, that it is for 9 months. We can cut back 25 percent on all the increases, effectuate economy, yet change nothing in the activity rate, because we are legislating now for only 9 months, appropriating for 9 months, but we continue to appropriate on a 12-month basis, while only 9 months remain in the fiscal year.

This is October. So far as I know, this session of Congress apparently never intends to adjourn. I see no activity stirring up. We do not meet in the evenings, we do not meet on Saturdays, we do not vote on Fridays, and sometimes we discontinue our work on Thursdays. That is not my responsibility. I am not the leadership. However, there are some economies we should effectuate and look at since we are not very busy at other jobs.

Somebody at the other end of the avenue and Members of this body and of the other body should remember that we are now committing ourselves as a group to try to do some economizing. That is what this very unusual, short term continuing resolution is all about.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have been interested in what the distinguished Senator from South Dakota has just said about a so-called abbreviated workweek in the Senate. I respectfully challenge the Senator's characterization and refer him to the fact that the record just does not bear him out—there have been no such abbreviated weeks in the Senate. I cite as my proof, in addition to my actual knowledge, and I am sure it is the Senate's actual knowledge, too, that up through October 1, the Senate had been in session 150 days, and during that time had been in session 783 hours and 36 minutes which is nearly 6 hours a day; in comparison with the other body which had been in session for 140 days, and the time in session had been 611 hours and 40 minutes.

I say to my distinguished colleague from South Dakota, the Senate has not been operating on a Tuesday-to-Thursday basis. We have been meeting on Saturdays, when necessary, but fortunately, thanks to the cooperation of the Senate as a whole, the calendar has remained relatively clear up to the present time. I am sure that a close investigation of the record will show that the Senate has been equally productive in disposing of legislation on Mondays and Fridays as on the other days of the week.

Insofar as the proposal to pass the buck to the President on this matter of expenditures is concerned, I would point out that we have a far greater responsibility than does the President; our responsibility is prescribed by the Constitution and if we are afraid to face up to that responsibility, we should not pass the buck to him.

I would point out also that over the past several months, the President has requested the leadership time and time again to please get the appropriation bills to him as soon as possible so that after determining where the Congress wanted emphasis, he could apply the scalpel and belt tightening and see where additional cuts may be made. But the task will not be easy. The figure within which to work is something like $21 billion. Is he going to cut out defense expenditures in excess of $70 billion? He cannot touch $13 billion we are paying in interest today. He should not touch veterans' benefits. What he has done has been to make recommendations based on laws passed by the Congress which call for appropriations, as well as authorizations. So I think that really it is our responsibility and not the President's; I think it is up to us here in the Congress to take the initiative on this matter.

There are four appropriation bills on the calendar now, including the NASA appropriation, which was reported by the full committee yesterday and appears on the calendar today. It will be some time before these bills reach the White House for signing; all of them are going to generate some debate and thorough consideration. The President should be given this opportunity to try to excise what he can out of the appropriation bills. But at the same time Congress must face up to its responsibility and cut out projects and appropriations which may not be deemed worthy and indeed, essential. In that respect I will be just as diligent as any Senator in fighting for appropriations for my State. However, I think collectively we should face up to our responsibility—our responsibility under the Constitution—to the end that this difficulty, which could well develop into a political donnybrook, could be forestalled and settled.

This matter of the continuing appropriations was discussed, as the Senator from South Dakota pointed out, in the Committee on Appropriations this morning. Various suggestions were made: to agree to the House date of October 10, to agree to a date of October 25, or to agree to a date of October 31—which I advocated by the way. Finally, in an effort to reach unanimous agreement, the committee agreed to the date proposed by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, who now has the floor.

It is true that we do face troublous times in this Nation today; in my opinion, the most troublous times in the history of our Republic. There is a very difficult situation in Vietnam. There is urban unrest in our cities. We face the possibility of a $29 billion or $30 billion deficit for this fiscal year; and even if the President's proposal is agreed to and a tax increase of something on the order of $7 billion or $8 billion is forthcoming, it will cause little more than a dent in this deficit.

If the position of the President prevails and the appropriation bills he sought are enacted, and if we do not go beyond the expenditures he recommends, it is his hope that between $4 and $5 billion will be saved. I say: Stay as close to his budget as possible, give him his chance, and let us face our responsibility.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I wish to say to my distinguished friend that what he said pretty well reiterates the point of view I expressed. I find nothing that he said which I can disagree with very seriously, except one point.

If I said, in my enthusiasm, trying to be heard above the chaos of the Senate, an abbreviated session of the Senate instead of the Congress, I apologize. I was trying to apply the rules of comity between the two Houses. If I did not, I should have said Congress, and let the RECORD so show.

Neither am I trying to pass the buck to the President, and nothing that I said indicated that. We have some responsibility in Congress in this matter.

I am well advised, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, and the Congress for 30 years, that Congress has the control of the purse. I always look a little askance at the process that says, "Hurry up. Pass appropriation bills. Send them to the White House, and let the President decide what to spend." That process moves in the direction of item vetoes. If we ever establish an item veto in this country we will have destroyed the independence of Congress because we will have given the President control of the purse.

I hope the President will make some rescissions. I think that Congress should, too. Before we send our appropriation bills down there, we should be sure that we have squeezed out all the waste we can.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator in that respect, but I point out that under the Reorganization Act we are supposed to have appropriation bills passed by June 30. Here we are 3 months into the present fiscal year, 3 months beyond the time when we were supposed to be finished with their consideration.

I am delighted the Senator has indicated that if we are not careful, if we operate under this procedure, we will give the President the right to item veto, which I think would be disastrous. I think the way we presently handle this matter—with bit-by-bit extensions, as is exemplified in the resolution today—tends to place more power down there at the White House, removing it from the Congress in the process. I agree with the Senator in that respect. I am opposed to any further diminution of the Senate's power. I hope the Senate will consider that today while considering this resolution.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the Senator has made a good point. Congress should maintain the control of the purse that the Constitution gives us. That control is basic and essential.

I shall join the Senator from Montana in trying to get Congress to exercise the power that the Constitution gives us over the purse, instead of trying to rely on the other end of the avenue in making decisions on the appropriations we make. We have the rescission power if we want to take a backward look at what we have done and find places to reduce expenditures already approved. I cannot, however, exonerate the President altogether in this matter. I join the Senator from Montana in saying that the President is not responsible for the fact that the Senate is 90 days late with the appropriation bills. But, if it is not the fault of the President or the Senate, the responsibility must repose somewhere. The rules of the Senate prohibit me from indicating where the difficulty lies. All I know is that someone must be responsible for the fact that, while we should pass these bills by the first of the fiscal year, that is not being done year after year. We cannot hold the President responsible for that, but we cannot exonerate him on other reasons for the prevailing "squandermania" in this era of extravagance.

If we examine the present appropriation bills and wonder why they grow so fast, so often, and so much, we will find that many new programs are being advocated, urged, and prodded through Congress on recommendations from the White House. Congress gets the price tag, and the President gets the credit. So we cannot simply say that our big financial deficit is because Congress has not met its responsibilities. After new programs have been pushed through, it becomes necessary to populate them with people to run them, and then Congress has to appropriate money for the programs.

But jointly, the Senate, the House, and the administration, since we are going to be here for quite a while, should effectuate some genuine economies. This should be done before we even take up a tax bill, to say nothing about having any hope of passing the new levies on to our hard-pressed taxpayers.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. Although it is apropos to the Senator's remarks, I hesitate to bring up a minor matter. Since we are considering finances in the area of billions of dollars, this item for only $40 million might be considered inconsequential. However, I assure the Senator that $40 million is not a negligible amount to me.

Yesterday, it was brought to my attention that there is a new program, which will cost $40 million and which reportedly will be executed under existing legislation and with existing money. It is an entirely new slum employment program, which is relevant to the exact bill we are discussing. There are many considerations in the Labor and Public Welfare Committee regarding the approach to a slum employment plan, but here we find that there will be a pilot plan for five cities which have been selected, and the moneys will be provided from existing Federal programs.

I have asked the Secretary of Commerce, who made the statement, to supply me with the exact sources of the funds to be so used. I think we have the right to know. I have cited this as a concrete example—fresh, brand new—of what the Senator has been talking about.

However, I think the time has come when we should know. I, as a Senator, wish to find out as much about it as I can.

I agree completely that under present conditions it is time to take another hard look at the money that is provided and what is happening to our taxpayers' dollars, and to make certain that the Senate and House know exactly how much is being provided, how much is actually needed, and what use is actually being made of the money.

I mention this as a minor item. But $40 million multiplied enough times becomes quite an important sum.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's statement. Forty million dollars is not a minor item. It is an important amount of money to me. I do not know whether this is a program which has been enacted by legislation and for which funds have been appropriated as a line item or whether, in fact, it is, as the Senator says, money which has been accumulated by reprograming or overfinancing certain other programs so that the President uses it to start out on a new and gay adventure.

That is the kind of proposal as to which, I think, without incurring the danger of an item veto, the President could show us where economies can be made.

Let me illustrate another one: In the last days of December, 1965, in a brief and courageous statement which was applauded around the country, President Lyndon Johnson said from his ranch in Texas, "We have got too many people employed on the payroll."

He was meticulous. He was precise and exact in his language.

He did not say, "We have got too many people working in the Government." He said, "We have got too many people employed on the Federal payroll." He did not indicate what percentage were working.

More than 3 million persons are on the payroll. He said, "We are going to cut down 25,000 of them next month."

So I watched the papers, as other Senators, I know, watched the papers; but there was no 25,000 reduction that month.

The following month instead there was an increase of 23,000.

The number was increased by, I think it was, 17,000 the following month.

In the next 12 months—looking back—President Johnson (by executive action on the part of his administration, by scratches of the pen, added 200,000 more persons to the Federal payroll.

There are 200,000 persons who can be taken off the Federal payroll by the man who added them. There is a logical and effective place for the President to cut down, without trying to exercise the item veto, a place where he can help to effectuate an economy.

Statisticians figure that the average Federal employee costs the taxpayer $7,000 a year. Some, of course, are paid more and some less. That is the average cost, however.

The 200,000 multiplied by $7,000 is $1,400 million. The President could save us that much money and take that burden off the taxpayers simply by taking off the payroll the 200,000 people he added to the payroll after the time he said there were already 25,000 too many on that same payroll.

That kind of cooperation between Congress and the administration could help to obviate the necessity for a tax bill, or could make the enactment of a tax bill effective in curbing inflation if we find we still have to have one, after we have engaged in some economies.

Those kinds of exercises of the scalpel, which the Senator from Montana talks about, are within the proper administrative purview of the President, and he does not have to exercise the item veto to obtain these economies. He also can make sure that there are not those extra funds which come at this time of year when we vote a 12-month appropriation to meet 9 calendar months for the remainder of the year. We have already financed, at the present level, the first 90 days by our continuing resolutions.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wish the Senator, when he talks about additions to the payroll, would differentiate between those added to the Defense Establishment and to the war effort, and those which were added to the regular Government departments.

It is my distinct impression—and the Senator is a Member of the Appropriations Committee—that in most of the regular Government departments we have held employment, in many cases, at a plateau—in some cases, at a lower level.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is correct about his overall concept that war is responsible for the addition of some people to the Federal payroll, but the Senator is talking about the wrong war. In the last year, there has not been a great expansion of civilian employment at the Pentagon necessitated by the war, but there have been a great many additions of civilian payrollers in the Government in fighting the war on poverty. I say that without any criticism of the war on poverty.

But let us find out what we are doing. The President has said and the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee has said that in the past 5 years this country has spent more money fighting the war on poverty than it has in fighting the war in Vietnam.

Unhappily, we do not seem to be winning either one.

Let us keep the record straight. It is not the war in Vietnam which has created the 200,000 additional employees; it is the war on poverty.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We should be more definitive about where they were added. I do not know the figure. The Senator is probably correct.

Mr. MUNDT. I say they have not been added to the old-line agencies for the established traditional functions of the Government.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Colorado and I usually start out with a lecture on Parkinson's law within the independent agencies. I must say that in the past 3 years we have kept employment almost at a plateau. Only with rare exceptions have there been any increases in those agencies or others.

Second, I think it ought to be understood, when we talk about the responsibilities of Congress, that we speak only for the Senate. I do not know of an appropriation bill—most of them are now ready for action—which has not been under the budget estimate in many cases. I do not know of an appropriation bill, with the exception of the one involving the OEO and other similar programs, in which that is not true. With respect to the regular appropriations, the Appropriations Committee has lived up to its responsibility.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct. Those bills are under the budget estimate most of the time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. They are under the budget.

I go back to the independent agencies appropriation bill, which is a big bill. In the past 12 years we have kept that bill under the budget estimates; for instance, a total of something like $6 billion.

As was pointed out, there is one agency we cannot do anything about. I refer to the Veterans' Administration appropriation. The appropriation for that agency has gone up, but most of its costs are fixed charges; there is not much we can do about them.

Medical costs have increased. The veterans are getting older. I think there are in this country, from all the wars, going way back, 21 million veterans.

I think the Senate Appropriations Committee, particularly the subcommittees having to do with the regular Government agencies, have done a real, responsible job in cutting the budgets. All the bills that I know of are ready for floor action. The appropriation bill for the new Department of Transportation is an exception. We had no criteria to work with, because that Department is new. But the rest have been under the budget. I think if we added up the cuts they would run into hundreds of millions of dollars.

The poverty program is another story, also the so-called war—or both wars, whatever one wants to call them. But I think we have done a good job and a responsible job. Perhaps some programs could be cut, but I suggest that some of the appropriations that the committee agreed to proceed with are somewhat necessary, because unless some of the programs are kept going, in which the Federal Government participates jointly with private enterprise, as it does in many of them, earnings will not be created that will enable taxes to be paid into the Treasury.

Many programs could be cut, and we might find the Treasury in the same condition as Mother Hubbard's cupboard. In other words, we must proceed with some of these programs so as to keep the country moving, in order that money can come into the Treasury.

I have said I oppose the tax bill because I am not sure that the additional $7 billion or $8 billion in taxes might not have the psychological effect on the country of denying the Treasury perhaps $15 billion. I do not know whether we have reached that economic condition, but the Appropriations Committee has been very diligent.

I work on about five subcommittees. To date, we have cut every appropriation bill under the budget estimates, so far as I know. I asked the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] about the HEW bill, which he handles. That bill has been somewhat over the budget recently, but he tells me that even his bill is under the budget.

I am sure that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] will agree with me that we have kept the appropriations under the budget in all the committees on which we serve. The space bill was reported today. That bill is a great deal under the budget, and the authorization, which came after the budget cut was way down. We cut it under the authorization. Perhaps we should have cut it more.

However, some programs must be kept going in order to take care of the economy, so as to get money into the Treasury. Sometimes it is pennywise and pound foolish to say we are not going to advance money to keep certain programs moving, particularly where there is a joint effort between the Federal Government and private enterprise to keep the economy of the country moving.

The Senator from South Dakota and I have been members of the Appropriations Committee for a long, long time. It has taken a pretty diligent job to do much cutting under the original budgets sent up to us by the President.

Mr. MUNDT. I am glad the Senator emphasized that, because it is true. I did not emphasize it in my statement.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I did not suggest that the Senator did not. I can understand the argument over the new programs—the poverty program, the program for the cities, and others which are comparatively new. There we come up against a question of judgment as to whether they are worthwhile continuing. I have heard it suggested that the public works bill is always an easy one to pick on. Some of these programs can be suspended, but unless some public works programs are continued, programs which create jobs and keep the economy moving forward, the Treasury would lose more by cutting out those appropriations than if Congress provided the money.

Mr. MUNDT. There is no question about that. I too am proud of the fact that, on the Senate side—and let it be said for the House side, too—we have kept below the budget estimate.

For the benefit of the people in the country who read the RECORD, so that they can understand governmental gobbledygook, when we talk about cutting under the budget, I should explain that the budget is simply the amount that President Johnson, or whoever is President, asks Congress to provide for his programs. This means that when Congress provides appropriations that are under the budget, it provides less than what the President has asked to be enabled to spend.

So we have effected some economies. The question remains: Who is spending the money? Who is responsible for it? At least, when Congress cuts under the budget, we deny the President some of the money he has asked for. It is not easy to do. It takes cooperation between Democrats and Republicans. We do not do it capriciously or on every item, but we do it where it can be done and that is a precise demonstration of specific economies being produced by congressional action.

I think we should declare an armistice on the war on the American dollar simply by suspending some programs and holding them in abeyance during the war. Some of these programs could be slowed down during the war. Some of them could be put entirely on the shelf by saying, "This is a wonderful project, but let us do it after the war is over." I do not think Congress can conduct business as usual in wartime any more than we can have business as usual around the countryside in time of war—and we are in a war. In fact, I think the Senate has been spending a great deal more time debating the war—with futility—than it has the economy which is an area of action in which we have authority to act.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, first of all, the matter pending before us is the continuing resolution, which I believe came out of the committee almost unanimously, and which I support, but it has raised questions which ought to be discussed now, at the time it is being considered.

I do not want anything I say to be considered in opposition to the resolution, because I do support the committee action and the resolution in its amended form. But there are certain implications that arise out of the situation in which we find ourselves today of which we ought to take cognizance. In fact, we ought to be aware that there is a red light in front of us and that we had better slow down in the course we are pursuing. The distinguished Senator from South Dakota has touched on this point briefly.

A few moments ago on the floor of the Senate the distinguished majority leader used the term that we should get these bills passed and then let the President "apply the scalpel." Mr. President, if we accept this kind of thing, the very basic constitutional processes of this country are in dire danger. It is the obligation of the Congress to appropriate after proper authorization.

Of course, we recognize the right of the President to withhold after Congress has appropriated. But to fall into the mental trap of saying "We will just pass these bills, and let the President apply the scalpel" simply means that we are transferring all of our authority to the President in the appropriations process; and where, to this budget of $131 billion, the scalpel will be applied becomes then the prerogative, not of Congress, but of one man down at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

I was interested in the discussion between the two members of the Appropriations Committee, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], who is the chairman of the Independent Offices Subcommittee, of which I am ranking minority member. But after all is said and done, the facts are that the increase in total spending since 1960 has been 83 percent, and nondefense spending has more than doubled. Much of it is accounted for, of course, by increased Federal employment.

It seems to me if we are going to get Congress back on the right legislative track, there are certain things that should be done. But I am absolutely opposed to the idea of sending our appropriations down to the President, all $131 billion of them, and letting the President, in effect, use an item veto on such things as he wishes. Heaven knows what that would be. Probably none of us would agree with the way he did it, and that includes the members of the majority party as well as those of my party.

In seeking to put us back on track, I remind the Senate that the President said, more than 2 months ago, that he was anticipating and staring right in the face, a $28 billion deficit. But we have not received from the President, during this entire year—although the inflationary impact on our economy has been apparent for months—one single modification of the budget. If there have been any modifications, they have all been upward.

I have in my hand a chart which, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. ALLOTT. I see that the budget estimate on the Treasury-Post Office bill was $7,615 million. The conference committee's final bill was $7,545 million, or $69 million under the budget figure.

The Interior bill, in the President's budget, was in the amount of $1,458,000,000, and the bill as passed was in the amount of $1,382,000,000, or $75 million under the budget figure.

The Defense bill, which amounted to $71.5 billion, in round figures, in the budget, was finally passed in the amount of $69,936,000,000, or $1,647,000,000 under the budget.

So the guidelines that the President set down for us in his budget at the beginning of the year have remained unchanged; and those of us who serve on the Appropriations Committee know all too well why they remain unchanged. When the independent offices appropriation bill was recently considered by the Senate, particularly as to the item for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the pressure was on every member of that committee to put every last dollar that the President had requested in his budget in that bill. The pressure on the committee was so great, and the pressure on the Senate was so great, that every last dollar the President asked for went into that bill, in accordance with the budget which he submitted to us in January.

I think, as I look through these figures—and I believe these are the only four appropriation bills that have become law in this session; these figures were hastily gotten together for me, but in those bills which have passed the Senate or been reported to the Senate, in every instance, they are decidedly less than the budget figures. I say and I believe that in view of the situation in this country, which the President himself recognized, he had an obligation to send to us, not yesterday, not last week, but 2 or 3 months ago, if not by the beginning of the summer, an amended budget, to try to stave off this financial dilemma, if in fact it does not turn out to be a catastrophe, which we face.

I say only this in conclusion: I am concerned about this method of procedure. I am unwilling, as a Senator, having taken my oath of office before the Senate three times, to concede to the President, in effect, an item veto, and to pass bills based upon his budget which he submitted to us the first of the year, without any revision from him, and say, "Well, we are going merrily on our way, here is the budget; now you cut it wherever you desire."

When we do that, if we fall into that trap—and that is what many people are thinking of today, right here in the Senate and in the House of Representatives—if we fall into the trap of seeking to let the President do our job for us, we will have surrendered more power to the President this year than Congress has surrendered to him in the last 10 years.

There is only one path for us to follow, and that is to do our job as effectively as we can. But I feel it is a necessity that I try to point out to Congress the trap in which we are becoming ensnared, which can bode no good for the country, and can only serve to break down our legislative processes and give to the President a power that every Congress in the history of the United States has always refused to give to the President—that of an item veto—because that is what shirking our responsibility would mean.

EXHIBIT 1

Bill	Budget estimate	House passed	Senate passed	Plus or minus budget	Conference	Plus or minus budget	Public Law No.
Treasury-Post Office	$7,615.15	$7,493.23	$7,555.17	−$59.98	$7,545.64	−$69.51	90–47
District of Columbia	526.06	463.34					
Interior	1,458.22	1,365.31	1,399.36	−58.86	1,382.85	−75.37	90–28
Independent offices	10,804.64	10,013.18	10,487.64	−317.11			
Labor-HEW	13,424.15	13,137.48	13,421.66	−2.49	13,276.02		
State, Justice, Commerce	2,342.94	2,194.03	[1] 2,185.87				
Legislative	[2] 231.31	228.09	275.89		275.70		90–57
Agriculture	5,021.09	4,770.58	6,782.53	+1,761.43			
Defense	71,584.00	70,295.20	70,132.32	−1,427.50	69,936.63	−1,647.38	90–96
Transportation	1,718.62	1,530.20	[1] 1,615.41				
Public works	4,867.81	4,622.92	[1] 4,776.06				
NASA	5,100.00	4,583.40	[1] 4,678.90				

[1] Reported version; no Senate action yet.

[2] Estimate to House; estimate to Senate, $276.01.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I am happy to yield to my friend from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. I applaud the Senator from Colorado for pointing out this potential entrapment. But those of us on this side of the aisle are in a very difficult dilemma. We do what we can to hold down the appropriations. I am sure that the Senator from Colorado has done more than his share in trying to hold down appropriations within the Appropriations Committee.

But when the chips are down, Mr. President, we are outvoted. We do not control the Senate. These appropriations are made, apparently, on the basis of the budget that was presented earlier this year, which is long since outdated.

People then say, "Well, the Appropriations Committee did a pretty good job.

It held the figure down below the budget." Or they say, "It didn't exceed the budget."

This is relatively meaningless when the budget itself is completely out of date. It went out of date formally about 2 months ago when the President issued the supplemental budget message in which he asked for a 10-percent tax increase and indicated that their figures were off a little bit as of early this year; that expenditures were going to be several billion dollars more and that revenues were going to be several billion dollars less.

What should have been done, as the Senator from Colorado ably pointed out, is for the President to have sent along a supplemental list of budget requests geared into his supplemental budget message and then let the Appropriations Committee consider those recommendations. However, no recommendations were forthcoming.

That does not mean, however, that the legislative branch of the Government should compound the error by shirking its responsibility to the taxpayers of this country. And it still had the responsibility to look at this supplemental budget message of the President and be guided accordingly in its appropriations. However, it has not done so.

In fairness, I recognize what so many of our colleagues in the House have been trying to do, because they have been in the same boat that the Senator from Colorado and other Senators on this side of the aisle have been in. They have been trying to cut appropriations in the House. They have been trying to recognize that the original budget request was outdated and outmoded and that there was an impending $29 billion deficit. However, they were not able to succeed because they did not have the votes.

So the Congress itself, as a whole, shirked its responsibility, apparently wanting to play a cat and mouse game with the President over who is going to face the public reaction to recommended cuts in the programs, and shirking its responsibility by appropriating according to the outdated original budget. We are faced with a $29 billion deficit as a result.

So, a group of representatives, faced with, I think, no other alternative, have said: "Since those in control of the legislative branch of the Government have shirked their responsibility, the only way we can see to cut this deficit down and put some kind of a stop to inflation and high interest rates is to give the President a direction to take the scalpel and cut off $5 billion or so."

It is an exceedingly difficult situation to be faced with. Members of the legislative branch of the Government who have been unable to get those in control of the legislative branch to live up to their responsibilities to have this Government live within its means, have as a last resort said, "Well, if we have to, for the sake of the economy of this country, for the sake of the soundness of the American dollar, and for the sake of stopping inflation and the high interest rates, let us abdicate a proper legislative power and let the President use a scalpel to the extent of $5 billion."

I do not like to see this last resort have to come about, but I do not know what else there is to do.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] offered several amendments last week to the appropriations bill on independent offices and HUD. Every one of those amendments was rejected by a vote of about 2 to 1 or 3 to 1. And those amendments were not designed to eliminate programs. They were designed to cut the figures back to the amount the House itself had appropriated.

In the face of that, I do not see how I or any other Member of this side of the aisle can expect to do anything except take this action as a last resort. And when I refer to this side of the aisle, I give recognition to a few of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle who have joined with us in trying to do something about it. However, those in control of this body have frustrated that effort. I do not know what else we can do now.

It is too late. They are not going to recall the appropriations bills and not only cut them below the budget at the beginning of the year but cut them down to fit the budget that came out 2 months ago.

I do not know what else we will do except to say to the President, "Mr. President, we will give you a tax increase if you will use the scalpel and cut $5 billion in expenditures so that we will have a two-way sacrifice: a sacrifice by the taxpayers and a sacrifice by the administration."

With that one exception, I do agree with what the Senator from Colorado has said.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I thank the Senator and appreciate his remarks.

In conclusion, I do not think this is a situation where we ought, for 1 minute, to depend upon the President to apply the scalpel.

If we do, we are surrendering our rights, powers, and authority. And frankly, I do not have the confidence in any man that I would have in the Senate to exercise the power of cutting the appropriation bills in the areas in which it thinks they should be cut.

After all, we all represent States. We represent a composite point of view of the United States. We are elected directly by our constituents. This is a surrender. It is a mental entrapment that I do not think Congress should abide by.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I support the resolution reported by the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona. I should like to comment a moment or two on the action taken yesterday in the House of Representatives.

It seems to me that the action of the House Ways and Means Committee in refusing to consider the President's 10-percent tax increase proposal until Federal spending has been reduced has great significance.

The House Ways and Means Committee is dominated by Democrats and is led by the distinguished Representative WILBUR MILLS, of Arkansas. That committee acted by the impressive vote of 20 to 5.

In my judgment, the committee majority has a far more accurate view of the sentiment of the public than does the Johnson administration.

I applaud the action of the House committee under the chairmanship of Representative MILLS. Neither the President nor Congress has faced squarely the need to get this Nation back on a sound fiscal basis. We have a joint responsibility, as I see it. The President and Congress must act jointly in this matter of fiscal responsibility.

Under the law, the President has the responsibility to submit a budget, but only Congress has the power to appropriate.

I was most pleased—and I think it is highly important—to have this debate take place today because the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]—all these outstanding Senators—have made clear that the Senate has reduced the spending proposals submitted to Congress by the President.

In order for our Government to return to a higher degree of fiscal responsibility, it is important that the President of the United States take the leadership in this matter. It is important that he take the leadership and submit to Congress an amended budget.

This morning, various Members of the Senate, led by the distinguished senior Senator from Washington, have pointed out that the Senate has cut the appropriations recommended by the President, and presumably additional cuts will be made in the President's proposals. But as I view the matter, that is not enough to accomplish the job.

It is necessary that the President submit a revised and reduced budget and take the leadership in a matter of such grave fiscal difficulty.

The gravity of our situation has been pointed up by the action yesterday of the House Ways and Means Committee, which, by a vote of 20 to 5, under the leadership of the distinguished Democratic chairman, made clear that it will not consider a tax increase as recommended by the President until Congress and the President have taken steps to reduce Federal spending.

I am not impressed with the argument that Congress should pass the appropriations bills and then let the President make the decision as to whether or not and where there will be reductions. The effect of that argument is to say, "$5 to $7 billion of unnecessary spending is included in this budget, but we want you to appropriate that money anyway—appropriate $5 to $7 billion more than is necessary—and then the President will determine whether or not to spend it and, if so, where."

I do not believe that is the appropriate approach. I believe that the appropriate approach is to follow the established law and procedures, that the President should submit a budget—in this case a revised budget—and then Congress should consider his recommendations and vote on the appropriations it believes are necessary.

I submit that unless spending is checked, the citizens of our Nation must pay much heavier taxes or suffer severe inflation—and both or either of these results hit hardest the average citizen.

As has been pointed out on the floor of the Senate this morning, Federal spending has increased 87 percent since 1960, and more than 50 percent of this increase has been in nondefense spending.

Perhaps Chairman MILLS and his strategic committee will provide the rallying point for those who want more sanity in the handling of the taxpayer's dollar.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I agree with the majority leader and other Senators who have said that it is the responsibility of Congress to cut these appropriations.

In this connection, I call attention to the fact that four appropriations bills are on the Senate Calendar, and I am certain that an opportunity to cut the appropriations will be available to us at that time. Amendments to reduce those appropriations will be submitted. How we vote on those measures will show whether or not we, as Members of the Senate, are in earnest when we suggest cutting the appropriations.

Much has been said about the fact that we can achieve economy by merely voting for all that is in the budget. I call attention to the fact that this annual escalation in expenditures develops because in the original appropriations Congress will approve 99 percent of the budget and then boast that we have reduced expenditures by 1 percent. But we overlook the fact that we get at least one or two supplemental appropriations for each of these agencies. When we get through we almost always have approximately 115 to 120 percent appropriations as compared with the year before.

An excuse has been made that the reason so many employees were added in the last few months is that a war is going on.

On September 20, 1966, at which time the President issued an Executive order freezing civilian employment in the Federal Government at the then existing level, the same war was going on, and it was just as serious as it is today. Notwithstanding the Executive order, the administration in the succeeding 9 months added 206,432 civilian employees to the Federal Government. They were not all in defense agencies; over 120,000 were scattered throughout the various civilian agencies to take care of the expansion of the Great Society.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a breakdown of these 121,123 employees. This shows that every agency of the Government added to the public payroll in violation of the President's Executive order freezing employment.

There being no objection, the breakdown was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Department or agency	June 1966	June 1967	Difference
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (EXCEPT DEFENSE)			
Agriculture	118,585	121,871	+3,286
Commerce	39,873	38,193	−1,680
Health, Education, and Welfare	100,012	105,600	+5,588
Housing and Urban Development	14,464	14,757	+293
Interior	74,985	76,770	+1,785
Justice	33,733	34,052	+319
Labor	10,045	10,295	+250
Post Office	675,423	716,603	+41,180
State	42,649	47,415	+4,766
Transportation		58,325	+58,325
Treasury	91,365	89,496	−1,869
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT			
White House Office	295	272	−23
Bureau of the Budget	626	654	+28
Commission on Marine Science, Engineering, and Resources		23	+23
Council of Economic Advisers	53	55	+2
Executive Mansion and Grounds	68	68	
National Advisory Commission on Food and Fiber	22	40	+18
National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty		18	+18
National Aeronautics and Space Council	28	28	
National Conference on the Problems of Mexican-American and Puerto Rican Communities		2	+2
National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development		24	+24
National Security Council	37	38	+1
Office of Economic Opportunity	2,908	3,020	+112
Office of Emergency Planning	414	425	+11
Office of Science and Technology	55	101	+46
Office of Special Representative for Trade Negotiations	31	23	−8
President's Commission on Budget Concepts		16	+16
President's Commission on Crime in the District of Columbia	26		−26
President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice	46	7	−39
President's Commission on Consumer Interests	27	19	−8
President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in Housing	8	6	−2
President's Council on Youth Opportunity		4	+4
White House Conference on Civil Rights	43		−43
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES			
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	24	28	+4
American Battle Monuments Commission	439	440	+1
Atomic Energy Commission	7,445	7,506	+61
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES—Continued			
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	693	753	+60
Civil Aeronautics Board	824	639	−185
Civil Service Commission	4,385	5,499	+1,114
Commission on Civil Rights	167	173	+6
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission	227	362	+135
Export-Import Bank of Washington	302	310	+8
Farm Credit Administration	239	233	−6
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	5	9	+4
Federal Communications Commission	1,541	1,538	−3
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,573	1,837	+264
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	1,288	1,320	+32
Federal Maritime Commission	257	270	+13
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	436	451	+15
Federal Power Commission	1,163	1,208	+45
Federal Radiation Council	6	4	−2
Federal Trade Commission	1,136	1,173	+37
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	191	110	−81
General Accounting Office	4,144	4,219	+75
General Services Administration	38,175	39,891	+1,716
Government Printing Office	7,568	7,688	+120
Indian Claims Commission	19	20	+1
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,383	1,952	−431
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	35,708	35,860	+152
National Capital Housing Authority	501	658	+157
National Capital Planning Commission	62	74	+12
National Capital Transportation Agency	39	42	+3
National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities	74	91	+17
National Gallery of Art	372	411	+39
National Labor Relations Board	2,327	2,360	+33
National Mediation Board	139	140	+1
National Science Foundation	1,121	1,291	+170
Panama Canal	15,204	15,569	+365
Railroad Retirement Board	1,707	1,747	+40
Renegotiation Board	179	178	−1
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,385	1,390	+5
Selective Service System	9,047	9,014	−33
Small Business Administration	4,106	4,321	+215
Smithsonian Institution	2,042	2,213	+171
Soldiers' Home	1,141	1,152	+11
Tariff Commission	294	292	−2
Tax Court of the United States	156	154	−2
Tennessee Valley Authority	17,943	18,736	+793
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	187	180	−7
U.S. Information Agency	11,802	12,114	+312
Veterans' Administration	170,228	173,474	+3,246
Water Resources Council	5	29	+24
Total	1,556,220	1,677,343	121,123

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I mentioned that these 206,432 employees are costing $1.5 billion a year in additional expenditures, just to pay for employees whom President Johnson said, as recently as September 20, 1966, that he did not need.

The August report on civilian employment by the Federal Government discloses a reduction of 10,593 in the month of August as contrasted to a 32,215 increase for July, leaving a net increase thus far for this fiscal year of 21,622 extra employees.

This increase of 21,000 employees for the first 2 months of fiscal 1968 comes on top of an increase of 206,432 employees who were added in the last 9 months of the preceding fiscal year.

It should be noted that these increases in civilian employment by the Federal Government have taken place since the September 20, 1966, Executive order which purportedly froze the Federal payroll at the then existing level.

I ask unanimous consent that this August report, as released by the chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Executive agencies of the Federal Government reported civilian employment in the month of August totaling 3,001,781. This was a net decrease of 10,593 as compared with employment reported in the preceding month of July, reflecting reduction in temporary seasonal employment and temporary summer employment under the President's youth opportunity program.

Civilian employment reported by the executive agencies of the Federal Government, by months in fiscal year 1968, which began July 1, 1967, follows:

Month	Employment	Increase	Decrease
July 1967	3,012,374	32,215	--------
August	3,001,781	--------	10,593

Total federal employment in civilian agencies for the month of August was 1,695,235, a decrease of 5,582 as compared with the July total of 1,700,817. Total civilian employment in the military agencies in August was 1,306,546, a decrease of 5,011 as compared with 1,311,557 in July.

Civilian agencies reporting the larger decreases were Agriculture Department with 2,626, Veterans' Administration with 1,903, Interior Department with 838, and Treasury Department with 688. The largest increases were reported by Post Office Department with 1,458 and HEW Department with 535.

In the Department of Defense the larger decreases in civilian employment were reported by the Air Force with 4,092, and Defense Supply Agency with 1,905. Increases were reported by the Army with 758 and the Navy with 346.

Total employment inside the United States in August was 2,761,678, a decrease of 14,194 as compared with July. Total employment outside the United States in August was 240,103, an increase of 3,601 as compared with July. Industrial employment by federal agencies in August was 605,942, an increase of 1,461 as compared with July.

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies as compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

FOREIGN NATIONALS

The total of 3,001,781 civilian employees certified to the Committee by federal agencies in their regular monthly personnel reports includes some foreign nationals employed in U.S. Government activities abroad, but in addition to these there were 119,630 foreign nationals working for U.S. agencies overseas during August who were not counted in the usual personnel reports. The number in July was 122,547.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. As one example of the increased expenditures in the forthcoming appropriation bills, I invite attention to the public works appropriation, which will be before the Senate within the next couple of days. The budget estimate included nine new starts, involving future commitments of $139,756,000. The House committee approved five of those projects for future commitment, totaling $16,799,000, and provided only for land acquisitions on the remaining four projects. But then the House itself proceeded to add 16 new starts, involving future commitments of $80,028,000.

The Senate committee restored the four construction starts which the House had eliminated and then proceeded to approve 50 new construction starts involving a total future commitment of $529,387,000 over the life of those projects. These are new projects, over and beyond those provided in the budget. They are in the bill which will be before the Senate in the next couple of days, and how the Senate will vote on these proposals will determine just how serious we are in reducing expenditures.

I agree completely that it is rather hypocritical for Congress to vote the full amount of appropriations, and then later pass a joint resolution asking the President to do what we in Congress have not had the courage to do.

If we are in favor of cutting appropriations let us cut them by our votes in the Senate. Let us not pass the buck to the President. It is our responsibility.

Lest there be any misunderstanding, I am not excusing the President from his responsibility. The addition of the 206,000 employees by the executive branch was a violation of the President's own Executive order. The $1.5 million that is being paid to meet their payroll is the responsibility of the President. The only way Congress can overcome that action is by a resolution to rescind it or a cut in their appropriations. Far too often the President has been talking on both sides of this question. He talks economy in the daytime; but at night, when the lights are off in the White House, the spending gates are wide open. I say that what we need is more light at the White House so that the taxpayers can see what is going on.

(At this point Mr. HOLLINGS assumed the chair.)

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate long. I favor this resolution. However, I consider it my duty to speak briefly because I believe I represent a point of view which needs to be expressed, and which is held by a good many Senators.

Mr. President, we face a financial crisis with a $29 billion deficit and we must face the facts in terms of what it takes to fight a war. That is what we must recognize. I am a member of the Committee on Appropriations. I am not given to being classed as one of the traditional economizers who might take the position to cut at any price, for any reason. I do not feel that way. I feel we cannot accept the $29 billion deficit. In my judgment the most that we can possibly tolerate without serious financial dislocation, unless we tax to get more money, is a budget deficit of between $10 and $15 billion.

I do not exculpate the President; on the contrary, I think he has a clear duty. His clear duty is to send to the Congress a message giving the priorities as he sees them upon which he desires that there be reductions of expenditures of roughly $5 billion, as is being suggested in the other body. The reason is that these sporadic cuts, based on judgment and opinion as to economizing, are not economizing and do not represent national priorities, as this is not a matter of judgment on each item or cut; but there should be a certain amount of money to show where economies will fall without impairment of the situation. It is the duty of the President to give us his judgment based upon that assumption, just as it is our judgment to give our opinion.

Mr. President, Congress must also, in my judgment, be ready to effect those cuts, which I say should be about $5 billion; but it is also the President's duty to inform us as to what tax loopholes can be closed, and there are quite a few, beginning with the 27 percent depletion allowance for oil and gas. Closing that loophole should aggregate between $3 billion and $5 billion. Then, we should, as a duty, add a tax surcharge aggregating roughly the same amount. Then, we would have had a contribution from every sector of society so that they will know what it means to fight a war and we will have brought the deficit down to manageable proportions. This is the only way it can happen.

Traditionally the President is elected by the people and that is why he has the power. He also has a duty to inform the people. He must tell us the priorities. It will not do for him to tell us he will take $1 billion off of this item or $2 billion off of that item, because a majority feel this way about it.

Mr. President, this is not a situation for business as usual. It is the duty of the President to present a budget, cut expenditures, close loopholes, and increase taxes, if the United States is to meet the issues it faces. In my judgment, unless he does that, he is not doing what we have a right to expect of the leadership he is supposed to give this Nation. That is why in the deliberations of the committee I opposed the pressures which are inherent in extensions of a few days; to show the President that we insist on proper procedures and the duties of the committees. That is very superficial. What is really profound is to have a package which would cut the deficit to manageable proportions under the leadership of the Executive, whose duty it is to do so if Congress is called upon to support him intelligently, and we are handed a package, not for just $1 billion here or $2 billion there, or $4 billion here, without a sense of national priorities.

Mr. President, I feel the cities are entitled to a high priority immediately after security, to wit, Vietnam. I think the President owes us his judgment in that respect. Otherwise, we will flounder and get into a situation where we are not able to act intelligently. I am glad that our committee did not fall for that procedure.

Inasmuch as we have no written report before the Senate in respect to this extension, it was important to express individual views as they have been expressed on this critical financial crisis.

Mr. President, a solution to our critical crisis will take the leadership of the President and not business as usual, and this is vital to the financial operations of the Government. That is why I have made the recommendations that I have made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the committee amendment and the third reading of the joint resolution.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 853) was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment to the resolution, request a conference thereon with the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HILL, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. MUNDT, and Mrs. SMITH conferees on the part of the Senate.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1884. An act for the relief of Virgile Posfay;

H.R. 2283. An act for the relief of Dr. Ray F. McMillan;

H.R. 3727. An act for the relief of Elpidio Dimacali Damazo and Natividad Simsuangco Damazo;

H.R. 6096. An act for the relief of Mrs. Inge Hemmersbach Hilton; and

H.R. 10932. An act for the relief of Gilmour C. MacDonald, colonel, U.S. Air Force (retired).

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H.R. 1884. An act for the relief of Virgile Posfay;

H.R. 2283. An act for the relief of Dr. Ray F. McMillan;

H.R. 3727. An act for the relief of Elpidio Dimacali Damazo and Natividad Simsuangco Damazo;

H.R. 6096. An act for the relief of Mrs. Inge Hemmersbach Hilton; and

H.R. 10932. An act for the relief of Gilmour C. MacDonald, colonel, U.S. Air Force (retired); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11722) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of October 3, 1967, pp. 27665–27675, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I move the adoption of the conference report on H.R. 11722, the military construction authorization bill for fiscal year 1968, and in connection therewith, I have a brief statement I should like to make.

The report was signed by all the conferees on the part of the House of Representatives and the Senate and has now been agreed to by the House.

The sum total of the bill as agreed to in conference is $2,333,255,000. This amount is only $51,446,000 above the amount approved by the Senate and $75,551,000 below the amount approved by the House. The action of the conferees resulted in a decrease in the Department's request of $327,128,000 for a reduction of almost 12.5 percent.

As may be seen from the small increase above the amount approved by the Senate, the Senate position prevailed in most every instance. This may be further emphasized by the fact that the Senate conferees accepted a provision contained in the House-passed bill to provide $60 million for NATO infrastructure which was in the bill that passed the House but not in the Senate bill. The bill as presented to the Congress this year contained a section authorizing the Secretary of Defense to carry out bilateral and multilateral arrangements with foreign governments for sharing the costs of acquiring and construction of military facilities and installations, including military headquarters, for collective defense. Although the original bill did not so state, the arrangements relate to NATO and the money figure, which was not set out in the bill, was $60 million.

The House properly modified this language to place authority in the Secretary of the Army which is, in fact, the executive agency for this construction; limited the cost to NATO; and inserted the specific money figure of $60 million which is the anticipated expenditure for these purposes during the coming year. The Senate committee, taking note of the fact that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee granted similar authority for the NATO infrastructure in the foreign aid bill, deleted the proposed authority from the military construction authorization bill. As of this time, however, the conference between the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House Foreign Affairs Committee has not been completed. Therefore, the Senate conferees felt compelled to include this provision in the bill. Otherwise, the total amount agreed upon by the conference would have been below the Senate figure.

While some minor adjustments were made within the requirements of the three military departments, I shall mention only one of them, namely, the Navy request for $1,135,000 to provide for a new laundry and dry cleaning plant at the Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md. The Senate denied this item in the belief that the building was overdesigned and entirely too expensive. Subsequently, a letter was received from the Department of the Navy indicating that this request might be reduced to $953,000 for a reduction of $182,000. Nevertheless, the conferees on the part of the House insisted on the original amount. This is a reduction of approximately 16 percent although the Navy frankly admits the unit construction cost of $17.85 per square foot is considered by them to be equivalent to approximately $13.50 per square foot for a commercially built facility, or some 32 percent higher. The Senate conferees acquiesced with the understanding that this discrepancy would be called to the attention of the Committee on Appropriations in order that they might give this matter due consideration in providing the funds for this project.

Next, I should like to mention the $200 million contingency fund requested by the Secretary of Defense for his use, primarily in southeast Asia. In considering the bill, the House reduced this amount to $150 million and earmarked $50 million of the remainder to be used on road construction. The conferees finally agreed to a reduction of $50 million in the amount requested, none of which is earmarked for any purpose.

Finally, I should like to refer to title VI of the bill which relates to military family housing. It is to be recalled that the Department requested the construction of 12,500 new units of family housing and the Senate reduced by 2,816 the number of units requested. Of the number deleted, the conferees agreed to restore 725 units, bringing the total number of units authorized to 10,409, for an increase of $14,552,000 above the amount approved by the Senate. I am happy to state, however, that several language provisions inserted in the bill by the Senate, which would give the Congress better control over the family housing program, were accepted by the conferees.

Mr. President, I believe that I have fairly summarized the action taken by the conference committee and I feel confident that the construction needs of the military departments and the Defense agencies have been adequately provided for for fiscal year 1968, and I shall be happy to answer any questions.

I make my motion, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington.

The motion was agreed to.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question recurs on S. 2388, the motion of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] to recommit the bill with instructions.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the yeas and nays on my motion to recommit with instructions be withdrawn.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on behalf of several Senators on this side of the aisle who thought we should vote, I would have to object at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, we understand the situation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the pending motion of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], to recommit title II, take place at 1 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, with the time to be charged equally to the distinguished Senator in charge of the bill [Mr. CLARK], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] whose motion is now pending.

I would ask the attachés on both sides of the aisle to notify all Senators about the vote at 1 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may be entitled to.

The very close vote, 47 to 42, by which the Prouty amendment was defeated was strong indication to me, particularly in view of the strong support from the Republican side of the aisle the Prouty amendment achieved, that it will not be many months before the Senate is prepared to face up to the problem of doing something effective for the poor people in our urban and rural ghettos in terms of giving them useful employment and thereby placing them on the tax rolls.

As a matter of fact, the vote was closer than the record indicates, because the two Senators who gave pairs were prepared to support the Prouty amendment if their votes would have made any difference.

I am not unaware of the fact that on the record vote which will take place in less than half an hour there will be an appearance of many Senators falling away from their compassionate interest in the poor people of America. The arguments which have been made with respect to no hearings on the bill, and the fiscal implications of a $2.8 billion authorization to put poor people to work, have an appeal to many Senators. There has been a curious sort of turning away from the suggestion that the swollen military appropriations, which are the principal cause of the fiscal problems we face, should be cut.

I would like to say that, as far as I am concerned, those who are committed to vote for the Clark Emergency Employment Act are released from commitments. I shall vote against the motion to strike. I would urge my colleagues who were prepared to support me in this regard to use their own judgment, because the critical vote was the vote which took place a little while ago. What was the high water mark for those who have a keen and abiding interest in the fate of the poor people of our country and seek to give it the highest consideration to which it is entitled. But I shall vote against the Byrd amendment because I believe deeply in the Emergency Employment Act, and I want to be so recorded.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. As the Senator knows, I have high regard and great respect for the Senator from West Virginia. He is just as dedicated in his support of his amendment as I am in opposition to it. We just have honest differences of opinion. I cannot support the Byrd amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Neither can I.

Mr. MORSE. I shall not support the Byrd amendment. The Senator from Pennsylvania, in his typical fairness and graciousness, has made clear that because the vote on the Prouty amendment really was the key vote, therefore he was releasing any Senators who might think that they had committed themselves to the Senator from Pennsylvania. This is typical of the Senator from Pennsylvania. But I shall vote against the Byrd amendment on the merits as I see the merits. I may be wrong, but I feel that way.

I did not get the chance, in the minute that I had to discuss the Prouty amendment, to call attention to an experience I had yesterday that I am never going to forget, in hearing what I think is typical of the views of the poverty-stricken people of this country. I spent yesterday morning in a poverty workshop in my State. My State is not one that is characterized—I see the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY] on the floor—with the kind of problems that exist in Chicago or Philadelphia or Pittsburgh or Newark or Detroit or in the other great metropolitan areas of the country.

I listened to this poverty spokesman from the ranks of poverty. In my judgment, if we do not have the crash program that the Senator from Pennsylvania and the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], and the other Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and other Senators on the floor are fighting for, the taxpayers in the time ahead are going to lose many times the cost of that crash program as a result of what is going to occur in this country in the troubled spots.

I yield to no one on law and order, but let us face it, the poverty-stricken people of this country are not going to see the degradation forced upon them that is being forced upon them while we spend over $75 billion around the world, only $22 billion of which in the present defense bill is Vietnam-connected.

The taxpayers will have to face up to the fact that the poverty-stricken people of this country recognize that we cannot justify that kind of appropriation for defense in Africa, Asia, and Latin America.

I just came out of a meeting with the House on the appropriations bill in regard to military aid. There is talk that if we do not make supersonic bombers available to South America, they will go to France. Blackmail. Let them go, but also let us make clear that they are not going to get cooperation from the United States in regard to other programs. First things have to come first.

One of the first things facing the American taxpayers is that we have to meet the crisis in the poverty-stricken ghettos of America or they will pay several times the money they think they are going to save by the vote already taken here this morning and by the vote, if the Byrd amendment should pass, to be taken, which in effect will table it. That is what it means.

Does anyone think we are going to get any action on this matter before we adjourn? This is a motion, not by intent but by result, that is going to mean the postponement of consideration of this matter until we reconvene in January. That is too late. Now is the time, this is the hour, in which we have to live up to what I think—speaking of my own personal philosophy—is my responsibility to the poverty-stricken people of this country to meet the most serious domestic problem in our body politic.

Mr. CLARK. I agree with everything the Senator has said. We know there are three serious problems confronting the country today which are giving the President grave concern. They have been discussed around here day after day.

They are, in my opinion, first, the war in Vietnam, which carries with it a swollen military appropriation pressed through the Congress by the military-industrial-scientific establishment—an unconscionable amount of money.

The second is the enormous deficit which we are facing, which is going to require the flotation of $30 billion of Federal bonds next year to meet the deficit.

The third is the plight of the cities.

So far it is the point of view of the Senate that the plight of the cities and the urban ghettos come last. We are in a dilemma as to what to do about a tax increase and the deficit. That particular problem has not been solved.

There is only one way to solve this problem, and that is to cut the military budget. The only way is for Congress to unwrap itself from phony patriotism and talk about protecting our boys by providing billions of dollars for the industrial lobby, and to put some commonsense into the economic policy of the United States.

I hope that day will come soon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one sentence?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say that I think the problem will be resolved next November at the ballot boxes, by the American people who will do the voting. They are going to put first things first; and they know that a $70 billion defense budget, the largest in the history of the Republic, is not putting first things first.

Mr. CLARK. If I may say also to my friends from Illinois and Oregon, who are among the small group on the floor of the Senate now—as is not unusual in the Senate—this fight to get some money for jobs for the unemployed in our rural and urban ghettos is just beginning. The Senator is probably correct; we probably cannot bring a bill to the floor before the end of this session. But a bill will be introduced, and hearings will be held, and every member of the Urban Coalition who says we need enough emergency employment funds to create 1 million jobs—not the 200,000 jobs that this modest proposal calls for—will have an opportunity to come in and testify. We will mark up the bill, and get it on the Calendar before we adjourn.

This fight, my friends, is just beginning; and the vote we are about to have is a very small skirmish in a very long war, which in the end will be won.

I yield to my friend from Illinois.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I just called the Department of Labor to obtain figures for unemployment in an area across the river from Illinois, in the principle Negro community of St. Louis.

The latest survey they had taken was in November 1966, but they maintain that they have no reason to believe the figures are any different today.

Their figures show that in Northside St. Louis, which is largely a Negro slum area, unemployment was 12.9 percent, overall; but that in this great country of ours, at the height of a period of sustained prosperity, the rate of unemployment there among teenagers aged 16 to 19 years is 40 percent. I have no reason to believe that that figure is too far off from the condition in my own State, in the area of East St. Louis across the river.

In August 1967, nationally nonwhite teenage unemployment was 26.6 percent, compared to 11.7 percent for white teenagers. As a rule of thumb, I am told that white teenagers have roughly four times the unemployment rate of the total labor force, which is now 3.8 percent, but nonwhite teenagers have a rate roughly twice that of white teenagers.

I think we face a very critical condition. Certainly, when we look at the billion-dollar expense that lies in the rubble of Detroit and the rubble of Newark, when we look at figures such as we are talking about now, looking back on the destructive cost of not having done something before this, is it not about time that we do something to prevent these things in the future, and not wait for the long hot summer next year, but recognize that the bitterness and the frustration of the unemployed and the idle is just as great in times of cool weather as it is in hot weather? That frustration, I submit, exists the year round.

I have struggled, in my own mind, with this problem, because I, too, know from weeks of hearings in the Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Affairs of the Banking and Currency Committee and in the Subcommittee on Urban Affairs of the Joint Economic Committee, that the testimony that comes to us is irrefutable, from the academicians, business leaders, civic leaders, and others who come before us, who say that frustration and despair comes from inadequate education, poor housing, and lack of jobs. Unless we do something about it, this country can be torn asunder and divided by the haves and the have-nots. If we can finance a multi-billion-dollar foreign aid program for other people in other lands, we can certainly think in terms that such programs being undertaken at home.

I am impressed with one other fact.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. CLARK. I ask my friend, the Senator from West Virginia, if he would be willing to yield the Senator from Illinois 2 minutes.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield 2 minutes.

Mr. PERCY. I am impressed with the fact that the unemployed are supported now by relief measures just as my own family was in the midst of the great depression. We were on relief. We received a stipend from the Government; a food truck came by and dropped off parcels. It cost the public something to keep our family from starving in those days.

Then a WPA work project came along, and the Illinois Symphony Orchestra was created. My mother was a violinist, and she went from a relief roll to a payroll—to be sure, a public payroll, but I will never forget the sense of dignity she had, walking out with a violin under her arm, to go to play in a school for children—and that orchestra toured the Chicago area, performing for the public and for schoolchildren who had never heard a symphony orchestra; and all of the musicians in it, who had been on relief or welfare before, were now usefully employed. While the cost to the public was the same——

Mr. CLARK. That was the WPA, was it not?

Mr. PERCY. That was the WPA.

Mr. CLARK. A much maligned program.

Mr. PERCY. A much maligned program, and there is no question about it, there were flaws and holes in it. But, as a young boy, I can remember the difference between idleness, sitting at home doing nothing and taking a handout, and having a job and feeling you are contributing something.

We are not going to let people starve in this country. I think that is what we are up against right now. I am a fiscal conservative. I never had an unbalanced budget in my life—public life, private life, or business—until I arrived in Washington in January. There has been nothing but red ink since then.

So in dealing with this issue also I have tried to take the most fiscally responsible route. The first route was the 2 percent plan, under the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] and myself, whereby we established an Emergency Employment Fund without any new funds being appropriated. The second was private employment, under the Prouty amendment. I must say that the measure before us now is my third choice. It would provide public jobs—but public jobs, not public welfare; and I would always prefer a job ahead of welfare—a helping hand instead of giving a demeaning handout.

I support the position of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from West Virginia for his courtesy. I support the motion to recommit the pending bill and to strike title II thereof.

I also think that title I should be given further consideration by the Senate and that some advice and counsel should be obtained from an appropriate authority, perhaps the Senate Finance Committee, as to the demands this bill would add to our already strained sources of revenue.

More and more Senate procedure has become a practice of authorizing Federal programs on the basis of the benefits to the beneficiaries of the program proposed. Too little consideration has been given to the burden these programs place on the taxpayer.

We must weigh and judge programs we approve not only from the standpoint of the good that might be done for society, but also from the standpoint of whether our society can afford the cost required to support them.

The taxpayer, Mr. President, as a citizen, is also entitled to equal treatment by Congress, and to have his day in court. I am certainly in sympathy with people who are in poverty, and willing for the Government to help them some, if they try to help themselves, or to administer to those who are unable. But the Senator from Pennsylvania—and he and I have worked together on many matters—stated that they intend to get this money anyway, in greater sums. I believe they will, in astronomical sums, unless at some point Congress calls a halt to its present trend.

This bill, as now reported, provides for $5.05 billion, or 150 percent more than was requested in the President's budget. It authorizes $3.4 billion, or over 300 percent more than was appropriated last year. This big additional demand for more money comes at a time when all expenditures are sharply rising, revenues are falling below estimates, the deficit is growing, rapidly, and additional new multi-billion-dollar military programs are being started.

Last year's total appropriations were well above those of the year before. This year's requests are well above last year's.

Revenues to meet these expenditures are considerably less than anticipated. When the budget came to Congress in January it was estimated that in the coming year we would collect $126.9 billion. Now that estimate has dropped to $122.5 billion.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I have very little time remaining, but out of courtesy I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask the Senator if he does not really believe that the place to make such a cut would be in the military budget.

Mr. STENNIS. The last major military appropriation bill from the Appropriations Committee did have a sizable reduction. As I said then, we felt it was not cutting the bone and the muscle from the military program, nor from the war effort. I believe that continued effort can save even more money from that source.

The deficit continues to grow at a much more rapid rate than predicted. In fiscal 1967 the actual deficit was five times higher than predicted when the budget was presented. The deficit this year was estimated at the outset to be four times the predicted deficit of last year, and the most current estimates indicate that it may be six to 13 times higher than the predicted deficit of last year, depending upon what happens with regard to a tax increase.

Moreover we are at war. While there is no doubt we will obtain a victory or a negotiated peace on honorable terms, the time and the cost required to do so is highly uncertain. We have reduced defense expenditures to the lowest limit possible without cutting into the bone and muscle of our military forces. We cut this year's Defense request by $1.6 billion but some badly needed items were not requested and not enough was requested for others. As an example, we really need more pilots and other manpower, the Reserve Forces need additional equipment. One of the greatest handicaps in controlling the recent Detroit riots was the lack of transportation and communications equipment which the National Guard should have had but did not have. Some units had to charter commercial busses to get from their home towns to Detroit because they had no trucks available.

We will have to have additional money appropriated to pay for the direct cost of running the war.

We must put up an antiballistic missile defense to protect ourselves from Red China and from Russia or take the chance of having to yield to their threats and demands. This will cost many billions of dollars.

The load all the Federal programs now on the books has put on the taxpayer's back is already so heavy the average taxpayer can hardly stand up under it.

Before we pass another bill to authorize billions more of Federal expenditures, we should know what effect it will have on the taxpayer. That is why I think this bill should have more consideration. We cannot authorize a sum of money as large as that requested here without dipping deeply into the revenue now available. This bill, if passed, will put heavy additional demands upon our ability to pay for other needs and upon our sources of revenue. We need to know what effect these added demands will have, whether they will have to be met by new taxes, and if so what effect these new taxes might have on the economy generally, upon the individual taxpayer, and on the general financial condition of the country.

With all deference to those Senators who serve on the Appropriations Subcommittee that considers this bill—and I am one and take full responsibility for my part—it has had no full hearing in the lifetime of the program. The poverty program has always been in the supplemental bill and has been considered in the very last days of the session. Last year, for example, the $1.6 billion appropriation for the Office of Economic Opportunity was examined in a hearing that lasted less than 3 hours. The bill was marked up the next day and taken up on the floor of the Senate and passed the day after that—just 2 days before the Senate adjourned.

With all the demands on a Senator's time in the dying days of the session, it is impossible to give a $1.5 billion program the kind of consideration it should be given. If that procedure is to be followed in this session, as it apparently will be, the error will be compounded by over 300 percent.

The taxpaying man and woman who has to foot the bill deserves to have this program given closer examination than it has been given in the past. When a Senator votes on this bill, he should have full knowledge of what he is doing to the taxpayer as well as what he is doing for the beneficiary under the program. By recommitting the bill to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, such action as is taken on the bill can be taken in light of all the facts, and each Senator will then be aware of the full consequences of his vote, not only on the people to be helped, but also on the people that have to do the helping.

As I understand, a new tax bill will be presented to the Senate partly on the basis of being necessary because of the cost of the war. In fact, I think it will be needed largely because of excessive nondefense expenditures, including this poverty program for the past 2 years, and because of the excessive authorizations provided in this bill.

The average person paying taxes in American is the so-called small taxpayer, but in proportion to his or her earnings or retirement benefit, these taxes are very large indeed. These taxpayers are already paying until it hurts, and they will resent paying more taxes. Unless they think their money is being spent for the necessities of the Government, there will be a revolt by the taxpayer at the polls.

This bill ought to be recommitted and I hope that it will be.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, once again, I would like to briefly outline the reasons which compel me to believe that it is our clear duty to delete title II from the pending bill. These reasons, which I expressed on yesterday, appear to me to so far outweigh the arguments in favor of title II which have been offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania and others that I am sure it will be the overwhelming consensus of this body that the pending bill cannot be approved until it is shorn of title II.

First, Mr. President, the program proposed by this title would create half a million new jobs at a time when there are probably 1 million existing unfilled job openings in our economy and when there are 50,000 unfilled openings in MDTA projects in the Nation's 48 largest cities. Before we create another half million job openings, we clearly should concentrate on filling as many of these existing jobs and job training openings as possible. The problem is not a shortage of jobs in the United States, but rather a lack of qualified people to fill job openings and, in that respect, title II of this bill would go charging off in the wrong direction and at the wrong time.

Second, the jobs that this title would create would be what I have called pseudo-jobs. They would be, as I said yesterday, make-work jobs, shadow jobs, deadend jobs, jobs without a future, and jobs without the essential ingredients of meaningful employment. Such jobs would not only isolate the poor from the rest of society and freeze poverty into the proposed job categories, but would also make this body that much more vulnerable to charges of supporting Federal handouts, as well as hopelessly disrupt and undercut the President's carefully considered program for bringing greater job opportunities to the poor.

Mr. President, this crash program would crash right into a solid wall of public disapproval and by providing half a million leaf-raking assignments would contribute nothing to the national need for trained, skilled, and truly qualified workers.

Third, the program proposed by this title would be at odds with existing employment opportunity programs firmly supported by the administration which really can offer meaningful, purposeful, and career-oriented jobs. These administration programs, such as the Manpower Development and Training Act, which have already proved their success many times over in training or retraining people for better jobs, are the ones that we should give our support to, rather than going off halfcocked in search of new panaceas through ill-conceived and massively funded new programs.

Fourth, title II must be rejected because its provisions are so very vague, ambiguous, and unclear. Instead of being the product of careful and thorough study and consideration in the normal committee process, this program is urged upon us de novo, springing from the imagination of its sponsors. Rather than the product of exhaustive hearings, this program has been the subject of no hearings whatsoever. Even if the administration and the Congress were convinced that a real national emergency existed in this area, so as to justify an emergency program of the type here proposed, the underlying concepts as well as the working details of such a program would have to be set forth for our deliberation in far more concrete and far more carefully evaluated form than is the case here. Indeed, the manifest defects in this title have been called to our attention by four of our distinguished colleagues, Senators Dominick, Fannon, Murphy, and Griffin, in supplemental views which they submitted to the committee report on this bill.

I am especially persuaded by Senator Murphy's observation with regard to title II that—

> Here, again, we seem to be faced with a lack of planning, a lack of definition, a lack of guidelines, and an absence of complete preparation. In good conscience, I cannot agree to spending $2.8 billion of the taxpayers' dollars on such a program.

Fifth, and perhaps most important, is the fact that title II of this bill would have a tremendous inflationary impact on the economy at precisely the time when anti-inflationary measures are in order. As I pointed out yesterday, nearly $3 billion poured indiscriminately into 500,000 jobs of very slight productivity must either give us a solid dose of new inflation or force the President and Congress to raise taxes even higher, and probably much higher, than now proposed. Now is not the time to add to an already fantastic national debt, or to increase an anticipated deficit for fiscal 1968, which the Secretary of the Treasury has estimated before the House Ways and Means Committee could go as high as $29 billion. The additional $1.3 billion required under this title for fiscal 1968 would not only compound this extremely dangerous deficit, but would also be a cruel blow to a President who is striving diligently to balance national needs against available limited national resources. This title would play havoc with the President's carefully considered and reasonably developed antipoverty budget and would be a grave disservice to the administration at a time of growing fiscal crisis.

Finally, Mr. President, as I said yesterday, this title raises extremely troublesome basic philosophical questions which I feel have got to be fully answered before we take a further step down the road proposed by title II. Is our country ready at this time to provide a subsidized and purposeless job to anyone who cannot or will not find work on his own? Where is the connection between such a program and truly productive, meaningful employment? How would we ever elevate people out of the make-work jobs this title would provide? If this program were enacted, would we not be creating a vast new public welfare bureaucracy? Can we justify to the American taxpayer paying up to half a million people for doing nothing productive, over the objections of the administration and contrary to our national economic situation and our priority commitment to victory in Vietnam? Can we ask the American taxpayers to assume the added and probably permanent public burden which this title would entail? Do we have the slightest idea where such a program would lead in the future except our knowledge, based upon abundant experience, that it would inevitably mushroom beyond all manageable bounds?

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be 2 additional minutes allotted to each side and that the vote which was to take place at 1 o'clock be delayed until 1:04 p.m.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator reserve that request?

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening] has just asked if I could yield him 1 minute. Could we make it 3 additional minutes?

Mr. GRUENING. Could we make it 5 minutes?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I modify my request and ask for 5 additional minutes to each side, and that the vote occur at 1:10 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, can we ask the American taxpayers to assume the added and probably permanent public burden which this title would entail? Do we have the slightest idea where such a program would lead in the future except our knowledge, based upon abundant experience, that it would inevitably mushroom beyond all manageable bounds?

Mr. President, it is abundantly clear to me, and I think to the decided majority of this body as well, that the sense of the American people and of their Congress today is that this program is both unnecessary and unwise. I, therefore, urge that my motion be accepted, so as to delete this ill-considered title from the pending bill.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. Javits].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, as a coauthor, with Senator Clark, of this bill, I consider it a matter of dignity and self-respect to rise in its defense.

I shall vote against recommitting the bill, and my reason, first, is that we now have a consensus in Congress, in my judgment, and in the country, that the key to dealing with the poverty program is jobs.

Second, this is a basic national crisis, tantamount to the crises which we face in Vietnam, and therefore is entitled to the highest priority. All the arguments made against it are the business-as-usual arguments. This is not business as usual. You had widespread riots and violence in American cities this past summer, involving almost 80 cities. You may have them this winter; we hope and pray we will not. Now is the time to provide against that situation.

So I urge that this matter be dealt with on the national priority to which it is entitled. Do not charge the Vietnam war against this priority. If you do, you will suffer a tremendous slackening in morale, as well as grave danger to domestic tranquility, which we have already experienced.

Finally, Mr. President, everything the Senator from West Virginia has said we have done. These are meaningful jobs, based on training, based on education. They tie the private enterprise system in completely.

This program is basic, constructive, and well architected. This is the very contribution. This was Senator Clark's program. I wrote into it all the features the Senator from West Virginia has stated he wants. They are in the bill.

The important feature is that this matter must be put on the right priority. We are not paying for the Vietnam war. We should not be under the charge by millions of Americans that we are taking it out of their backs. That is why this program is necessary.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Alaska.

THE EFFORTS TO FIGHT THE WAR ON POVERTY SHOULD BE EXPANDED—NOT CUT BACK

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I have been consistently voting against all amendments intended to cut back the funds to be made available for the war on poverty.

This is no time to go back on the Nation's commitments to our economically disadvantaged.

For years now I have been stating that the United States is engaged in an illegal, immoral, and unconstitutional war in Vietnam, where it is an aggressor against people who have been fighting for their independence from foreign domination for decades.

It is bad enough for the United States to become involved in fighting such an unjustified war in Vietnam at the cost of tens of thousands of fine American boys killed or wounded at an ever-escalating rate and at a cost in dollars of more than $3 billion each month.

It is far, far worse to say that the United States is so deeply committed to fighting in Vietnam that it must neglect its vital needs at home. What shall it profit the United States to continue the costly stalemate in Vietnam while our cities continue in their squalor or go up in flames, while its poor face at least another generation of misery and despair, while its natural resources lie fallow and undeveloped, and while the education and health needs of its people are being shortchanged?

Some years ago, Nikita Khrushchev, speaking for the Soviet Union about the United States, said: "We shall bury you!"

Are we now seeing this prophecy coming true?

While the vital resources of the United States in both men and dollars are being needlessly squandered in the rice paddies and jungles of Vietnam, the Soviet Union is able to devote its men and money to the development of its own country.

This reckless and needless course of action is cruelly unfair to those men and women of the United States who were promised the alleviation of their manifold ills through an all-out war against poverty only to have the wherewithal to carry out the war wasted in Vietnam.

I cannot, I will not, vote to deprive the poor of the United States of funds so urgently needed for their relief only to have those funds siphoned off not only for irresponsibly fighting a senseless war in Vietnam but also to line the pockets of the corrupt military and civilian officials of the Government of South Vietnam.

I shall vote against recommitting this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I shall support the motion of the Senator from West Virginia to strike title II from the bill.

If title II is retained it would cost $2.8 billion over the amount recommended in the budget. We are already confronted with a deficit averaging $2 billion a month and an administration request for a 10 percent increase in taxes. It should be pointed out that each 1 percent increase in taxes provides approximately $1 billion. So those who will vote to retain title II in the bill, which would require an additional $2.8 billion expenditure should be reconciled to the fact that they will in effect be voting for a 3 percent increase across-the-board in income taxes. This is above the increase already requested by the President. Unless they are willing to finance that increase I do not believe they should vote for the expenditures.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

In summation, I call to the attention of Senators, first, that no hearings have been held on title II.

Second, the language in title II is vague, ambiguous, unclear, and the programs provided for are not concrete and well delineated.

Third, ample authorities exist now to do the things which title II would provide.

Fourth, we would be embarking on a new program which we might expect, as I said yesterday, to mushroom, like the prophet's gourd, overnight. Title II would provide authorization for $2.8 billion over the next 2 years; and at the end of that time, of course, we might expect—if we have learned anything by experience—that the next request would be even larger.

Fifth, I call attention again to the fact that this authorization is above the President's request, in the amount of $2.8 billion. That represents almost $3 per minute for every minute that has passed since Jesus Christ was born.

So I say to my colleagues that here is the place to apply some economy to a measure which has not been requested by the President, and to a measure which will only exacerbate the problems concomitant with a great national deficit.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

I will answer the Senator from West Virginia in a friendly way, but categorically.

First, there was no need for hearings on this emergency employment bill. We have a pamphlet this thick showing what all the witnesses said and the statements we received, emphasizing the need for an emergency employment program now. Hearings would not have changed this amount of $1 nor would it have changed one word in the bill.

Second, the language is not vague. It is precise. It would give the Secretary of Labor exactly what he would need to put this action into effect. The bill is well drawn. It is not vague.

Third, there is not ample authority to put this program into effect, and I am surprised that the Senator from West Virginia should say there is. Although there may be authority, there is no money; and what is needed is the money to do the job.

Fourth, the Senator from West Virginia has said that the new program will mushroom—and it probably will. It probably will mushroom next year, because the Urban Coalition has asked for a million jobs, not 200,000; and I predict that before 1968 is over, we will get them, because we need them, and the American people will insist on it.

Fifth, of course, this bill is above the budget request of the President. This is so because the President's budget request authorizes a swollen military budget, far above the legitimate security needs of the United States.

This is not the place to apply economy. As I have said earlier in this debate, the place from which to get the money is the military budget.

I have said that I would vote in opposition to the motion but I release all my colleagues who are committed to vote in support of the Emergency Employment Act to vote as they see fit. They will vote as their consciences dictate, and my conscience dictates that I vote against the motion.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I am going to vote for the emergency program of on-the-job training for unemployed people provided in title II of the Economic Opportunity Act amendments bill we are now considering. I think it is better to train people to be workers and taxpayers than to leave them on the welfare rolls. This whole program will cost less for an entire year than the Vietnam war costs every 2 weeks. It will provide some Federal funds to continue the emergency employment efforts Governor Agnew of Maryland started in Baltimore this summer. These jobs and the money to pay for them are desperately needed in our own State.

This is no WPA bill. It will provide a steppingstone between unemployment and jobs in private business for tens of thousands of untrained people every year. Cities and States will receive the money necessary to hire unemployed people to work on public projects—like park construction, conservation, and housing and neighborhood improvement—which are needed in both cities and rural areas. The program will take more than 200,000 untrained workers a year, give them on-the-job training, and move these men into private employment as rapidly as possible, in order to make taxpayers out of tax eaters.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, today I voted against the motion of the acting majority leader, Senator BYRD, of West Virginia, to recommit S. 2338 with instructions to the committee to strike from the bill title II. Title II would have provided an authorization of $2.8 billion for jobs for the unemployed. The motion was successful, and title II has been stricken from the bill.

The support of title II was a matter of great controversy. In frankness, if it had been adopted and passed and approved by the House, it would create a difficult fiscal problem. Thus, the question of voting against striking this title did raise the question of fiscal responsibility, even though it was known that it would be stricken from the bill.

But as in all our decisions in the Senate regarding appropriations, Members give priority to those subjects which they believe to be of the greatest importance. During this session, I have voted to reduce appropriations in a total sum larger than that involved in title II of this bill. On September 25, I voted against the military construction bill authorizing $2.3 billion which could have been postponed to later years. Bills which will be presented to the Senate before this session is over will cost more than $2.8 billion—for programs which are not needed in this year, and against which I will vote. I voted for title II as an expression of my belief that a program to provide employment must eventually be adopted by the Congress. While there are undoubtedly those who could find employment, and every effort must be made in this direction, there are thousands who because of lack of education and training cannot do so. This problem of unemployment, lack of education and housing have become the major domestic issues before this country, and must be met. They will require the full efforts of the Federal Government and also local governments and most important our private enterprise system.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, it has frequently been said that the U.S. Senate is the greatest deliberative body in the world. In fact, it has been accused at times of being too deliberative. Be that as it may, I respectfully suggest today that this great deliberative body consider an admittedly extreme but definitely possible alternative, that is, action without deliberation. Is there even one among us who would advocate such procedure? Who in these ranks would substitute impulse for committee hearings, whim for deliberations, and reflexes for Senate debate? The very idea, Mr. President, sounds preposterous. But that is precisely what we are being asked to do today. Despite the deepest traditions of the Senate, despite this body's historic insistence on thorough investigation and full discussion, we have been offered for action the unstudied, undocumented, untested and unproven Emergency Employment Act. No hearings were held on this bill, Mr. President. Not 1 minute of subcommittee consideration was given to it. Instead, the Emergency Employment Act was simply tacked onto the Economic Opportunity Amendments and sent to the full committee with scarcely more than what amounted to a sparse letter of introduction. You might say, Mr. President, that the full committee gave this intruder the attention it deserved under the circumstances for it failed completely to give the act the detailed consideration due any proposal of this magnitude. In fact, the report expressing the need for such a program is no more than a compilation of excerpts from testimony on S. 1545 as well as some articles expressing the need for the creation of jobs. Where is the expert testimony? Where is the examination of witnesses? Where are the normal, probing, clarifying, perfecting committee arguments, pro and con? There are none, Mr. President, and for this and other reasons which I shall mention in a moment, I believe that this bill should be recommitted.

If, Mr. President, there had been full hearings and study of the proposed Emergency Employment Act, two highly important facts would certainly have been emphasized and publicized. First, of course, is the fact that enactment of this legislation would cost the taxpayers $2.8 billion, or nearly one-third of the amount which will be collected if the President's request for a tax increase is approved by the Congress. Second, and most important, is the fact that the act fails to provide even a plan which might result in meaningful and permanent employment opportunities for the disadvantaged. I shall discuss each of these points briefly.

At the present time, as we all know, the Congress is being asked by the President to approve a 10 percent surtax. Passage of this legislation will only remove some $8 billion from a budgetary deficit which, it is estimated, could reach $29 billion for the fiscal year. Yet the Emergency Employment Act would eat up nearly one-third of the extra revenue collected. The American taxpayer is already shouldering a heavy burden, and your mail and my mail show that he is beginning to rebel. If he is to be asked to carry this additional load as well, he deserves to know that the money is not going to be channeled into a wasteful effort. Yet we have no evidence to this effect. What kinds of jobs will be provided? How many? Is this the best plan for alleviating the existing employment problem? Our taxpayers, Mr. President, and this body which represents them have a right and a duty to demand answers to these questions.

Frankly, Mr. President, without testimony to the contrary, this seems to be simply another case of leaving everything to the Secretary although in the very bill we are considering today we have had ample evidence of the results of such procedure.

In the absence of full hearings and studies, we must try to interpret the Emergency Employment Act from its text alone and herein we find that the intent is to provide employment for "large concentrations of persons who are unable to obtain jobs in regular, competitive employment because of lack of education, occupation and skill, or work experience and because of artificial barriers to employment and occupational advancement." In order to accomplish this, it directs the Secretary of Labor to authorize funds for employment programs in such fields as health, public safety, education, recreation, streets, and parks. However, these will not be permanent employment opportunities. They will only be make work. I submit, Mr. President, that the circumstances of today dictate against the application of such methods which, as we all know, were once employed in another era to meet a different problem. Let me explain. When the Works Progress Administration and the Civilian Conservation Corps were instituted during the great depression, the unemployment rate in this Nation was 24.9 percent. Those were devastating times demanding drastic measures. Of necessity, the viable solution sought at the time required the inclusion of make-work programs as there was a desperate need to regenerate the economy; that is, to put money into people's pockets and thereby increase purchasing power. Today, on the other hand, our Nation is generally affluent, shouldering an unemployment rate of less than 4 percent. Consequently, there is no need for us to tread down the path we took in the 1930's under dissimilar conditions.

Make no mistake, Mr. President, I do not speak lightly of our unemployment problem. Even an unemployment rate of 4 percent demands our attention and assistance, and the degree of urgency becomes all the more apparent when we study the problem in its true perspective and perceive the extent to which the illness is concentrated in our heavily populated urban areas. For instance, 15 percent of the people living in Hough are without work; 12 percent in South Los Angeles; 13 percent in the Bayside section of Oakland, and 11 percent in the Mission-Fillmore district of San Francisco. Appropriately, the bill recognizes the need in such areas but it fails to provide the proper remedy. True, the unemployed in Hough and South Los Angeles and in hundreds of other similar areas throughout the country need jobs, but jobs, as such, are not enough. They need lasting jobs with advancement possibilities. Today it is estimated that there are 1.3 million job vacancies in industry. The task we now face, therefore, is to provide the unemployed person with the necessary skills so that he can fill these existing vacancies. This is the basic philosophy behind economic opportunity and we should not distort it. What we need—indeed, what is envisioned by the phrase "economic opportunity"—is emphasis on our school systems, our adult basic education programs, vocational education, transportation and job skill training. Short-term, make-work jobs will not suffice.

The Congress has considered and made available many job training programs. It is now taking under advisement other plans designed to accomplish the same end—for example, the provision for tax incentives for industry to offer training programs to the unemployed or upgrading programs to the presently employed, and the proposal that tax incentives be offered to industries which create new plants in disadvantaged urban areas, thereby bringing job opportunities within geographical reach of the unemployed. Before the enactment of any of these proposals, however, hearings will be conducted and sufficient testimony will be taken so that the Congress can make intelligent decisions in terms of need, cost-effectiveness and possible efficacy as compared to other programs. On the Emergency Employment Act, we have no such information.

I might add in conclusion, Mr. President, that private industry has already demonstrated dramatically that it can and will tackle the job and produce positive results. In my own area of Los Angeles, for instance, in the highly publicized community of Watts, private enterprise under the leadership of Chad McClellan went to work voluntarily with no Government funding whatsoever and filled at least 18,000 jobs in a year and a half. Also in Watts, Aerojet-General opened a manufacturing plant to employ local people in making tents for the armed forces. The company's first Government contract was worth $2.5 million and resulted in the employment of 450 persons. Mr. President, these are permanent job opportunities that are being offered. I would hope that when the Congress embarks on an emergency employment program it will confine itself to finding ways to offer this type of opportunity instead of some make-work plan which, I want to emphasize again, would provide only a temporary solution at best.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back.

Under the previous order, the question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from West Virginia to recommit. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INOUYE (when his name was called). On this vote I have a live pair with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin]. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

Mr. PROUTY (when his name was called). On this vote I have a live pair with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton]. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

Mr. MUSKIE (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy]. If he were present and voting he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

Mr. DODD (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy]. If he were present and voting he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. MANSFIELD (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote I have a pair with the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell]. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were to vote I would vote "nay." Therefore, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. DIRKSEN (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Brooke]. If he were present and voting he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote I would vote "yea." I withdraw my vote.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore] would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Baker], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] are necessarily absent.

The pair of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Brooke] has been previously announced.

The pair of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton] has been previously announced.

If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Baker], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 28, as follows:

[No. 276 Leg.]

YEAS—54

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Church
Cotton
Curtis
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Griffin
Hansen
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hollings
Hruska
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, La.
McClellan
McGovern
McIntyre
Miller
Monroney
Montoya
Mundt
Murphy
Pearson
Proxmire
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Spong
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—28

Bartlett
Bayh
Case
Clark
Cooper
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hatfield
Jackson
Javits
Long, Mo.
McCarthy
McGee
Metcalf
Mondale
Morse
Nelson
Pell
Percy
Randolph
Ribicoff
Scott
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—18

Baker
Brooke
Dirksen
Dodd
Ervin
Gore
Inouye
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Magnuson
Mansfield
Morton
Moss
Muskie
Pastore
Prouty
Russell
Tower

So the motion of Mr. Byrd of West Virginia to recommit was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the motion to recommit was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK obtained the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to inquire of the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania whether he knows how many amendments are still to be offered. I believe there are about a dozen on this side of the aisle.

Mr. CLARK. Will the Senator from Illinois kindly withhold that request for 30 seconds?

Mr. President, in accordance with instructions just given by the Senate, on behalf of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I report back the bill, S. 2388—that is to say, the bill as reported to the Senate—with title II stricken out.

May I say to my good friend from Illinois that, so far as I know, all the remaining amendments are on his side of the aisle. I know that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty] has one, that the Senator from California [Mr. Murphy] has two——

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams] has one.

Mr. CLARK. I am not in the confidence of the Senator from Delaware. I am interested to know that he has one. I do not know what it is all about.

Does anyone else have amendments on this side of the aisle? I believe that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Monroney] has an amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I respectfully suggest that perhaps a time limitation might be contrived on these amendments now that the authors of the bill are in the Chamber.

Mr. CLARK. I regret to advise my good friend from Illinois that I am going to have to answer that on an ad hoc basis.

There are some amendments on which I would be glad to agree to a time limit, but there are others on which I have commitments, to Senators who are out of town, not to allow votes. I think I should, if I can, protect them until they get back from a very important engagement in Boston.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I have one amendment the purpose of which is to change the figure in title II of the budget estimate.

Mr. CLARK. Title II has been disposed of.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I meant title I.

Mr. CLARK. That is the very amendment on which I cannot agree to put a time limitation for the reasons I have just suggested. I will say to the Senator from Delaware there are a number of amendments we can dispose of in the meantime.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If the Senator prefers, I will withhold that amendment. Let us dispose of the others first, and then I will offer it later.

Mr. CLARK. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Delaware.

Now, Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CLARK. Is the bill open to further amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment offered by Mr. Prouty is as follows:

On page 91, between lines 14 and 15, insert the following new subsection:

"(h) Title VI of such Act is amended by adding the following new section after section 618:

"'RESPONSIBILITY FOR FOLLOW THROUGH PROGRAMS

"'Sec 619. Pursuant to section 602(d), the Director shall delegate his functions under section 221(b)(2) to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and such functions shall be carried out through the Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.'"

On page 55, line 22, insert the following at the end of the sentence: "Funds for such program shall be transferred directly from the Director to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Financial assistance for such projects shall be provided by the Secretary on the basis of agreements reached with the Director directly to local educational agencies except as otherwise provided by such agreements."

On page 54, line 22, strike the word "subsection" and insert the following: "subsections (b)(2) and".

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. HARTKE. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, last July the Office of Education and the Office of Economic Opportunity jointly announced the establishment of a new educational venture—Operation Followthrough. Thirty school districts in 25 States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico were selected to participate in pilot projects. "Graduates" of Headstart and other preschool programs—some 3,000 in all—are now enrolled in the projects.

Research shows that many of the gains made in Headstart are lost if these children do not continue to receive special attention and assistance in overcoming the handicaps imposed on them by poverty. Followthrough will provide that attention and assistance.

The central concept of Followthrough is to bring together the resources of school, community, and family to help the child. With the special assistance available under the program, it will be possible to provide individual educational diagnosis and prescription to meet the needs of the particular child. The programs utilize instructional specialists and new teaching techniques, teacher aides, psychologists, social workers, doctors, dentists—all services needed to bring the children up to the level of their more affluent classmates.

The amendment now before this body will insure that this program will continue to be administered in the manner currently provided in memorandum of understanding between the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Pursuant to this agreement, the Director has delegated his responsibility for administering this program to the Secretary—who, in turn, has vested the authority in the Office of Education.

This agreement provides in most cases that grants shall be made to local public educational agencies, which are required to make services available on an equitable basis to children in both public and nonpublic schools. If a local educational agency is unable or unwilling to provide services to children in nonpublic schools on an equitable basis, the Commissioner of Education may arrange with an appropriate community action agency to provide such services. Where the school district serves an area which has a community action agency, it is required to consult with such agency in the development of its Followthrough program, and school districts must involve parents both in the development of the applications and in the carrying out of the programs.

Under the memorandum of understanding, applicants are required to maintain current levels of effort in the grade levels in which the Followthrough children are enrolled. They are also encouraged to utilize other available funds, such as those provided under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, in developing the best possible program for the early elementary grades.

In testimony before the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty, officials of OEO and the Office of Education stressed that the programs envisioned by the memorandum of understanding were the best, educationally, that could be devised. Funding through local educational agencies assures that Followthrough programs will be conducted during the school day, as well as after school and in the summer months. It avoids the danger that disadvantaged children in the early grades may be channeled into a second, competitive school system. It guarantees that those who know children best—their teachers and their parents—will devise supplementary programs designed to compensate for the crippling effects of poverty.

This program has already been launched. Children are now receiving these enriching services. To change the concept of Followthrough, as the Committee bill proposes to do, might mean the death of the program for the school year which has already begun. School systems have begun planning programs for next year. If the responsibility were taken away from the schools and given to community action agencies, the benefits of advance planning would be lost. The children would be the ultimate losers.

Even if community action agencies redelegated authority for Followthrough to the school systems, administrative complexity would threaten the success of the program. Community action boards could exercise a veto power over educational decisions. School officials would be confronted with a maze of forms, guidelines, and regulations put out by several different Federal and State agencies. The result could be administrative chaos.

The amendment I propose will simplify the administrative mechanism for Operation Followthrough. It assures that this program, which is primarily a compensatory education program, will be carried out by our educational system. It assures that all the work which has gone into making the program a success will not be lost. I urge the Senate to adopt my amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CLARK. It is my understanding that the amendment of the Senator from Vermont with respect to Followthrough merely writes into law the present administrative practice by which the program has been delegated to the Office of Education.

Mr. PROUTY. That is exactly what it proposes to do.

Mr. CLARK. As I said earlier when the Senator offered the amendment, I am perfectly willing and prepared to accept it. It is a good amendment. I cannot understand why any Senator would want to have a rollcall on it, because I do not know of any Senator who is against it. Therefore, I suggest we vote on the amendment.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I asked for a rollcall vote on the amendment. I asked for a rollcall vote on it previously, and put it off when the amendment was withdrawn. The reason for it is that there is an inconsistency in approach. I have no quarrel with inconsistency, but I think the Senate should go on record as to whether these matters of education belong in an education bill or do not. It cannot divide people at the age of 3 and 4 and say we will put 3- and 4-year-olds under Operation Headstart in the Office of Economic Opportunity and then, when they cross the threshold of the grand old age of 5, say it thinks they should be under the Office of Education. I think they belong in the Office of Education. I think this is a good amendment.

The Headstart program is not a new program or an innovation. I remember when my sister, who was killed in an automobile accident in 1964, had a Headstart operation in Dearborn, Mich., in 1951. So this is nothing new.

The problems of education belong in the schools. That is where they should be handled. Those people should be given the opportunity to handle education matters. That is where the Followthrough program belongs. It is an extension of Operation Headstart. If Headstart and Followthrough mean anything, they are part of the same program and they belong in the same agency.

The Senate went on record in a rollcall vote as favoring taking the operation Headstart and putting it in one agency of the Government. Now it is going to take another program, called Followthrough, which involves only possibly a difference of half a year in the age of these children, and say it should be administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. That is perfectly all right with me, but I think the Senate ought to display consistency.

I personally intend to vote for the amendment, as I did for the amendment which would have placed Headstart in the Office of Education. I am not going to detain the Senate, but I am glad we are going to have a rollcall vote on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] is absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 89, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 277 Leg.]

YEAS—89

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Griffin
Gruening
Hansen
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hatfield
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland

Hollings
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Pearson
Pell
Percy
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Scott
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Spong
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—11

Baker
Brooke
Ervin
Gore
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Morton
Moss
Pastore
Russell
Tower

So Mr. Prouty's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 67, line 1, strike "part B of title I and title II", and insert in lieu thereof the following: "part B of title I, title II, and part B of title III".

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURPHY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. As I understand it, the pending amendment is the Governor's veto amendment.

Mr. MURPHY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CLARK. Would the Senator from California be willing to enter into a unanimous-consent agreement for, let us say, a half an hour on a side on the pending amendment?

Mr. MURPHY. I would.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, is the majority leader agreeable to that?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, indeed.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on the pending amendment be limited to 1 hour, half of the time to be controlled by the Senator from California [Mr. Murphy] and the other half to be controlled by the manager of the bill, and that any amendments thereto must be germane.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Certain Senators want to vote on this amendment, and they will not be back until late afternoon.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, Senators will be coming and going all the time.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I renew my unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania renews his unanimous-consent request. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

How much time does the Senator from California yield himself?

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. President, at the present time, the Governor of a State in which a Job Corps camp is proposed to be established has the power, under section 109, to prohibit its construction and operation if he believes the burdens created by its operation would outweigh the benefits it might engender.

By the same token, section 209(c) grants the Governor a limited veto power over the title I, part B, and title II projects—the work training and community action programs.

Mr. President, may we have order? I am extremely sorry to ask for order, but it is difficult for me to be heard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. MURPHY. It is very difficult for me to be heard. I ask for special thoughtfulness on the part of my colleagues because I think what I have to say is quite important. Otherwise, I would not take up the time of the Senate to bring the matter to its attention.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 10 seconds?

Mr. MURPHY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I join in the request of the Senator from California. The Senate owes him the courtesy, in view of the difficulty he has in being heard, of remaining in complete silence while we listen to the Senator from California.

Mr. MURPHY. I thank the Senator from Oregon very much.

Mr. President, at the present time, the Governor of a State in which a Job Corps Camp is proposed to be established, has the power, under section 109, to prohibit its construction and operation if he believes the burdens created by its operation would outweigh the benefits it might engender.

By the same token, section 209(c) grants the governor a limited veto power over title I, part B, and title II projects—the work training and community action programs.

The amendment I am sending to the desk would confer this same limited veto power on the Governor for title III, B programs; so that the State's chief executive could prohibit the implementation of a migrant assistance program within 30 days upon receiving a copy of the grant if he did not believe it would result in an effective weapon for battling the symptoms and causes of poverty among migrant workers.

Since 1964, when the Congress inaugurated the war on poverty, the State OEO offices have gained a great deal of technical expertise in the problems causing and perpetuating poverty.

They have also become equipped to deal with the particular problems of their States, and we all know that these problems vary from State to State. While the regional OEO offices concentrate on the poverty program over a three-, four-, or five-State area, we know that the State OEO offices are well acquainted with the entire needs of one specific State. Consequently, it seems to me that the regional and Federal OEO offices ought to look to the State office for the specific requirements, needs and programs that should be generated for that particular State.

The necessity of utilizing this knowledge and advice is underscored in a letter I received from Mr. Ralph Gunderson, chief of migrant programs of the California State OEO, and in a telegram from Governor Reagan. The correspondence ably states the problem which exists in my home State due to the overlapping and uncoordinated activities of the State and regional offices. I ask unanimous consent that the letter and the telegram be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter and the telegram were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

LETTER FROM MR. GUNDERSON

In answer to your query on migrant adult education programs in California:

(1) On January 1, 1967, the administration's position toward migrant programs was made known to U.S. OEO. The first priority was housing for migrants with associated programs of day care and health. Advise to the Governor came from Dr. Paul O'Rourke, former Director of California's OEO, who re-emphasized priorities in testimony in Stockton on May 11, 1967, before the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Farm Labor. This position has not been changed and has the concurrence of the Honorable Theron J. Bell, Director of California OEO.

(2) The California migrant master plan is designed to provide adult education for migrants on a continuing basis in conjunction with other programs, in an integrated frontal assault on migrant poverty. Funding outside the migrant master plan prevents a coordinated and structured effort to eliminate the causes of this poverty, and proliferates programs which contemplate no logical culmination (i.e., jobs).

(3) There is a wide body of criticism at local levels about staffing for these projects not under state auspices. Well known long time proponents of dissention and agitation of means of approaching farm labor problems are all too frequently found on these staff rolls. In our opinion, their very presence mitigates against community acceptance and cooperation which is essential to success in this type of program.

(4) In at least two counties (Kern and Stanislaus) migrant adult education projects were approved without full discussion of the issues. Two members of the Board of Supervisors of Kern County resigned from the Community Action Council because they could not obtain full details on the programs. Although some members of the Stanislaus County CAC insisted on further debate, the project was approved without such discussion.

(5) The stipend system is a source of potential conflict with gainful employment on farms where the school may be competing with the farmer for the time of the worker.

(6) Adult education programs operated in camps under the migrant master plan tend to serve migrants exclusively with the intent of breaking the cycle of poverty. Local grants of this kind operating presumably

only in the off-season tend to serve seasonal farm workers and do little to solve migrant problems.

(7) Ineffective administration is a common charge leveled at these programs; i.e., proposed salary raises for personnel before a project is even begun, early staffing, excessive needs etc. We do not think any of the projects are yet mature enough to evaluate their administration.

(8) Educational programs of this sort are now under consideration in spite of the omni-present controversy.

(9) The programs tend to be extremely dear, particularly in terms of administration changes already at state OEO.

None of these things appear to comply with the spirit of the President's message of November 11, 1966, titled, "Advice and Consultations with State and Local Officials."

RALPH GUNDERSON,
Chief, Migrant Programs, OEO.

SEPTEMBER 26, 1967.

Senator MURPHY: I request that you implement changes in legislation to provide Governors veto power over Title III(B) migrant projects. These are intended to alleviate poverty among farm workers and their families, problems which intimately and profoundly affect this State's economy. This power is necessary to prevent wasteful programs and to provide a coordinated Federal-State assault on existing problems.

RONALD REAGAN.

Mr. MURPHY. The fact that the Governor is unable to veto title III(B) programs leaves the door wide open for the OEO to move any title II program, which the Governor has seen fit to refuse, into title III. To demonstrate this, let me cite one example from California.

The center for community development, known as CCCD, was originally funded in the amount of $280,000 through title II. This organization cosponsored the Watts Social Action Training Center—SATC—which gave 16- to 24-year-old "leaders," mostly from outside Watts, an "intensive social action orientation program" which included the teaching of how to participate in an organized picket line and demonstrations. The CCCD also organized farmworkers through its main headquarters in Del Rey, Calif., by lending personnel to Mr. Caesar Chavez, who was active in the area at that time. It also helped garbage collectors in Bakersfield form a union and organize a strike. Finally, it formed the Los Angeles Welfare Rights Organizing Committee.

Not only did I question the propriety of these actions, but Governor Reagan did also; and when the CCCD requested a $109,000 refunding grant, the Governor vetoed it. This he did by utilizing section 209(c).

Soon thereafter, however, an organization called the Central California Action Associates—it will be noticed that they have substituted an "A" for one "C" and an "A" for one "D"—requested more than $3 million for an adult migrant education program to cover an eight county area and to be funded under title IIIB. Not only was it disturbing to note that the application submitted by the CCAA for such funding contained little description of the consistency of the adult migrant education program it was to encompass, but also that the directors of the CCAA were exactly the same—to the man—as the board of directors of the CCCD, which no longer functioned. This was obviously an action to circumvent the veto of the Governor. The Governor, of course, had no say in approving or refusing this new grant, since it was a title IIIB program.

Today, it is funded in the amount of $1.5 million and it is beginning to operate. Exactly what the program is doing, I have not found out. I am hopeful that it will work effectively in alleviating the needs of the migrant workers and help the poor whom it was intended to help in the first instance. But I have no evidence of this. The directors of the program have since been changed—I am pleased to report—but that is not the point. The accomplishment of such a change took months of concerted effort on the part of the citizens in the eight-county area who were to be affected by this program, and on the part of the Governor's office, this Senator, and other Members of Congress. So that the Members of Congress, the Governor, this Senator, and the citizens of the area are in complete agreement with respect to this matter.

In the meantime, the poor migrant workers, who are supposed to be the ones we are trying to help, were just being told what might be done in the future for their benefit; but, actually, they were getting little, if any, benefit. This could have been averted had the Governor been able originally to review the program. The veto assures the State will have an opportunity to be heard, to improve the program. The veto is only used when necessary and Mr. Sargent Shriver can override the veto, as he could under the other sections. But at least the local representatives of the people of that area should have been given an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. President, this is one of many examples that I could cite which clearly are not the intent of the program, as I understand it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPONG in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MURPHY. I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

I believe, quite honestly, that in the administration of these large sums of money, much improvement could and should be made immediately.

One improvement I strongly recommend is close cooperation between the Federal OEO and the Governors of the several States. The recommendations of the State OEO to the Governor must be concurred in by the Federal OEO, because, as I pointed out in my opening remarks, they are the people in a position to know the actual and practical needs and they should be the people with firsthand knowledge and information and experience to know how best to take care of the needs of the migrants.

Therefore, Mr. President, I strongly recommend that the limited veto which is granted to the Governors for title IB and title II programs be extended to cover projects under title IIIB.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, first, I should like to thank the Senator from California for the courtesy extended to all Senators by distributing the explanation of his amendment. I believe he did so last week. So there is no surprise involved with respect to the proposed amendment.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, may I say that I was prepared to offer the amendment last week, on one very dull afternoon; but at the request of another Senator who wished to be present and to make remarks concerning the amendment, I withheld offering it until the manager of the bill signified that he desired that I bring it forth.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. We are now engaged in debate with respect to the amendment. I oppose the amendment, but I do appreciate the courtesy of having the Senator's speech in advance, so that I had several days to review it.

This is rather an inappropriate time to be talking about migrant workers, when we have the St. Louis Cardinals in Boston. Some of the fellows from Puerto Rico play for Boston, and the score is one to one at this time, I am informed.

Mr. MURPHY. May I say that presently, in my State of California, because of some misunderstandings, which I will deal with in another amendment I shall offer later, we are now short farm labor, so that 20 percent of the crop of tomatoes in the Salinas Valley has already gone to rot in the field. The Governor of the State has had to accept the suggestion which I believe was made originally by former Governor Brown, 2 years ago, to release 400 prisoners to work in the grape vineyards in order to keep the grape crop from rotting on the vine.

I am in great sympathy with what is going on in Boston, and I may say that I have a personal interest, having been a classmate of Tom Yawkey and having been on the Boston season ticket list for many years.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. This is on my time, but it is pleasant to hear, anyway.

Mr. MURPHY. I am most appreciative of the conditions in Boston, but the conditions in California insist that I bring this matter forward at this time. In other words, I would have been glad to wait another few days.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I will say, in connection with pressing prisoners into work for the harvest in California, there are a large number of unemployed people in Texas, particularly now, because of the tragic floods there.

It has been my effort over the years to try to develop communication lines, transportation, and adequate housing that would bring farmworkers who want to work from areas, such as Texas, to California.

Mr. MURPHY. Nobody has been more diligent about this problem than the Senator from New Jersey. I hope that some day we will be able to accomplish all of these things, such as transportation and communication and make a practical approach in getting the workers who want the job to the job so that they may take advantage of the situation and that the economy will not be interrupted by not having workers in the right place at the right time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I agree

with the Senator. I appreciate his conscientious efforts in helping migratory farmworkers. We saw some of the worst of the housing in California. I believe I am correct in what I am about to say. I recall the junior Senator from California, at his own expense, made several trips to California to straighten out that matter.

Mr. MURPHY. It is done.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, returning to the amendment extending the veto power of Governors to title III programs, I am opposed to the measure for many reasons.

Most of the programs that are developed under this title come from private agencies and not State or local government. The list shows the American Friends Service Committee, the bishop's committee for the Spanish speaking, the National Catholic Rural Life Conference, the migratory committee of the National Council of Churches, and the National Consumers League have programs or support groups having such programs. The American Friends also have a self-help housing program.

The amendment proposes that the Governor could veto these privately generated programs that reach down into the real bowels of poverty, the poorest people in this country; and yet the State and its Governor are not charged with any financial responsibility at all in this program. They have no financial responsibility at stake. They do have a competitive stake because the funds for the total of these programs are limited.

The American Friends or the Catholic Rural Life Conference could submit applications and the State might have an application. They would therefore be in competition for funds. It seems to me that if I were a Governor. I would fight for my State program, and if the funds were limited, I would veto the private program so that the State program could go further. This is only human.

I know there is a limited veto in other programs. I was here at this desk about 5 years ago when I accepted the first Governors' veto amendment. That proposal was offered by the then-Democratic Senator from South Carolina, now a Republican from South Carolina, [Mr. THURMOND]. I accepted it, frankly, not because I believed in it, but because I thought it was necessary to pass the National Service Corps volunteers. In fact, the judgment was right. We won by two votes.

Ever since then, the veto idea has been running through several programs. This is a most inappropriate program for it because most of the activities that are generated out of title III come from private generations. It has nothing to do with Governor Reagan and the State of California, or Governor Wallace and the State of Alabama, and yet they are the two Governors who have been most responsible for vetoes where vetoes are permitted. As a matter of fact these two States account for 60 percent of all the vetoes cast.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I answer the Senator by saying that I completely respect his judgment in this matter. In preparing this amendment I thought of all the possibilities that could occur to me. However, I notice that at the outset there was a Governor's veto in the poverty program. Then as it developed, after I came to the Senate, the veto was taken out of the poverty program. Then it was seen fit to restore a temporary veto, an almost veto. It is not a real veto. It merely gives the Governor the opportunity to object and object publicly within 30 days. The director of the program at all times can override the Governor; at all times he can say, as we may say here in our judgment—God help us if we are wrong—this program is good and this program is bad.

All I ask in this amendment is exactly the same potential for the local people, the State people, the people most intimately concerned with this matter, to have a chance to express their desire or object in the limited veto which is now in existence throughout the remainder of the program. I believe it was put there because public feelings were so high that it was better to restore it on a limited basis.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I would yield to the Senator, but this is now on my time. Will the Senator from California give me equal time if I use all of my time?

Mr. MURPHY. I shall.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. MURPHY. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield?

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, I ask the Senator to yield to me for 5 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY. I yield to the Senator 5 minutes.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, I was the Governor of Wyoming for 4 years before coming to the Senate. During that time we had a number of proposals by the Office of Economic Opportunity for different kinds of programs within the State of Wyoming. I speak particularly of Job Corps programs.

It was not my interest or desire at that time to try to veto, by virtue of the power that was vested in me as the Governor of Wyoming, programs with which I might not have been in complete accord because I differed with the philosophy, but rather to see if what I did would be most helpful, so that the Federal dollar spent would result in the greatest amount of good, and because of my intimate knowledge of Wyoming—as would be true of any other Governor of a State—I was able to call the attention of the Office of Economic Opportunity to certain conditions I thought were important. Had it not been for my exercising the veto that was then vested in me I am certain that some Federal funds would have been wasted.

First, I felt in the establishment of a Job Corps camp in Wyoming, it was important that the camp had the support of a majority of the people in the city which was adjacent or contiguous to that Job Corps camp.

I polled the city of Casper, Wyo., by talking to the mayor, the city council, the county commissioners, and the school people to find out if they were receptive to the idea. After I found that they were I gave my endorsement to the idea.

At another time a camp was proposed in Jeffrey City, Wyo., and I said that a Job Corps camp should not be placed there.

My reasons were, despite the fact a number of people were there and there was a post office present in that little town, it was a town established by a mining corporation and there were no civil officials as would be found in the average city. Without any police protection or any kind of civil authority being exercised, I felt it would not be proper to establish a Job Corps camp in that area.

I suggest that no one knows better than the Governor of the State the specific conditions which may determine the effectiveness with which a program can be implemented, or some of the pitfalls likely to overtake it. For those reasons, I support the amendment of the Senator from California because, it seems to me, it makes good sense to bring to bear the most precise knowledge we can obtain in each of these areas as we attempt to implement Federal programs and spend Federal dollars.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I have been deluged with telegrams and letters in opposition to the amendment dealing with the Governor's veto. Many of them come from the State of California, by the way.

Mr. MURPHY. If the Senator will forgive this interjection, I am very certain that he has received many from California. I venture to say that I can almost guess the names of some of those who sent them, and I can almost tell the Senator what they say.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. They are from some of the Senator's very best friends.

Mr. MURPHY. I know a great deal about this problem in California. I have been at it for 20 years now and I know exactly what they have in mind.

Let me assure the distinguished Senator from New Jersey that I would not be putting the Senate and the visitors in the gallery through the discomfiture, if I did not think this was extremely important.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I will say that these letters and telegrams represent a broad geographical expression of opinion. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegrams and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SYNOD OF CALIFORNIA, SOUTHERN
AREA, THE UNITED PRESBYTERIAN
CHURCH IN THE U.S.A.,
Los Angeles, Calif., September 28, 1967.

Subject: Amendment to title IIIB, migrant section, OEO Act.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: It is my understanding that an amendment to the OEO Act has been introduced by Senator Murphy with regard to Title IIIB, the Migrant Section. Evidently this amendment would give individual state governor's full veto power over OEO programs related to migrant workers within the boundaries of their states.

I am writing in opposition to such an amendment and urge that you do all that is possible to prevent its adoption.

The United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. called upon its constituents in 1965 to "recognize poverty as a problem which evokes repentance and renewed Christian commitment by . . . continuing all necessary ministries of symptomatic relief while concentrating on the discovery and eradication of the causes of poverty; . . . insisting that the poor themselves be drawn into decision-making participation in the shaping of their destiny, which is none other than our common destiny . . ."

My information indicates that the OEO programs related to migrant workers are indeed trying to give symptomatic relief while researching root causes of poverty and that this is being done with full participation of the poor themselves. Accordingly, they have my support and encouragement although I recognize that any innovative programs will have some failures and create some antagonism.

My belief is that poverty is a national problem and that migrant poverty is, if not national, at least inter-state in scope. For this reason, I believe that full consideration should be given to the views of individual state governors but that they should not have absolute control over the life and death of basic remedial programs which have been deemed essential for the health of the nation by the collective wisdom of Congress.

I am contacting other persons within our denomination on this matter in the hope that they might personally become involved in this issue which I consider vital to the rural poor, not only in California but in other states as well.

Sincerely,

Robert F. Hermanson,
Associate Executive Secretary.

Princeton University,
Princeton, N.J., September 29, 1967.

Senator Harrison Williams,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Williams: I have been informed recently that Senator Murphy of California is proposing an amendment to the OEO statute concerning migrant labor which would permit a veto or suspension of programs in a given state when the governor disagreed with it. Although I have not had the opportunity to read the amendment, if the description I have had is accurate, then I want to register strong disapproval.

During the last nine months I have become familiar with some of the problems of migrant labor as a result of being on Governor Hughes' Task Force on Migrant Farm Labor. I think the work done by OEO has a great potential to help migrant workers, and I should regret it greatly if some uncooperative governor in any state should decide to delay a project. For delay often means the demise of these projects, as we have all observed. I can see no good that the amendment would achieve, and I visualize much harm instead. A little more compassion for the plight of these people rather than building roadblocks against aid to them seems to be in order.

Sincerely yours,

W. Duane Lockard,
Vice Chairman, Governor's Task Force on Migrant Farm Labor (New Jersey).

San Antonio, Tex.,
October 2, 1967.

Senator Harrison Williams, Jr.,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

This is no time to undercut the migrant division of the Office of Economic Opportunity. I therefore oppose most vigorously the amendment offered by Senator George Murphy giving governors veto power over migrant programs please oppose this amendment with your usual effectiveness.

Robert E. Lucey,
Archbishop of San Antonio.

Golden, Colo.,
September 29, 1967.

Senator Harrison A. Williams,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly urge defeat of Murphy amendment giving State Governors veto power over section 111(b) proposals for OEO programs. Workers are from many States across the Nation. I recommend administration nationally and regionally for more uniformity of OEO programs according to need. Cannot condone situation in some States where OEO programs would be politically segregated by decision of Governor.

Rev. Jack H. Alford,
National Council of Churches.

San Francisco, Calif.,
September 30, 1967.

Senator Harrison Williams,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Honorable Senator: We vigorously oppose the Murphy amendment which would give Governor the power of veto over OEO programs for migrant workers. We encourage you to do all within your power to oppose this measure.

Sincerely,

John F. McCarthy,
Acting Director, Western Regional Office of Bishops Committee for the Spanish Speaking.

San Antonio, Tex.,
September 29, 1967.

Senator Harrison Williams,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Senator: The Texas Bishops Committee for the Spanish speaking vigorously opposes the Murphy amendment giving veto power to Governor. Please oppose.

Rev. Patrick Flores,
State Chairman.

Berkeley Heights, N.J.,
October 2, 1967.

Senator Harrison A. Williams,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please be advised that the Consumer League of New Jersey stands in opposition to Senator Murphy's proposed amendment of title 3B of the Economic Opportunity Act.

John M. Stochaj,
Consumers League of New Jersey.

Visalia, Calif.,
September 28, 1967.

Senator Harrison Williams,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge opposition to OEO amendment to allow Governors veto of migrant programs. Programs need flexibility and freedom from political interference.

Herbert Foster, Jr.,
Agriculture Labor Representative, American Friends Service Committee.

San Antonio, Tex.,
September 29, 1967.

Senator Harrison Williams,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The National Bishops Committee for the Spanish Speaking opposes the amendment offered by Senator George Murphy placing veto power over migratory programs of OEO. Please oppose.

Rev. John McCarthy,
Executive Secretary.

Denver, Colo.,
September 29, 1967.

Senator Harrison Williams, Jr.,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Senator Murphy's amendment to OEO bill should be defeated giving a Governor the power of veto over OEO programs is not in the best interest of the people needing the program. Please do what you can to defeat the amendment.

Edward L. Whittemore,
Executive Secretary.
Jas. L. Selmser,
Director, Migrant Ministry.
Franklin P. Wherry,
Chairman, Social Action Department, Colorado Council of Churches.

Fair Lawn, N.J.,
October 2, 1967.

Senator Harrison A. Williams Jr.,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge negative vote, Governors veto over title 3B, Economic Opportunity Act. Regards progressive States.

Mrs. Lora Liss,
Member, Governor's Migrant Labor Task Force.

Lansing, Mich.,
September 29, 1967.

Senator Harrison Williams,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please oppose amendment to title 3B of Economic Opportunity Act which allows State Governors veto power over migrant poverty programs. Services for interstate people are easily dismissed by local opinion as responsibility of someone else.

Will Benallack,
Director,
Michigan Migrant Ministry.

Merced, Calif.,
September 28, 1967.

Hon. Harrison Williams,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I oppose amendment requiring the Governors signature on title III–B OEO programs because it delays the program.

Sara Gracia.

Merced, Calif.,
September 28, 1967.

Hon. Harrison Williams,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I oppose the amendment requiring Governors signatures on title III–B OEO program.

Mrs. Inez L. Valdez.

Merced, Calif.,
September 28, 1967.

Hon. Harrison Williams,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Please do all you can to defeat the amendment which would require the signature of the Governor on title III–B Office of Economic Opportunity project in many States. This amendment would stop many of the more meaningful projects for migrant and seasonal farm workers.

Mr. and Mrs. William H. Stockard.

San Francisco, Calif.,
September 30, 1967.

Senator Harrison Williams,
Washington, D.C.:

Centro Social Obrero, vigorously oppose the Murphy amendment which will give veto power to any Governor concerning migrant worker programs.

Centro Social Obrero

Mexican League of the Construction Workers of North America.

MERCED, CALIF.,
September 28, 1967.
Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: I am against the amendment proposed by Senator Murphy to title III–B migrant education. With such an amendment it would only delete or delay funds and programs for migrants.

DENARD W. DAVIS,
Coordinator, Adult Education, Merced County.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
September 30, 1967.
Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The Mission Economic Opportunity Council vigorously opposes the Murphy amendment which would give veto power to Governors over migrant worker programs.

Respectfully,
RAYMONJ R. ACOSTA,
Chairman, Mission Area Community Action Board.

MERCED, CALIF.,
September 28, 1967.
Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I have been associated with programs for migrant workers and I am opposed to the amendment which would require the Governor's signature to title IIIB OEO projects. This would cost undue delay in programs designed to help migrant farm workers. I feel that the Governor of California is not in sympathy with meaningful programs for migrant farm workers.

MARIA RODRIGUEZ,
Director, Planada Migrant Programs.

MERCED, CALIF.,
September 29, 1967.
Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SENATOR HARRISON WILLIAMS: I have worked in this program for 3 years. Migrants need this program very much. I oppose amendment requiring Government signature on title 3B OEO programs. I urge you to oppose defeat amendment will only cause delay of program.

DORA BUSTOS.

MERCED, CALIF.,
September 29, 1967.
Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge you to defeat the amendment title 3B OEO program. This program is very much needed in spite of opposed opinions. If not, it would only cause delay of program.

JUANS RAMIREZ.

MERCED, CALIF.,
September 29, 1967.
Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I oppose the amendment requiring Governors signature on title 3B OEO programs.

DELORES BENABIDEZ.

MERCED, CALIF.,
September 29, 1967.
Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS.

I oppose the amendment 3B OEO program for delay.

JUANITA MARTINEZ.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
September 29, 1967.
Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Reagan veto prerogative over California OEO 3B programs disastrous. Farm workers urge opposition Murphy amendment.

RALPH KENNEDY,
President, Los Angeles Presbyterian Interracial Council.

MIAMI, FLA.,
September 28, 1967.
Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I oppose the placing of title 3B under Governor veto.

WILLIAM BLACK.

LANSING, MICH.,
September 29, 1967.
Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We vigorously oppose any amendment in title 3B which would give to governors veto power over the OEO migrant program. Many governors, including Michigan, have demonstrated little concern for migrant workers and are likely to prevent much needed programs for these disadvantaged people.

MIDWEST OFFICE BISHOPS COMMITTEE FOR SPANISH SPEAKING AND LANSING DIOCESAN MIGRANT APOSTOLATE.

MERCED, CALIF.,
September 29, 1967.
Hon. HARRISON WILLIAMS,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

This program is in great need for the migrant and seasonal workers. I oppose and urge you to defeat the amendment requiring Governor's signature on title 3b OEO program. It will only cause delay of EOC program.

MRS. VERA SALEIDO.

MERCED, CALIF.,
September 28, 1967.
Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
Washington, D.C.:

I oppose the amendment requiring governor's signature on title III–B O.E.O. programs.

SAMUEL VLADIMIRSKY,
Director-Teacher, Planada Migrant Child-Care Center.

MERCED, CALIF.,
September 29, 1967.
Hon. HARRISON WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge you defeat amendment title 3B OEO. Migrants seasonal workers need this program in spite of opposed opinions. If not this will cause program delay.

FLORA R. MARTINEZ.

HANFORD, CALIF.,
September 29, 1967.
Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly oppose EOA rider sponsored by Senator George Murphy to provide Governors' veto power over Title III–B projects. Believe this power would prevent many good programs from proving themselves.

JERALD L. WEBSTER,
Executive Director, Kings County Community Action Organization.

LANTANA, FLA.,
September 28, 1967.
Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge Senate reject Senator Murphy's amendment to OEO appropriation OB bill allowing Governor's Veto title 3B.

FLORIDA COUNCIL OF CHAPTERS, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SOCIAL WORKERS.

MIAMI, FLA.,
September 28, 1967.
Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge against placing 3B under Governor's veto.

AUGUST VANDENBOSCHE,
Coordinating Committee for Farmworkers.

VISALIA, CALIF.,
September 28, 1967.
Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We appreciate support you have given self help housing programs. Feel it would be a mistake to provide for Governor's veto in the OEO bill to title III–B programs as recently proposed by Senator Murphy. This could impede the development and expansion of this and other worthwhile programs to migrant and seasonal farm workers.

ROBERT MARSHALL,
Executive Director.

COATESVILLE, PA.,
October 2, 1967.
Hon. HARRISON WILLIAMS,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Migrants often ineligible state benefits. Title III funds should not be under Governors' veto.

CHARLES S. HEARNE,
President, Chester County Migrant Commission.

KENNETT SQUARE, PA.,
September 28, 1967.
Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS, Jr.,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Object to placing title 3 OEO Act under Governors' veto.

ALAN HARDY,
RITA HARDY,
ALICE MOULTON,
HENRIETTA SHOLARS,
ALLEN CROMMER,
JAMES HORGAN.

MERCED, CALIF.,
September 29, 1967.
Hon. HARRISON WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Please do all you can to defeat the amendment which would require the signature of the Governor on title 3b Office of Economic Opportunity project. This amendment would stop many of the more meaningful projects for migrant and seasonal farm workers.

ROBERT W. JONES,
Central Labor Council AFL–CIO.

TRENTON, N.J.,
October 1, 1967.
Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Wish to express strong opposition to amendment proposed to title 3B.

DR. PAUL T. WILLIAMS.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD some tables on Governors' vetoes which were prepared by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNORS' VETOES

Grantee	Funds and OEO approval	Governor's action	OEO action (or further action by Governor)
		REGION III	
Alabama (9):			
New York Grant No. 8443, National Sharecroppers Fund, Inc., New York, N.Y.	$229,767 (jointly with Georgia), training-technical assistant, Dec. 21, 1966.	Vetoed Jan. 9, 1967, by Gov. George Wallace. Veto sustained Mar. 13, 1967, by Gov. Lurleen Wallace.	Pending decision (as of Mar. 29, 1967). Decision not to override per letter, May 8, 1967.
Grant No. 3037–A/O, Mobile Area Community, Action Committee, Mobile, Ala.	$43,519, program development, May 14, 1966.	Vetoed June 17, 1966	Resubmitted Oct. 3, 1966. 30-day waiting period passed without signature or veto. Funded.
Grant No. 3453, Antipoverty Coordinating Committee, SCLC, Inc., Wilcox County, Ala.	$123,282, summer Headstart	Vetoed	Sustained.
Grant No. CG–8798–A/O, Wilcox County, Ala.	$180,152, emergency family loan	Vetoed Aug. 7, 1967	Pending.
Grant No. 3250, St. Clair Child Development Program, St. Clair County, Ala. (Ashville).	$47,790, summer Headstart, May 26, 1966.	Vetoed June 30, 1966	Overridden Aug. 12, 1966.
Same program vetoed this year	$57,000	Vetoed June 1967	Overridden July 1967.
Grant No. 657, Birmingham Area Committee for Development of Economic Opportunities, Inc., Birmingham, Ala.	$66,349, program development, Apr. 13, 1965.	Vetoed May 7, 1965	Sustained.
Grant No. 464, Elk River Development Council, Fayetteville, Tenn.	Program development for 9-county area but Limestone County only one in Alabama.	Vetoed Alabama portion Apr. 23, 1965	Sustained. (There was no veto of Tennessee portion.)
Grant No. 706–A/10, Huntsville Madison County Community Action Committee, Huntsville, Ala., community organization and training.	$48,565, approved Mar. 15, 1967, people-for-people program.	Vetoed Apr. 28, 1967	Withdrawn.
Grant No. 8881–A, Southwest Alabama Farmers Cooperative Association (SWAFCA), farmers' cooperative, Selma, Ala.	$399,967, demonstration grant, May 11, 1967.	Vetoed June 8, 1967	Overridden.
Florida (3):			
Grant No. 119, Economic Opportunity Program, Inc., Miami.	$957,503, child development program, day care.	Vetoed	Governor withdrew veto May 9, 1967.
Grant No. 3035, Economic Opportunity Council, Inc., Tampa.	$203,882, Headstart, day care	do	Do.
Do	$1,133,383, full year, Headstart	do	Do.
Mississippi (1): Grant No. 3155–A/1, Southwest Mississippi Opportunity, Inc., Woodville.	$713,300, Headstart, Oct. 7, 1966	Vetoed Nov. 1, 1966	Overridden Nov. 16, 1966.
South Carolina (1): Grant No. 316, Council of Southern Mountains, Berea, Ky.	$252,119 to 9 States, sec. 206	Declined South Carolina's participation Mar. 15, 1965.	Sustained. (Continues in other 8 States.)
		REGION IV	
Indiana (1): Grant No. 343, Indiana Office of Economic Opportunity, Indianapolis.	$72,000, refunding application for State technical assistance (sec. 209) (grant was never sent to Governor so this is actually not a veto).	Withdrawn February 1967 and STA closed by Governor.	Sustained by regional office.
		REGION V	
Louisiana (2):			
Grant No. 5103 (St. Mary's Parish), Southern Consumer Education Foundation, Lafayette.	Full-year Headstart	Vetoed June 6, 1966	Governor rescinded his veto June 6, 1966.
Grant No. CG–5103–A–3 (St. Mary's Parish), Southern Consumer Education Foundation, Lafayette.	do	Vetoed June 1967	Pending (?).
		REGION VI	
Missouri (1): Grant No. 8825, St. Louis Human Development Corp., St. Louis.	$346,000, technical assistance (206), Feb. 17, 1967.	Vetoed Mar. 6, 1967	Resubmitted Mar. 16, 1967, for training portion only. Governor approved by letter Mar. 24.
North Dakota (2):			
Grant No. 6315, Legal Aid Society of North Dakota, Bismarck.	$292,385, legal services, Apr. 25, 1966	Vetoed May 13, 1966	Sustained.
Grant No. 776/2, Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa Indians, Belcourt.	$40,226, legal services	Vetoed May 23, 1966	Do.
Wyoming (1): Grant No. 6261, county of Natrona opportunity development, Casper.	$24,816	Vetoed Apr. 1, 1966	Do.
California (8):			
Grant No. 8837–A/O, California Center for Community Development, Del Rey.	$109,520, demonstration grant (207) funded.	Vetoed Mar. 30, 1967	Partial override to reimburse grantee for operating expenses incurred during Governor's consideration.
Grant No. CG–6764–A/O, Yolo County Emergency Migrant Loan Program, Economic Opportunity Committee of Yolo County.	$15,000, emergency loan funded, July 11, 1967.	Vetoed Aug. 11, 1967	OEO action under consideration.
Grant No. CG–7167–A/O, Alameda County Legal Aid Society.	$32,314, on-campus legal services funded July 20.	Vetoed Aug. 23, 1967	Objections presently being reviewed with Governor's office.
Grant No. CG–0656–B/4, Community Action Council of San Joaquin County.	$69,911, adult basic education	do	OEO action under consideration.
Grant No. OG–0629–B/6, Solano Economic Opportunity Commission.	$92,992, legal services	Vetoed July 6, 1967	Veto verbally withdrawn by Governor's office; withdrawal not as yet confirmed.
Grant No. BWPM–7–7234–05, Ventura County Community Action Commission.	$63,270, job placement (U.S. Department of Labor program).	do	OEO action under consideration.
OEO contract (part) No. 4110, May 11, 1967, Los Angeles Neighborhood Legal Services Society.	12 VISTA volunteers	Vetoed July 5, 1967	Veto sustained.
Grant No. CG–705–B/7, Economic Opportunity Commission of San Diego County, Inc.	$13,074, neighborhood service center	Carbon copy, Governor's letter of Aug. 21, 1967, recommending disapproval received by regional office. Governor announced veto at subsequent press conference.	Awaiting official action by Governor.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Texas such time as he may require.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas will state it.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. How much time does the distinguished Senator from New Jersey have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would advise the Senator from Texas that the Senator from New Jersey has 20 minutes remaining.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. As much time as the distinguished Senator needs, he has.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, the provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act affecting migratory labor are among the most important in the act. Much more must be done in this area, and programs should not be unnecessarily hindered by the adoption of an amendment which would add the Governor's veto to title III(b) programs. More than 7½ million Americans in many States are affected by this provision, for it seeks to give assistance to the families as well as to the workers involved in migratory and seasonal farm labor.

Presently the Office of Economic Opportunity programs have reached fewer than 2 percent of the migrants. Our future programs should reach more migrants with aid particularly in three areas. Housing remains a continuing and degrading problem among migrants. Education must be increased for both adults and youth so that they can prepare themselves adequately for their futures. And day-care assistance must be used to prevent even worse deficiencies among the children left unattended while the rest of the family must labor in the field.

Persons trapped in this means of employment have long suffered inattention in many States. State governments have certainly not been leaders in developing programs for their assistance. Now that the Federal Government has taken the initiative, it would be counter to the basic objectives of the war on poverty, and this act, to place the migrants' fate again in the hands of the Governor.

This is an important question for State government as well. Where there is direct Federal activity, such as the VISTA program, the consent requirement may be justified. It does not transfer to the Governor control over any matter normally assigned elsewhere in State law.

But many types of migrant assistance will count on programs using local agencies and organizations. These local organizations want to help, despite the State government's opposition—this has been true in my State, Mr. President—and they are the key to a comprehensive attack on this problem. Under State law, the Governor would normally have no direct control over such local programs and he would not be expected to be directly responsible for them. This amendment would give him that control and would, therefore, confer more power over a federally assisted program than the Governor enjoys with respect to State action.

In addition to opposing such an amendment in principle, I oppose it because of the way such veto power has operated in practice. It can provide a license for abuse and harassment of programs.

I believe that the Senator from New Jersey has already placed in the RECORD the tables regarding the Governors' vetoes; is that not correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Yes. Let me mention that Alabama had 10 vetoes and California eight. It runs through seven other States.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I believe that California had 60 percent of the vetoes; is that not true? Or is it true that California and Alabama combined account for 60 percent of the vetoes?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The Senator's latter statement is correct.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. And seven more vetoes are pending in California now?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. That is correct. I will say that these are recent figures. I think we can name the Governors: Mrs. Lurleen Wallace, of Alabama, and Governor Reagan, of California, were the vetoers.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield for a question?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from California, provided the time is taken out of the time of the proponents of the amendment.

Mr. MURPHY. Just 10 seconds. I should like the RECORD to show that insofar as I can ascertain, there has been no collusion between the Governor of California and the Governor of Alabama.

Mr. CLARK. There will be next year, though. [Laughter.]

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, to continue, frequent letters from my own State have indicated that the hindering effects of the politically motivated activities of the Governors under their veto power are in contradiction to our purpose in this act to move forward. Even when not overtly exercised, the veto power has great coercive force. Under threat of veto, program content can be altered, friends can be appointed to projects, enemies of the Governor can be forced to resign, and seemingly endless frustrations and delays can be caused. The main argument for adding veto power to title III(b) is that similar veto power is included in other parts of the act. But if we look at the effect veto power has had on operation of other parts of the act, then one can see precisely why it should be opposed.

In discussions about this amendment, the comment is sometimes made that without veto power under title III(b), programs that were vetoed elsewhere can be resubmitted through this loophole. I would be against any clever reworking of a program merely to sneak it through. But I am even more opposed to the clever ways that a Governor would be able to use this veto power, with all its coercive potential, to render ineffective our plans and attempts to provide this much needed assistance to migrants.

Mr. President, in closing, let me say to the Senator from California that I sympathize with the problems of the tomato growers in California.

Tomatoes are grown in my State also, as the Senator knows. But it is a crop which comes on later than in California, and our plants were placed in the ground just before Hurricane Beulah hit. The crop was utterly destroyed. Now our workers are unemployed.

Last Friday, I addressed a letter to Secretary of Labor Wirtz, requesting that we get some transportation to California for the tomato and farm workers in my State so that they could help to harvest the crops in California. My letter is printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Friday, September 29, on page 27384.

I call the attention of the distinguished Senator from California again, in answer to his plea for the admission of workers from other countries, that he does not have to go to other nations for his help, that Texas is ready, able, and willing to go to work and help to harvest the California crop, if a means of transportation for them can be found.

I thank the Senator from New Jersey for yielding to me at this time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I certainly appreciate the forceful statement of the Senator from Texas. I do want to say this which I overlooked in response to the Senator from California: there was a title II program which had application in California by the CCCD. Is that correct?

Mr. MURPHY. According to my information, yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. What do those initials stand for?

Mr. MURPHY. California Center for Community Development.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. That was the program, under title II, that was vetoed by Governor Reagan?

Mr. MURPHY. Yes; a refunding grant was vetoed. Then another organization applied for the program, and it was called CCAA.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. That was for adult education. Is that correct?

Mr. MURPHY. Basically; yes. I have not been able to find out exactly what it is.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. That came under title III, which does not carry a veto by the Governor as of this date.

Mr. MURPHY. That is right. It proposed to have the same directors, which made me believe that there was a capability provided to circumvent the provisions of the other part of the Act.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. That is why I raised this question, because I knew this was in the Senator's prepared remarks. I had a check run on the board of directors of the first organization and the board of directors of the second organization, and there was only one man who was on both the first and the second.

Mr. MURPHY. That was a new board of directors. The original board of directors of the second organization was changed and a new board was appointed.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The first project was an application for $109,000, as I recall.

Mr. MURPHY. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The adult education program under title III was for about $1.5 million.

Mr. MURPHY. It was $1.5 million.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California does not have the floor. The Senator from New Jersey has.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Oregon has asked for time, and I would like to yield to him at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. What we need and what we have.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, as floor manager of the bill, I yield 3 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that the Senator from California and I have been together on almost all farm migratory problems. Last year a series of amendments sponsored by the Senator from California and other Senators on the Labor and Public Welfare Committee were adopted, after a considerable amount of opposition. But on this one I cannot join the Senator from California, because I have always opposed the Governor's veto power under the legislation and I oppose its extension in this case.

I do not think we can have a program that involves national problems such as are involved in the migratory work program and then segmentize the program.

The bracero program, in the first instance—which I have always defended—came out of my Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs of the Foreign Relations Committee. I thought we made a great mistake when it was abolished. I opposed its abolition.

As the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] knows, he was on the other side of that one, as he was last year on the migratory labor amendments I offered in committee.

I think it is a mistake to give Governors the veto power. I opposed it in the original bill. I oppose it today. I speak respectfully, but I speak in disagreement with the policies of the Governor of California as announced in a Associated Press dispatch of October 3. I recognize his reasons for doing it, but I do not think they justify the course of action he took. The dispatch reads as follows:

> Over the objections of organized labor, California convicts were out in orchards plucking figs to avert what Gov. Ronald Reagan said would be a disaster for growers.
>
> Last week the Governor authorized the use of about 200 prisoners from the minimum-security Deuel Vocational Institution at nearby Tracy to lend a hand in harvesting the ripe fig crop. The men are being paid prevailing wages. Thomas Pitts, secretary-treasurer of the California Federation of Labor, AFL–CIO, protested the action. He contended growers hadn't made full efforts to find domestic help.

I think there is a clear duty to do what can be done to provide the workers to meet crop labor emergencies. It has been done in most instances, as far as I know. I do not think that a Governor, instead of going along with a program, would have the power to veto it and then resort to convict labor, is very desirable. It is likely to create more tension between the growers and labor than already exists. I think it is completely unacceptable to do that. I do not believe in this veto power being given to the Governors. I believe in making the Federal program work and in adopting whatever reforms are necessary to make it work, but not by giving the Governors veto power.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for 1 additional minute.

Mr. CLARK. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. A Governor, by utilizing the veto power could have a bad effect on the national program and on national legislation. I do not think we should segmentize it that way.

I wish to place in the RECORD at this time statistics in regard to Governors' vetoes. We have found, for example, that in the community action program, there were 10 vetoes out of Alabama, eight out of California, and three out of Florida out of a total of 30 vetoes.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire material be printed in the RECORD at this point. Time does not permit me to go into detail, but it illustrates the point of the Senator from Oregon's argument that to give power to individual Governors to exercise a veto can jeopardize the entire program.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNORS' VETOES

I. Community Action Program: 30 Vetoes out of over 16,600 grants; of these, 9 were sustained; 4 were overridden in whole and 1 was overridden in part; 2 were accepted as resubmitted; 6 went forward due to the veto being withdrawn or rescinded; 1 was an imperfect veto not recognized by OEO; and 7 are still pending (6 in California). Thus, of the 30 vetoes, 23 have reached final disposition, and of these 23, only 5 were overridden and 8 programs have gone forward without use of the override (besides the one imperfect veto).

The CAP vetoes occurred in these States:

Alabama	10
California	8
Florida	3
Louisiana	2
North Dakota	2
Mississippi	1
Kentucky	1
Indiana	1
Missouri	1
Wyoming	1
Total	30

Thus, Alabama accounts for 33⅓% of all CAP vetoes, and Alabama and California together account for 60%. Four Deep South States (Alabama, Florida, Mississippi and Louisiana) account for over 50%. Those four plus California account for 80%. All CAP vetoes have occurred in 20% of the States (10 of 50) in 80% of all States, there have been no CAP vetoes.

II. VISTA: There have been 2 VISTA vetoes, one in Mississippi, and one partial veto of a 5-State project under OEO Contract #4110: California and Ohio refused participation in a VISTA Associates project (N.Y., N.J., and Pa. accepted). VISTA vetoes are not subject to override. There are currently 420 VISTA Projects.

III. NYC: There have been 2 NYC vetoes, both in 1965 prior to the override authority, one in Texas and one in Montana—as far as we know.

IV. Job Corps: No Job Corps Center has ever been vetoed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MORSE. I ask for 1 additional minute.

Mr. CLARK. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I do not want to see extended this afternoon the veto power of Governors over such programs, and I shall vote against the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I reserve the balance of my time for the time being.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, how much time does the Senator have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania has 5 minutes remaining on his side, and the Senator from California has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I wish to point out to my distinguished friend from Oregon—and I find myself uncomfortable to find him in opposition to me on this, because I generally agree with him wholeheartedly on this—that the amendment I am presenting here really has nothing to do with convict labor in the fields of California to meet an emergency.

If I recall correctly, it was only a year ago that the then Democratic Governor of California suggested the use of convict labor. I do not recall that Mr. Pitts made any loud objection at that time.

I do not favor convict labor. I spoke out at that time. I do not think it is right. But there are many times when farmers face an emergency, when their crops are rotting in the fields. That is an emergency equivalent to that of a house burning down. Those crops have to be gotten out. It must be done quickly. Sometimes things are done which should not be done. Knowing the Governor of California and having been involved in labor organizations over the last 25 years, I know this goes against his beliefs. But, as Governor of a State, he must put the interests of the entire State first, and the desires of organized labor second.

I yield now to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much times does the Senator yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. MURPHY. Five minutes.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I should like to direct an inquiry to the sponsor of the amendment, so that I can be sure I understand it.

The impression may have gone forth, based on some of the remarks that have been made, that the amendment of the Senator from California will give the Governors of the States an absolute veto over projects under title III.

I am aware of the fact that the veto under title I and title II is a very limited veto, which can be overridden by Sargent Shriver, the Director of the poverty program.

The Senator from Oregon referred to a number of instances where Governors' vetoes have been exercised. I would assume that in every one of those cases, Sargent Shriver could have or did override the veto of the Governor in those situations, if he believed the Governor did not have good reason to exercise the veto.

I ask the Senator from California whether or not his amendment would be consistent with the limited veto power that is now available under title I and title II, and whether or not Sargent Shriver, the director of the poverty program, could override the Governor's veto if he believed it was without justification.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, my distinguished friend from Michigan has made an excellent point, and has cleared up what might have been a misunderstanding.

The veto provided in this amendment is a limited veto, conferring exactly the same power, under exactly the same definition, as the vetoes which exist in the other parts of the program.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Then there is no arbitrary right of the Governor to kill a program, or discriminate against it because of racial motives, for example?

Mr. MURPHY. None whatever.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Reference has been made to Governor Wallace of Alabama.

The impression may have been left that it might have something to do with race if there were a veto exercised by a Governor. In a situation where that might be the case, is my understanding correct that Sargent Shriver could override such a veto?

Mr. MURPHY. The Senator is correct; he could override the veto. Actually, the Governor's veto is not a veto at all. It merely provides an opportunity for him to object. Sargent Shriver has the right at all times to override the veto.

Mr. GRIFFIN. The Senator has correctly stated that it is not a veto at all. That is not even an appropriate name for it. All the Governor can do is say, in effect, "Just a second, here, let us take a look at this; if you want to override my veto, that is your privilege, but here are things I see wrong with it as Governor of the State"; is that correct?

Mr. MURPHY. That is exactly correct.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURPHY. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield?

Mr. MURPHY. Three minutes.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I support the amendment of the Senator from California, because I feel that it brings a better balance to this important program. I know that every Senator who has spoken today has a desire to assist in bringing about better coordination between the Federal and State Governments. I also know, from having had experience with OEO programs subject to the Governor's veto—although it was a full veto and not a limited veto at that time—that with it the program had greater flexibility. The veto gave the Governor a meaningful say in programs vitally affecting his State. The Governors of most States have migratory labor committees or commissions that they work with, consequently, a veto authority would assure his local committee the opportunity to investigate any migratory programs to effect their improvement.

We all realize that no Governor is going to take an action that is detrimental to the people involved, nor an action that is detrimental to the voters, if he can avoid doing so.

Therefore, I emphasize that this is an amendment that will bring about the balance so badly needed. I think having the matter arbitrarily determined by a Federal official is not in the best interests of the migratory worker. This is a good amendment, and should have the support of my fellow Senators.

Mr. MURPHY. I thank my distinguished friend from Arizona. I am certain that the position of the Governor as he has stated it is generally the case. There may be instances, in some States, where Governors, Senators, and Congressmen do not always see eye to eye. But I think in the overall picture, it should be a matter for the decision of the voters of those States who is right and who is wrong, and I do not think we should write legislation in this Chamber to take care of one or two particular instances. I think rather we should write it with the idea of the general good and the general performance.

I point out, Mr. President, that one of the vetoes the Governor of California exercised had to do with a project in which there were 17 workers, 17 poor people to be benefited, and seven supervisors were assigned to the project—seven supervisors to look after 17 workers. The Governor of California vetoed that project, and I think quite rightly; and I am sure that, after he brought the matter to the attention of Sargent Shriver, he did not insist on overriding the veto.

I yield now to the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield?

Mr. MURPHY. How much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. MURPHY. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I support the amendment offered by the Senator from California. I do so because I believe the adoption of it will insure a better and more efficient administration of the entire program.

Written into the act already is the right of the Governor of a State to express his opinion about the merits of a proposal coming out of the office of Sargent Shriver. With reference to two of the titles, the right of the Governor to express himself as the chief of his State is already in the law.

The amendment of the Senator from California contemplates giving to the Governor the right of expressing himself on the merits of a proposal with respect to title III, as he has the right to do with respect to title I.

Mr. President, why should the Governor of a State, chosen by the people, living within it, not have the right to express himself on the merits of a proposal made by the Federal Government in the administration of this program? Should he not at least be accorded the dignity of saying, "I believe this program is good" or "I believe it is bad"? That is all he can do, as has been pointed out by the Senator from Michigan. He has no absolute power of veto. All he can do is express an opinion. Sargent Shriver thereafter can finally say, "My judgment shall prevail; the Governor's judgment shall be cast aside. This program must be adopted, whether the State wants it or does not want it."

Are we to adopt a policy of placing tyrannical and absolute powers over the States, without the right of their Governors to complain? I do not think it should be done. Governors have a great responsibility. I assume that they will act with integrity. If they do not, Sargent Shriver, sitting here in Washington, can say, "I reject your thinking; your State must accept this program whether you want it or not."

I commend the Senator from California for sponsoring this amendment.

Mr. MURPHY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

I point out that at the outset, when this program was first instituted, it is my understanding that it contained an absolute Governor's veto. I ask my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania to correct me if I am wrong. The next time it came around for action, the veto was taken out.

One of the weaknesses of the program has been its unpopularity, its lack of acceptance in local situations. Were I in Sargent Shriver's position today, I would recommend this veto. He has done it in the other areas of the act. Were I in his position, I would recommend it today, because it would give me a reflection of the feelings of local groups and the feelings of the elected representatives of the people of a given area. It would give me a chance to further ascertain whether or not the judgment of the people setting up the program was, in the final analysis, in the best interests of the poor who are supposed to be helped, the poor who are supposed to be getting the benefits from these tremendous amounts of money we in the Senate have voted to expend.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may I have 1 minute?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Oregon. Then I reserve the remainder of my time for myself.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, very briefly, in answer to the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from California, what we sought to do in the first place was to get arrangements whereby the Governors could make known or have an opportunity to make known to Mr. Shriver their views in regard to a project. We did not try to give them the so-called veto power because the veto power does provide for another step in the administration where a review commission is set up to determine whether a veto should stand.

What has happened is that too many times this has been used for a political battleground. We have a Federal policy and a Governor is politically against the administration of the whole program. So he capitalizes on it politically. That provision ought to be removed from the program.

I said when we were fighting the veto battle in the first place that I was for a program whereby a Governor would be given an opportunity to make known his view to Mr. Shriver.

But I do not think it ought to be done through the procedure of a veto to require a veto commission to have the Governor overruled on the recommendations. That is where politics enters, and we ought to keep all politics out.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President the committee has wrestled with this problem of the Governor's veto now for the better part of 3 years. It is a very controversial subject, and the importance of the veto varies to a certain extent with the nature of the program.

The Murphy amendment is very restricted in that it applies only to migratory labor projects under title III(b) of the pending bill.

This in turn affects migratory labor programs in about 30 States. There are only about three States in which this has occurred. They are California, Alabama, and Florida.

The difficulty with accepting the amendment is that it throws the whole migratory labor problem right into the middle of partisan politics, because those Governors who are opposed to any reasonable regulation of migratory labor practices within the States are the very ones who want this veto.

It is for that reason that the committee felt it was unwise to change the present situation as it concerns the veto with respect to the migratory labor problem.

If we were able to handle the situation in Alabama, California, and Florida, there would be no problem. However, the fact of the matter is that the Governors of those States are not receptive to modern working conditions, such as wages and the like, for migratory labor. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], as chairman of the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has told me that this amendment would be very difficult for those who would like to see the working conditions of migratory labor improve. I believe him.

I therefore hope that the amendment will be rejected.

I think the Senator from California has made a pretty good legal argument. However, the fact of the matter is that the amendment will be defeated because migratory labor, in at least those three States, would be prejudiced.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, do I have any time remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that the Senator from California has no time remaining.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from California may have as much time as he desires.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, how much time will that be?

Mr. MURPHY. Three minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, recently in the Senate Chamber I successfully restored a temporary housing project which had been taken out of the OEO. It had strong support of the State of California.

It is a housing project which our committee visited. We looked at this housing project. However, the OEO, being 3,000 miles away, had taken it out.

I believe we all concurred that it was an excellent project.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from California and I just put it back in again.

Mr. MURPHY. That was the exact point of my argument.

There is no absolute veto here. This merely gives a Governor a chance to point out matters with respect to a project.

This project with 17 people certainly should not have seven supervisors. The Governor wants the chance to point out that it is a waste of the taxpayers' money to put this money into administration and into all sorts of programs with which we are not familiar. That is the only reason I put the provision in.

I know that it is not an absolute veto. It is merely a procedure by which the Governor can say, "Well, look, Mr. Shriver. I don't think this is in our best interest."

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I think we are about out of time. I suggest that we vote. The persuasive argument of the Senator from California has not persuaded me.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, is there any more time remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no time remaining.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Arizona may have 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Senator from Arizona is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I merely want to correct an impression that perhaps was given when the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania was discussing the wages paid farmers in California. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that it is a low wage scale?

Mr. CLARK. I think the Senator misunderstood me. What I intended to say was that California, Alabama, and Florida are States in which, if we give the Governors even a qualified veto, we will not get much in the way of favorable treatment of working conditions and other conditions for migratory labor that we have tried to achieve in 30 States.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I think the Senator realizes that California, from the standpoint of competitive conditions, has the highest farm labor wage rates in the Nation.

When I was Governor of Arizona, the minimum wage for the country went to $1.40 an hour, while Texas was paying $0.75.

Mr. CLARK. I have no basis for disagreeing with the statement of the Senator from Arizona about the wages in California. I only add that California has one of the most unusual Governors among the 50 States.

Mr. FANNIN. That is the opinion of the Senator. I would not agree with the Senator on that. I think Governor Reagan is one of the outstanding Governors in the United States.

Mr. CLARK. I think the word "unusual" is quite complimentary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having expired, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from California. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum for not to exceed 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, with one possible exception, there be a time limitation of 30 minutes on each amendment, the time to be equally divided between the Senator who offers the amendment and the floor manager of the bill, the agreement to begin after the conclusion of the vote on the pending amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator restate that?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that there be a time limitation on each amendment of 30 minutes, the time to be equally divided between the Senator who offers the amendment and the floor manager of the bill, with one exception which we are still working out.

Mr. CLARK. That means 15 minutes to a side?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CLARK. I hope that if we agree to the unanimous-consent request the majority leader will, and I shall, be lenient with Senators who urge us to give them a minute or two more.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Of course.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCGOVERN in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from California. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HATFIELD (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE]. If he were present, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withhold my vote.

The assistant legislative clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and the Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Baker], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Brooke], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] are necessarily absent.

The pair of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Brooke] has been previously announced.

If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Baker], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 45, as follows:

[No. 278 Leg.]

YEAS—41

Aiken
Allott
Bennett
Boggs
Byrd, Va.
Carlson
Church
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Eastland
Fannin
Fong
Griffin
Hansen
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hollings
Hruska
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Lausche
McClellan
Miller
Mundt
Murphy
Pearson
Percy
Prouty
Scott
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Spong
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Williams, Del.

NAYS—45

Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Clark
Cooper
Dodd
Fulbright
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Muskie
Nelson
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Symington
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—14

Baker
Brooke
Ellender
Ervin
Gore
Hatfield
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Metcalf
Morton
Moss
Pastore
Russell
Tower

So Mr. Murphy's amendment was rejected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CLARK. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield 30 seconds to the Senator from Maryland.

SENATOR ROBERT C. BYRD, OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, an article entitled "West Virginia's Byrd Gains Key Role in Senate," published in this morning's Washington Post, describes the extraordinary energy, diligence, and devotion which our distinguished colleague, Senator Robert Byrd, of West Virginia, has applied to his important duties as assistant majority whip in the Senate and as chairman of the Subcommittee on District of Columbia Appropriations of the Committee on Appropriations. As the article points out:

> The indefatigable West Virginian never takes any job lightly and has an almost Victorian concept of "duty."

I commend this interesting article to the attention of my fellow Senators and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Hard Worker in Ascendancy: West Virginia's Byrd Gains Key Senate Role

(By Robert C. Albright)

Ever so quietly over a brief 9-month span, Sen. Robert C. Byrd (D-W.Va.), has emerged as the recognized though uncrowned deputy leader of the Senate.

The 49-year-old Byrd, in the Senate 9 years now, has converted his once comparatively minor Party post of Secretary of the Senate Democratic Conference into an assignment of major importance. Some already are saying the West Virginia conservative will be the man to beat for his Party's next top Senate leadership vacancy.

Byrd will be in the Senate limelight today, when the chamber debates his motion to kill a $2.8 billion emergency job program added to the anti-poverty bill by the Labor Committee. [For poverty bill developments, see Page A7.]

Byrd's gradual ascent to a leading role in the Senate was achieved by dint of long, lunchless working hours in constant Senate attendance and by full consultation and clearance with the chamber's two top Democratic leaders.

Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield (Mont.), has always welcomed help in his more wearing floor duties. Senate Majority Whip Russell B. Long (La.), No. 2 in command, continues free to step in to relieve Mansfield at any time, but generally yields the assist job to Byrd.

"Byrd is completely loyal to Mike and carries out all of his instructions to the letter," said one Party insider.

Byrd already has become in effect the man who runs the Senate during most of its 9 to 5 normal working hours. In the process he has become the man most fellow Democrats seek out to "protect their interests" and to perform the innumerable other big and small favors expected from a working floor leader.

As some put it, he's made himself "the indispensable man."

WON OUT OVER CLARK

Only last January, Byrd, a conservative on most issues, won out in the Senate Democratic caucus over Sen. Joseph S. Clark (D-Pa.), an outspoken liberal, for the post of conference secretary.

Seldom has a party job been more sharply contested, even though the No. 3 spot was not then regarded as a springboard for leadership and power. It was always potentially so, however, for the conference secretary along with the Party's top leaders are among the Capitol's select who have the ear of the President at the weekly White House legislative conferences.

Byrd's friends say that the indefatigable West Virginian never takes any job lightly and has an almost Victorian concept of "duty".

This has extended to the District Appropriations Subcommittee, which Byrd has headed for the last seven years.

Despite his ever-increasing duties in the Senate, this year he conducted the most detailed, line-by-line, hearings ever held on the city's budget. He has maintained his absolute control over the city's welfare policies, and has continued his strong interest in upgrading education in the District.

When Byrd was elected conference secretary, Mansfield already had four "assistant whips" from the moderate to liberal wing of the Party, ready to sit in for the leaders on a call or standby basis.

They were, and still are, Sens. Philip A. Hart (D-Mich.), Edmund S. Muskie (D-Me.), Daniel K. Inouye (D-Hawaii) and Daniel B. Brewster (D-Md.).

For a time after Byrd's election they offered to assist occasionally when and if the need arose. But with Byrd available on a virtually around-the-clock basis, they have ceased even to make the gesture.

During Mansfield's recent foreign relations study tour "around Asia's rim," Byrd functioned altogether as acting leader of the Senate for an unbroken ten days.

Nor does Byrd confine himself entirely to leadership routine. Last week when he moved to recommit the Senate Labor Committee's $5 billion antipoverty bill, with instruction to delete Clark's $2.8 billion emergency job program, it was clear that he reflected Administration wishes. He said he decided to make the motion on his own.

Before presenting his motion, however, he dutifully cleared it with Mansfield.

From the moment Byrd was elected he regarded his new job as a challenge, moved over to the Senate floor almost full time, and placed himself completely at the disposal of the leadership.

Byrd uses his mornings for office chores, and committee hearings, then generally takes over in the Senate at noon. He seldom leaves the chamber until it adjourns, anywhere from 5 p.m. to 7 p.m. Then he goes back to his office for more homework. He's usually the last man to leave the Capitol, after putting in a 12-hour day.

In his West Virginia "hill" philosophy, it takes a big man and hard work to make a big job out of a little job. Back home he applied himself so assiduously that in 1964 he was reelected to the Senate by the biggest vote ever cast for a West Virginia candidate.

When he set out to bat for Mansfield he boned up on the Senate's strange and often devious rules until he'd mastered them. Whenever in doubt, he goes to school again with Senate Parliamentarian Floyd M. Riddick.

Mansfield heartily approves of his performance.

"Bob Byrd does a first rate job," said Mansfield. "He is of great assistance to me, and he takes a great load off my shoulders. I am glad he is getting a little recognition."

One significant reason for Byrd's growing acceptance is a little notebook he carries around in his pocket.

TO EACH HIS OWN

On separate pages are listed the names of all Senators. Lest he forget, he jots down the requests any one of them makes, no matter how minor.

One Senator is taking a group of constituents to lunch, wants to be called if a given measure comes up.

Another wants to be alerted by a quorum call when there's a business break, so he can make a prepared speech.

Another has an important out-of-town engagement, wants his "position protected" during his absence.

Still another is seeking a "live pair" on the poverty bill while he's away.

Byrd dutifully jots down each request, sees to it meticulously that each is fulfilled. One of these days all those favors will pay dividends.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, there is no pending amendment. I ask unanimous consent that the majority leader may be recognized for not in excess of 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, an order has been entered that on all amendments except one from now on—and that includes amendments to be offered by the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and perhaps others—there be a time limitation of one-half hour, with the time to be equally divided on each amendment. There was one exception at the time and I feel somewhat embarrassed, but no matter which direction the leadership moves, it comes up against a proposition which is hard to find an answer to.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, at this time I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today it stand in adjournment until 9:30 tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that there be a morning hour at that time not to exceed 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there are no other amendments to be considered at that time I ask that the Williams amendment become the pending business and that a vote take place not later than 45 minutes after that, the time to be equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall not object. I do not know yet whether I will be here but I wish the RECORD to show that for personal reasons which are very well known I have asked the majority leader to extend that time to the afternoon. The majority leader and the minority leader find themselves unable to do so. I have the deepest and most devoted feeling about the passage of this bill as being essential to the Nation. That is why I shall not object. I wanted that statement to appear in the RECORD.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, we are fully familiar with the situation confronting the distinguished Senator from New York. I wish it were possible to expedite this matter and at the same time make it possible to accede to his desires and request. The Senator expressed a hope rather than a formal request. It is one of the difficulties with which we have to deal in moving Senate business forward. The RECORD should note that the Senator's reasons are the very highest.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask that the Senator amend his statement to show that I did make the request.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; the Senator did.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I join the minority leader in expressing thanks and appreciation for the understanding of the distinguished senior Senator from New York. His reasons are of the highest which could be found.

Mr. President, I wish that the calendar was such that we could do something to accede to the Senator's request. Unfortunately, we find ourselves in a position, as I indicated earlier, so that no matter which way we turn we come up against an obstacle which is a little difficult to overcome.

Mr. President, has the request been granted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, now that the request has been granted, the Senate will be on notice that not later than 10:30 tomorrow morning, barring unforeseen developments, there may very well be a vote on the Williams amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there will be votes today. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Does the majority leader contemplate that immediately after the Williams amendment is disposed of we will go to third reading and have final passage tomorrow?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would hope for that, but that is up to the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, I had intended to add to the previous unanimous-consent request to which the Senate agreed that 1 hour of debate be allowed on the bill, the time to be equally divided between the majority and minority leaders or whomever they designate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 853) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 536) to provide that the United States shall hold certain Chilocco Indian School lands at Chilocco, Okla., in trust for the Cherokee Nation upon payment by the Cherokee Nation of $3.75 per acre to the Federal Government; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. HALEY, Mr. EDMONDSON, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. BERRY, and Mr. MCCLURE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 117. An act for the relief of Martha Blankenship;

S. 534. An act for the relief of Setsuko Wilson (nee Hiranaka); and

S. 1320. An act to provide for the acquisition of career status by certain temporary employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to state the amendment.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:

On page 68, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following: new subsection:

"(d) The Director shall conduct, either directly or through grants or other arrangements, research and pilot projects designed to assure a more effective use of human and natural resources of rural America and to slow the migration from rural areas due to lack of economic opportunity, thereby reducing population pressures in urban centers. Such projects may be operated jointly or in cooperation with other federally assisted programs, particularly programs authorized under the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, in the area to be served by the project."

On page 68, line 13, strike out "(d)" and insert in lieu thereof "(e)".

On page 69, line 6, strike out "(e)" and insert in lieu thereof "(f)".

On page 69, line 6, strike out "10 per centum" and insert in lieu thereof "15 per centum".

On page 69, line 8, after the period insert the following new sentence: "Notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the sums appropriated pursuant to this Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, $50,000,000 shall be available only for projects authorized under subsection (d) of this section."

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

This is a revision of amendment No. 348 which we discussed for about 1 hour earlier in the week. It provides for the transferrance of $50 million authorized to be appropriated to OEO to a special program designed to benefit the rural areas and to prevent the flow of vast numbers of rural inhabitants from the places where they are now located to the ghettos of the cities to further complicate the multitude of problems which are there. The $50 million would not increase the cost of the bill but merely earmark $50 million which is already in the bill.

Mr. President, the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967 contain several helpful provisions which focus on rural poverty. The committee report states that rural programs should be strengthened and expanded and that rural areas should receive a more equitable share of financing than they have in the past. I commend the members of the subcommittee for reaching these conclusions. They are of utmost importance to the Nation.

I believe, however, that an even greater push is needed. Under my amendment, a new subsection would be added to section 232 of the bill, on page 68 at line 12, stating that:

> The Director shall conduct, either directly or through grants or other arrangements, research and pilot projects designed to assure a more effective use of human and natural resources of rural America and to slow the migration from rural areas due to lack of economic opportunity, thereby reducing population pressures in urban centers.

The amendment, in which my colleague, Mr. HARRIS, joins, further directs that:

> Such projects may be operated jointly or in cooperation with other Federally assisted programs, particularly programs authorized under the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, in the area to be served by the project.

On page 69, line 6, the amount available for carrying out section 232 would be changed from a ceiling of 10 percent of the sums appropriated for any OEO program to 15 percent. A sentence would be added on line 8 stating that $50 million of the funds appropriated pursuant to title II would be available for projects authorized under the new subsection.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield at that point?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Kansas who has pending a bill on tax credit legislation, which I have joined him in cosponsoring, to try to encourage industry to come into rural areas to relieve the migration to our already overcrowded metropolitan centers.

Mr. PEARSON. I thank the Senator for yielding to me. As he commented and observed, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS] is a cosponsor of the amendment and joined in introducing legislation which sought to recognize that the crisis in the cities has become almost a slogan for America in the great urban areas of the country over the past 2, 3, and 4 years, that it has a direct relationship to rural problems to develop migration of those seeking to come into the ghettos of the large metropolitan cities which has accelerated and accentuated the problem.

It is not a case of keeping them "down on the farm." It is a case of seeking to develop those potentialities they have not only at the core of our great cities, but also in the rural areas.

I commend the Senator for this particular amendment. I intend to support it, and I thank him for having offered it.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank my colleague for his support.

Mr. President, let me emphasize at the outset that this amendment does not increase in any way the cost of the bill. The $50 million for the program, as the amendment is now drafted, would come out of the community action authorization. The amendment as I originally introduced it would have taken the $50 million from the Job Corps authorization. I still have great doubts about the Job Corps program. I think it is one of the least effective programs we have. I believe, however, that it is the will of the Senate at the present time, especially in view of the tremendous capital investment we have in Job Corps camps around the country, that this questionable program be given another chance to prove its worth. It is for this reason that I have redrafted the amendment.

The Economic Opportunity Act calls for an all-out attack against the sources of poverty in the United States. But the main thrust of this attack since the program's inception in 1964 has been aimed primarily at the Nation's urban centers. Little has been done in rural areas. I agree completely with the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON], in his introductory remarks on the Rural Job Development Act:

> The root cause of many of the problems of the large cities today can be traced to the problems of rural America.

That is where our attack on poverty should begin. That is the real challenge—to reverse the forced migration to the slums and ghettos of the large cities. In order to do this, however, greater opportunities must be provided in the rural areas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Chair.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I commend my able colleague from Oklahoma on the introduction of his amendment and the perfection of it. I ask that I be privileged to become a cosponsor.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am delighted to have the distinguished Senator from West Virginia as a cosponsor. The senior Senator from West Virginia has contributed greatly to the Appalachia program and other economic development programs. He has always been in the forefront in aiding rural America. If he will ask for permission from the Chair, I am sure that it will be granted by unanimous consent.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to join my colleague from Oklahoma in cosponsoring the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. I certainly support the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma. I might point out that 5 years ago, at the time we were considering amendments to the Area Development Act, I proposed an amendment quite similar to the one now pending. I regret to say that the leadership did not see fit to accept it. I say that with the clear understanding that I do not mean that the Senator from Oklahoma did not wish to see that amendment adopted. I tried the same thing 3 years ago, and at that time was assured that efforts were being made by the Department of Agriculture under the rural area development program to achieve the objectives that we were seeking to achieve.

I regret to say that those objectives have not been achieved so that the pending amendment is very much in order. It is too bad that something like this was not done a long time ago. Because of my long and continued interest in this very approach to the problem, I wonder whether the Senator would be good enough to permit me to be a cosponsor.

Mr. MONRONEY. I would be honored to have my distinguished colleague as a cosponsor of the pending amendment because of the work he has done so faithfully in this field.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] be added as a cosponsor of the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I wish to thank both the Senator from Iowa and the Senator from West Virginia who have both done so much in the field of rural development and in the struggle to try to improve the economy of the rural areas.

I was interested to read in last week's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that according to a recent report of the Economic Development Agency, it has been the push of hopelessness, of discouragingly poor rural conditions rather than the pull of urban economic opportunities that produced the migration of more than 10 million persons from rural to metropolitan areas in the 1950–60 decade.

Few Americans in our increasingly urbanized society are aware of the abject poverty in rural areas. Today almost half of the Nation's poor live in small towns, on farms, or in nonfarm rural areas. Most of these are the invisible poor. They do not often make headlines. We do not pass them as we make our way from the suburbs into our financial and business centers. They are easy to ignore. But they are there—spread out all across our land. These are truly the forgotten Americans.

Mr. President, we must encourage, we must establish, programs and projects which will enable farmworkers and other rural inhabitants whose jobs have been abolished by increased mechanization and advanced technology to find work near their homes. We cannot afford to continue to drive these people into the ghettos of the cities. Rural America must be reenergized. By harnessing local private initiative together with various State and Federal agencies, much can be done in this effort. But before the problem is compounded any further, we must get started.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, just a few days ago, the Senate voted 77 to 25 to increase the model cities program from $237 to $537 million. I have supported the model cities concept because it is obvious that existing urban renewal programs have been inadequate to halt the cancerous spread of urban blight, and new methods of dealing with the crisis of the cities must be tried on an emergency basis.

But a program of model rural community development is equally important. This Nation cannot develop model cities until it also makes a greater effort to develop model rural areas. That is the purpose of my amendment.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from West Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The pending amendment authorizing and directing research and pilot projects to assure a more effective use of human and natural resources of rural America and to slow the migration from rural areas due to lack of economic opportunity is timely and thoroughly meaningful. Congress could not give the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity a more useful and important mission than that of directing research and setting up pilot projects to find ways to make family life in the rural and semirural areas of our country more satisfying and pleasant. Among the actions we must take in the United States are those which will slow down the migration of rural oriented citizens into the already overcrowded cities if we are to solve the problems of the ghettos and the disturbances in city streets.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank my colleague and agree with his comments.

I thank the able Senator for his cogent remarks.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute from my time to the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I just wanted to say to the Senator that I think he has now perfected his amendment in such a way as to make it satisfactory to the friends of the program and to do what he desires to do. I am very pleased to see it generally accepted on the floor, and I join in accepting it.

Mr. MONRONEY. I deeply appreciate the remarks of the Senator and his acceptance of the amendment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] be added as one of the authors of this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield now to my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my distinguished senior colleague in support of this amendment. I commend him for bringing it before the Senate and for the excellent groundwork he has laid for its passage here today. I hope it will be adopted by the Senate.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank my distinguished colleague for his great help on this amendment.

RURAL AGRICULTURAL POVERTY IS NO MYTH

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I commend my distinguished colleague from Oklahoma for proposing this amendment to slow the migration from rural areas to our overburdened cities. I strongly support its passage.

The plight of persons in rural areas often escapes legislative attention. This amendment not only recognizes a critical problem, but meets it in a constructive and practical way.

This problem of migration calls attention once again to the pervasive poverty in rural areas that is so severe it causes persons to flee toward any hope of a better life.

Anyone who thinks present conditions are adequate is a victim of one of the most persistent and unrealistic of American myths concerning poverty in the United States. The myth is that rural poverty is decidedly limited in our country and what there is of it is not severe.

The myth undoubtedly flows from our unwillingness to accept the idea that in the midst of much of the world's richest farmland and surrounded by agricultural abundance there can be thousands upon thousands of poverty-stricken and even hungry Americans.

But the tragic fact is that there are scores of thousands of impoverished men, women and children barely surviving in areas of agricultural affluence and there are hungry people living in a country producing such fabulous quantities of food that it can feed millions of starving people in other lands.

Mr. President, rural poverty is a pressing concern today and is likely to become increasingly urgent in the future as mechanization, and even automation, take over more and more kinds of farming and more and more acres of food production.

For these reasons the pending bill, S. 2388, the Emergency Employment Act it incorporates, and this amendment in particular, are profoundly important not alone in terms of urban poverty but also in terms of impoverishment in farm areas and country communities.

And here, Mr. President, I would like to pay tribute not only to the breadth and comprehension of this legislation but also to the wisdom and thoroughness of the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty, which held hearings on the antipoverty program in nearly all sections of the country, from border to border and from coast to coast. The subcommittee's distinguished chairman, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] made certain that the testimony received by his subcommittee was not confined to the problems—overwhelming as they are—of poverty in our metropolitan ghettos. He insisted on extensive testimony dealing with rural poverty and, in fact, together with other members of his subcommittee personally inspected situations of rural impoverishment. He and other members of the subcommittee personally talked with agricultural workers and migrant farmhands and their families, and inspected the shacks and hovels and dilapidated camps these men, women, and children are forced to live in. This subcommittee's proposed legislation, as a result, is not based merely on hearsay evidence; it is based upon first-hand experience of rural poverty along dusty country roads of the East, the South, the North, and the West.

Therefore, Mr. President, this bill demands our respect as legislation that is based on present and urgent realities, on present and urgent needs that members of the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty are personally familiar with.

With this as background I would like to review some of the accomplishments that have already been registered in the war on rural poverty. It is wise that we engage in such a review in order to understand what kind of a start we have made and how far we have come in the fight to eradicate penury and economic injustice in the Nation's farm areas.

Mr. President, roughly 43 percent of this Nation's poor live in rural areas. The rural poor, who typically exist far from the main currents of American life in deprivation as grim and unrelenting as it is invisible to the affluent majority, are found in the Mississippi Delta and mountainous Appalachia, in southwestern deserts and in northern Michigan, in California's central valley and Alabama's Black Belt, in migrant labor camps and on Indian reservations, sometimes in sizable concentrations but more often in isolated pockets of poverty in hundreds and hundreds of rural communities scattered all across the Nation.

For these Americans—nearly 13 million of them—living in quiet and terrible desperation—the pending bill is of absolutely crucial importance, and a vote against this bill, Mr. President, is a vote against them, at least some of whom are represented by practically every Member of this body.

This bill would continue and slightly expand the economic opportunity programs which have become vital to the hopes and aspirations of our rural poor. In fiscal year 1967, $248.6 million in community action funds were granted to support rural community action programs. This was 32 percent of all community action program money, up from 27 percent in fiscal 1966. During the current fiscal year the figure will climb to about 36 percent of all community action program funds.

Thus from ground zero less than 3 years ago, OEO has assisted in the development of 618 rural community action agencies, covering 1,551 counties, about two-thirds of all U.S. counties designated as rural. This is an especially impressive accomplishment in light of the fact that the struggle against rural poverty is greatly complicated by isolation and a dearth of existing antipoverty organizational structures, as well as a lack of educational, vocational, and social services. For this reason, many rural community action agencies operate on a multi-county basis to assure maximum use of limited local resources. In fiscal 1968, 50 new rural community action agencies will cover about 350 additional rural counties—if the pending bill is approved.

Mr. President, rural community action programs take many forms. In Tennessee, for example, the Elk River Valley Authority uses Federal, State, and local resources to serve the poor in 10 counties having a combined population of 225,000. Aproximately one-half of this population lives in poverty, and one-fifth of the families earn less than $1,000 per year. In this community action agency, the neighborhood center has become the focal point for community action: four primary centers and 28 subcenters offer job placement, consumer education, homemaking and education programs. The community action agency also operates Upward Bound and Neighborhood Youth Corps programs as well as an Outreach program for mothers of Headstart enrollees. Other rural community action agencies offer different combinations of programs to meet particular needs.

In Michigan, an organization called UPCAP—Upper Peninsula Committee for Area Progress—coordinates the activities of six local, multicounty community action agencies. UPCAP, whose origins predate passage of the Economic Opportunity Act, and the community action agencies work jointly to provide an administrative structure by which resources can be mobilized and programs implemented. They are assisted by U.S. Department of Agriculture personnel, particularly the Extension Service, and State representatives of education, housing, and manpower programs. Because of the "umbrella agency" structure and coordination activities, when a suitable program is developed for the Upper Peninsula area, it can be used by all six local areas.

In Leslie, Knott, Letcher, and Perry Counties in Eastern Kentucky, a multicounty Community Action Council with headquarters in Whitesburg has received a grant of $73,733 which will enable it to undertake the first rural housing demonstration project in the Nation. The council will plan and develop realistic programs for eliminating rural slums in Appalachia. An areawide, multicounty nonprofit corporation will be organized under the council's auspices to conduct the 7-month program, which will utilize a low-cost prototype house especially designed for the needs of the area.

In Minnesota, the Mahube Community Action Agency, after a year's operation of an excellent home health aid program, has 23 trained home health aides to serve low-income families in Mahnomen, Hubbard, and Becker Counties. During this year, 1,815 nursing visits have been made to homes of the poor, with 51 percent of them to persons of 65 years or over.

In Oregon, the community action team of Columbia County has launched a truly comprehensive program of self-help efforts, including a smaller communities survey of employment services. This project has produced a countywide listing of employers, jobs available, and skill levels required, as well as employee skills and skills of the currently unemployed. A projection of future employment needs has also been made. A new employment office at St. Helens now has a full-time agent, and each community center maintains a list of small jobs available locally.

Other services on which antipoverty agencies and the communities have worked together are adult education, legal service, and improved service in the surplus commodity distribution program. A survey is now in process looking toward a home help aid program for the elderly.

In Rainier, Oreg., the center has rented an aged two-room building in which it held the first well-baby clinic in Columbia County. It offers a home nursing course, and with the help of the county extension service, nutrition classes are available as well as other homemaking projects.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars in Vernonia donated a building for the community center, and in St. Helens the Odd Fellows gave a building.

Moving on to the rural areas of other States, we find tremendously promising comprehensive health service programs have been launched by local Community Action Agencies with OEO funds in Belmont County, Ohio; Muskegon, Mason, Manistee, Lake, and Newaygo Counties in Michigan; Raleigh County, W. Va.; Alviso County, Calif.; Lowndes County, Ala.; and Bolivar County, Miss. To be set up as health centers in rural target areas, the projects will provide the one door of entry to virtually all health services needed by rural low-income citizens and their families—preventive, curative, rehabilitation, dental care, mental services, home care, drugs and appliances, and, when necessary, hospitalization.

Common to all the comprehensive health services programs is the training of low-income workers as health aides, dental aides, medical clerks and in a variety of other duties related to the running of the health center. One of the most effective jobs these workers do is to go out into the community, inform their neighbors of the center and its services, and get them to participate.

Mr. President, the entire range of Community Action programs is at work in rural America, instilling hope, strengthening communities economically and socially, and providing a wide range of cooperative, self-help exits from poverty. Head Start, Upward Bound, Legal Services, Foster Grandparents, Health Services, and a vast array of locally initiated and directed efforts are moving forward against great obstacles because community action prevails. In testimony before the House of Representatives Committee on Education and Labor in July, Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman said:

> OEO's Community Action Programs and the USDA's Technical Action Panels are working together to help create a new dimension in rural life. Community Action Agencies are making it possible for rural people to share in the benefits of many Federal programs which formerly were out of reach because the people did not know they existed or lacked the know-how to take advantage of them. They are reaching and stirring hope in the poor who otherwise were hopeless and forsaken.

Mr. President, other Economic Opportunity programs are making significant contributions to the war on rural poverty. As of the end of fiscal 1967, at least 13,200 rural youth were enrolled in Job Corps Centers, and a total of about 26,000 rural youth had been in the Job Corps since its inception. And many Job Corps Conservation Centers are performing an enormously valuable service to rural America through work in conservation projects.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps has provided jobs for 250,000 high-school-aged rural youth since the program began. They may work in a school cafeteria, or as an aide to a home demonstration agency, or help build a community water system, such as the one the Reverend Billy Graham and Sargent Shriver visited recently at Blevins Creek in North Carolina.

In January of this year, 52,000 rural young people were enrolled in Neighborhood Youth Corps, receiving wages of $2.8 million per month. This represents 31.6 percent of the total Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollment. The work experience program under title V of the Economic Opportunity Act is reaching into hundreds of rural communities. Forty percent of all funded training spaces have been allotted to rural America. Since the inception of the program, almost $50 million in work-experience funds have gone into projects in the 182 poorest counties in the Nation.

Nearly one-third of the strength of VISTA is in rural areas, with more than 1,000 volunteers assigned to 135 projects in 34 States, as of the beginning of this fiscal year.

Through the OEO program of rural loans, administered through the Farmers Home Administration, nearly $80 million has gone to 37,900 low-income families and 740 cooperatives. These loans are financing investments in farming and about 350 different types of nonfarming enterprises. The money is made available to rural men and women who never before could have qualified for a loan, giving them now an opportunity to become self-sufficient and to rise out of poverty.

Mr. President, all these programs, as well as the highly successful employment programs administered by the Labor Department under the Economic Opportunity Act—including the Nelson amendment, Project Green Thumb, and Operation Mainstream programs of such great benefit to rural antipoverty efforts—all these would be extended and expanded under the pending bill. But the bill places a new sense of urgency and priority on rural programs, and requires the Director of OEO to undertake special efforts to increase the effectiveness of rural antipoverty programs. In particular, the committee report on the bill urges the Director to act under the Community Action title to establish pilot projects in rural areas, to give preference to rural areas in providing technical assistance and personnel training, to develop model programs easily adaptable to rural communities, and to use simplified procedures, forms, and guidelines for rural areas.

Mr. President, the importance of the

pending bill to nearly 13,000,000 Americans living in rural poverty cannot be exaggerated. The bill will not wipe out poverty overnight—in rural areas any more than in urban areas—but it will permit the very encouraging efforts launched less than 3 years ago to be continued, and in many cases expanded.

It will constitute a ringing reaffirmation of the commitment this body made in 1964 to eradicate poverty in the United States. Mr. President, I strongly urge the prompt passage of S. 2388. And this amendment by my distinguished colleague from Oklahoma provides a strengthening of the tools we will have to help rural Americans lift themselves out of poverty.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma has modified the amendment he originally proposed, so that it now calls for a useful and salutary program to devote $50 million to rural undertakings with emphasis on jobs, which one hopes will slow down the rush to the cities from rural areas.

I am happy to accept the amendment, having talked to many members of the subcommittee about it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I want to express my absolute support of the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma.

I regret that there were not more Senators present to hear the proposal made by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma. It has been my distinct impression also that we are aggravating the problems of metropolitan communities by excessive feeding of money into them, thus encouraging increasing immigration from rural areas into the cities.

The city of Cleveland now has a population of 37 percent of the primary minority group. The more money we feed in there, the greater the immigration will be. A policy should be adopted, and an effort made to put it into effect, that will discourage inmigration and aid the solution of employment problems in the local communities, which differ from those in the metropolitan centers.

Mr. President, if the Federal Government feeds $5 billion into the metropolitan communities for the purpose of aiding the poor, what will that $5 billion do toward inducing excessive immigration to the big cities? And, if the immigration is motivated and induced among those that are told that there is $5 billion available there, will that produce increased population and thus aggravate the problems of the big cities?

There is a natural trend of the people in the rural areas to move into the metropolitan communities. The metropolitan communities have not been able to digest satisfactorily the great immigration that has occurred.

The error of what we are doing is accentuated by the natural tendency of the rural people to move into the metropolitan areas because billions of dollars have been fed into the metropolitan communities and have enhanced the reason for moving there.

Mr. President, Cleveland has been labeled as unfair to the primary minority group. The fact is, however, that in the last 3 years 75,000 more members of the primary minority group have moved into the city. They believe it is good for them and that they will find comfort, economic advancement, and salvation there. The fact is, however, that eventually trouble will be experienced.

I subscribe heavily to the proposal of the Senator from Oklahoma. Let us do something to induce industry to establish itself in the rural communities and not in the big communities. If we do, we will, to a substantial degree, solve the problem of the metropolitan area.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN] be added as a cosponsor of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield back my time.

Mr. CLARK. I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma, offered for himself and other Senators.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I desire to call up another amendment, which I send to the clerk's desk, for myself and my colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 74, between lines 18 and 19, insert the following new paragraph:

"(7) No financial assistance shall be extended under this title in any case in which the Director determines that the costs of developing and administering all of the programs assisted under this title carried on by or under the supervision of any community action agency exceed 15 percent of the total costs, including non-federal contributions to such costs, of such programs. The Director, after consultation with the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, shall establish by regulation, criteria for determining (i) the costs of developing and administering such programs, and (ii) the total costs of such programs. In any case in which the Director determines that the cost of administering such programs does not exceed 15 percent of such total costs but is, in his judgment, excessive, he shall forthwith require such community action agency to take such steps prescribed by him as will eliminate such excessive administrative cost, including the sharing by one or more such community action agencies of a common director and other administrative personnel. The Director may waive the limitation prescribed by this paragraph for specific periods of time not to exceed six months whenever he determines that such a waiver is necessary in order to carry out the purposes of this title."

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, this amendment, in which my distinguished colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS] joins, would put an absolute limit on the administrative overhead costs of Community Action Agency programs. It provides that no financial assistance shall be extended under title II for any program where the cost of developing and administering the program exceeds 15 percent of the total cost. By total cost we include non-Federal contributions and participation in all such programs.

This amendment is consistent with an earlier amendment which was adopted to this bill which provides for an investigation and evaluation by the General Accounting Office of Office of Economic Opportunity expenditures in order to determine the efficiency of the administration of OEO programs.

The GAO, at my request, has been examining Community Action Agency spending in Oklahoma for several months. More than a year ago, it became apparent that the Community Action program was being established in such a way that a continuing high overburden would be required in many areas to keep it going. This is not the case in every locality by any means. Speaking generally, it is my observation that Community Action programs can be operated more efficiently and with less overhead in the more populous areas than in nonmetropolitan or rural areas.

Inevitably, administrative costs are going to be high in the beginning of any new program of governmental action. To launch a program of public works where only brick and mortar or structures or roads or buildings are to be the end results necessitates heavy administrative outlays in the beginning. This is no less true when we seek to establish and implement programs directed to the far less indefinable but tremendously more important objective of human resource development.

Therefore, criticism of administrative costs which have been encountered up to this point in the war on poverty should be tempered with an understanding of the extremely difficult organizational problems involved. Nevertheless, rigid and severe cost accounting methods must be adopted by OEO and it is incumbent upon Congress to provide specific guidelines as to what administrative and developmental costs should be.

The GAO has told me that in its preliminary inquiries in rural areas in my State of Oklahoma administrative costs up to this point have run as high as 25 percent. This is largely a result of decisions made either at the State or local level under terms of the 1964 act which provided for maximum local initiative in the establishment of community action agencies. Far too often the Federal administrative structure of the war on poverty has been blamed for administrative or supervisory conditions which actually were generated largely on the basis of technical assistance provided in most States from the office of the Governor. In Oklahoma, OEO funds in excess of $300,000 have been spent through the Governor's office in order to provide a degree of local initiative far greater than is generally recognized.

Administrative costs in community action programs have been established on the basis of local decisions, and it is my firm opinion that the OEO as a Federal agency has not had sufficient control over such costs.

This amendment would remedy that situation. It would provide that the Director shall consult with the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and then establish by regulation criteria for determining the developmental and administrative costs of such programs. In addition to the flat 15-percent limitation, the amendment provides that even if such costs do not exceed 15 percent and yet are, in the judgment of OEO, excessive, the Director can require community action agencies to reduce administrative expenditures. This includes the right of the OEO Director to require one or more such community action agencies to share a common director and other administrative staff people.

Senator Harris and I propose in this manner to strengthen community action administration in nonmetropolitan areas where up to this time many of the administrative units have been too small and too limited by budget to be effective. A staff-sharing program already has been tried on a very limited basis, I am advised. Also, I have personally examined, in Oklahoma, community action agencies of varying sizes. It is my opinion, on the basis of firsthand examination, that the multicounty administrative unit often proves more efficient in the less populous areas.

Mr. President, it is the purpose of this amendment to make community action agencies as cost-efficient as we would want any business to be. We must make certain that community action agencies do not turn into patronage refuges for a lot of useless people who hold down desk jobs and drain money off from the real business of helping the poor. If ever there was a program that ought to stay lean and hard, it is the war on poverty.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am glad to yield to my distinguished colleague, who is a cosponsor of the amendment.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I am honored to have joined with my distinguished senior colleague in the preparation and presentation of this amendment. He and I share a feeling, which I am sure all other members of the Senate share, that, most of all, we intend that this program get results and that it help the poor and that we cut down in every way possible unnecessary overhead and administrative expenses so that good results and action for the poor can be obtained.

Therefore I commend my senior colleague for the work he has put into this amendment and for his offering it today. I hope it will be adopted by the Senate.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank my distinguished colleague for his help. I feel we can certainly justify efforts to try to abolish poverty if we are watchful and careful in keeping administrative expenses and costs to the very minimum. Dollars spent on duplication of effort, wasted personnel, and other sources that unnecessarily consume dollars, ought to go to help to eliminate poverty. We can ill-afford to spend too much for the employment of high officials at high salaries.

I thank my distinguished colleague for his cosponsorship.

Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

As I understand the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma, it puts a limit of 15 percent on all administrative expenses of community action agencies; is that correct?

Mr. MONRONEY. Except that the Director may waive the limitations prescribed by this paragraph for specific periods of time not to exceed 6 months, whenever he determines such a waiver is necessary in order to carry out the purposes of this title.

Mr. CLARK. My understanding is that the Senator from Oklahoma has discussed this matter with Mr. Shriver, the Director of OEO.

Mr. MONRONEY. I have discussed it with him. I would not say that he agrees 100 percent with it. I believe he does, however.

Mr. CLARK. He at least agrees with it 99 percent, does he not?

Mr. MONRONEY. I would say so. The question we were in slight disagreement upon, and I do not recall its being definitely settled, was as to the non-Federal contributions to such costs, and whether the 15 percent would apply to them.

Mr. CLARK. It is my understanding, having checked with the OEO Director's office, that he has no serious objection to this amendment. I cannot say I am enthusiastic about it, but I am prepared to accept it, and I do accept it.

Mr. MONRONEY. May I say to the Senator, I was under the impression that the Director was quite enthusiastic about having some limitations written in, to give him greater authority to say no to over-ambitious community action groups that felt it was necessary to establish a very high overhead.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

I say again that generally speaking, I am opposed to writing what ought to be administrative regulations into legislation; but since the Director of the OEO has indicated that he sees no particular objection to this amendment, and since the Senator from Oklahoma feels so strongly about it, and is a very difficult Senator to oppose, I am prepared to accept the amendment.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator reserve 1 minute, and yield to me for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I reserve 1 minute of my time, and yield it to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished occupant of the chair, the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern], be listed as one of the sponsors of my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Special Committee on Aging, I have been pleased to note the provisions regarding older Americans in the proposed Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967. Those who developed this bill deserve much credit for the imaginative approach of their bill to the problems and opportunities of our older compatriots.

One provision greatly strengthens section 610 of the Economic Opportunity Act, which since 1965 has declared the intention of Congress that whenever feasible the special problems of the elderly poor shall be considered in the development, conduct and administration of programs under the act. It would spell out in more detail the obligations of the Office of Economic Opportunity to carry out a plan for the participation of the elderly poor in war on poverty programs and to help the elderly poor to achieve self-sufficiency. Further, it would require the Director to include in his annual report a description of the ways in which this mandate has been implemented.

A provision which is not limited in its effect to the elderly but which would be especially helpful to elderly public assistance recipients is the proposed revision of title VII on "Treatment of Income for Certain Public Assistance Purposes." Heretofore, title VII has required that of the income received by a participant in Economic Opportunity programs, the first $85 per month of such amounts plus one-half of the excess over $85 must be disregarded in computing his public assistance benefit. The proposed treatment of Economic Opportunity income is designed to encourage the public assistance recipient to bring himself up to a minimum standard of economic adequacy instead of penalizing his efforts to do so. Furthermore, the participant's public assistance would not be reduced if the sum of his income from all sources, including public assistance, is insufficient to bring him out of poverty. This proposal would stimulate America's older public assistance recipients to take maximum advantage of the Economic Opportunity Act to launch themselves out of poverty and dependence.

The bill proposes a comprehensive revision of the title on Volunteers in Service to America, known as VISTA. As part of the revision, language is included to state a stronger congressional intention that the fullest participation of older persons as volunteers be encouraged. This is in accord with my efforts and those of the Special Committee on Aging to make available to older Americans opportunities to continue to be active and useful. We are convinced that this would benefit both the older individuals who serve and their communities, which have myriad needs for services they could perform.

Another provision to benefit the elderly is section 126 of the bill. It is an amendment to part B of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act, which part relates to the provision of useful work and training opportunities for youths and adults. Section 126 makes it clear that part B is to help relieve long-term unemployment among persons 55 years of age and older as well as unemployment among other age groups.

Employment of the elderly would also be encouraged by a provision requiring that the Director of OEO "encourage the employment of persons 55 years and older as regular, part-time and short-term staff" in OEO programs.

Finally, the bill would make Project Find a national emphasis program. Project Find is a program administered by OEO to identify the needs and problems of the elderly poor, to refer them to existing health, welfare, employment, housing, legal aid, recreation and other needed services, and to provide some of the elderly poor with employment and volunteer opportunities. Making this program a national emphasis program would express strong congressional support for it and would encourage OEO to lend additional emphasis to it.

I am confident, Mr. President, that I reflect the sentiments of the Senators on the Committee on Aging in expressing appreciation for the emphasis upon the needs of the elderly poor which has been given by the Senator from Pennsylvania and other Senators who have developed this bill. These provisions to assist our older compatriots deserve the support of all Senators, and I hope they can become law.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I know of no better way of helping disadvantaged people to become self-sustaining and stabilizing elements in our society than by making it possible for them to become proprietors of their own small businesses.

Under section IV of the Economic Opportunity Act, the Small Business Administration has the responsibility of providing loans and management training to help these people become business owners and thus acquire a stake in society.

This program of assistance is now available to disadvantaged people in every State of the Union. Under the able direction of Administrator Robert C. Moot, the SBA is actively seeking to extend the program in areas that are sometimes difficult to reach.

It was with great pleasure, therefore, that I read in the September issue of South Carolina Education News, an announcement by Arthur J. Glick, SBA Regional Director in Columbia, that low-income and disadvantaged persons in South Carolina are eligible for these long-term loans.

I was particularly impressed by SBA's statement that it will go into the poor sections of cities and into depressed rural areas actively seeking business owners, or potential business owners, who can benefit from this program.

To carry this work forward, SBA's office in Columbia is cooperating with educational associations and other groups in South Carolina to reach the people who can be helped by this program.

I congratulate the SBA and the editor of Education News for their cooperation and request unanimous consent that the article be inserted at this point in the Record:

Small Business Loan Program Available in South Carolina

> The Small Business Administration's Economic Opportunity Loan Program is now available throughout South Carolina, it was announced by Arthur J. Glick, SBA Regional Director.
>
> Applications for loans will be accepted to existing and new businesses by SBA's Regional Office at 1801 Assembly Street, Columbia, S.C., and by 72 other SBA field offices throughout the Nation.
>
> To find those low-income and other handicapped people with the best potential to successfully operate a business, SBA will work closely with Educational Associations, Community Action groups, neighborhood centers, regional organizations and other groups throughout South Carolina, Glick said. These organizations will also be asked to assist in providing volunteers from the business community to work with SBA personnel in providing management assistance to loan recipients. In this regard, Glick said that "America has always relied upon the voluntary efforts of its community leaders to help those less fortunate and the people have always responded."
>
> He further stated that "We do not intend to make bad loans under this program, but neither do we intend to set up inflexible road blocks. Our people are going into the poor sections of cities and into the depressed rural areas. We are looking for loans that will expand viable businesses, exploit new ideas, establish small manufacturing plants—the kinds of businesses which can have a healthy effect on the community, which can expand employment opportunities, which can stimulate the economy and be in concert with our National goals.
>
> "In addition, SBA will make available to EOL recipients all of our management assistance tools in a combined effort to assure the success of these small businesses."
>
> A key feature of the expanded EOL program is that it will also seek to assist for the first time those who are above the poverty level, and yet cannot qualify for SBA's regular business loan program.
>
> Glick said that "One of the basic problems in any program of this type is reaching the people we are attempting to help and our educational leaders and teachers can render an additional public service in carrying this message to the grass roots of our communities."

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, since no amendment is pending, and the proponent of an amendment has not arrived in the Senate Chamber, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick] may be recognized to speak on another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MILITARY PROCUREMENT PRACTICES

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, on September 19, 1967, I delivered an initial floor speech concerning questionable military procurement policies and procedures. It concerned two Army contracts. Both were awarded to big business firms although substantially lower bids were on file from small business firms. Specifically, one award was given to Northrop Nortronics—a division of Northrop Aviation—the high bidder, over Custom Packaging Co., the low bidder. The other award was given to Radio Corp. of America, the high bidder over Decitron Electronics Corp., the low bidder.

The first contract involved a shoulder-borne portable flame weapon. The other contract involved a portable walkie-talkie radio set. In both transactions the procedures used to justify the excessive cost to the taxpayers seemed to me to be so highly questionable that I urged that Congress proceed with a thorough investigation of our military procurement policies.

The case involving my constituent, Custom Packaging Co., Aurora, Colo., clearly pointed out a serious shortcoming in our ability to properly review transactions involving millions upon millions of the taxpayers' dollars. Congress has depended upon the Comptroller General of the United States to accomplish the technical aspects of this review. The Comptroller General has acknowledged that this is not being done.

In response to the protest filed by my constituent, the Comptroller General responded in part as follows:

> Your claim of improper use by the procuring activity of proprietary information contained in Custom's unsolicited proposal is categorically denied by responsible and knowledgeable technical personnel of the Department of the Army. And while your rebuttal and other correspondence dealing with this allegation strongly disputes the conclusion reached by the Army Technical Personnel, we have no alternative but to accept the facts as reported by the Army. In factual disputes, such as here, which are technically beyond the competence of our office because of the scientific or engineering concepts involved, we must accord a significant degree of finality to the Administrative position.

In other words, Mr. President, the Comptroller General is saying that no review was made of the charge beyond asking the Army whether it disagreed with the assertion made by my constituent. Of course, the Army responded in the manner it did in order to protect those responsible for this questionable transaction in the first place.

The Small Business Administration also questioned the Comptroller General about the award of the contract to Nortronics at more than twice the amount bid by Custom Packaging Co. In his response to the Small Business Administration, the Comptroller General hedged the question posed by the Small Business Administrator that, under the Small Business Act, provision is made that where a small business concern is certified by SBA to be a competent Government contractor with respect to capacity and credit, the procuring officers of the Government must accept such certification as conclusive. After having admitted in his letter to my constituent that in actual fact no review was made, the Comptroller General goes on to say:

> On the basis of the record before us, we are of the view that Custom's proposal was technically non-responsive to the Army's requirements as detailed in the statement of work accompanying the request for proposals. In reaching this view, we are aware that some of Custom's deficiency disclosed in the technical evaluation related to its capacity and credit.

And then he revealed the following:

> However, Custom received only a rating of 2 on its technical approach to the government's requirements out of a possible weighted factor of 40.

This "weighted average" method of eliminating the lowest bidder struck me as being familiar. Upon checking, I find that this very same gambit was used to eliminate the low bidders on the development of a portable radio communications set which has the official nomenclature AN/PRC-62( ). The Army Electronics Command awarded a contract to the Radio Corp. of America—and here we go again with RCA. This is the third time I have brought them up—for $1,073,150 in spite of the fact that the Army had received substantially lower bids from such companies as Bendix Radio, General Motors Delco Radio Division, Raytheon, General Dynamics, Magnavox, Sylvania, and others. The lowest bid received for this AN/PRC-62 radio came from the International Telephone & Telegraph Co. We all know these are the giants of the electronics industry.

It is a well-known fact that the United States—and we can say this again after today's debate—is not a profitmaking organization. But, when we have procurement officials who can throw out low bids from firms such as I.T. & T., who are enormously well qualified to develop any kind of radio we could think of, then I think it is high time we took another look at the regulation the Army cited as justification for its actions. The Army justified these actions under section IV, part 2 of the Armed Services Procurement Regulations. Just how does this work?

The Comptroller General's report No. B-160809 explains how the Army did this in the case of my constituent, Custom Packaging Co. First, they completely ignored the price of the item to be procured. Then the Army proceeded to assign an arbitrary set of "values" to the various bids. The Army said that technical approach to the problem was to count 40 percent; technical personnel 20 percent; background experience only 15 percent; facilities 15 percent; and schedule—whatever that is—was to count 10 percent.

Having established this approach, the Army then contrived a new set of numbers having nothing whatever to do with price, and lo and behold, Nortronics got the highest rating, while Custom Packaging Co., which conceived the flame weapon, developed it at its own expense—and demonstrated it to the Army—got a rating of two points out of a possible weighted factor of 40. This, I might say, is despite the fact that SBA had certified the company's capacity and credit ahead of time.

Mr. President, the case of the AN/PRC-62 radio procurement was well documented by GAO report B-152884. There again the weighted average was used. The report shows that in awarding the contract to the Radio Corp. of America for an amount in excess of $1 million, the Army Electronics Command ignored the following lower bids:

I.T. & T., $421,140.
Bendix Radio, $434,627.
Advanced Communications, $470,445.
Electronics Communications, $489,155.
General Motors Delco Radio Division, $556,152.

The report contains the following incredible admission:

> We could not independently evaluate the technical aspects of the proposals, nor could we determine from an engineering standpoint whether the Agency's technical evaluations were reasonable. Furthermore, many of the Agency's technical evaluations were not adequately documented. However, our review disclosed that the Agency's engineers responsible for evaluating the proposals were in general agreement that RCA's proposal was the best.

Of course, they would.

Mr. President, I think we ought to think about this for a second. Here is the Office of the Comptroller General which is designed to be at least Congress agency to determine whether the executive departments of the Government are operating in the best interests of the taxpayers and in the best interests of the country. Yet, they have said now on three consecutive occasions that they were not qualified to analyze the scientific and other material which forms the basis of the Army's decision. Consequently, the only thing they can do is accept the Army's decision, even when in the Comptroller General's report it says it is not documented, and the Army's opinion has been based on the claimed lack of technical competency of companies like International Telephone & Telegraph.

Can we conceive of any more ridiculous position than having the Army come up and try to tell the Comptroller General or anybody else that ITT or Bendix or Advanced Communications or General Motors cannot build a portable radio? It is the most ridiculous thing I have ever heard of.

Here we have another $500,000—that is not a great amount in the present budget—thrown down the drain solely because the Army wants to deal with RCA to the exclusion of everybody else. I say it is amazing indeed.

I am informed today that the Army is right this minute scheduling $8.5 million in this fiscal year into sole-source noncompetitive production for the AN/PRC-62( ) radio set that I have just finished talking about, where we have bids from five perfectly competent companies that are far lower than the bid from RCA. In view of what has transpired, it will come as no surprise when RCA is announced as the lucky company that is going to get this "urgent" award—much to its happy surprise.

I would not be surprised next month to learn that the Army has generated another of its classic "urgent" requirements—this time for shoulder-borne flame weapons to be produced by Nortronics on a noncompetitive basis, because the Army will say they need them in a hurry, even though they have a 2-year development program already in operation.

The Senate Select Committee on Small Business, of which I am a member, has recently held hearings, during the course of which I was assured by Mr. Robert Moot, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, that SBA is going to be far more vigorous in seeking corrective action in this area. We have been promised a report on the cases which I have previously reported to the Senate. I am looking forward to receiving these reports.

Mr. President, I believe that this free ride on the taxpayers' back has gone on long enough. Surely, not every research and development program has to come up devoid of manufacturing drawings, precisely in point of time to coincide with an overpowering, overriding demand for immediate delivery. Certainly, we should be capable of orderly planning that would allow open competitive bidding for our military requirements. As it is today, less than 15 percent of all the money spent by the Pentagon—the billions of dollars that we spend—is awarded under contracts based on competitive bidding and public opening of bids. This situation exists in spite of the fact that it is common knowledge that competitive bidding reduces the cost from 30 to 50 percent under noncompetitive costs.

Mr. President, as I have said, this is the third speech I have made on this subject, and the third series of contracts I have brought up. I hope to bring up more such instances in the future, because the point I am making is that somewhere something is wrong in the Army procurement system. One result of this wrong is that tax funds are being spent at a rate far in excess of what is needed. Another result is that the low bidder, time and time again, has been knocked out as the eventual procurer of the contract, and it is given to the big companies that already seem to have a great number of defense contracts. This situation raises questions in my mind and, I believe, in the minds of all of us.

I do not wish to accuse anybody of wrongdoing. But it seems to me that the cases I have already developed are sufficient in nature and in scope to warrant a thorough-going congressional investigation into what is happening in the military procurement policies as they are being administered today under the Secretary of Defense.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 853) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, there are many and varied approaches which can be made to the training provisions under this act. There are many areas in which training can be accomplished which have not been explored to the full extent that they can be.

The national system of libraries is a case in point. It seems to me that training programs through the local library system might be a very worthwhile project.

Librarians in public, professional, and school libraries have in many cases direct lines of communication to the disadvantaged communities and the disadvantaged adults and children in those places. Many libraries are in or close to the heart of impoverished areas, and librarians perform yeoman service in efforts to stimulate participation of all people in the community in the wonderful experience of learning.

I would hope, Mr. President, that the Office of Economic Opportunity might make extra effort to involve more closely libraries and librarians with the various aspects of the poverty program. Theirs is a unique situation which we would do well to use to the fullest extent possible.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

LABORATORY ANIMAL WELFARE ACT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, yesterday the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] made certain comments and introduced certain editorials in regard to the bill which I have introduced with a number of cosponsors, which is called the Laboratory Animal Welfare Act, which deals with medical experimentation, which is a matter of great importance in the field of health, and which is a part of the work of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the Subcommittee on Health, of which I am the ranking minority member.

Mr. President, I believe that the questions raised deserve reply and, therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks answers to questions most frequently asked about the so-called Rogers-Javits bill, together with a brief analysis of the bill, so that Members may have both sides of the story presented to them at this rather preliminary stage in relation to the bill.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibits 1 and 2.)

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I point out that the bill I have introduced has the support of the Humane Society and the doctors' organization which deals with experimentation of this character, which is so very important to health, to the future health, and to the care and cure of disease in our country.

The fundamental idea is to try to reconcile the views of all concerned consistent with the traditional humane outlook of our country toward animals. I joined in the enactment of one bill which took the animal care to preexperimentation stages. This is an effort to extend that measure to the experimental stage.

I hope that common ground may be found between the two views. I am not opinionated about the matter, but I believe in reply to the Senator from Oklahoma this information should be available to show the other side of the case.

EXHIBIT 1

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS MOST FREQUENTLY ASKED ABOUT THE ROGERS-JAVITS BILL

Q. What effect would this legislation have on P.L. 89–544 (The Dealer's Bill passed in 1966?)

A. None immediately. P.L. 89–544 will remain in full force *for two years* after the new bill is passed in order to insure continuous protection for animals. After that, the work of the Department of Agriculture in enforcing standards within dealers' premises, regulating the procurement of animals, and searching for lost animals both outside *and inside* laboratories will continue as it is being done at present. But at that time, the care of animals within laboratories will be stricken out of 89–544 and transferred to the extended program.

Q. What effect will the introduction of the new bill have on the current appropriations for P.L. 89–544?

A. This bill should make no difference whatever on appropriations for P.L. 89–544 for at least two or three years. After the care of animals in laboratories ceases to come under that law, the appropriations may be adjusted to whatever is necessary to continue the dealer operations.

Q. How will the care of animals be changed when they are taken away from the protection of P.L. 89–544?

A. P.L. 89–544 protects only 6 species of animals in about 1,400 research laboratories out of a possible 10,000, and then only when the animals are not under experimentation. The new program will cover all warm-blooded animals in nearly all laboratories, including commercial plants making drugs, cosmetics, detergents, etc. where some of the most painful work is performed. The standards set up for P.L. 89–544 will serve as a basis for the new standards, with many additions. For example, P.L. 89–544 is strictly limited to regulating only 8 categories of care and housing, whereas the Rogers-Javits Bill will allow the Secretary to make regulations on all matters pertaining to bodily comfort, such as provisions for exercise which are excluded by law from P.L. 89–544. And, of course, there will be many regulations for keeping pain to a minimum in different situations.

Q. If P.L. 89–544 had enough funds and enough time, couldn't it do all this?

A. No. More money would only allow for more frequent inspections of the same animals under the same limited circumstances. Coverage for more animals in more laboratories for more purposes can only be done if a new law is passed.

Q. Shouldn't we wait to see how the present law works before branching out into something new?

A. P.L. 89–544 has proved itself to work extremely well in the limited field it covers. What more will a few more years prove while 95% of all laboratory animals get no protection at all?

Q. Why should a laboratory appoint its own committee to implement the standards and regulations? Isn't this just self-policing?

A. It would be administratively almost impossible for any government agency to appoint committees for 10,000 laboratories. These committees do not take the place of outside inspections, they merely serve between inspections to be responsible for seeing that the laboratory is in compliance with the regulations of the law. They will also see that all persons using or caring for animals are adequately qualified to do so, and to review painful procedures in order to protect the animals from unnecessary pain and suffering.

Q. How can we be sure that these committees perform these duties?

A. The bill provides that at least one member of the committee must be a veterinarian, because a veterinarian can give advice on the proper care of various species of animals. Not only the compliance with regulations, but the judgments which are made by the committee will be periodically reviewed by inspectors who are professionally qualified to evaluate these judgments.

Q. If the "professional body" which is chosen to inspect is the American Association for Accreditation of Laboratory Animal Care, a body which is sponsored by the major bio-medical scientific societies, wouldn't this allow laboratories to be inspected by their own colleagues who would tend to be too lenient?

A. The Secretary may use any accrediting body of his choice to serve only as his agents to make reports on whether a laboratory is complying with regulations and to make recommendations for accreditation. It will have no power to change or ignore these regulations in making its reports and recommendations. If the Secretary suspects that his appointed agents are not making proper judgments, he may send his own employees to review the situation, and any laboratory found not in compliance will face a fine of $500 a day plus loss of the privilege to receive grants or contracts from the government. Nor does any professional body have any power to accredit on its own. Only the Secretary can determine if a laboratory merits accreditation and confer it. Actually P.L. 89–544 has a much more lenient self-policing clause than any in this bill. Under that law any laboratory may totally exempt itself from allowing any inspections at all simply by asserting that all its animals are in some stage of experimentation (as most of them are). The fact that these laboratories have not done so, but rather have complied admirably with the spirit of the law, attests to the high integrity of the scientific community. Why, then, should we fear these same people will have less integrity in an expanded program?

Q. Wouldn't it be better for the Department of Agriculture to administer the expanded program since they have already done such a good job under P.L. 89–544?

A. This is the area on which there is the least agreement. The medical men prefer H.E.W. because an applicant for a grant must fulfill certain requirements for H.E.W. and it would be simpler for the grantee to work through only one agency which would set up all requirements. On the other hand, many humanitarians feel that a check by another department would be extra insurance for the welfare of the animals. The consideration which may have tipped the scales in favor of H.E.W. may be contained in Sections 8 and 9 of the bill. The administrator must do more than just enforce minimum requirements. He must also make studies in, and collect and disseminate information about, improved techniques for reducing pain, for getting better scientific results with fewer animals if possible, to promote the use of less sentient or non-sentient models and many other related subjects. He must also seek more efficient ways for exchanging information about research as to reduce the duplication or near-duplication of experiments. All of this is somewhat more in the field of H.E.W. than Agriculture. Nevertheless, the program will be so broad that any Department getting the assignment will doubtless have to set up a new "office" with a new staff hired for its competence in these things. Certainly either Department would make a conscientious effort to carry out the intent of Congress in administering this law. The choice of the best Department for this task lies with the Committees who will consider these bills, and who will certainly be glad to receive opinions at the time of the hearings.

EXHIBIT 2

THE ROGERS-JAVITS BILL

ENDORSEMENTS

The Rogers-Javits bill is endorsed by The Humane Society of the United States and the American Humane Association. Through their members and through their branches, affiliates and member societies, these two organizations represent 90% of the organized humane movement. The Rogers-Javits bill is also endorsed by the New York State Society for Medical Research and by the American Society for Pharmacology and Experimental Therapeutics.

EFFECT ON PUBLIC LAW 89–544

P.L. 89–544 covers only dogs, cats, hamsters, guinea pigs, rabbits and monkeys in two thousand of the 11 thousand research laboratories in the United States and this coverage only applies during the period prior to the commencement of research. Thus, only a small percentage of animals used are covered and only for a minor portion of their stay in laboratories.

In contrast, the Rogers-Javits bill covers at least 95% of the hundreds of millions of animals used and the coverage applies throughout the stay in the laboratory.

The Rogers-Javits bill will not void any of the standards established by the Secretary of Agriculture under P.L. 89–544. In fact, it will add to these standards and will extend their coverage greatly.

SUMMARY OF PRINCIPAL PROVISIONS OF ROGERS-JAVITS BILL

Administrative Officer—The Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare.

Inspection—Inspection of laboratories to be made by designated agents of the Secretary including qualified employees and scientific bodies officially approved for the purpose.

Standards—Humane standards of care, housing and other environmental factors and the proper use of anesthesia and pain-relieving drugs in post-operative care.

Laboratory Committees—Each laboratory shall establish a committee of scientists and at least one veterinarian as a committee on animal care and utilization. This committee will be responsible for the policies and procedures in its laboratory. However, standards promulgated by the Secretary must be complied with and inspection by agents of the Secretary will verify compliance.

Other Objectives for the Secretary—Money will be made available and the Secretary shall otherwise encourage various programs of assistance to research as well as programs designed to reduce animal suffering. Among the latter, the substitution of less sentient or non-sentient material wherever possible as the biological model is specifically included.

Scientists' Research—Each scientist is individually responsible for the welfare of the animals he uses.

Enforcement—Compliance will be assured on the part of the individual scientist by the penalty of ineligibility to use animals and, on the part of laboratories, by fines and withholding of Federal funds.

DISPOSITION OF FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO PAY A JUDGMENT IN FAVOR OF THE UPPER AND LOWER CHEHALIS TRIBES OF INDIANS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 678) to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Upper and Lower Chehalis Tribes of Indians in Claims Commission docket No. 237, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

> The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 678) entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Upper and Lower Chehalis Tribes of Indians in Claims Commission docket numbered 237, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:
>
> That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the first sentence of section 3 and insert in lieu thereof the following:
>
> "Sums payable to enrollees or to their heirs or legatees who are less than twenty-one years of age or who are under a legal disability shall be held in trust by the Secretary of the Interior with use limited to emergency medical care and direct educational expenses, until such minor becomes of age or disability ceases."; and the Senate agree to the same.
>
> HENRY M. JACKSON,
> GEORGE S. MCGOVERN,
> PAUL FANNIN,
> *Managers on the Part of the Senate.*
>
> JAMES A. HALEY,
> ED EDMONDSON,
> ROY A. TAYLOR,
> E. Y. BERRY,
> GEORGE V. HANSEN,
> *Managers on the Part of the House.*

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as passed by the House on June 5 this year, H.R. 678 provided that sums from the per capita distribution fund payable to enrollees of the tribe who were minors or under legal disability were to be held in trust by the superintendent of the western Washington agency. Thus, no part of the money could have been used on behalf of the minors or the disabled.

In the Senate, we amended the measure on July 31 to provide that the Secretary of the Interior would be the officer responsible for the money, and authorized expenditures for the needs of the beneficiaries.

The committee on conference of both Houses met and agreed upon a compromise provision by which the Secretary would hold the funds in trust, but that expenditures from them would be limited to emergency medical care and direct educational expenses until the minor becomes of age or the disability ceases.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of the report of the conferees on H.R. 678.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oregon.

The motion was agreed to.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION INVESTMENT IN FARM COMMODITIES REACHES 15-YEAR LOW

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, it has recently come to my attention that the Commodity Credit Corporation investment in farm commodities is the lowest in 15 years. This is proof of progress toward solving the difficult farm surplus problem.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture informs me that CCC investment in commodities under price-support loan and in inventory was down to $3,361,000,000 at the end of the 1966–67 fiscal year on June 30. This is nearly $2 billion less than a year ago. And it is less than half the investment level of more than $8 billion when the grain surpluses were at their peak in the early 1960's. With the cotton surplus fast vanishing, the investment total will drop further, particularly as the 3.3 million bales of cotton sold for delivery after June 30 are recorded in the CCC books.

The end of the wheat and feed grain surpluses and the substantial decline in cotton holdings account for most of the CCC investment decline. Commodity acreage diversion authorized by legislation since 1961 and particularly by the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 have brought the surplus down. As a result, grains are a much smaller proportion of the total CCC investment than in the past. Wheat and feed grains, which made up 70 percent of the investment a few years ago, now comprise about 30 percent of the total.

The reduction of surpluses should permit the CCC price-support loan operation to return to its basic function of helping farmers to market their commodities in a more orderly manner. Even though the surplus threat has been removed from farm markets, the large quantities moving into market channels, particularly at harvest time, can force prices down. The price-support loan gives farmers an alternative to immediate marketing. They can get cash through the loan and hold their crops for later marketing when the harvest price pressure has lessened. This permits a more even flow into market channels over a longer period. Thus, the price-depressing effects of a temporary oversupply are avoided.

Greater use of loans for orderly marketing is shown by the records for the past fiscal year when a record $1.1 billion in loans were repaid by farmers. This high repayment of loans is in sharp contrast to the surplus years when farmers settled a major proportion of loans by turning commodities over to CCC because market prices were below loan levels. Then, cash repayments were much smaller than now and CCC acquisitions of farm commodities much greater.

The value of CCC acquisitions dropped below $1 billion during this past year for the lowest total in 15 years, and much of this was 1965-crop cotton produced before the new cotton program began to make inroads in the surplus. In several years in the past, CCC yearly acquisitions went well above $2 billion.

The removal of the surplus and the improved financial condition of the Commodity Credit Corporation provides a solid basis to move forward toward a much-needed improvement in farm income. It is a tribute to the well-informed farmers of America and to their willingness to cooperate in the interest of the public and themselves.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I send to the desk and amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] proposes an amendment as follows:

> On page 56, line 3, delete the period, substitute a semicolon, and add the following: "*Provided*, no project under such program may grant assistance to bring any action against any public agency of the United States, any State, or any political subdivision thereof."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield to himself?

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I yield myself 12 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized for 12 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I have sent to the desk an amendment to section 221(B)(3). As written, this section designates the legal services program as a national emphasis program in our Nation's battle to eliminate poverty.

In waging this war to help the poor to rise out of living conditions which offer little or no hope for the future and into a world which offers a real economic opportunity, the Office of Economic Opportunity has designed, and the Congress has approved a frontal attack on many conditions which have kept these people living in a world without a ray of light or hope. Some facets of the program are designed to be immediate cures. Other projects are designed to prepare the person to face the challenge he will encounter as he hopefully walks out of poverty's door into a brighter sunlight in the future.

Increased educational opportunities do this. So do job skill training programs and the providing of jobs. Still other programs are designed to attack community problems and personal problems if you will. The OEO has concluded that it is not enough simply to educate and train a man for a job, but, rather, it must also help him confront some of his other social problems.

To this end, the OEO has established a legal services program in order to make the law an instrument which could work for the poor as well as work against them. In the past, persons of low income have had great difficulty in receiving competent legal guidance and assistance. I know this, because at several periods in my lifetime I could very well have used the good offices of a competent lawyer, but I could not afford to hire one. Oftentimes the cost has been prohibitive. The legal services program seeks to remedy exactly this condition.

In June, the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty received testimony from Orison S. Marden, the president of the American Bar Association. In reviewing the accomplishments of the legal services program during the last 6 months of 1966, Mr. Marden told us that based on reports received from 104 legal services programs throughout the country, legal assistance had been rendered in 92,000 cases and an additional 15,000 persons received nonlegal help or interviews. He also stated:

> By June 30th the total clients served will have exceeded 300,000. The great bulk of these cases has been settled by advice or negotiation. Only 15 percent required action in the courts. Yet the court record is impressive: they won 75 percent of their cases and prevailed in 62 out of 71 appeals filed. In addition, more than 2 million of the Nation's poor have received education in their legal rights and obligations.

I think that is a most remarkable record.

The work they have done is good and the dedication they have exhibited is moving, indeed. But, legal services attorneys are not only working as defense council, they will also bring a cause of action as well as defend an indigent in a suit. They will do one thing more. They will institute test cases. Recently, in this manner, they have begun to challenge our laws all too often.

While there is nothing wrong with this, we must remember that the taxpayers of our great Nation are paying for the services of these attorneys and, consequently, I question the propriety and the enormous expense to the taxpayer of a legal service program bringing suit against an agency of the Federal, State, county, or local government. In such instance, the taxpayer is paying the legal fees of both the plaintiff and the defendant—which does not seem quite right to me.

It has come to my attention that last April the California rural legal assistance program began an all-out assault on the Sutter County, Calif., welfare office rounding up potential welfare recipients and taking them to the county welfare office. The director of the office, in compliance with the regulations, granted immediate payments when she considered the application "to be in immediate need." In other cases, aid was denied at the immediate moment pending evaluation of the complaint. As a result, the California rural legal assistance program has filed some 30 appeals based on the fact that some applicants were denied on-the-spot aid as well as the fact that other applicants deserved retroactive reimbursement for denied payments. Concurrent with these 30-odd appeals, the CRLA has filed a law suit against the welfare director which has occasioned the Sutter County board of supervisors to hire an attorney to defend her. This suit has now gone from the local superior court to the district court of appeals and to the State supreme court. While all courts have refused to hear the case, the taxpayers will be forced to bear the burden of the cost of both the plaintiff and the defendant.

I assure you, Mr. President, that this was not in my mind when I stated I was greatly in favor of the rural legal services program.

In another example, this same group, the California rural legal assistance program, brought suit against the Department of Labor. Earlier this year, I alerted the Department of Labor to the forthcoming need for a minimum of 10,000 Mexican farmworkers to harvest tomatoes and other crops in the northern San Joaquin Valley of California. On September 7 Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz approved the importation of 8,100 Mexican supplemental workers after California growers and the California Department of Labor issued a formal request. The next day an attorney for the California rural legal assistance program on behalf of 26 California farmworkers filed suits in U.S. District Courts in San Jose and San Francisco seeking to enjoin temporarily the importation on the ground that the certification order by Secretary Wirtz violated procedural regulations.

Once again the taxpayers financed the legal expenses of both parties to the suit—really a ludicrous and ridiculous situation. In this case however adjudication was forestalled by an agreement between the CRLA and the Department of Labor.

Included in this agreement is a formal procedure for California worker representatives to protest the admission of foreign workers and the establishment of an independent panel of citizens to review the entire system which permits growers to use foreign workers as well as an increase in the number of compliance officers. Furthermore it is my understanding that this panel will consist of seven members three of which will be CRLA attorneys.

I further submit that this was never envisioned by the members of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 12 minutes have expired.

Mr. MURPHY. I yield myself another 4 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has only 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. MURPHY. I yield myself 3 minutes.

I cannot for 1 minute believe that this was the original intent of the legal services program. I cannot believe that affording legal advice, counsel, and representation to persons unable to afford it in order to promote justice should include the right to bring suit against a Federal, State, or local agency supported by taxpayers' money when the party is represented by another agency or program which is financed by the same funds.

Although I will not dwell on this subject, I cannot believe that in either case the welfare recipient or the farmworkers went to the CRLA for assistance. It is far more likely that the CRLA drummed up clients to come and do battle. This is the problem of Mr. Shriver and Mr. Earl Johnson, the Director of the legal services program, to determine whether the attorneys employed by this program are working and conducting themselves in a proper manner.

Therefore, Mr. President, I hope that my colleagues will consider this amendment which will prohibit legal service lawyers from bringing suit against any Federal, State, county, or local agency. This program is not designed to be a demonstration project or a "trial and error" program. We are funding it presently in the amount of $47 million, and we should not treat its implementation lightly. The program was designed to aid the poor in achieving the legal rights and privileges which the rich can afford. It was designed to make them equal to the average citizen in the courts of our Nation. And I cannot believe that the average citizen goes to court with a test case which is of a spurious nature. He does not have the money to do so and he certainly does not have the money to give it to the poor person to use in such a questionable fashion. The disadvantaged should be helped, but we must remember the burden which is being placed on the taxpayer in providing benefits under this program. There are too many cases for legal service attorneys to handle without involving themselves in these test cases.

Therefore, I urge the acceptance of this amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, this amendment, which would prohibit the spending of any money for legal services to support any action against any Federal, State, or local agency would, in effect, repeal the first 10 amendments to the Constitution of the United States if a poor person is involved. In effect, this amendment says that if such a person is having trouble with his welfare payments and needs a lawyer to help him, he cannot have that help. He has to do with his own lawyer, assuming he can get one. If the chief of police picks him up on an illegal arrest, and he wants to have a lawyer to defend him, he cannot do it. If the police break into his house without a warrant, he cannot do anything about it, because that is a local agency, and he, therefore, cannot be allowed to have help from the legal services division. If any official from welfare, the chief of police, the building inspector, or anyone else violates his constitutional rights, the legal services section of the OEO is not allowed to receive 1 cent for defending him.

To me the issue is simple. Does the Constitution of the United States, so far as the first 10 amendments are concerned, apply only to those who can hire their own lawyers, but not to anyone who must depend, because of his economic circumstances, on a lawyer from the Legal Services Division of the OEO?

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question before he leaves that point?

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

Mr. MURPHY. I would like to ask the Senator, most respectfully, how has this problem been handled before in this Republic up to the institution of these services? Have the poor had to handle it themselves?

Mr. CLARK. Pretty much. In my city we have a voluntary service, badly supported by the community, barely able to handle more than 10 percent of legitimate cases.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the answer to the question of the Senator from California is "Yes." We have not only had volunteer services; we have had a voluntary defender, given very little money out of the city budget. We have had a legal services division paid for, quite inadequately, by the communities themselves. But the overwhelming majority of the people in Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and other cities in my State never have had adequate legal services until this program started.

By his amendment the Senator is saying that if an automobile dealer takes illegal action to take back his automobile, the poor person can take action against him; if a loan company wants to take illegal action, he can present his case; but if the chief of police engages in police brutality or other illegal action, he has no recourse.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, there is the Civil Liberties Union.

Mr. CLARK. Yes, there is the Civil Liberties Union.

I plead with the Senator not to press the amendment. It denies the poor their constitutional and legal rights, and I would have to strongly oppose it.

Mr. MURPHY. What I am trying to do is really preserve the actual rights of the poor and place the services where they are needed. I brought up a case, which was absolutely a rigged case and the case was settled out of court. The Government's representative could have won the case, but he was embarrassed to be representing the growers and farmers——

Mr. CLARK. The Senator told me about that case. I think he is quite right in that case, but what the Senator is doing is throwing the baby out with the bathwater by his amendment.

Mr. President, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MURPHY. I think our concern is exactly parallel. I had one of these lawyers in my office last week. He said these fellows are all over the place and they are doing this kind of representation. In the State of California the purpose of this legal assistance is not being used for the poor; it is being used by organizations for an entirely different purpose, never envisioned by me, at least.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I have no particular quarrel with the cases the Senator from California brought out. I am saying, the way this amendment is drafted, I think it is unconstitutional, and it certainly is going to remove from the poor most of the protections we hope to get them under the Constitution of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has expired.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, may I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] may have 1 minute?

Mr. LAUSCHE. No; I had better not.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 30 seconds to propound a unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the agreement which was entered into as a result of the unanimous-consent request earlier today by the majority leader be printed in its usual form and that immediately after the conclusion of morning business on tomorrow the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] be recognized for the consideration of his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement reduced to writing is as follows:

Ordered, That during the further consideration of S. 2388, a bill to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes, debate on any amendment (except one amendment to be offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]), motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 30 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]: *Provided*, That in the event the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him. *Provided further*, That on the amendment to be offered by Mr. WILLIAMS following the routine morning business tomorrow (October 5, 1967), which is not to exceed 15 minutes, debate shall be limited to 45 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by Mr. WILLIAMS and Mr. CLARK.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders or someone designated by them: *Provided*, That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from California. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Baker], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Brooke], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton] is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Brooke]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea," and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 36, nays 52, as follows:

[No. 279 Leg.]

YEAS—36

Allott
Bennett
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Carlson
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Hansen
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hollings
Hruska
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Long, La.
McClellan
Miller
Mundt
Murphy
Pearson
Sparkman
Spong
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—52

Aiken
Anderson
Bartlett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Dodd
Fulbright
Gore
Griffin
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hatfield
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Muskie
Nelson
Pell
Percy
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Scott
Smathers
Smith
Symington
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—12

Baker
Bayh
Brooke
Cooper
Hayden
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Morton
Moss
Pastore
Russell
Tower

So Mr. Murphy's amendment was rejected.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The PRESIDING OFFICER announced that on today, October 4, 1967, the Vice President signed the following enrolled bills, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

S. 1564. An act to amend the marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; and

S. 2162. An act to amend the act of January 17, 1936 (49 Stat. 1094), reserving certain public domain lands in Nevada and Oregon as a grazing reserve for Indians of Fort McDermitt, Nev.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS ETC.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Report of Federal Contributions Program Equipment and Facilities Pursuant to Subsection 201(i), Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as Amended

A letter from the Acting Director of Civil Defense, Department of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of Federal contributions program equipment and facilities (reporting symbol OCD–CONG(Q)2), for the quarter ended June 30, 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report of Federal Contributions Pursuant to Subsection 205, Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as Amended

A letter from the Acting Director of Civil Defense, Department of the Army transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of Federal contributions—personnel and administration (reporting symbol OCD–CONG(A)3), for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Second Report on High-Speed Ground Transportation Act of 1965

A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the second report on activities carried out during the fiscal year 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

Duty-Free Entry of Gifts for Members of the Armed Forces

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend for a temporary period the existing provisions of law relating to the duty-free entry of gifts not exceeding $50 in retail value from members of the Armed Forces serving in combat zones (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

PETITION

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Upper Great Lakes Regional Commission, Washington, D.C., endorsing the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. MONRONEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States, dated September 25, 1967, that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 2501. A bill for the relief of Dr. Fernando Rafael Boudet-Esteban; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 2502. A bill for the relief of Ping Kan Hui, Yun Sung Tam, Shui Wong, Po Fat Cheng, Yuen Chun Cheuk, Chun Ho, Cheung Wu, and Yiung Shing Cheung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 2503. A bill for the relief of Vassilios Tsibukis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 2504. A bill for the relief of Dr. Martiniano L. Orta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

S. 2505. A bill for the relief of Gregorio De Santis; and

S. 2506. A bill for the relief of Dr. Julio Epifanio Morera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENTS NOS. 377 AND 378

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate referral two amendments to H.R. 12080, the Social Security Amendments of 1967, recently transmitted to the Senate by the House of Representatives.

The first seeks to raise the present earnings limitation under social security from the present $1,500 per annum to $2,400, or to put it in monthly terms, from the present $125 per month to $200 per month. Unfortunately, the House-reported bill only raises the earnings limitation to $1,680 per year, or $140 per month. This amendment would allow those people on social security to earn up to $2,400 per year without reduction in benefits.

Mr. President, I believe it is most important that we enact a meaningful increase in the earnings limitation. Many of our older citizens, who are retired, find it well nigh impossible to live on the expected maximum benefit payment of $189 per month. However, if allowed to earn $200 extra per month, they could maintain an adequate living standard.

To my mind, it is paradoxical that we enact all sorts of Federal programs to help the senior citizen, yet we seem to do nothing to support any initiative on the part of these same citizens; in fact, we seem to penalize it.

These people possess many skills, skills learned over a lifetime of work. In my own State there is a shortage of skilled workers. The Rhode Island State Employment Service has had great success in placing older workers who have the needed skills. The one drawback to the success of this job placement program is the fact that the limitation on earnings and its attendant reduction on benefits puts a damper on initiative.

The second amendment calls for a cost-of-living adjustment for social security benefits, an adjustment that would rise or fall with the movement of the consumer price index.

Economists preach that this cost-of-living adjustment is, in the long run, a bad feature which would eventually work against social security. However, the long run is of no interest to those people of 65 who would have to struggle to earn a decent living on the expected maximum of $189 per month.

It is quite clear that living costs are constantly rising. It is manifestly unfair that those people with the least amount of money should have to wait for Congress to act every 2 or 3 years in order to live in a market of rising costs. A cost-of-living adjustment will, of its own accord, insure that social security benefits truly reflect the consumer market.

I urge the Senate Finance Committee to consider these amendments to H.R. 12080, for I feel that they will be of great aid to our senior citizens.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The amendments will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendments (Nos. 377 and 378) were referred to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT NO. 379

Mr. **HARTKE**. Mr. President, action is needed, as it has been over these years, to remove a longstanding inequity in the social security law. There is no penalty for those who in retirement receive investment income. It is possible to have $5,000, $10,000, or any other amount of income so long as it does not come from wages. But for many a worker, particularly those whose lives have been spent in low-paid employment resulting in no savings and investments as they struggle daily to make ends meet, there is a need, so long as health and circumstance permit, to continue working. Social security alone is insufficient to meet the need for income in retirement, yet many have no other resources. In fact, a study by the administration on aging shows that those over 65, 9 percent of the population, comprise 16 percent of all our poor. Put another way nearly a third of all retired persons fall in the poverty class.

Administration recommendations to raise the income limitation are inadequate. The limitation should be removed completely. We should make the desire to work a desire that is rewarded instead of penalized. Let us not continue to make it unprofitable for a worker to want to continue to contribute to his own and the Nation's economic betterment.

Mr. President, on May 2 of this year I introduced S. 1665, a bill to remove completely the earnings limitation on income of social security beneficiaries. Today I offer the bill in the form of an amendment to H.R. 12080, the omnibus social security bill now before the Senate Finance Committee.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendment (No. 379) was referred to the Committee on Finance.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENT, DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL

AMENDMENT NO. 380

Mr. **DIRKSEN** submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H.R. 10345) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: On page 48, between lines 15 and 16, insert the following:

"That section 2 of the Subversive Activities Control Act is hereby amended by adding immediately following paragraph (15), a new paragraph, as follows:

" '(16) The findings of fact contained in paragraphs (1) through (15) of this section are reiterated. Recent court decisions involving the registration provisions of this Act make it necessary to enact legislation to accomplish the purposes of such Act without the requirements of registration. Disclosure of Communist organizations and of the members of Communist-action organizations as provided herein is essential to the protection of the national welfare.'

"SEC. 2. Section 5 of the Subversive Activities Control Act is amended as follows:

"(a) By changing that part of subsection (a) thereof beginning with the first word of the subsection and continuing down to subparagraph (1) thereof, so as to read:

" '(a) When there is in effect a final order of the Board determining any organization to be a Communist-action organization or a Communist-front organization, it shall be unlawful—'

"(b)) By changing that part of subparagraph (1) of subsection (a) thereof which precedes (A) so as to read:

" '(1) For any member of such organization, with knowledge or notice of such final order of the Board—'.

"(c) By changing that part of subparagraph (2) of subsection (a) thereof precedes (A) so as to read:

" '(2) For any officer or employee of the United States or of any defense facility, with knowledge or notice of such final order of the Board—'.

"SEC. 3. Sections 7 and 8 of the Subversive Activities Control Act are hereby repealed.

"SEC. 4. The caption to section 9 of the Subversive Activities Control Act is amended so as to read: 'RECORDS OF FINAL ORDERS OF THE BOARD; PUBLIC INSPECTION; REPORTS TO PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS.'; and

"Section 9 of such Act is amended so as to read:

" 'SEC. 9. (a) The Board shall keep and maintain records, which shall be open to public inspection, giving the names and addresses of all organizations as to which, and individuals as to whom, there are in effect final orders of the Board issued pursuant to any of the provisions of subsections (g) through (j), inclusive, of section 13, or subsection (f) of section 13A.

" '(b) Copies of the reports and orders of the Board so issued shall be furnished by the Board to any person upon request and upon the payment of the reasonable costs thereof as then currently fixed by the Board.

" '(c) The Board shall submit to the President and to the Congress on or before June 1 of each year (and at any other time when requested by either House by resolution) a report giving the names and addresses of all organizations as to which, and all individuals as to whom, there are in effect such final orders of the Board.'

"SEC. 5. Section 10 of the Subversive Activities Control Act is amended as follows: the first sentence thereof preceding subparagraph (1) is amended so as to read:

" 'SEC. 10. (a) It shall be unlawful for any organization with respect to which there is in effect a final order of the Board determining it to be a Communist-action organization or a Communist-front organization—'.

"(b) The phrase following the colon at the end of subparagraph (1) thereof is amended to read: 'Disseminated by ———, an organization determined by final order of the Subversive Activities Control Board to be a Communist- ——— organization;'.

"(c) The phrase following the colon at the end of subparagraph (2) thereof is amended to read: 'The following program is sponsored by ——— an organization determined by final order of the Subversive Activities Control Board to be a Communist- ——— organization.'

"SEC. 6. Beginning with (j), all that of subsection (a) of section 11 of the Subversive Activities Control Act down to and including the end thereof is amended so as to read: 'there is in effect a final order of the Board determining such organization to be a Communist-action or a Communist-front organization.'

"SEC. 7. Beginning with (j), all that of subsection (b) of section 11 of the Subversive Activities Control Act down to and including the end thereof is amended so as to read: 'there is in effect a final order of the Board determining such organization to be a Communist-action or a Communist-front organization.'

"SEC. 8. Paragraph (2) of subsection (e) of section 12 of the Subversive Activities Control Act is amended so as to read:

" '(2) upon application made by the Attorney General under section 13(a) of this title, or by any individual under section 13(b) of this title, to determine whether any individual is a member of any organization as to which there is in effect a final order of the Board determining such organization to be a Communist-action organization.'

"SEC. 9. Section 13 of the Subversive Activities Control Act is amended as follows:

"(a) By amending subsection (a) thereof so as to read:

" '(a) (I) Whenever the Attorney General has reason to believe that any organization is a Communist-action organization or a Communist-front organization, he shall file with the Board and serve upon such organization a petition for a determination that such organization is a Communist-action organization or a Communist-front organization, as the case may be.

" '(II) Whenever the Attorney General has reason to believe that any individual is a member of an organization which has been finally determined under this section to be a Communist-action organization, he shall file with the Board and serve upon such individual a petition for a determination that such individual is a member of such organization. Each petition under part (I) or part (II) of this subsection shall be verified under oath, and shall contain a statement of the facts upon which the Attorney General relies in support of his prayer for the issuance of such order.'

"(b) By amending subsection (b) thereof so as to read:

"'(b) Any organization as to which there is in effect a final order of the Board determining it to be a Communist organization, and any individual as to whom there is in effect a final order of the Board determining him to be a member of a Communist-action organization may, not more often than once in each calendar year, file with the Board and serve upon the Attorney General a petition for a determination that such organization no longer is a Communist organization (in the case of an organization which has been determined under subsection (a) of this section to be one of the types of Communist organizations) or that such individual no longer is a member of a Communist-action organization, as the case may be. Each petition filed under and pursuant to this subsection shall be verified under oath, and shall contain a statement of the facts relied upon in support thereof. Upon the filing of any such petition, the Board shall serve upon each party to such proceeding a notice specifying the time and place for hearing upon such petition. No such hearing shall be conducted within twenty days after the service of such notice.'

"(c) By amending that portion of paragraph (2) of subsection (d) thereof which precedes the last sentence thereof so as to read:

"'(2) Where an organization or individual declines or fails to appear at a hearing accorded to such organization or individual by the Board in proceedings under subsection (a) of this section, the Board shall, nevertheless, proceed to receive evidence, make a determination of the issues, and enter such order as shall be just and appropriate. Upon failure of an organization or individual to appear at a hearing accorded to such organization or individual in proceedings under subsection (b) of this section the Board may forthwith and without further proceedings enter an order dismissing the petition of such organization or individual.'

"(d) By amending subsection (g) thereof so as to read:

"'(g) If, after hearing upon a petition filed under subsection (a) of this section, the Board determines—

"'(1) that an organization is a Communist-action organization or a Communist-front organization, as the case may be, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts and shall issue and cause to be served on such organization an order determining the organization to be a Communist-action organization or a Communist-front organization as the case may be;

"'(2) that an individual is a member of a Communist-action organization, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts and shall issue and cause to be served on such individual an order determining such individual to be a member of a Communist-action organization.'

"(e) By amending subsection (h) thereof so as to read:

"'(h) If, after hearing upon a petition filed under subsection (a) of this section, the Board determines—

"'(1) that an organization is not a Communist-action organization or a Communist-front organization, as the case may be, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts and shall issue and cause to be served upon the Attorney General an order denying the determination sought by his petition, and shall send a copy of such order to such organization;

"'(2) that an individual is not a member of any Communist-action organization, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts and shall issue and cause to be served upon the Attorney General an order denying the determination sought by his petition, and shall send a copy of such order to such individual.'

"(f) By amending subsection (i) thereof so as to read:

"'(i) If, after hearing upon a petition filed under subsection (b) of this section, the Board determines—

"'(1) that an organization no longer is a Communist-action organization or a Communist-front organization, as the case may be, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts and shall issue and cause to be served upon the Attorney General and such organization an order determining that the organization no longer is a Communist-action organization or Communist-front organization as the case may be;

"'(2) that an individual no longer is a member of any Communist-action organization, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts and shall issue and cause to be served upon the Attorney General and such individual an order determining that such individual no longer is a member of a Communist-action organization.'

"(g) By amending subsection (j) thereof so as to read:

"'(j) If, after hearing upon a petition filed under subsection (b) of this section, the Board determines—

"'(1) that an organization is a Communist-action organization or a communist-front organization, as the case may be, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts and shall issue and cause to be served on such organization an order denying its petition for a determination that the organization no longer is a Communist-action organization or a Communist-front organization as the case may be;

"'(2) that an individual is a member of a Communist-action organization, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts and shall issue and cause to be served upon such an individual an order denying his petition for a determination that the individual no longer is a member of a Communist-action organization.'

"(h) By amending subsection (k) thereof so as to read:

"'(k) When any order of the Board issued under subsection (g), (h), (i), or (j), of this section becomes final under the provisions of section 14(b) of this title, the Board shall publish in the Federal Register the fact that such order has become final, and publication thereof shall constitute notice to all persons that such order has become final.'

"SEC. 10. The seventh sentence of subsection (a) of section 14 of the Subversive Activities Control Act is amended so as to read: 'If the court shall set aside an order issued under subsection (j) of section 13, it may, in the case of an organization, enter a judgment requiring the Board to issue an order determining that such organization no longer is a Communist-action organization or Communist-front organization, as the case may be, or in the case of an individual, enter a judgment requiring the Board to issue an order determining that such individual no longer is a member of a Communist-action organization.'

"SEC. 11. Section 15 of the Subversive Activities Control Act is amended so as to read:

"'SEC. 15. (a) In the case of any organization which by proceedings under section 13(a) prior to the date of enactment hereof has been finally determined by the Board in carrying out its duties under subsection (e) of section 12, to be a "Communist-action organization" or a "Communist-front organization", and as a result of such determination has been ordered to register, the Board shall forthwith modify its previously issued registration order as may be necessary to conform such order to the provisions of section 13(g) hereof, and shall forthwith include such organization on the record maintained under section 9: *Provided, however,* That nothing in this subsection shall be construed so as to prevent any such organization from filing a petition as provided in subsection (b) of section 13.

"'(b) In the case of any proceeding pending before the Board on the effective date of this enactment the Board and the Attorney General are authorized to proceed in accordance with the provisions of this Act as herein amended. No suit, action, or other proceeding lawfully commenced prior to this enactment in any court of the United States shall abate by reason of this enactment. The court in any such case may allow such motion or supplemental pleadings as may be necessary to conform the litigation to the provisions of this Act as amended'."

Mr. DIRKSEN also submitted an amendment (No. 380), intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 10345, making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 381

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware (for himself and Mr. THURMOND) proposed an amendment to the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes, which was ordered to be printed.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS] I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the distinguished Senator from Washington [M. JACKSON] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1796) to impose quotas on the importation of certain textile articles.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing, the name of the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1073) to remove arbitrary limitations upon attorneys' fees for services rendered in proceedings before administrative agencies of the United States, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2043) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that a farmer (or fisherman) shall have until March 15, instead of only until February 15 as at present, to file an income tax return which also satisfies the requirements relating to declarations of estimated tax.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF AMENDMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of amendment No. 307, an amendment to S. 1125 which would allow a minimum annual allotment of $100,000 to each State for the education of the handicapped, that the name of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE] be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations be discharged from further consideration of S. 2186, a bill to establish a National Consumer Service Foundation as an independent agency in the executive branch of the Federal Government, and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, October 4, 1967, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 117. An act for the relief of Martha Blankenship;

S. 534. An act for the relief of Setsuko Wilson (nee Hiranaka);

S. 1320. An act to provide for the acquisition of career status by certain temporary employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes;

S. 1564. An act to amend the marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; and

S. 2162. An act to amend the act of January 17, 1936 (49 Stat. 1094), reserving certain public domain lands in Nevada and Oregon as a grazing reserve for Indians at Fort McDermitt, Nev.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF ERWIN N. GRISWOLD, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE SOLICITOR GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, October 11, 1967, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, before the Committee on the Judiciary, upon the nomination of Erwin N. Griswold, of Massachusetts, to be Solicitor General of the United States.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the above nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. COOPER:

Statement by Senator PERCY before Committee on Foreign Relations on Senate Resolution 151, August 21, 1967.

INCORPORATION OF THE JUNIOR NAVAL CADETS OF AMERICA

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I have introduced, for appropriate reference, a bill authorizing the incorporation of the Junior Naval Cadets of America. I introduced this legislation at the request of a distinguished constituent, Mr. Mario R. aRussilo of Johnston, R.I., who holds the rank of captain in the Junior Naval Cadets of America, and who is the commandant of the Rhode Island State Command, JNCA.

The purpose of this excellent organization is to drill and instruct young people between the ages of 12 and 18 in the tradition and science of the naval service. My own State, with its long and honorable nautical heritage, has had a great interest in the Junior Naval Cadets from the beginning. From their origin in nearby Connecticut with only a few hundred members, the Junior Naval Cadets now claim several thousand members in a dozen States across the Nation.

Because of their growth to national status and because of the consequent need to centralize and consolidate their legal status, the Junior Naval Cadets have decided to seek a congressional charter through the legislation which I have introduced. I do hope that the excellent Subcommittee on Federal Charters, Holidays, and Celebrations, which is headed by the distinguished minority leader, may see fit to consider this bill favorably.

THE CONTRIBUTION OF COOPERATIVES

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, Vice President HUMPHREY has written an excellent article for the October News for Farmer Cooperatives on the importance of cooperatives to the United States. During this 1967 Cooperative Month observance, the Vice President points out that the contribution of cooperatives both to the United States and to the underdeveloped world will be limited in the future only by the vision and energy of those in the cooperative movement. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the News for Farmer Cooperatives, Oct. 1, 1967]

COOPERATIVES: A NATIONAL ASSET

(By HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Vice President of the United States)

Cooperatives are built of bricks and mortar, glass and steel, wood and iron.

But they also are built with hands and hearts, with hopes and visions of men.

The Mortar.—We can see and touch the bricks and mortar. We can grasp the vast cooperative structure as a physical asset which enriches the Nation.

Farmers market and buy about $15 billion worth of goods through their cooperatives each year.

Over the past three decades 20 million rural people have been getting light and power through rural electric cooperatives. Each year rural power users buy over $1 billion worth of electrical appliances and equipment.

Farmers and their cooperatives borrowed $8 billion through the cooperative farm credit system last year. With this they kept a bounty of food flowing in the United States and to many of the hungry of the world.

To help produce this food, they also used cooperatives to water about 25 percent of all the irrigated land in this country.

Some 18 million people have built up assets of $11 billion in their credit unions.

Others live in housing cooperatives, get group health and insurance protection, and unite to obtain many other services.

These are matters of proud record for cooperative business in the United States.

The Men.—But it is more of men than mortar that I want to write. For the genius of cooperatives lies in its people, the greatest asset of any Nation. Thus a matter of even prouder record is a self-reliant people going about its business.

During this century cooperatives have given us a generation of agricultural leaders. Their voices are heard effectively in joint counsels between Government and citizens, as well as in their own business environments.

I watched cooperatives begin to develop this body of men—the early giants who had persuasive powers, high vision, and great business ability.

I watched too as new leaders began to emerge—the next generation who now stand beside their elders in high agricultural circles. Their names go on rosters of national commissions, national advisory committees, and other influential groups.

Five from cooperatives served with diligence on the National Advisory Commission on Food and Fiber. They have just completed 18 months of intensive exploration into agricultural policies' effects on our economy's performance and our foreign relations—a task assigned by President Johnson in January 1966.

I watched also as hundreds of thousands of people with little business background applied themselves diligently to learning their jobs as directors. Here, too, cooperatives molded a great body of better informed and more capable people. They add to this country's wealth of able citizens.

Took Daring and Resolution—The early cooperative builders knew no easy times—just as we know none today. One of our great Midwest cooperatives started in the twenties with one man and a few farmers who knew there had to be a better way. Today this cooperative stands among *Fortune* magazine's top 500 businesses, as do four other cooperatives.

This Midwest farmer business had no vertical takeoff. Just as most of the successes in today's cooperatives, it struggled through early lean years, started to grow, fell back a time or two, and then began to really move.

It took the master builders and the resolute will of determined members and directors to erect the major cooperative structure in American society. People often had to muster untried resources, untapped courage, just to keep going.

Strong Support by Government—But it also took something else: A recognition within the structure of Government that these men had high purpose and high potential and deserved support the Government could appropriately give.

That is why we have statutes and policies that make clear the rights of men to form cooperatives and do business through them.

That is why Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman has firmly stood up for the cooperatives' place in our economy.

That is why he and others in the Federal Government are again this year lending strong support to cooperatives by recognition of October as Cooperative Month.

That is why Governors of more than half our States this year issued Proclamations signaling recognition of cooperatives' importance to their States.

Others Starting To Build Today—But man can never rest on his accomplishments. Much as he likes to settle back after he reaches one peak of success, some inner spark keeps him moving. And behind him others come, also striving to lift themselves up.

It is to these people, just beginning their long struggle upward, that I now want to turn—to the low income, the minority, the disadvantaged of our own and other lands.

Many of these are looking toward cooperatives as a peaceful and productive way to bring about a better life for themselves and their families.

It is these people at home and overseas that now need the strong helping hand. So today the Government is focusing major efforts for them in cities and rural communities across the United States and throughout the world community.

Our Communities of Tomorrow.—The crisis in our cities is upon us. I have walked the streets that spawn revolt, seen the desperation of such environments. The chance to break out, to emerge into brighter opportunities must be given.

And yet we know that merely offering a chance is often not enough. People must first rouse themselves both to hope and to try. Some have made a start.

A housing cooperative in New York City points proudly to its no-crime record. None of its 300 middle- and lower-middle income members has ever been convicted of a felony. Yet the rate of crime in surrounding neighborhoods, filled with people of similar racial and cultural backgrounds, is no better and no worse than New York City as a whole.

In other housing co-ops in other parts of New York and other cities, the crime rate also is significantly lower than in housing in comparable neighborhoods.

Today's active programs to increase credit unions among low-income people are giving many their first grasp of money management and their first release from excessive interest costs. They are getting a taste of what they can do by joint effort.

Simple buying clubs also are teaching ways to live and work together for a common purpose. Some groups are moving on to get their food and other necessities by opening cooperative stores.

Cooperative enterprises on our city streets, whether formal or infomal, are one of the staging areas where the individual's sense of responsibility and belief in his own ability can be developed.

In addition, people usually do not destroy what they own and share in. We must find more and better ways of making such ownership and involvement possible to the millions of our own needy. Cooperatives, of course, aren't the whole answer. But they are part of it, often the first start toward finding sensible solutions.

Rural Communities Under Stress.—The rural community is no longer a place where even bare subsistence is possible with that "little piece of land." The crisis has been building there just as it has in the cities.

The Food and Fiber Commission reports: "We may be poised on the threshold of an even greater technological revolution on the farm." It then warns, "Unless the United States can provide employment by 1980 for the equivalent of 40 percent of the people now working on farms, returns to farm labor will continue to be depressed, and a substantial number of farm families will continue to live in poverty."

The Commission sees the task ahead in the rural areas as enormous—"a reorganization and reorientation of the rural community."

Certainly the rural town is so closely intermingled with farming that it cannot prosper when number of farmers is down drastically, and their income is not on a par with the rest of the economy.

Together farmers have established in their own home towns thousands of thriving small businesses—their cooperatives. These add to the money base of the community with jobs, taxes, and money paid others for services.

Cooperatives are the one mainline business, the one bright business spot in many small towns. They stand beside other businesses as generator of jobs and added income in many others.

But the job is far from finished. The future holds the further urgent challenge for building communities of tomorrow. This is a job we must do while we still have time for sensible transition from the old-line, on-farm economy to an increasingly more, complex agricultural business system.

Local, State, and Federal energies now are wrestling with finding help for rural people with no opportunities for farm land, for other jobs, or for training. Many programs already are in action.

Cooperatives need to be more a part of this action if they are to fulfill their promise. They must not be considered, however, as mere survival kits, something to be tried only *in extremis*. Neither must they be considered a miracle cure, whatever the ailment.

The Federal Government is providing loans and grants and technical advice as aids. Its participation in this year's Cooperative Month gives meaning to our firm commitment for a creative effort to help people lift themselves up—be they sharecropper, small farmer, large family farmer, or city resident.

Some early-stage co-ops now starting will have the same growing pains as the successful cooperatives of today. They won't have time to wait to simply outgrow them on their own. But they need more than time; they need sound advice and help; and they need the benefit of others' experiences.

The International Community of Tomorrow.—I have long proclaimed the need to lend cooperative knowledge overseas as a basic part of our international programs to help the needy of the world. I spoke of this again this past February at a conference on the Fifth Anniversary of the Amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act that bears my name.

There I expressed my pleasure that the Agency for International Development (AID) had been carrying out the mandate of the Amendment to step up development of cooperatives overseas. I said the people at this conference were "mobilizing resources under the banner of cooperatives and helping in the business of nation building."

Cooperatives in these needy areas are the seed centers from which can grow the people and the principles every nation of free men needs.

We have made a start in setting down these seed centers in the vast continents where our poor would be their rich. Cooperatives have been generous of their time, skills, and people—sending all three across vast distances to other less favored people.

The rural electrics have been helping bring light and power to rural communities of other lands, and ultimately expect 1.25 million people in 50 countries to benefit from United States pioneering with electrical cooperatives.

That you can build cooperatives under real adversity has been demonstrated in Viet Nam.

The first of three pilot electric cooperatives a few months ago started bringing electricity to 90 of the eventual 12,000 families it will serve.

An Army Colonel helped set up several cooperatives to increase local production of fresh vegetables and fruits to help feed allied forces and the Vietnamese. About 2,700 farmers formed the first of these 165 miles north of Saigon.

These cooperatives now have started their own processing and packaging businesses. Reports are that the farmers have greatly increased their incomes as well as their crops.

Cooperatives are lending their men to help India develop fertilizer systems for a land that must produce more and do it quickly to feed its hungry millions.

Our own cooperative people are well accepted in almost every area, and bring more of the true picture of the United States to these people than they have seen before.

Many parts of the world will be in a food crisis in all too few years. Whatever we can do to help the farmers of the needier nations improve their productivity and their efficiency is vital for the good of us all. We are learning that the United States and today's other food exporting nations cannot feed all the hungry of the world.

Cooperatives bring better prices for products and lower costs for fertilizers and other supplies; better assurance of places to market what farmers produce and direct advice on improved farming practices—all incentives to produce more.

Cooperatives are one of the lifts people are using in trying to reach up—too often with high hopes only and no solid foundation on which to build for their own countries.

We need more people to give them a hand, people grounded in basic business facts the United States cooperatives have had to learn in day-to-day operations. We need people with a deep commitment to the struggling at home and overseas, those with compassion as well as pride of accomplishment.

We need people who do not "go gentle into that night" when faced with death of their hopes and plans. We need people who not only can pick themselves up, but can lift others with them and once again move fiercely into changing things for the better.

We are a people in the United States who seldom write Mission Accomplished if there is more to be done on the road ahead. We are a people of discontent, but not of malcontents.

Cooperatives are a response to discontent, a way to channel this urge for better things into a positive asset for the common good.

J. EDGAR HOOVER SPEAKS ON THE RIOTS THIS SUMMER

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the October edition of the Law Enforcement Bulletin of the Federal Bureau of Investigation contains an excellent statement by Director J. Edgar Hoover on the rioting this summer.

Mr. Hoover takes the position, as I do along with a great many others, that much of the mob violence we have seen in our city streets has resulted in part from the so-called civil disobedience movement.

It has long been my feeling that civil disobedience was degenerating into an outright criminal action in all too many instances. One cannot go about the country preaching disrespect for law and order, urging people to take the law into their own hands, or advising people on what laws they ought to obey and which ones they ought to disobey without inviting chaos and anarchy, and in many of our cities this summer we have seen just that.

I feel as does Mr. Hoover that "if our system of law is to survive, then the law must be enforced."

Mr. Hoover's statement on this problem is one of the finest I have read. I invite the attention of the Senate to it and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MESSAGE FROM THE DIRECTOR

In a riot there are no victors. The losers include everybody—the rioters, the victims, law enforcement, the community, the State, and the Nation.

Causes of riots can be counted by the score. A study of the overall problem indicates, however, that the widespread violence in our country to some degree is a direct outgrowth of the civil disobedience movement. In recent years, some leaders of dubious stature have made a grandiose gesture of willfully violating laws they deem to be unjust. For the most part, these individuals, although admittedly guilty of breaking the law, have gone unpunished. Young thugs and misguided teenagers, seeing others defy authority and the courts with impunity, have been led to believe that any crime under a banner of complaints is justified. Consequently, they ignore the law and roam through their communities creating violence and terror. Certainly, those who espouse the theory of civil disobedience and authorities who free guilty violators must share a portion of the blame and responsibility for the turmoil in our streets. It should be abundantly clear that the doctrine of civil disobedience is a doctrine of self-destruction.

Stern, decisive action is needed when a street disturbance begins. Justice is not served when a growing horde of vandals and looters is appeased and their pillage overlooked lest "a show of force might provoke them to greater violence." Quiescence does not satisfy rioters. Procrastination or uncertainty on the part of authorities denotes weakness or concession to a mob. Thus, the offenders are encouraged, and their violence gains momentum.

A judicial self-appraisal by the news media of their riot coverage might also be in order. Some media have already taken action in this regard. There can be no quarrel with the all-important role of keeping the public informed as quickly and as completely as possible. No one rightfully expects riots to be played down or salient facts withheld.

On the other hand, militant agitators, hatemongers, and publicity-seeking rabble rousers who incite riots have no fear of overexposure. They know that television, radio, and front-page news stories are the best and quickest means of getting their views before the public. Thus, they seek attention from the news media. In riot reporting, objectivity and balance, always key factors of responsible journalism, help expose distortion and reduce the special treatment of those who advocate violence. Strict adherence to high journalistic principles is a valuable public service in matters affecting public safety.

Many proposals have been advanced to help eliminate the causes of riots. Just as there is no single cause, there is no single remedy. I do know, however, that the answer will not be found in sociological remedies alone. If our system of law is to survive, then the law must be enforced. Those who break the law, acting alone or in concert, must be detected and arrested, promptly prosecuted, and given proper, substantial punishment. In halting riots and removing crime from our Nation's streets, this should be the first order of business.

October 1. 1967.

JOHN EDGAR HOOVER,
Director.

CONSIDERATION OF FISH, WILDLIFE, AND RECREATIONAL VALUES IN PLANNING FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, during the 87th Congress and again in the 88th, I introduced legislation which would assure the consideration of fish, wildlife, and recreation values in the planning and development of Federal-aid highways. It was my conviction that great stretches of valuable stream as well as areas of recreation and scenic value were being damaged or completely destroyed by a shortsighted Federal highways development policy which considered only the economic and engineering criteria in the routing, location, and design of roads. To illustrate the severity of the problem I launched a Save Our Streams campaign citing case after case where fish, wildlife, and scenic resources were being sacrificed to the highway builder.

Fortunately, there are encouraging signs that much of this is changing. The enabling legislation of the new Department of Transportation specifically directs the Secretary to give special consideration to the preservation of scenery, recreation, wildlife, and waterfowl in the development of transportation plans and programs. The move, however, from generalized statements of national policy objectives to the specifics of locating a particular segment of highway, is not one which occurs automatically. Without specific implementing procedures at the working level where the route selections are actually made, well intended statements of national policy become empty phrases. For this reason I read with particular interest the recent recommendations made to the President by the Citizens Advisory Committee on Recreation and Natural Beauty. The recommendations on the selection of highway routes by this Committee, of which Laurence S. Rockefeller is the chairman, offers specific suggestions for the protection of fish, wildlife, scenic, and recreational resources. These are thoughtful and worthwhile considerations. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SELECTION OF HIGHWAY ROUTES

Recent proposals for new highway construction have raised storms of feeling from Franconia Notch in New England to the coastal redwood forests of California. Many people are deeply concerned, not only about the threat to great natural treasures but to the open spaces in their own local areas. They charge that only lip service is paid to environmental values; that route selections are arbitrary and based on narrow grounds; that the public can express itself only after the decisions have been made; and that once they are made, there is no deflecting the engineers from their inexorable course.

People have reason to be concerned. Many valuable open spaces have already been lost to highways, and the pressure on what is left is sharpening. With more people and more cars to be served, the demand for highways goes up as the space available for them goes down.

The situation is aggravated by archaic methods of choosing locations for highways. The methods were devised when the overriding need was to provide safe and efficient transportation. The chief concerns in deciding on route locations were engineering considerations and costs; preservation of open space or scenery were hardly factors. Road building agencies were made nearly immune from outside pressure.

Since then, America has moved forward to a different set of needs. The pioneering era, when new routes were punched through fields and forest, is largely over. Experience has taught us that we require more uses from the land than can be considered in the simple cost-benefit formula. Highways have effects that reach far beyond those who drive on them; yet our present devices for choosing locations are still based mostly on requirements of the highway user rather than the community at large.

But this is not the national policy. The President and Congress have declared that our highway programs should seek to preserve our countryside and our park lands. The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1966 and the Department of Transportation Act of 1966 clearly establish these concerns as not only desirable but mandatory.

But these concerns have yet to be made an integral part of the highway planning process. They should be.

New techniques are being devised so that the selection of routes can be made on qualitative, as well as quantitative, grounds. These techniques, which attempt to translate social needs in terms as tangible as engineering costs, hold great promise for highway planning.

We recognize that any change in existing procedures involves risk. If the public is allowed a larger role in making decisions, and if the decisions of highway officials are subjected to more appeals and more review, highway costs may rise and construction time may be slowed. We also recognize that route selection will always be a matter of reconciling many different needs. Adding further steps to the highway planning process will increase the lead time from concept to construction. Understandably, those charged with seeing that the concrete is poured will not like the idea of further procedural complications.

But these are secondary considerations. Highway planning is not going to be improved unless procedures are changed. In 1965, the Assembly Interim Committee on Natural Resources, Planning and Public Works of the State of California under the chairmanship of Edwin L. Z'berg, studied this problem and published an outstanding report. The basic conclusion of the Z'berg report was that highway agencies ". . . should be specifically directed to consider, in a formalized procedure equivalent to that devoted to engineering and cost considerations, all factors, translated into costs whenever feasible, affected by the location of a highway or freeway, including but not limited to such factors as community values, recreational, aesthetic, and park values; historical values; adjacent land values; impact on local tax roles; and total projected regional transportation requirements . . ." This recommendation has now become law, if not practice, in California.

We believe that these goals should be incorporated into the regulations of the Department of Transportation governing federal highway aid to all the states. We realize that the Bureau of Public Roads has already made some moves in this direction. We think a stronger effort is in order and offer these recommendations to that end. They are limited to highways, but the principles may apply to problems raised by other forms of transportation as well.

1. The Department of Transportation should make federal aid for highways contingent on route selection procedures that guarantee consideration of natural resources, recreation and natural beauty. The procedures should include early involvement of all interested public agencies, two full pub-

lic hearings, a complete and public record, and greater consideration to natural values in competition with economic and engineering considerations.

2. The Secretary of Transportation should establish a Route Selection Review Board. We suggest a five member review board, which would include representatives of the Departments of the Interior, Housing and Urban Development, and Agriculture as well as the Department of Transportation.

3. Similar review boards should be established by the governors of each state. The state planning offices might serve as the coordinating agency.

ROUTE SELECTION AT THE STATE LEVEL

In the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1966, Congress directed the Secretary of Transportation to work with the states in developing highway programs that make maximum effort to preserve parks, historic sites and places of natural beauty. As an aid to the development of such programs, the Committee recommends that the Bureau of Public Roads amend its procedures for the granting of aid to highways to establish the following requirements:

1. Coordination with resource agencies from the beginning

Environmental factors must be worked into the highway planning procedure—and at the earliest possible opportunity. As soon as a state highway department begins considering an area as a possible location for a new highway, the department should be required to communicate that information to the state's resource and recreation agencies, the relevant federal agencies, and the agencies of the local governments of the area affected.

The state planing agency could bring the various agencies together. It should request them to advise the highway department about the specific resource and other environmental factors they believe should be considered in the selection of the route.

This early consultation would help the highway planners. They would be apprised of the potential conflicts when the planning begins, rather than later when it is over.

The resource agencies and the highway department should continue to work closely together throughout the design and construction phases.

2. Early public hearing

As soon as the reports of the resource agencies are on file, a first public hearing should be held. The subject of this first hearing would be the corridor under consideration, the objective of the proposed highway, alternative routes, and the criteria which are to guide the route selection process.

When the highway department has decided on the route, it should make public the decision and the reasons for it. It should note the resource problems that had been brought up and explain how each was considered.

3. Second public hearing

In most cases, it is likely that the first hearing will suffice. However, in unusually difficult or controversial cases, there should be a second hearing.

The subject of the second public hearing would be the proposed alignment within the selected corridor. As in the first public hearing, resource agencies data bearing upon the proposed alignment should be presented along with the state highway department's own presentation.

4. Formal decision on the final proposed alignment

After the second public hearing, the state highway department should make public the alignment it intends to propose to the federal government. The value of this requirement cannot be overstated.

There should be appended to this formal announcement final written statements of approval or disapproval by those resource and planning agencies which had made specific suggestions for modification. These commentaries, together with rebuttal comments by the highway department, would be part of the record sent forward to federal authorities.

5. Impartial hearing forum

In some situations highway hearings become, in effect, adversary proceedings between those who want the route and those who do not, with those who want it having the chair. Hearings would obviously be more equitable if conducted by someone other than the highway agency. Impartial hearing officials are now required by California and Michigan. Other states should follow suit.

REVIEW AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL

When the highway proposal has been forwarded from the state to the Department of Transportation for approval of federal aid, there is another opportunity to consider environmental factors. The provisions of section 15 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1966, and sections 2(b)(2) and 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act come into play. These legislative requirements apply most specifically to publicly owned lands; but there is also a strong directive that "special effort should be made to preserve the natural beauty of the countryside . . ."

We recommend that a definite review procedure be established to insure that the objectives of the Acts are carried out forcefully.

To provide a workable procedure, we recommend that the Secretary of Transportation establish a Highway Review Board. It could consist of five members, one each appointed by the Secretaries of the Interior, Housing and Urban Development, and Agriculture, and two appointed by the Secretary of Transportation. One of the last named could be designated as chairman. The members could serve at the pleasure of the respective appointing officials.

A highway project considered to be contrary to the national policy could be referred within a specified time limit to the review board. The review board, of course, would have to lay down rules as to what kind of cases it would consider and who would have standing to initiate them. Eligible cases would be screened to determine whether the case was of sufficient significance to warrant a formal review by the board. The thorough documentation of the background of the case including the written record of the first public hearing, and the detailed explanation of the state highway department giving the reasons for its decision as to the route location, would greatly help the review board to determine whether the case warrants detailed review or not.

The review board would be required to state in writing its reasons for accepting or rejecting each case for detailed review. The series of discussion in such cases would build up a body of precedent and standards, comparable to certiorari in the Supreme Court, that would provide highway officials and the public with understanding of the application of national policy to specific problems.

In those cases which were accepted for review, the members of the board would study the records of the first and second public hearings, and the staff would review the technical issues. The rules for the review would be developed by the board.

Following the detailed study, the review board would forward to the Secretary of Transportation its recommendation as to whether the project be approved or modified. The Secretary would make the final decision which might or might not be in accord with what the board recommended. The recommendation of the review board would be made public together with the Secretary's decision and his reasons for making it.

REVIEW AT THE STATE LEVEL

We recommend that the governor of each state establish a similar review procedure. The state's planning agency might be charged with the task. Typically, planning agencies are charged with the development of statewide comprehensive plans, including those for recreation and transportation. They also report directly to the governor and are well situated to deal with the various other agencies.

Use should also be made of the new metropolitan agencies that have been set up in response to recent federal legislation. These agencies are charged with reviewing applications for federal grants-in-aid, and it is their job to determine whether specific projects are consistent with comprehensive metropolitan area plans. They could help insure that highway plans are geared to the environmental needs of the areas.

In the long run, the states should be the place to settle highway controversies. The state highway department currently sends its recommendations off to the Federal Bureau of Public Roads without review by the governor or other state agencies. Controversy simply follows the project to Washington. In the spirit of creative federalism, we believe that most of the highway controversies should be settled at the state level. This would provide a hearing closer to the people and would relieve the Department of Transportation, the Secretary, and the proposed Federal Review Board of undue and unproductive burden.

WE SHOULD FORTHWITH STOP BOMBING NORTH VIETNAM AND DEESCALATE THE GROUND WAR

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, in his speech at San Antonio last Friday, President Johnson again announced that we will cease bombing North Vietnam provided that prior to our doing so the Hanoi government agrees to enter into negotiations.

There is overwhelming agreement among our closest allies and even among those few countries which support our involvement in Vietnam—however token that support may be—that the bombing is a failure, that it prevents effective probing for peace, and that an unconditional cessation of bombing the north and without a time limit would probably lead to negotiations toward a ceasefire and an armistice. This is reflected in the appeals of more than half a dozen foreign ministers at the United Nations General Assembly.

Mr. President, yesterday, the Premier of Laos, Prince Souvanna Phouma, publicly urged the United States to stop bombing north Vietnam. He stated:

> The United States ought to stop bombing North Vietnam, as otherwise the war in Vietnam might easily become the fuse setting alight the third world war.

It is noteworthy that the premier of a nation which was once a part of the French Indochinese colonial empire along with Vietnam, a leader who has usually taken a neutral position on the civil war in Vietnam, now feels impelled to join the leaders of other nations of the world in calling for an end to the bombing. This also, from the leader of a nation which President Johnson claimed is a victim of north Vietnamese aggression.

The appeal made by Foreign Minister Malik of Indonesia before the General Assembly calling for an end to our bombing of north Vietnam is also of particular interest because of the repeated claim of administration officials that American intervention in Vietnam saved Indonesia from communism. This allegation was most recently alluded to by the President in his San Antonio speech. Foreign Minister Malik, who was one of those who really did prevent a Communist coup in Indonesia, obviously feels that Indonesia's interests and those of Asia as a whole would be best served by a political accommodation in Vietnam and by an end to the bombing of North Vietnam rather than by continuation of this ugly war.

The peace plan put forward by the Canadian Foreign Minister, Paul Martin, is of extreme importance because of continued Canadian contract with the Hanoi government as a member of the International Control Commission created in Vietnam by the Geneva accords in 1954. Mr. Martin has described a halt in the bombing as the "first priority before further steps can be taken toward a ceasefire and an armistice."

Secretary General U Thant has expressed confidence that negotiations could begin within 3 or 4 weeks if the bombing ended unconditionally. There is every reason to believe that an opening of negotiations would follow an unconditional—or indefinite—cessation of the bombing within 3 or 4 weeks. If talks did not begin after several weeks of a bombing suspension, the United States would be in a strong position in world opinion to take whatever necessary action might be deemed desirable at that time.

Mr. President, the risks involved in taking the necessary first step of a bombing pause are much less than those that will result from continued escalation of the bombing and of the ground war. The greater danger of a global war lies in the steady expansion of the Vietnamese fighting.

The risks that are involved are very limited and are worth taking especially in view of the statements by Secretary of Defense McNamara concerning the limited effectiveness to date of the bombing of North Vietnam and in view of the alternative risks involved in the continued escalation of the war. Certainly, we as the most powerful nation on earth can afford to bend a little and venture this minimal risk which could possibly lead to an end to this war which now seriously threatens the peace of the entire world.

Mr. President, I commend the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] on the proposal which he made in the Senate yesterday that we invite North Vietnam to peace talks by announcing a date on which we would halt all military action in the war including reinforcements of our forces. I am hopeful that President Johnson will heed the suggestion urged yesterday by the distinguished Senator from Missouri. I also urge the President to announce that along with stopping all bombing of North Vietnam unconditionally, we will withdraw to Saigon and our coastal bases or enclaves under the protection of our air power and our 1st and 7th Fleets once negotiations begin, provided, of course, that the Vietcong cease offensive action during that period.

Mr. President, there are many paths toward peace in Vietnam available to us. However, before we can begin any of them, it is obvious to all that an unconditional halt in the bombing is the essential prerequisite.

LONG-TERM PLANNING FOR GROWTH OF METROPOLITAN AREAS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I have long been concerned with the need for adequate long-term planning to provide sound plans and projects for the growth of our metropolitan areas. Skilled planning agencies at the local level are necessary to help the Federal Government plan and budget Federal grant-in-aid programs for urban improvement.

Recently, Mr. Charles M. Haar, Assistant Secretary for Metropolitan Development, Department of Housing and Urban Development, discussed this subject in a speech delivered at Columbia University. Titled "Metropolitan Development and Budgeting: A Step Toward Creative Federalism," Mr. Haar stresses the importance of strong local involvement for adequate Federal planning.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Haar's remarks be reprinted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT AND BUDGETING: A STEP TOWARD CREATIVE FEDERALISM

(Remarks of Charles M. Haar, Assistant Secretary for Metropolitan Development, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, at Columbia University, New York City, September 21, 1967)

> "The heavens themselves, the planets, and this centre
> Observe degree, priority, and place,
> Insisture, course, proportion, season, form,
> Office, and custom, in all line of Order"
> —TROILUS AND CRESSIDA.

Substance of programs of an Administration is the first order of public concern. But, as Maitland pointed out, the substance of laws is often to be found in procedural interstices. So, too, may the general approach toward coping with substance mold the very nature of program solutions, and become the key to success or failure. Thinking clearly about goals, relating them to actions, and weaving these priorities together on the third dimension of a National-State-local framework is the assignment given to the present Federal establishment by President Johnson. The establishment of intellectual order is thus the essence of the President's approach to the operation and management of government. Consequently, the achievement of the Administration may be measured in terms of its search for efficiency, its awareness of relating action programs to objectives and of its attainments in meshing the different capabilities of the local and National levels—and how these increase human welfare.

It is these new concepts of scientific management in the Federal Government which have led the Department of Housing and Urban Development to look afresh at the way it implements national urban goals.

For, indeed, Congress has established national goals for housing and urban environments: it has also set forth a practical series of financial programs to help local communities work toward these goals. Thus far, the tendency nationally has been to state these goals in terms of broad national commitments, such as "a decent home and suitable living environment for every American family" (Section 2 of the Housing Act of 1949) rather than as programs for specific action. The grant-in-aid programs, on the other hand, can be little more than a functional way of paying for financing local needs. It is in identifying and measuring the link between the two wherein resides the major task of budgeting and programing.

On November 17, 1966, the President issued a memorandum to the heads of executive agencies, stressing the use of Programing and Budgeting Systems to: Identify our national goals with greater precision, determine priority among goals, develop and analyze alternate means of effectively reaching those goals, obtain accurate information about probable costs for programs, relate analysis to budget requests so that those requests follow and support comprehensive and sound agency planning.

Greater precision in the identification of national goals in the Federal system demands much more than sophisticated budgeting techniques on the Departmental level. The use of systems analysis requires inputs of information which must be both current and accurate, and, in the particular case of urban planning, based on local research and knowledge of local conditions. Comprehensive metropolitan planning must provide perspective on a range of urban problems based on such research and knowledge. The Office of Metropolitan Development seeks to help local governments develop and interpret statements of metropolitan policies in order to better formulate and quantify national goals. For national goals to be effective, they must reflect the plans of the urban areas affected, and be suitable for translation into action by local urban institutions. The problem faced by the administrator of a Federal grant-in-aid program is to establish the essential connections between local problem definition and aggregate national goals so that urban planning can lead to effective action.

Quantification is basic to the use of the systems analysis effort to link programs and goals more closely together. Although there are many factors which cannot now be easily quantified, more of the planning process is amenable to this treatment than was once thought possible. As usable data become available, further goals and more standards can be made explicit and operationally defined. As quantitative information increases, the possibilities of establishing effective cost/benefit ratios for qualitative evaluation also increase. The relationships among such goals as adequate water supply, waste disposal, and stream purification should be clarified by definite characteristics, and the evaluation of combined programs for meeting established goals should be made with objective criteria. On the basis of such analytical series, it is possible to develop priorities among these goals and plan for action to meet them.

The commitment of the Department of Housing and Urban Development toward meeting such goals will require a series of programs, working through the cycle of development and feedback, with specific results to be obtained during each stage. These will lead toward amelioration of the urban environment only by a high level of coordination among federally aided projects, and between these and other development activities. The emphasis on the concentrated and coordinated use of Federal aids which is the guiding principle of the new Model Cities program should also be applied to the planning of other urban development programs.

When the goals and schedules of a series of development programs have been prepared, they can serve as the base for advance programming and as an informed and definite rationale for yearly budget requests.

Use of systems analysis in planning and budgeting Federal Urban programs will institute important changes in present procedures, and, at the same time, make different demands on the planners. Recently, the Department of Housing and Urban Development prepared projections of national needs for the major facilities funded under metropolitan development programs: water supplies, sewer systems, waste treatment plants, open space and outdoor recreation areas, and mass transportation systems. These projections considered the current backlog of needs which have not been met, future needs arising from an expected population increase, and the continuing need for replacement as facilities wear out or become obsolete. The Department can use these projections to make rough estimates of future Federal program levels. Yet these projections are inadequate in the information they contain.

They do not tell us about the intentions of local communities to make use of Federal aid programs, or about the ability of local governments to contribute to the cost of any facility. Furthermore, these projections indicate only the demand side of the equation, but contain no information by which to measure and compare the benefits. Again, they do not describe the relations among facilities at the local level—such as the possibility of undertaking several projects jointly to meet common needs and achieve economies in accomplishment. Nor do they describe possible indirect impact of Federal investments, such as the extent to which water and sewer programs will contribute to anti-pollution goals, often benefiting other areas in the same watershed as the projects. Furthermore, the national projections do not take into account the special circumstances of individual urban areas—exceptional needs, or opportunities, or unusual problems in the provision of better facilities.

Such national projections, then, have their limitations in their inability to encompass the realities and complexities which are inherent in each individual urban area. Even though they may be based on the best information available at the national level, they may be out of touch with the realities and complexities that can be appreciated only by a closer look at individual urban areas.

Moreover, the structuring of these national overviews is not well matched to the way in which development decisions are made within the Federal system. Decisions to make use of Federal grants-in-aid (and appropriate matching funds where necessary) originate with state and local governments. Although Federal funds provide the impetus, Federal participation must blend with these local activities and with those of the private sector. The development of programs to advance national goals toward attainment requires liaison among all levels of government, and a system of data collection and communication which will adequately reflect the problems and events occurring at the local levels.

Clearly, adequate Federal programming requires very strong local involvement: participation in the full sense of the word. If the tool of systems analysis is to attain full usefulness, the Department of Housing and Urban Development should inaugurate new cooperative arrangements which will assign major responsibility to metropolitan planning agencies for gathering information on the needs and capacities of urban areas and for assisting in planning and budgeting Federal grants-in-aid programs.

The metropolitan planning agencies now operating in almost all urban areas are particularly well equipped to perform these functions. They are in close touch with local governments in the areas they serve, and in many cases their staffs are directly responsible to councils of locally elected officials. Their understanding of local problems gives them insight and perspective on areawide urban development. Their studies of population trends and economic growth supply a realistic context for evaluating the metropolitan impact of local development proposals. As planners of the future metropolis, they are concerned with establishing goals for metropolitan development, and with programs to meet them.

Most of these metropolitan planning agencies are aided through the Federal 701 Planning Assistance program. This permits the Department of Housing and Urban Development to give grants at all levels—city, county, and state—to establish comprehensive planning capabilities, including data collection. Now the Department intends to ask these agencies to assist the Federal government by supplying information needed for the advance budgeting of Federal urban development programs. This contribution from the metropolitan planning agencies will help the Department to perform its role of developing policies for fostering the orderly growth and development of the Nation's urban areas, and assisting the President in achieving maximum coordination of the various Federal activities which have a major effect upon urban and metropolitan development. At the same time, this new function will help to strengthen the metropolitan planning agencies in carrying out their basic responsibilities for planning the development of their own areas.

As a first step toward improved budgeting, we shall ask the metropolitan planning agencies to look ahead two years and give us an estimate of the local applications which are likely to be submitted for Federal grants-in-aid for metropolitan development. We shall ask them to consider the connections between these proposals—that is, which proposals are interdependent, which are closely related to one another, and which are relatively independent. We shall ask them to tell us what they expect to be achieved if these proposals are all funded—how far these projects will advance the area toward its metropolitan goals; what contribution these projects will make in terms of improving standards of public service, reducing environmental pollution, reducing travel times, or expanding the supply of sound housing. By combining these results for a large number of metropolitan areas, the Department hopes to get a relatively adequate picture of the demand for Federal aid in urban development, and the extent to which this level of Federal spending would achieve local and national urban goals.

Concurrently, we shall ask the metropolitan planning agencies to begin converting their own metropolitan development goals into preliminary targets to be achieved by 1970, and into a staged program for meeting these targets. We will want to know what requests for Federal urban development aid will be generated by this program, and what progress can be made by 1970 as a result of this aid.

This new involvement of metropolitan planning agencies in advance budgeting for Federal-aid programs will benefit these agencies as well as the Federal government. It will help move metropolitan planning from a long-range vision to a realistic plan of action. And it will serve the metropolitan area in this descent from the clouds, improving communication among local communities on their development projects, so that these can be coordinated for maximum effect and economy. It can work toward acquiring basic sources of information—information which can be organized on a comparative and operational basis, and organized into coherent, demonstrable propositions.

The Federal government will also benefit by having more realistic information on future requests for Federal aid and a greater understanding of what might be achieved by means of this aid. Our hypothesis is that a higher proportion of metropolitan development decisions can be made on the basis of systematic quantifications than are now being made. Metropolitan planning needs more means of obtaining comparative cost/benefit ratios. The costs of achieving urban goals will become clearer, and goals can be related to different program levels. Meaningful choices are possible. With the help of metropolitan planning agencies, the Federal and local governments will also be able to move beyond general goals for the future of our urban areas into staged programs for getting from here to there. We can have firmer underpinnings for proof and demonstration.

The benefits which this cooperative planning is designed to realize will be still-born, however, in the absence of adequate federal funds to support the metropolitan planning agencies and the grant-in-aid investment programs. To insure that these urban programs can continue to go forward, President Johnson has requested Congress to increase federal taxes through a 10 per cent surcharge. Passage of the additional taxes will be essential if metropolitan planning and the new budgeting system are to fulfill their goals.

Systems analysis and programs budgeting are not cure-alls for the sound and orderly development of metropolitan areas. They cannot, by computerized magic, accomplish the thinking and the work of the Department of Housing and Urban Development and of the many metropolitan planning agencies involved. They are highly serviceable tools, which, if used properly, will increase the effectiveness of both planning and action, at all levels of government—local and Federal. Used with full knowledge of their advantages and limitations, these methods can both improve and accelerate the Administration's efforts in bettering the quality of urban life. For the measure of this Administration's success is not in the number of dollars it spends, nor in the number of projects it manages, but in the positive benefits which its efforts bring to individuals and communities.

GEORGE MEANY COMMENTS ON SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, in his recent testimony before the Committee on Finance, called upon the Senate to make vitally necessary improvements in the Social Security Amendments of 1967 passed by the House.

Mr. Meany said he was shocked when the House of Representatives reduced the overall benefit increases asked by the President, especially as they affect the "most-poverty stricken beneficiaries." He called indefensible House "failure to include the disabled under medicare, its drastic cutback in coverage and services under medicaid, and its harsh and punitive restrictions aimed at destitute mothers and children receiving public assistance."

Mr. President, since Mr. Meany's testimony is worthy of our careful study in considering this important legislation, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement on Social Security Amendments of 1967 (H.R. 12080)

(Summary of statement of George Meany, president, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, to the Senate Committee on Finance, September 19, 1967)

Mr. Chairman, I greatly appreciate this opportunity to present the views of the AFL–CIO on H.R. 12080, the amendments to the Social Security Act passed by the House of

Representatives, which your Committee is now considering. I will briefly summarize our position on the major features of the bill. You will find our detailed comments in my longer statement which I respectfully request be included in the record of these hearings. I have also attached the statement on the Social Security bill the Executive Council of the AFL–CIO unanimously adopted just last week.

The AFL–CIO has been frankly disappointed in the Social Security bill the House of Representatives has passed. We welcomed the proposals the President announced earlier this year as a sincere, if somewhat modest, effort to improve the nation's Social Security and Public Welfare programs. In my statement to the House Ways and Means Committee I said that we regarded the President's proposals as a significant down-payment toward the kind of Social Security system this country can and should have.

We were shocked, therefore, when the House sharply reduced the over-all benefit increase the President recommended, especially for some of the most poverty-stricken Social Security beneficiaries who are receiving the lowest benefits. We also regard as indefensible such other features of the House bill as its failure to include the disabled under Medicare, its drastic cut-back in coverage and services under Medicaid—a program which I remind you is just now getting underway—and its harsh and punitive restrictions aimed at destitute mothers and children receiving public assistance.

Let me turn first to needed improvements in Social Security benefit levels. I am sure that the members of the Committee are well aware of how inadequate and out-of-date Social Security payments are today. Social Security benefits have lagged far behind the rise in living costs, to say nothing of the better living standards most Americans enjoy. Since 1940 Social Security beneficiaries have been fighting a losing battle with the cost of living. Although Social Security benefits have been increased five times during that period, those increases have failed to keep pace with the rise in living costs.

If you look at the more recent situation, we had Social Security benefit increases in 1959 and 1965. Neither matched the increase in living costs since the previous benefit increase.

Let me cite an example of what I have in mind. The average monthly benefit today for a worker who retired in 1954 is $76, but it would have to be $82 to purchase the same goods and services that worker could buy with the $76 benefit he got when he retired thirteen years ago. And to keep pace with wages of employed workers, he'd have to get $104, 37 percent more than his actual benefit today.

The fact is that the average individual or couple on Social Security can barely eke out a sub-poverty level of living. The poverty standard is $1470 for a single aged individual and $1850 for an elderly couple. Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I'd call it a standard far below the poverty level. But the average Social Security beneficiary is below even that subsistence level. On an annual basis, a single aged person now averages only $1008 and a couple $1716.

Yet when we talk about Social Security we are talking about what is still the main retirement income protection for most elderly Americans. Less than 15 percent of those 65 and over receive private pension payments; even 15 years from now Social Security will be the only pension system for 70 percent.

Clearly, therefore, the 12½ percent across-the-board increase in the House bill is inadequate. It will leave far too many Social Security beneficiaries, and not just those receiving minimum benefits either, in the mire of poverty at incomes far below their own earnings when they were working or those of most Americans still on the job.

We urge your Committee to raise benefits generally by at least the 15 percent the President recommended. Indeed, even an increase of 20 percent would be fully justified since it still would not permit most Social Security beneficiaries to escape from their dreary lives of want and deprivation. In fact, a fully adequate level of payments would require a boost of at least 50 percent. We would regard the increase of 20 percent or more we hope this Committee will recommend as a down-payment toward that goal.

The House was even less generous in its increase for those at the very bottom than for average beneficiaries. The President recommended an increase in the minimum benefit from today's pitiful $44 to $70 (from $66 to $105 for a couple). Instead, the House raised the minimum to only $50, in percentage terms just a shade over the 12½ percent increase for all other beneficiaries. The House completely ignored the President's proposal for a $100 minimum benefit for long-service workers with 25 or more years of coverage.

Mr. Chairman, in a social insurance system, and I stress that word "social," it is entirely right and proper that those most in need of improvement in benefit payments should obtain the largest proportionate increase. If a Social Security system does not help those at the bottom the most, it is not advancing what should be one of its major goals. Therefore, we ask the Committee to recommend enactment of at least the $70 minimum the President proposed, indeed a substantially higher amount if possible, as well as the special minimum benefit for long-service workers.

We have other recommendations you will find in my detailed statement but I should like to briefly mention only one. The House decided to cover disabled widows, a particularly deserving group largely without other sources of income. However, they would be eligible only at age 50 and on a sliding scale of benefits beginning at only 50 percent of the regular amount. We urge full coverage for this group and at unreduced widows' benefits. Moreover, we understand the cost of our recommendation would be minimal, amounting to only .06 percent of payroll.

Now a word on how the benefit improvements should be financed. As we see it, the reason the House cut back so severely on the benefit improvements the President recommended was that it failed to recognize the necessity for the earnings base to keep pace with the level of workers' incomes. This we simply do not understand.

When the Social Security system got underway in 1936, the full incomes of about 95 percent of all workers were subject to the Social Security tax. At $7600, the earnnigs base in the House bill, only ⅔ would be covered to this extent, declining to about ½ by 1974, approximately the proportion today.

We think this is wrong. It is wrong because it puts a disproportionate burden on low-wage workers. It is wrong because as the House bill so clearly demonstrates, it fails to provide the funds required for needed benefit improvements. And it is wrong because it puts an unduly low ceiling on the benefits paid to moderate or high-wage workers, thus forcing them to suffer drastic reductions in their living standards when they retire.

The President proposed raising the earnings base from the present $6,600 in three steps to $10,800 by 1974. We think it could go even higher to $15,000 which would cover about the same proportion of taxable payroll as the $3,000 base did in 1936.

We have no particular quarrel with the moderate rise in the contributions rate called for, with minor differences, in both the President's proposals and the House bill. We do wish to point out, however, that these increases in the rates are probably the maximum workers should be expected to pay. Therefore, you can expect us to urge the next time we come before you gradual introduction of a contribution from general revenues to the Social Security Trust Fund. Indeed, you may want to consider a beginning step in that direction even now to finance this year's Social Security improvements.

Now as to Medicare. We disagree 100 percent with the decision of the House not to include the disabled under Medicare. Instead, the House has proposed that an advisory council be set up to study the question and make recommendations.

Well, Mr. Chairman, there was an advisory council, the Advisory Council on Social Security, which did study this question as recently as 1964 and recommended that the disabled be covered. It made this recommendation for the very good reason that the disabled are a high-cost, high-risk group living on drastically reduced incomes who are faced with far greater than average medical and hospital expenditures.

The House Report on the bill argues that because the disabled are a high-cost group they shouldn't be covered. I think that is putting things upside-down. It is precisely because of the high costs the disabled have to bear to obtain needed medical care out of their very meager incomes that they should be covered under Medicare. We sincerely hope the Senate will correct this glaring omission in the House bill.

I want to register our enthusiastic support for S. 2299 (Amendment 266), introduced by Senator Long, the distinguished Chairman of this Committee, which would encourage prescribing of drugs for Medicare patients by their generic names, as well as S. 17 (Amendment 265), introduced by Senator Montoya, which provides for coverage of drug costs of Medicare patients at home or in nursing homes. These bills represent a sound approach to control of unduly high drug prices. We also request the Committee to give serious consideration to the urgent need to control rapidly escalating physicians' fees and hospital charges under Medicare whose repercussions are having a tremendous impact on the entire health economy of the nation.

One of the outstanding features of the amendments to the Social Security Act of 1965 was the launching of the so-called Title XIX program, or Medicaid. The aim was to make available to low-income families comprehensive quality medical care that they can't afford to pay for themselves.

Medicaid was never thought to be confined to just the poorest families or families receiving public assistance. It was intended to meet the medical needs of not just the needy but the medically needy, those people who can afford to meet everyday living costs but not the added costs of proper medical care.

The House bill completely departs from this fundamental principle. It makes Medicaid just another charity medical program by cutting back eligibility so drastically that only the poorest families will have access to it.

No less than 14 States in various parts of the country would be immediately affected. A lot of publicity has been given to the New York eligibility standards which some people consider too high. But not many people know that the formula in the House bill would have a drastic impact in other States, not just New York. For a 4-person family the eligibility requirement would be cut by $1,100 in Nebraska, $1,200 in Iowa and $1,400 in Rhode Island.

These States established their Medicaid eligibility standards in good faith on the basis of the 1965 law. There is no reason why they should be forced to deprive low-income people from needed medical care even before the program has gotten off the ground.

We also think the House made a serious mistake in eliminating the present requirement that the State must provide to Medicaid patients the five fundamental health care services, namely, in-patient hospital services, out-patient hospital services, other laboratory and X-ray services, skilled nursing home services and physicians' services. It makes no sense whatsoever to permit the States to establish Medicaid programs without physician and hospital services but including other less essential services. Congress was right the first time. We urge retention of the requirement for the five basic services.

Just a few words about child health. We endorse 100 percent the child health provisions in H.R. 12080 which would be still further strengthened by adoption of the very worthwhile program for medical screening of pre-school children Senator Ribicoff has proposed in S. 590.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, we come to the provisions of this bill which deal with our Public Welfare program.

This issue has generated a lot of heat. Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I think it is time for us to look at it both objectively and humanely.

Let's look at the facts. Let's remember also that we are not just talking about social theories or elaborate statistics. We are talking principally about mothers and their children for they are the overwhelming majority of those receiving aid to families with dependent children. And we are talking about the most deprived, the most disadvantaged, the most poorly housed and generally the most discriminated against group of people in the United States. In fact, the only group which is even more deprived is the 25 million poor people who get no assistance whatsoever.

Now we know the Public Welfare program is a long way from being perfect. Furthermore, the few recommendations the President made for improvements in the Public Welfare program—the principal one being to require the States to meet their own minimum needs standards in their welfare payments—would permit only a slight improvement in the abysmally low level of welfare payments. The President's recommendations were in H.R. 5710 and we urge that they be reinstated in the bill this Committee will report.

But the shocking fact is that the House did not even consider these minimum improvements. Instead, it put its full energies behind what we regard as a seriously misguided effort to pare the welfare rolls by forcing mothers and older children not in school into what I can only describe as a very badly conceived work and training program. And for those who do not conform to the requirements, the penalty is deprivation of assistance for themselves, and in practice also, for the completely innocent and still just as needy small children in their families. All of this is capped by a rigid formula which would hold the proportion of children in broken homes receiving assistance at the level of January 1, 1967.

I do not have time to comment at length on these changes. But let me offer just a few ideas:

1. For some welfare recipients, training for adequately paying jobs for which they might qualify and which they might obtain could be the road out of poverty. But, clearly, this approach is not indicated for all welfare recipients. Some mothers can and should be trained for work. Others, because of either family conditions or personal limitations, would do much better to stay home and take care of their children. This is particularly true if adequate day care facilities are not available, and they are not in most communities. Neither can you set up adequate day care facilities with properly trained staff overnight. Having said this, I want to make it clear that we would support the provisions in H.R. 12080 for long needed expansion of child welfare and day care facilities if they are not tied to the punitive measures in the bill.

2. For those who are to be trained, the worst thing that could happen is to provide inadequate training for poor or nonexistent jobs. This means that the work and training program must be entrusted to a qualified agency that knows training and knows how to place trainees in jobs. Mr. Chairman, that agency, in my opinion, is the Labor Department. It is not the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and the State Welfare Departments which are the administrative agencies for work and training under the House bill. We strongly urge that the work and training program for welfare recipients be placed under the administration of the Labor Department which has the skill, knowledge and machinery for effectively training and placing welfare recipients in decent jobs.

3. The House Report indicates that welfare recipients could be assigned for work and training to private employers and it asks the Secretary of Labor to permit this to be done at sub-minimum wages. Mr. Chairman, this would open the door to industrial exploitation of a defenseless group, the kind of exploitation organized labor has long opposed. We strongly urge this Committee to require payment of the prevailing wage to participants in the work and training program and specifically not to permit employment at less than the regular minimum wage.

4. In order to keep families together rather than encourage their dissolution, we have recommended making the program of assistance to families with unemployed fathers mandatory upon the States instead of voluntary. Instead, the House bill ignores this proposal and narrows the possibilities to obtain needed help by making ineligible families where the father has not had a recent attachment to the labor force or is receiving unemployment insurance, no matter how inadequate these payments may be to meet family needs. We urge deletion of these restrictive provisions.

5. The Administration proposed a new provision for grants to the States for temporary assistance up to 60 days for migrant workers and their families. The House bill provides emergency assistance for only 30 days and with only 50 percent Federal matching. We strongly support the original provisions which will more realistically meet the needs of migrant workers.

6. I understand that one of the main aims of the punitive provisions against welfare recipients in the House bill is to cut down on welfare expenditures. But the House Report reveals quite clearly that the very questionable measures it would institute would result in increased, not decreased, costs. This is because the estimated cost of the work and training and day care programs would be five times the savings in welfare payments of those who would be removed from the rolls. We are for sound programs of work and training and day care for those welfare recipients who can benefit from them but we are against expensive compulsory punitive approaches which will harshly penalize mothers and children while entailing huge additional costs.

Let me reiterate that we are concerned that the Public Welfare system is not meeting minimum subsistence needs for most welfare recipients. We are concerned that many of those receiving assistance are forced to comply with complex and often degrading procedures. We are concerned because welfare rules tend to disqualify and discourage people in need from seeking assistance and especially because they often force fathers to desert so that their families can obtain assistance.

It is these glaring deficiencies in our present welfare system which we respectfully suggest deserve the sympathetic consideration of the Congress. The punitive measures the House bill provides contain the seeds for continued deprivation, misery and unrest for decades into the future. Let us not take this backward step.

Mr. Chairman, I won't presume much longer on your patience. It would be presumptuous of me to emphasize the great responsibility which is yours in the actions you will take on this bill.

Through what I have been trying to say runs what I think is a common thread—that is, we should do the most we can for those, who for various reasons beyond their control, cannot unaided meet even their minimum needs. But the rest of us can meet their needs and together as a nation we can help the least fortunate amongst us.

Some of them, as for example those receiving Social Security benefits, are fully entitled to decent payments now because of what they contributed while they worked. Others, usually even less fortunate, simply deserve our help—the most, not the least we can afford—because they are fellow human beings in distress.

This Committee has not forsaken the neediest Americans in the past. I know you will not forsake them now.

ALASKAN INDIANS AND ESKIMOS DISTINGUISH THEMSELVES AS FIREFIGHTERS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, it comes as no surprise that the work by the Alaskan Indian and Eskimo firefighters who were on the frontlines in many of our Western States this summer was outstanding. Let me quote in part what was said about their ability.

Glacier National Park Superintendent Keith Neilson said:

> Their enthusiasm, drive and initiative made them the acknowledged pace setters almost from the time of their arrival.

The assistant fire boss of the Eagle Zone Fire, Prineville, Oreg., Frank Hamerski, noted the Alaskans were:

> Well trained and know what to do with hand tools and pumpers. Highly diversified, very good morale, and they don't poop out.

Fire boss Art Gerity, China Creek, Idaho, said:

> I would certainly want them back again if I had the chance to get them, and there are a lot of crews I wouldn't say that about. They disciplined themselves very well.

And so the comments range—laudatory in all respects for these men who did such a fine job in their work to help save the forests of the West.

A more complete account of their efforts appeared in the Anchorage Daily Times of September 21, 1967. I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the article, which was called to my attention by Col. M. R. "Muktuk" Marston, of Anchorage, be printed at the close of my remarks.

Colonel Marston was the man most instrumental in the organization and training of the Alaska Territorial Guard, which at its peak strength during World War II had more than 3,000 members, principally Eskimos and Indians.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Anchorage Daily Times, Sept. 21, 1967]

Alaska Native Crews Win High Praise for Forest Fire Work

The Alaska Indian and Eskimo crews that battled the recent forest fires in the western states earned high praise from the men who supervised them.

Following are quotes taken from reports filed by men who led and worked in the firefighting effort. Most of the supervisors listed here were with crews of Alaskan Indians from Glennallen and Eskimos from Holy Cross and Aniak.

Keith Neilson, superintendent of Glacier National Park:

"I want to tell you what a tremendous job your Eskimo firefighters have accomplished for Glacier National Park. When word first came through that we were to have Eskimo firefighters, there were many expressions of skepticism. However, when the Alaskans arrived, and pitched in, there were no more doubting Thomases. In fact it wasn't long before all the sector bosses and the fire bosses were singing their praises. Their enthusiasm, drive and initiative made them the acknowledged pace setters almost from the time of their arrival. Their extremely friendly approach to everything and everyone only added to their reputation.

When mop-up operations started, the Alaskans proved even more adept at this particular phase of firefighting, which calls for small crews of two and three men who can and will work without supervision. Here again, the drive and the individual initiative of the Alaskans paid off in a big way. Each fire boss was asking for more Alaskans and only offering to release other than Alaskans. In fact, two of our supervisory overhead stopped at park headquarters just to tell us what a wonderful job the Alaskans had accomplished.

The drop-out and quit rate on line firefighters is extremely high. This, however, is definitely not true with respect to the Alaskans. They all have stayed until the job was finished."

Frank Hamerski, assistant fire boss, Eagle Zone Fire, Prineville, Ore.:

"It is the best crew on the Eagle Creek Fire. This was the word I got from the boys on the line (sector bosses). Well trained and know what to do with hand tools and pumpers. Highly diversified, very good morale, they don't poop out. They don't ask to go home after a couple days. These people deserve a real commendation. We have used them as hot shots—we kept them for the hottest and worst spots. They seem to look forward to getting to the worst parts of the fire. They are careful workers and have had no injuries."

Wayne Gearhard, chief warrant officer, 116th Ordnance, National Guard:

"They are a real nice bunch. They are very literate and their politeness was outstanding. They always took time to thank the mess personnel, which was unusual in this situation. They always kept themselves very clean."

Butch Casper, Liaison Officer with Glennallen crew:

"They have a very good attitude. They were working here under conditions that are a little different than they have been used to. They are used to moss, heavy brush, smaller trees, and more water. Here in the mop-up, this is their show. There isn't one that isn't a good nozzle man or pumper man. You don't get complaints. They accepted things the way they were, and we are very satisfied working with these people."

Harlan Smith, Las Cruces, New Mexico, sector boss trainee with the Glennallen crew:

"It is a real good crew. They are very capable in the good thick brush. They go through and find the hot spots that are not even smoking. They have good morale and a terrific sense of humor, which helps in a situation like this. Problems—they are not used to the heat; however, they are rapidly getting used to it and they have not complained. In a show like this (pumpers), they are better than the average. I don't have to tell them what to do—I just give them the tools and they will do the job in the best manner that it can be done. There are many old hands—some of 15 years experience. They have a man in every crew who is a trained timekeeper. They are the most honorable people I have ever worked with—barring none. Not a man in the crews that I wouldn't leave $500 lying in the tent and be certain that it wouldn't be there six months later."

Del Waddoups, Holy Cross crews, Burley District, Idaho:

"Definitely one of the better crews I have worked with on the fire. Conscientious and hard workers. Excellent service and everybody on the fire wanted to use them."

He commented on the organization of the crews, saying it was excellent particularly on their own supervision. He pointed out that if any of their crew steps out of line, the crew boss steps in and gives him a good kick in the rear end. He mentioned that he felt one reason they strive to do such a good job is that they are hoping they might be called back again for fire fighting. He had had absolutely no complaints from them and they were very happy with the food. It was very good for their morale. (Note written by Waddoups' supervisor).

Lloyd Ferguson, service chief at China Creek, Idaho:

"Very cooperative. I hardly knew they were around. They came off the line, ate, and then went to their sleeping area. We have had no problems whatsoever. They were always ready to go in the morning and never complained."

Art Gerity, fire boss, China Creek:

"Performed very well. As matter of fact, excellent. As good as or better than the best. I would certainly want them back again if I had the chance to get them, and there are a lot of crews I wouldn't say that about. They disciplined themselves very well."

Loren Glade, sector boss, Missoula, Mont., District:

"I enjoyed working with them and would rather work with them than any other crew here. They are reliable. Give them something to do, walk away, and the work will be finished when you get back. They don't complain. If I could pick a crew, I would ask for them everytime. They are deliberate in their work, thorough, and steady. They were used primarily on mop-up—which is very boring. But they stick to it better than any other crews. In my opinion, it is well worth the trouble it took to bring them down here. I don't think anybody that ever worked with them has regretted it."

Larry Newman, division boss, Missoula District:

"If I had my choice, I would take the Alaskans and skip the (Lower 48) Indians. They take a lot of pride in their outfit. They have their own organization with good internal control. When you put them on the line, you don't worry.

BETTER UTILIZATION OF FEDERAL PROPERTY

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, there is a growing recognition in this country that we must do a far better job than we have in the past in utilizing our underemployed economic and population resources and particularly we must attempt to bring about a more balanced geographical distribution in our economy.

The growing debate over the past several months has generated a number of proposals. In this connection I invite attention to a recent editorial published in the Wichita Eagle, which argues effectively that we could and should make a more effective use of Federal property sites such as military bases that are now either underutilized or are totally abandoned. I think the point raised by the editorial is well taken and effectively stated. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POSSIBLE USE FOR OLD BASES

Why not combine the President's plan to check federally owned land for its possible use as sites for low-income housing with Sen. James Pearson's bill to induce industry to locate in underemployed areas?

Pearson, R-Kan., and Sen. Robert Kennedy, D-N.Y., are co-sponsoring legislation to provide tax incentives to encourage industry to locate in underemployed areas, and these areas usually coincide with those which have housing problems.

Obsolete military bases could provide sites which not only would benefit industry and the unemployed, but would also help the cities in which they are located.

Many of these old World War II bases are growing up in weeds now or are only partially utilized.

Take the Hutchinson Naval Air Station vacated by the Navy in 1957 and the Kansas Air National Guard this year. Its hangars could house industries which would provide jobs for the unemployed. Other buildings could be used for manpower training programs, and barracks could be remodeled for housing.

The post exchange building, officers' and enlisted men's clubs and the station's theater could be used for entertainment.

A number of problems could be dealt with. Unemployment would be eased, welfare rolls could be reduced, the area would have new industry and the land now idle would be utilized.

Hardly a city, medium sized and larger, is without some federal land that could be used or at least traded for land that might be more useful.

Many of the old bases have been deeded to the cities, but only partial use has been made of the property in many cases. Where this has happened, it would be in the interests of these cities to donate the land, either to industry or the federal government.

It would be a modern way of beating swords into plowshares.

MILWAUKEE JOURNAL STRONGLY ENDORSES SENATE RATIFICATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Milwaukee Journal, widely recognized as one of America's outstanding newspapers, on September 30 strongly endorsed, editorially, Senate ratification of the Human Rights Conventions on Slavery, Forced Labor, Political Rights of Women, and Genocide.

The Journal not only makes a strong case for our ratification on legal grounds, but also points out quite accurately the strange company the United States keeps through its failure to act. The only nations which have failed to approve one or more of these treaties are Bolivia, the Maldives, Paraguay, Spain, Togo, the Union of South Africa, Uruguay, Yemen, and the United States of America. As the Journal so aptly puts it: "Fine company we keep."

Because I believe this editorial from the Milwaukee Journal will be of great interest and real value to the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Company We Keep

Now that the foreign relations committee has completed hearings on three human rights treaties backed by the United Nations there seems no reason why the senate shouldn't ratify them. This country is certainly against slavery and forced labor and for the political rights of women.

The chief opponent over the years, of these three and of the treaty on genocide, which we have also failed to ratify, has been the American Bar association. Its latest report shows some progress in that it favors ratifying the treaty on slavery, ignoring the one on forced labor and rejecting the one on women's rights. Its stand on the latter two, as on genocide, amounts mainly to legalisms.

There is no reason why the senate, if it is worried about application of the treaties, cannot insert some reservations. The genocide treaty, for example, specifies that persons convicted of genocide be sentenced to death or life imprisonment. This interferes with normal court discretion.

But consider this in connection with all the treaties. The only nations that have not approved one or more are these: Bolivia, the Maldives, Paraguay, Spain, Togo, the Union of South Africa, Uruguay, Yemen—and the United States of America. Fine company we keep!

THE BADLY TARNISHED IMAGE OF KING HUSSEIN OF JORDAN

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, events in the Middle East since May have seriously tarnished the image which King Hussein had sought to build in the eyes of the people of the United States.

The image which his imagemakers had sought to convey was that of a moderate ruler seeking to stave off attempts by his fanatical Arab neighbors to pull him off his throne while the King, in turn, sought only to make economically viable a desolately, backward country.

The truth is that King Hussein has through the years been propped up on his throne by U.S. dollars—over $436 million through fiscal year 1966 to be exact. Without that economic and military aid there would have been no King Hussein sitting on his throne in Amman. Neither would the artificially created nation of Jordan, have continued to exist.

The reason advanced by the State Department for all this aid to Jordan was that King Hussein was a leavening influence in the Middle East—that without King Hussein's moderating efforts in that area of the world the often expressed hostility of the other Arab nations would erupt into a military attempt to carry out their threats to drive Israel into the sea.

That fanciful image was destroyed by King Hussein's actions during the 6-day war in the Middle East.

It can be said, in the light of the events which took place at that time, that whatever grief lies ahead for King Hussein and the people of Jordan was brought about by their own willful actions.

On May 31, 1967, King Hussein went to Cairo to sign a so-called defense pact with Egypt which provided that—

> In case of the commencement of military operations, the Chief of Staff of the United Arab Republic Armed Forces will assume the direction of operations in both countries.

In an interview on June 2, 1967, King Hussein, belying the image of moderation which he had sought to project, stated:

> Our increased cooperation with Egypt and other Arab States both in the East and in the West will enable us to march along the right road which will lead us to the erasure of the shame and the liberation of Palestine. This is a cornerstone of our policy.

On June 5, 1967, Israel offered King Hussein an honorable way of staying out of the impending military conflagration. The Prime Minister of Israel sent a message to King Hussein through the United Nations representative in the area, General Odd Bull, in which King Hussein was told:

> We shall not initiate any action whatsoever against Jordan. However, should Jordan open hostilities, we shall react with all our might and he will have to bear the full responsibility for all the consequences.

Jordan's reply to Israel's conciliatory offer blared forth from Radio Amman on the morning of June 5.

At 9:15 a.m. on June 5, 1967, Radio Amman carried the following call to arms to the people of Jordan:

> Free citizens, heroic sons of Jordan. The hoped-for moment has arrived. The hour which you longed for is here. Forward to arms, to battle, to new pages of glory. To regain our rights, to smash the aggressor, to revenge!

At 9:58 that same morning Radio Amman exhorted:

> O Arabs, wherever you are! Hit everywhere and hit till the end. The end of Israel is in your hands. Forward, soldiers, to victory. Cooperate wherever you are. Fly, o eagles, o heroic pilots.

Less than an hour later, at 10:45 a.m., King Hussein went on Radio Amman to tell his people:

> O brethren, wherever you are stationed along the lengthy front! Be certain that our forces and the whole Arab nation will meet the test and reach the target. The decisive battle has started and I hope it will soon end in the victory which we all pray for.

These are not the words of moderation and peace which the image built for King Hussein in the United States would have led us to expect.

These are the words of an aggressor—of the leader of a nation who had never laid aside his intense determination to destroy the neighboring nation of Israel, the only oasis of freedom and democracy in the desert of Arab backwardness in the Middle East.

Moreover, secret orders to the Jordanian commanders captured by the Israelis called for the extermination of every man, woman, and child in Israel.

And yet this same King Hussein, who spurned the olive branch of peace when it was offered by Israel and chose instead the ways of ruthless war, is seen today fluttering from Moscow to Washington, hat in hand, seeking more weapons to support his continued aggressive intentions against Israel.

The time has come for the United States to view King Hussein realistically and not through illusory, rose-colored glasses. Further economic and military assistance to Jordan should be stopped at once and should not be resumed until Jordan has agreed to sit down at the peace table with Israel. If King Hussein chooses to squander his country's meager economic resources on armed aggression rather than on its economic development, he should not be supported in these rash endeavors by U.S. economic and military assistance.

But above all, the people of the United States should appraise King Hussein for what he really is: a backward Arab monarch more interested in military aggrandizement than in peace and who has forfeited all claims for further support from the taxpayers of the United States.

RIOTS, SLUMS, AND BANKING

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, a highly significant speech was delivered last week to the American Bankers Association convention by the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett], who serves as the ranking Republican on the Committee on Banking and Currency. His speech is justly receiving wide national attention.

The distinguished Senator struck a vital note in calling upon America's bankers "to assume major, new leadership roles in helping to bring the needy, downtrodden slumdwellers back into the mainstream of American economic life." He rightly pointed out that solutions to the problems of poverty cannot be worked out on a mass basis. Poverty is personal, and the solution must be found one person at a time, one job at a time, one step at a time.

Senator Bennett—who speaks authoritatively through many years of close association with the banking world—expressed his deep concern that two ways of life have existed side by side in this country for 30 years: the way of free enterprise, and the way of welfare. He said:

> We will never solve the problems of the poor of 1967 until we can move them out of the half-world of government support and make them part of the real economic world we call the private enterprise system.

To help to achieve the urgent goal of breaking down the attitudes which separate the poor from the rest of American society, Senator Beennett asked for new public relations programs to acquaint the Nation's poor with the proper uses of banks as savings and credit institutions, and to encourage Negro college students in particular to enter the banking field.

I feel that Senator Bennett's speech, entitled "Riots, Slums, and Banking," should receive the wide circulation of the Congressional Record. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record, together with a complementary article entitled "U.S. Job Training Plan Heartening," written by David Lawrence, and published in yesterday's Washington Evening Star.

There being no objection, the speech and article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Riots, Slums, and Banking

(Speech by Senator Wallace F. Bennett, to the American Bankers Association Convention, September 25, 1967)

Charles Dickens, in the opening paragraph of his classic novel, *A Tale of Two Cities*, gave us with uncanny accuracy an excellent description of America's present domestic dilemma:

"It was the best of times, it was the worst of times," he wrote. "It was the age of wisdom, it was the age of foolishness. It was the epoch of belief, it was the epoch of incredulity. It was the season of light, it was the season of darkness. It was the spring of hope, it was the winter of despair."

If you are in the mainstream of our American economic system based on private property, which rewards individual enterprise with the increasing comforts of a growing production of an explosively expanding economy, it is the best of times. But if you consider those who are outside this system's mainstream and the number who are on government welfare, it is the worst of times.

This government-centered program for the care of the needy has been with us for a third of a century, and to its authors and advocates, this promised to be, in Dickens' words, the age of wisdom. Now even some of its friends are admitting its failures, thus branding it as the "age of foolishness."

Thirty years ago, all America was groping in a season of darkness. So far as the value of our private enterprise system was concerned, it was an epoch of incredulity, a winter of despair. This was not our first depression, but in the earlier ones Americans came through on their own courage and resources, and with the help of their families, neighbors and friends plus unorganized county help. Even when the going was rough, they never became separated from the system. But this time, taking advantage of the fact that the faith of many faltered, astute politicians stepped in and offered an attractive alternative—government welfare. Since then the two ways of life have existed side by side, and both have grown.

Our economic indicators record that the benefits of our free enterprise system are at an all-time high, to be shared by those who participate and contribute.

In the second quarter of this year, our gross national product exceeded an annual rate of $775 billion, and disposable personal income reached an all-time high of $540 billion. Distributed equally over our population, this amounted to $2,716 annually for each man, woman, and child in this country. Corporate profits both before and after taxes reached new levels. Non-military employment surpassed any previous mark, as 76 million of our citizens were gainfully employed. Unemployment, according to the latest figures, is at a satisfactory rate of 3.9 per cent on a seasonally adjusted basis. We have more money, more purchasing power, more education, more of the things that make life pleasant, and more savings than ever before in history. Commercial banking has participated in and contributed to this growth and now has a total of $334 billion in loans and investments. Truly, in many respects, this is the best of times.

In the face of this evidence, one might conclude that related problems of social and economic weakness would be at an all-time low. Unfortunately this is not true. The basic problems of the depressed 30's have survived and even flourished in the shadow-world of government welfare.

Although the number of individuals and families with incomes below the poverty level has dropped steadily as prosperity has increased throughout the last three decades, the number of public relief welfare rolls has continued to increase at what is to many an alarming rate. Three decades ago, there were just over 3 million persons receiving government welfare payments. Today, that number has increased to over 12 million. The dollar outlay for welfare payments has increased over eight-fold during the period until today it is over $5 billion annually. What is startling is that some individuals have never known any other way of life. Their parents and grandparents lived on public welfare, and they have been brought up in this same environment, depending on these payments for their livelihood. True, there are among those dependent on welfare many who would prefer gainful employment, but they have been squeezed out of the labor market because their skills and education do not qualify them to earn today's minimum wage requirements.

Along with this increase in the number of welfare recipients, we have seen a tragic increase in crime, divorce, bankruptcy, illegitimacy, slum housing, alcoholism, and drug usage. It is surprising to know that there are six serious crimes committed each minute in this country. Crime has skyrocketed 62 per cent in the last six years alone, while the population has risen by only nine per cent. There is more than a murder every hour, a burglary every 23 seconds, and an auto theft every 57 seconds. Personal bankruptcies in fiscal 1967 were 191,729, compared with about 40,000 per year during the depressed thirties. Illegitimate births were at a rate of 7 per thousand unmarried women in the child bearing years of 15 to 44 years of age, three decades ago. Today, the rate is more than triple at 25 per 1,000 unmarried women in that age range. Alcoholism is increasing annually and drug usage is becoming almost commonplace.

While these earmarks of a corrupt society are not limited to those who are outside of the mainstream of American affluent life, they are more prominent among those groups.

We are beginning to accept the fact that there is a definite correlation between unemployment, lack of education, slum housing, and crime. Latest unemployment statistics indicate that the unemployment rate among non-whites is twice what it is among the white work force. In 1960, 46 per cent of the non-white urban population lives in unsound housing compared with 14 per cent of the white urban population. Crime by non-whites is at a significantly higher rate. On a per population basis, the incidence of murder is 5 times as great among non-whites. Forcible rape occurs 4 times as often; robbery incidence is 5 times as great; prostitution occurs at a five to one ratio and narcotics violations at a three to one ratio. All these sad statistics strengthen the evidence that the recent rioting has been largely by those who are not participating in production and ownership in our system.

In a way, then, we've seen the concept of Federal paternalism come full circle and grow in the process. It has preserved the economic misery of the 30's and added to it the deeper suffering of older and more overcrowded slums, and the breakdown of the family, the current expression of which is hatred, crime, rioting. Even the system's friends are beginning to realize that it has failed, as revealed by these very recent statements made in the Senate and on the record. Let me quote just a few statements from some of the Senate's most liberal members and from one of the most vocal of civil rights spokesmen. Here's one statement by a recently elected liberal Democrat:

"In the midst of these riots, and all this difficulty, one of the problems is obvious, that our promise and our claimed achievements did not match the substance of what we did."

Here are five others, by other liberals:

1. "Thirty years ago, it was the private system, the private sector of the economy, which had failed. But now, after 30 years, it is the government welfare system which has broken down."

2. "For these same 30 years, we have had categorical welfare programs—yet every year we seem less able to help people off the welfare rolls into positions of dignity and independence."

3. "The antipoverty efforts . . . have proven to be an effective curse. I see these paternalists coming into our cities under the guise of community developers, and they are an effective menace."

4. "We have had misplaced good will, misplaced kindness, and programs which bring relief rather than bring rehabilitation and recreation in human terms. They are not answers to our urgent plight today."

5. "I would underscore the fact that massive doses of the same old things will only lead us more aggressively to national self-destruction."

It is hopeful that many in Congress have finally come to realize what has always been obvious to some, that government paternalistic control and handouts, instead of encouraging people to get off relief, actually tend to attract more to welfare as a way of life, and once in this pattern to cling to it. This is particularly true for the program for aid to dependent children, which, for as long as three generations in some families, has made the rearing of illegitimate children a source of income.

With this realization has come a challenge to try to break this vicious circle, and new programs are being suggested for the transitional period. One common concept is to add some form of training to many existing programs, including this same program for aid to families with dependent children. In addition to such other expensive War on Poverty programs as the Job Corps and the Community Action set-up, these mothers are going to be pressured into some sort of training. This idea will require still another government program for the day-care of children whose mothers are being trained.

In theory and in spirit, this training-by-government approach is commendable, but if past experience is any guide, the training will take place in a vacuum, unrelated to a specific job, unless such a job is, in turn, supplied by government.

What I have said about jobs is also true for government solutions to the problem of housing. We have had low-income housing programs for three decades and yet over 40 per cent of housing in many sections of our cities is being categorized as substandard, dilapidated, and unhealthy. Federally-provided public housing was a natural partner of Federally-financed welfare cash income. But neither has met the essential spiritual need a person has to manage his own affairs. This can only be satisfied when those slum dwellers who wish to do so can have a chance to have an equity in their own homes.

At best, all programs initiated by government include some significant degree of continuing Federal control or supervision of the persons needing help, which means that after all we are still only making different patterns in the same old circle. Referring again to my point that we have in the United States two separate economic systems spiraling together, with a minimum of overlapping, it is clear to me that we will never solve the problem of the poor of 1967 until we can move them out of the half-world of government support, and make them a part of the real economic world we call the private enterprise system. That this can be done is demonstrated by the fact that many trapped in the 30's fought their own way back and have shared in the free economy's rewards.

While it is easy to agree that this is desirable, it should also be clear that government can never provide the leadership needed to bring it about. In the first place, many men in government have themselves never been a part of the productive side of our free system, and therefore do not understand or trust it. This is evident from the criticism which has been leveled against the student loan program that banks have tried so hard to make successful even at some cost in profit. Yet it is being assailed as a bonus to bankers and it is suggested that direct government loans should replace the guarantee program. Another example of this mistrust is a flood insurance program which has been approved by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee. The program is set up to use private industry to the maximum extent with Federal Government reinsurance for catastrophic losses. There were accusations that the program represented a guaranteed profit to industry with government taking all of the risk and that the program should be replaced with an all government program. Moreover, there are also many whose political careers have been built on the concept that the votes of people who are dependent on government can be mostly easily controlled.

So the responsibility falls upon the men whose faith in our free system, and understanding of its processes, have made them leaders in it. Only these men can actually develop programs which will bring the outcasts in—provide the jobs, the specific training, and the proof that the free system can provide greater incentive, security, and satisfaction than the government sheltered one.

It is a sad commentary that life in the government welfare compound has produced one or more generations of economic illiterates, economic cripples, and economic agnostics. The so-called self-appointed authorities on consumerism, including many in government, instead of helping people to understand how our system works, have deliberately concentrated their efforts to try to prove that it *does not* work and that government controls are necessary. Perhaps we ourselves are partially to blame for that, because we haven't tried very hard to explain the system either and prove that it can best overcome our nation's problems and bring in those who are not participating in productive efforts and their rewards.

In this respect, as in many others, in general the most seriously unprepared Americans are our non-white citizens. This is not surprising when you realize the great difference that existed in the conditions under which the members of the two races came in the beginning.

The earliest white settlers came seeking a refuge, seeking an opportunity for freedom. The earliest Negroes came as slaves. Until little more than a century ago, some whites profited in their control of an economic system which exploited the uncompensated labor of their dark skinned slaves. Even when these had become legally free, they still essentially remained outside the free enterprise system so far as ownership and management and profit were concerned. Today's problems underscore the fact that this is still true for far too many of them. It is certainly true for those who are condemned by circumstances to the most meager education, the lowest income from the poorest jobs, and to live in the worst housing. To paraphrase Dickens again, "It was an age of foolishness" in which they were held out so long, and ours will be "an age of wisdom" if we can find a successful way to bring them in.

One of the greatest handicaps to so many of the welfare-supported poor is their lack of understanding of credit—its purposes, its benefits, its uses and its responsibilities. This has been dramatically underscored recently by the announcement of a planned campaign to persuade Negroes to take bankruptcy. Those who advocate this do so with the idea that it will punish and injure the white lenders and merchants, not realizing that they are slamming one of the necessary and essential doors to full participation in our system.

Banks are the heart of our credit-oriented economy, yet apparently only a few of our 20 million American Negroes have bank accounts, and fewer still have qualified for bank loans. In fact, many, if not most of them, are suspicious of banks and never come into them. Studies have shown that many of those in the lower income groups do not feel comfortable in your banks. They find them impersonal and cold compared to the high cost "first name basis" service provided by some of the less reputable sources of financing. I have discovered that a great proportion of our Negroes, both merchants and customers, are actually suspicious of checks, and all too frequently will not accept them. Even Negroes who are obviously responsible are unwilling to accept them in normal transactions because they find it difficult to get them cashed.

Thus, too often, their money and credit experiences are also outside the mainstream of normal white American processes. If they need to borrow money, they may end up in the hands of the hip-pocket lender. Without a normal credit record, they cannot buy on time from reputable merchants, and so are thrown into the hands of the back-street operator, who sells them shoddy merchandise at exorbitant prices and on unconscionable credit terms.

It was this situation and not the credit practices of reputable lenders that produced the horrible examples that were used to whip up emotional pressure for the so-called Truth in Lending Bill. If these poor people had been taught earlier to use credit properly, there would have been little basis for the enactment of such Federal legislation which restricts our whole consumer credit system.

This whole unfortunate pattern presents a clear challenge to the bankers of America. You must provide the initiative and the imagination to replace suspicions with confidence, and help them to use all your services—as depositors, savers, checkwriters and borrowers—with the same freedom as their white neighbors do. I'm sure many of you have begun to move in this direction, but much remains to be done.

There is a great need for simple education about the place of banking in a person's life, with emphasis on the use of checks and credit. It should begin at least in high schools, maybe with programs for activity experience. This is an area in which individual bankers and your association are making a good effort. This activity must be increased particularly in deprived neighborhoods.

A careful review of your public relations and advertising programs to reach adults and get them into the banks might also be worthwhile, even if you have to eliminate some of your present practices and minimums. This was done by a Washington bank recently to encourage those involved in "Pride," a youth clean-up experimental program in Washington, to start a savings account in the bank when they cashed their paychecks.

The whole problem of the slums, with all its aspects, is a dramatic challenge to bankers, to builders, and to Congress. The Federal Housing Administration insurance program has proven to be successful at no cost to taxpayers, because it is essentially a private enterprise operation with only a bare minimum of government involvement. The great urban renewal idea, on the other hand, has displaced many poor people and only produced still-empty cleared land, or developments into which the poor could not move. It has aggravated rather than solved the problems of the poor. It has now been proved through a relatively new so-called Turnkey program that private enterprise can construct public housing at a substantially lower cost than can be obtained through the use of the Public Housing Authority. The difference is not in the quality of construction, but in the greater efficiency of permitting private contractors to erect the building without all of the redtape, expensive and unnecessary procedures the housing authorities would normally have to follow. The cost savings is around 7 per cent and many months in construction time.

We have had some slum rehabilitation programs, but most have produced little more than one-short publicity. Fortunately, forced by the imagination and drive of Senator Charles Percy of Illinois, the present Administration in self defense is being forced into tentative approval of the basic idea that ways should be found to help residents of the slums to acquire an equity in property, under programs which include putting an investment value on their own labor. This could represent another application of the typical American spirit of good neighborliness which produced the "barn raisings" of New England and middle west, and the cooperative building programs of the pioneer days in my own State of Utah.

Banking has always been ahead of most other economic groups in terms of its in-service training and education. Federal Government training programs thus far have not proved to be very effective because they have not been under the direction of those who are in a position to do the hiring. Far more effective than governmental make-work projects would be training and educational programs under the direction and in the places of business or private enterprise. If it is necessary for the community, or the State, or the Federal Government to assist in the financing of these programs, that would still be far better than setting up sterile Federal programs. If labor organizations must make exceptions to their rules and if minimum wage laws must be foregone during training periods, then let's have the vision to recognize and accept this truth.

I noticed in a September 5 issue of a monthly reporting service that private industry shuns government funds for on-the-job training. The refusal is primarily due to the government restrictions on the operation of the program while industry wants a free hand. One company, it is reported, had signed a contract for over $50,000, and on rereading the contract, turned it down in favor of a token $1 contract and will use the program to improve its public relations. Such programs could prove beneficial to bankers, also.

It is to be assumed that these programs are extended to Negro employees who can qualify. Perhaps banking leaders should encourage reaching out for promising Negro college students who, with the support of scholarships at both graduate and undergraduate levels, can be prepared to enter banking and hope for an executive career. I hate the idea of quotas, but the size of the total problem represented by the challenge to bring America's Negroes into the mainstream of our economic system is measured as 10 per cent.

With such executive and clerical trainees, it would be easier for bankers to meet the same challenge in service to the Negro as to other Americans, to take the service physically to him, where he lives and works. This may not carry with it much hope of early profit, but even so it probably can be justified in the long run as a valuable way to reach the overall objective of helping to give all citizens full participation in our American economic system.

One final observation. The terms we are using today: slums, ghettos, riots, would seem to indicate that solutions can be worked out on a mass basis, that we can move whole groups out of poverty as groups. This concept is one that lies at the root of the failure of our present government programs, because it rests on a false premise. President Johnson put that false premise into words when he said, "A great society builds great people." America, with all its wealth of resources and achievement, has justified the title "A Great Society," for most of this century and now is admittedly the world's greatest. Still, after 30 years of Federal management of their lives, many of our people have not had the opportunity or have not responded to the opportunity to become "Great People."

The truth in that statement comes when it is reversed. It takes great people to build a great society. Building great people is a one-person-at-a-time job. Every man is different—a challenge. Poverty is personal. Slums are the result of the decay of many single buildings. Dropouts are individuals, and so for that matter are hippies, rioters, and advocates of black power. If they are to be helped, they must be found, one by one, known by their names, helped with their own problems.

As bankers, you hold a position of respect in your communities. You have been able to do a great deal in improving communities through your participation in civic activities as well as individually through your banking operations. Many of today's most talented young students are interested in participating in the solutions of our social problems of poverty, air pollution, slum housing, bankruptcy, and unemployment. If bankers expect to attract these individuals as employees into the banking industry, opportunities to contribute to solutions must be sought. I am aware of many bankers who have fought against apathy in their cities, who have supported rehabilitation programs and training programs which are anxious to help to overcome housing and unemployment problems. I am aware of the efforts made by your association and the individual bankers to provide loans to students in order that they may receive the necessary education to contribute rather than detract from our growth and progress. I am aware that in some instances, your efforts have not been based on short run profit motives but on long run benefit to your community and to the country. With the changing attitude throughout the country that the government cannot cope wih these problems, the energy, the power, and the contribution that can be made by private enterprise is receiving greater focus. If the major problems facing this country are to be solved, it will be through the support and activities of individuals who have faith in our free system, not through greater Federal Government paternalism. We must work for Federal and State legislation which will provide incentives to private enterprise, and we must also be willing to undertake new programs and provide our support both personal and financial.

As those who are now non-contributors and a drain on our resources are made to feel part of the system, as they develop pride in themselves and their communities, all of us will reap the benefits through civil peace as well as a greater level of prosperity, not to mention the obvious increases in economic rewards.

You know the human assets of banking in your city better than I do. Can you muster and motivate your people to give leadership in the solution of this problem, so that the negative side of Dickens' description of our times could be stricken, leaving only these good words:

"It was the best of times; it was the age of wisdom; it was the epoch of belief; it was the season of light"; and I underline this last phrase, "it was the spring of hope."

I hope you can!

[From the Washington Evening Star, Oct. 3, 1967]

U.S. Job Training Plan Heartening

(By David Lawrence)

The federal government 30 years ago tried by means of "make work" projects to diminish unemployment, but the effort failed. Today, in the midst of a period of economic expansion unemployment persists. But this time a new approach is being tried. President Johnson has just directed five cabinet officers, along with the administrators of three federal agencies, to launch a major test program whereby the government would join private industry to help find jobs and provide training for the "hard core" unemployed.

This decision—to cooperate with private industry and give it a major part in dealing with unemployment—is a step that has long been advocated by businessmen. It may not succeed even now unless private enterprise is given the fullest responsibility, without the interjection of governmental bureaucracy.

The situation was emphasized a few days ago in a significant speech in New York City by Senator Wallace F. Bennett, R-Utah, at the convention of the American Bankers Association. He is a former president of the National Association of Manufacturers and has an intimate knowledge of business operations. He said:

"The basic problems of the depressed '30s have survived and even flourished in the shadow world of government welfare. Although the number of individuals and families with incomes below the poverty level has dropped steadily as prosperity has increased throughout the last three decades, the number of public relief welfare rolls has continued to increase at what is to many an alarming rate.

"Three decades ago, there were just over 3 million persons receiving government welfare payments. Today, that number has increased to over 12 million. The dollar outlay for welfare payments has increased over eightfold during the period until today it is over $5 billion annually . . .

"It is hopeful that many in Congress have finally come to realize what has always been obvious to some, that government paternalistic control and handouts, instead of encouraging people to get off relief, actually tend to attract more to welfare as a way of life, and once in this pattern to cling to it . . .

"It is clear to me that we will never solve the problem of the poor of 1967 until we can move them out of the half-world of government support, and make them a part of the real economic world we call the private enterprise system . . .

"While it is easy to agree that this is desirable, it should also be clear that government can never provide the leadership needed to bring it about. In the first place, many men in government have themselves never been a part of the productive side of our free system, and therefore do not understand or trust it."

Senator Bennett stressed, moreover, that the responsibility falls upon the men "whose faith in our free system, and understanding of its processes, have made them leaders in it."

The latest action of President Johnson indicates an awareness of these very aspects of the unemployment problem. As the administration asks businesmen to mobilize their resources to help in job training programs, it is apparent that the government's role cannot be merely one that furnishes subsidies. What is most needed is legislation that will recognize the importance of incentives to private enterprise so that job creation will be encouraged.

Unemployment is related also to geographical factors. For, as the President said in launching the new program, the need is "to create new jobs and new training opportunities for the seriously disadvantaged in plants which will be established in or near areas of concentrated unemployment."

There are, to be sure, parts of the country which can use more employes. But it is difficult to transport the unemployed from their cities of residence because many persons dislike to move to other parts of the United States, away from relatives and friends.

The major experiment envisaged by the administration's new policy, while relatively small in amount, could initiate further experiments on an even larger scale. The fact that business and government are planning at last to work together to try to find a solution to the unemployment problem is a heartening sign.

MAKING THE BEST USE OF THE FEDERAL DOLLAR

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, the administration's request for a 10-percent surtax against the background of a $29 billion deficit has dramatically called attention to the Federal Government's enormous volume of spending and the consequent burden that the financing of this spending imposes upon the American taxpayer. Because of this burden, the American people demand and have a right to expect that all Federal programs are operated as efficiently as possible, that they be designed and administered to achieve the declared goals with the fewest dollars possible.

If history is any lesson, we know that 10 years from now the Federal budget will be even larger than it is today. But to assure that this spending is administered with the least possible waste and the most possible efficiency we must determine that the Federal agencies are utilizing modern techniques of administration and that overlapping in functions and services be reduced to the minimum.

An editorial published recently in the Wichita Eagle addresses itself to these and other points. Because of its cogency, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Surprising Facts on U.S. Spending Give Hints on How To Make Cuts

Congress apparently is not swallowing the President's tale of woe about why a turtax on the income tax is needed.

President Johnson has called for the tax to support what he calls unforeseen expenditures resulting from a stepped up war in Vietnam.

And because the lawmakers are aware of a grassroots objection to new taxes, they apparently will insist on a commensurate reduction in government spending.

To bring this about, a bi-partisan group is working on a proposal to force the President to trim $7.5 to $10 billion from his "Great Society" programs and other nondefense items.

Quite possibly this is an attempt to embarrass the President by forcing him either to cut programs which may be popular in the areas where they function or to furnish a more complete justification for increased defense spending.

Neither alternative would be especially palatable to the President.

For the Congressmen, though, such a bill would serve a two-fold purpose. They would look good at home because they support a reduction in federal spending, and they are in little danger of losing money for vital programs at home because the President faces reelection in 1968, and isn't likely to risk losing any more votes than necessary.

Yet there is good reason to seek nondefense cuts in spending.

One reason is that believe it or not, nondefense spending has grown much faster in the past decade than defense spending.

The American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, a nonprofit, nonpartisan research and educational organization, reports that from fiscal 1955 to fiscal 1965, between periods of accelerated spending caused by military operations in Korea and Vietnam, the increase in national defense payments was from $40.9 billion to $50.8 billion, or 24 per cent.

But the increase for "other federal functions" in the same period was from $29.7 billion to $71.6 billion, or 141 per cent. The "other functions" include social security.

In terms of per capita averages in constant-value dollars at 1965 prices, national defense costs have ranged from $373 in 1953 to $344 as estimated for fiscal 1967. This represents an actual decline in inflation-free per capita dollars for the Korea-Vietnam war years.

For other federal functions on the same basis, the range was from $214 in 1948 to $193 in 1953 to $432 in 1967.

In the 20-year period the federal national debt has risen steadily, but in proportion to the gross national product, has been sharply reduced, according to the study.

Economically, then, the national, state and local governments are spending more, but the nation's capacity to spend has increased. In addition, government has accepted more responsibility for social problems than ever before.

And the sharpened awareness of social problems has revealed complexities in racial relations, urban blight, illiteracy and unemployment previously hidden under the surface.

So chances are spending for nondefense will continue to increase, hopefully a little slower than the nation's capacity to spend.

To assure that the economy can stand the strain, a mechanism should be established to keep a constant watch on spending.

A Hoover-type commission to study overlapping of government services and establishment of priorities should be authorized immediately. This has been proposed this term by Kansas Sen. James Pearson.

Then steps should be taken to assure proper coordination of programs in the future.

GUY M. MINARD CLIMBS TO TOP AT KIMBERLY-CLARK

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Kimberly-Clark Corp., which has its headquarters in Neenah, Wis., and is one of the world's biggest producers of paper and paper products, has just named as its sixth president an able and dynamic man named Guy M. Minard. We in Wisconsin are very proud of Kimberly-Clark. It has been a brilliantly successful company and a highly important employer.

Mr. Minard, the first non-Kimberly to take the reins at Kimberly-Clark, worked his way up from a job as laborer which he held just after joining the company in 1928. He moved rapidly to a post as a chemist, then to laboratory superintendent, and then, in 1930, to technical director. He had an outstanding war record as an engineering officer and later a wing commander with the Royal Canadian Air Force. He returned to Kimberly after the war. He was named a vice president for all Canadian operations of the company in 1951 and executive vice president of Kimberly in 1964.

I am sure Mr. Minard will provide Kimberly with vigorous leadership as it embarks on the biggest capital expansion program in its history.

I ask unanimous consent that an article about Mr. Minard, which was published in the October 1, 1967, edition of the New York Times, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PERSONALITY: FORMER LABORER CLIMBS TO TOP

(William M. Freeman)

Guy M. (for McRae) Minard, who was once a forest laborer in Ontario, has just become the sixth president of the Kimberly-Clark Corporation, one of the biggest producers of paper and paper products in the world.

Mr. Minard, a young-minded, young-looking 60-year-old with fresh ideas, had this to say:

"The growth of this business is going to depend on a whole new concept of what paper means. To some it may mean entirely new kinds of material, perhaps made on paper machines, but strengthened, softened or beautified by new applications of chemistry. To others it will mean new products, satisfying needs we don't even think of today.

"To still others it will be the familiar papers used for printing, packaging and construction, but manufactured by new processes to make them more useful and less expensive."

Mr. Minard, who gives—deceptively—the impression of being shy, dropped in at the American Paper Institute's mind-stretching seminar at the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration in Boston a few weeks ago.

Characteristically, he had little to say, chatting with old friends and a few new ones—he makes friends easily—and he gave the impression of harboring subdued fires.

"This company will grow more in the next 10 years than it has in the last 96," he remarked.

Internal development? Creative markting?

"This doesn't mean we're not considering acquisition or diversification of our product lines, but it does mean Kimberly-Clark is not interested in being a conglomerate.

"The future of some portions of our business are the brightest of almost any industry, and we plan to grow into these promising markets."

Right now the company, a giant in its field, is embarking on the greatest capital expansion program in its history. It is planning to spend in the fiscal year ending next April 30 an amount equaling or exceeding the $75 million it spent last year, when a record was set.

It is building a big new tissue products mill at Beech Island, S.C., and it has announced a major expansion of its business papers mill at Moraine, Ohio. A new paper-making machine will go into operation at the company's newsprint mill at Coosa Pines, Ala., in the fall.

In the last two years Kimberly-Clark has announced or put into operation new production facilities in Australia, France, Japan, South Africa, Mexico and the Philippines and has acquired operating facilities in Colombia.

It is these areas of new markets and new products in which Mr. Minard is interested. For much of his career he has been closely associated with convenience products and disposables.

"This is the most exciting part of the paper business," in his view. "Disposable products have become big sellers in the past few years, and we are right in the middle of this expansion," he said.

Kimberly-Clark has long been a major producer of disposables, and its Kleenex, Kotex and Delsey brands are known throughout the world.

More recently, attention has been drawn to the disposable nonwoven materials produced by several companies in the paper field. These are fabrics formed of layers of tissue and reinforced with synthetic fibers. The resulting fabric is strong, soft and comparatively inexpensive.

Kimberly-Clark's nonwoven materials are being used for items such as paper dresses, hospital sheets and aisle runners on jet airliners, and the company expects demand to grow in many areas.

Mr. Minard brings considerable experience in manufacturing, resource management, sales and executive leadership to his new post.

He was born Dec. 19, 1906, in Ottawa, and attended Queens University in Kingston, Ont., winning an honors degree in chemical engineering.

Mr. Minard, the first non-Kimberly to head the Kimberly-Clark organization, joined the company in 1928 as a laborer at the Spruce Falls Power and Paper Company, a Kimberly-Clark affiliate in Kapuskasing, Ont.

He moved rapidly from the laboring job to a post as a chemist, then to laboratory superintendent, and then, in 1930, to technical director.

He left the company in 1940 to join the Royal Canadian Air Force as an engineering officer. He was attached to the Training Command and was decorated in 1943 with the Order of the British Empire for special services.

With the rank of wing commander, he flew to India and Burma early in 1944 to help form the Canadian air liaison mission to Southeast Asia.

He and his party were ordered to return to Canada by the shortest and quickest route, and he learned later that the urgency was brought about by the United States plan to explode an atomic bomb over Japan.

"We pulled all the seats and other nonessential gear out of our DC-3 to save weight and charted a nonstop flight from the Azores across the Atlantic to Newfoundland," he recalled. "The 1,600 miles was somewhat farther than the normal range of that aircraft, and we knew we'd be pushing a westerly wind all the way. But we took off—and we made it."

After the war he returned to Spruce Falls as assistant managing director and was elected vice president of the company in 1951. He was named vice president for all Kimberly-Clark operations in Canada in 1951, senior vice president in 1961 and president of both Spruce Falls Power and Paper and Canadian Kimberly-Clark operations a year later.

In April, 1964, Mr. Minard was elected executive vice president in charge of operations for Kimberly-Clark and also was named a director. He moved to Neenah, Wis., headquarters of Kimberly-Clark, where he now lives. Two children, a son and a daughter, live in Canada.

Underlying Mr. Minard's management philosophy is the belief that people, properly trained, directed and motivated, will be the deciding factor in corporate growth.

"Most people derive great satisfaction from doing their best," he told a recent conference of company foresters. "And they can achieve their own personal goals by helping the company meet its corporate objectives. Our job is to convince each employe that it really makes a difference to Kimberly-Clark whether he does well or badly."

COASTAL EROSION

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, an article published in this morning's Baltimore Sun emphasizes the urgency of the coastal erosion problem faced by the United States. The article describes the efforts by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to control the washing away of Wallops Island, upon which this country has constructed a major space research facility. The action of ocean waves is gradually eroding the island and threatening the installation.

I have introduced, and 26 Senators have cosponsored, S. 1262, a bill to authorize a 3-year coastal erosion study by the U.S. Corps of Engineers to determine the extent of coastal erosion in the United States and to make a beginning toward controlling that erosion. Two weeks ago the Public Works Committee conducted hearings on this bill in Annapolis, Md., to hear from officials in my own State about the great progress Maryland has made in surveying and laying the basis for controlling coastal erosion. What we heard in Annapolis only reemphasizes the urgency of prompt Federal action against the coastal erosion threat which is costing our Nation thousands of acres and millions of dollars every year.

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "NASA Builds a Home for Fish," published in the Baltimore Sun, October 4, 1967, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NASA BUILDS A HOME FOR FISH—FAKE SEAWEED INTENDED TO LURE NATURE INTO BUILDING SANDBAR

WALLOPS ISLAND, VA., October 3.—The spacemen who launch and track rockets from this Atlantic Ocean island put out to sea in a barge today to build a new home for fish.

The fish's new lodging will be a 300-foot stretch of artificial seaweed that engineers from the National Aeronautics and Space Agency station here began planting on the island's battered northeast beachfront this morning.

The 30,000 6-foot-long orange-colored plastic tendrils are designed to seduce nature into building a wave breaking sandbar 600 to 800 yards beyond the island's eroding shoreline.

"Hopeful it will break the orbital action of the waves and trap sand that can build up into a bar to protect the island; Robert Brashears, head of NASA's range engineering division at Wallops, said today.

The floating strands are also expected to furnish a feeding ground for fish and small crustaceans, Mr. Brashears said.

The artificial seaweed, developed by the space agency, the Army Engineer Corps and a Philadelphia plastics firm, is the latest weapon in NASA's arsenal against the sea pounding this small island.

The space facility has already built 34 jetty-like groins stretching out into the ocean, installed sand-fences to trap blowing sand, and planted beach grass to stop the Atlantic from eating up the beach across the dunes from the concrete pads holding its launch gantries and radar antennae.

"We're having problems with mother nature's encroachments," Mr. Brashears said today, estimating that his division spends two months a year fighting erosion. "She's a pretty insidious character and keeps moving in on us."

A NASA spokesman said today that the agency's engineers and a Norfolk construction company expect to take three days to plant the 68 concrete weighted steel frames anchoring the artificial seaweed in ten feet of water.

The off-shore planting ground was once a part of the island, Mr. Brashears said today.

THE JEWISH NEW YEAR REMINDS US OF A 5,000-YEAR TRADITION OF ENDING THE EVILS OF POVERTY

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, today we extend greetings and best wishes for the New Year to our brothers and sisters of the Jewish faith. This evening at sundown our Jewish friends and associates mark the start of the year 5728. We of the Christian community extend to them our hopes that the New Year will be one of peace, progress, and fulfillment.

The start of the year 5728 is an appropriate occasion, Mr. President, to express our admiration for an ancient tradition in the Jewish community that is frequently overlooked, a tradition that has persevered actively and effectively into this modern day.

It may well have been the Jews who first started the war on poverty 5,000 years ago. Their scriptures, the Torah and the Old Testament, are full of concern for the poor, the needy, the disadvantaged.

A continuing theme, running through all the Jewish holy writing and traditions, is the invocation found in Psalms, "Blessed is he who considereth the poor."

Our Judao-Christian tradition reminds us that few people in history developed a deeper sense of compassion and concern for the poor and the less fortunate members of the community. Very early in history the Jewish community reached the fateful conclusion expressed in the words, "Yes, I am my brother's keeper."

With that conviction as an animating spirit, Jewry down through the centuries has offered to the world an example of brotherhood and humanitarianism. The Christian injunction "and the greatest of these is charity" stems directly from our Jewish heritage.

But I am speaking today, Mr. President, not just to praise the Jewish tradition of fraternal concern for the poor. I want to commend, also, the large and continuing contributions that Jewish organizations have made to our 3-year-old war on poverty in the United States.

These organizations have been among the most prominent and effective in their moral support of the antipoverty programs, but their devotion to the cause of eradicating poverty has extended far beyond that. They have contributed generously of their time, their money, their talent, and their leadership capabilities to insure the success of our war on poverty programs, both nationally and in a thousand large and small communities from coast to coast.

Our brothers and sisters of the Jewish faith have proved invaluable allies, indomitable warriors in the war on poverty.

When that war is won we will be standing proudly shoulder to shoulder, not only to celebrate that victory, but also in determination to march together to create a world of genuine brotherhood and peace.

TIME FOR GREAT DECISIONS: ADDRESS BY ALF M. LANDON

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, the international scene is undergoing many changes of far ranging and fateful consequences. Old and familiar conditions are being engulfed by new and powerful forces. How well we understand these new forces, and how well we develop and execute our foreign policy programs will determine America's role in the world of tomorrow. In this period of changing world realities, there is an imperative need for clear, consistent and enlightened leadership.

Mr. Alf M. Landon, in a major speech of September 18, addressed himself to these problems of today and drawing from his long and productive experience offered wise counsel for tomorrow. Because of the importance of these remarks, I invite them to the attention of the Senate, and ask unanimous consent that Mr. Landon's speech be printed in the RECORD.

Among other things, Mr. Landon argues persuasively for the need of greater participation by the United Nations in bringing about an honorable settlement to the situation in Vietnam. He also stresses the value of the role of the Senate in reviewing and advising on American foreign policy. But his concluding remarks are most valuable I think and I want to quote one brief sentence which captures the essence of his message:

> What is required is the determination by the President for a long-range American design toward peace—rather than one developed piecemeal to meet the crisis as seen from the eyes of the President alone.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kansas?

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TIME FOR GREAT DECISIONS

(By Alf M. Landon at the Johnson County Republican Women's Clubs, Overland Park, Kans., September 18, 1967)

I am going to discuss the issues that confront us tonight and their relationship to political and economic life in the future.

I am speaking tonight of the high points of four gaps that exist in the Johnson administration's international relations and foreign policies. They are, first, the credibility gap—on which Senator James Pearson spoke in an excellent Senate speech of May, 1966—then the power gap—the economic gap—and how they all tie into the peace gap.

One of the Democrat leaders in the United States Senate, Joseph S. Clark of Pennsylvania, has described this credibility gap as meaning that "the President has lost his consensus." In other words, the President has lost the confidence of Democrats and Republicans alike in the Congress—and of the American people generally—in his leadership.

President Johnson's "loss of consensus" is more than a national disaster. For that is just what it is when people lose confidence in their leader.

This same question exists in governments all over the world. It exists not because it exists in the United States of America—as the President would have it. It exists because of the confusion created by frequent administration contradictory interpretations of factual press reports on major decisions within high ranking official circles.

The latest case in point: On Thursday, August 30th, the Senate Sub-Committee on National Preparedness—after three weeks of secret hearings—unanimously criticized President Johnson's management of the Vietnamese War, citing the difference of opinion on major strategy and tactics between the civilian Secretary of Defense and the military experts of the General Staff, and urged the President to step up the war—which he is doing. The President immediately had a press interview—saying he never had known more complete agreement!

Ten days later, he approved bombing attacks on port facilities of two North Vietnamese principal harbors, despite press reports of strong objections of Secretary of Defense McNamara. This is the second time in a month that the objections of the Secretary of Defense to bombing targets were overruled in favor of bombing attacks urged by the General Staff.

Then comes the news today of the strange proceedings of a letter prepared in the State Department by two journalists of standing—Harry Ashmore, Pulitzer Prize-winning former editor of the Arkansas Gazette, and William C. Baggs, editor of the Miami News—in collaboration with Assistant Secretary of State William Bundy that was mailed to Ho Chi Minh.

Senator Fulbright was by invitation an observer and confirms that. Mr. Bundy has not denied it as yet.

It is inconceivable that Secretary of State Rusk and the President himself were not privy to this.

Yet, according to Mr. Ashmore, President Johnson three days later wrote Ho Chi Minh a letter which "effectively and brutally" cancelled this private letter.

Let us take a look at the Vietnam War—that has grown in two and one-half years under President Johnson from a comparatively few advisors to a major American war.

From the reports of the news media in Saigon—the Pentagon—the State Department and the White House in Washington—no one would think they covered the same war.

This war is obviously not a partisan question. Both major parties are widely divided on both how effectively it is being conducted and as to its wisdom.

Senator Everett Dirksen—the Republican minority leader of the United States Senate—is closer to President Johnson on both questions than Senator Mike Mansfield—the Democrat majority leader of the United States Senate.

As a matter of fact, future historians will undoubtedly refer to President Johnson's Vietnam policy as the Johnson-Goldwater policy, because these future historians will be able to interpret the division among Democrats on Mr. Johnson's Vietnamese policies today—by and large—as the positions Senator Barry Goldwater advocated in his 1964 presidential campaign. For that reason, future historians will be able to understand the division among some of the Democrat leaders.

Let me refresh your recollection. I remember the hilarious ridiculing of the Republican presidential candidate when he proposed defoliation of the jungle. Today—and for the past year or so—President Johnson is following that military tactic.

Also, the 1964 Republican presidential candidate advocated reducing Haiphong Harbor as the logistic base for modern military equipment and supplies for the North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong.

Just ten days ago, the Pentagon announced bombing targets closer to that harbor than heretofore, and, a week ago, the third largest port in North Vietnam was bombed—destroying docks and other harbor facilities for the unloading of ships.

It is timely to note, also, that this split in Democrat ranks is not confined to the "nervous Nellies"—as President Johnson sneeringly called them. Only a few weeks ago, the Young Democrats from seven midwestern states rejected a resolution offered by the Kansas delegation endorsing President Johnson's Vietnamese war policies.

And a few weeks prior to that, the Young Republicans National Convention in Omaha in effect supported the Johnson-Goldwater Vietnamese war policies.

In the meantime, Americans for Democratic Action—with an unbroken record of supporting Democrat presidential nominees—are more than mildly critical of President Johnson's Vietnamese war. They vigorously disagree that he inherited it—as he claims.

They point out accurately—along with others—that he completely changed its characteristics when he turned it from a war by the South Vietnamese in defense of their country, aided and supported with United States supplies and only fourteen or so thousand advisors, into an American war—with a five hundred thousand military force—and when the President reversed completely—in six months after the election—his pledge that no American boy would be sent over there to fight in the place of the Vietnamese boys.

South Vietnam's first elected president last week announced that he was for a continuation of the policy of the American boys doing the fighting and the South Vietnamese boys doing the pacification work behind the lines. Also that he would immediately enact a truce in bombing if North Vietnam would reciprocate.

That brings me to the power gap.

The President himself announced at one time that he personally selected—the first of every morning—the targets that were to be bombed. He did not only that. He selected the number of bombs that were to be carried and the type and load of the bombs. For a while, at least, he decided the strategy of the General in command on the field of action. Senator Mansfield said the Senate Preparedness Sub-Committee report was directed at President Johnson—although only mentioning Secretary of Defense McNamara.

Vietnam—a jungle-ridden, swamp-ridden country four years ago—with no logistic military value—no good road system at all—no good harbors—no modern air fields to speak of—has today, because of American dollars, good roads—major harbors and major air fields. It is therefore a place of logistic military value—perhaps second only to Okinawa.

Last week, Secretary of Defense McNamara ordered the erection of barbed wire and electronic barriers to block infiltration of combatants and supplies to the Communist forces in South Vietnam, with "nary a termine at neither end"—as an early Kansas legislator described a proposed new Kansas railroad. The press has already labeled it the "LBJ Wall"—somewhat unpleasantly reminiscent of the Great Wall of China and the Maginot Line of France.

The Secretary of Defense—over a difference of opinion with the military—decided to spend untold millions of dollars and untold casualties in constructing a new barrier of barbed wire and most effective electronic equipment available in an attempt to stop the proliferation of men and supplies for the Communist forces in South Vietnam.

Yet the Secretary of Defenes is reluctant to start on an anti-ballistic missile system—favored by military experts.

America has three distant early warning huge radar outposts—one in the northern Canada, one in Alaska and one in Greenland—warning of any launching of missiles with nuclear warheads.

I do not believe there should be any longer delay by the President in deciding—or if the President continues to make no decision on this most vital factor in America's defense against a surprise missile attack, the Congress should itself made the decision—to start an adequate anti-ballistic missile system, located in Alaska. There can be no question that location would be a most needful contribution to our present warning system.

A location in Alaska—only seconds away from our present radar outpost there—could intercept nuclear warhead missiles coming over the top—as it were—the Arctic Circle. That is the shortest route for any enemy missile attack on the United States.

We are spending billions in South Vietnam—unable to stop the build-up of men, supplies and more effective military equipment to the Communist forces in South Vietnam—unable to bring the North Vietnamese any nearer a negotiating meeting.

Russia is building an anti-ballistic missile system to guard Moscow. China's border is so close, that is the best location the Soviet has.

America's geography is so different that Alaska is the natural and best location for its anti-ballistic missile system for a missile attack from any direction.

The Secretary of Defense is right in basing his objections on the fact that it involves extremely complicated technological factors with constant changes all the time—not only in the anti-ballistic missile system but also in the missiles—that would change the design of the anti-ballistic missile system.

Nevertheless, I think America can meet the cost of such a system with all its attendant changes. The President or the Congress should forthwith authorize and see to the construction of an adequate anti-ballistic missile system immediately located in Alaska. In today's news, Secretary of Defense McNamara reversed his previous opposition to the construction of an Anti-Ballistic Missile system with the announcement of a "thin" ABM system. Just what the Secretary has in mind is not clear. It no doubt will be explained further for consideration by the Congress and the country.

By way of the Manila Times come reports of increased bombing of North Vietnamese river dykes. Military men have believed the destruction of these dykes and flooding of North Vietnamese crop lands and blocking transportation would soon end the war.

Gunfire is rampant in China. There is gunfire along the Russian-Mongolian border—along the North-South Korean boundary line; gunfire between the Egyptians and the Israelis. Gunfire broke out last week along the China-India border.

Many governments in the world are facing internal rifts and crises of varying proportions on military-economic and political issues. The Israeli victory has completely altered the entire Middle East's position and problems.

All of which brings me to the immensely valuable review of our entire international relations policy initiated by Senator Fulbright for the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

Just what are the commitments President Johnson made at the Manila Conference of October, a year ago, for the military defense of all Asia? That is still kept a secret from the American people by the President.

Just what are America's commitments to the Congo that prompted President Johnson's hasty dispatch of three or four big cargo planes to the Congo a few months ago in response to that country's president's appeal for help?

Just what are the commitments that the Israeli government thought it had from the United States of America—that President Johnson said not so?

And what are our relations with the new government of South Vietnam? The election—the first in all its history—may have been fair—but the sky is cloudy.

These are only a few of the international policies of this administration that call for a review by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

This is not an attempt by the Senate to conduct the foreign policies of the United States of America. It is simply an attempt to apply Woodrow Wilson's famous doctrine of "open covenants openly arrived at."

Senator Fulbright is simply applying that to the people's right to know of commitments secretly arrived at—and not so secret at that. For these other governments know what President Johnson's commitments are—or what they think they are.

For sure—the American people do not want to get into another major war in Asia or Africa—without knowing what it is all about—and without a declaration of war by the Congress.

President Johnson has at one time said the Vietnam War is carrying out the Containment Policy of President Truman. At another time, it was for the freedom of the South Vietnamese. He has compared them to the American colonies in the War of Independence.

As for me, the Containment Policy is one thing. I am not willing to spend one drop of an American boy's blood fighting for the freedom of a people unwilling to fight for their own freedom.

All foreign treaties can be made constitutionally only by and with the advice of the Senate. It is high time the Senate asserts its constitutional responsibility and that the American voters hold the Senators—who ignore their obligations of their office in that respect—responsible for involving us in any future major wars.

Therefore, I believe Senator Fulbright and other members of his Committee—in reviewing America's position in its foreign policies and international relations—should have the stout support of all Americans opposed to getting involved in another major undeclared war.

That brings me to the economic gap.

Russia today is suffering quite an economic loss in the Middle East—not to mention the political phase. The Soviet is building back at additional cost the Arab military equipment destroyed or captured by the Israelis.

The big military base in Cuba is an economic drain on Russia. The Vietnamese war is a steadily increasing economic drain. So is China.

I think the question can be raised with validity that the costly anti-ballistic missile system the Soviet is building to guard Moscow is for protection against a nuclear attack from China rather than from the United States of America.

Moscow is only maybe a thousand miles from the present atomic base of China, as compared with many more thousands of miles from America. On top of all that is the increasing pressure on the inefficient and unworkable Marx-Lenin economic theories of keeping up with the United States of America in the arms race—especially space developments.

Furthermore, I repeat my previous question: After Mao—what? That is of infinitely more concern to Russia than any other factor in the international situation today—and to the United States of America as well.

As evidence of this economic drain on Russia, I call attention to the fact that Communists inherited all the accumulated wealth of the Czars of centuries and the private property and money in the banks they seized and expropriated.

The Soviets inherited no debts to offset these enormous assets because the Communists repudiated all public and private debts. That enormous treasury has enabled the Soviets to weather forty and more years of the economic failure of Marx-Lenin theories.

Not long ago, I read that the Soviets have offered for sale for the first time some of the valuables they acquired in the Czar's collection. It is always a sign of economic stress and strain when a country starts selling very rare collections of that nature. It also indicates its dependence on international trade.

The same economic and political strain is telling on America.

The Johnson fiscal policy is really an adaptation of Lord Keynes' economic theories that have not been adopted in any country in the world except the United States of America. Even in England—his home country—the different governments, whether Conservative or Labor, have been reluctant to make Lord Keynes' new economic theories the basis of their fiscal policy.

The Keynes theories have been widely accepted by modern economists in this country. They provided for deficit spending in time of depression—to be paid for in good times.

The Johnson administration fiscal policy has completely disregarded that last provision.

As I've said heretofore, it is not only the theories of Keynes that trial and error would prove; it would be the management. And sound management would always be handicapped by the politics of preparing for the next election.

In late 1965, the President's Economic Advisory Council recommended an increase in taxes for the fiscal budget planning of 1966. There was a division in the Council, but the majority—including Chairman Ackly—favored the tax increase.

Instead of following the recommendation of the trained economic experts, the President disregarded it as a way of meeting the mounting pressure of inflationary prices created by the so-called good times boom.

He left it to the Federal Reserve Bank to increase the interest rate as a brake on that anticipated pressure. When the Federal Reserve action was attacked, he sympathized with that in a public statement. When he had the opportunity to change the set-up of the Federal Reserve Bank to correct the action he criticized, he did not do so.

It is obvious that the President was trying to avoid a tax rise in an election year.

In his fiscal budget recommended to the Congress in 1967, he asked for a six percent sur charge tax. But that was not followed with any legislative information to the Ways and Means Committee of the National House of Representatives—where all such fiscal legislation has to start. As a result, the House Committee simply waited for that proposed legislation.

A month ago he increased his recommendation to ten percent.

Today we are confronted with an estimated astronomical $29 billion deficit if the Congress does not enact the President's request for increased taxes. Even if it does, America is confronted with its largest deficit at any time in its history—except for World War Two—of approximately $19 billion.

Therefore, America is confronted—on the one hand—with an increased tax rate—on which the President's Economic Advisory Council is divided because of the timing of the brake—or—on the other hand—even if it is passed—with an equally threatening fiscal policy of still an astronomical deficit of $19 billion.

Therefore, the entire world situation is completely changed from a year ago—and there is significant change in South Vietnam itself.

That brings me to the peace gap.

There is general agreement among those familiar with the facts that President Johnson has missed worthwhile opportunities for peace.

There are, for instance, the leads that our late Ambassador to the United Nations, Adlai Stevenson, believed were worthwhile following up in further conversations with the North Vietnamese that President Johnson brushed aside as being of no consequence.

This points up the lamentable failure of President Johnson's administration to accept the formal proposal of Premier Chou En Lai and Chairman Mao—two days after the explosion of their first bomb in October, 1964—for a meeting of the five nuclear powers—America, Russia, France, England, and China—preliminary to a meeting of all governments to eliminate nuclear weapons. The Pentagon dismissed the Chinese bomb as obsolete. The State Department dismissed their proposal as propaganda.

Five days later, I urged its acceptance for the purpose of discussion, at least. If it was mere propaganda, that was the way to find out. France and Russia, two months later, agreed to the Chinese proposal. Our refusal to do so can be the most fateful decision for the entire world—for a nuclear war will not be limited to one country or a number of countries, as what is now called the "conventional wars" or "conventional weapons" of the past.

What I have briefly outlined of the changing world situation may offer new opportunities for exploring an over-all stabilization and stopping of these incipient wars scattered all over the world. I've always said that Vietnam was a part and parcel of the entire international relations.

It is evident that President Johnson can no longer continue in place his present policy. He has to move in one direction or another. The American people are growing impatient and frustrated over the failures of his military decisions in South Vietnam. He has to move either to step up the war, as the Sub-Committee on National Preparedness called for—or step up negotiations for peace, as the increasing pressure of the United States Senate calls for.

The time is right for factual, realistic talks instead of such fanciful claims for the Nuclear Arms Embargo Agreement that is meaningless—with the key third clause left blank because no agreement could be reached on the provisions for inspection and enforcement, and with the failure of France and China—with nuclear powers in their own right—to sign this facade of a nuclear weapons limitation agreement.

I call your attention to a speech on the floor of the Senate by Senator Mike Mansfield on September 1st—the day after the report of the Senate Sub-Committee on Preparedness I have referred to.

Then the Senator said that, with the approval of the President, he was urging referring the peaceful solution of the Vietnam War to the United Nations.

Using the good offices of the United Nations is not a new position for Senator Mansfield—or Senator Fulbright—or Senator Morse—or Senator Carlson—or Senator Aiken—or other Democrat and Republican members of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

The importance of Senator Mansfield's statement is the use of the word "approval" in the timing and the new approach.

ON THE POSSIBILITY OF BEING WRONG

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I commend to Members of Congress a commencement address by Mr. Hedley Donovan, editor in chief of Time, Inc., delivered at New York University on June 13, 1967. The address, entitled "On the Possibility of Being Wrong," is a thoughtful perceptive discussion of the importance of magnanimity of thought on the part of Americans viewing the Vietnam war.

Said Mr. Donovan:

> I foresee in this country a kind of crisis of integrity, in which powerful and influential people will have to consider the possibility of saying out loud that they were wrong. Many of them have never tried it before, and it would not come easy to them. But if they cannot bring themselves to it, I think the American intellectual climate and the whole tone of our politics could be embittered for years.

Mr. President, I was impressed by the breadth of mind and the refreshing frankness of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton] when, last week, he simply said:

> I was wrong about Vietnam.

Senator Morton is one of the most respected leaders of the Republican Party, serving formerly as national GOP chairman. He had previously backed the Vietnam escalation policy, including the bombing of North Vietnam. Now he has changed his mind and is honest enough to say so. I believe this is the kind of spirit Mr. Donovan is recommending.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Donovan's address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON THE POSSIBILITY OF BEING WRONG

(Commencement address given at the 135th exercises of New York University, June 13, 1967, by Hedley Donovan, editor in chief of Time Inc., trustee of the university)

Chairman Murphy, President Hester, Faculty, Trustees, alumni, friends of New York University; and Graduates of 1967:

Along with all your academic achievements that we are saluting today, I think you should also be congratulated for choosing such an exceptionally interesting moment of history for your Commencement Day.

History has been moving with dazzling speed in the Middle East these past few days. In Southeast Asia it moves with agonizing slowness, but equally momentously. And history has not exactly been idle in other regions. Britain once more is trying to join Europe; Nigeria, the most populous state of Africa, is tearing itself apart; China's "Cultural Revolution" continues to shake the most populous nation on earth.

I don't know how often it happens that a Trustee of New York University is caught quoting Leon Trotsky with approval, but I will risk it this morning Trotsky said nobody who longs for a quiet life should be born into the Twentieth Century.

Clearly enough, all of you New York University graduates of 1967 come equipped with good steady nerves.

But I want to talk this morning about quite a different quality which I hope you also possess. If you have this quality, I think you must have learned it from wise parents, or developed it out of your own innate good sense, because I am not sure it is being taught today at any major American university. I am speaking of the ability to be wrong.

You may consider this a peculiarly appropriate subject for a speech by a journalist, and so do I. In our line of work we journalists are given a good many opportunities to be wrong. We have one or two other weakness I should mention. We are often too heavily preoccupied with the news of the last ten minutes. We are always flattered, therefore, and sometimes a little intoxicated, by an invitation to speak in some setting where it is permissible, or even customary, to talk in terms of generations, and lifetimes, and the long sweep of history. I shall try not to be carried away by the spaciousness of this occasion.

But I do want to try to look a year or two beyond today's front pages, to what seems to me to loom up as a difficult and perhaps dangerous moment in the intellectual and political life of the United States. I foresee in this country a kind of crisis of integrity, in which powerful and influential people will have to consider the possibility of saying out loud that they were wrong. Many of them have never tried it before, and it would not come easy to them. But if they cannot bring themselves to it, I think the American intellectual climate and the whole tone of our politics could be embittered for years.

So I am going to ask you this morning to consider the American aftermath of Viet Nam. But I want to go there by way of the Middle East. The Middle East has given us a short vacation from Viet Nam; I think it may also give us fresh perspective on Viet Nam. There are certainly some instructive contrasts between the two wars, and there are also significant connections.

I think if we are honest, we must all admit we found last week very exciting. It has been a long time, if ever, since Viet Nam seemed exciting. I think we must admit that we were caught up last week in some very old-fashioned emotions, ignited by a popular war, even a romantic war. It has been a long time, if ever, since there seemed to be anything romantic about Viet Nam. And wasn't it gratifying to be able to follow it all so clearly on sensible old-fashioned war maps— two columns advancing here, three towns captured over there, and so on, a satisfaction we never have (and never will have) in that maddening new-style war in Viet Nam. I suppose if we are honest we also must admit that as we saw those advancing arrows on the maps, our first thoughts did *not* turn instinctively to the casualties that must have been suffered, civilian and military, Israeli and Arab. No, I think we were busy cheering.

So the brilliant Israeli army has among other things given us an interesting glimpse into ourselves, and what we see in there is that we Americans are certainly not a pacificist people, we do not believe the use of military force is immoral *per se,* we are quite prepared to see it used in behalf of a just cause, and in the last analysis it is we ourselves, and other nations whom we think well of, who will be the judges of what is just.

Speaking to this generation of university students, I think that you, if I may say so, are especially indebted to the Israeli army, because you had not had any previous exposure to a popular war. The only war you had known, I mean not from the history books but in your daily life, as readers of the press, viewers of television, voters or voters soon to be, debaters, demonstrators, soldiers and potential soldiers, your only war has been the extremely controversial, complicated, frustrating war in Viet Nam. But now you have had at least a brief experience of another face of war.

I am not suggesting that everyone who admired the operations of the Israeli army last week must now necessarily support the operations of the American forces in Viet Nam. We might well wish that we could see in Viet Nam such surgically exact use of force as the Israelis so masterfully demonstrated. We might also wish that South Viet Nam had the cohesiveness and discipline and national spirit of Israel. We are there, of course, precisely because South Viet Nam does *not* have those things, but might in time develop them, and meanwhile occupies a piece of ground that has become enormously important, strategically, politically, and psychologically.

By the way, General Moshe Dayan, the Israeli Defense Minister, made a tour of the Viet Nam war last year. When he returned to Israel he published some articles supporting the general objectives of the U.S. stand in Viet Nam, criticizing some aspects of the U.S. performance there, praising others. Just this past Sunday, on a C.B.S. program, somebody said to General Dayan wouldn't it be nice if South Viet Nam would fight like Israel, and the General was tactful enough to say that it would also help if the Viet Cong were Arabs. My own amateur guess is that within the next year—or two years at the most—we will see the shape of the final outcome in Viet Nam, not the last shot but an unmistakable trend. It will begin to come clear that the Viet Nam policy of the Johnson Administration is a failure, or that it is a success. This war is just not going to grind along forever.

I would define any of the following situations as constituting clear failure of the Johnson Administration's Viet Nam policy: Any significant reduction in the percentage of the South Viet Nam population now under control of the Saigon government; or a disruptive new round of coups among the South Vietnamese Generals; or a condition in which the rural pacification and development programs were completely stalled, and very large increases in the American troop commitment—such as a quarter million more men— were being requested. A more advanced stage of failure would be a negotiated American evacuation, in a situation which gave the Viet Cong control of South Viet Nam or put them in a good position to take it over soon. The latter of course is a settlement we could have had at any time with no effort whatever, so if that should be the final result of all our sacrifice, the whole policy would have been a sorry mistake indeed.

Confronted with a failure of the policy in any of these forms, there are several lines of rationalization by which an individual supporter of the policy could avoid saying he himself had actually been wrong. One obvious line would be that the policy was right but it hadn't been prosecuted vigorously enough, that we should have gone all-out to win. Another argument might be that our Viet Nam stand had already brought about certain strategic benefits—that it had helped, for instance, make possible the anti-communist revolution in Indonesia—but now this effort was no longer needed. Other ways of evading an acknowledgment of failure are fairly easy to think up. What is perhaps more difficult to visualize is any important number of politicians, editors, generals, or ordinary citizens stepping up and saying, "I was wrong. I thought the policy would work, but it didn't."

But now consider another possible outcome, that the policy succeeds. I would define success as a situation in which the percentage of Viet Nam population under government control is increasing; political stability in the countryside is improving; enemy troop strength is declining; U.S. and Allied casualties are declining though guerrilla operations might still continue for quite a time; U.S. troop strength has leveled out; and a schedule can be set up for the first gradual withdrawals of U.S. troops. If that should be the situation sometime within the next year or two, I would say the Administration's Viet Nam policy had been vindicated.

Again, however, there could be many possible ways for opponents of the policy to evade such an admission. One would be to say that such stability as existed had been achieved in spite of the Johnson Administration's policy, that the big U.S. military effort had served to magnify rather than reduce the underlying political and economic problems of Viet Nam. Another argument would be: Yes, we did finally succeed but it just wasn't worth the cost. And still another argument could be that our policy was morally indefensible from the beginning, and therefore any apparent successes for the policy are morally unacceptable.

But I wonder if any Senator, columnist, professor, clergyman, pediatrician might come forward and simply say, "Well, what do you know, I have to admit Lyndon Johnson was right about Viet Nam." It is kind of fun to try to imagine some of these scenes, and I admit there are one or two particular individuals it would be especially interesting to watch in these roles.

But there is a much more serious point involved. Viet Nam has been a bitterly divisive issue in American life for some two and a half years, ever since we began the air attacks on the North and made the first commitment of U.S. ground combat units. Viet Nam will continue to be a highly divisive issue until the Johnson policy has unmistakably failed or succeeded. I think that realization will come not in a single thunderclap some Monday morning, but in an accumulation of evidence over several months.

And when that happens—and I believe it will happen in 1968 or 1969—then surely there is plenty of other business America should be turning to. But if at that time everyone must still insist he was right about Viet Nam, and no one is willing to admit he was wrong, then I am afraid we are doomed to go on arguing about Viet Nam. This could perpetuate in America a very sour political and intellectual atmosphere. It would not be an atmosphere favorable to trust and confidence and purpose in our national life.

Politicians, of course, are notoriously reluctant to admit error. Few of them have ever gone so far as Mayor Fiorello La Guardia, N.Y.U. Law School, 1910. You remember his famous line—"When I make a mistake, it's a beaut."

The President of the United States at the time of my graduation from college, indeed for more than a decade afterward, was Franklin Roosevelt. There is no instance of President Roosevelt ever publicly acknowledging a mistake.

Harry Truman once went to a seminar at another university of this city—I hope it's all right to mention the name—it was Columbia—and said "On the big things, I was right. And on the little things . . . well, if there's anyone listening here who hasn't ever made a mistake, let him put on his wings and fly the hell out of here." You notice, of course, that President Truman was conceding mistakes only on the occasional little thing, and even this confession did not come until 1959, six years after he had left the White House.

President Kennedy has been credited by some biographers with a particularly generous confession of error after the Bay of Pigs, when he said he would not try "to conceal responsibility . . . because I am the responsible officer of the government." This was a manly but I think entirely obvious statement of a simple constitutional fact. In a great many private and semi-private remarks which got leaked to the press quite rapidly, President Kennedy made it very clear that he felt he had been given very bad advice by the CIA and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and that his error was in underwriting their error. They in turn have let it be known that they, of course, were right, and that the crucial error was President Kennedy's, because he watered down their plans.

Lyndon Johnson is another President who is not on the record with many acknowledgments of fallibility. He did say at a press conference in February, "From time to time we will make mistakes," and then just last month he said, "We try not to think ourselves in possession of all truths . . ." At first glance these are appealingly humble statements, but then you begin to wonder a little about that "we." It's somewhat ambiguous, perhaps a trifle imperial. Or maybe it's merely the "editorial we."

Coming to the editorial, I would have to say that journalists have never been notoriously eager to acknowledge their mistakes. Many, indeed, have perfected a smooth, effortless way of taking a new position without ever noting that they once held quite the opposite view.

I do know one editor, however, who developed a remarkable facility in confessing error, and he used this to play upon the sympathies of his staff; they felt so sorry for a man who could make so many mistakes that they would do almost anything for him. Indeed one of his colleagues once accused him of practicing "wrongmanship." This is really very rare.

A few weeks ago in New York I attended a ceremony where some of the most prestigious prizes in journalism were being distributed. One of the recipients made a graceful little speech saying, among other things, that reporters in specialized technical fields do from time to time make mistakes. But I thought the particular language chosen by the reporter for this confession was revealing, and so I wrote it down. "No reporter in these fields has totally escaped from being had in some particularly difficult and humiliating way." *Being had*—here you will note that the main burden of error rests not so much on the reporter as on the people he was unlucky enough to listen to. Perhaps a little like the President and the Bay of Pigs.

Maybe journalists and politicians are hopeless cases, though I prefer to think not. But surely everyone would agree that the people who should be first and frankest in admitting error would be the academic intellectuals with their totally disinterested dedication to free inquiry and the pursuit of the truth. If the academy is indeed faithful to the rigorous standards it professes, one might expect to see it lead the way when there are errors to be acknowledged. But the recent record is not reassuring.

It may seem hard to remember now, but only two years ago much of the intellectual community of the United States was in a furor of indignation against Lyndon Johnson's intervention in the Dominican Republic. There were protest meetings, angry letters to the editor, paid ads in the papers with hundreds of professors' names in fine print, and so on. A much louder protest, as a matter of fact, than the President's Viet Nam policy had then begun to draw.

Well, you don't hear much about the Dominican Republic any more. It has not turned into a land of milk and honey, or a nice clean Anglo-Saxon model democracy, and like almost any one of the 131 countries in the world with the exception of the dozen or so richest and most stable, the Dominican Republic could have a revolution tomorrow. But in the meantime, by any reasonable standards for its part of the world, it is getting along pretty well. There is no evidence that President Johnson's intervention did any lasting harm to U.S. relations with Latin America, and in the Dominican Republic itself there is considerable evidence that his intervention did quite a lot of good. But we certainly don't see very many of those intellectuals who protested the President's Dominican policy now coming forward by letter, picket line, lecture, editorial, paid ad, or any other of our many available means of free speech to say, "Well, Johnson was right, and I was wrong."

I wonder if it will be this generation of university graduates—your generation—that could perhaps teach Americans how to be wrong. All it takes is courage, honesty, self-respect, grace—and sometimes a sense of humor can help. You might give quite a lesson to some of your elders—journalists, politicians, even some professors and preachers.

I know many students of New York University have felt deeply, and spoken up strongly, on Viet Nam, the issue that has dominated the public life of the United States for half or more of your college years. I as a Trustee of this University am proud that so many of you have taken a stand in this passionate debate.

Some of you will turn out to have been wrong. It is in the way you react to that moment, I suggest, that you will get a chance to take another stand—in behalf of a mature and civilized style of public life in America.

How to be *right* is something of an art, too, and some of you will get a chance to show your skill at that, when the Viet Nam returns are finally in. How to be right in ways that make it a little easier for the people who were wrong to decide that they were wrong, and that make it easier for all of us to turn together to a fresh agenda.

You know, after a war we Americans do a beautiful job of binding up the wounds of the enemy. Look at Japan and Germany today. After Viet Nam, I think many of the most serious wounds will be internal, right here at home, and some of the most grievous will be in this very deeply divided city of New York.

Looking ahead to that time, we might perhaps begin even now, without in any way restricting the Viet Nam debate, to let a certain measure of modesty and generosity into the dialogue. As to what will or won't work in Viet Nam, we might begin by admitting that we are all to some extent guessing. Nothing is guaranteed. So far as the morality of the policy is concerned, we might do well to credit all parties to the debate with decent motives and a normal sense of human compassion. We might also try, even as we go on arguing, to reawaken some sense among us of community. As Americans we have come a long way together; our history, when you get right down to it, really reads pretty well.

I was in Viet Nam last month, and one day in Saigon I met a New York University alumnus named Hoang Nang Oanh. He took a Master's degree here in Comparative Jurisprudence, Class of 1964. He is now a Third Lieutenant—they have such a thing—in the South Vietnamese army. In the course of our conversation, he said to me, "You know it is only two days from Saigon to Washington, but it is also 200 years."

The incredibly audacious thing that Third Lieutenant Oanh—and a few million other people in South Viet Nam—and we Americans—are trying to do, is to defend not so much a nation as the possibility that South Viet Nam can become a nation. It's a very tough proposition. We may fail. If so I hope that I, as one who has supported the policy, will be prompt to admit that we had attempted something beyond our powers.

But you know, we may just succeed. And if that happens, I hope that the many thoughtful and dedicated Americans who have opposed the policy will be glad to acknowledge that their country is sometimes capable of even more than we should dare to dream.

HOW TO CUT SPENDING SHARPLY AND RESPONSIBLY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, succeedingly over the past few weeks, more and more critical appraisal of administration economic policy has been raised. And heard throughout this criticism is the reasoning that it is up to the Government sector to meet the threat of inflation and recession; that, indeed, wasteful public spending and inflationary pressures go hand in hand.

The September 23 issue of Business Week contains an editorial aptly stating the current dilemma. The editorial says in part:

> The President would be well-advised to respond to this resistance and make a really tough program-by-program review of his budget. Every billion dollars in outlays he can cut is a billion dollars that could be scaled off the needed tax bill. All programs—military, space, agriculture, public works, and welfare—need to be subjected to fiscal scrutiny, with an eye to eliminating fat and pork.

Mr. President, there is no room today for policies which misallocate valuable resources. Government spending programs should be funded only if they can return significant benefits. But this has not been the case in the past.

A major gap now exists between the exjected rate of return on investment in the public sector and the rate found in the private sector. The rate used in Government projects corresponds to the historical coupon rate on outstanding long-term Government bonds. This rate is slightly over 3 percent, even though the Government is currently paying more than 5 percent. When the low rate is applied to Government planned projects, it means that funds transferred to the public sector will be used in spending programs which do not necessarily yield large-scale benefits on any realistic basis.

In the study of economics, the term

"cost" includes an evaluation of the alternative uses in which a resource could have been used. A low estimate of opportunity cost understates the real cost of a project; it creates inflationary pressures, an increasing national debt, and lower overall economic growth.

Members of the economics professions are adamant that the administration is applying the wrong discount rate. In recent hearings of the Joint Economic Committee's Subcommittee on Economy in Government, a group of leading economists agreed that the private sector discount rate should be the relevant rate for public projects. These economists testified that by using the private sector rate—which they noted was at least 10 percent, and perhaps as high as 15 percent—billions of dollars in long-term public works type programs could be pared from the budget.

This criticism does not mean that we should begin slicing away at every Government program. That is not either the idea or the intent of these remarks. The point to be raised is that many possibilities do exist for cutting back administration spending requests. It is within the role of Congress to insist that realistic discount rates be applied to both existing and future budget plans. Already I have asked that the Department of the Interior redo its cost-benefit calculations on projects undertaken during the past 3 years, showing comparisons with the present rate and the discount rate used in the private sector.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Business Week editorial, entitled "The Two Sides of Fiscal Policy," be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Two Sides of Fiscal Policy

The evidence is mounting that the Administration is right in calling for fiscal measures to damp down inflationary pressure and to maintain balance in the U.S. economy. Personal income took a $4.5-billion upward jump in August. Industrial production climbed more than a full point in the same month. At the rate these indicators are moving, it is likely that gross national product will climb by almost $15-billion in the current quarter—of which about two-thirds will be real gains, and one-third will represent price inflation.

With military spending on Vietnam slated to rise and the deficit in the federal budget widening, there is genuine danger that we will have a worsening of inflation if the Adminstration fails to take restrictive action. This would surely bring back tight money, hurt capital spending and housing—and in effect, replay the policy blunders of 1966.

A very substantial majority of informed economists, businessmen, and bankers have now agreed that taxes must be raised—and have so advised the House Ways & Means Committee. Nevertheless, the committee's powerful chairman, Representative Wilbur Mills, has made it perfectly clear that he and a substantial majority of his committee are not going to go along with the Administration's tax request unless the President shows that he is willing to cut the expenditure side of the budget.

It will do no good for the Administration to contend that this is impossible with the war in Vietnam still escalating, the war on poverty and urban squalor still building, and new programs like the "thin" anti-missile defense system getting under way. The hard political fact the Administration must face is that the proposed tax increase is bitterly unpopular, not merely with congressmen but with the voters to whom they respond. It is too easy to assume that this resistance is simply based on short-sighted self-interest. There is some of this, of course, but resistance also stems from concerns over inequities among different taxpayers and industries that would result from the proposed flat 10% surtax. It also reflects widespread popular discontent with the Administration's management of public policy, and a feeling not very clearly defined, that the Administration is trying to do too much in too many different directions.

The President would be well-advised to respond to the resistance and make a really tough program-by-program review of his budget. Every billion dollars in outlays he can cut is a billion dollars that could be scaled off the needed tax bill. All programs—military, space, agriculture, public works, and welfare—need to be subjected to fiscal scrutiny, with an eye to eliminating fat and pork.

After the President has demonstrated that he is determined to meet the sort of stiff criticism he is getting from Wilbur Mills, he will win the size and kind of tax increase the country needs. But this struggle over fiscal policy is going to take more time—probably until the last hours of the Congressional session late this fall.

SUBSIDIES FOR MARYLAND TOBACCO EXPORTS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, yesterday I had the opportunity to testify before the Subcommittee on Foreign Agricultural Operations of the House Committee on Agriculture on a bill (H.R. 7986) which would allow Maryland tobacco farmers to receive subsidies for tobacco exports. I have cosponsored in the Senate, S. 1444, identical to H.R. 7986, and currently pending before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

For more than a year, now, the Department of Agriculture has continued to discriminate against Maryland tobacco exports by denying the Maryland farmers a subsidy of 5 cents a pound of tobacco. The proposed legislation, if enacted, would put an end to this discrimination visited upon Maryland tobacco farmers by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my testimony before the House Agriculture Subcommittee be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Testimony of Senator Joseph D. Tydings Before the Foreign Agricultural Operations Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee Regarding Export Subsidies for Maryland Tobacco, October 3, 1967

Mr. Chairman, I appear this morning to urge this subcommittee to act favorably on H.R. 7986, a bill to encourage the exportation of agricultural commodities. This bill would allow Maryland tobacco farmers to receive subsidies for tobacco exports regardless of their disapproval of marketing quotas.

Maryland tobacco has been an important export crop since colonial times. Today, five counties in Maryland grow tobacco, and three of them are heavily dependent upon this crop to sustain their economy. In fact, both the federal and state governments have spent considerable effort and money in recent years to develop the economies of these counties. The Department of Commerce has classified one of these counties as economically "depressed," but, regardless, the Department of Agriculture has continued to deny a subsidy that would protect its tobacco and thus its economy. The economic effect of the denial of this export subsidy to Maryland tobacco by the Department of Agriculture is not only felt directly by the tobacco farmers and dealers, but by countless citizens of the five Southern Maryland counties where tobacco is the prime cash crop and whose livelihood depends upon the tobacco industry. Only by the enactment of this legislation, Mr. Chairman, can the Congress end the unjustifiable treatment which Maryland tobacco exports have been subjected to by the Department of Agriculture.

I would like to indicate briefly how this problem developed.

On February 25, 1966, faced with a second consecutive 15% cut in acreage allotments, the Maryland tobacco growers voted against marketing quotas. Having elected to take their chances on the workings of a free market, the Maryland producers assumed that their crops would have the same competitive advantages as other tobacco. Subsequent action by the Department of Agriculture prove these assumptions wrong. On June 10, 1966, the Department announced that Maryland growers, who had rejected acreage quotas, would not be eligible to receive the newly-created export subsidies of 5 cents per pound of tobacco. This action was taken even though the export subsidy was instituted, according to the Department of Agriculture, to help American tobacco "regain and expand foreign markets." In light of this rationale for the subsidy, it is difficult to understand the Department's conflicting position of denying the subsidy for Maryland tobacco. This discriminatory decision by the Department can *only* be seen as an attempt to punish Maryland tobacco farmers for voting to remove acreage allotment controls for the 1966 crops.

It must be noted that it would have been impossible for Maryland tobacco farmers to know at the time of their vote that they would be denied export payments as a result of their decision to reject acreage restrictions. There was no precedent for the Department's inconsistent action. Furthermore, the farmer did not know at the time he voted that the Department of Agriculture was actively considering the implementation of this export subsidy program, and, to compound the hardship on the Maryland tobacco farmer, the Department even refused to extend the export payments to previous crops that were grown under acreage controls.

The Maryland Congressional delegation has constantly tried to persuade the Department of Agriculture to rescind its decision. I would like to insert in the committee's records copies of correspondence the Maryland delegation has had with Secretary Freeman. I think these letters clearly indicate the detail to which we have gone in stating the case for the Maryland tobacco farmer.

Members of the delegation and their staff personnel have spent many hours in conference and consultation with officials, representatives of the Maryland Port Authority and the steamship trade association, members of the banking fraternity, the American Farm Bureau, the American Tobacco Exporters Committee, agricultural officials at the University of Maryland, and growers and dealers. Virtually all of these organizations and individuals have gone on record in support of the position of the Maryland tobacco farmer and the belief that Maryland is being unjustly punished by the Department of Agriculture's decision. Secretary Freeman says he interprets the law to forbid the payment of an export subsidy for uncontrolled crops. The Agricultural Act of 1949 does provide that no price support shall be made available for any crop of tobacco for which marketing quotas have been disapproved by producers, *but*, the language of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act, which provides authority for the Department of Agriculture to initiate export subsidy programs, is broad enough to allow export payments to be made on non-price supported crops. It states that:

"In the fulfillment of its purposes and in carrying out its annual budget programs submitted to and approved by the Congress pursuant to the Government Corporation Act, the Corporation is authorized to use its general powers to—

"(f) Export or cause to be exported, or aid in the development of foreign markets for, agricultural commodities." Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act, 15 U.S.C.A. Sec. 714 (c).

At a meeting on September 16th, 1966 between the Maryland delegation and Mr. Horace Godfrey, Executive Vice President of the Commodity Credit Corporation of the Department of Agriculture, it was admitted by Department officials that they possessed the authority to grant Maryland an export subsidy. In other words, Mr. Chairman, the Department of Agriculture had the legal authority to interpret subsection (f) of Section 714 (c) of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act so as to allow Maryland tobacco farmers to be included in the export subsidy program. But the Department of Agriculture has continued to say NO to the Maryland tobacco farmers—continued to deny them export subsidy payments—continued to punish them for their referendum vote—and continued to threaten the economic future of the 7,000 Maryland tobacco farmers.

It is in the face of this continued refusal of the Department of Agriculture to extend export subsidies to Maryland tobacco farmers that I wholeheartedly endorse H.R. 7986. I am co-sponsor of similar legislation in the Senate. The effect of this bill would be to change the present interpretation of the laws by the Department of Agriculture, by spelling out that acreage controls are not to be linked to payments of agricultural export commodity subsidies. The Commodity Credit Corporation Act does not limit export subsidies to price supported crops. It was never intended that acreage allotment controls should be linked to the Commodity Credit Corporation as a criteria for receiving export subsidies. The Department of Agriculture has not cited any precedents or clear statutory language to support their administrative decision.

The continued imposition of such a penalty could lead to the eventual destruction of the Maryland tobacco industry. Maryland tobacco has been historically dependent on foreign markets. In dollar value between ⅓ and ½ of every Maryland crop is exported. It is absolutely essential to the Maryland growers that they maintain and increase their share of foreign consumption. If Maryand tobacco is continually discriminated against on the export market, European customers will find substitute tobacco for their blends.

I would like to submit to the Committee a copy of a unsolicited letter from the Portuguese tobacco industry to an American exporter of Maryland tobacco. It clearly demonstrates that the absence of subsidy will place Maryland tobacco at a relative disadvantage on the foreign market, threaten the future of consumption abroad and encourage the use of foreign grown Maryland-type tobacco as a substitute. Maryland tobacco can *not* be allowed to remain non-competitive on the world market. There is *neither* a legal nor a logical justification for withholding export subsidies from Maryland tobacco. Unless the Department of Agriculture's position is changed, as H.R. 7986 would do, Maryland's annual exports will be lost to other countries. This, plus the grave injury imposed upon the growers in the five Maryand counties, is too high a price to pay for this unprecedented and dubious decision by the Department of Agriculture.

I urge the enactment of H.R. 7986.

HIGHWAY SAFETY STANDARDS

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, for too many years, highway safety in our country has been the victim of what Will Rogers used to say about the weather—everybody talks about it but nobody does anything about it. Or, at least, nobody did enough to reverse the shocking level of highway accidents, injuries, fatalities, and property damage.

In 1966, Congress passed two laws which, in sum, are meant to come to terms with the most important aspects of the American highway safety problem. The National Traffic Safety Act of 1966 deals with the vehicle or, to put it another way, the safety of the highway traveler's immediate environment. The National Highway Safety Act of 1966 aims at improving State and community highway safety programs with the funding and advisory support of the Federal Government.

Both of these acts are now being administered by the Department of Transportation. The first, involving auto safety features, has received by far the heaviest public attention up to now. But the second, dealing with State and local highway safety efforts, actually will have a much greater impact upon the driving habits and practices of millions of individual Americans.

The Secretary of Transportation has transmitted to Congress the Federal standards which he approved for application to State and local highway safety efforts. These 13 standards represent the first concrete demonstration of Federal activity under the National Highway Safety Act. As such, they deserve the interest and support of every citizen who has a stake in making our highways safer.

The standards cover a variety of performance areas including driver education, licensing and relicensing examinations, motorcycle driver protection, vehicle inspection, and others. To the best of my knowledge, no one in the administration or anywhere else claims that these standards represent all that ultimately needs to be done by States and cities to bring highway accident figures to an absolute minimum. Instead, they represent realistic goals at which States and communities can begin aiming today, with the firm hope of achievement in the near future. But if that achievement is to mean anything, we cannot back away from the Federal commitment. We must restore the highway safety funds cut by the House.

It is worth stressing that these standards are the first of many steps which the Federal Government is committed to take under the act. The Department of Transportation will be continually working to develop additional or improved standards which may be found necessary to advance its program.

These standards will be aired and processed with the advice of the States and cities themselves, the National Highway Safety Advisory Committee appointed by the President, and all other interested governmental and private groups.

Thus, we can be assured that the full exchange of views which contributed to development of the first standards, also will be provided in connection with future standards.

President Johnson has said that no responsibility of the Federal Government is more important than the saving of American lives and property. And the President has labored diligently to that end.

The new highway safety program is an excellent example.

THE DOVE WHO FLIES WITH HIS OWN WINGS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, with every day of continued escalation of the war in Vietnam, more and more Americans are questioning the extent and purpose of our involvement in Asia. My personal opposition to this tragic bloodbath is a matter of record. Among those Americans whose views and attitudes are turning, are many of my distinguished colleagues in this Chamber. This is heartening, for there has been a long period in which only a handful of us raised our voices in the most unpopular of all political actions—open dissent with the administration. We have all paid a price for our convictions. One of the most courageous and eloquent of this small group has been the distinguished senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church]. His courage perhaps cost him most dearly, for it subjected him to a vicious public attack in his own State—an attack financed from out of State by a wealthy, unscrupulous individual, using both his money and unwitting people as tools for personal power. An effort was made to recall the distinguished Senator from Idaho because of his honest concern over our involvement in Asia.

What has been the reaction to this unwarranted attack? One of the most definitive accounts of public reaction was published on September 3, 1967, in the magazine section of the Sunday Oregonian. Reporter Blaine Schulz traveled with Senator Frank Church in Idaho. I commend this article to all Senators, for it is gratifying to know that integrity in public office is still a most-valued characteristic of an elected official and that the American people want no part of a rubberstamp politician. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Dove Who Flies With His Own Wings

(By Blaine Schulz)

The sun was high in the sky and the 95-degree heat was like an oven.

Sen. Frank Church, the 43-year-old Stanford-educated politician from Idaho, sat with me in the back seat of a car that wound its way through the parched, high valley south of McCall, Idaho, on the way to Boise.

I wanted him to tell me why he is a "dove"—why he had taken on the unpopular role of a dissenter on American foreign policy.

It was well known he doesn't believe the

United States is facing the Communists in Vietnam in some sort of Armageddon.

His previous pronouncements had indicated he sees the war as a civil conflict that the United States was unwise to get involved in.

Now, coatless, shirt sleeves rolled up, he hazarded no miracle cures about Southeast Asia but said the hour is late and America must find new priorities on how it is spending money at home and abroad.

He said he rated the war in Vietnam "as a blunder that we are stuck with" and would explain why.

Sen. Church, the night before, had addressed the Young Democrats of Idaho at a convention in the Payette Lake resort town of McCall. He had struck hard at what he called the "apostles of fear in America," who, he said, "would have us believe that the world is a great Red sea into which we are rapidly sinking."

In the oratory at the convention, the Democratic senator had cited numerous examples of hysteria. Fearful men, he said, "see every step toward peace as a sell-out, every attempt to deal with dangerous tensions as appeasement, every rational act of confidence as a signal of impending doom."

He had told the Young Democrats that "Communism is not taking over" because "it is too poor a system for that, and it isn't even holding its own."

Now, as the engine droned monotonously along the road through the hot, high grazing land, Church glanced at the livestock munching a noon meal.

Turning to me, he brushed aside a heavy crop of black hair and elaborated on the topic of hysteria, fear and self-delusion.

"This notion," he said, "that we are somehow going to settle everything by teaching the Communists a lesson in Vietnam is a grandiose self-delusion."

He said he believes the Communists and the followers of Ho Chi Minh are going to continue to seek their own way. "We are living in an age of ferment and revolution that we will not see an end of in our time. We've got to learn to live in this kind of an untidy and uncomfortable world. There are not weapons enough in our arsenal or money enough in our treasury to damp down the smouldering fires of revolution everywhere in the world, and that ought not to be our purpose."

What we have to get over, he said, "is our paranoiac fear of communism and be less concerned about other people's ideologies."

Americans, he said, should learn from Vietnam not to involve themselves in the future in a foreign war "where our own vital national interests are not really at stake." This means, he said, "we must learn to keep our commitments commensurate with our real interests."

Loosening his shirt to let in a fresh breeze around his neck, the boyish-looking senator let the words flow through a gesture made by an outstretched palm: "Vietnam is the end product of frozen patterns of thought that have resulted from the prolongation of the Cold War."

America's "obsession with Communism," which permits it to follow a 1947 foreign policy in 1967, "has caused us to pursue a policy that contradicted the principle we stood for everywhere else in Asia and Africa—the right of self-determination and an end to colonialism," he said.

Drawing from a metaphor used by Harvard's John K. Fairbank, a noted American authority on Far Eastern affairs, the Idaho senator said, "We sleep in the same bed the French slept in though we dream very different dreams."

To the Vietnamese, he said, "we are now the foreigners in their house."

Wracked by the Birch-oriented drive to have him recalled from the U.S. Senate because he has served himself up as spokesman for an unpopular cause on affairs dealing with Southeast Asia and American policy abroad, the "Boy Orator of Idaho," is, nevertheless, reaching a new peak in his career.

This is because the recall movement is turning in his favor. Even the Republicans in Idaho admit the charges against Church are unsupportable.

Said Valley County Republican district attorney Larry Schoenhut, "Before the recall, Church was dead. The people feel this way, 'We like the independency here. Somebody is picking on Frank Church.' "

By taking the recall movement to the District Court in Idaho, the conservatives "are helping out Frank Church," Schoenhut said.

Responsible Republicans in the state, he said, believe that "if you don't like a man, vote against him." Attempting to remove a senator because you don't agree with him is not the right way to tackle the problem, he said.

The man-in-the-street's reaction to the recall attempt, which was fostered by Californians, is this: "Sounds like a bunch of kooks to me." Such is the appraisal of Democrat Cecil D. Andrus, Orofino businessman who tried for the governor's seat in the last election and lost.

Thus, basic Idaho provincialism—the mistrust of "carpetbaggers and outsiders" is working in Church's favor.

Many Democrats, Republicans, and political observers in Idaho believe Church could not have stumbled onto a better attention-getter for his election campaign coming up next year if he had dreamed it up with all his Party's congressional aides in Washington.

The recall is a rallying force, causing the man-in-the-street to have a second look at the credibility of Church's record. Moreover, it gives Church and the Democrats a good chance to point out what his record really is. As a Grand View, Idaho, farmer and former state senator, Harold Collett, put it, "I personally am a Hawk." Of the war in Vietnam, he said, "I believe we can get away with it, but I feel the senator's position is basically responsible. We all agree with (Church's) policy statement against unilateral withdrawal."

A man outside a restaurant in Cascade, Ida., responding to the question of the recall movement, said, "It will elect him; it makes a martyr out of him."

In recent years, Idaho has been moving to the right. The recall petition was presented by a citizen of Idaho, Gene M. Mileck, dogcatcher from St. Maries, but it was printed in California.

The chief advisor for the recall movement, Ronald Rankin, was once a leader of the right-wing political movement in Orange and Los Angeles Counties in California before moving to Idaho two years ago. He has gone to the District Court in Idaho to force Secretary of State Pete Penarrusa to accept the initial recall petition, which Penarrusa turned down because of a ruling from Idaho Atty. Gen. Allan Shepard that a petition in Idaho to recall a U.S. senator is against the Constitution.

The petition against Church specifies that he should be recalled because of his opposition to military measures which would help win the war in Vietnam and Church's support of the Soviet consular treaty, "thereby giving aid and comfort to the Soviet Union."

Rankin, it is reported, doesn't believe he can now get the required 24,538 signatures necessary for a successful recall petition, but he believes the issue should be tested. Church, himself, said he is not opposed to the "test" in the courts so long as it is carried out with fair play.

For Church, the danger is not so much in the recall petition as it is that the insinuations and charges may return to haunt him in the coming election. Voters may feel they were right in going against the recall, but they could choose to throw him out of office when they get in the voting booth.

So the senator has been working hard to mend his fences at home.

Six months ago, the people who make bets on the futures of politicians, were saying that Frank Church could not get re-elected. This feeling was reflected in the comment from a housewife in the resort town of McCall. "I feel Frank lost a little touch with the Idaho people for awhile. During the time of President Kennedy he got a little federally involved." She added, "I don't believe they have any legitimate reason for the recall."

Now, having held 13 courthouse conferences with the home folks since March and traveling home every chance he gets, the youthful senator is finding again what it means to have his hand squeezed, to serve as mother confessor and counselor.

A big, boyish grin and easy laughter erupts from his face as he meets the townspeople, one by one, in a small room in the courthouse, as he did recently in a conference in Cascade, the home of 1,000 and the seat of Valley County.

An elderly woman walked into the small office, and he greeted her. "I'm surely glad to see you. How's your son?" At the conclusion of the conference, when the woman stood up to leave, he said, "I'll give your regards to Mrs. Clark." (Mrs. Clark is Church's mother-in-law. Church married the daughter of the late federal judge and Gov. Chase Clark of Idaho.)

At no point during the conferences did anyone bring up the matter of the recall or of Church's position on Vietnam, except for one man, who said, "I want to shake your hand. Anyone who has caused the stir you have deserves support."

Church said later, however, that some of his Town House conferences had elicited comments from persons who wanted to talk about foreign affairs and his positions on the war. But in the rural areas, such as Cascade, the questions deal with personal problems faced by the constituents. Water rights, life estates, irrigation taxes are on the minds of the people who come in to see the senator. One woman complained she could not get a federal loan to get her son into college.

If these questions seemed small compared to the big issues involving foreign affairs, Church gave no hint of it and promised to write to the people who could do something about the problems with which the townspeople were concerned.

A little past noon, we walked with the tall, boyish figure down the street to a luncheon at a cafe in Cascade. His youthfulness and relaxed manner betrayed the restlessness he feels now.

"After I turned 40, I discovered I don't sleep as well at night as I used to," he said.

Later, getting Church by himself in the car was one way to learn why he chose to "fly like a dove" rather than "screech like a Hawk." The decision comes out of deep-seated philosophies that he believes are rooted in the pages of history and the realities of modern national movements on all the major continents.

"It is nationalism, not communism, which is the dominant force in the former colonial regions of the world," said the Idaho senator.

He went on to say that if we had a better sense of history, we would scoff at the notion that Vietnam is some sort of test case, where Communists must be taught to abandon their resort to force.

"I totally disagree with the Department of State: to view 'Ho Chi Minh's War' as no more than an extension of Stalin's post-war aggressions in Europe—to regard communism still as a seamless web—is not 'the beginning of wisdom.' It is the denial of wisdom. It is a view of the world as rigid and doctrinaire as that of the most credulous

Marxist. It is a myopia reminiscent of the Bourbon Kings of whom it was said, "They have learned nothing, and forgotten nothing.'"

Regardless of the final outcome in Vietnam, according to Church, guerrilla wars will continue to break out in the future whenever internal conditions in any country seed revolt. "We can draw no battleline—in Vietnam, the Dominican Republic, or any other foreign country—which will either put an end to future revolutions, or cause the Communists to quit trying to take charge of them."

Rather than rushing in with our troops whenever a guerrilla war in some distant country takes a bad turn, "we should begin to exercise prudent restraint," he said, adding:

"The Communists are doing badly in the underdeveloped world. Only where they have managed to seize hold of nationalist aspirations have they gained the upper hand. The lesson for us, in dealing with communist rebellions in Asia, should be to hold our distance, extend our aid at arm's length and avoid implicating ourselves so openly as to convert these struggles into American wars."

As our driver steered the car down out of the high plateau country toward Boise, the heat gathered in intensity and the youthful senator put the important touches on what he saw as the basic flaw in America's Asian policy.

Turning toward the interviewer as though no one else existed at this moment, he said, "Each people must find its own natural path to freedom."

He went on, "Democracy can't be exported or imported. It has to grow. I doubt that any government, no matter what outward form it may take, will have genuine support in Vietnam if it depends for its protection and its sustenance on the United States or any foreign power."

He said the greatest weapon against Communism in Asia is indigenous nationalism. With Ho Chi Minh as their leader, the Vietnamese struggle on fiercely in what they regard as a continuing struggle for national independence.

The tragedy of the war, he said, is that "the longer it lasts and the greater it grows, the more Ho Chi Minh is forced to depend on China."

Hammering home the point, he declared, "We may end up driving him into the Chinese hands if the escalation continues, and thus we will have accomplished the very thing that we say we are fighting to avoid."

Asked if there are any alternatives to what we are doing now in Vietnam, Church, the first Democratic senator in the history of Idaho to be elected to two successive terms, said the war is a "quagmire" and "there are no satisfactory answers now. If we can't achieve a settlement of the war to permit us to extricate ourselves with honor from South Vietnam without repudiating our commitments there, the other alternative may well become the establishment of an American protectorate with a large occupational army stationed in South Vietnam for many years to come."

The elections in Vietnam, he said, demonstrate America's "limitless capacity for self-delusion." Why? "There are no traditions of democratic government in Vietnam. The system is wholly alien to them. They can't learn it as a foreign import. They can put up a facade, as many South American governments put up the facade of democracy with institutions patterned after those in the United States."

We watched as the driver passed a car on the long stretch of roadway, and the specter of Robert Duncan, who failed to convince Oregonians they should pick him for the Senate instead of Mark Hatfield, hung in the air as Church spoke of America's fear of Communism.

"It's only hysteria that leads people to believe that if we don't fight the Communists at the 12th parallel we'll have to fight them later at the beaches of Hawaii or the gates of Seattle."

He punctuated the comment by saying, "A moment's reflection should be enough to explode that myth; the elephant can't drive the whale from the sea or the eagle from the sky."

But conceding that Americans often see things in terms of an undifferentiated whole, he continued, "If you ever believed in the monolithic character of the Communists, the place to drive the defense line is along the Western Pacific, not on the mainland of Asia—least of all in a country of no size or strategic consequence—the Balkans of Asia."

Is the United States winning the war? "We have the resources and the power—so overwhelming against a country of this size that in time we can suppress the war and maintain control as long as we are willing to occupy the country. But the Vietnamese say, 'We are going to live here always; that means we are going to have greater staying power than the Americans.' It's hard to argue with that."

In our determination to maintain military superiority there no matter how long it takes to stop the fighting, "our motives are all the best," the senator acknowledged. "We really are not interested in making Vietnam an American colony. Our purpose there is totally different from that of the French. The tragedy is it is really impossible to convince the Vietnamese themselves that this is so.

"Out there, Communism isn't the ugly word; it's Capitalism. Asian people tend to relate Capitalism with the foreign-owned system of the colonial period."

How do congressmen feel about the war? Are they talking about it in the cloakrooms? "Surely," answered the Boise solon who has been close to them. He holds a seat on the foreign relations committee and was U.S. delegate to the 21st General Assembly of the United Nations last fall.

"There are many more dissenters in the Congress than those few who have spoken up," he said. "But the political instinct for self-survival leads many to remain silent."

There are some signs, he added, that the Republicans now are beginning to express disfavor with the conduct of the war. George Romney is now beginning to move in that direction, but his stand on Vietnam seems to change with each new pronouncement.

Asked if the Republicans have a chance of winning against President Johnson in 1968, he said, "If the Republicans present an alternative policy which gives us a hope for peace, and conditions remain as they are today, their prospects for victory in the next election will be great, but it depends on the man they nominate and the path they follow. A candidate who would propose to outdo Johnson on the war would lose."

In either party, he said, "I don't see anyone on the stage or in the wings who would advocate a reversal of the war policy."

He said it is very difficult for any country to change course; it happens rarely. "De Gaulle is a phenomenon in political life because he had the strength and stature to reverse French policy in Algeria. He said France had been wrong and Algeria should have independence. He did this when the French were on the verge of civil war, but the French came out feeling greater pride in being French than they had ever felt before."

Church said it takes someone like an Eisenhower or De Gaulle, "who are the personification of patriotism and in whom people will have implicit trust." Eisenhower, he said, "had the opportunity to make significant changes in American policy abroad but he failed to do it. He lacked the personal conviction and the determination of a great political leader."

What has happened, Church said, is that the American position in Vietnam "has thrown the nationalist banners into Ho Chi Minh's hands and has branded the Saigon government with the most contemptible of epithets—puppetry."

Church referred to Ho as a despot who has used regressive practices, "but since he is an architect of Vietnamese independence, he has retained strong popular backing."

To put across his point, Church talked about Burma, which has 1,500 miles of common frontier with China. Said Church, "U Thant (U.N. secretary) told me that had the Burmese government turned to a white Western nation to rescue it. Burma today would be either all Communist or split with a non-Communist half and an occupied Western protectorate. It's now all non-Communist. The Communists are all in jail and have been for the last 15 years."

It was on the subject of the Birchers, extremism, and American priorities that we closed the interview as the car approached the Boise city limits.

"There is a strong Birch movement in Idaho," Church said, "and they've claimed credit for the outcome of the governor's election and the election of two Idaho congressmen.

"Nationally, they are concentrating their efforts in states like Idaho—small states, where their money can be concentrated in the most telling effect."

The Birchers, he said, are not to be ignored as a threat because "the next elections are likely to be a testing case determining whether or not extremism is going to take charge and whether Idaho is going to become one of the first states to be captured by extremism.

"They'll concentrate their fire and fanaticism against me."

Civil rights, the riots in the ghettos, the cost of fighting a costly war in Southeast Asia—Church studies the topics in a tight perspective in an attempt to find new answers to old problems.

He said that because the recent riots call for a clearing up of the ghettos and new job opportunities for Negroes, "the great need in this country is to re-order our priorities."

He said 80 per cent of the people in this country enjoy a great affluence, but 20 per cent have been left out.

"Congress is calloused and unwilling to pay for rat eradication, which could be paid for by just four hours of the war in Vietnam.

"We want to take the Great Society to Southeast Asia; we don't even have the Great Society here. We've been carried away by our own romanticism. We need to bring things back into perspective and re-order our priorities.

"Only circumstances will change the emphasis, and a new conventional wisdom will grow up around it for rationalizing the new policy.

"I see the first evidence of it—within the past year—within recent months.

"The public is coming to recognize the elements of folly and futility involved in the war in Vietnam and is being shocked by the riots to the problems at home. We are recognizing that much has to be done to put our own house in order."

The car pulled up in front of the old Chase mansion where the Churches live when in Boise. He stepped out and gripped the luggage and walked toward the white frame house. It would be quiet for a few hours before he had to catch the plane to Washington.

WALKER STONE'S REPORT FROM BANGKOK

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, Walker Stone, of the Scripps-Howard newspapers, who has been traveling in Asia and filing a remarkable series of interviews with Asian leaders, has recently presented us with an excellent view of troubled Southeast Asia from the viewpoint of Thailand.

Thailand is, of course, the next nation of Southeast Asia on the list of China. It is the next target for subversion and overthrow. The effort in Thailand is, in fact, underway, though the Thai Government has proven capable, so far, of containing the threat. The leaders of Thailand are not hedging their bet that Communist aggression will be stopped in Vietnam by American muscle, as Mr. Stone reports. That does not mean the Thais are unconcerned with developments which feed the Communist hopes we will tire and withdraw.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Walker Stone's report from Bangkok, published in Monday's Washington Daily News, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Why Thais Back U.S. Policy

(By Walker Stone)

Bangkok, October 2.—The rulers of Thailand, long known as the world's greatest anticipators of history, are not hedging their bet that communist aggression will be stopped in Vietnam with America providing most of the muscle.

Accommodation has been a trademark of Thai diplomacy that has maintained this small kingdom's independence for centuries against political and military surges across Southeast Asia. It worked out neatly in World War II, permitting a Japanese occupation which was de facto but not de jure, and Thailand emerged from the war unscathed and still free.

The hedging technique was evident in our early arrangements to establish U.S. Air Force bases on Thai soil for use in the Vietnam conflict. The agreement was that our planes could fly out of here on their missions but it should not be a matter of public record. That diplomatic fiction was dropped as air strikes entered large-scale operations and the Thais assumed that Americans were in the area to finish the job they had started.

STANDING PAT

A reason for Thailand standing pat on our side is expressed simply by elder statesman Prince Wan Waith Ayakon, deputy prime minister: "If Vietnam falls our turn will come. China has declared it."

Similarly, Foreign Minister Thanat Khoman, when asked about statements of other area political leaders that, if the Vietnam war ended in a way which did not give stability, smaller Southeast Asia nations would have to make accommodations with Red China, said:

"The communists never made accommodation with anyone for any length of time. They may make a truce, until the time they can grab the whole thing. Everyone should know that. God should condemn us to make accommodation with the communists. It would mean that it would be a very short-lived truce, a temporary moratorium, because in no time the communists would take over.

METHOD DESCRIBED

"We knew the method of operation, the 'M.O.' of the communists. They make no accommodation unless it be for a few months, a few weeks, but not permanently. The Indians thought they could share power with Communist China, that they could set up some kind of condominium of Asia with Communist China. You see how it worked. That was the policy of India which had been thought out by Mr. Nehru when he was in jail. He thought that it would be possible to set up two poles of power in Asia, one pole in Peking and the other in New Delhi, and that the smaller nations in Asia would gravitate around one or the other pole.

"To his great regret, he died seeing his theory of condominum with Communist China fall into dust."

The fact that the Thai leaders are not yet hedging does not mean they are unconcerned with the hawk-dove debates in the U.S. and elsewhere.

On the military side of the Vietnam situation, said Foreign Minister Thanat, we are making progress, but on the propaganda side we are taking a beating.

COMMUNISTS AIDED

"The communist side," he continued, "has a great deal of help, not only from sister communist nations, but also from our own (allied) people, from some of the senators, some of the professors, some of our press people, from several other people in Western Europe from non-communist countries, in Asia also.

"That gives them the feeling if they can hold out somewhat longer, they will get the results they want—mainly that Americans, Australians, Thais, Koreans will get tired of the war in Vietnam and pull out and therefore let them grab the whole of South Vietnam."

Asked about proposals to stop the bombing of North Vietnam was a move toward a negotiated peace, Mr. Thanat's response was not muted:

"This is one of the strange approaches. When the Viet Cong or the North Vietnamese use mortars against South Vietnam's people, no one ever thinks of asking the North Vietnamese or the Viet Cong to stop the shelling or the massacres."

HUD UNDER SECRETARY ROBERT WOOD'S "REDISCOVERY OF THE AMERICAN CITY"

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, Under Secretary Robert Wood, of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, recently delivered one of the most balanced and most cogent statements on the American city that I have ever read. Entitled "The Rediscovery of the American City," this fine speech is one of constructive criticism and cautious optimism. At a time when urban critics abound, it is particularly refreshing to find these qualities in an advocate of the cities. Mr. Wood's thesis is that, contrary to general impressions and current controversies about our urban ills, the potential for building great new cities in the United States has never been brighter.

Mr. President, I commend Mr. Wood for his excellent statement, and I recommend it to the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Rediscovery of the American City

(Address by Robert C. Wood, Under Secretary, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, MIT Alumni Seminar, 1967, Cambridge, Mass., September 8, 1967)

Good evening. It has been twenty months since my sabbatical year was suddenly transformed from one of political speculation to political experimentation—and extended somewhat in duration. But three times since then one group or another on this lively, diverse and changing campus has welcomed me home again. I appreciate every opportunity.

Early in my Washington days, I explored with undergraduates the new career challenges urban affairs offers young scientists and engineers.

Later on, I talked with faculty friends as they took up Jim Killian's and Howard Johnson's charge to bring the resources of this great university to bear on urban problems in a major new commitment. And I salute the program's first great accomplishment, persuading one of the country's great urban leaders, John Collins, to join MIT's ranks.

Tonight, I meet with this distinguished group of alumni and alumnae—hoping to help make clear how your fortunes and interests are intertwined with the American urban community and to encourage the use of your talents and energies in its behalf.

From each visit to MIT I take more than I give. There are older universities in this nation and some that profess a more cosmopolitan style. But none can claim to be in closer touch with those distinctive features of the American character and culture that have generated this nation's uniquely successful development:

A reliance on reason in place of emotion or illusion as a means to solve problems both human and material;

An emphasis on productivity, on action, on work, on results—not talk—as the measure of competence;

An insistence on quality in the application of reason and the execution of tasks, so that the mark of the professional stamps the men and women of MIT from their freshman year onward.

It is worth recalling these characteristics. They underlie the Institute's reputation. They are also qualities sorely needed in our present struggle to build cities that reflect the best of America's aspirations.

For, since the time I accepted Bob Bishop's invitation to join this Seminar today, we have passed through a series of calamitous events in our cities. In President Johnson's words, "We have been through a time no nation should endure." Since last May, storms of urban discontent have broken over Cincinnati and Tampa, over Newark and Detroit, here over Boston—indeed over more than a score of American cities.

This is the fourth consecutive year of urban violence and the intensity is increasing.

These outbreaks were not unexpected. Nor were they, to the professional observer, inexplicable. But they have produced the torrent of commentary and explanation that now swirls around us and the sense of urgency and concern with our urban civilization that was lacking in earlier years.

All of us in the urban business welcome every indication of the public's sense of heightened urgency and broader concern. However, the solemn predictions of disaster, and the panicky search for panaceas is another—and disturbing—matter.

Urban problems we have aplenty—and inventory of ills assembled over years of indifference and inattention. Yet the potential for city-building in the United States grand in scale and fine in quality has never been greater.

Indeed, my central theme is that we are in fact further along in understanding the urban system, developing the capabilities to direct it, and deciding in what direction it should go than most Americans appreciate—or, given the decades of neglect, than we probably deserve.

This thesis runs contrary, of course, to the cloudburst of criticism that now falls on our city policies. The urban wailing wall is lined today with eloquent comunicators urging us in this direction or that. Some of these are old colleagues who only a few short years ago wrote learned treatises entitled "There is no Urban Problem" or

"Cities are Better Than Ever." Others are the experts who called for the abolition of the automobile as a practical solution to the unspecified ills of suburbia.

Now while these observers come forward with a different set of opinions and assertions, prescriptions and philosophies, let me present some evidence for long-run confidence in Americans as urbanites. The foundation for this optimism is principally that the characteristics of reason and problem solving which give validity to this Institute's approach, are now being applied to urban affairs.

Specifically, *we come increasingly to understand the city as a system of many variables in precise and accurate terms, as a complex set of relations of people and space involving many dimensions*. This may sound theoretical, but an accurate description of the phenomenon is a prerequisite for guiding it. Until very recently in urban scholarship there was a clear and present danger of committing the single-factor fallacy in diagnosing our cities ills. The special error was a tendency to analyze them solely in terms of race.

Second, we are beginning to develop a balanced capacity to design and build better city systems. We are learning that, as in all great national endeavors, manpower, knowhow, talent, and commitment are as important as dollars. We ignore any one component at the peril of the total enterprise. And when we emphasize only one, we invite waste and error.

Third, our national policy states clearly that the task is still city-building in the broadest sense of the word everywhere across this continent. It is not only the ghetto and the ghetto resident that concerns us, but all urban dwellers and all parts of the urban complex. This means we must develop a broader system and direct it toward goals we identify and come to agree upon more clearly.

Let me expand on each of these points.

The first reason for some confidence in our urban future is that, despite the spate of Sunday supplement commentary, we are beginning to define and study urban behavior systematically. It has been ten years since Raymond Vernon began directing the New York Metropolitan Study. This was a truly extraordinary nine volume inquiry into the economic functioning of our largest metropolitan area.

This thirty-man professional group effort established a new direction in urban scholarship. It shifted the study of the city away from the emotionally oriented, intuitive, historical and architectural approaches of the lonely-scholar tradition. It moved urban scholarship toward a carefully designed, multi-disciplinary exploration of the varied relationships between the location of jobs and households in urban space.

The economic focus of the New York Study had its limitations. Vernon's policy conclusions were largely comforting and reassuring. They gave heavy emphasis to the fact that *relatively speaking* city dwellers are better off in material terms than ever before.

With ten years' hindsight, it is possible to identify some critical missing elements of analysis. They include the failure to recognize that there is a psychological identity crisis among the new migrants from rural American circumstances; that we wrote off too quickly the potential role of government in the process of urban development; that we did not take into account the full meaning of changing technology.

But the foundations of urban systems analysis were clearly set by the Study. They still stand in stark contrast to some contemporary diagnoses by latecomers in the field who even now persist in treating a multi-variable situation in single cause and effect terms. The Study carefully avoided any simple classification of a special category of urban people, a single source of discontent, or a particular kind of family problem.

As we build on the work of the 1950's we have come to know that urban conditions of stability or instability, squalor or decency, efficiency or inefficiency, beauty or ugliness, are not the function of single factors.

They are not the result of just obsolescence of our housing supply; just the changing requirements of industrial location; just a radical change in the character of the jobs technology makes available; just the vast migration of rural citizens to strange and complex urban circumstances; just discrimination; just the desire of new urban residents to be heard; just hostility between generations; just the increase in sheer numbers.

The urban condition is all of these. The issue is not the intuitive search for the single thesis, be it anomie, or the unemployment rate among central city residents, or the family structure of poor people. The issue is how to balance and take into account, on some weighted basis, the play and pull of all these varied forces.

The Woods Hole Conference which the President's Science Advisor, Donald Hornig, and Secretary Weaver sponsored in the summer of 1966 marked the first official effort to move in this direction. Walter Rosenblith, Chairman of the Faculty at MIT, led some fifty largely "hardware" researchers in the search for simultaneous equations to locate and remove the sources of urban discontent. That Summer Study began the process that continues today within the Department. Its work was the basis that led the Congress to approve our first meaningful research and development budget.

Where one appreciates that a problem is complex and subtle, not responsive to massive undirected applications of energy or simple professions of good will and heartfelt concern, one is likely to search for a reasonably comprehensive and carefully-developed response. This is the second reason for some optimism for urban America. Our public policy today, proposed by the President, enacted by the Congress, is of that character.

In the tumult of this summer, it is easy to forget—but vital to remember—that urban aid legislation enacted in 1965 and 1966 was designed to remove the causes of the tumult. We have many new efforts underway to provide more housing for those who desperately need it. For the first time we are seeing the leaders of private enterprise focusing their talents and energies on the nation's most pressing urban problem. Here I mean the involvement of private industry in the Rent Supplements Program which makes privately developed housing available to low-income families by helping them to pay the rent. I also mean the new program of leasing private housing which increases our supply of low-cost public housing. I mean the Turnkey process by which private enterprise uses its ingenuity and efficiency to build low-cost housing for sale to local authorities. And I mean the new refinement of Turnkey—we call it Turnkey II—in which private management firms will operate public housing.

The Model Cities Program of the 1966 Act is designed explicitly to bring comprehensiveness to the rebuilding of older portions of older cities. It will provide more housing. But, more than that, the Model Cities Program seeks to restore all aspects of the neighborhood environment—by merging social, physical, public and private programs from many sources into a total attack. For the first time, it introduces quality control into urban rebuilding. For the first time, it offers bonuses to stimulate local innovation, local ingenuity, local solutions of local problems.

Then there is the Metropolitan Development Program of 1966. It would reward, and therefore, encourage collaboration between local governments. Finally, there is the new program to stimulate the development of entirely new communities. This offers the hope of providing fresh alternatives to urban living.

Taken together, these new efforts represent a reasoned strategy. They will expand the freedom of choice for urbanites. For all of us, they will increase our options for where we seek to live, to work, and to invest our leisure time.

These, among others, are programs now on the statute books. Now they are all in the process of first funding.

They already authorize many of the programs proposed in the 30-odd new bills introduced in the Congress in the aftermath of Newark and Detroit.

Their principal limitation at the moment is the size of the investment they call for.

But here, amid calls for billion dollar emergency funds, and a thirty billion dollar housing investment, three comments are in order.

The urban professional recognizes that all three levels of government and the private sector as well must be involved in the process of rebuilding our cities. The Federal investment is not the total investment, as it is in space or national security programs. Those who make facile comparisons of just the gross Federal budget figures are either amateurs in urban affairs, or worse, they are actors engaging in political chicanery.

The urban professional also recognizes that the investment of economic resources alone does not assure effective capacity. Talent and knowledge are equally essential components and our shortages in each are awesome. This year is the first year of urban planning fellowships supported by the Federal government. Our $500,000 authorization this year will support 95 fellowships against an estimated shortage in urban planners of 1,500 to 1,700. This is also the first year of operation for our new Office of Urban Technology and Research in HUD. At a time when Federal Research and Development expenditures were 16 billion, we in HUD have spent only $70 million. Though we have begun the development of a genuine research program, we remain woefully behind other areas of national concern.

Meantime, the popular battle cry of many local officials remains: "Give us the money and we will do the job." This does not ring so true when they cannot show that they have people to spend the money on programs and enterprises that are well designed, carefully tested, and certain to achieve the purposes for which they were intended.

Finally the urban professional recognizes that the true test for an effective urban response is how it helps people. An effective program, at a minimum, involves an appreciation of the needs of the human personality and the human spirit. There is an oft-quoted line of Martin Lomasney, the old political boss of Boston, to the effect that "there's got to be in every ward somebody that any bloke can come to and get help. Help, you understand, none of your law and justice, but help."

But, it is no less true today than it was at the opening of this century that "the greatest of evils and the worst of crimes is poverty." Help these days is more than more urban renewal funds, more jobs, more housing. Help is all of these and law and justice, too. But, help is first communicating with those who now feel debarred from our society and consequently debased. Second, it is assurance of genuine participation in the process of city rebuilding and neighborhood restoration. Access to those in authority, a share in decision-making—these are the vital components today.

It was this desire to show tangible, visible concern for the current conditions of the poor—and to take at least one specific step to eliminate at least one shameful condition—that led the Administration to propose the so-called Rat control bill to the Congress. Those members of the House of Representatives who thoughtlessly laughed it out of the chamber, and those outside observers who wrote it off as budgetary trivia, and therefore, of no consequence, underestimate grievously one whole dimension of the urban challenge.

The same drive for action underlies our new program of making Federal surplus property available for new community development. Our first project is building a new town in town for 25,000 people on the site of the National Training School in Washington.

Admittedly, human concerns are the most elusive elements of a truly capable response. Effective programs and activities are evolving slowly from the trial and error, and success and triumph, in our economic opportunity programs. But they are vital components and those who would have us return to New Deal days—of simply providing dole for the poor until their children or their childrens' children struggle forward to a state of middle class blessedness—place more faith in economics and less faith in other social skills than I do.

At rockbottom, I cannot believe that we do not have the ability to engage our urban poor in democracy today nor any prospect of increasing their competence to deal with urban life today.

I cannot accept the proposition that there is no hope for my contemporaries in this urban world who did not have the luck of a good education and equal opportunity for a job.

I cannot believe that the only way to assure eventual economic well-being for all Americans is to relive the miseries, pain, despair and human costs of the Industrial Revolution of the 19th Century.

Understanding the pattern of urban development as a complex system fashioning a capacity with manpower and know-how, as well as money, to respond to the urban challenges, these two processes are well underway. But unless we are prepared to deal with our urban future as well as correct the mistakes of our urban past, they will not be enough. That is, no genuine urban response is sufficient that focuses solely on the American core city or identifies only the urban poor as the beneficiary of our public and private policies.

The truth is that the entire pattern of urban development, from central city to suburb to exurb, is robbing us all of genuine freedom. We are all losing the choice of a clean, healthful and pleasing environment—with pure air and water, a landscape unimpaired by destructive building processes. We are all losers when we are hit in the pocketbook by excessive and unnecessary costs in the construction of housing and provision of community facilities and services today. Unplanned, unguided, sporadic urban development cheapens our common environment and places prohibitive prices on land and improvements.

As we prepare for the generation of city building that lies just ahead—when we distribute 100 million more Americans across the continent in the next 30 years—these spiraling costs, this waste, and the despoilation are common concerns. They shape a common cause among the urban poor, the urban middle class, the urban rich—Caucasian, Negro, Mexican-American, and Puerto Rican.

There is a final common concern and challenge. How do we build our new urban communities on a geographical and numerical scale unanticipated even twenty years ago and still retain a sense of genuine community? What modern counterparts do we have for barn-raisings, street dancing, Fourth of July celebrations? Where are our new village greens and town commons?

To rediscover community on a larger scale will surely mean making real again the old colonial adage, "you are as good as any man—and better than none." Today, this means, at a minimum, freedom of choice for any family to live anywhere that its home economics makes possible. Open occupancy is a rudimentary necessity of an urban civilization today. Our increasingly urban character only serves to make more compelling than ever the fulfillment of the promises of democracy.

But genuine community building in our urban circumstances will require more positive action. Urban and suburban communities must recognize more explicitly that they have common concerns and common obligations.

We now, for example, at HUD are using some of our assistance grants in mass transportation to carry workers from poor neighborhoods in the central city to factories on the suburban fringe.

This is, we believe, a socially beneficial and well justified policy. It is, however, only a substitute for workers freely following their jobs and taking up residence close to where they work. If that freedom already existed, we could use this investment for other vital transportation needs.

Indeed, if we provide genuine variety in occupations, in income, in race and religion in cities and towns across our metropolitan regions, we accomplish two other things simultaneously, we insure that no single part of the new urban community has to care for the majority of the poor, the old, and the helpless; we provide the excitement of variety and complexity to the human experience in all parts of the community. For our children, free exchanges and encounters in early life can prevent prejudicial confrontations later on.

These are aspirations of community life yet to be realized of course. Major changes in public attitude, in private industrial performance, in labor practices, in governmental patterns of behavior must occur before these aspirations are realized. But they are the objectives to which present, established national policy is committed.

Let me add, that one of the most encouraging developments of this summer has been the unmistakable evidence of the community commitment by the private sector. Representatives of business associations, of individual industries, of community enterprises: group after group have been visiting with us in Washington. They all seek effective ways to expand their commitment to our urban communities. They no longer withdraw, retreat, or simply complain about the urban condition. We welcome each and every step in the direction of massive commitment by private enterprise.

Those, then, are the bases for urban optimism. Urban programs fashioned by reason and not illusion, emphasizing practical and tangible results, committed to quality, are now underway.

They will not immediately quiet urban discontent nor instantly make competent citizens of the newest migrants from rural circumstances. They will not magically introduce effective local land development and tax policy nor will they easily eliminate hazards to health and beauty. They never will—without expanded and sustained commitment from the private sector and the academy on a scale never before undertaken. Thus, in the unspoken words of Franklin Roosevelt, "The only limit to their realization will be our doubts of today."

But given such commitment and common effort the America of the 21st Century can offer its urbanites greater hope than the newly urbanized nation entering the 20th Century offered earlier generations.

This nation will have come to peaceful terms with the urban destiny that it now no longer refuses to acknowledge. It will have arrived at the time the President pictured when he said: "Those who came to this land sought to build more than just a new country. They sought a new world. . . . let us from this moment begin our work so that in the future men will look back and say, 'It was then, after a long and weary way, that man turned the exploits of his genius to the full enrichment of his life.' "

TOM WICKER'S MEMOIR OF WASHINGTON

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the New York Times Washington bureau chief, Tom Wicker, has written a deeply moving memoir of his feelings about the Capital City. His love of this city and his emotional reactions to it reflect much of what I have experienced. I believe that others will find his beautifully written article in the September 9, 1967, issue of the Saturday Review of interest. The article is a preview of Mr. Wicker's introduction to the forthcoming book entitled "The New York Times Guide to the Nation's Capital." I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON: A REPORTER'S MEMOIR

(By Tom Wicker)

In the summer when I was nine years old my parents gathered up what cash the Depression had left them and took my sister and me to see Washington, I never got over it.

My father worked for the Seaboard Air Line Railway, whose passenger trains his family consequently could ride free; this was the great privilege of my youth and caused me to admire my father wildly. He could also get a mysterious document called a "strip pass" from other—I thought lesser—lines, and for this excursion we got one from the Richmond, Fredericksburg, and Potomac (R F & P, we called it). That meant we had only to pay the Pullman fare, and in those days a family of four could make out perfectly well—at least we did—with a lower for the parents, an upper for the kids, and a box of sandwiches and fried chicken.

The trip was overnight, from Hamlet, North Carolina, and I don't recall much about it except that my sister and I kept the car awake half the night and I didn't want the porter to move the ladder. But I remember coming out of Union Station the next morning, in brilliant sunshine, and looking across the great plaza to the Capitol; a fierce, choking patriotism blazed in my breast. I thought the dome against the sky was the most beautiful sight I had ever seen, and I still do.

I remember the little Negro children who were playing in the huge fountain before the station—marvelous privilege of the city child! I remember more cars going past than I had ever seen, and the trolleys sliding to a halt under the stone facade that seemed to tower miles above me. I remember the trees and the grass and the people sitting on benches and a man selling balloons. Along the right side of the plaza there was a row of hotels, elegant and expensive—or so I thought, and that made it true. Only children know how to arrive.

We stayed in a rooming house. As I recall, it must have been somewhere out on East Capitol Street; the trolleys went past the door, and it was only a short ride to the Capitol. We went there one night to sit on the grass and listen to the United States Marine Band play on the very spot—someone told us—where Franklin Delano Roosevelt had been sworn in as President. The glorious ring of that name—Roosevelt!—made the place hallowed to me. (I have seen Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson sworn in there, but I am a child of the Depression and I will always think of it as the place where Roosevelt personally saved my father's house and job and where the Marine Band played in his honor and maybe my family's on a hot summer night when I was nine years old and knew more than I ever will again.)

My mother wept in the Lincoln Memorial, and why not? A smiling man took us on a sightseeing tour. We stood in the blistering heat outside the Washington Monument, waiting for the elevator, and when we reached the top my father held me under the arms so I could see out the small barred windows. We talked about the man who had tried to catch a baseball somebody dropped from one of those windows and what would happen if an airplane flew into the monument. We marveled at the green money flowing from the presses at the Bureau of Engraving and we stared in silence at Lindbergh's *Spirit of St. Louis* and the Wright Brothers' plane suspended above us at the Smithsonian Institution, and took in the waxed dummies wearing all the First Ladies' inaugural gowns; but I liked the old cars and locomotives best, and the engine that even small boys could operate. We toured the FBI and saw the fingerprint machines and were told how they got Dillinger. I was proud to have been a Melvin Purvis Junior G-Man. We went through the White House in a long line, even though the smiling man who drove us on our sightseeing tour said Mr. Roosevelt was off on his sailboat somewhere. My mother said she liked to think of him getting a good rest.

We shrieked with laughter at the Monkey House in the zoo and recoiled with shudders from the snakes. We took the boat trip to Mount Vernon and ate ice cream on the deck and hung over the rail to watch the water curling back from the bow. Then, up the steep green hillside and through that fascinating place with its smokehouse and separate kitchen and slave quarters and the bed where George Washington died. Then we went cautiously down the path, a little fearful, to stand in silence before the tomb where George and Martha lay; my sister and I held our breaths, because we believed the signs implicitly and thought that if we made a single sound we would be dishonored forever.

Later we gawked at the fish in the little aquarium in the Commerce Building, watched the guard changed at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, and walked with special Southern reverence through the beautiful house where Robert E. Lee forsook the Union. We went to Ford's Theatre, too, and saw the door with the little hole in it through which John Wilkes Booth peeped on the fatal night; and then crossed 10th Street to the drab, small, somehow shocking house where Abraham Lincoln passed to the ages. I did not like it much; I had wanted to take the Cabin John trolley to Glen Echo amusement park and ride the roller coaster, but my father drew the line at that.

And a final treat: we had dinner, our last night, in the Occidental Restaurant. Someone had told us it was the place where the famous men of Washington ate; I only remember it was crowded, noisy, brilliant with light. (Now, sometimes, I have lunch there and it is still crowded and noisy and I wonder what table our family had that night—those two wide-eyed children, my father, my mother, spending money they could ill afford to make sure our trip was complete. If I thought it was a bad, out-of-the-way table I could never go there again.)

The next year in school I reported to the fourth grade on what we had seen in Washington. My teacher said I was a lucky boy, and I think I was. I never forgot that fair city—the long, broad avenues with the trees of summer hanging over them, the view from the Monument, the old cars at the Smithsonian, the silence at Washington's tomb, the green slopes at Arlington.

Now I live in Washington—one of the few desires of my life that, fulfilled, has not disappointed me. For one thing, out past the crowds of tourists and the downtown streets and the great monuments and buildings there is a pleasant, quiet, almost placid city where at least the fortunate among us can raise our families and spend our leisure in something like comfort—a commodity in increasingly short supply in urban America.

One of Washington's distinctions, I think, is that it is mostly a residential city. Beyond its fairly restricted government and downtown areas Washington is a city of houses and quiet streets and power mowers on Sunday morning. One can have a house and yard not unlike the ones I knew in the South years ago and still walk a half-hour to work in the heart of the city—a pleasant walk, too.

There has been an apartment explosion and a lot of people live ten floors up, with or without a balcony and a pool on the roof. But the basic living unit here is the house—rowhouses with quiet rear gardens in Georgetown, big old barns with surrounding yards like mine in Cleveland Park, imposing mansions, boxy cottages, duplexes, triplexes, ramblers, split-level homes. People give a lot of dinner parties at home, in all styles from black tie with three wines to walking shorts with charcoal grills. Almost everyone I know is something of a gardener, and when Bill Henry, the former chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, left town in 1966, his parting gift to close friends was a dogwood tree for each.

It is also a city for children. The schools are starved by Congress but the place is full of parks and playgrounds and out in Rock Creek Park there is the zoo, with a white tiger and the world's largest bird cage; even farther out, there is the nature center where children can watch bees making honey in a glass hive, learn about the plant life around them, and see movies about mountain lions and horned owls. Small boys can fish in Rock Creek or on the banks of the Potomac, and everywhere you look there is a picnic table and a fireplace. Perspiring fathers can puff along after their progeny on the Nature Trail in Glover-Archibald Park. It is as easy to play tennis here as it is anywhere in the world, although there is a dismal shortage of public swimming pools—Congress again. In Montrose Park there is a spectacular hill where sledders can risk their necks between the trees, and that is only one of many well-sledded trails.

A baseball game goes on all summer long at the Macomb Street playground near my house and probably at dozens of others. You can still rent a barge and get yourself towed up the C&O Canal, or walk the towpath if you prefer. And when a child's birthday demands a special treat, it's hard to beat the FBI tour, the Smithsonian, the Marine Retreat, or the displays in the National Geographic building. For more serious outings, there are the National Gallery of Art, the enthralling Phillips Gallery, and the children's concerts of the National Symphony. D.C. Stadium is one of the best places anywhere to take a boy to see a big-league ball game, and there's always softball or touch football on the Ellipse within sight of the White House and the Washington Monument.

Nor is Washington really, as myth has it, either a provincial or a stuffy city. As Russell Baker points out, most of us are not natives and all too few of us can count on permanency here or afford to leave the fences unmended on the old home place. For numerous Washingtonians, what goes on elsewhere in the country is of extreme importance—what the voters are thinking in Missouri, for instance, or what economic conditions are in Oregon, or how the Governor of Michigan is faring. For many others the events of the whole wide world are just as vital.

Thus, while "shop talk" is the staple of conversation here—where is it not?—it is apt to be of sweeping variety. At any one dinner party the shop talk can range from the problems of NATO to the primaries in California, from the war in Vietnam to the moods of the President, from the latest odds on the Secretary of State's tenure of office to the progress of school desegregation. Provincial? Not half as much as what one hears at similar dinner parties in, say, New York, where it is well known that the country is bounded on the west by the Hudson River; or San Francisco, where it is not certain that the Eastern Seaboard exists.

On the other hand, when Otto Preminger filmed *Advise and Consent* here and passed the word for extras, Washingtonians turned out like so many small-town gawkers to get themselves in the movies. They will turn out, too, for almost any parade, whether for an astronaut or the Cherry Blossom Festival; and almost any foreign dignitary can count on a good audience if the President takes him for the short ceremonial whirl from the White House along E Street to 14th, up 14th to New York Avenue, then along New York and Pennsylvania Avenues back to the White House.

They say most people who live in New York never go to the Broadway theater, and I suppose most people who live in Washington never get to the Capitol or the Lincoln Memorial or the Supreme Court, either. That is not the point. They are there, and one has only to hail a taxi or catch the bus. I like to think that I can take my children down to watch the House of Representatives in session almost any time I want to and that the black car speeding past my house is the President's and that on Inauguration Day, naturally, we'll be there in the crowd. When I took my little girl to the circus at the D.C. Armory we stopped on the way to ride the little underground railroad between the Capitol and the Senate Office Building. We can take a five-minute walk through Normanstone Drive, past the house where John Foster Dulles used to live, past the Canadian Embassy residence, up Massachusetts Avenue a bit, and examine the new statue of Winston Churchill which has one foot on American soil and the other on the territory of the British Embassy. Then we can cut behind the embassy and come out in Montrose Park, which is next door to Dumbarton Oaks, where they planned the United Nations and where there are some of the most beautiful formal gardens in America.

On my way to work I can pass through the block of N Street between Connecticut and 17th; a few fine old houses live above the parking lots in there, where Franklin Roosevelt resided when he was Assistant Secretary of the Navy in Wilson's Administration. When I walk from my office to the White House I go past Dolley Madison's old house, and Stephen Decatur's, within sight of the block where John Hay and Henry Adams used to live side by side, down the opposite side of Lafayette Square from the spot where Gen. Dan Sickles, hero of Gettysburg, shot his wife's lover, and half a block east of Blair House, where a White House policeman named Leslie Coffelt died on the sidewalk in 1950 defending Harry Truman's life. Across Pennsylvania Avenue is one of my personal favorites, the old State-War-Navy Building, a massively detailed Victorian pile with high ceilings, tiled corridors, and some of the few remaining offices with real fireplaces.

My own office building is on one of the city's busiest corners—Connecticut Avenue, K Street, and 17 Street—but trees line the sidewalks and I look out over Farragut Square all year long. Office girls eat lunch on the grass in favorable weather—a pretty sight indeed. President Kennedy came back from Europe with an idea for beautifying the city trash cans and it worked; ours are the handsomest anywhere. Now officials are planting flowers and trees in every available space and Washington is blooming. (I'm not sure I approve of the magnolias they planted up the middle of Connecticut Avenue over the old trolley tunnel; I don't believe they'll have enough root space and I am against cramped trees.)

Other cities, of course, have their own distinctions and style. And just as those cities have their dark undersides, so does Washington.

Pierre L'Enfant's splendid, flawed plan for the original city—never fully put into effect has been distorted by numerous subsequent planners and even more by haphazard growth into something infrequently magnificent, at times ridiculous, at times nightmarish. Of its main features, only the twin centers of the Capitol and White House, the Mall L'Enfant envisioned as a magnificent American promenade, and the broad avenues (yielding a high annual rate of pedestrian mortality) survive as anything like this creator intended. His multiple intersections, instead of being bustling islands of urban activity in a sea of residential tranquility, are honking horrors of circling traffic; the great vistas he hoped for are swallowed in urban tangle, save for the Mall—which is too sunbaked for summertime strolling. And if, as Paul Spreiregen commented some years ago in the *Journal of the American Institute of Architects,* a city plan influenced by the Baroque concept of Versailles really was "an assertion of a bold new republic in a barely touched wilderness," today it seems more nearly like some nineteenth-century millionaire's castle transported brick by brick from its European setting to an esthetically uncertain America.

Worse, if the "plan" of the federal city has been distorted by growth and in its turn has distorted growth, then beyond the limits of L'Enfant's sketch maps there is little but helter-skelter. Far into the Virginia and Maryland countryside sprawl the suburbs, some tight and lovely like Kenwood with its cherry trees, most flung down with a builder's giant careless hand on treeless plains that were formerly forests, some waiting hideously to become official slums. The freeway builders, frantically flinging as much traffic as possible into Washington's already strangling thoroughfares, are at once behind in their work and agitating for the privilege of pouring concrete over everything. Rapid transit does not exist, although a limited subway system soon will be under construction; some federal workers who live in far-out suburbs actually arrive in their parking lots at 5 and 6 o'clock in the morning to avoid rush-hour traffic, then sleep behind the wheel until time to punch the clock. What they suffer on the way home is ghastly to contemplate, especially in the special torture Washington reserves for creeping motorists—August.

East of 16th Street, whole areas are entirely populated by Negroes living in the poverty and slum conditions they have endured so long in other cities. Many of them can see the Capitol dome from the littered alleys and cluttered sidewalks and bare, sunbaked porches that are their escape from the tenements; it can hardly be an inspiring view.

Washington is famous for crime and rape and muggers—although I know of no statistics which prove it the worst in this regard, or even an unsafe city. The fact that it has a majority of Negroes, and its hierarchy of Southern politicians, combine to foster the myth that black men make this a terrified place. But there is no part of Washington so sullen as the Watts district of Los Angeles or Oakland's Negro ghetto, so seething as New York's Harlem, or more dangerous than its Central Park.

The petty bureaucracy of what is laughingly called the District of Columbia government is inefficient, impervious, and immovable. Congress is responsible, in many ways, for inadequate school budgets, shocking welfare payments and institutions, and low prices at the whiskey stores (you can buy better wines more cheaply in Washington than in any city I know—a poor consolation). Nobody has the right to vote anybody out of office, much less in, and there is so much slow, sloppy, and untimely street construction and repair that the old saying perfectly fits: "It'll be a great city if they ever get it finished." Old landmarks go under here as they do elsewhere—the house where Woodrow Wilson married Mrs. Galt got the wrecking ball a year or so ago, and only the Kennedys saved part of Lafayette Square opposite the White House from becoming a concrete canyon; two sides of Farragut Square have been completely rebuilt while I have watched from my office window, and what they have done to Capitol Hill in a decade ought to be a federal crime.

In the summer the Potomac is apt to smell, and any time, as Bobby Kennedy said of New York's East River, if you fall in, you don't drown; you dissolve. In winter the streets are either glassy or slushy and snow removal is hopeless. When I lived on R Street, hard-packed snow stayed on the pavement for six weeks after the Kennedy Inaugural blizzard.

But all of this is not really the Washington I first saw that brilliant morning thirty years ago when I came out of Union Station to the edge of the great plaza, holding my father's hand, and stood stricken in the giddy light, dumb with wonder and belief.

This is not merely because the surface of the city is so much altered from the miracle place of my boyhood. The trolleys are gone now, and I don't suppose tourist families stay in rooming houses on Capitol Hill any more. The Smithsonian has a massive new building. John Kennedy lies at Arlington with the Unknown Soldier. They have restored Ford's Theatre to look like a theater, and everyone drives down to Mount Vernon on a four-lane highway. There is a cheap new façade on the Capitol, and Harry Truman put a balcony on the White House; Mrs. Kennedy filled its public rooms with antiques, and Lyndon Johnson filled its private offices with Dallas modern and piped-in Muzak. Union Station is cavernous and gloomy now, and the last time I was there the fountain where the children played was dry and full of dead leaves. Jimmy Hoffa's marble temple for the Teamsters' Union stands along the plaza where one of those elegant hotels did, and the rest of them are no longer elegant, if they ever were. Now the great entrance to the city—the most beautiful entrance in the world, I think—is the long ride in from Dulles International Airport, along the Potomac on the George Washington Parkway, with the spires of Georgetown University rising across the river and the Washington Monument shining in the distance.

That is not, of course, real change, and neither is the relatively new Jefferson Memorial on the Tidal Basin or the Theodore Roosevelt Bridge or even the monstrously ugly third House Office Building. (There always has been a touch of the grotesque about Washington—the old Smithsonian, for instance—and perhaps in time even this crouching eyesore on Capitol Hill will seem, like others, at home in the city.) No, the essential Washington is just what it was thirty years ago, and more, having survived architects, engineers, politicians, bureaucrats, demonstrators, and urban planners. It is just what it was because Americans still weep in the Lincoln Memorial and small boys still stand in awe in front of George Washington's tomb and troop happily through the old cars at the Smithsonian and dream their secret dreams at the FBI and burst with pride when they first see the nation's Capitol. Parents still bring their children here and show them the Declaration of Independence under glass and listen to the tour guide's spiel in front of the Supreme Court and take pictures of the statue of Albert Gallatin in front of the Treasury.

Perhaps few of them know who Gallatin was, or care, but the meanest of them know he was part of something, and they are part of it, too. I have seen fat women in ridiculously tight shorts walking carefully around Statuary Hall in the Capitol, peering closely at banal bonze figures of men so obscure even historians would have to look them up, and high school kids wearing Confederate caps and popping gum line up for blocks to take a quick walk through the White House. They are part of the same thing: secret sharers, bearers of a seed.

But not merely sharers of the showplace, the museum, the history lesson. Behind those facades, those bronze doors, down this echoing corridor, the collective work of a people is in progress. The President really is at his desk in that great house on Pennsylvania Avenue, making his way like the rest of us, enduring his trials, doing his best. Those men down there on the floor of the Senate and the House, those small posturers glimpsed from the crowded galleries, really are representing us, really are trying to make our case, whatever it is. And there behind the great stone faces of the Commerce Department and the Justice Department and the Federal Trade Commission and the Pentagon and the State Department our business is going forward, or maybe backward, but going somewhere, getting done. We are at the heart of the matter here. Washington's business is the people's business, for better or for worse.

That is what Washington really is and what we all share—the place where the past has produced this present, and this present will go on to whatever future, carrying us all with it, influenced by each of us as we must be by it. It is what we have made of things, and shall make. It is where America lives—all of us in spirit if only a few in fact, in our vigor and our dreams, our carelessness and haste, our glory and our burden, our borrowed finery from another world that gave us birth, our native grace, our coarse pretension. It is all here—what we remember, what we hope; what we are and what we ought to be—in this city of the strong but chastened heart.

I did not know, that morning all those years ago, that carved above me in the patient stone of Union Station I could find the truth about Washington:

"He who would bring home the wealth of the Indies must carry the wealth of the Indies with him."

I did not know the words, but I found that truth anyway. Americans must bring Washington here in their hearts, if they would carry it with them when they go.

WILDCAT STRIKE IN STEEL HAUL INDUSTRY DEPLORED

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Teamster General Vice President Frank E. Fitzsimmons today deplored the violence and irresponsibility of wildcat strikers in the steel haul industry.

Fitzsimmons made the International Brotherhood of Teamsters' position clear in a statement today to both Labor Committees of Congress. Fitzsimmons said:

> This is a wildcat strike. It is not sanctioned by the International Union. These people have an agreement, which is a supplement to our Master National Freight Agreement. It was properly put before the 450,000 members covered under the agreement and overwhelmingly ratified. The vote, a mail referendum, was supervised by the U.S. Department of Labor.
>
> Neither do we condone the violence which

> has accompanied this wildcat strike, and we are somewhat amazed that state officials have let the violence continue—

Fitzsimmons said.

> We have held meetings with these people trying to determine their grievances, if any exist. These meetings have been unsuccessful.
>
> Both the union and management take the position that these workers have a signed contract which has proper machinery for the processing of grievances. The Union has consistently tried to get these people to use this grievance machinery, and has consistently and still urges them to return to work. Doing this, we will be able to air the grievances in concert with the terms of the agreement—

Fitzsimmons said.

> The International Union stands ready and willing to assist when the parties to this wildcat action indicate a responsible approach to the problem. In the meantime, we take the position that it is a wildcat strike, it is not sanctioned by the International Union, and are quite in accord with the sentiment that the violence must be stopped—

Fitzsimmons declared.

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF LANGLEY RESEARCH CENTER

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I received word that the President signed Senate Joint Resolution 109 today. This was the joint resolution introduced by me, with Senator WILLIAM SPONG as cosponsor, setting aside the first week in October to celebrate the 50th anniversary of Langley Research Center. It is a fitting tribute to an installation that has contributed for 50 years to American advancement in aeronautical and space research.

I spent Monday morning touring the facilities and exhibits at Langley Research Center at Hampton, Va. I have seldom spent a more enlightening and informative morning.

This week, through Friday, the personnel of Langley will be happy and proud to show everyone through the facilities. Were it not for the press of business in the Senate, I would urge all Senators to take advantage of this opportunity to witness firsthand the advancements that are being made at this vital research center.

THE THRUST OF OUR VIETNAM POLICY

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, as the presidential election campaign approaches, the great Vietnam debate grows more persistent, more passionate, and, unfortunately, more political. Twelve months ago it was not this way. Then, too, there were disagreements with the administration's Vietnam policies. Then they were more in the nature of scholarly efforts to evaluate different courses of action. The change has not been altogether subtle. Now much of the criticism has become politically motivated. It is based on whatever advantage may be gained by appealing to an apparent antiadministration attitude on the part of the general public. Both Democrats and Republicans are busy releasing position papers to the news media. They hurry to put their own plans for peace before the television cameras. In some of this, there is cynical disregard for the tremendous responsibility involved in the ultimate choice of national policy.

Many of the proposals are based on the delightful but unrealistic theory that "faith, hope, and charity" abound in the world; that wishful thinking will somehow affect the actions of Hanoi and Peking. Others subscribe to the "eye-for-an-eye" or "might makes right" principle, by which peace may be realized only through complete and overwhelming military victory. Attractive as these proposals may be, at the moment and on the surface—each to some segment of American public opinion—none of them bears up under careful examination in the light of what is best for the future security of the United States.

The thrust of our Vietnam policy must be maintained far above the reach of politically motivated consideration. It must be based on lessons learned from recent history. It must be influenced by hardheaded understanding of the Communist doctrines of expansion and aggression. In sustaining a policy based on these factors, President Johnson is much too experienced a politician not to appreciate the resulting political disadvantage. Nevertheless, while riddled by the sniping of politically motivated criticism, the President has remained firm.

This resolve has not gone altogether unnoticed in the press. A recent editorial in the Claremont, N.H., Daily Eagle gave an objective analysis of the President's problems. It cleared away a considerable amount of political fog and penetrated to the heart of the issue. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "Johnson Still Gets Our Vote," published in the Claremont, N.H., Daily Eagle, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHNSON STILL GETS OUR VOTE

President Johnson's popularity in the polls is slipping because of his Vietnam policies and because some voters believe that the Johnson administration and the Democrats, generally, have a soft-line policy on Negroes.

The President is vulnerable in both areas as witness the defection amongst the governors and leaders in his own party.

Many believe that he cannot win reelection, even if Nixon is the Republicans' candidate.

Governor Romney of Michigan says he's been brainwashed by the administration on Vietnam. He is now counted out of the GOP race as a man with demonstrable shortcomings.

Governor Rockefeller says that, unless some new course of action is taken, this country will have civil war in the cities.

Rockefeller declines candidacy, but is far and away the ablest man the Republicans can field.

Senator Percy is now being pushed by Senator Dirksen and others as the new moderate Republican candidate for President to replace Romney, who has been cashiered.

Percy declines the candidacy publicly, but is making pronouncements on Vietnam, such as the most recent, stating that the President is lying to the American people.

Strong words, we think, for a man with no experience in international affairs and a very junior senator from Illinois.

Our posture in Vietnam was inherited by President Johnson. He had, of course, at that time, the option to reverse things, but he did not do so.

Since then the situation has worsened and the war has been accelerated to the degree that no one could have forecast—except the Vietnamese—two or three years ago.

President Johnson has been resolute and firm in the execution of his Vietnamese policy.

This he has done in the face of continuing losses in popularity with the voters and, of course, with the politicians in his own party, many of whom need coat-tails.

In addition to this, much of the press has become hostile and more recently, a misguided, however sincere, couple returned to the President a posthumous award sent to them from the White House.

This was the President's war, they said, and their son need not have perished.

Even presidents get hit below the belt.

Governor Romney, a states' righter of the first water, is, however, the first to run to Washington for military assistance in Detroit rioting last summer.

He is fighting yet with the President about this and no one is really sure which run of the argument to accept, save that the President is being blamed for slow response to Michigan for "political reasons," thereby allowing the riots to spread.

We are not sold on the Administration's position in Vietnam, but it is a position that has been taken by President Johnson and a position that has been maintained without wavering since its outset.

To a great degree our Vietnam situation is a national commitment, beyond anything but academic debate.

We are there.

Men have been and are giving of their lives for the commitment.

President Johnson's high purpose and resolution in Vietnam seems to have escaped many Americans.

While he continues to take a pounding on all sides, even more praise-worthy is his restraint in dignifying some of the criticisms with a response.

The President is unpopular at a time when the country enjoys the greatest prosperity any nation in the world has ever known; but he gets no credit for this; only blame for what is not going well.

This newspaper supported President Johnson for the presidency in 1964 with some reservations, but as the only sensible choice.

Many supported and voted for Johnson as "the lesser of two evils."

Some supposed that the man really lacked the moral character and fibres to be anything more than the "wheeler-dealer" politician.

We believe time has shown that there is more to Lyndon Johnson.

Johnson has demonstrated some characteristics in office that confound and belie the Johnson saga.

In Vietnam he may be dead right, or dead wrong.

Who is really to say?

But he has set a course of policy and has had the courage and determination to adhere to it, despite loss of popularity and personal abuse.

It is said that the President would lose an election today, but there isn't one Republican candidate yet on the horizon whom we'd support.

Lyndon Johnson still gets our vote.

THE ABM ILLUSION

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, Mr. Edwin Diamond, senior editor of Newsweek magazine, has written a devastating analysis of the illusory notion that we are buying security by constructing a costly anti-ballistic-missile system. This perceptive analysis appears in the October 2, 1967, issue of Newsweek. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GRAND ILLUSION

(By Edwin Diamond)

Secretary McNamara's decision to go ahead with an anti-ballistic-missile (ABM) system is based on a set of brilliantly reasoned, highly sophisticated, and strongly persuasive arguments. But the decision is wrong, and the consequences of this error will burden every American for years to come.

Instead of strengthening the national security, the ABM decision may well undermine it, for it upsets the present delicate balance of nuclear terror based on the twin implicit assumptions of a strong (four-to-one) but not overwhelming U.S. offensive missile superiority and a modest Soviet defensive advantage. Worse, the ABM move signals another dangerous upward spiral in the nuclear-arms race which may lead to a renewed drive by both the U.S. and Soviet Union to add new offensive weapons to the overkill arsenals each already possesses. Roswell L. Gilpatric, McNamara's own former Deputy Defense Secretary, fears the ABM means a U.S. global strategy based more on conflict than accommodation. The go-ahead, he said, "is certainly a move in the wrong direction."

Let's put these abstractions in concrete terms—and concrete is exactly where we are now heading. At the very least, this new nuclear escalation means the expenditure of untold billions in exchange for a wholly illusory security blanket. Whether the U.S. spends $4 to $5 billion for the "thin" ABM system to guard its Minuteman strike force, or $40 billion for the "thickening" of the blanket to protect major American cities, or $400 billion to protect smaller cities, the end result will be the same: all of us will still be 30 minutes away from nuclear annihilation.

MOLE SOCIETY

Indeed, with the ABM escalation, the possibility of this supposedly "unthinkable" missile Armageddon is greater, not smaller. All of us have now been propelled by the logic of nuclear events that McNamara grasps so well toward the next era of the atomic age—the mole society where the cities and civilians of the 1980's may have to burrow underground to join the concrete Minuteman silos sunk in the 1960s and the subterranean ABM control centers built in the 1970s.

Unlikely, you will say; right out of some science-fiction paperback. But who would have believed, ten years ago, at the time of Sputnik 1 and the "missile gap," that the U.S. within five years would possess the nuclear missiles to destroy the Soviet society and population five times over?

What evidence have I that McNamara—one of the most brilliant and dedicated minds in the nation—is wrong about the ABM? What proof is there that the U.S. has embarked on a dangerous new course? The evidence is abundant. Precisely because McNamara has such a firm grasp of the complexities of the age, he himself has supplied some of the best arguments against the ABM and a new arms race. In fact, if an analyst were to overlay McNamara's speech with one of the cryptologist's sheets that cover some paragraphs while revealing others, the case for the present stabilized strategic situation would become compelling.

"ACTION-REACTION"

First of all, as McNamara makes clear, the U.S. now has "a numerical superiority over the Soviet Union in reliable, accurate and effective warheads [that] is both greater than we had originally planned, and is in fact more than we require." This, to use the blunt term, is what overkill means. And overkill, to be blunt again, is the legacy of politically motivated "missile-gap" cries of the late 1950s. The panic button was pushed in the U.S. and a real missile gap did eventually materialize. But as McNamara points out in his speech, this gap favors the U.S. At present the U.S. has 2,200 strategic nuclear weapons in readiness against 700 for the U.S.S.R. The Russian response to this U.S. superiority has been to concede an offensive disparity. In effect the Soviet Union acknowledged that the richness and ingenuity of American technology could not be matched. But it began an ABM system—the Russian military has been traditionally defense minded—as part of what McNamara calls the "action-reaction" of the arms race.

McNamara has been conspicuously unworried by this deployment. As he explains it, the offense always has an advantage over the defense and any ABM system "can rather obviously be defeated by an enemy simply sending over more offensive warheads, or dummy warheads, than there are defensive missiles capable of disposing of them."

The logic of the situation calls for one of the superpowers to forego the next turn in the vicious cycle of action-reaction. A Soviet McMamara—they have their sophisticated strategists and their war gamesmen, too—might argue that the Soviet ABM deployment represented a limited and measured response to U.S. superiority, a move intended to assure Russian second-strike capability and thus make the Soviet deterrent credible. Why not leave the arms race in this trade-off situation? Why upset the fearfully delicate balance of terror with a U.S. ABM system?

McNamara's answer last week was: because of the looming Chinese nuclear-missile threat of the 1970's. The proposed U.S. ABM system, in McNamara's words, is "Chinese-oriented," designed to deter Chairman Mao or his successors from an attack on the U.S. It is at this point that McNamara's computer logic breaks down.

MAD ADVENTURE

First, if Peking is suicidally mad enough to mount an attack on a country possessing 200 times more nuclear power than it has, then no amount of objective reality in the form of an American ABM barrier can dissuade the Chinese from their insanity. If the Chinese are bent on nuclear genocide, they could smuggle an atomic bomb into San Francisco harbor aboard a freighter and detonate it. No ABM system can protect against such mad adventures.

Second, the Soviet Union can also argue that its ABM is "Chinese-oriented," and merely a matter of insurance against an irrational attack by a country that shares on uneasy border with Russia and is violently hostile to it. After all, the same madness that might lead the Chinese to attack the U.S. might also push Mao over the brink with the Russians. Would we believe the Russians if they said, "It's the Chinese we are worried about—ignore our ABM"? Yet we expect them to believe our ABM is China-oriented.

The truth is the ABM decision was dictated not by strategy but by politics. Computer logic breaks down because men aren't computers; they are imperfect beings shaped by history and emotion as well as reason. There are really two McNamaras. One McNamara cooly attempts to manage the arms race by force of argument and intellect. He even on occasion does the Russian's thinking for them, patiently elucidating the nuclear strategic options available and their consequences in speeches and in briefings held for the press, but aimed at Moscow. The second McNamara is an American, a patriot and a member of the Johnson Administration (just as his opposite in the Kremlin is a Russian, a patriot, and a member of the Communist Party).

It is well known in Washington that Secretary McNamara for months has opposed deployment of the ABM system despite the urgings of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, of Democratic hawks and of Republicans sensing a hot campaign issue for 1968. As James Reston suggested last week, the ABM system launched by McNamara is not aimed at blocking the Chinese or even the Russians, but the Republicans. By acceding now to the clamor, McNamara has blunted the GOP charge that he is "indifferent" to the defense of the American people.

GOOD GUYS

Yet, isn't the U.S. asking—a bit illogically—the Soviet McNamara to be indifferent to the defense of his people? More fundamentally, isn't the U.S. saying—also a bit illogically—that when it comes to the crunch, two standards apply: we are the good guys and would never attack first; you are the bad guys and you might attack first, and that is why we must have a four-to-one offensive superiority and defensive parity (at least)—and a lead in whatever else we decide to build.

Last week was the time for patience and courage—patience to lecture the Russians once again on the reasons behind the eminently equitable U.S. plan to put a freeze on all missiles, offensive and defensive; courage, in the words of former Kennedy science adviser Jerome Wiesner, to run the risks of deescalation instead of the risks of new escalation; and patience and courage to explain to the American people, even in a pre-election year, why the ABM is not good for their security.

Instead, Washington gave us the ABM. By some curious alchemy, the Administration has convinced itself that the thin ABM system doesn't really change the balance of terror: only a thick system would do that. But thin leads to thick. It is all like that celebrated biology experiment: a frog is placed in a tank of water; daily the temperature is increased one degree; the frog exists as always—until one more degree . . . the water boils . . . the frog dies.

A SMALL BUSINESS IS SAVED

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, a business employing 75 persons in three different plants is a very substantial enterprise in North Dakota. Those interested in promoting the economic well-being of the State and its citizens became justifiably alarmed when, in 1963, such a firm appeared to be reaching the end of its life cycle.

The company was highly regarded, having been in business for almost 60 years. The firm had a healthy backlog of unfilled sales orders but working capital had been devastated by excessive growth of inventory and accounts receivable.

On a May morning in 1963, the company's shareholders petitioned a North Dakota court to appoint a receiver to reorganize the company. The court complied, appointing as receiver a North Dakota businessman with a growing reputation for saving insolvent companies, Mr. Richard Barry, of Fargo.

Within a year after petitioning the court, the company was reestablished on a sound, profitable basis. What had occurred in the intervening months was a testimonial to what can be achieved by smooth-functioning cooperation among business, labor, and Government.

The patient forebearance of creditors was rewarded by full payment of their claims against the company. Funds for repayment came from the proceeds of a Small Business Administration loan. Careful analysis of the company's financial records and outlook had convinced SBA officials of the firm's basic soundness. Sensing the importance of quick action, the SBA expeditiously approved a $225,000 loan to the reorganizing firm.

During the time the company was in receivership, the employees, with the concurrence of their Teamster Union officers, agreed to reductions of about $1,000 per month in certain fringe benefits to which they were otherwise entitled under their union contract with the company. Unless the company's working capital had been relieved of this burden it is doubtful the company could have survived this critical period.

Today this company remains an important contributor to the economy of North Dakota. Without the enlightened cooperation of the receiver, the employees and their union, creditors, and the Small Business Administration, the company would merely have become an addition to our business failure statistics.

HARD-CORE POVERTY PROBLEMS

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, many programs have been pursued by our Government in its efforts to resolve the hard-core poverty problems of our cities and our rural areas.

There have been successes and there have been mistakes. There have even been a few failures. But there is no doubt in my mind that our efforts have been serious and reflect a genuine concern for the disadvantaged of our Nation.

One of the key attacks on poverty has revolved around the question of providing meaningful jobs for those who have not been able to obtain them—and of training those who are not qualified so they can become employable. In this respect, such concentrated employment programs as the Neighborhood Youth Corps, on-the-job training, and institutional training under the Manpower Development and Training Act, and new careers and special impact have resulted in thousands of jobs for disadvantaged persons in our society who held little hope for employment before.

But if there has been any one thing which has made it difficult to step up our efforts, perhaps it has been the multiplicity and complexity of programs and the intricate network of agencies and bureaus which often confront those who wish to help with discouraging confusion.

Mr. President, President Johnson has just announced a new Government-wide pilot program to mobilize the resources of private industry and the Federal Government to help find jobs and provide training for thousands more of America's hard-core unemployed. As I understand the President's proposals, this new program will go far toward cutting through the redtape which has sometimes delayed and even prevented the flow of action needed to move forward with this much-needed task.

The President's new program aims at providing one-stop service for interested businessmen and coordinates effort by the five Cabinet-level departments and three independent agencies which have principal responsibility in this vital field of jobs and training.

Using some $40 million of funds already available, the initial efforts of the coordinated program will be applied to the slum or ghetto areas of five cities and two or three rural poverty areas.

I am particularly pleased to note that our Nation's Capital has been selected as one of these pilot cities. There is not only a real need for this approach to our problems in the District, but, by example, the seat of our National Government should provide leadership to the rest of the Nation in solving our serious urban problems.

Any of us who thinks that this country does not have such problems and a responsibility to solve them has but to look back over the past summer months at the riots which took a tragic toll in lives and cost us millions in property losses.

I am convinced that business and industry shares with us the acute awareness that solutions must be found, and found quickly, to the root causes of these devastating upheavals. It is not only a matter on our collective conscience, it is a matter of economic survival.

The President's new approach deserves our earnest support. It can put the Federal Government and private industry into a new partnership which may very well be the saving of our cities and, indeed, our society. At the very least, it can develop new and quicker avenues of communication, can open up the intricate paths of bureaucracy to something more like an expressway for those who want to help take action.

Surplus Federal property and equipment will be used, present training and job programs will be focused, risks such as vandalism—which have kept business and industry away from the ghetto—will be insured to encourage development of employment where it is sorely needed, in the heart of the problem.

Mr. President, I commend the President for these new proposals and urge Senators to join with me in seriously considering and supporting this new and significant effort.

SENATOR PROUTY ADDRESSES OMAHA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, last week the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] took time out from debating the poverty bill to address 100 members of the Omaha Chamber of Commerce who were in Washington on a study tour.

The topic of the Senator's speech was the Human Investment Act approach to the unemployment and underemployment problems of our Nation. This subject has great relevance today because of our concern over the problems of poverty and our search for solutions to them. I ask unanimous consent that the text of Senator PROUTY'S speech be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am delighted to have this opportunity to talk to you today. It is always a pleausre to be able to address high-minded and knowledgeable groups who take time out to familiarize themselves with the legislative process, and crucial issues of the time. Perhaps after this trip to Washington, you can return home and make some contributions of your own by educating fellow citizens and by vocalizing your own views.

Incidentally, I imagine that many of you are also members of the National Federation of Independent Business. This organization performed a very useful service lately when it conducted a survey about job loss resulting from the minimum wage extension. Only after we have necessary data such as that contained in this worthwhile study, can we in Congress formulate laws which will benefit both our workers and our industry.

Gentlemen, all of this week, the United States Senate has been considering and debating the 1967 amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act. This legislation is vitally important to each of us—not only because large sums of money are involved, but because the issues involved are crucial to our well-being and to the well-being of the nation.

Last Monday I made a major speech on the floor of the Senate outlining my views on the Act itself and the War on Poverty in general. Today I would like to speak to you briefly about one aspect of the War on Poverty and present a challenge to you which I hope you and other members of the Chamber of Commerce across the United States will meet.

In 1964 Congress enacted the Administration's Economic Opportunity Act—touted as the ultimate effort in the battle against poverty. All of us—to varying degrees had hopes that a mammoth governmental effort in this sphere of activity would result in the rapid reduction of the evils and ills of poverty in both rural and urban areas of the country.

Our naivete add complacency were shattered less than a year later when Watts erupted in violence. The conflagration has spread to other cities—Chicago, Minneapolis, Newark, Plainfield, New Haven, Detroit and yes—even your own great city of Omaha. Obviously, in the cities we have failed. And it appears as though the poverty war has not made much headway in the rural sections of our country either. Sargent Shriver indicated in a March 11 letter that OEO had spent only 30% of its funds in rural areas and admitted that, "we have not been able to get enough programs active in the rural areas." Obviously, we cannot declare "victory" in our war on poverty. We seem to have reached a stalemate.

The increasing frequency of violence and civil disorder is indicative of the fact that discontent and frustration and resentment are rising among the poor, and that our previous efforts at alleviation of their anguish have failed.

Thus far the only answer to the riots has been an application of force. Force has been necessary since in all cases it was imperative that law and order be restored immediately. However, force cannot speak to the underlying causes of riots. Until we understand these causes and relieve them, force in and of itself can only serve to buy us time.

What are these causes?

Your own Mayor, A. W. Sorensen, who I was pleased to note, was cited by Vice President Humphrey as one of the five mayors in the United States who had done the best job this past summer to head off riots, spoke to this issue last summer.

In August of 1966 he was one of the distinguished leaders of city government who came before Senator Ribicoff's Subcommittee to discuss the crisis in our cities. He came only a month after the July 4 riots in Omaha, during the course of which he was forced to appeal to the Governor to bring out the National Guard to preserve law and order.

With this fresh in his mind, Mayor Sorensen gave the Subcommittee a pentrating analysis of the underlying causes of poverty and unrest. As he saw them, those causes were—overcrowded and substandard housing in the ghetto—the lack of adequate recreational facilities for Negro teenagers—inadequate education opportunities for slum children—inequality of opportunity in choosing a home—poor relations with the police and last, and perhaps most crucial, inadequate job training and jobs.

Those of us who sit on the Senate Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty saw nothing new or startling in this list. What was startling was Mayor Sorensen's repeated and emphatic assertion that the causes of the rioting have not been diminished although the Federal government has initiated program after program to solve the underlying problems of poverty.

"The Negro in Omaha," Mayor Sorensen testified, "wants first class citizenship now instead of a lot of headline promises from government . . . The Federal government is constantly making statements and reports . . . about the millions upon millions of dollars which are available to relieve every social evil that we have . . . The sad fact of life is . . . that much of what we have done, constructive as it may have been, did not reach down to the teenager who was actually causing the riot." (Hearings part 4, p. 1047 (Govt. Op.)

What Mayor Sorensen is saying, it seems to me, is simply this: if government makes extravagant promises that it cannot fulfill, the potential for violence and destruction becomes greater than it would have had no promises been made in the first place. In my judgment, the Government has done just this.

Enthusiastic public endorsements of Great Society programs, particularly the Economic Opportunity Act have tended to raise the aspirations of millions of poor Americans. Yet the expectations of these poor have not been met. Several billion dollars have been voted for the implementation of sorted and sundry programs but very few people have actually benefited.

Let me give you just one example. I am convinced that any real solution to the poverty problem must include massive job training for meaningful employment. One of the main purposes of the EOA, as I understood it, was to give skills to the unskilled, giving as much attention as possible to members of families whose income was below the poverty level.

The job training programs have not been successful, however, and there are great problems which plague the whole effort. There is, for example, too much training for non-existent jobs, and for jobs in which there is already an over-supply of labor. There is so much overlap that it is now an established fact that some programs actually compete for and assist the same needy clientele.

This is understandable if we note that the Federal government alone administers 79 separate training and education programs under the aegis of 15 different bureaus and agencies. The W. E. Upjohn Institute reports that funds for job recruitment can be obtained from nine manpower sources; funds for adult basic education from ten; funds for prevocational training and skill training from ten and funds for work experience from five. On the job training can be subsidized by five programs and supportive services can be funded from nine programs.

Despite all these programs, only some 280,000 persons are being trained in 1966–67—out of an estimated four million who need training. Moreover, follow-up surveys have indicated that the programs are failing to successfully place people in jobs. One half of the public assistance recipients who entered Work Experience and Training programs return to public assistance when they leave it.

The most successful program, in fact, is one which was enacted before the EOA. I speak now of the MDTA which was passed by Congress with strong bipartisan support five years ago.

The legislation for MDTA was written essentially in two parts. The first part, administered by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, authorized educational training and vocational courses, to be conducted by schools of various kinds, for the preparation of the workers. The second part, administered by the Secretary of Labor, authorized contracts with employers for the on-the-job training of workers in skills needed for better jobs.

Although only 14% of all MDTA graduates were unemployed when last contacted, the two parts of MDTA have not been equally successful. Of the institutional graduates almost 25% were unemployed when last contacted. Under this training course type of program, the trainee had no assurance whatsoever of finding a job upon successful graduation.

By contrast, the on-the-job training provisions of the MDTA Act have been vastly more successful. Over 90% of the trainees under this program were actually carried on the payroll of the private firm providing the training. They were trained for jobs with that firm. They filled jobs which were open and waiting for a qualified applicant. Knowing that graduation meant immediate employment with a familiar company in familiar surroundings, their motivation to achieve was high and their dropout rate low. And when their training was completed, over 90% of these OJT trainees were bringing home a paycheck.

In fairness, I must add that OJT trainees were, by and large a better qualified group of workers to begin with. But even with that qualification, there can be no doubt any more that the most effective and economical way to bring jobs to the unemployed is to give them on-the-job training, not under government auspices, but in the private enterprise system.

This point ties in again with Mayor Sorensen's testimony. He said to the Subcommittee that—

"Industry in Omaha has been very generous in cooperating with me in trying to provide jobs for our disadvantaged people. I would like to recommend some Government incentive in providing job training, in jobs for the unskilled, because our industry has been so exceptionally cooperative. Given Federal incentives I believe that private industry can do a tremendous job and will do a tremendous job."

More and more people are coming to the conclusion that the Federal government has not succeeded in its war on poverty, nor can it succeed in the future by its own efforts. Even the most liberal of our leaders and scholars are beginning to agree. Senator Abraham Ribicoff recently admitted with regard to urban renewal, that "it is self-evident that the job is too big to be accomplished by government alone." D. V. Moynihan just the other day stated that "liberals should divest themselves of the notion that the nation . . . can be run from agencies in Washington."

This opinion is not universal, however, as witnessed by the recent efforts of some Senators to attach an "Emergency Employment Act" to the EOA. This would not provide training or supportive services, but would spend an inordinate amount of money—over $2.8 billion for make-work employment. This is not a long-range nor an economically efficient way to solve the unemployment and underemployment programs. I submit, however, that there is a feasible approach which is both economically efficient, and which represents a long-range solution.

Three years ago, in a report signed by myself and Senator Len Jordan of Idaho, I suggested that Congress should provide an incentive to private enterprise to expand job training opportunities—opportunities leading directly to jobs. The simplest method, and the method least susceptible to governmental interference in the affairs of business, was that of a tax credit.

As businessmen, you are all familiar with the 7% investment tax credit enacted at the request of President Kennedy in 1962. That tax credit, applied across the board to all new investment in equipment and machinery, gave American manufacturers a strong incentive to invest in new equipment. The result, taken together with other tax revisions made at the same time, gave a significant boost to the economy. This I can say with the benefit of hindsight, for in 1961 when this issue was before the Senate I was among those who seriously doubted that the proposed credit would lead to the kind of upturn its backers foresaw.

So when a small group of Senators joined me in February of 1965 in introducing legislation to give private enterprise a tax credit toward certain job training expenses, they did so because they believe that investment in human capital—the skills and talents of our labor force—was at least as important to the health of the economy and to the well-being of our people as investment in machines.

That legislation, developed and refined by the efforts of dozens of Congressional staff experts, labor lawyers, economists, training specialists, and businessmen, is now embodied in S. 812, the Human Investment Act. It is sponsored by 29 Senators and some 140 members of the House. I am proud to say among this number is a great United States Senator from Nebraska, my good friend Roman Hruska.

In its original form, the Human Investment Act allowed a tax credit, in addition to the ordinary deduction, of 10% of allowable training costs with maximum of $25,000—plus 50% of tax liability in excess of $25,000. These expenses are defined in the Act. They are, briefly:

1. Apprenticeship wages.
2. Wages of OJT enrollees.
3. Wages of workers in cooperative education programs.
4. Tuition and course fees for workers attending trade, business, or vocational schools or colleges.
5. Tuition and course fees in accredited correspondence schools.
6. Organized job training programs conducted by the taxpayer.
7. Organized job training programs conducted by one taxpayer on contract with another.
8. Organized job training programs conducted by a trade association, joint labor-management council, or other such group.

There are several reasons why the Human Investment Act is preferable to alternative programs that have been advocated in some quarters.

First, it is not unduly costly. A Congressional Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation has stated that the tax exemptions allowed under the Act would result in an annual loss of only "$200 to $350 million of federal revenue," depending on the extent to which the tax credit stimulated new training programs. These dollars would have a multiplied effect, however. With a 10% deduction, each $10 of Federal cost would result in a $100 expenditure on the part of industry for training.

Second, the human investment approach is founded on the strength of the Nation's greatest job trainer, the private enterprise system. Private enterprise alone has the know-how and the equipment to do this job. The private employer knows the needs of the labor market, far better than government officials in Washington.

Third, by using the tax system in this

creative way, private enterprise is spared the intrusion of legions of government officials into company affairs. Red tape, delay, and frustration are held to the minimum. The only government agency the employer deals with is the familiar Internal Revenue Service.

Fourth, the act would quickly help break through the severe skilled labor bottlenecks that have plagued business over the last two years, and which have hampered our war effort abroad. Under the act, investment in human capital is not limited to the hard core unemployed. Employers would have a much needed new incentive to expand programs to upgrade the skills of those already working as well as the unemployed. Thus, as a machinist's assistant becomes a drill press operator, a sweeper may move to machinist's assistant, and an unemployed man may come in to start his climb up the job ladder as a sweeper.

The importance of concept of the skill ladder was clearly described in the Republican views in the Joint Economic Report of 1964:

"The solution to the problem of technological displacement demands a broad national effort to upgrade the labor force by small stages all along the line—providing the unskilled with minor skills, preparing the semiskilled for skilled work, turning the skilled into advanced technicians, and rehabilitating the handicapped. Workers on all levels of the skill ladder must be encouraged and helped to move up into higher and more demanding jobs, leaving the positions which they once held to be filled by less skilled but striving applicants."

Fifth, the Human Investment Act would have an anti-inflationary impact. The shortage of skilled workers leads to rising costs and rising prices. An expansion of the supply of workers with needed skills would help to hold inflation in check. This point is forcefully made in the October, 1966, monthly letter of the highly respected First National City Bank of New York, whose economists specifically recommended the extension of the investment tax credit to investment in human beings.

Sixth, the Human Investment Act would yield disproportionate benefits to the small firm. A Labor Department survey of firms hiring 37 million workers in 1962 revealed that small businesses—those with less than 500 employees—conducted more than their share of job training programs for unskilled, semi-skilled and skilled workmen; big businesses, by contrast, devoted more of their training resources to managerial, administrative, sales and personnel training, which would not be covered by the human investment credit.

These are but a few of the advantages of the Human Investment approach. But rather than exhaust your patience by recounting them further, let me close by describing the progress which this approach has made and the challenge which remains.

Private industry is finding itself more and more unable to fill good jobs because of the shortage of trained, even adequately literate applicants. I was heartened to read in the September 7, 1967, Reporter that some large companies are instituting tape recorded crash courses in the three R's to functional illiterates either already employed or applying for jobs. I was, also, heartened to hear last Sunday on Face the Nation, that some of Rochester, New York's industrial concerns are taking it upon themselves to hire and train the city's 2,000 unemployed. This is but a drop in the bucket of need, however. Larger industries may be able to afford these programs; they may prove too expensive for smaller businesses. The Human Investment tax credit can benefit all business.

Tuesday I offered a modified version of the Human Investment Act on the floor of the Senate as an amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act. My version, which provided $200 million in grants for the purpose of paying 15% of training costs to private industry, unfortunately lost. It was supported by 27 Republicans and only one Democrat.

I am convinced that the Human Investment approach is the major way private industry can be encouraged to enter into job training on a massive scale. Although the tax credit has been a traditionally Republican approach, I do not believe that we can afford the luxury of party politics any longer, when the need for increased training is so desperately great.

Jobs are going unfilled while men remain unemployed. This represents a challenge which must be put to those of us who are concerned about the economics of poverty, and who believe that only if government acts in concert with private industry can solutions be found.

In closing, let me reiterate the points I have made today. For thirty years the Federal Government has become increasingly involved in almost every area of human life. Every time there was a need, someone advocated a new government program to meet it. All too often, in my opinion, the Congress has rushed to enact these programs into law. As a result of this trend, the law books have grown thicker and there has been a proliferation of government agencies, officials, experts, and administrators.

But now it is becoming apparent to all, even those who advocated governmental activity, in the first place that the creation of new programs is just not likely to do the job.

This realization has led to the growing feeling that this Nation can solve its problems only if the immense strength and resources of the private sector is mobilized for that purpose.

I have spoken today about providing the private sector with an incentive to expand job training programs through the Human Investment Act. This is only one example. Basic education, pollution control, public transportation and slum rehabilitation are now increasingly the concerns of private business. Businessmen are beginning to step forward to tackle the problems that government has failed to solve; and government is very slowly beginning to think of itself more as the stimulator and guarantor, rather than an executor and controller.

The Chamber of Commerce of the United States and the Chambers of the individual states have played an active role in spurring this most salutary development. With the brains and dedication of business—and labor, and the colleges, and the churches, and the community organizations—I believe America can and will move forward into a new and brighter era; an era where true opportunity, available to all, makes anguish, despair, poverty and violence in our cities a matter for historians, rather than journalists to discuss and ponder.

FISHERIES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1967

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, on September 18, 1967, I introduced for myself and the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie], the proposed Fisheries Development Act of 1967, S. 2426.

Both of our offices have had many requests for copies of the bill, and I believe it would facilitate the dissemination of it, were it printed in the Record.

Consequently, I ask unanimous consent that the text of S. 2426 be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SHORT TITLE

Section 1. This Act may be cited as the "Fisheries Development Act of 1967."

TITLE I

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

Sec. 101. The purpose of this title is to coordinate all fisheries extension activity of the Department of the Interior in a Fisheries Extension Service in the Department, to give certain additional authority to the Secretary of the Interior for fisheries extension activities, and to provide certain additional assistance to the fisheries industry.

FISHERIES EXTENSION SERVICE

Sec. 102. (a) In order to aid in diffusing useful and practical information on subjects related to commercial fishing operations, the processing of fisheries products, and the marketing thereof, and to encourage the application of such knowledge, the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the Secretary) is authorized to establish in the Department of the Interior a Fisheries Extension Service and to exercise through such Service the existing extension authority of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, as well as the extension authority under the provisions of this section. All such extension activities shall be coordinated with the fisheries extension activities carried on by the States and by the sea grant colleges.

(b) In determining which industries and geographic areas shall receive priority for the purposes of initiating extension activities authorized in this section, the Secretary shall consider such factors as (1) the size of the industries to be affected; (2) the state of their technology as compared to that of similar industries in foreign countries; (3) the extent of the potential resources and markets; (4) the amount of information resulting from relevant research activities; and (5) the economic benefits to be derived from the practical application of such information to commercial operations.

(c) The Secretary is authorized to carry out fisheries extension work pursuant to this section which shall consist of the giving of instruction and practical demonstrations in commercial fishing, in the processing of fisheries products, and in the marketing thereof, to persons engaged in such activities for economic gain, and of imparting information on said subjects through demonstrations, publications, and otherwise. Such work shall be carried on in such manner as may be determined by the Secretary after consultation with appropriate State and local officials, and local representatives of the industries to be benefited by such work.

(d) There are authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of this section $10,000,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1968, $15,000,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1969, and $20,000,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1970. Not more than 15 per centum of the funds made available pursuant to this section in any fiscal year may be used to assist the fishing industry in any one State.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS

Sec. 103. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make technical assistance grants to fishery cooperatives, marketing associations, and other private agencies or organizations, to pay in whole or in part the costs of implementing technological improvements in the fisheries for demonstration purposes.

(b) In determining whether to make such a grant, and in fixing the amount thereof, and the terms and conditions on which it will be made, the Secretary shall take into consideration the amount available for grants under this section; the number of applications for such grants; the financial condition of the applicant; and the benefits which are expected to accrue from the proposed demonstration project.

(c) Payments pursuant to a grant under this section may be made in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments as the Secretary may determine.

(d) There are authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of this section $5,000,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1968, $7,500,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1969, and $10,000,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1970.

FISHERIES LAW STUDY

SEC. 104. (a) The Secretary is authorized to undertake a comprehensive study and review of existing fisheries regulation at the local, State, and Federal levels. Such study shall include but need not be limited to (1) a review of existing Federal, State, and local regulation of commercial and recreational fishing, and (2) an assessment of the effectiveness of such regulation in promoting the efficient and beneficial use of marine resources.

(b) The Secretary is further authorized to develop a series of model codes suitable for adoption by the various coastal States. These codes shall be designed to harmonize the conflicting interest of commercial and recreational fishing, and to promote the conservation and efficient exploitation of marine resources.

(c) The results of such study and such model codes shall be incorporated into a report on the state of fishery regulation and shall be presented to the Congress and the President on April 26, 1969, and kept up to date by an annual supplement presented on May 31 of each following year.

(d) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of this section $1,000,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1968, plus such additional sums as the Congress may deem necessary for each fiscal year thereafter.

IMPORT STUDY

SEC. 105. In order to aid the Congress in adopting the Nation's tariff policies to the needs of the domestic fishing industry, the Secretary shall submit beginning as soon as practicable a seminannual report to the President and the Congress on the importation of fisheries products into the United States. Such report shall include, but need not be limited to (1) a profile of the quantity and value of the fisheries products imported into the United States in the preceding six months, broken down by tariff category and country of origin, (2) a projection of imports of fisheries products anticipated in the following six months, and (3) an analysis of the effects of these past and projected imports on the domestic fisheries.

FISHING VESSEL CONSTRUCTION SUBSIDIES

SEC. 106. (a) Section 2 of the United States Fishing Fleet Improvement Act (46 U.S.C. 1404), is amended by striking out "and (8)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(8) that the vessel conforms to all applicable water pollution control requirements, and (9)".

(b) Section 5 of such Act is amended by striking out "an amount equal to the difference, as determined by the Maritime Administrator, between the cost of constructing such vessel in a shipyard in the United States based upon the lowest responsible domestic bid for the conclusion of such vessel and the estimated cost, as determined by the Maritime Administrator, of constructing such vessel under similar plans and specifications in a foreign shipbuilding center which is determined by the Maritime Administrator to furnish a fair and representative example for the determination of the estimated total cost of constructing a vessel of the type proposed to be constructed but in no event shall the subsidy exceed 50 percent" and inserting in lieu thereof "50 percent".

(c) Section 12 of such Act is amended by striking out "$10,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$20,000,000".

FISH PROTEIN CONCENTRATE

SEC. 107. Section 3 of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to develop through the use of experiment and demonstration plants, practicable and economic means for the production by the commercial fishing industry of fish protein concentrate", approved November 2, 1966 (80 Stat. 1089), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. There are authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $1,500,000 for each fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1967, to carry out the research authorized by the first section of this Act, and a total amount of not to exceed $1,000,000 for the construction of one experiment and demonstration plant authorized by section 2 of this Act. There is also authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $1,555,000 annually for a period of five fiscal years, beginning with the fiscal year 1968 for the leasing of one additional experiment and demonstration plant, and for the operation and maintenance of experiment and demonstration plants leased or constructed under this Act. Sums appropriated under this section are authorized to remain available until expended. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to amend, repeal, or otherwise modify the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to carry out fish protein concentrate research under any other provision of law."

TITLE II

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

SEC. 201. The purpose of this title is to conditionally exempt voluntary associations of handlers of certain fish and fish products from certain provisions of the antitrust laws, so that they may, through marketing agreements, promotional and product development activities, marketing research, and other related activities, better regulate the fluctuation of prices and the marketing of fish and fish products which create the unstable and chaotic conditions in the fishing industry.

VOLUNTARY ASSOCIATIONS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 202. (a) In order to effect the purpose of this title, the Secretary shall have the power, after due notice and opportunity for hearing, to permit the voluntary association for the purpose of this title of fishermen, processors, and others engaged in the handling of any fish or fish products (hereinafter referred to as "handlers").

(b) Such voluntary associations may be formed for the purposes of the issuance of marketing agreements, the development and promotion of a specific product or products, and the establishment of market and product research programs designed to improve the quality or increase the consumption of the product.

(c) The making of any such agreement shall be lawful and shall not be held in violation of any of the antitrust laws of the United States if such agreement meets the requirements of this title and such additional requirements as are prescribed by the Secretary for the purpose of this title.

PURPOSES OF MARKETING AGREEMENTS

SEC. 203. Agreements made pursuant to section 202 may—

(a) limit, or provide methods for limiting, in a fair and equitable manner the total quantity of any fish or fish product, or any grade, size, or quality thereof, produced in any specified manner during any specified period or periods of more than three months each, which may be marketed in or transported to any or all markets during any specified period or periods by each handler or all handlers, but such limits shall be subject to minimum limits determined by the Secretary;

(b) allot, or provide methods for allotting, in a fair and equitable manner the amount of any fish or fish product, or of any grade, size, or quality thereof, which each handler may purchase from or handle on behalf of any and all other handlers during any specified period or periods;

(c) establish or provide for the establishment of reserve pools of any such fish or fish product, or of any grade, size, or quality thereof, and provide for the equitable disposition of the net return derived from the sale thereof among the persons beneficially interested therein;

(d) require or provide for the requirement of inspection of any such fish or fish product produced during specified periods of marketing;

(e) determine, or provide methods for determining the evidence and extent of the surplus of any fish or fish product, or of any grade, size, or quality thereof and provide for the control and disposition of such surplus, and for equalizing the burden of such surplus elimination or control among the handlers thereof;

(f) prohibit unfair methods of competition and unfair trade practices in the handling of any fish or fish product;

(g) provide that any fish or fish product, or any grade, size, or quality thereof shall be sold by the handlers of any class or handlers in the manner provided in such agreement;

(h) provide to the association the powers and duties—

(1) to administer such agreement in accordance with its terms and provisions;

(2) to make rules and regulations to execute the terms and provisions of such agreement;

(3) to receive, investigate, and report on complaints of violation of such agreement; and

(4) to recommend amendments to such agreement; and

(i) make such other provisions incidental to, and not inconsistent with the terms and conditions above specified and necessary to execute the provisions of such agreements.

AGREEMENTS NOT APPLICABLE TO RETAILERS

SEC. 204. Agreements formulated under this title shall not be applicable to any person who sells fish or fish products at retail in his capacity as retailer.

AUTHORITY TO PREVENT SHORTAGES

SEC. 205. The Secretary shall not permit to continue in effect any agreement which reduces the supply of any fish or fish product below a quantity sufficient to provide for normal domestic consumption, exports, and carryover.

SHARING OF EXPENSES

SEC. 206. Each association formed under this title and approved by the Secretary may require that each member thereof shall pay to the association such member's pro rata share (as approved by the Secretary) of such expenses as the Secretary may find are reasonable and are likely to be incurred by such association, during any period specified by him, for such purposes as the Secretary may determine to be appropriate for the maintenance and functioning of such association, other than expenses incurred in receiving, handling, holding, or disposing of any quantity of commodity received, handled, held, or disposed of by such association for the benefit or account of persons other than members. Such pro rata shares shall be computed on the basis of the quantity of the fish or fish products distributed, processed, or shipped by such association, and such other activities as the Secretary may approve.

SEC. 207. (a) All parties to any marketing agreement pursuant to this title shall severally, from time to time, upon the request of the Secretary, furnish him with such information as he finds to be necessary to enable him to ascertain and determine the extent to which such agreement has been carried out or has effectuated the declared policy of this title, and with such information as he finds to be necessary to determine whether or not there has been any abuse of exemptions from the antitrust laws. Such information shall be furnished in accordance with forms of reports to be prescribed by the Secretary. For the purpose of ascertaining the accuracy of any report made to the Secretary pursuant to this section, or for the purpose of obtaining the information required in any such report, where it has been requested and has not been furnished, the Secretary is authorized to examine such books, records, papers, copies of income tax reports, accounts, correspondence, contracts, documents, or memorandums, as he deems relevant and which are within the control of (1) any such party to such agreement from whom such report was requested, (2) any person having, either directly or indirectly, actual or legal control of or over such party, or (3) any subsidiary of any such party.

(b) All information furnished to or acquired by the Secretary pursuant to this section shall be kept confidential by all officers and employees of the Department of the Interior and only such information so furnished or acquired as the Secretary deems relevant shall be disclosed by them, and then only in a suit or administrative hearing brought at the direction, or upon the request, of the Secretary, or which he or any officer of the United States is a party, and involving the agreement with reference to which the information so to be disclosed was furnished or acquired. Nothing in this section shall be deemed to prohibit (1) the issuance of general statements based upon the reports of a number of parties to an agreement or of handlers subject to an agreement, which statements do not identify the information furnished by any persons, or (2) the publication by direction of the Secretary, of the name of any person violating any marketing agreement, together with a statement of the particular provisions of the agreement violated by such person. Any such officer or employee violating the provisions of this section shall upon conviction be subject to a fine of not more than $1,000 or to imprisonment for not more than one year, or to both, and shall be removed from office.

SEPARABILITY

Sec. 208. If any provision of this title is declared unconstitutional, or the applicability thereof to any person, circumstance, or commodity is held invalid the validity of the remainder of this title and the applicability thereof to other persons, circumstances, or commodities shall not be affected thereby.

SYMPATHY AT DEATH OF MRS. HANNAH NIXON, MOTHER OF FORMER VICE PRESIDENT RICHARD NIXON

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, it was with regret that I learned last weekend of the death of Mrs. Hannah Milhous Nixon, in Whittier, Calif.

Mrs. Nixon was a lady of character and dedication. She was an excellent example of the mother who realizes the importance of rearing her children in an atmosphere of Christian discipline, in this case it being based upon the Quaker religion.

The mother of five sons, one of whom died at age 7, Mrs. Nixon was typical of the mothers of the Western part of our country in that she worked to help support her family in addition to filling her role as mother and wife.

The election of her second eldest son, Richard Nixon, to the office of Vice President in 1951 and his subsequent service during the following 8 years often brought her into the public spotlight. She was a lady of few words, but when quoted in the press her comments were always worth hearing.

I wish to extend to the former Vice President, his brothers and other members of the family my heartfelt sympathy at the passing of Mrs. Nixon.

I ask unanimous consent that an article by the Associated Press, in which Mrs. Nixon's death was reported, in the October 1, 1967, issue of The State newspaper, Columbia, S.C., be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Nixon's Mother Dies at 82

Whittier, Calif.—Mrs. Hannah Milhous Nixon, mother of former Vice President Richard M. Nixon, died today in a convalescent home. She was 82.

Nixon's aides said Mr. and Mrs. Nixon and their two daughters would fly to Los Angeles Sunday afternoon from their home in New York.

Mrs. Nixon died in the Whitmar Convalescent hospital, where she had stayed the past two years. She had been ill several years.

Mrs. Nixon moved west to Whittier with her father, Franklin Milhous, in 1897. In 1908 she married Francis Anthony Nixon, who had moved from McArthur, Vinton County, Ohio, to Yorba Linda in 1906. He died in 1956 at the age of 77.

The couple had five sons, Harold, the oldest, died of tuberculosis at 33. Arthur died at 7 of tubercular meningitis.

Richard, the second eldest, was born in Yorba Linda, Jan. 9, 1911. The others are F. Donald, sales executive with Carnation Co., and the youngest, Edward C., a Navy officer.

The elder Nixon, a Methodist, embraced his wife's Quaker religion after they married. They had met at a Quaker church party.

Nixon was a streetcar motorman when he moved to Los Angeles in 1906. He gave that up and became a citrus rancher a year or so later. After marrying, he went into business, opening a market and a gasoline station in Whittier, across the street from Quaker church. The store building formerly had been the church meeting hall.

Mrs. Nixon worked in the store during the day. She always insisted she was sparing with physical punishment during the future vice president's early years:

"For some reason, I could never bring myself to spank Richard. My friends warned me that I'd spoil him, and then I'd have only myself to blame. But it didn't work out that way, did it?"

In 1953, the year after Nixon became vice president, his mother traveled from Whittier to Florida, and made the trip in a chair car instead of a more sumptuous sleeper.

"You meet so many nice people in the coach," she said.

The quiet Quaker woman attended services regularly at the East Whittier Friends Church and reared her sons in the same religion. She was particularly pleased when her vice president son attended with her. On one occasion he flew from Washington to Southern California for a speaking engagement.

"He drove all the way from Anaheim to Yorba Linda, just to take me to . . . church for Sunday morning service," she remembered.

In 1960, when Nixon was seeking the presidential nomination, his mother was asked whether she would campaign for him.

"It's been a campaign since the day he was born," she said. "All his life I've been his campaigner."

Survivors include four sisters, Mrs. Martha Gibbons of Alameda, Calif., Mrs. Oliver Marshburn of Whittier, Mrs. Edith Timberlake, Riverside, Calif., and Mrs. Jane Beeson, Lindsay, Calif.; a brother, Ezra Milhous, of Lindsay; and seven grandchildren.

OMBUDSMAN

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, on several occasions, I have informed Senators of the Ombudsman-like role which our daily newspapers are now performing. In Washington, our Ombudsman today is the "Action Line" column of the Evening Star. In Philadelphia, the Bulletin runs a "Mr. Fixit" column which also takes on Ombudsman-like functions.

Recently, British Prime Minister Harold Wilson's son, working at the University of Pennsylvania, ran into some Internal Revenue Service bureaucratic redtape. With the assistance of the Philadelphia Bulletin's "Mr. Fixit" column, Mr. Wilson's problem was solved.

More and more, we are beginning to see the need for some form of Ombudsman-like creature, whether at the Federal, State, or local level. Early this year, the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson] and I cosponsored a bill to create a small claims tax court of the United States. We were pleased with the overwhelming support for this bill from the majority of my colleagues. Unfortunately, the Committee on Finance has not yet scheduled hearings on this important bill. Had this small claims tax court bill been enacted, Mr. Wilson and countless other taxpayers—citizens or otherwise—would be assured of continuing relief from their problems with the Internal Revenue Service.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record, an article published in the September 28, 1967, issue of the Evening Star, which discusses the matter.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

People in the News: Newspaper Helps Out Prime Minister's Son

Philadelphia.—Even British Prime Minister Harold Wilson's son runs into red tape when involved with the U.S. government.

Robin Wilson had earned $2,500 last year as a freshman math instructor at the University of Pennsylvania and, as an alien working here temporarily, he was entitled to a full refund of the $250 taxes he paid.

But, after repeated prodding, the Internal Revenue Service sent him only $39.54.

So Wilson wrote the Philadelphia Bulletin's "Mr. Fixit'" column, whose operatives diplomatically informed Washington of the delicate international situation that existed.

The remainder of the $250 was refunded promptly, the Bulletin reported.

DEATH OF JACOB M. LASHLY, OF ST. LOUIS, MO.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, our Nation suffered a great loss with the death of Mr. Jacob M. Lashly on Sunday. Mr. Lashly, of St. Louis, was one of our country's leading lawyers. He was a former president of the American Bar Association and the St. Louis Bar Association. After World War II, Mr. Lashly served as chairman of a special committee established by the ABA to aid lawyers in war-devastated countries. For his service in this capacity, he was awarded the Medal of Exceptional Service to the Bar by the ABA in 1961. In further recognition of his ability he served as a member of the United Nations Administrative Tribunal from 1953 to 1958.

Mr. Lashly's public service was by no means limited to the bar and related activities. He was former board chairman of the chamber of commerce of Metropolitan St. Louis, former president of the St. Louis Municipal Opera Association, and former president of the board of directors of the St. Louis Public Library. Having served so devotedly and given so much of himself to his community and country, he will be greatly missed.

Mr. President, I want to extend my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Lashly and the family in this time of grief.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a St. Louis Globe-Democrat editorial and a St. Louis Post-Dispatch article on the life and service of Mr. Lashly be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Oct. 3, 1967]

JACOB M. LASHLY

St. Louis has lost one of its most distinguished citizens in the death of Jacob M. Lashly. An attorney more than 60 years and a former president of the American Bar Association, Mr. Lashly excelled as a leader in local, national and even international affairs.

A man of unusual gifts, he was of distinguished service to his community, his country and his profession. During World War II, he directed the reorganization of military law. After the conflict he was an enthusiastic supporter of the United Nations and one of seven members of the world body's administrative tribunal which acted as a court of last resort of internal disputes.

Mr. Lashly served as president of the Municipal Opera Association from 1942 to 1954, and as president of the board of the St. Louis Public Library from 1953 to 1964. It is fitting that a new branch at 4537 West Pine Bl. was named in his honor.

In other community fields, Mr. Lashly served as a member of the executive committee of the St. Louis Area Boy Scout Council, and as chairman of the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce.

Possibly the honor that Mr. Lashly valued most—and one that he richly deserved—was the Medal of Exceptional Service to the Bar, the highest award conferred by the American Bar Association. He received this in 1961 in recognition of his humane assistance to lawyers in countries devastated by World War II.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Oct. 2, 1967]

JACOB M. LASHLY DIES; LAWYER, CIVIC LEADER

Funeral services for Jacob M. Lashly, St. Louis lawyer and civic leader who died yesterday will be at 11 a.m. Wednesday at Trinity Presbyterian Church, 6800 Washington avenue, University City. Burial will be in Lake Charles Memorial Park.

Mr. Lashly, 85 years old, died of infirmities of age at his home at 20 Windermere place. Members of the family said he died quietly when taking a nap about 1:30 p.m.

He was an attorney here for more than 60 years, and retired from active law practice about two years ago. He was senior member of the law firm of Lashly, Lashly, Rava, Hyndman and Rutherford with offices at 705 Olive street.

HEADED BAR GROUPS

Mr. Lashly was a former president of the American Bar Association and the St. Louis Bar Association, former board chairman of the Chamber of Commerce of Metropolitan St. Louis, former president of the Municipal Opera Association and of the board of directors of the St. Louis Public Library.

He was born in Randolph county, Illinois, and received his early education in the public schools there. He received his bachelor and master of arts degree from St. Louis University and his bachelor of law degree from Washington University.

He was admitted to the Missouri Bar in 1906 and had maintained his law office here since that time. He formerly served as a part-time instructor and lecturer at Washington University.

AIDED WAR EFFORT

Mr. Lashly served as president of the American Bar Association in 1941. As president of the association, he directed the reorganization of military law and marshaled attorneys throughout the country to support the war effort by making citizenship speeches.

After World War II, he served as chairman of the association's special committee on aid to lawyers in devastated countries. He spent several weeks in Europe in 1947 in connection with his duties as chairman of this committee.

In recognition of his services, the American Bar Association's highest award for exceptional professional service to the bar was presented to him in 1961.

The citation stated that he "helped to spread the spirit of comradeship between American lawyers and their colleagues abroad who had suffered privation and indignity."

OTHER SERVICES

In the American Bar Association he served five years as chairman of the committee on commercial law and bankruptcy and two years as chairman of the section on commercial law. He served a three-year term on the general council as a member from Missouri and later was a member of the board of governors for three years.

Mr. Lashly served as a member of the United Nations Administrative Tribunal from 1953 to 1958. The seven-member body was set up by the UN to serve as a court of appeal for discharge employes.

He served as president of the Municipal Theater Association for 12 years, 1942 to 1954. After his resignation as president of the association, he was made an honorary life member.

HEADED LIBRARY BOARD

Mr. Lashly served as a member of the St. Louis Public Library Board for more than 25 years and was president from 1953 to 1964. Two bond issues providing funds for construction of branch libraries were authorized in his term as president.

Surviving are his wife; two daughters, Miss Jean Ellen Lashly of Washington, and Mrs. Elizabeth L. Ferris of St. Louis; a son, John H. Lashly of St. Louis, and a sister-in-law, Miss Mabel M. Henderson of St. Louis.

REVELATIONS ON HOME IMPROVEMENT PRACTICES

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I am sure that many Senators have been reading with interest the series of articles in the Washington Post on the practices of some home improvement firms in the District of Columbia.

I have found these articles interesting and informative, and would like to commend Leonard Downie, Jr., and David A. Jewell, who wrote them, and all others who worked on them, for a superior job of reporting. The articles are splendidly written, and contain a wealth of factual information that must have been difficult to obtain.

I should like also to commend the Montgomery County Sentinel for the series of articles by Martha Robinson, on the subject of home-improvement fraud, which was published last February.

Also, WWDC, the Washington radio station, last winter broadcast a series of editorials dealing with this same subject.

All of these journalistic efforts demonstrate one essential point: The need to protect the consumer against high-pressure and often fraudulent door-to-door salesmanship.

Earlier this session, the distinguished chairman of the Commerce Committee and I introduced legislation aimed at just this problem.

I am pleased to note that the Consumer Subcommittee has scheduled hearings on this bill, S. 1599, the Door-to-Door Sales Act, for early next winter. Once the facts have been gathered, we should act quickly to pass this measure into law. There can be little doubt that it is badly needed.

At least one of the tragic situations reported in the Post this past Sunday could have been avoided if S. 1599 were now public law.

The article states that the day after she signed a contract with the Monarch Construction Co., Mrs. Alberta K. Smith, of 778 Irving Street NW., called Monarch and ordered the firm not to do any work.

If the Door-to-Door Sales Act, S. 1599, were law, she would have been able to cancel her contract within 24 hours of signing.

Instead, she was stuck with her "bargain," and was sued by Monarch for the contract price of $4,500. Fortunately, Mrs. Smith took her case to court, where she was awarded substantial punitive damages—which she has not been able to collect.

S. 1599 would prevent this sort of situation, and spare people like Mrs. Smith considerable worry and expense.

Let me illustrate the whole problem of door-to-door sales with a few examples from Maryland. In my State, about seven out of every 10 homeowners are planning some kind of home improvement. Most of these jobs will be done by contractors, many of whom solicit door-to-door.

The series of articles in the Montgomery County Sentinel showed that Marylanders had been bilked out of sums up to $5,000 because they signed home repair contracts without having time to consider what they were agreeing to.

As a result, nearly 600 complaints a year have been made to the Maryland Home Improvement Commission. Some of these complaints have dealt with shoddy work or other problems. But a large number result from contracts which the homeowner was rushed into signing.

The executive director of the commission, Thomas J. Guidera, has said that the chief characteristic of unscrupulous operators is their hurry. They never want the customer to "sleep on the proposition." They want a signed contract right away.

Mr. President, the American consumer needs time to reflect on the implications of a contract signed with a door-to-door salesman. He needs a "cooling-off period."

Often the contracts are signed late at night. A brief period of grace is particularly needed by low-income consumers like those described in the Washington Post article—people especially vulnerable to the tactics of high-pressure salesmen who linger in their homes for hours. S. 1599, the Door-to-Door Sales Act, is designed to protect these people, and shelter them from the abuses detailed in the Washington Post and elsewhere.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the articles by Leonard Downie, Jr., and David A. Jewell in the Washington Post editions of October 1, 2, 3, and 4, 1967, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIRM DUPED THEM, SAY RESIDENTS

(By Leonard Downie Jr. and David A. Jewell)

A current Washington ghetto synonym for "you've been had" is "you've been Monarched."

The genesis of the term goes back to 1963, when the Monarch Construction Company began its massive canvassing here of low- and middle-class homeowners, selling private "urban renewal": the "American Townehouse Front," other home improvements, debt consolidation, the works.

By the beginning of last year—after Monarch disbanded and its president, Nathan H. Cohen, left town—Monarch had sold contracts to hundreds of Washington homeowners and grossed $2.5 million, according to one estimate.

Cohen said yesterday he would not answer any questions about Monarch operations, whether the company was still in business, or about court suits alleging fraud.

He was reached in Baltimore where he and his mother, who was also a Monarch officer, operate the Baltimore Business School, 303 E. Fayette st., a computer training school.

In more than 25 civil suits in General Sessions and U.S. District Courts here, homeowners have charged that Monarch used high-pressure salesmanship and fraud to get their signatures on contracts and home mortgages.

Monarch's Townehouse Front usually is a combination of white aluminum siding, black aluminum shutters, new windows and door, carriage lamps and trim put on the front of a row house. It can look handsome from a distance, but some owners have complained that the work is shoddy and deteriorating.

Interviews with dozens of Monarch customers draw similar complaints: the Monarch salesman mentioned something about urban renewal and being forced to make improvements; the Townehouse Front looked so nice in the photographs; there were apparent endorsements of Monarch by Negro leaders and Congressmen; there was so much shuffling and signing of papers; finally, there was the debt—often thousands of dollars more than the price they remembered quoted or the worth of the job. Almost always, the note was secured by a deed of trust.

In a civil suit in the Court of General Sessions, Judge Catherine B. Kelly found that Monarch was guilty of using "fraudulent representation" to procure the signature of Alberta K. Smith, 778 Irving st. nw., on a home improvement contract.

Mrs. Smith testified that the Monarch salesman said he was a "representative of urban renewal," that her home "would not be torn down" if she signed the contract and that "urban renewal" would pay $2000 of its cost.

When she called the Redevelopment Land Agency the next day, she testified, she was told it had no connection with Monarch. Mrs. Smith called Monarch immediately and ordered the firm not to do any work.

Monarch sued her for the contract of $4500. Judge Kelly in July, 1966, awarded Mrs. Smith $1525 punitive damages instead. She has not been able to collect.

Monarch might be termed the "granddaddy" of the nearly dozen firms here that have engaged in second mortgage schemes. A number of companies are under investigation by four Federal agencies and by the U.S. Attorney's office.

Usually, Monarch got the customer's signature on a mortgage to his home, too. Several homeowners complained in the court suits and interviews with reporters that they did not know they were signing mortgages, that no notary public was present, or that the amount of the debt was not the same or did not cover all the work as they had been told.

When Monarch obtained mortgage loans insured by the Federal Housing Administration through a reputable bank, the amount was usually $3500 total cost for the job plus $837 financing charges.

MAXIMUM ALLOWED

The final $4337 amount on the mortgage is the maximum allowed by the FHA under its Title I home improvement program. Usually the customer received the American Townehouse Front which, court suits show, cost Monarch about $1500.

The FHA allows 15 per cent overhead and 40 per cent profit. This would total about $2500 for a Townehouse Front. Monarch usually charged about $3500, plus interest.

Like the customers of nearly a dozen other home improvement firms investigated by reporters from The Washington Post in the past four months, the homeowners who were "Monarched" must pay or lose their homes.

At least three homeowners have lost their homes after signing Monarch contracts. At least six more are in court trying to stave off foreclosures.

Clarence and Georgia Winters, who live in a modest row house at 1102 Park st. ne., are trying to fight that inevitable fate.

Winters 61, has worked as a skilled laborer for a Washington construction firm for 20 years. His wife, who is 54, has worked for the past seven years as a cook for Sen. Stuart Symington (D-Mo.).

GOOD CREDIT RECORD

In buying furniture, appliances and cars on time over the years, the Winterses have maintained a good credit record. During the 16 years they lived in the house on Park Street, they whittled the first trust on their home down to less than $1000. That is, until Monarch came along in December, 1964.

What happened since to the Winterses is recounted by them under oath in separate depositions filed in their suit in the U.S. District Court:

A woman had called Mrs. Winters talking about improvements to be made in her neighborhood. It was not until two men came to her house a few days later that she knew the call came from Monarch. (Monarch, is believed to have called 6000 homeowners while it was in business.)

The salesmen "were so friendly and nice" and showed them photographs of other Negro homeowners, some prominent Washington Negroes and homes "improved" with an American Townehouse Front.

"They said that Roy Wilkins sent them there," Mrs. Winters attested.

One salesman "said he was going to do the whole entire front, and he was going to remove the windows and give us new windows, and build a brick wall all around the front, and a cement porch, and the aluminum siding."

The Winters said their kitchen was what really needed work. The salesman told them that the kitchen work would be included, too, and the whole job would be $2000 cheaper than usual "by letting him write it up in December."

The Winters family says the prices quoted that night and on other nights by Monarch salesmen varied from $2500 to $4000. They said they signed one set of contracts the first night, which were taken away from them and replaced by others when the salesmen came back later.

Then, one night three months later, the salesmen came to the Winters home again and asked the couple to sign the top page of a "big pad" of documents.

In their depositions, the Winters couple states further that one of the men identified himself as Nathan Cohen and explained that the other papers were copies of the top page.

"It is just as much for your benefit as it is for mine," Mrs. Winters says Cohen told her as they sat at the dining room table. "We have to get some more copies."

When Winters asked why so many copies were necessary, a man who had accompanied Cohen told Winters to "calm down, you're getting all upset." He took Winters into another room to look at the Winters furniture. The man told him that some of it appeared to be "antiques."

Cohen placed the thick pad in front of Mrs. Winters and told her to "press hard, press real hard," according to her deposition. When Winters came back into the room, he saw his wife's signature and signed himself.

It was only later, the Winterses said, when they got a payment book from Citizens Building and Loan Association of Silver Spring, that they discovered their signatures were on a mortgage (deed of trust) on their home for $4,337 and on a completion certificate for the work.

As work progressed on their home, the Winterses found several things that displeased them: cement splashed on the front door, rags and other refuse left on the front lawn, sticky windows, a loose lamp.

Winters, who worked as a carpenter's helper on his construction job, was particularly upset by "the rough job" a workman was doing in his kitchen: such as wooden panels installed upside down, with wide gaps between them.

REFUSE TO PAY

He stopped Monarch's carpenter from doing anything further on the kitchen and began calling Monarch to complain. The Winterses said they never got a satisfactory answer to their complaints and, when they received the payment book from the bank, called to say they would not pay until the job was finished right.

That was when they found the Citizens Building and Loan had already paid Monarch its $3500 out of the $4337 loan insured by the Federal Housing Authority. The bank said Monarch had presented a signed completion certificate required by the FHA.

The Winterses insist they never signed a completion certificate, since the work was never finished. The completion certificate the bank's attorney has introduced into the court record has no date on it, in violation of FHA regulations.

The bank has introduced into the suit the mortgage it holds to secure the Winters loan. It bears a different date than the mortgage recorded with the District Recorder of Deeds.

Complaints about Monarch first surfaced

in the autumn of 1964, after it had been in business for a little more than a year.

In a story published in The Washington Post on November 1, 1964, several owners of homes on unrestored fringes of Capitol Hill complained about Monarch's sales tactics. One woman had already filed suit in U.S. District Court, charging Monarch with "trickery" and "false pretenses."

The homeowners said that Monarch's telephone solicitation, sprinkled heavily with references to "urban renewal" and "talking to you about schedules for your property and your street," led them to believe the Government was somehow behind it.

NO MONOPOLY

Cohen told a reporter then that "we don't think the Government has a monopoly on the words." He said then: "Our program is to rehabilitate a large part of Washington over a period of ten years. If we'd remodel the insides of houses nobody'd see them, while on the outside you can see the change right away."

At the same time, the Capitol Hill Restoration Society, complained about Monarch to Government agencies. Some homeowners and a former Monarch salesman went to talk with prosecutors in the U.S. Attorney's Office about Monarch in 1964.

Yet Monarch's business continued to flourish. In January and February of 1965, it took out full-page newspaper advertisements criticizing Federal urban renewal as "far more urban removal" and boasting its own "private urban renewal program" as having "created $2,149,500 in new first trust loans" and "$300,000 worth of approved Title I FHA loans."

But the FHA was investigating Monarch by then and, on May 11, 1965, placed the firm on its "precautionary measures list."

Notice went out to all banks handling FHA-insured loans that FHA had information "indicating that the subject has not conducted his operations . . . consistent with the purposes and objectives of the FHA Property Improvements Program."

Banks were instructed to deal with Monarch only in cases in which bank officers personally checked the contractors' work and to have completion certificates signed in the presence of bank officers.

Monarch no longer obtained FHA insured loans. Instead, it sold some of its second mortgage notes to Allstate Mortgage Corp., now of 1111 Massachusetts ave. nw. Allstate, in turn, sold some of the mortgages to the Atlas Credit Corporation of Philadelphia (recently renamed Sunasco as a result of mergers). Atlas assigned the notes to its subsidiaries to collect payments from the Washington homeowners.

Monarch also was still able to obtain, from reputable banks, new first mortgage loans not insured by the FHA for its customers. Money from these mortgages was used to pay off the customers' old mortgages and, in some cases, also to pay Monarch for home improvements.

In many of these cases, records indicate that Monarch also obtained the customers' signatures on a new second, and sometimes a third, mortgage. Money from these also went to Monarch for home improvement contracts.

After being involved in more than 50 suits in Washington's courts—more than 25 involving charges of fraud against it—Monarch has suffered one judgment against it and lost four other times on dismissals when it failed to answer questions filed by opposing attorneys.

Monarch and the dozen other firms under investigation are a minority of the home improvement contractors who do business in the city. Most contractors are reputable businessmen who tell customers just what they are getting and how much it will cost.

Suits Hit Mortgage Practices—Misled on Loan Terms, Claim Homeowners

(By Leonard Downie Jr., and David A. Jewell)

Custom House Construction Co. went into the business of home improvement construction on March 3, 1966, in an office at 7849 Eastern ave., Silver Spring.

Almost six months to the day later, Custom House went out of business, according to its president, Harvey W. Davis.

Records in the D.C. recorder of deeds office show 55 second mortgages worth $250,000 made out to Custom House.

In the past four months, a team of reporters from The Washington Post interviewed 23 Custom House customers.

All are low-income Negroes, elderly and often widowed, and in each case the price of the job done or products received (such as a paint job or a color television set) was secured by a mortgage on their homes.

DIDN'T KNOW OF MORTGAGE

Four Custom House customers said they had no idea there was a second mortgage on their homes until they were told so by reporters. The other 19 said they first learned of the mortgages from United State postal inspectors, who are investigating Custom House.

At least one customer, Chester Thompson, has lost his home through foreclosure on the second mortgage. Six others—faced with foreclosure—filed court suits charging that their signatures on the mortgages were secured through fraud.

A pattern appeared in the complaints:

The customers were contacted by Custom House, not vice versa.

The customers said they signed what they thought was a contract but later turned out to be a note and mortgage.

The customers said there was no notary public present when they signed the "papers" although the mortgages on their homes bore notarization seals.

All said they received payment books in the mail from companies they had never heard of demanding payment of notes they didn't know they had signed.

The 23 additional Custom House customers interviewed by reporters said the same points apply in their cases.

Custom House is one of nearly a dozen home-improvement firms under investigation by Federal authorities for their second mortgage dealings in Washington. The U.S. attorney's office expects grand jury action within two weeks.

The vast majority of home-improvement firms in Washington enjoy good reputations.

PRICE ABOVE APPRAISALS

Sources said that one professional appraiser who dealt with Custom House said that when he had done appraisals for Custom House the firm automatically increased its prices well above the appraisals.

Suits in court indicate that Custom House would then quote prices to the customers but give them contracts to sign, the face values of which would be double the quoted prices.

In two court suits, customers have claimed notes and mortgages were filed against their home for at least double the amounts quoted on the jobs by the Custom House salesman.

The contract in one case tells the story:

One customer had the front of his house painted "for the total sum of $2350." The contract says that the customer agrees "to pay the sum of $2350 upon completion, secured by a note of $5875 plus 8 per cent interest in monthly installments of $58.75."

When reporters asked the customer, an elderly man who cannot work because he is being treated for cancer, why he agreed to $5875 for work that cost "the total sum of $2350," the homeowner replied:

"I thought just the monthly payment was $58.75."

USED TELEPHONE SALESGIRLS

Custom House employed a battery of girl telephone solicitors. One of the girls told an investigator about the sales talk:

The girls were given phone numbers of houses in low-income Negro areas selected from a cross-index file.

They were told to hang up if they judged a white person had answered.

Otherwise, they were to find out within 60 seconds if the resident of the house owned or was buying the house.

If it was discovered the resident was only renting, they were under orders to terminate the conversation and make another call.

Otherwise, they would try to interest homeowners in anything from a television set to a new roof. If the prospects seemed good, they would then turn the files over to salesmen.

One of Custom House's first jobs was on the home of Albert and Mattie Smalls, at 401 11th st. se.

SMALLS FILE SUIT

After being threatened with foreclosure, the Smalls filed suit against Custom House charging "willful, deliberate and malicious fraud."

The Smalls' suit says the salesman told them he could fix up the front of their house for $800.

They thought that would be nice, but lamented that they already had debts of $4900 and didn't feel they could afford it.

The salesman then said he could arrange to get them a loan that would permit them to pay off the $4900 as well as cover the cost of fixing up the house front, according to the suit.

They agreed to this, and signed papers they thought were contracts and loan application forms.

The job was done. They learned later, however, that only $575 worth of outstanding debts were paid off, leaving them with $4397 in old debts plus a mortgage on their home for $500 that they didn't know they signed, the suit says.

The couple paid $1000 on this note until they contacted attorney John J. Carmody Jr., who filed suit. On July 24, 1967, U.S. District Court Judge Joseph C. Waddy issued a temporary restraining order against the present holder of the Smalls' note, prohibiting the holder from making any further collections until the court case is decided.

ACCEPTANCE CORP. NAMED

The Smalls' suit also named as defendant a company called Universal Acceptance Corp., located at 6400 Georgia ave. nw.

According to official D.C. records, a founder, a director and president of Custom House is Harvey W. Davis of 8313 Raymond st., Potomac.

According to these same records, Harvey W. Davis is also secretary, treasurer and a director of Universal Acceptance, with an address at that time of 8804 Lanier dr., Silver Spring.

Davis told a reporter: "I really can't answer your questions. I really don't know much about that. I took in a partner who knew the home-improvement business. He did the selling and I did the bookkeeping. I never knew any contracts were fraudulent."

All notes and mortgages generated by Custom House were sold immediately, sometimes within hours, to second parties, known legally as "holders in due course."

The Smalls' case was no exception. Their note was sold to Universal Acceptance. Much of the paper generated by Custom House went to Universal.

The Smalls' suit contains the following allegation:

"Davis conspired with both Custom House and Universal to hatch a scheme whereby Custom House would fraudulently obtain a promissory note, reinforce its right to enforce the terms of the note by fraudulently obtaining a deed of trust (mortgage) against the property, fail to perform the consideration for said note, sell the note to Universal at a fraudulent discount rate, allow Custom House to lapse into insolvency thereby defrauding potential creditors and hide the whole behind the sham shield of the 'holder in due course' defense of Universal."

NOTE DISCOUNT CLAIMED

The suit also alleges that Universal bought the Smalls' $5500 note from Custom House for $2200—at a discount of 60 per cent.

Many Custom House notes were sold at discounts ranging from 40 to 60 per cent.

The U.S. Court of Appeals here has characterized discounts of 40 per cent or more as "outrageous" and stated that such discounts, if there are also circumstances such as the purchase of notes executed by unknown persons whose credit has not been investigated, constitute a "badge of fraud."

An answer to this suit was filed on behalf of Universal by Bernard T. Levin, a local attorney. The answer denied all allegations of fraud and maintained that Universal had purchased the note in the ordinary course of business.

In its answer, Universal argued that it was merely a "holder in due course," and it also filed a counterclaim against the Smalls for $5,119.55 not yet paid on the note, plus attorney's fee.

Custom House Construction Co. has not yet answered the allegations contained in the Smalls' suit.

The signature of the notary public who swore she witnessed the Smalls' signatures on the $550 mortgage on their home was Louise Beane.

In January of this year, Louise Beane, a licensed notary public in Maryland, was indicted and charged with the false notarization of two mortgages in Washington.

NOTARY PLEADED GUILTY

Mrs. Beane pleaded guilty and received a suspended sentence in U.S. District Court here.

Those two mortgages had been generated by Custom House. Mrs. Beane notarized a total of 27 mortgages generated by Custom House.

In six court suits, homeowners have claimed that they did not know they signed mortgages, that no notary public was present when they signed papers and that they had never seen anyone named Louise Beane, either in their homes or in Maryland. Numerous other homeowners made similar claims to reporters.

Seven Custom House notes were purchased by a District realtor named Leonard Freedman, of 761 17th st. nw., for what investigators say were 40 per cent or greater. Freedman denies the discounts were that large.

One of those mortgages was on the home of an elderly widow, Alberta Kibler, or 1737 D st. se.

After her home was threatened with foreclosure, she filed suit against Custom House and Freedman, charging that her mortgage was secured by fraud through a conspiracy between Custom House and Mrs. Beane.

Her suit alleges that Custom House's dealings with her were "part of a conspiracy in which Louise Beane similarly made many false notarizations for Custom House."

It says that she was quoted a price of $2750 for a new kitchen and discovered a mortgage against her home she didn't know she had signed for $5550.

FIRM DENIES FRAUD

Custom House answered this suit with a denial of fraud and conspiracy and denied that Mrs. Beane was an agent of Custom House.

Freedman answered by saying he was without sufficient knowledge to admit or deny the charges since he was merely a "holder in due course" and he denied any conspiracy existed. He said yesterday that "all I can do is check the District records to see that it's a legitimate mortgage. I dealt with Custom House the same way I dealt with everybody else."

One Custom House customer, Amanda Green, 56, of 829 Sheridan st. nw., bought four air conditioners for what she thought was "a little over $2000" and later learned there was a mortgage on her home for $5800, plus 7 per cent interest.

Her paper was purchased from Custom House by Freedman. He showed her a note bearing her signature that called for payments of $33.50 a month for 60 months.

At this rate Mrs. Green could not have paid off the interest due on the note by the end of the 60 months, much less the principal.

Since by the 60th month she would have only paid $2010, much of it having gone to pay off interest, Mrs. Green stood to lose her home unless she could pay the balance or obtain a new loan for it.

If she refinanced the note for the same schedule of monthly payments, she would not have been able to pay off the principal due in her lifetime, Federal investigators say.

Mrs. Green hired an attorney before making any payments. He hired an appraiser who valued the air conditioners at $974. U.S. postal inspectors had them appraised for $971.

Mrs. Green's attorney reached an agreement with Freedman whereby he wiped off the mortgage on her home in return for a payment of $1000.

LABORER SUES

Frank Harris, of 124 10th st. ne., an illiterate, elderly laborer has filed suit saying he was tricked into signing a $7450 mortgage on his home and received only $500 worth of work in return.

His suit claims he signed certain papers because Jack Shulman, Davis' partner and the salesman in this and many Custom House transactions, promised him that Custom House would pay off two previous mortgages on his home.

On the original two mortgages, he was paying a total of $100 a month, Harris said, in the suit. He also said that he had to pay $80 a month on the new mortgage held by Custom House, plus the same old $100 he had been paying.

He earns $65 a week.

Shulman, of 5300 Westbard ave., Bethesda, and Custom House answered the suit and denied any fraud or wrongdoing.

MENTIONED IN SUITS

Shulman is mentioned in most of the Custom House suits as the salesman involved and by most of the customers contacted by reporters.

Shulman told a reporter that none of the mortgages signed up by him were obtained by fraud.

"You will find they were all legitimately signed," said Shulman.

Shulman said that in each instance he was accompanied by a notary public, including those in which Louise Beane's signature appears on the mortgage.

The activities of Custom House, and several other home-improvement contractors, are being looked into by Federal authorities. Most home-improvement contractors are reputable businessmen who tell customers what they are getting and how much it will cost.

Five Custom House mortgages ended up in the hands of Atlas Credit Corp. of Philadelphia, which has been renamed Sunasco, Inc., following a merger. Atlas is now also under investigation by Federal authorities.

Atlas buys second mortgage paper from firms in 40 states and two Canadian provinces.

Intercom Buyers Expected Prizes, but Got Mortgages

(By Leonard Downie Jr. and David A. Jewell)

"The salesman made it seem so nice," one housewife remembered. "It looked as though we could cut the total price way down—maybe even make a profit."

She did not make a profit. Instead, she is paying more than she expected for a very special kind of status symbol—a home intercom system. And she had a second mortgage on her home that she never knew she signed.

She is one of scores of customers of six local firms who sold intercoms and water softeners during the past five years and whose sales practices are now under investigation by Federal authorities.

There are many reputable electrical firms in Washington that sell such equipment without questionable sales methods and without obtaining second mortgages to secure payment of the sales price.

The salesmen of the six firms under investigation went door-to-door in ghetto and other inner-city neighborhoods where the intercoms and water softeners are surprisingly big sellers.

The six firms used "chain referral" sales schemes in which salesmen offered homeowners a chance to get large amounts of their money back by referring new customers to the firm.

Their customers have complained, in court suits and interviews with reporters of The Washington Post, that they did not get much or any money back and that they wound up with second mortgages on their homes—mortgages they didn't know they had signed.

The six firms are among a dozen under investigation by local and Federal authorities for their second-mortgage practice.

Reporters went through real estate records and called homeowner after homeowner listed as having $1389 second mortgages on their homes. Time after time, it turned out that the homeowner was a customer of one of the firms, Allied Enterprizes Inc.

Many said they had not known that the mortgages existed. Those who did know about them said they had not found out until they were contacted by police or Federal investigators, or called the finance company that was collecting their payments.

The homeowners all told the same story:

An Allied salesman came to their home to tell them about the intercom system—complete with am-fm radio, and burglar and fire "panic" alarms.

The $1389 price seemed high to the homeowner. (One electrical contractor told reporters that a maximum for this type of job would be $600, without financing charges.)

PROMISED PRIZES

But the Allied salesman told them they could get money back in "prizes" for referring friends to Allied as customers, according to the homeowners.

The homeowner was told he would become an "equipment-owning representative" and receive $100 for each person referred who bought an intercom. And he could receive up to $1000 in additional prizes for making 45 "qualified demonstrations" of his intercom system to prospective customers.

But a Federal Trade Commission examiner found earlier this year that "few, if any" of Allied's customers received "enough referral commissions to obtain their intercom at little or no cost."

Allied's salesmen made "false, misleading and deceptive" statements to customers that the intercom was "being sold at a reduced price as an introductory or advertising plan," the FTC examiner ruled.

And, he added, Allied's salesmen, "for the purpose of inducing the sale" of its product, failed to inform customers that they were signing a second mortgage on their home.

The FTC examiner ordered Allied, and its president, William R. Marion Sr., to "cease and desist" from using chain-referral selling schemes or any "false, misleading or deceptive" statements in trying to get names of more prospective customers.

WENT OUT OF BUSINESS

At about this time, when the FTC order was issued last January, Allied went out of business. It left behind more than 200 homeowners with nearly $300,000 worth of second mortgages, according to District real estate records.

Five homeowners have brought suit against Allied in U.S. District Court charging that the firm defrauded them through misleading chain referral sales schemes, and obtained their signatures on second mortgages without their knowledge.

Marion, who lives at 211 Dorset rd., Laurel, Md., said last night the suit against him "is nothing but paper. They know I didn't do anything wrong."

He said he did not know what his salesmen told his customers but they were periodically told at sales meetings not to misrepresent the referral program. "But lying is a salesman's business," he said. "You know that. I know what they do.

"These people (his customers) were trying to get something for nothing."

He said that each deal he made was consummated by Samuel C. Cratch Jr., Marion's public relations director, so there would not be any misrepresentation.

He said that after a customer's credit was approved Cratch would call on the customer at his home, accompanied by a notary public, so the signatures could be witnessed. In each case, he said, the customer was made aware that he was signing a second mortgage on his home and the signature on the mortgage was notarized on the spot.

ABOUT $30,000 IN PRIZES

Marion said while he was in the intercom business he paid out about $30,000 in referral prizes. He said the highest was $600 to Josephine Hill of the Deanwood area and "Lots got two, three, and four hundred dollars."

He added that most of the customers did not give his firm genuine referrals.

Marion called the FTC action against him "meddling."

One homeowner who has filed suit against Allied, Lugenure Talbert, of 1224 Farraday pl. ne., said in her suit that Cratch persuaded her to buy an intercom after he had explained the sales referral plan.

After the intercom was installed, she said, Cratch returned with more papers to sign. "You signed the contract improperly," Mrs. Talbert quoted Cratch in her court complaint. She signed again.

She said she did not realize that she must have signed a mortgage at that time until she got a letter from the Atlas Credit Corp. in Philadelphia informing her that it had bought her note, secured by a second mortgage. Her note was for $1389, the price of the intercom plus financing charges.

Cratch, in his answer to Mrs. Talbert's complaint, denied any wrongdoing. Atlas answered that it bought the note without knowledge of any fraud. Allied has not yet answered the suit.

Mrs. Talbert also charged that no notary public was present when she signed the papers in her home. The other four homeowners who sued Allied also said that they never appeared before a notary public during their dealings with Allied.

Yet in all five cases, the name and seal of the same notary public in Prince George's County, Md., appears on second mortgage in favor of Allied filed in the D.C. Recorder of Deeds office.

Several Allied customers interviewed by reporters said they would not have bought the intercoms if they had realized they were signing second mortgages to secure the notes for them. They also said they would have rejected the deal if they had known they wouldn't get any referral "prizes."

FEW GOT PRIZES

Only a few of the Allied customers interviewed said they got any money back from Allied at all. No one interviewed said they received more than $100.

Allied broke down its $1389 price for the intercom into $992 for the equipment and installation and $397 financing charges. The system included the intercom master panel with an am-fm radio, six speakers and fire and burglar alarm devices.

The same brand of intercom system was sold by yet another firm operating here until late last year. This firm was called United Home Enterprises Corp., which also sold water softeners. United did at least $120,000 worth of business here in two years, real estate records show.

In February, two of its officers, Robert M. Cederloff and Adrian J. Barba, were indicted by a U.S. grand jury, which charged them with forging the names of eight Washington homeowners on eight mortgages in favor of United Home Enterprises. Their case is still pending and they are free in custody of their counsel.

Three of the homeowners named as complaining witnesses in the criminal case have filed suit against United Home Enterprises, claiming that their signatures were obtained on second mortgages by "fraud, trick and device" or by forgery.

They charge that they were talked into buying intercoms or water softeners at prices "in excess of the fair value of the equipment," again through the device of being offered money "prizes" for customer referrals.

In all three cases, the homeowners also charged that they never appeared before a notary public while signing papers for the United salesman.

In two cases, the seal and signature of a Prince George's County notary appears on the mortgage filed with the D.C. Recorder of Deeds. In the third case, the notarization is by a D.C. notary public.

NOTARIZATION DISPUTED

Other United Home Enterprises customers whose mortgage signatures were notarized by these two notaries told reporters that they never appeared before a notary public.

Cederloff said he told all the homeowners that they were signing "a second trust," although he added that he did not explain what it meant. "If you are a property owner, you should know what that means," Cederloff said.

When asked about the use of a chain referral sales method that homeowners have claimed is fraudulent, Cederloff said that "my firm is not being accused of this in the indictments."

Cederloff said the firm stopped doing business last year. "I don't feel that I misrepresented anything to the people," he says.

Besides Allied and United, at least four other firms have sold intercoms or water softeners to Washington homeowners using the chain referral sales method and obtaining signatures unknowingly in second mortgages, according to homeowners' court complaints.

According to court suits, interviews with homeowners, and information in the D.C. Recorder of Deeds office, the majority of the notes and mortgages generated by Allied Enterprizes and United Home Enterprises was bought by the Atlas Credit Corporation of Philadelphia (since merged into Sunasco, Inc.), through a Washington mortgage broker.

Atlas is named as a defendant in seven of the eight court suits by homeowners against the two intercom firms. In each case, Atlas answered by saying that it bought the notes as a third party "without knowledge of any fraud" in the obtaining of the notes.

The law generally presumes that the third party—the "holder in due course"—has bought the note in good faith and has the right to collect on the note it paid for.

City Hit for "Slowness" in Probe of Mortgages

(By Leonard Downie Jr. and David A. Jewell)

The General Improvement Contractors Association of Washington criticized the city government yesterday for being "so slow" to move against the Monarch Construction Co., a home-improvement firm whose second mortgage practices were revealed in The Washington Post.

John H. Haas, executive vice president of the Association, said his group complained to the city about Monarch in mid-1963, when Monarch first started selling its "American Townehouse Front" here.

Haas said a hearing was held at the District Building as a result of his group's complaint, under the aegis of the city's Department of Licenses and Inspections.

Haas said that an L & I spokesman said Monarch's activities would be considered, but that nothing ever happened.

Between that hearing and December, 1965, when Monarch went out of business (and its president, Nathan Cohen, and secretary-treasurer, Thelma Cohen, left the city), Monarch had contacted 6000 homeowners and had written $2.4 million worth of contracts, according to Federal investigators.

Monarch and nearly a dozen other home-improvement firms are being investigated by four different Federal agencies.

Haas said yesterday that the home-improvement firms cited in The Washington Post were "an exception to the rule as far as home-improvement contractors in the District are concerned." He added:

"I can only say now, 'We told you so.' We tried to bring attention to Monarch and these other firms before, but no one listened."

Haas said his Association had also complained to the Federal Housing Authority about Monarch.

The FHA put Monarch on its precautionary measures list on May 11, 1965, 7½ months before Monarch ceased operations.

Sen. Charles H. Percy (R-Ill.) said yesterday that he had written the FHA asking for recommendations on remedial legislation that would assure no repetition of the practices described in the newspaper articles.

Sen. Percy said he was "shocked" at the revelations.

Meanwhile, Corporation Counsel Charles T. Duncan said he was ordering his staff to examine the city's licensing regulations for home-improvement contractors "to see whether any changes are needed and to take whatever steps may be necessary."

Duncan said that "the regulations are not self-enforcing and we have not received any complaints from citizens since I have been here. Perhaps people aren't aware the regulations exist."

Rep. Wright Patman (D-Tex.), chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, said he felt there were "some mighty big people in on" the second mortgage practices occurring here.

He said he intends to confer today, with Rep. William B. Widnall (R-N.J.), about how best to conduct an investigation into the situation here. "Things such as this have caused riots," Widnall said.

Widnall called Saturday for a House investigation of the home-improvement firms cited in the articles.

Rep. Leonor K. Sullivan (D-Mo.), chairman of the House Banking Committee's subcommittee on consumer affairs, said the revelations prove her point that the new Consumer Credit Protection Act she is sponsoring needs a clause governing first mortgages.

She said that opponents are attacking a

first-mortgage clause on grounds that first mortgages rarely are connected with questionable business practices.

Some of the home-improvement contractors cited in articles have secured new first mortgages on customers' homes, while the customers have claimed they thought they were signing only loan contracts.

Also yesterday, U.S. Attorney David G. Bress said his special fraud squad was undertaking an "intensive investigation" into the second-mortgage field here.

He said again that he expected that his office would make presentments to a grand jury within two weeks. Bress' fraud squad, however, consists only of Assistant U.S. Attorney Seymour Glanzer, and Glanzer reportedly was not detached from his regular duties for the investigation until yesterday, after articles had appeared about the practices.

Glanzer is being assisted by John Risher, an attorney lent for the purpose from the Department of Justice.

Sen. Joseph D. Tydings (D-Md.) has been working up a bill on consumer protection, and the bill is expected to be submitted shortly. There was some speculation yesterday that he may try to hold hearings this month about the disclosures on second-mortgage practices.

RETIREMENT OF CLYDE T. ELLIS FROM GENERAL MANAGERSHIP OF NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC ASSOCIATION

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, when the Rural Electrification Administration was established May 11, 1935, by an Executive order of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, only 11 percent of the Nation's farms had electric service. Now 98 percent of our farms have electricity. Great progress has been achieved under the REA program. Farm families have improved their standard of living and American consumers have benefited from increased efficiency of production.

Much of the advancement enjoyed by our farm families is directly attributable to the dedication and leadership of one man, Clyde T. Ellis, whose name has become synonymous with the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. As the general manager of the association since its establishment in 1943, he worked untiringly toward a better life for American farmers. His efforts are clearly shown in the loans of approximately $6 billion to over 900 cooperatives throughout the country.

When he retired September 8, his service to electric cooperatives did not come to an end, for Mr. Ellis will continue to serve as a consultant and special adviser.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial concerning his retirement, published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of September 23, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SALUTE TO CLYDE ELLIS

Clyde T. Ellis's retirement from the general managership of the National Rural Electric Co-operative Association marks the end of an era. NRECA and Clyde Ellis have been practically synonymous since he became its general manager when it came into existence a quarter-century ago; and during all that time, which comes only four years short of half his own life to date, he has served with an intensity of dedication exceptional for any man. His strength became the strength of his organization, given unstintingly and endlessly, and it was and is great.

He entered the service of bringing electricity to the countryside when the decisive question was whether it could be done at all, having never before been attempted. He has ever since been in the thick of an unremitting fight to protect the rural electric cooperatives from hostile power companies and their partisans in Congress. For the past several years he has been engaged in the challenging effort to adapt the co-ops' financing to meet expanding demand for electricity despite a static amount of credit available in Government loans.

The plan for a gradual transition to open-market credit which has resulted is to our mind one of Mr. Ellis's most brilliant achievements. That it has thus far not become a reality is no failure of Mr. Ellis, but that of Congress. In retiring from the arduous duties of general manager Mr. Ellis will continue to serve NRECA as a consultant and special adviser. He carries with him the gratitude and regard of those many whose lives he has helped so much to better. We warmly wish him all the satisfactions of having been in the forefront of a strenuous endeavor.

STUDY OF VIETNAM BY RIPON SOCIETY

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous approval to have printed in the Record of a recent study published by the Ripon Society.

This research report reflects not only outstanding scholarship in detailing the history of Vietnam and the nature of the conflict in the South but its proposals also reflect an awareness of political realism.

The Ripon Society has offered the American people an alternative to a course of action that the President, for too long, has told us has no alternative. Its proposal recognizes the need for a political rather than a military solution to Vietnam. It also recognizes that the responsibility and determination to pursue this solution must rest with the South Vietnamese and not with the United States.

I recommend "The Realities of Vietnam" to anyone who is seeking an honest analysis of the situation in Vietnam and a creative and hopeful alternative to the fruitless and dangerous policies of the Johnson administration.

I hope the Society's proposal for a confederal solution to Vietnam will be given very serious consideration by my congressional colleagues and by the American people.

There being no objection, the study was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE REALITIES OF VIETNAM: AN ALTERNATIVE FOR REPUBLICANS

(A Ripon research paper, the Ripon Forum, September 1967)

(Note.—This paper was written for the Ripon Society by Josiah Lee Auspitz and approved by the National Governing Board of the Ripon Society, Inc. The Appendix was written by Christopher W. Beal, who also prepared supporting research for the main body of the paper. A fully footnoted version of the paper and Appendix will be published separately by the Ripon Society, along with a transcript of its Vietnam symposium and several studies on specific aspects of the Vietnamese war. The map on page 17 [map not printed in Record] is reprinted by courtesy of the United States Government. The Society would also like to acknowledge the helpful suggestions of several of its members and the number of non-members who are intimately acquainted with the materials covered.)

"Better is a poor and wise youth than an old and foolish king who will no longer take advice . . ." (Ecclesiastes 4:13).

With one eye fixed on remote posterity and the other on the Gallup polls, President Johnson has had little vision to spare for the real constituency of his Vietnam policy: the generation of men who are expected to fight the war and live with the results.

As members of that generation, we have sought the advice of experienced men; we are conscious of the informed and responsible counsel that is available to the makers of American foreign policy. But even seasoned observers agree that on the subject of Vietnam *rigor mortis* has set in. A bureaucratic coalition within the administration has reached a rigid consensus that repels knowledgeable advice. It has set its own terms of discussion, enshrined its own version of the facts and has for the most part succeeded in imposing its internal verities on public debate as a whole.

Flurry of diplomacy

Thus, the American people have been asking whether more bombing, more troops, more diplomacy, more refugee relief, better elections, or more economic aid hold the key to our difficulties in Vietnam. And the administration has graciously suffered "dissent" on these questions. Small wonder, when dissent on tactical issues is easily preempted by bureaucrats who have the power to act: when "hawks" have the public ear, the administration can intensify military activity; when "doves" seem ascendant, it can treat them to a flurry of diplomacy. But the basic structure of administration policy remains untouched by these fluctuations. The larger questions of our involvement in Vietnam remain to be asked.

Why has a conflict which has been repeatedly defined as "political" and "essentially Vietnamese" become a largely military, largely American undertaking? Why, after six years of "limited" war, punctuated by glowing predictions of success, has no upper limit yet been reached on American troops or expenditure? Why, despite American talk about bringing peace and democracy to South Vietnam, has American policy led to the further entrenchment of a regime of generals, who are dependent for their power on the continuation of the war?

Prideful commitment

Answers exist to these questions, answers that demand an unflinching reappraisal both of the structure of our Vietnam policy and of the conduct of our foreign affairs as a whole. The Johnson administration is incapable of carrying out this reappraisal. It is motivated, as the President and his advisors assure us, by a sense of commitment. A commitment to a brave little nation? To the cause of freedom and democracy? To the containment of aggressive Communism? No, these broader goals have been obscured behind commitments of a different sort: a prideful commitment to continuing a misconceived policy, an ignoble commitment to covering over mistakes, an imprudent commitment to the unlimited use of American resources and moral energy in a dubious cause.

The time has come for simple commitments to reality and the national interest. Vietnam is the place to begin. The course of this war may well shape American thinking on foreign policy for a generation to come, just as the bitter neutrality controversy of the 'Thirties dominates the thinking of many officials responsible for our present position. It is important, therefore, that the proper lessons be drawn early. And it is appropriate that they be drawn by young men who will have to build from the pieces that the Johnson administration leaves behind.

Agenda for action

The Ripon Society proposes a thorough reorientation of American foreign policy in Vietnam and new departures in our conduct of foreign policy as a whole. It calls for frank discussion of American goals in Vietnam, the costs of fulfilling them, and their place in a larger context of priorities for global foreign policy and domestic spending. It proposes the following agenda for debate and action.

1. There must be an examination of present policies in the light of the facts of Vietnamese political life. It is the conclusion of the Ripon Society that the present structure of policy is built on an expensive fiction about what South Vietnam is and what it can become. The American people should know how much it will cost to make this fiction into a reality.

2. New concepts are needed for Vietnam. Instead of our present military, centralized, "nation-building" approach, the Ripon Society calls for a flexible, political approach to the problem that will reduce American troop commitments in the long run and take cognizance of the strong ethnic and religious rivalries that divide many non-Communist South Vietnamese from the Saigon government.

3. The conflict in Vietnam has increased certain imbalances in American political institutions: the imbalance between our ability to wage war and our administrative capacity to seek peace; the imbalance between Congress and the Executive in the formulation of foreign policy. These imbalances as well as the present administration's failures in foreign policy, provide both an opportunity and a duty for the Republican Party. The Ripon Society calls on the Republican Party to bring the issues of foreign policy to the people in the 1968 elections.

I. THE COSTS OF IMPLEMENTING A FICTION

Visiting Congressmen and journalists who ask to see the success of pacification programs in South Vietnam are often taken to An Giang province. There they are treated to the spectacle of orderly village life directed by respected local leaders who have a long history of resistance to Communist control. These villages, stable and secure from attack, have been electrified; aerial land surveys have been carried out; American-sponsored improvements in sanitary, educational, and medical facilities have been made. To extend similar benefits to all the villages in all the provinces of South Vietnam is the American goal, and it is a noble goal.

But there is another remarkable feature about the model villages of An Giang province. They are under the sway of the Hoa Hao sect, which as recently as 1963 was declared by the Saigon government to be part of the Viet Cong. American officials in nearby provinces and in Saigon fully accepted this interpretation, and U.S. equipment and support enabled Premier Diem to carry out a program aimed at the destruction of Hoa Hao power. Had Diem succeeded, there would be no model villages in An Giang province today. There would be refugee camps, large numbers of U.S. troops, and fragmented settlements that would be easy prey for the Viet Cong.

Local autonomy

Happily, the Hoa Hao were able to hold out against their enemies both in Saigon and in the Viet Cong until Ngo Dinh Diem was overthrown. In 1964 they negotiated an agreement with the new central government: Hoa Hao areas, considerably reduced by Diem's attacks, were grouped wtihin the newly drawn boundaries of An Giang province; the autonomy of local leaders was assured; and, in return for allegiance to the Saigon government, the new province was guaranteed immunity from harassment by the Army of South Vietnam. Almost overnight, An Giang became a "pacified" area, and U.S. teams were able to enter to improve the lives of the villagers and to help them in their long-standing effort to defend themselves against Viet Cong infiltration. Thus, the most successful example of "pacification" is an area that has never had the advantage of occupation by American or Army of the Republic of Viet Nam (ARVN) troops. It is a region in which a local group has been "redefined" from pro-Communist to anti-Communist status and which has been allowed a measure of autonomy in return for allegiance to Saigon.

Other local leaders have not been so lucky as the Hoa Hao. They have been defeated by the combined efforts of the Viet Cong, the Saigon government, and American policy. But since particularism runs deep in Vietnam, local leadership may reemerge, just as the Hoa Hao resurfaced after American officials proclaimed them to have been "for all purposes eliminated as a powerful political and military force."

The tenacity of local loyalties is a product of the ethnic and religious diversity of South Vietnam. South Vietnam is a fragmented country; it is the product of several waves of conquest and a long history of ethnic, religious and geographical rivalries that left divisive hatreds. Even before the arrival of nearly a million refugees from the North, it was rent by localism in the rural areas and factionalism in the cities. A realistic approach to the country must build from this legacy. It must recognize that there are many non-Communists who, like the Hoa Hao, hate the mandarins and the army of Saigon just as much as they hate the Communists.

Three regions

As a first simplification, the real South Vietnam may be divided into three regions, each of which has a distinctive political culture: first, the northern Coastal Strip, an area which is characterized by an imperial tradition and deep-seated contempt for the government of Saigon and where the militant Buddhists are the most important non-Communist faction; second, the Central Highlands, populated by mountain tribesmen who are not ethnically Vietnamese and who are willing to ally themselves with any force that will protect them from Vietnamese cultural domination;, third, the southern part of the country (old Cochin China), which is divided among important religious groups (Catholic, Buddhist, Cao Dai, Hoa Hao), each of which has strong political interests. The presence of ethnic Cambodians adds an element of racial diversity to the southern part of the country.

Finally, in all these areas are the Viet Cong, whose cadres control fully one-fourth of the rural population. They have developed an intricate network of front organizations that include youth groups, women's clubs, and civic action groups in villages which, taken together, contain three-fourths of the rural population. For many villages the cadre's authority is inseparable from village life, and indeed, the cadres have become a new social class in rural Vietnam.

Centralized democracy

To build a stable coalition from the non-Communist fragments is an ambitious undertaking that might be accomplished by skillful bargaining. But the American aim in Vietnam is more than ambitious. Under the Kennedy and Johnson administrations the United States has been the partisan of a policy of centralized government in South Vietnam. Instead of seeking to foster a political system built upon grass-roots support, American policy has been preoccupied with a dream of centralized democracy radiating out from Saigon, much as communism is thought to radiate from Hanoi. (In actuality, the North allows some local autonomy to ethnic minorities, a fact which the Viet Con use to good effect in their propaganda campaign among the mountain tribesmen of the Central Highlands.) The American mission in Saigon has accordingly been engaged in a search for a "national leader" capable of carrying out a program of "nation building," a sort of man on a white horse who will be the South Vietnamese counterpart of Ho Chi Minh.

In the beginning this national leader was Premier Diem, and we acquiesced while he persecuted the Hoa Hao and made political prisoners of more than 40,000 of his non-Communist enemies. Later he was Premier Ky, and we supported him in smashing the Budhhists in the northern provinces and in sending lowland Vietnamese with American troops to organize the mountain tribesmen of the Central Highlands. Now our candidate for national leadership is General Thieu, who has been chosen president in an election from which all "neutralists" (including a former Cabinet minister) were excluded.

Government by army

But whoever the man, there must also be a white horse, and unfortunately only one group in South Vietnam has even a remote possibility of being ridden to power over the factions and fragments of political life. This is the army, most of whose top officers were born in the North or fought for the French. The American dream of making South Vietnam into a centralized, unified state thus inevitably means military government. From the experience of other underdeveloped countries, no reason exists to hope that a military regime will turn itself quickly into a constitutional democracy or that it will be responsive to the interests of the rural population. "Nation-building" as it is now conceived in U.S. policy means nothing if not military rule in South Vietnam, and indeed within the State Department the military regime of South Korea is given as a model for South Vietnam. It would be enough if we could hope for a military ruler who was capable simply of administering the countryside.

But even here there are enormous difficulties. The army does not have sufficient contact with the rural areas to understand peasant problems or to administer them effectively. The army of South Vietnam has had only one top-ranking general of peasant origin, General Thi, and Premier Ky relieved him of his command of the I corps area soon after the Honolulu Conference. The social distance between officers and enlisted men is great. Officers despise their troops with the traditional contempt of the high-born for the manual laborer. Enlisted men are rarely promoted into the officer corps; in the last three years only one field grade officer in the army of South Vietnam has been wounded leading his men into battle. The pruning out of ethnic Southerners and former members of the Viet Minh in favor of Northerners has further divorced the officer corps from the country.

Bad bet

The army of South Vietnam is thus not to be compared with the popularly-based armies of some other underdeveloped countries. It lacks their social base and political skills. What is more, the generals cannot even command the respect of the mandarin class, the traditional rulers of the country, who have always asserted the superiority of civilian to military authority.

On its own merits, the Army of the Republic of South Vietnam is not, then, a good bet for unifying the country on a centralized model. But with the thrust of American policy behind it, it is an even worse bet. Just as U.S. military support relieves the ARVN from going into the swamps, so U.S. political support relieves the Saigon generals from the need to bargain with civilian factions. Indeed, the one ruling general whom the United States Mission publicly criticized, General Khanh (now stripped of power), was also the only one to bring the militant Buddhists into a ruling coalition. But American policy has become fixed around the idea that a nation-building war must be carried out on all political and military fronts at once, against Communist, neutralist, and anti-Communist rivals alike.

Expensive project

Can such a war, carried on without regard to the political terrain, aimed at imposing central government in a country with decentralized bases of power, dependent on the administrative capabilities of a narrowly based and politically unskilled military elite, can such a war be successful? Probably it can. Implementing a fiction is not impossible, merely expensive. It is now costing the United States, according to reputable estimates, upward of 24 billion dollars a year and casualties of 7000 a month. The budgetary figure represents three times the total of American overseas investment for the current fiscal year and about seven times the total foreign aid budget. The monthly casualty figure equals the total number of Peace Corps volunteers who went abroad last year. The troop commitments to Vietnam represent an almost total investment of our available troops for flexible response to unanticipated crises in other parts of the world. If unexpected trouble should occur abroad or in American cities, the U.S. strategic reserve would be inadequate to respond. To ask whether this represents a prudent investment of American resources, manpower, and moral energy is now academic. The question is whether we can hope for any substantial reduction of cost if present policies continue.

Installment plan

The costs of Vietnam have been built up on an installment plan. First a little more bombing, then a few more troops for conventional operations, then a few more for counter-insurgency warfare, then more investments in the "other war." With these four major elements—and with well-advertised elections and peace offensives to legitimize its operations—the Administration has attempted to implement the fiction of unified central government in Vietnam and to protect this government against external aggression. The Administration clearly believes that more installment plan increases hold the best prospect for a long-run reduction in the costs of the war. But what are the likely results of intensification of the four major elements of present policy? What are the prospects for success of the two legitimizing devices?

1. Bombing of North Vietnam

Many impatient strategists who apply a simple-minded interpretation of the lessons of World War II to the Vietnam situation insist that the quickest solution is to intensify the bombing of the enemy, assumed in this case to be North Vietnam.

A. Interdictory: The first kind of bombing, mostly south of the 18.5° parallel, aims at interdicting infiltration. It has not, however, prevented the North Vietnamese from installing missile launching sites and storage depots, nor from surfacing a road within South Vietnam.

And the fact is that even if North Vietnam is bombed to rubble, the war in the South will continue. For although North Vietnam unquestionably aids and guides the Viet Cong, the conflict in the South is not a result of simple aggression. Unlike World War II, and unlike the Korean engagement, the Vietnamese conflict is largely a counter-insurgency war. Right now, the larger part of American troops is employed in securing the South from guerrilla activities, while the smaller part is employed in checking infiltration from the North. Many military and civilian leaders whose ideas were formed by the two previous American engagements have been unable to come to terms with this fact. They have continually tried to define the war as a simple question of stopping aggression and have maintained that air power provides the most economical way of doing this. Now, the insurgency in the South *is* supported by a kind of aggression from Hanoi, but it is not one that can be stopped by bombing. The Northerners have trained guerrilla cadres who operate in the South and bring isolated villages under the control of a centralized Communist hierarchy. To try to eliminate these cadres with airplanes is an admission of failure.

B. Punitive: Bombing north to the 18.5° parallel is usually punitive, designed to "raise the cost of aggression to Hanoi," without directly reducing infiltration. But Hanoi's "costs" are calculated not by the monetary value of the installations destroyed but by the alternative uses for the labor and capital needed to replace bombed facilities; i.e., by the "opportunity costs." The Hanoi regime presides over a largely peasant economy in one of the most densely populated agricultural areas of the world. The regime thus has a more comfortable supply of underemployed labor than most underdeveloped countries. If the Russians and Chinese supply heavy equipment and technicians, the opportunity cost to the North Vietnamese of diverting labor to repair damaged facilities is low.

The only way to overtax the North Vietnamese labor supply is by systematic bombing in civilian areas. The administration denies any intention of doing this. But according to reputable non-Communist sources, American planes began punitive bombing against dikes in the Red River Delta of North Vietnam when the waters were at a seasonal high this summer. Further bombing of the dikes will flood the best rice-producing area of North Vietnam just before the October-November harvest, creating conditions rivalling those of 1946, when a famine caused the death of one million North Vietnamese.

Chinese intervention

Proponents of punitive bombing may also want to humiliate Communist China by destroying the Chinese railway line that cuts through North Vietnam. They claim that the Chinese railway brings supplies to Hanoi, and this is part of the truth. But no Administration spokesman has ever mentioned that the railway also has strategic importance within China: it is a major means for transporting raw materials between Yunnan Province and the rest of China. A measure of its value to the Chinese is that even before the extension of U.S. bombing, 40,000 Chinese paramilitary technicians were assigned to repairing the part of the link that passed through North Vietnam. The intensified bombing of the railway thus represents a calculated risk of bringing China into the war. Will internal difficulties prevent the Chinese from intervening or will they postpone their quarrels in the face of external humiliation?

Some within the administration may not care whether we do provoke a Chinese response. They believe that a war with China is inevitable and that it is better fought now than in the 1970's, when the Chinese will be able to deliver nuclear weapons. When this view is stated in explicit terms, it is easily countered by those knowledgeable in the pattern of Chinese hostility. But it is more often held implicitly. Many leading policy-makers who publicly discount the possibility of Chinese intervention are also those who believe in the inevitability of a war with China.

Bombing also involves a calculated risk of escalation by the Russians, who are committed to preventing the collapse of the government of North Vietnam and to protecting the integrity of shipping to Hanoi. The costs to the Russians in prestige should not be underestimated at a time when they are taunted by the Chinese for collaboration with the West. Finally, the North Vietnamese themselves can escalate the war in response to bombing. North Vietnamese and Communist Pathet Lao troops already hold sway over large parts of Laos. Ho Chi Minh could reactivate the war there at will in the hope that an expansion of the ground war into Laos might take some of the pressure off Vietnamese soil. Nor is this the only possible response by the North Vietnamese.

2. Conventional Ground Forces

Despite U.S. bombing, the North Vietnamese now have the initiative for escalating the conventional ground war. They hold in reserve eighty per cent of their regular army (some 400,000) men and during recent months have been concentrating forces near the demilitarized zone. Constant U.S. bombing by B–52's has not been able to prevent them from building a surfaced road through the A-Shau valley within South Vietnam, nor has it stopped them from storing in the caves near A-Shau supplies sufficient to support several divisions. They have also received six-inch rockets from the Russians that have been installed and are being used inside South Vietnam. During the past six months Communist troops already in South Vietnam have occupied for short periods four of the five provincial capitals in the I Corps region without any protest from the local population. If the Northerners are convinced that the United States means to destroy their country from the air, they might very well try to make this occupation permanent by sending new troops to hold Quang Tri and Thua Thien provinces. Guerrilla activities within both of these provinces have already been shifted from Viet Cong to North Vietnamese Army command. Such action might easily tip the balance in Washington in favor of a plan previously set aside for invading North Vietnam up to the narrow neck of the country.

It should be noted that no increase in bombing is likely to avert an invasion from the North. The more new targets that are bombed, the less deterrent effect the threat of future bombing will have on Hanoi to hold back its ground forces. In effect, the more hostages we destroy, the fewer we have to bargain with. The American public was not made aware of these facts earlier this year when General Westmoreland bargained for 45,000 more troops. They were not informed that any increase of conventional American forces up to 300,000 men can probably be matched by North Vietnam. And any increase above that number is likely to be the result of a full-scale, conventional, Korean-style conflict that has hitherto been avoided.

3. Counterinsurgency

Regardless of what happens in the conventional war against main force units of the Viet Cong and the army of North Vietnam, the counter-insurgency war will continue, and the prospect is for stalemate unless allied forces are vastly increased. The Pentagon's declared ratio for success is ten counter-insurgency troops to one guerrilla.

The reason for a high ratio is that counter-insurgency warfare is essentially a local policing operation. The Viet Cong operate by calculated acts of assassination and terror that can be carried out by small bands of lightly armed men. To protect against such harassment requires a day and night policing function and an intimate knowledge of the political terrain. Guerrillas can harass villages on a rotating basis, but counter-insurgency forces must stay put. The ten-to-one ratio, moreover, is based on the experience of the British in Malaya and other long-term professional counter-insurgency operations. To get a counter-insurgency operation in motion takes more than the standard ratio. Only when once established can the ratio decrease as the perimeter of effective control spreads out. For American troops in Vietnam who are rotated annually, the ratio may be much higher than the standard estimates. Counter-insurgency cannot be carried out effectively on a short-term basis, and the yearly rotation of American troops makes almost impossible the establishment of necessary relations with translators, spies, and local contacts. What is more, the northern coastal strip of the country does not permit economies of scale. The strip is broken into isolated valleys so narrow that a counter-insurgency operation has no room to spread out. In any case, even the standard ratio would imply a total allied force of more than two million men, as the Viet Cong now have upwards of two hundred thousand native Southerners in the field.

As for the South Vietnamese army, the ARVN will not be much more effective in counter-insurgency than it has been to date. Half of its total of 700,000 is composed of police, local, and regional forces who have been poorly paid and badly treated. They are not an efficient policing force, and in many areas they have a tacit agreement to coexist with the Viet Cong. The regular army, just over 300,000 men, has been an overly centralized force, with too much authority concentrated in too many generals, ever since it was reorganized under American advisers in the mid-1950's. A return to a decentralized force, giving more authority to lower-ranking officers commanding smaller units, more appropriate to counter-insurgency operations, would eliminate the work of half of the ARVN's present generals. Corrupt recruiting procedures and the lack of Vietnamese interest in joining the army so long as American troops are still available means that the ARVN cannot provide forces for a larger counter-insurgency operation.

The fact remains that with more than a million allied troops now in the country, counter-insurgency cannot be carried against all areas contested by the Viet Cong. The area south of the Mekong River has not yet been entered by American troops. The ARVN troops stationed there engage in little fighting, as a result of a tacit agreement to coexist with the Viet Cong. If under American pressure, this area should be opened to active counter-insurgency operations, the level of U.S. involvement would rise. Thus, if present policies continue, the aim of pacifying all sections of the country by counter-insurgency methods would result in a serious and long-term drain on American manpower. And if the Viet Cong recruit an additional one hundred thousand men in the next year, the American manpower requirement for counter-insurgency will skyrocket, regardless of what happens south of the Mekong River.

4. The "Other War"

Because the counter-insurgency and conventional efforts have reached the point where only a massive infusion of troops can change the balance, many spokesmen, including Generals Thieu and Westmoreland, have spoken of a long war of attrition, lasting perhaps ten to fifteen years. But there is no need to be so pessimistic. Within the structure of present policy a solution could be found within three to five years that would make possible a modified form of central government. It is, we feel, an unconscionable solution, but the only way in which centralized control can be imposed upon South Vietnam.

Suppose for a moment that the rice supply of a Communist-held area were destroyed and the population made dependent on imported food distributed in refugee camps administered by the Saigon government. Such a refugee camp solution would give the central government a sure hold on areas that have been impervious to its influence. It might be seen as part of the "other war," the war for the hearts and minds of the people of South Vietnam. It wins the minds of Viet Cong sympathizers by disorienting them; it forces simple villages off their lands, erodes their independence, and destroys the social order in which Viet Cong cadres thrive.

A refugee camp solution to the problem of insurgency is, perhaps inadvertently, well underway. As a result of the war, South Vietnam must now import rice for the first time in its history. "Search and destroy" operations on the ground and bombing from the air have drastically reduced local rice supplies.

Meanwhile, under the U.S.-sponsored Chieu Hoy program Communists everywhere are encouraged to defect on an individual basis, villages are given the chance to flee communist domination, but there is no way in which a Viet Cong cadre can agree to defect and bring his village with him. Thus, regardless of how many defections are recorded, the rice must be destroyed and the villagers removed to "deprive" those hard-core elements that remain of both food and troops. The effect is that sections of Vietnam are being devastated and refugees generated at a high rate.

Between late 1964 and mid-1967, 1.8 million South Vietnamese peasants were made homeless by the war. The present rate is probably greater than one million a year. If refugee generation continues at its present rates—and any intensification of the ground war would make the rates higher—one-third of the rural population of South Vietnam, some 4.5 million people will be in refugee camps or relocation settlements within three years. Since no estimates put Viet Cong control, total or partial, at higher than 4.5 million people, the gathering of that many peasants into refugee camps could go far to eradicate from the countryside the settlements that supply the Viet Cong with their food and troops. Peasants would then be domiciled in manageable units; a central government in Saigon would distribute American aid to one-third of its population; and the dream of nation-building in South Vietnam would become a reality, even if the reality were, as one anti-Communist editor (now deprived of his right to publish) has put it, "a nation of thieves and beggars."

It should be emphasized that though the refugee camp solution is a likely one if present policies are extended south of the Mekong, there are obstacles to the success of even this inhuman course of action. So far, the Saigon government has been incapable of securing the allegiance of even its homeless population. There are not less than 1.8 million refugees of South Vietnamese origin, yet not more than 500,000 of the rural population are under total control of the Saigon government. Indeed, after six years of war, Saigon can claim total or partial control of only 3.6 million of the total rural population of 13.4 million. This number is less than the total of groups who should be rock-bottom allies of the government, namely, the Southern refugees dependent upon it and traditional anti-Communist groups like the Hoa Hao, Catholics, farming refugees from the North, and ethnic Cambodians. (See Tables I and II.) The Saigon government, then, has barely held its ground, despite massive American support. And because of American support it has felt free to alienate actively "neutral" groups like the militant Buddhists and mountain highlanders.

Even so, since it would be easier to convert the ARVN into a refugee police force than into an effective counter-insurgency force, the refugee camp solution is the cheapest way to "win" the war. For refugee relief, though prolonged, is much less costly than conventional and counter-insurgency warfare, and in strictly military terms, it may also be much more effective. Bombing and conventional warfare cannot solve the problem of insurgency; counter-insurgency warfare requires close knowledge of the political terrain and upwards of two million men. Refugee generation, on the other hand, requires no more troops and no costly escalation, it can be accomplished without knowing the language and without making difficult distinctions between friend and enemy. It is accordingly the path of least resistance for American policy; it represents the lower limit of cost to the United States under present policies. The cost to South Vietnam in human terms is of course intolerable, but it is fully consistent with the declared aim of the Saigon government to eliminate Communist influence from the countryside.

5. Peace Offensives

To placate domestic critics the Johnson administration has periodically made public appeals to Hanoi to negotiate. Energy expended on these peace offensives is likely to be wasted. Hanoi remains committed to the Mao-Giap theory of guerrilla warfare: captured documents provide ample evidence that the North Vietnamese leaders believe Viet Cong cadres can keep the United States from winning the countryside and then can induce it to abandon the cities as well. Only an alteration in the balance of factions in North Vietnam, including the demise of the "bitter ender" First Party Secretary, Le Duan, would mark a change in this attitude. During the coming election year, Hanoi will no doubt try to influence American public opinion with diplomatic overtures. But the American effort at negotiations is much better directed at cadres within South Vietnam who are independent of aid from the North. For though Hanoi and the Viet Cong hierarchy remain ideologically opposed to any sincere negotiation with the United States or the Saigon government, the best American sources agree that a large proportion of Viet Cong cadres are not indoctrinated in Communist ideology. What is more, local cadres, who see the scale of American commitment, are much more likely than their leaders to become convinced of the permanency of the American presence in South Vietnam, to admit the hopelessness of taking the cities, and to be willing to make deals with the Americans. Only negotiations which seek local rather than national solutions to the problem of insurgency have even a moderate chance of success during the coming year. Only piecemeal negotiations which bid away their cadres will convince Communist leaders to come to the bargaining table for a total solution. Yet these are precisely the kinds of negotiations that are actively discouraged by both the Saigon regime and the Johnson administration, both of which prefer to polarize the alternatives between all (a capitulation by Hanoi) or nothing.

6. Elections

There is, of course, a widely publicized political element amidst the overwhelmingly military devices by which the United States is trying to build a nation in South Vietnam: the September elections. They occupy in American policy much the same symbolic function that the fort at Dien Bien Phu held for the French: they are yet another turning point in the war; they are a promise of lasting order; they are a glimpse of the new vision that the United States is bringing to the people of South Vietnam. And they would not have been held had it not been for the insistence of the American Mission in Saigon for a sign of national regeneration.

It should be recalled that it was not the military consequence of the defeat of Dien Bien Phu that caused French withdrawal, but rather the public reaction within France to the collapse of a symbol that had been trumpeted by the military as a new approach to the Indochinese war. The Johnson administration has broadcast similar hopes about the September elections, which were its fortress against the realities of Vietnam. These elections were structured not to draw non-Communist factions into a new ruling coalition, but to lend an air of legitimacy to the nation-building war. South Vietnamese political leaders who could challenge the military junta or who favor negotiating with local Viet Cong groups were and have been systematically excluded from running. To speak of local negotiations was to admit that the problem of insurgency exists, and this Saigon (and until late August the Johnson Administration) has been unwilling to do. Political processes which are open only to those who reject reality are not likely to work wonders. And now in the aftermath of the Saigon elections, as it becomes increasingly apparent that central democracy is spurious, it is time to reassess the costs of American support.

Upper and lower limits

The assessment should be made not by talking of "escalation" and "withdrawal," but by comparing the likely upper and lower limits of present policies with those of alternative approaches.

Within the structure of present policy, the best one can hope for is a refugee-camp solution to the problem of insurgency in South Vietnam. It can be reached, without mentioning the word "refugee," by emphasizing current programs to relocate villagers in secure areas, to promote individual defections, and to deprive the Viet Cong of their rice supply. It would probably require a continuation of expenditures at their present levels for three years, followed by a period in which American troops would be withdrawn and an expensive program of refugee relief and rural reconstruction would be expanded in accordance with the humanitarian aims of the "other war." Such a solution represents the lower limit of cost under present policies. But to win the temporary allegiance of a people by starving them into one's camp is short-sighted and self-defeating.

As for the upper limit to the American commitment, there is none. A different mix of elements—more emphasis on bombing or conventional warfare—could lead to an invasion of North Vietnam, an extension of the war into Laos and China, a confrontation with the Russians.

So long as it is conducted in accordance with the aims of the Johnson Administration, the war will, in sum, get worse before it gets better. It is of course possible that both President Johnson and Ho Chi Minh may flinch and open negotiations. But they are both stubborn men and their terms for bargaining are very far apart.

Skewed priorities

What should the upper and lower limits to the American commitment be? The Ripon Society believes that the proper upper limit of the American commitment has already been exceeded. A prudent policy would demand that the level of present involvement be taken as a ceiling and that steps be taken to reduce the drain on American resources. To do otherwise is to further distort our sense of priorities away from other, strategically more important parts of the world and away from necessary expenditures of money and idealism at home.

But President Johnson's policy, however unrealistic and costly, has also created obligations that put a lower limit on the American involvement. The United States has a moral commitment to the one million refugees from the North who have been resettled in South Vietnam with our aid. It has an obligation to the 1.8 million refugees generated in the South during the past two years of heavy fighting. It cannot lightly abandon these people and the others of South Vietnam who are not Communists to the vengeance of the Viet Cong and their Northern supporters. Nor can we accept a solution that would pose a military threat to *Thailand which, unlike South Vietnam, is a signatory member of SEATO.*

Reduced commitments

The Ripon Society believes that an honorable approach to Vietnam can be found that will work within these new upper and lower limits, *i.e.*, an approach that will reduce American troop commitments in the long run and minimize the destruction of Vietnamese society. It is an approach that does not demand precipitant withdrawal or imprudent escalation; its effectiveness does not depend on the panacea of immediate negotiation. It does demand something perhaps more difficult at this late date: a patient, realistic, flexible, and humane vision of what can reasonably be achieved in South Vietnam.

II. THE NEED FOR A CONFEDERAL STRATEGY

At selected moments in the unfolding of its Vietnam policies, the Johnson Administration has challenged its critics to provide alternatives. After Hanoi failed to respond to the bombing pause, for instance, the Administration asked whether there was any choice but to resume bombing. When intelligence reports showed increases in Viet Cong troop strength, the Administration paused to ask whether it could do anything but increase American troop commitments. And so it has been. By posing stacked questions sequentially, the administration has proven to its own satisfaction that its critics are naive and incapable of posing feasible proposals for a change in policy.

Now the real basis for a responsible alternative in Vietnam is not to be found by manipulating elements within the present structure of policy. The alternative to policy based on a fiction is policy based on reality. In reassessing the American undertaking in Vietnam, two central realities must be confronted.

Political fragments

The first reality is the fragmentation of the traditionally anti-Communist forces in South Vietnamese political life. In addition to the regional, religious, and ethnic rivalries traced in the Appendix to this paper, there is a wide gulf between the French-educated urban middle classes and the rural population. The former have a typically French faith in centralized government, to which the United States Mission has somehow been converted under the conviction that it represents "nation-building." Non-Communist peasants, on the other hand, have fought to resist centralized control, whether from Hanoi or Saigon. If both urban and rural sources of support are to be drawn into a stable non-Communist government, it will have to be on the basis of decentralized rule. Regardless of the protests of the French-educated centralists local leaders will have to have a greater degree of autonomy than they have yet been granted. If they are not, if local leadership, however ignorant and unsavory it may appear to city folk, is further undermined and destroyed, the result will not be a democratic government from Saigon. The result will be no government from Saigon, save for refugee camps and American troops to carry out the policing functions normally performed by local leadership. American troops would then be the objects not merely of Communist hostility but of opposition from all traditional groups seeking to protect their social order from alien interference.

The Vietcong cadre

The second reality is the political and social innovation that is the basis of Viet Cong strength throughout South Vietnam; the local cadre. Viet Cong cadres are the only effective link between many Vietnamese villages and centralized commands, and they are the strongest such link in Vietnamese history. The cadre member is trained to live with the people of his village, to seek out those with grievances against Saigon-appointed officials and local notables, and to provoke incidents which mobilize the peasantry against the government. He is instructed in the techniques of organizing front groups, engaging in the selective use of terror to intimidate his opponents, accumulating intelligence from children and village spies, and coexisting with potentially hostile groups until he is ready to overthrow them. Very often "coexistence villages" that are well-infiltrated by cadres admit U.S. medical teams, vote in elections, and listen to Saigon-trained propagandists by day, while the Viet Cong maintains control by night. Cadres are an important new part of the village social structure in three-fourths of the rural population of South Vietnam, although only one-fourth of the rural population is under their total control.

Careful analyses of their training and internal messages indicates that they have taken on a new social role that is more important to most of them than adherence to Communist ideology. Hence, recent American usage of the term "cadre" does not recognize the Communists' claim to mechanical control. In our usage, "cadre" is not a collective noun denoting a well-disciplined group of men; it denotes an individual, professional agitator.

If the cadres are to be dealt with realistically, both the Saigon government and the American mission will have to abandon the goal of extirpating them from village life. And the United States will have to recognize the futility of a Chieu Hoy program designed to encourage individual defections from cadres without guaranteeing a continuation of their social role. Viet Cong cadres are presently tying down nearly all the ARVN troops and more than half the American troops in the country. To destroy them means either the destruction of a large part of rural South Vietnam or an enormous drain on American manpower. A means must be found to allow them to hold their social function, while neutralizing their military threat.

A *confederal strategy* would deal with these two realities in a way that both Americans and Vietnamese could understand.

First phase

In its first phase, a confederal strategy would aim at developing an effective and stable non-Communist coalition between the cities and the twenty-seven per cent of the rural population that is subject to government control. In cases of conflict among factions, American support would go to those which have effective control of rural areas, since their loyalty and local policing efforts are alone able to free American troops for their proper function of checking infiltration from the North.

The concept of a coalition based on a confederal approach requires the concession to local leaders of formal guarantees of autonomy in the following ways:

Control over local police and militia.

Election of provincial and district officials who are now centrally appointed. (Provincial and district chiefs, most of them military men, now approve candidates for hamlet and village elections and make the major civilian decisions affecting their areas.)

Government officials of local origin. (This is crucial in Vietnam where administrative rules are traditionally loose, allowing for wide discretion.)

Local rule in formulation of land tenure regulations and reforms.

Redrawing of provincial boundaries to correspond to the realities of political control.

Cultural guarantees to ethnic minorities (e.g., preservation of customary law, use of ethnic languages for primary school instruction).

Right to collect local taxes, supplemented where necessary by direct access to U.S. aid. (A recent amendment to Title IX of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1967 permits the United States to find local channels for the distribution of aid.)

In other countries similar measures for decentralization might be accomplished by informal understandings, without written guarantees. But the time for that has passed in Vietnam. Too many promises have been made and broken for regional groups to trust any authority in Saigon. Nor can the United States serve as guarantor of informal bargains, for our Mission, too, has found it convenient to forget pledges made to minority groups in South Vietnam. National elections may give the regional minorities temporary leverage because of their ability to deliver bloc votes, but in a national legislature overwhelmingly dominated by urban Vietnamese the ethnic minorities have no continuing means of enforcing their interests. They will be restive whenever they are not actively courted by the ruling faction in Saigon.

In the September presidential elections, for example, the Thieu-Ky ticket actively sought the support of the Hoa Hao in An Giang province, of the Cambodian minority in Ba Xuyen province, and of the Highland tribesmen. If Thieu is able to deliver on his promises of financial aid and autonomy, these ethnic minorities will no doubt continue to hold anti-government feelings in abeyance. But their loyalty is not to the constitution of South Vietnam, which provides no guarantee of their rights, but to the military faction. Should it break its word or be replaced by a rival coalition (*e.g.*, one composed of Coastal Buddhists, Southern army officers, and Mekong Delta Vietnamese), the ethnic minorities would again feel isolated. Thus, before any form of parliamentary coalition politics can be stable, prior confederal steps must be taken to give all important non-Communist groups a stake in the idea of national government.

A first, obvious step is to make formal and public the arrangements already in force with the Hoa Hao in An Giang province and to ratify similar arrangements for the enclaves of Cham peoples in Binh Thuan province.

Second, the government of South Vietnam should fulfill promises already made to the mountain tribesmen to draft guarantees of cultural autonomy when the National Legislature meets this fall.

Third, confederal decentralization and redrawing of boundaries should be carried out to give other strong local groups authority over their own regional affairs: the Buddhists in the northern coastal provinces; the Cao Dai and the settlements of Catholics and Northern refugees in the lowlands; and, the ethnic Cambodians in Kieng Giang, Ba Xuyen, and Vinh Binh provinces. Measures of this sort, which could be adopted almost immediately, would give non-Communist groups a stake in the South Vietnamese government and constitution regardless of which faction happened to hold the reins in Saigon. There is no other way to deal with the problem of fragmentation of the non-Communist groups.

Second phase

Once the rock-bottom non-Communist groups are consolidated the same confederal framework can be offered to "co-existence" villages, which comprise much of the contested half of rural South Vietnam. Local Viet Cong cadres and ARVN troops who have developed a relationship of tacit collaboration would be encouraged to formalize their relationships in exchange for regional autonomy from Saigon. Provincial boundaries can be redrawn for such areas, just as they were redrawn for An Giang province in October 1965.

These agreements might require the marketing of all surplus rice through Saigon, the payment of nominal taxes, and other signs of allegiance in exchange for separate access to U.S. aid to repair the devastation of war. The second phase would provide an alternative to the ravages of war that does not now exist for these villages. There is at present no way in which a Viet Cong cadre operating in contested villages can submit to popular war-weariness without losing his social function. And villagers have no incentive to denounce cadres so long as the alternative is not local control but administration by a Saigon-appointed military governor.

It is, of course, likely that the Viet Cong cadres would receive orders from above not to participate in confederal bargains, in which case a clear conflict of interest would be established within the Viet Cong ranks. Cadres who are not ideological Communists or not dependent on the North for supplies would perceive differing interests from those trapped in the Communist hierarchy. This would put pressure on the Viet Cong where it is economically most vulnerable, for those cadres who are independent of Northern supplies currently provide surplus rice for the Viet Cong efforts in weaker areas. Bidding away independent villages would begin the process of crippling the Communist movement by alienating cadres whose local social role is more important to them than the ultimate Viet Cong aim of winning the cities.

Third phase

In its third phase, a confederal strategy would be offered to villages under the full control of the Viet Cong, which now hold approximately one-fourth of the total rural population. Such hard-core villages would face increasing isolation as the earlier phases of the confederal approach progressed. At this point the Viet Cong hierarchy would face three alternatives: 1) remaining in the South while their villages are losing food and manpower; 2) fleeing to the North; or, 3) retaining much of their local power in Communist enclaves and participating in the confederal framework. Once their prospects for taking over the entire country are cut off by a consolidation of non-Communist groups, it is likely that the Viet Cong high command would negotiate for the third alternative.

Possible outcome

A confederal strategy provides a vision of a feasible outcome that South Vietnamese and Americans both lack. Urban Vietnamese can now envisage only a French-style solution, with the urban classes playing the role of colonial administrators and the army securing the countryside. The American Mission, on the other hand, seems infatuated with the model of South Korea, where a military junta has taken steps toward democratization. Both of these models fail to cope with the fragmentation of South Vietnamese political life and the new social role of village cadres. A decentralized solution, by contrast, would permit both local leaders and rural cadres to keep a stable base of power now denied to them under the slogan of nationbuilding.

The minimal result of a confederal approach would be a consolidation of non-Communist groups, whose territory the United States could then defend with conventional forces. The maximal application of the confederal framework to the rest of the countryside would make possible a political system that accommodates sharp political differences (as does Italy) and deep cultural diversity (as does Switzerland).

Reasonable Costs

A confederal strategy is designed to reduce the American commitment in installments much as the present policy seems destined to escalate it by installments. Barring massive invasion by North Vietnam, a confederal strategy would operate well within the present troop commitment.

It would save manpower almost immediately by winning the cooperation of the local population in the northern provinces of the Coastal Strip and Central Highlands. It would prevent vast numbers of American troops from being sent for new counterinsurgency operations south of the Mekong River. Saigon can no more surely lose its influence in this area than by permitting the entry of U.S. forces, which Communist propaganda convincingly identifies with the French, to enter.

Finally, by lowering the level of violence in selected "coexistence villages," it would put steady political pressure on the Communists, who would be faced with possible defections by their non-ideological cadres. The present policy of Saigon to root out all cadres gives them no choice but to continue obeying orders from the Communist hierarchy. A confederal strategy would promote factionalism in the Viet Cong and unity among non-Communists; the present policy does the reverse.

It should be emphasized that the confederal concept is a *strategy, not a rigid blueprint*. It is designed to keep the costs of the war below the upper limit recommended in the previous section. It permits a rethinking of Vietnam policy that provides not merely an alternative vision to that of the Administration but alternative emphases at every step of the way. This can be best illustrated by showing how the major elements of present policy will fit into a new pattern under a confederal strategy, how such an orientation cuts across some of the well-known "hawk-dove" distinctions.

1. Bombing North Vietnam

Even if bombing some day leads Hanoi to nominal capitulation and negotiation, the Viet Cong can still conduct intensive guerrilla activities, and they will do so unless they have an alternative that permits popular southern Viet Cong leaders to retain political power. A confederal strategy encourages the formulation of such alternatives. It can be adopted regardless of one's attitude to the effectiveness of bombing in inhibiting infiltration.

But we would claim as an advantage for confederalism the fact that it will allow for a de-emphasis on bombing. The effect of bombing in fulfilling its two major purposes has been very much overrated by the administration.

Punitive bombing north of the 18.5° parallel simply does not save American lives. It risks conditions under which more lives, American and civilian Vietnamese, will be lost. And it is irrelevant to the insurgency in the South, which is the major drain on American fighting forces. *For these reasons, a confederal strategy would heavily de-emphasize bombing the North. Interdictory bombing south of the* 18.5° *parallel would continue as long as it was necessary to cut infiltration and troop buildups.*

2. Conventional Ground Forces

Invasion and insurgency are the two major military problems the United States faces. A confederal approach would employ conventional ground forces to defend areas where the Saigon government had won the loyalty of the people. It would also use them along the demilitarized zone and at crucial mountain passes to prevent an invasion of the northern I corps area.

While military leaders have been debating over bombing, barriers, and infiltration, they have failed to remind the American public that the North Vietnamese seem to be preparing an invasion of the I corps area, where American troops are already stretched dangerously thin. A confederal strategy would release troops from policing and counter-insurgency operations to counter a conventional thrust by the North Vietnamese. South Vietnam is not worth the millions of troops needed to counter both invasion *and* insurgency. Hence a confederal strategy provides a political framework in which present troops could be deployed against the invasion of areas in which the local population ceases anti-government activity.

A barrier

The approval of a limited barrier by Secretary of Defense McNamara is a half-way measure that has more meaning for the bureaucratic struggle over punitive bombing in Washington than for the realities of the Vietnamese situation.

The original purpose of the barrier concept was to threaten the North Vietnamese with interdiction of their supply lines to the South. In the years of its building the barrier would cost more lives than bombing would but afterwards it would be a permanent structure that would reshape politics in Southeast Asia. Supporters of the concept argued that if the Administration made known its firm intention to build a barrier clear across Laos, the only way to cut the Ho Chi Minh trail, the North Vietnamese might have been led to negotiate before the barrier was even completed.

The Administration, however, has committed itself only to a very limited barrier, which does not include Laos. The major hindrance to going into Laos is not the Geneva agreements, for the North Vietnamese army has been operating in Laos for years. Nor is it the "giving away" of Northern Laos to the Communists, since most of it is in Communist hands already. The hard-core objection is that the North Vietnamese might support a conventional military operation in Laos and they would probably receive Soviet aid.

The major function of the *limited* barrier is to demonstrate publicly that there is an alternative to bombing, even if that alternative is no more effective at attacking the main problems of insurgency and invasion. Both punitive bombing and a limited barrier would receive low priority in a confederal strategy.

3. Counter-insurgency

The United States can win the counter-insurgency war, but the standard ten-to-one ratio of conventional to guerrilla forces is not worth the price. Under a confederal strategy counter-insurgency operations would not be extended to new areas of the country. Plans for an offensive south of the Mekong River and based in the town of Can Tho would be permanently abandoned. In areas where counter-insurgency operations are now underway, the promise of selective withdrawal of American forces would be used to increase the attractiveness of piecemeal negotiations under a confederal framework. With counter-insurgency as with bombing and conventional warfare, military action is used in a confederal strategy to advance feasible political goals.

4. The "Other War"

Under present policy the "other war" is too often the camp follower of military initiatives. After bombing, search and destroy operations, and refugee generation have taken their toll, American teams offer food, medical aid, and refugee relief. The confederal strategy would use the economic, psychological, and social programs of the "other war" independently to fulfill political objectives.

A. Chieu Hoy: The Chieu Hoy program, which encourages individual defections of Viet Cong cadres, would operate in a wider context. Defections would still be welcomed, but primary emphasis would be placed on negotiation that permit cadres to retain their social role. Under present policies, defections among high-level units are virtually impossible. The favorable statistics on Chieu Hoy defections trumpeted by the Administration make no careful distinction between political defectors and simple refugees.

B. Land reform: Having ignored for some time the pledges for land reform made in Honolulu in February of 1966, the Johnson Administration is considering putting new pressures on Saigon. Now that it has declared the election a success, the American Mission may demand a centralized land reform program which is designed to win peasant loyalty for the central government.

But a centralized program of land reform is unrealistic. In many areas where land records have been destroyed, the attempt to resolve tenure disputes from Saigon can only be capricious and corrupt. Local administration of reforms is needed, not more centralization.

A confederal approach would subordinate land reform to the political goal of developing local leadership. Saigon might limit the size of family plots; it might provide surveying teams and keep a central record of land transactions. But the administration of reforms and the settling of disputes—a powerful source of patronage—would be left to local leaders. The power to implement land reforms would provide an added incentive for local leadership in coexistence villages to participate in a confederal framework.

C. Economic aid: To make a confederal strategy credible the United States will have to demonstrate its willingness to aid areas that are not under direct American military control. In principle, President Johnson has committed himself to such a course, and indeed An Giang province provides an isolated example of the purity of American intentions. The most dramatic symbol of American aims, however, was the proposed project for a Mekong Dam to aid people of Laos, Cambodia, and South Vietnam who are not under American military occupation. After publicizing the project and engaging in preliminary studies, the Johnson Administration dropped it without explanation. There is perhaps no single act that would better symbolize the American commitment to the long-term interests of Southeast Asians than the revival of this project. Because it would take years to complete, it would make Communists and non-Communists alike believe that the United States has a permanent concern for the welfare of Southeast Asia and that, unlike the French, Americans will not leave when they grow tired of the war.

A confederal strategy will also implement the Foreign Assistance Act of 1967, which stipulates that "emphasis shall be placed on assuring maximum participation in the task of economic development on the part of people of the developing countries through the encouragement of democratic private and local governmental institutions." (Title IX, Sec. 281.) This would depart from present policies which emphasize channeling aid through the Saigon regime, which regularly tries to deny American funds to its non-Communist opponents.

5. Peace Offensive

A confederal strategy will steadily improve the negotiating position of the South Vietnamese government by consolidating its support and enabling it to bid away Communist cadres. It will create a basis for national negotiations that cannot presently exist so long as the Communists perceive that the government of Saigon is inherently unstable. Should Hanoi and the Viet Cong hierarchy become reconciled to the impossibility of a conventional military victory, they will still have the choice of reverting to guerrilla warfare or of trying to bargain for partial control of their enclaves in the countryside in general negotiations. A confederal approach will then make possible a stable solution. It should be emphasized that as long as all efforts for limiting American costs are directed at securing general negotiations, military escalation will go unchecked. A confederal approach, by coordinating military and political initiatives, will assure a lessening of the conflict until such time as peace talks become feasible.

6. Elections

A confederal strategy would attack the endemic cause of instability in an overly centralized system by conceding a measure of power to local leaders. Instead of placing preponderant emphasis on village and national elections, it would promise elections on the district and provincial level. Under present policies almost all provincial and district chiefs are military officers and all middle-level officials are appointed and promoted from Saigon; under a confederal strategy many of these administrators will be elected.

Vietnam's local leaders need something to fight for. An increase in their own authority is a more plausible incentive than the imposition of corrupt officials from Saigon. A confederal strategy would accordingly urge that provincial and district elections be offered to all areas that are able to maintain internal security.

Possible objections

Elements of the French-educated middle class of Saigon and perhaps all the refugees from the North may greet a confederal strategy without enthusiasm, and even with outright hostility. Thirteen years of American support have accustomed many Saigon residents to the illusion that they themselves have ruled the provincial towns and the countryside. French intellectual habits have made them see Saigon as the Paris of South Vietnam, as an administrative capital of a thoroughly centralized regime. Northern refugees, for their part, are likely to oppose bitterly any scheme emphasizing regional bases of power and implicitly denying their right to return.

But Vietnamese political and military leaders, however adamantly they may oppose a change in their comfortable assumptions, have also shown a remarkable ability to adapt to political realities when they are not protected from them by American troops and economic aid. The confederal strategy will remind recalcitrant Vietnamese leaders that the illusion of centralized rule was possible in the past only because of massive American support and that such support will henceforth go to a vision of government that is more consistent with democratic ideals and more appropriate to Vietnamese political realities. The United States can begin distributing its aid in a decentralized fashion even during the period of readjustment to the new idea.

A second possible objection is that thanks to thirteen years of suppression of local leadership, there may be no popular regional and ethnic leaders with which to bargain on a confederal basis. The Appendix to this paper should satisfy doubts on this matter. It demonstrates the tenacity of particularistic loyalties in South Vietnam. American officials and Vietnamese politicians who deny these loyalties should spend more time outside Saigon.

Finally, must not areas be pacified militarily before they can participate in a confederal framework? An Giang province suggests not, as do the repeated demands by northern Buddhists and mountain tribesmen for a measure of self-rule. In a counter-insurgency war the loyalty of the population is invaluable for reporting and resisting Viet Cong infiltrators. Wherever such loyalty can be won by the mere extension of local democracy, massive military pacification is neither necessary nor right.

Closed options

One cannot, of course, reduce the costs of the Vietnamese undertaking without eliminating certain options now open to American policy-makers; and it is only fair to list two options that a confederal strategy forecloses. The first is the possibility of ridding the countryside of all Communist influence. This has been the expressed aim of a few Saigon army officers, but no reputable American official has ever publicly favored sending the millions of counter-insurgency troops required.

The second option is that of destroying North Vietnam and thereby provoking the Chinese into a war in which their nuclear capacity would be destroyed. This would presumedly be done by creating a situation in Vietnam analogous to that in Korea. If the Chinese were convinced that the United States had extended its original war aims to include heavy punishment and possible invasion of the North, they might intervene and provide an excuse for pre-emptive war.

A confederal strategy assumes that the United States can contain the Chinese without destroying neighboring states, much as it contained the Russians in Europe. Those who disagree with this assumption will of course find the cost of this strategy too high. They will find it intolerable that the United States adhere to its declared war aims, which include a preservation of the South but not the destruction of the North.

Four aims

A confederal strategy is designed to:

I. *Reduce American costs without sacrificing America's moral obligations to its Southeast Asian allies.* In contrast to present policies which increase the level of United States military involvement in installments, a confederal strategy aims at a decrease from the present troop levels. It accepts as a lower limit any troops necessary to defend from conventional attack those areas in which the local population is loyal to the government and constitution of South Vietnam and able to maintain internal stability.

II. *To confront the significant a) political, b) military, and c) diplomatic realities of the Vietnamese situation.* These are: a) the fragmentation of non-Communist political groups and the social role of the cadre; b) the primacy of insurgency and the possibility of large-scale invasion; and, c) the unlikelihood of any diplomatic resolution of the conflict until there is a stable government in Saigon with a framework that will permit the Viet Cong to retain power in the countryside.

III. *Provide a direction for change and a vision of a feasible outcome.*

IV. *Coordinate military and political initiatives so that they are mutually reinforcing.*

A confederal strategy offers a coherent overview of the Vietnamese conflict that specifies *operational* political goals for every province and district of South Vietnam. The present goal of centralized government is unprecedented in Vietnamese history and is accordingly incapable of inspiring any real comprehension or loyalty in the countryside. A confederal strategy reasserts the primacy of the political element in limited warfare and does so on a level where political guidelines can save American lives.

For these reasons the Ripon Society endorses a nonfederal strategy. If great obstacles to its implementation exist, they are not to be found on the terrain of South Vietnam. They are to be found in Washington.

III. THE REPUBLICAN RESPONSIBILITY

It is not necessary to blame the entire structure of present policy on any one man or party, or any small group of officials. For although President Johnson and his advisers seem stubbornly committed to an imprudent and costly course of action, and although they will continue to use every available form of political leverage to avoid being confronted with their mistakes, the fault is not entirely theirs. Their misconceived policies could not have developed unchecked were it not for deeper malfunctions in our political institutions.

Bureaucratic momentum

There has been, to begin with, an administrative imbalance between our ability to take military risks and our ability to take political risks. The Department of Defense, reformed under unified civilian control, has been able to offer flexible responses to world problems. It has adopted a method of planning and budgeting that enables it to see clearly the costs, interrelations, and long-range military implications of its programs. And it engages in planning for contingencies so that it will be prepared for crises.

No comparable comprehensive effort in cost analysis, coordination, and contingency planning has been undertaken among the cluster of civilian agencies charged with economic and political elements of foreign policy. As a result, the relations between military and non-military instruments of foreign policy have often been determined by blind bureaucratic momentum, which naturally favors the better-prepared agencies. Because the Department of Defense is unified, massive and engaged in stand-by operations, while civilian agencies are fragmented and devoted to day-to-day details, American policy has a built-in tendency to drift toward military measures in time of stress.

South Vietnam provides a tragic example. America's power to wage war in that country is enormous. But we have been unable to wage peace, to formulate a political strategy that would limit the loss of life and build a basis for a negotiated settlement. American forces destroy entire villages on less hard intelligence than the Viet Cong use in assassinating a single village chief. Military contingency plans exist for invasion of North Vietnam, for bombing of Haiphong, for bombing of dikes, for counter-insurgency operations south of the Mekong River and doubtless even for use of nuclear weapons. But do similar plans exist for a confederal initiative or for any realistic settlement? Perhaps in a sub-basement of the State Department. But so long as there is no public indication of them American talk of negotiation lacks credibility. Political preparedness, like military preparedness, has to be publicized to be believed. It is meaningless for officials to talk of America's desire for peace and for a "political solution" so long as the administrative means to implement these hopes are not known to exist.

Congressional weakness

A second imbalance, between Congress and the Executive branch, has permitted bureaucratic mistakes to go unchecked. The Legislative branch faces long-term problems in adapting its procedures to the growth of executive power. In recent years it has begun laying plans for such adaptation: plans for Congressional reorganization, for improved staffing, for proper access to information and expert advice. But the Vietnamese conflict came before any innovations could be made and although it has forced many responsible legislators to revise their own roles in the making of foreign policy, it has caught Congress as a whole off guard.

Congress has neither the staffing nor the machinery to assert its prerogatives in the making of Vietnam policy. Its right to be consulted has been compromised into a right to ratify. Bureaucrats come before its inquiries in a contrived atmosphere of crisis with answers which are predetermined by carefully controlled information. Congress' right to know has been reduced to the right to be briefed. Legislators have been informed promptly of the *results* of policy in Vietnam, but no body of Congress has had continuing access to the political intelligence and strategic plans from which decisions are really made. Even Congress' right to set broad aims has been undermined by executive decisions which, although apparently "tactical," have altered the character of the war. Congress, in sum, has been unable to check the bureaucracy from without. Since significant checks are also absent from within, the pattern of Vietnam can easily be repeated: American policy can drift toward military solutions where political ones will suffice; American youth can die because its elders lack decisive civilian leadership.

Presidential style

President Johnson did not create the imbalances in our political institutions, but neither has he tried to correct them. If anything, his personal style of administration has accentuated the difficulties. His is a style of secrecy and silence. He has been willing to consider only proposals that filter noiselessly through bureaucratic channels. He is famous for rejecting out of hand programs that originate outside his administration and for cancelling plans that are leaked prematurely to the press. He has been criticized for this, and he has also been praised for relying more than any recent president on career civil servants.

But the Johnson style has more important consequences than its occasional outbursts of pique or its encouragement of career service. Its charm for the President lies in its ability to stifle effective criticism. By keeping programs secret until the moment of their release, the President gives opponents no time to prepare alternatives. He subjects legislators to a blitz of proposals that overwhelms their meager staffs. The President's practice of withdrawing nominations and programs that receive advance publicity also keeps dissidents within the administration from taking their case to the public. Since a public row means the sure rejection of a proposal, civil servants seldom dare to express their preferences outside official channels. The president's style thus excludes the public (and Congress) from bureaucratic debate and in so doing leaves the natural momentum of the bureaucracy uncorrected by external pressures. In foreign affairs this means that however many skirmishes may be won by proponents of political initiatives, the main thrust of American policy remains in the hands of the strongest agency, the Pentagon. Even if the President should reorient his Vietnam policy, his administration is unlikely to overcome its dependence on military plans and its habituation to military risks. It presents a classic example of self-entrenching bureaucracy that cannot be reformed from within.

Lessons for the GOP

If foreign policy is to change, if the serious imbalances in our institutions are to be corrected, if the lessons of Vietnam are to teach anything, a new administration must be elected. An alternative in foreign policy will have to be Republican.

Not any Republican alternative will do. A Republican administration must be committed to reducing the costs of the American undertaking in Vietnam. We have described a general approach to Vietnam that eschews escalation, that can succeed without the good will of the North Vietnamese, that keeps the cost below an acceptable upper limit, and that can lead to an honorable outcome. It remains for a new administration, undeluded and free to act, to adopt a confederal strategy.

A Republican president must also commit himself to long-range reforms in the administration of foreign policy. Future involvements should be shaped by realities abroad rather than bureaucratic inertia in Washington. Numerous analyses and proposals for administrative reform already exist. It is time to review these materials and to lay plans for a change. Here is one area in which the appointment of a Presidential Commission could be more than a publicity stunt.

A Republican Congress (or at least a Republican House) must adapt Congressional machinery to the demands of global foreign policy. Congress should consider establishing a joint committee on intelligence and strategic planning which would require the Executive Branch to report periodically on America's international position, much as the Joint Economic Committee requires it to report on budgetary policies. * * *

New departures

The need for changes in foreign policy imposes a responsibility on the Republican Party. On all fronts the Johnson Administration has failed to provide prudent, realistic leadership. Its political policies, which remain open-ended, will require many more American troops unless a hard decision is made between countering invasion and countering insurgency. Its diplomatic policies, which ignore local negotiations, have no prospect for success during the coming year. Its failure to take steps for long-term administrative reform assures that these deficiencies will persist, that American policies will drift by installments toward an ever wider, ever more senseless war. The Republican Party can provide a way out of this fiasco. It can grasp the realities of local politics in Vietnam; it can reassert the limited nature of American aims; it can reduce the costs in human life; it can bring into Government men from our universities, our professions, our business community who are better qualified to run this country's foreign policy than the self-deluded men who try to make reality out of fiction from their desks in Washington. The best men, the best minds in this country are not making American foreign policy.

The Ripon Society calls on Republicans to undertake new departures in foreign affairs. Though the issues are complex, their essentials can be brought to the people. In 1952 the Republican Party demonstrated that it could extricate America from a war on the Asian mainland. The issue now is whether the American people think our present course in Vietnam is worth more deception, more resources, more lives.

If they do not, there *is* an alternative.

SAIGON'S POOR CONTROL OVER THE RURAL POPULATION

The most important conclusions of the following tables are:

1. While the Viet Cong's control over its rural areas is almost always "total," Saigon's is usually only "partial."

2. Viet Cong cadres operate regularly among almost three-fourths of the rural population—the 25% controlled and the 47% contested.

3. The Saigon government has little positive attraction for rural areas, for it controls no more people (3.6 million) than the number who have been alienated by the Viet Cong (3.0 to 4.0 million).

4. Over one-fifth of the rural population north of the Saigon area have become refugees since 1964.

5. While the government probably relies on recent refugees for most of its controlled areas north of Saigon, one-fourth of the rural population in the Southern Lowlands traditionally has opposed the Communists.

The numbers behind these discouraging comparisons are very conservative. The "rural" population under Saigon's control is greatly exaggerated, because it includes district town (and probably also most provincial capitals) which are not really rural and which can be protected by artillery and airpower without control over their inhabitants. The anti-Communist groups are estimated by increasing past numbers with a 2.8% annual population growth, U.S. AID's official figure; but since 1960, the year of Diem's most reliable census, the population has grown even faster. The number of refugees since 1964 is underestimated, because many rural people who have fled to the cities and are now scratching out a living on their own have never been registered with the Saigon government.

TABLE I.—SAIGON'S AND THE VIETCONG'S CONTROL OVER THE POPULATION OF SOUTH VIETNAM

	Number	Percent of total population	Percent of rural population
Nonurban population:			
Saigon's control	3,618,400	21	27
Total control	489,300	3	4
Partial control	3,129,100	18	23
Contested population	6,336,700	37	47
Government leaning	4,360,600	25	32
Vietcong leaning	1,976,100	12	15
Vietcong's control	3,325,400	19	25
Partial control	402,200	2	3
Total control	2,923,200	17	22
Unclassified	152,300	1	1
Urban population	3,732,500	22	------
Totals:			
Nonurban population	13,432,800	78	100
Total population	17,165,300	100	------
Number of voters registered for the presidential election	5,853,251	69	[1] 60
Total eligible population over 18	8,500,000	------	------

[1] Percentage for rural areas registered assumes ½ of the urban population to be eligible and entirely registered.

Note: The registered total corresponds almost exactly to ½ the sum of the urban population, plus the rural areas under total and partial control and the Government leaning portion of the contested areas.

TABLE II.—RURAL GROUPS THAT SHOULD SUPPORT THE SAIGON GOVERNMENT COMPARED TO POPULATION ACTUALLY CONTROLLED

	Rural population groups			Control statistics (for comparison with rural group totals for all of South Vietnam)
	Northern half of South Vietnam (I and II corps)	Southern half of South Vietnam (III and IV corps)	All of South Vietnam	
Most secure Province (excluding Provincial capital): An Giang Province (Hoa Hao sect).	------------	440,000	440,000	489,300 (population under total control of Saigon Government).
2 fairly secure Provinces (excluding Provincial capital):				
Kien Giang Province (assumed ½ Cambodian): 22,000 farmer refugees, descendants of 1954 farmer refugees.	------------	339,000	339,000	
Ninh Thuan Province: 2,000 descendants of 1954 farmer refugees.	128,000	------------	128,000	
Traditional anti-Communist groups:				
Cambodians (170,000 already counted in Kien Giang Province)	------------	374,000– 624,000	374,000– 624,000	
Descendants of 1954, I: Farmer refugees resettled through land development program (24,000 already counted).	76,000	80,000	156,000	
Descendants of 1954, II: Farmer refugees not resettled through land development program and hence still near Saigon or now refugees in Saigon.	------------	765,000	765,000	
Southern Catholics: Descendants of Catholics living south of the 17th parallel in 1954 and outside of the main cities (33 percent of total).	89,000	140,000	229,000	
Double counting (item to be subtracted before totaling)	------------	194,000	194,000	
Saigon's natural support: Total (3 most secure provinces and other traditional anti-Communist groups).	293,000	1,944,000–2,194,000	2,237,000–2,487,000	3,618,000 (population under total or partial control of Saigon Government).
Refugees since 1964 (in refugee camps, returned to home villages, resettled elsewhere, registered and receiving limited assistance).	1,080,000	720,000	1,800,000	
Minimum additional refugees (assumes recent refugees include as many as possible traditional anti-Communists).	787,000	------------	787,000	
Maximum additional refugees (assumes same proportion of traditional anti-Communists among refugees as in general population)	1,018,000	552,000– 531,000	1,570,000–1,549,000	
Saigon's minimum potential control: Range: Group closest to Saigon Government control (traditional anti-Communists, 3 secure Provinces, 1954 refugees)	1,080,000–1,311,000	1,944,000–2,725,000	3,024,000–4,036,000	3,618,000 (population under total or partial control of Saigon Government; repeated for another comparison).
Total rural population	5,080,000	8,350,000	13,432,800	13,432,800.
Percent of Saigon's natural support as share of rural population	5.8	23.3–26.3	16.7–18.5	
Percent of refugees as share of rural population (minimum comparison, for rural base does not include both reported and unreported refugees now in cities)	21.3	8.6	13.4	
Range: Percent of group closest to Saigon Government control	21.3–25.8	23.3–32.6	22.4–29.8	27 (total and partial control of rural population claimed by Saigon Government).

SOURCES

Control Statistics: R. W. Apple, Jr., "Vietam: Signs of Stalemate," New York *Times*, August 7, 1967, p. 14.

2.8% Yearly Population Increase: U.S.A.I.D,. Vietnam, Joint Economic Division, *Annual Statistical Bulletin*, No. 9, issued September 1966, p. 2.

Provincial Population Estimates (as of July 1964) *Ibid.*, p. 5.

Listing of An Giang as Most Secure Province; Kien Giang and Ninh Thuan as Next Most Secure, Simon Head, "Pacifying Vietnam," *Far Eastern Economic Review*, May 4, 1967, p. 260.

Number of Cambodians (assumed for mid-1960 to be 300,000–500,000), Joseph Buttinger, "The Ethnic Minorities in the Republic of Vietnam, pp. 99–121 of *Problems of Freedom*, ed., by Wesley R. Fishel, M.S.U. Press, 1961, p. 120, n. 3.

Northern Refugees Resettled before July 1959; William Henderson, "Opening of New Lands and Villages," *Ibid.*, p. 136.

Farmer Refugees from North; Bui Van Long, former General Director of the Refugee Commission of the Government of Vietnam, "The Role of Friendly Nations," pp. 48–53 of *Viet-Nam: The First Five Years, An International Symposium*, ed. by Richard W. Lindholm, M.S.U. Press, 1959, p. 49.

Refugees in South Vietnam as of June 30, 1966; Government of Vietnam Special Commissariat for Refugees, reproduced in William A. Nighswonger, *Rural Pacification in Vietnam* Praeger, 1966, pp. 181.

Refugees in South Vietnam as of February 6, 1967 *Congressional Record*, February 6, 1967, S 1609.

Descendants of Catholics in South Vietnam before 1954; Francis J. Corley, "Vietnam Since Geneva" in ***Thought: Fordham University Quarterly***, Vol. XXXIII, No. 131, Winter 1958–1959; reprinted by American Friends of Vietnam, p. 523. Higher estimate is closer, for it includes the Hue vicariate, "most" of whom were south of the 17th parallel.

APPENDIX: THE HISTORICAL BASIS FOR A CONFEDERAL STRATEGY—THE THREE REGIONS OF SOUTH VIETNAM

The following appendix reviews the different political histories of the three basic regions of South Vietnam: the Coast, the Highlands, and the Southern Lowlands. The historic roots and modern survival of crucial regional differences are traced through five periods: pre-French and French (up to 1945); Viet Minh activities (1945–54); the Diem regime (1954–63); the Start of the Insurgency (1957–63); and, Recent Events and U.S. Policy. Because of their greater importance for one region, Diem and the Viet Cong are discussed most fully in the appropriate sections under the Southern Lowlands, and the Buddhists are treated in the last section on the Coast.

Any stable solution in South Vietnam other than complete Communist control will have to respond much better to local differences than is now possible. Even the Communists in the North, with much smaller minority populations, grant more cultural autonomy than the government in Saigon. It is too late simply to make informal concessions to local leaders within a centralized legal structure, because such concessions have been made and betrayed by past Saigon governments, sometimes with American assistance.

Our purpose is not to discredit the desire for centralized unity held by many urban Vietnamese nor to recriminate against American officials who often had to make decisions within incorrect policy assumptions. It is necessary, however, for anyone who wants to avoid the refugee camp "solution" to appreciate the views of the different rural areas, cut off from Saigon and from each other. It is also necessary to realize that past mistakes in American policy cannot be dismissed by well-informed Vietnamese as simply unfortunate decisions by a previous rotation of Americans, because, unlike the French, the American government has great power to change reality to fit its myths.

The United States has great moral responsibilities for South Vietnam's present difficulties, not only for millions of refugees and for military officers and civilian officials with poor prospects under a Communist regime. The United States has steadily supported, in the name of "freedom" for South Vietnam, a great degree of centralization and has ignored political repression. Americans would never accept these actions at home. South Vietnam's fragmented urban political groups and confused countryside are partly the result of thirteen years of independence without reform under Saigon governments able to rely on American aid instead of taxes. Americans should hesitate before being patronizing about South Vietnam's lack of democracy.

A Vietnamese businessman summed it up to an American reporter last month: "You Americans think we are stupid and backward people, but we are progressive, and we will not be given a chance in this election." He had half a chance, and 65% of the country took it to show that they did not like the generals. But, because of military pressure on the Constituent Assembly last summer the South Vietnamese did not have a chance to vote in a run-off between the generals and their closest civilian rivals. Now our government is touting the generals as the first ticket in a "fair" election, but American officials will not mention at home that the generals did not dare enter a run-off. And neither will they mention that the generals, with the encouragement of American policy, are ignoring the persistent regional differences of South Vietnam.

THE HIGHLAND: PRE-FRENCH TRADITION AND FRENCH RULE

The Highlands—comprising well over half of the territory and within an hour's drive of most of the rest of South Vietnam—have always been unattractive to lowland Vietnamese. Malaria, infertile soil, tigers, and hostile tribesmen kept out Vietnamese settlements during a thousand years of Vietnamese migration in adjacent areas.

The tribesmen living in the Highlands are of at least two races, speak many languages, live in settlements of only a few thousand, and have no generally recognized political institutions or tradition of common action. But the tribesmen have one thing in common—fear and hatred of the lowlanders, first of the Cham who drove them from the fertile lowlands into the malarial hills and then of the Vietnamese who kept them there and who sometimes tried to impose upon them the Vietnamese way of life.

Another thing most tribesmen have in common is a slash-and-burn technique of rice growing. Most land is left to weeds, small brush, and trees. Every few years an area is cleared, burned over, and cultivated until the soil's temporary fertility is exhausted. The slash-and-burn technique imposes a low population density and small, scattered settlements on the tribes because most of the land is left to grow wild.

The French did not rule the Highlands with consistent policies. Sometimes they used tribesmen as local administrators, sometimes Frenchmen, and sometimes the hated Vietnamese. The French started schools, invented scripts for tribal languages, and established some modern medical facilities. At the same time, the French brought new products to the lowlands which replaced the cash crops of the tribesmen, reducing their ability to support themselves. The French also impressed tribesmen to work on roads and plantations.

Although the French record in the Highlands was certainly a dubious one—and provoked widespread tribal revolts in the 1930's—the tribesmen south of the 17th parallel can compare them favorably to the last Vietnamese dynasty and to the Diem regime, both of which seized tribal lands, established Vietnamese settlements in the Highlands, and tried to impose Vietnamese customs on the tribesmen.

THE HIGHLANDS: VIET MINH ACTIVITIES

The Viet Minh success was based on an unprecedented adjustment by lowland Vietnamese to the Highland environment and to tribal customs. The anti-malarial pill, which the Viet Minh secretly purchased in large quantities from French merchants, was generally regarded within the Viet Minh as the greatest physical factor (aside from captured weapons and ammunition) behind their success. Viet Minh cadres who worked among the tribes learned their languages, adopted their dress (even breaking their front teeth if local custom demanded), and married tribal women. Able tribesmen were given leadership posts within the Viet Minh, and the most loyal tribe (the Tho) was even represented by a Brigadier General.

Unlike earlier rebels against the French, the Viet Minh were able to use the Highlands for base camps and rest areas and to recruit tribesmen for coolies and soldiers. In the North, the Viet Minh had already advanced into Laos when the French decided to fortify Dien Bien Phu in a vain effort to keep the loyalty of the Tai tribes and to defend Laos (whose French-supported government was the only one in Indochina satisfied with its limited degree of independence) against further invasions.

South of the 17th parallel, the Viet Minh effort came later but with as much success. By 1954, the Viet Minh had infiltrated the Highlands, opened the Ho Chi Minh Trail, defeated the elite French Groupe Mobile 100, and gained a position to cut through to the sea coast if the French refused a cease-fire after Dien Bien Phu. In the post-Geneva regroupment, some 25,000 tribesmen left the area south of the 17th parallel—over twice as many proportionally as the number of lowland regroupees to the North.

THE HIGHLANDS: DIEM AND EARLY U.S. POLICY

Diem was the first lowland Vietnamese ever to rule the Highlands directly, and his policies basically reflected lowland contempt of the tribesmen. He regarded tribal lands as the public domain and granted the choicest valleys to ethnic Vietnamese in order to facilitate direct Vietnamese physical control over the Highlands, to settle refugees from the North, and to relieve population pressure along the crowded Coast. Diem abolished the customary tribal courts established by the French and made Vietnamese the language of instruction in the schools.

Many of Diem's important American supporters approved of his approach to the tribesmen. An Associate Executive Director of the Council on Foreign Relations and one of the Council's Far Eastern specialists dismissed other approaches (presumably the autonomous zones of the French and of North Vietnam) as "reservations." Under Diem, the tribes were to be "made more subject to civil administration" and "ultimately assimilated" into "the surrounding civilization." Another early supporter, the Chairman of the Executive Committee of the American Friends of Vietnam, wrote:

"The tribesmen, unused to Vietnamese friendliness, grew more suspicious with every official assurance of concern; the more they were told that the government would at last do something to remove the causes of their plight, the more opposed they seemed to every new administrative measure." *

Not surprisingly, Diem's policies provoked a widespread revolt in the Highlands. In the revolt were the two tribes which the French had given important administrative posts and hence contacts beyond their villages. The leader, Y Bham, a Rhade tribesman, is now the leader of FULRO, the leading tribal organization.

Early American policy in the Highlands was different from, but no better than Diem's. The French disbanded their commando force, the GMCA, and the American Military Mission did not pick up French contacts for commando or intelligence operations. When two members of the Michigan State Advisory Group in Vietnam returned from field trips with reports of tribesmen cadres from North Vietnam organizing groups in the Highlands, the U.S. Mission ignored them. When even Diem himself, in a visit to Washington described below, warned of infiltration in the Highlands and asked for American aid to counter it he was refused. When the American Mission eventually opposed Diem's project for resettling ethnic Vietnamese in the Highlands, the reason given was the infertility of the soil in the strategic places Diem chose, not the hostility such settlements were arousing among the tribes.

---

* The latter and probably also the former later changed their views on Diem. These passages are not cited to reflect discredit on these men, but to illustrate the general approval given by Americans to even Diem's cultural imperialism. (Pages 125 and 105 of Problems of Freedom, edited by Wesley R. Fishel, Michigan State University Press, 1961.)

Diem had taken office without a clear idea of the Viet Minh path to victory, but by 1957, when the infiltration began from the North, he was very sensitive to the unprecedented danger posed by enemy control of the Highlands. In addition to intensifying his unfortunate cultural imperialism, Diem wanted to build access roads through the Highlands and to turn his Civil Guard into a paramilitary force to combat the infiltration by North Vietnam. In Saigon, the American Embassy and the U.S. Mission preferred more conspicuous roads, between the cities. U.S. officials in Saigon also opposed giving military training to the Civil Guard because it was grouped in Diem's Interior Department instead of Defense! When Diem made a special State Visit to Washington to ask for bulldozers for the roads and for financial and training support for a paramilitary force, he was again refused.

THE HIGHLANDS: START OF THE INSURGENCY

In 1957, just as Diem's repressive policies were taking effect, tribesmen who had gone north in 1954 and who had been trained as cadres in Hanoi began returning and starting cells in their home villages. Since the Viet Minh had earlier taken over the area from the French and since Diem had a much worse record among the tribes (around Kontum, Communist propaganda even promised to bring back a popular French administrator once the South Vietnamese were driven from the Highlands), the newly trained cadres moved easily through the Highlands.

The Communist propaganda emphasized the autonomous zones (on the Soviet and Communist Chinese models) recently created for the tribes in North Vietnam. In the North, tribesmen were given administrative posts within their areas, the Tho general cited earlier was made chairman of his zone, tribal languages were kept in the schools, tribesmen were given higher education in Hanoi and elsewhere in the Communist bloc, and there was no land-grabbing by ethnic Vietnamese, although population pressure was much greater in the North than along Diem's Coast. Supporting the cadres were radio programs in tribal languages broadcast from Hanoi, while Diem's government had discontinued such broadcasts after the regroupment period, 1954-1955.

THE HIGHLANDS: RECENT EVENTS AND U.S. POLICY

A crucial recent development has been the disillusionment of the tribesmen with the Viet Cong. Harsh taxation and impressment of coolies for increased Viet Cong operations over the past few years have destroyed the advantage the Viet Cong once had in the region. While taxes and recruitment have always been great burdens on Viet Minh and Viet Cong hard-core villages, the Communists have generally used political techniques which prevent effective opposition. Short-sighted exactions in the Highlands may have been undertaken consciously, in the hope that victory over all of South Vietnam would come too swiftly for the tribesmen to resist.

Unfortunately, the post-Diem Saigon governments have not moved strongly enough in the Highlands to make up for Diem's mistakes. The first steps have been taken, and many good promises have been made. In February 1964, Y Bham, the leader of the 1958 revolt, was released from jail; in March a Bureau of Montagnard Affairs was established. In October 1964, the Saigon government held a conference for tribal leaders to present their grievances. The tribesmen now have national representation, access to universities through lower admissions test scores than are required of the better-educated Vietnamese, places in noncommissioned officers' schools, a greater hand in local administration, and a promise of a fair system of land titles.

Yet the confidence of the tribesmen has not yet been gained. The conference of October 1964 was held only after a revolt in September, and that revolt was caused by the assumption of command over tribal military units by ethnic Vietnamese ARVN officers. There have been two revolts since, in October and December 1965. The latter revolt was well-organized, being staged simultaneously in five of the seven provincial capitals. Armed tribesmen serving under Vietnamese officers have expressed the intent to throw out the South Vietnamese by force when the Viet Cong are defeated.

A tribal revolt this fall?

This fall there may be still yet another revolt in the Highlands. When the Constituent Assembly was writing the present South Vietnamese Constitution, the tribesmen demanded explicit guarantees of autonomy. The Assembly, largely composed of urban Vietnamese, refused to include such guarantees, though they wrote a long and detailed document with over one hundred articles. A tribal revolt was averted this spring only by promises from Saigon and American officials that similar guarantees of autonomy will be passed by statute when the new House and Senate convene this fall. If the newly elected legislators refuse to honor promises made by the military government and U.S. officials (quite possible for civilian politicians who hate the military government and who fear permanent American domination), then another tribal revolt seems likely. It is important to note that the previous revolts have occurred in the fall, when the rainy season hampers the transport of Vietnamese and American troops into the Highlands.

Y Bham, now living in Cambodia, heads the only tribal political group (FULRO) and claims to have organized the three revolts of 1964–65. In their negotiations with FULRO representatives, the Saigon government and the U.S. Mission have recognized FULRO leadership of past revolts and taken seriously FULRO threats of revolts in the future. FULRO and the Cambodian government have agreed on a common propaganda line, that all the Montagnards of South Vietnam are of the same racial stock as the Cambodians in South Vietnam and Cambodia. While based on false history (at least two racial groups live in the Highlands), FULRO-Cambodian cooperation corresponds to joint self-interest. FULRO gains a safe headquarters on the Cambodian side of the border and access to the outside world. Cambodia gains contacts in the strategic Highlands of South Vietnam which may help less populous Cambodia to restrain any future expansionist ethnic Vietnamese government in Saigon, whether Communist or not.

The United States has always been in a difficult position in the Highlands. In 1961, the sending of the Special Forces (similar to the previously disbanded French commandos) was an implicit repudiation of Diem's tribal policies and aroused Vietnamese suspicions. In 1964, after Diem's fall, the Special Forces were transferred from the CIA to the U.S. Army. Vietnamese ARVN officers replaced Americans commanding tribal units and American officers became "advisers," as in the Lowlands. In the revolt and negotiations that have followed this shift, Americans have played a crucial role in mediating between the tribes and the ARVN. (The only Vietnamese officer the tribes respected in 1964 was jailed as a "neuralist.") But the unremitting hostility between most Vietnamese and the tribesmen (and Cambodians) and repeated decisions by the U.S. Mission in Saigon in favor of the Vietnamese will eventually undermine the prestige of Americans on the spot. The U.S. cannot expect to keep tribal loyalties by giving out medical care and T-shirts emblazoned with the South Vietnamese flag, because the Saigon government is not yet trusted. The only stable solution is a full recognition of tribal autonomy by urban Vietnamese. The U.S. cannot simultaneously mollify the tribes by implying a long American presence and placate the Vietnamese by promising to leave as soon as Hanoi negotiates. Tribal minorities are a general post-colonial problem, for most anti-colonial revolutions were led by well-educated lowlanders insisting that a highly centralized unity was the only way to eliminate foreign domination. In South Vietnam, the U.S. must show that this is not true.

THE COAST: PRE-FRENCH TRADITION AND FRENCH RULE

Coastal Vietnam differs from the Southern Lowlands in several important respects: it has a longer pre-French history; more extensive pre-French social cohesion, smaller change under French colonial rule; and, most important, a far longer history of Communist influence. Because he is more traditional, is less Westernized, and probably has Communist relatives, even the most anti-Communist Coastal Vietnamese is more difficult for Americans to understand than a Vietnamese from Saigon or the Mekong Delta.

The Coastal Region of South Vietnam extends down through the present I Corps, the northernmost military region. But south of the next province, Binh Dinh, the land narrows even further and is disrupted by sand dunes. Many villages (Phu Yen, Khanh Hoa) depend upon fishing instead of upon rice-farming. Still farther south, there is a half-settled area (Ninh Thuan, Binh Thuan) which was once fully cultivated by the Cham people but which the Vietnamese did not maintain or revive.

Vietnam's traditional civilization began in the Red River Delta in North Vietnam. Because the Coastal Lowlands are too narrow to attract quick settlement, the Vietnamese moved down the coast only quite slowly, less than a thousand miles in about a thousand years. Their migration, spurred by internal political disputes and population pressure, was necessarily southward; movement was blocked to the North by the stronger Chinese and to the West by the even less hospitable mountains.

Poor communications made a centralized state impossible, but migration was slow enough that the same structure of village life existed all the way down the Coast when the French arrived in the mid-1800's. These villages were the basis of Vietnamese tradition. Much of the land, averaging 25% and sometimes as much as 70%, was redistributed every few years among the households. Except for trade with neighboring villages specializing in certain handicrafts, the rice-growing villages were self-sufficient communities, independent of outside influence. Anyone from beyond the ring of immediately surrounding villages was regarded as a "foreigner." Except for levying taxes and occasionally recruiting troops, the power of the Emperor stopped at the village gate.

In the traditional village the mandarin class provided the best tie to the outside world. Most mandarins lived in the villages, renting land, lending money, and serving on the village Councils of Notables. Some obtained, through examination or purchase, appointments from the Emperor to provincial and district posts.

Fortunately, the Emperor was not a dictator in the modern sense. Though the Confucian ethic supported his powers over the mandarins in theory, the Emperor was restrained by the mandarins' partial independence of their salaries provided by their rents, interest, and bribes and by the general expectation of all office-purchasers that they would not be removed until they had gained a fair return on their investment. The power of the mandarins over the villagers was restricted by several factors: the large proportion of communal land; the lack of absentee landowners; a consciousness of extended families, all of whose members, rich and poor, worshipped the same ancestors; and a tradition of compromise and adjustment in interpersonal relations.

Even before the arrival of French officials, this village tradition was challenged by Catholic missionaries in the North and along much of the Coast. The Buddhists had not established a centralized hierarchy extending down into the villages that could compete with the influence of the mandarin class. The Catholics not only set up such a hierarchy, they also developed a village daily routine—mass every morning and regular prayers in the fields at the ringing of the Angelus—which defied the tradition of compromise and forced villages to convert as whole units. Catholic villages were persecuted regularly by their neighbors, often with the encouragement of the Emperor, for their competing hierarchy and foreign way of life.

But despite the Catholic problem, when French officials arrived in the late 1800's, they found a relatively stable social and political system,which they chose to preserve along the Coast. Unlike the Southern Lowlands, the Highlands, and the Red River Delta, the Coast had no minerals or lands appropriate for rice or rubber plantations whose exploitation would require and pay for direct French rule. The French therefore gave the Vietnamese in Hue nominal authority, maintained a small French staff for the Coast, and controlled the Emperor through the Resident, ostensibly just an "adviser." The French even preserved the traditional civil service examination based on the Confucian Classics until 1917, twelve years after the Chinese themselves had abandoned them.

While they had lost some power, Coastal mandarins, unlike those of the North and South, were not closely tied to French officials and businessmen. The French presence along the Coast did not bring great economic changes or disrupt traditional village life. Therefore, Coastal Vietnamese of all social classes, no matter how well they spoke the French language, always regarded the French presence as an insulting, alien intrusion which would eventually be expelled.

THE COAST: VIET MINH ACTIVITIES

From the outset of the anti-French revolt, the Viet Minh controlled most of the Coastal region. The situation was so severe for the French that they did not even attempt population estimates for most of the Coastal provinces—indispensable for taxation and recruitment. These estimates were made even for hostile provinces to the North and South.

Viet Minh influence along the Coast was assisted by the fact that the only political groups active in the region were those the Viet Minh were already defeating in the Red River Delta through better organization, superior tactics and assassination of crucial leaders.

With the exception of the Catholic Bishoprics, and the Emperor Bao Dai, political groups could be started only in exile in China, Hong Kong, and Japan. When Northern and Coastal students conspired in exile for unity, their rivalries were not so much regional as personal or ideological, except to the extent of excluding Southerners, whom the French were more confident of controlling and who therefore were allowed some political activity. When the Communists were able to limit the power of rival exile groups in the North, the power of anti-Communist groups was simultaneously limited along the Coast.

By 1949, according to Lucien Boddard's insurgency map, the Viet Minh controlled all of the Coast north of Dong Hoi, a city just north of the 17th parallel. The French then had a thin strip of four cities down to the 16th parallel: Dong Noi, Quang Tri, Hue, and Danang.

Farther south, the Viet Minh controlled between the 16th and 14th parallels in 1949. During the next four years, according to the May 1953 insurgency map of the French General Henri Navarre, the Viet Minh extended their control down to the 11th parallel, around Phan Thiet. Only two isolated French controlled cities in this area, Nha Trang and Phan Rang, were outside of Viet Minh control in this period. Bernard Fall's insurgency maps for 1954 (the first presumably for January or February, published in March; the second for July) credit the French with regaining control of the countryside between Phan Rang and Phan Thiet, but Fall still conceded the Viet Minh control of the Coast between the 16th and 12th parallels when the war ended. Yet these estimates are clearly biased against the Viet Minh. They include French urban enclaves, but omit at least one prominent rural enclave controlled by the Viet Minh—the famous "Street Without Joy," a strip of villages between Quang Tri and Hue.

Fall revealed the extent of Navarre's bias against acknowledging Viet Minh control in the Red River Delta. The French military map conceded only five small, isolated areas to the Viet Minh in May 1953. On the other hand, the map of the French civilian officials who had to estimate probable tax returns and decide to travel without military escorts was quite different from Navarre's. According to the civilians, France controlled only four isolated areas: the Hanoi-Haiphong area (where many French troops were stationed) and the Catholic Bishoprics of Phat Diem and Bui Chu, where an anti-French Vietnamese clergy, not Frenchmen, enjoyed the support of the populace.

Along the Coast, in 1954 it was not even Frenchmen who were in charge of the non-Viet Minh enclaves. The decisive political figures under Emperor Bao Dai, the French "alternative" to Ho Chi Minh, were Coastal mandarins and adventurers. By the end of the war, these men had finally bargained from the French the financial support for a "Vietnamese" army, predominantly led by French officers. During the Battle of Dien Bien Phu, Bao Dai's followers were even able to obtain a major separate operation along the Coast with troops that might have been better used in the undermanned French fortress to the North.

After the settlement in Geneva just as the French were allowed to occupy Hanoi and Haiphong for 300 days to regroup their forces, the Viet Minh received full legal authority over Quang Ngai and Binh Dinh, a longtime Coastal stronghold between the 16th and 14th parallels. In the two provinces, the Viet Minh established a long-term political base by ordering several hundred of their regular soldiers to marry local girls and leave them behind when they were withdrawn to the North in accord with the Geneva agreements.

In most provinces, the Viet Minh ordered specific members to stay behind, and in many areas, they maintained an intelligence network. The Hanoi government itself produced convincing evidence for such a network when it described in detail to the International Control Commission reprisals by the Diem government in South Vietnam against former members of the Viet Minh between July 1954 and July 1957. According to Bernard Fall's map of Communist Complaints, this intelligence network was especially active in the Quang Tri-Hue-Danang area, which produced over one-third of the descriptions of reprisals.

THE COAST: DIEM FAMILY'S RULE

Diem's family, the Ngo Dinh's, was a leading Catholic mandarin clan centered on Hue. Diem and his older brother Khoi served as provincial governors under French indirect rule in Binh Dinh and Quang Tri Provinces, both along the Coast. When Diem took power in Saigon, his authority along the Coast was exercised by two men whose names did not appear in official government documents: his brothers Thuc and Can. (Diem himself is therefore discussed later, under the Southern Lowlands.)

Thuc played a crucial role in the family and in the regime because he was the eldest surviving brother in the clan (Khoi was buried alive by the Viet Minh) and the leading Vietnamese Catholic prelate. He frequently mediated among the other brothers, especially at the clan's annual meetings in Hue. Thuc also provided a discreet channel between the clan and important foreign Catholics. (He was a former classmate of Francis Cardinal Spellman in the Vatican.) Thuc also provided access to the regime for prominent Vietnamese, many of them non-Catholic, who had complaints or suggestions but who feared Diem and his brother Nhu too much to approach them directly. This mediating role for non-Catholic Vietnamese was crucial for Thuc, because it protected him from criticism against his ideological role in the regime.

The ideology of the regime was "Personalism," an intellectually respectable doctrine originally developed by liberal Catholics in the 1930's. Many non-Catholic Vietnamese, however, regarded it as simply a new political terminology which the Ngo Dinh family could use to communicate with Vietnamese Catholics without encouraging comparisons to the Catholic role under the French. Thuc had started an institute to train people in Personalism during the war against the French, when he was Bishop of Vinh Long. About the time Diem took power, Thuc was elevated to the Archbishopric of Hue. He moved his institute to Dalat and (with Cardinal Spellman's financial assistance) he simultaneously founded the Catholic University of Dalat. Under Diem, Thuc's institute for Personalism was the training school for members of the Can Lao, a secret political group whose members held administrative posts in the provinces and who reported directly to Diem's brother Nhu on the behavior of non-Can Lao (hence mostly non-Catholic) officials.

Diem's brother Can was a complete contrast to the rest of the clan. He did not speak a foreign language and hence had almost no contact with foreigners. Nor did he have much contact with Vietnamese, rarely appearing in public and usually speaking only to his own followers. He ran a skeleton network of secret agents for Diem to watch Nhu and his supporters in the South, predominantly refugee Catholics from the North. Otherwise, Can confined his activities to the Coast. He was a traditional, consistent warlord in the region, promoting his supporters and punishing his opponents with political prisons and tortures that eventually shocked even old Asia hands; he controlled nominations to the National Assembly and provincial and district appointments. After 1956, when Diem abolished traditional Vietnamese village elections, Can replaced doubtful village and hamlet officials as well. Before the elections of March 1956, Can had almost fifteen thousand people arrested, a far larger number than any estimate of Viet Minh agents left south of the 17th parallel and an average of three people per hamlet.

In Western terms, both Thuc and Can were "corrupt." They exploited their public influence to assist their operations in Saigon real estate, forest concessions in the Highlands, and the shipping business. But their system of rule was inherently more stable than that of Diem and Nhu in the Southern Lowlands. Can was predicable in his repressions, so people who never spoke against him in private did not feel threatened; Thuc provided access and an incentive for respected non-Personalists to remain discreet. Both brothers maintained loyal followings through careful promotions.

THE COAST: START OF THE INSURGENCY

The present Viet Cong strength along the Coast is the natural result of the past twenty years. The Viet Minh controlled most of the rural areas against the French and eliminated their nationalist rivals in the region.

When almost all of the Viet Minh had gone north in 1954–55, Ngo Dinh Can imposed a repressive rule mostly through Catholics which, like that of the earlier French, prevented all political activity along the Coast except for secret activity. As under the French, exile groups formed (in Paris instead of South China), but no new indigenous organizations could be started.

People hostile to Can had few alternatives. They could remain silent and do nothing, although this was impossible under Vietnamese custom for anyone with a friend or relative imprisoned or tortured. If they were rich enough, they could go to Paris. Anyone who stayed and wanted to resist had to join the Viet Cong, the successor to the Viet Minh and the only organization with the clandestine techniques sufficient to survive Can's secret police.

The Viet Cong were therefore able to regain the position held by the Viet Minh along the Coast without nearly as many demonstrations and assassinations as in the Southern Lowlands. In the first period of Viet Cong violence tabulated by Bernard Fall, April 1957 to April 1958, there were only two assassination along the Coast, compared with more than fifty to the south. When Fall made his second analysis, April 1959 to April 1960, he did not even survey most of the Coast. Douglas Pike's list of "struggle movements" publicized by the Viet Cong between December 1960 (founding of NLF) and September 1964 credits (aside from eleven places whose region cannot be identified) only sixteen movements to specific places along the Coast and one hundred seven to places in the Southern Lowlands.

At the same time, in the years after 1956, surviving Viet Minh agents along the Coast were supplemented by the return of Viet Minh members who had gone north for further training in 1954. While the word "insurgency" is used here to describe the Viet Cong, it is not meant to imply a spontaneous rebellion. The tragedy of South Vietnam, especially along the Coast, is that the only form of resistance available on the spot was a Communist movement already repudiated, at least implicitly, by the urban elite that had not already joined the Viet Minh. This tragedy was the responsibility of Ngo Dinh Can along the Coast. The role of North Vietnam was clear: retaining an intelligence network after the partition of 1954, supplementing that network with well-trained local men who had been picked to go north in 1954; and, supplying the Viet Cong with limited arms and ammunition, in addition to those captured and secretly manufactured. Though not "aggression" in a conventional military sense, these acts were unequivocally aggressive.

When Can realized the growing Viet Cong strength in his region, he responded, not by shelling and relocating villages as Diem and Nhu did to the south, but by training cadres to live with the villagers as the Viet Cong do. Can's cadres minimized the level of violence by firing only at individuals only when fired upon, and they kept the struggles on a political basis which did not force the villagers to choose sides. Can's cadres, some of whom were even being trained for the Mekong Delta when Diem fell, were the direct antecedent of the present "Revolutionary Development" cadres now gaining much attention.

THE COAST: RECENT EVENTS AND U.S. POLICY

Only an extraordinary group of men could have organized a new political group without succumbing to the secret agents of Can and the Viet Cong. Fortunately for Vietnam, such men appeared, inspiring millions of Vietnamese along the Coast and in Saigon. They were the militant Buddhists, based in the imperial city of Hue. While their successes were wholly unexpected, they were not without their weaknesses, the simple products of their past.

In addition to arousing Vietnamese and foreigners to the hopelessness of the Diem regime and bringing down several post-Diem governments, the militant Buddhists negotiated two coalitions which promised them dominant influence around Hue and some national representation in Saigon. The first coalition was suppressed by force, the second was betrayed by Ky. Both the suppression and the betrayal had U.S. support. The refusal of other non-Communist Vietnamese and of American policy-makers to develop a coalition with these men was a mistake which may have been irrevocable.

The militant Buddists' leader, Thich ("Reverend") Tri Quang, is completely different from the urban Vietnamese politicians and ARVN officers Americans prefer to deal with. He lacks both a manadarin education and foreign contacts, both of which are now in disrepute along the traditionalist Coast. Originally respected for his knowledge of Buddhist scripture and self-denying ascetism, Thich Tri Quang has been out of Vietnam only once, for a short visit to Japan. His sudden popularity was both a reflection of his intense, inflammatory speaking style and a repudiation of first the Diem regime and then successive Saigon governments as hopeless alternatives to the Viet Cong along the Coast.

The first political effort of the Buddhists was against the Diem regime, beginning publicly in May 1963 with an incident at the Buddha's birthday celebration. According to Ngo Dinh Nhu, Tri Quang had actually started the movement in Hue in 1961 by tricking Ngro Dinh Can into paying subsidies for an inner group to prevent Communist infiltration of the Buddhist organization around Hue. Even if he did plan extensively in advance, Tri Quang was by no means in a position to overthrow Can when at the celebration his police prevented the normal flying of the Buddhist flag without the simultaneous display of the South Vietnamese flag. After several celebrators were killed, the Buddhist leadership tried to prolong the ensuing tension. When Diem met their demands for assistance to the victims' survivors, they insisted that the aid be described as "compensation," thus trying to force an implict admission of police guilt.

Two great strokes of luck turned the Buddhist leadership from a conspiracy seeking a cause into a factor in world politics. On June 11, when the Buddhist leadership was straining to keep resentment alive, an old monk burned himself to death in Saigon. While the Buddhist tradition respects such suicides, nothing like it had ever been done before in Vietnam. Instead of gaining simply a mild boost, the Buddhists found a transformed population. In Saigon the popular response was extended by memorial services and the display of a heart, said to have survived the monk's immolation and a final cremation. As a Saigon official told a Time reporter, "We have been living under a regime of terrorism, but after Quang Duc [the immolated monk] I no longer feel fear."

The second event occurred in August, when Nhu sent the police into the pagoda used as the Buddhists' Saigon headquarters. The United States had already urged Diem to mollify the Buddhists, and in other Buddhist countries Asians were blaming the Catholic President Kennedy for the supposed repressions of Buddhism by the Catholic President Diem. After the pagoda raid, President Kennedy hinted that Nhu's overthrow was necessary and made his famous remark "they [the Vietnamese] have to win it." The coup that followed two months later was the result of complex military intrigues and complicity by United States officials. Though the Buddhist leaders did not play a direct role in the coup itself, they emerged from Diem's fall with immense prestige throughout all of South Vietnam, far beyond the reach of their small organization.

Factionalism after Diem

Unfortunately, in 1964–65 the Buddhists lost much of their general popularity and, after an initial effort at unity, the militant Buddhists from Hue split from the Saigon groups, composed of refugees from the North and unorganized Southerners. The Buddhist loss of popularity and internal division occurred during the post-Diem "decompression" period of fierce factional infighting in Saigon. With almost fifty thousand political prisoners freed from the jails, a generation of exiles returning from abroad, and an internally divided army suddenly freed from Diem's security agents, too many people wanted to rule South Vietnam. Since the civilian politicians had no organizations, their powers for good or ill, were confined to teahouse intrigues, to deciding which group of civilians would provide external respectability and internal political skills for the rulers of the day in the army. Shifts within the army caused most of the ten changes of government in nineteen months, but most of the troop movements were swift and bloodless.

Since the Buddhists were the only group able to summon mass support, their factional efforts were the most conspicuous and the bloodiest. Their mass support frightened Vietnamese Catholics and urban politicians. It seems probable from later events that U.S. officials in Saigon and Washington gave up forever on the Hue Buddhists in this period. Since then, when they have acted constructively within the implicit rules of the political system, the United States has given Ky and the Saigon politicians full approval to repress the Hue Buddhists by military force and to change the rules against them. When the Hue Buddhists have been powerful within their region, U.S. officials have publicly criticized them; when the Hue Buddhists have tried to resist being double-crossed, U.S. officials have called for "unity" and for letting "the Vietnamese" decide the matter "by themselves."

At first all Buddhist leaders, not just the ones from Hue, frightened the Catholic groups. The Diem regime, it must be remembered, had not persecuted Buddhists for their religion. Buddhism did not have a hierarchy or a doctrinal unity transferable to political affairs which could have been persecuted even if Diem had so wished. Diem went so far as to dedicate all of South Vietnam to the Immaculate Heart of Mary in 1959, but neither religious persecution nor forcible conversion were attempted.

In politics, the Diem regime had simply favored Catholics and other Can Lao members and then imprisoned and tortured its opponents. These opponents differed in many respects, but by the process of elimination they were almost all Buddhists. In 1964, many Buddhists leaders tried to whip up an anti-Catholic sentiment as a means of strengthening their own position with the vast non-Catholic majority.

At the same time, all Buddhist leaders were agreed that only an ideology based on Buddhism could save Vietnam from Communism, that an empty anti-Communism led by Catholics could not win in the villages. Immediately after Diem's fall, the Buddhist leaders planned a national Buddhist organization parallel to the South Vietnamese government and reaching down into the villages, as exists in Thailand and Cambodia. Thich Tri Quang became the symbolic leader of the new organization, corresponding to the head of state. Thich Tam Chau, a milder refugee from the North who had led Buddhists against the Viet Minh in the autonomous Catholic Bishopric of Phat Diem, was made premier and placed over a cabinet of ministers. At the same time, many Buddhist monks were made chaplains to ARVN units.

Naturally, Vietnamese Catholic leaders were opposed to the Buddhists riding to power on a wave of anti-Catholic feeling and then assuming exactly the same political role the Catholics had enjoyed first under the French and then under Diem. Since the native Southern Catholics were a disproportionately large portion of the urban middle class and since most of the Northern Catholic refugees remained in the Saigon area, Catholic leaders were also able to produce favorable demonstrations in Saigon.

At the same time, most Can Lao members were able to regain posts in the bureaucracy. Although they were removed from their provincial and district posts in late 1963, not enough others had the training and experience to compete with them, and after several months of confusion, most former Diem officials were simply assigned to different posts. Since the training of Buddhist monks concentrates entirely on scripture and omits both mandarin and foreign education, the Buddhist leaders could do no more than obtain a temporary preference for non-Can Lao officials. Though temporarily embarrassed and weakened, a Diemist recovery was inevitable after the fall of Diem himself.

Just as frightened of the Buddhists as the Catholics were the traditional urban politicians who had no organization, no mass following in the cities, and no tie to the countryside (except sometimes the dubious one of absentee landownership). Since they could not quickly make up for lost time, their only hope for power was for the military to eliminate the Buddhists as a national factor. Then civilian rule would mean rule by old men who had been jailed by Diem instead of by monks and students who had demonstrated against him.

Neutralization under Tri Quang?

A tragic element to the Buddhist defeat was their emphasis on being the only group who could gain a sufficient mass following in the villages to deal with the Viet Cong. Especially along the Coast, where people had never had an open alternative to the Communists and the mandarins, the appeal of a negotiated settlement, a coalition government, and neutralization of South Vietnam was very powerful. Although Thich Tam Chau was more cautious about the Viet Cong (as befitted a leader of Northern refugees, whatever the merits of the case), Thich Tri Quang cultivated an air of mystery, encouraging Vietnamese to feel that given sufficient power he could bring a stable settlement. Although this behavior is universal among politicians, the more Thich Tri Quang pursued this line with non-Catholic Vietnamese, the more Americans mistrusted him.

In Saigon, Vietnamese fearful of Tri Quang's domestic appeal quickly found that the best way to oppose him at the U.S. Mission was to exploit his claim to be able to bargain with the Viet Cong. Refugee leaders from the North used their Communist relatives and old friends as proof of a painful break, of an abiding feud with the Communists. The Northern ties of the Hue Buddhists, however, provided innuendos of Communist influence. (Of course the Americans given these innuendos never were told that Tri Quang's mother and elder brother died in a Communist prison camp in the North after partition.) Even Tri Quang's mass support from city people and from villagers who were trucked in for demonstrations was used as evidence of Viet Cong influence! It was permissible for the Viet Cong not to stop villagers from benefiting from U.S. medical teams, but when the Viet Cong did not stop villagers who wanted to demonstrate for Vietnam's first non-Communist charismatic leader, then Americans in Saigon and Washington became suspicious.

Not surprisingly, the Buddhists' most ambitious plans for separate organizations failed. Tam Chau, the Northerner who was supposed to head the hierarchy, lost interest. After he received no cabinet appointments and Tri Quang got three, Tam Chau tried to regain his power by allying with Northern Catholic leaders instead of working within the Buddhist coalition. Along the Coast, the Hue Buddhists tried to strengthen their organization with "People's Councils for National Salvation," but when their student leaders led demonstrations in the cities (which the Viet Cong had never been able to do), more experienced Viet Cong cadres took the crowds away from them and discredited the movement (a hostile action which was often regarded as roof of cooperation).

The I Corps coalition: Tri Quang and General Thi

By early 1966, the Hue Buddhists had turned their attention to another coalition, with ARVN officers and civilian officials in the I Corps, the military region comprising the five Coastal provinces around Hue. The ARVN commander was Lieutenant General Nguyen Chanh Thi. He was a native of Hue and the only important ARVN general born of a peasant family. He led the first coup attempt against Diem, in November 1960, with elite paratrooper units who were disgusted with Diem's inability to contend with the Viet Cong's first massive wave of terror. After Diem's fall, General Thi took command of the I Corps, his home area.

The I Corps coalition also included one of South Vietnam's two civilian province chiefs, an able, former exile civilian as Mayor of Danang, officials and professors at the University of Hue, and many civilian politicians who made up for the Buddhists' lack of administrative training. None of these men was a Communist. Some were suspicious of Americans conducting separate military operations and taking power more directly than the French had done in their area, and they became positively hostile when American policy gave Ky full support in trying to break up their coalition. The Honolulu Conference of February 1966 probably finished the Hue Buddhists under the Johnson Administration. Although its timing may have been planned to turn public attention away from the critical testimony of General Gavin and Ambassador Kennan, the Administration had prepared a series of demands on Ky. One demand, agreed to them and now practically forgotten, was "social revolution, including land reform," for which the Administration promised its "full support" (the U.S. had refused to help Diem pay for even his mild land reform). Also agreed upon was "a democratic constitution," "its ratification by secret ballot," and "elections rooted in that constitution." In his first announcement of the elections, Ky said that he would not himself be a candidate. President Johnson emerged from the Conference saying, "We talked of very specific things," and after the Conference Vice President Humphrey and the Secretaries of Agriculture and Health, Education and Welfare visited Vietnam.

Ky and U.S. Oppose Coalition

Ky's first "specific thing" after the Conference was to maneuver against General Thi in I Corps. In early March, the National Leadership Council unanimously deposed Thi, calling him a "war lord." The U.S. Mission in Saigon agreed immediately, calling the deposition of a popular general from his native area a "step toward political stability" and "a defeat for warlordism." It was perfectly clear that the U.S. would not continue to assist Thi, whose command corresponded to that of the U.S. Marines (also confined to I Corps), no matter how popular he was with his troops and the surrounding population.

Two days later the Hue Buddhists issued a demand for the return of Thi and the maintenance of all Corps commanders until the elections. When demonstrations began, General Thi appeared in person to ask them to stop, and they stopped. Fierce negotiations began in Saigon, with Ky, the Northerner Thich Tam Chau, and the Hue representative in Saigon meeting on March 12, 13, and 17. By the end of the month, father Quynh, leader of the Northern Catholics from Phat Diem and an impeccable anti-Communist, was also criticizing Ky.

In the first half of April, a compromise was developed and General Thieu signed a decree promising elections within five months, informally understood to be on August 15. The Buddhists asked for a definite agreement that the Constituent Assembly would replace the military government as soon as the new Constitution was ratified, and to everyone's surprise, a commission of politicians appointed by the generals to oppose the Buddhists agreed with them. On April 17, Tri Quang flew back to Hue and stopped demonstrations against Ky. This compromise definitely was influenced by the U.S. On April 5, Ambassador Lodge had personally ordered American aircraft to help fly to Danang ARVN troops loyal to Ky in a show of force; the troops were kept on the airbase and then later flown back to Saigon. On April 8, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, William P. Bundy, publicly criticized the Buddhists for refusing to compromise, ignoring the fact that the dispute began by disrupting a Buddhist compromise, the I Corps coalition.

Ky doublecrosses Tri Quang

Once he had Tri Quang satisfied, Ky betrayed him. On May 7 over a paper cup of Jim Beam bourbon he suddenly revealed to a group of American reporters that he would continue in office and that the Constituent Assembly would be disbanded when the Constitution was ratified. This news was censored in the Vietnamese press, and Ky surprised his enemies by sending ARVN troops and a third replacement for General Thi back to Danang, just as the current I Corps commander was about to start a solidarity party of Catholics and Buddhists to demonstrate to American officials and reporters their agreement. In Washington, Secretary Rusk and then a State Department spokesman disassociated themselves from Ky's alcoholic revelation and his second dispatch of troops to Danang, but an American helicopter was supplied to take the new I Corps commander from Danang to the hostile city of Hue. This man, Ky's final replacement for General Thi, was a notorious favorite of Diem (now head of an extremist Catholic ticket in the Senate). His appointment was a clear indication that the coalition which the Buddhists had developed with General Thi and which had survived his first two replacements was shattered. The Diemist appointment was also a calculated insult to the Hue Buddhists. As the American helicopter flew the new commander away after his speech, a young ARVN officer tried to shoot him down. The American gunner in the helicopter fired a burst of machine gun bullets into the crowd, killing the officer and wounding others.

United States ignores doublecross

In the next ten days, Tri Quang tried to gain a reversal of American policy. He stopped a demonstration after the helicopter incident and withheld the news that an American (rather than an ARVN) soldier had fired into the crowd. Three meetings with U.S. consular officials and a cable to President Johnson produced a "leave it to the Vietnamese themselves" style remark by Secretary Rusk and a non-committal reply from the President.

Ky made many conciliatory statements, but he did not explain how he expected to be trusted. On May 26, the point of no return was reached in Hue: the helicopter gunner was identified as an American at the funeral procession for the dead ARVN officer, and Tri Quang's students led a crowd to burn the USIA library in Hue. ARVN troops were sent into Hue; the Buddhist leaders were cornered and then captured after a three-week seige.

American experts on the Viet Cong are rightly quick to point out that the Viet Cong does not attract the South Vietnamese elite and that even Tri Quang in his most anti-Saigon and anti-American moments did not threaten to seek Viet Cong support. When defeated, he still did not flee to the Viet Cong; instead he risked house arrest under a hostile government in circumstances similar to those that killed Diem and Nhu. If American experts emphasize this point, then they should also emphasize the desirability of reversing American policy and giving Tri Quang and General Thi (now in Washington, trying to learn English) a chance to reform their coalition.

Ky agreed to hold elections, and he has. The Hue Buddhists were excluded from the Constituent Assembly and from the Senate for the sin of "neutralism." Tri Quang's group would have had a very good chance in the Senate contest, because the multiplicity of candidates disproportionately favored a well-educated block vote. This advantage was reaped by Catholic groups, who may control over fifty percent of the Senate with less than ten percent of the population and whose most popular Senate ticket received less than fifteen percent of the Presidential vote.

THE SOUTHERN LOWLANDS: PRE-FRENCH TRADITION AND FRENCH RULE

The Southern Lowlands were completely changed by the French. In the 1860's, a small Vietnamese population lived in villages less than one hundred years old and cultivated about 500,000 acres of land, mostly between Saigon and My Tho. As the Vietnamese Emperor had ordered all his mandarins to leave the southern area first ceded to the French, the French had to rely upon themselves and the only inhabitants who knew any Western languages, the Vietnamese Catholics. Saigon became the base of French activities in Indochina and the Southern Catholics (unlike Northern and Coastal Catholics, mostly living in their own villages) became the basis for an urban middle class, working under French officials, businessmen, and customers.

Great canals were dug to drain the vast areas flooded annually by the Mekong and bi-monthly by salt water from unusually high tides. By 1880 the cultivated area had more than doubled to almost 1.3 million acres; by 1937 it had quadrupled again, reaching 5.5 million. In those 57 years the population almost tripled, from 1.7 million to 4.5 million.

The great expansion in rice fields produced two new Vietnamese social classes: the absentee landlord, with vast holdings supervised by managers, and what a colonial report of 1931 emphasized as a "very important rural proletariat" of tenants and migrant workers. Physically, there was plenty of land for all in the South, now almost four times as much per villager. But the expense of opening new areas, even when they had already been drained, and the competition for large plots completely disqualified most of the rural population from potential ownership. Along the Coast 65% of the households owned at least a small plot, and everyone could rent communal land.

But in the South only 28% owned any land at all, and the landless had no communal land to speak of (only 3% of the total rice area, as contrasted with 25% along the Coast). Coastal landholdings were generally worked by their owner or his sons and only 10% of the plots were worked entirely by tenants. In the South 35% of the plots were owned by absentees, and, assuming their plots were the largest, these men owned 85% of the rice land.

The new villages in the South were connected to Can Tho and Saigon by cheap, fast water transport. Most of their inhabitants immigrated; everyone depended on a good price for exporting rice all over Asia. Some fields (80% in Bac Lieu Province, from which the present An Xuyen Province was separated) were worked entirely by migrant workers who would follow transplantings and harvests up and down the Mekong. Some did not even live in villages—they simply lived on the bank of a canal without a government or community. In some areas, no effective government ruled at all; the landlord ruled without challenge from either established communities or from the French administration.

The result, of course, was a society in the South whose relations were monetary and impersonal and hence materialistic and individualistic by traditional Vietnamese standards, but the peasants were not Europeanized. The traditional responsibility of the landlord and creditor to be easy on the tenant and debtor after a bad harvest could not hold if the landlord lived in Saigon or Can Tho, depended solely on his rents and interest to live a gay urban life and conducted his business through a middleman. Even today, after a generation of warfare in the South, Vietnamese families are strong enough that orphans are taken in by relatives of the fourth and fifth degrees, rather than be left homeless. Pearl Buck's foundation for orphans and abandoned children of American soldiers recently found that even compared with Japan and Korea Vietnam has few deserted children.

Cao Dai and Hoa Hao

Instead of forming political parties and trade unions along Western lines, Southerners found escape, unity, and resistance to the French in two new Buddhist sects. The first, Cao Daism, founded by a group of Vietnamese in 1926, was not exclusively Buddhist, but a combination of the world's religions plus hero worship. (Winston Churchill and Victor Hugo, for example, are Cao Dai saints.) Its organization was consciously patterned on that of the Catholic Church, and it spread so rapidly among peasants as well as government officials that the French banned its advocacy from the Coast and in the North. The Cao Dai "Pope" had close ties with reformist political parties and with the Japanese. In fact, when the latter took over Indochina, the French deported the Cao Dai Pope to Madagascar. After World War II, the Cao Dai claimed a total of twelve sub-sects, totaling between one and four million members, a large proportion of the population in the South.

Hoa Haoism, the second sect, was started not by a committee, but by a charismatic leader, the twenty-year-old son of a minor notable. After developing a very attractive Protestant version of Buddhism (better to have a pure heart than a rich altar—and debts to pay for the altar), the Hoa Hao prophet predicted a Japanese attack on Indochina as soon as France fell to Germany. With more than one hundred thousand followers in less than a year of preaching, Huynh Phu So was soon a potent force. When the French exiled him to another part of the South, So converted the surrounding population. When the French committed him to a Saigon hospital, So converted his psychiatrist. A second exile became a place of pilgrimage; only Japanese intervention prevented a third exile, this one to be outside Vietnam.

The area between the Mekong and the Bassac (the southernmost branch of the Mekong) rivers was more fully developed by the French than the land farther to the southwest, the Transbassac. There drainage canals were still being dug when the Depression and World War II disrupted the French pattern of colonial development. The Transbassac contained the largest landholdings, with landlords whose word was law throughout their domains. Fiercely militant Cambodian villages, survivors of the original Cambodian occupants of the Mekong Delta driven south by the invading Vietnamese, were (and are) also found in the Transbassac.

To the north of the Saigon-Tay Minh line the lands were inhospitable all the way to the sandy and abandoned areas on the Coast mentioned above. The major river in this barren area, the Dong Nai, was overgrown with mangroves and the high ground beyond the river was cursed by malaria, a complete barrier to Vietnamese settlement. In the 1900's the French began developing the malarial high ground; its red and grey soils were good for rubber, whose rising price made cultivation very profitable. The rubber plantations soon became more valuable than the French rice holdings (most large riceland owners were Vietnamese) and the rubber plantations have become even more important to Americans today, because the undeveloped surrounding swamps and forest provide cover for guerrillas and because rubber trees are vulnerable (they must grow seven years before producing) and easily taxed.

As far as most peasants were concerned, the South was essentially a French creation. The Vietnamese and Cambodians had dug some canals, and, if the French had never taken over, large indigenous landowners and a rural proletariat might have arisen anyway. But everywhere Frenchmen held critical positions: officials granting land concessions and businessmen importing foreign manufactures in exchange for rice. While Coastal Vietnamese could hate the French from a position of self-confidence because of a memory of pre-French stability. Vietnamese in the South could hate the French only from a position of subjugation. For the United States today this legacy has meant that while the suspicious Coastal Vietnamese feel that "We don't need you—except to supplement our army," the suspicious Southerners say, "We don't want you running things on any terms, French or American." Therefore, no matter how terrible the Viet Cong may seem, it is very difficult for Americans to appear to offer a constructive alternative.

THE SOUTHERN LOWLANDS: VIET MINH ACTIVITIES

Unlike the North and the Coast, the South had several active indigenous organizations in addition to the Viet Minh working against the French. The French had permitted some urban political parties and had not suppressed the Cao Dai and Hoa Hao, so none of these groups were vulnerable to the Communists' mastery of exile politics. During World War II the Viet Minh controlled only a few villages and a forested enclave in the North; it started operations in the South too hastily at the end of the War to take over all anti-French activity.

Even before the War Southern Marxists were divided. A strong Trotskyite organization, led by the lower-class Ta Thu Thau, had badly defeated the predominately middle-class, orthodox Communists in the elections of 1938. In 1940 the orthodox Communists had tried to lead a peasant rebellion, but a security leak alerted the French, the rebellion was crushed, and the Communist organization was destroyed.

The Cao Dai and Hoa Hao had improved their positions during the War as the result of a less hostile administration. A new group, improperly called a "sect," had also formed: the Binh Xuyen, a coalition of robber bands around Saigon. Southwest of the Mekong Delta and in Vinh Binh Province the Cambodian minority, armed by the French, fought all Vietnamese. In Kien Hoa Province the Catholics organized a militia to defend themselves against the Viet Minh. At first the various factions in the South fought as much among themselves as they did against the French and the Viet Minh. Only the consistent hostility of the Viet Minh and the eventual French recognition that these factions could be bargained with more easily than they could be "pacified" permitted a loose anti-Communist coalition. Among the factions two great surprises came during the war against the Viet Minh. The Hoa Hao, regarded as a loose, one-man organization, recovered after the assassination by the Viet Minh of their charismatic founder. And the larger Cao Dai failed to establish a secure rural power base; not even a small one could be set up around their Pope's residence in Tay Ninh.

The large number of indigenous factions make it even harder to estimate the extent of Viet Minh activities and control in the South than along the Coast. Village land records, for example, were destroyed throughout most of Vinh Binh Province. The French of course blamed the Viet Minh. The Viet Cong, claiming always to be their successors (but also careful since then to have a Cambodian representative on the National Liberation Front's Central Committee), have also given full credit to the Viet Minh. But it is impossible to verify today who destroyed which records, the Viet Minh rebels or the anti-Vietnamese Cambodians armed by the French. It is clear, however, that unlike in the North and on the Coast the Viet Minh were not the only organization fighting the French and terrorizing landlords.

The Communists fall in the south

The Communist party, moreover, revealed more factionalism in the South than in the North and along the Coast. The first Communist leader, Tran Van Giau, shortly after World War II tried to establish a tractable popular front in the South which would correspond to the Viet Minh. When, in 1946, it was clear that he had failed, he was repudiated in the South and assigned overseas. Then Nguyen Binh, an ex-member of the VNQDD (the Communists' mortal rival in the North), was appointed leader of the Viet Minh in the South. By 1949, according to Lucien Bodard, Nguyen Binh controlled almost all of the South except for the vital roads connecting Saigon and Quan Long: most of the Transbassac; the seaward tips of the Mekong Delta provinces; and, both sides of the "Duck's Bill"—from beyond Tay Ninh in the North to beyond Sa Dec, across the Mekong, to the south. In 1950 Nguyen Binh directed a conventional military campaign, similar to many of Giap's in the North, in an attempt to seize the large cities from the French, but apparently without having consolidated his control over many rural areas.

When this effort failed, Nguyen Binh was killed, not by simple execution, for he was too popular in the South. He was sent, without any rest, with a small party of troops loyal to Le Duan into the worst Cambodian jungle, supposedly to find a new infiltration route. When surprised by a unit of the Cambodian army, Binh's nominal subordinates killed him before fleeing into the jungle.

In 1951 after Nguyen Binh came Le Duan, the present First Secretary of the North Vietnamese Communist Party, and Le Duc Tho, present head of the party's Orgburo, as rival leaders in the South. While the origins and meaning of their rivalry are not clear, it certainly dates back to a dispute over the conduct of the war in the South, which had to be resolved by Ho Chi Minh himself.

In 1954 three short-term regroupment areas were established for the Viet Minh in the South: the tip of the Camau peninsula, an area somewhat larger than the present An Xuyen Province; the Plain of Reeds, somewhat larger than the present Kien Tuong Province; and, the Xuyen Moc-Ham Tan area, which then straddled the border between Cochin China and Annam and now overlaps Binh Tuy and Phouc Tuy Provinces. At that time the Viet Minh probably had two other base camps. First was the present "Zone C," around Tay Minh and easily connected to the Plain of Reeds regroupment area. Second was the present "Zone D," until recently corresponding to the Phuoc Thanh Province and now the area where four provinces meet northeast of Saigon and are easily connected to the Xuyen Moc-Ham regroupment area.

In the Southern Lowlands the Communist Party did not hold the monopoly on effective, tested political organization it enjoyed elsewhere in Vietnam. It could not claim, simply as director of the Viet Minh, as much respect as it could command farther north. When Vietnam was divided at the 17th parallel in 1954 to give the anti-Communists a second chance, the best opportunities for an indigenous anti-Communist coalition were in the Southern Lowlands.

THE SOUTHERN LOWLANDS: DIEM

Since Diem had delegated most of his power along the Coast to his brothers Can and Thuc, the Southern Lowlands tested his own abilities. His personality, like his political support, had two complementary elements: the traditional Vietnamese mandarin of Hue and the devout, medieval Catholic of the North and the Coast. He worked long into the night in the tradition of the self-sacrificing mandarin or prelate, but he had neither administrative skills nor charismatic powers. Though he was impressive in small meetings with Western diplomats and journalists, he came to rely on his brother Nhu to decide which Vietnamese leaders and official papers were to be sent to his office and to rely on the semi-secret Can Lao to control the population.

When Diem became premier in 1954, he was manifestly the representative of the American policy of a second chance south of the 17th parallel for the anti-Communist nationalists of Vietnam. The initial French policy after Dien Bien Phu was to preserve as many plantations and as much cultural influence as possible by sending an old friend of Ho Chi Minh's (Jean Sainteny) to Hanoi and by not trying to develop an anti-Communist coalition for the elections scheduled for 1956. The French still had close ties to the major opponents of the Viet Minh in the South: Emperor Bao Dai, the recently created army, the Binh Xuyen, the Cao Dai, and the Hoa Hao.

Diem's first cabinet was unimpressive; it was composed almost entirely of blood relatives and in-laws. But the end of 1954 saw a much broader cabinet, in which a majority (8 of 14) was held by the Cao Dai and the Hoa Hao. Both of these groups had long feared the Communists and had interests which no longer corresponded to those of the French. Diem secured his position by gaining control over the army—with substantial American help. The crucial subordinates of General Hinh, the army's commander were lured away on a visit to the much-admired President Magsaysay of the Philippines and General Hinh was told bluntly that no military aid would be given until the army was under complete civilian control (*i.e.*, Diem's). Though he later claimed he could have started a coup against Diem with a telephone call, General Hinh yielded and soon left for France, where has was given a military appointment.

Diem then began to fragment the sects represented within his cabinet, paying several Cao Dai and Hoa Hao leaders over $10 million from American military aid for "back pay." At the same time, in early 1954, Western representatives sympathetic to the sects (and hence their only hope of getting the U.S. to moderate Diem's hostility toward them) were withdrawn from South Vietnam. When they realized Diem's intention to destroy their groups, most Cao Dai and Hoa Hao leaders joined the Binh Xuyen leader on March 5, 1955 in demanding a greater role in the cabinet. Of course this was denied them.

Although the Cao Dai and Hoa Hao held political control over the Tay Ninh area northwest of Saigon and over many areas south of the Mekong River, they had no conventional force to match the 250,000-man army under Diem, and their local exactions could not compete with the $250 million annual American aid given Diem. Even their claims to conventional military forces never reached 50,000. The generally accepted total of 15,000 to 20,000 for the Cao Dai forces grossly exceeded the 4,916 regular troops actually subsidized by the French at the end of 1953. While the details of Diem's negotiations with the sects are still obscure, the Cao Dai and Hoa Hao leaders who had fought the French and the Viet Minh only when necessary could hardly have expected to defeat Diem's army in conventional warfare. Their resistance must have been a desperate last resort, and they were defeated within a few months. The only surviving units were four Hoa Hao battalions which fled up the Mekong beyond Long Xuyen and preserved themselves only by adopting guerrilla tactics and hiding amidst the loyal Hoa Hao population.

With the defeat of the Binh Xuyen and the sects, Diem had a chance to offer a non-Communist, non-sectarian alternative to rural areas of the Southern Lowlands, but he failed to make good on this opportunity. Large areas of land around Saigon (Binh Xuyen) and south of the Mekong River (Cao Dai and Hoa Hao), abandoned during the war against the French, were taken for the settlement of refugees from the North (most of whom were tightly-knit Catholic villagers) without the permission of local inhabitants. Improved security in rural areas, especially those formerly terrorized by the aggressive and intolerant Hoa Hao bands, led to some economic improvement. But the new rural security also permitted Saigon landlords who had not received rents for years to return to the countryside on the heels of the army and to make exactions in the form of "back rents," much as Diem had paid bribes in the form of "back pay." Even refugee Catholic villagers, a basis of Diem's support and able to publicize their complaints, were preyed upon by national and provincial officials until they were stopped by a national scandal and the dismissal by Diem of a cooperative cabinet minister.

Diem misrules the Hoa Hao

Hoa Hao areas associated with the surviving four battalions were repeatedly attacked by ARVN units, and the one peaceful Hoa Hao area for which information is available was badly treated. As late as 1960, a Michigan State University group found that Diem's government had taken over all Hoa Hao buildings without payment and had appointed all non-Hoa Hao officials in My Thuan, a former Hoa Hao headquarters in a part of Vinh Long Province where 85–90% of the population belonged to the Hoa Hao sect. The Americans then saw the suppression of a Hoa Hao ceremony on the Buddha's birthday, initially approved to honor Hoa Hao soldiers killed fighting the French and the Viet Minh. There were only 250 Catholics in the area, but they included crucial local officials, like the district chief, the district "information" officer, and the canton chief. Catholics were allowed to build a church instead of working on the local forced-labor construction projects (agroville) against the Viet Cong. Under prodding from a priest from Vinh Long, the seat of the area's Bishopric, the district "information" officer was reluctantly starting an organization to propagate Catholicism among the hostile local populace. Threatening letters to and assassinations of local officials were an increasing problem. Diem's officials blamed the Hoa Hao, and the latter blamed the Viet Cong, claiming that the local ARVN units were infiltrated and useless. Since Americans made only a few short visits outside of Saigon between 1955 and 1962, it is impossible to say if My Thuan's plight was unusual. It should be emphasized, however, that the Americans reported no embarassment by Diem's officials at seeing their behavior observed and recorded.

Even the Binh Xuyen—the gangland alliance which had controlled the roads into Saigon, the city's rackets, and the French secret police—were not replaced by superior institutions. Brother Nhu ran most of these activities, not for personal profit, but to finance the Can Lao and his family's political activities independently of U.S. aid. Nhu controlled the opium trade and the lotteries, manipulated the foreign exchange market, and extorted Saigon businessmen. The only Binh Xuyen activities Nhu did not take over were those that were banned by his puritanical wife, the famous Mme. Nhu.

Mistakes by the U.S. Mission had a great influence on South Vietnam's increasing difficulties. United States military "advisers" made no effort to anticipate a resumption of Viet Minh guerrilla activities and converted the new Vietnamese army, originally created by the French for decentralized, small-unit, counter-insurgency operations, into a highly centralized conventional force, consciously imitating the South Korean army and preparing for a conventional invasion from the North. The refusal to finance Diem's plans for a para-military force has already been mentioned. In the Mekong Delta, the United States refused to continue the French-developed naval units used to patrol the hundreds of miles of rivers and canals (compared with only one major road south of Saigon). These military mistakes are being reversed today, but without the slightest hint that present improvements are more a return to French methods than American invention. United States Navy activities in the Mekong, for instance, are being publicized as having been inspired by the Monitor and the Merrimac, two American ships of a completely different war a century ago, rather than by methods successful in the same place against the Viet Minh within the past generation.

United States ignores assassinations

When evidence increased of a systematic insurgency as in reports of Hanoi-trained cadres in the Highlands and of assassinations and kidnappings concentrated in strategic provinces south of the Mekong where the Viet Minh had not been strong, the U.S. Mission maintained that the country was too prosperous for an insurgency to survive. United States aid was mostly in the form of consumer goods sold to merchants by the Saigon government, which then spent the proceeds instead of relying on local taxes. The merchants sold the consumer goods in the provinces and peasants bought them, without feeling the slightest gratitude to the United States for not being taxed harder. There was no way of knowing whether the peasantry had gained more from larger peacetime harvests and Diem's mild land reform and rent control laws than had to be paid in rents to absentee landlords. Since no prolonged American contact with rural areas existed until 1962, it was surely cavalier to ignore totally signs of trouble and bury them under claims of South Vietnamese rural "prosperity." The present Administration line, that the North began the insurgency because it was afraid of Diem's popularity, similarly lacks supporting evidence and is grossly deceptive.

The most grotesque American mistake was to conclude that there was "no alternative" to Diem and his family. The original reason for favoring Diem was a sound one: Diem was the best man to lead an anti-Communist coalition. Bao Dai had been discredited by years of association with the French and of high living in Vietnamese and European resorts. Diem had stayed clear of both the French and the Viet Minh, had good connections in the United States, and was a hard worker. In 1953, in a "neutralist" campaign that would be banned today in South Vietnam, brother Nhu organized a party that performed well in the election held by the French. Unfortunately, Diem did not try to lead a coalition. He established an inefficient dictatorship based on his family and the Can Lao, preventing legal opposition but not providing reforms and local competition against the Viet Cong.

In 1960, eighteen leading civilian politicians, including Suu and Huong, the best-known recent civilian Presidential candidates, signed a long manifesto against Diem. ARVN officers, disgusted by Diem's preoccupation with dividing the army rather than by fighting the Viet Cong, attempted coups in 1960 and 1962. Diem's jails were full of political prisoners, many of whom were brutally tortured; 46,000 survivors were released in 1963 and 1964.

Yet U.S. policy decided to reinforce Diem and the Can Lao instead of letting their domestic opponents replace them before Diem could fragment his opposition even further. But after visits by Vice President Johnson (May 1961) and General Taylor (October 1961) and a major speech (June 1962) by Senator Mansfield, one of Diem's original American supporters, calling for a reappraisal, the United States started an approach similar to the use of the Can Lao. Instead of trying to pressure Diem or to allow his enemies to combine him, American civilians and military officers were sent to crucial provinces to "advise" Vietnamese civil servants and ARVN officers, trying to persuade them to work against the system being buttressed by American aid in Saigon by taking precisely those local initiatives which would yield local popularity and which Diem's family would not reward if the individual's full loyalty was doubted in secret Can Lao reports. The hypocrisy and foolishness of such provincial activities in support of a hopeless central government may be symbolized by the American AID official in Quang Nam Province who unknowingly rented his house from a notorious (to Vietnamese neighbors) participant in local torture sessions.

THE SOUTHERN LOWLANDS: START OF THE INSURGENCY AND THE VIETCONG CADRE

The survival of at least one Hoa Hao unit and of elements of the Cao Dai and Binh Xuyen forces, coupled with the weak initial strength provided for the Viet Cong by the Viet Minh, make it impossible to be sure of the degree of North Vietnamese control of the insurgency in its early stages. The National Liberation Front (NLF) was not started until December 1960, but even so, according to a May 1966 memo issued by the U.S. Mission in Saigon, survivors of the sects "made up the bulk of the early NLF support, although the alliance was at all times an uneasy one." Yet the December 1961 State Department booklet meant to "inform" Americans and foreigners of "A Threat to the Peace: North Viet-Nam's Effort to Conquer South Viet-Nam" referred to the NLF as "Hanoi's creation" (p. 15) and did not even hint at the participation of non-Communists in their own groups, let alone at their ever having provided "the bulk of early NLF support." The return of Communist cadres to the Highlands in 1957 proves that North Vietnam was involved in the insurgency from its beginnings, but the original degree of Hanoi's control will remain in doubt until a wider range of evidence is publicly available.

The violent start of the insurgency was traced by Bernard Fall from contemporary newspaper reports of assassinations, ambushes, raids, and cells of dissidents. The campaign of violence began in the Mekong Delta, where the Communists were disproportionately weak. The first concentrations of violence (April 1957 to April 1958) were in the areas around Chau Phu and My Tho, presumably establishing a position on the Mekong River where the Cambodian border would provide a convenient sanctuary and preparing to cut off the only roads bringing rice from the Delta and Transbassac to Saigon.

The next pair of Viet Cong targets was immediately to the north and to the south of My Tho, further isolating Saigon from the Delta. In the period between April 1959 and April 1960 Long An Province had about one assassination per month, and there were other deaths in the adjacent parts of Hau Ngia and Kien Tuong Provinces.

South of My Tho, Kien Hoa Province was a crucial target, and captured documents indicated Viet Cong intention to make Kien Hoa its model province for the Delta. Kien Hoa is a cluster of three islands, and their inlets offer many good places for concealed depots, hospitals, and rest camps at the opposite end of the Mekong Delta from Chau Phu. At the same time, like the strip of rubber plantations circling Saigon to the north, Kien Hoa offers an easily taxed cash crop, coconuts. The Catholic militia of the Vinh Long Bishopric had cleared out most of the Viet Minh, but some agents survived and went north in 1954. In early 1958, in areas where the Saigon government had not gained control, some of these agents started returning to their native villages. There was as much violence in Kien Hoa as in Long An in 1959–60, about ten assassinations over twelve months. But when an honest military officer was sent by Diem to clean up Kien Hoa, he found far more (1,200) political prisoners in the provincial jail whom the former provincial governor had been trying to extort for their release. This military officer, a former chief of counter-intelligence on the Viet Minh in all of the Southern Lowlands, reopened the road to Saigon. This man's successor also did well until he was transferred in May 1963, but thereafter the situation deteriorated and proved difficult to retrieve after Diem's fall. Today much of Kien Hoa is controlled by the Viet Cong, and parts of it are being bombed.

THE SOUTHERN LOWLANDS: RECENT EVENTS AND U.S. POLICY

The Southern Lowlands have been divided since 1964 by the fact that major military operations have been concentrated north of the Mekong River. Few American ground troops, and even fewer North Vietnamese troops or cadres, have been operating south of the Mekong. Most North Vietnamese units have been fighting in the Highlands and along the Coast. Until they drew away American troops from the Saigon area this spring, American operations were concentrated on "search and destroy" missions in Viet Cong base areas in the sparsely populated Plain of Reeds (Kien Tuong Province) and rubber plantation area circling Saigon to the north (Tay Ninh to Phuoc Tuy Province).

Yet the only large secure rural area is south of the Mekong, the Hoa Hao stronghold of An Giang Province. After Diem's fall, the survivors of the four Hoa Hao battalions managed to negotiate with Saigon an agreement whose terms have not been publicized. It is clear, however, that Hoa Hao leaders remain in charge of their province, that the population quickly turns in Viet Cong agitators trying to establish a foothold, and that the province is receiving types of American aid which are possible only when full security is assured, such as electrification and a land survey. Unfortunately, the present An Giang Province (redefined on October 1, 1964, around the time of the agreement) is much smaller than the areas controlled by the Hoa Hao before their conventional defeat and steady harassment by Diem's forces.

In addition to the Hoa Hao, the Cambodian minority is a traditional enemy of the Viet Cong. Kien Giang Province, south of An Giang, has a substantial Cambodian minority and the most successful resettlement of Northern refugees in all of South Vietnam. Not surprisingly, Kien Giang is often mentioned as being more secure than most areas. Two other provinces with large Cambodian minorities are Ba Xuyen and Vinh Binh. Cao Dai and Catholic groups, who once maintained order around Quan Long and in most of the Delta (Vinh Long, Kien Hoa, and Vinh Binh), are no longer mentioned for their local control.

Most of the populous area south of the Mekong River appears to be involved in "live and let live" arrangements. Local holders of power, Viet Cong cadres controlling the villages (there being few local notables because of the predominance of absentees ownership) and ARVIN units stationed in the district town (there being few civilian district chiefs), do not challenge each other openly or with violence. The Viet Cong cadres do not expect to take over the district towns from the ARVN, especially when these towns are protected by artillery and airpower. At the same time, the local ARVN officers, whether in civilian or military posts, do not expect to challenge the Viet Cong seriously in the villages.

THE VIETCONG: THE CADRE, HIS SOCIAL ROLE AND HIS MISLEADING TACTICS

Since most violence and struggle movements occurred in the Southern Lowlands, eventually entirely under Viet Cong direction, it is vital to treat separately the basis of Viet Cong activity. This basis is a Communist political and social innovation, the local cadre, and subtle political tactics which make detection of his activity and a response by the legal government very difficult. The Viet Cong cadres are the only effective link between many Vietnamese villages and centralized commands, and they are the strongest such link in Vietnamese history.

The Viet Cong cadre is almost always an ambitious local person who has been trained to live with the people of his village, to seek out those with grievances against Saigon-appointed local officials and against local notables and to provide incidents which mobilize the peasantry against the government. Land reform, for instance, is not an abstract goal for the cadre and his followers—instead it provides patronage for political power. Landless tenants who join the cause are given plots of absentee landlords and owners of medium-sized plots still living in the village often join the Viet Cong to protect their holdings.

In each village, the Viet Cong cadre starts a series of front organizations which eventually should include every villager. There are Liberation Fronts for farmers, for their wives, for their children, and for old villagers. At first, only a nominal membership fee is requested, but enthusiastic members recruit their neighbors and eventually social pressure forces everyone to join and to participate actively. If a village is hesitant or hostile toward the Viet Cong, the cadre mobilizes greater hostility toward the Saigon government by calling in a Viet Cong military unit from another area and provoking air strikes or artillery fire from nearby ARVN or U.S. forces.

Even in contested villages, the Viet Cong cadre is the most knowledgeable about local affairs. He deputizes children to report on who enters and leaves the village and on what newspapers are read and what radio stations are listened to. As the cadre's control increases, he announces more rules, "requests contributions" (taxes), and recruits troops, and villagers are increasingly careful to obey him.

Thorough investigation of their training and internal messages, together with lengthy interviews with cadres who have come over as individuals through the Chieu Hoy amnesty program, have shown that the Viet Cong cadres assigned below the provincial or district level are not usually ideologically motivated. Just as many Vietnamese learned to speak French as a path to power, without necessarily liking Frenchmen, so many low-level cadres seem to have learned and applied new political methods to take over their native villages without necessarily liking the Communists who trained them. Cadres from middle class backgrounds, who are better educated and perform vital skilled functions, as in propaganda and medicine, may even become inwardly hostile to the Viet Cong command because it mechanically gives preferential promotions to their lower class rivals. The cadre's chief concern is with his new social and political role, as the promoter of non-family social ties and as a new bureaucratic link between the village and the outside world, interpreting commands from the center and communicating village grievances back to it.

Two tactics are crucial to a cadre-based insurgency. The first is the use of terror, which is directed not simply at eliminating enemies but more at manipulating the survivors. Before a man is assassinated or kidnapped, he usually receives a threatening letter listing grievances against him and warning him to change his ways. At the time of an assassination or kidnapping, a list of the offenses for which he is being punished is pinned to his clothing, or posted on a building, or read off to his frightened family and neighbors.

Until the last few years, the Viet Cong had a "Robin Hood" image, gained by killing and publicizing many obviously corrupt officials. As a result, assassinations on false charges of honest and able officials, the insurgency's worst enemies, were sometimes believed and did not provoke the local hostility toward the Viet Cong that an air-strike does against Saigon. Furthermore, not only are Viet Cong methods of violence inherently more selective than those of ARVN and U.S. forces, but the political intelligence of a Viet Cong cadre is much better than that of the typical Vietnamese or American local official on rapid rotation. Because of his better information, the Viet Cong cadre gets more political leverage from his carrots and sticks than our side does. Attacks on the most able men as well as on the most corrupt clearly indicates that Viet Cong cadres are seeking power in their villages and not simply reforms.

The second crucial tactic is that of the "coexistence" village, where the Viet Cong cadre, the village notables, the Saigon appointed district chief, and local ARVN officer "won't fight" and "live and let live," jockeying for political position without open resort to violence. Once a village's front organizations have started up a Viet Cong cadre is not supposed to provoke attacks for fear of being shown as unable to defend his people. By day, such villages are supposed to admit joint teams of American medical personnel and Saigon-trained propagandists. These villages all use Saigon government identity cards. In such villages, Viet Cong cadres would encourage participation in Saigon's elections in order to keep all identity cards in good standing, and the cadres would also oppose mutilating ballots which could be traced to their districts.

While this balance of local power is stable, neither the Viet Cong cadres nor the ARVN officers can formalize their tacit arrangement. Viet Cong cadres can get amnesty only as individuals through the Chieu Hoy program, and if a cadre were to bring over his small military force with him, it would be imprisoned for treason or placed under the district ARVN officer, outside of the control of the amnestied cadre and his village. "Coexistence" ARVN officers have enough trouble avoiding taunts that they "won't fight" without trying to suggest to Saigon that power be shared locally. In short, while the cadres and the officers can forestall disruption from their commands by reporting back that all is quiet (but not yet quiet enough to become a Viet Cong base camp or for landlords to return for their rents) and by avoiding violence which would attract attention to their area, they can do nothing constructive to promote their common interests and those of the populations they rule.

Unfortunately, the introduction of foreign troops or advisers disrupts the tacit peace and brings on violent incidents without being able to change the basic division of authority. North Vietnamese units can not capture district towns, and American forces, short of a full counter-insurgency operation, cannot capture the villages. Americans usually cannot provide a direct alternative to the Viet Cong, even if a village's cadre has become unpopular, because mistrust of a return to colonialism is stronger than dislike of the Viet Cong. Under Diem villagers south of Saigon openly referred to the government as the "My-Diem" regime the "American-Diem" regime. In one Mekong Delta village where the peasants disliked the Viet Cong a young ARVN officer began to make good impression last year and he was warned in time to leave each time the Viet Cong assassination squad visited the village. But when an American was assigned to advise him the villagers changed their minds decided that the Viet Cong were right in opposing even good officials from Saigon because they would bring American control and allowed the next assassination squad to kill the young ARVN officer.

LINOTRON—FASTEST TYPESETTING MACHINE IN THE WORLD

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, it is a pleasure for me to report on an important scientific development in the world of printing.

It is an electronic typesetting system which composes words on film at speeds of more than 1,000 characters per second. It is now in use at the Government Printing Office.

Called Linotron, it is the fastest typesetting machine in the world. It is the first ever to set an entire page of type at one time. All previous methods compose type one line at a time.

Linotron uses a highly advanced television technique where the functions of 256 television cameras are applied to set pages from computer programed tapes. At its average pace of 1,000 characters per second, the system completes a book-size page every 5 seconds with no time loss between pages. It could typeset the Bible in about 77 minutes, a job which took Johannes Gutenberg nearly 5 years in the 15th century.

The system is the result of more than 4 years of joint development effort by the CBS Laboratories of Stamford, Conn., and Mergenthaler Linotype Co., a division of ELTRA Corp.

At formal ceremonies on Monday, the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], chairman of the Congressional Joint Committee on Printing, described Linotron as the most significant development in typesetting since the invention of the Linotype machine in 1886. He said:

> In the effort to cope with the information explosion, a major bottleneck has been eliminated. For the first time, man is able to compose typography at computer speeds—not a line at a time, but over an entire page in any sequence of characters desired. It is

> an amazing machine and will save the government thousands of dollars.

Immediately following the ceremonies, the Linotron began work on a Defense Supply Agency stock catalog job of nearly 50,000 pages. Formerly reproduced from computer printout copy, the catalog, as typeset by Linotron, will save the Government an estimated $250,000 annually.

James L. Harrison, the head of the Government Printing Office, said that up to 40 percent of the bulk of large printing jobs can be saved with the use of one Linotron system. The GPO will receive a second system later this year. He added:

> The use of two Linotron systems will repay the government's $2 million investment in less than two years.

An even more advanced version of Linotron, designed to reproduce pictures as well as type, is now being built by CBS Laboratories and Mergenthaler for the U.S. Air Force Logistics Command.

J. A. Keller, president of ELTRA Corp., said:

> Linotron will have a profound effect on the future of printing and publishing. The systems now in existence and those presently being built are sophisticated and have great capacity, but development work is continuing.
>
> Linotron is expanding into a whole family of systems involving computer typesetting, and can be tailored to individual needs in the fields of general printing, book publishing, newspapers and computer printout.

The development of the Linotron was led by Kenneth Moore, general manager of CBS Laboratories' Graphic Systems Department, according to Dr. Peter C. Goldmark, president and director of research of CBS Laboratories, who said:

> The principles on which the Linotron developments are based lend themselves to fundamentally new methods of selectively retrieving and randomly recording extreme resolution alpha numeric symbols or picture material. An entirely new generation of full page character and picture typesetting systems will evolve from the first phase of our development work which resulted in the Linotron machine placed into operation today.
>
> It is gratifying to CBS Laboratories that such diverse government projects as CBS Laboratories' Lunar Orbiter development and the Linotron shared in many of our fundamental technologies.

The heart of the radically new composing system is an electronic tube developed by CBS Laboratories, according to Mr. Moore. From a set of glass plate type character grids, letters, numerals and symbols are projected onto a light-sensitive surface of the tube.

Mr. Moore said:

> The tube essentially performs the function of television cameras, each aimed at a different character.
>
> On command from a coded computer tape, the tube releases the characters—in the form of electrons, which are amplified into video signals—and allows them to appear in any desired position and size on the screen of a unique cathode ray tube. The tube can display 180 times more detailed type and picture information than an ordinary television receiver. As the characters appear on the screen—faster than the human eye can detect—they are instantly recorded on film in front of the screen.

Although Linotron averages 1,000 characters per second for extreme high-quality reproduction, it can run as fast as 10,000 characters per second for print of typewriter quality. There are no moving parts except for advancing the film and changing the glass grids to different type styles. Each of these motions takes a fraction of a second.

Computer programing codes to operate Linotron were developed by Mergenthaler Linotype Co., prime contractor of the system. Basic copy to be printed is first punched on paper tape along with instructions for page makeup, indentation, type changes and other information. The paper tape is then converted to magnetic tape by the computer, which adds directions for spacing and hyphenating.

Mr. Harrison observed:

> Almost 20 percent of the total $1 billion Federal printing program now involves photographic reproduction of information fed out directly from computers. This is somewhat like reproducing an endless telegram, with its accompanying poor quality, hard to read type and mammoth waste of paper.

Mr. Harrison emphasized:

> Because it uses magnetic tape, Linotron will free computers to do other jobs. A computer can put information on tape many times faster than it can print the same information on paper.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished acting majority leader, to fully confirm my understanding, that the Senate will convene at 9:30 tomorrow morning.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in response to the query from the distinguished minority leader, there will be no more votes tonight.

The Williams amendment will be made the pending amendment tonight before we adjourn. We will adjourn until 9:30 tomorrow morning under the previous agreement. There will be no more than 15 minutes for morning business, after which the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the Williams amendment and, under the previous agreement, up to 45 minutes will be allowed for the Williams amendment.

So it is anticipated that there will be a vote by 10:30 tomorrow morning on the Williams amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have one further inquiry. As I understand it, when action is completed on the pending bill, the next order of business will be the so-called transportation appropriation bill.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, that is also my understanding. There are four appropriation bills on the calendar, and it is my understanding, after talking with the distinguished majority leader, Mr. Mansfield, that the first of those appropriation bills to be considered by the Senate will be the transportation bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I understand also that after we complete the consideration of that bill, we will consider the State, Justice, and Commerce appropriation bill.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. That is correct. And then perhaps NASA and finally public works.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But not necessarily in that order.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Not necessarily in that order.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, do I correctly understand the Senator to say that the State, Justice, and Commerce appropriation bill will follow the Transportation appropriation bill?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I referred to it as the second in a series, but I then stated that these would not necessarily follow in that order. The transportation appropriation bill will be first.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I hope that bill will not come up before next Tuesday. I hope that can be arranged satisfactorily.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The leadership will be glad to cooperate as far as possible, I am sure.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 381

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the amendment will be printed in the Record.

The amendment, ordered to be printed in the Record, reads as follows:

> On page 2, beginning with line 3, strike out everything through line 17 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "sum of $2,060,000,000 of which, subject to the provisions of section 616 of such Act, the amounts appropriated or made available by appropriation Act shall not exceed $295,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of part A of title I of such Act, $579,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out part B of title I, $1,022,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out title II, $20,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out part A of title III, $27,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out part B of title III, $70,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out title V, $16,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out title VI, and $31,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out title VIII, and".

On page 26, strike out lines 10 and 11, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 102. Parts B and D of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 are consolidated as a new part of such title and amended to read as follows:".

On page 37, in line 19, strike out "and part D of this title".

Beginning with line 17 on page 40, strike out everything through line 12 on page 45.

Beginning with line 8 on page 78, strike out everything through line 21 on page 86.

Redesignate sections 104 through 106 as sections 103 through 105, respectively, and redesignate sections 109 through 113 as sections 106 through 110, respectively.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself 30 seconds so that I may yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask whether it is expected that there will be a final vote on the poverty program tomorrow.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I am very sanguine that we can have third reading and passage of the bill reasonably early tomorrow. Of course, I would have to tell my friend the Senator from New Jersey that doubtful things are very uncertain. It is possible that the bill will go over. However, I am pretty confident that we can finish the bill tomorrow, and that there will be votes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I can now answer the question of a distinguished citizen of New Jersey who just called me, Elston Howard, who catches for the Boston Red Sox. He has offered me two tickets for the game. I will call him back and tell him I will have to be here.

Mr. CLARK. I am sorry. Perhaps the Senator can make it for the third game.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 minutes without taking time from the bill.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE F-111 AIRCRAFT PROGRAM

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, during recent months, Congress and the American public have received much information regarding serious problems which continue to plague the F-111 aircraft program. There have been many news articles and broadcasts about the TFX, as it was originally called. They have been extremely interesting and quite enlightening to Members of Congress and to many millions of citizens who are concerned with our national defense capability. A number of these accounts have been printed in the RECORD at my request.

Another excellent article, entitled "The Critics Paint an Airplane Lemon," by Ralph K. Bennett, appeared in the October 2, 1967, issue of the National Observer. I wish to commend the author for having placed the troubles of this F-111 biservice aircraft in proper perspective for discerning and interested readers.

We recall that it was almost 5 years ago that research and development for this airplane was initiated. It is now conceded that the Navy version, the F-111B, is more than 2½ years behind schedule. We all know that the total costs of the original TFX aircraft, as estimated in 1962, have now more than doubled. The cost of approximately 1,300 of these planes which we now propose to buy has spiraled to more than double the estimated cost of the more than 1,700 we originally intended to procure. It also is well known that Pentagon officials have admitted in congressional hearings that both the Navy and Air Force versions of the plane are seriously deficient in specified combat mission performance.

In his article, Mr. Bennett indicates that a primary cause for the multiple problems of the F-111 is found in the insistence of the Secretary of Defense that the dubious goal of "commonality" between both versions take precedence over the vital objective of attaining weaponry effectiveness. When an airplane's costs escalate and when its performance is sacrificed to maintain an unrealistic concept like commonality, the heralded theory of "cost effectivness" produces, as it has in this instance, an aircraft which military officials in the Pentagon now privately refer to as a "clunker."

Mr. President, I am not implying that commonality cannot be a valid and economical concept. Money can certainly be saved by ordering the procurement of a common weapon when the requirements of the individual services are identical. There is no way, however, to build with identical parts an effective single weapons system which will carry out separate and widely diverse military missions. Mr. Bennett's article points out that the TFX program was an attempt to combine the drastically different design and performance characteristics of a Navy plane weighing 50,000 pounds and an Air Force plane weighing 90,000 pounds. The result is an 80,000-pound hybrid craft that cannot capably perform to the requirements of either service.

The original insistence upon commonality, by amateurs in the Pentagon, despite the warnings of expert engineers and technicians that in this case the concept was neither valid nor feasible, is one of the glaring and most critical mistakes made in the F-111 program. The stubborn refusal of top Pentagon officials to admit the basic error of applying the commonality concept to this program has compounded and intensified the F-111's fundamental problems in almost 5 years of research and development and caused the costs to soar while the weaponry effectiveness has alarmingly sagged. It is now crystal clear that a complete redesign of the airplane in both its versions would be necessary to produce two individual weapons systems that would meet the separate needs of the services and the initial operational requirements specified by the Navy and the Air Force.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Bennett's article in the National Observer be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the National Observer, Oct. 2, 1967]

AFTERBURN FOR MR. McNAMARA: THE CRITICS PAINT AN AIRPLANE LEMON

(By Ralph K. Bennett)

". . . If the military really must fly, why can't it buy one machine and take turns using it?"—President CALVIN COOLIDGE.

F-111 born TFX out of Robert Strange McNamara. On paper it is the most sophisticated, flexible, yet economic air-weapons system yet devised—a single airplane capable of performing the divergent missions of both Navy and Air Force. In reality it may be the most costly bungle in the not-too-tidy history of American military procurement—a multibillion-dollar farrago, which may not only place an imposition on the taxpayer but may also compromise national defense.

What to do about it? Men of good will are torn by indecision. On the one hand they listen as starchy U.S. Sen. John McClellan, Arkansas Democrat, says the plans ought to be scrapped now, while there's time. On the other hand, they listen to Mr. McNamara's continuing insistence that the plane can meet all the requirements for which it was built, and maybe more.

The F-111 is the most controversial weapons system ever built, and last week the controversy showed no signs of slackening off. The Defense Department says the sleek, "swing wing" jet represents a bundle of technological firsts. Critics argue that it has established some other "firsts."

They believe the F-111 represents the first instance of a multibillion-dollar defense project being undertaken *entirely on the basis of rough figures,* never set down for accounting, but merely stashed away "in his head" by the Secretary of Defense.

They believe the F-111 is the first major air-weapons system, *already scheduled for complete integration into national defense,* that has reached its fifth year of development without meeting the standards originally set for it, and without operating with complete reliability.

They believe the F-111 represents the first time that a highly qualified military selection board has been overruled on its selection of an aircraft by the Secretary of Defense. In this particular instance, the board was given no opportunity to explain why it preferred an alternate design to the F-111 through four reviews of the project.

They believe the F-111 is the first major U.S. military aircraft to have doubled and perhaps tripled in cost before ever becoming operational. Expected to average about $3,000,000 per plane at the outset of the program, the F-111 now bears a price tag of about $6,000,000 for the Air Force version, $8,000,000 for the Navy version.

THE SWINGING WING

General Dynamics, of Fort Worth, which won out over the Boeing Co. for the contract to build the F-111, is now working feverishly to make the plane a semblance of what it was originally intended to be. Theoretically, the secret of the F-111's "success" is its variable sweep wing. With the wing extended at right angles to the fuselage, the plane should have the capability of taking off and landing at very low speeds over a very short distance. If it sweeps its wing back 60 degrees, the F-111 should be able to fly at Mach 2.5 (about 1,650 m.p.h.) at very high altitudes. With wings swept entirely back, the plane takes on the appearance of a delta-wing jet, and should be able to streak along at supersonic speeds at tree-top level, thus avoiding enemy radar.

This amazing versatility, envisioned back in 1962, was to be the one-plane answer to the differing needs of the Air Force and the Navy. At that time, the Air Force wanted a heavy (between 80,000 and 90,000 pounds), slim, sleek, and strong fighter-bomber able to defend itself and able to make sustained supersonic "dashes" beneath enemy radar. The Air Force was already undertaking preliminary study of such a plane.

The Navy, meanwhile, was seeking a successor to its highly successful McDonnell F-4 fighter. The Navy wanted a plane with the capability of protecting the fleet from aerial attack at a great distance from the fleet itself. It had to be light (no more than

50,000 pounds) and short (for aircraft carrier stowage); and stubby, (to permit pilot and copilot to sit side-by-side). The plane must of course be capable of short take-off and landing, must have a long range, and must be able to "loiter" for great lengths of time, watching for approaching enemy aircraft. It would defend the fleet by firing sophisticated Phoenix missiles, computerized to select and destroy the most dangerous of incoming targets.

Both services were playing with the idea of a swing-wing aircraft for their needs when President John F. Kennedy came into office and Mr. McNamara went to the Pentagon. Mr. McNamara's zeal in cutting out unnecessary duplication between the services is already legend. When he saw that the Air Force and the Navy were planning to develop two swing-wing planes, he reasoned that if they both were to build and buy the same swing-wing aircraft there would be a tremendous saving in research and development and production costs.

This new plane, in short, would be the synthesis of Mr. McNamara's gospel of "commonality." It is in many ways a sound gospel, preaching as it does that the various military services can save a lot of money by using the same basic items wherever possible, from belt buckles, to boots, to butcher's smocks. But now commonality was to be carried into the realm of a sophisticated weapons system. There the trouble began. Mr. McNamara saw little difference in the mission requirements of the Navy and the Air Force. He ordered joint development "of a single aircraft of genuine tactical utility to both services" in a now famous memorandum of Sept. 1, 1961. The Navy and the Air Force grumbled, but a joint Source Selection Board was formed to establish criteria and select the best design offered by contractors.

TOO MUCH COMPROMISING

The problem of commonality pervaded work on the plane, then designated TFX for Tactical Fighter Experimental. Neither the Navy nor the Air Force felt a truly superior weapons system was possible. There was simply too much compromising. ". . . The incompatability of requirements led the Navy to say that the things that made the Air Force plane better, made the Navy airplane worse," said George Spangenberg, evaluation director of the Bureau of Naval Weapons. He and other officials said commonality would present great difficulty for any manufacturer.

The two services finally did achieve compromises on performance, weight, and various aircraft characteristics. The two companies offering the best designs to meet the joint service terms were General Dynamics and the Boeing Co. Both offered swing-wing planes of very similar configuration, although the Boeing design had large air scoops above and behind the cockpit, which made it easily recognizable. Neither designer could meet the requirements of the services. Four times they reworked their designs and presented them to the Source Selection Board. *Through all four go-rounds the members of the board preferred the Boeing design*. It had longer range, greater fire power, could carry a greater selection of weapons, used thrust reversers instead of air brakes, and it was about 2,000 pounds lighter. The high-mounted air scoops meant there was less chance of damage to jet engines from foreign objects sucked in from the ground. They also minimized the possibility of exhaust from a fired missile blasting into the engine, cutting off its air supply, and thereby conking it out. They felt that Boeing management expertise, and the fact that the Boeing plane was lighter, would make its plane more economical.

The Source Selection Board made its recommendation to the Air Force Council, consisting of nine generals and (because of the joint effort) three admirals. On Nov. 8, 1962, the Air Force Council met. Its chairman, Air Force Gen. William F. McKee, recalled that "because of the clear operational superiority of the Boeing aircraft and other factors, the Air Force Council, with Navy members, voted unanimously to recommend Boeing as a source . . ." for the new aircraft. The council said the Boeing design advantage over General Dynamics was "clear and substantial."

Secretary McNamara turned down the decision and chose General Dynamics. In a memorandum of Nov. 21, 1962, he criticized the "excessive optimism" of Boeing reflected in its design, and ordered acceptance of General Dynamics' proposal "on the basis that it proposes the greater degree of commonness, contemplates the use of conventional materials [Boeing had urged use of titanium], provides the higher confidence in structural design, and offers the better possibility of obtaining *the aircraft desired on schedule and within the dollars programed.*"

The Source Selection Board and the Air Force Council were never called for consultation, given an opportunity to explain, or to hear explanations. They were merely informed of the decision. Albert W. Blackburn, an aerospace consultant in the Pentagon at the time, later observed that "it is difficult to imagine that several hundred top technical experts . . . would again with such seriousness of purpose and over such a long period of time . . . so enthusiastically seek to accomplish the choice of the superior weapon-system proposal in another such competition when the total effort expended by them is from their point of view completely negated by an executive decision."

M'NAMARA STANDS FIRM

This executive decision by Mr. McNamara is the pivot point of the entire F–111 controversy. If it negated all that went before, it also places full responsibility for what comes after upon Mr. McNamara's shoulders. The Secretary of Defense has gladly accepted this burden, and has stood by it unflinchingly to this day, through a storm of criticism and a continuing investigation by the Senate Permanent Investigating Subcommittee, headed by Senator McClellan.

Mr. McNamara's reputation as the great steel-trap brain of the Pentagon, the decision maker who brought economy and efficiency to the Defense Department, was put on the line with the F–111 decision. Was it a bankrupt decision? A costly mistake? The people who will answer "yes" to those questions are legion. But remembering the animosity that has developed between the civilian element in the Pentagon, represented by Mr. McNamara, and the military, most of the brickbats thrown the Secretary's way must be examined judiciously, taken sparingly. However, there are undeniable facts arising from the inception of the TFX program, and the subsequent development of the F–111, which today place Mr. McNamara's decision in dubious light.

First, the cost. Since 1962, Mr. McNamara and his aides have trumpeted the "fact" that building of the joint-service airplane would save the taxpayers $1 billion. A year later, the Senate investigators discovered that the $1 billion figure was computed by a consultant in the Pentagon on a hypothetical airplane with "no relationship to General Dynamics or Boeing, or any of the other four earlier contractors." But the $1 billion figure has become an amusing antigue anyway, because of the ballooning cost of the F–111 program.

ESTIMATES GO UP

Back in 1963, the Air Force looked forward to spending $711,000,000 on research and development of the F–111, with this included in a total cost of just under $6 billion for purchase of 1,700 of the planes. Now the Air Force has revised its estimates. Misgivings about the plane have caused the total purchase to be reduced to 1,300 planes. However, research and development costs are now topping out at $2 billion, with at least $10 billion to be spent on actual plane purchases.

How could there be so much miscalculation on this revolutionary move to bring economy to military procurement? Of course the original figures upon which costs were calculated would be of great help in providing an answer. But there aren't any. Secretary McNamara rejected Air Force cost estimates on the TFX program as "unreliable" back in 1962. However, as the then comptroller general of the United States, Joseph Campbell, testified in 1963, Mr. McNamara had no "independent or additional cost estimates" of his own upon which to base the feasibility of the TFX program. When representatives from Mr. Campbell's office personally asked the Secretary of Defense for such figures, "he (the Secretary) stated that he had the figures in his head, indicating to us that he did not have them on paper."

Mr. McNamara's remarkable candor at this juncture must certainly be applauded, but Mr. Campbell was appalled by the implications of what the Secretary of Defense had said. "I would expect the fullest kind of documentation in this case for two reasons," the comptroller general told the Senate investigators. "One is the enormous expenditure involved, and second, which may not seem important, but it is to me, in case I were not around to explain something, the supporting documents would be available."

The second element detracting from Mr. McNamara's decision is the evidence of the F–111 itself. The Air Force version of the plane can reach scarcely over 25,000 feet when fully loaded with bombs and fuel. This is far below the projected—and secret—ceiling for the aircraft. Its ferry range is 600 miles short of requirements, and its crucial tree-top "dash" range (the Air Force's prime requirement) is about 25 to 50 miles compared to the 200 miles needed. The speed brake—a hinged device that projects from the fuselage to increase wind resistance and slow the plane—continues to give trouble. (The Boeing design called for thrust reversers in the engines, such as are used on jet liners, to substitute for a speed brake).

Because of the effort towards "commonality," the Navy version—designated F–111B—suffers all these same ills, plus more. The most important is weight. In compromising with the Air Force, the Navy accepted a projected 55,000-pound weight for its plane. Now the Navy version weighs about 75,000 pounds when armed and fueled. This is dangerously excessive for carrier operations and leaves little leeway for the fact that military planes grow in weight by as much as 25 per cent over the years, as new armament and electronic systems are added. The Navy will have to restructure most of its carrier elevators to accommodate all this weight. Usually, when a plane is brought up to the deck of the carrier, it rises on the elevator with a tractor already attached to drag it to the catapult. Not so with the F–111B. The Navy will need extra tractors since the plane will not fit on an elevator with its tractor. So there will have to be tractors below decks and tractors above decks.

A LOT OF WIND

One of the most crucial of the Navy's military requirements has sadly eroded too. The Navy wanted a plane that could take off from a carrier at anchor with no wind. The F–111B will need a wind of 29 knots (allowing for the Navy's 10-knot safety margin) to take off. This means that the F–111B will only be able to take off when the carrier is moving, and moving into the wind. If there is a wind of, say, 20 knots the carrier will have to be moving at least at 9 knots in order for the F–111B to take off. If there is little wind the carrier will have to be moving at top speed to permit take-off of F–111Bs. And the carrier will be moving in a predictable direction, since it must move into the wind. An enemy could therefore know by wind direction which way the carrier is moving. Original requirements, if satisfied, would have provided an almost instant response capability, which the Navy will not have with the F–111B—a plane ironically designated for defense of the fleet.

ONE VERSION PROCEEDS

Other problems plaguing both planes are myriad. They have caused production and development delays that have put the Navy version of the plane behind schedule by as much as two years. It is still considered "unacceptable for service use" by the Navy. But the Pentagon has steamed ahead, letting a $1.8 billion contract for the Air Force version (for an initial 493 planes) to General Dynamics. The Pentagon insists that while the Navy plan has had its troubles, the Air Force version is getting along fine. Senator McClellan observes, however, that "in view of the persistence for commonality, most of the defects in the Navy plane are also present in the Air Force plane. If these defects cannot be corrected, there is reason to consider abandonment of the project."

Far from abandoning the project, Mr. McNamara has announced more tasks will be assigned to the F–111. He plans to phase out 345 B–52s and 80 B–58s of the Strategic Air Command (SAC) and replace them with an F–111 modification called the FB–111. SAC and other military officials have pointed out that, judging from the present standards of the F–111 series, such a plane would be sadly deficient in almost every service requirement as a long-range bomber.

Such moves by Mr. McNamara have shaken his critics somewhat. How can he be wrong if he keeps banking on the F–111 so much? "Gad, what a poker player he'd be," remarked a member of the House of Representatives, intimating that the Secretary may be bluffing his way through an incredible error. Other Congressmen believe the Secretary is just too "vain and egotistical" (as Senator McClellan put it in a speech) to back down and admit an error. This has put Mr. McClellan in an uncomfortable position. He wants the Armed Services to have the best possible airplane for their needs; but he does not want a program costing so much money to slip through if it is not feasible. He has sought to withhold major funding of the F–111 program, but all the while he has been beset by the nagging thought that Mr. McNamara may have put the United States so far out on the limb with F–111 that its defense may be compromised unless this plane, good or bad, is used. Since the F–111 controversy began there have been no major new military-aircraft programs begun to fulfill similar defense needs.

"We may find ourselves out on the edge somewhere about 1970 with a lousy airplane and nothing to replace it," said a Navy officer in the Pentagon last week.

THE COST OF COMMONALITY

Secretary McNamara insists the F–111 is not a "lousy" airplane. He is staking everything on it, and on the concept of commonality. This is rather ironic, since the whole reason for commonality is economy. The F–111 gives every evidence of being an airplane in which money, lots of it, is being paid out to achieve commonality. General Dynamics and the Defense Department maintain that the "commonality factor" of the F–111 is about 80 per cent. This means that 80 per cent of the parts in the Air Force and Navy versions are identical. Aircraft designers and consultants interviewed by The National Observer refuse to believe this is so. Some venture to believe the factor has dropped to 60 per cent, and will go much lower before the F–111 is completely operational.

It is possible to achieve commonality and come up with something acceptable. But is acceptable good enough, where national defense is at stake? "The Defense Department has been able to say this plane is acceptable," notes Senator McClellan. "Well, acceptable is something far less than was expected in the F–111. These planes are not what either service asked for. The cost is more. The quality is less."

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Percy in the chair). Who yields time?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time on the pending amendment not start running until tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

IMPACT SCHOOL AID

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the conferees on H.R. 10196, the appropriations bill for the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, have reached a decision on the impacted school aid problem which will cause great difficulties in many localities across the Nation.

The conference committee agreed to take the House figure on this item—$439,137,000. The Senate had voted for $33,800,000 more for this purpose, or a total of $472,937,000. I am convinced the Senate's decision for the larger figure was completely justified, and that Congress will have to consider supplemental nourishment for these federally-affected areas.

I know that this has been a matter of great concern to the members of the conference committee, and that their decision was not arrived at without much attention. However, we must recognize the connection that this item has to our national defense posture. Schools within military-affected areas are under severe strain due to the extraordinary activity resulting from the war in Vietnam. Thus, important reductions made by the House figure will affect adversely the school programs of these already overcrowded schools.

JEWISH NEW YEAR

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, at 7 p.m. on this day, Wednesday, October 4, Jews throughout the world will usher in their New Year, of 5728. I rejoice with them in the observance that they will tender to this new milestone of their life.

In the main, their 5,728 years have been filled with adversities and difficulties. They were robbed by the kings and mobbed by the people, stopped from working at their professions by the guilds, and prohibited from worshiping in accordance with their faith by rulers intolerant of other people's religions. Without a common language, without a land to which they could go and rest their weary heads, but devotedly adhering to their Torah they struggled through life.

In the year 1492, when Columbus discovered America, the King of Spain discovered the Jews. He robbed them of their possesisons. Under penalty of torture and frequently death, an abandonment of their religion was demanded. To their great tribute, they suffered tortures and confiscation of their property, and forfeiture of life, rather than abandon their faith.

They were driven out of their ancient land of Jerusalem, driven out of Spain, and caused to move to various places of the world, but never have they given up their faith in their Torah.

Six million of them suffered death under the cruelty and terrorism of Hitler. Their only uniting force was the Torah, carried with them wherever they sought refuge.

How these people were able to survive has been a mystery and, in fact, a miracle in the history of the people of the world.

Mr. President, Rabbi David L. Genuth, of Cleveland, Ohio, a distinguished Jewish Rabbi, has issued a message in connection with this significant beginning of the 5,728th year of Jewish life. His message is so replete with tender and appropriate thoughts that I feel it is highly worthy of becoming a part of the Record of the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the message of Rabbi David L. Genuth be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> On Wednesday, October 4th at 7 P.M., Jews throughout the world will usher in the year 5728.
>
> One of the inspiring prayers reads as follows:
>
> "Now, Lord our God, put thy awe upon all whom thou hast made, thy dread upon all whom thou hast created; let thy works revere thee, let all thy creatures worship thee; may thy all blend into one brotherhood to do thy will with a perfect heart. For we know, Lord our God, that there is dominion, power and might; thou are revered above all that thou hast created."
>
> This year more than ever we are going to offer special prayers for the Fatherhood of God and for the Brotherhood of Man.
>
> According to our belief the first man was created on our Religious New Year. He was created in the image of God and he was endowed with an immortal soul.
>
> When we refer to man, we include all of God's children, regardless of race, creed or color.
>
> I believe it will be very appropriate for Jews all over the world to pray for peace in general and for peace in Viet Nam in particular.
>
> We, as Americans of Jewish faith had a great share in the making of this nation. In the mine and in the mill, at the lathe and at the loom, in counting room and council chamber, the Jews has been at work for 3 centuries and a half for his America. He has sentried his nation's camp; he has been in the mast's look-out on his nations ship; he has gone out to battle, and he was among them that fell at the firing line . . . The future will place new solemn obligations upon us for the country's sake and as Judaism's consecration; we shall not shirk our duties.

We will continue to defend our Americanism with all our hearts and souls.

On the New Year's we read Biblical portions pertaining to the day and one of the portions we recall the stirring challenge in the Bible, "I call heaven and earth to witness against you this day."

"Choose life" has been spoken throughout history to men and nations at the point when a life-or-death decision has to be made. The challenge is more urgent and more momentous today than ever before, because man has acquired skills and studied techniques which can easily eliminate him from our planet. His amazing conquests in the realm of nature may only speed his own annihilation unless he is more successful in conquering human nature. The tragedy of our age is that man learned to split the atom before he achieved a united humanity.

The High Holy Days present man with the greatest gift of God, that man was created in the image of God, and he was endowed with a Divine and Immortal Soul.

In the last 30 or 40 years we presented him with a concept which is not true, and therefore we corrupted him. We presented man as an automation of reflexes, as a mind-machine, as a bundle of instincts, and environment. We feel the nihilism to which modern man is, in any case, prone. This is the reason why on the Day of Atonement we read the story of Jonah, the Prophet. He was the Prophet who tried to run away from his Divinely-given duty but could never escape. He was also the Prophet who had to learn the lesson of the High Holy Days—that human life is a gift from God, and all men are God's children.

Rosh Hashanah also reminds us how important it is for each and every one of us to listen to God in the soft, still voice of our conscience. The Bible depicts the situation most picturesquely. The great Prophet Alijah was weary of life and prayed to die. He then received a Divine Command to go to Mt. Sinai. The trip took him 40 days; when he stood on top of the Mountain, great upheavals took place. There was a whirlwind that broke the rocks in pieces, there was an earthquake, and there was fire. The Holy Scriptures report that God was not in the whirlwind or in the earthquake, nor in the fire. Then came a soft, still voice. Alijah was suddenly aware of the presence of God. He received the Divine message and returned to his people. How important this message is for modern man!

Earthquakes in the shape of major or minor wars will not create the Kingdom of God. Riots and violence, burning and destroying will not assure us of a world of brotherhood and peace. Only by listening to the soft-still voice of God who keeps on repeating every moment of the day, "Choose life—choose peace—choose brotherhood," only then will our civilization be saved and mankind will enjoy peace and tranquillity in all eternity.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Percy in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM FOR TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, before making a motion to adjourn, I ask that the clerk state the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending amendment will be stated.

The Assistant Legislative Clerk. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams] proposes an amendment to S. 2388, as follows:

On page 2, beginning with line 3, strike out everything through line 17 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "sum of $2,060,000,000 of which, subject to the provisions of section 616 of such Act, the amounts appropriated or made available by appropriation Act shall not exceed $295,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of part A of title I of such Act, $579,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out part B of title I, $1,022,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out title II, $20,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out part A of title III, $27,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out part B of title III, $70,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out title V, $16,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out title VI, and $31,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out title VIII, and".

On page 26, strike out lines 10 and 11, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 102. Parts B and D of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 are consolidated as a new part of such title and amended to read as follows:".

On page 37, in line 19, strike out "and part D of this title".

Beginning with line 17 on page 40, strike out everything through line 12 on page 45.

Beginning with line 8 on page 78, strike out everything through line 21 on page 86.

Redesignate sections 104 through 106 as sections 103 through 105, respectively, and redesignate sections 109 through 113 as sections 106 through 110, respectively.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, for the information of Senators, I wish to recapitulate the information I gave to the Senate earlier today in response to the question propounded by the distinguished and able minority leader.

In the morning, in accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement offered by the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield], the morning business will be confined to no more than 15 minutes, following which, the consideration of the Williams amendment will take place, and 45 minutes is allotted to the consideration of that amendment. There will then be a vote on the Williams amendment.

Following the vote on the Williams amendment there may be other amendments and there may be other votes; but it is hoped that the third reading of the bill would follow not too long thereafter and that the Senate might then reach a final vote on the poverty bill.

Following the disposition of the poverty bill it is intended that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the Transportation Department appropriation bill. When the consideration of that bill has been concluded, any one or more of three appropriation bills will be brought up during the rest of the week for consideration. Those three bills are the NASA appropriation bill, the State, Justice, and Commerce appropriation bill, and the public works appropriation bill. The bills will not necessarily be considered in that order.

Mr. President, again, we expect to have some votes on tomorrow.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 9:30 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 5, 1967, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 4 (legislative day of October 2), 1967:

In the Navy

The following-named officers, when retired, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 5233:

Vice Adm. Charles B. Martell, U.S. Navy.
Vice Adm. Charles E. Weakley, U.S. Navy.

In the Army

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3284 and 3298:

To be first lieutenants

Aasen, Robert B., OF100369.
Adair, William H., OF101302.
Adams, James L., OF101303.
Adams, Robert G., OF100372.
Adams, Stanley L., OF100373.
Adams, Thomas L., OF100374.
Adams, William D., OF103166.
Adkins, Hubert R., OF101872.
Alitz, Douglas A., OF101304.
Alldredge, Donald H., OF100378.
Allen, John M., OF100380.
Allison, David B., OF102305.
Allman, Gary W., OF100382.
Amedick, Paul F., OF100741.
Ames, Robert A., OF101305.
Amrine, Robert M., OF101306.
Anderson, Darwin J., OF100383.
Anderson, Norman L., OF101307.
Anderson, Raymond W., OF101308.
Andre, James C., OF100366.
Andrews, Andrew E., OF101309.
Andrews, Roger L., OF103808.
Ankrom, Charles B., OF101873.
Annan, William M., OF101310.
Anthony, Thomas E., OF101311.
Armstrong, David B., OF102400.
Arnold, Joseph C., OF101312.
Arrington, John W., OF101313.
Asbury, David L., O095425.
Ashbrook, Lonnie R., OF100392.
Austin, Lavern M., OF100393.
Avery, Ronald L., OF100742.
Bachman, Howard F., OF101314.
Badger, Thomas A., OF101315.
Bailey, Harvey J., OF101876.
Bain, Seavy A., Jr., OF101316.
Baker, Joel S., OF100398.
Balderson, Robert A., OF101317.
Baldwin, Roger L., OF101318.
Ball, Francisco, Jr., OF100402.
Ballagh, Robert S., OF101319.
Ballou, Roger W., OF100988.
Banovic, Daniel M., OF101320.
Baratto, David J., OF101321.
Barber, Victor C., OO99128.
Barnett, Phillip G., OF100405.
Barnett, Ronald V., OO96821.
Baron, Thomas S., OF100406.
Barovetto, John L., OO97752.
Barr, Douglas H., OF101322.
Barrett, Robert W., OF100407.
Barrow, Joseph M., OF102307.

Barry, Anthony, OF100408.
Baseheart, George M., OF101323.
Basile, Domenic F., OF100410.
Bast, Christopher O., OF101324.
Batchelder, Michael., OF100411.
Batrow, Peter P., Jr., OF100413.
Battey, Robert E., OF100414.
Battilega, John A., OO99130.
Baukert, Frank P., OF100415.
Baumann, Charles H., OF100416
Beale, Richard E., Jr., OF101879
Beardslee, Harold M., OF100419
Beasley, Clifford M., OF101325
Beaumont, Richard A., OF100420
Bechtold, Earl E., OF100421
Beck, William R., OF101326
Bedford, Ralph F., OF100422
Beierschmitt, James, OF101328
Bell, David G., OF100423
Bell, Terence M., OF102309
Bennett, David W., OF100920
Bennett, Douglas P., OF101329
Bennett, James R., OF101880.
Bennett, Jay F., OF101330.
Bergen, John D., Jr., OF101331.
Bergeron, Daniel M., OF106497.
Bergman, David M., OF101332.
Bertelli, Paul F., OF101333.
Best, Billy B., OF105618.
Bettner, Steven M., OF101334.
Biank, Samuel A., OF101335.
Bigelow, James E., II, OF101336.
Binney, David G., OF101337.
Bischoff, Eric L., OF101338.
Bjork, Gary F., OF100438.
Black, Bruce R., OF100439.
Black, William L., Jr., OF100440.
Black, William R., OF101339.
Blair, Joseph M., III, OF100442.
Blalock, Harry H., OF101082.
Blankenship, Dumont, OF100444.
Bloomfield, Kenneth, OF101340.
Bogensberger, Paul, OF100448.
Boland, Edward J., OF100449.
Bolen, William R., OF101341.
Boling, Joseph E., OF100453.
Bonine, Larry S., OF101881.
Boone, Howard E., OF101342.
Booth, Teddy J., OF100454.
Boroff, Michael A., OF100456.
Bosworth, Weldon S., OF100458.
Bouchard, Frederick, OF100459.
Bourne, Robert R., OF106063.
Bowers, Michael J., OF101343.
Bowman, Thomas E., OF100461.
Boyd, Hugh F., III, OF101344.
Boyles, Calvin E., OF100463.
Bradham, R. A., OF102690.
Bramlett, David A., OF101345.
Bramlette, Larry J., OF101346.
Branch, David D., Jr., OF101882.
Brandon, James C., OF102313.
Bransford, Ann H., LO00834.
Brennan, Mark F., Jr., OF101347.
Brennan, Robert F., OF100079.
Bresley, Kenneth V., OF96825.
Brewer, Larry K., OF101348.
Brinkman, Edward P., OF101349.
Brinton, Robert H., OF100470.
Brockliss, John A., OF100471.
Brogdon, James M., II, OF100472.
Brokaw, Milton J., OF101350.
Brophy, Daniel M., OF100473.
Brotzman, Ellis R., OF100475.
Brown, Albert S., Jr., OF100476.
Brown, Charles T., Jr., OF101352.
Brown, Gerald C., OF101353.
Brown, James H., OF100477.
Brown, Martin G., OF100478.
Brown, Richard J., OF100480.
Brown, Robert B., OF100481.
Brown, Victor A., OF100483.
Brucker, Willis H., OF101354.
Bruggeman, Bradley, OF100485.
Brunner, William H., OF101887.
Burton, Robert W., OF100486.
Bryon, Larry A., OF101355.
Brye, Paul E., OF100487.
Buckles, Richard L., OF100024.
Buckley, Michael J., OF101356.
Buckner, Roy C., OF101357.
Buehler, Christian, OF100962.
Bujalski, David A., OF101358.
Bullard, Charles N., OF100489.
Burch, Harold E., OF101889.
Burke, John C., III, OF100491.
Burkett, Lawrence A., OF100493.
Burney, Samuel M., Jr., OF101359.
Burns, Edward C., OF101171.
Burton, Emmette Y., OF103091.
Butiak, Jan M., OF100495.
Butler, Thomas W., OF101360.
Byrd, Wayne W., OF100497.
Cahill, Gregory, OF100498.
Campbell, Donald L., OF101890.
Campbell, James L., OF100518.
Campbell, Ralph J., OF101361.
Cappellino, Anthony, OF100502.
Cardwell, Stephen G., OF100506.
Carey, John P., OF100507.
Carlisle, Richard D., OF105642.
Carlson, Robert H., OF101362.
Carmichael, John H., OF100509.
Carnes, Robert D., OF100605.
Carr, Jeremiah T., OF100510.
Carr, Richard L., Jr., OF101363.
Carson, James M., Jr., OF101364.
Carter, Ian B., OF101365.
Carter, Virgil R., II, OF100721.
Carver, George A., Jr., OF101366.
Cary, John R., OF101367.
Case, Harry M., OF100088.
Case, Melvin E., OF1011368.
Casey, Bernard J., OF100251.
Casey, Michael T., OF100513.
Cate, Paul E., Jr., OF101369.
Cates, William N., Jr., OF100516.
Caudill, Watson G., OF101370.
Cavanaugh, Roger J., OF100517.
Cecchine, Gary A., OF101371.
Cella, James J., OF102698.
Cesarski, William V., OF101372.
Chaffers, James A., OF100519.
Chaffin, Sherrill T., OF100520.
Chapin, Edward D., OF101892.
Chapman, James H., OF104392.
Chapman, Thomas W., OF101373.
Charlton, Darrel T., OF100524.
Charpentier, Lino G., OF102317.
Charron, Leo D., Jr., OF101374.
Cherrie, Stanley F., OF100525.
Chescavage, William, OF101375.
Chilcoat, Richard A., OF101376.
Childress, Richard, OF100526.
Ching, Wendell T. P., OF100527.
Chiota, Robert J., OF100528.
Chirico, Carl F., Jr., O096832.
Chmielak, Jerome A., OF101377.
Christensen, Alan N., OF101378.
Christoffersen, Jon, OF100529.
Chun, Kenneth W., OF102699.
Churchill, Floyd V., OF100530.
Ciancaglini, Joseph, OF100531.
Clark, John R., OF101379.
Clearwaters, Boyd L., OF101893.
Cleavenger, Carl M., OF103261.
Cleek, Don E., OF101894.
Clelland, David H., OF100532.
Clingham, James H., OF100534.
Cobbs, James S., OF101380.
Colburn, Neville, OF101381.
Colclasure, Wyett H., OF102318.
Cole, Coye M., OF100536.
Cole, Edward G., II, OF100094.
Coleman, Fredrick W., OF101382.
Collins, Arthur L., OF100538.
Collins, Bernhard B., OF103093.
Collins, David, OF100539.
Collins, Francis J., OF101383.
Collins, Ronald S., OF100540.
Condon, Thomas B., OF100542.
Confer, Kenneth T., OF100543.
Conn, Samuel H., Jr., O096835.
Conner, John T., OF100545.
Connolly, Patrick C., OF100546.
Connor, William M., OF101384.
Conrad, Joseph C., OF100547.
Conway, Michael J., OF101385.
Cook, Michael R., OF101386.
Cook, Robert E., OF100548.
Cook, William H., OF106552.
Cooper, Norman G., OF100071.
Cope, John A., Jr., OF101387.
Coppin, Thomas D., O099550.
Corbett, David A., OF101388.
Corcoran, Edward J., OF100549.
Corey, George C., OF100550.
Corey, Joseph J., Jr., OF101389.
Corley, Bruce R., OF101390.
Cornell, James E., OF101391.
Counts, Clyde G., OF103096.
Covalucci, Robert J., OF100553.
Covington, Terrell, OF101393.
Cox, Walter T., III, OF101896.
Craighill, Robert R., OF101394.
Crissman, Kearney W., OF101395.
Crites, Richard J., OF100556.
Cromartie, George D., OF101396.
Cross, Ronald M., OF101397.
Crossman, John S., OF100558.
Crowder, Lewis H., OF102706.
Culp, Dennis K., Jr., OF101398.
Cunningham, Clyde R., O096838.
Cunningham Richard, OF100560.
Cunningham Thomas, OF101399.
Cupp, James L., OF100562.
Curran, Thomas M., OF101400.
Cusick, John J., OF100563.
Dabrowski, Peter F., OF103100.
Dahl, Matthew G., OF101698.
Daily, Robert R., Jr., OF102036.
Dalessandro, Peter, OF101401.
Daly, James M., Jr., OF101402.
Danielski, Loren R., OF101900.
Danylchuk, Peter R., OF101403.
Darrow, John H., OF101404.
Dash, Michael E., OF100570.
Daub, Russe, OF100571.
Davis, Charlton E., OF100573.
Davis, Charles T., O095475.
Davis, Curtis A., OF101405.
Davis, Glendel C., OF100574.
Davis, Richard W., Jr., OF101406.
Davis, Stewart P., OF102038.
Davis, Walter W., Jr., OF101407.
Davison, Michael S., OF101408.
Davy, Douglas C., OF100575.
Day, James R., OF101902.
De Gon, Kenneth M., OF101409.
De Vito, Kenneth J., OF101903.
Dean, Richard V., OF100576.
Deasy, Kevin B., OF100577.
Decoteau, Glynn T., OF100578.
Dee, Raymond C., OF100579.
Deloatch, Voneree, OF100581.
Derrah, Donald W., OF100582.
Desjardins, George, OF101410.
Deter, Daniel E., OF101411.
Devanney, Thomas M., OF100583.
Dexter, Craig M., OF101904.
Dexter, Paul D., OF100584.
Dexter, Richard P., OF101412.
Di Nens, William T., OF101413.
Dick, Donald E., OF100587.
Dickey, James L., OF101905.
Dickson, John R., OF103101.
Diesing, Richard C., OF100589.
Dietze, Jeffrey C., OF100590.
Dixon, Daniel D., OF100591.
Dixon, Peter J., OF100592.
Doerfler, Donald W., OF106572.
Dole, William E., Jr., OF101906.
Dollar, William M., OF102039.
Dollhausen, Hans C., O096365.
Domas, George J., Jr., OF101414.
Donnelly, Joseph J., OF100594.
Doolittle, Robert J., OF101416.
Dovas, Christos A., OF100597.
Dowdy, Edward C., III, OF100598.
Downey, James P., OF101417.
Downs, Michael C., OF100600.
Draper, Stephen E., OF101418.
Dresser, Paul A., Jr., OF100601.
Drillock, Serge, OF100602.
Due, William F., Jr., OF101419.
Duffy, John P., OF101420.
Duke, Wayne, OF102041.
Dundy, Michael W., OF101910.
Dunlap, David W., OF101911.
Dunn, Emet C., Jr., OF100606.
Dunn, Thomas D., Jr., OF106582.
Dunning, Raymond M., OF100607.
Durand, Pedro J., OF101912.

Durfee, Thomas J., OF101422.
Durgin, Harry W., OF101913.
Dye, Carl E., OF101423.
Dykes, Andrew A., OF101424.
East, Jared, OF102321.
Ebert, Marlin J., OF104414.
Ebitz, Curtis V., OF102322.
Edwards, Dennis L., O099832.
Edwards, Jerry W., OF100614.
Efird, Crayon C., Jr., OF101425.
Eggers, Howard C., OF100619.
Egner, George F., OF101426.
Ehrlich, Martin L., OF101915.
Eklund, Kenneth R., OF101427.
Elliott, Charles B., OF100624.
Elliott, Don A., OF102862.
Ellis, Harold J., OF102323.
Ellison, John S., OF100625.
Elson, Peter M., OF101428.
Ely, Douglas C., OF100626.
Ely, Thomas L., OF100627.
Endress, George W., OF100629.
Engelking, Roger F., OF100630.
Erdmans, Thomas J., OF101429.
Eschenwald, Aldolfo, OF101916.
Ethington, William, OF100632.
Evans, Daniel M., Jr., OF101430.
Faddis, Roy J., OF101431.
Falconer, Thomas J., OF102711.
Falise, Ferdinand R., OF100634.
Farnsworth, John A., OF101432.
Faulds, Thomas G., OF101433.
Fechner, Robert F., OF100637.
Felton, William D., OF100639.
Ferry, Bernard A., Jr., OF101434.
Ferry, John V., OF100643.
Filaseta, Michael A., OF100645.
Fillingame, Billy W., OF100646.
Fincher, Betty H., L000644.
Finno, Roy S., OF101435.
Fischer, Paul H., OF102324.
Fischer, Ronald E., OF100648.
Fishback, David M., OF101436.
Fisher, George A., Jr., OF101437.
Fitzgerald, Daniel, OF100650.
Fitzgibbon, Daniel, OF101438.
Flanagan, James A., OF100651.
Flick, Michael B., OF100654.
Flint, Charles K., OF101439.
Flowers, James P., OF102713.
Fly, Francis L., Jr., OF101440.
Fontaine, Roland G., OF109047.
Fortunato, Edward T., OF100660.
Foster, Richard A., OF100670.
Foster, Robert B., OF101441.
Fostervold, Harald, OF100662.
Fowler, James A., OF103110.
Fox, David W., OF100663.
Fracker, Stanley S., OF101442.
Francis, Joseph J., O099842.
Francis, Marion E., OF102328.
Francisco, John R., OF100667.
Fraser, George D., OF100671.
Freeman, Eldon V., OF106112.
Freeman, Waldo D., Jr., OF101444.
Freestone, William, OF100672.
Friedman, Jay A., OF102327.
Friedrich, Robert L., OF100676.
Fritchie, John W., OF100679.
Fulco, Albert P., Jr., OF101445.
Gadarowski, James J., OF100371.
Gaetje, Frank C., OF100684.
Gaither, John B., OF100685.
Galton, Mark C., OF101447.
Gantsoudes, James G., OF101448.
Garber, William B., OF100687.
Gares, William M., Jr., OF100691.
Gasdek, Barry D., OF101921.
Gaston, Hardie M., OF100165.
Gauger, George H., OF100692.
Gawronski, Kenneth, OF100693.
Gaylor, Arnold H., OF101449.
Genther, William E., OF100695.
George, James D., OF100696.
Gesner, Robert W., OF101450.
Gibson, Clyde K., OF101922.
Gibson, William D., OF102330.
Gilbert, Ralph W., Jr., O096856.
Gill, Norman W., Jr., OF101451.
Gillem, Dennis J., OF101452.
Gilson, Dennis, R., OF101453.
Gimbert, Robert A., OF102050.
Giordano, Frank, R., OF100985.
Givens, John W., OF100701.
Gledhill, Carl W., OF101923.
Gleszer, Peter E., OF101454.
Golas, Robert J., OF100707.
Gonzalez, John A., OF100709.
Gooch, Gerald L., OF100710.
Gordon, Charles L., O096587.
Gordon, Donald J., OF101924.
Goriup, Franklin J., OF105681.
Goularte, Richard W., OF101926.
Gragg, Robe, O099549.
Graham, John M., OF101456.
Gralla, Lawrence J., OF102052.
Grammel, Ronald G., OF100716.
Grant, Ernest R., OF102053.
Grasfeder, Lee R., OF101457.
Graves, Patrick H., OF101458.
Graw, Leroy H., OF101459.
Gray, Frederick C., OF101460.
Gray, Richard L., OF101461.
Gray, Roy V., OF100717.
Green, Jerry, OF100718.
Green, Martin L., Jr., OF101462.
Gregson, Robert M., OF101463.
Greiner, Bruce I., OF101464.
Griffin, Sanford W., OF100703.
Griffith, Michael W., OF101465.
Grimes, Everett D., OF101466.
Grippe, Jerome P., OF100720.
Grisham, James W., OF101467.
Grisham, Jerret R., OF102333.
Grote, Dennis A., OF101930.
Grotheer, Allan J., OF100722.
Grubbs, John H., OF101468.
Grunstad, Norman L., OF101469.
Guimond, Paul R., OF100726.
Gulstrand, Rudolph, O098556.
Guthrie, William E., OF101470.
Gventer, Elliott J., OF102054.
Haas, Charles W., II, OF100728.
Haessig, Arthur G., OF100731.
Halberg, Richard C., OF100733.
Hall, Donald A., OF101471.
Hall, Philip L., OF100734.
Hall, Roger P., OF102056.
Hampton, John J., OF101933.
Hanko, Thomas M., OF106640.
Haraszko, Dennis A., OF100757.
Harding, James R., OF101472.
Hardy, Leonard D., Jr., OF101473.
Harnisch, John M., OF101474.
Harris, James S. W., OF102338.
Harris, Philip, R., OF100740.
Harris, Randolph L., OF101475.
Hartle, Anthony E., OF101476.
Hartley, George M., OF101477.
Hartman, Clarence B., OF101478.
Hartman, Thomas E., OF103841.
Harvey, James F., OF101479.
Hatfield, Harold M., OF101480.
Hayashida, Myron K., OF100745.
Haydash, Edward J., OF101481.
Haydon, David E., OF100746.
Hayward, Gregory J., OF101482.
Heard, George L., Jr., OF102067.
Heger, Richard G., OF100750.
Hegg, George H., OF100751.
Hegglund, James W. OF101483.
Heine, Charles E., OF101936.
Heisterman, Robert, OF103120.
Hellmuth, Robert W., O094072.
Henderson, Robert S., OF100753.
Heneman, Helmuth J., OF101484.
Henry, William A., OF101485.
Herdegen, Lawrence, OF101486.
Herold, Thomas J., OF102058.
Herron, Reese P., Jr. OF102340.
Hess, Michel E., OF100754.
Heydt, Richard H., OF101467.
Hickson, Robert D., OF101488.
Higbee, Roger C., OF101489.
Hillard, David F., OF100757.
Hillard, George O., OF101490.
Hilliard, Robert W., OF106138.
Hillyer, Robert A., OF101491.
Hinshaw, Frederick, OF101492.
Hodor, Robe, OF100761.
Hoefer, Rufus S., OF104352.
Holdsworth, David R., OF101493.
Holeman, J. B., Jr., OF101494.
Hollingsworth, Rona, OF100766.
Holmes, Jack J., OF100767.
Holms, Richard L., Jr., OF102059.
Holt, Wayland T., OF100769.
Holway, William K., OF10639.
Hoover, William O., OF101495.
Hornbarger, Daniel, OF101496.
Horstman, Michael L., OF101497.
Hospodar, William G., OF100772.
Hottell, John A. III, OF101498.
Houck, Merle L., OF100773.
Houston, William R., OF102061.
Hovey, Roy, A., OF102724.
Howard, Bruce L., OF101499.
Howard, John D., OF101500.
Huber, Walter D., OF100776.
Hudak, Daniel X., OF101940.
Hudgins, Seth F., Jr., OF101501.
Hudson, Kelly S., OF100777.
Hughes, Justin R., OF101502.
Hughey, Philip J., OF101503.
Hunt, Leon T., OF100778.
Igel, Peter A., OF100782.
Induni, Stephen J., OF101505.
Isaac, Alfred G., OF100785.
Israel, James L., OF102063.
Jackman, William L., OF101506.
Jackson, Charles L., OF101507.
Jackson, Dixie J., OF102343.
Jackson, Richard E., OF100786.
Jackson, Robert L., OF101942.
Jacoby, Thomas G., OF101943.
Jucunski, George G., OF101508.
Janairo, Antonio R., OF101509.
Jappen, John W., OF102062.
Jenkins, Charles A., O099763.
Jerge, Louis A., OF101510.
Jinks, James R., OF101511.
Johnson, Allan W., OF102064.
Johnson, Bobby D., OF102065.
Johnson, Charles L., OF100792.
Johnson, Curtis S., OF101944.
Johnson, Gary R., OF101512.
Johnson, Max W., OF101513.
Johnson, Robert L., OF101514.
Johnson, Robert B., OF101945.
Johnston, J. Ford, Jr., OF102066.
Jones, Allen F., OF101515.
Jones, Buddington B., OF100793.
Jones, Herman H., OF100795.
Jones, Philip A., OF100797.
Jones, Raymond M., OF101516.
Jones, Roy, Jr., OF101517.
Jorgensen, Michael, OF100801.
Jorgensen, Robert B., OF103857.
Judge, Robert M., OF106152.
Juergens, William A., O096876.
Jullian, Robert A., OF100802.
Jump, Robert K., OF102067.
Kacsmar, Francis N., OF101949.
Kamicka, Gerald W., OF105446.
Kane, Mark A., OF100805.
Katsuyoshi, Charles, O096854.
Kaufman, Harold J., OF101518.
Kawamoto, Spencer K., OF100807.
Keenan, Robert L., OF100801
Kelley, Kevin C., OF101519.
Kelley, Randall R., OF100512.
Kelly, Arthur M., Jr., OF101520.
Kelly, James A., Jr., OF100814.
Kelly, Richard J., OF100813.
Kelly, Robert J., OF100816.
Kelton, Earl R., OF101521.
Kempinski, Chester, OF101522.
Kendall, Arnold E., OF100818.
Kendall, Glen R., OF100819.
Kenison, Charles B., OF102069.
Kernahan, Gregory P., OF100823.
Kernen, George G., OF100824.
Kerns, Thomas C., OF101523.
Kerrigan, Robert J., OF100825.
Kesler, Robert W., OF100826.
Kevitz, Eric A., OF100827.
Keyes, Joseph E., OF100828.
Kiely, William L., OF100830.
Kierstead, Arthur E., OF101524.
Kievenaar, Henry A., OF100831.
Kiley, Michael J., OF101525.
Kim, Dennis S. Q., OF101951.
Kindergan, John F., OF100832.

King, Carll, OF102346.
King, Henry, OF100833.
King, Jay P., OF100834.
Kirkpatrick, David, OF101527.
Kite-Powell, Christopher R., OF101528.
Kleb, Geoffrey H., OF101529.
Klein, George C., OF100837.
Klein, Robert J., OF101530.
Kluess, Calvin R., OF101531.
Klunk, Daniel S., OF101532.
Knell, Raymond E., Jr., OF101533.
Knickerbocker, Raymond J., OF105721.
Knight, Richard G., OF101534.
Knowles, Richard W., OF106159.
Knox, Rhona M., N003159.
Knudsen, Jerald G., OF102348.
Knutzen, John A., OF101535.
Kobayashi, Ted M., OF101536.
Koeplin, Wayne M., OF101952.
Kofalt, James A., OF101537.
Kolanowski, Stanley, OF100933.
Kollarik, Donald M., OF102071.
Korponai, David A., OF100842.
Koster, James L., OF101538.
Kotch, Stephen, Jr., OF102072.
Koterwas, Donald J., OF101539.
Kotrc, James C., OF101540.
Kowalchik, Michael, OF101541.
Kramer, William J., OF100843.
Kratz, Paul J., OF106161.
Kraus, Robert G., OF101953.
Kresefski, Leonard, OF101542.
Kruger, Lawrence J., OF100846.
Krutulis, Joseph W., OF102073.
Kubicek, Charles K., OF100848.
Kufeke, Ralph P., OF101543.
Kullman, Thomas M., OF101544.
Kvam, Kenneth C., OF101545.
Labutti, Ronald J., OF100850.
Ladd, Richard B., O096880.
Laier, James E., OF101955.
Lake, Joseph R., OF101547.
Lamar, Lawson L., OF102349.
Lamarine, Paul A., OF100851.
Lamback, Samuel P., OF101548.
Lambert, Franklin P., OF101549.
Lamkin, Fletcher M., OF101550
Lamoureux, Michael, OF100852
Landers, Willard O., OF101956.
Landgraf, William H., OF101551.
Landowski, Robert R., OF010853.
Lang, John W., III, OF101552.
Lange, David L., OF100856.
Lanier, Tharan J., OF100857.
Lanning, James W., OF100858.
Larkin, Andrew M., Jr., OF100859.
Larson, Jeffrey A., OF101553.
Latimer, David M., Jr., OF101554.
Lavoy, Gary R., OF101546.
Lazenby, Gerald A., OF101958.
Leaptrott, William, OF101959.
Lee, Dwaye G., OF101555.
Lee, Frederick O., OF102352.
Legan, Thomas L., OF101556.
Lehman, Nelson S., Jr., O097642.
Lehner, Jon O., OF100867.
Lehowicz, Larry G., OF100868.
Leishner, Stanley L., OF100159.
Lent, Morris J., OF101557.
Leonard, Michael, OF101558.
Levin, Daniel, OF101559.
Lew, James W., OF101560.
Lewis, David P., Jr., OF101961.
Lewis, James M., OF100871.
Leyendecker, John S., OF100872.
Leyerzaph, John W., OF101561.
Libbey, Glidden N., OF102722.
Lincoln, Daniel B., OF100873.
Lind, Ronald W., OF101562.
Lindou, James R., OF101563.
Lindstrom, Lawrence, OF100876.
Little, Robert D., OF103455.
Littnan, Charles L., O099771.
Lohmiller, William E., OF109988.
Lorenz, John F., OF100883.
Losey, Myron D., OF100884.
Lott, Thomas W., OF101963.
Lough, Maurice T., OF101564.
Louis, Geoffrey R., OF101565.
Lovelace, Frederick, OF100886.
Lowe, Richard A., OF100887.
Lowe, Richard V., OF102076.
Loyd, Gerald E., OF100888.
Lozeau, Arthur G., OF101566.
Luckie, William J., OF101567.
Lucyk, Edward J., OF101568.
Lufkins, Daniel F., OF102077.
Lum, Franklin Y. S., OF100889.
Lundquist, Loren G., OF100891.
Lundy, Robert J., Jr., OF100892.
Lyon, Kenneth S., OF105745.
MacDonald, Clifford, OF100894.
MacDonald, Donald, OF106301.
MacDonald, Terence, OF100895.
Macchiaroli, Charles R., OF101570.
Macia, James H., III, OF101571.
Mack, Arthur R., OF101572.
Mackey, Edward E., OF101573.
Maddocks, Carmen F., N3280.
Madsen, Per I., OF101574.
Magnell, Carl O., OF101575.
Magruder, Robert B., OF101576.
Mahar, Harold W., OF101966.
Mahley, Donald A., II, OF102741.
Mahn, Michael J., OF100896.
Major, William J., Jr., OF101577.
Makieve, Mi, OF100897.
Mallberg, Dale D., OF101967.
Mallory, Reginald, OF100898.
Manhart, Michael H., OF100899.
Manske, Tad P., OF100902.
Manton, Terry D., OF101578.
Marinelli, Libero, OF102079.
Marino, Benedict T., OF101579.
Markowski, Eugene P., OF101580.
Martin, Edward G., OF100906.
Martin, Jim I., OF100907.
Martin, Ronald S., OF100150.
Marxen, Edward L., OF101969.
Mashburn, Frank C., OF101581.
Mastriani, Joseph A., OF101582.
Matrosic, Charles A., OF100915.
Matsumoto, Robert K., OF101583.
Maulella, Vincent M., OF100917.
Mayhew, William J., OF101584.
Mazik, Peter D., OF100918.
McAdams, Richard C., OF101585.
McAteer, Peter J., OF101586.
McCaffrey, Barry R., OF101587.
McCanham, Frank A., OF101972.
McCarley, Kenneth, OF101973.
McCloskey, John S., OF100921.
McClure, James R., OF101568.
McClure, John A., OF100922.
McConnell, Jeffrey, OF100924.
McCormack, Harold, OF101589.
McCormack, James R., OF101590.
McCoy, Bob F., OF101591.
McCoy, Frederick W., OF100926.
McCranie, Von S., OF106706.
McCutchan, James B., OF101592.
McFarlin, Robert P., OF100928.
McGrath, Dennis J., OF100929.
McGrath, Francis C., OF100930.
McInnis, William L., OF102080.
McKay, Donald M., Jr., O096914.
McKinley, Bruce A., OF101593.
McKinley, Michael, OF101594.
McKittrick, James, OF101595.
McLaughlin, Stanley, OF101596.
McLemore, Eugene M., OF101597.
McMakin, William H., OF101598.
McNamara, James C., OF105947.
McNeill, David, Jr., OF100935.
McNulty, James F., OF101599.
McTernan, Bernard, O092990.
McWatters, Jack W., OF101600.
Melchiori, Remo, Jr., OF101601.
Mellett, Richard E., OF100940.
Melton, Jackson D., OF100941.
Menzel, Sewall H., OF100944.
Merritt, Robert G., OF101602.
Messinger, Boyd R., OF100945.
Metz, Richard H., OF100946.
Metzger, William H., OF100847.
Meyer, Peter J., OF101605.
Micek, Jerome J., OF100948.
Michela, Robert J., OF101604.
Michlik, Martin J., OF101605.
Miles, Rich, OF101978.
Miller, Brink P., OF101607.
Miller, Charles S., OF101608.
Miller, Jack T., OF101609.
Miller, Leonard D., OF101979.
Miller, Michael D., OF101610.
Miller, Warren F., Jr., OF101611.
Miller, William J., OF101612.
Mingo, Fred, OF100955.
Mirus, John E., OF100956.
Mitchell, Michael A., OF101980.
Moakley, Geoffrey S., OF101614.
Monson, Robert E., OF101615.
Moomaw, Robert C., OF101616.
Moran, Michael J., OF101617.
Morgan, Ted G., OF101618.
Morig, Robert D., OF100967.
Morris, Alton D., OF106192.
Morris, John C., OF102356.
Morse, Jan R., OF100970.
Mortimer, S., OF100971.
Morton, Frederic W., OF100972.
Morton, Hugh P., OF101619.
Moser, John T., OF100973.
Moss, Jesse, Jr., OF101983.
Moss, Robert V., OF101620.
Mozden, James P., OF101621.
Muir, James I., III, OF101622.
Mullen, James F., OF100975.
Muratti, Jose A., OF101623.
Murdy, William F., II, OF101624.
Murimoto, Warren S., OF100960.
Murphy, Alfred W., OF102358.
Murphy, Kevin R., OF101625.
Murray, John F., OF101626.
Murray, Kenneth L., OF100980.
Mutal, Morris F., OF103142.
Myers, William D., OF102084.
Nagy, Edward L., OF100983.
Nahas, Nicholas M., OF101627.
Nanstad, Randy K., OF101628.
Nawrosky, Michael R., OF101629.
Neale, Justice W., OF101630.
Nelsen, James W., OF100986.
Nelson, Larry L., OF100987.
Newman, Ray D., OF106755.
Newman, Thomas K., OF102085.
Nichols, Harwood S., OF101631.
Nielsen, Alan R., OF100989.
Nieman, Dowell T., OF100990.
Niford, Chester R., OF101984.
Nisbet, Gerald D., OF100991.
Nischwitz, John A., OF101632.
Normyle, James W., OF101633.
Nowak, Richard A., OF101635.
Nunn, Jack H., OF101636.
O'Brien, Joseph J., Jr., OF101637.
O'Bryan, James M., OF100998.
O'Connor, Dennis J., OF101638.
Odea, David P., OF100999.
Odom, Ronald G., OF101641.
O'Donnell, James E., OF101639.
O'Donnell, Robert M., OF101000.
Odum, Michael R. R., OF101001.
Oehrlein, Richard V., OF101642.
Oesterling, Richard, OF100172.
O'Neal, Douglas P., OF101640.
O'Neal, Jerry L., OF101002.
O'Neill, Joseph T., OF101985.
Onweller, Arthur E., OF101004.
Orndorff, Christopher M., OF101643.
Orr, Robert H., OF101644.
Osterlin, Howard P., OF101006.
O'Sullivan, Kevin E., OF101008.
Otjen, John P., OF101645.
Overton, Stephen M., OF101646.
Pachler, Francis T., OF101647.
Page, Gary O., OF101648.
Pagliaro, Salvatore, O095653.
Paconis, William G., OF101010.
Palma, Gerard V., OF101650.
Palmer, Allyn J., OF101651.
Palumbo, Guy B., OF101011.
Parker, Arthur E., OF101652.
Parrott, Preston A., OF102361.
Paton, Thomas D., OF101014.
Patterson, Alexander, OF100460.
Pauley, Richard E., O097724.
Payne, David P., OF103144.
Payne, William B., OF101653.
Peake, Charles A., OF101016.
Pedersen, James H., OF101654.
Pedersen, William N., OF101019.
Pells, Russell K., OF101655.

Pembrook, Stephen B., OF101656.
Perkins, Jacob H., O092792.
Perrill, Robert D., OF101022.
Perryman, Steven, OF101657.
Peters, Roosevelt, OF102363.
Petersen, Bradley H., OF101986.
Peterson, Jay R., OF101024.
Pezzillo, Frank M., OF101987.
Pfeiff, William P., OF101026.
Pheeney, Walter T., OF101027.
Pickett, George E., OF101028.
Piekarski, Richard, OF101658.
Pietsch, Kent L., OF101659.
Pike, Nolan A., III, OF101031.
Pittman, James T., OF101660.
Plaut, Peter K., OF101035.
Poe, Gerald D., OF101036.
Pokras, Richard M., OF106357.
Polliard, John C., OF101037.
Polonitza, Edmund H., OF101039.
Ponko, Marshall D., OF104516.
Ponzoli, Gary P., OF101661.
Pope, Frederick M., OF101662.
Popp, James L., OF101663.
Popp, Ronald S., OF102090.
Powers, James C., OF101664.
Powers, James W., OF101665.
Prather, Dan E., OF105801.
Prawdzik, David A., OF101990.
Price, John S., OF101666.
Priest, James H., OF102091.
Prothero, Michael B., OF101667.
Puckett, John D., OF101050.
Pulsts, Peteris, OF101053.
Quann, Brendan T., OF101668.
Quidgley, Ernesto, OF101993.
Quist, Frederick F., OF101669.
Rafanelli, Gene H., OF101057.
Raley, Thomas S., O096909.
Rasor, Sam J., Jr., OF102092.
Rath, Frank H., Jr., OF101995.
Rayman, John R., OF101058.
Redmond, James P., OF101062.
Reed, Podge M., Jr., OF101670.
Reese, Thomas R., OF101671.
Reeves, Robert L., OF101672.
Reh, Donald C., OF101673.
Reich, Robert M., OF101674.
Reilly, Philip H., OF101066.
Reilly, Terry H., OF102093.
Reineck, Theodore C., OF101067.
Renfro, Don L., OF101675.
Rennie, Paul T., OF101676.
Reth, Thomas B., OF101068.
Revie, Charles D., OF101677.
Reynolds, Harvey J., OF106213.
Reynolds, William J., OF101678.
Rezek, Ronald E., OF101679.
Rhoades, Gordon T., OF101680.
Richard, Michael W., OF101681.
Richards, John L., OF101682.
Richards, Robert E., OF101997.
Richardson, Lloyd M., OF102365.
Rintamaki, John M., OF101998.
Riscavage, George A., OF101074.
Rivera, Alfredo, OF101999.
Robb, Nathaniel H., OF102001.
Robbins, John E., OF102095.
Roberts, Norman L., OF101683.
Roberts, Thomas C., OF101684.
Roberts, Thurman M., OF101685.
Robertson, William, OF101686.
Robinson, Karl W., OF101687.
Robinson, Robert R., OF101079.
Robinson, Winston T., OF101080.
Roby, Edward F., OF101688.
Roemer, Harold E., Jr., OF101083.
Roesler, David E., OF101689.
Rogers, Arthur N., OF101084.
Roller, Barry J., OF101690.
Roller, John F., Jr., OF101691.
Romero, Robert T., OF102003.
Rose, Joseph S., Jr., OF102096.
Rosson, Allen K., OF103488.
Rowland, Michael Y., OF101091.
Rubel, Ronald G., OF102367.
Rucker, James S., OF105336.
Rundquist, James W., OF101094.
Rusnak, Terrence J., OF101692.
Russell, W. Arthur, OF101693.
Russo, Alan M., OF101694.
Ryan, James P., OF101695.
Ryan, Martin F., OF101696.
Ryan, Michael L., OF101096.
Sadler, Larry D., OF101098.
Salgado, Eduardo A., OF102004.
Sam, John R. E., OF101697.
Sanders, Joe M., Jr., O099055.
Sanderson, Michael, OF101698.
Sandman, Robert B., OF101699.
Sanford, Teddy H., Jr., OF101100.
Sarantakes, John E., OF101989.
Sargent, Martin W., OF101101.
Schantz, Vincent L., OF101106.
Schaufelberger, John E., OF102098.
Schillo, Edward C., OF101700.
Schlenker, Patrick, OF101109.
Schmeelk, Peter F., OF101701.
Schmidt, Richard A., OF105821.
Schoeller, Herbert, OF101112.
Schoening, Klaus D., OF102006.
Schoonover, James F., OF101702.
Schou, Dirck T., OF101703.
Schroeder, James M., OF104330.
Schwartz, Ronald J., OF101113.
Schwartz, Thomas M., OF101114.
Scotnicki, John P., OF101704.
Scott, Edward A., OF103148.
Scott, Richard P., Jr., OF101705.
Scully, John J., OF102370.
Seale, James E., OF102371.
Seeber, Joseph G., OF101706.
Seelig, Lou, OF101115.
Seely, William H., OF101707.
Seiler, Dennis L., OF101708.
Sells, Harold E., OF102007.
Serio, Robert F., OF101709.
Setikas, Algimantas, OF102008.
Shannon, Kenneth M., OF101121.
Sharpe, Gerald W., OF106226.
Sharratt, Thomas B., OF101122.
Shaughnessey, Peter, OF101710.
Sheak, Jack C., OF101123.
Sherman, Roger G., OF102372.
Shive, Donald W., Jr., OF101711.
Shoemaker, Philip H., OF101712.
Shoemaker, Raymond, OF101713.
Shore, Christian M., OF101714.
Showalter, James V., OF103733.
Shrader, Charles R., OF102270.
Shurtleff, Charles, OF102099.
Simmons, Bobby J., OF103150.
Simmons, Douglas M., OF101127.
Simonis, Joseph W., OF101715.
Sims, Eddie R., OF101716.
Simus, John O., OF101128.
Sinclair, Robert B., OF101717.
Skaggs, Gary C., OF103151.
Skerker, Alan L., OF102010.
Skrzypek, George J., O096916.
Slabaugh, Bryce L., OF101129.
Slama, Richard A., OF101130.
Sleet, Phillip M., Jr., OF101718.
Slominski, Michael, O096917.
Smay, Donald R., OF101132.
Smith, Charlie W., OF101134.
Smith, David H., OF102012.
Smith, David M., OF101719.
Smith, David N., OF102101.
Smith, Douglas M., OF102102.
Smith, Edward C., OF106232.
Smith, George F., OF101720.
Smith, Harold W., OF101721.
Smith, Jimmy T., O096918.
Smith, Norman S., Jr., OF101722.
Smith, Robert L., OF106233.
Smith, Walton N., OF101137.
Smith, Wiley R., OF101723.
Smothers, Curtis R., OF102087.
Snow, Joseph T., OF101139.
Solomon, Steven P., OF101724.
Sommerkamp, Robert, OF101142.
Sorensen, Kenneth C., OF101143.
Sornson, Roger L., OF101725.
Spannaus, Owen L., OF101726.
Spear, Albert C., OF102103.
Speedy, John C., OF101727.
Spells, John D., OF101144.
Speranza, Nicholas, OF101145.
Spinosa, Ray D., OF101728.
Sprague, Kenneth E., OF101729.
Staas, Donald F., OF102014.
Stack, John J., OF101147.
Stair, Gary I., OF102015.
Spanko, John R., OF101730.
Staples, Arthur W., OF101151.
Stapleton, James B., OF101731.
Starnes, John L., OF101153.
Starzynski, James R., OF101154.
Steiner, Joseph C., OF102375.
Stepek, David F., OF101732.
Stephenson, Francis, OF101733.
Sternberg, Ben, Jr., OF101734.
Stewart, William T., OF101163.
Stickler, Tom E., OF101164.
Stisitis, Robert P., OF101165.
Stocker, Ralph F., OF101167.
Stockmoe, Lyle D., OF106027.
Stone, Edmund C., III, OF101736.
Stone, Haskel P., Jr., OF101168.
Straub, William J., OF101737.
Stumpf, James C., OF102105.
Styer, Norman W., Jr., OF102017.
Sullivan, Eugene R., OF101738.
Sullivan, Timothy J., OF101175.
Swanson, Roland I., OF101179.
Sylvester, Ernest, OF106241.
Szekely, Akos D., OF101739.
Tanner, William P., OF101740.
Tapscott, James W., OF102377.
Tate, John H., II, OF101741.
Taylor, Erle A., Jr., OF102107.
Taylor, Frederick C., OF101742.
Tedesco, Vincent J., OF101185.
Tellis, Andrew J., OF101186.
Temple, Albert W., Jr., OF101743.
Terry, John F., OF102109.
Tetu, Robert G., Jr., OF101744.
Textor, William M., OF101189.
Thackston, Bruce L., OF101190.
Therrell, Brock M., OF101192.
Thie, Harry J., OF101193.
Thies, Bob L., OF101194.
Thomas, Charles L., O096518.
Thomas, John S., OF102110.
Thomas, Thomas N., OF101746.
Thompson, Fred B., OF105840.
Thompson, Robert A., OF102111.
Tingle, Gordon W., OF101200.
Tivol, Edwin A., OF101201.
Togashi, Theodore T., OF101748.
Tomlan, Jolene K., M010206.
Toney, Elijah, OF101202.
Torres, Walter, Jr., OF101204.
Townsend, Elester C., OF101205.
Tratensek, Milivoj, OF101749.
Traylor, John A., OF101750.
Treado, Alvin D., OF101751.
Treese, Edwin J., OF102022.
Treinen, Michael D., OF102378.
Treweek, Gordon P., OF101752.
Trifiletti, Anthony, OF101753.
Trussell, James B., OF105853.
Tschanz, Arnold T., OF101209.
Tucker, Edwin H., OF100200.
Tucker, Jeffrey, OF102023.
Turner, Thomas M., OF102380.
Turner, William E., OF101212.
Tuttle, Herbert M., OF101213.
Twining, David T., OF102024.
Ullmann, Donald F., OF101755.
Underwood, Alan K., OF101214.
Upchurch, Robert H., OF102381.
Usher, David J., OF102112.
Utley, Melvin A., OF102382.
Vaillancourt, Kenneth, OF102113.
Van Horn, John B., OF101218.
Van Matre, Donald G., OF101219.
Van Stone, Donald L., OF101220.
Vaughan, Herbert G., OF101756.
Velkey, Robert J., OF101221.
Venckus, Edward W., OF102383.
Vennard, Gerald A., OF101222.
Verdel, Thomas H., OF102026.
Verdier, Douglas L., OF101223.
Vice, John B. W., OF101225.
Vigue, Ronald L., OF101226.
Villiere, George J., OF101227.
Vineyard, William R., OF101757.
Von Freymann, Ronald, OF101758.
Vonderahe, Thomas A., OF100221.
Vondruska, George B., OF101759.
Vooys, Daniel F., OF102115.

Wade, David C. III, OF101760.
Wagner, Frank J., Jr., OF101229.
Wagner, Terry L., OF102385.
Wahl, William E., OF101230.
Wakefield, William, OF105574.
Walbeck, Daryl G., OF101231.
Walden, Robert D., OF102027.
Waldrop, Kenneth M., OF101761.
Walk, Gary J., OF101762.
Walker, Charles L., OF101232.
Walker, Lawrence A., OF102386.
Walker, Lyman J., II, OF106867.
Walker, Patrick E., OF101234.
Walker, Thomas M., OF101235.
Wallace, Thomas L., OF105923.
Walters, Robert J., OF101763.
Ward, Dennis, OF102119.
Ward, Emmett J., OF101236.
Ward, John H., OF101764.
Warner, Jeffrey K., OF101765.
Warner, Lance C., OF102784.
Wass, De Czege Huba, OF101766.
Watson, Gordon E., OF101238.
Watts, Olen C., OF101239.
Weathers, Robert L., OF101767.
Webb, Alfred N., Jr., OF101768.
Weber, John P., OF101769.
Weeden, Donald C., OF101243.
Weichel, Frederick, OF101244.
Weisel, Stephen L., OF101770.
Weiss, Arthur D., OF101771.
Weiss, Robert M., OF102389.
Wells, Geoffrey F., OF101246.
Wells, George W., Jr., OF102786.
Welte, Ronald F., OF106883.
Werner, Gerald C., OF101772.
West, Arthur L., III, OF101773.
Westfall, Grover D., OF104052.
Wettack, John T., III, OF101248.
Wetzel, David C., OF101249.
Wetzel, Lawrence R., OF101250.
Wheeler, Wayne R., OF101774.
White, David A., Jr., OF101775.
White, Howard W., Jr., OF102030.
Whitehead, Charlie, O095288.
Whitehorne, Joseph, OF101254.
Whitney, Roger B., OF101257.
Whitten, Wilburn L., OF101258.
Wickens, Donaldson, OF101259.
Wickman, Lance B., OF102122.
Wikan, Michael E., OF101776.
Wilcox, Charles K., OF101777.
Wilderman, Glenn R., OF101778.
Williams, Albert C., OF101779.
Williams, Arthur, OF102790.
Williams, Gerald P., OF104164.
Williams, William R., OF102792.
Williamson, Ronald, OF101780.
Willis, Edward J., Jr., OF102031.
Wilson, Gary R., OF100228.
Wilson, Howard W., OF101781.
Wilson, James L., OF101270.
Wilson, Julian A., Jr., OF102032.
Wilson, Robert D., Jr., OF101271.
Winiecki, Stephen D., OF101273.
Winkler, John K., Jr., OF101782.
Winslow, Wendelin W., OF101275.
Winter, Carl J., Jr., OF101783.
Winters, David R., OF101784.
Winton, Harold R., OF101785.
Wisdom, Jesse A., OF101276.
Wiser, James W., OF101277.
Wissinger, Thomas R., OF102033.
Womack, Robert L., OF101280.
Womble, Carl C., Jr., OF102124.
Wong, Frederick G., OF102392.
Wood, Marion D., Jr., OF101281.
Wood, Norman M., Jr., OF101282.
Wood, William R., Jr., OF101284.
Woodbury, Kenneth M., OF101285.
Woodle, Clyde E., Jr., OF101786.
Woods, Patricia M., N3181.
Wooley, Bo, OF102125.
Woolsey, George T., OF101787.
Worcester, Theodore, OF100368.
Wright, Michael L., OF102126.
Wright, Robert E., OF101788.
Wright, Thomas L., OF101789.
Wrona, Richard M., OF102393.
Wynn, Robert E., OF101790.
Yamada, Earl M., OF101289.
Yankoupe, Roger F., OF101791.
Young, John F., OF105887.
Young, Philip W., OF101290.
Young, Robert F., Jr., OF101792.
Yourtee, Leon R., III, OF101793.
Zachels, David W., OF101293.
Zengerle, Joseph C., OF101794.
Ziegler, William A., OF101795.
Zimmerman, Henry H., OF101796.
Zitz, John E., OF101298.
Zolkiwsky, Donald J., OF101299.
Zschoche, Robert C., OF102127.
Zugmier, George A., OF101300.
Zweig, Richard N., OF101301.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

H.R. 6418, the Partnership for Health Amendments, Will Strengthen Health Care in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD M. FRASER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 4, 1967

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, last year, when the Comprehensive Health Planning and Public Health Services Amendments of 1967 were enacted, I felt that we had made a major move toward better health for all the people in this Nation. When the President recommended the extension of the Partnership for Health program, I supported his position enthusiastically. Now I want to emphasize to my colleagues in the House my conviction that we have taken a giant step when we passed H.R. 6418 on Sept. 20.

There are many innovations in this legislation. It provides for States and communities to use Federal grants in programs that they know to be important to the health of their people. Before, they could receive Federal money only for certain specified programs that perhaps were not the most urgent to meet their needs. It allows programs to be redesigned around the total health needs of people, where before they were designed around diseases or categories of need. It provides for the establishment and support of comprehensive planning for health, where before health planning was done piecemeal without any way of avoiding duplication or overlap of programs. And in the planning process, it gives a major voice to the consumers of health service, all too often unheard in the past.

As an example of what the President means by creative federalism, this legis- in our country and that the States and local programs, it recognizes the variety in our country and that the States and communities have and can fulfill the responsibility for fully assessing their own health situations and deciding how best to go about improving them.

This is a very good piece of legislation, and I am grateful that we acted upon it with wisdom.

Social Security: 30th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 4, 1967

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, on last Friday, September 29, the Gary, Ind., Social Security Office celebrated the 30th anniversary of its opening on September 30, 1937.

Howard Jennings, Director of the Social Security Administration at Gary, is to be commended for his efficient work in successfully administering the operations of one of the largest social security branch offices in the Middle West.

Orland C. Zajicek, assistant regional representative, in the Chicago Social Security Office, was present for the occasion along with other officials, businessmen, and citizens of the Calumet region.

In 1937, when this great program of the Federal Government was initiated, the industrial Calumet region of Indiana was just recovering from the greatest depression in our Nation's history. Steel mills, factories, and businesses of all kinds that survived that depression were just beginning to successfully operate again. Thousands of our citizens were gradually being reemployed and the dark depression days of the early 1930's were becoming a memory. The enactment of the nationwide social security program under Franklin D. Roosevelt and a Democratic Congress in the middle 1930's was the greatest sparkplug to start our Nation back on the road to the economy enjoyed in later years.

Excerpts from my remarks made on the occasion of the 30th anniversary of the opening of the Gary Social Security Office in 1937 follow:

> In 1937 when the Gary office opened, it serviced both Lake and Porter Counties and there was but a small staff on hand to carry on the work for the people of this area. At that time the duties principally consisted of issuing account number cards to workers in commerce and industry, the only ones then covered by Social Security. Workers then could look forward to monthly benefits for themselves when they reached the age of 65. Two years later, in 1939, the law was expanded to provide benefits for dependents and survivors. Later, Social Security coverage over the years has been extended to farm workers, domestic workers and self-employed people. Over 90% of our population now has Social Security protection.
>
> Originally, the program was intended for the benefit of older people, but now it includes benefits for young dependents of disabled or deceased workers and disability benefits for younger workers. At the present time, Lake, Porter and Newton County area receive monthly Social Security checks totalling over 55 million dollars a year.
>
> Starting last year, Congress added the Medicare Program to our cash benefit program, and in 1966, over 92% of our Senior

Citizens have signed up for the Medicare Program. Approximately 23 million men, women and children—one out of nine Americans—are receiving Social Security benefits every month. About 86 million earners will pay Social Security contributions this year. 95 out of every 100 children could get benefits if the provider or head of the family should die. Approximately 9 out of 10 people past 65 years of age are either getting benefits now or will get them when their husbands retire and about 87 out of 100 people, age 25 to 64, have disability insurance protection.

In this session of Congress, I am happy to say, that I cast my vote in support of legislation extending a substantial increase in Social Security benefits. The bill was passed by the House last month and calls for an across-the-board increase of at least 12½% for every beneficiary on the rolls. In certain cases, some beneficiaries will be eligible for more than 12½%.

Older people remember the panic, the destitution, the unemployment, the bread lines of the early 1930's. We can vividly recall the absence of income protection for families against the hazards of old age, death, disability or illness. Older folks can appreciate how recently the poor farm and the orphans' home represented society's organized way of meeting the problems of dependency.

Today, 30 years later, we have a strong, comprehensive and national system of Social Security or Social Insurance which has changed the face of America in one generation. Today, the retired aged, widows, orphans, the totally disabled and the unemployed, have an orderly system for providing income security and protection.

Future historians will look at the social and economic development in the last 30 years and no doubt conclude that Social Security is our most successful effort to assure the peace, prosperity and domestic tranquillity of our society.

As you know so well, Social Insurance is designed to prevent poverty rather than relieve it after it occurs. The right to benefits grows out of work. The individual earns protection as he earns his living. Because it is insurance against earnings loss and is paid without regard to savings and resources. Today people can and do build upon their basic Social Security to achieve a higher standard of living. In other words, this method is designed to work in partnership with voluntary insurance, individual savings and private pension plans.

Celebrating this anniversary and the publicity therefrom, will inform many of our younger folks of the struggles that their parents and grandparents had in former years when their wages or work income terminated. The American youth should certainly appreciate the successful battles which have been won through intense struggles to make life more comfortable for them in their future pioneer days.

Reassertion of Congressional Role in Development and Determination of Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 4, 1967

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, on last August 21, the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. Percy], testifying before the Committee on Foreign Relations, made a significant and helpful contribution upon the difficult question now being considered by the committee—the reassertion of the congressional role in the development and determination of foreign policy.

I ask unanimous consent that his testimony be printed in the Congressional Record, I know that it will be read widely.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator Charles H. Percy, Republican, of Illinois, at the Hearings Before the Committee on Foreign Relations of the U.S. Senate, August 21, 1967, on Senate Resolution 151

Mr. President, the initiative of the Foreign Relations Committee to reassert the constitutional role of the Congress in the determination of foreign policy is an important one. The Committee hearings on Senate Resolution 151 deserve the attention of all thoughtful Americans because the security of the nation is directly involved.

Clearly the Congress cannot play its constitutional role in the determination of foreign policy so long as the Executive Branch fails to inform the Congress of major international agreements, promises, compacts, covenants, doctrines, obligations and understandings. The basic problem is that only the Executive Branch knows the details of these American commitments. As a result, the Congress may learn of an important national obligation only after the Administration has incurred it, and only *if* the Administration tells Congress about it. Even then, steps may already have been taken in pursuance of such a commitment; frequently, the Administration is merely presenting the Congress with a *fait accompli* to be ratified by resolution.

If the Congress is to play its constitutional role, it must have access to the actual facts of national commitments or, more realistically, to what the President conceives are our national commitments.

I propose that the President, on an annual basis, itemize for the Congress—or at least for the Senate—our national commitments as he sees them, detailing the nature of each commitment, its limitations and the justification for it in terms of national interest.

This procedure would serve three important purposes:

1. It would require the President to distinguish between commitments of economic assistance and military commitments including armed intervention, thus clarifying the policy of his administration and leading to a more rational response consistent with policy when an emergency arises.

2. It would enable the Congress, and particularly the Senate, to express itself on the validity of commitments before they are extended and especially before any of them are implemented by force. Thus Congress would be able to play the advisory role in foreign affairs for which the members have a constitutional responsibility and for which they were in part elected.

3. It would give the people more influence in the shaping of policies which involve their very lives and the expenditures of huge amounts of their tax dollars. This is especially appropriate today when Americans fight in Vietnam and the defense budget consumes half of all federal spending.

The American people, through their representatives, have a right to know whether our men will be committed to combat in defense of a Congo, from an insurgency of left or right; or whether our tax dollars, through supporting assistance, will be transferred to the treasury of an Iran if that government should approach bankruptcy.

The Senate has a right to know when such commitments are being made. "Advice and consent" are meaningless *after* troops are dispatched overseas or after monies are transferred to a foreign treasury.

It is my conviction that no President should engage his people—without the prior knowledge of their representatives—in foreign undertakings which may take their lives and treasure.

Some will say that it is impractical, for security reasons, to have the President report to the Congress on our national commitments. They will allege that disclosure of certain commitments would tip our hand to potential enemies, and could upset some allies. If this is the case, disclosure of commitments could be revealed in executive session of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House Foreign Affairs Committee and treated for security purposes as classified information.

Were the President to report on our national commitments as he sees them, then the appropriate committees of the Congress would be in a position to ascertain the true nature of a commitment. The President would be less likely then to follow a vague, open-ended, limitless commitment such as has been pursued in Vietnam. Each commitment would be clarified and we would know its anticipated limits. For example, we know that the Administration is committed to defend South Vietnam, but we don't know whether the President conceives that there is a limit to the commitment. Without a precise statement of his conception of the commitment, and his justification for it, we cannot know what price in lives and money corresponds to the level of our national interest in supporting the Saigon government.

At a time when many believe that the Congress has abdicated its role in foreign policy, I suggest that the Congress cannot perform this constitutional function without a clear and current exposition by the President of his understanding of our national commitments in the foreign field. I respectfully request that this suggestion be studied and improved with a view to implementation in the interest of our country.

The Kee Report: Underseas Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 1967

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include last week's public service television and radio newscast, "The Kee Report."

The subject discussed in this report is "Underseas Research," and what the United States is doing in this new field of deep sea exploration. The report follows:

Underseas Research

This is Jim Kee—bringing you the Kee Report.

The American people have always had a lively interest in exploration. This is natural in a nation which owes its beginning and subsequent growth to the bold explorations of hardy pioneers.

When men succeeded in reaching the North and South Poles early in this century, there was a widespread belief that the exciting age of exploration had just about come to its end. Then, about a decade ago, the first man-made objects began rushing through outer space and the public sensed that mankind was about to realize the age-old dream of conquering the heavens. As a symbol of the future, this nation is hoping to land a man on the moon within a few years.

However, the notion that the age of exploration on this planet has ended is a serious error. The truth is that an entirely new phase in adventure is just beginning. This is the exploration of deep sea bottoms which cover nearly three-quarters of the globe. While this undersea pioneering may be less spectacular than the conquest of outer space, the men of science believe that eventually it may prove just as important in terms of human benefit.

The ocean floors are an immense storehouse of minerals which are essential to industry, and some of which are already in short supply. In addition, there are unlimited quantities of edible fish which could be developed into the world's greatest source of inexpensive food.

But to enter the game of oceanography entails careful preparation in many different fields, and the Federal Government is working out a broad program for developing its marine resources. One of the first needs is for a remapping of the nation's long coastlines. This work is already underway along the Pacific shoreline, and next year, it will begin in the Gulf of Mexico.

Perhaps the greatest need is for trained personnel in a branch of activity which is almost new. While there have been a few preliminary efforts to reach the deepest sections of the ocean floor, this kind of work must be expanded on a vast scale to meet the needs of the new science.

The immediate need is for scientists, engineers and technicians who have been trained in the science of Oceanography and who are willing to make their careers in this work. The government has offered inducements to those college students who specialize in marine subjects.

The public is aware that drilling for oil has been going on in our coastal waters and in other parts of the world for some years. It is less well known that oil is only a part of the marine storehouse—that the ocean floors are literally a treasure chest of the most precious substances including gold, silver and pearls.

Efforts are now underway to develop fish protein into a usable source of food. If successful, this could be shipped in quantities to those countries threatened by famine. In addition, there are many varieties of fish which live at great depths and which are fit for human consumption. If this new food source can be tapped at reasonable cost, the world's supply of inexpensive food will be greatly expanded.

The science of Oceanography is in its infancy. Within the next decade, it should begin making sizable contributions to the national economy.

Thank you for listening.

Speech by Representative John M. Murphy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL D. ROSTENKOWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 1967

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, my friend and colleague, JOHN M. MURPHY, of New York, recently addressed the Pulaski Memorial Committee of Richmond County, N.Y., at a dinner commemorating Casimir Pulaski, the Polish-American hero of our Revolutionary War. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of Mr. MURPHY's speech:

REMARKS BY HON. JOHN M. MURPHY BEFORE THE PULASKI MEMORIAL COMMITTEE OF RICHMOND COUNTY, SEPTEMBER 24, 1967

We assemble this evening to commemorate the achievements of Casimir Pulaski, the courageous Polish freedom fighter who gave his life so that America might be a free nation.

Pulaski was born in Poland in 1748, the son of a Polish Count. By the time he was twenty he had already participated in numerous battles in an attempt to free Poland from the domination of Czarist Russia. In 1772 he was forced to flee Poland to avoid capture by his enemies, but he continued his effort to free Poland by attempting to organize troops in Turkey to fight the Russians. Failing in this endeavor he went to Paris, where he met Benjamin Franklin. Franklin, recognizing Pulaski's talent for leadership and willingness to fight for freedom, advanced him the money to travel to this country and gave him a letter of introduction to George Washington.

When he arrived, Washington recommended to the Continental Congress that Pulaski be given the authority to organize the cavalry. This authority was granted, and Pulaski has been known ever since as the Father of our Cavalry. But he was not content to be so far away from the heat of battle. Carrying the rank of Brigadier General, he organized his own independent corps of cavalry and light infantry which became known as Pulaski's Legion.

As the head of this fighting unit he distinguished himself in many important battles of our War of Independence. He fought with Washington at Brandywine and Germantown, and joined with General Anthony Wayne to scout for supplies for the famishing troops at Valley Forge. He was sent to the southern front, arriving just in time to save Charleston, S.C., and later, in command of French and American cavalry at the siege of Savannah, he led a full cavalry charge into an opening in the enemy's works. In this battle he was mortally wounded, and he died two days later on the American brig Wasp, at the age of 31.

Pulaski had been here only two years at the time of his death, but his name and deeds will be forever etched on the pages of American history. He will be remembered, of course, for his daring on the field of battle; he once remarked in a letter to General Washington that: "The chief thing for which I ask is to be near the enemy. . . ."

But he will be remembered even more for his dedication and love for the cause of freedom. I think his own words best describe the intensity of his devotion:

"I came here to sacrifice everything for the independence of America. I wish to live in a free country and before I settle down here I wish to fight for that country's freedom."

Pulaski Day, therefore, is more than a day to praise one man's accomplishments, however much those accomplishments are worthy of our praise. It is a time to rededicate ourselves to the principle of freedom for which his name has become synonymous. We who are free must remember that today over one-third of the earth's population is under communist domination; we who are free must remember that freedom is not a gift, it must be earned, and having been earned, it must be protected. We must also remember that we have the obligation to assist any nation whose freedom is threatened, because our own freedom is at stake whenever one nation seeks to dominate another.

It is our willingness to make the sacrifice and pay the price to defend freedom which has preserved our nation in the past; it is our resolve to continue to do so which will determine whether the world of tomorrow will be free. We would do well, therefore, to emulate the example set by the man for whom this celebration is held, and to whom we owe so much. Casimir Pulaski may be dead, but his dedicated service to the cause of freedom will be remembered forever.

The Real Facts About Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 1967

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, I doubt very much whether any American wants peace in Vietnam any more than does President Johnson.

Yet the fact is that the President is being attacked in a way that would make it appear that he relishes his role as Commander in Chief in a bloody and costly war.

This is grossly unfair, Mr. Speaker, and does great disservice not only to the President, but to all those millions of Americans who share his belief that what we are doing in Vietnam is right.

I will now document the numerous efforts made by the President to try to get Hanoi to the conference table. I will show how the administration has proved its sincerity in wanting a quick, honorable and peaceful solution to the conflict.

And I will also show that all of these efforts have been rebuffed by an enemy that has not demonstrated the slightest interest in ending this war.

This record is beyond dispute. And it deserves reflection by those who, too often, seem to ignore the real facts about the Vietnamese war.

America is engaged in two wars over Vietnam. One is ranging 10,000 miles away in the hills and rice paddies of that war-torn country. The other is being waged here at home—a political war fought for narrow partisan purposes.

In Vietnam, the Communist aggressors believe that victory will be theirs. Their thinking is not based on any conviction that their troops are better than ours, or that our men lack the will to fight. In fact, Hanoi knows the opposite is true.

No, their conviction is based on events 10,000 miles away from them. They read our speeches, study our criticisms of the administration and conclude that President Johnson will never be able to hold out against such pressure.

I doubt whether Ho Chi Minh is a profound student of American politics. I doubt whether he understands that much of the Republican attacks against the President are the result of a rapidly approaching election year.

I doubt whether he has considered the fact that many of these vocal Republicans committed themselves to defending freedom in Vietnam by voting for the Gulf of Tonkin resolution.

And I doubt, Mr. Speaker, whether Ho Chi Minh realizes that, to date, not one of the President's critics has offered a single reasonable alternative to our present Vietnam policies.

This Nation has always detested war. And may this attitude never change. But we have also had the very commendable habit of closing ranks behind our Commander in Chief in matters dealing with war and peace.

This is what we used to call bipartisan support of foreign policy. It used to be said in some far-off, obviously forgotten time that politics stops at the water's edge.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder what the late Senator Arthur Vandenberg would say about some of the statements being made these days by his Republican colleagues?

I am certain he would be incredulous at the blatant appeals of some of his fellow Republicans to turn the American people against their President during a time of war.

He would be dismayed to see some Republicans attempt to capitalize on the American people's natural abhorrence of war. And he would be saddened by the hypocrisy of some members of his party who claim to support our presence in Vietnam, but who attack every move the President makes to insure the security of our forces there.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is that few, if any, of the President's critics have called for the withdrawal of our forces in Vietnam.

Why have they refrained from taking such a position? The answer is obvious, Mr. Speaker: They know that the overwhelming majority of the American people supports our commitment to help the South Vietnamese preserve their freedom and independence.

Our people know—indeed, the lessons of history have taught us—the high price paid by those who appease aggressors or who fail to live up to their commitments in the world.

The result, Mr. Speaker, is inevitable—the appetite of the aggressor is increased dangerously and war, far from being avoided, is made more certain.

If these Republicans are sincere in seeking a way to end the struggle, let them communicate their views to Hanoi.

If they want to stop the bombing in the north, Ho Chi Minh is the man to tell about it.

The onus for peace rests squarely with Hanoi.

Ho Chi Minh knows that American planes will stop bombing his homeland the moment he agrees to reciprocal deescalation.

Ho Chi Minh knows that peace talks could begin tomorrow if only he would agree to sit down with our side.

Those who call upon President Johnson to end the bombing and ignore the responsibilities Hanoi must assume to similarly deescalate—do a grave disservice to those fighting to defend freedom in South Vietnam.

North Vietnam is the enemy's heartland. It is the center for military support and supplies. Why should North Vietnam be spared from air attack? Why should the enemy be free to move his men and supplies into the South? Why should North Vietnam's transportation routes, industrial plants, and assembling points be spared destruction?

Why should the enemy be given a carte blanche invitation to remain strong and effective behind the lines?

War is immoral, Mr. Speaker.

But the United States and its Vietnamese allies did not start this war. Hanoi did. And it is not immoral to carry this fight to the enemy.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, it would be immoral to jeopardize the brave men fighting for freedom in the South, by halting the bombing in the North—without any guarantees from Hanoi.

Mr. Speaker, President Johnson does not relish our involvement in this war.

We did not seek this mission. But as the leading democracy in the world, this mission became ours because others in the world believe that we value our freedom enough to help the weak defend theirs from the strong.

The President wants peace in Vietnam perhaps more than anyone else in the world.

He has, on five separate occasions, halted the bombing of the north to show our country's sincerity in wanting peace talks.

He has communicated directly with Ho Chi Minh and supported more than 30 proposals for negotiations.

Let be briefly document our attempts to find peace in Vietnam:

Laos Conference, July 23, 1962.

U.N. Security Council invitation to Hanoi, August 7, 1964.

Seventeen nonalined nations' appeal, April 1, 1965.

President Johnson's speech at Johns Hopkins University, April 7, 1965.

Indian Government's proposal, April 1965.

U.N. Secretary General U Thant's peace efforts, April 1965.

Suspension of bombing, May 12 to 17, 1965.

Commonwealth Prime Ministers' initiative, June 1965.

Davies mission, July 1965.

President's letter to U Thant, July 28, 1965.

Ambassador Goldberg's letter to President of Security Council, July 30, 1965.

Indian Yugoslav proposal, August 1965.

United Kingdom 12-nation appeal, December 1965.

Cambodian proposal for ICC expansion, December 1965.

Pope Paul VI's appeal, December 19, 1965.

Concentrated peace effort, December 1965 to January 1966.

Ronning mission, June 1966.

Asian Conference initiative, August 6 1965.

U.N. Secretary-General's proposal, August 31, 1966.

Ambassador Goldberg's General Assembly address, September 22, 1966.

British six-point plan, October 6, 1966.

Manila Communique, October 25, 1966.

Ambassador Goldberg's letter to U Thant, December 19, 1966.

British proposal for cessation of hostilities, December 30, 1966.

Tet—Lunar New Year—truce, February 8 to 13, 1967.

President Johnson's letter to Ho Chi Minh, February 8, 15, 1967.

Continuous bilateral contacts with Communist states.

Bombing pauses: First, May 12 to 17, 1965—5 days, 20 hours; second, December 24, 1965, to January 30, 1966—36 days, 15 hours; third, December 23 to 25, 1966—2 days; fourth, December 30, 1966, to January 1, 1967—2 days; and fifth, February 8 to 13, 1967—5 days, 18 hours.

All of the President's efforts have, to date, been rejected by Hanoi. And while not everyone agrees with our Vietnam policy, there can be no reasonable dispute over the fact that the President continues to press for a peaceful settlement.

Mr. Speaker, President Johnson will continue to remain firm against Communist aggression, while doing everything he can to find an honorable peace.

The American people know and understand this. And they will continue to support the American policy in Vietnam.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 5, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

He giveth power to the faint; and to them that have no might He increaseth strength.—Isaiah 40: 29.

O God, our Father, who art always the same, whose saving truth never lets us down and whose patient love never lets us go, make us conscious of Thy presence as in spirit we kneel before Thee in this morning moment of meditation. Speak Thou Thy word to us and give us ears to hear, minds to heed, and hands and feet to do Thy will in Thy way for Thy work.

Humble us in our pride, strengthen us in our weakness, and make us great in heart when we would be little in spirit that we may have joy in our endeavors and peace in our hearts.

Bless Thou our country and every institution, every person, every effort made which helps men to love one another and to live together in peace. May Thy kingdom come and Thy will be done in us now. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 3979. An act to amend section 6409 (b)(1) of title 39, United States Code, which relates to transportation compensation paid by the Postmaster General.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 678) entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Upper and Lower Chehalis Tribes of Indians in Claims Commission docket No. 237, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2310. An act to provide more effectively for the regulation of the use of, and for the preservation of safety and order within, the U.S. Capitol buildings and the U.S. Capitol Grounds, and for other purposes.

BIRTHDAY GREETINGS TO LESOTHO

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, yesterday marked the first anniversary of the independence of Lesotho, located within the east-central part of the Republic of South Africa.

Slightly larger than the State of Maryland, Lesotho covers an area of 11,716 square miles. While her population is small, approximately 976,000, the literacy rate for this tiny but progressive country is said to be about 75 percent. The University of Botswana, Lesotho, and Swaziland is located at Roma, some 25 miles from Maseru, the capital of the Nation.

The economy of Lesotho is based almost exclusively on agriculture, a livestock industry, and the earnings of labor employed outside the territory. Very little manufacturing is done in the country. Cooperative organizations have been successfully established for agricultural marketing and credit, as well as cooperative savings society and a central banking and marketing union.

Owing to its geographical position, Lesotho, like Botswana and Swaziland, has strong economic links with South Africa, where so many of its people are employed and most of its exports are sold, and there is close cooperation over a wide range of practical matters. With the other two countries Lesotho is joined with South Africa in a customs union and uses South African currency. Her geographic location and heavy economic dependence on South Africa combine to make the territory extremely sensitive to political and economic developments in South Africa.

Americans will watch with interest Lesotho's endeavors to preserve the practical advantages of cooperation with South Africa without jeopardizing the full achievement and maintenance of its own national sovereignty.

The United States desires to expand and strengthen its present friendly relations with the people of Lesotho. It will encourage the country's progressive political, economic, and social development as a nonracial, democratic, independent nation.

To the King, Moshoeshoe II, the Prime Minister, His Excellency Leabua Jonathan, and Lesotho's Ambassador to the United States, His Excellency Albert Steerforth Mohale, and to all the people of Lesotho, may I express best wishes for a happy and prosperous future from my colleagues in the Congress and the people of the United States.

TEXAS FIRM INCREASES EXPORTS

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Department of Commerce, under the direction of Secretary of Commerce Alexander B. Trowbridge, carries on an active program aimed at expanding American exports in world markets. Objectives of this program, as outlined by President Johnson, are to create more jobs and profits at home, while at the same time reducing the deficit in our international balance of payments.

This year, a Texas business firm, the Crown Machine & Tool Co. of Arlington, took part in a foreign trade show arranged by the Department of Commerce for the purpose of exhibiting American products to prospective buyers abroad. This show was held in London, England, and dealt with packaging machinery and materials.

The Crown Machine & Tool Co. was new to this market. Nevertheless, as a direct result of the show, the company, headed by James M. Harrison as president, estimates that during the next 12 months it will make more than one-third of a million dollars in sales.

Furthermore, the company made contact with a number of potential sales agents to handle its products in this new market. This has been a most outstanding example of Government-business cooperation, and I am pleased to bring it to the attention of the Members.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to pay tribute to a great American with whom I served in this body many years ago. I refer to the distinguished minority leader of the other body, the gentleman from Illinois, Senator DIRKSEN. I believe that he has exhibited and manifested great statesmanship in supporting our Commander in Chief, President Lyndon B. Johnson, when we are engaged in a nasty, dirty war 10,000 miles from the shores of this country.

I agree with the distinguished minority leader of the other body that those who lambast and demean the Commander in Chief, the President of this country, are demeaning the American people and the representative system, and holding up before the eyes of the world this great country for ridicule. The gentleman from Illinois, Senator DIRKSEN, is a dedicated, devoted American, who places the welfare of our Nation before any political party or political consideration.

The great majority of the American people are grateful to him for his loyalty, patriotism to our country and, his concern for our men fighting valiantly against Communist terror and aggression.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORN. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished majority whip, the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman for his observation with reference to the statesmanlike address delivered by the minority leader of the other body the early part of this week, to the effect that castigating the President of the United States under these circumstances does nothing but give aid and comfort to the enemy at a time of national crisis. I commend the gentleman for what he said.

Mr. DORN. The distinguished whip is eminently correct and I appreciate his comments. I want to commend my friend and able leader from Louisiana for his outstanding leadership in supporting President Johnson during these times of national crisis.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORN. I am delighted to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. I was just reading the statement made by the distinguished minority leader in the other body as the gentleman from South Carolina was speaking, and I would like to read one sentence from it, which is as follows:

> I think it was General Grant who said that the greatest aid for him was from none other than Jefferson Davis, the President of the Confederacy, because he was interfering with Robert E. Lee and his tactics and his strategy.

Mr. DORN. I agree with my distinguished, able and beloved colleague, the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORN. I yield to the distinguished minority whip, the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my thanks to the gentleman for again calling the attention of those who may not have noticed the remarks of the minority leader in the Senate the other day, and to the people of this country that at this particular time we, regardless of the party we belong to, do believe in supporting the President of the United States in these difficult and tumultuous times such as we face at this particular moment. I think the words of the Senator from Illinois, Mr. Dirksen, are well taken and I hope they will have the attention of the country.

Mr. DORN. I want to thank my distinguished colleague, the minority whip who himself is a great American in the tradition of Abraham Lincoln. I would say to my beloved fellow colleague of the Congress of the United States from Illinois, that his great and distinguished Senator Dirksen has taken his place in history alongside of the late Arthur Vandenberg, and with our former colleague who recently served so ably in South Vietnam, Henry Cabot Lodge, likewise a member of the other party, who is advocating unity in order to win this war and bring a maximum number of our boys home.

It little serves our fighting men in Vietnam for people in responsible positions to infer that their efforts are not fully supported here at home.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the Senator from Illinois, the distinguished minority leader of the other body, has exhibited the kind of statesmanship that should be emulated.

ECONOMIC AID TO GREECE

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, yesterday 52 Members of the House addressed a very important letter regarding the question of economic aid to Greece to four officials representing our Government. We took this course because we were informed that there was a delegation in Washington this week from the military junta now in power in Greece, seeking such aid.

We believe, Mr. Speaker, that it is most important for the United States to make very clear its opposition to the military takeover before it has time to become so entrenched that political and economic pressure from outside will be useless. That time, Mr. Speaker, is rapidly approaching. The news from Greece gets more shocking each day. Former Premier Canneloupoulos is under house arrest for breaking his promise not to criticize the colonels who seized power on April 21. A famous conservative newspaper publisher is also under house arrest because she refuses to publish under total censorship. This courageous lady, Mrs. Helen Vlachou, is charged with insulting the junta because she called them mediocre and ignorant people.

Mr. Speaker, I have requested consent to have our letter of yesterday printed in full with all of the signers immediately following these remarks. It follows:

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., October 3, 1967.

Mr. George D. Woods,
President, International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

Mr. Anthony M. Solomon,
Assistant Secretary for Economic Affairs, Department of State.

Mr. Harold F. Linder,
President, Export-Import Bank of Washington.

Mr. William B. Dale,
Board of Executive Directors, International Monetary Fund.

Gentlemen: We understand that there is a delegation in Washington representing the present military dictatorship of Greece seeking economic aid.

In spite of assurances by those who have seized power that there would be an early return to constitutional government in Greece, there is no evidence to support such statements. In fact, the news of what is going on in Greece gets more ominous every day.

We would consider it most unfortunate if the United States were to give any respectability to the present regime by assisting with economic aid. Such a step would do most serious damage to our position, especially in Western Europe, as a nation which believes in and supports the right of people to elect their own government.

Sincerely,

Don Edwards, William F. Ryan, Bob Kastenmeier, Phillip Burton, Augustus F. Hawkins, Edward R. Roybal, Henry S. Reuss, Thomas M. Rees, Henry Helstoski, Benjamin S. Rosenthal, Donald M. Fraser, Robert L. Leggett, James H. Scheuer, Jeffery Cohelan, Frank J. Brasco, John Conyers, Jr., Jacob H. Gilbert, Andrew Jacobs, Jr., Chas. H. Wilson, John G. Dow, Jonathan B. Bingham, Joseph P. Addabbo, Robert N. C. Nix, Martha W. Griffiths, John E. Moss, Jerome R. Waldie, Harold T. Johnson, Patsy T. Mink, Joshua Eilberg, Lucien N. Nedzi, William D. Ford, Lester L. Wolff, Charles S. Joelson, Edith Green, James C. Corman, John A. Blatnik, John V. Tunney, Richard T. Hanna, Lionel Van Deerlin, Richard L. Ottinger, Theodore R. Kupferman, Bernie Sisk, Barratt O'Hara, Daniel E. Button, Arnold Olsen, Frank Horton, Seymour Halpern, Ogden Reid, William L. St. Onge, William J. Green, Joseph Y. Resnick, George E. Brown, Jr.,
Members of Congress.

PROGRESS IN SPACE

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday marked the passing of the first decade of the space race. Since the Soviet Union startled the world with their sputnik in October of 1957, the United States has made far-reaching and far greater probes into the environs outside our relatively small world.

Earlier this week, the Texas State society and members of the Texas congressional delegation were afforded the opportunity to hear a lecture by Dr. George Mueller, Associate Administrator for Manned Space Flight at NASA.

Dr. Mueller is one of the foremost space program authorities in this country and I found his remarks to be exciting and prophetic.

So that our colleagues may have an authoritative recap of American space accomplishments in the past 10 years and take a glimpse of what is to come in the future, I have requested unanimous consent that they be inserted in the Record at this point:

Remarks by Dr. Mueller

It is a pleasure for me to be here tonight, and I would like to thank Congressman Pickle for inviting me to talk with you. I am privileged to deal with a number of distinguished members of the Texas delegation to Congress in my work with NASA. In particular, I would like to mention Olin Teague, Chairman of the Manned Space Flight Subcommittee, and Earle Cabell and Bob Eckhardt, of the House Space Committee; and, also, Chairman George Mahon and Bob Casey, of the House Appropriations Committee.

It is said that Texas is the richest political subdivision in the world, with the possible exception of the Russian Ukraine.

I am not an expert in that field but I am sure that in the field of Manned Space Flight, Texas is the leader in the Free World and it may even be ahead of Russia's Kazakhstan where the center of manned space flight in the USSR is located.

Many thousands of Texans working for dozens of Texas firms are creating through their research and development effort the new technology required for space exploration. One measure of Texas contributions may be made in terms of the $771,000,000 of work that your state's firms have performed on NASA's programs. In addition, Texas colleges and universities are not only conducting high level research for NASA, but are training future space scientists and engineers under NASA grants.

Texas is the birthplace of seven of our astronauts, more than any other state. (They are: Alan Bean, from Wheeler; Dr. Donald Holmquest, from Dallas; Dr. Edgar Mitchell, from Hereford; and Dave Scott, from San Antonio. Also the late Ed White, from San Antonio; Elliot See, from Dallas; and Ed Givens, from Quanah.)

In addition, five of the Astronaut's wives were born in Texas.

And, of course, Texas can lay claim to being the "home town" for all 56 of the astronauts, headquartered at the Manned Spacecraft Center in Houston.

The Manned Spacecraft Center, of course, is one of the three major manned space flight field centers, and is charged with the triple responsibility of management, engineering and development of the Apollo spacecraft; direction of flight operations through the Mission Control Center; and conduct of astronaut training and operations.

Through the cooperation which has evolved among the Federal Government, industrial communities, and the academic community, the nation has made great strides in overcoming the early Soviet lead and in fulfilling our national goals in space. Tonight, I want to talk with you about these goals and the progress we are making in establishing an unquestionable preeminence in space. I will discuss the values of the space program and its relationship to other goals of our society. And I will review NASA's manned space flight programs, which constitute the largest and most complex engineering, scientific and technological undertaking ever attempted in the free world.

The Mercury and Gemini programs are now history. In these programs we conducted 16 successful manned flights, and logged 2,000 man-hours in space. This is about as much time as the average man spends on his job in a year.

In the Mercury and Gemini programs, we have learned to control missions and to operate manned spacecraft traveling in orbit at speeds of almost 18,000 miles an hour. Such a speed is fast enough to travel from Chicago to New York—or, from Beaumont to El Paso—in three minutes.

We have learned that man is able to live and work effectively in weightless space flight for periods up to fourteen days.

We have learned to rendezvous a manned spacecraft with another unmanned spacecraft.

We have learned to assemble these separate craft into a spacecraft cluster.

We have learned to employ such a clustered spacecraft to launch from one orbit to another orbit, thus enabling men to fly higher and faster than they have ever flown before.

We have learned some of the problems and promise of manned activity outside a spacecraft in a protective suit. This knowledge was gained through more than 12 hours—half a day—of experience in open space.

We have learned to make precision landings of manned spacecraft, within sight of the recovery ships.

We have learned that man can perform experiments in space. These have included such carefully timed actions as photographing an eclipse of the sun.

Finally, we have learned to manage and schedule such a program, following principles that permit us either to move forward rapidly to capitalize on progress or to accommodate unexpected setbacks.

The understanding we have gained from Mercury and Gemini is being applied to the Apollo program. The objective of Apollo is leadership in space. We are working to demonstrate that leadership by landing men on the moon and returning them safely to earth before this decade is out.

The Apollo problems are large. But so is the scope of the effort to solve them. Despite these problems I for one believe that we *can* achieve the mission objective of manned lunar flight and safe return in this decade.

The Age of Space began its profound impact on human affairs just 10 years ago this week—on October 4, 1957—with the launching by the Soviets of Sputnik I, to a startled world, the impact of this event was as personal as a body-blow.

Since that time, however, our reactions as individuals have varied widely.

Let us remember that for more than a million and a half years there have been man-like creatures on this planet. And during all of these eons man has been confined to the thin membrane of his earth's atmosphere. Now, in just the past 10 years, man has broken these confines.

For some, the meaning of this achievement is seen only dimly and superficially. The purpose of space exploration and discovery are no clearer to many men in this age than they were in the days of Galileo.

Some persons are simply amazed, still reluctant to accept the reality that man has actually ventured into space. There are those who regard the exploration of space as impractical, or downright unnecessary, and who remain unconvinced that the results are worth the cost.

Others are struck with awe and wonder at the enormous distances—the moon 240,000 miles away, Venus 26 million miles away, the nearest star 25 million million miles.

Some see space as just another arena of battle and conflict between nations, with frightful new weapons of mass destruction.

Some, however, see space as a positive opportunity for international cooperation, a place where the nations of the world may work together in the exploration and exploitation of space for peaceful purposes and for the benefit of mankind.

Others see space as a vast unexplored domain to be developed for the economic and social benefit of mankind. The rich treasure to be obtained from space is just as real as spices from India, gold from the New World, or furs from the Hudson Bay.

Still others see space as an intellectual gold mine of new knowledge. New knowledge in the past has always had a profound effect on man's life on earth and on his intellectual horizons. Today, more than ever, man's survival depends upon how rapidly he accumulates and understands knowledge concerning both his environment and himself, and how effectively he learns to use that knowledge. Our reservoir of knowledge has become much more than a mere instrument for perpetuating our culture. It has come to be a prime index of our greatness, functioning not only as a source of our strength, but as a measure of our fitness to survive and grow as a nation. For today, knowledge, as well as guns and butter, measures the true power of modern states.

It is easy to understand how the more dramatic aspects of the space program sometimes tend to overshadow the fundamental purposes of the space effort. The excitement of lunar exploration has blinded many to the deeper purposes and far-reaching benefits of the nation's overall space program, and its deep impact on present and future generations.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration has been chartered to develop and to demonstrate our country's capability for space exploration, and the landing of men on the moon has been established as one of the goals to accomplish this objective. To do this, NASA is developing the whole range of technology which gives us a manned space flight capability. This development, in turn will, I believe, provide benefits for every walk of life in our whole country.

The space program helps to demonstrate our preeminence in science and technology before all the nations of the world. It does for our free enterprise system what advertising does for individual business. It has an enormous, and to some extent, an unsuspected impact on our educational system, challenging and stimulating our youth to new standards of excellence.

A most important benefit of the space program is the economic stimulus of the space investment. Space has created basic new industries for our economy and is creating many thousands of productive, useful jobs for our people. I am speaking not just of employment for engineers and scientists, but of jobs created for people of every skill in every kind of work.

Space has given us world-wide communications systems of great capacity. It is providing greatly improved weather forecasts and better navigation systems. Other immediate benefits are being produced in the form of new products. Whenever a laboratory develops a new scientific concept or a piece of hardware for space purposes, the probability is high that its development will turn out to have usefulness in everyday living.

Despite the normally long lead time from research to practical application, we can already see the beginning of the use of space technology in commercial products and processes.

The present list is long, so let me give you just a few examples. Lightweight plastics developed for use in rockets are being considered to cut the weight of railway tank cars in half. New metals developed by space researchers are being used in oil refineries where resistance to corrosion is required. Sealants developed for spacecraft seams are being used to caulk bathroom tiles and to seal automobile windows. New weather-resistant paint is on the market. A new crushable material used on the Apollo lunar spacecraft landing mechanism may be used to create crushable structures such as bridge abutments to cut down on traffic deaths.

A space-inspired device with truly down-to-earth applications is a chair that walks up and down steps. This unusual machine was conceived originally as a means for walking on the moon. Our plans for the walking chair have since been superseded by larger vehicles more suited to lunar exploration, but it is now being developed to replace the wheel chair on earth.

In the field of medicine, we have already seen many benefits stemming from the space program. One of these is the hospital adaptation of the tiny biosensors developed to monitor the physical condition of the astronauts during space flight. These biosensors are now being used in many hospitals to permit one nurse, seated at a central console, to monitor the condition of many patients at the same time.

Perhaps one of the greatest benefits that will come to mankind through our space research is a better understanding of the healthy human being under stress. The ordinary physician looks at many sick people in a normal earth environment; our space medicine people (many of them located at the Manned Spacecraft Center in Houston), in their work with the astronauts, are able to monitor healthy people in the "abnormal" environment of space. By changing the environment, we are able to get a different view of the mechanism that is the human body. We are thus able to gain a better understanding of just what a healthy human being is, and how he can be kept healthy.

I would also like to discuss the role of space in our country when increasing emphasis is being placed on programs to better the economic and social conditions of less fortunate citizens.

In this connection, it is well to remember that the space program is being carried out on earth, in almost every portion of the country, and reaches into almost every corner of American life.

The direct economic impact of the space program is quite obvious. Not so obvious, but nonetheless real, are the more fundamental contributions of the program to the economic growth of the Nation and its various regional components.

The process of economic growth necessitates the rapid development, acceptance, and implementation of new technologies. In an economically developed nation such as ours, this is accomplished by invention and innovation. Thus, the Nation's efforts to push into the frontiers of space have accelerated materially a fundamental aspect of economic growth—the generation of new technology.

Further as the program contributes to the promotion of educational and intellectual ferment, a strong new force is added for the development and maintenance of social attitudes and behavior so essential to economic growth. The latter possesses particular significance for relatively underdeveloped regions of the Nation.

It is thus apparent that the space program is not in conflict with efforts to end poverty and improve human welfare. On the contrary, it contributes to the fundamental solution of these problems by bringing about advancement in economic and technological growth, giving people the opportunity to help themselves through new economic activities.

Congressman Karth, Chairman of the Space Science and Applications Subcommittee, emphasized this fact earlier this year when he declared, "Every nation in the world that fails to carry out an aggressive research and technology advancement program also fails to develop an economy that educates, feeds, houses, and clothes its people. That's why underdeveloped nations are underdeveloped."

But how, one may ask, will our space programs of today lead to these practical benefits that will come in the future? In other words, what must we do today to accomplish these wonders of tomorrow?

Let me try to answer this question.

You are aware that this nation has willingly made a sizable investment in the space program. This investment is in reality the seed for the future harvest in space. All of the future missions and benefits cannot now be identified, but I can tell you now what we plan to do in the next several years to capitalize on our space investment.

The President has proposed and the Congress has approved a modest program of new undertakings that will return maximum benefits to each of us here on earth at minimum additional cost. This program is called Apollo Applications. Its basic concept is to apply the people, industrial team, physical plant and space vehicles from Apollo, to explore how to use space flight for the benefit of people here on earth.

In this program, we are working on a number of ways to reduce the cost of space flight. One is by obtaining double use of the second stage of one of our rockets, the Saturn I. First it will be employed to propel the spacecraft into orbit. Then it will serve as a workshop and living space for the astronauts on long flights.

Another step is the repeated use of this workshop as an embryonic space station. The astronauts will return to earth at the end of a mission in the Apollo spacecraft, but the workshop will remain in orbit, waiting to be used again.

This workshop has an airlock to permit easy access to a ferry vehicle, and egress into space by the scientists and technicians who will be working in it. It is about the size of a small two-story home. Living quarters occupy about a third of the space. The remainder is devoted to a laboratory and maintenance area.

A third economy step planned is flights of increasing duration. It appears that we can obtain greater value per dollar from longer flights and we are hopeful that we can extend our stays in orbit to as long as a year.

A major objective of these flights will be the study of benefits here on earth. We already have operational weather satellites. The forecast you saw in this evening's paper was based in part on information returned to earth from space. But much more is possible. We plan to experiment with advanced equipment, which may help the weather services to forecast more reliably and for longer periods of time. All of this will bring closer the time when we can really do something about the weather, an objective that people in Texas would endorse right now.

Perhaps the most interesting of the areas of experiment in Apollo Applications is the observation and study of the earth's resources. We plan to fly sensing equipment to determine the status quo of crops and forests, establish the whereabouts of schools of fish at sea, prospect for ores and oil deposits, keep world maps current, and plan transportation routes. The analysis of the photographs taken from the Gemini spacecraft show a tremendous potential here.

Major research and deveolpment activity and studies by a number of Government agencies would be needed before such a system could be inaugurated. But the earth resources survey does seem to be a technically feasible way to help solve some of the most pressing problems of our growing world population.

From the brief description I have given of just a few of the forthcoming space missions, it can be seen that Apollo Applications will extend this country's capabilities in space. The program will be another step in the scientific and technological revolution that already has begun to change our whole way of living here on earth. Yet, like the three Princes of Serendip, the most important things we discover will not be those we set out to find.

All of us here are concerned for the progress of our society, and the space program shares in this objective. I believe, or I wouldn't be here, that the national space effort both directly and indirectly benefits us here on earth in all walks of life and all economic strata.

Man and particularly Texans have always shown curiosity, courage, and adventurous determination in probing and exploiting the unknown. Space exploration is our generation's new frontier. The nations that seize the leadership in the exploitation of this frontier will survive and grow. Those that do not will fall behind. I hope we will see and seize the opportunity we have to lead in space. If we do our Nation's role and the role of Texas in this future is unlimited.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT FRIDAY, OCTOBER 6, TO FILE REPORTS ON H.R. 12066 AND H.R. 13094

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture have permission to file reports by midnight Friday, October 6, on H.R. 12066, a bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, to provide an additional source of financing for the rural telephone program, and for other purposes; and H.R. 13094, a bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

CO-OPS AID EXPANDED SOYBEAN PRODUCTION IN SOUTHEAST

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the farmers of my western Kentucky congressional district—like the farmers of districts further south in Tennessee and Mississippi—are in the midst of a vast expansion of grain and soybean production.

A recent survey in eight of the 23 counties in my district shows that farmers there will harvest 1½ million bushels of soybeans this year. Ten years ago soybean production in several of these counties was mighty hard to find among the statistics. This is quite a change and quite an improvement.

These farmers must find some way to market these new crops—small grains and soybeans. The University of Kentucky is helping them, and I am glad to say that several U.S. Department of Agriculture agencies are also aiding them.

I am proud that one of the businesses in my hometown of Murray, the Western Dark Fired Tobacco Cooperative, is taking the leadership in providing marketing and storage facilities for these crops. Officers of the cooperative expect to store grain and market it—just as the co-op has marketed the farmers' tobacco.

Many farmers in my district have been impressed with the accomplishments of grain marketing cooperatives in the Corn Belt, the Wheat Belt, and the Upper Midwest. These co-ops there have provided a competitive yardstick of fair charges for marketing grains and soybeans. Our Kentucky farmers feel they can do at least as well.

Our growers will put up their own money, of course, to get this marketing organization underway. They have already sought—and received—guidance from the Department of Agriculture's Farmer Cooperative Service in undertaking this new service. Once underway, the co-op will seek Commodity Credit Corporation approval as a warehouse under CCC's uniform grain storage agreement. The co-op's members can bring their warehouse receipts to county offices of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service for loans. And a pattern for cooperative grain and soybean marketing in western Kentucky will be in motion.

October is Co-op Month throughout the Nation, Mr. Speaker. It is being celebrated with statements from the President and others and proclamations from Governors of a great many of the States. I am especially pleased, therefore, to be able to report that a cooperative in my district is taking the leadership in establishing a service essential for our continued development—a marketing and storage service for soybeans—and that this service will be farmer owned.

JAMMED M-16'S AND DEAD AMERICANS

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve to have all the facts about the M-16 rifle scandal brought to light in public hearings.

Today's news that the scene of a recent bloody ambush 40 miles from Saigon was strewn with jammed M-16 rifles and the bodies of dead American soldiers absolutely calls for immediate action by Congress.

Here are questions which must be answered:

Why, after years of research, development, and testing, are American men losing their lives because of repeated failure of this weapon?

Were the jammed rifles at the scene of the ambush equipped with the new buffer which was manufactured beginning last December as a means of preventing gun failures? If not, why not?

If these guns were not so equipped, the Congress must find out exactly what officials were responsible and see to it that proper action is taken against them.

I have evidence that, contrary to assurances given Congress by the Defense Department in August, our combat men in Vietnam are not fully supplied with improved buffer-equipped M-16's.

I have talked personally today with a marine who said that as late as September 16, no one in his company of 50—

headed for a combat area in Vietnam—had their M–16's retrofitted with the new assembly and only five or six were lucky enough to have the new model M–16 which has the buffer and other improvements as standard equipment.

This same marine told me that last June, before a congressional inspection party arrived, he and his buddies were ordered to lie about the performance of the M–16 rifle. They were told to say it worked fine even after several thousand rounds, although the truth was quite another thing. The Congress should identify and see that appropriate charges are brought against the officials responsible for the orders to lie.

Congress should also find out why the administration did not act immediately in July—under Taft-Hartley authority—to prevent a month-long strike at Colt Industries, the only plant producing the improved M–16 rifles and refitting the old models.

Production of at least 25,000 new M–16's plus many thousands of buffer assemblies was lost forever because of the strike.

The Congress should pinpoint the blame.

This sad, unconscionable delay in giving our fighting men the weapons they deserve exemplifies the halfway measures we are using to fight this war. The "ho hum," "business-as-usual" attitude still displayed by much of our Government and many of our people is shocking in view of the sacrifices that American and allied troops are making in Vietnam.

DISPOSITION OF JUDGMENT FUNDS OF THE UPPER AND LOWER CHEHALIS TRIBES OF WASHINGTON—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ASPINALL submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 678) to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Upper and Lower Chehalis Tribes of Indians in Claims Commission docket No. 237, and for other purposes.

PUBLIC LAND LAW REVIEW COMMISSION AND CONSERVATION

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the House recently passed a bill designed to provide adequate time and money for completion of the work of the Public Land Law Review Commission. The Members are, I think, therefore, interested in how the work of the Commission is viewed and received.

This past Saturday at the 63d National Convention of the Audubon Society, one of America's outstanding conservationists, C. R. "Pink" Gutermuth, a member of the Commission's Advisory Council, reported his view on the work of the Commission as seen from a conservation standpoint. As the ranking minority member of your Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as a member of the Public Land Law Review Commission, and a lifelong friend of conservation, I heartily agree with Mr. Gutermuth's statement that:

> From the standpoint of conservation, no commission, of the hundreds that have functioned since the turn of the century or that exist now, has had a more important purpose than that of the Public Land Law Review Commission.

For the information of the Members, under leave previously granted, I include the full text of Mr. Gutermuth's remarks at this point in the Record:

Public Land Law Review and Conservation

(By C. R. Gutermuth, vice president, Wildlife Management Institute, presented at the 63d National Audubon Society Convention, Atlantic City, N.J., September 30, 1967)

It is a pleasure for me to address this 63d National Audubon Convention on the subject of the Public Land Law Review Commission. Few current topics could be more appropriate to the theme of this meeting—"Protecting Your Environment." If the prime objective of the Congress in establishing the Commission on September 19, 1964, had to be stated in three words, those comprising that theme would be as suitable as any that might be composed.

Thirty-four percent of the land area of the United States—one acre in three—is owned by the American people. That, I submit, is a sizable part of our total environment. To study the multiplicity of laws, rules and regulations governing the administration and management of our 770 million acres of federal lands, and report by December 31, 1968, is the stupendous job of the Commission. The way in which these lands are managed or mismanaged, used or abused, affects every one of us; how they are handled in the future is of vital concern to coming generations. Certainly, from the standpoint of conservation, no commission, of the hundreds that have functioned since the turn of the century or that exist now, has had a more important purpose than that of the Public Land Law Review Commission.

Some of you know, I am sure, what the Commission is and what it is charged with doing. As a member of its Advisory Council, I see faces of persons in the audience who have attended some of the eight regional hearings that already have been held throughout the country. To most of you, however, I believe that the name and function of the PLLRC are only vaguely recognized, or lost completely in the proliferation of governmental agencies and organizations that are operating in so many specialized fields today. This has been evident to me since all too few of my kind of conservationists have been testifying at the hearings and expressing the well-balanced type of multiple-use concepts that should be presented and defended.

The Commission was established by an Act of Congress, perhaps I should make clear, through Pubic Law 88–606, for the purpose of examining all statutes, regulations, policies and practices governing the use, management, retention and/or disposal of the public lands of the United States. It was further charged with the responsibility of compiling data and conducting studies necessary to determine the demands for, and uses of federal land resources. Finally, it must recommend to the Congress and the President such modifications and changes in existing laws, regulations and practices as would best serve the public interest.

Under the original Act, the Commission was to complete its work by the end of next year, but this would be extended to June 30, 1970, under the terms of an amendment that has passed the House and is before the Senate—an extension that is absolutely necessary for the Commission to complete its assigned tasks. The amendment also would increase the authorization to the Commission from $4 million to $7,390,000.

The Commission is composed of six United States Senators and six Members of the House of Representatives divided equally between the two major political parties, and six members not associated with the Federal Government appointed by the President. The chairman, chosen by the 18 appointed members, makes. a total of 19. The Advisory Council consists of 25 individuals from various citizen groups and eight representatives of federal agencies concerned with public land administration. In addition, each of the 50 state governors has appointed a representative to work with the Commission.

I can say without hesitation that this has been a hard-working, hard-driving group under the chairmanship of Congressman Wayne N. Aspinall of Colorado, who also is the chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. And although there has been a disposition by some to point to the heavy representation of user groups on the Advisory Council and to attempt to show that issues are being weighed in favor of commercial interests, everyone appears to be quite satisfied with the study plans that have been prepared to guide the work of outside contractors, who will complete most of the studies.

In the last hearing in the Northwest, one wilderness and park advocate complained that there were "few if any" conservationists on the Commission and Advisory Council. With that, some of my associates on the Council who represent user interests invited me to join their camp, since I obviously had been disowned by the *true* conservationists. After relating that experience, I am prompted to state that it has been comparatively easy for me to start an argument at almost any time or place during the hearings, and to be "told off" a plenty, by merely inferring that I represent the broad public interest and not just one segment or phase of the overall program. All of the users have been quick to maintain that, despite the fact that they stand to gain personally, they too are sincerely interested in conservation of public resources, and are serving the citizenry at large by providing an abundance of all forms of essential commodities. It is imperative, therefore, that we conservationists justify our goals as being of a higher and better use of our limited resources for the greatest good for the most people over the long term, if the ultimate recommendations and decisions are to give full consideration to cultural and environmental values, as opposed to maximum productivity and financial returns.

The scope of the Commission's assignment is almost staggering. The federal lands and their resources now are administered and managed under a complex of innumerable laws and regulations that have been enacted and promulgated over a period of nearly 200 years. Many are obsolete. Others are contradictory or confusing. There are about 5,000 laws and 15,000 rules and regulations that must be reviewed, studied in depth, and commented upon before the task of the Commission is completed.

An exceedingly large Commission staff would be required to finish this Congressional assignment in even ten years, let alone three. In order to accomplish the job, the Commission has divided its review and analysis into 34 major subjects. These study outlines or project plans cover every aspect of public land administration and use, from questions involving the outer continental shelf, to user fees and charges. Specific intensive studies will deal with water, forests, timber, recreation, fish and wildlife, to name only five of direct interest to this audience. All but a couple of the studies will be made under contract by private organizations and institutions over periods ranging from six to 19 months. Six of the 34 contracts already have been let.

This fall the Commission should have the first draft of a history of public land law development, which is being prepared under the direction of Dr. Paul W. Gates of Cornell University. The Commission and its staff will have this comprehensive reference available when making its recommendations. A digest of the public land laws, past and present, is being prepared by Shepard's Associates of Colorado Springs and is due in late October.

One separate study of the federal land laws and policies in Alaska, where 95 percent of the land is publicly owned, has been awarded to the University of Wisconsin. It will be completed by the close of 1968.

Citizen views on virtually every conceivable type of federal land matter have been expressed in the eight public hearings that have been held in all parts of the United States. The ninth is scheduled in Milwaukee next week and the tenth and final meeting in the preliminary series will be in Washington in January, 1968. A second series of hearings, primarily to obtain recommendations of future policy, will follow.

The ultimate function of the Commission, after all facts have been gathered and weighed, will be to draft recommendations for consideration by the Congress and the Executive Branch of the government. The Advisory Council and governors' representatives are expected to analyze the reports of the contractors and confer with the Commission in its making of recommendations that will enable the general public to realize maximum benefits from its public lands.

Due primarily to their geological nature and historical development, most of the public lands are in the West and Alaska, but no state can claim them. They belong to you and to me and to every other citizen. They total 770 million acres, an area roughly equivalent to all the United States east of the Missouri River. They contain renewable and non-renewable resources—timber, water, grazing, minerals, fish and wildlife—valued in billions of dollars. Their potential for recreation and wildlife production scarcely has been touched. All of us, whether we live in New York City or Boise, Idaho, have a definite stake in their utilization and management.

Because of this, I urge each of you to keep informed of the far-reaching work of the Commission, and to take advantage of the hearings to express your opinions on major issues. If circumstances make it impossible to appear in person, written statements may be submitted for inclusion in the record by addressing them to Milton A. Pearl, Director, Public Land Law Review Commission, 1730 K Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006. Those presenting prepared statements should be concise and should bring ten copies to the hearing with them.

If outdoor recreation, fish and wildlife, and environmental values are to have full consideration in the deliberations of the Commission, and subsequently by the Congress, more conservationists will have to make their views known. The Commission has been soliciting the opinions of all, and I can assure you that the so-called user groups—the mining, timber, irrigation, forage and public-land occupancy interests—have been filling the record and making demands to which many of us are opposed.

PROPOSAL TO RESCIND APPROPRIATION FOR THE SUPERSONIC TRANSPORT PLANE

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, the day before yesterday the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations stated to the House that it was his hope that a recision bill could be brought to the House next week on one or more of the items already appropriated by the House of Representatives.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, during the last 48 hours we have heard from distinguished Members on both sides of the aisle a good deal of talk about rescinding appropriations heretofore passed by this House.

I am today introducing a recision bill. It calls for action by the Appropriations Committee and by this House to rescind the appropriation of some $143 million in public funds for the commercial supersonic transport aircraft.

Republicans for the past 9 months, through amendments in committee and in this Chamber, have repeatedly offered opportunities to curtail or eliminate nonessential spending. We are happy to say these Republican efforts have met with at least modest success.

But as the gentleman from Ohio, Representative Bow, pointed out earlier in the week, a number of our proposals were rejected. I am delighted that the Appropriations Committee is now prepared to take a second look at some of these recommendations. That committee could make no better start than by striking the $143 million appropriation for the SST which we voted on July 18 of this year.

We can then proceed to consider the pending bills to provide private financing in lieu of public funds for this wholly commercial endeavor. This recision could cut the deficit by hundreds of millions of dollars without in any way hampering the development of the supersonic transport aircraft.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE WEEK OF OCTOBER 9, 1967

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute in order that the majority leader might inform us as to the program for the following week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlemen from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, Monday is District Day and there are six bills:

H.R. 11395, to amend subway routes for the District of Columbia.

H.R. 10213, to amend the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia.

H.R. 11131, to incorporate the Paralyzed Veterans of America.

H.R. 6527, to amend the Statute of Limitations in certain civil actions.

H.R. 11638, to provide safety standards for buildings in the District of Columbia.

H.R. 9059, to exempt public international organizations from the Unemployment Compensation Act.

On Tuesday and the balance of the week, we will consider H.R. 7977, the Postal Revenue and Federal Salary Act of 1967 with an open rule and 2 hours of debate, waiving points of order and making it in order to consider the committee substitute as an original bill for purpose of amendment; and then S. 676, obstruction of criminal investigations, with an open rule and 1 hour of debate.

This announcement is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and that any further program may be announced later.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, OCTOBER 9, 1967

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, did I understand the gentleman to say there are only 2 hours of debate on the postal rate increase bill and the Government-wide, or almost Government-wide, pay bill?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct. The Rules Committee in its wisdom saw fit to give an open rule with 2 hours of general debate. Of course, that has nothing to do with any limitations under the 5-minute rule, and we expect the bill to take 2 days.

Mr. GROSS. Is Thursday of next week set aside as a day of no business?

Mr. ALBERT. Thursday of next week is Columbus Day, a very important day in the history of the United States. We are hopeful we can finish the business before then. Friday is a Jewish holiday.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman this is a very short time to allow for discussion of two tremendously important bills, one bill that raises a tremendous amount of revenue in the nature of a stamp tax and a bill to almost immediately pay much of that same revenue out and, in addition, pay increases to other Federal employees. I am very much surprised to hear that only 2 hours have been allowed for general debate and that the move evidently will be made to suspend the operation of Congress on Thursday.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is a member, I believe, of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, is he not?

Mr. GROSS. Yes; I am a member.

Mr. ALBERT. Did the gentleman express his views to the Committee on Rules?

Mr. GROSS. I did not think it was necessary insofar as that kind of time limitation for general debate on a bill of such importance—a combined bill of that importance. I cannot conceive even now that only 2 hours of debate have been allowed.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is in a much better position to discuss this than I am. I am not familiar with the bill in detail and I do not have any knowledge as to how much time should be given. I simply trust the judgment of the committee that made the request and that of the Committee on Rules.

This is the day, Mr. Speaker, on which we honor the gentleman. This is our 144th day of legislation this year. This is Gross Day, and I hope the gentleman will let us celebrate it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman I never anticipated being here on this day. I thought that this session of Congress would be out and over long ago. I might say that I am overwhelmed by the tremendous outpouring of Members of the House today in observance of this 144th legislative day, and I thank the distinguished majority leader for calling attention to it.

Mr. ALBERT. It is an important day.

Mr. GROSS. I should like to ask the gentleman one other question.

Can we now proceed to buy our Thanksgiving turkeys, and at the same time order our Christmas trees for the observance of these events in Washington?

Mr. ALBERT. If the gentleman will agree to be Santa Claus, perhaps we will have the celebration right here.

Mr. GROSS. That is asking just a little bit too much of me, if the reference to "Santa Claus" is what I think it is.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO FILE CERTAIN REPORTS UNTIL MIDNIGHT OCTOBER 7

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may have until midnight October 7 to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

"FEDERAL RATS" AND "NON-FEDERAL RATS"

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, customary as it normally is for me to make a point of order in honor of Gross Day, I shall forgo that out of comity for the membership today.

Mr. Speaker, according to an article by "The Rambler" in the Washington Star of October 4, the Federal Government is going into the rat-breeding business, not just plain everyday poverty stricken rats but middle class "randombred albino rats." This is all the more appropriate in view of this body's action yesterday, in recommitting the conference report on the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare annual appropriation bill.

The cost of this—no doubt a high priority project—will be $76,440 and for that amount the Government will get 78,000 rats. Now a quick calculation will show that it will cost a little less than a dollar to produce a Federal rat, but under the recent House-passed legislation it will cost more than $5 to eliminate a "non-Federal" rat.

I will not go into the question of what might happen if just two of the Federal rats should escape and join their so-called "disease-spreading" brethren, for we all know of their breeding capabilities. It does seem however, that the Great Society cannot have it both ways. Either they are for rats, or against them. At a time when we are struggling with a budget problem of immense proportions, it seems we are having a leadership crisis over whether to assign a higher priority to breeding rats or eliminating them. No doubt HEW, if it chooses to respond to the Rambler article, will tell us that its entire research effort will collapse if the $76,000 rat breeding money is withheld, just as we were told that no rat control program could succeed without Federal participation. But I also note, in the same article, that the Federal Government is providing a $91,000 grant to breed mice, and I suppose this suggests that we will soon have another $40 million proposal to eradicate mice, the non-Federal variety that is.

The article follows:

WANTS NEWS SUPPRESSED

(By John McKelway)

From time to time, one hears the gripe that the government does not release enough information.

This is probably true in certain areas. The Central Intelligence Agency, for example, simply refuses to issue any news releases concerning the work of its agents around the world. This seems a shame. Such reports would be timely, readable and informative.

Strangely enough, there are other government agencies which probably let go of entirely too much information, causing people like the Rambler to spend entirely too much time going over the stuff. For there are some of us who simply can't ignore long lists.

Just recently, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare let loose a huge list which somehow fell into the Rambler's hands. More and more as he reads the list—it takes about a week—he has approached the conclusion that HEW would probably have been better off if it had been quiet about the whole business. It should have marked everything secret.

The list covers thousands of grants made by the Public Health Service to scientific types throughout the country, as well as to various mysterious organizations engaged in projects like producing whiskerless rats.

The trouble with the Rambler is that he takes each listing personally and winds up extremely envious.

I mean, I had nothing against Everett R. Dempster of the University of California at Berkeley until the list was published. But now the Rambler can read that Dempster received a grant totaling $19,258 for "a genetic study of leaf-shape mutants in the tomato."

Now, sometimes in traffic, I get to thinking about Everett R. Dempster studying his leaf-shaped mutants for $19,258 and, well, I just wish I'd thought of that.

And a lot of these grants can be picked up in the Washington area. Over at Georgetown University one was made to Dr. Gertrude D. Maengwyn-Davies for a study of the "autonomic drug effects on dihydroxyphenylethylamines." The grant totals $16,507.

In this case, the Rambler has nothing but admiration for Dr. Maengwyn-Davies. But, sometimes in traffic, it irritates him that Dempster got more for that tomato study than our local doctor got for fooling around with dihydroxyphenylethylamines.

And, frankly, the Rambler guesses the good doctor is going to find a lot more than the Institute for Behavorial Research in Silver Spring will, with a grant of $26,637. The institute is trying to set up a "computer-based scoring system for inkblot research."

Meanwhile, while all of this is going on, the Richard E. Saunders Corp. of Richmond, Va., has signed a contract for $9,000 to produce 120 Beagle hound dogs. No details are given.

And the A. R. Schmidt Co. of Madison, Wis., turns up, in the list, as one of the largest mice breeding companies going—another thing the Rambler thinks about in traffic. He assumes that having a mouse factory must be a pleasant way of life, and he doesn't have one.

The Schmidt Company's business with the government runs sort of like this:

For $91,914 they're going to "develop germ-free inbred mouse stock"; for $76,440, they're going to supply somebody with 78,000 random-bred albino rats; for $38,892 they will deliver a disease-free colony of hamsters.

The Rambler assumes this can all be done with relatively little effort, and the work appears to be lucrative. Still, it irritates him. If he had any sense, he would have picked up a pair of hamsters and two or three mice and gone into business.

Incidentally, out in Falls Church, the Bionetics Research Laboratories, Inc., has been awarded a grant of $31,149 for "maintenance of a Marmoset colony." That sounds quiet and restful.

Oh well. Some people get all the breaks. But it hurts when you hear about 'em. And HEW ought to operate like the CIA. What we don't know won't hurt us.

FORTY-FIVE BILLION DOLLARS PAID FOR ONCE AND WILL HAVE TO BE PAID FOR AGAIN UNLESS CONGRESS PREVENTS—INCREASE IN DEBT LIMIT UNNECESSARY IF BONDS THAT HAVE BEEN PAID FOR WERE NOT CHARGED UP AGAINST THE TAXPAYERS BUT INSTEAD CANCELED

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the public debt ceiling bill was before the Ways and Means Committee in May of this year.

On May 16, I testified in favor of canceling $45 billion worth of bonds that have been paid for one time and that would make unnecessary the raising of the debt limit. My testimony is inserted herewith in full.

To date, no one has successfully contradicted what I said in this testimony. It is invited to your attention in view of the tremendous importance of what was discussed.

The testimony follows:

Statement of Hon. Wright Patman, a Representative in Congress From the State of Texas

Mr. PATMAN. Thank you very much, sir. I appreciate the opportunity and I do not have a prepared talk, but I have my notes assembled. I think that I can present them in a coordinated way.

Mr. HERLONG. That is fine.

Mr. PATMAN. The subject of this discussion so far as I am concerned is the bill before this committee to raise the debt limit, I believe to $365 billion.

Mr. HERLONG. Yes, sir.

Mr. PATMAN. I contend that $45 billion of that debt has already been paid for once. Therefore, if we take that into account it is not necessary to raise the debt to $365 billion. Let me develop the background and present the fact behind this statement. As we know, the Federal Reserve Act was passed in 1913, a couple of days before Christmas. The System actually got started in 1914. At that time it was not a central bank. It was 12 separate and distinct banks, each bank autonomous. There was no law that permitted the banks to operate together. They operated separately.

Mr. Wilson, the President, was opposed to a central bank. I think if he were living today he would probably be in favor of it; that is, geared to the public interest, but he was opposed to a central bank at that time.

Of course the big banks didn't like the Federal Reserve law. They wanted the Aldrich plan which would give the bankers control of interest rates, the supply of money—all monetary policy—but they didn't get what they wanted.

Therefore, they opposed the Federal Reserve Act. But after it was passed they accepted it as the law and commenced immediately to try to get it changed to a pattern that would fit into what they had originally advocated.

It took them a long time to do it, but finally the 1935 act, which amended the Federal Reserve Act, almost completely gave the bankers what they had always wanted. The 1935 act created a central bank and that meant that they had an open market committee that would have charge really of the monetary system. This open market committee was composed of seven members of the Federal Reserve Board and five presidents of Federal Reserve banks.

Now, remember, on this open market committee of 12, five of them were selected by private banks. That meant that just one of the board members coming over on a vote that would mean that the Federal Reserve Board could not succeed in anything that it wanted to do. That made the margin rather close. It is still that way.

Now, then, at first under the Federal Reserve system it was quite a difficult job to make enough money to pay the current expenses of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and they were looking around for ways to secure income.

They were determined not to come to the Congress because they didn't want to go through the congressional appropriation process. Nor did they want to assess the member banks because they could hardly hold the banks in at that time, anyway. A lot of the bankers were displeased.

Therefore, they commenced what they had a right to do but they had not discovered it on passage of the Federal Reserve Act in 1913. The first discovery was in New York when the New York Federal Reserve Bank bought some municipal bonds of the city of New York using the credit of the Nation and by buying these bonds they very soon, of course, collected interest on those bonds. This, of course, was a very fine way of getting operating expenses without coming to Congress and without assessing the Federal Reserve member banks. It looked mighty nice. It was a real sweet deal, I might call it, for all 12 Federal Reserve banks and they immediately commenced to engage in this type of operation, the 12 banks, each one of them on his own, not together.

By doing that they had plenty of money to use for almost any purpose they wanted to use money for.

In other words, they had it made. All they had to do was just create the money on the books of the banks, buy Government bonds or any other kind of bonds, pay for them with that created money, and then, of course, collect the interest. In terms of income this didn't mean too much until World War II and following.

During World War II the Federal Open Market Committee increased their purchases of Government securities to about $25 billion, and from there it has gone up until now it is $45 billion. The reason, of course, those bonds were bought was for the purpose of creating reserves upon which the member banks of the Federal Reserve System could make loans and investments on created or manufactured money.

Banks can create $6 or $7 for every dollar they have in reserves. They could create $6 to every one of high-powered dollar. You know, every one of those dollars that the member bank received from the Fed that way by selling, say, a $1 million bond became a part of its reserves and they could expand on that to 6 or 7 to 1 just on demand deposits, and on time deposits they could expand many more times than that, this gives the banks a great advantage. I personally don't object to this, the fractional reserve system, if it is used in the public interest, but if it is abused and just used for a few and not for the public interest, I think correction should be made.

The Federal Reserve Board has been trying to lower reserve requirements so as to give the member banks additional reserves. Just recently this was done. Reserves were lowered from 4 percent to 3 percent on time deposits and of course that gave the commercial banks about $800 million of excess reserves and they could make loans and investments at this time nearly by 33⅓ to 1. That is pretty good.

Now, in doing that the Federal Reserve was doing something against the public interest. They were not thinking about the public. They were not thinking about the taxpayers. They were thinking about the member banks. If they had gone into the market and bought bonds to that extent, $800 million, we would be getting about $34 million a year interest on those bonds. The effect would be identical. Nobody denies that. The effect would be exactly the same.

So the Federal Reserve has been trying to get around buying any more bonds if they can help it. They don't want to do it. It is in the public interest for them to do it, because after the expenses are paid the remainder goes back into the Treasury. It runs over a billion and a half dollars now a year, a substantial amount.

This brings me to the specific point I want to discuss.

The $45 billion that the Federal Reserve System now has been paid for once. No one questions that statement that I make. If they do I have documentation for it. I can go back to Mr. Eccles and to the members of the Board of Governors and to the Presidents of the banks and they have all admitted that this is correct, they have been paid for once.

This is the way they have been paid for. They have been paid for just like everything else is paid for through the Federal Reserve. The Federal Reserve notes are made over here at the Bureau of Engraving and Printing. Of course the notes that we use now are worth 100 cents on the dollar. They are legal tender notes. These are legal tender notes and everyone must accept these notes in payment of any debts of any kind, public or private.

The Federal Reserve takes these Federal Reserve notes and Government credit trades them for these bonds. That is the way they have gotten $44 billion in bonds.

Well, that means that they are paid for once and they are paid for by exchanging one form of Federal Government obligation for another. In other words, at that time they preferred money to bonds. In other words, one form of Government obligation, money (Federal Reserve notes) was exchanged for another form of Government obligation—Government bonds.

Now, that makes two forms of Government obligations out, and why should you permit a double obligation for one debt? Let me give you an example of how ridiculous it is. If Mr. William McChesney Martin in the past had bought a home that he owed, say $10,000 on because of a debt that he assumed and he goes to his broker and he says, "Now, Mr. Broker, I want to pay this debt. It is not due for 15 or 20 years, but you find out who owns it and you make arrangements for me to pay the mortgage on my home that is due in 15 or 20 years," and the broker gets busy and finds out who owns the mortgage. He makes a deal with him for so much money. He will settle the $10,000 debt and Mr. Martin gives the broker a check for the amount of money to pay off that mortgage, and of course the check is cashed by the broker and the money of course goes out of Mr. Martin's account into the broker's account, the broker takes it, pays it to the person holding the mortgage, and then the mortgage instead of being canceled the broker keeps it and when the interest and principal comes due, he calls on Mr. Martin to pay it, why, Mr. Martin of course would go up in smoke. He wouldn't think about paying it. He had paid the debt once.

But that is exactly what is happening now with the bonded indebtedness of the United States. We are paying for it once and the person who gets it, like the Federal Reserve, is not canceling it. They are keeping it and they are making the people continue, the taxpayers, to pay interest on that debt that has been paid for once.

That is exactly what is involved here, Mr. Chairman. We can't pay our debts once very easily and conveniently, and certainly nobody should be required to pay their debts twice.

In this scheme of things we are required to pay our debts twice.

Now, I have gone into this over a period of years. I have had hearings on it. The bill that I have introduced to cancel the obligations I have not been insisting upon in the Banking and Currency Committee because I knew if the bill ever reached the floor of the House a point of order would be made against it and I was apprehensive that it would be sustained because the rules of the House give your Ways and Means Committee complete charge of bills involving bonded indebtedness of the United States.

Therefore, your committee is the one to do it. So I am bringing to your attention that this $45 billion has been paid for once. The bonds are in the vault of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, $45 billion. We assume that they are there. The General Accounting Office has been denied the privilege of auditing the Federal Reserve banks. They have been denied the privilege of auditing this portfolio to see if the bonds are there, but we will assume that they are there.

But we have no audits, not only of the Federal Reserve, but of the Comptroller of the Currency. that issues these Federal Reserve notes. We have no General Accounting Office audit of either the Federal Reserve, Comptroller of the Currency, or FDIC in large part, so as representatives of the people and responsible to the people we are on a little thin ice there in our normal relationships with these Government agencies.

Now, take the Agriculture Department or the Labor Department. You think we would let these agencies go unaudited? No; they are audited right down to the penny, everything, but everything affecting the Federal Reserve is excused from a GAO audit, and also of these other supervisory agencies.

Now getting back to the basic point, the fact is that we just traded one form of Government obligation for another form of Government obligation.

Now, remember, in the law, Mr. Chairman, the Federal Reserve is the fiscal agent of the U.S. Government. Now, if I am any judge of things it occurs to me that being a fiscal agent relates to something akin to trustee and imposes a specific trust upon the person who is charged with that responsibility.

Now, as fiscal agent the Federal Reserve owed it to the Government of the United States and to the taxpayers of the United States to say, "Now, we have these bonds. We have paid for them with government money. They ought to be cancelled."

We shouldn't have two debts outstanding, but just one debt. We shouldn't make the taxpayers pay two debts in order to satisfy one. And if they didn't have the power to do it, which of course I believe they did, but if they didn't I believe that obligation of being the fiscal agent, carrying with it the responsibility of trust that it does, would obligate them to come to Congress and say, "We want to adjust this thing. There is something wrong here. We are requiring the taxpayers to pay this money twice." And get something done. But they haven't done that.

And there is another way that this could be done and if we are forced to do it I think we will just have to do it. Under the law known as the Federal Reserve Act, when the charter was agreed upon it was stated that the charter could be revoked, and obviously Congress has the power to dissolve any institution it has created. Congress created the Federal Reserve banks.

Now, then, in the law it provides that in case of dissolution by Congress—it is written into the law—then the assets of the bank, each of the 12 banks, of course the first goes to pay the so-called stockholders. They are not stockholders because the word "stock" is a misnomer. It is an involuntary investment and there is no proprietary interest by reason of the stock. Under title 12 section 290 should a Federal Reserve Bank be dissolved or liquidated any surplus remains after payment of all debts, dividends, et cetera, shall be paid to and become part of the property of the United States.

Therefore, it is not stock at all. Now, there are $562 million invested by the banks in this so-called stock in the 12 Federal Reserve banks. The first thing that the Government would do would be to pay back that $562 million with 6 percent interest up to date and the rest of it would go to the Government of the United States.

You know how much that would be? It would be well over $50 billion.

Now, if we are going to have all the trouble with the Federal Reserve in the future that we have had in the past I think it might be well to consider liquidation of the Federal Reserve System, take the $50 billion, use it to pay on the national debt, and have a system that is more closely identified with the public interest and certainly not a system that is identified closely with the private interests.

Every time they raise interest rates they collect the money. Money goes into their pockets. It is easy to do that. And they cause good times and hard times when they can profit from it. We shouldn't have people in charge of our monetary system involving the making of interest rates and also the supply of money that had an ax to grind. That is what we have, Mr. Chairman, people who have an ax to grind, and they have been grinding this ax in a way that would help them and not the public interest, and here they are making a campaign right now to transfer this $45 billion to the private banks—for nothing, absolutely free, and it can be done. The American Bankers Association has always lobbied for this. They have a very fine, efficient lobby. They have got the best lobby I guess in the United States, and considering the fact that they interlock with the biggest corporations in the country that have many more lobbyists here in Washington they can call on them.

There is hardly anything that they can't accomplish. The past is the best evidence of that, and a hundred years that lobby has been working and they have information that is passed on from year to year and from Congress to Congress.

Now, Members of Congress come in, out, every 2, 4, 6 years or 15 or 20, but this lobby stays on forever. They have been here for over a hundred years and they know all the tricks in the trade, which you would expect them to, and you would expect them to use those tricks in a way that would help their particular lobby.

We don't object to that. We are used to it, and we recognize it is happening and we are not making any point on that, except to say that they have the know-how.

Now, they commenced in 1957 by getting up a book, "Member Bank Reserve Requirements," put out by the Economic Policy Committee of the American Bankers Association. In this book they make certain statements about the bonds held by the Federal Reserve System. Now remember these bonds have been paid for once and here the Federal Reserve has been collecting interest on them every year as though they hadn't been paid and the Government will have to pay for them again.

Why can't we slip them into the portfolios of the private banks the ABA thought. Just leave enough bonds in the Federal Reserve portfolio to collect enough interest to pay the operating expenses of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and that's all. Transfer the rest of them into the member banks for nothing.

All right. Here is one of the quotes from this document:

"If the Federal were to cut the reserve percentages and then absorb the resulting excess reserves by selling government (bonds), the result would be to shift part of its security holdings to other investors (meaning the banks) over a period of time."

Of course the commercial banks would be the ones that would get them.

"Would this be desirable?" That is the question. "In our opinion it would be." And when they go ahead and they explain carefully how this portfolio can be shifted over to the member banks without cost and to enable the private banks to collect the interest on these bonds, and ultimately the principal.

For instance, I will relate to you here an attempt to do this. This was the vault cash bill. This was in 1959. This ABA report was made in January 1959. The bill was introduced shortly after that. The bill would allow vault cash to be carried as reserves. It was an insignificant amount at the time in the scheme of things. Therefore, I don't believe it was just vault cash that they had in mind, and when they put other language in here to allow these bonds to be siphoned off, transferred off, to the commercial banks, the member banks, away from the Federal Reserve, now instead of collecting $1,900 million interest, we wouldn't collect any, but the member banks would collect that interest and then when the bonds became due they would require that the bonds be paid again.

In other words, we would have to pay the obligation twice. Now, this bill was introduced and hearings were held in the Senate. Mr. Balderston as Vice Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board testified. For some unknown reason Mr. Martin didn't show up in this hearing in the Senate. Neither did he show up in the hearing in the House of Representatives that I participated in.

But Mr. Balderston, the Vice Chairman, showed up. And when Mr. Balderston got through testifying, on page 13 of the hearings, the chairman of the committee in the Senate said:

"In addition, I should like to insert in the appendix to the hearings a study entitled 'Proposed Legislation for Revision of Reserve Requirements,' dated January 29, 1959, prepared by members of the staff of the Board of Governors."

All right. "Mr. Balderston. Copies of this have been placed before the members of the committee," and then of course Mr. Balderston finished his testimony, but that document became a part of the legislative history of this bill.

Now, in this legislative history right there you find the secret of the whole thing. You take, for instance, on page 54 where Mr. Bell was testifying, Daniel Bell. You gentlemen remember him, he was Under Secretary of the Treasury a long time, a very fine man. At that time he was with the American Bankers Association and he appeared for them in this hearing.

He said:

"It is impossible to say how much credit expansion would take place if these changes were to be made. In theory there could be a multiple expansion of something like 6½ times the amount of the reserves released, about $18 billion, if we were to assume that none of the related reserves released would be absorbed by open market sales of government securities by the Federal Reserve system."

He put his finger right on it. That is what they intend to do with this, to sell from the portfolio of the Federal Reserve to the member banks.

Now, then, quoting Mr. Bell further—

"Actually, of course, the reserve authorities would undoubtedly absorb a substantial part of the released reserves in this manner, at least for the time being."

In other words, they are greasing the skids pretty well just to transfer these Government bonds over into the member banks' portfolio.

Now, on page 102 of the hearings it says here:

"For purpose of monetary policy reserve requirements of member banks do not need to be as high as they have been in recent years. Federal Reserve holdings of government securities are large enough so that they could be reduced to absorb a substantial amount of reserves released without impairing the ability of the System to perform its essential functions. Requirements, moreover, may be lowered in the course of time to release reserves needed to cover growing monetary need of the economy. Some reduction in requirements could help improve the earnings and capital positions of member banks without impairing their liquidity or soundness."

But the fact is, and I am glad that Chairman Mills has arrived, if they had gotten by with the transfer of these $45 billion of bonds now in the Fed that has been paid for once to the member banks, that would be the equivalent of giving a cash dividend of 150 percent on the capital accounts of those member banks right now.

It would be equivalent to that. One hundred and fifty percent on the capital account is about $25 billion of all the member banks and this portfolio is $45 billion. It would be giving about $150 to each $100 of capital account. In the other hearing before the Banking and Currency Committee in the House of Representatives, we started off the same way.

Mr. Balderston came and, as I say, for some unknown reason Mr. Martin didn't participate in these hearings, but these hearings were intended and they show that they were intended for the purpose of transferring these Government bonds that have been paid for once to the private banks, member banks, and the member banks get the interest and then when they are due collect again for them.

That is exactly what was planned. These proceedings show it. Mr. Balderston gets on the witness stand and the first thing that was done was to make this staff report part of the record.

Now, there is a good reason for that. Mr. Brown, chairman of the subcommittee in the House says:

"Mr. Balderston, I want to congratulate you on your splendid statement. I understand the staff of the Federal Reserve Board has prepared a helpful memorandum of background material for each member of the committee. Without objection, the memorandum will be inserted in the record at this point."

Again that is for legislative history. If this bill were to pass like it was the Federal Reserve would feel like they had the power to transfer these bonds from the portfolio of the Federal Reserve to portfolios of the member banks, so they wanted to make sure.

Now, on page 187 of these hearings Mr. Wolcott testified and he was Vice Chairman of the FDIC at that time and he also mentioned the fact to not overlook the staff report, that that staff report meant something. That is legislative history. That would give the Federal Reserve the necessary power. They didn't want to come out and say much about that and when we forced the issue some of them actually denied that was their object in doing it, but the truth is when the bill finally passed we made such a good case along the lines that I am presenting here right now that the conferees on the part of the House and the conferees on the part of the Senate unanimously agreed that we would insert certain language in the conference report in the House.

As you gentlemen know, the Senators don't make a conference report. It is only the House. So the House conferees did it and we all signed it and here is what it says:

"During the debate on this bill in the House questions were raised as to whether the purpose of this bill was to transfer government securities held by the Federal Reserve banks to privately owned commercial banks. To avoid any possible misunderstanding."

And this is what has kept them from doing it since that time. It is stopping them now. They don't like it. They are trying to change it.

Further quoting:

"To avoid any possible misunderstanding on this point the managers on the part of the House wish to emphasize that it is not the intent of this legislation to encourage or cause the federal open market committee to reduce the Federal Reserve's holdings of government securities. As was made clear in the House debate, the purpose of this bill is simply to make needed reforms in the structure of reserve requirements."

Then it is signed by Mr. Spence, Mr. Brown, Mr. Patman, Mr. Multer, Mr. McDonough, Mr. Widnall, and Mr. Hiestand, managers on the part of the House. So they haven't been able to do it.

It will require another law, and that law they are trying to get passed right now, so I insist, Mr. Chairman, that it would certainly be against conscience for those bonds to be transferred in that manner.

Now, eventually it is possible, if we don't get the law changed, that the Federal Reserve will own $100 billion in Government bonds or maybe the entire national debt. I don't know.

That is evidently what Mr. Fowler had in mind yesterday when he said consideration should be given to the fact that these bonds were really not in the market, public domain, that they are segregated and isolated off in what he considered trust funds, but of course in the Federal Reserve it couldn't be considered a trust fund and they should not be given the same consideration in the public debt.

Now, if the committee were to say, "Well, the Federal Reserve is right, that we should have enough bonds to secure the Federal Reserve notes that were issued to buy these bonds," I had a study made when I happened to be chairman of the Joint Economic Committee on this portfolio of the Federal Reserve banks and I had the outstanding economists over the Nation to send in statements which are very enlightening.

I got up this compilation and we received their replies, not substantially different from what I have said here, but many of them said:

"Now, if it is insisted upon that we need another government obligation of 100 percent to guarantee the first federal reserve notes of 100 percent, that can be done without drawing interest on these bonds all the time."

The easy way would be to just have the Federal Reserve open market committee send the bonds to the Treasury and get noninterest bearing bonds substituted, file them there and would have the same protection and save the interest, and the bonds, of course, would not have any payment date.

This change should be made. These bonds should be canceled outright, or if need be noninterest bearing bonds should be issued in their place. If this were done, the national debt would be reduced by $45 billion. The debt would be reduced by $45 billion even if noninterest bearing bonds were issued in place of the interest-bearing bonds the Federal Reserve holds, because like Federal Reserve notes which are noninterest hearing, are not part of the national debt.

The Federal Reserve doesn't want to come to Congress for their funds. They don't want any audits. They have been able to stay away from any audits. No audit since the Federal Reserve Act passed has ever been made by the General Accounting Office of the money, the books, or anything that they have done. The Federal Reserve has spent money just almost any way they want to. They want to be able to continue to do this, spend money for any purpose.

I will give you a list of just a few things that they have been spending money for, such ridiculous items as $4,697 for an employee's dinner, $5,000 to a local chapter of the American Institute of Banking, $5,350 for a luncheon given by the New York Federal Reserve Bank for the New York Bankers Association, $3,000 for a theater party given by the Chicago Federal Reserve Bank, $90,000 in dues to bankers associations, including the American Bankers Association.

Now, they have the Congress in the ridiculous position of approving the payment of dues by the Federal Reserve to the banker's lobbying organizations out of taxpayer's money. That is not a very comfortable position for a Member of Congress to be in, but we are in that position.

I am just relating a few of these items to show what they do. They could spend that whole $1,900 million a year for anything they want to and under present law we couldn't say a word. They can transfer these $45 billion in bonds to private investors, including the commercial banks, and we couldn't say a word legally because at this time there is nothing in the law to prevent it. The Federal Reserve has unlimited power and they go too far with it. They have abused it.

Instead of buying bonds for instance, where the Government would get some credit, the taxpayers, they reduce Reserve requirements. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the proof is abundant. There is no doubt about it that these bonds have been paid for once. They shouldn't be paid for twice and this should be taken into account in determining whether the temporary or permanent debt limit should be increased.

Before you came back, Mr. Chairman, I mentioned the fact that the bonds held by the Federal Reserve System having been paid for once was something that we just can't overlook. We have to give it attention. I think Congress is on the spot about this. We have permitted it to go on over the years.

It started back in Mr. Eccle's time. I interrogated him about this. When you would say something about it people just wouldn't believe it. They would say, "Well, Congress wouldn't let anything like that happen." But Congress has and it has gone to the extent of $45 billion now, which is a very large amount, a very huge sum, and we should do something about it and do it now."

I would like to try to answer any questions, Mr. Chairman, if you have any to ask.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Patman, we do appreciate your coming to the committee this morning. I apologize for being late approximately 20 minutes. I am sure you discussed it while I was away, but go through this arithmetic of just how these bonds have been paid for once that are owned by the Federal Reserve.

Mr. PATMAN. Well, the best way I could answer that is to quote the text of transcripts where I interrogated Mr. Eccles and all the members of the Board. I had every member of the Federal Reserve Board before my committee one time, the Joint Economic Committee, and every president of the banks, and everyone of them admitted without doubt that they are paid for once.

Here is the way they are paid for. How does the Federal Reserve buy anything? They don't have any money to buy it with. They create the money. They have a right to create or manufacture money, and of course it is legal to do it and if it is done in the public interest nobody could object to it. I wouldn't.

So the Federal Reserve banks create the money on the books of the banks, to buy, say, a million dollar bond. That money is put in just like a deposit in your account in your local bank and the bank of course can use that for their reserves, and under the law the commercial banking system can expand and create credit by 6 or 7 times the reserves on demand deposits and of course much higher than that on time deposits.

In truth and in fact, they commingle these reserves and they take the average of time and also demand deposits, which makes a pretty good ratio. I don't object to that if they use this Government-granted power in the public interest, but when they ignore the public interest I think it is time for Congress to take a long hard look at the way the commercial banks and Federal Reserve operates.

The bonds in the Federal Open Market Committee portfolio have been paid for once. Mr. Martin said it in a statement just recently. He says, "Yes, they have been paid for once." Nobody disputes that. Nobody questions it. Nobody can question it.

The CHAIRMAN. Quote to me what Mr. Martin said from where and when.

Mr. PATMAN. All right. In hearings on H.R. 7601 before the Banking and Currency Committee of the House on July 7, 1965, to retire $30 billion of U.S. Government bonds held by the Reserve System, Chairman Martin on pages 89 and 90 of the printed testimony again admitted that these bonds had already been paid for once.

Here is a colloquy:

"Mr. Martin. The bonds were paid for in the normal course of business.

"The Chairman. That is right.

"Mr. Martin. And that is the only time they were paid for.

"The Chairman. Just like we pay debt with checks and credit.

"Mr. Martin. Exactly."

Now, the chairman:

"In the normal course of business they were paid for once. You will admit that, will you not? They were paid for once and that's all?"

The Chairman. Let's get away from what Mr. Martin says. You are an expert in this field and I am not. I want to take just a simple example and you show me how it is handled and show me where the payment occurs and when. Let me give you a little example.

The Secretary of the Treasury wants the Federal Reserve System to assume a billion dollars, say, of short-term paper. He is in a bind. He has to have a billion dollars to pay his bills. He doesn't want to go to the money market to do it because of the possibility of upsetting some situation that exists or making it worse. So he calls on the Federal Reserve Bank of New York to make available to him a billion dollars in return for a billion dollars of bonds that are printed by the Treasury Department.

Now, the bank makes that available, does it not, that billion dollars, and the Secretary draws on it and meets the $1 billion of obligations from that transaction, is that right?

Mr. Patman. The method is not correct, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman. I want to know what the method is.

Mr. Patman. The method is that. There are 21 Federal Government bond dealers. They are the fair-haired boys of the Federal Reserve. Twenty-one dealers mainly in New York only can operate with the Federal Reserve. You could get on top of the Federal Reserve Bank building with a rock and throw to the top of the building of each one of them. It is just that close. They are very close to the Federal Reserve, the Federal Open Market Committee operates exclusively through these dealers.

The FOMC would have to sell these Government bonds out of their portfolio through the dealers, and the dealers would of course get a cut on them too. You know the dealers have two tollgates, each one of them, one tollgate when the bonds are bought and one when they are sold. Then they sell them, they go out, and they get a cut. So, Mr. Chairman, the U.S. Treasury can't ask the Federal Open Market Committee to buy its bonds. The Treasury sells their bonds in the open market.

The Chairman. I am not arguing with you. I am trying to understand.

Mr. Patman. Yes, sir.

The Chairman. If the Federal Reserve has beaten the public out of $45 billion I want to know how and when, and if they are charging us with something we don't need to pay then I don't want to pay. What I want to know is this:

When the Secretary of the Treasury needs a billion dollars and proposes to have a billion dollars of Government credit absorbed by the Federal Reserve, what takes place, how is it handled, and so on?

Mr. Patman. Well, I can expand on that. They will get their billion dollars, but there is no conversation like you mentioned. It is not necessary to have any conversation because they can't do it that way.

The U.S. Treasury has to get those bonds up and offer them for sale to the public and the dealers and others will buy them and then the dealers will report the money to the open market committee that will make it available to the Federal Reserve banks and the Federal Reserve banks can be checked on to pay the **Postmaster's salary**, the Congressman, or anybody else's.

The Chairman. I am not talking about some dealer getting bonds now. I know what takes place when we sell bonds to the public through these dealers, but I am talking about the absorption of Government credit by the Federal Reserve—to the extent, you say, of $45 billion.

Mr. Patman. That is right.

The Chairman. What is involved in such a transaction? Does not the Federal Reserve make available to the Government a billion dollars which the Government can use for every billion dollars of bonds that the Federal Reserve buys?

Mr. Patman. Well, of course the Treasury will have to make those bonds, billion dollars, available to the market.

The Chairman. And if the market won't take them?

Mr. Patman. Yes, they will.

The Chairman. What if they won't?

Mr. Patman. The market and dealers will take them at a price.

The Chairman. Let's suppose in this instance the dealers won't take them.

Mr. Patman. But that is what they are for. If they refuse to make a market for the bonds the Federal Open Market Committee offers, they go out of business. That is their business.

The Chairman. I am not talking about the bonds the dealers own. I am talking about the $45 billion of bonds that the Federal Reserve owns.

Mr. Patman. All right. They were acquired this way. They were acquired by giving Federal Reserve notes and credit to commercial banks on the books of the Federal Reserve banks, which is one form of Government obligation that is just as good as a bond, but they are noninterest bearing, and to trade one form of Government obligation for another form.

The Chairman. The type of Federal Reserve note you are talking about, is it a $20 bill or a $10 bill?

Mr. Patman. Yes.

The Chairman. So they give us money.

Mr. Patman. Yes, sir. Of course if the commercial banks don't want the money right then, just like when you have a deposit in the bank; you might not want the money right then, you would take a credit. This is where the high powered reserve dollars get created.

The Chairman. What I am trying to figure out now is when did the Government pay the Federal Reserve back for that billion dollars of bonds?

Mr. Patman. When it made available the credit for the purchase of the $45 billion and that credit was used, and remember this: that was high-powered dollars that they got. High-powered dollars means that they can expand on them, from $10 to $15 on every one, and that is better than these other just real dollars. We paid the hard way.

The Chairman. The point is this. The Federal Reserve gave the U.S. Government a billion dollars in currency in exchange for a billion dollars of bonds that the Federal Reserve absorbed from the Treasury. Now, when did the Federal Reserve pay for those bonds?

Mr. Patman. When the credit was given at the time the bonds were taken.

The Chairman. All right. Now, when did the U.S. Government pay the Federal Reserve back for those bonds the first time?

Mr. Patman. The Government doesn't have to pay the Federal Reserve back.

The Chairman. I thought that you said they had been paid for once.

Mr. Patman. They have, when the money and the credit was created, when the Federal Reserve created the money.

The Chairman. Didn't they buy the bonds in the manner that the Congress authorized the Federal Reserves to do?

Mr. Patman. But the Federal Reserve didn't have to pay the Federal Government. The Federal Reserve manufactured the money and/or credit. A counterfeiter would have to go to the penitentiary for it.

The Chairman. But if the Federal Reserve didn't create the notes or currency that you are talking about, who is left to create them?

Mr. Patman. The Federal Reserve creates them on Federal Government credit. The Congress gave them the power to do it in the Federal Reserve Act.

The Chairman. Who is left to create them if the Federal Reserve doesn't create them?

Mr. Patman. The U.S. Government of course has created money in the past.

The Chairman. Is the Secretary of Treasury authorized by law to create moneys?

Mr. Patman. I don't know that.

The Chairman. I mean through the mint.

Mr. Patman. What?

The Chairman. I say, can't the Government create money through the mint?

Mr. Patman. I know. That is minor coins.

The Chairman. That is right.

Mr. Patman. That is not enough to be meaningful or significant.

The Chairman. But are you suggesting, Mr. Patman, I just want to know, that the Federal Reserve should not have the authority to create money?

Mr. Patman. No. I say I am all for it as long as they use it in the public interest, but they haven't been using it in the public interest.

The Chairman. Let's see if it gets down to this. If the Secretary of the Treasury needs a billion dollars are you proposing that the Federal Reserve create a billion dollars of its notes without receipted bonds?

Mr. Patman. Oh, no; that would be printing press money that is worse. I am not for that.

The Chairman. All right.

Mr. Patman. I am for our traditional money system when used in the public interest.

The Chairman. You would cancel the $45 billion for which the Government got $45 billion of currency. What do you call that?

Mr. Patman. No; the Government didn't get the $45 billion of currency. The commercial banks that sold Government bonds to the Federal Open Market Committee get the currency or credit on the books of the Federal Reserve Banks.

The Chairman. No; the Federal Government paid $45 billion of bills with it, as I understand the situation.

Now, if the Government got the $45 billion of credit, money, or whatever it got, to pay for $45 billion of bills——

Mr. Patman. Mr. Chairman, you are wrong about that.

The Chairman. Wouldn't it be about the same——

Mr. Patman. No; it is not.

The Chairman. Wouldn't it be about the same to simply say that because we have $20 billion of Government obligations in the social security fund that we should just cancel them?

Mr. Patman. No; that is not related at all the way I see it. Participants in the social security system actually pay earned cash into the trust funds, which is not so when the FOMC purchases Government bonds from commercial banks.

The Chairman. I know, but didn't we pay for them once? Taxpayers money was put in the fund. We paid for the bonds with that money. Haven't the obligations clearly been paid for once?

Mr. Patman. I don't understand your reasoning there, Mr. Chairman. It is two different transactions the way you relate it.

One is when the Government gets money to pay bills it gets through the sale of certain bonds or short term securities. That is done in one way and then this other is entirely different. It is not related at all.

The Chairman. I want you to understand clearly. I am not arguing with you. I am trying to understand your point because it is most enlightening to me to know that we don't need to increase the debt ceiling and that all we need to do is to cancel some obligations.

Mr. Patman. All I ask you to do is to go into this thing.

The Chairman. I am like Mr. Doughton. One time a man came to the committee and said that if you could forgive taxes you would have more money at the end of the year than you would have if you didn't forgive the taxes. Mr. Doughton asked the witness, "Just how many years' taxes would we have to forgive to pay off the public debt?"

I take the position that if this is a good thing with respect to the Federal Reserve System, then I want to explore to see if there are not some other bonds that we could cancel——

Mr. Patman. No; we are not talking about any other bonds.

The Chairman (continuing). Without destroying the confidence of the people. Why do we want to cancel the Federal Reserve bonds then?

Mr. Patman. I don't think that you are approaching this thing, Mr. Chairman, in the right light, certainly not according to logic and reasoning, the way I see it, and facts.

It is entirely different. The only one point involved here is that that $45 billion held in the portfolio of the Federal Reserve banks has been paid for once. Now, as to the social security fund, and funds like that, actual dollars went into that fund. When the Social Security Trust Fund purchases Government securities they do not create the money to buy them. There is an actual transfer of cash to the U.S. Treasury.

Certainly you wouldn't want to cancel that.

The Chairman. No; I am not saying that. Let's go back to the bonds to which we are referring. Have they been paid for once? Did the Federal Reserve create currency and pay for these bonds?

Mr. Patman. That is right.

The Chairman. Now, when did we pay them back? That is the point.

Mr. Patman. Pay who back?

The Chairman. You don't take something away from somebody—I don't believe you do in this country—without paying for it.

Mr. Patman. There is where the bonds come in. That is what paid them back. They created the $45 billion in money and credit to buy $45 billion in Government bonds.

The Chairman. Here is the way it works; isn't it, Mr. Patman: The Federal Reserve System creates a billion dollars to buy a billion dollars of bonds today? Isn't that the way it works?

Mr. Patman. Well, you don't have to identify any bonds. It is those in the open market, the bonds that are in the open market that are salable, you know, in the market at the price that is offered.

The Chairman. Does the Federal Reserve normally sell these bonds once they are purchased?

Mr. Patman. For what?

The Chairman. Does the Federal Reserve sell the bonds that it purchases from the Treasury?

Mr. Patman. No; they don't sell any bonds as you describe. They have no direct relationship with the Treasury as far as purchasing Government bonds directly from them.

The Chairman. They have no authority to sell any Government bonds?

Mr. Patman. No. The Treasury sells its bonds to the public in the public market.

The Chairman. I am talking about the $45 billion of bonds that I understand from you the Federal Reserve owns.

Mr. Patman. The Federal Open Market Committee is in the market practically all the time buying and selling Government securities.

The Chairman. Does the Federal Reserve sell those bonds?

Mr. Patman. All the time.

The Chairman. What are their limitations?

Mr. Patman. In effect, there are none. There is no legal restriction in Federal law or elsewhere on how, when, or how much the Federal Open Market Committee can do as far as purchasing or selling bonds are concerned.

The Chairman. That is right.

Mr. Patman. Or recession. These $45 billion represent really a reservoir for the recessions and depressions. They can't be used for anything else.

The Chairman. And for the issuance of our currency?

Mr. Patman. And there are enough bonds there to create 15 depressions of the 1930 type.

The Chairman. And enough bonds there to create how much currency?

Mr. Patman. Well, of course you don't create from the open market portfolio.

The Chairman. The Federal Reserve can't create currency without something to support it, can it? The Federal Reserve issues notes which are currency. What does it have to back them?

Mr. Patman. Then it is guaranteed by the Government. They are not Federal Reserve notes. They are obligations of the U.S. Government.

The Chairman. They are not issued by the Federal Government. They are issued by the Federal Reserve.

Mr. Patman. I know, but they are obligations of the U.S. Government.

The Chairman. I know, but the Federal Government has to have something on hand as backing in order to issue notes.

Mr. Patman. The Government prints the Federal Reserve notes for the Federal Reserve over here at the Bureau of Engraving and Printing and they get them without cost. The fact of the business for the notes that are issued the taxpayers have to pay for the cost of printing.

The Chairman. I know, but what does the Federal Reserve have to have on hand in order to get the Government to print a billion dollars of notes for the Federal Reserve?

Mr. Patman. Either gold certificates or U.S. securities.

The Chairman. That is right. That is what I am trying to get at.

Let's see this other point. I am interested always in reducing expenditures. You make the point that if we don't cancel these obligations we ought to make the Federal Reserve turn them in for interest-free obligations. Did I understand you correctly?

Mr. Patman. That is one way of doing it. That is the alternative method.

The Chairman. Did I understand you correctly?

Mr. Patman. Yes, sir; you did.

The Chairman. Under existing law is it not necessary for the Federal Reserve at the end of each year to return to the Treasury the excess of earnings over and above its net operating cost plus whatever may be kept in the surplus account?

Mr. Patman. Yes, But practically all their earnings are interest on these bonds that have been paid for once, 97 percent. That is what they call earnings. They think they earned that. What they return to the Treasury is by administrative decision. There is nothing in the Federal Revenue Act that says the Federal Reserve has to return these funds to the Treasury.

The Chairman. Absolutely. Let's look at the calendar years 1964, 1965, and 1966 and I am quoting from what the Federal Reserve reports in its annual statement.

In 1964 it reports that it had earnings of $1,324 million. It returned to the Treasury that year $1,582 million. That includes an amount that it returned to the Treasury out out a surplus account.

In 1965 it had earnings of $1,522 million and, as you point out, all of it comes from the interest on Government obligations. And it returned to the Treasury that year $1,297 million.

In 1966 it had earnings of $1,851 million. It returned to the Treasury $1,649 million.

Mr. Patman, if we did not allow the Federal Reserve to have the right to pay its operating cost out of the earnings from these bonds and return the excess to the Federal Treasury, how would the Federal Reserve get money to operate?

Mr. Patman. You mean the Federal Reserve System?

The Chairman. Yes.

Mr. Patman. Through appropriations from Congress, according to U.S. Constitution. There is where most other agencies and departments get their money. The Federal Reserve doesn't want to come to Congress because then their operations would be looked into and some of them won't stand the light of day.

The Chairman. Let's assume I am chairman of the Appropriations Committee and for the sake of argument I am a strong chairman who works his will with all agencies of Government if they come through the committee and want money. I generally end up making these agencies subservient to my wishes. They not only appoint someone that I want appointed, but they carry out the policies in the operation of our laws that I want them to follow.

Would you think it would be well for me to superimpose my judgment over that of the Federal Reserve with respect to the fixing of any and all things that are fixed by the Federal Reserve? Would that not just absolutely defeat the entire intention of Congress initially in making it a body not subservient to the Congress and not subservient to the President of the United States?

You wouldn't want me in that position over and above those that are appointed to carry out the law as governors of the Federal Reserve System, would you? I don't believe you would.

Mr. Patman. Well, you put your finger on exactly what is involved here. You see, the Fed at first didn't have enough earnings to pay their expenses.

The Chairman. We used to have to appropriate it?

Mr. Patman. No, we didn't.

The Chairman. Didn't we? How did we do it?

Mr. Patman. Back in 1914 the Federal Reserve was faced with this problem. They had to either assess the member banks—they didn't think they would get by with that because a lot of the member banks didn't want to be members of the system anyway and they were afraid to undertake that—or they had to go to Congress to ask for an appropriation like all other agencies do. They decided that there must be another way and the New York Federal Reserve Bank broke the ice. They found a way.

You see, then we did not have a central bank. It wasn't a central bank until 1935. Then each district bank was separate and autonomous. They couldn't work together. They were not supposed to. But each one could engage in open market operations, so the New York Bank bought $500,000 worth of New York City municipal bonds, and that, of course, was a good deal.

They bought these bonds on the credit of the nation and they received interest on them, and then the other Federal Reserve regional banks began to do the same thing and the first thing you know they had plenty of bonds and the interest on them would give them plenty of money and they didn't have to come to Congress.

That is what they feared, because they didn't want any Congressman looking over their shoulders. They didn't want anybody to know what they were doing. They were then and are now doing their business in secret.

So by having these interest-bearing bonds in the portfolio they can take the interest and spend it for any purpose on earth. Were you here when I read the number of things they spent?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. PATMAN. Even including the payment of dues of about $90,000 to local State and national bankers associations.

The CHAIRMAN. I am surprised actually that the Congress hasn't had something to say about how the Federal Reserve spends its money because under the initial act Congress could amend it and restrict them.

Mr. PATMAN. I know, but bankers have a pretty powerful lobby and they use it pretty effectively. I don't charge any corruption or anything like that, but they just have a built-in intimidation without any saying of a word or anything else, because people don't like to do anything that the bankers don't like.

The CHAIRMAN. This committee is made up of people who withstand all kinds of pressure, but I know this committee is not the only one in Congress that has to do that. I am sure the gentleman can get a bill out of his committee that would prevent the Federal Reserve paying any part of these earnings to the American Bankers Association.

Mr. PATMAN. The Federal Reserve doesn't have much earnings, just about all the income they have comes from interest on Government bonds.

The CHAIRMAN. Whoever it is that has these earnings and pays $90,000 a year to the American Bankers Association to come down here and lobby you and me, I think, they ought to be stopped.

Mr. PATMAN. I am glad to hear you say that. I do too. They are dues-paying and card-carrying members of the biggest lobbying organization in the country.

The CHAIRMAN. Let's do something about it.

Mr. PATMAN. All right. If you will help me we will go right to work on it.

The CHAIRMAN. This is not in the jurisdiction of this committee, however.

Mr. PATMAN. I will tell you now you will have an awfully hard time getting their statements for last year of what they spent. It might take you 2 or 3 years to do it.

The CHAIRMAN. I just wanted to understand. I didn't want to argue with you. I yield to Mr. Watts.

Mr. WATTS. Let me ask you about the $90,000. I am intrigued by it myself. Is that paid by the Federal Reserve bank itself, or by the member banks?

Mr. PATMAN. It is paid by the Federal Reserve.

Mr. WATTS. In a lump sum?

Mr. PATMAN. That is paid out of money that would go to the Treasury.

Mr. WATTS. I can understand why a lot of national banks would be members of the association. That has nothing to do with it, however, has it?

Mr. PATMAN. No, sir.

Mr. WATTS. They just take $90,000 out of—

Mr. PATMAN. That is right, money that came from the taxpayers, interest on bonds that have been paid for once.

Mr. WATTS. When did that start?

Mr. PATMAN. It started some years ago. We had an awful time getting the first report. I spent years on it.

Mr. WATTS. What is the rationale back of it? Have they tried to explain it?

Mr. PATMAN. Oh, no, they don't try to explain it. They don't have to because they can spend this money for anything they want. There is no audit of the Federal Reserve System by the GAO.

Mr. WATTS. Where did this New York outfit get the money to buy these municipal bonds? They printed it, did they?

Mr. PATMAN. They created it just like they did in buying Government bonds. The banks have gone into something I think is very bad. To manufacture money that is all right. I don't object to it at all if they do it in the public interest, but when they manufacture money on our credit and buy tax-exempt bonds, municipal bonds, on it, and they own $40 billion out of $104 billion that have been issued, and they use our credit to buy tax-exempt bonds, that is going rather far.

Mr. WATTS. If I understand you correctly that New York outfit did start it, just created the money themselves.

Mr. PATMAN. That was the initial one, yes.

Mr. WATTS. And didn't have to pay any interest on the money they created.

Mr. PATMAN. Oh, no.

Mr. WATTS. They went out and took the money they created and bought these bonds and got income from it?

Mr. PATMAN. They didn't go out. They didn't have to leave. They are just right there, just created the money on the books.

Mr. WATTS. Took the money and purchased the municipal bonds.

Mr. PATMAN. Right.

Mr. WATTS. And there is absolutely no law on the books that says what they should do with any income they have?

Mr. PATMAN. That is right. It is terrible. The General Accounting Office can't even inspect the portfolio. It is supposed to be $45 billion. They have never had a look at it. They have never had a look at the Comptroller of the Currency's books either.

Mr. WATTS. Is there any other organization they are donating to besides the American Bankers Association?

Mr. PATMAN. I don't know. In fact what you get is a hard way and it is years after before it is available to you.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Patman, it is possible I think for Congress to amend the Federal Reserve Act to provide for the Federal Reserve's use of these funds to be reviewed by the General Accounting Office.

Mr. PATMAN. That is right. Sure it would. That would be wonderful. That is in a bill I have now we are trying to get through. Would you favor it, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Oh, yes, I want to do anything I can to help you preserve the integrity of the Federal Reserve.

Mr. PATMAN. That is wonderful. Another thing. Would you be for the Federal Reserve coming to Congress for appropriations?

The CHAIRMAN. No, I would not.

Mr. PATMAN. You wouldn't?

The CHAIRMAN. No, sir.

Mr. PATMAN. I am surprised.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Conable.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Patman, you don't mean to imply that the $45 billion in bonds isn't there, do you?

Mr. PATMAN. No, that they are not there. You know, the Federal Reserve System is a Government institution.

Mr. CONABLE. Yes, sir, but I mean you said that nobody had taken a look at the portfolio.

Mr. PATMAN. I don't doubt they are there. I don't think they are dishonest. I don't think they would steal.

Mr. CONABLE. They can't make this money from some other source?

Mr. PATMAN. They did get caught in an act that is pretty bad, almost like stealing, when they tried to get a law through Congress that would let them commence transferring these bonds from the Federal Open Market Committee portfolio to the private banks without charge on the theory that they didn't need the interest from these bonds, except just a certain amount to pay their expenses, and the private banks did need the interest. They were caught redhanded in that just like a chicken thief in the middle of the night coming out of a chicken coop with a chicken under each arm. They got caught on that.

Mr. CONABLE. All I wanted to ask was if there was any implication in what you said that the $45 billion of bonds wasn't there. Do you have any evidence that anything else has happened to the portfolio that is illegal?

Mr. PATMAN. No, I am not charging that. I am assuming that they are there. Generally they are high-class fellows and honest, but, you see, sometimes their honest views are not the way we would construe them.

Mr. CONABLE. I would like to ask you if there is any possible advantage in members of the Federal Reserve System belonging to the American Bankers Association. Isn't it important that they have some sort of liaison with bankers through associations of one sort or another?

Mr. PATMAN. You mean the Federal Reserve banking system?

Mr. CONABLE. Yes.

Mr. PATMAN. Oh, they are supposed to represent the people. They are not supposed to be in a bankers' lobby.

Mr. CONABLE. But they have to deal with bankers a great deal.

Mr. PATMAN. I know, but the bankers have to deal with them. They don't have to deal with the bankers.

The CHAIRMAN. Any further questions?

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Ullman.

Mr. ULLMAN. This $45 billion of U.S. securities owned by the Fed comes under the debt ceiling, does it not? That is what we are talking about here today.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, certainly, yes. If non-interest-bearing bonds were issued they would have the same effect as Mr. Mills suggested they should and they would not be in the national debt limit and you wouldn't have to pay this bill.

Mr. ULLMAN. Why wouldn't they be under the debt limit if they were interest-free obligations?

Mr. PATMAN. It is only interest-bearing securities of the Government that are included. Federal Reserve notes are not interest bearing. They are not included in the national debt, or an obligation that is past due is not included in the national debt.

Mr. ULLMAN. In addition to the $45 billion of Government obligations that the Fed owns we have allowed them to make what other purchases? You mentioned that they could buy municipal bonds.

Mr. PATMAN. I was talking about the member banks there.

Mr. ULLMAN. The member banks.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. ULLMAN. But the Fed itself——

Mr. PATMAN. Of course the Fed could too, but they haven't been engaging in that. They could buy Fannie Mae paper and Federal Home Loan Bank Board paper and they could really do a lot to assist our economic activity.

Mr. ULLMAN. The Fed itself could not purchase municipals?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, it could. The first bonds that were bought when they caught on to this business of buying securities and collecting the interest and spending it in any way they want to, they bought up $500,000 worth of bonds from the city of New York.

Mr. ULLMAN. And you are not talking about the member banks?

Mr. PATMAN. No, I am talking about the Federal Reserve Bank in New York did it, but I say generally they don't buy anything but Government securities.

Mr. ULLMAN. But we are talking about the Federal Reserve System and the $45 billion.

Mr. PATMAN. That is right.

Mr. ULLMAN. Now let's confine ourselves to the Federal Reserve as we know it, not member banks. The Federal Reserve can't buy municipal bonds?

Mr. PATMAN. The Federal Reserve bank can buy municipals but they have not engaged in that practice, although the first bond that was bought by a Federal bank that started out this theory of having a big portfolio with interest-bearing obligations was a municipal bond, the city of New York.

Mr. ULLMAN. But they have no portfolio now?

Mr. PATMAN. No. They might have a few, but it would just be a very small amount, if any.

Mr. ULLMAN. Their revenue then would come completely from the interest on the $45 billion?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, and if you will take their report, my dear sir, you will find that the service they render is very little compared to what they used to render. They are relying almost solely and completely on interest on bonds that have been paid for once. The taxpayers should not be compelled to pay interest on bonds that have been paid for once, but they are and nobody can deny that.

Mr. ULLMAN. However, they don't necessarily issue the currency?

Mr. PATMAN. Unless it is needed, unless it is wanted.

Mr. ULLMAN. In relation to the $45 billion how much do they have of outstanding Federal Reserve currency?

Mr. PATMAN. There would be no way of knowing because it is just like in your account. You might have a deposit and you might not want the money, but the next day you want some money and you get it just like when this credit is set up.

Mr. ULLMAN. Do you have any idea of approximately how much is outstanding?

Mr. PATMAN. There is about $38 billion of Federal Reserve notes out. That is to the best of my recollection.

Mr. ULLMAN. In other words, there is a leeway maybe of $7 billion.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; or even more. Some of that could come about another way, you know, but certainly a large part of it is Federal Reserve notes and they could get the rest of it if they want to because that creation of credit is payable in Federal Reserve notes. They can pick it up right then or they can pick it up any time they want to, through any bank in the United States.

Mr. ULLMAN. On a different matter, you mentioned the fact that this is the kind of money that they can expand 10 times.

Mr. PATMAN. In other words, those are high-powered dollars, high-powered dollars, upon which they can expand 10 or 15 times.

Mr. ULLMAN. Not automatically, but how do they do it?

Mr. PATMAN. Make loans and investments on it, either loan or investment or both.

Mr. ULLMAN. To their member banks?

Mr. PATMAN. Well, no. You are talking about the member banks now making the loans and investments?

Mr. ULLMAN. Yes.

Mr. PATMAN. You see, when the money is created on the books of the bank for this bank that is getting this million dollar bond, they can spend that money usually any way they want to. They can make time loans or they can make them on demand deposits. If it is demand deposits the ratio is about 9 or 10 to 1. If it is a time deposit it is up to 33⅓ to 1, so it is almost unlimited there. That is creation of money on every dollar that they get in the process that we have described.

Those are high-powered dollars. If they take it in cash they wouldn't have the credit-creating ability of course because it would be taken out of the reserve fund.

Mr. ULLMAN. If you had interest-free bonds could they do it?

Mr. PATMAN. No, I wouldn't know how they would fit in. If the law were changed or if the Fed wanted to do it it could be done, but I don't see where it would serve any better purpose just offhand. I haven't given consideration to it, Mr. Ullman.

Mr. ULLMAN. As far as this $45 billion is concerned the Fed gets interest on the $45 billion, collects interest?

Mr. PATMAN. That is right.

Mr. ULLMAN. Then makes its expenditures and you question the legitimacy of some of the expenditures, but the U.S. Government gets back all of the interest except the expenses, is that right?

Mr. PATMAN. That is right, but, you see, they got that money from the taxpayers on bonds that have been paid for. There is the evil in it. The reason that they want it that way is they don't want to come to Congress.

If they came to Congress these expenditures I have mentioned wouldn't be allowed. They couldn't get by with it.

Do you think we would allow a postmaster to have a $5,000 banquet for somebody out of town at the Waldorf Astoria to pay dues to the American Bankers Association and related associations of $90,000 a year. Why, of course, they would laugh.

The Members of Congress would laugh at them for coming in and asking for payment of things like that.

Mr. ULLMAN. We can argue about the expenditures, whether they are legitimate or not, but let's get back to the fundamental proposition of whether the system is unfair itself.

Assuming that the Federal Reserve spends its money for legitimate expenditures under rules quite comparable to other such governmental or semigovernmental agencies, supposing that the expenditures were fair and according to the rules, then what is basically wrong with the system?

Mr. PATMAN. What is basically wrong is requiring taxpayers to pay interest on bonds that have been paid for once. If they got it from services now it would be all right.

Mr. ULLMAN. The Government gets back all the interest, anyway.

Mr. PATMAN. I know, but that doesn't justify taxpayers having to pay bonds that have been paid for once.

Mr. ULLMAN. Except if the Government gets it all back except the legitimate expenditures, then actually the taxpayers aren't paying any interest on the bonds. All they are paying are the expenses of the Federal Reserve System.

Mr. PATMAN. Of that $1,900 million in interest income that they got last year, very little of that, about 2 or 3 percent, was for services rendered by the Federal Reserve banks. Ninety-seven percent or more was for interest on these bonds that have been paid for once, and nobody should be required to pay as a taxpayer interest on bonds that have been paid for once.

Now, if this goes on like it is, and Mr. Chairman, this is a great responsibility on you—I know it is—you would be requiring the people to pay for these bonds twice. That is not right.

In addition to paying interest on them, as long as they are not due they will have to pay for them again. No government on earth can justify that.

Now, that is just too bad, having to pay the principal and the interest.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Patman, confining ourselves again to the issue of the fact that the taxpayers are paying interest to the Federal Reserve System, the facts are that in recent years 89 percent of the interest that is paid by the taxpayers is returned to the Treasury. Isn't that correct?

Mr. PATMAN. Eighty-nine percent is returned to the Treasury? You see, the Treasury collects all this money through the Internal Revenue Service and then of course the Federal Reserve open market committee in New York is paid this $1,900 million direct from the Treasury and there is where the taxpayers come in.

They have paid that $1,900 million which went for the payment of a debt that is not due, not morally due. It is not morally right to pay debts twice.

Mr. ULLMAN. Except that if it is returned to the Treasury the only costs to the taxpayer are the expenditures of the Federal Reserve System, and I don't see how you can say the taxpayers are paying the interest when the interest actually is returned to the Treasury except for the expenditures.

Mr. PATMAN. Except what the Fed spends. They spend over $200 million and part of that is for services to banks, like this. You see, the banks get a big subsidy out of this thing, a huge subsidy.

Mr. ULLMAN. If your argument is limited to the criticism that the Fed is not spending its money wisely, then I think maybe you have an argument, but I can't accept your argument, and I am trying to because I very much would like to believe that we could do something here that would relieve us of some of this debt obligation, that the taxpayers are paying interest when in fact that interest comes back into the Treasury except for the expenditures, and if you are just criticizing the expenditures then I think that is another thing.

Mr. PATMAN. Maybe I can explain it a little bit better from my viewpoint. The taxpayers shouldn't have to pay money that is used to pay interest on a debt that has been paid, a Government debt that has been paid.

Now, if that money were not paid, that $1,900 million would remain in the pockets of the people and they could use it for anything they want, but they are being required to pay enough money to pay $1,900 million on bonds that have been paid for once. There is no getting around that.

Mr. ULLMAN. But 89 perecnt does come back to the Treasury and is that returned to the taxpayer.

Mr. PATMAN. Not the principal. When the principal is paid of course it will go to the Federal Reserve and they will have other bonds in connection with it.

Mr. HERLONG. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. ULLMAN. Yes, I will yield.

Mr. HERLONG. You are saying these bonds have been paid for once. They were paid for by the Federal Reserve with the $45 billion that we authorized the Federal Reserve to print and issue, is that right?

Mr. PATMAN. Well, in a way that is right.

Mr. HERLONG. It was Government money that the Federal Reserve had and they bought these bonds with Government money?

Mr. PATMAN. That is right. They bought them with Government money.

Mr. HERLONG. And how did they get that Government money?

Mr. PATMAN. They got it from Bureau of Engraving and Printing. They are printed over there every day and every night.

Mr. HERLONG. I am not talking about the mechanics of how they got it. How did they get it?

Mr. PATMAN. They have the right under the law to do it either by gold certificates or Government securities.

Mr. HERLONG. Where did they get the gold certificates?

Mr. PATMAN. They don't have any more. They don't use them.

Mr. HERLONG. Where did they get the support for this money that they issued?

Mr. PATMAN. The Treasury.

Mr. HERLONG. The Treasury gave it to them?

Mr. PATMAN. The bonds of course are put in the box for the purpose of backing Federal Reserve notes. They are already backed 100 percent by this now.

Mr. HERLONG. How did they get the money to buy the bonds? You state they paid for these with Government money.

Mr. PATMAN. They use the words "create" and "manufacture." That is not a nasty word. It is right. They do create the money. They manufacture it, and they manufacture it themselves on the books which the Government has to redeem.

Mr. HERLONG. But you haven't answered my question, "How did they get the money?" You say they used Government money with which to buy these bonds?

Mr. PATMAN. That is right.

Mr. HERLONG. How did they get the Government money?

Mr. PATMAN. Through the regular process that they always get it.

Mr. HERLONG. Didn't they have to have something to support it?

Mr. PATMAN. Gold certificates or Government securities.

Mr. HERLONG. Where did they get them?

Mr. PATMAN. They don't have gold certificates any more. That part is obsolete.

Mr. HERLONG. Where did they get them to start with?

Mr. PATMAN. Of course that was based upon the gold. They are now in existence, but they are not in circulation. The Federal Reserve banks have gold certificates and to the extent they have them they could use them, but the others don't have gold certificates.

Mr. HERLONG. It all goes back then to Government securities to start with?

Mr. PATMAN. Sure.

Mr. HERLONG. How did they get the Government securities?

Mr. PATMAN. They created the money to buy the Government securities. The money cost them nothing, just like when they started out and bought the $500,000 in bonds from the city of New York when they didn't have any money. They created that money.

Mr. HERLONG. They created that money. What was their authority for creating it?

Mr. PATMAN. The law.

Mr. HERLONG. The Congress gave the Federal Reserve the authority?

Mr. PATMAN. There are two financial institutions that can create money. That is the Federal Reserve banks for the banks reserves and the member banks—commercial banks. The commercial banks create money on the books of the banks just by a flick of the pen.

The CHAIRMAN. No, no, Mr. Patman. That is oversimplified. Yield to me just a second.

Nobody under the Federal Reserve Act can create money unless they have something to support that money.

Mr. PATMAN. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. All right. Always add that.

Mr. PATMAN. Now, then, if you get the Federal Reserve notes and you buy these bonds with them, why should you keep the bonds there to support the Federal Reserve notes when the Government is responsible 100 percent for the notes? Do you have to have 200 percent obligations?

The CHAIRMAN. Your committee has jurisdiction over the Federal Reserve Act and I thought that you wanted not only the full faith and credit of the U.S. Government behind these non-interest-bearing notes that are called currency, but I thought you wanted them to also be supported by some obligation.

Mr. PATMAN. They are supported by the Government of the United States. It couldn't be any better than that.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that enough?

Mr. PATMAN. Sure, it is enough.

The CHAIRMAN. Why don't we just discontinue this process then and just let the Secretary of the Treasury have authority to issue full faith and credit Government notes that are currency?

Mr. PATMAN. Nobody wants to do that that I know of.

The CHAIRMAN. I know, but I am trying to figure out what you want to do.

Mr. PATMAN. I don't want to do that.

The CHAIRMAN. You don't?

Mr. PATMAN. I just want to cancel an obligation that has already been paid once.

The CHAIRMAN. If we cancel it, then what will support the money that has been issued by the Federal Reserve? Nothing in the world except the full faith and credit of the United States. What is the difference between the Federal Reserve making currency—creating it—in the name of the Government with the full faith and credit of the United States behind it and the Secretary of the Treasury doing it?

Mr. PATMAN. Well, I am just talking about canceling a debt that has been paid for once.

The CHAIRMAN. It is a greenback by whatever name we call it.

Mr. PATMAN. Any debts that have been paid once is enough.

The CHAIRMAN. I say it would be a greenback even though it had the full faith and credit of the United States behind it. They called it a greenback once, didn't they?

Mr. PATMAN. I don't know. The gentleman would know more about it than I.

The CHAIRMAN. Greenbacks had the full faith and credit of the United States behind them, didn't they?

Mr. PATMAN. At the time they did, yes. Take the Lincoln greenbacks. That is all that they had, $364 million, and if Mr. Lincoln had issued bonds of 5 percent payable semiannually instead and they had been delayed in payment like usually interest payments are, up to now we would owe $60 billion on that $364 million.

The CHAIRMAN. I don't believe you properly recalled the provisions of the Second Liberty Loan Act when you said that if we issued a non-interest-bearing security it would not be included in the debt——

Mr. PATMAN. I didn't say issue it. No, I said if you considered these $45 million paid, that would reduce the national debt that much.

The CHAIRMAN. That is true, but then you said that you would be satisfied if we replaced them, I thought you said, with noninterest securities.

Mr. PATMAN. That is what a number of outstanding economists said in their report, that that would be just as good, if they wanted something there to make it 200 percent instead of 100 percent. I don't see where 200 percent is needed.

The CHAIRMAN. What I am getting to is the difference between just canceling these out, which I assume we could do by law and then they wouldn't be in the debt, and merely replacing them with non-interest-bearing securities. In the latter case, I think you have misread the Second Liberty Loan Act. They would still be in the overall debt——

Mr. PATMAN. You mean noninterest bearing.

The CHAIRMAN. Oh, yes, we have some of them under the debt ceiling now and we also have some securities that have matured.

Mr. PATMAN. Well, they ought to be taken out of the debt.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Mr. PATMAN. Here is all I ask you to do, Mr. Chairman, to have an investigation of this. There is something here. It can be done and can be done right

The CHAIRMAN. The matured public debt on which interest has ceased amounted to $262,625,286.89 as of April 30, 1967. In addition, the debt bearing no interest which was included in the national debt was $3,662,902,426.56.

Mr. PATMAN. How much Federal Reserve notes?

The CHAIRMAN. National and Federal Reserve notes assumed by the United States on deposit of lawful money for their retirement exceeded $86 million. We also have some old demand notes and fractional currency, we have some thrift and Treasury savings stamps, old series currency, and so so. These are all matured debt.

Mr. PATMAN. But you haven't listed Federal Reserve notes of about $38 billion and they are not included.

The CHAIRMAN. No, they are not included. We don't include those, but we do include some non-interest-bearing obligations of the Government. We don't include the things you are talking about.

Mr. PATMAN. Anyway, Mr. Chairman, if what I propose doesn't cancel this obligation, I want you to do something to cancel it so as to reduce the national debt because we shouldn't have to pay our debts twice, and an investigation by this committee, and I have the utmost confidence in them, will get the right thing done, I know it, because you can have the Federal Reserve up here. You can have anybody.

The CHAIRMAN. I am not qualified to disagree with the gentleman.

What I am trying to get to is what would happen. Suppose that we cancel it out. It would mean that the $38 billion of outstanding currency would have nothing behind it. That is, our Federal Reserve notes, our currency, would have nothing behind them except the full faith and credit of the United States. Isn't that right?

Mr. PATMAN. You do it any way you want to.

The CHAIRMAN. I am asking you.

Mr. PATMAN. But cancel them, because they have been paid for once and where there is a wrong there is a remedy.

The CHAIRMAN. I have already told you I am depending on you.

Mr. PATMAN. And this committee is the best committee in Congress to find the remedy.

The CHAIRMAN. But wouldn't that be the result? There would be nothing back of currency now outstanding except the full faith and credit of the United States.

Mr. PATMAN. That is right. That is behind them now. Why have it doubly behind them?

The CHAIRMAN. Can you assure me, because I am much interested in this? I hate to go to the House of Representatives with a bill increasing the national debt if there is any way to avoid it.

Mr. PATMAN. There is a way; yes, sir. If you go into this thing, Mr. Chairman, you will find it.

The CHAIRMAN. I am trying to find out what the results will be, Mr. Patman.

Mr. PATMAN. The results will be good.

The CHAIRMAN. They will? Have you oversimplified it, or have you given me your best judgment?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. All right. I am just wondering what the effect would be.

Mr. PATMAN. The effect is pretty bad on the people to have to pay $1,900 million a year interest on bonds that have been paid for once. That is pretty bad, too.

The CHAIRMAN. No, they don't.

Mr. PATMAN. They don't pay it?

The CHAIRMAN. I don't consider it payment if I let my child have $16 in her pocket during the day and at night the child gives me back $16. I don't see I am out anything.

Mr. PATMAN. That is not comparable.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, maybe the child spent a dollar. Would that be comparable?

Mr. PATMAN. No. This is $45 billion that has been paid for once.

The CHAIRMAN. I haven't understood it yet.

Mr. HERLONG. Let me ask you another question about this $45 billion of Government money that the Federal Reserve used to buy these bonds with. This $45 billion of money is not a part of the national debt, is it?

Mr. PATMAN. No, it is not interest bearing.

Mr. HERLONG. So it is not in the national debt. Then they bought these bonds which are a part of the national debt.

Mr. PATMAN. Oh, I understood you to say Federal Reserve notes were not a part of the national debt. They are not, but the bonds are a part of the national debt. Although they have been paid once they are still part of the national debt.

Mr. HERLONG. But the $45 billion is only in the national debt one time?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, but the obligation is doubled. You see, the Government has its full faith and credit behind the Federal Reserve notes that were used to buy the bonds. There is where we are paying twice when we pay the bonds again. We paid once when we gave full faith and credit Federal Reserve notes, but the bonds for which these notes were given are still outstanding.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Patman, just one second. Let me ask again who has the primary liability with respect to Federal Reserve notes that are issued?

Mr. PATMAN. The U.S. Government.

The CHAIRMAN. Oh, no. Who has the primary liability? Against whom is the primary liability lodged for the Federal Reserve notes—the currency that is outstanding—issued by the Federal Reserve? Doesn't the

Federal Reserve system? Go back and read the Federal Reserve Act. I don't know that it has ever been passed upon.

Mr. Patman. You mean they are responsible for these notes?

The Chairman. Primarily.

Mr. Patman. Oh, Mr. Chairman, you are just as wrong as you can be.

The Federal Reserve Act, on this point (USC Title 12, Sec. 411), as follows:

"Federal reserve notes, to be issued at the discretion of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for the purpose of making advances to Federal Reserve Banks . . . are hereby authorized. The said notes shall be obligations of the United States . . . They shall be redeemed in lawful money on demand at the Treasury Department of the United States."

The Chairman. That is why they have to have the bonds issued by the Federal Government to support the currency.

Mr. Patman. There is a lot of discussion about that in the book. There is no doubt about it.

The Chairman. I understand that. Has the court ever decided that the full faith and credit of the United States is back of the Reserve notes?

Mr. Patman. Of course they are. It is written into the law.

The Chairman. Has the court ever decided that?

Mr. Patman. Mr. Carter Glass, you know, was determined on that. When they wanted to make it the obligation of the Federal Reserve banks he took an adamant' position against the proposals.

The Chairman. Has the court ever decided who has primary obligation?

Mr. Patman. They don't have to. It is just as plain as the nose on your face. When the Federal Reserve bill was before Congress efforts were made in the House and Senate to make the Federal Reserve notes obligations of the Federal Reserve banks and not the Federal Government, but such efforts were unsuccessful.

The Chairman. Let's put in this hearing the actual statute itself.

BANKING AND CURRENCY CHAIRMAN PATMAN INSTRUCTS TREASURY DEPARTMENT ON NATION'S CURRENCY SYSTEM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Patman] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the great responsibilities of the Congress is that of legislative oversight over executive departments and agencies. Congress itself, along with the judiciary, is the best judge of whether the statutes we enact and our public policies are properly carried out by the executive branch.

A point I have made for some time now is the unsound fiscal policy involved in our permitting over $40 billion of public property to be held by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, which bank claims to be independent of both the executive and the Congress, without even a routine General Accounting Office audit. In point of fact, I have introduced legislation to correct this bad situation by providing for retirement of $40 billion of these bonds and for a General Accounting Office audit.

Very recently, Secretary of the Treasury Fowler had occasion to comment upon my bill H.R. 9156, providing for the bond retirement. The essential reason for Mr. Fowler's lack of support is his allegation that these bonds must remain in the hands of the New York bankers as collateral for the Federal Reserve notes issued through Federal Reserve banks. The Secretary takes the position that Federal Reserve notes, the public's main circulating currency, are primarily obligations of the banker-dominated Federal Reserve System and not the United States of America.

My colleagues will recall that on May 31, 1967, I wrote to every member of the House explaining why we should enact my bill H.R. 9156 to retire and cancel these bonds. Thereupon, my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Evins], asked Secretary Fowler for his views on my proposed legislation. On the grounds cited above, the Secretary, in replying to the gentleman, as appears on page 16841 of the Congressional Record of June 22, 1967, attempts to justify his lack of support for the bill. I therefore found it necessary to write to Mr. Fowler and carefully explain to him why Federal Reserve notes are first and foremost obligations of the United States, and only incidentally obligations of these banks. Therefore, it is clearly unnecessary that they be "collateralized" by other Government obligations. Members will observe that Mr. Marriner Eccles, Federal Reserve Board Chairman under Presidents Roosevelt and Truman, fully agrees with my position, as indicated in my September 9 letter to Mr. Fowler, which follows:

House of Representatives,
Committee on Banking and Currency,
Washington, D.C., September 9, 1967.

Hon. Henry H. Fowler,
Secretary, Department of the Treasury,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Secretary: This refers to our earlier correspondence concerning my bill to retire and cancel United States bonds and other Government obligations held by the Federal Reserve banks. A primary objection you raise with respect to this legislation is that inasmuch as "Federal Reserve notes are primarily obligations of the Federal Reserve banks . . . there must be sufficient assets in those banks to secure these liabilities if Federal Reserve notes are to command confidence and remain a viable currency".

My conclusions that Federal Reserve notes need not be secured by United States bonds are based on a careful analysis of the relevant provisions of the Federal Reserve Act as well as upon common sense.

Federal Reserve notes are, first and foremost, the obligations of the United States of America. Federal Reserve notes carry the legend, "United States of America. This note is legal tender for all debts, public and private". Federal Reserve notes also bear the Seal of the Treasury Department as well as the signature of the Secretary of the Treasury and of the Treasurer of the United States. That such notes represent primarily obligations of the Government itself, rather than of the Federal Reserve banks, is made perfectly clear by the legislative history of what is now Section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 411).

The House report to accompany H.R. 7837, the original Federal Reserve Act, reveals that the representatives of the people clearly understood that what they were creating was an obligation of the United States itself, and only incidentally an obligation of the Federal Reserve Banks. The Federal Reserve Banks were brought into the situation only because they would be used as a means of distribution of needed currency to finance commercial transactions at their situs, as stated in the committee report:

"The committee recommends that there shall be an issue of 'Federal Reserve Treasury notes', to be the obligations of the United States but to be paid out solely through Federal Reserve Banks."

In fact, the Republican members of the Glass Committee, who wanted the creation of money to be a monopoly for the bankers rather than a function of the Government which it properly is, strongly objected to the provision in the bill designating Federal Reserve notes as Government obligations. Fortunately, however, the bill was favorably reported, retaining this provision, notwithstanding the opposition of the Republican minority. (House Report No. 69, 63rd Congress, First Session, p. 133–134.)

In the House debates on the bill, Representative Hayes, the ranking Republican on the committee, made abundantly clear the meaning of Section 17 by spelling out in detail the basis of the minority opposition to that section. Mr. Hayes made the following statement on the House floor on September 10, 1913:

"This bill makes the Government of the United States primarily liable on the notes authorized by it. They are not to be the notes of the banks in any sense, but the notes—the obligations—of the Government. It is true that the bill provides for securing the Government against loss by taking good security for lending its credit to the banks, but that in no way changes the fundamental character of the notes. They are still the notes of the Government and not of the banks . . . And to whom in the first instance will the holders of the proposed notes look for payment? To the Government, of course, and not to the bank whose letter and serial number are found upon it as provided in the bill and which, by the way, will mean nothing whatever to the ordinary holder." (*Congressional Record*, 63rd Congress, First Session, Vol. 50, Part IV, p. 4653.)

Accordingly, several amendments were offered by Republican members to strike out the designation of Federal Reserve notes as "obligations of the United States", and to "make these notes distinctly bank notes" and "deleting the Government obligation and specifically designating Federal Reserve notes as obligations of the Federal Reserve banks". These amendments were offered by Republican Representatives Platt of New York, Willis of Ohio, Madden of Illinois and Mondell of Wyoming. All three such amendments were defeated by voice vote on September 17, 1913. (*Congressional Record*, 63rd Congress, First Session, Vol. 59, p. 5081.)

The same thing happened in the Senate, where again three proposed amendments striking out the clause designating Federal Reserve notes as obligations of the United States were defeated. Senator Elihu Root of New York was the leader of the movement to retain banker control of the currency. Senator Root's amendment was defeated by a vote of 22 to 49 on December 18, 1913. (*Congressional Record*, 63rd Congress, Second Session, Vol. 51, Part II, p. 1149).

The fact that Republican members of both Houses of Congress, strongly opposed to providing a public monetary system instead of a banker-dominated monetary system, were defeated in an open attempt to delete the language making Federal Reserve notes *Government* obligations, proves my point that these notes were never intended to be primarily obligations of the Federal Reserve Banks.

Public confidence in our legal tender very definitely does not depend upon United States bonds as collateral. For example, notice the ready public acceptance of billions of dollars of a coinage entirely unsecured by any Government obligation and composed essentially of base metals. Furthermore, you will recall that public confidence in Federal Reserve notes was in no way lessened during the period beginning in 1932, in the very depths of the Depression through the end of World War II in 1945, when it was provided by law that "obligations of the United States were to be retired as security for Federal Reserve notes" (12 U.S.C. 412, as amended by 47 Stat. 56, 57, § 3). If there was any genuine necessity for securing Federal Reserve notes with Government bonds it certainly would have become apparent during these thirteen most devastating years our Nation has ever experienced in its entire history.

Conceptual or common sense flaws in your position, Mr. Secretary, are also present. For example, according to your reasoning, the national debt can never be retired, without depriving the public of circulating currency. You apparently believe that our currency must remain dependent upon the existence of Government debt for collateral purposes. I find this to be an unsound position. Our money supply should not depend on the national debt as such, but only upon the needs of the economy.

Furthermore, Federal Reserve notes are now our lawful money and, as such, are the paramount obligations of the United States Government into which all other Government obligations are ultimately redeemable. Therefore, how can it be said that it is necessary to secure Federal Reserve notes with United States bonds when the bonds themselves, upon maturity, will be redeemed by Federal Reserve notes? I think the point is obvious, Mr. Secretary, that the statutory provisions of "lawful money" and "legal tender" simply negate any idea of collateralization by some other Government obligation.

Finally, Mr. Secretary, the following statement by former Federal Reserve Chairman, Marriner Eccles, pretty much sums up my own position, and I commend it to your attention as well as to your Department's monetary and debt management officials:

"If you wanted to, you might very well issue them without anything back of the currency, anything back of the Federal Reserve note, as I have advocated for a long time. When the Banking Act of 1935 came along, I urged that we eliminate the collateral. It passed the House at that time.

"We are practically the only country in the world that requires collateral. So, if you want to, why not cut off the collateral, the Government bonds back of the money and go ahead as almost every other country in the world does. It is a serious waste of money and an entirely unnecessary one . . .

"Why have gold or collateral, Government bonds back of your currency? This is the currency of the United States Government, and they are the backers of that money. Why have any collateral back of that?" (U.S. Cong. Senate Committee on Banking and Currency. Hearings on S. 510, 79th Congress, First Session; February 20, 28 and March 7, 1945; p. 29.)

Mr. Secretary, the facts I have presented are not mere matters of opinion. The legislative history is crystal clear on the status of Federal Reserve notes as primarily obligations of the United States Government. Therefore, one can only conclude that the cancellation and retirement of Government bonds held as "collateral" for Federal Reserve notes can in no way impair this currency, nor the soundness of the Federal Reserve Banks.

I am hopeful that, after further studying this matter, you will see fit to support my bill, H.R. 9156, providing for the retirement of $40 billion of Government obligations held by the Federal Reserve Banks.

Sincerely yours,

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman.

A BILL FOR THE RELIEF OF DR. JACQUES SAUVAGE

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill for the relief of Dr. Jacques Sauvage, the purpose of which will be to waive the 2-year foreign residency requirement of the exchange visitor program and permit him to remain in this country on a permanent resident basis and continue the work in which he is engaged at the Washington University School of Medicine in St. Louis.

The foreign exchange program contemplates the return of the student after he has completed his studies. However, in this case, Mr. Speaker, it is pointed out that Dr. Sauvage's home country officials have advised that Belgium enjoys a surplus of qualified physicians and that Dr. Sauvage's failure to return would result in no detriment. On the other hand it is also pointed out that Dr. Sauvage is involved in most valuable work at Washington University which may result in great value to all countries.

I would hope that the proper committee and the House could evaluate this particular situation, and I have introduced the bill for that purpose.

WORKERS' PARADISE LOST

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, in a little over a month from now, on November 7, the U.S.S.R. will celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Soviet October Revolution. Much preparation has gone into the coming commemoration of this event, and, as I have stated before, we can expect to be deluged with an avalanche of propaganda extolling the benefits to the Soviet Union and mankind of the revolution.

It is to be expected that any reference to tsarist Russia will portray that regime as having hardly a modicum of progress to its credit. Eugene Lyons, in his recently published book, "Workers' Paradise Lost," explores this facet of Russian history and finds that—

The Bolsheviks took over a young but vigorous economy, with experienced manpower, technological literacy, an industrious population, an educated class of high intellectual caliber—in a gigantic country well endowed with natural resources.

The overall condition of the Russian nation before the October Revolution is but one area which is covered by Lyons' excellent book.

Eugene Lyons is certainly qualified to write on the Soviet Union. In the early days of the Soviet State he was a reporter for Tass, the Soviet news agency. From 1928 to 1934, he was correspondent for United Press in Moscow. His best-selling book, "Assignment in Utopia," issued some years ago, tells the story of his years as a journalist in the Soviet Union. He later wrote a biography of Stalin entitled "Stalin: Czar of All the Russias." Next came a history of Communist penetration in the United States, "The Red Decade," followed by "Our Secret Allies: The Peoples of Russia."

A longstanding, consuming interest in the Soviet Union has equipped the author, who reads Russian fluently, with excellent credentials to destroy the many myths which have been fostered about the U.S.S.R. For instance, Lyons deals with the myth that the Bolsheviks came to power through revolution, the myth that the masses supported the Bolshevik seizure of power, the myth that Russia before the revolution was an economic desert, the myth that the Soviet people love the Communist system.

These are four of the 21 fantasies which are demolished by the author. A summation of the costs of Soviet communism in terms of life, terror, political and civil rights, moral values, and world disorder are tabulated for a true audit of the Soviets' 50-year record.

William F. Buckley, Jr., the widely read author and columnist, reviewed "Workers' Paradise Lost" in his column in the Evening Star of October 4. His appraisal indicates that, for a well-rounded approach to the 50th anniversary of the October Revolution, Lyons' effort is must reading.

I insert Buckley's column, "Fifty Years of Red 'Paradise Lost' " in the RECORD at this point:

FIFTY YEARS OF RED "PARADISE LOST"

(By William F. Buckley, Jr.)

I suppose it is too late, and that the President of the United States, the majority leaders of Congress, and the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court will join the Soviet ambassador next month in celebrating the 50th anniversary of the Soviet Revolution. My proposal would be that, instead, they convene somewhere to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the education of Eugene Lyons.

Lyons was a freshman at C.C.N.Y. when the Revolution happened. And now, to celebrate the event, he brings out a book "Workers' Paradise Lost," the purpose of which is to remind the world how greatly it has paid for having misunderstood that revolution. And to remind those who forget, and they are legion, of the price the Soviet revolutionists exacted, and continue to exact, for their fanatical concepts.

The subtitle of Lyons' book, published today, is "Fifty Years of Soviet Communism—a Balance Sheet." It has been hailed by the prestigious Library Journal as "a natural history of nonsense about Russia."

Comparing it to Lyons' earlier books on Russia, most notably "Assignment in Utopia," and some of the searing personal testimonials by first-hand victims of the Soviet Revolution, the reviewer says this volume might justly be hailed, as "the best book on Russia within the last two decades."

The accent, during the celebrations, will surely be, even as it is at the Russian exhibit at EXPO 67, on the great material accomplishments of the Revolution. It is one of the most useful parts of Mr. Lyons' book, the challenge to popular notions about tsarist

Russia. "Russia was backward and reactionary compared to any modern democratic nation," he points out—"but the comparison is with Soviet Russia." To judge Russia before 1917 from Communist literature is "as if the world were to judge America solely by Uncle Tom's Cabin, The Jungle, and The Grapes of Wrath."

Consider the economic question. (If the Soviet Union accomplished nothing materially, it is surely nothing, material advancement being the prime purpose of the entire Marxian illusion.):

In 1912, Russia was second to the United States in total railroad mileage, a generally accepted index of industrial advancement. The general industrial output had increased by almost 20 percent in the last prewar year, 1912–1913. The French economist Edmond Thery projected that at the rate at which Russia had been advancing before the World War I, it would have outstripped other European nations "by the middle of the century." And the social historian Manya Gordon remarked in her book, "Workers Before and After Lenin," that "Every increase in the size of the industrial plant and the number of employes registered a corresponding increase in strikes. In other words, the workers were always conscious of their right to a share of the increase in profits."

This is hardly a picture of the "cowed" labor population whose liberation President Johnson and others are being invited to celebrate. Labor compared favorably, for instance with that of democratic France. And, needless to say, compares favorably with legislation in Russia fifty years after the triumph of the proletarian revolution.

"The evidence is conclusive that Russia was preparing vast industrial advances before war interrupted the process. The plain fact is that the Bolsheviks took over a young but vigorous economy, with experienced manpower, technological literacy, an industrious population, an educated class of high intellectual calibre—in a gigantic country well endowed with natural resources.

"We need only project the curve of progress as of 1914—an industry, agriculture, science, education—into the future for half a century to realize that the country, if it had been spared the agonies of totalitarianism, the colossal waste of collective ownership, and the paralyzing effects of rigid dogmas, would have been far ahead of the present Soviet Union. And this without such lovely sacrifices as millions of deaths, slaves labor camps, and statefeudal serfs on the land."

What, then, is there to celebrate? The publication of this book by Eugene Lyons. The reading of it in Russia would bring such a revolution as we might genuinely celebrate.

KREMLIN'S ANTI-SEMITISM

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Derwinski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in view of the growing concern with Soviet involvement in the Middle East, which is in line with the historic Russian designs for a foothold in the Mediterranean, it is important that we study all aspects of Soviet motivations in the Middle East crisis.

One major point must be the Kremlin's obvious anti-Semitic policies. A very thoughtful and timely commentary on these policies was produced by the scholarly international writer of the Copley News Service, Mr. Dumitru Danielopol, in three articles which appeared in the San Diego Union on September 17, 18, and 19. I insert these articles in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The Soviet has a strong toehold in Egypt, is the major factor in Syrian domestic politics and is concentrating their infiltration in Algeria. They thus threaten to outflank our NATO alliance just as they threaten the security of Israel. Therefore, I believe Mr. Danielopol's articles merit very careful study.

The articles referred to, follow:

[From the San Diego Union, Sept. 17, 1967]

Israel's Victory Was Trigger—Kremlin's Anti-Semitism Spotlighted Anew

(By Dumitru Danielopol)

Washington.—Communist anti-Semitism, treated gingerly in the West for decades, suddenly has come under the glare of publicity. The campaign against Jews in Red nations since the Israeli defeat of Communist-backed Arab forces has been the trigger.

At the recent 72nd annual national convention of the Jewish War Veterans in Washington, National Commander Malcolm A. Tarlov called a spade a spade.

"Since Israel's victory there have been many authenticated reports of atrocities, terror and vilification against Soviet Jews," Tarlov said.

"The Kremlin has tried to coerce Soviet citizens of Jewish faith into denouncing Israel."

Such statements are important. They may open old Soviet persecution to new examination and they come at a time when many church leaders in the West, including rabbis, are ignoring evidence and advocating closer cooperation with the Communists.

Anti-Semitism has been a permanent feature of communism and the story of Jewish persecutions in Russia is a long one.

The word "pogrom," which means the massacre of helpless people, is a Russian word taken into other languages after the devastation of the Jews in Kishinev in 1903.

In the years that followed Jews were attacked in 600 cities and villages. Thousands were killed.

The Bolshevik revolution with its songs of equality was soon to prove a great disappointment to Russian Jews. Anti-Semitism never abated.

Karl Marx himself was anti-Semitic. Born a Jew, he was baptized as a Protestant. He distrusted the Jewish intellectuals, as he made clear in his book, the "Jewish Question."

"I hope Herbert Aptheker reads Marx' book," the Rev. Richard Wurmbrand told the House Committee on Un-American Activities recently.

Born a Jew, Wurmbrand adopted Christianity, became a Lutheran minister and spent 14 years in Communist prisons. But Wurmbrand never turned his back on the Jews.

"Communism is the end of Judaism," he told the committee.

The Kremlin will point to a Soviet decree of July 27, 1918, that made anti-Semitism a punishable offense. But can it show any evidence that the law was administered?

The statute on crimes against the state of Feb. 25, 1927, which makes "propaganda and agitation aimed at arousing national or religious enmities" punishable by death, also is cited by Soviet propagandists, but where is the evidence that its provisions have been seriously applied?

Stalin was a rabid Jew hater. Jews who held posts in the Communist party came into direct conflict with him during the power struggle following the death of Lenin. When Stalin took control Jewish leaders were his first victims.

The number of Jewish members of the Supreme Soviet dropped from 47 (4.1 per cent) in 1937 to three (0.25 per cent) in 1958.

The last Jew left in the Soviet government, Kaganovich, was accused in 1957 by Nikita Khrushchev of having belonged to the group hostile to the party and was eliminated.

As a gesture of appeasement to Hitler, Stalin retired Maxim Litvinov, commissar for foreign affairs, on May 5, 1939, because he was a Jew.

The Stalin-Hitler pact brought even more drastic purges in the Soviet Union.

For instance, Foreign Commissar Vyzcheslev Molotov purged most Jewish officials and diplomats.

"The Nazi invasion of the Soviet Union did not persuade the Kremlin to abandon its persecution of the Jews," said Sen. Thomas J. Dodd, D-Conn., in his report to the U.S. Senate on March 15, 1960. Dodd had been executive trial counsel at the Nurenberg trials of war criminals.

"Stalin by this time apparently shared Hitler's psychopathic hatred for the Jews. The result was a policy of passive cooperation with the Nazi enemy permitting their extermination."

Of the 5 million Jews in the Soviet Union and annexed territories, at the beginning of the war, 3 million disappeared. The majority died in Hitler's extermination camps, but as Sen. Dodd said:

"Jewish organizations in this country are convinced that the Soviet government did nothing to facilitate the evacuation of the Jews from the areas that were threatened by the Nazi armies."

[From the San Diego Union, Sept. 18, 1967]

Successor No Better—Miss Stalina Can Attest to Dad's Hatred of Jews

(By Dumitru Danielopol)

Washington.—Svetlana Stalina can write a chapter about anti-Semitism in Russia. Her father apparently shared Hitler's psychopathic hatred of the Jews.

When his daughter married Lt. Grigory Mirozov, a Jew, the Soviet dictator flew into a rage.

"Stalin said he hated Grigory," wrote British author Peter Randolph, "because he was a Jew."

He finally forced his daughter to divorce Mirozov, who was relegated to minor positions far from Moscow.

The war's end did not bring an end to anti-Semitism in Russia.

A massive campaign was begun in 1946 by Andrey Zhdanov, at that time a power in the Soviet Union who was considered a likely Stalin successor. (Ironically, his son eventually married Svetlana.)

Zhdanov's aim was the liquidation of Jewish writers and critics and the eventual destruction of Jewish culture.

WERE MURDERED

It was at that time that Solomon Michoels, chairman of the Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee, and ballet critic Gobulov-Potopov were murdered by an anti-Semitic gang.

The campaign continued after the death of Zhdanov in 1948.

The "Doctor's Plot" staged by Stalin in January, 1953, was the final act of his anti-Semitic career.

A number of Jewish physicians in the Soviet Union were accused of a plot to murder top Soviet officials by prescribing the wrong treatments for their ailments.

They were accused in particular of the murder of Zhdanov and A. S. Shtsherbakov, head of a political division of the Red army. Shtsherbakov, brother-in-law of Zhdanov, was considered the most radical anti-Semite in the Politburo. He died in 1945.

DOCTOR'S PLOT

The "doctor's plot," which Khrushchev later admitted was "invented from the beginning to the end," furnished a pretext for a huge deportation of Jews to Siberia and the Arctic.

The situation hardly improved after the death of Stalin. The victims of his anti-Semitism were never rehabilitated.

Khrushchev is a notorious anti-Semite and directed the persecution of the Jews of the Ukraine.

"In the Ukraine, under the leadership of Nikita Khrushchev," wrote Judd L. Teller in the New York Herald Tribune in 1957, "anti-Semitism in the postwar era led to physical acts of violence of such extent . . . that Stalin himself feared it might develop a springboard for Ukrainian separatists."

J. Edgar Hoover, director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, said during a television interview in July, 1956, that "the anti-Semitism of the Russian rulers was worse than Hitler's."

Nor did Khrushchev's ouster bring much change.

Israel is the focal point of increasing anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union. This has been even more evident since the recent Middle East war.

SEES EXTINCTION

In a Look magazine article last November, Rabbi Arthur Schneir of New York said:

"In another 15 years, if present conditions continue, Russia's nearly 3 million Jews will no longer exist as Jews. The Soviet Union is making it impossible for Jewishness to survive . . .

"Soon, the few elderly rabbis will be dead; so will the elders of each congregation. No new rabbis are being trained. And the tattered prayer books will finally disintegrate."

Similar stories are told by other American publications.

"Being a Jew in Russia is not the easiest thing in the world," wrote Elie Weisel, in a recent copyrighted article, after a trip to Russia.

"From all sides they are made to believe that Russia without them would be a better place," Weisel said. The Jews who remain in Russia live in fear, he said.

In Kiev he was told that "anyone who teaches children the Torah runs an awful risk. . . Jews are haunted by relentless insecurity . . . the Jewish spirit is deteriorating rapidly. . ."

The smashing defeat suffered in June by the Arabs has worsened the position of Soviet Jews.

"Israel defeated the Communist drive for power in the Middle East," said Malcolm A. Tarlov, national commander of the Jewish War Veterans in America. "Now the Jews (in Russia) are being made scapegoats and victims."

[From the San Diego Union, Sept. 19, 1967.]

Periodic Rampages—Satellite Nations Get Anti-Semitic Cue From Russia

(By Dumitru Danielopol)

Washington.—Communist anti-Semitism is not limited to Russia.

According to reports from Eastern Europe, only Romania has remained aloof from a campaign of vengeance that followed Israel's victory in the Middle East war.

"Satellite countries take their cue from Moscow," says CIAS, an international exile organization based in Luxembourg.

Sometimes anti-Semitism is latent, sometimes it is displayed quite openly, but it always is present in a Communist nation.

Communists in the satellite nations always react to the trend in Moscow, the CIAS noted. A big postwar anti-Semitic wave in the Soviet Union, set in motion by A. A. Zhdanov, was followed by similar waves in the satellite countries.

Hundreds of Jews were murdered in pogroms, tens of thousands were taken to labor camps.

In Hungary in 1949, Laszlo Rajk, a former minister of interior, a gentile, was accused of a "Zionist world plot" in a show trial, sentenced to death and executed with his codefendants.

In Bulgaria during the trial of Traicho Kostov, secretary of the Communist party, also a gentile, similar accusations of "Zionism" were made.

SPECTACULAR TRIAL IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA

The most spectacular anti-Semitic trial was that of Rudolph Slansky, secretary-general of the Czechoslovakian Communist party, in 1952. Slansky and his co-defenders were termed to be of "Jewish descent," "Jewish-nationalists," "Zionists" or "Trotzkyists."

The prosecutor accused them of "Zionist subversive activities." Among the accused but not present at the trial were the former U.S. secretary of the Treasury, Henry Morgenthau, elder statesman Bernard Baruch and Prime Minister David Ben Gurion of Israel.

The defenders on hand were forced to incriminate these persons in their confessions and the trial was branded in Washington as "an obscene anti-Semitic orgy."

Slansky and 10 of his co-defenders, eight of them Jews, were hanged.

More recently, the murder of Charles Jordan, executive vice president of the (Jewish) American Joint Distribution Committee, in Prague has been denounced as a "terrible crime against the Jews."

Speaking before the Veterans of Foreign Wars' convention in New Orleans, Samuel Samuels, newly elected national commander of the Jewish War Veterans, accused the Czech Communists of "perpetrating pogrom-type psychology as revenge for the failure of Communist policies in the Middle East."

In January, 1953, the Soviet Union accused a number of Jewish physicians of a plot to murder top Russian officials by prescribing the wrong treatments for their ailments.

Following Russia's lead, Hungarian Communists proceeded with a huge anti-Semitic drive started by the arrest of Louis Stoeckler, president of the Jewish community of Budapest.

HIGH OFFICIALS WERE ARRESTED

A large number of Jewish functionaries, officials and doctors were arrested. Among them were Gabot Pater, chief of the secret police; Ladislas Benedek, head physician of the Jewish hospital, and Imre Biro, father-in-law of Matthias Rakosi, chief of the Hungarian Communist party.

Even Romania, angling for the presidency of the United Nations General Assembly, and "neutral" in the Israeli war, has experienced rampant anti-Semitism at various times in the last 20 years.

The Jewish population in Romania is at its lowest point in history. Jews have few facilities to practice their religion. They even have to pay a tax to visit their cemeteries.

Of 450,000 Jews in Romania after the war, only 110,000 remain. Many of the rest died in jails and others were allowed to leave after their families ransomed them.

RABBI TERMED RED "STOOGE"

Chief Rabbi Moses Rosen, who tours the West trying to raise money for the Reds, has been denounced as a Communist "stooge" by Rabbi Alexander Rubin, who escaped to Israel. (He has changed his name since he left Romania for fear of persecution.)

Before the war, Rubin says, Rosen was known for his anti-Semitic sentiments.

President Tito's Yugoslavia, supposedly independent from Russia, has joined the latest attacks on Israel and Jews.

"Today we find Belgrade even more Stalinist and militant than Moscow in its anti-Israel and anti-Jewish line," said Malcolm A. Tarlov, former national commander of the Jewish War Veterans of America.

Perhaps now, after decades, the West will recognize another facet of communism. In the words of the Rev. Richard Wurmbrand: "Communism is the end of Judaism."

HEALTH CARE IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Kupferman] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have long been concerned about the quality and quantity of medical care available in the United States.

This country, in the forefront in its number of physicians and hospitals, and amount of equipment, with wonder drugs and great specialists, must nonetheless ponder the great gaps in health care that, unfortunately, are still to be found—and conditions worsen.

A penetrating study of the problem in depth has just been written by Richard D. Lyons and published as front page news in the New York Times of Thursday, Friday, and Saturday, September 28, 29, and 30, and the titles "Doctor Shortage Nearing a Crisis," "Foreign Physicians, Many Unqualified, Fill Vacuum in the United States," and "Fund Woes Beset Medical Schools."

I commend these articles, which follow, for careful study by my colleagues:

[From the New York Times, Sept. 28, 1967]

Doctor Shortage Nearing a Crisis—Need for Phsicians in United States Placed at 50,000—Man Areas Left With None

(By Richard D. Lyons)

The health industry of the United States, a $50 billion-a-year complex of hospitals, clinics and laboratories responsible for the well-being of every American, is suffering from a shortage of tens of thousands of doctors.

Hundreds of small towns from Wounded Knee, S. Dak., to Medicine Park, Okla., as well as many big city slums, are increasingly being left without family doctors as young physicians shun general practice.

The United States is losing ground to many nations in such common standards of health care as infant mortality and life expectancy at the same time that the demand for medical services is luring thousands of foreign physicians to this country.

And the nation's medical schools are facing critical financial problems while thousands of qualified applicants are being turned away for lack of places.

These are some of the findings of a six-week study of the nation's doctor shortage, including interviews with Federal officials, medical educators, hospital administrators and practicing physicians.

Most agreed that during the last decade there has been a change in public attitude toward access to medical care that it is now regarded as a right rather than a privilege.

By enacting Medicare and Medicaid programs, the Federal and state governments have responded with the first firm steps toward underwriting and coordinating the nation's fragmented health care system. And now Federal programs tailored to meet the demand for medical services are beginning to get under way.

The most common Federal estimate of the doctor shortage is 50,000. But statistics alone, as Dr. Gerald A. Kerrigan, dean of the Marquette University School of Medicine in Milwaukee, pointed out in a recent conservation, are not necessarily a true indicator of the problem.

"The United States is relatively rich in physicians yet the national life expectancy and infant mortality rates are poor in comparison with some other nations," he said.

Dr. Robert H. Ebert, dean of the Harvard Medical School, said that "it would be a mistake to say that there is a substantial crisis but the situation is serious, especially in the central cities and rural areas."

The shortage of doctors, he said, "is being accentuated and is growing more apparent simply because more people are covered by health insurance, including Medicare and Medicaid, and they can now buy the medical care they couldn't afford in the past."

EIGHTEEN OPERATIONS IN 2 WEEKS

Just after Medicare went into effect, one California ophthalmologist performed in two weeks 18 cataract operations upon low-income people who had been waiting for surgical treatment for up to three years.

Before Medicare the patients were considered clinic cases and the specialist would have had to perform the operation for almost nothing. But now he can charge his "usual and customary fee," regardless of the state of the patients' finances.

According to one as yet unpublished Federal estimate, "there was an unmet need for some 20,000 practicing physicians" two years ago.

"In addition, the shortage of psychiatrists was estimated at between 10,000 and 15,000," it added. "Hospitals reported needs for some 10,000 additional interns and residents. When these and other needs are taken together, total requirements are probably about 50,000 more than the supply."

The Federal study says that the ratio of physicians in private practice who devoted themselves to family medicine, such as general practitioners, internists and pediatricians, had fallen to 50 per 100,000 persons in 1965, from 76 per 100,000 in 1950. Yet the ratio of physicians to population has remained constant over the last 20 years at about 150 per 100,000 persons, it said.

The number of nurses being trained, the report said, "has remained at essentially the same level for about 10 years" and the annual graduation rate of 35,000 a year "should be increased to between 50,000 and 60,000 by 1975."

The National League of Nursing reported 125,000 unfilled openings for registered nurses this year, while a survey by the Surgeon General's Task Force on Nursing estimated that the demand for nurses by 1970 would exceed this supply by more than 210,000.

HEALTH PLAN STAFFING

The report also noted that the large prepayment medical care plans, such as the Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York and the Kaiser-Permanente medical centers on the West Coast, "provide staffing ratios of a little more than 100 physicians per 100,000 population," exclusive of psychiatrists, interns and residents.

Few medical experts have ventured to predict the extent of the growing demand for doctors' services. But Dr. Rashi Fein, an economist on the staff of the Brookings Institution in Washington, estimated in his analysis, "The Doctor Shortage: An Economic Diagnosis," that "the total demand for physicians' visits can be expected to grow by perhaps 22 to 26 per cent by 1975 [over 1965] and by 35 to 40 per cent by 1980."

Dr. Fein's estimate took into account the expected population growth, increased personal income, a higher level of education, and the impact of medicare, which he reckoned at between 1 and 2 per cent.

If Dr. Fein is correct, this country will need to train an additional 50,000 doctors by 1975 to meet the rising demand for medical care, even though the nation already has an estimated deficit of 50,000.

The annual number of American medical school graduates has actually risen in the last 15 years from 6,600 to about 7,600. But accompanying this increase has been a steady decline in the number of new doctors choosing to enter general practice.

The latest study of career choices of medical internes showed that only one in eight planned to become a general practitioner. At the turn of the century, in contrast, seven of eight became G.P.'s.

The situation is further complicated according to the Federal survey, because "the number of physicians giving their time to teaching, research, administration and other activities has risen and the ratio of physicians who provide personal health services has declined."

SEARCH FOR A DOCTOR

In Kirkland, Ill., a farm town 65 miles west of Chicago, Edwin L. Johnson, an insurance man, heads a local committee attempting to persuade a physician to settle in the community, which has been without a practicing doctor for two years.

Mr. Johnson said that three persons in Kirkland had died of heart attacks this year without medical attention and several persons involved in serious accidents had been forced to "go miles to get medical aid."

Although the nearest doctor is in the town of Genoa, eight miles away, Mr. Johnson said that he was already overworked and "can hardly look after us since he has 3,000 people to take care of there."

The population of Kirkland, which has three small industrial plants employing about 225 persons, has grown from 500 to 1,000 in the last generation, Mr. Johnson said, but the lack of a physician is hampering future growth.

"Young couples are reluctant to move into town without a doctor," he said.

A medical-economic survey of Kirkland conducted by the Sears-Roebuck Foundation showed that residents drove more than a quarter of a million miles last year making 8,000 visits to doctors in other towns. While away, these persons spent almost $100,000, aside from doctors' fees, which might otherwise have gone into Kirkland's economy, the study found.

The Chicago-based foundation, which has helped more than 100 towns find doctors in the last 10 years, concluded that Kirkland could indeed support a doctor.

Backed by the foundation's survey and recommendations, the town set out to help itself two years ago. Land was donated and $40,000 raised to build a clinic containing five examination and treatment rooms, two consultation rooms, an X-ray room, a laboratory and a waiting room.

The clinic has been standing idle since it was finished 18 months ago and petunias planted in front of the building after its completion by the town's 4-H Club have long since wilted and died.

"We've been in touch with at least 125 doctors since the clinic was finished and 15 have actually come here to look over the town," Mr. Johnson said.

But none has stayed and Mr. Johnson and the other townspeople are puzzled and hurt. They cannot understand why physicians do not want to settle in communities without large department stores, libraries and theaters.

Attempts to attract doctors by other communities are apparently working no better.

Dr. George S. Palmer, director of the Florida Board of Medical Examiners, said that the state had tried and failed to draw young doctors to rural areas, offering medical students loans that did not have to be repaid if they settled in small towns of their choice for two years after graduation.

"But all the new doctors chickened out," Dr. Palmer said. "Not one student who accepted the loans settled in a doctorless town. After medical school they chose to repay the money and go into research or specialty practice in the cities while whole counties are without doctors, although I can't blame any one for not wanting to live in some parts of the state."

WIVES ALSO OBJECT

Occasionally it is not the doctor but his wife who balks at settling in a small community. The decision to practice in a small town has been a constant cause of argument between one Midwestern physician and his wife, who grew up in a medium-sized city.

They met and married at the state university while he was going to medical school. After internship and residency he chose to return to his hometown to practice medicine. For him it meant a place and people he knew and loved, plus a chance to indulge his favorite sports, hunting and fishing. For his wife, however, it meant moving in among people she not only did not know but also regarded as her social and intellectual inferiors.

A study made by the New York State Medical Society has shown that the major causes of dissatisfaction among country doctors include such complaints as long, unrelieved working hours, inadequate time to study or to mingle with other doctors at medical meetings, and the lack of the educational stimuli generally found around hospitals, medical centers and clinics. Income and economic factors were not cited as causes of complaint.

A United States Public Health Service study showed that the percentage of country doctors over the age of 65 was twice as high as that of big city practitioners. In addition, the two urban areas of Nebraska, a state near the national average in the ratio of physicians to population, average twice as many physicians as the state's rural regions.

Whatever the reasons, more and more American rural communities and hamlets—in which 20 per cent of all Americans live—are without the services of resident physicians.

New Medical Materia, a trade publication, conducted two studies in an effort to locate the nation's doctorless towns. In 1959 the magazine found 1,079 such communities. Three years later the number had risen to 1,442, an increase of 33 per cent. Not included in the statistics were towns of fewer than 500 persons and those in which a doctor lived within five miles. Several experts have estimated that there are at least 5,000 doctorless communities in the nation, and that this number is rising.

SITUATION GETTING WORSE

"The situation in rural areas is getting steadily worse," said Norman Davis, director of medical programs for the Sears-Roebuck Foundation in Chicago. He said that "only general practitioners can offer services to rural areas and there aren't enough G.P's.'

Mr. Davis foresaw the day when rural health care might be dispensed from mobile units staffed by circuit riding physicians, pointing out that some doctors now pilot airplanes to visit patients in isolated areas.

But another alternative is developing—the rural clinic. In such medium-size towns as Sayre, Pa.; Temple, Tex., and Marshfield, Wis., doctors have banded together to form large group practice organizations centered on a clinic that serves not only the town but also a wide area around it. The Marshfield Clinic, with 76 physicians, serves an area of 150,000 persons.

As the family doctor has become harder to find in the country, so has his counterpart in the cities. A survey of general practitioners conducted by St. Luke's Hospital in a mixed-income section of New York City, for example, turned up almost no G.P.'s under the age of 30, showing that few recent medical graduates had chosen to start practice there.

Some cities, including New York, have telephone referral systems to provide emergency home medical service if no doctor can be found otherwise.

The nation's 6,200 general care hospitals have had to take up a larger share of the primary medical services once dispensed by the general practitioner.

The number of persons seeking treatment in the emergency room in the hospital in York, Pa., has more than quadrupled, from 7,000 to 30,000 a year, in this decade.

"The irony of the situation is that the medical profession holds sacred the right of doctors to treat patients privately rather than collectively," said one hospital official who asked that he not be named. "Yet while the average private practitioner wants to preserve 'the sacred doctor-patient relationship' he also wants hospitals to have a large staff of house physicians on call all the time so that the private practitioners won't have to get out of bed for emergencies or have their Sunday golf games disturbed."

INCREASE IN FACULTY

One Pennsylvania physician who gave up a full-time practice to teach, acknowledged: "I wanted some time for myself—in private practice I never had a personal life. The modern American medical school graduate has had it with solo practice because he knows that the private practitioner is the only person in the country who is expected to work 24 hours a day."

Many other physicians feel the same way. On the bulletin board of the New York Medical College was a note from a Queens pediatrician offering all his office equipment for sale because, it said, "I'm going academic full-time."

The number of full-time medical school faculty has increased to 18,000 today from 4,000 in 1952. Thus the number of faculty members increased by 350 per cent while the number of students was rising by 25 per cent.

One reason for this increase is that many faculty members are doing medical research as a sideline. A generation ago the Federal Government's support of research in medical schools was almost nothing. Today it is almost $500 million a year.

The number of medical specialists has also increased. About 5,500 doctors a year are being certified as specialists, four times the rate of 20 years ago. During that period the ratio of specialists rose from one-third to almost two-thirds of all physicians in private practice.

"Specialization has completely altered the meaning of the physician-population ratio by which manpower needs have been measured for many years," Dr. William H. Stewart, Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, said last year.

The trend toward specialization has been brought on by the increasing complexities of medicine, such as more sophisticated equipment and more effective though more toxic drugs.

Despite medical discoveries, better training of doctors and the rise in money being spent on health care, however, Americans do not appear to be getting any healthier.

"During the last two decades life expectancy in the United States has increased very little," Dr. Philip R. Lee, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's Assistant Secretary for Health and Scientific Affairs, said last week.

As compared with citizens of other nations, American men and women are in 22nd and 10th places, respectively, in life expectancy. The infant mortality rate in the United States is higher than that of 14 other countries. (Norway is first in life expectancy, Sweden in infant mortality.)

"So far as disease control is concerned the American health establishment is marking time—the rapid advance in saving lives has stopped," said Dr. George James, head of the new Mount Sinai School of Medicine in New York.

"Life expectancy has been practically constant for a couple of decades and so has the death rate," he said, "but hidden behind this plateau is at least one ominous fact: The spread between the level of health of whites and nonwhites is widening."

Mr. Davis of the Sears-Roebuck Foundation, who has examined the doctor shortage in urban as well as rural areas, said "there is no motivation for a physician to practice in the inner city slums because of the uninspiring surroundings and the lack of financial rewards."

Dr. Ebert of Harvard said: "Negro areas would not get an increased share of the medical manpower even if twice as many physicians were turned out."

But the Office of Economic Opportunity is seeking to combat the effect of the flight of doctors from ghettos by setting up health clinics in central city neighborhoods, some of which contain large Negro populations, such as Watts in Los Angeles, North Lawndale in Chicago, Columbia Point in Boston, and the south Bronx.

Dr. Joseph T. English, acting assistant director for health affairs at the O.E.O., said that 41 such programs were being set up, some in rural areas, and that 10 were now in operation. He said 115 other areas had made proposals for similar clinics dispensing medical, dental and social services.

"There has been a flight to the suburbs of practicing physicians because of the tremendous frustration of trying to practice high-quality medicine in the ghettos," Dr. English said.

He pointed out that the 6,000 residents of Columbia Point were without the services of a single general practitioner before the O.E.O. had set up the clinic.

The clinics are not only starting to provide health care for more persons but also relieving pressure on municipal hospitals on which ghetto residents have increasingly depended for medical attention.

But the hospitals themselves are having problems, including obsolescence and lack of space in some parts of the country and a shortage of internes nationwide.

Of the 14,000 openings for internes this year, only half are being filled by graduates of American medical schools. One quarter are still vacant, but one quarter have gone to foreign medical graduates, many of doubtful ability who have failed tests of basic medical knowledge and are practicing medicine without licenses.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 29, 1967]

Foreign Physicians, Many Unqualified, Fill Vacuum in the United States

(By Richard D. Lyons)

The national shortage of doctors and the rising demand for health services has led to the immigration of thousands of foreign physicians, many of doubtful ability who may arrive to practice in American medical institutions sight unseen and quality untested.

The influx of doctors from overseas has become so great in the last 20 years that as many foreign-trained physicians enter the health care system of the United States each year as are gradulated from American medical schools.

About 45,000 doctors who were trained in foreign medical schools now reside in this country, and the number is increasing at the rate of 10 per cent a year.

Many of the foreign doctors, possibly as many as 5,000, have been unable to pass tests of basic medical knowledge and are practicing medicine without licenses, sometimes because of loopholes in state certification rules and sometimes with the knowledge of the hospitals in which they work.

Interviews with medical educators, hospital executives and public officials showed that some American hospitals were so short-staffed that they were advertising for doctors overseas and paying their travel expenses to come here, ostensibly for post-graduate study but often for use as cheap help.

The paradox of the migrant doctor problem is that the countries with the better medical schools and standards of health care have far fewer physicians migrating to the United States than those nations whose levels of medical education and services are poor.

England, France, Japan and the Scandinavian nations enjoy higher longevity and lower infant mortality rates than the United States, a reflection of national systems of health care at least as good if not better, but relatively few doctors from there come to this country.

A much larger number enter from such underdeveloped nations as India, Iran and the Dominican Republic, countries with lower standards of health care and a doctor shortage of their own, and these physicians may have only the sketchiest knowledge of both English and medicine.

"This is a major national scandal and there has been no policing of foreign doctors because no central organization is responsible for them," said Dr. Harold Margulies of Washington, assistant director of the American Medical Association's Division of Socio-Economic Activities.

Dr. Margulies, who has studied the problem for six years, estimated that from 2,000 to 5,000 foreign-trained doctors were practicing medicine in the United States without licenses.

SUBSTANDARD CARE SEEN

"I have personally seen unlicensed foreign medical graduates working in hospitals," he said. "We have been meeting our manpower shortage in the United States with substandard people who are offering substandard care in our institutions."

While some of the foreign doctors practicing medicine without licenses do so in violation of state laws, the shortage of physicians has been so acute that many regulatory groups have not moved against them. Penalties vary widely between jurisdictions.

Some hospital officials said that the employment of foreign medical graduates was dictated through necessity as the demands increased for the staffing of emergency rooms, hospital wards and psychiatric institutions.

"Patients in many state hospitals have no hope of getting out and many doctors are uninterested in drab surroundings and uninteresting work," said one hospital executive in Chicago, who added bluntly: "So why not bring in doctors who have 'read' medicine for only six months?"

Dr. Edwin L. Crosby, director of the American Hospital Association in Chicago, attributed the influx of foreign-trained physicians to the increased demand for medical services that opened "thousands of more internship and residency posts" in American hospitals, along with the desire "of many foreign graduates for training in the United States."

He said that the association "recognizes the value of the services contributed by the participants in this foreign graduates program" and that "it is important to share our resources in medical training with other countries."

Dr. Crosby stressed, however, that the hospital association "does not believe that the presence of the vacancies and the need for physician coverage should be used to permit the employment of inadequately trained physicians or those with a substantial language barrier."

An official of the American Medical Association in Chicago said that according to association records almost 7,000 foreign doctors enter the United States every year, yet only half had passed a formal test of medical knowledge prepared by the Educational

Council for Foreign Medical Graduates in Philadelphia.

Without certification that he has passed this test, a foreign doctor cannot enter a post-graduate training program in a good hospital, which was probably what attracted him to the United States in the first place.

MAY BE LISTED AS ORDERLIES

"We feel that a lot of these guys end up working in state institutions and marginal hospitals," the A.M.A. official said. "They may be on the books as broom handlers and orderlies even though they may be actually practicing medicine."

Several medical educators agreed, however, that the instruction foreign doctors receive in this country produces many fine physicians who practice high-quality medicine whether they choose to remain here or return home. But no one knows how many do eventually leave the United States.

According to A.M.A. records, there are 45,749 graduates of foreign medical schools residing in the United States. The figure includes 5,722 graduates of Canadian schools, whose standards are as high as American institutions. The countries of origin and numbers of others are: the Philippines, 5,055; Germany, 4,150; Italy, 2,811; Switzerland, 2,313; the United Kingdom, 2,110; India, 1,833; Mexico, 1,201; Korea, 1,060, and Iran, 1,000.

Federal surveys have shown that last year 2,952 foreign medical graduates entered the United States, while 4,500 more came here on exchange visas. In addition, 500 United States citizens returned home after receiving doctorates of medicine at foreign schools. Thus, a total of 7,952 foreign medical graduates entered the United States last year while American medical schools graduated 7,574.

The drain on medical manpower has become so acute in India that this month she refused to allow physicians to take an examination that would qualify them for practice in the United States.

As one Pennsylvania medical educator said: "This country is simply stealing talent and stealing it from countries that can least afford it."

A study by the Association of American Medical Colleges seemed to bear him out. One-quarter of the positions open to interns and residents in American hospitals were being filled by foreign medical graduates, but most of the foreign doctors were not going to the best institutions.

"Most of those who do not have licenses disappear to state hospitals and some states grant special licenses to practice medicine only in that state and only in that institution," he said.

According to a list of state licensing requirements printed in the Journal of the American Medical Association, 20 states have limited licensing arrangements allowing physicians to practice medicine even though they have not been licensed to do so.

But half of the 3,000 foreign medical graduates who take state licensing examinations every year fail the tests, according to the Association of American Medical Colleges. And passing the examinations may not be a true indication of a doctor's proficiency.

NONE FAILED IN THREE STATES

Dr. Robert C. Derbyshire, past president of the Federation of State Medical Boards and secretary of New Mexico's Board of Medical Examiners, conducted a study of state licensing procedures between 1955 and 1965.

During that period, he said, the boards in Oklahoma, Idaho and Tennessee "did not fail a single candidate" for a license to practice medicine. In addition, Kentucky, Wyoming, Michigan, Minnesota, Alabama and South Carolina failed only 14 applicants. "The nine states with the lowest failure rates examined 10,455 candidates, with a failure rate of less than 0.14 per cent," he said.

Armand L. Bird, executive secretary of the Idaho Board of Medical Examiners, said that the failure rate was low because "applicants for licensure are screened well in advance of the test" to see if they are competent. But Mr. Bird declined to estimate how many applicants had been turned down before the formal test was given.

The Oklahoma Board of Medical Examiners reported that 20 applicants failed in the last two years, and that some failed in previous years, but that the statistics had become garbled.

The administrative assistant to the Tennessee board, Mrs. Gertrude Moore, said that 13 applicants had failed since 1964 but that they were not listed as "failures." She said that the 13 were given a second chance to pass the test and that most did.

Dr. G. Halsey Hunt, executive director of the Educational Council for Foreign Medical Graduates, said that "the licensing each year of close to 1,500 graduates of foreign schools is not a good thing for the United States."

"If these doctors stay in this country," Dr. Hunt said, "they drain something out of the economy of their homeland. They come here because it looks like greener pastures with interns making $400 a month and residents $600, even though the American graduates get the good jobs and the foreign medical graduate gets what's left."

Council statistics showed a high failure rate among those foreign doctors taking the council's test, which is given at United States embassies and consulates. About 60 per cent of those taking the test for the first time overseas fail, Dr. Hunt said, although 98 per cent of Americans would pass it.

But Dr. Hunt pointed out that many of those who failed took the examination again and that 65 per cent eventually passed. "Anyone who has passed the ECFMG is a person who has a degree of medical knowledge comparable to 98 per cent of American medical graduates," he said.

The council's test is a one-day examination containing 360 questions taken from the National Board of Medical Examiners tests that many American medical students take in place of state licensing tests. The passing score is 75. Yet only 12 per cent of foreigners score above 80, as opposed to 80 per cent of Americans.

"The ECFMG examination is a meaningless, watered down test," said Dr. Margulies of the A.M.A. He contended that while the questions were taken from the national board tests, "the most difficult questions are eliminated to allow a larger percentage to pass."

The council's annual report for 1965 says: "It must not be assumed, however, that passing the ECFMG examinations means the same as passing National Board Examinations. Questions that have been judged to be very difficult for American graduates have not been included in the ECFMG examinations."

"To use 75 as a passing grade for this exam would be okay if those who came here returned home again after specialized training," Dr. Margulies said. "But giving them patient responsibility is simply unsatisfactory."

Failure rates for graduates of foreign medical schools vary widely depending on the institution. Last year graduates of the University of Santo Tomas in Manila passed 170 state licensing examinations and failed 110. Istanbul University graduates took 158 tests and failed more than half. University of Bologna graduates passed 48 tests and failed 44. Graduates of British and Scandinavian medical schools passed 100 examinations and failed only nine.

"We are pretending that every medical degree is the same," one medical educator said. In many overseas medical schools, he added, students attend lectures for four years "and never see a patient until they come to the United States to serve as internes."

The curriculum of American medical schools devotes the first two years to instruction in the basic medical sciences, while the second two are used for clinical teaching in which the students work with patients under the tutelage of experienced physicians.

Most foreign-trained doctors entering this country are tested to determine minimum competence, but there has apparently been only one attempt to rate their over-all performance as doctors.

Dr. Erwin Hirsch, director of medical education at the Princeton (N.J.) Hospital, has been giving the same test of basic medical knowledge to American-trained doctors and physicians trained overseas for more than a year.

"The test does not pretend to prove that a man is a good doctor because you can't rate a doctor by an exam alone," Dr. Hirsch said. "But it is a devilishly clever test and the best gauge we have of measuring clinical competence. The test takes a full day and comes pretty close to judging the art of being a doctor. Actual cases and their management are presented, including motion pictures of patients."

Thus far 60 Americans and 129 foreign doctors have taken the test, which has been given at the beginning and end of their internships. Dr. Hirsch said that there was only one American failure both times. One-third of the foreign graduates passed the test the first time, he said, but after internship two-thirds of them passed.

Dr. Hirsch said that hospitals were using a variety of "recruiting drives" for foreign medical graduates. A director of medical education in a nearby state said he received monthly letters from travel agencies in New York offering to arrange delivery of foreign medical graduates. One of these agencies is the Korea Travel Service in Manhattan, directed by Peter Ohm.

"Business is booming," Mr. Ohm told a recent visitor. He estimated that in the last three years he had placed 120 graduates of South Korean medical schools in American hospitals.

Mr. Ohm said that South Korean doctors who want to come to the United States get in touch with his office in Seoul "and we contact the hospitals here." The American hospitals advance the money for tickets to his travel agency, he said, and the Seoul office gives the tickets to the Korean doctors.

"Today if I call a hospital and say I have a doctor for them they would pay me immediately," Mr. Ohm said.

Mr. Ohm said that internship "used to be slavery, but it's not any more." He explained that some small hospitals give the air fare to the doctor as a bonus, as well as furnishing him with an apartment and a salary of $600 a month. He said that the Korean doctors seemed to be satisfied with their new jobs. "Most don't go back home once they get here," he said.

South Korea has been writing them to return to help ease her own doctor shortage.

Attempts to limit the influx of foreign doctors have failed in part because of changes in the immigration regulations.

At one time ECFMG certification was almost mandatory. Then the regulations were relaxed to let foreign doctors enter the country without certification if they had a medical degree and had practiced for at least two years in their own countries. This year the law was changed again to allow in any graduate of a medical school.

"Something should be done about it," Dr. Hunt of the educational council said.

Something is being done about it—in Canada. Medical licensure boards there are studying means of developing uniform requirements for medical licenses that would apply in all 10 provinces, said Dr. J. C. C. Dawson, registrar of the Ontario College of Physicians and Surgeons.

Dr. Dawson said that Canada's foreign doctor problem was more acute than America's because "when your immigration people tell them [the foreign doctors] to move on they come here."

But Dr. Dawson, like his American colleagues, did not envision any quick solution because of the difficulties of getting 10 provincial or 50 state boards to agree on uniform standards.

Many American private health groups are seeking to involve the Federal Government, not only in the foreign doctor problem but also in the whole range of troubles of the American system of health care.

One panel of leading medical educators estimated in a report to the Federal Government that the cost of expanding medical schools to the point that they could start to produce as many new American doctors each year as are entering from overseas could be as high as $1-billion. Yet many American medical schools are on the verge of bankruptcy.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 30, 1967]

Fund Woes Beset Medical Schools—Enrollment and Income Lag Behind Rising Costs, Yet Expansion Is Needed

(By Richard D. Lyons)

American medical schools, the apparent fat cats of higher education, are facing serious financial troubles as rising income lags behind soaring costs.

The combined budgets of the nation's 94 medical schools have risen by 4,000 per cent to $1-billion in the last generation. But enrollment has increased by only 50 per cent to 33,000 and expenses have swollen "to a horrendous degree," as one educator put it.

Despite the financial problems, perhaps as many as 100 new medical schools are needed to increase the national capacity for training doctors.

EXPANSION IS URGED

Lack of medical school expansion, coupled with increased demands for health services, has led to a shortage of tens of thousands of doctors and has lured to the United States thousands of foreign physicians, many of doubtful ability.

The roots of the shortage are grounded in the hiatus in the expansion of medical education in the nineteen-thirties and nineteen-forties and the opposition of organized medicine toward graduating more doctors. This year, however, the American Medical Association called for an "immediate and unprecedented" expansion of medical school facilities. Conversations with more than a score of medical educators and practicing physicians in the last six weeks brought out sharp dissatisfaction with the role medical schools are playing in the nation's health care system.

WIDE RANGE OF COMPLAINTS

Most of the doctors accused the schools of devoting more time to research than teaching, or training too many specialists and not enough family physicians, or paying too little attention to the health needs of their communities, or failing to expand classes to alleviate the national shortage of doctors.

But they asked, in effect, what can we do without more money?

With the help of two huge grants totaling $71-million, a new medical school opened classes with 40 students this week on a Pennsylvania farm that once raised corn, wheat and pheasants.

The Pennsylvania State University College of Medicine at Hershey intends to emphasize the training of family physicians and the practice of community medicine, a shift in philosophy embraced by many of the 17 other new medical schools now being planned or developed.

But for most medical schools even the most prestigious, funds of such magnitude for such new undertakings are not available.

"Every academic medical center in the United States is in trouble financially and some are in desperate straits," said a report issued this year by the Association of American Medical Colleges.

Dr. Lewis Thomas, dean of the New York University School of Medicine, said that "25 per cent of American medical schools have to be bailed out fast."

Exactly how deeply medical schools are in trouble is hard to determine. But Dr. Robert C. Berson, executive director of the Association of American Medical Colleges in Washington, said: "There are rising demands, even in the face of rising support, that lead to the brink of bankruptcy."

WOULD HAVE GONE BANKRUPT

Had the state of New Jersey not taken over the Seton Hall College of Medicine and Dentistry in Jersey City, he said, the school, now named the New Jersey College of Medicine and Dentistry, would have gone bankrupt.

Officials of several medical schools were reluctant to discuss their troubles. But others felt that making their problems public might lead to a solution.

One is Dr. Gerald A. Kerigan, dean of Marquette's medical school. He conceded that the school's deficit in each of the last two years had been $800,000 and that the deficit in this decade had been about $3-million, which was taken from the school's endowment.

"We have cried enough," he said. "We cannot continue to meet expenses from capital—there has to be some other source of support."

Dr. Kerrigan pointed out that in 1940 endowment met more than half of the basic operating expenses of the private medical schools, although today it meets less than a quarter. Schools supported by the state funds have, generally, been in a better financial position.

According to Dr. David D. Denker, president of the New York Medical College, the institution has lost $1-million since 1964, although it hopes to balance its budget during this academic year.

The amount of research money going to the college has almost tripled in the last four years, Dr. Denker said, "but unhappily income from other sources has remained almost stationary."

Research money from Federal agencies has been the one factor responsible for the huge increase in the budgets of medical schools, and at the same time has been one of the causes of their problems.

In the 1930s, medical schools received only a few thousand dollars from the Federal Government, which now allots almost $500-million in research grant money yearly.

Dr. Denker said: "Medical educators go to sleep each night with the nagging fear that if something should happen to the economy or there is a shift in diplomacy that there will be a drop in the Federal support of research and there will be a hell of an academic recession and that some of the smaller institutions will have to close their doors."

Many large institutions with big endowments have found it increasingly hard to raise the huge capitalization costs for plant and equipment.

TUITION ALREADY HIGHER

These include the Columbia College of Physicians and Surgeons, the Yale University School of Medicine; Duke University School of Medicine; the Stanford University School of Medicine; the University of Rochester School of Medicine and Dentistry; Washington University School of Medicine, and the Case Western Reserve University School of Medicine.

Medical educators agree that increasing tuition fees is not the answer. More than half of today's medical students come from the small minority of families having incomes of more than $10,000 a year.

"The lower income people haven't been able to go to medical school," said Dr. Kerrigan of Marquette. "If they could, different people would be in the classes."

In addition to tuition charges, 13 private schools now charge $2,000 a year, and the costs of books, fees, room, board, clothing and incidentals must be met so that a student's yearly out-of-pocket expenses more closely approximate $4,000.

Charges in the 49 state-supported schools are less, and a Federal loan program is permitting 13,000 medical students to borrow $15-million this academic year. Yet the high costs of medical education all but bar medical school to many qualified students from low-income families, especially Negroes, who constitute only 3 percent of doctors.

"There simply is no money in most Negro families for longterm improvement of opportunities," said Dr. Berson.

He said that Negroes would probably be "favored for admission to most medical schools but relatively few apply" because of finances, poor academic preparation, and the lack of motivation.

A generation ago there were repeated charges of discrimination against Jewish applicants to medical schools. Yet Brooklyn College, which has a large Jewish undergraduate enrollment, noted recently that 97 per cent of its seniors who had applied to medical school with recommendations from the faculty were accepted.

About 18,000 college students apply to medical schools each year, but according to Dr. Berson, "we don't know but that one-quarter of those who are rejected are good enough to become doctors if sufficient places in medical schools were available." About 9,000 applicants are rejected each year.

One sidelight to the doctor shortage is that while enrollments in medical schools are generally rising, the student bodies at 20 of the schools have shown little numerical change in the last 25 years and five have actually decreased.

Harvard and Johns Hopkins are now graduating about the same number of doctors of medicine as they did a generation ago.

Complicating the squeeze between the large number of applicants and the much smaller number of places for them in first-year medical school classes, is another curious phenomenon—the medical school dropout.

One recent survey of medical school dropouts found that over a 10-year period 6,556 failed to graduate, a number equal to the combined annual graduating classes of all the schools in the nation. And the dropout rate among entering students has slowly passed the 10 per cent mark and is continuing to rise.

"The cost of attrition is estimated in the hundreds of millions of dollars, and this figure will skyrocket if the dropout phenomenon continues to increase at its present rate," said one medical educator. "The fact that annually there are 500 to 600 first-year dropouts highlights the tragedy of attrition—particularly when one considers the rejected applicants who were standing by and denied the opportunities to begin the study of medicine."

PERCENTAGE DECLINING

Considering that college enrollment has quadrupled in the last generation, the percentage of graduates applying for medical school is going down. Dr. Berson said the attractions of nuclear physics and the space program might be luring away the more intellectual students.

"Some aspects of medicine are not intellectually satisfying and it may be just as well that some of the whiz kids are not going into it," he added.

According to one study of the intelligence levels of persons holding doctoral degrees, the I.Q.s of the biological scientists were below those of persons holding Ph.D.s in the natural and physical sciences and engineering. Physicists and mathematicians were at the highest end of the scale.

But conditions may be changing.

The entering class of the new Pennsylvania State University College of Medicine includes engineers, two of them graduates of West Point, psychologists, English majors and other students who had concentrated in sociology, political science, economics and literature. More than a third of the incoming class of 40 students did not major in traditional pre-medical studies.

"These people are different," said Dr. Evan G. Pattishall Jr., the head of the school's selection committee and chairman of the department of behavioral science.

A $50 MILLION GIFT

He said the committee viewed the "depth" of an applicant, as well as his undergraduate grades, in selecting the entering class of 40 from the 1,100 who had applied, a number Dr. Pattishall termed "flabbergasting."

The establishment of the school was made possible by a gift of $50 million from the Milton S. Hershey Foundation, a charitable trust set up by the late chocolate company president. The Federal Government also contributed $21 million for construction of buildings that include a 45-bed hospital.

Dr. Pattishall estimated that only one ill person out of 1,000 ends up in a university hospital, where most of the teaching of medical students is conducted. But by incorporating the practice of family medicine into medical school, he said, "we hope to expose our students to 750 of these 1,000 persons so that our students see the whole spectrum of medical practice."

Nearly every person interviewed said the Federal Government held the key to the problems of medical education and health.

Federal programs are already supplying funds for construction of new buildings, for loans and scholarships, for improving the training of professional personnel, for staffing and equipping community health clinics, for the expansion of regional medical centers, and for scientific research.

Yet those interviewed agreed that even more money was needed for the expansion of aid programs overseas that would provide graduate training to foreign doctors in their homelands rather than the United States, for meeting the day-to-day operating expenses of medical schools, and for cementing a link among doctors, clinics, hospitals and medical centers that may eventually lead to a healthier America.

"A Federal program of huge proportions is needed to double the number of medical schools so that 15,000 doctors a year can be graduated by the end of the nineteen-seventies," said Dr. Martin Cherkasky, director of Montefiore Hospital in the Bronx.

Dr. Cherkasky said Federal funds also were needed to help construct "pyramids of regional health care topped by 'nuclear hospitals' and their medical schools" to which district hospitals, ambulatory clinics and practicing physicians would be connected.

"Only in this way," he added, "will all Americans have access to all levels of medical services and all the health care that they need."

SANTA FE'S POSITION ON THE REDUCTION OF PASSENGER TRAIN SERVICE

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, in the light of recent developments which have seen a reduction in railroad passenger service throughout the Nation, I think that my colleagues will be interested in a cogent statement just issued by Mr. John S. Reed of Chicago, president of the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co.

I commend Mr. Reed's remarks to the attention of all who have faith in the survival of the free enterprise system on a sound basis. The statement follows:

Future Train Service on the Santa Fe

(A statement by John S. Reed, president, the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., Chicago, Ill., October 4, 1967)

Santa Fe throughout its nearly one hundred year history has been a leader in serving its territory with passenger train service. That policy will remain unchanged, but present-day circumstances warrant a reappraisal of the size of our passenger operations.

LOSS OF MAIL REVENUE FROM PASSENGER TRAINS

On September 6 we were notified by the United States Post Office Department that by October 6, 1967, all but two Railway Post Office Cars would be removed from our passenger trains. A new system of nationwide mail distribution embodying air transportation of all First Class Mail is now being instituted. Additionally, the Post Office Department announced it will pay for the transportation of all Second, Third and Fourth Class Mail at such a reduced rate it is no longer feasible or practicable to handle this mail in passenger train service. This latter class of mail will shortly be moving in Santa Fe's fast freight service. Nearly $35 million of annual mail revenue, the backbone of our passenger trains, will no longer be available to help support these trains.

The loss of mail on passenger trains was a sudden devastating blow on the continuance of services that were already marginal or being operated at a loss.

THE DETERIORATING MARKET FOR RAILROAD PASSENGER SERVICE

For sometime railroads have not shared in the rapid growth of travel occurring in this country. On the Santa Fe this recently has been evidenced by a decline of 17.3% in passenger revenues in the first eight months of this year compared to the same period a year ago. We do not foresee a reversal of this trend despite our best efforts to promote rail passenger travel.

Two factors have contributed to the decline in rail travel. First, unparalleled construction of highways and accompanying growth of automobile ownership. Last year alone the federal and state governments spent $15 billion on new construction. For short distances the traveler prefers his automobile because he can make his own schedule. Second, air travel is booming. Here, too, a competitor has been aided by local, state and federal governmental agencies spending millions of dollars on meterological and guidance systems as well as new airport facilities. With over 165 daily flights between Chicago and California alone, the preference for jet travel on long haul is clearly indicated.

Last year the Santa Fe passenger loss, under the formula for apportioning passenger train costs prescribed by the Interstate Commerce Commission exceeded $32 million. This year the figure will be significantly greater primarily because of: (1) the mail revenue loss; (2) declining patronage; and (3) sharply increased costs for labor and materials, which have risen steadily year after year. While the validity of the I.C.C. formula is debatable, nevertheless the upward trend is signficant. When the full impact of the loss of mail revenue becomes effective, passenger train losses under *any* formula will be staggering.

SANTA FE HAS MADE AN AGGRESSIVE EFFORT TO COMPETE FOR PASSENGER BUSINESS

Since 1946 we have spent $136 million for cars and locomotives used in passenger train service. Several thousand miles of continuous welded rail have been installed to produce a better ride and reduce maintenance costs. An aggressive TV, magazine and newspaper advertising campaign, Bank Credit Cards, One-Price Tickets, Family and Off-Season Fares—all have been employed to attract patronage. We have placed special emphasis on courtesy and service by educational seminars, incentive programs and the like. Equipment maintenance and cleanliness coupled with good food service have been paramount.

Santa Fe has not abandoned the traveling public—travelers show an increasing preference to drive or fly.

SANTA FE'S FUTURE PASSENGER TRAIN SERVICE

Faced with a sharply declining trend in passenger travel and the immediate loss of mail revenue from our passenger trains, Santa Fe has had to make a prompt change. With the loss of mail revenue from our passenger trains, there was only one course of action left open. Passenger service had to be reduced. The plan to restructure passenger service was based on maintaining needed services to the area we serve, while safeguarding the interest of our employes and investors by preventing money-losing operations which would otherwise surely occur.

In the next few days the Santa Fe will file with the appropriate regulatory agencies proposals which will restructure our passenger operation. It is our intent to maintain the following trains: The Super Chief, El Capitan, the San Francisco Chief, the Texas Chief, and certain connecting service to San Diego. The future of these remaining fine trains will depend on continued patronage. We propose to discontinue all other service.

It is believed this approach will give our territory and customers a passenger service more nearly tailored to its present needs.

It is logical to assume that restructuring of our passenger train service will affect some of our personnel; however, we are unable at this time to forecast with accuracy the impact on individual employes brought about by this change.

THE LOSSES FROM PROVIDING UNNEEDED PASSENGER TRAINS WOULD AFFECT THE PROGRESS OF SANTA FE AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF FREIGHT TRANSPORTATION FOR THE AREAS WE SERVE

The territory we serve, our patrons, our stockholders and the largest number of our employes will benefit in the long run if we are relieved of the serious future monetary drain which unnecessary passenger train service will impose. Funds for progress and change on a railroad must not be wasted on any services that the public will no longer support. These funds should be devoted to types and concepts of service which will create additional employment opportunities and meet the needs of the public.

We have recently invested large sums for new hopper cars to carry bulk loads of grains, potash and other commodities produced in our areas. Other substantial investments have also produced new methods for Piggy-Back service, multilevel cars for carrying automobiles and other types of equipment vital to the constantly changing needs of our shippers. Millions have also been spent for high-horsepower diesels, microwave, radio and signal systems, as well as for push-button yard and other modern facilities.

Santa Fe is planning for bold new types of freight service in the near future. This would include expansion of container freight operations and special equipment, such as the recently introduced flat cars that have their own power plant for quick "plug-in" of refrigerator containers moving to and from overseas points in intermodal service. All of these plans and more will tend to create new employment opportunities.

These and other new ideas are being implemented to gain additional business as we move toward better ways to keep Santa Fe a progressive and profitable railroad.

NO-ACCOUNT FEDERAL ACCOUNTING

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. Dwyer] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, while the Congress is engaged in pruning unnecessary spending it would be well to consider a prime cause of waste and mismanagement in the executive branch. This is the failure of most major Federal departments and agencies to establish modern cost-accounting systems. The Comptroller General has said such accounting systems are basic and fundamental to the whole operation of the Federal Government.

As a cosponsor of legislation—H.R. 12998—which would require a speedup of accounting system reforms in accordance with requirements prescribed by the General Accounting Office, I was pleased to see the need for action on this bill so well presented in an editorial appearing in the Wall Street Journal of October 4, 1967. Our colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Betts] documented the case for enactment of this legislation before the House last month and the editorial properly recognizes his leadership in efforts to establish proper management practices in the Federal Government.

The editorial, which I include as a part of my remarks, follows:

No-Account Federal Accounting

> Eleven years ago Congress took a look at all the money the Government was spending, and at the antiquated, helter-skelter accounting systems most Federal agencies were using. Alarmed by what it saw, it amended the Budget and Accounting Act to require the agencies to adopt up-to-date, cost accounting systems.
>
> At the time, in 1956, annual Federal expenditures totaled about $66 billion and the public debt stood at $273 billion. This fiscal year, spending is expected to reach about $143 billion and the debt may exceed $335 billion.
>
> However, of the 173 Federal agencies subject to the law requiring them to set up Government Accounting Office-approved, modernized accounting systems, only 61 have complied. And most of those are small agencies with small budgets.
>
> The big agencies are still dragging their feet, for the most part using what are called obligation accounting systems. These show the amount of money agencies are authorized to spend, but fail to show the actual costs of particular programs or operations.
>
> Properly designed cost accrual accounting systems, on the other hand, provide not only better control over funds but also up to-date cost data on operations. They help to determine whether money is being spent wisely and used efficiently, and whether results justify the costs. Adequate cost accounting systems, says the U.S. Comptroller General, are "basic and fundamental to the whole operation of the Federal Government."
>
> If that is so, perhaps it helps to explain some of the deficiencies evident in Federal agency operations. The Health, Education and Welfare Department, for instance, has 12 accounting systems subject to GAO approval; the number so far approved is zero. HEW has been found, by GAO, to be guilty during fiscal 1966 of inefficient record-keeping and property management.
>
> The Agriculture Department has 15 accounting systems subject to approval; only five have been approved. Interior has 17 systems with six so far approved. And Treasury, which surely ought to be setting an example, has only four approved systems out of 18.
>
> Rep. Jackson Betts of Ohio is leading a move in the House to compel all agencies to speed up the accounting reforms they were obligated by law to adopt 11 years ago. Since no-account Federal accounting tends to breed no-account Federal programs, that move deserves full Congressional support.

NASA CANDOR AND THE MOON GOAL

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, it would appear that NASA continues to evade the serious responsibility of candor.

In private discussion, many people close to the space program have lately been asking when NASA will admit, as is now widely believed, that in face of persistent technical problems the goal of a manned lunar landing in this decade is no longer seriously possible. Accompanying this question runs speculation as to what method NASA will use to make known that the moon deadline is out of reach. Recent events begin to suggest an answer which was also pointed to during the Apollo hearings of April and May this year.

On April 10, the first day of those hearings, Mr. Webb spoke of the enormous challenges facing NASA and said—page 6, Apollo hearings—House:

> We have had to meet these problems along with the uncertainties of congressional authorization and appropriation on an annual basis.

Later that day Mr. Webb added another facet to this complaint in response to congressional efforts to inquire whether mismanagement had contributed to the situation that permitted the Apollo fire. Mr. Webb stated—page 16, House hearing:

> The issue here is broader than that. It is broader than those questions Mr. Rumsfeld has been asking. It is whether the United States can conduct an open program where everything that happens in any factor gets in the newspapers.

More recently, according to the Associated Press as reported in the Christian Science Monitor on October 2, Mr. Webb, on Thursday, September 28, before a Senate Appropriations subcommittee, testified that pending budget reductions may help to "upset the goal of landing American astronauts on the moon and return them by 1970." At one point in that hearing Mr. Webb stated:

> We had been expecting to fly out the Apollo missions, and originally hoped we could accomplish all 15 Saturn flights that we needed to accomplish within about $20 billion. Now, we have slipped due to lack of appropriations and other factors over the years.

In other words, Congress, by making budget cuts, must accept blame if the deadline is missed.

The recent 1-day Government-wide technical money stoppage resulting from House action was again immediately cited by NASA as a probable cause of further delay in the moon shot, according to United Press as reported in the press on October 3. The suggested ratio here between cause and effect staggers the imagination.

I have just seen an Associated Press report from the ticker in which NASA states that the first landing of the Saturn V rocket, which was scheduled for October 24, has been delayed because of a series of technical problems, and that the target date will probably slip into November.

Are budget reductions the cause of this delay? I hardly think so.

Mr. Speaker, I include the Associated Press report at this point in the Record:

> Cape Kennedy, Fla.—The launch date for the first Saturn 5 rocket probably will slip into November because of a series of problems that have cropped up during a countdown rehearsal.
>
> The planned 83-hour practice countdown, which started eight days ago, hit many snags that caused delays totaling more than three days.
>
> Wednesday night, just 30 minutes before a simulated blastoff was to occur, a ground computer misbehaved. The exercise was postponed again, this time for at least two days.
>
> The computer was part of a system that monitored the status of propellants in the Saturn 5, the world's most powerful rocket and forerunner of man-to-the-moon boosters.
>
> Tons of propellant had been pumped into the rocket. This had to be dumped. NASA said the launch crew will have to return to some earlier point in the countdown and reload the fuel before again picking up the count.
>
> An official said most of the problems have involved groundsupport equipment in the extremely complex system. He said the purpose of the exercise was to uncover such problems.
>
> Before the countdown started, the target for the launching had been Oct. 24. By Wednesday this had slid to Oct. 28. The latest delay probably will slip the target date into November.

It should be clearly understood that even the House-approved reductions for fiscal year 1968 are in new projects and do not significantly affect the Apollo program. The House voted an appropriation of $2.496 billion out of $2.546 billion requested. It would be absolutely outrageous for anyone to contend that Congress has stinted on funds for the Apollo program and thereby contributed to the persistent managerial and technical problems that daily make more remote the likelihood of meeting the moon goal. On the contrary, no other civilian agency has enjoyed such faithful—perhaps too faithful—response from Congress to its entire annual budget requests.

Last year's appropriation, for example, was 99 percent of NASA's own suggested budget total. This included an adjusted appropriation for Apollo which totalled 98 percent of NASA's request. From 1959 to 1967, NASA's budget requests totaled $28.9 billion of which $27.8 billion was appropriated. The major portion of the difference between the two figures occurred in one year—1964—when NASA astonished Congress by attempting to increase its budget by $2 billion—to $5.712 billion—after having already increased its budget by $2 billion in the previous year. On that occasion Congress cut $612 million out of the unprecedented request. This cut was largely in construction funds and had little to do with line items under research and development.

It is clear that Congress has been a dependable advocate of NASA's importance and priority status in Federal budget considerations, and has readily acquiesced to NASA's judgment about its own needs.

According to John V. Reistrup, in the Washington Post of September 19, at a press briefing on September 18, Mike Vucelic, manager for Apollo spacecraft requirements at North American Aviation, told reporters that "all-up testing proves to be a very feasible way of testing the flight hardware." One would assume that this is NASA policy as understood and expressed by a responsible representative of its prime contractor. Yet in a letter to me of September 14, 1967, Administrator James E. Webb would appear to be laying the groundwork for blaming Congress on procedural as well as fiscal grounds should failures and further delays arise in the Saturn V program. In his letter Mr. Webb stated:

> As we move into the flight testing of the Saturn V, we are deeply concerned that this huge system includes many elements unproven in flight. Great care is needed and we will exercise it. The concept of 'all-up' system testing is a risky way to proceed, if looked at from the standpoint of any one test. However, actions by the Congress forced its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, if all-up system testing is in any way ill-advised, I think NASA should say so, and this fact should be made absolutely and currently clear to all members of the committee in in both House and Senate. If this is an acceptable testing procedure, then Mr. Webb's comment of September 14 would seem misleading and gratuitous.

The fact is that on February 18, 1964, Dr. George E. Mueller, Associate Administrator for Manned Space Flight, during the fiscal year 1965 authorization hearings in the House explained at length the advantages of "all-up" system testing. He stated as follows:

> Flight tests demonstrate operational capability, provide for a high degree of crew safety, allow for maximum flexibility by use of the "all-up" concept, and involve maximum utilization of the capabilities of each type of launch vehicle.
>
> *"All-up" concept.*—As we saw in our discussion of systems engineering, a major decision was made in 1963 involving adoption of the "all-up" concept as a basic approach to our flight verification test program. In "all-up" testing, all flights will be scheduled with complete space vehicles, using live stages and all-systems spacecraft.
>
> A step by step procedure was used in the past. Recent successful events—such as five S–I stage launches, ground tests of the liquid hydrogen second stage for Saturn I, the launching of the Centaur with its hydrogen upper stage, and the results of the Minuteman program (which also used "all-up" testing)—have brought us to the point where the technology and experience is such that we can now drop the step by step procedure.
>
> The "all-up" approach has several advantages. It will permit us to land an American astronaut on the Moon, and return him safely to Earth, in accordance with our schedule, even though we are operating this year on a reduced budget. It will permit us to capitalize on successful flights. It will also allow us to gather a very large amount of data early in the flight program, and thereby provide much-needed information to our design organizations. Finally, by testing essentially complete spacecraft on earlier flights and by acquiring more data per flight, the probability of meeting scheduled dates for the manned lunar landing is improved. (1965 NASA authorization—Hearings before the Subcommittee on Manned Space Flight of the Committee on Science & Astronautics—Part II—Page 430).

It is useful to note that, although Dr. Mueller makes reference to a reduced budget, he explains that Minuteman had used "all-up" testing procedures, which was part of the reason for NASA's decision. Minuteman was a military program for which the decision to use "all-up" testing certainly was not made because of a lack of funds. Without retracing the history of NASA's success in obtaining maximum appropriations, it is appropriate to consider that what Minuteman and the moon program have had in common is schedule pressures—in the case of NASA, the pressures resulting from the space race and the lunar landing deadline. Since failures in "all-up" testing would appear to increase costs, it seems a reasonable conclusion that time and not money was the major consideration.

Mr. Speaker, the question of candor once again becomes very serious when suspicion is created that a clear view of reality is being denied to Members of Congress who must take responsibility for financial decisions of great magnitude vis-a-vis the space program. In Jack Robertson's article of October 2 in the Electronic News we read:

> Reliable sources said NASA had dispatched a "Phillips" type task force to Grumman Aviation, Long Island, N.Y., to whip the LM program into shape, as General Samuel Phillips did for the Command Module at North American Aviation. A similar report by task force leader Russ Jornavik (sic) of MSC reportedly made sweeping review changes. The NASA spokesman denied any Jornavik Report.

Concerning NASA's denial—in 1967 the House Committee on Science and Astronautics prepared a staff report called Apollo Program Pace and Progress. On page 1206 of this report Mr. Hjornevik is quoted as saying on October 6, 1966, at the Manned Spacecraft Center in Houston:

> In the Apollo program we have literally formed task forces of the best people we have . . . For instance, we spent 6 weeks up at Grumman.

On this same point, in a letter of August 1 to Mr. Webb I said:

> Although documents such as the Hjornevik and Middleton reviews of Grumman Aviation have been at times acknowledged, to the best of my knowledge they have not been presented by NASA to the Committee on Science and Astronautics for detailed consideration. Other similar management reviews have not been specifically acknowledged. If my information is not correct, I trust that you will so advise me.

Mr. Webb did not so advise me.

Mr. Speaker, also in my letter of August 1 to Mr. Webb I asked, as a member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, for an accounting of certain difficulties about which I have been very concerned. I wrote as follows:

> I should like to refer to a particular problem that alarmed NASA officials earlier this year subsequent to the Apollo fire of January 27 and during the time that NASA was reporting to the Committees of Congress. I refer to the SI–B/H–I engine combination and J–2 engine programs of the Rocketdyne Division of North American Aviation. These difficulties caused Dr. von Braun, on February 15, 1967, to warn about excessive hardware failure and ". . . engines which are going to cause us a serious accident if this situation is allowed to continue."
>
> I believe that Committee Members are entitled to know the current status of the H–I and J–2 engine programs since Congress has the responsibility to appropriate public funds and to answer for its decisions on funding and program integrity to the American public. Therefore, I request that you make available to all Members of both House and Senate Space Committees, full, objective and current status reports on all major aspects of NASA's operations. This should include a complete report on the difficulties encountered in the SI–B/H–I engine combination and J–2 engine programs and a full account of NASA's follow-up activities in connection with the improvement of these engine programs.

The basis for my concern was a letter dated February 15, 1967, from Dr. Wernher von Braun addressed to Mr. S. K. Hoffman, president, Rocketdyne Division, North American Aviation, Inc., 6633 Canoga Avenue, Canoga Park, Calif. 91304. The full text of this letter reads as follows:

> NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION, GEORGE C. MARSHALL SPACE FLIGHT CENTER,
> *Huntsville, Ala., February 15, 1967.*
>
> In reply refer to: Director
> Mr. S. K. HOFFMAN,
> *President, Rocketdyne Division, North American Aviation, Inc., Canoga Park, Calif.*
>
> DEAR SAM: Reference my letter to you of February 3 on the subject of hardware failure, most of which we find traceable to human error, inadequate manufacturing, quality control, or test procedures.
>
> Attached you will find two reports which I have received in the last ten days. These reports deal with the S–IB/H–I engine combination and the J–2 engine. They serve to strengthen my conviction that you, Chrysler, and/or other major stage contractors have a most serious job to do in eliminating the numbers of mistakes which are occurring on your hardware. Either the engines are being delivered after manufacturing, static testing, and poststatic checkout in a very unacceptable condition, or our stage contractors in their work with these engines are introducing an unacceptable amount of human error. With an engine as old as the H–I powering a stage as mature as the S–IB, and with the checks and balances which are built into the checkout and acceptance procedures, I just cannot believe that these kinds of findings and mistakes are still so commonplace.
>
> In my letter referenced above, I asked for your help, and specifically asked you what approach Rocketdyne would recommend in eliminating such deficiencies. I would still like to receive those recommendations from you. In the meantime, however, I wish you

would immediately and personally ascertain the nature of the problems contained in the attachments and advise me of your corrective actions, including your coordination with Chrysler. Whether these occurrences are a result of Rocketdyne or stage contractor actions, they lead me to wonder whether your field engineering activity is performing its function. These are your engines which are going to cause us a serious accident if this situation is allowed to continue. For your information, I have written to Doug Lowrey on the same subject.

Sincerely yours,

EBERHARD REES,
(For Wernher von Braun, Director).

Mr. Speaker, this would sound like a serious problem, and I found it difficult to believe that the very able and distinguished Dr. von Braun would be likely to make such severe and distressing charges in connection with a minor difficulty. Very concerned, therefore, I wrote my letter of August 1 to the Administrator of NASA and, on the same day, a letter to the chairman of the Subcommittee on NASA Oversight. At a briefing on August 9 my question was answered to the effect that the problem had been merely some lint discovered in various engines after checkout, and that it had been quickly rectified. Not yet fully satisfied I contacted NASA again several times requesting a written reply to my letter of August 1. In his letter of September 14, the Administrator replied—I quote his entire response to this particular point:

> The problem referred to in Dr. von Braun's letter, which you quote, was one of stressing the importance of achieving and maintaining a rigorous standard of perfection on the part of thousands of men and women who were involved in the checkout and testing of these engines. This was discussed in the most recent Manned Space Flight briefing, which you attended. Small particles of foreign matter have been found in the engines after testing and clean-up. Dr. von Braun acted quickly and strongly to direct the contractors involved to correct these deficiencies.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly hope the problem was no more serious than a small amount of lint remaining after clean-up and has been easily resolved. But it is dismaying that a growing list of reports concerning new difficulties in the Apollo program would tend to belie NASA's much-publicized optimism about its current status. For example, according to Mr. Robertson's article of October 2, in the Electronic News:

> The Apollo Lunar Module is overweight and has already started to curtail part of the moon landing mission . . . The LM has used up all its weight contingency margin . . . Yet, with fixes and design changes, the spacecraft weight continues to spiral . . . The fuel tank space for LM is fully committed, with virtually no room to add extra Delta V to offset the increasing weight . . . NASA is busy whittling batteries on the LM by 11 percent . . . LM has run into development troubles as serious as the much publicized Apollo Command Module plight, knowledgeable sources said. A NASA manned spaceflight office spokesman denied that LM is encountering anything but routine problems.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Webb says, in the concluding paragraph of his letter of September 14:

> NASA programs are conducted under full and frequent public and Congressional scrutiny. The status of these programs, their progress and problems, are made known to Committee and Subcommittee Chairmen and in hearings as provided for by these officials of Congress. Status reports on each of the projects which you mention have been made.

I do not think it amiss that NASA should experience great difficulties and occasional failures. I have many times explained in defense of NASA that the space agency faces unknown technical and managerial challenges of unprecedented magnitude and difficulty—more complex than those faced by any other government agency. What is distressing is that somehow, in spite of the advertised "full and frequent public and congressional scrutiny," I do not believe that a realistic picture of the problems, difficulties and probabilities in the space program is filtering through the committee members. I do not fully comprehend where the communication bottleneck may lie, but I maintain my belief that the public, which pays for the space program, is entitled to know the full story, especially when Members of Congress are given insufficient information.

Mr. Speaker, this finally leaves us with two important points that must be made. First—as long as we must continue to rely on the news media and other unofficial sources to get current information about NASA's problems, we have not yet achieved acceptable communication from and with the space agency. Second—any attempt by NASA to place the blame for Apollo program failures and schedule slippages on Congress and on budget cuts not only completely denies the history that has emerged via the Phillips Report and the unhappy revelations surrounding the Apollo fire—it is both irresponsible and unfounded in fact.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD the full text of Jack Robertson's article, of October 2, in the Electronic News:

[From the Electronic News, Oct. 2, 1967]

WEIGHT PROBLEMS BURDEN APOLLO LUNAR MODULE

(By Jack Robertson)

WASHINGTON.—The Apollo Lunar Module is overweight and has already started to curtail part of the moon landing mission, reliable sources said.

The LM has used up all its weight contingency margin, they said. Yet, with fixes and design changes, the spacecraft weight continues to spiral, it was reported.

The fuel tank space for LM is fully committed, with virtually no room to add extra Delta to offset the increasing weight, sources said. NASA is busy whittling pounds from every possible system aboard.

The space agency has cut batteries on the LM by 11 percent, thus limiting total lunar stay time to only 22½ hours, confirmed Chris Kraft, NASA Manned Spacecraft Center director of flight operations. He was questioned by Electronic News at Goddard Space Flight Center here.

Mr. Kraft confirmed that LM has a weight problem and NASA is exploring all possible avenues to cut weight.

The first unmanned test of the LM is slated in January atop an uprated Saturn 1B. The Saturn has more than enough power to put the test LM into orbit but the crux is weight limits on the LM engine.

DEVELOPMENT TROUBLES, TOO

In addition, LM has run into development troubles as serious as the much publicized Apollo Command Module plight, knowledgeable sources said. A NASA manned spaceflight office spokesman denied that LM is encountering anything but routine problems.

However, reliable sources said NASA had dispatched a "Phillips" type task force to Grumman Aviation, Long Island, N.Y. to whip the LM program into shape, as Gen. Samuel Phillips did for the Command Module at North American Aviation. A similar report by task force leader Russ Jornavik of MSC reportedly made sweeping review changes.

The NASA spokeman denied any Jornavik Report and said NASA is doing nothing more than normal contractor surveillance.

Sources also said as late as this spring NASA made another survey of LM troubles at Grumman under Capt. Roger Middleton, manager of Apollo program at Kennedy Space Center. NASA said he would survey Grumman routinely as part of his normal duties.

A spokesman for Grumman said his firm has checked and is unaware of the NASA statement or of Chris Kraft's confirmation of the statement. He stated also that Grumman is unaware any task force was sent to investigate the Lunar Module's overweight problem.

A growing list of LM problems is coming to light as the spacecraft nears it first test flight. Tank leaks have delayed the flight twice, and as recently as a month ago NASA went out to a second contractor, North American Rocketdyne Division, for a fuel injection system for LM when Bell Aerosystems ran into difficulty.

Reliability on an order of magnitude higher than Gemini is needed for all Apollo systems, Mr. Kraft told Electronic News. The LM and other systems will be committed to an 11-day mission with abort times back to earth measured in days rather than 30 minutes from Gemini orbits.

MUST WORK PERFECTLY

In addition, the LM ascent must work perfectly to bring lunar astronauts back to the mother command module since Apollo has no ability to rescue stranded astronauts from the lunar surface. The astronauts have at the most a 7- to 9-hour launch window from the moon after a 22-hour moon stay. After that time, onboard oxygen and life support supplies are exhausted.

Weight continues the most glaring LM problem, all sources agreed. The LM configuration locked up years ago the available fuel tank for the spacecraft so no further engine power is open to offset increasing weight.

The only answer is a perspicacious whittling of a pound here and there. Some sources expect NASA to throw up its hands and just off-load fuel to make up for the added weight. The lower fuel load, however, would cut margins for the flight and eliminate some plane changes planned in the LM flight, authoritative sources said.

The weight problem may likely scrap the lunar surface experiments package. The experiments package will probably not be deployed on the first lunar landing, though it is still planned to be carried, sources said. NASA expects its first landing astronauts will be so busy adjusting to the moon that the space agency does not want to tax them with deploying the experiments package. Sources said it is likely the package will be scratched completely from the first flight.

Another "expendable" is the lunar television camera slated to be carried by astronauts. Since it is such a huge power drain, the camera will be used miserly, but sources said NASA publicity desires may try to keep the Lunar TV aboard LM at all costs.

WEIGHT PROBLEMS IN FUTURE

Follow-on advanced lunar missions face an even bigger weight barrier, managers in Apollo work said. Longer lunar stay times will need more battery power and life support expendables. More sophisticated lunar experiments and lunar maneuvering units will eat up weight in huge chunks.

An extended LM is not on the horizon at this time so something must give on the current LM version to make way for advanced mission gear, sources said. One possible plan under study is cutting back the lunar landing crew of followon missions to a single astronaut, a reliable source said.

NASA is also hoping that some of the elaborate redundant LM systems built into the first model for extreme safety can be modified to save weight especially as the space agency gains experience and confidence on the moon.

NASA has no plans to switch from batteries to fuel cells. Although the fuel cell itself is a much smaller, lighter system. The associated plumbing adds weight and would force extensive redesign of the LM.

APPOINTMENT OF MAX M. KAMPELMAN AS CHAIRMAN OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COUNCIL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it is now revealed that President Johnson's nominee as Chairman of the new City Council of the Nation's Capital, Max M. Kampelman, is a director of a Minneapolis company that has obtained from the Agency for International Development nearly $4 million in a scheme to unload worn-out and obsolete gearmaking machinery at the expense of American taxpayers.

Kampelman, it will be remembered, was a conscientious objector in World War II who, after the shooting ended in Korea, manipulated a commission in the Marine Corps Reserve. When the war in Vietnam was expanded he tossed up his commission in the Marines.

Between times, he says he was "associated" with former Senator HUMPHREY and he was a pal of the notorious Bobby Baker, who was a protege of former Senator Lyndon B. Johnson. Kampelman was an official of the D.C. National Bank when it handed the highflying Bobby Baker an unsecured loan of $125,000.

The machinery deal was a rather complex operation, Mr. Speaker, and one that allegedly hoodwinked the AID handout artists. But thanks to the General Accounting Office, we have a reasonably complete picture of what happened.

This wheeler-dealer operation involves Napco Industries, Inc., of Minneapolis—of which the President's nominee is a director—and Napco Bevel Gear of India, Ltd.—a firm that was established to buy Napco Industry's Detroit bevel gear division, which was losing money hand over fist.

Kampelman was one of the original directors of Napco Bevel Gear of India, Ltd., which obtained, first, a $2,300,000 loan from the foreign aid outfit to buy the equipment, much of it obsolete, and subsequently two other AID loans in rupees of $840,000 each.

It was on July 27, 1962, that AID made the $2,300,000 loan to Napco Bevel Gear of India, Ltd., to help that company buy the gear manufacturing machinery of a division of Napco Industries, Inc., of Minneapolis.

At this point it is interesting to note that the General Accounting Office, in its report, states:

> Napco Industries, in addition to being paid the proceeds of the loan, was issued 37.5 percent of the initial issue of capital stock of NBGI (Napco Bevel Gear of India), worth about $1 million.

According to GAO:

> AID made the loan in 1962, on the basis of statements in NBGI's application setting forth the conclusions formulated by Napco Industries and NBGI that the project was feasible; that the plant could be moved, installed and undergoing test runs within a period of 13 months, and that the various gears planned for production would have a ready market within India and abroad.

But in an annual report to stockholders, on April 20, 1965, in explaining the subsequent delay in getting this Indian operation going, Napco Industries said, in part:

> Commencing four years ago, our gear manufacturing division became increasingly troublesome—creating losses that at times more than consumed the profits of the healthy divisions . . . we came to the conclusion that the facilities of our Detroit Bevel Gear plant in Detroit would be excess to our needs.

The General Accounting Office states that at the time of the $2,300,000 loan, AID officials knew the gear machinery "would require reconditioning" before shipment to India. Although AID had this knowledge in 1962, its officials did not inspect the equipment until January 1965, at which time one of AID's engineers "confirmed that the equipment received in India had not been reconditioned and that much of it could not be reconditioned and was little more than junk."

The engineer also found that:

> The tools received in India were used for making gears for United States motor vehicles constructed on the United States system of measurement, but were to be used for making gears for Indian motor vehicles constructed on the British metric system.

The GAO further says:

> Moreover, in September 1962, or about one year before AID actually disbursed any of the loan funds, AID received specific allegations from one of the prospective Indian stockholders that the equipment was substantially worn out and was overpriced.
>
> Despite these circumstances which, in our opinion, should have raised serious doubt as to the feasibility of the proposed project, AID continued with the financing of the project as originally planned.

It is interesting to note that when these aid loans were made, Max M. Kampelman was a member of the board of directors of Napco Bevel Gear of India, Ltd., along with Max E. Rappaport, who was president of Napco Industries, Inc., of Minneapolis.

Since that time, Kampelman has been made a member of the board of directors of Napco Industries, Inc., of Minneapolis.

It is also interesting to observe that during the early stages of this deal, William S. Gaud, now the Administrator of AID, was the Assistant Administrator for Material Resources for Southeast Asia, and Herbert J. Waters, a former administrative assistant to Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, was AID's Assistant Administrator for Material Resources.

To recapitulate briefly, Kampelman and associates were not satisfied with the original AID loan of $2,300,000 so they quickly extracted from the foreign aiders an additional $1,680,000 in rupees by obtaining two identical loans, one on July 31, 1963, and the other on August 27, 1964. This made a grand total of $3,980,000 in loans to finance the unloading on India of gear production machinery, a substantial part of which, according to GAO and others, was either worn out, obsolete, junk, or otherwise unusable.

The General Accounting Office said that at the time of its inspection:

> Production had reportedly been substantially limited to Mercedes crown wheel and pinion gears for which there was no ready market.

In February 1966, the plant was out of production.

Mr. Speaker, on the basis of the General Accounting Office investigation and report, this deal reeks of incompetence or fraud or both. In any event it is a poor recommendation for the appointment by President Johnson of Max M. Kampelman to be the chairman of the City Council of Washington, D.C., and I again call for an immediate and thorough investigation of his activities.

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman accusing the nominee of dishonesty?

Mr. GROSS. I will let the statement stand and let the gentleman make his own deduction.

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman accusing AID officials of dishonesty?

Mr. GROSS. I said I would let the statement stand.

Mr. WALDIE. The statement, as I understood it, was they were accused of incompetency or fraud. Was the allegation directed at the AID officials or the nominee?

Mr. GROSS. I did not hear the last question of the gentleman.

Mr. WALDIE. The concluding remarks of the gentleman were, in his terms, that the deal reeked of incompetency or fraud. Were those allegations directed at the nominee or AID officials?

Mr. GROSS. They are directed at anyone to whom they properly apply.

Mr. WALDIE. Can the gentleman tell me to whom he thinks they properly belong?

Mr. GROSS. There are a lot of individuals involved in this matter. If the gentleman desires to acquaint himself with the subject—and I am sure he is not now acquainted with it—he can send to the General Accounting Office and get its report for September 1967, dealing with this subject, and then I will be glad to spend some time on the floor of the House discussing this with him, but I would rather the gentleman would be enlightened on the subject before we get into a discussion of it.

Mr. WALDIE. I am attempting to be enlightened on the subject.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

JOINT RESOLUTION IN OPPOSITION TO VESTING TITLE TO THE OCEAN FLOOR TO THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to a movement to confer title to the ocean floor to the United Nations for to do so would be inconsistent with the proclaimed policy of this Nation and would be extremely foolish.

In 1945 President Truman, realizing the growing value and future needs of the resources of the Continental Shelf, made the following proclamation:

> Having concern for the urgency of conserving and prudently utilizing its natural resources, the government of the United States regards the natural resources of the subsoil and seabed of the Continental Shelf beneath the high seas but contiguous to the coasts of the United States, subject to its jurisdiction and control.

The ocean floor, Mr. Speaker, and the waters above it are of inestimable value to this Nation which, presently, is just beginning to formulate much needed oceanographic programs that will unlock some of the treasures that the ocean and ocean floor holds for us.

Ultimately, perhaps, it may be best to vest title to the ocean floor in the United Nations but to do so at this time would indeed be a serious and most unfortunate mistake.

Many advancements in oceanography have been made in recent years by this Nation and the future appears bright. Such schools as the University of Rhode Island have made great strides in providing us with more knowledge in the vital field of oceanography. If we continue in the same vein, this Nation will once again take its rightful place in the world fishing industry and will lead the world in oceanography, a field which holds more potential for us than outer space.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a joint resolution which expresses the opposition of the Congress to vesting title to the ocean floor in the United Nations.

CONGRESSMAN ANNUNZIO URGES ENACTMENT OF LEGISLATION TO MAKE COLUMBUS DAY A NATIONAL LEGAL HOLIDAY

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, on October 4, I appeared before the House Judiciary Subcommittee No. 5 on behalf of H.R. 3891 which I introduced to make Columbus Day a national legal holiday.

As all of us know, the other body in the 88th Congress passed this legislation, but the bill died in the House Judiciary Committee. Now, 4 years have passed, and the House has an opportunity to do what the other body did 4 years ago and pass this legislation in order to make Columbus Day a national legal holiday.

This year, in 1967, we celebrate the 475th anniversary of the great voyage that Columbus made to the new continent. This historic voyage was responsible for the discovery of North and South America.

It is the nations of the Western Hemisphere that are maintaining peace in the world. It is the nations of the Western Hemisphere that are the democratic nations of the world. It is the nations of the Western Hemisphere that are fighting totalitarianism and communism so that people can live in the image of their Creator—as free people with free governments.

My testimony follows:

TESTIMONY OF HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO, OF ILLINOIS, BEFORE HOUSE JUDICIARY SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 5, ON LEGISLATION TO MAKE COLUMBUS DAY A NATIONAL LEGAL HOLIDAY, OCTOBER 4, 1967

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I want to thank you and the other distinguished Members of the Subcommittee for the opportunity provided me to appear here this morning to testify on behalf of my bill, H.R. 3891, which would make Columbus Day a national legal holiday.

Many of my Colleagues in the 90th Congress have joined me in introducing identical legislation in order to honor Christopher Columbus, the great Italian navigator who discovered America in 1492, and I am pleased that they, too, recognize the pressing need for enactment of this legislation.

Thirty-eight States have already declared Columbus Day a legal holiday, but national recognition of Christopher Columbus' momentous discovery has been withheld all these many years. It is indeed an oversight on the part of the United States Congress to withhold this national recognition, particularly when we realize that the development of our great country, as well as the development of the whole Western Hemisphere, resulted from Columbus' discovery.

Almost every country in South America, and parts of Canada, observe Columbus Day as a national holiday. Yet we ourselves refrain from observing this holiday on a national level.

It is unfortunate that we in the United States do not celebrate Columbus Day as a national legal holiday, for if we did, we could join hands with our brothers and sisters in South America in a joint celebration of the one event which holds such profound meaning for all of us. Perhaps, by extending our hand in friendship and by celebrating this holiday together, we could create a more hospitable atmosphere for settling some of the vital social and economic problems which confront us.

Of all the outstanding men whose deeds have made an imperishable record in the hearts and minds of men and women through the ages, it is Columbus whose fame will last forever. Perhaps his achievement is more meaningful for us today than it was for previous generations, because we face the vastness of outer space in the same way that Columbus faced the expanse of the uncharted ocean.

Despite all obstacles and hazards, despite primitive navigational equipment, this great Italian found land and achieved the most spectacular and important geographical discovery in the history of our planet.

The qualities that made Columbus great—stubborn persistence despite discouragement and danger, indomitable will, faith in God, and absolute fearlessness—are qualities which our early settlers possessed, which our courageous pioneers demonstrated as they opened up the West, and which our great industrialists and labor leaders have used in building the successful economic enterprises and achieving the remarkable industrial advances that have made our country the greatest nation in the world.

Today, we have more people employed than at any time in our history, our country is enjoying the greatest prosperity we have ever known. Our gross national product is over $740 billion and by 1972 it is predicted that our gross national product will exceed $1 trillion.

In this era of prosperity and progress, it is difficult to believe that there are those who would oppose making Columbus Day a national legal holiday on the basis that it would cost too much money to close our Government offices, our schools, our banks, and other public places. When one takes into consideration the great prosperity in our country, and our constantly growing and expanding economy, this excuse of cost becomes weak, flimsy, and ineffective.

Mr. Chairman, the magnificent courage and boundless imagination of Columbus made possible the discovery of our country where today the greatest democracy ever known to man is flourishing. His indomitable spirit has become a part of us and our way of life. Today, our astronauts who explore outer space are manifesting the same dauntless spirit that Columbus demonstrated when he sailed an uncharted and trackless ocean to find America.

Our debt to Columbus is profound, for his discovery marked the actual beginning of our culture and our country. No longer can we deny him national recognition.

The other body, during the 88th Congress, recognized this debt, and in an effort to give Columbus the recognition he justly deserves, passed on August 15, 1964, a bill introduced by Senator J. Caleb Boggs, of Delaware, to make Columbus Day a national legal holiday. Unfortunately, this bill never came to the floor of the House for action, and died in the House Judiciary Committee when the 88th Congress expired.

Today, in these hearings before this distinguished Subcommittee, we have the opportunity to follow the commendable lead of the other body and take positive action on legislation to make Columbus Day a national legal holiday. Only by doing so can our debt to Columbus be adequately paid.

My files contain many, many letters which I have received from various organizations and from people in all walks of life urging that Columbus Day be made a national legal holiday. In order to provide the Members of this Subcommittee with the sentiments contained in some of these letters, I would like to have them included in my testimony and made a part of the official record of the hearing. The letters from The United Italian-American Organizations, the Grand Lodge of the State of New York Order Sons of Italy in America, the Grand Lodge of Virginia Order Sons of Italy in America, the Lodge No. 53 Italo American National Union of Gary, Indiana, the Modugno Recreational Social Club of Gary, Indiana, the Calumet Chapter of American Italian Societies of East Chicago, Indiana, the Italian-American Women's Club of Lake County, Indiana, the Consolidated Italo-Americans, The Italo-Americans National Union, and from Mr. Alfred P. Adamo of Detroit, Michigan, appear following my statement.

I feel that the hearings this year are being held at a most appropriate time of the year—as the 475th anniversary of Columbus' discovery of America approaches. There is no better time than now to take favorable action on the legislation before this Subcommittee.

I wholeheartedly support the legislation and I am hopeful that the distinguished Members of this Subcommittee will find it possible to act favorably in order that this long overdue recognition can be extended to the great Italian navigator who made the most important geographical discovery in modern history.

Again, I want to express my deep appreciation to all the Members of this Subcommittee and to the distinguished Chairman, Honorable Byron Rogers, for the opportunity to appear and to express my views to you.

United Italian-American
Organizations,
Chicago, Ill., March 2, 1967.

Hon. Frank Annunzio,
Congressman of the Seventh District.

Dear Congressman: The members of the United Italian-American Organizations, known as Unitamo, have been following your progress and your set backs, in getting legislation to make Columbus Day a Legal Holiday. We have supported you ever since you first introduced it to Congress. Again, we the members of Unitamo, support you in getting Columbus Day a Legal Holiday. Unfortunately, that it died in the House Judiciary Committee. It is unfair, that all the Members of the House of Representatives did not have the opportunity to vote on this legislation.

All of the affiliated Societies, of Unitamo, urge you to continue to fight for this legislation and get all the members of the House, to vote on this. We are confident, that you will not rest, until Columbus is recognized.

In closing, may we wish you well, and may God give you the necessary strength and wisdom to bring this to a successful conclusion.

Respectfully yours,
Fred Parisi, *President.*
Joseph A. Maniscalco,
Chairman of the Board of Directors.
Frank P. Pitarro,
President Emeritus.
John A. Crocco,
Public Relations Director.

Detroit, Mich.,
August 8, 1967.

Dear Editor: Christopher Columbus was ridiculed in 1486 by the Erudites of Salamanca in Spain, when he tried to convince them that the earth was round.

Columbus, a man of wisdom, imagination and sincerity, had great faith in God and his fellow men—so therefore, he took great risk in crossing the sea, and in 1492 his wishes came true when he discovered America. As history tells us, he was the only man to discover the republic which is the United States of America.

Therefore, 38 states recognize his honor and merit and have declared October 12th a legal holiday in his honor, and celebrate this day each and every year.

The American people have been disappointed that Congress did not recognize the value and merits of the accomplishments of Christopher Columbus. Many bills have been introduced before the United States Congress but all have died in the Judicial Committee Room. Therefore, I ask your help in urging your readers to write to their respective Congressmen stating that the time for this is overdue, and that Congress should finally honor Columbus as a first citizen of our Republic, by making October 12th a National Holiday.

The honor should not only be given to Columbus but to the people of the 38 states which are now legally honoring this great soul of a great navigator, Christopher Columbus.

The following 38 states now celebrate October 12th in honor of Columbus:

Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas.

Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota.

Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Wyoming, Rhode Island, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin.

Respectfully,
Alfred P. Adamo.

Consolidated Italo-Americans,
Brooklyn, N.Y.

Dear Sir: We, the officers and members of "Consolidated Italo-Americans, Inc.," Brooklyn Headquarters, extend to you our greetings.

Recently our Congressman, the Honorable Abraham Multer from the 13th Congressional District of Brooklyn, introduced a bill in the House of Representatives (H.R. 8501) to make Columbus Day, October 12th, a legal holiday.

We would be remiss in our responsibilities as a functioning organization, both to ourselves and to our people, were such an important Legislative measure allowed to go unheralded into defeat due to any lack of pertinent action on our part.

We, therefore, shall defend, support, and assist, by all means at our disposal, its passage into law.

We sincerely believe that enactment of this bill would give twenty-three million Americans of Italian lineage, residing throughout these United States, a needed uplift in their morale, and would re-affirm their belief in this system of government, which is the cornerstone of our great democracy.

We further hope that passage of this bill might serve to offset the defamatory connotations which invariably arise every time one of our people runs afoul of the law.

We respectfully request that you carefully weigh the many merits offered by this bill to such a considerable portion of the population, and give it your full support when it comes to the floor for a vote.

Very truly yours,
Guy Giuliano,
President.

Crown Point, Ind.,
September 29, 1967.

Hon. Frank Annunzio,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Annunzio: Enclosed you will find a copy of a resolution passed by the Calumet Chapter of American-Italian Societies, which is self-explanatory.

Naturally, I already know your position—but though you would like to have this for your files for added support.

Keep up the good work.

Sincerely,
Sam Bushemi,
Lake County Assessor.

RESOLUTION OF CALUMET CHAPTER, AMERICAN-ITALIAN SOCIETIES, EAST CHICAGO, IND.

Whereas, the Calumet Chapter of American-Italian Societies is a council of sixteen (16) American-Italian clubs in Lake County, and,

Whereas, this year there are several bills in the National Congress that would make Columbus Day a Federal Legal Holiday, and

Whereas, this organization has since its inception in 1957 constantly supported legislation to make Columbus Day a Federal Legal Holiday, and

Whereas, the House Judiciary Sub-Committee No. 4, Congressman Byron G. Rogers (Demo.-Colorado), Chairman, has formally announced the scheduling of hearings on Columbus Day bills on the dates of Wednesday and Thursday, October 4 and 5, 1967 in Washington, D.C., and,

Whereas, the Board of Directors (which includes current and past presidents of the local American-Italian Societies) assembled in special meeting on Thursday, September 28, 1967 to consider this question again, and

Now, therefore, Be it resolved, that the Calumet Chapter, American-Italian Societies hereby recommends to the National Congress that it pass this year a bill to make Columbus Day a Federal Legal Holiday, and

Be it further resolved, that copies of this resolution be sent to: Congressman Byron G. Rogers; Congressman Frank Annunzio; U.S. Senator Vance Hartke; U.S. Senator Birch Bayh; Congressman Ray J. Madden; and President Lyndon B. Johnson.

Sam Bushemi,
Lake County Assessor, and Past President, Calumet Chapter.

Attest:
Mrs. Angeline Zimmerman,
Secretary.

RESOLUTION OF MODUGNO RECREATIONAL SOCIAL CLUB, GARY, IND.

Whereas, the Modugno Recreational Social Club of Gary, Indiana,

Whereas, this organization has since its inception in 1957 constantly supported legislation to make Columbus Day a Federal Legal Holiday, and

Whereas, this year are several bills in the National Congress that would make Columbus Day a Federal Legal Holiday, and

Whereas, the House Judiciary Sub-Committee #4, Congressman Byron G. Rogers (demo-Colorado), Chairman, has formally announced the scheduling of hearings on Columbus Day bills on the dates of Wednesday and Thursday October 4 and 5, 1957 in Washington, D.C. and,

Whereas, the Board of Directors (which includes current and past presidents of the local American Thursday, September 28, 1967 to consider this question again and,

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the Calumet Chapter, American-Italian Societies hereby recommends to the National Congress that it pass this year a bill to make Columbus Day a Legal Holiday, and

Be it further resolved, that copies of this resolution be sent to: Congressman Byron G. Rogers; Congressman Frank Annuzio; U. S. Senator Vance Hartke; U.S. Senator Birch Bayh; Congressman Ray J. Madden; and President Lyndon B. Johnson.

Emilio J. Ottomanelli,
President.

Principessa Maria Di Piemonte,
Lodge No. 53, Italo American
National Union,
Gary, Ind., September 30, 1967.

Congressman Frank Annunzio,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Annunzio: On behalf of the Principessa Maria di Piemonte Lodge No. 53 of the Italo American National Union, I wish to add our support for legislation to make Columbus Day a National Legal Holiday. Our Lodge has a membership of 100 and has been in existence since 1930.

Your favorable support of this legislation will be grantly appreciated. Thanking you, I am,

Sincerely,
Angeline Casale,
President.

RESOLUTION OF THE GRAND LODGE OF VIRGINIA, ORDER SONS OF ITALY IN AMERICA, IN RICHMOND, ON JUNE 17, 1967

Re Designation by act of Congress of October 12 as a national holiday.

Whereas, Christopher Columbus, the great Genovese navigator, has always been recognized in responsible intellectual circles as the true discoverer of the New World, and

Whereas, from the very inception of our great Republic, it has been the fashion and tradition to honor the memory of Columbus so that the Founding Fathers often referred to the Republic as "Columbia," and

Whereas, there has been in recent years a waning of patriotic ferver and a tendency to gloss over the achievements of the great historical figure,

Be it resolved, that the Grand Lodge of Virginia, Order Sons of Italy in America, place itself on record to reaffirm the collective desire of its members that our nation perpetuate its debt of gratitude to the memory of Christopher Columbus officially by Act of Congress by designating October 12 of each year as "Columbus Day," a national holiday to be dedicated to the everlasting glory of Christopher Columbus, and

Be it further resolved, that the Chairman of the Resolutions Committee make known this action of the Grand Lodge of Virginia to the President of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson, by sending a letter to him communicating the contents of this resolution and copies of this resolution be sent to all Italian-American Congressmen in Washington, D.C.

FRANK J. FILIPPONE,
Chairman, Resolutions Committee.

GRAND LODGE OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK, ORDER SONS OF ITALY IN AMERICA,
White Plains, N.Y., March 8, 1967.

Hon. FRANK ANNUNZIO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Re: Columbus Day—National Holiday.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ANNUNZIO: On behalf of the Grand Lodge of the State of New York, Order Sons of Italy in America, please accept our thanks for your efforts in seeking the passage of a bill making Columbus Day a National Holiday.

Over the years a great number of Congressmen and Senators have been slowly rallying to the cause. It appears that this year may be the time to look for success.

Our own State Legislature has been prevailed upon to release a resolution memorializing Congress to pass legislation to declare Columbus Day a National Holiday. I have written to the Speaker of the Assembly (Assemblyman Travia—who is also the Chairman of the Rules Committee), imploring him to have the resolution released from Committee. State Senator Anderson has also assured me he will do his best. Other representatives from Westchester County have indicated they will support the measure. Our two Congressmen from Westchester—Ottinger and Reid—will, I am sure, also go along.

Accordingly, we of the Grand Lodge of the State of New York will continue to support your efforts and those of all Legislators who are working towards the attainment of the goal—to have Columbus Day Declared a National Holiday!

Good luck and best wishes.

Sincerely and fraterally,
SALVATORE H. MIGLIACCIO,
Grand Venerable.

ITALIAN-AMERICAN WOMENS CLUB OF LAKE COUNTY, INDIANA,
East Chicago, Ind.

On behalf of the Italian-American Womens Club of Lake County, Indiana, I wish to add our support to make Columbus Day, a Federal Legal Holiday.

We have a membership of 60 ladies. We have been in existence since 1963.

Your favorable support of this legalization will be greatly appreciated.

Thanking you,
Sincerely,
MRS. JOSEPHINE GEMIGNONI,
President.

RESOLUTION OF LODGE CESARE BATTISTI, NO. 27, ITALO AMERICAN NATIONAL UNION, EAST CHICAGO, IND.

Whereas, the Lodge Cesare Battisti, n. 27, of the Italo-American National Union, in East Chicago, Indiana, is composed of citizens of Italian extraction residing in Lake County, Indiana; and

Whereas, this organization has always been in favor and constantly supported legislation to make Columbus Day a Federal Legal Holiday, and

Whereas, this year there are several bills in the National Congress that would make Columbus Day a Federal legal Holiday, and

Whereas, the House Judiciary Sub-Committee #4, Congressman Byron G. Rogers (Demo-Colorado), Chairman, has formally announced the scheduling of hearings on Columbus Day bills on the dates of Wednesday and Thursday, October 4th and 5th, 1967, in Washington, D.C., and

Whereas, the officers of the Lodge Casare Battisti n.27, Italo American National Union, assembled in special meeting on Thursday, September 28th, 1967 to consider this question again, and

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the Lodge Casare Battisti n. 27 of the Italo-American National Union hereby recommends to the National Cogress that it pass this year a bill to make Columbus Day a Federal Legal Holiday, and

Be it further resolved, that copies of this resolution be sent to Congressman Byron G. Rogers; Congressman Frank Annunzio; Congressman Ray J. Madden; U.S. Senator Vance Hartke; U.S. Senator Birch Bayh; and President Lyndon B. Johnson.

FRANCIS J. GEMIGNENI,
President.

Attest: RICHARD MCCOY,
Secretary.

CONSTRUCTIVE REVOLUTION

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FULTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, to many people, the word "revolution" carries with it an ominous meaning. Bloodshed, anarchy, starvation, a shredding of the fabric of orderly government. I would like to point out that "revolution" can be a good word, a constructive word, a word that can claim a proud position in the lexicon of America's growth as a rich and free Nation. The latest manifestation of constructive revolution can be seen in the dramatic and unprecedented proposal of a partnership between Government and industry to bring education, jobs, income, and dignity to the slums of our blighted cities and pockets of poverty in rural areas.

I refer, Mr. Speaker, to the administration's recently announced plan to mobilize the resources of private industry and the Federal Government to help find jobs and provide job training for thousands of America's hard-core unemployed.

Another revolutionary aspect of this dramatic undertaking is the formation of a one-stop, single-point-of-contact office within the Government and the designation of a leading industrialist, Mr. William E. Zisch, of the Aerojet General Corp., to head it up.

It is heartening to look back over the last few years and to view the success of other programs started by this administration and joined by private industries with a social awareness of the domestic problems which face our Nation today.

For several years now some of America's largest corporations have quietly and with great modesty been operating highly successful centers where thousands of unskilled American youth—so-called school dropouts—have become society's drop-ins.

The Nation's insurance industries pledged billions of dollars to improve urban areas that have become blighted by human neglect and an industrial society's indifference.

Private industry is now beginning to develop and build, and also to manage, public housing.

If ever an administration held out the hand of partnership and cooperation to private enterprise, the present administration is it. Mr. Speaker, the people of Tennessee have a proud heritage in things revolutionary, and we wholeheartedly join with and support the administration and industry in this truly American enterprise.

POLISH WRESTLING CHAMPION PASSES AWAY

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HELSTOSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, the sports pages of nearly every large metropolitan newspaper carried the story, last week, of the passing away of Stanislaus Zbyszko at the age of 88.

Mr. Zbyszko was a legend of the wrestling world at the time when the sport was a test of skill and strength; and not the theatrical exhibition which this sport has achieved in recent years.

Mr. Speaker, Stanislaus Zbyszko was a Pole by birth and besides being a well-known sports figure of his time was also a man of many other talents. He had degrees in law and philosophy, he possessed the culture of a musician and poet, and mastered 11 languages.

At one time or another, he and his younger brother, Wladek, toured throughout the United States and many foreign countries exhibiting their skills against the strongest opponents that could be found to challenge them. The two brothers were a drawing card in a sport which was not as popular as many of the others which drew large crowds.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I would like to include an excellent article which appeared in the New York Times on Sunday, September 24, 1967, on the demise of this great athlete.

The article follows:

STANISLAUS ZBYSZKO DIES AT 88; WRESTLING CHAMPION IN 1920'S

ST. JOSEPH, MO., September 23.—Stanislaus Zbyszko, the Polish strongman who won two world wrestling championships in the days when the sport was a true test of strength and skill, died yesterday in a hospital here at the age of 88.

An articulate advocate of the old Greco-Roman style of wrestling, Mr. Zbyszko contended that theatrics had no place in the ring and was bitter over the trend to exhibitionism in the last 30 years.

He began wrestling in Poland at the age of 15 and amassed a fortune of more than $1 million prior to World War I. But when the Bolshevik Revolution broke out, he was imprisoned for five years and lost his fortune.

Mr. Zbyszko came to the United States in 1922 and won his first world title by defeating Joe Stetcher, Earl Caddock and Ed (Strangler) Lewis. He lost the title in 1923, but regained it later that year. He said that in 3,000 matches he had lost only five.

A graduate of the University of Vienna, Mr. Zbyszko held degrees in philosophy and law. He was a musician and poet, could speak 11 languages and he appeared in a movie based on his life.

His brother, Wladek, who survives him, was also a wrestler. Stanislaus's health began failing two years ago, and the brothers had lived in a nursing home in Savannah.

MOVED ONCE IN HALF HOUR

John Lardner, the sports writer, once recalled: "As a boy, I saw Hans Steinke and Stanislaus Zbyszko wrestle honestly in a hall in Great Neck, L.I. At 10:45, when my family took me home, without resistance, the pachyderms had moved once in half an hour—when Steinke's nose twitched."

The subsequent decline of wrestling, the bald and burly Mr. Zbyszko, wrote 15 years ago to Arthur Daley, sports columnist of the New York Times:

"Personally I enjoyed every wrestling match I was in, regardless of whether I was winner or loser. The wonderful sport of wrestling was highly respected then and surely it will survive this period of degradation and deception. It hurts me to see it dragged in the gutter."

DID HIS SON DIE IN VAIN?

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. Baring] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, I received a letter today from a father who lost his son in Vietnam. It is a most thought-provoking letter and I urge my colleagues to read it. The father seeks an answer from all of us. Did his son die in vain?

Huntington Park, Calif.,
October 3, 1967.

Representative Walter S. Baring,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Representative Baring: I am writing this letter for my dead son Lieutenant Dennis W. Peterson, U.S.N., a command helicopter pilot, who was killed in North Vietnam July 19, 1967.

It is written with hope and a prayer that he did not die in vain.

Dennis didn't understand the war and in so doing didn't believe in it. Do you? He thought the war was serving no useful purpose—only an endless waste of men and supplies.

Last year after he returned from his first tour of duty in Vietnam he said, "Dad, we're not really trying to win this war. Bombers take off on bombing missions with only a half load of bombs. The most important targets are not bombed—secondary targets are used, yet our men are still sacrificed. If we wanted to stop the war, all that would be necessary would be the mining of the harbors of Hanoi and Haiphong. Every day we see Russian ships enter the ports loaded to the gunnels with war supplies and leave riding high and dry, yet we can't do a single thing to stop them. Boy, it sure is a lousy way to fight a war!"

Why is it that our memories are so short? During the late thirties Germany could have been stopped, but no, the cry went out that the U.S. should not provoke a war. We kept on sending steel to Japan even though we knew she was expanding her fleet of warships at our expense.

Now the cry is the same, only louder, "Don't make Red China mad. Be careful, don't antagonize Communist Russia. Don't provoke a full scale war." Believe me, there is no such thing as a small war. The boys who are wounded are affected for life—the boys who are killed are gone forever—wasted and sacrificed. Only our best men qualify for duty.

The big trouble with the United States and its people is that they want to be the "good" guys. They don't want to hurt anyone's feelings.

Actually the attitude stems from the home—Mother and Father want junior to love them and in so doing do not demand respect. No doubt more ground is lost when discipline is not administered. Gifts and bribes are common. "Be a good boy and Mother will buy you a new toy." Respect for authority is lost. The disrespect that is shown to our teachers and our policemen is all too common and the daily newspapers bear this out. Authority is held in contempt, thus respect for law and order is lost.

The nation is no better trying to buy goodwill and respect by giving relief and welfare to the rest of the world. Trying to buy respect through gifts has failed. People make up nations and consequently lost self respect when they accept charity or relief.

The United States is not respected by the other nations of the world. This disrespect is mainly due to the fact the U.S. vascillates rather than taking a firm stand on world issues. As an example, take communism. How is it possible to be involved in athletic contests and cultural exchange on one front, business and trade on another, and still fight a war on another? Two brothers, one an athlete and the other a soldier, may both win medals, however, the soldier must die to win his. Like Dennis said, "What a lousy way to fight a war."

Did my son die in vain? I feel I might be able to justify his death if he had died believing that he was fighting a useful war—one with an objective and purpose. How am I going to explain this sacrifice to his children ten or fifteen years from now?

The best men we have are being killed and wounded every day. Can this be justified in any sense of the word? How many more good men will be killed before it is stopped? Believe me, I know grief. I've lost the finest son that any man ever had. I grieve now for all fathers who will lose their sons if the conflict is allowed to continue.

Now, now is the time to do something to bring this war to a climax. I demand that my government do everything in its power to bring this horrible war to a successful conclusion as quickly as possible. Let's win the war and get out. Bring our boys home.

Sincerely,

Dudley H. Peterson.

TIME FOR CONGRESS TO ACT

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. Baring] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, I should like to commend to the attention of my colleagues the following letter that was addressed to myself and my good friend and colleague, Representative Durward G. Hall.

The author of this letter, Frank Upman, Jr., is a man that I have known for 30 years, a man who served on the two Hoover Commissions and as a staff director over all of the second Commission.

Frank Upman has long been alined with Government affairs on Capitol Hill, and the contents of his letter I feel should be read by every Member of Congress. His thoughts are indicated in the bulk of the mail that I am getting today.

The letter follows:

Congressman Walter S. Baring,
Congressman Durwald G. Hall,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Walter and Doc: This is likely to turn out to be the most difficult letter I've ever undertaken to write—yet it must be written. Some, perhaps much, of what I shall say could well offend even some of my friends. Nevertheless, all of it must be said, and—while it is with malice of forethought toward none—it is said without excuse or apology.

The letter is being addressed to the two of you as friends whom I cherish, and Congressmen that I hold in high esteem. In turn, it is written not so much to you as through you to every Member of Congress. I say not so much to you because I am fully cognizant that each of you have consistently spoken out against the acts and things which bring us to our present sorry State of the Union.

As you both are aware, I have experienced extensive and quite varied exposure to Government and world events pretty continually ever since 1928—which is a fair period of time by anybody's measure. It included knowing personally four Presidents—with intimate contact with two, and long personal association with one right up to the time of his passing. In addition, as perhaps Walter knows as well as anyone, it has been my privilege to have close association with a great many Members of the United States Congress. A number of these developed into friendships which I have cherished during the years.

All of which I feel contributed to my acquiring a greater and more meaningful understanding of our constitutional form of government—the "American Republic." And, believe me gentlemen it was something to cherish, something to sing about, to be proud of, and fight for when necessary. It was not perfect by a damn-sight—no fool's utopia, or fabian liberal's dream. Yet, it was the greatest dream ever put into practice by man—the best thing on the face of the earth, and far better than anything man shall ever find, or think he finds in space.

I say *was* because this is no longer true. Now, as an American who once walked proudly, I am forced to hang my head in shame and despair as I daily see our cities plundered, burned and destroyed. My heart is filled with bitter anger that my government condones this and even alibis for those who do it—while, at the same time, fighting a war of attrition in Vietnam—a war which it refuses to fight to win. Yes, for the first time in my life, I am ashamed to call myself an American.

How has all this come about?

It has come to be because we—the people—listened to false prophets, who misled us and then caused us, for the first time in our history, to cringe and draw back in fear. Ever since then we as a people—including the Congress, as the people's representatives—have been prime subjects of national blackmail.

Who is to blame?

We are to blame, every one of us. Every citizen who existed in a state of apathy while the government stole his birthright piece by piece, and then sold it for a cup of political porridge. A porridge which has now turned to a steaming caldron of rancid stew.

With further regard to the how's and the who's, it is wise to remember that—in politics and diplomacy, as in war, it is the act and the result of that act which counts, not the motive. For motive is important only in meting out punishment, not in assessing error. Perhaps some who have sheltered or carried the torch for Communists, both in and out of government and elsewhere in the world, did so for reasons which we might respect. But there should be only anger and scorn for the strategy of "False Liberalism" which defends the motive by denying that the overt act was committed.

Today, we can no longer deny—even to ourselves—that the overt acts exist. They are there, living, burning, terrible things for everyone to see and feel. Now, it is solely a question of the *"Safety of the People."* The saving of the Republic *now*—at whatever cost—with no further appeasement or acceptance of blackmail. Otherwise our country, our homes, our families and many of our lives are lost.

While we must all share in the blame for the disgrace which has befallen this once proud land of ours, if we are to promptly stop the overt acts and repair the damage already done, we must unhesitatingly place the finger of guilt on those who committed the overt acts. Not only those who held the gun, or the firebrand—but those who handed them the gun, or firebrand. For history shows that men and nations learn by their mistakes, but only if they recognize them as such.

As to the riots, the burning, the looting of our cities—it is natural to think first in terms of the Stokely Carmichael's the Rap Brown's and the Martin Luther King's just to mention a few. And mind you, one is just as bad as the other—they merely operate in different ways. However, they are all from the same cloth and—like puppets—pulled by the same strings. They are the scum on the caldron of our rancid stew, and of course they should be quickly and severely dealt with. Which is something our government leaders can do anytime they mount the courage of a field mouse on the lam. Their refusal to do so is tampering with the safety of the nation, and may already be responsible for the death of scores of innocent people.

It is suicidal to longer ignore, or excuse the extent to which the acts of government, and the statements of high government officials have helped to provide the climate which spawned and nurtured the likes of Brown, Carmichael and King. Without these none of them would have dared to preach violence, or commit their acts of insurrection and treason.

As an example of such a statement by a high government official, consider for a moment the speech which President Johnson made from the south lawn of the White House, August 3, 1965 when he said. . . . "Free speech, free press, free religion, the right of free assembly, yes the right of petition, the right to buy ads, and to have sit-ins, teach-ins and parades and marches and demonstrations—well they're still radical ideas. And so is the principle of equal dignity. . . . I hope that you will go out into the hinterland and rouse the masses and blow the bugles and tell them that the hour has arrived and their day is here; that we are on the march against the ancient enemies and we are going to be successful."

Six days later we had the Watts riots and we've had a surge of rioting, burning, killing and looting ever since. In 1966 almost 3½ million serious crimes were reported. It is estimated they will run well over 4 million in 1967. And these are entirely apart from the riots, which this year have already hit 63 cities and towns—some two, three and four times.

No amount of spending on the multitude of so-called "War on Poverty" programs, for any other government programs, will ever restore law and order in our nation. Quite to to the contrary, these programs, these expenditures and these give-aways merely add fuel to the fires, and often directly provide the funds needed for the riots. Instead of free-loading and arming those who do the rioting, we should arm the police, National Guard and regular soldiers whom we call upon to stop the rioting.

Today, the present administration has reached the lowest rating with the people of any in our history. Also, the feeling of the great majority of the people runs much deeper than a matter of rating. It implies disgust, and a complete lack of either respect, or trust for the President and those who serve him. Further, this disrespect and lack of faith is openly expressed not only as to the President, but as to the Vice-President and other top officials. Those most often included by name are the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Commissioner of Education, our Ambassador to the United Nations and the Attorney General.

As a result the people are today looking to the Congress as never before. They are desperately hoping the Congress will stop being a rubber stamp and fully reclaim the powers delegated by the Constitution to the Congress. In fact, the mood of the people may fast be approaching the point where, if the Congress does not do so, the people may themselves. The people are fed up with half truths, bureaucratic gobble-dy-gook and just plain lies. They are fed up with the rioting at home, and failure to win the war in Vietnam.

I believe the people have the right to expect that the Congress will reassert itself and take the necessary steps to save the Republic. And save it we must, my friends, for the great common-sense and unique qualities embodied in the American constitutional system are truly a heritage too precious to lose.

With warm regards, and best wishes to you both,

Sincerely,

Frank Upman, Jr.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. Kupferman (at the request of Mr. Arends), for Monday, October 16, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. Gross, today, for 30 minutes; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. Dorn.

Mr. Reuss.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Mize) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Rumsfeld.

Mr. Zwach.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. Waldie) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Donohue.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on October 4, 1967, present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 853. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, October 9, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HALEY: Committee of conference. H.R. 678. An act to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Upper and Lower Chehalis Tribes of Indians in Claims Commission docket No. 237, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 735). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 13338. A bill to amend section 2(3) and section 8c(6)(I) of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BUSH:

H.R. 13339. A bill to amend section 2204 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a method for the discharge of fiduciaries from personal liability for the estate tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 13340. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 13341. A bill to repeal the tax exemptions of Federal land banks and Federal land bank associations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 13342. A bill to expand and improve the provisions of the Oil Pollution Act, 1924; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 13343. A bill to require reports to Congress of certain actions of the Federal

Power Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 13344. A bill to insure that public buildings financed with Federal funds are so designed and constructed as to be accessible to the physically handicapped; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HARSHA:

H.R. 13345. A bill arranging for orderly marketing of certain imported articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LLOYD:

H.R. 13346. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make it unlawful to assault or kill any member of the armed services engaged in the performance of his official duties while on duty under orders of the President under chapter 15 of title 10 of the United States Code or paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 3500 of title 10 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H.R. 13347. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on whole skins of mink, whether or not dressed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 13348. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide special assistance for the improvement of laboratory animal research facilities, to establish standards for the humane care, handling, and treatment of laboratory animals in departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States and by recipients of grants, awards, and contracts from the United States, to encourage the study and improvement of the care, handling, and treatment and the development of methods for minimizing pain and discomfort of laboratory animals used in biomedical activities, and to otherwise assure humane care, handling, and treatment of laboratory animals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.J. Res. 875. Joint resolution creating a Federal Committee on Nuclear Development to review and reevaluate the existing civilian nuclear program of the United States; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.J. Res. 876. Joint resolution expressing opposition to vesting title to the ocean floor in the United Nations at this time; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MacGREGOR:

H. Res. 940. Resolution relating to rescission of appropriations for civil supersonic aircraft development; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 13349. A bill for the relief of certain individuals employed by the Department of the Interior as members of the U.S. Park Police; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 13350. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jacques Sauvage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 13351. A bill for the relief of Ana Yap-Diangco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 13352. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Albertina Mejia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 13353. A bill for the relief of Dr. Isaac Cohen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13354. A bill for the relief of Capt. Bruce E. Wiita, U.S Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr. VAN DEERLIN:

H.R. 13355. A bill for the relief of Aristeo Rodriguez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13356. A bill for the relief of J. Jesus Vasquez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 5, 1967

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray:

O God of grace and glory, in whose love and wisdom lies all our help and hope, in these hectic and explosive days may we be strengthened with might and our jaded souls refreshed as Thou dost lead us into green pastures and beside still waters.

By Thine enabling grace may the ruling passions and the deepest desires of those who here are called to serve the entire Nation be worthy for the facing of this hour.

Spirit of purity and grace,
Our weakness pitying see,
O make our hearts Thy dwelling place,
And worthier of Thee.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, October 4, 1967, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a brief morning hour and that there be a time limitation of 3 minutes on statements.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRANSPORTATION OF MAIL BY SEA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 51, H.R. 3979.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 3979) to amend section 6409(b)(1) of title 39, United States Code, which relates to transportation compensation paid by the Postmaster General.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 578), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This legislation would remove the statutory ceiling on rates payable ocean vessels of U.S. registry for the transportation of mail. The present legal limit is 80 cents per pound for letters and cards and 8 cents for other mail. Very little letter mail is carried by ship, and since 1954 the Postmaster General has paid on the basis of 8 cents per pound for all mail.

Rates paid are determined, subject to the ceiling, by the Postmaster General. Prior to this year, the maximum rate was greater than the international rate established by the Universal Postal Union Convention. In 1966, the convention established a new rate schedule, the maximum of which is greater than the legal ceiling paid by the Federal Government to U.S. vessels.

The rates now in effect are as follows:

COMPARISON OF RATES PAID BY POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT FOR OCEAN TRANSPORTATION OF INTERNATIONAL MAILS WITH RATES ADOPTED JAN. 1, 1966, BY UPU COUNTRIES FOR SETTLEMENT OF ACCOUNTS IN OCEAN TRANSPORTATION OF INTERNATIONAL MAILS

Miles	Post Office Department rates in cents per pound [39 CFR 94.5(a)]	
	U.S.-flag vessels	Universal Postal Union settlement rate
Up to 300	3.6	2.8
301 to 600	3.6	4.0
601 to 1,000	3.6	4.9
1,001 to 1,500	4.1	5.6
1,501 to 2,000	5.4	6.4
2,001 to 2,500	5.4	7.0
2,501 to 3,000	5.4	7.4
3,001 to 3,500	5.8	7.9
3,501 to 4,000	6.1	8.3
4,001 to 5,000	6.4	8.9
5,001 to 6,000	7.0	9.5
6,001 to 7,000	7.5	10.2
7,001 to 8,000	7.8	10.7
Over 8,000	8.0	11.3

The legal ceiling results in some American ships being paid a lower rate by our Government for mail transportation than they are paid by foreign governments.

Because the maximum rate has been reached for certain long-haul services, no further increase can be made regardless of the justification for such increases.

H.R. 3979 will permit such adjustments by the Postmaster General when evidence indicates that increases are justified.

COST

There is no cost directly attributable to the enactment of this legislation. The Post Office Department has paid an average of $10,867,000 each year for the past 9 years for ocean mail transportation, and the figure for any year has not changed appreciably despite the periodic adjustment of individual haul rates. No increase in cost will occur until rates of compensation are actually adjusted upward by the Postmaster General.

About 76 percent of all payments are made to ships of U.S. registry. There is a legal requirement that the Post Office Department utilize U.S. ships when possible (39 U.S.C. 6104).

Public hearings were held before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service in the House of Representatives on April 11, 1967.

PRESERVATION OF SAFETY AND ORDER WITHIN THE U.S. CAPITOL BUILDINGS AND CAPITOL GROUNDS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 558, S. 2310.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2310) to provide more effectively for the regulation of the use of, and for the preservation of safety and order within the U.S. Capitol buildings and the U.S. Capitol Grounds.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. METCALF). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert:

That (a) the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to define the area of the United States Capitol Grounds, to regulate the use thereof, and for other purposes", approved July 31, 1946 (60 Stat. 718; 40 U.S.C. 193a; D.C. Code 9–118), is amended by—

(1) inserting therein, immediately after the words "book 127, page 8,", the words "including all additions added thereto by law subsequent to June 25, 1946,"; and

(2) striking out the words "as defined on the aforementioned map".

(b) Section 6 of that Act (40 U.S.C. 193f; D.C. Code 9–123) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 6. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person or group of persons—

"(1) Except as authorized by regulations which shall be promulgated by the Capitol Police Board:

"(A) to carry on or have readily accessible to the person of any individual upon the United States Capitol Grounds or within any of the Capitol Buildings any firearm, dangerous weapon, explosive, or incendiary device;

"(B) to discharge any firearm or explosive, to use any dangerous weapon, or to ignite any incendiary device, upon the United States Capitol Grounds or within any of the Capitol Buildings; or

"(C) to transport by any means upon the United States Capitol Grounds or within any of the Capitol Buildings any explosive or incendiary device; or

"(2) Knowingly, with force and violence, to enter or to remain upon the floor of either House of the Congress.

"(b) It shall be unlawful for any person or group of persons willfully—

"(1) to enter or to remain upon the floor of either House of the Congress, to enter or to remain in any cloakroom or lobby adjacent to such floor, or to enter or to remain in the Marble Room of the Senate, unless such person is authorized, pursuant to rules adopted by that House or pursuant to authorization given by that House, to enter or to remain upon such floor or in such cloakroom, lobby, or room;

"(2) to enter or to remain in the gallery of either House of the Congress in violation of rules governing admission to such gallery adopted by that House or pursuant to authorization given by that House;

"(3) to enter or to remain in any room within any of the Capitol Buildings set aside or designated for the use of either House of the Congress or any Member, committee, subcommittee, officer, or employee of the Congress or either House thereof with intent to disrupt the orderly conduct of official business;

"(4) to utter loud, threatening, or abusive language, or to engage in any disorderly or disruptive conduct, at any place upon the United States Capitol Grounds or within any of the Capitol Buildings with intent to impede, disrupt, or disturb the orderly conduct of any session of the Congress or either House thereof, or the orderly conduct within any such building of any hearing before, or any deliberations of, any committee or subcommittee of the Congress or either House thereof;

"(5) to obstruct, or to impede passage through or within, the United States Capitol Grounds or any of the Capitol Buildings; or

"(6) to engage in any act of physical violence upon the United States Capitol Grounds or within any of the Capitol Buildings; or

"(7) to parade, demonstrate, or picket within any of the Capitol Buildings."

"(c) Nothing contained in this section shall forbid any act of any Member of the Congress, or any employee of a Member of the Congress, any officer or employee of the Congress or any committee or subcommittee thereof, or any officer or employee of either House of the Congress or any committee or subcommittee thereof, which is performed in the lawful discharge of his official duties."

(c) Section 8 of that Act (40 U.S.C. 193h; D.C. Code 9–125) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 8. (a) Any violation of section 6(a) of this Act, and any attempt to commit any such violation, shall be a felony punishable by a fine not exceeding $5,000, or imprisonment not exceeding five years, or both.

"(b) Any violation of section 2, 3, 4, 5, 6(b), or (7) of this Act, and any attempt to commit any such violation, shall be a misdemeanor punishable by a fine not exceeding $500, or imprisonment not exceeding six months, or both.

"(c) Violations of this Act, including attempts and conspiracies to commit such violations, shall be prosecuted by the United States Attorney or his assistants in the name of the United States. None of the general laws of the United States and none of the laws of the District of Columbia shall be superseded by any provision of this Act. Where the conduct violating this Act also violates the general laws of the United States or the laws of the District of Columbia, both violations may be joined in a single prosecution. Prosecution for any violation of section 6(a) or for conduct which constitutes a felony under the general laws of the United States or the laws of the District of Columbia shall be in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. All other prosecutions for violations of this Act shall be in the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions. Whenever any person is convicted of a violation of this Act and of the general laws of the United States or the laws of the District of Columbia, in a prosecution under this subsection, the penalty which may be imposed for such violation is the highest penalty authorized by any of the laws for violation of which the defendant is convicted."

(d) Section 16(a) of that Act (40 U.S.C. 193m; D.C. Code 9–132) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 16. (a) As used in this Act—

"(1) The term 'Capitol Buildings' shall be construed to include all buildings or other structures situated upon or located within the boundaries of the United States Capitol Grounds and all subways and enclosed passages connecting two or more of those buildings.

"(2) The term 'firearm' shall have the same meaning as when used in section 1(3) of the Federal Firearms Act (52 Stat. 1252, as amended; 15 U.S.C. 901(3)).

"(3) The term 'dangerous weapon' includes all articles enumerated in section 14(a) of the Act of July 8, 1932 (47 Stat. 654, as amended; D.C. Code 22–3214(a)) and also daggers, dirks, stilettoes, and knives having blades over three inches in length.

"(4) The term 'explosive' shall have the same meaning as when used in section 1(1) of the Act of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 385, as amended; 50 U.S.C. 121).

(5) The term 'act of physical violence' means any act involving (1) an assault or any other infliction or threat of infliction of death or bodily harm upon any individual, or (2) damage to or destruction of any real property or personal property."

SEC. 2. Section 15 of the Act of July 29, 1892 (27 Stat. 325; 40 U.S.C. 101; D.C. Code 4–120, 22–3111) is amended by deleting "shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $50", and inserting in lieu thereof: "shall be fined not more than $500, or imprisoned not more than six months, or both."

SEC. 3. Prosecutions for violations of the Act of July 31, 1946 (60 Stat. 718; 40 U.S.C. 193a et seq.; D.C. Code 9–118 et seq.) and of section 15 of the Act of July 29, 1892 (27 Stat. 325; D.C. Code 4–120, 22–3111) occurring prior to the enactment of these amendments shall not be affected by these amendments or abated by reason thereof. The provisions of this Act shall be applicable to violations occurring after its enactment.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I call up S. 2310, a bill to amend the present laws on security of the Capitol buildings and Grounds.

Mr. President, in 1892 the Congress passed the law pertaining to the conduct of persons in public buildings and on public grounds within the District of Columbia and in 1946 the Congress passed another law pertaining to the conduct of persons on the Capitol Grounds.

There has been considerable confusion in the courts in recent years as to whether the 1946 law actually applied to the Capitol Building and other buildings on the Capitol Grounds or applied specifically to Capitol Grounds.

In recent months there has been an increasing number of instances in the Capitol Building and in the other Capitol buildings which I thought should be dealt with much more severely than in the past. The old law provides that a simple misdemeanor carry a fine not to exceed $50.

S. 2310 amends the act of 1946 by thoroughly revising section 6 of that act and by making it clear that the offenses enumerated and prohibited therein apply with equal force in the Capitol buildings as well as on the Capitol Grounds.

This bill does not change section 7 of the 1946 act as the witnesses who testified before the committee stated that while no arrests and convictions had ever been made under this act, at the same time it had served a good purpose in deterring mobs and unruly groups before they arrived at or in the Capitol buildings, and I would like to further point out that no peaceful gathering or parade has ever been questioned nor will it be, but that this bill is designed entirely to enforce law and order in the Capitol buildings as well as on the Capitol Grounds.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send

to the desk a technical amendment to the committee amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the amendment, as follows:

On page 11, strike out line 3 through line 8 and insert in lieu thereof:

"Sec. 2. Section 15 of the Act of July 29, 1892 (27 Stat. 325; 40 U.S.C. 101; D.C. Code 22–3111), is amended by deleting 'shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $50', and inserting in lieu thereof: 'shall be punished according to the laws and regulations within the District of Columbia, or shall be fined not more than $500, or imprisoned not more than six months, or both, whichever is greater.' "

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, section 2 is intended to eliminate the artificial limitation contained in existing law—40 U.S.C. 101; D.C. Code 22–3111—on the penalties for disorderly conduct and injuries to property in public buildings and on public grounds belonging to the United States in the District of Columbia. In many cases involving misdemeanors, the new penalty under amended 40 U.S.C. 101 will be substantially greater than the applicable penalty under other provisions of law. For example, the maximum penalty for disorderly conduct is a fine of $250 or imprisonment for 90 days. D.C. Code 22–1107, 1121. In some cases, however, especially those involving injury to property, the unlawful conduct may constitute a felony under existing law. In such cases, penalties more severe than those under 40 U.S.C. 101, even as amended by H.R. 13178, should be applicable. The amendment proposed herein would make clear that 40 U.S.C. 101 is not intended to limit the imposition of heavier penalties under other laws of the District of Columbia.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, S. 2310, as reported by the Senate Committee on Public Works, under the able leadership of the Senator from North Carolina, Senator Jordan, is intended to provide proper protection for the legislative process of the Congress and for orderly conduct within the Capitol and the buildings and offices used by the Congress.

The bill, in my view—and I must say that the committee, under the leadership of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Jordan], gave very careful attention to this point—protects and secures the constitutional right of the people under the first amendment of the Constitution "peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

The bill also provides penalties for those who willfully or with force and violence obstruct the legislative process. This is necessary and constitutional. The first amendment does not protect anarchy.

The provisions of the bill are directed to the Capitol and the buildings used by the Congress. It does not deal specifically with the Capitol Grounds. I thought it would be well to provide legislation for protection of the Capitol Grounds, because some of the present statutes seem to be inadequate and also constitutionally doubtful. But we dealt with the buildings.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point my separate views which are printed in the report accompanying S. 2310. I hope that these matters will later be considered by our committee.

There being no objection, the views were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Separate Views of Mr. Cooper

The overwhelming number of the people of our country who visit the Congress with the purpose of making their views known on legislation and other matters within the jurisdiction of the Congress, do so in the spirit of the first amendment to the Constitution. They have the unquestioned right to do so under the first amendment, and under the principle of a free and democratic government. If there are groups whose purpose in coming to the Capitol is to disrupt or attempt to stop the very legislative process required by the Constitution, appropriate and constitutional protection must be provided, as S. 2310 proposes, against such an assertion of anarchy.

Senate bill 2310 directs attention to two principal considerations: It involves the right, at the Capitol of the United States, of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition their Government. And, it deals with the preservation of safety and order upon the U.S. Capitol Grounds and within the Capitol Buildings, including the protection of the proceedings of the Congress from interference and disruption.

With respect to the second issue, the committee bill prohibits upon the Capitol Grounds and within the Capitol Buildings specific acts done with the intent, or which could have the effect, of interfering with or disrupting the legislative process. Such provisions are legal and constitutional, are necessary for the orderly dispatch of the business of Congress, and I strongly support their purpose.

With respect to the first issue, the first amendment to the Constitution states:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

The act of July 31, 1946 (60 Stat. 718), which Senate bill 2310 otherwise amends, contains a section 7 (40 USC 193g), which states:

"Sec. 7. It is forbidden to parade, *stand, or move* in processions or *assemblages* in said United States Capitol Grounds, or to display therein any flag, banner, or device designed or adapted to bring into public notice any party, organization, or movement, except as hereinafter provided in sections 11 and 12 of this Act." [Emphasis supplied.]

Being an absolute prohibition against parades and assemblages on the Capitol Grounds, section 7 negates that mode of exercising the rights of peaceable assembly and petition, and contradicts the guarantee of the first amendment. However, the committee bill as reported contains no reference to section 7 of existing law.

At the public hearing held by the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds, testimony was directed to section 7. In the committee, it was variously proposed that section 7 be repealed, that notice of the intention to parade, demonstrate or picket be required, or that a system of regulation be established—all in my view appropriate and constitutional means of dealing with the issue.

Section 6 of the same act forbids, among other things, the making of any harangue or oration on the Capitol Grounds. In amending section 6, the committee bill properly omits that prohibition and thus repeals it. Despite the fact the committee bill in new section 6 provides for the prohibition of acts which could go beyond the proper limits of first amendment rights, S. 2310 as reported fails to deal with the problems obvious on the face of section 7.

The U.S. district attorney testified that, so far as he knew, no prosecution had ever been brought under section 7. There has never been a final test of section 7 in the courts. Mr. David G. Bress, U.S. district attorney, also stated that he foresaw no problem of enforcement, given the new provisions of the committee bill, if section 7 were repealed or amended.

It is improper in my view for the Congress to rely on a general provision of doubtful constitutionality as a means of preserving order upon the Capitol Grounds, or to give the appearance of doing so. The committee bill itself contains specific and effective prohibitions which are consonant with the rights of assembly and petition.

We have the right and the duty to protect and maintain the ability of Congress to act. We expect that the rights of freedom of speech, of peaceable assembly, and of petition be exercised responsibly and within constitutional limits. But there is no more appropriate place to petition the Government than at the seat of the Federal Government. I do not believe the Congress wants to fence away the first amendment from its front door.

In the committee, I voted to repeal section 7 (40 U.S.C. 193g). I believe it appropriate to repeal or amend the section, especially in view of the much more specific provisions which S. 2310 would make available for the security of the Capitol buildings and Grounds.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, in the Public Works Subcommittee and then in committee, I expressed my views in opposition to this bill S. 2310. Mr. President, I filed individual views. My judgment is the same now as then. I voice no objection whatever to a unanimous-consent request to bring this bill before the Senate for consideration. However, as I am now just as much opposed to the enactment of this amended bill into law as I was in committee, my voice and vote is against its passage.

Mr. President, in opposition to this legislative proposal I maintain it is neither necessary nor desirable. There are already ample laws in the Federal Criminal Code on this subject matter. Frankly, I am of the opinion that enacting new statutes wherein fines up to $5,000 or imprisonment up to 5 years, or both, are provided as penalties is the wrong approach. Personally I believe that punishment, like a shadow, should follow the commission of offenses against our laws. However, we now have ample laws. We do not always have judges with sufficient backbone to enforce them. It seems that when a legislative body has nothing better to do, it creates additional crimes.

I was particularly disappointed that the Senate Committee on Public Works did not repeal section 7 of Public Law 570, the statute which now regulates the use of the U.S. Capitol Building and Grounds. Section 7 provides:

> It is forbidden to parade, stand, or move in processions or assemblages in said United States Capitol Grounds, or to display therein any flag, banner, or device designed or adapted to bring into public notice any party, organization, or movement, except as hereinafter provided in sections 11 and 12 of this Act.

The exceptions set forth in sections 11 and 12 relate to "suitable ceremonies" celebrating occasions of national interest.

As the distinguished junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], and I stated in our separate views embodied in the committee report, this provision is clearly in violation of the first amendment to the U.S. Constitution. The first amendment to the Constitution of our country was written on the demand of the men who won the Revolutionary War. Of the first 10 amendments to the Constitution, which we affectionately term the Bill of Rights, certainly the first is the most sacrosanct. It reads as follows:

> Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble; and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

Under any reasonable interpretation, section 7 runs afoul of the interpretation of the first amendment by the Supreme Court in *Edwards v. South Carolina*, 372 U.S. 229 (1963). Until the Supreme Court spoke in the Edwards case, it was constitutionally permissible for Congress to quarantine itself from the people by forbidding any kind of demonstrations or assemblage on the Capitol Grounds. That is no longer true.

In Edwards against South Carolina, eight members of the U.S. Supreme Court recognized that a demonstration on the driveway in front of the South Carolina statehouse while the legislature was in session was protected by the first amendment. Even though the demonstrators sang songs, cheered, clapped, and stomped, there was no showing there was any interference with the legislature's duties. The Court stated:

> The circumstances in this case reflect an exercise of basic constitutional rights in their most pristine and classic form. . . . They peaceably assembled at the site of the State Government and there peaceably expressed their grievances to the citizens of South Carolina, along with the legislative bodies of South Carolina.

The Court went on to say:

> We do not review in this case criminal convictions resulting from the even-handed application of a precise and narrowly drawn regulatory statute evincing a legislative judgment that certain specific conduct be limited or proscribed.

It is clear that section 7 of the act of July 31, 1946, does not meet the criteria laid down by the Court. The people do have the right, under the first amendment, to stage peaceful demonstrations on the Capitol Grounds. This is precisely the place where citizens would be expected to petition for a redress of grievances.

The Congress of the United States must not have its work interfered with or unduly disturbed. Therefore, it is proper for Congress to prohibit demonstrations within the Capitol Building itself. On the other hand, Congress should not quarantine itself from contact with the public, so that the people's right to petition is limited to the quiet, sedate channels of congressional mail and committee hearings.

Of course, a narrowly drawn regulatory statute, evincing legislative judgment that certain specific conduct be limited or proscribed, is permissible. It could, for example, reasonably limit the periods during which the Capitol Grounds are open to the public. It could place controls on where people are to march, so they do not unduly burden traffic or access or egress to the Capitol. However, such statutes would be a far cry from the present flat ban against demonstration, picketing, or parades on the Capitol Grounds.

For the Congress to fail to recognize its duty in repealing section 7 would be to follow the example of many State legislatures which have refused to acknowledge Supreme Court decisions declaring various forms of segregation as unconstitutional. For the Congress of the United States to follow such examples by refusing to repeal section 7 is, or should be, unthinkable.

The provisions contained in the pending bill are more than adequate to quell riotous or disorderly behavior or actions which, in fact, interfere with the work of the Congress. I approved of those provisions and so voted in committee.

In addition, I spoke out in the Public Works Committee in favor of striking from this bill the language which included "conspiracies to commit such violations" as punishable under the proposed act. Unfortunately, in conspiracy cases evidence not admissible in other criminal cases by reason of its hearsay character becomes admissible. In my view it is evil to permit the conviction of persons accused of crime on the basis of hearsay evidence.

In his autobiography, a great American trial lawyer, Clarence Darrow, stated his views in the following language:

> If there are still any citizens interested in protecting human liberty, let them study the conspiracy laws of the United States. They have grown apace in the last forty years until today no ones liberty is safe. The conspiracy laws magnify misdeameanors into serious felonies. If a boy should steal a dime a small fine should cover the offense—he could not be sent to the penitentiary. But if two boys by agreement should steal a dime both of them could be sent to the penitentiary as conspirators. Not only could they be, but boys are constantly being sent under similar circumstances.
>
> If A is indicted and a conspiracy charged, or even if it is not charged, the State's attorney is allowed to prove what A said to B and what B said to C while the defendant was not present. Then he can prove what C said to D and what D said to E and so on, to the end of the alphabet, and after the letters are used up the State's attorney can resort to figures for so long a stretch as he cares to continue. To make this hearsay or gossip competent, the State's attorney informs the Court that later he will connect it up by showing that the defendant was informed of the various conversations, or that he otherwise had acknowledge of them. Thereupon, the complaisant judge holds that the evidence is admissable, but if it is not connected up it will be stricken out. A week or month may pass by and then a motion is made to strike it out. By that time it is of no consequence whether it is stricken out or not, it had entered the jurors' consciousness with a mess of other matter, and altogether it has made an impression on his mind. What particular thing made the impression, neither the juror or anyone else can know.

He also included the following definition of conspiracy:

> Conspiracy—the modern and ancient dragnet for compassing the imprisonment and death whom the ruling class does not like.

Mr. President, while I feel that additional legislation in this area is not really necessary, I can support the bill provided that section 7 of Public Law 570 is repealed. Otherwise, I cannot in good conscience vote for legislation which allows a patently unconstitutional provision to remain on the statute books.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, S. 2310 is a measure that I believe will substantially increase the security of the Capitol buildings and Grounds and, at the same time, provide additional assurance that the work of the Congress can proceed with dignity and order.

We have recently witnessed two disgraceful episodes affecting the work of the Senate. One occurred in this Chamber itself when demonstrators in the gallery dropped leaflets, opposing the war in Vietnam, to the Senate floor. The other took place in a Senate committee room when relief recipients demonstrated against legislative proposals before the committee.

If these occurrences had been allowed to pass without notice or action, more violent demonstrations might well have followed them, for, as I have stated before, I believe these things to be part of a pattern of disorder deliberately calculated to create a crisis in the operations of our Government.

The bill we are about to pass today corrects a serious omission in the previously existing Capitol Grounds Act, which prohibited disorderly, disruptive, or dangerous conduct on the Capitol Grounds but did not prohibit such conduct within the buildings themselves. This situation had been further confused by the fact that the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia had held that the general laws applicable to disorderly conduct in the District did not apply with equal force to the Capitol buildings or Grounds. I am happy to say that that anomaly should now be removed. I am also glad that the penalties for conduct aimed at hampering the work of the Congress will be substantially increased.

Mr. President, breaches of the peace have occurred within the Capitol and adjacent buildings from time to time over the years. But it is the recent increase of such incidents that makes this legislation so necessary.

I congratulate the distinguished majority and minority leaders of this body for their expeditious action in introducing and bringing this measure to speedy enactment, and I commend the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN] and the Committee on Public Works, of which my esteemed colleague from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] is chairman, for the dispatch with which this matter was handled.

There is no question, of course, of the right of all Americans to give public expression to their views, whatever those views may be. The right to dissent is a legitimate and cherished right. I feel that the committee took this principle into full account, and that this legislation in no way interferes with or infringes upon the guarantees of free speech and expression provided in the Constitution. There are innumerable channels and avenues open to all for expression and for dissent.

What this bill does, in the excellent phrase of the committee report, is to erect new safeguards for "the integrity of the legislative process." It is as important to the future of this Nation to safeguard that right as it is to protect the rights of individuals and groups in their peaceful actions and expressions.

What we have to guard against—and what this legislation is aimed at—is violent action and expression and unlawful interruption of the legislative machinery, by incipient revolutionaries. I believe, Mr. President, that this measure, if properly implemented, will prove an effective deterrent to those who would impede, harrass, or disrupt the Federal legislative processes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to provide more effectively for the regulation of the use of, and for the preservation of safety and order within, the U.S. Capitol buildings and the U.S. Capitol Grounds, and for other purposes."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

CARROLL BURKS AND THE SHORT LINE ASSOCIATION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, this month will mark the 54th annual meeting of the American Short Line Railroad Association, and the third anniversary in office of its president, Carroll P. Burks.

Short line railroads are an often overlooked but vital part of our rail system. They employ over 32,000, represent an investment estimated to be $1.6 billion, and earned in 1965 over $65 million. These rail lines can only be said to be short in terms of their main line trackage.

Carroll Burks, president of the Short Line Railroad Association, came to that association from my own Pacific Northwest, where he spent 8 years as general superintendent of the Tacoma Municipal Belt Line Railroad. Congratulations are due Carroll for his 3 years of able leadership of the 245-member railroads of the Short Line Association.

I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks an article which appeared on Carroll Burks and the Short Line Association in the September 26, 1966, issue of Railway Age.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY SHORT LINES ARE AN IMPORTANT SEGMENT OF NATION'S RAIL NETWORK—ASSOCIATION'S PRESIDENT BURKS WILL PRESIDE OVER GROUP'S 53D ANNUAL MEETING IN DENVER THIS WEEK

One place where a roll-call can be entertaining is at a meeting of short line railroads. The names of the companies at such meetings are not well-known, even in railroad circles. But they are, often in the phrase of a trainmaster who has just seen a Camas Prairie gondola, "a glory."

When Carroll P. Burks, president of the American Short Line Railroad Association, calls the group's 53rd annual meeting to order in Denver this week there will be a few old names missing. But there will be present a few new lines with intriguing names, almost enough to offset the short lines that were absorbed by Class I roads, abandoned or shut down in 1965.

MANY DIFFERENT TYPES

Short lines constitute a substantial part of the U.S. railroad plant. But they are little known except to professional short line operators and an occasional railfan with a taste for reading the fine type in Interstate Commerce Commission reports. Short lines include railroads that, literally, exist only on paper, properties that have operated in the red for 50 years and also lines whose operating ratios make some blue chip trunk lines look inefficient.

There are short lines that pay $35 dividends and there are short lines that somehow exist on a cash trickle that wouldn't keep a moderately-sized supermarket solvent. Few short lines would know what to do with a computer if they had one, but they provide direct, personal and efficient railroad service to thousands of shippers Some operate at a 19th-century pace, but they haul bricks, potash, coal, pulpwood, sugar beets, sand and even trainloads of railfans with aplomb—mostly at a profit. They are, in short, an important segment of the nation's rail network

THE PROBLEMS GET KNOTTIER

Short Line Association President Burks will be presiding over a meeting this week that will grapple with many of the same problems that a gathering of Class I roads would attempt to unravel. Despite the colorful-labeled membership, the group's 245 member lines, like the trunk roads, reflect the economic and competitive wringer through which the entire industry has gone since the depression. The 245 short lines represent 13,042 miles of main line railroad.

Not that the short lines are in any danger of becoming moribund. Far from it. There are several short lines under construction. The first new interstate railroad built in more than a quarter century (the Corinth & Counce in southwestern Tennessee) was completed just a few years ago. An even bigger road, the Sabine River & Northern, a $40-million, 35-mile road is being built from Echo, Tex., to an interchange point with the Missouri Pacific and the Kansas City Southern.

Short line fans, in fact, say that a new golden age of short lines might even be in the cards—should Congress relent and moderate the Commodities Clause in the Interstate Commerce Act that prohibits railroads from hauling traffic in which they have an interest.

But, still new problems are increasing and old problems are more pressing. Many short lines are being bought up by larger roads. Some are being abandoned. Some are caught between rising equipment-hire costs and diminishing revenues. Others are feeling the threat of trunk line competition via piggyback.

ASLRA's 245 member roads manage to perform an astonishing variety of work. The short lines may have operated only 13,042 miles of main line, but they paid more than $269 million in wages to their 32,284 employees in 1965. ASLRA President Burks notes that his member roads represent an investment of $1.6 billion and that they chalked up $528.5 million in gross operating revenues last year. More impressively, they managed to get $65,085,000 of that down to the net column—a performance that draws envious sighs from many Class I rail officers. And '66 will probably be better. Says Burks: "Short lines generally are sharing in the high rate of present general business activity."

AFTER 1966?

There are dark spots in the short lines' future however, Burks says many lines are experiencing trouble because of the increased cost of car-hire and the absolute decrease in average ton-mile revenue that has come in recent years as the trunk lines have made competion to win back traffic from the highways. "Our costs are increasing, but our revenues, to a large extent, are controlled by the Class I carriers," he says.

Some short lines, too, are not able to handle the larger cars that are pouring into the nation's carfleet. "Short lines are spending increasing sums on upgrading fixed plant, bridges, power and other things to stay alive," notes an experienced short line officer, "but it's a race trying to keep up with all the changes being effected by the large railroads." Another short line officer gloomily points out the disastrous potential for small roads if trunk lines continue to invade their territory with TOFC. Short lines everywhere are countering by entering the piggyback business themselves.

PEOPLE PROBLEMS TOO

Like the giants in railroading short lines find personnel problems bothersome. Some make extensive use of college and high school students on vacation. Wage scales, while comparable over-all to scales in national contracts (the short line wage bill amounted to about 55% of gross revenues), vary from property to property. Some short lines have no unions. Some short lines employees have better contracts than do workers on large roads. Many short lines operate on standby agreements, whereby workers get whatever national settlements provide.

There is a bright side to the situation. The jack-of-all-trades demands upon short line officers does tend to produce versatile, experienced officers whose knowledge of railroading is instinctive, wide and intimate. Says one knowledgeable personnel officer, "I have always wondered why big roads haven't raided short lines for management recruits. I would think the small roads would have some top-notch prospects."

PASSENGERS NO PROBLEM

Unlike the large roads, short lines have no passenger problems. Here and there, short lines are in the passenger business, though only seasonally and only for devoted train-lovers. The California Western, the Reader, the Strassburg Junction, the Arcadia, the New Hope & Ivy Land and others run passenger trains for railfans—and profit.

Both the short lines and the ASLRA have some long-range things going for them. While longer line-hauls are not likely they do have high percentages of originating and terminating traffic. Short lines, traditionally not equipment-owning roads, are able to concentrate their capital expenditures into projects that will directly benefit their shippers and communities.

Short lines are not likely to buy much equipment, despite growing shortages. "We're not going to get into the scramble for equipment," notes one veteran short line railroader, "unless Rule 1 of the Car Service Rules is amended to make the short line car-owner position the same as that of the trunk line car-owner."

Another short line man points out that many short lines own and lease cars, but that high per diem rates are beginning to destroy many old and valid traffic relationships. He puts it this way: "If you can make money leasing cars, the per diem rates are too high. Short lines feel car-hire charges should be a break-even proposition all-around."

Another plus for the short lines could come from repeal or amendment of the Commodities Clause which ASLRA feels has had a dampening effect upon entry into the short line field. A decision described as "too-close-for-comfort" in a 5-to-4 Supreme Court case involving a short line's traffic has probably kept some short lines from being built.

Still another plus is the financial solidity of the short lines. Many of them are owned by prosperous companies. Many are municipally owned, though a majority of short lines are either publicly or privately held. One is owned by an orphange. An oil-rich Osage Indian gave the Sand Springs Railroad in Oklahoma to the Sand Springs Orphanage. The road's three diesels handled $620,000 in business (with a net of $49,807) in 1965, with an operating ratio that trunk line men dream about.

INVOLVED IN LOCAL AFFAIRS

Roads like the Sand Springs, in fact, are the backbone of the group meeting in Denver this week. They very much tend to be intimately involved in the affairs of the towns and communities they serve. Newcomers at the ASLRA session will include the Livonia, Avon & Lakeville, the New Hope & Ivyland and the Narragansett Pier railroads. They'll lend their musical names to the short lines' hustings and probably have some of their versatile executives in attendance.

ALL OVER THE COUNTRY

Old ASLRA lines in every corner of the country, however, can match names with any companies in the country. In the East, for example, are the Moshassuck Valley and the Steelton & Highspire railroads. The South can boast of the Cape Fear Railroad, the Aberdeen & Rockfish Railroad and the Brimstone Railroad. The West and Southwest need feel no shame, not with the Marinette, Tomahawk & Western, the Advance & Puxico and other such gracing the roster of the region's short lines. The Pacific region can point with pride to the Yreka & Western, the Apache Railroad and the Condon, Kinzua & Southern.

As one astonished (and delighted) traffic officer of a major railroad said upon going through a short line roster. "It's almost enough to make one want to join 'em—to be listed with such railroads as the Boyne City Railroad and the Apalachicola Northern." Had he done his homework, he could have added that both the Boyne City and the Apalachicola Northern would rather stylishly improve the averages of any group to which they belonged—especially in net income and operating efficiency. Boyne City, with an operating ratio below 50%, and Apalachicola Northern, with a $379,888 net on a gross of $2.3 million, seem able to railroad with the best in the field.

WHO JOINS ASLRA—AND WHY?

About 40 Class I roads belong to the Short Line association. Denver & Rio Grande Western, Delaware & Ohio, Boston & Maine and other trunk lines pay ASLRA's maximum fee of $1,980. The minimum fee is $264. There are various reasons for joining the association. Traffic is important and the short lines do have traffic offices and connections for traffic that rolls in interchange.

One short line veteran points to the personal friendships many short line officers have with politicians high and low. Yet another observer notes that short lines are able to lobby and press for legislation at local, state and national levels—when some trunk lines are unable or unwilling to do so. "We can sometimes get a consensus when the ARR cannot."

Short lines, of course, find their organization valuable for direct and obvious reasons. Short line officers, often men with a half-dozen hats hanging in their offices, desperately need the expertise that an industry-wide association can provide. The short line executive is often president, traffic solicitor, general manager, purchasing agent, accountant, treasurer and chief engineer—all rolled into one. He is sometimes also locomotive engineer, section foreman and labor relations officer.

ASLRA, with a 14-man staff in Washington and other major cities, provides short line officers with legal counsel, traffic organization, and other important aid on an industry-wide basis. An important part of the association's work is advising members negotiating labor contracts. Notes an association officer, "One bad contract agreed to by an inexperienced operator can create a real mess in the short line part of the railroad business—and perhaps beyond. The typical short line operator is an innocent dealing with the experienced negotiators unions have on the other side of the table."

Association President Burks explains the short lines' vitality this way: "Short lines are often captive lines, originating and terminating traffic—often at less cost than could the parent company. Over-all, the continued existence of the short lines is fairly good evidence for their being able to railroad at less cost than the trunk lines. We expect to be in business for a long time to come."

RICHARD H. AMBERG

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, on September 3, Richard Hillery Amberg, publisher of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat and nationally-known newspaperman and community leader, died unexpectedly at New York City Hospital from a heart attack. He had been in the East on a combined business and personal trip with his family.

Dick Amberg's energy and tireless devotion to the Globe-Democrat, the city of St. Louis, the State of Missouri, and the country will be sorely missed. The causes he supported effectively for the public good are legion.

He is survived by his wife, Janet; his mother, Mrs. M. W. Amberg of Scarsdale, N.Y.; a daughter, Katharine, 21, a senior at Drury College in Springfield, Mo.; two sons, Richard Jr., 24, an employee of the Staten Island, N.Y., Advance, and Thomas, 19; and two sisters, Mrs. Thomas Moore and Mrs. George Franham, both of Scarsdale.

Dick Amberg was a dynamic crusader. It was my privilege to know him as a true friend; and on that friendship, I placed high value. His death leaves my wife and me with a sense of deep personal loss.

Richard Amberg took over as Globe-Democrat publisher 12 years ago, coming from the Post-Standard of Syracuse, N.Y., where he had served as publisher for some 3½ years. When he first became publisher of the Globe-Democrat in 1955, he told me that he was determined to improve the civic and economic spirit of St. Louis. Assigning reporters to research the field by interviewing civic, business, and labor leaders, he determined that of top priority was putting life into the national memorial on the city's historic riverfront. The project had been struggling along for 20 years without interest or funds from the Federal Government. Dick worked arduously for local and national support for the project; and soon thereafter the first Federal funds were forthcoming for the 630-foot Gateway Arch.

One of his many additional achievements was the establishment of the Herbert Hoover Boys' Club of St. Louis on the site of the old Busch Stadium in North St. Louis. In 1966 he raised approximately $1 million for this project, and named it after his close friend who he often commented had a compassion for the underprivileged which influenced him throughout his life.

Dick Amberg also organized the Backstoppers which supports the St. Louis Police and Firemen's Fund, Inc. In addition, he was general chairman of the 1961 Brotherhood Week sponsored by the National Conference of Christians and Jews, and executive vice chairman of the drive for the Winston Churchill Memorial Library at Fulton, Mo.

The city which he served so well expressed its appreciation last December with the highest tribute possible to one dedicated to community improvement by bestowing upon him the coveted St. Louis Award. In addition, he had the great honor of being elected to the Missouri Squires.

Dick Amberg also played a vital role in State government. In 1958, he instituted the Globe-Democrat awards for legislators, which are given to nine or 10 outstanding lawmakers every 2 years. He worked relentlessly for State conflict of interest statutes. Having served on a commission which drew up a successful conflict of interest bill for the State of New York in 1954, he began urging enactment of similar legislation in Missouri. In 1961, he testified for such legislation before a legislative committee. It was defeated in 1961 and 1963. Continuing to work for its enactment, however, he was rewarded in 1965 when the State legislature approved a strong conflicts bill.

Other legislation to which he devoted much of his efforts included tougher laws for unsafe drivers, legislation requiring chemical tests for drunk driving suspects, and establishment of a point system to take repeated offenders off the roads. He urged higher gasoline taxes to build better roads, and was a strong backer of the recent improvement of Missouri's mental health program.

The University of Missouri's Honor Award for Distinguished Service in Journalism was presented to the Globe-Democrat in May 1967.

Last April Dick Amberg was one of three new Associated Press directors elected at the worldwide news-gathering organization's annual meeting in New York.

When Dick came to St. Louis, he brought with him a record of achievement and hard work. He graduated from Harvard in 1933 magna cum laude in history and literature; and he was also a graduate of the U.S. Naval War College.

Dick rose from ensign to commander during World War II, serving as flag secretary to Adm. R. K. Turner, commander of the amphibious forces in the Pacific. He was also naval adviser on the staff of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur. He was awarded the Legion of Merit by General MacArthur, and had seven battle stars on his Pacific ribbon.

Dick was a great admirer of General MacArthur. He served as trustee of the foundation which maintains the Old Soldier's tomb.

Wednesday, prior to his death, Dick had received the American Legion's annual Fourth Estate Award for distinguished public service in the field of communications. He was to have had lunch with President Johnson the following Wednesday.

Dick was born June 5, 1912, in New York City, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Max W. Amberg. On June 18, 1938, he married the former Janet Katharine Law, as well respected and loved as any woman in Missouri. He began his career in journalism in 1933. Four years later he became the youngest publisher of a daily newspaper in the United States, the Oil City, Pa., Blizzard.

Following the war, Dick became director of public relations for the American Transit Co., general manager of a Long Island, N.Y., newspaper; and administrative assistant at the New York Herald Tribune before going to Syracuse in 1950 as vice president and general manager. He was named publisher of the Post-Standard on January 1, 1952.

In 1954 the former New York Gov. Thomas E. Dewey named him to a Commission on Ethics and Integrity in Government. In 1966 he was appointed by Secretary of Defense McNamara to the Board of the National War College.

Dick was a member of the board of directors of nine national organizations including the Boy Scouts, Boys Clubs, and the American Cancer Society. He held memberships on 18 local and State boards including Scottish Rite Foundation, Central Institute for the Deaf, and the Missouri Public Expenditure Survey.

The day Richard Amberg left us was a sad day for St. Louis and the Nation. He was an American patriot, one who held his head high in the sincerity of his convictions. To us who loved and respected him he brings to mind the words of Ralph Waldo Emerson: "A friend may well be reckoned the masterpiece of nature."

In closing, Mr. President, the Globe-Democrat of September 5 contained a most moving tribute to its publisher. The eulogy delivered by the Rev. Dr. J. Layton Mauze, Jr. at the funeral of Richard Amberg expresses the thought of many who knew him. KMOX radio had an editorial which also expresses this thinking. I ask unanimous consent that the Globe-Democrat article, "A Giant Has Passed Our Way;" the KMOX editorial "The Living Legacy of Richard Amberg;" and the text of the eulogy be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the items requested were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, September 5, 1967]

A GIANT HAS PASSED OUR WAY

When he came to St. Louis from his home in the East a dozen years ago hardly a soul knew him here. He was new to the Midwest and when he walked along the streets he received only rarely a greeting or a nod of recognition from a passerby. But seldom has a stranger become so quickly a vital part of his new community, and seldom has he contributed so much to its progress and welfare or left such an impress on its people and its spirit in so short a span of years.

Now he is gone from the community as suddenly as he came. And there is a deep sadness, an empty feeling of great loss among those men and women on The Globe-Democrat who worked intimately with and for Richard H. Amberg, who was publisher of this newspaper for the past 12 years. His untimely and unexpected death occurred in New York Sunday a few hours after he was stricken by a heart attack.

But there is equally a feeling of deep sadness and irrepairable loss among the people of the St. Louis community, where he labored courageously and tirelessly for the right and for the public welfare.

They say—many of these people—that his like will not soon be found again, that he will be sorely missed because he gave the community an inspiring and a dynamic leadership that did much to move it forward from its former lethargy and put it among the cities of the nation which are in the forefront of progress.

They speak of his courage to fight indomitably for what he believed was right, and of his zeal for good and just causes, and of his abiding compassion for his fellow man and his selfless expenditure of time and energy in behalf of the public welfare.

They say he was a catalyst who stimulated many constructive civic programs in this community, who brought a new driving force which has done much to inspire the amazing renaissance which has given the downtown business section new life. He helped transform the eyesore riverfront now dominated by the incomparable Gateway Arc of world renown, encouraged the new downtown stadium, helped effect the miracle of the Mill Creek Valley renewal and brought to imminent completion the vital new Poplar street free bridge which will span the Mississippi.

They speak, too, of the dynamism he gave The Globe-Democrat, changing it from a lackadaisical newspaper into a vigorous and beneficial force locally and nationally, causing it to be ranked among the nation's top dailies. And whether they agreed with him or not, they speak of his pungent, incisive and eloquent editorials which gave crystalline clarity to the issues of the day.

And they speak of his many humanitarian campaigns to raise funds for those who needed help of some kind.

There are, indeed, those who say it may have been these relentless efforts through his newspaper and personally in behalf of the public weal that hastened his death.

He was at the apex of a brilliant newspaper career which had spread his name far beyond St. Louis and the Midwest and had made him one of the best known publishers and editors in America. He was consulted by Governors and even Presidents, and was the subject of occasional articles in national magazines and other publications.

The most recent of the giant community projects on which he worked long and assidiously was the establishment of the new Herbert Hoover Boys' Club of St. Louis on the historic old baseball field where Busch Stadium stood on North Grand boulevard. He was the prime mover of this project from the beginning and headed a campaign which raised approximately $1,000,000 to build the club, the finest of its kind in America.

There, 3300 boys from 6 to 16 years can get off the streets, find recreation, entertainment, instruction and a practical application of ideals that will make them good and responsible citizens. It was a project close to Mr. Amberg's heart, and one that will remain as a living monument to his deep concern for the youth of the community and the nation and to his devotion and admiration for the late Herbert Hoover—in whose honor he asked that the club be named.

Mr. Amberg was an enduring patriot, and he manifested it in his daily life as well as his editorials. Transplanted from the Eastern seaboard to the Middle West, he soon came to love St. Louis and its people. He will be buried here among those he came to know so fondly. But his devotion to his country was not more than that to his community.

During World War II he served with the Navy and saw enough active duty in the Pacific to receive seven battle stars and 13 medals and citations. Among them was the Legion of Merit, given him by General Douglas MacArthur whose naval advisor he had been. A comradeship developed between the two which continued until the General's death.

And Mr. Amberg came to regard General MacArthur as one of the great Americans, and he shared the old warrior's resolute conviction that there is no substitute for victory. Hence, with a strong clear voice he unceasingly advocated editorially that the United States should not dally with Communist aggression in Vietnam, but should strike the enemy with the full and devastating force of America's military might to bring the war to a complete and decisive victory in the shortest possible time.

Indeed, it was partly his courageous editorials for sterner measures against North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong—in the face of a great outcry from some quarters for soft measures and compromise—together with other manifestations of selfless patriotism that took him to Boston three days before his death to receive from the American Legion its highest honor to newspapers—the Fourth Estate Award for distinguished public service in the field of communications.

Richard H. Amberg was born in New York City 55 years ago. He was educated at Harvard where he was graduated in 1933 magna cum laude. He started his newspaper career shortly thereafter and his first position of prominence was as publisher and editor of the Oil City (Pa.) Blizzard. He was 25, and the youngest publisher of a daily in the United States.

World War II interrupted his career and afterward he caught the eye of Samuel I. Newhouse, who was building a giant newspaper empire. He became publisher of the Syracuse (N.Y.) Post-Standard. He was a refreshingly new kind of publisher and editor. He was also a speaker and writer with a fluent, trenchant style who projected a lot of positive opinions from his editorial page.

Mr. Newhouse bought the sluggish St. Louis Globe-Democrat in 1955. "Dick" Amberg, as he was commonly known to his friends, was made publisher.

To the people of St. Louis and to his staff he introduced himself by announcing, "We are going to be a fighter for the right. We are going to take sides on every issue. . . . The Globe-Democrat will never run away from a battle. . . . We may not always be right, but we will take an honest cut at the ball."

He set the new pace and spirit of the newspaper. Editorials acquired a new zing.

A rousing Globe-Democrat campaign, together with effective personal maneuvering by Mr. Amberg among railroads and politicians, did much to break the riverfront log jam. Today the result is the beautiful new Jefferson National Expansion Memorial and its towering Gateway Arch. This inspiring success brought an exciting chain reaction of new developments in the area which has rejuvenated the entire downtown area.

The equally revitalized Globe-Democrat became a crusading newspaper, with the publisher himself as the dynamo in nearly all crusades. He used the hard-hitting newspaper campaign to get things done. He fought for better public health, better public safety, better government, greater civic growth, more prosperity. He detested and castigated crime and corruption in any form and attacked them with stinging articles and editorials.

He believed newspapers had lost the capacity for indignation. Certainly he hadn't.

He did more than that. He moved out among the people. He went to luncheons and dinners and other gatherings. He served on a plethora of boards and committees. He talked to the people individually and collectively. He talked to them from the speaker's platform—his extemporaneous addresses sounded as though they had been meticulously prepared and rehearsed.

In his prodigious participation in the affairs of the community—the people's problems became those of his newspaper—he belonged to a great list of civic, welfare, business, educational, fraternal and other organizations. He served on the boards of 19 local and state associations, on nine national boards. He was trustee of a half dozen colleges.

His honors and awards for his selfless services added up to the dozens. One of them was the coveted St. Louis Award of 1966.

A giant has passed our way. His courage and good works will long be remembered.

[An editorial of KMOX radio, Sept. 4, 1967]

The Living Legacy of Richard Amberg

Richard Amberg is gone . . . suddenly, shockingly, tragically. It's difficult to imagine St. Louis without him.

Richard Amberg was a big man . . . big in mind, in heart, in spirit. And his passing leaves a big void.

Richard Amberg was a great publisher. His newspaper's energetic devotion to our city . . . its growth and its future . . . were vital factors in the rebirth of our metropolitan area.

Richard Amberg was a great humanitarian. His concern for the less fortunate was a driving force for action. The Herbert Hoover Boys' Club, the Old Newsboys campaign for children's charity will bring our city a harvest of good citizenship in the generations to come.

Richard Amberg was a great patriot . . . not "my country right or wrong". . . but a thoughtful dedication to the ideals of individualism, personal responsibility, self-discipline, initiative that made our country grow . . . and will keep it growing.

[An editorial of KMOX radio, Sept. 4, 1967]

Tribute to Publisher of St. Louis Globe-Democrat on the Occasion of His Sudden Death

Richard Amberg was a great St. Louisian . . . concerned with a broad spectrum of civic problems and potentials, working tirelessly . . . and often without personal credit . . . for the good of the community as a whole.

Richard Amberg was a great human being. His devoted family life . . . his example to the young people in his own family and the entire community . . . his application of great spiritual principles in his every effort. These contributions cannot be forgotten.

Richard Amberg is gone. But the achievements he leaves behind him will continue to be guideposts for all of us. When perplexing problems challenge our minds and our hearts in the future, we will ask ourselves . . . "What would Dick Amberg have done?" This reliance on his principles and his precedents will be his living legacy to all of us.

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Sept. 7, 1967]

A Final Tribute

(Text of the eulogy delivered by the Rev. Dr. J. Layton Mauze, Jr., at the funeral of Richard H. Amberg)

It is quite difficult for me to crowd the reflections of 12 years of intimate association with Dick Amberg into a rather brief statement. Indeed a volume could be written of his worth and works, his true nobility and power, his good sense, his absolute integrity, his lovely companionableness, his goodness and his greatness.

The practice of the law of human service is, in the eyes of all truly native members of an acquisitive society, the most drab and unattractive of pursuits. Such an observer must have been puzzled and incredulous when he saw the air with which this great friend of ours, Dick Amberg, trudged from an office interview to an important meeting, to a large dinner or some speaking engagement. For he did it all with a persistent gusto of enjoyment that makes me think of Francis of Assissi at the edge of a forest drawing one twig over another to make music for God and his living creatures.

"Heard melodies are sweet—but those unheard are sweeter."

Dick could give himself so constantly and so usefully because he was endowed with so many gifts of mind and heart. He had at once a deep love for men and a very shrewd understanding of their foibles as well as of their virtues. His sagacity in determining a course of action rested solely on his insight. A man who had been associated with him in various endeavors once said to me, "The only man whose judgment I would accept in preference to my own is Dick Amberg."

Dick loved and admired the simple worth of steadfast lives, whether in humble places or in high. But he counted it right to be helpful to all men. I personally know that he helped many, without harshness, who might be numbered among the unworthy. But he was never taken in by them. And I think it must have been a salutary experience for some of this sort to receive his generosity, while they had to bear at the same the glance of those tolerant but penetrating eyes.

Dick's intellect was such that few men dreamed of matching it, but the erring, the humblest, the poorest, and the most illiterate, never felt uncomfortable or unhappy in his presence. His kindliness, his understanding, his sympathy, his broad outlook on life, his lack of thought of himself and what he had accomplished, somehow closed the barrier and made him kin with his less privileged brother.

With Dick there was never any waste of motion or effort. He did all that was to be done without friction, or delay or haste. He spoke no unnecessary words and he wasted no time. He was the soul of promptitude and accuracy and honor. His spirit was all kindness and goodness, but it was also direct and quick and intense. He made no concealment of his approvals or disapprovals when it was his duty to speak or act. In a day when multitudes think it's wrong to be right, Dick was mostly right, and he courageously stood for it.

One of Dick's favorite passages from literature was when Joan of Arc was being hounded by her inquisitors: "Why was it your Standard had place at the crowning of the King in the Cathedral of Rheims, rather than those of other captains?"

Then soft and low, came this touching speech which will live as long as language lives, and pass into all tongues, and move all gentle hearts wheresoever it shall come, down to the latest day. Says Joan, "It had borne the burden; it had earned the honor."

Well, Dick also bore the burden and justly earned the multiplicity of honors conferred upon him, but he wore them all very lightly, there were no balloons under his armpits, and he forgot them entirely in his daily contacts with men and women.

Men trusted Dick because he was wise; they loved him because he was good. They confided in him because he had the large charity that covers a multitude of sins and the human sympathy that makes men kind. They sought his friendship because they knew that he himself followed his divine Master and Savior Jesus Christ, in loving mercy, doing justly and walking humbly with his God.

He was a devoted and loyal member of this church and for many years served on the Session. Never a Sunday passed when Dick and his lovely family were absent from worship on Sunday morning except for illness or unless they were out of the city. He loved his Lord and he wasn't ashamed to say so. His faith was deep. You ask the secret of such a worthy life? It can only be one thing—it's a life hid with Christ in God. His life has been a great inspiration to all who have known and loved him, and somehow we have been better men because we have known him.

Now that he no longer walks with us in the flesh, we are the more keenly aware of his magnanimous spirit, and while we mourn our personal loss, we are eternally thankful to God that we were vouchsafed to know and love His worthy servant. Truly through him, there was ever manifested the Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Love of God our Father, and the fellowship of the Holy Spirit.

I can see him now accepting the joys of Heaven with the same quick gladness, and heaven's honors with the same humble and slightly deprecating geniality with which he accepted, as they came, the joys and honors of earth, now that he has heard the summons, "Come up higher." Even then, we may surmise that he had to be led, or perhaps gently pushed by a smiling angel into the place God had prepared for one who loved Him.

To be sure, others will carry on Dick's work, but his place will always remain vacant.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the Committee on Banking and Currency, the Committee on Public Works, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Commerce be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask

unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Report on Reapportionment of an Appropriation

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Department of the Interior for "Management and protection," National Park Service, for the fiscal year 1968, had been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Suspension of Deportation of Aliens—Withdrawal of Name

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the name of Don Ho Yee from a report relating to aliens whose deportation has been suspended, transmitted to the Senate on February 1, 1967; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITION

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a letter, in the nature of a petition, praying for a redress of grievances, with accompanying papers, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CANNON, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Alfred B. Fitt, of Michigan, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

By Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Price Daniel, of Texas, to be Director of the Office of Emergency Planning.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the nomination of Maj. Gen. Winston P. Wilson, Air National Guard, for reappointment as Chief, National Guard Bureau for 4 years; and the nomination of Adm. Noel A. M. Gaylor, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral in connection with his assignment as Deputy Director, Strategic Target Planning. I ask that these nominations be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations, ordered to be placed on the calendar, are as follows:

Maj. Gen. Winston P. Wilson, Air National Guard, to be reappointed as Chief, National Guard Bureau; and

Rear Adm. Noel A. M. Gayler, U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, in addition, I report favorably 509 promotions to the grade of captain in the Navy, 237 appointments in the Marine Corps in grade of colonel and below, and 983 appointments in the Air Force in the grade of lieutenant colonel and below. Since these names have already been printed in the Congressional Record, in order to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk for the information of any Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations, ordered to lie on the desk, are as follows:

Roy J. Casteel, and sundry other officers, for appointment and reappointment in the Marine Corps;

William C. Airheart, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Marine Corps;

Frank M. Adams, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the U.S. Navy;

William B. Duty, for reappointment to the active list of the Regular Air Force, from the temporary disability retired list;

Eugene J. Birkemeyer, and sundry other persons, for appointment in the Regular Air Force;

Franklin G. Abel, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Regular Air Force; and

Elmer L. Alderfer, and sundry other distinguished graduates of the Air Force Officer Training School, for appointment in the Regular Air Force.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 2507. A bill relating to dealings between parties to franchise agreements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Eastland when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HARTKE (for himself and Mr. Mondale):

S. 2508. A bill to authorize direct home loans by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development in certain cases where private financing on reasonable terms and conditions is not available; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hartke when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. COOPER:

S. 2509. A bill for the relief of William H. T. Carney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTION

PROMOTION OF ALLIED COOPERATION TO BRING AN END TO THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. PERCY (for himself, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Boggs, Mr. Byrd of Virginia, Mr. Carlson, Mr. Clark, Mr. Cotton, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Hatfield, Mr. Hruska, Mr. Javits, Mr. Jordan of Idaho, Mr. Morton, Mr. Pearson, Mr. Prouty, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Ribicoff, Mr. Scott, Mr. Talmadge, Mr. Thurmond, and Mr. Young of North Dakota) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 173) to promote Allied cooperation to bring an end to the war in Vietnam, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Percy, which appears under a separate heading.)

THE FRANCHISE DISTRIBUTION ACT OF 1967

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, today I introduce the Franchise Distribution Act of 1967.

This legislation is long overdue.

In the past decade there has been an enormous growth in the franchise system of distributing goods and services in this country. It is presently estimated that the franchise system accounts for 10 percent of this Nation's gross national product and 25 percent of all retail sales. Thus, the welfare of these franchisees as such is a matter of direct public concern.

With the growth in the franchise system there has been a rising ground swell of complaints of unfair practices by franchisors. To many, the franchisee seems to be losing his stature as an independent businessman. In a number of industries franchisees have become simply the tools of the franchisors even though the franchisee is supplying the capital and effort to market the goods and products of the franchisor. Unfair and inequitable practices by franchisors are widespread. In short, the balance of power in the franchisor-franchisee relationship is now heavily weighed in favor of the franchisor.

The bill, which I introduced herewith, tends to correct this imbalance of power between franchisors and franchisees. It is a simple and direct bill relating to the franchise system as a whole whether the franchisor distributes goods or commodities or renders services. The term "franchise" is broadly defined to include almost every type of franchise arrangement.

This bill first requires that, notwithstanding the terms of any franchise agreement, that the franchisor must deal in a fair and equitable manner with its franchisees and must also deal in accordance with reasonable standards of fair dealing. The franchisor is also required to deal honestly and to avoid coercing and intimidating its franchise.

The bill further provides that the franchisor must not compete unfairly with its franchisee in selling goods or rendering services and provides that a franchisee must be on an equal basis with any other person in buying goods or commodities from its franchisor. This latter provision simply requires that the franchisor sell its goods or commodities at the same price to its franchisee as to any other person.

This bill also relates to termination or cancellation of franchisees. When a franchisee desires to sell its business, it is permitted to do so under this bill without unreasonable interference by the franchisor. Further, in the event the franchisor terminates the franchisee without the consent of the franchisee, the franchisor is required to buy the facilities of the franchisee at fair market value.

The statute provides improved remedies for the franchisees' protection. The franchisee may recover twofold damages for violation of the act. In addition, the franchisee may obtain an injunction to prevent continuation of violations of the act injurious to the franchisee.

Gentlemen, remedial legislation in this

area is long overdue and I urge your serious consideration and support of this bill.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2507) relating to dealings between parties to franchise agreements, introduced by Mr. EASTLAND, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DIRECT HOUSING LOANS

Mr. **HARTKE.** Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce today, with Senator MONDALE as cosponsor, a bill authorizing direct home loans by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development in certain cases where private financing on reasonable terms and conditions is not available.

I am particularly pleased to have Senator MONDALE, who is so well known for his able work on the Housing Subcommittee, as a cosponsor of this bill. The bill itself is in many respects identical to S. 2280 on which I testified before the subcommittee recently.

The bill is aimed to deal with the problem of those who, having found a home they desire to purchase, are unable to find private financing for the mortgage in spite of meeting all the normal requirements of a borrower for this purpose. In such a case, having been unable to secure mortgage funds, this bill would make it possible for the prospective borrower to secure them directly from a $50 million revolving fund administered by the Department. Having met the criteria, the mortgage would then be purchased by the Federal National Mortgage Association just as though this were any other kind of FHA arrangement, and the purchase price would revert to the fund, thus making it available for others.

The $50 million fund is a revolving fund, replenished as the mortgages it finances are "turned over," so that its potential is much greater than its face sum. While more might be desirable, probably the new sum is more realistic in the current atmosphere of cost cutting than was the $100 million in S. 2280, even though a loan fund is not an ultimate expense.

It is my hope, Mr. President, that in view of the consideration of S. 2280 in the hearings and the revisions made in the bill that I offer for myself and Senator MONDALE, that the bill will be adopted by the Banking and Currency Committee in its deliberations now being carried on.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2508) to authorize direct home loans by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development in certain cases where private financing on reasonable terms and conditions is not available, introduced by Mr. HARTKE (for himself and Mr. MONDALE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

AMENDMENT NO. 382

A FAIR METHOD OF REIMBURSEMENT FOR HOSPITAL AND EXTENDED CARE SERVICES

Mr. **MILLER.** Mr. President, I submit an amendment to H.R. 12080 and ask that it be printed in the RECORD, and printed and appropriately referred.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The amendment will be received, and printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment (No. 382) was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

On page 69, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following:

"METHOD OF DETERMINING REASONABLE COST FOR PROVIDERS OF SERVICES

"SEC. 142. (a) (1) Strike out the third sentence of section 1861 (v) (1) of the Social Security Act and insert in lieu thereof the following: 'Such regulations (A) shall provide for the determination of costs of services on a per diem basis in all cases where the circumstances under which the services provided so permit, and, in cases where such circumstances do not so permit, may provide for the determination of costs of services on a per unit, per capita, or other basis, (B) may provide for the use of estimates of costs of particular items or services, and (C) may provide for the use of charges or a percentage of charges where this method reasonably reflects the costs. With a view to not encouraging inefficiency, in determining a per diem basis for cost of services there shall be taken into account the per diem costs prevailing in a community for comparable quality and levels of services. Such regulations shall include provision for specific recognition of a reasonable return on fair market value of the facility (determined in accordance with periodic Federal Housing Administration or similar appraisals); but the rate of return so recognized shall not exceed one and one-half times the average of the rates of interest, for each of the months any part of which is included in such fiscal period, on obligations issued for purchase by the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund. Where such return is allowed, there shall not be allowed interest on capital indebtedness or depreciation on the facility in determining reimbursable costs.'

"(2) The fourth sentence of such section 1861(v)(1) is amended by inserting '(except as might happen by reason of the provisions of clause (A) of the preceding sentence)' immediately after 'will not'.

"(3) The last sentence of such section 1861(v)(1) is hereby repealed.

"(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall be applicable to services provided under title XVIII of the Social Security Act on and after July 1, 1968."

On page 160, between lines 6 and 7, insert the following:

"METHOD OF DETERMINING REASONABLE COST UNDER TITLE XIX FOR INPATIENT HOSPITAL SERVICES, SKILLED NURSING HOME SERVICES, AND HOME HEALTH CARE SERVICES

"SEC. 232. (a) Section 1902(a)(13)(B) of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows: '(B) for payment of the reasonable cost (as determined in accordance with the regulations promulgated by the Secretary for determining reasonable cost under title XVIII) of inpatient hospital services, skilled nursing home services, and home health care services, provided under the plan;'.

"(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect July 1, 1969."

On page 187, strike out lines 18 through 20, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "(as determined in accordance with the regulations promulgated by the Secretary for determining reasonable cost under title XVIII) of inpatient hospital services, skilled nursing home services, and home health care services, provided under the plan;".

Mr. **MILLER.** Mr. President, many of our colleagues are aware that our hospitals and extended-care facilities around the Nation are very dissatisfied with the reimbursement which they are receiving under the medicare program. In particular, hospitals are very dissatisfied, and I believe rightfully so, with the so-called RCCAC method which the regulations of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare now require. This method is very complicated and deliberately reflects one conclusion about the difference in hospital costs for different age groups. It takes advantage of the fact that aged people use less hospital ancillary services per patient day than younger patients but does not reflect the likelihood that aged people use more nursing services and other components of the room and board category of hospital expenses.

I am aware that the position of some administration officials is to take a "wait-and-see" attitude toward this important problem. They seem to want to "wait and see" if hospitals and extended-care facilities can survive their shortsighted policies. Mr. President, we just cannot take the risks the administration would have us take. We cannot risk that the present policies and procedures of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will result in widespread financial havoc among our health facilities, which responsible people in the field assure us will happen.

Mr. President, we cannot run the risk of having hospitals and extended-care facilities denied those entitled to them because these facilities cannot afford to seek certification under our Federal programs.

We must have reimbursement policies in these Government programs which support our hospitals and extended care facilities in their efforts to maintain and improve the quality of services, and we need them now.

Mr. President, I offer what I believe is an equitable, sound, and acceptable solution to this problem. My amendment to the House-passed social security bill, H.R. 12080, would require the Government to use the per diem method of reimbursing hospitals and extended care facilities under all of the programs in the Social Security Act, not just medicare. We must remember that title XIX, the medicaid program, and title V, the maternal and infant care and crippled children's program, also pay for these services.

Title XIX covers a wide segment of the population, those who are medically indigent, ranging in age from the very young to the very old. The maternal and infant care and crippled children's programs meet the hospital expenses of many mothers and children. What I propose, Mr. President, is to pay for services for all of the patients under these titles through one single, easy-to-administer, easy-to-understand method. This method, the per diem method, is in widespread use by Blue Cross plans around the country and Blue Cross plans and hospitals are accustomed to the method and satisfied with it. Moreover, Mr. President, my proposal for using the per diem method for all of these programs avoids the problems which the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare says that it sees with using the per diem method for title XVIII alone. Since the per diem method would apply to patients of all ages there would no longer be any supposed need to try to use a complicated method like the RCCAC method to separate one group's costs from all the rest.

Mr. President, my amendment also provides for a fair rate of return on the fair market value of the facility. The Senate passed this portion of the amendment last year insofar as extended care facilities are concerned, but the conference report changed it to apply to "net equity" rather than fair market value. This is not a fair basis, and has resulted in much dissatisfaction. The fairest approach is to use fair market value, based on an FHA appraisal. This, of course, should not permit a doubling up by allowing reimbursable costs to include interest on capital investment and depreciation, and my amendment so provides.

Mr. President, my proposal is simple, it is just. It is fair to the hospitals, and extended care facilities, it is fair to patients, it is fair to the Government. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, which will assure that those entitled to quality services will be able to receive them.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATION BILL, 1968—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 383

Mr. PROXMIRE submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 12474) making appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings], I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 915) to provide for the establishment of a Federal Judicial Center.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings], I also ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2349) to provide for the appointment of additional circuit judges.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EMPLOYMENT OF INDIVIDUALS DISADVANTAGED BY LACK OF EDUCATION OR JOB TRAINING

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, last Thursday my friend, the distinguished junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty] addressed the national meeting of the Institute of Temporary Services, Inc., in Washington.

Senator Prouty offered important challenges to the organization for making significant contributions toward the employment of individuals who are disadvantaged by age or lack of education or job training. I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Please accept my apologies for not having been able to lunch with you, much as I would have desired to do so. As you probably know, the 1967 amendments, to the Poverty Program are now being debated in the Senate, and, as ranking minority member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare's Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower and Poverty, it is necessary for me to be on the Floor most of the time.

I intend to talk to you generally about the need for and types of training programs required in our national commitment to fight poverty.

It is impossible for me to get into this subject, however, without a few preliminary remarks bearing on the over-all concepts and policies of the War on Poverty. I think we can accept as a basic premise the fact that the objectives sought to be obtained by the Poverty Program are accepted by a vast majority of our citizens. This is so because the results we seek are consistent with the American Dream on which this nation has been built—the concept that any boy can grow up to be President, the rags-to-riches stories by such writers as Horatio Alger which I am sure that most of us read in our childhood, and the American's traditional sympathy for the underdog.

The inevitable question which then arises is, why is the Poverty Program the most controversial program in our country today? Why is it being criticized by rank and file citizens more than any other Federally financed program? I do not like the answer I will give you. Yet I am convinced that this is true because there is growing skepticism as to the integrity and efficiency of administration, and a wide conclusion that political influence and interference with these programs is increasing.

We are now starting our fourth year of our formal and federally contrived effort known as the War on Poverty. We must face up to the fact that we have so far failed in substantial measure to accomplish the goals set by the initial Economic Opportunity Act passed by the Congress in 1964.

We must acknowledge that we have failed because we have not produced. Catchy slogans which instill hope in those who have no hope and lilting promises which bring the first sparks of motivation to the hearts of those who have known only failure and despair during their lives may help win elections for a while, but frustration and bitter disillusionment replace these feelings when the passage of time reveals that the slogans have been repudiated and that the promises have not been fulfilled. Events of the past summer amply illustrate the fact that the bitterness engendered among our disadvantaged people by this failure may be leading us rapidly down the road to anarchy.

I have characterized our failure in the War on Poverty as the Performance Gap between promises and results. Failure here, however, is crueler than if we had never declared war on poverty in the first place.

I submit that we cannot intelligently consider the elimination of poverty without considering how the major roadblocks to massive training and retraining of substantial segments of this nation's labor force can be resolved.

When I speak of training, I include the need to educate, as both these elements are indispensable in making our unemployed employable.

In the not too distant past, most untrained workers could procure unskilled or semiskilled jobs and many boys grew up working on the family farm or on a farm "just outside of town". When our economy was oriented to a predominantly rural society, the demand for unskilled labor increased almost as rapidly as the available work force expanded.

Today, the situation is entirely different. Not only is our society now urban-oriented, but employment opportunities regardless of their location have tremendously increased their demands for skilled and technical training and education, and it is obvious that this trend will increase at an accelerated pace.

At a time when our labor force is annually being flooded with the entry of new job seekers, positions for unskilled and semiskilled employees are declining at an ever-increasing rate. At a time when we are entering the age of automation, the major factors that have sustained our high employment rate have been the great demand for skilled personnel in service industries, the need for technically trained individuals in all sectors of private enterprise, and the increase in requirements for educated employees in the various fields of personal services.

Today, training and education have become conditions precedent to most meaningful employment capable of lifting a family out of the poverty classification. I venture to say that a survey would reveal sufficient job vacancies to put all our nation's unemployed to work if they possessed the required education, skill or technical know-how, and would also provide upgrading for substantial numbers of our people who are employed at minimum wage rates if they met the required qualifications.

Here, then is the challenge. Although the scope and dimensions of the problems are huge, they are not insurmountable. We must take whatever action is necessary to insure that never again shall we be faced with the paradox of increasing numbers of our citizens on welfare roles at a time when good jobs are going begging because our unemployed do not meet the qualifications to fill them.

Tragically, the Great Society's poverty programs during the last three years have shown a considerable lack of foresight and an even greater degree of ineptitude.

Let me say at this point that I am convinced that the only real answer to reducing poverty is to provide real and meaning jobs in the private sector of our economy. Supportive services in many other areas are certainly necessary in the short run, as are "make work" programs for those who today are incapable of being educated and trained for productive jobs. In the long run, however—for any permanent and lasting solution—"make work" programs aggravate rather than remedy the problems which face us. In the long run, the only answer is education and training leading to meaningful and productive employment.

This is where the work and training programs of the War on Poverty have failed. Three years after its inception, the results show that the Job Corps program has not produced. Literally, it has merely taken some of our disadvantaged youths off the streets for periods ranging from a few months to one or two years, but by and large it has then returned them to the streets completely unprepared and unequipped to obtain jobs in the competitive job market. The results from the Job Corps Conservation Camps run by the Departments of Agriculture and Interior are even more appalling.

I probably should note here that, because of a series of amendments which I offered to the Job Corps provisions in the bill now before the Senate which were accepted, I shall support giving the Job Corps an additional two-year lease on life. However, as I have informed the Job Corps Director, he had better produce some tangible results or I will not be this charitable the next time.

The results of the Neighborhood Youth Corps program are equally distressing. Secretary of Labor Wirtz's top staff member, his Manpower Administrator, sat in my office last month and conceded that the Neighborhood Youth Corps had engaged in little else but "make work" programs, and that enrollees who left this program were generally unqualified to compete for available job vacancies.

The Work Training and Experience Program under Title V of the Economic Opportunity Act, administered through the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, is another program which should have caught the imagination of the American people. This program was designed to recruit trainees off public welfare rolls and, through training and placement in jobs with private businesses, reduce welfare costs at the same time as it trained unskilled unemployables for productive jobs. Yet a survey conducted at Princeton University establishes, and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare admits, that this program has been more or less of a failure, and that most of the "jobs" found for welfare recipients have been "make work" jobs primarily, such as custodial and janitorial positions for local or state governments.

Another reason why these programs have failed is because of bureaucratic ineptitude in duplicating programs and in overlap of functions.

For example, in a recent report, the Upjohn Institute noted that there are at least 79 different training programs and education programs administered under the auspices of 15 different Federal bureaus and agencies. Did you know that funds for job recruiting can be obtained from nine different manpower program sources, or that funds for adult basic education—in addition to general education sources—can be obtained from ten different places? Are you aware that on-the-job training programs can be subsidized under five programs, or that supportive services are available from nine sources, or that income maintenance is available to participants under nine different programs? Of course, the eligibility rules, application procedures, allocation formulas, expiration dates and contracting arrangements vary for each as widely as the funding sources.

To summarize, then, there are two major areas where drastic changes in policy and direction must be made if the War on Poverty is to succeed.

The first area involves administration, and requires the Congress to take immediate action to avoid inefficiency, duplication and overlap in the implementation of education and work training programs. Unfortunately, our Subcommittee has been unable to develop sufficient factual data during the course of its study this year to warrant my telling you that we now have all the answers to these intricate problems.

However, I am offering an amendment to the pending poverty bill which will require that the Comptroller General conduct an in-depth investigation of these issues during the next fifteen months and to submit a detailed report of his findings and recommendations in these areas to the Congress by February 1, 1969.

The present poverty bill extend existing programs for two years, so that the next time that the Poverty Program will be subject to review and scrutiny by the Congress will be by the 91st Congress in 1969. If my amendment is adopted, we will then be able to cut through the red tape and straighten out the bureaucratic fumbling and mismanagement in the administration of these programs.

The second major area in which we must change our thinking relates to the objectives we are seeking in the War on Poverty. As I have already stated, satisfactory long term results can be obtained only through education and training programs which equip the unemployed and unskilled with the required qualifications to compete for necessary and available jobs in our free enterprise economy. "Make work" employment is a temporary panacea which is in reality an extension of public welfare assistance, and provides no real solution either for the government or for illiterate and untrained families presently living in poverty.

Data now available reveals that 280,000 training slots were authorized for 1966–67 programs at a time when more than four million people were in need of training. Follow-up surveys indicate even more tragic results for those who entered these programs. They show, for example, that more than 50% of welfare recipients who enter these programs return to public assistance after leaving the programs, and that a vast majority of those placed in jobs are employed in "make work" positions supplied by State, local and Federal governments.

The most successful training programs have been those authorized under the Manpower Development and Training Act, particularly under on-the-job training programs conducted pursuant to Part II of this statute. I might note that this legislation was enacted two years prior to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

The on-the-job training programs of M.D.T.A., where it has been possible to implement them, have placed over 90% of the trainees in existing job vacancies in our private economy. This is not too surprising when we note that these trainees are carried on payrolls of private companies which are providing the training and that they are trained for jobs with a particular company that are open and waiting for qualified applicants. Motivation is high and the drop-out rate low among these enrollees because they realize that successful completion of their training means immediate employment at a good job in familiar surroundings.

By contrast, the first part of M.D.T.A., which is administered by the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, and which provides various educational, vocational and institutional on-the-job training programs, has not been anywhere near as successful.

The most recent survey indicates that at least 25% of those who underwent institutional on-the-job training programs were unemployed when last contacted. It seems to me that the crux of the matter is that in this type of program the trainee has no assurance whatsoever of finding meaningful employment upon successful graduation. Far too often here we are training unemployed welders to become unemployed bakers and unemployed miners to become unemployed bulldozer operators.

I have been convinced for a long time that no program to substantially reduce poverty by providing meaningful employment opportunities can be successful without the full-fledged involvement and cooperation of the private sector of our economy.

In 1964, when Congress was considering enactment of the Economic Opportunity Act, I first suggested that we pass the Human Investment Act, designed to give private enterprise—a tax credit towards certain job training expenses for their participation in much needed work training programs. I did so because I believed then as I do today that investment in human capital by private industry is at least as important as its investment in new machines, and that the skills and talents of our potential labor force can never be fully developed without the active involvement of our nation's businesses.

The present version of my Human Investment Act is now sponsored by 29 Senators and 140 members of the House. This proposal is too complex to explain in detail here, but in general it provides a tax credit of 10% of expenses incurred as a result of training new employees in addition to the ordinary allowable deductions permitted under the Tax Code.

I am pleased to note that in recent months more and more leaders and scholars are reaching the conclusion that I have expressed for many years that the War on Poverty can never be successful unless and until it brings the resources and ideas of the private sector of our economy into the battle.

For example, speaking on the subject of urban renewal, Senator Ribicoff recently stated: "It is self-evident that the job is too big to be accomplished by government alone."

And just a few days ago that well-known Liberal, Daniel P. Moynihan, concluded that "Liberals should divest themselves of the notion that the nation . . . can be run from agencies in Washington."

A final point to consider today is the question of what can your companies do—what are your responsibilities in providing meaningful training and employment? In your role as formers of public opinion in your own area or locality, you can, of course, help to shape the type of educational and training policies which are necessary to achieve our objectives.

Specifically, however, you are in a unique position due to the fact that you offer temporary rather than full-time employment. Because of lifetime habits, many of the unemployed among our disadvantaged citizens are not psychologically adjusted to full-time employment even when they are qualified. When employment is obtained by these individuals, their environment and way of life is not conducive to their reporting for work early in the morning every day and working an eight-hour day five days a week.

If your agencies make a concerted effort to find and employ these people, you may be able to gradually instill proper motivation and work habits as an accepted part of their living conditions. When a man in these circumstances becomes accustomed to working two or three days a week, it seems to me that the transition to a full-time job would be much easier for him.

It is my understanding that many of your companies meet temporary needs for unskilled as well as skilled employees and I believe that this is another area where emphasis on hiring available members of minority and unemployed groups may contribute to meeting private enterprise's responsibility in this field.

For example, a concentration of effort along these lines could result in finding part-time jobs as clerks in stores for mothers from poverty families who have responsibilities which preclude their working full-time, as well as giving a male head of household from such a family temporary work in a warehouse.

Another area where special attention would prove beneficial would be in the recruitment of our older citizens for temporary and part-time employment. It is estimated that 5½ million Americans over the age of 65 have income below the poverty level. This represents approximately 20% of all Americans living in poverty. Many of these individuals have held productive jobs in the past and are qualified for further employment. I have introduced an amendment to raise the amount of money which these persons may earn without suffering a reduction or loss in social security benefits. In my opinion, you people are in an admirable position to provide these citizens with an opportunity to supplement their inadequate retirement pensions and to thus bring more dignity and independence to their latter years.

These are some of the ways in which you can contribute to the solution of the poverty crisis facing us today by assisting disadvantaged and unskilled members of our society.

An example of what can be accomplished in a much larger sense can be seen from what the President of one of your member organizations has done in Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

Mr. Elmer L. Winter, President of Manpower, Inc., has shown that his energetic imagination is not confined strictly to the business of running Manpower, Inc. He has exhibited sincere civic pride by devoting part of his energy to the job of being President of "We Milwaukeeans Housing Foundation, Inc.", a voluntary group of businessmen and civic leaders who are leading the way toward the development of a dynamic housing project which will have a two-fold purpose.

First, it will remove a blighted slum area from downtown Milwaukee. Second, it will provide 150 three-bedroom homes to serve families who are in the $5,000 to $9,000 income group.

The Secretary of Labor has instituted a pilot program based on the Human Investment concept, although the tax incentive idea has been replaced by a 4% to 6% grant towards training expenses. It is interesting to note that contracts for nine of the first ten projects entered into by the Secretary of Labor under this program are for the implementation of proposals submitted from private enterprise.

This seems to reflect the Secretary of Labor's agreement that job training for meaningful jobs can best be accomplished through private industry. If any of your companies are seriously interested, I believe that you can receive constructive suggestions on possible participation by contacting the Secretary of Labor.

I apologise for having taken more of your time than I had intended. In closing, I would like to quote a statement made by H. G. Wells many years ago, that "human history becomes more and more a race between education and catastrophe".

Let us hope that as a nation and as a people we have learned enough from our past failures to give us the wisdom to eliminate the Performance Gap and to win this race of destiny.

WHAT IS OUR NATIONAL INTEREST IN VIETNAM?

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, the Senate has heard a great many words—and a good deal of debate—about our involvement in Vietnam.

I think that few if any of the exchanges that have occurred brought us closer to the heart of the matter than the one we heard yesterday between the distinguished Senators from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

The fundamental question is: What is the U.S. national interest?

The eminent minority leader put his finger on this key question when he pointed out:

> Yesterday you said that our security is not involved at all. It depends on whether or not you take a global view of security. If you do not, the chances are that you are right. I take a different view, because we have conquered time, space, and distance to the point where this is a pretty small world.

Mr. President, this is the crux of the matter. Is our national interest to be defined broadly or narrowly? Is the issue Vietnam? Or is it our role and our interest in Asia?

We are all acutely aware of the pain and the sacrifice and the cost of our present course. But is that course going to make less likely incredibly greater pain, vastly greater sacrifices, and tremendously greater costs in the future?

It was said here yesterday that someone is trying to make Ho Chi Minh into a Hitler—and that that effort was nonsense.

I am not aware that such an effort has been made. What has been done—in this Chamber and elsewhere—is to underline the wisdom of meeting aggression in its early stages rather than later, when the cost may be disaster for mankind.

I remember very well a time not too many years ago when reasonable men in Europe argued that they had no national interest in Spain or in Ethiopia. I remember that many Americans argued that we had no vital interest in Europe. And this estimate of national interest produced inaction—and inaction produced disaster.

Surely the course of history would have been vastly different if men had only realized that what happened in far-off countries, small countries, did indeed ultimately involve their own deepest interests.

Ho Chi Minh is not a Hitler. But I would remind Senators that he was a founding member of the French Communist Party. He is something more than a genial old grandfather, more than a devoted nationalist leader.

An attempt was made in the Chamber yesterday to define American national interest by one simple, single criterion. Did country X have the capacity physically to attack the United States, or did country Y intend to use country X for such an attack?

That, I submit, is an oversimplified and naive description of the national interest of a great nation.

Thirteen years ago, the Members of this body debated and discussed the implication of our involvement in Southeast Asia. In the end, we determined overwhelmingly that our national interest was involved in that part of the world.

We were told yesterday that our only obligation under that treaty was to cooperate with other treaty members as to what course we should take.

That is not my reading of the SEATO Treaty. That is not my definition of what we said we would do.

I would remind Senators that the consultative portion of the treaty related to threats "other than by armed attack."

The heart of the treaty—article IV—says very explicitly:

> Each party recognizes that aggression by means of armed attack in the treaty area against any of the parties or against any State or territory which the parties by unanimous agreement may hereafter designate, would endanger its own peace and safety, and agrees that it will in that event act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes.

Mr. President, South Vietnam was designated by the treaty parties as a protocol state falling under the protective umbrella of the treaty. There is and has been armed attack against South Vietnam. And we have treated it as a threat to us—as we said we would.

We knew perfectly well what we were doing at the time. The vote in support was overwhelming. And we have lived up to our word.

I would remind Senators of what a former Commander in Chief, General Eisenhower, said of the importance of South Vietnam just 1 year before he left office:

> Strategically, South Vietnam's capture by the Communists would bring their power several hundred miles into a hitherto free region. The remaining countries in Southeast Asia would be menaced by a great flanking movement. The freedom of 12 million people (today it is 17 million people) would be lost immediately, and that of 150 million in adjacent areas (the number is now 200 million) would be seriously endangered. The loss of South Vietnam would set in motion a crumbling process that could, as it progressed, have grave consequences for us and for freedom . . .

Mr. President, can there be any doubt that Southeast Asia is of importance to us? Can there be any doubt that all of Asia is of utmost importance to us? It is where about two-thirds of humanity lives. It is an area of rich resources and great potential. Southeast Asia is the crossroads between the Pacific and the Indian Oceans.

The problem is not whether one or another country in the area is going to be the base for missiles that might be used against us tomorrow. It is whether the millions of people are going to be able to live in freedom. It is whether their skills and resources and energies are going to be used for cooperation in creating a freer and better world or whether they are going to be harnessed under a system that has as one of its primary goals our destruction—and the destruction of all we believe in.

Looked at in this light, can there be any doubt of where our national interest lies?

And can there be any doubt of where the vast majority of Asians stand?

We have seen remarkable changes in Asia over the past few years. There is now more cooperation and constructive work going on there than ever before in history.

Just ask any Asian whether there is a connection between what has been happening in Asia and the firm commitment—backed up by force and determination—of the United States in Vietnam. The testimony is overwhelming—and it is unmistakable.

It is sad to see the kind of soul-searching and self-doubt that is reflected in some statements here—just at a time when our efforts in Vietnam are beginning to produce clear and positive results.

Slowly but surely, the Vietnamese people are building their own country, electing their own officials, moving down the road toward nationhood.

The military tide has clearly turned. Ho Chi Minh's legions and their followers in the South have been thrown back. They have failed in their goal—which was very close, indeed, 2 years ago—of splitting South Vietnam and taking over. The number of Vietnamese who move under their own government's protection increases each month.

Two things have happened, then. We are winning in South Vietnam.

Second, all of Asia has taken new heart, new encouragement from our interest, from our commitment. And Asia is moving forward in cooperation with free men—with us, with Europe, with each other.

Yes, Mr. President, we do have a vital national interest in Asia. And in fighting in Vietnam we are expressing that interest in a highly effective way.

I predict that if our stand now begins to waver and to weaken, the Members of this body, the American people, and the world are going to rue the day. On that day, we can begin to prepare for world war III.

I pray that that day never comes.

THE WASHINGTON STAR ENDORSES SENATOR SYMINGTON'S PLAN FOR PEACE IN VIETNAM

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, earlier this week, after returning from an extensive fact-finding tour of the Far East, the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] proposed a solution to the war in Vietnam. The Senator speaks from a rich background as a former Secretary of the Air Force and as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services.

He has proposed that on an announced date, the United States halt all military activity in Vietnam, both in the air and on the ground. He proposes that our ally, South Vietnam, simultaneously offer to negotiate a settlement with the enemy forces.

If Hanoi fails to begin negotiations and continues to fight, the Senator concludes that:

> The United States would feel free to pursue the war in any manner of its choosing.

The editors of the Washington Evening Star yesterday, October 4, strongly commended Senator SYMINGTON for his thoughtful proposal. Referring to the Senator's proposal, the Star editors expressed the belief that if the administration were to try this formula, it would be a genuine test of whether Hanoi wishes peace or not. They say:

> We don't think Senator Symington means that, if his peace move failed, a massive escalation of the conflict must necessarily flow. That would not be our idea. We presumably would continue to slug it out along the lines that have already taken shape.

I agree with the Star that the Senator from Missouri has put forward a constructive proposal designed to end the war. I feel confident that he does not do so in the spirit of an ultimatum aimed at a radical change in our strategy in the event his proposal is not accepted.

I ask unanimous consent that the Star editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A TEST FOR HANOI

Missouri's Senator Symington, a former Air Force Secretary, has come forward with a new and very interesting suggestion for getting to the negotiating table in South Vietnam. Before taking a closer look at the Symington proposal, however, it is useful to go back to President Johnson's speech last Friday night—and to Hanoi's reaction to the key paragraph in that address.

Most of the President's remarks were in the nature of an argument against leading this country to a "Munich" in Southeast Asia. Down in the middle of the text, however, this paragraph appeared: "As we have told Hanoi time and again, the heart of the matter is this: The United States is willing immediately to stop aerial and naval bombardment of North Vietnam when this will lead promptly to productive discussion. We would assume that while discussions proceed, North Vietnam would not take advantage of the bombing cessation or limitation."

The meaning of the first sentence in "the heart of the matter" is obscure. How and when would the President determine whether "productive discussion would promptly follow" a halt to the bombing? There seems to be a bit of give, however, in the second sentence. The statement that we would "assume" that North Vietnam would not take advantage of a bombing pause is new, and stops well short, in our view, of earlier insistence upon some assured reciprocal act of good faith on Hanoi's part. In fact, it comes rather close to an unconditional offer.

Hanoi evidently does not think so. After mulling over the Johnson speech for three days, North Vietnam's official newspaper, Nhan Dan, has rejected the Johnson appeal on the ground that it contained "nothing new." Perhaps this rejection was not quite as harshly worded as some in the past. But it did say this: "So long as the U.S. imperialists stubbornly pursue their war of aggression, the Vietnamese people will continue to fight them until their aggression design is shattered."

Very well. Let's overlook the hyperbole and go back to Symington.

The Missouri Senator is opposed to a bombing pause, which we have favored, because he thinks it would be used by the enemy to the disadvantage of our troops in South Vietnam. What he urges is a stop to *all* fighting in Vietnam, North and South, as of a certain date which would be announced in advance. He would also halt the dispatch of American reinforcements to South Vietnam and would have the South Vietnamese government declare "its willingness to negotiate with anybody and offer amnesty to members of the Viet Cong." Should Hanoi reject this and keep on fighting, "the United States would feel free to pursue the war in any manner of its choosing." We don't think Senator Symington means that, if his peace move failed, a massive escalation of the conflict must necessarily follow. That would not be our idea. We presumably would continue to slug it out along the lines that have already taken shape.

But what about Hanoi? How will Ho Chi Minh respond to the Symington suggestion if the President adopts it? Certainly he cannot reject such a move as "nothing new," or as another dirty trick by U.S. imperialists seeking to pursue their "war of aggression." For what Symington is saying in essence is this: We will stop all fighting, if you will. And then we can talk peace.

If the men who make the decisions in Hanoi really want peace, they will accept the proposal. If they want more war, they will reject it. And should they opt for more war, that at least should put a stop to the extraordinary dovish debate which has been the hallmark of the Senate in recent days.

SUPPORT FROM MINING CONGRESS JOURNAL FOR S. 522, A BILL TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL MINING AND MINERALS POLICY

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I think that a recent editorial of the Mining Congress Journal should be brought to the attention of Members of the Senate. The editorial emphasizes that the current disruption of essential raw materials from some foreign sources has dramatized the need for a dependable domestic resource base to serve the needs of our growing economy.

It was because of my continuing conviction that the establishment of a national minerals policy is essential to the well-being of our country that early in this session of Congress I introduced legislation calling for the establishment of a national minerals policy. The bill, S. 522, simply provides for a congressional declaration that the establishment of a national minerals policy is in the national interest and that the Federal Government should foster a sound domestic mining and minerals industry, encourage the provision for adequate mineral reserves, and promote mineral research to provide efficient use of our mineral resources.

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs [Mr. JACKSON] requested departmental reports from affected Federal agencies regarding S. 522 over 8 months ago. We are still waiting for these reports. As the chairman so aptly observed in his most recent letter again requesting the submission of these reports:

> It seems unreasonable that it should take this long to formulate a policy position with respect to this particular legislation.

The editorial of the Mining Congress Journal clearly demonstrates the emergent problem confronting this Nation. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SERVING THE NATIONAL INTEREST

The recent hostilities in the Middle East have led to the banning of oil shipments to the United States and Great Britain by a number of Arab countries. The ban will apparently be of little immediate consequence to the United States but it does call attention to our vulnerability with respect to the availability of certain essential raw materials from some foreign sources.

This can be better understood by remembering that importation of mineral products continues to grow and by recalling, for example, the seizure of American-owned nickel properties in Cuba, the prohibition by the U.S. Government against importation of chrome and other products originating in Rhodesia, the tragic events that rocked the mineral-rich Congo a few years back, recent purchases of magnesium from Russia, the continuing releases of a variety of metals from federal stockpiles, and current disorders in Bolivia's tin producing areas. All of these add dimension to the matter of having an adequate and dependable resource base to serve the needs of a growing economy and, equally, to assure the national security.

It is widely recognized that mineral raw materials are being consumed at accelerating rates throughout the world. This is particularly true in the United States, which now produces roughly 60 percent of its metal requirements from domestic resources compared to about 84 percent in 1920. It appears obvious that our dependence on foreign resources will continue to rise.

These circumstances, it seems to us, call for policy makers throughout government to do all possible to promote a stronger domestic mining industry. The first step in this direction would be for those who criticize the industry's every move to stop looking at the mining industry merely as a special interest exploiting our mineral resources, and instead consider mining's total contribution to our way of life and its basic importance to improving the lot of everyone. A realistic appreciation of this viewpoint will serve the national interest well.

SUPERSONIC TRANSPORT

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I believe it is a sad state of affairs that skeptics of the American SST program here in the United States do not share the opinion and confidence in America's excellence in aviation products as the foreign customers of those products. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article published in Aviation Daily of June 9, 1967, which quotes the executive vice president of Swissair, who said he thinks that Swissair will wait for the improved version of the United States supersonic transport before ordering a faster than sound airliner.

The foreign carriers have long since evidenced their faith in American-built equipment, and the above statement by a Swissair official shows beyond a shadow of a doubt that this faith is such that they will wait for the American SST. But how long will the foreign carriers wait for our SST? The answer is that if we share their trust in American leadership in aviation and we aggressively pursue this program now, we shall nullify the effect of the foreign competitors; the British-French Concorde and the Soviet Union's TU-144.

America has held aviation superiority since the dawn of aviation; let us not lose it in the darkness of doubt and indecision.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILL WAIT FOR "IMPROVED" U.S. SST, SWISSAIR EXECUTIVE SAYS

Swissair thinks it "will wait for an improved version of the United States supersonic transport" before ordering a faster-than-sound airliner, Armin O. Baltensweiler, the carrier's executive vice president, said during a Seattle visit. "We think we could get such a plane in 1976," Baltensweiler said. "We will have to sit it out and wait."

Baltensweiler meant Swissair does not plan to order the Concorde for its North Atlantic run, preferring to wait for an improved version of the Boeing SST that would offer acceptable economics for the line's long Zurich-New York route. "We feel it would be no use to begin operating an SST (the Concorde) that would have to stop (on a Zurich-New York trip)," he said.

"I think we would be about four years behind the Concorde with 1976 deliveries," he said. "This might be hard to live with, but it would be tougher to buy the Concorde and operate one-stop SST service over the Atlantic. As it is now, the Concorde would be a terrific gamble for us. But they might come up with a better airplane."

The Swissair plan calls for beginning Boeing 747 service early in 1971, with both 747s the line ordered this spring to be in service by the peak-travel 1971 season. The line thinks bringing the 747 on line in the early 1970's will enable the carrier to build up traffic to cope with the great productivity of the American SST, he said.

"We think we could cover our route requirements with four SSTs," he said. "And we would commit ourselves on an SST just as soon as we could get the necessary range." Baltensweiler pointed out the Boeing SST was designed to meet FAA specifications, which included a 4000-mile range. A growth version proposed by Boeing, he said "would come closer to our requirements." He said "I believe very much in the supersonic transport. When it becomes a reality, we would rather put money in SSTs than in subsonic jets."

SST CENTRAL TO MOST OF AIRLINE'S EQUIPMENT PLANS

Much of Swissair's equipment planning revolves around the SST because of the airliner's importance on such runs as the North and South Atlantic and to the Far East. The question of an air bus, for example, is tied to the SST in the Swissair view, since the carrier wants to make certain if the SST becomes a reality that it has the money to buy it. Then, if Swissair were satisfied it could handle the SST financing, it would consider the air bus, Baltensweiler said. Such an advanced-technology plane would replace the line's Convair 990 fleet and part of its DC-9 fleet. "We have some very clear ideas on the air bus for such routes as London-Zurich, Paris-Copenhagen and Spain-Rome," he said.

"We also feel our Mediterranean and Africa routes could be served by an air bus in 10 years. So we need a range of 2000 nautical miles for such a plane. And we think an air bus almost requires three engines rather than two. We would rather have a 200-passenger plane with a 2000-nautical-mile range than a 300-passenger transport with a 1500-mile range." Swissair sees an eventual need for five to 10 air bus transports, Baltensweiler said. "But the air bus is not as important as getting the right SST," he emphasized.

Swissair, a major operator of Douglas jets, plans to be operating in 1972 a fleet of nine to 10 DC-8s, about 18 DC-9s, its 990s and 747s and three F-27s for internal services, Baltensweiler said. He revealed that Swissair had recommended selection of the Boeing variable-sweep-wing SST design over Lockheed's fixed-delta-wing plane. A key feature, he said, was the Boeing SST's "flexibility."

L. John Eichner has joined Simat, Helliesen and Associates, transportation economists with headquarters in New York, as v.p. For the past five years, Eichner was assistant v.p.-corporate planning of American Airlines, and prior to that was v.p.-marketing of Trans-Texas for eight years.

Delta Air Lines has made a $2,000 grant to the Institute of Certified Travel Agents. It will be used to develop business management techniques in the travel agent industry, through a project to be selected, the institute said.

CONGRESSIONALLY APPLIED DISCOUNT RATES ON PUBLIC WORKS HURT NATION'S ECONOMIC PERFORMANCE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, it is disheartening to report on national policies that are causing serious economic dislocations. These days, when we are barraged with demands for a tax surcharge, we must remember that there are indeed viable alternatives open to administration consideration.

The art by which such alternatives can be analyzed was the subject of recent hearings held by the Joint Economic Committee's Economy in Government Subcommittee, which I have the honor to chair. The hearings which covered 4 days concerned themselves with the planning-programing-budgeting—PPB—evaluation methods.

One integral tool in the PPB system is that of benefit/cost analysis; in simple terms, the overall benefits—that is, both direct and indirect returns—of a proposal are gaged against the overall costs, again, both primary and secondary. In using these techniques, it is important that the factors used to measure the variables be as honestly derived as possible. And foremost of these key factors is the discount rate used to evaluate a project's rate of return. Since 1962, Congress has kept the discount rate on Government projects based upon the average rate of interest payable by the Treasury on longrun interest-bearing marketable securities; historically, the rate remained at 3⅛ percent until only recently, when it was pushed up to 3¼ percent. In using this low rate, the Congress approves projects, primarily in public works, when the rate of return from the project is equal to or above the long-term Government security rate noted above.

But, Mr. President, in our hearings, a panel of highly placed economists emphatically emphasized that this rate is wrong. The correct rate, they told us, is the percentage rate of return that the resources could have obtained in the economy's private sector; a rate ranging from 10 to 15 percent.

While it is hard to measure precisely the total degree of waste caused by administration use of the lower discount rate, some effects can be noted. The administration requested over $4.5 billion in public works projects for fiscal 1968; fiscal 1966 public works expenditures totaled $4.67 billion, and the fiscal 1967 estimate is approximately $4.6 billion. Since 1961, almost $24 billion has been spent in various public works programs.

When the rate of return in these public programs is appreciably less than could be earned in the private economy, the whole economy suffers. Both public and private investment programs compete for scarce resources. The channeling of such resources to projects with low payoffs diverts resources from optimum allocations and tends toward creating inflationary pressures among those projects with higher returns, and leads to less overall economic growth.

In straightforward terms, administration utilization of "wrong" discount rates has contributed to the vexing problems in inflation, credit squeezes, capacity conditions, and sluggish growth over the past few years. Panaceas, like surcharges, have to be rejected in the face of the obvious fact that proper project evaluation could lead to substantial decreases in Government spending.

S. 1035, AN ACT TO PROTECT THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF EMPLOYEES OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF GOVERNMENT AND TO PREVENT UNWARRANTED GOVERNMENTAL INVASIONS OF THEIR PRIVACY

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on September 13, the Senate passed S. 1035, an act to protect all employees of the Federal Government from unwarranted invasion of their privacy in their personal thoughts, beliefs, and activities. To judge from the letters and telephone calls, I believe that the action of this body gave Americans renewed faith in Congress as guardian of the liberties of the people.

But the Senate only took care of half of the job: much remains to be done. The responsibility for steering this bill on to the Presidential signature now rests with the House of Representatives.

S. 1035 is pending before a subcommittee of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, together with several companion bills. Among sponsors of these measures are Representatives Reuss, Galifianakis, Reinecke, Cunningham, Watson, Moss, Matsunaga, Long, Lennon, and Fulton.

The yea-and-nay vote on the passage of S. 1035 shows the overwhelmingly broad bipartisan support for the proposal. The hearing record and subcommittee investigation of the denial of employee privacy amply demonstrate the urgent need for such guarantees. It is my hope that the House will have the opportunity to act on the bill at this session.

Under unanimous consent I include in the Record at this point a number of articles and editorials commenting on S. 1035 and invasion of privacy. These are from the Gastonia, N.C., Gazette, August 31, 1967; the Wilmington, N.C., Morning Star, September 15, 1967; the Washington Post, September 16, 1967; the Christian Science Monitor, September 18, 1967; the St. Louis, Mo., Post-Dispatch, September 21, 1967; the Charlotte, N.C., Observer, September 14, 1967, article by James K. Batten; the Nation, September 25, 1967; Press, Pittsburgh, Pa., September 23, 1967; the Sentinel, Chicago, Ill., September 21, 1967; the Washington Daily News, September 21, 1967; Newsday, Garden City, N.Y., article by Clayton Fritchey, September 20, 1967; the Washington Daily News, September 15, 1967; the Charlotte, N.C., News, September 2, 1967; the News Sentinel, Knoxville, Tenn., August 30, 1967, article by Marshall McNeil; Federal Employees News Digest, edited by Joseph Young, September 25, 1967; and Post Herald, Birmingham, Ala., September 21, 1967.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Gastonia (N.C.) Gazette, Aug. 31, 1967]

The Senator Has Good Cause for Being Riled

North Carolina's Sen. Sam J. Ervin Jr. got riled again. And again there will be a lot of people who won't understand why.

From Washington it was reported that the Senator was red-faced, and editorialized that he was furious, because, as he saw it, the Central Intelligence Agency thinks it has a right to "stand above the law."

The Senator does not want the secret CIA organization to have the power to ask employees and applicants for employment about such personal matters as family relationships, religious beliefs, and sex habits.

And he resented the CIA's maneuvering in legislative places to win elmination of his bill which would safeguard people from such invasions.

Further, the Senator left no doubt that he considers the CIA is not only overstepping proper procedure and denying personal rights, but also is acting illegally by lobbying as a federal agency on pending legislation.

"They want the unmitigated right to kick federal employees around and deny them the basic rights which belong to every American," Senator Ervin charged. That is strong language for the usually cautious man. And it is forceful language, considering that he is a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee which is supposed to have jurisdiction over the CIA.

There is really no cause for failing to understand the Senator's attitude. It is the same attitude which has governed his words and actions in many other matters.

Senator Ervin understands perfectly well that the CIA and the National Security Agency—or some agencies by whatever names—have a vitally important job to do.

As long as nations of people build fences around themselves and regard those on the outside as foreign and potential enemies, there will continue to be a need for what used to be called spying and counterspying.

Both demand more than a little secrecy and a great deal of security within themselves.

Neither can ever be completely achieved. For that reason security agencies are always prone to push harder and harder for additional tools and additional powers.

In that, they are no different from any other close-knit pressure group. And, like every other pressure group, they come to a point where benefits gained have so diminished that they are not worth the cost.

That point comes very early when the cost is in terms of the individual person's rights. When those rights are lost, whatever security agency we have, it is no better than its counterpart in Moscow or pre-war Germany. We shall have spent our real treasure trying to protect it.

All this Senator Ervin knows.

And all this is only a part of why he has appeared over and over again struggling for recognition of the person first. It happens that Senator Ervin is an American. He finds the case for the individual extraordinarily well said in the Constitution. So that is where he makes his stand.

If he were an Englishman, he would make the same fight, taking his stand on whatever basic statement of rights he found in the law.

So he rises to the cause of the individual. He knows that every time a pressure group wins for itself, whatever the excuse or justification, every individual man loses.

In short, human rights have to take precedence over all. And those rights are the property of individual men and women, not of clubs, associations, unions, races, or government agencies.

Senator Ervin is usually called a conservative. The fact is, he is the most liberal believer in democracy one could find.

[From the Wilmington (N.C.) Morning Star, Sept. 15, 1967]

The Right of Privacy

If ever an individual member of the Congress deserved credit for almost single-handedly protecting the privacy of the American citizen it must go to North Carolina's Sen. Sam J. Ervin, Jr.

For months and years Sen. Ervin has been campaigning against the "Big Brother Is Watching You" technique so vividly related by George Orwell in the frightening book, "1984".

Success came at long last for Sen. Ervin Wednesday when the U.S. Senate voted 79 to 4 to keep Uncle Sam's nose out of the private lives of federal employees. The legislation would prevent applicants for government jobs from having to undergo questioning about sex, religion and personal relationships. The bill now goes to the House.

The North Carolina Democrat was forced to go along with partial exemptions in the case of the CIA, the National Security Agency and the FBI, which will be permitted to use lie detectors and psychological tests during job interviews. No one can have much quarrel with this compromise in such sensitive areas.

During recent years, the invasion of privacy of the American citizens has grown to irritating proportions. His eating habits, his drinking habits, whether he's happily married, where was he on the night of July 3, 1953—all of these absurd queries are hurled at him at some time during his daily existence. He is even harried on the telephone as to his personal habits.

Sen. Ervin, under considerable adverse pressure from federal agencies, has just about won the good fight as a starter. It is to be hoped that the House goes along with the Senate and that President Johnson signs the measure into law.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Sept. 16, 1967]

Official Prurience

Those who defend intrusive and intimate questions regarding the private sexual lives of Government employes and job applicants argue that such interrogation reveals much that may help protect national security. Perhaps they do not quite realize how much they reveal about themselves. Probing the privacy of young men and women who want to work for their country may gratify arcane needs of the probers and may provide amusing material for coffee-break and cocktail conversation; but it has by no means been demonstrated that it has any utility whatever for judging fitness or reliability for Government employment.

Effective recruiting is a vital element of national security. A civil service that can enlist the best graduates of the Nation's colleges can contribute a great deal to national strength. But of course able men and women want to work for agencies that treat them fairly and with dignity and that respect their fundamental rights. Some of the questions asked of job applicants by so-called security agencies—Senator Sam Ervin gave a number of disgusting examples in the course of Wednesday's Senate debate on his bill to protect the privacy of Federal employes—are as pointless as they are prurient. They not only serve no purpose in screening the unfit; they outrage the healthy and make the Federal service repugnant to them.

The Senate passed Senator Ervin's bill overwhelmingly on Wednesday as, indeed, it should have done. But it adopted exemptions for the Central Intelligence Agency, the National Security Agency and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. It is a reflection on these agencies that they should want to be exempted. It is a reflection on the judgment of the first two—the FBI has long since learned better—that they want to place reliance in judging the candor of persons under investigation on those discredited instruments of contemporary witchcraft, lie detectors. It is currently fashionable to dress the lie detector up under the more hifalutin name of "polygraph"; but by any name it would be more sensible to rely on reading the entrails of sheep.

The House has important work to do on Senator Ervin's praiseworthy bill. It ought to make its old-fashioned American decency applicable to every agency of the American Government.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Sept. 18, 1967]

To Protect Their Privacy

Government workers and job applicants have been asked by federal agencies all sorts of questions about their private lives and opinions—their religion and religious beliefs, race, national origin, family relationships, sexual matters, finances, and outside activities.

Sen. Sam J. Ervin, Jr. (D), of North Carolina, along with 54 bipartisan cosponsors, introduced legislation forbidding government agencies to require or request current or prospective federal employees to disclose this kind of information about their private lives.

Senator Ervin and his subcommittee on constitutional rights had previously heard extensive testimony complaining that federal government personnel procedures violated personal privacy. They concluded that government has been gathering and filing personal information much of which has little or nothing to do with a person's ability or qualifications.

The bill, soon due for Senate floor debate, exempts from its provisions only employees of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. It makes special provision for the Central Intelligence Agency and the National Security Agency, but these are both seeking the same status as the FBI.

With technical advances making it much easier to gather, store, and widely disseminate personnel information, it is all the more important that Congress pass this "bill of rights for federal employees." The rights which this bill would protect are implicit in the Constitution of the United States.

But specific legislation is needed to erase any doubt whether a man, by accepting employment with the federal government, thereby bargains away these rights. Some government agencies, judging by their questionnaires and their psychological and polygraph tests, have apparently assumed that he does. Passage of this legislation will make it plain that he does not.

Senator Ervin put it more dramatically when he declared that this bill is based on the premise "that a man who works for the federal government sells his services, not his soul."

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, Sept. 21, 1967]

A Measure of Privacy

Though the President and Supreme Court have often spoken out against invasions of personal privacy, the leading invader of privacy for some years has been the Federal Government itself. To make the Government set a better example, the Senate has now passed by 79 to 4 a measure meant to uphold constitutional rights of federal employes.

If the overwhelming Senate vote is not enough to suggest the need for such a bill, results of a long investigation by a Senate subcommittee should prove it. For example, the Senators found that one woman applying for a Foreign Service job was asked to "answer quickly and without any thinking or deliberation" whether these statements are true or false: I believe in a life hereafter. I read the Bible several times a week. My sex life is satisfactory. Evil spirits possess me at times.

An 18-year-old college girl told the Senators she had thought working for the State Department one summer might be fun, until a departmental interrogator began asking her personal questions about her relations with a boy friend. She lost interest in a federal job.

Such intimate questions about family relationships, sex, religion and personal habits (even dreams) were a familiar part of what officials termed "psychological testing," involving both questionnaires and use of polygraphs, the so-called lie detectors. The subcommittee found that 16 federal agencies had hired 633 polygraph examiners, though it also heard expert testimony that polygraph results were not reliable. The FBI does not use them.

Of course, federal officials defended psychological testing on various grounds: national security, determination of fitness of employes, even the need to provide medical or other aid for employes. The diverse defenses did not make much sense. Senator Sam Ervin of North Carolina, subcommittee chairman, said the tests were both "useless and offensive." "If the security of the United States rests on these devices," he added, "we are indeed pitifully insecure."

But the invasion of privacy of government employes does not stop there. The subcommittee also heard of coercion against them to buy bonds, to take part in some outside activities and to avoid others, and to conduct any public writing or speaking according to some official's preconceived rules.

To make matters worse, this infernal meddling in private lives was not restricted to so-called security agencies, but was spread throughout the bureaucracy. Nor was there any relation between security and the granting of such elementary protection as a right to counsel in hearings; the Defense Department allowed counsel but, until recently, the Civil Service Commission did not.

As passed by the Senate, Senator Ervin's bill is aimed specifically at all these malpractices, exempting only the three major intelligence agencies: the CIA, NSA and FBI. The military is covered by its own rules.

For other federal departments, the bill prohibits bureaucratic demands that employes disclose their race, religion or national origin or take psychological or polygraph tests involving family, sex and religion. The measure bars demands that employes engage in outside activities or report those of a voluntary nature. It prohibits coercion as to charitable gifts and bonds and in political matters. It also requires the right to counsel in disciplinary hearings.

Senator Ervin deserves a great deal of credit for disclosing the Big Brotherly operations of government and proposing to put an end to them. As a practical matter, such invasions of a citizen's rights, innermost thoughts and beliefs can only discourage sound federal employment practices. But the principle involved is far more important.

The principle is the Constitutional one of protecting private thoughts from intrusion. When the Government itself assumes the privileges of keyhole aristocracy it should, as Senator Ervin said, "disturb every American who takes pride in his government." We hope the House will be as disturbed as the Senate proved to be.

[From the Charlotte (N.C.) Observer, Sept. 14, 1967]

Ervin's Privacy Bill Passes—With CIA in It

(By James K. Batten)

WASHINGTON.—The Central Intelligence Agency lost its battle to be exempted from Sen. Sam Ervin's "bill of rights" for government employes Wednesday as the Senate approved the bill, 79 to 4.

Ervin called the vote "a great victory for human rights and human dignity." But Senate defenders of the CIA warned that the bill could hamper U.S. intelligence efforts all over the world.

Most of the four-hour debate centered on the use of lie-detector and psychological tests to screen out homosexuals and other undesirables applying for jobs with the CIA and the National Security Agency. The Ervin bill would sharply limit the use of such tests.

Sen. Henry M. Jackson, D-Wash., a member of the Senate's CIA watchdog committee, claimed that more than 10 "definite security risks" were screened out by the CIA last year after other methods failed to identify them.

Ervin remarked that two cryptographers who worked for the National Security Agency, William H. Martin and Vernon F. Mitchell, both had passed lie-detector tests before they defected to Russia in 1960.

"A man that will believe in polygraph tests will believe in witchcraft," Ervin declared.

The question of exempting the CIA and the NSA from the Ervin bill never came to a showdown, reportedly because a nose count convinced Jackson, Sen. John Stennis, D-Miss., and Sen. Richard B. Russell, D-Ga., that they would lose.

Stennis and his allies stayed in close touch with the CIA and NSA throughout the afternoon's debate. At least four agents from the CIA and the NSA watched the proceedings from the gallery, ducking out frequently to confer with strategists in the cloakrooms below.

The CIA, particularly, had fought hard to escape coverage by the bill. Just before the Labor Day recess, the Ervin bill was pulled off the Senate agenda on short notice in response to CIA request for time to plead its case.

CIA Director Richard Helms and other agents visited a number of senators shortly thereafter, insisting that the bill would cause serious problems for the super-secret intelligence agency. But apparently their efforts failed to sway the Senate majority.

Ervin did yield on one point in Wednesday's debate, and there were varying interpretations of its importance.

The N.C. Democrat agreed to an amendment permitting the directors of the CIA and the NSA to designate officials within their agencies to decide when special circumstances dictated use of otherwise forbidden questions on lie-detector and psychological tests.

Ervin originally urged the Judiciary Committee to require CIA and NSA, like all other government agencies, to abstain from asking employes and job applicants questions about sex, religion, or family relations in the course of lie-detector or psychological tests.

But the committee voted, instead, to permit such questioning when the direction of the agency personally determined that it was necessary to protect the national security.

On the floor Wednesday, Ervin agreed to permit an agency director to delegate such decisions to "his designee," if he wished. Whether such language would permit CIA and NSA to continue as they have in the past was not immediately clear.

Prospects for House action on the bill this year are uncertain.

In general, the Ervin bill is designed to safeguard the privacy of government employes from unwarranted intrusions by their superiors.

Among other things, the bill would forbid requirement that employes buy savings bonds, make certain charitable contributions, attend off-duty meetings and report on personal activities unrelated to their jobs.

"There is nothing in this bill which will handicap the CIA or NSA in protecting America against enemies of America," Ervin told the Senate. "All this bill does is try to make them have a proper respect for the rights of privacy of their employes."

[From the Nation, Sept. 25, 1967]

House of Spooks

Critics of the Central Intelligence Agency have for years said that that house of spooks is nutty; but for the most part such things were said in the spirit of hyperbole. Now it appears that perhaps they were right in this: the CIA does in fact appear to be run by kooks.

Assuming that an organization's sanity can be tested by the manner in which it hires and fires its employees, consider this evidence of mental aberration: The CIA uses handwriting analysis (according to *The Wall Street Journal*) to test the character and personality traits of job applicants. This is scarcely a scientific or even a common-sense test, of course, but that doesn't seem to bother the men who run the CIA.

More recently Sen. Sam Ervin of North Carolina came up with the fascinating information that at least as late as 1963 the

CIA was financing the development of a "wiggle seat," a sly kind of lie detector. The job applicant would be seated in a plain-looking chair during his interview; but unbeknownst to him, the specially equipped seat would be recording his pulse, adrenalin flow, respiration and skin dampness. It is not known whether the wiggle seat has ever been put into service.

What is known is that the CIA is using its battery of ordinary lie-detector machines with a mindless fury. Senator Ervin has learned, through his own sources within the spy agency (its top officials will no longer talk with him) that more than 5,000 lie tests were administered on both employees and would-be employees during the last year, and only thirty for counterintelligence purposes.

Because of his psychotic affection for the machine, CIA Director Richard Helms is frantically determined that Congress shall not include his agency under the pending bill to outlaw lie-detector tests and to prohibit any government agency from asking a job applicant such things as whether he ever had sexual relations with an animal, whether he slept with his wife before marriage, whether he urinates more than other people, or whether he believes in the Second Coming. Helms has lobbied furiously in the Senate to keep the privilege of asking CIA workers questions of this sort, and he will undoubtedly now go to work on the House to defend his bureaucratic voyeurism.

He is especially interested in having the right to use the lie detector to hunt for homosexuals. But the reason is not clear. Does he wish to get rid of them as security risks? Or does he want to recruit them as agents? The latter is rumored and the rumor has been published, even in the highly responsible *Christian Science Monitor*. Helms has not denied the published rumors. Senator Ervin—certainly no defender of Helms—feels, however, that not even the CIA is that dumb. But even assuming the CIA wants to use the lie detector to weed out homosexuals, this makes little sense.

In one of the closed sessions of the Senate subcommittee considering Ervin's bill, Sen. Birch Bayh of Indiana, a close friend of Helms, argued with Ervin: "Sam, if the Russians find a queer on the CIA payroll, they can intimidate him and put him to their own service." To which Ervin responded tiredly: "Yeah? And how are the Russians going to find him—with a lie detector?"

But logic, as Ervin has discovered, isn't the best of weapons to use in fighting for legislation.

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa) Press, Sept. 23, 1967]

Privacy for Government Employees

Largely through the long effort of Sen. Sam J. Ervin of North Carolina, the Senate has passed and sent to the House a bill designed to protect Government employes from unnecessary invasions of their privacy by zealous superiors or other official stuffed shirts.

In view of the evidence uncovered by a Senate committee, the bill not only is badly needed but long ouverdue. And it is a disgusting reflection on the petty-minded Government officials who not only tolerated this nonsense but promoted it.

In support of the bill, Sen Roman Hruska of Nebraska said employes had been coerced into revealing highly personal information, forced to account for off-duty hours and compelled to donate time and money to assorted projects—among other things. Some of the intimate questions asked of job applicants were outrageous.

As passed by the Senate the bill attempts to outlaw such practices as requiring employes to attend lectures or take part in activities unrelated to their jobs, quizzing them about religious beliefs or sexual attitudes, forcing them to attend political meetings, or to buy bonds or contribute to charities.

In short, it is a sweeping bill to do away with "big brotherism."

The Senate action is proper and the same protection eventually should be provided all citizens who are increasingly subjected to prying, irrelevant questions from nib-noses in and out of Government.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Sentinel, Sept. 21, 1967]

Government Stalling Action on Bill Banning Disclosure of Applicant's Religion

(By Milton Friedman)

The Administration is seeking to stall action by the House on the Senate-approved "Bill of Rights" for Federal employees that would forbid Government agencies from requiring job applicants to disclose their religious background, national origin or race.

The bill also prohibits lie detector and psychological tests to force disclosure of other personal data. It protects individuals from other forms of coercion and invasions of privacy.

Five huge filing cabinets in the office of the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee are bulging with complaints. Some of the complainants told how the Government required them to answer "true" or "false" to such questions as "Christ performed miracles." . . . "I go to church almost every week." . . . "I believe in the second coming of Christ."

Subcommittee chairman Sam Ervin, Jr., North Carolina Democrat, felt that the Government had no right to force answers to such inquiries. He said that "anyone who wishes to understand what intrusion of privacy really means can find out by applying for a Government job."

PRESERVATION OF FREEDOM

Sen. Ervin and the 78 other Senators who voted for his bill, S. 1035, were concerned about the preservation of individual freedom in an age of computers and scientific technology. They noted not only the bold probing of religious beliefs under the guise of security requirements but also probes into philanthropic practices and even sexual behavior.

Pressure by the Administration forced the exemption from the protection of the bill the two agencies concerned with overseas sleuthing—the Central Intelligence Agency and the National Security Agency. Sen. Ervin told the Senate he did not favor even these exemptions.

The FBI was given the same authority provided the CIA and NSA. However, the FBI said it did not use the objectionable testing methods on its employees.

Sen. Ervin said that his own research as subcommittee chairman convinced him that polygraph machines (lie detectors) "are totally unreliable for any purpose." He said that "if the security of the United States rests on these devices, we are indeed pitifully insecure. Fortunately, it does not, for the FBI does not use these examinations."

"But even if it could be shown that psychological tests and polygraph tests have mystical powers and can be used to predict behavior or divine the truth, I would still oppose their being used to probe the religious beliefs, family relationships, or sexual attitudes of American citizens," said the Senator.

An exemption was made for questions concerning national origin where the information is needed for security purposes involving overseas assignments.

Under the pending legislation, Government officials found guilty of violating employees' rights could be suspended or fired. A three-member bipartisan board of employee rights would be created to police the program. The board would hear cases and make regular reports to Congress.

Although the watered-down bill passed the Senate by a vote of 79 to 4, it faces an uncertain future in the House. The Administration is expected to seek futher modification. An attempt will be made to stall action.

Government officials contend that there are already enough Administrative regulations to safeguard employee rights.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Sept. 21, 1967]

Privacy by Statute

Largely thru the long effort of Sen. Sam J. Ervin of North Carolina, the Senate has passed and sent to the House a bill designed to protect Government employes from unnecessary invasions of their privacy by zealous superiors or other official stuffed shirts.

In view of the evidence uncovered by the Senate committee, the bill not only is badly needed but long overdue. And it is a disgusting reflection on the petty-minded Government officials who not only tolerated this nonsense but promoted it.

In support of the bill, Sen. Roman Hruska of Nebraska said employes had been coerced into revealing highly personal information, forced to account for off-duty hours and compelled to donate time and money to assorted projects—among other things. Some of the intimate questions asked of job applicants were outrageous.

As passed by the Senate the bill attempts to outlaw such practices as requiring employes to attend lectures or take part in activities unrelated to their jobs, quizzing them about religious beliefs or sexual attitudes, forcing them to attend political meetings, or to buy bonds or contribute to charities.

In short, it is a sweeping bill to do away with "big brotherism."

We applaud the Senate action and hope the same protection eventually will be provided all citizens who are increasingly subjected to prying, irrelevant questions from nib-noses in and out of government.

[From Newsday, Sept. 20, 1967]

Senate Pulls Plug on Lie Detector

(By Clayton Fritchey)

WASHINGTON.—It's hard to say what will finally become of the Senate's new proclamation of privacy for federal employes, because the bill has yet to pass the House, but come what may it has dealt the polygraph machine (lie detector) a withering blow.

Hopefully, the legislation ultimately will protect federal workers from all kinds of prying into the most intimate recesses of their private lives. Even if it falls short of this, however, it has speeded the end of the polygraph, which has been used so indiscriminately in government hiring and firing.

During the Senate hearings, the testimony against the lie detector, both as to its abuse and unreliability, was so devastating that its further use, outside of government as well as in, will undoubtedly be curtailed, irrespective of whether the House approves the Senate bill or not.

Federal discontinuance is certain to accelerate a similar trend at the state and local levels. A number of states, in fact, have already adopted statutes comparable to the one in Massachusetts, which says, "No employer shall require or subject any employe to any lie detector test as a condition of employment or continued employment." Oregon, Rhode Island, and Hawaii have similar proscriptions. More are on the way.

It is reported that no court in the land, state or federal, will now permit a polygraph test to be admitted in evidence. The reason for this, according to Sen. Sam J. Ervin (D-N.C.), a former judge, is that "the machine is of the most dubious value." It cannot interpret itself, he points out, "but must be interpreted by an operator. The machine merely measures physiological reactions as blood pressure, the pumping of adrenalin by the adrenal glands into the blood stream, and the like, as a result of excitement and stimulation."

While presiding over a murder trial, the former judge said, he had given "close study" to polygraph tests when the prosecution tried to introduce them as evidence. "I came to the conclusion," he says, "that a brazen liar can pass a polygraph test without any difficulty but that a nervous or excitable individual, or an individual who resents being insulted, no matter how truthful he may be, is not likely to do so."

This view is supported by the Warren Commission, which said, "In evaluating the polygraph, due consideration must be given to the fact that a physiological response may be caused by factors other than deception, such as fear, anxiety, neurosis, dislike, and other emotions. There are no valid statistics as to the reliability of the polygraph."

The new Senate bill specifically exempts the FBI, but FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover is already on record against the polygraph for personnel purposes. Labor unions are also beginning to protest against their use.

The AFL–CIO Executive Council has "deplored" them "not only because their claims to reliability are dubious, but because they infringe on the fundamental rights of American citizens to personal privacy. Neither the government nor private employers should be permitted to engage in this sort of police state surveillance of the lives of individual citizens."

Only the CIA and the National Security Agency resisted the Senate legislation, which prompted Sen. Roman Hruska (R.-Neb.) to accuse them of being the "greatest transgressors" in using the polygraph. "What they want," said Ervin, "is to stand above the law."

The U.S. Civil Service Commission, on the other hand, has been showing a growing respect for the private lives of federal employes. It has just quietly, but efficiently, reprimanded one of its investigators for "improperly" inquiring into a report that an applicant had borne a child out of a wedlock.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, September 15, 1967]

U.S. Employees' Bill of Rights

The "bill of rights" for Federal employees passed Wednesday by the Senate by a vote of 79 to 4, was sponsored by Sen. Sam Ervin (D., N.C.) and 54 other senators. We felicitate all of them, sponsors and those who joined in voting for the measure.

The bill would prohibit many forms of coercion which have been practiced upon Federal employees, and, further, would protect them against many indefensible forms of invasion of their privacy.

An amendment gives FBI, CIA and NSA special rights to make apply certain tests to employees for security reasons, which is only proper and wise.

Now the bill goes to the House where further action probably will be delayed until next year. We deplore this and wish that the whole legislative bundle could have been wrapped up right now. However, a fine start has been made toward assuring Federal employees their rightful dignity, and we hope that the bill rides into law before too long.

[From the Charlotte (N.C.) News, Sept. 2, 1967]

A CIA Above the Law

The more there is to say about the Central Intelligence Agency, apparently, the less there is to say for it. The spy guys scare you when you can't see them but it's much worse when you can.

First, the CIA refused to appear in hearings on a Sam Ervin-sponsored bill that would limit the agency's blanket rights to pry into the lives of its employes. Then it announced it would be glad to take part in a—you guessed it—secret hearing before the Judiciary Committee. Then Richard Helms, the new CIA chief, got busy and managed to have the Ervin bill removed from the Senate agenda.

The performance prompted Senator Ervin to make public a blistering memorandum he had sent to other Judiciary Committee members accusing the CIA of trying to stand above the law and of active and illegal lobbying in Congress. He read the appropriate federal law forbidding agencies of the government from attempting to influence the passage or defeat of legislation before Congress and suggested that the CIA might leave its lie detectors long enough to investigate whether this statute has been violated.

An investigation of some sort definitely is called for. It is no light matter when government agencies begin bullying Congress or trading off favors for preferential treatment. The applicable law in this case is vital to protect government from the paralyzing grip of an all-powerful bureaucracy. If this matter is allowed to drop without further comment, Congress will serve notice that the CIA is indeed above the law.

[From the Knoxville (Tenn.) News-Sentinel, Aug. 30, 1967]

CIA Rocks Boat

(By Marshall McNeil)

WASHINGTON.—The Central Intelligence Agency wants its spies to be left out in the cold.

It is asking the Senate for exemption from terms of the proposed "bill of rights" to protect Federal Government employees from uninhibited grilling about intimate details of their family relations, sex life and religion.

The CIA request has caused the leadership to delay until next month debate on the "bill of rights," a measure co-sponsored by 50 senators and recommended by the Judiciary Committee.

Thus CIA, swathed in the secrecy said to be so essential to success in the shadowy crafts of spies and counterspies, has stirred up another public fuss, plus the ire of that eloquent old parliamentary battler, Sen. Sam Ervin (D-N.C.).

And the threat has been made that if CIA persists in its request, in which it is joined by that other supersecret bureau, the National Security Agency, both may endanger the partial exemptions already written into the bill for them.

There are some who think that if CIA ever is compromised, it may have only itself to blame.

USE LIE DETECTORS

The courtly Ervin discovered some time ago that to get a Federal job some young applicants were required to take lie-detector tests and answer such questions as: "When was the first time you had sexual relations with a woman? Have you ever engaged in homosexual activities? . . . Did you have intercourse with (your wife) before you were married? How many times?"

The bill, product of long hearings by Ervin's Constitutional Rights subcommittee, would put an end to such questioning. It would also prohibit:

Indiscriminate requirements that employees and applicants for Government employment disclose their race, religion or national origin; participation in outside activities unrelated to their employment; reports on their outside activities; or support of political candidates.

It would make it illegal to coerce an employe to buy bonds or make charitable contributions or to require him to disclose his personal assets, liabilities or expenditures or those of any member of his family unless such items would tend to show a conflict of interests.

"Why," asked Ervin, "do these two agencies want the license to coerce their employes to contribute to charity and to buy bonds? Do they not know how to evaluate a secretary for employment without asking for . . . if she loved her mother, if she goes to church every week, if she believes in God, if she believes in the second coming of Christ, if her sex life is satisfactory . . . what she dreams about, and many other extraneous matters?"

SELF SERVICES

Moreover, Ervin said, the bill already allows CIA and NSA to use lie-detector or psychological tests to elicit information from an employe or applicant on his personal relations with any person connected with him by blood or marriage, his religious beliefs, or his attitude or conduct with respect to sexual matters. The only requirement is that before such questions can be asked, the directors of CIA and NSA must make a personal finding that such a test is required to protect the national security.

Ervin said he was furnished a 10-page statement by CIA about things it objected to in the bill, but—wouldn't you know!—the statement was marked "Secret." He said in response to it he changed the bill to meet what he regarded as every relevant complaint.

"The idea that any Government agency is entitled to the 'total man' and to knowledge and control of all the details of his personal and community life unrelated to his employment of law enforcement is more appropriate for totalitarian countries than for a society of free men," Ervin said.

"The basic premise of (the 'bill of rights') is that a man who works for the Federal Government sell his services, not his soul."

[From Federal Employees' News Digest, Sept. 25, 1967]

Bill of Rights Snag

(By Joseph Young)

The House appears in no hurry to take action on the Senate-approved "bill of rights" for government employees.

Rep. David Henderson, D-N.C., chairman of the House Civil Service Manpower subcommittee to which the Senate-okayed bill was referred, said his group has other legislation pending before it that will receive priority.

Henderson said he wanted to study the Senate-approved measure to protect government workers against unwarranted invasion of privacy before he decides what action, if any, to take.

"I guess you can't be against a bill such as this," Henderson said. "But I want to study it more thoroughly."

Indications point to Henderson's subcommittee preferring not to take action until next year. Since next year's session of Congress will be merely a continuation of this year, lack of House action this year would not kill the measure.

But Sen. Sam Ervin, D-N.C., chief Senate sponsor of the bill, is anxious to get final approval by Congress this year. Incidentally, Ervin deserves the great support and thanks of all federal and postal employees for his monumental efforts on their behalf. His name belongs in that small roster of the truly great champions in the history of Congress on behalf of government employees.

The administration is opposed to the measure as approved by the Senate and would like the House to either kill it or modify it drastically.

In the final analysis, it will be up to the federal and postal unions to bring pressure to bear on the Henderson group to hold hearings and take action on the Senate-approved bill. This the employee groups intend to do. They strongly favor the measure and feel its enactment into law is essential.

Individual employees can also help. Those living in the districts of the members of the subcommittee should contact their congressman and urge prompt hearings and action. The subcommittee members are Reps. David Henderson, N.C.; Charles Wilson, Calif.; Richard White, Tex.; Lee Hamilton, Tex.; Frank Brasco, N.Y.; H. R. Gross, Iowa; Edward Derwinski, Ill.; James Broyhill, N.C. Also, letters to Rep. Thaddeus Dulski, D-N.Y., chairman of the full House Civil Service Committee; and Robert Corbett, Pa., the group's ranking minority member, would be helpful.

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) Post-Herald, Sept. 21, 1967]

Privacy by Statute

Largely through the long effort of Sen. Sam J. Ervin of North Carolina, the Senate has passed and sent to the House a bill designed to protect Government employees from unnecessary invasions of their privacy by zealous superiors or other official stuffed shirts.

In view of the evidence uncovered by a Senate committee, the bill not only is badly needed but long overdue. And it is a disgusting reflection on the petty-minded Government officials who not only tolerated this nonsense but promoted it.

In support of the bill, Sen. Roman Hruska of Nebraska said employes had been coerced into revealing highly personal information, forced to account for off-duty hours and compelled to donate time and money to assorted projects—among other things. Some of the intimate questions asked of job applicants were outrageous.

As passed by the Senate the bill attempts to outlaw such practices as requiring employes to attend lectures or take part in activities unrelated to their jobs, quizzing them about religious beliefs or sexual attitudes, forcing them to attend political meetings, or to buy bonds or contribute to charities.

In short, it is a sweeping bill to do away with "big brotherism."

We applaud the Senate action and hope the same protection eventually will be provided all citizens who are increasingly subjected to prying, irrelevant questions from nib-noses in and out of Government.

THE RESOLUTION URGING ASIAN ALLIES FOR MORE CONTRIBUTION IN VIETNAM

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I welcome the opportunity to speak in behalf of this fine resolution which has been introduced by my friend the able Senator from Illinois, which has been cosponsored by many distinguished colleagues.

While I do not wish to have this action of the Senate increase the many burdens or pressures now on our busy President, I do feel that this resolution, expressing the opinion of the Senate, will be useful in obtaining more military assistance from our Asian allies.

In this regard, I should like to give special recognition to the splendid record of the Australian and Korean combat units that are already fighting by our side in South Vietnam. And, of course, I am certain that we welcome the engineering, medical, and other support we receive from units of our other allies in the far Pacific.

I should like to have the RECORD show the total numbers of allied military men now on the scene in Vietnam. According to the Department of Defense, the following numbers of allied troops were in South Vietnam as of October 1:

South Vietnam (about 327,000 regular forces)	730, 000
South Korea	45, 000
Australia	6, 300
Thailand	2, 500
Philippines	2, 000
New Zealand	400

The resolution is addressed to the non-Communist nations of Asia, and it asks for more contribution. I concur wholeheartedly with this general thought. At the same time I might add that, in my opinion, we need different kinds of contributions.

From the South Vietnamese, who have endured long years of conflict and who have many splendidly trained combat units, we could use greater assistance at our side on the frontlines.

With the possible exception of South Korea, which has done so much already, we could use additional combat and support units from our other Asian allies, particularly from Thailand. By its proximity to Vietnam, Thailand has one of the greatest vested interests in the outcome of the war.

Finally, I suggest that we not ignore the great potential of the armed forces of the Republic of China. That great country has, more than once, offered to send significant assistance to the Vietnam theater.

STATEMENT BY MORRIS B. ABRAM, IN FAVOR OF SENATE RATIFICATION OF THE HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS—CLI

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Mr. Morris B. Abram, U.S. representative on the United Nations Commission on Human Rights and president of the American Jewish Committee, presented to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee a most persuasive statement in favor of U.S. ratification of the human rights conventions.

Mr. Abram points out quite accurately that—

> No serious authority disputes the conclusion of Ambassador Goldberg on behalf of the Administration, that the provisions of these Conventions coincide the fundamental rights already guaranteed by our Federal Constitution, and that their ratification would neither enlarge the existing Federal competence, nor require any implementing legislation, nor impose higher standards than those already observed in this country.

I believe that it goes without saying that I agree wholeheartedly with the arguments and conclusions so effectively articulated by Mr. Abram. Because I am certain that the statement of Morris Abram will be of real value to the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Statement on Human Rights Conventions by Morris B. Abram, Before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, September 13, 1967

Mr. Chairman, I am Morris B. Abram, a member of the law firm of Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 575 Madison Avenue, New York City. I have the honor of serving as U.S. representative on the UN Commission on Human Rights. I also serve as President of the American Jewish Committee, and am a member of the American Bar Association.

I am grateful to you and to the other members of the Committee for the opportunity to present my views on the question before you. I regret that I was unable to present them at the earlier hearing last Spring of Senator Dodd's Ad Hoc Subcommittee, since I was then in Geneva at the session of the Human Rights Commission.

I shall not burden the Committee with a detailed analysis of the legal issues raised in connection with the three conventions which are the subject of these hearings. These were thoroughly and admirably discussed in the February 23 testimony of Ambassador Goldberg and in the statements of other excellent witnesses who appeared on March 8 before the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on behalf of a great many important citizens' organizations. I refer, in particular, to the testimony of Richard Gardner for the more than 50 organizations composing the Ad Hoc Committee on Human Rights and Genocide Treaties, I draw your attention also to the reports of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, and of the Committee of Human Rights and the Committee on Women of the National Citizens' Commission on International Cooperation. This material is reproduced in the record of the Ad Hoc Subcommittee's hearings. Though my remarks will touch on the legal issues, they will center on the question of policy and national interest.

I think it is significant, Mr. Chairman, that not one of the witnesses before the Subcommittee opposed the ratification of any of the three conventions, but, to the contrary, all strongly urged that our country join the great number of others that have become parties to these elementary human rights instruments. I think it is also significant that no local bar association opposes their ratification, and at least seven that I know of, have endorsed ratification. These are the bar associations of Alaska, Colorado, District of Columbia, Los Angeles, New Jersey, New York City and New York State.

Mr. Chairman, no serious authority disputes the conclusion of Ambassador Goldberg on behalf of the Administration, that the provisions of these conventions coincide with fundamental rights already guaranteed by our Federal Constitution, and that their ratification would neither enlarge the existing Federal competence, nor require any implementing legislation, nor impose higher standards than those already observed in this country. No authority challenges the assertion that none of their provisions contravene State laws which are otherwise valid under the Federal Constitution.

The chief argument voiced by certain opponents of ratification, is that these Conventions do not deal with matters properly within our Constitution's treaty-making power; that is, they deal with matters that concern the relations between a State and its own citizens, and are not matters of "international concern," and hence not proper subjects for the exercise of this power.

Ambassador Goldberg and other witnesses at the Subcommittee's hearings effectively disposed of this argument. They established that the treaty-making power extends to all matters that are proper subjects of international negotiation—in other words, of international concern—as determined by the contemporary situation. That the subject matter involved is of a domestic nature does not preclude dealing with it by treaty, providing it is also of international concern. The only treaties that are excluded by the Constitution are those designed as a contrivance to make law internally by circumventing the ordinary legislative processes; or treaties whose provisions contravene the express prohibitions of the Constitution—neither of which exclusions apply to the conventions under consideration.

Ambassador Goldberg and the other witnesses substantiated with ample documentation that human rights in general, and the subject matter of these conventions in particular, are an established concern of our foreign policy as well as a concern of the international community. They cited the repeated humanitarian interventions by our government on behalf of oppressed groups in other countries, President Roosevelt's Four Freedoms Proclamation of 1941 and other historic Presidential statements, and our role in the drafting of the United Nations Charter (1945) and the Charter of the Organization of American States (1948). They referred to our role in the writing and our ratification of the ILO Constitution of 1919, whose premise is that the conditions of labor are a matter of international concern, our ratification of the Slavery Convention of 1926, and our participation in the peace treaties of 1947 with the several Central and East European states, containing provisions proscribing discrimination on religious, political and sex grounds. They drew attention to the large number of ratifications of the conventions under consideration here—68 for the Supplementary Slavery Convention, 75 for the Forced Labor Convention, and 51 for the Political Rights of Women Convention.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that there is no constitutional difficulty impeding our ratification of these conventions. Moreover, ratification would be decidedly in our national interest.

I am pleased to note that the American Bar Association, several weeks ago at the meeting of its House of Delegates in Honolulu, came to this conclusion with regard to the Supplementary Slavery Convention. However, as a member of this great Association, I must express regret that the House of Delegates did not make a similar finding with regard to the Forced Labor and the Political Rights of Women conventions. These, it declined to endorse—I may add, by a narrow vote, at which several former presidents spoke out eloquently against this posture—because, in its view, they did not meet these requirements.

Mr. Chairman, if the abolition of slavery in its various manifestations is an acknowledged objective of our foreign relations, and a matter of genuine international concern—because it is an evil which breeds social and political tensions and which, moreover, can have a harmful impact on the sales of American products within our country and in foreign markets—it is difficult for me to understand why this reasoning does apply equally to the evil of forced labor. It is relevant to recall, in this connection, that even the 1926 Slavery Convention, which we ratified long before the existence of the United Nations, called (in Article 5) for all necessary measures to prevent forced labor from developing into conditions resembling slavery—indicating that already then, over 40 years ago, we acknowledged by treaty the similarity of the two evils.

I believe, also, that the Political Rights of Women Convention meets the test both of constitutionality and national interest—in that it is both an important objective of our foreign relations and a matter of genuine international concern. Clearly, genuine economic and social progress is difficult of attainment, especially in the developing countries—to which we send quantities of aid—if half the population is deprived of status and dignity, of the right to vote and to hold public office. Moreover, as pointed out by one witness before the Subcommittee, the withholding from women of civil and political rights, the regarding of them as household possessions, is an obstacle to the progress of family planning—a crucial means for defusing the population explosion, which is perhaps the most critical problem that faces mankind today.

We practice no forced labor in our country. Our women enjoy political rights on a par with men. The standards of these conventions are entirely consistent with our own practices; they are a projection internationally of our own human rights principles and commitments. We should rejoice that they have become part of the growing body of international law in the field of human rights. We should have been the first to ratify them, rather than still be haggling about vague and fictitious dangers lurking in them.

I believe there exists in some circles a vague fear of the consequences that might flow from opening ourselves up to criticism from foreign powers. It is not clear whether what is feared is deserved or undeserved criticism. In either case, the fear is mistaken. For if the fear is that we may be criticized for national conduct falling below the standards in these conventions—for reinstituting conditions of slavery or practicing forced labor or depriving our women of their political rights—should not external criticism be welcomed? But this eventuality is obviously academic, since we have every reason to be secure in and proud of our standards in the areas covered by these conventions.

On the other hand, if it is feared that the conventions might be used as a peg for subjecting us to *undeserved* criticism, this reveals an unwarranted under-estimation of our capacity to defend ourselves in international forums. The truth is that by becoming a party to these conventions we would not give our "enemies" any propaganda weapon that they do not already have, and that we are not capable of effectively resisting. As an open society, with our practices widely discussed in our own as well as the world information media, we risk nothing. The risk lies rather with the communist and other closed societies, against which our ratification would provide us with a legal and moral handle to prod for *their* delinquencies.

Mr. Chairman, the question before this Committee goes beyond the three conventions under consideration. This question is whether our country is to operate with a conception of the treaty power that is suitable for the realities of the rapidly shrinking world we inhabit. It is whether our policies are to be responsive to the objective facts of the increasing interdependence of nations, and the relationship between the conditions of freedom, economic and social progress, and international peace and security. It is whether our policies will reflect the recurrently demonstrated truth that the effects of the suppression of liberty, of race and sex discrimination, of poverty and illiteracy, tend to overflow borders and affect adversely other countries and the world-at-large.

The question is also whether the ideals which inspired the authors of our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution, that human rights and freedoms are the rightful heritage not only of Americans but of all men, is valid for us today; whether the American tradition of espousing the cause of the oppressed, or promoting the fundamental values of human rights, not only at home but abroad, is still an essential element of our national policy. It is whether we still adhere to, or whether we intend to renege on, the commitment we made when we joined the United Nations, to cooperate with other nations "in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion", and in solving international economic and social problems.

Mr. Chairman, if we did not expect to carry out this commitment seriously, why did we ratify the UN Charter? If we did not intend to join in measures for implementing this undertaking, of which the most crucial is the adoption and the ratification of conventions, why did we indorse the inclusion in the Charter of this human rights purpose? Do we want the contemporary worldwide effort to extend the rule of law in the field of human rights to succeed or, by standing aloof from it, are we prepared to be a witness to its demise—as our failure to join the League of Nations contributed to the demise of that noble effort. For it is a fact of today's reality that when the United States, the world's strongest power and leading democracy, stands aloof from an international undertaking, that undertaking has little chance to succeed.

For this past July, before the World Conference on World Peace Through Law, and the First World Assembly of the World Association of Judges, both meeting in Geneva (organizations, incidentally, which are emanations of a praiseworthy initiative of leading members of the American Bar Association, and both of which have called upon the nations of the world to ratify human rights conventions)—the Chief Justice of the United States addressed himself to the subject of the treaty-making power in our time "of enormous growth and of unfortunate turmoil". "We believe," the Chief Justice said, "that the treaty-making power of all sovereign nations, broadly exercised, is at once perhaps the most potent, realistic and wholesome instrumentality for peace that can be exercised in our complex world." "Law," he said, "is the substance out of which man has most successfully fashioned ways and means to avoid or peacefully resolve conflict. It is not sufficient for us to know what the law has been in the past or what it is today. It is our responsibility to guide its future and see that it is adequate to meet conditions." The Chief Justice continued: "Those who seek to further world-wide cooperation, to spread social, economic and technological advances among all the world's peoples, those who seek to avoid conflict and collision by controlling threats to peace, usually urge that law is the tool whereby these things can be accomplished. Internationally, this chiefly means treaties."

Mr. Chairman, the thoughts conveyed by the Chief Justice—the law as a means for spreading progress and avoiding conflict, the importance of the law's adaptability to changing conditions and problems, the role of treaties as the principal means of developing law internationally—these are concepts projected by our founding fathers, concepts underlying our Constitution. Elasticity, capability of accommodation to change, domestically and internationally—this is the strength of our Constitution. As it has adapted itself so magnificently to the changing realities of the relationship between our Federal government and the several states—quite recently to cite a dramatic example, when the murder of a President, so obviously an event of momentous import to the nation as a whole, was made a federal crime—so it is designed, by way of the treaty-making power, to adapt to changing international realities.

And I would recall to this Committee that even the late Secretary of State Dulles, in the very statement of April 1953 before the Senate Judiciary Committee, in which he pronounced the intention of the Administration then in office not to seek ratification of human rights conventions, said "I do not mean to imply that the boundary between international and domestic concerns is rigid for all time."

Accordingly, I cannot indorse strongly enough the viewpoint expressed in the report of the New York City Bar Association, reproduced in the record of the Subcommittee's hearings: "Surely the Constitution does not render the United States impotent to do what other nations can do, i.e., participate in one of the major developments of the international community in the last half-century—the quest for common minimum standards through 'international legislation' by multilateral convention."

In urging a forward-looking perspective in regard to the exercise of the treaty-making power, I do not intend, Mr. Chairman, to suggest that we should join in every convention drafted by the United Nations or other international agency. Clearly there are, and may be in the future, conventions which are not appropriate to us—either because they are not relevant to the setting or circumstances of our country or because they are inconsistent with our legal principles or domestic goals or policies. Such conventions we are free to abstain from ratifying, as are other governments with regard to conventions they consider inappropriate to their situation. We are free to evaluate—we would be remiss if we did not—any new convention on its merits. I would go further: we are free to withdraw from, "denounce" in the international law jargon, any ratified convention which proves mischievous or injurious to our domestic harmony or our national interest. In short, Mr. Chairman, the "wedge" argument of the opponents of ratification is without merit.

On the other hand, where the provision of particular conventions are in harmony with our principles, where they are consistent with our laws and practices, where it is in our national interest to encourage other nations to raise their laws and practices to the level of standards of these conventions—I find no justification for our failure to ratify them. I see no reason for us, by not ratifying these conventions, to lessen our capacity to encourage other nations to adhere to them and to implement them in their countries. I see no reason, by our failure to ratify, to prejudice our legal and moral standing to protest the infringement of the conventions in other countries. I see no reason to undermine the credibility of our participation in the ongoing international process of debating and drafting additional norms in new human rights instruments—indeed, the credibility of our participation in the overall "cause of human rights."

Mr. Chairman, this brings me to a problem of which I have had a frontline experience as our representative to the Human Rights Commission—the serious embarrassment to the conduct of our policy at the United Nations stemming from our failure to ratify these conventions. I would like to take as my text the following remarks directed to me by the Soviet Delegate in the course of the Commission's Spring 1966 Session. With your permission I shall read an excerpt from the Summary Record of that session:

"Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, having listened carefully to the statement by the United States representative on 25 March and having heard him warmly support the Costa Rican proposal for the creation of a post of United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, he was obliged to point out that once again the Commission was witnessing an attempt by the United States to divert it from its basic task, which was to promote respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. Once again, instead of being encouraged to follow its proper course, which was to draw up conventions and instruments in the sphere of human rights with supervisory machinery to ensure their implementation, the Commission had before it a proposal so nebulous that even those who supported it were unable to speak clearly on the subject.

"An objective analysis of the political orientation of the proposal so ardently supported by the United States and its allies soon revealed that the proposal was designed to give world public opinion the impression of active participation in the cause of human rights by States which in practice obstinately refused to fulfill their obligations under the multilateral international conventions in the field of human rights drawn up under the auspices of the United Nations and its specialized agencies.

"The United States representative had admitted that the United States had lagged behind in that sphere. That was an understatement; he would mention some of the conventions which the United States had not yet ratified.

"Firstly, there was the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, which had come into force on 12 January 1951. Not only had the United States failed to ratify that Convention, which was designed to prevent the recurrence of nazi and fascist crimes, but during the drafting of that instrument it had endeavoured to deform the text by a series of proposals and amendments.

"Similarly, during the preparation of the Convention on the Political Rights of Women, the United States had endeavoured to diminish its scope and, despite the concessions that had been made in the hope that it would ratify the Convention, the United States had still not done so, twelve years after it had come into force.

"The United States was still not a party to the Slavery Convention of 7 June 1955 or the Supplementary Convention on the Abolition of Slavery, the Slave Trade and Institutions and Practices Similar to Slavery of 30 April 1957. It might also be wondered when the United States would decide to ratify the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, which had recently been adopted by the General Assembly.

"With regard to the conventions drawn up under the auspices of the specialized agencies, he pointed out that the United States had so far failed to sign certain very important conventions, such as the Convention on Discrimination in Respect of Employment and Occupation and the Convention against Discrimination in Education, which included measures designed to ensure the implementation without discrimination of certain fundamental human rights at the national and international level.

"As for the draft Covenants on Civil and Political Rights and on Economics, Social and Cultural Rights, the United States delegation had long since made it clear that its country would not sign them.

"Instead of criticizing the various conventions adopted in the sphere of human rights for their narrow scope, the United States would do well to accede to those instruments and try to increase their effectiveness.

"It was clear from the facts he had just mentioned that the United States, wishing to escape from the untenable position into which it had been forced by its refusal to ratify the conventions in question, had thought that it could confuse the issue by strongly supporting the creation of the post of United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights." (E/CN.4/SR.879, pp. 9–10.)

As I sat and listened to Mr. Morozov, I felt indeed like "the embarrassed American," described in an article in the *Saturday Review*, which pointed out the harmful effects to our credibility in the international human rights field, of our record of nonratification of conventions. We participate in drafting them, in criticizing them, in proposing this addition and that deletion—and then we fail to ratify any of them.

Of course, I replied to Mr. Morozov's charges. I retorted that America does not need to ratify a genocide treaty in order to prevent genocide; we do not need to ratify a religious intolerance convention in order to guarantee the rights both of believers and atheists, and we do not need a convention on the right to leave one's country and to return, to persuade us not to build "walls," and so forth.

This was all fine as polemic, but it could not hide the fact the world's greatest Power, the professed leader of the Free World, stands side-by-side with Bolivia, Spain, Togo, South Africa and Yemen, as one of the tiny minority of Members of the United Nations which has not ratified any of its human rights conventions.

The Soviet Union holds our record in this field over our head as a club ready for use to counter any initiative in the human rights field of which they do not approve. Worse, the questioning of our sincerity is not limited to Soviet delegates. For, while others, including some friendly states, do not indulge in the same crude sarcasm concerning this record, their cynicism, often expressed in private, is not disguised.

I hasten to add that I, in no way imply that the sarcastic criticism of the Soviet delegates should be a deciding or even a weighty factor in the determination of our policies. (This hypocrisy, incidentally, is evident in the very statement of the Soviet delegate that I have just read, for he conveniently omits to mention the Forced Labor Convention which, except for Poland, none of the communist countries has ratified.) However, I believe, when a proposed policy or course of action presents no legal or practical problems, indeed, when this policy is an expression of our historic ideals, it makes little sense for us unnecessarily to play into their hands, to hand them a gratuitous propaganda weapon with which to flagellate us.

Nor do I intend to imply that the ratification of these, or even other Conventions, will bring the world significantly closer to a human rights millenium. Obviously, the prevalence of human rights is in the main a by-product of other conditions and developments within and among nations—of internal harmony and stability, of improved economic conditions, of lessened international tensions, and of a more generally cooperative international environment.

Nor, again, do I wish to suggest that our position in the United Nations, the attitudes of others to us, is determined solely by our policy in the matter of human rights conventions. For the fact is that we have earned respect on the basis of other considerations, by other demonstrations of our human rights concerns, among them, our espousal of measures to strengthen UN procedures in the human rights field—apart from conventions—and our interventions against specific violations of human rights in the Communist and other countries.

But, I contend, if as I believe to be the case, our participation in the human rights convention system will make even a modest contribution to bringing about a more decent world—by encouraging other countries to accept the standards of the conventions as binding obligations, by generating forces within these countries in support of their observance, by influencing the conduct even of nations which do not adhere to the conventions (for people tend to demand rights which others enjoy)—our failure to ratify cannot be justified. To prejudice our national image—by allowing ourselves to be included among the only eight Members of the 122 UN Member States which have failed to ratify any of the three conventions makes little sense. To be included—we who lay claim to the position of leadership of the Free World—among states which have failed to participate in the principal means available to the world for developing international standards in the field of human rights, I submit, is a national embarrassment and indignity.

Mr. Chairman, international cooperation for human rights—meaning primarily, treaty agreements in this field—is no longer an academic question; it is a practical necessity. I urge that, in pursuance of our national interest, our government resume the position of world leadership in the human rights field we occupied in the early years of the United

Nations, and to this end, that the Foreign Relations Committee recommend to the Senate to ratify all three conventions now under consideration.

Thank you.

ADDRESS BY ADM. THOMAS H. MOORER BEFORE NATIONAL SECURITY INDUSTRIAL ASSOCIATION

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I invite the Senate's attention to a thoughtful and significant speech delivered recently by the new Chief of Naval Operations, Adm. Thomas H. Moorer, speaking in Washington at the annual dinner of the National Security Industrial Association.

As a member of the Committee on Armed Services, it has been my pleasure to know and to counsel with Admiral Moorer. I regard him as one of the finest military professionals our Nation ever has produced, and I cannot commend too highly to the Senate his remarks on seapower and national security. I ask unanimous consent that the admiral's speech be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SEAPOWER ON THE MOVE

(An address by Adm. Thomas H. Moorer, U.S. Navy Chief of Naval Operations, at the National Security Industrial Association, 24th annual dinner, September 28, 1967, Washington, D.C.)

President McFarlane, Chairman Joyce, Distinguished Guests, Ladies and Gentlemen, this is what I would believe would be labeled on Capitol Hill as my maiden speech in Washington since I assumed the duties of Chief of Naval Operations nearly two months ago. It is an honor and pleasure to make my podium debut before the members of the NSIA, for it is your ability, to look ahead, and to schedule and deliver on time the many thousands of complex items which we in uniform require, that makes you a partner in the most effective military industrial team in the world today.

I am sure that all of you came here expecting the new CNO to talk about the Navy. *You will not be disappointed. U.S. Seapower is on the move!* And I feel rather strongly about it. Tonight I would like to impart some of my feelings to you—tell you why I think the Navy's value and importance is accelerating—with the thought that each of you might better evaluate the requirements of the Navy together with their effect on you as an industrialist and you as an American citizen.

As background, let me begin my talk with statements in the form of conclusions that express some of the Navy's *beliefs* and *disbeliefs*. Then I hope that the remainder of my talk will demonstrate in part how these beliefs serve to support our overall use of seapower.

First, *the Navy does not believe* in a single strategy or a single weapons system. Rather, we believe that the military posture of the United States must be flexible enough to respond quickly—by the *discriminate* and *selective* use of force to the degree any particular situation dictates.

The Navy does believe that the coordinated combat power of all the United States Armed Services must be projected overseas in any type of conflict. We fully recognize the Navy's role in the support of the other Services in this matter.

The Navy believes that the United States must maintain at the ready the capability for causing unacceptable damage to a potential adversary no matter what preemptive action he may choose to take against us.

The Navy believes that for many reasons, including diversity and security, a good portion of our nuclear delivery system should be seabased.

The Navy believes that, so long as we maintain adequate deterrence, limited wars of all types are more probable than general war and that our readiness for nuclear war must not and need not be incompatible with a readiness for limited war.

The Navy believes that wars are never fought strictly according to a preconceived and documented plan. The capability for a rapid adjustment of forces, plans, and tactics for the unexpected must be retained.

The Navy believes in maintaining mobile streamlined forces that can operate at sea on a self-sufficient sustained basis and that can be tailored for a specific task. Task forces incapable of rapid alteration are not acceptable.

The Navy believes that the roles of all the armed forces are played best if they are coordinated, and that the combined strengths of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps and Air Force forces employed in concert is far greater than the sum of these separate strengths.

Finally, the Navy believes no matter how complex or how awesome you build the weapons of war that *man is still the vital element of our defense team*. Men make decisions—men fight battles—men win wars.

These then are some of our beliefs. Control and use of the seas for the benefit of the United States and her allies are basic to this philosophy, which incidentally has *long endured*.

Nevertheless, a few short years ago some people, perhaps blinded by the flash, considered the hydrogen bomb to be the total solution to future world security and wrote the Navy off as an effective force. Some—outside of the Navy—felt that the ultimate evolution of seapower had occurred during World War II and put forth the theory that no significant military action could be expected to take place at sea in the "modern" future.

Even further doubt occurred on the part of some with the advent of the missile age—but only for a moment. For it was at this time that the Navy with your help produced the Polaris weapon system. I need not tell those of you in this audience that besides being a complex and sophisticated industrial marvel, Polaris is, to this moment, the most invulnerable deterrent weapon in the U.S. armory.

Polaris is only part of the story. Concurrently, other weapons systems for other purposes were designed, programmed and produced.

For this, we must credit the incredible technology of American industry as well as the Navy—a technology capturing the *public imagination*. The variety and speed of accomplishment of this team in developing and perfecting myriad weapon systems—has been impressive.

Most of you are familiar with these weapons, now almost too numerous to enumerate:

The A-4 Light Attack Jet that entered service in 1956 and today has perhaps flown more combat missions over North Vietnam than any other single type of aircraft.

The F-4, probably the finest fighter aircraft in the world and the front line fighter of all the U.S. armed forces.

The A-6 Intruder, the first completely all-weather attack aircraft ever used in combat.

The SH-3A Helicopter, mainstay of both the Navy and the Air Force in the search and rescue of our pilots.

The *Navy missile family* stretches the imagination: Sidewinder and Sparrow in the air; for air to ground the 2.75 rocket, the Zuni, the Bullpup, the Snakeye, and the Shrike, just to name a few. It is significant that all of these were developed by the Navy *before* South Vietnam and almost every one was on hand in useful quantities when the war started. That's a record that *you* and those of us in the Navy are tremendously proud of.

This is just a suggestion of the modern technology which I referred to as a primary reason for our Navy being on the move. There is not sufficient time here tonight to discuss the effect of the tremendous advances in electronics, propulsion, nuclear physics, and the data systems which coordinate our command and control.

Our operations in Vietnam are obviously another large indication of the Navy's present course and speed. Typical of our efforts there are our air and land striking forces.

When it became necessary to launch air strikes into Vietnam, the first ones were flown from aircraft carriers. And when it became necessary to land additional combat troops in the Spring of 1965, the first ashore were our Marines from the 7th Fleet Amphibious Forces. Why? Simply because they were *there*; they were *ready*; they were operating on the free oceans, and they could be used immediately at the sole direction of our Commander in Chief. As the need for air power increased faster than we could build airfields, there was only one way to fill the need. More carriers. So we went from three deployed in the Western Pacific, to four, and then to five. And we're still keeping five deployed with three in continuous combat. During these last two years of combat operations in Southeast Asia, almost half of all the combat missions over North Vietnam have been flown from the decks of Navy aircraft carriers.

Beneath the Navy wings is the gunfire support of our Sea Dragon surface ships, to be joined later by the battleship *New Jersey*; the surveillance and inspection activities of our Market Time forces; the peace-keeping operations of our River Patrol Force; and the pressure on the Viet Cong exerted by our Riverine Assault Force.

The Navy Seabees are nearing completion of their part in the largest construction program ever undertaken in the history of the world—one billion dollars in airfields, petroleum facilities, roads, wharves, hangars, barracks—everything that can be built by man.

Ashore in Vietnam, including our Seabees, we have over 30,000 Navy officers and men, hospital corpsmen, chaplains, dentists, and doctors—the total variety of skills needed to sustain and maintain our troops ashore.

Off-shore is the Navy's sealift. The back-breaking, frustrating and often dull task of delivering the trucks, aviation fuels, the food, the ammunition, the heavy equipment, and all the construction materials. It is a 10,000 mile life line which delivers one long ton per month per man to the half million U.S. and allied soldiers in Vietnam. It is still true that about 98% of everything going into Vietnam goes by ship. Not only is it the Navy's job to get people and supplies to Vietnam, it also has the responsibility of making sure that no power—or combination of powers—can interrupt this flow of material. Knowledge of this sealift has, I think, brought home to a great many Americans and people of other countries just how vital open sea lanes are to a maritime nation such as the United States—and to our forces and allies overseas.

I've mentioned two reasons why the Navy is on the move—our superb technology and the accomplishments of our forces in the Vietnam conflict which exercise almost the entire spectrum of Navy capability in limited war.

There are at least three other main reasons for the inevitable increase in the influence of seapower in our immediate future. One is the wide variety of future military strategies being developed which lend themselves to the use of the oceans. These strategies are not static. Strategies today, a product of our constant learning through the evolution of science and history, must, to be effective, run the entire gamut. That is, we must be prepared for almost *any* contingency in *any* environment in *any* area of the world.

In taking this large view, there is an awakening to the advantages of the ocean areas. They are away from our population centers, yet they are in proximity to all major population concentrations in the world. The oceans provide the only area wherein potential conflict does not involve the civilian populace. The oceans, contiguous to the lands of those who would choose not to be our friends, provide to a strong naval power the means of sealing off and combating the enemy under the water, on its surface and in the air in his own back yard—far away from American shores.

In this world of micro-second communication, supersonic transportation and weapon delivery, the world grows smaller by the minute. As long as three-quarters of its surface is covered by water, any war must necessarily include a wet war—waged in support of our Army, our Air Force, and our Marine Corps.

As our technology continues to leap forward, new ways of utilizing the oceans continue to present themselves. As contributors to the Navy's forward movement, I have mentioned our *technical expansion*, our *performance in Vietnam* and just a suggestion of the *strategic options* which are and will open to the sea. Next among the prime movement factors of indicators of increased seapower need and utilization is the acute shrinkage of overseas bases available to U.S. forces. Coupled with this is the impact of the British reduction in their naval presence in the Middle East and the area east of the Suez.

It is a simple matter of record that at the end of the Korean War in June, 1953, the United States had the rights to use a total of 551 major overseas bases. In December, 1966, our total bases numbered 179—a decrease of 372 major bases or almost 70%. A current case in point is the recent conflict in the Middle East. As you know, in that instance it developed that the air bases that had been available to us around the littoral of the Mediterranean became either unavailable for political reasons, or were of minimal use because of the distance factor. As it evolved, the only forces that could be put into position immediately were sea-borne forces and with the nationalism of newly emerging nations being felt all over the world, it is quite clear that as time goes on the availability of bases which we have come to rely on for routine military missions and possible contingencies is going to continue to be diminished.

What this means to me is that we are going to have to take another look at the way we have been operating our military forces and as always, be ready to adapt to change. It is quite clear that such an examination might readily dictate the movement of more of our military capability to sea. It is, I think, well known that the deployment of naval forces on the international oceans cannot be equated with the basing or operating of land environment, that is, air and ground forces, within the sovereign territory of another nation or state. The contrast between the two is that our President always has the *power* and *authority* to move naval forces as he desires to influence, to persuade, to assist, or, if necessary, to intervene for the protection of lives and property of Americans and foreign nationals. Sea forces can avoid intrusion upon the domestic affairs of another country while still providing the security, protection, and strength desired in a specific geographic location.

I have but two factors left to tick off—one of which, is perhaps the most telling in its impact on the future course of world events. I refer to the almost explosive expansion of the Soviet Navy and Merchant Marine.

Many people still think of the USSR as a predominantly land power with her military strength vested mainly in large armies. This was true at the close of World War II, and it was essentially true even ten years ago. Since then, however, the USSR has made a massive investment in both her Navy and her Merchant Marine, with the result today that the Soviet Union is a major maritime power. Their force of nearly 400 submarines is the largest in the world. It is no secret that one of the U.S. Navy's highest priority efforts is to develop and maintain the capability to counter this threat. Soviet surface ships have been equipped with modern missile systems which provide them with extended offensive weapon ranges and improved defensive capability. These ships are appearing on the high seas in the vicinity of our naval task forces and are ever-increasing the extent of their operations and their visits to other than Soviet ports.

It is obvious, that for military purposes at least, our assumptions concerning Soviet capabilities must be based upon that which we can see and measure, rather than estimates of their intentions. Furthermore, it can be assumed that Soviet military capabilities reflect their strategy and therefore must give us some indication of their political aims. By any measuring stick, they are today the second largest seapower in the world. In ten years the Soviet Union with dedication of purpose, large outlays of funds, and with priorities equivalent to or even surpassing their space program, has transferred itself from a maritime nonentity to a major seapower.

This new power is dramatically evidenced in their ever-increasing naval presence in the Mediterranean. Soviet naval forces there just prior to the Middle East conflict had grown to twenty-five to thirty ships. At that time this was the largest number of Soviet naval ships ever deployed into the Mediterranean. The conflict of the Middle East apparently presaged a significant augmentation of Soviet naval forces to the Med. Shortly after this conflict Soviet naval strength increased to thirty-five or forty ships and has remained at this level. This rather formidable force is comprised generally of from four to six submarines, approximately fourteen surface combatant ships, and then to twelve auxiliary and support ships. The number of their intelligence collecting trawlers has also increased. Certainly, there is nothing covert about the Soviet activity at sea, in fact, the Chief of the Soviet Navy has stated, "In the past our ships and naval aviation units have operated primarily near our coast, concerned mainly with operations and tactical coordination with ground troops. Now, we must be prepared for broad offensive operations against sea and ground troops of the imperialists *on any point* of the world's oceans and adjacent territories."

In the Mediterranean, it is apparent that the USSR is implementing these policies. Other recent speeches have highlighted the importance of war ship visits to far ports to develop relationships and strengthen the authority and influence of the Soviet Union.

It is clear that the challenge of our free use of the seas is here for all to see. Our Navy must stay on the move if we are to maintain the quality, valuable depth of experience, and sufficient numbers necessary to counter the Soviet challenge.

Taken in combination, it is readily apparent to me that the expanding state of the art of our technology, the spotlight on the Navy's accomplishments in Vietnam, the necessary evolving of new strategies, the diminishment of overseas bases, the Soviet's decision to meet us at sea with an enormous merchant fleet and modern navy all dictate that U.S. seapower must stay on the move! We will stay on the move because we have the dedication and desire, because we have the know-how and capability, and because the interest of our country demands it.

With this overview, one must conclude that the Navy, with your help, must exploit all technologies in order to retain a favorable position on the high seas.

With ever-increasing costs of production and the narrow time frames of the future we can no longer afford the luxury of three or four prototypes from which we choose the best. We will have to insure such integrity of design that we learn at an early stage and can meet the deadline in the end. The team effort between the military and industry—and the taxpayer, must be greater than ever before. We cannot operate on a sustaining basis in the oceans of the world without the very best equipment. We cannot meet the challenge of competitive forces of other countries unless our management procedures and workmanship blend with our technology to such an extent that we can produce hardware at acceptable cost and on timely schedules.

Our achievements are yours. Your achievements are our country's—the power base of democracy on which the security of the free world depends.

I look forward in great anticipation and enthusiasm to our continued work together in the future. Let us ensure that the U.S. maintains seapower supremacy.

WOODY GUTHRIE

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the folk singer of my generation was Woody Guthrie. He sang of dust bowls, redwood forests, big dams, and the people in picket lines, migrant camps, and freight cars. He could sing and compose about hard times because his own luck ran out early. He could have been rich, but he disdained wealth. He gave it away and hit the road with his guitar.

When Woody died Tuesday, he left a legacy of songs about America, the good and the bad. His "This Land Is Your Land" is one of the best known, and one of the best.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record Woody Guthrie's obituary, written by Phil Casey, and published in the Washington Post of October 4, 1967, and a tribute to Guthrie by Gus Norwood, who is now Administrator of the Alaska Power Administration, published in the Northwest Public Power Bulletin.

So long, Woody—it's been good to know you.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 4, 1967]

Woody Guthrie Dies of Muscular Illness; Wrote Songs, Sang About Poor People

(By Phil Casey)

Woody Guthrie, who sang his songs in boxcars and bars, picket lines and concert halls, migrant camps and Madison Square Garden, died in Creedmore State Hospital, Queens, N.Y., yesterday.

The 55-year-old folk singer and composer, who has been described as "a national possession, like Yellowstone and Yosemite," had been doomed for 15 years by Huntington's chorea, the disease that killed his mother when he was a boy. It destroys muscle coordination, and Mr. Guthrie had been helpless for years. At the end, only his eyelids moved.

But before all that happened to him, he had been a traveling man, roaming the country for more than 20 years. He wouldn't give up the road. Even when fame and a chance for big money finally came, he avoided comfort like the plague and kept on wandering.

When he became the star of a radio show in the early 1940s, he bought a Chrysler after the first four programs and fled New York. He gave the Chrysler to a Farmers Union organizer in Oklahoma City, and kept on going with his guitar.

From 1932 to 1952, he is believed to have written more than 1000 folk-type songs (he wrote 26 to celebrate the building of the Grand Coulee and Bonneville Dams) and everybody, from Frank Sinatra to the long-haired boys twanging guitars in Dupont Circle, sings them.

Many of the songs are gone, but some are part of every folk singer's repertoire, and concert halls, night clubs, bars and kindergartens are filled with the sound of his music.

The best known, of course, are "Hard Travelin," "So Long, It's Been Good to Know You," and "This Land Is Your Land."

Mr. Guthrie was a poet of the down-trodden, the poor and the lost. He had grown up in hard times and had a hard life. He remembered the Okies vividly, the dust bowl and the refugees from their own homes. He sought out the poor.

Much of his work was filled with anger and outrage at what man had done and kept doing to man, but there was no despair. His lyrics contained wit, humor and tenderness.

"I am out," he said "to sing songs that will prove to you that this is your world and that if it has hit you pretty hard and knocked you for a dozen loops . . . no matter what color, what size you are, how you are built, I am out to sing the songs that make you take pride in yourself and in your work . . . I hate a song that make you think you're not any good. I hate a song that makes you think you are just born to lose. . ."

It was Clifton Fadiman, writing in the New Yorker magazine in the 1940's, who proclaimed Mr. Guthrie "a national possession, like Yellowstone or Yosemite, and part of the best stuff this country has to show the world." In 1966, Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall awarded him the Conservation Service Award and called him a poet of the American landscape. Mr. Guthrie couldn't attend the ceremony. He was bedridden, able only to move his eyelids and a hand, feebly. He could hear, but he couldn't talk.

Born in Okemah, Okla., one of five children, he learned blues and folk songs from Negroes and played the harmonica. But, it was a hard childhood. A sister died in a fire, his mother in an insane asylum. His father committed suicide, after bankruptcy.

Mr. Guthrie was on the road at 17, singing and playing his guitar and composing songs all over the Southwest and California.

The plight of the Okies, the dispossessed families of the dust bowl and the Depression, he saw them at first hand and the memory stayed with him.

He made art of the experience. As Nat Hentoff wrote in The Reporter magazine several years ago, "Guthrie wrote songs that have outlasted the Okies—'Talkin' Dust Bowl Blues', 'I Ain't Got No Home in This World', and 'Dust Bowl Refugee'."

He wrote poems, short stories, articles and letters. His autobiography, "Bound for Glory," was much-praised in the 1940s, and there have been plans to publish much of his other writing.

Short and lean, with a solemn, weather beaten face and wiry, bushy hair. He looked like the man of the people he insisted on being. He never got rich, though he could have.

Mr. Guthrie was married and divorced three times and had seven children, one of whom, a girl, died in a fire. He is survived by three daughters and three sons, one of whom, Arlo, is a folk singer.

[From the Northwest Public Power Bulletin]

"THIS LAND IS YOUR LAND"—TRIBUTE TO WOODY GUTHRIE

(By Gus Norwood)

The Boston Pops Orchestra finished their tune-up and settled down. The Maestro walked briskly as he received the applause.

Then he tugged at the hearts of his audience with Woody Guthrie's "This Land Is Your Land."

The Pacific Northwest had quite a few people in Boston's old Symphony Hall because the American Public Power Association annual convention was being held in Boston that first week of May 1966.

John Nelson of Seattle City Light, my daughter Emily, a student at Radcliffe, and I were seated together. Later we talked about Woody Guthrie and the need to write a tribute in his honor. More People should know about Woody.

UDALL PAYS TRIBUTE

A month earlier on April 6, 1966, Secretary Stewart L. Udall presented the Interior Department's "Conservation Service Award" plus a fine letter and news release addressed to Mr. Woodrow Wilson Guthrie, Brooklyn State Hospital.

Here Woody lies dying, a silenced victim of Huntington's chorea, an hereditary nerve disorder.

The popularity of folk singing came too late for Woody who has been hospitalized many years.

A prolific and creative composer and folksinger, Woody worked for the Bonneville Power Administration around 1947 writing 26 ballads about Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams on the Columbia River.

HIS STORY

Born in Oklahoma in 1912 Woody suffered the hardships of the dust bowl. His mother died of Huntington's chorea.

Uprooted, he migrated to California, always singing of the little man facing almost impossible odds. He lived the Grapes of Wrath, yet is remembered and described by many who knew him as optimistic, hopeful of ultimate victory.

He describes his youth in his autobiography, "Bound For Glory." Later he wrote another book, edited by Robert Shelton, "Born To Win."

He wrote much but he said no novel rings down the plaster like a room full of friends singing his songs.

Those who knew him and heard him sing speak of him as of a legend. Yet his songs are not easy to find. Our research effort located these in the Portland library collection of phonograph records.

SO LONG, WOODY

On May 8, 1966, the Sunday Portland Oregonian article by Ralph Friedman entitled "So Long, Woody" was headed by an ink sketch of the almost skinny Woody strumming his guitar against a background of snowcapped and forested mountains.

Meanwhile Bonneville Power Administration has named one of its substations in his honor.

ROLL ON, COLUMBIA, ROLL ON

Green Douglas firs where the water cuts through
Down her wild mountains and canyons she flew
The Canadian Northwest to the ocean so blue.
Roll on, Columbia, roll on.

Other big rivers add power to you
Yakima, Snake, and the Klickitat, too
Sandy, Willamette and Hood River too.
Roll on, Columbia, roll on

Roll on, Columbia, roll on
Roll on, Columbia, roll on.
Your power is turning our darkness to dawn
Roll on, Columbia, roll on.

At Bonneville now there are ships in the locks
The waters have risen and shiploads of plenty'll
Steam past the docks
Roll on, Columbia, roll on

And on up the river is the Grand Coulee Dam
The biggest thing built by the hand of man
To run the great factories and water the land.
Roll on, Columbia, roll on.

THIS LAND IS YOUR LAND

This land is your land, this land is my land,
From California to the New York Island,
From the redwood forest to the gulf-stream waters,
This land was made for you and me.

As I was walking that ribbon of highway,
I saw above me that endless skyway,
I saw below me that golden valley
This land was made for you and me.

I roamed and rambled, and I followed my footsteps
To the sparkling sands of her diamond deserts,
All around me a voice was sounding,
This land was made for you and me.

When the sun come shining, then I was strolling,
And the wheat fields waving, and the dust clouds rolling,
A voice was chanting as the fog was lifting,
This land was made for you and me.

PASTURES OF PLENTY

It's a mighty hard row that my pore hands has hoed;
My pore feet has travelled a hot, dusty road;
Out of your dustbowl and westward we rolled;
And your deserts was hot and your mountains was cold.

I worked in your orchards of peaches and prunes;
I slept on the ground in the light of your moon;
On the edge of your city you'll see us and then
We come with the dust and we go with the wind.

California, Arizona, I make all your crops;
Well, it's north up to Oregon to gather your hops;
Dig the beets from your ground, cut the grapes from your vine;
To set on your table your light sparkling wine.

Green Pastures of plenty from dry desert ground;
From the Grand Coulee dam where the waters run down;
Every state in this union us migrants has been;
We'll work in this fight and we'll fight till we win.

It's always we rambled, that river and I;
All along your green valley I will work till I die;
My land I'll defend with my life if it be;
'Cause my pastures of plenty must always be free.

FOREIGN AID

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, my attention has been drawn to an excellent speech on the subject of foreign assistance by a Member of the House of Representatives, Congressman LEE HAMILTON of Indiana. As he points out in this speech, delivered September 22 to the League of Women Voters of Columbus, Ind., the United States was, in its infancy, the recipient of considerable foreign aid itself. But our memories are short. Today, though there are many detractors of foreign aid, the consensus of four Presidents, the Congress and many Americans is that the world and, thus, the United States as well, is a little healthier with our help.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Congressman HAMILTON's speech appear in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICANS HAVE ALWAYS HAD A TOUGH ATTITUDE TOWARD FOREIGN AID

Ben Franklin, in despair of human devices, proposed that Constitutional Convention (1787) be opened with daily prayer invoking divine guidance to save it from ruin.

Hard-headed Hamilton objected, saying they were not in need of "foreign aid."

Despite Hamilton's objection, the historians among us know that this country in the days of its infancy, was very much a recipient of foreign aid, including military assistance, soft loans, development loans, technical assistance. And it is the judgment of more than one historian that we would not have survived without it.

But our memories are short.

I got a letter the other day from a young man who asked indignantly how those idiots in the State Department thought that a candidate in South Vietnam elected by only 35% of the vote could run a country. I wrote back and suggested he read American history, and especially about John Q. Adams, who was elected President by 31% of the vote.

No major program consistently enacted into law by the United States Congress has fewer friends than foreign assistance. There are many reasons for this:

It costs a lot of money;

It is not one of the traditional and familiar tools of foreign policy;

It is hard to point to conspicuous, clear cut successes;

It is not difficult to find projects that just did not work out right;

It is a marvelous target for the politician; no one in his constituency has an entrenched interest in it. No lobbyists work for it. Everyone knows we are spending too much money—and this is the place to cut without getting anyone mad;

It is easy to refer to aid as a "gigantic giveaway" by "Uncle Sucker", the "International Santa Claus" pouring money down a "foreign rathole;"

Its beneficiaries are either far away and without votes or unorganized.

When you talk to people about where the budget should be cut, almost unanimously the response will include foreign aid.

And yet it is a curious thing. Since the end of World War II, every President, every Secretary of State, every Congress has supported foreign aid. It has been a part of American foreign policy for 18 years. My guess is that you could not find a professional diplomat in the United States Government today who would be opposed to it.

Always attacked, but always enacted (this year by only 8 votes in the House). Why? I'm not sure I know, but I think I do.

When the tumult and the shouting die, when the campaign orator has breathed his last fiery denunciation of waste inefficiency, giveaway, and those elected are faced with the stark realities of the responsibility to govern, the majority of them—not all—see that the foreign assistance program, despite its shortcomings, is in the national interest.

Let's draw back for a few minutes tonight and ask, and, I hope at least suggest, some answers to some of the basic questions about foreign assistance.

What are we trying to achieve—what is our purpose? It is important to understand what we are not trying to do.

The task of our economic assistance program is not to make over the world in our image of free enterprise in democracy. The task is not to buy votes in the United Nations or to win a political point for every dollar of aid. The task is not to win either gratitude or slavish devotion from other governments.

We do not appropriate aid funds with the intention of buying friends. When the critics say the foreign aid program cannot buy friends, they are exactly right. No one claims that it can.

If our primary objective was to assure the unquestioning support for our Foreign policy objectives or servile gratitude toward a beneficent Uncle Sam, we should have abandoned the Foreign Aid Program long ago. You cannot purchase loyalty or gratitude of sovereign nations.

DEVELOPMENT

The purpose of the Foreign Aid Program is to help create a community of free and independent nations. We are seeking not popularity or gratitude, but respect and results.

Foreign assistance is not sport for the shortwinded. We must discipline ourselves to take a long view. We are really interested in generating economic growth and political stability in less developed areas of the world.

The task is to provide the right additional resources, the right extra margin that will help to speed up social and economic progress.

So the major objective of the United States Foreign Assistance Program is to assist other countries which want to maintain their independence and to develop into self-supporting nations. The resulting community of free nations offers the best long-run prospect of security—prosperity and peace for the United States.

SECURITY

Certainly there is a humanitarian aspect to the foreign assistance program. We want to better human conditions. We want to help less fortunate neighbors. But much more is involved. The security of the United States depends in the long run upon a community of free, developing nations, building their own solid foundation for national growth.

On occasion we may be angered by criticism of American policies, by the very nations we are striving to help, but we should not allow our irritations to obscure the central objective.

There are those today who blame Foreign Aid for the restlessness in the world. However, we must not blame the doctor for the disease. The problems of the underdeveloped nations were not created by the efforts to solve them.

The development process is underway in nation after nation. It is very much in the interest of the United States to align itself with the forces of constructive national development around the world.

We should assist the development process because it is happening.

Unless the wealthy nations wage a vigorous war on the poverty, hunger, ignorance, disease and despair, that afflict more than half the world's population, widespread economic and political chaos will ensue.

The world's economically advanced nations have 29 percent of the population. They have 83 percent of the Gross National Product and an average per capita income of just under $1800 a year.

On the other hand 71 percent of the world's population in the underdeveloped countries have only 17 percent of the world's Gross National Product and an average per capita income of $154.

We simply cannot accept so stark a contrast between the future we ask for ourselves and the future to which others aspire.

There is an irrefutable relationship between violence in the world and economic backwardness and the trend of such violence is up not down.

Since 1958, 87 percent of the very poor nations of the world, 69 percent of the poor nations and 48 percent of the middle income nations have suffered serious violence.

Of the wealthy nations only one has suffered a major internal upheaval.

It would be reassuring if the gap between the rich nations and the poor nations were closing and economic backwardness receding, but it is not. The economic gap is widening.

Citizens of many developing nations walk in misery. Half the adults have never been to school, over half the people are hungry or malnourished, food production per person is falling and at present rates of growth population will double before the year 2000.

These are the dominant facts of our age, they challenge our security, they threaten the future of the world.

The conclusion is that the years that lie ahead are pregnant with violence for nations in the underdeveloped category. Our security is related directly to the security of the newly developing world and our role must be to help provide security to those developing nations which genuinely need and request our help and which demonstrably are willing and able to help themselves.

The blunt truth is that security means development. Without development, there can be no security. Without development, order and stability are not possible. Without development, Communism can spread.

In talking about the purpose of foreign aid, I don't want to overstate its importance. Keep in mind that Foreign Assistance is a very limited instrument. It is only one among many means for carrying out the foreign policy of the United States, along with military activities, information programs, diplomatic negotiations, participation in the United Nations, the Organization of American States and other institutions.

But the questions to ask about Foreign Aid, it seems to me, deal with its effectiveness, rather than its purpose.

Is the recipient nation using American Aid efficiently?

Is it making an honest effort to tax its people fairly, to encourage widespread landownership, to grow more food, to expand its exports, to root out corruption, to reduce its rate of population increase, to stimulate individual initiative?

IS THE FOREIGN AID ACHIEVING WORTHWHILE RESULTS?

There is no disagreement today that our economic assistance to Europe and our parallel help to post-war Japan were highly successful. Our economic aid to these countries ended years ago. They are now thriving economies, themselves contributing three and four billion dollars each year in Foreign Aid to the underdeveloped countries of Asia, Africa and Latin American.

Recently I attended part of a joint meeting of the United States and Japanese cabinets. The subject of discussion was how to increase Japan's Foreign Aid contributions. What a delightful topic of discussion!

Now we are concentrating on the much more difficult, underdeveloped countries.

What can we show in terms of results? There are many spectacular gains in human terms.

In India, for example:

Steel production is increased sevenfold since the early 1950's.

Electrical power is five times what it was in 1953. It will double again in the next five years.

The fertilizer industry is growing steadily.

The tax system is being revamped and improved.

Malaria has been reduced from 100 million cases annually to less than 50 thousand last year.

Four times as many youngsters are going to school.

Thirty million acres have been added to the 50 million already under irrigation.

In Latin America:

Six years ago there were several Latin American nations very close to coming under Communist domination. Now only six years later there is no serious Communist threat to any government in the hemisphere. The reason for this shift in tide has been the rise of a non-Communist alternative to satisfy the popular hunger for land and justice.

In tax reform, 9 countries have adopted legislation for more equitable and modern tax system.

In 10 countries death caused by malaria dropped from 11 thousand to 2 thousand in three years' time.

Smallpox declined just as sharply.

Twelve hundred health centers are in operation.

Two thousand rural wells have been dug.

Primary school enrollments have increased 23 percent.

Secondary school enrollments, 50 percent.

University enrollments 40 percent.

28,000 classrooms have been built.

160 thousand teachers trained.

14 million textbooks distributed.

16 countries have legislation dealing directly with land reform.

So Foreign Aid is attacking illiteracy, it's feeding hungry people, it is helping people build decent places in which to live. Illustrations of the type I have given could be cited in great numbers.

But let me express a word of caution. It would be a mistake to think that by themselves the measure of success of the Foreign Aid Program are these statistics.

We're after something even more fundamental than an improvement in the material welfare, as important as that is. We want them to stand on their own feet, independent of our help or any one elses.

We believe that the fundamental security of the United States rests on the successful establishment of independent self-supporting countries around the world, countries that are prepared to join in defending their own freedom against Communist aggression.

The test of the Foreign Aid Program is not merely the number of children fed, schools built, or business firms established. The test is whether the countries we are helping are enlarging their own resources, relying less on our gifts, less on soft loans to achieve economic development and where necessary, military strength.

Material accomplishment is not the only evidence we are making progress. A second type of evidence that aid is worthwhile is that several countries previously recipients of Foreign Aid no longer receive it. These include Greece, Taiwan, Israel, Mexico, Venezuela, and the Philippines.

And a number of other countries are making solid economic progress, although they are not yet at the end of the need for outside aid.

I believe that it's fair to say that United States Foreign Aid has achieved a great deal that is of fundamental importance to our national interests. Many countries have graduated from the need for aid. A number more can be expected to join them soon. Others are making strong and steady progress. We should also acknowledge, however, that there are countries where the Communist threat is grave and immediate and where we're not making nearly as much progress as we would like to.

There are many things we just can't know about the effectiveness of the Foreign Aid Programs. We don't know how many crises have been averted, how much violence avoided, how many minds have been won to the cause of freedom.

WHAT ABOUT MILITARY AID?

Why should the United States engage in a vast traffic of military weapons. Over the last 17 years we have either given or sold almost $50 billion worth of weapons, almost as much as we have given in economic grants and loans since 1948.

Military aid ordinarily consists of military hardware and training services for the military organization. It is distinct from outlays by this country on behalf of our military bases and forces abroad.

We face a Communist threat that is great and complex. At one end of the spectrum of aggression there is a possibility of nuclear war. At the other end there is the threat of subversion and terrorism. In between are the threats of major conventional attack, local probes and logistic and manpower support across borders. This entire spectrum is relevant and threats must be dealt with.

Great as our power is the United States simply does not have the resources to maintain a credible force by itself to contain the entire Communist threat.

The purpose of military aid is to achieve a posture to deter aggression and to assure sufficient indigenous military forces to combat subversion and insurgency.

If we did not have the military assistance program, it would be necessary for us to either drastically modify our foreign policy, move back to a fortress America concept, or to raise the military budget by 3 or 4 dollars for each dollar of the present military program. We would have to find the manpower to replace 3½ million allied or friendly fighting men. The average cost of annual cost to keep the United States soldier is $4,500. The similar average cost of the 3½ million allied fighting men in the forward stategy countries is about ⅛ of that, about $500 per soldier. If military assistance is cut, the United States either must make up for the reductions with United States forces or must retrench its foreign policy.

Let me interject a personal observation about military aid. I agree that it is necessary, but I have been among those who are critical of many aspects of it.

I believe the arms traffic in the world is almost out of control. It is not easy to stop. In some instances, it is probably necessary to engage in it. When the Soviets begin to rearm the Arab states to get great influence over the oil and transportation crossroads to Asia and Africa—with all this implies to our strategic position in Southern Europe—what is the United States to do?

But I am not persuaded that the United States should send more weapons to more countries than any nation in the world. Moreover, the trend is up, and I don't like that. Every situation must be separately analyzed. But my own feeling is that we must act with restraint and caution in the area of military assistance.

IS FOREIGN AID A MAJOR CAUSE OF THE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS DEFICIT?

This can be answered categorically. No, under present policies the United States programs of economic and military assistance are not major contributors to the deficit. About 85 to 90 percent of A.I.D. funds for this fiscal year will be spent in the United States. (In 1961—only 41% spent in U.S.) In fact, A.I.D. purchases help boost United States exports which contribute to a reduction in United States balance of payments deficit. An appropriation cut intended to reduce the balance of payments deficit would in fact mainly reduce U.S. exports.

The net impact in fiscal year 1968 of the A.I.D. Program will be about $100 million. It is now a virtually irreducible minimum.

SHOULD OTHER NATIONS SHARE MORE OF THE LOAD? THE ANSWER IS YES

We are not satisfied with the effort of our allies. In the recent Kennedy Round negotiation we insisted that other developed nations participate more in assistance programs, and major diplomatic efforts are underway at all times to get other nations to share development responsibility.

In 1965 net free world public aid to developing nations was $6.3 billion of which the United States contributed its proportionate share—about 60%. A guiding principle of Foreign Assistance programs must be that every advanced nation has a duty to contribute its share of the cost.

Many nations are doing their share in proportion to their capacities and problems. On a relative basis, some exceed the efforts of the United States.

Three countries provide proportionately more, and five lend for development on more generous terms than the United States. 7 Countries furnished relatively more aid on a grant basis while more than 75 percent of the experts and volunteers working and developing countries come from 8 donors other than the United States.

The burden of foreign aid in the United States has declined over the past 15 years. It has dropped from about 2 percent of Gross National Product at the start of the Marshall Plan to about 7/10 of 1 percent. As a percentage of the Federal budget it has declined from about 11½ percent in 1948 to less than 2% in 1968.

CAN WE OPERATE OUR AID PROGRAMS MORE EFFICIENTLY?

The answer is yes. There's room for improvement. We can do this in several ways.

First, is through a policy of careful selectivity and concentration, stressing aid to those countries where the United States interest is most urgent, and which countries are in a position to make the best use of our help.

Economic assistance is concentrated to a far greater degree than is generally realized. 92 percent of the entire amount goes to 20 countries. 80 percent of our development loans go to 8 countries, 93 percent of supporting assistance goes to 5 countries, 72 percent alone is for Vietnam and 65 percent of all Alliance for Progress funds go to three countries.

Secondly, we seek to obtain maximum by results by stressing self-help measures. Development can only occur when a government decides that they're willing to sacrifice and work for it. Development is work. It is they who must analyze the needs, determine the courses of action, acquire the necessary skills, make the commitment of energy, resources and wealth. On the average developing countries contribute the equivalent of $8 in their own resources for every one dollar in goods received from aid. Some do far more. India, for example, was in the ratio to United States assistance of 24 to 1.

Let me give you some specific examples of self help. Before a loan was made to a Bolivian Mining Bank to finance expansion and modernization, we required the Bolivian government to undertake a major reform of the mining code, a reorganization of the bank and tax laws to encourage mining investments.

In Korea, a recent $10 million loan to finance import of commodities commited its government to better budgeting, better foreign exchange management, restraint on private credit, higher revenue collection and increased domestic savings. The loan was dispersed in installments as Korea complied with the self-help agreement.

We must and we do hold back funds available for foreign aid if potential recipients are not helping themselves.

Third, another way we have tried to make the program work more efficiently is to increase the emphasis on loans as against grants.

FIFTY TO SIXTY PERCENT LOANS—FISCAL YEAR 1968

Most foreign assistance is in the form of loans, which must be repaid in American dollars.

The repayment record on Foreign Aid Programs has been as good or better than the repayment record for regular commercial loans.

Fourth, we are also trying to make the Foreign Aid Program more efficient by encouraging a country to use the initiative of its own businessmen, farmers. We do this by means of development banks and credit cooperatives, by conditioning assistance on government policy, reforms, urging governments to eliminate rigid import controls, inhibiting tax policies and encouraging land reforms.

Fifth, another way we are improving the foreign assistance program is to increase our focus on the key sectors of agriculture, health, education, as the critical elements of development.

Quite frankly, we have learned the hard way. For a long time the experts thought there was something magic about industrial development that would automatically put a developing country on the road to economic self-sufficiency. A lot of money was pumped into this vain pursuit of viability through industrialization.

Slowly, it has become apparent that no amount of investment in industry could have the desired effect until hunger, disease and ignorance were irradicated or brought under control.

Gradually we are learning more about the business of development and foreign assistance. One lesson we have learned is that we must concentrate on fundamentals of sufficient food, freedom from disease, and an opportunity to learn.

Sixth, we are making improvements in foreign assistance by the maximum use of American private enterprise and nonprofit institutions.

American Universities, businesses, labor unions, nonprofit organizations now provide more than 40% of the total number of A. I. D. technicians overseas.

We have also found that Government can't do the job alone. The private sector must be developed in these emerging nations. A key measure of self-help is the willingness of a country to encourage the initiative of its own businessmen and farmers.

For example, we try to open new sources of capital at the grass roots level by means of a development bank, or credit cooperatives. The record here is beginning to be impressive.

38 industrial development banks in 23 countries.

13 agricultural credit banks in 9 countries have been established.

88 savings and loan associations in 9 Latin American countries.

1,745 credit unions in Latin America.

One reason the program in Taiwan has succeeded is the remarkable increase in private enterprise.

The number of family farms rose from 118 thousand to 725 thousand.

The number of private businesses from 68 thousand to 227 thousand.

The number of business corporations from 1 thousand to 11 thousand.

Seventh: how much is it appropriate for the United States to spend on the Foreign Aid Program?

Some say we should spend much more. They say this country has not lived up to its obligations. They like to point to the British overseas effort during the heyday of the British Empire, which ran about 7 percent of their current Gross National Product. Today the United States is far below 1 percent.

Others argue we shouldn't spend anything. There's no question but the Foreign Aid Program has cost a great deal of money. And we do have a deficit problem.

On the other hand the United States is the wealthiest nation in the world. It has a Gross National Product of about $750 billion dollars a year, and to suggest that such an economic giant cannot afford to share less than 1 percent of this affluence with less developed nations is preposterous.

Well, I have spoken long enough and have scarcely begun to cover the problem of foreign assistance.

Many strong supporters of the program claim miracles for the program. Others can only see "a giveaway." The judgment of the Congress, four Presidents, and many Americans has been that the world is a little healthier with United States help, and think that the United States is a little healthier too.

RELIGION AND COMMUNISM

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, in 1962 the National Council of Churches initiated a publication entitled "Religion in Communist Dominated Areas"—RCDA—which provided for the first time a regular source of information on Communist policies and practices with regard to churches and religion.

Published twice monthly, the periodical consists largely of direct translations of articles selected from more than 100 Soviet, East European and Chinese publications. These articles reflect attitudes and activities of Communist parties with respect to life, work and concerns of people of all religions in Communist-dominated countries.

RCDA has been acclaimed by leaders of the Protestant, Orthodox, Roman Catholic and Jewish faiths, by academicians, Government leaders, and individuals representing other responsible groups.

This year, Christianity Today published two articles about RCDA, its editors and its future as a valued publication. I ask unanimous consent that the articles be placed in the RECORD at this time.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Christianity Today, Washington, (D.C.), Mar. 31, 1967]

KEEPING TABS ON RED RELIGION

Many American Christians see the National Council of Churches as giving aid and comfort to the Communist world through leftist-oriented reports and pronouncements. Few realize that the council also sponsors the best running account of Communist repression of religion: the semimonthly newsletter *Religion in Communist Dominated Areas.*

Last year *RCDA* made public the growing anti-government dissent among Orthodox and Baptists in the Soviet Union. This month it is printing details on the Baptist uproar gleaned from an atheistic Ukrainian publication. In the works is a report on what *RCDA* calls "brutal suppression of religious activities of dissenting Baptists in Kiev and other places."

RCDA consists largely of direct translations of articles selected from more than one hundred Soviet, East European, and Chinese publications. A brief comment accompanies each article. The maroon-trimmed first page always features a photograph or drawing. The February 15 issue showed a satirical cartoon from a Moscow publication contrasting the Oriental lines of an old shrine with the sleek, squared-off look of a modern building.

RCDA is put out by a pair of experts on Eastern Europe. The editor, 72-year-old Paul Anderson, an Episcopalian, served as a YMCA representative in Russia through the Bolshevik Revolution after a four-year stint in China. He has written two books on religion in Russia and has served as negotiator and translator in clergy exchange visits between the United States and the Soviet Union.

RCDA's managing editor is the Rev. Blahoslav Hruby, 55, a Czech-born linguist who fled the Gestapo on a bicycle and crossed the Pyrenees on foot before coming to the United States. He was a U.S. Army intelligence officer during World War II and worked for Radio Free Europe before joining the council. He and his wife can together handle translations from twenty languages. They live in a Manhattan apartment with their 16-year-old daughter, who spent last summer taking intensive Chinese language training at Columbia University. Between issues of *RCDA*, Hruby likes to go mushroom-picking ("I specialize in edible mushrooms").

RCDA grew out of a research project occasioned by a visit of American churchmen to the Soviet Union. Members of the delegation liked the information so well they suggested a continuing report. The newsletter was begun in the spring of 1962 with financial help from United Presbyterian Lutherans, Episcopalians, and Methodists.

RCDA runs eight pages per issue and costs ten dollars a year. It is now mailed to people in fifty countries, but circulation totals a mere 1,600, including many free copies sent to Africa, Asia, and Latin America. The publication costs the NCC's International Affairs Commission about $40,000 a year, and in 1966 the project went $17,000 in the red despite hundreds of hours of volunteer labor. Continuing deficits seem likely unless circulation can be substantially increased.

Competition for the budget dollar is keen among NCC agencies, and some people have campaigned against *RCDA*. They contend the reports do not contribute to the principle of coexistence.

But Hruby, a part-time Presbyterian minister, can preach a sermon of rebuttal on that point. "A fruitful dialogue cannot take place if we do not know the facts," he says.

"The Communist governments are sensitive to this kind of publication," Hruby adds, "and they seem to be less offensive in their policies concerning churches behind the Iron Curtain because they know that violations against religious freedom in the Soviet Union are reported. It is apparent that the Soviet Embassy and other embassies of Communist countries are eager to have good relations with *RCDA*."

[From Christianity Today, Apr. 28, 1967]

WHAT OF RELIGION UNDER COMMUNISM

Never has the religious situation in Communist countries been more confused and ambiguous than it is today.

Except for Mao's China, where the fury of the barbaric "cultural revolution" strikes hard against Buddhists and Muslims as well as Protestants and Catholics, a relative calm and a sort of "peaceful coexistence" now seems to prevail between governments and various religious groups. Church delegations from Communist countries visit the United States and other Western nations almost routinely. Various churches of the Soviet Union and other Communist nations have been permitted to join the World Council of Churches and international denominational bodies. Roman Catholic representatives from most Communist countries were able to attend the sessions of Vatican Council II.

The greatest breakthrough in church-state relations in the Soviet Union was the first visit of the head of the Soviet Union to the Vatican in January of this year, the fiftieth anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution. Church dignitaries are now more often invited to official state receptions in Communist capitals though they are not yet asked to say grace at banquets given by Communist leaders. It is becoming almost routine for the officials of ministries of foreign affairs and other high state offices in Communist nations to be present at the arrivals and departures of national and foreign ecclesiastical dignitaries.

A superficial observer might be easily tempted to misinterpret such phenomena. He might conclude, hastily and optimistically, that the churches behind the Iron Curtain are now much better off than before, that the coexistence between religion and Communism works, and that a promising new era of a dialogue between Christians and Marxists is at hand. American churchmen, knowing neither the language nor the extent of complex problems in these areas, often make inaccurate and misleading appraisals of the religious situation. Their opinions tend to reflect wishful thinking rather than historical realities. A distorted picture of the situation not only disadvantages Christian brethren in Communist nations but also confuses churchgoers in the United States and other countries.

The need for reliable information about the religious situation in Communist countries was apparently one main reason that, five years ago, the National Council of Churches started a modest semi-monthly publication, *Religion in Communist Dominated Areas* (*RCDA*). It is published by the Department of International Affairs and edited by two experts on religion in Communist countries, Paul B. Anderson and Czech-born Blahoslav Hruby, and it garners surprising amounts of information on attitudes and practices of Communist parties in regard to the life, work, and vital concerns of Christians and people of other religions throughout the Communist world. Few publications issued by the National Council of Churches are so urgently needed, and none give so balanced a view of the problem of religion under Communism. *RCDA* publishes translations of articles and documents—regarding religion in Communist nations and originating from these countries—most of which can be found in no other publication. In its very first volume, *RCDA* discovered a viciously anti-Semitic author, T. Kitchko, whose Nazi-like anti-Jewish book *Judaism Without Embellishment* (published by the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences in Kiev) was condemned by the world press as well as by major Communist parties.

Perhaps the most important documents published by *RCDA* were two letters by two courageous Russian Orthodox clergymen, the Rev. Mr. Eshliman and the Rev. Mr. Yakunin of Moscow. Last year *RCDA* first disclosed to the American public their protest against the harassment of the Russian Orthodox Church, a protest addressed to President Podgorny as well as to Patriarch Alexei. These documents are a telling story of a continuous Soviet struggle against the Russian Orthodox Church and other churches, and they irrefutably detail numerous serious violations by Soviet authorities of Paragraph 124 of the U.S.S.R. constitution, which guarantees freedom of religion to citizens of the Soviet Union. *RCDA* has also published interesting material about dissent among the Soviet Baptists and the Czech Presbyterians.

RCDA tries to cover the whole Communist world, with an eye not only on the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe but also on Communist China, Viet Nam, and Cuba. This is highly important at a time when the monolithic type of Communism belongs definitely to the past and when a pluralistic type is more and more in evidence. *RCDA* editors handle about 150 foreign-language publications. Along with translations of articles from these sources, they supply factual comments and explanations that make such reports comprehensible to persons unfamiliar with particular areas. The publication is now being mailed to readers in almost sixty countries, although only a limited number of copies reach readers in Africa and Asia because of lack of funds. Ecclesiastical and academic spokesmen, as well as various private and governmental institutions and organizations, consider it an invaluable source of balanced information about religion and Communism.

One would think that such an important ecumenical project serving people in so many countries would have the moral and financial support of the most important denominations affiliated with the National Council of Churches. The truth, however, is that only the Episcopalians, Lutherns (National Lutheran Council), Methodists, United Church of Christ and United Presbyterians have supported this project, and their modest grants are not sufficient to balance the *RCDA* budget.

Jan van Hoogstraten, director of the NCC's Church World Service for Africa, asks whether "some people here in the United States on occasion feel" that *RCDA* is embarrassing their efforts to create "better relations" with the Communist world. He stresses the importance of making known to the larger non-Communist world what is largely printed for home consumption in the Communist world.

Rumors are rife that *RCDA* is in dire financial straits. If this is true, the ecumenical churches may discover too late that they are neglecting a worthy project. The financial situation of *RCDA* is apparently so serious that its survival beyond June of this year is now uncertain. If this publication's objective reports on religion under Communism are halted, the field will be wide open to peddlers of slanted news. They will tell us that churches in Communist countries are full and that religion is now much better off than before.

We must ask two questions at this point. First, has the National Council of Churches done all that is necessary to provide sufficient funding for this important project? Or has it capitulated to pressures by those individuals and groups who vocally and illogically peddle one-sided peace in Viet Nam, one-sided coexistence, one-sided dialogue between the Christians and Marxists, and almost anything one-sided that appeals to their soft "liberalism"? One would hope that Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, not only as president of the NCC but also as president of the University of Oregon and as a former leader in government, would recognize *RCDA* as a vehicle for information that is particularly needed today in Africa, Asia, and Latin America, as well as elsewhere. Instead of letting it die, the NCC should take pride in this balanced publication.

The second question must be addressed to various member denominations of the NCC that contribute little or nothing to support this effort. Why? Some denominations spend thousands of dollars to invite churchmen from Communist nations to the United States. We have no objection to a re-establishment of communication with Christian brethren after many years of separation. Such visitors should, however, be chosen with more care.

It is a known fact that Communists are using some churchmen as agents to spread Communist propaganda. A typical case is Milan Opocensky, a young theologian from Prague, Czechoslovakia, who has been invited to the United States at least five times in recent years. Recently, he joined the staff of the World Student Christian Federation in Geneva, Switzerland, as its European secretary. Opocensky never forgets to propagate the Communist regime while sprinkling his propaganda with allusions to the Gospel, Karl Barth, Bonhoeffer, Tillich, and others. He is quite successful in confusing the minds of American youth and students who are already disturbed by all kinds of theological nonsense. While students of European history know that Czechoslovakia was brought under the Communist dictatorship by Stalin's interference in Czechoslovakia's affairs, Opocensky repeats again and again that his country was not able to solve its problems in 1948 and that the Communists had no other choice but to take over the Czechoslovakian government. He also defended Stalin and his policies when Stalin's cult was shattered by Khrushchev. American Christians pay thousands of dollars for Opocensky's travel expenses while Communists in Prague laugh at how cheap and easy it is to spread Communist propaganda in the United States.

Several American denominations spend thousands of dollars to send delegates to various meetings of the Christian Peace Conference (CPC) in Europe, or to bring its representatives to the United States. CPC headquarters is located in Prague, Czechoslovakia. It is a meeting place for many Christians from Communist countries who otherwise would have little chance to travel abroad. CPC statements and manifestos have the classical trademark of a Communist-front organization.

If some American denominations spend so much money for such projects offering one-sided and unbalanced information, why do they not give money to support *RCDA?* Have the American churches no moral duty to support this effort to provide balanced information on religion in Communist countries?

Communists take *RCDA* seriously; they would like to see it disappear. Churchmen from several Communist countries have expressed appreciation for *RCDA*. They have reason to believe that Communist governments are sensitive to a publication that keeps constant tabs on their behavior toward religion. We are not in a position to divulge details, but we know of Communist attempts to interfere with *RCDA* by personal threats and harassment. When these tactics did not work, Communists spread word through their church emissaries in the United States that *RCDA* hurts East-West relations between nations and churches. Some naive churchmen apparently believe this Communist nonsense and seem to be trying to do what the Communists have so far been unable to do—eliminate *RCDA*.

We hope that the NCC and its major member churches will see that *RCDA* is continued and assured of moral and financial backing. If they fail, other American Christians and local churches will do well to give this publication full moral and financial support. Church members reluctant to support other phases of NCC work may designate their contributions for this purpose. Gifts (which are tax deductible) may be sent to *Religion in Communist Dominated Areas*, National Council of Churches, Room 566, 475 Riverside Drive, New York, New York 10027.

SENATOR EUGENE McCARTHY'S NEW BOOK

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, Senator McCarthy has just seen his new book come from the press, a book which without a doubt will be widely discussed. "The Limits of Power," which is subtitled "America's Role in the World," is a book which, in the language of a discussion of it on the editorial page of yesterday's Washington Star, "in lucid compass, conducts a brilliant analysis of our present foreign policy, how we got where we are, why we ought to reconsider our position and what we really ought to be doing in the world of men and nations."

We in the Senate are well aware of the soundness and clarity of the thinking of our distinguished colleague from Minnesota, who speaks in this book from the vantage point of membership in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

The limits of power to which the title refers are real, as the Star column notes in stating Senator McCarthy's thesis that "no nation can run the world singlehandedly and it is high time we stopped trying."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article by Frank Getlein, "The U.S. Illusion of Impotence," from the October 4 Washington Star may appear in the Congressional Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The U.S. Illusion of Omnipotence

(By Frank Getlein)

The ancient wisdom expressed in the line, "O that mine enemy would write a book," is not an absolute. It depends entirely on how good your enemy is at writing books. The varied examples of Norman Mailer and Jim Bishop to the contrary, it is possible to write a good one.

Senator Eugene J. McCarthy, D-Minn., has just written one and it is hard to see how his enemies—or the enemies of the general position he advocates—can derive much pleasure or profit from the fact. The book is called "The Limits of Power," and the very title must seem a contradiction in terms to such enemies. Yet in lucid language, in brief compass, the last Stevensonian conducts a brilliant analysis of our present foreign policy, how we got where we are, why we ought to reconsider our position and what we really ought to be doing in the world of men and nations. . . .

In the senator's compressed summary of the years since World War II, we have drifted into the illusion of omnipotence in foreign policy, partly by accident, partly by self-righteous design, mostly because we didn't know what we were doing and still don't.

The last good times, in this view of our history in the world for the last two decades, were with Truman and Acheson, the latter a classical, therefore conservative, shaper of foreign policy. They were succeeded by Eisenhower and John Foster Dulles, the latter a stern and rockbound moralist and fighter of Communist devils.

Dulles did two things that still take their toll. He established a worldwide system of treaties that gives us the theoretical justification to do anything, anywhere, anytime, to anyone that pleases us. And he allowed the CIA, under his brother Allen, to become the quasi-independent, policymaking, operation-mounting entity that it is. . . .

Perhaps the most damning judgment in the book is the judgment that no judgment is yet possible on Rusk: after six years in office he remains an unknown. Yet the policy set by the Dulles brothers continues to shape our ends, rough hew them as we will. It is a policy based on the belief that communism is always evil and always the same and always to be opposed or "contained" by us in any way necessary.

Senator McCarthy is keenly aware of the inertia factor in government at large and in foreign policy in particular. He feels that much of our present trouble comes from inertia, the dead weight of vested interest that keeps policy going in all areas long after its original purpose in one area has been fulfilled or abandoned.

The underlying thesis is simply that no nation can run the world singlehandedly and it is high time we stopped trying.

It is an extremely attractive possibility that emerges in the final pages, an America that would base its foreign policy on close examination and constant re-examination of the way things actually are in the numerous parts of the world, an examination steadily illuminated by the knowledge that there are limits to what power can do, any power. He concludes, "America's contribution to world civilization must be more than a continuous performance demonstrating that we can police the planet."

Yes, we can all agree, it must be. But will it be? Can it be?

The melancholy answer is probably in Senator McCarthy's note that the personal mark of his book, if any, is "that which I believe Adlai Stevenson would have made on American foreign policy, had his ideas and his attitudes been translated into political reality."

We all know what happened to those ideas and attitudes, first at the hands of the electorate and second at the hands of his own party in victory.

But even beyond that question of whether, there is the question of how. As others have so often in history, we are finding in Vietnam that the only hard part about going for a ride on a tiger is getting off.

STERNER ACTION NEEDED

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record an editorial, entitled "Sterner Action Needed at Outset," which appeared in the October 3, 1967, edition of the Williamson Daily News.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Stern Action Needed at Outset

Rioting and crime in the streets are two of the most urgent problems confronting this nation. These have resulted in a myriad of suggestions as to their causes and an even greater number of remedial measures for their cure. By virtue of his long career in directing the nation's No. One law enforcement agency, J. Edgar Hoover, director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, certainly should be competent to discuss these conditions with an air of authority. This he does in his message to all law enforcement officials which appears in the FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin. Mr. Hoover's message reads as follows:

In a riot there are no victors. The losers include everybody—the rioters, the victims, law enforcement, the community, the State, and the Nation.

Causes of riots can be counted by the score. A study of the overall problem indicates, however, that the widespread violence in our country to some degree is a direct outgrowth of the civil disobedience movement. In recent years, some leaders of dubious stature have made a grandiose gesture of willfully violating laws they deem to be unjust. For the most part, these individuals, although admittedly guilty of breaking the law, have gone unpunished. Young thugs and misguided teen-agers, seeing others defy authority and the courts with impugnity, have been led to believe that any crime under a banner of complaints is justified. Consequently, they ignore the law and roam through their communities creating violence and terror. Certainly, those who espouse the theory of civil disobedience and authorities who free guilty violators must share a portion of the blame and responsibility for the turmoil in our streets. It should be abundantly clear that the doctrine of civil disobedience is a doctrine of self-destruction.

Stern, decisive action is needed when a street disturbance begins. Justice is not served when a growing horde of vandals and looters is appeased and their pillage overlooked lest "a show of force might provoke them to greater violence." Quiescence does not satisfy rioters. Procrastination or uncertainty on the part of authorities denotes weakness or concession to a mob. Thus, the offenders are encouraged and their violence gains momentum.

A judicial self-appraisal by the news media of their riot coverage might also be in order. Some media have already taken action in this regard. There can be no quarrel with the all-important role of keeping the public informed as quickly and as completely as possible. No one rightfully expects riots to be played down or salient facts withheld.

On the other hand, militant agitators, hate-mongers, and publicity-seeking rabble rousers who incite riots have no fear of overexposure. They know that television, radio, and front-page news stories are the best and quickest means of getting their views before the public. Thus, they seek attention from the news media. In riot reporting, objectivity and balance, always key factors of responsible journalism, help expose distortion and reduce the special treatment of those who advocate violence. Strict adverence to high journalistic principles is a valuable public service in matters affecting public safety.

Many proposals have been advanced to help eliminate the causes of riots. Just as there is no single cause, there is no single remedy. I do know, however, that the answer will not be found in sociological remedies alone. If our system of law is to survive, then the law must be enforced. Those who break the law, acting alone or in concert, must be detected and arrested, promptly prosecuted, and given proper, substantial punishment. In halting riots and removing crime from our Nation's streets, this should be the first order of business.

USING THE POOR, CHEAP POLITICS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record an editorial, entitled "Using the Poor, Cheap Politics," which appeared in the September 28, 1967, Wheeling, W. Va., News Register.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Using the Poor, Cheap Politics

It is a shame that the politicians have come to believe that in every city they visit today they must walk through the slums and have their pictures taken patting some poor child on the head.

If anything, this sort of press agentry is bound to create ill-feelings among the residents of the rundown neighborhoods who must feel they are being used by politicians. Some of these people are getting angry over being treated as tourist attractions. They are fed up with the political gimmicks and with politicians who make a whirl-wind tour of the slums while TV and newspaper cameras click away. They know the politician will not return again until the next campaign.

Under the circumstances we would suggest that quick-tempered politicos of the George Romney stripe especially should stay away from the guided tours of the slum neighborhoods. Last week Gov. Romney, who has presidential aspirations, got into a shouting match with a young Puerto Rican in a Chicago slum. The young man spoke out his resentment of politicians using the poor people. Gov. Romney's temper got the best of him and according to reports he almost punched the Puerto Rican in the mouth.

That should have been enough to alert the Romney camp to avoid any further excursions into blighted areas. But it wasn't and thus on Monday the Republican Governor of Michigan had a similar encounter while touring the poverty areas of Los Angeles. The press reported a sharp exchange between Gov. Romney and two militant young Negroes.

The politicians have done enough to create the tensions existing today in many of the dilapidated neighborhoods which infest every city. Often they have made grandiose promises on which they could not deliver. They have played the poverty issue to the hilt for the sake of politics. They have created committee upon committee, commission upon commission. Always it is the same—study, survey, consult, plan, testify, investigate. The talk is the same too, rats, slum housing, no jobs, cold water, unheated rooms. In the end the money goes to the bureaucrats, the political hangers-on and the consultants. It is a disgusting situation and shows no real charitable concern for the truly needy among us. Shame, shame. The politicians should quit posing for pictures in the slums and go about doing something meaningful about the urban problems which confront our Nation.

As for Gov. Romney and his temper that is something else again. It seems wherever he goes he gets into a fight. He did it recently while visiting in San Francisco where he had an encounter with the hippies. Imagine that, a fight with the hippies. They are arch enemies of violence!

Gov. Romney also dislikes newsmen asking him questions, which leads us to the advice handed out by The Philadelphia Inquirer the other day in preparation for Gov. Romney's visit to the City of Brotherly Love.

All newsmen were requested to refrain from asking Gov. Romney about the following:

North Vietnam, South Vietnam, black people, white people, Republicans, Democrats, the Mormon religion, American Motors, the Detroit News, and the American League pennant race.

About the only thing open for newsmen to discuss with Gov. Romney would be his stamp collection. That should be safe.

STANDARDS NECESSARY FOR LIBERTY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record a recent column by Bruce Biossat, entitled "Standards Necessary for Liberty."

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Standards Necessary for Liberty

(By Bruce Biossat)

Washington.—An enlarging number of Americans seem bent on defining American democratic freedoms to allow them greater and greater license in their personal and public lives.

Increasingly, freedom is seen by some as, above all, an immunity—in the extreme view, from the law and the moral code themselves; in the less extreme, from criticism, from any kind of gradation, from all social penalty.

To the extent that political radicals of the right and left, with some support from more moderate types, are attacking the established framework of U.S. society as an inhibitor to freedom, they seem to give the sanction of a "high cause" to the libertarian bent of many average Americans.

But the latter probably do not need that sanction. On their own, by their own route, they have come to the notion that it is virtually undemocratic to note differences between one individual and another in matters of achievement or potential; to call attention to mistakes; to fix blame; or to make too much of many kinds of wrongdoing.

In all this there is a wicked irony. In the name of allowing individually its freest rein, the growing army of libertarians would bar society from making some crucial individual distinction among people.

ARRESTS ARE RESENTED

Grades and tests in school are increasingly frowned upon. Legitimate arrests for offenses against the law are resented as unwarranted invasions of personal rights. Minor wrongdoing is widely acceptable. Law enforcers, engulfed by rising serious crime, seem to underscore the tolerance by leaving many minor transgressions unprobed and unpunished.

The libertarians want no harsh words, no penalties, no standards to be measured by. Democracy, thus rationalized, means being left alone, to do as one wishes.

Those social analysts who are not caught up in these loose notions brand them as painfully immature. The bent is all for privilege and pleasure, with no balancing burden for responsibility.

One practiced observer, author Barbara W. Tuchman, sees a great failure of confidence among Americans as a key cause. In a McCall's article she added:

"As a result we tend to shy away from all judgments. We hesitate to label anything wrong, and we therefore hesitate to require the individual to bear moral responsibility for his acts. . . .

MUST MAINTAIN VALUES

"To adopt the position that we must not condemn but only understand may be very Christian in intent, but in reality it is an escape from the necessity of exercising judgment. . . . What is required is courage—just a little, not very much—the courage to be independent and stand up for the standard of values one believes in. . . .

"If the educated man is not willing to express standards, if he cannot show that he has them and applies them, what then is education for?"

Should it be correct that immaturity and lack of confidence underlie the mounting libertarian strain among us, then at the very least we shall have to face this reality—and cease trying to invest these tendencies with high nobility.

The blunt fact is that we cannot function as a society or as individuals without a "system," without law, a moral code, an encompassing set of standards, a capacity and a willingness to make judgments about people and their problems.

Flaws and roadblocks in the system deserve to be attacked. But freedom cannot exist without the shelter of a durable framework. A discerning radical, Harvard sociologist Martin Peretz, sees that. Those who want to short-circuit the system, he says, simply lack the proper patience and stomach and drive to change society for the better by truly democratic means.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE NEEDED IN INSURANCE OF LOW-LYING AREAS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, periodically Texas is visited by a great disaster caused by driving wind and water, such as Hurricane Carla, in 1961, and very recently, Hurricane Beulah. This problem is of common concern to other coastal States in the United States. Likewise, from time to time lowland areas in such cities as Dallas and Fort Worth, far inland from any coastal regions, are swamped by floods of major proportions.

The estimates of the losses incurred, while reaching into the millions, do not approach the true economic consequences. Aside from the loss of life and human misery, all regular activities are disrupted, productive capacity is impaired, strategic facilities cannot be used, and housing is destroyed.

We have various programs to rebuild public facilities and to make loans for the purposes of rebuilding private structures; but what about a small businessman or homeowner when he has to stand such an economic loss alone? He may be able to get a loan to rebuild, but how can he pay off two mortgages? The nature of flood damage is such that insurance companies have been unwilling to write policies that will provide relief for these victims.

I have for a number of years been engaged with other Senators in the search for a sound flood insurance program. This search led to the passage earlier this session in the Senate of S. 1985, of which I am a cosponsor. This Senate action is a tribute to the author of the bill, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams].

A flood insurance bill has been reported favorably by the Housing Subcommittee of the House Committee on Banking and Currency.

The Houston Chronicle took this occasion on September 28 to publish an editorial supporting the quick passage of the bill. I agree with the Chronicle, because I think that the bill is necessary to make small home ownership and small business ownership secure in high-risk areas.

The editorial is to the point and the reasoning is sound. Since it is representative of the thinking of many of my constituents and of the great majority of the American people, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Flood Insurance Bill

Hurricane Beulah packed some of the strongest winds ever recorded for a hurricane. But it is the flooding in South Texas that is causing the worst damage. Unfortunately, the less serious wind damage will be covered by insurance; the water damage will not be.

Anything is insurable. The reason little if any flood insurance is sold is that the cost of premiums makes it prohibitive. Insuring against flood damage violates two basic actuarial principles:

First, high risk must be spread across a wide population base. People who live on high ground aren't interested in flood insurance. Those living in areas that may flood can't pay the exorbitant premiums necessary to cover their potential loss.

Second, in floods high loss is coupled with high frequency of loss. For successful insurance-writing, these two characteristics cannot be combined. For example, in fire insurance loss may be high but the frequency of loss is low. In auto insurance, frequency is high but claims generally are small. In floods, the loss per property holder is high and everybody gets hit at the same time.

Help for flood victims may soon arrive, however. A bill is now before Congress that would establish a federal flood insurance program. The bill, sponsored by Sen. Harrison Williams of New Jersey, passed the Senate almost unnoticed on Sept. 14. A similar measure, sponsored by Rep. Wright Patman of Texarkana, is now before the House Banking and Currency Committee.

This plan, which is backed by the administration, would set up a flood insurance system supported both by the private insurance industry and the federal government. A $500 million fund in the Treasury Department would be used to subsidize the premiums. It also would reimburse private companies should a catastrophic loss—like Beulah—occur which might threaten the companies with bankruptcy.

Under this plan, a number of private companies would set up an insurance pool to deal with the federal government. The insurance could then be sold at rates that would appeal to the average individual. One-family dwellings would be insured up to $15,000, multiple units up to $30,000, and personal property up to $5000.

Disasters like Beulah, or Hurricane Betsy which caused $1 billion of damage to Louisiana in 1965, vividly demonstrate the need for such insurance. This is good legislation.

THE REAL AMERICA FOUND IN DAKOTAS

Mr. MUNDT. The Dakota Twins—South and North Dakota—are indebted to a Chicago stock-brokerage firm for bringing national recognition to the fact that our area of the Union reflects what these analysts refer to as "the real America." Certainly no citizen of either Dakota would argue with that gratifying finding.

For the information of Congress and the country, I ask unanimous consent that the report issued by Wayne Hunter & Co. of Chicago, Ill., be printed in the Record.

I completely endorse this report on the two Dakotas. Whether it is to invest one's time as a tourist, his talents as a pheasant hunter in the world's best pheasant hunting country, or as one seeking to buy a home, a farm, or a business, I suggest investing in the Dakotas—preferably, of course, in South Dakota. I give assurance that it will be a triple-A, gilt-edged, guaranteed, and most profitable investment.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record as follows:

[From the Aberdeen American-News]

The Real America Found in Dakotas

The South Dakota image is improving!

One of the first honorary citizenship certificates awarded by Gov. Nils Boe in connection with the Proud State program for bringing recognition to South Dakota should go to Wayne Hunter & Co., Chicago stockbrokers.

The nationally respected brokerage firm has reprinted in its widely circulated bulletin what it calls a Bank Bond Comment Letter. Under the title, "The Real America," it said:

"We have just returned from a visit with some of our banker friends in North Dakota and South Dakota. There we discovered afresh the spirit and character that made the United States great. At a time of strife in many large cities, unease in Washington and crisis in the sense of natural purpose, an atmosphere of self-fulfillment and resolute determination is evident at every turn in the road in the 'Dakota Territory'. These are people whose forebears, like themselves, sought opportunity rather than privilege. This is big country, whose settlers needed abundant ambition and energy.

"The rewards of successful enterprise are mirrored in the large farms that dot the countryside with their well-kept buildings and many acres of carefully-tended crops. Even old-timers whose memories go back to the 1890's can recall few better years than 1967 for small grain crops.

"Grass is thick and hay, in bales and stacks, is everywhere. Cattle, with calves by their sides, are fat and sleek. There are problems. Canada's drought has slipped over the border and damaged the corn crop in some areas. Farmers again find grain prices hitting lows even as costs of operating a farm continue to spiral. Concern is sometimes expressed about conditions among the Indian population.

"Yet, problems are viewed more as challenges than as reasons for complaint. Difficulties are not unheard of in this country. The early pioneer families underwent severe trials. A wave of bank failures occurred in the 1920s. Few Americans have ever withstood such hardships as the great drought and duststorms of the 1930s which struck just as depression gripped the nation. These Dakotans who stayed and fought back were rewarded when the scales of nature were brought back into balance. Today, to the visitor on a brief sojourn, there is an inescapable overall impression of peace and plenty, health and happiness.

"Driving down the long and narrow road toward the endless horizon, the visitor to the Dakotas can only conclude—here is a measure of the real America, here is the spirit representative of so much of the nation that is not reported on the front page. Here is reason enough not to harbor fear for our free society, but instead to look upward in hope for the future security of the United States."

PRIVATE INDUSTRY AIDS TEXAS DISASTER VICTIMS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on Friday, September 29, I received a telegram from Mr. Thomas M. Rauch, president of Smith Kline & French Laboratories.

This was, indeed, a welcome message since in it Mr. Rauch informed me that he had made arrangements through drug channels to replace at no cost all uninsured stocks of medical products produced by Smith Kline & French which had been damaged or destroyed by hurricane Beulah or its aftermath. This is an excellent example of how private industry can accept a responsible social role in times of great disaster.

I thank Mr. Rauch for his action, and I invite the attention of the Senate to the telegram. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
September 29, 1967.

Hon. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH,
U.S. Senator,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Smith Kline & French Laboratories expresses deep sympathy for the citizens of Texas whose lives have been disrupted by the recent floods. My company stands ready to help as best it can the difficult process of return to normal conditions. We have made arrangements through drug trade channels to replace at no cost all uninsured stock of medicinal products produced by SK&F and our subsidiary, Menley & James, which have been damaged or destroyed. Please accept for the people of Texas our hope for an early and complete recovery.

THOMAS M. RAUCH,
President, Smith Kline & French Laboratories.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the pending question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and ask unanimous consent that the time for the quorum call be charged equally to both sides.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The Clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the purpose of the pending amendment is to reduce the authorization as provided in the pending bill from $2,258,000,000 to $2,060,000,000. This is a reduction of $198 million.

The adoption of the pending amendment would still give this agency every dollar that was requested in the budget. It would give them every dollar that the agency itself said it could properly spend. Certainly, at a time when we are operating with a deficit that is approaching $2 billion a month and is estimated sometimes to be as high as $28 billion to $30 billion for the next fiscal year the very least we can do is to hold the appropriations not to exceed the amount which the agency itself says it can properly spend.

Personally, I think we shall have to go even further before this is over and reduce the budget estimate.

Nevertheless, this is an opportunity for the Senate to go on record as to whether it wants to live up to its promise to reduce the expenditures or whether it wants, by rejecting the pending amendment, to provide more money than the Budget Bureau says the agency can properly and efficiently spend.

I urge the adoption of the pending amendment and reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. If the pending amendment is agreed to, to what extent would it curtail the job training program?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It would not curtail it at all as it has been recommended by the budget or by the agency itself. Job training is covered in title I, parts (B) and (D). Two titles are covered under this amendment: Part (A), title I, provides $295 million, and the amendment would allow $295 million. Under part (B) of title I, the Senate bill provides $567 million. The pending amendment provides $579 million, or an increase of $12 million.

The pending amendment would provide for that increase on this item. It does eliminate $105 million which the Senate bill would put in part (D), title II.

Mr. COTTON. In other words, the impact of the pending amendment on the job training aspect would be comparatively minor.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. It would give to the agency every dollar which the Budget Bureau says can efficiently be spent during 1968.

Mr. COTTON. Undoubtedly the Senator is aware that the other body has just overwhelmingly rejected the conference report on the HEW appropriations bill which, incidentally, would provide for more money for the established, tried, and tested job training activities and programs that have been long established. That indicates that if we exceed the amount recommended in the President's budget with respect to the pending bill the other body is likely to reject the amount by which we exceed the President's budget.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. Last year the total appropriation was only $1,750,000,000. We might also jeopardize the enactment of the proposal itself by approving this further increase of $200 million. This is not the only job training program. In a bill pending before the Finance Committee the HEW has a substantial amount included for job training.

With the adoption of the pending amendment they will still have every dollar that they can efficiently spend. Certainly that is the objective.

Last year the total authorization for this agency was $1,750,000,000. Budget requests for this year are for $2,060,000,000. This is an increase of about 17 percent over last year. The Senate bill proposes to add another $198 million, or 10 percent more than the administration requests. The pending amendment will cancel this Senate increase.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the Senator.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may require.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I have listened with interest to the comments of the Senator from Pennsylvania. I am sure that, quite inadvertently, he did not state the position of the agency request.

The Senate bill has recommended for this agency almost $250 million more than the committee has put into the bill. It was the Bureau of the Budget, and not the agency, which made the cut resulting in $2.06 billion.

Let me say very candidly that, so far as the other body is concerned, I am well aware of the attitudes over there. And, quite frankly, I want some wiggle room in conference. And, if for no other reason than that, I would urge my Republican friends to give us that wiggle room. We are going to have a tough time in conference and we need some flexibility.

With respect to each of these increases, let me point to where they came from.

The first is a $10 million increase in the training program in title I. That is a Republican amendment. It was put in the bill at the request of the minority members in order to give incentive to private enterprise to train and employ the hard-core unemployed.

We asked for $925 million for that purpose yesterday and were turned down on a close vote. There is only $10 million in there at the request of the Republicans. I hope the Republicans will not make us take it out.

With respect to the special impact program, which is the joint brainchild of the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] and the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], that matter will be discussed in a few minutes by the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY]. We put $83 million into that in excess of the entirely inadequate $22 million which the Bureau of the Budget had allowed us.

If that is not entirely a Republican program, the Republicans must take at least half the credit for the authorship or parenthood, as the case may be.

With respect to the $40 million added to the community action program, $10 million of that is for health aid; $15 million is for aid to the elderly who have generally been shortchanged in this program; and $15 million is for family planning.

If there is any way to curtail the number of young Americans who are going into poverty if nothing is to be done about it, I would suggest that family planning is perhaps the best. The agency reported that for every dollar spent on family planning they got a higher return than for any other project in the antipoverty spectrum. The next item was for the migrant program and involved $3 million. That is a joint project of the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] and me.

I am happy to accept the junior parentship of what the Senator from California so badly wanted for the migrants in California and elsewhere.

The next item is $25 million for small business loans in poverty areas. That was the brainchild of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], a Republican addition.

Title V had an additional sum put in, $35 million, at the specific request of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. That is a Republican addition.

The final addition, $2 million, means we will add $2 million to the VISTA program which, with all deference to my friend, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], has been a conspicuous success in practically every State of the Union.

That $2 million provision has 16 cosponsors in an effort to add this amount to the VISTA program, a great many of whom are Republicans.

So, that is where the $198 million in excess of the budget comes from.

I hope very much that the Senate will reject the Williams amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. Yes; I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I thank the distinguished floor manager of the bill, and tell him that I will be brief.

The amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] will strike $198 million from the bill, and will do so in the manner just outlined by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

I was the author of an amendment, accepted by the committee, which is responsible for $40 million of the funds the amendment would cut from the bill, and I would like to explain the rationale for my amendment.

OEO's effort in programs for the elderly poor has been distressingly small, as ample testimony in the hearings confirms. Consequently, I proposed a new, national emphasis program—Project Find—to enlarge OEO's effort, and it was accepted.

Similarly, I proposed a program designed to bring new people into, and to enhance knowledge of, the field of health services for the poor. Once again, ample testimony confirms the need for a program of this sort, and I refer my colleagues to a statement I made in this Chamber on October 3 for excerpts from the testimony.

One other new program—family planning—was added by the committee to title II of the bill, and this, too, was supported by testimony.

Now, the budget request for title II, already pared to the bone by the Bureau of the Budget, did not, of course, take into account these new programs. Consequently, I proposed to raise the authorization $40 million in order to obviate the need of taking funds from other title II programs.

That is the rationale for $40 million of the $198 million proposed to be cut from the committee bill, and I know that the other $158 million is equally well justified.

I urge rejection of the Williams amendment, as the programs they will affect are badly needed.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, it had been my intention to support the amendment of the Senator from Delaware. One reason why I had intended to support it was that I happened to serve on the Subcommittee on HEW of the Committee on Appropriations; and many of the meritorious programs in this bill are, in my opinion, duplication of or parallel to the programs in HEW. I believe the HEW people, who have worked through the years, are much more competent—or at least have the better experience—to administer the programs.

However, since yesterday, we know that the HEW programs will be severely cut. I am not interested in which of these programs is advocated by Democrats and which by Republicans. I do not wish to see the job training cut, if I can help it. I believe I could only continue to support the amendment of the Senator from Delaware upon one of two bases: If it were amended to give more money earmarked for the job-training program; or, two, if it were amended so that those who administer the program would be empowered to transfer funds back and forth within the program—just within this program—so that they would have the opportunity to use funds for purposes which they consider the most vital. I consider the actual job training the most vital.

Incidentally, I am not interested in giving the able Senator from Pennsylvania more "wiggle room" in conference. I believe the Senate should work its will and stand as steadfast as the other body. There has been too much "wiggling" in conferences.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I thank the Senator from New Hampshire, and I appreciate his position.

In the colloquy earlier with the Senator from New York—who will discuss his own position with regard to this amendment—the suggestion was made that if this amendment were adopted I should agree to go along with a second amendment which would give to the conferees the right to rearrange these figures in a manner within the confines of the bill as they thought best. I told him I would have no objection to such a proposal. I was only seeking to reduce this amount by the $198 million, and I would be willing to confer upon the conferees the authority to rearrange this amount in a manner they believe would be best.

I call the attention of the Senator from New Hampshire to the fact that not only in the HEW bill which he mentioned, which is now before the House, but also in the social security bill, about which the HEW representatives are testifying before the Committee on Finance, there are included sections dealing with welfare, the Job Corps, and aid to the elderly. Under that bill the administration proposals call for a separate multimillion-dollar job training program, which will be handled either by HEW or by the Secretary of Labor.

There is no question about the fact that all these agencies are recommending an expansion of the job-training program. This is by far not the only agency dealing with this subject.

The question is what is the most efficient manner in which to handle the job training program and just how much can we afford. I agree with the Senator from New Hampshire that this is one of the more important items in this program and one that should be given top priority. Nevertheless, we have before us an amendment which gives to this agency all it can spend properly and efficiently.

Mr. CLARK. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I shall yield shortly——

Mr. CLARK. That is the second time the Senator has misstated the fact.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's 2 minutes have expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield myself 1 additional minute. The Senator from Pennsylvania is in error. I will agree with the Senator from Pennsylvania that the agency could spend more if Congress wants to be so free. I do not doubt that any agency under this Great Society could spend five times more than it gets. They are experts at spending.

Mr. CLARK. Asked for more.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. They are not bashful about asking. I have never seen any of these agencies that did not ask for more and spend more just as I have seen the Senator from Pennsylvania ask for more and spend more for every spending program. But to spend more we also have to tax more, and which Senator is going say, "Tax more"? It is all right to promise, but with what are you going to pay for it?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold that request for 1 minute?

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

Mr. COTTON. Will the Senator yield me 1 minute?

Mr. CLARK. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. I am disturbed because of the fact that the ax fell yesterday, and the money for job training which we expected in HEW will not be there.

Before this matter is frozen with the yeas and nays, I wish the Senator from Delaware would consider amending his motion, while he can, to allow a little more money earmarked for job training, because we are not likely to get it in the HEW bill, though we shall fight for it.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I wish to say to my good friend from New Hampshire that it may be his suggestion has merit, but we are on limited time. We have Senators about to leave the Chamber, and we have committed ourselves to voting at the end of 45 minutes. There will be opportunity after we dispose of the Williams amendment, with a little less speed and a little more wisdom, to see what can be worked out. I do not believe that we can do it on the floor in the next 20 minutes.

Therefore, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. COTTON. The Senator is compelling me to vote for the Williams amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I shall vote against the amendment of my colleague, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

There is logic and consistency in his position that we should oppose appropriations larger than recommended by the administration and should, in fact, reduce appropriation. I have been following this position. Only a few days ago I was one of three Senators who voted against a $2.5 billion appropriation for military construction in the United States and all over the world because it has little relevance to the war in Vietnam and should be postponed. We will have a pay raise bill coming up shortly costing up to $5 billion. I intend to vote to postpone pay raises, other than for the military.

The human needs of the people who have no jobs must be considered. Each Senator makes a judgment as to the relative worth of various programs. I believe there are no more pressing problems before the country than jobs for people who are out of work, for decent housing and measures to close the gap between people who are steadily advancing and those who remain behind.

I have my doubts and troubles concerning the poverty program, its waste and duplication in my State and in the country. This bill is an improvement and I hope that the programs will be improved.

Mr. President, I shall vote against the amendment.

I congratulate Senator CLARK for his able management of that bill, and the members of the committee, Republicans and Democrats alike.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Who yields time?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Delaware if he intends to use the remainder of his time. He has more time remaining than I have.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If the Senator is ready to vote, we can terminate the debate now and vote, if he wishes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, what concerns me in connection with this amendment is not only that it would cut down on the war on poverty, but also that it would cut down on it in a number of particularly critical areas.

President Johnson made a statement just 2 days ago about the importance of the private enterprise system in dealing with poverty; he announced that about $50 million was going to be taken from various programs to permit private enterprise to proceed on the unemployment problem.

This amendment would eliminate almost all private enterprise effort from the war on poverty.

It would cut down on it first by deleting $10 million for special incentives to private employers to hire poor people. In committee the senior Senator from New York [Mr JAVITS] led an effort, which was supported by the Republican members of the committee, to get the private sector more actively involved.

Although the proposal was offered by the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], it was supported by all members of the committee. This resulted in a $10 million incentive to private enterprise to actively go out and hire people; it seeks to bring the private sector in in a major way and to assist in an ongoing program.

Second, the special impact program added to the law last year is based on inducing private enterprise to locate in the ghetto, working with Government, and yet giving incentive to the private sector to hire people who are unemployed. This program has worked well, as Secretary Wirtz and Mr. Shriver told the committee at our hearings.

So there is a major effort at the present moment to bring in the private sector. And so, Mr. President, it does not seem to make sense to agree to this proposal. It would also cut all funds to aid the development of small business in the ghetto. Again, this would eliminate money in an area where the private sector of our economy was to be involved in fighting poverty.

The proposal of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] was supported by all members of the committee. We discussed the importance of bringing in the private enterprise system, and what it can do. We talked about the fact that we want to get away from the Government doing everything out of Washington, the fact that we do not like centralization of Government, and that the private sector should be involved.

Mr. President, hearings were held and it was unanimously agreed that the idea of greater private enterprise involvement is a good one. Some amendments were introduced by Republican Members and some amendments were introduced by Democratic Members, with everybody getting together and agreeing that we do want this kind of program. Now, in one amendment which is advocated on the floor, all of those programs would be eliminated in one fell swoop; almost all of the programs existing at the present time to bring in the private sector to focus on unemployment are going to be eliminated.

It does not make a great deal of sense when we realize that the statistics show that "subemployment" in our urban poverty areas varies from 27 percent to on up to 49.1 percent, and that unemployment on Indian reservations, and among Mexicans and Negroes is steadily growing higher instead of lower. This was a new and innovative way to approach the problem and now it is suggested that we eliminate it on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, I hope we reject the amendment.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I think the remarks of the Senator from New York are valid because here is an opportunity for the Senate to bring the creative element of private enterprise into a cooperative effort with the Federal Government. I believe it is a partnership.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. The Senator is correct.

Mr. RANDOLPH. A partnership is needed if we are to bring about employment and reemployment in America. We must mobilize our entire society if this Nation is to wage an effective battle against the conditions of poverty and lack of education under which so many of our citizenry exist. Our endeavors in this area must be creative, and our task will not be fulfilled in a matter of days or months or a year. The challenge of increasing opportunities for education, jobs, housing, health care, and for a better life for the low-income citizen involves a timespan of years. I believe that significant and constructive beginnings have been made—there has been meaningful progress. In many cases, this progress is very evident. The point is, however, that the stage has been set for the pulling in of our total resources in the attack against poverty. And our resources include the private enterprise system, which will exercise a vital role.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time, but I now yield to the Senator from Vermont 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I endorse what my distinguished chairman of the subcommittee has just said.

Had the amendment which I offered yesterday been approved by the Senate, I would give serious consideration to the proposal made by my distinguished colleague and friend, the Senator from Delaware. My amendment would have provided substantial funds for job training under both the existing NDTA legislation and through additional job training programs under the human investment approach. If this had been approved, I could consider cutting the present funds. However, since the effect of this cut would now be to reduce amounts expended for job training, I cannot agree. I am in favor of reducing expenditures where possible. Many Republicans, including myself, have made proposals to do so. But, we cannot afford to cut funds at the risk of discouraging private industry from entering the job training field.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, how much time is remaining?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Delaware has 10 minutes remaining, and the Senator from Pennsylvania has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Delaware is recognized.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the arguments advanced on the other side have a certain amount of merit when they discuss particular programs, but they overlook the fact that by the adoption of the pending amendment we are not destroying the program. Even with the adoption of this amendment, we would leave over $2 billion in the bill, or 17 percent more than they had last year.

In addition to this bill there is pending in the Committee on Finance another bill which has the support of the administration and which would provide another $6 billion for aid to the elderly, the handicapped, and family planning plus millions for the Job Corps. All of these programs are covered by other agencies.

At some point, somewhere, Congress must face its responsibility to reduce these expenditures. Programs cannot be financed with promises. If Congress is going to keep adopting and approving all of these increased spending programs we should be hearing speeches on the other side of the aisle supporting the 10 percent tax increase, or perhaps a tax increase of 15 or 18 percent. Significantly, most of those advocating the spending say that they are also against the tax increase.

What good is a promise to these people if they are not going to finance it and if they are not going to vote for the tax increase? If they are going to vote for a tax increase of 5 to 10 percent I would be glad to yield to them to state their position.

Those supporting these ever-expanding spending programs must accept the responsibility for the higher taxes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's 2 minutes have expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 additional minute. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I wish to ask a specific question of the Senator from Delaware. What is the President's recommendation of the total amount of money that should be allocated to this general program?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The President, through the Bureau of the Budget, asked Congress to approve $2.06 billion to cover all phases of this program. The adoption of this amendment would give them every dime which the Bureau of the Budget said could be efficiently spent.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is my understanding that this same program was adopted in 1964, at which time we allocated to it about $1 billion. In fiscal year 1968, according to the figures discussed, it has risen to $2.06 billion on the basis of the President's recommendations; is that not correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct. In addition, during the same period we have had other duplicating programs, with other agencies being built up into multimillion-dollar programs, all operating at the same time.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it not correct that there are job training programs in the Department of Labor, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and also in OEO which fights the war on poverty?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct. It was confirmed before our committee by the agencies themselves that the rivalry between the various agencies operating all in the same areas is resulting in an unnecessary waste of taxpayers' money.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the

Senator from Delaware yield me 3 minutes?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I intend to support the amendment authorized by the Senator from Delaware because I am convinced that $2,060 million is an adequate amount to allocate to this program.

Of course I am conscious of the fact that we have job-training programs in the three departments I mentioned a moment ago. There seem to be so many of them that few are able to identify the job training programs which are being duplicated time and time again.

I cannot dismiss from my mind the fact that the President is asking for a 10-percent surtax and that while he is asking for that, I should also begin to subscribe to expenditures in excess of what he regarded and what he believed to be his best judgment in helping to solve the problems of those who are out of work or who are poor.

Mr. President, I shall not be placed in that class which votes for increased expenditures but will vote against taxes which the President has asked for. The two positions do not go hand in hand. If we adopt one, we must of necessity exclude the other. We cannot vote against the tax proposal and at the same time vote for increased expenditures.

I humbly say, Mr. President, that if we are going to get into the trouble which the President now fears, it will be because of the adoption of the policy that we can expand on spending without increasing taxes. We just cannot do it and I shall not join with that group which advocates such an indefensible principal in the management of our Government.

I shall vote against the 10-percent surtax, and while I do so, I shall vote against expanding the spending recommended by the President.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield my remaining 2 minutes to the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is under consideration here is something quite different from the $2.8 billion added on in title II of the bill and deleted by the Senate yesterday. Insofar as that matter was concerned, no formal hearings had been held, although pertinent information was obtained incidentally during the course of the hearings on the bill itself.

So far as the tax bill is concerned, it is my intention, based on the information at my disposal and the accounts which have been given by reputable and knowledgeable witnesses, to vote for a 10-percent surtax as recommended by the President. I can see no other way out of the difficulty which faces this country and Congress at this time.

With respect to this bill, as a result of the hearings $198 million was added to title I. I support the addition. I think this is a reasonable sum. The difficulties which have confronted the urban centers of the Nation during the past few months—difficulties which may confront them during this coming winter and which may continue as a way of life for some years to come—alone warrant this added authorization.

Ten million dollars will be used for special incentives for private employers to hire the disadvantaged.

Eighty million dollars will be available for the special impact programs established in urban ghettos and other areas.

Forty million dollars will be used for projects for the elderly, family planning, training, and health provisions.

There will be $3 million for temporary housing for migrants and $25 million for technical assistance to small business and low income areas; $35 million for day care; and $2 million for VISTA demonstration projects related to persons returning from correctional institutions.

All of these are worthy objectives.

It is my further understanding that the $198 million indicated in the titles which I have just read were incorporated in the bill not because of Democratic initiative, but on the basis of bipartisan understanding and appreciation of the problems confronting this Nation at this time.

Therefore, Mr. President, I would hope that the amendment to strike this part of the authorization would be rejected.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Who yields time?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I respect the position of the majority leader, and I want to compliment him in that while he endorses the increase but he also endorses the tax increase to pay for it.

I take my hat off to any man who is willing to raise taxes to cover the cost of the money being spent.

I think that is the question which all of those who vote for the increased spending should begin to ask themselves.

There is merit in the job training programs, but I am not unmindful of the fact that there is a limit as to what we can afford in job training programs. We are today being told that they want to help train the 4 million to 5 million unemployed in this country, yet just a few days ago the Secretary of Labor issued a report pointing out how the booming economy under the administration there were less than 3 million unemployed in the country. This figure included those who were temporarily laid off as well as those poorly trained. Which figure is correct?

Where do they get these statistics? Are more people suddenly getting on poverty rolls, and is the administration planning on bankrupting another couple of million in the next 2 years by inflation which will result from their increased spending policies?

What concerns me is that the more we spend on these programs the larger the estimated number of unemployed gets.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Do Senators yield back their remaining time?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, how much time is left on the other side?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania has used up all his time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time. Let us vote.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. All time on the amendment has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Brooke]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were free to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. LAUSCHE (after having voted in the affirmative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD (after having voted in the negative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. MONTOYA (after having voted in the negative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] and the Senators from Georgia [Mr. Russell and Mr. Talmadge] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore] would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Talmadge] is paired with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young].

If present and voting, the Senator from Georgia would vote "yea," and the Senator from Ohio would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Brooke], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson] is absent on official business.

The pair of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Brooke] has been previously announced.

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON].

If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea," and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 36, nays 50, as follows:

[No. 280 Leg.]

YEAS—36

Allott
Baker
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Cotton
Curtis
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Hansen
Hickenlooper
Holland
Hollings
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Long, La.
McClellan
Miller
Monroney
Mundt
Murphy
Proxmire
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Spong
Stennis
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—50

Aiken
Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Brewster
Burdick
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Dodd
Dominick
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Griffin
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hatfield
Hayden
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Mondale
Morse
Muskie
Nelson
Pearson
Pell
Percy
Prouty
Randolph
Ribicoff
Scott
Symington
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough

NOT VOTING—14

Brooke
Carlson
Dirksen
Hill
Hruska
Lausche
Mansfield
Montoya
Morton
Moss
Pastore
Russell
Talmadge
Young, Ohio

So the amendment of Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware was rejected.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, in this 2-week debate on the 1967 antipoverty bill we have explored a great many of the programs and projects which we devoutly hope will make major contributions, next year and in the years that follow, toward the eradication of penury and deprivation in this most affluent of all nations.

One of the programs that other Senators and I feel has been most successful, a program that we feel will have an enduring effect, is the OEO legal services program. To a large extent its success has been due to the active and abiding interest taken in its operations by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. Senator KENNEDY's interest and support have helped make the OEO's legal aid program one of the most glowing accomplishments of the war on poverty.

On September 29 Senator KENNEDY made a memorable address on the subject of legal services for the poor to the OEO's Legal Services Northeast Regional Conference in New York City. It is an address that merits careful study by all Members of Congress and, indeed, by all Americans interested in seeing to it that American law does not discriminate, that it serves the rich and poor alike, people from all walks of life, without regard to race, color, creed, national origin, or economic status.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this excellent address by the Senator from Massachusetts appear in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I was extremely pleased and honored when Bill Greenawalt suggested that I join you here today. I am a member of both the Senate Judiciary Committee, which has jurisdiction over many of the Federal Government's legal activities, and the Labor and Welfare Committee, which watches over the entire Poverty Program, including legal services. In this dual role I have taken a special interest in the OEO Legal Services Program and have sought to be your spokesman and your advocate in the Senate.

I do so because I firmly believe that Legal Services has been one of the most promising, and effective and exciting dimensions of the War on Poverty. Its product is seen not only in the specific result of its clients cases but perhaps more strikingly in its broader effects:

A new sense of participation in the social system by those who have been alienated from it;

A confidence in the ability of the law to be a force for good, in those who have only experienced it as an adversary;

The development of a sensitivity in official agencies to the impact of their actions and procedures on the poor;

A growing demonstration to the public that the legal profession has a heart and a conscience;

The increased attraction of law, as a lifework, for many of our most talented young people;

A stimulation of new social awareness and participation among the natioh's law schools;

And, finally, and perhaps in the long run, most important, the establishment of contact and communication and understanding between the world of poverty and deprivation and injustice, and the separate, settled world of the bar leader, who with this new experience can be a strong force for social change and human progress.

Yet I hardly need convince this audience of the merits of the legal services concept or of its accomplishments. If the programs in your cities and states are running well, each of you, in one role or another, observes these phenomena first hand and daily.

Apart from my own interest in your work, I am especially pleased to be here today to help celebrate the second anniversary of the formal organization of the Legal Services unit in OEO. The progress since that day in 1965, when Clint Bamberger was sworn in, has been incredible. There are now nearly 300 programs funded, with 800 offices and 1,800 attorneys, at an annual cost of over $40 million.

In fact, of course, the Federal Government's involvement in the law and poverty field goes back beyond 1965. It was in the Fall of 1963 that the first Federal funds went to a neighborhood legal office right here in New York, as part of the prototype of the Poverty Program which was developed under the 1961 Juvenile Delinquency Act. But we can go back still further. For the spirit which guided the Federal planners in 1963 and 1965 traces back to the vital work in the field of criminal justice for the poor which preceded, and laid the necessary predicate for, Federal entry into the civil legal field. Less than three months after President Kennedy's inauguration, the Justice Department was immersed in the problems of the poor defendant. The Attorney General appointed a Committee on Poverty and the Administration of Federal Criminal Justice, now known as the Allen Committee. The now famous Allen Report cited Judge Learned Hand's remarks that "If we are to keep our democracy, there must be one commandment: Thou shalt not ration justice." The Report added, "One of the prime objectives of the civilized administration of justice is to render the poverty of the litigant an irrelevancy."

That is the course the Federal Government has pursued for the past six years. The Allen Report, the establishment of the Office of Criminal Justice in the Justice Department, the passage of the Criminal Justice Act, the funding of the early Legal Services Programs, the establishment of the OEO, and the formation of the OEO Legal Services Program, all form a continuum of which we here are part.

One would think that a program with this history and these roots would be well-embedded and well-accepted by now, especially when it has received the support and assistance of the organized bar at every step of the way.

Yet incredibly enough, in the past several days we have witnessed the irony of the very success of the Program leading to a re-questioning of its basic principles and purposes. One Congressman stood on the floor of the House and gave what he intended to be a scathing attack on one OEO funded Legal Services Program, but which seemed to me to contain the highest kind of praise. He said that the lawyers for the poor had brought the entire Department of Labor into "groveling submission," that the Department had "paid tribute to a rump organization which suckles the Federal Poverty Program for its existence." He called the settlement agreed to by the Labor Department a "surrender document" and pointed out in horror that it would enable the poverty lawyers to insure continuing review of the disputed issue and full access to the information necessary to bring future cases.

* * * * *

Now the lesson I would take from his words is that here was a program that had identified an injustice, made it visible through the initiation of litigation, and had achieved not only the possibility of relief in the particular plaintiffs' cases, but also a means of future relief in future cases. This would certainly seem to be legal services at its finest.

Yet the Congressman saw a different message. He could not understand how one entity funded by the Federal Government could do battle with another Federal entity. He saw an infringement by the Poverty lawyers into the Labor Department's territory. He saw the filing of a suit as blackmail and coercion. He implied a lack of legitimate standing and interest in the Legal Services Agency, because it existed only by the grace of OEO.

At this point in time, I don't think anyone could take seriously the resultant proposal by this Congressman and others that the Legal Services Programs be prohibited from filing cases against government agencies. Your task is to assist your clients in resisting and rooting out injustice wherever it is found. If it is found in the laws or regulations or practices which govern the government, then they must be attacked. If you refuse to do this, then you can hardly convince your communities that you are a force for justice, nor, most likely, can you be much help to them.

If fact, to some extent the heat of the opposition to your work may be a good barometer of your success. If you are not perturbing someone in some government each week, then the chances are that you are not doing an effective job. For your job is to change the status quo, when the status quo ignores the needs, and problems and legitimate aspirations of the poor. As lawyers, you have no more right to be reticent about taking on a government agency than the Justice Department's lawyers have when they take on the FCC or the Comptroller of Currency, or than the defense lawyer paid with Federal Criminal Justice Act funds has when he takes on the U.S. Attorney.

We had another relevant example presented to us during the riot hearings in the Judiciary Committee. A policeman from Newark complained that lawyers from the Legal Services Program were advising demonstrators as to their legal rights and obligations during picketing of city officials. One Senator recoiled in horror at the thought of Federally-paid attorneys performing such a function. Yet now can anyone doubt the desirability of having dissatisfied citizens know what the legal limits on their activities are, and at the same time having the police in the heat of conflict know that they are on their best behavior. The effect can only be moderation and caution on both sides. The alternative may be, as we have seen repeatedly this summer, one of those small incidents which can spark an orgy of lawlessness, or at least an abuse of privilege on one side or of power on the other, leading to increased tension and frustration.

Again I would hope that there is no doubt on these questions in this audience. But I think it is healthy to review them in our minds regularly to make sure that we have not slipped unconsciously into a posture we would not conciously assume. The fact is that the first "acceptance" stage of your programs is past. You have the support of the Bar, of the Congress, of the public, and of the Executive Branch. And more and more you have the support, as well, of local leaders. They realize that the kind of change you bring about, and the way you bring it about, are good for the entire community. So you need not be shy, or timid or fearful. I do not think anyone, not even Congress, could turn the clock backwards on Legal Services now.

The question really is where we are heading as the clock goes forward. We have discovered, or aroused, a demand for legal services. How is it to be met? How should the supply be rationed where demand cannot be met? Here again you have an obligation to proceed boldly. For in your discussions here, in the law reviews, in the symposia, in the proceedings of the 1965 Conference on Law and Poverty, you will find a whole spectrum of proposals, suggestions, ideas, and issues which should be explored and developed. You have before you large immediate questions, such as the division of lawyer time between routine cases and test cases, the possible use of supplementary lay personnel, and the standards of indigency. And you have large, long-term issues, like the proposed development of new forms of group legal services legal insurance, the role of mediation and arbitration, and the formulation of new mechanisms and new directions to combat the roots of poverty by providing adequate housing, employment education, and health care. And you have smaller questions like library access, salaries, relationships, to CAP's and so on.

As an interested outsider let me express the hope that your discussion of all these subjects can be open and frank, with no holds barred and no taboos. All of us must constantly reexamine the foundations on which our traditional ethical, procedural, and philosophical approaches to the law stand. For times and conditions and needs change. And perhaps some of the constraints we lawyers put on our own activities need updating, too.

And let me express the hope as well that your discussions here can lead to action, that you can go back home with the determination and courage to experiment with new ideas and new assumptions. For example, I am sure someone here will suggest that you be more selective in accepting cases, that you avoid overloading your lawyers with so many service cases that they turn into impersonal automations giving routinized attention to a continuous stream of clients. You will be told that your client population will understand, if you explain that turning some away gives you more time to concentrate on, and win, cases which will benefit many people at one time, cases which might change the whole fabric of community life by changing the basic nature of relationships with landlords, loansharks, retail stores, or welfare agencies. You may be told that the community *can* be kept involved if you appoint a citizen advisory committee to help select the general kinds of cases which should receive emphasis. It will then be easy for you just to say "that's nice," and quietly go home. But you can do yourselves and all the other programs a favor if you try some of the suggestions out, analyze them, and report your results. For no professor sitting in his office, and no administrator sitting in Washington can do what you can do or learn what you can learn. You are where the action is.

You are also in a unique position to play another vital role. Because your clients are at the receiving end of so many governmental practices and procedures, you can see, in a way which government administrators can never see, exactly how their agencies are operating *vis a vis* the ordinary citizen. Your descriptions, your assessments, and your suggestions, whether communicated directly to the agencies involved, or through legislative representatives, can have a direct result. Most government officials want their staffs to do a good job and a fair job, but they may not know of long-accepted, inbred abuses and barriers unless you make these visible.

This is really a two-sided job. You can provide the information about the many government programs you come in contact with. And there are many other direct and indirect government programs which impinge on every facet of our daily lives. In each of these there can be an important difference if the factors of poverty, inexperience, or lack of education are not taken into account. The Department of Justice discovered, for example, that the rules governing settlement of damage cases against the government were such that they caused people to file suits and incur legal expenses for small claims when quick administrative settlements would have been feasible and proper. The result was a change in rules which will benefit many hundreds of citizens every year. And similar instances can arise in all sorts of activities large and small.

In fact we in the Federal Government should be doing more than we are, both legislatively and administratively to see how each of our activities affects the poor or disadvantaged. Are we making people incur bus costs and miss work in order to fill out forms in person which could be filed by mail? Are our welfare standards causing families to break up? Are our farm programs, home mortgage programs, park programs complementing or contradicting our anti-poverty programs? Do we make dealing with the government so complex that poor people either stay away or feel impelled to secure unnecessary attorney services.

As I have said, you can help us to identify many of these issues, and I am hopeful you will; but we also have to do a better job within the government to get our own house in order. Certainly changes in housing and welfare regulations, for example, could moot many of your cases. And in these cases an administrative policy win, may be worth several judicial wins.

I know you have a good deal of talking to do yourselves, so I will vacate the rostrum now. Again my thinks to you all for having me here today. I congratulate each of you for taking part in this important task of assuring citizens of every status a chance to see that the full majesty of the law is meant to serve not just some of the people, but all of the people.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Are we under controlled time?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. All time is under control.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

JUDICIAL CONFERENCE SUPPORTS WIRETAPPING

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on September 26, the Judicial Conference of the United States endorsed legislation to permit Federal and State law enforcement officers to wiretap and eavesdrop electronically, under court observation and supervision. Since then, a number of newspaper articles and editorials have been published regarding this endorsement.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point an article entitled "Judges Back Bill To Ease Wiretaps," written by Fred P. Graham and published in the New York Times of Wednesday, September 27, 1967; an editorial entitled "Judges Back Wiretaps," published in the Washington Daily News of September 28, 1967; and an editorial entitled "Wiretap Support," published in the Washington Evening Star of Saturday, September 30, 1967.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Sept. 27, 1967]

JUDGES BACK BILL TO EASE WIRETAPS—PERMISSIVE RULES ENDORSED BY FEDERAL CONFERENCE

(By Fred P. Graham)

WASHINGTON, September 26.—The Judicial Conference of the United States threw its weight yesterday behind an effort in Congress to legalize court-approved wiretapping and electronic eavesdropping by state and Federal policemen.

In a letter to Sentaor James O. Eastland, Democrat of Mississippi, chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, the Judicial Conference endorsed a permissive wiretap bill that has the support of many Republicans and conservative Southerners and is opposed by the Johnson Administration.

The bill, introduced by Senator John L. McClellan, Arkansas Democrat, would permit law enforcement officials, in investigating certain serious crimes, to tap telephone wires and plant hidden microphones in private premises under court orders.

Under the bill, judges could approve eavesdropping in a broad spectrum of crimes, ranging from graft and bribery to murder and espionage. Information picked up by the listening devices would be admissible in court under the bill.

LONG BILL BACKED

The Johnson Administration has supported a proposal introduced by Senator Edward V.

Long, a Missouri Democrat, that would outlaw all wiretapping and electronic eavesdropping by state and Federal police, except in internal security investigations.

The Judicial Conference, which consists of ranking Federal judges from across the nation and is headed by Chief Justice Earl Warren, told Mr. Eastland that it approved the purposes of the McClellan bill, "providing that it be amended to comply with the standards set forth in the opinion of the Supreme Court in Berger v. New York."

In that 5-to-4 decision, which was handed down June 12, the Court struck down New York's permissive police bugging law on the ground that it did not meet the search and seizure standards of the Fourth Amendment.

Legal scholars have since debated whether any effective statute could be drafted to satisfy the standards that were mentioned in general terms in the Berger opinion. The opinion by Justice Tom C. Clark implied that any valid law would have to include such safeguards as limited time periods of surveillance and notice to the subjects of the eavesdropping.

Although these requirements might be met through such devices as periodic disclosure of the names of those who had been bugged, the dissenting Justices warned that the rigid standards might prove to be impossible to meet.

However, proponents of legalized police bugging have insisted that the Berger case was intended by the Court to be an invitation for Congress to pass a detailed law, and Republicans have charged that organized crime cannot be brought under control without it.

EXISTING LAW CITED

Under existing law, wiretapping is a Federal felony and wiretap information is not admissible as evidence in United States courts. Electronic eavesdropping with hidden microphones is not outlawed by present Federal statutes, but United States officials have been forbidden by Attorney General Ramsey Clark to use it.

The Judicial Conference also urged Congress to pass "as quickly as possible" a bill designed to provide a cross-section of the population on Federal District Court jury panels. The bill, which was drafted by a special committee of judges headed by Judge Irving I. Kauffman of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, would require that prospective jurors' names be picked by lot from voter lists.

[From the Washington Daily News, Sept. 28, 1967]

THE JUDGES BACK WIRETAPS

Federal judges from all over the country have indorsed the proposal to legalize circumspect wiretapping and bugging in criminal cases.

The indorsement was approved at a meeting of the National Judicial Conference, composed of the chief judges of the circuit courts, district judges from each circuit and the presiding judges of special courts. Chief Justice Warren is chairman of the conference.

The bill before Congress would permit law enforcement officers to use wiretaps and bugs in investigating serious crimes—such as espionage, murder, kidnaping—and especially organized rackets and crimes involving national security.

Before using these devices, a law officer would be required to obtain permission from a court, and the judges recommended that these petitions should be specific about the crimes and the evidence which might be acquired. This evidence would be admissible at trials.

Also the bill would outlaw wiretaps and bugging by other than law officers.

As it is, evidence obtained from wiretaps is not admissible in Federal courts, and the Supreme Court last spring nullified a New York state law which authorized wiretapping under rigid conditions. But private wiretappers virtually are free to ply their sneak trade.

A wiretap law would provide an important—and sometimes the only—means of gathering convincing evidence in many instances. It ought to be used.

The Johnson Administration, while calling for an all-out drive against crime, for some inscrutable reason balks at using wiretaps, even under the most restricted conditions.

The judges, it seem to us are much more practical.

[From the Evening Star, Sept. 30, 1967]

WIRETAP SUPPORT

The drive during this session of Congress to pass legislation permitting the use of wiretaps and electronic bugs has received a helping hand from an unexpected source. At least, support from this source—the Judicial Conference of the United States—was unexpected as far as we are concerned.

What the conference did was to go on record as approving the "purposes" of Senator McClellan's wiretap bill, provided it is amended to conform to the requirements announced by the Supreme Court last June in its decision in the Berger case. That decision struck down a conviction obtained under a New York law which permitted the use of wiretaps and bugs in certain types of cases and under judicial supervision. As far as the constitutionality of that law was concerned, the court divided 5 to 4, with Justice Tom Clark, now retired, writing the majority opinion.

It would be unwise to read too much into the action by the judicial conference, which consists of Chief Justice Warren, the chief judges of the 11 federal appellate courts and perhaps a dozen federal district court judges. It does not mean that any law which may finally emerge from Congress is assured of judicial approval. But at the very least, it would seem to mean that the judicial conference recognizes the need for appropriate legislation in this area. And this is in refreshing contrast to the attitude of Attorney General Ramsey Clark and President Lyndon Johnson, who are backing a bill which would outlaw all wiretaps and bugging except in what they choose to consider national security cases.

Almost everyone having anything to do with law enforcement, except the President and his attorney general, recognizes the need for wiretaps and bugging. Let's mention just two. Justice Black wrote a scathing dissent in the Berger case. Pointing out that Berger was a briber and a corrupter of public officials, Justice Black said: It cannot be denied "that to deal with such specimens of our society, eavesdroppers are not merely useful, they are frequently a necessity." In recent days, Representative Poff of Virginia, chairman of the House Republican Task Force on Crime, has released a statement by the Association of Federal Investigators, representing 1,000 federal career employes active in law enforcement. The association says electronic surveillance devices "are necessary, useful and effective investigative weapons, particularly where organized crime cases are concerned."

Yet Ramsey Clark and Lyndon Johnson, heads deeply buried in the theoretical sand, insist that these devices, though necessary in national security cases, are of no value in dealing with other types of crime. Which prompts us to ask once again: Why?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, this announced support of wiretap and eavesdrop legislation by the Federal judiciary should weigh heavily with Members of Congress. Such endorsement, it seems to me, should dispel any fears that court authorized and supervised wiretapping and eavesdropping might be abused, since it is the judges themselves who would have such operations under their jurisdiction, constant surveillance, and control.

I call to the attention of the Senate a resolution adopted by the National Association of Attorneys General, supporting court-supervised electronic surveillance, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION XIV, FEDERAL LEGISLATION AUTHORIZING LIMITED ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE

(Resolution adopted by 61st annual meeting, National Association of Attorneys General, August 30, 1967, Portland, Oreg.)

Whereas we believe that modern law enforcement, in order to be both effective and law abiding, must not be denied the right to use advanced, scientific methods of crime detection, including electronic surveillance; and

Whereas at the same time we recognize the strong public interest in guarding the right to privacy of law-abiding individuals and against the dangers of abuse of electronic devices and hence the need for devising safeguards, controls, and restrictions applicable to their use;

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the 61st Annual Meeting of the National Association of Attorneys General in Portland, Oregon that we favor in principle federal legislation now pending before the Congress, permitting the use of electronic surveillance devices limited to federal and, where authorized by state law, state enforcement agencies, under strict supervision by the courts, along principles applicable to the issuance of search warrants and confined to specifically enumerated classes of cases involving serious crimes and organized criminal activities, as each state may deem appropriate.

(The States of Kentucky, New Jersey and New Mexico were recorded as voting "no.")

Mr. McCLELLAN. I also call to the attention of my fellow Senators a letter to the editor of the Washington Star, published in that newspaper on October 3, 1967, signed by the 23 members of the July Federal Grand Jury No. 1 of Washington, D.C., entitled "A Jury Looks at Crime," in which that Federal grand jury emphasizes that the pendulum has swung too far in one direction, and that the scales need to be balanced.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter to the editor was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A JURY LOOKS AT CRIME

SIR: Can it be that 23 people sitting on a grand jury cannot come to some reasonable accurate conclusions regarding crimes and their handling in our city? We are not lawyers, prosecutors or judges, and we grant our ignorance in many of the subtleties of law, but we are people from many walks in life with many experiences to help us in arriving at some sound conclusions. We should be able to at least observe the obvious.

It may be that some people have forgotten, but we would like to again remind them, that there are people who commit crimes. At some time in the past they were referred to as criminals and society was protected from them. Perhaps too harshly in many cases.

But we feel that the pendulum has swung too far. After two months of duty we find ourselves amazed and shocked at the exaggerated considerations given to those who roam our streets indulging themselves in acts of the most outrageous nature. Pity the mother who is silly enough to think that the child molester will not be back in a few days after being caught redhanded. Pity the teller or shopkeeper who thinks he won't see the robber again before the week is over. If the criminal does not return, it will not be because of our police, prosecutors, legislators or judges. It will be because the criminal only chooses to commit his crime elsewhere.

Police and prosecutors have made serious mistakes in the past and will make them in the future, but by and large we have been impressed by the high caliber of these officials. But how can they work with the limitations being imposed upon them?

As an example, the Bail and Bond Act in force at this time allows any prime suspect to be free in hours except where he has committed a capital crime or it appears he will "skip" bail. We have our legislators to thank for that and any number of unsound laws.

If you happen to decide to murder someone in the near future, feel free to confess to one of a hundred people. Unless you are informed of your rights in the most precise terminology, the odds are that the judiciary branch will see to your freedom.

We are aware that there are a fantastic variety of reasons for a criminal act as well as good and bad police, judges, prosecutors, defense attorneys, rights groups and hard-headed conservatives, but we must protest the injustices being laid upon the law-abiding majority of our society. When can we look forward to a balancing of the scales?

23 Members, July Federal Grand Jury No. 1.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 1411) to amend title 39, United States Code, with respect to use of the mails to obtain money or property under false representations, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 1411) to amend title 39, United States Code, with respect to use of the mails to obtain money or property under false representations, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 2, strike out lines 18 and 19, and insert in lieu thereof "There is authorized to be appropriated $2,360,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. The Senator from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes, and I ask for the attention of the Senator from Pennsylvania, the manager of the bill.

This is an amendment designed to cure what I think is a fundamental defect in procedure, by placing a specific amount on an authorization. At the present time, the authorization with reference to the 1969 fiscal year simply says "Such sums as may be appropriated," which means that the Appropriations Committee does not have the faintest idea as to what the authorization should be; and which also means that Congress has not gone ahead, in a legislative manner, and stated what it believes its authorization figure should be.

Ever since I have been a Member of the Senate, I have had a feeling, which I think has been shared by the majority of Senators, that we should state an authorization figure in every piece of legislation we pass. The particular figure I have chosen is $102 million more than the total authorization for fiscal 1968, thereby gives us some room for the inflationary process which seems to be so prevalent today.

I see no objection to it, frankly. It can still be apportioned in whatever way Congress or the Appropriations Committee wants to. I would hope that the Senator from Pennsylvania would accept the amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum without the time being charged to either side, so that I may confer with the Senator from Colorado.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I modify the figure in my amendment to $2.4 billion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is accordingly modified.

Mr. DOMINICK. On that basis, it is my understanding that the Senator from Pennsylvania will accept the amendment.

The purpose of the amendment is to keep consistent our rule that we should have a specific authorization in any legislative matter of this kind.

I think it is also important to point out that this makes the bill not a bill for $2,258 million, but for $4,158 million over a 2-year period, which will, I think, emphasize the amount of money that it is being poured into this program.

I think this is important for the country at large to realize.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I am receptive to the suggestion of the Senator from Colorado. However, I would like to address a question to him as a matter of legislative history.

I ask the Senator from Colorado, who is a valued member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, whether it is not correct that if the administration should decide it wants a higher sum next year than $2,400 million, or if the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare should want to hold hearings to determine whether the authorization should be increased next year, that would be entirely feasible.

Mr. DOMINICK. It certainly would. I think the figure is entirely open for Congress to take whatever action they need to take next year. If we are in very bad fiscal shape then, we may want to cut the figure back.

The purpose is to lay some ground work for the carrying on of a program which has no set figure for the fiscal year 1969.

Mr. CLARK. The reason why the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare left the amount open was that it felt there was so much uncertainty with respect to the future of the poverty program and the possibility of further riots this winter or next summer.

There are too many variables to attempt to fix a realistic figure at this time and have it accepted by the Senate. That was a possibility we were not prepared to face up to. Nevertheless, the Senator from Colorado has made a strong case.

I wonder what the views of my friend, the Senator from Vermont, are on this matter. He being the ranking minority member on the committee, I would be inclined to accept the amendment if it were agreeable to the Senator from Vermont.

I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I am very happy to support the amendment introduced by my friend, the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

It is as both the Senators from Pennsylvania and Colorado pointed out, sound legislative procedure for the Senate to place a specific amount on authorizations. It will be a guideline to the Appropriation Subcommittee. The amount agreed upon should be adequate. However, I would like to point out that under the amendment which I offered last Friday, and which was accepted, the Comptroller General will in 1969 report to Congress regarding the poverty program. From this report, and in the future we should be able to better assess the needs of the program, and be better able to make changes at that time.

I have no objection to the amendment and will support it.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, under the circumstances, I am prepared to accept the amendment, to fix the authorization for fiscal 1969 at $2.4 billion.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I wish to make it crystal clear that I am not saying that we should go forward with the poverty program in fiscal 1969 at a rate of $2.4 billion. It is my opinion that we can do more for the poor in other ways than we can under the poverty program as it is now organized. But whether I believe this or not, it is important to follow through on our legislative procedures, one of which is to require a specific sum in an authorization bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do Senators yield back the remainder of their time?

Mr. CLARK. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment proposed by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams] and myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The Assistant Legislative Clerk. On page 98 line 21, strike out "Sec. 636" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 636(a)".

On page 99, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following:

> (b) No financial assistance shall be extended under this act for the purposes of voter registration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield himself?

Mr. MURPHY. I yield myself 8 minutes.

Mr. President, I am becoming increasingly alarmed over the use of funds appropriated by the Office of Economic Opportunity for the purpose of increasing voter registration.

On September 3, I watched 83 percent of the registered voters, or some 56 percent of the eligible voters, in South Vietnam walk into the voting booths to cast a ballot for democratic government. Some of them arrived wrapped in bandages, on crutches, or assisted by their fellow citizens who had not been injured by the Vietcong terrorist activities aimed at preventing them from voting and demonstrating their belief that a better way of life could be had than that which exists under a Communist yoke of oppression.

They voted because they cared. Yet, here in America, without the echo of explosions and the fear of death, 83 percent of the people have never voted in a presidential election. To my mind, this is a travesty. Election day in Vietnam was the greatest example I have ever witnessed of people demonstrating their determination to live under a democratic form of government, while here in America we have to coax and beg people to exercise their right to vote.

One reason ascribed to the lack of participation is economic and social impoverishment. Yet, the people who voted in Vietnam, I would venture to say, were far more impoverished than the people living in our great land. The Office of Economic Opportunity, nevertheless, has decided that part of its task should be to "get out the vote." Included within its community action program in some parts of the country has been a drive to register voters.

While a nonpartisan voter participation drive in no way violates the Hatch Act or OEO regulations, I sincerely question the propriety of using taxpayers' dollars for this purpose. I am quite certain that it was never the intent of Congress that funds set aside to help the poor should be used for the purpose of voter registration. Surely, there are programs more necessary—more improvements of immediate importance—for which we can spend tax dollars in order to make the disadvantaged individual a real participant in his community and his nation. This is the intent of the community action program, and I do not believe that a voter registration drive, no matter how carefully it is supervised in order to make certain that it is nonpartisan, is a priority item.

In Reading, in Berks County, Pa., the League of Women Voters last month aided the Economic Opportunity Council by lending technical assistance and training community service aides under the summer opportunity program to register voters. My colleague, the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott], aptly pointed out that while the local EOC was lending its staff and money to accomplish this drive, the OEO was compelled to deny a program application designed to aid retarded children in McKean County because of lack of funds. This I consider an excellent example of very bad judgment in the allocation of poverty funds.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURPHY. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. I should like to point out that I learned of the activity of OEO in the city of Reading, in Berks County, Pa., and found, to my astonishment, that a function which normally should be performed by such civic organizations as the American Heritage Foundation, the League of Women Voters, and so on, would be undertaken by OEO with taxpayers' money—namely, the registration of voters.

I am in favor of the registration of voters. I will support every movement for the registration of voters. But I do not favor the covert, rather slick, and, in my mind, definitely underhanded way in which voters were carefully selected and registered from areas where only one political party was dominant, where the county chairmen of both political parties were solicited to support this program and did so in good faith, without any idea that it would not be a broad, general registration program, but would, in fact, undertake registration of the most partisan aspect.

I received a letter from Sargent Shriver; and, as usual, he jumped high in the air at the moment anyone criticizes the OEO, whether one is right or wrong. In my opinion, I happen to be right. He said in his letter to me, if I can recall the phraseology—I will paraphrase it as closely as I can—that he is doing what the law permits. He gives the impression that he is doing what the law encourages.

I am not aware that any part of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 says that you may go out and register voters of a single political party in selected areas, anywhere in the United States, with taxpayers' money. If the act permits such activity, or if those charged with its administration believe that it does, I am for stopping it, and I hope we will; and I support the amendment offered by the Senator from California and the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. MURPHY. I thank the Senator. That is exactly the purpose of the amendment, stated much better than I would be capable of stating it.

In early June of this year, it was brought to my attention that the Santa Clara County, Calif., Economic Opportunity Commission intended to establish a voter registration drive. At that time I sent a letter to Mr. Shriver, and on June 26 I received his reply. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that these two letters be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Lausche in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The letters are as follows:

June 8, 1967.

Mr. Sargent Shriver,
Director, Office of Economic Opportunity,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sarge: It has recently been called to my attention that the Economic Opportunity Commission in Santa Clara County, California, intends to establish a voter registration program.

The task of voter registration has been undertaken by both political parties, the California Non-Partisan Registration Committee, the Chamber of Commerce, the League of Women Voters, and many other groups in the past. To my mind there is little need for the local arm of the Office of Economic Opportunity to embark on such a program utilizing Federal funds. I would prefer to believe that local community action activities are directed towards advancement in the area of education and job-skill development. Granted that the cohesiveness of a community may be important in waging a battle against poverty within that community, and that attention can certainly be paid to this end by the E.O.C., I, nevertheless, do not envision a voter registration program in this spirit. It seems to me that such a program, while it might not result in direct political action certainly offers the opportunity for such activity.

Consequently, I hope you will be kind enough to inform me of the structural operation of this program as it is being designed by the Santa Clara County E.O.C. and to advise me of the names of any other Community Action Programs throughout the country which are presently, or are intending to embark on similar activities.

Thanking you in advance, I am,
Sincerely,
George Murphy.

Office of Economic Opportunity,
Washington, D.C. June 26, 1967.

Hon. George Murphy,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Murphy: Thank you for your letter inquiring about the voter registration program in Santa Clara.

The Santa Clara Economic Opportunity Commission (SCEOC), with which the program has been linked both in the press and in the minds of many people, is neither financing nor itself conducting a registration drive. The confusion over SCEOC's role arose on May 18 when Dr. Stanley Skillicorn, in his final report as outgoing president of SCEOC, suggested that there should be a county-wide voter registration program for the poor.

Plans were then made to establish a joint committee of SCEOC and the county-wide Santa Clara League of Women Voters organizations to pursue the idea. This committee has not yet been set up. However, the Central Santa Clara League of Women Voters, one of the four local chapters of the League, has now decided to conduct a voter registration drive on its own, and SCEOC has offered to help locate volunteers for that drive, which has not yet begun. We understand that certain SCEOC neighborhood workers in the Morgan Hill area, who are already licensed by the county as deputy voting registrars, may have done some individual voter registration. This appears to be the entire extent of SCEOC's current involvement in registration activities.

Non-partisan voter registration projects are undertaken as part of local community action programs—which, as you know, vary with every community action agency—such as multi-purpose neighborhood centers, community development programs, community organization programs, and the like. To obtain a complete list of community action agencies involved in such activities would, therefore, require a canvass of each of the approximately 1100 communtiy action agencies in the country.

All CAP activities, however, must be carried out under stipulations of community action guidelines. I enclose Community Action Memo 50–A and draw your attention particularly to part D, pages 5 and 6, which emphasizes the strictly non-partisan nature we require of all such activities. If a community action agency should violate these guidelines, we would, of course, not allow the expenditure of OEO funds and would take whatever other measures are appropriate for the individual case.

I sincerely hope that this explains to you satisfactorily our policy regarding voter registration.

Thank you for your continued interest in our programs.

Sincerely,

SARGENT SHRIVER,
Director.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURPHY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I do not have copies of those letters. Will the Senator give me copies?

Mr. MURPHY. I will.

While Mr. Shriver is correct in saying that nonpartisan voter registration projects do not violate the stipulations of community action program guidelines, particularly those of Community Action Memo 50–A, I cannot believe that such a program is a priority program. I am certain that there are many programs to help the poor that need more immediate attention than does this. Furthermore, this type of program might easily result in political activity which would be violative of the Hatch Act.

In order to demonstrate what might be the end result of activity which begins as a nonpartisan voter registration drive, I should like to call the attention of Senators to the report by the Comptroller General of the United States—dated May 1967—entitled, "Report on Investigation of Alleged Political and Union Activities by Certain Grantees Under Grants by the Office of Economic Opportunity." After reviewing recent activities in Palm Beach County, Fla., the GAO concluded that two community action fund—funded by the OEO—employees were appointed as deputy voting registrars; that while the registration in Palm Beach County is predominantly Democratic and that the ratio of Negro voters in the county is up to 14 to 1 Democratic, the persons registered by the two CAF employees registered Democratic at a ratio of more than 100 to 1; and that CAF employees "were extensively engaged in transporting farmworkers to voter registration places over a period of several months and in transporting voters to the polls on November 8, 1966, and that grant funds were used for these purposes." I have also heard rumors of similar activity taking place in several areas in the great State of Texas.

Senators may remember the statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 27 by Congressman GARDNER regarding the work of Operation Breakthrough in Durham, N.C., while local OEO activities may often stay within the confines of the law and OEO regulations, Operation Breakthrough, which did exactly that—it broke through the regulations—had its workers drive voters to the polls and hand them sample ballots already marked, something I never saw while I was in Vietnam.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I yield myself an additional 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, maybe they should have gone to Durham, N.C., to observe elections there.

What is the effectiveness of a voter registration drive? Is it worth the money? The Springfield, Mass., News, on July 22, 1967, reported that six VISTA volunteers, working over a 4-week period, attempted to register some 800 citizens. Only 106 of these completed the registration procedure. At this point, I must wonder whether these six volunteers could not have accomplished something far more constructive over a 4-week period than register 4.3 voters each a week.

Mr. President, it is deeply disturbing to me that the Office of Economic Opportunity has decided to allow its local community action programs to divert their efforts and funds from educational and job developmental services, which are so badly needed. Also, I would like to point out that taxpayer-financed registration programs could very easily lend themselves to perversions so as to fulfill the political ambitions of the leaders of the local arm of the war on poverty. This would result in an ultimate disservice to the people the program was designed to serve. Consequently, I would hope that my colleagues see fit to amend section 636 of S. 2388 by adding a new subsection stating:

> No financial assistance shall be extended under this Act for the purposes of voter registration.

Local poverty warriors should not become involved in voter registration, while they are working on the poverty program. This most commendable activity should be conducted on their own time without Federal funding. This is not a poverty program by any figment of the imagination. Furthermore, registration drives which have begun as nonpartisan can easily develop into a partisan operation. The OEO should never be permitted to operate as such. In that it has been unable to control itself, Mr. President, I believe that prohibitive legislation is now necessary.

Mr. President, from the very beginning, I have fought as hard as I could to keep politics out of the poverty program. I hope that Senators will vote in favor of this amendment designed to benefit the poor by keeping funds from being expended on a nonpriority program.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURPHY. I yield.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I can think of nothing more likely to endanger the success of the war on poverty than to have poverty workers, poverty volunteers, and community action agencies become actively involved in partisan politics. The few mistakes of voter canvassing by poverty workers which have been publicized substantiate my feeling that such drives cannot escape being partisan, and as such should be forbidden. Since I am very concerned about making our poverty programs successful, I hope very much that the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee will find it possible to accept the amendment. We must insure that poverty workers attend fully to their work of reducing poverty rather than becoming pawns in the hands of partisan governments at the local level.

I highly commend the distinguished Senator from California for proposing the amendment.

Mr. MURPHY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURPHY. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURPHY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I shall need only 1 minute.

Mr. MURPHY. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, as a cosponsor, I strongly support the amendment offered by the Senator from California. Certainly it was never intended by Congress that public money be used to finance registration whereby either political party could channel the money into districts where they would have an overwhelming advantage. Whether it is so intended or not that is the result, and, in my opinion, the present law would already have precluded that. However, since the law has not been interpreted differently and we know there has been public money used for registering voters, I think the amendment should be agreed to.

Mr. President, I wish to point out one additional fact. Ofttimes these programs are financed partly by public contributions, which, for instance, may raise

$25,000, and the Government will match that amount with $100,000 or $125,000. We then are faced with the question as to whether or not this matching money would be deductible for tax purposes. If there happens to be an educational group sponsoring the registration drive the private money could be tax deductions. If this practice is not stopped we will have a situation where private contributions could be made and a tax credit received, while at the same time the money would be used for the political registration of voters.

Mr. President, we have just passed an election reform bill, and certainly it would be a backward step if this procedure is not stopped before it gets out of hand. This is a gray area as to whether or not these contributions, which are matching the Government money, would be tax-exempt. I have discussed the matter with the staff; and they are unable to give a categorical answer, but they admit that in some instances it could be tax-exempt.

Mr. MURPHY. I thank the Senator.

(At this point Mr. Bible assumed the chair.)

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I shall support the amendment of the Senator from California. I shall do so because, in my opinion, we would be entering into a most dangerous field in spending the money of taxpayers to participate in elections.

The object here is to augment registrations at the voting places. Those who are in charge should not be put in the dangerous position of using their office to promote the success of one political party or the other. This is a field that the Government should stay out of. No administrator should be put into this hazardous position of handling money in the field in the election of officers to the Government of the United States. What I have said applies to Democrats and it applies to Republicans. A dangerous precedent would be established.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished colleague from Ohio.

From the beginning of our experience in Los Angeles there was a political tug of war that held up the poverty program for over 18 months. I am sure that happened in other parts of the country.

I am in complete favor of registering the greatest number of voters. I have worked on this matter for over 25 years of my life. However, I do not think this is a proper application of poverty funds which are designed to help the poor. I know that an argument can be made that it was perhaps a part of instruction in the rights of citizenship. I would agree if it were limited to that. I would not have proposed the amendment if it were limited to that, but the temptation of taking political advantage might be too great. Therefore, I have proposed the amendment. I thank Senators for supporting the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Lausche in the chair). The time of the Senator from California has expired.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, this is a matter about which I do not believe the committee feels very strongly, but I do think the case made by the Senator from California has been somewhat exaggerated.

I looked carefully into the situation in Reading, Berks County, Pa., after my colleague became somewhat aroused about the matter. I find that the OEO community action summer program in Reading was funded for $65,000. I reiterate that it was a summer program and, therefore, a temporary program. The local community action agency wanted to spend $3,000 of that amount for a voter registration drive in the city of Reading, where registration was pretty low.

They went first to the chairman of the Democratic county committee and then to the chairman of the Republican county committee, and they both endorsed the registration drive, publicly and in print. Thereupon, they went to the League of Women Voters, a well-known nonpartisan agency for training young people they send to register nonregistered voters. They found 15 youngsters aged 16 to 21, all of them from low-income families, and they got all their training and instruction from the League of Women Voters. As a result of that, they went through with the registration projects. I do not know whether they registered more Republicans than Democrats; but let me say with respect to the argument about using the taxpayers' money, I assume that many Senators are familiar with conditions in local municipalities throughout the State.

In Philadelphia, as my colleague knows, we have had for many years a bipartisan registration commission which conducts an active drive each year for registering. They send traveling registrars all around the city. They advertise in newspapers that they are coming to a particular district for the purpose of registration. When I was mayor—and the practice has been continued since—I always appointed a bipartisan citizens committee to promote registration with cochairmen, one a Republican and one a Democrat.

Thus, I do not see anything particularly wrong with this practice. As I said, I do not feel too strongly about it. Concerning Durham, N.C., that was a nonpartisan election. Candidates on the ballot were not permitted to have any particular affiliation.

Mr. MURPHY and Mr. SCOTT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield to my colleague from Pennsylvania, from my time, 2 of my precious minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. SCOTT. I shall be very brief. I do not want to make this a sort of confrontation, but I do want to make my point clear.

Let me say that I would not object if some people encourage registration on their own time and at their own expense. I do not think it is right to register anyone with taxpayers' money, regardless of party, because I think that the money should be used to fight poverty. At the very time I was trying to get money for a children's program way up in McKean County, I did not like to see $3,000 diverted to the city of Reading and invested in an area, for voter registration, where it was well known to the citizens of Reading that it was inhabited only by members of one party, even though other low-income areas of Reading were inhabited by members of both parties.

I thought that the sponsors of this project had shrewdly picked out the closest electoral situation in Pennsylvania at that time, and sought to affect the outcome of that election by selective registration. That was all I was pointing out.

I support the poverty program. I even agree, as my senior colleague knows, with many of his views on the poverty program. But I do not support making any part of this of political advantage to either political party.

I thank my colleague for yielding to me.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. CLARK. I think the Record should show that there is no connection between the funding of the summer program of CAP in Reading, and the failure to fund a program up in McKean County. As I said before to my good friend from California, I do not have any strong feelings about that.

If the Senator from California would withdraw his request for the yeas and nays on his amendment, I would be glad to accept his amendment.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I should like to point out to my esteemed colleague that it is true that the example in Durham he and I cited was of a nonpartisan registration drive and election. The fact that disturbed me is that OEO volunteers showed marked ballots to the voters. This was an attempt to actually guide people in their voting and I object to this.

I would be glad to withdraw the request for the yeas and nays, if my colleague——

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. MURPHY. Let me say to the Senator from Pennsylvania that I must defer and yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CLARK. He is a tough customer. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The amendment of the Senator from California is certainly meritorious. I think that the position of the Senate should be made clear that we are strongly against any such use of these funds for that purpose. Therefore, I would insist on a RECORD vote on this proposal. I think we should settle it definitely.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] to ask questions of the author of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I should like to ask the Senator from California a question or two on his amendment.

If a VISTA volunteer or a poverty worker is approached by individuals in the poverty area about how they can obtain their rights, or how they can exercise greater political power in an area, is there anything in the amendment that would prevent such VISTA volunteer or poverty worker from telling them to go out and register to vote?

Mr. MURPHY. Does the Senator mean in casual conversation with regard to that kind of information? For instance, if an individual said to the volunteer, "Do you know where I can go and register to vote?" or "Do you know where I could go and get some information for voting?" or "Where can I get a list of the candidates?"—that sort of activity. There is no objection to that, of course.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I understand.

Mr. MURPHY. The fault would be where paid employees of the OEO are sent out on a definite program to register voters. I think it is dangerous. I do not think we should divide the poor as between Democrats and Republicans regardless of which party happens to be in power. The poor should be treated in a bipartisan way.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. That is what I thought the Senator from California intended. Part of that which I expect the Senator from California would not object to is either a VISTA volunteer or a poverty worker urging people to go out and register and participate actively in the political life of their country; is that not correct?

Mr. MURPHY. Within the limitations of the amendment, of course, it would have to be decided. I have found, in my short experience in the Senate, that we write language and later on the legal staff of the department or bureau concerned tells us what the language actually means.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. That is what I thought, that the Senator from California might be able to work something out that would be acceptable.

Mr. MURPHY. I find myself at a disadvantage with the distinguished Senator from New York. He has had experience as Attorney General of the United States. So it would be presumptuous of me to attempt to enter into a dialog with him in order to establish this meaning. I think the Senator understands what I have in mind, and I am quite certain that the Senator is in agreement with me.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Right. I am not attempting to put words in the Senator's mouth, or to trap him. I have thought about what the intent of the Senator from California is. I thought that if there were activities in which VISTA volunteers or poverty workers might be involved, they should be able to look at this legislation and know whether they could be involved in any registration efforts at all. For example, what if someone came up to them and said, "What can we do to take a more active part in the political life of this country?" Can they answer, "Go ahead and register?" Or, in the course of conversation or work of VISTA volunteers or poverty workers, could they say, "Why don't you go out and register?"

Mr. MURPHY. So far as I am concerned it would be perfectly acceptable. This comes under the heading of personal rights.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. That is right.

Mr. MURPHY. There is no intention to invade those rights. This is merely a restriction on organized activity.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. That is what I thought. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may require to ask the Senator from California a question about his amendment.

As I understand it, all it does is prohibit the use of Federal funds to finance a registration drive by the OEO; is that not correct? It has nothing to do with what was developed in colloquy between the Senator from California and the Senator from New York just now, as to individual activities of employees so long as they are not being paid by the Federal Government, except to the extent that partisan political activity is already forbidden by the bill.

Mr. MURPHY. That is correct.

I have the feeling somehow——

Mr. CLARK. I am not trying to trap the Senator. Let that be written into the RECORD.

Mr. MURPHY. That never occurred to me. How could the Senator imagine such a thought on my part?

There are certain individual rights which the Senator from California would be the first to defend for all citizens. This amendment merely sets out a restriction for the Office of Economic Opportunity whereby it may not use funds that were taxpayers' dollars appropriated in the desire to help to set up voters' drives.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I regret the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] is insisting on the yeas and nays after the sponsor of the amendment, the Senator from California, has been willing to withdraw them.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I happen to be one of the sponsors of the amendment. The reason I insist on a record vote is that I think the Senate should be on record as being unalterably opposed to using Government funds to register voters or to pay workers on election day.

Mr. CLARK. I ask the Senator to speak on his own time, and not on mine. I suggest that he yield himself time on the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I have nothing further to say. The issue is clear. I am willing to get to a vote.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself the balance of my time and such time as I may require on the bill, on which there is an hour.

On behalf of the committee, I am not going to oppose the amendment. I shall advise my colleagues on this side of the aisle to vote for it if they see fit. I imagine most of them will.

To me, this amendment has none of the fierce spirit of righteousness which the Senator from Delaware, but not the Senator from California, has endeavored to give it. I hope, for the legislative record, it might be clear that this is a matter of relative insignificance which arose because 15 young people between the ages of 16 and 21 went out on the streets of Reading, as part of a summer program, for 1 month, to get people registered who were not registered. A number of people, in spite of the fact that the chairman of the county Republican committee had endorsed the project, felt this was a foul Democratic trick to get more Democrats registered for Reading. Nothing is further from the truth.

I could not get excited about the amendment. Nor do I think the practically unanimous vote which I am sure it will receive has any significance.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. I suggest the amendment might have great significance. As the Senator knows, I am not too long in this distinguished body——

Mr. CLARK. The Senator has made a great record in a short time.

Mr. MURPHY. A successful vote, once in a while, for a member of the minority party would do much for his confidence and such a vote would cause me to do more in the service of my State and people. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, if for no other reason than those stated by the Senator from California, for whom I have a deep affection and whose reputation in the Senate is growing day by day, and has now reached practically gigantic stature, I am glad to support the Senator from California on this vote. I hope the Senate will adopt his amendment by a smashing majority.

I am ready for a vote.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I want to point out to the Senator from Pennsylvania that I had not heard of the use of poverty funds to which he refers as having taken place in Pennsylvania, but I had heard about it in several other States. My attention had been called to this abuse as a result of registration drives in Tennessee, Michigan, and California. Today the Senate has an opportunity emphatically to put a stop to this by adopting the pending amendment. I certainly think it should be passed by a rollcall vote. I welcome the support of the Senator from Pennsylvania in this direction.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I would warn the Senator that if he continues the debate he may change my mind. I suggest that we vote right now.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thought of that possibility just as I thought of the possibility that the Senator might change his mind in conference. That is why I insist on a record vote. If this amendment is rejected—and that is a possibility—let us get our positions on record. That is the reason I want the Senate to go on record as disapproving the spending of any Government funds to finance drives to register voters. I think we should settle the issue once and for all. That is the reason I welcome the support of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I want the RECORD to show that there are more than the 15 people who were involved in the State of Pennsylvania——

Mr. CLARK. Reading—a very important city.

Mr. GRIFFIN. There are numerous places in the State of Michigan where this has been called to my attention. I have served, in both the House and the Senate, on committees that handled poverty legislation since it came into existence. It was always my understanding, and I think that of most Members of Congress, when we passed the legislation, that these funds would not be used for political purposes. These funds have been used for political purposes. Whether we call them nonpartisan or anything else, it is for a political purpose.

The other day I met with people involved with the Neighborhood Youth Corps projects who told me how they had young people working last year. The question was asked, "What were they doing?" The answer was, "Well, we had them out registering voters."

I think this is the kind of thing that undermines the confidence of the American people in this whole poverty program. I have supported it. I just voted against an amendment to cut it back. But it is hard to explain it to the people back home and the voters when they say, "Yes, but look what they are spending the money for. They are not spending the money to train people in useful work, not for jobs in the future, but they are doing political work, registering voters, which does not train them for earning a livelihood."

True, it may help them in understanding something about citizenship, but this has always been done on a voluntary basis in our country. We do not pay people to become good citizens.

I hope that not only will the amendment be adopted but that it will be kept in the bill when the conference committee meets.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has been used or yielded back. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from California, offered for himself and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], and the Senators from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL and Mr. TALMADGE], are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senators from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL and Mr. TALMADGE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] is absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 85, nays 3, as follows:

[No. 281 Leg.]

YEAS—85

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Baker
Bartlett
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Griffin
Gruening
Hansen
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hatfield
Hickenlooper
Holland
Hollings
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Pearson
Pell
Percy
Prouty
Proxmire
Ribicoff
Scott
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Spong
Stennis
Symington
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—3

Hayden
McCarthy
Morse

NOT VOTING—12

Brooke
Carlson
Dodd
Hill
Hruska
Morton
Moss
Pastore
Randolph
Russell
Talmadge
Young, Ohio

So Mr. MURPHY'S amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield myself such time as I need from the time allotted on the bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] on September 28, 1967, appearing on page 27154 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which amendment was accepted by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], and agreed to by the Senate on that date, be changed to read as follows:

On page 118, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following new subsection:

"(d) Persons serving as volunteers under this section or under section 821 shall provide such information concerning their qualifications including their ability to perform their assigned tasks and their integrity as the Director shall prescribe and shall be subject to the same procedures, to the extent practicable, for selection and approval as the Director requires under part A of this title. The Director may fix such procedures for the selection and approval of persons who are low-income residents of the area to be served by the project and who wish to become volunteers as he determines will contribute to carrying out the purposes of this title."

Mr. President, this change would direct that the amendment appear in a different section of the bill. As agreed to, as I understand it, the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky would apply only to the special so-called hometown VISTA volunteers. The change I am proposing would assure that the amendment apply to all VISTA volunteers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from West Virgina state whose time is being used?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes on the bill.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, would the Senator explain what his amendment would do?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The amendment of the Senator from Kentucky, as I understand it, would apply only to the special so-called hometown VISTA volunteers. My amendment would be applicable to all volunteers who are related to the VISTA program, regardless of capacity or length of service. It would apply to the full-time, all-year VISTA volunteers, as well as to the summer volunteers. I think that the able Senator from Kentucky is in favor of this, and intended that his amendment so apply. But it is my belief that his amendment did not do everything he intended. My amendment seeks to close the gap and cover those VISTA volunteers not covered by the amendment offered by the able Senator from Kentucky and adopted by the Senate.

I talked to a member of the Senator's staff and he indicated that the Senator would have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. COOPER. I want to have an explanation of it stated in the RECORD.

Mr. President, may the amendment be stated again?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

> On page 118, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following new subsection:
>
> "(d) Persons serving as volunteers under this section or under section 821 shall provide such information concerning their qualifications including their ability to perform their assigned tasks and their integrity, as the Director shall prescribe and shall be subject to the same procedures to the extent practicable, for selection and approval as the Director requires under part A of this title. The Director may fix such procedures for the selection and approval of persons who are low income residents of the area to be served by the project and who wish to become volunteers as he determines will contribute to carrying out the purposes of this title."

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I shall tell the Senator and the Senate what my amendment proposed to do. If it did not accomplish that fully, I would like to have the Senator tell me.

My amendment arose from reports I had received from citizens in my State. In talks with the Director and people from the VISTA program of the OEO here in Washington, I found that they followed certain procedures in the selection of their volunteers.

I point out that I was informed there were several categories of volunteers.

The first were those that are recruited and selected by VISTA in Washington. I was informed that these volunteers were required to submit applications similar to those required of all civil service applicants, and were examined and processed accordingly.

I was further informed that where applications reported circumstances indicating a criminal record or subversive activities, the matter would be referred to the FBI before the application would be approved.

The purpose of my amendment was to reach all other volunteers. The second class of volunteers are those who are recruited by sponsoring organizations funded by OEO, such as the Appalachian volunteers. The Appalachian volunteers received a grant of some $15 million. The Appalachian volunteers recruit individuals who perform services similar to those performed by the VISTA volunteers. But OEO told me that they could not say whether or not that type volunteer was required to prepare an application similar to the civil service applications required by VISTA and whether these applications were properly screened and reviewed.

My amendment was designed to reach them, by placing the responsibility on the Director, Mr. Shriver, through the Director of VISTA, to require the same application procedures and the same screening of applications and the same referral for FBI investigation, if appropriate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY of New York in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Kentucky may proceed for 5 minutes, and that the time not be charged to either side on the bill.

Mr. COOPER. I believe this is a rather important matter.

Mr. CLARK. I suggest that the time be taken from the bill, because there is sufficient time.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I modify my request, and ask that the time be taken from both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COOPER. My amendment would have placed the responsibility on Mr. Shriver and his delegate, the head of VISTA, to see that every organization that receives money from OEO and recruits volunteers shall require the same procedures of application and approval as are required in Washington.

There is one other group of volunteers. There are some volunteers recruited, say, in Kentucky or West Virginia or any other State, who do not have the educational qualifications that are required for regular VISTA volunteers. They are the low-income residents of the area to be served.

Of course, those men and women do not have the educational and work experience qualifications such as the regular volunteers have, and my amendment prescribed that the Director could establish special qualifications for them. That was the purpose of my amendment. It provided a means of assuring that these people had some qualifications, and had not engaged in criminal activities or subversive activities.

We had an unfortunate incident in Kentucky—involving the Appalachian volunteers who had employed a man named McSurley, who had been fired in Washington by OEO and was later fired by the Appalachian volunteers. He went into eastern Kentucky, passing himself off as an Appalachian volunteer, and he used the name of Appalachian volunteers on his literature. I read this literature, not all of it, but a considerable part of it—and he was advocating the overthrow of the Government. Of course, people were outraged by this, because they thought he was on the payroll of the Federal Government in the poverty program. He was not then but he had been.

Activities such as these cause great trouble and dissatisfaction with the program.

My amendment was aimed at seeing that OEO had some responsibility in setting the qualifications and passing on and approving the people in this program. It is a good program. It brings into play the work and helpfulness and idealism of young people, but it should not be destroyed by the activities of a few destructive individuals, and I wanted some assurance that it will not be destroyed. That was the reason for my amendment.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. I believe the Senator has raised a very important point, one that has disturbed me from the outset—the matter of selection and screening.

I know that the purpose of the program is to pick up fellows who are in deep trouble, fellows who have had really bad backgrounds, to see if they can be straightened out, rehabilitated, and helped. But along the line there have been many instances of this sort of thing. Not long ago, in California, a group walked into the legislature with guns.

Mr. COOPER. I recall the incident.

Mr. MURPHY. With submachineguns. The leader of the group was at that time on the OEO payroll as a family counselor. He was later removed.

This sort of situation occurs continually, and I have become tired of saying, "Please, let us step up screening."

With respect to the Job Corps, I have objected to mixing hard-case, criminal types with some poor kids who just could not learn to read and therefore were dropouts at school. These really tough kids, tough guys, go in there and scare the other youngsters to death.

I have an amendment in the bill this year, which was agreed to, to set up a pilot program. These two ingredients should not be mixed; it is not proper.

I believe the Senator from Kentucky has made a very important point.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator from California.

May I ask the Senator from West Virginia in what way his amendment would change the situation that I tried to reach by my amendment? Would it require the same strict qualifications for these poor people?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I believe that the Senator from Kentucky and I see this matter almost alike. We want to get at the same aspect.

We have had problems in my State with some of the VISTA volunteers, and I am seeking to be sure that this amendment covers all the volunteers.

I should like to ask the Senator a question, if he will yield to me for that purpose.

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Does the Senator's amendment cover the full-time, full-year volunteers?

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I believe the Senator is mistaken. This is part of what I am trying to accomplish. I do not believe the Senator's amendment does that. I may be in error, but I do not believe it does that, and this is what I am seeking to do.

The Senator's amendment was only to section 820, paragraph (a), part (B), which deals with auxiliary and special volunteer programs. I believe the Senator desires to do what my amendment would do, but I do not believe his amendment carries out the purpose. My amendment directs itself also to VISTA volunteers covered in other sections and parts of the bill.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator's contention is that my amendment covers those who are called VISTA volunteers, who make application and are approved by VISTA in Washington. Is my understanding correct?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. COOPER. My amendment was drawn to include the categories of volunteers about whom I have been talking: the one employed in Washington, directly under the VISTA program, and the one employed by organizations funded by OEO.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. But there are full-year volunteers and there are summer volunteers, both of which I feel are not covered by the distinguished Senator's amendment to which the Senate agreed a few days ago.

Mr. COOPER. I have no objection, except that I do not want the strict qualifications to apply to volunteers of the poor who could not meet the educational requiremens. If the Senator can assure me that it does not apply to that group, I have no objection.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I am advised by the subcommittee counsel that it would not.

Mr. COOPER. I will agree, on the grounds that the amendment will reach volunteers who are recruited by VISTA in Washington and recruited by organizations that are funded by OEO——

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Such as Appalachian volunteers.

Mr. COOPER. But that it does not prescribe the same qualifications for volunteers who assist in menial chores. Then I agree.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I have no desire to include that group.

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I have been advised by the subcommittee counsel that the amendment offered a few days ago by the able Senator from Kentucky and accepted by the Senate, does not reach the full-time, full-year volunteer, and does not reach the summer volunteer; and I believe the Senator joins with me in wanting these volunteers included.

Mr. COOPER. I want them. That is what my amendment intended.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, is there an amendment pending at the desk?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is pending the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. CLARK. I would suggest to my good friend from West Virginia that he withdraw his unanimous-consent request and propose an amendment.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, may I repeat my unanimous-consent request?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I am concerned about the parliamentary procedure on this matter. I do not want to prolong the matter, but there has been objection made by the Senator that this is not a good way to legislate, and I agree.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Unanimous consent would be required for the Senate to strike the amendment which has already been agreed to by the Senate.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am now informed that this amendment has again been submitted to legislative counsel, and it would achieve my purposes. I have no objection.

Mr. CLARK. For the record, in view of this very unusual parliamentary situation, I shall not object to the unanimous-consent request because counsel for the subcommittee has discussed this amendment with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and find it entirely unobjectionable. I think it is perhaps a little peculiar way to legislate, but the parliamentarian said that it was all right, so I have no objection to the unanimous-consent request.

On behalf of the committee, I am prepared to accept the Byrd amendment to the Cooper amendment.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I wish to repeat my unanimous-consent request.

I ask unanimous consent that the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], at page 113, previously adopted, be deleted, and that I be permitted to offer another amendment to replace it at another point in the bill——

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, inasmuch as I proposed the measure, I hope the Senator will permit me to join therein.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. And that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] be joined as a cosponsor.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is agreed to, and the suggested amendments are agreed to.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I wish to confirm my understanding of the last amendment.

The amendment would be applicable to all volunteers who are related to the VISTA program, regardless of capacity or length of service. It would apply to full-time all-year VISTA workers as well as summer volunteers. It would require that persons wishing to work in VISTA and related programs furnish to the Director evidence of their ability to perform the work in question as well as of their integrity. From this information the Director shall determine their suitability.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the Senator is correct. That is my understanding of the amendment.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment on this issue?

Mr. CLARK. I yield time on the bill but could we get to third reading first?

Mr. President, there are no further amendments. Could we get to third reading?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield such time as he requires on the bill to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I shall only take a few minutes. I wish to address a question which relates to the volunteers and I would like to have the Senator's judgment about the question I am going to ask.

First, I ask if political activity on the part of volunteers is in any way restricted under the OEO program?

Mr. CLARK. Yes; there are strict restrictions against the activities which we wrote into the bill a year and a half ago.

Mr. COOPER. That is what I thought. I receive many complaints—and to be honest I do not know how accurate all of them are—that in Kentucky the volunteers are engaged in political activities. I know that can be interpreted in several ways. A person engaged in political activities could go out through the country and support or oppose candidates. Another type of political activity could be interpreted from their support or opposition to certain operations of government in that community.

I have talked to some of these volunteers. They were Appalachian volunteers and came to my office. They told me that they felt it was one of their duties to help the people who had been isolated, in rural and mountain areas, for such a long time. I know all of these people in these areas. I have been through all of these areas more than any VISTA volunteer ever will.

They told me that it is their duty to orient those people in political ways and to arouse their political consciences, so that they can form their own political judgments. They said flatly that to direct the attention of the people toward what they call "the establishment" or "the power structure" was one of their duties.

I, too, believe that people should have the opportunity to be better able to form judgments about political issues and even political candidates or officials. However, as a practical matter, it seems to me that the chief function of these volunteers, as it is of the poverty program, to try to correct the circumstances which have kept them down, economically, socially, culturally, educationally, and in many other ways. I have thought that if these volunteers have the idea that their chief function is to arouse everybody politically, then their job is really not being done, because that is not the chief purpose of their job. I would be interested in knowing the Senator's position.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I support the position taken by the VISTA organization within the OEO, which has issued to each VISTA volunteer a handbook. I shall read from page 22 of that handbook under the title "Political Activities":

> A. POLITICAL ACTIVITIES
>
> Because of recent amendments to our act, you as a VISTA Volunteer are now considered a Federal employee for purposes of the Hatch

Act. As a result you may not engage in partisan political activities of any sort during your service. You may not assume a position of political leadership or become prominently identified with any political party or candidate. You may not publicly support or speak in behalf of or against a given political party or political candidate. You may, however, take positions in support of or opposition to the passage or repeal of laws and ordinances, and support or oppose issues which are not specifically identified with a political party or which are the subject of non-political elections, such as referendums, bond issues, constitutional amendments, or the like. You may participate in petitions and drives provided the petition is not associated with any political party or candidate.

Mr. COOPER. I understand generally the purpose of that language. Would the Senator consider that that section of the instructions for VISTA volunteers would approve and condone advice and suggestions to people to disobey the law?

Mr. CLARK. No.

Mr. COOPER. If these volunteers advise people to disobey the law would the Senator consider that they should be continued as volunteers?

Mr. CLARK. No. I think they should be dismissed.

Mr. COOPER. I asked the head of VISTA whether that was his position and he told me that it was and that it was the policy of VISTA not to condone volunteers advising people to disobey the law. Some of these activities have occurred and I want to condemn them. I believe that if VISTA volunteers advise people to disobey the law and to avoid the processes of law and government, then they should be fired.

One more question and I shall be through. This information came to me today from people in eastern Kentucky concerning the expenditure of certain Federal funds in eastern Kentucky. The chief source of income, perhaps, next to welfare, which is No. 2, is the coal industry. The coal industry has been improving in eastern Kentucky and, I am sure, in West Virginia, over the past 2 or 3 years. But, I am informed that 20-percent additional production could be assured and could be marketed if they had the men to work the mines.

Today, I talked to a group of people from Harlan County, and they told me that their coal production last year was 7,300,000 tons, but that production could be increased 20 percent; that is, by 1.5 million tons more, if they could find men to employ—150 to 350 additional miners.

I was told the reason they cannot find them is that there are no programs in the war on poverty or under the regular vocational programs to train men for jobs which are needed in the mining industry, such as handling, loading, and cutting machines, and shuttle-car drivers, which pay up to $24 a day and more. Yet, they cannot get the people to work in the mines.

I was further informed that, if there were adequate training programs, at least 2,000 or 3,000 more miners could be employed in eastern Kentucky right now, and at good wages.

Does the Senator in charge of the bill favor—if it is correct that there are no training programs for potential miners—the establishment of such programs?

Mr. CLARK. Yes. But, I think the Senator's question should be asked of the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Wirtz. That should be placed on his doorstep, to find out whether he does not have such programs under NDTA. I am surprised.

Mr. COOPER. This is the first time I had brought to my attention that there are no provisions for training programs for miners in the bill. Coal is still the greatest industry in this country. Would the Senator favor such a program?

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. To train people for work in the mines, if such a program does not now exist?

Mr. CLARK. Yes. I assume that I would. I do not know all the basic facts, as the Senator said he did not either. Therefore, I would want to find out whether there are any in the NDTA program.

If the Senator has been correctly informed, the answer to his question is "yes."

Mr. COOPER. I wish to say that I have just been given these facts this morning. I think it is worthy of investigation. I intend to make my own study and inquiry concerning this problem. Considering the importance of such a basic industry to our State's economy there should be programs to train people for employment in that industry.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I have one question which I think has been corrected by regulations, but for the record I should like to point out that we had a situation in our State some time ago where an overenthusiastic group of workers of this agency were engaged in lobbying activities with the State legislature, recommending certain changes in the welfare program.

We reported that to the Washington office, and we were advised that there were regulations against it and that they had so notified these people in Wilmington. I think this problem has now been corrected, but for the legislative record I would ask the Senator this question: Is it correct that lobbying activities of such nature by such a group in a State legislature is strictly a lobbying activity and is forbidden?

Mr. CLARK. It is my understanding that the Senator is correct.

I hold in my hand a memorandum published by the community action program of OEO under date of June 10, 1967. It is entitled "Policy Guidance on Lobbying Activities." It is signed by Theodore M. Berry, director of the Community Action program. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMUNITY ACTION MEMO

Memorandum No. 66.

Date: June 10, 1967.

Subject: Policy Guidance on Lobbying Activities.

PURPOSE OF THIS MEMORANDUM

Many of the problems which cause or aggravate poverty are bound up with harsh or outmoded laws. Others can be most effectively attacked by the passage of new legislation. Community action is thus inevitably concerned with the shape of the laws which affect the poor.

On the other hand, there are necessarily very sharp limitations on the use of project funds by grantee and delegate agencies to influence the passage or defeat of legislation. Moreover, there are certain kinds of lobbying which interfere with the work of legislatures and thus impair the basic processes of democratic self-government.

The primary purpose of this memorandum is to identify essential restrictions on lobbying activities by grantees and delegate agencies that receive OEO funds under Titles II–A and III–B of the Economic Opportunity Act. The memorandum also serves as a reminder that under federal (and many state) tax laws, private non-profit agencies may endanger their capacity to receive tax-deductible contributions if they engage in substantial lobbying activities.

A. RESTRICTIONS ON LOBBYING WITH PROJECT FUNDS

Project funds may not be used to support any of the following:

1. Any activity which is planned and carried out in such a manner as to disrupt the orderly conduct of business by Congress or any other legislative body. This includes, but is not limited to, any disruptive action carried on in the chambers of Congress or any other legislative body or in any capitol or legislative office building.
2. Any demonstration, rally, picketing, or other form of direct action aimed at the family or home of a member of a legislative body for the purpose of influencing his actions as a member of that body.
3. Any campaign of advertising carried on through commercial media for the purpose of influencing the passage or defeat of legislation.
4. Any campaign of letter writing, of other mass communications, or of mass visits to individual members of Congress or state legislatures for the purpose of influencing the passage or defeat of legislation. This restriction does not prohibit purely informational and educational activities involving target areas and groups.

These restrictions on use of project funds apply to federal and matching non-federal shares of approved program budgets under Titles II–A and III–B of the Economic Opportunity Act and include the use of equipment, material, and facilities and employee time and services which are either paid for with project funds or contributed to project funds.

These restrictions are not intended to limit the rights of individuals to express their personal views on public issues so long as they do so in their capacity as private citizens rather than employees. Nor are they intended to limit the freedom of local agencies to express their views on legislation so long as project funds are not used in violation of the foregoing limitations.

B. REMINDER CONCERNING TAX IMPLICATIONS OF LOBBYING

Under federal income, estate, and gift tax laws, gifts made to private non-profit organizations which devote a substantial part of their activities to carrying on propaganda or other activities aimed at influencing legislation, are not considered tax deductible "charitable contributions." This applies not only to federal and state legislation but also to the legislative actions of county and city councils and similar local bodies. Many state tax laws contain similar provisions.

In view of these tax laws, private non-profit grantee and delegate agencies should bear in mind that if they devote any substantial part of their activities to lobbying efforts, they may be endangering their ability to receive tax-deductible contributions.

> Such contributions may represent an important means of providing the non-federal share required in programs assisted under Section 204/205 of the Economic Opportunity Act. They also enable many local agencies to carry out other programs of assistance to the poor, apart from the Act.
>
> There are no published rules defining what is meant under the federal tax laws by the term "substantial" lobbying activities. In cases of doubt local agencies should seek private tax counsel or contact the nearest field offices of the Internal Revenue Service and state tax authorities.
>
> EFFECTIVE DATE
>
> Part A of this memo is to take effect ten days from the official date of issuance shown above.
>
> Part B of this memo merely serves as a reminder concerning existing law.
>
> THEODORE M. BERRY,
> *Director, Community Action Program.*

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator. That was my understanding from my conversations with the department, that this lobbying activity was not permissible and that they have so advised the group. I have heard no further complaints from that area, but I thought it best to establish the record so that all would understand that this kind of operation is prohibited.

I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on final passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. How much time does the Senator from Ohio want?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Five minutes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, recently, when I was in Cleveland, I met with a delegation of women who had worked at one of the Job Corps centers in that city. They related to me conditions in one of the institutions which was allegedly helping the development of the ability of girls to get jobs and adjust themselves to life.

The story that was told to me I did not willingly accept. It was of a nature that caused great concern to me.

Subsequent to the meeting with those women, some of whom had been employees at the girls' institution, I received a letter from a lady who was connected with the institution but had left it and no longer lives in Ohio.

The letter reads:

> DEAR SIR: I am writing to you about the Cleveland, Ohio, Job Corps for girls, in hopes that something can be done before girls' lives are destroyed or corrupted before they can be educated.
>
> My daughter enrolled in Job Corps and we were told what a wonderful place it was. When my daughter arrived in Cleveland, she then realized that the place was nothing like what she had been told. The article in *Glamor* that dealt with the Job Corps had not one picture nor illustration which is quite understandable for who would send their daughter to such a place if they knew what it truly was like.
>
> We are a white family, but if we were Negro, I would still feel as I do now. I believe in equal rights for everyone, but I do not believe in inter-marriage nor inter-dating for my family.
>
> The people who run Job Corps are trying to do a good job with what they have to work with. They are able to see what is going on inside, but once the girls leave on a pass for the evening no one knows what is happening. During the few weeks that my daughter spent at the Job Corps Center, she met the most interesting people who live near the Job Corps Center. She met pimps, dope pushers, homosexuals of both sexes, and had an offer to become a prostitute at night after classes were over.
>
> My daughter was more fortunate than some, because I had told all four of my children about sex, drugs, homosexuality, and their effect on an individual. I feel sorry for the girls who were never told and therefore had to find out the hard way—through experience.
>
> We are not from a slum area, but if we were that doesn't mean I would want my daughter sent into another slum area and to be exposed to the happenings within a slum district. I brought my daughter home until something can be done to either relocate the Job Corps or until she can be transferred.
>
> Thank you for reading my letter and I sincerely hope that with your influence something can be done about this deplorable happening within our United States. Surely you must agree with me when I say that no good can come from placing teenagers in a slum district to be educated. I, myself, fear the type of education they may be receiving.

That is about the end of the letter.

The charges made in this letter are more than substantiated by the women with whom I spoke in Cleveland and who were connected with this institution. The conditions about which complaint was made are that girls have been brought in from all over the country to the Cleveland area, from as far west as California. The complaint was also made that there was a program of developing socialization——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I ask for 1 more minute.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, there is no time left.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield time to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Of developing socialization. And so the enrollees of an institution in Pennsylvania are brought to Cleveland for a night or two nights of socialization, and then they go back home to where they came from.

I mention this matter today because it is one of grave importance, and the officials administering this program should give heed to what has happened.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, we come now to the end of the road for Senate action on S. 2388, the bill to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act.

I want to thank all my colleagues in the Senate for their courtesy and consideration during the long and somewhat tedious process of considering this bill. It reached the Senate floor on September 22. Here we are on October 5, about to, I hope, pass it by a resounding majority.

I think it is a good bill. I regret very much that title II has been stricken, but whoever fights and runs away lives to fight another day, and we will be back on another day in reasonably short order.

I would like particularly to thank the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] for his courteous consideration of all matters, sometimes in dispute, but always he dealt with them with the great degree of courtesy for which he is known.

I want to pay tribute to counsel for the subcommittee, William C. Smith, and to the director of the poverty study program, Howard W. Hallman, for the long and dedicated service they gave in preparing memorandums and their help in the many changes made in the bill.

I would like to pay tribute to Bob Patricelli, minority counsel for the subcommittee.

We could not have succeeded as we have without the splendid cooperation of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], and the other Members of the Senate who serve on the subcommittee, and the full Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which has had this bill in charge.

I am particularly grateful to the KENNEDY brothers from Massachusetts and New York for the splendid assistance they gave; to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON]; to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL]; to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]; and to all the members of the subcommittee and the full committee.

The Office of Economic Opportunity has given us splendid cooperation in responding to inquiries. The staff of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, particularly Mr. Stewart McClure, chief clerk, and Mr. John Forsythe, counsel for the committee, have been most helpful, as have the staffs of Senators KENNEDY of New York, KENNEDY of Massachusetts, and PROUTY of Vermont.

Finally, I would like to say I think the President of the United States sent us a good bill. I think we have improved it. I think there is nothing we have done which cannot be considered as an endorsement of what the President proposed, with some additional authorizations for new programs, which I believe the Senate and the committee were justified in putting into the bill.

I hope very much, if this bill is passed—and I hope it will be—we will be able to persuade our friends in the House of Representatives to accept the bill at least in major extent, so that in coming out of conference we can have a bill of which all Members of the Congress can be proud.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 1 minute?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I want to commend my colleague, the Senator from Pennsylvania, for his conscientious efforts in presenting this legislation. I do not think there is any member of the committee who has not been impressed with the knowledge and the dedication of the Senator from Pennsylvania. Nobody has worked harder or with greater understanding of the problems involved than has the Senator from Pennsylvania. So I did not want this legislation to come to a final vote without acknowledgment of that fact.

I also want to say how impressed I have been with the work of the members of the staff of the committee.

Also, if I may take 15 more seconds, I would like to say what a pleasure it has been to work with the Republican members of the committee, who have been so conscientious, the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], who has always been present, and whose contributions to this legislation have been immense. They have been extremely impressive. The Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], who is present on the floor, has also been most impressive and has contributed much to this legislation.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me briefly?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, first of all, I would like to express appreciation to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], for his kindness in accepting the amendment cosponsored by Senator COOPER and me.

Second, I want to congratulate him for his dedicated effort and hard work, and his fine presentation and managership of this bill. He has done a good job. I also express appreciation to the members of his staff who have been so cooperative with me.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute to applaud the efforts of members of the committee on our side of the aisle, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. JAVITS, and Mr. GRIFFIN. All have been remarkably assiduous in pursuing this work, and this "high rise" of hearing transcripts which graces every senatorial desk is probably the best tribute I know to the long and arduous labors involved in this bill.

At the same time, I salute the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], manager of the bill.

Now I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, there is much merit in many of the programs in this bill, and I support many of them. However, I call attention to the fact that last year's authorization for this same program totaled only $1.75 billion. The fiscal 1968 budget as submitted to the Congress asked that that amount be increased this year by $310 million, or an increase of 17 percent, bringing the total to $2.060 billion.

The Senate committee has added another $198 million on top of the previous 17 percent increase. This bill's authorization is about 10 percent more than the amount requested by the Budget Bureau and more than they can efficiently use.

At some point the Senate is going to have to stop this continuous escalation of increased expenditures.

Even though I support individual programs in the bill but as one who feels we have reached that point, I shall vote against the bill, just as I voted against other proposals planning to increase expenditures far beyond last year's and also far beyond what the administration itself requested.

Certainly this Congress cannot, with all good intention, vote for these increases on individual programs and then, after all appropriation bills have been passed, expect to soothe their consciences by passing resolutions and passing the buck to the President by demanding he cut $5 billion from the budget expenditures. We should have the courage to vote against such expenditures or be willing to accept our own responsibility.

Senate approval of this bill adds over $500 million to last year's expenditures and around $200 million above budget requests.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the bill before us now is the product of exhaustive study and careful thought. Under the sure leadership of its distinguished chairman [Mr. CLARK], the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty undertook a thorough examination of the war on poverty to see how the present Economic Opportunity Act is working and what legislative changes should be made. I think the subcommittee is to be especially commended for taking its hearings beyond the District of Columbia into nine States to gather the thoughts, criticisms, and recommendations of the people. I think S. 2388 reflects the sort of responsiveness, creativeness, and flexibility that good government demands and that the people of this country hope for.

One of the most important conclusions to be gleaned from the subcommittee's extensive study is that the incidence of poverty is still very much—indeed, too much—a part of the American picture. The Bureau of the Census recently released information revealing that "the number of U.S. residents with incomes below the poverty level decreased from 39 million to 30 million between 1959 and 1966." These figures indicate two things: First, we are making progress toward our goal of eliminating poverty in America, but, second, poverty continues to be a most serious national problem deserving high-priority attention. Even accepting the rather low poverty levels applied by the Census Bureau to their sample survey, something over 15 percent of our nearly 200 million citizens remain in the shadows of American abundance. Clearly there is much work to do, and recent history reveals the cost of neglect.

Mr. President, the amendments presently under consideration represent a significant advance in the development of this Government's economic opportunity endeavor. Through them, our past experience in this field has been related to our present needs and actions. This bill contemplates both procedural and substantive changes which are designed to bring up to date the original Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. If I may be allowed to generalize about the thorough revisions capably undertaken and set before us here, I think that there are two exceptionally fine threads of improvement woven throughout the fabric of these amendments: first, there is a very appropriate stress on local initiative and responsibility; second, there is established in practically every phase of this program the means for continuing evaluation of its operation.

Mr. President, I submit that the former improvement is essential to the success of this program, and that it might well be taken as a model for future governmental activities. It seems to me that one of the great needs with which government must cope is the need of an individual citizen to feel a positive relationship with his society and his government. I speak, Mr. President, of the Jeffersonian, Jacksonian, and Lincolnian concepts of government "by the people." In an age of bigness and complexity, I am afraid that too few are concerned with the little man, who finds himself drifting with no oar to grasp for steerage. In short, the individual is not personally involved and loses a sense of control over his destiny. We can and must begin to help him regain this control by positively involving him and, as this bill does, by placing an oar in his hands. I do not imply here, nor does this bill intend, any merely negative tearing down of big government; rather I am calling for a creative endeavor and flexibility, such as this bill provides, to respond to the very real needs of the individuals of this Nation.

Whether he is a farmer on poor land, a businessman in Dallas, or a Mexican-American laborer in San Antonio, these economic opportunity amendments place much of the initiative and responsibility in local hands. The focus is on community, neighborhood, and individual self-help. As the brief summary of S. 2388, prepared for the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, stated the intent of just one phase of the program:

> The focus of such programs would be upon opportunity and self-help. The ultimate goal is to enable low-income persons to achieve self-sufficiency. In short, the community action program would move poor people through their own efforts into the mainstream of American life (Sec. 201).

The committee went on to conclude that—

> Not only does local initiative need to be emphasized but also to be built into the processes of the community action program. Therefore, the bill contains a provision which seeks to balance the national interest and local initiative by reserving 50 percent of Title II funds for locally selected programs (Sec. 220(d)).

Mr. President, I am in total sympathy with this intent, and I commend and support the subcommittee's perceptiveness and their responsiveness to this need.

At the very least, the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 has been controversial and has stirred new thinking and creative ideas. I think these amendments are a worthy product of that controversy. If our skirmish with poverty has had failings, they have been largely failings of commitment. It seems undeniable that this Nation has not yet committed sufficient resources nor developed all the programs needed to eliminate poverty. The subcommittee has made one worthy response to this need by proposing the adoption of an Emergency Employment Act.

Mr. President, I endorse the general spirit and direction of the 1967 Economic Opportunity Act Amendments and the Emergency Employment Act, and I will speak to some of the specific provisions later.

Mr. PROUTY. I rise to state my support for the proposed amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act, as it appears that we are now approaching the vote on final passage.

The proposed legislation which we reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was, by and large, a good bill, and I believe that it has been materially strengthened by amendments which have been adopted on the floor of the Senate. Although I still have reservations in certain areas, the overall package to amend the poverty program is one which I can fully support.

Many important changes have been made in our commitment to fight poverty. However, I am convinced that my amendment calling for a truly representative, unbiased, and objective investigation for all the poverty programs on a national basis by the Comptroller General is the most important change we have made in this bill in terms of securing the long-range success of the war on poverty. The results of this investigation will provide a real basis for the sound evaluation of all these programs by the 91st Congress.

I have certain feelings of regret and disappointment, Mr. President, that the Senate did not see fit to adopt the Prouty-Scott substitute for the Emergency Employment Act. However, I would like to thank all my colleagues who supported our proposal for amending title II of the bill, and I am especially gratified by the substantial support which this amendment received from my fellow Republicans.

It is clear that the closeness of the vote on this amendment is indicative of the soundness of our approach, particularly when we take into consideration the administration's strong opposition to the Emergency Employment Act in any form.

If there is one significant fact which emerges from the debate of the last few days concerning enactment of an Emergency Employment Act, Mr. President, it is that, by our actions yesterday, we have merely postponed the time when programs such as these must be considered and acted upon in an affirmative manner. When that time arrives, and it must not be too far away, it is essential that we act constructively to insure that these programs train our poverty-afflicted citizens for meaningful and productive jobs in the private sector of our economy where there are actual employment openings and opportunities.

As I have said before, I favor make work employment only to the extent that this type of program is necessary to provide employment for our disadvantaged poor who have reached a point in life where further education and training programs are incapable of permitting them to qualify for positions needed in private enterprise.

Finally, Mr. President, I should like to commend the distinguished chairman of our Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty, the Senior Senator from Pennsylvania, for his willingness to consider my amendment on its merits and for his subsequent support. In addition I want to express my personal appreciation for the long hours of hard work put in on this bill by both my Republican and Democratic colleagues on the full committee.

Finally I would also like to take this opportunity to thank Bill Smith and Howard Hallman, of the majority staff, and Robert Patricelli and Peter Benedict, of the minority staff, for their hard work on this bill. I also appreciated the able assistance of Richard Murphy, from the staff of Senator Hugh Scott, and Eugene Jenkins, Arthur Dufresne, Mary Hoag, Paul Molloy, Betty Collins, Margaret Blackstone, and Suzan O'Neil from my own staff.

Again, Mr. President, I thank all my colleagues who supported my emergency employment amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I should like to take 15 seconds of my time to thank the Senator from Vermont for his kind words, and to express my appreciation of the cooperation we achieved together in our unsuccessful but nonetheless significant efforts.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, in connection with the Senate's continuing discussion of the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point an excellent report which appeared in the Nashville News on August 11, 1967, on the success of an Operation Headstart program in Nashville, Ark.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Headstart Success Opens New World to Youngsters

A whole new world—bright with challenge and promising better health and education—opened this Summer for some 142 pre-school children, mostly from lower income families.

And closed Friday with the promise fulfilled.

Operation Headstart, under the aegis of the Office of Economic Opportunity, provided for the underpriviliged just what the name predicted, a jump into the school world and a better chance to avoid dropout status and the entrapment of minimum reward for unskilled adult labor later.

Nashville's Headstart program for 124 of those children came off as a striking example of the willingness of white and Negro races to face a 20th century challenge with respect for others.

The last two weeks of Headstart, with its special trip to Hope and a picnic at the fair ground, was in startling contrast to violent events elsewhere in nation undergoing integration.

Teachers and officials are all in agreement. Headstart worked, and proved itself of value.

Youngsters were divided. There were about 10 more white children than Negroes in the 124 attending Headstart classes at Nashville's elementary building during the eight weeks. Absenteeism was rare. Parents often came with their children just to observe, and went away, pleased according to Mrs. Herman Stavely, county director for Headstart. She directed the Nashville and Dierks schools.

Teachers and aides were both white and Negro. There were seven teachers and seven aides, including two Negro teachers, four Negro aides and one Negro social worker.

Little was overlooked in the program for the 5 and 6-year oldsters who will enter their first classroom this Fall. It all began with health.

Mrs. Stavely said that every child was given a thorough examination. That included eyes, ears, nose, teeth and heart. A tubercular test showed four positive and they received second x-rays. The child needing dental care was given up to $40 from federal funds for that work. Federal funds paid the doctors who gave physical examinations.

New state laws requiring five inoculations prior to school days were followed. The county health nurse gave most children their required five shots.

Food was provided. Children received a mid-morning snack. Usually this was fruit, crackers or cookies and milk. "Some of the children rode the bus without any breakfast," the teachers learned. The US provided 40c per day for the food, and the noon meal was served without charge.

Primarily the children were introduced to the world of knowledge.

The kindergarten program provided educational materials such as blocks, flash cards, picture number information, art work, and even music. A rhythm band was formed and homemade instruments put to play.

"A big change was noticed in the children after the first week," one classroom teacher said.

The objectives of classroom work were varied. One teacher listed these:

1. To help children adjust socially and physically;
2. To give them an insight to education via instruction;
3. To teach the child discipline;
4. To improve eating habits and food selection.

Teachers were unanimous in giving a high rating to Headstart here.

Here is what one teacher from the Tollette faculty had to say: "The children seemed to adjust all right. They liked the play period, they liked art work."

She recalled that early in the schooling one little girl cried to return home with her mother No more. She conquered her fears and had no problems.

Headstart, she said, was quite a help to children. "They adjusted to other people, and I enjoyed working in the integrated situation. I certainly hope Headstart is continued."

Mineral Springs furnished a teacher for the faculty. She too praised the program.

She had 18 in her Headstart class and her estimate of the program:

Attendance was good, most of the children didn't miss a day;

There was improvement from every child;

Visitors were amazed at the improved ability of children to communicate;

Food? One little girl had never seen celery.

This teacher compared a pupil with an older brother who is a likely drop-out. The boy knew little about school but a lot about profanity. That changed, and he isn't the potential drop-out his brother is.

"The youngest boy is starting almost on an equal footing with other children, and this is good. Otherwise he would be held back and this would be expensive to taxpayers as well as lead to a social problem," she commented.

At their innocent ages, they knew no color lines.

"There just was no color difference," one white teacher noted. "They are just children. If they find another boy who wants to play cowboy, he doesn't care if he's polka dot. They are too busy to be conscious of racial differences."

Teacher rapport was the same. "There was no difference in teacher-pupil relationship because of race."

One teacher pointed out that "the white students had a great need too."

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, for very good reasons, I cannot support S. 2388, the proposed Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967. I only wish I could do otherwise—and do so with the conviction that I would be helping to improve the lot of the many Americans who do need help to break through the barrier of poverty.

I realize, as presumably does each Senator who will cast a similar ballot, that a vote against the so-called antipoverty bill will in some instances be interpreted as a vote for poverty. And that is precisely the conclusion many supporters of the measure hope Americans will draw. Nothing would please them more than to tar-and-feather us with the stigma that we are unsympathetic with the plight of the economically disadvantaged, or that we are indifferent to the Nation's needs. Very well. But that certainly is not the truth. Almost to a man, we have supported, and will continue to support, every realistic antipoverty measure, whether in the field of education, health, or welfare. But this bill, S. 2388, is not realistic—and primarily because it is based on a false assumption, namely that our problems are wholly economic. They are not. But even if they were, even if the Government now had the money to fight costly wars on two fronts, even if public spending were superior to private investment in solving these problems—even if you assume all these things, what reason is there for believing that we can buy our way out of poverty. Certainly, the present poverty program does not warrant such confidence, such hope. At best, with the exception of Headstart, it has achieved only mediocre success. And even that has been expensively purchased.

Therefore, what we object to in the antipoverty program is not its aim, which we also share, but its excesses, its failures, its unfulfilled dreams—and the frustrations they in turn produce. Specifically, what I object to in the program are its high administrative costs; its paying for programs that encourage one group of Americans to hate other Americans; its reliance on measures that are throwbacks to a depression era; its practice of ignoring and bypassing State and locally elected officials; and its almost total exclusion of the resources that private industry could bring to bear.

Furthermore, there is no logical reason why many of the new poverty programs cannot be funded through and administered by existing Federal agencies. Why must we forever establish new bureaus, new sections, to deal with problems and programs that clearly are within the province of a functioning agency, whether it is HEW or HUD or whichever? The practice produces great duplication and waste.

Another concern, of course, is whether we—whether taxpayers—can afford so expensive a program, at least now when our spending for national defense is at such a high level. State and local taxes have been increased throughout the Nation, social security taxes soon will be raised, the administration is urging a 10-percent surtax—where will it end? How much of a burden must the average taxpayer be asked to shoulder? How much can he shoulder? The only thing we can accomplish by this foolishness is not to raise the poor out of the depths of poverty, but rather to tax countless more Americans, those who work and pay a large share of the costs of government, into that position. We must find the moral courage to admit that we cannot afford to do everything at once, no matter how much we might think it needs doing. We cannot purchase instant affluence.

We must find an answer to the problems of poverty, Mr. President. But this bill is not it.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, at this time when the poverty program in America is coming under attack from all sides for its failures in some instances and its cost in all instances, a very timely study has been reported by the Wall Street Journal of the pockets of poverty, where people remain desperate and starving. As noted in this article of October 3, "The problem is how to break the cycle of deprivation." And only slowly is this cycle being broken, through education and training for the children, through decent living conditions provided for the families.

This very thorough study goes from the "dogpatch" areas of south and west to "Uptown" Chicago where thousands of poor Southern whites have been stalemated in their search for self-betterment in the more prosperous north. Everywhere are found those characteristics which make poverty self-perpetuating—poor education, poor health, and, an important quality which the article points out, "almost uniformly, they lack political muscle." Time and again, throughout this article, it is pointed out that local officials do not help and do not care to help in the solving of local poverty problems. It is such an attitude that the poverty workers must fight in localities throughout America, and it is such an attitude that we in Washington who care must fight if headway is to be made.

Standing out in my reading of the article, "Living in Poverty," was a short review of the situation in Starr and Hidalgo Counties in Texas:

> Poverty workers are desperate. "Officials don't believe it," says one volunteer. "They say we're only pointing out the exceptional cases. But people are literally starving to death here."

And bear in mind that these very people are presently faced with the new difficulties of Hurricane Beulah and her aftermath—are homeless, helpless, and without jobs, for the crops which most of them pick for a living are wiped out.

Mentioned are the efforts of a great man, Mayor Leo J. Leo of La Joya, Tex., whom I know well, to find a program which would assist these people. I insist, as he does, that something must be done here, for in Texas, where more people live below the poverty level than in any other State, where child welfare payments are the lowest in the Nation, there is not yet even a State minimum wage law. The situation is urgent.

I commend the Wall Street Journal on the concern shown in this article, and by this excellent reporting of a condition which America cannot ignore. Perhaps these reports should read, "Thousands of people lost today in the war against poverty—lost to starvation, to lack of medical treatment, to unsanitary conditions, to unheated tenements, to poor skills and low pay." Perhaps then our consciences would demand that these lives and these people be saved.

Today we in the Senate have an opportunity to show our interest and concern, in the passage of the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967, S. 2388. In our Nation something must be done about poverty, and we must remain alert to the necessity of congressional action and interest, without which the greatest war of our times would be lost.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article from the October Wall Street Journal, "Living in Poverty: How Some People Exist at the Bottom of the Economic Ladder," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Oct. 3, 1967]

LIVING IN POVERTY: HOW SOME AMERICANS SCRAPE BY AT BOTTOM OF ECONOMIC LADDER—SOUTHERN WHITES IN CHICAGO, ARIZONA INDIANS, ESKIMOS SHARE COMMON PROBLEMS—JUST A DEAD MAN WALKING

The five of Mrs. Lillie Harrison's 14 children who still live at home, in rural Madison County, Miss., have never talked on a telephone, been to a movie or ridden a bicycle. The Negro family gets $66 worth of food stamps a month, enough for two meals a day.

John Seczizinski, 76, gets old age assistance of $104 a month. It buys a plate of stew each day and covers the rent on his 12-foot-by-7-foot room in a north Philadelphia flophouse. But, clad in a sweat-stained undershirt and rumpled trousers, he looks up bleakly and says, "The living isn't so good. Sometimes I just sit down and cry."

Twinsburg Heights, Ohio, isn't far from a number of affluent suburbs, and a tall water storage tower belonging to Chrysler Corp. looms within view. But this enclave of Negroes outside Cleveland has neither water nor sewage facilities, and the residents make do with wells and outhouses.

In a migrant labor camp outside Stockton, Calif., William Burns stretches out on a thin, soiled pallet in the single males' barracks. Food and lodgings cost $1.75 a day, and contractors charge $1 or $2 a day for the privilege of working. Even in the best of times, when the tomato crop comes in, Mr. Burns seldom makes much more than expenses.

HIDDEN POVERTY

That some Americans live in poverty has been public knowledge for some time, of course, and lately more than ever. Bloody riots have pinpointed deprivations in the big city ghettos, and a Senate subcommittee recently heard testimony that displaced sharecroppers in Mississippi were starving. But Wall Street Journal reporters around the country find that there still exist pockets of poverty scarcely noticed by society, let alone attacked, although the "war" on poverty officially is three years old. For some families in these localities, the $3,000 annual income generally recognized as reaching the poverty barrier would be a fortune.

Between Independence and Kansas City, Mo., for instance, is a dreary "Dogpatch" city of wooden shacks that is disowned by both municipalities; most residents are unemployed. On a Passamaquoddy Indian reservation in Washington County, Maine, unemployment is 97%. Up to 13 persons sleep in one room at the Gallardo labor camp in Stanislaus County, Calif. Among the poorly housed Eskimos in the hinterlands of southwest Alaska, the average life span is 34.3 years.

The catalogue of difficulties among the people at the very bottom of the economic heap—poor nutrition and housing, inadequate medical and dental care, menial jobs or none, and a prevailing lack of hope—tends to be perpetuated when their children don't finish school, as is often the case. Although antipoverty programs are making inroads in some areas, some of the very poor are beyond the reach of social programs, too suspicious or proud to ask for help, ignorant of their rights or simply apathetic. Almost uniformly, they lack political muscle.

DISBELIEVING OFFICIALS

All the problems are on view among the Mexican-American farm workers in Starr and Hidalgo Counties, Texas, in the Rio Grande valley, and local poverty workers are desperate. "Officials don't believe it," says one volunteer. "They say we're only pointing out the exceptional cases. But people are literally starving to death here."

A survey by the Starr County antipoverty program of several impoverished communities showed 71% of 3,339 families with annual incomes of less than $3,000. About 1,000 of those families had incomes below $1,000. Only 4% of children 14 and 15 years old still were in school, and 90% of the men over 14 were unemployed.

The problem is how to break the cycle of deprivation. In the one-room shack of Carlos Ramirez, in La Joya, in Hidalgo County, three generations of poverty are represented. Mr. Ramirez, 70, became a widower two years ago. The chief income for himself, four of his children who usually are at home and a six-year-old granddaughter, is $94 a month in state welfare. Lately this has been supplemented by $50 a month sent from an Idaho Job Corps camp by Carlos Jr., 19.

Carlos Jr. left school after the third grade. Julia Anne, 26, has a fifth grand education. Last summer she worked hoeing cabbage on a truck farm. Otelia, 22, who was burned badly in a kerosene fire several years ago, still lives in the 12-foot-by-20-foot shack. Juan, 16, has a fourth grade education. Dominga, the granddaughter, was left at the shack by her parents five years ago and never retrieved.

DIFFERENT BUT THE SAME

Equally resistant, although 1,200 miles distant, are the problems of a poverty pocket in metropolitan Chicago. Much has been said about the migration of Southern Negroes to Northern Cities, but little of migration north by Southern whites. "Uptown," a 120-square-block section five miles north of downtown Chicago, contains about 33,000 poor whites from the rural South.

They came from economically depressed areas to make a new start. But Uptown, the port of entry, tends to become the last stop. "You never have enough to get ahead," says one resident. "It takes all your income just to live." An Office of Economic Opportunity study showed that 51% of heads of households either were unemployed or had jobs that paid less than $3,000 a year.

The men get day labor or other short-lived jobs, and the families live in tiny furnished apartments, with the rent paid weekly. A 14-year-old from Tennessee says his father made $35 in the first week in Uptown; $20 went for rent, leaving only $15 to cover other expenses for their family of eight.

The newcomers can't adjust to big city life, social workers say. Some aren't sufficiently literate to fill out an employment application. Others are frightened of such big city appurtenances as buses. An Uptown resident of 10 years standing, one poverty worker says, is still likely to list his residence as "Pike County, Ky."

Services to help them are meager. "Southern whites have no Martin Luther King or Stokely Carmichael," notes Tom Nolan of the Catholic Poverty Committee. Another social worker says: "They get the crumbs of the relief pie." Welfare officials also say the Southern whites often are too proud to ask for help. Typically, a Tennessee mother who finally did go on relief complains: "They question you to death."

Amidst such difficulties, why do they come north? A poverty official who has visited eastern Kentucky, a prime source of Uptown immigrants, says, "Sure, slums in Chicago are bad, dirty and depressing. But a kid can bust out if he's sharp and lucky. Down there it's utterly hopeless. People live in shacks and sit around with blank looks on their faces."

But life in Uptown is poorly geared to "busting out." Changes of residence are so frequent, school officials say, that one grade school reports annual student turnover of 150%. One girl had moved 23 times before her 13th birthday. And education officials say parents are prone to take their children out of school frequently for visits to relatives or to help around the household for a few weeks.

HARD-CORE APPALACHIA

The poverty worker's assessment of Appalachia would seem to be borne out by the Mark B. Smith family in Cremona, Ky. "I'm just a dead man walkin'," says Mr. Smith. Once a coal miner and construction worker, he hasn't been able to work since 1965.

Mr. Smith's disabilities, ranging from back injuries to a nervous condition, don't qualify him for public assistance. He, his wife Clara, and their six shoeless children subsist on a Salvation Army stipend which allows purchase of food stamps worth $82 each month.

The Smiths had a four-room shack, but it burned down during the summer, and they now live with his mother. His children, aged 16 months to 17 years, use pebbles and twigs as makeshift toys while Mr. Smith, thin and unshaven, says, "About the future? I just couldn't tell you. If something doesn't turn up soon, it's a hopeless case."

Poverty workers in the area are stymied. Antipoverty programs, they say, don't get the needed cooperation from local officials or the poor. Edwin J. Safford, director of an OEO community action program, bemoans what he considers meager antipoverty resources and says, "There's no answer for this area until new industry moves in." But, he adds, there is little to attract industrial investment.

Other poverty workers assail what they consider a lack of concern for the Appalachian indigents. "How do you compete with riots in the cities?" asks an OEO volunteer. At a recent meeting of unemployed men at the abandoned mine workers' union meeting hall in Hazard, Ky., a wife rose, and shaking her fist said, "You men oughta go marching like niggers, and tear everything to hell as you go."

A POLITICAL ORPHAN

Another kind of political impotence blights life in Twinsburg Heights, Ohio, a curious community of 200 Negro families that has no government. Seventeen miles from both Cleveland and Akron, it is a backwater amidst explosive urban and suburban growth (there are at least seven such poverty pockets in Ohio, social workers say).

Technically, the Heights is part of Twinsburg Township, but the 1,200 Negro residents say they have been excluded from representation in local government. Although water lines from both Cleveland and Akron run nearby, the Heights has no water system. Twinsburg Township zoning restrictions forbid commercial establishments, residents say, preventing development of local businesses.

"Most people are apathetic and indifferent," a poverty worker says. In the Heights, crumbling homes occupy tiny plots along dirt streets with no sidewalks. Nearly 40% of the adults don't have an eighth grade education. Their children attend a nearby suburban school, but a social worker says, "There is a stigma attached to the children of the Heights that can't help but affect their school work and outlook on life." Other children make fun of the outhouses in the Heights.

The mold was cast in the 1920s when a real estate developer bought farm land, subdivided it and sold to Negroes, over the objections of local residents. Politically and psychologically, the Heights has been an orphan ever since, and the Negroes are convinced other communities would like to ease them out to make way for industry. "It is a poverty of the spirit more than economic," a social worker thinks.

THE ELDERLY

A poverty of the spirit perhaps even more desolating afflicts the indigent elderly, like Mr. Seczizinski, the man who leads a flophouse existence in north Philadelphia. The 76-year-old Mr. Seczizinski, who came to this country from Poland in 1912, has no friends or relatives.

A large wall clock ticks oppressively in Mr. Seczizinski's room, and a single light bulb hangs on a cord from the ceiling. The linoleum on the floor is wearing thin, and the walls are stained by steam from exposed pipes. The furniture includes four straight chairs, a small bed and a sink.

Rent takes $35 of his $104 monthly income. When other necessities are subtracted, he has about $1 a day for food. Mr. Seczizinski occupies his time wandering about the Market Street area or listening to his small transistor radio.

Mrs. Effie Stokes, a 71-year-old Negro widow who lives about 10 blocks from Mr. Seczizinski, has the same income but remains resolutely cheerful and active. She budgets carefully, but coal bills in winter throw her finances out of kilter. When the money runs out, she sifts the ashes for unburned lumps. "You have to know how to make things last," she says.

POOR MEDICAL CARE

Mrs. Stokes and Mr. Seczizinski share with many of the poor an aversion to doctors and dentists, often found even when they are eligible for Medicare or other help. "I don't go to see no doctor," he says, although he speaks of rheumatism in his legs. Mrs. Stokes says, "I can't recall the last time I've been to a doctor." Nor does she have a dentist. When her teeth hurt, "I rub salt on them and swab them with alcohol. This helps for a while."

Welfare officials can't explain this attitude. A spokesman for the Philadelphia County Board of Assistance says it will pay medical bills for such persons over 65 years of age if the treatment is essential. But many doctors won't accept the Board's $4 payment for an office call. And nursing homes are reluctant to take elderly indigents, for whom the Board will pay only $225 a month.

Other poverty pocket families are equally lacking in medical and dental care. In the Mexican-American town of Lariat, Colo., Richard Naranjo, 13, concedes that he never has brushed his teeth. Dr. William Bradley, a physician who has opened a clinic to help Lariat's adobe dwellers, talks sadly of untreated cases of hepatitis, dysentery, encephalitis and syphilis. "What can you do when the ambulance to Denver costs $125?" he asks. "The medical profession is defeated because there is nothing we can do."

TB AMONG THE ESKIMOS

In the impoverished Hinsdale County area of southern Colorado, there is no hospital. The Dogpatch area between Independence and Kansas City doesn't get public health services from either city. Emil Notti, an Eskimo leader, says 80% of Eskimo children in remote sections of Alaska have active tuberculosis, but few get treatment.

In some poverty pockets, health is being improved. The 2.8 million-acre reservation of the Papago Indians, in the mesquite and cactus-studded Sonoran desert of Arizona, got a 50-bed hospital in 1961, erected by the U.S. Public Health Service. Now 80% of the reservation's babies are born in the hospital, and infant mortality, which was 60 per 1,000 live births in 1955, has declined to about 40 per 1,000 (the national average is about 25 per 1,000).

The USPHS says also that half the Indians now have adequate water and waste disposal facilities, compared with 10% in 1955. But the life span of the Papago still is in the low 40s, at least 20 years less than that of the general population.

The panoply of Federal OEO programs, augmented by local welfare efforts and initiatives by some religious groups, is showing tentative results in some poverty pockets. In Twinsburg Heights, 30 Negro children are in a preschool Head Start program, and 23 teen-agers are in Upward Bound classes at nearby colleges, hopefully in preparation for higher education.

FORMER NUNS HELP

The OEO has brought preschool, parent-child and remedial reading programs to the Papago Indians, along with instruction in legal aid, community development and youth opportunity. In Chicago's Uptown, former Catholic nuns who left the Glenmary order and formed their own group are winning the confidence of the Southern white migrants.

But social workers complain elsewhere of a lack of funds, of disinterest among local governments and of an inability to overcome deep-seated problems. Peter Louwerys, director of the Farm Workers Opportunity Committee of the American Friends Service Committee, says antipoverty programs haven't measurably bettered living standards of agricultural workers in California.

In Detroit, welfare officials note that a year's residency is necessary to become eligible for relief, and then a migrant has to produce birth certificates for each member of his family. Employers often demand birth certificates, too. In the case of immigrating Negroes, this means a request to a Southern county courthouse. "They're not too anxious to help us," one welfare official says.

In the village of Abram, in Hidalgo County, Texas, the Vega family lives on about $800 a year, the amount daughter Adela, 37, makes on citrus and vegetable farms. Juanita, 22, is a polio victim. Their 56-year-old mother is a widow. Leo J. Leo, mayor of nearby La Joya and a sort of unofficial one-man war on poverty, can't find a single public assistance program for which the family qualifies.

"If ever there was poverty, these people have it," he says heatedly. "My God, something should be done."

DO THINGS COST MORE?

Among the poor, a common complaint is economic exploitation, Mrs. G., a Negro mother who lives in the Detroit ghetto, claims the local supermarket raised prices sharply after this summer's riots (although the city passed, and enforced, an antigouging ordinance). "They wanted $1.78 for a package of six neckbones," she says. "Everything was really high."

The California Farm Labor Office says migrant farm workers get an average wage of $1.40 an hour, but Tom Williams, vice chairman of an OEO program in Ventura County, reads a different story into check stubs supplied by the workers. One man, he says, got $10.37 for nine hours of lemon picking. But after a local growers' association deducted for transportation, glove rental, housing and other matters, net income for the day was $1.12. Such cases aren't unusual, he says.

The poor and uneducated may be vulnerable through lack of information. In Lariat, Colo., a worker for VISTA, the domestic Peace Corps, says Spanish-speaking residents are making instalment payments they can't afford at exorbitantly high interest. "People are signing contracts they don't understand," he says.

Like anyone else, the poor person has extravagances, too. Mrs. Lillie Harrison and her five children in Madison County, Miss., have an income of only $75 monthly, in the form of two relief checks. But this spring she squandered almost 7% of the annual income on her daughter Lena Pearl—$28 for a peach-colored party dress for a school dance and $32.60 more for a class ring. But it was a symbolic event. Lena Pearl probably will be the first of her 14 children to graduate from high school.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I have been critical of some aspects of the antipoverty program. At the same time, however, I have expressed support for other aspects thereof. I want, as much as anyone, to help the poor, especially those persons who will try to help themselves.

As we now approach the final vote on the bill before us, I would have preferred to see the Senate reduce title I by $198 million so as to make the authorization for that title conform to the administration's request. I voted for the Williams amendment which would have brought about a reduction in the title I authorization, but that amendment was defeated.

Nevertheless, in view of the Senate vote on yesterday deleting title II, and thus eliminating the authorization therein amounting to $2.8 billion, and in view of other refinements which have been made during floor debate, I am willing now to vote for the bill. I supported the amendment by Senator PROUTY, which was adopted, to require a thorough investigation of the poverty programs by the General Accounting Office. Moreover, the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] has accepted the amendment which Senator COOPER and I cosponsored to place tighter restrictions and controls over the selection and activities of VISTA volunteers.

Without these improvements which have been made on the Senate floor, and without the deletion of title II, which would have authorized an additional $2.8 billion, I could not have voted for the bill on final passage.

I hope that the Office of Economic Opportunity will exercise greater care in, and control over, the selection and activities of poverty workers so as to avoid, in the future, some of the criticism which I and others have voiced.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I rise in support of S. 2388, the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967.

I believe that the bill as reported by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with the committee amendments together with the amendments that were adopted on the floor will make for an improved bill.

I believe that these amendments will insure certain procedures and safeguards necessary to make the poverty program more effective and responsive to the efforts of our communities in assisting the poor.

In voting for final passage, I am pleased to note that the manager of the bill [Mr. CLARK] accepted four of my amendments which I called up on September 28, and which are incorporated in the final text of the bill. The main thrust of my amendments is to provide for greater participation and responsibilities in the poverty program at the State and community levels and to establish procedures for the selection of applicants serving as volunteers in the VISTA programs where no procedures exist today.

First, the present law provides that the assignment of VISTA volunteers shall be under such terms and conditions as the director may determine but volunteers shall not be assigned to duties or work in any State without the consent of the Governor.

Where an assignment of volunteers has been consented to by the Governor and, at a subsequent time, he does not feel that the volunteers are carrying out their duties in the best interests of the program the present law does not specifically authorize the Governor to request the withdrawal of such volunteers. I have been informed by the Office of Economic Opportunity that in the absence of explicit statutory authorization it is the policy of the agency to withdraw volunteers at any time at the request of the Governor. My amendment would write this policy into the bill so as to avoid any misunderstanding as to the individual responsibilities of the Governor and the Director.

My second amendment requires that the chief elected official or officials of a community have the opportunity to serve on their community action board and if such official desires not to serve, to designate a person to serve in his place. In addition, the amendment specifically provides for membership on community action boards of representatives of business, labor, religious, or other major groups and interests in the community.

It is my belief that if community action programs are to be successful the support of all the community is necessary, not only its private citizens and organizations, but the governing officials of the community, as well. Further, it is necessary to mobilize local resources, including funds, and, we would hope, the abilities and capacities of the community's officials.

The language of the reported bill provided that in assisting in the provision of legal services to the poor, the director shall make arrangements with the principal bar associations in the area. A third amendment I introduced provided that, in addition, they shall seek the advice and comments of the State bar association. I believe that State bar associations are more broadly based, and they usually have a staff which is better able to provide helpful assistance.

My last amendment requires that the Director of OEO employ the same procedures and information of all volunteer applicants in the VISTA programs as is required of those who are selected as representatives of VISTA. In securing its applicants to serve as volunteers in its programs VISTA uses application forms substantially the same as those used by the civil service. Where such applications reveal circumstances indicating criminal activities, subversive activities, or other forms of misconduct, VISTA then refers the application to the FBI for further investigation.

However, with respect to volunteers who are selected by other agencies funded by OEO, there are no similar procedures or requirements. For example, the Appalachian volunteers have received several million dollars from OEO, but as far as OEO is aware the Appalachian volunteers have no procedures to screen and select their applications, and the Director of OEO has no control over their selection or approval.

My amendment would make applicable to all categories of volunteers the same procedures so as to assure the selection of persons with proper qualifications and good character. At the same time, my amendment would authorize the Director to prescribe other qualifications for those volunteers selected from the poor and low-income residents of the area to be served who cannot meet the educational qualifications of the VISTA applicants.

Today, Senator BYRD, by unanimous consent, introduced an amendment to my amendment which I agreed to and was accepted by the manager of the bill [Mr. CLARK] which makes certain that these procedures apply to volunteers in all of the VISTA title programs.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I would like to call the Senate's attention to an amendment I offered in committee to the Job Corps section of S. 2388. This amendment is incorporated in section 113(c). The amendment provides for the establishment and the operation of a model combination vocational school and skill center. The center will be located in an urban area having a high dropout rate, a large number of unemployed youths and a need in the area for a combination vocational school and skill center. The amendment will attempt to "determine whether upgraded vocational education schools could eliminate or substantially reduce the school dropout problem and to demonstrate how communities could make maximum utilization of expensive educational and training facilities."

The assigned task of the center will be to prevent or reduce the dropout rate of the area schools and secondly, to train those in the community who have previously dropped out of school or who are in need of remedial education and training. Under the amendment, the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, in cooperation with the Commissioner of Education, will enter into one or more agreements with State educational agencies to pay for the establishment and the operation of such centers. The amendment requires that any agreement entered into contain provisions to assure that, first, a job survey be made of the area; second, the training program of the school and skill center reflect the job market needs as reflected by the survey; third, an advisory committee composed of representatives of business, labor, education, and community leaders be formed to follow the center's activities and to make periodic recommendations regarding its operations; fourth, arrangements have been worked out with schools in the area and the administrator of the skill center for maximum utilization of the center both during and after school hours; and, fifth, such accounting and evaluation procedures as the Director and the Commissioner of Education deem necessary to carry out the purpose of this project will be provided.

A few observations regarding these requirements may be useful. First, requirements of a job survey be made available to the area and that the training program of the school and skill center reflect the job market needs as reflected by the survey. While this may seem so elementary that one would wonder why it is necessary to write such a requirement into the statute, the facts are that, in all too many cases, this fundamental step has not been taken. As a result, we often find the training and skills taught have little if any relation to the local and State job markets. As a result, at the end of their training, graduates frequently find frustration, not jobs. These requirements will help to assure that jobs are available by requiring that the center be geared to the present and projected job opportunities. By further insisting as the third requirement does that "an advisory committee composed of business, labor, education, and community leaders be formed to follow the center's activities and to make periodic recommendations regarding its operation," we will make certain that there will be a continuous following of the center's activities to assure that the centers will respond to changes in the job market and that there will be the needed interaction between the centers and industry, labor, education, and the community.

The Chamber of Commerce of the United States in a task force report, entitled "The Disadvantaged Poor: Education and Employment," underscored the need for these requirements by noting:

> (One of the reasons) why vocational-technical education suffers is that courses are insufficiently related to actual labor market conditions; courses often prepare people for jobs that either do not exist or are disappearing. As John H. Fischer, President of Teachers College, Columbia University, points out, "schools have adhered too long and too closely to concepts of [vocational] curriculum and organization developed forty years ago." In some places, courses are still centered around woodworking and mechanical drawing at a time when the economy needs—and compensates well—mechanics, computer operators, electrical appliance repairmen, welders, tool and die makers, carpenters, lathe operators and a host of other highly respectable skills.
>
> As Dr. Swanson points out and as the Task Force learned first hand during field trips, schools do not generally know what jobs are available in a community. Schools do not generally know of the changing skills and knowledge requirements of many job opportunities. Less is known about the number and kinds of job opportunities that may be available in the future when today's younger students complete their educations. Without current and projected information about the labor market, schools cannot design and carry out effective vocational-technical education programs. To the extent the schools fail to prepare their graduates for jobs, the image of vocational-technical education deteriorates. A vicious circle effect emerges. As one panelist told the Task Force, the single most effective way to uplift the prestige of vocational-technical education and promote incentives for people to enroll is for vocational education to demonstrate success in leading people to well paid and respectable jobs.
>
> Effective vocational education is pivotal to the alleviation of poverty. Few jobs remain that require no training or skills. For every scientist and engineer half a dozen or more technicians and craftsmen are needed. And the men who build, test, try out, adjust and repair equipment are as vital in an industrial economy as the scientists and engineers who create. Graduates of vocational-technical training are in great demand by industry and business. In a recent survey by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 90 percent of the local chamber of commerce executives reported that their members have been voicing concern about the shortages of skilled manpower.

An advisory committee assigned the responsibility to continually review the center's activities and to make periodic recommendations thereto should prove mutually beneficial to the center and to labor, industry, and the community. The chamber's task force discussed the benefits that may result therefrom in the following manner:

> To achieve this, educators should take the initiative, inviting the interest and involvement of business and industry. Businessmen can help design vocational-technical education programs by keeping education officials thoroughly informed about current and anticipated job markets and about changes in the skills and knowledge needed by the economy. Businessmen can help by lending their own experts to help the school system train vocational-technical teachers. Businessmen can help by providing up-to-date equipment to schools or advising school officials about new equipment being introduced in industry. Businessmen can help by taking an active interest in placing graduates of vocational-technical training in jobs immediately upon graduation. Businessmen can help by insisting that vocational-technical schools publish periodic reports on their graduates' success in finding jobs for which they were trained or in entering apprenticeship and advanced training programs for which the schools qualify them. Finally, businessmen can help by promoting more and better vocational-technical training high schools and junior colleges wherever they are needed.
>
> It is in the interest of businessmen to involve themselves actively in public school vocational-technical education. To the extent that public schools can turn out people ready for employment, businessmen are saved training expenses. In many cases businessmen are saved taxes that would be necessary to meet welfare and law enforcement problems often associated with undereducation and unemployment. Remarkable progress has resulted where business has taken an active part in vocational-technical education.
>
> Labor leaders can also make a contribution to improved vocational-technical education. Craft unions can open their apprenticeship programs to graduates of vocational programs, without regard to race or minority affiliation. Labor leaders can cooperate by making people available to speak to young people and acquaint them with various aspects of different jobs and with expected on-the-job behavior. And labor leaders can consult with businessmen and educators in designing programs that prepare graduates adequately to cope with on-the-job conditions.

The fourth requirement "that arrangements be worked out with schools in the area and the administrator of the skill center for maximum utilization of the center both during and after school hours" is aimed at demonstrating how communities may make maximum utilization of an expensive facility. American citizens across the Nation have a tremendous investment in educational facilities. Yet, anachronisms from our past linger in American education.

Today, as in our past, at the end of our typical schoolday, which generally continues to run from 8:30 to 3:30, and at the close of the school year, which generally runs from September to June, the schools are deserted. I have even read cases where playgrounds have been locked, thus preventing youngsters from using them. There are, of course, places where the schools are used to a greater extent and summer programs are coming into vogue in more and more areas. This, however, is not the general picture nationwide. These customs originated in our agrarian past. It allowed students an opportunity to assist with the chores in the evening and the 3-month interval in the summer enabled the gathering of the harvest.

For today's urban Johnny, the reasons and rationale for the customs no longer hold true. This is particularly the case in some of our schools located in urban areas serving a large number of disadvantaged youngsters. Here the youngsters need extra help, extra time. Particularly, then, for these youngsters carryovers from our past need reexamining. Schools should be the work horse of the community. They should be the hub of community activity. They should be used as nearly as possible around the clock, around the year. Thus, requirement 4 attempts to demonstrate how an expensive facility with expensive equipment may be used to the maximum feasible extent.

The fifth requirement assures that accounting and evaluating procedures will be provided. Educational level of the participants, vocational skills, placement records, and the number of dropouts along with other matters are critical if we are to make a judgment as to the success of a program. I have been insisting that the poverty program provide the data necessary for Congress to evaluate its programs. This requirement will see that the information is provided for this pilot program.

Mr. President, 750,000 young Americans drop out of school each year. For these dropouts a difficult road lies ahead. Today's technological society demands educated and skilled workers. Job opportunities for the unskilled and the poorly educated continue to diminish. In reading the Nation's newspapers, one can see daily the evidence of the mismatch between the job openings and the workers. There are jobs available. Unfortunately, lack of education and training prevent many from filling them. These 750,000 dropouts must be the target. For lack of education and training are the root causes of many of our problems.

The amendment I offered has the potential of reaching these root causes. I am most excited about its potential. I intend to follow the pilot projects most closely.

Unlike the Job Corps, which is a repair job and an expensive one, the purpose of this program is preventive. We have heard testimony before the Subcommittee on Education expressing concern over the imbalance of Federal funding going to treat the problem—Job Corps—and Federal funds going to prevent the problem before it occurs—vocational education. We spend $295 million for Job Corps to repair and rehabilitate the dropout, but we are investing only $230 million of Federal funds on vocational education.

Mr. Johnson, president of the American Vocational Association, put it this way:

> It seems to me that there is today at the federal level an imbalance of expenditures for various levels and types of educational programs. For higher education, federal expenditures are $4.5 billion. For elementary and secondary education, $3.2 billion; for occupational training of various types, including Office of Economic Opportunity programs, MDTA, $1.8 billion. Of the $1.8 billion, only $280 million was authorized for vocational training in high schools, other vocational schools, community and junior colleges, and technical institutions.

Yet, Mr. President, presently there are 7 million youngsters enrolled in vocational educational programs and by 1970, this number is expected to reach 9½ million. Even if the Job Corps were successful with all of the youngsters it has served—and it clearly is not—it would still be a "drop in the bucket." It seems rather clear that vocational education must be our frontline in our battle against the dropouts. It is further clear to me, Mr. President, that preventive programs are less costly and more effective than programs which attempt to rehabilitate and repair a youngster after he has already departed from the public school system. The number-of-dropouts rate makes it imperative that we mount an attack. It is my hope that this pilot program will be a significant step in that direction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, if I have any to yield back, I yield back the remainder of my time.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it may be that the distinguished acting majority leader can be responsive to the question I have in mind.

I believe on yesterday we determined that after action on this measure had been completed, we would proceed to the Department of Transportation appropriation bill.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is that still the plan?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. That is still the plan.

Mr. DIRKSEN. And following that, we were to take up State, Justice, and Commerce?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I believe that has been changed, and it has been determined that NASA will follow Transportation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. And then State, Justice, and Commerce?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In the Senator's judgment, are we likely to get beyond NASA today?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. No.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So State, Justice, and Commerce would go over, probably, until tomorrow?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Or Monday.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What is the plan about coming in tomorrow?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I have not discussed that with the majority leader. I see he has returned to the Chamber. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in response to the question asked by the distinguished minority leader, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I had intended to ask the distinguished majority leader about that schedule, but I believe the changes have been noted: that NASA will follow Transportation, and State, Justice, Commerce probably thereafter, and then finally public works?

Mr. MANSFIELD. With one minor correction. Transportation appropriations will be laid before the Senate following the pending business. It will be followed by NASA, which, in turn will be followed by public works so that, if possible, we will get to that Monday, and give those who are interested a chance to proceed on that bill, to be followed by State, Commerce, and Justice. The last two items are subject to change, if extraordinary circumstances develop.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, from this colloquy, I think every Senator can satisfy himself as to what lies ahead for the remainder of the week and Monday.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The leadership should point out that there may be arguments relative to the SST on the Transportation appropriation bill, and there may be some questions raised during the discussion of NASA. There will be considerable debate on the public works appropriation bill, and there will be discussion and debate on the State, Justice, and Commerce bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wanted to give the leadership this information on the appropriation bills: There will be at least one vote on the Transportation appropriation. On NASA, we have four items different than in the House bill, so there could possibly be three or four votes on those items, but that is about all. I do not think there will be many more amendments on NASA, because the disagreement involved only four items.

Mr. MANSFIELD. At least that is enough to give the Senate notice that there may be votes tomorrow.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If we do not finish NASA tonight, there will undoubtedly be a vote on NASA tomorrow, and a vote on final passage, naturally.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, adding to what the distinguished majority leader has said, there probably will be some controversy about the item of the appropriation for the Subversive Activities Control Board.

I shall resist, as best I can, every effort to diminish, to reduce, or to cut out that appropriation; and, along with it, I propose to follow up and enlist the aid of every one of the veterans' organizations in this country, which are firmly behind the bill that is now on the calendar; and accordingly, since there has been indication of a possible little filibuster to prevent action, I have filed a motion to suspend the rules, and if we preserve the appropriation, I shall ask to have that bill considered.

It will have to be done under a suspension of the rules, because it is legislative in character, and I am not unmindful of the fact that it requires a two-thirds vote. But every endeavor will be made, under that motion to suspend, to have that added, and to complete this action once and for all.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, and for other purposes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time having been yielded back, the question is, Shall the bill pass? On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BENNETT (after having voted in the negative). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Brooke]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withdraw my vote.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young]. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph]. If he were present, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withdraw my vote.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote I have a live pair with the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill]. Were he present, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." I withdraw my vote.

Mr. SPARKMAN (after having voted in the negative). On this vote I have a live pair with the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore]. If he were present, he would vote "yea." If I were privileged to vote, I would vote "nay." I withdraw my vote.

Mr. SPONG (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell]. Were he here and voting he would vote "nay." Were I to vote, I would vote "yea." I withdraw my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph], and the Senators from Georgia [Mr. Russell and Mr. Talmadge] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska].

If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea" and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton].

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "yea" and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Brooke], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson] is absent on official business.

The pair of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Brooke] has been previously amended.

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd].

If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay" and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton] is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay" and the Senator from Utah would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 60, nays 21, as follows:

[No. 282 Leg.]

YEAS—60

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Baker
Bartlett
Bayh
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Dirksen
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Griffin
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hatfield
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Mundt
Muskie
Nelson
Pearson
Pell
Percy
Prouty
Proxmire
Ribicoff
Scott
Smathers
Smith
Symington
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough

NAYS—21

Curtis
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Hansen
Hartke
Hickenlooper
Holland
Hollings
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
McClellan
Miller
Murphy
Stennis
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—19

Bennett
Brooke
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Carlson
Dodd
Hayden
Hill
Hruska
Mansfield
Morton
Moss
Pastore
Randolph
Russell
Sparkman
Spong
Talmadge
Young, Ohio

So the bill (S. 2388) was passed.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MORSE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to make technical and clerical corrections in the engrossment of S. 2388.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senate has witnessed the outstanding skill and ability of the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark]. He directed this authorization for the war against poverty with the same articulate advocacy that has characterized his many notable achievements in this body. The Senate deeply appreciates his efforts on this measure; those who shall continue to benefit from the poverty program are forever in his debt.

Joining Senator Clark to assure this overwhelming success were the two senior committee members from the other side of the aisle, whose diligence and strong efforts in behalf of the poverty stricken have long been well known. I refer of course to the senior Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty]. Both exhibited their abiding devotion to the welfare and interest of the poor; their strong efforts are immensely appreciated.

The junior Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson] similarly are to be commended for helping to obtain the decisive approval of the Senate on this measure. Cooperating to make certain that the proposal would receive efficient disposition were the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams] and the Senator from California [Mr. Murphy]. They demonstrated a broad and knowledgeable understanding of the poverty program, as did the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Monroney], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA].

While the Senate spent nearly 2 weeks discussing this authorization, I do feel that its thorough consideration was of great value, insofar as it highlighted much of the constructive work being accomplished by the poverty program, noting also some of the mistakes that have occurred. In any event, the authorization adopted will permit the war on poverty to continue as a viable and effective program.

The Senate may be proud of another great achievement.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 557, H.R. 11456. I do this so that the bill will become the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. An act (H.R. 11456) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. HOLLINGS obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS] has finished with his remarks, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the chairman of the committee handling the bill, be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OUR NATIONAL INTEREST IN VIETNAM

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I rise today to address myself to one specific portion of a much larger question—the question of Vietnam. It is not my purpose to debate the origin of our involvement there nor do I intend to comment on the conduct of the war. I support our involvement there. I disagree in part with the way the war is being conducted.

But my purpose today is to answer what I believe is the question uppermost in the minds of the citizens of this country: What is our national interest in Vietnam? Recently, this question has been asked on the floor of the Senate. Twice I have heard it said that our national security is not dependent on our stand in Vietnam. This assertion came from two of the most distinguished Members of this body—the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. President, I do not pretend to have the experience of either of these gentlemen in foreign affairs, nor do I presume to place my judgment over theirs. But I do not agree. I believe our national security is at stake, and I believe that we do, indeed, have a great national interest in Vietnam.

I do not mean to imply that if we do not prevail in Vietnam, the battleground tomorrow will be Los Angeles County, because that is not so. However, in my opinion, our national interests in Vietnam are just as great as if this were the case. I believe our interest there is twofold.

First, we are fighting in Southeast Asia for the credibility of this Nation and her commitments. The belief that the United States means what she says in her international commitments is the keystone to freedom and is by necessity, the cornerstone of our foreign policy.

By continuing to honor our commitment in Vietnam, we are proving this credibility in three ways:

First. We are telling the Communist nations that aggression and the use of force against free nations shall be met with force by this country.

Second. We are telling our allies that we keep our word, that they can believe what we say, that this country fully intends to stand behind NATO, SEATO, CENTO, ANZUS, or any other common defense pact to which we are party.

Third. We are telling the uncommitted nations of the world that our commitment to freedom and self-determination is much more than a policy line—we are saying that it is a living, breathing, viable doctrine—and the very essence of the democratic system.

The second part of our twofold purpose for fighting in Vietnam is the autonomy of Southeast Asia. And guaranteeing this autonomy is inextricably bound to our national interest.

The aggression of the Communists in South Vietnam is not the only example of aggression in Southeast Asia.

Today we have Communist cadres in Laos, in Thailand, and more recently in Cambodia.

These countries are already earmarked for Communist takeover if we do not prevail in Vietnam. There is no question about this in my mind. There is no doubt about it in the minds of the leaders of Southeast Asia.

Recently, Lee Kuang Yew, of Singapore, said:

> If we can prevail, all of eastern Asia will be closer to stability than at any time in this century. If you do not hold out, we are finished.

Similar sentiments have been voiced by President Marcos, of the Philippines, and Thanat Khoman, Foreign Minister of Thailand.

Charles de Gaulle may sulk over his lost colonialism. After defeat in Vietnam, he may find the stand of other nations for peace in the Far East a threat to peace.

But the nations immediately involved know who is who and what is what.

They know it is aggression in Vietnam—not civil war.

They know the ultimate goal of the Communists.

They know, as I know, that South Vietnam is merely the opening play of an attempt to subjugate all of Southeast Asia through "national liberation."

Other than a continuing desire for world conquest, the motivation behind the Communist aggression in this part of the globe is not difficult to fathom. Southeast Asia is one of the richly endowed areas in the world.

This is why the French fought so hard to maintain their hegemony there.

The area known as the "rice bowl of the world" has the potential to feed the hungry of India and Red China combined.

It contains over 250 million people, or some 10 percent of the world's population.

It produces 80 percent of the world's natural rubber and 60 percent of the world's supply of tin.

Additionally, large amounts of oil, copra, bauxite, and sugar are produced in this region.

Is there any wonder that the Communists deem Southeast Asia such a prize—a prize to be taken by sheer force if this country does not stand as we are standing in Vietnam and providing the shield against aggression?

This brings me to the final point of my remarks, and my answer to another question which I believe the American people deserve to have anwered:

And what will be the result of this Nation's stand in Vietnam?

What do we hope to achieve?

The first and most obvious desired result would be the end of aggression against South Vietnam. I would hope that with the end of this aggression, the United States could bring its troops home and proceed with the business of assisting Vietnam in building a strong and stable economy and the type of representative democratic government that I am convinced they want. If we are successful in this effort, then I believe we would realize an additional and even greater benefit in that we would acquire as allies many of the now uncommitted Southeast Asian countries.

On Tuesday, the Senator from Arkansas pressed the Senator from Illinois, questioning:

> What does the Senator say is the objective of our war in Vietnam? What is it that we wish to achieve that is worthy of what we are doing? Does he want a colony?

Would the Senator from Arkansas have argued in World War II that our goal was to make a colony of Germany or of Italy? When we prevailed over Japan, did we make that a colony? When we assisted the Nationalist Chinese, did we make colonies of Quemoy and Matsu? When we defended South Korea, did we give her colonial government or free government? When we intervened at the Dominican, did we acquire a colony or did we give her people freedom? When we flew the blockade and President Kennedy proclaimed "Ich bin ein Berliner." Did he mean that the people of Berlin were American subjects—or symbols of a free people for the world to behold? Who gave Cuba her first and only freedom? Who gave autonomy to the Philippines? Who took possessions and gave them statehood and citizenship? No, my colleagues, to suggest that our stand in

Vietnam is tinged by any other than a hope for world peace and freedom belies the history of this Republic and her people.

It has been said that in political discussion, heat is in inverse proportion to knowledge, and the debate on Vietnam proves the point. The torrent of argument has completely obscured the greatness of the battle. This greatness lies not in destroying the enemy but in building a nation. General Westmoreland calls it "the work of a generation." This is the first time in history that men engaged in war are at the same time building a free society. The eyes of over 1 billion people in the Far East watch with interest. Since the emergence of Red China, Peking has told these people that the white man was not interested in the yellow man; that rich America had no concern for the poor lands of the Pacific; and that communism was the wave of the future. Now 38 nations are actively engaged in the support of South Vietnam. And the greatest Asian effort to preserve its own freedom is underway. The real issue is not between those who want to escalate and those who want to come to terms. The fundamental issue is whether America, the world's richest and most powerful nation, possesses the greatness of heart, the tenacity of spirit, and the moral strength to give what communism has failed to give the nations—a great and satisfying purpose for living as well as the means for livelihood. In other words, the issue is not the escalation of the military, but the escalation of the spirit of man. We have already taken significant steps down that road. A new constitution has been promulgated and a representative government chosen in free elections. American aid has brought to the people of South Vietnam health care, and agricultural technology. But far more important than money, machines, and materialism—we have brought them hope. Hope that a war of 20 years duration might finally come to an end—hope that they might be permitted to live in peace and prosperity.

If we can do this for Vietnam, we can do it for the millions of Asia. And, unwittingly, for the first time, we would have a Far East policy—a policy with which we can all agree. And even more significant, we will have come one step closer to the end of Communist aggression and one step closer to world freedom and world peace. If we can make that step, then we will have indeed served our national interest well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. Byrd of Virginia in the chair). Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senator from Mississippi was to have been recognized. Since he is not in the Chamber, the Chair recognizes the Senator from Illinois.

VIETNAM—A RESOLUTION

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, on behalf of Senators Bennett, Boggs, Byrd of Virginia, Carlson, Clark, Cotton, Curtis, Hansen, Hatfield, Hruska, Javits, Jordan of Idaho, Morton, Pearson, Prouty, Randolph, Ribicoff, Scott, Talmadge, Thurmond, and Young of North Dakota, I am submitting the following resolution:

S. Res. 173

Whereas a solution of the Vietnam war can best be found through regional cooperation in military, diplomatic, economic and psychological efforts; and

Whereas pending negotiations for a just settlement of the war, the non-Communist nations of Asia must work together; and

Whereas the leaders of these nations insist that prosecution of the war is of vital concern to their peoples; and

Whereas the leaders of South Vietnam insist that prosecution of the war is essential to the security of their country,

Resolved, in the hope that it will promote more Allied cooperation in bringing an end to the war, it is the sense of the Senate that—

(a) The Armed Forces of the United States should not continue to bear an ever-increasing proportion of the fighting in Vietnam; and

(b) The non-Communist nations of Asia, including South Vietnam, should contribute substantially more manpower and resources to share the military diplomatic, economic and psychological tasks in Vietnam; and

(c) The President of the United States should move with greater determination to obtain commitments of such manpower and resources in support of the effort in Vietnam.

Mr. President, less than 3 months before his death, President Kennedy said of the Vietnam war and of our South Vietnamese allies:

> In the final analysis, it is their war. They are the ones who have to win it or lose it. We can help them, we can give them equipment, we can send our men out there as advisers, but they have to win it, the people of Vietnam . . . .

At that time Asian troops still carried the burden of the war. There were only 15,000 American forces in South Vietnam.

Today the United States carries the burden of the war. More than half a million American men are involved there now. Asian troops, other than the South Vietnamese themselves, number fewer than 50,000. In some periods, American casualties have surpassed South Vietnamese casualties.

Despite President Johnson's 1964 warning that "We don't want our American boys to do the fighting for Asian boys," we are tied down in a land war in Asia and we have taken over the major burden of combat from the South Vietnamese. In other words, it has become our war.

I think this is as much a mistake today as it would have been in 1963, when President Kennedy spoke, or in 1964, when President Johnson spoke. U.S. domination of the war is a mistake because American men and money are being sucked into the quicksand of Vietnam in extravagant numbers, and the end is nowhere in sight. It is a mistake because it is the Asians' freedom and right to self determination that presumably will be endangered if South Vietnam falls. The war is already costing the United States almost $30 billion a year, yet failure threatens Asian security far more than our own.

It is long since time that Asian nations did their part by contributing greater economic and military aid to the effort in South Vietnam. They should be involved also in the psychological tasks of pacification and in diplomatic initiatives toward negotiations. By our presence in Vietnam, we have saved these nations millions of dollars they otherwise might have had to spend on national security. It is time they invested a portion of that saving in the support of South Vietnam.

By this I do not mean that the war should be escalated. Rather, I would hope that fresh incoming Asian troops and pacification teams would gradually lighten the load borne by our men. Instead of American manpower soaring to 600,000 and more, we might gradually decrease the necessity for more American troops. Although we might help to equip new Asian contingents, our own share of the bill in Vietnam would be somewhat smaller. We could thus afford to attend better to some of our domestic problems, particularly the urban crisis.

Most of the non-Communist Asian nations have considered helping South Vietnam. But why should they risk the lives of their own young men or spend their own national treasure when the United States seems willing to do it for them, and do it alone?

The United States appears anxious to police the entire world. Well, let it, they may say to themselves; we will build up our own nations, and leave the United States to save the world.

Perhaps that sounds harsh, but I have no doubt that there is truth in it. What possible incentive is there for other nations to assist South Vietnam when the United States has so massively and completely taken over the war? After all, who for a moment thinks the United States needs help in fighting its wars? We forever boast of our unmatched power. We seem willing and able to pour in men by the hundreds of thousands wherever they are needed. We have announced that North Vietnam and the Vietcong have been stopped. So why should any other nation, wisely putting its own self-interest first, expend its resources in Vietnam?

They would not, and generally speaking, they do not. And as long as we persist in making this our war, they will not.

Until we notify them that our commitment in Southeast Asia is by no means open-ended, our potential allies will feel they have little to gain and much to lose by participating in this struggle. No one is anxious to enter a war that others seem willing and clearly capable of handling themselves.

I think we must make it clear, especially to our Asian friends, that we have no intention of indefinitely protecting their interests without their full cooperation and participation.

Some of these nations can be expected to object strenuously as we urge them to do their part. Their objections will be primarily political and economic. Politically, some will say, we cannot afford the risks of doing more in Vietnam; many of our people are opposed to the war. We might remind them that many people here are vigorously opposed to a war in which our national self-interest seems far less at stake than that of Asian nations closer to the conflict.

Economically, they will protest, the war in Vietnam deserves low priority—we cannot afford to help the Vietnamese and still do all that we want to do in our own lands. In reply, we might remind them of our estimated budget deficit of $29 billion; we might show them the front page of any American newspaper: stories of riots, slums, crime, poverty, and pollution indicate that we are sacrificing many urgent projects at home to help Asians half-a-world away. Surely they can sacrifice as much to assist their own neighbors.

The primary purpose of the resolution I am introducing today is to indicate to our Asian friends that the United States wants and needs their help, and to bolster the hand of the President in getting that help. Whether we feel our country is doing too much in Vietnam or too little, I think most of us agree that our Asian allies are not doing enough. This resolution indicates just that.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. PERCY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. McGEE. The Senator from Illinois and I had a rather protracted dialog on several questions affecting our foreign policy in Asia earlier this week. The point raised here is a part of the pattern of that dialog. Thus, I hesitate to repeat some of the things said on that occasion. The real burden of it comes down to this: That the governments in Asia know that their fates are hanging in the balance as to how the war comes out in Vietnam.

Where I believe the Senator from Illinois misses their point, as one candid enough to say so, is that when the breakthrough began a little over 2 years ago, they did not have the resources or the trained manpower ready to move that fast in order to stop it. The only alternative facing them at that time, in their opinion, was to knuckle under, to learn to live under an umbrella held over them by the Chinese. They say so, in all bluntness. The Philippines, Malaysia, Thailand, Indonesia now all say that. Indonesia came very close to such a demise.

It seems to me that our first priority, in our national interest, leaving them out of it for the moment, is to try to prevent that from happening. I think that this is the difference, in the national interest of our country, that Southeast Asia not come apart, that it not go under, that it not come under the domination of mainland China.

Therefore, it puts this matter in a different order of things. As we said the other day in colloquy, we all want more help from everyone, from our friends in Europe, in Latin America, and in Asia. But I think we have to bear in mind that these people are already contributing a great deal. This is an area which makes a difference to them. When I say "a great deal," we are talking in relative terms, because of what our disproportionate capability, sometimes, can do to diminish what they, in fact, are doing.

Suffice it to suggest that the total non-American, non-ARVN manpower contribution in South Vietnam is larger than was the total non-American, non-Korean contribution in the Korean war, that some headway is being made, that this has been a rather steady growth of participation by the Southeast Asians themselves. I think the highest point reached in the Korean war was 48,000 troops outside of the ROK's and the Americans. The present non-American, non-Vietnamese manpower commitment in the field right now is approximately 60,000—59,000-plus.

They are moving in the right direction. I think that, when we add to that the varied kinds of contributions made by the Asians, it is an injustice to them to cast aspersions on their efforts, and particularly for us to appear to be—I guess we could say—blackjacking them into greater participation. Their efforts have been going on, if I may say so to the distinguished Senator from Illinois, vigorously, and they have been continuing at every level through every source and through every kind of official and nonofficial channel at all times to try to get them to mobilize all of which they are capable.

It is important that we be mindful of the difference between Americans persuading friends and allies to participate, and a totalitarian regime commanding satellites. There is a difference between allies and satellites. I think that the process of negotiating with allies who are equals, in the international sovereignty sense, requires a great deal more finesse, sophistication, and understanding on our part to try to bring it about.

The fact that the participation of the Asian countries has steadily risen rather than declined, as the Senator suggests in part (a) of his resolution, should suggest to him as well that we are moving forward on this front.

The Koreans have more men committed there, in proportion to their population, than does the United States. The ARVN groups have multiplied their troop commitments in the past 6 months at a greater rate—again, in line with the proportional manpower commitment statistics.

They are not shying away from an effort. They are not reneging on an obligation. I could take the time to go nation by nation, but I will not take that time. I will put it in only as a matter of record from a whole collection of between 30 and 40 nations which are doing something. But, in particular, the breakdown on the Asian nations and what they are doing, I think, belongs in it as part of the picture.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the material and facts covering this subject.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREE WORLD ASSISTANCE TO VIETNAM AS OF OCTOBER 1, 1967

Thirty-one nations besides the United States are assisting Viet-Nam under the Free World Assistance Program. Six other countries not considered part of the FWA program and the United Nations also assist, and promises of help have come from three other nations. Five Asian countries now have almost 60,000 troops on the ground in Viet-Nam. A detailed listing by geographic area follows:

FAR EAST

Australia

Australia is providing a wide and substantial range of aid to Viet-Nam under the Colombo Plan and by direct bilateral assistance. Economic aid since 1964 is valued at more than $10 million.

Military aid consists of:

1. Approximately 5,750 combat troops including a brigade and support, and a squadron of 8 Canberra bombers. In addition, they provide naval assistance and a guided missile destroyer.
2. 100 combat advisors (primarily specialists in jungle warfare).
3. A 73-man air force unit at Vung Tau with six Australian caribou planes which fly daily logistical transport missions in support of Vietnamese military forces.

Economic and technical assistance includes:

1. Three surgical teams, totaling 37 personnel, in 3 provincial hospitals. These teams, in addition to performing major operations, have established a blood bank and are giving lessons in nursing.
2. A group of civil engineers working on water supply and road construction projects.
3. Three experts in dairy and crop practices and radio techniques.
4. Training of 130 Vietnamese in Australia.
5. In goods and materials: 1,250,000 textbooks in Vietnamese for rural schools; 3,300 tons of corrugated roofing for Vietnamese military dependents' housing; 6 large community windmills; 15,750 sets of hand tools; 400 radio sets and 2,400 loud-speakers; 16,000 blankets and 14,000 cases of condensed milk.
6. A 55 kilowatt broadcasting station at Ban Me Thuot.

The Australian Government decided on February 1 to increase its non-military aid to Viet-Nam during FY 1967 to $2 million. This will permit substantial enlargement of current medical and civic action programs and the undertaking of new projects such as providing equipment for refugee resettlement centers.

Republic of China

The Republic of China has provided:

1. An 80-man agricultural team.
2. An 18-man military psychological warfare team.
3. A 34-man electrical power mission under the leadership of Taipower.
4. A 16-man surgical team.

China has also provided training for more than 200 Vietnamese in Taiwan. In the way of goods and materials, they have provided 26 aluminum prefabricated warehouses, agricultural tools, seeds and fertilizers, 500,000 copies of mathematics textbooks and an electrical power substation.

Japan

Japan has provided over $55 million worth of economic assistance to Viet-Nam, chiefly through reparations. Japan has sent two medical teams, considerable amounts of medical goods (4,544 cases), 20,000 transistor radios and 25 ambulances. It has provided technical personnel and funds for the construction of a large power dam across the Da Nhim River and electrical transmission line. A new medical aid agreement ($1.1 million) was signed in June 1967.

Korea

Korea has sent approximately 48,800 troops including:

1. 2 combat divisions and 1 combat brigade.
2. A 130-man Mobile Army Surgical Hospital (MASH).
3. 10 military instructors in Korean karate for training Vietnamese military in hand-to-hand combat.
4. A 2,200-man Task Force Unit composed of the following elements: 1 Army engineer

battalion, 1 Headquarters group, 1 Army Transportation company, 1 Marine Corps Engineer company, 1 Infantry battalion, 1 LST and 2 LSMs, 1 Composite Support unit (communications, medical supplies, etc.).

Korean military medical personnel are providing some medical care to the local population in areas where ROK troops are stationed. In addition, 7 civilian medical teams totalling 118 doctors, nurses and support personnel are working in provincial health programs.

Laos

One million *kip* ($4,167) for flood relief in 1965 and a small cash donation for refugees in 1966.

Malaysia

Since 1963, Malaysia has trained over 2,000 Vietnamese military and police officers. Groups of 30–60 are regularly sent for about a month's training in counterinsurgency with Malaysian Special Constabulary. Malaysia has previously provided substantial amounts of counterinsurgency materials, primarily military and police transport such as armored behicles. Medicines and relief supplies have also been donated.

New Zealand

New Zealand has sent an artillery battery and an infantry company (approximately 350 men) and provided a 25-man army engineer detachment.

In *non-military aid*, New Zealand has sent a 15-man surgical team, and a professor in English language for the University of Saigon. A second 16-man medical team will be sent to Binh Dinh province. They are presently training 83 Vietnamese in New Zealand and have provided NZ£7,500 ($21,000) for equipment for a technical high school. They are also assisting by providing approximately $600,000 for a science building at the University of Saigon.

Philippines

The Philippine Government has sent a 2,000-man military engineering unit with security support personnel, a station hospital, and rural health and civic action teams.

In *non-military aid*, approximately 60 Philippine civic action personnel including military and civilian medical teams have been working in Viet-Nam for several years.

Thailand

Thailand has sent a total of approximately 2,200 men including a recently arrived combat brigade. A 150-man Thai naval group manning an LST and PGM patrol craft arrived in Viet-Nam in December 1966. A 35-man air force contingent has been flying operational transport missions for the Vietnamese forces. The Thais have also been providing jet training for Vietnamese pilots in Thailand.

In *non-military aid*, the Thais have provided rice for refugees and cement and zinc roofing materials. At the Manila Conference, the Thais offered the Vietnamese a $20 million rice credit. The Thais have also announced they will send a medical unit to Viet-Nam.

MIDDLE EAST

Greece

Greece has contributed $15,000 worth of medical supplies.

Iran

Iran has contributed 1,000 tons of petroleum products to Viet-Nam and has despatched a 20-man medical team to Viet-Nam.

Turkey

Turkey has provided medicines and also offered to provide a substantial amount of cement.

EUROPE

Austria

Austria has offered to supply medical supplies, blankets, tents, through the Austrian Red Cross.

Belgium

Belgium has provided medicines and an ambulance and has given scholarships for 15 Vietnamese to study in Belgium.

Denmark

Denmark has provided medical supplies and has offered to train 12 Vietnamese nurses in Denmark.

Germany

Personnel in Vietnam

A 3,000-ton hospital ship, the "helgoland" with 8 doctors, 30 other medical personnel and 145 beds is on duty in Viet-Nam.

Seven Germans, a director and six instructors, are teaching at the new Vietnamese-German Technical High School at Thu Duc near Saigon. At Hue University there are five Germans: three physicians in the Medical School, a professor of music, a professor of German language, and one expert in forestry is working at the Department of Rural Affairs, Saigon.

Vietnamese in Germany

Forty Vietnamese are studying in Germany and the Germans have agreed to accept 30 more primarily for training as future instructors in the technical high school. A considerable number have previously been trained.

Goods and Materials

The Germans have provided the following credits:

(1) DM 15 million ($3.75 million) for import of German products such as machine tools, fertilizer, etc. The piastre funds generated go to the National Office of Agricultural Credit to aid farmers, particularly with loans;

(2) a credit of DM 50 million ($12.5 million) for development of the major industrial complex at An Hoan-Nong Son;

(3) a credit for DM 20 million ($5 million) for construction of an abattoir at Saigon-Cholon, and three coastal vessels;

(4) a credit of DM 500,000 ($125,000) for equipment at the Vietnamese-German Technical High School at Thu Duc.

In April 1966, the Germans announced a gift of DM 17.5 million ($4.4 million) worth of pharmaceuticals, the first shipments of which have arrived. Also in the medical field, they have provided two mobile dental clinics and 30 ambulances for the Ministry of Health.

In June 1966, the Cabinet voted DM 25 million (US $6.25 million) for new aid to Viet-Nam including:

(1) sending 25 experts to establish a refugee center;

(2) building a home for wayward youths;

(3) expansion of eight social centers and construction of a ninth, and

(4) establishment of a training center for social workers. The Germans have also donated 260 tons of rice for refugee relief programs.

Italy

The Italians provided a 10-man surgical team and have offered science scholarships to 10 Vietnamese to study in Italy.

Luxembourg

Luxembourg has provided plasma and blood transfusion equipment.

The Netherlands

The Dutch have undertaken to build 5 tuberculosis centers in Saigon; sites for 3 have been selected. In August, the Netherlands announced a contribution of $355,000 for a 4-year UN project in social welfare, part of the $1 million they have earmarked for UN projects in Viet-Nam. In 1964, the Dutch gave antibiotics and 4 scholarships for Vietnamese. They previously provided a dredge.

Spain

Spain has sent a 12-man medical team to Viet-Nam and has provided 800 pounds of medicines, medical equipment and blankets.

United Kingdom

The United Kingdom has supplied economic aid valued at more than $2 million in the past three years. It has provided six civilians for the British Advisory Mission and a Professor of English at Hue University. Twenty-one Vietnamese are receiving training in the United Kingdom. A pediatric team of four British doctors and six nurses went to Viet-Nam in August 1966.

In 1963–64, the United Kingdom provided the following goods and materials: Laboratory equipment for Saigon University; a typesetting machine for the Government Printing Office; a cobalt deep-ray therapy unit for the National Cancer Institute; various equipment for the faculties of Medicine, Science and Pharmacy at Saigon University, the Meteorologic Service and the Agricultural School at Saigon, and Atomic Research Establishment at Dalat and the Faculty of Education at Hue. In 1965–1966, British economic aid totalled $226,800 for roadbuilding equipment, diesel fishing boat engines, and portable anesthetic machines. Total aid in British FY 1967 was $515,200 and it is estimated $666,400 will be expended in FY 1968.

LATIN AMERICA

Argentina

Argentina is contributing 5,000 tons of wheat.

Brazil

Brazil has sent a substantial quantity of medical supplies which was carried to Viet-Nam by a Brazilian Air force plane and has also provided coffee.

Costa Rica

Costa Rica is contributing an ambulance for use in Viet-Nam.

Dominican Republic

Cement has been offered by the Dominican Republic for use in Viet-Nam.

Ecuador

Ecuador has sent medical supplies to Viet-Nam.

Guatemala

Guatemala has sent 15,000 doses of typhoid-paratyphoid serum for use in Viet-Nam.

Honduras

Honduras has contributed drugs and dry goods for refugees in Viet-Nam, flown there on a Honduras Air Force plane.

Uruguay

Uruguay has contributed $21,500 for relief supplies and medicine for Viet-Nam.

Venezuela

Venezuela has provided 500 tons of rice for refugee relief, and two civilian doctors are working in Viet-Nam.

AFRICA

Liberia

A contribution of $50,000 has been made by Liberia for the purchase of hospital equipment and other medical supplies for Viet-Nam.

Tunisia

Tunisia has made available 15 to 20 scholarships for Vietnamese.

NORTH AMERICA

Canada

Almost $6 million of development assistance to Viet-Nam has been provided by Canada.

1. Since 1964 Canada has supplied more than $4.5 million in economic aid. It increased its aid to South Viet-Nam this fiscal year allocating $1 million for medical assistance including providing ten 200-bed emergency hospital units. The first two units have arrived and have been installed at Phan Tiet and at Phu Tho near Saigon. A Canadian doctor and technician visited Viet-Nam

in the fall to inspect potential sites. Canada has sent 650,000 doses of polio vaccine for Vietnamese school children and offered additional vaccines against polio, TB and smallpox. Consideration is being given to establishment of a children's rehabilitation center in Viet-Nam.

2. Since 1958, Canada has provided $850,000 worth of food aid for Viet-Nam. Funds generated by sales are used for capital construction projects in Viet-Nam.

3. A new science building for the medical faculty at the University of Hue is being built costing about $333,000, drawn from counterpart funds generated by sales of food supplied by Canada. Construction has passed the half-way mark.

4. The Canadians have also agreed to construct an auditorium for the Faculty of Sciences at Hue University which will cost about $125,000.

5. Canada is printing half a million copies of a social sciences textbook for Vietnamese grade school children.

6. *Personnel in Viet-Nam.*—A Canadian Supervisor has been at Quang Ngai supervising construction of a small TB Clinic which the Canadians are funding. The Canadians have sent two doctors and four nurses to staff the clinic. A professor of orthopedics is working at Cho Ray Hospital, Saigon, and there is a Canadian teacher at the University of Hue.

7. *Vietnamese in Canada.*—380 Colombo Plan trainees and a total of 463 trainees under all programs, including those sponsored by other agencies and third countries (as well as Colombo Plan), have been trained in Canada. There are currently 231 Vietnamese students in Canada.

OTHER ASSISTANCE

Six other nations whose help does not fall under the Free World Assistance Program have provided valuable assistance to Viet-Nam in economic and humanitarian fields.

France

Since 1956, France has contributed about $115 million in assistance to South Viet-Nam. Present aid is running at a rate of about $4 million per year, largely in the cultural field.

In 1965 France had nearly 500 persons serving in South Viet-Nam. Among them were 65 experts under France's program of economic and technical assistance, including 32 physicians, professors and other medical personnel. Under its cultural programs, 471 professors (350 French and 121 Vietnamese) were teaching at 9 French-teaching institutions, and 30 French professors are at Vietnamese institutions. France provided in 1965 for Vietnamese to study in France, 55 fellowships for technical training and 85 academic fellowships. These programs are continuing on a somewhat reduced scale.

France has provided low-interest credits of 100 million francs ($20 million) for financing imports of French equipment for Vietnamese industry, a grant of 500,000 francs ($100,000) for equipment for L'Ecole Nationale d'Ingenieurs des Arts Industriels.

In 1960 France extended a low-interest credit of 70 million francs ($14 million) to aid construction of the major coal and chemical complex at An Hoa Nong Son south of Da Nang which is underway. It also provides a low-interest, five-year credit of 60 million francs ($12 million) for construction of Viet-Nam's largest cement-producing complex with plants at Hatien and Thu Duc. In 1964, France provided a 930,000 francs ($186,000) grant for the installation of a training center for electrical technicians and in 1965 a gift of 1.25 million francs ($250,000) for teaching equipment, primarily in the medical field.

Ireland

The Irish people have contributed £1,000 ($2,800) for Vietnamese flood victims through their Red Cross.

Israel

Israel made a gift of pharmaceutical supplies for flood victims and will train five Vietnamese in irrigation and animal husbandry.

Norway

Norway sent a contribution through the International Red Cross for flood victims in February 1965.

Pakistan

Pakistan made a financial contribution for assistance to flood victims and donated clothing for them.

Switzerland

The Swiss have provided microscopes for the University of Saigon. The Swiss Red Cross has sent an 11-man medical team through the International Committee of the Red Cross to work in a provincial hospital in the Central Highlands of South Viet-Nam.

U.N. aid to Vietnam

The United Nations and its specialized agencies are also making a significant contribution to the social and economic development of Viet-Nam. Under the Expanded Program of Technical Assistance of the U.N. Development Program, 15 technical assistance projects are scheduled for 1967 and 1968 at a cost of $724,475. These projects range across such varied fields as maternal and child health, labor administration, educational planning, telecommunications, meteorology and civil aviation. Among the participating agencies are ILO, FAO, UNESCO, WHO, ICAO, ITU, WMO, and the Department of Economic and Social Affairs of the U.N. In addition UNICEF has substantially expanded its health and child care programs with the 1967 program totalling $562,000, an increase over the 1966 level of $226,000.

Several major projects financed by the Special Fund of the U.N. Development Program are about to get underway. A National Technical Center (total international contribution approximately $1.5 million), with UNESCO is becoming operational. The Special Fund in January approved a Fisheries Development Project including exploratory and experimental fishing in the waters of the South China Sea, to be executed by FAO at a cost of $1.3 million. Also being negotiated is a Social Welfare Training Center to be executed by the Bureau of Social Affairs of the U.N. ECAFE is pressing ahead with regional projects of benefit to the nations of the Mekong Basin and has undertaken surveys of irrigation, hydro-electric facilities and bridge construction projects in Viet-Nam.

While we hold the line, the Asians are busily at work trying to get new programs off the ground that they themselves will be responsible for—all aimed at making Eastern Asia better. These programs include six points:

1. Asian Development Bank—which was launched at the initiative of a Burmese by the name of U Nyun.

2. The Mekong Basin Commission—with blueprints for power development as vast as the TVA.

3. Asian-Pacific Council—formed one year ago in Seoul is preparing for its second session.

4. Association of Southeast Asia—has been reactivated.

5. The Southeast Asian Ministers of Education—are now organized.

6. Conference on Asian Economic Development.

These and other groups like them include cooperative efforts on hydroelectric power, transportation, resource development, scientific and technical research, trade, finance.

Additional facts:

1. Korea is furnishing 48,000 troops out of a total population of 29,000,000.

2. Free World troops have more than doubled over the last year and a half, now total 59,650.

3. Incremental troop increase of 65,000 announced by GVN in July equates a 700,000 increase in U.S. armed forces.

4. Philcag (Philippines force) represents 15% of Philippine Army.

5. Comparison:

Korean War.—Non-U.S./ROK forces amounted to 48,000 (approx.).

Viet-Nam War.—There are now almost 60,000 non-U.S./GVN forces.

6. Total Asian contribution in Viet Nam far greater than in UN force in Korea.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, finally, let me say to my good friend from Illinois that, much as appreciate and have seriously weighed and studied the proposal he had to make, I have come to the conclusion that it cannot contribute to the goal we would all like to see where we still get more and more. Instead it poses a hazard.

The hazard is that it is premised on the assumption that there is nothing going on; that there are no efforts being made.

Part (c) of the resolution says that the President, if I may read it exactly, should move with greater determination. These are relative terms. I do not know how to define "greater determination." Greater than what? Great determination is already a matter of fact. Great efforts are exerted even right now. It seems to me we might run the very risk that some thrust from the floor of the Senate at this particular moment might well upset long negotiations that have been underway for some time.

A big power negotiating with a sovereign equal in a sensitive area of the world is a very, very sensitive operation at best. It would seem to me that if the Senate were to proceed to act on this proposal at this moment, it could well place in jeopardy those efforts which have been underway for a long time to bring even more participation on the part of Southeast Asia.

So I would question the wisdom of seeking to enter the channels of diplomacy by pressure from the floor of the Senate without being fully mindful of what was already moving ahead and underway. I think that does not speak well of the more sophisticated position that the United States of America, as a leader of a major portion of the world, has to learn to live with, and accommodate itself to, the great patience that big nations have to exert, if they are going to be responsible for the consequences of their acts, in trying to understand the movements of the smaller countries which are so overwhelmingly overshadowed by the large ones.

I would say, when all this is added up, that the peoples in Southeast Asia are making steadily increasing efforts as their own capabilities are increasing, as their own mobilizing efforts are intensifying. Let us not sell them short, whether we are talking about the Thais on the one hand, or, on the other hand, the Filipinos or Koreans or Austrians, or even the Indians. Do not leave out the Indians, for they have, in contrast to the days of Mahatma Gandhi, 465,000 Indian troops mobilized today on the frontiers with China. That is another element which belongs in the overall picture of Asia now and the commitments that have been undertaken there. Likewise, the presence of the Indian troops, it seems to me at least, inhibits the freedom of action which might otherwise lead to a reckless commitment of troops from the north into Vietnam.

It is that kind of equation that adds itself to the balance of forces in dealing with the scale of relative power balances in eastern Asia.

I am reluctant to mention Taiwan at all, because there are those who recklessly suggest, "Why don't you get the Taiwanians?" I know the Senator from Illinois stands as one of those who recognizes that that would be suicidal in terms of committing the mainland Chinese. But even the presence of the Taiwanians should not cause misapprehension because they involve troops directly across the Strait of Formosa. That, too, is a restraint. That, too, lessens the kind of pressure that could be brought from the north.

So I think it is important that we keep all of this in balance. I think it is important to remember that there is more there than meets the more sensational headlines about commitments.

Furthermore, I think what we would be doing in the Senator's resolution would be to downgrade or to impugn the role of the President in a very active field in ways that are better not talked about or realized in terms of improvement in participation and in policy positions in general; and the refinement of this factor in itself is not best achieved on the open floor of the Senate of the United States.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, so that we do not delay the proceedings of the Senate this afternoon, I should like to comment for just a moment on my distinguished colleague's remarks and then insert in the Record the analysis I have made on the amount of assistance being offered by foreign countries, including our own friends in Southeast Asia, and other countries, to indicate my concern that they do have the potential for contributing substantially more.

I would like to say this is not at all an attempt to blackjack. As the distinguished Senator knows, I have carried on conversations with the State Department and Defense Department over a period of a year and a half, and with other Members of this body, about my deep concern that the American people have felt, and I have felt, that the sacrifice being asked of us is considerably greater than the sacrifice being asked of those whose security and well-being is very much at stake.

Mention has been made of the contribution by the South Koreans. I think we have to take into account that whereas they have 45,000 of their forces in Vietnam, we have 50,000 of American forces today still in South Korea, so that their net is not very great as a contribution, though we deeply appreciate it.

But it is my feeling that they could contribute 30,000 more South Korean forces. I would much prefer them to do it than to have a further escalation with 30,000 more American forces.

When we come to the question of what countries could do, while I recognize the delicacy of negotiations, I think we can be frank with Australia and New Zealand, for example, who have been our allies and who recognize that their territorial integrity and political freedom could be endangered, particularly when we have, with respect to New Zealand, 150, to be increased to 360. It is a small country, but I still feel they could do more. I would say Australia could step up its support by two or three times.

I would appreciate permission to put in the body of the Record, by unanimous consent, the contribution being made by these countries, all of which is appreciated, to indicate the level of continuing support.

I hope to strengthen the hand of the President by this resolution to indicate that a number of those in Congress believe, as the Senator has reiterated on this floor, that every chance we have to indicate that we have asked them for more help, we should do it. I think the fact of 25 of our colleagues being added to the voice of the administration would be an important addition.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President——

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, will he yield to me while the Senator has the floor?

Mr. PERCY. Yes; with the understanding that the Senator from Mississippi has precedence then.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I wish only to make a concluding comment. Then I shall be glad to yield the floor to the Senator.

Each country, deciding in the light of all of its commitments, its local problems at home, its economic capabilities, its political stability, knows best where it can make its meaningful contributions and where those are to be negotiated. I doubt that we here in the Senate of the United States fully can evaluate all the considerations that President Marcos has to experience before determining what his country can best contribute. I doubt that from the floor of the Senate of the United States we can understand the political and economic questions that likewise have to be weighed and balanced in Australia in regard to its contributions.

The same way with the Koreans or the Thais. All of them would fit this same pattern.

What I call into question, Mr. President, is the use of the floor of the Senate to tell those countries, in very complex situations, what they ought to be doing or not be doing in this regard. This is underway; it has been going on for a long time, and it has already yielded results. But I think if my friend were to recheck with all those with whom he has had conversations in the Pentagon and the State Department, he would find them in agreement that this especial moment is not the most propitious moment for this kind of a declaration coming from the floor of this body.

Whatever the other factors may be, these smaller nations are especially sensitive over their disproportionate size, and for understandable reasons, they do not like to get the idea. I am sure, that somebody is trying to shove them around, that the big guy is going to use them or force them to do something.

Thus it seems to me that we have to lean over backward, at the moment, right now, in order not to play into the hands of thwarting or obstructing that which may be on the verge of yielding real dividends at this time. All I am saying to my friend from Illinois is that this is not the moment to run that risk.

Given the record of increasing contributions, given the things that must be underway at this very moment, I would hope that the Senator would not act precipitately or in a too promiscuous way in this particular exercise.

I thank my friend from Illinois for his indulgence.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, my only motive is a desire to work closely with the administration in this regard. As recently as yesterday, an Assistant Secretary of State indicated that he had no objection to a declaration by a Senator or a group of Senators, and I have indicated that I would not press for hearings or a vote until such time as it seemed in the national interest to do so. But I have been talking about this subject for a year and a half; I have been as patient as I could be, and I have not seen results. I am gratified to hear it, if there are going to be results forthcoming.

Mr. McGEE. Yes; I think the Secretary's position would be that a very broad resolution, without barbs and spikes, would be a little more in order; that the suggestion that somehow this was a club that was going to be held over Asians—which is a part of the implication—and the fact that the President was moving with greater determination, are the things that detract from the Senator's declaration of his wishes to try to get something helpful out of the Senate.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, and read to me the portion of my resolution he thinks is a club?

Mr. McGEE. Yes. Let me read two sections. The first is section (b):

> The non-Communist nations of Asia, including South Vietnam, should contribute substantially more manpower and resources to share the military, diplomatic, economic, and psychological tasks in Vietnam;

Mr. PERCY. Does the distinguished Senator disagree with that?

Mr. McGEE. Yes; as I just spelled out in the Record. I think the margin has been moving in the other direction. It is not enough, I agree with the Senator, but I think the effort is being made, these gaps are being closed, and the point is that now, in the face of the efforts that have already been made a matter of record, this thus becomes a question of high pressure being applied to them for still more, when this is already the subject of very considerable discussion.

Point (c) of the Senator's resolution reads as follows:

> The President of the United States should move with greater determination to obtain commitments of such manpower and resources in support of the effort in Vietnam.

That, it seems to me, is a very specific thrust at the President, without recognition, not only of what has been done, but of what is underway even at this time.

I think, in the context of those factors, that the proposed resolution could be submitted with much more restrained language, and still contribute to achieving the goal which it would be my hope that we commonly share.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 173) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point a summary of other nation's assistance to South Vietnam, as well as a summary of U.S. assistance to those nations.

I do not cite America's generosity to these many nations in the spirit of Shylock demanding his pound of flesh. I cite it as a reminder that freedom has survived in this century because free men have helped each other in hours of danger and need.

There being no objection, the summaries were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JAPAN

Has provided over $55 million worth of economic assistance to VN, chiefly through reparations. This is repayment of debt and should not be included as aid in the war effort.

Has sent two medical teams, 4,544 cases of medical goods, 25 ambulances and 20,000 transistor radios.

Has provided technical personnel and funds for construction of a power dam across the Da Nhim River, an electrical transmission line, and agreed to participate in the construction of a bridge across the Mekong near Vinh Long. Funds for power dam from reparations; remainder from $7.5 million loan.

U.S. foreign aid to Japan, 1946–66

	Millions
Military	$1,073.1
Economic	2,899.8
Total	3,972.9

KOREA

Has sent about 45,000 troops including two combat divisions, a 130-man mobile army surgical hospital, 10 karate instructors, and a 2,200-man task force.

Korean military medical personnel provide some medical care for local civilians. Seven civilian medical teams (118 Koreans) work in provincial health programs.

U.S. foreign aid to Korea, 1946–66

	Millions
Military	$2,416.6
Economic	4,260.1
Total	6,676.7

In addition, the total U.S. cost of the Korean war is officially estimated at $18 billion. And today the U.S. has 50,000 military personnel and 1,316 civilian military employees (as of Mar. 31, 1967) in Korea.

MALAYSIA

Has trained about 2,000 Vietnam military and police officers. Has previously provided military and police vehicles.

U.S. foreign aid to Malaysia, –1966

	Millions
Military	$3.8
Economic	43.7
Total	47.5

PHILIPPINES

Has sent a 2,000-man military engineering unit with security support personnel, a station hospital, and rural health and civic action teams.

U.S. foreign aid to the Philippines, 1946–66

	Million
Military	$489.5
Economic	1,435.5
Total	1,925.0

THAILAND

Has sent 2,000 to 2,500 ground forces to Vietnam. A 200-man naval group mans an LST and PGM patrol craft. A 35-man AF contingent flies operational transport missions for the VN forces. Some Vietnamese pilots get jet training in Thailand. Will send a medical unit.

Have provided some rice for refugees, and some cement and zinc roofing materials. At the Manila Conference offered Vietnam a $20 million rice credit.

U.S. foreign aid to Thailand, 1946–66

	Million
Military	$612.2
Economic	477.0
Total	1,089.2

AUSTRALIA

Has sent 6,300 combat troops, 100 combat advisers, a 73-man AF unit with six caribou planes which fly logistical support missions for Vietnam forces.

Has given a total of nearly $10 million in economic and technical assistance. On Feb. 1, 1967, decided to increase non-military aid during fiscal 1967 to $2 million.

U.S. foreign aid to Australia, 1946–66

	Million
Military	$125.9
Economic	149.4
Total	275.3

NEW ZEALAND

Military personnel (150) to be increased to 360 in Vietnam. Also provide an 8-man surgical team, a 16-man medical team to arrive shortly, and a professor of English for University of Saigon. Sent $21,000 for equipment for a technical high school and $600,000 for a science building for the University of Saigon.

U.S. foreign aid to New Zealand, 1946–66

	Million
Military	$4.7
Economic	23.0
Total	27.7

DENMARK

Has provided medical supplies and is training Vietnamese nurses in Denmark.

U.S. foreign aid to Denmark, 1946–66

	Million
Military	$618.7
Economic	301.8
Total	920.5

ITALY

Has provided a 10-man surgical team and offered 10 science scholarships for Vietnamese to study in Italy.

U.S. foreign aid to Italy, 1946–66

	Million
Military	$2,312.4
Economic	3,780.5
Total	6,092.9

NETHERLANDS

Will build five TB centers in Saigon. Has contributed $355,000 for a 4-year UN project in social welfare as part of a $1 million they have earmarked for UN projects in VN. In 1964 they gave antibiotics and four scholarships. Previously provided a dredge.

U.S. foreign aid to the Netherlands, 1946–66

	Million
Military	$1,240.6
Economic	1,229.8
Total	2,470.4

SPAIN

Has provided 800 pounds of medicines, medical equipment and blankets. Has sent a 12-man medical team.

U.S. foreign aid to Spain, 1946–66

	Million
Military	$608.6
Economic	1,395.7
Total	2,004.3

ARGENTINA

Has contributed 5,000 tons of wheat.

U.S. foreign aid to Argentina, 1946–66

	Million
Military	$92.2
Economic	666.4
Total	758.6

BRAZIL

Has sent medical supplies and coffee.

U.S. foreign aid to Brazil, 1946–66

	Million
Military	$298.6
Economic	2,887.1
Total	3,185.7

COSTA RICA

Has contributed an ambulance.

U.S foreign aid to Costa Rica, 1946–66

	Million
Military	$1.9
Economic	147.1
Total	148.0

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Has offered cement for use in VN.

U.S. foreign aid to Dominican Republic, 1946–66

	Million
Military	$17.1
Economic	303.0
Total	320.1

ECUADOR

Has sent medical supplies to VN.

U.S. foreign aid to Ecuador, 1946–66

	Million
Military	$44.9
Economic	234.7
Total	279.6

GUATEMALA

Has sent 15,000 doses of typhoid-paratyphoid serum.

U.S. foreign aid to Guatemala, 1946–66

	Million
Military	$11.1
Economic	198.1
Total	209.2

HONDURAS

Has contributed drugs and dry goods for refugees.

U.S. foreign aid to Honduras, 1946–66

	Million
Military	$5.3
Economic	83.2
Total	88.5

URUGUAY

Has contributed $21,500 for relief supplies and medicines.

U.S. foreign aid to Uruguay, 1946–66

	Million
Military	$37.4
Economic	82.0
Total	119.4

VENEZUELA

Has provided 500 tons of rice for refugee relief and two civilian doctors.

U.S. foreign aid to Venezuela, 1946–66

	Million
Military	$103.9
Economic	288.3
Total	392.2

LIBERIA

Has contributed $50,000 for purchase of hospital equipment and medical supplies.

U.S. foreign aid to Liberia, 1946–66

	Million
Military	$6.2
Economic	235.4
Total	241.6

TUNISIA

Has made available a number of scholarships for Vietnamese.

U.S. foreign aid to Tunisia, 1946–66

	Million
Military	$19.8
Economic	468.1
Total	487.9

IRELAND

The Irish people have contributed $2,800 for flood relief through their Red Cross.

U.S. foreign aid to Ireland, 1946–55 (ended in 1955)

	Million
Economic	$146.5

ISRAEL

Has sent drugs for flood victims and is training five Vietnemese in irrigation and animal husbandry.

U.S. foreign aid to Israel, 1948–66

	Million
Military	$27.6
Economic	1,076.9
Total	1,104.5

NORWAY

Sent a contribution for flood victims through the International Red Cross in February 1965.

U.S. foreign aid to Norway, 1946–66

	Million
Military	$884.2
Economic	351.8
Total	1,236.0

PAKISTAN

Sent money and clothing for VN flood victims.

U.S. foreign aid to Pakistan, 1947–66

	Million
Military	Classified
Economic	$3,072

SWITZERLAND

Has provided microscopes for the University of Saigon. The Swiss Red Cross has an 11-man medical team working in VN.

There has been no U.S. foreign aid to Switzerland.

TAIWAN

China (Taiwan) has provided an 80-man agricultural team, an 18-man military paywar team, a 12-man electrical power mission, and a 10-man surgical team. Has trained over 200 Vietnamese in Taiwan. Has given 26 aluminum prefab warehouses, farm tools, seeds and fertilizers, an electrical power substation, and 500,000 math textbooks.

U.S. foreign aid to Taiwan, (1949?)–1966

	Million
Military	$2,606.0
Economic	2,293.5
Total	4,899.5

LAOS

Has given $4,167 for flood relief (Feb. 1965).

U.S. foreign aid to Laos, 1955–66

	Million
Military (Classified)	
Economic	$473.4

AUSTRIA

Has offered to supply medical supplies, blankets and tents through the Austrian Red Cross.

U.S. foreign aid to Austria, –1966

	Million
Military (Classified)	
Economic	$1,198

WEST GERMANY

Has provided 18 Germans as teachers and technicians, and a hospital ship with eight doctors and 30 other medical personnel. Forty Vietnamese are now studying in West Germany, and the Germans have agreed to accept 30 more.

Has given about $22 million in credits and a gift of $4.4 million worth of drugs. Has provided two mobile dental clinics and 30 ambulances for the VN Ministry of Health.

On June 29, 1967, the Cabinet voted $6.25 million in additional aid to VN in the social welfare sector, including 100 buses.

Has given 260 tons of rice for refugee relief programs.

U.S. foreign aid to West Germany, 1946–66

	Million
Military	$951.5
Economic	4,045.9
Total	4,997.4

UNITED KINGDOM

Has provided six civilian advisors, an English professor, and a pediatric team of four doctors and six nurses. Twenty-one Vietnamese are studying in the UK. In 1963–64, the UK provided considerable scientific equipment to VN. In 1965–66, the UK gave economic aid totalling $226,800.

U.S. foreign aid to the United Kingdom, 1946–66

	Million
Military	$1,034.5
Economic	8,010.4
Total	9,044.9

CANADA

Has provided almost $6 million worth of development assistance.

Nine Canadians are working in VN. There are currently 231 Vietnamese students in Canada. Canada allocates $1 million for medical assistance to VN this fiscal year.

U.S. foreign aid to Canada, 1946–61

	Million
Military	$13.1
Economic	23.2
Total	36.3

FRANCE

Has contributed about $111 million in assistance to VN since 1956. France has nearly 500 persons serving in economic, technical, cultural and educational programs in Vietnam.

U.S. foreign aid to France, 1946–66

	Million
Military	$4,258.7
Economic	5,150.9
Total	9,409.6

GREECE

Has contributed $15,000 worth of medical supplies.

U.S. foreign aid to Greece, 1946–66

	Million
Military	$1,854.3
Economic	1,895.1
Total	3,749.4

IRAN

Has contributed one thousand tons of petroleum products to VN and has sent a 20-man medical team.

U.S. foreign aid to Iran, 1946–66

	Million
Military	$895.2
Economic	856.8
Total	1,752.0

TURKEY

Has provided some medicines and has offered a substantial amount of cement.

U.S. foreign aid to Turkey, 1946–66

	Million
Military	$2,762.1
Economic	2,277.7
Total	5,039.8

BELGIUM

Has provided some medicines, an ambulance and scholarships for nine Vietnamese to study in Belgium. (Luxembourg has given plasma and blood transfusion equipment.)

U.S. foreign aid to Belgium, 1946–66 (with Luxembourg)

	Million
Military	$1,255.3
Economic	749.6
Total	2,004.9

VIETNAM

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in connection with my speech on August 23, appearing at pages 23773 through 23776 of the Record, there was recently published in the Washington Post a column entitled "GOP Role in Vietnam Debate Can Result in 'New Look' Policy," written by the distinguished columnist David S. Broder. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Broder's article be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record as follows:

GOP Role in Vietnam Debate Can Result in New Look Policy

(By David S. Broder)

It has taken the better part of two years, but the debate about our Vietnam policy, which began in the Democratic Party, has now become a major interest of the Republicans. The development is healthy for the country, but no one should be misled about the probable result.

The result is not likely to be the nomination of an allout "dove" by the Republican convention next August or the conversion of the presidential campaign next fall into a debate between a Republican advocate of disengagement and a President who insists the struggle must go on, no matter what its cost or consequences.

No one can say such an outcome is impossible, of course, but another result is much more likely. Before speculating, however, let us look for a moment at the national advantage that is gained by shifting the Vietnam debate to the minority party.

So long as the Vietnam argument was centered among Democrats it was subject to two distortions.

First, the Democratic critics of the President's war policy were always accused of operating from personal motives, making it difficult to distinguish personal antipathies from policy differences. Sen. J. W. Fulbright was suspected of harboring grievances over presidential slights to his role as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. Sen. Robert F. Kennedy, it was widely held, was out to "settle an old score" with Mr. Johnson and to serve his own ambitions in the bargain.

Second, the internal Democratic debate on Vietnam has been stunted by the political reality that the critics could force a change in policy only by defeating the President for renomination. That is a task which Kennedy, Fulbright and all but the rankest amateurs in the peace movement recognize is impossible.

Thus, the Democratic debate on Vietnam has been twisted by circumstances into an unseemingly personal squabble whose outcome is a foreordained victory for the President. Mr. Johnson has further diminished its usefulness by his effort to obscure, confuse and distort the issues his intra-party critics were trying to raise.

Now, thanks to the efforts of a variety of Republicans with widely differing viewpoints, including, George Aiken, Clifford Case, Gerald Ford, Mark Hatfield, Melvin Laird, Bradford Morse, Thruston Morton, Richard Nixon, Charles Percy and George Romney, the debate has shifted to the GOP.

Each of these Republicans has taken a certain amount of criticism for "undercutting the President," "embarrassing the Party," or "creating doubt in Hanoi." But if this country is so weak, or its cause in Vietnam so fragile, that it cannot tolerate responsible debate within the opposition party on a major foreign policy question, then matters have indeed reached a pretty pass.

Actually, a Republican debate on Vietnam is likely to be of great use to the country, because it is free of the two major distortions that affect the Democratic argument. The Republican debate is less envenomed by personal feelings, for the simple reason that Republicans are not expected to give aid and comfort to an opposition-party President.

And the outcome of the Republican debate is not predetermined; in the open battle for the GOP nomination, Vietnam policy is a legitimate weapon for all contenders, and no one can say with certainty whose views will prevail.

However, the "doves" are unlikely to triumph, for three reasons.

First, the Republican tradition is one of staunch anti-communism. The Republican advocates of disengagement in Vietnam have not yet framed an adequate answer to those who contend that an American backdown in Vietnam would give the Communists a vital strategic victory.

Second, those who occupy the traditional power centers in the party—titular leaders Eisenhower and Goldwater, congressional leaders Dirksen and Ford, and the Governors of the largest states—all favor continuing or expanding the present military effort to secure the strategic objective of a non-Communist regime in South Vietnam.

Third, the three prospective nominees whose stock has been rising in recent months—Nixon, Nelson Rockefeller and Ronald Reagan—are all hard-liners on Vietnam. Those who have been slumping or standing still—Romney and Percy—are the ones who are talking of limiting the U.S. effort. In the coming primaries, one would guess, Nixon will articulate the case for continuing the war more effectively than Romney will argue for limiting the U.S. involvement.

Thus, to see the Republican Party emerging with a "dove" candidate and platform next August, one would have to imagine the successful refutation of traditional anti-communism; a policy reversal by, or repudiation of, its most influential leaders; and a complete upset in the present odds on the prospective candidate.

All of this may occur, of course, or even be forced on the GOP by a marked shift in public sentiment against continuing the war, a shift which Morton and others think may already be under way.

But more likely, in my view, is the prospect that the Republican urge for "unity" will assert itself and prospects in Vietnam. And that promises a "new look" at Vietnam strategy, without rejecting either the present military effort or the value of winning the struggle.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11456) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I propose, now, to bring to the Senate an explanation of the appropriation bill for the Department of Transportation. Before doing so, however, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield for the purpose of a quorum call, without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STENNIS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, may we have order, please?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is H.R. 11456.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, H.R. 11456 is the appropriation, for fiscal year 1968, for the Department of Transportation.

The Appropriations Committee's recommendations for the Department of Transportation appropriation for fiscal 1968 totals $1,651,407,272 from the general fund of the Treasury, and $3,770,945,000 for the Federal aid highway programs, to be derived from the highway trust fund.

Mr. President, I say by way of introduction that this is the first year that the funds for these programs have been in a separate bill, and the reason is that we now have a Department of Transportation at the Cabinet level, of which Mr. Boyd is the first Secretary; and, therefore, the items over which that Department exercises jurisdiction are collected here, now, and put in this one Department of Transportation appropriation bill.

Mr. President, the members of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations which considered this measure include the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

I have the privilege of being the chairman of that subcommittee. I named the membership because they have given unusual attention to the pending bill. Furthermore, the list includes membership on the legislative committee that has handled much of the legislation for which funds are provided in the pending bill. The Members are unusually well-versed in their field, particularly with reference to aviation.

We have the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE]—who is now the chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy—and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], who has been the ranking minority member on the committee dealing with this subject for a long time. We have other Senators who have worked in the field.

I am particularly honored to be chairman of this group and have been very pleased and impressed with the fine knowledge the Members have on the subject matter.

We have all been impressed with the way Mr. Boyd is trying to get the Department started on a sound basis. I believe the Department is doing splendid work.

The general fund appropriations are $67,211,500 less than the budget estimates for fiscal year 1968. That is largely because of substantial reductions in the estimates for the civilian supersonic transport of some $54 million in what is called the payback reserve fund, an action concurred in by the House and the Senate committee.

Another substantial reduction, $60 million, is attributable to an allowance of $40 million in lieu of a requested $100 million for the State and community highway safety program. I will go into that in more detail later.

In considering the pending bill, the details of which will be found covered in their entirety in Senate Report No. 572, it might be well to begin with the SST item.

The recommendation of the committee is $142,375,000.

The amount of the House allowance would finance the Federal Government's portion of the 1968 costs of the prototype construction phase of the SST development program. That is the big SST that has been under research for a good while now. It is now in the development stage.

This appropriation should be sufficient to continue the program at the planned rate through fiscal year 1968 when combined with the carryover funds available and $52 million of the U.S. airlines' contribution.

The two prototype aircrafts that are provided for are estimated to be available by the end of the calendar year 1970.

These funds are not questioned in any way as to the manner in which they are apportioned, but I understand the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] is going to offer an amendment to strike out all funds for this fiscal year except $1 million.

For the sake of continuity, I hope that we will get to that amendment first. I say in passing, however, that we are right at the peak of the development of this program. We are passing this year beyond the half-way mark. The amount in the pending bill is some $54 million less than the budget request.

As I say, that is due to the deletion of the pay-back reserve.

With respect to the FAA operations and facilities that come under the pending bill, in the course of the hearings the subcommittee was concerned with the rapidly increasing rate of aviation activity and what appeared to be inadequate resources for manpower and equipment to meet the current and foreseeable future requirements.

Mr. President, this is a well-known story to those of us on the committee. However, I do not think the public has had a chance to really get the facts that are so impressive to us with respect to the absolute demands—not merely the needs—and the urgent necessity for more trained men to operate the towers and the centers. These men have to be trained for a period of 2 years. We also need extra funds for additional overtime payments.

Even more pressing than that in a way was the absolute necessity of having a stepped-up program for the equipment that enables these known safety practices to be actually carried out.

That includes radar and other equipment in connection with landings and takeoffs.

In view of this, the recommendation here presented contemplates the provision of $20 million above the original budget estimates for the operations account of the FAA to provide this additional manpower.

That includes air traffic controllers and others. More personnel have to be recruited and put into training now. I believe more than this amount of money could be used, but we did not want to go too fast.

Further, the committee recommendation provides $30 million over the original budget estimates for facilities and equipment to provide such essential equipment as airport surveillance radar, terminal automation to receive and process altitude information on radarscopes, instrument landing systems, and approach lights.

As I say, the total amount contained in the bill is under the budget request. However, this item is over the budget request.

The committee went into this matter very carefully and thoroughly on its own responsibility. No one in the Transportation Department tried to come around or talk to us on the side about this matter. We raised the issue ourselves.

We did what we could to get sound features, and we are certain that this is a conservative figure.

The committee recommendation was unanimously adopted by the full committee. Everybody on the committee voted for it.

Mr. President, I do not have a long statement, and I hope that the Senators on the floor will join in the debate later.

In connection with the Coast Guard and its construction program, the committee has recommended increased funds in order to permit the construction of an oceanographic vessel. The total amount provided will also permit the construction of two high-endurance cutters approved by the House.

In the budget there was provision for one regular cutter and for one oceanographic cutter or ship. The House took out the oceanographic ship and put in two endurance cutters.

We think that the oceanographic work is far behind and that a larger part of it that needs to be done at the present time can be done by the Coast Guard.

When the bill goes to conference, we will have all three items in conference, and we will be able to work out something. That was only an $14.5 million increase, which is the approximate cost.

With respect to Federal aid to highways, the recommendations for the Federal Highway Administration include the funds requested for the construction activities of the Federal highway aid program to be derived from the highway trust fund. As Senators will recall, this is a special fund into which money is automatically paid, which originated when the Interstate System was adopted. All these funds go in there, and all the highway aid funds are financed out of the trust fund. It is tax money, and it is spent in the course of the year, just as any other money, and should be included in the consideration of what we call the spending budget; but it is not reflected in the ordinary columns of appropriations out of the general treasury.

In the course of the hearing, the committee was informed that an additional $450 million will be required to permit the Federal aid highway program to go forward at the authorized level for the ABC and the interstate program. These recommendations include $40 million of the requested $100 million liquidating cash fund for the State and community highway safety program.

I should like to say one further word about the $450 million in the supplemental appropriations bill, before we leave this subject. Unanimously and consistently, we have discouraged requests being brought back to the Senate for consideration with respect to the supplemental bill, because we believe that these requests should come through the regular channels, at the regular time, to the regular subcommittees, so that they can be considered in line with other requests for those departments.

Last year, we had a supplemental bill involving $8 billion, and it did not come to the Senate until approximately 1 week before adjournment; and despite everything that the members of the Committee on Appropriations could do, including the hard-working chairman, there was little opportunity for consideration of the measure.

I believe they should be required to bring requests in on time. The $450 million was an exception. It is almost a set requirement, anyhow. So we just note this and move on.

The committee believes that the highway safety program, with matching requirements from the States to participate in approximately 13 areas for which standards have been approved, would appear to be developing more slowly than the $100 million budget estimate assumed. The bill under which this program operates did not become law until October 1966, and the program at the State level did not develop as fast as anticipated. Some States required legislation; some required appropriations. Time is required to initiate these programs. We have included $40 million for these highway safety programs for the current fiscal year, which we believe is all that will be necessary to meet the requirements of the programs filed by the States. That is our best estimate.

The House put in $20 million, but we considered it later, when the State program had matured more, and we put in $40 million—intending to keep faith with the promises made to those States in connection with the preparations they have made, to match them on a requirement basis and to get the program started at every level possible. There is a great deal of interest in this matter throughout the country, and I believe that this sum—if the House will agree to it—will meet the requirements.

We have in the bill an item for railroad research, which pertains principally to passenger travel on the railroads, under the new condition that has developed. This is for research and development.

In closing, I should like to point out to the Senate that we have restored the full budget request for the vitally important railroad research project in the northeast corridor—that is, the rapid transit, ground-level train transportation experiments—and have provided $2 million of a requested $3.5 million to continue work on a demonstration project involving an auto-on-train service from Washington to Florida.

That is a piggyback operation. A man and his family would get in their car and drive their automobile onto a special railroad car in Washington and get off in Jacksonville, Fla., the next morning. The fare would be relatively small for the family and the automobile. This only involves an experiment. A prototype train—engines, cars, and everything else—is to be built. If it proves successful, the railroad will buy it from the Government at what it cost, with depreciation allowance. It will cost about $7.5 million. Depreciation allowances are figured now at $1 million, perhaps. So the Government will get back its money, except for the $1 million, if the railroad decides the train is successful and purchases it. If it is successful, the presumption is that the operation will spread to other areas. I believe the strongest point that can be made for this matter is that if it is successful, it will relieve highway traffic in the future.

Two other experiments are the one from New York to New England, which is the rapid transit experiment, and the one from New York to Washington.

The committee has also recommended the deletion of the general provision which would have had the effect of an overall 5 percent expenditure reduction. In other words, we made our own reductions on the individual item that we were considering, and that came out all right, so we struck out the overall 5 percent across-the-board expenditure reduction.

Before concluding, I should like to pay tribute to the Honorable Alan S. Boyd, our first Secretary of Transportation. He brings to this post a distinguished career of public service in the field of transportation. I was impressed by his candor and frankness, as evidenced in our discussions prior to the hearing and during the course of the hearing, and I look forward to a pleasant and productive association with him and the committee in working out the transportation problems that currently afflict us.

I hope that other Senators will speak on this matter.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I shall be glad to yield shortly to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc, and that the bill as thus amended be regarded as original text for the purpose of amendment, provided that no point of order shall be considered to have been waived by reason of agreement to the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Mississippi? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendments agreed to en bloc areas follows:

On page 2, line 3, after the word "determine," strike out "$6,985,100" and insert "$7,800,000".

On page 2, line 13, after the word "statistics", strike out "$5,950,000" and insert "$6,200,000".

On page 2, at the beginning of line 25, strike out "$339,992,500" and insert "$344,429,500".

On page 4, at the beginning of line 17, strike out "$107,014,000" and insert "$121,514,000".

On page 5, line 22, after the word "snowshoes", strike out "$593,326,000" and insert "$618,400,000".

On page 6, line 11, after the word "aircraft", strike out "$30,000,000" and insert "$65,400,000".

On page 7, after line 2, strike out:

"OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NATIONAL CAPITAL AIRPORTS

"For expenses incident to the care, operation, maintenance, improvement and protection of the federally owned civil airports in the vicinity of the District of Columbia, including purchase of seven passenger motor vehicles for police use, for replacement only, which may exceed by $300 the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year; purchase, cleaning and repair of uniforms; and arms and ammunitions; $8,500,000."

On page 7, after line 12, insert:

"OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT

"For expenses incident to the care, operation, maintenance, improvement, and protection of the Washington National Airport including purchase of two passenger motor vehicles for police use, for replacement only, which may exceed by $300 the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year; purchase, cleaning, and repair of uniforms; and arms and ammunition, $3,971,000."

On page 7, after line 21, insert:

"OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DULLES INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

"For expenses incident to the care, operation, maintenance, improvement, and protection of the Dulles International Airport, including purchase of five passenger motor vehicles for police use, for replacement only, which may exceed by $300 the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year; purchase, cleaning, and repair of uniforms; and arms and ammunitions, $4,529,000."

On page 8, after line 5, strike out:

"CONSTRUCTION, NATIONAL CAPITAL AIRPORTS

"For necessary expenses for construction at the federally owned civil airports in the vicinity of the District of Columbia, $160,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the unexpended balances of the appropriations for 'Construction, Dulles International Airport' and 'Construction, Washington National Airport' shall be merged with this appropriation."

On page 8, after line 13, insert:

"CONSTRUCTION, DULLES INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

"For necessary expenses for construction at Dulles International Airport, $160,000 to remain available until expended."

On page 8, line 21, after "1969", strike out "$65,000,000" and insert "$75,000,000".

On page 10, after line 6, insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 303. Funds heretofore appropriated to the Department of the Army for the Libby Dam and Reservoir project in Montana may be used in an amount not to exceed $140,000 in participation with local interests and the Federal Aviation Administration for the construction of an airport facility at Kelley Flats, Montana, in a manner deemed appropriate by the Chief of Engineers."

On page 10, at the beginning of line 20, strike out "$59,833,000" and insert "$60,000,000".

On page 11, line 11, after the word "expended", strike out "$3,770,778,000" and insert "$3,770,945,000"; and in line 15, after the word "and", strike out "$3,012,687,270" and insert "$3,012,854,270".

On page 12, line 16, after the word "with", strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$1,400,000".

On page 12, line 23, after the word "expended", strike out "$20,000,000" and insert "$40,000,000"; and in line 24, after the word "exceed", strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$1,400,000".

On page 13, line 4, after "(80 Stat. 939–40);" strike out "$1,670,000" and insert "$1,780,000".

On page 14, at the beginning of line 20, strike out "$4,000,000'" and insert "$8,000,000".

On page 15, after line 5, strike out:

"GENERAL PROVISION

"SEC. 401. None of the funds provided in this title shall be available for the planning or execution of programs the obligations for which are in excess of $20,000,000 in fiscal year 1968 for 'State and Community Highway Safety'."

On page 16, line 4, after the word "transportation," strike out "$10,300,000" and insert "$16,632,000".

On page 18, line 12, after "(5 U.S.C. 5901; 80 Stat. 299);", strike out "$4,000,000" and insert "$4,291,000".

On page 18, after line 17, strike out:

"SEC. 702. Money appropriated in this Act shall be available for expenditure in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968 only to the extent that expenditure thereof shall not result in total aggregate net expenditures of all agencies provided for herein beyond ninety-five percent of the total aggregate net expenditures estimated therefor in the budget for 1968 (H. Doc. 15)."

Mr. STENNIS. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire. He is the ranking minority member of the committee. He has a fine knowledge of the subject matter and has a special interest in it, and he has contributed greatly to the makeup of the bill.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished chairman of our committee for yielding. My purpose in asking the Senator to yield was not to supplement his very lucid and complete discussion of the contents of the bill. As the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, I wanted to join the Senator from Mississippi in every word he said about Secretary Boyd. I also wanted to say that in the years I have served on the Committee on Appropriations and on subcommittees and listened to the testimony I have never known an appropriation bill to be more fairly or better handled that this bill under the leadership of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. President, I think that perhaps in his career on the bench, the Senator from Mississippi must have learned the art or solved the art of keeping school without offense, because while every witness was treated with the utmost courtesy and consideration, as was every Senator on both sides in the committee. The Senator from Mississippi somehow managed to imply that what we could say in 5 minutes might be just as effective as if we said it in 1 hour and 5 minutes. The result was that I came out of these hearings and out of these deliberations in executive session of the subcommittee less tired and less weary and with as great a satisfaction as I have ever gotten out of any session of any of the various subcommittees, and this does not reflect in any way on the very able chairmen of other committees.

This is a good bill. It has been carefully screened, thanks not only to the chairman of the committee, but also to the members of the committee, and probably to a great extent, the full committee, which is practically in unanimous accord on the provisions of the bill.

Mr. President, the bill is a good job well done, and for that job, much of the credit goes to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I certainly thank the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, for his overgenerous thoughts for my small effort. This has been a team job altogether, and the Senator from New Hampshire certainly contributed more than his share.

Mr. President, I do not intend to try to retain the floor, except to maintain continuity.

Does the Senator from Washington wish to speak in connection with this matter now?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I merely wish to reiterate what has been said by the Senator from New Hampshire with respect to the chairman and the other members of the committee. This was a new subcommittee and it brought together, into the new department, a great variety of agencies dealing with transportation in many of its phases.

I think the committee did a remarkable job in that this was a new bill and we were dealing with a subject that greatly and virtually affects the public. This bill was reported as swiftly as we could while at the same time hearing all the testimony and considering carefully each item.

Witnesses were heard fully, intelligent questions were advanced and responsible debate within the committee took place. It is a pleasure to see on the desks of Senators hearings on an appropriation bill which is one concise volume instead of a great number of volumes. I think we may all take satisfaction in that.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator for his very fine remarks.

These funds were once handled by a subcommittee of which the Senator from Washington was chairman, and he did an outstanding job in that respect and as chairman of the legislative committee. The Senator from Washington was the father and contributed greatly to a major part of this legislation, as did the Senator from New Hampshire and other Senators.

Mr. President, of course, whatever is the pleasure of the Senate is satisfactory to me; but the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Proxmire] had an amendment that is a major proposal. The amendment to be proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin has to do with the supersonic transport. I trust that the Senator will be here shortly to offer his amendment, if that is still in keeping with his wishes. I wish to mention that there are other Senators who wanted to be present.

Mr. President, I wish to make the following statement for emphasis. There is no question about the matter of the supersonic transport. The committee went into the matter fully this year, and heretofore committees have gone into the matter, both the authorizing the committee and the Appropriations Committee.

This matter has been curried, combed, and dissected by committees in the House of Representatives and committees in the Senate. The matter originated with a request by the late President Kennedy that we have to go into this field. Briefly, it is that public financing and long research and development projects are needed to create a supersonic transport.

I have been on the Committee on Armed Services for a long time. One of the things that has impressed me since World War II, as we went from plane to plane in the military, commercial aviation, and the public, as a whole, have gotten the benefit or the fallout from that research and development in the military. We were able to develop the fine passenger planes that we have now. For instance, the first large jet was a tanker, a B-47, and then the B-52. From that was developed one of the large modern transport planes, now the Boeing 707. In fact, they are the same. The Presidential plane today is converted over from one of the KC-135 tankers.

In the past we have gotten the benefit of all of this research and development, but that time has ended. There are no more big bombers on the production lines. This matter is too big an undertaking, it is thought, and it was in those years that it started to be financed by airline companies that America did lag and fall behind.

All proposals as to private financing and public financing of the entire project have been gone over, and that is all explained fully in our official records.

In financing, so far we have appropriated $511 million; this bill carries $142 million.

So that shows that we are passing the hump—that is, $653 million, including what is in the bill, and we will have to spend, then, between $400 million and $500 million to complete the research, development, and building of two prototype planes.

With that brief summary, I shall yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 374 and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 9, line 3, it is proposed to strike "$142,375,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,000,000."

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, my amendment to cut the appropriation for the supersonic transport would do two things. First, it would drastically reduce spending in fiscal 1968 on a major Federal project at a time when a reduction in Federal spending is an urgent necessity. It would do so, I emphasize, not by killing the SST program, but simply by slowing it down. The substantial funds remaining from the previous appropriation for the SST—a total of $124.5 million—would provide adequate support, in my view, for a more gradual development program in fiscal 1968.

The second effect of the amendment, if approved, would be to buy time—time needed to restudy the wisdom of the continued predominance of Federal financial participation in the project; time needed to search for solutions to the sonic boom problem, which is the fatal flaw in this venture—at least, the fatal technological flaw. It would provide the time needed to reexamine with thoroughness and objectivity the relative costs and benefits to the Nation as a whole of a federally developed SST.

Specifically, the amendment would reduce the amount appropriated for the SST for this fiscal year from $142,375,000 to $1 million.

The question I am putting before the Senate by proposing the amendment is: Shall we spend $142 million of the taxpayers' money this year on a project that will directly benefit only a handful of Americans; a project having a potential to impose enormous social and economic costs on every one of us, in order to provide unneeded protection for our thriving aviation industry and a highly uncertain defense for our balance-of-payments position and our national prestige against the grossly overblown threat of an overrated foreign competitor, the Concorde—and this at a time when the President is calling for a 10-percent tax increase in an effort to reduce what is likely to be one of the largest budget deficits in our history?

Are we going to spend $142 million on a supersonic transport that nobody but the aircraft manufacturing industry really wants and nobody but the jet set would use, and then give in to the growing pressures to cut spending on some less glamorous but vital program which lacks the powerful backers the SST has, but which actually offers a solution to some one of our pressing national problems?

Are we going to spend $142 million on a program that in this year of the big deficit is conspicuously absent from every reasonable list of national priorities?

How could anyone place the SST anywhere near the top position the priorities of this Nation warrant?

Are we going to spend it even though cutting it out will not jeopardize at all the ultimate objectives of the program and in the long run could result in a far better SST?

I have said repeatedly that we must cut Federal spending this year before we consider increasing taxes. The House Ways and Means Committee led by its very able chairman, Wilbur Mills, has, in effect, said the same thing by voting this week by an overwhelming and, I can say, an irreversible vote of 20 to 5, to shelve the tax surcharge proposal. Congressman Mills has called for a $7 to $10 billion cut. Some weeks ago I called for a $9 billion cut. I am convinced the President must lead the way in making these reductions but we can provide some guidance by cutting the most nonessential, the most obviously deferrable expenditures such as on the SST, the space program and public works. Admittedly, the $142 million involved here is not large compared to the total spending cut we need to make, but it is a beginning.

Let me say at this point, to defend myself against misinterpretation, that I recognize supersonic flight is inevitable and, if freed of some of the more objectionable liabilities it now carries with it, even quite desirable. I am as enthusiastic as anyone in this body about the prospect of being able to fly from Washington to London in 3 hours instead of 7½. I welcome as much as anyone the prospect of flying from Los Angeles to Sydney in 7½ hours instead of 15½. Pacific flights, in particular, would be made far less grueling with the introduction of SST's. Bringing the Pacific nations closer to us is likely to have significant effects on trade, on tourism, on international understanding—although, I would add, the likely effects can easily be overdrawn.

But, is the duration of the average commercial flight between Washington and London or between Los Angeles and Sydney a national problem of such magnitude that it deserves to be treated with as much concern and have as much public money contributed to it as the crisis in our cities, the education of our children, or the pollution of our air, and our lakes and streams?

Even in the unlikely event your answer to that is "Yes," there is still this question: Will the SST really have much of an impact—in the short run—on door-to-door, city-to-city travel times? Every minute gained in the air seems likely to be all but canceled out by a growth in traffic congestion on the ground and in the holding patterns over our major airports. Furthermore, as planes grow bigger and increasingly noisy, airports will be moved farther and farther away from the central city, adding to the transportation problem.

We have plunged ahead in a hell-for-leather rush to build an SST for one overriding reason: the economic threat of the Concorde. The Russian TU–144 has also been touted as a major threat.

Our SST program has thus been driven by fear of competition rather than by reason. It bears all the marks of undue haste—an inequitable financing plan, loosely drawn contracts and a willingness to overlook, or at least not to meet head-on, serious obstacles such as the sonic boom problem.

Fearful predictions of the serious economic damage the Concorde and the Russian TU–144 will do to our aviation industry have been excessively alarmist.

Our response to this excessive alarm has been a project that, in effect, is a protectionist measure of the sort American administrations of both parties have sought to avoid since the mid-1930's.

What is worse, the protection is unnecessary. Why defend from foreign competition a thriving industry which does not need the protection? Why create more jobs when nearly all of those created by this project demand highly skilled workers for whom the demand already far exceeds the supply?

For example, the Boeing Co.'s backlog of orders for subsonic jets and space and defense items increased from the $3.2 billion of over a year ago to in excess of $5 billion. United Airlines placed an order with Boeing during last summer for 61 subsonic jet transports. That order was worth $520 million. Boeing is in the process of building the world's largest manufacturing plant at Everett, Wash., for construction of the 747 jumbo jet which, in its own way, promises to revolutionize air travel as much as the SST will. To illustrate Boeing's financial prowess, the 747 program was funded by a $700 million financial package the company put together during a period of tight credit in 1966.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield at that point?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I want to associate myself with what the Senator has said as to the lack of urgency for this project. I can say the same thing about the urgency of a manned trip to the moon. Boeing, I think, also participates in the program for going to the moon, does it not—or in one of the space programs—aerospace; is that not true?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am not sure whether it is. I know that it is an enormous force in the aircraft industry. As I have said, Boeing has a vast backlog of orders at the present time; greater, I think, than any aviation manufacturer has had in history.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I join in supporting the Senator's comments as to the urgency for the SST. Last week, I came back from Arkansas in a 747. I think we were an hour and a half in the air from Memphis to Washington, and then we had to circle just under an hour—58 minutes, I believe—after we reached Washington. Thus, even though these planes are quite adequate——

Mr. JACKSON. Will the Senator from Arkansas yield at that point for a correction?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. The 747 is yet to be built.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I mean the 727.

Mr. JACKSON. The 727; that is right.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I apologize. There are so many of these planes with fancy numbers that no one can keep them straight except those who are closely associated with Boeing.

Mr. JACKSON. What does the Senator mean by that?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is obvious.

Mr. JACKSON. I think the Senator——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Boeing is located in the Senator's State. It is the largest employer in the State of Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. That is right. They are heavily engaged in——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is no secret about it. I did not know the Senator was so sensitive about that.

Mr. JACKSON. I am not sensitive about it. But I want to point out to the Senator that from time to time he has made some comments about the military industrial complex.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes——

Mr. JACKSON. As the Senator should know, about 85 percent of Boeing's business in the State of Washington is nondefense—it is commercial. The Senator apparently is not familiar with that.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is very little, if any, distinction between the political influence of those associated with aerospace, or going to the moon, or the SST, because it is all one large industrial-military complex. It now influences, certainly, the financial operations in the Congress, because the Senator from Wisconsin is making, and has made before, an unanswerable case. Under present conditions in this country, to be spending this money on these projects that have no immediate urgency, and then to be asking for a tax increase on top of that, with a deficit of $28 billion, makes no sense at all. If this country is that stupid, it will get what it deserves.

I think the Senator from Wisconsin is absolutely right. I cannot understand why the President or the Congress should insist on this except for the pressure from the enormously influential forces that are interested in this irrational program dominating the Congress. They dominate them through their employees and through their influence back home. I have had people here tell me, "You know, the largest employer in my State makes modules," or makes this or that, "and I cannot afford to take a position which would undermine the jobs of the people there." It is political suicide to do so, it has gotten so big.

The size of the space program is perfectly ridiculous, when there is no sense in getting a man on the moon under present conditions, when we are fighting in Vietnam, when there have been riots in Detroit, and there will probably be other riots.

There is a priority here of putting aside the problems of the cities and other domestic needs and going ahead with this kind of project, which to me is utterly indefensible.

I realize the Senator from Washington has great influence. If he wants to make a correction of what I said as between 747 to 727, he is correct. I do not know how many airplanes or submarines Boeing makes, but it does not make any difference. It is one of the largest single prime contractors in the whole world, certainly in the United States. If it were in my State, I probably would be subject to a different set of ideas, myself, or I would not be here. That is all right. He is perfectly entitled to represent his State. He does it most effectively.

I have traveled on the 722. It brought me here from Arkansas. It took me an hour and a half to get here, and then it circled in the air for an hour. What good would it do to get me here in half an hour and then have to circle for an hour? In fact, it would probably take longer than that, because it would bring so many more people in the air. The congestion in and around the airport is terrible. I am going to Arkansas this afternoon. I will probably have to have a seeing-eye dog to get me through the airport. The jets make so much noise that they make life unbearable for people who live along the Potomac River. Anybody who lives there will tell us that. I do not live there, but I know many people who do.

Nobody knows what they are going to do about the sonic boom. Gene Black, who was the head of a group that looked into this problem, told me they did not know what to do about the sonic boom. They do not know what they are going to do about it, but they are going ahead with the plane. They do not have the airports to handle the airplanes, but they are going ahead.

Mr. PROXMIRE. If I may just say a word at this point, Boeing has been involved very substantially in the space program. It is completing, or has already completed, part of the Minuteman program. It is a part of the very important management team on the Apollo program. So the Senator's statement is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator. The Senator from Washington corrected me on the number of the 727. I had no intention to refer to him or any other Senator. I know Senators react to their constituencies in a proper manner. I do, too. I do not criticize the Senators from Washington. I only envy them their influence by which they have been able to benefit their State. I wish I could do half as much for my State. I am sure their constituents are proud of them.

I do not criticize them. I only point out the truth. If it is not true that the SST has a sonic boom problem, if it is not true that perhaps only one-half of 1 percent of the people would use the SST in the foreseeable future, because it has a restricted use, and it is not going to remake the economy or modes of pleasure, I wish they would show me how it is not true.

I take this opportunity to say this particularly because of the pressures being brought to bear for a tax increase. Pressure is being brought to bear from the administration to cut other programs.

I have in my hand an article written by Joseph R. Slevin, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Oct. 1, 1967]

Big Spending Cut Backers Disregard Painful Lessons

(By Joseph R. Slevin)

Congressional backers of big Federal spending cuts are disregarding some painful lessons in budget arithmetic.

The burden of the lessons is that President Johnson can satisfy Congressional demands for a spending slash of $5 billion or more only by ordering deep cuts in a large number of popular programs. The candidates for the Presidential axe include everything from the school lunch program and the agricultural extension service to small business loans and new Bureau of Reclamation dams.

Congressional Republicans and a big clutch of Democrats have been pushing the spending cuts as their price for supporting the President's Vietnam War surtax. Mr. Johnson agrees that spending has to be reduced. He pledged a cut of more than $2 billion when he sent his tax request to Congress in early August. But the White House insists that there cannot be an additional $5 billion of reductions without drastic cutbacks in programs that command powerful support in Congress and in the country at large.

Slashing Federal outlays by over $5 billion looks manageable when the cut is measured against a Federal spending budget that currently totals more than $141 billion.

The trouble is that most of the $141 billion is beyond Mr. Johnson's control. The startling fact is that any savings will have to come out of a relatively small $21 billion slice of the total budget, including $9 billion that is earmarked to meet the Government's payroll.

A quick look at the rest of the $21 billion shows that it covers $3.2 billion for space, $3.1 billion for the sacrosanct National Institutes of Health and school aid. $1.8 billion to provide surplus food to needy, underdeveloped countries, $1.9 billion for school lunches, food stamps, housing, urban development, and a variety of veterans programs, $500 million for transportation, and $500 million for foreign aid.

The biggest untouchable chunk of Government spending is more than $75 billion that is budgeted for Viet Nam and other defense programs this year. The question is not whether the $75 billion can be reduced but whether it can be kept from going even higher.

Another $45 billion of civilian spending is beyond Mr. Johnson's control because it either is fixed by law or is tied to contracts that the Government cannot breech without huge losses. Major items include $14 billion for interest on the public debt, $5 billion for veterans benefits, $4.4 billion for public assistance grants to the states, $1.9 billion for the jealously guarded farm price supports, and $1 billion to cover the post office deficit.

The President, as this is written, has been steadfastly refusing to give Congress a list of potential spending cuts but high officials privately have been showing lawmakers a teeth-rattling rundown of the kind of slashes that would have to be ordered to chop the $21 billion of relatively controllable civilian programs by $5 billion.

At the top of their list, the Administration officials have a one-third slash in grants to states and local communities for aid to education, school lunches, maternal and child welfare, antipoverty programs, urban transportation, waste disposal, agricultural extension activities, and a broad range of other programs.

New construction of dams and Federal buildings is prohibited. All recently started projects of the Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation are to be halted immediately.

The confidential Administration list includes a 50 per cent slash in new loans including loans to farmers for electricity and telephones, in Federal emergency loans to disaster areas, and in housing, small business, and foreign aid loans.

The closing of some VA hospitals is proposed along with the discharge of a number of doctors and nurses.

The Administration officials even have included a cut in the FBI. They don't think the number of FBI agents is likely to be reduced under any circumstances but they stress that other programs would have to be chopped more severely if the FBI did not bear its share of the $5 billion spending reduction.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The article reads, in part:

> At the top of their list, the Administration officials have a one-third slash in grants to states and local communities for aid to education, school lunches, maternal and child welfare, antipoverty programs, urban transportation—

Urban transportation, when everyone knows the traffic conditions in Washington—

> Waste disposal, agricultural extension activities, and a broad range of other programs.

It states that there will be no new starts. It sounds like it did under the Eisenhower administration. It continues:

> New construction of dams and Federal buildings is prohibited.

Yet we are going to vote to go to the moon. We have already spent many billions on the NASA program, and another appropriation for NASA will come before the Senate soon. Now we want to continue this program, which can cost anywhere from $1 to $5 billion. Invariably the cost turns out to be four or five times what the original estimates were, and that undoubtedly will be the case here.

What purpose does it serve? I do not understand it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a short statement on the amendment which I have prepared.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

I wholeheartedly support the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. Proxmire. This amendment affords an opportunity to defer the expenditure of $141 million without ultimate damage to the role of the government in developing a supersonic transport aircraft. The Senator's amendment would provide $1 million to evidence the government's continuing interest in this project, but the amendment would make a needed reduction of $141 million in the present fiscal year.

There is no urgency for the development of this aircraft. Opportunities for reducing government spending are very few, and this is a non-essential activity which may be postponed. We are faced with the prospect of a $28 billion deficit—enormous incomprehensible expenditures for war and defense—and a tax increase to finance the war in Vietnam.

I read in the *Washington Post* last Sunday that the Administration has plans for a one-third cut in funds for aid to education, school lunches, child welfare, urban transportation, waste disposal, agricultural extension services, and many more necessary programs. This same article reported the possibility of 50% cuts in loans for rural electric cooperatives, disaster loans, and housing and small business loans—and a complete cessation of projects by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation.

There is no justification for a scheme of national priorities which puts supersonic transports, trips to the moon, and anti-ballistic missiles ahead of hot lunches for school children, loans to victims of natural disasters, and aid to education.

The time may come when the nation can afford the luxury of contributions to development of a supersonic transport aircraft, but now is not the time. Let us delay this expenditure until war and defense expenditures have been reduced, until we discern some progress in efforts to purify polluted air and polluted rivers, until we have found ways at least to make progress on the problems of urban violence, unemployment, ignorance, malnutrition, and inadequate health services.

I urge the Senate to approve Senator Proxmire's amendment, and to take this first step toward sanity in redirecting the emphasis of Federal spending. Let us save $141 million now.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I congratulate the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, is the Senator through?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. One more word. The Senator from Wisconsin has stood up here making this fight. I know there are big manufacturers in his State, many of them with important contracts. He has stood here and made his case. He does a thorough research job to back him up. I have read his arguments. I have never found anything inaccurate in them.

I congratulate him on his industry and courage in revealing the facts and in at least making it possible, but not probable, that the Senate could benefit from his wisdom.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in answer——

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I thought the Senator was through.

Mr. PROXMIRE. No, I just started.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I will wait until the Senator is through. Then I will correct the Record.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I very deeply appreciate the statement of the Senator from Arkansas. What he says is unanswerable and completely correct. He has asked the right questions. Who is going to benefit? Why in the world should the taxpayers provide a subsidy for a private operation—which breaks all of our precedents, as has been shown—for the benefit of a very tiny fraction of the American people? Especially is it true when there is so much pressure to reduce Government spending and spending in other fields.

Now I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I just wanted to make the observation, in light of what the distinguished Senator from Arkansas had to say, that I do not think anyone in this body is going to believe for one moment that the late President John F. Kennedy started this program on the SST because of any military-industrial complex. This is the burden of the position of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas. I think it is a very unfair assumption.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. When the program was begun by President Kennedy, it was more of a research program, to see whether it made sense at that time. I do not think it is fair to say the Government or the executive branch of the Government was committed to going ahead with this program. In addition, a great many things have arisen since then. We are spending $30 billion a year in Vietnam. We are going to have a deficit of $29 billion. Yesterday the Senate voted for a cut of $900 million for jobs for the unemployed because we do not have enough money.

We are spending about $70 billion in the military field. I do not think that was anticipated 3 or 4 years ago, when we allocated $30 million or $40 million for this program.

I think the grave question is whether we should not postpone this matter for at least a year.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Six years.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Whether we should postpone the matter for at least a year, or even several years, to determine whether we can afford to go ahead with the program at this particular time, and whether the great demands being made on our economy and on the taxpayers of this country at the present time would not argue that to continue this program, at the moment, does not make a great deal of sense.

Mr. JACKSON. Does the Senator from New York think the late President John F. Kennedy got into this program because of some military-industrial complex?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. No, I do not think that at all.

Mr. JACKSON. That is my point.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. But if we go ahead now, may I say to the Senator from Washington, for whom I have great respect, and who always, in my judgment, decides these matters on the basis of what is in the best interests of the country, and not any selfish interest—I have found that to be true continuously, again and again, as shown by his votes in the Senate—the question I raise is not that, but just the question of whether, in view of the problems facing this country at the moment, in view of the problems which have arisen in this country during the past summer, in view of the problems that we face in Southeast Asia, Latin America, the Middle East, and all over the globe, in view of the fact that we face an expected deficit of $29 billion, with a suggested tax increase, we can really afford to go ahead with the program.

I heard Mr. Webb say yesterday that we are going to have to cut down a great deal on our space program. Perhaps that makes sense; I have asked serious questions about that program.

As I understand, this plane cannot even fly over land. I think there is a grave question, which all of us have to answer, on the issue of priorities. I cannot believe that the Senate of the United States, after acting yesterday to cut out jobs for the unemployed, which are desperately needed, with unemployment growing in our urban and rural ghettos, would today, the very next day, vote for this appropriation, which will cost the United States such a great deal, and will affect less than 5 percent of our population. It does not make any sense whatever to me, when we have just cut out an appropriation to help fellow citizens who desperately need help.

There are a number of other problems with the SST as well. There have been a number of studies, to which the Senator from Wisconsin has referred, which make it clear that the Government should not be investing at this time in the SST. It is probably not going to make money; its effects on the balance of payments will not be very large; it will be hard to avoid either getting into further regulation of airline prices or into an unwarranted subsidy to the manufacturers; most important, it will benefit a very small part of the American people and will have serious adverse effects on a great many people if the aircraft is allowed to fly in the manner that it has to if it is going to be economically viable.

The most important point is that the Government ought to enter into this type of project only if there are substantial public interests that are not private interests. This means that the program ought to benefit a large number of people in a substantial way. The SST program clearly does not do this. About 85 percent of U.S. residents have never flown, those who do fly do not always take long-haul flights, and considerably less than 5 percent of all Americans will ever fly SST's at the higher fare that will have to be charged. Except for businessmen on expense accounts, most people are going to continue to fly subsonic. Furthermore, American SST passengers will be coming from or going to a rather small number of places. Americans living elsewhere may never use an SST at all. On the other hand, the sonic boom is quite likely to affect everybody if the SST goes over land and there will be substantial nuisance value to it even if it is restricted to flying over water. The direct benefits to the public are therefore pretty small.

It has been suggested that there are indirect benefits: for example, the enhancement of national prestige and in the technological fallout from the research and development work. The first point seems to me to be too vague to justify this massive expenditure, particularly under present circumstances of inflationary pressure. The second may justify spending money on some research and development program but there is technological fallout from nearly every research and development program and it is not clear at all that that of the SST will be significantly greater than if the money is spent in some other way.

It is argued that the sale of SST's at $35 million or so each will benefit the balance of payments in the 1970's. This is not at all clear. It is certainly not the whole picture. If the United States sells SST's to foreign airlines, and this leads the foreign airlines to be better able to compete for American traffic, then some of the effects on the balance of payments will be offset by increased American tourist spending on foreign-flag transportation and possibly increased tourist spending abroad if more tourists go as a result of faster transportation. Further, the United States now exports a great many subsonic aircraft. Selling an SST abroad may result in the loss of a sale of an advanced subsonic. This would also reduce the effect on the balance of payments. The best guess of reliable experts is that over 5 years from date of sale the net balance-of-payments benefit to the United States from the sale of an SST will be no more than 5 to 10 percent of its export price, and may be less.

Turning to the pure economics, it appears that the rate of profit on the investment in the SST will be pretty low. Only under the most favorable assumptions does it turn out that such investment will earn the same rate of return as resources invested in manufacturing generally. On other possible assumptions, the SST loses money. The best available estimate is it will earn about 5 percent. This means that unless there is a special public interest in the SST, government investment in the project is an unwarranted, costly waste of resources. The resources used for the SST would be more productive invested elsewhere in the American economy. There are a number of major reasons for this.

One is competition with advanced subsonic aircraft; another is the uncertainty as to how much people are willing to pay for a relatively short decrease in speed; the SST will not reduce time in getting to airports. It will cut a transatlantic flight by a maximum of roughly 3½ hours, maybe less as faster subsonics are introduced. A third is uncertainty as to whether the SST will be permitted to fly over populated areas or allowed to get up to speed close to land, in view of the sonic-boom problem. Incidentally, the bigger you make the plane so as to carry more seats and make it pay off better, the worse the sonic-boom problem becomes.

Aside from the sonic-boom problem, there are other costs of the SST which will not be included in the direct cost to the Government and will have to be incurred to make the SST economical. Principally, sustantial expenditures will be required for improved air traffic control, solar and cosmic radiation monitoring systems, and improved meteorological forecasting. These items could run over a billion dollars from 1970 through

1990. The problem occurs because the SST moves so fast and because wind and temperature have a large impact on fuel consumption and payload.

With all of these problems, I think the Senate should vote to defer the project for the 1 year which the Senator from Wisconsin suggests.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I think the record, with all due respect to the Senator from New York, ought to be clear. On June 9, 1963, President Kennedy stated:

> The Government should immediately commence a program to develop, at the earliest practicable date, a prototype of a commercially successful supersonic transport superior to that being built by any other country in the world.

That is exactly what we would provide for here. We are trying to provide the funds to complete the research, development, and production of two prototypes, in order to be first in the science of aviation.

I think it is of vital importance, not whether 2 or 3 or 5 percent of our people ride the supersonic transports, but that America still be preeminent in the world in the quality, the speed, and the performance of the greatest means of transportation that the world has, which is aviation.

Certainly, every single contribution that has yet been made in aviation research and development has been inaugurated primarily by the infusion of Government money. The greatest plane flying today, the prototype of all the large family of jet transports, including the 727 of the distinguished junior Senator from Arkansas, the oncoming 747, the jumbo jet, and all the others, was developed completely and totally with Government money, on Government contracts for the KC-135, the giant jet tanker that was procured to supply our Strategic Air Command. It was almost identical with the plane from which the 707 developed, and put Boeing first in the manufacture of air transports. Being first, they have continued to lead all the rest of the world in the quality, ability, speed, and performance of American-made planes. I do not think Boeing has any plant or any interest in Oklahoma; but I do think America must have an interest, not in the jet set and not in the few who might want to go first class, in 2 hours and 30 minutes, to England or France, but in producing, in America, the best quality of plane that we can produce. Shall we put that effort in mothballs, and cast away an investment of around $1.2 billion in the world's finest aircraft, which will probably be the parent of all the coming family of long-haul planes?

Certainly, there are a few problems that have not been solved. We have not solved the sonic boom. Nobody claims we have. The whole project is engineered, financed, and projected to fly the air routes of the world, 75 percent of which are over water. Nobody yet has produced any testimony to show that the fish will write their Congressmen, protesting against sonic booms. Anyone who has studied the matter, as I am sure most Senators have, is aware of the fact that when you approach land, you go subsonic about 75 miles away from the airport, while still over the water, and come in as quiet as today's 707's, if not more quietly. All of this talk about sonic booms, and being unable to fly over land, is merely a bugbear to prevent us from spending—not spending, but investing—in this field, in which America is superior, due to World War II research, from France, England, and other countries.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, almost everything that has been said by the Senator from Oklahoma about this supersonic transport, is completedly irrelevant to my amendment. My amendment would not kill the program, but would simply stretch it out, and would slow it down by only a few months, and it would save a very substantial amount of money on a major program.

I know that the Senator from Oklahoma is sincere in saying that private aviation has gained enormously from Government research on military aircraft. I have no objection to that. If private aviation can gain from Government research of the military on supersonic bombers, and so forth, as I am sure they have from the B-70 and the B-55, that is fine; but I say we should not pour hundreds of millions of dollars—this year $142 million—into a specific subsidy exclusively for private aircraft, which the Department of Defense says has absolutely no military value to them, and has made it absolutely clear. Under those circumstances, I think it is quite a different operation.

Furthermore, I should like to point out that whereas 75 percent of the air routes may be over water, in terms of density it is quite different. The flights are overwhelmingly over land. That means, on the basis of the implications of what the Senator from Oklahoma is saying, that you could not make a transcontinental flight in the supersonic transport; you could only use it for the relatively few flights and relatively few people flying over the Pacific or the Atlantic.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to correct the RECORD.

The Senator from New York made a comment that he did not believe that the Senator from Washington had a selfish attitude. I do not, either. I tried to make it clear that he was representing a large industry in his State.

I am very sensitive to the needs of the poultry industry. I am sure that raising broilers is in the national interest. You can call it selfish or not. I do not have any criticism, and did not mean to imply that the Senator from Washington is doing this for his own personal fortune at all.

It is a Senator's duty to represent a large industry in his State; and he represents it well. I thought the comment of the Senator from New York that he did not believe that he took the position he did on a selfish basis may have intimated that I thought he did. Of course I do not. He represents his State properly, as all of us should, and does it extremely well, as does the senior Senator from Washington.

I only wanted to add, with respect to what the Senator from New York said, that in 1963, at the time when this program was initiated, President Kennedy had not sent 500,000 men to Vietnam; we did not have a deficit of $30 billion staring us in the face; and he did not have anything like the domestic difficulties which face us today.

If we had no other burdens pressing upon us, if we were not in a war, and were suffering for lack of something to do with the money, I would say this was all right and would not raise my voice about it.

It was more or less like that. We had plans for going to the moon before we were involved in a war and before we had riots in many of our big cities and before we recognized the need for the kind of training that the poverty program deals with. These conditions are different, however.

This is one of the great troubles with our national policy, and particularly with our foreign policy. We seem unable to recognize that things are different in the world today than they were 15 years ago.

We still have the leading administrator of the executive branch, the Secretary of State, talking as if the same conditions exist today that existed in the day of Stalin. We cannot seem to make the transition from one period to another. This is clearly a matter of low priority.

The President has appealed that we save money. Efforts have been made by him to cut down on as many things as he can. He has made many efforts to save money. I will not belabor the RECORD. However, they are cutting many fundamental programs in my State, programs for water and sewage projects, simple things that any American ought to be entitled to, even in the smaller cities.

The money is not available to make needed loans and grants for water and sewer projects. The old area redevelopment projects, such as we had 2 or 3 or 4 years ago—and they did a wonderful job in my State—are limited now because the money is limited.

All that is provided for the Ozark development program now is enough planning money to barely keep it alive—a few thousand dollars to allow them to make plans.

This is what the attitude is. Surely no one denies that a great effort is being exerted to cut all important nondefense, nonmilitary, nonspace, and nonaircraft industry expenses in this country.

I do not think it is wise. I think it is against the long-term interests of the country. I do not understand why we do not see what the Concorde is like. It is supposed to be out in 1970. My guess is that it will have more bugs than our SST will have.

I do not think that any disaster will take place. I would like to see the project delayed. It would make me feel better about a tax bill.

I notice that the Secretary of Defense gave notice the other day that he has a new idea on how to save money. The Secretary said that it costs a billion dollars a year to operate the early warning defense system and that by spending $4 billion more now, we can save half of that amount.

The Secretary is a very good figurer. If he could make it $8 billion, perhaps we could really get rich.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the excessive alarm generated by the Concorde is based on an extremely optimistic view of the market prospects for supersonic transports relative to subsonic jets. These fears ignore the enormous comparative advantage enjoyed by our aviation industry in international trade—an advantage so great that we provide most of the commercial aircraft for the free world. It will take more than the Concorde with its serious limitations to destroy or even damage that comparative advantage.

The jumbo jets our aircraft industry is building now will be flying long before the Concorde is introduced and they are sure to be a big factor in maintaining our trade advantage. The jumbo jets offer the very attractive prospect of much lower air fares because of their high payload capacity. Because of their great size, a few airlines are talking about turning some of these huge planes into flying luxury liners with all the comforts of the Queen Elizabeth. The SST's may have a tough job displacing them. The SST's will be selling speed. The jumbo's will be selling comfort and low fares. Which will the customers choose? It is anyone's guess. But putting all the marbles on SST's or Concordes may be a bad bet. The threat of the Concorde, which has frightened us into this venture, could very well turn out to be a myth.

The Concorde is already in a dozen different kinds of trouble. Its costs are running far beyond original estimates which projected an estimated cost-per-plane of $10 million. The cost per plane is now up to $20 million, according to Sir George Edwards, the managing director of the British Aircraft Corp., which is one of the two manufacturers in the British-French consortium building the plane. The most recent estimate of expected total development costs put it at $1.5 billion. A report just made by the British Committee of Public Accounts, a public spending watchdog, warns, however, that the total development costs by the time the Concorde takes to the air is likely to have reached $2 billion.

This, to understate it, does not please the British, who are embroiled in serious economic difficulties anyway. The Committee of Public Accounts urged in its report that both the French and British Governments immediately establish machinery to review the entire program. Newsweek magazine reported, in the latest issue out, that members of the British Cabinet have been arguing privately that the Concorde looks less and less like a productive investment and are urging the Government's participation in the program be discontinued.

Because the Concorde will have a fixed wing instead of a hinged wing like our SST, it will be able to fly economically only at supersonic speeds and thus will be highly vulnerable to sonic boom limitations. That means they will have a great deal of trouble unless they fly people from one ocean port to another ocean port, across one ocean. And there is mounting evidence that these limitations will be adopted. The city of Santa Barbara, Calif., passed an ordinance a few weeks ago prohibiting flights over the city that would produce sonic booms. Legislation is being considered in the Swedish Parliament to ban supersonic flights over that country causing booms that would be capable of waking a sleeping person. The Swiss Government, concerned about avalanches caused by sonic booms, is known to be considering similar legislation as is the Government of West Germany.

I can recall so vividly when the B-58 was making trial supersonic runs over Milwaukee, the tremendous amount of mail and calls I received, not to mention the damage charged against the Government at that time.

The only reason this boom was accepted at all by the people of my State was because they recognized the military necessity and military purpose. However, we can imagine the views of the people when these planes are flown by individuals carrying people for pleasure or for commercial purposes with no relationship whatsoever to defense or the national interest.

Let me say at this point that I think sonic boom limitations have the same serious implications for our own SST, despite the fact that it will be able to fly at something less than prohibitive costs at subsonic speeds. Why spend $4 or $4.5 billion developing a plane capable of flying at supersonic speeds when it will be forced to fly much of the time at subsonic speeds?

As was pointed out in the discussion with the Senator from Oklahoma, while 75 percent of the world's air routes are over water, most of the fights are over land, and the intensity factor is much greater over land.

The answer FAA officials would give to that, if they could speak freely, is that they have every expectation that people will learn to accept the boom. The SST's will start by flying the ocean routes. And soon the economic pressures of flying these high-cost planes on limited routes will force admission of the planes to a few scattered land routes. And ultimately they will be flying everywhere. And we will all live out our lives in an immense drop forge foundry.

At any rate, I simply do not believe the Concordes are the big threat they are reputed to be. I believe we can afford to delay our own program as much as 2 years without our aircraft trade account suffering any damage at all. The pending amendment would slow it down less than a year. In fact, the Institute for Defense Analyses, which projected potential demand for the SST to 1990 for the FAA, declared that if introduction of our SST were pushed back from the current target of mid-1974 to a new target of mid-1976, the total number of Concordes and SST's sold would ultimately be substantially identical to the number sold if there had been no 2-year slip. A 2-year delay, in other words, would make almost no difference at all. And that is just what the pending budget-cutting amendment would achieve.

If this is true, why should we appropriate $142 million in fiscal 1968 for the SST, when the Vietnam war costs continue to mount, when we are facing a serious budget deficit?

We are not really in a race with the Concorde, anyway. The Concorde and the Russian TU-144 will be made of aluminum. A plane with aluminum skin, flying at supersonic speeds for the long periods of time and with the frequency required by airlines, pushes aluminum to its very limit. Aluminum will not stand up with the friction heat that is generated. If what is necessary is a heat-resistant titanium, that puts us in an entirely different ball game, and no one is even in the ball park with us. It means we can take all the time we need to build the best plane possible. Any SST that does not incorporate some solution to the sonic boom problem will not be a good plane and is not worth spending money on, because sonic boom restrictions will make any such plane—whether it is American or Anglo-French—a commercial failure.

One of the principal justifications for undertaking the SST program is that it would make a substantial contribution to our foreign receipts. We must build the SST, we are told, because that is the only way we can defend ourselves from the severe negative impact on our balance of payments that would result from the sale of Concordes to U.S. airlines and the displacement of U.S.-built subsonic planes in foreign airline fleets.

I should like to point out, however—incidentally, this is a point that has been relied on by the aircraft industry in big advertisements in the newspapers and by proponents in the Senate, in the House, and elsewhere—that the U.S. Treasury, the U.S. Commerce Department, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and the Budget Bureau are the agencies in the Government with the responsibility for overseeing our balance of payments. They are the agencies possessing the greatest expertise on this subject. But not one of these four agencies has made public a single word of comment on the balance of payments effect of the SST program. What do the experts tell us about the balance-of-payments effect?

The public has been treated to ex parte statements. We have not heard any evaluation from responsible executive expert bodies. Since the balance-of-payments question has loomed so large in debate on the SST, the Senate cannot act intelligently on this appropriation until the whole balance-of-payments question has been subjected to expert analysis on an impartial basis.

Two economists in the Office of Business Economics, in the Department of Commerce, did submit private comments to the FAA evaluating this question; and they concluded that only if the SST did not impair our competitive position in world markets for subsonic planes could the balance-of-payments effects of the SST be favorable. I believe this is a highly questionable assumption. It seems clear to me that if we produce the SST, it will be in competition with our own subsonic jets that we would otherwise sell overseas.

The Institute for Defense Analyses,

which draws on a stable of superb economists, arrived at essentially the same conclusion, in a special study for the FAA. IDA agreed there would be an effect on the balance of payments but said it could just as easily be either very minor on the positive side or even slightly negative if export sales of American SST's reduced exports of American subsonic planes or if U.S. airlines lost passengers to foreign airlines operating American SST's.

In view of the wide disagreements among economists on this question, the FAA's independent claim that the SST will make a huge cumulative contribution to our balance-of-payments position is preposterous and impossible to substantiate.

The uncertainties of any forecast concerning the balance of payments are large enough to make a firm narrow-range estimate impossible. What happens is that the assumptions you use are enough to create the result. That is precisely what the FAA has done. Because it wants the program, it has used sufficiently optimistic assumptions to create a result that justifies its want. This is no way to make either a governmental or a business decision.

The FAA analysis ignores the fact that the likely high fares on the SST will limit it, to some extent, to high-income passengers. This means that regardless of who owns the SST's, Americans—because of their affluence—would make up the largest proportion of SST passengers. As a result, our travel balance might well be much less favorable.

What I am saying is that if we, with our terrific manufacturing capacity, build many SST's, it will mean that there will be more flights overseas. It will mean that Americans will fly overseas and spend their money overseas. Will this have a favorable effect on our balance of payments? Of course not. The big effect of this development will be unfavorable to our balance of payments, because one of the most adverse elements in our balance of payments is American tourist dollars spent overseas.

The FAA analysis is defective because it pays attention exclusively to the revenue from sales of the SST abroad and totally ignores the income that would be generated abroad by the use of the planes sold—which also would have an effect on our balance of payments.

The FAA, in effect, has done a sum in which you count all the plus items—the receipts—and leave out a good many of the minus items—the loss of other receipts.

There is another factor—the most important factor of all—that must be considered in analyzing the balance of payments and the SST's effect on it. That is the time factor. The balance of payments is a time factor. It is not a problem in 1975 or 1980. It is a problem today, and now.

The SST will not go on the market until 1974—at the very earliest. By then, we may have extricated ourselves from Vietnam, and thus drastically reduced our military commitments abroad; and our foreign aid by then may be reduced relative to our gross national product. As a result, we might be running an embarrassingly large surplus in our balance of payments.

Of course, one of the big elements in our adverse balance of payments, is the fact that we have troops overseas, particularly our Vietnam experience, which is probably contributing, on the basis of the best estimates I have seen, up to $1 billion to our adverse balance of payments. Are we going to have 500,000 troops in Vietnam in 1974, which will be the first time that the SST can be sold by American manufacturers? Foreign aid, too, contributes somewhat to our adverse balance of payments. That is likely to diminish in relation to our gross national product. Of course, the biggest element in our adverse balance of payments today is American investment abroad.

There is every prospect that within 8 or 10 years we will be in a position where American investment abroad is bringing in far more than we are expending in investment abroad, because, by and large, the return from investment abroad is very substantial.

Under those circumstances, there is a real prospect that we could have a very favorable—almost an embarrassingly favorable—balance of payments by 1974 or 1975. That is why the President has reiterated, and so has the Secretary of the Treasury, that the balance-of-payments problem is a problem for now. That is why they have put into effect strictly temporary measures for curbing our adverse balance of payments.

Many economists question whether the balance-of-payments issue is even a valid one in connection with a decision on the SST. It seems to me quite possible that it is a fake issue or one that simply cannot be adequately assessed. Prof. Charles Kindleberger of MIT, one of this country's leading international economists, said in a letter to me several months ago:

> The United States ought to decide whether to invest in the SST on the basis of the cost-benefit criteria related to tastes and productive resources, not the balance of payments. The latter concept relates to liquidity, or the cash position, and should not have a major impact on expenditure decisions.

So the balance-of-payments issue is really an irrelevant one in deciding on the SST. If it is unwise, the balance of payments does not change that.

But I cannot regard it as irrelevant that the Treasury Department in particular has made no assessment that would assist our decisionmaking. If the FAA claim is true—and I believe it is not—the Treasury should be interested enough to say so in favor of such a substantial difference to our balance of payments. If the FAA claim is false, I would like to have the Treasury's estimate as a more valid basis for making a decision.

Mr. President, at this point I should like to review briefly the kind of money we have tied up in this project.

Congress has appropriated since fiscal 1962 a total of $511 million for a supersonic transport development. The total would go to $653 million if the amount recommended by the Appropriations Committee is approved.

Booz, Allen & Hamilton predict that the Government will have to fund the major part of the cost of the certification stage and some of the costs of the production stage.

Mr. President, Booz, Allen & Hamilton are financial consultants, and I think they are in a far better position to make an assessment in this matter. They have studied it, and they are an efficient financial firm.

They say that the Government will have to pump in another $1.3 billion which will jump the sum to $2.6 billion.

If their figures are correct, as they always are on these matters, the Government investment would go far higher at that time.

In my judgment, it will be at least $4 billion.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator has stated that the Federal Government, after developing these two prototypes, will have to "pump in" $1.3 billion. I think the Senator owes an explanation to the Senate as to what he means by "pump."

Is it to provide for the revolving credit financing of the plane sold to airlines, which will be repaid when the plane is resold, or is it money never to be recovered? The word "pump" is very ambiguous and it is misleading. I am sure that the distinguished Senator does not wish to be indefinite in this matter.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I shall elaborate in considerable detail in a moment as to why I think this is likely not to be recoverable, and why the contract is so badly drafted that the taxpayers will not get any of this money back.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Does the Senator honestly believe that?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I certainly do and I think I can demonstrate that to the satisfaction of observers.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I was interested in the terminology that the Senator used when he referred to "pump." I wonder if the Senator was talking about an approved and certificated supersonic transport which is sold and put under a temporary mortgage and is subject to long-term financing, perhaps by an insurance company, or what does "pump" mean?

Mr. PROXMIRE. This is not the view of the Senator from Wisconsin. This is the view of Booz, Allen & Hamilton.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am sure they did not use the word "pump" without clarifying or defining it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Whether it will be pumped in, vested in, or expended on behalf of research with sincere conviction that it will be paid back—although I am convinced it will not be paid back—it is the view of these experts that if we are going to get a supersonic transport beyond the prototype stage and in a position to be sold commercially when finished, the Government liability will be $2.6 billion.

Mr. MONRONEY. Industry contributed to that, but if the Senator is talking about another $1.3 billion I think he owes the Senate a detailed explanation as to where this money is coming from and what is meant by the word "pump."

Mr. PROXMIRE. The source of the money is the American taxpayer. The source of it is the same as the source of the other money. The American taxpayer. The argument for it will be the same argument as now. The argument will be that we have gone so far with this matter that we should not give up; that we have so much in the pot in this poker game that we cannot withdraw. It will be said that we have put in $1.3 billion and we cannot afford not to press on and up the ante. This is the kind of argument which will be used to persuade us to go forward.

I realize that the FAA has assured us that our commitment is limited, but on the basis of the best advice of financial experts who have studied the matter and who favor the project, and incidentally, who were employed by the FAA, we are going to have to expend—if the Senator prefers this phrase—an additional amount.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator adds $1.3 billion to this amount. He seems not to be able to identify what it is, as to whether it is a loan to be paid back on a short-time basis by the airlines, who are capable of meeting financing. They have financing by giant insurance companies who look on aircraft financing as one of their best sources for extending credit. This is the only way I can possibly see how the Senator contributes an additional $1.3 billion to the cost.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Booz, Allen & Hamilton say the Government will have to fund a major share of the cost of the certification stage and some of the cost of the prototype stage, in their judgment, if this is going to be commercially successful. These are people with great reputations as financial experts and they are one of the 2 or 3 top financial firms in the country.

Mr. MONRONEY. They are a good firm. The Senator realizes this is a charge against Boeing Aircraft and the profits made by this airline, and the production credit as this plane goes down the line. If one is sold to American Airlines, United Air Lines, I have no objection and I am sure the Government is taking no risk in connection with production credit for delivery of these planes during the course of manufacture.

It is as good as a loan and as good as any financing you could get. This is no giveaway or a risk of capital. This is as normal as bread and butter, and yet the Senator would make this look like it is high risk, speculative, and uncertain when he talks about the money that is going to be cranked into this in trying to conjure up something in connection with the development of the plane.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Perhaps it would be helpful to have the actual figures involved in the additional investment. I have an article before me which appeared in the American Economic Review, by Stephen Enke. I understand he was involved as a Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense in this matter as it developed.

He states:

> If the U.S. Government is initially to finance 80–90 percent of the U.S. SST's development costs, and if up to $4 or $5 billions of American resources must somehow be invested in development and manufacture before the program generates a net cash inflow from sales to airlines, on obvious economic test of the U.S. SST's justification is its ability to earn the 10-15 percent rate of return earned on an average by domestic resources employed in U.S. industry.

Is it correct that before this program is completed the taxpayer is going to have to put up $4 to $5 billion?

Mr. PROXMIRE. There is a very great difference of opinion in the Senate on this matter. The contention of those who support the program say the liability is limited to $1.2 billion. They contend this amount will be repaid.

I disagree strongly with that contention and say that on the basis of the judgment of the financial consultants, and I accept their view, it is going to cost $2.6 billion on the basis of our experience with research programs in the military and so forth. I think that is optimistic. It is much more likely to cost $4 billion or more.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. When the Senator mentions $1.3 billion, is that only through the prototype stage?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct. That would be through two prototypes.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Are taxpayers' funds necessary after the prototype is developed?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The view of Booz, Allen, and Hamilton is that the additional cost to achieve certification and a plane capable of certification and additional construction costs will entail, in their view, a further Federal Government investment, a further taxpayer investment, which will amount to $2.6 billion or $1.3 billion more involved in the later stage.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Could we ascertain from the Senator from Washington or one of those Senators who support this matter whether they can give assurance to the Senate that no more than $1.3 billion will be spent?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I must turn to the testimony of all witnesses who assure us that there is no Government commitment whatsoever beyond $1.2 billion.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I understand that there is no commitment, but the point the Senator from Wisconsin is raising, and what is said also in the recent objective reports, and the Booz, Allen & Hamilton study, is that it will cost $3 billion, $4 billion, or $5 billion.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The entire cost of the project might, but I do not think Federal Government funds will be involved when we reach this point. The financial investment by the Federal Government in this airplane, that is the amount of money it will have put in, I do not think need trouble anyone at all because, as the Senator from Oklahoma has pointed out the Government commitment, as it now stands, ends when two prototypes are built and each flies 100 test hours. I do not know how Booz, Allen & Hamilton arrived at its estimate and come to a different conclusion but hundreds of experts have looked into this program. Reams of testimony have been printed. The committee examined this project with a fine tooth comb, as did the House and its committees.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Could I ask the Senator——

Mr. MAGNUSON. Let me finish please.

The Senate committee did not decide upon the amount of the appropriation. The House did. The House had a rollcall vote on it and decided it.

The House, as we all know well, is aware of the fiscal condition of the budget. This SST project was part of the administration budget. The House has already reduced the budget request by $50 million. The Senate committee went along with that action. These contracts and commitments were screened for 18 long months by a special committee appointed by the President. It included Mr. Eugene Black and Mr. John McCone—and Mr. Stanley Osborne. After 18 months it was decided that the financing embodied in the present contract was the best course and no further commitment was made.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. What concerns me is that it appears, from some of the objective studies which have been made as to what it will cost—the airplane itself, to develop from the prototype of the plane, and then the plane which will actually fly and be utilized—all this will cost the Federal Government a great deal more money.

Second, I do not believe we have the airports now which can accommodate this kind of airplane. As I understand it, the Los Angeles authorities will have to construct a special airport further away, which will mean an extra long period of time to go to and from such an airport.

Further, this plane will not be able to fly over land, or take a trip from Oklahoma to California, or Oklahoma to New York, or from Chicago to New York, or from the Midwest to the Far West, or to the East. It is not going to be able to fly over Europe, either.

I think it is a splendid thing for the airlines to do. I think it is a splendid thing for the airplane manufacturers. But I do not understand what the taxpayers of America will be getting out of it, particularly during this critical and crucial period of time in our history.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I should like to answer that——

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. That is why I raise the question.

Mr. MAGNUSON. When this airplane was first proposed, and it has been in the proposal stage for almost 12 years, many airplane companies worked on it. No design was ever suggested at any time, even during the industry competition, that would have precluded the airplane using any of our major airports today.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. If I may interject there, we cannot get an airplane into any regular airport today, let alone this kind of plane.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The SST will not make any difference. The Senator is correct, as everyone knows, the planes of today are stacked up over every one of our major airports. The SST and the Jumbo 747 jets might even help because they will carry more passengers, thus perhaps lessening the number of airplanes flying and trying to take off and land at our airports.

Mr. PROXMIRE. There is a technical point here. RAND technicians have informed us recently that this plane is likely to weigh 900,000 pounds—that is, if it is to become a real possibility—so, a plane weighing that much would certainly constitute a real problem for our present runways and we would have to do something about new runways.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Well, the RAM technicians are in conflict with 213 aviation engineers and technicians who worked on the SST specifications for two and a half years.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. If this plane is as good as the Senator from Washington says it is, why do not the aviation manufacturers make this plane and keep the Government out of it? If it is such a great plane, why not let private industry do it and keep Government out of it?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Because no one aircraft company has the tremendous financial resources needed to do it by itself.

The late President, in Colorado, made clear the necessity for moving ahead to maintain American air superiority at that time. In a speech there in 1961 he suggested that this SST was a matter on which the Government must proceed, and he was hopeful that there would be Government participation. President Kennedy suggested formula of 75 percent Government participation-25 percent industry. Long hearings were held in the Commerce Committee—about a year and a half ago—chaired by the Senator from Oklahoma, and we determined that that figure was not quite equitable. Thus, the commitment the Presidential Advisory Committee worked out, after 18 months of study, provides the present formula.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That was the position which the Assistant Secretary of Defense, after careful study, took, to wit, that it should be built and it would be much better for private industry to build it. The answer to the Senator's question is that there is no very good reason for the Federal Government to come in on this, under any circumstances.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Well, that argument was settled long ago. At this point, I just want to answer and hope to clear up to the best of my ability some of the technical questions raised here.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I appreciate that.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am not an aeronautical engineer. I did not propose nor start the SST project myself. The design competition was keen. The Boeing Co. happened to win the airframe part of the competition. Its headquarters, of course, is in my State. That is all well and good. I am not embarrassed to talk about it. I would be just as concerned and just as enthusiastic, after all these years, of going through this SST project, both in the Appropriations and Commerce Committees if "company B" were doing it, or Lockheed, or North American, or Douglas, because I think it is good for America.

I am talking about superiority in the air. Now we can talk about all the social programs we want—and I have always enthusiastically supported these programs, and I know something about the pressing and urgent needs of our country—I have been voting for the social needs of this country in Congress for 31 years. I think I know a little bit about them. I think I am keenly aware of them. But I also know that we have to have some economic programs going to keep business alive and prospering, to provide new job opportunities and to preserve the health of one of America's great industries. We must be concerned with our unfavorable balance of payments, and many other things—in order to draw tax revenue into the Treasury to pay for our important social programs. I think the SST project happens to be one of great economic and technological importance for the future. I think it will eventually return to the Treasury much more than we ever will invest in it. This has been the history of Government investments in science and technology, and other areas of investment, including many public works projects.

The Senator from Colorado and I have sat in committee, hour after hour, for 6 years, listening to testimony on this subject. At first, we were skeptical, too. We were not sure it would fly. But I bow to the aeronautical engineers who have brought this concept to life. The financing part of the project, I think, has been gone over as thoroughly and with as fine a toothcomb by these same committees and the financial aspects of the program have been called fair and equitable by some of the most expert and knowledgeable men in this field.

I do not think that the motives of the junior Senator from Washington or myself should be impugned because we happen to have in our State a company which makes the most successful commercial airplanes in use today. About 80 percent of the people in the world are flying in Boeing airplanes today. I am sure there is no contribution which the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] and I make to the fine airplanes which Boeing produces. They just happen to be doing that. And I am confident they will do likewise with the SST. When Boeing makes a bad airplane, it will be a long, blue Monday for the world. Furthermore, I think the SST will be a good financial investment for the airlines.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin has the floor.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I go back to the point I made earlier, that perhaps this would make a good deal of sense if the world in which we live were different and the problems that face the country were different, but we are not talking here in a vacuum. We are talking about a war that is going on, and we are talking about the problem of our country facing a deficit of $29 billion, according to President Johnson. Perhaps I would look at it in an entirely different way if it were not for our internal problems. I know the Senators from Washington are much more aware of some of those problems than I am.

Mr. MAGNUSON. As the Senator knows, I was fighting on the floor 2 weeks ago for 5 long days trying to establish the proper priorities for some of these important housing and urban needs.

The House approved the $142 million SST appropriation by a 3-to-1 vote. That is the way the House voted, with all the priorities they are so keenly aware of over there. We, in the committee, merely accepted the House figure.

I think we must look ahead to keep our superior position in every way, including working for the vital domestic programs for which the Senator from New York so diligently labors, we must consider our balance-of-payments problem, and try to assure increasing tax revenues to pay for some of the social and urban programs we have been fighting so hard for.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Three hours ago the administration was in favor of cutting $198 million from the poverty program which would have provided jobs. Now it is supporting this kind of legislation and thinks it is important to have this kind of program. I think it is also important to have the other.

Mr. MAGNUSON. As you know, I voted against that administration cut, but that additional money was not budgeted. This SST appropriation is a budgeted item.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. If it was not budgeted, that means the administration was against it. Now the administration is suggesting this. It is the fact that it is a budgeted item that concerns me.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I do not want to prolong this debate. I simply wish to emphasize that this country has to remain great and strong in all fields. We cannot quit seeking to strengthen our economy and our industrial development, because then Mother Hubbard's cupboard—or the Treasury if you wish—would be bare, and we could not fund some of the programs that the Senator from New York and I so strongly favor. Commercial transport development is one of the fields in which we should move ahead. I think the amount of money we are asking you to provide today will keep us abreast of this field and is well worth while as we look toward the future and try to guarantee that more tax dollars will flow into the Treasury in the future.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. To clear up the matter of the $1.3 billion, this is not Federal money. It is a fact that if this plane is unsuccessful this money will not be used, because there would be no mass production of supersonic aircraft. They have to be manufactured and completed before long-term financing can be had on them from the insurance companies or banking institutions. The $1.3 billion figure is working capital. What the Senator is talking about, with respect to the $1.3 billion that would be underwritten, is what would happen if there was a great credit demand and success and demand for the plane.

Mr. PROXMIRE. This $1.3 billion would be after the prototype but before certification.

Mr. MONRONEY. There will be no drag on production credit until after certification. These prototypes are going to have to go through certification. One hundred and thirty of them have already been sold, with big deposits, to almost every American airline, running into $52 million. So we are talking about production credit. The Senator is worrying about total production credit, but I am saying that until the plane is a huge success they will not need that credit. If it is a success, Boeing will put under construction at least 300 supersonic aircraft, the price tag of which is $40 million per copy.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think I can explain my position better if I can proceed with my statement. The likelihood of getting back the huge initial Federal investment is very small in view of the weaknesses in the contract.

Mr. MONRONEY. There are no weaknesses in the contract. The plane is the important thing. The insurance companies will not insure an unfinished plane, but when it is finished, they will insure the plane. It is that span that we are talking about, in view of the high number to be served. This amount of money will be required only if the plane is very successful and if the sales appear to be mounting.

Mr. PROXMIRE. There is an overlap of $1.3 billion between prototype and certification, tooling up, and so forth, before the plane will be sold in sufficient amounts, according to the Booz-Allen estimates.

To continue with my statement, we are spending all of this money on a project that has never been specifically authorized by Congress. The statutory authority upon which all appropriations for the SST have been based thus far is the implied authority of section 312 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, which allows the FAA to procure "experimental aircraft." Is the Congress going to allow billions of dollars of public funds to be committed to development and construction of a contraption that may well be irrelevant to the country's real needs without even taking a hard look at both sides of the issue.

I want to come now to the point so properly raised by the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY]. The possibility of totally or predominantly private financing of the SST has never been adequately explored. I think the magnitude of Federal spending on the SST has reached a point where a thorough reconsideration of this alternative would be appropriate. Such studies as there have been on this question have been suppressed. One I am referring to in particular was completed 2 years ago. It was done by now Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, Robert H. Charles. It was made public only a month ago after columnists Rowland Evans and Robert Novak got wind of it. One of the major conclusions of the Charles report was that extensive direct Government assistance to SST development would mean Government control which would result in a less satisfactory and more costly SST. The Government currently is financing directly 80 to 90 percent of the project's costs. Mr. Charles concluded, on the basis of a very detailed study, that the entire cost of development and production of the SST could be financed privately if the Government insured part, but at no time more than half, of the risk.

One compelling reason for exploring more intensively the possibility of total private financing is this: It has not been proven that the SST would directly benefit anyone beyond the 1 or 2 percent of the population who ride in these planes. It is unfair for a democratic government to use public funds to finance a project that will directly benefit only 1 or 2 percent of the population while imposing both a tax levy on all Americans as well as the additional cost of sonic boom damage to property, the deterioration of health due to an increase in noise pollution and the potential damage to the free enterprise system that would flow from the predicted bankruptcy of some airlines and the monopolization of aircraft manufacturing.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Would the Senator clarify how many people it is estimated, or what percentage of the population it is estimated, will use the plane?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The estimate I made was based on the percentage of the people who now fly, the estimate of the percentage of people who fly overseas; and, to be fair to the proponents, it was assumed that the number might double or triple.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. What percentage of Americans does the Senator think are apt to use the plane?

Mr. PROXMIRE. One or two percent.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. One or two percent of the population of the whole country are likely to use the SST?

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is my view, but if the figure were 5 percent, the argument is almost just as good.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Is it also correct that traveling on the SST will be more expensive than on the subsonic plane?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Well, travel on the SST may be at a fare comparable with present costs. It might be a little lower. On the best estimates I have seen, it is likely to be substantially higher than on the jumbo jets which will be coming into production in 1970 or so, which are so much bigger than the present planes and which will fly at 600 miles an hour, and are likely to provide great competition.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Has the Senator worked out at all what the additional cost will be in more electronic equipment and more safety equipment and new airports if we go ahead with the SST?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I have no estimates at all on the cost of the new airports. We understand the weight of the SST may make the cost higher. We do not know. We have not worked it out. On the other hand, we have made the assumption that the estimates by the FAA may be reasonably accurate. We have had to increase the projected cost of the Concorde. It was estimated originally at $10 million a plane. Now it has already increased to $20 million. It is likely to be much higher.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Again going back to this article by Stephen Enke, he anticipates and predicts that the cost of additional airports, and additional equipment for the airports, because of the SST, will be at least several billions of dollars, which will have to be added to the cost if we go ahead with this airplane.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the entire article to which I have referred.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It would be very helpful.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the American Economic Review, Vol. LXII, No. 2, May 1967]

COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS FOR GOVERNMENT DECISIONS—GOVERNMENT-INDUSTRY DEVELOPMENT OF A COMMERCIAL SUPERSONIC TRANSPORT*

(By Stephen Enke)

The U.S. Government is expected to spend $2 billion or more to develop a commercial supersonic transport (SST) that will be safe, profitable, and available for airline use around 1974.

Among the major policy questions now being raised by the U.S. SST program are: (1) Is a U.S. SST economically justifiable? (2) Why is federal assistance necessary? (3) How much of its expenditures on the SST should the federal government recover, and through what means? (4) How can government finance an SST monopoly, and yet protect the public interest without concerning itself with aircraft prices, flight frequencies, and passenger fares? (5) Are the benefits of the SST sufficiently general to justify a federal subsidy of its development and possible manufacture?

The answers to these questions are of very broad interest because the U.S. SST may be the first of several federal government programs to develop products of advanced technology for commercial use.

SST'S ECONOMIC JUSTIFICATION

The President has declared that the U.S. SST must be safe and "profitable," but what is the interpretation of profitable and how can it be estimated far in advance?

Airline managements presumably will not buy an SST unless it can earn as much on its investment cost as can be earned on the advanced subsonics of the 1970's (e.g., the Boeing 747). Practically, this means that SST prices, flight costs, and receipts must permit a return of about 20 percent before taxes and interest. (Publicized "orders" for SST's are revocable until performance and prices are known.)

What airframe and engine manufacturers must ordinarily expect to earn from a new aircraft is more uncertain. Realizations have often been far worse than expectations, and several new commercial aircraft of the past ten years have lost money for their manufacturers (e.g., Convair 880). Expectations of profit must presumably be higher the greater are the sums to be risked and the greater the dispersion of possible financial outcomes.

---

*The author wishes to acknowledge contributions from Drs. Arnold B. Moore, Edward H. Rastatter, and John A. Walgreen.

If the U.S. government is initially to finance 80–90 percent of the U.S. SST's development costs, and if up to $4 or $5 billions of American resources must somehow be invested in development and manufacture before the program generates a net cash inflow from sales to airlines, an obvious economic test of the U.S. SST's justification is ability to earn the 10–15 percent rate of return earned on an average by domestic resources employed in U.S. industry.

Whether the resource and money costs sunk in the U.S. SST's development and manufacture can earn a 10–15 percent rate of return depends upon: (1) costs of development, for airframe and engine; (2) costs of manufacture, for airframe and engine, as a function of production rate, cumulative output, and calendar date; (3) operating costs per plane mile, as a function of various performance parameters (e.g., specific fuel consumption) and permissible altitude of transonic acceleration; (4) operating receipts per plane mile, as a function of seating capacity, load factor (percentage capacity sold), and fare levels; (5) availability of supersonic passengers, as a function of number of long-haul passengers, subsonic passenger fares, willingness to pay more for less time in the air, and extent to which sonic boom nuisance restricts available routes and schedules. All of these factors remain shrouded in uncertainty.

Development costs of aircraft have often been underestimated by a factor of two—especially where the necessary state of art has yet to be attained.

SST operating profits are extremely sensitive to specific fuel consumption, lift-drag ratio (a measure of aerodynamic efficiency), and aircraft weight empty. Of its maximum gross take-off weight of maybe 650,000 pounds 10 percent or less will be payload and about 45 percent will be fuel. An X percent improvement in fuel economy, if translatable into greater seating capacity, could increase net flight receipts by perhaps 3X percent, proportionately increasing the selling price the aircraft can command.

Supersonics will have to compete with subsonics. Advanced subsonics may have costs per seat mile 20–30 percent below those of the U.S. SST. Airlines, unless they acquire SST's at subsidized prices, will hence buy relatively few SST's so that load factors are exceptionally high (e.g., 70 percent of seats are filled instead of the 55 percent typical of today's jets) and have to levy a surcharge (e.g., 10–20 percent) on SST tickets. No one knows how many long-haul passengers would be diverted to subsonics by such fare differentials. Estimates are that one-half may be lost.

The growth rate of passenger demand is also uncertain. Long-haul revenue passenger miles have increased at an average of 14 percent during the past ten years, but this rate is expected by most to decline. Continued growth will presumably vary with quality of service, per capita incomes, and population growth. The lowest estimate of passenger volume growth between 1966 and 1990 is five times.

Public acceptance or nonacceptance of frequent sonic booms by commercial aircraft remains doubtful. If commercial overland supersonic flight is not permitted by the U.S. and most foreign governments, no more than 40 percent of long-haul passengers remains to be shared with subsonics on the available routes over water. Conversely, as the SST's engines are "sized" for high altitude transonic acceleration (above 35,000 feet) and fuel consumption per mile at subsonic speeds is much higher, the economics of the SST are improved if it is permitted to cross the sound barrier at lower altitudes nearer to airport terminals. Unfortunately, as SST designs increase in gross take-off weight to permit more seats and hence lower seat mile costs, the severity of expected sonic boom increases and the possibility of operating restrictions (e.g., curfews on transcontinental flights) is increased. The prudent assumption, until more conclusive predictions can be made of public reaction to boom, is that commercial supersonic flights over populated land areas will be prohibited.

Anyone who has been intimately involved in econometric assessments of SST "profitability" realizes full well that its prospects will remain most uncertain at least until prototype flight tests and possibly until regular commercial operations begin. The total market for SST's to 1990 is probably somewhere between 150 to 600 aircraft. The profitability of the program is sensitive to numbers of SST's sold. Under certain sets of favorable assumptions the overall rate of return could be 10-15 percent. But under other sets of equally plausible assumptions the return is negative. Perhaps a best guess is an overall program rate of return of 0 to 5 percent.

The simple truth, however, is that such a complex and technically advanced aircraft must be an investment gamble in its first generation.

NECESSARY FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

There is general agreement that, if there is to be a U.S. SST program, the federal government must finance it, past flight test and possibly certification, by means of outright grants, advances to be recouped later, and/or guarantees of borrowing by the airframe and engine contractors from the financial community.

Three of the principal manufacturers and their suppliers lack both the ability and willingness to provide $4 billion or so for the development and production funds required before the date around 1975 at which time net cash inflows commence. Their collective net worths, including that of some of their probable subcontractors, do not approach such a figure. Besides, even if able, why should airframe and engine manufacturers risk such sums on an SST? They have alternative investment opportunities involving fewer technical uncertainties, smaller investments, and shorter "dry" periods before recovery of principal. That one airframe and one engine manufacturer are expected to be selected around January 1, 1967, for continued development with government assistance, almost guaranteeing a limited monopoly of a usable design eventually, is not enough apparently to evoke more than 10–20 percent participation in development costs by the manufacturers.

Potential airline customers are not expected to be a significant source of funds. No way remains of compelling the airlines to depart from their usual policy of "wait and see" before purchasing. Firm orders cannot be expected until after successful prototype flight tests in 1970 perhaps. And even then it seems unlikely that more than half the aircraft's flyaway price can be extracted through progress payments six to twelve months before delivery. (Although the first fifty or so SST's delivered probably have a special premium value of several million dollars each, because of high load factors during their initial two to three years of service, the first hundred-odd U.S. SST's have already been allocated for refundable deposits of $100,000 each.)

The combination of high technical risks and large dollar magnitudes makes it most improbable that the manufacturer, or indirectly the financial community, will provide the needed funds. Thus the federal government must either provide assurance against certain risks (e.g., accidental loss of a prototype) and/or become a sort of silent partner (providing say 80 percent of the net cash outflows and sharing say 80 per cent of the net cash inflows). Such a scaling down of the private sums at risk to one-fifth of the total funds involved, with a commensurate scaling down of cash surpluses later, might be sufficient to evoke limited private financing despite the program's many uncertainties.

In addition to the funds required for development and production of an SST, safe and economical operation of SST's will be possible only if government expenditures are made for improved air traffic control, solar and cosmic radiation monitoring systems, and an improved meteorological forecasting capability.

The SST will cruise at 65,000 as compared to 35,000 feet for subsonics. The effects of wind and temperature on SST fuel consumption and the consequent impact on SST operating costs and payload make better data on the parameters vital. At supersonic speeds more advance warning is required to maneuver around unfavorable weather. In the period from 1970 through 1990 meteorological improvements alone could cost governments over a billion dollars.

These negative "externalities" should be considered part of the price of having an SST.

HOW SHOULD THE GOVERNMENT RECOVER?

The manufacturers will not risk even limited sums unless they and the government can agree on a financial plan that specifies at least the formula by which government will recoup its share of development and other "sunk" costs.

Unless there are significant and "external" national interests served by the program, a controversial issue discussed below, the federal government must be placed in a position to obtain the same rate of return on its investment as do the manufacturers if an impolitic and unwarranted subsidy is to be avoided. Thus if the program is continued because the $4 billions-odd worth of resources invested in it are expected to earn 10 to 15 percent before taxes or interest, and if the government were to accept say 5 percent on an 80 percent share of costs, the manufacturers would be expected to earn 30 percent to 55 percent on their investments. The only way government can avoid paying such a subsidy and still accept say 5 percent for itself, is to continue a program that prospectively wastes some of the nation's resources by promising a return less than that ordinarily obtained from domestic labor and capital used by industry in the U.S.

Thus government must be expected to share in profits if (1) the program appears economically justifiable and (2) unjustified subsidies to manufacturers are to be avoided. There is no logical escape. This requirement for government profit sharing has nothing to do with "socialism."

A major issue is whether government recovery should be either through some sort of tax or through sharing in net cash inflows as a silent partner.

Levies most often mentioned are:

1. A "royalty" or tax "off the top," added to the manufacturer's price of the aircraft: this would probably mean a $10 million tax added to say a $35 million manufacturer's price, and such a tax would lose sales to competing subsonics and possible supersonics.

2. An annual tax on SST aircraft operated by U.S. airlines: this would advantage foreign airlines, and a tax adequate for full government recovery plus an equity risk return would have the same present discounted value and incidence on price and sales as would an adequate royalty on delivery.

3. A tax of 10–20 percent on fares charged all SST passengers originating or terminating in U.S. territory: such a tax would further divert passengers to subsonic aircraft.

A tax on jet fuel purchased in the U.S. by all commercial supersonics may have to be reserved to pay for the special SST flight support services discussed above.

The alternative to a tax is sharing through a financial partnership or "pooling" arrangement. There could be one pool on the airframe and another on the engine. In each case the selected manufacturer and the federal government would be the initial members—able to sell their shares later to financial intermediaries. They would contribute, quarter by quarter, development and production costs in some agreed upon ratio. And, when net cash inflows start around 1975, these would be shared by the contractor and the government in proportion to their credits in the pool. Such credits should include both advances and an equity rate of return, preferably the same for each partner, of from 10 to 15 percent compounded.

One advantage of pooling as against taxing is that there is less likelihood of handicapping U.S. SST manufacturers or U.S. airlines operating SST's.

Another potentially important advantage of pooling is that the self-interests of the airframe and engine manufacturers are made coincident with the interests of the federal government. If the contractor believes some design change will more than pay for itself, i.e., that it will earn a good rate of return on the extra cost of making a change, government will similarly be advantaged if the contractor knows his business. And ordinarily, because airframe and engine manufacturers are experienced in commercial air transport and presumably know the airlines' needs better than FAA officials, pooling could permit the federal government to give the manufacturers the maximum degree of private initiative possible. Such freedom may be needed to make the program an economic success. Certainly, the SST program should not be administered as though the U.S. were developing and procuring a bomber say, for hopefully it is airlines and not the federal government that will buy and use this aircraft.

Another recoupment issue is whether the government should share in manufacturers' receipts or net cash inflows forever or only until such time as the government has realized some previously stipulated rate of return on its outlays.

Making either the royalty or pooling claims to SST sales revenue transferable would enable the government to sell its rights to future revenues to the private sector if and when success of the program seems assured.

Why should government seek to recover all its advances from those who buy or use the SST, for are there not other broad national interests being served?

The most intangible and commonly suggested "external" benefits are (1) technological "fall-out," (2) contingent military use, and (3) national prestige, but each of these proclaimed grounds has been vigorously denied by others.

A more explicit argument is that the sale of U.S. SST's at $35 million or so each will benefit the U.S. balance of payments in the 1970's. Such claims ignore many substitution effects. Traditionally, half U.S. aircraft exports have been financed in the U.S. Each U.S. SST exported may mean at least one less U.S. subsonic exported. If the U.S. sells competitive aircraft to foreign airlines, U.S. airlines may lose passengers to them. Estimates suggest that, over five years from date of sale, the net balance-of-payments credit for the U.S. from the sale of an SST is no more than 5–10 percent of its U.S. export price (and may even be negative if increased U.S. tourist spending abroad is considered).

Nevertheless, some gross external benefits must exist, although not necessarily net of special high altitude meteorology costs, etc. In the end the program's Phase I and II (design competition) costs to the federal treasury might be "forgotten" as an alleged contribution of $300 million-odd to some vague "national interests." But beyond that, and starting with Phase III (prototype development) in 1967, the program should be treated as a commercial risk enterprise of manufacturers and government in partnership.

MITIGATING THE MONOPOLY

The federal government in early 1967 may select a single SST airframe and engine contractor to continue prototype development. The selected manufacturers will emerge with considerable monopoly power that could be of considerable value. How can the government use public funds to create a monopoly and yet protect the public interest without destroying the managerial prerogatives and efficiency of private manufacturers and airlines?

First, the monopoly will be limited, for there may be some competition from the supersonic Anglo-French Concorde; but more important should be the rivalry of growth subsonics, competition that compels the selected U.S. SST manufacturers to provide the best possible performance at a price.

Second, the selected prime development contractors will have many subcontractors, especially on the airframe. These subcontractors will acquire a competence that later could be used by a rival prime contractor. Also key employees have been known to transfer at higher salary to a rival manufacturer.

Third, the federal government is expected to have the right to license patents at zero cost, together with shop drawings, to any other airframe and/or engine manufacturers who might later seek to compete.

Hence, if a really large and profitable SST market were to prove itself, it is not evident that rival manufacturers could not materialize. The DC–8 did follow the Boeing 707. A first generation manufacturer is not always sure of developing a profitable aircraft that excludes competition.

A single airframe and single engine manufacturer for the U.S. SST should create other novel problems more easily overlooked.

One is division of the flyaway aircraft's price between airframe and engine. There is a very large range of indeterminacy. The engine for example might be priced almost down to its marginal production cost. But its price could be as high as the aircraft price minus marginal airframe cost. The maximum conceivable engine price could be three times the minimum. Previously an airframe company had some choice among engine firms to narrow the range of possible engine prices.

The airlines will be face to face with a limited monopolist able to charge variable (i.e., discriminatory) prices unless prevented by government. Some of the earlier deliveries, assuming they can maintain schedules, have potentially higher load factors and hence should command premium prices. Should the competition of Concorde and the subsonics prove minor, some airlines may ask for federal ceilings on U.S. SST prices.

This could be a dangerous step. If government regulates SST prices, should it not more energetically regulate SST fares so that airlines do not receive unjustified profits, and perhaps depress load factors through excessive competition in flight frequencies on approved SST routes? The situation of the U.S. merchant marine should be enough to deter any airline management from inviting government intervention.

The remaining alternative would be to develop two airframe-engine combinations—which practically would mean also producing two rival aircraft. This would double development costs. It would also lose some "learning curve" efficiencies in manufacturing. These extra costs would be justified only if, attributable solely to prolonged competition, operating costs were reduced by about a quarter.

ARE THE BENEFITS GENERAL ENOUGH

Costly public enterprises of great inherent risk are more easily justified if the spending of taxpayers' funds occasions widespread benefits. It is not enough that they provide employment and profits for a few localities and firms. How diffused are the benefits of the SST program likely to be?

About 85 percent of U.S. residents have never flown, those who do fly do not always take long-haul flights, and perhaps less than 5 percent of all Americans will ever fly SST's at their higher fares. Private, nonexpense account, long-haul passengers will mostly continue to fly subsonically. (It is not even certain that the federal government will reimburse its employees and those of its contractors for a supersonic surcharge.)

Further, American SST passengers will tend to travel to and from a few areas, such as New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Seattle, Washington, D.C., and Miami. Americans living elsewhere may never use an SST except on international flights. But 100 million Americans may find themselves subjected daily to sonic booms if overland SST flights are permitted.

For all these reasons, and as the U.S. SST program is seen increasingly as a rival to expansion of Great Society programs, it is certain to become more controversial.

CONCLUSIONS

There are few modern instances of development with public funds of a technologically advanced product that is to be produced—very likely by a monopoly—and used commercially by private firms. Desirable guidelines in such cases are: (1) continuation only so long as the program is expected to earn a rate of return comparable to that expected by U.S. industry in making investments; (2) equal government sharing in such a rate of return, partly to avoid subsidization, but also to provide incentives for only economical design changes, etc.; (3) full recoupment by government, plus an equity or risk-taker's return, except insofar as there clearly are not "external" or national interests; (4) recoupment by government of its advances, not by taxes that reduce sales and use, but through some partnership (pooling) arrangement; (5) avoidance of special controls that will prevent the usual exercise of experienced management by the airframe and engine manufacturers; (6) use of public funds only to the extent that a private and excessively profitable monopoly will not be created; (7) no unrecovered government subsidies except where adequate benefits are likely to be diffused among a large fraction of citizens.

Finally, it is to be hoped and expected that a U.S. prototype of an SST will be flying well before the end of the 1970's, one that promises to be safe and profitable without being a public nuisance because of sonic boom. This means a state of art that will permit a rate of return of at least 10 percent on all resources invested in development after 1966 without supersonic flight over populated land areas. Until proposed designs can give this promise with more confidence it seems premature to begin construction of a prototype aircraft.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the counterargument is that the numerous subcontracts for SST parts will spread the benefits among a large number of people by creating or maintaining many jobs over large geographic areas. This is the same tired old argument used to defend the space program. The fact is that the jobs provided would be primarily for the highly skilled, as I pointed out earlier. The supply of skilled workmen is already too small to meet the demand. Creating more demand pressure does nothing but boost wages artificially. It can also have the effect of drawing skilled workmen away from vital defense projects into nonessential projects such as the SST. The SST would do very little to satisfy the real need—providing jobs to the unskilled or partially skilled.

Furthermore, are we to produce an unnecessary, unwanted, and uneconomic "gadget" at great cost to the majority of the population in order to achieve some desirable, but minor, side effects?

The alternative of total private financing must be thoroughly studied. Those who say the amount of money required is much more than the aviation industry could ever pull together are underestimating the industry's resources. If the market mechanism reflected a genuine demand for supersonic flight and a genuine need for it, if our aviation industry were, in fact, threatened by the Concorde or the TU–144, then I think the market mechanism would also draw forth sufficient private capital to finance development of SST's just as it did for the jumbo jets and the earlier subsonics, without substantial Government intervention.

Mr. President, regardless of our political philosophy, whether we are liberal or conservative, I think hard, practical experience shows that when the Government gets into these big subsidy operations, and subsidizes something of this kind to the extent of hundreds of millions of dollars, we are very likely to create an uneconomic product, a product that cannot stand on its own feet, that involves very great waste.

All of us are familiar with how this has necessarily occurred in our defense program. There we have to go ahead with planes. We know what a fiasco the B–70 was, what enormous waste was involved in that plane. That, too, was a supersonic plane. By the same token, if we rely on the test of the market and rely upon private financing, which top governmental people like Secretary Charles insist can work, then we are much more likely to get a practical product, and the timing is more likely to be economically sound and sensible.

We abandoned the guidance of the market, in this case, far too hastily and with too little cause.

If the Government participates at all in a project like this which provides minor benefits for a very narrow segment of the population, it should participate on the same terms as any private entrepreneur would, for in such a case there is no justification for passing the costs on to the taxpayer. The Government should have an airtight agreement for getting its money back. It should be paid a fair market price for its risk taking.

Here, Mr. President, is the real weakness of this proposition. We do not have any airtight contract. And, parenthetically, the Government should not get involved at all if it is spending very heavily on other more significant projects and running a big deficit.

The Government, in this case, does not have an airtight agreement for recovering its investment. The repayment agreement signed early this year has too many loopholes.

The phase III contracts—the contracts for the construction of the two prototypes—contain a section outlining the formula by which the Government will recoup its investment—which, as I said, could run to $2.6 billion, by conservative estimates, and probably much more. This section of the contract specifies that the Government will be repaid through royalties from the manufacturers when and if the plane goes into full production. The airframe royalties would start with the 100th model off the assembly line.

In other words, there would be no royalties until the 100th model has been produced. By that time, all the tooling has been accomplished, and not only have the prototypes been developed, but you have a substantial amount, by far the most expensive element, in production. And this, remember, would be 9 or 10 years from now, if the present schedule is followed.

Contrary to the advice of an advisory group consisting of Government lawyers and economists from the Bureau of the Budget and the Justice and Treasury Departments, the FAA wrote an extremely narrow definition of what will constitute a "royalty-bearing airframe."

Mr. President, as I say, this was contrary to the advice of the Bureau of the Budget, the advice of the Department of Justice, and the advice of the Treasury Department—that is, a production model airframe upon which the airframe manufacturer would be obligated to pay the Government a royalty. The definition of a royalty-bearing airframe written into the phase III contract is that it would be "principally of titanium structure" and that it would "achieve a maximum speed of not less than mach 2.2 nor more than mach 3.1." This is so narrow, as the advisory group pointed out, that the Government could be completely denied its share of returns on the SST if changes are made in the production model, over which the Government presently has no contractual authority whatever. The Government's control over model changes extends only through the prototype stage. If a couple of years after the SST goes into production, Boeing switches from titanium to another more superior metal alloy, or if the top speed is pushed a hair above mach 3.1, then the Government could be out all of what we have invested in it. We could lose it all.

I say either of those events is a real possibility, over the next 10 years. Anyone who does not think so has only to recognize what has happened during the past 15 or 20 years. With the advances in chemistry, especially the chemistry of metals, the advances in aircraft, with all the experimentation that has been going on in the military and overseas and elsewhere, there is a significant prospect that in the next 10 years we could have the kind of technological changes that could make the evasion of this contract easy, and of course inviting.

Boron filament and boron-reinforced plastics are only a couple of examples of materials that may have a big future in high-speed planes because of their extremely high strength-to-weight ratios. I am not saying, and never have said, that we have reached a point with any of these materials that would permit us to use them on the initial SST's. For one thing, at $300 a pound, boron costs too much. But 2 years ago, its cost was close to $2,000 a pound. Yet, even now, the Defense Department is considering the possibility of using boron filament in the horizontal tail surface, the landing gear door, and other sections of a selected number of F–111 production models. If the price of boron continues to drop, it could well become a strong competitor to titanium. A lot can happen in metals technology in the next decade. And because the 4,000-mile range of the SST may be a significant limitation on its ability to compete in the market, switching to a lighter and stronger alloy could become important.

Going to another metal like boron filament, or pushing the speed up a little would be minor steps compared to the giant first step of developing an SST in the first place and the Government should not be cheated out of its investment in that first step. The SST will represent a 200-percent increase in speed and a 200-percent increase in weight over present jet transports. These are enormous and unprecedented gains. The taxpayer is footing between 80 and 90 percent of the cost of making them. A contract should have been drawn that would protect his interest.

If a private entrepreneur assumed 90 percent of the risk, as the Government is doing, in developing an SST, he would be paid handsomely. I am not suggesting that the Government should earn a windfall on this investment. But, by the same token, I seriously question whether Boeing and General Electric should be allowed to earn the windfall profits forecast for them by the firm to which the Senator from Washintgon has referred—Booz, Allen & Hamilton in their financial study on the basis of only a 10-percent investment in the development. The Booz, Allen & Hamilton study shows that if SST were highly successful and 1,200 of them were sold by 1990, Boeing would earn a 38-percent return on its investment while the Government would only earn 10 percent.

If 500 planes were sold, as the FAA now predicts, Boeing would earn 12 percent, General Electric 11 percent, and the Government 4 percent. Even if the SST were a dismal failure and only 200 of them were sold, Boeing would still earn an 18-percent return on its investment, GE 5 percent, and the Government nothing.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, when the Senator refers to the 12 percent earned by Boeing and the 11 percent earned by General Electric as compared to the 4 percent earned by the Government, does that take into consideration the taxes that will have been paid by Boeing and GE on this transaction? I think that is important.

Mr. PROXMIRE. This is such a complicated element.

Mr. MURPHY. It is not really complicated.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is complicated in this case.

Mr. MURPHY. I cannot see that it is complicated.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Let me say why I think it is complicated. I think it is complicated because, in my view, if the SST's are sold in anything like this amount, it will mean that we will not sell as many jumbo jets. Therefore, the people making the jumbo jets will not be paying taxes.

My answer would be that we are unlikely to get any significant net increase in tax revenue as a result of this kind of investment.

Mr. MURPHY. The Senator was quoting an actual case with regard to this particular project. And I would like to point out that there is roughly a 52-percent corporate tax that returns to the Government immediately. So, that might change the reflection cast by these figures a little bit.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I understand, and the Senator makes an excellent point. We should take those things into consideration. However, this will simply replace the market for the jumbo jets, subsonic jets, and other jets which would be sold.

There would be a reduced profit on those planes because the market would diminish as the market for the other planes increased. I agree with the Senator that there may be some gain. It would be modest.

Mr. MURPHY. Is it not true that, historically, since the first day we felt we could make a supersonic plane—which is not so long ago, and incidentally one of my old schoolmates was the metallurgist who made it possible—there have been prognostications of many kinds with regard to the cost, the amount of planes to be sold, and the number of people to be handled which far outnumbered the guesses we have been able to make?

Is it not also true that with regard to the actual use, international and otherwise, and the benefits that may be obtained by further shrinking the globe and bringing people closer together, these are considerations that make it very dangerous to try and prophesize exactly what is going to happen.

Over 2 years ago I thought that our airport in Los Angeles was very good. I must say now that it is very bad.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Projections have been good, bad, and indifferent. The Lockheed projections on the Electra were overly optimistic.

We are going to see a great change in technology that will move things ahead. We will get improved metal and planes that will move faster.

The supersonic transport will probably have a short life. It will have competition which will sharply reduce its competitive advantage in a relatively few years.

The manufacturers may sell quite a few. However, there is the counteracting argument, that they will get competition and that there will be new technology in this field that will erode most of this kind of gain.

The main point is that the contract we have here is a contract that just overlooks changes in technology. It provides that the subsidized industry will not pay a nickel back if they can fly faster than mach 3.1 or use anything besides titanium. This is a very unsound contract.

My amendment would slow this down. It would provide something like $188 million that would be available for the SST this year, $124 million from the Federal Government and the remainder from the private agencies and industry.

In a year of tremendous stress on our finances, and at a time when we have this enormous deficit, this is a wise and sensible stretchout. It would not kill the program. However, more important than anything else, it would give us a chance to take a longer and more careful look at the program to decide whether we should revise or change the contract, and whether we should reconsider how we want to proceed with this.

Mr. MURPHY. The Senator made a remark about the B-70 program which was held up a tremendously long time by the Secretary of Defense. Three planes were ordered to be built. However, only one was built in spite of the legislation. One was manufactured, and then a second one was built because of the destruction of the first one.

I assure the Senator, from firsthand knowledge, that there has been a great deal of advancement in aviation and the ability to carry the passengers further and faster, and that much of the military knowledge gained from the B-70's, I am satisfied, was well worth the investment.

As the Senator knows, I am one who is most concerned with what happens to the taxpayers' dollars. I am known as Old Tight-Purse Murphy around here.

In this case, I want to make certain that we consider every aspect of this matter, which I consider to be very important, not only economically and commercially, but also militarily.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from California.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I only have about 5 minutes remaining. I prefer to continue with my statement.

I will mention one other weakness in the present program before concluding, and that has to do with the overlapping of the certification stage, phase IV, and the production stage, phase V, in the program's present master schedule. The schedule calls for the manufacturers to begin ordering long-lead items for full-scale production as early as the second half of 1970. The certification stage will have just gotten underway at that point. Flight testing, which is actually a part of the development stage, will still be going on also. The purpose of this overlapping is to make it possible to get the first production SST into the air very shortly after FAA certification has been obtained.

Certainly, there is enough conflict involved here when the same agency is both masterminding the development of a plane and is also responsible for certifying its safety, without adding this additional pressure to "look the other way" during certification tests in order to prevent delay. But, in the event certification testing did reveal substantial deficiencies in the SST airframe or the engine that would have to be corrected, the overlapping in the schedule could result in enormous unnecessary costs. If, for example, the deficiencies discovered during certification necessitated major changes in airframe and engine design, substantial investments in work in progress might have to be written off because it would have been initiated before the defects were discovered. In other words, the manufacturers would have invested large amounts of money in new facilities, tooling, and inventories for full-scale production under the assumption that the original design would be approved. A design change might require scrapping much of this. I think this is a poor way to run a development program—especially when we do not need to rush.

Striking all but a million dollars of the SST funds from this bill will by no means kill the SST program. There is a $99 million carryover from the money appropriated for fiscal 1967. There is also $25.5 million that was set aside from previous appropriations for a payback reserve fund established by the FAA to repay the contractors in the event the Government unilaterally withdrew from the contract. Both the Senate and House Appropriations Committees have recommended that this fund be abolished and the money applied to program costs.

The carryover from fiscal year 1967 and the money in the payback reserve fund total $124.5 million. This amount would constitute about a third of what the FAA has said would be needed from all sources in fiscal 1968.

In addition, a total of $64 million in airline contributions could become available in fiscal 1968. The 10 U.S. air carriers who were in the initial group of airlines to order SST's promised on June 5, 1967, in an agreement with the Boeing Co., to contribute during 1968 a total of $52 million in risk capital toward development of the SST.

Later in the summer, six airlines promised under a similar agreement to contribute another $12 million in 1968. These contributions are contingent, however, on congressional appropriation of funds for fiscal year 1968 for financing "all or any portion of the costs of phase III contract work." I suggest that Congress approve an appropriation of $1 million, as provided in my amendment, to insure that this contract continues to be legally binding.

Mr. President, I shall summarize briefly later. Before I yield the floor, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I think we have had a good debate on this subject. It certainly is highly important that Senators be well versed in it.

I am glad that the Senator from Wisconsin has obtained an order for the yeas and nays on his amendment, because Senators have asked me about that.

I want to sum up, somewhat, and point out the need for the supersonic transport; but I ask unanimous consent that I may first yield to the Senator from Missouri as much time as he may need to speak on this subject, without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I thank the able Senator from Mississippi.

It has been many months since the Senate last debated the many difficult problems raised by the proposal that the U.S. Government should contribute to the cost of designing and producing a commercial aircraft capable of flight beyond the speed of sound—the so-called SST.

The problems, however, are still before us and still before the country. If anything they are more urgent now than they were last year; in fact, even more urgent than they were in 1961, when we first considered them.

Time in the world of technology does not stand still. The Anglo-French supersonic prototype, the Concorde, is nearing completition. It will be tested within the year and may well be in operation by 1970.

The Soviet TU-144 may be even further advanced.

The American program, toward which we voted $280,000,000 in August of 1966, calls for a flight-testing of a prototype in 1970 and commencement of passenger flight by 1974.

In other words, it is a program now approaching the point at which it must either move ahead, or be written off.

My own attitude toward this project is familiar to the Senate. From time to time I have questioned it in the past, not because I was opposed to technological progress in the air—no resident of the State which launched Colonel Lindbergh's famous *Spirit of St. Louis* 40 years ago this spring could fairly be charged with that—but precisely because I believe in technological progress. Both as a Member of this body and as a former member of the Air Force I have long been interested in the development of new planes and engines, the air power of the United States that has been established and is superior to all others.

But a belief in the ever-opening frontiers which the advancing technology of aviation has conquered is a belief also in the methods of technology. Sound technological advance demands inquiry, scientific detachment, and a long, hard look.

It was this long, hard look for which we argued last year, and also in 1964, and as far back as 1961.

When last August I voted for the Proxmire amendment, an amendment which would have reduced by $200 million the contribution of the Federal Government to supersonic experiment and design, I did so, as presented the Senate, because it was felt that haste should be made more slowly; questions should be answered first, not after. I believed the objections raised and difficulties foreseen, should be examined not after the country was irretrievably committed to the supersonic program, but before it was thus committed.

There were, as Senators will recall, many such objections, many and earnest doubts—doubts which were held not only here and in the press, but also within the industry itself.

I presented some of them in a list of questions put to the Senate a year ago last August. Let me recall a few now.

There was first the question of priorities as between military and commercial development in the supersonic field. As early as July of 1961 I had taken the position that the Senate should not vote funds for commercial supersonic transportation until military supersonic aircraft had been fully developed.

There was also the related question of the level of supersonic speed appropriate to commercial transportation.

Down to last year, we were told that the new plane was to fly at mach 3. This proposal, as I presented the Senate in October of 1965, was disturbing not only to me, but also to many people whose opinion I respect who were apprehensive because of the tremendous expense and delay. The British and French and apparently the Russians were working on a mach 2 airplane and I felt, as I said at the time that "if we stick to the mach 3 airplane we will have a great number of theoretical engineering problems as well as applied engineering problems to solve. We would have to put up additional billions of dollars into research and development."

These engineering problems included the extreme heat of the skin of the plane at high supersonic speeds, possible dangers from radiation at the altitudes envisioned, the maintenance of cabin pressure in the event of accident, and all the unknowns for scheduled transport at these combat velocities.

In addition, beyond these engineering problems were economic questions touching the feasibility of supersonic commercial transportation. We were told that one airline had conducted a survey which proved the operating cost of a plane flying at mach 3 would be 4¾ percent higher than the operating cost of a subsonic jet over short hauls and 26 percent higher over long hauls; and plans, at that time, it will be remembered, called for the use of the new supersonic jet for short as well as long hauls.

Another, and equally disturbing, economic consideration had to do with the cost to the Federal Government—which meant the cost to the taxpayer—of the whole program.

In 1961 it had been estimated that the Federal Government's contribution for a smaller plane would be $750 million but by last year the estimated cost of development and test had risen to $1.5 billion, with the taxpayers providing 90 percent; and although there was talk at that time of repayment of the Government's contribution, there was no firm commitment. History, as I said in presenting questions to the Senate, offered little basis for optimism that repayment under such circumstances would ever be made.

Again, there was the question as to the agency of the Government which would administer the undertaking. The intention when last this matter was before the Senate, had been to confine administration to the Federal Aviation Administration. But the difficulty, as I presented, was that the FAA was also the agency which, under the law, would certify the new plane as operational once it was constructed. This seemed to some of us to create a situation in which a conflict of interest between the promoter and the regulator could hardly be avoided.

It was these objections, these doubts, that I felt we must discuss frankly before approving the proposal made to us.

In the debates of August 1966, however, we did confront them; and possibly partly as a result of these discussions, there has been a reconsideration of the whole project in the industry as well as among aviation engineers and the management of the country's airlines.

This reconsideration has brought changes. Let me note some of them.

First, the design of the new SST has been altered considerably, with its proposed speed reduced. To me, that is very important. We are no longer asked to provide a compromise supersonic airplane capable of both intercontinental and transcontinental ranges; we are asked to think only of a long-range, overwater, intercontinental version—the Boeing-100—which will carry 280 passengers up to 4,000 miles at speeds not of mach 3, but around mach 2.7. This reduction of speed, I am assured by engineers for whom I have great respect, will reduce the engineering problems which multiply at rising velocities; and the clarification of the design will reduce the anticipated operating cost by omitting the costly short-haul features.

Second, and in this same connection, the entire program has been tied in to the military development of supersonic aircraft in such a way as to put the experience of the armed services at the service of the designers of the supersonic transport plane in such a way as to relate the two undertakings to each other with the result that the question of priorities previously much on my mind, is no longer a prime consideration.

As example, the entire B-70 program has now been redirected so as to support and assist the SST program; and the experience gained in supersonic flight with the SR-71/F-12 family of reconnaissance aircraft, now amounting to several thousand supersonic hours, has been placed at the disposal of the designers and engineers of the supersonic transport plane.

At the same time, technological advances in metallurgy, combined with the reduction in planned speed, have apparently solved one of the most critical engineering problems, that of excessive heat. We are told that titanium alloys used on reconnaissance planes of the SR-71/F-12 family have successfully met the demands of flight at mach 3. U.S. production of titanium alloys has more that doubled over the last 5 years—27,500,000 pounds in 1966 as against 11,200,000 in 1961. In addition, the price has dropped some 20 percent.

In this connection, by all odds, the finest fighter in North Vietnam or South Vietnam is the F-4. There is a great deal of titanium on it. I checked with the president of the company and I looked at the plane, and I was assured by him they have no more problems with titanium as with the average metal of that type and character. That was one of the most important developments because 15 years ago, after extensive study in the Committee on Armed Services we were quite cool on titanium. That problem has been licked.

A similar change for improvement has been agreed to in the development of plans for financing the program.

As the project was presented to us last August, the economic burden fell too heavily on the Federal Government—which is to say the taxpayers—with the manufacturers carrying little of the risk; and the prospect of repayment of the Government's investment seemed dubious.

I am now informed, however, by Gen. William F. McKee, able and experienced Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, that a new contract has been negotiated between the Government and the airplane and airframe manufacturers under which the manufacturers will not only share in the development costs at full risk, but will share substantially in any cost overruns should manufacturing costs prove to have been underestimated. General McKee computes the investment at risk by the manufacturers by the end of the prototype program as $288 million.

The negotiation of this contract changes radically the financing of the project, and goes a long way toward meeting the objection I presented during last year's discussion.

And there are other similar developments. It was believed last year, as I presented the Senate, that the airlines, the potential purchasers of the SST, were not convinced that such a plan would be economically feasible because the cost of operation would be too high. Indeed, one of them, as previously mentioned, had conducted a survey which reached the conclusion that the design as then proposed fell short of economic feasibility.

Now, however, the airlines would appear to have changed their views as a result of the changes in the program. Eleven carriers, including the airline which made the survey just referred to, have already committed a total of $52,000,000 toward the expenses of development; and General McKee advises that this commitment has been reduced to contract form.

At the same time, I am told Government economists and engineers have reached an optimistic conclusion as to the marketability of the plane as now programed. They have reported that there is a market for 500 SST's at $40,000,000 a unit even if operations over noise-sensitive areas are prohibited because of sonic boom. If, however, the SST proves to be usable over such areas, they conclude that the sales potential figure would rise from 500 to 1,200.

Furthermore, the Government's future position in the program has been contractually assured. The FAA has obtained from both the manufacturers and the airlines firm commitments by which the investment of the Government will have been returned out of royalties by the time 300 SST's have been sold. If and when 500 are sold, the interest at 6 percent will also have been repaid.

Finally, as the Senate well knows, for many years I have been viewing with growing apprehension the continuing 18-year unfavorable international balance of payments that has been running against the United States. Today, with less than 10 percent of the free "nonmonetized gold" required to honor our current liabilities abroad redeemable in gold, anything and everything that might be done to correct this growing danger to the value of the dollar should be given serious attention.

It is significant, therefore, that the effect of the SST program on U.S. balance of payments can now be estimated with some assurance.

With the sale of the minimum estimated figure—500—involved, sales would amount to some $20 billion; and if 50 percent of these sales were made abroad, as is possible, the "swing" ranges of potential favorable balance of payments would, according to President Tillinghast of TWA—one of the finest of all operators of airlines we have had in the experience of this country—run from 20 billion of dollars up for a 15-year period from 1975 to 1990.

Finally, the question of potential conflict of interest within the FAA would appear to be resolved. The Secretary of the new Department of Transportation, Mr. Alan Boyd, states that the FAA will not be permitted to act as judge of its own safety performance.

All this leads me to conclude that the Senate should now agree to proceed with this program.

I think it is fair to say, based on the record I have presented, that I have studied this matter thoroughly and I am convinced that it is in the best interests of the country. I cannot say to the Senate that all my doubts have been resolved, or all my questions disposed of: There are still doubts, and there are still questions. But the decision which must be made, as is true of so many decisions in this modern, complicated technological world, is one in which the pros and cons must be balanced against each other.

As I said at the beginning of these remarks, time in technology does not stand still. The Anglo-French Concorde is now close to production to the point where a hundred purchasers have already made down payments; and American airlines, if they are to maintain their leadership in the industry, will shortly be compelled to decide whether self-interest, to some extent survival, do not require them to place or increase their orders for the Concorde.

Given a choice between the Concorde and the SST, they tell me they would choose the SST, because it is larger, and because its cost of operation will be lower. Unless it becomes certain in the relatively near future that the American SST is to be built, however, U.S. airlines will have no choice but to place their orders abroad, and that is what they have told me.

If they do, the effect on the U.S. balance of payments in the late seventies and eighties would be precisely the opposite of the effect foreseen by Mr. Tillinghast.

I asked last year, and in 1964 and 1961, that we take a long, hard look at the SST project before approving Government participation. That long, hard look has now been taken, and I now believe that, on balance, the program should be approved.

(At this point, Mr. MUSKIE assumed the chair.)

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to my friend from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I shall not trespass on this subject because there are others in the Chamber who will summarize it ably.

I wanted to express my gratification and satisfaction in the able presentation made by the Senator from Missouri. If I remember correctly, I think it was the year before last that the Senator, in a speech in this Chamber, to which I listened attentively, raised some very pertinent questions about the practicability of our proceeding with the SST. Those questions were so pertinent and so impressive to me that even though I was, at that time, serving as the senior minority member of the Subcommittee on Air Transportation, under the able chairmanship and leadership of the Senator from Oklahoma, and I had been constantly impressed with the need for the SST, his speech disturbed me so much and I found myself in such grave doubt that I, too, went to General McKee. I, too, discussed this with Secretary Ford who was then, I believe, on the CAB, and went downtown and looked over the plans. Then I felt reassured.

As time went on, my duties led me to the subcommittee, and I felt much more reassured. But what troubled me were the able and pertinent questions raised by the Senator from Missouri, for whom I have great respect and whose experience in this field as Secretary of the Air Force and his long years of experience caused me a great deal of mental—I shall not say anguish—but grave doubts.

I resolved those doubts. It is particularly reassuring to have the able Senator from Missouri find that he has resolved most of his doubts and feels that this is the thing to do at this time.

I want to thank him for the aid and comfort he has given me in reassuring me on my decision.

I want to say this, and I want to say it to my chairman because I do not want to trespass more than half a minute more on the time which other Senators might take, that I think it has been most unfortunate and somewhat thoughtless that Members of the Senate this afternoon, have been constantly comparing this proposal with the moon shot, or placing a man on the moon. I can see not the slightest analogy there. The moon shot is a prestige matter, largely, unless we find some unexpected riches on the moon that could contribute to the stability of our economy, which is extremely unlikely. This project is just as in the old days, before the self-starter for the automobile was invented, when we had to reach our hand down and lift the crank in order to start the motor pulsating.

In the same way, the Government has, in my opinion, reached down and turned that crank to start private enterprise pulsating, in order to see to it that the United States continues in the forefront on one of the great frontiers of development, that we are at the head of the procession and not behind it.

Again, I want to thank the distinguished Senator from Missouri for what he said.

Mr. SYMINGTON. If the Senator from Mississippi will yield, let me express, first, my deep gratitude for the kind remarks that the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire has made. We do not happen to sit on the same side of the aisle, but every Member over here as well as every Member over there knows that the Senator from New Hampshire is a true patriot and would never take a position on a matter of this kind unless he thought it was the best thing for the country.

With respect to many of the programs which have been brought up, we do have great poverty in our cities, as well as in the rural areas.

Still this country has been able to achieve the finest standard of living of any in the world. Why?

One of the reasons for that is that instead of making handouts the standard practice, we have adopted policies which have created jobs by keeping us ahead in industry and therefore in banking and business in general, not only in this country but also all over the world.

I am convinced in my mind, after careful study of this project, that we would be losing dollars to save pennies if we did not proceed.

In addition to that—and we might as well be frank about it—there is a certain basic requirement incident to the program that relates to our national security.

Last July, at the first air show in 6 years since 1961, the Soviets flew six brand new fighters, including two with variable wings and, of course, all in the supersonic field, as well as three fighters with major improvements which they have made.

We in this country have not got a strictly new fighter even out of the blueprint or drawing board stage.

I think the experience of the SST will help preserve our commercial position around the world. It will also improve our balance-of-payments situation. It will create jobs for more people. In the long run, its importance to the national security of the United States will be evident.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. I want to commend the able senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] for a brilliant statement on this subject.

I know of no one in this body who has spent more time, for example, on the problem of our balance of payments, than the able Senator from Missouri.

I think his analysis of the problem here this afternoon is extremely helpful to all Members of the Senate.

He has raised the questions which are most pertinent and appropriate to this problem, and he has answered them most effectively.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator is very kind. Naturally, I appreciate his gracious remarks.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, let me commend the Senator from Missouri, as well as the Senator from Wisconsin, for fine presentations. The Senator from Missouri, in particular, has made a fine presentation and a summing up which will be a historical statement with reference to the SST. It is a statement made by someone who really knows the subject, who has prepared himself and presented the major points, principles, and problems involved, and has given thorough, honest, and valuable answers. I think he has made a very fine contribution.

I am also impressed with the remarks made by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], who has also wrestled with this problem.

I thank the Senator from Missouri for his very fine analysis. He has really answered all the questions. He is well versed in those subjects.

Mr. President, we are in this thing now. A year ago was the time of decision, and we have passed that and appropriated $280 million. I think that has now been spent or committed.

Someone mentioned the B-70, the large bomber which was never perfected. It was not so much the victim of mistakes, or anything like that, as it was the victim of the improved offensive missile. That is what really took it out, plus those weapons we have right today which are ready to move. There are other contributing factors, such as more effective ground defenses. That is the basic reason why we have to go into this move now and go over into private plane manufacturing, we might say, because we did not perfect the super, super bomber but went back to the smaller bomber which is just not large enough.

Now, Mr. President, during the hearings I became aware of the very fine knowledge on this subject which the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] possesses, and I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to him, a member of the subcommittee, for his remarks, without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, first, let me say to the distinguished chairman that I did not want to interrupt the earlier flow of debate when he first presented the bill to the Senate.

Like the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], I want to pay my tribute to the Senator from Mississippi for the way in which he has handled the bill. He has a very unusual facility and ability to bring to the committee room, and the Senate in particular, which enables the committee to act at its best, at its most efficient, and with the greatest speed, without curtailing the rights of anyone to express their thoughts.

I would therefore be remiss if I did not express these sentiments to him, and to the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] who is the ranking minority member of the subcommittee who has also done so much.

Second, let me say to my good friend from Missouri, I appreciated hearing the thoroughly detailed and analytical remarks he made about this matter. He did have some serious questions, and no one could be honest with himself and be involved in this matter, as the Senator from Washington and I have been since 1961, and not have some serious questions in his mind. It is well to have those questions laid out on the floor of the Senate and analyzed.

My remarks will be brief, but I do want to straighten out a little history in this matter, and I want to read all the words of our late President on this subject, which I think will provide the direction that we only partially obtained from the quotation that the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma had with him. I understood he did not have the full quotation with him.

In the first place, the initial appropriation on this program was made in the summer of 1961 by the Independent Offices Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, of which the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] was chairman, and I was the ranking minority member. We appropriated $11 million, most of which went into engine research. That was for the fiscal year 1962.

In the following year we appropriated $20 million more.

This amount has been added to year by year.

Earlier in the discussion some question was raised as to what part the Government would play in this program. It will be recalled also that the present President of the United States had headed a committee to study this matter and had recommended this program favorably to President Kennedy. So in a speech at graduation at the Air Force Academy on June 5, 1963—and I am reading from the public papers of President John F. Kennedy, at page 221—President Kennedy said as follows:

> I am announcing today that the United States will commit itself to an important new program in civilian aviation. Civilian aviation, long both the beneficiary and the benefactor of military aviation, is of necessity equally dynamic. Neither the economics nor the politics of international air competition permits us to stand still in this area. Today the challenging new frontier in commercial aviation and in military aviation is a frontier already crossed by the military—supersonic flight. Leading members of the administration under the chairmanship of the Vice President have been considering carefully the role to be played by the National Government in determining the economic and technical feasibility of an American commercial supersonic aircraft, and in the development of such an aircraft if it be feasible.
>
> Having reviewed their recommendations, it is my judgment that this Government should immediately commence a new program in partnership with private industry to develop at the earliest practical date the prototype of a commercially successful supersonic transport superior to that being built in any other country of the world. An open, preliminary design competition will be initiated immediately among American airframe and powerplant manufacturers with a more detailed design phase to follow. If these initial phases do not produce an aircraft capable of transporting people and goods safely, swiftly, and at prices the traveler can afford and the airlines find profitable, we shall not go further.
>
> But if we can build the best operational plane of this type—and I believe we can—then the Congress and the country should

> be prepared to invest the funds and effort necessary to maintain this Nation's lead in long-range aircraft, a lead we have held since the end of the Second World War, a lead we should make every responsible effort to maintain. Spurred by competition from across the Atlantic and by the productivity of our own companies, the Federal Government must pledge funds to supplement the risk capital to be contributed by private companies. It must then rely heavily on the flexibility and ingenuity of private enterprise to make the detailed decisions and to introduce successfully this new jet-age transport into worldwide service, and we are talking about a plane in the end of the 60's that will move ahead at a speed faster than Mach 2 to all corners of the globe. This commitment, I believe, is essential to a strong and forward-looking Nation, and indicates the future of the manned aircraft as we move into a missile age as well.

He goes on to discuss other matters, but I think I have covered all the text of his address at that time which relates to the supersonic transport. In it he lays out the direct participation of the Government—the heavy participation of the Government.

I am particularly appreciative of the distinguished Senator from Missouri's remarks about the balance of payments. Awhile ago a good friend of mine—and I do read many of the things he says and writes—said something to the effect that we might even have a large balance of payments by 1974. I hope I will live to see the day. But there can be no question in my mind—and the argument he used is not to be compared with the argument the Senator from Missouri used—that what is going to happen is simply this. The figures I have, which are probably not as recent as those of the Senator from Missouri, shows that 74 delivery positions have been reserved for the Concorde, 40 of these by seven major U.S. lines, 36 by nine foreign carriers.

Why does this mean? I think the figure the Senator from Missouri used was 100, or something like that. Does it mean airlines are going to buy jumbo jets in this country and use them when the rest of the companies in this country and the rest of the world are buying supersonics? I do not think so.

Let us go back to the days when we had the "Connie Super G" and the DC-7, probably the best workhorses of our airlines. All of a sudden we had produced subsonic jets which were selling at about $5 million a copy, and perhaps more by the time they were equipped. Many of us must have wondered, if we were honest, how in the world such an expensive plane could be made to pay. How could an airline pay that much for an airplane and find that it could be made to pay its way?

We have found out several things from that experience. We have found that man will demand, and he will get, the fastest speed, the most comfortable speed, he can get. He will demand it, and he will get it. That is the first thing we found out.

Second, we found out that the cost per mile of running one of our old planes—and I am not downgrading the fine old prop planes we had; they were great planes for their day—simply would not compare with the cost of the jets.

So we have seen the pressure for speed and the pressure for comfort take hold until we have almost divested ourselves, in the commercial field, of prop planes in this country.

I predict the same thing will happen with the supersonic jet. We have the technology. We have the know-how. When we perfect ours, what will happen will be that the orders will flow from the Concorde to the SST, which I believe is designated the 100 by the Boeing Co.

In lieu of this, if we do not develop it, or if we put it off for a period of a year, as the Senator suggests, it seems to me only logical that what we will be doing is foregoing the opportunity for a favorable balance of trade. Great organizations, engineering and economic and fiscal structures, will have to be put in mothballs for a year. Then we will have to get those technical people back together. While there is some evidence, I grant, that it would only mean a delay of a year, in my opinion it would mean a much greater delay than that.

The Senator from Wisconsin counts very much upon the $52 million as a part of the money that could be used during this year.

When the U.S. Government asked the U.S. airlines to contribute $1 million per aircraft position held, the intent was clear that this $50 million would help reduce the Government's share for the fiscal year 1968 requirements to keep the program on schedule so that the airplane would be ready for timely use by the airlines. A $1 million Government appropriation for a fiscal year is clearly not the understanding—and I think we ought to spell this out—under which the airlines agreed to participate. While the clause taken literally as written states the Government can appropriate any portion of funds to support fiscal year 1968 efforts, the airlines would be in a strong position to balk and break their contracts with Boeing for the $1 million payment.

If the airlines were able to relieve their obligation to contribute the $1 million each, the SST program would only have approximately $125 million available to apply to the program. It is estimated using funds at this reduced level would result in approximately a year slip in the first flight of the prototype. Even if the airlines were forced to contribute their $1 million, the added $52 million would only gain back a portion of this time—probably at the most about 3 months of that year.

The most serious impact of such a funding restriction cannot be stated in dollars and cents, but will be felt in loss of momentum in the program and will open the door to contract changes that are disadvantageous to the Government. The SST program is a cost-sharing contract—in effect, a partnership. If the senior partner elects to alter the terms of the agreement the others will have cause to seek redress. Renegotiation of contract terms under sole source conditions can only weaken the favorable terms which have been secured through long negotiations in the competitive phase.

Mr. President, I think no one in the Senate has devoted himself more assiduously than have I to the effort to effect savings in the cost of Government, especially through my activities on the Appropriations Committee. And I feel that way about this particular bill. But even with this amount in, the bill as reported to the Senate is $67 million under the estimates for 1968, and it is under the appropriations for last year by $69 million.

I think it is a remarkable achievement that this committee, headed by its distinguished chairman, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], has been able to accomplish such a thing and still preserve the momentum of this project, which can mean so much—not to 5 percent of the people of this country, but these jobs will spill over into other jobs, and their effect will be felt clear across the country—have no doubt about it; people in Nebraska, Missouri, Colorado, Illinois, Massachusetts, New York, and even Wisconsin will feel part of the spillover from the successful attainment of this SST. We already have a great investment in it, Mr. President, it is not an investment that we can afford to let go down the drain today.

I thank the Senator very much for yielding.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the contribution the Senator from Colorado has made to the debate, and the contribution he made to the hearings. He is one of the best versed Members of the Committee on Appropriations on many subjects. I thank him very much.

Mr. President, I am not trying to hold the floor. I do not want to keep the floor. I do wish to address the Senate a few minutes longer before we conclude, but I certainly hope we can reach a vote this afternoon, Mr. President, not only on this amendment, but on the bill. I think that the pending amendment is the only thing—I know it is the only thing the chairman knows about—that is really in contest on this entire measure; and I hope, after every Senator has had all the time he wants to debate it, we can proceed to a vote on the amendment, and then to a final vote, even if we have to have a night session; and I, for one, am prepared for a night session if necessary.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes, I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The purpose of my questioning is to learn to what extent the U.S. Government will become involved, in total, in the development of this supersonic plane.

I refer to a table at page 423 of the record of the hearings, which purports to show the costs of the prototype program, phase III.

Under the heading "Who Pays?" it shows the Government, $953 million.

I now direct the Senator's attention to page 396 of the hearings record, on which are set forth the appropriations for this project beginning with 1962, and showing that up through fiscal 1967, $511 million was appropriated.

Is that correct?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The bill before us would provide an additional $142 million?

Mr. STENNIS. That is the correct figure.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That would make a total of $653 million down to the end of fiscal 1968, is that correct?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Now, my question is, Is the $653 million appropriated for this project since 1962, down to the end of fiscal 1968, included in the figure of $953 million which is supposed to be the Government's cost of the project, down to the completion of phase II?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct. The $653 million is included in the $953 million; but I really think the projected total cost to the Government will run somewhat above the $953 million.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I believe there is a statement here that it would be somewhere about $1.1 billion.

Mr. STENNIS. As near as it can be determined now, it is $1.2 billion. I said in the opening argument here that we had just passed the midway mark.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I now direct the attention of the Senate to page 398 of the testimony in which there is a paragraph discussing the Government's commitment, which paragraph reads as follows:

> I would like to emphasize that our commitment to this program is to Phase III only. There is no commitment on the part of the Government to support in any way, shape, form, or fashion, these following phases for certification or production.

This language does not mean that we are out of this project at the end of phase II. At the end of phase II, we must determine whether we are going into phase III.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct. We would not necessarily be out of it. However, contractually we would be out of it. There is no promise or no definite binding obligation involved.

On the remaining questions, it would be an open question. However, hope was expressed that the cost would fall within the private sector.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it the argument that since we already have $511 million in it, without the $142 million contemplated for 1968 within the overall cost of $1.100 million, that we should go forward now with the completion of phase II?

Mr. STENNIS. That point is certainly a substantial factor in the picture. It adds momentum and reason and logic to the other points that are involved.

There have been no setbacks in this program. There has been no delay. There has been perhaps some little slippage. However, there has been no marked disappointment in the way things are turning out.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, for my information, will the Senator describe to me what commitments are made in the contracts concerning the reimbursement of the Government if and when the supersonic planes are sold in the market at an anticipated frequency that will enable the manufacturers to sell them and make a profit so that the Government can be paid back?

Mr. STENNIS. That is certainly a part of the picture. That is somewhat speculative. However, the best calculations that can be made are reflected in the RECORD here.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is the Government to be reimbursed in full?

Mr. STENNIS. The sales could go on to that point. As I understand the contract, if there are enough sales, the Government will be reimbursed in full, according to the calculations.

The calculations reveal that the Government will be reimbursed when the point of 300 sales has been reached. Referring to page 424, there is then a provision for a return of Government money from additional sales, but that is highly speculative. That is a chance that no one can calculate.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If 300 planes are sold, what part of the $1.1 billion that the Government will invest will be reimbursed, approximately?

Mr. STENNIS. There is a general calculation of a break-even point at 300 sales. That is a general calculation. However, I do not consider that those are hard figures. I want to be perfectly clear on this. They calculate that there will be a break-even point on the sale of 300 aircraft.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator means that the Government will be reimbursed in full?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. However, if fewer planes are sold, the reimbursement will not be as great.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What if more than 300 planes are sold?

Mr. STENNIS. It is possible that they will get into the black and that there will be a profit return. Certain calculations have been made on sales up to 500, I believe it is. However, I want to make it clear—and I think these are good questions and should be considered—that there is no guarantee on this. However, this information is believed to be approximately correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, regarding the engine royalties, which amounts to half of the contract, the engine royalty payments begin with the first engine sold and it applies to a percentage of the sales price on all engines and spare parts for 18 years beyond the engine certification date.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Then it is just a inference to draw the judgment that on the basis of the advice of experts and those who have studied this matter, it is anticipated that the development will be a success, production will be achieved, and sales will be made in substantial numbers, and the Government substantially, at least, reimbursed for its investment.

Mr. STENNIS. There is no doubt about that. If there are 300 sales, the Government will probably be fully reimbursed. This is a calculation by FFA, and they are the Government authority on the subject. They told us that financial studies indicate that the 500 aircraft market estimate would not only repay the basic investment, but would also return sufficient additional money to be at least equivalent to the amount of interest that the Government would pay for the use of the money during the same period.

It is estimated that we will recover the additional amount by virtue of the sale of 500 aircraft. The basic investment itself must be returned at the 300 aircraft sales level. So, they have calculated these things the best they can, we believe.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I point out to the distinguished Senator from Ohio that this is all contingent on the plane flying less than 3.1 mach speed. If it flies over that, none of it has to be paid. This is also contingent on them using titanium. If they use some other metal, none of it has to be paid.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the administration's recently released objections to Senate action placing restrictions on the military assistance and arms sales programs in the foreign aid bill demonstrate the potentially dangerous influence of the Pentagon and the arms industry over foreign policy and underscores the wisdom of the Senate on setting limitations on arms distribution.

When the bill was under consideration in the Senate, administration spokesmen expressed more concern over the military program than over the economic provisions of the bill. They continue to do so. The administration now argues that a limitation on arms distribution will have "a major adverse effect on our global defense posture and on the effectiveness of U.S. foreign policy," and describes the Senate action as unilateral disarmament by the United States.

We passed a $2 billion defense appropriation last week and anticipate additional requests.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the Senate have rejected the contention that reduction of the military assistance program and establishment of greater congressional surveillance over that program puts the Nation's security in jeopardy. Administration and the Pentagon does not seem to understand.

The administration has said, "Our ability to influence the course of events or to assist in the solution of problems in the Middle East and Africa will appreciably diminish" if the Senate action is sustained.

The intention of the Foreign Relations Committee is that the use of arms as an instrument of U.S. foreign policy be changed and that the use of weapons to influence the course of events in other nations—particularly the less-developed nations—and the futile attempt to win friends through arms supply be modified.

Five countries on the perimeter of the Soviet Union and China are singled out for special attention by the administration. The administration claims that, if the proposed reductions are sustained, "it will be necessary to make crippling cuts, perhaps as much as 40 percent" in the programs in Korea, Taiwan, Greece, Turkey, and Iran, since programs in "all of Latin America and Africa, and Indonesia and the Philippines . . . cannot be wiped out entirely." A 40-percent cutback might be a good thing. The program is not likely to be cut back so severely. In any case let us consider the case of Africa and Latin America. It is not clear that the marginal benefits of the military assistance program to improve internal security and civic action efforts outweigh the harmful effects.

In Latin America, the military aid program has led to continued identification of the United States with military elements which too frequently overthrow constitutional government on grounds of which they alone are the judges or which demand the preservation of special privileges or policies as the price for permitting the survival of constitutional government.

In Africa, where national development is proceeding precariously and where instability is widespread, even small supplies of arms can have a highly disruptive effect, as recent events in the Congo have demonstrated. A little over 10 years ago, only one country in Africa—Ethiopia—was receiving grant military aid, in the amount of $4 million. By 1962, 15 countries were receiving this type of assistance, and today we are attempting, with difficulty, to keep the lid on military assistance and sales to Africa at $25 million.

As for Indonesia, its most pressing needs are in nonmilitary areas. Secretary McNamara advised the Foreign Relations Committee in July, 1967, that "no weapons are involved" in the proposed program for Indonesia. Why cannot assistance, therefore, emphasize the economic needs. Flexibility, sufficient for any real need, remains in effect. The administration still has authority to sell, lease, or grant up to $300,000,000 worth of equipment out of inventory—to transfer from economic aid to military aid—approximately $250,000,000 worth of equipment.

Although the United States has a historical interest in the Philippines, the real problems are economic and not military. It is difficult to see how additional U.S. weapons could contribute to the solution of these problems.

The military requirements in these areas—Africa, Latin America, the Philippines—are not pressing. The security of the United States is not at stake, and in some cases military assistance and arms sales programs appear to be doing more harm than good.

What is the case as to the countries on the periphery of the Soviet Union and China? We are told programs of aid will have to be severely cut if the military assistance program in Korea is to remain intact while Korean troops are fighting in Vietnam. This clearly implies a payment for mercenaries. Not only is the United States paying the costs for the Korean troops in Vietnam, but we have more American troops in Korea today—50,000-55,000—than there are Korean troops in Vietnam—approximately 45,000.

The administration states:

> The Iran program is part of a prior commitment which would be politically difficult to reschedule.

One of the major justifications for the decision to sell our most sophisticated operational jet fighter, the F-4, to Iran was that if we did not, the Iranians might accept Soviet aid. A Defense Department witness advised Senator GORE's Subcommittee on Disarmament February 7, 1967:

> The U.S. sale was made fundamentally to avoid the serious danger of a radical shift in the orientation of the recipient country through the introduction of Soviet arms, training missions and other instruments of influence.

But the Iranians accepted Soviet assistance anyway. As the Defense Department later advised Senator SYMINGTON's Subcommittee on Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs:

> The decision to sell F-4 aircraft to Iran was conveyed to the Government of Iran on July 20, 1966, and the letter of offer was signed on September 30, 1966. The Iranian arms barter transaction with the Soviet Union was announced by the Prime Minister of Iran on February 19, 1967.

There are all kinds of political difficulties, including those we make for ourselves.

If these restrictions will keep us out of the arms supply business with the Arab States, perhaps we can avoid the mistakes of our past policies. The previous policy of attempting to balance the Arab States against each other has been a failure, as the events of last spring demonstrated. It should again be noted that Israel would not be affected by these limitations, as financing for the arms she requires for her defense is available without use of a Defense Department guarantee.

As far as Greece and Turkey are concerned, the administration claims that NATO readiness would be reduced if programs in these countries have to be cut. Our generals are still, it seems, preparing for the unlikely event of Soviet land power rolling across Europe. The Greek generals, however, seem more interested in taking over the country than in making their contribution to NATO.

The administration states that negotiations over "U.S. forces in Turkey would be made more difficult" and "U.S. willingness to support NATO could be questioned" if we do not give the Turks more arms. But, apart from the continued existence of tensions between Greece and Turkey, it should not be forgotten that, over the past 17 years, we have given the Turks some $2.5 billion in military assistance. At what point can it be said that the position of our troops and the good faith of the United States are assured?

The administration further claims Taiwan's defensive capabilities will deteriorate if we have to cut the program there, yet Chiang Kai-shek's army, no matter how well equipped, would be of little effect against the Chinese were it not for the presence of the U.S. 7th Fleet.

The administration claims that our bases in Ethiopia, Libya, Spain, Portugal, and the Philippines would be imperiled if the Senate action is sustained. In Libya and the Philippines, the status of American bases has already become a point of discussion, if not friction. If the availability of American arms is the only reason these countries have permitted us to have bases on their soil, we ought to question how important they consider our bases to their own security. We might also question the wisdom of a U.S. defense posture based on such tenuous grounds. In any case, the amounts involved here are very small.

In attempting to place restrictions on the military assistance and arms sales programs, a main concern of the Senate has been a reevaluation of the concepts of "forward strategy" and the "instant interventionism" which have assumed such a dominant place in our relations with the rest of the world. An indifferent Pentagon did not get the message, it said.

In the administration's appeal for the retention of the authority to guarantee credit for arms sales, we have a further warning against development of what President Eisenhower called the "military-industrial complex": a listing of some of the manufacturers and the banks who have been engaged in the arms supply business under the aegis of the Pentagon's international logistics negotiations office:

> (*a*) A $36 million loan to the Government of Iran by the First National City Bank of New York, Morgan Guaranty Trust Bank, and the Chase National Bank. This was part of an overall $200 million agreement between the United States and the Government of Iran which involved prior foreign economic and military policy agreement before going ahead with the loan.
>
> (*b*) The Raytheon Corp. sale of HAWK air defense missile systems to the Government of Saudi Arabia in the amount of $126 million as part of a major British-United States-Saudi Arabia agreement. Saudi Arabia desired to implement the agreement directly with the Raytheon Corp. Raytheon would not have been able to obtain credit for this transaction without a Department of Defense guarantee covering $73 million of the sale.
>
> (*c*) The Hiller sale of $800,000 in SL-4 helicopters to Chile. The Bank of New York financed this transaction with a U.S. guarantee.
>
> (*d*) The pending $10.5 million sale of C-130 transport aircraft by Lockheed Corp. to the Government of Saudi Arabia. The sale has been approved as being in our foreign policy interest and will be carried out directly between Lockheed and the Government of Saudi Arabia. Lockheed has obtained agreement of a private bank to finance the sale on the assumption that the U.S. guarantee is available.

All we in the Senate are trying to do is put some kind of a limit on the power of the military-industrial-financial complex to control or unduly influence the foreign policy of this Nation.

Because the Nation is engaged in the third largest war in its history, because a new and infinitely more dangerous round in the nuclear arms race threatens, and because of an increasing tendency to see America's role in the world in terms of our capacity to respond to every challenge in military terms, I urge that the foreign aid conference sustain the Senate action in reducing the military assistance program and in repealing credit authority for arms sales.

I ask unanimous consent that the comments of the administration on these provisions in the foreign aid bill, on which I have just commented, may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the comments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE BRANCH COMMENTS

GENERAL AUTHORITY

(House—Section 201(b)1)

(Senate—Section 201(b)1)

The Difference

The House version, in accordance with an Executive Branch request, strikes out the words "lease, sale, exchange" in Section 503(a).

The Senate version, in addition to striking out "lease, sale, exchange", also strikes out the words "or any other means" in Section 503(a).

Executive Branch Position

The Executive Branch prefers the House version but has no objection to the Senate version. The word "grant" should be understood to include those transactions carried on MAP records and reported to the Congress as grant aid which take the ostensible form publicly of a sales transaction calling for nominal payment in local currency.

GUARANTEES

(House—Sections 201(b)(3)(A) and 201(i)(5))

(Senate—Sections 201(b)(4) and 201(i))

The Difference

The Senate version repeals the guaranty authority.

The House version retains the guaranty authority.

Executive Branch Position

The Executive Branch prefers the House version.

1. The purpose of the guaranty authority is to make effective use of private rather than federal budget financing for sales, which are approved by the Departments of State and Defense as being in our national interest, in accordance with the general philosophy expounded in the Foreign Assistance Act of making maximum use of private channels. Examples of some of the credit sales which have been undertaken in the past and which would not be possible in the future without such guaranty authority or the appropriation of substantial amounts of increased NOA are as follows:

a. A $36 million loan to the Government of Iran by the First National City Bank of New York, Morgan Guaranty Trust Bank, and the Chase National Bank. This was part of an overall $200 million agreement between the United States and the Government of Iran which involved prior foreign economic and military policy agreement before going ahead with the loan.

b. The Raytheon Corporation sale of Hawk air defense missile systems to the Government of Saudi Arabia in the amount of $126 million as part of a major British/U.S./Saudi Arabia agreement. Saudi Arabia desired to implement the agreement directly with the Raytheon Corporation. Raytheon would not have been able to obtain credit for this transaction without a DOD guaranty covering $73 million of the sale.

c. The Hiller sale of $800,000 in SL–4 helicopters to Chile. The Bank of New York financed this transaction with a U.S. guarantee.

d. The pending $10.5 million sale of C–130 transport aircraft by Lockheed Corporation to the Government of Saudi Arabia. The sale has been approved as being in our foreign policy interest and will be carried out directly between Lockheed and the Government of Saudi Arabia. Lockheed has obtained agreement of a private bank to finance the sale on the assumption that the U.S. guarantee is available.

2. The alternative to continuation of the guaranty authority, if such sales which further the national interest are to continue, is to authorize and appropriate approximately $300 million annually for directly financing such sales.

FUNDING LEVELS

(House—Section 201(c))

(Senate—Section 201(c))

The Difference

The Senate version authorizes $475.1 million for fiscal year 1968 and, within that amount, earmarks $84.1 million for Infrastructure and International Military Headquarters.

The House version authorizes $590 million for fiscal year 1968, of which amount $24.1 million is available only for International Military Headquarters.

Executive Branch Position

The Executive Branch strongly supports the House version.

The Senate version leaves us $205 million short for grant aid and credit sales of meeting minimum United States security objectives. This reduction will have a major adverse effect on our global defense posture and on the effectiveness of United States foreign policy. It will most certainly cause consternation among our friends and allies who rely on our adherence to the principle and practice of free world collective security.

This $205 million shortage in the fiscal year 1968 program is about equal to all military assistance and sales requirements for fiscal year 1968 other than grant aid planned for the five countries on the perimeter of the USSR and Communist China—Korea, Republic of China, Greece, Turkey and Iran.

Since all these other programs (including all of Latin America and Africa, and Indonesia and the Philippines in East Asia) cannot be wiped out entirely without serious security and foreign policy implications, it will be necessary to make crippling cuts, perhaps up to 40 percent, in programs of the key forward defense countries contiguous to Communist China and the Soviet Union, since the planned programs for these five countries make up the bulk—about three-quarters—of the total program.

If the Korean program is to remain intact, or nearly so, while its troops are fighting in Vietnam, then the programs for Greece, Turkey, Iran and China must absorb the majority of the cut. Replacement of obsolescent and worn-out equipment planned for these countries will be virtually precluded. Operating support will be reduced. The countries may have to increase their defense budgets, thus cutting into economic sector programs. The readiness of these countries to meet Communist aggression would be adversely affected.

The Iran program is part of a prior commitment which would be politically difficult to reschedule.

In Greece and Turkey there would be a reduction of NATO readiness, with consequent increased reliance on reinforcements from other NATO nations, including the United States. Our negotiations concerning United States forces in Turkey would be made more difficult. United States willingness to support NATO could be questioned.

The defensive capabilities of the Republic of China will deteriorate unless the GRC is willing and financially able to make up the cuts by purchasing the necessary arms. However, another Senate amendment deleted the authority for credit sales. Taiwan's first line of defense—her air force and navy—will suffer the most, since they were due to receive the bulk of modernization equipment.

Military assistance extended to countries where we maintain important bases in our own security interests must be drastically reduced. While our need for bases in Ethiopia, Lybia, Spain, Portugal and the Philippines remains, our tenure could be jeopardized by our inability to provide anticipated military assistance.

Latin American programs, already cut to a bare minimum, would be further reduced at the same time that Castro is reaffirming his subversive intentions in the area. Latin American internal security programs would be summarily disrupted by abrupt cuts in military assistance.

Our ability to influence the course of events or to assist in the solution of problems in the Middle East and Africa will appreciably diminish. At a time when the Soviet presence is increasing in the Middle East area we would have no flexibility to take countering action. United States military assistance support for moderate Arab states would be reduced severely.

Military assistance supports major forces on the periphery of the USSR and Communist China which form a shield deterring Communist aggression and thus maintaining the peace. In other nations of the world to which military assistance is extended, it promotes internal security so that the nations can develop in the more stable atmosphere existing as long as Communist aggression is deterred. These other countries need assistance to solve their internal security problems. The reduction will severely limit our capability to provide any such assistance. By forcing reductions in assistance to countries essential to our forward defense, as well as in assistance to the other countries included in the program, the free world security posture is weakened.

REVOLVING FUND

(Senate—Section 201(h))

(House—Section 201(h))

The Difference

The Senate version terminates the Credit Sales Account as of 31 December 1967.

The House version retains the Credit Sales Account and makes minor technical language changes in proposed Section 526 of the Act.

Executive Branch Position

The Executive Branch strongly supports the House version.

Both the Senate and the House versions eliminate the proposed section 524 which set forth the general authority for credit sales. Hence, the only extant authority for credit sales is the language of the revolving fund, which states that funds placed in the Credit Sales Account either directly or as a result of repayments on prior loans shall be available until expended solely for the purpose of financing sales and guarantees including the overhead costs thereof.

In the absence of the revolving fund and its implicit authority to make credit sales, no authority would exist to finance credit sales from new procurement. The only means available to provide material from new procurement would be either on a grant basis or on cash payments basis. Since the principal purpose of the general credit sales authority was to provide credit to those countries capable of paying but not able to obtain Export-Import Bank or private bank credits, the deletion of such credit sales authority would eliminate, not limit, all DOD financed credit sales to any Middle Eastern country, any Latin American country and numerous other countries around the periphery of the Communist world.

Without the revolving fund credit authority, repayments from countries cannot be channeled to the ExImBank, private banks or the U.S. Services as appropriate since all repayments under the Senate version go to the general fund of the Treasury. Further, it would not be possible to pay outstanding obligations of the Account of approximately $700 million as of December 31, 1967, the date on which the Senate version terminates the Account. To prevent default on such outstanding obligations, the Administration would have no recourse other than to request that the Congress vote approximately $230 million of appropriations to pay outstanding obligations which will come due in the last half of fiscal year 1968 and an estimated additional $500 million in subsequent fiscal years to meet payments due after fiscal 1968.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I think that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] said most of the things I might have said. There are several other corrections in the RECORD that I want to make as to figures in answer to some of the questions.

Mr. President, this country must maintain its superiority in the field of air transportation. This is the reason why this country must proceed with the supersonic transport program. The reasons for maintaining air superiority are obvious.

When President Kennedy first called me to the White House in 1961, he said that we should start on the SST because the British and the French were beginning and he also had word that the Russians were proceeding on a program. These predictions have proven to be true. The British-French Concorde is scheduled to fly early next year and is 3½ years ahead of the United States. The Russians are also well on their way. When I was in Russia last fall, they would not let me see their TU-144. However, it may well be that the Russians will be first to fly an SST into Kennedy Airport.

Commercial SST travel will soon be a reality. The question is: Will the U.S. SST, the Concorde, or the TU-144 dominate the air?

The U.S. supersonic transport will be a larger, faster, and a more profitable plane. Airlines would rather fly the U.S. SST since it will be a greater money-maker than the Concorde. Already, orders have been placed for 129 U.S. SST's. Of that number, 65 have been from foreign-flag carriers and 64 from U.S. carriers.

On April 29, 1967, President Johnson authorized the FAA to sign contracts with Boeing and General Electric to begin prototype construction of two supersonic transports. These contracts were signed on May 1 and a budget amendment was forwarded to the Congress to finance construction for fiscal year 1968.

Congress has already appropriated $511 million for the SST. Of that amount $200 million was appropriated last year to begin prototype construction. The $142,375,000 which the House has appropriated for fiscal year 1968 will allow work to proceed so the United States will have an SST flying late in 1970.

To deny this current request would have a serious effect on the SST program. The program slippage would be 12 to 15 months and would add additional millions of dollars in expenses due to the escalation of prices and materials. The market for the U.S. SST would also be reduced since the airlines would be forced to buy more Concordes and, consequently, adversely affect our balance-of-payments position.

A more serious impact would be a loss of confidence and momentum in the program. The door would be open to contract changes that would be disadvantageous to the Government. The contracts with the manufacturers were negotiated under competitive conditions. Renegotiations of contracts under sole-source conditions can only weaken the favorable terms secured through long negotiations in the competitive phase.

As of this date, Boeing has signed agreements with the airlines to contribute $52 million in risk money this fiscal year. In addition, they have tentative offers for $12 million additional in risk contributions but these latter agreements have not yet been signed. If this appropriation should not go forward, it would be a breach of faith with the airlines and any future financial support would be hard to come by.

The SST is a partnership program between the government, the airlines and the manufacturers. The manufacturers, Boeing on the airframe and General Electric on the engine, will have nearly $300 million invested in the program during the prototype phase. The basic reason the Government is involved in this program is that it is a high-risk program beyond the financial potential of the manufacturers. This is the first commercial SST to be built in this country and presents certain risks. The effort is large, involving approximately $1,450 million for the construction and testing of two prototypes. There will be a long dry period before profit is possible.

The SST contracts call for the Government to recoup its investment. The Government will receive a royalty payment on each plane sold and on the sale of 300 planes the Government will receive its investment back; on the sale of 500 planes the Government will receive its investment plus 6 percent interest. Contrary to statements of some of the critics, there are no loopholes whereby the Government would never get a cent back.

The sonic boom does present probably the biggest problem in the development of a supersonic aircraft. At this time it is not known whether this plane will be able to fly over land and this may not be known until the plane is actually flown. In any event, current market projections show a minimum of 500 planes over-water market alone. This first model is being designed as a primarily intercontinental plane. If it cannot fly over land, derivative versions of it may have much better sonic boom characteristics which will be tolerable over land. The contract with the manufacturers states that the Government will also receive a royalty on derivative products.

The Boeing design of the SST also has one other factor in its favor, the variable sweep wing allows this plane to cruise efficiently at subsonic speeds, consequently, giving it excellent characteristics around airports.

The SST program has many positive factors. The balance-of-payments positions of this country will be enhanced since half our sales are projected to be to foreign buyers. With a market of 500 aircraft this could result in a favorable balance of payments of $17 billion, and the 1,200 market could amount to as much as $32 billion.

The SST will create jobs. There are approximately 50,000 jobs associated with the manufacturers of this plane, and, using the ordinary rule of thumb and multiplier effect, 200,000 to 250,000 jobs would be created by this program.

Mr. President, the SST will be in commercial service in the 1970's. People will ride on the SST in the same way they flocked to jets when they first entered into commercial service. The question is whether they will ride on a U.S. SST, the Concorde, or the TU-144. We are already behind on this program. To deny this appropriation would put us further behind and cost us a great deal more in the long run.

Mr. President, one of the Nation's most important developmental programs, the civil supersonic transport project has been the object of much criticism in recent weeks in the press and here in the Senate.

Much of the criticism has been based on misinformation, unsubstantiated charges, and a general misunderstanding of the nature of the program.

Many of the critics urge the project be delayed or even permanently shelved. Perhaps unwittingly, these people are actually advocating that the United States relinquish its world superiority in commercial aviation.

A delay in the U.S. supersonic transport project at this point would be a great boost to the British-French combine which now plans to put a supersonic airliner aloft several years before the American transport will make her maiden flight. This British-French airliner is now for sale and threatens to capture the commercial market for the SST transport should our own program be delayed.

The Russians, too, are pushing their own SST project forward at full speed and are making every effort to move into the forefront of commercial aviation.

The U.S. longtime domination in this vitally important area of commerce and technology must not be sacrificed simply because some prefer to see the United States stand still and fail to meet the opportunities and challenges of civil aviation in the next decade. Their cries for economy are, in reality, hollow.

They fail to realize the undeniable adverse impact on the U.S. economy should the U.S. airlines turn to foreign manufacturers for the transports they will need in the 1970's. They fail to see the consequences of an ailing American air transport industry on employment, tax revenues, and balance of payments. They fail to admit that carriers and air travelers of the future will demand supersonic transportation regardless of whether the airliners are manufactured abroad. But perhaps most importantly they fail to realize the impact of an entirely new technology—developed by American scientists, engineers, and technicians—on the lives of every American in the decades to come.

No, we must not sit back complacently while progress in commercial aviation continues its inexorable advance. Rather, the United States must continually move ahead to maintain its commanding lead in this exciting and challenging project of the future.

The September–October issue of Aerospace International contains a simple, succinct, and factual explanation of the American supersonic airliner now being developed by Boeing and General Electric. The article is written by the man who probably knows more about the project than any other American and the man best qualified to put to rest some of the ill-advised attacks on the supersonic transport project, the brilliantly able Maj. Gen. J. C. Maxwell, Director of the U.S. supersonic transport development program.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE U.S. SST: SAFE, FAST, AND PRODUCTIVE

(By Maj. Gen. J. C. Maxwell, USAF)

(NOTE.—The U.S. SST's reason for being is one of economics: The aircraft must be comfortable enough, safe enough, and fast enough to attract the passenger. It must be productive and profitable enough to attract the airline operators, and lastly, it must show a profit for the manufacturers and the taxpayers who are underwriting the entire project during the prototype phase. The Air Force General charged with the awesome responsibility of running the SST development program answers these and other questions about supersonic travel in this exclusive article for Aerospace International.)

Most transportation economists would agree that air traffic is going to grow at a rapid rate for the foreseeable future. Assuming an annual growth rate of ten percent—a rate lower than our current experience and one that most experts agree is reasonable—the number of revenue passenger-miles flown in the Free World is expected to increase tenfold—from about 140,000,000,000 in 1966 to approximately 1,400,000,000,000 in 1990. More than two-thirds of the total forecast for 1990, or 1,000,000,000,000 revenue seat-miles, will be for route segments that are more than 700 miles (1,130 km) long. This is the market in which the SSTs can win up to 1,000,000,000,000 revenue passenger-miles. How much of this vast market can be captured by an SST depends upon how efficient, reliable, and economical it will be. One trillion revenue passenger-miles works out to a market potential of some $90,000,000,000 to $100,000,000,000 worth of airplanes, subsonic and supersonic. This market is for passenger aircraft alone. It does not even include the air-cargo market, which is growing by leaps and bounds.

The United States Government, in partnership with private industry, has for the past five years undertaken extensive research, technical development, and detailed design investigations to come up with the kind of supersonic transport that the airlines need and that passengers will want to fly on. The objective is to develop a safe, reliable, and profitable SST for the world's air carriers, one that is capable of servicing the market.

SAFETY

To be successful, the SST must meet safety demands that are almost absolute. And it must be versatile—able to operate under a wide variety of conditions. These factors underlie the U.S. decision to incorporate variable-wing geometry, which was tested on experimental research aircraft as early as 1951. More recently, variable geometry was employed on the supersonic F–111 fighter, now in large-scale production for the U.S. Air Force and Navy.

For subsonic flight, the variable-sweep wing design offers many advantages. In this configuration, the U.S. SST incorporates a high-lift system that provides slow approach speeds, conventional handling qualities, and good approach attitude and visibility similar to that of a Boeing 707 or McDonnell Douglas DC–8. Its takeoff and landing speeds, ground-roll distances, and general-handling qualities in ascent and descent are comparable to today's jets. The SST's lowered nose will give better visibility than today's jets. The takeoff and handling attitudes, similar to present airplanes, will be simple for today's jet transport pilot. Four powerful General Electric engines contribute to safety in the air and give an extra margin of safety in takeoff and landing. Shorter takeoff rolls combined with high rates of climb mean that the SST can be at a significantly high altitude as it passes over areas surrounding airports. Since takeoff and landing requirements and speeds are comparable to today's jet aircraft, the U.S. SST can use existing air terminal and airways systems with very little difficulty.

The supersonic cruise configuration, with the wings fully swept back, provides high-speed stability and control, maximum lift/drag ratio, and simple operating procedures. In supersonic configuration the wing is integrated with the horizontal stabilizer into a single aerodynamic unit, which makes it look much like a deltawing. Obviously, the swept-wing mechanism adds some weight and complexity, but these are more than offset by more efficient subsonic, transonic, and supersonic performance.

To ensure maximum reliability and easy maintenance, proven structural concepts have been used throughout the airframe. Titanium, which is one-half the weight of steel but far more heat resistant than aluminum, is used in the airplane structure, which is designed for a service life of more than 50,000 hours. All important systems are backed up by alternate systems so that the SST can proceed safely and reliably to its scheduled destination even if trouble should develop en route. High daily airplane utilization will be possible by reducing ground times for through, stop, and turnaround maintenance, fueling, cleaning, and cargo loading and unloading. These normal activities should take no longer than at present.

Four main landing gears permit high gross weight takeoffs and inherently soft landings. More importantly, a safe emergency landing can be made using only one main gear on one side of the airplane. This added safety feature is not available on today's aircraft. The four General Electric engines utilize technology and experience gained from the XB–70 program.

ECONOMICS

An SST design must give the airlines a chance to make money with it. Initially, the SST will operate on longhaul, overwater intercontinental routes. The design is aimed at highest efficiency and economy on supersonic nonstop flights of about 4,000 miles (6,440) km), but it can be operated subsonically on short overland segments and still remain economically profitable.

Airlines need an airliner that is not only efficient but also highly productive. The Boeing SST offers three times the speed and two-thirds the number of seats for about twice the price of the largest subsonic airplane currently in planning. Economic efficiency—attaining the highest speed for the least fuel with the most passengers—when expressed as direct operating costs per seat-mile, is well below those of current subsonic jets in international operation. In fact, direct operating costs are only slightly higher than those of proposed subsonic transports which can carry more passengers than the SST.

The U.S. SST's productivity (work capacity in available seat-miles per year for the international market) is almost equal to that of four 707s and 30 percent better than that of the large capacity subsonic jets. Since airplane productivity is a function of speed and capacity, a productive airliner must provide high flexibility in seating combinations and trip times, so as to be useful for a variety of individual markets. The large passenger cabin and the high-lift variable-sweep wing of the U.S. SST increase its adaptability and productivity in matching specific airline markets.

Productivity, however, is only theoretical unless the passenger likes the airplane. The SST's speed alone will provide high passenger appeal. And it will not only be fast, but comfortable as well. Cabin interiors will be more spacious than those of today's jetliners. The wide fuselage permits double aisles and wider seats. Passengers will not realize how fast they are flying. They will notice no change, for example, when they pass through the speed of sound. Supersonic flight will be smooth and quiet, since the engines are mounted aft and beneath the tail plane. This fact, plus thermal insulation, will hold cabin noise below the level of current jet transports. In short, the SST is designed as a passengers' airplane.

The high productive capacity of the U.S. SST, coupled with its ability to grow in size and range, will permit it to meet increasing traffic demands, including peak load requirements at popular departure hours. Structural and aerodynamic efficiency will improve. So will engine thrust and fuel economy. International operators will take advantage of these growth factors to increase range and payload on such routes as Rome-New York and Tokyo-Seattle. The built-in growth potential assures future lower unit operating costs. And the SST's greater seat-mile capacity may well help reduce both airport congestion and the need for new facilities.

THE VALUE OF TIME

Before we decided to build an airplane that can fly 1,800 miles (2,900 km) per hour (Mach 2.7) we tried to find out if this kind of speed was important to the passenger. While the U.S. SST design promises to provide an attractive airliner from the airline point of view, the passenger himself is the real judge. What is the value of his time? Are several days or hours intrinsically valuable, or important, or necessary? How much is an hour, or a day, really worth?

Let us compare the cost/value considerations for a round trip between Washington, D.C., and Los Angeles. By today's jet the trip takes about ten hours' flight time and costs $210, with meals included. The train takes six days and costs about the same when meals and tips are added on. The bus also takes six days for the transcontinental trip, with the total cost about $50 less. The six days' travel time lost in either case has some valve. A vacationer could increase his income by working when he otherwise would be en route, or he can use the time saved to lengthen his real vacation. A business or professional man's time has implicit value, which can be equated against his income. Thus, it is always cheaper, in fact, to travel by air when the monetary value of the time saved is recognized. The growth of the international transportation market attests to this hard monetary fact.

With the U.S. SST any two points on the globe will be within 12 hours of each other. History has shown that whenever travel time is substantially reduced there is a dramatic expansion in trade and population mobility. These factors, in turn, feed the growth of international air transportation, in a political sense, air travel time can be equally significant. For instance, President Johnson could have saved nine hours if he could have used the SST on his recent trip to Vietnam, a 50 percent saving in time. And everyone would agree that his time is pretty valuable.

Nothing but good can come from exploiting the technological explosion to secure faster, more efficient means of transportation. Time and distance barriers to communications among nations must be reduced. As the world grows smaller, men must come closer together. The SST will help, immeasurably.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, commercial aviation has become the fastest growing segment of the American economy. Air travel is growing at the rate of 17 percent a year. American built jet aircraft far outnumber their foreign counterparts in the skies throughout the globe.

The United States is the world leader in this vital, sophisticated field of endeavor—air transportation. It leads in both the manufacture of planes, in quantity and quality, and as a carrier of passengers.

The supersonic transport, Mr. President, makes sense as the next step in the growth of aviation that started on the shores of this country—at Kitty Hawk. The seeds of aviation were planted here, and through our enterprise we have nurtured it to its present state. Much of this Nation's prosperity is attributal to this industry—just as steel and automobiles have been so important. In the cities of this Nation, where the finding of jobs is so necessary to solve the social problems, the aircraft industry is a leading employer. A great number of SST dollars will go into urban centers throughout the country.

Mr. President, the United States has moved from the origins of flight to the threshold of the availability of supersonic transportation for its citizens. We have moved a step at a time, from biplanes to monoplanes, from one engine, propeller driven aircraft to four and six-engine transports. We have moved from propeller planes to subsonic jets. Now we move to the next step—the supersonic jet transport. It is part and parcel of the scientific and technical evolution that has enriched this country.

But our efforts are not unilateral. The pressure of competition exists. Great Britain and France are actually ahead of us with their SST, the Concorde, which was the greatest attraction at the big Paris Air Show last spring. While the Soviet Union's efforts in this area are cloaked in secrecy, there are strong indications that Russia is moving steadily ahead. The Russians claim the world's largest air network in their widespread Aeroflot operations, covering 325,000 miles. The Anglo-French company is taking orders—from both U.S. and foreign carriers. We know in the United States than we can build a superior aircraft in both efficiency and economy. Commercial carriers are prepared to purchase the American supersonic transport if it can meet their timetables. A delay of the U.S. version will enhance the salability of the Concorde.

The Federal Aviation Agency economic feasibility report concluded that SST aircraft sales for a 15-year period starting in 1975 can result in a favorable balance-of-payments impact of $17 billion on minimum estimates and $32 billion with maximum estimates.

It has been estimated that a 2-year delay in the program could reduce sales from 1,100 by 1990 to about 660. At best we can hope for initial deliveries to take place from three to four years after the Concorde begins carrying passengers.

It makes no more sense, Mr. President, for this country to rule itself out of production of sophisticated aircraft than it has been for the United States to deteriorate to its present position as a second-ranking merchant marine power—in both vessels on the seas and our shipbuilding capacity.

America's broad continent and its wide oceans on either side insist that we be a leader in transportation. We cannot wipe out the immense gains we have made in the most dramatic transportation area of all—the skies of the world.

I am aware of expressions made by high officials of the Department of Defense that the SST has no military application. Lacking a crystal ball, I will trust history on this question.

Every major aeronautical development over many years has seen beneficial fallout to the second party, be it military or commercial. An excellent example is the old workhorse DC-3 which came on the scene as the major airliner of the 1930's and also served the military so gallantly for many years.

The Air Force is building the huge C-5A, capable of carrying outsize cargoes to all points on the globe at less than sonic speeds. The C-5A's civilian counterpart is the jumbo jet, 747. Commercial lines are ordering both the subsonic 747 and the SST, planning to use both aircraft on their routes to meet specific needs. It will follow that the military, too, will need a transport of supersonic speed where time is a more critical factor in movement of personnel or high priority cargo. The SST engine development will have very considerable military significance, with a possible almost immediate application on fighter aircraft.

Congress first saw the military need for nuclear power on its warships, and the Polaris submarine has proved the wisdom of the Congress. I know that Congress is keenly interested in what contributions the SST can make to our defense posture and what the presence of such an airplane can do to help maintain the peace.

It has been predicted that before the SST flies in a commercial operation, military requirements will have been developed and military orders will have been placed for this aircraft. But, while the military possibilities must be considered, they are in no way involved in the ultimate success of the program. The SST will be a financial success purely in the commercial realm.

The breakeven point—when the Government will fully recoup its investment—is at the construction of the 300th plane. Yet, informed estimates are that some 1,200 will be sold if the program proceeds on schedule.

Mr. President, a Cabinet member in the late 19th century, on contemplating the great technical advances that had been made to that time, guessed that "there's nothing new to invent."

It would rival this 19th century assumption if we were today to conclude that we have nothing more to develop in the way of bigger, faster, more efficient air transports. I support the appropriation for this program and urge my colleagues to do so.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, for the benefit of the Senators who came in late, I do not know of any other amendment. It is my impression that there will be one vote on the amendment and then a vote on passage of the bill.

I certainly hope we can dispose of the bill this afternoon. I am willing to stay here as long as necessary.

I yield the floor.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, what concerns me are the questions of priority in this matter.

As I have said, yesterday, with the administration's support, we cut the budget by about $900 million in the field of poverty, cutting from the recommendation of the committee. This morning we almost cut another $198 million; we avoided this cut despite the administration. I do not believe any investment is more worthwhile in our country at the moment than to find jobs, so that people can become productive members of society and can get off relief. It seems to me that that problem should receive the highest priority, a higher priority than any plane we can make, or any engine we can build, a higher priority than enabling people, 15 years from now, to travel across the Atlantic or the Pacific at 800 miles an hour rather than 600 miles an hour. That would be very comfortable. It would be fine for those of our population who fly to be able to get to Europe in 3½ or 4 hours, instead of 6 or 7 hours. But I do not believe that the longer trip will kill anybody. If they are going to Paris or London or Rome, it will not hurt them to stay on the plane 2 or 3 hours longer than they do at present. I do not believe that having to spend 6 hours on a plane rather than 4 hours will destroy their vacation or their trip.

With all the problems we have in the United States at the moment, we are now debating something which—if it is completely successful—will give us some gain seven years from now. We are not talking about something in 1969, or 1971, or even 1973. We are talking about 1974. We are going to take some steps. We are going to spend $142 million this year. We have already spent $511 million. We are going to spend another $142 million this year, and continue to spend more each year, so that we will have some possible gain—if the program is completely effective—7 years from now.

Looking at this matter from the position of the administration, first, they say, as Members of the Senate have said, that it is possible we will have a deficit of $29 billion this year. How, then, can we afford to spend $142 million this year for this plane, when it will not give us any gain for at least 7 years? How can we say, as many Senators have said when they argued against the poverty programs, that we must save money and cannot afford the poverty programs? If we cannot afford any program, we cannot afford the supersonic jet program, which will not give us any benefit until 1974.

It is not a question of cutting out the

ahead to maintain its commanding lead in this exciting and challenging project of the future.

The September–October issue of Aerospace International contains a simple, succinct, and factual explanation of the American supersonic airliner now being developed by Boeing and General Electric. The article is written by the man who probably knows more about the project than any other American and the man best qualified to put to rest some of the ill-advised attacks on the supersonic transport project, the brilliantly able Maj. Gen. J. C. Maxwell, Director of the U.S. supersonic transport development program.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE U.S. SST: SAFE, FAST, AND PRODUCTIVE

(By Maj. Gen. J. C. Maxwell, USAF)

(NOTE.—The U.S. SST's reason for being is one of economics: The aircraft must be comfortable enough, safe enough, and fast enough to attract the passenger. It must be productive and profitable enough to attract the airline operators, and lastly, it must show a profit for the manufacturers and the taxpayers who are underwriting the entire project during the prototype phase. The Air Force General charged with the awesome responsibility of running the SST development program answers these and other questions about supersonic travel in this exclusive article for Aerospace International.)

Most transportation economists would agree that air traffic is going to grow at a rapid rate for the foreseeable future. Assuming an annual growth rate of ten percent—a rate lower than our current experience and one that most experts agree is reasonable—the number of revenue passenger-miles flown in the Free World is expected to increase tenfold—from about 140,000,000,000 in 1966 to approximately 1,400,000,000,000 in 1990. More than two-thirds of the total forecast for 1990, or 1,000,000,000,000 revenue seat-miles, will be for route segments that are more than 700 miles (1,130 km) long. This is the market in which the SSTs can win up to 1,000,000,000,000 revenue passenger-miles. How much of this vast market can be captured by an SST depends upon how efficient, reliable, and economical it will be. One trillion revenue passenger-miles works out to a market potential of some $90,000,000,000 to $100,000,000,000 worth of airplanes, subsonic and supersonic. This market is for passenger aircraft alone. It does not even include the air-cargo market, which is growing by leaps and bounds.

The United States Government, in partnership with private industry, has for the past five years undertaken extensive research, technical development, and detailed design investigations to come up with the kind of supersonic transport that the airlines need and that passengers will want to fly on. The objective is to develop a safe, reliable, and profitable SST for the world's air carriers, one that is capable of servicing the market.

SAFETY

To be successful, the SST must meet safety demands that are almost absolute. And it must be versatile—able to operate under a wide variety of conditions. These factors underlie the U.S. decision to incorporate variable-wing geometry, which was tested on experimental research aircraft as early as 1951. More recently, variable geometry was employed on the supersonic F-111 fighter, now in large-scale production for the U.S. Air Force and Navy.

For subsonic flight, the variable-sweep wing design offers many advantages. In this configuration, the U.S. SST incorporates a high-lift system that provides slow approach speeds, conventional handling qualities, and good approach attitude and visibility similar to that of a Boeing 707 or McDonnell Douglas DC–8. Its takeoff and landing speeds, ground-roll distances, and general-handling qualities in ascent and descent are comparable to today's jets. The SST's lowered nose will give better visibility than today's jets. The takeoff and handling attitudes, similar to present airplanes, will be simple for today's jet transport pilot. Four powerful General Electric engines contribute to safety in the air and give an extra margin of safety in takeoff and landing. Shorter takeoff rolls combined with high rates of climb mean that the SST can be at a significantly high altitude as it passes over areas surrounding airports. Since takeoff and landing requirements and speeds are comparable to today's jet aircraft, the U.S. SST can use existing air terminal and airways systems with very little difficulty.

The supersonic cruise configuration, with the wings fully swept back, provides high-speed stability and control, maximum lift/drag ratio, and simple operating procedures. In supersonic configuration the wing is integrated with the horizontal stabilizer into a single aerodynamic unit, which makes it look much like a deltawing. Obviously, the swept-wing mechanism adds some weight and complexity, but these are more than offset by more efficient subsonic, transonic, and supersonic performance.

To ensure maximum reliability and easy maintenance, proven structural concepts have been used throughout the airframe. Titanium, which is one-half the weight of steel but far more heat resistant than aluminum, is used in the airplane structure, which is designed for a service life of more than 50,000 hours. All important systems are backed up by alternate systems so that the SST can proceed safely and reliably to its scheduled destination even if trouble should develop en route. High daily airplane utilization will be possible by reducing ground times for through, stop, and turnaround maintenance, fueling, cleaning, and cargo loading and unloading. These normal activities should take no longer than at present.

Four main landing gears permit high gross weight takeoffs and inherently soft landings. More importantly, a safe emergency landing can be made using only one main gear on one side of the airplane. This added safety feature is not available on today's aircraft. The four General Electric engines utilize technology and experience gained from the XB–70 program.

ECONOMICS

An SST design must give the airlines a chance to make money with it. Initially, the SST will operate on longhaul, overwater intercontinental routes. The design is aimed at highest efficiency and economy on supersonic nonstop flights of about 4,000 miles (6,440) km), but it can be operated subsonically on short overland segments and still remain economically profitable.

Airlines need an airliner that is not only efficient but also highly productive. The Boeing SST offers three times the speed and two-thirds the number of seats for about twice the price of the largest subsonic airplane currently in planning. Economic efficiency—attaining the highest speed for the least fuel with the most passengers—when expressed as direct operating costs per seat-mile, is well below those of current subsonic jets in international operation. In fact, direct operating costs are only slightly higher than those of proposed subsonic transports which can carry more passengers than the SST.

The U.S. SST's productivity (work capacity in available seat-miles per year for the international market) is almost equal to that of four 707s and 30 percent better than that of the large capacity subsonic jets. Since airplane productivity is a function of speed and capacity, a productive airliner must provide high flexibility in seating combinations and trip times, so as to be useful for a variety of individual markets. The large passenger cabin and the high-lift variable-sweep wing of the U.S. SST increase its adaptability and productivity in matching specific airline markets.

Productivity, however, is only theoretical unless the passenger likes the airplane. The SST's speed alone will provide high passenger appeal. And it will not only be fast, but comfortable as well. Cabin interiors will be more spacious than those of today's jetliners. The wide fuselage permits double aisles and wider seats. Passengers will not realize how fast they are flying. They will notice no change, for example, when they pass through the speed of sound. Supersonic flight will be smooth and quiet, since the engines are mounted aft and beneath the tail plane. This fact, plus thermal insulation, will hold cabin noise below the level of current jet transports. In short, the SST is designed as a passengers' airplane.

The high productive capacity of the U.S. SST, coupled with its ability to grow in size and range, will permit it to meet increasing traffic demands, including peak load requirements at popular departure hours. Structural and aerodynamic efficiency will improve. So will engine thrust and fuel economy. International operators will take advantage of these growth factors to increase range and payload on such routes as Rome-New York and Tokyo-Seattle. The built-in growth potential assures future lower unit operating costs. And the SST's greater seat-mile capacity may well help reduce both airport congestion and the need for new facilities.

THE VALUE OF TIME

Before we decided to build an airplane that can fly 1,800 miles (2,900 km) per hour (Mach 2.7) we tried to find out if this kind of speed was important to the passenger. While the U.S. SST design promises to provide an attractive airliner from the airline point of view, the passenger himself is the real judge. What is the value of his time? Are several days or hours intrinsically valuable, or important, or necessary? How much is an hour, or a day, really worth?

Let us compare the cost/value considerations for a round trip between Washington, D.C., and Los Angeles. By today's jet the trip takes about ten hours' flight time and costs $210, with meals included. The train takes six days and costs about the same when meals and tips are added on. The bus also takes six days for the transcontinental trip, with the total cost about $50 less. The six days' travel time lost in either case has some valve. A vacationer could increase his income by working when he otherwise would be en route, or he can use the time saved to lengthen his real vacation. A business or professional man's time has implicit value, which can be equated against his income. Thus, it is always cheaper, in fact, to travel by air when the monetary value of the time saved is recognized. The growth of the international transportation market attests to this hard monetary fact.

With the U.S. SST any two points on the globe will be within 12 hours of each other. History has shown that whenever travel time is substantially reduced there is a dramatic expansion in trade and population mobility. These factors, in turn, feed the growth of international air transportation, in a political sense, air travel time can be equally significant. For instance, President Johnson could have saved nine hours if he could have used the SST on his recent trip to Vietnam, a 50 percent saving in time. And everyone would agree that his time is pretty valuable.

Nothing but good can come from exploiting the technological explosion to secure faster, more efficient means of transportation. Time and distance barriers to communications among nations must be reduced. As the world grows smaller, men must come closer together. The SST will help, immeasurably.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, commercial aviation has become the fastest growing segment of the American economy. Air travel is growing at the rate of 17 percent a year. American built jet aircraft far outnumber their foreign counterparts in the skies throughout the globe.

The United States is the world leader in this vital, sophisticated field of endeavor—air transportation. It leads in both the manufacture of planes, in quantity and quality, and as a carrier of passengers.

The supersonic transport, Mr. President, makes sense as the next step in the growth of aviation that started on the shores of this country—at Kitty Hawk. The seeds of aviation were planted here, and through our enterprise we have nurtured it to its present state. Much of this Nation's prosperity is attributal to this industry—just as steel and automobiles have been so important. In the cities of this Nation, where the finding of jobs is so necessary to solve the social problems, the aircraft industry is a leading employer. A great number of SST dollars will go into urban centers throughout the country.

Mr. President, the United States has moved from the origins of flight to the threshold of the availability of supersonic transportation for its citizens. We have moved a step at a time, from biplanes to monoplanes, from one engine, propeller driven aircraft to four and six-engine transports. We have moved from propeller planes to subsonic jets. Now we move to the next step—the supersonic jet transport. It is part and parcel of the scientific and technical evolution that has enriched this country.

But our efforts are not unilateral. The pressure of competition exists. Great Britain and France are actually ahead of us with their SST, the Concorde, which was the greatest attraction at the big Paris Air Show last spring. While the Soviet Union's efforts in this area are cloaked in secrecy, there are strong indications that Russia is moving steadily ahead. The Russians claim the world's largest air network in their widespread Aeroflot operations, covering 325,000 miles. The Anglo-French company is taking orders—from both U.S. and foreign carriers. We know in the United States than we can build a superior aircraft in both efficiency and economy. Commercial carriers are prepared to purchase the American supersonic transport if it can meet their timetables. A delay of the U.S. version will enhance the salability of the Concorde.

The Federal Aviation Agency economic feasibility report concluded that SST aircraft sales for a 15-year period starting in 1975 can result in a favorable balance-of-payments impact of $17 billion on minimum estimates and $32 billion with maximum estimates.

It has been estimated that a 2-year delay in the program could reduce sales from 1,100 by 1990 to about 660. At best we can hope for initial deliveries to take place from three to four years after the Concorde begins carrying passengers.

It makes no more sense, Mr. President, for this country to rule itself out of production of sophisticated aircraft than it has been for the United States to deteriorate to its present position as a second-ranking merchant marine power—in both vessels on the seas and our shipbuilding capacity.

America's broad continent and its wide oceans on either side insist that we be a leader in transportation. We cannot wipe out the immense gains we have made in the most dramatic transportation area of all—the skies of the world.

I am aware of expressions made by high officials of the Department of Defense that the SST has no military application. Lacking a crystal ball, I will trust history on this question.

Every major aeronautical development over many years has seen beneficial fallout to the second party, be it military or commercial. An excellent example is the old workhorse DC–3 which came on the scene as the major airliner of the 1930's and also served the military so gallantly for many years.

The Air Force is building the huge C–5A, capable of carrying outsize cargoes to all points on the globe at less than sonic speeds. The C–5A's civilian counterpart is the jumbo jet, 747. Commercial lines are ordering both the subsonic 747 and the SST, planning to use both aircraft on their routes to meet specific needs. It will follow that the military, too, will need a transport of supersonic speed where time is a more critical factor in movement of personnel or high priority cargo. The SST engine development will have very considerable military significance, with a possible almost immediate application on fighter aircraft.

Congress first saw the military need for nuclear power on its warships, and the Polaris submarine has proved the wisdom of the Congress. I know that Congress is keenly interested in what contributions the SST can make to our defense posture and what the presence of such an airplane can do to help maintain the peace.

It has been predicted that before the SST flies in a commercial operation, military requirements will have been developed and military orders will have been placed for this aircraft. But, while the military possibilities must be considered, they are in no way involved in the ultimate success of the program. The SST will be a financial success purely in the commercial realm.

The breakeven point—when the Government will fully recoup its investment—is at the construction of the 300th plane. Yet, informed estimates are that some 1,200 will be sold if the program proceeds on schedule.

Mr. President, a Cabinet member in the late 19th century, on contemplating the great technical advances that had been made to that time, guessed that "there's nothing new to invent."

It would rival this 19th century assumption if we were today to conclude that we have nothing more to develop in the way of bigger, faster, more efficient air transports. I support the appropriation for this program and urge my colleagues to do so.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, for the benefit of the Senators who came in late, I do not know of any other amendment. It is my impression that there will be one vote on the amendment and then a vote on passage of the bill.

I certainly hope we can dispose of the bill this afternoon. I am willing to stay here as long as necessary.

I yield the floor.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, what concerns me are the questions of priority in this matter.

As I have said, yesterday, with the administration's support, we cut the budget by about $900 million in the field of poverty, cutting from the recommendation of the committee. This morning we almost cut another $198 million; we avoided this cut despite the administration. I do not believe any investment is more worthwhile in our country at the moment than to find jobs, so that people can become productive members of society and can get off relief. It seems to me that that problem should receive the highest priority, a higher priority than any plane we can make, or any engine we can build, a higher priority than enabling people, 15 years from now, to travel across the Atlantic or the Pacific at 800 miles an hour rather than 600 miles an hour. That would be very comfortable. It would be fine for those of our population who fly to be able to get to Europe in 3½ or 4 hours, instead of 6 or 7 hours. But I do not believe that the longer trip will kill anybody. If they are going to Paris or London or Rome, it will not hurt them to stay on the plane 2 or 3 hours longer than they do at present. I do not believe that having to spend 6 hours on a plane rather than 4 hours will destroy their vacation or their trip.

With all the problems we have in the United States at the moment, we are now debating something which—if it is completely successful—will give us some gain seven years from now. We are not talking about something in 1969, or 1971, or even 1973. We are talking about 1974. We are going to take some steps. We are going to spend $142 million this year. We have already spent $511 million. We are going to spend another $142 million this year, and continue to spend more each year, so that we will have some possible gain—if the program is completely effective—7 years from now.

Looking at this matter from the position of the administration, first, they say, as Members of the Senate have said, that it is possible we will have a deficit of $29 billion this year. How, then, can we afford to spend $142 million this year for this plane, when it will not give us any gain for at least 7 years? How can we say, as many Senators have said when they argued against the poverty programs, that we must save money and cannot afford the poverty programs? If we cannot afford any program, we cannot afford the supersonic jet program, which will not give us any benefit until 1974.

It is not a question of cutting out the

program completely. Nobody has suggested that. It might be a worthwhile program. But at least let us defer it, in view of the problems that this country is experiencing internally and externally. We are faced with a $29 billion deficit. We are spending approximately $30 billion a year in Vietnam. We have internal problems in our own country, and the problems are not improving.

The unemployment rate of those who live in the ghettos and in the high rate of unemployment centers across the country is becoming worse, not better, according to the Department of Labor.

A number of those who advocate the SST program say that it will make jobs, and this is one of the reasons we should approve the program. If we are going to get jobs for people, why do we not build housing in the ghettos or where there is unemployment in the rural areas of the United States? Why do we not build factories or hospitals in those areas and give the people jobs on those projects and in those facilities when they are finished?

We should not build a supersonic plane so that 1 percent of our population can get to Paris in 4 hours—that is the basic question—while so many of our people are in such desperate need, not only the Negroes, but the whites of Appalachia, the Puerto Ricans, and the Mexican-Americans as well. What will they say when they read of this debate—on the same day it has been advocated to cut $198 million from our poverty program, and but one day after we cut $900 million from our poverty program which was designed specifically to find jobs.

We would be committing ourselves to a program that possibly would bring benefit in 1974—a plane that could not fly over the United States and would only be able to fly over the oceans. It could not fly from the east coast to the west coast. It would be for the benefit of the people in the United States who could afford to go to Europe or to Asia, either on an expense account or on vacation. I believe they constitute a small minority.

I support the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin, an amendment which would not destroy the program but would just postpone it.

Let us take another look at the matter. There is enough controversy about this program, and it deserves another look. There are enough problems at the present time in our own country, as well as our problems in the Far East, in Vietnam, and all over the globe. I believe this matter deserves another look, and I support the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I should like to make a few remarks to see whether we can clear up some of the misunderstanding that has been generated in the discussion of this matter.

I do not look at the SST—nor do I believe any member of the committee does—as a special conveyance to transport a few members of our jet set to Europe, Singapore, or the Middle East. I look at it as a vital factor in a very important industry which must be kept modern. It must be given the excellence of the American standards. Certainly, this jet plane, with the sonic boom, will probably not be very useful for transcontinental flight. Neither were the clipper ships useful for transcontinental traffic, but they brought the world's commerce to America.

You do not have to look at any statistics other than the retirement of the *Queen Mary*, the *Queen Elizabeth*, and other ocean liners, to realize that the passenger traffic of the world is moving by air; and when it moves by air on the long-haul routes, it will move by the fastest aircraft available.

On February 29 of next year, the British will fly the Concorde. Make no mistake about it. I have heard this announced by the chairman of the board of the consortium that Britain joined with France in its production. On this day, the age of supersonic flight will be here. Of course, it will take 3 or 4 years for the delivery of the Concorde. That is why most of our own transoceanic airlines have covered themselves for this period by buying the Concorde, because they know they dare not be second best. They want to buy American aircraft, because they know it will be the best.

If we fail to take this opportunity to move forward, if we curtail, by the amendment of the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin, and chop from the funds all but $1 million, we will be doing, I believe, a tremendous disservice to this country.

In the first place, as the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado mentioned, I believe we certainly will be forgoing the $52 million that was asked for by the opponents of this program to be put up by the airlines; because I cannot conceive this Government—I cannot conceive the ethical standards with which we try to deal with people dealing with the Government—that would consider that money put up in good faith for a continuation of this program, could be held in force perhaps by a legal suit, certainly not by ethical standards, to keep the $52 million that has been put in as their contribution of good faith for the continuation of this program, with the normal speed of the development and the continuation of the funding of this program.

Certainly, I do not wish to see us slide back to 2 or 3 years' delay, because each year will mean a further penetration of this supersonic market by the Concorde. They will be forced to buy the Concorde, or perhaps the Soviet plane, both of which will be flying, because of our insistence on building the finest plane, which will be delayed several years after the Concorde is on the air routes of the world.

We will have the best plane, because titanium is the new metal. It is the only metal that can withstand the heat generated at supersonic speeds beyond mach 2.1. I disagree strongly with the contention that there is any trick or any joker—it has been outlined repeatedly in the contracts—that because the contract requires a titanium structure that will fly beween ranges of mach 2.2 and mach 3.1, there is a joker in it.

Mr. President, I say to my distinguished colleague, whom I love dearly and whose association I enjoy so much in the Senate, if by any chance we should find another metal that would be more superior than titanium it would be worth every dollar to have this developed and placed on the market instead of titanium. If we can bring about the development of another metal in the range of time of 10 years that we have been talking about, I think our moving ahead at this time would be justified.

The first metal planes that came into existence, which were made of aluminum, somewhere back in the late 1920's have been extremely useful as the principal airplanes in aviation. Now we are moving to a new metal after all these many years. I doubt seriously if we have true mach 3.1. If the plane should exceed this speed it would be unfit to fly because none of the systems, and there are multimillion-dollar systems that have to go into this complex aircraft, would operate or be safe or workable at above mach 3.1 because at that point the temperature on the airframe would exceed 650 degrees Fahrenheit, a heat beyond which the systems being designed in this plane will not be able to take.

Mr. President, with respect to the fear of being booby-trapped into a contract that is inescapable, I find it difficult to understand that argument. We will get our money back when we begin the 300 number in delivery. We will have justified the recovery of our investment. If we go forward to 500 we reach beyond, according to Secretary Boyd of the Department of Transportation, and we should receive and realize $1.1 billion in profits and interest. If 500 planes are sold or if 1,200 planes should be sold, through a breakthrough in the sound barrier handicap, we should receive $3.8 billion. This is not a subsidy. It is not a gamble. American technology is capable of doing it. Nearly every plane that has written great records for America in aviation has been the result of Government investment.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a photostatic copy of a memorandum from the War Department dated February 10, 1908. The contract is signed by the Wright Brothers at Dayton, Ohio, and it provides for the order of one heavier-than-air flying machine, in accordance with Signal Corps specification No. 486, dated December 23, 1907, at a price of $25,000.

This is where it all began and the fertilization of aviation has been possible by that $25,000 for the first Wright brothers plane. It is difficult to find any aircraft we produce that does not go back to the genesis that governmental research has been the most important factor in its success. We are not subsidizing; we are advancing the funds.

I believe this will be the finest and best supersonic transport in the skies when it is completed and that it will return not only the original investment but a profit on that investment.

Mr. President, I urge the Senate not to accept the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] and I believe that the committee recommendation would permit us to move forward at the best and most appropriate speed.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, it is time to recognize and act on the indisputable fact that our Nation, rich and powerful though it is, does not have inexhaustible resources.

The recent event in our cities have clearly demonstrated that we have a crisis right on the main streets of our Nation. This crisis poses a challenge to the ingenuity, the skills, and the resources of our society.

The Senate must recognize the legitimate needs of our citizens. We must establish some priorities, and I support the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE].

The plan to cut funds earmarked for development of the SST does not kill the idea. Adequate funds remain for a more deliberate program which can proceed at a slower pace and study the effects of the sonic boom—a major stumbling block for the future of the SST.

It is not responsible to say we as a Nation can have everything at once. I do not believe a few hours faster trip to Europe takes precedence over our own massive domestic requirements.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the committee feels that the facts have been developed at the hearings and the record has been fully presented to the Senate. We rest on the matter. Other than that, the debate will close with a statement by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] on his amendment.

Mr. President, will the Chair actively see that we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, for the last hour or so I have listened to arguments against the amendment and in favor of going ahead full blast with $142 million for the SST.

One of the arguments is that this would help the balance of payments. This argument completely overlooks the fact that there will be no benefit to our balance of payments for 10 years. The balance-of-payments problem that we have is not 10 years from now, but this problem is with us now.

The argument overlooks the fact that none of the competent agencies of the Government which deal with balance of payments, and I refer to the Treasury, Commerce, the Federal Reserve and the Council of Economic Advisers, have made any statement on this matter at all. The best estimate I can get from the economists is that the matter is a tossup as to whether it would favorably or adversely affect the balance of payments.

Mr. President, in the second place, there has been no answer to the contention we made that this is a rush job to attempt to combat competition from the Concorde. The Concorde is a plane that has already jumped in cost from $10 to $20 million, and it is going to cost more.

There is no answer to the argument that the Concorde will not be able to compete because it cannot fly over land at high speeds and will not be in the same ball park with our supersonic transport even if we take 2 or 3 years more. There is no answer to the argument that the Concorde is made of aluminum and cannot fly more than mach 2 and for that reason will not be able to compete, even if we take 3 or 4 more years.

There is no answer to the alternative offered by the Assistant Secretary of State who said we could finance this plane as effectively by private funds as well as by public funds, and that indeed it would be much better. This SST constitutes a new departure that we should finance a commercial and profit venture at the expense of the taxpayer, which is not for military purposes, but for the benefit of those who take advantage of flying by air.

There has been no answer on the contracts. The Senator from Oklahoma is very expert in this area, but he conceded that if the SST flies at more than mach 3.1, the taxpayer loses everything under this contract. The SR-71 now flies at mach 3, and with tolerances there, does go over mach 3.1, with none of the breakdown of equipment the Senator referred to. There is a real possibility with the advancement of air technology this plane could fly at more than mach 3.1. If it does, the Federal Government has lost all of our investment.

Mr. President, there is a possibility we can develop another metal other than titanium; if so the Federal Government loses all of its investment. To this there has been no answer.

There has been no answer to the argument made by the Senator from New York that there is no urgency on this SST. What is the hurry? What difference does it make if we postpone this for a few months?

There has been no answer to the argument of the Senator from New York and the Senator from Arkansas that this SST cannot be placed in any priority of national needs. There are many priorities above this.

There has been no answer to the argument that very few persons will benefit from this. No one has contended that more than 3 percent or 5 percent of the population could benefit from this kind of flight. They are the only persons who could afford it.

Finally this year, this month of October 1967, the House Ways and Means Committee has said that unless the President can reduce spending by $7 to $10 billion, they will not proceed on the tax bill. This is a time when we all should be conscious of our fiscal responsibility. There has been no answer and there has been no attempt to answer the argument that we face a $30 billion deficit, and yet we would go ahead with a frill that could be postponed without any significant loss and we would be going ahead with it on the basis of grossly inadequate justification.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MUSKIE in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina would vote "yea," and the Senator from Florida would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas would vote "yea," and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] is paired with the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea," and the Senator from Alaska would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is absent for religious observance.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] are absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE] is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea," and the Senator from New York would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 19, nays 54, as follows:

[No. 283 Leg.]

YEAS—19

Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Case
Clark
Griffin
Gruening
Hansen
Hatfield
Holland
Kennedy, N.Y.
Lausche
Mondale
Morse
Nelson
Proxmire
Ribicoff
Spong
Williams, Del.
Yarborough

NAYS—54

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Church
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Ellender
Fong
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hickenlooper
Hollings
Inouye
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McIntyre
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Montoya
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Pearson
Pell
Percy
Scott
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Tower
Williams, N.J.
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—27

Baker
Bartlett
Brooke
Carlson
Dodd
Eastland
Ervin
Fannin
Fulbright
Gore
Hayden
Hill
Hruska
Javits
Kennedy, Mass.
McGovern
Morton
Moss
Pastore
Prouty
Randolph
Russell
Smathers
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tydings
Young, Ohio

So Mr. PROXMIRE's amendment was rejected.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask to have it read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 6, lines 11 and 12, to strike out "$65,400,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$28,400,000."

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senate, I would like to make a unanimous-consent request, which has been discussed with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], manager of the bill, and the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

I ask unanimous consent that on all amendments there be a time limitation of not to exceed 30 minutes, the time to be equally divided between the proposer of the amendment and the chairman of the subcommittee, the manager of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. And, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that 1 hour of debate be allowed on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, if the Chair could get order and keep it, I believe we could dispose of the amendment rather rapidly. I believe the Senator from Delaware said he had only a few remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized. For how much time?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield myself 5 minutes, Mr. President. I concur in what the Senator from Mississippi has said. I think we can dispose of this amendment very quickly.

I am not debating the merits or demerits of this particular appropriation. It is just a question of how much we can afford.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, we are not in order and we cannot hear.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The Senate is not in order.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to suspend the business of the Senate until we can hear. There is so much talk going on back here that those of us who must handle the business of the Senate cannot hear what is being said.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi is more successful than the Chair. The Chair thanks the Senators from Mississippi.

The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, this is a section of the bill which deals with facilities and equipment at the airports.

Under the budget as submitted to the House the administration asked for $35.4 million. This compares with $28 million appropriated for the same purpose in 1967. The House allowed $30 million.

After the bill came over to the Senate a revised budget request was submitted in which this estimate was revised downward to $28.4 million. Their request was revised downward on the ground that the extra money was not needed.

The administration asked for only $28.4 million.

The bill as reported by the committee, instead of complying with the budget request, provided $65.4 million or an increase of $37 million.

My amendment would reduce the amount to exactly that which the Budget told the committee it would need. Reading from the House committee report, it was stated that it is estimated that even with the lower amount, at the end of the fiscal year they will have an unobligated balance of $33.138 million. At the beginning of this fiscal year this agency had an unobligated balance remaining of $84,038,000.

I quote these figures from the House report.

I see no need to appropriate more than double the amount which the Budget thinks this agency needs. That is why I offer this amendment.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes or such part of it as I may use.

Let me direct the attention of the Senate to what we think is a highly important matter. This concerns itself solely with the question of safety. These funds are to be used exclusively for procurement of equipment. These items are listed at the top of page 7 of the report. The increases contemplated by the committee would include airport surveillance radar. The lack of such equipment is what may have cost the lives of the 84 people at Asheville, N.C., just about 2 months ago.

This item also includes terminal automation to receive and process altitude information on radar scopes, instrument landing systems, and approach lights.

Members of the Senate, this figure was arrived at after the closest study and seeking of information, not from the Budget Bureau, but from the FAA. They did not volunteer anything. We had to use a corkscrew to get it out of them. I finally got General McKee and put the question in such a way that it was not suggesting anything.

This is a purely Federal undertaking. It involves terminals and centers. It is interstate commerce, to begin with, but the Federal Government is the only one in the business, the only one who can do the job, the only one who has control over it.

I am not talking out of school, but one of the most recent air disasters involved a small plane coming into an airport. He was told to turn to the right and follow a certain line. Instead, it turned to the left, but the man in the tower had no way of knowing that, although it was only a few miles away. If the man had had the ground radar, he would have seen the error of the little plane, and through communications, could have told the pilot he was on the wrong route and to change his course. No one knew that, and the small plane hit into the underside of the jet airplane, and 82 people were killed in one disaster.

Those are things that happen.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does not the Senator think we need ground radar here at National Airport?

Mr. STENNIS. We have it here. It is needed in many other places. I am not willing to wait any longer. The Senate can do what it wants to. We can forget about the $7 million request that came in late. The men who work in the towers have to be employed and trained for 2 years before they are ready to go to work.

So the Budget Bureau took $7 million off of facilities, and added $7 million to operations. But, frankly, the committee ignored both of those items, and put in 30 million new dollars into facilities and equipment and 20 million new dollars into operations, to provide more manpower and more money to pay for some extra hours.

I ask Senators to be careful before they vote to take this money out, or somebody, I am afraid, will get stung.

I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I point out to the Senator from Delaware that there is really no economy in cutting this payment, because what we are doing here is fulfilling a commitment which the Federal Government has made, under the law, to these airports, to provide these safety devices. This is the place to provide for them. All we could do by cutting it back would be to defer it for a year or more and running the additional risk, but ultimately the Federal Government has to meet its commitment to provide the safety devices.

So, if Senators agree with the Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from Mississippi—and other Senators, I am sure—that aviation is here to stay, I say there is no economy in just postponing a commitment we have to meet. I think we ought to do it now, and provide these airports with the kind of safety devices that can protect human life, as we proceed with the aviation program. I do not think this is a place where we can afford to cut back.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from South Dakota for his kind remarks.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes. I believe just as strongly in safety as does the Senator from Mississippi. I do not disagree with the chairman on that point at all; but appropriating more money would not have changed the facts, as far as the 1966 accident to which he has referred or any other accident is concerned this year, because at the end of fiscal 1966 there remained $123,324,000 of unobligated balances in this Agency's account, and at the end of fiscal 1967 the unobligated balance was $186,456,000. Had they wished they could have spent more to buy the equipment of which the Senator was speaking.

These accidents resulted not from a shortage of funds for the Agency.

At the end of fiscal 1966 there was $186,456,000 remaining as unobligated and, according to the House committee report, it is estimated that at the end of fiscal 1968 there will be $86,300,000 in unobligated balances, even with the amount being reduced as proposed in the pending amendment.

I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from this House committee report, beginning on page 13 and continuing on page 14, confirming the statistics I have quoted, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

Following this House report I insert an excerpt of the Senate report, which confirms that the Budget had reduced its original request by $7 million, or to the amount of $28,400,000.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the House and Senate reports were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPT FROM HOUSE REPORT

Facilities and equipment

Appropriation, 1967 ___________	$28, 000, 000
Estimate, 1968 ________________	35, 400, 000
Recommended in the bill_______	30, 000, 000
Reduction below estimate ______	−5, 400, 000

> The $30,000,000 recommended is $2,000,000 more than the $28,000,000 appropriated last year for this activity. The total obligations in this activity anticipated in fiscal year 1968 total $86,300,000. At the beginning of the fiscal year an unobligated balance of $84,038,000 was estimated to be available. The Committee opposes the buildup of unduly large unobligated balances and feels that the funds available, along with the additional $30,000,000 provided, will enable the FAA to fund those activities for which obligations are required during the fiscal year.
>
> It is estimated that at the end of fiscal year 1968 $33,138,000 will remain unobligated. Usually, estimates of unobligated balances are optimistic. Last year, it was estimated that $123,324,000 would be unobligated at the end of fiscal year 1966. In the fiscal year 1968 budget, it is shown that the actual amount unobligated at the end of fiscal year 1966 was $186,456,000.

EXCERPT FROM SENATE REPORT

Facilities and equipment

1967 appropriations to date_____	$28, 000, 000
1968 budget estimate _________	[1] 28, 400, 000
House allowance _____________	30, 000, 000
Committee recommendation __	65, 400, 000

[1] As amended by S. Doc. 50. (Original estimate decreased by $7,000,000.)

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. This report shows that there are and will be available funds in this program without the $37 million added by the Senate committee. This is an area where we can cut back on the recommended appropriation.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute. With the greatest of deference to the Senator from Delaware, there is an explanation about there being this much available money. There is a time-lag question involved here, of long leadtime, to obtain this equipment. But I have no doubt that we know what we are talking about, about this need, and that the appropriation of these funds will make this equipment start to move. The orders have to be made, and the long wait cannot be avoided. We are overdue now.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I quoted the statistics from the House committee report. I read just one sentence from that report:

> It is estimated that at the end of fiscal year 1968, $86,300,000 will remain unobligated.

It goes on to point out the other figures which I have stated; and I feel we have a right to rely upon the committee reports.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, on July 19, I received a note from a gentleman in the Government, transmitting to me an interoffice memorandum from a Federal aviation agent in my own State.

This is what the memorandum says:

> Beginning on or about July 24, the radar communication crew will become involved with installation of the ASR-5—

This is the new radar—

> We will transfer———to the installation crew for the duration of the project. This transfer, during the annual leave season, leaves the crew 2 men short. Operating this short, we may not always have a man available to take care of your problems, so be patient, and we will take care of the equipment failures as soon as we can.

I sent the memorandum to the FAA, to find out whether in fact we had a situation which was of critical importance should a breakdown in the radar system occur.

They replied that although they were short of people and did need more funding for them, nevertheless, these people could be available, because their installation work was being done at the same field, and they could be shifted over to take care of the other unit.

It does seem to me that this, interoffice memorandum, clearly reveals the need for additional money, as advocated by the committee. This memorandum is particularly significant in view of the fact it was not prepared for a Senator or committee but was for intraoffice use. I think this issue is extremely important. Ordinarily, as Senators know, I try to support cuts in what I think are unnecessary expenditures; but with the enormous increase in air traffic that we are experiencing, I sincerely hope that we can retain the committee recommendations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is time yielded back?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. STENNIS. Under the parliamentary situation, this is really a committee amendment we are about to vote on, is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is an amendment to a committee amendment which was left open for further amendment.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Presiding Officer. Those in favor of the Senator's amendment, of course, would vote yea, and those not in favor would vote nay; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. Does the Senator yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. For what purpose does the Senator from Oklahoma address the Chair?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am not clear as to the holding of the Chair with reference to the vote on the amendment of the Senator from Delaware. If one is in favor of the amendment, would his vote be "nay"?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware. A yea vote would support his amendment, and a nay vote would be in favor of retaining the committee amendment unchanged.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Presiding Officer.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from

Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE] , the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is absent for religious observance.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] are absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 2, nays 68, as follows:

[No. 284 Leg.]

YEAS—2

Proxmire
Williams, Del.

NAYS—68

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Ellender
Fong
Griffin
Gruening
Hansen
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hickenlooper
Holland
Hollings
Inouye
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McClellan
McGee
McIntyre
Metcalf
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Morse
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Pearson
Pell
Percy
Ribicoff
Scott
Smith
Sparkman
Spong
Stennis
Symington
Tower
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—30

Baker
Bartlett
Brooke
Carlson
Dodd
Eastland
Ervin
Fannin
Fulbright
Gore
Hatfield
Hayden
Hill
Hruska
Javits
Kennedy, Mass.
McCarthy
McGovern
Montoya
Morton
Moss
Pastore
Prouty
Randolph
Russell
Smathers
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tydings
Young, Ohio

So the amendment of Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware was rejected.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 5, line 22, strike out "$618,400,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$605,400,000."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, if I understand the tabulation correctly, I believe that I lost the other amendment.

Seriously though, I recognize the futility of pressing this matter further. I offered this amendment merely to get an opportunity to point out the increases over the budget on certain items in this bill. On page 4 of the bill, under title acquisition and construction and improvements, the committee added $14½ million over the budget.

On page 5, under Federal Aviation Administration allowances for operations, the committee amount is $13 million over the budget. The budget request for that items was originally $598 million.

A revised budget request added $7 million. The Senate committee, however, added $20 million instead of $7 million. That amount is $13 million over the budget. In other words, the Budget Bureau asked for $7 million extra, and the committee in its generosity added $20 million. I had planned to offer an amendment to reduce that to the Budget request.

On page 14 we find that the Senate committee added $8 million for Alaskan assistance under the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1966. This was not a budget request. The entire item of $8 million was added by the Senate over the administration's recommendations.

Added altogether we have $72 million over and beyond what was requested by the budget.

I recognize that to try to cut the appropriations for this agency is like killing the sacred cow. In light of the recent vote I realize the futility of any further effort, and in view of the lateness of the hour I withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in withdrawing this amendment I reiterate that we in the Senate had better pause and ask ourselves how long we can continue to increase these various appropriations over the budget requests.

At the same time, I pay my respects to the Senator from Mississippi because I fully recognize that the overall total of this particular bill is slightly below the budget request.

But that does not justify the increases of $72 million to which I have referred.

I shall not press the point further at this time. I merely wish to emphasize that whether it be in my pet project or in the other fellow's pet project, at some point this Congress must decide whether or not we will roll back these expenditures; otherwise we shall be confronted with a sizable increase in taxes, and that rollcall vote will be interesting.

I am withdrawing these amendments because I see no evidence that a Senate vote on the other amendments to which I have just referred would be any different from the preceding vote; therefore I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read the third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, today, as we consider the Department of Transportation appropriations bill for fiscal 1968, we are debating the merits of the future of the supersonic transport in the United States. This bill includes an appropriation of $142,375,000 for the SST. Throughout recent months, there has been a great deal of criticism directed at the Government for its proposed large participation in the SST program and at the huge sums of money which the Federal Government is now planning to make available for the development of the SST.

There is no question that there are current strains on our economy which must be evaluated. The Federal Government is participating more heavily than ever in projects to improve our schools, our lakes and rivers, our ghetto areas, and many other things. Of course, we face the huge defense outlay which is greatly increased by our involvement in Southeast Asia. Many, including myself, are calling for reductions in nonessential Federal spending in order that a serious inflation does not beset the economy, and there are those on this floor today who argue that these funds for the SST program should be reduced for this very reason.

Mr. President, with this argument I cannot agree. I support the SST program for what I believe to be very valid reasons.

Air transportation today is a major economic asset to this country both in manufacturing commercial transports and in operating them on the airlines. Air transportation is the fastest growing segment of our economy today and promises to multiply tenfold in the next 25 years. Supersonic air transportation for passenger carrying is clearly going to be a part of that future whether or not the United States builds an SST. The SST is going to capture between 25 and 50 percent of a $1 billion market for aircraft sales. What this would mean to American industry and labor is obvious.

Mr. President, the question today is whether the U.S. Government should proceed with its support of the SST development as planned, or whether it should defer its responsibility in this area until such time as these funds would be more readily available. To delay our proposed spending on the SST would be, in my opinion, a mistake. I believe it is imperative that we proceed as planned so that the SST can be in full operation at least by 1975. While there are certain technical problems, including the most serious sonic boom, which must be solved, I strongly feel that the technical capability of our engineers will prove to be equal to the task by the time this plane is flying.

I have already briefly touched on the impact which the SST program will have on our economy. A successful SST program will pump from $20 to $48 billion into our economy over a 15-year period. Virtually every State in the Union would share in the benefits since approximately 65 percent of the SST productive program would be subcontracted out. Some 60,000 jobs would be created in the aerospace industry and at least that many in the airline and associated industries. In addition, there are other selling points. The balance of payments considered is a major one. The projected market for the SST is 500 to 1,200 aircraft by 1990. Half of these sales will be to foreign-flag airlines, resulting in a gold inflow of $10 to $24 billion over a 15-year period. Availability of a U.S. manufactured SST will also limit sales of the British-French Concorde to the U.S. airlines and prevent billions of dollars in gold from leaving this country.

It should also be emphasized that the Government will receive a royalty on the sale of each SST and thus recover its investment. To date, 113 delivery positions have been reserved through the Government and 16 through Boeing. Airlines have contributed $11.3 million for 113 positions in the SST allocations. An additional $11.3 million will be contributed by October 31, 1967. In addition, the U.S. airlines have agreed to contribute as risk money $1 million per position or a total of $52 million.

Mr. President, these arguments are put forth very briefly in the hope that my colleagues will share my concern over the success of the SST program and will choose to retain the $142,375,000 appropriation in this bill. The development of a successful SST program by the United States will undoubtedly be of tremendous significance in the world of transportation in future years. It is imperative that we face up to this task and choose to support this program now when it should be supported. To delay would be to flounder and would, I fear, be defeating.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I wish to comment on the remarks of my esteemed colleague from Wisconsin regarding the SST program.

Why are we building an SST? The answer is simple, we have found in the United States that building and operating commercial aircraft is a very lucrative and a most rewarding business. We are No. 1 in commercial aviation and we intend to try harder now and stay No. 1. But is it that important? Let us look at a few facts.

Air transportation is our seventh largest industry and growing faster than any other major segment of our economy. For the past 20 years air travel has been growing at the rate of about 17 percent annually, which is nearly double the rate of the second most vital sector of our economy—electric utilities. Last year, even with a 43-day airline strike, air travel was up 16 percent and the number of passengers carried topped 100 million for the first time in history. In fact, the airlines have become the primary means of commercial travel within the United States, carrying more passengers than trains and buses combined. Last year the airlines accounted for about 62 percent of common carrier passenger traffic between U.S. cities. This is almost double the share of the market the airlines had only 10 years ago.

Today, 86 percent of all people who travel overseas fly as compared with 68 percent a decade ago. The number of international passangers carried by U.S. airlines has grown from 1,700,000 in 1956 to 5 million in 1966. The competitive success of air travel is the reason the *Queen Mary* and other big cruise ships are retiring from the scene. The *Queen Mary* offers an interesting comparison between the productivity of large ocean liners and intercontinental aircraft. The SST will carry more passengers to and from Europe in 1 year than six *Queen Marys,* and while the SST is expensive, it certainly is not going to cost as much as six *Queen Marys.*

Air cargo is also beginning to stir and grow by leaps and bounds. Over the past 3 years the number of cargo ton miles flown by the airlines has doubled. Not that we envision the SST as a cargo plane—certainly it will not be in the first generation—but the SST will carry some cargo and in the future there is every reason to believe that urgently needed and high-value cargo may well move on SST's.

Twenty years ago, at the end of World War II, anyone who predicted that we would be flying freight by jet transports would have been called a starry-eyed dreamer.

The tremendous growth in air travel and air cargo is creating new jobs in the airline industry and all of the associated sectors of the economy. Last year, 33,000 new jobs were created in the airline industry alone. Over the past 10 years the number of airline jobs has jumped almost 80 percent—from 131,000 in 1956 to 244,000 in 1966. The airline payroll has increased from $706 million to $2.1 billion in this same time—an increase of 175 percent.

Most transportation economists agree that air travel is going to continue to grow at a rapid rate for the foreseeable future. Assuming an annual growth rate of 10 percent—which is less than our current experience, and a rate that most transportation economists will agree is reasonable and perhaps even conservative—we find that the number of revenue passenger-miles flown in the free world will multiply tenfold from about 140 billion in 1966 to approximately 1.4 trillion in 1990. About 1 trillion of the total revenue passenger-miles forecast for 1990 will be for route segments that are over 700 miles long, and this is the market in which the SST will compete. This is equivalent to the entire population of the United States—every man, woman, and child—making a round trip flight from New York to Los Angeles and back. Or another example, the entire population of England making three round trips from London to New York and back. Or finally, a third example, 1 trillion passenger-miles a year means the entire population of Japan making a round trip from Tokyo to San Francisco and back. I give you these simply as examples of what kind of air travel we are talking about.

It is going to take a lot of airplanes with great productivity to satisfy this need. As a matter of fact, somebody will have to build about $90 to $100 billion worth of airplanes to fill this need whether they be subsonic or supersonic—Concorde or SST—and this is just for the passengers. I have not attempted to project what the figure would be for air cargo, but it certainly will swell the total.

Now a $100 billion market is not just a frill or a luxury. Obviously a manufacturing task of this size will have a major impact on our economy.

This is a business proposition. We are in competition with the British and the French. The Anglo-French Concorde will be on the scene 3 years ahead of the American SST. We have already lost valuable ground. We must not allow this lead to grow. We must maintain our No. 1 position in the field of commercial aviation.

The gold flow situation demands it. This is not something like the poverty program that can be put off until next year. We must act now.

HIGHWAY SAFETY

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, in 1894, the first gasoline automobile in the world, the Panhard, was invented. In 1966 this Nation's annual highway death toll exceeded 50,000. Our automotive progress has been costly. So it was with a real sense of urgency that the Congress passed both the Vehicle Safety Act and the Highway Safety Act in 1966. These laws committed, for the first time, all levels of government—Federal, State, and local—to the task of reducing the senseless carnage on our Nation's highways. As a result, we now have national uniform standards designed to insure both the operational safety of the automobile and maximum safety precautions on the highway.

In 1968, new cars will include, as standard equipment, a variety of safety features including seat belts, better braking systems, outside mirrors, padded interiors, energy-absorbing steering columns, shoulder belts and other more complicated items.

The highway standards cover periodic vehicle inspections, driver licensing, driver education programs, emergency medical care, compilation of driver and accident records, protective gear for motorcyclists, and driver examinations for alcohol content.

The first 13 highway safety standards issued marked an important beginning. They sounded the notice that the Nation, working with State and local communities, finally is going to do something about the mounting deaths and injuries on our highways.

This we have needed for many years. Many fine civic-minded and dedicated organizations have done yeoman work in this field, but never before in history has such a comprehensive and carefully planned attack been mounted in the realm of safety.

When the National Highway Safety Act—which gave birth to these standards—was passed in 1966, we in the Congress voted funds to get the work underway. Now we have reached a critical time in getting these programs started in the States. I, for one, am not ready to say that saving lives is too costly to attempt.

President Johnson has repeatedly asked for increased State-Federal cooperation in the highway safety effort. The recently issued standards provide the perfect opportunity for that cooperation to flourish.

I am particularly pleased that the Senate has restored $20 million of the funds for State and community programs cut by the House. The $40 million appropriated is still less than half the funds requested for these vital programs, but they will assist the States in beginning such important safety programs as driver education and vehicle inspection, two programs I have long fought for.

HIGH-SPEED GROUND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, part of the important work going on in the Department of Transportation's Office of High Speed Ground Transportation is based on the knowledge that rail passenger service may shortly become a thing of the past if efforts are not made to revive it.

We have all heard about the new types of passenger trains which will soon be put into service in the eastern United States as part of this program. Yet, I fear that we do not all appreciate the fact that these trains represent important experiments with new equipment and service.

The Office of High Speed Ground Transportation will demonstrate and test technological innovations in these trains. New services will also be tested on passengers—food service, baggage handling, and the public relations of railroad personnel will be improved, for example.

Through these demonstrations, therefore, the program will derive information of value in future railroad research and development work, and information on the comfort and service requirements which passengers will want if they are to return to the rails for intercity travel.

These demonstrations do not represent an attempt or any intention on the part of the Department of Transportation to go into the railroad business.

The projects will be operated for the high-speed ground transportation program by privately owned railroads in areas where testing of equipment and service promises to produce the most and the best data. These experiments will be conducted for specific periods of time, after which the railroads involved—and others not involved initially—may choose to continue the improved service on their own.

The results of this work will have implications of national import. The railroad industry and railroad equipment manufacturers are taking an interest in the potential renaissance of rail passenger travel which may be stimulated. They have not had funds to devote to the extensive research and development and demonstrations which will be required to initiate such a revival. Those of us in the Federal Government and others in government on all levels who must make decisions regarding the investment of public funds in transportation facilities will benefit from information on the potential role of railroads in meeting the Nation's future requirements for additional intercity passenger transportation, especially in densely populated regions.

I cannot imagine that these facts about the demonstrations aspect of the work of the Office of High Speed Ground Transportation had been adequately brought to the attention of Members of the House who voted to cut this program's fiscal 1968 budget request so drastically.

Only $5,650,000 of the $9,611,000 was allowed for demonstration projects. One of the three proposed projects—the Washington to Jacksonville auto-train—was completely eliminated. A second—the Boston to New York TurboTrain service—was cut. Funds for the third—Washington to New York service—were not involved in the current budget request.

I urge restoration of all of the funds which the House disallowed for these projects.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is all time yielded back?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the committee is happy to submit the bill, and with the understanding that all time will be yielded back, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. KUCHEL. Any time we have remaining is yielded back, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is absent for religious observance.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] are absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 71, nays 1, as follows:

[No. 285 Leg.]

YEAS—71

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Baker
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Ellender
Fong
Griffin
Gruening
Hansen
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hickenlooper
Holland
Hollings
Inouye
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McClellan
McGee
McIntyre
Metcalf
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Morse
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Pearson
Pell
Percy
Ribicoff
Scott
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Spong
Stennis
Symington
Tower
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—1

Proxmire

NOT VOTING—28

Bartlett
Brooke
Carlson
Dodd
Eastland
Ervin
Fannin
Fulbright
Gore
Hatfield
Hayden
Hill
Hruska
Javits
Kennedy, Mass.
McCarthy
McGovern
Montoya
Morton
Moss
Pastore
Prouty
Randolph
Russell
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tydings
Young, Ohio

So the bill (H.R. 11456) was passed.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill (H.R. 11456) was passed.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized in the engrossment of the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 11456) to correct any technical or clerical errors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer (Mr. MUSKIE in the chair) appointed Mr. STENNIS, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. MUNDT conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation to the Senate as a whole for its cooperation in expediting the final passage of the Transportation appropriation bill; in particular recognition should be given to the excellent management of this measure by the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] and the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the ranking minority member of the subcommittee. When this combination is responsible, there are few wasted moments.

To the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senators from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. JACKSON], the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the leadership expresses its deep appreciation for the expeditious manner in which they each expressed their strongly held views without delaying the disposition of the matter.

With the passage today of the poverty bill and the appropriation bill on Transportation, the Senate has truly been productive. I hope that the momentum gained today can be continued tomorrow, throughout next week and for the remaining days of this session.

FREE WORLD ASSISTANCE TO VIETNAM

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I understand that there has been presented in the Senate today a proposed resolution stating that the free nations of Asia should be doing more to help the Republic of South Vietnam and the United States in the conflict in Southeast Asia.

While I am sure everybody would always like to have more help from somebody else no matter what they are trying to do, I would not like for the impression to be left here today that the United States and South Vietnam are virtually alone or unsupported in the current effort.

The facts of the matter are that a total of 39 free nations of the world—that is, 39—are providing assistance in the Vietnam effort; and the United Nations is adding additional help on its own part. Just so we can keep things in perspective here today and in discussions and news reports about the proposed resolution, here is a list of the nations providing military, technical, or financial support of some kind:

Australia, China, Japan, Korea, Laos, Malaysia, New Zealand, the Philippines, Thailand, Greece, Iran, Turkey, Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Spain, United Kingdom, Argentina, Brazil, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guatemala, Honduras, Uruguay, Venezuela, Liberia, Tunisia, Canada, France, Ireland, Israel, Norway, Pakistan Switzerland, and the United Nations.

As General Westmoreland said when he addressed Congress:

> We must remember that Korea, Australia, New Zealand, Thailand and the Philippines all have military forces working and fighting with the South Vietnamese and Americans—that more than 30 other nations are helping provide non-combat support—and that the whole of free Asia opposes Communist expansionism.

The facts of the matter are that nearly 60,000 combat troops from Asian nations are now in Vietnam fighting the Communists, and more troops are pledged for the future—pledged from nations far, far smaller and less prosperous than the United States; nations which normally count their armed forces in hundreds rather than the thousands we are used to talking about in our country.

Australia has sent almost 6,000 troops; Korea nearly 50,000; New Zealand 375; the Philippines 2,000; and Thailand nearly 2,500. It should be noted that these are the nations immediately threatened by Asian communism. They recognize the threat. They are helping, within the limits of their capabilities, to meet and defeat the threat.

In addition, other nations around the world are sending doctors, nurses, teachers, agricultural advisers, engineers, and other technical personnel. Some 25 medical and surgical teams from a dozen nations are providing care in provincial hospitals.

Other nations which have not been able to send personnel have helped in Vietnam by sending substantial material help, including medical supplies, textbooks, construction materials, construction equipment, refugee-relief supplies, and foodstuffs. They also have provided generous scholarship aid to Vietnamese students and training for Vietnamese civil policemen.

We are not alone in this world in our recognition of the need to control Communist expansion. We are not alone in our desire to preserve world order. We are not by ourselves in the belief that stopping the Reds today will save lives in the future.

Although I have been critical of the administration's policy of "gradualism" which I think prolongs the war unnecessarily, I would never seek to convince Americans that we are unaided in Vietnam. We are the free world's leader. As such, special demands are on our shoulders. But we have many friends in this world, and they are doing what they can in following our leadership toward a more stable, peaceful world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD a detailed listing of the free world assistance to Vietnam.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREE WORLD ASSISTANCE TO VIETNAM AS OF OCTOBER 1, 1967

Thirty-one nations besides the United States are assisting Vietnam under the Free World Assistance Program. Six other countries not considered part of the FWA program and the United Nations also assist, and promises of help have come from three other nations. Five Asian countries now have almost 60,000 troops on the ground in Vietnam. A detailed listing by geographic area follows:

FAR EAST

Australia

Australia is providing a wide and substantial range of aid to Vietnam under the Colombo Plan and by direct bilateral assistance. Economic aid since 1964 is valued at more than $10 million.

Military aid consists of:

1. Approximately 5,750 combat troops including a brigade and support, and a squadron of 8 Canberra bombers. In addition, they provide naval assistance and a guided missile destroyer.
2. 100 combat advisors (primarily specialists in jungle warfare).
3. A 73-man air force unit at Vung Tau with six Australian caribou planes which fly daily logistical transport missions in support of Vietnamese military forces.

Economic and technical assistance includes:

1. Three surgical teams, totalling 37 personnel, in 3 provincial hospitals. These teams, in addition to performing major operations, have established a blood bank and are giving lessons in nursing.
2. A group of civil engineers working on water supply and road construction projects.
3. Three experts in dairy and crop practices and radio techniques.
4. Training of 130 Vietnamese in Australia.
5. In goods and materials: 1,250,000 textbooks in Vietnamese for rural schools; 3,300 tons of corrugated roofing for Vietnamese military dependents' housing; 6 large community windmills; 15,750 sets of hand tools; 400 radio sets and 2,400 loud-speakers; 16,000 blankets and 14,000 cases of condensed milk.
6. A 55 kilowatt broadcasting station at Ban Me Thuot.

The Australian Government decided on February 1 to increase its non-military aid to Viet-Nam during FY 1967 to $2 million. This will permit substantial enlargement of current medical and civic action programs and the undertaking of new projects such as providing equipment for refugee resettlement centers.

Republic of China

The Republic of China has provided:

1. An 80-man agricultural team.
2. An 18-man military psychological warfare team.
3. A 34-man electrical power mission under the leadership of Taipower.

4. A 16-man surgical team.

China has also provided training for more than 200 Vietnamese in Taiwan. In the way of goods and materials, they have provided 26 aluminum prefabricated warehouses, agricultural tools, seeds and fertilizers, 500,000 copies of mathematics textbooks and an electrical power substation.

Japan

Japan has provided over $55 million worth of economic assistance to Viet-Nam, chiefly through reparations. Japan has sent two medical teams, considerable amounts of medical goods (4,544 cases), 20,000 transistor radios and 25 ambulances. It has provided technical personnel and funds for the construction of a large power dam across the Da Nhim River and electrical transmission line. A new medical aid agreement ($1.1 million) was signed in une 1967.

Korea

Korea has sent approximately 48,800 troops including:

1. 2 combat divisions and 1 combat brigade.
2. A 130-man Mobile Army Surgical Hospital (MASH).
3. 10 military instructors in Korean karate for training Vietnamese military in hand-to-hand combat.
4. A 2,200-man Task Force Unit composed of the following elements: 1 Army engineer battalion, 1 Headquarters group, 1 Army Transportation company, 1 Marine Corps Engineer company, 1 Infantry battalion, 1 LST and 2 LSMs, 1 Composite Support unit (communications, medical supplies, etc.).

Korean military medical personnel are providing some medical care to the local population in areas where ROK troops are stationed. In addition, 7 civilian medical teams totaling 118 doctors, nurses and support personnel are working in provincial health programs.

LAOS

One million *kip* ($4,167) for flood relief in 1965 and a small cash donation for refugees in 1966.

Malaysia

Since 1963, Malaysia has trained over 2,000 Vietnamese military and police officers. Groups of 30–60 are regularly sent for about a month's training in counterinsurgency with Malaysian Police Special Constabulary. Malaysia has previously provided substantial amounts of counterinsurgency materials, primarily military and police transport such as armored vehicles. Medicines and relief supplies have also been donated.

New Zealand

New Zealand has sent an artillery battery and an infantry companay (approximately 350 men) and provided a 25-man army engineer detachment.

In *non-military aid*, New Zealand has sent a 15-man surgical team, and a professor in English language for the University of Saigon. A second 16-man medical team will be sent to Binh Dinh province. They are presently training 83 Vietnamese in New Zealand and have provided 7,500£ ($21,000) for equipment for a technical high school. They are also assisting by providing approximately $600,000 for a science building at the University of Saigon.

Philippines

The Philippine Government has sent a 2,000-man military engineering unit with security support personnel, a station hospital, and rural health and civic action teams.

In *non-military aid*, approximately 60 Philippine civic action personnel including military and civilian medical teams have been working in Viet-Nam for several years.

Thailand

Thailand has sent a total of approximately 2,200, men including a recently arrived combat brigade. A 150-man Thai naval group manning an LST and PGM patrol craft arrived in Viet-Nam in December 1966. A 35-man air force contingent has been flying operational transport missions for the Vietnamese forces. The Thais have also been providing jet training for Vietnamese pilots in Thailand.

In *non military aid*, the Thais have provided rice for refugees and cement and zinc roofing materials. At the Manila Conference, the Thais offered the Vietnamese a $20 million rice credit. The Thais have also announced they will send a medical unit to Viet-Nam.

MIDDLE EAST

Greece

Greece has contributed $15,000 worth of medical supplies.

Iran

Iran has contributed 1,000 tons of petroleum products to Viet-Nam and has dispatched a 20-man medical team to Viet-Nam.

Turkey

Turkey has provided medicines and also offered to provide a substantial amount of cement.

EUROPE

Austria

Austria has offered to supply medical supplies, blankets, tents through the Austrian Red Cross.

Belgium

Belgium has provided medicines and an ambulance and has given scholarships for 15 Vietnamese to study in Belgium.

Denmark

Denmark has provided medical supplies and has offered to train 12 Vietnamese nurses in Denmark.

Germany

Personnel in Viet-Nam: A 3,000-ton hospital ship, the "Helgoland," with 8 doctors, 30 other medical personnel and 145 beds, is on duty in Viet-Nam. Seven Germans, a director and six instructors, are teaching at the new Vietnamese-German Technical High School at Thu Duc near Saigon. At Hue University there are five Germans: three physicians in the Medical School, a professor of music, a professor of German language, and one expert in forestry is working at the Department of Rural Affairs, Saigon.

Vietnamese in Germany: Forty Vietnamese are studying in Germany and the Germans have agreed to accept 30 more primarily for training as future instructors in the technical high school. A considerable number have previously been trained.

Goods and Materials: The Germans have provided the following credits:

(1) DM 15 million ($3.75 million) for import of German products such as machine tools, fertilizer, etc. The piastre funds generated go to the National Office of Agricultural Credit to aid farmers, particularly with loans;

(2) A credit of DM 50 million ($12.5 million) for development of the major industrial complex at An Hoan-Nong Son;

(3) A credit for DM 20 million ($5 million) for construction of an abattoir at Saigon-Cholon, and three coastal vessels;

(4) A credit of DM 500,000 ($125,000) for equipment at the Vietnamese-German Technical High School at Thu Duc.

In April 1966, the Germans announced a gift of DM 17.5 million ($4.4 million) worth of pharmaceuticals, the first shipments of which have arrived. Also in the medical field, they have provided two mobile dental clinics and 30 ambulances for the Ministry of Health.

In June 1966, the Cabinet voted DM 25 million (U.S. $6.25 million) for new aid to Viet-Nam including:

(1) Sending 25 experts to establish a refugee center;

(2) Building a home for wayward youths;

(3) Expansion of eight social centers and construction of a ninth, and

(4) Establishment of a training center for social workers.

The Germans have also donated 260 tons of rice for refugee relief programs.

Italy

The Italians provided a 10-man surgical team and have offered science scholarships to 10 Vietnamese to study in Italy.

Luxembourg

Luxembourg has provided plasma and blood transfusion equipment.

The Netherlands

The Dutch have undertaken to build 5 tuberculosis centers in Saigon; sites for 3 have been selected. In August, the Netherlands announced a contribution of $355,000 for a 4-year UN project in social welfare, part of the $1 million they have earmarked for UN projects in Viet-Nam. In 1964, the Dutch gave antibiotics and 4 scholarships for Vietnamese. They previously provided a dredge.

Spain

Spain has sent a 12-man medical team to Viet-Nam and has provided 800 pounds of medicines, medical equipment and blankets.

United Kingdom

The United Kingdom has supplied economic aid valued at more than $2 million in the past three years. It has provided six civilians for the British Advisory Mission and a Professor of English at Hue University. Twenty-one Vietnamese are receiving training in the United Kingdom. A pediatric team of four British doctors and six nurses went to Viet-Nam in August, 1966.

In 1963–64, the United Kingdom provided the following goods and materials: Laboratory equipment for Saigon University; a typesetting machine for the Government Printing Office; a cobalt deep-ray therapy unit for the National Cancer Institute; various equipment for the faculties of Medicine, Science and Pharmacy at Saigon University, the Meteorologic Service and the Agricultural School at Saigon, and Atomic Research Establishment at Dalat and the Faculty of Education at Hue. In 1965-1966, British economic aid totalled $226,800 for roadbuilding equipment, diesel fishing boat engines, and portable anesthetic machines. Total aid in British FY 1967 was $515,200 and it is estimated $666,400 will be expended in FY 1968.

LATIN AMERICA

Argentina

Argentina is contributing 5,000 tons of wheat.

Brazil

Brazil has sent a substantial quantity of medical supplies which was carried to Viet-Nam by a Brazilian Air force plane and has also provided coffee.

Costa Rica

Costa Rica is contributing an ambulance for use in Viet-Nam.

Dominican Republic

Cement has been offered by the Dominican Republic for use in Viet-Nam.

Ecuador

Ecuador has sent medical supplies to Viet-Nam.

Guatemala

Guatemala has sent 15,000 doses of typhoid-paratyphoid serum for use in Viet-Nam.

Honduras

Honduras has contributed drugs and dry goods for refugees in Viet-Nam, flown there on a Honduras Air Force plane.

Uruguay

Uruguay has contributed $21,500 for relief supplies and medicines for Viet-Nam.

Venezuela

Venezuela has provided 500 tons of rice for refugee relief, and two civilian doctors are working in Viet-Nam.

AFRICA

Liberia

A contribution of $50,000 has been made by Liberia for the purchase of hospital equipment and other medical supplies for Viet-Nam.

Tunisia

Tunisia has made available 15 to 20 scholarships for Vietnamese.

NORTH AMERICA

Canada

Almost $6 million of development assistance to Viet-Nam has been provided by Canada.

1. Since 1964 Canada has supplied more than $4.5 million in economic aid. It increased its aid to South Viet-Nam this fiscal year allocating $1 million for medical assistance including providing ten 200-bed emergency hospital units. The first two units have arrived and have been installed at Phan Tiet and at Phu Tho near Saigon. A Canadian doctor and technician visited Viet-Nam in the fall to inspect potential sites. Canada has sent 650,000 doses of polio vaccine for Vietnamese school children and offered additional vaccines against polio, TB and smallpox. Consideration is being given to establishment of a children's rehabilitation center in Viet-Nam.

2. Since 1958, Canada has provided $850,000 worth of food aid for Viet-Nam. Funds generated by sales are used for capital construction projects in Viet-Nam.

3. A new science building for the medical faculty at the University of Hue is being built costing about $333,000, drawn from counterpart funds generated by sales of food supplied by Canada. Construction has passed the half-way mark.

4. The Canadians have also agreed to construct an auditorium for the Faculty of Sciences at Hue University which will cost about $125,000.

5. Canada is printing half a million copies of a social sciences textbook for Vietnamese grade school children.

6. *Personnel in Viet-Nam:* A Canadian Supervisor has been at Quang Ngai supervising construction of a small TB Clinic which the Canadians are funding. The Canadians have sent two doctors and four nurses to staff the clinic. A professor of orthopedics is working at Cho Ray Hospital, Saigon, and there is a Canadian teacher at the University of Hue.

7. *Vietnamese in Canada:* 380 Colombo Plan trainees and a total of 463 trainees under all programs, including those sponsored by other agencies and third countries (as well as Colombo Plan), have been trained in Canada. There are currently 231 Vietnamese students in Canada.

OTHER ASSISTANCE

Six other nations whose help does not fall under the Free World Assistance Program have provided valuable assistance to Viet-Nam in economic and humanitarian fields.

France

Since 1956, France has contributed about $115 million in assistance to South Viet-Nam. Present aid is running at a rate of about $4 million per year, largely in the cultural field.

In 1965 France had nearly 500 persons serving in South Viet-Nam. Among them were 65 experts under France's program of economic and technical assistance, including 32 physicians, professors and other medical personnel. Under its cultural programs, 471 professors (350 French and 121 Vietnamese) were teaching at 9 French-teaching institutions, and 30 French professors are at Vietnamese institutions. France provided in 1965 for Vietnamese to study in France, 55 fellowships for technical training and 85 academic fellowships. These programs are continuing on a somewhat reduced scale.

France has provided low-interest credits of 100 million francs ($20 million) for financing imports of French equipment for Vietnamese industry, a grant of 500,000 francs ($100,000) for equipment for L'Ecole Nationale d'Ingenieurs des Arts Industriels.

In 1960 France extended a low-interest credit of 70 million francs ($14 million) to aid construction of the major coal and chemical complex at An Hoa Nong Son south of Da Nang which is underway. It also provides a low-interest, five-year credit of 60 million francs ($12 million) for construction of Viet-Nam's largest cement-producing complex with plants at Hatien and Thu Duc. In 1964, France provided a 930,000 francs ($186,000) grant for the installation of a training center for electrical technicians and in 1965 a gift of 1.25 million francs ($250,000) for teaching equipment, primarily in the medical field.

Ireland

The Irish people have contributed 1,000£ ($2,800) for Vietnamese flood victims through their Red Cross.

Israel

Israel made a gift of pharmaceutical supplies for flood victims and will train five Vietnamese in irrigation and animal husbandry.

Norway

Norway sent a contribution through the International Red Cross for flood victims in February 1965.

Pakistan

Pakistan made a financial contribution for assistance to flood victims and donated clothing for them.

Switzerland

The Swiss have provided microscopes for the University of Saigon. The Swiss Red Cross has sent an 11-man medical team through the International Committee of the Red Cross to work in a provincial hospital in the Central Highlands of South Viet-Nam.

UN Aid to Viet-Nam

The United Nations and its specialized agencies are also making a significant contribution to the social and economic development of Viet-Nam. Under the Expanded Program of Technical Assistance of the UN Development Program, 15 technical assistance projects are scheduled for 1967 and 1968 at a cost of $724,475. These projects range across such varied fields as maternal and child health, labor administration, educational planning, telecommunications, meteorology and civil aviation. Among the participating agencies are ILO, FAO, UNESCO, WHO, ICAO, ITU, WMO, and the Department of Economic and Social Affairs of the UN. In addition UNICEF has substantially expanded its health and child care programs with the 1967 program totalling $562,000, an increase over the 1966 level of $226,000.

Several major projects financed by the Special Fund of the UN Development Program are about to get underway. A National Technical Center (total international contribution approximately $1.5 million), with UNESCO is becoming operational. The Special Fund in January approved a Fisheries Development Project including exploratory and experimental fishing in the waters of the South China Sea, to be executed by FAO at a cost of $1.3 million. Also being negotiated is a Social Welfare Training Center to be executed by the Bureau of Social Affairs of the UN. ECAFE is pressing ahead with regional projects of benefit to the nations of the Mekong Basin and has undertaken surveys of irrigation, hydroelectric facilities and bridge construction projects in Viet-Nam.

WILLIAM C. GARDNER, PRESIDENTIAL NOMINEE FOR A JUDGESHIP

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in the Washington Post, September 22 edition, appeared an article by Staffwriter Jack White concerning the filing of tax liens against William C. Gardner, a Presidential nominee for a judgeship in the court of general sessions.

The article states that informed court sources say that the White House is considering withdrawing Mr. Gardner's name from nomination in much the same way as the nomination of Washington Attorney Frank Reeves' name was withdrawn by the late President Kennedy, who had nominated him for District Commissioner.

According to the article, records in the U.S. district court show that, in the last 9 years, three Federal tax liens totaling $9,258.84 and five District of Columbia liens totaling $1,688.06 were filed against Mr. Gardner over the last 9 years. I am advised that two of these liens were filed as recently as 1966, the last one not being satisfied by the taxpayer until November of 1966.

Apparently there was no irregularity with respect to the tax returns themselves, and it was simply a case of the taxpayer not paying his taxes as shown to be due according to the returns.

The article quotes Assistant Attorney General Ernest Friesen, Jr., as saying that the Justice Department was aware of these liens and was satisfied that they were not evidence of moral turpitude. In turn, Mr. Gardner was quoted as saying he did not have any recollection of these liens; that he often had to pay his taxes late because he did not have the money on schedule; and that it would have been to his advantage to pay on time because he was charged a rate of 6 percent interest on the late payments.

First, let me say that I am shocked at the attitude expressed by one of our Assistant Attorneys General. Surely the Department of Justice should be the first to not only become aware of these liens but of what their filing signifies. It is well known that the Internal Revenue Service exercises considerable restraint in the filing of tax liens, and it does so only when there is persistent neglect on the part of a taxpayer to work out suitable arrangements to pay delinquent taxes or failure to pay taxes pursuant to such arrangements, or in case of danger that the taxes owed will not be paid at all. The number of liens filed in this case shows a pattern of disregard by the taxpayer of his responsibilities. An isolated instance of a lien or two would not represent a pattern, but that is not this case.

The statement by this prospective judge that he had to pay 6 percent interest on his late payments does not excuse his failure to pay his taxes on time, as everyone else is supposed to do, or his failure to avoid the filing of liens by working out suitable arrangements with the Internal Revenue Service. The amount of money involved would seem to indicate that Mr. Gardner saw fit to use up his income for some other purposes ahead of his obligation to pay his taxes on time. Here again, an isolated instance would not be particularly significant. A pattern of such instances is.

One of the highest duties of a citizen of our country is to pay his lawfully owing tax, and to pay it on time. Most taxpayers have their taxes withheld currently on their income, and it is not possible for them to decide to pay some other bills ahead of their taxes. As a professional person, Mr. Gardner was supposed to make payments on his estimated income, with a certain amount of leeway for underestimating his income. As a lawyer he certainly understood this. If he did not wish to comply with the law, that was his decision. But that does not mean that he should have been nominated for a judgeship, and it certainly does not mean that one of our Assistant Attorneys General should seek to excuse such disregard for the law.

Those who serve on the bench and who pass on the violations of law by others should be above reproach as far as their own personal conduct is concerned. It is not good for public confidence in our democratic institutions to have it otherwise, and if this nomination is brought before the Senate, it will prove most embarassing to all concerned.

The nomination should be withdrawn. And Assistant Attorney General Friesen should be reprimanded.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the article to which I have referred printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Eight Tax Liens Laid to L. B. J. Court Choice

(By Jack White)

Eight Federal and District liens for late payment of taxes have been filed over the last nine years against William C. Gardner, a presidential nominee for a seat on the Court of General Sessions.

Informed court sources say that the White House is considering withdrawing Gardner's name from nomination in much the same way as the nomination of Frank D. Reeves for a District Commissionership was withdrawn six years ago.

Records in the U.S. District Court show that, in the last nine years, three Federal tax liens totaling $9258.84 and five D.C. liens totaling $1688.06 were filed against Gardner, who was nominated Aug. 7 by President Johnson.

Assistant Attorney General Ernest Friesen Jr. said yesterday that the Justice Department was aware of the liens and "was satisfied that they were not evidence of moral turpitude or anything like that."

There was no irregularity concerning Gardner's tax returns.

Friesen said that he did not expect the liens to have any effect on Gardner's nomination.

"We will tell the (Senate District) Committee everything we know about it," he said.

"If they repeat that (the Reeves episode)," he said, "they are doing it for the wrong reasons because they've known about other people who've come before them" and ignored tax liens.

"Some of the leading citizens in Washington have liens out against them," Friesen added.

Contacted by phone, Gardner said "I don't have any recollection of any liens being filed." He said that he had often had to pay his taxes late because "sometimes you just don't have your money on schedule."

Gardner said that he had made arrangements to pay his taxes late with the Internal Revenue Service. "Failure to pay taxes on time doesn't necessarily mean that a lien has been filed," he said.

Denying any wrong doing, Gardner said it would have been to his advantage to pay his taxes on time because paying them late meant also paying 6 per cent interest on the unpaid taxes.

Questioned further, Gardner said, and the records show, that he paid each tax bill within six months after the liens were filed.

Friesen said "almost everybody who practices law on the basis that Gardner does—sometimes bringing in a lot of money, sometimes none— has difficulty paying their taxes on the day it's due."

Gardner, 49, is a domestic relations specialist with the firm of Houston & Gardner, 615 F st. nw.

In Reeves' case, his name was withdrawn from nomination after a Senate hearing disclosed he had failed to pay his taxes on time. John B. Duncan was nominated instead.

S. 2388—TO PROVIDE AN IMPROVED ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill S. 2388, which the Senate passed today, be ordered printed as passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WARREN F. COLEMAN, JR.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on S. 985.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 985) for the relief of Warren F. Coleman, Jr., which was, on page 2, line 8, after "Act." insert:

> No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the amendment adopted by the House of Representatives simply provides that no part of the amount appropriated in the act shall be paid or delivered to any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and provides that any person violating such prohibition shall be fined in the sum of not exceeding $1,000.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from West Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATION BILL, 1968

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 562, H.R. 12474. I do this so that the bill will become the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. H.R. 12474, making appropriations for NASA for fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from West Virginia?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, it is expected that there will be votes tomorrow on this appropriation bill.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, October 6, 1967, at 12 noon.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Salute to National 4-H Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 5, 1967

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, this week—September 30 to October 7—is designated as National 4-H Week. This is the one week of the year when not only does a very special effort go into encouraging youngsters and their parents to join a 4-H club for the coming year, it is also a time to pay recognition to the 2,153,000 youngsters and nearly 50,000 parent-leaders who have completed the 1967 program.

This great arm of the cooperative extension service has been, and will continue to be, one of the finest organizations for improving our Nation and contributing to its well being.

In Minnesota, Mr. Leonard Harkness, 4-H State leader, who has been a tremendous inspiration for the extension 4-H agents, the club leaders, and to the members, reports that over 55,000 young people had enrolled in the traditional programs. In addition, there were 21,000 others who were enrolled in any one of a variety of short-term projects. I am also advised that there is an avalanche of youngsters who are taking the opportunity of this national enrollment week to join for 1968.

Nearly one-half of the total enrollment in Minnesota had livestock projects, 23,000 were involved in food preparation projects, 17,000 girls in clothing projects, 19,000 boys and girls in gardening, landscaping, and home beautification.

It is a great testimony to the uniqueness and thorough lasting value of the programs to know that there are now 750,000 adult alumni of this great 4-H club program in Minnesota.

I salute the 13,000 adult leaders and 55,000 members for their participation in 1967, and challenge them once more in 1968 to live up to their motto of "To Make the Best Better."

Columbus Day Should Be a National Holiday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 5, 1967

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, as many colleagues here know, there are some 40 bills pending before the House Judiciary Committee designed to make Columbus Day a national holiday.

I have personally introduced H.R. 7532 for this purpose, and I am pleased to include, at this point, the testimony that I presented to the House Judiciary Committee yesterday urging their favorable report and recommendation for the enactment of this legislation.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE, BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 4 OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, OCTOBER 4, 1967, RE: H.R. 7532, MAKING COLUMBUS DAY A LEGAL HOLIDAY

Mr. Chairman, may I first be permitted to extend the very deep gratitude of thousands of my constituents and myself to you and the esteemed members of this distinguished Committee for taking the time, in an extremely busy schedule, to conduct this hearing on the bill I introduced, H.R. 7532, and so many other identical bills, designed to make Columbus Day a national legal holiday.

Let me please make it very clear, right now, that I am primarily interested in, and concerned with, your consideration and approval of the objective contained in each of these bills before you and that is to make Columbus Day a national holiday. Whatever particular bill you select from those before you today, or if you decide to present a Committee bill, is of no concern so long as it contains the fundamental objective recommended in each of the measures being reviewed.

May I express my very deep belief that there is overwhelmingly strong sentiment throughout the United States for the enactment of this legislation, not only to honor Columbus but also as a well-merited tribute to the millions of Italian-Americans who have contributed and who continue to contribute so substantially to the progress and development of the United States.

It has been authoritatively observed that there are, now, some thirty-five States in the country that have already granted some degree of recognition to Columbus Day and I think you will agree that this fact is substantial evidence of the great desire of the majority of the American people to have special, national recognition, as a holiday, given to Columbus Day.

The tremendous meaning which Columbus Day holds for all Americans cannot be denied and I believe it ought to be formally emphasized by the Congress.

To our people, Columbus represents not only the starting point of our Nation, but he is truly the symbol of a great and persevering heroic spirit who dared to penetrate great and unknown dangers in his search of "a better way." It is this mighty spirit that is responsible for our remarkable national growth and development into the greatest and best land on earth. And it is of this Columbian spirit and heart that we must be ever-mindful if this country and our people are to successfully meet the great challenges and responsibilities that face and rest upon us in this dangerous period in our history.

Mr. Chairman, the adoption of this measure would, of course, also demonstrate, in a concrete and effective way, the appreciation and gratitude of this country for the great contributions to our national welfare and development made by Italian-Americans, in war and in peace, since 1492. The historical record of Italian-Americans in furthering our American progress in free government, in music, in the sciences, in the professions, in the arts, and at every other level of our national life is unsurpassed by any other segment of our population.

I was born and have lived and worked among Italian-Americans all my life and down through the years have personally observed and admired their unwavering religious devotion, their high standards of individual conduct, their traditional family fidelity, their energetic paricipation in all community projects and their intense patriotic dedication to our national principles and purposes.

Christopher Columbus and the Italian-Americans are eminently worthy and deserving of the special honor and recognition proposed by my bill and all the similar bills now pending before you. Therefore, Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I most earnestly urge and hope that you will favorably consider and recommend the prompt enactment of this legislation by the Congress.

May I again express my appreciation for the opportunity to present this testimony to the Committee.

Broad Health Grants Represent Major Step in Improving Federal Grant-in-Aid Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 5, 1967

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the Partnership for Health Amendments of 1967, which this body approved overwhelmingly last month, are important for the direction they take in the provision of Federal grants-in-aid as well as for the improved health services they will provide.

The partnership for health amendments confirm the policy, which Congress adopted provisionally through the Comprehensive Health Planning and Services Act of 1966, of providing broad, flexible grants for health.

By thus replacing some 17 small, segmented, categorical grants, Congress will have given States and localities new flexibility in meeting the health problems which are most pressing in their areas. We will have taken a significant step toward the elimination of the confusion, competition, and misdirection of effort which have resulted from the number and complexity of many of our grant programs and from the rigidities stemming from excessive centralization and compartmentalization.

The partnership for health amendments blaze a trail which we would do well to follow in other areas.

This good bill was made better by this body's action to add $40 million over 2 years to allow, but not require, public health authorities to mount effective efforts to control rats.

With the expansion of authorizations under this program by $932 million over 4 years and the provision of an important new program for research on delivery of health services, this legislation takes its place as one of the most progressive enactments of this session.

Brent Spence—A Great American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 5, 1967

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives is the people's institution. Its Members, elected every 2 years, are close to the people. Members of the House are no further away from the humblest citizen than the telephone or a postal card.

Great and revered public servants over the years have made of the House of Representatives the greatest deliberative body in the world. Among the giants who created a great image for the House of Representatives and for public service was the late Brent Spence, of Kentucky. I was saddened and shocked to learn of his passing even though I knew he must be approaching the end.

Brent Spence was an outstanding committee chairman who presided over the Banking and Currency Committee with great wisdom and fatherly advice. Brent Spence was a great Kentuckian, serving in the tradition of Henry Clay and Alben Barkley. He was a loyal Democrat, but did not let his love of the Democratic Party make him biased and partisan when the welfare of his country was at stake.

Brent Spence was a great American, and this Nation is a better Nation because of his service here in the Congress and because of his understanding of fiscal and monetary affairs. Brent Spence was down to earth, humble—the markings of a truly great servant of the people.

Brent Spence was a warm personal friend whose memory I shall always cherish as a friend and as one of the great men in the history of the House of Representatives.

Suburban Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 5, 1967

Mr. RUMFELD. Mr. Speaker, the growing stature and importance of the suburban press is a healthy trend in the communications field today. While some newspapers are falling and others merging, the suburban press continues to expand and to provide their readers with an increasingly fine service.

I believe the mature suburban press is epitomized by the newspapers in the 13th Congressional District of Illinois.

At the annual editorial seminar banquet of the Suburban Press Foundation, held in Chicago on September 28, 1967, achievement awards for excellence in photography, sports writing, women's-interest writing, and feature writing, were presented to suburban newsmen. Of the five award categories, newsmen from the 13th district won honors in no fewer than four. The winners from the 13th district were:

Top award of "Suburban Journalist of the Year" was won by the writer-photographer team of Clifford H. Rowe, feature writer, and Harry Cameron, photographer, of Paddock Publications, Inc., Arlington Heights, Ill., for a feature series on air pollution in the Chicago metropolitan area entitled, "Don't Stop Breathing—Yet." The significance of this subject is known to all; I can attest to the skill with which the series was presented.

The award for best feature writing was won by Paul A. Johnson, Jr., of Hollister Newspapers, Wilmette, Ill.

Robert Strawn, of Paddock Publications, was awarded the top prize for photography.

The award for women's-interest writing was presented to Mrs. Mary B. Good, also of Paddock Publications.

In addition to the four top awards, 13th district newspaper personnel won numerous honorable mentions and other citations.

The awards banquet was a part of the Suburban Press Foundation's seventh annual 2-day editorial seminar attended by editorial staff and publishers of foundation member newspapers from coast to coast. Seminar sessions were devoted to various aspects of suburban newspaper coverage, with special emphasis on the role of the suburban newspaper in keeping its readership informed on the problems of the central city in this period of social unrest.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the Suburban Press Foundation for its interest and concern for the problems of the central city and for its continuing attention to stimulating civic responsibility in the suburbs.

No country can possibly move ahead, and no society can be free, unless its citizens are acquainted with all aspects of the basic problems of their communities. The suburban press is making significant contributions to an alert and informed citizenry.

SENATE

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 6, 1967

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Father, as we rejoice in the gift of another day, may its hours be made luminous by Thy presence, who art the light of all our seeing. In everything we are called to face may we do our best and so be worthy of our high calling.

Undergird us with Thy might to exercise the potent ministry to all the world to which, in Thy providence, we believe Thou hast called us in this age on ages telling.

In the crises of our times join us with those, who across the waste and wilderness of human hate and need, preparing the way of the Lord, throw up a highway for our God.

As Thy servants in this temple of democracy, give us courage and strength for the vast task of social rebuilding that needs to be dared if life for all men is to be made full and free.

We ask it in that Name which is above every name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, October 5, 1967, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on October 3, 1967, the President had approved and signed the following act and joint resolution:

S. 188. An act creating a commission to be known as the Commission on Obscenity and Pornography; and

S.J. Res. 109 Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation commemorating 50 years of service to the Nation by the Langley Research Center.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of L. Dean Brown, of Maryland, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Senegal, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Gambia, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Alfred B. Fitt, of Michigan, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PLANNING

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Price Daniel, of Texas, to be Director of the Office of Emergency Planning.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Maj. Gen. Winston P. Wilson, to be Chief of the National Guard Bureau.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

U.S. NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Rear Adm. Noel A. M. Gayler to be vice admiral.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK—AIR FORCE, NAVY, AND MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Air Force, the Navy, and the Marine Corps which had been placed on the Secretary's desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements during the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10:30 A.M. MONDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 10:30 Monday morning next.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR SCOTT AND SENATOR CLARK ON MONDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] be recognized at the conclusion of the prayer and the reading of the Journal on Monday next, for a period not to exceed 45 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that he be followed, in turn, by the other distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], for a period not to exceed 1 hour.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED ADDITION OF AREAS TO BE PROCLAIMED WILDERNESS AREAS

A communication from the President of the United States, proposing that three additional areas, in California, Oregon, and Wyoming, be proclaimed wilderness areas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF MILITARY PROCUREMENT ACTIONS FOR EXPERIMENTAL, DEVELOPMENTAL, TEST, OR RESEARCH WORK

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics) transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of contracts negotiated for experimental, developmental, test, or research work in the interest of national defense or industrial mobilization, covering the period January–June 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

CRATER LAKE LODGE, INC.—PROPOSED CONCESSION CONTRACT

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed concession contract under which Crater Lake Lodge, Inc., will be authorized to continue to provide accommodations, facilities, and services for the public in Crater Lake National Park, Oreg., for a 30-year period from November 1, 1967, through October 31, 1997 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT PROVIDING EXEMPTIONS FROM ANTITRUST LAWS TO ASSIST IN SAFEGUARDING BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on providing exemptions from the antitrust laws to assist in safeguarding the balance of payments position of the United States (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered, granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Imperial Beach, Calif., favoring the enactment of some form of a Federal tax-sharing program, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MUSKIE (for Mr. RANDOLPH), from the Committee on Public Works, with amendments:

S. 1552. A bill to amend the Highway Safety Act of 1966 (Rept. No. 581).

By Mr. MORSE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, without amendment:

S. 768. A bill to amend the Act entitled "An Act to provide for compulsory school attendance, for the taking of a school census in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes", approved February 4, 1925 (Rept. No. 582);

S. 770. A bill to amend the act to provide for the establishment of a public crematorium in the District of Columbia. (Rept. No. 583);

S. 1631. A bill to raise the maximum age limit of schoolchildren entitled to transportation in the District of Columbia at a reduced fare (Rept. No. 584); and

S. 2012. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Public School Food Services Act (Rept. No. 585).

By Mr. MORSE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with an amendment:

S. 765. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, and the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia, as amended, so as to bring within the provisions of such act any person operating a motor vehicle while under the influence of a drug rendering such person incapable of operating the motor vehicle safely (Rept. No. 586);

S. 1224. A bill to establish a register of blind persons in the District of Columbia, to provide for the mandatory reporting of information concerning such persons, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 587); and

H.R. 3973. An act to amend the Healing Arts Practice Act, District of Columbia, 1928, and the act of June 6, 1892, relating to the licensing of dentists in the District of Columbia, to exempt from the licensing requirements of such acts physicians and dentists while performing services in the employ of the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 589).

By Mr. MORSE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments:

S. 318. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish and administer a plan to provide for the care and protection of children through public day care services, and to provide public assistance in the form of foster home care to certain dependent children (Rept. No. 588).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and Mr. FULBRIGHT):

S. 2510. A bill to authorize the Smithsonian Institution to acquire lands for a museum park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. TALMADGE:

S. 2511. A bill to maintain and improve the income of producers of crude pine gum, to stabilize production of crude pine gum, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. TALMADGE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. METCALF:

S. 2512. A bill to provide financial assistance to candidates for President and Vice President and candidates for the Senate and House of Representatives to assist in defraying their election campaign expenses; to the Committee on Finance.

CRUDE PINE GUM ACT OF 1967

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I introduce a bill today to provide a practical and workable means of meeting a serious problem in the crude pine gum industry.

More than 30,000 people, from South Carolina to Florida to Mississippi, are mainly dependent for their livelihood on income derived from crude pine gum. These people—including workers and their families—face a crisis affecting their very survival in the areas where they have lived for generations. Moreover, about a dozen counties are threatened with the loss of at least 20 percent of their agricultural income, as a result of the possible ending of commercial pine gum production.

The problem is that the gum naval stores industry is expected to terminate output on a commercially practical level unless measures are taken to improve the net income of gum farmers. The purpose of the proposed Crude Pine Gum Act of 1967 is to provide continuing work for thousands of otherwise unemployable people and to maintain and improve net income to gum farmers in the calendar years 1968 through 1970. At the end of that period, it is expected that new practices and techniques will have improved the competitive position of the gum segment of the naval stores industry—with the result that the problem will be alleviated.

Meanwhile, this bill would provide legislative authority to help with this transition—to keep the gum industry in business while it modernizes and at the same time preserve farm jobs without impairing the competitiveness of their product from a price standpoint, and at no increased net expenditures to the Commodity Credit Corporation. I might point out that the present crisis results in part from the application to gum farming of minimum wage provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Amendment of 1966, and the bill I am proposing would help greatly in this adjustment. It would, I believe, curb the rise in unemployment that has been reported in that area and slow or halt the migration to urban centers of gum workers who are usually not prepared for urban employment.

This bill would give the Secretary of Agriculture permissive authority to establish in each calendar year 1968 through 1970, a national crude pine gum production goal, which would be shared by each producer, then provide compliance payments to producers up to the limit of their individual shares. Payments would be restricted to producers who comply with the minimum wage law and who follow one or more good conservation practices. These compliance payments would supplement price support already available to producers under the Agricultural Act of 1949, which would be amended to provide the new authority. Price support would be within a range of 50 to 90 percent of parity. Combined payments and price support under the act would not exceed 90 percent of parity.

It is expected that the proposed program would maintain laborers—who are not trained or readily trainable for any other line of work in their areas—on the farm and slow down the migration to the already overcrowded cities. This program would counter the trend toward progressively lower net returns to producers of crude pine gum—a trend which has been apparent since 1962.

The proposed program would, we believe, stabilize the domestic production of gum resin and of resin in the aggregate. Annual production of steam distilled wood resin is expected to decline about 20 percent between 1967 and 1970—this decline to be largely offset by increases averaging 6 percent a year in tall oil resin output. Domestic use of all types of resin is expected to continue a gradual upward trend, with exports likely to be down some as supplies decline. By 1971, domestic stocks will decline, it is expected, to about a 3-month supply—the lowest level since 1962.

Production, disappearance, and prices of turpentine, the other major naval stores products derived from the processing of crude pine gum, would be at stable levels—with stocks likely to remain within easily manageable limits. The United States would likely shift from an export to an import basis.

The proposed bill would bring relief to a small but important American industry which at present is caught in the pressure of social and technological change. Its enactment would also be of assistance to dozens of industries which make use of turpentine and resin, including paper size, synthetic rubber, adhesives, printing ink, varnish and lacquers, chewing gum, cleaners, and insecticides.

Three-fourths of the producers of naval stores are small, and they account for one-fourth of output. Large producers are 1½ percent of the total number, and they produce about 18 percent of the crop. The remaining 24 percent of all producers fall in an intermediate-size range, and they account for 58 percent of the total output.

I repeat, the purpose of this bill is to provide legislative authority which will permit improvement in farmers' income and preserve the jobs of thousands of workers who are sharply limited in other opportunities because of age or lack of education and training. At the same time, the bill would make it possible for their products to remain competitive in the marketplace.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. SPONG in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2511) to maintain and improve the income of producers of crude pine gum, to stabilize production of crude pine gum, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. TALMADGE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

SOCIAL SECURITY PENALTIES—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 384

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate referral, an amendment to H.R. 12080, the Social Security Amendments of 1967, recently transmitted to the Senate by the House of Representatives.

Each month approximately 115,000 Americans attain age 65 and become eligible for health insurance for the aged and supplemental medical insurance benefit under the Social Security Act. Nearly 90 percent of these newly turned 65-year-olds immediately enroll in both programs.

When the medicare program was initiated, the Social Security Administration made a concentrated national effort to reach every one eligible and to get them enrolled in the program.

In the case of supplemental medical insurance benefits, a voluntary program was offered to give our senior citizens additional medical coverage beyond that in the basic act. A 10-percent premium was imposed upon those who failed to enroll in the voluntary program during their initial period of eligibility, as well as on those who did enroll, but who dropped out later and then sought to again participate.

It is to this added premium or penalty provision that I address myself and offer an amendment to the act.

I wish to point out that the initial premium for this voluntary insurance was set at $3 monthly, which the enrollee could designate to have deducted from his or her old age insurance payments.

But the act further directs the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to redetermine the amount of annual premium every 2 years, in order to maintain the required financial integrity of the insurance fund. It is my understanding that the premium has now risen to $4 monthly.

Accordingly, those who failed to enroll during their initial period of eligibility but who desire to come in during the next general enrollment period, must now pay $4.40 monthly.

If the cost of this insurance is like everything else in recent years, I have no reason to believe that the premiums will not continue to rise. And, as the monthly premiums go up, the 10-percent penalty continues to rise so that 4 years hence, or later, an initial enrollee might be paying $6.60 as opposed to $6 monthly for those who did immediately enroll.

Now this may not seem like a great sum, Mr. President, but since the premiums could continue to rise every 2 years, the 10-percent inequity would also grow. The majority of those eligible are those whose incomes are derived almost entirely from old-age benefits. When you look at 60 cents, 70 cents, 80 cents, or even a dollar a month out of an already meager budget, it becomes an appreciable sum.

Although I can understand the desire of the Social Security Administration to have had as many early enrollees as possible, I don't agree that an initial penalty should have been assessed.

There are many reasons why an eligible person might not want to join the voluntary program immediately. Many persons reach 65 years of age in excellent health. They are immediately covered without cost by the basic medicare program. Being in good health, they may feel that the monthly premium, be it $3, $4, $5 or more, could be better spent—or at least not spared—from their retirement benefits immediately. Many a person may not feel the need for this supplemental insurance until he or she attains the age of 70 or more. I fail to see how the Government has suffered from their failure to enroll earlier, or how their eligibility is in any way lessened. Accordingly, I see no reason, morally or fiscally, for the 10-percent penalty.

On the other hand, I do feel that a person who has once enrolled and drops out for whatever reason, then seeks to reenter the program, is not in the same category as the initial enrollee. This person may have taken the coverage to meet illness at the time of eligibility and then, having recovered, drops it until he becomes seriously ill again. This is playing games with the system and I have no quarrel with the penalty provisions of the act for second-time enrollees.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I now submit an amendment to H.R. 12080, to eliminate the 10-percent penalty for late initial enrollees in the supplemental medical insurance benefit titles of the act, and urge the appropriate committee to consider this corrective action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendment (No. 384) was re-referred to the Committee on Finance.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 385

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I submit an amendment to H.R. 12080, the Social Security Amendments of 1967, and ask that it be printed and appropriately referred.

One serious defect which has appeared under medicare is the requirement that, under the supplementary medical plan, reimbursement to the beneficiary is made only on the basis of a receipted bill. Under present law, there are two methods of payment for physicians services under the medicare insurance plan. Where the patient pays the bill, payment is made to the patient on the basis of a receipted bill. Secondly, if the physician and the patient agree, payment may be made to the physician on the basis of the patient's assignment.

It is this requirement that this payment is made to the patient only on the basis of a receipted bill which is causing great difficulty to many of the Americans that medicare was intended to benefit. I have heard of this hardship many times over from the actual cases of my constituents.

The patient has to pay the doctor first if the doctor will not take an assignment—and often the patient simply does not have the money.

This medical insurance plan was designed to assist the patient who had trouble paying his bill. Illness is often accompanied by a lack of cash. That is why we have an insurance program. But under current procedures, the patient is required to pay the bill before he can get reimbursed from the plan. In many cases, this places an unfair burden on the beneficiary.

There is no reason why the beneficiary should not be reimbursed from the plan on the basis of a simple itemized bill. Then he will have the money to pay his medical expense. This is the way commercial medical insurance plans have all worked and worked very successfully.

I am pleased that the bill now before the Finance Committee recognizes the problem that exists. The bill does provide for payment on the basis of an itemized bill. However, the administrative procedures that go along with it are most unfortunate. In solving one problem, it creates more.

Specifically, it requires that if an unpaid itemized bill is submitted by a doctor to a medicare carrier within a grace period, to be specified by the Secretary of HEW, and is for an amount which is determined to be reasonable, the payment is to be made to the doctor. Otherwise payment is to be made to the beneficiary. If the beneficiary submits an unpaid itemized bill during this grace period, the carrier may not pay the beneficiary immediately but must set up a special suspense file. The claim must be held until the grace period has expired, or alternatively, the carrier must contact the doctor to obtain assurance that the physician will not exercise his right to claim payment during the grace period.

While the carrier may notify the patient of the unavoidable delay in such a claim situation, there is no question that the patient will not be happy with the delay and in most cases will not understand the reason for it.

In Connecticut, the medicare carrier, Connecticut General Life Insurance Co., is now mailing out benefit checks on an average of 14 days after receiving a claim from a patient. It has worked hard to get this processing time down. It is doing an excellent job.

But under the proposed new procedure, all would be changed. A simple, straightforward system would be complicated. Across the country, millions of suspense files would have to be set up. Delay would be legislated into the system, after a year of striving to eliminate delay.

Millions of additional letters would flow back and forth. To what end?

There is too much redtape in the world already.

There is virtue in simplicity.

I, therefore, urge that the Senate simply eliminate the problem in the present system by changing the word "receipted" in the statute to "itemized."

This simplifies the present procedure without creating a new procedure.

It eliminates the present problem without creating new problems.

It eliminates correspondence without creating more.

It would improve the service to the elderly to the benefit of patients, doctors, and carriers alike.

I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and will be appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment (No. 385) was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

Beginning on page 47 line 4, strike out all through line 14, page 48, and insert in lieu thereof:

"SEC. 125. (a) Section 1842(b)(3)(B) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out the word 'receipted' and inserting in lieu thereof the word 'itemized'."

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] be added as a cosponsor of the bill—S. 1286—to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to facilitate the immigration of aliens seeking to enter the United States to perform labor of a type for which there are not sufficient workers available in the United States, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOMINATION BY THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, as acting chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that today the Senate received the following nomination:

L. Dean Brown, of Maryland, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Senegal, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Gambia, vice William R. Rivkin, deceased.

In accordance with the committee rule, this pending nomination may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of its receipt in the Senate.

NOTICE OF CHANGE OF HEARINGS ON TAX COURT BILL (S. 2041)

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, as chairman of the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, I wish to announce a change of time of the hearing for the consideration of S. 2041.

The hearing originally scheduled for 10 a.m. on Tuesday, October 10, 1967, will now be held at 9:30 a.m. The hearing on Wednesday, October 11, will remain at 10 a.m. The hearings will be held in the District of Columbia hearing room, 6226 New Senate Office Building.

ACE POWELL, MONTANA'S WESTERN ARTIST

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in Montana we have, in my judgment, an artist who is a worthy successor to the great Charles Marion Russell, who, in my opinion, is the outstanding western artist in the history of the Republic. That man is Ace Powell, who was born of Norwegian parents in New Mexico but came to Montana shortly afterward.

Ace Powell has lived the life of the cowboy, as did Charlie Russell, and he knew Charlie well. Ace had the good fortune of being able to watch the great western painting master at work and, like Russell, through observation he developed a technique which merits and entitles him to be considered the old master's successor. Like Russell, also, Ace Powell has worked not only on canvas but has varied his talent to take in carving in wood and clay as well.

Ace's life has not been an easy one, but it has been most rewarding. His contributions to the State and the Nation through his talent will be his contribution to many generations through the years and decades ahead.

Ace worked many years among the Flatheads and the Blackfeet, learned the Blackfeet sign language, and is considered one of the Blackfeet Nation's great friends.

It was my good fortune to have a brief visit with Ace and his family recently in Kalispell, and I was delighted to see the dedication with which he is applying himself to his art and the fine works he is continuing to turn out.

Montana is fortunate in having an artist of the ability of Ace Powell. I am fortunate in having him as a friend.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a story on Ace by Carol Woster, of Columbia Falls, published in the Great Falls Tribune, of September 3, 1967, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARTIST "PAINTS HIS WAY OUT"

(By Carol Woster)

Great painters belong to many different worlds. But whether life has raised them out of a Paris side street or a Montana prairie town, one thing they have in common, an eternal gnawing inside saying, "I want out! I want to be told about!"

A man stops to look at a sunset and exclaims, "How beautiful!" The colors of this sunset rage inside the artist; he analyzes its components in paint. He wants to give it; he wants to make a tangible form of it.

The great artist painter can say what Ace Powell says, "If I go out for an evening, I'm still painting a picture. My whole life is wrapped up in what I am doing." Ace Powell is the man who stands in the presence of a sunset and sees a job.

In 1912, New Mexico became a state. That same year on April 3, in Tularosa, N.M., Asa (a Norwegian name later changed to Ace) Powell was born.

His parents had met while Ace's mother was a teacher in Harlem, Mont. After the Civil War, her father had come to this town to run a trading post. She met Ace's dad, who was running a ranch for Bill Seamen a few miles out of Harlem. The couple married and moved to New Mexico.

When Ace was two years old, the family moved to Apgar, Mont. Here an interesting interweaving of events took place. Ace's dad sold horses. He knew well one of the pillars of Apgar society, Horace Brewster. Brewster is remembered locally as a top park ranger.

Others know him as Charlie Russell's former boss. The cowboy wanderings of Russell had led him to this little village lying under the shadow of Glacier Park's snowy peaks. At different periods, Russell and Ace's dad worked for the same cow outfits in Apgar.

In later years, Russell did many paintings from his Apgar home called "Bull Head Lodge."

Ace tells of this era, "Mrs. Russell used to be snowed under with tourists. I was about 12 or 13 years old and baby-sat for their stepson, Jackie." Ace watched the great western painting master at work, too. "Most of the time," he adds, "I didn't ask him questions, I'd just observe."

Ace knew the work and years of experience necessary to be able to sit at the easel and paint. He speaks of his childhood years and says, if he was frustrated or sick, he would always turn to art to solve his problems. (A friend, Dick Flood, said many years later, "You always paint your way out of everything!").

At first, Ace was attracted to clay and wood modeling and sketching. Then his young eyes began to see the long and arduous steps to be taken in order to paint a good picture.

There was a period of learning technique and intense discipline. It had to be gone through. He did pen exercises everyday; he taught himself how to put a shape down on paper to look as though it could be touched and felt.

His mother and father encouraged him. "With my dad, I could express my opinion. I felt I had a right to disagree. My dad said, 'You can have anything you're willing to work hard enough for and learn'."

Ace argued, "I have to go out and find what to say in my painting." His dad countered, "Sit at the easel and paint!"

When Ace was ready to go to high school, there were eight little brothers and sisters in the household. Ace took some of his belongings and went to Browning for school. He paid $20 a month to board and attend school. He speaks with great fondness of Dr. Douglas Gold, then the superintendent of schools for the Blackfeet Reservation community. "Dr. Gold was one of the great educators in the United States," he reminisces fondly.

Then another crossing of paths took place. A stocky, well-built, dark-haired lad named Bob Scriver was in the same class.

They did not become friends right away. In fact, their friendship started slowly. One year, Powell and Scriver were assigned to illustrate the high school annual. For several days, the two worked hard on the project.

One day Ace remarked casually to Bob, "I'm going to be an artist." Bob said quickly, "I am, too!" The idea came to rest for a period, when Bob announced his ambition to his parents. They discouraged him. So Scriver went on to get a master's degree in music.

Now Scriver has his own painting, sculpture and taxidermy museum in Browning. It is famous in the state and has been nationally publicized. Ace says of his lifelong friend, "He is a great sculptor. He made an art out of taxidermy."

After high school, an experience which gave him a life-long interest and love for the Blackfeet Indians, Ace returned home. With even greater conviction, he told his parents, "I'm going to be an artist." His father replied, "You have the talent. You should be." Slight of build but strong in her ideas, his mother said quietly, "You always cast your bread up stream, Ace."

Powell, the artist, had a lot of hardship in front of him. No money for art school, either—but his beloved parents were on his side.

One thing young Ace felt certain of—they couldn't teach him to paint Montana skies at art school in Paris. He fairly burst with love of America, "I really truly love this country. I love our constitution . . . every part of America." These things he knew, but he was held back by lack of experience.

Life! Young Ace wanted to drink fully from the cup! He became a cowboy east of the divide. He broke horses and lived and worked on the reservation. He learned the Blackfeet sign language. They came to love him, as he loved them. He guided pack trips through Glacier Park and participated in one of the biggest events in Glacier history.

Ace's father and another man, Dallas Disparrow (whose father was from Sheridan, Wyo., and a saddle maker in Kalispell) packed in great loads of dynamite for contractors opening Logan Pass. It all happened in 1930. Ace says, "That road was built by common labor and dynamite . . . only one caterpillar—not worth a damn," adding, "with the equipment at that time, it was a great piece of engineering."

Ace worked up there on a CCC camp and was in charge of feeding Blackfeet and Flathead Indians encamped in tepees on the pass. They put up cook tents and fed them great stores of beans.

From age 21 to 26, Ace was on the range. He worked for Bill Moyers out of Babb breaking horses.

When World War II came, Ace continued his pattern of different experience by working for civilian pilot training.

About this time Ace just about gave up painting portraits. And Ace will spin a yarn, explaining why. It went something like this.

On assuring the wife of a railroad section hand he was "the Ace Powell, who paints pitchers," he learned she wanted her son's portrait painted and told her it would be $25. (His usual fee was $150.)

The mother explained the boy was "like an angel" and asked Ace to include the child's sensitivity in the portrait. The father, on the sly, advised the artist, "I call him Butch. Get a look of the devil in 'im."

The father liked the finished portrait, but the mother said, "That isn't him, he's so sensitive."

Ace recalled, "I told her, 'If you want him to look like an angel, I'll put wings on the little devil, and we'll all be happy.' Everyone was mad. They stormed out. After a year, I dirtied up the face, titled it 'Neglected Child' and sold it to a lady, who gave it to a welfare worker in Nebraska."

"I could go from senator to skid row. I've enjoyed company on all intellectual levels." This Ace felt was necessary. He had to know all kinds of people. He spent time in several "skid" rows in Montana. "God gives us a certain amount of things we have to discipline ourselves for."

Ace Powell was talking about alcohol. "I went there (skid row)," he said. "I got a bottle. I shared it with the rest." He added, "Winos on skid row have a social discipline tougher than any on the streets."

Basic thrusts of Ace Powell's thought today, "Appeal to youth. That's how to perpetuate life." On Montana's Indian Reservations, he is a great friend as well as a great painter. He'll give canvasses to an Indian youth, who has been using stretched window shades.

Indian children become wild with excitement, when he appears, always with cookies or sweets for them. Squinty-eyed Indian grandmas brighten at the sound of his name.

He'll quickly tell you what he stands for and believes in. "There's never a substitute for quality . . . don't let the price tag come ahead of the quality of your work." He hates compromise.

Ace comments, "Art doesn't necessarily have to have meaning, but it should make people think." He feels his role is to paint the west between Remington and the jet age.

Montana gave him the rich knowledge of life that he wanted. Experiences mean everything to Ace Powell; he looks forward to the moment, the day—he loves things and people.

In his little studio on a comfortable tree-lined street in Kalispell, Ace is still at his easel and painting. He has thought the long thoughts. Recently, as dusk was falling, silhouetting a tall tree outside his window, he looked out upon nature's fading colors.

With a faraway look in his blue eyes, he leaned away from his painting. "I thoroughly believe in a hereafter." He spoke slowly, "I am a little curious about death," and continued, "my last wish will be that when I die, I won't be suffering but will be able to enjoy the sensation of death, the last greatest event of my life."

SENATOR JAVITS RECEIVES CONGRESSIONAL DISTINGUISHED SERVICE AWARD

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on September 8, my good friend, the distinguished senior Senator from New York, Jack Javits, was honored by the American Political Science Association. He was awarded their Congressional Distinguished Service Award Citation, one of four such awards made by this 16,000-member organization at the close of each Congress. Jack Javits richly deserved this award.

In determining who shall receive the award, the association takes several factors into consideration, and I should like to list four of them. They are:

Devotion to public welfare joined with a firm grasp of the skills required of a lawmaker;

High competence measured in terms of effectiveness and concrete accomplishment;

Constructive imagination, hard-headed acumen, and a capacity to formulate and advance objectives of national policy and yet be mindful of the welfare of constituents back home;

The respect of colleagues based on the day-to-day contacts that reveal the true worth of the individual.

Mr. President, in every respect Jack Javits meets those qualifications fully, and more.

I ask unanimous consent that the citation be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the citation was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Congressional Distinguished Service Award Citation: Senator Jacob K. Javits

Uncompromising in his concern for both equal justice and equal opportunity, Jacob K. Javits is a creative spokesman for urban America.

While striving for solution of the immediate problems of his state and nation, he also anticipates future public policy needs and forcefully advocates appropriate action to meet them. As an early sponsor of expanded protection for the interests of minorities, he was instrumental in developing and mobilizing support for legislative proposals incorporated into the landmark civil rights acts of 1964 and 1965. Equally unsatisfied with second class status for cities, his amendments have shaped and broadened major legislation and programs in the fields of housing and urban renewal, labor and poverty, health care, and education. Fiery and incisive, dynamic and undismayed by the prospect of controversy, he serves as a goad to the national conscience.

The American Political Science Association takes great pleasure in presenting this Congressional Distinguished Service Award to Jacob K. Javits, Republican of New York—a perceptive innovator and tenacious activist whose ideas and energy have substantially improved the quality of American life.

TAX HIKE WILL NOT HOLD DOWN INFLATION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, it is becoming more and evident with each passing day that the administration's proposed 10-percent surtax will not stop inflation. The only possible contribution a tax increase can make to stemming inflation is by reducing excessive demand. A tax increase will not slow inflation that results from rising costs. Quite the contrary, a tax increase under such circumstances will aggravate inflation because the tax itself becomes a cost.

For the past several months, prices have been rising. They have been rising at a wholly unacceptable inflationary 3½ percent annual rate. There is every evidence they will continue to rise at least that rapidly.

Does this situation call for a tax increase?

Absolutely not. Why not?

Because there is no evidence that prices are being pulled up by demand pressure—by a shortage of facilities or manpower to produce products that are in short supply.

There is no such shortage.

Not only do we have more than 3 million Americans seeking work and unable to find it; but we have, as well, our skilled factory workers working close to the shortest hours in 6 years.

We have new factory orders falling in July and August and, according to preliminary data, probably falling in September.

Even now, our industrial capacity is less than 85 percent utilized—far, far below the optimum.

And where have most of the price increases been recorded? In precisely those industries that are operating furthest below their capacity rate.

Auto demand has fallen off. But auto prices have been raised.

Steel demand was well below last year. But steel prices have been steadily rising.

In chemicals and elsewhere, the same story—demand off, prices up.

Now, just what does a tax increase contribute in this kind of an economic situation? As it further reduces demand, will it help keep prices down? The experience in steel, autos, chemicals indicates the answer.

By increasing costs, the tax increases will contribute to inflation; will worsen it, not lessen it.

This morning's Washington Post, in an editorial entitled "Fiscal Politics," brings up the political implications of action by Congress under present circumstances to increase taxes. This is what the Post says, in part:

> Suppose, after a bitter fight, that a compromise surcharge, yielding $6 or $7 billion of additional revenues, is passed. And suppose, as seems entirely likely, that the imposition of the tax does not affect the uptrends of prices in any perceptible way. In that event the Administration will be open to the charge of reducing money incomes at a time when the purchasing power of the dollar is being eroded by inflation.

In other words, Mr. President, the average taxpayer is going to say: "Senator, don't do me any more favors like this: to stop inflation you increase my taxes. This takes more out of my pay check. But prices continue to go up. I should thank you for this?"

As an alternative, the Post calls on Congress to forget about the surtax. The embarrassment of doing this, as the Post says, will be eased "as it becomes more clearly apparent that the visions of excessive demand pressures conjured up by the Council of Economic Advisers and the Treasury aren't going to be realized."

Instead, the Post calls on Congress to look toward the 1969 budget and "lay the basis for a system of national priorities that could guide it in deciding what programs ought to be expanded and which should be reduced or even abandoned."

Mr. President, without such a system of priorities, without some definition of our goals and some evaluation of the most efficient method of achieving those goals, the fiscal nightmare of 1967 will haunt this country for years to come. We will be faced by immense deficits, Federal spending that involves vast misallocation and waste of our resources.

I ask unanimous consent that the Post editorial be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Fiscal Politics

With the shelving of the income tax surcharge by the Ways and Means Committee, the fiscal battle takes a new turn. It opened with salvos of heavy economic artillery: a debate—of sorts—on the Administration's contention that demand is about to outstrip productive capacity and on the effectiveness of fiscal restraints. But now trench warfare along party lines is the order of the day with each side making bayonet charges at the budget while keeping a keen eye on the upcoming elections.

The discussion of expenditure reductions isn't going to be remembered as one of the more elevated exchanges between the branches of the Government. It's a Gaston and Alphonse routine. House members, in a righteous lather over the upward trend of Federal expenditures, invite the President to trim the budget, hoping of course that the knife will come nowhere near their toes. And the President, who can hardly be expected to commit an act of self-immolation, politely suggests that the House first appropriate funds and then worry about cuts.

The skirmishing over the budget is likely to continue for a time, and in the interval some attention should be given to the higher political strategy, specifically the relationship of the fiscal battle to 1968 elections.

President Johnson, whose political generalship should never be underestimated, hinted at a strategy when he said that the failure to pass the surcharge will levy the "tax of inflation" upon the American people. That slogan, coupled with charges of fiscal irresponsibility, could be used against the Republicans in the event that the surcharge bill fails. The Republicans in turn would concentrate their fire on the size of the deficit and the refusal of the Democrats to reduce nonessential expenditures.

But the tax-of-inflation strategy could backfire. Suppose, after a bitter fight, that a compromise surcharge, yielding $6 or $7 billion of additional revenues, is passed. And suppose, as seems entirely likely, that the imposition of the tax does not affect the uptrend of prices in any perceptible way. In that event the Administration will be open to the charge of reducing money incomes at a time when the purchasing power of the dollar is being eroded by inflation. That double impact—higher taxes and higher prices—could have a deadly political impact, one that could not easily be countered with arguments about the future integrity of the dollar.

A safer strategy calls for abandoning the surcharge altogether. An about-face would prove embarrassing at first, but the process of extrication would be eased as it became more clearly apparent that the visions of excessive demand pressures conjured up by the Council of Economic Advisers and the Treasury aren't going to be realized. With the surcharge permanently shelved, the House could then seriously tackle the issue of expenditure control. Hacking at the 1968 budget will accomplish nothing, not even a meaningful reduction in expenditures. The House should be looking toward the 1969 budget and laying the basis for a system of rational priorities that would guide it in deciding what programs ought to be expanded and which should be reduced or even abandoned.

HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS IMPORTANT TO AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY—CLII

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, we have heard both provocative and perceptive discussion in this Chamber recently on the proper role of the United States in the world.

I believe that whatever the judgments may be on the limitations and exercise of American influence and American action, the United States stands for something very definite in the world.

Our Declaration of Independence proclaimed certain inalienable rights—not merely for Americans, but for all men.

Abraham Lincoln later observed that there was something in the Declaration giving liberty "not alone to the people of this country, but the hope for the world for all future time."

I reject any misreading of President Lincoln's words which would infer that we can or should impose our views upon the entire world.

But I do subscribe wholeheartedly to the belief that we, as a nation, should be faithful to the great principles and traditions expressed in our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution.

As the world's most celebrated exponent of liberty and equality for all people, the United States should recognize that since we are a very substantial figure on the international stage, we, above all others, cannot be indifferent to the principles and practices which distinguish our system from others.

Ambassador Arthur Goldberg artfully expressed this position before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee when he said:

> And I can say to you that our dedication to these ideals (of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution) is one of the great armories that a representative of the United States in the world community carries with him.

I believe further, Mr. President, that the "something" America stands for in this world is partially embodied in the Human Rights Conventions which are before the Senate.

I urge the Senate to translate our American principles of liberty and equality into legal reality by ratifying the Human Rights Conventions on Forced Labor, Freedom of Association, Genocide, Political Rights of Women, and Slavery.

AN INACCURATE DEDUCTION

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, in the New York Times this morning, Mr. James Reston has an article in which he criticizes a proposal I made recently that, in effort to get to the conference table, as of a certain date the United States offer to stop all air and sea action in South Vietnam as well as North Vietnam; this offer in conjunction with an additional offer by the newly elected South Vietnamese Government to negotiate with anybody, and offer amnesty to the Vietcong.

Mr. Reston criticizes the suggestion on the grounds "there is absolutely no evidence that the Communists would negotiate under threat." This is curious, because one of the members of his office called to ask if my proposal was to be considered a threat, and I told him, as I did other newsmen, that it was in no way to be so considered.

Over a long period Mr. Reston has consistently advocated unconditional cessation of the bombing, presumably in the belief that such action would bring the North Vietnamese to the conference table. Only today, on the same page as his column, the last sentence of the lead editorial states:

> Surely the strategic moment has now arrived to try the one gesture—unconditional cessation of bombing—that might bring negotiations.

Perhaps a cessation would bring negotiations. Perhaps it would not; but in any case it is important to consider that every military person, and every civilian with whom I talked in the Vietnamese theater, believes such a cessation would result in more American casualties in South Vietnam.

I was in Vietnam during the 37-day cessation of 1965–66, and convinced myself at that time that this was true; and much testimony from many people before the Senate verifies that fact.

Perhaps most convincing, there are a number of actual photographs of Communist supply efforts by water from Haiphong to the DMZ area which took place during the 4-day cessation of bombing over the Tet holiday. These photographs would seem to justify testimony from some of those who were there that the chief reason for the heavy marine casualties which occurred shortly thereafter resulted from this cessation.

Bearing in mind these photographs and that testimony, I suggested something new in the way of this overall cease-fire, in the hope that such a cease-fire would offer more chance of reaching meaningful negotiations.

Mr. Reston states the Communists "have insisted from the beginning that the bombing must be stopped unconditionally." But he does not add that they have also insisted—

> The U.S. Government must withdraw from South Vietnam U.S. troops, military personnel, and weapons of all kinds, dismantle all U.S. military bases there, and cancel its "military alliance" with South Vietnam.

Mr. Reston says:

> And the people who feel uneasy with a limited war would have a neat and simple formula: no nonsense, no more ambiguity; either peace or war to the death.

If there is any implication that this was my thinking, he could not be more mistaken. As presented to the Senate since a year ago last spring, it is my conviction the United States is overextended, politically, militarily, and economically; and this conviction was reinforced on my recent trip, primarily because of new conditions developing in the western Mediterranean as well as the eastern Mediterranean.

This Nation has had large armies of occupation in various foreign countries for many years, in one case hundreds of thousands of men for over a quarter of a century. I do not believe, and have long so stated, that our economy can continue to support present political and military policies and commitments over an extended additional period.

Accordingly, in effort to arrive at negotiations, if the President went further than agreeing to another cessation of bombing over North Vietnam by means of this proposed cease-fire, and that too was rejected by the North Vietnamese, then I believe the decision as to what to do next should be up to this Government; and based on world conditions, that decision by no means should be strictly limited to an escalation of the war.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD my original statement and the article by Mr. Reston.

There being no objection, the statement and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PROPOSAL LOOKING TOWARD PEACE IN VIETNAM

(Statement by Senator STUART SYMINGTON, October 3, 1967)

I have just returned from a trip to the Far East, Middle East and Europe, visiting Japan, Hong Kong, South Vietnam, Laos, Thailand, Israel, Greece, Italy and Great Britain.

A report of findings and conclusions will be made shortly to the Chairmen of the Senate Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees. In the meantime, however, one can only view with increased apprehension the nature and extent of the current worldwide commitments of the United States.

In Vietnam the pot has boiled over. In other countries where we have binding commitments, however, the water also is becoming very warm indeed.

In this connection, one notes the strange paradox of the brilliant military victory recently achieved by Israel against sophisticated Soviet weaponry nevertheless resulting in a much improved Soviet position in the Middle East; because both the United Arab Republic and Syria are now so weak militarily they can only hope to be rearmed by the Soviet on the latter's terms (said rearmament is proceeding rapidly, to the point where 70% of their air equipment losses have now been replaced).

The Soviet position is also improving steadily in the Western Mediterranean. Today Algeria is probably the strongest Arab country in their orbit; and if there is any truth in the rumor that General de Gaulle plans to turn over to Algeria the great naval base of Mers el Kebir, the Soviets will obtain further significant leverage in that part of the Mediterranean.

Such a development would, in effect, turn the southern flank of SHAPE; and the original concept of NATO, already heavily damaged in the center by the withdrawal of France, would be weakened still further.

The resources of any country, even those of the United States, are not inexhaustible; and therefore these developments in the Middle East and Europe should also be considered as we in turn consider future policies incident to Vietnam.

I have presented for many months my con-

viction that the United States is overcommitted and over-extended. We need a great deal of money to handle all these commitments along with our growing problems at home, and we do not want to jeopardize the integrity of the dollar.

In addition, and most important, is the matter of American lives. In this latter connection, the campaign here to cease air attacks against North Vietnam is receiving full attention in the other countries. But all civilian and military people abroad with whom I discussed this matter warn that another cessation of the raids against North Vietnam would guarantee additional casualties in South Vietnam (13,500 Americans have already been killed, 85,000 wounded).

Instead of only another cessation in the air attacks against North Vietnam, therefore, I propose that this Government announce, as of a certain date, the cessation of all military action in South Vietnam as well as over North Vietnam; also announce that there will be no reinforcements into the theater.

The Government would announce that these policies were being undertaken in earnest hope that their adoption would result in prompt and meaningful negotiations in the interest of a just peace.

At the same time the United States should also announce that, if after this cessation of all military action in South Vietnam, as well as North Vietnam, the North Vietnamese and Viet Cong nevertheless continued hostilities, then the United States would feel free to pursue this war in any manner of its own choosing.

It would appear that the political objectives of the United States have now been achieved through the creation, by means of free elections of the present Saigon Government; and the military objectives of this Government have never included the invasion of North Vietnam, or the occupation of Hanoi, or the taking over of the Government of North Vietnam.

Concurrently with the above proposed announcement of United States policy, the Government of South Vietnam should announce its willingness to negotiate with anybody, and offer amnesty to members of the Viet Cong.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 6, 1967]

WASHINGTON: DIRKSEN'S DEFENSE OF JOHNSON

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, October 5.—The Senate has finally had a serious debate on Vietnam, but in the process it has produced two ideas which could actually make the situation there even worse than it is now.

The first is the Symington idea of a cease-fire coupled with a threat. The Missouri Senator proposes that we stop all military activity, including all reinforcements in both North and South Vietnam on a certain date and announce that if the enemy continues the hostilities, the United States will then "feel free to pursue this war in any manner of its own choosing."

SOMETHING FOR EVERYONE

This seems to give something to all the contending factions in the current controversy. The doves would get their cease-fire. If the enemy did not stop fighting, then the implication is that the hawks would be liberated to hit any targets they liked anywhere in North Vietnam. And the people who feel uneasy with a limited war, would have a neat and simple formula: no nonsense, no more ambiguity; either peace or war to the death.

The trouble with this is that there is absolutely no evidence that the Communists would negotiate under threat. On the contrary, they have insisted from the beginning that the bombing must be stopped unconditionally. Accordingly, about the only sure thing in this, other than a rejection from the Communists, would be increased pressure here at home for a more savage war if the cease-fire didn't lead to the kind of peace we want.

The second idea that came out of the debate was Senator Dirksen's definition of why the United States is fighting in Vietnam. Not only because we are treaty-bound to do so, he said: not only to keep the Communists from imposing their political will on South Vietnam by force; not only in defense of the principle of self-determination, but because the strategic line from Korea through Vietnam is essential to the security of the United States.

"I do not want to see that line broken," Senator Dirksen kept repeating in a colloquy with Senator Fulbright, "so that all of the rest of Southeast Asia is exposed, because if it is, then the whole Pacific coastline of this country will be exposed."

PRINCIPLES OR BASES?

Now this is a critical point, for this is what the Communists have always feared: that the United States is fighting there to maintain a strategic stronghold close to the China frontier. It was to remove this fear that the Johnson Administration has emphasized that it wants no bases in Vietnam, and is willing to abide by the will of the people there, even if they decide freely to form a Communist government.

This has been said by the Johnson Administration time and again, both here and at the United Nations, for it was recognized by the President that the Communists would probably never agree to a compromise that left the United States either with bases or a strong military ally in South Vietnam.

Mr. Dirksen, however, has now confused this issue again and given support to the very thing the Communists fear the most. He is not, of course, a spokesman for the President, but ironically and in actual fact he is closer to the President on this issue than the President's own majority leader in the Senate.

Senator Fulbright asked Senator Dirksen: "Do I then understand that the Senator believes a permanent base there is necessary for our security?" Senator Dirksen replied: "No. I think that after stability is restored at long last, they [the South Vietnamese] can set up their own military requirements in order to meet this threat."

To most military experts here, however, this is really a formula for an endless U.S. military presence in South Vietnam. For nobody can foresee the day when any of the South Vietnamese leaders now on the scene can "restore" stability.

IT'S NOT EASY

It is not easy to make things in Vietnam worse than they now are, but it is certainly possible. Symington would gamble both on a one-way cease-fire and, if it didn't work, on a bigger and riskier war. Dirksen would fight on for a "strategic line" running through Saigon until stability is restored and South Vietnam can defend itself, which is likely to be a very long time indeed.

There is no doubt that Dirksen felt the criticism of the President was going too far and wanted to help him, but, ironically, he may very well have done the opposite. For he has raised fundamental doubts again about the nation's war aims in Vietnam; and so long as there is the least suspicion in Hanoi that the United States is trying to retain a powerful base or ally in that peninsula, the President's chances of a negotiated settlement are not likely to be very good.

VIETNAM

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, several days ago I received a letter in which I was asked two questions. One question was: "Do you have any suggestions of ways and means of bringing the war in Vietnam to a quicker and successful end?" The second question was: "If your suggestions are carried into effect, when do you anticipate the war would be ended?"

Mr. President, I threw the letter in the wastepaper basket. Then, upon reflection, I took it out, and I dictated an answer. At this time I wish to recite to Senators my answer to those questions.

Yes, I have a suggestion about ways and means that can be adopted to bring the war to a quicker and a successful end. That suggestion is that we stop labeling the United States: One, as the aggressor in the war in South Vietnam; two, as the maker of South Vietnam of a nation of brothels: three, as demandant of unconditional surrender, making it impossible for Ho Chi Minh to go to the negotiating table; four, as the user of a planned and designed method of committing atrocities, cruel and indefensible, among the innocent men, women, and children of South Vietnam; five, as seeking to impose colonial domination upon South Vietnam with a view of exploiting their mineral and human resources; six, as being unwilling to negotiate.

Mr. President, that course would be most constructive in bringing that war to an end.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, Ho Chi Minh will never go to the negotiating table as long as we, and in many instances on the floor of the Senate, heap upon the United States the libel, the slander, and the abuses to which we have subjected our country. Ho Chi Minh is definitely of the belief that we are so divided that we do not possess the will to maintain our honor. He is of the belief that if he waits until the election of 1968, the present President will be repudiated and the Communists of North Vietnam will thus win by default.

How long can a nation endure if its leading citizens unjustly and falsely condemn that nation as being the perpetrator of the wrongs which I have just described?

I mentioned six condemnations. I did not mention a seventh, but I shall now.

The seventh point of condemnation was that in South Vietnam the United States dressed some of its personnel in the uniform of the Communist Vietcong, and then had these boys commit rape upon the women of South Vietnam and death upon public officials, solely for the purpose of putting the blame on the Vietcong.

If I were Ho Chi Minh, when he heard that statement made by a distinguished official of the United States, I would have used it—and Ho Chi Minh did—by circulating it all throughout South Vietnam as to what America is doing in violating every conceivable moral concept of decency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, Ho Chi Minh will wait. He believes that we are so divided that we cannot succeed in the war. On that basis I think he is right.

About 8 weeks ago, I proposed another pause in the bombing. I did so having in mind that on five previous occasions we had done so, begging the Communist leader to come to the negotiating table. On each occasion he viciously and inconsiderately rejected our proposals.

Senators might ask, Why did I propose a cessation of the bombing? In effect, I said what the Senator from Missouri said a moment ago: to cease the bombing without any conditions and then wait to see if Ho Chi Minh was telling the truth when he said that the stopping of the bombing would be a vehicle which would bring him to the negotiating table. I want to reconfirm the statement of the Senator from Missouri that Ho Chi Minh, in his proposal for peace, said:

> Quit bombing the North. Pull your troops out of South Vietnam and recognize that the National Liberation Front's program must be adopted as the existing and proper government of South Vietnam.

I proposed the pause in the bombing, knowing the danger attendant thereon, but I wanted another demonstration to the Senate and to the people of the United States that all that Ho Chi Minh has been saying has been untrue all along. I suggested the pause in the bombing solely to demonstrate to those who contend that we do not want to negotiate, that they are not properly informed.

In other words, I hoped that their tongues would be tied so as to prevent them from saying in the future that the United States is not doing everything reasonable and available to enable it to go to the negotiating table.

I regret, Mr. President, that I have been driven to make these remarks today, but had I not made them, I would not feel at ease with myself.

Within the next few days, a meeting will be held in the caucus room of the Capitol in which it will again be asserted that we are not doing the best we can to get to the negotiating table.

Mr. President, I think we have leaned over backward to get to the negotiating table. I feel that for the purpose of solidifying the thinking of our people, and for the purpose of tying the tongues of those who are slandering and libeling the United States, a pause in the bombing should again be instituted.

It is my country. Let me repeat the oft-used words: right or wrong, it is my country. But on this great issue, it is right. It is not wrong.

With respect to President Johnson, although I have disagreed with him many times, if he has played politics, the best way to play politics now would seemingly be to abandon honor and surrender to Ho Chi Minh; but the President refuses to do so.

I suggest that the war can be brought to a successful and quicker end by a halt and stoppage of the vilification that unjustly and indefensibly is being heaped by our own civil leaders upon our country.

THE SUPERSONIC TRANSPORT

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in the Wall Street Journal for October 2, 1967, there is published an editorial entitled "Which Comes First?"

The editorial takes exception to the expanded expenditures now being approved by the Senate. In particular it suggests that the Senate could slow down the $142 million expenditure for the supersonic transport. It also calls attention to the fact that the Senate voted for seven times as much for certain safety measures as President Johnson requested.

Yesterday, the Senate rejected efforts to curtail these expenditures, as referred to in the editorial.

I agree with the editorial, which states, in part:

> This performance lent at least some support to the President's argument that his suggestions for spending cuts should await completion of action on the appropriations bills. It would do no good for him to propose reduction in a few items if Congress then proceeded to inflate everything else.

Mr. President, I concur completely that cutting these expenditures is the responsibility of Congress.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHICH COMES FIRST?

President Johnson has let it be known that he's all for cuts in Federal spending. But before he urges any specific reductions, he wants to see what Congress does with pending appropriations bills.

Many Congressmen claim they are enthused about trimming outlays, too. But they want to stand back while the White House wields the knife.

The result of this Alphonse-Gaston colloquy, of course, is that spending proceeds merrily upward, putting still more inflationary pressures on the economy. So it's worth asking where the responsibility really rests.

Congress, it seems to us, has the ultimate responsibility, since it has the final say-so. As the House underlined last week by delaying an appropriations bill, the Administration can't spend a nickel until Congress provides it.

Rep. George Mahon, chairman of the Appropriations Committee, put it very well. Arguing against passing the buck to the President, he said "this would be a confession to the American people of our inability in Congress to discharge our responsibility." It would "make Congress appear to be hopelessly bogged down and incompetent."

As Mr. Mahon was calling on Congress to assert itself on economy, some of his colleagues on the other side of the Capitol appeared to be rushing rapidly in the opposite direction. In the Senate Appropriations Committee, at any rate, thrift was anything but the order of the day.

One item up for consideration, for example, was $142 million more for the supersonic transport. The SST will be a considerable technological achievement, but it's hard to see, in the current fiscal crisis, that the project's present swift pace is essential. The Senators, though, were in no mood for waiting; they overwhelmingly okayed the full appropriation.

That was far from all. At the same sitting the Senate panel doubled the amount that the House had approved for highway-safety grants to the states. And they voted more than seven times as much for air safety as President Johnson had requested only a few days earlier.

This performance lent at least some support to the President's argument that his suggestions for spending cuts should await completion of action on the appropriations bills. It would do no good for him to propose reductions in a few items if Congress then proceeded to inflate everything else.

If, however, the upward rush of Federal outlays is ever to be stopped or even slowed, the Administration must assume the primary responsibility.

In this nation's fiscal scheme of things, only the Administration ever is able to consider the vast Federal edifice in its entirety. Appropriations bills go to Congress piecemeal, so that even the hardest-working lawmakers are unlikely ever to see the complete picture.

Increasingly it is the Administration that originates major spending programs, that effectively decides the direction of Federal outlays, if not always their specifics. More often than not, the changes that Congress does make are calculated only to speed spending more swiftly upward.

Both Congress and the Administration might stand a better chance of living up to their respective responsibilities if the financial mechanics of the Government were in somewhat sounder shape. Accounting practices of various agencies still vary so wildly that accurate analysis becomes almost impossible.

It's high time, too, to end all the fiddling with different forms of budgets; the idea usually has been to favor the one that seemed to show the Government in the most favorable fiscal light. Things are so obviously out of hand now that the Administration might as well make a clean breast of it by settling on something close to the cash budget, which includes all Federal transactions with the public.

In any reform effort, even the finest of financial methods will of course provide only a way, not the will. And the will must come, if it ever does, not just from Congress or the Administration but from both.

THE JET AGE CRISIS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, man has had to face the constant challenge of keeping up with modern technology, particularly in the area of transportation. This new transportation technology is evidenced clearly today by the development of advanced and improved means of air travel. But because of these bigger and faster planes, commercial aviation is today being overwhelmed by expanding traffic, safety and noise problems. The so-called jet age is bringing with it a challenging crisis which, if not met, could well jeopardize the public interest.

From the beginning of commercial air travel, airlines have had a growth rate unprecedented in the history of American business. The airlines served over 110 million people last year—an increase exceeding 474 percent over 1950. It is estimated that they will double their traffic by 1971 and triple it by 1975. Within this very decade, air passenger traffic will reach the 454 million level.

To provide for this phenomenal growth, the airlines industry has increased its investment in aircraft from $3 billion in 1960 to almost $9 billion in 1966. By 1975, the industry will spend some $18 billion for new equipment and facilities.

New planes are being developed to fly more passengers at faster speeds. Boeing's 747 will be capable of handling 500 people, and Lockheed is presently working on plans for an 800-passenger aircraft. The much publicized SST, a project approved yesterday by the Senate, will have a capacity of 250 passengers but it will carry them at speeds around 2,000 miles per hour, over three times the present speed of commercial aircraft.

Today, the airlines operate approximately 2,000 aircraft and this fleet is expected to grow to around 3,500 aircraft by 1977. But this is not the entire picture. By 1977, the Federal Aviation Administration expects a doubling in the general aviation fleet to a level around 180,000, of which 8,000 will be business jets.

This growth has had, and continues to have, a bolstering and healthy effect on the Nation's economy. And yet, growth also multiplies the problems. It increases the probability of accidents, heightens the threat of mass congestion, increases the discomfort of noise, and presents a thousand other complex problems relating to the jet age.

On July 19 of this year, a tragic air crash over Hendersonville, N.C., killed 82 people, including newly-designated Secretary of the Navy John T. McNaughton. A small, private plane crashed into a Piedmont Airlines jet shortly after its takeoff. The real tragedy of this crash is that it could have been avoided. News reports place the small private plane off course, and the Asheville airport did not have the radar facilities by which the small aircraft could have been warned and the accident possibly prevented.

I find it alarming to learn that of the 547 airports used by the public in airline service, only 234 have control towers and 105 have radar surveillance of the traffic arriving into and departing from the airport. In my own State of California, I am shocked to learn that the following cities are without tower service: El Centro, Marysville, Merced, Redding, Santa Maria, and Visalia. Equally disturbing is the fact that the following California cities have no radar service at their airports: Bakersfield, El Centro, Modesto, Palm Springs, Santa Barbara, Santa Rosa, and Stockton.

With air traffic increasing almost daily, our air corridors are increasingly becoming crowded and the danger of mid-air collisions are mounting daily. No airport having airline passenger service can afford the risk of being without a control tower and radar. The costs for providing these services may be considerable; but I suggest that they may be undertaken in a well-planned and responsible manner within a reasonable time period. Certainly, the protection of human life must require no less.

The 14 mid-air collisions of 1963 did not involve one commercial air carrier. Last year, there was a total of 25 such collisions. In 1967, we have witnessed already 14 mid-air collisions and three of them—including the one in which Secretary-designate McNaughton so tragically lost his life—involved commercial air carriers. These distressing figures will, in all likelihood, exceed those of last year.

It is time that through our forward-looking air technology, we are developing more efficient and sophisticated aircraft. But with the bigger jumbo jets such as the 747's and SST's, will come higher speeds, greater loads, and very significant increases in passengers per aircraft. The dark shadow of disaster, particularly with so many lives at stake, will follow closely every plane into the air.

The complex problems of air safety do not lend themselves to simple answers. Greater strides must be made in aviation safety, in the air and on the ground, for both commercial and general aviation. I understand that a number of major corporations are engaged in the research and development of a collision avoidance system. It will be 5 years, however, before it can be put to general use, and will cost somewhere around $50,000. The device promises to be a great boon toward safe flying and will reduce accidents significantly. The price range, however, will make it prohibitive for smaller aircraft, the planes which make up the great bulk of increased air traffic. Cheaper devices must be sought if an effective collision avoidance system is to be achieved.

"Alpha-numeric" systems are being planned for installation at many major airports. These systems would identify the plane and the altitude at which it was flying; it would thus be easier to insure that no two planes were flying on the same level or too close to each other. The Air Transport Association, however, estimates that only one-third of the major airports will be ready to install these by 1970.

Too often, those directly involved in aviation think only in terms of sophisticated and expensive devices as solutions to the problems of air safety. There are two areas wherein, from both a cost and engineering standpoint, improvement can be made at reasonable cost. The first is a more expeditious system of clearing the runways and taxiways in order to avoid delaying aircraft landings and the second is a more realistic solution to the air traffic congestion existing at major air terminals now. I will touch on each of these subsequently.

Other safety devices must also be researched and developed. Planes should be made more "crashworthy," escape systems can be improved, more sensitive smoke- and fire-detection equipment installed.

The bitter tragedy of a midair explosion wherein lightning is believed to have been involved, has led to action by the FAA in spelling out an explosion suppression device for our air carriers. After years of research and testing, the majority of which was funded by the manufacturers and two of our air carriers—Pan American and TWA—the equipment is available. In fact, it has already been installed on the aircraft of TWA. The research on emulsified fuels offers a hopeful solution to the problem of neutralizing fuels in the event of a crash.

Automation wherever it will increase efficiency also should be put into effect. Pilot training programs can be more thorough and uniform for more effective regulation. The Federal Government should conduct and support further research on weather and terrain conditions. This information should be accurate and be kept up to date. Private industry has played an important role in studying and developing invaluable safety devices. Surely, Government must continue to help and encourage these endeavors.

Today, airlines are the most heavily used form of transportation: 59 percent of all intercity traffic is now done by flying, and this is more than both the railways and buses combined. By 1970, airlines may very well be flying 100 billion revenue passenger-miles. The great expansion in all forms of air traffic—freight, passenger, and general aviation—has been terrific and this has put a severe strain on facilities now existing. Air traffic has been growing at a rate much faster than the systems capable of accommodating it. Most of our airports already are strained beyond their peak capacity. Within the next decade, expansion will be at a rate far more rapid than the last and the concomitant problems will increase exponentially.

Many aviation experts charge that we are in the midst of an airport crisis whose ramifications will be dire indeed—a crisis which did not have to happen because we have the technology and resources which could have averted it. Already congestion and delays have reached proportions that are intolerable. Much of this has been the result of poor planning.

On the access highways to the airports, in the parking lots, at the ticket windows and baggage counters, on the runways, in the skyways—everywhere we turn, we see and experience gigantic traffic jams. There is hardly a commercial airliner in the country that does not get delayed at least once a day at an airport.

According to figures supplied by the FAA, delays in 1965 amounted to 130,000 hours. The cost of delays at 23 major airports—including Los Angeles and San Francisco—to the airlines was about $28 million. This cost is figured mostly in terms of extra crew time and increased fuel consumption. It does not include the ill will engendered by the long waiting periods and the anger caused by missed appointments. There were some 7 million man-hours of passenger delay last year. My distinguished colleague and friend Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, of Washington, has estimated that this would be some $50 million worth of productive earning time which was not performed last year.

A recent study of delays on the ground subsequent to landing or prior to takeoff indicated that on the San Francisco International Airport alone:

> The existing facilities of the San Francisco International Airport are nearing the saturation point and are inadequate to accommodate the forecast growth of future aeronautical activities.

These delays cost air carriers over $700,000 in a 1-year period. A system to facilitate and improve the ground control of aircraft and the hardware to implement it is now available. A high FAA official has stated:

> FAA is most interested in establishing an airport ground guidance and control capability at major high-density airports. However, we are not at the present time in a position to fund such installations.

The jumbo jets will tend further to add to the problem. Deplaning and em-planing of these aircraft, arriving and departing within minutes of each other, will cause overwhelming delays and congestion.

Twenty-three major hub airports are now reaching the complete saturation point. A short-range solution would be to increase the capacity of existing airports by constructing new runways and extending old ones wherever feasible.

There is no doubt that the need for more airports is great, everyone wants more airports, but because of extreme noise, increased traffic, and other nuisances, they want it in other people's neighborhoods. Too often in the past, airports have been badly conceived, poorly planned, and inconveniently situated. There is no doubt that entirely new facilities are needed but more concern should be given to the surrounding areas in such planning.

Terminal and runway congestion can be relieved somewhat by removing general aviation from commercial terminals. This can be accomplished by developing a system of satellite airports around the city. Such a system would also reduce the hazards of any collisions between smaller aircraft and commercial aircraft. At a recent aviation gathering, Mr. Sherman Fairchild, an eminent figure in the aviation manufacturing community, cited the requirement for forward thinking in this problem of developing an adequate system of satellite airports. He referred specifically to STOL—short takeoff/landing aircraft—as one of the effective answers to this problem and these aircraft are presently available. He stated in part:

> A large segment of traffic can conceivably be moved from existing runways to operate at the same airport but in short and vertical take-off modes thus alleviating to some extent runway and "stack" congestion.

I think that it is very easy to see that, so long as there is congestion, the airports will not be able to handle the larger planes because they simply will not have the facilities for it. The significance of this to the manufacturers will be that they will not be able to sell as many aircraft as would otherwise be the case. To the airlines, minimal delays are a necessity if they are to reduce costs and insure a reasonable return on their investment.

An important aspect of the aviation-airport problem which effective planning must take into account is aircraft noise. According to a report made public on August 3, 1967, by the Office of Science and Technology, sonic booms do not seem to be harmful. Nevertheless, the report indicates that people find sonic booms very difficult to get used to. They remain a great annoyance to those living around and nearby airports.

The aircraft industry, along with NASA, is now developing a quieter jet engine. But I doubt whether this is enough. Consider the increase in air traffic, the great changeovers from props to jets, and the development of SST and jumbo jets—all of this will still mean greater noise despite the reductions which would be brought about by quieter jet engines. We must push for better flight procedures and more careful airport planning.

I have been informed that there are now studies underway on how to cope with the noise problem around Los Angeles, O'Hare, and Kennedy International Airports. These studies are expected to result in proposals by the FAA and HUD. I look forward to these proposals in the hope that we can alleviate some of the annoyances.

I was pleased to see that the Los Angeles Department of Airports is proceeding with a pilot program to soundproof homes near the Los Angeles International Airport. This is the type of program which may reap a significant approach to the noise problem.

With the extensive economic burdens facing the Nation this year, money, of course, remains a substantial problem. The FAA estimates that as much as $3 billion is needed for airport construction by 1971 and $6 billion by 1975. Our present level of funding only provides for $70 million per year under the Federal aid to airports program, and this would seem hopelessly short of coping with the problem. For these reasons, I was most pleased by the recent actions of the President and the Senate. The President recently called for a comprehensive Government plan to expand and improve the Nation's air traffic control system that would cost over $5 billion. Only yesterday, the Senate approved over $618 million for air traffic management and facilities. These certainly are steps in the right direction.

But money is not the only problem. There is also the challenge of proper planning. I regard it as being unfortunate that there is no planning on a national level for the entire aviation system. This can be traced largely to the fact the Nation's public airports, with very few exceptions, are under private or municipal control. In effect, this means a different program for each airport. Because of an inability to anticipate problems, many airports find it impossible to develop along with the jet age. The result has been, and is, that many airports are outdated in this era. We need a policy for the entire Nation, coordinated on a national level. The planning must be comprehensive and forward looking, and it must deal with the entire airport system.

Problems of aircraft and passenger safety, traffic, congestions, delays, noise, runway and terminal development, automation, and other aviation-related problems are all becoming more acute. We can effectively cope with these problems if business and Government coordinate their efforts in responsible, imaginative, and creative planning. If this coordination can be achieved, then America will be prepared to accept the challenge of the jet age.

Mr. President, I hold a letter from a very able American, and a very good friend of mine, Joseph D. Caldara, major general, U.S. Air Force, retired, who is now the president of Flight Safety Foundation, Inc. He sent me an article published in the New York Times under date of September 17, 1967, entitled "FAA Is Pressing for More Funds in Safety Drive," written by Evert Clark. I believe his letter and this article are relevant to the points I have attempted to make in my address.

I ask unanimous consent to have the letter and the article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FSF FLIGHT SAFETY FOUNDATION, INC.,
New York, N.Y., September 18, 1967.
Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR TOM: An extremely interesting account in today's New York Times on air safety and the problems the FAA is having in funding it touches on a most critical subject. The opening sentence, "The Federal Aviation Administration, fearing it cannot keep pace with air travel growth is fighting the White House for more air safety funds," is the reason for this letter.

Over the years I have seen, sometimes to my horror, vital decisions affecting the safety of flight deferred until after an accident or, worse yet, after a series of accidents. Such decisions based on emotion rather than analytical fact generally fall far short of providing the necessary or even a realistic solution.

The recent mid-air collisions, the inexcusable delays that are costly in both time and money, and the already sorely lacking traffic control capability, as attested by our constant communications within the industry, point the way to additional disasters unless positive action is taken now.

The article also stated, "Only if top Administration officials become convinced that air safety might develop into a troublesome political issue are they believed likely to approve the supplemental request for funds for the fiscal year . . . to be about $100-million." In addition to the political issue of a failure in air safety to the economic aspect of one accident can easily exceed the $100-million requested.

While I am sending a letter similar to this to the President, I am taking the liberty of calling the very real and present danger of potential disaster in the air to the attention of each member of The Congress. As a professional in the discipline of air safety—and all we are really talking about is efficient flight—I urge you and all the members of The Congress to take the action necessary to provide this vital funding for this all-important effort.

Sincerely,
JOSEPH D. CALDARA,
Major General, USAF (Retired).

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION IS PRESSING FOR MORE FUNDS IN SAFETY DRIVE—PLEADS FOR WHITE HOUSE AID TO ADD TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS, TOWERS AND EQUIPMENT

(By Evert Clark)

WASHINGTON, September 17.—The Federal Aviation Administration, fearing it cannot keep pace with air travel growth, is fighting the White House for more air safety funds.

To date the White House and the Budget Bureau have resisted the pressure. The agency's greatest need is for more air traffic controllers, but it also wants more money for control towers and electronic equipment.

Only if top Administration officials become convinced that air safety might develop into a troublesome political issue are they believed likely to approve the supplemental request for funds for the fiscal year 1968. The amount involved is said to be about $100-million.

If a denial of the request were to be followed by a major accident involving air traffic control, the safety issue could be catapulted into a political controversy.

Congress, concerned about two midair collisions this year involving airlines, has recently shown considerable interest in air safety problems.

FATAL ACCIDENTS CONTINUE

There were 10 fatal airline accidents in the first eight months of this year. The annual average for the last five years was 12. Crashes this year have taken 217 lives, compared with a five-year average of 293.

The F.A.A.'s regular budget request for the fiscal year 1968, which has passed the House but not the Senate, is the first in four years that would permit the recruiting of new controllers in any volume.

Even then the $811-million requested would add only 648 controllers and 121 maintenance men to the 14,000 controllers and maintenance men who now run the traffic centers and the control towers.

But David D. Thomas, deputy administrator, indicated that this increase was only about one-third of what was really needed. The deficiency, he said, would be made up, as it has been in the last few years, by asking each controller to work harder.

"The way air traffic is growing now, with the budget now before you, if each air traffic controller did exactly the same amount of work that he is doing this year, it would take 1,500 more positions than you have in the budget just to keep up with the traffic," Mr. Thomas said.

"We are actually expecting him to do 8 to 10 per cent more work next year, with the equipment we are furnishing him and the improvement we are making in the traffic control system."

He explained that the productivity of the air traffic control system—that is, the number of take-offs, landings and overflights it can handle—had already been increased by 178 per cent of what it was in 1963, without the hiring of any appreciable number of new controllers.

In other words the system has been able to handle far more traffic, partly because electronic aids have improved but chiefly because individual controllers now deal with many more planes on a radar scope at one time than they ever have before.

Agency officials told Congress last May of their "urgent" air traffic problems and said that they might return to ask for more money if conditions worsened and the Administration approved such a request.

Gen. William F. McKee, the agency's chief, testified that F.A.A. traffic forecasts prepared only a few months before had already been exceeded.

"I am concerned about the number of personnel, particularly in our air traffic control system," he said.

Since he testified, the House has acted on the budget request. It did not cut money for controllers, but it did make cuts that would force the agency to defer 12 new control towers and six new radar installations.

These improvements were planned before the current budget was submitted. The budget does not include any new money for further tower or radar installations.

Typifying the Administration's budgetary problems, the Budget Bureau cut $70.2-million from the agency's proposed 1968 request before the request went to Capitol Hill.

It would have cut more, but General McKee made a strong plea to the President and the budget director that he have at least a handful of new controllers.

The agency is now in the position of having to ask the Budget Bureau and the President for still more money just to keep pace with traffic growth.

It does not pretend that the supplemental request would permit it to go ahead of the problem.

SOCIETAL IMPLICATIONS OF ACCELERATING TECHNOLOGY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BAKER

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, in a recent address before the Association for Computing Machinery, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER] spoke of "the upcoming sociotechnological revolution."

Already the changes which science and man's inventiveness are making in our living environment and in our institutions pose a threat to some of the most basic values of our society.

At the same time, we know that technology, if made to serve the long-term best interests of mankind, can enhance the quality of life and the prospects of achievement for each and all of us.

I happen to know that the Senator from Tennessee has informed himself thoroughly on the societal implications of accelerating technology. I hope that other Senators will give thoughtful attention to what he had to say to the Association of Computing Machinery, for his remarks have a special meaning to us as legislators. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Senator BAKER's address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF ADDRESS BY SENATOR HOWARD H. BAKER, JR., TENNESSEE, BEFORE ASSOCIATION FOR COMPUTING MACHINERY, AUGUST 30, 1967, WASHINGTON, D.C.

I thank you for the opportunity to appear and discuss a matter of mutual interest, the upcoming socio-technological revolution. I bring you the genuine regrets of my colleague, Senator Muskie, that he could not be with you today. I think it would have been especially appropriate and significant had he been your luncheon guest and had the opportunity to discuss the creation of a Select Committee of the United States Senate for Technology and Human Environment, S. Res. 68, of which he is the author. However, as you know, he is part of a special mission designated by the President to observe the conduct of the elections in South Vietnam.

I am pleased to have had the opportunity to enthusiastically support Senator Muskie in this important effort, and before I discuss the aspects of the proposal itself, I would like to speak in broader terms and paint with a broader brush for just a moment.

Your field of interest is as broad as the entire scope of the activities and the environment of mankind. The computing sciences provide the tools and techniques which permit us to bring coherence and organization to the exploding body of knowledge which will directly affect every life and all our governmental institutions both now and for the future. Without the computing industry the new burgeoning science of cybernetics would be only an abstract concept and "the art of steersmanship," as the American College Dictionary defines cybernetics, would be impossible of obtainment.

In the social sciences as distinguished from the purely scientific, your industry and talents and imagination will permit us to, for the first time, engage in scientific and systematic inquiries into the nature of existence and the form and substance of theory in a logical, useable and useful form.

For the first time theoretical science, applied science, engineering, economics and government are discernibly interacting, and thus the reason and the necessity for the creation of a Select Committee such as proposed by Senator Muskie in order to assure that the governing process, which in the democratic form is itself a computing machine of sorts, keeps pace with and maintains an awareness of the forces and vectors of change and opportunity.

Let me speak of one aspect of the socio-technological revolution that is basic to all our considerations.

We are about to enter an age of vast, unbelievably cheap power. We will see the unlimited availability of nuclear power in the next few years at almost zero fuel cost. This production of power at zero fuel cost will transform our society in nearly every aspect.

As Dr. Alvin Weinberg, director of the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, has said: "the advent of very cheap, ubiquitous and inexhaustible nuclear energy, through the development of the breeder reactor, will make a qualitative change in man's relation to his environment."

Energy is the ultimate raw material. If we make energy available at almost no cost, then we will be faced with a revaluation of everything that is produced.

Even now we are working hard for implementation of a proposal by former President Eisenhower and Admiral Lewis Strauss to provide fresh water for the strife-torn Middle East with nuclear power plants. This is already practical and if adopted, will revolutionize the Middle East, hopefully bringing peace and prosperity to that troubled, arid land.

With Breeder Reactors producing this near costless energy, the promise is even greater.

But revolution is a concept that is fraught with peril. For, as we have seen in the revolutions perpetrated by man across the course of history, they can be for good, or they can be for bad.

Every Fourth of July, we celebrate with pride and patriotism the American Revolution in which our forefathers revolted against the mother country and declared themselves forever free of tyrannical oppression.

But we also know of the revolution of the Fidel Castro variety where one despot is replaced with an even more ruthless tyrant.

So, revolution, if not carefully controlled, can enslave rather than free.

It is, therefore, imperative that we begin now to plan for the great technological revolution which is almost upon us.

We must make the necessary adjustments and preparations to assure that this revolution works for our benefit, that it makes us freer, and that it does not destroy the basic values upon which our nation was founded.

You are well aware of the fears expressed of the "big brotherism" aspects of the computerized society. And you've heard the humorously told accounts of people fighting frustrating battles against an immutable computer which insists on sending a bill which for some reason or other is erroneous.

These stories and jokes are funny today. But tomorrow when our society becomes completely dependent on computerization, they could become nightmares, unless we plan for the new age computers are bringing us.

The anguish of the economic dislocation in the coal mining areas of West Virginia and Tennessee is an illustration in miniature of the problems that may beset this nation on a much broader scale as a result of new automative techniques, on the basis of new labor saving approaches.

The plight of the coal miner is essentially a problem where our economy has failed to anticipate the disruptive impact of high mechanization in one industry but the new frontiers of science and technology threatens these very same economic disruptive forces throughout the fabric of the entire economy and the problem we are confronted with in the hills and valleys of Tennessee and West Virginia will be multiplied many times over in many other industries unless we have the foresight to anticipate and provide against these contingencies in the immediate years to come.

This exciting prospect of unlimited nuclear energy, and all that one can see flowing from it has been described by Dr. Weinberg as constituting a "technological fix"—a means of circumventing, through technology a profoundly disturbing social problem.

He used the case of the classical Malthusian dilemma. One hopes through this technology, he said, to buy the time the world needs to work the social changes which will ultimately be needed if we are to control the world's population.

These "technological fixes" help but they alone are not enough.

To attack these problems we need a coherent and coordinated approach of the socio-technological and political implications.

To those of us who are not scientists or technicians, but politicians rooted in the experience of people, their idiosyncrasies, their prejudices and vagaries, the future of automated machines, manipulated genetic structures, self-contained new cities which recycle their own wastes and giant airplanes * * * the nuclear devices that produce costless energy, give us substantial cause of concern on Capitol Hill.

And, of course, in order that no one here may be offended by being excluded from the list of these frightening projections, there is the cybernetic revolution, which Glenn Seaborg terms "the quantum jump in the existence of man," which will have all manner of far-reaching effects on the individual and his environment.

What we lack in the Senate, in Congress, in the Executive Branch, and among our State and local governments is a mechanism for inquiring into the broad impact of science and technology on man's thinking, his health, work, living habits and individual security over the next fifty years. There is a tremendous information gap between the politician and the scientist. We really don't know where we are heading—where the benefits of technology can be best applied, and what the hazards and problems that may flow from such technological application.

In an attempt to meet this information gap, Senator Muskie has proposed legislation which would establish in the Senate the Select Committee on Technology and the Human Environment, composed of members from each of the standing committees most involved with legislation affecting human needs. This committee would provide an excellent forum where scientists and legislators could face each other across the table and discuss the critical environmental problems ahead and what science and technology can do to solve them.

It would provide a central source of information and analysis—not now available in the Senate—comprehensive information cutting across the technological spectrum, which the standing committees and members of the Senate would use in developing their legislative policies.

This Select Committee would have no jurisdiction over legislation or powers of legislative oversight, but its reports and recommendations covering essential environmental problems could well become a foundation for development of national goals and planning involving science and technology as key ingredients in building a modern America.

We are well along with our scientific and technological planning and programming, our system management, our cybernetic progress in the military and defense sectors, and in our efforts to put a man on the moon. There have been problems in these sectors, but extraordinary minds and machines have worked to solve them.

But what does the next fifty years of science and technology hold for man on earth? Is he to be consigned to the ghettos, stalled in traffic, choked by poisoned atmosphere, and subjected to the continuing noise, strain, speed tension and social instability of our increasingly crowded urban and suburban environments? Can he be released, at least in part, from these intolerable conditions, from the kind of scientific effort that is going forward so energetically in the space and defense fields? And if we bring in the scientists and the technologists, and their 21st Century equipment and ideas, do we have the type of governmental structure and administrative process to implement effectively the rebuilding process? How much of our concepts of free enterprise, of individual freedom and initiative and of democratic decision-making will have to be forfeited in order to plan and to build a new American society along scientific lines?

These are hard questions requiring some very hard decisions. But the internal conditions of many areas urban and rural in this country are getting so serious that we are going to have to make these decisions sooner than we think. Hopefully, a Select Committee on Technology and the Human Environment can help us along the way.

All the witnesses that appeared before our Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations to comment on the resolution were optimistic—that we have—or are rapidly building—the scientific capability to solve environmental problems.

Again, the question—to what extent will the "technological fix" impair the democratic decision-making process, and reduce individual freedom? Could it be that we as legislators representing a hundred and ninety million people are looked into a technological system over which in the long run we are powerless to control?

Many witnesses see this high energy civilization coming on us before we may be ready to cope with it. They see the impact of trillions of kilowatt hours of low cost electricity spread across our Nation by massive interconnecting grids as revolutionizing nearly every facet of our American life.

They picture cities built in the nature of a closed system, powered by huge atomic reactors which will breed their own fuel run by automation. These cities could produce their own materials, recycle their water, sewage, and industrial waste, have modern efficient heating, housing and transportation facilities, and concentrate heavily on education, research and development, along with service industries as contrasted to productive industry.

Other than atomic power, computerization would be at the heart of the operations of such a city. The computer complex would be the city's largest decision-making body.

What kind of a government would such a city have? What kind of political decisions would be needed? What kind of competition would there be? How much private ownership? How much individual freedom would a person have? There are many interesting questions here, which no doubt a Select Committee would consider.

Never before in our Nation's history has it been quite so critical that we shorten the 10- to 20-year gap between basic research discoveries and their practical applications. Never has it been quite so critical that Congress legislate intelligently so that taxpayers, impatient to achieve effective solutions to a myriad of social problems, get their money's worth from each dollar spent.

The Select Committee will be a major first step in preparing for this technological revolution I have discussed with you today. But an important next step should be given immediate consideration, perhaps as the first major inquiry of the Select Committee.

This would be the question of establishing coherent National Socio-Technological Institutes that could mobilize around the great social problems that mar the quality of our life. Such institutes would be concerned with the city, with race relations, with crime, with civil defense and with the environment. The institutes would have both social scientists and technologists working in daily give-and-take, exchanging views and keeping each other honest. Some of the institutes might represent a redeployment of existing government laboratories but others would spring up anew. Some might be university-connected; others would have no such connection. But, above all, the institutes would have a coherence in their attacks on these profoundly different questions.

The thought that I really want to leave with you in summing up is that all of us—you in the computer manufacturing industry—we in the Congress—have got to do a great deal more thinking about where science and technology is leading us, and what kind of mechanism we can devise for coordinating the information as to what is happening, and what benefits and hazards are developing as a result of all this activity.

Second, the time is long overdue for the development of national goals and planning with respect to relationship between our scientific and technological achievement and the improvement of our human environment. We can no longer rely on Federal grants in aid and State and local administrators to solve the problems of our cities. Science and industry have got to be brought into the picture.

Third, we have to think seriously about the kind of creative Federal system of government that will best serve our needs in the 21st Century, preserving to the greatest extent possible individual freedom, and the democratic process of decision-making.

And finally, we must develop a national purpose, to which everyone is dedicated—to rebuild, refurbish, rejuvenate this Nation at every level of human activity to reduce the widening gap between affluence and despair that is threatening the strength of this Nation as we approach the 21st Century.

MORMON TABERNACLE—A CENTURY OF HISTORY

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, today marks the 100th birthday of one of the world's great religious landmarks—the historic Mormon Tabernacle on Temple Square in Salt Lake City.

It was on October 6, 1867, that the Mormon leader Brigham Young called to order the first meeting held in the building. It was a general conference of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Since then, the church has held within its walls such semiannual gatherings every year, and they are now seen and heard around the world through the wonders of modern communications.

Many of the world's great personalities have visited or spoken in the tabernacle, including at least 11 Presidents of the United States.

Numerous other world statesmen, educators, clergymen of other denominations, and other dignitaries have felt honored to occupy its tiered stand. Millions of visitors have made it a "must" stop when touring the intermountain area.

The elliptically shaped edifice, which seats 8,000, is perhaps best known for the famous 375-voice choir of the same name which it houses. The Mormon Tabernacle Choir has presented nationwide broadcasts since 1949—the oldest continuously presented musical program on radio. It is heard each Sunday morning, along with "The Spoken Word" by Richard L. Evans.

Experts on sound have acclaimed the uniquely structured building as having some of the finest acoustics in existence. This complemented by its huge organ of

11,558 individual pipes, has provided an excellent setting for many of the world's great instrumental and vocal musicians who have performed in the tabernacle.

However, most important of all, the tabernacle stands today as a monument to the faith and perseverence of a people who—when driven from the East by religious persecution—preferred to face the unknowns of an untamed West rather than relinquish their cherished beliefs.

An article detailing the construction of the Mormon Tabernacle was published in the September 30, 1967, "Church News" section of the Salt Lake Deseret News. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABERNACLE: NOTED BUILDING HAS A BIRTHDAY

(By George L. Scott)

The historic Salt Lake Tabernacle on Temple Square is 100 years old this October. It still stands as the main gathering place of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. In 1867, the Tabernacle had the freshness of new construction when President Brigham Young called the first conference to order on Oct. 6.

It had taken two years to plan and four years to build. Much work was still to be done although it was serviceable at that time for the conference session.

William H. Folsom and Truman O. Angell, architects, and Henry Grow, master mechanic, with hundreds of pioneer builders took pride in their part of the work.

The huge Tabernacle auditorium, elliptical in shape, 250 feet long, 150 feet wide, and 80 feet in height, rested upon pillars or buttresses of red sandstone quarried from the mountains east of Salt Lake City.

These buttresses stand 10 feet to 12 feet apart in the whole circumference of the building and support wooden arches that span the 150-foot width. It is the largest work of timber roof framing surviving in this country today.

Despite its enormous size, the Tabernacle was constructed completely by hand. All materials were hand-fashioned because of the lack of shops, foundries and mills in the infant Mormon settlement during those years.

The cornerstone was laid in July of 1864.

Crews of men, sometimes totaling 250, worked on the Tabernacle as carpenters and masons plus a crew of 70 plasterers.

One of the most interesting aspects in its construction was the knowhow of a convert bridge builder, Henry Grow. He had built a bridge over the Jordan River using a patented system of construction known as the Remington latticed bridge in which planking and pegs were used.

He gained permission from the Remington inventor to use this pattern of construction to build the Tabernacle roof. Today, those planks and pegs bound with rawhide which made the Tabernacle roof possible, are still used.

The bridge-like arches spring from 13 piers at each end of the Tabernacle, forming semicircles and join with other arches that rise from 30 piers on the north and south sides. Height from the floor to the ceiling is 70 feet. The bridge-like structural work between ceiling and roof is 10 feet thick.

With the arches in place, lath tacked on with imported nails, the big plaster crews of men went to work. They used plaster embedded with horse and cattle hair, which was laid on the lath nailed to rafters and in turn to little wooden hangers suspended below the lower-most struts, braces and the ribs of the framing system.

The underside of the rafters was cut to conform to the profile of the ceiling's vault curve.

Oddly enough, there has been little cracking of the hair reinforced plaster and since the double shell of the roof and ceiling provides ideal protection of the structural system, there has been little, if any, deterioration of the framing units.

No plate glass was available for Tabernacle windows, so the builders placed smaller window panes in frames between the piers which added up to a total of 2,500 lights of glass—a window-cleaning task that would make any housewife shudder.

The gallery was not built until 1870. It circles the entire Tabernacle except the choir seats. This had a pleasing effect in reducing the feeling of vast emptiness overhead in addition to adding hundreds of seats which brought the total seating capacity to 8,000. The gallery measures 395 feet from one end to the other and is 30 feet wide. It is supported by 72 columns.

Years later a children's room was provided at the back where mothers could take youngsters whose voices, when not controlled, could be heard all over the Tabernacle.

The Tabernacle's simple lines keep it a major point of interest for tourists as it is distinctive from other houses of worship.

Unlike today, Church authorities in 1867 did not know what acoustical problems they would encounter as they assembled in the Tabernacle.

President Young made preliminary tests speaking to different persons in various parts of the Tabernacle before services began for the first time to find out how the speaker could be heard.

Today, the remarkable acoustics of the Tabernacle astound the thousands of tourists who listen to a pin drop on the pulpit.

Little do they know of the scientific work and hard labor that made it possible for them to hear the tick of the pin that is dropped, even when they are in the rear of the Tabernacle, 200 feet from the pulpit.

Neither did the pioneers dream that their Tabernacle would be the center of worship for people all over the world by means of radio and TV, now operating on a color-TV basis.

This technical equipment is now stationed in a studio just below the south side of the choir seats. TV stations in 49 states will carry the voices of General Authorities and the Tabernacle Choir to millions of people.

A closed-circuit radio will carry the Saturday night's priesthood meeting to stakes and missions in the United States and Canada.

The Church-owned shortwave radio station WNYW in New York also will beam conference sessions to Europe, Africa and Latin America in English, German, Spanish and Portuguese.

This is in contrast to the fact that it took nearly four years to build the Tabernacle before the railroad had reached Utah and all imported material had to be hauled in with ox teams from the Missouri River.

Thick wooden shingles which shed rain and snow for 63 years gave way to a new metallic covering in the 1930s.

Original cost of the building was approximately $300,000, not including the cost of the organ.

The Tabernacle organ, which has been enlarged several times since its original installation, had one-third of its initial 2,000 pipes installed for the first meeting. The organ casement was then only 15 feet high but reached upward of 40 feet when completed. While not completely tuned, they were able to use the organ to accompany the first Tabernacle Choir.

Joseph Ridges, instructed by Brigham Young to build an organ for the Tabernacle, was able to take only $900 from Church funds when he went to New York and Boston to purchase items for the organ that could not be manufactured in Utah.

These items included spring wire, thin sheet brass, soft fluff leather for the valves, ivory for the keys and other items. These were brought to Salt Lake by ox team from the nearest railroad.

Mr. Ridges described the building of the organ at a testimonial in his honor. He said:

"We wanted immense quantities of glue, so we made banks of fires just outside the Tabernacle walls and put on big iron pots. We wanted cow hides to chop up and boil down into glue. We got them. The cows simply died. We also wanted calves' skins to hinge the ribs of the great bellows and, well, the calves died also."

The organ builder said there was not a man in Utah who knew the first thing about an organ. He had to teach each of the 10 assistants who aided him in building the organ.

Although preliminary work had begun in 1866, the base of the organ was not laid in the Tabernacle until the summer of 1867.

The organ had two manuals, the great and swell, both heavily filled and the pipes on large scale. The pipes numbered upward of 2,000. Today the organ has 11,588 pipes—one of the world's largest organs.

The organ's design, described in an 1868 edition of the Deseret News, stated . . . "The front will be formed with flutings, panels, and pillars in the Corinthian style, tastefully carved and crowned with pyramidal tops . . . which will rise over 40 feet above the floor. . . ."

"We can't preach the Gospel unless we have good music," said President Brigham Young.

It was not until 1869 that the work on the Tabernacle and the organ neared an end. Dedication of the Tabernacle, however, did not take place as a formal place of worship until the October conference of 1875.

At first the organ was pumped by hand prior to 1875 when a large waterwheel was installed in the basement of the Tabernacle to pump air into the organ. Water was taken from City Creek which at that time ran along North Temple Street. Electricity eventually replaced the waterwheel production of air for the organ pipes.

Few of today's members realize that there was another tabernacle on Temple Square, also with an organ, before the present Tabernacle was constructed.

It is now known as "The Old Tabernacle," finished in 1852. Its adobe walls stood on a rock foundation in the southwest corner of Temple Square. It measured 126 feet in length and 64 feet in width, had a sloping roof covered with wooden shingles and seating for 2,500. The original Tabernacle Choir was organized in this building and sang regularly at Sunday meetings.

This "old" tabernacle was torn down in 1877 to make room for the present Assembly Hall on Temple Square.

There have been times when the Tabernacle was endangered.

On March 14, 1959, a flash fire threatened serious trouble when a light globe set a drop cloth on fire.

The fire was discovered by Ray Loveless of KSL who with Roy M. Darley, organist, sounded the alarm and then put out the fire with a fire extinguisher before fire trucks arrived.

Damage was caused in 1962 when two sprinkler pipes burst above the ceiling, causing seepage.

The following year, the Tabernacle was insulated against fire with new insulation in the eaves and partitions to aid in temperature control and fire protection. More than 10,000 square feet of rock wool insulation was placed over the rafters, sprinkling pipes and partitions.

In the same year, a coat of paint placed over the outside stone walls of the Tabernacle was removed, restoring the original look of the stone walls and buttresses.

Today, as "The Saints Come Marching Home," they will enter their 100-year-old Tabernacle with a feeling of pride for its sturdy walls, newly renovated interior, painted walls and varnished benches but above all—its memories of a great pioneer heritage.

THE SLEEPER OF THE 89TH CONGRESS GOES TO WORK

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, 2 years ago, when President Johnson signed the State Technical Services Act, he predicted that the act would "do for the American businessman what the great Agricultural Extension Service has done for the American farmer. It will put into their hands the latest ideas and methods, the fruits of research and development." The President referred to the act as the "sleeper" of the 89th Congress.

Today, I am happy to report that the "sleeper" of the 89th Congress has gone to work, and that in the State of North Carolina an outstanding job has been done. This program is funded, in part, by Federal moneys, but the actual transfer of new technology is accomplished through State and local organizations, and the success of the effort depends upon local initiative, direction, leadership, and support.

Recently, Dr. H. F. Robinson, dean for research at North Carolina State University, reported on some of the projects underway at the university. I should like to describe a few examples, to give the flavor of this program, and to illustrate what has been happening since this experimental program went into effect.

More than 1,000 persons enrolled in television courses teaching industrial statistics and industrial engineering.

A manufacturer of brass products was experiencing a high reject rate. Investigation revealed the problem to have its origin in contamination of a solvent used in his production process. With the problem pinpointed, it was soon remedied, and rejects were practically stopped.

A firm making ornamental concrete products had a breakage-in-handling problem. The problem was solved by making changes in the ratio of the raw materials mix, and in the processing methods.

A furniture manufacturer had profit margin problems, in spite of a good line of products. He solved the problem by getting the latest technical know-how on cost estimating, and on breakeven analyses for his output.

These case histories by no means tell the whole story of North Carolina and State technical services. However, it is abundantly clear that this pioneering attempt to extend the benefits of advanced technology throughout the country has already demonstrated its value.

FIRST MEETING OF PEASE CHAPTER OF AIR FORCE ASSOCIATION

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, a kickoff dinner was held at Pease Air Force Base, Portsmouth, N.H., on September 16, marking the first meeting of the newly chartered Pease Chapter of the Air Force Association. Principal speaker on this occasion was Lt. Gen. Jack L. Catton, U.S. Air Force, one of the most able and distinguished of our ranking military leaders.

An extremely fine commentary on General Catton was published in the Exeter, N.H., News-Letter of Thursday, September 21. It was written by this fine newspaper's highly knowledgeable publisher, Mr. James P. Lynch. I ask unanimous consent that his column, entitled "Down in Our Corner," be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

As Mr. Lynch points out, this was in the nature of a homecoming for the general, whose skill and dedication helped build for Pease its reputation as one of our great, if not our greatest, air base facilities. He was a welcome visitor indeed, and I am sure he knows that New Hampshire's latchstring is always out to him.

Mr. Lynch describes General Catton as "a man of destiny" and that may well be so. I would heartily concur that he does not know the meaning of defeat, no matter how difficult the odds, and I have no doubt that he will have continued success wherever his future course is charted, whether it involves increasing responsibilities as a military decisionmaker or whether he eventually directs his talents to industry or politics. Of one thing we can be sure, Jack Catton will continue to make immense contributions to the good of our Nation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Hampshire?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOWN IN OUR CORNER

(By James P. Lynch)

"If you think the many outstanding changes during the past 10 to 15 years have been spectacular then they are nothing in comparison with the various plans in the making for the next 10 to 15 years."

These were the words expressed by Lt. Gen. Jack J. Catton, USAF, deputy chief of staff, plans and resources, at the kick-off dinner of the Air Force Association last Saturday night at Pease Air Force Base.

General Catton, a former division commander at Pease, seemed to be delivering a challenge as well as words of advice. He talks from several years' military experience and not from hearsay.

To many his address lent encouragement for what lies ahead. His positive approach in these confusing times is a good illustration that this great nation is not short of exceptional leaders.

While his speech was devoted strictly to our military position, it could also be considered a warning to the people to exercise extreme caution in choosing elective officials.

His projection of our future accomplishments makes it compulsory that we avoid a negative approach. There can be no compromise.

This is true not only in matters concerning the military, but also political, statesmanship and business decisions.

At present General Catton is part of that military complex called the Pentagon. He is one of many thousands who go about their business each day attempting to keep this nation in the lead.

RETURNING "HOME"

When General Catton arrived at Pease Saturday it was in a sense returning home. While stationed here he was considered one of the best ambassadors in the state. He liked New Hampshire, and he wanted everyone to know this.

His assignment was too short, although militarywise it was considered of average duration. But insofar as General Catton is concerned, he was always classified as one of the greatest men in uniform to come to the area.

NOT FORGOTTEN

While he no longer directs the destiny of Pease, he is still looked upon as one of the leaders by those who knew him while he was here.

Undoubtedly a number of those who listened to him the other evening felt more confident of this country's future, because men like General Catton are the decisionmakers.

He was not here the other evening to seek glory or praise but rather to express his personal and quite experienced views on circumstances confronting our nation in the past, the present and the future.

TYPICAL EXAMPLE

General Catton's successful rise may sound like a Horatio Alger story, but in reality it typifies the opportunities available to the people of this country.

It was no easy task for the general, especially since he was a polio victim. While this did create an obstacle, he proved he could conquer the situation.

When he was assigned to Pease he was the youngest general in the Air Force. Eventually he lost this recognition because time does not stand still. Nor did General Catton.

ASSIGNED TO HEADQUARTERS

After a few interim assignments, the Catton address was shifted to the Pentagon. Also the one star of a brigadier general was replaced by the two stars of a major general. Then this summer there was another star added and he became lieutenant general.

While the advancements brought greater recognition, they also meant further responsibilities. But General Catton is a man who likes to face challenges and then conquer them. His whole career has proven it.

UNFORTUNATE SITUATION

The genial general is not a resident of New Hampshire which, indeed, is unfortunate. Nor is his scope of thinking limited to state boundaries.

He is a man of vision who believes in the future of his country. More important, he is helping shape its destiny.

In the days ahead both political parties would do well if they kept their eyes on people like this young general. He would be a great asset to either party.

While his subject of conversation is primarily on national and international matters, he always avoids getting into discussion of politics and politicians.

NO DESIRE

To him this is another field, and he has no desire to be a political general. He has the utmost faith in his branch of the military service, and dedicates himself to this cause.

Yet, while he is projecting the future for 10 and 15 years, it may be wise for the political opportunists to have their eyes on these men of destiny.

General Catton is impressive without attempting to play the role. He indeed would be able to establish an exceptional image if, in time, he chose a political career.

NOTHING NEW

He would not be the first military officer who turned to politics once out of the service Some have been successful, while others met defeat.

Insofar as he is concerned, his history has proven that the odds favor him with victory. Some say that Jack Catton doesn't know what the word defeat means. They could be accurate.

The primary reason is because he is not

willing to lose when he knows more effort will produce success.

Unfortunately when men of his ability get out of the service, they are quickly grabbed by private industry for a lucrative position. Elective office cannot compete with the high salaries available outside.

WILLING TO SACRIFICE

Yet many of these men have demonstrated they are willing to sacrifice high remuneration in order to serve their country in the military. Thus, they should be encouraged to enter a field where they can continue to serve.

If we are to face the challenge ahead so aptly described by General Catton the other evening, then it is quite necessary that we strengthen not only our military manpower but also our political structure.

REMOVING BARRIERS

In doing so it would open an avenue of interest to many of the leaders of the former group. They want to see a strong front on the military scale. They have much to offer, too, in assuring similar strength in the political field.

Unfortunately some quarters would prefer to avoid encouraging career military men to actively participate in politics after they leave the service. This is detrimental to the welfare of the country.

OPEN INVITATION

Politics should be an organization of inclusion not exclusion. Everyone should be encouraged to actively participate not only in the election but also in the primaries.

There are those who prefer to avoid getting involved in the latter in order not to commit themselves in regard to party designation. In doing so they are allowing political bosses to make the choice of primary candidates, and thus they must be satisfied with the results.

FEDERAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN FINANCE BILL

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, yesterday's edition of the Washington Evening Star contained an excellent column by David Braaten which puts the Federal election campaign finance bill in its proper perspective.

Mr. Braaten points out that this measure is more popularly referred to as the "Great Treasury Raid of 1967" and that it would compel the taxpayers to put their money in the political pot.

As I have already noted in this Chamber, I am unalterably opposed to this proposed legislation, and I believe my feelings are shared by an overwhelming majority of the American people. I hope the Senate will reject the bill.

I bring the column to the attention of the Senate and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE "RIGHT" TO SUPPORT POLITICIANS

(By David Braaten)

Assuming that Congress passes the "Honest Election Law of 1967"—and with a title like that, who can afford to vote against it?—a major step toward reform in the American electoral system will have been taken.

The "Great Treasury Raid of 1967"—to give the campaign-subsidy bill its less popular, if more accurate, name—will result in disbursement of roughly $40 million to candidates of the two major parties next year, helping them fill the gap between campaign expenditures and the largesse of wealthy friends and other favor seekers.

It may be no coincidence that the sum is the same as that being put up for rat control. After all, the campaign-fund bill's backers reason, who would begrudge politicians the amount of money being allocated to rats?

The historic significance of the campaign-subsidy bill is that it will mark the point at which the American voter is finally going to be penalized directly for voting. The more we vote, the more we pay, the bill provides.

That is how far the democratic process has progressed from the days when a man could expect to collect five bucks or a couple of glasses of whiskey every time he voted.

The change was inevitable, of course, once they began curtaining off voting booths, thus preventing the buyer from making sure the seller was living up to his end of the transaction. Office seekers were then forced to rely on the indirect payola, the campaign promise that appealed to the voter's special interest.

It didn't take long for the electorate to realize that this kind of bribe was unenforceable, but by then the remorseless illogic of the thing had taken over. It was impossible to reverse the trend and go back to the good old honest vote purchase system.

Now, the traditional American view had always been that seekers after public office were, through no particular fault of their own, less fortunate members of society, to be pitied and cared for by the productive citizens of the community. "The politicians we always have with us," was the phrase.

Yet somehow, when nobody was looking, they achieved a state of equality with the voters. They got to the point where they were demanding and expecting support as a right, instead of begging and hoping for it as a boon. Some people blame it all on Franklin Roosevelt, but this is probably unfair.

At any rate, once the politicians discovered such bureaucratic devices as the voice vote, executive orders, confidential caucuses and supplemental appropriations, voter control was finished. Undeclared Asian wars and the Rayburn House Office Building should really have come as no surprise.

The campaign-subsidy bill is simply the end result of a process that began when Congress first realized it could raise its own salaries, pad the payroll with relatives and pocket unspent petty cash from the stationery allowance—all without a rollcall.

Last spring, Senator Russell Long, in a quixotic attempt to turn the clock back, tried to make the campaign-subsidy system voluntary, requiring a taxpayer's conscious decision to allot $1 to the political pot. But the crux of the new welfare-campaign philosophy is that the contributor-taxpayer must have no option. That way, the politician-recipients realize, lies party bankruptcy. Thus Long's effort was doomed from the start.

There are some who worry about the social implications of campaign handouts. Why, they ask, would a political candidate go out and work for his campaign funds when he can just sit back and collect all he needs from the government. Where is the incentive?

An especially pernicious feature of the subsidy bill, the critics feel, is that funds will go to both parties impartially. No longer will success at the polls be rewarded and failure punished, in the old American manner. What can be better calculated to sap a politician's self-reliance, his good old-fashioned get-up-and-go?

And finally, thoughtful observers point to the alarming trend among American politicians toward office seeking as a way of life. Already there are third and fourth generation campaigners cropping up in some constituencies. Should this be encouraged? As someone, probably wise old Ben Franklin, phrased it: "Once a man hath supped at the publick trough, it be hard indeede to wean him away to honest pursuits."

Yet the logic of the campaign-subsidy system, is inescapable: If public office is a public trust, should not the seeking of it be a private right?

WRONG DISCOUNT RATES CREATE ECONOMIC DISLOCATIONS AND INFLATIONARY PRESSURES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, another leading analyst has noted that current Government discount rate policies lead to serious resource misallocations. According to Robert L. Banks, a specialist in the economics of transportation:

> The method by which the interest/discount rate is determined is inappropriate and ought to be changed.

At present, there is a significant gap between the discount rate applied by the Government to its projects and the rate employed in the private sector. The Government rate, based on the historical coupon rate on long-term securities, is 3¼ percent at the present time; in comparison, the relevant private sector rate is at least 10 percent and, in a good many instances, as high as 15 percent.

In a paper submitted to the Joint Economic Committee's Subcommittee on Economy in Government, which has been studying the programing-planning-budgeting system—PPBS—Mr. Banks says that the low Government discount rate leads "to faulty economic evaluation. A new formula is needed."

Mr. Banks is not alone in feeling that the Government system of discount rate formulation is wrong, and that it creates untimely economic dislocations. In testimony before the Economy in Government Subcommittee, a panel of three top economists strongly emphasized that virtually all the economics profession agree that the Government's policy is very unrealistic and wasteful. This is a powerful indictment.

When the "wrong" discount rate is used in benefit/cost analysis, some projects which would never be considered are approved. These projects then compete for scarce resources with higher-return investments in the private sector creating economic dislocations and inflationary pressures.

Congress holds the legislative responsibility to approve only those projects which can contribute positively to a stable economy. Utilization of the low discount rate in public works programs alone is wasting billions of dollars each year. It is up to Congress to act now to stop this dangerous drain on the economy.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Banks' paper, entitled "The Role of the Discount/Interest Rate in Evaluating the Economic Efficiency of Government Financed Transportation Projects," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ROLE OF THE DISCOUNT/INTEREST RATE IN EVALUATING THE ECONOMIC EFFICIENCY OF GOVERNMENT-FINANCED TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS

(By Robert L. Banks)

My name is Robert L. Banks. I am a transportation consultant specializing in economics of the several modes of transportation. I appreciate the opportunity to discuss the question of the appropriate interest, or discount rate to be used in assessing the economic feasibility of government investment in transportation projects.

My comments will be directed specifically at the discount/interest rate used in evaluating water resource projects. Analysis in this area is probably more advanced than in most other areas, and the techniques employed therefore point the way for studying other government investment projects. It is particularly important that this path finding analysis conform to sound economic principles.

In constructing the benefit-cost ratios which it presents to the Congress as a part of the appropriation procedure, the Corps of Engineers computes average annual benefits by a discounting process, and these are compared with average annual cost of operation plus interest and amortization computed in the manner of an equal-payment mortgage. The same discount/interest rate is used for both purposes.

Although I am particularly concerned with water resource evaluation, my comments would be relevant to appraisal of other government projects, especially where a choice between alternative investments is involved.

What brings me before you is my belief that the method by which the interest/discount rate is determined is inappropriate and ought to be changed. Since publication of Senate Document No. 97 in 1962 the discount rate has been "based upon the average rate of interest payable by the Treasury on interest bearing marketable securities of the United States outstanding at the end of the fiscal year preceding such computation which, upon original issue, had terms to maturity of 15 years or more." [1]

This formula has produced a rate of 3⅛ percent for use over the past several years. I believe this rate to be unrealistic at present; its use can lead only to faulty economic evaluation. A new formula is needed.

The paramount objection to continued use of the present formula is the subject of the balance of my testimony, but an incidental objection is the use of *coupon rates* of interest, rather than *yields* in application of the formula. The 3⅛ percent was calculated by the Treasury Department on the basis of coupon rates. Such rates are a fiction; rarely do securities sell at precisely their coupon rate. Yield, on the other hand, is a measure of the cost of borrowing. If in benefit-cost calculations the cost of borrowing by long term debt is to be determined by the interest rate (which I will argue against), the cost should at least be computed on the basis of bond yields, not coupon rates.

Before proceeding, I should also make clear that the issue of proper interest rates to be used in evaluating the economics of governmentally financed projects, which is the subject of my testimony, should not be confused with the question of what interest rates the government should charge for its various loan programs. The latter issue is beyond the scope of my testimony. I am concerned only with the rates employed in evaluating economic feasibility of public works projects. This is a separate issue and can be discussed most fruitfully in isolation from the heat of controversy which so often surrounds the question of rates charged by the government.

I. BACKGROUND

The selection of an appropriate rate has had considerable attention in academic circles for the past several years, and is increasingly recognized as a national issue. As the government sector grows larger in the national economy, and more and more public money is invested, the urgency becomes greater than ever before. Moreover, the new planning and programming approach to budgeting which involves appraisal of alternatives, places a premium on well-founded inputs, one of which is the discount rate at which intertemporal differences are equalized.

One of our national goals is efficiency in the use of our resources. Misunderstanding of government investment projects stems in part from the vagueness of specifying goals of social welfare functions and confusion surrounding means of achieving them. National welfare goals are, of course, manifold. The goal of efficiency, with which I am concerned, involves the maximization of social output over time for any given input of resources. In benefit-cost analysis, decision-makers want to maximize the present value of total benefits less that of total costs. The aim is to achieve an economically efficient allocation of limited resources.

Another, and different, goal might be to minimize the inequality of income distribution among regions or social classes. In the establishment of the Area Redevelopment Agency and its successor, the Economic Development Administration, for example, this objective was quite clear. Not so clear is the tendency for waterway development projects sometimes to be authorized for similar reasons, but clothed in a favorably benefit-cost ratio and ostensibly approved as an economically sound project. Good management requires that even when a goal other than efficiency is held paramount, the benefits and costs be properly measured so that the true net costs or benefits are known. Economic efficiency may be secondary in considering a particular project, but it may still have a bearing on the method by which the social objective is achieved.

There are any number of goals other than economic efficiency which also might be fostered through public investment in waterways and other forms of intercity or urban transportation. Some, such as the goals of the Northeast Corridor High Speed Ground Transportation Project, the Federal airport and air navigation facility programs, urban transport measures and the supersonic air transport program have been pursued without any real pretense of quantifying economic benefits. Their value has been sensed or appraised by intuitive means, not by formal methods resembling benefit-cost analysis. This approach leaves us in the dark as to the efficiency of expenditures, but we at least understand that we do not have a measure of their efficiency.

As to water resource development projects, on the other hand, we are led to believe that they are approved only upon their economic merit: a benefit-cost ratio is computed for each, and benefits in excess of costs, as estimated by the Corps of Engineers, indicate economic feasibility. But if the benefit-cost analysis is improperly executed, we delude ourselves. An incorrect interest rate contributes to this delusion.

II. THE CRITICAL ROLE OF DISCOUNT/INTEREST RATES IN BENEFIT-COST CALCULATION

Benefit-cost analysis is an administrative technique used to appraise the economic efficiency of a proposed investment project. There are many imponderables in the enumeration and valuation of both benefits and costs, but only the interest rate is of concern here. I shall demonstrate why and how the benefit-cost ratio varies inversely with the discount/interest rate, other things being equal. The policy implication of this relationship is that an inappropriate rate of discount/interest rate will make a project appear to be economically more or less desirable than it really is. A rate that is too low can even mean the difference between a favorable and an unfavorable benefit-cost ratio.

One of the outstanding characteristics of government projects where large physical plants are involved is that benefits and costs accrue in different time patterns. Typically, the period of project life can be divided into two distinct stages. In the earlier period annual costs are normally in excess of benefits and there is an annual loss. Net profit comes, if ever, in the later stage of project life, after use and benefits have had opportunity to build up. The benefit-cost ratio reflects the balance between discounted values of the sum of annual profits and those of annual loss as defined above.

The impacts of discounting upon profit and loss are different. The total sum of annual profit returned in the *later* stage of project life will be discounted more heavily than that of annual loss, which accrues in the *earlier* period. Moreover, even if the annual flows of benefits and costs over the life of the project are constant, the *discounted* values of benefits and costs vary with the discount/interest rate selected. Because of the timing of net costs and net benefits, discounted benefits shrink at a much faster rate than discounted costs if a higher rate of discount/interest is chosen.

In numeric terms, the effect is as follows: Let us assume that a hypothetical project has a 50-year life. Let us assume further, for the sake of simplicity, that all costs, of whatever nature, amount to $400,000, and that these are all incurred in a single year, the fifth year of project life. Similarly, we will assume that all benefits, amount to $400,000, and that these are all incurred in a single year, the fifth year of project life. Similarly, we will assume that all benefits, amounting to $1,000,000, occur in a single year, which we will choose as the 25th year of project life, so as to conform with the usual temporal sequence. If a discount/interest rate of 3⅛ percent is used, the discounted or present value of the benefits is $463,300, and discounted costs amount to $342,960. The resulting benefit-cost ratio is 1.35 to 1.

If, on the other hand, a rate of 5.5 percent were to be used for the same project, the discounted benefits and costs are reduced respectively to $262,200 and $306,050. The benefit-cost ratio is also reduced to 0.86 to 1, indicating that the project will yield a net loss to the economy.

It will be noted that in this illustration the switchover point from a favorable to an unfavorable ratio occurred within a rather narrow range of interest rates.

III. AN APPROPRIATE INTEREST/DISCOUNT RATE

It is clear that a benefit-cost calculation is valid only if an appropriate interest rate is used. Scholars have considered at length the question of a proper rate.[2] They are not in complete agreement as to what the rate should be, or by what formula it should be determined. However, I think it is accurate to state that none believe that a rate as low as 3⅛ percent has been adequate for the past decade or more. The concept which finds most support in their writings is that the economically relevant interest rate is the one which measures the opportunity costs of the funds utilized by the project.

The heart of this concept is that any government project must use up economic resources. In the absence of the project, the resources would be left to private investment which would yield a certain amount of real output in the future. The opportunity to invest and earn a certain rate of return for a different use by the *private* sector is foregone as a result of governmental investment. It is a loss to the private sector. This loss is known in economic theory as the opportunity cost of that government project.

This definition leads us away from the notion that interest cost, or appropriate discount rate is adequately reflected by interest rates on some selected group of government bonds.

---

[1] *Policies, Standards and Procedures in the Formulation, Evaluation, and Review of Plans for Use and Development of Water and Related Land Resources*, The President's Water Resources Council, Senate Document No. 97, 87th Congress, 2nd Session, Washington, D.C., May 29, 1962, p. 12.

[2] See Selected Bibliography attached.

It states that true cost includes cost of all resources used by government, including those diverted by taxation from use in the private sector. There is a lack of unanimity among economists as to the specific value of this social cost, largely as a consequence of the practical problems of measurement, but I am aware of no one who argues that it is much below 5 percent at present.

Characteristics of the appropriate rate

The appropriate rate of interest/discount has several characteristics. First, it measures the *true* opportunity cost of any government project. If it is used, the same degree of economic efficiency will be achieved from the allocation of resources to the public sector as would otherwise be attained from their use in the private sector. Thus, the social goal of efficiency is satisfied.

Secondly, it is not arbitrarily selected. A rate linked to other and more limited criteria, for example, the coupon rate or yields on long-term government debt, ignores the fact that a large part of the funds to be invested by government are raised through taxation, which involves different costs to different taxpayers.

Third, it is a weighted average, reflecting time preference and expected rates of return from investment of *all* taxpayers.

Cost to society

Departure from the appropriate interest/discount rate necessarily results in an inefficient allocation of resources. In addition to violating the social goal of allocative efficiency, use of the wrong interest/discount rate conflicts with advances made in the past several years in defense management. Principles pioneered in the Defense Department focus mainly on cost-effectiveness. The application of this management technique to all Federal budget divisions is now being extended to other agencies through program budgeting.

As indicated earlier, there may be good reason for pursuing programs for reasons other than economic efficiency, but this does not relieve the government of the need to know the true economic cost, nor is it reason to distort analyses of true cost.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

In evaluating government projects the social goal should be unequivocally understood. A principal goal, as I see it, is to achieve an optimal allocation of our limited resources. I believe that if a project is designed to serve other purposes at the expense of economic efficiency, it should be authorized explicitly in terms of those other goals.

To avoid distortions in the benefit-cost calculation an appropriate interest/discount rate should be calculated on the basis of the opportunity cost principle. In the current situation it probably is in excess of 5 percent. Use of a rate below this range will only permit skim milk to masquerade as cream. The present practice is not only economically indefensible but it is also incompatible with our political and social philosophy. For these reasons the interest/discount rate issue requires review.

Selected bibliography

1. R. L. Banks & Associates, Inc., *The Economic Feasibility of a Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal,* Report to Upper Ohio Valley Association, Washington, D.C., June, 1965.

2. Association of American Railroads, *Preliminary Examination of Interim Report on Navigation and Bank Stabilization—Red River Below Denison Dam* (an unpublished report) June 12, 1966.

3. R. L. Banks and A. Kotz, "The Program Budget and the Interest Rate for Public Investment," *Public Administration Review,* Vol. XXVI, No. 4, December, 1966, pp. 283–292.

4. M. E. Borus, "A Benefit Cost Analysis of the Economic Effectiveness of Retraining the Unemployed," *Yale Economic Essays,* Vol. 4, No. 2, Fall, 1964.

5. C. Hitch and R. McKean, *The Economics of Defense in the Nuclear Age,* The Rand Corporation, Santa Monica, California, 1960.

6. J. V. Krutilla and Otto Eckstein, *Multiple Purpose River Development,* Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, Md., 1958.

7. A. R. Prest and R. Turvey, "Cost-Benefit Analysis: A Survey," *Surveys of Economic Theory,* Vol III, Resource Allocation, prepared for the American Economic Association and the Royal Economic Society, St. Martin's Press, New York, N.Y., 1966.

8. B. A. Weisbrod, *Economics of Public Health Measuring the Economic Impact of Diseases,* University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia, Pa., 1960.

DEATH OF MAJ. CLIFTON C. WILLIAMS, JR., U.S. MARINE CORPS

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the hearts of Alabama and the Nation were saddened yesterday with the announcement by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration that one of our most able astronauts, Maj. Clifton C. Williams, Jr., of the U.S. Marine Corps, had died in an airplane crash.

Major Williams was a son of Alabama, and the tragic accident which took his life occurred while he was on a flight from Cape Kennedy, Fla., to Brookley Air Force Base, at Mobile, where his parents reside.

I had the pleasure of meeting Major Williams shortly after he had been named as one of the third group of astronauts in the fall of 1963. I was at once impressed by his leadership qualities, his boundless enthusiasm, and the justifiable pride he took for having been selected as a pioneer in the new space frontier. But what most impressed me about this remarkable and talented young man was his keen knowledge and understanding of the importance of his vital mission to the peace and security of America and the free world. This can only signify a deep sense of purpose, devotion to public duty, and love of country.

Yes, Mr. President, Major Williams did indeed know the meaning of freedom and democracy, and America can ill afford to lose young men possessed of such loyalty and devotion.

Mr. President, I know that I speak for all of Alabama in extending my heartfelt sympathy to the widow of Major Williams, to his precious young daughter, and to his parents on the loss they have suffered.

NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESS ASSOCIATION SUPPORTS DIRECT ELECTION APPROACH TO ELECTORAL REFORM

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, a membership survey recently conducted by the National Small Business Association upon the question of electoral reform produced some significant results.

According to the association's tabulation, 91 percent of the members responding to the survey favored direct popular election of the President and Vice President. Only about 5 percent preferred a proportional electoral system, while less than 1 percent advocated the district system of electoral votes. Significantly, less than 3 percent of the persons responding to the survey indicated that they desired no change whatsoever in the existing method.

The National Business Association is to be commended for its continuing interest in this subject. The groups and organizations which have expressed support for the direct election method of electoral reform have been growing steadily.

The National Small Business Association, which has for several years maintained a steadfast interest in electoral reform, was largely responsible for filing the unique suit of Delaware against New York last term in the U.S. Supreme Court. In this suit, which the Court declined to hear, 13 States joined in asking that the existing winner-take-all electoral system be declared unconstitutional. While the Delaware brief requested the Supreme Court to "open the door" and "point the way" by providing "equitable interim relief," it pointedly recognized that "ultimate correction may best be achieved by constitutional amendment."

It is my hope that in the near future the Senate will have the opportunity to consider an amendment designed to assure the direct popular election of the President and Vice President.

Mr. President, the July 1967 issue of the Small Business Bulletin of the National Small Business Association contained two very informative and worthwhile articles analyzing the presidential election system and describing the recent attempt to secure judicial relief. I ask unanimous consent that these articles be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT IS THE FAIREST WAY TO ELECT THE PRESIDENT?

The flexibility of the Constitution is in large measure responsible for its durability. We are forever indebted to those men who, with profound wisdom and inspired foresight, drafted our basic law, not as a monolithic code of irrevocable statutes, but as a viable basis for the government of a free people, sufficiently elastic to meet the changing *needs* of changing times.

One of the needs which is becoming more and more imperative is an alternative to the present electoral college method of electing our presidents and vice presidents.

"Archaic, undemocratic, complex, ambiguous, indirect, and dangerous"—that is the way the electoral college method of electing a president is described in a recent report of the American Bar Association.

HOW SYSTEM WORKS

Under the U.S. Constitution each state is required to appoint presidential electors, who, in turn, elect the President and Vice President of the U.S. The laws of each state provide for popular election of presidential electors but allow each voter to vote for all of its electors on a general ticket. The result is that all of a state's electoral votes are cast as a *unit* for the presidential candidate who wins a plurality of its popular votes.

The state unit system allows *all* of a state's votes to be cast for a candidate *opposed by as many as 49 percent of its voters.* Votes cast for the losing candidate within a particular state are treated as if they had been cast for his opponent. The barest popular vote plurality is converted into a *unan-*

imous state vote for the winning candidate.

The state unit vote system is a "winner-take-all" system. All electoral votes go to the plurality winner in the state. Thus in the 1960 Kennedy-Nixon race, New Jersey voters cast 1,385,415 votes for Kennedy and 1,363,324 for Nixon. Although Nixon trailed by only 22,091 votes out of 2,748,739, New Jersey's *entire* electoral vote was cast for Kennedy. In effect the 1,363,324 votes cast for Nixon in New Jersey were discarded and cancelled, isolated from those cast by voters of the same party in other states.

Distorted and inequitable results are always *possible* when each state's electoral vote for its plurality winner is combined with the electoral vote for plurality winners in other states to determine the President of our country. Thus only three years ago Lyndon B. Johnson won 61 percent of the popular vote in the nation, but received 90 percent of the electoral vote.

The electoral college method has been used in 45 presidential elections. Under it 14 Presidents have been elected who did not obtain a majority of the *popular* votes cast in the election, and of these 14 minority Presidents, *three of them each received fewer popular votes than his major opponent*. They were John Q. Adams (1824), Rutherford B. Hayes (1876) and Benjamin Harrison (1888).

In 1916, a shift of 1,904 votes for Hughes in California would have awarded its 13 electoral votes to him and resulted in his election even though Wilson would have remained the national electorate's choice by more than 587,000 votes. In 1948, a shift of 29,294 votes in California, Illinois, and Ohio would have elected Dewey by two electoral votes, although Truman would still have had a national plurality of more than 2,077,000 popular votes.

In recent Senate testimony, Professor Paul Freund of the Harvard Law School said the fact that the popular vote winner has been the Presidential winner in 93 percent of our elections is not enough. "This is like boasting that 93 percent of the planes leaving Washington airport arrive at their destination," he said.

Analyzing the electoral college system, Professor Freund said:

"The rise of political parties, with their designated candidates, converted the electoral college into a group at best of useless ciphers and at worst of dangerous mavericks. Moreover, the other central feature of the present system—the unit count in each state—came about in contravention of the original (Founding Fathers') understanding, through the unilateral action of the largest states in the early nineteenth century, and a similar response by the smaller states in order to keep such leverage as they could in the total electoral count. Beyond the historical anomalies stand the practical inequities and risks of the system."

ALTERNATIVE REFORMS

Although pressures for reform of the electoral college system are growing in intensity, and amendment will be achieved only after a long and hard legislative and educational campaign. The Constitutional amendment process requires approval by two-thirds of the members of Senate and House and ratification by three-fourths of the states' legislatures. Hearings on proposed amendments are now being held by the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments.

DISTRICT SYSTEM

The specific nature of reform is optional in the sense that there are several alternatives. One is the district system by which electoral votes would be awarded to the plurality winners in Congressional districts for those electoral votes corresponding to Representatives. In testimony before the Senate it had been pointed out that the District system would still involve the risk of the present electoral college system wherein the candidate with the highest popular vote would not necessarily win the election. The ballots of those who voted for the loser would be discarded as under the present system. The District system would give a premium to Districts with a light voter turnout. It would accentuate controversy over gerrymandering—where district lines are to be drawn—and other problems of apportionment.

PROPORTIONAL METHOD

Another variant of reform would be to divide each state's electoral vote proportionally according to the percentages of statewide popular vote. Senate testimony opposing the proportional approach emphasizes that the method (1) would retain the inequitable features inherent in the allotment of electoral votes to the states and (2) would not take account of voter non-participation.

DIRECT, POPULAR VOTE

Another alternative would be the election of a president and vice president by direct, nationwide popular vote, thus ignoring district or state lines. Objections to this method, as presented in the Senate hearings, are that direct, popular vote would encourage the proliferation of splinter political parties, damage to the state-federal system, and would require sacrifice by the smaller states of their two bonus electoral votes as represented by their U.S. Senators.

Most students of the electoral college system agree that the larger states would be giving up more than smaller states by their support of the direct, popular vote method. The present electoral college system gives excessive power to organized groups, enabling them to swing the entire electoral vote of a state to one candidate or the other. The American Bar Association pointed out in its report that under the present system it is conceivable a candidate could win the popular vote of 11 large states and one small state by a slight margin and therefore win the election, although having less than 25 percent of the total popular vote cast in the country.

It is maintained that a provision requiring a candidate to receive 40 percent of the popular vote to be elected would give splinter parties less leverage under the direct, popular vote method than now enjoyed by them under the present system. One Constitutional amendment proposed provides for a national runoff election between the two top candidates in the event that no candidate receives at least 40 percent of the popular vote.

EQUALITY NEEDED

There is growing support for direct, popular election. Advocates of this method declare that, on principle, it is the fairest method; that the President is the president of all the people; that the constituency of the president transcends state lines, district lines, and every man's vote regardless of where he lives should be of equal weight to every other man's vote in choosing the president; and that the right and duty of all citizens to participate, and share responsibility equally, in providing good national government is encouraged by direct, popular vote.

DISTORTION OF POPULAR VOTE BY ELECTORAL COLLEGE (1960 ELECTION)

	Kennedy		Nixon	
	Popular vote	Electoral vote	Popular vote	Electoral vote
Illinois	2,377,846	27	2,368,988	0
Indiana	952,358	0	1,175,120	13
2-State total	3,330,204	27	3,544,108	13
Percent	48.4	67.5	51.6	32.5

Thus, the winner of a clear majority of the popular votes cast in the two states received less than one-third of their electoral votes. In the adjoining states of Virginia and Maryland, voters who supported Kennedy suffered a similar fate:

	Kennedy		Nixon	
	Popular vote	Electoral vote	Popular vote	Electoral vote
Maryland	565,808	8	489,538	0
Virginia	362,327	0	404,521	12
2-State total	928,135	8	894,059	12
Percent	50.9	40	49.1	60

Again, the unit-votes by states converted a two-state popular vote minority into a sizable electoral vote majority.

NSBA Long Active in Push for Electoral Reform

For several years the National Small Business Association, in its publications, in seminars, and in its community education program, has spotlighted forcefully the inequities and dangers of the electoral college method. Congress repeatedly has failed to act to overhaul the antiquated system.

It was primarily for this reason that the National Small Business Association made available the money needed for research and printing in connection with the suit filed last year in the U.S. Supreme Court by Delaware and 12 other states. To force relief and to give broad exposure to the inequities of the electoral college as implemented by state laws, the Delaware suit asked the U.S. Supreme Court to declare unconstitutional the state unit-vote "winner-take-all" system. Frustrated by Congressional inaction going back to the late 1790s, the 13 states requested the Supreme Court to "open the door" and "point the way through equitable interim relief."

It is generally agreed that reform of our electoral college system has been delayed because of the hope that the judicial branch of government would inject itself into the "political thicket" just as the Courts had done in the field of legislative apportionment.

The U.S. Supreme Court, however, declined to hear the Delaware suit. Although it gave no reasons for its refusal to extend the "one person—one vote" principle to the election of the President, the Court's implicit message was: "This is a grave and fundamental matter that Congress and the states must decide." The Delaware brief had pointedly recognized that "ultimate correction may best be achieved by Constitutional Amendment."

John A. Gosnell, NSBA General Counsel, was a leading participant in the drafting of the able briefs presented to the Court. In addition to clarifying procedural aspects of undertaking reform, the Delaware suit served other laudatory purposes as pointed out by Felix Morley writing in *Nation's Business* of October, 1966:

"Whatever the outcome, the well reasoned plea . . . will stand out as a landmark in our Constitutional history. . . . The scholarly care behind the presentation is only one of the factors making it distinctive. Here is an elucidation of the subject, as important as it is complicated, helpful to all students of American government."

Neal R. Peirce writing in *The Reporter* (October 6, 1966) made this comment:

"Almost one hundred pages in length, the Delaware brief constitutes a remarkable *tour de force* on all the laws and Constitutional precedents affecting voting rights and the institution of the Electoral College."

Joining Delaware in the suit were South Dakota, Kentucky, Pennsylvania, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming, Florida, Iowa, Arkansas, Kansas, and West Virginia.

VIETNAM—CRISIS OF INDECISION

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I would invite the attention of Senators to what I think is a stimulating article on the terribly difficult and divisive subject of Vietnam.

Writing in the October issue of Foreign Affairs, Robert Shaplen entitles his article "Vietnam: Crisis of Indecision." In it, he concentrates on the possibilities of a political settlement of the conflict there, providing both a review of the developing and present political forces in South Vietnam and some suggestions for taking advantage of them.

I found the conclusion of his article particularly interesting in view of the obvious escalation of emotion in this body and the Nation concerning the war. He says:

> If Vietnam has been a tragic and often misconstrued chapter of this American commitment and involvement (in Asia), the trend toward withdrawal and neo-isolationism, which has become the confused domestic political by-product of the conflict, does not either represent a practical solution or augur well for acceptance of our unavoidable responsibilities in a world that remains highly combustible and revolutionary.

The article contains much that is speculative in its discussion of possibilities for political developments within South Vietnam and among the various structures of power involved in the war, but I believe it adds an important perspective to our consideration of this vital matter.

Mr. Shaplen is the east Asia correspondent of the New Yorker and former Newsweek bureau chief in Shanghai. I ask unanimous consent that his article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Vietnam: Crisis of Indecision

(By Robert Shaplen)

As the war in Viet Nam moves well into the third year of the major phase that began early in 1965 with the deployment of large numbers of American troops, there are indications that the long and difficult conflict is in a state of irresolution, or what the communists describe as "indecisiveness." This does not mean stalemate, a word Washington officials rightly reject, since the military contest on the ground remains highly fluid and damaging to both sides, while the population and economy of North Viet Nam, subject as they are to an ever-widening pattern of bombing, are obviously being hurt (reports from the North say that half a million persons, including perhaps 100,000 Chinese, are now engaged in repairing the bomb damage). In South Viet Nam, American troops and their foreign allies, and occasionally the South Vietnamese, are continuing to win some major battles and with the help of coordinated tactical air, heavy bombing and artillery attacks are inflicting heavy casualties on the communists.

Despite these losses by attrition, however, and despite their acknowledged difficulties in replenishing their guerrilla ranks, the communists have held their own, are still able to strike back effectively, and have managed over the last six months, through continued infiltration from the North and some recruitment in the South, to increase their total number of men fighting in South Viet Nam from 260,000 to approximately 300,000, of whom some 60,000 at present are North Vietnamese. According to accounts of prisoners and defectors, as many as two-thirds of the four or five thousand men being infiltrated each month in small units into South Viet Nam are being lost within a period of months, through bombing of infiltration routes, as a result of illness (chiefly malaria or intestinal disorders) or in battle. Nevertheless, the replacements keep filtering through the Laos corridor, and in addition the North Vietnamese have committed as many as three full divisions at a time across the Demilitarized Zone for action in the First Corps area, the northernmost part of South Viet Nam; elsewhere, the communists have shown signs of shifting their strategy and tactics and of being less prone to engage in large-unit actions—company-size or better—unless, in their calculation, they either have the advantage of superior strength or total surprise, or unless special circumstances seem to warrant the risks. Their basic weapons, mainly of the Chinese-manufactured 7.62 millimeter family, are as good as or better than ever, and as plentiful, in spite of increasing losses of guns in battle and the Allied capture of some large ammunition caches, while their recent employment of sophisticated Russian howitzers, artillery, mortar and rockets, especially in the area just south of the D.M.Z., has enabled them to retaliate in kind for some of the artillery and bombing punishment they have suffered.

The American response to this sustained communist challenge has undergone some adjustments and alterations of its own as it has become apparent that the Allied momentum of 1965 and 1966 has slowed down and that, notwithstanding their superior firepower and mobility, the Allies cannot provide a knockout blow in 1967 any more than the communists were able to achieve such a blow two years ago. Faced with obligations elsewhere in the world, and eager to avoid having to call up reserves, President Johnson and Secretary of Defense McNamara, despite some hawkish pressure from high-ranking members of the military establishment and of Congress, have limited the additional troops likely to be sent to General Westmoreland this year and early next to two reinforced divisions.

Even if the Koreans and Australians add some more troops, if the South Vietnamese increase their draft calls, thereby building up a total Allied force of some 1.3 million, the war on the ground is not likely to be anything but "indecisive." The communists cannot be expected to fall below the 1:4 ratio of total strength, and the ratio is actually less since a larger proportion of their men is engaged in fighting. In other respects, most importantly in organization of the countryside, the Viet Cong are still considerably ahead of the South Vietnamese. In the murky area of pacification and revolutionary development, after several years of repeated experimentation and reorganization, progress on the government side is still excruciatingly slow. There is a belated awareness that the regular South Vietnamese forces (ARVN) will probably never be galvanized and motivated into providing proper security for the revolutionary development teams, and that the job should be given to the local or Popular Forces, who are to be paid more money (they are still by far the poorest paid of all Vietnamese troops) and given better weapons. This overdue step may slowly improve the situation, but most observers with long experience in Viet Nam have become thoroughly skeptical that the pacification program, under the present complicated and fragmented social-economic and political-military dispensation in the country will ever really get off the ground. Consequently, there has been a shift in thinking and a new concentration on improving certain aspects of the political situation, which is at least more flexible if also more explosive. An improvement politically should all along have been a parallel objective to successful pacification and revolutionary development, which together define a good counterinsurgency program; but unfortunately it has not worked out that way.

If there are some Americans, including some in the highest places who still believe that the war can be won militarily, or that at least the government in Hanoi can be forced by bombing and by military pressure in the South to come to the conference table, there are increasing numbers who now feel that the way to bring the conflict to an end is through political accommodation in South Viet Nam. This trend of thinking coincides with signs of a new line of thought among the North Vietnamese. While so far they show no indication of giving up or diminishing their commitment, the communist leaders directing the war effort are beginning to talk more and more, as captured documents reveal, of reaching that "indecisive" period when it will pay them to start "fighting while negotiating." General Nguyen Van Vinh, chairman of the National Reunification Commission of North Viet Nam, which directs the war in the South, still speaks of achieving "decisive victory within the next four years," but he has frequently modified this by declaring that "our policy is to continue fighting until such time as we can fight and negotiate at the same time" and has added that "while negotiating we will continue fighting even more vigorously." Vinh, further, has emphasized that "it is possible that the North will conduct negotiations while the South continues fighting, and that the South will also participate in negotiations while continuing to fight."

It seems likely that these possible courses of action were high on the agenda of discussion during the July meeting in Hanoi of North Vietnamese diplomatic representatives summoned home from their posts. Another topic that undoubtedly came up concerned the future relationship between Hanoi and its South Vietnamese offspring, the National Liberation Front, which it dominates and controls more thoroughly than ever but which nevertheless still contains non-Northern and even non-communist elements. Inevitably, if the fighting-while-negotiating phase is coming closer, the position of the N.L.F., which Hanoi has always alleged is an independent entity, will become crucial; Hanoi will have to face the problem of maintaining tight controls over the Front while simultaneously pretending to give it a looser rein. Finally, the July meeting in Hanoi and continuing discussions among North Vietnamese Communist leaders have surely been concerned with the critical national manpower and resupply problems created by the bombing; these are directly related to the complicated question of Chinese internal disorder and to China's capacity and willingness to continue sending unlimited help to North Viet Nam, primarily guns and bullets, without obtaining a pledge from Hanoi favoring Peking over Moscow in the ideological split and promising to go on fighting and not to negotiate—a pledge Hanoi is loath to give.

It is apparent that the North Vietnamese are becoming increasingly upset by the effects the Peking-Moscow clash is having on the prosecution of the war. "We are worried," General Vinh has bluntly admitted, and Le Duan, the Lao Dong (Workers) Party chairman, has declared that the large commitment of United States forces was encouraged by the American realization that "the foreseeable situation would not drive them into becoming involved in a major limited war which required that they cope with the strong reaction of the entire Socialist bloc." Recently, the North Vietnamese have criticized Chinese theoretical thinking about "revisionism," which is described as "too extreme," as well as Chinese strategy and tactics of prolonged "wars of liberation." General Vinh has said, undoubtedly without having first consulted the Russian, "The Soviet Union will support us under all conditions, whether we fight, or negotiate, or fight and negotiate," and has added: "China gives us wholehearted support, but she has weak points," including her "technical ability [which] is inferior to that of the Soviet Union." More and more, the North Vietnamese are stressing their old theme of tough "self-reliance." Reading between the lines, it would seem that Hanoi's careful balancing act between Moscow and Peking, which it has managed to carry on for years, may by necessity be undergoing some revamping; events may force the North Vietnamese to make some sort of choice, or at least a shift, and this is likely to determine what they do about any and all forms of negotiation.

In this context, there are three levels on which negotiations, or steps leading toward negotiations while some fighting in South Viet Nam continues, could take place, beginning either early next year, possibly during and after the annual Tet (New Year's) holiday, or perhaps not until after the November 1968 American Presidential election. (The election in the United States remains another important factor in Hanoi's overall calculation. If the communists decide to gamble on the mounting American debate and confusion, and to wait until after the election to negotiate, they will naturally have to reconsider the other factors enumerated above, especially any drastic change in their relations with China.)

The first of the three levels may be described as "local and political." In certain areas, a series of covert approaches might be made by South Vietnamese hamlet and village representatives to members of the Front or the People's Revolutionary Party, the southern political arm of the Lao Dong; these approaches might be followed by formal or, as is more likely initially, informal discussions and arrangements. Their ultimate objective would be the holding of new hamlet and village elections in South Viet Nam in which *all* local elements would participate; but such elections would follow a period of mutual reconciliation worked out autonomously within the village and hamlet areas concerned, with as little outside interference as possible from higher echelons of either side.

The second level of negotiations might involve discussions between Hanoi and the Front on one side and the Americans and the Saigon government on the other, and they might be engendered and facilitated in one of the many ways suggested over the last two years, either privately or publicly; such negotiations conceivably would deal with some of the basic questions such as an end to the bombing, withdrawals of troops on both sides, etc.

The third level would bring the United States and the Soviet Union into the picture together, and perhaps others, as guarantors of an agreement. The effect of such negotiations, whether they were conducted at another Geneva conference or somewhere else, would be to strengthen the hand of the Russians in North Viet Nam and leave the Americans with a role of some influence in South Viet Nam. For the moment anyway, in view of the havoc in China, the Chinese would be effectively squeezed out, which might produce some loud propaganda screams and intensify the heat of the Moscow-Peking dispute, but not much else. Since a primary objective of both the Americans and the Russians is to persuade Hanoi to disentangle itself from Peking, which despite the strong pro-Peking sentiments among some North Vietnamese leaders may not now be as difficult as it would have been a year or so ago, a joint Russian-American move, if properly timed and executed, would no doubt contain the Chinese and restrain them from taking any rash steps that could provoke a larger war, such as a "spontaneous" eruption of Chinese troops across the North Vietnamese border. The purpose of the Russian-American détente would be the creation of an effective Vietnamese buffer zone. A further step might then be the neutralization of other parts of Southeast Asia, starting with Cambodia and Laos, both of which would be only too willing to accept this.

There is nothing to suggest that negotiations on these three levels must proceed separately, although it would seem logical that the first level must start first. At some point during the period of "fighting and negotiating" at the same time, while the first-level accommodations were being attempted, the second and even the third negotiatory level might be reached; it would seem practical, if not in fact unavoidable, that the first two levels should sooner or later be conducted simultaneously. However, for the purposes of discussion here, the three levels, and the possibilities they suggest of ending the war, will be taken up one at a time.

II

Any possibility of local arrangements between pro-Saigon and pro-Viet Cong elements in the South Vietnamese countryside must presuppose two related conditions: the existence of a government in Saigon led by civilians who have the respect of all South Vietnamese, including at least potentially that of the five million living in Viet Cong-controlled areas, and a consequent willingness on the part of the local leaders of these five million to begin a series of selective dialogues. At this writing, it is impossible to predict what the effect of the September Presidential and Senatorial elections in South Viet Nam will be. Whether or not the military ticket headed by General Nguyen Van Thieu and Marshal Nguyen Cao Ky has been elected, the key man remains Tran Van Huong, who has been the leading civilian candidate for President. Those Vietnamese who are eager to settle the war through accommodation—and they include almost all civilian leaders and the majority of the population—believe that Huong, if not as President then as the chosen Prime Minister, has the best chance of prosecuting a peace plan. Although he is not physically strong and is not always forceful in action, Huong, a southerner, which is important in itself for purposes of negotiation, is firm in his convictions, and more importantly he is respected for his honesty and integrity and for his dedication to the cause of seeking peace without selling out to the communists. He is for accommodation and for free elections, which ultimately might produce a pro-communist or strongly neutralist President, but he is against any premature coalition government, which surely would have that effect. He is said to favor a gradual approach to peace, locally and then regionally.

If Huong, or anyone else, is to succeed in this pursuit, the military must be held in check. This will be difficult to do unless the United States is determined finally to use its influence and leverage to restrain the generals, individually and collectively, and to give the civilians a chance to *try* accommodation. What Huong or another civilian leader would require, in effect, is a guarantee from the United States that his position would be safeguarded from coups or demi-coups of the sort that early in 1965 forced Huong himself out of office after he had been Prime Minister for three months. Since the overthrow of Ngo Dinh Diem and his brother Ngo Dinh Nhu in November 1963, which Washington promoted and helped execute, the United States has been signally unsuccessful in the use of its leverage to influence important political decisions and events in South Viet Nam. The next few months may offer the last chance. The only other option short of withdrawal is to go on prosecuting the war through further gradual or rapid escalation to force a military decision. The search for peace, when it comes, might then include some of the same efforts at accommodation, but they would be much harder to pursue in an atmosphere of more despair, bitterness and recrimination.

If a decent and respected and unmolested civilian government can be established in Saigon, supported by an alert and active Senate (and a similar House of Representatives to be elected early in November), how could it proceed to deal with local Viet Cong elements? One must here begin with some other assumptions. The most important of these is that Viet Cong cadres in enough key areas could be persuaded that the alternatives offered by the Saigon representatives are worth their attention.

The Viet Cong would have to believe that the opportunities to maintain a voice for themselves in the countryside, through participation in local elections and otherwise, would be worth more than maintaining a series of shadow governments while the fighting-and-negotiating continued, with the possibility of resuming prolonged and painful guerrilla warfare of course always in the back of their minds. They would have to be further persuaded that, even though many if not most of them have been well-disciplined communists, the chance to be "legal" at the low levels, and to compete more openly than clandestinely with Saigon's representatives, warrants their coöperation. To turn this around, realistically, it should be said that the impact the Viet Cong have had in the rural areas will not easily be eliminated, no matter how and when the war ends. While it is true that the communists have lost some of their popularity in the areas they hold as a result of higher taxes, rougher treatment of the local population, including conscription, food controls and so on, it is also true that the government's image through the revolutionary development program and in other ways has not come through nearly strongly nor widely enough to compensate for the essentially low regard in which the great majority of government agents are still held; these include tax collectors, the police, district and province chiefs, and individual officers and soldiers, not to mention profiteers and landlords who still engage in widespread corruption and have resumed their own tax collections whenever they can return to cleared local areas behind the skirts of government troops.

The Viet Cong cadres who might be persuaded to participate in new local elections, starting in the hamlets, would, under any circumstances, be making a calculated gamble. They are still ahead of the government in the areas they control, and would conceivably be enticed by the prospect of gaining more initially in the indeterminate and government-controlled places. A contest and a race against time would develop, and the best thing that Saigon under pressure, would have going for itself is the establishment, finally of a viable constitutional government whose popularity would increase in direct ratio to its ability to continue gaining the support and respect of the peasantry. This might be enhanced in various ways, including the proper implementation of the new local election regulations already in effect which call for villages to retain 40 percent of what they collect in local taxes for their own use, instead of turning everything over to the districts and provinces. An immediate reevaluation of the policy on land rents would be another way of gaining popular support. It is a fact, as has recently been brought out, that the abolition or lowering of rent collections would be more meaningful to the peasants right now than the parceling out of former French or Vietnamese holdings; much of this land, along with church or communally held properties, is tied up in a vast confusion of ownership claims and general bureaucratic red tape, and it will take years to clear all this up.

The willingness of the local Viet Cong cadres (a good number of whom have been disillusioned and whose lives have been deeply disrupted by the ever-increasing violence of the war) to cooperate in a new program of hamlet self-rule would also depend on various intangible factors. The native cadres, residents of their areas since birth or for many years, would have to be convinced that by going along with Saigon's "opening to the left" they would not only preserve hamlet and village self-determination as *they* see it, but as it is part of the historic Vietnamese tradition of local autonomy.

The local cadres who have been most politically active on a day-by-day, week-by-week and month-by-month basis are the nuts and bolts of the Viet Cong and the National Liberation Front machine, and the control exercised over them by the People's Revolutionary Party, while it has been severe, has been in the nature of a steel hood placed over an engine composed of many small parts. Conceivably, the parts could be stirred below the hood. There is another factor: the local cadres would have to be further persuaded to gamble for the chance to maintain their own southern image, in cooperation with a southern-led Saigon government, against the threat by the North to impose its rule. There seems little doubt that the southern cadres, no matter how thoroughly indoctrinated with communism they have been, and how well disciplined, still resent being ordered about in the execution of their revolutionary duties by northern political and military officers. The fact remains, while the southerners may think in terms of ultimate reunification with the North, there is a strong tradition of southern separatism and a desire to retain a southern identity, and to develop and complete the revolution in the South prior to discussing unity. This tradition and thrust of southern revolutionary independence dates back to the 1930s. Can local nationalist and regional expression now be reinvigorated as part of a movement toward peace? Can the true nationalists in South Viet Nam, including among others, a considerable number of Socialists ideologically independent of both Moscow and Peking and a number of peasant labor-union cadres, be projected into the political maelstrom and given a chance to play meaningful roles among the peasantry? These may prove to be the most significant questions as the coming crisis of peace and war unfolds, and they obviously offer challenges and opportunities to both sides.

III

If the attempt to reach local accommodations looking chiefly toward new elections is at all successful, a number of by-products would soon create situations of a second-level negotiatory nature. These would include the opening of some hostile or contested areas to access by both sides; that is, district heretofore available only to the Viet Cong would become available to government representatives, and vice versa. The regional flow of local trade would increase, and communication in and out of areas generally would become more possible. Refugees could return to their homes. It would be illusory to suppose that some degree of clandestine activity of a proselytizing nature would not continue on both sides, but this would be acceptable if the incidence of terror and assassination could be limited. The possibility of establishing local ceasefire zones suggests itself as the best way to achieve a balance of power instead of a balance of terror.

The creation of cease-fire zones would almost certainly have to be negotiated between higher authorities, between regimental or division commanders on the government side, for example, and communist zone commanders. The cease-fires might have to have the approval of even higher authorities, including central government officals in Saigon and representatives of the National Liberation Front, acting on its own behalf or as the "branch office" of Hanoi, though it would not admit to being that. Actually, there are numbers of areas in Viet Nam today where tacit cease-fires already exist between communist and government forces, each agreeing to leave the other alone, so a framework of such accommodation has been established.

Whether Hanoi would condone a formalization of such cease-fires without the Americans first calling off the bombing of the North is surely doubtful. And whether the Americans would call off the bombing without evidence that Hanoi had ceased infiltrating reinforcements south is problematical. At this point, the bombing issues might become a matter of negotiation between the United States and North Viet Nam, or, if not yet of full negotiation, of probings or even of tentative acts of faith. In the meantime, in any event, it would not be supposed that all military activity would have ceased in the South. In fact, American search-and-destroy operations against communist main-force elements would probably have continued all along, and would probably still go on even as small cease-fire zones or truce areas were established. But the way might now be cleared to enter into the major second-level area of discussion, including cessation of bombing in the South as well as the North, and the bombing question as a whole would thus become more of a tactical instrument in the large strategy of the search for peace and not simply an almost irresolvable issue in itself. The difficulty of calling off the bombing in return for some significant large act of de-escalation on the part of the North Vietnamese, such as an abrupt end to infiltration, would thus be eliminated, or reduced to a more workable perspective. Social psychologists have aptly pointed out that too broad and unspecified a "behavior" has been requested of the North Vietnamese in order to achieve too broad and unspecified a goal, and the longer such demands are made the more difficult it becomes to attain that goal. By breaking the goal down into lesser goals, attainable step by step, the ultimate goal might become more realizable.

This does not, for a moment, mean compromising with our primary goals, foremost of which is our insistence that the territorial and political integrity of South Viet Nam, and for that matter of North Viet Nam too, be preserved and guaranteed. However, the Americans and the South Vietnamese must take certain risks as well as the Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese, for under any circumstances, especially during a period of fighting and negotiating at the same time, politics, to reverse the classic formula, is simply a means of waging war by other means. Nor is there any reason to suppose that, whatever happens, the North Vietnamese Communists will give up their efforts to subvert South Viet Nam to their own purposes through a phased social-economic and "national democratic" revolution in the South aimed at ultimately building a single nation of some thirty million people. Our objective is to limit the scope and possibilities of subversion by imposing a workable legal framework, and then to convince as many local southern communists as possible that this framework offers them the best opportunity for the welfare and development of South Viet Nam.

The North Vietnamese themselves have declared that the existence of a communist state in the North "cannot replace the inherent social contradictions of South Viet Nam." An approach of gradualism in the rural areas is obviously best calculated to create conditions for challenging local Viet Cong cadres to a true revolutionary contest. If this groundwork can be laid, suggestions have been made that the establishment of an increasing number of cease-fires accompanied by political accommodation be then tied to a reduction of the bombing of the North on the basis of a phasing down of the attacks. For example, the United States would agree not to bomb certain parts of the North or to halt all bombing north of certain lines, unless violations of the cease-fires in the South occurred. This idea has already had some currency, most recently in the recommendation of a group of Republican Congressmen. It seems unwise to couch any such offer in terms of punishment for violations, although that is what it might amount to, or to place any formal deadlines on it. At some point, perhaps halfway through the process of establishing cease-fire areas in the South, as the selected zones have been extended to a number of important delta provinces and to some key provinces elsewhere, and perhaps the bombing within these provinces as well as in at least part of the North has been cut down, an effort might be made to create two larger cease-fire zones involving both major American search-and-destroy units and communist main-force elements. One logical zone would be within the D.M.Z. and in an area extending south of it for a stretch of at least ten miles; the projected electronic detection barrier to be built by the United States might fit into this plan. The second zone ostensibly could take in an area stretching east from the Cambodian border in the Third Corps region and eventually could extend across the highlands and plateau to the coastal provinces of Quang Nagi, Binh Dinh and Phu Yen.

It is perfectly possible, if not likely, that the North Vietnamese would not go along with any gradual reduction of the bombing and would still insist, as they have all along, that the bombing be stopped completely before any discussions can start. However, if the United States dropped its insistence on a positive and specific reciprocal gesture—namely, a cessation of infiltration from the North—the above plan would stand a better chance. The dangers of permitting infiltration to continue while the plan is being launched are not nearly as great as the advantages that would accrue from a gradual extension of the cease-fire zones, since infiltration, by itself, is more the effect than the cause of the continuing war; for the real cause is the determination of Hanoi and the Viet Cong to go on fighting at the current level of activity or to revert to action somewhere between phase one and phase two. The time to bring up the question of infiltration and the total end of the bombing of the North, as well as the extension of the cease-fire throughout South Viet Nam, would come when the plan had succeeded up to the point of reducing the level of action sufficiently to warrant the hope that an overall agreement might be negotiated. It might even be argued that if there are enough hopeful signs as the process unfolds, the United States could end the bombing unconditionally even before the third level of the negotiatory process gets under way.

IV

If the process of local accommodation accompanied by the establishment of cease-fire zones has even been partially successful, with Hanoi as well as the Viet Cong accepting the challenge, third-level discussions would serve to enlarge the scope and portent of the peace plan. It is at this juncture that the role of the Russians, as adjudicators and as persuaders of Hanoi, would be of paramount importance. The initial spirit and purpose of the 1962 Geneva Conference that sought to neutralize Laos could here perhaps be recaptured. There is no reason to doubt the desire of the Russians to bring an end to the war in Viet Nam, and no reason to suppose that they would not, at this point, join with the Americans in diplomatic manoeuvres to encourage and facilitate a broader agreement. As stated earlier, the mechanics and techniques of such an approach are best left to the parties concerned.

It would, however, seem advisable to project an agreement on Viet Nam as much as possible into a larger Southeast Asian context, and to bring Cambodia and Laos, and possibly some other nations of the region, into the ultimate discussions, wherever they are held. In so far as possible, the earlier stages of such discussions, of establishing and exploring contacts, should be secret. And certainly the talks, when they begin in earnest, should not aim at the exclusion of the Chinese; in fact, at the opportune time the Chinese should be assured that their participation in the economic development of Southeast Asia is welcomed, and that both the United States and the Soviet Union are eager to discuss such larger problems as nuclear disarmament in cooperation with China. The settlement of the Viet Nam issue, once Peking is forced to accept the idea of a Vietnamese buffer state, may yet prove the way for a larger accommodation with China, unless, of course, that country by then is convulsed in civil war.

A broad Geneva-type conference, if it develops out of initial private soundings and arrangements, would obviously have to deal with the difficult matter of policing any agreement reached. It is the writer's opinion that almost any policing plan that would include such straightjacketed mechanisms as the International Control Commission is doomed to failure. Not only would the present members of the I.C.C., if they are retained, end up in bickering and in vetoing of each other's purposes and prerogatives, but they conceivably would tend to exacerbate friction among the Vietnamese seeking to resolve their own problems.

What the Viet Nam situation desperately demands is a more free revolutionary expression of its own ethos, something which, during the long and tragic postwar period when the French refused to let go in the South, was denied it, and which, under Diem and since, has continued to be precluded. If the South is to rediscover its own revolutionary traditions, and to preserve or modify them in relation to the communist North, it must be as unmolested and even as unsupervised as possible. This naturally involves risks of communist domination or subversion, but the risks must be taken in a true revolutionary atmosphere and milieu, and not under the gaze of an ineffective international police element.

This does not mean that the Americans and the Russians and possibly other powers should not play a role, but in so far as possible the role should be of a "good offices" nature. A Geneva-type conference might properly define the purpose of such a mission, and the United Nations might underwrite it. It could project its own mechanism for action, either if called upon by the Vietnamese or perhaps on the basis of its own readings of the unfolding situation in Viet Nam, as a result of which it might interpose suggestions for resolving potential or actual issues and quarrels. There remain some substantive preliminary matters that should rightfully be considered and acted upon at a conference. These include the phased withdrawal of troops from South Viet Nam, both American and North Vietnamese, the surrender of as many weapons as can feasibly be uncovered in the villages during the prolonged cease-fires (obviously some weapons will always remain hidden), the dismantling of bases or the procedure for turning them over to the Vietnamese, the reestablishment of fuller trade and communication between North and South Viet Nam, and perhaps the selection of a date, no less than five years away, for the holding of a referendum on reunification. The implementation of a Mekong Valley development program, the benefits of which, as President Johnson has pledged, would extend to North Viet Nam, could also logically be brought within the purview of a broad agreement that genuinely concerned itself with the future of all of Southeast Asia.

None of this is meant, furthermore, to deny or exclude considerations of power or influence. The often stated determination of the United States to remain involved in Southeast Asian affairs is one that this writer strongly shares, though the commitment today is confused and undefined. Such involvement unavoidably requires the existence of a military shield. There would appear to be ample reason to reapproach this matter with a fresh set of ideas and to replace the somewhat tarnished Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO) with something more acceptable to the Asians and perhaps more palatable to at least part of the neutral and unaligned if not the communist world. To expect that this might become part of a larger Russian-American accommodation is to much, and is illusory or naive for Moscow cannot afford to renounce its own concept of revolutionary development and will undoubtedly continue to project it in competition with Peking. We cannot realistically assume anything otherwise. However, we can operate in the hope that a peaceful contest for influence in Southeast Asia, on behalf of nationalist development in revolutionary terms, will prevail; though it would also be naive to presume that the Chinese will not continue their efforts to disrupt such peaceful evolvement by fomenting violence in Thailand, the Philippines and again in Indonesia. The effort, on our part, should nevertheless be designed to encourage as much peaceful development as possible, and, if that proves ineffective or insufficient, to promote successful programs of counterinsurgency.

Whatever impetus to regional cooperation develops out of a Vietnamese settlement—such cooperation is already burgeoning in several fields, such as education, transportation, banking and finance—should not be inhibited by threats or interpositions of major military might from any outside source, including the United States. Once the Viet Nam situation is regulated, the security of the area will nevertheless depend in the immediate future on the existence of a protective shield supplied in large part by the United States, with the help of Australia and perhaps a lingering British contribution. In the final analysis, the degree of American determination to support nationalist development in Viet Nam and elsewhere in Southeast Asia, and to back up its support with its multifarious resources, will prove the key factor, politically and economically more than militarily. One of the generally unrealized benefits of the war in Viet Nam has been an awareness on the part of Asian leaders—as best expressed so far by Singapore's Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew—that the United States has bought time in Viet Nam for the rest of Southeast Asia to get together and avoid another Viet Nam. The success of the American commitment in the future will depend on our inner resolve, on our understanding of the area's problems and potentialities, as well as on our patience and willingness to remain "involved" indefinitely.

If Viet Nam has been a tragic and often misconstrued chapter of this American commitment and involvement, the trend toward withdrawal and neo-isolationism, which has become the confused domestic political by-product of the conflict, does not either represent a practical solution or augur well for acceptance of our unavoidable responsibilities in a world that remains highly combustible and revolutionary. The crisis of indecision that confronts us in Viet Nam has simply prolonged and aggravated the confusion, and has made it more difficult to deal with the long-term problems of creating a constructive peace in Southeast Asia. Whatever the risks involved, we now must face up to the "indecisiveness" of the war and attempt, as best we can with the best elements among the Vietnamese we can find, to reach a political solution for a war that has always been essentially political.

TOUCH OF TRAGEDY IN ANTI-BALLISTIC-MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, as the Chicago Sun-Times said in an editorial comment upon this Nation's decision to undertake an anti-ballistic-missile defense system, there is a touch of tragedy involved. It lies in the fact that such a system, designed to guard us against possible attack by the unstable Chinese nation, can be effective in neutralizing the danger of nuclear holocaust but not the danger of continued guerrilla warfare as practiced by Mao Tse-tung and his followers.

This is not to say that such sophisticated defenses are not needed. Indeed, as this editorial aptly points up, the need for nuclear weapons and deterrents against their use will remain with us so long as the battle for men's minds and world security is not won. It is that battle in which we are now engaged, of course, in Southeast Asia.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Sun-Times editorial, entitled "Escalation for Safety," published on September 20, 1967, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Escalation for Safety

The U.S. decision to build an anti-ballistic missile (ABM) defense network to guard against a nuclear attack from Red China is significant in two areas. It recognizes the growing threat of Red China's nuclear weapon capacity. It acknowledges that the United States is confident that Russia, and its nuclear armory, poses no present threat to world peace.

Sec. of Defense Robert S. McNamara, in announcing the new ABM network, made the point that neither the United States nor Russia possesses "first-strike capability." That is, neither nation has the ability to attack the other with nuclear weapons without suffering lethal retaliation. Nor, in McNamara's assessment, is either nation likely ever to gain such an advantage.

McNamara says both Russia and the United States are at the point where an escalation of defenses or weaponry by either nation would result in matching escalation by the other. In McNamara's opinion such an effort, which would result in the same balance of deterrence that now exists, would be futile—although the United States is willing to spend any amount of money and effort to protect itself.

The unknown danger to the United States and the world is Red China. Isolated, suspicious, torn by internal dissensions, possibly irresponsible, Red China and its future actions cannot be charted. Its animosities cannot be assessed. Its potential for destruction has been computed. McNamara said a limited ABM defense against the Red Chinese nuclear weapons armory would have a "higher degree of reliability against a Chinese attack than the much more massive and complicated system some have recommended against a possible Soviet attack." The proposed ABM network is thus a necessary effort to safeguard the future.

The tragedy of such a necessity is that a major power can guard itself and others against nuclear attack with the most sophisticated of weapons and defense measures. However, that same sophistication is no deterrent to the Communist guerrilla who, as Mao Tse-tung has said, operates as a "fish swimming in the sea of the enemy."

The battle to neutralize the danger of nuclear attack can be won. The battle for men's minds, and world security, is not won. Until it is, the need for nuclear weapons and deterrents will remain.

FEDERAL BAR ASSOCIATION SUPPORTS DIRECT ELECTION OF THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I am pleased to invite the Senate's attention to the action taken by a distinguished organization on the question of electoral reform. At its convention held recently in San Francisco, the Federal Bar Association adopted an eight-point resolution favoring an amendment to the Constitution which would provide for the election of the President and Vice President by a direct, nationwide, popular vote. It is gratifying to note that the stand taken by the Federal Bar Association conforms closely with the features of Senate Joint Resolution 2, the constitutional amendment which I introduced on January 11, for myself and 18 other sponsors.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Federal Bar Association resolution, adopted at the convention in San Francisco, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> Resolved that the Federal Bar Association hereby places itself on record as favoring an Amendment to the Constitution of the United States which will:
>
> 1. Provide for the election of the President and Vice President by direct nationwide popular vote;
>
> 2. Require a candidate to obtain at least 40 per cent of the popular vote in order to be elected President or Vice President;
>
> 3. Provide for a national run-off election between the two top candidates in the event no candidate receives at least 40 per cent of the popular vote;
>
> 4. Require the President and Vice President to be voted for jointly;
>
> 5. Empower Congress to determine the days upon which the original election and the run-off election are to be held, which days shall be uniform throughout the United States;
>
> 6. Provide that the places and manner of holding the Presidential election and the inclusion of the names of candidates on the ballot shall be prescribed in each state by the legislature thereof, with the proviso that Congress may at anytime by law make or alter such regulations;
>
> 7. Require that the voters for President and Vice President in each state shall have the qualifications requisite for persons voting for members of Congress, with the proviso that each state may adopt a less restrictive residence requirement for voting for President and Vice President provided that Congress may adopt uniform age and residence requirements; and
>
> 8. Contain appropriate provisions in case of the death of a candidate.

NATIONAL 4-H WEEK

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, tomorrow marks the conclusion of this year's observance of National 4-H Week. Nearly 3 million members of 4-H in every State and territory, residing in both urban and rural environs, are now undertaking diverse new projects for the coming year.

As a former member of 4-H, I know firsthand the incalculable contributions being made by this program emphasizing head, heart, hands, and health. It would, I think, be very difficult to overstate the tremendous contribution 4-H Club activities have made over the last five decades to rural America.

I think it is also appropriate to note, particularly during National 4-H Week, the increasing contribution which these programs are making to urban youngsters. The House Appropriations Committee, in its report on the fiscal year 1968 agricultural appropriations bill, observed this fact and urged that additional funds and effort be expended for providing additional opportunities to underprivileged youngsters in our great cities to participate in 4-H type youth development projects. That report stated that—

> The wholesome effect of 4-H club activities has been so beneficial to rural youth that additional efforts to bring 4-H programs to young people in the congested and deprived urban areas of the United States would make an invaluable contribution to the moral, spiritual, and economic strength of this Nation.

I most heartily concur in the committee's recommendation.

I have, in fact, introduced legislation in the Senate which is designed to bring these beneficial programs to the young people of one of our greatest cities—Washington, D.C. At the present time, the District of Columbia is the lone city statutorily denied the opportunity to participate in the activities of the Extension Service of the Agriculture Department, a principle source of support and leadership for 4-H. My proposal, S. 2105, would eliminate this barrier to the development of 4-H Clubs and related youth-development activities in the District of Columbia. I am pleased to report that the bill has received wide support, as well as favorable attention, by Senator Jordan's Subcommittee on Agricultural Research and General Legislation. I am most hopeful that S. 2105 will be reported and approved by the Senate at an early date.

Mr. President, 4-H contributed greatly to me as an individual. Its contribution to the Nation as a whole is known by every Member of the Senate. I am honored to have this opportunity to express my personal appreciation to those millions of youngsters and adults whose cooperative efforts over the years have made, and continue to make, 4-H one of America's most worthwhile organizations.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (H.R. 12474) making appropriations for NASA for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12474) making appropriations for NASA for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent—and this has been cleared all around—that there be a time limitation on all amendments of 30 minutes, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the proponent of the amendment and the floor manager of the bill [Mr. Magnuson], and 1 hour on the bill, to be equally divided and controlled by the majority leader and minority leader or whoever is designated by them.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, reserving an objection, I wonder if there is going to be an opportunity for me, under that time limitation, to make a speech of about 5 or 6 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. There will be plenty of time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, this time will not start until after the distinguished manager of the bill, the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], makes his opening remarks.

I ask unanimous consent at this time that the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick] may have 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the understanding is agreed to.

CRASH-LOCATOR BEACONS

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, an article in the Washington Post of 3 days ago was undoubtedly noted by many of my distinguished colleagues with a great deal of remorse. I refer to the report of the diary written by 16-year-old Carla Corbus and her mother, whose remains were found almost 6 months after their plane went down in the mountains of California. I only hope the top echelon of the Federal Aviation Administration, who have consistently refused to require installation of crash-locator beacons in private aircraft, will take note of this tragic incident.

At this point, Mr. President, I would like to recapitulate on some of the points I have brought out in previous statements urging requirement of crash-locator beacons. On August 7, in this Chamber, I pointed out the number of fatalities resulting from general aviation accidents, noting that 53 percent of these fatalities have resulted from crashes occurring more than 5 miles from an airport—only 20 percent of the total general aviation accidents.

The costs incurred in searching for lost aircraft have been tremendous—$59,224,142 for search and rescue missions flown by the Air Force alone in fiscal 1966. I am sure no one will argue the justification of using taxpayers' funds for these missions, but I do question the refusal of the FAA to take such an urgently needed step to reduce the hazards and the expense of conducting searches for missing aircraft. And, as so tragically illustrated by the report of 3 days ago, crash-locator beacons would most assuredly save lives.

Just 2 months ago, a plane crash in the Colorado mountains was the object of a weeklong search by the Civil Air Patrol and private citizens. I reported in detail to the Senate on this incident in a statement August 18. In this case, there may not have been survivors of the crash—a question which will never be answered. Nevertheless, a full week was spent by ground and air units before the wreckage was finally found, and with no small hazard to pilots trying to fly low enough in mountainous terrain to spot the plane.

In the letters I have received subsequent to my statements calling for requirement of crash-locator beacons, wholehearted support for the proposal has been expressed by pilots in many areas of the country. The few objections raised have been on the grounds of undue expense to owners of private aircraft and the thought that the device would be helpful only for mountain flying.

On the first point, I sympathize with the reluctance of pilots to stand the $200 expense; but for a device that could very well save their own lives, I certainly do not think it would be asking too much. Since it is for their own protection, it seems just a little unreasonable to leave the entire burden to the taxpayers and the Civil Air Patrol when an alternative is so readily available. One FAA representative commented not long ago that there is no law requiring the Air Force, the Civil Air Patrol, or private pilots to undertake searching missions for downed aircraft. No law, perhaps, other than a moral obligation to save human life, regardless of expense, if there is a remote chance of success. Just what does it take to convince the FAA that the possibilities of success could be greatly increased by this one regulation? Should not the burden of the expense rest with those whose lives might be saved through precautionary measures, rather than in expensive, hazardous assessments on those with the moral responsibility to find them, even if it may be too late?

The second objection—that crash-locator beacons would be necessary only in a few areas of the country—I think is a highly fallacious assumption. I doubt that there are many pilots in this country who have not at one time or another found themselves flying over a relatively unpopulated area, or over rough, wooded terrain, or even over a mountainous region. I would stress again the letter I quoted in my statement before the Senate on August 7, from a Colorado woman whose husband was killed in a plane crash near Gunnison, Colo. After a week of searching, the plane was finally located only 33 miles from the airport on a heavily timbered mesa. The plane was not high on a mountain peak, inaccessible to ground searching crews. It was, in fact, finally located by ground crews, and even then could not be spotted from the air because of the way it had dived into the timber. There are many other regions in the United States where a plane could go down and not be spotted from the air for just such a reason. I received a very simple response to my proposal for crash-locator beacons recently, which certainly attests to this fact. It reads:

> A few years ago, I crashed on take-off in the mountains of Maine. I wasn't found for 24 hours. With a locator beacon I believe I would have been found very quickly. I favor this recommendation.

Another letter from Ogdensburg, N.Y., reads as follows:

> I have read the copy of your recent aviation speech. In my short aviation life (200 hours) I have already learned that the weather station forecasts must be confirmed by personal observation. On one occasion I found the weather report to be quite erroneous only 30 miles from the station. The men working the stations have always spared no effort to assist me, you understand, but I would agree with your thinking on this matter.
>
> I too have spent long hours on a Search Mission in the Civil Air Patrol. I shouldn't have been there, really, as the weather was marginal and I am strictly VFR. However, the thought that people might be alive and lying out in the snow with broken legs kept me going. We never found the wreck. A farmer on a tractor did after we had searched for almost three days. A crash locator beacon would have shown us the way in 30 minutes. Such beacons would be a boon.

This letter is from a doctor in Ogdensburg, N.Y. His experience clearly indicates that there are circumstances other than those to be encountered in our Colorado mountains that make search-and-rescue missions both hazardous and expensive. Ogdensburg, to my knowledge, is not in a mountainous region. It is on the St. Lawrence River, and, I believe, in a relatively flat area; but in this instance the weather conditions hampered search operations, not the terrain.

In other correspondence from the State of New York, I find that there are problems at least comparable to our own Rocky Mountains in the West. In a letter from Col. John C. Campbell, Jr., commander of the New York Air National Guard at Schenectady County Airport, I received the following report as evidence of the need for crash-locator beacons:

> I have read your speech to the United States Senate with regard to aircraft crashes. I am in complete agreement with your views. I, too, am strongly in favor of crash locator beacons.
>
> This year at least three private aircraft crashed and were missing in our area. These aircraft crashed in mountainous, wooded terrain and could not be spotted from the air, since the woods had complete leaf cover. All were reported missing for many, many days. Help could not reach them in time, even though the crashes occurred relatively close to high population centers with all the elaborate paraphernalia of our advanced society.
>
> In each case, crash locator beacons would have summoned aid days earlier and would have saved thousands of wasted manhours in futile search.
>
> Over the years, I can recall many missing aircraft crashes in the Catskill, Adirondack, and Green Mountain areas which surround our Capitol District. When a small aircraft crashes in late spring or summertime, the common saying here is to wait for some deer hunter to find the wreck in the fall of the year. A sad commentary, but so very true in too many cases.

In subsequent correspondence with Colonel Campbell, I received further details on five crashes which occurred this year in that region. I ask unanimous consent that Colonel Campbell's letter of September 15 and the attached report from Mr. Francis Mosher, Jr., air safety investigator for the New York office of the Department of Transportation, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter and report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK AIR NATIONAL GUARD,
Schenectady County Airport, N.Y.,
September 15, 1967.

Senator PETER H. DOMINICK,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DOMINICK: I refer to your letter of September 6th and my answering letter of September 15th. The inclosed Department of Transportation letter has the details of the aircraft crashes which have occurred this year in the Albany, New York area.

You will notice that all aircraft were lost for several days, at least. One has not been found yet and one was missing for almost two years. It seems obvious that had crash locator beacons been installed they would have, first, pinpointed these crashes and thus directed rescue efforts to the scene with some dispatch and, secondly, saved the expenditure of countless manhours in air and ground search.

I look forward to the success of your efforts to improve the safety of those who fly and the protection of those unfortunates who are exposed to accident. Crash locator beacons will save lives and will spare needless and fruitless searching.

Very truly yours,
Col. JOHN C. CAMPBELL, Jr.,
Commander.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION,
NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD,
Jamaica, N.Y.

Col. JOHN C. CAMPBELL, Jr.,
New York Air National Guard,
Schenectady, N.Y.

DEAR COLONEL CAMPBELL: The following is a resume of aircraft accidents which have crashed into mountainous terrain in the immediate Albany, New York area within the last six months or have been located during this period:

Piper PA–23–250, N–5604Y, Owned and operated by New Haven Airways. Crew two commercial instrument rated pilots, High Peak Mountain (elevation 3,580 feet MSL), Tannerville, New York. Departed Albany County Airport 1414 EDT, June 13, 1967, destination Ulster County Airport, Kingston, New York, Albany weather—1500 broken, visibility 6 miles, haze, Poughkeepsie weather—estimated 900 overcast, visibility 2 miles, fog. Flight contacted Albany approach control, reporting over Hudson River and returning to Albany. The wreckage was located on June 19, 1967.

Beech 35, CF-FAS, Owned and operated by Guy Boisvert, Canadian Private Pilot, 3 passengers, Shokan Mountain (elevation 3,700 feet MSL), Margretville, New York, Departed Cartierville, Quebec, 1013 EDT, June 18, 1967, VFR flight plan to Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Weather in general area reported as thunderstorms, low ceilings and rain. Poughkeepsie weather: (aircraft reports): 1000 broken, 1800 overcast, visibility 3 miles, light thunderstorm, haze. The wreckage was located on July 4, 1967.

Piper PA-28, N-540W, Owned by Flying West Flying Club, Crew—Private pilot and one passenger, Departed Baltimore, Maryland 1120 EDT, 6-25-67, Destination Montreal, Quebec, Albany weather: 2500 overcast, visibility 7 miles, light rainshowers. Aircraft contacted Albany approach control at 1425 EDT and reported stabilizer and gyro difficulty in precipitation east-southeast of Albany Airport. Aircraft not located to date.

Piper PA-28-150, Operator Captain (USAF), Owner Donald R. Wilkinson, New Windsor, New York, Pilot-in-command commercial, airplane single, multi-engine land, instrument, 3 passengers. Departed Orange County Airport, Walden, New York, 0835 EDT, July 1, 1967, VFR flight plan to Syracuse, New York. Weather in general area: low ceiling and fog. Wreckage located July 4, 1967, Mt. Cragmoore (elevation 3400 feet MSL), Ellenville, New York.

Cessna 172, N-9809T, Owned by Skyhaven, Inc., Rochester, New Hampshire, Operated by Private Pilot, One passenger, Departed Rochester, New Hampshire, 1445 EDT, 9-13-65, Destination Windsor Locks, Connecticut. Briefed on weather (telephone) prior to departure, weather reported as VFR marginal. The flight contacted Gardner radio. Wreckage located on July 4, 1967, on Haystack Mt. (elevation 3200 feet MSL), North Bennington, Vermont.

If further information is needed, please feel free to contact this office. The telephone number is Area Code 212, 995-3716, which is on the FTS system. It is requested that the aforegoing information not be released for public information.

The reports, when completed, can be obtained by writing to:

Accident Inquiry Section, SB-84C, National Transportation Safety Board, DOT, Bureau of Aviation Safety, 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

The date, location, aircraft registration number should be included with the request.

Sincerely yours,
FRANCIS MOSHER, Jr.,
Air Safety Investigator,
New York Office.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, each of these accidents resulted in a great deal of time and expense to the local civil air patrol and the local pilots who joined in the searches. Most of the time an expense would have been unnecessary with the aid of a crash-locator beacons, which the FAA reports has been perfected. So despite this fact, the FAA has not recommended regulatory action to require their use.

These reports, along with the discovery of the plane wreckage in California, must surely provide the clearest and most tragic evidence of the urgent need for FAA action to require crash-locator beacons. In most cases of lost aircraft, no record is left of the agony and suffering of the victims, but the picture is made painfully clear by reading of the 7-week ordeal of Mr. and Mrs. Olen and their daughter. Carla noted in one entry of her diary:

> I hope you are happy, Search and Rescue. You haven't found us yet.

The fault lay not, however, with the searching mission, but quite simply with the fact that they did not have a crash-locator beacon. It is indeed a sad commentary on our system when three persons—and Heaven only knows how many more—suffer through such an ordeal, when our technology has provided us with an effective and available means of averting just such a disaster. How many more lives will have to be lost, Mr. President, before the FAA wakes up to its responsibility?

At this point, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article entitled "Last Days of Three Crash Victims," published in the Washington Daily News of October 3, 1967, and the article entitled "Diary Records Losing Fight for Life by Girl, Mother in Crashed Plane," published in the Washington Post of October 3, 1967.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Oct, 3, 1967]

DIARY OF 16-YEAR-OLD GIRL: LAST DAYS OF THREE CRASH VICTIMS

REDDING, CALIF., October 3.—A girl's diary found at the scene of a plane crash told yesterday of a two-month struggle to survive in the snowy Trinity mountains which ended in death.

The bones of a man and two women were discovered Sunday by a deer hunter near the summit of 3213-foot-high Buckhorn mountain 35 miles west of here in northern California.

At least one of them had survived seven weeks in the rugged snow country after a forced landing March 11 on a flight from Portland, Ore., to Red Bluff, Calif.

The pilot was Al F. Olen, owner of the Clifford Hotel in Portland. Others were his wife, Phyllis, and her daughter, Carla Corbus, 16.

"On leg of journey to Red Bluff," said the diary's first entry. "Plane on left side in snowbank, 1215 p.m. Fuselage broken. Door ajar. Windows on right side were broken as well as windshield."

In another entry, Carla said Olen suffered a broken right arm, crushed right ribs and had pain in his back. Mrs. Olen, she said, was delirious for one day and suffered a broken right hand and left ankle.

Carla said her own injuries were an injured back, a sore right ankle and a cut on the left knee.

On April 30, she noted her 16th birthday: "I want to be rescued today," she wrote. The final entry was dated May 4 and read, "we are completely soaked."

Most of the diary, written in a flight guide book, noted weather conditions. She said the three melted snow for water but made no mention of obtaining food.

The diary also told of planes flying overhead and at one point said "Al" went for help—but apparently he returned when he failed. No mention was made of the deaths of Mr. and Mrs. Olen.

The plane was found by Floyd Bolling, a Shasta, Calif., mill worker, and his wife.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Oct. 3, 1967]

DIARY RECORDS LOSING FIGHT FOR LIFE BY GIRL, MOTHER IN CRASHED PLANE

REDDING, CALIF., October 2.—A 16-year-old girl and her mother fought for two months a losing battle for their lives in the freezing carcass of their plane after it crashed on a snowy mountain peak in March, a makeshift diary disclosed tonight.

"Today is my 16th birthday. I wanted to be rescued today," the girl scribbled in the back of an airman's guide 50 days after the crash. "I hope you are happy, Search and Rescue. You haven't found us yet."

That was on April 30, and rescue never came for Carla Corbus or for her mother, Phyllis. Their scattered bones were found near the plane today. Many animal tracks were nearby.

Search parties found no trace of her stepfather, Alvin Olen, a 59-year-old hotel owner from Portland, Ore., who left the plane six days after it crashed on March 11 to seek help.

A deer hunter discovered the wreckage of the single-engine Cessna 191 about 4,000 feet up the summit of Bully Choot Mountain, about 35 miles west of Redding and a mile from a seldom-used road. Search parties had been concentrating their hunt for the missing plane miles north of the site where it actually crashed.

The three victims were on their way to San Francisco to visit Olen's oldest son, Alvin Jr., 32. The son, an airline pilot, spent 107 days in Northern California after the crash. But, he recalled here Monday, during most of that time the weather was so foul he could not fly to hunt for the lost plane.

(In Portland, the Civil Aeronautics Authority said Olen was the object of a search over Montana in 1956 on a flight from Minneapolis to Portland after he changed plans enroute. In 1954 he was fined for reckless flying after taking off from and landing in Vancouver, B.C., only by the light of automobile headlights.)

"On leg of journey to Red Bluff (Calif.)" said the diary's first entry. "Plane on left side in snowbank, 12:15 p.m. Fuselage broken. Door ajar. Windows on right side were broken as well as windshield."

The diary, with entries by both mother and daughter, then described the injuries suffered in the crash.

"Al" suffered a cut on the chin, three cuts on the forehead, a broken arm, crushed ribs on the right side, and "pain in his vertebrae."

Phyllis was "delirious one day," suffering a broken left arm, cuts on the right hand, a broken left ankle and many cuts and bruises, plus frostbitten feet.

Carla was less seriously hurt. The diary noted she "hurt in the back near her left kidney. Sore right ankle. Cut on her left knee."

Three days after the crash, Carla tried to walk through the snow but was turned back "because her feet were frozen and she had lost her shoes."

Six days after the crash, the diary said Olen left the crash scene at the 5000-foot level of the mountain.

"Al shouted ok. He crossed the gully. He was on his way for help."

A week later, an entry written by Mrs. Olen said: "Fear Al did not make it for help. Getting weak."

The diary said they melted snow for water but made only one reference to food—the day Olen left. It said simply: One glass of jelly left."

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, in addition to those whose planes have crashed, we have also done some investigation to find out how many of the people who have been looking for them have also lost their lives.

In 1965, the Civil Air Patrol had three accidents with one life lost. They had test missions, practicing the procedures for rescue, in which they had five accidents and two lives lost. In 1966, they had two accidents in the CAP, although, fortunately, they did not lose any lives.

In 1967, up to date, there have been two accidents, with three lives lost.

These statistics are from information given to us by **Lt. Col. Charles McDonell,** U.S. Air Force liaison officer for the Civil Air Patrol.

Fortunately, Mr. President, there have been no U.S. Air Force aircraft lost this year, although there has been one accident with a helicopter. But this report just points out the cost in lives, money, and time which are expended in searching for downed craft.

In the report from Colonel Campbell—which I shall not read in its entirety—it is stated that just this year, in New York, a Piper crashed on June 13, which was not located until July 19. A Beech which crashed on June 18 was not located until July 4. Another Piper which crashed on June 25 has not been located to date.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Colorado may have 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMINICK. That aircraft has not been located to date, though it crashed on June 25.

Another Piper which went down on July 1, was found on the 4th. Also, Mr. President, there is a report of a Cessna 172 which went down on September 13, 1965, in New York, and was finally located on July 4, 1967—almost 2 years after it crashed.

Yet the FAA has stated, in reports to me, that the crash-locator beacon is not required because the pilots object to the added expense. The only way we will ever get these devices into the planes is to have a regulation that the manufacturers must incorporate them as original equipment when they build the airplane, with the cost included as part of the purchase price. For the small additional cost each pilot would have to assume in order to take care of the expense of this item, we could possibly save as much as $59 million in tax funds expended for search-and-rescue mission. It seems ridiculous to me to have the FAA time after time, state that they are not going to do anything about crash beacons because they have heard some objections from some of the aviation people, who do not wish to pay that much money. I certainly must say this makes little sense from the taxpayer's point of view, from the point of view of human suffering, or from the point of view of the country at large, in our effort to try to use updated technology to provide aviation safety at its best.

THE SUPERSONIC TRANSPORT

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, yesterday, I voted in favor of retaining the funds for the SST. In connection with some investigation on the matter I conducted early this year, I got in touch with a very fine, experienced man by the name of G. C. Clementson, who lives in my State. I ask unanimous consent that a letter which he wrote to me on April 10, 1967, analyzing problems and positions with regard to the SST, together with a copy of his own résumé of his experience to show what his capability is in this field, be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the letter and résumé were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Denver, Colo.,
April 10, 1967.

Hon. Peter H. Dominick,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Peter: Sorry that I've been so long in responding to your request for comments on the supersonic transport program. I unfortunately underestimated the wealth of material in the literature on this program and my own time for reading, criticizing, and formulating an opinion. I hope this letter proves helpful, even if somewhat late.

At the risk of dwelling on the obvious, I would first like to point out several factors which make the supersonic transport program different from any other commercial aircraft development undertaken in the United States, and then discuss the present program.

The supersonic transport development is the first commercial aircraft development in the history of American aviation which was not preceded by extensive development, test, large-quantity production, and then service use by the U.S. military services in a particular flight regime. To illustrate this point, let me define four aircraft flight regimes as follows:

1. Low Subsonic—Piston Engine Regime:

Examples: Military Aircraft: B–10 through B–18. Commercial Aircraft: DC2/DC3, Douglas; Lodestar, Lockheed.

2. Medium Subsonic—Piston Engine Regime:

Examples: Military Aircraft: B–25 through B–29. Commercial Aircraft: DC–4/DC–7, Douglas; Constellation Series, Lockheed; Stratocruiser, Boeing; 202/404, Convair; 440, Martin.

3. High Subsonic—Jet Engine Regime:

Examples: Military Aircraft: B–45, No. Amer.; B–47, Boeing; B–52, Boeing; B–57, Martin.

Commercial Aircraft: 700 Series, Boeing; 880/990, Convair; DC–8/DC–9, Douglas.

4. Supersonic—Jet Engine Regime:

Examples: Military Aircraft: B–58, Convair; B–70, No. Amer.; SR–71, Lockheed.

Commercial Aircraft: SST, Boeing.

From this listing, it is apparent that with the exception of the last category several military aircraft in each category were produced and used in service in large quantities; and that more than one aircraft manufacturer was involved in both the military and commercial developments. From these facts it can be concluded that, although commercial development has been heavily subsidized in the past, the entire cost was not readily determined. Only the cost necessary to adapt existing knowledge to a particular commercial application was borne by the aircraft manufacturer. The U. S. Government paid the remainder under military defense expenditures.

In addition, technical knowledge associated with each flight regime was efficiently transferred between aircraft manufacturers through governmental agencies of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. (The visual and performance similarity between the Douglas DC–8 and the Boeing 707 is a striking example of the effectiveness of this transfer of knowledge.)

In the fourth flight regime, since changing military requirements have created a situation wherein the justification for supersonic manned bombers is questionable, the normal extensive military developmental programs have been severely restricted. As a consequence, the cost of development of the supersonic transport must be almost completely borne by the commercial design; hence, the cost appears not only exceedingly large, but to some people of questionable justification.

In order to attempt to minimize these costs, the Supersonic Transport Program Office has done two things, i.e., (1) narrowed the competing manufacturers down to one airplane manufacturer (Boeing) and one engine manufacturer (G.E.); and (2) spread the development costs so that the manufacturers involved, as well as commercial airline carriers, are assuming a minor portion of the risk (10%). This procedure has created a drastic break with past experience, in that we are creating an almost complete monopoly in the manufacture of commercial aircraft (it will be virtually impossible for other competing manufacturers to catch up with the technical headstart the Government is giving to Boeing and General Electric).

I suspect this may also be the reason for your stated reservation with respect to the preferred position of the selected manufacturers. I, also, have reservations about the long-term effect of this approach, but before I state my position let me present a summary discussion of the presently proposed program under the following categories: (1) Technical, (2) Operational, (3) Managerial, (4) Financial. I will then give you my personal conclusions and recommendations.

TECHNICAL

Although a large number of articles, both pro and con, have been written about the nature and severity of the technical problems involved in the development of the supersonic transport, I do not consider these problems to constitute the crucial problem area of the program. I do not intend by this statement to imply that the technical problems are easy to solve. To the contrary, there are and will be some rather difficult problems to resolve in the successful development of the jet engines; in the performance and handling qualities of the aircraft; in the choice and use of structural materials; and in creating an acceptable radiation environment for the passengers and crew. However, in none of these problem areas do I believe the proposed design is beyond the present state-of-art in technology.

You specifically mentioned in your letter concern for problems in stability of the aircraft clear air turbulence, and aerodynamic heating. In response I should like to point out that in re-entering manned space vehicles, both of these problems have been successfully solved under conditions more severe than that which the supersonic transport will need to tolerate.

To summarize, it is my personal opinion that, provided sufficient funds are available on a timely basis, the technical problems will not restrict or defeat the supersonic transport program.

OPERATIONAL

The operational problem areas are: (1) Sonic boom tolerance, (2) traffic control, and (3) route economics.

Experience to date seems to indicate a very low tolerance on the part of the public for sonic booms. Although there are flight planning techniques to minimize the intensity and prevalence of sonic booms, it is generally conceded that (barring some presently unknown techniques for attenuating sonic booms) the supersonic transport will be restricted to overwater flights only. However, when you consider the perennial Navy observation that three-quarters of the earth's surface is water, the restriction certainly cannot be a major factor in defeating the success of the program.

There is no doubt that the inclusion of the supersonic transport into the present air traffic control network will create control problems. However, a more severe problem in air traffic control is the sheer number of vehicles to control rather than their speeds. The volume of traffic problem must be solved, supersonic or not, since it is evident that the rate of growth of air traffic is far from leveling off. When the system for adequately handling the air traffic volumes of the future has been developed, the inclusion of (relatively) small numbers of supersonic transports into the same environment will be only a minor perturbation.

On the question of the validity of the route economics with respect to the supersonic transport, one can find all shades of opinion. United States studies conducted by personnel in the FAA and the Department of Commerce present a rather convincing case that the supersonic transport can and will be an economic success. However, one should pause to consider the arguments presented by BO K. O. Lundberg of Sweden.* Essentially, he challenges the argument that the public will use the supersonic transport primarily because it goes faster. My statement certainly is an over-simplification of his position, but I do believe that he vastly underestimates the intense desire of people in our time to "get there quickly."

It was this sort of logic that led Lockheed Aircraft to develop in a major way the turboprop transport (Electra) instead of taking the next step to the turbo-jet transport such as Boeing, Douglas, North American, and Convair did. This short-sighted management decision caused Lockheed Aircraft to lose leadership in the commercial transportation field which so far they have not regained.

A similar argument can be presented with respect to the "Concorde" versus our Supersonic Transport. I am sure that the British-French combine will make major gain in overseas public travel preference; but I am equally sure they will lose that gain as soon as the SST is available. Like the Electra, the Concorde will rapidly decline in use because of greater public preference for the faster jet transports.

MANAGERIAL

The Supersonic Transport Program presents management problems, not only from the standpoint of sheer size, but also the conflict which arises when the responsibility for development of this supersonic transport is included within the FAA. I am referring here to the problem that the FAA is *the* governmental agency responsible for certifying the airworthiness of all commercial transports, and yet must simultaneously be responsible for their development. Mr. Alan S. Boyd has stated that he plans to eventually remove the SST Program Office from the FAA and transfer it to another section of the Transportation Department. This is in the right direction, but basically only removes the conflict from within the FAA to some undetermined group within the Transportation Department. In an obviously accelerated development program with elements of national prestige at stake, I question whether or not this will be an effective solution.

FINANCIAL

Major General J. C. Maxwell has presented a strong case as to why the financial risk for development of the supersonic transport is far too great for private industry as separate corporations to undertake, and hence the Federal Government must subsidize the program. I do not question these arguments. They appear to be well founded. However, I do question the implied assumption that the risk must be taken by only one aircraft manufacturer and one engine manufacturer plus minor help from the major airlines. It is this assumption that forces the final conclusion that the major program risk *must* be borne by the U.S. Government. I don't believe it!

Representative Frank T. Bow (R-Ohio) has already proposed that a Supersonic Transport Development Authority be established by act of Congress to sell $1.5 billion in bonds and notes to finance the project. The Development Authority would later establish the Supersonic Transport Production Corporation to produce and sell the aircraft. In the Bow plan, investments in the Authority would be guaranteed by the U.S. Government. It was this last provision that probably led Budget Director Charles L. Schultze to state that under these arrangements the Government is assuming the entire risk rather than the 90% as presently proposed. Consequently, the Administration as represented by Mr. Schultze prefers the present financing arrangements with the manufacturers and airlines sharing 10% of the risk in order to provide "incentives to succeed" for private industry.

Perhaps I am overly naive, but I cannot see in these arguments any basic reason why the financial and organizational arrangements established for the Communications Satellite Corporation do not apply equally well to the Supersonic Transport Program. I see many similarities between the two development areas, and no fundamental reason why the same pattern of action cannot be applied here.

At this point, I have a sad feeling, wonderfully expressed by Voltaire when he apologized in the last paragraph of a three-page letter for not having sufficient time to write a brief letter. I hope this rather lengthy letter has not been too rambling, and that I have managed to get a few thoughts across in a convincing manner.

To summarize my conclusions:

(1) Technical: There are no technical problems which call for knowledge beyond the present state-of-the-art.

(2) Operational: The SST will probably be restricted to trans-oceanic flights, but should not present any problems greater than presently being or to be encountered by the high subsonic jets.

(3) Managerial: It is difficult to perceive how the fundamental management conflict in the development and activation of the SST can be resolved by moving the SST Program Office out of the FAA.

(4) Financial: I do not believe that the U.S. Government should bear the major portion of financial risk (90%) in order to create a manufacturing monopoly for Boeing and General Electric. Schemes such as the equivalent of COMSAT for the SST have not been fully and objectively explored.

(5) The SST program is already late in development, and hence should not be required to mark time while financial and managerial problems are resolved.

RECOMMENDATIONS

(1) The present budgetary request of the FAA for the Supersonic Transport Development should be essentially met, in order to avoid further delay in the development.

(2) However, the Congress, when it authorizes the requested funds, should establish a select committee to explore in detail and recommend an agency similar to the Communications Satellite Corporation for the purpose of financing and managing the development of the Supersonic Transport. (It is my understanding that the U.S. Government did not underwrite the financial risks of COMSAT, and I fail to see why the Government should do otherwise in the case of the Supersonic Transport.) If you are interested in this approach, I can furnish additional ideas on the composition and organization of an SST corporation.

If you're still with me—congratulations! I'll get this typed and in the mail. Hope you find it helpful.

As ever,

G. C. CLEMENTSON.

A RÉSUMÉ OF GERHARDT C. CLEMENTSON, LITTLETON, COLO.

Business experience: Space & Information Systems Division, North American Aviation, Inc., Downey, Calif.

S&ID (formerly called the Missile Division) is the division of NAA specializing the Space Vehicle Systems and Information Processing Systems. The major programs of this division are 1. the command and service modules of the Apollo Spacecraft, and 2. the second stage (S–II) of the Saturn 5 Launch Vehicle.

From 1964 to present: *Director—Engineering Computing and Simulation.*

Department of approximately three hundred engineers responsible for 1. physical simulation of man-machine interfaces in space vehicles, 2. central digital programming support for scientific problem solving, and 3. central digital programming support for development and monitoring engineering data handing systems such as wire listing and measurement listing. Currently—Manager, technical operations of the Falcon Research & Development Co.

From 1962 to 1964: *Technical Director—Apollo Space Sciences.*

Reported to the Vice President and Program Manager, Apollo Program. Responsible for and authorized to: 1. conduct studies on the scientific experiments appropriate to the Apollo Mission, 2. review and approve the selection and utilization of scientific and engineering consultants, 3. develop and maintain an interface with the scientific community on associated space science research programs, and 4. conduct scientific staff studies on technical problems as requested by the Apollo Program Manager.

From 1961 to 1962: *Director—Aerospace Technology.*

Responsible for all advanced engineering and research in support of division programs and bidding activity in the functional disciplines of Aerodynamics, Thermodynamics, Applied Mechanics, Materials, Space Physics, Power and Propulsion Systems and Structural Dynamics. Work was supported through: 1. NAA funded research, 2. contracted research, 3. advanced engineering in support of division programs and 4. bidding funds.

Management experience in the Air Force, 1955 to 1961: Faculty, USAF Academy, Colorado.

Professor and Head, Department of Aeronautics. Responsible for: 1. all phases of cadet instruction in the fields of thermodynamics and aerodynamics, including four prescribed and ten elective courses, 2. administration of programs for two wind tunnels, intensive aircraft power plant demonstration and other laboratory facilities. Direct supervision of eighteen officers, and nine civilian personnel.

From 1954 to 1955: Faculty, USAF Institute of Technology.

Assistant Professor of Electrical Engineering. Responsible for developing and teaching a program of study in automatic control theory.

From 1951 to 1954: Armament Laboratory, Wright Air Development Center, Ohio.

Chief, Fighter Systems Branch. Responsible for research and development in flight control and weapons control as applied to fighter type aircraft. . . . Supervised 40 project engineers.

From 1950 to 1951: *Technical Staff Officer, Armament Laboratory.*

Responsible for monitoring plans and programs in research and development of fighter flight and weapons control systems.

From 1945 to 1947: *Chief, Aerodynamics Section, Flight Test Division, Wright Field.*

Responsible for developing special flight test methods for measuring performance, stability and control factors. Functioned as test pilot as well as flight test engineer.

Flying experience: United States Air Force.

From 1947 to 1961: Supplemental flying duties—Command Pilot Rating, jet qualified.

---

* *Pros and Cons of Supersonic Aviation Relative to Gains or Losses in the Combined Time/Comfort Considerations.* BO K. O. Lundberg. Journal of the Royal Aeronautical Society, Sept. 1964.

In 1967, up to date, there have been two accidents, with three lives lost.

These statistics are from information given to us by Lt. Col. Charles McDonell, U.S. Air Force liaison officer for the Civil Air Patrol.

Fortunately, Mr. President, there have been no U.S. Air Force aircraft lost this year, although there has been one accident with a helicopter. But this report just points out the cost in lives, money, and time which are expended in searching for downed craft.

In the report from Colonel Campbell—which I shall not read in its entirety—it is stated that just this year, in New York, a Piper crashed on June 13, which was not located until July 19. A Beech which crashed on June 18 was not located until July 4. Another Piper which crashed on June 25 has not been located to date.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Colorado may have 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMINICK. That aircraft has not been located to date, though it crashed on June 25.

Another Piper which went down on July 1, was found on the 4th. Also, Mr. President, there is a report of a Cessna 172 which went down on September 13, 1965, in New York, and was finally located on July 4, 1967—almost 2 years after it crashed.

Yet the FAA has stated, in reports to me, that the crash-locator beacon is not required because the pilots object to the added expense. The only way we will ever get these devices into the planes is to have a regulation that the manufacturers must incorporate them as original equipment when they build the airplane, with the cost included as part of the purchase price. For the small additional cost each pilot would have to assume in order to take care of the expense of this item, we could possibly save as much as $59 million in tax funds expended for search-and-rescue mission. It seems ridiculous to me to have the FAA time after time, state that they are not going to do anything about crash beacons because they have heard some objections from some of the aviation people, who do not wish to pay that much money. I certainly must say this makes little sense from the taxpayer's point of view, from the point of view of human suffering, or from the point of view of the country at large, in our effort to try to use updated technology to provide aviation safety at its best.

THE SUPERSONIC TRANSPORT

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, yesterday, I voted in favor of retaining the funds for the SST. In connection with some investigation on the matter I conducted early this year, I got in touch with a very fine, experienced man by the name of G. C. Clementson, who lives in my State. I ask unanimous consent that a letter which he wrote to me on April 10, 1967, analyzing problems and positions with regard to the SST, together with a copy of his own résumé of his experience to show what his capability is in this field, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter and résumé were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DENVER, COLO.,
April 10, 1967.

Hon. PETER H. DOMINICK,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PETER: Sorry that I've been so long in responding to your request for comments on the supersonic transport program. I unfortunately underestimated the wealth of material in the literature on this program and my own time for reading, criticizing, and formulating an opinion. I hope this letter proves helpful, even if somewhat late.

At the risk of dwelling on the obvious, I would first like to point out several factors which make the supersonic transport program different from any other commercial aircraft development undertaken in the United States, and then discuss the present program.

The supersonic transport development is the first commercial aircraft development in the history of American aviation which was not preceded by extensive development, test, large-quantity production, and then service use by the U.S. military services in a particular flight regime. To illustrate this point, let me define four aircraft flight regimes as follows:

1. Low Subsonic—Piston Engine Regime:

Examples: Military Aircraft: B–10 through B–18. Commercial Aircraft: DC2/DC3, Douglas; Lodestar, Lockheed.

2. Medium Subsonic—Piston Engine Regime:

Examples: Military Aircraft: B–25 through B–29. Commercial Aircraft: DC–4/DC–7, Douglas; Constellation Series, Lockheed; Stratocruiser, Boeing; 202/404, Convair; 440, Martin.

3. High Subsonic—Jet Engine Regime:

Examples: Military Aircraft: B–45, No. Amer.; B–47, Boeing; B–52, Boeing; B–57, Martin.

Commercial Aircraft: 700 Series, Boeing; 880/990, Convair; DC–8/DC–9, Douglas.

4. Supersonic—Jet Engine Regime:

Examples: Military Aircraft: B–58, Convair; B–70, No. Amer.; SR–71, Lockheed.

Commercial Aircraft: SST, Boeing.

From this listing, it is apparent that with the exception of the last category several military aircraft in each category were produced and used in service in large quantities; and that more than one aircraft manufacturer was involved in both the military and commercial developments. From these facts it can be concluded that, although commercial development has been heavily subsidized in the past, the entire cost was not readily determined. Only the cost necessary to adapt existing knowledge to a particular commercial application was borne by the aircraft manufacturer. The U. S. Government paid the remainder under military defense expenditures.

In addition, technical knowledge associated with each flight regime was efficiently transferred between aircraft manufacturers through governmental agencies of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. (The visual and performance similarity between the Douglas DC–8 and the Boeing 707 is a striking example of the effectiveness of this transfer of knowledge.)

In the fourth flight regime, since changing military requirements have created a situation wherein the justification for supersonic manned bombers is questionable, the normal extensive military developmental programs have been severely restricted. As a consequence, the cost of development of the supersonic transport must be almost completely borne by the commercial design; hence, the cost appears not only exceedingly large, but to some people of questionable justification.

In order to attempt to minimize these costs, the Supersonic Transport Program Office has done two things, i.e., (1) narrowed the competing manufacturers down to one airplane manufacturer (Boeing) and one engine manufacturer (G.E.); and (2) spread the development costs so that the manufacturers involved, as well as commercial airline carriers, are assuming a minor portion of the risk (10%). This procedure has created a drastic break with past experience, in that we are creating an almost complete monopoly in the manufacture of commercial aircraft (it will be virtually impossible for other competing manufacturers to catch up with the technical headstart the Government is giving to Boeing and General Electric).

I suspect this may also be the reason for your stated reservation with respect to the preferred position of the selected manufacturers. I, also, have reservations about the long-term effect of this approach, but before I state my position let me present a summary discussion of the presently proposed program under the following categories: (1) Technical, (2) Operational, (3) Managerial, (4) Financial. I will then give you my personal conclusions and recommendations.

TECHNICAL

Although a large number of articles, both pro and con, have been written about the nature and severity of the technical problems involved in the development of the supersonic transport, I do not consider these problems to constitute the crucial problem area of the program. I do not intend by this statement to imply that the technical problems are easy to solve. To the contrary, there are and will be some rather difficult problems to resolve in the successful development of the jet engines; in the performance and handling qualities of the aircraft; in the choice and use of structural materials; and in creating an acceptable radiation environment for the passengers and crew. However, in none of these problem areas do I believe the proposed design is beyond the present state-of-art in technology.

You specifically mentioned in your letter concern for problems in stability of the aircraft clear air turbulence, and aerodynamic heating. In response I should like to point out that in re-entering manned space vehicles, both of these problems have been successfully solved under conditions more severe than that which the supersonic transport will need to tolerate.

To summarize, it is my personal opinion that, provided sufficient funds are available on a timely basis, the technical problems will not restrict or defeat the supersonic transport program.

OPERATIONAL

The operational problem areas are: (1) Sonic boom tolerance, (2) traffic control, and (3) route economics.

Experience to date seems to indicate a very low tolerance on the part of the public for sonic booms. Although there are flight planning techniques to minimize the intensity and prevalence of sonic booms, it is generally conceded that (barring some presently unknown techniques for attenuating sonic booms) the supersonic transport will be restricted to overwater flights only. However, when you consider the perennial Navy observation that three-quarters of the earth's surface is water, the restriction certainly cannot be a major factor in defeating the success of the program.

There is no doubt that the inclusion of the supersonic transport into the present air traffic control network will create control problems. However, a more severe problem in air traffic control is the sheer number of vehicles to control rather than their speeds. The volume of traffic problem must be solved, supersonic or not, since it is evident that the rate of growth of air traffic is far from leveling off. When the system for adequately handling the air traffic volumes of the future has been developed, the inclusion of (relatively) small numbers of supersonic transports into the same environment will be only a minor perturbation.

On the question of the validity of the route economics with respect to the supersonic transport, one can find all shades of opinion. United States studies conducted by personnel in the FAA and the Department of Commerce present a rather convincing case that the supersonic transport can and will be an economic success. However, one should pause to consider the arguments presented by BO K. O. Lundberg of Sweden.* Essentially, he challenges the argument that the public will use the supersonic transport primarily because it goes faster. My statement certainly is an over-simplification of his position, but I do believe that he vastly underestimates the intense desire of people in our time to "get there quickly."

It was this sort of logic that led Lockheed Aircraft to develop in a major way the turboprop transport (Electra) instead of taking the next step to the turbo-jet transport such as Boeing, Douglas, North American, and Convair did. This short-sighted management decision caused Lockheed Aircraft to lose leadership in the commercial transportation field which so far they have not regained.

A similar argument can be presented with respect to the "Concorde" versus our Supersonic Transport. I am sure that the British-French combine will make major gain in overseas public travel preference; but I am equally sure they will lose that gain as soon as the SST is available. Like the Electra, the Concorde will rapidly decline in use because of greater public preference for the faster jet transports.

MANAGERIAL

The Supersonic Transport Program presents management problems, not only from the standpoint of sheer size, but also the conflict which arises when the responsibility for development of this supersonic transport is included within the FAA. I am referring here to the problem that the FAA is *the* governmental agency responsible for certifying the airworthiness of all commercial transports, and yet must simultaneously be responsible for their development. Mr. Alan S. Boyd has stated that he plans to eventually remove the SST Program Office from the FAA and transfer it to another section of the Transportation Department. This is in the right direction, but basically only removes the conflict from within the FAA to some undetermined group within the Transportation Department. In an obviously accelerated development program with elements of national prestige at stake, I question whether or not this will be an effective solution.

FINANCIAL

Major General J. C. Maxwell has presented a strong case as to why the financial risk for development of the supersonic transport is far too great for private industry as separate corporations to undertake, and hence the Federal Government must subsidize the program. I do not question these arguments. They appear to be well founded. However, I do question the implied assumption that the risk must be taken by only one aircraft manufacturer and one engine manufacturer plus minor help from the major airlines. It is this assumption that forces the final conclusion that the major program risk *must* be borne by the U.S. Government. I don't believe it!

Representative Frank T. Bow (R-Ohio) has already proposed that a Supersonic Transport Development Authority be established by act of Congress to sell $1.5 billion in bonds and notes to finance the project. The Development Authority would later establish the Supersonic Transport Production Corporation to produce and sell the aircraft. In the Bow plan, investments in the Authority would be guaranteed by the U.S. Government. It was this last provision that probably led Budget Director Charles L. Schultze to state that under these arrangements the Government is assuming the entire risk rather than the 90% as presently proposed. Consequently, the Administration as represented by Mr. Schultze prefers the present financing arrangements with the manufacturers and airlines sharing 10% of the risk in order to provide "incentives to succeed" for private industry.

Perhaps I am overly naive, but I cannot see in these arguments any basic reason why the financial and organizational arrangements established for the Communications Satellite Corporation do not apply equally well to the Supersonic Transport Program. I see many similarities between the two development areas, and no fundamental reason why the same pattern of action cannot be applied here.

At this point, I have a sad feeling, wonderfully expressed by Voltaire when he apologized in the last paragraph of a three-page letter for not having sufficient time to write a brief letter. I hope this rather lengthy letter has not been too rambling, and that I have managed to get a few thoughts across in a convincing manner.

To summarize my conclusions:

(1) Technical: There are no technical problems which call for knowledge beyond the present state-of-the-art.

(2) Operational: The SST will probably be restricted to trans-oceanic flights, but should not present any problems greater than presently being or to be encountered by the high subsonic jets.

(3) Managerial: It is difficult to perceive how the fundamental management conflict in the development and activation of the SST can be resolved by moving the SST Program Office out of the FAA.

(4) Financial: I do not believe that the U.S. Government should bear the major portion of financial risk (90%) in order to create a manufacturing monopoly for Boeing and General Electric. Schemes such as the equivalent of COMSAT for the SST have not been fully and objectively explored.

(5) The SST program is already late in development, and hence should not be required to mark time while financial and managerial problems are resolved.

RECOMMENDATIONS

(1) The present budgetary request of the FAA for the Supersonic Transport Development should be essentially met, in order to avoid further delay in the development.

(2) However, the Congress, when it authorizes the requested funds, should establish a select committee to explore in detail and recommend an agency similar to the Communications Satellite Corporation for the purpose of financing and managing the development of the Supersonic Transport. (It is my understanding that the U.S. Government did not underwrite the financial risks of COMSAT, and I fail to see why the Government should do otherwise in the case of the Supersonic Transport.) If you are interested in this approach, I can furnish additional ideas on the composition and organization of an SST corporation.

If you're still with me—congratulations! I'll get this typed and in the mail. Hope you find it helpful.

As ever,

G. C. CLEMENTSON.

A RÉSUMÉ OF GERHARDT C. CLEMENTSON, LITTLETON, COLO.

Business experience: Space & Information Systems Division, North American Aviation, Inc., Downey, Calif.

S&ID (formerly called the Missile Division) is the division of NAA specializing the Space Vehicle Systems and Information Processing Systems. The major programs of this division are 1. the command and service modules of the Apollo Spacecraft, and 2. the second stage (S–II) of the Saturn 5 Launch Vehicle.

From 1964 to present: *Director—Engineering Computing and Simulation.*

Department of approximately three hundred engineers responsible for 1. physical simulation of man-machine interfaces in space vehicles, 2. central digital programming support for scientific problem solving, and 3. central digital programming support for development and monitoring engineering data handing systems such as wire listing and measurement listing. Currently—Manager, technical operations of the Falcon Research & Development Co.

From 1962 to 1964: *Technical Director—Apollo Space Sciences.*

Reported to the Vice President and Program Manager, Apollo Program. Responsible for and authorized to: 1. conduct studies on the scientific experiments appropriate to the Apollo Mission, 2. review and approve the selection and utilization of scientific and engineering consultants, 3. develop and maintain an interface with the scientific community on associated space science research programs, and 4. conduct scientific staff studies on technical problems as requested by the Apollo Program Manager.

From 1961 to 1962: *Director—Aerospace Technology.*

Responsible for all advanced engineering and research in support of division programs and bidding activity in the functional disciplines of Aerodynamics, Thermodynamics, Applied Mechanics, Materials, Space Physics, Power and Propulsion Systems and Structural Dynamics. Work was supported through: 1. NAA funded research, 2. contracted research, 3. advanced engineering in support of division programs and 4. bidding funds.

Management experience in the Air Force, 1955 to 1961: Faculty, USAF Academy, Colorado.

Professor and Head, Department of Aeronautics. Responsible for: 1. all phases of cadet instruction in the fields of thermodynamics and aerodynamics, including four prescribed and ten elective courses, 2. administration of programs for two wind tunnels, intensive aircraft power plant demonstration and other laboratory facilities. Direct supervision of eighteen officers, and nine civilian personnel.

From 1954 to 1955: Faculty, USAF Institute of Technology.

Assistant Professor of Electrical Engineering. Responsible for developing and teaching a program of study in automatic control theory.

From 1951 to 1954: Armament Laboratory, Wright Air Development Center, Ohio.

Chief, Fighter Systems Branch. Responsible for research and development in flight control and weapons control as applied to fighter type aircraft. . . . Supervised 40 project engineers.

From 1950 to 1951: *Technical Staff Officer, Armament Laboratory.*

Responsible for monitoring plans and programs in research and development of fighter flight and weapons control systems.

From 1945 to 1947: *Chief, Aerodynamics Section, Flight Test Division, Wright Field.*

Responsible for developing special flight test methods for measuring performance, stability and control factors. Functioned as test pilot as well as flight test engineer.

Flying experience: United States Air Force.

From 1947 to 1961: Supplemental flying duties—Command Pilot Rating, jet qualified.

---

* *Pros and Cons of Supersonic Aviation Relative to Gains or Losses in the Combined Time/Comfort Considerations.* BO K. O. Lundberg. Journal of the Royal Aeronautical Society, Sept. 1964.

From 1945 to 1947: Experimental Test Pilot . . . Flight Test Division. Wright-Patterson Air Field.

From 1942 to 1945: Operational pilot—4th Fighter Command (P-38's).

Education: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

From 1948 to 1950: *Degree of Doctor in Science in Instrumentation.*

Comprehensive program of studies in Instrumentation and Automatic Control. Doctoral dissertation . . . An investigation of the Power Spectral Density of Atmospheric Turbulence. Elected member of Sigma Xi.

From 1947 to 1948: *Degree of Master of Science in Aeronautical Engineering.*

Program of studies in aircraft dynamics and automatic control techniques. Master's thesis . . . The Pulse Technique for Determining Aircraft Performance Functions.

From 1944 to 1945: California Institute of Technology.

Degree of Master of Science, Program of studies of aerodynamics of compressible flow.

From 1938 to 1942: United States Military Academy.

Degree of Bachelor of Science. Program of studies in humanities, social sciences, basic sciences, and basic engineering.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12474) making appropriations for NASA for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to my colleague such time as he may desire, with the time not taken out of the limitation on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Chair recognizes the junior Senator from Washington.

CONGRESSIONAL ACTION ON MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS IGNORED BY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, earlier this week, the day before yesterday to be exact, the Congress completed legislative action on the military construction authorization bill for fiscal year 1968, the largest such bill to come before this body in many years. In defense of this measure, the then Assistant Secretary of Defense for Installations and Logistics, the Honorable Paul Ignatius, appeared before the Armed Services Committee as late as July 11, 1967, and stated:

> This year's program represents a substantial increase over the bill which we brought before your committee for fiscal year 1967. The major reasons for the greater size are twofold: First, a resumption of our long-range program to replace outmoded and inadequate facilities, and secondly, a return to our objective of providing regular increments of military family housing in annual military construction programs.
>
> The committee will recall from the fiscal year 1967 hearings, the program requested at that time was purposely held to austere levels in deference to our growing commitment in Southeast Asia and because of an increasing concern over inflationary tendencies in the construction industry. Only those projects which were clearly essential to meet operational schedules, to support new missions, or which were necessary for other compelling reasons were included. Many worthwhile replacements, particularly in the housing area, were postponed.
>
> As we promised the committee last year, we have been following the economic situation very closely and we have now concluded, after a review of key indices, that the inflationary trends of a year ago have abated to a point where the construction economy can both absorb and benefit from an increase in construction placements. It is in this context that the Secretary of Defense, on January 20, 1967, released for construction the fiscal year 1966 and all prior year projects which were deferred in December 1965.
>
> In this light, the fiscal year 1968 construction request reflects an upturn to the more realistic programming levels we consider must be established if we are to achieve long-range goals for modernizing our aging facilities inventory and improving the standards of living accommodations for military persons. The continued deferral of such improvements must inevitably lead to reduced efficiency in our operations and a weakening in the morale of our military forces. Moreover, because of the escalating costs for upkeep which must be borne if outmoded facilities are continued in use, the repeated postponement of such replacements is simply not good business.

Mr. Ignatius further stated:

> As in previous years, the selection of projects included in this year's bill has been accomplished in accordance with 5-year Defense programming procedures, and has been subjected to final review by the Secretary of Defense in conjunction with the fiscal year 1968 program/budget decision process. The construction proposals contained in the bill are necessary beginning in the fiscal year 1968 time frame to meet the broad objectives and missions of the Department of Defense which were outlined in the Secretary's comprehensive posture statement.

In light of this, Mr. President, it comes as a complete surprise that the Secretary of Defense announced late yesterday afternoon, without any consultation with the Congress so far as I know, that because of the uncertain state of Federal finances, he had taken steps to defer various military construction projects previously authorized and appropriated for by the Congress. Certainly, this casts grave doubt on the validity of the 1968 construction program which we have just approved after many days of hearings, study, and debate. I should like to read a memorandum Secretary McNamara prepared for the Secretaries of the military departments:

> Because of the uncertain state of federal finances, the following actions in respect to military construction contract awards will be put into effect immediately:
>
> 1. For all projects on which bids have been opened on or before October 9, 1967, awards shall be consummated in accordance with normal procedures.
>
> 2. For projects on which bids have not been opened as of October 9, 1967, the opening date shall be postponed until at least November 9, 1967. However, each such project shall be reviewed by the Secretary of the Department concerned, and any which are clearly associated with new weapons systems, or in direct support of Southeast Asia, may be approved for earlier opening. Any others which a Secretary desires to open because of exceptional circumstances shall be referred to Mr. Nitze or me for approval on an individual basis.
>
> 3. Effective October 9, 1967, no new invitations for bids shall be issued except for those projects clearly associated with new weapons systems or in direct support of Southeast Asia, as approved by the Secretary of a Military Department. Any other exceptions recommended by a Secretary will be referred to Mr. Nitze or me for approval on an individual basis.

This, of course, is not the first time Secretary McNamara has taken this position in regard to military construction matters and if I may, I should like to review the situation during the recent past. When the military construction authorization bill for fiscal year 1965 was before the Senate Armed Services Committee for consideration, responsible witnesses of the Defense Establishment offered assurances, as they did this year, that the authorization requested and contained in that bill was for construction to support the latest approved programs which should be in place no later than fiscal year 1967. We were told that their requests represented their most urgent construction needs. That bill was signed into law on August 1, 1964, and on November 19, 1964, with little prior notice to the Congress, the Secretary of Defense announced 95 actions to consolidate, reduce, or discontinue altogether Department of Defense activities in the United States and overseas. Surprisingly enough, several construction projects had been included in the recently approved construction bill for installations that were announced for closing.

The following year, when the fiscal year 1966 construction bill was before the committee for consideration, we were again assured that the projects included in that bill represented the fiscal year 1966 segment of the approved 5-year plan and must be in place not later than 1968. The bill finally agreed upon by the Congress contained a provision designed to assure some advance notice to the Congress of any future base closures proposed by the Department of Defense. This bill was signed into law on September 16, 1965. On December 21, 1965, however, and again with little advance notice to the Congress, the Secretary of Defense announced the indefinite deferral of 50 percent of the recently approved construction bill for a total of $620 million. This program included among other things many badly needed barracks and bachelor officer spaces so necessary to the welfare of the troops.

In considering the fiscal year 1967 program, the committee found itself in the strange if not almost untenable position of being asked to pass upon many construction projects that seemed to be of secondary importance to many of those that had been deferred. There had been no assurance forthcoming that the fiscal year 1966 funds would be released for the construction of those deferred projects. Therefore, the Congress found it necessary to include a provision in the fiscal year 1967 bill designed to prevent the execution of the construction authorized in that bill prior to that authorized in previous years that had been deferred.

Perhaps our efforts at that time did bear a little fruit because on January 20, 1967, Secretary McNamara did rescind the December 1965 order deferring the award of contracts for more than 550 military construction projects and 8,250 units of family housing totaling $564,000,000. At that time he indicated the action taken would have a beneficial effect upon morale in the Armed Forces, satisfy valid construction and housing requirements, and have a salutary effect on the construction industry. But this is not all, Mr. President. The military construction bill for fiscal year 1968 was submitted to the Congress on March 9, of this year, and it is my understanding that within a matter of hours before the budget was submitted to the Congress, $1 billion in additional projects was added to the budget, again to aid the lagging construction industry. This was evident to those of us who were called upon to review the program by the many projects contained therein that did not appear to be urgent, or in some instances even essential, with the result that the Congress denied over $327 million of the authority requested for the fiscal year 1968. During consideration of this measure I—and I am reasonably sure other Members of the Senate—was approached on various occasions by high departmental officials urging support of various programs they thought might be in jeopardy.

Now, Mr. President, it seems to me that this body has been very valiant and forthright in its efforts year after year to obtain from the Department of Defense the basic salient facts upon which to base a sound judgment in regard to the annual military construction program. It is indeed discouraging if not frustrating to be called upon to spend hours and days in considering a program that in the final analysis seems to be of dubious importance to the Department of Defense. It might be assumed that if the fiscal year 1966 program, and now the fiscal year 1967 program, can be deferred at the will of the Secretary of Defense, they must not be of great urgency and the fiscal year 1968 program can be considered in the same light, and I trust that the Appropriations Committees that have not yet acted on the latter program, will give the funding requests the most careful attention they deserve under the circumstances.

Personally, I do not consider the military construction program to be an unimportant one and I feel that the health and welfare of our fighting men are being subordinated for economic reasons, either real or imaginary. Certainly I do not oppose the deferral of those projects that turn out not to be of great urgency and there will always be some in this category even though we have tried to eliminate them from the program. But to make an arbitrary deferral of all projects within the United States, which would presumably include those recently approved in the fiscal year 1968 program, is in my opinion a dangerous procedure. For example, we took lengthy testimony on the need for a buffer zone around the Concord Naval Weapons Station, Port Chicago, Calif., and provided $19,800,000 as a downpayment to relieve this grave safety hazard. Are programs such as this to be jeopardized?

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Washington yield at that point?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I have followed the statement of the Senator with great interest, and I am in full accord with what the Senator has said.

As the Senator knows, this is my first year as chairman of the Military Appropriations Subcommittee. We have worked together for, I believe, a period of some 2 weeks meeting both in the morning and in the afternoon, hearing the requests from the military, and actually being urged time and time again to accede to their requests.

My problem—I am looking to the Senator from Washington for guidance on this question—is, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Construction, what do I do now? We will soon be at the point of holding a hearing and then to the markup stage. As chairman of the subcommittee what do I do in this situation? Whom can I believe as to what the needs are for the military? Can the distinguished Senator give me some guidance with respect to this matter?

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, first I wish to say, as I have said before, that the able senior Senator from Nevada, who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Construction of the Committee on Appropriations, did a tremendous job in teaming up with the subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services, not only in connection with the hearings but also in the actual markup of the authorization bill which has been sent to the White House.

I must say that his counsel, advice, and assistance—ably assisted by his very competent staff director, Mr. Mike Rexroad and Gordon Nease of my subcommittee—played an invaluable part in trying to reach the decision at which we arrived in making a substantial cut in the authorization requests.

The normal thing one would do under the circumstances would be to call in the Defense Department representatives and ask them, "What projects are you going to fund?" But I must confess that after the experience I have related on the floor today, going back not just to this week but over several years as well, I do not believe the Senator can rely on the representations that they will make to his subcommittee. My advice would be not to take any action, except as to the items that relate directly to the war in Vietnam.

Mr. BIBLE. That is exactly the problem I face. This is my first year as chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Construction. The distinguished Senator from Mississippi preceded me in this position and has far more ability and knowledge in this field, because he also serves on the Committee on Armed Services.

It occurred to me, in reading the release from Secretary McNamara of October 5, that it might be well to limit our appropriations hearings to actually two classes—those items that are clearly associated with the new weapons system or in direct support of Southeast Asia; because it appears to me that what the Secretary said in his release is that this is all he is going to put under contract, in any event.

Mr. JACKSON. I would amend my earlier comments to say that, of course, it should include those items related to our strategic defense posture, both offensive, and defensive. That, of course, includes the proposed ABM program and our Minuteman sites.

Mr. BIBLE. As the Senator knows, there are items—that are needed and justified items—as additional support for our three great military academies, and they are certainly in this picture, in view of the buildup in Southeast Asia. I am wondering whether one hears the witnesses in support of those items—in view of this directive.

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator raises a proper question.

I might also call to the Senator's attention—because he took such a keen interest in it—that we had the problem before us of the Concord Naval Weapons Station at Port Chicago, Calif. This project relates directly to the safety of several hundred people. As I read this directive, this item in the amount of $19.8 million is frozen. This is a situation in which the Navy is now violating its own safety standards.

They have requested, as the Senator knows, the money to take over surrounding lands, including the town of Port Chicago in order to provide a buffer zone. As I read this directive, what will be done about that? This is a matter affecting the safety of people living in that area, and no exceptions have been provided.

This is not a matter that comes under the heading of support for South Vietnam. This is one of the regularly established military installations. If, however, the point is stretched with respect to items directly related to the support of South Vietnam, most of military installations in the United States are involved.

Mr. BIBLE. We certainly need additional guidelines. As I move forward into the military construction appropriations bill, I shall have to lean very heavily on the advice of the Senator from Washington, who has the expertise in this field, because we do not know whom to believe now.

Mr. JACKSON. We cannot rely on the representations that have been made to us.

I believe the distinguished Senator from Nevada would agree with me that we do want to save money wherever we can. But we were told, right down to the last minute, right to the time of the confernce, that they needed the money for all the projects requested. On the Senate side we had cut the buget, as the able Senator will recall, by a little over 14 percent, yet we were advised continuously by representatives of the Department of Defense that they needed all the money requested.

We tried to find out where we could reduce the bill. We tried over and over again to find what items we could postpone or defer, what items we could eliminate. We were just told, "This is the budget, and we want you to support it."

Mr. President, it seems to me that what has happened here is a breakdown of consultation between the Department of Defense and the appropriate committees of Congress. This discussion on the floor of the Senate would not be taking place at this time if the Department of Defense, through its appropriate representatives, had come to us and said there has been a change since July 11, when Assistant Secretary Ignatius made a statement before our committee in which he said that all these items are essential and necessary. We would have made whatever adjustments should have been made under the circumstances.

Every member of the committee is trying to save money. This is our objective. We wanted to cut any fat that was in the body of the defense program, without interfering with the muscle; and we made a diligent search to find where those items might be.

Now we are confronted with a situation—as I read the third paragraph of the Secretary's directive, that virtually all the items we have approved are being deferred. Why could not this information have been made available to us prior to our markup on the bill? Certainly, nothing has happened in the last few days that would give reason to take the action that has been taken by the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. President, I wish to say, for myself, that I strongly support the President of the United States in every move he makes in trying to save money. Yes, I support the President of the United States in his request for some kind of an appropriate tax increase.

I must say that to have this type of procedure develop on the part of the Department of Defense at this time is most disheartening to me, because it is exactly the wrong way to deal with the U.S. Senate.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I believe it would be well to add to this most forthright discussion of Department of Defense inconsistencies the priority list that the Department submitted to the House of Representatives.

I note that many of the high priority items will be deferred, according to the latest directive.

Mr. JACKSON. Yes.

Mr. INOUYE. Where is the priority?

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, my good friend from Hawaii, who has made so many valuable contributions to our deliberations as a member of the Subcommittee on Military Construction and has put his finger on the whole question of what we can and cannot rely upon as far as representations being made by the Department of Defense. I think the answer is, a priority list from the Department of Defense does not mean a thing any more, because not only are the priority lists that are submitted of little value, the overall representation as to the projects that are absolutely essential and necessary in connection with support of our Armed Forces leaves us in doubt.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one question?

Mr. JACKSON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. INOUYE. For purposes of clarification, who will decide whether a project is directly related to the conflict in Vietnam?

Mr. JACKSON. As I read the memorandum, the Secretary of Defense will make that decision. He will receive recommendations from the service secretaries involved or, if not, the Secretary of Defense will make the decision, or, his deputy, as I read the directive.

The pertinent part of the directive that applies, as I interpret it, to the authorization bill which we have just sent to the White House, is paragraph 3 of his memorandum of 5 October. That paragraph reads as follows:

> Effective October 9, 1967, no new invitations for bids shall be issued except for those projects clearly associated with new weapons systems or in direct support of Southeast Asia, as approved by the Secretary of a Military Department. Any other exceptions recommended by a Secretary shall be referred to Mr. Nitze or me for approval on an individal basis.

Mr. President, I would hope and trust that this will be the last time—and I am afraid it will not be—that we will have to take a matter of this kind to the floor of the Senate to point out what happens when an important segment of the executive branch of Government fails to be forthright and fails to consult the Congress. All of this could have been avoided.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12474) making appropriations for NASA for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In accordance with the order previously entered, the Chair recognizes the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, before we begin to consider the NASA appropriation bill, I wish to make a statement for the RECORD which I am sure the present occupant of the chair [Mr. SPONG] will be interested in.

The Langley Research Center of NASA, located at Hampton, Va., is celebrating this week its 50th anniversary. This is a reminder to us that the marvelous achievements in aeronautics and astronautics that have been made are not forced by any crash program, but are the result of half a century of progress in research and development attained through the dedication and ingenuity of leading scientists and engineers over the years. As unlikely as it seems, the Saturn V rocket, soon to be tested and for which funds are included in this bill, had its genesis in the experiments of Dr. Samuel Pierpont Langley and of Wilbur and Orville Wright on heavier-than-air biplanes.

Langley was the first laboratory of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, in 1917, others were added after 1938, and all of them were included as the nucleus of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in 1958.

Langley pioneered with X-1 to explore transonic and supersonic speeds of rocket planes, and just this week the X-15 has achieved a record speed of 4,534 miles per hour.

Other and more detailed accomplishments are set out in the press release from NASA of October 1.

Mr. President, on this 50th anniversary of Langley Research Center of NASA, at Hampton, Va., I ask unanimous consent that this press release be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[A National Aeronautics and Space Administration news release, Oct. 1, 1967]

LANGLEY 50TH ANNIVERSARY

On Oct. 7, 1903, Charles M. Manley, chief assistant to Samuel Pierpont Langley, was launched from a houseboat on the Potomac in a heavier-than-air machine that was designed to fly. It sank.

Sixty-eight days later a similar wood and canvas contraption, designed by a pair of bicycle mechanics, Wilbur and Orville Wright, shot down the sands at Kitty Hawk, N.C., stayed in the air for 3.5 seconds and covered a distance of 105 feet.

A few weeks from now a sleek rocket, the Saturn V, 365 feet tall and with a thrust comparable to 160 million horsepower, will take off from Cape Kennedy, Fla., on a test flight in preparation for this country's first trip to the Moon and back.

As unlikely as it seems, the Saturn V had its genesis in the Langley and Wright machines.

The journey from the first biplanes to supersonic aircraft and space vehicles was exciting, arduous and rewarding. Credit for the success of man's conquest of the air and space must go in large part to the work done at the research center, later named after Dr. Langley, located in Hampton, Va.

In recognition of Langley Research Center's contribution to the advancement of the United States in aeronautics and astronautics, the first week of October has been set aside by Presidential proclamation to commemorate 50 years of service to the Nation.

From 1917 to 1938, Langley, as the single laboratory of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, provided the facilities and scientific brainpower necessary to keep the nation in the vanguard of aviation progress. As other research centers were established across the country after 1938, Langley staff members provided the leadership to make them work. When the National Aeronautics and Space Administration was established in 1958, it was built largely around NACA and the experience gained at Langley.

Langley has assisted in increasing the speed of the airplane from less than 100 miles-per-hour to more than 4,000 miles-per-hour. It has helped man conquer the air and move toward mastery of the infinite space above the atmosphere.

Its milestones include:

The development in the 1920's of a cowling for air-cooled engines, a streamlining effect credited with increasing the speeds of airplanes of that period from 12 to 15 per cent; an innovation that made possible the use of engines of much higher horsepower;

The accumulation of scientific data and technical competence that increased the performance and utility of aircraft used in World War II;

The conception in the 1940's of research planes leading to history-making advancements at supersonic and hypersonic speeds;

The design, development, and practical application in the '50's of the world's first transonic wind tunnels which bridged the technological gap in research facilities between subsonic and supersonic speeds;

The discovery and verification of the Area Rule, a revolutionary idea concerning the configuration of aircraft;

The development of much of the technology for a practical supersonic commercial air transport plane.

Langley continues in its aeronautical researches, working on current and future concepts of hypersonic flight, advanced supersonic aircraft, helicopters, vertical takeoff and landing and short takeoff and landing aircraft (VTOL/STOL), and support services for the exploration of space.

If Dr. Langley were alive today he would be gratified by the nation's space program. He would also have a part in it. He had from his earliest years been interested in astronomy. For many years he was interested in research as Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution. He and his brother John built from scratch a telescope with a five-foot focal length and a seven-inch mirror. They polished and discarded 20 mirrors before they fabricated one that met their standards.

Later, at the Allegheny Observatory, he made drawings that served for years as classic sunspot representations. Having realized early the limitations placed on astrophysics by the blanketing layer of Earth's atmosphere, he attempted to overcome them first by trying to find a constant that would represent the filtering atmosphere of the Earth, and later by moving instruments to the tops of mountains where this effect would be minimized.

In order to explore the physics of outer space further he invented the boloscope, a device that could measure temperature differences of 1/100,000 of one degree Centigrade. With this instrument he extended the spectrum to a point until then undreamed of.

It was not until he was 50 years old that he launched a new career in aerodynamics.

The credit for flying the first heavier-than-air machine was hotly disputed by followers of the Wright brothers and Langley for many years, but time eventually dulled the dispute and all of the figures involved were given due credit.

Disputes were not unusual in the history of aviation progress.

Attempts to end NACA's existence as an independent agency were made with regularity. It was proposed at varying intervals that NACA's facilities and functions be transferred to the Navy, the Army, the Bureau of Standards, the War Department and the Department of Commerce.

The Langley laboratory also suffered its share of natural disasters. Wooden buildings, hangars and wind tunnels were beset by fires, and storms and floods took their toll. Langley, however, pushed aviation progress ahead in the face of adversity in politics, natural disasters, and a shortage of funds during the Great Depression of the 30's.

A five-foot wind tunnel was opened in 1920. In many ways, the development of the airplane has been the development of the wind tunnel, and Langley consistently has pioneered in these devices, extending with each new one the range of aerodynamic testing that can be done on the ground.

Langley's first wind tunnel was not unusual. It was modeled after one in use at the British National Physical Laboratory. Similar models were in use by the Army, Navy and various engineering schools. Its operation was quite simple: it directed a stream of air across a model airplane, where gages measured the stresses.

By the following year it was decided that a new kind of wind tunnel was needed, one using compressed air. It was known for some time that a model's behavior differed from that of a full-scale airplane. By raising the air pressure in the wind tunnel this difference in the effects of scale was overcome. As a result of tests in this so-called "variable density" wind tunnel, NACA studied the feasibility of jet propulsion some 25 years before the first jet airplane flew.

In 1927, a tunnel known as the propeller research tunnel, large enough to test full-scale parts, was put into operation. It had a 20-foot test section through which air flowed at 110 miles-per-hour. This tunnel, the world's largest at that time, allowed aerodynamic tests on full-scale propellers, fuselages, landing gear and other aircraft parts.

The most dramatic breakthrough achieved by this equipment was what came to be known as the NACA cowling. A steamlined covering for radial air-cooled engines, the cowling reduced the drag created by exposed engine parts. Because it greatly improved cooling, it permitted much larger engines of greater power.

In its 1928 report, NACA stated, "by the application of the results of this study to a Curtiss AT–5A Army pursuit training plane, the maximum speed was increased from 118 to 137 mph. This is equivalent to providing approximately 83 additional horsepower without additional weight or cost of engine, fuel consumption, or weight of structure." For this achievement, NACA was awarded the Collier Trophy for 1928.

Another benefit from the propeller research tunnel was the location of engine nacelles on the leading edges of wings, rather than slung beneath them as had been the previous practice. This resulted in important speed gains. The amount of drag on fixed landing gear was also accurately determined.

Throughout the 1930's, aviation continued its advance. The shape of wings and airplane bodies all over the world were determined by the knowledge gained at Langley. And when World War II came, the information acquired over the years at this NACA facility contributed mightily to America's superior wartime air power.

Elaborately instrumented research rocket planes were carried above the atmosphere, where the density of the air was low, to explore transonic and supersonic speeds. Starting with the spectacular flight of the X–1 and progressing through the more and more advanced models, speed and altitude records were broken again and again. Langley shared the Collier Trophy with Bell Aircraft and the U.S. Air Force for this pioneering research in 1947. Today the X–15, latest in the series, has achieved speeds over 4,000 miles-per-hour and altitudes of more than 354,000 feet.

Langley was honored with the Collier Trophy again in 1951 for the development and practical application of the transonic wind tunnel, a facility that bridged the gap which once existed in wind tunnel research in the range from high subsonic speeds to those just above the speed of sound.

Langley's fourth Collier Trophy was won in 1954 for the discovery and experimental verification of the Area Rule.

Essentially, the Area Rule is a method to balance in a rational way the lengthwise distribution of volume of fuselage and wings in order to produce an airplane with minimum drag at transonic speeds.

Slight modifications of the shape of the airplane fuselage can result in highly-improved performance. For example, a fighter plane prototype was unable in tests to achieve supersonic speed. With slight modifications indicated by the Area Rule, a gain in speed as much as 25 per cent was attained.

Today, Langley continues to improve the speed and versatility of aircraft. Some of its objectives are improved helicopters for urban travel up to 100 miles, short takeoff and landing aircraft for interurban travel up to about 500 miles, and improvements in subsonic jet transports to allow short runway operation.

Work is going forward on the supersonic airplane, and in the more distant future for an airplane designed to go more than five times the speed of sound—the hypersonic airplane.

Langley was the birthplace of Project Mercury, the first United States manned space flight project. It was instrumental in some of the key research in support of the successful Gemini project and the Apollo program, now just getting under way.

Langley research contributed to the Echo passive communication satellites. Once launched into orbit, a large aluminum-covered mylar plastic balloon automatically inflated and was used to bounce electronic signals from one point on Earth down to another. Line-of-sight electronic transmission is generally restricted to about 150 miles; by means of Echo satellites, this range was extended to span oceans and continents. In addition, regularly published reports of the transit of the Echo balloon allowed people all over the world to see their first man-made satellite move across the night sky.

Langley also took part in the development of the versatile Scout rocket, first all-solid-fueled launch vehicle to put a satellite in orbit, and the management of Lunar Orbiter, a spacecraft which circled and helped map the Moon. Lunar Orbiter was successful in five launches on five attempts.

Mercury models were tested in Langley's wind tunnels. Tests varied from static stability studies on full-scale models to drag and heat transfer investigations on models weighing less than a ping-pong ball.

The research center is supporting project Apollo through the use of unique simulators and specialized laboratories, designed to enable the country to gain on the ground experience of the rigors of outer space.

The experience and accomplishments gained at Langley, combined with the availability at one location of an array of specialized laboratory facilities and equipment at Hampton, is unique. Langley today constitutes a vital national resource for the future conduct of advanced research and technology programs in aeronautics and the manned and unmanned exploration of space.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, H.R. 12474 provides appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for 1968. Such appropriations normally would have been included in H.R. 9960, making appropriations for independent offices and the Department of Housing and Urban Development, which was passed by the Senate on September 21. But when the House reported that bill on May 12, 1967, funds for NASA were omitted because the required authorization had not been enacted. The authorization was approved on August 21, and is contained in Public Law 90–67. The House then passed this appropriation bill on August 22.

The amount of the bill as reported to the Senate is $4,678,900,000, which is an increase of $95,500,000 over the House, but is under the estimates by $421,100,000, is under the 1967 appropriations by $289,100,000 and is under the authorizations for 1968 by $186,851,000.

There are three items of appropriations in the bill: Research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations.

For "Research and development," the bill provides $3,995,500,000, which is an increase of $96,000,000 over the House, but is under the estimates by $356,500,000, is under the 1967 appropriations by $249,500,000 and is under the authorization by $152,065,000.

For "Construction of facilities," the bill provides $55,400,000, which is an increase of $19,500,000 over the House, but is under the estimates by $21,300,000, is under the 1967 appropriations by $27,600,000 and is under the authorization by $14,580,000.

Mr. President, these are line items that are referred to in the report.

For "Administrative operations," the bill provides $628,000,000, which is a reduction below the House of $20,000,000, and is under the estimates by $43,300,000, is under the 1967 appropriations by $12,000,000 and is under the authorization by $20,206,000.

Mr. President, the increases recommended by the committee are in the following programs:

Apollo applications was increased by the committee by $35 million; Voyager was increased by $36 million; nuclear rockets was increased by $10 million; Nuclear Rocket Development Station, which must be considered with nuclear rocket programs, was increased by $19.5 million. This will allow forward progress on both Nerva I and Nerva II.

In addition, tracking and data acquisition, which is required to operate the system efficiently, and to assure maximum safety for the astronauts when they are in space, and permit the monitoring of other space vehicles, was increased by the Senate by $15 million, making total increases of $115.5 million.

The committee then recommended the decrease, which I mentioned, of $20 million for administrative operations, thus resulting in a net increase of $95.5 million over the House bill.

This, Mr. President, briefly states the amounts which the Senate committee considered essential.

I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments to H.R. 12474 be agreed to en bloc; that the bill, as so amended, be considered as original text for the purpose of further amendment; and that no points of order be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 2, line 11, after the word "Administration", strike out "$3,899,500,000" and insert $3,995,500,000".

On page 2, line 18, after the word "law", strike out "$35,900,000" and insert "$55,000,000".

On page 3, line 6, after the word "property", strike out "$648,000,000" and insert "$628,000,000".

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I support the recommendations of the Senate Appropriations Committee for NASA's fiscal year 1968 appropriations. I extend my compliments to the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], for the excellent work that they, and their colleagues, both on the subcommittee and the full committee, have performed in reporting out this bill.

The committee has reviewed at length NASA's fiscal year 1968 budget request and has recommended a very realistic budget, taking into consideration the great demands on our resources being made at the present time. This can be attested to by the fact that the committee is recommending a total amount which is $421,100,000 below the administration's request for fiscal year 1968 and $186,851,000 below the total amount authorized by the Congress for NASA for fiscal year 1968 earlier this year. If this bill is approved, NASA will be faced with carrying out a very austere aeronautical and space program for fiscal year 1968. I feel, however, despite the austerity, that NASA can move forward to develop the technologies in space necessary for our Nation to maintain its leadership.

A nation of our stature cannot afford to lag in any major technology. Neither can we afford to surrender our leadership in space technology freely to others. We need only be mindful of the Nation's despair on October 4, 1957, only 10 years ago, to recognize the truth of this assertion. As a great nation we must acquire and retain a preeminent position in aeronautics and space, and this requires that we command the great technologies of our time.

Our space program has been directed to achieve specific goals. In striving to reach these goals we have learned to command space technology and have turned our efforts to constructive ends. These ends are the scientific exploration of space to acquire new knowledge necessary to the advancement of civilization. I cannot identify the new knowledge we will acquire but that new truths remain to be discovered and that we are on the threshold of a scientific and technological revolution no one can doubt. History recalls that the first inkling of nuclear energy was gained from man's observing his universe. He knew that the amounts of energy radiated from the stars and his sun could not be produced by any mechanism known here on earth. In his search to explain the production of the energy of the stars, he developed the first theories of atomic and then nuclear energy.

Only recently we have again discovered energy sources in our universe which are difficult to explain with our current knowledge, but it has started men thinking and you can be assured that the future will provide the theory to explain these tremendous sources of energy. All of us here today will agree that the United States of America should be the leader in these discoveries. Only through support of programs aimed at gaining this new knowledge for mankind can such discoveries be made. Basically, this is what the space program does.

The Senate Appropriations Committee in their deliberations of this bill have carefully considered the recommendations of the other House. We found that in some instances the House had cut too deeply; so we restored some funds.

For example, NASA requested $297.7 million for their tracking and data acquisition program. The Congress authorized $290 million but the House in cutting the research and development budget recommended only $260 million. Our worldwide tracking and data acquisition system simply cannot be run efficiently at that level. Moreover, the Administrator of NASA, the Honorable James E. Webb, testified that to provide adequately for the safety of the astronauts, he must have at least another $15 million in that program. Therefore, the Senate committee has recommended that $15 million be added to the research and development budget for the tracking and data acquisition program.

The committee believed, however, that at the level of appropriations being recommended, less money was necessary for administrative operations and, therefore, recommends a $20 million cut in that appropriation.

Mr. President, earlier this year the Senate authorizing committee analyzed in great detail NASA's program and the Congress authorized a program for NASA of about $4,866 million. The Senate Appropriations Committee now has carefully reviewed this program again in light of today's fiscal requirements as well as the reductions made by the House. The bill the committee has recommended to the Senate is sound. It provides our Nation with a strong program in aeronautics and space. It provides the means for our country to retain its leadership in these important areas of science and technology. Mr. President, I fully support the recommendations of the committee and strongly urge my colleagues to vote for this bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, we have a unanimous-consent agreement on a time limitation on these proposed amendments. I understand that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] has an amendment at the desk.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Colorado first, and then will yield to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] for the purpose of presenting his amendment.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's yielding to me. I was not informed that a unanimous-consent agreement had been made.

Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado will state it.

Mr. ALLOTT. What is the unanimous-consent agreement which has been entered into?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That after the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] yields the floor, there will be one-half hour on each amendment to be equally divided, after which there will be 1 hour on the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] on the general aspects of the pending bill will not be included in the time limitation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, at this time I have no intention of making a long statement about the bill. It has caused us as much concern as any bill ever has, partially because of the very late authorization for it, it was not included in the independent offices appropriations bill.

For the sake of the record, let me repeat some of the figures that the Senator from Washington has given.

The amount of the bill passed by the House was $4,583,000,000, and as reported by the Senate, $4,678,900,000. It is $289,100,000 under the appropriations for 1967, which were $4,968,000,000.

The budget estimate was amended to $5,100,000,000 so that the bill as reported by the committee—and I think this should be borne in mind—is $421,100,000 under the estimate for 1968 as amended.

It is under the authorization by $186,851,000—almost $200 million.

These figures were not arrived at with any ease by the committee. I think for the moment the only thing that I really want to point out can be capsulized into two or three points.

First, we did receive the advice and consultation of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], who is chairman of the Space Committee, not only throughout the hearings but also throughout the markup of the bill itself.

Joining him in that was the ranking minority member, the very distinguished and charming lady from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], whose knowledge of this particular area is probably unsurpassed by anyone in the Senate. So that with these two advising and working with us all the way through, and with the many, many long hours which the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and I and others spent on the space program, plus three separate hearings which extended over many months, I think that we have given the bill as careful, thorough, and thoughtful consideration as any bill which has ever come before the Senate.

The second point I should like to make is that there is one amendment before the Senate, in two parts, attempting to cut the bill. Senators should decide very carefully what they want to do with it. I would call their attention to the fact that when the space program was started—at the time everyone, in 1957, was in a state of alarm over Sputnik I, which was the beginning of the space program—and then with the election of President Kennedy—and I may refer later to some remarks he made—we engaged in a program to make a moon landing during the 1960's. In fact, this was a Presidential commitment to do this by President Kennedy. It was a commitment which the country as a whole gathered up, accepted, and was greatly enthusiastic over.

Undoubtedly, it will be argued that today is a new day and there is a different situation in the country. That is true. We did not face a $29 billion deficit then. We did face a substantial deficit at that time, as we had during all those years.

Yet the country committed itself. There were those of us at that time, and I think the record will disclose in the hearings on the independent offices bill back in those early years, questions by the senior Senator from Colorado as to whether the decision to place a man on the moon at any time, not alone during the 1960's, was not something which should be considered and studied, and the advice of independent scientists obtained to the fullest extent, in order to determine whether this was a really legitimate goal for the United States, considering all of its aspects, considering the risks we took in competition with Russia concerning the development of the Russian space program, and considering the cost of the program.

I must say, at that time, the scientists in this country who had the knowledge to speak out, did not speak out.

It is only in the last year or two that we have found a few willing to come out of the woodwork and say they did not think this was really a reasonable goal and aim of the United States. So we explored this question as much as we could during those times. I think it is perhaps unfortunate that at this stage and time we have responsible men criticizing the program who could have and should have at that time made their voices heard and given the Members of the Congress of the United States, who, by and large, are not scientists, the opportunity to hear them and take advantage of what knowledge they have.

So the United States did engage itself in this program, To do so, we have had to develop technologies in hundreds of fields—I should say thousands of fields. This technology has gone on. It has involved developing all kinds of booster vehicles and all kinds of capsules. It has involved one great tragedy which brought sorrow to all of us, and particularly those who had known these men.

We have developed the Titan booster series, which lifted all of the Gemini series successfully into the air and brought them back home. We have developed the Saturn I engine, which has a very great capability. We now have a Titan III–C and a Titan III–M, which is based upon the same strap-on principle as the Titan III–C, which has not yet been tested, but which has every indication of a very potential vehicle.

Beyond that, we have the Saturn V rocket, the huge booster which is the one which will finally lift, we hope, our men into space to a manned landing on the moon and bring them home safely.

So this is a sort of résumé of where we stand, looking at it objectively, and not looking at it emotionally in any sense of the word.

I can understand those who disagree with the figures in this particular bill, but I say to Members of the Senate and to others who hear my voice that this bill represents, in our opinion, the best bill we can bring out which simply does not throw out developed machinery, technology, knowledge, and hardware into the trash can, and provides a reasonable look into the future without committing ourselves to endless manned explorations in space.

It was a hard decision for the committee. It was a hard decision when the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] worked upon the authorization bill. But what we have here—and I want to emphasize it—is a bill which, in my opinion, provides a lucid, reasonable, sound application and use of all the science and technology and hardware we have developed and ordered, without committing ourselves to just untold billions of dollars in the area of manned exploration of space which some people seem to desire. This appropriation will enable us to go ahead without sacrificing what we have gained and what we have learned; and I think this is the decision which governed our committee in our deliberations.

I hope the amendment will be rejected. I shall probably speak on it later, but I emphasize again that this was the basis upon which the committee made its decision.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator from Colorado for the fine work he has done. I think he understands the facts involved. He has a very strong opinion on wanting to do the things which ought to be done. I thank him very much for his contributions. As far as I am concerned, he has performed exceptionally fine service for the people.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator very much. I yield the floor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I now yield to the Senator from Wisconsin for the purpose of offering and discussing his amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 383

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 383, and ask unanimous consent that the amendment not be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Amendment No. 383 is as follows:

On page 2, line 12, strike "$3,995,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,914,500,000".

On page 2, line 18, strike "$55,400,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$35,900,000".

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] be added as a cosponsor of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in essence, my proposal would cut funds added to the bill by the Senate Appropriations Committee over and above the amount approved by the House with one exception. The Proxmire amendment would not touch an additional $15 million provided by the Senate Appropriations Committee for tracking and data acquisition. These funds are necessary, in the words of the committee, to "operate the system efficiently and to assure maximum safety for the astronauts."

That addition by the Senate Appropriations Committee would not be eliminated. It would be kept in the bill if my amendment were successful.

Frankly, I was strongly tempted to try to cut even more from the bill as reported to the floor of the Senate. I think an excellent case could be made for slicing $200 to $300 million from the bill. However, I wanted to give a number of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have expressed their concern over excessive Federal spending a chance to vote for a moderate, reasonable, unquestionably sound amendment that at the most would simply mean the postponement for a relatively short period of time of post-moon projects. I stress post-moon projects, after what we do after we approach the moon.

Furthermore, I wanted to give my colleagues a chance to support the President's effort to cut spending in this area, because the President has gone on record in favor of the cuts made by the House of Representatives in the space budget—the very cuts that my amendment would preserve.

I say this position of the President should have special force—it certainly does with me—in causing us to divert some funds which would go to the space program. The President told me that, if he had his preference, the space program would go ahead at full tilt, as the administration originally requested, but he recognizes the great need for paring programs wherever they can be cut. Therefore, he very reluctantly acceded to the position taken by the House Appropriations Committee in August when it cut the space program.

On August 21, 1967, when President Johnson signed the space authorization bill he referred to the cuts made in the fiscal 1968 space program by the House Appropriations Committee as cuts that "under other circumstances I would have opposed." But, the President went on to say:

> The times demand responsibility from us all.
>
> Every Federal dollar must be scrutinized by the Congress before it is appropriated and by the Executive branch before it is spent. And in the process some hard choices must be made. The test is to distinguish between the necessary and the desirable.
>
> To reach our expenditure reduction target will not be easy, for the January budget was lean. By working together with the Congress we will pursue that goal . . . Our task is to pare the desirable.
>
> The administration and the Congress must face up to these choices in the space program. I recognize—as also must the Congress—that the reduction in funds recommended by the House Appropriations Committee will require the deferral and reduction of some desirable space projects. Yet, in the face of present circumstances, I join with the Congress and accept this reduction.

So the budget request, in realistic and effective terms, has been modified and changed to take the position the House took. The Senate Space Subcommittee's position is over the position taken by the President.

It seems to me that we must either accept that Presidential advice today by going back to the House figures in this bill or, in effect, say, "the responsibility is yours, Mr. President, we wash our hands of any responsibility to hold down Federal spending."

Let us take a look at what the proposed cut would mean. By reducing the Apollo applications program by $35 million we would simply be postponing immediate procurement of materials for a flight not scheduled for 4 years. In any event the Apollo applications program amounts to an experiment to see how we should spend great sums of money in space on missions that are not yet off the drawing boards. These missions have not been justified or reviewed or, indeed, determined by Congress to be in the national interest.

The elimination of $36 million for the Voyager program would postpone design and development of a project to soft-land an automated laboratory on the surface of Mars. Funds for this project were not even permitted by your own authorizing committee—the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences. The committee felt, with great justification, in my estimation, that, and I quote, "the program could be deferred, particularly in view of the concern by many for the budgetary situation this year." These funds were restored in the authorization bill in conference when the House insisted on its language. Ironically enough, now the House Appropriations Committee has deleted the funds altogether and the Senate Appropriations Committee has restored them.

I submit that we can wait to land on Mars for a few months while we take care of the needs of our great cities which are literally under siege by the forgotten citizens in this country—the ghetto dwellers who have so little stake in society that they are prepared to destroy it.

My amendment would also cut almost $30 million from our nuclear rocket development program. $10 million of this amount would be for nuclear rockets per se while another $19,500,000 would delete funds for a test complex for the Nerva 2 which is not, as yet, completely designed.

These giant atomic rockets are meant for a manned Mars mission. This is heady stuff. But we live on planet earth and this is where we will die. Let us place first things first and take care of the needs of our own citizens for jobs, education, adequate medical care, adequate housing, adequate law enforcement before looking for life on the planet Mars. We cannot and must not try to escape from the deeply serious problems we face in the United States by pointing to the stars—by squandering Federal funds that have become increasingly difficult to allocate on a Mars probe.

Mr. President, it seems to me that we have distorted the space program over the past few years. We set out to land on the moon as quickly as possible at the beginning of this decade. We knew that a great deal of waste was involved but we felt that prestige factors outweighed these considerations. We have most emphatically not, however, made a conscious decision to undertake a crash program to explore other planets. In this year 1967 we have not said, at least no one has said to me, "It will cost billions to reach Mars but every cent spent is worth it, even if substantial waste is involved, because we must get there ahead of the Soviet Union."

It is almost as though we feel we must extend this massive program at any cost just because the hardware is there. It is as though Louis Pasteur spent money trying to create new diseases because he did not want his expertise in the area of immunology to go to waste. We are spending millions of dollars to keep the monster machinery cranked up by our space program in motion, even if we are not sure what direction it should go in. That is the meaning of the Apollo Applications program and of the Voyager and Nerva programs as well.

My amendment would simply slow down this rush toward the unknown at a time when the known problems we face on this planet are far from solved or, in many instances, solvable. The slowdown would be minimal. I am not asking for a major cutback in our space program. But a vote for my amendment today would simply be a recognition of the need for taking a second look at our post-Apollo program in view of the serious budgetary problems being faced by our Nation.

I suppose some may talk of "technological fallout"—that vague term that means if you spend enough on any scientific endeavor you will get some side benefits. I suppose if we decided to spend two billion dollars on a baldness cure, we would have plenty of fallout of one kind with less fallout of another. I shall not speculate on what the fall-out benefits would be but we could hardly expect to spend this amount of money on anything without making progress in basic research concepts as well as technological advances. Again, however, we have great uncertainty about what we are trying to do. The very term fallout suggests the unexpected by-product, the pleasant surprise. This is hardly a factor we can or should take into account in planning the expenditure of tax dollars.

In summation then, a vote for my amendment means a vote in support of the President's efforts to hold down Federal spending. It means a vote for a second look at where we are going after we land on the moon. It means a vote for a sensible system of spending priorities. It means a vote for people instead of machines. It means a vote for sound fiscal policies. It means a vote for the many Americans who have come to have serious doubts about our space program—not just the post-moon-shot program, but the effort to get a man on the moon. For in a recent Harris poll a clear majority of American people expressed opposition to any space program costing more than $4 billion.

This modest amendment would still leave the space budget almost $600 million over $4 billion.

Certainly, Senators who have any concern for fiscal responsibility will support an amendment that reduces spending by $100 million—or about 2 percent—in accordance with Presidential recommendations and which only slightly slows down the long and I mean long term future expenditures for space, expenditures that involve no competitive race—and no priority even within the space budget.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time, and I yield the floor.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Who yields time?

Mr. **MAGNUSON.** Mr. President, I do not wish to take too much time on this matter. I believe that the Senator from Colorado and other Senators do not entirely disagree with what the Senator from Wisconsin says.

This is a program which we had to evaluate and analyze, going through the programs with a fine-tooth comb. It is hard to know just where maximum value in a program such as this begins, and where it ends, or when you reach the point where the benefits no longer justify the expenditures. That has been true in the consideration of all the Space appropriations.

It is true that the President of the United States made the general suggestion that the House figures be approved. When he said that, he meant the overall reductions by the House of Representatives. He did not single out individual items. The Senate committee had the responsibility of taking the items line by line. We might have wished to agree with the overall House figure; but we may have desired to reduce in one place and add in another place.

We conscientiously went about that job. As the Senator from Colorado has stated, this is the most reasonable and consistent bill the committee considered possible in reporting it to the Senate. There is a great amount of expertise in the membership of the Senate committee when it comes to space programs.

I repeat what I said yesterday: I do not think there are any Senators who are more inclined to be more economical than myself or the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield very briefly so that I may ask for the yeas and nays?

Mr. MAGNUSON. In a minute.

I think the Senator's definition of economy and mine may sometimes be different. I said yesterday on another matter, and I say it again on this matter; we have to keep some of these programs going to keep the economy moving, so we can collect some taxes to put in the Treasury to pay for the urban and social programs we are now talking about. We could cut out everything, and then go down and find the Treasury's cupboard was bare, like Mother Hubbard's cupboard. Approximately 92 percent of all this work is subcontracted to private industry and they are profitmaking taxpayers.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that we can ask for the yeas and nays while other Senators are still on the floor? I ask unanimous consent that I may ask for the yeas and nays without the time being taken out of either side.

Mr. MAGNUSON. In a minute.

We know there is a point where we must question how far we go, and we are attempting to express that judgment. Apollo explorations is a simple matter. We have spent billions in this effort to go to the moon. I say again, as I have said before, that if the moon was not there, if it disappeared, we would be doing much of this manned exploration in space, anyway.

Apollo explorations take advantage of many things. I do not need to take up the time of the Senate with what we have learned in this effort. It involves the whole problem of manned vehicles in space, and incidentally it involves great achievement in how we may apply the military or defense applications, or affirmative application of men in space with rockets, missiles, and other things.

That is why we thought the figure for the Apollo applications program was about as close as we could come without throwing out many of the things we already had. As the Senator from Colorado has said, to put them in the ash can and try to pick them up later.

The additional funds of $35 million for the Apollo applications program will enable this country to investigate man's capability to function effectively in space for periods ranging up to a year or more. Developing this capability in earth orbital flights of increasing length and complexity in the near future is essential to the success of our civil and military manned space programs.

This funding will enable us to pursue a balanced manned orbital program involving early flights of 28 days duration and later of 56 days duration with existing equipment. We thus will make effective use of the Saturn I booster capability, which has been developed. These flights will be forerunners of others extending our manned orbital capability to a year or more.

Adequate funding of the Apollo applications program will allow for continuing production of Saturn I booster and its possible upgrading to a more powerful version, as required, in a timely manner. Through such a careful Saturn booster development program we will have a versatile capability for long life manned earth orbiting missions, extended lunar exploration and both manned and unmanned planetary exploration—later in combination with nuclear rockets.

Adequate funding is also necessary to pursue effectively the very promising earth resource sensing technology using the versatility of man in space.

Restoration of $15 million to tracking and data acquisition brings the funding for these operations just to the absolute minimum required to support fiscal year 1968 spaceflights. Our tracking systems have successfully covered every manned U.S. flight and enabled the safe recovery of our astronauts. The deep space network has acquired scientific data from spacecraft at the far side of the solar system. These facilities are the heart of successful manned and unmanned mission operations.

The economies already effected by congressional action, in stretching out programs and eliminating new starts, do not reduce the tracking requirements for payloads now in orbit or to be launched this year. If less than the minimum operating budget for these facilities were provided, support of applications technology satellites, Pioneer, Mariner IV, and Mariner V, or other missions, would have to be reduced. The reduced return of data from any of these projects, already ongoing and paid for, would be false economy at best.

Our tracking facilities are also a key factor in our international space cooperation with friendly countries. We have tracking agreements with 24 countries which give us a worldwide capability to track U.S. and other cooperating country satellites on request.

On two other items, nuclear rocket and nuclear rocket development station for our space program itself.

Initiating the development of the Nerva II nuclear rocket engine is an efficient and logical step in the nuclear rocket program at this time. A long series of highly successful ground reactor tests proves that we have mastered basic nuclear rocket technology. We can now take advantage of this technology advance to build a new generation of versatile and reliable nuclear rocket engines of great power.

This engine will afford the Nation a new range of advanced space propulsion capability. It can be used for a wide range of potential space missions from earth orbital to solar system exploration. The basic engine can be used singly or in clusters. It can also be used in combination with the Saturn chemical booster. In earth orbit this engine will have the potential for missions requiring significant maneuverability well beyond that of present chemical rockets—like shifting from near earth orbit to earth synchronous and return. It will give us significant payload increases and timing and landing versatility for lunar flights. It will also afford the country a long-range capability to conduct a large manned expedition to the planets. Development of the Nerva II will thus help to insure this country's preeminence in space in the last third of the 20th century.

The proposed initiation of construction of a complex at the Nevada nuclear test site to test the large Nerva II nuclear rocket engine is essential to the success of this engine program. The test stand complex, with about a 4-year construction period, is a pacing item in the progress of the Nerva II engine. Consequently the start of site development and the procurement of long-leadtime items this year is essential to the timely progress of the nuclear rocket development. It will be the only facility in the country capable of flight testing the large nuclear rocket on the ground with safety and with full simulation of space conditions.

The committee thought, after listening to days of testimony, that if there is anything that we ought to continue to develop in this whole field, it is the use of nuclear power in the boosters.

If we do that, the testimony from all scientists is that we will save hundreds of millions of dollars in the cost of the boosters, that we possibly could use the boosters over and over again, and that they would be involved in nearly all of the space effort. We are just beginning with nuclear propulsion, and we thought we should not delay.

We were in the position that the House and the Senate committee, without a protest, allowed the Atomic Energy Commission, which is a partner in this effort, $94 million to go ahead with this joint program. The Space Agency, as partner, can meet its share of participation under this proposal.

We approved this amount of money in this joint space effort—and I voted to allow the Atomic Energy Commission to go ahead with this matter. I think it is well worth while.

I think it would be penny wise and pound foolish for us to stop this modest effort and attempt to find out whether we could use nuclear power in rockets. Once we do, I think we will have gained further superiority in this field over the whole world.

The other project, Voyager, gave both bodies some trouble. Voyager is a program that is to go on beyond the Apollo program.

I have had some personal concerns as to what our space program might be after Apollo. I have had some doubts as to whether the expenditure of a great deal of money to find out certain things about the other planets might be worth while at a time when money is scarce. There is no question about money being scarce.

I have suggested on many occasions—and I am sure that many Senators agree with me—that after Apollo we perhaps ought to make our best effort to see if we cannot have a cooperative exploration of space with other countries. At the meeting in Belgrade, Yugoslavia, most of the aeronautical and space scientists around the world have put their stamp of approval on this joint undertaking.

It would save us a great deal of money. We could explore space for the good of mankind as we do with oceanography, and in the use of weather satellites. I think it would do more to relieve world tension than any other one thing we could do.

After we leave Apollo, the work we will do will have little or no military application. It will be purely scientific knowledge. The Apollo applications program, in which we will have manned platforms in space, is a different story.

The committee thought we should continue with a modest amount for Voyager so that we would not lose what we have achieved now in the interwoven application of all these things, and so that later on if we can join with other nations of the world we will then have a contribution of scientific knowledge to make.

This was the most precise figure we could arrive at. We are $421,100,000 under the budget. I say to my friend, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], that we worked hard on the pending bill. It gave us much difficulty because we have to rely so heavily on information received from these great men who are involved in this program. We are laymen in this field.

I think that the pending bill is a sound, responsible bill, considering the times. I think that the spinoffs, even now, and particularly in the future, are and will be much greater than we now imagine.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I am going to pursue this matter of cooperation in exploring outer space in the best way I know how. I hope that we will be able to have a great joint effort of all countries in the world with respect to the future programs in space that have some know-how in this field. It will benefit all mankind.

We should be very careful in the future, as to whether we will support any space program to spend hundreds of millions and perhaps billions of dollars until my suggestion is pursued to its ultimate and until every possibility of cooperation is completely explored.

I think it would be a great thing for the world and everybody in it.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, as a cosponsor I certainly support the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin.

There is no question that there is considerable merit in the space program. There is a question in the minds of many of us as to how much we can afford to put in it, particularly at a time when we are confronted with a staggering deficit.

We need not be so concerned about who gets to the moon first. I do not think that is so important. In fact, it was said the other day that regardless of who gets to the moon first, we can rest assured that we will be the first nation there with foreign aid.

I am also reminded of the fact that the pending bill would provide $4,678,900,000 for this year's program for space. With respect to the project of going to the moon, it is interesting to note that if this amount of money were reduced to $1 bills and sewn together, the strip would reach from Washington, D.C., to the moon and back to the Texas ranch. We do not have enough dollars to keep pouring them in all of these projects.

The $36 million which we cut out of the money to launch this Voyager is not just a $36 million saving. This is the initial cost of a commitment on a program to go to Mars, which will cost at least $1 billion and perhaps much more.

Is this the time to start a program to reach Mars, or should we hold it back until such time as we have better control of our financial structure?

The very least we can do is to adopt this amendment, which reduces the amount to the House figure. It represents a cut of $110 million.

As pointed out by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, the President has endorsed these cuts made by the House as not jeopardizing the programs or the security of this country. I repeat, the President has endorsed the cuts which the House made; this amendment would restore the House figure. Such a reduction is certainly in the best interest of the country at a time when we are operating with a sizable deficit.

Earlier today we heard considerable criticism of the President because he had frozen certain funds which had been previously approved by Congress.

The argument was made that it is a responsibility of Congress to make these cuts and endorse or reject these programs.

I agree fully. It is our responsibility, but if we do not accept that responsibility I do not think Congress should criticize the President if he later wishes to exercise the authority to override our action.

The place to make cuts in expenditures is on the floor of the Senate. We should do it by a rollcall vote, and those of us who feel that our expenditures are getting out of hand should back up our speeches with votes.

Our votes on all of these programs, not only on this program but on all other programs, should reflect our true positions. Certainly some of these programs may be the pet projects in our own immediate area, but we must curtail all new projects until our budget is nearer balanced.

At very least, this amendment, which would cut the appropriation by $110.5 million, should be agreed to by the Senate.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, 10 years ago, on October 4, 1957, the Russians surprised the world with the launching of Sputnik I. Rarely in history has a technological achievement had such an impact on human affairs. Many of us were worried about the military implications because they had used military hardware to launch that satellite.

President Johnson was the majority leader of this body at that time. He was also chairman of the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, a position which I now have the honor to hold. Many weeks of hearings were held by that subcommittee in the latter part of 1957 and early 1958, the purpose of which was to ascertain the facts about our missile and space developments. The subcommittee unanimously determined that we were dangerously behind in this area and made numerous recommendations as to what we had to do, as a nation, to catch up.

In the past 10 years, many of those recommendations have been carried out. Our accomplishments in space have been little short of miraculous. Our plans have been ambitious and our resolve has been steadfast. We have chosen as our goal nothing less than landing men on the moon itself. The real purpose of this goal is, of course, not just to pull some cosmic stunt, but to have the capability to operate in this new environment—this "new ocean" as the late President Kennedy called it—the capability to operate in a way that would put us second to no nation on this earth.

But today, 10 years after sputnik, at the same time that we are actually building this great capability, we find ourselves curiously at another crossroad—not as to what we are going to do next year or even the year after that, because the programs that will come to fruition in 1968 and 1969 are already too far down the road to change very much—we are at the crossroads of decision as to what our space program is going to be in 1970 and beyond, and there are two programs in this appropriations bill that I would specifically like to discuss in this regard.

The first is the Apollo applications program. This is, in my opinion, the most important of NASA's followon programs. It will, in fact, build specifically on the technology and hardware developed during the Apollo program. For very little in the way of additional expenditures, it will allow us to utilize and take advantage of the capability it has cost us so much to attain. If we do not continue with this program, then the great expenditures and effort will have been wasted, our technological advantage scrapped, and our vast facilities mothballed.

The other program is the Voyager. This is a program to explore Mars and the other planets in 1973 and beyond. I will not dwell upon this except to say that as things stand at the present time, we have no plans whatsoever for interplanetary exploration in the 1970's. Unfortunately, we cannot say the same thing about the Russians. They have a vigorous interplanetary program now and give every indication that they will continue with these efforts. By whatever project name we call it, I think it is imperative that we have a well-planned interplanetary program. If we do not, we will simply forfeit the solar system to the Russians. I, for one, do not want to do that.

Ten years ago we did not have the knowledge or the equipment to meet the Russian challenge. We had to build it, the hard way. Today we are on a par with them—ahead in some areas, still behind in others. Today, in contrast to 10 years ago, we have the capability to meet the challenge. What we need is the will. And to show that will, we must make the decisions now, not 3 or 4 or 10 years from now. I do not want the chairman of the Preparedness Subcommittee, whether that is still my honor or someone else's, to have to call for hearings again in a few years in order to try to find out what we have to do to catch up.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, it is difficult for me to go against decisions of the Committee on Appropriations, of which I am a member; but I did reserve my right on this bill in the committee, largely because of one item that was added—$35 million on the Apollo application, which Mr. Webb, the Administrator, said he did not need—and because of the action in the last few days by the House of Representatives and the Secretary of Defense in cutting back many important programs which I believe are more important than the one referred to in the pending amendment, important as it is. Therefore, I shall vote to cut the appropriation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired on the amendment.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD (when his named was called). On this vote, I have a pair with the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea"; if I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote, I have a pair with the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay"; if I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore, I withdraw my vote.

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS] is paired with the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina would vote "yea," and the Senator from Alaska would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH]. If present and voting the Senator from Arkansas would vote "yea," and the Senator from Texas would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA]. If present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senators from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN and Mr. PROUTY], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS] is absent because of death in his family.

The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is absent for religious observance.

If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] is paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon would vote "yea," and the Senator from South Carolina would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY]. If present and voting, the Senator from New York would vote "yea," and the Senator from California would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 36, as follows:

[No. 286 Leg.]

YEAS—30

Baker
Bayh
Bennett
Brewster
Brooke
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Case
Church
Cooper
Cotton
Dirksen
Griffin
Gruening
Hansen
Kennedy, N.Y.
Lausche
Miller
Morse
Mundt
Nelson
Pell
Proxmire
Ribicoff
Spong
Talmadge
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—36

Allott
Anderson
Bible
Cannon
Curtis
Dominick
Ellender
Fong
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Inouye
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
McClellan
McGee
McIntyre
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Muskie
Pearson
Scott
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington

NOT VOTING—34

Aiken
Bartlett
Boggs
Byrd, W. Va.
Carlson
Clark
Dodd
Eastland
Ervin
Fannin
Fulbright
Gore
Harris
Hatfield
Hollings
Hruska
Javits
Kennedy, Mass.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGovern
Montoya
Morton
Moss
Murphy
Pastore
Percy
Prouty
Randolph
Russell
Thurmond
Tower
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

So Mr. PROXMIRE's amendment (No. 383) was rejected.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. ALLOTT. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I had informed most Senators, who have asked me, that we were going to have a vote on final passage immediately after the vote on the previous amendment. However, I understand now that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] has an amendment he wishes to offer, and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] has a very brief statement she wishes to make on the bill.

I understand that the Senator from Delaware will not require much time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, we can agree on 5 minutes limitation on this amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me briefly?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is the time fixed now?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The time has been fixed since we began.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I have need for a few minutes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I shall be pleased to

yield some of my time to the Senator later.

Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], on behalf of himself and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], proposes an amendment:

> On page 2, line 12, strike out "$3,995,500,000" and insert "$3,969,500,000."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on this amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, this is merely a part of the previous amendment. The purpose of this amendment is to reduce by $26 million the appropriation in the bill. The committee allowed $36 million for the Voyager, which is the project to go to Mars; this amendment will reduce that item by $26 million.

Some claim that there would be need for $10 million to keep the scientists and the research team in operation, but it was agreed that we could postpone the other $26 million without jeopardizing the program. It would, however, stop the long-range commitments, which ultimately could cost over $1 billion.

If we commit ourselves to this project we would be committing ourselves to a minimum of a billion dollars on a project to go to Mars. There are many stars in the universe, and whether we can pay a billion dollars to go to each of them is a question to be answered, particularly when it is being done on borrowed money.

If we agree to this amendment it would not destroy the organization, but it would hold in abeyance further commitments on this project until after Congress has again acted.

Mr. President, this amendment would affect that one project.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it not true that the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences recommended that the entire amount for Voyager be deleted? The Senator from Delaware is being very generous in allowing $10 million, when the committee recommended no money.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. In addition, the Appropriations Committee in the House of Representatives recommended no money for Voyager. Is that not correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. Both of those committees recommended no money.

Our earlier amendment, which would have met those recommendations, having failed, and recognizing that we do not have a sufficient number of votes, this amendment would leave $10 million in the bill to hold the organization together and to continue the research for this project. Approval of the amendment would stop further long-range commitments on this project, which lead to a cost of over $1 billion.

I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I have only this brief comment.

The reinstatement of $36 million for Voyager is necessary to maintain U.S. options with respect to planetary missions. The Voyager program is the next step beyond Mariner to explore our nearby neighbors, Venus and Mars, with spacecraft capable of orbiting the planets and landing on their surface to conduct useful experiments. At present, there are no plans for U.S. flights to the planets after the 1969 Mariner/Mars flyby.

There are many reasons why the United States should pursue a planetary flight program. First, if the United States does not continue in this field, we will virtually dissipate the competent industry-Government teams which carried out the highly successful lunar Ranger, Surveyor, Orbiter missions, the Mariner/Venus 1962 and 1965 missions, and the Mariner/Mars 1964 missions. We will literally abandon our planetary exploration lead to the Soviets who have doggedly attempted Venus and Mars missions at almost every opportunity. A Soviet spacecraft is now en route to Venus and scheduled to arrive there on October 18.

Second, there is exciting new scientific knowledge to be gained. The key to understanding the origin of the solar system and of the earth itself will likely be found when we explore the other planets. Further insights into the origin of life and its possible uniqueness on earth will be established. These questions alone, with their far-reaching implications, should be sufficient justification for the program.

Finally, the process of building new spacecraft has brought new developments in medical and other technology which benefit all Americans. Research to develop instruments to search for life on Mars has already increased our understanding of disease and life processes here on Earth.

Thus, investment in this seemingly far-out project will bring us immediate returns in prestige, knowledge, technology, and markets.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Mississippi.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCINTYRE in the chair). The Senator from Mississippi is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, this amendment affects only Voyager. It would still leave $10 million in the bill.

I was one of those who voted for retention of the Voyager program all the way through because, as I said, and as the Senator from Washington has said, otherwise we will abruptly abandon and bring to a halt the tremendous momentum we have built up in the moon shot program. Beyond Apollo, we have no interplanetary plans. That is the moon shot.

To bring this tremendous machine to a complete halt, to me, is just unthinkable. We should lay the groundwork for the necessary planning and the small beginnings, and that is all the $36 million would provide.

Frankly, I think that if we are going to take out $26 million, it would be better to knock the whole $36 million out. The testimony was that $10 million would not be enough.

To me, it would be unthinkable to do this at this early stage before we know the facts, and bring the program to a grinding and complete stop when the moon shot is over. That is why I vigorously support the Voyager program all the way through. The $36 million figure is a minimum figure.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. The distinguished Senator from Mississippi has well stated the case. There is no point in trying to be emotional about the matter. It is a very objective matter of judgment which should be exercised here.

The situation is that with the Voyager program there are two windows which may be utilized for an unmanned landing or a look at Mars. One is 1973 and one is 1975. It will be several years after that, if we do not utilize them at this time. We will have space boosters, Saturn V's, hopefully, on hand at that time, depending on how fortunate we are with our first flight with Saturn V's in order to do this.

Now, do we chuck these in the trash can—as I said a while ago—and forget about it, or do we pursue a logical plan for the utilization of what we have already developed? If we keep in the $36 million, we can, hopefully, do this in 1975. All hope of doing it in 1973 has now gone by the board by reason of the action of the other committees which have acted.

So that if we are going to retain and use the material, the supplies, the missiles, and the vehicles we have on hand and, hopefully, will have on hand at that time, which are already ordered, which are already in the pipeline, this is the only logical way to do it.

The distinguished Senator from Mississippi hit it right on the head. We can go on and do research and research and research for 10 years for $10 million. But if we keep in the $36 million, we cannot only do the research but also start the initial phases of the planned attack on the problem of getting into the window of Mars in 1975.

The problem is that simple. I hope that the Senate will reject the amendment.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I support without reservation the position taken by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi and the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

This amendment would end the interplanetary program. I would point out that we have spent billions and billions and billions of dollars on the space program and now, suddenly, under the circumstances we are all interested in saving money, and we would take an action with respect to a relatively small amount of money that would eliminate the entire future program which these tremendous investments represent.

Actually, this is about one-half of a day's cost of the Vietnamese war. I would hope that everyone would realize what they would be doing today if we abolished the Voyager program and, as a result, end our entire space program from an interplanetary standpoint.

To me, it is unthinkable that we would do that. I would hope that the Senate would reject the amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I support the amendment of the Senator from Delaware, not in terms of emotion, but in terms of hard consideration of the economic condition of this country.

Let us get clear in mind what we are doing. If we put in the $36 million—although the House put nothing in and the legislative committee did not recommend it—we are committed then to make a landing on Mars, which is going to cost $1 billion—perhaps it will be more than a $1 billion program. The $10 million will meet the objections raised by the Senator from Mississippi. It will keep the team intact. It will permit continued planning, and so forth. But it seems to me that before we even discover what we are going to learn by landing a man on the moon, if we now go off on another great adventure of simply landing a machine on Mars for $1 billion, we will be pretty reckless with the taxpayers' money in these times when $26 million is not just alfalfa hay, or peanuts. It is important money.

When in the world are we going to start economizing, if we cannot start economizing on a project as visionary as this one is? We have got the money in for the rest of the planetary program. We have got it in for Voyager, and for the moon. We are going to land a man up there very shortly to see what we can learn, eventually, we hope. What is the purpose of going out to Mars and landing a machine out there? Is there any great urgency about it?

Of course there is the curiosity of some scientists to consider. They may pick up a few ideas and some information. But it would seem to me that they will be a very long time digesting what they learn on the moon.

I agree with the Senator from Delaware that the constellations are pretty big out there. There are an awful lot of stars up in the sky. If we are going to start penetrating them $1 billion at a time, when are we ever going to balance the budget?

The place to start economizing is now. Here is $26 million we can save, not emotionally but economically, for the taxpayers of America.

I support the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In casting my votes on measures which come before the Senate, I try to follow a plan of determining the issues which should be given priority in spending the taxpayers' money.

We have our eyes set on the moon and on the planets. We are looking up at the sky unconscious of the pitfalls that lie beneath our feet as we walk upon the earth and contemplate the management of the fiscal affairs of our country.

All eyes are on the moon. All eyes are on the planets. No eyes seem to be upon the fiscal problems confronting us in the management of our simple earthly business.

Somewhere it has been said, pithily, as you gaze into the skies be sure that you do not stumble upon the pitfalls of the earth. How can I vote for cutting the economic opportunity program by $2.5 billion and then tell the people I am voting to put a man on the moon, and, possibly later, upon Saturn or other places in space? I cannot see it. We have too many problems on earth to handle.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING].

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, when our vital domestic programs are being cut, when appropriations for such pressing and long neglected needs in the fields of education, health, housing, slum clearance, pollution abatement, resource development, the war on poverty, the war on crime, are being drastically reduced, I can see no justification for the extravagant space programs. To spend billions of dollars to land a man on the moon when the needs of man on earth are being tragically slighted is unjustifiable.

One reason for the costliness of the space program is the desire to get to the moon before the Russians. I think it unimportant whether we get to the moon in 1969, 1970, 1980, or at all until our earthly needs are met. To spend more billions to explore the planet Mars when we fail to explore the needs and wants of people on our own planet is folly. I know of no place in our budget where economies can be more justified than on space. To spend $5 billion annually on this one program seems to me to exhibit a mistaken sense of priorities.

When I was a young man many believed that Mars was inhabited. A famous astronomer, Percival Lowell, who operated an observatory at Flagstaff, Ariz., thought not only that there were men on Mars but that they were very superior beings. Lowell had seen, or thought he had seen, canals on Mars running from that planet's two polar icecaps. He deduced from that that these highly intelligent Martians were utilizing high engineering ingenuity to irrigate this largely desert planet and thus to preserve life on it. So Lowell wrote a famous book called "Mars as the Abode of Life."

Unfortunately, no other astronomers saw those canals, and later observations with more powerful telescopes make clear that they do not exist. Other observations indicate that Mars is uninhabited and is not the abode of any kind of life.

It is, of course, disappointing that we may not be visited by little green men with a tassel coming out of their heads and perhaps coming on a saucer. But, in any event, why spend billions on the planet Mars when the planet Earth has so many unmet needs?

I shall vote for every cut in the space program, and wish they were more drastic. I know of no place where drastic cuts are more desirable than in a program to spend more than $5 billion annually, which is nothing less than folly, particularly when the needs of our folks at home are so great.

I am more interested in landing an unemployed man on his feet on Earth than landing a man on the Moon.

For these reasons, while I appreciate some of the useful byproducts in scientific knowledge incidental to the space program, I feel obliged to vote against it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I have been trying to follow the debate carefully. I understood from the Senator from Delaware's statement that there was no intention to continue the Voyager project. As a matter of fact, $10 million is being left intact for the purpose of leaving the personnel there to continue the Voyager project. Now from some Senators who are opposed to the amendment we are told that this would do away with the Voyager project. Both sides cannot be right. It seems to me if the personnel are continued, that does not mean the Voyager project is not going to be continued.

I wish, in the summation of the arguments, it would be made clear, because it is not clear to me how we can do away with the Voyager project when we are going to spend $10 million on personnel for it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I merely want to add again, for the RECORD, so it is perfectly clear, that the authorization for this Voyager project is $42 million, passed by the House and the Senate, and now authorized in Public Law 90–67.

We think this is a reasonable and responsible bill, with a reduction of $421,100,000 below the budget estimate.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] has asked a question, and I think he has a right to have that question answered. The Mariner project has been canceled. Therefore, the only utilization in sight now on which Saturn V and perhaps others which will be available is the Voyager program, outside of the Apollo applications.

If the Senate supports the motion that

is made here, what it will be doing is just keeping the personnel on board to study and restudy, when the real problem is to move ahead with a plan for the Voyager to take advantage of the window on Mars which opens in 1973 and again in 1975. After that, there will be several years, at least—I forget exactly, but I think it is 9 years—1973 and 1975 are the "window" years when we can get to it.

It is true that this is a large program, but it is the only method by which we can make use of the technology and the vehicles which we hope to have, which are ordered, and which are part of our upcoming arsenal in the space race.

No one can talk about specific things in this program, yet our own explorations in space so far have brought valuable information to this country—and I say this to my friend from South Dakota—which has been of almost inestimable value in our work of trying to predict the weather, which is of such great importance to the farmers, stockmen, and cattlemen in his State. This is one definite application we will get out of the work with Voyager. Knowing more about our universe, we will be able to predict weather, and we will get a hundred thousand other "fallouts" besides.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I am not questioning the efficacy of the project, but I am questioning what will happen if the $10 million is continued for the personnel.

Here we are in October. It will probably not be until next July or August when the follow-on money which is being knocked out will be raised. What will this do? Will this be actually a setback for the project? Are they going to be able to get the hardware started with the money knocked out? How much will this set back the project?

Mr. ALLOTT. The answer to that question is that research and design, particularly design, are very long lead items. If we do not put the $36 million into this bill, we will not see the 1975 "window" in the Mars program or the Voyager program. The $10 million will only keep the people "on board"—bodies working. It will not, however, enable us to go ahead with design, which has a long lead time, and which will help us accomplish, 8 years ahead, what we have been trying to accomplish so far.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, how much time do we have left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington has 4 minutes remaining and the Senator from Delaware has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott] has talked about the "window." I did not understand it myself for a while, but the "window" is the proper time when Mars will be in the best position for space exploration in its relation to the earth. That will happen in 1975. As I understand it, a period of 9 years is involved before the proper "window" will occur again. I wanted to explain for the Record what is meant by the term "window." I hope I have let in some light on this matter.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield myself just 1 minute.

Based on the recommendations of the Space Committee and based upon the recommendations of the President, this program should have been stricken out in its entirety, but since we were not able to get approval of the earlier amendment, this is compromise; we are leaving in the $10 million to take care of the staff and continued research.

As for the "window," which is of concern to the Senator from Colorado, if we keep piling deficits on top of deficits, we shall not need a window; we shall be able to stand on top of the national debt and look over the roof.

There is literally enough money in this one bill to run a strip of dollar bills to the moon and back again, and it is all borrowed money. The very least we can do is hold in abeyance some of these projects, at least until such time as we have the money.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. May I suggest to the Senator that there might be another definition for this "window" we are hearing so much about—that the "window" is the aperture through which it is proposed to throw another $26 million of the taxpayers' money, which we do not have to spend now, and at a time when we have been asked by the President to search for ways to save. Here is a pretty good place for a substantial start.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I conclude, Mr. President, by quoting what President Johnson said on August 21 in connection with the House bill which had eliminated this project in its entirety:

> The reduction in funds recommended by the House Appropriations Committee will require the deferment and reduction of some desirable space projects. Yet, in the face of present circumstances, I join with the Congress and accept this reduction.

Why should the Senate override the President's recommendations and give him $26 million he does not need?

If Congress wants to maintain control of the pursestrings we should at least stop sending the White House more money than it is asking for and then later salve our consciences by passing a resolution saying to the President, "You cut expenditures, we did not have the nerve to do it."

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back——

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have just a half minute.

The White House asked for $71 million for Voyager.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That was in January 1967. On August 21 the President said to reduce the appropriations for this project.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virignia (after having voted in the affirmative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with my colleague, the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Montoya], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Hollings], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough], are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright] is paired with the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett]. If present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas would vote "yea," and the Senator from Alaska would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin] is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Montoya]. If present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Hollings] is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina would vote "yea," and the Senator from Florida would vote "nay."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senators from Vermont [Mr. Aiken and Mr. Prouty], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Fannin], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Hatfield], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton], the Senator from California [Mr. Murphy], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Percy], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Thurmond], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. Boggs] is absent because of death in his family.

The Senator from New York [Mr. Jav-

ITS] is absent for religious observance.

If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] is paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon would vote "yea," and the Senator from South Carolina would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY]. If present and voting, the Senator from New York would vote "yea," and the Senator from California would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 34, as follows:

[No. 287 Leg.]

YEAS—31

Baker
Bayh
Bennett
Brewster
Brooke
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Case
Church
Cotton
Dirksen
Griffin
Gruening
Hansen
Harris
Kennedy, N.Y.
Lausche
Miller
Mondale
Morse
Mundt
Nelson
Pell
Proxmire
Ribicoff
Spong
Talmadge
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—34

Allott
Anderson
Bible
Cannon
Cooper
Curtis
Dominick
Ellender
Fong
Hart
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Inouye
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McClellan
McGee
McIntyre
Monroney
Muskie
Pearson
Scott
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington

NOT VOTING—35

Aiken
Bartlett
Boggs
Byrd, W. Va.
Carlson
Clark
Dodd
Eastland
Ervin
Fannin
Fulbright
Gore
Hartke
Hatfield
Hollings
Hruska
Javits
Kennedy, Mass.
McCarthy
McGovern
Metcalf
Montoya
Morton
Moss
Murphy
Pastore
Percy
Prouty
Randolph
Russell
Smathers
Thurmond
Tower
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

So the amendment of Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware was rejected.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, the Senate Appropriations Committee has reported out an fiscal year 1968 appropriations bill for NASA of $4,678,900,000. This is $421,100,000 below the administration's request and $186,851,000 below the amount authorized by the Congress.

The Senate Appropriations Committee in their deliberations of this bill carefully considered the recommendations of the other House. We found that in some instances the House had cut too deeply. For example, NASA requested $297.7 million for their tracking and data acquisition program. The Congress authorized $290 million but the House in cutting the research and development budget recommended only $260 million. Our worldwide tracking and data acquisition system simply cannot be run efficiently at that level. Moreover, the Administrator of NASA, the Honorable James E. Webb, testified that to provide for the safety of the astronauts, he must have at least another $15 million in that program. The Senate committee has recommended that $15 million for tracking and data acquisition be added to the research and development request.

In the case of the nuclear rocket engine, the Administrator, Mr. Webb, testified that, if cut to the $45.6 million level as recommended by the House, he could not undertake the development of the 200,000-pound-thrust engine which everyone agrees would be the most efficient engine to develop. He would instead have to fall back to the development of the Nerva I engine with a thrust of between 60,000 and 75,000 pounds. With the additional $10 million in the research and development budget and $19.5 million in the construction of facilities, which has been recommended by the Senate committee, we can proceed with the development of the 200,000-pound-thrust engine which everyone agrees will be needed in the future for our space exploration programs. This is an excellent investment for the future and I strongly support this recommendation.

In the case of our planetary programs, Mr. Webb testified that if he had to absorb the cut voted by the House he could not initiate the Voyager program for the exploration of the planets. This would mean that the planetary exploration program of the United States would end with the 1969 Mariner-Mars mission. Yet all of the scientific testimony before the Congress, and particularly the testimony of people from the National Academy of Sciences, has been that the United States should increase the amount of its resources that is devoted to planetary exploration. Planetary exploration bears on some of the fundamental questions of our time; the origin of the earth, and in fact the origin of the universe itself, and whether or not there is extraterrestrial life. The committee, therefore, added $36 million to the House bill with its recommendation that a Voyager program proceed at that level during fiscal year 1968. I fully support this recommendation and hope that NASA will go ahead with a Voyager program. In view of the tremendous success of the Lunar Orbiter, NASA should give careful consideration to first doing orbiting missions of Mars and Venus.

In the area of manned flight exploration, the Apollo program is reaching its final stages. There is still the possibility that man will reach the moon and return safely to earth within this decade. But because of the technical problems, the probability is getting lower. Nevertheless, we must plan for what comes after the Apollo program in manned space flight. NASA has proposed a realistic program called the Apollo Applications program under which they propose to make use of the technology and equipment developed under the Apollo program for long-duration, earth-orbital flight and further lunar exploration. However, under the cut passed by the House, the Apollo Applications program simply could not proceed with more than four flights using the uprated Saturn I vehicle and after these flights there would be a gap in our manned space flight program. Mr. Webb testified that if he must run the space program at the level recommended by the House then:

> There will, in my opinion, be from two to five years' gap in our large operations in space.

Mr. Webb said that at the level recommended by the House, he would be forced to stop the production of the uprated Saturn I booster which to date has been the most successful booster program this country has ever known—the program has never had a failure. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] questioned the witnesses on this point and his conclusion was that to stop the production of this booster after spending a billion dollars in developing it and then in 4 or 5 years having to go forward with the use of a different booster or the development of a new booster would be sheer waste. He said:

> In my opinion, that will be waste of the rankest kind.

I think we should go forward with the Apollo Applications program; the Congress authorized $347.7 million, the House recommended $300 million. This committee added $35 million to NASA's research and development budget with the recommendation that this be used for the Apollo Applications program. I strongly support that recommendation.

As a result of its analysis, the Senate Appropriations Committee also reduced the administrative operations request $20 million below the amount approved by the House.

Mr. President, this bill represents a detailed analysis in the best judgment of many of our most respected colleagues. It provides the Nation with an austere but strong program in aeronautics and space and with it our Nation can continue its leadership in these important areas of science and technology. I fully support the recommendations of the Appropriations Committee and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the U.S. space program has been directed toward balanced and orderly objectives in three fields: earth orbit, lunar, and planetary. Each is an essential element for balance. To maintain the balance requires the continuity, during 1968, of unmanned planetary program support. The fiscal 1968 decisions do, in fact, play a critical role in determining our planetary exploration capability in the 1970's which the National Academy of Sciences calls "the most rewarding goal on which to focus national attention for the 10 to 15 years following lunar landing."

Russia's planetary activity is a major part of her space program. Her launchings, while not as successful as ours, number 17, as opposed to our five. Further, they are now flying spacecraft that weigh up to 2,500 pounds, about four times the weight of our Mariner spacecraft. Our best estimates on the current Russian flight to Venus indicate that the is made here, what it will be doing is just keeping the personnel on board to study and restudy, when the real problem is to move ahead with a plan for the Voyager to take advantage of the window on Mars which opens in 1973 and again in 1975. After that, there will be several years, at least—I forget exactly, but I think it is 9 years—1973 and 1975 are the "window" years when we can get to it.

It is true that this is a large program, but it is the only method by which we can make use of the technology and the vehicles which we hope to have, which are ordered, and which are part of our upcoming arsenal in the space race.

No one can talk about specific things in this program, yet our own explorations in space so far have brought valuable information to this country—and I say this to my friend from South Dakota—which has been of almost inestimable value in our work of trying to predict the weather, which is of such great importance to the farmers, stockmen, and cattlemen in his State. This is one definite application we will get out of the work with Voyager. Knowing more about our universe, we will be able to predict weather, and we will get a hundred thousand other "fallouts" besides.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I am not questioning the efficacy of the project, but I am questioning what will happen if the $10 million is continued for the personnel.

Here we are in October. It will probably not be until next July or August when the follow-on money which is being knocked out will be raised. What will this do? Will this be actually a setback for the project? Are they going to be able to get the hardware started with the money knocked out? How much will this set back the project?

Mr. ALLOTT. The answer to that question is that research and design, particularly design, are very long lead items. If we do not put the $36 million into this bill, we will not see the 1975 "window" in the Mars program or the Voyager program. The $10 million will only keep the people "on board"—bodies working. It will not, however, enable us to go ahead with design, which has a long lead time, and which will help us accomplish, 8 years ahead, what we have been trying to accomplish so far.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, how much time do we have left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington has 4 minutes remaining and the Senator from Delaware has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] has talked about the "window." I did not understand it myself for a while, but the "window" is the proper time when Mars will be in the best position for space exploration in its relation to the earth. That will happen in 1975. As I understand it, a period of 9 years is involved before the proper "window" will occur again. I wanted to explain for the RECORD what is meant by the term "window." I hope I have let in some light on this matter.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield myself just 1 minute.

Based on the recommendations of the Space Committee and based upon the recommendations of the President, this program should have been stricken out in its entirety, but since we were not able to get approval of the earlier amendment, this is compromise; we are leaving in the $10 million to take care of the staff and continued research.

As for the "window," which is of concern to the Senator from Colorado, if we keep piling deficits on top of deficits, we shall not need a window; we shall be able to stand on top of the national debt and look over the roof.

There is literally enough money in this one bill to run a strip of dollar bills to the moon and back again, and it is all borrowed money. The very least we can do is hold in abeyance some of these projects, at least until such time as we have the money.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. May I suggest to the Senator that there might be another definition for this "window" we are hearing so much about—that the "window" is the aperture through which it is proposed to throw another $26 million of the taxpayers' money, which we do not have to spend now, and at a time when we have been asked by the President to search for ways to save. Here is a pretty good place for a substantial start.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I conclude, Mr. President, by quoting what President Johnson said on August 21 in connection with the House bill which had eliminated this project in its entirety:

> The reduction in funds recommended by the House Appropriations Committee will require the deferment and reduction of some desirable space projects. Yet, in the face of present circumstances, I join with the Congress and accept this reduction.

Why should the Senate override the President's recommendations and give him $26 million he does not need?

If Congress wants to maintain control of the pursestrings we should at least stop sending the White House more money than it is asking for and then later salve our consciences by passing a resolution saying to the President, "You cut expenditures, we did not have the nerve to do it."

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back——

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have just a half minute.

The White House asked for $71 million for Voyager.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That was in January 1967. On August 21 the President said to reduce the appropriations for this project.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virignia (after having voted in the affirmative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with my colleague, the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is paired with the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas would vote "yea," and the Senator from Alaska would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA]. If present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS] is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina would vote "yea," and the Senator from Florida would vote "nay."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senators from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN and Mr. PROUTY], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS] is absent because of death in his family.

The Senator from New York [Mr. JAV-

ITS] is absent for religious observance.

If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] is paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon would vote "yea," and the Senator from South Carolina would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY]. If present and voting, the Senator from New York would vote "yea," and the Senator from California would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 34, as follows:

[No. 287 Leg.]

YEAS—31

Baker
Bayh
Bennett
Brewster
Brooke
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Case
Church
Cotton
Dirksen
Griffin
Gruening
Hansen
Harris
Kennedy, N.Y.
Lausche
Miller
Mondale
Morse
Mundt
Nelson
Pell
Proxmire
Ribicoff
Spong
Talmadge
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—34

Allott
Anderson
Bible
Cannon
Cooper
Curtis
Dominick
Ellender
Fong
Hart
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Inouye
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McClellan
McGee
McIntyre
Monroney
Muskie
Pearson
Scott
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington

NOT VOTING—35

Aiken
Bartlett
Boggs
Byrd, W. Va.
Carlson
Clark
Dodd
Eastland
Ervin
Fannin
Fulbright
Gore
Hartke
Hatfield
Hollings
Hruska
Javits
Kennedy, Mass.
McCarthy
McGovern
Metcalf
Montoya
Morton
Moss
Murphy
Pastore
Percy
Prouty
Randolph
Russell
Smathers
Thurmond
Tower
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

So the amendment of Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware was rejected.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, the Senate Appropriations Committee has reported out an fiscal year 1968 appropriations bill for NASA of $4,678,900,000. This is $421,100,000 below the administration's request and $186,851,000 below the amount authorized by the Congress.

The Senate Appropriations Committee in their deliberations of this bill carefully considered the recommendations of the other House. We found that in some instances the House had cut too deeply. For example, NASA requested $297.7 million for their tracking and data acquisition program. The Congress authorized $290 million but the House in cutting the research and development budget recommended only $260 million. Our worldwide tracking and data acquisition system simply cannot be run efficiently at that level. Moreover, the Administrator of NASA, the Honorable James E. Webb, testified that to provide for the safety of the astronauts, he must have at least another $15 million in that program. The Senate committee has recommended that $15 million for tracking and data acquisition be added to the research and development request.

In the case of the nuclear rocket engine, the Administrator, Mr. Webb, testified that, if cut to the $45.6 million level as recommended by the House, he could not undertake the development of the 200,000-pound-thrust engine which everyone agrees would be the most efficient engine to develop. He would instead have to fall back to the development of the Nerva I engine with a thrust of between 60,000 and 75,000 pounds. With the additional $10 million in the research and development budget and $19.5 million in the construction of facilities, which has been recommended by the Senate committee, we can proceed with the development of the 200,000-pound-thrust engine which everyone agrees will be needed in the future for our space exploration programs. This is an excellent investment for the future and I strongly support this recommendation.

In the case of our planetary programs, Mr. Webb testified that if he had to absorb the cut voted by the House he could not initiate the Voyager program for the exploration of the planets. This would mean that the planetary exploration program of the United States would end with the 1969 Mariner-Mars mission. Yet all of the scientific testimony before the Congress, and particularly the testimony of people from the National Academy of Sciences, has been that the United States should increase the amount of its resources that is devoted to planetary exploration. Planetary exploration bears on some of the fundamental questions of our time; the origin of the earth, and in fact the origin of the universe itself, and whether or not there is extraterrestrial life. The committee, therefore, added $36 million to the House bill with its recommendation that a Voyager program proceed at that level during fiscal year 1968. I fully support this recommendation and hope that NASA will go ahead with a Voyager program. In view of the tremendous success of the Lunar Orbiter, NASA should give careful consideration to first doing orbiting missions of Mars and Venus.

In the area of manned flight exploration, the Apollo program is reaching its final stages. There is still the possibility that man will reach the moon and return safely to earth within this decade. But because of the technical problems, the probability is getting lower. Nevertheless, we must plan for what comes after the Apollo program in manned space flight. NASA has proposed a realistic program called the Apollo Applications program under which they propose to make use of the technology and equipment developed under the Apollo program for long-duration, earth-orbital flight and further lunar exploration. However, under the cut passed by the House, the Apollo Applications program simply could not proceed with more than four flights using the uprated Saturn I vehicle and after these flights there would be a gap in our manned space flight program. Mr. Webb testified that if he must run the space program at the level recommended by the House then:

> There will, in my opinion, be from two to five years' gap in our large operations in space.

Mr. Webb said that at the level recommended by the House, he would be forced to stop the production of the uprated Saturn I booster which to date has been the most successful booster program this country has ever known—the program has never had a failure. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] questioned the witnesses on this point and his conclusion was that to stop the production of this booster after spending a billion dollars in developing it and then in 4 or 5 years having to go forward with the use of a different booster or the development of a new booster would be sheer waste. He said:

> In my opinion, that will be waste of the rankest kind.

I think we should go forward with the Apollo Applications program; the Congress authorized $347.7 million, the House recommended $300 million. This committee added $35 million to NASA's research and development budget with the recommendation that this be used for the Apollo Applications program. I strongly support that recommendation.

As a result of its analysis, the Senate Appropriations Committee also reduced the administrative operations request $20 million below the amount approved by the House.

Mr. President, this bill represents a detailed analysis in the best judgment of many of our most respected colleagues. It provides the Nation with an austere but strong program in aeronautics and space and with it our Nation can continue its leadership in these important areas of science and technology. I fully support the recommendations of the Appropriations Committee and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the U.S. space program has been directed toward balanced and orderly objectives in three fields: earth orbit, lunar, and planetary. Each is an essential element for balance. To maintain the balance requires the continuity, during 1968, of unmanned planetary program support. The fiscal 1968 decisions do, in fact, play a critical role in determining our planetary exploration capability in the 1970's which the National Academy of Sciences calls "the most rewarding goal on which to focus national attention for the 10 to 15 years following lunar landing."

Russia's planetary activity is a major part of her space program. Her launchings, while not as successful as ours, number 17, as opposed to our five. Further, they are now flying spacecraft that weigh up to 2,500 pounds, about four times the weight of our Mariner spacecraft. Our best estimates on the current Russian flight to Venus indicate that the vehicle is carrying one or more probes to be launched when near the planet. The Russians must be convinced of the scientific, economic, political, and social rewards of an aggressive planetary exploration program. Their effort cannot be described as a race with us, but rather an orderly program to acquire knowledge of the planets.

NASA and the space industry have been investigating and refining concepts of Voyager since 1961. The program has been thoroughly defined and the required technologies will be available. If sufficient funds are not authorized for fiscal year 1968, the launch of Voyager will be delayed from 1973 to 1975 because Mars is "available" only once every 25 months.

Translated into resources, both Government and industry scientist-engineer teams have been building up and working for 6 years on Voyager at a substantial cost. A decision now to defer action in 1968 means these teams and their facilities and technologies cannot be held; rather, they would have to be dismembered and reassigned. Two years from now, the effort and starting costs to recreate this resource would be substantial.

The scientific community, NASA, the President and his advisers, all certify the scientific value of data from interplanetary space. Added to this are the Voyager-unique requirements that will result in the advancement of technologies. The space program is demonstrating how it can "spin off" elements of its technology to society. The Voyager program will assure the continued flow of these benefits, particularly in the areas of data management, automated science instruments, resources management, and long-life reliability for complex systems, as illustrated by work in the field of medical and health support, solution of problems of urban and regional areas, and education.

The amount of money approved by the Senate Appropriations Committee for the Voyager program is the minimum amount of money which can make this program viable.

Accordingly, I hope that the Senate will reject this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] has worked very long and diligently on the pending bill. She has a short statement to make, and I yield to her such time as she may desire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine is recognized.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, as a senior member of the Appropriations Committee, as well as the ranking minority member of the Senate Space Committee, I would like to add my observations on the NASA appropriations bill for fiscal year 1968 which is now before the Senate. First, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the chairman and the ranking minority member for the excellent manner in which they handled the hearings on this bill.

I think it is important to note that the appropriations bill which your committee has reported is substantially less than the authorization bill passed by the Senate.

In most instances, your committee carefully reviewed the funding for each of the program items and took the position that, wherever practicable, new, high cost programs should be deferred and that only those on-going programs which have proved successful and for which substantial investments had already been incurred during previous years be continued.

In my view, the appropriations bill before you provides for a well-balanced program at a funding level commensurate with the financial situation existing today. I therefore commend the passage of this bill to my colleagues.

In conclusion, I feel constrained to express my surprise at the action of the President with respect to the space program in announcing his acceptance of the NASA appropriations reductions made by the House Appropriations Committee at the time he signed the 1968 authorization bill.

He has certainly had quite a change of heart about the space program from those days when he headed the Senate Space Committee and so vigorously pushed for a full space program instead of a limited space program. His action clearly signaled a new policy of relegating the space program to a secondary position and one of considerably lower priority than that which he had insisted upon when he was chairman of the Senate Space Committee.

To be quite frank, he literally pulled the rug from under those who direct the space program. I am not surprised at the recent announcement of the resignation of Dr. Seamans effective at the end of this year. I am more surprised that his action has not, as yet, caused the resignation of Mr. Webb.

For surely Mr. Webb would be fully justified in resigning since the President has made his position almost untenable.

Nor would I be surprised at any other top level resignations at NASA now that the space program has been relegated to a secondary status.

Not only am I surprised at the President's statement but I am shocked at the timing of it—at the signing of an authorization bill before congressional action had been completed on the appropriations bill.

I fully agree with the observations made by the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on NASA, and by the ranking minority member of that subcommittee, when Mr. Webb was testifying before that subcommittee.

The chairman of the subcommittee stated:

> But when we talk about reduction of different amounts—the Senate also has a responsibility. Assume they would want to arrive at the total House figure. We still have the responsibility. We may want to cut one program instead of the one they cut, or vice versa. And we have that responsibility. We cannot just accept where the House made the cuts, even assuming that we were going to agree to the House total figure.

The ranking minority member of the subcommittee observed:

> I am fully aware of the prerogatives of the President, this one or any other to withhold funds that Congress has appropriated. But as a member of this committee and as a Member of the Senate, it seems to me that if we accept Mr. Webb's statement, he cannot ask for more than the House asked for in any item. But if we accept this in the context that the House's word is final, we might as well adjourn this meeting and take the House bill and go back. And this is not acceptable to me. And I think we have got to get such information as we can, because even though the President approved the report of the House, that would just simply forestall the constitutional function of this committee.

To this observation, the chairman of the subcommittee stated: "That is right."

And I join in in saying that it is right.

The President pulled the rug from under Mr. Webb, but the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on NASA and the full Senate Appropriations Committee refused to let the President pull the rug from under them and impose the will of the House on them in conflict with the constitutional function of the Senate committee and the conference procedure.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield such time, on the bill, to the Senator from Alabama as he may desire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I am grateful to the chairman for yielding to me.

I support the bill. I commend the committee for doing what I consider to be a very good job under extremely difficult circumstances.

I do have a few comments to make about one phase of the bill, referring to the administrative operations item.

The amount appropriated in the pending bill, H.R. 12474, is $628,000,000. This is $43.3 million less than the agency request, and $20 million less than the maximum permitted in the NASA authorization bill.

Despite the fact that the House reduced the NASA budget by $516 million, it appropriated virtually the full amount authorized for "Administrative operations." In other words, H.R. 12474 as passed by the House provides $648 million for "Administrative operations," the full amount authorized. The Senate bill provides only $628 million.

NASA officials have made it clear to me and others that even the House figure raises crucial problems. Cutting the appropriation by another $20 million raises even more complex and critical problems. Even under the higher House figure NASA might have to take advantage of its statutory reprograming authority to meet its minimum needs in this activity. NASA's administrators will have to display maximum ingenuity and flexibility to operate their programs under the amount appropriated for "Administrative operations."

It is a mistaken belief that huge reductions in space flight programs naturally permit corresponding reductions in appropriations for administration. Actually, reductions of the magnitude contained in this bill create innumerable new problems for NASA's administrators, and they will have to make considerable readjustment to maintain a viable program under the funds we have allowed them.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, this was a difficult bill to handle.

We reduced the administrative operations item by 6.5 percent. The research and development item, the big item, has been reduced 8 percent. I cannot see how a 6.5-percent cut is going to hurt the administration when the research and development item is 8 percent less.

We thought we did well. I want the record to show that the Senator from Maine did a great deal of work to get these figures for the committee. If we had been consistent, this cut across the board would have reduced the administrative operations item by 8 percent instead of 6.5 percent. I want the record to show that.

Mr. HOLLAND. Will the Senator yield me 3 minutes?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Florida, on the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I want it clearly understood by all Senators that this bill has been drastically reduced from the budget amount submitted by the administration. It has been reduced by the amount of $421,100,000, or 8.3 percent.

I also wish to make it very clear that the amount in this bill is approximately $95 million over the amount appropriated by the House. The reason for the increase is as clear as a bell, if one had listened to the testimony. There is not agreement now as to how this program can be balanced in view of its great overall reduction. Because of the increases we have made in the House bill and the provision mentioned by the distinguished Senator from Alabama, which allows a 5-percent reprograming latitude, there will be room, under this bill, to bring out a well-balanced bill, in my opinion, in conference, after we receive further information.

I cannot begin to state how distressed the Appropriations Subcommittee was to note how confused was the thinking of the Administrator when he appeared before us, after the action of the House; it indicated that he, himself, had little opinion at that time as to how a balanced program could be worked out.

This bill is of sufficient size to bring about a balanced program; yet, even the conference bill cannot be larger than 8.3 percent below the administration budget, which is a very material saving. I bring out this point because I believe we can get a well-balanced continuation of the important space program by the passage of this bill.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I wish to add to my earlier remarks, with particular reference to Nerva. It is appropriate and a bit ironic that the NASA appropriation comes to the Senate for a critical decision during the week of the 10th anniversary of the entry of the United States into the space race.

It would be unfortunate if this date passed without recognition of the tremendous human accomplishments which have transpired over the past 10 years since the beginning of the space age on October 4, 1957, when the first manmade, artificial earth satellite was launched into orbit. Thus started what many have thought to be man's noblest adventure.

History has a way of repeating itself. We stand today at virtually the same crossroads and have the same choice that faced the country a decade ago. I know that Members of the Senate share my recollection of a period of great national embarrassment, horrendous criticism, heated congressional debate, and investigations, even recriminations, which marked our reaction to the realization 10 years ago that our great American technology had failed at the starting gate of the space age.

History books will record many explanations of why we were not prepared. True, we had other problems on which to concentrate, just as we have today. They were problems which faded before our shocked realization in 1957 that the Russians had stolen the technological march on the United States.

Mr. Webb, the Director of NASA, told the Appropriations Committee just the other day, as he has said on other recent occasions, that Russia is expected to momentarily launch a new and bigger space spectacular, or a series of spectaculars that may even involve the orbiting of many men around the earth. This is to be done, our experts say, through the greater propulsion capability which the Russians have at this time.

The concern I have today is over threatening signs on the horizon for the future of American space technology. There are danger signals which indicate the possibility of a weakened resolve of our commitments in the face of technological and military challenges in 1967.

Mr. President, there were grave challenges and distractions 10 years ago, but these were brushed aside in our resolve to wipe out what for us was the shame of sputnik.

I was heartened a few days ago when the Senate Appropriations Committee put aside a weak-hearted 1968 appropriations bill sent to us by the House of Representatives which would have the effect of turning our back on firm national commitments made in the recent past. My esteemed colleague, the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], led the committee in reporting a bill which in effect said that we would not strip this mighty space age giant that we have created of its ability to survive the next decade.

Perhaps he was mindful of another great Senator of 10 years ago, Lyndon B. Johnson, who said in 1957 in a speech to CBS affiliates:

> There is now abundant evidence that a pattern of history is repeating. We are awakening to the reality that advances of Soviet technology and science have made our wall of security a relic of another age. . . . Our peril becomes a disaster when we fall so far behind that there is no hope of recovery. . . . We must not wait for calamity before undertaking a cure.

In 1958 and 1959 we began the slow road into space and later undertook the development of great rocket systems, the most advanced entry of which is soon to be launched at Cape Kennedy. I refer to the great Saturn V. With this vehicle, I have heard some say, we have kept our commitments and have been able to catch up with the Russians. But the one accomplishment that has remained beyond our grasp is the final closing of the "propulsion gap" which was discovered in 1957 and 1958.

Since 1955 tremendous accomplishments have been presented to the country by a small but uniquely qualified and trained Government/industrial team which has the responsibility of developing the Nerva rocket engine. That period of technology is coming to an end, but it is not a period when we can cut back and say that the job is ended. The basis of this logic was quickly recognized by the members of the Senate Appropriations Committee when they restored funds to the program which had been cut by the House of Representatives. The committee recognized that the Nerva II nuclear rocket engine may be our only hope of overtaking the Russians, whom we know are working on systems with capabilities greater than our mighty Saturn V.

It is imperative that we recognize what must be done to protect our technological options, and we must decide, as President Johnson so properly suggested, "between the necessary and the desirable." The President went on to say—and this point is conveniently missed by those who would strip us of our ability to keep our head above water in this propulsion race—that "we need not and dare not eliminate the necessary."

The action of the Senate Appropriations Committee and its subcommittee is entirely consistent with the unanimous and overwhelming support that the Space Committee always has given to the development of an atomic rocket engine for space travel. We have recognized the very great success that has been achieved in the laboratory and at the test site by continuing to fund the program.

Some who are stampeded by the concerns of today would have us mothball this program. They do not recognize that to do so would mean the abandonment of a successful $1 billion investment, together with the loss of a technological and scientific team that it may not be possible to reassemble again. Others have said, in effect, let us develop a smaller engine of 60,000 to 75,000 pounds of thrust which would take us to the moon and permit us to orbit the earth and indulge in experiments of that type.

What the Senate Space Committee and the Appropriations Committee have done is to put their overwhelming support behind the development of the next logical step—Nerva II, which would permit the development of rocket capabilities of 100,000 pounds of thrust. This would enable us to travel to the planets and to accomplish the boldest and most imaginative missions which are now foreseen, and to do it on the most economic and practical basis.

At the same time, the Senate Appropriations Committee has stripped from this program every ounce of fat. The committee has, in fact, given great weight to the financial realities of 1967 and has gone along with 80 percent of the cut which the House voted in the overall space program.

Mr. President, I believe that we have the obligation to pursue our opportunities in space and to fulfill the national commitment which has been pledged. I urge that the recommendation of the Appropriations Committee, which deserves to be praised, be supported to the fullest extent possible by the Members of the Senate.

It does not require a peer into the future to know that the Russians soon will launch a very dramatic and meaningful new achievement in space. All of our experts—while they may not agree in their predictions on what form the Russian spectacular will take—agree that this is definitely in the offing in the next weeks or months. When it happens, we will be able to look back on what we do today with a sense of accomplishment or a sense of failure.

Mr. President, without this atomic engine we will be consigning the United States to a secondary position in space. I am confident that the Senate is not going to permit this to happen.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, it is important that our Nation's nuclear rocket development program is given the proper perspective. There may be some who do not fully realize that this program called Project Rover is the next logical—and essential—step forward into space. It is not a question of "if" or "whether." It is a question of when.

The answer to that last question is now. Every scientist and technologist involved in our space effort will back that up. They will tell you that we cannot afford to wait, both in terms of time and money.

Our space effort is now at a critical juncture. It has moved ahead dramatically in what has essentially been a come-from-behind contest with Soviet space power. We have established a great capability of our own now, and I think we can begin to view the rocketry prowess of both nations as generally even.

But we know the Soviet Union is now developing a space booster far superior to our own best Saturn V. We may see that powerful booster in action this next year. There is also every reason to believe the Russians are also deeply involved in developing nuclear rocket engines.

The penalties of any delay now in Rover are enormous. We would immediately lose 2 years of advance—if not more—for 1 year's delay. More important, we would lose the initiative which I think we now hold.

And to save what? To save what is a relatively small budget expense we would automatically commit ourselves to a far greater expense involved in regrouping and reorganizing the fine group of people and the sophisticated equipment we now have gathered effectively—the group that has developed the brilliantly successful Nerva I engine prototype.

Now that we can move forward with assurance in developing the flying nuclear engine—Nerva II—how can we possibly hesitate? If we waited to develop a jet aircraft engine until we could afford it, we would still be droning along behind propellers. It would be just as pointless to limit ourselves deliberately to a restricted, chemically fueled engine as the power base for our space rocketry.

For those who prefer to restrict their consideration to strict dollars and cents, I have an equally compelling argument in support of Rover. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration appropriation, as submitted by your committee, has been chopped $421 million and more below the administration's budget request. Funds for nuclear rocket development, while bolstered by the Senate Appropriations Committee, are nonetheless $20.5 million under the budget recommendation.

So we have a meaningful spending cut in the overall appropriation and a significant reduction—as large as possible short of disablement—in the nuclear rocket program itself. The Project Rover total approved by the Senate Appropriations Committee—$76 million in all—is the "bare bones" compromise between the destructive House cut and the full administration recommendation of $96.5 million. If we can afford no more, we most certainly cannot afford less.

We are told the Rover appropriation now before us can be made sufficient to keep Nerva engine development moving ahead with the fine equipment and manpower now assembled. If it is not quite full speed ahead it is at least adequate to escape the tremendously costly setback a further reduction would cause.

One final word to those who have objected to the long-range commitment this program carries with it. I must point out that the commitment was made a long time ago when this Nation picked up the gauntlet dropped from Sputnik I. It is already a tremendous overall commitment, and the commitment to date in Project Rover alone has exceeded $1 billion.

Thus I must discount objections to a commitment. Our only commitment now is to the future. It cannot be avoided; only delayed. I submit that we would be foolish to delay the inevitable—pennywise and dollar foolish.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote, I have a pair with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay"; if I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore, I withdraw my vote.

The assistant legislative clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senators from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN and Mr. PROUTY], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS] is absent because of death in his family.

The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is absent for religious observance.

If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 60, nays 5, as follows:

[No. 268 Leg.]

YEAS—60

Allott
Anderson
Baker
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Brewster
Brooke
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Cannon
Case
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Ellender
Fong
Griffin
Hansen
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Inouye
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McClellan

McGee
McIntyre
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Mundt
Muskie
Nelson
Pearson
Proxmire
Ribicoff
Scott
Smith
Sparkman
Spong
Stennis
Symington
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—5

Church
Gruening
Metcalf
Morse
Pell

NOT VOTING—35

Aiken
Bartlett
Boggs
Byrd, W. Va.
Carlson
Clark
Dodd
Eastland
Ervin
Fannin
Fulbright
Gore
Hatfield
Hollings
Hruska
Javits
Kennedy, Mass.
Lausche
McCarthy
McGovern
Montoya
Morton
Moss
Murphy
Pastore
Percy
Prouty
Randolph
Russell
Smathers
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

So the bill (H.R. 12474) was passed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer (Mr. McINTYRE in the chair) appointed Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. ALLOTT, Mrs. SMITH, and Mr. HRUSKA conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, this measure funds the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; it will enable the continuation of this Nation's on-going space program.

The fact that the committee recommendations were so widely accepted by the Senate speaks best for the outstanding manner in which the measure was handled by the distinguished senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. Not many days have passed since Senator MAGNUSON last managed a bill of such major importance—the appropriations bill for HUD and independent offices. He nonetheless applied the same great diligence and careful scrutiny to the preparation of this measure; qualities that have characterized his handling of the many significant legislative achievements that bear his mark. The Senate is grateful to Senator MAGNUSON; it is grateful for the strong efforts he has again applied; it is grateful for another outstanding success—a success, in this instance, that enables our Nation to continue her vastly important space program. It is another great achievement for the senior Senator from Washington, but only one of many. The Senate and the Nation owe him a deep debt of gratitude—it is richly deserved.

Along with Senator MAGNUSON in leading the successful adoption of this measure was the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the ranking minority member of the subcommittee. His broad understanding of this Nation's space effort, his endeavor to assure that only funds required to maintain an effective program would be provided, served immensely to obtain the Senate's overwhelming endorsement. His efforts are greatly appreciated.

The senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] lent his valuable and highly effective support to this funding measure. His wide expertise and deep appreciation of both the needs and problems of our space program contributed so much to the discussion. As the chairman of the legislative committee charged with overseeing our space program, his clear and persuasive arguments supporting this measure were highly beneficial to the entire Senate.

Notable also was the support of the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH]. She urged the adoption of this measure with the same skillful advocacy that has been so consistently effective on every proposal that gains her endorsement. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] are to be singled out for their splendid cooperative efforts to expedite the disposition of this proposal. As always, they urged their own strong and sincere positions skillfully and ably but in no way impeded final action today.

Many other Senators joined the discussion; the debate was lively and most thoughtful. And yet the Senate acted with the utmost dispatch and efficiency—which certainly is a tribute to us all.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I strongly support the action of the Senate in restoring the budget of the National Transportation Safety Board in the amount requested.

The statistics of death, injury, and economic loss caused each year by transportation and transportation-related accidents are staggering. On our highways last year, 53,000 Americans were killed, 1,900,000 were injured, and $10 billion was wasted. In the air last year, 1,300 Americans were killed in approximately 5,500 aircraft accidents. In railroad accidents, including those at grade crossings, over 2,400 deaths occurred.

We must not, we cannot fail to take all necessary steps to end this national tragedy. In proposing a Department of Transportation, President Johnson wisely called for the establishment within the Department of a National Transportation Safety Board whose sole function was to be transportation safety. The President stated that the Safety Board's duties should include reviewing investigations of accidents to seek their causes, determining compliance with safety standards, examining the adequacy of the safety standards themselves, and assuming safety functions transferred from the ICC and the CAB.

The Congress followed the President's recommendations and created a National Transportation Safety Board. In the Department of Transportation Act, the Board was granted broad powers not only to recommend, but also to investigate and conduct special studies pertaining to safety in transportation and the prevention of accidents. The Board was given the statutory responsibility to act as an independent force in the Department for energizing safety activities.

The House cuts, if not restored, would have limited the Safety Board solely to accident investigations and appeal of certificate or license actions. The action taken by the Senate in restoring the amount requested represents a vote of approval for the Board to carry out the full duties which the President recommended, and the Congress authorized. I urge the Safety Board to proceed without delay to exercise its authority to the full extent necessary to carry out its sole function of saving the lives of its fellow Americans.

SEATTLE SUCCESS STORY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, Lawrence Electronics Co., of Seattle, Wash., is a small business, which manufactures highly sophisticated electronic instrumentation. In the spring of this year, the company employed five people, and the profit prospects for the immediate future were not too bright. In late May and early June, the company displayed its products at the Paris Air Show, with assistance from the U.S. Department of Commerce. Under directives from President Johnson, the Commerce Department has been very active in export expansion, and helping American businesses display their products in foreign countries has proven to be a very fruitful way to expand exports. In the case of Lawrence Electronics Co., the effort was a tremendous success. Mr. Samuel I. Lawrence, Jr., president of the firm, reported $120,000 in direct sales at the Paris Air Show, and he estimated that an additional $300,000 in sales would come about in the next 12 months as a result of his participation in the show. Although these figures may not seem significant when compared to the balance sheets of large corporations, I can assure you that the numbers marked a milestone in the history of this small business in Seattle. Mr. Lawrence reports that he can now look forward happily to paying taxes on his profits. In addition to this factor, of course, increased exports also create additional jobs in our economy, and help cut down the size of our international balance-of-payments deficit. To my mind, the export expansion program is an excellent illustration of a government-business partnership that is truly in the public interest.

PUBLIC WORKS AND ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 559, H.R. 11641.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 11641) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy

Commission, the Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission, the Delaware River Basin Commission, Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Water Resources Council, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there will be no more votes today. The introductory statements on the present bill will be made on Monday sometime after the transaction of routine morning business.

Mr. President, we have an agreement to adjourn until 10:30 a.m. on Monday next. The junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] will be recognized for up to 45 minutes, and the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] will follow and be recognized for up to 1 hour.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION ON MONDAY

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will committees be permitted to meet on Monday?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be permitted to meet until at least 12 noon on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESPONSIBILITY AND ACCOUNTABILITY OF THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, there has been a good deal of conversation lately—in the Congress, in the press, and throughout the Nation—about sympathy for the President.

Sympathy is a curious and questionable emotion. It implies, for me, an element of generous disdain. I frankly question whether any man, including the President, welcomes it.

It is true that our Nation faces, at this time, some of the most difficult, frustrating, and bitterly contested decisions of its story history. As the Nation's Chief Executive and as the focus of its policies, the President does bear a unique share of these burdens.

But a President also bears a unique responsibility for them—a responsibility which he openly seeks and the precise nature of which perhaps no candidate to seek that high office was ever so well aware as the incumbent one. There is every indication that he will ask the American people next year to renew his mandate for the exercise of that responsibility. This Presidency was openly sought. It has been exercised in full knowledge of its vast import.

With responsibility goes accountability, inseparably and without dispute. For those problems which he inherits, and for those crises not of his own making, no man can be held accountable. But where positive leadership can be reasonably asked, and when it is not provided, accountability begins to run.

Yesterday, Mr. President, the President of the United States lashed out at the Congress for its failure to avert an imminent fiscal crisis. It is the responsibility of Congress, we are told, to make cuts in the President's budget. And it is the further responsibility of the Congress, we are told, to promptly enact the President's proposed surtax. Otherwise, we are told, we in the Congress must be fully accountable for the "consequences"—runaway inflation and prohibitive interest rates.

Mr. President, I think it is time that it be made perfectly clear to the President and to the people precisely where the responsibility and its concomitant accountability properly rest. Speaking for myself, there is no question that they rest with the President.

Many of us, in both Houses and on both sides of the aisle, have frequently stated that in the absence of good-faith efforts by the President to make substantial cuts in Federal spending we will not support an increase in taxes. I, for one, will not vote for the tax until such efforts are made. But let us recognize this position for what it is. It is not necessarily an assertion that some additional tax might not be needed. It is a conditional demand for reduced spending. It is an effort on our part to convince the President that the people want a cut in spending. It may be that higher taxes are called for. But the taxing power is only one of the fiscal tools available to a government—and perhaps the most cumbersome. How can we, in good faith, ask the people we represent here to give up more when they clearly want and seek a reduction in spending?

The President told the Congress in August that he had directed his department and agency heads to "look into" the possibility of a reduction in expenditures. Mr. President, on Tuesday of this week, Assistant Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Charles J. Zwick, told an audience in New York that cuts of $5 billion would be "unreasonable, impractical, and of a size and nature that would undermine our domestic programs." It is highly improbable that Mr. Zwick would have made such a statement without the approval of the President. I suppose it might be reasonable to infer from such strong language that perhaps half that amount is about the best we can expect—$2.5 billion.

The tax proposal of the President, if enacted exactly as offered, would have provided, in his estimation, $6.3 billion in additional revenues during this fiscal year. Assuming that the President might be willing to reduce expenditures by, say, $2.7 billion, we would still be confronted by a budget deficit of $20 billion at a minimum, which does not include the sale of participation certificates, which have the same effect on the money market as the financing of the regular debt. And there is as yet no indication that the President might be willing to cut even $2.7 billion.

Mr. President, the most critical aspect of this loggerhead is the question of who is best qualified to identify those areas in which substantial cuts might be made. With all of the real respect and credit due the tremendously able members of the respective appropriations committees and their staffs, I submit with deep conviction that the man who makes the budget should cut the budget. The President, assisted by the department heads and the very able director of the Bureau of the Budget, and with a staff of literally thousands, is far better qualified than individual members of Congress to recommend these cuts.

Let there be no confusion of terms. We are speaking of recommendations. We are speaking of areas in which cuts might be made. The President is quite right that the Congress holds the purse strings. The actual and final cuts will be ours. What we ask for is the comprehensive sort of advice that the Executive is uniquely qualified to give.

For those who invoke the superficially attractive but specious argument that only when the Congress has completed the appropriation process will the Executive know what it has to work with, I answer that such an argument ignores entirely the nature of the process itself. The process begins with the budget. This is why we have a budget in the first place. This is why we have regular and routine budget revisions. If the Congress knew precisely what should be spent and how these funds should be apportioned among the various agencies and programs, there would be no need for an Executive budget submission. The Congress authorizes appropriations to indicate its evaluation of the value of individual programs. The President, in the context of these figures, makes his own evaluation and submits the budget request. Differences are ironed out and compromised in the Congress. This traditional and effective form of dialog between the two branches is now being disregarded by the President. For a President who berates the Congress for its delay in acting on his tax proposal, it is curious indeed that he waits indefinitely to make essential revisions and recommendations.

Mr. President, I think that it should be made clear, if it is not already, that the Congress is by no means unwilling to make cuts—deep, substantial ones. On the contrary, I feel that the Congress is fiercely eager to make such cuts.

Profoundly mindful of the urgency of many well-conceived and vital programs which affect people here at home and abroad, we remain convinced that priorities must be defined. The Congress might well disagree with the recommendations made by the President for reducing expenditures. In that event the responsibility and accountability would genuinely be ours. But until given that option, they are not. If persistently denied that option, the Congress will, I think, make cuts on its own—"meat-ax" cuts, a weak, incohesive, and dangerous approach. Whether they take the form of across-the-board percentage cuts or an unprecedented ceiling of expenditures, it is my belief that they will be made in any event. But why must it be done without the expertise of the executive branch?

Mr. President, if this administration believes that a 10-percent surtax alone can avert inflation, then I remain to be convinced of the gravity of the pending fiscal crisis. If this administration believes that cuts of $5 billion are unthinkable, then I remain to be convinced of the gravity of the crisis we face. The President seems to believe that he bears no responsibility for the size of his budget. He is wrong. I hope that he does not also mistakenly believe that he will not be held accountable by the people of this country for the size of that budget and the unprecedented deficit that it will almost certainly produce, together with consequent inflation and a tightening of the credit market.

The President is qualified to advise the Congress, today, as to how it might best reduce or defer nonessential expenditures. He must be aware of that option. He should be very much aware that the people of this country want him to exercise that option. If he will not, and if he now and later seeks to pass the buck to the Congress, then he must be prepared to be accountable to the people.

Yesterday, it seems clear, the President did seek to pass this buck to the Congress. He might bear in mind the well-known assertion of a former President, who said of his desk in the Oval Office: "The buck stops here."

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. BAKER. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. HANSEN. I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Tennessee for the pertinent and timely remarks he has just made.

These are, indeed, difficult days which face the people of this country. With the war in Vietnam costing, by some estimates, as much as $30 billion a year, with unprecedented domestic problems facing them on all sides, with nondefense spending rising more rapidly than the increase in the military budget, with crime up dramatically compared to the increase in the population, with civil strife rampant in most of America's major cities, and rioting becoming the No. 1 cause of concern among our people, I can understand why the distinguished Senator from Tennessee has chosen to speak out on some of the issues which we must face squarely at this time.

Against this backdrop of the confused and complicated economic picture which characterizes the country today, we must recognize that there are facets of the economy which are prosperous, which are doing well. At the same time, there are other significant elements of the economy which are hurting badly; so that we have, at one and the same time, those who believe we can do more of all things, and those who feel that the national interest demands we cut back, retrench, fix, and assign priorities.

I think that the President's attempt to pass the buck, as the distinguished Senator from Tennessee has said, does not reflect the Executive responsibility that we would hope he would continue to manifest but, rather, reflects political expediency.

I am certain that, just as the Senator from Tennessee has stated, if the President refuses longer to fulfill the duties which are clearly his, then the legislative arm of the Government will have to step in.

If it does so, it will step in not with all the understanding before it which the President himself must have, and surely does have, but rather will have to assume not only its responsibilities but those as well that clearly should be in the hands of the Chief Executive.

I hope that we may have the providential guidance and recommendations which come from a clear insight into all the problems, and a clear insight into what the various departments of Government believe they can operate with, insofar as their budgets are concerned. If we have this sort of direction from the President, then we can do a better job. We can be more responsive to the people of this country.

If we do not get that guidance and direction, then we will have to go ahead as the President seems to wish us to do.

I compliment the distinguished Senator from Tennessee for his very excellent statement.

Mr. BAKER. I thank the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

SUSPENSION OF CIVIL WORKS AND CERTAIN MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, one would have thought from President Johnson's news conference yesterday that his administration was helpless to reduce or suspend Federal spending until Congress had enacted all appropriation bills.

I am sure, therefore, that all Members of Congress were astonished by the action of the Pentagon in suspending certain military construction, and including all civil works. The only conclusion I draw from that action is that if the Pentagon can suspend progress on civil works, it can suspend further work on all other Defense Department activities, depending solely upon its discretion in the matter and not upon any action by Congress.

It is my understanding that the order of the Department directs all division engineers to suspend advertising and awards on all new civil works construction until further notice, effective immediately. Bids which have already been submitted on construction will be opened October 23; but new commitments in civil works research and development and new civil works hiring will be suspended indefinitely, except for maintenance and operations.

The press describes this action as a deferral only of authorized public works, for which appropriations were made for fiscal year 1967.

I can make my own interpretation of it, however. My interpretation, based on 22 years in public office, is that the administration has made an impoundment of money in the one area where it believes Members of Congress are most sensitive and will respond by acting on the President's request for a tax increase.

But I predict that the result will be quite different. Certainly it will be quite different at the grassroots of America, and at the ballot boxes of America, as the word goes out to one community after another that if it wants work to proceed on a development proved to be needed and economically sound that its people will first have to ante up 10 percent more in taxes to pay for the unjustifiable war in Vietnam.

I do not address these remarks to Members of Congress. They will have their own interpretations to make, and will respond to this pressure in their own ways.

But to the people of the United States, and the voters of America, I say: "Your Government is holding hostage for a tax boost the future resource development of every State and every community. It is telling you that if you want development of American rivers and harbors for our own commercial growth and expansion you must pay first for the war in Vietnam."

The administration thinks the American people will never catch up with the fact that the war in Vietnam is costing them over $29 billion a year, and that if the war were ended or even scaled down, there would not be any necessity for a tax increase and there would not be any need to postpone or cancel the development of the United States in favor of the development of millions of dollars worth of harbors, docks, roads, and development projects in South Vietnam and nearby countries.

Oh, we have millions for harbors and docks around the world, but we are going to freeze the millions in the United States. The answer of the voters should be to freeze the politicians out of office who stand by and permit this kind of political shakedown on the part of this administration.

The President mentioned that lack of congressional action on his tax request is costing the Government $20 million a day in lost revenue.

I have some suggestions where the President can save $20 million a day, and more, and not need more revenue.

First, he can bring home four divisions from Europe that are serving no useful purpose other than to eat up American taxpayers' money. If the development of American resources can be sacrificed to the war, the maintenance of the American Army in Europe can be sacrificed to the war. At the rate our defense spending is going, we are going to have to do something to enhance the economic base of our own country, for no Military Establishment the size of ours can exist for long without a vast and growing economic base to support it.

As I have said so many times, I say for the record again, we cannot justify maintaining six American divisions in Europe. We are the only nation in NATO that has ever kept its manpower commitments under NATO. Not even the Germans have kept their obligations under NATO from the standpoint of manpower commitments. Never has Canada kept its manpower commitments. Never has Great Britain kept its manpower commitments. Never has France kept its manpower commitments. Never has a single member of NATO. It is only the American taxpayers who have been played for suckers under NATO.

I want to say to the voters of this country: "Take them to an accounting at the voting booths when they continue to fleece you out of these millions of dollars and then freeze money to develop the economic strength of our country."

Second, may I say to my President that he can terminate the disgraceful, shameful support of the Greek military junta that is costing the American taxpayers a great amount of their largess, for that junta is even now clamoring for more American money. This administration is on the way to giving it to them. Read the New York Times for this morning.

The New York Times today tells of the displeasure of the American Ambassador in Greece over the blatant fascism of the Greek military clique. It seems its lack of discretion may have slowed up the American Ambassador's plans for getting $100 million worth of U.S. military aid resumed to this military junta. The Times story relates that since August, there has been on the President's desk a memorandum in support of resumption of U.S. aid to this Greek military dictatorship. The American Ambassador, according to the Times, "urged the military leaders to avoid such eye-catching action," referring to the jailing of leading Greek critics of the junta.

This country's financial and military backing of the current rulers of Greece is one of the most disgraceful chapters in our diplomatic history. It is a total sellout of American principles. It is the ultimate in the cynical, heavy-handed use of foreign countries that has come to characterize so much of American foreign policy.

The United States stands for nothing in Greece other than total militarism of the Greek military junta. Our policy is removing the last doubts about what America stands for. In Greece, we stand only for the furnishing of several hundreds of thousands of Greek bodies for the NATO army. That is the total interest of the United States in Greece, for to obtain those soldiers we have sold out constitutionalism, we have sold out personal liberty, and we have bought any Greek Army officer who can deliver soldiers to NATO.

It is shameful that this democracy of ours is supporting a shocking military dictatorship in Greece. The cost is $100 million of American arms. I say to the President, "You can save it, and the American taxpayers are entitled to have you save it."

Unless he does, Americans will sacrifice their own resource development, because there is not the slightest doubt that as soon as a velvet glove can be drawn over the iron fist of the Greek junta, our military aid will continue to flow to a land which could not possibly fight a war against anyone.

Let me say that to give the impression that the Greek Army could sustain any military action is wrong. Get into the records and find out what our military experts say about the lack of military efficiency of the Greek Army. It has no economic foundation whatsoever, other than the U.S. Treasury and U.S. weapons and supplies. Yet we pour millions and millions into that army.

Third, the President could save the American people about 2 days worth of tax increase by terminating our aid obligations to Argentina and Peru. I speak as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Latin America; and I yield to no one in the efforts I have been putting forth to help build up the economic productive power of Latin America. But the military aid that goes into Latin America detracts from its economic productive power. These two countries, Argentina and Peru, have been receiving economic and military aid from us on the ground that they were in dire economic need.

But obviously, what we hear about poverty and need, especially in Peru, cannot be true if that country can buy supersonic aircraft from France.

Here we are, dealing with a country whose per capita income is less than $200 a year. Yet they buy supersonic aircraft from France; and we pour military aid into their pockets.

Now we see Peru proposing to buy supersonic aircraft from France—only because they could not blackmail us into selling them supersonic aircraft. So they hold up the threat, "You either make it available to us, or we will go elsewhere."

Well, let them go elsewhere, but let them go elsewhere also to get their economic aid. Let them go elsewhere for all their foreign assistance. I say to the American taxpayers: "Make clear to the Members of Congress that you have had enough; you have had enough of the foreign aid program based upon the demands of small-time generals and admirals who command more support in the Pentagon than among their own people."

Another area where the President can save hundreds of millions of dollars is for the antiballistic missile, which has yet to be shown to be effective in increasing the protection of the American people, and which also, may I say, when you deal with nuclear bombs, involves a problem that we do not hear the administration telling the American people very much about.

Mr. President, it will not be the bomb that will kill millions of American people, to any degree whatsoever, in comparison with the fallout that will kill them.

Mr. President, even if we could assume—and we cannot assume it, because we know it is recognized we cannot be sure—than an anti-missile-missile program would knock out the missiles, we know it would not knock out the fallout.

That is why, Mr. President, we are confronted with the great problem of seeing to it that there is a nuclear disarmament program. That is why we have got to recognize, before it is too late, that unless we stop the development, the maintenance, and the possession of nuclear bombs, mankind's survival through this next century is very much in doubt.

Politicians ought to be thinking about the next century rather than the next election. Mr. President, if we do not proceed to take steps to bring to an end production of the bombs by which a nuclear war can be fought, then all the anti-missile-missile programs in the world will be for naught, for they cannot end the fallout.

While I am on that subject, Mr. President, we do not hear very much, either—although the physicists and the scientists can tell us, we do not hear much said—about giving an answer to the hydrogen bomb boys, when we hear them say, almost every day, "When is this administration going to let the military start dropping the hydrogen bomb?"

Sounds good, does it not? Mr. President, that is an adrenalin reaction, not a cortical reaction, on the part of the hydrogen bomb boys. They are thinking with their emotions, not with their heads.

Suppose, Mr. President, to use a hypothetical situation, we were to undertake a hydrogen bomb attack on China tomorrow. We cannot be sure but that thousands and thousands of others would die from it—perhaps even in the United States. Familiarize yourself with the direction and force of the prevailing winds. You do not drop hydrogen bombs in China and have the fallout stay in China. It will settle on Japan, the Philippines, Taiwan, eventually Hawaii, Seattle, on Portland, and on San Francisco. It will move inland all the way to Chicago, as the scientists point out.

Have we lost our senses? Have we in the United States with blind nationalism so completely wrapped the flag around us that we have become, among all the nations, the world's No. 1 warmonger? Well, we had better remove the blinders and take another look, with only 6 percent of the population of the world, and with an overwhelming majority of the world's people already against us, Mr. President; because we are developing here such blind nationalism that our only response to the troubled areas of the world is the advocacy of armed force.

That is why I have argued so consistently and persistently for so long that we had better face up to the fact that we cannot become the military policeman of the world and survive, for the world will destroy us. It may take the better part of a century to do it, but the United States, no more than any other power that has ever attempted it in the history of mankind, can set itself up as the military dominator of the world and expect to survive. And when we keep in mind the fact that by the year 2000 we will have less than 6 percent of the population of the world—assuming, of course, that the statistics I now give will not be changed by a nuclear war; and if they are changed by a nuclear war, it is all over for all of us, anyway—as the population experts point out, we will have a little less than 6 percent, which will be proportionately less than now; because while our population will have increased, it will not have increased at the same ratio as that of other areas.

The United States and the Western Powers together will have a little less than 20 percent of the population, but they will be divided, for the people in the other Western nations have more sense than to follow the blind nationalism of the United States. They are not following us now. France has thrown us out. She fears us. She fears what we are up to. She does not intend to cooperate with the military policies of the United States.

We will see, Mr. President, great changes taking place in the attitudes of the other Western peoples. The Prime Minister of Great Britain is getting a taste of it now. He recognizes that he will not for long be able to hold the people of his country behind him if he continues giving even lipservice to America's policies in Vietnam. There is too much growing opposition in British public opinion for that. He has already lost the support, on the military issue, of his own party. Analysts in Great Britain, in their writings these days, are pointing out that if the Prime Minister of Great Britain does not change his course vis-a-vis Vietnam, he is through. He should be, too.

Some of us had a conference with six members of the Labor Party sitting in the House of Commons who visited these Chambers not so many days ago. They came over here, they said, to try to make it clear in this country, particularly among the parliamentarians, before it is too late, that within the Members of the Parliament of the British Labor Party, there is a great rising opposition to the British Prime Minister in respect to his military policy.

I think we need to face up, and the President should face up, before it is too late, to the fact that here is a place where millions of dollars can be saved, rather than in an effort to seek to freeze and impound any money necessary to keep vital and volatile the domestic economy of the country.

VIETNAM WAR CAUSING DOMESTIC CRISIS

Most important, I would point out to the President that an end to the war in Vietnam would save $29 billion. When are the American taxpayers going to have an end to that costly and fruitless burden? The administration has not said. It has no plans for an end to the war, no program, nothing but the empty hope that if we just keep spending enough long enough, somehow it will come to an end. But if we can force a surrender, then eventually we may get negotiations, but no peace, only a truce.

Next, I suggest to the President that before he asks Congress to pass appropriations bills as a precondition to budget cuts, he show Congress a new tax plan that will bring oil and gas companies into the taxpaying fraternity.

If there is a war emergency that requires wartime taxes, I do not understand why the most wealthy companies and stockholders in the United States should be exempt from paying them.

Before Congress acts on the 10-percent surtax—and I shall vote against it on the basis of the administration's present fiscal policy—the administration should be asked to send an additional tax bill to the Hill, repealing the depletion allowance for oil and gas companies, plugging up the loopholes for charitable trusts that escape business taxes.

Mr. President, as a stanch defender of our system of economic freedom based upon a private enterprise system, I have for many years opposed the tax escape of so-called charitable trusts that are formed to operate private business, or what should be private business. One cannot really say that a business operated by a charitable trust is in fact a private business. It is in competition with private business.

I can take anyone interested across the country from coast to coast and show him a whole variety of businesses operated by charitable trusts that do not pay a cent of taxes and that operate in competition with businesses across the country that are run by private entrepreneurs that pay taxes. It is not fair. It is not equitable.

Let me say that some people think it is not good politics to say it, but whenever I start saying something because it is good politics, you will know that I am slipping. My job is not to speak for politics. My job is to speak for my people and country.

Any church that is operating a private business under a charitable trust and is not paying taxes on that business is not carrying out its responsibilities of good citizenship. The churches have the responsibility of being good citizens, too.

Any charitable trust that is operating a business in competition with private business ought to have that loophole taken away from it. Of course, I am for tax exemption for truly charitable operations, hospitals and churches as far as a church worship property is concerned. However, when a church builds up an economic dynasty, an economic empire in competition with the rest of the economy and avoids taxes, we ought to have the guts in the Congress of the United States to plug the loophole. We owe it to the taxpayers of the whole country.

Mr. President, we just got through on the floor of the Senate a few moments ago approving an appropriations bill for $5 billion in round numbers to put a man or men on the moon at a time of great national crisis, at a time when our total domestic budget is $20 billion compared, for example, to a military budget of over $70 billion—the largest in the history of the Republic.

To talk about restricting it is to talk about a sacred bull in American politics that many politicians seem to bow down to.

I have not forgotten one bit of sound observation that I heard from a former President of the United States, President Eisenhower. That was the comment he made as he retired from office about the danger of the industrial-military complex. It is upon us; It controls the economy today. It dominates the economic life of the American people, but they just do not know it.

We have a $70 billion budget there. Try to cut it. I know. I tried, but we could not cut it. However, we are supposed to cut right into the heart of the $20 billion domestic program on which the whole welfare of our people happens to be dependent.

We can pass today a $5 billion budget to put men on the moon. However, when we talked about putting men in the ghettos on jobs, then look at the problem we had with the poverty appropriations bill. The drive on vote after vote in the Senate was a drive to cut the guts out of the poverty program.

We are going to pay dearly for that course of action. Mr. President, those cuts in the poverty budget are going to cost the American taxpayers many times the so-called savings of the cuts. For, let us face it, these tens upon tens upon tens of thousands of fellow Americans that are poverty stricken and that are forced by the rest of us to live in conditions of human degradation and to see their children malnourished know what it is to suffer in a society most of which is affluent. They are not going to take it. And all the antiriot laws and all the law enforcement measures will not stop the insistence of these tens of thousands of Americans that they are entitled as a matter of right to humane treatment from the rest of an affluent country. And they are not getting it.

It is easy for politicians to pontificate about how some of them get into the condition they are in. But, Mr. President, I was not brought up on a religious faith that believes in visiting on the offspring the sins of the ancestors. I was brought up on a religious faith that we are our brother's keeper.

The Congress of the United States, in my judgment, has not lived up to that spiritual teaching in regard to the poverty bill.

Why do we talk about making a cut of some $7.5 billion in a $20-billion domestic program but say that we must not touch the $70 billion-plus military budget, only $22 billion of which in that program is Vietnam connected?

How can you possibly justify the military program, the expenditure of American taxpayers' dollars in Europe, in Africa, in Latin America, in the subcontinent, in an hour of crisis? That is where the cut should be made. Let me hear my President talk about why he does not propose a cut in a $70 billion military budget.

Let me hear my President tell the American people why he is not willing to cut deeply into a foreign aid program, including military aid, that is wracked with waste, inefficiency, and corruption.

Let me hear my President tell the American people why he is not insisting upon plugging the loopholes in the tax structure.

Let me hear my President tell the American people why he does not go only for a reasonable research program on NASA, and postpone—until we get out of the horrible mess we are in in Southeast Asia—the large expenditure that is involved in the $5 billion sanctioned by the Senate just a few moments ago.

I should like to hear my President and I should like to see my President adopt those reforms before my President hears from the voters; because he is going to hear from them if he follows the course of action that is now being followed. And I do not want that voter action. For let me say that when I compare this man with any of the offerings of the party of the opposition, I will still take my chances with my President, despite my disappointments with the course of action he is following in regard to his budget and in regard to some aspects of foreign policy.

But I will never give up, and I will continue to hope that he will see the light of reason that is involved in the position of those of us who have stood up against bitter castigation and attack now for approximately 4 years. We were alone for a long time, but no longer. We even have great support within Congress, and millions of Americans are behind us. They have recognized that this military course of action is a course of action of folly.

But it is not too late for my President, in my judgment, to change the course of action that his administration is following in foreign policy, in budgetary policies, and in tax policy.

It is not too late for the President to make the savings where they should be made, rather than from a $20 billion domestic program which is already inadequate to meet the crying economic needs of the people of our country.

I close my remarks on this subject by asking unanimous consent to have printed in the Record certain writings that I believe bear out with crystal clarity the point of view I have been expressing here today.

It is true that, in 95 percent of the programs of the President, he has found me supporting him; but I owe it to him, as I see my responsibility as a Senator, to disagree when I believe he is wrong, and to express my disagreement, in the hope that some way, somehow, he will see that it is important that he change his policy to meet the crying demands that the American people are rightfully making in respect to both his foreign policy and his economic domestic policy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the article from the New York Times entitled "Moves by Greece Delay U.S. Arms"; an editorial entitled "Tragedy in the Making," from the Washington Daily News of October 6; a letter from Dr. M. T. Merrill, of John Day, Oreg., which appeared in the Oregonian on October 3, describing his experience and conclusions from his medical service in South Vietnam; the editorial from the September 2 issue of Labor, entitled "Way To Equal Sacrifice: Plug Up Tax Loopholes," and the series of articles from Commonweal of September 22, the entire issue of which was devoted to the war in Vietnam. The first of these is "From Saigon to Detroit," by William Pfaff; the second is "Treadmill to Disaster," by James O'Gara; the third is "The Human Cost," by James Finn; the fourth is "Policies of Delusion," by John Moriarty; the fifth is "All, All Honorable Men," by Michael Novak; the sixth is "Exercise in Deception," by Tran Van Dinh; the seventh is "The Case for Withdrawal," by Peter Steinfels.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From The New York Times, Oct. 6, 1967]

Moves by Greece Delay U.S. Arms—Plan To Resume Shipments Undercut by Arrests

(By Peter Grose)

Washington, October 5.—New arrests of opposition figures by the Greek military regime are having the effect of undercutting efforts by the Johnson Administration to resume shipments of large-scale military aid to Greece.

The Administration wants to resume aid shipments because President Johnson's top advisers judge that Greece's role in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization requires continued support.

Nevertheless, the State Department expressed annoyance today that the outspoken Athens newspaper publisher, Mrs. Helen Vlachos, was placed under house arrest yesterday. Since the military coup of April 21, the United States has publicly chided the ruling junta about 20 times.

Yet United States officials believe that except for notorious individual blunders, the new regime shows promise of moving toward what they describe as "reasonably constitutional procedures."

RENEWAL RECOMMENDED

A comprehensive recommendation for resumption of the military aid, which was suspended after the coup, has been on President Johnson's desk since August. It was prepared by a senior interagency policymaking group headed by Under Secretary of State Nicholas de B. Katzenbach.

The United States had been supplying the Greek armed forces with about $100-million worth of military equipment a year, including tanks and jet aircraft, to help Greece meet its missions in NATO. Lesser supplies, such as small arms and ammunition, were quietly supplied throughout the summer, but the large shipments were blocked.

Momentum toward resuming the shipments late in the summer was abruptly halted by a series of what officials here called boners, such as the ban the regime imposed on miniskirts and its revocation of the Greek citizenship of Melina Mercouri, the actress, who had spoken out against the coup from the start.

United States officials, including the Ambassador in Athens, Phillips Talbot, urged the military leaders to avoid such eye-catching actions, which only added impetus to the more fundamental criticisms of military dictatorship voiced by the American liberal and intellectual community.

On Tuesday it became known that the civilian who had headed the Greek Government just before the coup, Panayotis Canellopoulos, had been placed under house arrest. He had publicly denounced the military junta. A State Department spokesman, Carl Bartch, added another to the series of complaints the next day and said the United States "continues to hope for an early return to constitutional procedures with traditional liberties restored."

Then yesterday, the junta put Mrs. Vlachos under the house arrest. She had called the military men who ruled Greece "mediocrities."

Criticism in Congress was aroused by a three-day visit to Washington by two senior financial officers of the military regime, the governor of the Bank of Greece, Dimitrios N. Galanis, and Costas Thanos, secretary general of the Ministry of Co-ordination. The two officials left Washington yesterday, after meetings at the State Department and the Export-Import Bank.

A bipartisan group of 52 members of the House of Representatives signed a letter to the Administration yesterday urging against any consideration of economic aid for Greece.

A spokesman for the Export-Import Bank said there had been no discussion of economic aid during the talks there, which he described as a courtesy call. The State Department spokesman said the Greek officials made no formal request for aid during their meeting with Assistant Secretary of State Anthony M. Solomon, and that there had been no change in the Administration's embargo on large military shipments.

[From the Washington Daily News, Oct. 6, 1967]

Tragedy in the Making?

Peru, which needs $20 million worth of the latest supersonic jet fighter-bombers like Uncle Sam needs more red ink, nevertheless has signed up to buy such planes from France, informed sources in Washington report.

Altho it has been U.S. policy to discourage a Latin American arms race, the U.S. has not unwillingly peddled less sophisticated arms south of the border as Latin governments conformed more or less to our democratic ideal for their development.

So U.S. gripes about Peru's nonsensical agreement to buy a dozen 1430-mile-an-hour Mirage V's from France would seem to carry little weight—except that the U.S. has been a generous contributor to Peru's economic development and the overall progress of Latin America.

Since 1961 the U.S. has contributed more than $300 million in economic aid to help Peru tackle such grave domestic problems as grinding poverty and mass illiteracy and to encourage tax and land reform. (Some 30 families are said to control most of the arable land while the majority of Peru's Indian population is landless, voteless and lives completely outside the fiscal sector).

Peru is, of course, a sovereign nation. It can, of course, buy whatever arms it can pay for where it can get them. And France, of course, can sell to Latin America where de Gaulle has been grandly busy trying to undercut U.S. influence.

But if the Peruvian plane purchase—plus the French sale to Argentina of 50 late-model tanks—does add up to the feared Latin American arms race, nobody but the cynical salesman will win.

Latin Americans will be deprived even longer of the economic and social progress they desperately need. Armed conflict among them will be encouraged. And most of the billions of dollars of Alliance for Progress funds the U.S. has pledged will be wasted.

[From the Oregonian, Oct. 3, 1967]

Must Go Now

To the Editor: Some of the disturbing questions about the Vietnam war are: Why do the South Vietnamese government trooops fight so little and so poorly? Why is their desertion rate so high? Why is the "pacification" program not working, after all the numerous revisions and reorganizations and intensified efforts? Why are the guerrillas able to move about so freely through the countryside, and to take over so much of the country at night? Once Americans have "secured" an area from the V.C., why can't the job of defending it be turned over to the South Vietnamese without losing all that has been gained?

Peter Arnett (The Sunday Oregonian, Sept. 17) cites, as one of many examples, the 470th Regional Force Company in Thu Thua district, Long An Province, which has not killed a single Viet Cong in its two years of existence. Last year, as a civilian physician, I visited a hamlet in Thu Thua on one of the medical visits routinely held in villages throughout Vietnam. I was escorted by two U.S. Army medics and a few of the Vietnamese soldiers of the Regional Forces Company. We set up shop in a private house, whose elderly owners seemed very friendly and served us tea. People brought their children to be treated, we gave cholera shots, and a Vietnamese health movie was shown in the house across the street.

As we were packing up in the afternoon, the Regional Forces soldiers hustled us along, saying, "Must go now. V.C. soon come," and they wouldn't let me go down to the river's edge to take a picture because "too many V.C.," (pointing to the banana groves across the river). And I was told by the American adviser that most of the young people in that hamlet were away, living and fighting with the Viet Cong.

We all—including the soldiers—left the hamlet, as well as the main highway through the province capital, to the uncontested control of the V.C. from dusk until sun-up. During the day, however, this was "government-controlled territory" and one of the most successfully pacified areas in the country.

How could I define the political views of the old man who served me tea? Is he friend or enemy? Does he see the Viet Cong as barbarian invaders, or as the home-town boys coming in from a day's work? And what is to be expected from the 479th Regional Force Company? As long as they avoid any embarrassing confrontation with the V.C. (who include some of their own cousins or brothers) life is relatively uncomplicated and nobody is likely to get hurt.

We talk of the war as if it were a matter of all the good guys fighting against all of the bad guys, with maybe a few opportunists not choosing sides. But the vast majority of the Vietnamese—including the soldiers—are interested primarily in avoiding trouble with either side and trying to survive. If their crops, homes, or children are destroyed, it makes little difference to them which side did it. They will smile, pay what is required, do what they are forced to do, and hope it ends soon.

When Gen. Thieu, shortly after his election, proposed that the Americans do more of the "heavy fighting" and leave "pacification" to the Vietnamese, he was merely acknowledging that the Vietnamese people have little stomach for killing other Vietnamese.

Failure to understand this fact is a source of much of our confusion and frustration in Vietnam.

M. T. MERRILL, M.D.

[From Labor, Sept. 2, 1967]

WAY TO EQUAL SACRIFICE: PLUG UP TAX LOOPHOLES

Who shall bear the main burden of the rising costs of the Vietnam war and the pressures of inflation? That question is agitating Capitol Hill at this moment.

President Johnson has proposed, as one answer, a uniform 10 per cent tax surcharge applied to all above a specified level of income. However, many other voices are strongly urging an alternative approach—that is, the plugging of those tax loopholes which now enrich the wealthy.

We think this latter approach is right and just. Certainly, if the time has come to sacrifice because of America's deepening involvement in Vietnam, then special tax favors for the affluent, whether they be individuals, or corporations, should be eliminated or modified.

This was among the points underscored by AFL-CIO President George Meany, in his testimony on tax legislation given the other day before the House Ways and Means Committee, and by many liberal members of Congress.

"Tax loopholes of special privilege for wealthy families and corporations are numerous and notorious," Meany said. As an example, he cited government figures showing that 482 persons in 1964 reported incomes of $1 million or more, and of these 19 "paid no tax at all—not one cent." (Later figures, as reported in last week's Labor, show the number with million-dollar incomes or more jumped to 646 in 1965, of which 22 paid no income taxes.)

Meany went on to itemize some of the loopholes. One of these is the capital gains, rolled up from the sale of stock, real estate and other property. Such gains have been running between $20 billion and $24 billion a year, but "only half of these profits" need be listed as income, and top tax rate on capital gains is only 25 percent, compared to 70 percent for other forms of income.

Meany also cited "double depreciation writeoffs" on new buildings, which are "wonderful" for real estate investors, but an "outrage" from the standpoint of the average citizen. "These tax-free cash returns add up to great fortunes," he declared.

This may not be the right time to engage in detailed structural tax reform, the AFL-CIO leader continued, but he insisted it "is the right time—when you are considering a war tax—to include some degree of federal taxation on the great amounts of cash returns that are now excluded from income reported for tax purposes."

"Major categories of such excluded income," Meany said, "are these: half of capital gains, income from tax-exempt state and local bonds, and (oil-mineral) depletion allowances. These excluded categories of income add up to something like $13 to $14 billion for individuals and families, and about $9 to $10 billion for corporations.

"To permit such huge categories of income to go untaxed while the government is imposing a special war tax, would be utterly unfair and inequitable," he said.

As an immediate step, he urged, that whatever surtax Congress votes should be extended to the major classes of excluded income, as well.

Meantime, among congressmen who spoke up on the subject, one of the most explicit calls for action to plug the loopholes came from Rep. Henry Reuss (D., Wis.), who is a leading member of the House Banking Committee and the Joint Economic Committee.

Reuss declared that "raising additional revenue by tax reform, rather than by a 10 per cent surtax, would avoid as much as possible the slowing down of economic growth and the increase in unemployment which would ensue from the proposed surtax."

Reuss then offered a package of loophole-closing proposals, covering untaxed capitals, unlimited charitable deductions, stock options, dividend exclusion, multiple corporations, tax-free municipal industrial bonds, oil-mineral depletion allowance, gift and estate tax abuses, and several others. Reuss estimated that his limited plan would yield at least $4 billion in taxes.

Another liberal congressman—Herbert Tenzer (D., N.Y.)—proposed a 10 per cent tax on all "loophole and tax-sheltered income." He cited estimates that his plan would produce another $7 billion a year in income.

Similar suggestions to close or narrow the various loopholes came from other members of Congress. We think they and the labor movement are on the right track. It seems to us that those now enjoying a bonanza of untaxed income should be the first to sacrifice a little, if sacrifices are needed.

[From Commonweal, Sept. 22, 1967]

FROM SAIGON TO DETROIT

(By William Pfaff)

A Bad Summer's Notes: The election in Vietnam has accomplished its purpose—which was to legitimize American policy. The legitimization of a Thieu-Ky government was the means to this end. The military leadership now can claim a popular mandate. We, in turn, can argue to ourselves that with an elected government in Saigon this Vietnamese ordeal of ours may yet have a good outcome.

But this exercise in democracy, so anxiously promoted by the American Embassy, may in fact have been the penultimate blow to Saigon governmental authority. We see the election as a necessarily flawed but genuine attempt to consult the will of the Vietnamese people. How did the Vietnamese see it? No American is very likely to know; few Americans can claim an intellectual, to say nothing of an emotional, grasp of Vietnamese political assumptions and perceptions. What I am about to suggest is nothing more than an opinion insecurely based on arguments about the character of politics and society elsewhere in that part of Asia which has roots in Chinese civilization. But it may be that in Vietnam political legitimacy, the acknowledged right of rulers to rule, is understood as intimately connected with the rulers' demonstration that they are able to rule—able to impose order and suppress challenges.

If this is true, the military junta's anxiety not merely to win the election but to humiliate its opponents becomes intelligible. By the very holding of an election, a formal competition on the issue of who is to be allowed to rule in the future, they placed themselves on a level with their opponents. To Vietnamese this may have seemed an admission of government incompetence, and even of powerlessness—the rulers implicitly conceded that they were no better than a crowd of quarrelsome critics and rivals. Thus the military men saw it as indispensable to demonstrate that the election was *not* serious—that it was a charade performed to satisfy foreign opinion. The American government at the same time used every pressure at its command to demonstrate that the election *was* serious. Both were convinced that theirs was the only way to strengthen the political structure of the country. In the end the United States won. The election seemed serious. The Thieu-Ky ticket won—by a humiliatingly low percentage. Such a victory may have been the worst of outcomes.

The election resulted from an American effort to come to terms with the moral issues of the war. Washington wants to believe that it defends the Vietnamese popular will. Critics of the war argue often enough that the American intervention is immoral because it balks the will of the Vietnamese majority.

Yet surely this war is between two Vietnamese minorities—or between one competent minority and several incompetent ones. The revolutionary minority has given ample evidence of a ruthlessness which concedes nothing to the practices of the national army or the national administration. The thing that must be said about the NLF is that it has demonstrated that it is the only sizable, coherent, serious national political force visible in the country. Vietnamese society, despite the opportunity, has persistently failed to supply a political or military alternative to this minority's victory. Only we Americans stand between South Vietnam and its zealot fate.

The moral issue then seems to me simply one of a proportionate means to a realizable end. Can we Americans save Vietnam from itself? Can the American intervention produce a result significantly better than the result of settlement and withdrawal? Can it do so at a morally intelligible cost—one that does not discredit the outcome? The answers, in my opinion, are that we cannot. I do not thereby think that Vietnam will not suffer—only that it may suffer less than by our persistence in our present course.

It is now conventional to say that the war is at a military stalemate. The Administration officially denies that this is so. Yet its escalation of the bombing of North Vietnam virtually concedes stalemate on the ground. Some hawks want more bombing to achieve the victory thus far denied us. Some believe that stalemate will eventually force the Viet Cong to compromise, if not to disintegrate. Some want a barrier at the 17th parallel to permit defeat of an isolated Viet Cong. Some want a million American troops and predict a ten-year war. But few hawks—or doves, for that matter—can conceive of an American military defeat.

Yet in an important respect, perhaps the most important, the defeat has already occurred. An American army of a half-million men, with enormous tactical air support and the assistance of the Strategic Air Command and the Pacific Fleet, is waging this war against a revolutionary minority in an allied country—and against North Vietnam. And as Shirley Temple Black has described it, "the largest, strongest military power in the world" has failed to defeat "one of the smallest and weakest countries in the world."

The principal argument made that we are winning is by body-count—attrition, a notoriously unreliable standard, and in a war alleged to be against Asian Communism a standard whose implications stagger the imagination. By other military standards—who controls the ground, who maintains the initiative in giving battle and breaking it off—the enemy has as reasonable a claim to victory as we. Tactically we may not be defeated in Vietnam; but strategically, by virtue of the forces we have had to commit and their dramatic inability to force a decision, we have suffered a serious defeat—one which may prove profoundly destabilizing for the future of international relations.

Exporting counterrevolution, we have imported revolution. That Black Power enthusiasts this summer should have identified their cause with that of the Viet Cong is comprehensible. That liberal political officials should have been willing to accept and promulgate this definition of the American racial crisis provides the unexpected shock. The descriptions of the Newark and Detroit riots as "rebellions" and "insurrections" came from within the state and national governments. This involuntary choice of language tells more about the condition of America today than any riot. National Guardsmen now are told that riot control is "counterinsurgency warfare," and some commanders describe how heavy weapons can be brought to bear in our cities. Stokely Carmichael is quoted as saying that in Newark "we applied the war tactics of the guerrillas." American Negroes and whites alike are being told by the most responsible and the least responsible elements in American life to look at the domestic crisis in categories relevant to Vietnam. Writers in the *New York Review* advise that moderation is dead, the responsibility of the intellectual to act, not analyze; the duty of revolutionaries to make revolution.

What revolution? The word means to seize power—as the Viet Cong understands. In this country racial revolution would be repressed. That is the fact of the matter.

Black Power advocates are not revolutionaries, they are anarchists. This is very different, intelligible, implying an achievable program. The program is one of despair; revolution is an act of hope. When Rap Brown says that "if American don't come around, we're going to burn America down," this is a reasonable threat—if Brown means it, or if Negroes will act on his words—but it ends with America burned down.

This is a program for death, not life. Asian revolution, on the other hand, whatever its inner impulses, is not consciously directed to its own destruction. The devastating difference between America and Asia is as evident in "revolution" as in counterrevolution.

Exporting war to a society we do not understand, we import its categories of struggle with equal incomprehension, blinded by that violence which is, as Brown devastatingly and accurately puts it, "as American as cherry pie."

As for civilian casualties in Vietnam, it seems impossible to get a completely accurate picture, as James Finn suggests elsewhere in this issue. We know they are high on both sides, and last Christmas twelve Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish clergymen told the President that "the heartless war in the South continues, with the United States and South Vietnam forces matching the terror and assassinations of the Viet Cong by killing somewhere from two to five civilians for every Viet Cong guerrilla or North Vietnam regular." Viet Cong terror is a horrible fact, but does anyone suggest that terror can be matched with terror, assassination on their side with widespread bombing and the use of napalm on ours? The principle of double effect may cover a multitude of things, but can it be used to justify killing the innocent on this scale? Is Hanoi to be turned into another Dresden? And if we escalate again, what will be our next target—the irrigation dikes, destruction of which would be tantamount to genocide?

The assumption behind escalation, of course, is that the other side will sit quietly while we act, thus giving us the margin of superiority. In fact, this improbable result has not happened, and as a consequence we have step by step increased our involvement and our commitment to the war. Each step was supposed to produce the magical result; each step in turn failed and was used to justify the next. What has happened, of course, is that the enemy kept pace with us every step of the way.

In January of 1965, for example, there were 100,000 Viet Cong forces. After active American entry that number rose to 135,000 by April and to 170,000 by August—most of them from South Vietnam, not North. This has been the pattern ever since. What will we think of escalation, though, if the U.S.S.R. supplies missiles to be used against Saigon every time we hit Hanoi? Or against our air bases in Thailand, for that matter? How will we react if Chinese planes start to attack our bombers in defense of North Vietnam? Escalation works both ways, and the next big jump may be a Communist move, perhaps a decision by North Vietnam to fully commit its 500,000 regular army or by China to send "volunteers" from its 800 million population.

Vietnam represents what Arthur Schlesinger called a "triumph of the politics of inadvertence." We have got to where we are by a series of small steps, each of which looked reasonable at the time. Yet each step led only to the next and in the end we have been trapped in that nightmare of American strategists, a land war in Asia.

TREADMILL TO DISASTER

(By James O'Gara, editor of Commonweal)

The war in Vietnam is a tragic and bloody mistake, in the course of which we are risking an even larger and bloodier war. We have become reckless in our use of power and indiscriminate in the goals we seek, so much so that the war cannot be justified morally or politically. If the traditional Christian norms of just means and right proportion mean anything, we should vigorously seek negotiations and get out of Vietnam as quickly as possible.

The United States, people say, is in South Vietnam to prevent one nation from being gobbled up by another; if we don't fight Communist aggression in Southeast Asia, we will have to resign ourselves to fighting it in Los Angeles; now is as good a time as any to show the Chinese that we won't let ourselves be pushed around. The only trouble with all of these popular "reasons," however, is that they have little or no relevance to the present situation in Vietnam.

Despite what the Administration tries to suggest, most of those fighting against us in South Vietnam are in fact people from South, not North, Vietnam. Indeed, until our bombing of North Vietnam caused Ho Chi Minh to commit more of his troops across the border, it is probable that we had more South Koreans (not South Vietnamese) fighting on our side than there were North Vietnamese on the other. China is undoubtedly sympathetic to North Vietnam, and we may yet provoke her into a more active role. At this point, however, there is nothing to indicate that China has ever sent any men to fight in Vietnam, and if our purpose is to show the Chinese that we will not be bluffed, killing Vietnamese is an odd way to go about it.

Vietnam is essentially a revolutionary civil war, reflecting a domestic situation that is beyond our power to resolve. Is it a matter of no concern to us that only intense diplomatic pressure has won us even nominal support from our usual allies? In the Asia we are supposed to be saving, only our client-states back us; no independent state is giving us even token support—not Japan, India, Pakistan, Burma, Malaysia, Indonesia. We are on a unilateral course in Asia, beset by notions of American omniscience and American omnipotence. It isn't that our best friends won't tell us; it is that we won't listen. If we pursue total victory as we have been doing, we will leave behind us in Vietnam a wilderness of dead civilians and ravaged villages. After such destruction what nations will want our protection?

Where China is concerned, responsible observers have noted that the Chinese may not unreasonably fear that our bases in Vietnam and in Thailand constitute preparations for war with them. As our bombers strike closer and closer to the Chinese border, with an occasional accidental intrusion into Chinese air space, the dangers of a world war escalate. Is this a rational national policy? The Administration is convinced that it can guess exactly how far we can go without bringing the Chinese into the war, but I doubt that most Americans really want to play what Walter Lippmann called this "deadly guessing game."

THE GUERRILLA WAR

As for the civil war in Vietnam itself, the Viet Cong could be defeated in the guerrilla fighting there only if the South Vietnamese regime had the support of the population. It did not have that support in Diem's day, and it does not today. Premier Ky served in the French Air Force in Vietnam in the years between 1946 and 1954, fighting, in other words, on the side of the colonialists when France sought to reestablish her prewar empire. Nor is Premier Ky alone in this; out of the ten generals who participated in the coup which brought him to power, nine were born in North Vietnam, not South, and nine fought for the French against the nationalists, only a small minority of whom were Communists. A lack of popular enthusiasm for a government headed by such men is hardly surprising.

American reporters on the scene in Vietnam during the Diem regime knew how badly the war was going. They knew Diem did not have the backing of the populace, even though he announced in 1955 that he intended to "liberate" the North. Despite these facts, American officials in Vietnam continued to send home glowing reports, and the American reporters who disagreed were accused of lacking the proper team spirit. Great progress was being made, U.S. officials insisted; as Senator Mike Mansfield recently remarked, progress reports are strewn like burned-out tanks all along the road into deeper U.S. involvement in Vietnam.

Why did the effort in Vietnam fail? President Kennedy said in 1963 that the war was essentially a Vietnamese war; it still is. We really cannot win the war for the Vietnamese, and any military effort in that unhappy country will remain bloody and useless without serious internal reform. 75% of the farms in the South are owned by absentee landlords. In the Mekong Delta, more than one-half of the peasants own no land whatsoever. Of those who do, most own a one-tenth of an acre rice paddy and have to rent another one-half acre in order to live—paying 30 to 50% of their crop to landlords with no security of tenure in return.

What are the chances for reform? A deliberately discriminatory election law kept not only members of the National Liberation Front but so-called neutralists and militant Buddhists from running for the present Constitutent Assembly, which in turn determined who could run in the just-concluded election. As a result, the regime in power represents still another mandarin-type collaboration between officers and landlords.

Typically, when a genuine measure of land reform was introduced, only 3 out of 117 members of the Constituent Assembly voted for it, as Senator Stephen M. Young of Ohio recently pointed out.

We badly need to know what the Vietnamese people want—not what the generals say they want. But Premier Ky said he would respond "militarily" if a civilian with whose policies he disagreed won the presidency. "If he is a Communist, or if he is a neutralist," Ky said, "I am going to fight him militarily. In any democratic country you have the right to disagree with the views of others."

How long are Americans going to die to support a regime that is obviously afraid of an honest election? Diem refused to hold the nation-wide elections in 1956 which had been promised by the Geneva agreement because he was afraid he would lose them; we supported him in this policy, as we have supported countless repressions of free speech and free political activity since then, even to the point of standing by while South Vietnamese troops tortured prisoners. Is there no limit at all to what we can stomach?

We now have in Vietnam 460,000 men—more troops than we had in Korea fifteen years ago. Over 12,000 American soldiers have been killed so far and 75,000 have been wounded. The cost of the war is running in the area of $25 billion annually—as much as we spent on foreign economic development in all the years from 1953 to 1965—and the trend is up, not down. Someone has even calculated that it is costing us in excess of $300,000 to kill or capture a single member of the Viet Cong, and the cost in damage to American reputation and leadership is incalculable.

BOMBING NORTH VIETNAM

Next to committing U.S. troops, our largest single step in escalation was the decision to bomb North Vietnam. We widened the war deliberately, and the suspicion is strong that we did so primarily to help the morale of the Ky regime. Roger Hilsman, for one, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs in the Kennedy Administration, has testified that before our bombing there was no evidence of substantial North Vietnamese infiltration to justify our action. Since that time, infiltration from the North has escalated and the bombing is now defended on the theory that it limits infiltration, punishes Hanoi and will help to end the war—always on the assumption, of course, that China will not intervene. But the war cannot be settled in North Vietnam, as Robert McNamara admits; even if we did as one U.S. general suggested and bombed North Vietnam back into the Stone Age, the war in South Vietnam would still continue. Guerrilla war in the South cannot be won by obliterating the North. As for China's intentions, we may yet find Chinese roulette even more dangerous than the Russian variety.

There should be no mistake about it: in the bombing of North Vietnam we are playing with fire, both literally and figuratively. Even now, North Vietnam regulars amount to only a small fraction of the enemy forces. To pretend that the war simply involves aggression by North Vietnam, as Secretary Rusk insists, is to distort the issues and deceive the American people. It will not deceive China. Mr. Rusk was Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs during the Korean War, and he assured us then that China would not intervene. Nonetheless, China did intervene, and it may intervene again.

In any case, the bombing of North Vietnam is doing nothing to speed the end of the war—quite the contrary. Even if beating North Vietnam were the answer, which it is not, bombing would not work. Korea demonstrated that underdeveloped nations have their own kind of immunity from bombing. Only 15% of the Gross National Product of North Vietnam comes from industry, and no nation in which this is so can be bombed into submission. On the contrary, all reports indicate that our bombing has merely stiffened the North Vietnamese will to resist. It has certainly stepped up the tempo of the in the South, and the North Vietnamese troops that Hilsman said were not there before are now crossing the border in increasing numbers.

The United States already drops more explosives each month in Vietnam than we dropped in Europe and Africa per month during World War II, more in one year than we dropped in the entire Pacific during World War II. One estimate is that we have already dropped a ton of bombs for every Viet Cong soldier. Even in military terms, the cost of this effort is prohibitively high. We have already spent over $1 billion in planes lost, and we have spent another billion in bombs and rockets. More than six hundred American pilots have been lost, most to the antiaircraft fire heavily concentrated around the few industrial targets. The Hanoi-Haiphong area, for example, is said to be ringed by 4,000 guns.

All this has been done under the illusion that the war could be shortened by all-out bombing. This has proved to be just that, an illusion. U Thant and other responsible observers insist that an end to our bombing of the North is the inescapable first step to negotiations; we should take that step. I grant that stopping the bombing is a calculated risk and one on which the prospects are not as good today as they were a few months ago, but it is a risk we must take; if we do not, we are risking World War III and a casualty list in the millions.

NEGOTIATIONS

Total military victory in Vietnam is unattainable and is in any case politically pointless. The alternative is negotiation, yet there are few subjects in connection with the war on which the American people are worse informed. Ask the average American and he will assure you that the United States is ready and eager to negotiate on the war, anytime and anywhere. In point of fact, however, the Administration has hedged all its offers to negotiate and has never made the Viet Cong a serious offer it could possibly accept, as Michael Novak details in his article.

A tragic gap has opened between reality in Vietnam and what the American people think is happening. That gap between the truth and what the American people believe to be the truth is being carefully widened by Administration half-truths and outright deceptions, deceptions that may in fact be self-deceptions. On the face of it, nothing could seem more reasonable than Mr. Johnson's customary call for negotiations, yet even in the very beginning we barred the National Liberation Front from full participation in the negotiations, thus setting conditions while protesting exactly the opposite. The same pattern has prevailed ever since, with first one condition and then another keeping us from the bargaining table.

I do not doubt that the President and those around him want the war over as much as I do; I fear, however, that they want it over only on their terms. Thus Mr. Johnson has assured the world that we would stop the bombing if we had some assurance of de-escalation—"just almost any step," the President said. But in a letter to Ho Chi Minh on February 2, Mr. Johnson said he would stop bombing "as soon as I am assured that infiltration into South Vietnam by land and by sea has been stopped." This would mean that Ho could not supply his forces; we could, of course, continue to supply ours. Why should the North Vietnamese leader be interested in such an offer? Significantly, the letter was released by the North Vietnamese, not by the United States, presumably because putting on the record how we had stiffened our conditions was an embarrassment to the Johnson Administration. Even so, the American people apparently did not grasp the significance of the letter, and the press treated the matter as if the North Vietnamese had rebuffed still another generous U.S. offer.

SELF-DECEPTION

In these matters it is painfully easy for all of us, from President Johnson down, to deceive ourselves. The enemy supplied their troops during the recent truce, and we did the same with ours. However, U.S. spokesmen charged the Viet Cong with breaking the truce, explaining to those who found it hard to understand that "the difference is a difference of intent. . . ." The enemy, it seems, intends aggression; we do not, so our hands are clean. In the same way we were, by our story, attacked in cold blood in the Gulf of Tonkin; the fact that our forces were standing by to support a South Vietnamese raid on the North Vietnamese coast is irrelevant. What can a rational man say of such reasoning?

Am I charging that President Johnson loves war and that Dean Rusk is Dr. Strangelove? Not at all—although it may be that some in the Administration believe the time to "face up" to China is now. But what I am saying is that a study of the evidence overwhelmingly suggests that the Administration decided months ago that it wanted to negotiate—but not yet, and only on its own terms. Washington officials seem to have become convinced that any settlement negotiated now would be unsatisfactory; they want more victories so the U.S. will be in a dominating position when the time comes for bargaining.

A case could be made for such a position, of course, although I would think it a mistaken case; obviously if both sides take such a view, negotiations will never take place. But the point is that such a case is not being made. Barry Goldwater made it in 1964, and he was roundly defeated at the polls. Top officials of the Johnson Administration now seem to have bought the Goldwater thesis, but while they use big bombs in Vietnam, they continue to talk softly to the American people. This is political manipulation at its most cynical.

In short, I charge that Administration policy on Vietnam is misguided, often cynical and by and large unsuccessful. All we have achieved by escalation is a bloodier stalemate on a still higher plateau. If we continue to follow our present course, there is no end to the war in sight, even if we commit the million soldiers that Hanson Baldwin has always said would be necessary. In addition, the world is in deadly peril of World War III, for the Chinese too may think appeasement is risky, and this threat grows with the passing of every day.

The danger is, of course, that it gets harder and harder for each side to compromise; as commitments enlarge, the national sacrifice involved becomes so great that it can only be justified retroactively by total victory. Already one out of every four Americans queried in the Gallup poll favors the use of atomic weapons to gain military victory in Vietnam. How many will there be tomorrow, as our casualties mount? How many Christian voices are being raised on behalf of a proper proportion between what we are seeking and the means we are using to achieve it? It is time, and more than time, to call a halt to encourage negotiation in Vietnam by the Vietnamese themselves; time to end brutality and slaughter on both sides; time for us to cease escalation and drastically change our direction.

There is no chance of winning everything we want at the bargaining table, and there is no doubt that the National Liberation Front will have to be assured of a place in the life of the country. Negotiation, like a halt to the bombing of North Vietnam, represents a real risk. Nonetheless, this risk too we must take. The real choice we face in Vietnam is not between good and evil but between two evils. Surely it is not unreasonable to suggest that we choose the lesser evil of negotiation and less-than-perfect settlement before all of Vietnam is turned into a vast wasteland.

THE WAR: THE HUMAN COST

(By James Finn)

What have the last 10 to 12 years done to Vietnam and its people? I presume that the questions cannot be answered both accurately and completely. First, the available statistics are overlapping and contradictory; second, for some quantifiable aspects of Vietnamese life no statistics are available; and third, some important aspects of Vietnamese life are simply not quantifiable.

But the answer that one can give to the question, as partial and incomplete as it must be, is nevertheless impressive—and depressing.

The Vietnamese have been subjected to war for decades, but 1954, the year in which the country was divided into North and South Vietnam according to the Geneva agreements, is a convenience point to start an assessment. In the years 1954–56 the Communist North instituted a harsh Land Reform Campaign during which, it has been estimated, 100,000 people were killed. (As George Carver pointed out in *Foreign Affairs* for April, 1966, this is equivalent to 1,000,000 American citizens.) There are no reliable figures for the number of people in South Vietnam who lost their lives under the dictatorial regime of President Diem.

When the all-Vietnamese election, which the Geneva Agreements scheduled for 1956, failed to take place, a program of violence, aimed at the Diem regime, was initiated in the South. It reached its peak in the years 1962–63, when approximately 20,000 were kidnapped or assassinated. (General Westmoreland has said that during the last nine years the number of kidnappings and assassinations in South Vietnam total 53,000, and most of these were local leaders.) But with the beginning of 1963, the conflict reached a new stage and casualties among armed forces increased rapidly. According to Douglas Pike, the total death rate in Vietnam from 1960 to 1966 "was an estimated 280,000 or 575 per week." To translate these figures again, this would be the rough equivalent of 3,200 people killed weekly in this country.

The tempo of the fighting has, of course, been stepped up gradually and steadily in the last two years, and with the bombing of the North it has become increasingly difficult for anyone to get dependable figures for the total number of Vietnamese casualties. But it is beyond question that the casualty rate has soared. For example, the U.S. Department of Defense says that the U.S. forces killed between Jan. 1, 1961, and July 1, 1967, were 11,534. Of these, almost 5,000 were killed this year. The over-all ratio of South Vietnamese casualties to U.S. casualties is roughly four to one. Another indication of the extensive death toll is that the number of enemy killed during the week of June 24–July 1 is given is 1,331.

The number of civilian casualties remains a tortured question. Senator Edward Kennedy predicted that there would be 100,000 civilian casualties in 1967 and drew no official criticism. The three-man medical team that went to South Vietnam earlier this year for the Committee of Responsibility reported that on the basis of the casualties admitted to the hospitals of the South Vietnamese Ministry of Health during the first three months of 1967 the hospitals would receive 50,000 during the year, 10,000 of which would be children. It has been estimated, however, that only one of every three casualties reaches a hospital. David McLanahan, a former intern in a Danang hospital, wrote in the March 25 *Saturday Review* that "in 1965, the total amount spent by all sources on medical care of Vietnamese civilians was $8,500,000, and it is estimated that $50,000,000 will be spent in 1967."

It is constantly acknowledged that the military conflict in Vietnam is only one aspect of the struggle. There must also be concern for political and social development. This means constant attacks on the problems of inflation and corruption which have accompanied, almost inevitably, the introduction of U.S. men, money and material into Vietnam. The reports of how well these social evils are contained fluctuate from one commentator to another, and one must be content to say that they remain extensive.

More important as a gauge to social development is the extensive effort of "pacification," or "rural construction," or—as it is currently called—"revolutionary development" (R.D.). In the June, 1967 issue of *Progressive,* Thomas Hagley offered some statistics that indicate the scope of the problem. The R.D. program is intended to enhance the security and improve the living conditions of the people in the hamlets of South Vietnam. Of the 11,000 hamlets, it is estimated that 4,500 support the Saigon government, 3,500 are controlled by the Viet Cong, and 3,000 are contested. To pacify five hamlets near Saigon required "more than 1,000 American and Vietnamese troops, more than 700 ambush patrols, more than 500 search-and-clear operations by 30-man teams, and more than 10,000 rounds of supporting artillery fire as well as jet fighter support" and supporting agencies. At such a rate, Hagley concludes, it could take more than 20 years to pacify all of South Vietnam. His view would gain support from Mary McCarthy who, reporting extensively on her recent trip to Vietnam, ladled scorn on the R.D. program.

Again there are counter-judgments, and not always from U.S. officials. For instance Alastair Hetherington, editor of the *Manchester Guardian* (which is not generally regarded as either conservative or pro-American) rejected a number of Miss McCarthy's statements as fanciful and believes that the R.D. teams are making progress. And according to the New York *Times* of July 10, even the critics of Robert W. Komer, our new Deputy Ambassador, concede that he is improving the organization and planning of the pacification program. But that still leaves open the question of what a successful pacification program does to the social fabric of Vietnamese life.

Against the estimates of the damage now being inflicted upon the Vietnamese—severe even in the most conservative estimates—must be placed estimates of the cost of a U.S. "victory," or withdrawal or another alternative. Mr. Hetherington, for example, writes: "Given the situation as it is today, will the Vietnamese attain peace more quickly if the Americans abandon Vietnam leaving it to chaos and further civil war, or if they stay until their task is done? Answers will differ. Mine is that the Americans ought to stay."

Others, even while they acknowledge that an American withdrawal would expose many South Vietnamese to the mercies of a harsh enemy, think the cost to the Vietnamese would be less than that of continued conflict. But we ascend here from uncertain estimates to rife speculation where objectivity is at a discount, and it is well to return to relative certitudes. The most obvious is that if the war continues to develop according to the pattern now firmly established, the cost to the Vietnamese, both North and South, will mount. Some of the damage could be repaired by massive infusions of postwar aid. What cannot be restored are the lives of the people. When we consider that France and England suffered for generations from the losses incurred in World War I, another war of attrition, we can form some idea of what the future holds for the Vietnamese.

THE WAR: POLICIES OF DELUSION

(By John K. Moriarty)

"The argument is about what the argument is about," was E. E. Schattschneider's comment on the American political process. Whoever defines what the argument is about has defined the problem and gone a long distance toward defining the answer. The debate over U.S. policy in Vietnam arises from the fact that a significant portion of the American populace will not accept the Administration's word for what the argument is about.

The argument over what the argument is about goes on, in one form or another, not only among the general public and in Congress but in the United States Executive Branch—including the State Department, the Department of Defense and the CIA. This lack of unanimity in the U.S. government pertains to (1) the threat in Vietnam, (2) the implications of the threat, and (3) what the U.S. should do about the threat. It accounts for most of the ambiguity in present U.S. policy. And there is ambiguity—an ambiguity that has many aspects but which generally resolves itself into two broad, and differing, justifications for our actions in Vietnam: (1) we are in South Vietnam at the request of an independent government, to assist in its defense against external aggression; (2) we are there to defeat, on this crucial battleground, the worldwide campaign of Communist aggression, because if the Communists win here they will probably also conquer Thailand, then the rest of Southeast Asia, and perhaps even the entire underdeveloped world. These two purposes of U.S. policy are not consistent.

The first objective—an independent South Vietnam free from foreign interference—requires that the U.S. itself not interfere unduly in this independent country, and implies that the U.S. would withdraw from South Vietnam if it were asked to do so by a representative South Vietnamese government—even if that government wished to compromise with the Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese. But the second objective—stopping in this crucial spot the worldwide aggressive campaign of subversive Communism—would require that the Communists be defeated in South Vietnam no matter what the cost to them. It is in the confusion between these two objectives, and particularly in the tendency to assume that the first is automatically included in the second, that there arises much of the wider confusion and controversy surrounding the U.S. presence in Vietnam.

THE "SPECTER" OF CHINA

A third objective for U.S. actions in Vietnam is sometimes cited by strategic "realists" in the Government. They declare that future Chinese expansionism (basically Chinese *national power* as opposed to *Communist ideology*) in the Far East must be contained by U.S. power, and that our stand in South Vietnam is necessary in order to prevent other neighboring countries—chiefly those in Southeast Asia, plus possibly the Philippines and Indonesia—from being brought into the Chinese sphere of influence, as presumably are the North Vietnamese. For the stricter advocates of this "containment" objective, then, Communism is not per se the threat, but is in fact merely a technique of Chinese imperialism. This third argument, however, is rarely heard in its unalloyed form and is not an important factor in the public debate. It will not be considered here in detail.

The fact that there are ambiguities in U.S. policy objectives in Vietnam does not connote U.S. insincerity, as is sometimes charged. A succession of governments in South Vietnam have made it clear that they do wish U.S. help against the Viet Cong, and certainly a considerable portion of the South

Vietnamese population does not wish to live under a Communist government. At the time of the 1954 Geneva Accords, for example, when the population of all Vietnam was given freedom of choice, some 900,000 people moved from the North to the South. They had good reason to fear the Communists. During the period 1953-56, the so-called Land Rent Reduction Program, and its successor the Agrarian Reform Program, became in practice a vast bloodletting in North Vietnam. By the time the terror was finished, some 100,000 people had been executed. Whether or not such a program would ever be instituted in the South if the Viet Cong won is perhaps a moot question, but one can certainly understand the concern of many people there over being brought under a Communist government.

Whether South Vietnam is an independent country, separate from its "neighbor" to the North, is one of those muddy historical questions which are resolved not by documents and logic but by force and accident. Certainly there is no experience of a united, homogeneous Vietnam comprising both North and South—but neither is there a separate South Vietnamese nationality. The people both North and South are basically Vietnamese (who comprise some five-sixths of the total), with the remainder consisting of pockets of Chinese, Cambodians and, of course, the Montagnards spread over the central highlands and the western mountains. But the Vietnamese peoples' loyalties are primarily local, down to village level, and they have historically shown little concern for a national government, either North or South, so long as it would leave them alone and not make the taxes too high. And whether one can speak of the two portions of Vietnam as being more different from each other than, say, North and South Korea, or East and West Germany, or for that matter, the Northern and Southern United States at the time of the Civil War would seem to be open to argument.

Presently—and largely by virtue of U.S. military power—South Vietnam is a separate country. It also faces the very real threat of conquest by force, if the U.S. should withdraw its assistance; and the threat against South Vietnam is closely controlled by North Vietnam. While the National Liberation Front undoubtedly contained significant non-Communist elements in its early years, any picture of it today as a coalition of nationalistic Vietnamese among whom the Communists are merely one group is a total misconception. In its policies and its action—in its very capability for effective continuation of the war—the NLF has shown itself to be basically a creature of Hanoi. On the other hand, the Viet Cong *have* been primarily *South* Vietnamese (with most of the leaders consisting of "regroupees" who went north in 1954 and were infiltrated back into the south several years later); even as late as 1963, it was difficult to find North Vietnamese among them, although they were sought for propaganda purposes.

The Viet Cong use of selectively applied terror as a deliberate technique of takeover is also real. Chiefly the victims of the terror are the very good or the very bad. An able, dedicated official or school teacher working in the villages for the government is a danger to the revolution and may thus become the target of an assassination team who will leave his head on a pole as a grim warning. The victim may also be selected from among government spies, however, or officials or policemen who are feared and hated by the villagers, and the Viet Cong may then be viewed as protectors and liberators.

For winning the support of the people—either through positive motivation or through fear—is the essence of revolutionary warfare. And peoples' support is not won through indiscriminate killing and terror. On its positive side, the Viet Cong philosophy is to teach their members to help the people, to pay for anything taken, not to rape or mistreat the women, and generally both to be and to appear as the friend of the people. The philosophy is certainly sound—and particularly effective, if, as is frequently the case, the government soldiers feel free to beat up or steal from anyone they please, and the South Vietnamese officers show virtually no feeling for the people. The Viet Cong often do not live up to their own standards, and the South Vietnamese government is striving, with American help, to instill a different approach into its civilian officials and military forces—but it is not clear at all that the government is winning this battle.

Taken all together, however, the U.S. case for its presence in South Vietnam is not a weak one. There is definitely a Communist threat; many people in the South have good reason to hate and fear it; the threat is strongly backed and basically controlled from Hanoi; and it has the support of the Communist world, especially China and the Soviet Union. There can be little question that many peoples and governments in Asia are watching with great concern the progress of the war in Vietnam. A U.S. military defeat or a withdrawal by the U.S. that would simply leave the people of the South to their own fate would have a major impact on the attitudes of many Asians regarding the probable future prospects of Communism. The United States bears a major responsibility for the future peace and order of this part of the world, and it can no more absolve itself of this responsibility than a powerful, wealthy individual in an American city can close his eyes in the belief that what goes on around him is no concern of his.

So if one admits that the United States is not in Vietnam because of some unacknowledged imperialistic ambitions, what fault can be found with what it is doing? I find three: (1) we have exaggerated the threat in Vietnam, and therefore the importance of defeating that threat; (2) because we have misunderstood the nature of the threat, we are using the wrong methods in meeting it; (3) we have misjudged the impact of our actions both on the Communist countries and on the so-called Free World.

The dimension of the threat has been exaggerated through the substitution of a metaphor for analysis—the "domino theory"—with its implications that somehow the Chinese Communists are directing the Communist effort in Vietnam, and that they can similarly control "proxy" revolutions in other countries. But Peking is not controlling the Communist effort in South Vietnam. Hanoi is. And there is no reason to believe that the North Vietnamese wish slavishly to follow Chinese orders in the future.

Moreover, it is not at all apparent, even if a Communist government should come to power in South Vietnam, and even if it *were* dominated by China, why Thailand would fall next, then Laos, Cambodia, Malaysia, Indonesia, Burma, India and so on through Asia, Africa and Latin America. Does anyone really believe that the Cubans, or the Egyptians, or the Congolese, or the Burmese, or the Indians, or any of the other hundreds of peoples in the Third World would subordinate for very long their own national interests to those of Peking? The Sino-Soviet Bloc did not hold together; even the Soviet Bloc in Eastern Europe could not be tightly controlled indefinitely from Moscow. China today is clearly having trouble even controlling *itself*. There is certainly nothing in political logic, in history, or in common sense to justify the belief that there could exist for even a few minutes a monolithic Communist bloc in the underdeveloped world controlled out of Peking.

Even the more limited view of the domino theory—that the only countries really in danger are those in Southeast Asia, including Indonesia and the Philippines—is far from obvious. Undoubtedly the Chinese would like to extend their influence over their neighbors. But China today is not a Great Power. Its huge army of over 2-million men is seriously lacking in modern military equipment, its navy and air force are not significant, its nuclear delivery capability cannot approach that of a Great Power for the indefinite future, and its vast and growing population can be regarded as an economic and political liability as much as a power asset. In fact, in terms of Gross National Product, Japan is a more powerful nation than China—and in the foreseeable future Japan might perhaps become a greater military power.

The claim is that the Chinese will conquer their neighbors by subversion and blackmail, rather than by outright military force. The Chinese record in this respect has been outstandingly poor so far, however—and those commentators who glibly find the Chinese failures in Africa and Indonesia a direct result of the U.S. military effort in Vietnam owe their audiences some proof more substantial than a mere wish that it be so. In every case, internal issues appear to have predominated in the turbulent contests for power in the underdeveloped countries—which is precisely what historical experience should lead us to expect.

The Communists (Chinese, Russian or Cuban) do not have a magic formula for taking over under-developed countries. The product they have to offer has not proved that attractive. In the years immediately after World War II they attempted takeovers in Burma, Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines and Indochina. In all of these except the last the question of national independence was quickly eliminated, and the Communists were eventually defeated. In Indochina, where the French attempted to reimpose their control, very possibly for psychological reasons as much as anything, the war has continued for over 20 years and reached even greater heights with the American involvement.

If the domino theory is interpreted to mean (the theory's adherents are rarely precise on just what it does mean) merely that regimes hostile to the U.S. will irreversibly come to power throughout the underdeveloped world, though not necessarily under Chinese or Russian domination, is there any reason to accept this as a mortal threat to U.S. security? What is their real power, if they are not under central control? And why should non-aligned, or life-leaning, regimes remain permanently hostile to the U.S.? The U.S. too can make powerful political and economic appeals to such countries, if it does not tie itself too closely to reactionary groups within them.

The domino theory posits not only that other countries must inevitably fall to the Communists if South Vietnam falls, but implies conversely that these countries will remain "free" if South Vietnam does not fall. From the standpoint of the peoples involved, however, the choice is not between freedom and slavery but usually between one kind of authoritarian government and another, one kind of poverty and another, one kind of injustice and another. A Communist victory or defeat in South Vietnam may influence, but it will not determine, the course of these separate struggles against authoritarianism, poverty and injustice; they will continue in any event.

In sum, while there is definitely a Communist threat in South Vietnam, the domino theory exaggerates both the scope of the threat and its crucial significance for the "free" world.

What of U.S. methods in Vietnam—the second item with which I have found fault? We began military involvement with Vietnam in 1950, channeling assistance through the French. Then, after the French defeat in 1954, we gave assistance directly to the South

Vietnamese government, building up a conventional army, along American lines and using American weapons, with the initial purpose of defending against an attack across the border such as had taken place in Korea. In the process, we made the army the dominant political institution in South Vietnam, as we did in several other underdeveloped countries. The dictator Diem was able to hold power only by gaining control of the army; when the army decided to depose him he was finished. And the elections held earlier this month in South Vietnam gave the country military officers who will rule as president and vice-president by virtue of the support of the armed forces.

In the last few years the thesis has increasingly found favor in official U.S. policy that the army in underdeveloped countries is the major force for stability, the guardian of social progress, the ultimate repository of political sanity. (It is indeed ironic that this principle should be espoused in the United States, a nation whose oldest and most fundamental political traditions involved a distrust, fear and even hatred of arbitrary military power.) In any event, the officer class in most underdeveloped countries is not the "nation's obedient handyman" of American nineteenth century history, but a powerful social group with its own political and economic interests. Thus, in South Vietnam, though the U.S. has had one policy of consistently urging reforms, its military policy has retained power in the class which supported the French against the Viet Minh and which has little will for the reforms required.

The increasing U.S. commitment of its own forces has compounded the mistake of dependence on the South Vietnamese military. As the U.S. military strength increased, so did the North Vietnamese efforts and resolve to throw out the "American invaders." And as the U.S. strength has increased, so has the disruption of the South Vietnamese social and economic life, and so has the dependence of the South Vietnamese Government on the United States for measures that it should take for itself.

Perhaps most important, it is not apparent that U.S. military forces can accomplish the task now set out for them—that of defeating the Communist threat militarily, so that indigenous South Vietnamese elements can then pacify the country and proceed with "nation building." In the first place, while U.S. forces clearly are not being defeated, it is not obvious that they are winning the war even against the Viet Cong and North Vietnamese main force units. The tactical initiative in actually joining combat still lies with the enemy, in spite of U.S. superior firepower and mobility, and the North Vietnamese have committed only a portion of their army. Secondly, even if the U.S. could defeat these main forces, there still would remain the guerrilla threat, and there is little evidence that much progress is being made in this sphere. Thirdly, even if the main force and guerrilla threat could be defeated, there is no cause to believe that South Vietnam yet has a government around which the people will rally. If there is not such a government, then the Communist drive for social and economic reform, for Vietnamese unification, for throwing out the "American invaders," and for bringing down the "puppet government" will continue to produce revolutionists for the foreseeable future. In sum, it is not apparent that we "can get there from here" by application of ever-growing U.S. military force in the South.

I further disagree with our methods in regard to the bombing of the North. We are not accomplishing the major objectives we set for ourselves in the bombing and it does not appear likely that we will do so. The U.S. objectives for the bombing have consistently been these three: (1) by interdiction of the infiltration routes to significantly reduce North Vietnam's ability to supply and maintain the war in the South, (2) through progressive destruction of selected targets in the North to make it increasingly difficult and costly for North Vietnam to support the war in the South, and thus force them to the conference table—presumably on our terms, and (3) to raise the morale of the South Vietnamese leadership, who about the time the bombing began were in rather desperate straits. The last of these, at least, has been accomplished.

The bombing has also seriously hurt the North Vietnamese transportation and communications network. It has destroyed bridges, fords, roads, trucks, locomotives, railroad cars, choke-points in mountain passes. But there is little evidence that it has significantly reduced the Communist capability to supply the South. The infiltration continues; the war continues; and any diminution in activity in the South can probably be attributed more to the tactical situation than to logistical deprivation. By the use of masses of human labor and improvisation, the North Vietnamese have kept the supply routes open. They have rebuilt smaller bridges, and camouflaged them; repaired railroads; constructed new fords in place of bridges; improvised pontoon bridges which are hidden in the daytime and used at night; built complete new roads; made jungle tracks motorable; by-passed choke points. And the people and supplies continue to move South.

What is probably worse, the routes are more invulnerable now than they were when we began. The big bridges have not been rebuilt. But they have been replaced by the fords and pontoon bridges, and all are more difficult to locate. Where there used to be one main road, now there are several, or even a network. Thus the targets get harder to find and less remunerative all the time.

Lastly, it probably should have been apparent to us beforehand that we were going to have trouble effectively interdicting the routes to the point that we would have a critical effect on the war: (1) much of the men and material originates in the South, and therefore doesn't come over the routes; (2) there are alternative routes, such as water; (3) and most important, we failed at least once before in similar tactics, in the Korean War, where even in a larger operation in which more supplies were being consumed, the tonnage arriving at the front was never reduced below that estimated as necessary for the North Koreans to maintain effective operational capability.

INDUSTRIALLY PRIMITIVE

As for the second objective of making the infiltration so difficult and costly for the North Vietnamese that they will come to the conference table, there is still no indication they will come on our terms—if they come at all. Probably the critical factor here is that the supplies moving over the infiltration routes are largely not originating in North Vietnam anyway, so that all the steel mills, power plants and factories there could be destroyed, with little effect. The supplies are coming from China and the Soviet Union, and North Vietnam is in effect simply a logistic funnel through which the supplies are being passed. Also, since North Vietnam is an industrially primitive country, probably all its vulnerable assets can be destroyed without having a critical effect on the leaders' resolve—and the remainder of the Communist world will undoubtedly replace, after the war, whatever has been destroyed.

Such targets as supply depots, fuel depots and military barracks which have been destroyed have not been rebuilt. And when they were bombed, most probably contained little worthwhile anyway, because both personnel and supplies had been dispersed in small packets in the forests and villages, where the targets are more difficult to find, less vulnerable and less remunerative. The results, then, are minimal—but the costs are not.

By our increasing military pressure we have driven the Liberation Front closer to Hanoi, and Hanoi closer to Peking, when one of our major objectives should be to divide them—and there are reasons to think they could be divided.

We have compromised the loyalty and sympathy of many friends of the U.S. in many parts of the world.

We are making a wider war much more likely. It is not improbable at all that in the near future some spectacular defeat will be inflicted on U.S. forces, and then public pressure in the United States will rise almost irresistibly to do something drastic, such as invade North Vietnam. From there it is but a step to direct war with China. And any idea that the Soviet Union would be happy to have us destroy China for them is, I believe, wild. The Soviets have objected for years to the fact that the strongest military power in Western Europe is the U.S.; they cannot wish that same power to reach round the world, establish itself in China, and enclose them in the pincers.

The U.S. commitment in Vietnam exceeds the importance of its objectives there—and also the clarity with which the nation sees those objectives. Instead of steadily escalating the war, while the objectives recede further into the distance, the U.S. should begin a program of gradual de-escalation to bring its commitments in Vietnam into balance with its stake there. One method of doing this would be as follows:

1. Stop the bombing of the North. It is not accomplishing objectives; it is dividing our friends from us; it is giving the United States an image of imperialism in Asia; and it bears within itself the very real dangers of a wider war, perhaps World War III.

2. Stop the bombing and shelling of the villages in the South. The bombing and shelling have been helpful militarily, it is true, and if we stop them the Viet Cong could use the villages as sanctuaries. On the other hand, by destruction of the villages we are disrupting the fabric of South Vietnamese society, we are doing nothing to defeat the more important guerrilla and non-military threat of the Viet Cong, and we are leaving a residue of hostility for the Americans and the South Vietnamese Government.

3. Stop the crop-spraying. This has also been helpful militarily, because it strikes at the greatest vulnerability of the Viet Cong, which is food. But it is subject to the same disadvantages mentioned above for the bombing and shelling of villages, and these outweigh any gain.

4. Simultaneously with the foregoing actions, reaffirm (a) that the United States is not going to abandon the South Vietnamese, (b) that U.S. objectives in South Vietnam are limited to defense against its takeover by force, and (c) that the U.S. intends to leave the country after the conclusion of hostilities, rather than stay and exploit it as the French did. Couple the above with a reaffirmation of U.S. willingness to draw up a timetable for withdrawal from South Vietnam, though dependent on the actual negotiations and on Viet Cong and North Vietnamese cooperation; also include a willingness to cease future U.S. military support to the South Vietnamese government, whoever comprises it.

5. Continue U.S. encouragement of the South Vietnamese government to get on with the so-called "other war" the land reform measures, administrative and political reforms, the attempts to make the government a friend rather than an enemy of the people, the measures to "civilianize" itself. An important aspect of this would be an extension of the present "Chieu Hoi," or amnesty program in which the members of the Liberation Front would be invited to participate on a no-

reprisals basis in the formation and operation of the government. A further aspect could be a provision for UN-supervised elections, though such matters as this should await developments.

There are obvious dangers in the above proposals. The Communists might not accept them. Or they might accept, and stall negotiations interminably. Or they might say nothing, and redouble their efforts in the South. The U.S. could make clear, however, that it is not going to leave South Vietnam until a settlement is reached. In effect, then, the Communists would have a chance to negotiate the U.S. out of Vietnam. There have been indications that they would pay quite a price for this result.

Another danger, of course, would be that Marshal Ky and others in Saigon would feel betrayed by some of the actions suggested above. They might even attempt an outright coup or revolt. But the U.S. commitment is to South Vietnam, not to Marshal Ky, and there is no reason to allow a military junta to make U.S. foreign policy for it. If the military revolted against their U.S. protector, it is difficult to see how they could sustain themselves for long. The U.S. would have to wait, with "strategic patience," and try to help pick up the pieces.

It is possible, of course, that there would be no pieces to pick up. The program I have suggested above might result in a temporary military or coalition government in South Vietnam, followed by a Communist guerrilla takeover, or it might result in a government which made peace with North Vietnam and merged with it. Either of these results would be very unfavorable for U.S. policy—but they would be preferable to the disadvantages of the present course of action. On the other hand, neither of these results is inevitable, and the U.S. has many cards to play to help prevent them.

NATION BUILDING

There are other implications of the U.S. intervention in Vietnam which require a broader look at U.S. political-military policy. One of these is the increasing importance of the U.S. military in the business of "stability operations" and "nation building." Herein lies one of the most portentous, and potentially dangerous, trends in U.S. relations with the underdeveloped world. For in the U.S. military a large number of conscientious, unimperialistic, even idealistic men, particularly in the Army, see for themselves and for the United States a future which involves "winning" the battle of the Free World against Communism, on the battleground of the Third World. The means by which they propose to do this include an entire gamut of actions ranging from outright U.S. military intervention, through military advice and logistical support, to economic assistance and political education at the other end of the spectrum.

In devising this role for the Army in the great battle against Communism they draw partly on their military experience, partly on their history of governing such territories as Alaska and the Canal Zone, partly on their accomplishments in the economic rebuilding and "democratization" of Germany and Japan as an occupation army, and partly on the remarkable record of the Corps of Engineers in the U.S. in integrating itself usefully with the civilian fabric by building bridges, dams, jetties, monuments, etc. But what the U.S. Army can do in the American political context, there must be grave doubts that it can accomplish in the underdeveloped world. If the U.S. is going to engage in this task, then let it find another approach, and another instrument. The primary U.S. contribution to the underdeveloped world is surely its political philosophy of individual freedom and its sincere belief in human material progress, rather than techniques for holding back revolution—whether Communist-inspired or otherwise.

A second implication of the U.S. war in Vietnam is the necessity for arriving at some larger solution to the problem of conflicting power interests in the Far East. A major U.S. task should be the promotion of an Asian security conference, with the objective of underwriting a settlement in Vietnam, and of establishing the outlines of future relationships among the powers in the area. Some of the major U.S. aims in such a conference would be to: (a) encourage the assumption by indigenous countries—especially Japan, the Philippines, Indonesia, Australia, India and Pakistan—of increasing responsibility for the future development, stability and security of the area; (b) reaffirm U.S.—and if possible, regional—support of countries which might be subjected to external aggression; (c) reaffirm U.S. willingness to participate in regional economic development proposals; (d) leave the door open for as much Chinese and even Soviet participation (however informal) as possible.

An important, though not the sole, purpose of the conference would be to make clear the terms on which Communist China can expect to live in peace with its neighbors in the Far East. For this reason it would be extremely important that the conference not take on simply anti-Communist or anti-Chinese tone. Otherwise, most of the large and truly important Asian nations would not attend or subscribe to its results, the small allies of the U.S. would insure that the divisive issues which will determine the future peace of Asia were sharpened rather than moderated or negotiated, and the U.S. would undoubtedly be committed to decades of conflict and intervention on the Asian continent.

The preparation and conduct of U.S. foreign policy for and during such a conference would pose immense problems. A great nation does not alter even slightly the direction of a policy it has pursued for a decade and a half without major effects upon—even disruptions of—other nations' affairs. Responsibilities have been incurred by the U.S. which cannot simply be dismissed. National expectations have been encouraged and important political figures' personal careers have been committed. There are genuine fears in the Far East both of Communist subversion and Chinese power. And the Soviet Union will look suspiciously at any evidence of detente between the U.S. and China, even though it has certainly not wanted outright war between the two. But these problems are not insoluble. And to the extent that U.S. diplomacy and leadership can rise to them, the most powerful country in the world can throw its weight either in the direction of future world order or increasing world conflict. The task is a truly great one—suitable for a great nation.

THE WAR: ALL, ALL HONORABLE MEN

(By Michael Novak)

To speak of military victory in South Vietnam, Secretary McNamara has warned us, is to speak nonsense. There are no front lines. There is hardly any opposing army—the major part of the revolutionary forces is composed of civilian soldiers, whose numbers grow steadily with the years, and whose presence in the countryside is extremely difficult even to detect. There is pitifully little to bomb or to shell, except silent jungle. Either the war will slowly peter out over many long years, or it will have to end through negotiations. But what is there to negotiate?

Perhaps even more interesting, who will be the negotiators? The flurry of diplomatic activity in the early part of 1967 revealed that the National Liberation Front in South Vietnam has significantly different ideas about the future than Hanoi. Meanwhile, the military regime in South Vietnam has a vested interest in continuing the war; Premier Ky, weeks before the September election, announced that if his people voted for a peace candidate or a neutralist he would feel obliged to seize command again by force. And what, exactly, are the aims of the United States concerning negotiations?

Theodore Draper has told the sorry story of the diplomacy of the Johnson administration during the first few months of 1967 in "How Not to Negotiate" in *The New York Review of Books* for May. A Stanford senior, James E. Marti, has prepared an unpublished study of 80 recorded exchanges between the United States and North Vietnam from Jan. 1 to Feb. 28, 1967. Forty of the 49 U.S. transactions, Mr. Marti finds, were nonconciliatory; of the conciliatory moves, eight were initiatives but only three were military. By contrast, the North Vietnamese made 19 conciliatory moves, 15 of which were initiatives, none military. Two patterns in U.S. activity emerged: (1) conciliatory verbal initiatives from North Vietnam met nonconciliatory *actions* from the U.S.; (2) conciliatory *verbal* initiatives from the U.S. were followed by nonconciliatory *actions* by the U.S.

On Jan. 1, for example, Hanoi proposed an extension of the 48-hour truce and Ambassador Goldberg said: "The United States welcomes an extension of the cease fire." The next day, only three hours after the truce had ended, U.S. planes were bombing the Demilitarized Zone. On Feb. 5, Hanoi rescinded earlier demands and announced that the opening of peace talks depended only on the cessation of U.S. bombing. Contacts were made in anticipation of the 96-hour Lunar Truce to begin Feb. 8. But on Feb. 6, the U.S. forces in the field launched a major offensive and made record air strikes in South Vietnam. One minute after the truce had ended, B-52's, in the air for hours, rained bombs on unseen targets. Ho Chi Minh sent a radio message to Pope Paul asking an end to the bombing. One hour later, U.S. bombers struck North Vietnam. North Vietnamese peace bids on Feb. 16, 18 and 22 were met by increased bombings, the "largest offensive yet in the Vietnamese war," the first artillery fire into North Vietnam, the mining of North Vietnamese rivers, and the violation of international waters by warships moving within 200 yards of shore to shell targets in North Vietnam.

On Feb. 9–10, negotiations between Prime Minister Wilson and Premier Kosygin had brought, in Wilson's words, "peace within our grasp." On Feb. 8, the bombing had stopped. Kosygin left London on Feb. 12; the next day the bombing was resumed.

What is the point of the bombing? On April 7, President Johnson pictured it as diplomatic "leverage": "I wish it were possible to convince others with words of what we now find necessary to say with guns and planes." The recurrent justification for the bombing has not been military but diplomatic; the bombing "raises the cost" of intransigence. What has the United States asked in return? On Jan. 5, it was a "reciprocal move toward peace"; on Jan. 6, "a reciprocal action"; and on Feb. 2, "just almost any action . . . just almost any reciprocal move." On Feb. 9, Secretary Rusk (one hour after the Wilson-Kosygin talks) asked on television that North Vietnam "reduce its military effort in South Vietnam." The U.S., in short, began to bomb in order to force North Vietnam to the peace table. When Hanoi began to talk about peace on condition that the bombing stop, the U.S. asked for some vague *further sign*—and meanwhile intensified offensive operations.

It seems quite plain that the U.S. does not want to stop the fighting and begin to talk, but wishes instead to gain military concessions *before* any cessation of the bombing. Beyond this, Secretary Rusk and President Johnson have laid down the following guidelines for a future settlement: (1) an end to "aggression" from the North; (2) the political separation of South Vietnam from North Vietnam; (3) the guaranteed independence of South Vietnam from North Vietnam; (4) the "freedom" and stability of South Vietnam.

It is instructive, however, to notice what these claims must look like from the point of view of Hanoi. In the first place, the Geneva Accords of 1954 specified clearly that the division of South Vietnam from North Vietnam was to be neither political nor permanent. Vietnam, North and South together, has been and is supposed to be as one indivisible nation. Thus, secondly, the troops from Hanoi, let alone the Viet Cong, can hardly see themselves as "aggressors" in their own land; quite clearly, the foreigners are the Americans and their allies. Thirdly, South Vietnam hardly looks to Hanoi like an "independent" nation; it seems quite clearly to be an American dependency, financially, militarily and politically. It seems plain that but for the massive U.S. military intervention in 1965, South Vietnam would by now have had to accept a new government which would have, at a minimum, included members of the National Liberation Front. Finally, the supposed "freedom" given to South Vietnam by the United States appears to have already taken the form of a military dictatorship and the reinforcement of the interests of the hereditary mandarin caste which has long played upon the miseries of the Vietnamese people. Premier Ky is an avowed militarist; he calls effort for peace treasonable, and openly mocks the electoral process.

Yet the United States' interests in South Vietnam are not exhausted by the four claims made public by President Johnson and Dean Rusk. With every American soldier who has been killed or been crippled in Vietnam, American emotional stakes in the war have risen. The buddies of every fallen man, his family and the public as a whole are impelled to ask "that these honored dead will not have died in vain." Thus the U.S. government cannot face the realities of Vietnam truthfully. It cannot admit that the war is largely a civil war. It cannot admit that the government it supports is not a free government. It cannot even admit that its generals are committing blunder after blunder, so that our military efforts are, despite the grander noises, as ineffective as those of the South Vietnamese armies ever were. The guerrillas lure the American behemoth into remote jungle areas (ambushing troops at will), so that after two years of massive American presence the extent of politically secured areas is no larger, perhaps smaller, than it was before the Americans arrived. Meanwhile, civilian workers in the field report, hatred for Americans grows daily in once friendly villages.

"Peace with honor," President Johnson urges. Honor appears to mean the abject surrender of our opponents, an agreement to mutilate their own nation by dividing it, the acceptance of a tyrannical general allied to mandarin interests as ruler of half the land, and the betrayal of a nationalist dream for which scores of thousands have laid down their lives for over 20 years. It is obvious that honor has a different meaning in Hanoi and in the jungle headquarters of the NLF, as it once had in Washington.

[From Commonweal, Sept. 22, 1967]

THE WAR: EXERCISE IN DECEPTION

(By Tran Van Dinh)

(NOTE.—Tran Van Dinh, a journalist and lecturer, was Chargé d'Affaires of South Vietnam to the United States in 1963.)

For the seventh time since Vietnam was temporarily divided by the 1954 Geneva Agreements, the people of South Vietnam, on Sept. 3, went to the polls (there were presidential elections in 1955 and 1961; Assembly elections in 1956, 1959, 1963 and 1966). Some 4,877,083 voters—83.3 percent of the eligible electorate—proceeded to 8.824 polling places to elect a President, a Vice President and 60 Senators. The figures seems impressive, but, as the New York *Times'* Tom Wicker noted, the 83.3 percent represented less than a third of the nation, the rest having been disqualified as neutralists or Communists or residents of insecure areas outside the reach of Saigon.

The Sept. 3 voter, who has had enough of bullets and ballots in the last 22 years, was handed 11 ballots—one for each presidential ticket (two names on each, President and Vice President); then he was given 48 other ballots—one for each senatorial slate (10 names on each). Thus he had to go over 502 names and scrutinize 59 symbols (11 presidential; 48 senatorial). Many Vietnamese are illiterate; those who do read would have had to have taken a speed-reading course to fulfill their duty. Consider Kien Hoa province in the Delta, with 120,000 registered voters and 161 polling stations: voters there would have had to have been processed at the rate of 82 per hour, or 42 seconds per voter.

The voter did not care. His attention was directed at the familiar face of the policeman who controlled the polling booth. General Nguyen Ngoc Loan, head of the national police force and a close associate of Nguyen Cao Ky, had declared in a press conference in Saigon on Aug. 22: "National policemen will be stationed inside and outside booths all over the country. As the national police are the people in closest contact with the lowest echelon, there will be police telling them where to vote, how to vote and when to vote." The policeman also stamped the voter's registration card and anyone subsequently searched (a routine in South Vietnam) and found without the election day stamp on his card would be in danger of prison and even death. Finally, no matter for whom he voted, the voter knew from past experiences that the government candidates would win.

The Thieu-Ky ticket won, as expected, by 34.8 percent of the votes. But General Nguyen Van Thieu was defeated by 5,000 votes in Saigon, where people by and large are more aware of the issues. The front runner in Saigon was Tran Van Huong, former mayor and prime minister and a man respected for his honesty and austerity. Strangely enough, Mr. Huong lost in his home province, Vinh Long, where the local administration had all means to influence or threaten the voters.

The surprise of the elections was peace candidate Truong Dinh Dzu, who made a white dove his symbol. His ticket ran second, followed by Tran Van Huong and Phan Khac Suu, chairman of the Constituent Assembly. Final figures showed opponents of the Thieu-Ky ticket polling an aggregate of 3,086,843 votes, almost two-thirds more than Thieu-Ky attracted. Dr. Dzu's total was 817,120, a figure which, if soberly taken into account, should keep the peace issue in the forefront of Vietnamese politics. Complaints of fraud are being filed with the Assembly (some polls opened late; some ran out of ballots, etc.); the Assembly has until Oct. 2 to consider these and certify the validity of the elections.

No matter what will be the decision of the Assembly, the 1967 Presidential election in South Vietnam was a fraud before it took place. In the first place, the Thieu-Ky ticket was illegal. Article 17 of Electoral Law No 001/67 stipulates: "Government employees and military men, to run for elections, must file and take a leave of absence without pay beginning the closing date of application for the candidacy until the end of election day." Although General Thieu and Vice Air Marshall Ky claimed they had asked for a leave of absence, they remained as government employees and men in power.

There were other travesties. On the eve of the elections, two newspapers, *Than Chung* (Sacred Bell) and *Sang* (Light), were closed down. Colonel Pham Van Lieu, former National Police Chief and a supporter of a rival candidate, and other officers were arrested. Thieu and Ky both used government facilities during the campaign. Also the Saigon regime excluded from the race the most serious competitors: General Duong Van Minh, in exile in Bangkok, and Dr. Au Truong Thanh, former Minister of Economy and Finance (1964–1966). All candidates closely connected with the Buddhists were barred. Finally, in one month the number of eligible voters jumped from 5,553,251 to 5,853,251. Said Tran Van Huong: "We are prolific in Vietnam but not that prolific." Admitted General Thieu: "Some soldiers have been given two voting cards."

As in the last elections, Washington was optimistic. Official spokesmen capitalized on the fact that the elections took place amidst Viet Cong sabotage. Did they really try? Wesley Pruden Jr. wrote from Saigon in the Sept. 4 *National Observer:* "Many here did not believe that Hanoi and the Viet Cong seriously tried to disrupt the election. There was, as usual, a long list of terrorist incidents during election week. But brutal death is an everyday Communist contribution to life in Vietnam. If terror had been the election tactic, the terror squad could have done a lot worse. The truth is that the Viet Cong have never put a hell of a lot of importance on this election, says one American here who has watched the long preparations for the campaign. This election and all the trappings have excited the Americans a lot more than the Vietnamese."

The real loser in the elections is Vice Air Marshal Ky. As an elected Vice President, he will have to give up his functions as Prime Minister and his command of the South Vietnam Air Force. These two positions have made him the most powerful man in the military junta. But since June 29, when he was forced by his fellow generals and by U.S. pressure to accept the number two spot on the presidential ticket with his rival General Thieu, Ky has been planning a comeback. He has openly declared that he is not going to be a "tea-drinking" Vice President, which is exactly what he should be according to Article 66 of the 1967 Constitution of South Vietnam. Article 66 reads: "1. The Vice President is chairman of the Culture and Educational Council, the Economic Council, the Social Council and the Ethnic Minority Council. 2. The Vice President *cannot* hold any other position in the government."

Ky, cunning, ambitious but talkative, has mapped his strategy carefully. He relies for strength on the 90,000-strong police force headed by General Loan, a Northerner and an Air Force officer. On July 16, four C47 planes brought to the mountain resort of Dalat province police chiefs (43 in all) for a conference, followed by a dinner-dance at the Lang Bian Palace with Ky and Loan. Only one "outsider" took part in the meeting: Bui Diem, South Vietnam Ambassador to the U.S. and a close associate of Ky for years. Bui Diem would give Ky the readings of Washington policies, the knowledge of which is vital; he would have told Ky that the mood in the U.S. was for more war. This was reflected in Ky's statements during the campaign. While Thieu, who reads the Vietnam mood, called for cessation of bombings of the North and negotiations with Hanoi (he even declared he is "ready to meet with official representatives of the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam"), Ky called for more bombings.

At Ky's instigation, the senior officers of the ARVN (Army Republic of Vietnam) formed a "military committee" to act as a kitchen cabinet for the future government. To upset Ky's maneuver, General Thieu announced in a press conference on Aug. 25, that "some general officers and high ranking colonels will be purged. Some of them will be discharged from the army, others will be brought before the Disciplinary Council." It remains to be seen if Thieu will carry out this purge, which would affect about 50 officers; it also remains to be seen how many of them are Ky's friends.

Depending on his strength, Ky could force the future parliament to amend the Constitution to enable the Vice President to take on the functions of Prime Minister, or he could simply overthrow Thieu and take his place as President. If, however, with the elections, Ky feels he is not strong enough, he can temporarily come to a compromise with Thieu and select a friend as a civilian Premier. Whatever, the elections will create more conflicts and divisions within the ARVN—and outside of it.

The most serious opposition is likely to come from the Buddhists. Since 1964, the Buddhists have struggled for the holding of elections which would be organized by an "interim government," not the military junta in power. Ruthlessly suppressed in the summer of 1966, Buddhists were excluded from the presidential race. (Buddhists would have supported General Duong Van Minh or Dr. Au Truong Thanh.)

Moreover, in the midst of the elections preparations, General Thieu, a Catholic convert, signed Decree Law 23/67 abolishing the Buddhist Charter (approved by Decree Law 158/SL/CT of May 14, 1964). In a "free" and "democratic" South Vietnam, the majority religion functions under government-approved charter. The approval by General Thieu of the new charter violates article 32 of the 1964 Charter and article 35 of the revised 1966 Charter. These articles stipulate that all amendments and modifications must be discussed and approved by at least two-thirds of the delegates of the General Buddhist Assembly, composed of members of the Council of the Central Committee of the Church and representatives from regions and provinces all over the country. The new charter was proposed by only five Buddhists, one of them the so-called "moderate" Thich Tam Chau.

The reaction of the Buddhists was predictable. On Aug. 8, the Venerable Thich Tinh Khiet, Patriarch of the United Buddhist Church, wrote to General Thieu to protest against the promulgation of the New Charter. On Aug. 24, an extraordinary General Assembly of the United Buddhist Church met at the An Quang Pagoda and unanimously rejected the new charter. The same day Patriarch Thich Tinh Khiet cabled Buddhist countries and Buddhist organizations abroad, and the Secretary General of the United Nations, to inform them of the decision of the Assembly.

A cable was also sent to the Pope, in which the Patriarch asked the Holy Father to intervene with those "who claim to be Catholic and yet engage themselves in destructive actions against religions." The cable mentioned the understanding and brotherhood existing between the Buddhist and the Catholic communities after the overthrow of President Ngo Dinh Diem in 1963. For the present, the Buddhists are advised to be in a state of alertness and wait directions from the Patriarch.

As for the future of the war and the "pacification," I am in agreement with Lt. Colonel William Carson, head of the Marine Combined Action Program in Danang. Colonel Carson is quoted in the July 29 *Washington Post:* "The peasant sees that we are supporting a local government structure he knows to be corrupt. So he assumes that we are either stupid or implicated. And he decides that we are not stupid. As for the elections, if they provide the leadership and the Revolutionary Development Program does better than it has done in the past, then we have a chance. If not, we've had it. The ball game is over."

The elections have returned the same leadership, corrupt, inefficient, alien to the peasantry. Directed by the same people, the Revolutionary Development Program is not going to be any better, but the game is not over. The elections were an exercise of deception to the American public. The Vietnamese peasants, after 22 years of war and betrayed revolutions, cannot be deceived.

The 22-man observation group sent by President Johnson has passed a favorable verdict. They did so after a few days in Vietnam, as guests of the Saigon government, escorted by government interpreters and equipped with not even the rudiment of Vietnamese politics and Vietnamese culture. It is a mystery how they could watch over 8,000 polling places. But it doesn't matter. The elections were simply a process of legitimization of the Saigon military junta and the legalization of the U.S. intervention in South Vietnam.

THE WAR: THE CASE FOR WITHDRAWAL

(Ey Peter Steinfels, Associate Editor of Commonweal)

The U.S. is pursuing "rollback" in Southeast Asia, a policy it has largely disavowed in the rest of the world. First practically and only later rhetorically, the U.S. decided that in Eastern Europe Communist regimes were a fact of life. We might deplore them, we might argue that they did not represent the majorities in their nations, we might suspend or grant aid in hope of encouraging a different sort of Communist regime, we might even hope for a future for these areas not all recognizable as Communist. But we gave up the idea of attaining our aims by armed invasion.

In Vietnam the U.S. has attempted "rollback" at least twice. In 1954 Washington decided to reverse the outcome of the Indochinese war by ignoring the Geneva agreements and by supporting an anti-Communist satellite state in the South. In 1965 Washington attempted to offset the virtually total military and political collapse of that satellite state by raining bombs on North Vietnam and sending a massive expeditionary force into Asia. On both occasions our own statesmen were of the opinion that for various reasons, many of them historically unique and by no means the doing of the U.S., the Communist-led forces had won the day and effective control of the country was all but in their hands.

Into this gap between almost certain possibility and actual accomplishment, the U.S. inserted its direct intervention; our temporary successes masked from us what we were doing. Gambling on "rollback" in 1954, we later refused to admit that we had lost the wager—and gambled again. There has been no nuclear war, yet. Otherwise, the results have been as disastrous as anything we could have feared in Eastern Europe.

While the United States is occupied in Southern Asia, international relations have reached a critical stage. Like the 1860's when Germany was unified or 1919 when old empires crumbled and the U.S. and Russia temporarily withdrew from Europe, today the emergence of China and of national Communism, the revival of Europe, the detente with Russia, the possibility of an international system vastly and irreversibly altered by nuclear proliferation, together these factors present one of those determining moments for the next decades of international relations. A similar point has been reached in developing lands and American cities, where continuing misery in the face of wealth has raised frustration to a revolutionary pitch. At such a moment, the world's greatest power is exhausting vast resources, economic, military and political, on a local war which is taking a toll worse than did Hanoi's cruel purges and which will, moreover, increase the very wartime terror and postwar bloodletting the war is meant to prevent. Simply put, the war in Vietnam is doing more harm—to the Vietnamese, to world peace, to America itself—than would even a Communist regime in Saigon.

This is the conclusion which underlies any call for American withdrawal. The United States must recognize the failure of its "rollback" and radically reverse its priorities. Those priorities now line up: (1) prevention of a Communist regime in the South; (2) ameliorative measures to minimize Vietnamese suffering; (3) ending the war. The order should be reversed: (1) ending the war; (2) ameliorative measures to minimize suffering; (3) prevention of a Communist regime.

The implications of such a reversal are that the U.S. would immediately try to obtain Hanoi and Vietcong agreement to a non-Communist coalition government in the South including Communist elements. If agreement could not be reached, the U.S. *should lower its demands,* to a coalition government in which the Communist elements would be stronger or even dominating. As part of the agreement, the various sides must guarantee measures to minimize the reprisals and postwar suffering: population movements; medical and economic assistance; U.N. or Red Cross observation units; phased withdrawal of American troops (presenting the unstated threat of a reversal of policy if reprisals went beyond the horrible minimum which can be realistically expected); or whatever ingenuity and a percentage of the billions now spent on the war can devise.

Hanoi and the N.L.F. may accept the first offer which presents at least a possibility of their future control of Vietnam; they may fear that such an offer, if refused, will only be followed by a hardening of U.S. policy. Or they may hold out for assurances of almost complete power from the start. America should consider the former eventuality a fortunate bonus, the latter outcome the just consequence of our failure. In either case, ending the war and employing every non-military means we can devise to limit Vietnamese suffering are higher priorities.

These, I realize, are radical proposals. They arise, however, from radically deranged situation: to "lose" this war today would be better for the world, the U.S. and Vietnam than to "win" it fifteen years from now. I put the words "win" and "lose" in quotation marks because in Vietnam their simple meaning has been strained to the breaking point.

THE ALTERNATIVES

A willingness to enlarge the bait until Hanoi and the N.L.F. bite adds up to the policy sometimes termed "withdrawal." Mention this word out loud, and you will usually receive three objections: "But the situation is complicated!" "But are you against negotiations?" "But we can't just abandon the Vietnamese."

Each of these objections has some basis. For some people, no doubt, the proposal to make an end to the war our overriding priority is an escape from the burden of complexity. Like the advocate of bombing North Vietnam back into the Stone Age, they merely want to "get finished with it." They forget that an American withdrawal won't make Vietnam or Southeast Asia or China disappear. (Or the State Department and the Pentagon, for that matter.) The problem is foreign *relations,* not foreign *events,* and these are long-term matters.

Still, to cry "complexity" is no unanswerable objection to withdrawal. Given, in fact, the full complexity of the situation and the drawbacks of every alternative, withdrawal may be the best of a bad lot, the lesser of evils. "Complexity" is certainly no argument for the present policy in Vietnam, except in the sense that attempting surgery with a cleaver is guaranteed to produce awesome complications. Is complexity on the side of any of the other alternatives?

Many answer that it is on the side of "negotiations," and the critics of the war can be roughly divided between advocates of a negotiated settlement and advocates of withdrawal. The antagonism between these groups is surprising, because any casual observer will note that their objectives are neither self-explanatory nor mutually exclusive. If the U.S., having reversed its priorities, were determined to withdraw, nothing would be easier than to arrange negotiations to formalize the process. On the other hand, almost every scheme for negotiations now in the public arena, including the State Department's, looks forward to some process of eventual withdrawal. There are, of course, those who would like to force Hanoi to sign what amounts to a surrender; and there are those who would savor some sort of American Dunkirk. Both groups sometimes cloak their desires with the terms "negotiations" or "withdrawal." But generally, serious critics of the war desire some combination of negotiations and withdrawal. And most of them realize that phrases like "*unconditional* negotiations" and "*immediate* withdrawal" are hyperbolic impossibilities. Neither Hanoi nor Washington will begin negotiations without *some* idea of what may emerge, and this constitutes a condition. No withdrawal could be accomplished in such a blink of the eye as to avoid decisions concerning the future rulers of Vietnam, and this constitutes an implicit or explicit form of negotiation.

The two formulas, then, are not dichotomous, but expressions of relative differences. The negotiator may feel there is still a good chance for a peaceful and non-Communist South Vietnam, led by the Buddhists or another "third way" group. Much as the withdrawer might prefer such a settlement, a Vietnam free of both war and Communism, he doubts whether it is any longer possible. The non-Communist forces in Vietnam are too weak, to local, too divided, or too unpopular to survive long without the American military prop. To insist absolutely on a non-Communist solution is to insist on a Vietnam at war.

The negotiator wants Hanoi and the Vietcong to "be reasonable" and come halfway, and he has faith that they would, if given a chance by Washington. The withdrawer doubts that "being reasonable" can mean the same thing for a revolutionary group fighting in its homeland as for a great power. Once again, he might prefer to see Hanoi and the Vietcong come halfway, but he doesn't want to depend on it.

The negotiator hopes that the very process of negotiations, once initiated, will lead to a lowering of American aims. The withdrawer fears that only a lowering of aims, a reversal of American priorities, will lead to the initiation of successful negotiations. He knows that, unless linked to a will to end the war, many of the negotiator's proposals—to start talks or de-escalate the war—can be manipulated for government purposes, either to cast responsibility for the war on Hanoi or to reduce the war effort to a level more acceptable to the American electorate. The withdrawer is aware that the hawks are watching like . . . hawks. And that the U.S. will not be pressed by any bargaining process into concessions its leaders are not completely prepared to defend. It will take a firm act of political will power to extricate us from Vietnam; it probably cannot be done on the sly, or on the cheap. Beyond the problem of raising public support for beginning talks, the withdrawer senses the need for public recognition of the price to be paid if talks are actually to occur and be successful. No new illusions for the old, please. The withdrawer is a dove, but a hardnosed one.

But another objection remains. If our first priority becomes ending the war rather than containing the Communists, are we abandoning the Vietnamese?

Not that America's concern for the Vietnamese has ever been overriding: we paid for the war of their colonial masters, tolerated the corruption of their ruling elites, and supported the oppression of their mandarin leaders. There are many ways to abandon a people. For two decades the Vietnamese have been abandoned to civil strife, military destruction, national division, individual suffering. We have pledged our willingness to abandon them, if necessary, to a vast war between American armies and hordes of their ancient Chinese oppressors. One of our ex-Presidents has approved of abandoning them, if necessary, to the pleasures of atomic weapons. The Vietnamese are being abandoned to American needs and notions today, have been so abandoned for a decade past, and may be so abandoned for years to come.

Let us not be hypocritical. There are few debts heavier than the one America now owes the Vietnamese. Are we going to pay by bombing, searching, destroying, pacifying, and rooting out, for fifteen years? Or will we, at last, *stop* abandoning Vietnam?

AMERICA'S INCREASING COMMITMENTS TO EDUCATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, two recent public pronouncements by the President and the Vice President of the United States clearly underline the fact that great progress has been made through legislation in bringing opportunities for educational attainment to American boys and girls.

I have reference to the remarks of the President of the United States upon the occasion of the signing of the Vocational Rehabilitation Amendments Act of 1967 on Tuesday, October 3, 1967, and the address of the Vice President before the Catholic Education Association in Cincinnati, Ohio, on September 28, 1967. Although the remarks were made in different forums, there is a unity of theme and a message in both which we would do well to take to heart. It is that the commitment of Americans to the provision of educational opportunity has never been stronger. Many of us, and I certainly include myself among the company, are impatient for the realization of the aspirations which we hold in this area; and we necessarily tend to concentrate upon that which is yet to be accomplished rather than upon the tremendous progress that has been made through enactment of statutes.

Thus, it is appropriate to have recalled to our attention by the President that:

> If men in the future want to suggest the range of our achievements, I think they could do it in only two sentences:
>
> "The American people in three years, multiplied their commitment to health and education four times over. They passed more laws and they committed more funds to the education of our children—and to the health of our people—in three years than in all the previous history of America put together."
>
> Junior colleges are now being founded in America at the rate of one per week.
>
> By 1965, new Federal programs were helping 500,000 young people go to college and without that help, they might not have had a chance. Next year—I want all of you to get this—we will be helping 1,200,000; so we have doubled the number that we helped go to college—more than doubled it in the last two years—500,000 to 1,200,000.
>
> Those to me are not just numbers. They are miracles. They represent human lives which are being changed and human lives which are being enriched.
>
> They mean that a new idea is already at work here in America.

As the Vice President recalled:

> Today, one American in four is enrolled in some sort of educational program.
>
> And in the last few years education has taken a more central place in national policy than at any other time in our history.
>
> As a parent, as a former teacher and professor, as a friend of education in the Senate, as your Vice President, I am proud to say it: The Johnson-Humphrey Administration has put into operation 31 major education and training laws. And these are laws not just in quantity, but of quality.
>
> I need not tell you that the most revolutionary breakthrough came, with your help in 1965, with the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Signing the Vocational Rehabilitation Amendments Act of 1967 was a symbol to be sure, but behind the symbol lies the reality. I applaud the statement made by President Johnson that the signing was more than just a ritual. By that act, he as the representative of all the people of the United States, expressed our national purpose which he defined on our behalf as fulfillment for the individual.

I am sure that all of us, irrespective of party, who serve on the Education Subcommittee on the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, are firmly behind the objective he outlined to knock down every barrier that keeps a child or a man from realizing his full potential in our country.

At the signing President Johnson paid just and due tribute to the great Senators in this body who helped to bring about this achievement for the people. As the historians of the future look back at our time they will echo, I know, the tribute given by the President to our beloved chairman, Senator HILL, and to the dean of the Senate, the uniquely distinguished senior Senator from Arizona, CARL HAYDEN.

Deserved tribute was also given by the President to our colleagues in the other body, Chairman PERKINS of the House Committee on Education and Labor and his colleague, Congressman DANIELS, and to all the other Members who worked with them on the bill. They, too, deserve the thanks of the people of this country.

A further unifying theme runs through both statements, and that is the task for the future, and here I refer first to the specific reference by the President to the National Center for Deaf-Blind Youth and Adults contained in the bill because this reference strengthens the testimony we have received during our hearings on the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments in support of the complementary facilities for boys and girls under the age of 16.

I shall take great pride as this proposal is debated in our subcommittee, in referring to the President's statement:

> And finally, it strikes at one of the most baffling and heartbreaking handicaps that we can imagine: the double handicap of deaf-blindness. For years, that problem seemed too difficult for us. Now, by establishing a National Center for Deaf-Blind Youth and Adults, we hope to change all of that.

It will be of enormous help to us.

So, too, in a similar fashion will be the reminders in the Vice President's address that American education, despite the progress that has been made does show inadequacies in areas, particularly the areas of our slum schools in our big cities. His recommendations for our future action will, I know, be given careful consideration and I hope favorable action as we review the specific language in our mark-up sessions on the 1967 amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

I am grateful, too, to the Vice President for the plea that he made on behalf of our committee when he told his audience:

> All of us believe it, but we must awake the national consciousness to this fact: an extra dollar well spent on education will be repaid by a lifetime of dividends . . . a dollar denied is a dollar that will soon be wasted in unproductive welfare.
>
> And so I specifically ask now your full support for the education measures still pending before the Congress. Let your Congressmen know about your support. Let your local newspapers and radio-tv stations know. Make yourselves heard, now.

And I join him in dedicating myself to the charter of educational opportunity with which he concluded his speech, in these words:

> I propose that we dedicate ourselves to a fresh Charter of Educational Opportunity for every American child—a promise that he can and will get the skills and the knowledge he needs to make the most of himself in our fast-changing and competitive society. We do not need to settle for less.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there appear at this point in my remarks these challenging and inspirational remarks of two great Americans.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT UPON SIGNING H.R. 12257, THE VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1967, EAST ROOM

Secretary Gardner, Under Secretary Cohen, Mrs. Switzer, Members of Congress, Ladies and Gentlemen:

Eight years ago in Portage, Pennsylvania, a 20-year machinist dived into a swimming hole and struck his head. Thus, he was paralyzed for life.

Even before that accident, he was handicapped; he had been partially deaf since his birth. Now he was not only deaf, but he was sentenced to another kind of life imprisonment. In many ways, that seemed to be a very, very hopeless case.

Today, that "hopeless case" is a very successful draftsman. He makes a good living with a design firm near Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. He pays his taxes. He is a member of a community—instead of its helpless ward.

All of that was true because he was helped, helped right from the start by a counselor from the Pennsylvania Bureau of Rehabilitation.

The law that I am going to sign today makes such stories as this possible. It brings them into reality. Thousands of them. Half a million exactly in the last four years. Since Woodrow Wilson's day it has helped more than two million Americans who—in one way or another—would be equally "hopeless cases."

As much as any law on the books, this law reveals what great possibilities every person has—and what, I believe, a great heart we have in America.

Last year, we helped restore 173,000 people to useful lives. Three-fourths of them had been unemployed—20 percent of them were already on welfare.

Today, every one of them are taxpayers. This program reaps five tax dollars for every dollar that we sow. And measured in human happiness, its value is beyond all of our counting.

So this moment is more than just a ritual. Today we express again our purpose in America: fulfillment for the individual. We aim to knock down every barrier that keeps a child or a man from realizing his full potential in our country.

The history of these years, I believe, when it is written, will be the story of how we in America accomplished that goal.

A rather bitter writer once gave this definition of history: "The account, mostly false, of events, mostly unimportant, which were brought about by rulers, mostly knaves. . . ."

I disagree with him on all counts.

History, I am convinced, will remember these years as a great awakening in America.

In these years, we discovered poverty in the midst of plenty—and we did something about it—not as much as we would like—but we did all that we could get a majority to do.

If historians seek a name for this age in the United States, I hope that they will call it the Age of Education.

Our government guarantees to all of its citizens all the education that he or she can take.

In the past six years, the number of young people going to college from poor homes has risen by more than 12 percent.

In six years, the number of high school dropouts has dropped—from 25 percent to only 18 percent of our young people between 16 and 24.

I regret we have 18 percent. But I would much rather have 18 than 25 that we started with.

If men in the future want to suggest the range of our achievements, I think they could do it in only two sentences:

"The American people in three years, multiplied their commitment to health and education four times over. They passed more laws and they committed more funds to the education of our children—and to the health of our people—in three years than in all the previous history of America put together."

Junior colleges are now being founded in America at the rate of one per week.

By 1965, new Federal programs were helping 500,000 young people go to college and without that help, they might not have had a chance. Next year—I want all of you to get this—we will be helping 1,200,000; so we have doubled the number that we helped go to college—more than doubled it in the last two years—500,000 to 1,200,000.

Those to me are not just numbers. They are miracles. They represent human lives which are being changed and human lives which are being enriched.

They mean that a new idea is already at work here in America.

Once, we thought of rehabilitation as something for the physically handicapped. This law is evidence of that. But now we have learned that other handicaps yield to the same treatment. The handicap of ignorance for example. Mental handicaps are another. The handicap of poverty is another.

Rehabilitation, in fact, has become a basic idea in our country. We act on the belief that every man—no matter what his color, no matter what his bank account, no matter what his handicap or no matter what his I.Q.—has abilities which America needs.

That is a new idea. But it is a great idea. It is like discovering a new country right in our midst—the territory of human promise. That idea promises not more welfare, but more well-being for all—well-being for our people—the people we have selected to serve.

So we come here to the East Room of the White House this afternoon to continue this program. To continue it—and to add much to it that is new:

This law extends rehabilitation service to migrant laborers—the poorest among us, the most needy among us.

It increases Federal support for rehabilitation here in our Nation's Capital.

"And finally, it strikes at one of the most baffling and heartbreaking handicaps that we can imagine: the double handicap of deaf-blindness. For years, that problem seemed too difficult for us. Now, by establishing a National Center for Deaf-Blind Youth and Adults, we hope to change all of that."

To all the supporters of this law in Congress, to all the Members of the House and Senate who are here this afternoon on behalf of all the Nation, I want to say the Nation owes you a debt of thanks.

I would like to call each of your names. I am sure I would overlook some and make some of you offended. But I must refer to Senator Hill, who is always in the limelight to anything that is good for health and education in this country—to Congressman Daniels, and to their committee members.

They gave this law dedicated—and bypartisan—support.

In the next few years, this law will turn hope into achievement for thousands of our people.

And it will prove something to us in history: that in America there is no such thing as a "Hopeless Case."

Before I conclude—because I couldn't go to the Capitol yesterday—I want to pay my respects, my very great esteem and affection to that grand young man who was 90 yesterday, Carl Hayden.

I have never known a better public servant. I have never known a better human being. And I have never had a better friend. I am so glad he could be here today.

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHERY BEFORE THE CATHOLIC EDUCATION ASSOCIATION, CINCINNATI, OHIO, SEPTEMBER 28, 1967

When the Office of Education was established by Congress just a century ago, the Secretary of the Interior—who was put in charge—very clearly set forth his regard for the new agency. "There is no necessity of anyone knowing anything whatever about education," he said.

Education has come a long way since then within our government—and within our country. I sometimes think we've forgotten just how far.

At the turn of this century, only 7 per cent of our teenagers were receiving secondary education of any kind. Today the figure is 93 per cent.

In the last 20 years alone, the percentage of American young people going to college has doubled.

Today, one American in four is enrolled in some sort of educational program.

And in the last few years education has taken a more central place in national policy than at any other time in our history.

As a parent, as a former teacher and professor, as a friend of education in the Senate, as your Vice President, I am proud to say it: The Johnson-Humphrey Administration has put into operation 31 major education and training laws. And these are laws not just in quantity, but of quality.

I need not tell you that the most revolutionary breakthrough came, with your help, in 1965 with the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

The immediate impact on the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, has been enormous. In its first year it provided additional services for 8.3 million educationally disadvantaged children—no matter whether they attended public, private, or parochial schools. Our average annual educational expenditure on those disadvantaged children has increased 119 dollars per capita—a major contribution in our educationally poor states, and an important amount in every community.

But the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is important not only because of this. It is important because of the spirit in which it was passed, and the precedent which it has set for the future.

As a Senator, I watched good bills for federal aid to education blocked year after year by intransigent attitudes on state-church relations, and by state and local interests who feared federal interference in their traditional education responsibilities.

The debate went on—and our children suffered.

Then the people and Congress came to the realization that it was our children, not long-standing doctrinal disputes, that counted. They realized that this country—if it wished to grow and flourish—had better start making the best possible use of all its educational resources—private as well as public, parochial as well as secular.

And they realized what some of us had been saying for a long time—that federal support need not and must not mean federal control. For quality education depends most of all on the creative initiative and competence of the local educators, public and private, who personally deal with the children we are trying to reach. Federal support for local initiative is the basis of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and I believe the basis of an historic first step toward the future path of education in our country.

Yes, there has been progress.

Yes, we have overcome some of the old jealousies and fears that stood in the way of a nation-wide effort in education.

But we have still done only enough to bring us to the starting line in the momentous race for truly adequate education in the last third of the 20th century.

We have passed through a summer of unprecedented lawlessness and conflict in our cities.

There is no room in America for lawlessness and violence—and it will be met by strict and uncompromising enforcement of the law. This country is not going to be taken over or held for ransom by inciters and haters who would wreck their own communities, and harm their innocent neighbors, to satisfy their own lust for personal power.

But every thinking American knows that the violence we have seen, however unjustified, is at the same time a symptom of deep social problems—of poverty and despair, of a feeling on the part of far too many citizens that society has nothing to offer them that is worth saving.

It is a symptom of ghetto unemployment rates three times the national average, of poor housing and shamefully inadequate public services.

And to a very large degree it is a symptom of grossly inadequate education in those very communities where education offers the only avenue of escape from a life, at best, on the American fringe.

The education offered in our slum schools is inadequate for a great many reasons:

Because it does not equip students with skills they need to hold a decent job;

Because it is not tailored to the needs of students from disadvantaged backgrounds; does not allay their fears and offer them a sense of personal worth and success;

Because it does not succeed in making the classroom more attractive than the street corner;

Because it is too often second or third rate in a country which can and should afford the best for its children.

I don't think we can point to a single big city in America today and say "education is working in the inner-city there."

The Coleman Report for the Office of Education . . . the U.S. Civil Rights Commission . . . the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and many other groups concerned with urban problems have documented the story of educational failure—of drop-outs, delinquency and hopelessness in our ghetto schools.

What does this national failure mean to the individual child?

Listen to this description of dreadful human destruction by a Negro mother trying to bring up a family in the ghetto in one of our big cities. She is talking about her children.

"They is alive," she said, "and you bet they is, and then they goes off and quits. I can tell it by their walk, and how they look. They slow down and get so tired in their face, real tired.

"And they get all full of hate; and they look cross at you, as if I cheated them when I brought them into the world. I have seven, and two of them have gone that way, and to be honest, I expect every child to have it happen—like it did to me.

"I just gave up when I was about 14 or so. And what brings us back to life is having the kids, and keeping them with us for a while away from the outside and everything bad.

"But there comes a day when they ask you why it's like it is for us, and all you can do is shrug your shoulders, or sometimes you scream.

"But they know already, and they're just asking for the record. And it don't take but a few months to see that they're no longer kids, and they've lost all the hope and the life you tried to give them."

Those words are a terrible indictment of every one of us, and they vividly point to the next great challenge before our schools, both public and private.

For it is through our schools, and through our teachers, that America must help to make up for the heritage of deprivation which destroys the hopes of such ghetto children.

For education is the basic starting point for the ghetto child—whose family may have been in poverty for generations—in building a life of productive and satisfying labor rather than a life of pent-up frustration and despair.

What are we going to do to make education work for the millions of American youngsters who need it most?

First, and most important, we have to stop locking students out of our schools in the summers, on weekends and in the evenings.

In the context of our present needs, the nine-month school year and the six-hour school day make no sense.

A century ago the school year lasted 78 days. Now it averages 162 days. I have suggested before—and I urge it again today—that every American school now become a full-time, year-round community center of opportunity.

Some communities have already adopted the 12-month school year with assistance from Title One of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

The results have been dramatic—particularly when students from disadvantaged backgrounds have been led out of the structured classroom environment, placed in smaller groups, and exposed to cultural and recreational opportunities which are not part of the normal school program.

Informality, and the absence of grades and the threat of failure, have given thousands of disadvantaged students what promises to be a decisive boost toward a successful education.

I am not the only person who thinks we should be making more use of our schools. The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, in a recent report on "Juvenile Delinquency and Crime" recommended that Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act be expanded to pay the cost of keeping schools open year-round, 15 hours a day, six days a week.

I regret to report, however, that in the summer of 1967, almost 100 million dollars less was spent on summer programs under Title I than in the summer of 1966.

Second, we have to be sure school leads to something—a good job or college.

For the ghetto youngster, it cannot be just one more dead end street.

We cannot promise and not produce.

Census figures for the state of Ohio tell a story which applies to every state in the union.

Some 42 per cent of the jobs in Ohio are for craftsmen or technicians, but back in 1960, when most of today's young workers were in school, only 3 per cent were trained for such jobs.

Almost 15 per cent of Ohio's job openings today are for retail sales people. But only 1.3 per cent of Ohio's youngsters were trained for this kind of work in 1960.

Our curricula must be matched with the world as it is today, not as it was 10 or 20 years ago.

My third point grows out of the second. We have to prevent drop-outs. A million students are going to drop out of school this year unless we do something about it; 8 million will drop out in this decade.

And many of them will not be drop-outs at all—they will be kick-outs or force-outs—youngsters who had to leave because it was financially or psychologically impossible for them to stay. Our society can not stand to let them fail.

Fourth, we have to insist on quality in our schools—adequate basic training and up-to-date refresher courses for our teachers . . . modern laboratories and teaching aids . . . specialized facilities for children who need them. We must have, in short, people and facilities that will elicit and demand the best performance from our students. And this is as much a matter of exacting, dedicated commitment by those with responsibility in and for our schools as it is a matter of the newest techniques or hardware.

Finally, our country must be willing to pay for education in proportion to its value for our society. Last year our society spent 32 billion dollars—5 per cent of our national income—for elementary and secondary education, both public and private.

America spends half as much on just alcohol and tobacco.

Our investment in education is a scant investment when we are talking about the human resources upon which the future strength and prosperity of our nation depend.

All of us believe it, but we must awake the national consciousness to this fact: an extra dollar well spent on education will be repaid by a lifetime of dividends . . . a dollar denied is a dollar that will soon be wasted in unproductive welfare.

And so I specifically ask now your full support for the education measures still pending before the Congress. Let your Congressmen know about your support. Let your local newspapers and radio-tv stations know. Make yourselves heard, now.

I propose that we dedicate ourselves to a fresh Charter of Educational Opportunity for every American child—a promise that he can and will get the skills and the knowledge he needs to make the most of himself in our fast-changing and competitive society. We do not need to settle for less.

I think the Catholic schools of this country have an especially great opportunity to help make that Charter a reality.

You already have six million students, and your schools have grown twice as fast as the public schools over the last 20 years.

You have a cadre of dedicated lay and clerical teachers.

You are in a unique position to experiment and innovate because you are not bound by political restraints and red tape. You can offer healthy competition for our public schools, the kind of competition and, I might add, a freedom of choice—that is the lifeblood of a pluralistic society.

Moreover, many of your schools are in the inner city where deficiencies in education are most acute. You, the leaders of your communities and governments at all levels can cooperate to keep those schools open and extend the opportunities they represent to all children—without respect to religious affiliations.

Monsignor Donohue, my good friend and your great educational leader, has made that suggestion, and I wholeheartedly endorse it.

The task before every educator and every public official in the United States today is to make that new Charter of Educational Opportunity available to each and every one of the children God placed in this land.

That is God's work. And that is a responsibility that none of us who accepts Judeo-Christian religious teaching can neglect.

"WHAT MAKES HUMANS HUMAN?"—SUMMER 1967 ISSUE OF IMPRINT, UNIVERSITY OF OREGON MEDICAL SCHOOL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the summer 1967 issue of Imprint, a publication of the University of Oregon Medical School contains an article entitled, "What Makes Humans Human?" written by Susan Avery Platt.

The article is concerned with the fine work being done by Dr. Archie Tunturi, associate professor of anatomy at the University of Oregon Medical School, in Portland, and it contains a very interesting exposition of the research he and his staff are conducting. I was particularly impressed to learn that research such as that undertaken by Dr. Tunturi has already made a difference in medical diagnosis and treatment in the field of hearing testing and I certainly echo the hope expressed by Susan Platt that when such research is completed and we know better how the brain works, we will be better able to use the capabilities of human beings, thus allowing those with brain and nervous disorders to live fuller lives.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have alluded be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT MAKES HUMANS HUMAN?

(By Susan Avery Platt)

Screaming and kicking, a red, slightly wizened baby emerges into the world. He has all the physical properties of a human being in miniature, yet the quality of being human does not imply just physical properties—there is something more.

What that something is has been answered many different ways. We assume that it originates in the brain, the heart having been ruled out, except figuratively years ago. Yet how the brain functions in humans or animals, and how differently in the two, has been an unanswered question. The neurosurgeon operating today knows precious little more about the actual functioning of the brain than the amateur surgeon or curious investigator of 2,000 years ago.

Some questions about how the brain functions are now being answered; part of this work is going on at the University of Oregon Medical School where Dr. Archie Tunturi, associate professor of anatomy, has worked for the last 25 years on tracing the nerve paths for sound in the brain.

So far Dr. Tunturi has worked with dogs. Because the nervous systems in dog and man are quite similar, we assume their brains are also. Shortly, consenting neurosurgery patients will give scientists a chance to confirm this theory.

The soon-to-be-begun studies of the human brain, built on the studies of the dog's brain, hold out a promise of help for children who cannot understand the meaning of speech because of aphasia (a condition akin to hearing but not comprehending a foreign language). They hold promise for epileptics, those with cerebral palsy, those blind because of damage to the cortex not the eye, and many with psychological disorders.

"If you know how a computer is put together," says Dr. Tunturi, "then you can repair it. If you don't, you are reduced to empirical methods like kicking it. That's about all we have now when dealing with disorders of the brain or nervous system.

People like 19-year-old Gloria, who is only now learning to speak (she heard sounds but could not put them together into meaningful language) may not have to wait that long once we know how the brain functions.

We will not have that knowledge tomorrow. The brain is an intricate system. It has taken 10 million years to put together; it is going to take some time to unravel.

A part of this unraveling process is going on behind an unimposing door, bearing only an inconspicuous name tag. Inside that door, and past three very ordinary looking desks, an $800,000 computer system works daily at the preliminaries of deciphering the minds that invented it. It is an impressive roomful of whirling tapes, flashing lights, printed forms, much more impressive to the average person than the much more efficient human brains he deals with daily.

The sound of the computer fills the room like the background hum of air conditioning. It is Monday afternoon, one of two experiment afternoons each week.

In a soundproof room in a corner of the laboratory a dog is resting, 50 electrodes placed painlessly on his brain, which has no sense of feeling.

The dog does not hear the noise of the computers, only a sound like the cork from a muffled pop gun. It is the *p* pulse, a very short duration of sound, an elementary signal which contains one bit of information.

The pulse drums its way across your consciousness at maddeningly regular intervals.

The animal's ears pick up the pulse, send the impulse to the brain, which responds by changing electrical activity in some of the nerve cells (neurones).

These changes (along with the regular brain activity) are picked up by the electrodes which transmit and trace the animal's response onto oscilloscope screens.

Only three of the 50 oscilloscopes show a marked upward jag at the beginning of the trace, indicating response to the sound. The other 47 oscilloscopes register normal brain activity.

The tone of the *p* pulse is changed. Again the blue light jags from left to right on the oscilloscope screens and fades to a green trace, but this time a different trio of oscilloscopes shows a response to the sound.

The *p* pulse is changed again and again. First it sounds like water dropped on an empty tin bucket, then like a bass-voiced cricket, then like the clicking of a fingernail. Each time the sound is changed there is a corresponding change in the area of the animal's brain which is responding. Usually there is about a two millimeter (.08 inch) difference for each octave, quite clear in some animals, crude in others, depending on the individual. Tone and area are being matched and charted.

Each time the animal's brain activity has been picked up by the electrodes, visually represented as a blue line racing across an oscilloscope face, the IBM 1410 Data Processing System has converted the responses to three-digit numbers, placing 15,000 numbers on the tape in a 1/3 second sample.

The measure is changed from 1/3 second to two seconds; the traces dance across the screens on tiptoe, an electronic ballet.

The machine goes on storing the information in numerical form, ready to be analyzed the next day.

Never before has this wealth of statistical data been available. In the last three years with the computer, Dr. Tunturi and his staff have done 2,000 years of work. A four-minute experiment with the computer would have taken 20 years without it.

But these scientists are not just collecting numbers, they are looking for the reasons behind those numbers. After they have run the control checks, they begin the real experiment. Today they are trying to induce paradoxical sleep—trying to find new circuits in the brain which do not appear under normal conditions.

Six states of consciousness have been discovered, each projecting its own pattern on the oscilloscopes. What circuits in the brain work during each of these states? Does each use a completely different thinking or responding system?

Still unanswered questions.

But some questions about the anatomy and functioning of animals' brain have been answered. Dr. Tunturi has found four separate hearing areas in the dog's brain (one in the region primarily for touch). He also found an association area which has connections from the other auditory areas but receives no direct impulses from the ears.

Most dogs, his research shows, have an arrangement for responding to different frequencies of sound. But some exhibit no apparent pattern in which certain frequencies are handled at certain points in the brain.

What of a human with the same condition?

"He might never learn to speak," says Dr. Tunturi, "assuredly his speech would be poor."

Dr. Tunturi has also found that the kinds of condition responses that dogs are trained to do (pick up balls, fetch sticks) are performed just as well or better when the primary auditory center of the brain is removed. Yet dogs can be trained to respond to a series of tones (a kind of tone language). Then they will not respond when the auditory center is removed. The auditory center, he concludes, is capable of higher functioning, but is normally not used for such.

At other research centers investigators have found eight auditory regions in cats' brains. Dr. Tunturi believes there are probably eight similar regions in all animals up the evolutionary scale from the cat—they just have not been found yet.

Also in other research, scientists have found a cell in the retina of the frog's eye which picks out moving dark spots in the environment and follows them throughout the field of vision. Designed for catching flies, the cell does not send a picture of the fly to the brain, merely the information that one is present. It is, in short, a cell that "thinks," which distinguishes one class of objects from all others.

In a similar vein, the cat's eye has receptors which respond only to certain angles, different receptors for different angles.

Are there such cells in human beings—cells which sort out and classify stimuli? We do not know. Nor is it known how many auditory areas there are in the human brain nor exactly what it is that the ear recognizes from speech.

When Dr. Tunturi and his staff begin to study the human brain, they will look first at the primary auditory center. Does it respond like the dog's to different frequencies at different locations? He assumes that the same basic structure exists as was found in laboratory animals.

Once he has run the "control checks" on the human brain, Dr. Tunturi will begin to look for meaning detectors—whatever it is that allows people to think.

The search will be involved. There are 10 billion neurones in the human central nervous system (CNS). Each neurone is either with or without a nerve impulse at a given point in time, like a lightbulb which is either on or off. These neurones are connected with another or several neurones by junctions known as synapses. At some junctions the impulse only has one choice of direction, one bulb to light up, at others it may follow one of many diverging paths.

The state of the CNS is the pattern of those neurones with an impulse and those without—like a switchboard pattern of lights off and on.

Imagine a very simple system, one with two neurones. With this number, there are four possible patterns the system can have: both neurones off, both on, first on and second off or vice versa.

The human nervous system with its 10 billion neurones has 10-followed-by-3,200,000,000-zeroes possible states. Working 24 hours a day and writing one zero per second, it would take over 100 years just to write this number.

Since the pattern changes each time the ear picks up a sound, and the number of possible states is so great, multivariate statistics (which allow consideration of many variables at one time) will be used to allow understanding of what occurs at complicated junctions, where cells classify words into categories.

In studying the human brain, the system for employing statistical analysis will be similar to that used for laboratory animals. Patients with epilepsy or temporal lobe tumors who enter the hospital for neurosurgery will be asked to participate in the experiment.

If the patient agrees, an hour or so before his operation 50 painless electrodes will be attached to his brain. Sounds will then be fed to him and his brain response transmitted over 11 telephone wires to the computer system in the Research Building. There the data will be monitored and stored on magnetic tape.

With human patients Dr. Tunturi will have an advantage—the patient can be asked to concentrate on the sound, can be asked what he hears, so that the physical response can be correlated with the subjective response of the patient. The patient can be asked to associate the sound or word with other things, perhaps bringing into play the complicated junctions or circuits at which Dr. Tunturi hopes to find out how humans abstract—in short, what makes humans human.

It's a rather Herculean task, yet the ability to understand language (which presupposes the ability to abstract, by definition) has greatly influenced the destiny of the human race, as metalinguists are only now beginning to explore.

Only man has the ability, so far as we know, to take sounds and make of them meaning. The word itself is not the meaning—that is basic to ideas about language. The American tourist who indignantly asks why the French insist on calling bread *pain* when any fool can see it's bread just as it was at home, confuses the word with the meaning. There is no necessary connection.

But human beings have formed such connections. Using the same basic sounds (phonemes) in all languages, but using them differently, all peoples have come up with systems of abstraction we call language.

A $3 million computer will do the work of physical speech recognition that the three by three by ⅛ inch speech and hearing center of the human brain can do. It cannot, however, recognize meaning.

Any computer manufacturer, obviously, would see his stock skyrocket if he knew how to duplicate the working of the human brain. The Navy would like to know how the brain works. Then its scientists could learn how to improve its sonar and underwater communications systems to mesh with the workings of the humans who use them.

But most importantly, doctors would welcome the knowledge of how to improve their treatment of patients with disorders of the nervous system or brain.

Research such as that conducted by Dr. Tunturi has already made a difference in medical diagnosis and treatment, for example, in hearing testing. A steady tone, it has been observed, is not a test of cortical (brain) functioning. Complicated systems have been worked out which apparently do test the cortex.

But we need to know more both about the brain and language itself. At Georgia Institute of Technology they have found that the loss of a tiny section of speech can often obliterate a consonant from a test syllable or cause it to sound like a different speech element altogether. What if a person's cortex did not respond to one or several of these recognition clues in consonants? Since 90 percent of the knowledge in a language is carried by the consonants, how much meaning might that person miss while still able to hear?

When research like Dr. Tunturi's is completed and we hopefully will know how the brain works, then we can better use the capabilities of human beings, allowing those with brain and nervous disorders to live fuller lives.

The possibilities sound like science fiction. What question would you ask a robot whose brain was modeled after yours to test whether or not he were human?

We know of no such question.

But if such a robot is built, he will affect each of our lives. For the questions being asked in this research may well affect thinking in all fields—sciences and humanities. Such research may well raise moral questions as it provides scientific answers; it may change our total outlook, for its probes to the core—what makes humans human?

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10:30 A.M. MONDAY

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10:30 a.m. on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, October 9, 1967, at 10:30 a.m.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate October 6, 1967:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

L. Dean Brown, of Maryland, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Senegal, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plentipotentiary of the United States of America to the Gambia, vice William R. Rivkin, deceased.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 6, 1967:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Alfred B. Fitt, of Michigan, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PLANNING

Price Daniel, of Texas, to be Director of the Office of Emergency Planning.

NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU

Maj. Gen. Winston P. Wilson, FG398325, Air National Guard, to be reappointed as Chief, National Guard Bureau, for a period of four years beginning September 1, 1967, under the provisions of section 3015, title 10, of the United States Code.

U.S. NAVY

Rear Adm. Noel A. M. Gayler, U.S. Navy, having been designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The nominations beginning William B. Duty, to be lieutenant colonel, and ending John R. Younger, to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on September 28, 1967.

IN THE NAVY

The nominations beginning Frank M. Adams, to be captain, and ending Martin "M" Zenni, to be captain, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on September 27, 1967.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The nominations beginning Roy J. Casteel, to be second lieutenant, and ending George W. Dilley, to be first lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on September 18, 1967; and

The nominations beginning William C. Airheart, to be colonel, and ending Sidney S. Wade, Jr., to be first lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on September 18, 1967.

◆

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, OCTOBER 9, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

The Lord is my strength and my song, and He has become my salvation; this is my God, and I will praise Him, my Father's God and I will exalt Him.—Exodus 15: 2.

Almighty and eternal God, before whom a thousand years pass as a watch in the night, rekindle within us Thy spirit and replenish us with Thy grace as we face the tasks of another week. Be Thou a pillar of fire to us by night and a pillar of cloud by day. Lead us into green pastures, beside still waters, along right paths, that our spirits may be restored, that we may find comfort in hours of need, and that goodness and mercy may follow us all the days of our lives.

In these trying times help us to rise

above that which is mean and small and enable us to work together in glad good will for the honor and security of our Nation, for the good of our people and for the welfare of all mankind. In Thy most holy name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, October 5, 1967, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 11456. An act making appropriations for the Department of Transportation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 12474. An act making appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 11456) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Transportation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. Stennis, Mr. McClellan, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. Cotton, and Mr. Mundt to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 12474) entitled "An act making appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. Magnuson, Mr. Ellender, Mr. Russell, Mr. Holland, Mr. Pastore, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Allott, Mrs. Smith, and Mr. Hruska to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 985. An act for the relief of Warren F. Coleman, Jr.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2388. An act to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 11456, MAKING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, FISCAL YEAR 1968

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 11456) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. Boland, McFall, Yates, Mahon, Minshall, Jonas, and Bow.

WAR DISSENT MUST BE RESPONSIBLE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I respect dissent but on one condition; namely, that that dissent be responsible. The condign criticism of President Johnson on his Vietnam policy is irresponsible and therefore reprehensible. Shocking are the epithets hurled at him. A solon charged that our policy was "bankrupt" and the President was "brainwashed" by the Pentagon. A professor at the University of Colorado said that we are in Vietnam just to kill Americans.

Now, dissent should not be in disregard of our devotion to our country and our duty to our soldiers in the battlefield, but such bitter and abusive harangue bolsters the morale of our foe and prolongs the war.

I applaud the courage of the President for refusing to take the easy way out. He deplores the sacrifices, as we all do, that must be made. He also realizes that you cannot make war with rose water. We must harken unto the statements he made Saturday night when he said:

> So we have a choice. We can take the easy road now, denying our responsibilities, hoping that a rise in our polls will compensate for what we ought to have done for our country, or we can take the harder road of responsibility. We can do what we believe is right for our children's future, though it may mean present pain.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 12474, NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 12474) making appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. Evins of Tennessee, Boland, Shipley, Giaimo, Marsh, Pryor, Mahon, Jonas, Minshall, Wyman, Talcott, and Bow.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, I was not able to be present for the rollcall vote on the conference report on the military construction bill, which was acted on by the House on October 3. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

LEIF ERIKSON DAY, OCTOBER 9, 1967

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, only the important business of this House of Representatives prevents me today from standing at the base of the statue of Leif Erikson, overlooking Shilshole breakwater in the Ballard area of Seattle.

However, I am mindful that this day is set aside annually to honor this man and all Scandinavians who have made so many great contributions to the life of our Nation.

As one of the original sponsors of the legislation which authorizes the President to proclaim October 9 in each year as Leif Erikson Day, I again proudly recognize the magnificent achievements of Leif Erikson.

Mr. Speaker, the saga of Leif Erikson's pioneering exploration of the link between Europe and the land we know as America, is a picture of bravery and intelligence.

And, today, as sturdy American citizens, the hard-working Scandinavian descendants of Leif Erikson stand to honor him.

Mr. Speaker, in spirit I join my constituents of Seattle and throughout the United States in paying tribute to Leif Erikson for whom this day has been proclaimed by the President for the flying of the American flag and for inviting the people of the United States to observe the annual commemoration with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

PROVIDING FOR THE DISPOSITION OF FUNDS TO THE UPPER AND LOWER CHEHALIS TRIBES OF INDIANS, WASHINGTON—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 678) to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Upper and Lower Chehalis Tribes of Indians in Claims Commission docket No. 237, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

Conference Report (H. Rept. No. 735)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 678) to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Upper and Lower Chehalis Tribes of Indians in Claims Commission docket No. 237, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Strike out the first sentence of section 3 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Sums payable to enrollees or to their heirs or legatees who are less than twenty-one years of age or who are under a legal disability shall be held in trust by the Secretary of the Interior with use limited to emergency medical care and direct educational expenses, until such minor becomes of age or disability ceases."

And the Senate agree to the same.

James A. Haley,
Ed Edmondson,
Roy A. Taylor,
E. Y. Berry,
George Hansen,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Henry M. Jackson,
George McGovern,
Paul Fannin,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

Statement

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (H.R. 678) to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Upper and Lower Chehalis Tribes of Indians in Claims Commission docket No. 237, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

H.R. 678, as passed by the House, provided in section 3 that sums payable to minor enrollees, their heirs or legatees, or enrollees suffering a legal disability shall be held in trust by the superintendent, Western Washington Agency, until such minor becomes of age or the disability ceases.

The Senate amended the bill to provide that payments to minor enrollees, their heirs or legatees, or enrollees under a legal disability, shall be held in trust by the Secretary of the Interior, to be expended for the sole benefit of the beneficiary until he becomes of age or the disability ceases.

The effect of the House amendment is to prohibit the expenditure of such funds on behalf of a minor enrollee or those under legal disability until such minor becomes 21 years of age or the disability ceases. On the other hand, the effect of the Senate amendment is to permit the expenditure of such funds for the sole benefit of the beneficiary until he becomes of age or the disability ceases.

The amendment agreed upon by the conferees clearly sets forth the intent of both the House and the Senate to permit the expenditure of sums payable to minor enrollees, their heirs or legatees, and those under legal disability, but limits such expenditures to emergency medical care and direct educational expenses, until such minor becomes of age or the disability ceases. The language of the amendment adopted by the conferees prevents the expenditure of such funds except for the purposes enumerated and protects the beneficiaries from those individuals who could otherwise obtain such funds on behalf of the beneficiaries and apply the same to their own purposes.

James A. Haley,
Ed Edmondson,
Roy A. Taylor,
E. Y. Berry,
George V. Hansen,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I assume the amendments that were adopted in conference were all germane to this bill?

Mr. ASPINALL. All the amendments are germane to the bill, and they were agreed upon unanimously by the conferees.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the conferees of this conference report before us today. I would particularly like to commend the House Subcommittee on Indian Affairs of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which was kind enough to take the time and effort to provide the leadership in taking steps toward solving a problem which has become increasingly troubling.

When these claims are settled, I am sure there is the hope in everyone of us that the money will be used in the most useful manner possible, and particularly in the instance of children and young people in making provision for their education and needed emergency medical attention. Too often in the past money has been carelessly used and the young people find themselves desiring an education with no money available.

This conference report today is a major step toward helping the Indian young people of our Nation.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks on the conference report just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 298]

Abbitt
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Anderson, Ill.
Ashley
Barrett
Blatnik
Bow
Brock
Broomfield
Burton, Utah
Button
Carey
Casey
Cederberg
Cleveland
Conyers
Corbett
Culver
Curtis
Daniels
Dent
Derwinski
Diggs
Downing
Dulski
Edmondson
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Farbstein
Fino
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Fulton, Tenn.
Galifianakis
Gallagher
Gardner
Goodell
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Hagan
Halpern
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Ichord
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Kelly
King, N.Y.
Kupferman
Kyl
Laird
Landrum
Leggett
Long, La.
Lukens
McDonald, Mich.
Martin
Mathias, Md.
Michel
Moorhead
Morse, Mass.
Morton
Multer
Nix
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen
Ottinger
Pirnie
Quillen
Railsback
Rarick
Reinecke
Resnick
Riegle
Rivers
Ronan
Sandman
St Germain
St. Onge
Scheuer
Sikes
Sisk
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Springer
Stephens
Taylor
Tenzer
Tiernan
Tuck
Ullman
Utt
Vander Jagt
Vigorito
Wampler
Watkins
Watts
Whalley
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 324 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL BY MIDNIGHT TONIGHT

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the Department of Agriculture and related agencies appropriation bill for fiscal year 1968.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION TO MEET DURING THE SESSION OF THE HOUSE TODAY

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be permitted to meet this afternoon during the session of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I said before upon one occasion that I would like to be present when this elections bill is considered by the Committee on House Administration. However, I am one of the House conferees of the conference committee on the foreign aid authorization bill, and the conferees on that bill are scheduled to meet this afternoon, in an effort toward reaching agreement. I would like to see this conference report cleared so that we could then get to the consideration of the appropriation bill providing funds for the foreign aid program. With that out of the way perhaps we can adjourn sine die at some reasonable time.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I am constrained to object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF MEETING OF COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce that should the House adjourn this afternoon by 4 o'clock, the Committee on House Administration will meet on the clean elections bill.

HOWARD J. SAMUELS, OF NEW YORK, AN OUTSTANDING NOMINATION

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the President on his recent nomination of Howard J. Samuels, of Canandaigua, N.Y., to the position of Under Secretary of the Department of Commerce. Mr. Samuels is a constituent of mine, and I know the Nation will be well served when his enormous talents and energy are directed at the challenges of service within the administration. Mr. Samuels is a success story in himself. In fact, his success story is also the story of this country. His college thesis at MIT became the basis for a multimillion-dollar corporation in the field of plastic packaging.

He also served with distinction on the battlefield during World War II, rising to the rank of lieutenant colonel at the age of 25. He has given unstintingly of himself to public and private organizations, with interests covering good government, education, employment, group relations, public health, philanthropy, and economic development. Mr. Samuels brings a freshness and vitality to Washington that we can readily put to good use, and I know he will be a great under secretary.

NATAL SALUTE TO UGANDA

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today the Government of Uganda celebrates its fifth birthday. It is interesting to note that a hundred years before its independence date, the territory that is now Uganda was first penetrated by explorers searching for the source of the Nile River.

The United States enjoys friendly relations with Uganda and is encouraging the government in a program to increase agricultural production and to make use of the limited mineral resources of the country.

The United States expects to see Uganda continue as a strong, self-assured, and independent nation, with democratic institutions which will fit local and national requirements.

Just last week I had the pleasure of meeting with the Foreign Minister of Uganda, His Excellency Sam N. Odaka. Our discussion in depth covered many subjects, including the economic and political situation of his country as well as the outlook for Africa as a whole. He left me with a continued feeling of optimism and confidence in Africa's future.

The Organization of African Unity, of which his country is a strong supporter, is a dominant force for the political and economic development of Africa.

To President A. Milton Obote and to the Ugandan Ambassador to the United States, His Excellency E. Otema Allimadi, I extend the best wishes of the people of the United States, from my colleagues in the Congress, and my own personal good wishes for the success and prosperity of Uganda in the future.

BOMBING PAUSE IN NORTH VIETNAM WOULD RELEASE 500,000 MORE COMMUNIST TROOPS TO WAGE WAR AGAINST AMERICAN TROOPS IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as I speak to my colleagues in the House of Representatives here in Washington, a young marine is being buried in Chicago, a victim of the war in Vietnam. He was shot and killed in Vietnam. This young man was Pfc. Gregory Kasper, who was killed in action on September 25 at Quang Tri. The flag flies over the Capitol in his honor today.

Mr. Speaker, I talked with his father yesterday. His father is a Chicago fireman. Both the father and mother told me of their tremendous loss. But they also told me of their pride in the fact that their son had participated voluntarily in defending the freedom of his country.

This Nation owes Mr. and Mrs. Melvin Kasper an eternal debt of gratitude for the sacrifice their son and they have made for our Nation's survival.

Mr. Speaker, as to those who have been advising the President of the United States to pull out of Vietnam, I wish they had an opportunity to talk to these patriotic albeit grief-stricken parents. It is beyond the capacity of anyone to describe fully their grief and the extent of their personal loss. But these two wonderful Americans and all of those in Edison Park who mourned the loss of Private First Class Kasper are a source of strength in their deep understanding of how high the stakes are in Vietnam for the survival of freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I saw in this morning's paper while flying to Washington an article to the effect that Life magazine was going to reverse its position in supporting the war and will urge the President to order a pause in our bombings of North Vietnam in the hope that such a pause will bring about negotiations for peace.

Mr. Speaker, at one time I also thought that we might consider a conditional pause until I had all the facts. I urged last May that we consider such a pause if the Communists would agree not to infiltrate South Vietnam. I said at the time that if they refuse to negotiate, then we should use all of our resources to force them to the negotiating table. It became quickly apparent, however, that the Communist are determined to resist all efforts at negotiations and our Nation has no choice but to pursue the war with whatever steps are necessary to a successful conclusion.

I hope that all of those who are urging a bombing pause, sincere as they are, will consider the fact that a bombing pause in North Vietnam would release 500,000 more Communists to wage war against our soldiers. We are tying up one-half million Communist soldiers in North Vietnam with our present bombing policy. The fact is that 175,000 Communist soldiers are tied up in the operation of antiaircraft batteries in anticipation of our aerial raids in North Vietnam.

Another 300,000 are tied up in cleaning up the damage that our airplanes and our bombers are causing in North Vietnam. Let there be no mistake. These incessant American bombings by our American bombers in North Vietnam are keeping Hanoi's best troops pinned down in the homeland. If the bombings should be stopped with no guarantee from the Communists that large troop transfers will not occur to South Vietnam, our casualties in Vietnam will mount measurably.

It is ironic that with our most recent successes in North Vietnam and at a time when our soldiers and our military people can see the hope of victory over communism in Vietnam, the crescendo is growing in this country for us to stop the bombings; pull back, and even abandon our mission. I believe that we Americans ought to unite behind our President and let him use all the resources at our command to get this war over with and be victorious as soon as possible.

So, Mr. Speaker, as I pause here today to pay homage to a young marine named Gregory Kasper, who gave his life for his country, and I hope that those who are urging that we quit now when there is a chance for victory in Vietnam will reconsider.

President Johnson has said repeatedly he is willing to halt the bombing if the Communists will agree to freeze their positions and not infiltrate South Vietnam during such a pause. The Communists refuse to make such a pledge.

Mr. Speaker, in the light of the figures I have cited above—based on a reliable estimate from the highest sources in our Government—that a bombing pause in North Vietnam would release 500,000 Communist troops against our soldiers in South Vietnam, I believe the President is most wise in pursuing his present policy. He has no choice but to continue until such time as the Communists are prepared to assure us that a pause in our bombing will not be a green light for them to move their forces into South Vietnam for a massive attack against our troops.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. This is District of Columbia day. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER].

AMEND THE NATIONAL CAPITAL TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1965

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 11395) to amend the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965 authorizing the prosecution of a transit development program for the National Capital region and to further the objectives of the act of July 14, 1960, and ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union be discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and that it be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 11395

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in accordance with section 204(c) of the Act of July 14, 1960 (40 U.S.C. 664(c); 74 Stat. 540), section 3(b) of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965 (40 U.S.C. 681; 79 Stat. 664) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. (b) The work authorized by this section shall be subject to the provisions of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1960, shall be carried out substantially in accordance with the plans and schedules contained in the aforesaid report, as modified in the report of the Agency entitled 'Revised Transit Development Program for the Nation's Capital, 1967', and shall be subject to the following:"

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That the portion of section 3(b) of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965 (40 U.S.C. 682) which precedes paragraph (1) is amended to read as follows:

" '(b) The work authorized by this section shall be subject to the provisions of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1960, shall be carried out substantially in accordance with the plans and schedules contained in the aforesaid report, as modified in the report of the Agency entitled "Revised Transit Development Program for the Nation's Capital, 1967", and shall be subject to the following:' "

The committee amendment was agreed to.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 11395 is to amend the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965—79 Stat. 663—which authorized the National Capital Transportation Agency to provide for the establishment of the system of rail rapid transit lines and related facilities described in the agency's report entitled "Rail Rapid Transit for the Nation's Capital, January 1965."

H.R. 11395 would modify that system in two material respects: First, by adding a line to serve the new and rapidly growing concentration of Federal employment in Southwest Washington, and second, by deleting the presently authorized spur line to Columbia Heights which branches off the Connecticut Avenue route.

BACKGROUND

The National Capital Transportation Agency—hereinafter referred to as "NCTA"—was established by the National Capital Transportation Act of 1960–74 Stat. 537—which requires, in section 204(a), that the Agency shall prepare and may from time to time revise a transit development program for the transportation of persons within the National Capital region. Section 204(c) of the 1960 act provides that no part of the program may be carried out until expressly authorized by the Congress.

Pursuant to recommendations contained in the NCTA report of January 1965, entitled "Rail Rapid Transit for the Nation's Capital," Congress in the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965—79 Stat. 663—authorized the prosecution of a transit development program for the National Capital region, consisting of a basic 25-mile system of rail rapid transit lines, stations, and related facilities.

Since the present program was approved on September 8, 1965, the Agency has moved forward with the general engineering and achitectural work on the authorized system: Its activities have included a continuing evaluation of the system in terms of its ability to distribute passengers where they want to go downtown, its operating efficiency, and its revenue potential.

Congress has each year appropriated funds to the NCTA for its operations, including funds to permit the start of engineering and other work preliminary to actual construction.

Contracts have been negotiated with general engineering consultants and with architects to press ahead with the work to be done before detailed design and actual construction could be undertaken. A contract has been negotiated for a comprehensive program of soils testing to obtain information about subsurface conditions essential to subway design.

NCTA recently announced it had completed, in a span of only 18 months, the aerial mapping, the base line control surveys, and the general plans—with the definitive calculated alinements and profiles—for those routes scheduled for early construction. In addition, directive drawings, design criteria, and standard construction specifications are complete.

Also it announced its soils consultant had completed the current drilling program with respect to all elements of the system not involved in the proposed changes, and that subsurface conditions in Washington are not as unfavorable as rumor and speculation might indicate. With 440 test holes drilled, and with a test pit deep beneath Lafayette Park, NCTA has found acceptable water conditions, generally an alluvial soil, and in some part of the city excellent rock which will be of advantage during construction.

MODIFICATIONS HEREIN ARE BASED ON NEW TRAFFIC STUDIES

The modification provided in H.R. 11395 are the result of further traffic studies and surveys directed by Congress to be made by NCTA.

In the course of reviewing NCTA's request for funds for 1966, the chairman and members of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies expressed concern whether or not certain traffic or patronage estimates of the Agency were sufficiently current or had been established by adequately sophisticated techniques. The Administrator was directed to arrange for an independent, professional study of probable patronage.

Pursuant thereto, the NCTA employed a consulting firm whom the NCTA Contractor Evaluation Board believed to be the most qualified and experienced organization for this particular study requiring knowledge of the highway and transit planning, traffic estimation, traffic engineering, and city planning.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDED MODIFICATIONS OF AUTHORIZED SYSTEM

FINDING I. GROWTH IN SOUTHWEST WASHINGTON

The study for the NCTA showed that downtown traffic congestion in Washington would not be alleviated by the authorized system to the extent that the Agency had expected. The Federal employment center in Southwest Washington proved to be a source of really tremendous patronage. The study found that large numbers would ride the rail system to G Street and then transfer to buses to complete their travel to the southwest. During the peak hour, at the 12th and G Street station, 70 buses would be required, and at Eighth and G Street 50 buses would be needed, to handle transfer traffic. Obviously, this would make traffic conditions worse than better. And fare splits with the bus company would be greater than had been anticipated, thus reducing rail transit revenues.

Since the present basic rapid rail transit system was approved, Southwest Washington between Capitol Hill and 12th Street SW., has been experiencing a dramatic change. With the new public building program now underway and the Federal departments and agencies already located there—the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department of Transportation, NASA, and others—this is fast becoming the major center of Federal employment in the District of Columbia.

This has been brought about by the extensive building program in Southwest Washington—a program that includes both Government buildings and private development which will include office buildings, stores, and a new hotel.

In the Government center alone employment is expected to approach a population figure nearly as great as in all of downtown Baltimore. The new Forrestal Building, which will be a sort of downtown Pentagon; the huge new headquarters of the Department of Housing and Urban Development; and the extensive population explosion brought about by the establishment of the Department of Transportation whose employees spill over into a half dozen new office buildings in Southwest; NASA, HEW, USIA—these are the major Government establishments in the area, but in point of numbers they represent just a few of the Government agencies which will eventually be housed in this new exploding population center.

EMPLOYMENT IN SOUTH MALL AREA

The startling present and projected employment figures for the Southwest area, which were not predicted when the basic system was approved, show the impact on transportation there.

SOUTH MALL EMPLOYMENT

	Existing (1967)	Projected (1980)
Federal		
Agriculture	9,700	11,000
Housing and Urban Development	--------	5,600
Health, Education, and Welfare	8,500	17,000
Department of Defense	--------	6,400
Department of Transportation	--------	9,000
Treasury	4,200	3,800
Smithsonian Institute	900	1,000
National Aeronatucs and Space Administration	2,400	2,400
Miscellaneous and other	7,800	12,300
Total	33,500	68,500
Private	1,200	18,800
Total	35,000	87,000

Prior to the 1965 act, NSTA's planning for the basic system was predicated on employment estimates of the National Capital Planning Commission that in 1980 there would be 46,000 jobs located in the Southwest area. Since then, the forecast has changed radically. By 1971 an estimated 85,000 workers will be traveling to and from their employment in Southwest. The area's downtown daytime population will exceed the downtown populations in cities such as Seattle, Pittsburgh, and Baltimore.

Street traffic congestion is already severe in Southwest Washington, especially during rush hours. Much of the parking area that was available when the present basic system was authorized has disappeared. Street congestion is expected to be such a problem that in one report by traffic consultants the General Services Administration has been advised to delay a part of its public building program in Southwest until the subway rapid transit service is in operation within the area. The Advisory Committee on Federal Buildings in the National Capital Region has unanimously endorsed the recommended Southwest alinement, and urges its construction as part of the basic system at the earliest possible date.

MODIFICATION NO. 1

Accordingly, the National Capital Transportation Agency recommended to the Congress that the approved basic rapid rail transit system be revised to include service to the area south of the Mall in Southwest Washington between Capitol Hill and 12th Street SW., as follows: by continuing the presently authorized Benning route in subway, from Pennsylvania Avenue and D Street SE., west beneath D Street to the vicinity of 12th Street SW., thence north along 12th Street to the vicinity of I Street NW., thence west along I Street NW., to a point where the line would connect with and become part of the already authorized Pentagon route. The new alinement would include stations in the vicinity of the Capitol, Fourth and D Streets SW., Seventh and D Streets SW., 12th Street and Independence Aveune SW., at the Federal Triangle along 12th Street NW., and at 15th and I Streets NW.

FINDING II. DELETION OF COLUMBIA HEIGHTS SPUR

The other significant finding of the NCTA recent traffic study raised serious questions concerning the economic justification for the presently authorized Columbia Heights route. The data collected show it to be the weakest in the system, producing only an estimated 3,100 passengers in its peak hour, instead of 6,700 originally forecast there.

Further, this 3,100 peak-hour ridership estimate for Columbia Heights is far less than the projections for the other routes, as, for example, 6,900 for the Connecticut Avenue line, 17,100 on the Benning line, and 19,000 on the B. & O. Silver Spring line.

This disparity between the Columbia Heights spur and the other routes is even more marked in the 24-hour estimates as shown in the following table submitted by the NCTA for the committee, based on the traffic studies and estimates referred to.

TABLE 12-A.—ESTIMATED 1980 TOTAL, 24-HOUR MAXIMUM LOAD POINTS AND VOLUMES, AUTHORIZED SYSTEM

Route	Location	Peak hour volume			Total 24-hour volume[1]
		Inbound	Outbound	Total	
Downtown subway	Between Judiciary Sq. and 8th and G	31,900	6,500	38,400	225,000
B. & O. Silver Spring	Between Union Station and Judiciary Sq	19,000	3,200	22,200	126,300
Connecticut	Between Calvert and Florida	6,900	2,600	9,500	66,000
Columbia Heights	Between Belmont and Florida	3,100	700	3,900	25,700
Connecticut and Columbia Heights	Between Connecticut and 12th and G and K	9,100	8,700	17,800	109,800
Benning	Between Capitol and Judiciary Sq	17,100	4,800	21,800	128,200
Pentagon	Between 18th and H and 12th and G	8,400	10,500	18,900	113,800

[1] Inbound plus outbound.

Note: Figures may not total due to rounding.

This volume of 3,100 peak-hour passengers from Columbia Heights does not, states the NCTA, justify rail rapid transit for that area and does not justify the estimated Columbia Heights line construction cost of $56.5 million, the NCTA concluded.

These NCTA studies show that trains from Columbia Heights would carry very few passengers as compared with trains from Connecticut Avenue, Benning, Silver Spring, or from Virginia, and that actually many of the trains from Columbia Heights would be operating almost empty as compared with loaded trains from these other points.

The NCTA, in testimony before your committee, questioned whether a $56 million feeder subway—the Columbia Heights spur—should be built to do the job of feeder bus routes, and pointed to the large percent of riders using crosstown buses to get to the Columbia Heights line. With the deletion of the Columbia Heights spur, these riders could continue on the buses to the Connecticut Avenue line and get the benefit there of more frequent service which that line generates.

The NCTA further testifies that there is another reason why the Columbia Heights spur should not be built, and that is that the needs of north-central Washington, including the Shaw urban renewal area, would be better and more efficiently served by the construction of an independent route in either the Seventh or 14th Street traffic corridor as part of an expanded regional rail system now being studied by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority. The building of the Columbia Heights line would foreclose this more desirable route.

This further survey would appear to offer a more reasonable solution to the overall requirements insofar as the Columbia Heights area is concerned and one which the Congress, in due course, can consider in lieu of now retaining in the presently authorized system any portion which the Congress has been advised is not economically justified.

MODIFICATION NO. 2

In light of the foregoing, the National Capital Transportation Agency recommended to the Congress that the Columbia Heights route be deleted from the approved basic rapid rail transit system, the area in question to be served by crosstown and other feeder bus routes connecting to the Connecticut Avenue and other lines. At the same time, the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority—regional organization successor to the NCTA—has underway studies of an independent route to serve the needs of this north-central Washington area.

FINANCING THE MODIFICATIONS

According to testimony presented to your committee, the NCTA studies show that, in 1980, the system as modified by H.R. 11395, will attract an estimated 12,000 more riders than the authorized system during the peak hour, about 70,000 more riders daily, and some 22,300,000 riders annually. The 1980 forecasts also show that the modified system will carry a total of 153,800,000 riders, whereas the authorized system would carry only 131,500,000 riders in that year. This increase actually becomes apparent as early as 1974 when the full system goes into operation. In that year 131,700,000 riders would be attracted to the modified system, compared to 113,000,000 on the authorized system. During the final 3 years, 1971 to 1973, when only segments of the system are operable, the difference is relatively insignificant.

Operating costs are not expected to be significantly different in the modified system from those for the authorized system, the NCTA testified. It expects that in 1980 the increased patronage on the modified system, as compared with the new traffic figures for the authorized system, would produce additional net annual revenue—after operating costs and payment for feeder buses—of approximately $3.5 million. Applied to bond debt service expense and assuming an interest rate of 5½ percent per annum, such added annual revenue would be sufficient to fund $55 million of added capital costs over a 40-year period.

This amount of additional revenue would more than cover the new increase in capital costs which would result from the recommended modifications, the NCTA testified. Its estimates indicate that the provision of service to Southwest Washington, as proposed and as outlined above, would increase the cost of the basic system at current prices by $98 million.

However, this would be reduced by $56.5 million—the cost of the deleted Columbia Heights spur—making the net increase of the system, in capital cost, to be $41.5 million, which NCTA officials testified can be financed from the additional revenues generated by the modified system, as indicated.

The total estimated capital cost of constructing the system originally authorized by Congress in 1965 was $431 million, exclusive of interest requirements, financed as follows:

Source of funds	*Million*
Federal contribution	$100
District of Columbia contribution	50
Public sale of revenue bonds	281
	431
Estimated additional cost of modified system	41.5
Total cost (exclusive of escalation)	472.5

ENDORSEMENT OF PROPOSED REVISIONS

Even before this proposed legislation was submitted to the Congress for introduction and consideration, the revised program had been studied and approved by 21 governing, regulatory, and planning bodies and other organizations concerned—practically all the agencies affected.

This action was taken as required by section 204(d) of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1960, and the National Capital Transportation Agency transmitted a draft copy of the revised transit development program 1967 report for review and comment to the various governing bodies, regulatory bodies, regional organizations, private transit companies and unions representing their employees, and others specified in that section of the act.

Following is a list of those endorsing the modified system:

Local governing bodies: District of Columbia Commissioners, Montgomery County (Md.) Council, Prince Georges County (Md.) Commissioners, Arlington County (Va.) Board, Fairfax County (Va.) Board of Supervisors, Loudon County (Va.) Board of Supervisors, City of Alexandria (Va.) Mayor, Falls Church (Va.), City Council.

Regulatory bodies: Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission.

Planning bodies: Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, Washington Suburban Transit Commission, Northern Virginia Tranportation Commission, National Capital Planning Commission, Council of Governments, Northern Virginia Regional Planning Commission, Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission, Federal City Council, National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board.

Transit companies: D.C. Transit System, Inc., Washington, Virginia and Maryland Coach Co., Inc.

Unions: Amalgamated Transit Union (Local 689).

Further, the proposed modification to add the line to serve Southwest Washington has the strong support of two Committees within the executive branch of the Government having clear interests and responsibilities on which the modifications bear significantly.

One of these, the Southwest Area Transportation Committee, consists of the Secretary of the Department of Transportation, the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Administrator of the General Services Administration, and representatives of the Department of Defense, Department of the Treasury, the National Aeronautics and Space Agency, the Smithsonian Institution, and various official organizations having cognizance of planning, traffic movement, and related matters on behalf of the District of Columbia, and the Federal Government.

The other committee, the Advisory Committee on Federal Buildings in the National Capital region, was created at the direction of the President early in 1966 and consists of the Administrator of GSA as Chairman; the Assistant Secretary of Defense—Administration; the Engineer Commissioner, government of the District of Columbia; the Chairman, National Capital Planning Commission; the Chairman, Commission of Fine Arts; and the Administrator of NCTA.

This Committee, charged with responsibility for developing and maintaining current and long-range plans for the provision of Federal office space in the National Capital region, and reporting its progress to the President, has noted the developing transportation problem in the Southwest. Unanimously, the Committee adopted a resolution urging provision of rapid rail transit service to the Southwest area such as that under consideration today.

CONCLUSION

Your committee believes that the proposed modifications of the transit system, as reflected in H.R. 11395, are completely justified.

The addition of the line to serve the Southwest area of Washington is fully supported. Certainly, the needs of the Federal Government alone in this area are such that this service should be provided as an acceleration of the authorized system and as a necessary adjunct to the basic rapid rail system.

Likewise, the committee supports the deletion of the Columbia Heights spur as not being economically justified according to the testimony presented, and for the other reasons offered by the National Capital Transportation Agency.

At the same time, the current studies being made by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority—successor to the NCTA—of the North-Central area of Washington, indicate further consideration will have to be given by the Congress to the needs of this area in the months ahead. Meanwhile, the Congress must proceed to enable the Agency to meet its other commitments and projected schedules. The approval of H.R. 11395 would effectuate this purpose, and your committee urges its adoption.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill, H.R. 11395, amends the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965 authorizing the preparation of a transit development program for the National Capital region and to further the objectives of the act of July 15, 1960:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in accordance with section 204(c) of the Act of July 14, 1960 (40 U.S.C. 664(c); 74 Stat. 540), section 3(b) of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965 (40 U.S.C. 681; 79 Stat. 664) is hereby amended to read as to follows:

"SEC. 3(b). The work authorized by this section shall be subject to the provisions of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1960, shall be carried out substantially in accordance with the plans and schedules contained in the aforesaid report, as modified in the report of the Agency entitled 'Revised Transit Development Program for the Nation's Capital, 1967', and shall be subject to the following:"

Stated simply, this proposed amendment of the authorized transit system for the Nation's Capital alters the alinement of the authorized routes to provide for—

First. For full service to the new and fast growing Southwest complex of new Government buildings;

Second. Service to the Hill; and

Third. Elimination of a weak line that would be a burden on the entire system.

Representing the National Capital Transportation Agency before the committee, Mr. Walter J. McCarter, the Administrator, and a man recognized as the outstanding transit expert in the Nation, made some significant statements. I would like to quote him here as I believe that his own words will best explain the need for H.R. 11395 to be approved by this body:

> With your permission, I should like first to report to you on the status of the authorized system, before urging the changes which I feel should be made. My background and experience of more than 45 years in the transit business, additional information not available when the 1965 plan was formulated, and some rather startling changes within the city of Washington, have all combined to produce my recommendations for change in that plan. I feel that you should have this report, and I believe that my report will be of assistance to you in reaching a decision about the changes.
>
> I was appointed Administrator of NCTA in May 1965, not long after this committee had approved NCTA's Transit Development Program 1965. The legislation passed the House in July, the Senate in August, and on September 8, 1965, it was approved by the President (P.L. 89–173). Shortly thereafter, in October, Congress appropriated funds to permit the start of engineering and other work along the long path to actual construction.
>
> In the course of reviewing our request for funds for 1966, the Chairman and Members of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies expressed concern whether or not certain traffic or patronage estimates of the Agency were sufficiently current or had been established by adequately sophisticated techniques. I was directed to arrange for an independent, professional study of probable patronage. This was welcome direction inasmuch as I felt that the results of the study would be of assistance to me in the review of the 1965 plan which I knew I must make. I had doubts about some elements of the 1965 plan. Pursuant to this direction from the Appropriations Subcommittee, I arranged for a study by an outstanding firm of traffic engineers.
>
> At about the same time contracts were negotiated with highly competent general engineering consultants and with equally able architects to press ahead with the work to be done before detailed design and actual construction could be undertaken. A contract was negotiated for a comprehensive program of soil testing to obtain information about subsurface conditions essential to subway design.
>
> I am pleased to report that we have completed, in a span of only 18 months, the aerial mapping, the base line control surveys, and the general plans—with the definitive calculated alignments and profiles—for those routes scheduled for early construction. In addition, directive drawings, design criteria, and standard construction specifications are complete.
>
> This brings me back to the traffic study. The results of the traffic study, the application of those results by the technicians, and my own judgment concerning their significance compel me to recommend the changes in plan which you are now considering.
>
> First, let me reassure you—the study of the traffic engineering firm (p. 64) indicated that Agency estimates of annual partonage were only 2½ percent high, and, in fact, that the Agency estimates of peak hour patronage had been low.
>
> There was an important difference between the conditions under which the Agency made its estimates of traffic for the authorized system and the conditions under which the traffic engineering firm made its later study. Where it had been necessary for the Agency to work without the assistance of local bus operators, the traffic engineering firm had the fullest cooperation from them. In consequence, they were able to conduct one of the largest origin and destination studies of bus riders ever conducted.
>
> Two significant findings resulted. First, the Columbia Heights route proved to be the weakest in the system, producing an estimated 3,100 passengers in its peak hour, instead of 6,700 originally forecast by the Agency. This volume of 3,100 does not justify rail rapid transit. Parenthetically, let me say that there is another reason why the Columbia Heights line should not be built—and a reason why this action should be entirely acceptable to the community. We feel that the needs of north central Washington, including the Shaw Urban Renewal Area, would be better and more efficiently served by construction of an independent route in either the 7th or 14th Street traffic corridors as part of an expanded regional rail system now being studied by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority. The building of the Columbia Heights line would foreclose this more desirable route.
>
> Second, the study showed that downtown traffic congestion would not be alleviated by the authorized system to the extent that the Agency had expected. The Federal employment center in Southwest Washington proved to be a source of really tremendous patronage. We found that large numbers would ride the rail system to G Street and then transfer to buses to complete their travel to the Southwest. During the peak hour, at the 12th and G Street Station, 70 buses would be required, and at 8th and G Street, 50 buses would be needed, to handle transfer traffic. Obviously, this would make traffic conditions worse rather than better. And fare-splits with the bus company would be greater than had been anticipated, thus reducing rail transit revenues.
>
> It was clear to me that system routing required re-examination. Along with the patronage figures and the traffic congestion problem there were operating characteristics of the authorized system which were not attractive to me. Working with the planning and engineering staff of the Agency, I concluded that the system should probably be changed in the fashion proposed in H.R. 11395. To obtain patronage figures of the changed system, I directed the same traffic engineering firm to examine this system as they had the other. In that way I was able to obtain recent and comparable traffic studies for the system authorized in 1965, and for the system which contains my recommendations for change.
>
> These studies show that, in 1980, the modified system will attract an estimated 12,000 more riders than the authorized system during the peak hour, about 70,000 more riders daily, and some 22,300,000 more riders annually. Operating costs are not expected to be significantly different than those for the authorized system. Thus, we expect that in 1980 the increased patronage on the modified system, when compared with the new traffic figures for the authorized system, would produce additional net annual revenue—after operating costs and payment for feeder buses—of approximately $3.5 million. Applied to bond debt service expense and assuming an interest rate of 5½ percent per annum, such added annual revenue would be sufficient to fund $55 million of added capital costs over a 40-year period.
>
> This amount of additional revenue would more than cover the net increase in capital costs which would result from the recommended modifications. Our estimates indicate that the provision of service to Southwest Washington, as proposed, would increase the cost of the basic system at current prices by $98 million. This increase, however, would be reduced substantially by the $56.5 million reduction which would result from deleting the Columbia Heights line. Thus, the net increase in capital cost is $41.5 million, which can be financed from the additional revenues generated by the modifications.

The portions of Mr. McCarter's testimony that I have just read to you do, I believe, express the need to pass H.R. 11395 today.

I would, however, like to emphasize that H.R. 11395, while modifying the authorized transit system, does not call upon the Congress for additional funds. It merely asks us to approve route changes that will result in greatly improved transit service for the Nation's Capital.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to enthusiastically endorse H.R. 11395, which modifies the authorized transit system approved by the Congress in 1965 for the Washington metropolitan area.

This bill provides a most realistic approach to one of the major transportation problems which have developed in the District. The problem has been brought about by the extensive building program in Southwest Washington—a program that includes both Government buildings and private development which will include office buildings, stores, and a new hotel.

In the Government center alone employment is expected to approach a population figure nearly as great as in all of downtown Baltimore. The new Forrestal Building, which will be a sort of downtown Pentagon; the huge new headquarters of the Department of Housing and Urban Development; and the extensive population explosion brought about by the establishment of the Department of Transportation whose employees spill over into a half dozen new office buildings in Southwest; NASA, HEW, USIA—these are the major Government establishments in the area, but in point of numbers they represent just a few of the Government agencies which will eventually be housed in this new exploding population center.

Most of the employees in this complex will come from Maryland and Virginia—well over two-thirds of them. The balance will, of course, be residents of the District of Columbia. The parking facilities in these agencies will be at a minimum. During the peak hours, bus transfer from the Federal Triangle to Southwest will involve between 70 and 100 bus loads.

I could go on and describe the almost frightening development of congestion in downtown Washington that we face if we do not authorize the new transit line as provided in H.R. 11395, to run down D Street through the Southwest area and connect with other lines of the transit system in such a way as to provide residents of the entire region with quick, economical, and comfortable travel from home to office and return.

It is my understanding that the net additional cost of this Southwest area line will be in the nature of $41 million more. However, I also understand that the increased number of riders of this line will provide sufficient revenue to obtain the amount necessary for debt amortization so that an equivalent amount of additional bonds can be sold to cover this extra cost.

I earnestly commend this bill to my colleagues for favorable action.

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, favorable action on this legislation, H.R. 11395, today will go far toward the development of the strongest possible rapid rail transit system for the Washington metropolitan area. While I regret the deletion of a short line to the center city, I am convinced that the only way any District or suburban resident will ever enjoy any type of rail transit system is by planning and building a system that has the best chance of paying for itself.

In a letter to Gen. Jackson Graham, general manager of the Washington Metropolitan Transit Authority, on September 1, 1967, I expressed my concern with the need to serve the center city, and strongly recommended the future planning to include a midcity line as part of the proposed regional system. I urged the Authority to give serious consideration to a maximum-service line connecting north-central Washington with downtown while providing equally direct access to the suburbs where many jobs are located. The Authority has assured me that they are giving such a route serious and favorable attention.

Addition of the Independence Avenue line, as provided here, will increase annual ridership of the entire system by 22 million, thereby strengthening the system economically and making a sound base for future extensions to serve the city as well as the suburbs.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to voice my concern over the changes H.R. 11395 would make in Washington's projected subway system. The bill would authorize a new route to serve the rapidly expanding Southwest Washington area. I think this is a most necessary change, and one that will speed rush-hour transportation for the many thousands of employees who will be pouring into an area that houses, among other things, the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare, Housing and Urban Development, and Transportation. I am doubtful about the wisdom of discontinuing plans to construct a route through the Columbia Heights area of the city. While the statistics presented by the Washington Metropolitan Transportation Agency in support of its proposal seem persuasive, the fact remains that there will now be no subway route servicing the low-income inner city area. In this time of urban discontent, when one of the chief problems is unemployment among ghetto residents, and unavailability of cheap and convenient mass transportation only aggravates this problem, it seems an inappropriate and impolitic moment to eliminate the one subway line which would serve these people. WMTA has promised further studies of the issue and that special attention will be paid to urban renewal developments in the Shaw area. I urge the WMTA to take prompt action and not view today's passage of H.R. 11395 as any kind of go-slow mandate. It is essential that we provide fast, accessible and reasonably priced transportation for our core-city residents. And the sooner the better.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks on all District bills considered today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

AMEND SECTION 11 OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA LIFE INSURANCE ACT

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 10213) to amend the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia, approved June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. 1125).

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 10213

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 11 of chapter II of the Life Insurance Act, approved June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. 1132), as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 35-410), is amended by adding at the end of the first paragraph thereof the following: "This paragraph shall not apply to an alien company which maintains in the United States as required by law, assets held in trust for the benefit of the United States policyholders in an amount not less than the sum of its required capital deposit and the amount of its outstanding liabilities arising out of its insurance transactions in the United States."

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 10213 is to amend section 11 of chapter II of the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia (48 Stat. 1125) to eliminate a technical provision which adversely affects alien life insurance companies operating in the District of Columbia.

PRESENT LAW

Title 35 of the District of Columbia Code includes the Insurance Code and chapter 4 thereof sets forth the District of Columbia Department of Insurance requirements with respect to life insurance companies. Section 34-410 of the District of Columbia Code, 1961 edition, prohibits an alien life insurance company—that is, a life insurance company not domiciled in the United States—doing business in the District from inculding in its advertising information as to its financial condition other than the capital stock and assets held by its U.S. branch. The total financial condition of such a company, as included in its annual report to the policyholders of its domicile, may be revealed in the District of Columbia only to the company's policyholders in the District. This latter permission was granted these alien life insurance companies by amendment to this section in 1963 by Public Law 88-193 (77 Stat. 347).

Section 35-410 was again amended in 1966, by Public Law 89-599 (80 Stat. 705), which permitted life insurance companies in the District, both alien and domestic, to issue public announcement of their financial condition at any time, on a current basis rather than on the basis of the data in its next preceding annual report to the District of Columbia Superintendent of Insurance.

This latter amendment, constructive though it was and in the interest of the buying public, did not in any way alleviate the problem confronting these alien life insurance companies in the District of Columbia in not being allowed to inform the public, other than their own local policyholders, as to their complete financial condition.

PROVISION OF THE BILL

The bill H.R. 10213 is designed to eliminate this problem, by relieving an alien life insurance company from that prohibition in all cases where such company maintains in the United States, as required by law, assets held in trust for the benefit of its U.S. policyholders in an amount not less than the sum of its required capital deposit and the amount of its outstanding liabilities arising out of its insurance transactions in the United States. In short, this proposed amendment to section 35-410 of the District of Columbia Code would permit the public, policyholders, and prospective policyholders alike, the benefit of full information concerning the capital stock and assets of an alien life insurance company, when sufficient of these assets are held in trust in the United States for the proper protection of the U.S. policyholders.

REASONS FOR LEGISLATION

Your committee is informed that this bill will affect only eight alien insurance companies operating in the District of Columbia, all of which are domiciled in Canada.

These companies are:

The Canada Life Assurance Co., Toronto, Ontario.

Confederation Life Association, Toronto, Ontario.

Crown Life Insurance Co., Toronto, Ontario.

The Great-West Life Assurance Co., Winnipeg, Manitoba.

The Manufacturers Life Insurance Co., Toronto, Ontario.

The National Life Assurance Co., Toronto, Ontario.

North American Life Assurance Co., Toronto, Ontario.

Sun Life Assurance Co. of Canada, Montreal, Quebec.

The Canadian companies are required by the laws of all the States in which they operate to maintain at all times in the United States, trusteed assets sufficient to meet their obligations to U.S. policyholders, plus a required capital deposit. In actual practice, your committee is advised, the companies maintain deposits which substantially exceed these requirements.

These companies naturally need to conduct a certain amount of advertising in the United States if they are to compete on even terms with U.S. companies. The District Code, as it now stands, handicaps these companies in the conduct of their business in the District in that they are not permitted to advertise, publish, or give out their total financial results as published in their annual reports. In fact, the present law can be interpreted to prohibit an annual report being given to a prospective new policyholder, even on request. Two or three States do have special requirements somewhat similar to those in the District. However, these States have adopted a simple routine which allows the Canadian companies to advertise total business figures without restriction.

Practically all State laws, and those of the District, contain a prohibition against the use of misleading information in advertising, and properly so. But State insurance departments have not construed this provision as requiring any limitation on the publication of total business figures by the Canadian companies. The Canadian companies naturally prefer to be in a position to draft advertisements in the United States which can be used nationwide. It is obvious that to make adjustments for an individual jurisdiction, as the District of Columbia, is a costly procedure, and should not be required unless some useful purpose is served thereby.

Your committee is informed that Canada allows complete freedom to U.S. life insurance companies to advertise their total business figures. This situation exists despite a requirement for the filing of figures of Canadian business similar to the treatment of the U.S. business of Canadian companies. Indeed, the extent of the Canadian operations alone of U.S. companies is rarely emphasized, and total business figures appear in substantially all publications.

PUBLIC HEARING

A hearing on this proposed legislation was conducted by Subcommittee No. 1 on October 2, 1967. At this time, testimony in favor of the bill was submitted by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the District of Columbia Superintendent of Insurance, and spokesmen for the Life Insurance Association of America, the American Life Convention, and the Sun Life Assurance Co., of Canada. No opposition was expressed to the enactment of the bill.

CONCLUSIONS

It is the view of your committee that this bill, by allowing these Canadian life insurance companies, which maintain by law adequate trusteed assets in the United States, to use their total financial figures in promoting their operations in the District of Columbia, will result in permitting the companies' prospective policyholders to obtain more information than is available to them under present law. This appears definitely to be in the public interest, and accordingly your committee strongly approves the enactment of this proposed legislation.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMEND STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS IN CERTAIN CIVIL ACTIONS

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 6527) to amend title 12, District of Columbia Code, to provide a limitation of actions for actions arising out of death or injury caused by a defective or unsafe improvement to real property.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 6527

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That

SECTION 1. (a) Chapter 3 of title 12 of the District of Columbia Code (relating to limitation of actions) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"§ 12-310. Actions arising out of death or injury caused by defective or unsafe improvements to real property.

"(a)(1) Except as provided in subsection (b), any action—

"(A) to recover damages for—

"(i) personal injury,

"(ii) injury to real or personal property, or

"(iii) wrongful death,

resulting from the defective or unsafe condition of an improvement to real property, and

"(B) for contribution or indemnity which is brought as a result of such injury or death,

shall be barred unless the action is commenced before the period specified in paragraph (2) has elapsed.

"(2) The period referred to in paragraph (1) is—

"(A) two years from the date such injury or death occurred, or

"(B) four years from the date the improvement was substantially completed.

whichever occurs first.

"(3) For purposes of this subsection, an improvement

"For purposes of this subsection, an improvement to real property shall be considered substantially completed when—

"(A) it is first used, or

"(B) it is first available for use after having been completed in accordance with the contract or agreement covering the improvement, including any agreed changes to the contract or agreement,

whichever occurs first.

"(b) The limitation of actions prescribed in subsection (a) shall not apply to—

"(1) any action based on a contract, express or implied, or

"(2) any action brought against the person who, at the time the defective or unsafe condition of the improvement to real property caused injury or death, was the owner of or in actual possession or control of such real property."

(b) The table of sections for such chapter 3 is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

"§ 12-310. Actions arising out of death or injury caused by defective or unsafe improvements to real property."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by section 1 of this Act shall apply only with respect to actions brought after the date of enactment of this Act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 3, strike out "That".

On page 2, strike out lines 14 through 22 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "shall be barred unless in the case where injury is the basis of such action, such injury occurs within the five-year period beginning on the date the improvement was substantially completed, or in the case where death is the basis of such action, either such death or the injury resulting in such death occurs within such five-year period.

"(2) For purposes of this subsection, an improvement".

On page 3, between lines 16 and 17, strike out "§".

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 6527 is to provide a limitation on the period of time during which an action may be brought to recover damages, contribution, or indemnity, against architects, designers, engineers, or contractors on the ground of a defective or unsafe condition of an improvement to real property. At the present time in the District of Columbia there is no limitation as to the period of liability of an architect, engineer, or contractor for a defective or unsafe condition in an improvement to real property. Thus, such parties may become defendants in a suit brought by a person who sustains a personal injury in a building which was built 25 or even 50 years ago. The only limitation applying in such case under District of Columbia law is that such an action must be brought within 3 years after the date of the cause of action accrues.

The bill, H.R. 6527, as amended, and reported by your committee, would require that such an action would be barred unless it is brought within 5 years from the date the improvement to real property was substantially completed.

NEED FOR THE LEGISLATION

In recent years there has been a substantial increase in the number of actions for the recovery of damages, contribution, or indemnity, for injury to property or persons or wrongful death against architects, engineers, and contractors, based upon a defective or unsafe condition of an improvement to real property.

The District of Columbia, as was the case in the States, has no statute of limitations relating to such actions. Architects who design buildings or improvements to real property, engineers who design and install equipment, or contractors, who build the improvements under rigid inspection and conformity with building codes, may find themselves named as defendants in such damage suits many years after the improvement was completed and occupied.

Comparatively, modern architecture, engineering, and construction, with the new techniques, technology, and methods, may give the appearance of defective or unsafe conditions to older structures which conditions may be used as a basis for such damage suits. In such cases, the architectural plans used may have been discarded, copies of building codes in force at the time of design or construction may no longer be in existence, and the persons who were individually involved may have deceased or may not be located. The purpose of the law is to provide a reasonable time and opportunity for a person who has suffered injury or damages to bring an action. To permit the bringing of such actions without any limitation as to time places the defendant in an unreasonable position if not imposing the impossibility of asserting a reasonable defense.

At hearings before your committee, specific cases were mentioned to illustrate the need for the pending legislation. In one case an architectural firm designed an auditorium which was built in 1928. In 1965, a visitor to the auditorium fell on the stairway and was injured. Her allegation in a suit for damages against the owner was that her injury was due to the improper location of a handrail. The owner of the building, in turn, filed suit against the architect for alleged negligence in designing the stairway and handrail. Thus, 38 years after the completion of the construction the architectural firm is now defending itself against a $50,000 lawsuit.

In another instance an engineering firm designed a grain elevator which was built in 1934. The elevator was destroyed by an explosion in 1957. In 1959, the owner sued the engineer for $250,000 alleging that the explosion was due to errors in the design of the ventilation system.

In the first case, none of the architects involved in the design of the auditorium is alive today but the architectural firm is being sued. The plans, specifications, and contracts may have been lost or destroyed. Old building codes, essential to the defense cannot be found. In the grain elevator case, the plaintiff in effect alleged that the engineer should have created in 1934 a ventilation system based on 1959 standards and technology.

Architects, engineers, and contractors have no control over an owner whose neglect in maintaining an improvement may cause dangerous or unsafe conditions to develop over a period of years. They cannot prevent an owner from using an improvement for purposes for which it was not designed. Nor can they prevent the owner of a building from making alterations or changes which may, years afterward, be determined unsafe or defective and appear to be a part of the original improvement.

Your committee believes that as a matter of good law, in fairness and equity to the architect, designer, engineer and builder, it is proper to enact legislation such as H.R. 6527 to establish a reasonable time limit within which suits for damages alleging defective or unsafe conditions, attributable to their actions, can be brought.

STATE ENACTMENTS

The problem which this legislation is designed to remedy has been recognized throughout the United States. Since 1960, 30 States have enacted statutes of limitation similar to that proposed in this bill. In addition, the legislatures in 10 other States are considering such legislation. Your committee finds that the provisions of the bill are reasonably comparable to legislation enacted in the States.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The bill as introduced provided that any action to recover damages for personal injury or injury to real or personal property, or for wrongful death or for contribution or indemnity as a result of injury or death, such action must be commenced within 2 years after the date of the injury or death and that the cause of action must have accrued within 4 years of the date the improvement to the real property was substantially completed. The Committee amendment other than technical changes, was directed toward having the terms of the bill harmonize with the existing provisions of law on limitations of actions—District of Columbia Code, section 12–301—and to extend the time from 4 to 5 years after the date of substantial completion of the improvement during which period a cause of action might accrue.

The effect of this amendment is that if a cause of action accrues at any time up to and including the last day of the 5-year period from the date the improvement was substantially completed, an action in damages for injury to real or personal property could be filed within 3 years—District of Columbia Code, section 12–301(3)—in the case of personal injury an action could be filed within 3 years—District of Columbia Code, section 12–301(8)—and in the case of wrongful death, an action could be filed within 1 year—District of Columbia Code, section 16–2702.

For the establishment of the date on which the time limitation was to begin to run, the bill provides that the term "substantially completed" shall mean, first, the date on which the improvement is first used or, second, the date on which the improvement is first available for use, whichever occurs first. In the first case, the owner of an improvement may desire to use the property before completion of all details required under the contracts or agreements between the parties involved in the design and construction. The 5-year limitation would begin to run from the date of such first use by the owner.

In the second case, the owner for reasons of his own convenience, may delay use of the improvement for some period after physical completion. The 5-year limitation would begin to run on such date as the owner and other parties agreed that the improvement had been completed in accordance with all contracts or agreements concerning it, including any agreed changes.

The limitation on actions provided in the bill does not apply to or affect the owner's contract or the warranties of an architect, contractor, or engineer in relation to the improvement. Similarly, the limitations do not apply to any action which may be brought against the owner or person in actual possession or control of such improvement for injury or death because of a defective or unsafe condition in the improvement.

The terms of the bill apply only to those actions which are brought following the date of enactment, thus preserving any existing actions.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

At committee hearings, your committee received testimony and statements from representatives of organizations whose members were interested in the legislation. Among those organizations represented at the hearing were the following: The Potomac Valley Chapter of the American Institute of Architects; Associated Builders and Contractors, Metropolitan Washington Chapter; the Washington Building Congress; the Washington Metropolitan Chapter of the American Institute of Architects; the National Society of Professional Engineers; the Consulting Engineers' Council of the United States for Metropolitan Washington; and the District of Columbia Society for Professional Engineers.

The report of the Commissioners for the District of Columbia on H.R. 6527 was presented by a representative of the office of the Corporation Counsel for the District of Columbia who indicated that the Commissioners had no objections to the legislation.

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support H.R. 6527, to establish a limitation on the period of time during which an action may be brought in the District of Columbia to recover damages, contribution or indemnity against architects, designers, engineers, or contractors on the ground of a defective or unsafe condition of an improvement to real property. This measure is identical in intent to my bill, H.R. 11544.

The proponents of this bill, and others engaged in the building industry in the District of Columbia and Maryland, have discussed with me the difficulties which they now face in the absence of any statute of limitations. Recent decisions of the courts have placed an extreme burden upon architects, engineers, builders, and all engaged in construction. They may be liable for their actions many years after completing their work, long after essential witnesses and records may have become unavailable, and long after technical advances may have made their prior work difficult or impossible to defend, although the practices may have been entirely proper and reasonable when undertaken.

This bill would both protect the building industry and continue reasonable protections for injured parties. A sensible time is allowed for commencement of an action, and even following the period of limitation the injured party could bring a claim against the owner or other person in control of the property. Thus this bill balances the interest of all concerned in a way very similar to laws recently enacted by a majority of the States.

I wish to commend the District of Columbia Committee for its prompt consideration of this legislation, and fully support its passage today.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read a third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO EXEMPT PUBLIC INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS FROM THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACT

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 9059) to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act to provide that employer contributions do not have to be made under that act with respect to service performed in the employ of certain public international organizations, and ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union be discharged from the further consideration of the bill and that it be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would just like to ask if these public international organizations as defined in the bill deserve this protection; and whom are we doing a favor—the employees of the organization—by keeping them outside the laws of our unemployment compensation; or are we doing them a disfavor?

I understand that it is the FAO and the ILO and the U.N. Information Center that are left. But try as I will, from the reading of the reports of the departments and the committee report, I am honestly not sure whether we are doing these employees—and I suppose that they are U.S. citizens working for these organizations—a favor by keeping them out of our unemployment compensation laws; or whether we are doing a disfavor to U.S. citizens who might be working in this information center of the U.N., for example.

I well realize that there is a question of reciprocity with other countries. Our employees, for example, who work in a similar organization in Geneva, may come under a similar Swiss law.

But I wonder if the gentleman, under my reservation of objection, would take the time to explain the pressure for this kind of legislation. I realize it has been requested by our Department of State—and they do not always come through to me loud and clear.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DOWDY. This bill came at the request of the Department of State. Usually these things are handled by treaty. Most of the organizations, situated as these are, are exempt by treaty.

I believe there are only two such international organizations located in the United States; one of them is the United Nations organization in New York and the Pan-American Union, of course, located here in Washington. These offices here in Washington are regional offices of other international organizations and it just puts them in the same position as other international organizations that are already exempt. They are presently exempt from other taxation and all this does is to exempt them from registering and from the payment of this particular tax in the District of Columbia. There are only 75 or 100 people involved.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, would the gentleman advise the Members whether this is in his opinion, and I respect his opinion, is a favor or a disfavor to a U.S. citizen who might be working for one of these international organizations in the District of Columbia? In other words, they are employees and they should have the right to unemployment compensation. I would just appreciate the gentleman's candid opinion. Do I understand we are only doing here what has been done for others by treaty?

Mr. DOWDY. I made no inquiry about how many of these 75 to 100 people who are involved are U.S. citizens and how many are foreign nationals. I would expect that at least part of them and maybe all of them are foreign nationals. Perhaps they would be sent back home if their connection with these offices was discontinued.

Mr. HALL. I can see why it would be an advantage to exempt a foreign national working here from the U.S. unemployment compensation laws. But it would strike me that the shoe has to apply also to the other foot—of the U.S. citizen—but apparently that information is not available.

Will the gentleman further advise the House, under this reservation, whether or not we are simply putting into law what the President has already done under his Executive order anyway, as far as these employees are concerned, and as far as exempting those employees from unemployment compensation is concerned?

Mr. DOWDY. I cannot answer for these two or three small regional offices. All other international organizations are exempt, of course, by treaty, and that would be carried out by Presidential action. I do not know that there is any order. I think not. If it were handled by Presidential order, this bill probably would not be called for.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to press too deeply. Does the gentleman or his staff know if these people are presently covered by Executive order and thereby exempt?

Mr. DOWDY. As I have said, this action is requested by the State Department. It does the same thing in respect to the employees concerned as we do with respect to congressional employees. Employees in our congressional offices are exempt.

Mr. HALL. I am sorry. I did not hear the gentleman.

Mr. DOWDY. I say the employees in our congressional offices are likewise exempt. At least the employees in our offices are not subject to unemployment compensation taxes. The proposition with reference to the offices concerned in the bill is similar.

Mr. HALL. Of course, there is a different reason for that, I am sure the gentleman will agree with me. There is the question of tenure, the right of Capitol Hill appointment, et cetera, et cetera, separation without pay, and serving at the pleasure of the individual Representatives of the people.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas if the United Nations Information Center referred to here is the U.S. branch of the Information Center of the United Nations, or is this the United Nations Information Center located in New York?

Mr. DOWDY. It is my understanding that it is a regional office of the United Nations. In other words, these three—the United Nations Information Center, the International Labor Organization, and the Food and Agriculture Organization—have mere regional offices here in Washington. They are regional offices of an organization that is located elsewhere. The International Labor Organization and the Food and Agriculture Organization I think are not even located in the United States.

Mr. GROSS. Are U.S. employees of the United Nations exempt from taxes, or does not the story go this way, that they pay taxes to the U.S. Government and are then reimbursed by the United Nations? Does the gentleman have any knowledge on this subject?

Mr. DOWDY. It is my understanding that those employees are exempt from income taxes. But this bill relates only to unemployment compensation taxes in the District of Columbia. That is all this relates to.

Mr. GROSS. Only to unemployment taxes?

Mr. DOWDY. That is correct. That is all this relates to.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Texas whether or not the International Labor Organization is one of those which would be so exempt.

Mr. DOWDY. That organization has a regional office here in the District of Columbia, and they would be exempt from payment of District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation taxes.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Am I to understand further that the International Labor Organization, its regional office acting as an employer, seeks to exempt its employees from the withholding or payment of unemployment compensation taxes?

Mr. DOWDY. Our request came from the State Department. I assume the State Department was requested by these organizations to get the exemption for them.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this is being done by Executive order, we are merely legalizing that action. Since it is done in other and similar situations by treaties, therefore we must presume that the action is taken in the interest of equity and justice. I withdraw my objection.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill, H.R. 9059, which is requested by the State Department, is to exempt certain public international organizations, which have headquarters or regional offices in the District of Columbia, from registering with the District of Columbia. Unemployment Compensation Board and from the payment of the unemployment compensation tax required by the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act—District of Columbia Code, title 46, section 301.

The international organizations exempted by the bill would be those designated by Executive order of the President as entitled to enjoy the privileges, exemptions, and immunities provided under the International Organizations Immunities Act—22 U.S.C. 288–288f–1.

Section 288 of that act defines an "international organization" as "a public international organization in which the United States participates pursuant to any treaty or under the authority of any act of Congress authorizing such participation or making an appropriation for such participation, and which shall have been designated by the President through appropriate Executive order as being entitled to enjoy the privileges, exemptions, and immunities provided" in the United States Code.

Under the International Organizations Immunities Act, it is further provided that where the United States participates in a public international organization either by treaty or by act of Congress authorizing an appropriation therefor, the President may designate that organization as being entitled to certain privileges and immunities, such as exemption from payment of taxes, inviolability of its records and property, and exemption of its non-American employees from U.S. income taxes, and from process as to their official actions.

PRESENT SITUATION

The State Department has advised your committee that with the exception of the United Nations organization, located in New York City, and the Pan-American Union, located in Washington, most public international organizations have their headquarters abroad, in Geneva, Switzerland, or other locations. However, some of these organizations do have small regional offices in Washington, which act as clearinghouses for information channeled to their main offices abroad.

Many such public international organizations with regional offices in the District, such as the International Bank for Construction and Development, are already exempt by treaty from local taxes.

There are only a few very small regional offices in the District not so exempt, as the United Nations Information Center, the International Labor Organization, and the Food and Agriculture Organization, employing a total of but 75 to 100 persons.

H.R. 9059 would give these remaining public international organizations the same exempt status as others now enjoy, and your committee recommends the bill be approved by the House.

ENDORSEMENT OF LEGISLATION

Not only is the bill urged by the State Department but it is approved by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia and by the Federal Bureau of the Budget. No opposition to the bill has been expressed to your committee.

Letters from the State Department and the District of Columbia Commissioners on behalf of this proposed legislation are as follows:

Department of State,
Washington, D.C., April 7, 1967.

Hon. John W. McCormack,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Dear Mr. Speaker: There is transmitted herewith for the consideration of the Congress proposed legislation to amend the "District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, As Amended", Public Law 424, 87th Congress. The proposed amendment would exempt certain public international organizations having a headquarters or regional office in the District of Columbia from the payment of an excise tax to the District of Columbia. The proposed amendment would not involve additional expense to the United States nor would the proposed amendment in any way diminish, abridge or weaken the right or power of the United States to safeguard its security.

The provision proposed to be added by the amendment would have the following effect:

Section T would exempt from the coverage of the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, As Amended, services performed after April 1, 1962 in the employ of public international organizations designated by Executive Order of the President as being entitled to the benefit of the International Organizations Immunities Act, Public Law 291—79th Congress, 59 Stat. 669, 22 U.S.C. 288. The provision would exempt the designated public international organizations from the requirement of registering with the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Board and from paying the unemployment compensation tax required by the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, As Amended.

A similar communication is being sent to the President of the Senate.

The Department has been informed by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this proposal to the Congress for its consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Nicholas deB. Katzenbach,
Acting Secretary.

Government of the District of
Columbia, Executive Office,
Washington, June 20, 1967.

Hon. John L. McMillan,
Chairman, Committee on the District of Columbia, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. McMillan: The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have for report H.R. 9059, 90th Congress, a bill "To amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act to provide that employer contributions do not have to be made under that Act with respect to service performed in the employ of certain public international organizations." The purpose of this bill is to exempt from coverage of the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act services performed after April 1, 1962 in the employ of public international organizations designated by Executive Order of the President as being entitled to the benefits of the International Organizations Immunities Act.

The bill amends section 1(b)(5) of the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46–310(b)(5)), by adding at the end thereof a new clause (T), and its passage would have the effect of relieving designated public international organizations from the requirement of registering with the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Board and from paying the unemployment compensation tax required by such Act.

The Commissioners offer no objection to enactment of the proposed legislation.

The Commissioners have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, there is no objection to the submission of this report to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

Walter N. Tobriner,
President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 9059

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (b)(5) of section 1 of the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46–301(b)(5)) is amended—

(1) by striking out the period at the end of clauses (P) and (R) and inserting at the end of such clause a semicolon, and

(2) by adding after clause (S) the following new clause:

"(T) service performed after April 1, 1962, in the employ of a public international organization designated by the President as entitled to enjoy the privileges, exemptions, and immunities provided under the International Organizations Immunities Act (22 U.S.C. 288–288f–1)."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMEND DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA INDUSTRIAL SAFETY ACT

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 11638) to amend title II of the act of September 19, 1918, relating to industrial safety in the District of Columbia.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 11638

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title II of the Act of September 19, 1918 (D.C. Code, secs. 36–431—36–442) is amended as follows:

(1) Section 2 of such title (D.C. Code, sec. 36–432) is amended—

(A) by striking out in paragraph (a) "industrial employment, place of employment," and inserting in lieu thereof "place of employment", and

(B) by striking out in paragraph (d) "industrial". (2) Section 3 of such title (D.C. Code, sec. 36–433) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "To promote the safety of persons employed in buildings or other structures, such rules, regulations, and standards may require, without limitation, changes in the permanent or temporary features of such buildings or other structures."

(3) Section 6 of such title (D.C. Code, sec. 36–436) is amended by striking out ": *Provided, however,* That the Board" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ". Any decision of the Board denying a variation from any such rule or regulation may be made only after the Board has afforded the employer requesting such variation a reasonable opportunity for a public hearing. Such decision shall be subject to review by the District of Columbia Court of Appeals under section 11–742 of title 11 of the District of Columbia Code. The Board".

(4) Section 12 of such title (D.C. Code, sec. 36–442) is amended by striking out "more than $300, or by imprisonment of not exceeding ninety days. Prosecutions for violations of this title shall be in the name of the District of Columbia on information filed in the police court of the District of Columbia" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "less than $100 or more than $1,000, or by imprisonment of not more than ninety days. Prosecutions for violations of this title shall be in the name of the District of Columbia on information filed in the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions."

Sec. 2. Section 11–742(a) of title 11 of the District of Columbia Code is amended—

(1) by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (9),

(2) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (10) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and", and

(3) by adding after paragraph (10) the following new paragraph:

"(11) decisions of the Minimum Wage and Industrial Safety Board made under section 36-436 denying a request for a variation from a rule or regulation of that Board."

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 11638 is to provide for a more general application of the rules and regulations of the safety code of the District of Columbia for the protection of employees in places of employment.

Industrial safety provisions of existing law were added to the minimum wage act by the act of October 14, 1941—55 Stat. 738; District of Columbia Code 36-431, and the following: Following this enactment, the law was construed to apply safety standards in places of employment in the District of Columbia except in the Federal and the District of Columbia government establishments. The act was interpreted to give the Industrial Safety Board the power to establish reasonable standards of safety for the protection of life and health of employees, to conduct inspections and investigations, to enforce reasonable standards, and to cite employers for any violations of provisions of the act or for violation of rules and regulations.

From the date of enactment until 1964, the provisions of the act were interpreted as applying generally to places of private employment in the District of Columbia. However, in 1964 the Corporation Counsel of the District of Columbia rendered an opinion which limited the application of the provisions of the act to the regulation of safety conditions in "industrial" places of employment, such as manufacturing plants and building construction.

The amendments proposed in H.R. 11638 are designed to restore the general application of safety rules and regulations and the jurisdiction of the Industrial Safety Board to enforce the safety code generally in places of private employment in the District of Columbia.

LIMITATIONS OF THE PRESENT LAW

Because of the interpretation placed on existing law by the Corporation Counsel in 1964, the great majority of employees in the District do not receive the benefit of the reasonable rules and regulations relating to safety in their places of employment. It is estimated that only approximately 16 percent of all such privately employed persons are now covered by provisions of the Industrial Safety Act. More than 100,000 employees engaged in employment in hotels, restaurants, retail establishments and in offices are now excluded from any coverage or protection under the safety code.

WHAT THE BILL PROVIDES

The bill, H.R. 11638, amends the existing law by striking out the term "industrial" in the definitions carried in the present law so as to make the provisions of the act apply generally to all usual places of private employment. The bill also provides that safety standards, rules and regulations apply without limitation to changes in the permanent or temporary features of places of employment. This is necessary, since buildings which may have been altered or may have had additions or which may have only temporary provisions made for use by employees should be covered by the act. Employees located in such circumstances should receive equal safety protection.

The bill also amends the provisions of existing law relating to applications filed by an employer for a variation from a provision of the safety code rules and regulations. In the application of the safety code, the Industrial Safety Board regulations may be such as to indicate a violation of the regulations in the strict sense of the safety code. Occasionally, such strict application actually accomplishes little or nothing insofar as employee safety is concerned and may work a substantial hardship upon the employer. In such situation, the Board, on application from the employer, may grant a variance relieving the employer from strict application of the rules and regulations.

When the Board receives such an application from an employer, the Board has the discretion to hold a hearing if it so desires. However, the employer is not entitled, as a matter of right, to any hearing before the Board for the purpose of presenting his case. The bill amends present law to provide that in the event an application for variance is made by an employer, and before the Board denies such application, it must hold a public hearing at which the employer may present his case. In the event of an adverse decision by the Board, the employer may appeal the decision of the Board to the District of Columbia Court of Appeals. The committee understands that the number of variances applied for by employers is relatively limited and believes that such provision for a public hearing would not place any undue burden upon the Board.

The bill provides for increase penalties for violation of the safety code regulations. Under present law, the penalties provided for violation are a fine of not more than $300 or imprisonment not exceeding 90 days. Under the bill the penalties for violation would be increased to a fine or not less than $100 nor more than $1,000 or by imprisonment of not more than 90 days.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Your committee held hearings at which representatives of employer groups and employee groups presented testimony and statements regarding the provisions of the bill. The greater Washington Central Labor Council, the Retail Store Employees Union, the Office and Professional Employees Union, the Building Service Employees International Union, the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, and the Hotel and Restaurant Employees and Bartenders Union expressed support for the legislation in behalf of employees.

Representatives of the District of Columbia Metropolitan Subcontractors Association and the Master Builders Association, Inc., presented employer testimony regarding the legislation.

Employer and employee groups generally expressed the need for and desirability of and support for adequate safety code enforcement in the District of Columbia being applied generally to places of employment.

The favorable recommendations of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia were presented to the committee by the Office of the Corporation Counsel. The Chairman of the Industrial Safety and Minimum Wage Board and the Director of Industrial Safety testified in support of the legislation.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL CONFEREE ON H.R. 8718, TO INCREASE ANNUAL FEDERAL PAYMENT TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Speaker be authorized to appoint an additional manager on the part of the House to serve on the conference on the bill (H.R. 8718) to increase the annual Federal payment to the District of Columbia and to provide a method for computing the annual borrowing authority for the general fund of the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

The Chair hears none, and appoints the following additional conferee: Mr. FUQUA.

The Clerk will notify the Senate.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, this concludes the work of our committee for District day.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the business for District day.

THE CONGRESS SHOULD MEET ITS OWN RESPONSIBILITIES ON MONETARY AND FISCAL POLICIES AND SAVE $7 BILLION A YEAR ON COST OF INTEREST ON NATIONAL DEBT ALONE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, In recent days we have had a great deal of comment in this Chamber about the responsibilities of the executive branch.

In their enthusiasm, some Members have been issuing directives—and at times, almost ultimatums—to the President of the United States. I have been in the Congress for 39 years and I have the deepest respect for prerogatives and the responsibilities of the legislative branch of our U.S. Government. By the same token, I have learned to respect the constitutional separation of powers.

Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives has no more authority to take over the operation of the executive branch than it does to operate the Supreme Court. Under our Constitution, the three branches of Government must operate separately. Frankly, I feel that some of the press releases, some of the speeches, and some of the statements which have been issued about fiscal policy in recent days demean the Congress. At a minimum they fail to recognize the separation of powers.

Mr. Speaker, it will do the 90th Congress and its individual Members no good to pass the buck. Under the Constitution we have to stand up on our own feet and meet our own responsibilities.

The truth is, the Congress has been dodging its responsibilities—particularly in the areas of monetary and fiscal policies—for many years. This is why we find ourselves in such a bad situation today. It has become general knowledge throughout the country that the Congress has not, and apparently will not, face responsibility for monetary affairs. In his own conscience, I suppose each Member of this Congress knows why this is true.

As a result of this dereliction of duty, the U.S. Government today is paying many times the interest that should be required to finance its borrowings. This is excessive interest rates that have to be paid by the American taxpayers.

If we had met our responsibility and kept interest rates down, we would not even be faced with the problem of a tax increase.

With lower interest rates, we would have had plenty of money to spend for both our foreign and domestic programs, including the war in Vietnam.

But, by failing to meet our responsibility, interest rates have soared over the past 14 years and, in this fiscal year, we will pay $14.2 billion interest on the national debt. This sum is second only to the expenditures for national defense. In recent days there has been talk about the need for a budget cut of $7 billion. Mr. Speaker, we would today be paying exactly $7 billion less in interest on the national debt if we had kept interest rates at the levels prevailing when President Truman went out of office.

Mr. Speaker, I am surprised that those who talk the loudest about spending cuts say absolutely nothing about high interest rates. Does it not seem strange that there is no talk on this floor about cutting the second largest item in the budget—interest rates? Surely that is where the economy drive should begin.

Unfortunately, high interest rates are being accepted in the 90th Congress as a way of life. Too many times, I have heard comments that high interest rates are necessary because of the War in Vietnam. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Let me remind my colleagues that we kept interest rates down throughout World War II, a conflict much larger and much more demanding on the economy than our present foray into Vietnam. In fact, interest rates on long-term Government obligations were kept below 2½ percent throughout World War II. Short-term interest rates were as low as three-eighths of 1 percent through this period. These low interest rates saved the American people billions of dollars.

Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD a table showing the tremendous rise in the yields on long-term Government bonds from 1939 to the present. While some of these rates may appear low, it must be remembered that these are wholesale rates and not retail rates of interest.

Yields on long-term Government bonds, by years, 1939 to present

[Percent per annum]

Year:	*Yield*
1939	2.36
1940	2.21
1941	1.95
1942	2.46
1943	2.47
1944	2.48
1945	2.37
1946	2.19
1947	2.25
1948	2.44
1949	2.31
1950	2.32
1951	2.57
1952	2.68
1953	2.94
1954	2.56
1955	2.84
1956	3.08
1957	3.47
1958	3.43
1959	4.08
1960	4.02
1961	3.90
1962	3.95
1963	4.00
1964	4.15
1965	4.12
1966	4.65

Mr. Speaker, I also place in the RECORD a table showing the total Federal debt and interest paid, fiscal years 1951–68:

TABLE II.—TOTAL, FEDERAL DEBT, AND INTEREST PAID, FISCAL 1951-68

Fiscal year	Total Federal debt (millions)	Total interest paid (millions)	Computed annual interest rates	Computed at 1951 rate (millions)
1951	$255.3	$5.7	2,233	$5.7
1952	259.2	5.9	2,276	5.8
1953	266.1	6.6	2,480	5.9
1954	271.3	6.5	2,396	6.1
1955	274.4	6.4	2,332	6.1
1956	272.8	6.8	2,493	6.1
1957	270.6	7.3	2,698	6.0
1958	276.4	7.7	2,786	6.2
1959	284.8	7.7	2,704	6.4
1960	286.5	9.3	3,246	6.4
1961	289.2	9.0	3,112	6.5
1962	298.6	9.2	3,081	6.7
1963	306.5	10.0	3,263	6.8
1964	312.5	10.7	3,424	7.0
1965	317.9	11.4	3,586	7.1
1966	320.4	12.1	3,777	7.2
1967 [1]	327.3	13.5	4,125	7.3
1968 [1]	335.4	14.2	4,234	7.5
Total		160.0		116.8

[1] Estimated.

Source: Economic Report of the President, 1967.

Yet today we seem to have a different philosophy, one which smacks of profiteering by the moneylenders in time of war.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress has full jurisdiction over the bonded indebtedness of this country. It can control the level of interest rates on borrowings by the U.S. Treasury. In fact, the Liberty Bond Act set a maximum interest rate of 4¼ percent on long-term Government obligations. Obviously the Congress has broad powers in this area and it could do wonders in the fight to lower interest charges on public borrowing.

The Congress could also require the cancellation of the $47 billion worth of bonds being held in the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. These bonds, part of the Federal Open Market Committee's portfolio, have been paid for in full. Yet the Federal Reserve continues to hold onto these bonds and if they are not canceled and retired, the American taxpayers will be forced to pay for them again.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Reserve each year sends a bill to the U.S. Treasury for interest on these paid-up bonds. Currently the Treasury is paying to the Federal Reserve about $2 billion annually in interest on the $47 billion worth of bonds already paid for in full.

This year I testified before the Ways and Means Committee and urged that they require the cancellation of these bonds in the public interest. I placed the text of my testimony in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Thursday, October 5, at pages 27953–27962.

Mr. Speaker, I do not condemn any Member for criticism of the President. Certainly this is the prerogative of any Member. However, I do feel strongly that it is time that the Congress meet its own responsibility in the area of fiscal and monetary policies.

All of us in politics recognize that it is easier to pass the buck than to go to work and solve the problems ourselves. In this instance, I hope that the Congress will overcome its inertia and will actually do something about monetary policy and high interest rates—the root of our current fiscal problems.

REPORT TO THE PEOPLE OF THE EIGHTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I am sending a report of my activities to the people of the Eighth District of Virginia and would like to share this report with the Members by inserting a copy of it at this point in the RECORD:

YOUR CONGRESSMAN, BILL SCOTT, REPORTS

Federal spending: One of the most interesting and probably most important matters considered by the House this year has been the suggested curtailment of total government spending for the current year. Economy-minded members have suggested an overall ceiling of $131.5 billion representing a cut of $5 billion on anticipated expenditures. I have voted in favor of this proposal and it appeared to have prevailed by a vote of 202 to 181 only to be reversed a few days later after the Administration rallied its forces and some of the members reversed their stand.

Suggestions have been made that the President should not be given the authority to cut appropriations and that control of the purse strings is the strongest prerogative of Congress. Certainly Congress should control spending and should refuse to appropriate any funds not proven to be essential to the conduct of government business. But placing a ceiling on spending does not increase the power of the President nor prevent the Congress from passing on the wisdom of expenditures for programs below the established ceiling.

The House Ways and Means Committee 20-5 decision to put aside consideration of the President's 10% surtax proposal until an understanding is reached between the White House and the Congress regarding spending cuts is to be applauded.

Even though the country is faced with an anticipated deficit this year of $30 billion, my present intention is to vote against the surtax because government has a habit of spending all of the money it receives through taxation. I have serious doubt that if additional funds are raised, they will be spent to reduce the deficit rather than to expand existing spending programs or develop new ones.

You may recall that during the last fiscal year, the government expended approximately $126 billion while receiving approximately $116 billion; that in January the President estimated total expenditures for the current fiscal year to be slightly over $135 billion with receipts of approximately $127 billion; and that on August 2, he revised expenditures for this fiscal year to over $143 billion and his estimate of receipts to $120 billion. While a deficit was suggested of $8 billion in January, it has now been revised to $23 billion if the 10% surtax is adopted and $30 billion, if not. In my opinion, it is essential to establish priorities in government spending much as you and I do with our household expenses.

We have grown: According to the Bureau of Population and Economic Research of the University of Virginia, our Eighth District is the largest congressional district in the state with a population now estimated at 544,021.

Committee work: One of my Subcommittees (Compensation and Pension) of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has just completed public hearings on more than 50 bills, all designed to prevent veteran pensioners from losing income as the result of the proposed increase in Social Security. Since the monthly rate of pension is determined by the amount of income received from other sources, it is quite possible for a veteran to receive a modest increase in Social Security payments, and thereby suffer a far greater reduction in pension payments. Certainly, the Nation's aged, needy pensioner should not suffer such a loss as the result of a small increase in pension payments. I plan to support the position that no increase in Social Security payments will result in a reduction in the total income of any person receiving a pension from the Veterans' Administration.

Schedule: You may be interested in my evening schedule for the next 30 days. This does not include a number of commitments primarily of a personal nature.

Oct. 15 Springfield: American Legion Boys and Girls State Program.

Oct. 17 McLean: McLean Business and Professional Association.

Oct. 19 Arlington: Virginia Medical Assn.

Oct. 21 Dulles International Airport: "Freedom Shrine" ceremony by the Exchange Club.

Falls Church: Order of Fraternal Americans.

Oct. 24 McLean: Greater Falls Church Republican Women's Club.

Oct. 25 Bailey's Crossroads: Hunt Clubs.

Oct. 27 Vienna: Reception for candidates.

Oct. 31 Vienna: Chamber of Commerce Halloween parade.

Nov. 1 West Point: King William County Forestry Club.

Nov. 2 Springfield: Reception for candidates.

Nov. 7 Tappahannock: St. Margaret's School Essex County Junior Women's Club.

Nov. 8 Purcellville: Grace Annex Methodist Church.

Nov. 10 Alexandria: Scottish Rite.

Nov. 13 Montross: Westmoreland Ruritan Club.

Hybla Valley landfill: As indicated in the last newsletter many citizens have been concerned about the prospect of bringing trash from the District of Columbia to the Hybla Valley area of Fairfax County. Contacts with the G.S.A., D.C. Government and House District Committee apparently have paid off because it now appears that alternatives have been found. If you hear differently, please let me know so we can get to work on it again.

Three Sisters Bridge: State Highway Commissioner Fugate has urged that the Department of Transportation complete its studies of the Three Sisters Bridge as soon as possible so that the Virginia Highway Department can complete plans for Interstate 66 from the Beltway into Washington. I have also contacted the Secretary of Transportation asking that the studies be completed as early as possible and that he reach a decision on this matter.

Agriculture bulletins: Please send the numbers and titles of the bulletins you wish to receive. Also available are copies of the helpful booklets, "Infant Care" and "Your Child from One to Six."

GS 1: Nutrition up-to-date, up to you.

G 5: Food for the family with young children.

G 13: Food for families with school children.

G 17: Food guide for older folks.

G 72: Nutritive value of foods.

G 74: Food and your weight.

G 85: Food for the young couple.

G 90: Conserving the nutritive values in foods.

L 424: Food for fitness . . . a daily food guide.

G 38: Buying your home sewing machine.

G 59: Simplified clothing construction.

G 107: Clothing repairs.

Something to ponder: Can our country continue fighting an extremely costly war and conquer the earth, the moon, and poverty at the same time?

CONGRESS, NOT THE PRESIDENT, SHOULD MAKE THE DECISIONS ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, ideally, Congress, not the President, should make the decisions on appropriations. Once the President has made his budget suggestions, if they are to be decreased, it should be the Congress that states where the decreases shall be. If these are to be increases, it should be the Congress that states where those increases shall be.

But it should be clearly held in mind that there exists a major point of distinction between appropriations and spending. Generally speaking, appropriation bills passed by the Congress, which create the authority to spend, relate to future fiscal years and future spending. There is thus a certain delay between the action of Congress and the effect on the actual spending of moneys. In addition, the congressional process is generally speaking a rather slow one. First, there are the matters of hearings in one body, then committee deliberations, then floor action, then the entire process is repeated in the other body and then possibly necessary compromise between the actions of the two Houses. Only after both bodies of the Congress have acted, and the President has signed the resulting bill, is congressional action really final or effective.

The combination of these two factors means that it is, as a practical matter, impossible for the Congress, acting alone, to have an immediate effect in cutting present spending. The administration, on the other hand, can reduce present spending almost overnight on the basis of proper Executive orders issued in such a manner as to call for immediate action by the various executive departments.

There has been a call by the President for immediate action by the Congress to increase Federal taxation. The Congress has countered by demanding that first there must be sizable cuts in Federal expenditures, and then consideration of the possible need for an income tax increase.

Thus, in one sense, the basic decisions for the Congress to make at this time are twofold. The first is whether action is really urgently called for. The second is whether Congress will insist that cuts precede any serious consideration of an income tax increase.

It is almost unanimously agreed that the fiscal position in which the Nation finds itself at the present time is extremely serious, calling for urgent action.

If the Congress decides, as I believe it should, that there should be definite action in the way of spending cuts before any serious consideration of an increase in income taxes, then we cannot wait for the Congress to move but must insist that the President make these spending cuts and make them immediately.

If one is willing to raise taxes before cutting spending, or if one does not believe that early action is urgently called for, then one can, in good conscience, vote against the proposal to insist that the President cut spending.

If, on the other hand, one believes, as I do, that almost immediate action is called for to stave off the threat of inflation and that spending cuts should precede any serious consideration of a Federal income tax increase, then one has no truly logical stand to take in this matter but to insist that a ceiling be placed on spending with orders to the President to take the necessary executive action immediately to see that such ceiling is enforced.

GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE ENTERPRISE: PARTNERS FOR JOB DEVELOPMENT IN THE CITIES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Michigan [Mrs. GRIFFITHS] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, last week, President Johnson proposed that Government and private enterprise once again cooperate in a new pilot program to bring jobs to the thousands of hard-core unemployed of our cities.

The plan is simple. First, encourage existing industry located in central city areas to expand operations and, thereby, create new, good paying jobs. Second, encourage new enterprises to locate in central cities and make new investments which would also create new jobs. Third, encourage large enterprises to join small business in the ghetto in a combined economic effort, again to increase jobs as well as business profits.

I stress the fact that these would be jobs that are necessary to the productive program.

Government's offer—clearly outlined by President Johnson in a memo to leading Government departments—is to utilize $40 million in allocated funds, plus Government surplus land, equipment, and other materials to make this test project work.

In my opinion, this is a first-class job development program. It aims at creating useful jobs in private enterprise for hard-core unemployed people.

The President has wisely delegated the major responsibility for the administration of this new program to the Department of Commerce and its able Secretary, Alexander B. Trowbridge. Secretary Trowbridge has already appointed a special representative—Mr. William E. Zisch—to oversee the entire program. It will be Mr. Zisch's prime responsibility to serve as a central focus for the interest expressed by industry in this project. And I must say that Mr. Zisch is admirably qualified for the position, since he is vice chairman and former president of the Aerojet General Corp., of Los Angeles. He knows how to administer a cooperative Government-industry program.

As the President said in his memo to all interested Cabinet officers, our Government stands ready to fulfill its responsibility for helping the unemployed get good jobs at decent wages. Private enterprise also understands its responsibility to promote the conditions which strengthen prosperity.

If there was ever an economic program which was advantageous to people, to business, and to the country as a whole, it is the President's test job development program for the cities.

I congratulate all those associated with it. I assure those who join in it that the Congress will be watching for the positive results we know will be forthcoming.

PROGRESSIVE LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM OF THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL WOMEN'S CLUBS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, October 15–21 this year will be observed as National Business Women's Week and will be highlighted by congresses of career women leaders at national, State, and local levels. This annual tribute has been sponsored by the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs of America—an organization which numbers among its members, some of the best, the finest citizens of our Nation. Numbered among them are those that constitute a part of that vast number of loyal American women who work for their native land unselfishly and with utmost devotion both in times of peace and in times of war. Constantly do they contribute their skills and devotedly do they give their talents to the growth and prosperity of every State of this Union. Also, numbered among them are the wives and mothers of courageous men now fighting for our survival against the tyrannical and aggressive forces of international communism on the battlefields of Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, this splendid and excellent organization of American women has presented to us and to the Nation a forward looking, progressive legislative program in which I am deeply and sincerely interested, and thinking that the other Members of this body will be similarly interested, under unanimous consent previously obtained, I insert that program in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The platform, embracing the program of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs is as follows:

NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE PLATFORM ADOPTED BY THE ANNUAL CONVENTION, JULY 23–27, 1967, NEW YORK CITY, N.Y.

LEGISLATIVE PURPOSES

To elevate standards for the employed woman, to promote her interests, to create a spirit of cooperation, to expand opportunities through industrial, scientific and vocational activities, to secure equal consideration under the law and to establish conditions which assure both men and women the fullest opportunity and reward for the development of their capacities to the maximum potential.

To consider the place and responsibility of the employed woman as a concerned citizen in the complex democratic society of the United States, and to strengthen the role of this nation in world affairs.

ACTION ITEMS

Item 1. Propose and support legislation to amend the Constitution of the United States to provide equality of rights under the law to men and women.

Item 2. Propose and support: (a) legislation in the field of employment which provides uniform laws and regulations for men and women as to working conditions, rates of pay, and equal employment opportunity; and (b) uniform legislation for men and women in the areas of taxation and retirement.

Item 3. Propose and support legislation to provide for uniform jury service and uniform qualifications in the selection of men and women to serve on grand or petit juries in any court.

POLICY ITEM

Support measures within the framework of the Constitution of the United States that promote peace and strengthen national security and make more effective the United Nations and such other international organizations of which the United States is a participant, without relinquishment of our basic freedoms.

WASHINGTON POST JOINS IN TRIBUTE TO EMILY AND PAUL DOUGLAS

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, reading the editorial page of the Washington Post of October 7, 1967, I was pleased and delighted to find the following editorial in tribute to Emily and Paul Douglas, the former brilliant Representative at large from the State of Illinois, and the former distinguished and beloved former Senator from Illinois, one of the outstanding wife-and-husband teams of the Nation, whose home is in the great Second District of Illinois:

PROPHET WITH HONOR

Although we are awkwardly late in saying so, we want a share in the tributes paid a week ago at Chicago State College to Paul and Emily Douglas. A building on the campus of that institution was named in their honor, and some 270 colleges, universities and learned societies were represented at a convocation acclaiming the Douglases for their distinguished contributions to the several communities of which they have long been members—the academic community, the City of Chicago, the State of Illinois and the American Republic.

There is a memorial to Paul Douglas in Washington, too. If it lacks brick-and-mortar substance, it is no less real on that account. It hovers incorporeally in the United States Senate, a goad to the consciences and capacities of those Senators who had acquaintance with the independence, integrity and drive of the professorial Marine from Illinois. He remains a force in the Senate. It is a pleasure to salute him.

THE FOOD STAMP ACT OF 1967—ANOTHER JOHNSON INITIATIVE FOR NEEDY AMERICANS

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, in a ceremony which has received too little public recognition, the President of the United States on September 27 signed into law the Food Stamp Act of 1967 at the White House.

This bold humanitarian program reflects the concern of this administration for the welfare of the people of America.

The food stamp program—which is now being expanded—bears President Johnson's imprint. It was first instituted on a trial basis 3 years ago. It has since been extended to 41 States. Today it is helping to feed 2 million Americans. The new bill authorizes more than $400 million to be used to help feed needy families over the next 2 years.

This program means help and health for many people who otherwise would not be able to afford proper food.

It means better diets for many hungry children.

It means new outlets for their production for American farmers.

It means that President Johnson and the Nation accept the philosophy that poverty of the body and poverty of the mind can and will be overcome in America.

I include at this point in the RECORD the remarks of President Johnson as he signed the Food Stamp Act at the White House on September 27:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT UPON SIGNING THE FOOD STAMP ACT, SEPTEMBER 27, 1967

Good morning ladies and gentlemen, Senator Aiken, Senator Byrd, Senator Ellender, Senator Boggs, Chairman Poage, Congresswoman Sullivan, Congressman Purcell, and the other members of the House and Senate who I did not get recorded here:

I welcome one and all of you for the good work that you have done. I think we all share the common view that we want no American in this country to ever go hungry. We believe that we have the knowledge, the compassion, and the resources to banish hunger and to do away with malnutrition, if we will only apply those resources and those energies.

The bill that I have asked you to be here with me when I sign puts some of that abundance into the reach of the people of America.

Under the Food Stamp Program a low-income family can take what little money it has for food and purchase food stamps. At the neighborhood grocery these are worth more than they cost. The difference is made up by the Federal Government.

Food Stamps are not the only weapon in the assault on hunger. The Food Stamp Act was passed three years ago. In that time, the program has expanded from 43 pilot areas in 23 States to 838 areas in 41 States. Today it is helping to feed nearly 2 million needy Americans. This extension will enable us to do still more.

We have nearly 20 million school children—more than ever before—receiving low cost or free meals under the School Lunch Program today is in its 21st year.

More than 100,000 children have a better chance to learn because they began their day with a decent breakfast because of the Child Nutrition Act that we passed in 1966.

Three-million needy Americans in family units are receiving better diets in the Commodity Donation Program of the Department of Agriculture.

As I sign this Act, I am asking the Secretary to help America's 300 poorest counties which do not now have food assistance to start a Community Distribution Program to be available for the low-income families.

We are all mindful that the poor need more than food. The causes of poverty are complex. The answers to poverty are very difficult. The escape from poverty is not going to come soon, but we must all continue to try the best way that we can to give all that we can to banish poverty from our land.

Poverty's cruelest wound is hunger. The Act that we will sign today, I think, will do some little something to relieve some of that hunger.

To those men and women in the House and Senate who have had the vision to help us prepare this bill by the long drawn out hearings and the days in conference, and the debates on the floor, we owe them all a debt of gratitude which I want to acknowledge on behalf of the American people.

This will help our poor. This will help our farmers. And even though this is a bipartisan group, I hope it will help our Congress.

"I AM IN THE RIGHT PLACE AT THE RIGHT TIME"—LT. THOMAS F. REGAN

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a letter from Lt. Thomas F. Regan.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, last week a requiem mass was offered in St. Anthony's Church, Falls Church, Va., for 1st Lt. Thomas F. Regan, 23, of 3812 Foxwood Nook, Falls Church, who died in Vietnam on September 18, 1967. As a member of the same parish and as an acquaintance of his family, Lieutenant Regan's heroic death brought Vietnam closer home.

About a month after Lieutenant Regan's arrival in Vietnam, he wrote to his parents, Mr. and Mrs. John M. Regan. He wanted them to know the reasons he volunteered for service in Vietnam.

> If anything happens to me, I want you to know that I am over here voluntarily—

He wrote—

> I want to be here and I know exactly why I want to be here.

Mr. and Mrs. Regan have made the letter from their son available to the press and it was featured in Sunday's Washington Post.

I think every American should read it.

Under unanimous consent, I herewith submit it for inclusion in the RECORD:

I AM IN THE RIGHT PLACE AT THE RIGHT TIME

(NOTE.—The accompanying letter was written by 1st Lt. Thomas F. Regan, 23, of 3812 Foxwood Nook, Falls Church, about a month after he arrived in Vietnam last May. On Sept. 18 he was drowned when he and seven other Marines were caught in the swollen Camlo River. He died trying to help the others, according to a letter from his commanding officer to his parents, Mr. and Mrs. John M. Regan.

(Lt. Regan was a graduate of the Marine Platoon Leader Training Program at Quantico and served as a forward artillery observer. He also was a sociology graduate of Wheeling (W. Va.) College in June, 1966, and had worked for several summers with retarded children.

(His brother Michael, 26, served ten months in Vietnam as an Army first lieutenant. He also leaves a 19-year-old sister, Mary. His father is a lawyer in the General Counsel's Office of the General Services Administration.)

DEAR FAMILY: Another short letter to let you know that everything is O.K. with me.

In a couple of days we are going out on a company-size operation where we have been before. We made no contact in this particular area before but hope to have better luck this time. Even if we don't find anything, we are still making it difficult for the NVAs to mass together, and this is one of the main reasons why they aren't making any great military progress (or any other, that matter).

In one section of The Post that you sent me, there was an article which said that this war may be unwinnable. This is true of any war if you let it be. I am not too sure of the feelings of the people in the States, but there is no doubt in my mind—and I think the same applies to Ho Chi Minh—that we are winning.

Our progress is slow but positive. The enemy's is sliding and negative. To be more specific, we are beating them clearly militarily and, most important, we are winning the people. The NVAs are losing this most important part of the war. Proof of this is their resort to violence and terror to control the people. This can do nothing but alienate the people.

In this part of the war, our progress is very slow because we just don't have the troops to protect all the people and chase after the NVA. But gradually we are winning this because we can give the people a better way of life—one free of the fear of having the village leaders killed, the males impressed into servitude and an unfair amount of their rice taken away.

This "revolution" is not a popular one with the South Vietnamese. Many have been forced into it. Don't be fooled for a minute by those who say we are interfering with the Vietnamese people's right to self-determination. We are interfering with a minority's option to do this, but that same minority is interfering with the majority's right not to choose a life offered by Ho.

The only thing I am really worried about is the fact that some people are becoming annoyed at our slow progress and that American support for this effort may dwindle as time goes on. I think that this is Ho Chi Minh's big hope. Is our country suddenly going to find the price too high to pay for the ideal that we pledged to support before it started actually affecting us?

If anyone ever asks you why Americans should fight over here when it's not really affecting America, tell them that our country pledged its support to the cause of a free South Vietnamese people. This was given the approval of Congress, the representatives of the people. If the people didn't want this to happen, they could have said so then. It's easier to say "Why let Americans die over there now?" than it was to say then, "No, we won't pledge American support for the Vietnamese people because it may cost us too much."

I don't mind honest protest by individuals with unselfish motives, but the selfishness expressed in a lot of newspapers and magazines by "respectable" people bothers me. It can poison the minds of others.

I know that there is nothing black or white that can really be said about this, but we should keep in mind that this is supposed to be for the Vietnamese people. My reason for being here is not to protect America from some future war because the rest of the world has fallen to communism. I have no great fear of this. My reason for being here is so the Vietnamese people can live with freedom—the kind we have in America.

If anything should happen to me, I want you to know that I am over here voluntarily. I want to be here and I know exactly why I want to be here. I feel that it would not be a waste or tragedy if anything happened to me.

I think that this cause is as worthy as any that we have fought for. We knew that Hitler was wrong and was butchering the Jews but we didn't enter World War II until we got hit at Pearl Harbor—until it threatened us. Over here, we have not that much to gain for ourselves but we can do so much for the Vietnamese.

I don't particularly enjoy my work here, but neither does the guy who collects trash in the morning. Both jobs are necessary and the trashman can take pride in his job as I do in mine.

I guess I got a little carried away in telling you why I am here and my views about this. I didn't want there to be any doubt in your mind.

I know that from reading the papers and listening to the radio and watching TV, you can get very confused about this war because so many different things are said and because a lot of it doesn't seem to tie in together. I don't expect this letter to help any of you to understand all the different things said about this war but I hope it gives you as clear a picture as possible of why I am here.

If anyone asks you about why I am here or tries to tell you that I just happened to be in the wrong place at the wrong time and it's all very unfortunate, show them this letter and tell them that I think I am in the right place at the right time and want to be here.

Well, so long for now, and pray that I do my best.

Love,

Tom.

FIRST LADY ADDRESSES WILLIAMS COLLEGE

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Conte] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, during this past weekend we in western Massachusetts were highly honored and privileged to have as our guest the Nation's First Lady, Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson. The warmth and graciousness of Mrs. Johnson are so striking and so natural that no one can fail to be overwhelmed by her; and this was just the reaction which occurred throughout my congressional district.

Everyone is aware of Mrs. Johnson's outstanding efforts on behalf of beautification, and of conservation of our natural resources. She has done more than anyone else in this country to bring these basic but vital matters to the forefront of public awareness.

In my First Congressional District of Massachusetts, Mrs. Johnson's magnificent programs are especially meaningful and appreciated. For we are fortunate enough to be blessed with landscape and scenery and natural beauty that cannot be matched anywhere in the United States. At no time, furthermore, can this splendor be more vividly observed than during the present fall season with the appearance of nature's autumn leaves.

It was truly fitting, therefore, for Williams College at Williamstown, Mass., to confer an honorary degree upon Mrs. Johnson at its fall convocation this past Sunday in recognition of her beautification efforts.

The First Lady, in accepting her honorary degree, addressed the fall convocation about the environmental crisis that we now face. Her critical message was one that should be heard not just by those who gathered at Williamstown but by everyone in this land. I have, therefore, obtained unanimous consent to have her speech inserted at this point in the Congressional Record.

Along with this speech, I am also inserting in the Record an excellent editorial concerning Mrs. Johnson's visit which appeared in the North Adams Transcript.

I do not want to go into an in-depth discussion at this time concerning the unfortunate incidents which occurred during the ceremonies at Williams. I would like to make clear, however, my firm belief that under no circumstances can it ever be considered to be proper to voice objections to the policies of the President of the United States by insulting and being rude to the First Lady of this Nation. I am in full agreement with the sentiments expressed by the editorial which follows Mrs. Johnson's speech in the Record.

Remarks of Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson at Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.

President Sawyer, friends, I will always treasure this degree that you have given me. It is thrilling to stand among you today and salute the Center for Environmental Studies and Planning whose promise is as fresh as tomorrow. For a college of this calibre to take such a step is an event which I applaud with all my heart.

It does not come too soon. Almost everyone agrees that we have reached an environmental crisis. And symptoms of the crisis abound—polluted streams, industrial slums, ghettos, littered roads.

But we should remember, perhaps, that our word "crisis" comes from the Greek word for *decision*. A time of difficulty calls for decisions—and this time calls on us to choose:

between apathy and action in cities;

between ugliness and beauty in the environment;

between escape and involvement for the individual.

We are talking about more than "beautification". We are talking, really, about one of the most fateful questions of the time: whether the physical setting of American life will be pleasant or squalid.

If that question is not given a lively and enlightened answer, all our other efforts could be in vain.

Everything I read and see convinces me the Nation is geared for action to attack the problems that abound.

A front page story in the Wall Street Journal reports that amenity of towns is a crucial factor in deciding where factories locate. The magazines you pick are apt to have an ad showing a trout rising from crystal clear waters, with the caption, "This water could come out of your town's treatment plant."

The morning newspaper brings more and more cartoons poking fun at billboards, tree cutters, and yes, sometimes tree planters. Even our laughter shows our awareness.

The parade of mayors and city planners through Washington reveals they are scouting not only for funds, but for style and direction for their communities.

The question in America now is, whether the skill and talent and know-how is rising to fulfill the desire. We have learned that we cannot protect and enhance the beauty of this Nation solely through federal action, or just through citizens groups, or simply through academic institutions. All of these are necessary, plus a strong national will. Today, the crying need is for a partnership of thinking, planning, and action on the port of all groups.

Enhancement of our natural beauty requires and deserves more than a sentimental urge, important though it is. It calls for hard analysis, imaginative planning, political action—hard day-to-day efforts to translate our dreams into realities.

If there is to be a meeting of minds between the professor and the mayor, between the architect and the budget officer, between the scientist and the artist, what better place than here, "far from the maddening crowds," where people can think through their long-range visions?

Williams College can become the wellspring of fresh solutions to the problems of our environment. One alert must be sounded, however, and that is, the need for constantly relating theory to practice, concept to application. There is no time for annotated studies to gather dust on the library shelves. The other day, I read that while 11,000 city planning positions must be filled in the next five years, planning schools are producing only 450 graduates a year.

This morning, as I flew out of the city and over these magnificent Berkshires, their foliage reaching like torches to the sky, my mind turned back over the history of how settlements evolved in our country, how we first wrested a beachhead on the Atlantic shores; later drove deep into the frontier with forts of protection; how patterns of settlement enlarged as people and goods swept westward. Centers of commerce in the eighteenth century became industrial beehives in the nineteenth.

Today, our minds throb with the vocabulary of megalopolis, the metropolitan agglomeration, with its core city, its inner freeway, its outer beltway, and its mile upon mile of suburban fringe. If the mass volume of the city shocks us, it can also spur us to action. How strange that after 5,000 years of building cities, we should at last rediscover the most obvious purpose of all—which the Athenians knew so well—the creation of a pleasant place to live.

There are more than 300 new towns in various stages of planning or development in the United States, and there are many rural regions, like this one in Berkshire County, searching for a harmonious growth pattern.

The President has recently announced that a 350-acre site in the Nation's Capital, no longer needed as a training school for boys, will become a model inner city community. There will be a welcome opportunity for creative new ideas about city living to show their merit.

I hope these new opportunities for study and application will be high on your agenda. Because the Nation needs thoughtful work that will approach the 20th Century man-and-nature equation as a science, and—hopefully, conclude it as an art.

I envy those of you who will be part of this Center. I hope that you will feed out to the Nation new thought, new ways for 350 million people to live according to their aspirations.

Each of you students will return to your home in Houston and Helena and Haverhill. Once more I want to repeat that what I hope you will do is to take all you have learned and put it to work at home where in the coming decades these problems will be attacked with varying degrees of skill, and dedication, and know-how, and also—in varying degrees—solved!

[From the North Adams Transcript, Oct. 6, 1967]

Welcome, Mrs. Johnson

The conservation of the nation's natural resources and the beautification of the countryside and the cities, to halt the spreading ugliness that is robbing the land of a priceless possession, are programs that deserve the whole-hearted support of every American.

Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson should be commended for the leadership she has assumed in trying to arouse the nation to the need for such projects.

And Williams College should be applauded for its decision to confer an honorary degree upon the First Lady at the annual Fall Convocation on Sunday—and should feel honored itself that Mrs. Johnson has consented to take time from what must be a busy schedule to come to Williamstown to receive the degree.

At the same time, it is deplorable that some members of the Williams faculty should be guilty of such atrociously bad manners in one case and such poor judgment in the other as to mar her visit.

Prof. Frederick L. Schuman's letter dissassociating himself from the convocation can be described as ridiculous at best, and crude to the point of being appalling at worst.

The suggestion that the convocation "is clearly a glorification of the Johnson administration" is absurd and defies all logic. Mrs. Johnson is not being honored at Williams because, as Prof. Schuman said, she symbolizes the Johnson administration and its policy in Vietnam. She has been chosen for the honorary degree in recognition of her placing her prestige as First Lady in the forefront of the beautification program that some day might bring rich rewards to this nation.

And when Prof. Schuman seized upon the occasion of Mrs. Johnson's visit to call her husband names, he forfeited any claim to serious attention.

As for the three faculty members who have drafted a letter that they propose to present privately to Mrs. Johnson expressing their opposition to the Vietnam war, their motives may be reasonable enough but their judgment is questionable.

There are ample means available and many channels open for informing the President how people feel about the Vietnam war. Using the occasion of his wife's visit to a college campus for a purpose that has nothing whatever to do with the war—or with administration policy, for that matter—is not one of them.

They could send, or take, their protest to Washington, and would have a perfect right to do so. But to take advantage of Mrs. Johnson's presence at Williams for an entirely unrelated purpose to dramatize their opposition, however, mildly, is misguided zeal.

Mrs. Johnson has said "An unforgettable thing is to go to New England in the autumn and fly over those gold and crimson and scarlet hills and valleys, dotted with lakes and enough green in it to serve as a foil."

It is that sort of thing that Mrs. Johnson is hoping to preserve by awakening people to the need for the beautification and conservation program. That is why she is being honored Sunday at Williams. Most of those at Williams and in the Northern Berkshire area will accord her a gracious welcome.

NATIONAL NEWSPAPER WEEK

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Nelsen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, in a special editorial, Alan C. McIntosh, of the Rock County, Minn., Star-Herald, calls National Newspaper Week "one more milestone in the never-ending battle between those who would suppress the truth and the newspapers." Mr. McIntoch brings home in a magnificent way the many obligations citizens owe to the courageous free press of America, and it is a pleasure to introduce his editorial for the Record as we observe National Newspaper Week, October 8–14.

Freedom . . . Paradise Lost

(By Alan C. McIntosh)

For several years we had a small picture of a newspaper printed on the envelopes in which we sent out the Star-Heralds to out-of-town subscribers.

A picture of a newspaper which bore these words as the headline: "Heritage of Truth, Frontier of Freedom"; "A Free Press Is Essential to an Informed People."

Eventually an overzealous postal department employe, who knew his Postal Laws and Regulations book better than his Bible, noticed one of our envelopes.

It wasn't long till we received an order to cease and desist using that picture and slogan . . . a violation of the "rules".

The fact that we had just received an order of 24,000 of these envelopes didn't make a bit of difference to the bureaucrat. It looked like we were stuck.

However, a cooler, wiser, head higher up realized the waste. He ruled that we could use up our supply of envelopes if we would deface that offending cut. So we "defaced" 24,000 envelopes.

Silly? Yes, But not half as silly and not one-hundredth as frightening as some of the things that happen just because people resent newspapers probing for the truth and the facts.

This is National Newspaper Week. It's one more milestone in the never-ending battle between those who would suppress the truth and the newspapers.

It is hard to believe the workings of the minds of the "Little Caesars" who believe they, and they only, should have the right to say what is "news".

For instance—the public officials high up in the Pentagon who put a rigid "classified" taboo on the publication of the amount of peanut butter purchases by our armed forces.

The genius figured that if our potential enemy ever found out how much peanut butter we were buying he could figure out how many men we had in our armed forces. Ridiculous when you remember that while they were clamping down on peanut butter figures the same Pentagon was releasing monthly the total numbers of our men in the armed forces.

The passion for secrecy never dies.

Write the Department of Defense and ask if it is true or false that General Custer had a feminine companion with him at the Battle of the Big Horn. See what kind of an answer you get.

Few people realize it, but our would-be "Little Caesars" still keep a vast amount of Civil War information as "classified".

An American author had done a biography on a Civil War General. He wanted some additional facts and information to up-date his book. He asked for that information from the Pentagon and found that it was still, after 100 years, withheld from the public as being "classified."

These things could be laughable if they weren't so tragic.

But they are symptomatic of the never-ending battle that has to be waged against those who would muzzle America's free newspapers.

Too many people know too little about what "Freedom of the Press" really means. They think it must mean some extra privilege for newspapers only.

"Freedom of the Press" in National Newspaper Week, and every other week, means that your newspaper is your "stand in" in the protection of the freedoms guaranteed to you by our Constitution.

Freedom of the Press belongs to the citizenry . . . *not* to the newspapers or publishers. We are merely the citizenry's trustees in *protecting* these precious freedoms.

It is left for the newspaperman to walk the lonely road. Long ago, when he took the vows of journalism, he renounced any dream of being his community's most beloved citizen. He knows that if he ever won that title he would have failed as a newspaperman. He's damned if he does and damned if he doesn't . . . but because he is a newspaperman, he is willing to pay the price in order to fulfill his obligation to print the truth—and the news.

Not all the "bad guys" ride "black horses." They aren't so esay to identify. The fellow who wants an item left out may be the man who you thought was your best friend. But the printing of that story may cost you his friendship.

To print a story about controversial events or write a hard hitting editorial may cost a newspaper heavily in revenue.

The public official who chafes visibly and audibly because the press shows up at a meeting is only typical of the thousands of "Little Caesars" who have a contempt for the ability of John Q. Citizen, to think for himself. They think that "they" should decide what should be called news. There are so many public officials today who can't understand why the press won't willingly and amiably agree to "managed news" instead of painfully digging for the facts—and the truth.

We have seen the lights of freedom wink out in many countries. And, as soon as the lights went out, the next step was to muzzle the press. Any dictator or would-be dictator fears one newspaper reporter's typewriter more than he does a machine-gun company.

What the "Little Caesars" in America forget, and where they make their fatal mistake, is their under-estimation of Mr. and Mrs. John Q. Public. They forget that Americans are not horses.

A horse has to be blindfolded in order that he can be led from a burning stable to safety.

Americans don't like blindfolds and they don't like people who try to blindfold them. Horses panic in the face of danger. An American panics only when he can't see what is ahead of him. He can face up to any disaster or meet any blood chilling challenge if he knows the truth and the facts.

As we observe National Newspaper Week, let us remember that "Freedom of the Press" doesn't mean special privilege for newspapers.

It is an obligation they gladly accept and carry—an obligation to help keep America free.

GOVERNOR LeVANDER DESCRIBES ORGANIZATIONAL STREAMLINING IN MINNESOTA

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Nelsen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Harold LeVander, Governor of the State of Minnesota, recently addressed the Midwestern Governor's Conference on various organizational ways our State is moving to meet urban and local problems.

In order to meet these urgent problems, the Governor points out:

> We cannot neglect the equally pressing problem of getting State Government organized and equipped to better assume its urban responsibilities.

I know those with responsibility for more effective government will find Minnesota's progress report helpful. I am, therefore, pleased to place in the Record the complete text of Governor LeVander's address at this point in my remarks:

Gov. Harold LeVander, Midwestern Governor's Conference Session on Urban Development, August 29, 1967

Much has been said at this conference about the need for more jobs for the disadvantaged calling for a full spectrum of opportunity programs for job training and the creation of job opportunities, both by private enterprise and public incentives. I would agree that these problems must be faced today, but we cannot neglect the equally pressing problem of getting state government organized and equipped to better assume its urban responsibilities.

State government is the source of local government authority, organization and finances. It is the administrator of most social programs and conducts many physical development activities, such as highways and open space. Because of these factors, state government is in the key strategic position to make our governmental system more workable and more able to deal with problems comprehensively. The Federal Government, basically, can only give incentives to State and local government to accomplish national goals, whereas State government has the responsibility and authority to change the structure and ground rules directly to make the system work better, and to unify and rationalize the roles of each unit of government.

I am pleased to report that in Minnesota the Governor has been given sweeping authority and responsibility for a frontal attack upon our urban development problems as a result of united action by the legislature and local government officials.

A Twin Cities metropolitan council, appointed by the Governor, has been created by the legislature, with the chief executive serving at the pleasure of the Governor. This council has the responsibility of coordinating metropolitan development through the employment of carefully selected powers to suspend projects and plans of special districts conducting such region-shaping programs as sewage systems, parks, and airports—with mediation powers between municipalities in regard to local government actions of areawide concern, and with review powers on Federal programs. Traditional metropolitan planning is superseded with a broad charge to search deeply into the social, economic and physical development problems and opportunities of the region.

The State legislature has also given the Governor direct responsibility for comprehensive State planning and the harmonizing of the plans and programs of State agencies with local and regional government. This charge gives the Governor substantial authority to coordinate social programs and region-shaping State action.

The legislature has also created, under the Governor's direction within the State planning agency, an office of local and urban affairs to help coordinate State and local programs, to give technical assistance to local government, to study and conduct research into local and urban problems, to analyze municipal boundaries, and to assist local governments in utilizing State and Federal aid programs.

In corollary action, the legislature, at my request:

Strengthened the water and air pollution control agency and placed it under the direct supervision of the Governor;

Consolidated fragmented civil rights agencies into a strong department of human relations responsible to the Governor;

Expanded fair housing laws to privately financed dwellings;

Established mandatory training for law enforcement officers in local government; and

Established a metropolitan transit commission, with the chairman responsible to the Governor.

Through coordinated application of these tools we will try to bring order and advancement of individual opportunity in the urban scene.

It is obvious that fragmented programs and overlapping government is not solving the problems of urban America. State action is essential if we are to meet today's problems.

We, in Minnesota, are acting.

IS THE JOHNSON ADMINISTRATION PLANNING TO USE NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN VIETNAM?

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Hosmer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the Members of the Congress and the public I have taken the necessary action to obtain unanimous consent for the reproduction below of my communication of this date to the House Republican conference discussing the question "Is the Johnson administration planning to use nuclear weapons in Vietnam?"

October 9, 1967.

From: Representative Craig Hosmer, Chairman, Conference Committee on Nuclear Affairs.

To: House Republican Conference.

Subject: Is the Johnson administration planning to use nuclear weapons in Vietnam?

During the 1964 Presidential campaign vast charges of atomic irresponsibility were leveled against Candidate Barry Goldwater. Johnson Administration campaigners villified him as a "Nuclear Nut" for views which basically: (1) endorsed development of "clean" neutron bombs; (2) envisaged an ABM defense system; and, (3) did not reject the possibility of using atomic land mines for defense against invasions of allied territory.

Subsequently the Johnson Administration has not denied that our weapons laboratories are working on the neutron bomb problem. Its deployment of an ABM system recently was announced by Secretary McNamara with the assertion that it is not a "provocative" move. It is considering with apparent favor the matter of nuclear land mines.

Just a few days ago, at the latest NATO nuclear planning meeting in Ankara, Turkish Defense Minister Ahmet Popaloglu suggested atomic mines be seeded along Turkey's frontier with the Soviet Union. The idea is to create an atomic barrier along the Turkish-Soviet boundary to thwart Soviet invasion. On his return from the meeting last Monday news dispatches quoted Mr. McNamara as stating, regarding the Popaloglu proposal:

"Of course, that could not be considered provocative because these atomic demolition charges are placed in the ground—under the ground along the border—and could be used only for defense and not for offensive purposes."

So, the Johnson Administration nuclear attitudes have switched to the Goldwater position on each of its three facets. In context of the Administration's previous violent objections, great uncertainty is aroused as to just what its current thinking is on the application of these attitudes to specific defense problems of deep and primary public concern.

For instance: Is the Johnson Administration planning to use nuclear weapons in Viet Nam? If it is, or if it is not, much concerns the Nation and the Administration ought to say something about it.

If nuclear land mines are not deemed provocative to the Soviets right on their own border with Turkey, why should they be provocative along the Demilitarized Zone of Viet Nam through which North Vietnamese are actually invading at such a high cost to U.S. Marine Corps defenders? If the mines are deemed effective against potential Soviet invaders, why should they not be deemed equally effective against actual North Vietnamese invaders? The Administration's moves and pronouncements raise these questions and they ought to be answered one way or the other.

Nuclear land mines below the DMZ stretching all along it might be buried deep enough to trap fission products beneath the surface and avoid radiological hazards. Triggering the explosives might be left to the invaders by devices which their presence activates—so that the decision to fire the nuclear devices—and the responsibility therefor—would rest on them, not us. They would not be fired if the North refrained from hostile invasion. They would be fired if it failed to refrain. By the process, the objective of clearing an exposed area just below the DMZ would be accomplished quickly and at modest monetary cost.

Is this the next logical step in Johnson Administration's shifting nuclear attitudes and changing nuclear applications?

What has evolved from 1964 to date gives reason to believe so. Thus it also gives reason for the Administration to speak out at an appropriate time consistent with military planning and security.

RADIOACTIVE WASTE DISPOSAL

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Hosmer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, a number of articles have been written in the past year or so which tend to sensationalize certain aspects of radioactive waste disposal. A great deal of effort has gone into research and development on safe methods for handling such wastes, and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has spent hundreds of hours in hearings on this subject. The progress has been impressive, and the record of safety in the atomic energy industry is a remarkably good one.

This is not to say that there is no potential danger. Members of the joint committee, of which I am ranking minority member, are very aware of this potential danger. This is why we have strongly supported research and development work in this field. The joint committee considers it extremely important to maintain the emphasis on safety in the nuclear industry, so that the outstanding record of this industry may continue.

In order to place the radioactive waste disposal picture in proper perspective, I personally prepared and am sending a response to a series of critical articles written by Mr. Ralph de Toledano. I think the information I provided him helps to focus on the pertinent facts. If there is no objection, I would like to have my letter to Mr. De Toledano included in the Record.

Congress of the United States,
Joint Committee on Atomic Energy,
Washington, D.C., October 5, 1967.

Mr. Ralph de Toledano,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Ralph: Your letter of September 18 transmitting three more articles on the AEC requested some "specifics." I have some now, and would have written sooner, but I've been away from my desk about 10 days.

I think it may be appropriate to start with your earlier article entitled: "The AEC's Gift to America: Radioactive Waste." Some of the questions you raise therein are similar to questions in your three most recent articles. Since the publication of your earlier article, the Joint Committee staff has been pulling together some material intended to help clarify the record. Six specific items are covered in some depth in attachment 1, and are keyed to quotes from your earlier article.

I would like to treat the first item directly, to wit, your comment that ". . . *Americans are being led down the garden path to national radioactive poisoning.*"

Occasionally we hear from interested citizens who are highly critical of the nuclear waste handling procedures in this country. Such individuals sometimes accuse the Atomic Energy Commission and the nuclear industry of withholding the facts. To the contrary, it appears that usually these individuals have not taken the trouble to learn the facts from the great quantity of information dealing with this subject which is in the public record.

The extensive public record on this subject includes:

(1) The comprehensive hearings by the JCAE in 1959, reported in 5 volumes, 3142 pages, which have been updated in subsequent hearings since then (see attachment 1; Bibliography of JCAE waste disposal hearings).

(2) The detailed regulatory proceedings on each licensed power reactor, available in the Commission's Public Document Room.

(3) The extensive reports on the results of environmental studies in the vicinity of AEC-owned plants and laboratories which have been issued by the AEC and the Public Health Service.

(4) A great deal of other information available to the public in the form of technical articles and speeches. See item 6, attachment 2, for some examples.

If you are looking for assessments of the radioactive waste question which have been made outside the AEC, I can mention at least three.

A. The National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council Publication 1400, "Waste Management and Control" (1966), summarizes radioactivity control in these words on page 199:

"Radioactive wastes are a potential source of ground pollution. However, they are not thought to constitute a problem requiring new abatement studies at the present time. The quantity of wastes is small and the quality of disposal is high. A variety of special techniques is used to confine the wastes and keep them out of circulating ground water for geologic periods of time. Wastes from nuclear power generation are certain to increase in future years, but disposal of these, using existing techniques, does not appear to present a serious problem."

B. In a report to the Secretary of HEW, the Task Force on Environmental Health and Related Problems submitted in June 1967 its recommendations under the title: "A Strategy for A Livable Environment." From hundreds of possible goals, the Task Force selected 10 that are worthy of high priority. One of these, Goal No. 8, has to do with radiation. The bulk of the Task Force's concern appears to be related to the need for refining standards governing the public's exposure to dental and medical X-rays, a subject which I am equally certain will continue to get attention and action. A general reference in the report to adequate safeguards to protect against any hazards arising out of new applications of nuclear power and nuclear radiations should be interpreted as a proper acknowledgement that the safeguards experts, the health physicists and the ecologists must continue to do their homework. We generally accept a responsibility to continue doing our homework as we progress in any area. There is no indication, however, that the safeguards homework in this area is lagging to the extent that all progress in nuclear developments should stop while we catch up on the homework.

C. The report of the Environmental Pollution Panel of the President's Science Advisory Committee, "Restoring the Quality of Our Environment," published by the White House in November 1965, contains 22 pages of recommendations. No recommendation mentions radioactivity. Conversely, on page 14, in a discussion of varying degrees of Federal authority to act on pollution, the report states "With some pollutants such as radionuclines, extreme caution is exercised to assure that unwanted effects in the environment will be prevented."

I could comment further on the extent to which the AEC and industry go to make such information available to the public, but item 6 in attachment 2 covers that pretty well.

On your three recent articles, I can only hit some of the highlights, and try to provide some detail later. You cover a great many issues in several broad strokes of your pen.

In the first place, you must be aware that the Joint Committee has never touted nuclear energy as the panacea for all our problems. But anyone entertaining the thought that it doesn't play a vital role in the near future has not examined the energy needs of this nation, or the world. We will soon need to exploit all sources of energy to meet our growing requirements. Our energy utilization is now doubling every 10 years or less. Note the confirmation of the need for nuclear power in the comprehensive report to the President in 1964—"Energy R & D & National Progress."

Similarly, perspective on radiological hazards can only be gained by careful comparison with progress in other areas toward meeting man's requirements for survival. Certainly radioactivity is dangerous if improperly handled, but do I need to mention countless other necessities of our civilization which are similarly dangerous—when handled improperly? There is no basis for perpetuating an unreasoning fear of radiation. One of the reasons we are spending a goodly sum on R&D is to make sure we know how to handle it properly. We are learning how and the record of safety is a remarkably good one.

You want specifics, and rightly so. But there are many general principles that cannot be ignored. For instance, in drawing comparisons between areas having numerous variables, the right parameters have to be compared. Thus, when one talks of the money going into nuclear development now, it means less to compare that amount of money with another item in the budget than it does to talk of the ultimate return on the investment.

For nuclear power it is countless billions of dollars in return to the taxpayers in the form of reduced power rates—or power rates which have remained stable rather than being boosted.

Similarly, if one talks about 5 million gallons of waste, one should know that a large percentage of the 5 million gallons represents harmless diluents which are added to the small percentage of radioactive material to bring down the radioactivity of the entire volume to permissible harmless levels. Put another way, did the dumping result in exceeding the permissible tolerance levels? There *is* a big difference between high level waste and low level waste, in any kind of waste category you wish to discuss.

Similarly, we all know about the impropriety of quoting someone out of context. Dr. Kavanagh's quote that the AEC is still "looking for a permanent method of disposal" for high level waste, doesn't mean there isn't a method. It means that investigations are still under way to find the safest, most economical method. Read references V and VI (attachment 2) if you wish consolation or confirmation on this.

Congressman Holifield is often quoted out of context, perhaps because he has the courage to enter into debate on so many controversial subjects. But to quote him in connection with a reference to the uranium miner deaths as saying merely "Maudlin sentimentality," is grossly unfair. Facts were being debated, and lacking facts the hearing witness did retreat in the fashion implied.

While on the subject of the uranium miner hearings, I will only say that the complete record will be published shortly. Anyone who reviews it carefully can sort out the facts. The original death statistics I believe were erroneous. I dare say Mr. Boyle's prediction of 6,000 is far off the target. I could go to great length trying to bring the hazards of the overall mining industry as well as other industries into perspective for you, but the hearings record will serve that purpose. For perspective, note the attached article—the most recent of many such articles to cross my desk—read the high rate of cancer noted among smokers in the asbestos industry.

On the closing down of reactors, this was normal and to be expected. There have been a few premature entries into the reactor construction phase. It was necessary to build them to determine technology and economics. As we have gained this experience and information the tendency in that direction has disappeared. Not all that investment was lost by any means. But again the enormity of the undertaking has to be considered along with the potential return on the investment. Trial and error methodology—except when safety is involved—is a necessary and accepted part of the development process.

You have to recall that some years back there were a number of attractive reactor concepts, on paper. The only way to really find out their relative promise was to perform reactor experiments. This kind of thing can't be done in a laboratory. So the reactors you refer to were really experiments from which we have learned a great deal. We knew it was a horse race between several reactor concepts, but it was a race that had to be run and it had its payoff. Among the many possible choices of materials, coolants and fuels, we now know pretty well how they compare in terms of performance, safety and economics. We still have a ways to go, but the first generation of power producers has come into the foreground in the form of the boiling water and pressurized water reactors. We still have a good bit to learn on the comparative standings among the advanced converters, including whether we really need them, or can we jump directly to the breeders?

I will endeavor to get some details for you on any substantive questions in your three most recent articles you may specify. I would hope that you might wish to give your readers a balanced outlook on emerging peaceful nuclear technologies which are destined by necessity to play a very large role in satisfying man's ever-increasing demands for energy.

Sincerely,

CRAIG HOSMER,
Member of Congress.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

(Industrial radioactive waste disposal hearings before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and Special Subcommittee on Radiation)

I. 1959—"Hearings on Industrial Radioactive Waste Disposal" (Subcommittee on Radiation, Jan. 28–30, Feb. 2–3).

Vol. 1: Origin and nature of wastes evolved from nuclear energy activities, and operations to manage these wastes at AEC and other installations. (986 p)

Vol. 2: Treatment and Disposal of low and intermediate wastes to atmosphere, surface waterways, and the ground. (837 p)

Vol. 3: Handling, treatment and proposed ultimate disposal of high level wastes; future estimates and economics of disposal. (685 p)

Vol. 4: Activities of Federal and State agencies in effluent control; interagency relationships and international aspects. (549 p)

Vol. 5: July 29, 1959; disposal of low level wastes into ocean. (85 p)

II. 1963—"202" Hearings: "Development, Growth, and State of the Atomic Energy Industry": updating all matters related to waste disposal. (41 pages of 1,042 pages in 2 Vols.)

III. 1959–1957—Virtually all of the annual authorization hearings and "202" hearings have elicited testimony and documentation for the record which contributed to the continual up-dating of the 1959 special hearings which still constitute the bible on the subject of radioactive waste disposal.

IV. 1959–1967—Special subjects, such as the mill tailings problem and related concerns over stream pollution, radon gas and blowing dust; the Hanford stream pollution; question; and cancer incidence in uranium miners; are all documented by voluminous JCAE files of correspondence and meeting records relating to JCAE coordination with the AEC, HEW (Public Health Service and Federal Water Pollution Control), and Federal Radiation Council. These reflect the close surveillance of the nature and resolution of such problems by the JCAE and its subcommittees, such as Mr. Aspinall's on Raw Materials and Mr. Price's on Research, Development and Radiation.

Staff Comments on De Toledano Waste Article

1. *Item:* "Every one of these plants, in producing energy, also produces radioactive waste. Now there is no way of neutralizing that waste." (6th paragraph)

Comment: It is important to understand that radioactive materials that are released to the environment in effluents from routine atomic energy power plant operations involve very low concentrations of radioactivity. Essentially all of the potentially hazardous radioactive fission products are contained in the fuel elements, which are designed to retain them even under extreme conditions. After a certain operating period, the spent fuel elements are removed from the reactor and shipped intact to a fuel reprocessing plant for recovery of valuable uranium and plutonium. It is in this part of the nuclear fuel cycle where highly radioactive waste is produced. (See comment on item 3.) In connection with the handling and treatment of very low levels of radioactivity produced in atomic energy power plants, it is noted that from 7–10 years of satisfactory waste management operating experience has been obtained to date. Radioactivity concentrations in plant liquid effluents, prior to discharge into streams, have ranged from 1–5% of the permissible concentration in water for continuous use by individuals in the general population as recommended by the International Commission on Radiological Protection.

2. *Item:* ". . . the AEC—at taxpayers' expense—has been creating vast 'cemeteries' in various parts of the country. There is one near Hanford, Washington, and another near Buffalo, New York." (6th paragraph)

Comment: The implication that taxpayers are improperly being made to pay for private industry's radioactive waste burials undoubtedly derives from Malcolm Kildale's press release of April 27. Most of the solid radioactive waste buried at Hanford is from the AEC's own production operations at that site. The AEC also buries solid radioactive wastes from its own production, testing, and research operations at several of its other sites. These costs are logically borne by the AEC itself.

Commercial services for the burial of solid radioactive waste are offered to the private nuclear industry as follows:

California Nuclear, Inc.—A site at Hanford near to but physically separated from, the AEC burial sites.

Nuclear Fuel Services, Inc.—West Valley, N.Y. (south of Buffalo).

Nuclear Engineering Co., Inc.—Near Morehead, Ky.

Nuclear Engineering Co., Inc.—Beatty, Nevada.

The cost of operating these commercial burial sites, including the costs of the environmental monitoring required by the licenses, are borne in full by the companies involved. In each case, the land is leased from the state government, and a fee per unit of volume of waste buried is paid to the state. This essentially creates a trust fund out of which the state may pay for continued environmental monitoring or other costs which might arise at some future time after expiration of the lease.

All of these commercial operations must be carried out only under an AEC or Agreement State specific license. The applicant for a license to operate a burial ground must demonstrate that the topographical, geological and hydrological characteristics of the site and the procedures which he proposes to follow are such that the operation will not in any way present a hazard to public health and safety.

3. *Item:* "But the radioactivity won't stay put. Buried in concrete canisters, sometimes only three feet deep, it seeps into the soil. Since these 'cemeteries' must be near running water—to prevent them from getting too 'hot'—the radioactivity affects plant and marine life." (7th paragraph)

Comment: This item reveals a number of misunderstandings of how radioactive waste is handled. Most of the radioactive waste in existence has been generated from the reprocessing of irradiated uranium reactor fuel. Almost all of this reprocessing waste is stored in underground steel tanks, rather than being buried in the soil. This storage is considered of an interim nature (several decades). The tanks are continually checked to assure that if any leaks develop they will be detected and appropriate corrective measures are taken. An extensive research and development program is being conducted by the AEC on ultimate disposal methods, such as conversion to solids and burial in salt mines or disposal in deep impermeable rock formations.

The solid wastes buried in soil are relatively small in radioactivity content, consisting of such items as contaminated scrap, laboratory equipment, defective piping, and used decontamination material. Very little of it is in "concrete canisters", nor are such canisters necessary. Cooling water is required by some of the tanks for high-level liquid waste, but no such cooling is required by the buried solid waste; in fact, extensive effort is applied to assuring that such burials are made in locations where underground or surface water streams will not encroach on the buried wastes.

The data from environmental monitoring programs carried out at the burial sites confirm that waste handling techniques both in the ATC programs and in the regulated private industry programs are adequate to assure that members of the public are not exposed to more than a small fraction of established radiation protection standards.

Following item No. 6, six references are listed. Reference I provides more description of these points. Reference II illustrates the extent of the information required by the AEC for review of license application for a commercial radioactive waste burial site. References III through VI are more technical but may serve to illustrate the degree of emphasis placed by the AEC upon radioactive waste control and improvement.

4. *Item:* "Not too long ago, a radioactive whale was discovered off the Pacific coast. It had been feeding on plankton infected by Columbia River water—the water flowing past Hanford." (7th paragraph)

Comment: No date for discovery of the "hot whale" was provided in the original Kildale press release of April 20. The press release did indicate the whale had been examined by "scientists". On September 19, 1963, a fin whale was captured west of Depoe Bay, Oregon. Radionuclides in various tissues of the whale were analyzed by Charles Osterberg, William Pearcy, and Norman Kujala, of the Department of Oceanography at Oregon State University, Corvallis.

These scientists reported their findings as a letter to the editor of the magazine "Nature". This weekly journal, published in England, has a worldwide circulation and reputation among scientists. The letter was published in the issue of December 5, 1964 (Volume 204, page 1006), and newspaper stories based upon it appeared in the New York Times of December 11 and the San Francisco Chronicle of December 13. Both of these newspaper stories correctly quoted the scientists as to the significance of their findings: "Levels are extremely low and no health hazard exists." If the Kildale news release is intended to describe the same whale, the omission of the scientists' findings is highly misleading.

The whale carcass was disposed of in the normal manner by a rendering plant, and it was not necessary to dispose of it as radioactive waste, as the Kildale press release implied. It should also be pointed out that the low concentrations of radioactivity mentioned in the scientific report represent short-lived radionuclides produced by irradiation of minerals in the river water used to cool the Hanford reactors. These radionuclides are not from reprocessing wastes or buried solid wastes.

5. *Item:* "The AEC, however, isn't telling the American people about this. Twenty years ago it discovered that radioactive waste was poisoning fish. So the AEC, in a report that is so secret even its title is classified, buried the facts . . ."

Comment: The titles of AEC classified reports must, by regulation, be themselves unclassified. The report in question is cited in Kildale's May 4 press release as "Radioactivity in various species of fish from the Columbia and Yakima Rivers", by K. E. Herde, dated 1947 and classified "Secret". Essentially all Hanford documents at that time were classified "Secret"; this particular one was declassified on September 29, 1960, and has been available to any one since then. The correct serial number of the Herde document is HEW 3–5501, indicating the 5501st document from the 300 Area at the Hanford Engineer Works. However, a request for HW 3–5501 would still produce the desired document. The Kildale press release erroneously lists it as HW–35501. The latter is the serial number of a document entitled "231 Bldg. Plutonium Nitrate Solution Data Sheets, Serial No. 962", dated February 25, 1955, by W. N. Mobley, which deals with classified plutonium production information. There is no connection between the subject matter of the two reports.

6. *Item:* "So far, the silence of the AEC and the companies concerned has been deafening."

Comment: The environmental monitoring activities of the AEC and its contractors, as well as the waste management activities, are summarized in periodic reports released to the press and available to the public through the various AEC public information offices. In addition, the data has been reported to the U.S. Public Health Service and, together with data gathered by that agency and by various state and local health agencies, published in the monthly journal, "Radiological Health Data", available from the Government Printing Office.

As an example of the content of "Radiological Health Data", the issue of August 1964 contains an article on "Radiological Survey of the Lower Columbia River in Oregon, January 1962–July 1963", by George L. Toombs and John G. Bailey of the Oregon State Board of Health. (Note that this is the period ending shortly before the capture of the "hot whale"). The paragraph of this article titled "Conclusions" is quoted in its entirety:

"Concentrations of radionuclides arising from the Hanford reactors and atmospheric nuclear weapons testing were readily detected in the environmental media in the area covered by this survey. Certain trends were generally seen for fission product and activation product radionuclide concentrations. Zinc-65 and chromium-51 concentrations were observed to decrease with increasing distance by water from the Hanford reactors, and to remain relatively stable with respect to time. The fission product radionuclides, zirconium-niobium-95 and ruthenium-103 and 106, did not show a trend with respect to distance from the Hanford reactors. However, with respect to time, they did show a generalized peak during the spring of 1963, probably due to the heavy fallout accompanying the spring rains. All concentrations for the radionuclides reported were below those recommended by the International Commission on Radiological Protection for the general public. The radionuclide concentrations measured during this survey warrant no action other than continued surveillance to insure that the levels of radioactivity in this environment are neither too high nor increasing too rapidly."

Copies of all applications to the Commission to construct and operate a nuclear power reactor, chemical reprocessing plant, or commercial waste burial ground are furnished to state and local officials and are placed in the AEC's Public Document Room. Public announcements of the receipt of the application and the subsequent action taken thereon are issued by AEC and notices are published in the Federal Register.

Copies of all correspondence and filings relating to the application, license or amendment to the license, including waste handling procedures, are placed in the public records of the Commission, which are available to any member of the public at the Commission's Public Document Room located at 1717 H Street, Washington, D.C.

REFERENCES

I. Radioactive Wastes", Division of Technical Information, USAEC.

II. "Licensing Requirements for Establishment of A Land Burial Facility for Burial of Radioactive Wastes".

III. "Waste Disposal Into the Ground at Hanford", S. J. Beard and W. L. Godfrey, Isochem, Inc.

IV. "Migration Characteristics of Radionuclides Through Sediments Underlying the Hanford Reservation", D. J. Brown, Isochem, Inc.

V. "Disposal of High Level Solidified Wastes in Salt Mines", W. C. McClain, R. L. Bradshaw, and F. M. Empson, Oak Ridge National Laboratory.

VI. "Solid Radioactive Waste Disposal at the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory", John W. Enders, Health Division, Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory.

(Enclosures III through VI were presented at the International Atomic Energy Agency-European Nuclear Energy Authority Symposium on the Disposal of Radioactive Waste Into the Ground, Vienna, Austria, May 29–June 2, 1967)

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 20, 1967]

HIGH RATE OF CANCER NOTED AMONG SMOKERS IN ASBESTOS INDUSTRY—COMBINATION OF ASBESTOS DUST, CIGARETTES POSES GREAT RISK OF LUNG CANCER, STUDY SHOWS

ATLANTIC CITY.—Asbestos workers who smoke cigarets have a ninetyfold greater risk of dying of lung cancer than persons who neither smoke nor work around asbestos, three New York medical researchers said.

The extremely high risk of lung cancer among persons exposed to the combination of asbestos dust and cigaret smoke was uncovered in a study of 370 members of the Newark, N.J., and New York locals of the International Association of Heat and Frost Insulators and Asbestos Workers union. The men are primarily involved in installing asbestos insulation in construction work.

The workers were exposed to a greater amount of asbestos dust than the general population, and all had been occupationally exposed to it for at least 20 years. But the researchers added that the general population, particularly in big-city areas, is exposed to a slight amount of such particles. As a result, they said, it is important to determine whether cigaret smoking makes this light exposure more hazardous than it would be otherwise.

In a report to the scientific session of the American Medical Association's annual convention here, the researchers said there were 94 deaths among the insulation workers during a 52-month period. This, they calculated, was 46 more than would have been expected among a similar group of men who hadn't been chronically exposed to asbestos.

Most of the men who died—78—were cigaret smokers. And among the smokers, 24 died of lung cancer. No lung-cancer deaths occurred among those who didn't smoke.

Twenty-four lung-cancer deaths was an extremely high rate, the researchers calculated. Among a similar group of smokers who hadn't been exposed to asbestos, statisticians would expect only about three deaths from lung cancer, they said.

"If they had neither smoked nor been exposed to asbestos dust," they said, the expected number of lung-cancer deaths would have been one or none during the 52-month period.

"All people incur a great increase in risk in lung cancer if they smoke cigarets; for asbestos workers the increase in risk is tremendous," they said. The researchers noted that microscopic asbestos fibers, once inhaled, remain permanently in the lung tissues. As a result, "asbestos workers who don't smoke cigarets should never begin. Those who do smoke should stop immediately."

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM: ACTION NOW

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GROVER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, a good article on the growing length of congressional sessions appeared in the Washington Sunday Star on October 1.

In the event some of my colleagues may have missed it, I will have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the article entitled "Should Congress Stay in Session 12 Months a Year?" by Allan C. Brownfield.

I would like to remind the House that under title 4 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1967—which passed the Senate overwhelmingly in March—Congress would be permitted to recess during the month of August if it had not completed its business by the statutory adjournment date of July 31 and provided that the country was not in a time of war or national emergency.

The August adjournment provision is only one of many needed improvements contained in the congressional reform bill passed by the Senate. While S. 355 is surely not the ultimate answer to modernization of the legislative branch, it is, on balance, a constructive and much-needed bill.

I urge the leadership to schedule this legislation as soon as possible for action by the House. Surely most of us must be aware that our workload problems are not going to diminish either in number or in complexity. Failure to take a few steps toward modernizing our procedures can only result in making the problems more difficult to handle.

The article follows:

SHOULD CONGRESSS STAY IN SESSION 12 MONTHS A YEAR?

(By Allan C. Brownfield)

As members of Congress go deeper into the fall months, the nagging problem of when to adjourn and how to maintain a close and effective contact with the people back home remains.

Can Congress complete its work within the period of a traditional nine-month session, or is it necessary to rethink the length of time during which members should be at work?

Many senators and representatives have given thought to this subject, and a number of proposals have been discussed. Yet, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1967, which passed the Senate 75 to 9, has remained in the hands of the House Rules Committee for some time, with the apparent concurrence of the House Democratic leadership.

This bill does not discuss the specific question of the length of congressional sessions, but it does concern itself with other reform measures such as tightening the regulation of lobbyists, assuring minority staffing of committees, stripping Congress of its historic role in selection and confirmation of paymasters and revamping committee procedures. Included is a provision for a month-long vacation every August.

NEED FOR REFORM

Even the limited reforms suggested in the Reorganization Bill seem difficult to achieve. Nevertheless, the need for reform is felt by many members of Congress, and several have come to grips with the question of the length of congressional sessions.

The late President Kennedy once noted that "during the 19th century, America had many distinguished senators, presidents, congressmen . . . but most of those men dealt in their entire political life . . . with only four or five major problems. . . . Now the problems swarm across the desks of political leaders of this country."

The current Congress, far from being an exception, is added proof of this fact. We face turmoil in our cities, a war which seems to be stalemated, a program of welfare which has suddenly become unpopular, and a nation whose people seek some answer to their sense of crisis from their elected representatives. In the midst of such a situation, who can seriously think of adjournment? Who can doubt that Congress is headed toward almost permanent year-round sessions?

The fact that Congress desperately seeks as early an adjournment as possible has led, in the opinions of many, to hasty and often irresponsible actions. Senator McGee, D-Wyo., points out that "Good bills representing long hours of investigation and debate are abandoned at the brink of passage; quickly, and sometimes carelessly, prepared legislation is rushed through in the press toward final adjournment, and tempers and physical constitutions—worn and strained by nine or ten months of solid work—approach the breaking point."

MECHANICAL CHORES

Senator McGee has urged the Congress to abandon the idea of nine-month sessions and to recognize the need for year-round meetings. He has also recognized the fact that members of Congress do not have the necessary time for reflection, thought, and consideration. Being in Washington for 12 months is damaging to perspective and broad understanding. He stated: "It can be truthfully said that we are becoming so caught up in the details of our job that all we see and all we have time to worry about are the mechanical chores of the moment. The basic ideas, the concepts by which we live and which we will pass to our posterity are not considered by us for want of time. We see the trees but not the forest."

A possible answer proposed by Senator McGee is a sabbatical leave for members of Congress, patterned on the practices of our large universities and business organizations. The period, according to this proposal, might run from three to six months on a staggered basis so that no more than a handful of members would be gone at one time.

Discussing this idea, Senator Monroney, D-Okla., said that ". . . the longer a man stays in Congress, generally the more he knows about government, the more he knows and understands about the philosophy of political science, about international affairs and about budgetary control. But he becomes further removed from the position he occupied when he was elected. What (the proposal for a sabbatical) . . . is saying is, for Pete's sake get back to being a civilian for six months so that you can come back refreshed with the viewpoint that you had originally but with the backup of the knowledge you have learned as a Senator or Congressman."

WEEK BACK HOME

On August 21 the House of Representatives amended the Legislative Act of 1959 authorizing each member one paid round trip to his district for each month the House is in session. But, what of the time to make such trips?

Commenting on this ironical state of affairs, Rep. Schadeberg, R-Wis., said that "If round trips are to be paid for by the government, then ample opportunity to meet with the people should be provided so that money yields the greatest return. I refer to the suggestions I made for the reorganization of the House which provide a one-week-a-month recess from legislative activity which would provide the members of the House an opportunity to hold office hours in their districts and to discuss pending legislation with interested parties before the legislation was considered on the floor."

Rep. O'Hara, D-Mich., stated that much confusion and uncertainty in Government is caused by the fact that fiscal years begin with continuing authorizations and that government agencies do not know what funds will become available for their programs until after the beginning of fiscal years. He also urged that "Changes in scheduling congressional business also might assist in a personal problem of members which I feel very keenly as the father of seven children of school age. Such changes might assist in making the sessions of Congress correspond more closely with the school year. As it is, the member of Congress with school-age children is forced to have his children attend two different schools in a school year, one back in his district and one in the District of Columbia."

DIVERSE ACTIVITIES

The modern world and the mass society have provided pressures upon government which could hardly have been imagined in a previous, quietier time. Meant to be a reflective body, Congress has been compelled by events to act quickly. Meant to be a body of limited functions and areas of jurisdiction, Congress is now called upon to perform such diverse functions as aiding education, controlling rats in urban areas, and insuring equal employment in private industries. Even when Congress believes an area of consideration to be none of its business, it must still debate and dispose of it.

In his volume, "Congress and the American Tradition," James Burnham points out that "Neither the Fathers nor the philosophers before and after them ever listed speed and efficiency among the virtues of a representative assembly. They wanted 'energy and dispatch' in the executive, but in the legislature, they believed, promptitude of decision is oftener an evil than a benefit. The difference of opinion, and jarrings of parties in the department of the government, though they may sometimes obstruct salutary plans, yet often promote deliberation and circumspection, and serve to check excesses in the majority.' (Federalist, Number 70) White haired, slow speaking Nestor, not the impulsive Achilles, the aged Priam and not passionate Troilus, are the archetypes of the legislator."

MISTAKEN STANDARD

The days of such reflective judgment appear to be at an end, just as the days of nine-month sessions of Congress appear to be ended. Yet, it is a situation with which few are happy.

For at a time when Congress is called upon to exercise judgment in an ever broadening range of issues, reflection and an opportunity to see such issues in a realistic national perspective are essential. Decision making, it must be remembered, is not judged by its speed but by its quality. A democracy is not judged by its efficiency but by the essence of its national life. Dictatorships have always proven notably more efficient. Mussolini, after all, did make the trains run on time. Hitler did construct the great German highways, and the Communists did launch Sputnik. For Congress to judge itself by such a mistaken standard would be a serious error.

Congressmen, however, should be more concerned with solving problems than with early Congressional adjournment. Just as many state legislatures have changed from semi-annual to annual sessions, it is now time for Congress to eliminate the facade of nine month sessions and accept the reality of year round meetings.

YEAR-ROUND SESSIONS

If this is done, there will be little temptation to use valuable debate time for a discussion of a projected adjournment date. And, within the context of a realistic approach, proper provision might be made for real vacations and for a real opportunity to meet with constituents and reflect upon the problems of an ever more complex age.

To this end, one upstate New York congressman expressed the view that if business was scheduled on Fridays, those members who leave town regularly for long weekends would be persuaded to stay. Another congressman urged that a one month summer vacation be considered, as well as a vacation in December, and that this be included in the context of a plan for year-round sessions.

Rep. Cleveland, R–N.H., recently announced that he was reactivating the House Republican Task Force on Congressional Reform to put pressure on House Democrats to report out the Congressional Reorganization Bill which has been in the House Rules Committee since March 9. If this bill reaches the floor during the current session, there is every prospect that the question of year-round sessions will be introduced.

Members of Congress will decide only reluctantly to meet on a year-round basis, but this is an age in which we do many things under protests, and members of Congress are in no way exempt.

LEIF ERICSSON DAY

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, for the first centuries of recorded history, the American continent was unknown to civilization, as we define it. In the past several hundred years, bloodlines have flowed into this vast land from every corner of the earth. We in the United States have built a great and powerful nation, using the fortitude of the English, the ardor of the Spanish and French, the ingenuity of the Italians, Scandinavian tenacity, Slavic endurance, and the luck of the Irish, plus many more. We have added to this the rhythm of Africa, the mystery of Asia—and yes, the courage of our native Americans.

Men who dreamed dreams of far horizons launched ships out into uncharted waters, and it was inevitable that they would one day reach the shores of this gigantic mass of earth. No group of these voyagers possessed more courage, adventure, hardiness, and perhaps at times, bold foolhardiness, than did the Vikings of the North.

One such Norseman was the Icelander, Leif Ericsson. In about the year 1000 his ship left Greenland to sail northern seas to the west. We have learned that it was this little group of Viking sailors that first touched the shores of the continent to be named America.

They never knew, but perhaps they envisioned, the far-reaching consequences of their journey. This was the new world, and from the old would come those who would one day populate the wilderness, build the cities, till the soil, and fly the banner of freedom.

I hope we will never forget the saga of a long line of courageous men, from Leif Ericsson to our astronauts, nor fail, as a nation, to be worthy of them. That is why we are on this day, October 9, 1967, by proclamation of the President of the United States, commemorating the event of Leif Ericsson's portentous voyage.

THE WASHINGTON POST: WRONG AGAIN

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, once again that great crusading publication, the Washington Post, has seen fit to attack legislation which I have sponsored to permit postal patrons to put a stop to the mailing of unsolicited obscene mail matter sent to their minor children. I am referring to an editorial carried in yesterday's Post.

As I am sure you know, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 7977, the postal rate pay bill which will be up for House consideration tomorrow, contains an amendment, title III, which authorizes the Postmaster General, if requested by the addressee, to issue an order to the sender of a "pandering advertisement" to refrain from further mailings of such matter to the named addressee.

Following the U.S. Supreme Court's definition in the Ginzburg case, a "pandering advertisement" is defined as one which offers for sale matter which the advertisement itself represents to be "erotically arousing or sexually provocative." In other words, this legislation merely gives every parent the right to stop the flow of unsolicited smutty advertisements into the mailbox of his home. I suggest that this is the right of every parent, and it is amazing to me that such publications as the Washington Post would oppose this under the spurious banner of free speech.

Mr. Speaker, I want to stress the fact that this bill does not preclude those who want such materials from having them delivered to them through the U.S. mails. The Postmaster General is not authorized to act on his own account; he may do so only after having been requested to do so by the named addressee. It is the same as though we were authorizing an individual to call the telephone company and ask it to put a stop to obscene telephone calls being made to his household. Surely no one would argue that to do so would be an invasion of the obscene caller's right of free speech. Yet this is the very type of argument being advanced by the Post.

I have always felt that a man's home is his castle. In my home I have a right to privacy and since my mailbox is an extension of my home, I have a right to keep smut peddlers from dropping solicitations to buy their wares into my mailbox. Certainly I have a right and a duty to exercise some control over the moral upbringing of my children. Yet, presently there is no way for me to stop the flow of unsolicited obscene mail matter to my home. Title III of H.R. 7977 gives every postal patron such an opportunity.

> Pandering advertisement in the mail—

Say the editors of the Post—

> are an undoubted nuisance. It is not impossible to deal with them, however, in any house equipped with a trash basket or a garbage can.

The editorial concludes. To say this, however, is to admit one's misunderstanding of the problem. It is like saying that one can always hang up on the maker of an obscene telephone call. But parents are not always at home when the children are exposed. Often, one's children are the first to see the mail and by the time the parents come home from work, the damage is already done.

Mr. Speaker, millions of parents want this legislation. It is my fervent hope that none of my colleagues will be deceived by the spurious arguments advanced by this editorial and that they will overwhelmingly support title III of H.R. 7977.

HOUSE MUST SHARE RESPONSIBILITY FOR QUALITY OF DISTRICT GOVERNMENT

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker although the other body has the dismal task of approving the President's recent nominees to the new City Council for the District of Columbia, the House must share responsibility for the quality of the District government.

The District of Columbia, the seat of our National Government, is a Federal District, which belongs partly to the citizens of our 50 States—not just to the people who happen to reside here temporarily. The citizens of these 50 States provide, in large measure, the financial support for this Federal District.

If the President had set out to sabotage self-government in Washington, to discredit the new City Council, to exalt patronage, to insult the competent, concerned citizens of the District, to degrade our National Capital in the eyes of our Nation and the world, he could not have succeeded better.

At least three of the President's nominations are incredible.

One is a draft dodger, a Bobby Baker crony, and, according to a creditable magazine article, one of the most influential lobbyists in the Capital. Can you imagine more serious disqualifications for a President of the Council of our Capital City during war?

Another led demonstrations and preached civil disobedience. Can you imagine more serious disqualifications for a Vice President of the City Council during times of civil unrest and disrespect for law and order?

A third nominee accepted attorney's fees to advise a home mortgage company that used despicable methods to bilk the poor and ignorant for profit? Can you imagine more serious disqualifications for a Councilman at a time when this very client is under investigation for criminally duping the poor for profit—and when the District is burdened with so many poor and disadvantaged people?

The reputation of the new City Council—the competency and integrity of each individual Councilman—is crucial to the future of "self-government" for Washington.

Certainly a thorough, comprehensive investigation of each nominee is indicated. A sudden nomination followed by a quick confirmation to avoid public scrutiny and knowledge of the backgrounds of these new Councilmen will contribute to the precipitous failure of District "self-government."

Mr. Speaker, does not the House have the responsibility to investigate, know and report the competency and qualifications of the President's nominees for the new City Council? I believe it does. In this case, where the President's nominees are prima facie incompetent, flagrantly involved with suspicious special interests, totally unrepresentative of the citizens of the District, and all political cronies of this administration, a thorough investigation and comprehensive report to the public is absolutely essential.

STUDY OF ECONOMIC CONDITIONS IN THE U.S. TEXTILE AND APPAREL INDUSTRIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. VANIK). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, on October 4, 1967, the President of the United States made a statement in which he directed the Tariff Commission to make a study of economic conditions in the U.S. textile and apparel industries, particularly with reference to the present and prospective impact of imports upon these industries. He asked the Tariff Commission to report back to him on or before January 15, 1968.

Perhaps there is no subject that has been studied as much as the impact of imports upon the domestic textile and apparel industries. It seems to me that further study is unnecessary to convince anyone that it is time that action be taken to protect the jobs of the American people in these beleaguered facets of our national economy.

I know there was a feeling of encouragement on the part of some industry people when this statement was made last week and I am not here to cast any sort of doubt as to the willingness of the administration to be helpful to our American people, but I have misgivings as to whether there is any basis for encouragement that relief will be had through administrative action.

However, I do believe it is proper that we give a little thought to the possible effect of this statement.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to make the statement of the President a part of my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The statement is as follows:

STATEMENT MADE BY PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON ON OCTOBER 4, 1967

> I have today asked the United States Tariff Commission to report to me by January 15, 1968, in the fullest detail possible on the economic conditions of the United States textile and apparel industries.
>
> In this report I expect in particular an intensive analysis of the present and prospective impact of the imports upon these industries.
>
> This administration has consistently acted in recognition of the fact that the textile and apparel industries are of great importance to our economy. In recent months representatives of these industries have expressed to me and to many others a deep concern over their future well-being in light of a number of factors, and especially im-

> port trends. A large number of the members of the Congress in both the House and Senate—including Chairman Mills of the Ways and Means Committee—have sponsored bills which deal with the question of imports.
>
> In considering this widespread concern I have concluded that we must have all the facts possible to guide our future actions in this important field, and I am pleased that Chairman Mills is joining my request. I hope that the Tariff Commission's report will permit all of us who are deeply interested in the welfare of the textile and apparel industries to take a course of action which will be both in their interest and the national interest.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, just a few days ago, when the House passed the bill written and handled by the gentlemen from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT], it became apparent to many of us that at long last we had reached a point at which the Congress was going to take this matter into hand and require by law that the people of America have a better deal in the field of foreign trade.

This vote on the Dent bill, which, I believe, produced only 29 adverse votes, was one of the most hopeful signs that some of us had seen.

But now we are wondering if perhaps this order for a so-called study by the Tariff Commission will not be one which might seek to slow down the exercise of the will of the Congress to protect the jobs of American people.

Just a few days ago in Pinehurst, N.C., the former Secretary of Commerce, Mr. John Connor, who is now president, I believe, of Allied Chemical Corp., a concern with a vital stake in textiles, was quoted in the press as having made the statement that—

> Textile import quotas as determined on some reasonable basis to fit the overall needs of both foreign and domestic manufacturers in the orderly development of U.S. textile markets are needed in the broad public interest.

Mr. Connor is further quoted as having said:

> If the U.S. Government can arrive at no suitable diplomatic conclusions with other nations I think we could consider new grounds for textile imports on a unilateral basis by force of Congressional action.

I believe this brings us to a problem each of us must take into account as we seek to do something for our country in this field of foreign trade. That is, that we not be governed by self-interest in dealing with the establishment of sound trade policies. This present hopeful sign for the textile industry might be considered by some other industry people who are equally injured by imports as holding out hope for the textile industry which is not held out for other industries which are hurt by imports.

As one who has been particularly interested in textiles, I believe it would be a great mistake if those of us who do have, because of our local industry, some peculiar interest in a particular industry, should ever let ourselves get diverted in selfish desire to serve our own particular interests, so that we will not have served the national interest.

May I confine myself today to the textile field? No one can question that imports are now ruining the job opportunities of more than 200,000 Americans in the textile industry who are debarred from employment there because of imports. Even a greater number are affected by curtailed operations in the textile industry as a direct and proximate result of the importation of inordinate amounts of textile products and apparel products.

Many other industries have taken up the cudgel for textiles because they see in this problem something broader than many of our friends who feel we are only concerned about the jobs of people in the textile field. The textile industry spends each year $10 billion with other industries for various services. This includes the trucking companies, paper mill operators, power companies, sheep ranchers, corn farmers, construction workers, machinery manufacturers, the chemical industry, the cotton producers, and the producer of machinery for the textile industry.

The trucking industry last year earned more than $100 million from the textile industry and hauled about 90 percent of all the American textiles that were manufactured and shipped within our own country. Paper manufacturers earned about $240 million from the sale of paper supplies for the textile industry. Power companies sold about $150 million worth of electrical power to the industry. The wool producers, that is, the sheep ranchers, sold 370 million pounds of wool costing about $190 million. The corn farmers, the corn raisers, found their product used in making 315 million pounds of corn starch for which the textile industry paid $31 million. Construction workers built more than $500 million worth of new plants, and textile machinery manufacturers sold about $640 million worth of new equipment. The chemical plants producing manmade fibers sold about 4 billion pounds of their fibers at a cost of $2.4 billion. Cotton farmers sold about 9.5 million bales of raw cotton for about $1 billion.

On top of that, when we take into account that the domestic textile industry paid $4.6 billion in wages which went into the economy of many hundreds of communities throughout this Nation, into the office of the attorney, the physician, the drugstore, the department store, and every other phase of economic life in the local community, you begin to see that this is an important problem which confronts not just the textile industry but all the people of America.

I was interested today to receive from the National Association of Wool Manufacturers a bulletin in which they express their views on the statement of the President to which I have referred earlier. They say, among other things, in their statement:

> We share the President's desire to have all of the facts possible concerning the textile import problem, and we shall, of course, cooperate with the Tariff Commission in its endeavor.
>
> The present critical need for limitations on textile imports is well established, however, and the pendency of this new study should not delay action by the Congress upon pending textile import quota legislation.
>
> The existence of the textile import problem has already been recognized by the President, who has publicly stated that reasonable limitations on wool textile imports are necessary, and by 68 Members of the Senate and 174 Members of the House who are sponsoring legislation to enable him to effectuate his policy. The industry's resources will continue to be kept fully mobilized to achieve prompt enactment of this legislation.

And, may I say, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that other industry representatives, whatever the phase of their textile operations in which they may engage, will follow the lead of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers in insisting that, notwithstanding the study by the Tariff Commission, the Congress proceed promptly with the legislation which so many of us are cosponsoring here in the House and which so many of our colleagues are cosponsoring in the Senate.

This is a serious problem. We talk about manpower retraining very glibly. In the Trade Expansion Act it was provided that there should be some funds available to retrain people who were put out of their jobs because of imports. I say to you that this is an indefensible sort of thing. It should be our view and it should be our deep concern to see to it that no American is deprived of his job by reason of foreign imports whatever the industry may be.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I hope that all the Members of the House who are interested in this problem will insist that we proceed on schedule with the consideration of the pending bill which is commonly referred to as the "Mills bill," and which has been sponsored by our colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], and approximately 176 others of us.

Mr. GETTYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. GETTYS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks which have been made by the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] and to congratulate the gentleman upon a splendid statement relating to problems that confront the textile industry today.

I particularly am appreciative of the gentleman's remarks to the effect that legislation is going to be required, apparently, before the problem is solved, both for the textile industry and for many other types of industries in the United States, and I thank the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina for his very splendid recognition of the facts of this matter.

Mr. WHITENER. I thank my friend and neighbor, the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. GETTYS], for his contribution. I hope that neither he nor others of my colleagues understand that what I am saying has to be limited to our concern about the textile industry. There are, for instance, the shoe industry, the athletic goods industry, the steel industry, and many others which are equally involved in this fight. I think we should not stand by and get ourselves blocked off as we have in the past. We should present a united front and be just as interested in the dairy farmer who is now being hurt by imports, the steel manufacturer and the employees of the steel industry, as we are in our particular area of interest.

Mr. GETTYS. The gentleman has correctly stated that there are so many related industries that are dependent upon these textile industries, which is the point we are raising on this subject.

Mr. WHITENER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, as I conclude I am expressing to all of my colleagues the fervent plea that they not be diverted from this effort which seems to be on its way to success, as is evidenced by the recent vote in the House on the very significant legislation from the Committee on Education and Labor which was given to us from the hand and mind of the very able gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Dent]. I hope we can all be steadfast in our zeal for this American program of a sound trade policy.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS—PERMISSION TO FILE REPORT

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H.R. 13178.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING EMERGENCY FOOD AND MEDICAL ASSISTANCE TO HUNGRY AMERICANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Vanik). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Foley] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday last the distinguished Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives, acting on S. 2138, voted to put the bill aside without prejudice.

This legislation, authored by Senator Stennis in the other body, permits the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to provide emergency food and medical assistance to hungry Americans in whatever State they may be found.

While I am pleased that the committee has kept the bill open for action, I am expressing my very deep concern that the time has long since passed when this or similar legislation should have been passed by the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, it is to me, nothing short of shocking, that in a country having an annual Federal budget in excess of 130 thousands of millions of dollars, questions of economy should be raised on the expenditure of $25 million to feed Americans who, for no fault of their own, are not being cared for under existing State or Federal programs, and whose children are found to be in a state of physical malnutrition, and in some places near starvation.

I am delighted that the distinguished Committee on Agriculture wisely chose to make public its executive hearing of last week, but I would hope that the committee would undertake further public hearings to make the record very plain as to the extent and character of the nutrition and allied medical problems widely varying estimates have been received as to the number of Americans who are suffering from serious malnutrition, and those estimates must be refined and made as precise as possible. I believe that the Congress would certainly impugn both its humanity and its responsibility if it does not thoroughly, fully, and publicly examine these assertions of hunger and malnutrition.

This can only be done properly if it is done through extended public hearings.

Even if the character of the problem has been exaggerated or misrepresented, such information would be a valuable addition. But I do not believe this is the case. On the contrary, I believe the problem is a real one, a pressing one, a critical one, and becomes exacerbated every week, as we approach in some areas of our country a harsh winter. Surely no Member of this House would wish that Americans here in our own country should be denied such fundamental aid at a time when our history of generosity to other peoples has passed a level of $120 billion in aid since World War II.

I have supported the foreign aid bill every year that I have been a Member of the Congress. But if the time ever comes when this country cannot afford to undertake responsibility for its own people, I will cease to support the foreign aid budget and I will cease to support many other domestic programs which can be put aside until these fundamental responsibilities can be undertaken.

In fact, I do not think that this need is in any sense beyond our present capacity. The testimony of the Bureau of the Budget officials was that present authorizations for the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare were sufficient to carry out the purposes of this program.

Mr. Speaker, so that every Member may have the benefit of the findings and recommendations of the very distinguished group of American citizens known as the Ad Hoc Committee on Emergency Food To Fight Hunger in the United States, I ask unanimous consent that its summary statement, dated September 27, 1967, by Mr. Robert B. Choate be included in its entirety in the Record, including its appendices of extraneous matter.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have listened to the gentleman's statement and not having seen this statement in its entirety, I note that earlier there were some newspaper stories, and stories from other sources, that reflected considerably on the area that I have the honor to represent.

To keep the record straight, this committee went only to certain specified areas, the medical committee, which the gentleman will recall. As soon as this was called to my attention, as a Representative of that area, I called on the people in authority in my State and asked them to check out all the names submitted to me by the Department of Agriculture.

As I recall, without exception all of the names listed were drawing relief.

There seems to be no question that in many areas of the country, that there are a few, a relatively few numerically, who are suffering from malnutrition. But by the same token, a research and study was made of this particular group in only one particular section of the country.

Following that I wrote Senator Clark and Senator Javits, who had identified themselves with this study project, and asked for a list of names of the persons that this group had found. That was some 2 months ago and just today I had an acknowledgement by letter, but no individuals names were listed in it.

So I would trust that the report that the gentleman is putting in the Record is not pointing the finger at one particular section of the country because this study quite definitely is not national in its scope. Insofar as my area is concerned, we deplore even one such case and we thank the Secretary of Agriculture for making this statement available and trust that what the gentleman is including in the Record is fair in its content.

Mr. FOLEY. I am very glad that the gentleman has taken this occasion to make his comments. There is no question in my judgment that the area which, as he says, he has the honor to represent, has been unfairly singled out in some quarters as the locus of this problem. Actually, malnutrition and allied problems exist in many parts of the United States. They exist, in my judgment, in several of the Northern States and in many of our northern metropolitan areas as well as in some rural areas. The gentleman's State is at the top of the list in participation by the poor in food programs in the United States.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman. I felt free to interrupt the gentleman because I know of his fairness in dealing with these matters. But not having seen the report I did want to make this statement that I have made.

Mr. FOLEY. If there is any question as to the report or any of the material which I have put into the Record today unfairly representing the problem as being limited to or particularly aimed at the gentleman's area, I would be happy to participate with him in putting the matter into a national perspective. I know the gentleman's State has done far more to care for people who are poor than many other States in the Union.

Mr. WHITTEN. I accept the statement of the gentleman.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLEY. I am happy to yield to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. MAY. I thank the gentleman from Washington for a very good statement. As a member of the House Committee on Agriculture who last week sat through the deliberations and the hearings that are now a matter of public record, I would like to emphasize that the gentleman's colloquy with the gentleman from Mississippi clarified a situation that has distressed many of us because of untrue implications that seemed to pinpoint one area only. I think perhaps also it would be a good time to point out that this was one of the reasons the committee voted not to complete action on the bill at this time, but to hold it over without prejudice until such time as we had more information from the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Both of those agencies testified that they had not asked for the bill and were at this time unprepared to give us reliable facts and figures on which we could write legislation that would really pinpoint the problem and solve it. I think the gentleman has put part of our dilemma in good context with his statement.

Will the gentleman yield further so that I may ask him a question?

Mr. FOLEY. I am glad to yield to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. MAY. On the day that the House Committee on Agriculture met, one of the members of that committee issued a press release concerning what went on in this executive session. In the release there was a statement saying committee members exhibited "joy over the imminent suffocation of this bill." This press release was put out before the committee even had an opportunity to vote. The gentleman was present at the hearing on that day, as was I. May I ask the gentleman this question for the record: At any time when the committee was discussing, deliberating, and asking questions on this bill, did you see any signs of unbecoming levity or opinions expressed that this was not a very serious problem that we had to solve?

Mr. FOLEY. I would be glad to say on my own part I was then convinced and am now convinced that all members of the committee took the matter very seriously. I did not draw the conclusion that others may have drawn from any levity that did exist in the committee. I think each member of the committee approaches this problem very seriously. I think the committee as a whole has been concerned about problems coming under its jurisdiction which have relevance to this condition or this problem. I hope that there will be prompt further consideration by the committee.

The only respect in which I disagree in any way with my distinguished friend and colleague from Washington is that I feel a temporary authorization, at least, should be given to cope with situations of real hunger and malnutrition discovered in the United States which cannot be cared for by any existing program while we are waiting for additional information.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. FOLEY asked and was given permission to proceed for an additional 3 minutes.)

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FOLEY. I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. MAY. May I say to the gentleman I think the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Department of Agriculture should give this immediate aid under present programs until we have the facts and figures, to honestly, intelligently, and factually argue in favor of this bill when we bring it before the House of Representatives. I thank the gentleman for his answer to my question.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I simply asked you to yield for the purpose of further clarifying your unanimous consent request which I believe is before the House, namely, to include the summary plus the entire bill. May I ask the gentleman if this is not in print either in the hearings before the Committee on Agriculture or as a report of the Commission, simply on the basis of not being advised on the question of the availability therein, and the fact that it costs the taxpayers some $210 a page for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD?

Mr. FOLEY. I thank the gentleman for his question. I am delighted to have the opportunity to answer it, because, in fact, it is not otherwise available. The initial public hearings which were scheduled by the House Agriculture Committee were not held because individuals who had indicated a desire to testify later informed the committee that they would be willing not to testify if the committee was going to move to go into executive session to consider the bill. Consequently the statement in question is not in the record of the hearings.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlemen will yield further, then neither the Commission itself nor the proper House committee appropriation for the Commission, either out of the executive contingency fund or by appropriation, includes any amount for the cost of printing?

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I believe the gentleman may have misunderstood my request. This is not an official document. It is the testimony of a member of a private group interested in this problem which is not printed in any Government-authorized publication to my knowledge.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the explanation of the gentleman. I thought it was an official document.

Mr. FOLEY. The ad hoc committee is a wholly private organization.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I reserved the right to object. In view of the explanation of the gentleman, I will not object and I will read the statement with interest, and, if further statements are required, I will make them at that time.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the request of the gentleman from Washington is granted.

There was no objection.

(The summary referred to follows:)

SUMMARY STATEMENT TO THE HOUSE AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE AS IT CONSIDERS S. 2138, THE EMERGENCY FOOD BILL, BY THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON EMERGENCY FOOD TO FIGHT HUNGER IN THE UNITED STATES, SEPTEMBER 27, 1967

Mr. Chairman, my name is Robert B. Choate. I am a businessman from Arizona; I am a civil engineer and a land (and farm) developer, when I am not involving myself in the problems of our society. Currently, I am spending a sabbatical year away from Arizona. Most of my time is occupied with interesting businessmen and business organizations with depressed area problems. In February, I started an evaluation of the commodity and food stamp programs from the recipient perspective. That work has so intrigued me that I am currently on leave of absence from my other work to seek the enactment of the Emergency Food Bill—S. 2138. The Ad Hoc Committee on Emergency Food To Fight Hunger in the United States has asked me to prepare a summary statement of those points of view which the Committee would have heard on September 29 had not an Executive Session replaced a public hearing.

It is an honor to be able to approach the House Agriculture Committee in this regard. Many of the members of this Committee have been in the forefront of increasing the agricultural cornucopia of the United States. Many of the members have contributed to the development of new products, new farming techniques, and new delivery systems. We are, as a result, one of the best fed countries on earth. The Chairman of this Committee is particularly to be praised for his understanding of the intricacies of feeding the world's hungry.

The Ad Hoc Committee supports the Senate Committee report and the bill as it was passed by the Senate.

The possibility of hunger in our affluent society raises questions of responsibility. Under the *Rules of the House of Representatives*, the Committee on Agriculture has many duties pertaining to agriculture, including "Human Nutrition and Home Economics". One assumes this description includes "hunger". If people are hungry in America, is it a problem of employment, income, or distribution systems? Of education or of health? Is it a problem of improving the balance of the diet or the size and number of daily meals throughout the changing seasons? Those deep in poverty may not have enough to satisfy a hungry stomach; others may attempt to fill their stomachs with inferior, unbalanced foods. While we believe that the matter of hunger in the United States may be as much a problem of poverty or health, we here address ourselves to the responsibilities of the House Agriculture Committee on the nutrition aspects of feeding America's hungry.

Poverty is an ugly word; consideration of the living conditions of those in poverty is not pleasant. We all wish that we could match jobs with the jobless, so that most of our citizens need have no fear of hunger. Perhaps that time is coming. Meanwhile, we face a situation wherein unidentified numbers of our own citizens may be suffering from malnutrition and hunger. S 2138 has many aspects which can clarify this situation.

People who are concerned with poverty within the United States recognize that there must be relative positions on the ladder of success in a competitive society. Those at the bottom of the ladder—economically, culturally, and educationally—are recognized to be in need of occasional forms of monetary support. In general, we call this welfare. In specifics, we use the terms "old age assistance", "aid to the blind", "aid to the permanently and totally disabled", "aid to families with dependent children", and "general assistance". These forms of welfare were initiated to ensure that all residents of our country, despite infirmities or personal poverty, would be supplied with the three basic needs of mankind: food, clothing, and shelter.

For many reasons, this nation has been parsimonious in setting individual levels of welfare assistance. As partial recompense for this, welfare checks are occasionally augmented by other forms of aid: private charity, rent subsidies, and government food programs. It is to the last of these that this paper addresses itself.

Federal food programs are a means of providing the most impoverished citizens of the United States with enough food to maintain life with a minimum of suffering. The best known of these programs is the Commodity Distribution Program. Conceived in 1935 and further defined in 1949, the Commodity Distribution program was enacted "to prevent the waste of food commodities . . . through deterioration or spoilage" by making them "available . . . to local public welfare organizations . . . (and) to private welfare organizations for the assistance of needy persons within the United States".

In 1964, a second federal food program was legislated. Known as the Food Stamp Program, it was designed "to strengthen the agricultural economy . . . (and) to provide for improved levels of nutrition among low-income households through a cooperative Federal-State program of food assistance".

Thirty-two years after the passage of the first federal food distribution program, we see a nation which ships more than 11 million tons of food to foreign countries a year, pays individual farmers more than $3 billion annually and wages a losing battle against the daily disposal of 137 truckloads of garbage in its capital city alone. We also see a nation in which perhaps 7 out of 8 of the poorest residents are unable to participate in a government food program. We know that some are hungry.

HUNGER VERSUS FAMINE

The current nationwide hearings being conducted by the Citizens' Board of Inquiry into Hunger and Malnutrition in the United States[1] already have shown that hunger in America is different from famine. People are not "dropping like flies" on American streets because not enough food is being produced. In the United States, hunger and severe malnutrition exist because of economic, political, racial, and educational problems. It is not an agricultural problem. There can be no doubt that this nation has the money to feed hungry people; a competitive political system should be able to break bureaucratic bonds inhibiting the delivery of food to the hungry; a nation committed to racial equality should be able to distribute food to black, brown, and white alike; a government which believes in education for all should be able to teach the poor to buy and process foodstuffs in a manner which will guarantee some nutrient balance to their menus.

Thus, it appears that the obstacles separating our country's overflowing cornucopia and the shriveled stomachs of less-than-fortunate children are manmade. We approach the House Agriculture Committee to review its position in regard to the feeding of the poorest of the poor. Access to food is an international issue today. Shouldn't we, at home, show the world how our system guarantees freedom from hunger?

WHO KNOWS WHAT ABOUT NUTRITION IN THE UNITED STATES?

The United States Public Health Service employs 40,376 persons. Only a few of these can be considered dietitians or nutritionists. There are 88 accredited medical schools in the country. Those at Harvard, M.I.T., the University of Iowa, Vanderbilt and Tulane seems noted for their contributions to this science. Throughout the country, there may be 20,000 professionals whom we can group under the title "dietitians and nutritionists". They are not well dispersed. The Past President of the American Society for Clinical Nutrition and the current Treasurer of the American Institute of Nutrition, Willard A. Krehl, M.D., Ph.D., recently submitted some rather pertinent comments:[2]

"I can assure you that there certainly would not be more than 50 nutritionists working in association with State health departments in the United States since many states do not have a nutritionist and, in fact, our own state of Iowa now is without the services of a nutritionist since the one who was employed resigned for other occupations."

Dr. Nevin S. Scrimshaw, Professor of Nutrition and Head of the Department of Nutrition and Food Science at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, commented that: ". . . clinical nutrition is not even taught in most medical schools and is not really adequately done in any of them."

Dr. Fredrick J. Stare, Chairman of the Department of Nutrition at the Harvard School of Public Health, summed up his comments on this subject by saying: ". . . There could be, and probably is, extensive undernourishment and malnutrition in the United States, but no one really knows. It is most unfortunate that none of our public health services at any level—national, state, city or town—have so far been concerned about the health of Americans of any social or economic class as it may relate to nutrition."

HOW ABOUT DOCTORS?

We posed the following question to several experts in the field of nutrition: To what degree are this nation's doctors prepared to identify malnutrition in a patient who walks through the door?

We gleaned the responses from telephone calls, letters, and previously written articles for professional publications:

Dr. Stare: "Not very well. Unfortunately, most physicians are not well trained to identify malnutrition except for gross under- or overweight, and this anyone can do."

Dr. Scrimshaw: "I would say very poorly. . . ."

Vonda Webb, Supervisor of Nutrition Services, Mississippi State Board of Health: "This varies with the physician, but I feel that most physicians rely on more detailed tests than observation or clinical appraisal."

Dr. Harry S. Lipscomb, Chairman, Department of Biochemistry, Texas Medical Center, Baylor University College of Medicine, Houston, Texas: "In short, neither are physicians prepared to identify malnutrition in their daily practice simply because they are not thinking of it . . .".

Dr. Krehl: "The fundamental principles of nutritional evaluation are no different from the classical ones of medicine and are based on careful general observation, adequate history including dietary history, complete physical examination, and appropriate laboratory studies. Along with these techniques, the most important factor in considering nutritional status in the total evaluation of the patient is—to think about it."[3]

WHO HAS DONE BROAD RESEARCH?

We asked our correspondents a second question: To what extent have the eating habits of the American poor (and their nutrition levels) been researched by competent authorities on a state, regional, or national basis?

Dr. Scrimshaw: "We know less about the eating habits of the various social and economic groups in the United States than in many developing countries because so few surveys have been carried out. The surveys of the U.S. Department of Agriculture do not, of course, give this type of information."

Dr. Stare: "Few, practically no attempts have been made to research the eating habits of the poor in our country or to study their nutritional health."

Dr. Lipscomb: ". . . I know of no recent studies in our country which have attempted to re-examine the problems of the eating habits of the American poor, which really search in depth both the nature and magnitude of the problem, as well as perhaps more importantly its long-term effect on the social, physical, and intellectual growth and development of our country."

Dr. Paul B. Pearson, President of The Nutrition Foundation: "The eating habits and nutritional status of low income families have been and are now being studied by both state and federal agencies."

WHAT ABOUT THE PRIVATE SECTOR?

The difference of opinion led us to interview many of the employees and executives of the nation's major food manufacturing concerns. (They are the main source of funds for The Nutrition Foundation.) Most of those interviewed preferred that we not identify them as speaking for their company. We asked them the following three questions:

1. What firms or organizations have done extensive research among the poor to establish eating habits, nutrition levels, and preparation customs?
2. What is the extent of knowledge within the industry relative to nutrition levels among the poor?
3. Have any firms developed low-cost food supplements which could be made available to the poor to up-grade their present nutrient intake?

Of the eight representatives of major food manufacturing firms with whom we spoke (in most cases, the Director of Nutrition Research) none knew of any significant research done in the area under consideration. The most frequent answer given to these three questions was, "I don't know of anything at all that's been done." One official of a soup company said, "If we saw evidence of profitability, we might look into this." A nutritionist with a major dairy concern, who was recommended to us by several other respondents as the person most knowledgeable about nutrition studies by private entities, said, "I don't know of a single study in this field by a private company." A spokesman for the cereal industry admitted, "We have been concerned with low cost food developments outside the United States and have looked a little inside, but we can't market to a specific income group." A highly respected nutritionist in the meat area told us, "I know there's a high incidence of malnutrition in this country. We learn that from Washington. That's why we have food programs."

In almost every instance, the persons we contacted were confident that their firms or industries would take on this task "if we knew there was a mass market . . . if we could justify it to our stockholders."

Our earlier correspondents, when asked the same questions, answered:

Dr. Krehl: "It is difficult not to be derogatory in answering this question but in reality, the attention of the manufacturer is directed to the area in which he can sell his product and advertising of course is similarly directed. . . . It is true however, on the other hand, that segments of the commercial industry have directed educational programs to all levels of our population including the poor and I cite such organizations as the National Dairy Council, the American Dairy Association, the Cereal Institute, among others."

Dr. Stare: "I'm not aware that our private food companies have addressed themselves to the nutritional problems of the nation's poor."

While our samples are small, we believe our correspondents to be among the most knowledgeable persons in the area of nutrition. We must therefore take their response as an indication that this affluent nation has never seriously studied the possibility of malnutrition in its midst. We believe most food concerns have not sought a market in fighting domestic malnutrition among the poor. For this reason, we believe the portion of S 2138 which calls for "a comprehensive study of the incidence and location of serious hunger and malnutrition . . . in the United

---

[1] See Appendix.

[2] Copies of related letters from correspondents can be provided upon request.

[3] From the *Medical Clinics of North America,* Sept. 1964, Vol. 48, No. 5, p. 1139.

States" is an imperative part of the bill. Such a study can point to the economic, political, cultural, seasonal, regional and racial aspects of hunger in an affluent society.

IS EXISTING LEGISLATION ADEQUATE TO SERVE THE NEEDS OF THE HUNGRY POOR?

The commodity distribution and food stamp programs should be able to care for the nation's hungry. At present, however, many areas do not use either of these programs for a variety of reasons. Both programs require a state to pay for local administrative costs. Most states pass this cost on to local county jurisdictions, where the decision to operate or not operate a program is made. Many counties in our country are too poor to pay the price of administration, even though it may be as little as $8 per recipient per year. A vast number of the nation's poor are in such counties. Other counties are disinclined to offer a food program for other economic reasons, or for political or other reasons.

Another problem, created by the wording of the Food Stamp Act itself, is that the two programs cannot operate simultaneously in one area "except during emergency situations caused by a national or other disaster as determined by the Secretary (of Agriculture)". In the Summer of 1967, Secretary Freeman stated that he does not have the power to declare a national or other disaster, and, therefore, he cannot authorize the distribution of life-saving commodities to people found starving in rural pockets or urban ghettos where a food stamp program exists. S 2138 would give the Secretary that authority. It would enable the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Secretary of Agriculture to jointly act where local conditions preclude the feeding of hungry and severely malnourished people. (S 2138 can *not* be invoked in case of disaster.)

Through the provisions of S 2138, persons who cannot afford food stamps or who, for reasons of length-of-residency or other restricting requirements, cannot be certified for a food program, can for the first time be fed. S 2138 should be regarded as an *emergency food measure,* and not as a third means of feeding the poor. This emergency food distribution capability is of paramount importance to the bill, for it fills a gap left by both of the existing pieces of legislation. Use of S 2138 should be focused on the short-term emergency situation while local and federal agencies devise better use of dominant commodity and food stamp programs.

HOW WELL DO THE FOOD STAMP AND COMMODITY DISTRIBUTION PROGRAMS DO THEIR JOB?

As we have said, the existing federal food programs should be able to care for the nation's hungry in areas where they operate. An analysis of their performance shows that they do not.

The Office of Economic Opportunity defines "poor" with the use of a sliding scale, based on 124 values graduated according to family income, size, composition, and location. On this basis, OEO estimates that in 1960 there were over 38 and one-half million poor persons in the United States. While this figure seems alarmingly high to some officials, we do not feel that a consensus opinion of the exact number of poor is necessary at this time. The gross number is obviously high enough to warrant national attention. (Even if OEO's figure were cut in half, the performance of our federal food programs would have to be considered inadequate.)

In June of 1967, the United States Department of Agriculture reported that 4,833,428 persons were served by either a commodity or a food stamp program. (There were 6.1 million being helped by commodities alone in October 1961.) 4.8 million is only 12% of OEO's estimate of the total number of poor in this country. This means that, if government figures are accurate, 7 out of 8 poor persons are not helped by existing food distribution programs. We do not believe that everyone defined by OEO to be poor should have access to governmental food programs. Some states have welfare payments of sufficient size to nearly meet the needs of the recipients. Some families who are poor may have occasional income to let them live without starving. But when two federal programs designed to feed the poor bat 12% in their performance, one is provoked to look behind the general statistics.

Let us look at the individual programs.

Commodity recipients dropped 1.8 million in the last year to a level where 3,004,376 persons received this form of food help. Commodities were available in 1280 jurisdictions (mainly counties) out of a total of 3,130. "Available" may be a misleading term. In one county, with 1873 designated poor persons, 16 were participating in a supposedly active commodity program in June of this year. In another county, with 40,083 designated poor, only 1646—or 2.45%—participated.

Food stamp recipients, whose number rose 50% in the last year, totalled 1,829,052. Food stamps were available in 838 jurisdictions (mostly counties) out of the national total of 3130. Again, however, caution should be used in looking at the figures, for in one county with 5483 persons adjudged poor, only 72 of them participated in the food stamp program. In the North and West, participants are generally those on welfare; in the South, the converse is true.

One should note that 1012 jurisdictions (mostly counties) offer neither food stamps nor commodities to their poor populations.

Thus we see that 33.7 million persons adjudged poor by OEO find no relief in the food stamp or commodity programs.

We have researched specific areas and regions. We have tabulated elsewhere how various states, and various Congressional districts, utilize the food stamp and commodity programs. Urban areas seem to prefer food stamps. Rural areas seem to prefer commodities. Poor counties seem to shy away from both.

The northern tier of states has many an area where the poor are offered little or no access to these food programs. For example, 1.1% of those adjudged poor in Hartford, Connecticut, participate in a food program. In Lehigh County (Allentown), Pennsylvania, 1066 out of 25,500 designated poor participate.

The following statement may sum up an area of high importance to this Committee:

Of 283 counties with high poor populations surveyed in the states from Texas to Delaware, 93 had neither program and thus 3,000,000 persons adjudged poor had no access to these programs; in the 190 counties that *did* have either commodities or food stamps, 6 million out of 7 million adjudged poor had no help from either federal food program. Welfare grants in these states are generally below the national average.[4]

THE IMPACT OF HUNGER

Many members have indicated in past hearings that the non-working and non-taxpaying poor are in need of jobs. The child of a malnourished mother starts with a strike against him, for brain damage and premature birth are suspected products of malnutrition in a conceiving mother. The hungry child is nigh onto uneducable. The malnourished youth is unambitious when it comes to sustained work. The malnourished parent is preoccupied with his stomach and not his job. The aging adult fears early death due to lack of lifelong good eating habits. Our society may have some who show little will to work; our society cannot expect good work habits of those to whom hunger is a way of life.

"Childhood malnutrition causes retardation of physical growth and development and recent evidence suggests that mental development may be impaired also. In malnourished preschool children, mortality and morbidity are extremely high and the common infectious diseases of childhood are catastrophic.

"Nutrition has a vital role in the health of adults, also, and influences socio-economic and cultural development profoundly. Malnutrition leads to deterioration of physical fitness and mental efficiency, to emotional and personality disturbances, and to reduction in the capacity to perform work." (Excerpt from *The World Food Problem*. A Report of the President's Science Advisory Committee, Vol. 1, p. 43, The White House, May 1967.)

S. 2138 has a health component related to hunger. If those who are found to be malnourished are in need of medical care as well as long-term improvement in their menus, S. 2138 authorizes emergency health care for such persons. Again, this should be recognized as an emergency measure. In most counties and jurisdictions there are medical services which can prescribe remedies for those who are suffering. We must be slightly wary of the ability of intake clinicians to identify malnutrition, for our aforesaid responses do not lead one to be happy about the preparation of doctors, much less nurses, in the field of nutrition.

SUMMARY

The members of the House Agriculture Committee realize that food and food systems are the world's major preoccupation. *U.S. News and World Report*[5] recently indicated we have succeeded to a degree of perhaps 96%. The 4% remaining—8 million persons—are the means by which we can prove to the world that there is a food system answer here in America. If we can eradicate hunger even among our most poverty-stricken, the skeptics of our free enterprise society will have been rebutted on one more front. S 2138 can be the lever by which existing agencies and programs meet the need of America's chronically hungry.

I thank the Committee for letting the Ad Hoc Committee on Emergency Food to Fight Hunger in the United States make this statement. We submit it with the realization that the Committee members are aware of our food resources and with the certainty that the members are fully committed, this year, to freedom from hunger in the United States.

Thank you.

APPENDIX A

Average percentage of poor participating in food programs, June 1967—All States

Alaska	0.3
Virginia	1.8
South Carolina	1.9
Connecticut	3.0
Idaho	4.0
Nebraska	4.5
Texas	5.0
Massachusetts	5.5
Kansas	5.6
Nevada	6.0
New Jersey	6.0
New Hampshire	7.0
Maine	7.1
Iowa	7.2
California	7.6
Indiana	7.8
Louisiana	7.9
North Carolina	8.0
Hawaii	8.2
Tennessee	8.8
Florida	9.0
Alabama	9.1

---

[4] See appendixes for substantiating details.

[5] Vol. LXIII, No. 10, Sept. 4, 1967, pp. 50–53. "Is U.S. Really Filled with Poverty? A Look at the Facts", by John B. Parrish.

APPENDIX A—Continued

Average percentage of poor participating in food programs, June 1967—All States—Con.

Minnesota	9.1
Wisconsin	9.1
Missouri	9.5
North Dakota	9.7
Georgia	10.6
Montana	10.9
Maryland	11.0
Washington, D.C	11.7
Colorado	12.0
Illinois	12.0
Pennsylvania	12.0
Utah	12.0
Vermont	12.0
Kentucky	13.0
Michigan	13.0
South Dakota	13.0
Rhode Island	13.5
Arkansas	14.0
Wyoming	14.0
Washington	14.9
Ohio	15.5
West Virginia	16.4
New York	18.5
Oregon	21.3
New Mexico	24.0
Arizona	26.0
Delaware	31.0
Oklahoma	31.0
Mississippi	32.0

APPENDIX B

Average welfare payment per recipient, 1966—All States

Mississippi	$34.16
West Virginia	39.71
South Carolina	40.23
Georgia	46.13
Florida	46.72
Alabama	47.11
Indiana	48.01
Nebraska	50.03
Utah	51.45
Nevada	52.61
Virginia	52.90
Tennessee	52.95
Arkansas	53.95
North Carolina	54.12
Texas	54.31
Arizona	55.37
Kentucky	55.98
Louisiana	56.39
New Mexico	57.70
Maine	57.80
Wisconsin	58.38
Washington	59.40
Maryland	59.62
Vermont	60.13
South Dakota	60.32
Idaho	60.71
Montana	61.21
Missouri	61.46
Minnesota	62.02
Rhode Island	62.30
Wyoming	62.37
Oregon	62.63
Washington, D.C	62.77
Iowa	63.20
Colorado	64.09
Illinois	64.80
Ohio	65.56
Alaska	65.85
Delaware	66.36
Connecticut	69.72
North Dakota	71.09
New Jersey	71.40
Pennsylvania	74.12
Oklahoma	77.87
Michigan	79.27
Kansas	79.46
Hawaii	79.50
New Hampshire	84.97
Massachusetts	85.12
New York	85.17
California	98.32

APPENDIX C

Rank of districts represented by Members of House Agriculture Committee in percent of poor constituents participating in food program

Congressmen:	
Brasco, Democrat, New York	(1)
Abbitt, Democrat, Virginia	0
Hansen, Republican, Idaho	0.03
Dole, Republican, Kansas	.79
Poage, Democrat, Texas	1.52
Kleppe, Republican, North Dakota	2.47
Price, Republican, Texas	3.41
Dow, Democrat, New York	3.60
Rarick, Democrat, Louisiana	4.71
Mayne, Republican, Iowa	5.41
Goodling, Republican, Pennsylvania	5.69
de la Garza, Democrat, Texas	5.92
Zwach, Republican, Minnesota	6.49
McMillan, Democrat, South Carolina	6.60
Mathias, Republican, California	7.26
Wampler, Republican, Virginia	7.46
Purcell, Democrat, Texas	7.80
Resnick, Democrat, New York	8.56
Nichols, Democrat, Alabama	9.34
Burke, Republican, Florida	10.13
Stubblefield, Democrat, Kentucky	10.32
Miller, Republican, Ohio	10.49
Myers, Republican, Indiana	10.95
Teague, Republican, California	11.13
Jones, Democrat, North Carolina	13.34
Stuckey, Democrat, Georgia	13.50
O'Neal, Democrat, Georgia	16.60
May, Republican, Washington	17.42
Belcher, Republican, Oklahoma	18.45
Gathings, Democrat, Arkansas	18.48
Foley, Democrat, Washington	20.11
Vigorito, Democrat, Pennsylvania	22.59
Jones, Democrat, Missouri	22.96
Abernethy, Democrat, Mississippi	29.90
Montgomery, Democrat, Mississippi	38.04
National average	12.70

[1] Not able to be calculated.

APPENDIX D

[From "The World Food Problem," A Report of the President's Science Advisory Committee, vol. 1, The White House, May 1967]

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington.

In all of recorded history, none have surpassed the American people in willingness to share their abundance with others. We have given unstintingly of our material wealth and our precious human resources to benefit the less fortunate of this earth. We have sought to restore those whom war has shattered. We have sought to provide assistance to the newly independent members of the family of nations who are making the effort to break the shackles of tradition and achieve a better life for their peoples.

But as success in programs to eradicate disease and to improve health have given more and more millions the opportunity to live out their natural span of life, the problem of hunger has lingered on and the shadow of starvation and impending famine has grown ever darker.

Hunger's unceasing anguish drains hope, crushes aspirations, and obstructs the generation of programs of self-help. The threat of starvation sets man against man and citizen against government, leading to civil strife and political unrest.

Our programs to help these new countries to increase food production have brought about striking improvement in a few instances. But in the total balance, food has not kept pace with population and the developing world continues to lose ground in this race.

The World Food Problem is one of the foremost challenges of mankind today. The dimension of the challenge will define the dimension of our response and the means for that response. We must join with others in a massive effort to help the less fortunate of the earth to help themselves. I am making this report public because of its significance for the American people and people all over the world.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

APPENDIX E

CITIZENS' BOARD OF INQUIRY INTO HUNGER AND MALNUTRITION IN THE UNITED STATES

COCHAIRMEN

Mays, Dr. Benjamin E.—Past President, Morehouse College, Atlanta, Georgia; Dunbar, Leslie—Executive Director, Field Foundation, Inc., New York, New York.

MEMBERS

Ashmore, Dr. Harry—Author, Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, Santa Barbara, California;

Carter, James, M.D.—Pediatrician, Division of Nutrition, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee;

Corcoran, Msgr. Lawrence J.—Secretary, National Conference of Catholic Charities, Washington, D.C.;

Corrigan, Rt. Rev. Daniel—Director, Home Department, Executive Council of Episcopal Churches, New York, New York;

Deloria, Vine, Jr.—Executive Director, National Congress of American Indians, Denver, Colorado;

Dorsen, Dr. Norman—Professor of Law, and Director, Arthur Garfield Hays Civil Liberties Program, New York University School of Law, New York, New York;

Esser, George—Executive Director, North Carolina Fund, Durham, North Carolina;

Fein, Rashi—Senior Staff Member for Economic Studies, Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C.;

Haynes, Dr. M. Alfred—Associate Professor of International Health, Johns Hopkins School of Hygiene and Public Health, Baltimore;

Helstein, Ralph—President, United Packinghouse, Food and Allied Workers, Chicago, Illinois;

Henderson, Dr. Vivian—President, Clark College, Atlanta, Georgia;

Huerta, Dolores—Secretary, United Farm Workers Organizing Committee, Delano, California;

Kahn, Rabbi Robert—Congregation Emanu-El, Houston, Texas;

Mayer, Jean, M.D.—Professor of Nutrition, Harvard School of Public Health, Boston, Massachusetts;

Mitchell, Walter—President, International Chemical Workers Union, Akron, Ohio;

O'Connor, Dr. James—President, American Freedom from Hunger Foundation, New York, New York;

Ogle, Milton—Executive Director, Appalachian Volunteers, Bristol, Tennessee;

Ortiz, Gilbert, M.D.—Chairman of ASPIRA, Bronx, New York;

Sorenson, Philip—Executive Director, Association of Foundations, Inc., Columbus, Indiana;

Sparer, Dr. Edward—Professor of Law, Columbia University, New York, New York;

Wheeler, Raymond, M.D.—Charlotte Medical Clinic, Charlotte, North Carolina.

[Reprinted from Harvard Business Review, May-June 1967]

CREATIVE COMPETITION

(By George Champion)

NOTE.—George Champion is Chairman of the Board of The Chase Manhattan Bank. Active for many years in civic and educational organizations, he is a director of a number of companies, including International Paper Company, American Smelting and Refining Company.

WORLD FOOD NEEDS

As the concept of social competition on a businesslike basis is extended to the international scene, it seems likely that private business can contribute effectively to solving the problem of feeding the world's hungry. It is becoming increasingly obvious that what countries with underdeveloped economies really want is self-sufficiency in food production along with the ability to produce agricultural products within the price range of their own low-income populations.

Some enterprising companies are demonstrating that private business can meet these requirements. They are introducing modified plantation schemes, directing and supervising credit, and pioneering in technical services and marketing arrangements. Companies already taking part in such sociocommercial projects include Anderson, Clayton and Company, California Packing Corporation, Campbell Soup Company, H. J. Heinz Company, Ralston Purina Company, Quaker Oats Company, Fisher Flour Mills, International Milling Company, Dole Corporation, and United Fruit Company.

Several of the more intriguing of these programs involve the processing and promoting of inexpensive but nourishing foods and animal feeds by American companies in overseas areas. For example:

Enriched Maizena is one product developed for the low-income, mass food market. Derived from a cornmeal product, it is produced and sold by the Corn Product Company of Latin America. Enriched with proteins, vitamins, and minerals, it is an all-purpose food that can be used as a pudding or a drink. While serving useful social purposes, it also sells well.

Another interesting project has been launched by Ralston Purina in Colombia. Recognizing an acute need for low-cost meat, milk, and eggs, the company decided to promote milo, a grain sorghum similar to Indian corn, as a suitable feed crop. Ralston introduced milo seed and financed local growers in Colombia by guaranteeing each a cash market for his harvest. The idea is that the increase in production in milo as a feed crop will in turn lead to the increased production of meat, milk, and eggs. Ralston Purina has also introduced improvements in local storage and transportation facilities and initiated consumer educational services.

The phrase "business know-how" has become a cliché, but there is no denying that, applied to social problems, it can be as effective and rewarding as it is in the normal run of commerce and industry.

CONGRESSMAN HANNA INTRODUCES PERFECTED TRUTH-IN-LENDING BILL

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HANNA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, for the many who have been closely following the progress of the truth-in-lending legislation I want to report briefly on the nature of my perfecting amendments.

On September 14, I introduced H.R. 12904. After its introduction a number of perfecting technical changes were brought to my attention. Today I have introduced a clean bill which in substance incorporates the substantive material of H.R. 12904. The bill I have introduced today (H.R. 13361) differs from the measure I introduced on September 14, in only two ways.

First, H.R. 13361 places banks and savings and loans under the jurisdiction of the Federal Reserve, and Federal Home Loan Bank Board respectively in regards to the enforcement provisions of the advertising section of the bill. Previously, the Federal Trade Commission had full jurisdiction for all the enforcement under the advertising section of my bill.

Second, I have included in my perfected bill the language of the "administrative enforcement" section of H.R. 11601. The fact that this language was left out on the Senate side leads me to conclude that it was only the fault of oversight rather than intention. This language strengthens and generally perfects the intent of the truth-in-lending measure.

The other amendments which I have incorporated in H.R. 13361 technically perfect the language of the advertising sections, and the "add on" provision in H.R. 12904. None of these perfecting amendments materially change the substance of my approach toward the issue of truth in lending.

I commend H.R. 13361 to the careful attention of all who have been engaged in the dialog on this issue.

HANOI NOT INTERESTED IN PEACE TALKS

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, on September 27 the Honorable Paul Martin, Canada's Secretary of State for External Affairs, delivered a constructive and provocative address at the United Nations General Assembly.

The part of his speech which dealt with Vietnam attracted considerable attention, particularly in view of the fact that Canada is a member of the International Control Commission in Vietnam and that Canada has had sufficiently friendly contacts with Communist states, such as mainland China, so that Canada's views ought to be taken seriously in Hanoi.

While Mr. Martin called for a cessation of U.S. bombing of North Vietnam as "a matter of first priority" and as necessary if attempts to bring about talks between the two sides are to succeed, he also stated that a halt to the bombing was "only one side of a military equation, and that we cannot proceed if we are to have any hope of success as if the other side did not exist."

As one who has consistently urged that the United States stop bombing North Vietnam as a first step toward peace negotiations, I cannot help expressing dismay at the failure of the Hanoi regime to indicate any interest in even such a proposal as that made by the Canadian Government.

That part of Mr. Martin's address to the General Assembly which dealt with Vietnam follows:

VIETNAM

It would be encouraging, and indeed deeply gratifying to all of us at this United Nations General Assembly if we were able to note that the thunderclouds of war had lifted from Vietnam since one year ago we gathered in this same forum to review the problems of the world. That is not the case. The suffering and the destruction continue unabated. Despite all efforts, including those of my own country, to seek a basis for negotiation, the issues behind the conflict seem to remain as intractable as ever.

Once again we face the question, therefore, of whether this organization can help to bring the Vietnam conflict closer to a peaceful and mutually acceptable conclusion, and to foster political stability and economic progress in an area of the world where both are so badly needed.

There are, of course, reasons which militate against immediate and formal action being taken by the United Nations at this time. We cannot escape obvious fact—and it is a fact that I regret—that some of those most directly concerned with this conflict are not represented in this organization. I do not wish to suggest that if it were otherwise, we would automatically, find ourselves closer to a concrete solution to the Vietnam problem. Whether this situation will change in the foreseeable future I cannot tell, but I do not believe that the efforts for peace need be held in abeyance until it does.

A second important reason for the inability of this organization to contribute constructively to a solution, is that great powers are divided on causes of conflict and on measures required to terminate it. As we all know, the Security Council can only function effectively if its members will unite their strength to maintain international peace and security as the Charter calls upon them to do. I can see no immediate prospect of this unity being found.

To be realistic in assessing our present ability to act collectively and as an organization must not be regarded as a justification for apathy and inertia by each of us individually. This, I think, has been the conviction of the Secretary General, who has made repeated efforts to find a solution. This has also been Canada's conviction. We must strive to bring into play whatever channels and whatever forms of peace seeking machinery may be available to the international community. Our goal must be the restoration of peace and making it secure. That surely was the overriding concern which gave birth to this organization. As members of the United Nations, partaking as we do of common objectives and obligations, I think we must register our concern in terms clear enough and unequivocal enough for all those directly involved in this conflict to hear and understand. And at the same time, we must work with all the resources of ingenuity, imagination, flexibility and above all with a sense of justice towards devising whatever means may be mutually acceptable for bringing the conflict in Vietnam to the conference table. Whether the path we select as the most direct route to that conference table bears a name derived from he Charter or from the Geneva Conference machinery matters less to my mind than our assessment of its likelihood of leading to an end to the war. For its part, the Canadian Government, which has a special interest and responsibility, because of Canada's membership in the International Control Commission, will as in the past, continue to explore all possibilities of making use of that Commission membership or acting in conjunction with its commission partners to try to lead the parties to the conflict towards negotiation.

There is not the slightest doubt in my mind that the first step in that direction will involve the question of the bombing of North Vietnam. It seems clear that all attempts to bring about talks between the two sides are doomed to failure unless the bombing is stopped. This is a matter of first priority, if we are to start the process of de-escalation and to open the door to the conference room as the several representatives who have preceded me at this rostrum have pointed out.

But, let us not for a moment pretend that a halt to the bombing would in itself bring the war to an end. There are no magic formulas; there are no simple prescriptions for the settlement of problems as complex as the issues behind the hostilities in Vietnam. In a speech in Ottawa on April 11 of this year, I made certain suggestions as to how a start might be made on the road away from war by a progressive return to the ceasefire arrangement worked out at Geneva in 1954. I proposed that the following steps might be taken:

(1) As a first step towards disengagement the bombing of the north might be terminated and the demilitarized zone restored to its intended status, subject to effective international supervision;

(2) A freezing, of course, of military events and capabilities in Vietnam at the existing levels;

(3) Cessation of all hostilities between the parties that is a ceasefire;

(4) Following the ceasefire, withdrawal of all outside forces whose presence in the area of conflict was not provided for at Geneva and the dismantling of military bases.

I recognized then, as I have elsewhere, that there is no hope for progress towards a peaceful settlement in appeals or proposals which place the total burden of responsibility for making essential concessions on only one side. That sort of approach is relevent only in circumstances of military victory or defeat.

If therefore, we are to recognize a halt to the bombing for what it is, namely, the key to solution, the starting point in the process of solving the Vietnam problem, let us be very clear in our own minds that it is only one side of a military equation and that we cannot proceed if we are to have any hope of success as if the other side did not exist. No attempt to bring an end to the conflict can disregard either political or military inter-relationships in the area. Canada is, I repeat, ready at all times to accept its responsibilities in the International Control Commission—to act in conjunction with its commission partners in helping to lead parties to the conflict in Vietnam to the conference table and to assist in every way to achieve the establishment of an equitable peace in Vietnam.

WHO IS LEADING IN AVIATION SAFETY?

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ottinger] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, on September 30 I released what I consider to be 20 essential measures to promote aviation safety in the United States. One of these was development and use of an emergency runway barrier to prevent the crash of an airliner should the plane threaten to overrun a runway because of an aborted takeoff or some mishap upon landing.

Unhappily for airline crews and passengers, the attitude of the Federal Aviation Administration with respect to such an innovation, has been for years a negative one and unfortunately, certain representatives of the airline industry share this attitude. Some years ago, the FAA determined that the hook and cable arresting system similar to that used on aircraft carriers was not suitable for use at civilian airports. But rather than accept the idea that some kind of protection against runway overruns was necessary, the FAA let the matter rest. It did not pursue the development of any kind of barrier.

It is significant that the French Government has contracted to test such a barrier with a U.S. firm—the All American Engineering Co. of Wilmington, Del. The barrier to be tested is a nylon net that can be strung across a runway. I am hopeful, for the sake of all airline passengers and crews, that the testing is successful and I am equally hopeful that the FAA will abandon its negative attitude in regard to this innovation and require the use of such a barrier at all airports. If the FAA fails to take such action, it will have established yet another area in which it cannot pass the buck for needless deaths and injuries in aircraft accidents.

I present herewith for the Record, the New York Times article of October 6, announcing the contract between France and the All American Engineering Co.:

France Will Test a Jet Crash Net—Runway Barrier for Civilian Airports To Be Sought

(By Edward Hudson)

The French Government has contracted for tests in the United States of an emergency runway barrier for civilian airports, the All American Engineering Company of Wilmington, Del., announced yesterday.

The barrier is a nylon net that can be rapidly strung across the end of a runway to prevent a plane in trouble from careening off. It is attached to energy absorbing devices that halt the plane. According to All American, the system can stop the largest four-engined jet airliner without discomfort to the passengers.

Emergency barriers and other types of aircraft-arresting devices have been in use by military forces here and abroad for many years. But, the company noted, the French Government is one of the first nations to take positive steps to adopt them at civilian airports.

The purpose of the barriers is to prevent possible injury to the occupants and damage to the plane in the event the plane threatens to run off the end of the runway because of an aborted take-off or a landing mishap.

One of the most disastrous overrun accidents occurred at Orly Airport in Paris on June 3, 1962, when an Air France Boeing 707 jet carrying an Atlanta art group sped off the runway during an attempted take-off and burned, killing 130 of the 132 persons aboard.

TESTING BY FAA

In this country the Federal Aviation Administration has tested the feasibility of a hook-and-cable arresting system for airliners but has never taken action to require such devices at civilian airports, an agency spokesman noted yesterday.

The spokesman said that officials of the agency believed that equivalent safety could be achieved at less cost by other means, such as grooving runway surfaces to increase aircraft braking power and improving thrust reversers for jet engines.

In the program announced yesterday, the French Ministry of Transportation has contracted for tests of a barrier system that employs a net made by a French concern, Aerazur Company, and an energy absorbing system built by All American.

The testing is to begin Oct. 16 and will be conducted over several months at All American's Georgetown, Del., facility using a framework that simulates a Boeing 707 jet and a high speed F.A.A. catapult.

The two companies have supplied similar barrier systems for the air forces of Switzerland and West Germany, for use with military aircraft.

The new system was reported to be capable of halting a four-engined jet aircraft traveling at take-off speed, without noticeable deceleration to passengers. Under the proposed system, the airport control tower operator could activate the emergency equipment that stretches safety net across the end of the runway.

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Gallagher] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, the food stamp program, recently extended for 2 years, is, in the words of the Washington Post, "an ingenious method for multiplying the effective purchasing power" of the undernourished.

The President's food stamp program has proven itself by its success in filling the nutritional gap in the diets of millions of families. This accomplishment has been made with a minimum of redtape and with a significant impact on local farm and grocery sales.

The food stamp program, originated by President Johnson and carried on by the Congress has, as the Post editorial says, proven a device "for ending the paradox of want in the midst of plenty, the anomaly of hunger in a land of abundance.

I place this editorial praising the President and the Congress in the Record at this point:

Food Stamps Continue

Under the law which Congress somewhat belately enacted, the food stamp plan will go forward for another two years with an appropriation of $425 million. It would have been an extraordinary lapse of good sense and sound policy if the plan had not been continued.

It is an ingenious method for multiplying the effective purchasing power of people who are unable to obtain the food they require through ordinary marketing channels. It is no cure-all for the most improverished, as the situation in Mississippi's backward areas demonstrated this year. Those at the very bottom of the ladder have difficulty finding the money needed to buy the stamps so they can use their multiplied purchasing power in stores.

Nevertheless, it has improved the diets of millions of families who need some help with food budgets. It has facilitated the movement of vast amounts of foodstuffs to deserving people without setting up the enormous bureaucracy that would be needed if government were to dole out rations through government distribution centers. There are no better devices at hand for ending the paradox of want in the midst of plenty, the anomaly of hunger in a land of abundance.

EULOGY TO JEFF KIBRE, RESPECTED LABOR LEADER

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. Matsunaga] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the passing on September 27, 1967, of veteran labor leader Jeff Kibre has stilled a dedicated and crusading voice in the American labor movement.

Prior to his retirement earlier this year due to ill health, Mr. Kibre had served the last 15 years of his life as the Washington representative of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union. During his longtime service in Washington, he became well known on Capitol Hill as an expert in the transportation and maritime fields, in addition to all other aspects of law pertaining to organized labor.

Jeff was a most effective representative of the ILWU, highly respected in the Nation's Capital, and liked by all. He was a dear personal friend of mine and I shall miss him. The passing of this courageous champion of labor leaves a void in the labor movement that will not readily be filled.

As stated so meaningfully in a scroll of appreciation prepared for presentation to Mr. Kibre by the officers and executive board of the ILWU at its recent meeting in San Francisco—

> Jeff Kibre's lifelong work is indelibly recorded in the historical growth of the American labor movement.

To Mrs. Kibre, and son, Joe, I extend my deepest condolences.

TESTIMONY OF VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS BEFORE U.S. VETERANS ADVISORY COMMISSION

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Teague] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Cooper T. Holt, VFW executive director; Francis W. Stover, national legislative service director; and Norman D. Jones, national rehabilitation service director, on October 2 presented the views of the Veterans of Foreign Wars to the Veterans Advisory Commission. I found their views informative and helpful, and I believe other Members will also. I include the text of the VFW presentation at this point in the Record:

Testimony of Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States Before the U.S. Veterans Advisory Commission, October 2, 1967

It is a pleasure for me to be here today representing Joseph A. Scerra Commander-in-Chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Commander-in-Chief Scerra has asked me to express his regret at not being able to be present on this significant occasion.

Fulfillment of the purpose for which this Advisory Commission was established can and must open up a new era of progress in the field of veterans benefits and programs.

This Commission was not established for the purpose of reducing the scope of present programs for the veteran. Nevertheless, it is understandable that there should have been some concern that a review, such as the one you have undertaken, might serve as a preliminary to the reduction of veterans programs. I know that the members of this Commission do not see their task in this light. I think we are all agreed that the primary purpose of this work, whatever specifics may ultimately emerge, is to further the interests of our veterans.

With this point made, it is possible to go on to a consideration of whatever additions or changes may be necessary to improve the substance and the servicing of veterans programs. You have made a substantial beginning toward this goal by making it possible for veterans, as members of our veterans organizations and as individuals, to present their views on what is necessary in order to go forward with this tremendous task.

As a representative of the National Organization of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, I wish to congratulate members of the Commission for taking the time to go to the veteran in order to determine current needs and aspirations. When you have completed these hearings, however, the real task will still be before you. Certainly your major contribution will be in sorting out the suggestions and recommendations made to you from which you must point the way. With this done, it will be the task of the Congress, the Executive and the veterans organizations to developed the legislative proposals and administrative innovations and procedures that we all expect shall result from your work.

Mr. Francis W. Stover, Director of the V.F.W. National Legislative Service, and Mr. Norman D. Jones, Director of the V.F.W. National Rehabilitation Service, are present with me here today and will detail the improvements we foresee as necessary and possible in order that we may fully translate the will of the people of this great Nation that our veterans shall be honored and their needs and the needs of their widows and children shall be met.

You will appreciate that down through the years the position of the Veterans of Foreign Wars has generally been determined by the resolutions adopted at our annual National Conventions.

Accordingly, recommendations made in this statement reflects to a large degree the almost 300 resolutions which were adopted at our most recent convention, which was held in New Orleans, Louisiana August 18 to 26, 1967.

All who have experience with legislation with the Congress do not have to be reminded that the Bureau of the Budget is the big roadblock which thwarts the dreams of so many. Veterans programs have for many years remained fairly constant while during the same period the cost of living, the gross national product, and other indexes of our economic prosperity have sharply increased. The so-called national "budget pie" indicates that the cost of veterans programs has sharply decreased on a proportionate basis. This fiscal year of 1968—the cost of veterans programs is approximately 4.5¢ of the budget dollar as opposed to 6 or 7¢ a few years ago.

As you make your considerations—keep in mind the modest cost of veterans programs. Remember other segments of our society do not hesitate to make huge demands for assistance to citizens whose contribution to our society has in so many instances been on the negative side. Veterans have made a special contribution by wearing the uniform and receiving an honorable discharge, and, therefore, deserve special consideration by the Government it defended in a time of peril. Do not be timid, therefore, in your recommendations because of the cost. Let your guide be as the President so eloquently stated in his message on veterans "that our Government is meeting fully its responsibilities to all those to whom we owe so much."

In the development of veterans programs, a most significant milestone was reached with the signing of Public Law 90–77. Since August 5, 1964 and on into the indefinite future, every person who serves in the Armed Forces of the United States will be a veteran upon his discharge or release from the Armed Forces.

Even today, 94 million or almost 50% of the total American population of now close to 200 million represent veterans and their families. With the signing of Public Law 90–77, veterans and their families will increase and continue to become a more significant percentage of the American population.

Public Law 90–77 has probably signaled the end of what is referred to as peace-time service. From now on, unless there is a drastic change in international events, all military service will probably be considered equivalent to wartime service for the purpose of veterans benefits. We hope that Vietnam is the last conflict to be recognized as equivalent to wartime service, but unfortunately this optimistic view is shared by few.

Any and all recommendations, therefore, that you may make to the Veterans Administrator will have a profound, long-lasting effect—not only on existing programs but perhaps for generations of veterans to come. For this reason alone you are urged to give very careful consideration to each and every recommendation of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, which it is our conviction are much needed and will greatly improve the present structure of veterans programs.

COMPENSATION

It has often been stated that the service connected disabled or, if deceased, their survivors deserve the highest consideration. Congress has generally adhered to this principle and since the end of World War II there has been a dramatic increase in the compensation to disabled veterans. Nevertheless, it is our considered opinion that compensation payments have not kept up with the vastly improved American way of life; for example, a 100% service connected veteran receives $300 a month or $3600 a year. This contrasts to the average American hourly wage earner who is now receiving in the vicinity of $5000 a year, or the average American family, whose income, depending on different criteria, is in the neighborhood of from $6000 to $7500 a year. These figures are subject to change but they demonstrate that the veteran with a service connected disability has somehow lagged far behind in his compensation payments when compared to the standard of living being enjoyed by the average American of the same age or status.

Probably the root cause of this development is the take-off point of $100 a month, which was the total disability payment to a veteran when World War II ended in 1945. Cost of living increases have been granted on a periodic basis to veterans receiving compensation, but this has not been enough.

It is recommended, therefore, that service connected disability compensation payments should be substantially increased and brought in line with the standard of living which is being enjoyed by the average American family.

This should not be construed as recommending an economic determination for disability compensation. The Veterans of Foreign Wars has always favored the larger payments to the more seriously service disabled. This continues to be our position.

Lastly, it should be remembered that many veterans have made miraculous recoveries and rehabilitation—not because of their disability but in spite of their disability—and they should not be penalized for having had the grit and determination to overcome their handicaps only to have their compensation payments reduced accordingly.

DIC PAYMENTS

The DIC payments are somewhat in the same category as the compensation payments. First established in 1956, the DIC payments have been improved since that time, so that the basic payment is now $120 a month to a widow. Coupled with the veteran's rank, the minimum to a widow is generally around $131—ranging on upwards to $361 a month for a high ranking officer with more than 30 years' service.

Most of those receiving DIC payments are widows who have been on the rolls for many years. It should be remembered that had these veterans lived they would be earning on the average of a much greater amount than $131 a month or whatever the figure might be.

It would seem appropriate, therefore, that a reevaluation of the DIC schedule should be made, with sufficient weight being given to the length of time that a widow had been receiving a pension, with due regard to her age and other factors which may be pertinent. An increased graduated DIC payment based on the length of time a widow is receiving DIC should be a part of the DIC program. For example, a widow of 20 years of age should not receive the same DIC payment as a widow of 60 who has been receiving DIC payments for 40 years.

One of the factors which is incorporated in the DIC payments is theoretically the equivalent of a free $10,000 life insurance policy. Notwithstanding, the Congress has provided an additional $10,000 life insurance policy to all those who have served in the Armed Forces since 1965 through its authorization of the Servicemen's Group Life Insurance policies. Consequently, any reevaluation of the DIC program must take into account the SGLI program. Further, the President has recommended that SGLI be increased from a minimum of $12,000 coverage to a maximum of $30,000 depending on the rank of the serviceman.

It is the considered judgment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars that the DIC program should also consider another factor. Upon remarriage, a widow forfeits her right to any more DIC payments. This in itself is an inequity. Most programs call for a lump sum settlement or payment when a guaranteed life income is terminated. It is recommended, therefore, that when a widow is remarried that she be provided a settlement payment which will take into account the age of the widow at the time of her remarriage and the amount of the DIC payments she would have received had she lived out her life expectancy without remarrying.

There is a precedent for this. The Federal Bureau of Employees Compensation provides a 24 month payment when a widow remarries. Present VA policy serves to deter or bar a widow from being remarried. A lump sum payment recognizes that a great saving has inured to the benefit of the Government. The DIC program should have the same principle and provision.

PENSION

The pension program is the most misunderstood of all veterans' programs. It is also the most political and Congress has received more heat over this program than any other since the end of World War II.

Today there are three pension programs: One for Spanish-American war veterans and their widows and prior wars, one for old law pensions and their widows, and one for new law or Public Law 86–211 cases, which has been in effect since July 1, 1960.

Presently, the Congress is considering restructuring the pension program to insure that there will be little or no decrease in pension payments when retirement and other types of income are increased. This year in Public Law 90–77, the Congress has approved a 5.4% cost of living increase, amounting to almost $100 million for those who are presently entitled to a pension payment.

The complicating development during the past several years has been the existence side by side of two pension programs—the old and the new. It was the studied opinion of the Congress when it approved Public Law 86–211 that the new pension program should be so liberal that eventually most of those receiving a pension under the old program would be phased out of the picture because of the more generous benefits under Public Law 86–211. This has not proven true. There are hundreds of thousands of veterans who are still under the old pension program and apparently will remain so as long as they live.

It is the recommendation, therefore, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars that there should be substantial increases in both the income limitations and the pension payments for those under the old pension program; for example, the Congress has provided a housebound allowance of $100 a month for those under the old pension program. It is our recommendation that the present aid and attendance allowance for the relatively few under the old pension program should be brought in line in the same amount as is paid under Public Law 86–211.

If it is in the wisdom of the Congress to restructure the new pension program along the lines of H.R. 12555—then the old pension program should be structured in the same manner. The President recommended—and the Congress has agreed—not to have any veteran suffer a loss in his aggregate income because of the Social Security increase. The refinements in the income limitations for the old pension program should be spelled out in the same manner as the refinements in H.R. 12555.

Further—for the consideration of this Commission is that old pension program cases be given a protected rating in much the same manner as compensation cases are protected under the Rating Schedules of 1925 and 1933, by guaranteeing at least $78.75 a month for the rest of their lives but with the opportunity to receive a higher amount should their income warrant. This would make the pension program much simpler and easier to explain.

What we are advocating is that those who are presently receiving a pension under the old program would have their pension payment protected so that in no event would they ever go below $78.75; then—if one of his neighbors comes along at a later date and does not receive as much because of a greater income, the situation could be explained—that his neighbor under the old program has a protected rating under an obsolete and ancient law.

Presently, a veteran with no dependents is guaranteed an income of $1248 a year. Obviously this is not enough for such a person to exist. The veteran must get additional assistance from other sources. It is the recommendation, therefore, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars that there be a substantial increase in the pension payments, especially for those with little or no income. Veterans who have worn the uniform have made a special contribution to their Nation in time of great peril, and it is the obligation of this Nation that these veterans can live in dignity during their declining years. This principle can best be carried out by making the pension program generous enough to provide the veteran with the basic necessities of life. Whatever amount of money this is estimated to be should be the minimum amount of pension paid to a veteran on a monthly basis for each year.

The payment of pensions to widows is a relatively recent development. Where veterans have been paid pensions down through the years since the founding of this Republic, it has only been in fairly recent times that pensions have been authorized for widows of veterans who have died from non-service connected disabilities; in fact, it was only since 1960 that the widows of World War II veterans have been paid a pension, where a veteran did not have any compensable service connected disability.

Consequently, the pension payments for widows has trailed in the amount of pension paid to the living veteran. However, the recently-enacted Public Law 90–77 has provided a new benefit—namely, an aid and attendance allowance, where a widow is so helpless that she needs the aid and attendance of another person. Thus, the Congress recognized that many of these widows are extremely elderly and in a helpless condition and has authorized additional assistance for them. With this policy, the Veterans of Foreign Wars wholeheartedly agrees.

It is recommended that the payments to widows be substantially increased with particular attention and consideration being given to those who have health problems or otherwise housebound or cut off from society because of their physical condition and age. Again, those with the least amount of income should be given a substantial increase to guarantee that these widows can at least be provided with the basic necessities of life.

MEDICAL CARE AND TREATMENT

Unhappily, something is happening in our VA hospitals. During the last several years the waiting lists for admission have drastically declined. The average daily patient load has drastically declined. Although the Congress has authorized a maximum of 125,000 VA hospital beds, only about 115,000 are in operation. Even the new hospitals do not have all of the beds in operation.

Military retirees are now permitted treatment at VA hospitals, provided a bed is available, as a matter of right. Post-Korean veterans are eligible for VA hospital care. On the other hand, Medicare has been made available to veterans who are 65 or older.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars believes that every effort should be made to have VA hospitals provide the same high standard of care which is being provided by university type hospitals and medical centers. There are alarming reports the quality of VA care has not been keeping up. To do this enough money has to be obtained through the budgetary process. It is strongly recommended that a much larger amount of money be provided the VA hospital system—to be sure that the latest type of hospital equipment is being obtained—and that the salaries for medical personnel are sufficiently attractive for the VA to recruit and retain the finest medical personnel. We can do no less for the veterans of this Nation.

Lastly, the Veterans of Foreign Wars has always strongly opposed the pauper's oath. With more VA beds becoming available, perhaps it would be feasible to liberalize this restriction and make it easier for more veterans to seek treatment at VA hospitals. This should not be construed as opening up the hospitals for all veterans regardless of their ability to pay, but to more liberally interpret existing law with respect to the inability to defray the cost of hospitalization as it applies to the individual veteran.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING

The most revolutionary development in veterans' programs, which occurred during World War II, was the enactment of the GI Bill. Instead of waiting until the veteran was disabled, the Congress decided to give the veteran help at the very beginning of his return to civil life. The success of the GI Bills is without parallel. The training provided under these programs will be a most significant factor in making it unnecessary for help and assistance to most of these veterans in later years.

Nevertheless, the post-Korean veteran is not being provided the same assistance as was provided to those in the Korean War. The formula for entitlement is based upon one day of training for each day of service. In the Korean conflict and World War II, it was a day and a half training for each day of service.

Likewise, the maximum of 36 months for World War II veterans established in 1944 still holds true for Vietnam veterans. There has been an educational revolution in this country during the last 20 years. In many instances 36 months of training will not do the trick—is not sufficient to complete the training of a veteran. It is recommended, therefore, that the Congress provide a day and a half of training for each day of service, where the maximum entitlement for education and training will be 48 months. This would simply be bringing the education and training program in line with present day requirements for many occupations and professions which require a long period of training and study.

CEMETERIES

The Veterans of Foreign Wars has long argued that there should be a national cemetery in every State in the Union. One of the problems is the many agencies which have responsibility for veterans cemeteries. Another reason is the way cemetery legislation is handled in the Congress, where it is divided among several committees.

Burial in a national cemetery is basically a veteran's benefit. The right to be buried is determined upon service in the Armed Forces. Consequently, it is recommended that the operation of national cemeteries be transferred to the Veterans Administration.

More basically—it is recommended that all legislation dealing with national cemeteries be transferred from the Interior Committee in the Congress to the House Veterans' Affairs Committee in the House and hopefully the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs, which will be established one day in the Senate.

GI LOANS

The FHA program has a permanent loan program. When a loan is paid off, then the borrower can take out another loan. It is a permanent program.

The Veterans Administration presently operates one of the largest loan programs in the Nation. Why should we let this experience and know-how go down the drain as these loans are retired? Ours is a mobile nation. Veterans are on the move and for this and many other reasons many will purchase more than one home during their lifetime.

Assuming that the veteran has paid off his first loan, it is recommended that he be granted another GI loan and as many other GI loans as he is qualified for, provided previous loans have all been paid. The GI loan program should be a permanent one.

REOPEN NSLI

It is astounding to many that only a small proportion of veterans have retained their National Service Life Insurance. For many reasons veterans permitted their NSLI policies to lapse shortly after their service during World War II. Then practically without notice, the Congress terminated the program in the early 1950's.

After many abortive attempts to reopen the program the Congress did approve a limited reopening for the service disabled and a few others. Many have lamented the fact that not as many as was anticipated took advantage of this opportunity to reopen.

Notwithstanding, it is the conviction of the Veterans of Foreign Wars that the NSLI Program should be reopened and that in no event should the service connected disability of a veteran serve as a bar to the granting of NSLI nor should it serve as a basis for higher premium payments.

HEALTH SERVICES

No explanation offered by the Veterans Administration justifies the drastic reduction in the total waiting list for hospital treatment in recent years. The number has reduced from 25,312 in 1950 to 7,715 in 1967. Factors undermining the logic of such reduction are the increased number of veterans and the increased incidence of hospitalization associated with advancing age. Factors which tend to reduce the waiting list are the intensified outplacement program, the pre-bed-care program, and improved treatment techniques which result in shorter length of stay and increased turnover rates.

The average rejection rate of applications for admission to VA hospitals is now approximately 35 per cent. There is no basis whatsoever for presuming that 35 per cent or at some hospitals as high as 50 per cent of veterans who apply for admission do not need hospital treatment. Many of the applicants who were rejected on the grounds of absence of medical need were recommended strongly for admission by their private physicians.

Improper medical school influence is evident at several facilities notwithstanding official denial by Veterans Administration spokesmen. Candid comments of hospital directors submitted anonymously to the distinguished Chairman of the Committee on Veterans Affairs of the House of Representatives support this opinion, and, in fact, clearly indicate numerous hospitals are in the unyielding grasp of the affiliated medical schools. The Administrator of Veterans Affairs should in these instances immediately reestablish the independence of VA hospitals as part of a system maintained for the sole purpose of providing treatment for eligible veterans.

Officials of some VA hospitals do not look with favor on maintenance of waiting lists, which are considered to be an administrative nuisance. The inability to immediately admit a veteran whose condition is not emergent may affect the judgment as to need for hospitalization. A legally eligible applicant who needs hospitalization should of course be promptly admitted or his name placed on the waiting list and admission accomplished at the earliest appropriate time.

The outplacement program, recently circumscribed by the blanket term of "Community Care Program", includes placement in nursing homes at VA expense and placement of veteran patients in many types of facilities at personal, family or welfare expense. The utilization of private nursing homes is disappointing. A proud proclamation by VA spokesmen that contracts have been negotiated with more than 2300 private nursing homes with a total capacity of more than 163,000 beds is unconvincing when compared to the current number of slightly in excess of 3000 patients cared for in private nursing homes at VA expense. Although the maximum payment for such care should be increased, and the six months restriction eliminated or grossly extended to facilitate the expanded utilization of this program, it is nevertheless evident that undue caution is partially the cause of such sparing use of contract nursing homes.

It is indeed unfortunate that caution has not been applied to the greatly expanded program of outplacement of mental patients. It was originally called The Foster Home Program. The types of facilities now utilized are of such varied often nondescript characteristics that the new term "community care facilities" is the terminology shield for all types of facilities utilized for post-hospital-care of mental patients. The desirability of timely and satisfactory outplacement of mental patients is conceded and supported. Nevertheless this interest should not result in placement in foster homes or other facilities of inadequate size or improper characteristics with respect to quarters, food service, supervision, patient activities or other important factors. Gross discrepancies in this program have been forcibly presented to the Veterans Administration. Corrective action to date is in our opinion inadequate. Statutory authorization permitting the Veterans Administration to pay for post-hospital-care of mentally ill patients would doubtless result in establishment of standards by the Veterans Administration and greatly improve the average quality of the facilities utilized for this purpose.

The reluctance of officials of the Department of Medicine and Surgery to candidly concede discrepancies is unfortunate. There is no place for a defensive mechanism in the operation of a system established and operated for the purpose of treatment of patients. In numerous instances responses to reports and communications have firmly denied existence of the reported conditions or claimed them to be inconsequential and to have been fully corrected. Persistent rebuttal have been necessary to obtain admissions of the gross faults reported. Administration officials should welcome rather than rebuff reports of policies, procedures, attitudes and judgment obviously inconsistent with professional and administrative standards.

Recognizing the probable impact of recent court decisions barring conviction and/or incarceration for alcoholism and the relative universal acceptance of classification of alcoholism as a disease, the Veterans Administration should initiate a crash program to establish more treatment centers for alcoholism in selected VA hospitals.

Inadequate professional staffing of some VA hospitals is alarming. This is particularly true with respect to psychiatry and other specialities. There is no single complete and guaranteed remedy for this condition. However, drastically increased maximum salary rates as high as $35,000 to $40,000 per annum for specialists, with related appropriation increases, would be of notable assistance in this regard. Authorization of what are commonly called fringe benefits, such as housing, salary differentials, increased opportunities for further professional training, and other benefits to be granted selectively by the Administrator would also be of assistance in recruitment.

The reduced appropriations for construction the last two fiscal years has assuredly detrimentally affected progress of modernization and replacement programs. Veterans Administration spokesmen have stated that the amount of $52,000,000 per year is adequate and all that can be utilized effectively but obviously this statement is inconsistent with the higher amounts originally requested by the agency. Even the higher amounts appropriated for a number of years were not adequate for all the projects needed to modernize and prevent deterioration of VA facilities. Certainly this subject merits immediate attention. It would indeed be unfortunate for the reduced appropriation rate to be continued for each of the next several years and allow VA hospitals to deteriorate to the dilapidated condition evident in the last decade before the modernization program was approved.

The value of VA hospital patients and domiciliary members as a clinical reservoir for research and training is recognized. Affiliation of a number of VA hospitals with outstanding medical schools for the purpose of cooperatively furthering the objective of improving and increasing the opportunities for professional training is proper. However, the Administrator of Veterans Affairs and his advisors in this important area of responsibility should not deviate from the purpose of providing hospital care for veterans reasonably convenient to their areas of residence throughout the country.

The discrimination which would result from further centralization of Veterans Administration Hospitals in the large urban centers near medical schools can not be tolerated. Additional smaller hospitals should be constructed in selected areas of the country. Authorization for reciprocal utilization of resources with other hospitals negates the old and invalid argument that smaller hospitals should not be operated because they cannot provide treatment for all conditions. Certainly they can be equipped and staffed to furnish treatment for more than 90 per cent of the applicants and patients. Transfer of a small number of patients or applicants to other facilities is not uncommon even between large Veterans Administration hospitals. The Veterans Administration hospital system should be structured, including geographical distribution of facilities, and operated for the treatment of veterans within reasonable geographical convenience.

It is probably impossible to accurately predict future VA hospital bed needs. Nonetheless, it is irrefutable that the dramatic increase in the number of eligible veterans resulting from recent legislation, the significant number added to the eligibility pool annually, and the increasing age of veterans, will increase the demand for VA hospitalization in future decades. The capacity of the system must not be inexorably reduced by annual reassessment, as seems to be the current pattern, with associated timidity in planning for the future. Forecasts and planning and construction should be based on generous estimates of projected patient loads to assure that adequate facilities will be available at all times.

The oath of inability to pay is of itself detestable and an insult to veterans who have served their country. It is amazing that the Veterans Administration, which as an agency should administer the laws designed to benefit veterans, their dependents, and survivors fairly and with compassion, would, by utilizing the authority of the Administrator of Veterans Affairs to interpret laws and establish rules and procedures, instigate a coercive procedure innocently called hospital admission counseling. Even if it were possible to concede that the counseling program is administered as intended in all facilities it nevertheless must be recognized as an unwarranted restriction of the veterans right of free decision. The number of cases identified for special review and appropriate action is negligible. The monetary equivalent of personnel time involved doubtless exceeds the amount recovered manyfold. Some veterans have withdrawn their applications during the course of or as a result of intensive counseling because of the fear incited by pointed remarks and questioning of the counselors. This program should be immediately discontinued.

It is generally agreed that it is desirable to increase state participation in the various care and treatment programs for veterans. An increase in the payment rates to state homes to $4.00 per day for domiciliary care, $6.00 per day for skilled nursing care, and $12.00 per day for hosiptal care, with a limitation in each instance of 50 per cent of the per capita operating expenditures of the state home, would doubtless be of benefit in improving quality of state provided care and encouraging states to increase the capacity of their facilities.

The 5-year period for federal financial assistance for construction of state nursing home care facilities should be extended for a second 5-year period with annual appropriations based on anticipated or known valid state requests. Inducement for states to establish state veterans homes or to increase the facilities thereof would be greatly enhanced by extension of the program of financial assistance for construction to include facilities for domiciliary care and for hospital treatment. For states which do not now have state veterans homes such assistance could properly be extended to include all commonly recognized essential facilities, including administrative headquarters, utilities, and all necessary adjunct structures.

We believe that the Administrator of Veterans Affairs and the Congress of the United States should reaffirm the importance of the domiciliary program as the most appropriate device for providing care for veterans not requiring hospitalization or skilled nursing care. The domiciliary admission criteria restrictively amended in 1955 should be reviewed and liberalized. Additional relatively small domiciliaries should be established at appropriate locations, perhaps associated with hospitals, throughout the country.

The statutory provision requiring that patients be transferred to contract nursing homes from VA hospitals and the administrative stipulation that admissions to VA nursing care units be limited to hospitalized patients discriminates against veterans who need definitely, even desperately, skilled nursing care but who do not require hospital treatment and therefore are denied or would be denied admission to VA hospitals, the current prerequisite for care in a VA nursing care unit or in a contract nursing care facility. It is recommended that direct admission to both types of facilities be permitted. VA hospital and clinical facilities and professional staff could be utilized in evaluating the need and appropriateness of skilled nursing care. In areas relatively remote from VA hospitals or clinics the VA could rely on selected private practitioners for this purpose.

INDEBTEDNESS

The financial distress associated with repayment of indebtedness to the Veterans Administration should be alleviated by administrative or legislative remedies. Harshness of judgment as to the question of extreme hardship is, in our opinion, apparent in many cases. Failure of the VA officials to correctly interpret the amendment to Title 38, U.S. Code, accomplished by P.L. 88–151 which in effect provides that with respect to G.I. loan indebtedness recovery shall not be effected if the veteran was without fault or repayment would cause extreme hardship is reprehensible. This language is certainly not ambiguous and the proper interpretation is clearly apparent. VA officials are apparently unduly disturbed by the possibility that a correct interpretation might result in an occasional waiver even though repayment by the veteran might be accomplished without extreme financial hardship. It is incomprehensible that this rare possibility should alter the proper interpretation and application of a statutory remedy.

It is, however, conceded that the best remedy is not within current statutory authority. It is believed that legislation according the Administrator of Veterans Affairs authority to waive any overpayment or indebtedness to the VA if recovery would be against equity and good conscience would be the most suitable vehicle. This would preclude specific findings related to fault and hardship although both factors might be considered in general evaluation of the petition for redress.

In the area of GI loan indebtedness it is believed that it would be appropriate to initiate changes which would eliminate the basis for indebtedness in many cases. An upset price at the time of the sale of the property by the veteran would be appropriate. Instigation of an effective procedure which would assure that each veteran proposing to sell his property involving a VA direct or guaranteed loan, request for release of liability or state in writing that he does not wish to do so would in the future minimize the number of cases in which veterans are obligated as a result of subsequent defaults and deficiencies resulting in obligation to pay the VA the amount of indemnity disbursed by that agency.

The VA should arrange for availability of mortgage credit insurance on a group basis for VA insured and direct loans. This would insure reasonable rates and acceptance of each concerned veteran without the necessity of meeting commercial life insurance health standards. It would also alleviate the problem of major indebtedness associated with the event of death and frequently minimal income of the survivors, and would, therefore, eliminate the possibility of indebtedness to the VA resulting from unavoidable default in such cases.

ECONOMIC VALIDATION OF THE VA SCHEDULE FOR RATING DISABILITIES

The economic validation project has been in process for several years. It will probably not be consummated before the expiration of an additional period of at least 2 years. This study of the average impairment caused by specific severity levels of diagnostic entities is being conducted in a period of economic virility. Job opportunities for many of the severely handicapped would not exist in average economic conditions or during a substantial recession or depression. We believe the VA to be in error in this project in not according an appropriate weight factor in evaluating the average economic impairment, particularly of severe disabilities. In response to our suggestion the Administrator stated that if the economic situation changes substantially an appropriate review would again be conducted. The length of time required for a comprehensive study of this nature precludes acceptance of this statement as an appropriate reaction to our suggestion.

The revision of the Rating Schedule should also provide for additional compensation for reduced life expectancy and social inadaptability.

BOARD OF VETERANS APPEALS

The case load of the Board of Veterans Appeals precludes adequate consideration of the individual claims and questions by members of the sections assigned responsibility as members of the Board. Each 3-member section is responsible for approximately 8 cases per day. Obviously, time does not permit the members to thoroughly review the evidence in all cases and direct preparation of each decision outlining the basis therefor; consequently, proposed decisions are prepared by consultants with board review of the cases after preparation of suggested decisions. An adequate number of additional board members should be authorized and employed to insure initial review of the evidence and decision determinations prior to referral to consultants for decision preparation.

Each adverse VA decision, including decisions related to VA administered insurance or Servicemen's Group Life insurance, should be subject to appellate consideration by the Board of Veterans Appeals. Only decisions as to need for and type and extent of treatment should be excepted.

MILITARY PAYMENTS TO VA BENEFITS AND EFFECT OF CHARACTER OF RELEASE FROM ACTIVE DUTY

Veterans receiving military longevity retirement may not also concurrently receive VA disability compensation or disability pension. This is obviously inequitable as such military retirement pay is based on length of service and not on disability. The authority to waive retirement pay and receive disability compensation or disability pension is not appropriate. Full payment of both military longevity retirement and VA disability compensation or disability pension should be authorized.

Recoupment of disability severance pay by offset of VA disability compensation should be computed from the date of release from active military duty irrespective of delay in filing a VA claim or in the effective date of VA benefits.

Present law requires recoupment of 75 per cent of military readjustment pay from VA disability benefits even though such readjustment pay has no legal or technical relationship to disability. This recoupment requirement should be abolished.

In some cases the character of final release from active duty bars authorization of VA administered benefits even though the individual served a period of many years, perhaps more than 15 years, and served with honor and distinction during one and perhaps two wars. The rule is premised on the fact that at the time of all status changes, such as reenlistment during the last continuous period of service, the individual was not free to be released from active duty on those specific dates. This policy is manifestly unfair. Benefits should be authorized based on satisfactory performance of wartime service without regard to character of subsequent release from extended service initiated by reenlistment or other change of status.

VETERANS FEDERAL CIVIL SERVICE PREFERENCE

Opponents of veterans Civil Service preference in federal employment have been unsuccessful in their efforts to persuade the Congress of the United States to adversely amend this beneficial legislation. The arguments have included the premise that special preference for veterans precludes selection of the most qualified applicant in some instances, and because the majority of veterans are beyond the normal age of seeking employment, the program has served its purpose and should be abolished.

Relatively recently initiated programs which provide special consideration for members of certain groups in some segments of federal employment negate veterans preference. All positions for which veterans preference applies should be filled through processes which insure appropriate consideration of applicants entitled to such preference. Favored consideration of other applicants pursuant to the terms of special programs established by administrative fiat circumvent the intent of Congress and the provisions of the Veterans Civil Service Preference Act.

Any degree of success of attacks on veterans preference will result in renewed attacks on the basic merit system. We believe it important that the Veterans Advisory Commission proclaim the importance and justification of special consideration of veterans and entitled dependents and survivors who seek employment in the federal system.

JOB COUNSELING AND PLACEMENT SERVICE

Reports of inadequate personnel to provide the preferred service to veterans prescribed by law at many local public employment service offices are distressing. The many special emphasis programs have placed an almost insurmountable burden on the public employment service, and personnel at many locations is inadequate for all of the assigned tasks.

Effective job counselling and placement service for veterans must be assured by adequate public employment service personnel, unquestioned sufficiency of time for each Veterans Employment Representative to perform his functional supervisory responsibilities, and adequate appropriations for the employment service and for the veterans employment service.

CONCLUSION

We urge adequate studies by or at the direction of the Commission of these recommendations and evaluation of each recommendation as to appropriate commission action. A study of Veterans Benefits conducted by the Administrator of Veterans Affairs through the medium of the Veterans Advisory Commission is as the President stated, to be conducted in consultation with leading veterans groups. It is manifestly inappropriate, therefore, for the Commission to proceed to formulate its final report without devoting adequate time to the study and consideration of the recommendations of national spokesmen of veterans organizations.

We recognize the Commission's expressed primary interest in subjects requiring legislation. We believe it appropriate, however, for the Commission to act with regard to recommendations not necessarily requiring legislation which ostensibly require remedial action. In some instances expression of concern by the Commission may be adequate. With respect to other situations the Commission might appropriately urge the concerned agency head to conduct studies and instigate appropriate corrective action or promulgate a statement of intent or declaration of policy which would accord some assurance of sympathetic consideration of the subjects in question.

We trust that the import of the projected monetary cost of the recommendations for new or liberalized benefits does not deter you from including all substantial recommendations of merit. We recognize the monetary consideration may affect the timeliness of legislative enactment of some of the recommendations and in consideration of this possibility you may wish to suggest a program of implementation of the Commission's recommendations.

We shall be pleased to respond to questions of the Commission members and to furnish further explanatory information upon request.

We again express our appreciation for the privilege of presenting testimony to this distinguished panel.

Thank you.

Veterans of Foreign Wars,
of the United States,
January 31, 1967.

Hon. Charles L. Schultze,
Director, Bureau of the Budget,
Executive Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Schultze: I am writing to register the strongest possible protest against the practice of the Bureau of the Budget in distorting the impact of veterans programs on governmental expenditures. This distortion, unfortunately, is consistent with a protracted and insidious campaign to undermine veterans programs.

A graphic prepared by the Bureau of the Budget widely reproduced in the press illustrates this. Examples from *The Evening Star* of January 24, 1967, and *Labor* of January 28, 1967, are enclosed [graphs do not appear in Record]. The effect of this graphic is to seriously misrepresent the cost of veterans programs.

The "pie" would indicate that the cost of veterans benefits is a significant portion of the 33 cents of the dollar cost of government charged to "Interest, Veterans, Other Fixed Charges." This is not true. The veterans portion of this 33 cent slice of the pie is only one-tenth of this total, or 3.6 cents. Interest charges amount to 10.5 cents of the 33 cent figure. Contractual obligations amount to 11.5 cents and public assistance grants amount to 3.1 cents of the 33 cent slice. It is a gross distortion of the facts to single out veterans in your presentation.

What happens is shown vividly in the reproduction of a portion of the front page of *The Evening Star* of January 24. The photograph used by *The Evening Star* cannot help but leave the impression that veterans costs bulk extremely large in the costs of government. Such costs are substantial but the proper perspective must be maintained. We suggest that in the future your depiction of the budget dollar be changed to delete the term "Interest, Veterans, Other Fixed Charges" and to substitute "Contractual Obligations, Interest, Other Fixed Charges." Let the actual figures tell their own story of the costs of meeting the Nation's obligations to its veterans.

Sincerely yours,

Leslie M. Fry,
Commander in Chief.

Executive Office of the President,
Bureau of the Budget,
Washington, D.C., March 4, 1967.

Mr. Leslie M. Fry,
Commander in Chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Fry: I've taken a long, hard look at that chart, and I can see your point. The fiscal and graphic motives were right, but the impact was obviously wrong. Our purpose was not to single out veterans, in some invidious sense, but to find a label that had concrete meaning in a few short words. In any event, we'll have a more careful reading of our graphics next year. You know, of course, that in the regular 1968 budget publications, such as "The Budget in Brief" and "The Budget," veterans' benefits are listed separately in chart.

I am sorry this reply has been so long delayed, but your letter of January 21 was being held for my personal attention.

Cordially,

Charles L. Schultze,
Director.

DEVELOP BUSINESS AND EMPLOYMENT IN SMALLER CITIES AND AREAS OF UNEMPLOYMENT AND UNDEREMPLOYMENT BY PROVIDING CERTAIN PREFERENCES FOR PROSPECTIVE GOVERNMENT CONTRACTORS IN SUCH CITIES AND AREAS

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. Morris] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, the long, hot summer's agony has called forth new and creative approaches to our urban problems. We now know that we can no longer consider urban problems in isolation from rural problems and the problems of the small city. Congressmen from areas of low density must join with their colleagues from megalopolis to bring about a workable urban-rural balance.

A little more than a month ago, Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman announced a midwinter conference to brainstorm what he described as one of the most urgent problems of our time:

> Should we try to check the accelerating movement of people from country to city?

Should we give high priority to building up smaller cities and creating new cities or should we resign ourselves to the kind of concentration we have increasingly today with 70 percent of the people now living on 1 percent of the land? I believe that it is time to come to grips with these questions.

We are all familiar with the growing problems of large cities. Nearly 600,000 people flow into our major cities each year, many without the skills for urban living, many who become a floating population among unfamiliar modes of life.

But even these nationwide urban growth statistics do not tell the whole story because growth is uneven. Eighty-four percent of our population increase is occurring within metropolitan areas. We now recognize the familiar pattern of the influx of low-income persons into the center city, the migration of higher income persons to the suburbs, the chaotic and unplanned growth of both city and suburb, the stagnation of small towns in the rural countryside—particularly in the Deep South. While the suburb strains to build new roads and provide sewers and schools, the central city suffers high rates of unemployment and poverty, overcrowded schools, and inadequate school buildings, substandard housing, and the lack of such basic neighborhood facilities as a place to meet, day-care centers, neighborhood health and welfare centers. Social alienation prevails; riot is the flag of desperation.

The overcrowded city is one aspect of the population movement; the stagnating rural town is another. It is all part of the same story but it is not a simple story. Overall, our population is now experiencing a 1-percent increase in births over deaths. Thus, while our rural population—in towns of 2,500 or less and on farms—undergoes an outmigration of between 500,000 and 600,000 a year, it remains constant in total numbers; it is, therefore, declining proportionately to the growing national population. At the same time farm population is suffering a drop in absolute numbers. These figures are overall figures and tend to obscure the fact that for our minority groups rural outmigration is proportionately much greater particularly among those persons moving from the Deep South. A large proportion of these persons make their way to the central cities of our large metropolitan areas. This undesirable pattern results in a floating element of the innercity population who remain unassimilated and become all too easily the pawns of those fermenting riot.

We must devise ways of developing business and employment opportunities within our smaller cities. This summer the National Advisory Commission on Food and Fiber gave us a glimpse into the future.

> Whether the Nation follow(s) a market-oriented policy, a policy of acreage controls and price supports, or a policy of all-out production, some 30 percent fewer man-hours of work in agriculture (will) still be needed in 1980.

In other words, in 1980 we will need only two-thirds of the farm labor we have today. The Nation should take advantage of this increase in farm productivity but not at the expense of the unneeded farmworker who must be provided with job opportunities accessible to where he lives.

The Advisory Commission recommends investment by the public in old and new communities in rural areas and "preferential formulas, similar to those applied to centers of unemployment, applicable to bidders on Government contracts by firms located in areas of serious underemployment." Such a concept meshes well with H.R. 12802, which I introduced on September 11, 1967. My bill presents, as a beginning step, a way for the Nation to develop business and employment in smaller cities and areas of underemployment and unemployment, to assist in bringing excess farm labor and other unemployed and underemployed labor into a new productive relation to society and yet to enable such people to remain in less densely populated areas, and not to be forced to migrate to our already overcrowded cities.

Let me consider specifically the needs of the West and of my own State, New Mexico. The West is, of course, the most recently settled portion of the country and it is an area where farms are still being established. However, it has one of the lowest rates for retaining its farm-born population on the farm and, in fact, finds it necessary to depend on migrants from other areas to replenish its farm population. Nevertheless, over 95 percent of those persons who are farm-born but leave the farm remain in the West. New Mexico is not losing population. In fact, over the last century, New Mexico has grown at a faster rate than the United States as a whole. Much of our population lives in small cities and we have only one standard metropolitan area, Albuquerque. Our State is vigorous and young with proportionately more people under 20 than has the United States as a whole. The State's proportion of adults who have completed 1 or more years of college is higher than the United States average. While incomes within the State are about the same as the national average, the State has almost as many white-collar workers as blue collar.

The overall picture is good. However, we must not overlook the disparities which exist within our State. Figures on employment and education are pulled up by the high averages found in our most prosperous communities. For example, Los Alamos, which did not exist in 1940, had a population in 1960 of over 13,000 persons. The median education of this population was 12.9 as compared to 11.2 for the State as a whole. A high of 80.4 percent of the population had completed high school and the median income reached $9,269 as compared to a State median of $5,371. 43.5 percent of the households had incomes of over $10,000. It is important to recognize that disparities exist as a first step toward bringing similar advantages to all of our citizens. Let us not forget that 24.4 percent of our households are still at the poverty level existing on incomes under $3,000 per year.

To strengthen our small cities is not only in the interest of New Mexico but also of the Nation. New programs will be required but we must also reexamine and redirect established programs in the light of the urban-rural balance. The proposal which I make does not rely on complicated procedures and large funding but rather it depends upon the private sector response to Federal incentives. We are aware of the high and immediate impact of Federal procurement. As I have pointed out previously, the Federal Government contracts for more than $85 billion a year, and where such contracts go influences job opportunities and hence population spread. Today Federal procurements go overwhelmingly to heavily urban areas. We must devise ways for the spread of investment to small cities so that the Federal Government will be more readily able to implement its policy of slowing the heavy flow of population into our large cities.

Such an approach to Federal policy is consistent with the recent emphasis, within the Government and without, on the importance of the role the private sector must play in solving our urban-rural problems. For instance, plans have recently been announced to involve the private builder more closely in the construction and management of public housing. A search has been launched for Federal excess lands to be converted into sites for low-income housing and industries that offer jobs to the unemployed. The FHA is moving to facilitate loans to persons within the inner city and a group of insurance companies has already announced plans to implement its policy of putting aside $1 billion for loans to housing projects and commercial enterprises within the slum areas.

Legislative proposals have been submitted to induce private industry to provide jobs and housing within the slum areas.

> This is—

According to the New York Times—

> consistent with the thrust among urbanists to devise new ways of attracting the private sector into the low-income housing field.

My bill is quite consistent with this trend. It provides that, in awarding contracts, the Government would give credit on the bids received from cities of under 250,000 population. One percent credit will be given cities with a population under 250,000, 2 percent if the area is under 100,000 population, and 3 percent if the area is under 50,000 population. A separate credit of 2 percent is proposed for any area where unemployment or underemployment exceeds the national average or for areas of serious emigration.

Such a bill could be easily implemented. It would require only that the Secretary of Labor determine, at least quarterly, those areas in which unemployment or underemployment is in excess of the national average, and those areas of serious emigration, and that the Secretary of Labor determine, at least metropolitan areas and the population of such areas on the basis of the latest census.

Let us put Federal action behind a sane policy to attain an urban-rural balance.

CASE FOR THE DEFENSE

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CABELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, the Dallas News recently published an editorial entitled "Case for the Defense" which mentioned some of the favorable results of the war on poverty. It points out that of the 30,000 antipoverty workers in the cities which were plagued by riots this past summer, only 16 were arrested. It describes the activities of the OEO workers in other cities who worked to help prevent riots.

As gratifying as these antiriot measures are, however, we should not forget the less spectacular activities of the many other thousands of OEO workers who are working across the country to improve the lives of the poor. They seek to give hope to the poor by showing them that a way exists for them to help themselves. It is their efforts, and their successes, which are the best riot preventives.

In order to share this editorial with my colleagues, I insert it in the RECORD at this point:

CASE FOR THE DEFENSE

It is generally conceded that the bad apples in the War on Poverty barrel did much to spoil the entire program's image this summer. The Office of Economic Opportunity ran a survey on the situation, and, in all fairness, that side of the story deserves to be heard.

For involvement in the riots, 16 poverty-war workers were arrested; 29,984 were not. Of the 16 suspects, only 6 were employed full-time in the program. None has been convicted.

Walter H. Richter, former state senator and now Southwest regional director for the OEO, recently ticked off what the War on Poverty was doing hereabouts while the riots were going on elsewhere.

In Dallas, in April, quick action by antipoverty workers was credited with helping to keep a potential police-brutality explosion from occurring.

In Oklahoma City, five boys with police records were put to work with the recreation and police departments. The one with the worst record did the best job, organizing a highly successful trash cleanup campaign in the slums.

In San Antonio, off-day police played big brother to Negro and Mexican-American youths, taking them to ball games, picnics, swimming pools and the like.

In Corpus Christi, reports the head of the police juvenile bureau, "criminal activity is almost at a standstill in those neighborhoods where the antipoverty program is operating."

Those are some of the bright spots, but they do not erase the smudges. Allan Maley, who directs Dallas' arm of the poverty war, sought to put it in perspective: "If you really believe that a local community should have the right to run its own programs, then how do you keep the community from having the right to fail as well as to succeed?"

ORDER OF THE ITALIAN SONS & DAUGHTERS OF AMERICA URGE RECOGNITION OF CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to call to the attention of my colleagues a very forthright and constructive statement made by the Order of the Italian Sons & Daughters of America on October 5 before the House Judiciary Subcommittee which held hearings on legislation to make Columbus Day a national legal holiday.

This great organization, in the best American tradition, is calling upon the Congress of the United States to give long overdue recognition to Christopher Columbus—the eminent navigator who discovered America 475 years ago.

The statement of the Order of the Italian Sons & Daughters of America follows:

STATEMENT OF THE ORDER ITALIAN SONS & DAUGHTERS OF AMERICA RELATING TO COLUMBUS DAY

It is the position of the Order Italian Sons and Daughters of America that Columbus Day should be declared a national holiday. Recognizing that it is an official holiday in at least thirty-six states, this alone should be persuasive reasoning why the United States Congress should enact a law making it nationwide in observance.

The Americans of Italian origin in this nation are disturbed that efforts to make this a national holiday are generally characterized as an attempt to impose a holiday in the United States for the satisfaction of only Americans of Italian origin. It is the position of ISDA that if it is the intention of the sponsors of this legislation to make Columbus Day as a holiday simply for Americans of Italian origin, then we will be opposed to it. The sole justification for making this a national holiday is to pay tribute to the discovery of America. October 12 is the birthdate of the Western Hemisphere. It is a date which commemorates the opening of the Western Hemisphere to the countries of Europe. Moreover, the Order Italian Sons and Daughters of America does not wish to participate in any argument as to who arrived first. Whether the Norsemen were here first, whether Leif Ericson did in fact come here, whether the Irish were here first, all of this is immaterial to the essential point. It was the coming of Columbus to America and his landing here on October 12, 1492, which opened the new world to the old world.

It is rather melancholy to compare the commemorative celebrations of Columbus Day in the United States with the enthusiastic commemoration in Central and South America. Our Latin American neighbors make this indeed a truly national festival. At the present time in America, because we have no national holiday, we see that usually the commemorations are sponsored by organizations of Americans of Italian lineage or religious groups such as the Knights of Columbus.

Although our organization is one of the largest organizations of Americans of Italian lineage, it is nevertheless our opinion that the necessity for making Columbus Day a national holiday is based not on an attempt to honor any one ethnic group, but to pay tribute to the date which heralds the discovery of the new world.

Another reason remains for advocating the creation of this new national holiday. Generally speaking, it has been the trend both in labor contracts and in modern thinking that each month of the year should feature some type of national holiday. Thus we see New Year's day in January; Washington's Birthday in February; various religious holidays in March, and April, including Purim, Holy Thursday, Good Friday, and the first day of Passover; in May we have Memorial Day; in June, Flag Day; in July, Independence Day; (there is no particular holiday in August because this is generally a vacation month); Labor Day in September; Thanksgiving Day in November; and Christmas in December. The creation of a national holiday practically midway between the Labor Day holiday of September and the Thanksgiving Day holiday in the last week of November would come at a most appropriate time.

For these and other reasons the National Council of the Order Italian Sons and Daughters of America has adopted the following resolution:

Resolved: That the Order Italian Sons and Daughters of America urge the Congress of the United States to enact October 12 as a national holiday entitled Columbus Day for the purpose of commemorating the discovery of America.

Judge RUGGERO J. ALDISERT,
National President.
JOHN B. DIGIORNO,
National Secretary.

BRITISH LABOUR PARTY ACTION IN SCARBOROUGH

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, last week I and my colleague, JOHN DOW, had the pleasure of attending a number of sessions of the annual conference of the British Labour Party, at Scarborough, England, at the invitation of members of the party's executive committee. The occasion was a memorable one for me because of the warmth of our welcome, the generous hospitality offered to us, and the obvious spirit of friendship expressed for the American people, even by those most vehement in their opposition to the policies of our Government in Vietnam.

We were invited to this conference to discuss Vietnam—the changing attitudes of the American people, and the American Congress, and the hopes for averting a greater war and obtaining a stable peace. We learned much of British attitudes on this subject, and at a later date I will take the time to expound on this point.

Today I want to make only one point clear. Over the strong objections of their own leaders—who value the benefits of the "special relationships" between their country and ours, and fear the impact on that relationship of any change in their policy of supporting our course in Vietnam—the Labour Party voted for dissociation from that policy. Lest there be any question as to the strength of their policy statement, I quote it in full:

> This Conference calls upon the Labour Government to dissociate itself completely from the policy of the United States Government in Vietnam and urges it to support U Thant and the overwhelming majority of the United Nations in trying to persuade the Government of the U.S.A. to end the bombing of North Vietnam immediately, permanently and unconditionally.
>
> Conference believes that any settlement must be based upon the 1954 Geneva Agreement, which required the withdrawal of all foreign troops from Vietnamese soil, and the reunification of Vietnam under the government chosen by the Vietnamese people.

The margin of victory for this resolution was not large—2,752,000 votes for, to 2,633,000 votes against. Obviously this was due to the very understandable desire of many of the delegates to stand behind their leaders, even though they may have disagreed with them. I am sure my colleagues need no explanation of how this might be true.

I need to make one additional point lest some of my colleagues might wish to attribute this action by the Labour Party to the influence of Congressman Dow and myself. The vote on this resolution was taken prior to our arrival in Scarborough. Knowing the sensitivity of any political organization to efforts by outsiders to influence their decision, it is probably just as well that this was so.

COPTER PILOT BEGGS BACK FROM WAR DUTY

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Bevill] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, an article appeared in the Friday, October 6, 1967, edition of the Gadsden Times about a returning Vietnam hero. As the Times pointed out, return of a hero is always notable, but in this case doubly so, for it marked another chapter in the 2-year saga of WO Franklin D. Beggs.

This young man took some rather unusual action to get the opportunity of serving his country. His story is unique and one that I feel needs the close attention of everyone. In this era of frustration and indecision on the part of many of our young people, it is certainly heartening to know we have dedicated young men such as Warrant Officer Beggs.

Under unanimous consent, I insert this article in the Record at this point and commend it to the close attention of my colleagues:

Copter Pilot Beggs Back From War Duty

(By Bill Maxwell)

An Army helicopter pilot, wearing the Distinguished Flying Cross, the Air Medal with 16 Oak Leaf Clusters, the Bronze Star and the Purple Heart, returned to Gadsden yesterday after a year's duty in Vietnam.

Return of a hero is always notable, but yesterday's was doubly so, for it marked another chapter in the two-year saga of Warrant Officer Franklin D. Beggs. For Beggs and his wife, Linda, were divorced two years ago so the husband could meet Army requirements and fulfill a burning desire to do his part in the war. They remarried, of course, after his wings were assured.

Neither Linda nor her huband believed in divorce—and still don't. But two years ago, Franklin (Linda calls him "Buddy") had too many dependents with his wife and son Mark to enlist in the Army and do his bit in Vietnam. Divorce was the only answer, both agreed, and it was done.

Franklin felt he had to go to Vietnam, and he did. After a year of flying the "choppers", five months in troop carriers, etc., and seven months as pilot of a gunship, he is a veteran of around 850 missions. He's done his bit—and more.

And on hand to greet him at the airport was Mark and his second son, Danny, 16 months old, who was born after the saga began. Beggs' parents, Mr. and Mrs. Franklin Beggs, from Decatur, also were on hand as was Linda's mother, Mrs. Elgin M. Bowen, of Gadsden.

Netiher Beggs nor his wife regret the sacrifices they have made for that year in Vietnam, serving his country as he felt he ought to do.

"There's a little bit of everything over there," Beggs said. "I'm glad I went for I found out a lot of things about myself. Glad to be home? Sure I am."

And Linda shows the same fortitude she displayed two years ago when Franklin first broached the idea of a divorce to gain his dream of serving in Vietnam. "It's been an awfully lonely year," she said, "but I'd do the same thing over again if that (divorce and marriage) were the only way."

There has been one break in the year's separation. Linda met her husband in Hawaii last July when he was given an R&R leave from combat duty. They spent a memorable week together, Beggs returning to combat duty and Linda coming back home to wait out the remainder of the year.

From all the worldwide publicity his divorce-enlistment-remarriage caper received, one would think that Beggs would come in for considerable ribbing from his buddies in the service, but not so, he says.

"Sure, they knew all about it since Stars and Stripes carried the story," Beggs explained, "but there wasn't any ribbing. They seemed to respect me for it."

Beggs sustained a shrapnel wound on a combat mission July 27, ground fire coming through the ship to "nick" him (his description). At the time he was flying 20 feet above the treetops on an assault mission, and was the only member of the four-man crew wounded. They were attacking Red bunkers at the time.

Beggs flew his last mission on Sept. 24 in support of a combat assault, but drew no return fire from Charlie (enemy forces).

Beggs left Vietnam last Monday by Air Force jet to San Francisco and then on to Dover, Del. From there he took a bus to New York City Tuesday to meet his wife, who was there with her sisters, Barbara, 18, and Mrs. Carolyn Mabrey, both of Gadsden. The three have been touring as a religious singing group with Evangelist David Epley of St. Louis.

The Beggs appeared on the CBS television show, "To Tell The Truth," yesterday morning. The taped show will be aired Oct. 16.

And what's on their schedule next? "Rest and plenty of it," they agreed. After three weeks' leave. Beggs reports to Ft. Stewart, Ga.

Mr. Beggs' story began in September, 1965, when he said a desire to fly and a compulsion to serve his country became intense. He tried to join the Army but was turned away because he was married, had a child and had no previous military service.

"The only thing I could do to get in was divorce Mary, join up, and then remarry," Mr. Beggs said.

"My wife had enough faith in me to respect my desires and wishes. She feels the same way I do and I know things will be a lot better for us now that I've gone, than if I had turned my back on it," Mr. Beggs said.

YOUTHS ON THE GO

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Bevill] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, it is encouraging to read and hear good things about teenagers. And it is especially satisfying to follow the works of the nearly 3 million boys and girls who are members of 4–H Clubs.

Last week, the Sand Mountain Reporter, a biweekly newspaper in my district, published a timely editorial recognizing the splendid work done by these young men and women. As the editorial points out, the spread of 4–H to 75 foreign countries is proof that the "learn-by-doing" program for youth is sound and successful.

Under unanimous consent I include in the Record this excellent editorial:

Youths on the Go

It's a treat this week to read and hear so many good things about hometown teenagers who are members of a real go-go group—4–H. During National 4–H Week, we join the nation in saluting nearly 3 million of the finest boys and girls anywhere in the world.

Four-H'ers are always on the go—both at home and abroad. The spread of 4–H to 75 foreign countries is further proof that the "learn-by-doing" program for youth is sound and successful.

Parents of 4–H members are on the go, too. They volunteer as club or project leaders; serve as judges of projects such as livestock, clothing, safety, health and scores of others. They chauffer members to meetings, fairs, camp and social events. They "finance" projects that require a cash outlay to get started. They encourage sons and daughters to keep trying until desired results are achieved. They see to it that 4–H is recognized in the community and throughout the country as a valuable experience for the development of Head, Heart, Hands and Health, and the making of responsible citizens.

If you are not yet acquainted with 4–H, we hope you'll make an effort to learn more about this unique youth organization. Then urge your children 9 to 10 to join. The Cooperative Extension Service of Auburn Universtiy supervises 4–H through its state and county staff.

Four–H has something for every boy and girl, no matter where they live.

The slogan for the 1967 4–H Week, is "A World Of Opportunity—Join 4–H." And this we heartily endorse!

CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Satterfield] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, this has been a year in which much has been said about civil disobedience. Last week, a noted constituent of mine, Lewis F. Powell, a past president of the American Bar Association and member of the President's Crime Commission, delivered the following address on the subject of civil disobedience to the Southern Co., conference of directors and executives at Point Clear, Ala. At this point, I would like to insert Mr. Powell's address in the Record for the interest of my colleagues:

This will be a lawyer's talk about law and order and civil disobedience. The subject is related to complex social and economic problems—some of the most perplexing of any age. But there is no hope of solving these problems unless an ordered society is preserved.

There is deep concern today about the disquieting trend—so evident in our country—toward organized lawlessness and even rebellion. One of the contributing causes is the doctrine of civil disobedience. This heresy was dramatically associated with the civil rights movement by the famous letter of Martin Luther King from a Birmingham jail.

As rationalized by King, some laws are "just" and others "unjust"; each person may determine for himself which laws are "unjust"; and each is free—indeed even morally bound—to violate the "unjust" laws.

Coming at a time when discriminatory state and local laws still existed in the South, civil disobedience was quickly enthroned as a worthy doctrine. It met the need of intellectuals and theologians for a moral and philosophical justification of conduct which, by all previous standards, was often lawless and indefensible.

Initially, disobedience tactics were directed specifically against discriminatory laws. The sit-ins and demonstrations were aimed primarily at segregated facilities and denial of voting rights—largely in the South. But as the use of disobedience tactics expanded, the relationship between the act of protest and the law protested became increasingly attenuated.

Indeed, as the protest movement expanded to northern and western cities, its objectives broadened from specific discriminatory laws and practices of the South to the age-old social and economic problems of bias, poverty and unemployment. Predictably, disobedience tactics were soon employed in other causes—on the campus and across our country.

Few voices spoke out against civil disobedience. Because of its association with the cause of civil rights, criticism of disobedience and its tactics was largely muted. Many persons of goodwill—including many clergymen and campus intellectuals—were so enchanted by the "causes" that they gave little thought to the means employed or to where the disobedience road would lead.

But all who advocated civil disobedience were not so naive. Political activists and extremists of all kinds were quick to recognize the potential of this doctrine as an extralegal means of attaining goals—and even of promoting revolution. Moreover, a doctrine which tolerates and justifies disobedience of law—implemented by sit-ins and street mobs—is made to order for cynical leaders promoting rebellion and other extremist causes.

One of the few national leaders, who had both the insight and the courage to speak out against civil disobedience tactics, was Mr. Justice Hugo Black. Writing early in 1966, he said:

"Governments like ours were formed to substitute the rule of law for the rule of force. Illustrations may be given where crowds have gathered together peaceably by reason of extraordinarily good discipline reinforced by vigilant officers. 'Demonstrations' have taken place without any manifestations of force at the time. But I say once more that the crowd moved by noble ideals today can become the mob ruled by hate and passion and greed and violence tomorrow. If we ever doubted that, we know it now. The peaceful songs of love can become as stirring and provocative as the Marseilles did in the days when a noble revolution gave way to rule by successive mobs until chaos set in. . . . It . . . [is] more necessary than ever that we stop and look more closely at where we are going."

It is notable that Mr. Justice Black wrote these prophetic words in February, 1966, before the emergence of black power as an overt doctrine, and prior to the riots of 1966 and 1967.

But few heeded his warning. Despite clearly visible danger signals, political, religious and intellectual leaders contained to tolerate and justify civil disobedience—even after such major eruptions as Watts, Cleveland and Chicago.

There seemed to be a curious unawareness that once lawlessness is tolerated and justified it feeds upon itself and leads either to revolution or violent repressive measures. It has been said wisely:

"Once you give a nervous, hostile and ill-informed people a theoretical justification for using violence in certain cases, it is like a tiny hole in the dike; the rationales rush through in a torrent, and violence becomes the normal, acceptable solution for a problem. . . . A cardinal fact about violence is that once initiated it tends to get out of hand. Its limits are not predictable."

So much for a review—obviously incomplete—of the origin and escalation of contemporary civil disobedience. This brings us to the year 1967—a year of crisis in which the symptoms of incipient revolution are all too evident.

Two movements have been merging: (1) a militant Negro nationalist movement, summed up in the slogan "black power"; and (2) a radical political movement called the "New Left" or "New Politics," which hopes to change our form of government. The two movements have been converging, and now pursue the common causes of black power and frustration of America's attempt to contain communism in Vietnam. Both of these movements rely heavily upon civil disobedience tactics.

The public is widely aware of the Negro revolt. There is far less awareness of the New Left, its organizations and its radical groups. There are a number of New Left groups with varying degrees of militancy. Although not yet coalesced into a single organization, they are moving toward a united front—certainly on race and Vietnam issues.

Most Americans—of both races—have been shocked and dismayed by a summer of unprecedented discord. The great majority of Negro citizens have been as dismayed as the whites. Yet, the average citizen, preoccupied with his own problems and pleasures, assumes that domestic tranquility is an inalienable right. There is a child-like disbelief that this land of the free—internally secure for 100 years—is actually confronted with strife and violence on a massive scale.

Complacent Americans would be well advised to heed the warnings of the militant leaders. Here are some random examples of what they are saying and planning—quite openly:

Carmichael—Carmichael has allied himself and black power with revolutionary Communism. Speaking at Havana he said: "There are no longer any isolated struggles. They are all correlated . . . The only solution is armed struggle."

H. Rap Brown—Speaking, of all places, in a Washington Episcopal church with permission of the controlling clergy, Brown is quoted as saying:

"We'll make the Viet Cong look like Sunday school teachers—violence is necessary."

"Get you some guns—(and) burn this town down."

Martin Luther King—The prophet of civil disobedience. King seems bewildered at times by the escalation of his own doctrine. On occasion he has joined moderate Negro leaders in criticizing riots. But he is arm-in-arm with Carmichael and McKissick in slandering his own government and in inciting violence of draft laws. He has said:

"America is the greatest purveyor of violence in the world today."

And he has compared the use of new American weapons in Vietnam to the Nazi testing of "new tortures in the concentration camps of Europe."

King's favorite role is organizing disruptive demonstrations. He is now urging "massive civil disobedience" for the purpose of "dislocating" northern cities. He is planning such "nonviolent" tactics as weekly school boycotts, blocking plant gates with unemployed Negroes, and disrupting governmental operations with sit-in demonstrations in federal buildings.

Core leaders—Although CORE has recently received a grant from the Ford Foundation, its leaders are now committed to black power extremism.

McKissick, replying to a question by a white reporter as to what the Negro wanted, put it quite simply in the classic terms of revolution:

"The answer is—everything you got right now, and everything you hope to get."

A New York Times story reported that CORE's number two leader, Wilfred Ussery, believes that:

"Armed conflict between black and white can no longer be averted."

Father Groppi—A newcomer to dubious prominence is Father Groppi, a Milwaukee Catholic priest. Working with the NAACP Youth Council, he has organized and led paralyzing demonstrations for open housing. The liberal mayor of Milwaukee, Henry W. Maier, charges that Groppi is "trying to incite riots," and that "rational discussions with him are impossible." Father Groppi has recently been quoted as saying: "Morally, I have no argument against the black man's right to use violence."

Dr. Benjamin Spock—Spock, a New Leftist dilettante, also has joined those who condone rebellion. Speaking at the recent convention on New Politics, he said:

"The situation in America is desperate. The principal sign of it is the revolt of our black fellow citizens. . . . The founding fathers declared that people who are oppressed, and can find no other redress, must rebel."

Staughton Lynd—Lynd, a Yale faculty member on leave and an intellectual leader of the New Left, made an unauthorized trip to Hanoi. He insists that representative democracy is outmoded; that we must substitute a "participatory democracy"—which apparently would function through mass meetings and demonstrations. In a revealing article to the New York Times magazine section, Lynd argues that the uprisings in the cities have been "rebellious" and not riots; and—citing the American Revolution and other irrelevant precedents—he justifies the Carmichaels and the Browns and their call for revolution.

The foregoing are only a few—if among the better known—of the leaders of militant civil disobedience. Their roles and views differ, and I do not suggest that each is equally responsible for the lawlessness which threatens to engulf our country. Yet these, and hundreds of lesser known leaders, are men determined to remake America—not by the democratic processes of our institutions but by varying forms and degrees of coercion. The more radical of these leaders, like Carmichael and Brown, are openly advocating revolution.

Let us turn now from the leaders to examples of extremism in action.

The first is Vietnam Week of last April, when tens of thousands marched in New York and San Francisco. Draft cards were burned, placards of hate displayed, and vicious anti-American speeches made by King, Carmichael and Spock.

The initial planning for Vietnam Week took place at a Chicago conference, instigated and dominated by Communists and fellow travelers. The Communist line objectives of Vietnam Week were to undermine United States opposition to communism in Vietnam and to ferment racial discord.

Shortly following these marches, King announced the formation of "Vietnam Summer"—a coalition of opponents to American policy and includes well-known Communist allies and other luminaries of the "hate America" left. The avowed objective is "to organize opposition to the war in ghetto areas", and encourage our youth to "refuse to fight."

As Dean O'Meara of Notre Dame Law School has said, many of those who thus aid the Communist enemy "give themselves away":

"For never once do they condemn the terrorist tactics of the North Vietnamese; never once do they condemn Hanoi's rejection of all peace proposals . . .; never once do they lament the suffering and death borne by our forces in Vietnam. These persons weep only for the enemy."

Having attained some success and notoriety through Vietnam Week, the New Leftists then planned and held what was called "The National Conference for New Politics", attended by some 5,000 delegates. Its stated purpose was to create a united front among groups supporting the black power and "peace" movements. King and Spock were among the principal speakers. The Communist party, as in the case of Vietnam Week, was active in the planning and manipulation.

The conference, dominated by black power militants, condemned "the savage and beastlike character that runs rampant through America as exemplified by the George Lincoln Rockwells and the Lyndon B. Johnsons". It also adopted a straight Communist Party line resolution, which pledged:

"Total and unquestioning support to all national peoples liberation wars . . . particularly in Vietnam."

The flavor of the New Politics Conference was summed up by Walter Goodman, writing in the N.Y. Times Magazine, who said:

". . . it stunk of totalitarianism."

Vietnam week and the Conference on New Politics are chilling examples of growing extremism in this country. The dominant themes of both were hatred of fellow Americans and contempt for our institutions. Their goals are to be attained not by democratic processes but by various techniques of civil disobedience.

One of the major targets is American policy in Vietnam, now under virulent attack. Reasonable men may well differ as to the wisdom of this policy. But only those who are blinded by their prejudices, or who are indifferent to the consequences of lawlessness, will deliberately incite disobedience of valid laws. A most recent example of this irresponsibility is the public demand by a group of some 320 clergymen, educators and writers that churches and synagogues be used as "sanctuaries" for youths who defy the draft law. If thousands of young men refused to fight for their country, as pointed out by Tom Wicker of the New York Times:

". . . the power (of the government) to pursue the Vietnam war or any other policy would be crippled if not destroyed. The government would then be faced, not with dissent, but with civil disobedience on a scale amounting to revolt."

Or, suppose, the campaign against payment of income taxes gains widespread support. This is not an illogical possibility, as this relatively bland form of civil disobedience has appeal to a broad spectrum of disaffected citizens. But however appealing it may be, wide spread refusal to pay taxes could bring orderly government to a halt.

So much for examples of nonviolent—though potentially disastrous—disobedience. But the greater concern has been the violent eruptions in our cities—where civil disobedience has reached its ultimate form. I do not know whether any of the persons or groups named above was legally implicated in any of these riots. Let us assume no such implication. Yet few can doubt that the cumulative effect of the black nationalist movement, and of the incitements to hatred and disobedience were major contributing factors. As J. Edgar Hoover has said:

"Those who espouse the theory of civil disobedience and authorities who free guilty violators must share a portion of the blame and responsibility for the turmoil in our streets."

There have been riots or major disorders in some 75 cities in 1967. Detroit was the shocker, with 43 killed, 386 injured and part of a great city destroyed. A less likely city for a race riot would be hard to find. Detroit had "no housing ghetto"; its Negro population was largely prosperous, and its race relations considered excellent.

The recent NBC documentary—in which Daniel P. Moynihan participated—contains a frightening analysis of the riot and the future prospects. Although apparently spontaneous in its inception, militant organized groups took over promptly, supplied the weapons, the Molotov cocktails, and directed the sniping and the arson. This was no revolt of oppressed people against local conditions. It was armed rebellion against American society.

Although the underlying causes are complex and deepseated, America's acceptance of civil disobedience was both a cause and a justification. Mr. Moynihan, former assistant secretary of labor, put it this way:

"We have legitimatized opposition to the police and disobedience to law. Now in the North it has become massive opposition to the rules of white society."

The Negro militant viewpoint, gaining increasing support, is that America is "irredeemably racist"; that Negroes should "forget America," and that the only course for Negroes is to bring about a final, violent apocalyptic confrontation of black and white."

The NBC investigating team confirmed that extremists already are planning future violence. Next time, it is said, they will attack and destroy the white sections of Detroit and other cities. As Frank McGee described it:

"These black extremists are willing and eager to risk a bloody showdown with white society."

Sharing the same pessimism, Roscoe Drummond recently said:

"The black militants and their white associates are irreversibly committed to the destruction of American democratic society to achieve their racist goals."

One may hope that the views of these observers—competent as they are—exaggerate the danger. But none can doubt that America faces a crisis of lawlessness with the gravest potential for disaster.

No man knows all the answers, but to me—as a lawyer—some simple truths are self-evident:

An ordered society governed by the rule of law must be preserved. Without law and order none of the liberties guaranteed by the Constitution can be safeguarded—for whites or blacks, radicals or conservatives. History has demonstrated that once a society condones defiance of law and due process, the liberties of all are lost in the excesses of anarchy which follow.

With these truths in mind, and if our cherished institutions are to be preserved, Americans of good will—of both races—must act together to assure the following:

1. Toleration of civil disobedience and justification of lawlessness must end—in government, in the pulpits, among the media, and on the ivory towered campuses.

2. Those who incite riots and rebellion should be treated as the most dangerous of criminals and relentlessly prosecuted. The irresolution of our society is attested by the fact that we hasten to put petty criminals in prison and yet permit the Carmichaels and Browns to remain free. Indeed, some still dignify their criminality by inviting them to speak in our schools and churches.

3. Those who participate in riots and rebellion should also be prosecuted with vigor, particularly the aronists and the snipers.

4. Criminal laws, at all levels of government, should be reviewed and strengthened to deal specifically with the foregoing crimes in light of present conditions. Penalties should be adequate to deter criminal conduct and justice should be swift and certain.

5. Effective gun control laws should be adopted at state and federal levels; sniping at policemen and firemen should be made special offenses with severe penalties; and possession or use of Molotov cocktails should be serious crimes.

6. Those who incite and participate in nonviolent civil disobedience should also be subjected to criminal sanctions. Where needed, laws should be clarified and strengthened with appropriate penalties provided. This is a more difficult area, as First Amendment freedoms must be carefully safeguarded. But rights of free speech and peaceful assembly do not justify incitement to revolt or the wilful violation of draft laws, income tax laws or court decrees.

7. Laws, especially against those who engage in nonviolent civil disobedience, should be enforced uniformly and promptly. A few draft law violators have been prosecuted but most have been ignored—especially the radical leaders who incite draft evasion. Public authorities have also failed to prosecute the growing number of dissidents who willfully refuse to pay all of their income taxes. How can officials sworn to uphold the law ignore its willful violation? In justice, how can a Cassius Clay be sent to jail for draft evasion while prominent self-styled intellectuals who refuse to pay their taxes are allowed to remain free?

8. In summary, America needs to awaken to its peril; it needs to understand that our society and system can be destroyed. Indeed, this can and will happen here unless Americans develop a new impatience with those who incite and perpetrate civil disobedience; unless laws against violence and disorder are strengthened, and enforced with vigor and impartiality; and unless we return once more to the orderly and democratic processes which alone can preserve our freedoms.

Now, a final caveat. I have spoken as a lawyer, deeply conscious that the rule of law in America is under unprecedented attack. There are, of course, other grave problems and other areas calling for determined and even generous action. The gap between the prosperous middle classes and the genuinely underprivileged—both white and black—must be narrowed. Many mistakes have been made in the past, and there is enough blame for all to share. But we have passed the point where recriminations and bitterness will solve problems.

We must come to grips realistically with the gravest domestic problem of this century. America has the resources, and our people have the compassion and the desire, to provide equal justice, adequate education and job opportunities for all. This, we surely must do.

At the same time, we must avoid the mindless folly of appeasing and even rewarding the extremists who incite or participate in civil disobedience. There must be a clearer understanding that those who preach, practice and condone lawlessness are the enemies of social reform and of freedom itself. In short, the one indispensable prerequisite to all progress is an ordered society governed by the rule of law.

THE U.S. DOLLAR—ITS PROBLEMS AND ITS CHALLENGES

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Michigan [Mrs. Griffiths] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, one of the country's most distinguished bankers, Henry T. Bodman, the chairman of the board of the National Bank of Detroit, made the following speech before the Citizens Research Council. It is a pleasure for me to share his thoughts with you:

THE U.S. DOLLAR—ITS PROBLEMS AND ITS CHALLENGES

(By Henry T. Bodman, chairman of the board, National Bank of Detroit)

I have been asked to make some comments this afternoon about the monetary problems of the United States. Obviously that is a very broad assignment—and I can get into only one or two aspects of this most far-reaching subject.

Most everyone in this room will remember the revered C. F. Kettering, who had as one of his greatest assets the ability to "debunk" things that look complicated, but aren't. I remember one evening some 15 years ago hearing him make a speech here in Detroit in which he touched on the subject of economics—and particularly money. He held up a dollar bill and said, "This is a receipt for doing some work," and went on to say, "If you start printing up these pieces of paper without doing any work, the value of these receipts will diminish; and if you print up enough of them, they will become *completely* worthless."

While the monetary process isn't *quite* that simple, "Ket" certainly got over the basic idea.

This is exactly what happened in post-World War I Germany, and post-World War II Hungary, just to cite two examples.

Many countries are experiencing similar conditions today. Bill Martin, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System in Washington, recently told me of a conversation he had with one of his counterparts in a central bank in South America. Bill said his friend told him that if in any year the price level in his country goes up 40% they fight inflation; if it goes up 20% they fight deflation!

In Brazil—which incidentally is not the country just mentioned—the country's currency depreciated in value at a compound annual rate of 31% between 1956 and 1966. This means that the price level rose at the rate of 45% *per annum* over the past decade—a fairly full-blown inflation, one might say.

Incidentally, this is one reason interest rates are so high in Brazil and in other countries with depreciating currencies. Short-term interest rates for example in Brazil range from 24% to 36%. People with money to lend are not only trying to earn a reasonable rate of return—they are also trying to protect themselves against the certainty that the loans they make will be repaid in money with less purchasing power.

Here in the United States our price experience, as measured by the value of our money, has been considerably better than that of most other countries in the past decade. Our record over the past 18 months, however, has not been so good.

Consumer prices, after having increased at a 1¼% annual rate during the 1959–64 period, have been rising at a 3¼% rate since late 1965. Wholesale prices, and most importantly, *industrial* wholesale prices have risen at a 2% annual rate since late 1965, after having remained essentially stable in the 1959–64 period.

This acceleration of price increases in the United States has been due largely to the excessively stimulative fiscal and monetary policies of the Government and the Federal Reserve System. The Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis recently cited evidence that indicates that fiscal policy during the first half of 1967 was more stimulative than at any time since World War II. This was during a period in which our labor force was being fully utilized with unemployment running at or below 4%.

The "money supply"—defined as private demand and time deposits in commercial banks, plus currency in circulation—grew at a 7% annual rate from 1960 to 1964, and at an 8% annual rate from 1964 to 1966. So far, in 1967, the money supply has grown at an annual rate of 13% at a time when the biggest Treasury deficit since World War II is in prospect.

Now, what I am saying is that the price rise acceleration of the past two years is an indication that we have been following inflationary policies. And the continuation of those policies will result in even more harmful price trends in the months ahead, to the detriment of all.

We have run budget deficits in 29 of the last 35 years, and the one facing us in fiscal 1968 promises to be enormous even if Congress passes the President's tax proposals. In the absence of such passage or of meaningful reductions in expenditures, the deficit could approach the startling figure of $30 billion. Such a situation could well result in frightening some of our foreign creditors into cashing in their U.S. dollar claims for gold we can ill afford to lose.

The immense Federal budget, and the heavy tax load required to carry it, are real barriers to greater economic achievement. True economic growth depends on the performance of the private economy. It does not depend on the performance of the Government, except for Government to resist the temptation to interfere with the working of the marketplace. Such interventions tend to frustrate the legitimate objectives of both management and labor, and to diminish the desires of the less fortunate to get ahead by contributing more to their own, and thus automatically, to the total welfare.

Returning now to our monetary and fiscal problems, the inflationary character of the Federal debt derives from the fact that it is much more likely than private debt to become imbedded in our monetary system. Congress has powers, delegated to the Federal Reserve, to create money; and the Federal Reserve acts under this responsibility to see that the U.S. Treasury can raise the money it needs to pay its bills. Nothwithstanding the fact that the Federal Reserve is, and should continue to be, an independent body, there is little doubt about what course of action the Federal Reserve would take should it find itself in the unhappy position of having to choose between accepting inflation on the one hand or standing by while the Government fails in an effort to finance itself.

Our experience with regard to inflation in the U.S., of course, has been substantially better than that of most other countries around the World—in large part due to the tremendous productivity of the American economy, and to the *relative* freedom we have had in the past to exercise American ingenuity without obstructive Government intervention. Our leadership in productivity stems from the enormous capital formation that takes place in this country, made possible to a great degree by the ability and willingness of individuals and businesses to save a portion of current income. For both the Government and our citizens, promoting economic progress requires increasing amounts of capital formation. The problem is how?

The solution is to save more so that more money will be available for investment in new and more efficient plant and equipment. For capital originates largely from one source—the savings of individuals and of businesses. One way to save more, apart from consuming less, is to earn more by producing more.

To produce more, we need more and better tools; they equip a growing labor force and they help create more and better goods and services in greater variety and at a lower relative cost. By thus increasing output, tools enable the consumer not only to consume more but also to save, lend and invest more—and in the process to contribute to the further regeneration of the nation's stock of capital goods and to even further rises in output.

They key element in this process, as suggested earlier, is saving. But saving requires incentives, and few things are more damaging to those incentives than inflation—the erosion of the real value of the money saved.

It is often asserted that a high rate of capital formation constitutes a threat to employment opportunities. It seems to me that this view is grossly fallacious. It rests on an implicit assumption of a generally static economy in which there is little or no growth.

As a matter of fact, in the private economy of the United States the rate of increase in the labor cost of an hour's work has been significantly greater than the rate of increase in the cost of a unit of capital equipment from which the improvements in output and efficiency mainly come. In other words, relative to wages, tools have become cheaper as, thanks to our scientists and engineers, they have become more sophisticated.

Yet tools have not replaced labor; rather they have re-aligned and expanded employment opportunities. As our increasing stock of tools has helped generate further economic growth, new jobs have replaced old jobs and earlier fears of automation have been replaced by recent evidence of "overfull" employment—even shortages of skilled labor to man the new machines. Thus, experience shows that high rates of capital formation go hand in hand with high rates of employment.

Furthermore, since capital formation is obviously dependent upon favorable levels of corporate earnings, the welfare of the employee is vitally dependent on the profit performance of his employer. Thus, the true objectives of labor and capital are in a very real sense the same, although sometimes it doesn't look that way.

Many will argue that a little inflation is all right, and even necessary to promote economic growth. This sentiment is patently false. Professor Karl Brandt of the Hoover Institution, Stanford University, and formerly a member of the President's Council of Economic Advisors, has pointed out just what inflation does. To quote him: "Inflation consumes the most precious substance on which any economic system depends: the confidence of the people that the rules of the game are fair and equitable and that long-term obligations are faithfully fulfilled. Inflation makes a fraud of such transactions and gives easy gains to some people at the expense of innocent others." It is a tragic thing that inflation injures most those least able to bear its cost.

Or, as Henry Hazlitt recently said, "The truth is that inflation is neither necessary for full employment nor sufficient to secure it. What is necessary is a workable coordination of the price system. This entails a coordination of wages and prices. Individual wage rates must be at the levels at which the full labor force can be profitably employed. Prices must be high enough to keep a profit incentive, but low enough to permit the optimum volume of goods and services to be sold."

Wage levels which put severe pressure on profit margins will always result in higher prices, and sooner or later, higher unemployment. The Federal Government interprets these results as calling for new spending programs to employ the now unemployed, and for vast injections of new credit and money to clear the market of the new higher priced goods. Then the whole dreary process starts over again.

It is a race that can only end in gross distortions of income distribution, incentives, and production, in falling confidence in the dollar, and in even more severe balance of payments problems. Such a disastrous inflationary race can be prevented if the Congress has the wisdom and the courage to promote an environment in which the continuous imposition of excessive wage demands can be halted.

This doesn't mean a freeze on wages, prices, or profits; nor does it mean anti-strike legislation; nor does it mean a return to "Guidelines"—voluntary or otherwise. But it does mean the revision of our present Federal laws which permit special compulsions to be put on employers and which grant special immunities to labor unions. Repeated injections of money and credit are no substitute for balanced labor laws in promoting lasting full employment. Excessive wage demands tend to be disruptive and are not in the long-term interests of employees. Such demands will create inflationary pressures that cannot be contained by monetary or fiscal measures without eventually creating serious economic dislocations, including widespread unemployment, or interest rates so high as to stifle new capital formation.

Numerous schemes proposed to promote sustainable long-term growth in the economy do not and will not accomplish this objective. In this category I would place most attempts to raise, by legislation, minimum wages above market levels.

Like most man-made laws intended to amend or repeal natural economic principles, such proposals create conditions quite opposite to their promised effects—instead of raising the earnings of those in low income categories, their earnings are reduced or cut off altogether.

As a consequence of uneconomically high wage rates in many job categories, we have priced tens of thousands of potential workers, including teen-agers, out of job opportunities. The economic cost alone is high enough; the social cost, as we have recently learned, is enormous. Furthermore, a decreed rise in the minimum wage level narrows wage differentials and thus generates additional pressures in many industries for uneconomic wage increases across the board.

Another equally unsound policy is to decree artificially high farm prices while at the same time restricting farm output. This is irresponsible and uneconomic because it boosts the cost of living and promotes a misallocation of the nation's resources. It is also inhuman at a time when one-third of the world's population suffers from malnutrition.

Returning again to our monetary and fiscal problems, an important consideration apparently overlooked by many proponents of deficit spending is the impact of Federal internal deficits on our international balance of payments situation. Since 1957 we have spent, invested, and given away about $25 billion more outside the United States than we have received. This "balance of payments" deficit has been met by a loss of nearly $10 billion of gold and by a $15 billion increase in foreign short-term claims on our remaining gold reserve. Today such foreign short-term claims on U.S. gold amount to more than $25 billion, which is about twice the size of our entire gold stock, most of which is already required under present law as backing for our Federal Reserve Currency.

Despite the moves which have been made by the Administration in the past few years to protect the dollar, our balance of payments position has continued to deteriorate during the first half of this year. It is abundantly clear that more fundamental measures will have to be taken if the dollar's international position is to be assured over a long period of time.

One of the outstanding scholars in the field of international finance, Professor Gottfried Haberler of Harvard University, has given a candid view of our precarious situation. Dr. Haberler, who served from 1943–47 as an economic specialist with the Federal Reserve Board, was Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the National Bureau of Economic Research in 1957–58 and is now one of its Directors. He is also a member of the Advisory Board of the American Enterprise Institute, of which Board our own Paul McCracken is distinguished Chairman.

In a monumental study entitled "Inflation—Its Causes and Cures" that Dr. Haberler prepared for publication by the Institute, he has this to say: "The position of the United States as the world's foremost banker, and of the dollar as the world's principal reserve currency, greatly increases our responsibility. At the same time, this excludes easy solutions which would be open to others. Thus, if a small country is confronted with a large deficit in its international transactions, it could let its currency drop a few points and that would take care of the problem.

"The U.S. cannot tamper with the gold value of the dollar without committing a crass breach of the confidence of all those who have entrusted us with keeping their international reserves and without provoking an international financial crisis which would greatly weaken American leadership in the Free World."

This is a statement not to be dismissed lightly.

On the same subject, Dr. Wilhelm Vocke, first President of the German Federal Bank following World War II, has said, "It is the gold convertibility alone which permits the dollar to perform its function as a world currency. Without it, the dollar would go under with disastrous consequences for America's political prestige throughout the world. By overestimating her power as well as her indifference to the strident warnings sounded by her enormous gold losses, America has overstepped the boundaries which exist even for the strongest nations."

As touched upon earlier our external problem is further aggravated by our huge internal Federal deficit. When we have to raise incomes taxes because of the extent of the Federal deficit, raise them above already very high existing levels, we hurt our balance of payments position even further. Why? Because as most economists now agree, income taxes, both personal and corporate, are reflected in the prices of finished products. So, by raising our income taxes internally, we become less competitive abroad.

Much the preferred way to correct this situation is to reduce overall spending by the Federal Government. It seems most probable that defense spending will go up in the years ahead, even if Viet Nam expenditures should decrease. Already there is talk of a major increase in expenditures for strategic weapons lest Russia overtake us in that area Some officials also believe that the U.S. will have to deploy an extremely costly Anti-Ballistic Missile System.

If the Administration will not cut less essential spending in the face of such demands, the question is raised: How much more taxation can be imposed without significantly interfering with the ability and willingness of people to save, to invest, and to produce? After all, it has been this process that has built in the U.S. the greatest industrial complex in the world, but even it cannot flourish under conditions of continuing inflation or excessive taxation.

This is the time for Congress to demonstrate enough courage to insist on substantial reductions in non-essential spending—and only then decide whether the proposed-tax increase is the best alternative.

Let us pray that we can regain enough economic sense, discipline, and integrity to deal with the substance of our problems, and to refrain from the apparently easy solutions that bring in their wake further inflation, deteriorating confidence in our currency, and ultimately the reappearance of those problems in magnified form.

As a distinguished European banker once told me, "If you want the dollar treated with respect abroad, you will have to treat it with respect at home." To which I might add the observation that when we lose our world financial leadership, we also lose our strength as a world power; and the representative form of government we have known may well suffer a defeat from which recovery will be difficult if not impossible.

This is what is at stake. It is groups such as this that must see to it that the real *issues* are clearly presented. We must have people in Government sufficiently intelligent to understand these problems, and with enough courage and dedication to do what is necessary to save this nation from the catastrophe that is bound to occur unless we take positive action before it is too late.

HOWARD J. SAMUELS—AN EXCELLENT CHOICE

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Hanley] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's nomination of Howard J. Samuels to be Under Secretary of Commerce reflects in a most favorable light upon the President for the wisdom of his choice, upon Mr. Samuels for the sterling characteristics which have brought him to this position, upon New York State for its longstanding tradition of providing exceptional people for high public office, and upon the Nation and the society which have produced this outstanding individual. To my pride as a New Yorker, I add a great sense of personal satisfaction, for I have known Howard Samuels for many years. In examining the life of this man, one is immediately struck by an apparent discrepancy—how could any individual have accomplished so much at the age of 47? Let me briefly sketch the background of Howard Samuels to illustrate my point. After attending public schools in Rochester, N.Y.—where, incidentally, he was a champion tennis player—he attended Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Most people would be satisfied with just receiving an education from MIT. Howard Samuels, however, graduated from MIT with an idea, contained in his thesis, for what is now a $50 million a year corporation, employing more than 2,000 people. In fact, the company is the largest producer of plastic packaging in the Nation. On the staff of Gen. George S. Patton during the Second World War, Mr. Samuels became a lieutenant colonel at the age of 25. To indicate the wide range of his interests and his commitment to the public good, I will mention some of his public service affiliations: chairman, Citizens Committee for an Effective Constitution; trustee, Public Education Association; member, Employment Service Task Force; participant, White House Conference on Education; member, National Citizens Committee for Community Relations; member, National Committee for Employment of Youth; chairman, American Histradrut Cultural Exchange Institute; New York chairman, March of Dimes and Cancer Crusade;

member, Governor Harriman's Business Advisory Committee; member, American Israel Public Affairs Committee; member, national policy committee on pockets of poverty of the Farmers Educational Foundation. He has also served on many city, county, and State civic groups. Last year, he was honored with two awards for his service to humanitarian causes. Mr. Samuels comes into Government in a period of great challenge and dynamic change. His life and his career indicate that he is just the right man for these times.

WAR ON POVERTY

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Leggett] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, business and industry joined the ranks of the war on poverty last week, strengthening the administration forces which have been fighting a successful but limited war over the past few years.

In his announcement of a pilot program "to mobilize the resources of private industry and the Federal Government to help find jobs and provide training for thousands of America's hard-core unemployed," the President stressed the need for the involvement of the private sector in reaching those citizens bypassed by conventional training programs.

To achieve needed cooperation, the new program has been designed to eliminate two major difficulties—the need to deal with a wide variety of Federal agencies and the inherent risks in providing job retraining for the hard-core unemployed.

The administration has shown foresight in recognizing these deterrents to the cooperation of the private sector. It will provide one-stop service to interested companies in an office headed by William E. Zisch, vice chairman of Aerojet-General Corp., Los Angeles, a firm that has had experience in operating in the Watts section of Los Angeles. The government will assume the special costs of training the severely disadvantaged as well as the additional risks of operating in ghetto areas.

The pilot program will operate in five of the cities already served by the Labor Department's concentrated employment program—Boston, Chicago, Los Angeles, San Antonio, and Washington, D.C. Although this program is relatively new, it has already proven that even the most severely disadvantaged of our citizens can be trained and placed in adequately paid jobs when business accepts its share of the problem. In Los Angeles this program is committed to some $7.6 million already and is having excellent results through the cooperation of private industry.

Writing in the current issue of the Harvard Business Review, the mayor of St. Louis, a city with its own hard-core unemployed problem, points out that 75 percent of the hard core can be made employable. And he added:

> But the Federal Government's programs taken all together leave the iceberg bulk of the unemployed untrained and unplaced. This is private industry's job.

With private industry and the Government working together at the task, most of the hard-core unemployed—currently unemployable—should soon become taxpaying citizens.

This program heralds a new era for the disadvantaged and for the private sector that will soon receive them.

FOOD AID NEEDED

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. Olsen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no criticism for the loyal opposition, but I believe Richard Wilson's column in today's Washington Star is excellent advice for all. Because we are a rich nation, we should not take individual credit for our prosperity. We must remember the good fortune which has been left us and, in return for our good fortune, we should be thankful enough to care for the poor, the sick, and the needy. Certainly we can afford it.

I insert Richard Wilson's fine column in the Record at this time:

House Republicans Stumble on Food-Aid Issue

(By Richard Wilson)

Republicans in the House after reversing themselves on a federal rat-control measure, slipped on the blinders again quite naturally and unaffectedly where hunger and malnutrition in the United States are concerned.

The House Agriculture Committee has set aside by a vote of 23 to 7 a bill supported by both Mississippi Democratic senators to study starvation and provide up to $75 million for food and medical attention for the undernourished.

This measure resulted from disclosures that in Mississippi and elsewhere in numerous other states millions of children and adults were, for various reasons, not benefited by food distribution and health programs initiated 35 years ago to carry out the common will that no one in such a rich country as this should go to bed hungry.

It must be said for the Mississippi Democratic Senators, John Stennis and James O. Eastland, that after at first bristling over disclosures that thousands of children are slowly starving in their state, they recognized the condition and moved to do something about it.

Some Republicans have not been as quick to learn. Their experience with the rat control bill taught nothing. After laughing rat control out of the House, 42 moderate and urban Republicans found themselves so badly bitten that they reversed themselves and enabled the House to approve a $40 million two-year plan for rat control in city slums.

A similar measure has been passed in the Senate and a difference must now be resolved on what agency will handle the rat-control program.

Moderate Republicans are now trying to rescue the Stennis legislation for food and medical aid for the forgotten and hungry children who have fallen through the slats of badly administered state and federal food-aid programs.

Speaking of reluctant members of his own party and Southern Democrats, Rep. Albert Quie, R-Minn., said, "They may be able to get by not taking care of rats, but when you have starving Americans, that's one thing we cannot tolerate." Quie and other Republicans are trying to revive the program as an emergency aid measure in the poverty bill.

This controversy reveals again the fatal fault in the conventional Republican approach to human problems, which has not been corrected in 20 years of trying by the moderates and plays a large, and perhaps the controlling part, in freezing the GOP into its minority political position.

The fault grows out of the defensive attitude that this is a great and strong country and that those who find it wanting in some respects wish to cause trouble, upset the apple cart and perhaps even change the whole American system. They are thus to be resisted as dangerous radicals or careless tinkerers who would aimlessly or willfully foul up the whole works.

What the conventional Republicans have failed to recognize fully and emphasize sufficiently is that a modern technocratic society benefits the vast majority but leaves pockets and fringes of human misery, maladjustment and deprivation which add up to an impressive total. Translated into human terms these pockets and fringes in their totality become an embarrassment of large proportions in a rich country, and to do nothing about them or accept them as the unavoidable fall-out of progress, gives those who do so a heartless countenance which is a heavy political debit.

The problem is no better illustrated than in the matter of unemployment. Unemployment for heads of families who wish work is actually now at the practical minimum in an economic set-up where movement from one job to another provides a fluid labor supply.

But, in addition, there are more than 2 million who cannot find work because they are not qualified or are not physically adapted or trained, including some hundreds of thousands who do not wish to work or do not have such rudimentary requirements as how to speak or write English intelligibly, or who have prison records unacceptable to employers.

Not to do anything about this merely sweeps under the rug a serious human problem, not to say that what is swept under the rug may be the seeds of a whirlwind.

To get back to the hungry and starving, these people are in the pockets and fringes of human misery of the abundant society. If the Republicans wish to improve their dour countenance they could well follow the lead of Quie.

COLUMBUS DAY, OCTOBER 12

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Barrett] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, this week, on Thursday, October 12, 1967, we mark the 475th anniversary of that truly great event in the annals of American history—the discovery of the New World by the great Italian navigator, Christopher Columbus. It is a day known to every man, woman, and child in America, and the name of Columbus is as well known as the names of Washington or Lincoln.

While Columbus Day is not a national holiday, its importance has been long recognized by many of our States. In many of our towns and cities there are parades, speeches, and other festivities to celebrate this date. The schools have special programs to acquaint our youngsters with the remarkable feat accomplished by this young Genoan. For Columbus was only 24 years of age when he set out to prove his theory, that land lay beyond the uncharted, untraveled, and unexplored waters west of Europe.

Since the discovery of this continent by Columbus, those of Italian descent have contributed to the development and enrichment of our great country. Our history and the American heritage is full of their contributions; they are an integral part of our culture. They came as explorers and settlers, to help conquer the wilderness; they joined in our initial fight for freedom, liberty, and justice.

Through the years, down to today, Italian immigrants and their children have made their mark in every possible occupation, in the most artistic and highest paid, as well as in the hardest and the humblest. Today, there are over 25 million Americans of Italian descent in the United States, and this group constitutes one of the most wholesome segments of American life; a people who are peaceful, God-fearing, law-abiding, and useful citizens making a valued contribution to the greatness of America in every field of endeavor.

To our people, Columbus represents not only the starting point of our Nation, but he is truly the symbol of a great and persevering heroic spirit who dared to penetrate great and unknown dangers in his search for "a better way." It is this mighty spirit that is responsible for our remarkable national growth and development into the greatest and best land on earth. And it is of the Columbian spirit and heart that we must be ever mindful if this country and our people are to successfully meet the great challenges and responsibilities that face and rest upon us in this dangerous period of our history.

HUMANE LABORATORY ANIMAL TREATMENT ACT

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TUNNEY] may revise and extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide special assistance for the improvement of laboratory animal research facilities; to establish standards for the humane care, handling, and treatment of laboratory animals in departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States and by recipients of grants, awards, and contracts from the United States; to encourage the study and improvement of the care, handling, and treatment and the development of methods for minimizing pain and discomfort of laboratory animals used in biomedical activities, and to otherwise assure humane care, handling, and treatment of laboratory animals.

As you know, legislation was enacted by the 89th Congress to regulate dealers, prohibit the kidnapping of animals and safeguard animals in transport. While this was an important step, thousands of animals used in laboratories and research facilities are not covered by this law. Under Public Law 89–544, if an animal is in the experimental process at a research facility, present law does not apply. I believe the law should be extended to give these animals the benefit of all possible humane treatment so long as medical research is not hampered. I believe this bill accomplishes that purpose.

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would be required to establish standards and regulations. Regular inspections would be made to enforce the regulations and standards once promulgated. For a research facility to be accredited it would be required to maintain the required standards and pass the inspections subject to judicial review.

I urge the House to enact this legislation and thereby declare that good health and high quality are essential in the laboratory animals used in medical research activities vital to the health and safety of the people of the United States and that laboratory animals used in medical research should be spared unnecessary pain and discomfort.

LAND IN PHOENIX IS PROVING FERTILE FOR ELECTRONICS

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, that the Phoenix, Ariz., area has become a center to be counted in the electronics field is proven by the following article, "Land in Phoenix Is Proving Fertile for Electronics," which appeared in the New York Times of October 8, 1967. We are proud to have this industry in the Valley of the Sun, and to have provided the companies which have located there with the fine workers, educational facilities, and recreational resources which they need and enjoy. Our latchstring is always open, and we look forward to welcoming others in this field—or in any other field—who might wish to take advantage of all the State of Arizona has to offer. The article follows:

PHOENIX, ARIZ.—"This town is full of engineers and scientists. They're a funny breed. They work hard and then they want to relax hunting or fishing or boating or picking up rocks. That's why they're all eager to come here to live."

The speaker is the public relations manager for one of the major electronics companies that have settled here and are directing their major expansion projects in this region. Most of the big names in the industry are represented here in manufacturing or research operations. They include the General Electric Company, Motorola, Inc., the Sperry Rand Corporation, the International Telephone and Telegraph Corporation, Kaiser Aerospace and the Airesearch Manufacturing Company along with such native-grown companies as the Dickson Electronics Corporation, Ameco, Inc., EMP Electronics, the Rogers Corporation and Unidynamics.

Ask the top executives of any of these companies and they all agree on why they chose Phoenix for their newest operations. They state flatly that engineering and scientific personnel seem to be attracted to the region and that cooperation with the local university, Arizona State, is so perfect that they are intrigued by the possibilities of updating their education.

They also cite the "living in the sun year-round" attitude that prevails here; the proximity of mountains, lakes and even the desert for recreation and the casual approach to life. Then, too, there has been up to now a readily available supply of semiskilled or even highly skilled labor, plus plenty of nonskilled help ready for training.

The experience of Robert B. Roe, vice president and general manager of Sperry's flight systems division, in locating in this region is typical. Back in 1954 and 1955, the company decided to end its corporate concentration in the New York area. Since the division was then making an automatic pilot for the B–52 and automatic controls for the QF–80 drone, it was decided to look first east of the Mississippi River for a new site in line with Department of Defense desires for spreading around defense business.

"We decided to look the West all over," Mr. Roe recalled in a recent interview. "We liked it here especially because of the ideal flight conditions with sunny, cloudless skies and plenty of room for maneuvering. The education facilities at Arizona State also attracted us and we would be much closer to Boeing, Lockheed and Douglas, our three major customers.

"We were also more than impressed with the figures supplied by Motorola and AiResearch on low turnover and ability to recruit workers. Our experience since we moved here in 1956 has more than verified their bullish outlook on this region," Mr. Roe added.

SOME 3,100 NOW EMPLOYED

Sperry's initial facility in Phoenix comprised about 85,000 square feet of space and 500 workers, with about 90 per cent of the products turned out for the military. Today, the division employs some 3,100 persons in 360,000 square feet of space on the north side. About 70 per cent of today's output is for commercial aircraft, with most of the balance for the military. The company is taking a serious look into the field of executive aircraft and Mr. Roe feels certain that "in the next five years we'll probably have to increase both our facilities and our labor force by 30 to 50 per cent."

The Western Electric Company, supply and manufacturing arm of the giant Bell System, is right now going through the same experience that Sperry did back in the mid-fifties. It is building on the west side of the city what will be the world's largest cable manufacturing facility, with an annual capacity of 53 billion conductor feet a year. T. G. Clark, general manager of the plant, said that when it was in full operation next year it would consume about 1.3 million pounds of copper a week and raise Western Electric's cable manufacturing capacity by 25 per cent.

The giant facility's manufacturing area is about 1,200 feet long, 600 feet deep and 40 feet high and is completely air-conditioned with a system that is one and a half times larger than that used in the Houston Astrodome. Situated on an 80-acre tract, it will be the largest power user in the state and will employ some 1,200 persons. There will be about 20 acres under roof, or 850,000 square feet.

MACHINISTS TRAINED

Mr. Clark said Western Electric would bring in only key personnel and recruit the others from the vicinity. About a year ago the company opened a school to train highly skilled machinists, a group that is in short supply even in this electronics mecca.

"We've been quite pleased with the training program to date," Mr. Clark said. "About 50 percent of the trainees are from minority groups and we have had no problems at all. They want to learn and they're progressing on schedule. We're quite pleased with their enthusiasm."

The decision to locate here was based in part on the reasons advanced by others, coupled with the fact that more than 50 per cent of the nation's copper is mined in the state.

"We'll be loading our five other cable plants by computer from here," Mr. Clark said. "This means that as supplier to the Bell System, we'll use our IBM-360 computer installation to decide the economics of which plant should turn out the cable for use in the various areas of the country." The other plants are in Buffalo, Baltimore, Kearny, N.J., Chicago and Omaha.

A NEIGHBOR'S COMPUTER

Western Electric turned to a Phoenix neighbor, General Electric, for a GE–PAC 4020 process computer as part of an electronic system that will monitor production. It will be used initially for production testing and later expanded to handle more complex control problems.

Vern S. Cooper, manager of G.E.'s information services marketing operation here, is certain that Phoenix is destined to become an even more important electronics center in the future. He noted that transportation of some finished goods posed some problems, particularly for heavy items.

"We'll never see the day when transportation will be as bad as it is today and today it's really excellent," he explained, adding, "We know we can always get back here if we can get off the ground at the other end."

G.E. produces its computer lines here, sells them through trained sales people in the field and intends to keep its main production operations in this region. The over-all computer operation is coordinated in New York City, while European production is centered in France and Italy.

As for G.E.'s well-known problems in the computer business, Mr. Cooper attributes most of them to "one hell of a lot of bad press."

"The problems are really generic. Third generation computers have provided problems for everyone in this industry, I.B.M. included," he said.

A MODEST START

G.E. officially entered the Phoenix area in November, 1956, with the formation of its computer department, which then consisted of a handful of employes in rented quarters. It had one project—development of a computer complex, known as ERMA, for the Bank of America. At that time, is was the largest single order ever received. Ground was broken for a permanent facility on a 160-acre tract northwest of the city. There have since been three major additions that have more than tripled the total floor space and the work force now totals some 6,000 people in one million square feet of space.

But the real Phoenix success story in the world of electronics comes from Motorola, which in December, 1948, opened the first electronics facility in the region. It was housed in a 6,500-square-foot laboratory near the downtown area. Today, with some 17,000 employes in three separate divisions operating in about 3.2 million square feet of space, Motorola is the state's largest industrial employer.

SPENT YEAR THERE

Dr. Daniel E. Noble, vice chairman of the company and its chief technical officer, chose Phoenix because he had spent a year as a child in this region and believed that it would attract the technical people he needed. He convinced Paul V. Galvin, the founder and president, that if Motorola was to stay among the leaders in electronics, it would have to get into the solid-state art as soon after the war as possible. The military electronics division was formed in the company's first new building in the city. This was followed in 1956 by the semiconductor products division, which is now reportedly the world's largest single production facility of its type.

The third division—control systems—was founded in 1962 and now occupies the original semiconductor plant.

Dr. C. Lester Hogan, vice president and general manager of the semiconductor division, looks upon his division as part of "a great industry, a perfect example of just how capitalism should work." He explained that there are roughly 100 companies in the industry and "no monopolies either on the manufacturing or the consumer end."

"We have to succeed in the face of real competition, matching wits with each competitor," he went on. "Today, I can say we are the second largest semi-conductor manufacturer in the world, with 15 per cent of the total output. We're damn close to the largest and expect to be that next year with 16 per cent of the total."

He placed Texas Instruments, Inc., on top of the industry, with the Fairchild Camera and Instrument Corporation third. Dr. Hogan does not see any shakedown in the industry to the point where there will be only a handful of manufacturers.

"The art changes too rapidly for that," he explained. "We now have a microminiature silicon chip that contains 524 individual components and a complexity comparable to that of three or four color TV sets. [It is about the size of a pinhead.] See me next year and we'll probably have one with 1,000 components and then 100,000. Who knows?"

NO FEAR OF PEACE

Dr. Hogan is not one who "fears any outbreak of peace," noting that it would at worst only create minor dislocations.

"The pace of research in integrated circuits is bound to continue," he said. "Our first customer is the computer industry and our second is the automotive, where the potential is almost without bounds."

Ralph Elsner, general manager of Motorola's aerospace center in the government electronics division, also believes there would be little effect on his division once peace comes.

"If the war ended tomorrow there'd be very little change in our forecasts for 1968 operations," Mr. Elsner said. "The Department of Defense arsenal would have to be replenished and we make such items as fuses and small missile guidance devices, all of which would be in short supply. Then, too, we'd be working on new items that are still in our research and development stages. We would also look for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to provide a shot in the arm to its procurement."

He pointed out that it was company policy to maintain steady employment through not devoting more than 50 per cent of the work effort to one branch of the military and not more than 20 per cent to any single program.

Raymond A. Zack is general manager of the control systems division, the newest division and one that many observers expect to be the fastest growth area for the company.

It produces digital processing and supervisory controls in competition with such leaders in the field as Foxboro, Honeywell and Taylor Instruments. Mr. Zach reported his division had "an excellent year to date principally in the industrial process line because of growing acceptance of electronics in this area." He noted that progress has been especially strong in the petrochemical industries where Motorola specialized equipment is compatible with computers from the major manufacturers.

One major project with great growth potential is in the discrete data processing field in conjunction with a major telephone system. In the event a line is down or a phone out of order, the operator marks a card, inserts it into a reader which transmits the information by telephone to a computer that selects the closest repair spot and dispatches the repair crew in hours instead of days in remote locations.

Virtually all of Mr. Zach's business is not militarily oriented, so he, too, has no fears of labor problems in the event of peace. In fact, he expects to add between 10 and 15 per cent to his work force and "should more than double the number of people we employ within three years because of new products and an expansion program aimed at doubling the division every three years."

The competition for skilled labor continues within the region. The Dickson Electronics Corporation is a perfect example. Donald C. Dickson, the founder and president, worked for Motorola until seven years ago when, with $300,000 capital, he founded his company to manufacture products similar to those produced by Motorola's semiconductor division. Dickson had 71 employes then; today it has more than 1,100 and its sales last year topped $11.5-million. Two weeks ago, it opened a new $1.9-million facility.

IMPORT QUOTAS AND THE NATIONAL INTEREST

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, an editorial of the August 16 Wall Street Journal deserves close attention. The Journal notes that—

> At the moment . . . the textile and other industries are pushing for still more quotas to restrict the inflow of goods from abroad.

The Journal goes on to list some of the disadvantages of the quota method of controlling imports. First, it notes that, in general principle, quotas are a far less desirable means of controlling imports than tariffs. A tariff applies to all importers and, therefore, does not discriminate among supplying countries and individual importers, and it at least provides public revenue. The Journal points out that—

> Under a quota, on the other hand, allegedly all-knowing bureaucrats carve up the domestic market to fit their idea of the equitable, "proper" pattern.

Quotas create upward pressures on prices and they tend to give the importers favored with the quotas an assured share of the business and thus an unhealthy stake in maintaining the quota. The Journal concludes that—

> The worst tactic of all is to try to manipulate the market with import quotas, all the

while pretending that this enforces American ideas of equity and fairness.

It is worth emphasizing the difference between tariffs and quotas. Tariffs are a means of measuring differentials in competitive conditions among nations, in comparison to the quota device. In the words of a Washington Post editorial on October 7—

> When compared with the insidious quotas, tariffs are an enlightened form of protection. Consumers, to be sure, pay higher prices when tariffs are levied. But if the demand is sufficiently strong, goods may be imported over the tariff wall. Moreover, the burden of protection borne by the public will be somewhat reduced by the tariff revenues that flow into the Treasury.
>
> Under quotas, the protecion tends to be absolute since the volume of imports is limited by fiat.

In this context it is apt to point to the fact that the quota device seems to be becoming much more widely accepted. Many groups have succeeded in having quota bills introduced on their behalf in the Senate and the House. Responding to or to minimize these pressures, the Senate Finance Committee has scheduled 3 days of hearings on quota measures for steel, oil, meat, dairy products, and textiles, among others, beginning on October 18. The hearings will serve the useful purpose of allowing the relevant interests to have a hearing, but on the other hand, it signals the need to make clear that quotas, by definition, are a movement away from fairer international toward a trading world where the economic forces that lie behind movements of goods and services across national boundaries are harnessed by arbitrary governmental administrative controls that prevent the operation of the marketplace and inject political judgments into economic processes.

The Wall Street Journal editorial referred to above follows:

The Case Against Quotas

> In testimony before Congress the other day, President David Rockefeller of Chase Manhattan Bank was arguing for removal of nontariff barriers to trade, such as import quotas. The point is well-taken and timely, and not only for the reasons he mentioned.
>
> After the tariff cuts negotiated this year at Geneva, quotas and similar devices, Mr. Rockefeller says, "remain the most serious obstacles to trade expansion." At the moment, moreover, the textile and other industries are pushing for still more quotas to restrict the inflow of goods from abroad.
>
> New quotas here would, of course, invite new quotas overseas, and the U.S. stands to lose more than anyone from moves to curb the growth of trade. This nation's exports, after all, long have substantially exceeded its imports; even if imports rose by a larger percentage than exports, the U.S. trade balance still could improve.
>
> As Mr. Rockefeller contends, therefore, trade restraints of any type are a bad bargain for the American economy. We would add that, of the two major types, quotas are much less desirable than tariffs.
>
> To begin with, a tariff at least permits a semblance of a free market to continue to operate. Foreign producers, by working to increase their own efficiency, may be able to cut prices enough to find entry into the tariff-protected market. Domestic producers thus still have some incentive to keep their own costs and prices down.
>
> Under a quota system, on the other hand, allegedly all-knowing bureaucrats carve up the domestic market to fit their idea of the equitable, "proper" pattern. Even if the planners' decision is relatively fair to begin with, economic change soon is sure to distort it into something quite different.
>
> By curbing import competition, quotas naturally tend to push domestic prices higher than they otherwise would be; like tariffs, they thus represent a hidden subsidy to domestic producers, a subsidy paid by consumers through the higher prices.
>
> In addition, though, quotas also are a subsidy to importers, since they often can buy goods at a lower world price and sell them in the shielded domestic market. It's small wonder that quotas usually are harder to erase than tariffs; the importers as well as domestic manufacturers have an economic stake in their preservation.
>
> Still another reason why quotas are a greater evil than tariffs is that import duties at least provide the Government with a certain amount of revenue. Quotas are, if anything, even more difficult to administer than tariffs, and yet they bring the Government no compensating income.
>
> In spite of these drawbacks and others, quotas will continue to have powerful friends. In a speech the other day, for instance, Senator John O. Pastore of Rhode Island argued that quotas were a "simple" solution to all the problems of the U.S. textile industry.
>
> "The solution," he said, "is to provide quantitative limitations or quotas on imports of all textiles—whether of cotton, wool or man-made fibers. . . . Controls must be global in scope—and industry-wide in application. These limitations must be broken down by different categories of textiles and textile products." What the Senator might consider a complex "solution" boggles the mind.
>
> As we've said before, if Congress decides that any industry is so vital to the U.S. economy that it must be subsidized, the subsidies should be paid directly and openly. To siphon the funds from consumers in hidden ways is, to put it mildly, scarcely consistent with the principles of a supposedly free society.
>
> And the worst tactic of all is to try to manipulate the market with import quotas, all the while pretending that this enforces American ideas of equity and fairness.

TAX EQUALITY: H.R. 13341, A BILL TO REMOVE THE TAX EXEMPTION OF FEDERAL LAND BANKS

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, it is important for good Federal tax policy that we constantly cull our Federal income tax laws to be certain that we tax our citizens, however organized to engage in economic activity, as equally as possible. Over a period of years I have introduced varied legislation, some of it now law, designed to equalize our Federal tax structure in this respect. I list a few examples merely to emphasize the point.

The Mills-Curtis law, Public Law 429, 84th Congress, to equalize the Federal taxation of mutual and stock life ininsurance companies.

H.R. 2900 of the 87th Congress, which became part of the Revenue Act of 1962, to equalize the taxation of the institutions financing homebuilding; namely, the savings and loan institutions vis-a-vis the banking institutions.

H.R. 3150 of the 86th Congress, which became part of the Revenue Act of 1962, to equalize the taxation of the cooperative form of doing business vis-a-vis the corporate form.

In need of constant review is the proper line of demarcation between those activities properly related and those unrelated to the purpose of nonprofit organizations, which is almost a separate field in itself. Certainly the question of what in-house operations government engages in directly to satisfy its requirements for goods and services in behalf of the people, instead of procuring these goods and services from tax-paying enterprises in the marketplace, should be of constant concern to those who establish Federal tax policies.

I have now introduced a bill, H.R. 13341, to repeal the tax exemptions of the Federal land banks. When the Federal land bank system was created in 1916 it was granted exemption from all taxation. At that time the composition of the Nation's agricultural economy and the character of the financial institutions which served it were vastly different from what they are today and probably justified the tax exemption. In the 50 years since their establishment these conditions have changed and, to the best of our ability to determine, the appropriateness of the tax exemption has never been reconsidered.

This is neglectful. We should review these federally chartered organizations and the laws under which they operate. Here follows a brief review for the consideration of the House.

Federal funds were retired from the Federal land bank system in 1947. Since that time the land banks have operated as private enterprise organizations under the supervision of the Farm Credit Administration. As private lenders, the land banks have been free to compete with other private lenders for the agricultural loan business. They have done so most effectively. In 1940 the percentage of the total—dollar volume—of the farm mortgages held by the land banks was only 8.3 percent. By 1965 the land banks' share of this business had climbed to 24 percent.

Stated another way, this means that nearly one-fourth of all farm mortgage lending, which produced net earnings for the Federal land banks of $37 million in 1966, was done on a tax-free basis. It is interesting to note that the Production Credit Association—PCA—and the banks for cooperatives, also supervised by the Farm Credit Administration, are not tax exempt. The banks for cooperatives pay taxes and the PCA's are subject to tax automatically as Federal funds are retired. Federal funds have been retired from nearly all PCA's today and so the operations are almost completely taxed.

Mr. Speaker, the point which should concern us the most, however, is that as the land banks seek an ever increasing share of the market it becomes less and less attractive to other agriculture lenders, with whom the land banks directly compete. If current trends continue the day will inevitably come when tax-paying private lenders do so little business in the agricultural field that they may no longer find it profitable to serve this market. We will have diminished healthy competition, which will adversely affect the borrower and at the same time we will have narrowed the Federal tax base, thus reducing Federal revenue.

It is to preserve and equalize the competition among lenders who serve our farmers, and thereby both to preserve for them maximum access to capital markets, and to broaden the Federal tax base, that I have introduced this tax equalization bill, H.R. 13341.

EXPORT OPPORTUNITY FOR AMERICAN AUTOS IN EUROPEAN COMMON MARKET

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. Curtis. Mr. Speaker, a major effort of any trade negotiation is to provide greater access to foreign markets for American products. This was certainly the case with the Kennedy round of trade negotiations, which was widely considered to be successful in opening new markets by reducing barriers to trade.

A rumor has come to my attention that for an important U.S. product the Common Market succeeded in maintaining its rather high tariff barrier. The rumor, which has become somewhat widespread, was that the EEC's duties on autos would be cut by 50 percent, but that the cut would not benefit American automobiles because a French lobby representing truck manufacturers managed to get this cut limited to vehicles with engines under 2.8 litres, which would automatically exclude the normal American automobile.

Wishing to examine this matter, I requested the facts from the special representative for trade negotiations. Our correspondence appears below. According to the special trade representative, all American passenger autos will benefit from the reduction of the EEC duty on automobiles from a rate of 22 to 11 percent, a full 50-percent cut.

I should go further here to note that the 50-percent duty cut on autos is not a priori an indication that sales of American autos to the EEC will increase. On the contrary, the several EEC member countries have for years applied a special tax to cars based on engine size. This auto "road tax," discriminatory in intent, had in practice a discriminatory effect on U.S. cars, as the only cars with engines large enough to be affected by the tax.

The road tax became an important item of negotiation between the EEC and the United States, and it found its way into the chemical sector negotiations particularly. In the final months of the negotiations, as a compromise on the difficult issue of the American selling price system of customs valuation began to form, the road tax was offered by the Community as an element in a possible ASP package. In the final negotiations, in the so-called second package of the chemical sector negotiations, the EEC contracted to modify the road tax so as to eliminate its discriminatory effects on American cars. The road tax, as an important nontariff trade barrier was considered by us a part payment for possible modification of the American selling price system, which is considered a nontariff barrier by the EEC and others.

But to date this contractual obligation, made part of the final EEC negotiations signed by the negotiating countries, has not to my knowledge been spelled out. It would be helpful to have a more exact idea of the precise means the EEC will use to implement its obligation, and to have therefore also an idea how sales of U.S. cars in Europe might favorably be affected. This matter will, of course, receive thorough scrutiny in Ways and Means Committee hearings on the implementation of the second package of the chemical sector negotiations.

The exchange of correspondence, referred to above, follows:

SEPT. 14, 1967.

Hon. WILLIAM M. ROTH,
Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. AMBASSADOR: A report has come to my attention which I would like to verify.

I am informed that EEC duties on autos will be cut by 50% but that the cut was limited to vehicles with engines under "2.8 liters capacity." I understand that this limitation was obtained by France at the behest of its automobile lobby, and that this limitation automatically excludes the normal American automobile from the 50% cut. I would appreciate having the facts on this matter.

Sincerely,

THOMAS B. CURTIS.

OFFICE OF THE SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE FOR TRADE NEGOTIATIONS,
Washington, September 20, 1967.

Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CURTIS: Thank you for your letter of September 14 inquiring about a report that the 50 percent cut in the EEC duties on autos obtained in the Kennedy Round was limited to vehicles with engines under 2.8 liters capacity and that this limitation automatically excludes the normal American automobile from the 50 percent cut.

This report is not correct. All American passenger automobiles will benefit from the reduction of the EEC duty on automobiles from 22 to 11 percent. The misunderstanding concerning the coverage of the EEC concession on automobiles results from an incorrect understanding of the French language nomenclature covering automotive passenger vehicles in the EEC tariff.

The EEC tariff paragraph covering such vehicles has two parts. The first part, on which no concession was made by the EEC reads "Autocars et autobus a moteur a explosion d'une cylindree egale ou superiere a 2.8 litres ou a moteur a combustion interne d'une cylindree egale ou superiere a 2.5 litres." An accurate translation would be "Sightseeing and other buses with an explosion motor with displacement equal to or greater than 170.8 cubic inches or internal combustion engine equal to or greater than 152.5 cubic inches." The second part of the tariff paragraph on which there was a 50 percent reduction merely says "other".

An improper translation of the French word "autocars" to mean "automobiles" rather than "sightseeing buses" would result in the erroneous conclusion that "the normal American automobile" was excluded from the concession on "other".

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM M. ROTH,
Special Representative.

REDUCING IMPORTS OF ALL TEXTILES INCLUDING WOOLEN GOODS AND WOOL

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. KLEPPE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation designed to reduce imports of all textiles, including woolen goods and wool.

The more than 5,000 sheep growers in North Dakota depend entirely upon the domestic textile industry as the only market for their wool production. Domestic wool prices have declined as imports of wool and woolen goods have increased.

The Department of Agriculture estimates U.S. wool production for 1967 at 228 million pounds, 3 percent below the 1966 level. This is the 7th consecutive year of declining domestic wool production. Sheep numbers declined 4 percent last year.

The U.S. market for wool has shrunk from 391 million pounds in 1961 to 364 million pounds last year, a drop of 7 percent. Over the same period, imports of wool textiles have nearly doubled, from 52 million to 98 million pounds.

This flood of imports has been disastrous both for sheep growers and the domestic wool industry. My bill would help to reverse that trend. The measure would authorize and direct the President to negotiate agreements providing for orderly trade in all textile articles, including wool, cotton and products made from these fibers.

The agreements would limit imports by categories of textile articles and would be based on a representative period of at least 1 year. After a significant amount of imports was covered by agreements, the President would have the authority to set quotas for those countries which were not signatories to an agreement. If, 6 months after the bill's enactment, agreements had not been concluded, the President would be directed to establish quotas limiting imports to their average annual quantity for the period 1961–66.

This bill is a reasonable and equitable approach to a critical problem. It would permit some increase in imports as our domestic market grows and is able to absorb them. At the same time, it brings wool imports under a system of reasonable controls which will protect the incomes of U.S. wool growers.

GOVERNOR ROMNEY SPEAKS ON THE "STRATEGY FOR A NEW AMERICA"

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, it is now generally agreed that unresolved urban problems constitute the major domestic crisis we face today. "Lawlessness," "housing," "unemployment," "relocation," "transportation," "open space," "pollution," "renewal," "poverty," and other key words delineate the full scope of this crisis.

Gov. George Romney of Michigan recently completed a 20-day tour of actual and potential urban area trouble spots which gave rise to some very pertinent observations on the depth of this problem and what might be done about it.

Speaking before the 21st annual meeting of the National Conference of Editorial Writers last Friday evening in Nashville, Tenn., Romney pointed out the need for equal justice. He said:

> The ghetto-dweller's plea for "equal justice" and the suburbanite's insistence on the maintenance of "law and order" are just differing expressions of the same objective. Almost all Americans want firm, fair enforcement of the law, which respects individual rights and insures the safety of our streets. This doesn't mean the coddling of law breakers, and it doesn't mean repressive police measures.

The Governor has made a sound observation which should be heeded if we are to achieve true and meaningful "equal justice."

Mr. Romney also spoke of the need for increased participation by private enterprise in meeting the housing and jobs crises of our urban areas. He said:

> Surely, here is an opportunity for private enterprise, with union cooperation and government encouragement as needed, to create a whole new industry in the heart of the ghettos—producing improved housing at a cost the people can afford, reversing neighborhood deterioration, upgrading the skills of the work force, providing meaningful and accessible jobs at reasonable wages where there are none today, and stimulating increased economic progress throughout the central cities.

It has become increasingly clear that Government cannot do the job alone. Constructive legislation, such as the Human Investment Act and the National Home Ownership Foundation Act—which seek increased private enterprise participation—must be enacted by this Congress to provide some badly needed problem-solving apparatus.

As Governor Romney said last Friday evening:

> Government's greatest role should be as stimulator, clearinghouse, and catalyst in helping to release the energies of the private, independent and voluntary sectors of the American community.

Governor Romney's address follows:

ADDRESS BY GOV. GEORGE ROMNEY, OF MICHIGAN, NASHVILLE, TENN., OCTOBER 6, 1967

I have just returned from a tour across America. It was the kind of tour that few Americans have taken, and few would care to take.

Yet I wish that every American could have been with me for those 20 days—to listen to the voices of the streets—to see the squalor of the slums—and to share the insights, the frustrations, and the hopes of concerned Americans who are striving desperately to make America's promise come true before it is too late.

For the America I saw was not America the Beautiful—not the America of the travel posters—not the America of opportunity and affluence that most of us call home.

Instead, I saw the other face of America—the America of ugly streets and rotted buildings, the America of congestion, illiteracy and want, the America of shattered expectations and rising fury.

This is the America of the inner city—jampacked with refugees from rural areas, who came to an alien environment unprepared but hopeful of opportunity, only to have the dehumanizing trap of the ghetto shut around them.

This is the America where ten people live crammed into two small rooms—where a four-room flat has only one light bulb—where children sleep five in a bed—where the accumulated litter and filth of many years breeds rats, roaches and foul odors.

This is the America where men who want work cannot find it—either because they lack needed skills, or because they cannot read and write and figure well enough to take advantage of job-training programs, or because they find the doors to jobs for which they may be qualified slammed shut by racial and class discrimination.

This is the America where people are locked into dependency by a welfare system that sustains life at a bare subsistence level with a monthly handout in the mail, and penalizes initiative by withdrawing even that minimum support if the recipient makes the mistake of finding even a low-paid, unskilled, entry-level job.

This is the America where an unemployed father too often learns that the greatest material contribution he can make is to move away from home, so that his wife and children can qualify for welfare payments.

This is the America where children grow up like weeds in a jungle, untended and undisciplined, without a father's guidance and example, without the opportunity to learn the value of work, in a society whose examples of success are the pimps, the pushers, and prostitutes.

This is the America where children enter school without being able to say a single word—and where they leave school after eight, ten, or 12 years with only a third-grade education.

This is the America where a young man or woman cannot aspire to go to college—where a family cannot aspire to own a home—where a would-be small businessman cannot get capital.

This is an ugly America and an angry America.

I have walked its streets and listened to its voices. They were sometimes plaintive and dispirited, sometimes ardent, sometimes menacing.

These were not the voices of the demagogues. The Rap Browns and the Stokely Carmichaels seem to have little active support among the people of the streets.

For the most part, these were the voices of young indigenous leaders who are increasingly emerging as authentic spokesmen of the ghetto streets—young Mexican-Americans, Italian-Americans, Puerto Rican-Americans, and Negro Americans—young men like Paris Moxley and Bernard Gifford in Rochester, Nick Dorenzo in Chicago, Herbie Miller and Arnie Segurra in Harlem, Roy Ballard in San Francisco, Lou Smith, Baltimore Scott and Billy Tidwell in Watts, and Hosea Williams in Atlanta.

Their message was the same. They are tired of broken promises. Their hopes have been raised, only to be dashed. They feel that they've been tricked. They believe America has broken faith with them. They don't trust anybody, least of all political leaders. They are fed up with outsiders and experts coming in with neatly packaged projects which deny them meaningful control of their own lives.

They want to help themselves and one another, free from barriers of discrimination and unequal opportunity. They are proud of their racial or ethnic heritage. They seek escape from dependency. They are anxious to communicate. They want a piece of the action, and they want it now. They want to turn the American dream from a mocking delusion into a reality.

In Watts, I had the opportunity to meet with a cross-section of Negro leadership—from white-collar, wealthy and middle-class businessmen, to blue-jeaned, bearded militants. It was the first time since the Watts riot of two years ago that this entire range of Negro leadership had assembled in one place.

We talked for several hours. At the beginning, some were shouting, while others weighed their words with extreme caution. But before our talk was over, all were speaking with the same passionate intensity—and all were voicing the same position.

They said that in spite of all the federal, state, local and private programs Watts is as explosive as it was two years ago.

Then I asked them what they wanted. These were their unanimous priorities:

First, they want human dignity. They want white people to stop treating them as inferiors. They want to be full-fledged American citizens.

Second, they want equal justice under equal laws, equally enforced. They want as much protection and consideration in the ghetto as in the suburbs.

Third, they want equal opportunity, not mere tokenism, all up and down the line—equal educational opportunity, equal training opportunity, equal job placement opportunity, equal promotion opportunity, equal housing opportunity, equal business ownership opportunity.

When they finished with the list, one of them said, "It sounds like we want the American dream."

I checked this list in other cities, in other slums, with other leaders. They all agreed that it accurately listed the aspirations of their people.

Clearly, the conditions I saw and the problems the ghetto leaders voiced are neither local nor sectional. They are not exclusively Negro or white. They are not limited to one minority group. They are found in every part of the country where there are cities. They are national conditions and national problems.

These problems did not spring up over night. For years they have been festering, unrecognized beneath the surface, until violence flared and they could no longer be ignored.

Because one America stood by while another America suffered, we face today not only a crisis of conscience, but a crisis of survival.

The bulk of the people who live in the black ghettos of America are watching and waiting and weighing which way to go.

The Carmichaels and the Browns do not yet speak for a majority of the black community, but they can articulate and capitalize on the injustices. Their hardened attitudes are too often mirrored in the white community. America is becoming dangerously polarized.

The greatest gap between the people of the slums and the people of the suburbs—greater than the education gap, the employment gap, even the opportunity gap—is the understanding gap, the communication gap. We aren't listening to one another. We don't know each other.

The suburbs and the slums are different worlds. Economic and social distance is increased by racial distance. Too few Negroes really know any whites and too few whites really know any Negroes.

The average, comfortable American living in the suburbs or on the fringes of the central city doesn't understand the unique conditions which breed the frustration, brokenness and heartache of the ghetto. He doesn't understand the rising turmoil in the inner city. He sees it as ingratitude on the part of those who are getting a free ride at the expense of people like himself who are making their own way. He sees it as a threat to his economic and physical security. Too often, he reacts with resentment and with anger born of fear.

As a result, this nation--which needs agreement on what to do in our cities more than it needs agreement on any other single thing—is today a house divided. Far from rewarding riots, we face public pressure to do comparatively less.

We face the mounting danger of a hostile confrontation between an achieving society and a dependent society—suburb against slum, prosperous against poor, white against black, brother against brother.

And that would be the death of America.

Surely it is clear, in the wake of the 1967 riots, including Newark and Detroit, that what we have been doing to solve the problems of our inner cities has been either inadequate or wrong. Detroit was known across the country as a model of enlightened federal, state and local action. Yet Detroit suffered the worst riot, with the most deaths and greatest damage, in our nations history.

Our best and most extensive efforts in the past have been mere palliatives, not cures. They have treated symptoms, not causes. They have failed to come to grips with the structural deficiencies in American society that are the root of the problem.

We must find better answers. We must find a better way.

And I have seen across America the beginnings of a better way. I found concerned Americans undertaking innovative and promising approaches in city after city.

There is wide local variation in the solutions they are using. The answers to our problems as a nation must spring up from the rich diversity of American life. No lasting solution can be imposed from the top down. It must grow from the bottom up.

And from the bottom up, the broad outlines of a strategy for a New America are beginning to emerge.

Here are some of its components.

First, in marshalling our resources to the task, the greatest advance can be achieved without money, government, or even private organization.

This advance depends on the thoughts, attitudes, speech and daily action of each of us individually. It simply depends on our treating each other with respect—esteeming others as we esteem ourselves. This is the essence of American citizenship—the God-given right of each and all to human dignity.

Second, a strategy for a New America demands more attention to providing genuinely equal justice. And this begins with equal law enforcement.

We must insist on just laws, equally applied and firmly enforced. No American has the right to violate the law.

The ghetto-dweller's plea fór "equal justice" and the suburbanite's insistence on the maintenance of "law and order" are just differing expressions of the same objective. Almost all Americans want firm, fair enforcement of the law, which respects individual rights and insures the safety of our streets.

This doesn't mean the coddling of law breakers, and it doesn't mean repressive police measures.

We need the kind of police-community relations work I saw in New York, Chicago and St. Louis. In New York, for example, police in Puerto Rican neighborhoods are trained to understand cultural differences. St. Louis maintains neighborhood store-front stations manned by patrolmen who handle individual complaints about city services, and help people solve their problems.

We need the kind of police professionalism I saw in Chicago, where electronic communications have reduced the *average* time required to respond to a telephoned request for help to four minutes.

And we need citizen involvement. One of the most dramatic programs I saw was the Indianapolis Women's Anti-Crime Crusade in which 50,000 women are informally organized to ride herd on the courts, assist the police department, and work with juveniles who might otherwise be involved in street crime.

These programs, and others like them, are essential if we are to have equal justice, law and order, and a climate in which violence is rejected in favor of peaceful change.

Third, a strategy for a New America requires us to stop looking at the people of the slums as a drag on our society, and see them rather as an untapped asset. There is as much talent and leadership in the slums as there is in the suburbs. Its development will create a New America.

Too many Americans in the ghetto see themselves as hopeless failures, because they have never known success. They are losers in school and losers in jobs. We must open opportunities for them to win the first-step success that will encourage them to believe in themselves.

For example, I saw dramatic breakthroughs in basic education, developed by private groups in Illinois and Indiana, which can give a functional illiterate the reading, spelling, and arithmetic skills of a high school graduate in just a few short weeks.

I saw private street academies in Harlem which promise to guarantee a college education to any dropout who will join—not through handouts, but through patient, loving, personal effort that imparts self-discipline, strength of character, and self-confidence along with basic academic skills.

I saw job training programs that guarantee job placement to anyone who completes the training course. One Indiana program goes even further, with volunteers whose personal concern, guidance and example—on a one-to-one basis—help a new employee through the critical early weeks on a new job.

These are programs that help turn losers into winners. They not only change the attitude of the individual toward himself, but they help change the attitude of society at large.

Fourth, a strategy for a New America demands a clearer understanding and more effective application of the principle of self-help at the level of the streets.

Self-help is the creative side of black power. It is black power in a dimension too often overlooked: the power of the people themselves—yes, even poor people—to mold their own future through positive action instead of handouts or violence in the streets.

Time and again the people of the ghettos showed me how they were altering the atmosphere and direction of life around them by producing progress of their own making—progress they will fight to defend, not to destroy, because it is their own.

In Watts, I saw Operation Bootstrap, a fiercely independent self-help program organized by militants, which provides basic education, job training and job placement, along with day care services.

In Indianapolis, I saw a housing project where every home was individually owned by a family which made their down-payment by applying a thousand hours of sweat toward its construction.

In Pittsburgh, I saw a range of self-help housing that included rehabilitation of run-down slum dwellings by both tenants and owners working in cooperation.

And again and again, I saw the self-help principle at work in the building of strong, representative ghetto organizations. The Indianapolis Crime Commission, for example, reported that strong block clubs and neighborhood associations were directly related to reduced crime rates.

In Detroit, I saw one ghetto area which escaped the riots because its people had been putting into practice the principles of effective citizenship common to small towns throughout the country. They had produced parks, clean streets, and rehabilitated homes without depending on government initiative. When the riots broke, they were not passive on-lookers—they took to the streets, defended their own neighborhood, and kept the rioters away.

In some cities, ghetto organization has achieved more equitable school and housing policies. In others, central city organizations have been given the resources and the determining voice to plan urban renewal and redevelopment of their own neighborhood.

In Rochester, New York, as a direct result of the activity of the militant ghetto organization, FIGHT, leadership from all segments of the community—from the ghettos to the giant corporations—have launched a bold, cooperative effort to guarantee job training and employment to every man and woman who needs it—including the so-called "unemployables."

The city that has a strong, representative ghetto organization is fortunate indeed. For the ardor, ambition and revoluntary zeal of the new leaders of the ghetto and those they represent cannot be quenched or even dampened—but it can find welcome expression where constructive outlets exist.

Professional agencies serving ghetto residents must learn to see themselves as advisors, not managers—as resources, not controllers. City halls must do less telling, and more listening. Government at every level must stop trying to impose ready-made plans on the people of the ghetto, and trust them with control over their own lives.

Fifth, a strategy for a New America must eliminate restrictions which hamper the full use of our resources.

Take housing. Living conditions in the ghetto are intolerable. Forty-three percent of all housing in our inner cities is seriously deteriorating. But inflation and high wage rates in the building industry have driven construction costs so high that it is uneconomical to contract for the reconstruction of run-down housing and still rent or sell it at a price ghetto people can afford.

As a result, housing conditions continue to get worse. Old dwellings are not being rehabilitated in significant numbers. New construction fell last year to its lowest point in twenty years.

Yet the ghettos are full of the underemployed and unemployed who could quickly and easily be trained in many building skills. They would be eager to learn and earn if they were given the opportunity to work on housing rehabilitation projects. And there is a potential $50 billion market for rehabilitation housing.

No artificial restrictions should be permitted to stand in the way of meeting housing needs so urgent and employment needs so vast.

Surely, here is an opportunity for private enterprise, with union cooperation and government encouragement as needed, to create a whole new industry in the heart of the ghettos—producing improved housing at a cost the people can afford, reversing neighborhood deterioration, upgrading the skills of the work force, providing meaningful and accessible jobs at reasonable wages where there are none today, and stimulating increased economic progress throughout the central cities.

Or take the fundamental question of job

training and employment. Poverty—not race—is the common denominator of the people of the slums. And the answer to poverty is employment, not welfare—jobs, not handouts.

Business and industry must bring new plants and new jobs into slum areas. It must build new towns with new employment opportunities in outlying areas, to which ghetto residents could afford to move. It must provide sound basic education and job training so that ghetto residents can qualify to fill the jobs that are available. It must liberalize promotion policies, to open up more entry level jobs.

Both business and unions must end discrimination and establish more flexible and realistic job entry standards. They must seek to subdivide job skills to the fullest possible extent so that those with even minimum training can qualify for entry level jobs. Examples of how it can be done exist. It's time to share them and use them.

The employment of the average Negro in a job as good as that of the average white worker would add $15 billion this year to the Gross National Product. For business in general, this increase would mean more sales, more output, more profit—and for government, more taxes and less deficit.

Business, industry and unions must realize that, in breaking through into the cycle of ignorance and poverty, their own self-interest and survival is at stake—because America's survival is at stake.

And we must eliminate restrictions on the availability of capital to start and expand ghetto enterprises.

As a rule today, the dollar bounces only once in the ghetto.

To achieve a multiplier effect, the financial community must be willing to supply working and risk capital to the ghetto entrepreneur. Experience shows that it can be just as rewarding as loans made elsewhere.

In Philadelphia, I saw thriving, modern stores owned and operated by Negroes in a dynamic, extensive program to bring risk capital—and locally controlled free enterprise—into the ghetto. A few moderately successful ghetto businessmen pooled a small amount of capital, which was supplemented with a large amount of capital from a major lending institution, making loans and technical advice available to ghetto merchants. We are already bringing this program to Michigan.

We must foster self-generating economic progress in the ghetto, building in the multiplier factors that will open up ever-widening economic opportunities.

Sixth, a strategy for a New America requires a drastic revision of the priorities reflected in the present federal budget. Out of $136 billion which the federal government plans to spend this year, more must be found for the needs I have been discussing.

If the lot of millions of people on earth is more important than putting a man on the moon in this decade, let us invest more in people and even less in space. Let us spend more in Harlem and less in the Sea of Tranquility. If it is more important to provide decent homes than to subsidize candidates seeking national office in 1968, let us provide tax credits for those who are providing housing rather than those who are making political contributions.

We can cut down and defer public works (for which the President has budgeted almost $10 billion); we can wait to beautify our highways; we can delay urban renewal projects that replace potentially serviceable housing with palatial office buildings and luxury apartments; we can slow down spending for a multitude of other purposes, even some defense spending—but we can't hold back on eradicating slums and on the promise of a better life for those who live in them.

Finally, a strategy for a New America requires personal involvement, personal commitment, and dedicated leadership.

Behind every creative, innovative, working program that I found across the nation, there is a creative, innovative, working, dedicated leader.

Some leaders are professionals, some volunteers. Some are white, some black. Some are wealthy, some poor.

But they all believe in the people they are trying to help. They all have the ability to inspire others to give of themselves in a team effort. And they all recognize the urgent need to draw on every resource they can muster.

Their programs are impressive and successful, but they are still only small, isolated examples of what people can do. We must find more effective ways to transfer experience from one city to another. Successful efforts must be quickly multiplied a thousand fold—and this requires that leadership be multiplied a thousand fold.

The great political temptation will be to institutionalize and federalize these programs, on the theory that only the vast resources of government can do the job. But that would be a tragic error. Not even government's resources are adequate to more than scratch the surface of the job that must be done.

Of course, national leadership and national resources are essential. But no single master plan can meet our needs. In order to achieve a total answer, we must have a thousand different answers.

Any approach which fails to recognize the importance of local diversity and leadership, personal involvement, private action, and self-help will smother the sparks of progress I have seen.

We cannot hire a federal good samaritan to substitute for our individual citizen involvement in solving the problems of the ghetto.

Government's greatest role should be as stimulator, clearinghouse, and catalyst in helping to release the energies of the private, independent and voluntary sectors of the American community.

We need dedicated national leadership which will identify, stimulate, and encourage the spread of proven and effective projects. We need leadership which understands the relative roles of the several levels of government and private activity.

One Negro leader said to me two weeks ago, "America must face up to the fact that it's a massive job, and there's no more important problem, and there's no more time."

We must arouse ourselves from our comfort, pleasures and preoccupations and listen to the voices from the ghettos.

We must help them help themselves so they, too, can be a part of the American dream.

Together, we can build a New America.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous request, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. Sullivan (at the request of Mr. Foley), for today and the balance of the week, on account of illness.

Mrs. Hansen of Washington (at the request of Mr. Boggs), for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Whitener, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. Foley, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. Schwengel (at the request of Mr. Arends), for 30 minutes, on October 11, 1967; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Corman (at the request of Mr. Foley), on October 12 for 20 minutes; and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. Cohelan.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Arends) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Springer.

Mr. Teague of California.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Foley) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Dingell.

Mr. Philbin.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2388. An act to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 985. An act for the relief of Warren F. Coleman, Jr.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until Tuesday, October 10, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1145. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a request that certain wilderness areas in California, Oregon, and Wyoming be included in the national wilderness preservation system (H. Doc. No. 173); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed.

1146. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession contract to continue to provide accommodations, facilities, and services in Crater Lake National Park, Oreg., pursuant to the provisions of 70 Stat. 543; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1147. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a report involving suspension of deportation, pursuant to the provisions of section 244(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1148. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 89–175; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1149. A letter from the Secretary, Panama Canal Company, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to correct and improve the Canal Zone Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1150. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated August 7, 1967, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on Kawkawlin River, Mich., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted July 15, 1947; no authorization by Congress is recommended as the desired improvement has been approved by the Chief of Engineers for accomplishment under section 205 of the 1948 Flood Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of October 5, 1967, the following bills were reported on October 6, 1967:

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 12066. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, to provide an additional source of financing for the rural telephone program, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 736). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 10213. A bill to amend the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia, approved June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. 1125) (Rept. No. 737). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 11131. A bill to incorporate the Paralyzed Veterans of America (Rept. No. 738). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 9059. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act to provide that employer contributions do not have to be made under that act with respect to service performed in the employ of certain public international organizations (Rept. No. 739). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia: H.R. 11395. A bill to amend the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965 authorizing the prosecution of a transit development program for the National Capital region and to further the objectives of the act of July 14, 1960; with amendment (Rept. No. 740). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 6527. A bill to amend title 12, District of Columbia Code, to provide a limitation of actions for actions arising out of death or injury caused by a defective or unsafe improvement to real property; with amendment (Rept. No. 741). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 11638. A bill to amend title II of the act of September 19, 1918, relating to industrial safety in the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 742). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 13094. A bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended (Rept. No. 743). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[*Submitted October 9, 1967*]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PERKINS: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 13048. A bill to make certain technical amendments to the Library Services and Construction Act (Rept. No. 744). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FALLON: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 13178. A bill to provide more effectively for the regulation of the use of, and for the preservation of safety and order within the U.S. Capitol Buildings and the U.S. Capitol Grounds, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 745). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WHITTEN: Committee of conference. H.R. 10509. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 746). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXIV, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 13357. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 13358. A bill to provide to every American a full opportunity to have adequate employment, housing, and education, free of any discrimination on account of race, color, religion, or national origin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DELLENBACK:

H.R. 13359. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to include a definition of food supplements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 13360. A bill to study the advisability of establishing an International Development Corps; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 13361. A bill to assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extension of credit; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.R. 13362. A bill to provide certain essential assistance to the U.S. fisheries industry; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KLEPPE:

H.R. 13363. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KYROS:

H.R. 13364. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the protection of the public health from radiation emissions from electronic products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LENNON:

H.R. 13365. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make it unlawful to assault or kill any member of the armed services engaged in the performance of his official duties while on duty under orders of the President under chapter 15 of title 10 of the United States Code or paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 3500 of title 10 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 13366. A bill to exempt certain vessels engaged in the fishing industry from the requirements of certain laws; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 13367. A bill to require reports to Congress of certain actions of the Federal Power Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 13368. A bill to amend section 509 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, to provide for construction aid for certain vessels operating on inland rivers and waterways; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN (for herself, Mr. Hechler of West Virginia, Mr. Hébert, Mr. Fulton of Tennessee, Mr. Hungate, Mr. Holland, Mr. Rarick, and Mr. Moorhead):

H.R. 13369. A bill to amend section 509 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, to provide for construction aid for certain vessels operating on the inland rivers and waterways; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 13370. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to make certain adjustments in lands or interests therein acquired in connection with the Navarro Mills Reservoir, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 13371. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide special assistance for the improvement of laboratory animal research facilities, to establish standards for the humane care, handling, and treatment of laboratory animals in departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States and by recipients of grants, awards, and contracts from the United States, to encourage the study and improvement of the care, handling, and treatment and the development of methods for minimizing pain and discomfort of laboratory animals used in biomedical activities, and to otherwise assure humane care, handling, and treatment of laboratory animals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 13372. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to authorize aircraft noise abatement regulation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LENNON:

H.J. Res. 877. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as National School Safety Patrol Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.J. Res. 878. Joint resolution creating a Federal Committee on Nuclear Development to review and reevaluate the existing civilian nuclear program of the United States; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. Con. Res. 521. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the elimination of the Castro-Communist regime of Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LENNON:

H. Con. Res. 522. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the elimination of the Castro-Communist regime of Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 13373. A bill for the relief of Richard C. Mockler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 13374. A bill for the relief of Sfc. Patrick Marratto, U.S. Army (retired); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 13375. A bill for the relief of Christopher John Kyriazis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H.R. 13376. A bill for the relief of Fong Shu Shee, Fong Toy Hing, Fong Ng Shee, Fong Mee Yew, and Fong Buck Hoi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 13377. A bill for the relief of Zacarias Quitoriano Montero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13378. A bill for the relief of Expedito Soriano Angco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13379. A bill for the relief of Demetrio Tabalon Morales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POLANCO-ABREU:

H.R. 13380. A bill for the relief of Dr. Arturo Brito Santos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13381. A bill for the relief of Dr. Victor Luis Bienes Jimenez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13382. A bill for the relief of Dr. Orlando De Varona De Zayas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13383. A bill for the relief of Marcelino Suarez Pedemonte; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13384. A bill for the relief of Dr. Angel Rafael Marino Varona; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13385. A bill for the relief of Dr. Nis Juarez Fernandez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13386. A bill for the relief of Dr. Mario A. Garcia Gamboa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALKER:

H.R. 13387. A bill for the relief of Dr. Julio Epifanio Morera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

170. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., relative to NASA appropriations; to the Committee on Appropriations.

171. Also, petition of the city of Brentwood, Calif., relative to tax sharing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

172. Also, petition of city of Oroville, Calif., relative to tax sharing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

173. Also, petition of city of Brea, Calif., relative to Government tax sharing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

MONDAY, OCTOBER 9, 1967

The Senate met at 10:30 a.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

O Thou God of love and hope, through all the length of changing years Thy goodness faileth never.

In a day so full of fear and threat, save us from any panic of spirit, because our inner strength is drawn from deep wells.

With the light of Thy wisdom and strength of Thy grace, enable those who in these baffling times have been entrusted with the stewardship of the national concern, to be true servants of Thine in the welfare of Thy kingdom's cause.

Help us to remember that we are Thy children and belong to Thee, who hast set a restlessness in our hearts, and made us all seekers after that which we can never fully find.

Deliver us from all malice and contempt lest we hurt others and sour our own souls.

Hear Thou our prayer as out of the depths we cry, asking for wisdom and strength as we bow at the altar stairs which slope through darkness up to Thee.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, October 6, 1967, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] there be a time limitation of 3 minutes on statements with relation to routine morning business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION TODAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees, except the Committee on Finance, be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Chair recognizes the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield without losing the floor?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask unanimous consent that the time be not charged to the time allotted to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPONG in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

VIETNAM

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, for the past several weeks, several Senators from both parties have commented, in major speeches, on the prosecution of the war in Vietnam. Some of their speeches represented a distinct change of opinion and contained rather severe criticism of the conduct of the war.

Since I am frequently asked what this means for the Republican Party and what my own personal opinion is, I wish today clearly to define my personal stand.

I do not believe that the individual view of any of us who are members of the Republican Party can validly be interpreted as an expression of party position any more than the variant views within the President's own ranks represent Democratic policy. I wish the Republican Party were solidly united on the issue of Vietnam, but I do not think it vitally significant that it is not. There is room for honest dissent and full respect for the opinions of others.

I say this because I want it clearly understood at the outset of my remarks that I am not trying to start an argument with or to denigrate the views of other members of my party. Nor am I attempting, at this time, to predict what the Republican Party, assembled at its national convention in Miami next year, will decide in presenting its foreign policy positions on Vietnam and Asia generally; nor, for that matter, what the Democratic Party, assembled at its national convention in Chicago next year, may decide with regard to its foreign policy positions.

I can say only where this Senator stands.

I wish first to speak in behalf of the Office of the President of the United States because its present occupant has, on the subject of Vietnam, been the target of a torrent of criticism—some of it proper, and some of it, in my view, beneath the dignity of his office.

My deepest concern, as I look at the position of my country in world affairs, is with the integrity and prestige of the Presidency. I believe it is imperative that we do not undermine the stature of the President as Commander in Chief and as the Nation's chief diplomat.

As a legislator, I, of course, would not downgrade the role of Congress in the formulation of our foreign policy. As a Senator, I share the jealousy of all my colleagues in the Senate's right to advise and consent. The President is, however, as John Marshall said in 1799, "the sole organ of the Nation in its external relations, and its sole representative with foreign nations." In the eyes of the world from beyond our borders, it is the President who is the focal point when America is the subject of attention. Loyal American support of Presidental action in resisting aggression must not be misunderstood or underestimated by friend or foe. Our resolution in support of our policies, if received with skepticism abroad, can only make more difficult our political and military commitments. I realize that on several occasions the President has been charged with lack of candor with respect to the war in Vietnam, leading to much debate over a credibility gap. Seeking neither to excuse nor exculpate the President from his responsibility here, I can understand why those charged with the formulation and conduct of our national security policies might become overzealous in their efforts to withhold from our adversaries what they regard as vital information. The present administration has at times seemed obsessed with secrecy, even in solely domestic matters. This can be remedied by greater candor with the American people within the legitimate bounds of national security.

Meanwhile, I reiterate my own trust and confidence in the President in his prosecution of our basic strategy in Vietnam, because I know that he is not deliberately trying to deceive the American people on such a serious matter.

I respect the President for the majesty of his office. I use the word "majesty" not because I am a monarchist nor because I think the present occupant of the Presidency is regal. I use it only to convey some sense of the aura that surrounds the office of the Presidency.

It is, in this spirit, that Clinton Rossiter wrote:

> The Presidency . . . unites power, drama, and prestige as does no other office in the world. Its incumbent sits, wherever he sits, at the head of the table.

I would also like to quote McGeorge Bundy, president of the Ford Foundation, from an article which I inserted in the Congressional Record on May 17. He was speaking of guidelines for debate on Vietnam. He said:

> We can have only one President at a time. If you accept this rule, it applies to questions of diplomatic negotiation, of command decision and of national political leadership. It confers no immunity from criticism and no requirement of support. Yet it does set the President apart—in our interest, not his own.

When we undermine the stature of the Presidency and derogate from the prestige of its occupant, we do a disservice to ourselves, our political parties, and our Nation.

Turning now to my position on Vietnam, I support the basic policy of the U.S. Government with respect to Vietnam and Southeast Asia. Our Government has repeatedly and, in my opinion, convincingly declared that we seek no permanent military bases nor any other territory on the Asian mainland—nor, for that matter anywhere in the world. Nor do we seek subservient allies on that continent—nor, for that matter, any other continent—nor to impose our way of life on any of its peoples.

Our objective in Southeast Asia, as in every other region of the world, is peace. We believe that the absence of armed hostilities or of the threat of force will enable the emerging independent countries of this region to develop their nationhood in such ways and with such institutions as are appropriate to the historical traditions and present needs of their people.

The indispensable prerequisite is peace. Regrettably, there is no peace today in Vietnam, or, for that matter, in neighboring Cambodia, Laos and Thailand, either. This tragic situation is not the result of American policies or actions. Rather, it is the consequence of a conscious decision, made many years ago by the Communist Governments of North Vietnam and China, to extend dominion over these countries by force and violence, in flagrant contravention of widely accepted principles which are embodied in the Charter of the United Nations, and in callous disregard of the desires of the people of these countries to be left alone in peace.

What North Vietnam is doing, and has been doing at least for the past decade, is to engage in sharp aggression. It may not be as clearcut as the attack of December 7, 1941, on Pearl Harbor. It may be cloaked under the euphemistic term "war of national liberation," but it is aggression, nevertheless.

I must support our policy with respect to Vietnam and the basic military and diplomatic strategy designed to achieve its objectives. I know of no better alternative. The origins of the American commitment in Vietnam and the size and intensity of the commitment may be debatable by some, but the fact is that we are quite definitely committed. The presence there of over half a million young Americans is evidence enough of that commitment. The question is not what we should have done, but what we must do.

My views have undergone no change. I believe we must pursue any honorable means to bring the aggressor to the conference table and I welcome any move, anywhere, any time to bring this terrible war to an end. Our objectives, and the nature of our commitments in Southeast Asia are peace, an independent South Vietnam free to decide its own destiny, and an honorable withdrawal of U.S. forces as soon thereafter as possible.

We have another commitment of a different kind, and that is to the American servicemen who are daily risking their lives in this beleaguered land more than 10,000 miles from home. We cannot falter in our support of those men.

We must use such force as may be required effectively to protect our men and to achieve our committed objectives. I believe the President and his advisers, armed with the knowledge available to them and burdened with the responsibilities, are presently pursuing the only course currently open to us.

While I feel there has been some change of attitude in my constituency away from approval of the conduct of the war, I have nevertheless had no advice or information which puts me in possession of a better course of action. I have talked to a number of members of the armed forces who served in Vietnam and they do not appear to me to share the sentiments of those people at home who would favor withdrawal into enclaves. Nor has any soldier yet spoken to me or written to me asking that we stop activity against the enemy which restricts that enemy's ability to kill American soldiers.

I add that we have recently completed a battle under the classic enclave theory at Conthien, with dreadful casualties on both sides; and if ever there was a demonstration of the illogicality of the enclave theory generally, it has been in the effective, to all intents and purposes, necessity for fighting out of an enclave at Conthien.

I am for constant, zealous, continuing negotiation and for cessation of hostilities as soon as reasonably possible; but I want some indication of good faith from the other side before we let down our guard and stand by while the enemy sends in more arms and ammunition with which to kill more American boys.

I know that there is frustration and dissatisfaction in all parts of the country over this war issue. Polls and surveys indicate increasing disapproval of present action. I do not think that this is valid justification for attacks upon the President, especially in the light of the absence of alternative courses of action based on anything more substantial than a desire to get it over with and the hope that the other side will behave like good fellows.

I am certain that the majority of the American people, despite their confusion and impatience, support American objectives and will continue to insist on maximum support for U.S. forces, especially if the administration repeatedly and candidly articulates its policy in terms which every citizen can understand.

The war in Vietnam is not, and must not become, a political issue. It would be unwise to seek political gain from involvement of American servicemen in this far-off land. It would be wrong for the loyal opposition so to misconceive its role as to become a peace-at-any-price party. I, for one, would find it impossible to explain such a party position to members of the Armed Forces who have been sent to Vietnam partly as a result of my vote. Nor would I be easy in my own conscience in supporting a peace-at-any-price position. For each Member of Congress is charged with responsibility in this matter.

Congress has helped define our policy toward Vietnam. Congress has endorsed it on a series of votes running from the Senate's approval of the SEATO pact in 1955, through the Gulf of Tonkin resolution in 1964, and up to the recently enacted defense appropriation bill. When the Gulf of Tonkin resolution was being debated, I asked Senator Fulbright, its floor manager, for confirmation of his earlier assertion that the resolution did not limit the right of the President to repel any attack or further aggression within the areas described by the resolution. Senator Fulbright's answer was quick and affirmative.

None of us could foresee then that the United States would be faced at the turn of that year with the imminent collapse of the South Vietnamese because of vastly intensified North Vietnamese infiltration. This action forced us to intensify our effort to defend South Vietnam. Like it or not, we did walk smack into a national commitment. I therefore, do not agree with those who would now have the President and Congress back away from their responsibilities.

I do not believe that I misconceive the

role of the loyal opposition. There are legitimate areas where that opposition should argue such considerations as who is to be included in negotiations for peace, and candidly discuss with the American people the pros and cons of the use of more or less military force, and other such matters of legitimate concern. On the most fundamental issues of the war, however, I must support the Commander in Chief. There can be, for me, no other consideration.

I personally, do not enjoy defending Lyndon Johnson. I am a partisan and I know the vulnerabilities of the other party. As a member of the opposition in 1968, I will vigorously support my party's candidate and will criticize the Democratic administration in every area where I feel criticism is deserved—and the list is long. I will do everything in my power to make sure that this country has a new Commander in Chief.

Wherever proper, I will be a partisan advocate for my party's stance within the competitive framework or our two-party system. But I will not play Parcheesi with the war.

Above all, I shall continue to plead for trust in the President out of the deep conviction that the maintenance of trust and confidence is essential to the integrity of the office, at home and abroad.

In short, I continue to support the President in his conduct of the war. If I knew a better way to end the war, I would recommend it. If a better alternative comes along, we would all welcome it. Until better solutions are offered, if they are, I am not going to add to the burdens of the Presidency in this frustrating unpopular war.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the able Senator yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I am very happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, my friend, the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania, has made a stimulating and effective contribution to the debate on American policy in Southeast Asia. I find myself in a wide measure of agreement with much of what he has said, and I congratulate him.

The truth is that America's defensive and deterrent power has had a marked effect on Communist North Vietnam and, consequently, on the course of this conflict.

The other day when I made some comments on this general subject, I quoted some of the leaders of free countries in Southeast Asia and beyond, each expressing his profound concern over the implications of any precipitate change in our Asian policy. This is the view, I believe, my friend, the able Senator from Pennsylvania has expressed today. I simply want the RECORD to show my very high esteem for the Senator, and my congratulations for his comments.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, yesterday the Washington Post published a lead editorial entitled "Which Defense Minister," in which the editorial went on to say:

> On the same day that Gen. Vo Nguyen Giap, Defense Minister of North Vietnam, was quoted in Hong Kong dispatches as saying the war would be protracted. Sardar Swaran Singh, India's Defense Minister, told the United Nations in New York he was confident that a halt in U.S. bombing would lead to peace.

Another comment in the editorial was:

> We will be well advised to make no plans for peace and no plans for war on either the hopes of Swaran Singh or the warnings of General Giap.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial to which I have referred printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, one of the points which the able Senator from Pennsylvania makes is that those who seek to advocate a change in our policy must carefully weigh the effectiveness of our military effort up to the present moment. There is a grave hazard of throwing away what has already been gained. If America were to change its course and, if the new direction were to be proved wrong, the advocates of the new policy would be forced to give way to their opposition, and whatever alternatives they have in mind. In the meantime we might all wish to be back where we started. But, by then, it might be far too late.

In sum, I think I may truthfully say that I am in widespread agreement with my friend, the able Senator from Pennsylvania, as he exercises, as many of the rest of us have, a constitutional right of free speech, recognizing, nevertheless, that this country is in danger and that there is only one national leader in time of crisis, the individual who holds that responsibility under our Constitution.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 18, 1967]

WHICH DEFENSE MINISTER

On the same day that Gen. Vo Nguyen Giap, Defense Minister of North Vietnam, was quoted in Hong Kong dispatches as saying the war would be protracted, Sardar Swaran Singh, India's Defense Minister, told the United Nations in New York he was confident that a halt in U.S. bombing would lead to peace.

That presents the government and the people of the United States with a choice. They can believe either one they wish to believe. Since it is Giap and not Singh who is in command of the North Vietnamese armed forces there is a certain practical consideration that invests Giap with the higher degree of credibility. Sardar Swaran Singh tenders a conjecture founded upon unnamed sources obtained in unspecified places and uttered at times not disclosed.

If the Swaran Singh forecast suffers the debility of anonymous speculation, however, the Giap summons to a longer war and ultimate victory is also a little mortgaged by the conventions of diplomatic necessity. Whatever the North Vietnamese intend to do, they certainly will indicate an intention to fight on forever until five minutes before negotiations.

So neither defense minister really proffers any very dependable basis on which to make a forecast or on which to found a policy. We will be well advised to make no plans for peace and no plans for war on either the hopes of Swaran Singh or the warnings of General Giap.

Many would like to respond to the hopeful conjectures of Swaran Singh by suspending the bombing; and others would like to respond to the bellicosity of Vo Nguyen Giap with increased bombing. There is a longing in the country for a change in our predicament in South Vietnam. It probably would be politically rewarding to respond to it with a dramatic suspension of the war or a dramatic escalation of it. But our course should not be set by every rumor from abroad or every clamor from at home. It must be set by the necessities of a war that is waged for limited ends by limited means. In such a war, the impulse to escalate hostilities is bound to alternate with the impulse to suspend them.

The hope of the country lies in the government having the wisdom to appraise all such conflicting counsels by looking beyond immediate to ultimate objectives. Those who wish to suspend military operations must be required to offer something better than mere conjecture as to what will happen after the suspension of bombing. The failure of such a suspension to elicit any satisfactory response from North Vietnam would produce a very dangerous situation. It could have direct and tragic consequences to combat troops in Vietnam. And it could produce in this country, after an interval of frustration and rising anger a demand for a resumption of hostilities at a level of intensity unprecedented in this conflict.

Those who counsel immediate escalation of the war also must be required to offer something better than mere conjecture as to what will follow the resort to their proposals for a wider war.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I am immensely grateful to my distinguished friend, the senior Senator from California. He and I, along with most of the Members of the Senate, have served in uniform at one time or another. We did not spend much time in an awareness of the political faith of the Commander in Chief. We were mostly concerned that the Commander in Chief would know what to do to help us to get out of the darn thing.

We were also primarily concerned that the Commander in Chief would be able to do this without incurring too much difficulty either outside or inside of the country.

Having been suffused with that feeling in a couple of wars, I am trying to reflect what I believe is the feeling of a great many of the veterans of Vietnam. I am trying to do it as tactfully as I can because I want to be neither enthusiastically embraced from one side by bear hugs nor criticized from another by those with whom I am in disagreement.

After 25 years of service in the Congress of the United States, I recognize the honor and the obligation of each Member to speak out. As I speak out, I am filled with affection for all of my brothers who may at times feel it necessary to disagree with me.

On the 9th of November I shall have dinner with Foreign Secretary George Brown of Great Britain. After talking with people of that country and of our country, my understanding is that, notwithstanding what we hear in party conventions or read in the papers, most of the people I meet are saying, "Get on with it. Get the war over. But do not listen to the people who would have you do something which either would be dishonorable to the United States or would diminish the effectiveness of your commitment."

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I express my thanks to the Senator from Pennsylvania for the service he has rendered, not only to his party but also to the country.

I ask the Senator if there would not be the danger, if the Republican Party were to become the peace-at-any-price party, that this action might be construed by Hanoi as an encouragement to keep their military effort against us in Vietnam on as high a level as possible with the hope that if they might be able to hold out until November of next year, the Republicans could offer them a thinly veiled surrender or some sort of face-saving accommodation that would allow them to achieve their objectives there anyway.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Texas has made a perfectly valid point. I hope that in neither party would any group or faction arise to assume leadership who would be identified as a peace-at-any-price faction, a group which would attempt to make the question of peace or war a national issue in this oncoming political campaign. Goodness knows, enough things are going to be said. We will indulge in a great deal of philippic and partisan oratory.

I am trying, while we are still cool, to nail down the point that the Presidency, especially in its role of Commander in Chief, is so respected that Hanoi will never be able to say of either political party that it has anything to gain by waiting until after our national elections in November 1968.

I do not want our elections in any remote sense to give the slightest idea of that or to infer that to the people in Hanoi who are conducting this dreadful series of aggressions against relatively defenseless people who only want to be left in peace and free.

I may add that I was in Iceland during the occupation; and, with the tail-wagging friendliness of the typical American in his first attempt to visit a country in a military capacity, I talked to some very literate Icelanders. I asked, "Aren't you glad the Germans didn't get here to occupy this country?" They said, "Yes. We want to keep them out."

Then I asked them, "What do you think of the Americans?" They said, "We wish you would go home, too."

This has been my experience in Japan, in Iceland, and in many places in between. There is not a people in the world who do not wish that other people would stay out of their country.

But we were asked in. And we are there. It is my judgment that we must do what is necessary effectively to maintain that commitment. This is all I am arguing. It is also my judgment that, in the course of our differing opinions—which I respect—we should always, and with great respect, bear in mind the symbolic significance of the Presidency in the eyes of the world beyond our boundaries.

Mr. TOWER. I believe that the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania, in his remarks this morning, has restated what should be the national objective—that is, that we are not in this business for our own territorial aggrandizement. We are trying to help create a climate in which self-determination is possible for these people, in which they not only can aspire to it but also have some hope of realizing it.

I wonder whether the Senator does not feel that, if around Communist China there are a number of Asian states in which there is an expanding social, economic, and political progress, ultimately there will exist in that area a climate hostile to the fomentation of so-called wars of national liberation.

Mr. SCOTT. Yes; I believe it exists. And while I have heard Senators say—I had such a debate recently—that an enormous body of public opinion in the world tells us that Ho Chi Minh is ready to talk, on the contrary, I am aware that Foreign Minister Thanat Khoman of Thailand and the leaders of the Philippines, of Japan, and other countries in Asia—nearly all of them, with the exception of one large country in that area—tell us publicly that we are doing what we have to do.

So, I do not believe the body of opinion is as great or as overwhelming as it sometimes is represented to be. Whether they are right or wrong, our task is to decide whether we are right or wrong.

I have joined in proposals designed to facilitate the end of the war. I joined last May with the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY] and the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] in a nine-point statement of principles on Vietnam proposing Asian initiatives and similar suggestions.

I know we all are anxious to do anything which will further an honorable negotiated settlement of the war. But for the purpose of this occasion, I have tried not to offer alternatives or to debate the issues of how we might do this or that in order to get out, but simply to urge that we remember that while the loyal opposition can be a raging torrent, it should rage within well-defined banks. I hope that we have good flowing and strong currents and that they will lead us somewhere to the sea. But I do not want us to overflow our banks.

Mr. TOWER. I agree with the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania. I believe if we should be irresponsible in making a political battle of aspects of this war, the American public would find us out. I believe that the stance the Senator from Pennsylvania has taken has given the responsible opposition a good image. The Senator from Pennsylvania has done a great service to his party in this connection, and I believe he has done a great service to his country, in pointing out the necessity of avoiding any sort of political activity that would undermine the President of the United States in his capacity as Commander in Chief and chief diplomat of the United States.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the distinguished Senator from Texas.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. PERCY. I, also, commend the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania for his comments this morning and for the spirit of those comments. I have enjoyed working with him for many years in Republican policy matters. I recall his distinguished service to the Republican platform committee, of which I was chairman in 1960, when he served as general counsel to the platform committee. I found him a source of inspiration and enlightened reason, and at times that year we engaged in some heated debates expressing differences of opinion among Republicans on both foreign and domestic affairs.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. PERCY. But we came out of it with what we considered to be a highly responsible statement on which we all united.

The distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] was a part of that platform formation. We held differences of opinion on certain critical key issues. I believe the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania will recall that the distinguished Senator from Texas moved the unanimous adoption of that platform, and we thus decided to unite around a body of statements with which none of us agreed totally, but which we felt embraced, in overall perspective, a responsible position for the Republican Party to take in 1960 on many issues facing the Nation.

It is for this reason that I am confident we will find a responsible position that we can take in the very critical issue in Vietnam. As I have listened to the comments of my colleagues on this side of the aisle—for all of whom I have the highest regard and respect—I know that there has not been the slightest political motivation on their part in raising the honest differences of opinion that they have, on a matter that involves the future well-being of this Nation and of the free world.

It is for this reason that three Republican Senators decided to sit down together last May to see whether we could agree upon a common program or principle on Vietnam. I have just taken from my files the statements on Vietnam made by Senator JAVITS, Senator SCOTT, and myself on May 2, 1967, which were prepared for distribution to the Republican policy committee, to see whether or not at this time, many months later, with the millions of words and the many events that have transpired in the meantime, we do not accept these as cardinal principles to which we would hold today just as firmly as we did last May 2.

Senators JAVITS, SCOTT, and PERCY agreed at that time as follows:

1. We accept and support the U.S. commitment to defend the territorial integrity and political independence of South Vietnam so that the South Vietnamese may freely determine their own destiny.

2. We express our pride in the valor and spirit of our men in arms who fight this battle in Vietnam for all of us.

3. We urge the Administration to persevere in greater efforts to bring about a negotiated settlement of the war. We should not allow battlefield successes to divert us from the pursuit of such a settlement.

4. We support the stated goal of avoiding a widening of the war and we caution the Administration against initiating actions

that are likely to lead to the introduction of Communist Chinese armed forces into Vietnam.

5. Since the war in Vietnam cannot be won by force alone, we urge greater efforts by the Administration to assist the South Vietnamese towards social, economic and political reform and development with special emphasis on the establishment of a government in Saigon with popular support as a result of the forthcoming elections. We point out, however, that this "other war" is primarily the responsibility of the South Vietnamese themselves, and we caution the Administration against any tendency to make it an "American" effort.

6. Debate of the issues on their merits is essential to a free society. We deplore criticism and acts which are irresponsible as much as we deplore attempts to equate responsible criticism with disloyalty.

7. We look with favor upon developing regional cooperation among Asian countries in the hope that through their cooperative efforts at self-help they will become much more self-sufficient economically, politically and militarily.

8. We note a sizable credibility gap between the Administration and the American people, and we call for candor on the part of the Administration in its public expressions and explanations of U.S. policy and actions in Vietnam.

9. We must emphasize and encourage Asian initiatives in finding a solution to the war. In this connection, we must encourage and seek Asian support also in non-military areas to help the people of South Vietnam and to put other nations more squarely with us in reaching the objective of a free South Vietnam.

I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania that I found these nine points to be exceedingly important principles that helped me anchor down positions I have taken in the intervening months. I do not believe I have taken any position at any time inconsistent with those nine points, which I reaffirm just as strongly today as I did at the time we agreed upon them.

Mr. President, I express my gratitude and commendation to the Senator from Pennsylvania for working with me and the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], which demonstrates that we can have areas of agreement where we can take responsible positions and hold to those positions in an effort to have as united an approach to a complex problem as we can. I have not seen the slightest evidence at any time with respect to any of my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle or, for that matter, on the Democratic side either, to in any way use the war for political motives and purposes. What we say is said from deep conviction and belief and out of love for country and dedication to our constitutional duties and responsibilities.

I thank my friend and esteemed colleague, the Senator from Pennsylvania, for his responsible comments this morning, so characteristic of him.

Mr. SCOTT. I am most grateful to the distinguished Senator from Illinois for his comments.

I agree that he and I and all of us are trying to make the same points here. I think the nine points that he, the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and I agreed on in May have worn very well. I stated earlier that I had not changed my opinion. I think that the Senator from Illinois and I are in the position that we have been indeed consistent. Since we made those observations there have been elections in Vietnam which indicate that the democratic process is working there as well as possible under most adverse conditions in time of war—especially given Vietnam's lack of a democratic political tradition—and surely better than some had conceived. We have recently received greater cooperation from other Asian countries in Vietnam. The Government of Thailand has contributed military and other assistance. So I think that the principles enunicated in our statement of May 2 are wearing well.

I echo what the Senator said. At no point do I so interpret any responsible comments or criticisms of the conduct of the war, or any honestly expressed difference of views because I think it is essential that we have that which we do have, the opportunity to vent opinions here, in the hope that those areas of dissent will be helpful to the President in his burdensome responsibility of conducting our foreign relations, and where our area in the Senate is one of advise and consent.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I am sorry that I was not here for the delivery of the Senator's speech. I think it is a most important speech. I welcome him to the ranks of those who have been and are being heard on the floor of the Senate on this matter. It seems to me there is nothing more important in the world than our conduct of our relations and our policy in Southeast Asia at the moment.

I am sure that in some quarters the fact that the Senator has taken the floor and made the remarks he has made will be regarded as further evidence of division among the Republicans, especially among the liberal Republicans; and possibly someone will point to the fact that now we have a former national committee chairman who is a dove, and he is balanced by the emergence of a former national Republican chairman who is a hawk.

Mr. SCOTT. Actually, I am not a hawk. I just do not want to be a pigeon.

Mr. CASE. This is the point I wish to comment on, if the Senator has a little time remaining, to develop an approach of reality as opposed to romanticism, and getting solutions, as opposed to dividing the country and the party.

The reason I welcome the Senator's speech, and I wish he were going to be around for the next couple of weeks so that I could continue the dialog with him, is that his is a most important voice and it has been during all of the period of his public service in probing to get at the facts of the situation, whatever the matter at issue may be. This is my interest.

I think the Senator has made note of a very useful point in stating that the main question is not how we got into this thing. We are there and our choices are limited.

Of course—and I do not think this can be said too often, but it can be misunderstood—we support our forces and the military as long as we have them there. They receive our full support whatever one's views may be about the wisdom or nonwisdom of the fighting. Therefore, that we must support our troops is no argument for one position or another about the war. I think it is well to lay that aside, as the Senator has done by implication, if not directly.

The point I wish to make is this. I, too. agree that the question is not whether we should have gotten in or not; it is not whether President Johnson is the big villain here or whether it is some predecessor in that regard. I think he had fewer options when he took office than perhaps any of his predecessors with respect to Vietnam, and I have said so.

Mr. President, the question is what we are doing there and should be doing; what is possible and what is not possible to accomplish in Vietnam; and are we going about it in the soundest way.

Because the Senator is so much in touch with all developments in the political world, especially, he is very conscious and knowledgeable about the Ripon Society. The Ripon Society is a group of people, I think largely Republican, but more independent that anything else, from the intellectual community in New England, with membership spreading over the country. The Ripon Society has recently issued a research paper in connection with Vietnam.

I would like, if I may, and if the Senator will indulge me, to ask that that paper and its accompanying analysis be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of the discussion today, because it will be helpful in the consideration of this matter.

Mr. SCOTT. The Ripon research paper is an excellent and thoughtful proposal.

Mr. CASE. I have made reference to the Ripon Society paper because I hope to make that the basis of a good many discussions about what goes on in Vietnam.

The real question is, Are we using the best tactics in Vietnam? Are we rightly or wrongly trying to help this present government establish itself as a highly centralized government in Saigon? Are we or are we not requiring our influence to be placed on the side of that government which has the best chance to win the allegiance of the people of Vietnam? These are questions that my friend from Texas and I will agree are important. None of us will basically disagree about military matters. All of us would say, as I say, that the military people are the ones to decide how that should happen.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. I wish to say to the Senator from New Jersey that I believe in democratic institutions and I believe every country should have them. Our objective must be to help create a climate in which democratic institutions can develop and they can establish self-government. This is my objective and I think it is the only justification for our being there.

Mr. CASE. I appreciate the comment of the Senator. It is in line with my thinking. We may have disagreements, for example, about whether bombing in a certain area is wise or not wise, productive or not productive, but those are matters apart from the broad policy we are all trying to pursue here, although the matter has been clouded by the tendency of everybody to cast us either in the camp of the doves or hawks, to either get out or destroy everything. If there is anybody in the Senate who belongs in either of those categories, I have yet to discover who it would be. That kind of categorizing only clouds and makes more difficult the solution of our problems over there.

We do have tough problems when we are dealing with a society as old as this one is, and as unlike our society as this one is. It is almost impossible for us to understand it. We are going to have great difficulties. The only justification, it seems to me, for a discussion of this sort is not that Senators may run the war, because Senators are not competent to run a war in the military sense, but Senators are supposed to be men of some intelligence and men possessed, above all, of the belief and governed by the principle that the facts are what count.

It seems to me very desirable, since the Senator's speech had been publicized—not by him but by the new media—as a "hawkish" speech. that we get as much of the characterization out of the thing and as much of the hard facts into it as we can.

I close by saying that for myself I shall continue to try to find out what the facts are and how we are actually doing. The Evans-Novak column the other day discussed a little phase of this thing—that is, the difference between statistics in their quantity and in their quality as regards Vietnam, and the accomplishments of the pacification program.

Well, this is another phase of the matter. It is very difficult for us in the Senate to get the kind of facts we must have in order to judge and guide policy and determine the success of the conduct of that policy; but I have a feeling that this debate must continue until all the facts are laid bare as to the success we are having in South Vietnam, or the lack of it, not just on the military side—although that is important, too, of course—but in the way of helping the South Vietnamese to establish a nation. That is the whole of the question.

I have some question as to the so-called pacification program. It is not something we can say is good and we must support it. I think there are many questions about whether, for instance, pacification as now conceived amounts to much more than a gigantic welfare program and attempting to buy support by tossing in a lot of money. I shall support those efforts to help South Vietnam in the hamlets, villages, sections, and different regions of the country to help themselves develop under a local autonomous system.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. I would certainly agree that the wrong approach would be the welfare approach, where we simply go in and give them bags of rice or build a school for them. That is not the approach we are taking. I think we are taking essentially the right one, although progress has not worked out as much as we thought. Nonetheless, I think the orientation is right, to the extent the military is involved, because the whole idea is one of self-help. In other words, to help them acquire the materials and then let them build the school, to show them how to get the maximum utilization out of their land and then let them take care of it. A good example is the Marine lance corporal, from the 4-H Club in Illinois who showed them how to get the most out of their pig farms.

That is an important thing we are doing there. It contributes to developing a viable and progressive economy in that country. Progress is slow, of course, but we are making it and I think that this is the way the program should be oriented.

I should like to say this: Our military men are making every effort to see that the pacification program succeeds not just from the standpoint of a self-help program, and for economic development, but also from the standpoint of developing native leadership.

As the Senator from New Jersey knows, France not only did not encourage the development of native leadership but she actively discouraged it. Of course, before these people can handle free institutions, they must be educated to it. They have to have not only the quality of leadership, the capacity for leadership, but also the capacity to understand the responsibilities of leadership.

I pay tribute to our servicemen in Vietnam, and to the AID personnel team out there, which I think is the best we have anywhere in the world, in trying to orient the program in this direction.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I shall not trespass further upon the time of the Senate, but I do think colloquy of this sort should be indulged in more, if I properly sense the mood of the Senate, and I know my own intentions are to try to make contributions as much as I can. But I want to say this, that any suggestions—and I have said it before—that a discussion of the wisdom of what we are doing, the facts of our operations and our success or nonsuccess, the way in which this whole matter is being conducted, in frankness and openness on the Senate floor, or anywhere else, are harmful to our success and can produce only aid and comfort to the enemy, is something which I repudiate down the line.

The only way we can be sure we are doing the right thing is constantly to examine it, not with any suggestion that we are going to cut and run, or pull out, but it is a question of being on the right track.

I think that much of the romantic idea that we could, by our massive efforts, quickly change the whole character of South Vietnam and Southeast Asia and win this thing, has been wrong and that we are coming quite soberly to a much wiser view in government, I hope, and I certainly think in the country.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the Senator. I am not arguing for indiscriminate or undiscriminating support of our course of conduct in Vietnam, nor am I making any point in derogation of any Senator whose position may differ from mine. I think we are learning from the various proposals offered in this Chamber. I do not believe that we should be set against one another by easy labels or quick and inappropriate definitions.

I would prefer that it be understood we derogate neither from the responsibility of Senators to advise and consent nor from the responsibility of the President to conduct the war.

Mr. President, much of the controversy over our conduct of the war in Vietnam stems, in my opinion, from fundamental disagreements over the historical background to the present hostilities.

Those who believe that the war is a civil war and a popular rebellion would profit, I believe, from studying the comments of Canada's distinguished Foreign Minister, the Honorable Paul Martin, which are contained in a comprehensive review of the Vietnam situation and of Canada's role therein which Foreign Secretary Martin presented on June 10, 1965, to the Standing Committee on External Affairs of Canada's House of Commons.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts of Foreign Secretary Martin's statement be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, it is noteworthy that Canada, as a noncombatant, has no special ax to grind in the war in Vietnam, but, as a member of the international body charged with the enforcement of the 1954 Geneva accords, she is in a position to give informed and objective assessments of events in Vietnam.

EXHIBIT 1

To solve a problem it is first necessary to understand it. I would like to speak about the nature of the problem in Viet Nam as we see it. No one is happy about the situation in Viet Nam. We all realize the dangerous implications if there were to be an extension of the conflict or a wider participation in it. It involves three of the most powerful nations in the world, including the most powerful nation in Asia and the most populated nation in the world. There is no doubt about the stakes in this situation. However, we have to look at all aspects of the problem in order to be able to fully understand it and to fully respond to it.

I hope it is clear that the position of the Canadian government as a non-combatant, as a member of the Commission, is to do whatever it can to try to bring about pacification. We have had a long experience in Indo-China. We have been on the Supervisory Commission with India and Poland for 11 years. This has given us an opportunity of objective assessment; it has given us a responsibility which we have to discharge in accordance with our international commitments.

To state that what is happening in Viet Nam is "an internal rebellion plain and simple" is clearly at variance with established facts which indicate beyond a shadow of a doubt that the essential element has been North Vietnamese interference, limited at first, but growing steadily in scope and intensity.

In the midst of the lack of experience in self-government in South Viet Nam, following the Geneva settlement of 1954, the Communists were able to build the subversive movement now known as the Viet Cong and it was able to flourish only because of the material support and political direction it received from outside.

When I came in here this morning I

thought carefully whether, in this committee, I should go further. I have gone thus far; but this is the best opportunity we, as a government, have yet had to put before a proper body of our parliament the facts involved in our stewardship as a member of that Commission. While I appreciate the risk involved in this aspect of my presentation, I feel there is a duty to put the following facts before this committee and I propose to do so.

Some people contest the claim that North Viet Nam has been deeply involved in or indeed has instigated the war in the South. They say there is no evidence to show any involvement on the part of North Viet Nam and that thus the claim of the United States of America and indeed other countries, like Australia and New Zealand, which now are involved, that they are helping South Viet Nam resist outside aggression, falls to the ground. This argument, I believe, is inadequate in its basis and is dangerous in its impact.

The evidence has not always been adequately presented. Here, of course, security factors are involved; but the evidence does exist, I assure you, and in quantity. Those who argue that North Viet Nam never has been interfering in the affairs of South Viet Nam are ignoring, for example, the conclusion on this question of the International Commission in its special report of June 2, 1962. In this report India and Canada agreed there was evidence to warrant the conclusion that North Viet Nam had, in violation of its obligations under the Cease Fire Agreement of 1954 encouraged, sponsored and supplied activities aimed at the overthrow of the authorities in the South. That special report of 1962 also said other things about the situation in Viet Nam. I want to say more about that later on. For the moment I simply wish to point out there has been an impartial international judgment on this matter and that that judgment is against North Viet Nam. That judgment was pronounced by members of the International Supervisory Commission, by majority composed of India and Canada, and other member of the Commission, of course, being Poland. However, this problem did not come to an end in 1962 with this report; on the contrary it has continued to exist and in fact its scope has increased seriously, and so has the evidence for this claim.

I tabled the special report in the House in March. It is available to the members of the committee and I think it is indispensable reading in order to fully understand the situation in this very complicated and regrettably dangerous matter.

Now to understand the situation confronting us in Viet Nam, I think we must uncover some of the vast complicated history of that little country. It is precisely because so many of these complexities seem to be lost sight of, or disregarded, in assessing the problem that I wish to point out now some of the relevant factors as I see them.

By the end of the Indo-China war in 1954, during and prior to which France had unsuccessfully tried a variety of constitutional arrangements for Viet Nam, two governments had been established in Viet Nam, both of which participated in the Geneva Conference, and both of which claimed to speak for the people of Viet Nam.

On the one hand, there was the regime of Ho Chi Minh which had begun as an anti-colonial resistance movement—the Viet Minh—under Communist leadership. This leadership quickly established its control over all elements in the movement. Although it was active during the resistance to the Japanese invasion, the Viet Minh cannot, in point of historical fact, be given credit for driving the Japanese out of Viet Nam in 1945. The Viet Minh had been formed in May, 1941, when the Indochinese Communist Party, having decided on a National Front policy, made approaches to various non-Communist groupings. During the war, the Viet Minh aided the allies by providing some intelligence information, distributing propaganda, and organizing the odd attack against the Japanese. At the same time, however, the Indochinese Communist Party consolidated its control over the National Front, eliminating or out-maneuvering the plethora of disorganized non-Communist nationalist groups. In March, 1945, the Japanese, fearing an allied landing, wiped away the facade of Vichy-French administration. The French army was interned (and remained so until the allies landed to disarm the Japanese), and the French administrators were arrested.

Thus, when Japan suddenly collapsed in August, 1945, catching the allies unprepared for the political consequences which were to follow in all of southeast Asia, a vacuum was created in Viet Nam which the Viet Minh rapidly sought to fill. Two days after the Japanese capitulation, the Viet Minh appeared in Hanoi. Refraining from any attacks on the Japanese, the Communist-led movement concentrated on driving other nationalist movements from the streets of the city. Encountering no resistance from the disorganized non-Communists, from the now uninterested Japanese or from the still imprisoned French, Ho Chi Minh formed a provisional government on August 29, in which the Indochinese Communist party or the Viet Minh held all key posts.

This is, of course, a very condensed view of the vastly complicated period of history in Viet Nam associated with the collapse of Japanese rule. I have for lack of time omitted reference to the role of the Chinese in this period, the re-entry of the French and their unsuccessful attempts to work out an accommodation with the Ho Chi Minh regime. I have mentioned the role of the Viet Minh vis-a-vis the Japanese because this matter was referred to in the House recently and because I wished to point out the movement's origins and the fact that it first came to prominence through the creation of a power vacuum, not through an anti-colonial war. That came later.

Of course, any member of the House of Commons has the duty to put on the record the facts as he sees them. It is equally the duty of those of us who, in the government, have information to give it and that is what I am now doing here. There was no adequate opportunity to do it in the debate in the House.

But to return to the two Viet Nams at Geneva in 1954. The second Vietnamese voice was that of the Southern regime based on Saigon—the State of Viet Nam as it was called at the time, to which the French had granted full independence at the beginning of the conference. The Southern government, while no less anti-colonial than the Northern, was at the same time anti-Communist not only for ideological reasons but also out of the fear that a Communist Viet Nam might become little more than a protectorate of China, a fate which the Vietnamese have always feared and rejected, as a small nation living close to a larger and more powerful one. Once again, however, it is important to get the historical facts accurate if the problem is to be understood. Although the presence of big powers has been a factor of considerable importance throughout Vietnamese history, it would be an error to see that history as one long struggle against foreign aggression. The Chinese were driven cut of Vietnam in 939 A.D. China continued to exert pressure on Viet Nam but Vietnamese independence was maintained until 1407 when Chinese rule was restored; this period lasted for only twenty years and in 1427 Vietnamese independence was reasserted. The Viet Nam of the time however was not of the same territorial dimensions as today and the period following the last defeat of Chinese rule is characterized by the extension of Vietnamese rule southwards, and by contending Vietnamese dynasties. National unity became established only in 1802, but this unity was forged in feudal, dynastic warfare, not in anti-imperialist struggles in the usual sense of the phrase. Although the French had begun to show a colonial interest in the Indo-China area somewhat earlier, it was not until the 1880's that France succeeded in establishing her rule throughout Viet Nam. It is therefore not really accurate to refer to a brief period of freedom enjoyed by the Vietnamese people in the latter half of the nineteenth century when the Chinese Empire was receding and before the French arrived.

I have given some account of these historical factors—and the summary is by no means complete and could not be in the time available—partly because I wished to have the record straight on certain points and partly because I believe it is essential to understand that the division of Viet Nam is not something created by the West in its own interests, but is something which represents the polarization of Vietnamese political forces into Communist and non-Communist sectors.

It is essential, moreover, to understand who was represented at Geneva in 1954 and who agreed to what before passing judgment on what has happened since then.

The settlement reached in Geneva in 1954 comprised two main elements—a Cease-Fire Agreement, signed by the French High Command of the day and the Peoples Army of Viet Nam (the Viet Minh), and a Final Declaration. The former document is a military agreement providing for regroupment of forces and spelling out other provisions looking to a separation of combatants and a freezing of their military activities and capabilities. The Final Declaration, on the other hand, was essentially a political document. It is there that we find references to the fact that the 17th parallel is not to be regarded as a permanent dividing line, and to the prospect of nationwide elections in 1956.

I will just make a parenthesis here. You will recall that about a week ago the Chinese Peoples Republic announced that this dividing line need no longer be recognized. I expressed some doubt that there would be public support given to this position of the Chinese Peoples Republic willingly or quickly by the government of North Viet Nam.

It is certainly clear that those who drafted and signed these documents anticipated that a permanent settlement would probably amount to the Viet Minh establishing its control over the whole territory of Viet Nam.

The important part of this analysis, however, is the phrase "those who drafted and signed" the Geneva documents. Realizing only too well what the objectives of the Viet Minh leaders would be, the South Vietnamese leaders rejected the terms of the Geneva settlement, before these documents were signed, on the grounds that the division of Viet Nam was inimical to the interests of the Vietnamese people because under these terms half of Viet Nam was turned over to Communist control. The stand of the Saigon government—and it must be remembered that it was a newly independent political entity trying to resist the attempt of larger powers to impose their terms of settlement on it—was spelled out in a separate declaration issued by Mr. Tran Van Do, who has most recently re-emerged on the Vietnamese political scene, where he is now Vice-Premier and Foreign Minister of South Viet Nam. It might be useful if this declaration could be made available to members of the Committee because it clearly indicates that the government of South Viet Nam did not support the Geneva settlement and, it must also be remembered, neither did the United States.

The rejection of the political portion of the Geneva settlement by the South Vietnamese government and the reason for it is often lost sight of by those who criticize the

Saigon government as a creation of the Americans and as a political entity which is alleged to continue in existence in violation of the Geneva settlement.

Having rejected the terms of the Geneva settlement before it was signed, and having explicitly reserved its right to safeguard its own interests, it cannot—as was argued the other day in the House of Commons—be convincingly accused of violating international obligations. To argue otherwise would be tantamount to saying that the great powers should be able to impose their will on a small and weak state. In fact, there is evidence that the division of Viet Nam was a bargain struck at Geneva between the French and the Chinese, the two traditional "imperialist powers" in Viet Nam. This division was accepted by the North Vietnamese because they thought it would be temporary and that they would subsequently get what they wanted—the whole of Viet Nam—by the kind of elections which were imprecisely referred to in paragraph 7 of the Final Declaration.

The South Vietnamese believed that such elections would amount only to a facade for a Communist takeover, and rejected the whole idea from the beginning.

I remember discussing with President Diem the question whether we should continue to maintain the Commission in Indo-China or whether the time had come for the holding of elections, as was envisaged in the Geneva settlement. He reminded me then, of course, that South Viet Nam was not a party to the settlement, and also that there was need for the Commission to maintain its presence until such time as a truly objective election could take place. I am not trying to suggest that this was a correct position for him to take, but I do give it as part of the impressions that I have in my mind, naturally, as I try to assess this situation.

While reaffirming their belief in the territorial integrity of Viet Nam, the South Vietnamese maintained that nationwide elections looking to the reunification of Viet Nam would be meaningful only if they were absolutely free, and with a Communist regime installed in Hanoi this condition seemed unlikely to be fulfilled in that half of the country. I myself found this confirmed when I spent three days visiting the million refugees just outside of Saigon. They had come from the North. They were mainly Christian refugees who had fled just as others in Europe have fled, from what they thought was the dangerous encroachment of a Communist power.

It is well for us when we are considering this situation to think that there are many parallels to what is happening in Asia today and what happened in Europe that brought about the creation by us of a defensive organization known as NATO to provide for our security. The absence of this kind of arrangement, and an effective kind of arrangement, in Asia today is one of the gaps, and it is one of the reasons perhaps why this situation exists at present.

This stand was consistently maintained by the government of South Viet Nam. The election envisaged in 1956 in the settlement (which had not been signed by the South) did not take place. There were, however, elections within South Viet Nam itself, on a South Vietnamese basis rather than on a nationwide basis.

As the French withdrew from Indo-China in the years immediately following the Geneva settlement, it became clear that the government in Saigon had no intention of passively accepting the absorption which Hanoi had planned for it. There were few observers at the time who expected a life span for the Saigon government of more than a few years. Where Hanoi had inherited the traditions of a victorious struggle against colonialism, Saigon inherited a legacy of collapse and defeat. Since Hanoi had been the administrative centre for the French administration in Indo-China, Saigon found itself with little political experience and without even the physical facilities for an effective administration. But South Viet Nam not only survived, it began to make tangible social and economic progress, partly with outside help but mainly through the determination of the South Vietnamese population itself. This population had by this time been swollen by the million refugees I mentioned a moment ago who chose not to live under the Communist regime in the North. The fact that this mass migration took place—often under the greatest hardship and in the face of active opposition from the Communist authorities—is reflection enough on the contention that the Viet Minh had the wholehearted support of the Vietnamese people. No one who could have seen the plight of these refugees could have believed that there is as much credence as some people give at the present time to a distinction between the ideological motive of the Communist in Asia and the Communist in Europe. Realizing that the administration in the South was not going to collapse or allow itself to disappear as anticipated as a result of manipulated elections, and indeed that it showed signs of economic progress beyond anything that had come about in the North, the Hanoi regime decided that a more active and aggressive policy was required in order to establish the control of the whole country; this had been denied by South Viet Nam's refusal to implement terms which the North had agreed to at Geneva but which had—I repeat—been then rejected by the South.

One of the basic stipulations of this Cease-Fire Agreement was that there should be a total regroupment of forces, with the French withdrawing into South Viet Nam and Ho Chi Minh's armies into the North. Unfortunately, the North carried out its obligations only partially, leaving behind—this is based on evidence dealt with by a Committee of an International Commission of which Canada is a member—secret caches of armaments and military personnel who shed their military identification and melted inconspicuously into the countryside, ready to organize political action or to resume hostilities if necessary. The fact that the Northern regime intended to interfere in the South was first made public, although very few people have paid attention to this, in a statement of the Vietnamese Workers Party in July of 1954, just at the end of the Geneva Conference.

In part this statement asserted, and I quote:

"Naturally, at a time when our troops and our administrative authority are being withdrawn towards the North, the Party members and co-patriots in Nam Bo—that is South Viet Nam—will continue to remain in the zones on the other side. The war-mongering elements seek to sabotage the Armistice and re-establish a state of war. Our compatriots and our members must continue to wage a hard struggle.

The Party must struggle; its duties must remain with the people educating them, unmasking all activities of war-mongers, maintaining the influence of the Party and the government with the people, and winning the respect of the mass for President Ho Chi Minh."

Translated from the usual Communist terminology, this statement clearly means one thing. It means that Northern agents would be left in the South to disrupt the government there. This residue of men and arms provided the basis for the beginnings of a Hanoi-directed aggression in the South.

As a partial take-over was seen to be improbable, innocent villagers were terrorized into providing shelter and food for the guerrillas and into helping them to finance their operations. The first target was usually the village administration officer whose murder could be seen as an effective challenge to the government's authority and a demonstration of what happens to those who refuse to co-operate.

In speaking of instability in Viet Nam, in arguing that the Viet Cong have been supported by the peasants, these basic facts must be kept in mind; the Viet Cong has deliberately literally murdered hundreds of trained and responsible administrators. In these circumstances it must be admitted that the phenomenon of instability must be judged cautiously. Similarly, peasant support for guerrillas, which is won by murder and intimidation, is not the same as support which is spontaneously given in the exercise of free choice as we know it.

Now, the suggestion has been made that the government of South Viet Nam has never been able to hold anthing but the cities because it has not enjoyed the support of the people. This was argued in the House of Commons, and this is believed throughout this country, as I see in my correspondence. Control of the countryside in South Viet Nam has always been a problem for the central authorities, as might be expected in an underdeveloped country where geographical obstacles are great and communication facilities are limited.

Even the Communists with their police-state apparatus have had to face revolts in the North, and fairly recently. Large areas of the South Vietnamese countryside regularly pass from government to Viet Cong control and back again depending on the local military conditions. Most observers of the Vietnamese scene claim that the peasants want nothing more than to be left alone. However, when they are subjected to techniques of blackmail, assassination and torture by marauding Viet cong bands, as the Prime Minister of New Zealand pointed out recently in a statement on Viet Nam, it would be an extraordinary act of local defiance to withhold co-operation. Co-operation given in this manner however is vastly different from the sort of popular support which critics of the Southern position in Viet Nam seem to assume the Viet Cong enjoy.

Gradually, in the years after 1956, the scope of these terrorist activities increased to the point where the South Vietnamese government, with the limited resources at its disposal, was unable to cope with the problem of guaranteeing the security of its people against this kind of subversion. In these circumstances the South Vietnamese government did what any government confronted with these problems would do: It appealed for help in the exercise of the legitimate right of self-defence. This is permitted under Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations. To this appeal the United States responded affirmatively, at the same time making it clear that when the need for military help ended, it would be terminated.

These then, are the basic elements in the historical evolution of the dangerous situation confronting the world today in Viet Nam. Steadily increasing interference by North Viet Nam in the affairs of the South has led to the steady increase of the United States presence. It is imperative that the two should be seen together if our analysis of the problem—let alone our prescription for its remedy—is to have any meaning. These developments have been a source of direct concern to the Canadian government right from the beginning. As a member of the International Commission in Viet Nam we have a firsthand and independent experience of the failure, on all sides, to live up to the terms of the Geneva Cease-Fire Agreement which it is the Commission's task to supervise but not to implement. I repeat, that if all sides were to live up to the Geneva Cease-Fire Agreement of 1954, we could have peace in that area. There are instruments provided in the Agreement for dealing with grievances. However, if there is no disposition to live up to an agreement, a country like ours has no power, certainly by itself; to enforce it. And so, we must observe and report the situation—in terms of violations of the agreement—as we see it. I think that to the best of our ability under the successive Canadian governments we have done so and we will continue to do so in the hope that the objective and impartial discharge of our responsibilities in the face of facts available to us may go some distance towards focusing international attention onto all the disturbing factors in the situation and persuading all those involved to face up to their own responsibilities for the generation of this tension and conversely for its relaxation.

In the Commission's special report of June 2, 1962, an Indian-Canadian majority presented a balanced assessment of what had been happening in Viet Nam where violations of the Cease-Fire Agreement by both sides were producing a dangerously unstable situation. Since that report was published, the situation has deteriorated even further, as we feared it would in the absence of corrective measures applicable to all violations of the Agreement. The intensification of activities in violation of the Agreement led to the Commission's special message, dated February 13 of this year which, together with the 1962 Report I tabled on March 8. It gives, as Prime Minister Wilson has said, a balanced picture. I would point out that of those countries with whom we are associated in the NATO alliance, no one country has publicly taken a position basically different from the position taken by the government of Canada. This is not without its significance. Since there has been some misunderstanding of the minority report of February 13 presented by Canada, I want to add a few comments by way of clarifying our position.

The Canadian minority statement represents our assessment of the facts available to the Commission in Viet Nam. It was submitted for reasons arising out of our conviction, based on more than ten years of experience, that to report on only one aspect of the situation in Viet Nam, to deal publicly with only one set of violations of the Agreement, is seriously to distort the assessment of the situation.

It has been argued that the Canadian statement condones the policies of South Viet Nam and United States authorities in bombing North Vietnamese installations. I do not know how anyone could possibly come to that conclusion. The sole purpose of the Canadian statement was to augment the presentation of facts in the Indian-Polish report with other and equally significant material including a direct reference to the South Vietnamese authorities' explanation of the events in question.

Our Commission colleagues had been unwilling in the opinion of the Canadian minority report to take these relevant facts into account; this made it necessary for us to do so in order to restore the sense of balance on which the 1962 report was based, but which the majority report in the 1965 message lacked.

If we had signed the Indian-Polish documents—and we did not disagree with the facts which it reports—without augmenting it, we might have run the risk of having the Commission convey the impression that the situation described in the 1962 report had changed; that the only violations of the Geneva Agreement since 1962 had been the air strikes against North Viet Nam, and that therefore responsibility rested on South Viet Nam and the United States for the danger of wider hostilities.

Well, in our statement I think we have indicated that this would clearly present a false impression. There is no change in the nature of the situation but rather there has been an intensification of the same factors as were noted in the 1962 report.

This leads me to make a few brief comments on the contents of the Canadian statement and the materials on which it was based. The first half of the statement relates to the conclusions of the comprehensive legal study prepared and re-edited within the Commission. I discussed this at some length in the House of Commons on March 8 and I explained the nature of this legal submission. What I said then may be perhaps read with what I am saying today.

The second section of the Canadian statement, in referring to recent allegations of Northern aggression, did not purport to be Commission conclusions. Rather, this section was intended to demonstrate that the Commission had, since its special report of 1962, continued to receive serious allegations, the gravity of which was indicated by references to the substance of the complaints, of Northern aggression in the South. The Commission has not given these matters the attention they deserve, it has not established to the best of its ability whether the complaints are supported by sufficient evidence to warrant the Commission drawing firm conclusions comparable to those concerning the earlier cases in the special report.

To ignore these problems by failing to report that they are and indeed have been before the Commission for some time would be to create a seriously distorted image of the full range of violations of the Geneva Agreements of which the Commission has had knowledge.

I am sure that members of the committee will agree that this would be an intolerable deviation from the impartial and objective approach which I am satisfied beyond any doubt Canadian representatives both civilian and military on the Commission have sought to follow since we accepted this responsibility in 1954.

Far from justifying or condoning the policies followed by one or the other of the parties, or both, we have attempted—and when I say we, I mean the Canadian members of the Commission, some former officers are here today sitting against this wall, who spent many difficult months under trying circumstances in Indo China—to take cognizance of all the relevant facts and to impart a sense of balance to the picture presented to the international community at large by the Commission.

Now I believe that if we are to understand what is at stake in Viet Nam, we must realize that this is no local rebellion arising mainly out of agrarian discontent with an unpopular government, although undoubtedly it contains some of these elements, and in sufficient degree to lend an air of credibility to the argument of those who would so convince us.

It is not uncommon to hear claims made that the Liberation Front—the political organization of the Viet Cong—and its leadership are drawn from a broad and representative stream of South Vietnamese dissenting opinion, not all of it Communist or even pro-Communist.

For example, it is sometimes asserted that the leader of the Liberation Front is not a Communist. As far as I can judge, this is largely a matter of speculation, and I have material on which to judge, because he is a shadowy figure seldom seen except by Communist journalists such as Wilfrid Burchett. For a political figure who is reported to control the greater part of the country and to command the allegiance of many people, he, no less than his organization, are shadowy presences indeed. As a movement, the Liberation Front has no acknowledged headquarters. Indeed I doubt whether many people even today know the leader's name. That his opposition to Diem was responsible for his leaving Saigon is indisputable, just as it is in the case of prominent figures in the present South Vietnamese administration headed by Dr. Quat, who was likewise an opponent of Diem but whose opposition did not take the form of joining the Viet Cong.

Similarly, it was recently asserted that Hanoi had no more control over the Viet Cong than Stalin had over Mao Tse-Tung. Now, this is a categorical statement made about a relationship, the nature of which deliberately is kept hidden. However, available evidence suggests that precisely the reverse conditions obtain. In this connection the comments of the Viet Nam Commission's legal committee, as quoted in our minority statement of February 13, are of direct relevance.

Now, I have gone into the background of some of our experiences on the Commission in this detail because I thought it important for the committee to understand why in a matter of this grave situation simple solutions will not do, attractive though they may appear.

I would not want anyone to think that in the last portion of my presentation I have sought to give the impression that our approach to this problem was that of a blind protagonist; it is not that at all. We have a responsibility on the Commission, and I have a responsibility on behalf of the government, to accept the submissions of that Commission or to reject them, and I have seen no reason for taking the latter course. Therefore, I felt it was my duty to at least take this opportunity, the first in some time, to put on the record our assessment of some of the factors; but I would not want this assessment in any way to becloud what I said at the beginning.

We appreciate the dangers involved in this situation. We recognise that it would be tragic if this situation in Viet Nam were to expand, if it were to involve more vigorous participation by other countries. I have no reason to believe that there is any evidence that this will be the case, but in this day when war should no longer be an instrument of national policy it is difficult for a country like Canada, subscribing as it does to the United Nations Charter, to see this kind of conflict being pursued. We have to bear in mind the consequence of capitulation or of defeat for either side. We must bear in mind the advantages of proper accommodation, perhaps through negotiations, without any preconditions, so that we might reach a stage of settlement in an area of Asia which vitally effects strategically not only the mainland but some other countries with whom we have closest Commonwealth association. I repeat, we are doing everything we can do. I asked myself this morning is there anything more that we, as a nation, can do, having in mind our responsibilities and our over-all obligations and interests, to try and bring about a cease-fire. I can only say I do not know of anything more that we can do. But, I do know we are not going to stop doing what we are doing.

I regret that the United Nations is not capable of intervening in this situation. This is not because of any act of ours, but there is a constitutional and financial crisis which has crippled its effectiveness in this kind of a situation. The Prime Minister has suggested that if a conference took place and conclusions are reached about an independent or neutral Viet Nam, in order to give substance to that conference arrangements must be made to provide guarantees for the observance of the commitments reached.

We have the experience of violations of the 1954 Agreement almost right away, infiltrations beginning from the North, with all the consequences that confront the world today. In view of the mistakes in Asia it would not be realistic for the west and for the nations of Asia, to assume that a final settlement can be reached in the absence of some kind of sanction, some kind of guarantee. The Prime Minister suggested that the United Nations normally would be the body to whom would be assigned this responsibility, but for the reasons I have mentioned this is not practical and there would thereby repose on the international community a responsibility to provide that kind of guarantee. This, I think, is a minimum requirement. But, it will not be easy because this kind of a presence depends in the final analysis upon the acceptance of all the parties concerned, and without their consent such an arrangement is just not practical even though it is undoubtedly desirable.

Then, I would like to say we have given consideration to the suggestion of the President of India, Mr. Radhakrishnon. His proposal for an Asian-African force or presence differs from our Prime Minister's in the fact that while we were thinking of a presence after a conference as a means of guaranteeing the terms of settlement, the President of India was thinking in terms of a presence that would intervene before any conclusions or any settlement was reached.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I wish to compliment the able Senator from Pennsylvania on his well-reasoned and thoughtful speech.

In his speech, he has very appropriately taken a phrase out of a statement made by the great Theodore Roosevelt, who said:

> The things that will destroy America are prosperity at any price, peace at any price, safety first instead of duty first, the love of soft living, and the get-rich-quick theory of life.

No one will misunderstand the able Senator or doubt his loyalty to his own party, either now or in 1968.

It should be an inspiration to men and women of both parties to see that the Senator places his country above his party. This is as it should be.

We live in a time when members of both parties should rally behind the Commander in Chief, regardless of the political affiliation of that Commander in Chief; because, above all and beyond all, the long-term security interests of the United States are at stake in Vietnam. Those interests outweigh by far the interests of any political party or group.

Unity in America, as much as or more than anything else, will speed the day when the fighting will cease and American boys can be brought home.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the Senator from West Virginia. I believe it was Gen. Robert E. Lee who, if I may paraphrase him, said, "There is a true glory and a true honor—the glory of integrity of purpose, and the honor of duty done." This is what all of us seek to live up to as an ideal.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a request?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from New Jersey without losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, a few moments ago I asked consent to have printed in the RECORD a research paper by the Ripon Society. I found that, under the request of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], this had already been done on October 4. So I withdraw that request, and ask only that the summary which the Ripon Society made and released at the same time be printed.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RIPON STUDY OUTLINES REPUBLICAN ALTERNATIVE ON VIETNAM—RIPON SOCIETY PROPOSES CONFEDERAL STRATEGY TO REDIRECT VIETNAMESE WAR, CALLS JOHNSON POLICY A "FIASCO" AND A "FICTION"

(NOTE.—The Ripon Society will hold a conference with the press to discuss its Vietnam paper on Tuesday, October 3rd at 10:30 am in the President's Room of the National Press Club, Washington, D.C. Mr. Lee W. Huebner, President of the Society, and Messrs. J. Lee Auspitz and Christopher W. Beal, co-authors of the Vietnam Statement, will represent the Society at the conference.

(The Ripon Society is a Republican research and policy organization composed of young members of the business, professional, and academic communities. The Society has chapters in Los Angeles, New York, New Haven, and Boston. Its national headquarters are located in Cambridge, Massachusetts.)

The Ripon Society published today a Vietnam proposal which, it suggested, could become the long sought responsible Republican alternative to President Johnson's war policies.

The current issue of the Ripon forum, circulated to all Republican Senators, Congressmen, Governors, National Committeemen and Presidential hopefuls, presents a comprehensive study which concludes that the United States:

Adopt a decentralized "confederal" strategy in Vietnam.

Redress the imbalances between our war making and our peace making bureaucracies.

Implement reforms to restore Congress to a proper role in foreign policy making.

The Society stated that the Republican party, if it presents a responsible alternative on Vietnam, can and should be returned to power in 1968.

The 30,000-word Ripon document outlines a Republican alternative on Vietnam that it claims will deal with the dangers of America's present course. The Society listed the dangers as: wasting American men and resources; turning South Vietnam into "a nation of thieves and beggars;" drifting towards war with China and the Soviet Union.

The Ripon Society calls its approach "a confederal strategy" to contrast it with the Johnson Administration's attempts to set up a centralized government in Saigon. This "fiction" of centralized democracy, it says, is doomed to failure because of the strong local, ethnic and religious differences in South Vietnam. The Ripon study shows that non-Communist forces are fragmented into many jealous groups that cannot be ruled from Saigon.

It enumerates these groups as the Hoa Hao, Cao Dai, mountain tribesmen, Coastal Buddhists, ethnic Cambodians, ethnic Chams, and Catholics (who are themselves divided by geographical origin). In a series of statistical tables .t shows that the Saigon government does not have full control even of these rock-bottom non-Communist forces and the 1.8 million refugees generated in the last two years of fighting.

THREE PHASES

The Forum study shows that the loyalty of these groups could be assured by conceding political powers to local leaders instead of the Saigon-appointed administrators who now hold sway. These leaders, it says, "hate the mandarins and army of Saigon just as much as they hate the Communists."

In its first phase, Ripon's confederal strategy would offer guarantees of local autonomy to non-Communist groups who maintain internal order and report infiltrators. Sample measures include provincial and district elections, direct access to U.S. aid, use of ethnic languages in primary schools, local administration of land reform, local taxing powers, local control of police and militia. Such arrangements, the Ripon study shows, have already been promised in many areas and could be turned into formal agreements almost overnight.

In its second phase, a confederal strategy offers the same framework to villages where Viet Cong and non-Communist leadership exists. This, Ripon concludes, would divide the loyalty of many Viet Cong cadres from the Communist hierarchy.

Ripon summarizes a number of scholarly and semi-official studies showing that many cadres are more concerned with their village role than with the ultimate Communist aim of winning the entire country. A framework enabling non-ideological cadres to keep their functions as village organizers in return for a cessation of anti-government activities would cripple the Viet Cong effort elsewhere in the country, it claims. Ripon concludes: "A confederal strategy would promote factionalism in the Viet Cong and unity among non-Communists; the present policy does the reverse."

In its third phase, confederal bargaining would be extended to hard-core Viet Cong areas. It would offer Viet Cong leaders control of their enclaves in the countryside as part of a national settlement. The Ripon study sees no hope for meaningful negotiations with the Viet Cong during the coming year because of U.S. elections and the lack of unity among non-Communist forces in South Vietnam. It calls instead for "piecemeal" and "local" negotiations to provide a basis for ultimate national negotiation.

MILITARY MEASURES COORDINATED WITH POLITICAL AIMS

Ripon charges that present military policies are wasting American lives because they are not coordinated with realistic political goals. It says that military planners have not come to grips with the true nature of the war. "Unlike World War II and unlike the Korean engagement, Vietnam is largely a counter-insurgency war." Most of the enemy is already within South Vietnam it says. "Even if North Vietnam were bombed to rubble," Ripon asserts, "the war in the South will continue." It estimates that to root out Viet Cong cadres will require two million allied troops. American troops have not yet ventured south of the Mekong River, it says. If they do, the manpower requirements will skyrocket.

Ripon asserts that present bombing policies also risk the loss of more American lives. It makes these points:

Heavy "interdictory" bombing South of the 18.5 parallel has failed to stop the North Vietnamese from paving a road, storing large quantities of supplies, and installing missiles in the A-Shau valley *within South Vietnam*. There is a real danger of invasion of the northern provinces of South Vietnam, and the military emphasis on bombing leaves us unprepared for this. Military spokesmen have not mentioned this failure to the public.

Present punitive bombing of the Chinese railway into North Vietnam will ultimately bring the Chinese into the war. The railway line is not merely a supply line to Hanoi; it is also the only link between China's Yunnan Province and the rest of China. A measure of its importance to China is that the Chinese had 40,000 paramilitary technicians working on it before the most recent bombings. Ripon charges that some within the administration don't care about Chinese intervention, since they are anxious to preempt China's nuclear capacity.

Heavy bombing of Haiphong will lead to a confrontation with the Russians who are committed to preserving the integrity of shipping to North Vietnam.

All present policies, Ripon concludes, lead to a widening of the war "on the installment plan." Even present patterns of refugee generation threaten the creation of an additional 4.5 million refugees in South Vietnam during the next three years. These refugees will have to be supported by American funds.

Ripon charges that Vietnam is not worth sending millions of American troops to the Asian mainland to continue unrealistic policies. It calls for a "hard decision" between countering invasion and countering insurgency. Since the insurgency problem would require millions of men, Ripon opts for using present troops to defend areas which demonstrate allegiance to Saigon in a confederal framework. It calls for heavy de-emphasis on bombing north of the 18.5 parallel. "The upper limit of the American commitment has already been exceeded . . . An honorable approach can be found that will reduce American troop commitments in the long run."

"A confederal strategy," it says, "is designed to reduce the American commitment in installments much as the present policy is destined to escalate it by installments."

INABILITY TO WAGE PEACE

In the final section of its study Ripon reviews the long-range problems that have allowed our "misconceived policies" to go unchecked. The first of these is "an administrative imbalance between our ability to take military risks and our ability to take political risks." The FORUM study charges that reforms in the Defense Department have given military planners a bureaucratic advantage over the cluster of civilian agencies charged with economic and political elements of foreign policy. As a result, "blind bureaucratic momentum" shifts policies in favor of solutions recommended by the Defense Department. This explains why "American policy can drift towards military solutions where political ones will suffice; American youth can die because its elders lack decisive civilian leadership."

"It is meaningless for officials to talk of America's desire for peace and for a 'political solution', so long as administrative means to implement these hopes are not known to exist," the study says. It charges that there has been no public indication of contingency plans for a realistic settlement in Vietnam.

CONGRESSIONAL WEAKNESS

The Ripon study also shows that Congress has been unprepared to check the Executive Branch on Vietnam. "Congress has had neither the staff nor the machinery to assert its prerogatives in the making of Vietnam policy. Its right to be consulted has been compromised into a right to ratify . . . Congress' right to know has been reduced to the right to be briefed."

The Ripon study says that President Johnson has tended to exploit Congress' weaknesses by a style of "secrecy and silence." It accuses him of relying on a "contrived atmosphere of crisis" and of blitzing Congress with questions, "the answers to which are predetermined by carefully controlled briefing."

REPUBLICAN RESPONSIBILITY

Because of the weakness of Congress and failure of the President to reform and coordinate civilian policy-making agencies, Ripon charges that Vietnam policy is made by a "self-entrenching bureaucratic coalition that cannot be reformed from within." It calls for partisan action by the Republican Party to correct the "fiasco" of American policy in Vietnam.

Republicans, the Ripon study says, can grasp the realities of local politics in South Vietnam and need for checks and balances in Washington. It charges that "the best men and the best minds are not making this country's foreign policy."

"In 1952," it concludes, "the Republican Party demonstrated its ability to extricate the United States from a war on the Asian mainland. "The issue now is whether the American people think our present course in Vietnam is worth more deception, more resources, more lives. If they do not, there is an alternative."

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to the order of Friday, the Chair recognizes the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], for a period not to exceed 1 hour.

THE ABM DECISION—A $5 BILLION INVESTMENT IN AN INEFFECTIVE SYSTEM

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, today I desire to address the Senate on the decision of the administration to deploy a so-called thin anti-ballistic-missile defense at a cost of $5 billion.

I submit that from the evidence it is clear that this vastly expensive new weapons system essentially contributes nothing to this country's security. I urge the administration to reconsider its decision, which I believe to be wrong on three counts—militarily, economically, and diplomatically.

The best arguments against ABM deployment have been made by Secretary McNamara himself. The Secretary pointed out in his San Francisco speech that there is no ABM system which can be built—no matter how much we spend on it—which would not be, and I quote the Secretary's own words, "ineffective against a sophisticated Soviet offense." Even if we were to spend $40 billion or more on a so-called massive system, the resulting increase in our security against a Russian attack would be zero, according to the Secretary of Defense. The result would be a waste of a great deal of money at a time when the war in Vietnam is costing us $2½ billion a month, when the President is asking for new taxes to offset a growing budget deficit, and our crucial domestic programs are being reduced to support the increases in the military budget. What would we get for our money? A very expensive flying "erector set" which the Russians could easily and cheaply overpower by increasing their offensive missile striking force.

The argument that the so-called thin system is justified by the approaching threat of Chinese nuclear-tipped missiles simply does not hold up. We have the capacity to devastate China many times over if her leaders should be so foolish as to initiate a nuclear exchange with us, and the Chinese know that. That fact is at the heart of the deterrence policy which has guided American military strategy since the beginning of the nuclear age. Our strategy has been to deter a first strike against ourselves by making it plain to any would-be aggressor that our second strike against him would be utterly and horribly devastating. Is there anyone who seriously believes that the Chinese Government would not be effectively deterred by that prospect?

I discussed this subject informally the other day with the President's scientific adviser, Dr. Hornig. After he said he agreed thoroughly that there was no point in building an antiballistic missile system against a possible Soviet threat—in other words, he agreed with Secretary McNamara—I said to him, "Well, if it would not be any good against the Russians, why do we need it against the Chinese?" "Well," he said, "the only basis is that maybe the Chinese are more irrational than the Russians, and, of course," he said, "that is not a scientific problem; that is a question of political judgment."

I think it is perfectly clear that practically everybody except the military-industrial complex, which would profit from the building of this system, is of the view that to build the system against the Chinese, realizing it is no good against Russia, just does not make any sense at all. I think there is no one who seriously believes that the Chinese Government could be effectively deterred by an anti-ballistic-missile system.

The second flaw in the argument is the assumption that a thin ABM system would be effective against the Chinese for any appreciable period of time. Even if it is conceded that a thin defense system would be effective against a Chinese offensive missile system which was still in its primitive stage, it is obvious that once the Chinese develop their rocket force beyond the primitive stage our ABM system will not be effective. If the Chinese get their rocket assembly lines going, and develop multiple warheads and penetration aids, they will be able to overwhelm our outmoded ABM system just as the Russians could overwhelm it today.

How long would that take? Secretary McNamara pointed out that the Chinese are devoting very substantial resources to the development of both nuclear warheads and missile delivery systems. Every time our experts have tried to predict the next advance in Chinese weapons development they have been wrong—the Chinese have moved faster than we expected. No one can say how long the period will be between the time the Chinese deploy their first primitive system capable of threatening the United States, and the time they have developed a larger and more sophisticated system capable of overwhelming first our thin, $5 billion ABM system, and ultimately even a massive $40-plus billion system.

The third fallacy in the logic is the assumption that even during the so-called "safe period" in Chinese nuclear development, we would be genuinely safe from a Chinese nuclear attack behind an ABM defense. There are many ways of launching a nuclear attack that an ABM is helpless to deter. A Chinese submarine could perhaps deliver a low trajectory rocket which would sneak through our radar screen, just as the Israeli Air Force sneaked through the Egyptian radar defenses. The Chinese could detonate a nuclear bomb underwater near our west coast—again from a submarine, or even from a trading vessel—where the prevailing winds would sweep the cloud of deadly radioactivity ashore. Or, James Bondish as it sounds, miniature bombs could be hand-carried into our cities in suitcases and detonated. If the Chinese are foolish enough to risk the total devastation of their country by launching a rocket strike against us, what is keeping them from attacking us in any of these ways? The answer is obvious—deterrence, effective deterrence of all forms of nuclear assault.

The inevitable conclusion is that the proposed thin $5 billion system simply will not do the job which its proponents say it will do. That, of course, is bad enough—squandering $5 billion of the taxpayers' money on a useless system is no light matter. But the problem is worse than this. For there is, as Secretary McNamara said, a "mad momentum intrinsic to the development of all new nuclear weaponry." That mad momentum, generated in part by the decision to go ahead with the deployment of a thin system, is already gathering force, as the Secretary foresaw, and as indeed I warned him in a letter I wrote to him on June 15, 1967, in which I said:

> As a practicing politician, I would like to comment on this proposition that the United States should build and deploy a "light" ABM defense. In my own view, I see no way of holding back pressure for a full or "heavy" ABM defense once a "light" system has been installed.

There is plentiful evidence that the curtain has already gone up on this new tragedy. We are only now in act I, with the squandering of $5 billion, the equivalent of 1 million jobs under the emergency employment program which I sponsored and which was approved by the full Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. How long will it be before we see $40 or $50 or $60 billion go down the drain in an orgy of misguided spending?

The most painful costs, however, cannot be counted in dollars. They are the diplomatic costs—the resulting increase in tensions between the United States and the Soviet Union which this new escalation of the arms race is bound to provoke. As Victor Zorza pointed out not long ago in the Washington Post, the most likely effect of our decision to begin ABM deployment will be the strengthening of the hard-liners in the Kremlin in their continuing see-saw battle with the more peace-oriented elements in the Soviet leadership.

This decision will not spur the Russians to come to agreement on limiting defensive and offensive missiles. It is far more likely to jeopardize the pending talks and crush the hopes for an arms control agreement which were generated by the Glassboro conference.

The only gainers from our action will be the members of the political, military-industrial complex on both sides—in the Soviet Union, and in this country. The Russian generals, their allies in the Communist Party, and the men who direct the Soviet defense industry will gain status and prestige at the expense of their colleagues. Their counterparts in the United States will have something more tangible to show—fantastic profits for the contractors, and new stars on the shoulders and stripes on the sleeves of the military men who will be in charge of the program.

The story is in the stock market reports for anyone who is interested to see. Where is the ABM money going to go? Raytheon, up 4⅛ to 91⅛ on Monday, September 18, the day of the McNamara speech. Aerojet General, up 4⅝ to 33¼ on the same day. Strong rising trends have been just as visible in other major ABM contractors—Thiokol, Martin Marietta, and Sperry Rand. The vast new defense pork lunch-wagon—maybe the biggest ever—has begun to roll, and the investors on the stock market know it.

Who are the losers? All of us, everyone, and particularly those who will be hardest hit by the fact that money that should be going into the effort to rebuild our cities and heal the wounds in our society—or possibly, if you take a more conservative point of view, to provide the funds which will make a tax increase unnecessary; or, indeed, to provide the funds which, in the long run, might make further tax decreases possible—is being drained off to build Armageddon instead. Americans who will be deprived of a chance to get an adequate education, necessary health care, a decent place to live, a chance for a job—for lack of funds, they will be the biggest losers.

Those higher up the income ladder will be losers because of the increased taxes which they will have to pay, or through the failure to receive the tax decrease to which they might otherwise be entitled. But the real, ultimate losers are every man, woman, and child on this planet whose lives are menaced by the threat of nuclear war, and whose only hope for genuine security lies in the amelioration of tensions between the great nuclear powers and the negotiation of effective agreements to halt the madness of the arms race and turn mankind toward the path to peace.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to my friend from South Dakota.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I have very little to add to what the Senator from Pennsylvania has said, other than to tell him how much I appreciate not only the courage, but beyond that, the commonsense, that he demonstrates here today; because he has taken on one of the most wasteful and, in my judgment, most dangerous proposals that have been suggested in a long time. I quite agree with him when he says that, far from adding to our security and to the chances for stability between the great powers, the introduction of the so-called ABM system really adds another dangerous new dimension that threatens both our security and the peace of the world.

One of the things that has puzzled me most about this whole discussion associated with the ABM is the seeming paradox between the devastating case that the Secretary of Defense has built against just such a system over the last few years, having added to it as recently as January 25 of this year in his statement before the Senate Appropriations Committee on defense appropriations, and the rather strange endorsement of such a proposal the Secretary made in his speech at San Francisco.

I believe if one looks at that speech carefully, 90 percent of it is a devastating, and, I think, unanswerable argument against the ABM system.

Mr. CLARK. If the Senator will yield briefly, I thoroughly agree with him. My heart bleeds for Secretary McNamara, who, as I think anybody who intelligently reads his speech must see, is doing what he is told to do, despite the fact that his convictions are otherwise.

The argument that we are building this ABM system against an anticipated Chinese attack is completely lacking in conviction, as far as Secretary McNamara's feelings come through his actual words.

Mr. McGOVERN. Would the Senator agree that the senior editor of Newsweek magazine, Mr. Edwin Diamond, describes well, in the October 2, 1967, issue of that magazine, what has happened in explaining this paradoxical situation with reference to our Secretary of Defense? He also refers to a column by Mr. James Reston of the New York Times.

Mr. President, I would like to read a couple of paragraphs if the Senator would yield further.

Mr. CLARK. I would be happy to have the article made part of the RECORD.

Mr. McGOVERN. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the editorial entitled, "The Grand Illusion," to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GRAND ILLUSION

(By Edwin Diamond)

Secretary McNamara's decision to go ahead with an anti-ballistic-missile (ABM) system is based on a set of brilliantly reasoned, highly sophisticated, and strongly persuasive arguments. But the decision is wrong, and the consequences of this error will burden every American for years to come.

Instead of strengthening the national security, the ABM decision may well undermine it, for it upsets the present delicate balance of nuclear terror based on the twin implicit assumptions of a strong (four-to-one) but not overwhelming U.S. offensive missile superiority and a modest Soviet defensive advantage. Worse, the ABM move signals another dangerous upward spiral in the nuclear-arms race which may lead to a renewed drive by both the U.S. and Soviet Union to add new offensive weapons to the overkill arsenals each already possesses. Roswell L. Gilpatric, McNamara's own former Deputy Defense Secretary, fears the ABM means a U.S. global strategy based more on conflict than accommodation. The go-ahead, he said, "is certainly a move in the wrong direction."

Let's put these abstractions in concrete terms—and concrete is exactly where we are now heading. At the very least, this new nuclear escalation means the expenditure of untold billions in exchange for a wholly illusory security blanket. Whether the U.S. spends $4 to $5 billion for the "thin" ABM system to guard its Minuteman strike force, or $40 billion for the "thickening" of the blanket to protect major American cities, or $400 billion to protect smaller cities, the end result will be the same: all of us will still be 30 minutes away from nuclear annihilation.

MOLE SOCIETY

Indeed, with the ABM escalation, the possibility of this supposedly "unthinkable" missile Armageddon is greater, not smaller. All of us have now been propelled by the logic of nuclear events that McNamara grasps so well toward the next era of the atomic age—the mole society where the cities and civilians of the 1980s may have to burrow underground to join the concrete Minuteman silos sunk in the 1960s and the subterranean ABM control centers built in the 1970s.

Unlikely, you will say; right out of some science-fiction paperback. But who would have believed, ten years ago, at the time of Sputnik 1 and the "missile gap," that the U.S. within five years would possess the nuclear missiles to destroy the Soviet society and population five times over?

What evidence have I that McNamara—one of the most brilliant and dedicated minds in the nation—is wrong about the ABM? What proof is there that the U.S. has embarked on a dangerous new course? The evidence is abundant. Precisely because McNamara has such a firm grasp of the complexities of the age, he himself has supplied some of the best arguments against the ABM and a new arms race. In fact, if an analyst were to overlay McNamara's speech with one of the cryptologist's sheets that cover some paragraphs while revealing others, the case for the present stabilized strategic situation would become compelling.

ACTION-REACTION

First of all, as McNamara makes clear, the U.S. now has "a numerical superiority over the Soviet Union in reliable, accurate and effective warheads [that] is both greater than we had originally planned, and is in fact more than we require." This, to use the blunt term, is what overkill means. And overkill, to be blunt again, is the legacy of politically motivated "missile-gap" cries of the late 1950s. The panic button was pushed in the U.S. and a real missile gap did eventually materialize. But as McNamara points out in his speech, this gap favors the U.S. At present the U.S. has 2,200 strategic nuclear weapons in readiness against 700 for the U.S.S.R. The Russian response to this U.S. superiority has been to concede an offensive disparity. In effect the Soviet Union acknowledged that the richness and ingenuity of American technology could not be matched. But it began an ABM system—the Russian military has been traditionally defense minded—as part of what McNamara calls the "action-reaction" of the arms race.

McNamara has been conspicuously unworried by this deployment. As he explains it, the offense always has an advantage over the defense and any ABM system "can rather obviously be defeated by an enemy simply sending over more offensive warheads, or dummy warheads, than there are defensive missiles capable of disposing of them."

The logic of the situation calls for one of the superpowers to forego the next turn in the vicious cycle of action-reaction. A Soviet McNamara—they have their sophisticated strategists and their war gamesmen, too—might argue that the Soviet ABM deployment represented a limited and measured response to U.S. superiority, a move intended to assure Russian second-strike capability and thus make the Soviet deterrent credible. Why not leave the arms race in this trade-off situation? Why upset the fearfully delicate balance of terror with a U.S. ABM system?

McNamara's answer last week was: because of the looming Chinese nuclear-missile threat of the 1970s. The proposed U.S. ABM system, in McNamara's words, is "Chinese-oriented," designed to deter Chairman Mao or his successors from an attack on the U.S. It is at this point that McNamara's computer logic breaks down.

MAD ADVENTURE

First, if Peking is suicidally mad enough to mount an attack on a country possessing 200 times more nuclear power than it has, then no amount of objective reality in the form of an American ABM barrier can dissuade the Chinese from their insanity. If the Chinese are bent on nuclear genocide, they could smuggle an atomic bomb into San Francisco harbor aboard a freighter and detonate it. No ABM system can protect against such mad adventures.

Second, the Soviet Union can also argue that its ABM is "Chinese-oriented," and merely a matter of insurance against an irrational attack by a country that shares an uneasy border with Russia and is violently hostile to it. After all, the same madness that might lead the Chinese to attack the U.S. might also push Mao over the brink with the Russians. Would we believe the Russians if they said, "It's the Chinese we are worried about—ignore our ABM"? Yet we expect them to believe our ABM is China-oriented.

The truth is the ABM decision was dictated not by strategy but by politics. Computer logic breaks down because men aren't computers; they are imperfect beings shaped by history and emotion as well as reason. There are really two McNamaras. One McNamara coolly attempts to manage the arms race by force of argument and intellect. He even on occasion does the Russians' thinking for them, patiently elucidating the nuclear strategic options available and their consequences in speeches and in briefings held for the press, but aimed at Moscow. The second McNamara is an American, a patriot and a member of the Johnson Administration (just as his opposite in the Kremlin is a Russian, a patriot, and a member of the Communist Party).

It is well known in Washington that Secretary McNamara for months has opposed deployment of the ABM system despite the urgings of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, of Democratic hawks and of Republicans sensing a hot campaign issue for 1968. As James Reston suggested last week, the ABM system launched by McNamara is not aimed at blocking the Chinese or even the Russians, but the Republicans. By acceding now to the clamor, McNamara has blunted the GOP charge that he is "indifferent" to the defense of the American people.

GOOD GUYS

Yet, isn't the U.S. asking—a bit illogically—the Soviet McNamara to be indifferent to the defense of his people? More fundamentally, isn't the U.S. saying—also a bit illogically—that when it comes to the crunch, two standards apply: we are the good guys and would never attack first; you are the bad guys and you might attack first, and that is why we must have a four-to-one offensive superiority and defensive parity (at least)—and a lead in whatever else we decide to build.

Last week was the time for patience and courage—patience to lecture the Russians once again on the reasons behind the eminently equitable U.S. plan to put a freeze on all missiles, offensive and defensive; courage, in the words of former Kennedy science adviser Jerome Wiesner, to run the risks of deescalation instead of the risks of new escalation; and patience and courage to explain to the American people, even in a pre-election year, why the ABM is not good for their security.

Instead, Washington gave us the ABM. By some curious alchemy, the Administration has convinced itself that the thin ABM system doesn't really change the balance of terror: only a thick system would do that. But thin leads to thick. It is all like that celebrated biology experiment: a frog is placed in a tank of water; daily the temperature is increased one degree; the frog exists as always—until one more degree . . . the water boils . . . the frog dies.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, reading from Mr. Diamond's editorial in the issue of Newsweek magazine of October 2, he has this to say:

> The truth is the ABM decision was dictated not by strategy, but by politics.

Mr. CLARK. That is entirely correct, in my opinion, and it is bad politics, in my judgment.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Diamond goes on to say:

> It is well known in Washington that Secretary McNamara for months has opposed deployment of the ABM system despite the urgings of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, of Democratic hawks and of Republicans sensing a hot campaign issue for 1968. As James Reston suggested last week, the ABM system launched by McNamara is not aimed at blocking the Chinese or even the Russians, but the Republicans.

If that is true, it seems to me to be a rather expensive campaign expenditure, to spend $5 billion, to try to defend our party against political charges apparently next November.

It seems to me that, instead of evaluating this issue in terms of what it may or may not do to our chances in the next election, we ought to be more concerned about the security of our country, and the peace of the world and our economy at a time when it is already strained.

Mr. CLARK. I thoroughly agree. I think that if a man from Mars with some sort of a sense of intelligence were to come here and look at what is happening in this country, he would think human beings here were going mad when we talk about building an anti-ballistic-missile system of this kind to compound the already frightening arms race.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD certain excerpts from the testimony of Secretary McNamara on January 25, 1967.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS HEARINGS, JANUARY 25, 1967

Secretary of Defense McNamara, on cost: "In this connection, it is worth noting that had we produced and deployed the NIKE-ZEUS system proposed by the Army in 1959 at an estimated cost of $13 to $14 billion, most of it would have had to be torn out and replaced, almost before it became operational, by the new missiles and radars of the NIKE-X system. By the same token, other technological developments in offensive forces over the next seven years may make obsolete or drastically degrade the NIKE-X system as presently envisioned . . . (page 57).

"Even before the systems became operational, pressures would mount for their expansion at a cost of still additional billions. The unprotected, or relatively unprotected, areas of the United States would claim that their tax dollars were being diverted to protect New York and Washington while they were left naked. And critics would point out that our strategic offensive force is premised on a much larger Soviet threat (the 'possible', not the 'probable' threat); they would conclude that the same principles should be applied to our strategic defensive forces. For these and other reasons, I believe that, once started, an ABM system deployed with the objective of protecting the United States against the Soviet Union would require an expenditure on the order of $40 billion over a 10-year period. (footnote, page 232).

". . . if you put these around (deleted) cities, the Soviet planners are going to retarget their weapons to all the other cities, because there is no sense wasting weapons on (deleted) if you have got all the rest unprotected. . . . And the danger to the other cities that aren't protected is increased by the fact that we protect (deleted) and make them less vulnerable and therefore less desirable targets. And that new factor is in addition to the fact that they just have no protection to begin with." (page 253).

Secretary McNamara; on Soviet reaction: "It is the virtual certainty that the Soviets will act to maintain their deterrent which casts such grave doubts on the advisability of our deploying the NIKE–X system for the protection of our cities against the kind of heavy, sophisticated missile attack they could launch in the 1970s. In all probability, all we would accomplish would be to increase greatly both their defense expenditures and ours without any gain in real security to either side." (Page 59).

Senator DOMINICK. I just want to be sure, Mr. Secretary, that I understand this. What you are saying in this first column is that the Soviets are technically capable of completely offsetting a NIKE–ZEUS system so that it wouldn't be worth much by the time it was installed.

Secretary MCNAMARA. Yes, that's true. They could both technically and financially, because the financial cost of doing this is not in any way beyond their budgetary limits, and not disproportionate to our cost of having put in the defense system. (Page 238).

U.S. Reaction to Soviet ABM: Arms race: "Although we believe the strategic missile programs now proposed will be adequate to meet the threat, even if the Soviet Union were to carry out a full-scale deployment of an ABM system and develop more effective ICBM's, we are making a very comprehensive study of a new long-range missile system. (page 241).

". . . I have not alluded in the statement to the arms race, although it would definitely escalate, in my opinion, at great cost and no real gain to either side. We are already reacting to their ABM." (Page 252, responding to question by Chairman Russell)

McNamara on ABM defense against China: "It is not clear that we need an ABM defense against China. In any event, the lead time for deployment of a significant Chinese offensive force is longer than that required for U.S. ABM deployment; therefore, the decision for the latter need not be made now." (Page 60).

Mr. McGOVERN. I will now read into the RECORD two or three paragraphs from that testimony.

The Secretary had this to say:

> In this connection, it is worth noting that had we produced and deployed the Nike-Zeus system proposed by the Army in 1959 at an estimated cost of $13 to $14 billion, most of it would have had to be torn out and replaced, almost before it became operational, by the new missiles and radars of the NIKE-X system. By the same token, other technological developments in offensive forces over the next seven years may make obsolete or drastically degrade the NIKE-X system as presently envisioned . . . . (page 57).

The Secretary then makes some other interesting points that, to me, are very conflicting.

He said:

> Even before the systems became operational, pressures would mount for their expansion at a cost of still additional billions. The unprotected, or relatively unprotected, areas of the United States would claim that their tax dollars were being diverted to protect New York and Washington while they were left naked.

Mr. CLARK. The original argument included the suggestion that first 25 and then 50 of our cities would be protected by the antiballistic missile system consisting of the peripheral defense called Spartan, and the spot defense which is called Sprint. The Pentagon was pressured to make the choice of what cities should be selected, and they did issue a list of 25 cities, and then a list of 50 cities.

I was a little concerned at the inadequate protection going to some of the cities in my home State of Pennsylvania. High up on the list was Charleston, S.C., a city with a population in the neighborhood of 83,000.

It was suggested by me—and I was taken to task by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] for the suggestion—that perhaps the Pentagon just might have been influenced in choosing Charleston, S.C., by the fact that the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee lives in that area.

I am not imputing motives to anyone. But can one think of the result of the Pentagon being involved in selecting particular cities for defense as opposed to letting it be done by the political agents, the President and the Congress, and can anyone think of what chances he would have to get elected in his own district or State if he did not insist that every city be included in the area? It would run the cost up overnight because of the pragmatic situation I have been talking about.

Mr. McGOVERN. Secretary McNamara in testifying before the committee said:

> For these and other reasons, I believe that, once started, an ABM system deployed with the objective of protecting the United States against the Soviet Union would require an expenditure on the order of $40 billion over a 10-year period. (footnote, page 232)

I can assure the Senator that every Senator would feel the same way. If my State were to be left out of a defensive system, I would feel obligated to do everything I possibly could to have it included.

I would not have any great confidence in the ability of the system to protect anybody, but nevertheless with the kind of emotional insecurity that exists, even if there were only some outside chance that we might hit one of these incoming missiles, one would want to make every effort to have his State included.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I point out what I have pointed out before on the floor of the Senate, and what I think is worth repeating.

In the hearings on the antiballistic missile system conducted by the Subcommittee on Disarmament of the Foreign Relations Committee, on which subcommittee I serve—and originally in executive session, but later the classification was removed so that it is now public information—all of our experts testified that we could destroy Moscow tomorrow despite its much vaunted antiballistic missile system, and that Moscow could destroy us the day after tomorrow—Washington, New York—pick the city or State. The experts were all of the view that our system would be utterly ineffective even if it were built, because the technology, which I will not attempt to describe in detail, requires that the incoming missile be identified by radar long enough before it reaches its target to enable the antiballistic missile to go up and intercept it in outer space, or possibly very high in space. This cannot be done because the effect of knocking down the first missile is to obfuscate the radar so that it cannot identify the oncoming second or third attacking missile.

Even if that were not true, there are so many devices by which the effectiveness of radar can be destroyed by an adequate offense which is aware of the problem, that the chances of the second, third, or fourth missile not getting through to its target are almost minimal.

Mr. McGOVERN. I know that the Senator, who is an expert, which I am not, has pointed out on the floor of the Senate a good many times how much more economical it would be to increase our offensive power.

Mr. CLARK. Of course, this is Secretary McNamara's deeply held opinion, and he has been overruled.

Mr. McGOVERN. A good many of our armament experts have pointed out over the years that they hope the Soviets would build an antiballistic missile system because they would be wasting their money when, by a much smaller expenditure, we could overwhelm that system.

Presumably, it would work the same way for the other side.

Mr. CLARK. I am sure the Senator is correct.

Mr. McGOVERN. I would like to read into the RECORD one other paragraph from the article by Mr. Diamond. With reference to the argument that it is not directed against the Soviets, but against the Chinese, Mr. Diamond has this to say:

> If Peking is suicidally mad enough to mount an attack on a country possessing 200 times more nuclear power than it has, then no amount of objective reality in the form of an American ABM barrier can dissuade the Chinese from their insanity. If the Chinese are bent on nuclear genocide, they could smuggle an atomic bomb into San Francisco Harbor aboard a freighter and detonate it. No ABM system can protect us against such mad adventures.

It seems to me, considering the state of the Chinese economy today and their missile development, that even if they did have such an insane notion as attacking the United States, that would be the form it would take, using a ship or perhaps smuggling it into the country in various ways and exploding it in one of our harbors or one of our internal cities, rather than relying on shooting missiles, a field in which we clearly have the superiority.

Again, I thank the Senator for his excellent statement today. I agree with every word, and I hope that somehow the wisdom of his remarks will be heard and felt in the executive branch.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend, the Senator from South Dakota, for his support, which I certainly welcome.

I yield to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART].

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I, too, thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for speaking as he has this morning. I do not know what the odds are that he will be listened to or that those of us who say "amen" to him will be heard.

Mr. CLARK. We will hope for the best.

Mr. HART. I hope we are not performing a useless function here this morning, because I sense that nothing more important will be discussed today, tomorrow, or any week than the point that the Senator from Pennsylvania seeks to call to our attention. I thank him for doing it.

The Senator from South Dakota made an important point. As I understand it, the offense outraces the defense all the time.

Mr. CLARK. This has been the case ever since the development of—well, I suppose before the development of atomic energy. I am sure I need not remind the Senator of the Maginot line in World War II.

I believe the Senator is clearly correct.

Mr. HART. My reason for underscoring this aspect of the matter is in anticipation of a reply that will be made to us by our critics, those who support the program that we are criticizing now. They will say, "So what? When gunpowder was developed, it outmoded the bow and arrow," but our critics will argue, it was known something would come along more effective than gunpowder. Did it follow that we should not have armed ourselves against those who used bows and arrows?

The point we are trying to make is that some major power at some point in today's devices of destruction must say, "Let's stop."

Mr. CLARK. "Let's stop and turn around and deaccelerate this mad arms race."

Mr. HART. Exactly. I hope sight is not lost of this point in reaction to our discussion this morning.

Those who propose the limited system and those who stand here this morning critical of it speak in an effort—and it is sincerely entertained, I know—to save lives. Those who want to put up this screen advocate it because, as they say, it will frighten the Chinese, or something, or it will reassure Paris, or it will undercut De Gaulle and reassure Berlin. Many nuances are put into this matter.

Those of us who criticize it say that if we do not stop at this point, how can we look forward to any kind of constructive arms control discussion? If we have 200 times—or whatever it is—more offensive power in these weapons than China, and if we put up this limited screen, when can we in logic look to the Kremlin to stand still? Our actions belie the fact that we want them to sit down and talk about turning down the heat in the interest of saving lives.

This is perhaps the most important point the Senator from Pennsylvania seeks to make this morning.

Mr. CLARK. I am delighted that the Senator from Michigan has put his finger on that point. I agree with him that it is very important, indeed.

Mr. HART. I heard a wise man comment that logic cries out against this limited system; that politics cries out for it; that there is no basis in logic for doing it, and there is no political justification for avoiding it. If we take that approach to all our problems, we will be in the kind of deep trouble the Senator from Pennsylvania cautions us against.

Mr. CLARK. I wonder whether the Senator would agree with me that this is not as politically wise as superficially it might appear.

Four or five billion dollars would be taken out of the economy to build this utterly useless antiballistic missile system, and that amount would be added to a contemplated deficit of $30 billion for the current year. We are unable to devote the resources essential to remedy the plight of our cities and even to stop the riots, if we wish to take that limited point of view, and more and more people are beginning to appreciate this fact. Therefore, the primitive suggestion—I call it primitive advisedly—that the expenditure of this money is good politics just does not stand up.

I may well be running for reelection in Pennsylvania next year. I do not know whether or not I will. I certainly would not have the slightest hesitation in vigorously opposing, during the course of my campaign, the expenditure of this money for such a useless purpose. I have sufficient confidence in the commonsense of the people of my Commonwealth to believe that would be the better side of the political argument.

Mr. HART. I hope that others will consider the point that the Senator from Pennsylvania has made and reject, or at least question, the assumption that it is good politics to put up this limited screen.

I rise to protest the program not in the belief that I am doing something heroic. I share the notion of the Senator from Pennsylvania that there may be no political danger in standing on the floor of the Senate and saying that this program does not make sense. Many people believe it does not make sense, but do not say so.

Mr. CLARK. Those people, in my judgment, vastly underestimate the intelligence of the average American voter.

Mr. HART. I believe that the average American voter will, in his decision a year from now, include this action in the agenda that he will be ticking off. He knows that we have this morning the power to incinerate most of China. He knows that the Chinese leadership knows that too. The Chinese leadership will be responsible or irresponsible, and the setting up of a limited screen will not contribute to their degreee of responsibility 7 cents' worth.

But it will cost us $5 billion to start with, and on a bookkeeping basis alone, that makes no sense at all. The Russians put up ABM screens around several of their cities. The United States would now put up a thin screen to protect, it is said, against China in the next few years. On it goes with each step calling forth greater and newer offensive weapon development, outmoding the screens, calling for still more screens. The way to save lives is by turning down, not up, and this moment in arms control negotiations calls for us to turn down—or at least not turn up—this ABM screen.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct. I certainly welcome his support.

Mr. President, the press in many areas has been quite incisive in its analysis of the futility and, indeed, the folly of the decision to deploy an antiballistic missile system.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks a number of press articles relating to this subject. They are as follows:

The first is an article entitled "Allies Foresee New Danger. Europe Suspects Thin ABM Is Step to Massive System," written by Murrey Marder, the well-known news analyst, and published in the Washington Post for today, October 9, 1967.

Second, an editorial entitled "Genie Out of the Bottle," published in the New York Times of September 20, 1967. The editorial takes the position that the decision is unsound.

Third, an editorial entitled "The Wrong Race," published in the Washington Post of September 19, 1967. The editorial quotes Secretary of Defense McNamara as saying:

> There is a kind of mad momentum intrinsic to the development of all new nuclear weaponry.

Fourth, an article entitled "In the Nation: A Nightmare Debate," written by Tom Wicker, and published in the New York Times of September 19, 1967.

Fifth, an editorial entitled "An Ominous Decision," published in the Providence Journal of September 20, 1967.

Sixth, an article entitled "A Defense Policy and New Dangers," written by Adam Yarmolinsky, and published in the Washington Post of September 28, 1967. Mr. Yarmolinsky was formerly special assistant to Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara and is currently a professor of law at Harvard University.

Seventh, an article entitled "State of Affairs," written by Clayton Fritchey, and released on September 25, 1967, by the syndicate which publishes Mr. Fritchey's able column.

Eighth, an article entitled "New Soviet Crisis Seen Over U.S. Missile Plan," written by Victor Zorza, who writes for the Manchester Guardian. The article is the first in a series and was reprinted in the Washington Post of September 20, 1967.

Ninth, an article published in the New Yorker magazine of September 30, 1967. It is the first item in the column, The Talk of the Town, which is always at the front of that brilliant weekly.

Mr. President, I believe that these statements of the press represent the most intelligent public reaction to this decision. I hope that they will be read most carefully by all readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there

objection to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania?

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 9, 1967]

ALLIES FORESEE NEW DANGER—EUROPE SUSPECTS THIN ABM IS STEP TO MASSIVE SYSTEM

(By Murrey Marder)

A rumble of suspicion is spreading in Western Europe about the intentions behind the "light" anti-missile system announced by the United States last month.

Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara, in unveiling the $5 billion project on Sept. 18, stressed that it was solely designed "to deter China from nuclear blackmail." A McNamara deputy, Assistant Secretary Paul C. Warnke, on Friday publicly underscored that limited objective.

Many European experts (and some American specialists as well) suspect, however, that the limited "China-oriented" anti-ballistic missile plan is the first step toward what the Johnson Administration adamantly insists it is not:

An ultimate, massive ABM system to try to ward off danger of a Soviet missile attack, matched by an equally massive Russian deployment to protect Soviet territory.

It is McNamara's determined desire, which Warnke reiterated for the Johnson Administration, to avoid that kind of an outcome by getting Soviet agreement to limit a missile race spiral. But the skeptics maintain that the U.S. foot has now joined the Soviet foot on the escalator.

The suspicion in Europe and elsewhere about the end result is not directed so much at McNamara's or the Administration's desires or objectives, but at their ability to accomplish them.

Despite Administration denials, the skeptics attribute the U.S. decision to launch a limited ABM system to internal political-military-industrial pressures in the United States, rather than to planned defense objectives. These pressures, they believe, will drive the United States into just the anti-missile race the Administration is pledged to endeavor to escape.

An advance guard of Western Europeans is beginning to worry if this will leave their security more dependent than ever on the two superpowers. They fear that Western Europe may be exposed to new danger as the United States and the Soviet Union mutually reinforce their own defenses.

What is potentially more troublesome for the two nuclear giants is that Western Europe's leaders are far readier than ever to challenge Washington-Moscow decisions that affect their fate. Moreover, they have opportunity to do so by footdragging on something that the superpowers want—the pending treaty to ban the spread of nuclear weapons.

EFFECTIVENESS OF SYSTEMS

So far, the relatively few Europeans who have come to grips with the anti-missile problem are divided on the effectiveness of ABM systems and their impact on Europe. But even if their thinking does not coalesce, it can still mean grief for Washington particularly and for the North Atlantic Alliance.

At Ankara, Turkey, in a Sept. 28–29 meeting of the seven-nation Allied Nuclear Planning Group, McNamara succeeded in mollifying Western defense ministers about the American decision of Sept. 18 to deploy a "light" ABM system. It was sprung upon them with short notice, and no consultation, even though Britain had been scheduled since April to report at the meeting on the ramifications of a possible anti-missile system for Western Europe.

Once again, McNamara's dazzling style of showering statistics and rationales on skeptics apparently was effective. But past performance shows that this technique often only suppresses doubt, without eliminating it. There are some indications that a "morning after" reaction already is developing.

Inquiries by The Washington Post in Western European capitals show there is widespread belief that political factors produced the U.S. decision of Sept. 18 for a limited ABM deployment.

SUSPICION AROUSED

This conviction, in turn, has aroused European suspicion that political and "military-industrial" forces inside the United States will, in turn, push it into massive ABM deployment, over McNamara's opposition, if necessary. McNamara has insisted that the result would be only a mutually-offsetting expenditure of about $40 billion each for the Soviet Union and the United States, without any gain in security, because each nation's offense could penetrate the other's defense.

According to American sources, the political suspicion is correct so far as the timing of the Johnson Administration's Sept. 18 decision was concerned. The Administration, inevitably, has denied that politics influenced its decision in any way.

The United States, in the absence of Soviet readiness to begin talks on limiting nuclear missilery, was originally headed, according to unofficial sources, toward a December announcement of a "light" ABM deployment.

President Johnson, however, confronted with soaring Congressional opposition on all fronts, suddenly accelerated the ABM timetable in an effort to ease the political pressures upon him, according to informed sources.

HEARINGS PLANNED

Among the President's typically multiple objectives, it is said, was a desire to outflank zealous pro-ABM forces in hearings planned by Sen. Henry M. Jackson (D-Wash.), plus an attempt to solicit support for the President's stymied tax increase proposal from pro-ABM members of Congress.

The ABM announcement was geared to help counter charges from hawks on Vietnam policy that the administration additionally was risking the Nation's defenses by avoiding any ABM deployment.

A blanket denial that any "Outside and unrelated pressures" influenced the Administration's ABM decision was newly made Friday by Assistant Defense Secretary Warnke. The "decision to deploy," he said in a major Administration speech, "resulted solely from a careful consideration of the security interests of the United States and its Allies."

The "Chinese-oriented ABM system," said Warnke, was carefully designed to avoid triggering "an acceleration of the strategic arms race with the Soviet Union." By building protection against the outside possibility that "the Chinese leadership might panic and press the button," he said, the United States sought to remove doubts among Asians who ask, "for example, if the United States would really be willing to risk Detroit to save a small Asian nation."

NUCLEAR TREATY

Special concern, said Warnke, was given to the question of whether this thin ABM deployment might impair American-Soviet efforts to achieve a treaty to halt the spread of nuclear weapons. "We came to the conclusion," he said, "that our Chinese-oriented ABM deployment should make it easier, and not harder, for countries in Asia to sign the NPT (non-proliferation treaty)."

No attempt, however, was made to make the same claim where the Europeans are concerned. The decision, in fact, has had the reverse effect there.

To the Western Europeans, China is very remote, its potential physical threat to them is remote, and extra suspicion therefore falls on the U.S. decision.

Western Europeans, preoccupied with the Soviet Union and their own security, automatically interpreted the U.S. decision in that dimension.

What looms in West Germany's official concern is that the nuclear non-proliferation treaty that the Soviet Union and the United States are urging it to participate in, might preclude a Western European anti-missile systems, because an ABM system employs nuclear warheads to knock down incoming missiles.

REACTION IN BONN

From Bonn, Dan Morgan of The Washington Post Foreign Service reported that the American ABM decision has further undermined the credibility of U.S. intentions about the nuclear treaty. Some Germans are contending that the U.S. action has cast doubt on the stability of the existing nuclear "ballance of terror," and that the whole structure of defense concepts may require reexamination.

But paradoxically, the British position, as stated at Scarborough, England, last week by Defense Minister Denis Healey is that: "There is no evidence whatsoever that any ABM system of which we have any knowledge today will produce a meaningful deterrent against a major nuclear power."

Healey expressed a similar position in private talks at Ankara with defense ministers of the United States, Germany, Italy, Turkey, Canada and the Netherlands.

There the defense chiefs discussed, inconclusively, whether any anti-missile system could be effective against the seven or eight hundred Soviet intermediate-range ballistic missiles targeted on Western Europe. The shorter range makes the problem technologically different from countering missiles fired between continents. Beyond that, Europe's close, crowded cities compound the problem of operating separate, national systems. The alternative, a multinational anti-missile system, raises the familiar nuclear force dilemma of who will pay for it, and more importantly, whose finger will be on the trigger.

EFFICACY DISPUTED

At the top, official level in Britain, the Washington Post bureau in London reported, one source said he accepts the American word that its limited ABM is directed at China and not against Russia. But he disputed the efficacy of that system and expressed belief it was adopted only because of intense political pressure in the United States.

An American counter-argument in this debate which is carried on largely behind the scenes, is this: Britain cannot admit that any ABM system is effective, for to do so would be to nullify Britain's own limited nuclear offensive force.

From Paris, Don Louchheim of The Washington Post Foreign Service reported that French officials are having a field day with the disquiet caused by the American decision.

"Predictably," he reported, the French "see a new vindication for their policy of disengagement from the Atlantic Alliance," and are "playing up the fact that there was little or no consultation before the decision."

"Some Frenchmen have even suggested that by creating an anti-missile barrier in the United States, Washington has made Europe more vulnerable, as a common enemy might prefer to send its nuclear weapons toward undefended targets."

REAFFIRMING THESIS

"The French, therefore, are quietly capitalizing on the ABM decision to reaffirm their thesis that 1. Europe must fend for itself; 2. A separate French nuclear force is more necessary than ever, and 3. NATO is for all practical purposes an American pawn, where

Washington calls the tune unilaterally and everyone must dance to it, whether they agree or not."

Gen. Pierre Gallois and other French nuclear strategists maintain that the limited French nuclear force, delivering weapons by low-flying supersonic planes, can elude any anti-missile defense. The French contend, Louchheim reported, that at comparatively low cost, new attack systems can be devised, rendering each new defensive screen a costly anachronism.

By uninterested timing, the new ABM debate inside the Alliance coincides with a conference in Ditchley, England, this week on proposals for modernizing the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to cope with the problems of the future.

Deputy Under Secretary of State Foy D. Kohler heads one of four subcommittees that will coordinate their private reports in a study initiated last year by Belgian Foreign Minister Pierre Harmel. These projections are scheduled to be presented to the NATO foreign ministers at their December meeting in Brussels.

The specific subject of a possible ABM system for Western Europe, however, presently is not scheduled for further major discussions until a spring meeting in The Hague of the NATO Nuclear Planning Group. These additional studies were requested, at Ankara, by West Germany and Italy. But inevitably the ABM dilemma for Western Europe can recur and rebound almost anywhere in Europe.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 20, 1967]

GENIE OUT OF THE BOTTLE

Secretary McNamara's San Francisco speech was evidently a replay of his brilliantly reasoned, impassioned appeal to Premier Kosygin at Glassboro to halt a dangerous new round in the strategic nuclear arms race.

Between these two speeches there intervened President Johnson's decision to build a "light" anti-ballistic-missile (ABM) system, probably designed for defense against the Republicans as much as against the Communist Chinese. The question now is whether this secondary decision, taken on what Mr. McNamara called "marginal grounds," will thwart the country's major security objective: to get the arms race under control. We do not think this will advance it.

Mr. Johnson has thrown a $5-billion fish to the cats. Will it quiet the country's military-industrial complex and its Congressional spokesmen? Or will construction of the proposed ABM defense lead to irresistible political pressure to build a $40-billion defense program for 25 cities, then fifty or more? The initial indications are that the advocates of heavy anti-missile defenses will not be appeased.

The illusory argument that population will be truly protected by ABM's and casualties reduced has a political appeal that the counter arguments, for all their logic, cannot match. The fact tends to get lost that offense always outruns the defense and that both the Soviet Union and the United States can build sufficient weapons to overwhelm the other's ABM system.

The probable effect on this country—a vast and essentially useless escalation of armaments expenditure in money and resources—is bad enough; even more dangerous is the likely effect on Russia.

"The Soviet Union and the United States mutually influence one another's strategic plans," Mr. McNamara points out. "Actions—or even realistically potential actions—on either side relating to the build-up of nuclear forces, be they either offensive or defensive weapons, necessarily trigger reactions on the other side. It is precisely this action-reaction phenomenon that fuels an arms race."

The Soviet Union may be reasonably sure that the current American intention is not to go beyond a defense against the relatively weak Chinese threat; but they also know that present American intentions could change and that there are domestic American political pressures which prove especially effective every two years as elections approach. Thus what appears clear to Americans—that the ABM system is in fact being built primarily to cope with China—may not appear so clear to Russians. And if they act according to their fears, as they usually do, the race will be on again.

The irony in the decision to go ahead at this point with anti-missile defense is that, as Mr. McNamara said, "none of the systems at the present or foreseeable state of the art would provide an impenetrable shield over the United States." The Soviet Union can build enough nuclear warheads to saturate any level of American defense. Even a Chinese missile attack on a small scale would probably destroy several American cities. Security against China will continue to rest largely on deterrence—and that means the existence of overwhelming offensive strength.

Some Administrative advisers believe American work on an anti-missile system will speed a Soviet response to American proposals for limitation of offensive and defensive missiles. But the Russians have more than sufficient incentive to open negotiations; the multiple-warhead offensive missels the United States already is building will be able to penetrate Soviet defenses.

The decision to go ahead with a limited ABM system makes it less likely that the genie of a new nuclear arms race can be put back into the bottle. But it remains imperative that every effort continue to bring it under some kind of control.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 19, 1967]

THE WRONG RACE

"There is a kind of mad momentum intrinsic to the development of all new nuclear weaponry," Secretary McNamara said yesterday in announcing President Johnson's decision to install a "thin," "China-oriented" $5 billion anti-ballistic missile system over the next five years. And he added: "The danger in deploying this . . . system is going to be that pressures will develop to expand it into a heavy Soviet-oriented ABM system."

This is indeed the danger, and it is demonstrated in no small way by the very decision which Mr. McNamara made the occasion for an eloquent and compelling argument against a race for armaments and in favor of a "race toward reasonableness." Just last January, Mr. McNamara was telling the Senate Armed Services that a decision to build a Chinese-oriented ABM system "need not be made this year." In the meantime, he has produced no fresh evidence which would suggest a heightened Chinese threat. There has, however, been very heightened political pressure for an American ABM system to counter suspected ABM deployments by the Russians. One can only conjecture whether this pressure may not have had something to do with the decision to announce the beginnings of a "thin," anti-Chinese ABM system at this time, and wonder, too, about the "reasonableness" of this.

Still less is the layman able to judge with much competence whether such a "thin" system is needed at all. On this point, the word and judgment of those who possess the intelligence data and the incredibly intricate technical knowledge must be taken largely on faith, for there was little in the Secretary's address to document this need.

Where Mr. McNamara was considerably more persuasive, however, was in his argument that the next step—towards a heavy ABM system—would take us and the Russians off on a "foolish and reckless course." It would, the Secretary said, be a strong inducement for the Soviets to "vastly increase their own offensive forces." And this, he added, would "make it necessary for us to respond in turn—and so the arms race would rush hopelessly on to no sensible purpose on either side."

This is the heart of the matter. And if we are obliged to assume that the Administration knows what it's talking about when it talks of the need for a "thin," Chinese-oriented ABM system, we must also assume that our officials and our experts and our scientists also know what they are talking about when they say that the Russian-American nuclear arms race has passed the point where either contestant can hope to gain decisively by continuing it.

If the Russians want to continue it anyway, out of false hope or for their own internal political needs, they would not require the pretext of the President's decision to deploy a new ABM missile system. Pretexts for arms spending can always be found. Conversely, if they see some merit in an agreement which would ratify the current stand-off, and slow or halt the nuclear arms race, they can quite readily ignore our ABM deployment for they are, after all, installing some such system of their own.

It is up to them—and up to us. If there is to be a race towards reasonableness, as Mr. McNamara rightly said, "we had better all run that race."

[From the New York Times, Sept. 19, 1967]

IN THE NATION: A NIGHTMARE DEBATE

(By Tom Wicker)

WASHINGTON, September 18.—Secretary McNamara, in announcing the Administration's decision to build a limited missile defense system, provided an unusual glimpse into the grisly, Strangelovish world of megatonnage and "assured destruction," where it makes no sense to "over-destroy" a target, but where one calculates how many millions of people must be incinerated before the damage becomes "unacceptable" to a society that wants to remain "viable."

All of that, of course, is merely horrible. The nuclear planner's world becomes truly grotesque—a maniacal joke on humanity—only when it is realized that nuclear "capability" is both fearsomely destructive and practically impotent.

As McNamara points out, nuclear capability cannot stop subversion in Southeast Asia or force commercial concessions in Africa or keep Latin America subservient to Washington's wishes. Nuclear capability is not like the British Navy in the nineteenth century, or the Marines, or the Green Berets, it has none of the practical possibilities for asserting power or persuading the recalcitrant that all other weapons possess.

Thus, American nuclear capability, at root, exists to convince Russian nuclear capability that it cannot destroy the United States without causing the Soviet Union to be destroyed, too; and Soviet nuclear capability exists for the reverse reason. To use either for a lesser purpose would be both impractical and dangerous.

This is the macabre proposition that lies at the root of the dangerous and divisive political debate that is sure to follow McNamara's chilling speech. The question at issue will be whether the terrible balance that renders both Soviet and American nuclear power useless for anything but mutual destruction is slowly being disrupted so that nuclear warfare, however infernal, might become a practical proposition for the Soviet Union.

Already, influential members of Congress—backed by some powerful military voices—are saying that the limited missile defense system to be erected against possible Chinese attack should be expanded into a massive system capable of defending against a Soviet attack. McNamara argued vigorously against this proposition with the nightmare logic that makes the nuclear planner's world so incredible and so blood-curdling.

Building a defense against Soviet attack, he said, would cause the Soviets vastly to increase their offensive capability. At the same time they would surely deploy their own defensive system to match ours, so that the United States would have to improve the American offensive ability. In the end, both sides would have spent billions; neither would have achieved additional security; and the arms race would have spiraled a notch higher toward that point where the ultimate confrontation might become inevitable.

The counter-arguments are that the Soviet Union will not in the long run have the technical and industrial capacity to maintain such a nuclear race with the United States; but that if Moscow deploys a missile defense first, the Soviets may come to believe that the American nuclear capability is no longer effective, and that they can launch a nuclear war without being themselves destroyed. There are also those who believe that the Soviets already may have made significant gains in defensive technology, which the United States will have to match.

At a less rarefied level of argument, there is not much doubt that if the Soviets do proceed with a missile defense, any American administration is likely to come under tremendous political pressure to match it, on the grounds that the security of the American people is at stake.

Thus, in announcing plans to build the limited defense system, the Administration took several calculated risks. One was that the announcement would end any chance of negotiations with the Soviets on nuclear arms limitations—although McNamara himself believes the limited nature of the Administration plan will, instead, encourage the Soviets to take part in such talks.

Another was that taking the little step will produce irresistable political pressure for taking a large step that McNamara plainly labeled dangerous and foolish, since he believes it would set both Washington and Moscow off on another form of nuclear arms race.

Finally, if the Soviets believe the limited defense system is only a first step in a larger system erected against their nuclear power, they might move ahead with their own defenses. That would leave McNamara and the Administration no choice but to enter the "foolish and reckless" competition they hope to avoid.

[From the Providence Journal, Sept. 20, 1967]

An Ominous Decision

The administration's decision to start building an anti-missile defense system opens an ominous new chapter in the nuclear arms race. It also puts the nation on a course that is clouded with doubts, uncertainties, and imponderables.

This is to be only a "thin" anti-missile deployment. As Defense Secretary McNamara pointed out, no existing or foreseeable defensive system could present an effective counter to a massive enemy attack on this country involving swarms of sophisticated ballistic missiles. The offense still enjoys a wide margin of superiority over the defense in this area. No matter how elaborate the defense system may be, it can be penetrated and frustrated if the attacker has at his disposal large numbers of missiles equipped with presently available penetration aids. Both Soviet Russia and the United States now have arsenals of such missiles, Mr. McNamara says, and neither can erect an effective defense against them.

Why, then was the decision made to proceed with any anti-missile deployment? It was made, Mr. McNamara explains, not to protect against an attack from Soviet Russia, but to protect against Communist China. The Red Chinese now are developing a nuclear capacity. By the mid-1970s they are expected to have a few long-range ballistic missiles with nuclear warheads. At that time, Mr. McNamara says, Red China might be so "incautious" as to attempt a nuclear attack on the United States.

"It would be insane and suicidal for her to do so," Mr. McNamara adds, "but one can conceive conditions under which China might miscalculate. We wish to reduce such possibilities to the minimum."

The "thin" deployment outlined by the administration, it is hoped, would be adequate to counter the relatively few and relatively unsophisticated nuclear missiles that China will have by the 1970s.

The price of this "thin" deployment of an anti-missile missile system comes high. Some four billion dollars already has been spent over the last seven years on preliminary development. Mr. McNamara suggests that an additional five billion may bring the system into being, though that estimate could balloon to a much higher figure as the complexities are worked out.

But far more disquieting than the costs involved are the pressures from many directions that are certain to be stimulated by this decision.

Some of the members of Congress—with Sen. John O. Pastore in the lead—already are demanding that we plunge ahead beyond the proposed "thin" deployment and erect a far more elaborate defensive system. They are quite unmoved by Mr. McNamara's arguments that such a system would be utterly futile.

No matter how carefully the "thin deployment is worked out, there are certain to be some cities or some regions that feel they have been neglected. The consequence inevitably will be pressures from these cities or regions to extend the system to give them "protection."

Nor are our friends abroad likely to view this development with complacency. Some of them are possible targets of nuclear blackmail from Red China. If they see us erecting an umbrella to protect ourselves from the Chinese threat, is it not logical to expect that they will pressure us to extend the umbrella to include them?

More subtle pressures unquestionably will be brought to bear by the aerospace industries that will profit by this huge expenditure for an anti-missile system. The financial community already is fingering the potential gainers, and the reaction in Wall Street to Mr. McNamara's announcement was a surge in the prices of stock of affected companies.

The total effect of these various pressures will be a massive effort to force us far beyond the relatively modest proposal outlined by Mr. McNamara. The Defense Secretary must have been aware of this consequence, for at one point in his address he observed: "There is kind of mad momentum intrinsic to the development of all nuclear weaponry."

There is, indeed, and a serious problem for the nation in the period ahead almost surely will be trying to keep our wits and our sense of values as we are swept along on this "mad momentum."

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 28, 1967]

A Defense Policy and New Dangers

(By Adam Yarmolinsky)

(Note.—The writer, former special assistant to Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara, is currently a professor of law at Harvard University.)

The administration's decision to produce a light anti-ballistic missile system as a defense against the threat of a possible Chinese nuclear attack by the mid-1970's was heralded by the most carefully hedged pronouncement of major military policy ever delivered in public. But all that care may not have been enough to prevent a new arms race.

Secretary McNamara spent the great bulk of his oversize (for him) San Francisco speech explaining why an anti-ballistic missile system aimed at Soviet missiles would do us no good at all. He argued that the only reasonable U.S. response to a major Soviet anti-missile buildup would be to increase the number and sophistication of our own missiles, so that we would be quite sure that we still had what is called an assured second-strike capability. That is Pentagon language for the power to get through and knock out the Soviet Union with our surviving nuclear weapons, even after we had sustained the heaviest strike the Russians could launch against us. He also pointed out that the inevitable Soviet response to a U.S. anti-ballistic missile system aimed at catching their missiles in midair would be to build up their nuclear arsenal until they could saturate any ABM system we set up—and there was no doubt about their having the resources to do it. He went on to say that the United States had clear nuclear superiority over the Soviet Union—in raw megatonage, as well as in numbers of weapons deliverable on target—but that this superiority, which would continue for the foreseeable future, did not and could not prevent the Soviets from acquiring a second-strike capability of their own.

With both sides able to destroy each other, but only at the price of self-destruction, we and the Soviets are indeed like Churchill's two scorpions in a bottle, and nuclear power is indeed an instrument of very limited effectiveness. In Berlin, in Korea, in Vietnam, nuclear power is of no value, on either side.

But the United States is still about to build an ABM system designed to catch any Chinese missile that might be thrown at us in the next decade. Secretary McNamara was at great pains to emphasize that neither the anti-Chinese system nor any system we could deploy would be effective against Soviet missiles. And he warned of the twin dangers of persuading ourselves that, with an anti-Chinese ABM system, our nuclear power could somehow substitute for conventional forces in Asia, or of sliding into the production of a more elaborate system directed against the Soviets.

There are a number of questions, however, that were not raised in his speech: why should the United States abandon reliance on its nuclear deterrent as an effective means to persuade the Chinese not to risk self-destruction? What if the Chinese were to threaten the United States with a surface missile based on a junk anchored a hundred miles off the California coast? Or a suitcase bomb smuggled into the country? If we can, and must rely on the deterrence of our assured second-strike capability not to be blackmailed by these possibilities, why can't we rely on deterrence against Chinese ICBMs?

But the decision has been taken. The important issue now is whether we can avoid dangers foreshadowed in the McNamara speech. Is it really possible to resist the pressures to expand the new system? If the projected talks with the Soviets fail to produce mutual restraints on building ABMs, will we find ourselves in another stage of the nuclear arms race that gives us no more military security, consumes immense resources, and only makes it harder to reach essential political agreements like the nonproliferation treaty

Even Soviet scientists concede that a political decision by the Soviet Government to deploy a major ABM system would be irrational. Surely the United States can avoid playing follow-the-leader in so senseless and dangerous a game. The issue is complex, but not so complex that it can't be understood, if properly explained, by those who will stop to read about it. President

Eisenhower's warning about the military industrial complex is relevant here, but with vigilance it can be resisted, particularly since the defense budget has been remarkably well-protected from the kind of congressional log-rolling that goes on with, say, rivers and harbor appropriations.

[From Newsday, Sept. 25, 1967]

STATE OF AFFAIRS

(By Clayton Fritchey)

NEW YORK.—There is one unremarked peculiarity about the Administration's new "light" defense against the Chinese nuclear missiles which calls for further explanation.

The building of the projected anti-ballistic missile (ABM) system apparently can be stopped in its tracks by merely one Russian diplomatic move, or at least that seems to be the message that emerges from further study of Defense Secretary McNamara's exposition of the government's present nuclear strategy.

Not having any faith in the effectiveness of ABMs, and knowing they might ultimately cost the U.S. $40 billion or more, the Administration has been trying for months to get an agreement with Russia against their deployment, either on a "heavy" or "light" scale.

Now, however, under increasing political and military pressure to build an anti-missile system in the U.S., the Administration has given ground, but it is significant that it emphasizes it has not lost hope that it can still reach an agreement with Russia to halt an ABM race.

McNamara is still pointedly saying "Both our nations would benefit from a properly safeguarded agreement first to limit, and later to reduce, both our offensive and defensive strategic nuclear forces." And he added, "We hope we can . . . achieve such an agreement." Later, the State Department's spokesman said the same thing. "We intend to continue trying," he said.

Beginning today, Secretary of State Rusk will be at the United Nations for a week where he will be discussing missiles (among other things) with Andrei Gromyko, the Soviet Foreign Minister. The U.S. Ambassador to Russia, Llewellyn Thompson, and the chief U.S. disarmament negotiator, William C. Foster, also will be on hand.

But if Russia accedes to our wishes, and agrees to an ABM freeze, what happens to the Administration's newly-announced plan for a missile defense system against Communist China? The implication is that it would be dropped, but, intentionally or not, there remains some confusion about this.

It goes without saying that Russia would hardly agree to a freeze if the U.S. insisted on going ahead, as planned, for the next five years with an new ABM system which could be used to defend against Russia as well as China. But if the Administration halts its ABM program in order to get the agreement it desires so much, does that leave the U.S. exposed to a Chinese nuclear attack? Or was that threat mostly conjured up to justify spending billions to develop the ABMs?

Alas, poor McNamara: it always devolves on him to try to explain to the public why it is urgent for the Administration to do things that it previously had said were undesirable, unnecessary, impracticable, extravagant, and dangerous. Such as bombing Hanoi and Haiphong. Such as the "barrier" across Vietnam. Such as the new ABM defense.

In announcing the anti-Chinese missile plan, McNamara made a withering attack on the whole ABM principle of defense. He virtually reduced it to fantasy. As a clincher, he said: "The four prominent scientists (who served as advisers to Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson) have unanimously recommended against the deployment of an ABM system designed to protect our population against Soviet attack."

McNamara's case against the effectiveness of ABMs is, in fact, so logical and overwhelming that it is hard to take seriously his involved explanation of why it is nevertheless necessary to develop an ABM system to save ourselves from China. Peking has already astonished the world with the speed of its nuclear development. If, as McNamara says, Russia can easily penetrate the "heaviest" possible ABM defense, it surely cannot be long before China is able to penetrate a "light" one.

The ABMs may not prove very effective against China when it develops long-range nuclear capacity, but momentarily at least they have knocked the wind out of Administration critics who had hoped to make political capital of the issue, which, after all, is an important mission, too.

Even more important, though, is what the Administration will say when and if the U.S. and Russia agree on an ABM freeze. Who will be tapped to tell the American public why China is suddenly no longer a nuclear threat to the U.S., and hence the new anti-missile system is no longer needed? We hope it isn't McNamara. He deserves relief.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 20, 1967]

NEW SOVIET CRISIS SEEN OVER U.S. MISSILE PLAN

(By Victor Zorza)

Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara's announcement that the United States is to build an ABM system to protect itself against China threatens to precipitate a major crisis in the Kremlin, of the kind that led to the fall of Khrushchev in 1964.

Many Soviet leaders will insist, in spite of McNamara's strenuous effort to reassure them, that the American ABM system is designed to neutralize not only Chinese but also Soviet missiles. They will therefore use the American announcement as ammunition in their struggle, which has grown increasingly intense in recent months, to get a much bigger slice of the nation's resources for a major rearmament program.

In this struggle Brezhnev, the party secretary, stands by and large on the military platform, and Premier Kosygin on the civilian.

Evidence gleaned between the lines of the Soviet press shows that Kosygin's position has already been dangerously undermined by the military political lobby. It is now in danger of collapsing altogether.

The Kremlin policy struggle is not a straight-forward contest between civilians and military. Nor is it a stark confrontation between those who simply want more money for defense, and those who prefer to have more consumer goods. Within this rough and ready outline, it is possible to discern contradictory trends and cross-currents, the most important of which concerns the Soviet ABM program.

Whether the Soviet Union is to build a full-fledged ABM system has been a major political issue in the Kremlin for many years. There is no reason to assume that the ABM installations around Moscow represent an advanced system. There is even less reason to make any such assumption about Soviet installations elsewhere—near Leningrad and Tallin, east of the Urals, or in South Russia.

EFFICACY QUESTIONED

The latest outburst of the Soviet ABM debate became evident in February, when some of Russia's highest military authorities took mutually contradictory positions in public on the efficacy of the Soviet system. Some of the statements, made on Armed Forces Day, could be read as saying that the Soviet ABM system was capable of providing reliable defenses—while others seemed designed to suggest that it provided no such thing.

The controversy was still at full tilt earlier this month when Marshal Krylov, the commander-in-chief of the strategic missile forces, listed publicly the factors which "ensure that rockets are virtually invulnerable, especially when used en masse."

For Krylov to say that missiles are "virtually invulnerable" is to deny any validity to the argument in favor of a Soviet ABM. For him to argue that large numbers make them even less vulnerable is to say that he wants more missiles, not more ABMs. This is much the same as McNamara's own arguments against those who want an anti-Soviet ABM.

The contrary view has been expressed most recently by Marshal Chuikov, the head of civil defense, who listed "our ABM" as being among "the best means of defending our country against a nuclear attack." It was their task to ensure, he said, that hostile missiles "will be destroyed even before they approach Soviet borders.

The inconclusive nature of the Soviet policy debate and the shifting alignments within even the military leadership, are best shown by the fact that during the February outburst Marshal Chuikov was still among those who tended to cast doubt on the effectiveness on an ABM.

PRESSURE INCREASES

But after February it became evident that the pressure for a Soviet ABM had greatly increased, and Marshal Chuikov's change of front is only one of a number of indications of the growing strength of the military-political lobby. The pressure found vent publicly in the military press, which had also provided similar indications, just before the fall of Khrushchev, of the gradual weakening of his position.

At that time, the military-political lobby urged the allocation of greater resources to heavy industry and to steel production which provide, even in modern times, the necessary underpinning for defense industries. The same symbols, and issues, have re-emerged in the course of the current Soviet policy debate, but this time they are linked with the demand for even greater resources needed to develop and deploy an ABM system.

Modern weapons development, said "Red Star," the army paper, had raised the role of economic factors to an "extraordinary" extent, and had faced the economy—"and particularly heavy industry"—with a number of new demands. The production of new weapons, including "anti-missile defenses, requires huge economic efforts," the newspaper said.

The military competition with the civilian sector for more money was only one element in the struggle. Kosygin was the great champion of the economic reform which would, in his view, improve Russia's economic and scientific potential so greatly as to provide the country with the necessary defense capability. Indeed, Kosygin's argument can be read as pressing for economic reform as the best way to provide the necessary military strength.

But writers in "Communist of the Armed Forces" argued that the reform, and economic and scientific potential, did not of themselves constitute military strength. "Actual defense measures," they argued, "are also necessary." And the implication was that those who were stressing the economic aspect were neglecting the real needs of defense.

How the fortunes of the battle went could best be judged by observing the debate on steel production. Under Khrushchev, this fight led to the identification of the military-political lobby as "metal eaters" in attacks on them published in the Soviet press.

After the fall of Khrushchev the steel production target was increased, but last year the differences between Brezhnev and Kosygin on this issue were almost allowed to come out in public. At the Party congress, Brezhnev condemned (Khrushchev's) "incorrect viewpoint" that modern substitutes would reduce the need for steel, and announced that this error would now be put right in the development of the steel industry.

BREZHNEV CHALLENGED

Kosygin, on the other hand, opened his remarks on steel by assuring the Congress that the industry had "considerable achievements" to its credit, and that in some ways it had even surpassed "the most developed capitalist countries." He was, in effect, challenging Brezhnev's implied view that the country needed much more steel. By last May Brezhnev also came to praise the steel industry—but only in order to bury Kosygin. He recalled that before the last war Russia was producing 18 million tons of steel; after the war this rose to 60 million, and now it was a 100 million. "And still," he said, "this cannot satisfy us."

It evidently satisfied Kosygin, but not the military-political lobby. Although the official steel target for 1970 is 124–129 million tons, Kosygin's planners had sabotaged it so effectively that the party leadership was constrained to issue a public rebuke to them.

This was in the form of a joint decision by the party central committee and the Government, which declared the "accelerated development" of the steel industry to be a highly important national task. It therefore ordered the "substantial intensification" of capital construction in the steel industry to enable it to achieve the 1970 output targets.

This can only mean that Kosygin, who is in charge of the economy, had viewed the proposed massive increase from just over 100 million tons this year to nearly 130 million tons within the next three years as wrong.

If he had provided the necessary production capacity in the first place, there would have been no need last month to issue orders for a speedup. The announcement was a major defeat for Kosygin, and a victory for the military-political lobby, whose pressure on behalf of heavy industry was also a pressure for steel—and for a Soviet ABM system.

As Marshal Krylov's article showed earlier this month, the victory of the military political lobby was confined to the steel issue—otherwise he would not have been able to publicly denigrate the effectiveness of the ABM.

But if the United States is building one, then those Soviet leaders who might have been willing to engage in talks on an ABM moratorium with the U.S. will have had the ground knocked from under them.

But might the American action provide a final incentive for the Russians, perhaps, to engage in talks with the United States, before deciding on a large-scale Soviet ABM development? It just conceivably might—but McNamara would first have to allay the misgivings which his announcement is bound to have aroused in the Kremlin.

[From the New Yorker, Sept. 30, 1967]

THE TALK OF THE TOWN

For a few encouraging years, it seemed as if President Eisenhower's valedictory warning against "the military-industrial complex" could safely be set aside. Civilian leadership, prodded and supported by President Kennedy, overwhelmed the startled generals with an almost terrifyingly brilliant combination of cost-analysis techniques, computerized strategy, and austere human intelligence. Secretary of Defense McNamara and his men soon knew more about the business of defense than the military itself, and combined the courage to make decisions with the skill to justify them. For a while, the enemies of "the McNamara revolution" were reduced to making the extraordinarily feeble and self-defeating assertion that the new civilian leadership was *too* intelligent and logical—as if the business of defense were properly an affair of the heart. In any event, new and terribly expensive weapons, the B–70 bomber among them, were rejected by the civilian leadership—judgments that in retrospect are for the most part unimpeachable. The effects of the McNamara years are too deeply embedded to be wholly dislodged, but there is mounting evidence that the military is now using the increased leverage given it by the Vietnam war to reassert is primacy over civilian control, and is finding an increasingly responsive President and Secretary of State. The military chiefs' recommendations for escalation in Vietnam now become national policy, despite apparent objections by the Secretary of Defense. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Earle G. Wheeler, disagrees ever more boldly and publicly with his civilian superiors, and clearly this superlatively cautious man would not venture to do so without considerable informal encouragement. Recently, Marine Commandant General Wallace M. Greene, Jr., took it upon himself to tell the country that Vietnam was far more important than any minor disturbances by a few Negro malcontents—exactly the kind of military intrusion into broad national concerns that seemed to have disappeared with the Eisenhower years. And now all these tokens of a military renaissance have culminated in the decision, after a decade-long battle, to build an anti-ballistic-missile, or A.B.M., system. Both the Secretary of Defense and the President were previously opposed to such a system.

Almost every independent scientific expert has concluded that a missile-defense system would be a costly, probably dangerous, and finally futile addition to the arms race. Yet we are going to build it just the same. Because the military and its allies want to. And because the President is unwilling to confront the political costs and pressures of a refusal. Apparently, the most important reason for the decision is the desire to deprive Republicans of the opportunity to make "the anti-missile gap" an issue in 1968. No one has clearly defined the phrase "military-industrial complex." Certainly, it's not, in any sense, a coherent and malevolent conspiracy. Nevertheless, it does exist. It consists basically of much of the military leadership, the large industrial firms that make weapons, and the members of Congress who have assimilated their public careers with the cause of armed strength. These people are impelled by motives ranging all the way from the desire for profits, through honest fear, to fierce patriotic dedication. However, the disparate impulses invariably converge in a continuous and powerful advocacy of more and better weapons and in an opposition to arms control. With the decision to begin the missile defense, they have won perhaps their greatest victory.

The arguments that are used to justify this decision indicate its remoteness from any logical analysis of the national interest. Until a few weeks ago, our official position was that we would not set up missile defenses if the Russians would also refrain. Now we intend to build a "light" system (only from five to ten billion dollars' worth), to defend ourselves against still nonexistent Chinese rockets. Plainly, if we need a defense against China, then to promise not to set up A.B.M.'s if the Soviet Union similarly held back was a dangerous blunder, since it would leave us defenseless against the Chinese. This mask of illogic must, therefore, conceal the real consideration: the military and its allies are eager to get going with missile defenses. We cannot afford a real defense against Russia, which by McNamara's estimate would cost forty billion dollars, and might well cost twice as much, and a smaller effort can be justified only by calling upon that convenient devil China.

The arguments that swirl around missile defense are labyrinthine and often technical. Yet there are some fairly clear considerations—the same ones that led Secretary McNamara to oppose any defense and that now support his continuing hostility to a system for countering Soviet attack. The first such consideration—and one that in a different official mood would be conclusive—is that there is no way to build a defense that cannot be overwhelmed. If the Russians build enough missiles, or put more warheads on the missiles they already have, they will be able to blow us up no matter how many A.B.M.s we construct. As the Secretary has said, it is extremely unrealistic to assume that the Russians would not do this. Of course, we would do the same. (Soon, scientific progress will lay to rest the archaic formula "One rocket, one city" by topping a single missile with ten or more hydrogen bombs, which after crossing the Atlantic together would disperse to ten different urban areas.) Thus, after we had spent tens of billions of dollars and encircled our cities with nuclear weapons, both countries would still be able to destroy each other—which is exactly where we are now. If the Soviet Union should construct defenses while we refrained from doing so, we could nullify its efforts simply by improving our offensive power, and thus again preserve the now familiar assurance of mutual destruction. There is no escape from this logical certainty. For the important thing about missile defenses is that they will not stop all missiles. A certain number will get through. Perhaps twenty-five per cent, perhaps fifty per cent, perhaps seventy-five per cent. No one really knows, and no one will ever know until the day of Armageddon. There is no way of testing such defenses against all the stratagems and technological devices that may be contrived to deceive them. Anyway, air defense has invariably proved less effective in actual combat than on the testing fields. Even if some distant day of scientific wonders enables us to guarantee ninety-per-cent perfection, then, as ten hydrogen warheads descend on Washington, there will be, at most, a few moments for quiet pride in the fact that nine of them will never reach the target.

The second consideration is that the potential cost of this particular upward spiral in the arms race is unlimited. In this respect, it is the ultimate dream of a weapons system. The flaw in previous strategies was that once there were enough missiles to blow the other fellow up a few times over, no more were really needed. (We have three or four times as many as the Russians, but we still assume they could destroy us.) However, once a race between defense and offense begins, there is never enough. Of course, it is possible to stop at any arbitrary point—say, ten billion dollars, or fifty—and we undoubtedly will stop, but that makes no logical sense. For if you are serious about defense, you must strive for a system that really defends you, and since there is no such system, you must build forever. Russia and, ultimately, China will increase their offensive strength to counter our A.B.M.s, which means we will need more. And we will increase our own offensive strength as their defenses grow. All this will be distorted by the pragmatic necessity of assuming that the other side has better defenses than it actually has and that our own will not work as well as we have calculated. In addition, there will be the pressure from unguarded cities. After all, it will be hard for the citizens of Butte, Montana, to understand why they should be left to nuclear incineration while New Yorkers are permitted to view the holocaust comfortably on television as A.B.M.s swat hostile rockets from Manhattan skies.

These are among the reasons our government has continued to reject a full-scale defense against Russia, though few doubt that, however limited the present step may be, it points the way toward far more extensive systems. For even if we accept today's justification at face value, the argument for a defense against China lacks rational force. McNamara, with his fatal bent toward intellectual honesty, has practically said as much, announcing our decision with the far from ringing affirmation that since we must be "conservative" and must always take into account "the possible irrational behavior" of our foes, "there are marginal grounds for concluding that a light deployment of U.S. A.B.M.s . . . is prudent," and, anyway, "the system would be relatively inexpensive." (Martin Luther King, Roy Wilkins, et al. will be glad to know it is only five billion dollars to start.) Such strained and reluctant prose must surely flow from the Secretary's knowledge of how little we are buying.

Defensive rockets will be pointed toward our northern border to intercept Chinese missiles taking, as the laws of physics recommend, the great-circle route to America (although some long-range A.B.M.s will theoretically be able to defend other approaches to the country). This will make it possible for most collisions to occur over Canada. Other A.B.M.s will be placed around our missile "farms," popularly known as bases. Once the Chinese build a large-scale striking force—say, from one hundred to two hundred warheads—this defense will be useless for exactly the same reasons that now apply in the case of Russia. Thus, its value is limited to the period between the present—when the Chinese have no missiles—and the time they enter the select company of nations able to devastate their enemies. This may be a very short interval indeed, since once a country has built its first dozen rockets it can easily, and swiftly, build a hundred more. If the Chinese manage to uncover the fact that many warheads can be carried on a single missile, the internal may be shortened even further. Moreover, the ingenious Chinese may well find ways to avoid their assigned routes and our defenses—for example, delivering their bombs by submarine and short-range rockets that will shoot under the system. While their force remains small, and if they are unable to fool or circumvent the "light" defense, it will probably stop a moderately high proportion of their missiles.

Although the abstractions of strategic thought lend themselves to infinite combinations of conjectural moves and countermoves, the fact is that such a defense would have little effect on Chinese policy.

The most the Chinese can hope for from a small striking force is to hold a few American cities hostage to nuclear destruction, thus increasing our reluctance to get involved in a war with them. Since we must accept the likelihood that some missiles will slip through any defense, there is no way to frustrate this objective. Therefore, we will always have to assume that the price of an allout war against China may well be Detroit, Los Angeles, and Chicago. If we ourselves should suddenly decide to make a surprise nuclear attack on China, defenses would be unnecessary, since we could destroy their missiles on the ground. So our A.B.M.s will save some American lives only if the Chinese impatiently decide to shoot their thirty or forty missiles at the United States in the knowledge that the consequence will be the total destruction of China, instead of waiting a few years, by the end of which time they can really do the job properly. Even this weak justification for the "light" defense is diluted by the probability that nuclear war between the United States and China would involve the Soviet Union, against which there is no defense.

If this decision takes us toward the probable goal of a much larger defense system, perhaps the most ominous consequences will be to the national psyche. Until now, nuclear war has been a terrifying but rather abstract possibility. Our weapons of destruction have been secreted on remote Western ranges, and their reality has been communicated to the average citizen through the dulling repetition of statistics and technical terms. If A.B.M.s expand, nuclear rockets will ring our major cities, and, undoubtedly, on Armed Forces Day and other patriotic occasions parents will drive their children out to see the impressive display of national might. The dawning awareness that we all live in armed camps will almost surely have a depressing effect on our thinking and our way of life. The constant physical reminder of danger, with its inevitable addition to the strains of daily life, may well bring closer the time when we will finally say, "Let's get it all over with." At least, we can be sure it will not help to liberate the more noble and creative impulses of the human spirit.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excellent article entitled "MIRV and the Offensive Missile Race," written by Robert Kleiman, and published in the New York Times of Monday, October 9, 1967; and an article entitled "The Grand Illusion," written by Edwin Diamond, and published in Newsweek magazine of October 2, 1967, from which I have quoted.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 9, 1967]

MIRV AND THE OFFENSIVE MISSILE RACE

(By Robert Kleiman)[1]

Pressure from Congress and the Joint Chiefs of Staff for a heavy antiballistc-missile (ABM) system oriented to defense against Soviet attack reflects an old military weakness: preparing to fight the last war.

Technology has overtaken the ABM. The United States already has developed an effective antidote to it—sophisticated multiple warheads for the new offensive missiles, Minuteman III and Poseidon, which are to be deployed in the early 1970's. Official estimates indicate that the Soviet Union can do the same in five to seven years.

Whatever the case for a "light" ABM defense against primitive Chinese missiles, arguments for either superpower to build a $40 billion missile defense to protect its cities against the other are now as dated as the Billy Mitchell bomber-vs.-battleship fight.

A hitherto-secret four-letter acronym, MIRV—Multiple Independent Re-entry Vehicles, and that key word is "independent"—describes an advance in nuclear weaponry that will enable the offense to penetrate any defense now foreseeable.

"Both our missile defense system and [Russia's] were designed before MIRV's came along as a serious possibility," Secretary McNamara admits.

One MIRV missile will be able to carry five or ten or more hydrogen warheads that can separate in flight, change trajectory several times and fly independently to five or ten or more widely dispersed, preselected targets. Equipped with MIRV, America's 1,700 strategic missiles could carry 17,000 or more separately targetable warheads, dwarfing the widely discussed Soviet increase this past year from 300 to about 450 single-warhead intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBM's).

Early in the ABM debate, Secretary McNamara predicted that the Soviet Union and the United States would respond to the other's ABM deployment, if undertaken, by improving offensive capabilities. "All we would accomplish," the Defense Secretary said, "would be to increase greatly both their defense expenditures and ours without any gain in real security to either side."

But now, before substantial ABM systems have been deployed on either side, rapidly advancing technology has vaulted Washington and Moscow into the offensive missle race that was feared for the post-ABM period. And this race is far more dangerous and difficult to control than the race in missile defenses which the U.S. seeks to head off.

The vast increase in offensive warheads that MIRV can provide will spur fear by each that the other is achieving first-strike capability that permits pre-emptive attack.

Extraordinary advances in missle accuracy add to this fear. There was a time when ten incoming missles were required to destroy one hardened ICBM and its single warhead in an underground silo. A one-for-one exchange is now almost attainable.

In the MIRV era, allowing for misfires and misses, ten missiles carrying 100 warheads will be able to destroy 80 to 90 ICBM's caught in their silos, thus wiping out 800 to 900 enemy warheads. If those 800 to 900 were launched first, the other side would need at least 800 to 900 antimissile missiles to intercept most of them.

The logic of this arithmetic—by increasing the fear that the other side may preempt—could turn the relative stability of mutual deterrence into a nightmare of nuclear nervousness.

Can this era still be headed off? Soviet-American talks on the limitation of offensive and defensive missiles have been pending since February. But Moscow has dallied in fixing a date, agreement within the Government evidently not easy.

There have been repeated hints that a concrete American proposal, rather than a plan for exploratory talks, would enable the Soviet leadership to shape an agreed policy more easily. Conversely, the lack of a firm date for a conference makes it difficult for the divided Washington bureaucracy to reach interagency agreement on a specific proposal; a deadline would force agreement.

Secretary Rusk told the Soviet Union in early September that, once a date was fixed American negotiators would come to a conference with "specific and detailed proposals." Some of these proposals may have to be made in advance to get a Soviet response. But Washington is still unprepared to make them, despite months of desultory interagency consultations.

Here is a field in which the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Congressional Joint Atomic Energy Commission could make invaluable contributions. Instead of pressure to race in the building of obsolete defensive missile systems, what is needed is a plan to limit the ABM-MIRV race. It will not be easy.

Spy satellites can count ABM's and offensive missile silos without the on-site inspection Russia has always refused. But they cannot tell whether a MIRV-tipped missile contains five or fifty hydrogen warheads. New approaches to arms control need devising.

The tragedy is that both the United States and the Soviet Union, according to Secretary McNamara, already have strategic nuclear arsenals "greatly in excess" of their present security needs. And "we're planning another big increase" in offensive capability that will be able to overcome "the most powerful defenses the Soviets could build," Mr. McNamara has warned.

With Moscow, presumably, making a similar plan, time clearly is running out.

[From Newsweek, Oct. 2, 1967]

THE GRAND ILLUSION

(By Edwin Diamond)

Secretary McNamara's decision to go ahead with an anti-ballistic-missile (ABM) system is based on a set of brilliantly reasoned, highly sophisticated, and strongly persuasive arguments. But the decision is wrong, and the consequences of this error will burden every American for years to come.

Instead of strengthening the national security, the ABM decision may well undermine it, for it upsets the present delicate balance of nuclear terror based on the twin implicit assumptions of a strong (four-to-one) but not overwhelming U.S. offensive missile superiority and a modest Soviet defensive advantage. Worse, the ABM move signals another dangerous upward spiral in the nuclear-arms race which may lead to a renewed drive by both the U.S. and Soviet Union to add new offensive weapons to the overkill arsenals each already possesses. Roswell L. Gilpatric, McNamara's own former Deputy Defense Secretary, fears the ABM means a U.S. global strategy based more on conflict than accommodation. The go-ahead, he said, "is certainly a move in the wrong direction."

---

[1] Robert Kleiman is a member of the editorial board of The Times.

Let's put these abstractions in concrete terms—and concrete is exactly where we are now heading. At the very least, this new nuclear escalation means the expenditure of untold billions in exchange for a wholly illusory security blanket. Whether the U.S. spends $4 to $5 billion for the "thin" ABM system to guard its Minuteman strike force, or $40 billion for the "thickening" of the blanket to protect major American cities, or $400 billion to protect smaller cities, the end result will be the same: all of us will still be 30 minutes away from nuclear annihilation.

MOLE SOCIETY

Indeed, with the ABM escalation, the possibility of this supposedly "unthinkable" missile Armageddon is greater, no smaller. All of us have now been propelled by the logic of nuclear events that McNamara grasps so well toward the next era of the atomic age—the mole society where the cities and civilians of the 1980's may have to burrow underground to join the concrete Minuteman silos sunk in the 1960s and the subterranean ABM control centers built in the 1970s.

Unlikely, you will say; right out of some science-fiction paperback. But who would have believed, ten years ago, at the time of Sputnik 1 and the "missile gap," that the U.S. within five years would possess the nuclear misisle to destroy the Soviet society and population five times over?

What evidence have I that McNamara—one of the most brilliant and dedicated minds in the nation—is wrong about the ABM? What proof is there that the U.S. has embarked on a dangerous new course? The evidence is abundant. Precisely because McNamara has such a firm grasp of the complexities of the age, he himself has supplied some of the best arguments against the ABM and a new arms race. In fact, if an analyst were to overlay McNamara's speech with one of the cryptologist's sheets that cover some paragraphs while revealing others, the case for the present stabilized strategic situation would become compelling.

ACTION-REACTION

First of all, as McNamara makes clear, the U.S. now has "a numerical superiority over the Soviet Union in reliable, accurate and effective warheads [that] is both greater than we had originally planned, and is in fact more than we require." This, to use the blunt term, is what overkill means. And politically motivated "missile-gap" cries of overkill, to be blunt again, is the legacy of politically motivated "missile-gap" cries of the late 1950s. The panic button was pushed in the U.S. and a real missile gap did eventually materialize. But as McNamara points out in his speech, this gap favors the U.S. At present the U.S. has 2,200 strategic nuclear weapons in readiness against 700 for the U.S.S.R. The Russian response to this U.S. superiority has been to concede an offensive disparity. In effect the Soviet Union acknowledged that the richness and ingenuity of American technology could not be matched. But it began an ABM system—the Russian military has been traditionally defense minded—as part of what McNamara calls the "action-reaction" of the arms race.

McNamara has been conspicuously unworried by this deployment. As he explains it, the offense always has an advantage over the defense and any ABM system "can rather obviously be defeated by an enemy simply sending over more offensive warheads, or dummy warheads, than there are defensive missiles capable of disposing of them."

The logic of the situation calls for one of the superpowers to forgo the next turn in the vicious cycle of action-reaction. A Soviet McNamara—they have their sophisticated strategists and their war gamesmen, too—might argue that the Soviet ABM deployment represented a limited and measured response to U.S. superiority, a move intended to assure Russian second-strike capability and thus make the Soviet deterrent credible. Why not leave the arms race in this trade-off situation? Why upset the fearfully delicate balance of terror with a U.S. ABM system?

McNamara's answer last week was: because of the looming Chinese nuclear-missile threat of the 1970's. The proposed U.S. ABM system, in McNamara's words, is "Chinese-oriented," designed to deter Chairman Mao or his successors from an attack on the U.S. It is at this point that McNamara's computer logic breaks down.

MAD ADVENTURE

First, if Peking is suicidally mad enough to mount an attack on a country possessing 200 times more nuclear power than it has, then no amount of objective reality in the form of an American ABM barrier can dissuade the Chinese from their insanity. If the Chinese are bent on nuclear genocide, they could smuggle an atomic bomb into San Francisco harbor aboard a freighter and detonate it. No ABM system can protect against such mad adventures.

Second, the Soviet Union can also argue that its ABM is "Chinese-oriented," and merely a matter of insurance against an irrational attack by a country that shares an uneasy border with Russia and is violently hostile to it. After all, the same madness that might lead the Chinese to attack the U.S. might also push Mao over the brink with the Russians. Would we believe the Russians if they said, "It's the Chinese we are worried about—ignore our ABM"? Yet we expect them to believe our ABM is China-oriented.

The truth is the ABM decision was dictated not by strategy but by politics. Computer logic breaks down because men aren't computers; they are imperfect beings shaped by history and emotion as well as reason. There are really two McNamaras. One McNamara cooly attempts to manage the arms race by force of argument and intellect. He even on occasion does the Russians' thinking for them, patiently elucidating the nuclear strategic options available and their consequences in speeches and in briefings held for the press, but aimed at Moscow. The second McNamara is an American, a patriot and a member of the Johnson Administration (just as his opposite in the Kremlin is a Russian, a patriot, and a member of the Communist Party).

It is well known in Washington that Secretary McNamara for months has opposed deployment of the ABM system despite the urgings of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, of Democratic hawks and of Republicans sensing a hot campaign issue for 1968. As James Reston suggested last week, the ABM system launched by McNamara is not aimed at blocking the Chinese or even the Russians, but the Republicans. By acceding now to the clamor McNamara has blunted the GOP charge that he is "indifferent" to the defense of the American people.

GOOD GUYS

Yet, isn't the U.S. asking—a bit illogically—the Soviet McNamara to be indifferent to the defense of his people? More fundamentally, isn't the U.S. saying—also a bit illogically—that when it comes to the crunch, two standards apply: we are the good guys and would never attack first; you are the bad guys and you might attack first, and that is why we must have a four-to-one offensive superiority and defensive parity (at least)—and a lead in whatever else we decide to build.

Last week was the time for patience and courage—patience to lecture the Russians once again on the reasons behind the eminently equitable U.S. plan to put a freeze on all missiles, offensive and defensive courage, in the words of former Kennedy science adviser Jerome Wiesner, to run the risks of deescalation instead of the risks of new escalation; and patience and courage to explain to the American people, even in a preelection year, why the ABM is not good for their security.

Instead, Washington gave us the ABM. By some curious alchemy, the Administration has convinced itself that the thin ABM system doesn't really change the balance of terror: only a thick system would do that. But thin leads to thick. It is all like that celebrated biology experiment: a frog is placed in a tank of water; daily the temperature is increased one degree; the frog exists as always—until one more degree . . . the water boils . . . the frog dies.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. I know that the Senator has already placed in the Record a most absorbing and provocative article published in this morning's Washington Post, but I think it would not be amiss to quote four or five rather pungent paragraphs from it.

As the Senator knows, I have been very much interested in the problems of the NATO alliance and in American policy in Europe. I think we have to take into account European reaction to the administration's decision to go forward with the deployment of an ABM system.

Let me quote the pertinent paragraphs from the article:

> To the Western Europeans, China is very remote, its potential physical threat to them is remote, and extra suspicion therefore falls on the U.S. decision.
>
> Western Europeans, preoccupied with the Soviet Union and their own security, automatically interpreted the U.S. decision in that dimension.
>
> What looms in West Germany's official concern is that the nuclear non-proliferation treaty that the Soviet Union and the United States are urging it to participate in, might preclude a Western European anti-missile system, because an ABM system employs nuclear warheads to knock down incoming missiles.
>
> ### REACTION IN BONN
>
> From Bonn, Dan Morgan of The Washington Post Foreign Service reported that the American ABM decision has further undermined the credibility of U.S. intentions about the nuclear treaty. Some Germans are contending that the U.S. action has cast doubt on the stability of the existing nuclear "balance of terror," and that the whole structure of defense concepts may require reexamination.
>
> But paradoxically, the British position, as stated at Scarborough, England, last week by Defense Minister Denis Healey is that: "There is no evidence whatsoever that any ABM system of which we have any knowledge today will produce a meaningful deterrent against a major nuclear power."

Mr. President, I make reference to these paragraphs because I think they illustrate the extent of the argument which our decision has precipitated in Western Europe among our NATO allies.

Insofar as Mr. Healey's comments go, I think they coincide with the judgment of our own Secretary of Defense.

Mr. CLARK. I think this is so, if I may interject—although the Secretary of Defense, for reasons which are rather obscure to me, appears to have changed his view insofar as protection against China is concerned. I commented during the course of my speech that I thought the Secretary of Defense, for whom I have the greatest admiration, was singularly unconvincing when he said that there is no use building an ABM system to deter the Soviet Union but there is justification for doing so against China. This makes no sense to me whatsoever.

Mr. CHURCH. It places us in the anomalous position of building an ABM system, not to defend ourselves against Russian ballistic missiles, which they do possess but, rather, to defend ourselves against Chinese ballastic missiles, which they do not possess.

Mr. CLARK. That is quite correct.

Mr. CHURCH. It is now, of course, just a matter of speculation as to the size, dimension, and capability of a Chinese delivery system. Moreover, if the Chinese are going to embark upon the construction of a sizable delivery system for their developing nuclear arsenal, it only makes sense that they will strive to create a system which will have effectiveness; they are not going to be content with a system so small in its delivery capability that it could, presumably, be fended off by an ABM system.

So, what Secretary McNamara is saying, really, is that we are now going to build an ABM system to protect ourselves against an anticipated Chinese capability of very limited scope. But, as the Chinese capability grows, then the pressures are going to increase to enlarge and deepen the system, until it becomes a major and enormously expensive new addition to the nuclear arms race. The argument that if a few ABM's are good, more must be better, will prove irresistible, yet, Mr. McNamara says that, against a major nuclear capability, an ABM system will not be effective?

That is why I say we ought not to deceive ourselves. We are not talking about a $5 billion ABM system; we are talking about the first step toward the creation of a $50 billion—indeed, before we are finished, a $100 billion—system, which, in my judgment, will be the most extravagant and expensive sieve ever constructed in history.

What is worse is that, as we proceed with its construction—given the fascination of the American people with our advanced technology, as we invest enormous sums in this system, as we publicize its capabilities, as we demonstrate that an antiballistic missile has successfully intercepted another missile in flight, the American people are going to embrace the system with an eagerness to believe in it, and we will enthrall ourselves with the fancied belief that we have fashioned a marvelous shield. And as we assume that we have, indeed, fashioned such a shield, the risks of nuclear war will increase. They will not diminish; they will increase, because once the balance of terror is tipped by the assumption that we have designed a shield for ourselves, which will give us protection against a massive nuclear onslaught, the risk of nuclear war will increase. Our leaders will be emboldened to undertake and assume risks that they otherwise would avoid, because of the knowledge that nuclear war would result in certain obliteration.

So I think, on balance, this is not a contribution to the security of the United States, but ultimately a contribution to the ultimate insecurity of the United States, for, in the end, it may well result in enhancing the risks of a nuclear catastrophe which would see us consumed by the witchfire of a thermonuclear exchange.

I thoroughly agree with the statement, which I think was made earlier in this debate, that the real reason for this decision has nothing to do with China, which presently has no capability whatsoever of reaching the United States. We are not building this system for the Chinese; we are building it for the Republicans. Mr. Reston has written that it is internal politics which dictated this decision, so that this administration will not have to explain to the American people why we are not building an ABM system, when the Russians are.

The difficulty, in the coming campaign, of explaining that an ABM system really does not contribute to the security of the country, really does not constitute a meaningful defense, is too much to face against the simplicity of the argument that "they are doing it; therefore we should do it, also." This has been the major impetus for the decision to deploy a so-called thin ABM shield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have an additional 15 minutes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I had a couple of matters to put in the RECORD, if the Senator will yield to me long enough to do that.

Mr. CLARK. I shall be happy to. The majority leader asked me to request additional time. If the Senator will permit the Senator from Idaho to complete his statement—and the Senator from Oregon has been waiting for a long time—I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I wanted to take only a moment.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, may I have a second or two to conclude my statement?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. I want to commend the Senator from Pennsylvania for an excellent presentation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to granting the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania for an additional 15 minutes? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield briefly?

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I welcome the speech of the Senator from Pennsylvania and associate myself with every word of it. Once again, I follow his leadership on a very vital foreign policy issue. I call his attention to the speech I made last Friday concerning the policy of the Johnson administration in freezing funds needed for domestic programs; but I wish to make these further brief comments.

This ABM program is a program that the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, speaking for the Johnson administration, is throwing out to apease the war wings of both the Republican and Democratic parties. I think that is the politics involved here. The Senator from Idaho used the word "deceived" quite properly. I think it is a deceptive program, for it will not give the American people the protection that the propagandists seek to fool them into believing it will give them. Even from a scientific stanpoint, scientists give little assurance that it will give any protection whatever.

Mr. CLARK. In fact, if I may interrupt the Senator for a moment, there is not a reputable scientist in the country today who believes that this system would be of the slightest protection against a Russian attack.

Mr. MORSE. That is the point I wish to make; and I point out further that this program cannot be sold, nor can most of the war programs of our Government be sold, without scaring the American people almost to death. This is part of the fear psychology or the fear propaganda being built up to frighten the American people. The American people can be frightened, as well as other people can be frightened. When people are frightened, they act emotionally and glandularly, not rationally.

That is part of this sales program to get us past November 1968. As I explained on Friday, I cannot be a party to it. It is also a part of the fear program being used to force through an unjustifiable income tax increase, while this administration refuses to face up to plugging tax loopholes and making cuts so as not to take away from the American people what they are entitled to in meeting our critical economic problems here at home.

But going back to the fact that it is not going to give us protection, let us go all the way, and assume that we knock out all the enemy missiles. We would still not knock out the fallout; and it is the fallout that will do most of the killing, not the explosive effects of the bombs. The explosion would kill thousands in the proximity of the bomb; but the fallout would kill additional hundreds of thousands hundreds of miles away.

That is why we do not find the Pentagon and the administration talking about another scientific fact that they are ignoring. They cannot give the American people these facts and receive support for their fear propaganda. All this talk about dropping nuclear bombs and the hydrogen bomb in North Vietnam and in

China—that is what the hydrogen bomb boys want to do, but they forget to tell the American people that if they drop them over there, hundreds of thousands of Americans will die in the United States, as far east as Chicago, from the fallout of the bombs we drop in Asia. That is easily seen, if we familiarize ourselves with the force and direction of the prevailing winds.

I am simply at a loss to understand how my country could get itself into the plight that it is in, and that there could be loose in this country supporters of this war, doing the bidding of the industrial-military complex that is taking over the policies of the Republic. The American people desperately need to recognize, before it is too late, that we are being run, in this country today, by an industrial-military complex that makes its profits out of American blood, and jeopardizes all the future generations of American boys and girls. I do not know how we can get the American people to recognize these facts before it is too late.

That is why I stand firm on every word I spoke on Friday, and apply every word I said then to the Senator's speech this morning. I can only say, the Senator is completely right. I do not intend for any of the blood of this war to be on my hands, and therefore I shall continue to fight in opposition to American continuation of a war in Southeast Asia in which we never should have involved ourselves in the first place, and in which we should not continue to involve ourselves.

It is time for us to stop making war in Southeast Asia and to insist that other nations of the world, which, as a Washington Post article this morning points out, are becoming scared to death of us—and they have every reason to be afraid of us, because we are following a military course of action that is jeopardizing the peace of the entire world—come in and settle this war for us. Apparently we cannot settle it. All we seem able to do is kill enough people and destroy enough property until we can hope to force a surrender. Even if we succeed, that will give us no peace; only a truce, endangering the lives of millions of American boys and girls in future generations as the world organizes against us, during the next century, to destroy us, if we do not stop this mad expectation of the United States to militarily dominate the world.

I am proud to associate myself with the speech of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend from Oregon for his comments, and welcome his support.

(The following colloquy between Senator CLARK and Senator NELSON, which occurred during the delivery of Senator CLARK's address, is presented at this point in the RECORD by unanimous consent.)

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I left the Presiding Officer's chair momentarily to come to my desk to commend the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] for his very thoughtful remarks about the thin ABM system.

The Senator has always had the courage to express forthrightly his views on any issue, no matter how controversial.

Mr. CLARK. Let me interject there to say that I thank the Senator for his kind remarks but, in my opinion, my statement requires no courage at all. I think it is good policy, in addition to being right. I intend to campaign on this issue, if I should run again next year, and I am confident that the majority of the people of Pennsylvania will agree with me.

Mr. NELSON. I am also confident that the Senator is correct. What astonishes me is the lack of opposition in Congress to the launching of this program which will provide a thin ABM system, which was described by one of my distinguished colleagues in the Senate, Mr. CHURCH, as the most expensive sieve ever constructed.

Mr. CLARK. I have often wondered whether we in the Senate are not more terrified of the Joint Chiefs of Staff than the Vietcong.

Mr. NELSON. It frightens me, too, when I consider the kind of judgment they have exercised in advising us on our intervention in Vietnam. In any event, I think, tragically, this is the first step down the road to the construction of what they are now saying will be a $40 billion ABM system, if we construct the most expensive and sophisticated one we can think of—and, of course we will; and that antiballistic missile system will not be any more effective, in my judgment, than the thin ABM will be.

Mr. CLARK. I am sure the Senator is correct.

Mr. NELSON. I conclude by saying that I commend the Senator for his thoughtful statement. At a later date I shall make a further statement on this matter on the Senate floor.

Mr. CLARK. At which point, in the best tradition of senatorial courtesy, I shall come over and agree with the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. NELSON. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I must say that I find considerable merit and food for thought in the argument that an antiballistic missile defense system, while perhaps adding to a degree to our national security, could also have the paradoxical effect of making us feel overly secure. This is a crucial consideration, because it bears on one of the most elemental problems of the nuclear age; namely, that of maintaining restraint, both in the public at large, and within the Government. If we had not exercised supreme restraint at the time of the Cuban missile crisis of 1962—which is the only true nuclear showdown the world has yet seen—we might have descended then and there to the Armageddon that would have erased vast portions of civilization as we know it from the earth. My fear is that the ABM may in some subtle way erode our restraint and permit our military leaders—and the public, too—to have a kind of unjustified overconfidence which will allow them to take greater risks and press stronger nuclear threats, on the mistaken and tragic assumption that we can afford to inflict astronomical damage because at least some of the retaliation will be diminished.

I recognize, of course, that another vital factor of the nuclear age is involved here, and that is our credibility. Our adversaries may be more inclined to take threats more seriously if they know that we have at least minimal protection against their retaliation. And it may be that for this reason we must reluctantly acquiesce in this latest increment to the arms race. But it seems to me that we must do so with the greatest caution and deliberation, remembering at every step of the way that nuclear defense does not in any way absolve us from awesome responsibility and restraint.

It must also be remembered that hostile nuclear missiles can be put in position in the United States by stealth and by trick, as well as by rocketry, and that the most sophisticated antiballistic missile system might in some circumstances be of no use whatsoever. In this regard, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an article by the sagacious and distinguished columnist, Stewart Alsop, in the current Saturday Evening Post.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUT IF 25 TRUCKS FANNED OUT

(By Stewart Alsop)

WASHINGTON.—The following exchange between Sen. Claiborne Pell of Rhode Island and Gen. Earle Wheeler, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, is excerpted from the record of a recent Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearing. The subject of their conversation was a grim one—the planting of nuclear bombs in American cities by stealth.

"Senator PELL. Is it not conceivable that missiles could be planted within our cities ... no matter how good our antiballistic-missile screen was?

"General WHEELER. This is a possibility ... (*deleted*).

"Senator PELL. But if twenty-five trucks fanned out over the United States they could do the same job and negate the most excellent ABM device, could they not?

"General WHEELER. If they could get the devices into the country, assemble them and fan them out, the answer is yes."

This coloquy has inspired the following experiment in science fiction:

From a document marked *London, Most Secret, Eyes Alone; From M16 for PM, FS, and M only:*

The records we have been enabled to obtain indicate that neither the Hertz nor the Avis auto-rental companies had the slightest suspicion that the American-International Shrimp Corporation was anything other than an authentic business concern. At the request of the corporation, Hertz therefore unhesitatingly delivered 13 refrigerated lorries to a dock in the vicinity of Port Isabel, Tex., while Avis supplied 12 lorries to the shrimp corporation's representative, at the unloading platform on the Caloosahatchee River, near Fort Myers, Fla.

According to a reconstruction of the event by our agents, 13 heavy containers smelling strongly of shrimp were hoisted aboard the Hertz lorries from three shrimp boats. The Avis lorries were similarly loaded from two shrimp boats tied up in the Caloosahatchee River. The loading of all 25 lorries was completed between 2 and 3 A.M. on July 11, 1971.

The lorries thereafter fanned out over the then excellent U.S. highway system, the

Hertz lorries heading for Chicago and points West, whilst the Avis lorries sped toward the 12 largest Eastern cities. Only one lorry failed to reach its destination.

We have obtained a still legible copy of the Washington Evening *Star* of July 12, 1971, which on page 2 reports a "mysterious explosion of a refrigerated truck" 110 miles south of Pittsburgh, Pa. The explosion apparently killed the driver and two policemen. Presumably the police had, for some reason, stopped the vehicle and begun to investigate its contents, thus triggering a "dead-man" fuse. In any case, alone of the major Eastern cities, Pittsburgh survived physically intact, although the majority of its citizens subsequently succumbed to the heavy fallout from Cleveland.

The driver-agents (who were doubtless unaware of the contents of their lorries) must have been exceedingly well briefed, for all the remaining 24 lorries arrived at their assigned destinations 36 hours after the start, give or take a half hour or so. It has been established from blast patterns that the Avis lorry in Washington was parked near the intersection of 16th and K streets, a few blocks from the White House, while the Hertz lorry in Chicago was parked a block from the Tribune Tower. Other locations were chosen with similar care.

The timing devices must have been extremely accurate, for all 24 explosions occurred within less than a minute of each other.

M16 has been able to obtain a portion of the tape recording of the final conversation between the general commanding the Strategic Air Force, in his underground command post near Omaha, Nebr., and the commanding general of North American Air Defense, in a cave in Colorado:

"SAC: No word from the Classified Locations, General?

"NORAD: Not a word, General. Congress was in session and the President was in the White House. The Vice President had the Second Satchel, but he must have got it too.

"SAC: Then I guess it's up to us.

"NORAD: Yes. . . . Must have been the Russians, of course. Funny we got nothing on the radar—never did trust that goddamn radar.

"SAC: Anything from Nudets?[*]

"NORAD: Nudets estimates fatalities in the eighty million range. Only preliminary, of course.

"SAC: I guess we've got to go. You concur?

"NORAD: I concur. Over and out."

Within 28 minutes the first missile in the U.S. salvo exploded on its programmed target in the U.S.S.R. The salvo delivered 400 megatons on Soviet targets, the megatonnage calculated by the Pentagon's cost-effectiveness analysts as the minimum required to destroy the Soviet Union as a functioning society. The Soviet counter-salvo, on top of the great damage already done, achieved the same purpose in the United States. Several of the larger American cities suffered the ignominy of being destroyed twice over.

In the opinion of MI 6 there is no question that the American-International Shrimp Corporation was the cover name for an elaborate Chinese Communist operation. Although Fidel Castro hotly denied it before he died of fallout from the mainland, there is little doubt that there was some element of Cuban collusion—the shrimp boats certainly embarked from Havana.

In his 78th year at the time, the late Mao Tse-tung was near death and unquestionably mad. But in destroying at one stroke both the hated "modern revisionists" and the "American imperialists" Mao surely displayed a certain genius in his madness. He was doubtless acting according to one of his favorite precepts, from Sun Tzu's *Art of War*: "Make a Noise in the East, Attack in the West."

The Chinese, of course have never acknowledged their role in the catastrophe, which utterly destroyed the world's two greatest powers. Given the unchallenged global domination of the People's Republic of China today, the Chinese role, on orders of the PM, may only be mentioned in a Most Secret document, such as this one—Destroy on Reading.

This little nightmare is not, of course, a prediction of things to come. And yet, as the colloquy between Senator Pell and General Wheeler indicates, there is no purely *technical* reason why something of the sort might not take place. According to the intelligence estimates, by the early 1970's the Chinese Communist intercontinental missile capability will still be rudimentary, but the Chinese by then should have been able to stockpile a considerable number of multimegaton thermonuclear devices. A three-megaton device should weigh on the order of one ton, and could easily be carried in a truck.

We Americans harbor a stubborn illusion that everybody else must do it our way—because we depend on an elaborate and immensely costly missile system to deliver nuclear warheads, we assume that every other country must do likewise. The above nightmare may serve as a reminder that there are more ways than one to skin a cat—or kill a country. Finally, it may also be worth noting that most U.S. intelligence experts believe that the senile genius, Mao Tse-tung, is already, to a degree which cannot be precisely determined, insane.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of routine morning business.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Asher E. Schroeder, of Maquoketa, Iowa, to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of Iowa, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CORRECTION AND IMPROVEMENT OF THE CANAL ZONE CODE

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary, Panama Canal Company, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to correct and improve the Canal Zone Code, and for other purposes, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDING OFFICER:

Petitions adopted by the City Councils of the City of Oroville, and the city of Breau, both in the State of California, favoring the enactment of some form of a Federal tax-sharing program; to the Committee on Finance.

A petition signed by members of the Communications Workers of America, AFL–CIO, of the State of Minnesota, relative to the provision of jobs, housing, and education to solve the problems of American cities; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the Robert B. Elliott Law Club, of Columbus, Ohio, commending the President and the Senate for the nomination and confirmation of the Honorable Thurgood Marshall to the U.S. Supreme Court; ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. PROXMIRE, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with amendments:

S. 1084. A bill to permit Federal employees to purchase shares of Federal or State-chartered credit unions through voluntary payroll allotment (Rept. No. 590); and

S. 1085. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to modernize the loan, investment, dividend, and reserve provisions; to require the establishment of an education committee; and for other purposes (Rept. No. 591).

RESOLUTION

TO PRINT ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON THE "COSTS AND DELIVERY OF HEALTH SERVICES TO OLDER AMERICANS"

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia (for Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 174); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 174

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Special Committee on Aging two thousand additional copies of its hearings of the Ninetieth Congress, first session, entitled "Costs and Delivery of Health Services to Older Americans."

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 386

Mr. RIBICOFF submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 12080) to amend the Social Security Act to provide an increase in benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to provide benefits for additional categories of individuals, to improve the public assistance program and programs relating to the welfare and health of children, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

---

[*] Nudets; Nuclear Detection and Reporting System currently being emplaced in more than 50 U.S. cities.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 387 THROUGH 390

Mr. FONG submitted four amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 12080, supra, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 391 THROUGH 392

Mr. METCALF submitted two amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 12080, supra, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

THE NEED TO APPROPRIATE FUNDS TO FIGHT WATER POLLUTION—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 393

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I am submitting an amendment to the Public Works appropriations bill to appropriate the full $450 million which the Congress unanimously authorized last year for Federal grants for the construction of waste treatment works.

In passing the Clean Waters Restoration Act of 1966, the Congress made a firm commitment to the American people to help in the battle against the pollution of our Nation's lakes and rivers. This is no time to back down from that commitment.

Our budget is strained by the rising costs of the war in Vietnam and it is apparent that there will have to be some budget cuts made. However, it does seem to me to be false economy to cut back on this important program.

Last year it was estimated that $3.5 billion was needed over the next 5 years for the Federal Government to meet its share of the responsibility for the costs of construction works. Section 8 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act was amended by the Clean Waters Restoration Act of 1966 to authorize appropriations of $150 million for fiscal 1967, $450 million for fiscal 1968, $700 million for fiscal 1969, $1 billion for fiscal 1970, and $1.2 billion for fiscal 1971.

Because the Congress authorized $450 million for fiscal 1968 for the construction of sewage treatment works, many State and local governments went ahead with their planning for pollution abatement based on that authorization. Many municipalities have already passed bond issues in order to provide their share of the costs.

Our programs to abate the disastrous pollution of our waters are just picking up momentum and now is not the time for the Federal Government to renege on its promises. To withhold funds now will cost us much more in the long run.

There are numerous examples of the need for more Federal money. I will not cite them all but I would like to mention just a few.

For the six New England States, the total cost of their pollution abatement program has been estimated at about $1.1 billion. Further, it has been estimated that those States will need about $61 million in Federal grants in fiscal 1968 to keep up their programs. With the full $450 million appropriation, they would receive only $28 million, while with the proposed $225 million, they would receive only about $14 million.

Under the full $450 million appropriation, the State of New Jersey would be eligible for about $14 million in Federal funds in fiscal 1968. If the appropriation is cut to $225 million, New Jersey would receive about $5.7 million. At the present time, there are 32 construction projects pending at the State, local, and Federal levels for New Jersey. These projects have a total construction cost of $35.9 million, of which the Federal share would be about $10.1 million.

In Wisconsin there are currently 71 applications pending for Federal grants-in-aid, with a total cost of $45.5 million. If these projects were approved and the Federal Government were willing to pay 30 percent, the Federal share for Wisconsin alone would be $13.7 million. If the State were willing to pay 25 percent and if the State's water quality standards were approved, then the Federal share would be 50 percent, or $22.8 million. Under the proposed $225 million appropriation, Wisconsin would receive about $4.5 million. Quite obviously, this is not enough.

As of July 31, the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration was processing 153 projects which contained requests for Federal grants totaling $43.5 million. At the same time there are 829 projects being considered in State agencies and an additional 823 projects in preparation. These 1,652 projects would require about $910 million in Federal grants.

I have prepared a list comparing Federal money available and projected needs of 21 States and the District of Columbia for 1968. Total money available for these States is $125 million while their needs total $404 million. Even if the full $450 million were to be appropriated, not all of these needs could be met. I would like to have this table made a part of the RECORD.

I have some detailed information on the State of Wisconsin including a list of the cities who have applications for Federal grants-in-aid and a letter from Gov. Warren Knowles to Secretary Udall which describes in some detail the problem that Wisconsin faces if the full authorization is not appropriated. I would like both of these items made a part of the RECORD.

The problem of water pollution in this country is enormous and at the present time we are fighting a losing battle. Unless the Federal Government is willing to meet its commitments and carry its share of the load, the tide of pollution which is sweeping the country will never be stemmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table; and, without objection, the material will be printed in the RECORD.

The material presented by Mr. NELSON is as follows:

REQUESTS FROM SELECTED STATES FOR FEDERAL GRANTS-IN-AID FOR SEWAGE CONSTRUCTION WORKS AS COMPARED TO MONEY AVAILABLE FOR THOSE STATES

State	Money for fiscal 1968[1]	Money needed (in fiscal year 1968)
Alaska	$883,000	$1,663,600
Arkansas	3,692,541	5,000,000
District of Columbia	1,226,250	4,300,000
Indiana	4,985,658	15,900,000
Maryland	5,268,380	20,700,000
Massachusetts	6,260,078	20,000,000
Michigan	7,622,632	14,000,000
Minnesota	5,255,246	10,000,000
Nevada	887,800	3,230,000
New Hampshire	1,786,825	3,500,000
New Jersey	6,133,316	14,000,000
New York	22,167,360	175,000,000
North Carolina	6,678,171	9,800,000
Ohio	9,796,211	[2] 27,000,000
Oregon	2,908,175	4,500,000
Pennsylvania	11,793,520	[2] 25,100,000
Rhode Island	1,756,764	2,900,000
Tennessee	6,056,436	12,295,000
Virginia	6,803,650	[2] 11,000,000
Washington	4,473,231	[2] 6,300,000
West Virginia	3,467,710	5,000,000
Wisconsin	5,019,267	22,800,000
Total	124,922,221	403,988,600

[1] Total available under proposed $200,000,000 appropriation plus $63,160,644 left over from fiscal 1967.

[2] 30 percent Federal share; all other figures are at 50 percent Federal share.

THE STATE OF WISCONSIN,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Madison, August 17, 1967.

Mr. STEWART L. UDALL,
U.S. Department of the Interior,
Office of the Secretary,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY UDALL: Several months ago, Wisconsin municipalities were required to file by August 1 their plans for sewage collection treatment facilities construction in the 1968 fiscal year. The purpose was to permit early assessment of the need for Federal matching funds in the current fiscal year.

Sixty-seven local governments have filed applications. Total construction costs represented in these applications are estimated to be in excess of $46.2 million. It is conceivable (although not likely) that as much as one-third of the planned construction may not be under way by June 30, 1968. However, if $30 million in projects prove eligible for Federal assistance, we must assume that these projects would be eligible for more than $15 million in funds under Section 8 (b)(7) of P.L. 84–660. If all were to begin, the amount would exceed $25 million.

Inasmuch as it would appear that less than $5 million will be available to Wisconsin for these projects under the terms of the appropriation measure recently passed by the House of Representatives, I would appreciate your counsel as to our future course of action.

We are already using the reimbursement provisions of the Act, under which a community builds now and hopes to be reimbursed later and, in FY 1967, persuaded our communities to accept one-third of the total Federal grant for which they were eligible. We did this so that we could begin more projects with the limited funds then available.

We are well aware of the escalating costs of the war in Viet Nam, which have been cited as justification for the failure of the President to request the funds authorized by Section 8(d) or P.L. 84–660. Since the costs of the war show no sign of receding, it does not seem prudent for the State of Wisconsin to advise communities to accept partial grants or proceed in the expectation that Federal funds will ever be appropriated to match the purposes of the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966.

Wisconsin and her cities will undoubtedly do their share to preserve and enhance the quality of Wisconsin's water but what assurance can you give that the brave words of the Clean Water Restoration Act will be matched by the Federal dollars of assistance that the Act promised? And when?

My query is serious, practical and immediate. Wisconsin has decisions to make.

Sincerely,

Warren P. Knowles,
Governor.

WISCONSIN—CURRENT APPLICATIONS FOR FEDERAL GRANT-IN-AID

Name	Project No.	Estimated cost
Barron	179	$764, 462
Do	343	238, 587
Beaver Dam	348	152, 000
Bloomer	345	164, 430
Bonduel	328	148, 400
Brookfield	334	6, 495, 000
Cable	221	45, 000
Caddy Vista S.D.	266	208, 600
Cameron	175	78, 650
Casco	319	20, 000
Chetek	120	105, 579
Colby	346	245, 400
Darien	299	139, 000
Deer Park	269	67, 000
De Forest	274	265, 990
Delton, Tn. S.D.	285	504, 000
Edgar	323	174, 265
Elcho	241	75, 300
Fox River Heights S.D.	295	63, 028
Genoa	278	70, 828
Germantown	313	194, 400
Gleason	240	87, 792
Green Bay M.S.D.	293	115, 000
Do	294	1, 450, 785
Greenfield, Tn. of (La Crosse County)	217	46, 055
Janesville	349	4, 564, 100
Johnson Creek	230	272, 359
Kendall	318	150, 981
Kewaunee	325	189, 950
Knapp	246	57, 700
Lena	171	195, 895
Menasha, Tn. S.D. No. 4	336	220, 000
Menomonie	344	320, 000
Milwaukee M.S.D.	315	7, 620, 000
Milwaukee M.S. Comm. (County)	337	676, 200
Do	338	4, 075, 600
Do	339	575, 000
Do	340	920, 000
Milwaukee M.S. Comm. (City)	341	1, 437, 500
Do	342	3, 162, 500
Mount Calvary	321	224, 281
Mount Hope	84	75, 658
Nekoosa	327	339, 083
Neosho	264	146, 852
North Freedom	282	85, 400
North Park S.D.	331	74, 800
Northern Colony and Training School	330	193, 200
Osceola	335	98, 410
Pembine	248	79, 945
Pewaukee	306	206, 400
Plainfield	58	68, 740
Platteville	324	580, 200
Port Edwards	322	515, 181
Potter S.D.	279	67, 800
Rosholt	212	165, 594
Rothschild	334	597, 635
Salem, Tn. (Hooker Lake area)	309	267, 640
Sauk County Hospital and Home	298	9, 500
Scandinavia	329	83, 467
Sheboygan County (Rocky Knoll Som. and Hospital)	332	85, 953
Sheboygan County Hospital	304	65, 600
South Wayne	284	96, 110
Stevens Point	351	1, 051, 000
Sturgeon Bay	333	35, 000
Thorp	181	135, 530
Union Grove So. Colony	307	274, 500
Upson	213	18, 100
Wausau	350	2, 702, 160
West Racine County M.S.D.	308	347, 000
Wild Rose	152	109, 312
Williams Bay	347	300, 000
Total (71 applications)	------	45, 457, 544

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF RESOLUTION

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern] be added as a cosponsor to Senate Resolution 173 at its next printing.

The purpose of Senate Resolution 173 is to strengthen the hand of the administration in the obtaining of commitments of manpower and resources from our allies in support of the effort in Vietnam so as to assist in this mutual undertaking and effort in Southeast Asia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE NEED FOR PUBLIC HOUSING

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, last Friday evening I briefly visited the riot areas of Newark, N.J., and talked with citizens of that community in the now quiet aftermath of that tragic event.

It is quite obvious that the price that will be borne for a long time to come by the citizens of that community is very great indeed—great in that many merchants have now left the area, left their stores that were looted and fired upon and set afire and the broken plate glass is now boarded up.

These vacant stores are now working a hardship on the citizens of the community. Some residents there told me that it is necessary now for them to walk a mile or more to find some of the articles they need for their household living, articles that could have been found within a block or two of their homes before.

It will take some time for the community to rebuild so that normal commercial transactions can be carried out and the needs of the people of the community adequately served.

I found great desire on the part of the citizens of Newark to rebuild the image of that fine city, however, and carry on some of the great work that was being done before.

Very close to the riot area is a section called Hyde Park. Instead of the 20-storied high-rise public housing which has put people from the rural South and housed them in a type of living to which they are not at all accustomed, there are three-storied apartment houses that have been constructed and offered to the occupants for homeownership.

The maintenance level of these buildings is very high, indeed. They are meticulously cared for by their occupants.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to continue for an additional 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PERCY. The apartment houses are meticulously cared for and the universal feeling in this homeownership area, where not one dollar's worth of damage was done during the Newark riot is that the difference between renting and enjoying homeownership is the difference between a feeling of wanting to care for the property and a feeling on the part of others that the destruction of property was the only way they could show their frustration and bitterness.

This visit reaffirmed my view that my colleagues in the Senate and those in the House under the leadership of Congressman William Widnall who have been working with me toward expanding homeownership opportunities for lower income American families are going to help bring about a program that will more stabilize our communities and democratize our cities.

In this connection, I pay high tribute to a Member of the House, the Honorable Leonor Sullivan who has herself pioneered in this area and has contributed importantly through section 221(h) of the Public Housing Act toward opening up greater homeownership opportunity.

I am pleased at the reports that the $20 million allocated to this program this year will be fully expended and, as a result, a great many additional lower income families who could not otherwise have the stabilizing influence of homeownership will have the opportunity to enjoy the same advantage that has been offered to many other middle-income families in America through the years—to be somebody and have something in which they can take great pride.

THE POVERTY WAR

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, in the Washington Post this morning there is a column by William S. White entitled "Friends Hurt Poverty War."

This column, I regret to say, is full of inaccurate statements of fact and erroneous conclusions about the status of the war on poverty. I ask unanimous consent that the column may be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Hart in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The article ordered to be printed in the Record is as follows:

Friends Hurt Poverty War

(By William S. White)

The real question for the antipoverty program is not whether it will be crippled by conservatives but rather whether it will ultimately be kissed to death from the left by excessively doting friends who are in a characteristic determination to support all appropriations and oppose all tax increases.

The Senate has now approved a $2.26 billion authorization for the next fiscal year; so far, so good. And in the process it has wisely struck down a truly wild blue yonder ultra-liberal attempt to double the amount, at a time when Congress generally is demanding very heavy spending cuts all along the line as its price even to consider the Administration's request for temporary tax surcharges.

But then the Senate has marched back downhill to add a budget-busting item of $198 millions at the behest primarily of Sens. Robert and Edward Kennedy.

This additional and unwanted item is not a very big thing in itself but it may be just provocative enough to an economy-minded House of Representatives to give it more excuse to lay the meat ax upon the whole of the poor old war on poverty. The end of it all thus may be a gutting of a program that, ironically, is directed by the Kennedy brother-in-law, Sargent Shriver.

If this is to be the outcome, it will be a great pity. For while the war on poverty has undoubted shortcomings, the fact is that down where it counts the thing is doing a good job.

The heart of this program, practically speaking, lies in the Job Corps. This is a sensible scheme to train unemployable and tax-spending boys to be employed boys able and willing to enter the ranks of self-supporting and self-respecting America.

They are trained for work with care and prudence and there is no room for real doubt that the Job Corps is reclaiming a human wastage that this nation simply cannot afford. It is keeping underprivileged youngsters out of beatnik hoodlumism. And in some cases it is making them not only able to work honestly for an honest living but also capable of fighting for this country in a place called Vietnam.

Beyond all this, however, the underlying concept here is indipensable to the national health. For it goes without saying that a majority of the Job Corps trainees are Negroes, since this is the race most disadvantaged, any fair-minded man must recognize that the Negro most of all needs simply a chance to earn his own way.

All talk of "unemployment" in this country is in truth nonsense, except insofar as unemployed means unemployable.

This is the bed-rock problem; and this problem the Job Corps is getting at in a rational way. Granted that some of these boys get into trouble—and who in the circumstances could expect otherwise?—the fact remains that they are handled without any of the syrupy social-worker ideology of the old leaf-raking days.

The truth, too, is that the administrators of the plan are more unpopular with, and have more trouble with, the most doctrinaire of reformers than with the most crusty of conservatives.

It would, therefore, be a genuine calamity should those who "demand" more and more outlays manage to create at least a climate of rejection of the whole business.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, this column deserves an answer in the interests of accuracy. Mr. White's conventional attack on the liberal defenders of the poverty program might well have been ignored and could have been ignored, but his distortion of the basic facts requires public correction.

Mr. White approves of the $2.26 billion authorization. At least, that is what he states the authorization is. Actually the authorization was $2.258 billion. Then, he disapproves of what he calls a budget-busting item of $198 million, which actually is a part of the larger figure he approves. One wonders what careless inaccuracy caused Mr. White to become so involved.

Second, Mr. White refers to this $198 million as unwanted. Who, it might be inquired, does not want it. The items totaling this amount were proposed by Republican members of the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which subcommittee I chair, with Democratic support.

The programs included in this $198 million are all approved by the Office of Economic Opportunity, although officially and in public Mr. Shriver's lips and those of his associates are sealed by the Bureau of the Budget. An effort to strike the item was rejected by the Senate by a vote of 50 to 36.

I have no evidence which would satisfy me that the administration was interested in striking that item. It was left to Republican Members of this body to make the motion to strike.

Third, the "truly wild blue yonder ultraliberal attempt to double the amount" of the bill, referred to by Mr. White, to provide for the emergency employment of 200,000 restless and unemployed residents of urban and rural ghettos is one-fifth of the program recommended by the Urban Coalition.

I think it is worth while to read into the RECORD the names of some of those so-called or alleged "truly wild blue yonder ultraliberals" who make up the Urban Coalition. The first such "wild blue yonder ultraliberal" is David Rockefeller, president, Chase Manhattan Bank; the second is Roy Ash, president, Litton Industries; third is Frederick J. Close, chairman of the board, Aluminum Co. of America; fourth is Archbishop John F. Dearden, of Detroit; fifth is Gilbert W. Fitzhugh, president, Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., New York; sixth is Henry Ford II, chairman, Ford Motor Co.; seventh is Andrew Heiskell, chairman of the board, Time, Inc.; eighth is Gerald L. Phillippe, chairman of the board, General Electric Co.; ninth is James Rouse, president of the Rouse Co. and president of Urban America, Inc.; tenth is Theodore Schlesinger, president, Allied Stores Corp.; eleventh is Asa Spaulding, president, North Carolina Mutual Insurance Co., Durham, N.C.

In addition, representing the National Council of Churches, is the Right Reverend John E. Hines, presiding bishop of the Episcopal Church; Roy Wilkins, head of the NAACP, and Whitney Young, Jr., executive director, National Urban League, representing civil rights leadership; Mayor James H. J. Tate, mayor of Philadelphia, president of the National League of Cities; Mayor Joseph M. Barr, of Pittsburgh, president of the U.S. Conference of Mayors; distinguished labor leaders such as I. W. Abel, president, United Steelworkers, and Walter Reuther, president of the United Auto Workers; and an entire spectrum of the American establishment.

Mr. President, these are the people who want five times as much for an emergency employment program as the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare requested the Senate to adopt. These are Mr. White's "wild blue yonder ultraliberals" because they want a program for 1 million jobs, not merely 200,000 jobs. One million jobs for 1 year would have cost $5 billion; we sought 200,000 jobs for 2 years costing $10 million. Perhaps Mr. White did not see the entire picture.

Mr. President, the fourth point I would like to make respecting Mr. White's column is that the Job Corps, which he praises is indeed, as he said, "a sensible scheme to train unemployable and tax spending boys."

The bill which we passed provides $295 million out of a total of $2,258 million for this purpose—slightly more than 10 percent. The capacity of the Job Corps camps is 42,000. The number of poor people presently being reached by the multitude of poverty programs is in the neighborhood of 4½ million. So that the Job Corps has responsibility for about 10 percent of the people who are currently being helped by the war on poverty. I welcome Mr. White's support for the Job Corps, which is certainly a worthwhile project, but it can hardly be called, as he does, the heart of the poverty program. Mr. White is correct in making the statement that a majority of Job Corps trainees are Negroes, but he is only correct by a little bit, because the figure is 55 percent.

My fifth point is that there is massive unemployment in the urban and rural ghettos of America today, running as high as 15 percent in Cleveland, and well over 10 percent in such cities as Oakland, St. Louis, Phoenix, and Los Angeles. To refer to "unemployment in this country" as "nonsense," as Mr. White does, is to put one's head in the sand.

Nor are these people, most of them young and able bodied, unemployable. They just do not happen to have the particular skills for which employers and Government are looking today. I think, with a little training, they can probably acquire those skills. That is what the program calls for. Without training, they can still do the kind of work which could easily be made and usefully made to repair and bring up to date a thousand projects all over the country where relatively unskilled labor is in demand.

My sixth and last point is, with respect to Mr. White, that I know of no liberal Member of the Senate with whom the administrators of the poverty program are unpopular. Mr. White makes that charge. It is the arch-conservatives such as Mr. White with whom Sargent Shriver and his able assistants are in trouble.

I am glad indeed that Mr. White's views did not prevail in the Senate. I hope they will not prevail in the House.

Mr. President, I just wanted to note that I had, earlier in my remarks, referred to the ABM system as a very expensive flying erector set. I think that is the kind of term which makes it easier and simpler to persuade the American people that they are wasting their money in a proposal which has no countervailing benefits over and above the huge sums of money which it will cost.

TAX INCREASE

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, there appeared in the Sunday Washington Post a very interesting article by James Tobin, entitled "Tobin: Case for Tax Increase Simple, Powerful." I would commend it to the reading of Senators and the public.

It is interesting to note that the analysis of Professor Tobin would indicate that prior to this time there had been no real economic case compelling a tax increase, even though the Government is running a substantial budget deficit. The professor makes an interesting argument that for the future a tax increase may be necessary. He points out in his article that certain reductions in the name of economy have to some extent had the effect of calling upon the poor of the Nation to bear the burden of reduction of proposed expenditures.

I would suggest that it might be worth considering the fact that we are going to pass a social security bill in this Congress which, in my judgment, will go substantially beyond that which was voted by the House of Representatives. This bill may very well go far beyond what many people anticipate in an attack on poverty in its own way, and in a very dignified fashion, by increasing social security benefits and providing medical care and improving upon public welfare.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 8, 1967]

TOBIN: CASE FOR TAX INCREASE SIMPLE, POWERFUL

(By James Tobin, sterling professor, Yale University)

(Prof. Tobin, a former member of the Council of Economic Advisers, writes a special article for The Washington Post every other month during the academic year.)

The case for a tax increase is simple and powerful. Growing steadily at full employment, the American economy can normally be expected to generate a supply of private saving that just about matches private investment and state and local borrowing. This balance of saving supply and demand is predicated on current tax rates, and on monetary and credit conditions, easier than during the squeeze of 1966. If the Federal Government piles on additional demands for savings to finance a large budget deficit, there will simply not be enough saving to go around. The result will be either inflation or a tightening of credit markets and interest rates, or most likely a mixture of the two, until enough competing demands are squeezed out of the market to restore balance.

Here are the details of the rough balance of full-employment private saving and investment:

Normal Demands for and Supplies of Saving

(Percent of full employment GNP)

DEMANDS

Private investment in new structures and equipment	10–10½
Accumulation of inventories	¾
Residential construction	3½–4
Foreign investment (exports less imports)	¾
Total	15–16

SUPPLIES

Capital consumption allowances	8½
Corporate retained earnings	2½–3
Personal saving	4–4½
Total	15–16

State and local fiscal operations do not disturb this balance by as much as one percentage point either way. These governments are more likely to be in slight deficit than in surplus, adding to the demand for saving rather than to the supply.

INFLATIONARY GAP PROSPECTS

The Federal budget, unless taxes are increased, will be in large deficit in 1968, between 1½ and 2½ per cent of full employment GNP. Therefore, the prospects are for a sizable inflationary gap—excess demand of the order of 12 to 20 billion dollars.

The Federal Government has already begun to run a big deficit on a national income accounts basis. The deficit was $15 billion annual rate as early as the second quarter of this year. Yet so far no inflationary gap has appeared. Indeed the economy had a narrow escape from recession early this year, and has not yet eliminated slack in the utilization of industrial capacity or even in the labor market. So far this year rising Federal deficit spending has been a welcome stimulus to the economy rather than a source of inflationary pressure. This is because special circumstances have depressed some of the private demands for saving below the "normal" values of the table above, and have raised the supply.

This year inventory accumulation has been abnormally low—below the amount needed for stocks of goods to keep pace with normal growth of output and sales. Sooner or later the excess stocks with which businessmen began 1967 will be worked off. Residential construction, though gradually reviving, has not fully recovered from its 25 per cent recession in 1966. Eventually home building will return to a more normal relationship to income and to population growth—unless failure of the government to take other anti-inflationary measures forces the Federal Reserve to administer a new dose of tight money. Plant and equipment expenditures have grown abnormally slowly this year, reflecting in part delayed impacts from tight money and suspension of investment credit in 1966 and in part the depressing influence of the excess capacity and low profits of 1967. Surveys already indicate more rapid growth next year. Finally, consumers cannot be counted on to maintain the unusually high saving rates of recent quarters.

SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES TEMPORARY

These special circumstances are surely temporary. Sooner or later private investment and saving will return to normal, and the latent inflationary imbalance will become a reality. The only question is, as it has been all year, how soon. The basic situation is not hard to diagnose; but it has been very difficult to tell when it will prevail over the transient influences which have controlled the course of the economy in 1967.

The Administration's diagnosis has been essentially correct. The recent accumulation of statistical indications of accelerating private demand should convince open-minded skeptics. Good marksmen lead moving targets, and the government economists deserve credit for recommending policies appropriate to the future when they will take effect. If the Council of Economic Advisers somewhat overestimated the speed of this year's recovery, their error is harmless compared with the stubborn myopia of their critics. It has been distressing to observe the most economically literate newspapers, *The Washington Post* and *The New York Times,* use their editorial influence against responsible and foresighted fiscal policy.

CASE FOR THE SURCHARGE

The case for the 10 per cent tax surcharge, enacted at this session of Congress to take full effect no later than January, is overwhelming on grounds of economic stabilization. Even with the surcharge, it is likely that demand will be strong enough to take up the slack now in the economy, to reduce unemployment and tighten labor markets—a most desirable development—and to increase the rate of price inflation. The tax surcharge will probably still leave some anti-inflationary work for the Federal Reserve to do. Without any tax increase, the inflationary gap will be much too big for monetary policy to close except by drastically restrictive measures with very uneven, disruptive, and inequitable incidence.

All too many people, unfortunately, refuse to view the tax increase solely as a measure of economic stabilization. True to form, Professor Galbraith favors and Professor Friedman opposes raising taxes; they both have the same reason, that higher taxes at any season will make the public sector larger in the long run.

Influential members of Congress find the surcharge proposal a lever to obtain reductions in civilian Federal expenditures they don't like anyway. The politically marginal items are welfare and anti-poverty expenditures, and foreign economic assistance. Somehow when fiscal conservatives call on the government to "tighten its belt" and forgo "luxuries," they are always referring to programs intended to make life more tolerable for the poor of this country and the world. Surely the affluent taxpayers of the country are better able than these people to shoulder the economic burden of the Vietnam war.

The press reports that Congress will exact $5 billion cuts in expenditure as the price of the tax increase. (Perhaps the Galbraith-Friedman assumption that higher taxes and higher expenditures go together is wrong, at least in the short run.) The price might be too high to pay. No doubt there are budget items that could be eliminated or postponed without hurting the country (e.g., supersonic transport, agricultural subsidies, space exploration, highways, irrigation projects), but these are not the items likely to be axed. There are some expenditure cuts that would do more damage to the country than inflation would.

Other critics, in the Congress and out, justify their reluctance to increase taxes by pointing to the many loopholes and inequities in the income tax code. Tax reform is needed all right, and has been for years. The case for reform is independent of the current need to raise taxes to check inflation. Oil depletion allowances, for example, are a scandal, but that has been true for many years. Let us wage each fight on its own battleground. If tax policy is to be used, as it must be, for economic stabilization, we cannot reopen all the complex issues and conflicts of interest involved in tax structure every time the economic situation calls for a rise or fall in tax revenues. For stabilization we must have a simple, quick, neutral way of adjusting taxes up or down. The proposed tax surcharge is an excellent device.

WRONG TARGET

Finally, there are those, including many of my colleagues in academia, who refuse to support the proposed tax increase even though they may recognize its economic merits. They oppose the war in Vietnam. Their protest is aimed at the wrong target. War and war expenditures have already been escalated. A vote to deny the Administration the tax increase is a vote for inflation and instability, not for peace. The scale of the war would not be diminished by failure to enact the surcharge, but expenditures to promote domestic tranquillity probably would be. If the object is to bring home to the American people, prior to the 1968 election the costs of the Johnson Administration's adventure in Southeast Asia, the responsible course is the one the President himself has recommended, to raise the tax bills of almost every taxpayer.

BRITISH SPIFS FOR THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, there appeared in the Washington Sunday Post an article entitled "How Philby Stabbed Into the Heart of British Security," and another entitled "Maclean's Spying More Vital Than British Have Admitted."

These articles should be read by people interested in the history of the Korean war. They highlight the fact that when the Chinese Communists came into that war British traitors made it possible for the Chinese to know for certain that the United States would not use the atom bomb against the Chinese aggressors in that fight, and also that America's enemies in that war were in a position to know what this Nation was planning to do before we could get around to doing it. Having that information in advance, they must have felt safe in taking the gamble to risk a major war with the United States.

Traitor Philby and traitors Maclean and Burgess, it seemed, had very successfully taken charge of the highest connections of British intelligence. This

Nation, it seems, had an understanding with the British that we would not use atomic weapons or attack the Chinese coast without consultation with them. The Attlee government was subjected to such treachery that the Communists were in a position to know, through the Russian connections conveying information to the Far East, every move that America communicated to its allies.

That was a very unfortunate situation, and is something we should keep in mind in the future, when this Nation takes steps that it regards as being essential and vital in its own defense and to help preserve the liberty of other countries fighting to defend their liberties.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 8, 1967]

How Philby Stabbed Into the Heart of British Security—Disguised Spy Slipped Past His Lax Superiors

London.—Harold (Kim) Philby's achievement in becoming head of the Soviet section of the British Secret Intelligence Service, while himself being a Soviet agent, must rank as one of the great professional coups in the twisted history of espionage.

Philby later went on to higher things when he became the linkman between the SIS and the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency, from which position he could give his Soviet spymasters thorough general knowledge of the operations of both the major Western intelligence agencies.

But there is a classic quality about the earlier achievement. The selection in 1944 of Philby, already a Soviet agent of more than ten years' standing as the man to conceive, build and control a new British operation against the Russians is an event embodying the purest essence of espionage.

WELL EQUIPPED

How was Philby able to do it?

First, he was superbly equipped for the role of spy: His markmanship was excellent, his mind was swift and clear, his nerves were strong. Despite some powerful drinking, he remained physically tough and resilient. He was also extremely attractive to women.

But above these qualities Philby had the capacity to disguise his feelings and intentions, a crucial professional attribute of a spy. For 30 years he lived as a passionate Communist behind the facade of a middle-class Englishman with Liberal-to-Conservative opinions.

It is still almost impossible to find chinks in the mask that Kim Philby first put on when he was 22. There are one or two clues: His writing was careful and restrained, and many people who knew him recall an elusive sense of distance or remoteness. Rarely did he allow himself to be engaged in such a way as to reveal his inner thoughts.

Had Philby been forced to spend more time in first-class intellectual company during those 30 years, it is questionable whether he could have kept up the charade. But the ineptitude of the British Intelligence Service helped to make his fantastic career possible.

Because the SIS bureaucracy was protected by layers of official mystery, the agency was even less prepared than others in the British establishment to cope with the mid-20th century. The Service was a caricature of the establishment, and so this is an account of a great breach that opened up the defenses of a social class, and therefore the defenses of the nation.

Philby was born on New Year's Day, 1912, in imperial India. Ironically, young Philby's Indian playmates nicknamed him "Kim," after the half-caste boy of the Kipling book whose central theme is intelligence work.

The boy's father, Harry St. John Bridger Philby, was an officer of the Indian civil service, a distinguished Arabist who, though he came of middle-class background, rejected its ordered virtues for the passionate, egotistic culture of the Arabian deserts. St. John Philby, like T. E. Lawrence, fought to free the Arab lands from Turkish rule and later came to share the Arab belief that Britain reneged on her promises at the end of World War I.

In 1929 Kim Philby entered Cambridge, where he met future colleagues Guy Burgess and Donald Maclean. Philby's political bend was steadily leftwards. His views were expressed more in private, although with great conviction.

Philby had traveled in Central and Eastern Europe during university vacations, and after graduation in 1933 he went for an extended stay to Germany and Austria. It was here and then, in the early days of the Nazi terror, that Philby's resolve was hardened. He became a determined Communist, and he was recruited as an agent.

A few months after he left Cambridge, Philby was given his lifetime task—to penetrate British intelligence. Every piece of objective evidence available points to this period in late 1933, and is corroborated by the accounts Philby has given to his children who have visited him in Moscow since his defection from Beirut in 1963.

On Feb. 23, 1934, Philby married an Austrian Jewish girl, Alice Friedmann, in Vienna. She was an avowed Communist, and now lives in East Berlin with her third husband.

Philby and Alice returned to London, where he became an assistant editor on a dying liberal magazine. But Philby was to spend the next five years carefully obscuring his left-wing past beneath a right-wing camouflage.

Obviously an excellent way to insulate oneself against charges of communism was to condone Hitler's Nazi regime, which both Philby and Burgess did by joining the Anglo-German Fellowship. Philby managed to have his picture taken at a Swastika-decked dinner. This was in 1936, just before the outbreak of the Spanish Civil War, which gave Philby another opportunity to establish his public political position.

Philby went to Spain in February, 1937, and began reporting as a free-lance writer from the Franco side.

Recently in Moscow, Philby told his son John: "I wouldn't have lasted a week in Spain without behaving like a Fascist." He behaved so well, in fact, that General Franco awarded him the Red Cross of Military Merit.

THE FIRST GLIMMERS

When the civil war ended, Philby had completed two years as an undercover Communist in Franco's camp. But was he already spying on the British? There are two bits of evidence.

One is that an officer named Pedro Giro recalls that in a cafe in Salamanca a German agent passed a note to him with a warning against two men then in the cafe. According to the German, these men were British agents. Twice subsequently, Giro saw Philby locked in conversation with the same two men.

Another point was noticed by Sam Pope Brewer, a New York Times correspondent (whose wife, Eleanor, Philby was to acquire 20 years later in Beirut). At press conferences, Kim was always the last questioner and the man who wanted to know just which regiment had made just which move.

Perhaps at this point Philby, anxious to ingratiate himself with British intelligence men, was collecting and passing on any tidbits he could get.

ZANY CORRESPONDENT

When the British expeditionary force left for France to fight the Germans, Kim Philby went with them as the London Times' No. 1 war correspondent. His colleague, Bob Cooper, thought Philby a wild, slightly drunken and rather brutal young man. Kim, it seems, was addicted to a curious bar game which involved busting people's knuckles. Also, as in Spain, where he had acquired a Royalist mistress, he was rather conspicuously living with a girl, this time Lady Margaret Vane-Tempest-Stewart.

Other colleagues still saw him as slightly pro-fascist. He wore the Franco decoration on his uniform. The disaster of Dunkirk in June, 1940, brought Philby back to London. At last conditions were ready for his crucial penetration of British intelligence.

These conditions were nowhere better than at the house where young intelligence officers set up residence. Among them were Guy Burgess and a number of homosexuals, heavy drinkers and hangers-on of varying types.

Philby was immediately taken into the department for sabotage, subversion and propaganda. His particular job was lecturing on propaganda leaflet technique. Philby was later transfered to a unit training for unarmed combat behind enemy lines, but his stammer and the fact that his work in Spain had made him known to a great many German military people made it seem suicidal to send him into occupied Europe.

So in the summer of 1941 Philby was recruited for work in the Secret Intelligence Service.

This agency, better known as MI–6, was and is concerned with espionage and counter-espionage in foreign countries. (MI–5, the home unit of the mythical James Bond, concerns itself with counter-espionage in Britain and the colonies). Both agencies had suffered a severe contraction since the palmy days of World War I.

MI–6 had escaped any basic reforms. During the 30s it had done its recruiting, in the tradition of the Great Game of the establishment, from the British police force in India and partly among rich, upper-class young men from London's financial district.

It was these men, often known as "the stockbrokers," who gave the Service its connection with White's Club, one of London's most exclusive men's clubs. This notorious liaison stands at the center of any picture of the wartime secret service. And it epitomizes the rougish, dilettante quality of MI–6, of which the rest of Whitehall, and especially the embryonic professionals of MI–5, were to become increasingly contemptuous over the next decade.

Most of the top brass belonged there, including Sir Steward Menzies, the MI–6 chief until 1951 and the model for Ian Fleming's fictional security chief "M." The etiquette of the time was to leave Menzies alone with his personal assistant when they were together, since it was understood that they were "running the secret service or something."

White's provided, too, a fertile source for emergency wartime recruits, on the basic English principle that if you could not trust your club, who could you trust?

As for Menzies himself, one former subordinate recalls: "He was terrifying to work with because he acted entirely on instinct. He rarely read a single case right through, yet he often came in with the answer."

COUNTERESPIONAGE

Kim Philby became part of Section Five of MI–6 which was responsible for counter-espionage, or more exactly, spying on the German spies. Through personal contact supplied by his old colleague Guy Burgess, Philby became head of the Iberian subsection.

"Philby just did not have the contacts to get that sort of job on his own," said one of his colleagues. "I know it was Burgess who rang up someone and got him in."

The Iberian subsection's theater was a vital one. Spain was a neutral, friendly to Germany, and provided the perfect base for operations against Britain's communications keystone, Gibraltar. Portugal was friendly to Britain, but Portuguese Mozambique was the center of German espionage operations in southern Africa. It was in this connection that Philby sent Malcolm Muggeridge to Lourenco Marques and Graham Greene to Sierra Leone.

As a boss, Philby was a quick success. He possessed both grasp and human sympathy, faculties which evidently won him intense personal loyalty. This was to be a feature of his entire career, and it is with an almost unspeakable sense of irony that associates recall the word which they always felt summed him up: "integrity."

"You didn't just like him, admire him, agree with him," says one man who saw him often from the war until his defection. "You worshipped him."

By 1943, two years after coming in, Philby was firmly established as one of Menzies' very best men.

But by early 1944 Philby was getting bored by the limitations of the Iberian subsection.

It was then that Menzies asked Philby, just a few months before D-Day, to revive the defunct counter-espionage operation against the Soviet Union. To Philby, this must have seemed the ultimate opportunity, and also to represent the ultimate folly of the men above him.

Philby's appointment is a measure of the blind faith in him on the part of his superiors, whose own reputations had been aided by Philby's work. Had Philby's early Communist experience been forgotten? Had it been obliterated from the record by his excellent performance? Or was it, just conceivably, noted and, in a moment of supreme political naivete, ignored?

The aging colonel who was the sole incumbent of the inactive Soviet section was pensioned off, and Philby moved in to build an empire which, within 18 months, occupied an entire floor and employed more than 100 people. Within two years, the section had accumulated a vast store of information on Communists in Western countries, front organizations and the other now-familiar stuff of Cold War counter-espionage. And Kim Philby had acquired the confidence of his staff.

"He could get them to do anything for him," one of them has recalled.

This witness remembers that everyone there came from a strict security background, where the rigid tradition was that office desks should be locked at night. But Kim broke that tradition as he broke so many others. "Don't worry about that," he said, "I'll lock them up later."

"I didn't like to do it," this witness now says, "but he was so charming that I couldn't refuse anything he asked."

Maclean's Spying More Vital Than British Have Admitted

London, October 7.—A secret intelligence report which the Sunday Times tracked down in Washington in the course of its investigations into the Philby conspiracy makes it clear that, contrary to repeated British government assertions since 1951, Donald Maclean had access to every crucial Anglo-American policy decision at the height of the Cold War.

The report was compiled in 1956 by U.S. State Department intelligence officers in an attempt to assess the damage done by Maclean and Guy D. Burgess who fled with him in 1951. For the first time, the report reveals the magnitude of Maclean's espionage achievements.

It is also the first evidence from official files that the British government has been consistently misleading in its statements on Maclean's duties and the type of material to which he had access.

In fact, the U.S. intelligence report reveals that Maclean had knowledge of secret Anglo-American exchanges on the North Atlantic pact, the Korean War and the Japanese peace treaty.

It also shows, for instance, that Maclean had full knowledge of the critical American determination to "localize the conflict," and therefore of its decision not to allow the United Nations forces under Gen. MacArthur to carry the war against the Chinese coast.

Both MacArthur and his chief of intelligence, Gen. Charles Willoughby, were certain at the time that this information had been passed to the Russians. Just before he died, MacArthur complained that the Chinese not only knew of this policy decision but "all our strategic troop movements."

Until now it has generally been believed that Maclean, first secretary in the British Embassy in Washington and later head of the American Department in the Foreign Office, passed to the Russians only marginal atomic secrets. He saw these in the course of his duties as U.K. secretary of the combined policy committee—the body set up to regulate the Anglo-American exchange of scientific information on the atomic program.

This information was vital enough, the report reveals. Maclean was able to tell the Russians the estimates made at that time of uranium ore supply available to the three governments—Britian, America, and Canada.

To appreciate the significance of this the circumstances of 1947 have to be recalled. In the early post-war years the world supply of uranium was thought to be limited. The West therefore embarked, in extreme secrecy upon a program of "pre-emptive buying" of uranium, in an attempt to corner all the known resources. Maclean was in a position to tell the Russians every detail of these vital negotiations.

The revelations provide the first credible explanation of the necessity that drove the master-spy Harold Philby to risking, and in the event wrecking, his whole espionage career, to tip off Maclean before the British security services could reach him.

Maclean was not, as previous explanations have suggested, simply an old friend. He was Russia's most important known diplomatic spy in the cold war years.

THE PRESIDENT'S DECLARATION OF FAITH

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I have just returned from 2 weeks' official assignment to Europe. Designated by the Vice President as congressional adviser to the 11th International Atomic Energy Conference at Vienna, it was also my privilege to attend at Geneva the 336th plenary meeting of the 18-Nation Committee on Disarmament.

I talked to and listened to leading figures of many nations with a common concern—nuclear progress for peace.

Everywhere, everyone asked about our American President, whose authority is not surpassed anywhere in the world, whose responsibility is not matched, whose burden is not equaled by anyone.

Our President answered for himself and for his Democratic Party last Saturday night.

I missed the President's party, but I would not miss his declaration of faith. It is a most important document of our times.

I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of the President of the United States, delivered at Washington on October 7, 1967, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks of the President at the President's Ball, Washington Hilton Hotel, Washington, D.C.

Thank you so much, Mr. Vice President, Mrs. Humphrey, distinguished Governors and outstanding Mayors of the Nation, Members of the Cabinet, Members of the Congress, and my beloved friends.

This is a very enjoyable evening. It is very thoughtful, to say nothing about how generous it is of you to bring us all together for this most pleasant evening.

I have been watching the polls pretty closely here of late. As you might imagine, I like some of them quite a lot more than I like others. The ones I like best are those that like me best.

But in this era in which we are living, I wasn't too sure of their credibility—so the other day I just went out and had a poll of my own made.

You may be interested. The question went this way:

"If President Johnson were to run against the following nationally known Republican leaders, who would you vote for?"

The first pairing showed:

Lyndon B. Johnson: 73%

William E. Miller: 27%

Then we added another picture that would involve the entire ticket. The second pairing dealt with the ticket of both President and Vice President. Once again I am happy to report that I think we did very well under the circumstances.

Lyndon Johnson and Hubert H. Humphrey—71%

Harold E. Stassen and Ezra Taft Benson—29%

I think I should tell you that we circulated our poll among leading editors throughout the country—and other experts. The response seemed to be very good. One telegram I remember came in from a very important national magazine. It said:

"Congratulations, Mr. President, on a very fine and well conducted poll."

It was signed, "Editor, Literary Digest."

A President, of course, sees a great many expressions of public opinion. The other day someone handed me this evaluation of the state of the world:

"The earth is degenerating these days. Bribery and corruption abound. Children no longer mind parents. Every man wants to write a book and it is evident that the end of the world is approaching fast."

I wonder who the columnist was. Later I discovered that, whoever he was, he wrote what he had to say on an Assyrian tablet almost 5,000 years ago.

You don't have to look far to see the same kind of thing today—much of it is directed at the man in the kitchen that President Harry Truman talked about.

Some people think we are spending too much, and some think we are not spending enough.

Some people think we shouldn't raise taxes, and some think we should have raised them last year.

Some think that we are not doing enough for the people in need, and some think we have done too much already.

Some think we should escalate the war in Vietnam, and some think we should get out of there tomorrow.

There is no lack of advice—however contradictory. In the crises of this hour—as in all others that we have faced since our Nation began—there are plenty of recommendations on how to get out of trouble cheaply and fast.

Most of them in the last analysis really come down to this: Deny your responsibilities.

In world affairs, behave as if you were a small nation with few interests; behave as if the oceans were twice as wide as they really are; behave as if you don't care what happens to people with different tongues or different cultures, or colors of skin—so long as they aren't shooting at your house—just now.

Here at home, behave as if every baby is born with the same chance to succeed in life—although his crib may lie in the squalid back room of a slum. Behave as if rats were funny—too funny to fight with Federal help. Behave as if health and education and jobs were somebody else's concern—not yours. Behave as if the farmer is getting as much as he deserves. Behave as if you have no interest in helping local authorities protect their communities from crime and violence. Behave as if runaway inflation is inevitable—above all, never send up a tax bill designed to fight inflation.

I hear and read a good deal of this kind of advice. It is much more subtle than I have described it tonight, more "reasonable". It is the voice not of the dove or the hawk, but of the ostrich.

Be certain of this—in the time that I have been give to lead this country, I shall not follow that kind of advice.

The Democratic Party has never chosen the road of irresponsibility. In the 1960's, America, under Democratic leadership, has faced up to the poverty and discrimination in its midst. It has not yet mastered them. But it has started—started on the road toward mastery—toward healing and educating and training and employing those whom life was passing by.

This party, and the programs it has inspired and legislated and turned into action, has set a standard in the 1960's by which every Administration that follows must be judged.

For it was we who said poverty must be abolished.

A good education must be the birthright of every child

Our cities must be made fit for a free people

The environment must be cleansed and protected for every family

Our streets must be made safe for law-abiding citizens

And basic human rights must be made real for every man and woman among us.

Let them say that we have aroused expectations. So have all of those who have liberated men from dreamless sleep and sullen apathy—and set them on the way to becoming what their Creator intended them to be.

Let them say that we have not accomplished our goals entirely—that there is still ignorance and misery and despair in our cities and rural towns. Yes, there is—and there always will be, unless America completes the work we have already begun in these seven years.

My friends, next year will be a testing time for America.

The question our people are going to have to answer is clear:

Shall we go on building?

Or shall we become discouraged with ourselves, impatient that the work is not yet finished? Shall we bury all that we have begun—begun with such hope and promise—and bury it in a shroud of inaction and reaction?

You here tonight have come a long way to give your answer. Every State in the Union is represented in this hall tonight.

You are making it possible for the party that believes in building to take its case to the people—to tell them what we promised to do on that August evening in 1964 at Atlantic City we have done—and that America is a richer and stronger and fairer Nation today because Democrats made it so. And we have only begun.

Our party and our country is greater than any of us. It is entitled to the best from all of us.

As for myself, my first and last business is trying to win and trying to secure the peace. That task will take all that I have—and I shall give it gladly.

So tonight I tell you that I will work as hard as any man can work for his country, and I will do everything in my power to build a record for our Democratic Party that America will enthusiastically embrace 13 months from now.

I regret that I cannot predict, this evening, when the issue that most concerns us will be resolved.

I do know that we are following the road of responsibility in Vietnam, as we are here at home. I know—I know probably as well as any man, save those who are fighting for us out there tonight, at this very hour—that it is a rough road to travel. But the road, I think, does lead to a free Asia—and the road does lead, I think, to a freer and a happier and a more secure United States.

I believe the American people will follow its course—not blithely, not cheerfully—for they all lament the waste of war; but they will follow it with a firm determination, now that we have begun it, to see it through all the way.

A very brave man, reflecting on the years that lay ahead for his country, back in 1960, had this to say:

"Now the age of consolidation is over and once again the age of change and challenge has come upon us."

The result, John Fitzgerald Kennedy said, is that

"The next year, the next decade, in all likelihood the next generation, will require more bravery and wisdom on our part than any period in our history. We will be face to face, every day, in every part of our lives and times, with the real issue of our age—the issue of survival."

So we are.

I live with that knowledge.

I live every day with the responsibilities it entails—with those our country bears, because it is the strongest and it is the freest of all nations, and also with those that I bear, because of the office I hold.

If I may, let me speak quite personally to you for a moment.

I have—as you know—spent my entire life in the political arena. I treasure the support of our people. I treasure that support as much, I think, as any man could. And I know, as you must know, that there are many who suggest ways to increase that support—temporarily—by softening or renouncing the struggle in Vietnam, or escalating it to the red line of danger, by giving in and retreating on the tax proposal, by abandoning the fight against discrimination—the fight for the poor—here at home.

Some say there is short term political gain for me, and for our party, if we could follow this kind of a course.

But what about a year from now? What about five years from now? What would choosing that course mean—not just for Lyndon Johnson, not just for the Democratic Party, but for the glorious United States of America?

It would mean, in my opinion, greatly increasing the chances of a major war—not this year, but in the years immediately ahead.

It would mean imposing a far more onerous tax, a tax of inflation, on all of our people—and the poorest among us—not just this year, but next year.

It would mean dooming our cities to angry strife and squalor—in every year yet to come.

So we do have a choice.

We can take the easy road tonight, denying our responsibilities, hoping that a rise in our polls will compensate for what we ought to have done for our country.

Or we can take the harder road of responsibility. We can do what we believe is right for our children's future, though it may mean a great deal of present pain.

I have made my choice. And I pray that I—and we—will have enough of that bravery, unselfishness and wisdom that Jack Kennedy said we would need—to see it through, all the way.

Just an additional minute. I won't be long. You have been here too long already, I know.

This is not in the text, but I want to say it while I have the chance.

This party tonight, this salute, should have been given to the man who really deserves it. The next one that the Democratic Committee gives is going to be for the man who deserves it more than any Vice President who ever served this Nation—Hubert Humphrey.

And to those great Governors of great Democratic states, those outstanding mayors from Chicago, Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, from throughout the country, who have come a long way to be here tonight to give us their support and their inspiration, to those of you who have made sacrifices from your family and your own luxury to come here and make it possible for your country to get the truth message, I want to tell you that we are so grateful.

It gives us such encouragement and strength to know that all of you in this room, and in the other room, would want to do what you have done.

To the National Committee, the Chairman and Vice Chairman, Mr. Bailey and Miss Price, to Mr. Criswell, who has done a remarkable job, I want to say thank you very much.

This is not a group of big men, rich men. This is not a group of little men and poor men. This is not a group from the Eastern Seaboard or the West Coast.

This group comes from every state in the Union—more from New York, Illinois, Ohio and Pennsylvania, some of the larger states, than from the smaller ones. But every state has sent someone here tonight.

The person who is most responsible for that, and the person who is most responsible for ridding us of all the troubles and heartaches that come from trying to meet leftover bills, is a quiet, silent, humble man from New York named Arthur Krim, who the people who believe in the Democratic Party owe as much to as any man who ever served the Democratic Party.

Thank you very much.

CHIEF LAYTON COMMENTS ON CRISIS IN LAW AND ORDER

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, having been recently advised by the Postmaster General of the plans for the issuance of a postage stamp during fiscal year 1968 as a law and order commemorative stamp, I communicated with the District of Columbia Police Chief, John B. Layton, to advise him of my gratification and satisfaction on learning of this decision.

Chief Layton's acknowledgment states plainly his feeling that we are reaching a crisis stage in this country as it relates to respect for law and order. As a person who has long deplored the passivity of a large portion of the people in the Nation toward persons openly and continuously displaying contempt for law and order, I feel it is well for the general public to have access to Chief Layton's remarks.

I support his view. Moreover, I am convinced that actions and expressions of support for greater law enforcement and greater respect for law enforcement officers will go a long way toward creating a better atmosphere for community relations throughout the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Police Chief Layton be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 29, 1967.

Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD,
U.S. Senate,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: Many thanks for sending me copies of the letter you sent to Mr. Quinn Tamm and the one you received from Mr. Lawrence F. O'Brien relative to the approval of a stamp based on the theme of respect for law and order.

I am delighted that the stamp will be issued and certainly appreciate your efforts in that direction. I feel that we are reaching a crisis stage in this country as it relates to respect for law and order; therefore, every forward step we can take in increasing such respect for obedience to the law is most desirable. There is no doubt that the U.S. Postal Stamp is a positive action in that direction.

With kind regards and appreciation for your continuing support of effective law enforcement, I am,

Sincerely yours,
JOHN B. LAYTON,
Chief of Police.

HEART FUND PROGRAM OF AHEPA

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, my good friend Andrew Fasseas, who was elected last month Supreme President of the Order of AHEPA, has brought to my attention the Order's heart fund program and its accomplishments in the last few years.

Through the efforts of the fraternity, young boys and girls from Greece, suffering from a heart condition which can only be corrected with special surgery in the United States, were brought here and through open heart operation were given a new normal life.

I consider this an excellent humanitarian effort for which the Order of AHEPA and its membership ought to be commended.

There are over 800 youngsters whose condition is reported to require this delicate operation before they are able to live normally again.

I sincerely feel that everything possible will be done to help restore their health and give them a new chance in life.

I hope also that several, fresh surgeons who, after being properly trained in this type of surgery in the United States, can go back and perform these life-saving operations in Greece.

I commend Andrew Fasseas and the Order of AHEPA's heart fund program for its great humanitarian efforts.

WHY TAX INCREASE WILL NOT STEM INFLATION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, for many weeks I have been contending on the floor of the Senate that Members of this body should recognize that their vote for a tax increase is unlikely to have much effect on inflation.

A front-page article written by John O'Riley and published in this morning's Wall Street Journal says why persuasively and concisely. With the reputation, the time, and the intellectual equipment, it would seem likely that some of the Nation's brilliant academic economists would make some analysis of the impact of a tax increase on the economy in terms of its effect on particular prices.

It would be hard to conceive of a more appropriate basis for tax policy decision by Congress.

Certainly with the responsibilities borne by governmental economists one would expect this kind of analysis. But if such an analysis has been made it has been suppressed. No governmental economist has explained to Congress just what prices will be restrained by a tax increase. Certainly the consensus is that food will not be affected. It is clear that commodities for which the supply is abundant and demand deficient will not be affected. As for steel, autos, and chemicals, the tax increase will not stem the inflation we are already suffering in these areas.

Mr. O'Riley suggests another area: where demand has been for years consistently outpacing supply and promises to do so for years to come, as in medical care service and household service, the tax increase will have little effect in stemming a steady, relentless inflation. In the many areas where costs are predominant—that is, where the labor component is big and decisive and the supply of that labor is limited—it will take years of time, not a 10-percent surtax, to stem inflation.

Where, then, will the tax increase slow down the rise of prices? There may be some products whose prices would be sensitive, but it is doubtful whether in the aggregate they would have much real effect on the cost of living.

Certainly, if Congress is to increase every American's taxes by 10 percent, and if the principal reason for the proposed tax increase is to stem inflation, the administration owes the Congress far more than wild statements that without the tax increase the economy will be in shambles, or that the inflation tax without a tax increase will be far worse than the inflation and tax increase that our citizens will suffer if we pass the tax increase. But no such analysis has been made available.

Mr. President, I can only conclude that when such competent economists as the present council of economic advisers, and such able national tax-hike proponents as Walter Heller, Joseph Pechman, Otto Eckstein, James Tobin, and others, fail to come up with the kind of specific analysis of just how the tax increase will solve the inflation problem—the long-run conclusion is that they cannot show how the tax increase will do the job, simply because it will not. If the tax hike would slow inflation, the proponents of the tax increase would give us more than generalized appeals to their prestige; they would give us a specific commodity-by-commodity analysis, and then an overall quantitative summary.

I ask unanimous consent that the O'Riley article, which gives us at least a beginning of the commodity-by-commodity argument, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE OUTLOOK: APPRAISAL OF CURRENT TRENDS IN BUSINESS AND FINANCE

If a few million people who heretofore couldn't afford to eat steak at all suddenly find themselves able and eager to eat it every day, the price of steers will go up. And they will stay up until cattle men can get more beef on the market. This is elementary supply-and-demand economics. Some might call it kindergarten economics. Yet it may be worth pondering by those who expect a boost in Federal taxes, if it comes, to put a big brake on the rising cost of living. Chances are good that the proposed tax increase will do no such thing.

Few economists can contemplate with comfort the huge Federal deficit that apparently lies ahead. The prospect of the Government, unable or unwilling to cut its spending, pumping out maybe as much as $30 billion a year more buying power than it takes in, hardly promises price stability. It looks like a price pusher-upper if there ever was one. And a tax hike should nip some of its potency. But a close look at the pull and tug of supply and demand suggests that the prices most responsible for the climbing cost of living will probably keep on rising with or without a tax boost.

The so-called "cost of living index" comes out every month. It reflects what consumers pay for (1) all kinds of commodities and (2) all services—haircuts, bus rides, hospital care, and so on. The index always makes page one headlines. It is nearly always up. It is often described as "spiraling."

When this index is broken down into its internal components, it is quickly apparent that some components—mostly services—have risen drastically more than others in recent years, The commodities, or physical consumables, have in general been the slow risers.

The table below, using price index figures with the 1957–59 average as a base and rounding off fractions, shows what's happened to the service costs in this decade.

Service	1957–59	Now	Percent change
All services	100	128	+28
Household services	100	127	+27
Public transportation	100	133	+33
Medical care service	100	147	+47
Other services	100	132	+32

The following table shows the record for the average of prices on all consumer-bought commodities, as well as that for some of the key commodity groups.

Commodity	1957–59	Now	Percent change
All Commodities	100	112	+12
Food Eaten at Home	100	114	+14
Men's, Boys' Apparel	100	114	+14
Women's, Girls' Apparel	100	109	+9
New Cars	100	97	−3
Household Durables	100	98	−2
Housefurnishings	100	101	+1

Behind the big difference in the two tables are the forces of supply and demand. The richly prospering American society in recent years has simply been demanding services in greater quantity than they could be supplied—at old prices. In the area of physical commodities, the producers, generally, have been keeping up.

The most dramatic example in the service area, of course, is medical care. Health insurance—Blue Cross, Blue Shield—has enabled rapidly expanding millions of people to effectively demand far more medical care than they ever had before. And medical facilities are hard put to meet this demand.

Here's a quick rundown on the swift rise in the number of people covered by Blue Cross and Blue Shield over the past two decades:

Year	Blue Cross	Blue Shield
1948	30,498,682	9,934,908
1950	37,515,745	16,182,014
1960	56,063,215	44,492,603
1966	63,713,722	54,627,902

Nor does this complete the medical demand story. Medicare for the old and Medicaid for the poor now add new demand pressure. Some 19 million elderly folks are already covered by Medicare. And in the 27 states which have so far adopted Medicaid, 10.6 million poor are estimated to be eligible for this coverage.

How all this immense pressure pushes hospital costs skyward is too well known to be detailed. It means heavy demand for more hospital help at higher wage rates and for more costly hospital equipment.

Will a tax increase perceptibly abate this upward pressure on medical costs? It is hard to argue convincingly that it will.

In other service areas—hair cutting, house cleaning, bus driving, TV repairing—it is harder to put the supply-demand factor sharply in focus. But it is there. With a prosperous and growing population demanding more services, it is hard to increase the supply. College-minded America puts a low status rating on many service jobs. Many a hard working bus driver, or barber, is putting his boy through college. And when the boy gets out, he most likely won't drive a bus. Or cut hair. Or repair TV sets. Yet the buses still have to run. Hair keeps growing. TVs keep conking out.

Will a Federal tax hike put a halt to the rise in New York bus or subway fares? Or the climb in the repairman's fees? It may, but it is not the sort of thing you'd want to bet on.

The area where consumer price increases have been the smallest in recent years is that of manufactured products. The cost of such things as automobiles and household appliances is simply not inflated. In relation to rising incomes, they are notably deflated.

Holding down the prices of manufactured products, of course, is massive capacity to produce—and the sharp competition that goes with it. Cars, television sets, refrigerators, toasters, garden tools flow from U.S. factories in increasing torrents. Capacity to increase the flow expands every day.

Competing with this big home output is the heavy flow of goods from the factories of Europe and Japan. It all lands in the retail stores.

No one strolling through the jam-packed consumer durable department of a big retail store can fail to see why it isn't easy to raise prices on this merchandise.

Thus while supply-demand forces work against cost-of-living increases where such increases have been smallest, they still exert an upward push where gains have been sharpest and will likely continue doing so—with or without a tax boost.

JOHN O'RILEY.

COLUMBUS—"TRIALS AND TRIUMPHS"—BY DR. JAMES FORRESTER

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, in this world which has known turbulence for thousands of years—a world that in this day looks to an America of an age less than 500 years, looks to this comparatively new land for security and responsibility—it seems fitting to look back to America's beginnings as we approach Columbus Day.

A scholarly treatise on Columbus, his trial and his triumphs, has just come to my attention.

Its author is a distinguished educator and churchman—not of Columbus' ancestry nor Columbus' faith. He is Dr. James Forrester, president of Gordon College and Gordon Divinity School, in Wenham, Mass.

A native of Scotland, a graduate of Canadian and California universities, Dr. Forrester was an Air Force chaplain in World War II, serving in the Pacific combat zones of the Marianas, Iwo Jima, and the Philippines.

He was the first American chaplain to conduct a Christmas Eve service on Mount Suribachi on Iwo Jima, and he delivered the Easter Sunday message of 1965 at the Boston Naval Shipyard from the deck of the historic U.S.S. *Constitution*.

As a man who has made American history himself, the history of America is close to his heart and his essay on Columbus deserves a place in every American classroom.

It is the product of deep research and is in a literary framework of the finest expression. I deem it an honor to have the privilege of making it a permanent chapter of our American history by asking unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the treatise was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLUMBUS—"TRIALS AND TRIUMPHS"

(By Dr. James Forrester, president, Gordon College and Gordon Divinity School, Wenham, Mass.)

America is the story of costly discovery, prodigious effort and the conviction that in a context of responsible freedom, human life can achieve its God-intended fulfillment. Christopher Columbus never could have imagined what he initiated when he hoisted his flag on the Santa Maria in August, 1492, and sailed her out of Palos Harbor and over the western horizon. His subsequent discovery was to double man's geographical knowledge and open the way for the greatest expression of human freedom ever attained. This courageous Italian mariner has an incontestable place of honor in the vanguard of our national heroes. The sufferings and trials which he endured in achieving his goal are little known.

Through the gate he opened to the west nearly 500 years ago has flowed an ever-widening stream of freedom-seeking humanity. Those who came in his wake can read a nation's creed which he could never have written:

"Give me your tired, your poor—
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore
Send these, the homeless tempest-tossed to me:
I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

Let no voice discredit this Italian navigator of amazing ingenuity and dedication. His indefatigable efforts were motivated by two clear purposes. He had a religious dedication. He wanted to propagate the Christian faith in Asia and convert the Grand Khan. He wished to rescue the holy sepulchre of Jerusalem from the Moslems. He had also an explorer's dedication. He wanted to reach the far continent believed to be Asia. Attempts have been made to diminish the importance of his role in the discovery of America. Let these documented facts speak for themselves. Let every Italian-American stand in the proud glory of this historic event as we celebrate Columbus Day!

Christopher Columbus was born in Genoa about 1435, the son of Domenico Columbus and Susannah Fontanarossa. He was given a good basic education in geometry, geography, astronomy, and navigation at the University of Pavia. As early as 14 years of age he made sea voyages which were filled with daring. As a young man Columbus was identified with some of the naval action related to the wars between the Italian states. He commanded a vessel in a small flotilla led by a cousin called "Columbo the Younger," to intercept four Venetian galleys returning, richly laden with merchandise from Flanders. Battle was joined off the Portuguese coast. Columbus engaged a huge Venetian vessel. In the heavy exchange of missiles, the Venetian vessel caught fire. Preliminary to boarding, the ships had been fastened together with grappling chains. They became one flaming mass. The crews threw themselves into the sea. Columbus seized an oar among the floating debris and swam two leagues to the shore of Lisbon.

Lisbon became the place of opportunity for Columbus to advance his knowledge of navigation and to heighten his curiosity about the world. He married Dona Felipa, the daughter of Bartholemew Monis de Perestrello, who was an Italian cavalier in the service of Prince Henry and one of his most distinguished navigators. Perestrello founded a colony in the Madeira Islands and was visited by Columbus at Porto Santo. Here Columbus made a living by drawing maps and charts. When Perestrello died, Columbus came into possession of all the logs and navigation records of his deceased father-in-law. He talked with seamen who had made voyages in the western seas. He knew that Prince Henry of Portugal believed the Continent of Africa to be circumnavigable and he had heard and read tales of the riches of Asia. Columbus sailed occasionally the Portuguese trade routes and knew the narratives of Marco Polo.

Fortuitously, at about the time the vigorous mind of Columbus was wrestling with the hypothesis of a direct sea route to Asia westward from Spain, an important aid to ocean navigation was being developed. The physicians of John, II, of Portugal, Roderigo and Joseph, the latter being a Jew, together with the celebrated cosmographer Martin Bohen, developed what was to be the forerunner of the sextant. The use of the astrolabe enabled seamen to ascertain their distance from the equator by measuring the altitude of the sun.

Step by step Columbus pieced the data together which convinced him that by sailing west he could reach Asia. He had no idea that America and the Pacific Ocean lay between Spain and Asia by the western route. But the brave dream of Columbus was taking shape which was to launch him toward the setting sun and the historic opening of the new world.

Columbus needed ships, men and supplies to implement his daring concept. He first tried to interest the city of Genoa but the Genoese wrote him off as a visionary schemer. Columbus appealed to King John, II, of Portugal. He referred him to a committee or junto charged with matters of maritime discovery. They treated Columbus' project as extravagant and visionary. This junto, seeing that King John, II, might help Columbus, suggested that Columbus be kept in suspense. The Bishop of Ceuta and the junto secretly dispatched a vessel to see if there was any foundation to Columbus' theory—that the world was round and if there was a western route to India. King John, II, assented to this scheme and they required Columbus to submit a detailed plan of his proposed voyages, with all charts and documents. A caravel was dispatched with the ostensible design of carrying provisions to the Cape Verde Islands but with private instructions to follow Columbus' routes. The vessels ran into severe storms and wild tumbling waves. The sailors lost courage and came back ridiculing the project of Columbus as extravagant and irrational. Columbus was without support, had suffered the loss of his wife and found himself destitute and disillusioned by the fraudulent treatment of his patron. Then began the lonely testing of the strength of his purpose.

He left Lisbon in secret with his son, Diego, and offering the princes of Europe the discovery of the new world, he begged his way from court to court. One day while passing a convent he begged a piece of bread for his famished lad. In 1485 he turned to the Spanish Duke of Medina Celi and opened up his plan to give the concept to the King of France for implementation. The Duke at first thought that he might by himself furnish the caravels to Columbus for his grand design. He kept him waiting more than two years and finally referred the matter to Queen Isabella of Spain. The Spanish Court was too heavily involved in the Moorish wars, however, and Columbus with his scheme was referred to a committee presided over by the Queen's confessor, Fray Hernando de Talavera.

After much time-consuming delay, the committee reported that it was vain and impracticable. Columbus did not give up but instead continued to gather support among influential friends of the Queen. Difficulties plagued his efforts continually. The scarcity of funds, the jealousy of courtiers, the doubts of King Ferdinand, the perfidy of those he trusted would have turned aside anyone but this lion-hearted mariner with the vision of the New World in his eyes.

Finally Queen Isabella consented to support the expedition, declaring, "I undertake the enterprise for my own Crown of Castile and will pledge my jewels to raise the necessary funds." Eighteen years of heartbreaking disappointment and unrelenting pursuit of the goal had brought Columbus to the first major step in fulfillment.

But there was still critical struggle ahead. When Columbus went to Palos to obtain and prepare his vessels, the owners refused to furnish them. When that difficulty was resolved, the ship builders did faulty work sabotaging critical components and did a sloppy job on the caulking of the vessels. Stories spread among the seamen of the wild visionary who would launch them on stormy untraveled waters with his primitive charts. Seamen had to be impressed by force to man the ships. Fortunately, two brothers named Martin and Vincente Pinzon, who were navigators of demonstrated courage and ability, threw in their lot with Columbus and furnished one of the vessels which had an effect of allaying opposition.

The vessels were ready in 1492 and August 3, Columbus hoisted his flag on the Santa Maria. The Pinta was commanded by Martin Alonzo Pinzon, with his brother Francisco Martin as pilot, The Nina was commanded by Vincente Yaney Pinzon and had latine sails.

One hundred and twenty persons were on the three ships, including a physician and surgeon.

When the ships set sail from Palos, a deep gloom spread over the community because almost everybody had relatives on board.

On the third day at sea, the Pinta's rudder was discovered broken and unhung, sabotaged by her owners. They finally made the Canary Islands where repairs were made. While sailing among the islands, the crews were terrified by the belching volcano, Teneriffe.

Columbus faced new dangers. While taking on water, he received word that Portuguese caravels were hovering off the islands to capture him. Fortunately he put out to sea quickly and avoided them. When out of sight of land, his own crew was in a constant state of panic and had to be reassured continuously. The crude navigation instruments deviated by five of six degrees from the North Star on September 13. This brought consternation to the pilots. Columbus had to keep two sets of calculations, one known only to himself and the other for the consolation of the crew. For twenty-one days they sailed on beyond the Canaries without any sight of land into wholly unknown seas. Would threat of mutiny now deter Columbus from the answer to the question which would open a new epoch in history? Would sullen officers and superstitious seamen break the firm resolve which had stood the testing of eighteen years of cruel reversal. Joaquin Miller poetically depicts Columbus giving his answers from the bridge to the "blanched mate's" question:

"These very winds forget their way
For God from these dread seas is gone.
Now, speak, brave admiral, speak and say—
He said, "Sail on! sail on! and on!"

(From "Columbus" by Joaquin Miller, 1839–1913.)

Then came October 12, 1492, after Columbus had spotted a wavering light on the horizon and a sailor on the Pinta announced a landfall. Columbus and his men went ashore, knelt before God in thanksgiving, and named the island San Salvador which means Holy Savior.

What does it matter now if Columbus thought the island close to India and called the natives Indians? The great Atlantic had been crossed and the intrepid Italian navigator had opened "the line of unimaginable coasts" and had established forever in history his rightful claim as the discoverer of the new world.

But having discovered America Columbus still had no peace, for new problems arose which would try the patience of any ordinary man. On November 19, 1492, while exploring the islands, the Pinta, commanded by Martin Alonzo Pinzon, slipped away and deserted. Columbus thought Pinzon intended to take upon himself a separate command or hasten back to Spain and bear off the glory of discovery. On December 24, 1492, Columbus set sail from Port St. Thomas. The steersman in charge of the helm put a ship boy in charge and went to sleep. This was in violation of Columbus' orders, and subsequently the ship was driven upon a sand bank and broken up. Here they built a fort of the wreck and called it La Navidad. On January 4, 1493, Columbus set sail for Spain.

On the way they met the Pinta, and Pinzon told Columbus he hadn't deserted, but was looking for gold. Columbus accompanied Pinzon to the place where the gold was supposed to be, and the natives protested to Columbus that Pinzon had captured four men and two girls to be sold in Spain as slaves. Columbus found this to be true and forced Pinzon to return the captives. On his return to the Old World, he landed at Portugal and was received with great acclaim, but the king and court were so jealous they planned to assassinate Columbus. Fortunately, the king would have no part in it. He then returned to Spain and was treated like a Roman conqueror. On the evening of his arrival in Spain, the Pinta, commanded by Martin Alonzo Pinzon, entered the river. Pinzon, seeing that Columbus had arrived already and learning of his triumphant reception, feared to meet Columbus because of his desertion in Cuba. If he had arrived first, he intended to proclaim discovery of the New World to himself. However, the Spanish court refused to admit him, and he died a few days later in disgrace.

On September 25, 1493, Columbus made a second voyage from Cadiz, Spain. When he arrived at La Navidad, he found the fort sacked and burned. He then founded the Christian city of Isabella. While making further explorations, he discovered a mutiny among his men, and Columbus ordered the ringleaders arrested. This bred hostility among the Spaniards since he was a foreigner among them. Disease and shortages of supplies caused great anxiety to Columbus plus the fact that the Spaniards did not treat the natives as kindly as Columbus desired. On March 15, 1495, hordes of native Indians gave battle, and it was very fortunate that the forces of Columbus won. Some of the mutineers returned to Spain and made trouble for Columbus. Other Spanish subjects were given licenses to make voyages and settle on the island. This brought many adventurers to the New World in search of gold.

On March 10, 1496, Columbus returned to Spain with 225 sick persons after a rough voyage. Upon his return, he found that envy and malice had undermined his popularity. On May 30, 1498, he made his third voyage to America and discovered Trinidad. When he arrived in Isabella, he found his followers in revolt, and eventually he had to hang some of the mutineers and was beset with internal troubles. At this time Ferdinand and the Spanish court became discouraged because there wasn't more profit in these enterprises of Columbus. They sent one, Don Francisco de Bobadilla, over to investigate Columbus in August 23, 1500. While Columbus was away, his brother, Don Diego, was seized, thrown in irons and confined on board a caravel for no reason. When Columbus returned, he and his other brother, Don Bartholomew, were also seized and bound in chains. The rebels claimed that Columbus had treated them cruelly.

Columbus and his brothers were returned to Spain in chains. When they arrived in Cadiz, Spain, it caused a sensation. Ferdinand and Isabella were incensed and ordered Columbus freed and his property restored.

On May 9, 1502, Columbus undertook his fourth and last voyage to the new world. On this trip his crew mutinied. He was shipwrecked on an island for a whole year before help came. On returning to Spain, Isabella died and Ferdinand refused to give him his just honors and estates. This last voyage had shattered his frame beyond repair, and the suspension of his honors robbed him of that repose so necessary in old age. Columbus died broken-hearted on May 20, 1506, at the age of about 70 years, and his remains were finally buried in Havana, Cuba.

Surely no explorer ever underwent such suffering and hardship as Columbus, and no explorer has ever discovered so much for so little a reward. Let us never attempt to take away from Columbus the honors of his discovery which were denied him during his lifetime.

Let him rest in peace as the discoverer of America.

GEORGE J. CONKLING, CONNECTICUT COMMISSIONER OF FINANCE

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, one of the key men in the government of the State of Connecticut is George J. Conkling, finance commissioner. George is a man of outstanding ability, unswerving integrity, and deep knowledge. There is no man in the State of Connecticut who better understands the problems of State government. I consider it a great privilege to have appointed him as finance commissioner. Gov. John Dempsey reappointed him and reposes the highest confidence in him.

Robert Conrad, of the Hartford Times, wrote a most perceptive article on George as a public servant and as a person. I ask unanimous consent that the article, dated October 5, 1967, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONKLING WATCHES STATE'S PURSE

(By Robert Conrad)

"I was just thinking while I was driving home last night," said George J. Conkling to a close aide one day recently.

And the well-worn phrase again introduced a matter that the state's commissioner of finance happened to be mulling over as he headed for home in North Haven after a typical day at the office.

People who work with Conkling, or the scores of officials who have business with him frequently, have heard the phrase many times. Sometimes there is a variation. "I was thinking while I was shaving this morning."

NEXT MOST POWERFUL

With the possible exception of the governor, Conkling is the most powerful official in state government. He may have earned that status because of his nearly three decades of working for the state. More importantly, though, it is because of his handling of Connecticut's most demanding public job since Gov. Abraham A. Ribicoff appointed him in July, 1957.

In that time, Conkling has learned how to ride with the political punches and to keep quiet when discretion so dictates. Even so, campaign barbs wound him more than he likes to admit.

At 61, George Joseph Conkling long ago qualified for retirement. He can at any time tell his critics to go fry and toddle off to the shelter of his hammock. Conkling's problem is that he has what a close friend describes as a "love affair" with the State of Connecticut.

He is a perfectionist who demands the best from everyone else. His small staff at the State Capitol includes the top people in their fields in state government. Conkling can be as tough with them as he sometimes is with commissioners of equal rank in the governor's cabinet.

Conkling is also a softie when any of his grandchildren are around the house in a corner of North Haven that juts into Hamden. The children are often there. And Conkling loves nothing better than a family party. His three chilldren are married.

The early years were far different than the routine today. Conkling went from high school into the big bands. He played the guitar back in the days when it was a musical instrument. He was also skilled with the banjo.

The commissioner still has the instruments at home, but it takes the greatest kind of pressure to coax him into playing for company.

The tough hide he can turn toward commissioners and agency heads when they are looking for money can be penetrated by criticism he judges to be inaccurate or unfair. Such was the case last fall when Republicans characterized him as the "financial governor," one of three running the state.

Gov. Dempsey was the "social governor and Democratic boss John M. Bailey rated" political governor in the GOP jibe.

While it was a cute figure of speech that hit close to the truth at the capitol, the label was offensive to Conkling because of his regard for the authority of the real governor's office.

Conkling worships the capitol. One story attributed to a member of the administration's inner circle has it that tears filled Conkling's eyes one evening as the two men paused a moment in a car on Capitol Ave., and the commissioner viewed the golden-domed structure in the moonlight.

COMPLEX ESSENTIAL

When Conkling feared that the capitol dome was losing its lustre, he decided to have a close look. He summoned Timothy J. Murphy, then public works commissioner, and the two hovered over the building in a helicopter to see how the paint job looked.

In Murphy's last year as commissioner, relations were strained with Conkling because the two disagreed over a stunning, $200 million complex of state government buildings which a high-priced planning firm recommended.

Conkling insisted that a new capitol and a complex like the one in the fancy drawings were essential. Murphy hated the idea. Now a legislative study committee has the task of proceeding with plans which will go to the 1969 General Assembly.

Whether critics go along with Conkling's policies or not, other states have shown interest in some of his innovations here. One was his plan to pay for the highway program with state bonds, and use federal grants to pay off the bonds. That way, a holdup in the federal program has not cut off the road building.

He lost patience when the state colleges increased the size of the faculty rolls and then wondered why the money for expected raises ran short.

The commissioner arrives at the capitol early each day and stays late. He eases his Cadillac into its parking place by the east wing at 8:15 or a few minutes later and hikes to the elevator for a ride up to his third floor office in the west wing.

His staff knows better than to beat the boss to work. Conkling doesn't like that. But they should be on hand by 8:30.

When he breaks for lunch, Conkling usually picks up two or three of the men on his staff, and sometimes is joined by a high-level administration crony or two, for a stroll to the State Armory and its Officers' Club dining room.

OPEN-DOOR POLICY

The finance commissioner holds to an open-door policy at the conference-type room he uses for an office. Traffic is steady on most work days, but no one ever has to knock.

Conkling has a desk in one corner of the room. He rarely uses it, except as a receptacle for the papers and files that go with the job. Instead, he prefers to sit at the end of a long conference table with his work spread out before him.

Newsmen find him immediately available, and always able to rattle off figures that may range from an obscure appropriations in an agency budget to the salaries of most key officials in government.

Reporters have given up trying to keep track of the committees and commissions on which Conkling serves, many times as chairman.

The story of Conkling's early career in the band business has been told many times. Best known of his one-time employers were Hal Kemp and Rudy Vallee. Conkling was expert with the guitar.

He quit professional music in 1931 when the constant travel and long-range outlook began to dim his interest in the band. He switched to the more stable line of accounting, after working as a bookkeeper by day and studying at the New Haven YMCA night school.

STARTED IN 1938

The start in state service for Conkling came in 1938, when he took a job with the Public Works Department. He became a state auditor in 1942 and was promoted to deputy under Finance Commissioner Frank Lynch (a Republican) in 1951.

When a Democratic administration took over in in 1955, under Gov. Abraham A. Ribicoff, Conkling was retained in the deputy's post by the new top man, Joseph M. Loughlin. Conkling moved up to the commissioner's post when Loughlin died in July, 1957.

As a bug on geography, Conkling makes a hobby out of driving. A trip to the West for this year's vacation was typical. And for any journey, long or short, a passenger with Conkling had better be prepared to leave the main arteries at any moment. The commissioner is great for poking into the byways and seeing more of the country.

If driving is his favorite form of relaxation, stamp collecting is a close second. It ties in with his interest in geography. Conkling has been a collector since he was a boy.

FLOOD INSURANCE ACT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] in connection with the Flood Insurance Act.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILLIAMS OF NEW JERSEY

I was gratified by the prompt action given the Senate-passed Flood Insurance Act by the Committee on Banking and Currency in the House of Representatives last Thursday. The Committee voted 31 to 0 to report the measure favorably to the floor of the House. This, coming so soon after Senate passage of the bill on September 14, should ensure early and, I hope, favorable consideration by the House of Representatives.

We have been working toward this goal since 1962. It has been a long, and sometimes frustrating, struggle. But it will be well worth it when President Johnson signs into law this flood insurance legislation.

I first introduced in 1963 a bill providing for a federal study aimed at devising a workable flood insurance program. Authorization for such a study was finally incorporated into the Southeast Hurricane Disaster Relief Act of 1965. The Department of Housing and Urban Development conducted the study and reported that the flood insurance program could, and should be established. It recommended a joint program involving the Federal Government and the private insurance industry.

The bill which I introduced, the basic provisions of which were passed by the Senate and reported by the House committee, provides for the private insurance industry to sell and service the insurance policies and the Federal Government to provide financial assistance and flood data to be used in determining premium rates.

The major differences between the Senate version and the House-reported bill lie in the coverage each provides. Our bill would only provide flood insurance for one- to four-family homes in the initial stages. It would later allow the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to extend flood insurance to small businesses and other non-covered risks as experience indicates it is practical. The House bill would provide for initial coverage for small businesses. The House committee also deleted an amendment added by the Senate which would provide some assurance that the companies would not receive excessive profits at the expense of the Federal Government. I was disappointed to see this amendment deleted, but I am sure we will be able to work out the differences.

Flood insurance cannot presently be purchased. The result frequently is tragedy. A flood victim faces not only the loss of his home and its furnishings, but he may very well be left with a mortgage on property which for all practical purposes no longer exists. We have from time to time appropriated emergency funds to aid flood victims, but it has been just that—emergency aid. It is never enough, and it cannot be depended upon. Our flood insurance legislation will give home owners and possibly, at least later, businessmen, the opportunity to make prudent provision against floods by purchasing insurance. It will also get the Federal Government out of this particular kind of emergency relief program.

I am hopeful that by the time the hurricane season comes around next fall, home owners will be able to insure themselves against disastrous financial loss from flooding which hurricanes usually leave in their wake.

HEROISM OF ARLAN GREVE, OMAHA, NEBR.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate for a moment to a feat of heroism performed by a civilian in Omaha, Nebr., several days ago.

I wish to pay tribute to a young man by the name of Arlan Greve for a lifesaving feat which I believe will go down in history as one of the outstanding acts of courage and valor in our time by a private American citizen.

Mr. Greve, who is 26 years old, is by no means an ordinary citizen. Fifteen years ago he was stricken with poliomyelitis. He cannot walk without crutches.

At about 1:15 p.m. last Thursday, Mr. Greve looked out the back window of his home at Omaha and saw the motionless body of a 3-year-old boy hanging from a gym set in the backyard of a neighbor.

Mr. Greve, who was alone at the time, called aloud for help, but no one in the neighborhood heard him. He made his way through his backyard to the wire fence between his and the neighbor's yard. He saw immediately that the gym set, although close to the fence, was not close enough for him to reach the boy across the fence.

When he came to the fence, Mr. Greve threw his crutches over it and leaned backward into the fence with all his weight and all the force he could muster. He managed to bend the fence downward until the weight of his body plunged him into the yard where the boy was hanging, according to an account in the October 7 issue of the Omaha World-Herald.

Mr. Greve found that the hood on the jacket which the boy was wearing had caught near the top of the gym set and choked the youngster.

> I don't know how I got up or got the boy down. I usually can't do that sort of thing—

Mr. Greve recalled in commenting later to a reporter.

But he did manage to remove the boy, who by then had turned blue and stiff, from the gym set. He checked quickly and found no signs of breathing or a heartbeat.

Mr. Greve, who works at night as a laboratory technician at Nebraska Methodist Hospital, began administering mouth-to-mouth resuscitation. When that did not work, he switched to artificial respiration. The boy started breathing but remained unconscious. Mr. Greve continued his efforts, periodically yelling for help but getting no response, for about 15 minutes.

When he was convinced the boy was breathing well enough to be left alone for a few minutes, Mr. Greve went to the boy's house and summoned the youngster's mother. The mother quickly called the rescue squad and called other neighbors for help. At Children's Hospital later, doctors credited Mr. Greve with saving the tot's life.

There is one additional fact of interest to Members of the Senate, Mr. President. The boy whose life was saved is Dean Alexis Zerbe, son of Mr. and Mrs. Mason Zerbe, Jr., of Omaha and grandson of the Hon. U. Alexis Johnson, U.S. Ambassador to Japan.

For his heroic feat, I am recommending Mr. Greve for the Nation's highest civilian lifesaving award.

MEETING THE WORLD'S FOOD EMERGENCY

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, a splendid and thought-provoking address on the world food problem has been delivered to the American Society of Agricultural Consultants by James G. Patton, former president of the National Farmers Union and a former president of the International Federation of Agricultural Producers, who has been involved in world food programs for many years.

Jim Patton, known to most Senators, is sure that the world food problem can be solved, but he realistically warns that the development of modern agricultural techniques in the underdeveloped world will be a long and difficult task, but a task that we must undertake if we want a peaceful world. He speaks from extensive, firsthand observation of conditions around the world and an intimate knowledge of the state of agricultural technology.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Patton's address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEVELOPMENT IN WORLDWIDE AGRICULTURE

(Address by James G. Patton, president, James G. Patton & Associates, before the American Society of Agricultural Consultants, Los Angeles, Calif., September 29, 1967)

Developments of agriculture in the world are occurring at a fast and furious rate. Such developments can be discussed from several vital approaches and in many different phases.

One can discuss the fantastic rate of new discoveries in basic sciences that relate themselves to food and agriculture. The production of new sources of proteins and the implications of protein feeding in relation to raising the level of intelligence. The manufacturing of proteins through petro-chemistry—by fermentation of petroleum—the synthesis of amino acids, fish meal derivatives or the new high protein genes of high-lysine. One can also discuss proteins from the standpoint of upgrading animal production by improving animals and their feeding. The increased production of proteins under factory-type industrialized food production such as broiler production and SPF sanitary quarantined hog production is still another rapidly developing area.

The technological and scientific developments of higher yielding rice strains at the International Rice Institute in the Philippines and production of the new Mexican wheat developed by Rockefeller Research are significant breakthroughs in plant genetics.

One can approach agricultural development from the standpoint of chemistry in relation to soils with use of the needed number of plant food units of nitrogen, phosphate, potash and trace minerals. The application of herbicides and insecticides is a part of the chemical breakthroughs. The use of basic sanitation plus chemicals has helped to eliminate the mass killers of people such as malaria, cholera, dysentery and other diseases in many parts of the world.

One of the most fundamental negative developments which is closely inter-related to agriculture is the population explosion which is now being so widely discussed. The more success achieved by the World Health Organization and other organizations who strive toward mass health improvement and life preserving techniques, the greater the food population gap and the greater the problem of food production and agricultural policy formation becomes.

There is some evidence, however, that as more deaths are prevented in the earlier years, a smaller number of children will be conceived in order to provide the culturally desired one or two sons for social security purposes. In other words, if people in the less-developed countries conclude that they will only need two sons to have one living long enough to provide their security in their old age, they will reduce the number of children they conceive. Whether this is a correct anthropological conclusion no one really knows and cannot know for at least a generation. But our business—the business of world agriculture and its related industries and services is to fight the War Against Hunger which is the toughest war we have.

Most of us could go around the world to Latin America, India, Africa, the Middle East and Asia—and with but a few exceptions, in country after country—observe starvation and crisis after crisis. *There is starvation in the world every day.* It is not a question of whether large numbers of how many will starve each day, month and year and how long before the "have" countries will inherit the political and economic instability this must inevitably bring to the world arena.

A prominent agricultural economist, now deceased, once said half cynically—"Of course the earth can feed her people—because what she does not feed will starve to death." I never thought that he really meant to be cynical because he was a man of faith, charity and compassion.

What is probably more to the point is: In a world wracked with revolutions and counter-revolution that hunger and starvation breed revolution, violence and war. "Stomach Communism" is not an idle play on words. Many who seek freedom, food and land will follow after those who make glib promises of food, land and security of tenure and improved opportunity.

I do not wish to bore you with statistics and facts with which you are already familiar. The problems of food and agricultural development and population explosions have been repeatedly covered. You have all read the generalizations which have been made with regard to hunger and malnutrition.

You all have available to you, and many of you have read the "State of Food and Agriculture" published every year by the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization. Such publications as the three volume Report of the President's Science Advisory Committee (May 1967) entitled "The World Food Problem," the United Nations Economic and Social Council's report entitled, "Increasing the Production and Use of Animal Protein" (E/4343—25 May 1967) provide ample information for challenging thought.

The Society for International Development devoted its entire conference in 1966 to the subject of International Development. The discussions of this conference are in a book entitled "International Development 1966." You will find that the principal area of the discussion at this SID Conference revolved around agricultural development, food production and population management.

"The subject of the world food problem has been treated so thoroughly in orations and editorials during the past two decades that both its size and significance tend to be obscured by rhetorical "overkill." All has been said and said extremely well—all has been repeated, reiterated, and rephrased.

"So repetitively has the problem been brought to the attention of the American public during the past several years that they seem almost to have lost the ability to respond to the stimulus: they are aware of the problem, they converse about it from time to time, but there is no longer any depth of understanding or concern. The situation has been aptly put." [1]

"A nation conditioned by affluence might possibly be suffering from compassion fatigue, or conscience sickness, the peril of narrowing our field of vision to leave out the unpleasant view of life disfigured by hunger." [2]

The people of the United States and other developed nations have spent about 150 billion dollars in Foreign Aid. Using PL 480, the USA has given and sold on concessional terms billions of dollars of food and fiber products. Through A.I.D. and its predecessors we have granted, invested and loaned additional billions of dollars. Through the U.S. Department of Agriculture and A.I.D. we have provided millions of man-years of technical assistance to less-developed countries.

Along with other nations through the United Nations agencies such as FAO, WHO, World Bank and UNESCO, we have provided billions of dollars of capital and millions of technical and scientific man-hours to the problems of food and population. Yet there are more hungry mouths in the world today than there were ten years ago.

The President's Science Advisory Commission properly asks, "Why is the race between food and population being lost?"

They have many plausible answers and suggestions. Obviously, agricultural development and general economic development are thoroughly interwoven. Obviously the problems of population and food imbalance are interwoven. The problem is to convince both governments and people of the necessity to manage population and to give sufficient income and other incentives to primary producers so that they will rapidly increase food production where they are. India is a case in point.

The provision of these incentives requires a broad array of economic, social, cultural and political considerations by governments and people which differ between countries.

History has shown that in such crisis the culture and fabric of traditional societies will be rewoven either by violent revolutions or rapid evolution before the situation will change perceptibly. *The changes must and will be made.*

We must recognize but should not be complacent about the fact that the elimination of world hunger and starvation will take many years—and require many and far-reaching changes.

Furthermore, the problem of food production is only one part, although a very important part, of the enormous job of economic development in the poor nations of the world.

The original concept of Point IV in President Truman's Inaugural Address still stands as a basic guideline despite international political emergencies which have necessitated military assistance. But, it is almost correct to say that technical assistance which is so vitally important to securing lasting and continuing increases in food production is still in its infancy.

Unfortunately the technical services of the United Nations agencies have been so small and passed around in such small allocations to the hungry countries of the world that in spite of some very fine and well-trained technicians, they have little lasting effect and practically no influence in securing improved policy decisions on the part of nation states. In other words, unless there is more and improved technical assistance, both the United States in a unilateral way and the United Nations' multilateral agencies will spend billions of dollars in these hungry countries without any lasting benefits or improvements. Along with technical assistance the basic problems of land tenure, income and price incentives must be met. Until this is done the money spent is almost wasted and we only put off the day of reckoning for a very short time.

The President's Science Advisory Committee also states: "Despite chronic reiterations for the need to involve private industry in economic assistance, no significant progress in engaging this rich reservoir of resources and skills can be reported at this time."

Such an admission is not just an indictment of business in the developed countries but is a black mark on the ingenuity of our policy-makers of the less-developed countries. Obviously, one must recognize the different political, cultural and social structures in the less-developed areas of the world, but the War on Hunger, as with any war, costs money, time, and effort on the part of all involved.

Finally, I wish to set forth a few ideas which I believe will help to substantially increase the use of the developed world's available and known food and agricultural technology with its required huge capital inputs, its industrial aspects, its fine technicians and scientists and its ability to assist the jump from the feudal and tribal state of agriculture in most underdeveloped countries to a vertically-integrated type of modern agriculture.

There are, of course, many factors which must be put together if we hope to avoid mass starvation and World War III.

First, it is obvious that agriculture with its present antiquated and unjust institutional structures is not fulfilling its role in the less-developed areas of the world. There are many reasons for this.

The land tenure and use pattern in many areas of the world is such that it discourages human and capital investment. In many countries agricultural land is still operated under feudal or tribal conditions. The people who work on these huge private and tribal holdings are slaves or near slaves. They hate their masters, have no incentive—economic, social or personal—to work hard.

The absentee owners of the huge private estates put very little money or managerial skills back into the farming operations they own. They use extensive rather than intensive farming and stock-raising methods.

The profits they receive from their vast holdings are not reinvested in the land, but are invested in city apartments and industries or in foreign corporate stocks or mutual funds, which purchase stocks of successful U.S. corporations. They exhibit little or no confidence in the future of their country. In some countries the land is held as a social status symbol of wealth and power. Increased production and profit offers little incentive to landowners in this category.

Almost universally where there are still large estates with poorly used or underused resources, the system of taxation of land and water use provides no incentive to do anything but to use these resources willy-nilly and even wastefully. In some countries production taxes levied by city "consumer dominated" legislative bodies finish the job by removing whatever incentive there may be to increase production. Low income, poor health, degradation and hopelessness make for very inefficient production on the part of the "sharecropper" tenants.

Many underdeveloped countries where a very high percent of the population is rural have a great outward surge of the poor people away from the land to the cities. And as food is so short, much emphasis is given to keeping food prices low in these cities. In most countries the incentives to increase production *are nil*. The rural areas are where the worst starvation is and these rural areas have the poorest services as to schools, hospitals, doctors, transportation and other services necessary to give people in rural areas a desire to stay there. As poverty-ridden and poor as the cities are, they do have better health facilities. Food is rationed and there are more social services. Once in awhile there is a chance to get a job.

With cybernation and automation in industry, the number of jobs resulting from industrialization in the underdeveloped countries will be fewer and fewer. Industrialization *will not* end unemployment and underemployment in the developing countries.

Several basic and fundamental things can be done:

(1) Stabilize raw material price levels in the world markets so that sharp rises and drops in prices will not adversely affect and destroy the primary producers of monoculture and other commodities sold on the world market. Billions of people depend for their meager incomes on world prices and markets. What good does it do for the wealthy countries to provide billions in foreign assistance while the primary producers are losing billions of dollars in the same period by a drastic drop in world price levels?

If price stabilization is undertaken (international), its benefits should be extended only to countries that have improved land-tenure conditions—otherwise, international price stabilization efforts will simply make the rich absentee landowner richer. In fact, some countries would not even enter into an international commodity agreement preferring to "take their chances"—they would hope that the stabilization scheme would so improve long-range prices that their rich absentee landowners would benefit from improved prices without undertaking any tenure-improvement at all—an important part of the international commodity price stabilization is the strength with which it is administered—so that unless the producer-nations take important and necessary land-tenure-improvement-steps, they will be shut out of the rich market areas. Otherwise, we in the market-area countries will be paying to keep the land-barons on top throughout the world.

(2) Provide market price incentives for farmers to use fertilizer and better techniques to produce more food right where they are without moving.

(3) Establish a World Land Bank with regional branches. This bank should be empowered to issue Land Income Bonds which can be marketed and the proceeds used for providing land transfers and production credit on a supervised basis. Such banks should provide credit for purchase of machinery, seeds, fertilizers and breeding animals. Such a credit program should be supervised and tied to technical assistance and farm management.

Long term credit to establish an efficient farm product processing, quality control, preservation and marketing structure through cooperatives and other non-governmental structures should be made available.

(4) Provide a multibillion dollar guarantee fund to American firms, farmers and tech-

---

[1] *The World Food Problem.*

[2] Cousins, Norman; *Saturday Review,* March 25, 1961.

nicians to go out in the world and enter into joint ventures in developing vertically-integrated modern agricultural and food production on a vast scale. Large sums of money should be invested in fertilizer production and its efficient distribution and use.

Adequate safeguards must be included so that human exploitation too common in the past will not be guaranteed by this fund—legal minimum wages, profit-sharing plans, proper education and health protection, etc., must be included in any such international guarantee scheme.

(5) Provide a large sum of funds for fundamental and applied research on tropical agriculture about which we know practically nothing compared to what we know about soils, plant foods and production methods in the temperate and subtropical belts.

(6) Seek out large areas of arable land around the world which have a low density of population and develop them through modern technology and large (per man) capital investments. One such area is the Campos Corado area of Brazil, the LaPlata basin of Bolivia, Paraguay, Uruguay and Argentina. Help in establishing public-private corporations to invest in these areas. The nation state should contribute the raw land as capital along with grants as to water, security and other available assets. The public-private corporation should be authorized to issue long-term income bonds to be purchased by the World Bank, the Inter-American Bank, AID and other international financial institutions. The proceeds from the bond sales should be used to build an infrastructure of roads, transportation, utilities, irrigation, test farms and pilot processing industries.

Private capital with proper guarantees should be asked to participate in developing agricultural production, processing, preservation and marketing and distribution of the products of the area and in providing the manufacturing, processing and services which would be increasingly needed as the area grew and developed a more sophisticated social and economic structure.

Several such areas exist. Madagascar is one such area, Angola is another. The Middle East, with nuclear desalinization, is another.

Lastly, the fundamental policy of the wealthy nations in relation to the poor nations *must change*.

The wealthy countries, for their own safety, must plan on an annual investment in the capital and technically-starved underdeveloped countries of not less than 5% of the wealthy country's Gross National Product. This is more important than getting to the moon by 1970 or having the first supersonic jet liner. It is positively ridiculous to talk about feeding two to three billion people with the penny ante approaches which the wealthy nations of the world are now discussing. Eliminating hunger and starvation is a war that is bigger than Korea or Viet Nam or World War II. It is going to cost billions upon billions for manpower, fertilizer, seeds, animals and other requisites. So far the rich nations have spent billions of dollars in money while contributing hundreds of billions of almost meaningless words to the hungry and starving people of the world.

Wendell Wilkie once said that the wealthy nations of the world could not live in the "big white house on the hill" while the poor people of the world live in the dirty, disease-ridden mud huts in the swamps. The challenges are tremendous—but we have the capacity to meet them. *We must meet them if we are to have lasting peace.*

DISSENT OR DESTRUCTION?

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, for a great many years, Mr. Eric Sevareid has ranked as one of America's keenest and most articulate observers of national and international problems. His radio and television broadcasts, as well as his columns and articles, have always reflected scholarship and erudition, in addition to being lucid and incisive. As a consequence he has gained a deservedly wide and enthusiastic audience.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that an article entitled "Dissent or Destruction?" written by Mr. Sevareid, and published in the September 5, 1967, issue of Look magazine achieves a new pinnacle. While the article is a comment—one of the best I have seen—on the apparent new fad of dissent for the sake of dissent, in no way could it be construed as a polemic designed to restrict the freedoms that Americans hold sacred. It examines carefully both the unreason and irresponsibility of all extremists in these times.

For example, Mr. Sevareid writes:

> Thousands of Americans . . . are busy invoking self-serving "higher laws" to supersede the national rulebook. None of them seems familiar with the words "duty" or "obligation."

He adds later:

> The notion is abroad that if dissent is good, as it is, then the more dissent the better, a most dubious proposition. The notion has taken hold of many that the manner and content of their dissent are sacred, whereas it is only the *right* of dissent that is sacred.

Perhaps most important, however, is Mr. Sevareid's thoughtful contention that the United States, rather than being on the road to conformity and mass-mindedness, has never before been so varied and individualistic. He writes:

> It is not our freedom that is in peril. . . . We have never had more freedom to speak out, to organize, to read what we choose, to question authority, whether political or cultural, to write. . . . Never has the police authority been more restricted, never have defendants been so girded with legal protections.
>
> Our freedom will be imperiled only if it turns into license, seriously imperiling order. There can be no freedom in the absence of order. There can be no personal or collective life worth living in the absence of moderation.

Although Mr. Sevareid makes certain observations in his excellent article with which I do not fully agree, his insight and perception make this one of the more important commentaries on our times and conditions.

In order that "Dissent or Destruction?" does not escape the attention of other Members of Congress, and that it be made available to a wider audience, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DISSENT OR DESTRUCTION?

(By Eric Sevareid)

These are odd times. Tens of thousands of Americans of every age, color, sex, and economic and intellectual condition are daily and hotly invoking every right and privilege mentioned in the Constitution, the Bible and Bartlett's *Familiar Quotations*. Others are busy invoking self-serving "higher laws" to supersede the national rulebook. None of them seems familiar with the words "duty" or "obligation."

The production curve on putative saints and martyrs has been rising rapidly—possibly in direct proportion to the availability of press and TV cameras. The country bears the aspect of one vast wailing wall, washed down daily with the tears of the self-pitying.

The general import of their varying messages, taken as a whole, seems to be that: all American policemen have joyfully renounced their days off in order to bludgeon Negroes as a wholesome exercise; the armed services of the United States, drunk with bloodlust, eagerly notch their guns for every Vietnamese civilian they kill; administrators burn the midnight oil in order to conceive new ways to coerce, threaten, silence and otherwise "alienate" that oppressed *lumpen-proletariat*, American college students.

And all the while, a mysterious group known as the "Power Elite" or the "Establishment" sits in Washington, New York, Chicago and Los Angeles, fat cigars in one hand, telephones in the other, engaged in a round-robin conversation featured by chortling remarks, such as "Hi, fella, how many of the downtrodden did you trod on today?"

As a result of all this, the familiar quotation that comes first to mind for an increasing number of other Americans is one of the opening lines of *The Man Who Came to Dinner*—"I may vomit."

Still others who believe firmly in free speech can no longer find the strength even to murmur Voltaire's celebrated remark that while he disapproved of what you say, he would defend to the death your right to say it, because they are already half-dead—with boredom.

When we reach the point, which we have, where an organization is formed, called "Proxy Pickets," to rent out picketers for any cause at so much an hour, then we know that the fine, careless rapture of this era of protest is all over and that the corruption of faddism has begun to set in. Every movement becomes an organization sooner or later, then a kind of business, often a racket. This is becoming the age of the cause. Cause kids will soon be hanging around back lots trading causes the way they used to trade aggies.

One of the oddest things about the period, no doubt, is that anyone like me should feel moved to say these things. I have always believed in the Negro "revolution," if that's the right word. I have not believed, for some time now, in the Vietnamese war because to me the official rationale for it simply does not add up, and as a college kid in the thirties, I was a hollering "activist" and even voted for that Oxford oath—"I will not fight for flag or country" (though I couldn't sleep that night for doubts about it, which will merely prove to today's hip set that I had the seeds of squaredom in me at an early age).

But it seems clear to me now that a high percentage of today's protests, in these three areas of civil rights, the Vietnam war and college life—all of which commingle at various points—have gone so far as to be senselessly harming the causes themselves, corroding the reputations of the most active leaders and loosening some of the cement that holds this American society together. There never was any real danger that this country would find itself groaning under Fascist oppression, but there is a measure of real danger that freedom can turn into nationwide license until the national spirit is truly darkened and freedom endangered.

The notion is aboard that if dissent is good, as it is, then the more dissent the better, a most dubious proposition. The notion has taken hold of many that the manner and content of their dissent are sacred, whereas it is only the *right* of dissent that is sacred. Reactions of many dissenters reveal a touch of paranoia. When strong exception is taken to what they say by the

President or by a General Westmoreland, the dissenters cry out immediately that free speech is about to be suppressed, and a reign of enforced silence is beginning.

What is more disturbing is that a considerable number of liberal Left activists, including educated ones, are exhibiting exactly the spirit of the right-wing McCarthyites 15 years ago, which the liberal Left fought so passionately against in the name of our liberties. For the life of me, I cannot see the difference in morality between the right-wing woman in Texas who struck Ambassador Adlai Stevenson and the left-wing students and off-campus characters at Dartmouth College who howled down ex-Governor Wallace of Alabama and tried to smash his car.

The use of force to express a conviction, even if it takes so relatively mild a form as a college sit-in that blocks an administration building, is intolerable. When Dr. Martin Luther King, who may well be one of the noblest Americans of the century, deliberately defies a court order, then he ought to go to jail. Laws and ordinances can be changed, and are constantly being changed, but they cannot be rewritten in the streets where other citizens also have their rights.

I must say that, kooky as we may have been in that first real American student movement in the thirties, we never, to my memory, ever dreamed of using force. We thought of the university, much as we often hated its official guts, as the one sanctuary where persuasion by reason must rule alone and supreme, if the university itself were to be preserved from the outside hands of force and unreason. What makes today's college activists think they can take the campus forcibly into national politics without national politics—in the form of police or legislature or troops—forcibly coming onto the campus? (Some of the activists, of course, are pure nihilists and *want* this to happen, but that's another story.)

The wild riots that have exploded in the Negro areas of American cities the last few summers should not be confused with protest movements. Most of them do not even deserve the designation of race riot. We had genuine race riots in Chicago, Detroit and Tulsa nearly half a century ago, whites against Negroes, and mass murders occurred. Nearly all the recent summer-night riots have chiefly involved Negro kids smashing and looting the nearest property, most of which was owned by other Negroes. This is sheer hoodlumism, involved as its psychological and sociological origins may be. It is a problem for sociologists, psychologists and economists only in the second instance. In the first instance, it is a police problem, as are the episodes of mass vandalism staged by prosperous white kids on the beaches of New Hampshire or Florida. Majorities have a right to protection quite as much as minorities, heretical as this may sound.

If there were no protests at all about the Vietnamese war, the American society would really be in sad shape. We were in this war very deeply almost before the average busy citizen grasped what had happened, and there was no serious congressional debate on the issue until the winter of 1966. The present national disunion, including the disaffection of so much of the "intellectual community," is just what happened in the War of 1812, the Mexican War of 1846–1848, the Spanish-American War and the war in the Philippines that followed. As historian Henry Steele Commager has pointed out, the only wars during which the President had all but universal support were the two world wars, and both were debated and discussed all over the nation for many long months before we got into action.

So the present protests about Vietnam are entirely within the American tradition. Even so, the law, public necessity and human reason must impose certain limitations.

It is outrageous and insupportable for anyone to desecrate the flag, the one symbol of nationhood that reminds all citizens of the country's meaning. It is disgusting for paraders to chant, "Hey, hey, LBJ, how many kids did you kill today?" These deaths in battle are eating at his soul, too, and vulgarities can help no high-minded cause.

It is a crime for rioters to terrorize cities as they did in the disgraceful upheavals in Newark and Detroit.

It is silly for a group of American artists to ask Pablo Picasso to withdraw his famous Spanish Civil War painting, *Guernica*, from the Museum of Modern Art in protest against our bombings in Vietnam.

It is unreasonable to become indignant about the civilian casualties our forces accidentally cause in Vietnam while remaining silent about the thousands of assassinations of civilian leaders by the Vietcong's "murder committees." The President rightly calls this "moral double bookkeeping."

It is unfair to say that some members of Congress don't mind the war because it helps defense industries in their districts, as Senator Fulbright did say—and then apologized.

It is damaging to the national awareness of reality, and to his own name and cause, for Dr. King to declare that the U.S. "is the greatest purveyor of violence in the world," and that "we may have killed a million [Vietnamese civilians]—mostly children." These statements are untrue. The first is a subjective generalization. The second bears no relationship to what civilian casualty figures we have been able to gather.

It is unreasonable to maintain that President Johnson does not *want* a negotiated peace and is intent on a military victory, because to say that is to say he has deliberately and repeatedly lied to the people, and for that, there is no convincing evidence.

If some of the war protesters go out-of-bounds, so do some of the war supporters and counterprotesters:

It is unfair for them to charge that the protesters are "letting the boys down." Serious protesters want to save the boys entirely by getting the war ended, and in the meantime will insist they have every bullet and article of use they require.

For the same kind of reason, it is unfair for the President to imply, as he did, that a Medal of Honor winner died by an enemy weapon shipped down during one of the bombing pauses. Rightly or wrongly, those calling for a pause in the bombing believe it may lead to an armistice saving the lives of *all* our heroes in Vietnam, and while they can only ask for the pause, it is the President who decides it.

It is grossly self-serving for Administration spokesmen to imply repeatedly that our domestic disunion over Vietnam keeps Hanoi fighting on in expectation that we will quit the war. Of course, Ho Chi Minh's regime *hopes* our will is going to break; but the overwhelming American reality they see before their eyes and that surely governs their reactions is our ever-increasing land force and our continuous bombing of the North. I am persuaded that were there no debate whatsoever in this country, Ho's regime and the Vietcong would be fighting just as relentlessly as they are today.

It was pettifogging, and indeed illegal, for General Hershey to support the drafting of young protesters by deliberately reclassifying them 1–A. The draft is not a punitive instrument.

It was pettifogging for state boxing commissions to strip Cassius Clay of his title—even before his conviction—because he refused to accept the draft. If he can lick any man in the world, he's still champion of the world. These silly irrelevancies are counterproductive.

It is wrongheaded for any maritime union to refuse to load or unload a foreign ship because they disapprove of that nation's philosophy or actions. It is hard enough for the Government to conduct foreign policy, without such presumptuous handicaps.

I happen to feel that the experience of American Negroes these many generations is the one deep stain in the American national soul. I cannot help a greater readiness to condone their excesses than those of prosperous white college students (though the law cannot be morally choosy). But there are some basic misconceptions about both.

One is that youths of both colors have been driven to action because their conditions of oppression were becoming intolerably miserable. The reverse is the truth. The barriers to Negro equality were beginning to fall before the period of mass physical action set in; this, in fact, is why mass action swept the nation. It is a commonplace now among social historians that change produces revolution before revolutions add to and institutionalize change. Basically, it has not been the street orators and marchers who have been bringing desegregation, for example; the marchers were set in motion by the fundamental changes of principle and law won in the courts by the quiet work of leaders like Roy Wilkins and Thurgood Marshall.

Totally oppressed people, here or in Africa or Asia, do not go into action. It is when the chains have been loosened, when they see some light at the end of the tunnel, that is, when *hope* is aroused, that the people arouse themselves.

In a certain sense, this pattern also applies to white college students protesting their "alienation" and the "establishments" they feel oppress them. Youth in any generation feels alienated because youth is the precarious, emotionally uprooted stage between childhood and maturity. But while individual youths of any generation are self-conscious because of this biochemical transition, today's collective self-consciousness of the young was not generated by them. The great American "youth cult" was generated by older people concerned with youth, from popular psychologists to advertising writers who realized that youth for the first time had sizable spending money, to publishers of girlie magazines who realized old moral barriers were giving way—and not, incidentally, from pressure by the young.

It is easy to sympathize with students in the massive institutions who feel they are treated as index-card numbers, not as individual souls, and various forms of decentralization must come about. But these youths will never persuade the graduating classes of the thirties, who faced the quiet desperations of the jobless Depression *and* the unmistakable imminence of a vast world war, that their lot is a tragic one. From my own life experience and travels, I would happily hazard the conjecture that to be young and to be a student in the United States of today is to enjoy the most favored condition that exists for any large, identifiable group anywhere in this world.

But experience, as every parent knows, is scarcely transferable. That hilarious slogan—"you can't trust anybody over thirty"—is, indeed, the explicit denial of the validity of experience.

When I listen to the young vigorously suggesting that if *they* had the governing influence, peace, love, beauty and sweet reason would spread o'er the world, I am tempted to remind them of the barbarities of the Hitler *Jugend*, the Mussolini Youth, the Chinese Red Guards, the Simbas of the Congo—but perhaps that would be over-egging the pudding, as the English say.

When I hear the passionate arrogances of a Mario Savio (the Berkeley fellow) or read about hundreds of University of Wisconsin students smashing windows and stopping traffic because they're sore about a bus-route schedule (or was it the price of textbooks?), I mutter to myself a private remark of Winston Churchill's: "I admire a manly man and a womanly woman, but I cannot abide a boyly boy."

If youth were complacent, devoid of the spirit of innovation and challenge, we would be in a bad way because some of the source springs of the American genius would dry up. Yet I think the "generational gap" in viewpoint will always be with us, for this reason: Youth can measure society only in one direction—forward, from things as they are, to their ideals. Older people, by the imperatives of experience, must add two other equally valid directions—backward, to things as they used to be, and sideways, to the other societies in the world they know.

Older people know something else: that the Savios, the Adam Clayton Powells and the Stokely Carmichaels are not, despite appearances, genuine leaders. Because they are not the strong men but the weak ones. They have not the moral stamina for the long haul, with its inevitable routines and periods of boredom. Eloquence, brilliance and perhaps even physical bravery are not what count in the end. What counts is the quality the Romans defined and respected above all others—*gravitas*, meaning patience, solidity, weight of judgment. As Eric Hoffer puts it, "people in a hurry can neither grow nor decay; they are preserved in a state of perpetual puerility."

Furthermore, it is usually true that the habitual protester, the man with a vested emotional interest in protest, unconsciously does not *want* his goals to be realized. Success would leave him psychically bereft. Many successful revolutionaries in other lands had to be replaced as leaders when the new order of life was installed, partly because of their practical incompetence, partly because they continued in one way or another as protesters, as their nature obliged them to do.

There is a great deal wrong with American society of mid-twentieth century. There are some very ugly areas in our life; but never have they been so thoroughly exposed, researched and organized against. Never in our history have we seen an assault on these evils mounted on the level of Federal action to compare with the legislation and programs started under the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations, particularly the latter. Were it not for the creeping calamity of the Vietnam war, Mr. Johnson would, I think, stand revealed to everyone as one of the most vigorously humanitarian Presidents America has had, in spite of those personal crudities that upset the fastidious.

America has never been a frozen, rigid society, caught in conformity. At times we may seem becalmed, but as the Frenchman Jacques Maritain wrote, "Wait a moment, another current will appear and bring the first one to naught. A great country, with as many windshifts as the sea." We are not repeating the experience of Europe, whatever the Marxists and other doctrinists may think. America has eloped with history and run away with it, says Eric Hoffer.

Conformity, mass-mindedness? Go to the totalitarian or to the primitive societies, if you wish to see them. Not here. If we live in a web of conforming laws and regulations, it is *because* we are so individualistic, so infinitely varied in our ideas, desires, ambitions and fears, and so very free to express them and to act upon them. Those who despair of getting public action on, let's say, our fearful urban problems, are wrong in thinking this is because "people don't take enough interest in public affairs." It is for the opposite reason; it is because so many groups, interests, points of view conflict. Ask any mayor. Ask any congressman whose desk is daily heaped with windrows of petitions, complaints, suggestions or denunciations.

It is not our freedom that is in peril, in the first instance. We have never had more freedom to speak out, to organize, to read what we choose, to question authority, whether political or cultural, to write, to film, to stage what would have been impermissible years ago. Never has the police authority been more restricted, never have defendants been so girded with legal protections.

Our freedom will be imperiled only if it turns into license, seriously imperiling order. There can be no freedom in the absence of order. There can be no personal or collective life worth living in the absence of moderation. Repeatedly, since the ancient Greeks, people have had to relearn this. Aristotle expressed it no better than Edmund Burke, the Anglo-Irish statesman, who said:

"Men are qualified for civil liberties in exact proportion to their disposition to put moral chains upon their own appetites . . . society cannot exist unless a controlling power upon will and appetite be placed somewhere, and the less of it there is within, the more there must be without. It is ordained in the eternal constitution of things that men of intemperate minds cannot be free. Their passions forge their fetters."

WEST VIRGINIAN ACHIEVING PROMINENCE

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, an editorial in the Fairmont, W. Va., Times of October 6, calls attention to the rapid rise to a position of high responsibility in the corporate and business world of Mr. C. Howard Hardesty, Jr., a former State tax commissioner of West Virginia. Citizens of our State are proud of the fine record Mr. Hardesty is making and the prominence he is achieving as an official of Consolidation Coal Co., and its parent firm, Continental Oil Co. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial by William D. Evans, editor of the Fairmont Times, be inserted in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Meteoric Rise

If this newspaper went for predictions in areas other than politics, it would guess that one of these days Charles Howard Hardesty Jr. will become president of Continental Oil Co., an industrial giant which owns, among other things, Consolidation Coal.

The rise of this young man, still only 45, can be described only as meteoric. He left here only four years ago to become general counsel for Consol, participated in the transaction which resulted in its acquisition by Conoco, and now is headed for a senior vice presidency of the parent firm.

There has been a feeling among Hardesty's friends and associates here that he would one day be in line for the top job in Consol. His shift to New York does not completely preclude this, but his progression up the Conoco ladder now becomes more probable.

Modestly, Hardesty says he happened to be in the right place at the right time when someone was looking for a man. That was the case when Gov. William Wallace Barron talked him into becoming State Tax Commissioner. And it was true when he joined Consol and then rose in two swift steps to become an executive vice president.

When he elected to follow the path of coporation law instead of staying in politics, Hardesty apparently made a wise choice, for his progress has been steadily onward and upward. Yet he turned his back on what appeared to be a shoo-in opportunity to be nominated—and elected—governor of West Virginia either in 1964 or, more probably, in 1968.

Hardesty still could command the support of the many diverse factions in the Democratic party for high political preferment, but he made his choice at the crossroads he reached four years ago and is not going to backtrack now.

Fairmont has been right proud of Howard Hardesty—and with good reason. His latest promotion is due to the high degree of intellect and ability he brings to the corporations which had the foresight to hire him. And, to our way of thinking, he's just started to move up.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND MEETING PRODUCES GREAT PROGRESS, SOME PROBLEMS

Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. President, an excellent article by Hobart Rowen, published in Sunday's Washington Post, does a fine job of pinpointing the substantial strides taken during the recent International Monetary Fund meeting in Rio de Janeiro toward a plan for special drawing rights that would be a step away from, in Rowen's words, "a blind dependence on gold."

Together with this giant step went the very real problem of a demand by the common-market countries for veto control over certain fund transactions. As the Rowen article points out, a decision to initiate the special drawing rights plan will undoubtedly depend on final acquiescence, at least in part, to the veto requests.

On balance, nevertheless, we can look back on the Rio meeting with real pride in the accomplishments of our negotiators. It may well prove to be a watershed in the history of international monetary arrangements.

I ask unanimous consent that the Rowen article, which sums up the IMF achievements so well, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

IMF Achievement at Rio Was Great

(By Hobart Rowen)

Any way you measure it, the 107 nations who comprise the International Monetary Fund turned in a great accomplishment at Rio de Janeiro last week. The plan they adopted for Special Drawing Rights (SDR)—paper gold—is a step toward deliberate creation of international monetary reserves, and away from a blind dependence on gold.

To be sure, what "paper gold" can ultimately do can easily be oversold. But never before in history has the international community decided, in principle, to control deliberately the supply of monetary reserves, instead of letting the reserves control or overwhelm the community.

On the other hand, the timetable for making paper gold a reality—certain to be slow and arduous in any event—was thrown into uncertainty by other developments at Rio.

Chief among these was the notice served by the Common Market that it intends to seek a change in the entire power structure of the IMF in order to achieve a role more equal to that of the United States.

My impression after talks with many of the principals at Rio is that if the United States does not agree to some of the changes the EEC wants, approval of the SDR plan will be delayed.

Already, it is apparent, the Anglo-Saxon bloc and the European Continentals had sharply differing ideas about what they were signing at a London conference last month, preliminary to Rio.

The U.S. thought it agreed only to studies "in parallel" of the changes in IMF rules sought by the EEC. But the Europeans, without exception, insist they made clear they wanted action timed to co-incide with the SDR scheme. "A study?" asks a Frenchman. "Why, that is a joke! We want reform in the rules, not a study."

If nothing else, this illustrates the fragility of international agreements, whether they relate to arms control or financial liquidity.

But U.S. officials were disingenuous in briefing Congress and the press after London. They kept their lips buttoned about prospective changes in IMF rules, in their anxiety to crow about the SDR scheme.

As a tactic, it boomeranged: if the Europeans looked out-maneuvered after London, the Americans and British looked outfoxed after Rio.

Europe is flexing its economic muscles. Having agreed, subject to a veto over actual activation, to the creation of paper gold, the Commart countries want the same veto control to govern an increase in IMF quotas and normal borrowings. As of now, the fairly stringent rules governing the extension of credit could be liberalized by a simple majority vote.

This question—changing the IMF rules—is now "wide open," Managing Director Pierre-Paul Schweitzer said in Rio.

By far, this is now a bigger obstacle to the actual implementing of the paper gold scheme than the existence of the U.S. balance of payments deficit. Despite tough French talk on the need for elimination (actually, the French would grandly allow us a $500 million deficit) the Germans, Italians, and other European powers insist only on a trend toward reduction of the U.S. deficit.

But the EEC got together more easily—and will stay there—on the new related question of a change in the rules. They want the power, the prestige, and the control, and figure that the U.S. thirst for paper gold gives them the leverage they need. It looks as if they hold strong cards in this international poker game.

The SDR plan and a change in IMF rules, said German Economics Minister Karl Schiller firmly, "are for us a single entity." And the French, who approach the whole issue with the aggressiveness of a Walter Reuther posing a list of labor grievances, say the acceptance of new rules is an absolute precondition for the SDRs.

The French want the veto to apply not only to quota increases and the credit tranches (drawings), but to any changes in the par value of currencies; to the gold guarantee of members' credits; to decisions on what portion of quota increases should be paid in gold; and to the Fund's gold "operations"—specifically its purchase of U.S. Treasury bills with gold.

And in a direct swipe at Schweitzer—about whom the French are bitter—they want any contested interpretations of the Fund's articles sent to "a court of three wise men."

There will be a meeting of the Common Market ministers in mid-November designed to deflate this French shopping list. But it can be predicted with assurance that there will emerge from this conference a joint position demanding a veto privilege on quotas and on any changes in the credit tranches.

Doubtless, the U.S. will try to whittle back the new European demands exposed at Rio. For example, it has a good case for suggesting that if the EEC wants more power over quota changes, it can get it by increasing its payments into the kitty.

But ultimately, if the U.S. wants to see the paper golden egg produced at Rio go through a hatching stage, there will be an additional price to pay the shrewd European bargainers.

EXCELLENT SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVING OUR SOCIAL DATA

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, after the introduction last February of S. 843, the proposed Full Opportunity and Social Accounting Act, and particularly during the hearings on the bill held in July by the Subcommittee on Government Research, I have become seriously concerned with the gaps existing in our social knowledge.

Very sophisticated efforts are now being made within the executive to appraise and evaluate our social programs. Repeatedly, as demonstrated by Elizabeth Drew in an article entitled "HEW Grapples With PPBS," published in the most recent issue of the Public Interest, these efforts have been stymied, substantially slowed, or reduced in scope because we lack some very basic data about this society and its troubles.

Some excellent suggestions for improving our ability to gather increasingly accurate and meaningful social statistics have been advanced in recent months. Among the better recommendations are those advanced by the Conference on Social Statistics and the City, convened by the Joint Center for Urban Studies of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Harvard University in Washington this past June.

I invite these recommendations to the attention of the Senate, and I also wish to underscore those suggested actions pertaining to the importance of accurate social statistics to a democratic government committed to improving the lot of all its citizens. Viewed in this light, the specific problem of underenumeration of minority groups, whose members happen to be among the more impoverished of our population and among those most in need of the assistance provided by various governmental programs, assumes urgent importance. In addition, the rapidity with which change is altering our social landscape makes imperative, I believe, early action on the conference recommendation of a full national census every 5 rather than every 10 years.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions of the Conference on Social Statistics and an editorial supporting "A Quinquennial Census," published in the New York Times, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS OF THE CONFERENCE ON SOCIAL STATISTICS

The Conference on Social Statistics and the City, convened by the Joint Center for Urban Studies of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Harvard University, meeting in Washington, D.C., June 22–23, 1967, by general concurrence resolved the following:

IMPROVING ENUMERATION OF NEGROES, PUERTO RICANS, AND MEXICANS

1. While American population statistics are among the very finest in the world, papers presented to the Conference have established beyond reasonable doubt that the Decennial Census, the Current Population Survey, and to a lesser degree, the Vital Statistics of the United States, seriously and significantly under-enumerate or under-estimate the size of the Negro, Puerto-Rican, and Mexican-American populations. As much as 10 percent of the Negro population may not have been counted in the 1960 Census, and there is considerable probability that the Puerto Rican and Mexican-American were similarly under-counted.

In 1960 as many as one Negro male in six within the age group of 20 to 39 years may have been omitted altogether.

In a modern society statistical information is not only a primary guide to public and private actions, in itself it profoundly influences patterns of thought and basic assumptions as to the way things are and the way they are likely to be. Were national statistics merely inadequate, but uniformly so, the nation would be at a disadvantage, but no special injury could be claimed by any region or group. As it happens, however, where American population statistics are inadequate, they will normally be found to be so in terms of the under-enumeration and under-estimation of minority groups, defined in terms of race, or national origin, and concentrated in specific neighborhoods, usually in densely populated central city areas. They are also, characteristically, defined by poverty. But a larger issue than that simply of efficiency and convenience must enter the consideration of this subject. A constitutional issue enters.

Article I, Section 3, of the Constitution provides for the enumeration once each ten years of all persons residing within the United States. This enumeration is explicitly and primarily designed to provide the basis for representation in the House of Representatives. In the years since the adoption of the Constitution, the Census enumeration and other statistical programs, such as those conducted by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, have come to be the basis for a host of public activities, and most particularly provide the basis on which public funds are allocated in a whole range of government programs at the national, state, and local level. In some cases funds are allocated on a straight "head count" basis. In other cases, as for example the Economic Development Act, Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and in the Model Cities legislation, public funds are allocated on the basis of population together with a range of special economic and other information collected by government agencies.

The record of these agencies, notably the Bureau of the Census, in gathering and compiling this information with the highest technical competence, the utmost standards of impartiality and integrity, and at the most modest cost is a matter of national pride. Typically it has been the Census Bureau itself that has been the most diligent in discovering and analyzing the problems of gathering statistics relating to minority groups.

Nonetheless, the problem of under-enumeration of minority groups is likely to persist unless it becomes a matter of more general concern. We believe that what were initially at least technical problems have by their very magnitude been transformed into social problems with powerful legal and ethical implications. Specifically, we hold that where a group defined by racial or ethnic terms, and concentrated in specific political jurisdictions, is significantly under-counted in relation to other groups, then individual members of that group are thereby deprived of the constitutional right to equal representation in the House of Representatives, and by inference in other legislative bodies. Further, we hold that individual members of such a group are thereby deprived of their right to equal protection of the laws as provided by Section I of the 14th Amendment to the Constitution in that they are deprived of their entitlement to partake in Federal and other programs designed for areas and populations with their characteristics.

injury, while general, is real; redress is in order. This would seem a matter of special concern to the nation in view of recent Supreme Court rulings establishing the one-man, one-vote principle in apportioning legislatures, and in view of the extensive Congressional activity in the establishment of programs designed to improve the economic and social status of just those groups that appear to be substantially under-represented in our current population statistics.

The Bureau of the Census, and other government statistical agencies, have set a superb standard of public accountability in themselves calling attention to this problem. We feel it is incumbent on the Congress to provide the Bureau of the Census, the National Center of Health Statistics, the Bureau of Labor Statistics and such other agencies as are concerned, with the funds necessary to obtain a full enumeration of all groups in the population, and also to gather the usual information on special and economic characteristics that is necessary to implement the laws of the nation.

2. The Conference likewise emphasizes that there is an obligation on the part of every resident to be enumerated.

3. The Conference commends the Bureau of the Census for the innovative use of the Post Office for the purpose of insuring a more complete enumeration. The Conference believes that the Post Office will contribute to the improvement of the coverage of the census not only in general, but particularly, in the central cities.

4. The Conference wishes to encourage the Bureau of the Census to explore more flexible personnel procedures from the standpoint first, of enlarging the number of people who can be located to serve usefully as regular enumerators and, second, to employ people in various auxiliary roles to help insure completeness of count.

5. The Bureau of the Census, working in concert with other groups, public and private, should work to develop enumerator skills, particularly for conditions in the central cities, and to instill a professional spirit among enumerators.

6. The Conference suggests consideration of the appointment of enumerators or supervisors by Presidential commission as a step to impress them with the seriousness of the task.

7. The Conference wishes to encourage the Bureau of the Census to take an experimental approach toward the use of various incentives for respondents.

8. The Conference is impressed with the extent to which improvements in close-out procedures[1] and procedures for following back to apparently vacant housing units may contribute to the reduction of under-enumeration. We put high priority, therefore, on changes in procedures and in allocation of resources that promise an improvement in this area.

9. The Conference would like to urge financial support for further studies of under-enumeration in the 1970 Census such as the study of 1960 under-enumeration by Jacob Siegal, extended to specific estimates of under-enumeration by age, sex, race, ethnic group, and residence.

IMPROVING VITAL STATISTICS FOR NEGROES, PUERTO RICANS AND MEXICANS

1. We recommend that the Bureau of the Census and the National Center for Health Statistics study methods for improving the completeness and quality of Census data to enable the computation of vital rates for minority groups, particularly those groups which have been included with the white population in the past.

2. We recommend that the National Center for Health Statistics through the mechanisms of the Public Health Conference on Records and Statistics and the American Association of Vital Registrars and Public Health Statisticians ask state and local health departments to make more tabulations and classifications of vital records for minority groups.

3. We recommend that the National Center for Health Statistics make known what material state and local health agencies collect, tabulate, and publish concerning vital rates for minority groups.

4. We recommend that the Bureau of the Census and the National Center for Health Statistics conduct a birth registration and enumeration matching test in conjunction with the Census of 1970. The aims of this test should be (a) test completeness of birth registration, (b) ascertain census under-enumeration of the young, (c) determine quality of both birth registration and census data, (d) study differentials in infant mortality by characteristics in family or household.

5. We encourage the National Center for Health Statistics to work through the Public Health Conference on Records and Statistics and the American Association of Vital Registrars and Public Health Statisticians to assure that a question concerning legitimacy will appear on the birth certificate and certificate of fetal death. This can be accomplished by having this item in the confidential section as recommended for the standard certificates[2] for 1968.

6. We recommend that the National Center for Health Statistics encourage record linkage studies utilizing birth, fetal death, death, marriage and divorce records. We recommend that the Bureau of the Census encourage record linkage studies based on the 1970 Census of Population and Housing.

7. We encourage states to retain the question concerning race on the birth and death certificates and we encourage states to include questions on race on marriage and divorce certificates. This can be accomplished by having this item in the confidential section as recommended for the standard certificates of 1968.

8. We urge the National Center for Health Statistics to continue and expand studies of the completeness of death registration and studies of the quality of data obtained on death certificates.

9. We urge the National Center for Health Statistics to encourage local agencies to classify birth and death certificates by city block or census tract, perhaps using the address register being developed by the Bureau of the Census for the Census of 1970. This will make possible further studies of the vital rates of minority groups.

10. We support efforts to obtain a quinquennial census and we recommend that such a census obtain adequate information to permit study of the vital rates of minority groups.

11. We urge states to affiliate as rapidly as possible with the Marriage and Divorce Registration Areas established by the National Center for Health Statistics.

12. We encourage the National Center for Health Statistics and the Bureau of the Census to explore, support and conduct surveys of fertility expectations and performance. In particular, adequate information should be obtained for minority groups with distinctive fertility patterns.

NEEDED ENLARGEMENT IN AVAILABLE SOCIAL STATISTICS FOR NEGROES, PUERTO RICANS, AND MEXICANS

1. The Conference recommends that the Census Bureau continue to clearly identify Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Cubans, Mexicans, white persons of Spanish surname, and American Indians in the Census. For the specific groups for which more data are desired Census publications should replace the categories of white and non-white with more specific ethnic or racial designations; for example, Negro, American Indian, and Cuban.

2. Federal statistical surveys should be designed from the beginning to provide data for specific minority groups. This may require special sampling and tabulation programs in addition to specifications of content appropriate to the social situation of minorities.

3. The Bureau of the Census and other statistical agencies should continue to experiment with methods of identifying ethnic groups; for example, by ethnic origin, language spoken in the home and birthplace of grandparents.

4. The presentation of survey and census results should be expanded in two ways—in summary form for general users and in easily available special tabulations for professional users.

5. The Conference recommends that the Census Bureau conduct frequent surveys to provide for individual cities and the minority groups within cities data of the type included in the program of the Current Population Survey.

6. A full census should be carried out more frequently than at present. A 5 year census should replace the present 10 year census.

APPRISING ORGANIZATIONS ABOUT THE CENSUS AND OTHER SOURCES OF SOCIAL STATISTICS

1. The Joint Center for Urban Studies of M.I.T. and Harvard should apprise organizations interested in social statistics, particularly those concerned with minority groups, of the proceedings of this Conference.

[From the New York Times, Aug 20, 1967]

A QUINQUENNIAL CENSUS

Instead of the regular decennial census, the House of Representatives has voted to take a head and place count of Americans every five years. Congressmen from fast-growing urban and suburban districts are for it because more current data would mean a better shake in allotting Federal and state aid and devising programs to meet urgent civic needs.

The half-decade census makes sense on several counts. City administrators, sociologists and scholars cannot plan for the future unless they know who's where. Some forecasters say that one out of two Americans no longer live where they did in 1960.

A significant census point has been underscored by the Center for Urban Studies of M.I.T.-Harvard. It is that Negroes and Americans of Puerto Rican and Mexican origin are undercounted. As much as 10 per cent of the real population of these minority groups may have received a short count. The poor, especially in the slum areas, frequently avoid the official knock on the door.

In the trial runs next year for the 1970 census, social statisticians suggest improved head-counting methods. The Post Office can contribute to fuller coverage; greater cooperation with state and city agencies is required, and enumerator skills must be improved.

In ancient Rome a census of citizens and their property was taken for purposes of taxation. In a more complex and greater society, a census is required to serve the people instead of the state. A quinquennial national census can help toward that end.

---

[1] Close-out procedures determine the number of calls an enumerator must make at a particular household in an attempt to gather information. If no information can be gathered after the specified number of calls, characteristics of the household are allocated by a computer.

[2] The standard certificate is that form which the National Center for Health Statistics recommends to the States as most appropriate.

THE F-111 CONTROVERSY

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, in connection with discussions incident to the F-111 program, I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Secretary of the Air Force be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, October 5, 1967.

Hon. STUART SYMINGTON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SYMINGTON: You have asked me to comment on the materials (two magazine stories, two newspaper articles, one television broadcast, and three brief editorial comments) inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 20. Having reviewed them, I conclude that they do not present a balanced picture of the testimony on the F-111 program.

One story, for example, features the "jolting admission" that there are penalty provisions in the F-111 R&D contract—a fact that has been public knowledge for almost five years. Another is headlined "Navy's Plane Requires Excessive Wind for Carrier Landings," yet fails to mention that the F-111 in this respect outperforms any supersonic fighter in the fleet. I have similar difficulties with the piece captioned "A New Plane—and Hardly Anybody is Happy." It is unfortunate that the author of this article did not take the trouble to talk with the Tactical Air Command crews who are eagerly forming F-111 operational units at Nellis Air Force Base today.

There has never been and will never be a major development program that does not provide grist for the critic's mill, and I say this without questioning either the sincerity of the critics or the utility of the function they perform. I will say only that these few selections are in no sense representative of, much less a substitute for, the comprehensive testimony given this year before Committees of both the Senate and the House, particularly the testimony of such responsible officials as the Chief of Staff of the Air Force and myself, who are on record that the F-111 is the aircraft we want and need.

Sincerely,

HAROLD BROWN.

BILINGUAL EDUCATION BILL HAILED AS MAJOR STEP IN BREAKING DOWN LANGUAGE WALLS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the recent issue of Commonweal, dated October 6, 1967, contained an article by Dr. Frank Cordasco, professor of education at Montclair State College, N.J., entitled "Knocking Down the Language Walls." Dr. Cordasco is a recognized expert in the field of language education and was one of the many expert witnesses which the Special Subcommittee on Bilingual Education heard during the course of its hearings on S. 428. His article on this problem is incisive and clearly indicates the nature of the problem which my bill attempts to attack.

I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Cordasco's article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KNOCKING DOWN THE LANGUAGE WALLS

It has long been an American illusion that for a child born in the United States English is not a foreign language; therefore, virtually all instruction in the schools must be through the medium of English. Some states (New York included) have mandated this ethnocentrism in statutes which expressly forbid instruction in any language but English. One result was that the schools became the agencies of social disaffection, cultural assault, and enforced assimilation. The schools had to minister to children who brought with them myriad cultures and a multiplicity of tongues. More often than not (almost always in the cities where immigrants clustered) the children also were poor. And within the perimeter of this poverty were cultural differences, language handicaps, social alienation and disaffection. In this sense, poor Negroes, migrating from rural areas to the urban ghettos of the 1960's, and the Mexican-American poor, largely an urban minority, are not newcomers to the American schools, nor do they present American educators with new problems.

In its efforts to "assimilate" all of its charges, the American school very often destroyed the cultural identity of the child; it forced him to leave his ancestral language at the schoolhouse door; it developed in the child an ambivalence of language, of culture, of ethnicity, and of personal self-affirmation. It held up to the children mirrors in which they saw, not themselves, but the stereotyped middle-class, white, English-speaking child who allegedly embodied what the American child was (or ought) to be. For the minority child, the images which the school fashioned were cruel deceptions. In the enforced acculturation there was bitterness and confusion, but tragically, too, there was the rejection of the wellsprings of identity, and more often than not, the failure of achievement. The non-English-speaking child (almost inevitably poor) was the easy victim of cultural assault, and his ancestral language was a target against which the school mounted relentless resources.

Against this tragic background and quixotic effort, largely unnoticed, is a "sleeper" amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (E.S.E.A.) which in essence proposes that we banish the ghosts of ethnocentrism and culural imperialism, and turn to the cultivation of individual differences which better reflect our pluralistic society.

The history of this "sleeper" amendment is a good illustration of what Kenneth Clark has characterized as "the dilemmas of power." Where would one have sought the power in the Congress to recognize the particular needs of Puerto Rican children, if previous Congresses had chosen largely to ignore millions of other children who were non-English-speaking? The tactic here was obviously to relate the Puerto Rican child to the needs of another group long indigenous in America but equally long disenfranchised, and for whom English was not their native language. In the five-state area of the Southwest (Texas, New Mexico, Colorado, Arizona, California) there are at least 1.75 million Mexican-American school children whose linguistic, cultural and psychological handicaps cause them to experience, in general, academic failure in our schools, or at best limit them to only mediocre success. The Mexican-American child classically demonstrated that an almost inevitable concomitant of poverty was low educational achievement. Thus, it was out of Texas, unlikely as it may seem, that an extraordinary amendment to the ESEA was proposed.

On Jan. 17, 1967, Ralph Yarborough (D.-Texas) introduced in the Senate S. 428, which proposed "to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in order to provide assistance to local educational agencies in establishing bilingual American education programs and to provide certain other assistance to promote such programs." At long last the Congress had before it legislation which would make legitimate the cultivation of individual differences in our schools. Understandably, Senator Yarborough was concerned with the problems of his Mexican-American constituents, but his bill explicitly noted, "For the purpose of this Title, Spanish-speaking elementary and secondary students means elementary and secondary school students born in, or one or both of whose parents were born in, Mexico or Puerto Rico, and, in states for which such information is available, other students with Spanish surnames." The very proposal of the bill was tantamount to the recognition that Mexican-American children had been neglected by American schools.

But Senator Yarborough's legislation went far beyond this elemental recognition. It proposed (1) bilingual educational programs; (2) the teaching of Spanish as the native language; (3) the teaching of English as a second language; (4) programs designed to impart to Spanish-speaking students a knowledge of and pride in their ancestral culture and language; (5) efforts to attract and retain as teachers promising individuals of Mexican or Puerto Rican descent; and (6) efforts to establish closer cooperation between the school and the home. What extraordinary proposals!

As was to be expected, Senator Yarborough's bill (which had as co-sponsors Mr. Javits and Mr. Kennedy of New York) created a flurry of activity in the House (although the bill went largely unnoticed outside the Congress) and a spate of companion House bills were proposed. Chief among them was H.R. 9840 offered by James H. Scheuer (D.-New York). Congressman Scheuer wished to include not only Spanish-speaking students, as Yarborough proposed, but all those whose native language is not English. Scheuer asked for five times the money Senator Yarborough had proposed ($25,000,000 as against $5,000,000 for fiscal year 1967–68); further, his bill provides for 'participation by full-time non-public school students (children in parochial and other private schools).

Of course, a few objections have been raised against such legislation. Some linguists have objected to linking the bill to poverty; they insist that the bill be completely unrestricted to allow the cultivation of a vast bi-lingual resource. But this is truly another problem. What the legislation has really proposed (no matter how awkwardly, and despite all the programming intricacies which will have to be worked out) is that the school, as a social institution which serves the children of an open society, must build on the cultural strengths which the child brings to the classroom; to cultivate in this child ancestral pride; to reinforce (not destroy) the language he natively speaks; and to give this child the sense of personal identification so essential to his social maturation.

Senator Yarborough's Senate Bill 428 was unanimously reported out of the Senate Subcommittee on Education in August. If it achieves passage, his "sleeper" will have thrust greatness upon him, and Texas will have become as illustrious in educational history as Massachusetts.

FRANK M. CORDASCO.

(*Dr. Frank Cordasco, sociologist and author, is professor of education, Montclair State College, N.J.*)

BIG REASON FOR SST-CONCORDE COMPETITION IS FADING

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the world's airlines are having second thoughts about the Anglo-French supersonic transport, the Concorde, which is scheduled to go into service in 1971.

Orders for this first entry in the SST sweepstakes have been lagging well behind expectations, according to a report published in this morning's edition of the Wall Street Journal. Not only that, some airlines that had purchased options to buy the plane now say they may not exercise them, the Journal reports. The options were picked up at a cost of up to $280,000 apiece.

These reports demonstrate that the Concorde is not going to be the enormous competitive threat to our aviation industry that had earlier been predicted for it. Some airlines have indicated they are willing to wait for the American SST not only because of its superior engineering but also because they are beginning to feel some strain on their financial resources imposed by purchases of Boeing 747's—the jumbo jet—on which they will take delivery in late 1969.

I submit—and so argued last Thursday when I offered an amendment to the transportation appropriations bill to slow down the SST development program—that delaying our SST program a year or even 2 years will not do one iota of damage to the sales outlook for the plane.

As the Journal report pointed out:

> The world's airlines aren't particularly averse to delaying their next period of major spending for several years . . .

Despite the fact the Senate and the House have voted to go ahead full steam with SST development, I hope President Johnson will take note of the Concorde's difficulties when he casts about for items to cut out of this year's budget. There is absolutely no reason to rush our SST development program. A 1- or 2-year delay will not hurt our competitive position at all; and certainly there is no military necessity for this project.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ORDERS FOR EUROPE'S CONCORDE PLANE LAG—SOME AIRLINES MAY AWAIT BOEING'S SST

The world's airlines appear to be having some second thoughts about the Concorde, the supersonic, 136-passenger jet being developed jointly by Britain and France and expected to go into service in 1971.

Orders for the aircraft haven't been coming in as fast as was earlier estimated and some airlines that already have purchased options to buy the jet, at up to $280,000 each, indicate they may not exercise them.

Reasons for the Concorde's apparent sales lag are varied, but one possible result could be that in forgoing the Anglo-French plane the airlines will put their money on Boeing Co.'s 2707, the 1,800-mile-an-hour, 350 passenger SST that's expected to go into operation in late 1974, at the earliest.

The Concorde is expected to sell for about $21 million, including spare parts, and Boeing's SST for about $40 million. More important than this difference in price, however, is the fact that airlines are coming into a period of severe strain on their financial resources, mostly in expanding current jet fleets and in borrowing to pay for Boeing's 747. This is the so-called jumbo jet that will carry up to 380 passengers and cost $20 million each. Initial deliveries of the 747 are expected in late 1969.

Also, there will be potential purchases of short and medium-range jets currently under development, such as the so-called air-bus being designed by Lockheed Aircraft Corp. and another air-bus version planned as a joint venture by Britain, West Germany and France, both being readied for the early 1970's.

Thus, the world's airlines aren't particularly averse to delaying their next period of major spending for several years—to 1974, when they can buy the Boeing 2707, from 1971, when they would be taking delivery on the Concorde.

RESERVATIONS ABOUT ENGINEERING

Among other reservations the airlines are said to have on the Concorde is its engineering. In the U.S., especially, potential buyers are concerned with an increase in the plane's overall weight from original specifications to about 370,000 pounds from 350,000.

It's understood U.S. engineers who have evaluated the Concorde aren't satisfied the plane, with the additional weight, will be able to fly the 3,600 miles between New York and Paris nonstop.

Contributing to the increased weight is the addition of two more thrust reversers, used to slow the plane on landing; this is being insisted on by U.S. airlines. The Concorde's developers recommended only two thrust reversers plus a drag parachute, but U.S. evaluators turned this down. Additional galley and other interior items asked for by U.S. airline engineers also are increasing the plane's weight.

The tight design of the Concorde to preserve its aerodynamic qualities, experts say, preclude enlargement of the fuel tanks to increase range. It's also considered possible the craft will be able to carry only 120 to 125 passengers on long-range flights instead of the planned 136.

Another point in controversy is the Concorde's projected high landing speed of about 158 knots, compared with 130 to 140 knots for current jets. Stress on tires and on runways at certain airports, plus high noise levels, also pose problems.

But British Aircraft Corp., and Sud Aviation, the plane's builders, claim they have made provisions for extra weight and that they will solve these problems. The buyers have about a year before they must make firm commitments tieing down to accepting the plane, during which period definite guarantees by the manufacturers will be worked out.

As for the airlines that already have ordered the Concorde, a spokesman for Air India said last week "We have two Boeing 747 jumbo jets on order, and we have reserved three positions for the U.S. supersonic jet. The possibility of our taking up our Concorde positions must now be regarded as very remote."

Also, it's understood Australia's Qantas Airlines is considering canceling its four Concorde options. Says a Qantas spokesman, "We haven't made and aren't in the process of making any decision on the Concorde." He noted the line doesn't have to make a decision until six months after the first prototype flies, expected next February. "It would be fatuous to say we don't want it until we see how it flies," he adds. Qantas has six Boeing SSTs on order.

Irish International Airlines says it is bypassing the Concorde entirely.

SALES BELOW EXPECTATIONS

There's little question but that sales so far of the Anglo-French plane have failed to come up to expectations. Brtish Aircraft confidently predicted earlier this year that orders in 1967 would reach 100 from the then-current 69.

But only five more options have been taken to date, three by Lufthansa, the West German line, and two by Eastern Air Lines. The latest order was in June.

A spokesman for British Aircraft concedes the earlier estimate of 100 orders by the end of this year was optimistic, but he says, "We are still confident the plane will do what we say it will do, operationally and saleswise."

Adds the BAC spokesman: "It isn't crucial to the project that we reach the 100-order mark by the end of 1967. We have our first three years of production pretty well committed (with existing orders) and when we reach the 100 mark is fairly immaterial. . . . There could well be an order lull until the prototypes fly."

The Concorde is costing the British and French $1.4 billion for development and construction of just four planes—a prototype and a preproduction model by both BAC and Sud.

Beyond this, it's believed it will take another $560 million total from the two countries to begin production runs of the aircraft. So far, this money hasn't been forthcoming, and there's continued speculation that the British government is unhappy with the project, that it's costing too much and that it doesn't want to put up its share. The French withdrawal from the "swing wing" fighter joint project this summer didn't make the British particularly happy about joint projects.

The British government insists it's fully committed to the Concorde, however, and that it isn't yet necessary to put up the extra cash. Indeed, John Stowehouse, minister of state in the Ministry of Technology, asserts the government already has spent $9.8 million in tooling and some materials for production models of the plane.

WILL THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD BE THE NEXT PUBLICATION TO BE BANNED IN SOUTH VIETNAM?

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, today's press carries the story that the October 9, 1967, issue of Newsweek has been banned by the South Vietnamese Government for carrying a story showing how poor and corrupt the Vietnamese Army is.

According to the new Vietnamese Constitution, there is supposed to be freedom of the press in South Vietnam. As was shown when there was a newspaper crackdown just before the September 3, 1967, so-called free elections, there is freedom of the press in South Vietnam only so long as the newspapers publish what the South Vietnamese military junta approves.

The article in Newsweek is entitled "Their Lions—Our Rabbits" and gives a factual account of the failure of the South Vietnamese Army to fight, of how corrupt it is, and of how so many members of that army are "opting out" of the war and turning it over to the U.S. forces. The article points out how, in August of this year, more Americans were drafted than the South Vietnamese Government had drafted in the preceding 6 months.

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Their Lions—Our Rabbits," published in the October 9, 1967, issue of Newsweek, be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

It may be that because the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will carry this Newsweek article, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD itself will now be banned in South Vietnam.

I shall have the article reprinted and offer to send a copy to anyone in South Vietnam who wants one—if they ever find out there that it was reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alaska?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Newsweek, Oct. 9, 1967]

THEIR LIONS—OUR RABBITS

(NOTE.—*By common consent, there is only one native institution in South Vietnam sufficiently strong and cohesive that it might be able to insure the country's survival as an independent, non-Communist state. That institution is the South Vietnamese armed forces. Recently, Newsweek Correspondent Merton D. Perry was asked to appraise the capacity of the South Vietnamese military to meet that heavy responsibility. His report follows:*)

At Dak To in the central highlands of Vietnam, an entire South Vietnamese regiment has taken itself out of action in order to concentrate upon supplying the 173rd U.S. Airborne Brigade base with beer, prostitutes and laundry service. A Vietnamese Ranger unit performs a similar function for the Fourth U.S. Division near Pleiku. And in Bien Hoa, next to a sprawling airfield crowded with GI's, another enterprising Ranger outfit has built a red-light district known as "Tijuana East."

All across the shell-pocked face of South Vietnam these days, a distressing fact is evident: an uncomfortably large number of South Vietnamese fighting men have virtually opted out of the war, leaving the field to their big American brothers. In each of the past three months, U.S. combat deaths have exceeded those of the South Vietnamese. Total American casualties now regularly outrun the South Vietnamese draft call, and in August alone the U.S. drafted more men than South Vietnam had in the previous six months.

The South Vietnamese Army, in short, is sick. Like the society which created it, it is riddled with factionalism, nepotism, corruption, inefficiency, incompetence and cowardice. As a result, the RVNAF (Republic of Vietnam Armed Forces) all too often prove either unwilling or unable to perform even the relatively limited task which is now their chief mission: the protection of rural pacification teams.

HEADS AND HEARTS

There is, of course, no inherent reason why the South Vietnamese Army should not be a first-class fighting force. As a Vietnamese colonel recently remarked to me over breakfast: "The North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong fight like lions while our soldiers fight like rabbits." Yet the rabbits come from the same stock as the lions. Often, they even come from the same families.

Why are "our" Vietnamese so poor and "theirs" so good? My colonel friend supplied part of the answer. "The Communists fight," he said, "because their officers have something in their heads and hearts—and the soldiers know what they are fighting for." Beyond that, the North Vietnamese and Viet Cong benefit from the impressive expertise in guerrilla tactics developed by their commanders in decades of war against the French and Americans. By contrast, the South Vietnamese serviceman is frequently led by venal and inexpert commanders and usually has no reason for wanting to fight at all.

To begin with, the South Vietnamese soldier is extremely poorly paid (a private draws about $15 a month) and poorly cared for. His officers generally make no attempt to motivate him. "Most enlisted men do not have any clear understanding that they are fighting Communists," a Vietnamese lieutenant recently told me. And because commanders often pocket part of their unit's food allowance, the soldiers are virtually forced to steal their food from the peasants. This, in turn, engenders in many South Vietnamese troops a contempt for the peasantry. On one operation near Bong Son which I witnessed recently, the men of a crack regular unit foresightedly brought along empty sandbags in which to carry their loot.

HISTORY

Such a sorry state is not achieved overnight, and, indeed, the present dilemma has sprung from years of ineptitude and missed opportunities. Created after the second world war as part of the French Army, the South Vietnamese military establishment was organized first into light-infantry battalions, for which French officers had little but contempt. After France's defeat, the destiny of the South Vietnamese Army was largely guided by two American advisers, Lt. Gen. John (Iron Mike) O'Daniel and Lt. Gen. Samuel (Hanging Sam) Williams. Between them, they eventually forged a system of heavy divisions and cumbersome staffs designed to repel a Korean-type attack across the 17th parallel by North Vietnam. By 1961, the South Vietnamese had an unwieldly, road-bound army that was incapable of meeting and defeating a guerrilla enemy on his own ground. And in 1961, the Communists launched just that sort of attack.

Then, it has been said, was the time for the U.S. to force the Vietnamese to redirect their efforts. Instead, the American military command in South Vietnam concentrated on beefing up its advisory force and bringing in a lot more military hardware. Thus, by early 1965, the South Vietnamese were very nearly beaten, and the U.S. had to send in its own troops to stave off disaster.

Since then, the South Vietnamese military have staggered haphazardly along the road to recovery. U.S. military men, in fact, steadfastly maintain that dramatic progress is being made, and the Pentagon's favorite ammunition—statistics—is liberally expended to prove the point. South Vietnam's armed forces have grown by more than 50 per cent a year in each of the last three years and now total more than 700,000 men—of whom 250,000 are regulars and the rest militia. The number of combat battalions rated "satisfactory" by U.S. observers has risen about 40 per cent since the end of 1965. Desertions have decreased sharply (although soldiers still are going over the hill at the rate of about 74,000 a year), the kill ratio is rising and the South Vietnamese, according to official statistics, are capturing more weapons than before.

DEATHS

To many, however, it still appears that the U.S. command is inclined to label as "progress" any action in which the Vietnamese have merely done their duty. There are, admittedly, some highly effective Vietnamese units—notably among the Marine and Ranger outfits. But the fact remains that 360 pacification workers have been assassinated so far this year—often while army units stood idly by not far away.

Corruption, moreover, continues to be endemic in the RVNAF. One South Vietnamese division commander was recently found to have sold to the Viet Cong rice that had been provided by the U.S. aid program. Other officers conduct a brisk smuggling trade across the Cambodian border, even importing such Red Chinese items as flashlights and ball-point pens. And commands in the RVNAF often are bought for officers by a syndicate of backers, assured of an immense profit out of illegal deals.

WHITEWASH

The Saigon government has pledged that it will stamp out all this, but frequently its efforts boil down to a whitewash. The district chief of Cu Chi, north of Saigon, was fired recently for his misdeeds, but soon surfaced again as chief of another province, having been promoted from captain to major.

Efforts at reform, however, continue. The Vietnamese Joint General Staff already has approved a 42-point plan to improve the quality of the armed forces; it includes provision for dependent housing and ration allowances for troops and several steps to upgrade military education. More promising yet is a scheme for a wholesale reorganization of the armed forces, scheduled to go into effect the first of next year. This scheme would strip corps commanders of their warlord powers and put 54 battalions directly under the control of province chiefs to concentrate on pacification security..

According to a knowledgeable officer in the U.S. command, however, the reorganization is in "limbo" for the moment. "It looks like there's still a lot of horse trading going on among the generals," this officer says. But the hard fact is that if this and other reforms are not carried out, if the Vietnamese armed forces do not somehow acquire the will and ability to fight, then the American shield will be needed in South Vietnam for a far longer time than anyone cares to contemplate.

AMBASSADOR EDWARD CLARK, TEXAN IN AUSTRALIA, IS A GREAT AMERICAN AMBASSADOR

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, we are all familiar with the job that Hon. Edward Clark is performing for our country as Ambassador to Australia. At this time of increasing importance of that part of the world and our vital friendship with Australia, Ed Clark is the right man to represent our interests.

Yesterday's New York Times Sunday magazine contains an article written by an assistant editor of the Melbourne Sun which colorfully describes our Ambassador's 2 years in Canberra, and what happened "When a Texas-Style Diplomat Hits Australia." I was pleased that the article reports the love this sixth-generation Texan feels for his home State, which strongly flavors his diplomatic style, but all of us can feel equal pride in the job of representation he is doing for our country.

He has traveled over a quarter of a million miles since his appointment and has taken the story of our country, and often the personal words of our President, into every corner and every organization in that country. I am privileged to count Mr. Clark as an old and close friend and know that the article rightly describes him as the finest Ambassador the United States has ever had in Australia.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHEN A TEXAS-STYLE DIPLOMAT HITS AUSTRALIA

(By Harry Gordon, assistant editor of the Melbourne Sun)

CANBERRA.—The bus pulled up outside the large red-brick Georgian building, and the driver called out, "Okay, then. Everybody out for the American Embassy." The tourists spilled across the sidewalk and into the marble-floored entrance, between framed replicas of the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights. They emerged on the other side of the hall, trooped across a formal garden and reached another front door. A rich Texan voice boomed: "Well, howdy folks. I'm the Ambassador, and this here is Missus Clark. Just take your time looking around, and ask me anything you want. It'd make me very happy if you'd all accept a Texas yellow rose and some literature about my home state."

The Hon. Edward Clark, Ambassador for the United States of America in the Australian capital city of Canberra, was wearing a yachting jacket that day, with a yellow rose in the lapel and watch chain that carried a golden miniature map of Texas; when he lifted his arms wide or pointed to his treasures—"That there's a Pic-cass-ee-oh, and here's a chart showing all the oldest houses in San Augustine, Texas," he revealed bright blue, three-inch-wide braces, decorated with reindeer.

Afterwards, the tourists marched back to the bus, loaded with little yellow roses, bundles of booklets and a mild air of bewilderment. They had just been hit by Hurricane Ed, and this can be an overwhelming experience. He had kissed babies, posed for snapshots beside his elm tree ("Miz Eleanor Roosevelt planted that") and extracted sincere, puzzled promises from a bunch of Indonesian students that they would visit his home in San Augustine. Other passengers had been treated to a series of jokes ("So President Lincoln said, 'If you-all think General Grant's drinking too much, I just wish you'd find out what brand he's drinking . . . he's the only one we got who's winning'"), and still others now possessed recipes for mixing drinks from bourbon, a potion not easily available in Australia.

The next stop on the bus tour was at the Japanese Embassy, and the disembarking tourists were disappointed to find that nobody was waiting at the front door to greet them. "Where the heck's the Ambassador?" asked several passengers of a butler who had obviously been told to keep an eye on the silverware and the ashtrays, but the butler remained silent and inscrutable. Nor were the tourists howdied at the British, the French and the German Embassies. At the Soviet mission's building, the bus did not even stop.

The bus jaunt around Canberra's embassies that day in 1965 had been organized to raise money for the Red Cross, and it was quite successful. But it did not endear Ed Clark, the newly appointed United States Ambassador, to all members of the resident diplomatic corps. What was the man trying to do, some of them asked, turn the place into some kind of fairground stall? Did he think he was running for office? Today Clark grins proudly as he recalls that the man who was then Prime Minister of Australia, Sir Robert Menzies, took him gently aside and told him: "You keep that stuff up, Ed, and they'll throw you out of the ambassadors' union."

In fact, Ed Clark has kept up the practice of meeting tourist coaches; he is, of course, the only ambassador in Canberra to do so. He shook hands with nearly 2,000 on that first strenuous, memorable Red Cross day, and his personal howdy-total (after two years in the job) is something over 14,000. So far, nobody has tried to throw him out of the ambassadors' union; indeed, most of his fellow diplomats have come to regard him with deep affection—although he is still apt to make the more pukka of them wince when he calls a greeting like "Howya, Charlie, y'ole hossfly," at a cocktail party.

Clark, at 61, is one of the United States Foreign Service's most unusual exports, and he is undoubtedly the leading character in the Australian national capital. Canberra (pop. 100,000) is a beautifully laid-out, rather staid city, which possesses a well-defined Establishment whose members come from the Australian National University, the diplomatic corps, the civil service and the Houses of Parliament. The pattern of living inside this Establishment is quite formal; with the bulky exception of Ed Clark, it has included only two really colorful ambassadorial characters in recent years. One was a Malaysian who disappeared mysteriously last year for nine days after striking up a friendship with a King's Cross (Sydney) stripper; the other was an Indonesian who insisted on performing somersaults in his garden each morning, clad only in a sarong. Both have now returned to their homelands, leaving Clark undisputed as the most refreshing personality in the rather pompous protocol-conscious diplomatic round.

Clark is a large, 200-pound extrovert who rambles at formal functions through an apparently endless supply of folksy, cracker-barrel, Texas-flavored stories. He has been branded a clown by some critics, and "Mister Ed" (after TV's talking horse) by others. He has certainly talked a lot, often in Texan superlatives, and he has a formidable reputation as a backslapper; he has dropped a few diplomatic clangers, is reputed to own the loudest (and thus least diplomatic) whisper in Canberra, and has shown an almost pathological determination to view the world through yellow-rose-colored glasses. His obsession with that Texas bloom asserts itself in many ways; at a conservative estimate, he has handed out some 50,000 of them; he rarely is without one in his buttonhole; there is, in fact, a rumor that he wears a yellow rose in his dressing gown lapel. He has 850 yellow rose bushes in his 10-acre gardens at the embassy, and when these are out of season he goes to extraordinary lengths to keep up the supply—he has even had them flown, packed in ice, from Texas.

This past Aug. 26 he sponsored Australia's first Texas race meeting in Canberra. Events included the election of a Yellow Rose Maiden, the Lone Star Flying Handicap, the Texas Handicap, the San Augustine Improvers' Race and the Austin Progressive Handicap. The Ambassador and his Chinese butler Huong dispensed bourbon and yellow roses to special guests under a flagpole from which fluttered the flag of the Lone Star State. The winning jockey in the Texas Handicap received a decanter full of bourbon and the lucky horse a garland of 300 yellow roses flown specially from Texas. Some of them, it ate.

It would be wrong to describe Clark as a discrete conversationalist at cocktail parties. He has been heard to say of one nationality, "They're not like Australians . . . they put their hand out to you, but it's not for shaking." And again, "Y'know, if you were on fire, those guys wouldn't even bother to extinguish you." (In truth, he expressed this sentiment a little more bawdily.) He prefaces many remarks with "Shoot, man," says "you-all," refers to himself as "Ah" and shortens the word "mister" to "mist'" or "mizzuh."

In a quiet way, he has managed to match his wardrobe admirably to his personality and his vocabulary. Not long ago he astonished natives in a New Guinea marketplace by arriving in a Stetson—and when he adjusts his bowler at a jaunty angle, low over one eye, he immediately takes on the look of an aging but enthusiastic vaudeville comic. He is not a wild dresser; but in striped pants, cutaway, silk topper and other formal gear, he always gives a mischievous, Groucho Marx impression of someone who has been playing at dressing up.

All of these things would seem to make Ed Clark rather unlikely ambassadorial material—and there is no doubt, frankly, that he is. He has been the target of a good deal of unsympathetic criticism. It is significant, though, that most of the criticism occurred soon after the Ambassador's arrival, when the general impression was that this was a noisy, over-jovial extrovert who had blundered, by reason of a close friendship with President Johnson, into diplomacy. Some of his most vehement early critics are now quite fervent admirers.

The most blistering early attack came from Douglas Brass, editorial director of Australia's only national newspaper, The Australian, and a columnist for that paper. A month after Clark presented his credentials in Canberra, Brass wrote: "He obviously has a heart of gold, but there's no disguising that the new American Ambassador to Australia is something of a disappointment. The general impression in the capital is that if Mr. Edward Clark has any talents to match the significance of his post, he does his genial best to conceal them. It is grossly undiplomatic to say these things—but diplomacy is no more my business than Mr. Clark's; and I think it tragic that the United States Administration should have so little regard for us as to send a folksy gladhander to Canberra at a time of mutual delicacy, in war, investment and trade. . . ."

Exactly six months later, Douglas Brass wrote about Ed Clark again. He recalled his charges that the Ambassador was a folksy gladhander with no talents for what should be an important job, and then he went on: "I eat my words now. Mr. Clark, though he still loves to clown in public, has endeared himself to Canberra as a very shrewd operator and genuine friend of this country. I can do no more than acknowledge it, and nobody has asked me to do it."

In the past couple of years, many revised their first unflattering opinions of Ed Clark, and it is no exaggeration to say that he is now regarded as the most successful Ambassador the United States has ever sent to Australia. The Premier of the state of Victoria, Sir Henry Bolte, says candidly: "No other American representative has attempted to learn about the country and know the people the way Ed Clark has. Never before has the U.S. been so well represented—and with our alliance in Vietnam, our closer trade ties and the growing U.S. investment in Australia, that representation *has* to be good."

How has Clark, the clown in the Stetson, done it? By displaying a massive appetite for work and a determination to see every one of Australia's 3-million square miles, by being totally sincere, by being closer to his head of state than any ambassador in the country. He has surrendered none of his flamboyance, and his extravagant behavior still causes a few shudders among the professional diplomats; but his overall performance has been so impressive that a member of his staff was recently moved to remark, "If this guy's not a professional, I just hope he never loses his amateur status."

It is hard, of course, to estimate the quality of an ambassador's work. His basic jobs are to feed information back to his government and to build good will between the two countries concerned. While there is no reliable gauge available to assess the quality of Clark's reports, it is known that last year, when President Johnson asked his ambassadors to poll the governments to which they were assigned on whether the U.S. should bomb Hanoi and mine the North Vietnamese port of Haiphong, Clark's reply was reported to be on the President's desk 10 days before the next reply was received.

In the field of goodwill, there is no doubt that the man has been immeasurably successful. Along with all the homilies, the platitudes and the Texas hokum that he dispenses comes a great deal of genuine warmth—and Australians, who normally distrust wordiness, have reacted well to him. They know that he has become a potent salesman in America for Australian trade, travel and investment.

"I asked the President just before I came out here what I was supposed to do," says Clark. "The President, he says, 'I want you to spread yourself around, Ed. Don't get stuck in no martini belt. Don't confine yourself to the striped-pants circuit. I want you to go out and meet these people. And I want you to tell us everything about Australia . . . what they're thinking, what they're doing, how stable they are, how friendly they are.' "

That Clark has followed the President's advice there can be little doubt. He may indeed have followed it too well, from the Australian point of view. Washington columnist Leslie Carpenter, whose wife Liz is press secretary to Mrs. Johnson, recently speculated that Clark may soon be named a White House "troubleshooter"—the latest in a spate of speculations that he will shortly be moving on, now that he has served a two-year stint in Canberra.

But Clark professes to be astonished by the report. He will be in Washington this week, but the visit, he says, "was my idea, not theirs. I have a number of matters to discuss with the Departments of State, Defense, Interior and Agriculture on matters concerning Australia—but I'm not looking for any trouble to shoot. If the President has any plans for me, I just don't know about them." He adds that he intends to be back in Australia in time for the Melbourne Cup, the nation's most famous horse race, which will be held Nov. 2. "I've picked the last two winners," he remarks, "and I intend to keep picking 'em."

An example of Clark's thoroughness in following the President's counsel has been his unprecedented record in going out and meeting the people. He has really "spread himself around." He flew 154,000 miles in 1966 and has flown another 110,000 miles this year—crisscrossing every Australian state, visiting as far north as New Guinea and as far south as Australia's Antarctic base. He has talked all the way, averaging a formal speech every five days, working a circuit that embraces churches, schools, Rotary and Lions clubs and all sorts of professional and trade organizations; his aides say that he has made far more speeches than any ambassador, from any country, in the capital.

More important Americans have visited Australia during Clark's term of office than ever before; mostly they are personal friends, and they seem to respect his judgment entirely. He is credited by many Canberra observers with having been responsible for the visit last year by President Johnson—the first to Australia by any American President-in-office. He has worked hard to promote American investment in Australia.

Clark is known to have intervened on Australia's behalf when U.S. Government authorities were discussing capital outflow restraints and possible restrictions on American investments overseas; several U.S. corporations were being questioned about programs involving the investment in Australia of sums of between $15-million and $250-million. "That's when I got into the act," Clark confesses. "The authorities who were doing the questioning backed off . . . maybe just to get rid of me." He induced a 14-man Texas business delegation (most of them wearing cowboy hats) to tour Australia in July, and recently persuaded leaders of two New York banks and representatives of the oil, steel and aluminum industries to offer to put up the money for the establishment of what may be Australia's first post-graduate school of business administration. He has worked hard this year at getting the U.S. Armed Forces to buy supplies for American troops in Vietnam and the Pacific in Australia.

Undoubtedly, Clark's great advantage over all other ambassadors in Canberra is his ability to communicate immediately without recourse to formal displomatic channels, with his President. He has done this quite often. One such instance came before Vice President Humphrey visited Australia and Asia last year; when his itinerary arrived from the State Department, it showed that Humphrey was due to have a half-day in Canberra, then two days in Manila, two in Bangkok and longer periods in other Asian capitals. Other ambassadors would have had no option but to accept the itinerary, even though the shortness of the Australian stay might have been construed as a small snub to the Australian Prime Minister; Clark was counseled by his own professionals not to take any official action.

According to Canberra newsmen, Clark ignored the advice. He telephoned the President and told him, "It's not good enough, Mr. President. You can't wipe these people off like that . . . it's an insult! If half a day is the best you can do, I suggest the Vice President doesn't call here at all." The itinerary was changed, and Humphrey stayed in Canberra for two days. The Australian Prime Minister, Harold Holt, who had been in office only a short time, was extremely grateful to Clark.

Ed Clark's direct route to the President has been the cause of some embarrassment. One veteran Canberra newspaperman met the Ambassador recently in a crowded lounge at the city's airport. "Waal, fancy meetin' you," Clark called. Then Clark lowered his voice to a gentle roar: "Y'know, I was talkin' 'smornin' to the President, and . . ." Suddenly the lounge was hushed; 500 people craned forward to hear what the President of the United States had been thinking. "Whatever it was, it was pretty insignificant," says the reporter. "But when Mister Ed decides to drop a name, he does it from a great height."

The Mister Ed label was first applied maliciously, but now it is used with total affection. Sometimes it appears in newspaper headlines, and reporters who attend conferences at the American Embassy have christened the cocktail he serves them—an old-fashioned with a burbon base—"Mister Ed's drink." His relationship with local newspapermen has been particularly affectionate ever since he played host at a press conference for Pierre Salinger, the late President Kennedy's press secretary. After the formal questioning had ended, Clark said to Salinger, who is an excellent pianist: "Hey, Pierre, what about you play a few tunes for the boys?" Salinger obliged, and somehow the affair developed into a singsong, with newspapermen, Clark and embassy aides grouped around the piano singing tunes like "Chicago" and "Give My Regards to Broadway."

Clark's nature is so aggressively jolly and his desire to be loved so obvious that it would be easy to underrate the man. But even while he's telling Texas jokes, indulging in Texas reminiscences and generally behaving like a Texas caricature, the eyes behind his rimless glasses are operating independently. They are cool, level, calculating—the eyes of a very shrewd man. Just how shrewd might be gauged from the fact that he has built up, from a stake of $150 in 1932, a personal fortune in the region of $10-million. When he left Texas for Australia, he was chairman of the Capital National Bank and a board member of Texas Southern University; his law firm of Clark, Thomas, Harris, Denius and Winters has handled the affairs of the Lyndon Johnson family for many years. He has been active in Democratic party politics since the early thirties, and has been an active supporter of L.B.J. since the pair met in 1934. In 1937 Johnson stood for Congress, and his campaign was handled by Clark; then, in 1949, Johnson was elected to the Senate in a close and disputed contest.

In the legal wrangle which followed—there were charges of vote rigging and claims that Johnson had no right to stand for Senate office while he was still a Congressman—Clark acted as Johnson's senior legal counsel. "A lot of people think Ed owes a great deal, including this job, to L.B.J." says one friend of the Clark family. "In fact, the truth is probably the opposite. Lyndon owes more to Clark than he could ever pay back." Whatever the case, there can be no doubt that the two men are very close; President Johnson is godfather to one of Clark's four grandchildren—three girls and a boy, all children of his daughter, Leila. (Clark is fiercely proud of the fact that these grandchildren are sixth-generation Texans: "My family arrived in 1842, when Texas was still a republic.")

In mid-1965, Australia had been without a United States Ambassador for exactly a year; the job was being held down very well by a charge d'affaires, but there were many Australians who regarded the absence of an ambassador as a considerable slight. Sir Robert Menzies, who was then Australia's Prime Minister, visited Washington.

"Sir Robert knew how to talk tough," says Clark. "He went to Washington and told President Johnson that Australia had waited long enough for an ambassador. The two countries had a lot of ties, and the Prime Minister made it obvious that he was getting ready to be offended. To be fair, the President had had a lot of things on his mind, and he simply hadn't gotten around to picking the right man.

" 'All right,' says the President. 'What kind of man you got in mind?'

" 'I want you to appoint a close friend,' says Menzies. 'Someone you've got confidence in . . . somebody who can ring you on the telephone and get straight through to you.'

" 'How would you feel about a Texan?' the President asks, and the Prime Minister says, 'I think that would be great . . . as long as he's a Texan who knows you very well.'

" 'Mist' Prime Minister,' says the President, 'I think I got your man.' "

On that summer day in 1965, Ed Clark and his wife Anne were driving from Washington to Austin, Tex. They arrived home to find a message asking Clark to ring the President immediately. "Ed," said the President, "I want you to come right back here and bring Anne with you."

"What's it for?" asked Clark. The President answered, "I can't tell you, Ed, but it's pretty important." That night Johnson introduced the Clarks to Menzies, and told him, "I think I've got your ambassador."

"We stayed at the White House that night and talked a lot more about the job at breakfast next morning," Clark recalls. "Then my wife and I went upstairs to talk it over. That Sir Robert was a very eloquent, persuasive man, but I had a lot of reservations. I kept telling my wife I was as busy as a bee with the law practice and the bank. I told her I felt I ought to keep working, and I said something about saving for a rainy day. 'As far as you're concerned, Ed Clark,' she said, 'it's raining right now. If you don't take this, you'll just keep on doing what you've been doing for the past 40 years.' I told her we'd better get on down, because we'd kept those two important men waiting a long time."

The couple went downstairs and had a cup of coffee; and suddenly Ed Clark, native son of Texas, banker, attorney, hamburger connoisseur and amateur breeder of bulls, was Ambassador-designate to Australia. "It all happened faster than a bull's blink," he says.

Recently, shambling amiably around his dining room, living room, "Texas Room" and garden, pausing often to point out the attractions (Steuben glass penguins, paintings, a husky-sled harness he brought back from the Antarctic, tennis courts—"Charlton Heston played there"—and a Texas pecan tree), Clark admitted frankly that he had been very nervous when he arrived in Australia. Interviewing the man is like standing under a waterfall: the torrent of words cascades all around, and it is utterly impossible to divert the flow. But when he talks about himself, Clark's honesty can be quite touching.

"I knew all the guys at the embassy here were professionals, and I was a rank amateur," he said. "I knew they'd look upon me as a political appointee, and I felt they would resent me. Yet I needed them so much. I didn't know a thing about diplomacy—I had no reason to. I didn't even know anyone in the Foreign Service. I knew it was important to have good manners, to be kind and considerate to people, but I didn't know when I was supposed to wear a cutaway or a silk hat. If I was due to call at some formal function, say an embassy party, I didn't know how long I was supposed to stay or who I was supposed to talk to or what I was supposed to talk about. I didn't know the rules of the game, and if they had wanted to make me look a fool, those professionals at the embassy could easily have done that. They turned out to be wonderfully loyal and cooperative, and they advised me well."

The loyalty has worked both ways. Ed Clark has 112 people on his embassy staff, and he has made some sort of history by entertaining all of them at barbecues and small lunch and dinner parties. He discusses every speech he makes and conference he attends with senior counselors, and is usually guided by their advice.

Mrs. Clark is a small, gray-blond woman whose gentle, rather shy and wry manner makes her an ideal foil for the gregarious Ambassador. She pretends to disapprove of Clark's almost belligerently friendly invitations—in back-country towns like Wagga Wagga and Coonabarabran he has been known to announce, "If you folks ever find yourselves in Canberra suffering from frostbite or snake-bite, just call in on Miz Clark and me for our bourbon cure." She chides him often about "talking too big," and tells him to remember that he is a foreigner in Australia. But they have been married for 39 years; she is intensely devoted and proud.

Mrs. Clark's gardening, church (they are Episcopalians) and needlework activities, plus a very catholic taste in books and magazines, give her a breadth of interests outside the embassy; Ed Clark has very few. A nongardener and nongolfer, he spends just about all his waking time in some form of embassy work, though he does keep in close touch with his Texas banking and legal interests, even to the point of staying abreast of all staff salary adjustments. Both send frequent tape recordings to their daughter and her family in Greenville, Mo.; they often show home movies (most of which happen to be about Texas) and entertain at barbecues which range from the intimate to the congested. One of the latter type was thrown on a cattle ranch owned by a friend during the Johnson visit; it was attended by 400 guests and a group of friendly kangaroos.

A couple of weeks ago, on a visit to Sydney to address the Institute of Engineers, Clark heard there were two American destroyers in town, fresh from Vietnam. He visited the ships, shook hands with everyone on board and asked his perennial question: "Anyone here from Texas?" There is always somebody there from Texas. This month Americans serving in Vietnam will begin taking short furloughs in Australia, and Ed Clark will be waiting to meet each planeload, watching specially for the inevitable Texan.

"People say to me 'You're not the Ambassador for the United States; you're the Ambassador for Texas,'" says Clark. "I say, 'That reminds me of the guy who threw a rock at a cat and hit his mother-in-law. It ain't so bad after all.'"

How much longer Ed Clark will remain the Ambassador for the United States (and for Texas) is, as indicated, open to some doubt. "Just before I came out," he said recently, "I asked Senator Fulbright how long an ambassador usually stayed, and he said a man usually had the job during the pleasure of the President. Other people have said that about two years is the normal term." Clark's two years were up on Aug. 15; it is known that the State Department has offered him three other ambassadorships, but so far he has chosen to remain in Canberra. "I wouldn't take another diplomatic job just for the honor of it," he said, but if the President told me that I might lighten his burden in some small way by accepting an appointment, I'd take it."

At this point his large face quarried itself into a broad grin. "I used to say that I didn't want to go any place where there was a language barrier," he said. "But my wife, a little unkindley, said, 'Let's face it, honey, wherever you go with that Southern accent, you gonna wind up with a language barrier.'" He dug his audience in the ribs, chuckled at some length and said good-by. Ed Clark is a trouper, and like all good troupers, he likes to leave 'em laughing.

FOREST SERVICE TIMBER SALES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on September 21, Secretary of Agriculture Freeman, in response to a letter I sent him on August 2, submitted to me a résumé of actions underway by the Forest Service in the Pacific Northwest which relate to timber supplies.

I ask unanimous consent that my letter to Secretary Freeman and his response be printed in the Record so that they will be generally available to all who are concerned with this vital subject.

Secretary Freeman has outlined four specific areas of activities where efforts are being made to deal with the critical log supply situation in the Pacific Northwest.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

August 2, 1967.

Hon. Orville Freeman,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Secretary: Enclosed is a photostatic copy of a letter addressed to me by an Oregon constituent, Mrs. Anna Bevans of the Northside Lumber Company, Philomath, Oregon. Also enclosed is a newspaper article which appeared in the July 13 issue of the Newport, Oregon, *News Times* announcing the signing of a contract for the purchase of logs to be shipped to Japan through facilities to be established at Yaquina Bay.

As you will note, Mrs. Bevans, a partner in a small business log and lumber operation, expressed deep concern over the fact that Japanese bids to be placed on logs within shipping distance of Yaquina Bay will be so excessive as to prohibit small lumber operations such as the Northside Lumber Company from bidding successfully. Mrs. Bevans makes special reference to the arrangements whereby the representatives of the Japanese firms who will bid on this timber will work on a cost plus basis. My constituent feels that a cost plus bid arrangement may possibly be prohibited on sales of Federal timber. I have not heard of such a provision, but I will appreciate information as to whether such practices are prohibited by the Government.

Any information you may be able to supply concerning the subjects discussed in Mrs. Bevans' letter would be appreciated.

For your information, I have suggested that Mrs. Bevans give consideration to filing a request with the Forest Service and the Small Business Administration for small business timber set aside sales in appropriate cases. I have made this suggestion with some reservations, however, because of the fact that the record concerning small business set asides in timber sales in Oregon is not at all impressive as compared with sales of this type in Washington, California and many of the Southern states. If you have any comments concerning the willingness and desire of the Forest Service Regional Office to entertain applications for small business timber set asides in the area in which the Bevans' firm would be bidding, such information would be most helpful to me for future guidance.

Finally, Mrs. Bevans inquires concerning the possibility that restrictions be placed by the Forest Service on log exports from Oregon and Washington in the same fashion that exports are excluded in Alaska. Upon the basis of the hearings that were conducted a few years ago on the proposal to establish the states of Oregon and Washington as a marketing area in which log exports would be restricted or limited, I cannot offer Mrs. Bevans much encouragement in answer to this specific inquiry.

However, the subject of log exports from Alaska raises this question in my mind: Would it now be appropriate for the Department of Agriculture to give serious consideration to lifting the present restrictions on log exports from Alaska in relation to Forest Service lands? If no limits were placed on log exports from Forest Service lands in Oregon and Washington, why should not the same rule be made applicable to Alaska? Your comments on this matter will be appreciated.

I continue to receive communications and representations stressing the adverse effects log exports are now having and are likely to have on the timber industry.

This is a matter I have raised before with you, in the last five years I think the Forest Service has responded by efforts to improve its timber management and sale operations. However, many in the industry continue to complain to me that agencies of the Federal government have not met the issue adequately.

The purpose of this letter is to acquaint you with a recent action I have taken, and to suggest specific actions for your prompt consideration.

Enclosed is a copy of my July 22 letter to Secretary of Commerce Trowbridge. It asks for a mill survey of the log export business so that the government and the industry generally can understand the causes and the effects of the actions of those who are producers and exporters.

The Forest Service, in a letter of July 24, points out that revisions of Federal agency allowable cut procedures should await completion of the Douglas fir supply study.

However, these are basic problems and the log export situation is at least an expression of the overall problem, namely, the lessening availability of timber for the domestic Pacific Northwest industry, and especially that segment dependent upon public timber.

The quarterly data I receive on exports do not place particular emphasis on the fact that log exports are predominantly timber other than Douglas fir. This tree, as I understand it, is the short domestic supply species. Is this a correct impression? If this impression is correct, I would like to have your views on the steps that might be taken to place the situation in a proper focus.

Also, is or is not the volume of Douglas fir going into export significant on both a regional or more localized basis? If the export volume of Douglas fir is significant, then the question of exports regulation devices becomes pertinent.

If exports are not significant, but the supply is short, then the question is what specific steps are reasonable, feasible and proper to increase the yield on a sound basis from public and private timber lands?

In my view the broader issues—those of timber demand and supply and sources of supply and their relation to the nature of the industrial production demand—are the compelling ones.

If the supply can be increased through

sound forest methods, now is the time to outline the potential and the actions needed.

I have opposed the use of political pressure to resolve the allowable cut issue. I shall continue to do so. However, if there are steps that should be taken in such matters as forest planting, reforestation, waste reduction in the forest and at the mill, tree breeding, aerial logging and other similar steps which increase timber availability to fill a genuine need, I think now is the time to act.

I would like a full report on the points I have raised, along with the estimates of funds and manpower that could be effectively used in this and the next fiscal year plus a statement on the immediate and long range benefits to be derived from programs of the types just mentioned.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., September 21, 1967.
Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your letter of August 2, 1967, about log exports and related National Forest timber management considerations has added stimulus to reviews of several aspects of Forest Service management and planning. We think it will be helpful if we reply to your letter insofar as we can at this time and to organize our response along lines of four broad subjects we discern in your letter.

1. *Set-aside sales.*

We are initiating a new review procedure about the ability of small firms in Washington and Oregon to obtain a fair share of National Forest timber sales. Henceforth this will be done routinely as a part of formulating each year's timber sale program on each National Forest. We plan to start now, by reviewing the remainder of this fiscal year's sale program. Where we can establish a clear need, appropriately selected sales will be offered as set asides. In the process, we will, of course, give consideration to any set-aside applications received. Whether this procedure will always provide open and shut answers on the need for and propriety of set asides, or whether the number of such sales will be increased in some areas, remains to be seen. We do think the plan will provide a systematic approach.

While set asides may be helpful to some small firms which are strongly dependent on the National Forests, there is much question whether set asides are a suitable answer to export problems, including the aspect of high stumpage prices. As you know, a substantial part of the logs exported now originate on private lands. Restraints imposed on the use of logs cut from public lands would probably further stimulate these shipments. This, in turn, could result in a new source of aggressive bidding on National Forest timber sales as firms attempt to replace the exported logs cut from private lands.

The planned evaluation of the success of small firms in obtaining National Forest timber sales will reflect consequences of competition stemming from both export and domestic buying forces. We doubt if it is feasible to separately evaluate these forces and, in effect, offer some set asides for possible anti-export benefits and others to meet impacts of domestic, intra-industry competition. Over the past three years, some 40-50 percent of the sales tributary to Puget Sound in Washington State have been made set asides because the exports there have had an impact on the ability of small firms to get a fair share of the logs. We should not extend this policy to other areas without having a basis to appraise its value. We are initiating a review of this program.

2. *General log export situation and the Alaska situation.*

The statement is made by your correspondent that representatives of Japanese firms bid on National Forest timber offerings and are reimbursed on a cost-plus basis. The question is then asked: Is a cost-plus bid arrangement prohibited in sales of Federal timber?

We are required to award sales of National Forest timber to the highest qualified bidder. There is no legal basis for denying anyone an opportunity to bid simply because of the source of his financing.

Export of logs from Alaska is more complex. Regulations under the Act of June 4, 1897, comprise the authority for the policy being followed on National Forests in Alaska. The specific requirement that logs harvested from the National Forests in Alaska receive primary manufacture within the State was established by Secretary W. M. Jardine in 1928, and this requirement, is still in effect. The reason given by the Secretary for this requirement, which in effect restricts the exporting of logs from Alaska, was to protect the development of the Territory's pioneer economy. The primary manufacture requirement is being maintained because Alaska is still in a stage of pioneer development where it needs large-scale expansion of forest products industries to develop the local economy and to provide the type of facilities essential for acceptable utilization of National Forest timber.

The authority for requiring the processing of National Forest timber in a stated area would be much the same elsewhere as in Alaska provided that similar administrative determinations could be made.

For this calendar year, it is expected that as much as 200 million board feet of cants and squares will be manufactured in Alaska for export to Japan where they are further remanufactured. Plans are under way to further increase this production of sawn material. The Japanese market has indicated willingness to accept large volumes of squares and cants from Alaska. This production plays an important part in meeting total Japanese lumber requirements, and we cannot see how anything can be gained by authorizing such material to be exported as logs. Consequently, we see no reason at this time to modify the primary manufacture policy in Alaska.

3. *Export of Douglas-fir species.*

In response to your inquiry regarding the export of Douglas-fir, we have reviewed our information on species distribution of log exports. In 1966, Douglas-fir log exports from western Washington and western Oregon amounted to 128 million board feet. This represented about 11.5 percent of total log exports. Other softwood species, primarily western hemlock and true firs, accounted for the remaining 88.5 percent.

The cut of Douglas-fir logs in western Washington and western Oregon in 1966 is estimated at 7.6 billion board feet, or about 60 percent of the total cut of all species. Although Douglas-fir exports accounted for only 1.7 percent of the total cut of Douglas-fir that year, it is probable the exports have added in an important way to the competition for Douglas-fir stumpage and logs in local areas in western Washington. This is especially so in heavy exporting areas around Grays Harbor and Puget Sound ports. The volume of Douglas-fir exports for 1967 is running about 50 percent ahead of last year.

Exports of Douglas-fir logs from the Oregon Customs District in 1966 were 48 million board feet—less than one percent of the production of Douglas-fir logs in western Oregon. Most of the competition for Douglas-fir logs in this area, and it is intense in many places, is among domestic mills. This competition reflects an economic scarcity of Douglas-fir timber.

We are considering expanding our research program on log exports at the Pacific Northwest Forest and Range Experiment Station so that we can better understand the economic effects of exports.

4. *Increase in timber supply.*

We agree with you that the basically compelling issues are, as you put it, those of timber demand and supply and sources of supply and their relation to the nature of the industrial production demand. In general, the demand-supply outlook is tight, and exports make it tighter. Considering all ownerships, the annual supply of timber available to industry in western Washington and western Oregon is now expected to increase by about 10 percent by 1985. This expansion is far below expected increases in domestic demands in the Pacific Northwest. Nationally, projections indicate supplies of timber will fall below demands by around 1980.

In the National Forests in western Washington and western Oregon, timber is being harvested at rates equivalent to their allowable cuts, plus substantial and increasing volumes obtained annually from thinnings of young stands and salvage cuttings.

We are constantly revising and updating inventories, management plans, and allowable cuts for individual working circles. We have an intensive study under way to consider management alternatives and costs. We do not propose considering any general changes in rotation lengths or other factors affecting allowable cut until we have had full opportunity to study the results of the Douglas-fir Supply Study. We are anxious to achieve the highest level of sustained yield that is technically supportable.

We are continuously conscious, in our budget presentations, of the need to increase available supplies of stumpage. Where such can be shown to be economically practicable and susceptible to being accomplished by the manpower and other resources that can be made available to us, we include requests for funds to accomplish this work. We are conscious of potential opportunities to increase production, such as aerial logging, fertilization, and other similar steps to increase availability and production. However, we do not include these in our project budgets until the procedures have been tested through controlled studies and research. We do appreciate your continued interest and support in these programs as they are proposed.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION ASSISTS A COMMUNITY ENTERPRISE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia and the Select Committee on Small Business, I have a continuing interest in District of Columbia small business and welfare matters.

I invite the attention of Senators to an Operation Impact loan made last year by the Washington regional office of the Small Business Administration, which draws in other Federal agencies, State and local programs, and the private sectors, as well. Community Laundries, Inc., located at 1125 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., was formed to promulgate the pattern created by James Thomas Lee, a laundromat manager in Southeast Washington, and a club of 30 warmhearted men in the community, the Twangers.

The Twangers recognized in the people around them, the nature of our American heritage, and saw a paradox in the fact that this independent heritage formed a ghetto mental block; that of being unable to receive without giving. They also recognized the back-to-the-wall stance; that of doing without, rather than asking for help. They listened to the people in the laundromat and requested their active assistance to effect their desired community improvements. Friendship was found in the action generated and many personal problems were brought to light and solved.

From his knowledge of the Twangers, Bruce Terris, a young attorney serving as a volunteer community organizer, decided that a community center connected to a neighborhood business would reach people more effectively than traditional centers. He began the project by forming two corporations: Community Action, a nonprofit corporation, to operate the center and, Community Laundries, Inc., a profitmaking corporation, to run the laundry. Sara Jane Hardin agreed to direct Community Action, Inc., and James T. Lee assisted in establishing the laundry facilities. The Philip M. Stern Foundation pledged its support to get the project started. It was the first project in Washington that began at neighborhood level to be approved by the Metropolitan Citizen's Advisory Council and the United Planning Organization. The Office of Economic Opportunity granted Community Action, Inc., $28,992 in June 1966.

The Small Business Administration made a $15,000 loan to Community Laundries, Inc., in February 1966. In early September, the sale of stock began at $2 per share and was limited to 25 shares per individual with one vote per stockholder irrespective of the amount owned. By the time of the stockholders' meeting in December, a total of 260 shares were owned by 92 people. At the first meeting and every succeeding one, about one-half of the people present were men and over two-thirds represented low-income neighborhood residents. These people take an active interest in the affairs of the business and are being strengthened in business techniques as they formulate and execute the necessary plans and decisions. The laundry has functioned well and its Small Business Administration loan is current.

The business give-and-take action of Community Laundries, Inc., has successfully created an atmosphere of receptivity for the services of Community Action, Inc. Eighty homeowners were reached by the volunteer staff and the students of the Legal Aid Society of Georgetown University Law Center who informed them that many unscrupulous home improvement salesmen were combing the neighborhood and cautioned them to screen contracts for "balloon" notes and other fraudulent practices. Besides the volunteer attorneys and law students, 100 volunteers work for the project in the whole range of welfare problem solving. In a sense, each customer of Community Laundries, Inc., becomes an active volunteer in the work of Community Action, Inc., through friendship.

Mr. President, Community Laundries, Inc., clearly reflects the desires of President Johnson's administration and Congress that all Federal programs be responsive to the people.

The Small Business Administration, with Robert C. Moot as its Administrator, deserves recognition for its part in carrying out President Johnson's and Congress' mandate of providing loan assistance to small businesses that are not only profit motivated but ones, such as Community Laundries, Inc., that provide a real community service.

DESPICABLE RACKET

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I feel the Washington Post has done the citizens of Washington a real service in exposing the nauseating manner in which low-income families have been defrauded and taken advantage of in the home improvement racket. I agree that vigorous prosecution is called for, and that, if it is found that new legislation is required, it should be enacted. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial of October 6 from the Post dealing with this subject be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

> The second-mortgage, home-improvement racket that has been uncovered here takes high rank among the most despicable forms of fraud. Its victims are for the most part low-income Negroes who have been swindled because of their ignorance of the law and of sharp business practices. In many cases the net effect of the fraud has been to deprive people, advanced in years, of their homes, the basic element in their economic security. In a few cases there are charges of false notarization and forgery, but most of the damage appears to have resulted from flagrant deception of gullible people.
>
> Probably the worst aspect of the racket has been the manner in which the original swindlers escape responsibility for the consequences. As disclosed by Leonard Downie Jr. and David A. Jewell in this newspaper, low-income homeowners are canvassed by telephone. High-powered salesmen follow up the calls that give some promise of being productive. They sell home improvements, television sets and other much-desired items and secure the signatures of the victims on notes and deeds on their homes.
>
> Sometimes old debts are consolidated into the new obligation, but the old debt may be paid by the smooth operator only in part or not at all. Frequently the victim discovers months after the transaction that he has unknowingly pledged himself to pay far more than the sums agreed upon. And the demand for payment comes, not from the firm which makes the slick deal, but from a finance company which has bought the paper involved at a discount.
>
> By the time the law catches up with the racket, if at all, the original operator is thus out of the deal. Indeed, he is likely to have moved on to another city to repeat his skin game. The firm taking over the note and mortgage can thus demand payment on the theory that it is a "holder in due course," an innocent beneficiary of the fraud because it had no part in the tainted deal.
>
> This theory wears patently thin, however, when any firm or firms consistently take over tainted contracts at heavy discounts. If they don't know what they are doing, they ought to. Both local and Federal authorities have been painfully slow in moving against the original perpetrators of this racket and against its chief beneficiaries in the financial world. In our view a double-barreled attack is essential. Though the primary responsibility may fall on the culprits who prey directly upon the poor, their shrewdly calculated schemes could not succeed without the aid of the financiers who pay them off and take over the actual fleecing of the victims.
>
> This racket calls for far more vigorous prosecution than it has had to date, and if new legislation should be needed, it should be promptly forthcoming.

THE TOTAL FAILURE OF U.S. MILITARY INTERVENTION IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, last night Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., noted historian, author of "The Vital Centre," "The Coming of the New Deal," and of "A Thousand Days," the Pulitzer prize-winning account of the Kennedy administration, delivered a noteworthy address before a group assembled in response to the call "Negotiation now." Arthur Schlesinger has analyzed the various follies which the United States has committed and continues to commit incidental to the overall folly of getting involved in a land war on the continent of Asia when no vital interest of the United States was at stake, and which moreover President Johnson in his 1964 campaign said he would not do. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this speech be printed at the conclusion of my remarks. I trust that it will have the widest reading by my colleagues in Congress and by the public.

I would say that the cry of "Negotiation now," if it is to be interpreted as a part of the rising tide of opposition to our military involvement in Southeast Asia deserves widespread support. But "Negotiation now" as a program seems to me to be futile as long as the administration persists in reiterating the myth that we are fighting the aggression of Hanoi. As long as that is the basis on which the United States is trying to bomb North Vietnam into coming to the conference table, that will never happen. The North Vietnamese know perfectly well that they are not the aggressors. They know that it was only after the United States, in violation of all its treaty commitments—the United Nations Charter, article 1 of the SEATO Treaty, and the commitment of Under Secretary of State Walter Bedell Smith that we would support the Geneva agreements—and started bombing north and south, it was only then that the infiltration of North Vietnam to help their fellow Vietnamese in the south began.

Actually it is the United States which is the aggressor. Consequently there is little prospect for "Negotiation now!" until the administration confesses its error or at least ceases to proclaim North Vietnam as the aggressor, and on that basis offers to negotiate. Obviously, no negotiation is possible as long as the administration tries to bomb North Vietnam into submission and into admission of a false premise. Also it must offer to negotiate the National Liberation Front of Vietcong who are the real adversaries. The administration has consistently refused to do this because it would discredit the myth of aggression from Hanoi. Consequently, while I welcome "Negotiation now!" as evidence of the rising opposition to our totally unjustified, illegal, unconstitutional and immoral war, I think it is an exercise in futility as long as the administration persists in its present policies.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alaska?

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

VIETNAM AND THE 1968 ELECTIONS

(By Arthur Schlesinger, Jr.)

Thirty-two months ago, in February 1965, the American government embarked on a new course in Vietnam—a course marked, first, by the bombing of North Vietnam, and, second, by the commitment of American combat units to the war in South Vietnam. These two and two-thirds years have seen a steady increase in both efforts—an increase which, in the melancholy jargon of our age, designed to hold horror at one remove and make it schematic and technical, has won the name 'escalation'.

Our planes, originally bombing North Vietnam under careful rules and limitations, now roam across the country, dropping more explosives than we used to drop on Nazi Germany, striking the major cities, striking within a few miles of the Chinese border, on occasion invading Chinese air space itself. Our ground troops, originally sent to stiffen and supplement South Vietnamese resistance, have now taken over almost all the fighting. We have over half a million soldiers in Vietnam today—more than we had in Korea at the height of the Korean War; more than we have had in the field in any war in our history, except for the Civil War and the two World Wars.

Since February 1965 the administration has operated on the assumption that the steady intensification of military pressure would end the war and force Hanoi to the negotiation table—that widening the war would prove the best way to shorten it. For most of this period, the escalation policy has commanded the backing of a sizable majority of the American people. But recent weeks and months have shown a visible and widespread increase in doubt and disquietude over this policy. The Harris poll of October 2 reported a sharp decline since July in support of the war, a sharp increase in the opposition to the bombing of North Vietnam, a sharp increase in the number of Americans who want to get out of South Vietnam as quickly as possible, a decline in the number who favor the pursuit of total military victory. Less than a third now express confidence in President Johnson's handling of the war.

The Democratic Party has long been divided on the Vietnam policy. It is increasingly evident today that the divisions are equally deep in the Republican Party. More and more newspapers criticize the bombing of the North. Here in Washington, the *Star*, long a supporter of the war, has proposed a halt to the bombing. There are even signs that the *Post* is entertaining second thoughts after its long and able defense of escalation. Such meager support as escalation has ever had abroad is ebbing away. In the United Nations our European allies urge an end to the bombing. On October 1, the *London Sunday Times*, an unimpeachably conservative paper, declared in a lead editorial:

"The time has come for the Americans unconditionally, and for an indefinite period, to stop bombing North Vietnam . . . The argument for stopping the bombing has become so strong that to withstand it any longer is going to make it far harder for the friends and allies of the U.S. to understand and support her case."

The reasons for both the initial support and the spreading disenchantment are not too mysterious. Vietnam has always been a highly complicated problem. The proper line of policy was not clear and self-evident. No one could be sure in February 1965 what would be the best course for the United States to follow. Given the murkiness of the situation, the administration, after earnest and conscientious consideration, made a choice and settled upon a certain hypothesis. This hypothesis was based on a number of premises which, when the escalation policy began, may have had—for many thoughtful people, did have—a strong *prima facie* plausibility. What has happened in the last 32 months has been the testing of these premises—the testing under fire.

How do the assumptions behind the escalation policy stand up after this period of trial? Let us cast a balance on the seven basic propositions on which this policy has been based:

1. *That escalation would break the will of North Vietnam and bring Hanoi to the conference table.* "The objective of our air campaign," said General Taylor two years ago, "is to change the will of the enemy leadership." After 32 months what has been the result? Newspapermen and others who have visited Hanoi are almost unanimous in testifying that the effect of the bombing has been, not to break, but to harden the will of North Vietnam. The Secretary of Defense recently said: "There is no basis to believe that any bombing campaign, short of one which had population as its target, would by itself force Ho Chi Minh's regime into submission." To those who say that we just haven't bombed the North Vietnamese enough, Mr. McNamara replies:

"As to breaking their will, I have seen no evidence in any of the many intelligence reports that would lead me to believe that a less selective bombing campaign would change the resolve of N.V.N.'s leaders or deprive them of the support of the North Vietnamese people."

Moreover, far from bringing the Hanoi regime to the negotiating chamber, our bombing of the North is at present the insuperable obstacle to having any negotiation at all. The Hanoi regime has made it abundantly clear that, so long as the bombing continues, it will not come near the conference table. In short, experience has plainly disproved the first premises of the escalation policy.

2. *That escalation would reduce the infiltration of supplies and men from North to South Vietnam.* Again this proposition had a certain initial plausibility. But does it stand up after 32 months of testing? Though our bombing has certainly increased the cost of infiltration, it has at the same time increased the quantity of men and the quality of arms infiltrated. The reason for this is that our escalation has invariably stimulated counter-escalation on the part of our enemy.

The administration has always assumed that, while we escalate, the other side would sit still; and that we would therefore improve our relative position. This has been the reasoning behind every step of escalation. It has always proved wrong. The other side, instead of obliging us and sitting still, has escalated too. Far from achieving a clear margin of superiority, all we have done is to make the stalemate more bloody and explosive.

Thus, in March 1965, after the bombing had started, the Hanoi regime, according to our own Department of Defense, had only 400 regular troops in South Vietnam. Today it has 50,000. In March 1965 our adversaries in South Vietnam were fighting with small arms and mortars. In the months since, with each new escalation on our part, their weaponry has grown more sophisticated and effective. As for stopping infiltration, Secretary McNamara has pointed out that "the quantity of externally supplied material, other than food, required to support the VC-NVN forces in South Vietnam at about their current level of combat activity is very, very small—significantly under 100 tons a day—a quantity that could be transported by only a few trucks." Nor does he see any reason to suppose that even wider bombing could miraculously achieve what the present very wide bombing has failed to achieve. "No improvements and refinements," Mr. McNamara has told us, "can be expected to accomplish much more than to continue to put a high price tag on NVN's continued aggression." So, too, the second proposition falls by the wayside.

3. *That escalation would lessen American casualties in the war.* This is the argument for the ever wider bombing of North Vietnam which has had the greatest influence with the American people. On occasion, this argument has even taken the contemptible form of suggesting that those who oppose the widening of the war are responsible for the deaths of young Americans. If this is the level on which our leaders desire to conduct the debate, they should consult their own statistics.

These statistics show that more than half the Americans killed in the whole length of the Vietnam war, from 1961 to the present, were killed since the beginning of this year—killed, in short, during the period of the most intense escalation. The statistics also show that the number of American deaths declined during the bombing pause last February. The statistics, in short, strongly suggest that the way to increase casualties is to escalate the war—and that the way to reduce casualties is to slow down the war. And, of course, the way to end casualties is to end the war. So, after 32 months and 13,000 deaths, one more premise of the escalation policy has been condemned by events.

4. *That escalation would strengthen the government and will of South Vietnam.* This was one of the three reasons cited by President Johnson in April 1965 when he explained the decision to start bombing North Vietnam; and there is reason to believe that it may in fact have been the major reason. How does this argument look 32 months later?

On the political side, it is true that South Vietnam has had an election and now boasts a 'constitutional' government. It is only coincidental, no doubt, that the new government consists of essentially the same faces as the military junta which preceded it. But the presidential election took place after the disqualification of the two most formidable opposition candidates, Au Truong Thanh and General Big Minh, both of whom were advocates of a negotiated solution—an action which meant that the election was rigged long before the voting took place. As for the voting itself, though given the seal of approval by President Johnson's team of Innocents Abroad, it was regarded with less enthusiasm by the Special Election Committee of South Vietnam's Constituent Assembly, which voted 16–2 to invalidate the results. In the end, the Assembly itself was induced to confirm the results only by a vote of 58–43.

Moreover, the winner, General Thieu, and the escalation policy received only 34.8 per cent of the vote; while the next three candidates, all of whom were for peace, received together 38 per cent. As for 'constitutional' government, the Saigon police since the election have detained Truong Dinh Dzu, who ran second in the election, as well as Au Truong Thanh; and, though the constitution expressly forbids press censorship, the Saigon government has suspended four Vietnamese-language dailies in the last month. All this hardly suggests that the escalation policy has strengthened the commitment of the people of South Vietnam to their government or to the war.

The sharper test, of course, is the Army of South Vietnam. There are nearly 700,000 troops—certainly an impressive number for a small country. But the soldiers are miserably paid and miserably led. They have no faith in their officers, indeed, of the officers of the rank of lieutenant colonel or higher, only two fought against the French in the war for Vietnamese independence. They have no faith in their government or their cause. Naturally many of them go over the hill whenever they can.

They don't fight at night. They don't fight on weekends. "Most of the troops," Peter Arnett of AP recently reported from Vietnam, "insist on a 5½ day week, taking Saturdays and Sundays off, while their allies and the Viet Cong go on fighting." According to the *National Observer* of September 25, "Collecting tales about the incredible inefficiency, slovenliness and laziness of South Vietnam's Army is perhaps the easiest work in all of the country. The Army is the No. 1 scandal of the war, and it is the No. 1 failure of the American military command."

Our escalation of the war, far from strengthening the government and will of South Vietnam, has had precisely the opposite effect. The more we do, the less they do; and, in consequence, the less they do, the more we do. In some months more Americans are killed than South Vietnamese are drafted. We have taken over the fighting. We are taking over the management of the economy. We are beginning to take over pacification. And, in the meantime, the weight of our presence crushes the frail fabric of Vietnamese society; our money degrades and debauches the people we are trying to save. We leave in our trail, not rising purpose and commitment, but deepening corruption and contempt. So, after 32 months, still another proposition turns out wrong.

5. *That we are holding the line against general communist aggression.* This, of course, has been the fundamental defense of the escalation policy. If this were simply a local war in Vietnam, no one would dream of sending half a million American soldiers there. But from the start the administration has conceived this conflict in loftier terms. Expounding the escalation policy in April 1965, the President said:

"There are great stakes in the balance. Let no one think for a moment that retreat from Vietnam would bring an end to the conflict. The battle would be renewed in one country and then another. The central lesson of our time is that the appetite of aggression is never satisfied. To withdraw from one battlefield means only to prepare for the next."

He repeated this theme the other day in San Antonio, calling Southeast Asia "the arena where communist expansionism is most aggressively at work in the world today" and concluding, "I would rather stand in Vietnam, in our time, and by meeting this danger now, and facing up to it, thereby reduce the danger for our children and for our grandchildren."

The President's words deserve the most careful attention. What does he mean when he talks about "communist expansionism"? Though on occasion he likes to compare Ho Chi Minh to Jack Dempsey, he cannot seriously believe that Ho and his ragged bands present America and the world with a threat comparable to that presented by Hitler in the thirties or by Stalin in the forties. If his statement makes any sense at all, it can only be on the assumption that communism is still some sort of coordinated, unified, centrally controlled world movement, that nothing important has happened to communism since the days of Stalin, that polycentrism is a delusion and national communism a fraud and that Hanoi and the Viet Cong are the spearhead of a Chinese program of aggression in East Asia.

The proposition that Hanoi and the Viet Cong are the obedient instrumentalities of Chinese expansionism is absolutely crucial to the President's San Antonio argument. Otherwise the speech makes no sense at all. Yet the administration has at no point produced convincing evidence to sustain this proposition. Nor is there any reason to suppose that North Vietnam has been, is or will be a puppet of Peking's. If communist North Korea, which would not even exist had it not been for Chinese intervention in the Korean War, now declares its independence of Peking, why should anyone suppose that North Vietnam, whose whole history has been shaped by resistance to China, would become a compliant adjunct to the Red Guard? As good a probability—and for a long time in the past a much better probability—is that North Vietnam, with its vast Russian support, would resist Mao's pressure and Chinese expansionism—and do so a good deal more effectively than the parade of gimcrack regimes we have sponsored in Saigon. The long-run bulwark against China in Asia will be, not white intervention from across the seas, but local nationalism, even if that nationalism sometimes assumes a communist form.

In Cambodia, for example, that inveterate and wily neutralist Prince Sihanouk has begun a purge of Chinese influence in his government and his society. The State Department no doubt thinks this is the consequence of our presence in Vietnam. But Sihanouk doesn't. In the midst of his campaign against the Chinese, he continues to urge us to pull out of Vietnam: "If the American government . . . one day took such a decision, the whole world, including Cambodia, would cheer America. For once America would be popular."

Our escalation policy in the last 32 months, far from discouraging North Vietnam from serving as an instrument of Chinese aggression, has had precisely the opposite effect: it has increased North Vietnam's dependence on China, increased the number of Chinese in North Vietnam, driven the two states closer together than they ever were before. Again, a basic premise of the administration argument has been refuted by events.

6. *That escalation proves we will keep our commitments everywhere.* This has been another fundamental thesis in the administration's case for widening the war. We are in Vietnam, the Secretary of State said in 1966, because we made a promise. We have made other promises in other parts of the world. If Moscow or Peking ever discovers that the promises of the United States do not mean what they say, then this world goes up in smoke. How does this piety stand up under the test of events? Has our deepening involvement in Vietnam persuaded anyone that we will involve ourselves equally elsewhere in new cases of aggression? Quite the contrary: on this point, let us consult the hawkiest hawk in the nation, Richard M. Nixon. (At least he has been the hawkiest hawk up to now: as he studies the public opinion polls, we may confidently expect that our flexible former Vice President will, in due course, stop screaming and start cooing—and I trust that you will continue to give his views on world matters the respect they deserve.) Mr. Nixon puts it this way:

"One of the legacies of Vietnam almost certainly will be a deep reluctance on the part of the United States to become involved once again in a similar intervention on a similar basis . . . If another friendly country should be faced with an externally supported communist insurrection—whether in Asia or in Africa or even Latin America—there is serious question whether the American public or the American Congress would now support a unilateral American intervention, even at the request of the host government."

The storm of senatorial criticism when we sent three innocuous Air Force jet transports to the Congo last July proves Mr. Nixon's point.

Escalation has thus gravely damaged our national credibility as a keeper of promises politically. It has also done so militarily. For, if our assistance were sought today in some other part of the world, what in fact *could* we do—with 40 per cent of our combat-ready divisions, more than 50 per cent of our air power and more than a third of our naval power tied down in a small country 10,000 miles from the United States? Moreover, if the United States, with its fantastic military strength, cannot defeat the guerrillas of Vietnam, and, if in the attempt it wrecks the country it is trying to protect, why should any rational nation ever seek our protection again?

The administration denounces its critics as isolationists. But the real isolationists are surely those who, in their dedication to the escalation policy, have isolated the United States from its traditional allies and from the people of the world. At San Antonio the President went through the litany of the Asian leaders who have given our policy verbal support. But words are cheap. Except for our client state, South Korea, no nation in the world has sent us the support which counts—that is, a combat detachment of any size in Vietnam. We are going it alone as a nation in a way we have not done for thirty years.

More than this, the escalation policy has set in motion through our land a basic questioning of the whole idea of overseas commitments. Not in our time has there been such doubt about our military, economic and political ties with other nations. The lesson of Vietnam is not, as the administration keeps saying, that America will meets its commitments everywhere on earth.

The lesson of Vietnam, as read not only by the American Congress and people but by our friends and enemies around the world, is: "No more Vietnams." The escalation policy, after 32 months of trial, far from proving that we will keep our promises elsewhere, has had precisely the opposite effect: it has been the greatest stimulus and boon to American isolationism in the last thirty years. So one more proposition must be struck off the list.

7. *That military men know how to win wars.* We have embarked on the escalation policy because the Joint Chiefs of Staff have told the President that this is the way to win the war. In recent months the military has boldly escalated its own campaign with Congress and the public. Admiral Sharp has said that a bombing pause would be "a disaster for the United States." General Wheeler has promised that the war could be ended in a "relatively short time" if we bombed the port of Haiphong and all lines of transport from South China. General Greene has had the presumption to tell the American people that the war in Vietnam is more important than the crisis of the American city.

Let us not make the mistake of condemning all military men. Such generals as James M. Gavin, Matthew Ridgway, David M. Shoup have offered searching criticism of the escalation policy. Within the Defense Department itself, Secretary McNamara has evidently—though with decreasing success in recent months—stood against the program of insensate escalation. Nor can one condemn the present Joint Chiefs of Staff for their insistence on a military solution. That is their business. The fault lies not with those who give such advice but with those who take it. There is nothing infallible about the JCS. I know what they recommended during great crises of the Kennedy Administration—the Bay of Pigs, the Berlin crisis of 1961, the missile crisis of 1962, the test ban debate of 1963—and in each case their recommendations were plainly wrong. President Kennedy took their advice on his great decisions once—before the Bay of Pigs. He did not make that mistake again. I know of no reason to suppose that the present Chiefs are wiser than their predecessors.

This sudden worship of the military is not in the American tradition. When General MacArthur carried his campaign for the escalation of the Korean War to Congress and the public, President Truman fired him. When Union generals in the Civil War showed that they could not succeed, President Lincoln fired them, one after another. Judging by the record, the present military leadership in South Vietnam is as disastrous as any we have had in the life of our nation. With over 500,000 American troops, better equipped than any troops in history, with 700,000 South Vietnamese, with 50,000 South Koreans, with total command of the air, with total command of the sea and, until recently, with total monopoly of heavy artillery, we have been fought to a standstill by 280,000 characters in black pajamas mostly armed, until recently, with rifles and mortars. In the last month, at Con Thien, our generals, in their wisdom, placed a group of gallant Marines in—and I quote that superhawk Josep Alsop—"just about the only position in the entire country where the North Vietnamese can hope to attain relative parity in heavy weapons when battle is engaged." Because, as General Westmoreland has elegantly put it, "There is more firepower concentrated in that area than on any single piece of real estate in the history of warfare," we have evidently staved off the assault; but the question remains whether the strategy of putting the men in this terribly exposed position made sense.

The inescapable conclusion is that our military leadership has grossly misjudged and misconceived the character of the war. The foremost authority in the west on counter-insurgency and the leading British expert on Vietnam, where he headed the British Advisory Mission for three and a half years, is Sir Robert Thompson, who organized the defeat of the guerrilla uprising in Malaya. Sir Robert recently pointed out that General Giap's strategy "has one main aim, to keep the American combat forces fully occupied on 'search and destroy' type operations in the Demilitarised Zone and in the spinal column of the Annamite mountain chain as far south as Zone D. . . . These are areas where he can most easily deploy his main units and where American forces can achieve, in comparatively unpopulated mountain and jungle, no permanent gains." The costs of this strategy for North Vietnam, Sir Robert says, are quite acceptable. If they lost twice as many troops per year as we claim they are losing, "it would still be less than half one annual age group (and there is an enormous reserve of these age groups between 18 and 30)." And American strategy, Sir Robert points out, is exactly what General Giap wants. It plays exactly into his hands. And the result? As Rowland Evans reported from Vietnam a few days ago, "The US position here in the critical northern provinces of South Vietnam is deteriorating as the communists press their remorseless campaign of attack, parry and retreat."

Let us liberate ourselves from this illusion of the infallibility of generals. Stewart Alsop, the wiser brother, recenty wrote in the *Saturday Evening Post*, after citing the historical record, "Almost all generals are almost always wrong about all wars. Generals shoud be listened to with skeptical respect, but never with reverent credulity." If the experience of the last 32 months proves anything, it proves that the administration's 7th assumption is as wrong as all the rest.

In February 1965 it was permissible to suppose that some, or all, of the administration's assumptions might be right. No one then could be certain whether or not the escalation policy would work. But now, for 32 long, terrible months, war has put to trial the validity of the propositions on which this policy is based. What may have seemed plausible in the abstract in February 1965 has received the laboratory test. It is no longer a question of speculation but of verification. The evidence is concrete. It is overwhelming. It is irrefutable.

History is the great executioner; and, in these months and years, as the basic assumptions, one after another, have run the gantlet of experience, none has survived. We are a pragmatic people. We believe in the process of trial and error, of experimentation. But we also believe in heeding the results of experiment. As Franklin Roosevelt once said, "it is common sense to take a method and try it. If it fails, admit it frankly and try another."

That is the way most Americans think—and this, I submit, is why there has been in recent months so marked a disillusion with the escalation policy. Some of us may have known from the start that the policy would not work. But let us be charitable to those who preferred to suspend judgment until the results were in. Let us unite now in the determination to slow down this ghastly war and move as speedily as possible toward a negotiated settlement.

This is the way most Americans are coming to think. But is it the way the American government is coming to think? So far as one can tell, our leaders remain stubbornly unimpressed by the collapse of their case for escalation. They continue to reiterate the propositions which experience has so cruelly disproved. Lashed to their own past policies, they seem incapable of admitting error or changing direction.

And so their only response to the failure of escalation is more escalation—like a doctor who, when the medicine fails to cure—doubles the dose.

Their only response to the misconceptions of our generals is to capitulate more and more to their demands.

Their only response to frustration and stalemate is to issue ever more fatuous statements about turning the corner of the war, turning the tide, the beginning of the end, victory in sight and so on.

It is difficult to see how serious men can, year after year, with the straight face, repeat the same optimistic predictions and do so, very often, in the identical words. Nor should we forget that herald angel of the hawks, Joseph Alsop, in this connection. *The Washington Post* on October 4 adorned his most recent effusion with the encouraging headline: "Vast Gains in Vietnam War Evident in Last Few Months." Hark how this herald angel has sung through the years. Thus February 1964, "In Communist North Vietnam . . . the situation is close to desperate"; in September 1965, "The whole pattern of the war has been utterly changed. . . . At last there is light at the end of the tunnel"; in October 1965, "Final defeat is beginning to be expected, even in the ranks of Viet Cong hard-core units"; in February 1966, "The enemy's backbone of regulars can even be broken this year. And when and if that happens, this war will be effectively won"; in April 1966, "The Vietnamese and American forces are now imposing a rate of loss on the Viet Cong which the enemy cannot indefinitely withstand"; in October 1966, "Within six, eight, ten or twelve months—before the end of 1967 at any rate—the chances are good that the Vietnamese war will look successful." Now in October 1967, just at the time when this last gorgeous prophecy is due for fulfillment, Mr. Alsop finds improvement so great that "the contrast between then and now is all but incredible." One is compelled to conclude that it is not the contrast but the columnist who is incredible. How consistently silly can an intelligent man be?

How do our leaders explain the failure of the escalation policy to produce the results so glowingly promised at such regular intervals? For some time, of course, they have been building their alibi. We all know what it is: that dissent in the United States is responsible for frustration in Vietnam. This is a familiar reflex of military disaster. One need only remember the *Dolchstegosslegende*—the stab-in-the-back myth concocted by the German generals to account for their defeat in the First World War.

The argument, like the escalation theory itself, has a certain initial plausibility. But let us consider what it really means—and the best way to do that is simply to invert it. If it means anything, it must mean that, if only everybody in the United States would shut up and rally behind their President, then Ho Chi Minh and his friends would stop doing what they are doing, and the war would be over. Simply to state this proposition is to demonstrate its absurdity. Serious leaders base their military decisions on the actual battlefield balance of force, will and opportunity, not on speculations about antiwar protests on the other side of the world. Our adversaries are fighting not because they count on protest at home but because they believe fanatically in their cause and because they have not been beaten in the field of battle. They would fight just as hard if everyone in America thought the escalation policy was perfect.

The rise of the Great Alibi has been paralleled by a curious sense of persecution within the administration as if it were some sort of beleaguered and impotent minority. A good example of this cry-baby reaction is the speech that Ambassador Gronouski gave this August at the University of Wisconsin. "Those charged with the conduct of foreign policy," the Ambassador said in his long wail of self-pity, ". . . find it difficult to maintain an attitude of rapport with a group (the intellectual community) which incessantly challenges their motives and morality."

Let us be clear about this. We are not questioning the motives and morality of the makers of policy; we are questioning their judgment, which is a very different matter. I know a good many of the men who have sponsored the escalation policy. They are not evil men. They are, as I suggested earlier, earnest and conscientious men. They are doing what they are doing because they profoundly believe it serves the interests of American security and world peace. They are doing their best for their country according to their lights. But it may justly be said, I think, that, in certain cases at least, their lights are dim. Historians have sometimes noted that the most underrated factor in the conduct of public affairs is stupidity.

Fortified by this sense of persecution, exonerated by their Great Alibi, deluded by their own propaganda and phophecy, still convinced that escalation is the road to peace, our leaders persist in their course. And, as they do so, another political year approaches. The 1968 election will provide, I believe, a test of the adequacy of our political process. For, given the size and intensity of dissent in our land, if this election does not offer the country a clear choice on the question of Vietnam, then something will have gone badly wrong with our political system. Now no political system works automatically. People make it work—and they make it work well, or they make it work badly. It is up to us, and people like us through the country, to do our best to make sure that our system meets its responsibilities.

Our objective is to bring the war in Vietnam to the end. We must not be under any illusions about the ease of a negotiated solution. While I have little doubt that an unconditional halt of the bombing of the north would soon lead to talks with Hanoi and the Viet Cong, I have considerable doubt that these talks would lead very soon to a mutually acceptable solution. So far as one can tell at present, each side continues to insist on terms which would mean, in effect, the defeat and humiliation of the other side. So long as this remains the case, no settlement will be possible. What both sides must come to in the end, I believe, is agreement on the creation of a structure in South Vietnam within which contending forces, including the communists, may compete by peaceful means for political representation and control. Such a structure would require some form of international supervision for a stated period in order to guarantee against reversion to terrorism and guerrilla warfare. It will take time—perhaps a long time—for such a solution to win mutual acceptance.

How do we move in this direction? The first necessity obviously is to slow down the war—to stop the bombing of the north, to reduce the fighting in the south, to do everything we can to lessen the killing.

The next necessity is to make it clear that we will keep an American military presence in South Vietnam until a negotiated settlement can be achieved. Let us have no confusion here. There will be no chance of negotiation if the other side thinks it is going to win; therefore a military stalemate is a self-evident precondition to negotiation. The advocates of a political solution and the advocates of unilateral withdrawal agree on the indispensability of slowing down the war; but, after this point. It seems to me, their paths diverge and their policies become incompatible. One cannot, of course, wholly exclude the possibility of unilateral withdrawal; it would not be America's finest hour, but it would obviously be greatly preferable to a policy of unlimited escalation. But the option of withdrawal is always open to us. It would be foolish to rush at once to that extreme without exhausting the possibilities of negotiation. It need hardly be said that, up to this point, we have not, despite fine words, pursued negotiation with a fraction of the zeal, ingenuity and perseverence with which we have pursued war.

This leads to the third necessity: we will not have a negotiated solution until we have a leadership which desires a negotiated solution—which has freed itself from the obsession with the idea of a military victory, or at least of a spectacular and favorable reversal of the present military balance: the obsession which evidently continues to possess the present administration. If our present leadership can think of nothing better than persistence in the policies which, after full and fair trial, for 32 bitter months, have proved a dismal failure, then this country, if it is to save itself, requires new leadership.

How do we make sure that the 1968 election offers an alternative? Let us be clear about another thing: the idea of a third party is an illusion. A third party based on the Vietnam war would get nowhere in the elections; it would run well behind George Wallace in the electoral college; and the only result would be drastically to understate the size of the opposition to the escalation policy and thereby to discredit the cause of peace. The serious issue must remain within the major parties. This means, I think, that the Republicans among us must work for anti-escalation candidates in their party—and that all of us must work for delegates to the party conventions pledged to an anti-escalation platform. As we do this, we may all be encouraged by the expectation that disenchantment with the war is bound to grow in the weeks and months ahead.

It is bound to grow so long as the present leadership remains frozen in its ideas, locked into its system of error, unable to think of anything to do but more of the same. How much more proof will they require before they recognize that the escalation policy has been a disaster? They began that policy in February 1965. Today, after 32 months, after the death of more than 13,000 American soldiers and of countless Vietnamese, after the expenditure of nearly $90 billion, after our increasing isolation in the world, after the irresponsible and dangerous neglect of the urgent problems of our national community—to which President Johnson's Great Society was so prominently dedicated—after all the blood and killing and waste and degradation, are we any closer to a solution than we were when we began? Are we nearer to winning the war? to establishing a healthy society in South Vietnam? to pacifying the countryside? to winning world confidence in American purpose and American sense? Are we not ever more deeply and hopelessly mired in the quicksand?

I say again: how much longer do our leaders insist on reinforcing error and dragging us down this dirty and hopeless road? Can nothing demonstrate to them the futility and folly of their course? "My brethern," said Cromwell, "I beseech you, in the bowels of Christ, think it possible that you may be mistaken." If this administration lacks the moral or the intellectual courage to conceive the possibility that it may be wrong, then the American people, I hope and believe, will turn next year to leadership determined to meet this tragic problem with the realism, the rationality and the high idealism that have marked the finest moments of our history.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

PUBLIC WORKS AND ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 11641) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission, the Delaware River Basin Commission, Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Water Resources Council, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. **LONG** of Louisiana. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. **ELLENDER**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. JORDAN of Idaho in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will state the first amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 3, line 21, after the word "construction", strike out "$33,745,000" and insert "$36,246,000".

Mr. **ELLENDER**. Mr. President, I should like to propose a unanimous-consent agreement, that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc; that the bill, as thus amended, be regarded for the purpose of further amendment as original text; and that no point of order shall be considered to have been waived by reason of agreement to this request.

Mr. **KUCHEL**. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I agree with my able friend—it has been brought to my attention that the Senator from Delaware might desire to object. I wonder, therefore, whether my able friend would withdraw his unanimous-consent request for a moment.

Mr. **ELLENDER**. Certainly.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. **ELLENDER**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. **ELLENDER**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc; that the bill, as thus amended, be regarded for the purpose of further amendment as original text; and that no point of order shall be considered to have been waived by reason of agreement to this request.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 3, line 21, after the word "construction", strike out "$33,745,000" and insert "$36,246,000".

On page 4, line 13, after the word "construction", strike out "$935,074,000" and insert "$1,010,823,000"; and, in line 19, after the word "appropriated", insert a colon and "*Provided further,* That in connection with the rehabilitation of the Snake Creek Embankment of the Garrison Dam and Reservoir Project, North Dakota, the Corps of Engineers is authorized to participate with the Stae of North Dakota to the extent of one-half the cost of widening the present embankment to provide a four-lane right-of-way for U.S. Highway 83 in lieu of the present two-lane highway".

On page 5, line 23, after the word "navigation", strike out "$189,000,000" and insert "$190,000,000".

On page 6, line 5, after "(33 U.S.C. 702a, 702g–1)", strike out "$83,400,000" and insert "$91,480,000".

On page 7, line 7, after the word "exceed", strike out "$156,000,000" and insert "$162,000,000".

On page 10, line 22, after the word "expended", strike out "$16,000,000" and insert "$21,555,000"; and, in line 23, after the word "which", strike out "$13,058,000" and insert "$16,113,000".

On page 11, at the beginning of line 16, strike out "$172,700,000" an insert "$185,005,000".

On page 14, line 9, after the word "program", strike out "$15,000,000" and insert "$15,400,000".

On page 21, line 2, after the word "area", strike out "$5,035,000" and insert "5,015,000".

On page 21, line 23, after the word "Act", strike out "$90,800,000" and insert "$94,935,000".

On page 22, line 7, after the word "expended", strike out "$203,000,000" and insert "$225,000,000".

On page 23, line 26, after the word "vehicles", strike out "$2,125,000,000" and insert "$2,142,402,000".

On page 25, line 10, after the word "aircraft", strike out "$367,733,000" and insert "$369,633,000".

On page 27, at the beginning of line 10, strike out "$6,115,000" and insert "$6,100,000".

On page 28, line 11, after the word "purchase", strike out "(not to exceed two hundred and thirty-two for replacement only)" and insert "(not to exceed two hundred and seventy-two of which two hundred and thirty-two shall be for replacement only)"; and, in line 15, after the word "vehicles", strike out "$60,000,000" and insert "$62,150,000".

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, we have under consideration this afternoon H.R. 11641, a bill making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, particularly with respect to the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, the Bureau of Reclamation and the power marketing activities, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission, the Delaware River Basin Commission, the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Water Resources Council, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968.

The amount of the bill as passed by the House totaled $4,622,922,000. The Senate Committee on Appropriations made a net increase in the sum adopted by the House of $153,142,000. Therefore, the total in the bill as reported to the Senate is $4,776,064,000.

The amount of the budget estimates considered by the Senate committee for fiscal year 1968 was $4,867,813,000.

The bill as reported to the Senate is under the budget estimate by $91,749,000, and over the appropriation for fiscal year 1967 by $465,893,000.

In view of the large financial requirements for meeting our commitments in Vietnam, the committee has deferred the initiation of many worthy projects which in fact, should be constructed now to prevent serious flood losses in many parts of the country or to promote and strengthen our economy here at home. Requirements for storage to meet the ever-increasing demands for municipal and industrial water supply, navigation, flood control, and work to protect and preserve our shoreline must be weighed against the fiscal requirements of other programs. However, the construction of works to preserve and protect our precious land and water resources cannot be postponed long without serious detriment to our domestic economy.

The President has submitted budget requests totaling $124,163,707,004, of which $4,867,813,000 was considered in this bill. Included in the budget estimate of $4,867,813,000 is $2,646,100,000 for the Atomic Energy Commission, leaving a balance of $2,221,713,000 for water resource development, of which $306,034,000 is for the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration. It is apparent, therefore that less than 1.8 percent of the budget has been allocated for the development and preservation of our most important resource—water, including pollution control. At this point I would like to state that I agree completely with the views of the House Appropriations Committee, as expressed in its report, that unless it is possible at an early date to make provision within the national budget for funding the most essential water resource projects, our Nation will be faced with a serious situation necessitating a costly and inefficient crash program.

Unfortunately, the committee was faced with the very practical problem concerning the large budget deficit with which this Nation is confronted, and its recommendations had to be tempered accordingly.

Mr. President, I am very hopeful that consideration of the bill can be concluded this afternoon so that, as soon as possible, we may go to conference with the House on the disagreeing amendments.

The bill passed the House of Representatives on July 25 and was referred to the Committee on Appropriations on July 27. The bill was reported to the Senate on September 28.

I believe it is not necessary for me to give a lengthy explanation of the bill. The report on it is on the desks of the Senators, and it very clearly sets forth the actions of the committee.

The Senate has adopted the committee amendments en bloc with the understanding that the bill as thus amended shall be considered as original text, so that the Senate will have every opportunity to work its will on the bill.

Mr. President, as is customary, the Subcommittee on Public Works divided itself into three panels for the consideration of the pending bill. The portion of the public works appropriation bill dealing with the Bureau of Reclamation and the power marketing activities of the Department of the Interior was handled by my good and able friend, the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], who is also chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. The portion of the bill covering the Atomic Energy Commission and the Tennessee Valley Authority was handled by my good friend, the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. I handled the portion relating to the civil functions of the Department of the Army, the Panama Canal, the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, the Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission, the Delaware River Basin Commission, the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, and the Water Resources Council.

The hearings on this bill started on March 14 and continued through August 3. The subcommittee held 38 sessions for the purpose of taking testimony, and three executive sessions for the purpose of marking up the bill. The subcommittee heard 874 witnesses, which included representatives of various organizations and local communities, in addition to departmental representations; 780 of the witnesses appeared before the panel handling the civil functions of the Department of the Army and the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration; 79 of the witnesses appeared before the panel headed by the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]; and the remaining 15 witnesses appeared before the panel headed by the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. The hearings comprise four volumes which contain 4,568 pages of testimony. A complete set of the hearings is on each Senator's desk. The hearings constitute the basic information upon which the subcommittee based its recommendations to the full committee.

Mr. President, I wish to reiterate what I have stated on many occasions on the floor of the Senate—that we have no project in this bill that has not been completely justified by the Corps of Engineers. The committee looked closely into the benefit-to-cost ratio on each project. I am happy to say that all of these projects, including the new starts that were recommended by the committee, as well as those included in the House-passed bill, have been thoroughly studied. All the projects recommended are economically justifiable and within the capability of the Corps of Engineers.

Mr. President, with respect to title I, before marking up the civil functions portion of the bill, we reviewed every project which was presented to the subcommittee, either budgeted or unbudgeted. We examined into every request made to the subcommittee for planning or construction funds. After all the requests had been received, the Engineers were called back for the purpose of obtaining their views on the projects presented to the committee. The intention of this recall was to determine whether the Engineers could economically and efficiently utilize the additional funds requested by the local witnesses, and whether the Corps of Engineers had the capability to undertake the unbudgeted new starts requested.

Mr. President, with respect to title I, which concerns the civil functions portion of the bill, we reviewed, as I have just said, every project and studied it thoroughly, to insure that each project conformed with the regulations that the committee adopted years ago. Under no conditions have we recommended any project that cannot be justified or that has not been authorized and that is not within the capability of the Corps of Engineers.

The Senate has before it a complete justification for all planning and construction projects which are included in the bill as recommended by the Senate committee, as well as for all the projects which were recommended by the House.

The President's budget contained nine new starts on projects, the total estimated cost of which is $152,223,000, and the amount recommended for funding in the budget for fiscal year 1968 is $7,458,000. The House reduced the budget estimate of $3,726,000 on three planning items to $750,000, and the budget estimate on 11 construction items under "Construction, general," from $32,577,000 to $21,123,000. Four reservoir projects included in this latter category were new budgeted construction starts and the funds allowed by the House for those four projects were for land acquisition only. The House of Representatives also provided funds totaling $905,000 for 11 unbudgeted planning items having a total estimated cost of $62,153,000, and increased one budgeted planning item from $200,000 to $450,000 on a project with an estimated total cost of $25,800,000.

The subcommittee, as well as the committee as a whole, agreed with the House action.

The House added 16 new construction starts having a total estimated cost of $93,245,000, and the House allowance for these projects was $5,843,000. The House also included unbudgeted funds for resumption of planning on one project and for resumption of construction on three projects, the total estimated cost of which is $84,790,000, and the House allow ance for both planning and construction on these resumptions was $2,730,000. The House also added to the bill $6,275,000 for unbudgeted land-acquisition items on seven projects having a total estimated cost of $257,890,000.

The bill as passed by the House provided $935,074,000 for "Construction, general," for the Corps of Engineers. This amount was $37,918,000 below the budget estimate. In order to show such a reduction below the budget, the House increased the reduction for savings and slippage by $39,491,000.

I wish to pause at this moment to state exactly what the House usually does with respect to slippages. As a rule, the overall amount of slippages aggregates about 5 percent of the amount appropriated. In this instance the budget estimate for slippage was 9 percent and the House has increased the slippages by about 3 percent in addition, or a total of 12 percent. It can easily be seen that such a procedure has a tendency to reduce the amount that can be allotted to a project. That is why the House was able to come before us with a bill that was more or less in line with the budget estimates.

That is due, of course, to the fact that this additional cut for slippages took place.

Mr. President, what that amounts to, if Congress should agree to it, is a cut of 12 percent on all of the budgeted items included in the bill. This procedure, Mr. President, is one with which I have taken issue on many occasions—in fact, practically every year that I have been handling these bills, or more than 14 years.

The sum of all the individual amounts recommended by the budget as shown in the committee report under construction, general, beginning on page 8 and continuing through page 21, totals $1,063,017,000. Recognizing that in any program of this size there will be unavoidable delays and slippages, the budget bureau recommended an appropriation of $972,992,000 to carry out this program—an underfinancing by $90,025,000—or about a 9-percent reduction. The sum total of the individual items in the bill as passed the House amounts to $1,064,590,000, or an increase of $1,573,000 in the program but a reduction of $36,242,000 in the appropriation to carry out the program. This was accomplished by increasing the reduction for slippage by $39,491,000. The reduction for slippage in the House bill amounts to about 12.2 percent compared to the budget estimate of 9 percent for slippage.

This year, Mr. President, even the Corps of Engineers has gone beyond its usual practice of providing a slippage of about 5 percent, and in some cases 6 percent.

The Senate committee felt that the House reduction for slippage was too severe and has recommended the budget figure for slippage.

Except for one planning item in California, the Senate committee has approved all of the House increases in planning and construction. The committee has recommended restoration of House cuts in the budget on five construction items in the amount of $1,801,000, and two planning items in the amount of $1,726,000. The committee recommendation provides $819,000 for 11 unbudgeted planning items. The committee also recommended the initiation of construction on 25 projects having a future commitment of $303,603,000. On one of these projects the House had recommended land acquisition only, while on five others the House had approved planning funds only.

As to land acquisition, Mr. President, I point out that that is really construction, because no construction can be started on a program unless ways and means are worked out so that the necessary land to construct the project is acquired. This is a new approach, different from what has been used in the past; and I consider that it really represents new construction starts, although the funds are mentioned in the report as available only to acquire land.

As a matter of fact, every time we put money in a bill for construction, one of the first expenditures made cn a project is for the acquisition of land upon which the project will be constructed or, in the case of a dam, land that may be inundated, or land upon which to relocate roads, highways, or railroads.

So, Mr. President, despite the fact that the House of Representatives has stated that the amount in this bill is for merely land acquisition, nevertheless construction is involved.

The increase recommended by the Senate committee on these 25 projects was $11,258,000. For projects under construction, the committee recommended additional amounts on 18 projects totaling $19,620,000. Similarly, the committee recommended increases on six budgeted planning items by $705,000.

. Mr. President, considering all of the unbudgeted new construction starts and all of the unbudgeted planning starts put into the bill by the House, in comparison with the Senate additions, the difference between the total added by each House will entail an expenditure of only between $4.5 million and $5 million; so the difference between the amounts added by the House and the Senate is really very small, and compares with differences that have occurred in previous years. Ever since I have been a member of this subcommittee, in presenting a bill to the Senate, our committee has invariably added a number of new projects. I can well remember, several years ago, when we met a challenge by the executive department, during the administration of President Eisenhower, when he tried to follow a policy of no new starts.

That, of course, was contrary to the policy that had been followed in the past; and the Senate committee, as well as the House committee, insisted on following the past procedure by adding new construction starts and new planning starts. We took the position that if we suddenly cut out new planning and construction starts, the important program for the development of our water resources would soon dry up.

The matter was debated on the floor of the Senate, as well as the floor of the House of Representatives, and a bill was passed wherein, as I recall, we added, altogether, around 65 or 68 new construction starts, as well as a number of planning starts, and the bill was sent to the President for his signature.

President Eisenhower vetoed the bill; it was sent back to Congress, and Congress overrode that veto. From that time until now, we have had no trouble, Mr. President, in incorporating in a bill a reasonable number of new starts in construction as well as in planning.

I think it is a good thing. I do not know of any expenditures which have inured more to the benefit of our Nation than these public works programs; and I am hopeful that Congress will continue to agree with that viewpoint.

Mr. President, under title II the committee considered budget estimates amounting to $468,498,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation and the other power activities of the Department of the Interior; and recommends an appropriation of $462,921,000. This is $18,240,000 more than was approved by the House of Representatives, and is $5,577,000 less than the budget estimates.

Of the increase proposed by the committee, $5,555,000 is for general investigations, and includes an additional $5,250,000 for expanding the atmospheric water resources research program.

For construction and rehabilitation, $12,305,000 is recommended for addition to the amount approved by the House of Representatives. Of this increase, $10,850,000 was budgeted for a transmission line from Fort Thompson, S. Dak., to Grand Island, Nebr., for which needed legislative authorization has now been enacted.

The bill includes two new construction starts which were proposed by the Department of the Interior in its budget submission.

For the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, the committee approved an additional $4,135,000 for water supply and water pollution control; and $22,000,000 for construction grants for waste treatment work.

Mr. President, title III deals with the Atomic Energy Commission. I shall not discuss in detail the Atomic Energy proposal, but hearings were held, and my good friend, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], who is an ex officio member of the subcommittee, was present. Our committee followed his recommendations, and I am sure that the committee has provided a sufficient sum for the Atomic Energy Commission.

The committee recommended $2,142,402,000 for the operating expenses of the Atomic Energy Commission. The committee recommendation is $17,402,000 above the amount allowed by the House; $27,498,000 below the budget; and $219,402,000 above the appropriation for 1967.

For plant and capital equipment, the committee recommended $369,633,000, which is $1,900,000 above the amount allowed by the House and $106,567,000 below the budget.

Mr. President, title IV covers several independent agencies.

For the Tennessee Valley Authority, the committee recommends $62,150,000, the budget estimate, and an increase of $2,150,000 over the amount allowed by the House.

The bill provides for the Federal participation in the Delaware River Basin Commission.

The bill also provides $6,100,000 for salaries and expenses of the Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission, which is $1,400,000 below the budget estimate, and $15,000 below the amount allowed by the House. The amount recommended by the committee is the balance of the available authorization. A bill to increase the authorized expenditure for this study is pending in the House of Representatives.

As we all know, fairly good progress has been made by this Commission. However, lately the Commission has found that the amount originally authorized was insufficient. The amount of the additional authorization is about $6.5 million, as I recall. The Commission ran short, and Congress is considering an additional authorization which I hope will be enacted sometime soon.

Mr. President, included in the bill again this year are appropriations for the Water Resources Council. The committee recommends $1,070,000, of which $290,000 is for salaries and expenses of the Council, and $780,000 is to finance the U.S. share of river basin commissions.

Mr. President, as I indicated in the earlier part of my remarks, the Senate has had before it the report which deals with all of the appropriations recommended.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana for the superb job he has done for many years in handling this bill.

The Senator from Louisiana has been very ably assisted this year as in previous years by Kenneth Bousquet, and by Edmund King who has so ably served the ranking minority member of the committee, the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL].

I should like to point out some of the benefits these projects have brought to my area. I am also quite familiar with the benefits that have accrued to other areas of the United States. However, along the Missouri River for 1,000 miles or more we have suffered devastating floods year after year. Now, because of a series of dams on the Missouri River, there is no chance whatever of experiencing any major floods in the future.

Along with this great accomplishment, of course, there will be plenty of water for irrigation and for navigation downstream.

Each year the Federal Government is collecting very large sums of money for electricity generated by these hydroelectric dams, to say nothing about the great benefits derived from recreation and other related activities.

Mr. President, I would like to ask the Senator two or three questions regarding some language appearing in the report.

I direct the Senator's attention to the language appearing on page 7 of the committee's report under the heading, "Red River of the North."

In the Senator's opinion, would this language in any way preclude the Corps of Engineers from requesting survey funds, if they can be justified, for a survey of the Sheyenne River above Bald Hill Dam in their budget for the next fiscal year?

Mr. ELLENDER. No, certainly not. The limitation to which the Senator from North Dakota refers applies only to the current fiscal year, fiscal 1968.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. In the Senator's opinion, would this language preclude the Corps of Engineers from proceeding with any existing or on-going flood control investigations in the Red River of the North Basin such as the so-called Kindred Dam study?

Mr. ELLENDER. It would not. The language in the committee report refers only to a new—and I emphasize new—study.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. If the so-called Kindred Dam has a favorable benefit-cost ratio, the Corps of Engineers would not be prevented from recommending its construction, would they?

Mr. ELLENDER. No, certainly not. It is my understanding that that project is currently under study as a part of the Red River of the North investigation.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. In including this limitation in our report, the committee's only purpose was to prohibit the Corps of Engineers from, in effect, starting a new study of a tributary stream by increasing the scope of the existing Red River of the North Basin study with the result that the submission of that important report would be further delayed, was it not?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct. And, as I said, it applies to this river only, and we are hopeful that with the money provided, substantial progress on this study can be made in fiscal year 1968.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I appreciate the comments of the Senator because this should straighten out any possible misunderstanding as to the intent of the language in the committee report.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct. In addition to what my good friend, the Senator from North Dakota, has said about the good that has come from all of these great projects we have had constructed in the past 15 years, I could stand before the Senate and recite project after project and point out the good that has come to the area and the Nation because of the wisdom, in my opinion, that was exhibited by Congress in providing the funds for these programs.

I would have included several other worthy projects in the pending bill if it were left to me, and in my opinion more money could be used to complete many of these projects at an accelerated rate. I am confident that it would be very beneficial to the country as a whole, and would help this Nation to build up its economy.

I wonder what would have happened to our economy, especially with respect to transportation, had we not insisted, for example, on building new locks on the Ohio River. The Senator is aware that for the past 14 years the committee has added projects on that great river to replace the system of 49 small locks that were there with a system of 19 large locks. In the past 14 or 15 years, we have constructed one large lock to replace the two or three small locks, so that we could accommodate the large increase in the tonnage that is taking advantage of the economical water transportation provided the area by the Ohio River.

The Senator knows that in the beginning many of the railroads in that area fought these works. But the railroads are now learning that they are making more money in carrying finished products than they would earn by carrying the bulk products.

Not only has this river navigation been instrumental in carrying millions of tons of raw materials and bulk products, but by the creation of these locks along the Ohio and Monongahela Rivers, we have created large pools of water; and the record indicates that around these pools over $25 billion has been invested by private industry within the past 14 or 15 years.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Only a few years ago, as the Senator will recall, this was one of the most controversial bills before Congress. It is now one of the least controversial, and its great contribution to our economy is now generally recognized.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have specific figures to indicate, for example, that in 1948, around the time I became a member of the subcommittee, the entire tonnage on the Ohio River was 42.8 million tons. Today it is 103.2 million tons. These figures apply only to the Ohio River.

I do not wish to burden the RECORD with all of the figures I have; but if the occasion should arise, I shall be glad, in the course of the debate on the bill, to indicate the good that has resulted from many of the projects that have been constructed in the past 15 or 16 years. This program has been good for our economy, and it has been money well spent.

For example, by harnessing the tributaries of the great Mississippi River, we can hold back the destructive floodwater behind these great dams. Not only does this prevent flood damage but these reservoirs provide water for irrigation and for the development of electricity, by permitting the floodwaters to flow gradually down the river; so that today, in the lower reaches of the Mississippi River, beginning at Memphis and going down to the mouth, we have a steady flow of fresh water at all times, instead of having it all in the spring or in the autumn, followed by salt water intrusion during the dry summer months.

The result has been a boon to business, and I am happy to have had a part in fostering this program, together with all the other Senators who worked on this program as members of the subcommittee, in order to provide the funds to make all these good projects possible.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate for just a moment. My purpose in rising is to pay a deserved tribute to the senior Senator from Louisiana, the floor manager of the bill. His devotion to duty is characteristically high for as he has suggested, the printed hearings on the items, most of which have come before him, constitute three volumes of testimony 6 or 7 inches thick.

I am particularly grateful for the manner in which he has passed judgment, with his committee, on the projects in which I have been interested. Sometimes his judgment has not been consonant with the position I have urged, as the Senator is aware; but in every instance, whether he has agreed or disagreed, his judgment has been based upon facts.

I heartily concur that what is in the bill is amply and completely justified by the testimony that was adduced at the hearings. I pay tribute to the Senator as one who has performed a high service to the people of this country in passing on the recommendations for civil public works in the manner he has done, once again, in handling this measure.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank my good friend, the Senator from California. As he knows—I am sure that many Senators in the Chamber will agree—when a bill comes before us, it is sort of out of balance, in that some areas of the country seem to be better taken care of than others. The members of the committee tried to balance the situation by providing worthy projects so that every area of the country would benefit.

I repeat: All projects in this bill—in fact, ever since I have been on this committee—have borne fruit and have been worthy. Often, the Corps of Engineers has been criticized because on a certain project they have made estimates which are out of line sometimes 4, 5, or 6 percent. I had the committee check into that matter, and it was found that for the 51 projects for which completion funds are requested, some of which have been under construction over a period of 10 years, the total of the estimates made by the Engineers at the time the first construction funds were requested and the present estimate, were off by less than one-tenth of 1 percent.

We sometimes read in popular magazines a sensational editorial about "pork barrel," and so forth. I believe the Engineers have done a good job in estimating costs. Their estimates, in my opinion, have been as accurate as could be expected, because all of these estimates have to be made far in advance of construction, as the Senator knows. I am surprised that their estimates have been as close as one-tenth of 1 percent.

Mr. KUCHEL. I agree with the Senator.

I wish to include in my congratulations the very able staff member, Ken Bousquet, and the very able staff member for the minority, Ed King, and all those who have worked with the Senator in bringing this bill to the floor.

Mr. ELLENDER. They undoubtedly are our right hand and left hand. They are excellent workers. Of course, under the proper guidance we have given them, they are bound to do a good job.

Mr. KUCHEL. I concur.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I believe I understand the major items in the bill, but I wish to reiterate the same thought that the Senator from California has just stated. Unless someone has worked on this bill, as evidenced by these three volumes of testimony, I believe it is impossible for him to understand the almost infinite amount of detail and testimony and figures involved in the matter. I pay tribute to my good friend, the Senator from California, for the fine work he has done in this matter.

If it were not for the distinguished Senator from Louisiana and the staff members, Mr. King and Mr. Bousquet, who have followed this bill day by day and hour by hour, it would not be possible.

There are other difficult bills—one of which I am involved in at present—but in my opinion the pending bill requires more constant attentive energy than any other appropriations bill or any other bill that is before Congress.

I would be very remiss if on this occasion I did not express my plaudits to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, and on behalf of myself and, I am sure, on behalf of many other people, thank him for the great job he has done on this bill.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I wish to echo the sentiments which have been so ably expressed by the Senator from Colorado. They are well deserved by the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. ELLENDER, and by the staff.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I join in these tributes being paid to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, the chairman of the subcommittee, and the members of the staff.

The Senator from Louisiana has done a magnificent piece of work for many years in handling this bill, and he has had these very able staff members by his side helping him. I heartily congratulate the distinguished Senator from Louisiana and his staff.

Mr. ELLENDER. I appreciate these remarks. They are really unnecessary because most of the Senators making the compliments are members of the committee, such as my friend from Alabama, who is responsible for a good part of this bill in connection with TVA and the Atomic Energy Commission. There is, as the Senator knows, a lot of detailed work involved in connection with the bill.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, being members of the subcommittee has given us the opportunity to see the magnificent work which the Senator from Louisiana has done and to see the fine help that has been given by the staff.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONDALE in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wish to join Senators in complimenting the Senator from Louisiana. I am a member of the subcommittee, as are many Senators in the Chamber. When the Senator from Louisiana suggests that he receives help from other members of the subcommittee, that is true, but he does not receive help to the extent he probably should, inasmuch as there are literally hundreds of items involved in the bill.

I remember 2 years ago we added up the number of witnesses who appeared and that tabulation showed that 829 witnesses testified in connection with all projects all over the United States. This task takes some doing and it also takes a man of the broad background of the Senator from Louisiana who knows most of these problems intimately. It takes a man of great experience to handle this matter, and a man who is reasonable and responsible. This is the job that the Senator from Louisiana performs every year. Members of the subcommittee are very fortunate to have him as their chairman.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I am pleased to note that the Senate Appropriations Committee in its report, No. 574 on H.R. 11641, has indicated its support of nuclear power development for the Bonneville Power Administration. The committee report points out—page 36—the need for a high degree of integration of power facilities in the Pacific Northwest, which requires close cooperative planning by all concerned power entities. The committee anticipates advance notice of contracts contemplated with respect to nuclear power generation.

The Appropriations Committee certainly has a direct interest in Bonneville Power Administration contracts for nuclear power generation. Development of great nuclear power offers great possibilities for savings of appropriated funds, and cost savings for the industries, utilities, public utility districts, cooperatives, and municipalities which purchase power from Bonneville Power Administration. The Tennessee Valley Authority is already developing a substantial nuclear generating capacity, as practically all power systems must in order to continue toward our goal of abundant power and lower and lower rates.

The Federal Government invested more than $2 billion in development of civilian nuclear power. The investor-owned utilities are presently engaged in a brazen effort to monopolize nuclear power—now that the taxpayers have made it profitable. A number of utilities are trying to exclude Federal, municipal, and cooperative power systems from nuclear generating facilities. The Federal yardstick has been growing shorter and shorter. Consequently, the overcharge of the investor-owned utilities has been growing higher and higher. Federal power generation now amounts to about 13 percent of the national total. During the fifties it was 13 percent.

In addition, the preference clause, provided by Congress to facilitate energy acquisition from the Federal Government by nonprofit power systems, is becoming less and less meaningful. Increasingly, Federal power generation is going to private industries and private utilities.

During the past 3 years Federal agency use of Federal power dropped sharply, from 32.2 percent of the total to 17.8 percent. The percentage purchased by cooperative utilities decreased, from 11.9 to 11.6 percent. The percentage purchased by State and miscellaneous public utilities also decreased from 11.3 to 8.2 percent.

Meanwhile, the percentage purchased by investor-owned utilities increased by more than three-fourths, from 5 percent of the total to 8.9 percent. The percentage purchased by private industry increased by three-eighths, from 18 to 24.7 percent. The percentage purchased by municipals increased by one-third, from 21.6 to 28.8 percent.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the Record the September 25, 1967, letter to me from Chairman Lee White of the Federal Power Commission, which includes the statistics on distribution of Federal power.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Federal Power Commission,
Washington, D.C., September 25, 1967.
Hon. Lee Metcalf,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Metcalf: In answer to your letter of September 20, 1967, the following tabulations give the figures you request pertaining to distribution of Federal power:

BILLION KILOWATT-HOURS

	Fiscal 1948	Fiscal 1953	Fiscal 1958	Fiscal 1963	Calendar 1966
Private industry	9.1	13.4	19.4	23.0	36.0
Federal agencies	2.5	8.6	31.9	41.2	26.0
Private utilities	8.4	8.6	12.9	6.5	13.0
Municipal utilities	8.4	14.0	21.1	27.6	42.0
Cooperative utilities	1.0	3.3	9.1	15.3	17.0
State and other public utilities	1.7	5.7	10.5	14.4	12.0
Total	31.1	53.6	104.9	128.0	146.0

PERCENTAGE

	Fiscal 1948	Fiscal 1953	Fiscal 1958	Fiscal 1963	Calendar 1966
Private industry	29.3	25.0	18.5	18.0	24.7
Federal agencies	7.8	16.1	30.5	32.2	17.8
Private utilities	27.1	16.1	12.3	5.0	8.9
Municipal utilities	27.1	26.0	20.1	21.6	28.8
Cooperative utilities	3.1	6.1	8.6	11.9	11.6
State and other public utilities	5.6	10.7	10.0	11.3	8.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Data for the fiscal years 1948, 1953, 1958, and 1963 were taken from the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association *Rural Electric Fact Books,* while the calendar year 1966 figures were prepared by our staff from reports to the Federal Power Commission.

Sincerely,

Lee C. White, *Chairman.*

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, a recent speech by a Member of the House is pertinent to this public works and atomic energy appropriation bill and to my remarks. Representative John E. Moss addressed the East River Electric Power Cooperative in Madison, S. Dak., on September 13. He develops the point that public thermal generation is necessary to maintain the yardstick of competition in the electric power industry. Most of the hydro sites are gone and, so far, TVA is the only Federal entity with its own thermal generation. I ask unanimous consent to have this excellent speech by Congressman Moss inserted at this point in the Record and commend it to all who wish to be informed on the disturbing increases in monopoly in the energy field.

There being no objection the speech was ordered printed as follows:

Speech of Hon. John E. Moss, Democrat of California, at the Annual Meeting of the East River Electric Power Cooperative, Inc., in Madison, S. Dak., September 13, 1967

I am delighted to be here with you today. You, as officers and members of the electric cooperatives, exercising local initiative and self-help in the American tradition, are building a better and more abundant life for your people here in South Dakota. You are lowering the cost and increasing the efficiency of the farming business, at a time when other forces seem in conspiracy to crush it to the wall between increasing costs and lower prices. You are making feasible other local industry which depends on abundant and reasonably priced electric power. And indirectly you are even helping to solve the urban problems we hear so much about nowadays, by making it possible for people to remain and prosper in the country instead of fleeing to the cities in penniless despair.

You perform another public service also to the nation at large, over and beyond the service you render to your communities and your members. You represent and protect the interests of the electric consumer.

Traditionally there have been three principal means to protect his interests. First, by the competition of other forms of energy, but such competition is now rapidly becoming obsolete even where the local power company doesn't own the gas company too. Second, by governmental regulation of rates and conditions of service, but such regulation has seldom been very effective and frequently it is pure sham. I'll have more to say about this later. And third, by the yardstick of public and cooperative power which helps measure the reasonableness of the rates and services of electric companies by comparison with the operations of municipal, PUD and rural cooperative electric systems.

You help provide the yardstick. Since much of cooperatives' electricity is sold to their own members they are probably more sensitive than all other power marketing entities to the consumer's interest in obtaining reliable electric service at the lowest possible cost.

We need more people today who are sensitive to the electric consumer's interest—among the informed public, in the administration, yes, and in Congress.

Of all the electric energy generated in this country in 1966, all but 24 percent was produced by the investor-owned, profit-making companies. State and local bodies produced 10 percent; cooperatives only 1 percent. The Federal Government produced 13 percent. It used to produce 15 percent. According to 1963 data, which is the latest published, less than half (45 percent) of this Federal output was sold to preference customers such as municipalities, rural cooperatives, public utility districts, States and other public agencies. Almost one-third (32 percent) was consumed by the Federal Government itself, and the balance (23 percent) was sold to private industry and investor-owned utilities.

Federal power production has been the backbone of the yardstick. This is because of the economy of size. A little generator just can't produce a kilowatt hour as cheaply as a big generator. And generators are getting very, very big—and very, very expensive.

Total electric consumption in the United States will at least double between now and 1980. Federal power production, therefore, should also double, at least, if we are to maintain even the present inadequate yardstick. Unfortunately, the trend is in the other direction.

We must begin to think very seriously about public thermal generation if we are going to be able to maintain the Federal yardstick. Traditionally, Federal power has meant hydropower. Even today, TVA is the only Federal entity with its own thermal generation. However, hydro alone will not provide the large increase in Federal power and energy required to maintain the present minimum Federally-generated proportion of all power produced in this country.

Furthermore, as new hydropower sources become scarce, and existing Federal hydropower is more and more reserved for peaking operation, it tends to lose its yardstick quality. With private steam plants carrying the base load, and the coordinated output sold at composite rates, which often include a private wheeling toll, it becomes difficult or impossible to compare Federal and private prices.

At the same time, however, the growing importance of hydropower for peaking purposes will make it feasible to develop many marginal hydro sites which previously were thought to be uneconomic because of their limited amount of water to produce energy. We should therefore urge that all such sites be reevaluated for Federal development as peaking plants. In many cases, these marginal sites can be made very useful for peaking power by inclusion of pumped storage facilities, which make possible the carrying of large peak loads with very small streamflow, provided, of course, they are operating as part of an adequate base load system.

Hydropower, therefore, can still have a great role in the future of the yardstick. However, the yardstick is under heavy attack. It has been whittled very thin. Unless the people learn the facts, and act to protect their interest as consumers of electricity, public power is not going to increase; it is going to disappear.

The trend began in 1953, when the Hell's Canyon dam site was awarded to the Idaho Power Company. In recent years, well-financed campaigns of misinformation, and the misguided opposition of well-intentioned people who are as devoted to conservation as I am, knocked out Echo Park Dam in Wyoming, Marble Canyon Dam and Hualapai Dam in Arizona, the Dickey-Lincoln Project in Maine, and the greatest of all, the Rampart Project in Alaska.

The power provisions of the Central Arizona bill, recently passed by the Senate, illustrate who is benefiting and who is suffering by the defeat of hydropower. The two Colorado River Dams were deleted from the bill. One of these alone, Hualapai, with pumped storage would have produced 5,000 megawatts of power. In place of the dams, the Senate approved a provision for the Secretary of the Interior to pay $103 million dollars, in advance, to a group of utilities to build a steam plant. In return for this vast expenditure of public money the Government will receive the right to use merely 470 megawatts of power for 50 years, in place of the 5,000 megawatt lost capacity of Hualapai Dam. The Federal Government's cost of money at present is at least 1.1 percent lower than that of private utilities. Thus, the Federal prepayment on the steam plant will represent a subsidy to its owners of at least $1,133,000 a year. Meanwhile, to finance the project minus power dams, the Interior Department will have to raise the rates it charges to preference customers for Hoover Dam power by 48 percent, according to information provided by the Department itself. So the power consumers will suffer, and the utility companies will benefit, from the elimination of these hydropower dams.

Hydropower dams, unlike fossil fuel and nuclear power plants, do not pollute the air with smoke and radioactivity, or the water of our rivers and lakes with heat or radioactive wastes. On the contrary, the reservoirs provide water for municipal purposes, flood control, irrigation, industrial use, and many forms of recreation, including boating, swimming, fishing, etc. Hydropower dams are a renewable resource, and frequently are less destructive to the natural environment than any other form of electric generation. Eliminating hydropower is not a conservation measure.

Conservation consists of the most effective long term use of the resources of nature for the benefit of mankind. It involves respect for mother earth. It does not imply idolizing one value—for instance, the sport of shooting rapids in rubber boats—to the exclusion of all others. It means reverent use, not non-use, of the gifts God has provided to man.

If we are to have more Federal dams, we must take our case to the public. We must describe the dangerous alternatives. We must explain the true meaning of conservation.

The campaign against new dams is only one part of the war against public power.

You all know how the Supplemental Financing Bill, which you worked for so long, failed. It was gutted by the private power lobby, and your own organizations had to request the House Rules Committee to kill it.

Less than 6 weeks ago, the Secretary of the Interior signed the 40 year contract with the Pacific Gas and Electric Company which makes the entire Central Valley Project power system an appendage of the company, freezes the load growth of existing preference customers, excludes the opportunity of other preference customers to obtain the benefits of low-cost Federal power, and subjects the Government and its customers to an intricate set of restrictions that will almost inevitably insure their permanent domination by the Company.

For 4 years I fought, along with several other Members of Congress, to eliminate or modify the many unconscionable features of the contract, some of which were severely criticized by the Federal Power Commission and the Anti-Trust Division of the Department of Justice. Our efforts resulted in various changes which improved the contract in some respects for both the Government and its preference customers.

I am sorry to say, however, that the contract, when it was signed on July 31, was still heavily loaded in the company's favor. Secretary Udall has said we will try to help the various smaller municipalities of Central and Northern California to assure their future power needs at economical cost. However, I have the gravest misgivings that the contract which he signed with the Company, over my objection, will make it most difficult, if not impossible, for the municipalities to develop their own sources for their future power needs, and for the Secretary to be of much help to them.

While the private power companies are ferociously working to curtail any subsidy to you little fellows, the consumer-owned cooperatives, they are at the same time asking bigger subsidies for themselves. They are subsidized already, you know.

I will speak first of the atomic subsidy.

It is in the field of atomic power that the betrayal of the public power yardstick is most tragic. Here is the greatest power source known to man, the energy that lights the stars. By public effort and at public expense it was made available to the world.

The Federal investment in research and development for civilian nuclear power alone already exceeds two billion dollars. Surely here is a resource more truly belonging to the people even than falling water, for the water was always available, but atomic energy remained locked in the nucleus of matter until public effort showed us how to release and use it.

If any resource ought to be subject to a public preference clause, if not to exclusive public use, it is atomic energy.

'There is a preference clause in the Atomic Energy Act. It is weak and worthless. It states that if the AEC produces electric energy, then public bodies and cooperatives shall be preference customers. But if the AEC produces steam, then the preference does not apply, even though the only use of the steam is to turn a generator. And if the AEC sells atomic fuel, as it has been authorized to do since 1964, it must do so under uniform, nondiscriminatory charges. After 1973 it may no longer lease nuclear fuel for power production, but must sell it at a price which provides reasonable compensation to the Government.

What could be fairer than this? It is like that law of France which prohibited rich and poor alike from begging in the streets or sleeping under bridges.

As a result of the present Federal atomic policy, nuclear power is becoming a private monopoly.

Last February the Atomic Energy Commission reported on all central station nuclear power reactors in the United States, including those in service, those under construction, and those contracted for. By the end of 1966, there were thirteen in operation, with a total capacity of 1,846 megawatts. The only large one was at the AEC's Hanford Plant in Washington State, which has a capacity of 786 megawatts. The average capacity of the other twelve plants is only 88 megawatts. Five more stations are scheduled for completion this year. Their average capacity is 196 megawatts. Thirty-two stations have been contracted for completion after 1967. Their average capacity will be 625 megawatts. The average size of the nuclear generating units ordered last year—which is the latest figure in the AEC report—was 790 megawatts. Indeed the smallest plant in the list for future completion is 450 megawatts.

Of course, the economies which result from large generators is the reason for the increasing capacity of new atomic plants. The AEC estimates the cost of production from a 500 megawatt nuclear plant at 4.4 mills per kilowatt hour. TVA has already begun construction of two nuclear plants, each over 1100 megawatts, which will produce energy at a cost of only 2.37 mills per kilowatt hour.

4.4 mill nuclear power may or may not be competitive with coal, but 2.37 mill energy is competitive even with hydropower. But you have to be awfully big to afford a 1100 megawatt plant. TVA is paying $122,700,000 for two of them—plus costs of the transmission plant, contingency allowance, and interest during construction, which run the bill up to $247,000,000—plus $232,000,000 for a twelve-year fuel supply. Significantly, however, even the investment in the plant itself, on a dollars-per-kilowatt basis, will be less than for a comparable coal plant—$116 compared to $117.

The prime component in the next 10 or 15 years will be nuclear energy. I understand that nuclear power was specified for 55 percent of the new generating capacity contracted for in the United States last year. But there are few non-Federal public power agencies or rural co-ops, that are big enough to play in the atomic league.

Of the 20,003 megawatts of total capacity of nuclear power plants under contract for completion after 1967, only TVA's 2,229 megawatts and the Omaha Public Power District 450 megawatts—the smallest plant on the list—will be publicly owned. We almost lost TVA during the '50's when we fought to keep it from being raided by Dixon-Yates and to enable it to build its own steam plants.

The Hanford plant, the only other large publicly owned nuclear power facility in the country, was built by the Atomic Energy Commission to make plutonium for bombs. The Commission considered producing electricity at Hanford itself, but the Congress would have preferred to waste the steam. Only after a bitter fight was this waste prevented, by legislation permitting a group of Washington State public power districts to recycle steam from the cooling water through their generator to produce 786 megawatts of useful power—but then only on condition that they offer 50 percent participation to the private companies. The private power interests today are very strong indeed.

Another example of their strangle-hold is shown in the recent deletion of funds for the proposed Dickey-Lincoln School Dam in Maine. Funds for this first Federal hydroelectric project in the northeast, the nation's highest cost power area, were amended out of this year's Public Works Appropriation bill in the House, with the approving votes of the majority of the New England delegation. It is most significant that the very threat of this project has led to at least five rate reductions from private power companies in Maine.

A more sinister deletion, however, took place in the Committee on Appropriations. The Committee stated on page 75 of its report:

"The Bonneville Power Administration has been conducting a nuclear plant site study in the Pacific Northwest. As the construction of such plants will not be the responsibility of the Federal Government, the Committee expects that hereafter the financing of such studies and planning shall be left entirely to private industry".

This sentence, buried in a 103-page report, not only purports to award nuclear power in the Northwest to the private companies, but would bar the Bonneville Power Administration even from conducting effective comprehensive regional planning.

The very success of the TVA in developing a once poor and backward region has made the private power industry vow never to permit it to happen again; and so far, they have kept their vow. There are no plans to repeat even the Hanford 50 percent public-50 percent private arrangement. Even half a loaf to the public is too much.

A potential new fuel for making electricity is geothermal steam—natural underground steam. Certainly steam under the public lands of the United States is a public resource, that ought to be developed for public benefit, either by the Government itself, or at least by public and cooperative bodies under a preference clause. The Department of the Interior proposed a leasing act to this Congress for geothermal steam. It contains no preference clause. Instead it provides for sale of steam leases to the highest bidder—again pricing the little fellows out of the market.

Almost sixty years ago, in vetoing a bill to give away a hydropower site on the James River in Missouri, President Theodore Roosevelt wrote as follows:

"The people of the country are threatened by a monopoly far more powerful, because it is in far closer touch with their domestic and industrial life, than anything known to our experience. . .

"To give away, without conditions, this, one of the greatest of our resources, would be an act of folly. If we are guilty of it, our children will be forced to pay an annual return upon a capitalization based upon the highest prices which 'the traffic will bear'. They will find themselves face to face with powerful interests intrenched behind the doctrine of 'vested rights' and strengthened by every defense which money can buy and the ingenuity of able corporation lawyers can devise. Long before that time they may and very probably will have become a consolidated interest, controlled from the great financial centers, dictating the terms upon which the citizen can conduct his business or earn his livelihood, and not amenable to the wholesome check of local opinion.

"* * * * *

"I esteem it my duty to use every endeavor to prevent this growing monopoly, the most threatening which has ever appeared, from being fastened upon the people of this nation".

We need another Roosevelt today.

Already electric power is the nation's largest industry. Its capital assets are 60 percent larger than those of the next largest industry—petroleum refining. Twelve percent of all capital invested in business in this country is under the control of the privately-owned electric power utilities. And they grasp for more at the public expense.

The State of New York has a fine power authority, which generates 20 percent of the electricity produced in that State, from the waters of the Niagara and St. Lawrence Rivers. These rivers are now almost fully developed. Logically, to maintain the yardstick, and to retain the public share of the market, the New York Power Authority, like TVA, should begin building nuclear plants.

This is not what the State Administration has proposed. Instead, it proposes to bring power costs down by providing free atomic fuel to the private companies.

Unless an enlightened and outraged public demands otherwise, this may be the ultimate fate of the yardstick—to be replaced by an undisguised subsidy to the private companies—a subsidy which will simply transfer part of their excessive rates from our light bills to our tax bills.

The proportion of Federally-generated power to privately-generated power must be maintained at least it its current level. How can public power survive the establishment of the large regional power pooling combines that are coming to be the predominant pattern of the electric power industry, if public generation does not keep pace with industry expansion? Either we maintain the balance between the private and public sectors of the industry, or the electric industry will become ever more dominated and controlled by the large private monopolies within the next decade.

The second method of protecting the consumer from abuse by the monopolistic electric utilities is through government regulation of rates and services. There is vast room for improvement in this field, both by the State Commissions and by the Federal Power Commission. However, I believe that despite the prior inadequacies of such regulation, we should continue to work to improve and strengthen the regulatory role of both the Federal and State Commissions, and not abandon regulation as a tool for protecting the interests of the consumer.

Most of you are familiar with the efforts made during the last Congress by the private utilities to enact the Holland-Smathers bill which would exempt them from FPC jurisdiction. Most of you are also familiar with the efforts of some of the rural electric cooperatives to obtain similar legislation, although for different motives. I warned that it would be a great mistake for the cooperatives to sponsor this exemption legislation in advance of any ruling by the FPC that would be disadvantageous to the co-ops, and that blanket exemption of the utilities from FPC jurisdiction would destroy hopes for rate reduction for consumers through regulation of electric wholesale rates. The bill was on its way to passage when the great Northeast Blackout of November 9, 1965, occurred. The Blackout graphically demonstrated the interstate character of the electric industry and the need for more regulation, rather than less regulation, and effectively killed the Holland-Smathers bill in the last Congress.

But the private power utilities are not easily discouraged. The Holland-Smathers bill has reappeared in this Congress. It would exempt from Federal regulation, including Federal accounting and disclosure requirements, any electric company "whose facilities are all situated in a single State and are not used to transmit or receive electric energy by direct connection, from or to any other State, or by indirect connection, from or to any other State except for temporary or emergency purposes".

The Florida Power and Light Company, which is one of the principal supporters of the present Holland-Smathers bill, is the largest utility in the State of Florida, with assets of about a billion dollars. It is ninth in revenues, among the almost 3,600 electric systems in the nation. It claims that the "onerous" FPC accounting requirements will force it to raise its rates, and that it is already adequately regulated by the Florida Public Service Commission.

In 1964, Florida Power and Light Company's rate of return was 12.3 percent, the third highest rate of return on invested capital of any power company in the country. In 1965 the Chairman of the Florida regulatory commission testified before the Senate Commerce Committee that in his opinion the best utility regulation "is little or no regulation". In 1966, a newspaper reporter who asked the director of the finance department of the Florida Commission about Florida Power and Light's rate base was told: "Where it is, if it still exists, I don't know". The law of Florida does not provide for any regulation of wholesale rates and service. Thus, if the Holland-Smathers bill should pass, there would be no one to require Florida Power and Light Company to sell electricity to a co-op, and perhaps ultimately, no more co-ops in Florida.

Florida Power and Light is not directly connected to any out-of-state utility. It is connected to Florida Power Corporation, which in turn is connected to the Georgia Power Company. The interchange contract between Florida Power and Light and the Florida Power Corporation is not to be found in either the FPC or the Florida Public Service Commission files. It apparently has never been put in writing. It remains more secret even than Florida Power and Light's rate base.

The new Holland-Smathers bill, although apparently motivated to fit the Florida Power and Light pattern, can also serve as the vehicle for exempting many other private electric utility companies from FPC jurisdiction, simply through the device of setting up a separate corporation to hold title to a substation, or other facility (even merely a 10-foot stretch of wire) at the state boundary, so that the utility is not connected "directly" to facilities in the next state.

The present Holland-Smathers bill also still contains the provision to confer statutory exemption from FPC regulation on co-ops. That provision is now, in any event, unnecessary because the Federal Power Commission recently ruled, in the *Dairyland* case, that it does not have jurisdiction over co-ops. It said they were "government instrumentalities".

I think that whatever may have been the short run gain for co-ops from that decision will be far outweighted by the overall impairment of protection for electric consumers generally, including cooperatives.

There are already examples of these bad consequences.

Recently the City of Paris, Kentucky, asked the FPC to require the Kentucky Utilities Company to wheel power to it which the City purchased from the East Kentucky co-op. "Sorry", the Commission ruled last month, "co-ops are government instrumentalities, and we cannot require a private utility to wheel government power". When the Colorado-Ute coal plant built with REA financing in Hayden, Colorado, was declared illegal by the Colorado Supreme Court, the co-ops sought to invoke the protection of the Federal Power Act. However, the FPC said, "Sorry, we have no jurisdiction over co-ops", and it rejected the co-ops' petition.

There will be many more instances, I fear, in which rural electric cooperatives will be unable to obtain the benefits of FPC protection because of the "governmental instrumentalities no jurisdiction" rule of the *Dairyland* case. This subject needs some more re-thinking by all of us.

Perhaps the remedy may come in the proposed Power Reliability Act which the FPC sent to Congress after the PJM Blackout of last June in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Maryland and Delaware which affected 13 million people.

In my opinion, the FPC bill offers a sound approach to the problem of reliability and adequacy of power planning and power transmission. However, as I studied the FPC bill I found a number of oversights or defects which should be corrected. Therefore, on August 14, I introduced a revised bill (H.R. 12322) which would, in my judgment, remedy those deficiencies.

The purpose of this legislation is not merely to prevent more cascading power failures. It is also designed to assure, in accordance with the national policy adopted 32 years ago, that there will be an abundant supply of electric energy throughout the United States, with the maximum possible economy and with due regard to the proper utilization and conservation of natural resources. This bill would also clarify the Congressional mandate to the Federal Power Commission to consider esthetic and historic values in carrying out its regulatory duties concerning electric power.

The FPC bill, and to a greater extent my bill, views the electric power industry as one nationwide public utility, consisting of all the local generating and transmission entities, including the public, private, and cooperative segments thereof. Both bills require organization of the industry into regional councils to plan, coordinate, and provide the most reliable, efficient, and economic service to all the people of the region, regardless of who provides retail distribution service, and to exchange and coordinate power with neighboring regions.

Strong interconnection between adequate generation is the key to power reliability in areas of heavy energy consumption. Every one of the 18 cascading power failures starting with the great Northeast Blackout of November 9, 1965, occurred because of inadequate interconnections. The Holland-Smathers bill in addition to its many other faults, would discourage interconnection, and hence decrease reliability. The Electric Power Reliability bill would help strengthen interconnections and thus increase the reliability of electric power systems.

Both the FPC bill and my bill seek to achieve these objectives by voluntary cooperation of the various managements within the regions. Both bills require that the regional councils be open to membership by all segments of the power industry so that all plans developed by the regional councils will be the product of all the power systems, including the public, private, and cooperative power networks within the same region.

My bill corrects an oversight in the FPC bill to provide for participation, on a voluntary basis, by State regulatory commissions as well as the utilities, in regional council work. Both bills empower the FPC to compel participation in council work by recalcitrant generating and transmission entities; however, my bill adds an explicit provision requiring such entities also to share reasonably in the council's expenses. Both bills provide that the FPC may review, and, if necessary, revise regional council plans; but both provide that the plans are to be developed in the first instance by the local utilities of the region.

The FPC bill provides that those who act pursuant to a regional plan shall be immune from suits for damages and injunctive relief under the antitrust laws by those who are hurt by such actions. I think such grant of immunity from suit under the antitrust laws would be a dangerous weakening of the protections against arbitrary monopoly actions. Furthermore, I believe the courts are a better forum than the FPC to resolve disputes under the antitrust laws. Hence, my bill does not authorize the FPC, by its approval of the plans of the regional councils, to confer antitrust immunity.

Both bills contemplate the establishment of mandatory reliability criteria by the FPC for bulk power supply facilities, which may be of nationwide or regional applicability. These criteria would be promulgated only after consultation with the regional councils, and may, in fact, be developed in the first instance by the councils. My bill differs in only two words from the FPC bill concerning reliability standards. I say the Commission "shall" promulgate regulations setting forth reliability criteria; and the FPC bill says it "may." Clearly, the criteria must be promulgated, and my bill explicitly so provides.

The FPC bill recognizes that the construction and operation of extra-high-voltage lines, those over 200,000 volts, will involve esthetic values. I want to provide increased protection to these values.

The FPC bill would authorize the FPC to appoint advisory coordination review boards, but does not explicitly encourage the appointment of persons interested in conservation and esthetics to those advisory boards. My bill will do so.

In addition, my bill expressly prohibits the grant of rights-of-way for extra-high-voltage power lines in national parks, national monuments, national battlefields, historic sites, and all other areas administered by the National Park Service, except three types of areas. The excepted areas are national parkways, which are narrow strips hundreds of miles long, and two varieties of recreation areas which frequently surround existing power dams and do not have preservation of the natural environment as their primary purpose.

My bill also goes beyond the FPC bill by authorizing the administering agency of Federal land to veto a proposed EHV power line over Federal lands, not only on the ground that it would endanger aesthetic or historic values but also if it would endanger identified species of flora or fauna. I have also added a provision to clarify that the Electric Power Reliability Act will not supersede the Wilderness Act in any way.

Both the FPC bill and my bill require review by the FPC before extra-high-voltage transmission lines may be built. One reason is to provide a forum for reviewing the aesthetic consequences of proposals such as Potomac Edison's plan to run an EHV line near Antietam battlefield in Maryland. The other reason is technological. The FPC will have an opportunity to determine whether the EHV line is adequate to do the job for which it is intended, whether it will increase the reliability of service at both its terminal, as it should, or increase the chances of cascading failures, as it should not.

My bill goes another step beyond the FPC bill, and makes extra-high-voltage lines true public utilities, giving to every electric entity the right to increase the capacity of such lines, by whomever owned, at its own expense and subject to FPC regulation and technological review, and to participate in joint use of such lines. This addition to the bill is important, both esthetically and economically, because it will reduce the need for unsightly and costly paralleling facilities. It recognizes the fact, which is far too frequently overlooked, that transmissions lines are part of this Nation's transportation system.

I have revised greatly the FPC bill's provision for granting rights-of-way across Federal lands for EHV lines. Under my bill rights-of-way over Federal land may be granted for a limited term, not in excess of 50 years; or for an unlimited duration. However, if the right-of-way is granted for an unlimited duration, then the FPC will have continuing jurisdiction at intervals of not less than 10 years to add to or change the conditions of the right-of-way grants.

The FPC bill makes no provision for payment to the United States for use of its land. Mine does.

The FPC bill completely overlooks Indian rights in Indian reservations. The Indians, rather than the Government, are the true owners of the reservations, many of which were set up by solemn treaty guaranteeing that no one would ever be permitted to reside or cross over them without the Indian's consent. My bill requires Indian consent before any EHV right-of-way can be granted through an Indian reservation, and, when consent is given, it requires the utility to pay the Indians for the use of their lands.

My bill, as does the FPC bill, authorizes the FPC, on its own motion, to compel interconnections between power systems—again giving priority to efficient public service for the consumers of a region. My bill, however, goes further, requiring each entity, public or private, to wheel power for other entities to the extent of excess capacity in its lines. For this service, it would, of course, be entitled to fair compensation.

I have added provisions to the FPC bill at several places to insure that the public receives notice of what is proposed and has access to information on file. Thus, when a statement of organization of a regional council, or a regional plan, is filed, my bill requires the FPC to give notice of the filing in the Federal Register, whereas the FPC bill requires such notice only in case of an EHV transmission line proposal. Furthermore, under my bill, all filings which are permitted or required to be made will be available for public inspection, including coordination contracts, such as for joint ownership or operation of generators and transmission lines.

I have also included a new section in my bill directing the Federal Power Commission to survey existing and planned extra-high-voltage testing laboratories in the United States and to report to Congress within 1 year whether any action is needed to provide more laboratories and to make them available to all persons desiring to test their EHV facilities. At the present time there are only two laboratories in this country, in contrast to 20 abroad, able to test extra-high-voltage equipment under operating conditions. Both American laboratories are maintained by individual manufacturers for their own use. I need not stress the hazard that inadequately tested equipment presents to reliable service.

I cannot predict when this bill will be enacted. A few more blackouts may hasten its enactment. But of this I am sure—that the national need for maximum reliability of electric service will inevitably demand the enactment of this bill, or similar legislation.

In the meantime, as consumers who want low cost power, you must work together to make sure that the economies of large-scale generation and transmission will be passed on to the consumer instead of into the salaries of company officials and the dividends of company stockholders. You must work to strengthen the governmental tools for protecting the consumer's interest. This includes both improved regulation of the monopolistic utilities, and the maintenance and strengthening of the yardstick of competition resulting from the availability of low cost public power. You must participate in all the benefits of pooling, and not permit the public and cooperative sectors of the electric industry to be smothered by private power domination of the benefits of large-scale generation and transmission.

The East River Electric Power Cooperative has been one of the great leaders in the continuing battle to protect the consumer. With the Basin Electric Power Cooperative, which shares your capable president Arthur Jones, East River has been in the forefront of the fight to develop the upper Missouri River Basin.

I applaud your pioneering efforts to utilize the great lignite resources of North Dakota for the maximum benefit of the people of this area. In your efforts to assure your future power supply, you have steadfastly endeavored to develop regional power coordination for maximum efficiency and economy. Your work to intertie the lignite fields of North Dakota with the power systems of Nebraska and Kansas will undoubtedly result in increased regional advantages that will greatly benefit your members, the region, and the nation too.

I share your disappointments over the way the Rural Electrification Administration handled the Minnkota loan, and the demise of the Supplemental Financing Bill in this Congress. I am confident, however, that you will maintain your alertness to the opportunities and the dangers that lie ahead for the consumer of electric power as the industry continues its massive expansion in the next decade.

I pledge to you that I shall continue to work with you in your efforts to provide consumers all the electricity they desire, at the lowest possible cost, and with the maximum possible reliability of service.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I rise to commend the chairman and the members of the Senate Appropriations Committee, particularly the chairman and members of the Public Works Subcommittee, for the outstanding job they have done on what is a very tough bill.

There are so many meritorious and necessary projects throughout the Nation that deciding which ones should be included this year and which deferred is like trying to decide which of your own children should be helped first.

The committee shouldered a particularly heavy burden at this time when our Government is faced with rising expenditures, huge deficits, and calls for tax increases.

The bill before us represents America's annual installment on needed river, harbor, flood control, water supply, irrigation, power, and beach erosion projects. It represents economic investment so essential to America's future growth.

Every project authorized for construction has met the test of providing more than $1 of benefits for every dollar of annual cost. In most cases, States or local interests must furnish cash or land or maintenance or make some other contribution to the cost.

Construction projects have been subjected to an intricate, time-consuming procedure including congressional review in authorizing legislation and in the appropriation review process.

These projects create jobs for Americans. They preserve, conserve, or develop our natural resources and so are vital to the economic development of our Nation. They are also vital to the saving of lives and property in America. Like so many essential functions, public works projects are not often glamorous. But they are tremendously important to the economic, and in many cases to the physical, well-being of the American people.

Every year, some Americans lose their lives, some have their homes ruined or destroyed, and some their businesses injured or wiped out by rampaging floodwaters. Year by year, ships get larger and maritime trade increases, requiring bigger, deeper harbors and rivers to accommodate them. Annually the demand for water supplies and power rises as our population grows. More Americans mean more food must be produced, and irrigation works such as included in this bill are needed to make land arable. With growing affluence and growing leisure, Americans are flocking to the Nation's shorelines, where beaches must be protected against erosion, lest valuable acreage be lost to sea.

It is highly regrettable that America has not made greater progress in harnessing its water resources, improving its harbors, controlling flood waters, and conserving its shorelines. And it is a shame that circumstances prevent pushing ahead faster this year.

I want to express special appreciation for the committee's action in including $200,000 to build a harbor of refuge at Honokahau, Hawaii, for the Kailua-Kona area. Many boatowners and operators earn their livelihood by hiring out to sport fishermen. Many others in the community also earn their livelihood by serving sport fishermen and their families who come to Kona, one of the finest deep-sea fishing areas in the world.

But skippers live in constant fear their boats, representing heavy investments, will be damaged or destroyed in the existing unprotected harbor. A few weeks ago, a sudden surge snapped the mooring line of one boat, and it was smashed beyond salvage on a nearby reef, a total loss estimated at $20,000. Many times when storms hit Kona, captains and their crews have to take their boats to sea to ride out the storm or try to find refuge in the nearest harbor 40 miles away.

So the proposed Honokahau Harbor is urgently needed. It has a benefit-cost ratio of 2.3 to 1. The President did not request funds for Honokahau, nor did the House of Representatives include such funds in H.R. 11641. Nevertheless, I hope the Senate conferees will insist upon funds for this needed project.

I also want to express appreciation to the committee for including preconstruction planning funds for needed small-boat harbors at Heeia-Kea, Oahu, and Reeds Bay, on the Island of Hawaii. Both of these are needed to serve rapidly growing areas. Heeia-Kea, for which $34,000 were recommended, has a benefit-cost ratio of 5.5 to 1. Reeds Bay, for which $35,000 were recommended, has a benefit-cost ratio of 2.2 to 1. Thus, both are well justified.

Mr. President, before I conclude, I would like to refer to one project vital to Hawaii which was deferred beyond the 1968 fiscal year. I refer to the authorized project for erosion control at Waikiki Beach.

This project has the extraordinarily high benefit-cost ratio of 15.9 to 1, one of the highest ratios for any project of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

The need for the project is based primarily on economics, not on personal pleasure or convenience of sunbathers and surfers as some people might wrongly assume. The industry involved is tourism, Hawaii's biggest source of private income next to agriculture. It is the fastest growing industry in the Islands and it has the greatest growth potential of any industry in the foreseeable future.

Waikiki is the physical heart of Hawaii's tourism. Of the 16,000 hotel rooms throughout the State, 11,000 are located in Waikiki. Economists estimate one hotel room generates about 1.5 jobs in directly associated employment. It generates even more jobs in indirectly associated employment.

Estimates show the Waikiki hotels generate about 15 percent of Hawaii's total civilian labor force of approximately 280,000. Counting dependents, more than 59,000 persons—almost 10 percent of our civilian resident population—are supported through tourism in Waikiki's existing hotel facilities.

This year, Hawaii may be host to nearly 1 million visitors, a record number. Most of them will stay at least part of their time at Waikiki Beach. By 1975, we may have 3 million visitors. Waikiki is expanding its facilities to house and serve these rapidly growing numbers of tourists. New hotel construction is providing jobs for construction workers, not counted in the employment figures I have cited.

Unless Waikiki Beach retains its attractiveness to visitors, Hawaii's economy, with its heavy reliance on tourism, will suffer and jobs for thousands of workers in Hawaii will be in jeopardy.

The State of Hawaii strongly supports work on the Waikiki Beach erosion control project. Hundreds of thousands of dollars have been appropriated by the State legislature for work on the Kuhio beach segment of the project. The State is moving ahead on this segment.

In April this year, the Hawaii State Senate approved a resolution urging appropriation of preconstruction planning funds for the Waikiki Beach project. This involves an estimated $82,000 to complete advance engineering.

The Hawaii Senate resolution refers to a new factor which has entered the picture since Congress authorized the Waikiki Beach erosion control project in 1965. Waikiki Beach has become very important as a recreation center for military personnel on rest and recuperation leave from Vietnam. An estimated 75,000 military personnel are expected to spend rest and recuperation leave in Hawaii each year.

In addition, 25,000 wives and other family members are expected to journey to Hawaii at their own expense to visit those on rest and recuperation. Almost all stay in or near Waikiki and use the beach facilities, primarily in the Fort DeRussy area.

The chairman of the Army Advisory Committee of Hawaii, Mr. Hung Wai Ching, in a letter dated July 24, wrote that Waikiki continues to be the most popular area for servicemen on rest and recuperation leave from Vietnam. He explained:

> The limited space on the beach, which is packed so tightly with people that it is even difficult to walk about, denies these men the real potential for recreational purposes.

Congress has just recognized the need to improve facilities at Fort DeRussy by approving the military construction authorization bill with $7,132,000 for the Army to build troop billets and support facilities there. The beach serving Fort DeRussy should also be improved.

With the influx of military personnel using the beach area and with sharply rising numbers of tourists in Waikiki, it is imperative that work proceed as fast as possible toward widening, improving, and protecting Waikiki Beach.

I can understand the committee's deferral of funds for Waikiki Beach as the President did not request the funds for the 1968 fiscal year.

I urge the President to include funds for Waikiki erosion control in his 1969 budget requests.

This is not a frivolous project, but a very necessary one. It will return at least $15.90 in benefits for every dollar of cost. So it is good economics as well as good conservation.

In conclusion, again I want to express particular appreciation to the chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee [Mr.

Ellender] and to the ranking minority member of the Senate Appropriations Committee [Mr. Young] for their understanding and support of projects needed for Hawaii.

FOR RELIEF OF UNDEVELOPED COUNTRIES

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, an organization known as Midwest Farmers in a Hungry World will meet at Morningside College, Sioux City, Iowa, on October 19, 1967.

I have received from the chairman of the Midwest Farmers in the Hungry World organization a letter in which I was asked certain questions. The questions, in substance, are: Will the United States expand, lessen, or maintain at its present level the food relief that it is sending to undeveloped countries in the world?

Mr. President, I shall read my answer to that letter:

> I received your letter of September 25 and the questionnaire attached to it.
>
> My own opinion is that within the reasonably foreseeable future, the Congress will not expand the shipment of food relief to the undeveloped countries of the world. Expressions have been made repeatedly in the Foreign Relations Committee while considering the Foreign Aid Bill that in face of the financial stringency resulting from unjustified spending practices and the Vietnam War, the practical emptiness of our surplus food bins, and because the recipient nations of our food relief have not made reasonable progress in increasing their own food production, the Congress will be reluctant to increase the moneys expended for the food relief program. It is my opinion that if a change is to be made it will be to give less rather than more for food relief.
>
> India is especially pointed out as seemingly feeling that it can remain substantially indifferent to its failure to produce adequate food because of its conviction that the United States will continue its generous help. The argument is made that by the course we are following we are not in truth helping but hindering the solution of the problem.
>
> Some day these recipient countries must make substantial progress in producing their own food and reducing their enormous population growth. So long as they keep getting food from us as a gift, an inducement exists for them to be neglectful and unmindful of the discipline that normally comes to human beings through the compelling force of need.

Necessity is a powerful teacher. There is no stronger doctrine than that which comes from necessity.

I continue to read from the letter:

> The United States will want to help the hungry but in the genuine meaning of the term "help." If we in truth are not helping but merely postponing the arrival of the crucial time when these countries must by their self-help aid in the solving of the problem, the views will be to modify our program so as to compel these nations to become conscious of their own responsibility.

Mr. President, I believe that the nations of the world have reached the judgment that they need not give concern to solving their own problems because they are convinced that, regardless of what they do, the United States will help them.

The United States is sympathetic in wanting to help hungry people around the world, but while we approach the problem of want in that light, it would be imprudent and inhumane to induce those countries to abandon any idea of helping themselves.

Past experience has demonstrated that no nation in the history of the world has been as desirous of helping the needy and those in want as the United States has demonstrated.

I repeat what I stated:

> If we in truth are not helping but merely postponing the arrival of the crucial time when these countries must by their self-help aid in the solving of the problem, the views will be to modify our program so as to compel these nations to become conscious of their own responsibility.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that Mr. Fuqua, of Florida, had been appointed as an additional manager on the part of the House at the conference on the bill (H.R. 8718) to increase the annual Federal payment to the District of Columbia and to provide a method for computing the annual borrowing authority for the general fund of the District of Columbia.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 678) to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Upper and Lower Chehalis Tribes of Indians in Claims Commission docket numbered 237, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11456) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. Boland, Mr. McFall, Mr. Yates, Mr. Mahon, Mr. Minshall, Mr. Jonas, and Mr. Bow were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12474) making appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. Evins of Tennessee, Mr. Boland, Mr. Shipley, Mr. Giaimo, Mr. Marsh, Mr. Pryor, Mr. Mahon, Mr. Jonas, Mr. Minshall, Mr. Wyman, Mr. Talcott, and Mr. Bow were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 985) for the relief of Warren F. Coleman, Jr.

SLOW BUSINESS PACE ARGUES AGAINST TAX INCREASE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, a survey of the Nation's purchasing agents just conducted discloses some interesting intelligence on whether or not we should pass a tax increase now.

First, they express serious disappointment about the performance of the economy for the past 3 months, and generally agree that it fell below their expectations. Second, they do not see the economy picking up in the next 3 months or so. Third, the express optimism about the economic outlook for next year.

To me, Mr. President this suggests a strong expectation that the economy probably will not need to have a tax increase to stem a too exuberant growth in the coming year or so. I say this because the best basis for economic policy is the hard, verifiable facts of the economy at the moment as we can see them, weigh them, measure them. And these the purchasing agents find disappointing.

In other words the economy has not been too booming, it has been too sluggish. This we know. It is not predicted, guessed at, estimated. It is certain, established, history.

Second, the short-term outlook is by far the easiest to predict, and the Nation's purchasing agents are in a strategic position to predict it. Their prediction for the short term is for more of the same—more sluggishness, hardly the basis for an economy depressing tax increase.

But how about the long-term outlook? How about next year? After all that is precisely the period for which the tax increase is to be effective. The purchasing agents are optimistic about the economy's performance in 1968.

First, Mr. President, we should be aware of feebleness of long-term predictions. Here is where all men are fallible. Whether they are purchasing agents, trained economists, or U.S. Senators, we just do not know. The National Bureau of Economic Research recently made a study of economic forecasting and found that short-range forecasting was reasonably reliable, but that long-range forecasting was anything but.

But let us assume that the purchasing agents are right, and that 1968 will be a good economic year. Does this suggest that the economy needs a tax hike to slow it down?

After all, what is wrong with economic growth? Perhaps we will get the unemployment rate down below 3½ percent. What would be wrong with that?

Good economic conditions, a healthy increase in demand would have to go a long way from the present to begin to put real inflationary demand pressure on this economy of ours.

We have the available manpower—with factory workers—working close to the shortest hours in 6 years. We have ample factory facilities with our vast manufacturing facilities producing at less than 85 percent capacity far below the optimum rate at which costs are lowest and profits best.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article from yesterday's Washington Post headlined "Business Pace Disappointing" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURCHASING AGENTS SURVEY: "BUSINESS PACE DISAPPOINTING"

A survey of the Nation's purchasing agents has revealed widespread disappointment with the general level of business during the third quarter.

The National Association of Purchasing Agents reported yesterday that 43 per cent of the purchasing executives surveyed said that third quarter business fell below their expectations, while only 12 per cent said business was better than they thought it would be.

For the future, the purchasers said they foresee no dramatic surges in business indicators that ordinarily reflect expansion of the economy, but they expressed "strong concern" about inflation of commodity prices.

The degree of disappointment with the third quarter results can best be appraised, the Association said, by comparing responses with those of recent years. Last year 21 per cent said the third quarter exceeded expectations and 17 per cent said it fell below them. In 1965, the figures were 26 per cent and 10 percent, and in 1964 they were 30 per cent and 6 per cent.

Although 35 per cent said they were "optimistic" about business for the next 12 months, compared with only 27 per cent a year ago, the purchasers give few specifics to support their feeling.

Higher new orders and production were reported by 42 per cent for September, but this was regarded as normal for the season. Inventory liquidation remained unchanged, with 1 per cent fewer purchasers reporting lower stocks for their companies during September, as compared with August, and 15 per cent noting higher inventories.

Buyers of production materials reported that they had shortened their forward commitments, indicating, possible concern over labor negotiations. The level of orders for new capital equipment and plant construction was reported to be following the "drifting" trend that has prevailed since the mid-1966 peak and the Association said purchasers showed "concern about utilizing capacity now coming on stream."

The survey found that 62 per cent of the purchasers paid higher prices for commodities during September than during August. This was the second highest surge in the last 11 years, topped only by that at the inflationary peak of last year.

Just four months ago, the Association said, only 15 per cent reported a month-to-month increase in commodity prices.

SENATE'S FAILURE TO RATIFY HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS MAKES U.S. RATIFICATION OF U.N. CHARTER AN EMPTY GESTURE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the stinging indictment Lord Byron delivered upon Wellington has contemporary relevance to the Senate's inaction on the human rights conventions:

> Never had mortal man such opportunity, except Napoleon, or abused it more.

This Senate has balked time and again on one of the most crucial questions of this century—the inherent rights and dignity of man.

The Senate, almost as if to expiate this body's guilt over our predecessor's failure to vitalize the League of Nations, overwhelmingly ratified the United Nations Charter in 1945. By ratifying the U.N. Charter, the Senate pledged the United States to uphold "the dignity and worth of the human person."

But since that pledge was made, the Senate has continuously reneged, reneged on our pledge to the people of the United States, and reneged on our promise to all mankind. We have failed to ratify a single human rights convention, signed by U.S. Ambassadors and supported by U.S. Presidents.

The Senate's failure to support these legal instruments whose aims are identical with our own national goals has been the cause of both national shame and international disillusionment.

All Americans have these rights and we are grateful for them. There is nothing alien or un-American about guaranteeing the right to live, the right to be free from forced labor or slavery, or the right of women to participate freely in political life.

The Senate has embarrassed the United States. The Senate has hurt the credibility of our Nation. This body's reluctance to ratify conventions establishing minimal standards of human dignity puts the United States in the comparable position of a Silas Marner sermon on "Personal Generosity" or Marie Antionette lecturing on "The Evils of Opulence."

We have said to the young nations—60 in the past 25 years—"you ratify, you participate, you observe. As for me, I am content to give lipservice."

Let the Senate restore the international credibility of the United States. Let the Senate fulfill the pledge made by an earlier Senate to the United Nations by ratifying the Conventions on Forced Labor, Freedom of Association, Genocide, Political Rights of Women, and Slavery.

L. B. J. DESERVES CREDIT FOR SUSPENDING PUBLIC WORKS SPENDING

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, President Johnson deserves solid credit for putting a freeze on new spending commitments for public works projects.

For months, leading Members of Congress have pleaded with the administration to reduce spending. The President is now doing exactly that. And he is making the reductions precisely where he should be making them, without penalizing public welfare programs or the national security. Criticism of the President's action by Members of Congress is grossly inconsistent.

News that the Pentagon is deferring contract awards on some $350 million in military construction projects and an unspecified amount in civil construction followed by Budget Director Schultze's statement that the freeze has been made effective throughout the Government, were, indeed, encouraging developments.

This spending freeze imposed by the administration should not be designed to put pressure on Congress to approve the President's tax surcharge proposal. It should indicate a more sensible approach to our current economic problems. The spending suspension can be maintained as long as the administration is concerned with the threat of inflation and high interest rates in lieu of a tax increase.

Cutting back on public works and other low priority expenditures makes much more economic sense than raising taxes. I have stressed the opinion many times that the tax increase would have a repressive effect on the economy without putting an effective lid on inflation.

Elimination of low priority expenditures is far less risky to our economic growth in the event that pressures from excess demand do not materialize.

The speed with which the President acted demonstrates how promptly the administration can act on spending reductions. It can act just as quickly to restore spending when the economic conditions warrant it. Speed is the attribute of the spending-cut route that makes it far superior to the tax-increase route.

The tax surcharge was proposed by the President 1 year ago. It was proposed in January. Congress still has not acted on it, and chances of its taking action at all this year appear extremely dim. Furthermore, when and if a tax surcharge is imposed, it will have a 2-year life. There would be little chance of rescinding it sooner if economic conditions should warrant it. A spending freeze can be rescinded instantly.

What a contrast with the speed with which the President can suspend and restore spending.

PUBLIC WORKS AND ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11641) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission, the Delaware River Basin Commission, Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Water Resources Council, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

WHY PROXMIRE WILL VOTE AGAINST THE PUBLIC WORKS BILL

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I want to say, as the Senate begins consideration of the public works appropriation bill, it is a bill which I consider a travesty of rational economic management and economy in Government.

With the prospect of a huge Federal

deficit—possibly of the magnitude of $29 billion—and a proposal by the President for a tax increase, it is high time that the Congress faced up to its responsibilities in budgetary control. I am well aware that many of these projects are politically important to Members of Congress, but, more important, this year should be the achievement of sufficient budgetary cuts to avoid a tax increase. And no area invites cuts as much as public works.

The fact is that, even if the Federal Government were not pressed for funds, many of these programs should be postponed, if not eliminated. I have been calling the attention of the Senate each day to the unanimous testimony received by the Joint Economic Committee's Subcommittee on Economy in Government to the effect that the Government's present evaluation of public works projects has led to gross overinvestment in this area.

In testimony which I found to be quite startling, three economic experts told the subcommittee that virtually the entire economics profession agree—an unusual situation in itself—that the administration is grossly misallocating resources by underpricing capital. This unfortunate situation has developed because the Government computes the cost of most public works at much too low a rate of interest. At the present time, the rate used is about 3⅛ percent—the rate today is about 3¼ percent—calculated on the basis of the average coupon rate on outstanding long-term Government bonds. All of the economists told the subcommittee that this method made no sense in economic terms, since the rate used was recording past history.

The economists all agreed that a better economic allocation of resources would be achieved if the Government used the private "opportunity cost" of capital in making investment decisions. On this basis they judged that the rate applied should be at least 10 percent and perhaps 15 percent. In other words, these economic experts told the subcommittee that the Federal Government was wasting resources by taking funds from the private sector which would be expected to yield a much higher return.

If we applied the private "opportunity cost" of capital—a 10- to 15-percent rate—to the investments proposed in this bill, most of it would not survive this market test. This contention has been substantiated by figures I have just received from the Deputy Under Secretary for Programs at the Department of the Interior. At my request, his staff calculated the benefit-cost ratios at an "opportunity cost" rate of 10 percent for reclamation projects on which construction was initiated in fiscal year 1966 or 1967.

I have a table showing the resulting benefit-cost ratios and the ratios at 3⅛ percent, and I also have a table showing similar calculations for a number of Corps of Engineers projects, which I ask unanimous consent to be included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERIOR

Project	Benefit-cost ratios (100-year period of analysis)	
	3⅛ percent	10 percent
Bonneville unit, Utah	1.8	0.6
Bostwick Park, Colo	2.2	.7
Grand Coulee 3d powerplant, Washington	3.2	.9
Garrison Diversion unit, North Dakota-South Dakota	2.2	.7

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

[Dollar amounts in millions]

Project	3⅛ percent	Cost	10 percent
Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma	1.5	$585.0	0.66
Ouachita and Black Rivers, Ark. and La	1.4	90.6	.56
Marysville Reservoir, Calif	1.5	143.0	.48
Cross Florida Barge Canal, Fla	1.1	145.3	.36
Kaskaskia River (navigation), Illinois	1.2	68.0	.48
Missouri River levee system, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska	1.16	101.7	.42
Kaysinger Bluff Reservoir, Mo	1.2	196.0	.37
Stockton Reservoir, Mo	1.3	66.1	.37
R. D. Bailey (Justice) Lake, W. Va	1.1	76.6	.31

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this table shows how a number of multimillion dollar projects which are now being funded would bear a ratio of costs exceeding benefits by enormous amounts. In some cases costs are two, or even three, times higher than benefits, when the rate of returned typical in the private economy is applied.

What this table means is that these hundreds of millions of dollars have been wasted. If the Government had not taken money by taxes from the private economy to spend on these projects, the growth of the economy, the incomes of millions of Americans, would be higher, and higher by hundreds of millions. Applied to all public works projects of the Federal Government, the cost to the American taxpayer in literally wasted spending is in the billions and it is embodied in the bill before us today, which is why I will vote against it.

Let me cite examples of a few cost benefit studied to illustrate my point:

One of the most recent and thorough studies of rates of return to education—"An Economic Analysis of Earnings and School," by Dr. Giora Hanock—showed that the returns from the education of white males are "considerably higher than rates of interest in the market and somewhat higher than average rates of return generally estimated for nonhuman capital." For example, the marginal rate for high school was about 16 percent in the North and 19 percent in the South. In the case of college training—to graduation—the returns were 12 and 11 percent, respectively. Although the estimates of rates of return to nonwhites were lower and less reliable, they were still substantial.

In the poverty area, a recent study made by the Office of Economic Opportunity—using most realistic assumptions—indicates that benefit-cost ratios from Job Corps training are greater than 1. And here I want to underscore the point that the OEO study used much more realistic discount rates—7 and 5 percent—than 3⅛ percent applied to public works projects.

In fact, the study makes some highly interesting comparisons between benefit-cost ratios for the Job Corps and for several water resource projects which the Army Corps of Engineers has recently advanced. Benefit-cost ratios were computed using the same interest rate, 3⅛ percent, which is used for public works projects. The benefit-cost ratio for the Job Corps was 1.9, compared to ratios of 1.5 for the "Upper Missouri-Yankton Navy project," and 1.3 for both the "Lake Erie-Ohio River project" and the "Red River below Denison Project." When some allowance for indirect benefits of the Job Corps training was made, the benefit-cost ratio was raised to 2.1.

A recent study published by the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Program Coordination concerning the adult basic education program stated:

> It is estimated that each $1 million expended on the current program will yield total quantifiable benefits of $8.8 million. Although a benefit-cost ratio of 8.8 to 1 for the program may seem rather large, it should be noted that this amount to an average lifetime benefit per person of less than $3,000.

In this study, it is highly significant that the rate used to discount future benefits was 8 percent—more than twice the 3⅛ percent used in the case of public works.

An early benefit-cost analysis of manpower training programs by Dr. Michael Borus indicated that the ratio from the standpoint of the individual was "somewhere between 3.2—the ratio at a 15-percent discount—and 6.2—the ratio at a 5-percent discount." A more recent study, undertaken by Dr. Garth Mangum, revealed that 68 percent of the completers had been employed in the post-training period and that their median hourly earnings were significantly higher after training than before—$1.74 after compared to $1.44 before.

A further factor in comparing the relative costs and benefits of investments in human resources and public works is the problem of measuring indirect benefits. In public works projects, virtually all of the benefits are quantifiable, and, accordingly, the cost-benefit calculus gives quite an accurate picture of their worth. On the other hand, many of the benefits from human resource programs are indirect and nonquantifiable, although nonetheless real and beneficial to society. For example, the Job Corps may yield benefits to society as a whole, through subsequent reductions in public assistance payments and other welfare payments or in the costs of law enforcement, delinquency, or crime. If these indirect benefits were measured, investment in human resources would appear even more worthwhile relative to public works.

In economic terms, it would hardly make sense to pass this bill and then cut funds out of the poverty areas, as some have proposed. Instead of talking about whether we can afford guns and butter, the latter apparently referring to our meager poverty expenditures, it is time to ask whether we can afford guns and public works.

I think this bill is a real test of whether the Congress can effectively control expenditures. Our subcommittee hearings on the planning, programing, budgeting system—which I have referred to previously—received a substantial body of testimony amounting to an indictment of the present budgetary process. Prof. Otto Davis of Carnegie-Mellon University Graduate School of Industrial Administration, said that he and two other professors have developed model equations to predict the budget as requested by the President and as finally appropriated by the Congress. These equations were tested for the years 1948 to 1963 for almost all the nondefense agencies of the Federal Government. While there were exceptions, Professor Davis told the committee that, in general, the equations fit the data very well. In fact, the computer did a better job of predicting congressional action on appropriations than on Presidential budget requests.

The reason the computer could be so accurate is that it calculated projections on the basis of what Professor Davis called "creeping incrementalism." In other words, it assumed that budgets were determined by such attitudes as, "Just ask for a bit more than we got this year" and "Just give them a little less than they asked for." Professor Davis concluded that, between 1948 and 1963, there was insufficient consideration of goals, alternatives, and whether programs were meeting their objectives, and that the budget process could stand considerable improvement.

Fortunately, he has not quite given up hope and proposed that Congress be replaced by a computer as yet, although I think, on the basis of his testimony, it would be a fair conclusion to say that between 1948 and 1963 we might just as well have used the computer and disposed of action by Congress on appropriation bills.

The truth of his thesis is clearly demonstrated by the public works bill before us today. When we compare the President's requests with the amounts in the present bill, it is apparent that the Congress has abdicated effective budgetary control. The President proposed $4,867,813,000 for the programs under consideration; the public works bill passed by the House calls for $4,622,922,000 in new appropriations, and the Senate bill for $4,776,064,000. And, if we go down the list of items, we find that each one is virtually unchanged. In other words, the Congress is not exercising independent judgment, but simply applying an attitude of "Give them a little less than they asked for."

With the country facing serious problems at home and abroad, and with a mounting deficit and the possibility of a tax increase confronting us, it is essential that the Congress do a better job in controlling the budget and ordering our national priorities. A first step would be a vote against this extravagant, wasteful bill. We need a reduction in expenditures right now. The reevaluation of projects before us, with a discount rate of 10 percent, would greatly postpone many expenditures.

I am aware that the requirement to use correct interest rates on next year's budget submissions is likely to produce changes in estimated costs and benefits on many programs. But now is the time to cut these programs down. Since the administration is hesitant to make any specific recommendations, we must act on our own, and our action should come from informed judgment based on a realistic knowledge of the economic consequences.

Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as the Senator knows, whenever a project is considered by the Corps of Engineers, the secondary benefits which will accrue in the future are not considered; it is only the anticipated primary benefits that will result, from construction of the project that are considered by the corps in computing the benefit-to-cost ratio.

Take, for example, the channel work along the Ohio River. That project was justified on the basis of 13 million tons of traffic. When I came on the committee in 1948 the actual commerce was 42.8 million tons. Before the project was constructed, of course, the amount of tonnage was much less than the estimate of 13 million tons.

But traffic borne by the river has now increased to 103 million tons, or almost eight times the benefits contemplated when the project was authorized.

Mr. PROXMIRE. May I say to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana that the calculations I have here are based on the cost. I understand higher discount rates were not applied to the benefits. The Corps of Engineers informed us that in their judgment, if the benefits were also discounted at 10 percent, the ratio would be even worse, and the benefit-cost ratio would be even less.

As the Senator knows, when you extend the life of a project, whether it is over 50 years or over 100 years, if you attempt to figure out completely, accurate, and comprehensively the benefit-to-cost ratio, you should discount the benefits you anticipate receiving in 1970, 1980, or 1990 on some basis. If you discount on the basis of 10 percent, your benefit will be considerably less than if you discount on the basis, for example, of 3⅛ percent or 3¼ percent.

Mr. ELLENDER. I had not quite completed my statement on the Ohio River project.

In addition to the traffic having increased more than eight times the anticipated amount, as I pointed out a while ago, these projects, 14 in number, after their construction formed pools of water which attracted business to a total of $25 billion. Suppose we had considered the employment resulting from that construction as a benefit; what would be the Senator's attitude? That actually happened.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I say to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, it is necessary and desirable that the Corps of Engineers do a competent job, and that Congress do the best job it can, in trying to anticipate all the benefits likely to result. It is my understanding that in most of these projects we do that. Sometimes, naturally, the benefits will be underestimated, and sometimes the costs, as the Senator knows.

In the particular instance, the Senator has cited, it may also be that if the project had not been constructed, there might have been far more business for the railroads or other alternative, competing means of transportation. Any fair evaluation would have to take that into consideration also.

Mr. ELLENDER. At a greater cost.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is possible.

Mr. ELLENDER. I also point out the example of the intercoastal waterway, which starts at Brownsville, Tex., and follows the coast all the way up to the New England States. When that project was authorized, and the benefit-to-cost ratio was figured, the amount of traffic was estimated at around 8 million tons. Today that traffic amounts to 78½ million tons. If the Engineers had been able to foresee those great benefits, certainly they could have included them, and shown a much better benefit-to-cost ratio.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct. Whenever we underestimate benefits, we will get an inaccurate estimate. We are always anxious to get as accurate an estimate as we can on the benefit side and the cost side—and certainly on the discount side.

When we consider the cost of capital, we must properly consider the alternatives. If private industry can make an investment and get a return of 10 percent on its investment, the Federal Government should not take that money from the private economy in taxes and invest it at 3¼ percent. To do so slows the economy, penalizes economic growth, diminishes the income of all Americans.

Mr. ELLENDER. I shall cite another instance to indicate that the Corps of Engineers does not take into consideration secondary benefits. It must justify a project on primary benefits if the project is to be constructed.

For example, the Mississippi River between New Orleans and Baton Rouge was deepened to 40 feet, and the cost was very small. Because it was possible in the past to harness the Missouri, the Ohio, and the tributaries of those rivers, the Arkansas and Red, it was possible to provide a constant flow of fresh water down the river. What has happened? As a result of the constant flow of fresh water, hundreds of millions of dollars of industry are now located along that waterway. Those benefits to the locality and the country as a whole were never considered in the cost-benefit ratio presented by the Corps of Engineers when the project was first submitted to the Congress.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I would not disagree at all with the Senator. Private industry has exactly the same kind of problem. It does not invest unless it can expect a 10-percent return. Sometimes the return will be 30 or 40 percent.

The same is true in the public sector. The Government does not invest unless it can get a 3- or 3⅛-percent return. Sometimes it gets a better return. But in all cases, we should apply the same rate for public projects as for private projects. Economists agree that if we did so, we would have a much better utilization of our available resources. In a time of great depression, when millions of persons are out of work, we can sensibly make such an investment so that idle resources can be put to work.

But certainly at a time when the economy is operationg reasonably close to capacity, and we are considering a tax hike to reduce activity in the private sector, to take money out of the private sector, where it is earning 10 percent, and to put it into the public sector, where it will earn 3 percent, is a bad allocation of public resources and is wasteful.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am not an expert, but I do not see how that could be accomplished in public works. I go back to the proposition that if it were possible to look into the future and know all the benefits that would accrue from a project under consideration, such as I have shown in the cases I have mentioned, the benefit-to-cost ratios would be much higher. I do not know of any case in which the benefits would not be greater than the estimates made by the Corps of Engineers. If we were to take into consideration future growth and secondary benefits, I feel certain that the return would be in keeping with what the Senator from Wisconsin is now talking about.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I hope the Senator is right. I also call his attention again to the fact that private industry could do the same thing, undoubtedly it could show much greater returns than it anticipated in many instances.

All I am arguing for is that we use the same rules and the same market rate for public and private investments spending. Why not be fair? If we were to do that, we would have a far better allocation of resources. We would save billions. We could hold down taxes.

I again point out that the overwhelming sentiment in the economic profession is virtually unanimous that this is the case. And we should follow the same rules for both public and private investment, the same discount rate.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment on behalf of myself and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Proxmire], and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

> On page 4, line 14, in lieu of "$1,010,823,000" insert "$992,307,000".

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all time on the pending amendment be limited to 30 minutes, the time to be equally divided between the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, a yea-and-nay vote will be asked for on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield himself?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to strike from the bill those 41 new construction starts which were approved by the House and Senate but which were not a part of the budget recommendations.

Originally the budget estimate included nine new starts, involving future commitments of $139,756,000.

The House included five of those projects, involving $16,799,000, but eliminated the other four except for the planning money.

The House then included 16 new projects which were not in the budget, the ultimate cost of the 16 to be $86,028,000.

The Senate included all the money requested by the budget for the four starts, which totaled $122,957,000. In addition to including those budget items the Senate added 25 new projects which had not been recommended by the budget.

The ultimate cost of the 25 new projects will be $303,603,000. Thus we have the situation where the budget recommended nine projects with a long-range cost of $139,750,000. They are not affected by the pending amendment. In addition, the House added 16 new projects and the Senate added 25 which, when completed, the ultimate cost will be $389,631,000.

The pending amendment would eliminate this $390 million from the bill.

Summarizing, the bill as reported to the Senate provides for a total of 50 new construction starts. That includes nine budget items and the 41 nonbudgeted items and involves a future commitment of $525,327,000.

Mr. President, there is no reason why we should not strike from the bill the 41 new, nonbudgeted projects. None of these were recommended by the budget.

As I have pointed out before, during World War II, the President and Congress, working together, postponed or held in abeyance until completion of the war all new construction starts and projects unless they were first certified as being absolutely essential for the national defense. During the Korean war one of the first steps which President Truman took was to issue an Executive order freezing all new construction projects so that they would be held in abeyance until the war was over.

I supported that action.

Unfortunately, neither the present administration nor the Congress has recognized that there really is a war going on at the present time. Congress is being told that we can afford both guns and butter—life as usual on the home front—with a major war on our hands.

The Senate, while urging the President to reduce expenditures, includes 41 new projects above the budget.

I think the very least we can do at this time is to ask all Americans to cooperate in our efforts to cut back on spending, even if it involves one of their favorite projects. I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the amendment if adopted would involve the reduction of $389,631,000 in future commitments. Once we start these projects we have no choice but to proceed.

I hope that this amendment will be adopted.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY R. C. COTTON, A SENATOR FROM NEW SOUTH WALES, AUSTRALIA

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, on a matter of personal privilege, that I may be recognized for one minute, with the time to be charged to neither side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, it is my unique pleasure to introduce a namesake who happens to be in town today, Mr. R. C. Cotton, a Senator from New South Wales, in the Parliament of Australia.

I take great pleasure in presenting him to the Senate, even though he does not claim any relationship to me.

In order not to disturb debate, I shall retire with him to the cloakroom and would appreciate it if any Senators who would like to meet him will join us there. [Applause, Senators rising.]

RECESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess for 2 minutes, for the purpose of meeting Mr. Cotton, with the time not to be charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to; and 3:28 p.m., the Senate took a recess.

At 3:30 p.m., the Senate reassembled, when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. Mondale in the chair).

PUBLIC WORKS AND ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11641) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission, the Delaware River Basin Commission, Intrastate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Water Resources Council, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

I express the hope that the Senate will not vote for the amendment proposed by the Senator from Delaware. As I pointed out earlier in the afternoon, ever since I have been on this committee as its chairman, we have invariably added new construction starts as well as new planning starts. In my humble judgment, if that had not been done, this great program of resource development, of which most of us are proud, would probably not have occurred. There would have been peaks and valleys in the program with the result that there would be a loss of efficiency and the country would have been deprived of many of the economic benefits that accrue to the region and the Nation as a result of the development of these resources.

Mr. President, I pointed out earlier that when a public works bill comes before the Congress, some areas of the country are better taken care of than others. Why that is, I do not know. As chairman of the subcommittee, what I have endeavored to do is to try to take care of the needs as closely as possible, with the moneys at hand, and to have a balance in the projects spread over the whole country.

As I stated earlier, I think 14 to 16 modern locks and dams on the Ohio River have, in the course of the last 15 years, been completed or placed under construction. Those were all authorized, but in most cases there were no budget estimates.

As a result of that construction program, we now have increased tonnage on that great river by over 2½ times what it was in 1948, when I became a member of this subcommittee.

In addition, we have done a great deal of work in preventing floods throughout the Nation by providing the necessary funds for reservoir projects in, for example, Nebraska, Kansas, and other States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

The amount of the saving to the people as a result of preventing flood damage has been great.

My good friend should realize one thing. Every time we postpone construction of any worthy project the costs for labor and materials, and items of that kind, increases from 3 to 4 percent a year. It simply means that if a project which would have cost $50 million is postponed, there will be an additional cost in the year ahead of about $2,000,000. If it is postponed for 2 or 3 or 4 years, the increased cost can be measured by multiplying that increased cost by the number of years it is postponed.

I have much information that I could produce to indicate the great savings that have been accomplished by the engineers in the construction of these projects.

As the Senator from Delaware stated, the House did add 16 new projects, and the Senate 25. That is about in line with what we have done in the past. If we take the cost of all those projects into consideration as well as the nine new starts recommended in the budget we find that the future commitment on all of these projects will be about equal to 6 months work at the present rate of appropriations. If we take out of the pipeline this $500 million worth of work, it will mean that, if it is continued for the next few years, this great program to develop the water resources of this country will come to a halt. I do not think anyone wants to do that.

I hope the amendment is not agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I shall support this amendment. My reasoning is as follows. I have been critical of the priorities of the Congress, and, indeed, of the President. In view of the pending conflict in Vietnam, the fact that we have an impending deficit which may run as high as $30 billion, and the fact that, in my opinion, we are not doing anything adequate to deal with the critical problems of our cities, it is my view that, in order to cut back on the deficit, we ought to make primarily large economies in the military program. I am well aware that Congress is not in the mood to do that, although I shall continue to urge that it do so. One of the next areas where I would think we could economize without serious damage to our country is by stopping new starts, by the Corps of Engineers.

I realize that this is an area where it will be difficult, indeed, to get enough votes to get the amendments adopted, but with a war going on—and it is a war—it would seem to me one of the least defensible new ventures is to appropriate for new starts for the Corps of Engineers. It is true that since new starts are being provided for in the States of many Senators, it will be most difficult to support the pending amendment. There is a small one in my State. But if we are ever going to face up to the fiscal deficit, I think the place where we could make a cut in an area which is most expendable is in the public works bill, which is traditionally known as the pork barrel.

I stood up on the floor of the Senate and urged substantial new expenditures for the poverty program, and I have no apologies to make for that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. That is where, in my opinion, our money should be put in an endeavor to solve the problem of poverty and crime in the cities. To me that should have a higher priority than any public works projects. When a public works project is started, it costs money to stop it; but when one has not even started, I can see little, if any, excuse to start projects which the administration has not requested.

For that reason I shall support the Williams amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The Senator from Louisiana points out that what the Senate committee has done in increasing these appropriations is in line with what the Congress has been doing in the past. That is correct. But I call attention to the fact that today we are at war. We are confronted with one of the largest deficits we have had in the history of this country. We are confronted with a sizable tax increase plus a serious threat of inflation.

There is only one way to check this alarming trend and that is to slow down spending.

The Senator from Louisiana points out that at the rate of the present inflation if we postpone these projects until next year they may cost more money. I recognize that. But why will they cost more money? Because we are in an inflationary spiral which is being fed by the deficit spending of this administration. If the Government is going to keep increasing its own spending to get ahead of inflation then we are never going to check these deficits. I think the Government of the United States has more responsibility than the average citizen. It should set an example and hold back on those expenditures which can be curtailed without disrupting the security of this country.

I am not arguing the merits or demerits of any one of these individual projects; perhaps if we were in normal times they would be meritorious. I am sure the committee did a good job of evaluating them. That is why I am not arguing the merits of the individual projects, but I am arguing that now is not the time to authorize 41 new projects at a cost of $390 million. Should we not postpone these expenditures until we have ended the war or at least brought our budgetary condition under control?

The suggestion is made that such action might disrupt the work of the Corps of Engineers. I respect the job that the Corps of Engineers has done in the past and is doing today. It does a remarkable job, but this does not disrupt its program. I call attention to the fact that even with the adoption of this amendment we would still be leaving $1.4 billion available for Corps of Engineers' expenditures. There would be left $992 million under this item, another $190 million would be left in the bill for operation and maintenance—all of this under Corps of Engineers' jurisdiction. There would be $91 million left for flood control, $18.9 million would be provided for general expenses of Corps of Engineers, and in addition there would be $162 million for a revolving fund under the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers. These funds are to take care of situations involving, for example, the Philadelphia, Baltimore, New York, or San Francisco channel, or harbor facilities, where they sometimes have to act quickly. This amendment does not reduce this revolving fund or the other mentioned items. I recognize that it is impossible to anticipate what the need will be in such situations.

Adequate money is provided for all normal operations. The amendment does not touch, at all, the money needed to keep open sea lanes for commerce. All the amendment does is to hold in abeyance all these new projects, even though they may be highly meritorious in normal times. It would hold up the expenditure of $389,000,000 until either we have the budget more nearly in balance or the war is over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, with all due respect to my distinguished friend from Delaware, I think he is not correct in his statement that we would be doing the right thing if we simply go along with the budget.

The one project added in my State, at my request, after the bill came to the Senate, illustrates my point. It is the deepening of the channel at Jacksonville Harbor from 34 to 38 feet. The appropriation recommended by the committee provided for $500,000 to begin construction on a project that has a recognized benefit to cost ratio of 1.9.

The fact of the matter is that the city and the port authority are putting up millions of dollars in the construction of new facilities for the enlarged port. They have already let the contract for a big bridge across the old channel of the St. Johns River to make accessible some of the newly developed area. The Navy, Mr. President, has a large oil depot along the upper channel, and large-draft tankers cannot now get to it when fully loaded. They will be able to do so after the channel is deepened.

Mr. President, the fact of the matter is that the President can refuse to go ahead with any new start if he wishes to do so. I am quite content with his having that right; and I believe that he will be well able, knowing as he does the condition of our country, to decide which projects are needed most by the Nation, and to release the funds to go ahead promptly with those projects. I believed that the Jacksonville Harbor project was such a project, and that is why I asked that construction funds be included in the bill.

Mr. President, I do not have a great deal more to say, except to pay my compliments to the Senator from Louisiana, who certainly goes through these matters with a fine-toothed comb. I do not believe he has recommended to the committee and to the Senate the inclusion of a single new start, except from the point of view that he thinks it is important for the country for it to move ahead at this time.

I am willing to have the President pass on these projects, and to determine which of the new projects he thinks are of sufficient importance to the Nation that they should be started at this time.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I just wish to state that I support the committee in its proposals. The distinguished Senator from Louisiana has been more than generous and kind to us in Kansas; and I know how thoroughly he studied every project before he brought out this bill. I agree fully with the statement just made by the distinguished Senator from Florida in support of the action of the committee.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator, and certainly concur in his statement.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, as I read this report, the State I have the honor to represent in part does not have any projects that are without budget approval. Nevertheless, I will support the committee, because I understand the burden they have taken on over the years, and I believe they have handled it very well. I further believe that the committee has a continuing knowledge concerning the development of our resources that extends from one administration to the next. The bill before us is $91,749,000 below the budget in the total amount appropriated.

At the same time, I am not unmindful of the deficit we face, and that we are in a serious war. I believe a decision may become necessary that all public works, budgeted and unbudgeted, be suspended unless they are of an emergency nature and directly connected with the war effort. If it does, I am sure the State I represent in part will accept that verdict without complaint. We do want to give due priority to the war effort, stop inflation, and put our financial house in order. Therefore, whatever program is adopted across the board, either to reduce expenditures or to raise revenues, we shall accept.

In the meantime, however, I shall support the committee, even though, as I read the report, I have no particular project involved in this amendment.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. President, I am in a similar position to that of the Senator from Nebraska in that there are a few unbudgeted items in the bill and the committee report pertaining to my State.

However, I feel, as the Senator from Florida pointed out, that some of these unbudgeted items may be even more important than the budgeted items. I certainly feel, as a Member of Congress, that I have the prerogative to decide whether or not the President's budgeted items are of equal force and necessity with others that may not have been included in the budget.

The committee saw fit to place some items in the report which were not in the President's budget. I believe they did so with good reason. I, too, am deeply concerned about the fact that the amount of the bill represents an increase over and above the current level of spending. To me, the only way to handle that is to hope that the President will see fit either to reduce the spending for some items by slowing them down, or possibly just not to begin some projects. I think such action must be taken on a prudent basis.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware has 6 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator from Delaware.

I would hope that, instead of knocking out and not starting some of these projects, other projects which are underway might be slowed down somewhat.

I can think of one or two projects in my State which I believe could be slowed down certainly to meet the necessity for reducing spending. I think the State of Iowa would join with all of the other States in bearing its fair share of these expenditure reductions.

I hope that this can be done at an administration level.

I thank the committee for using its good judgment in including some of these projects which I regard as equal to if not more important than the budget items.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the argument has been made that these particular projects have great merit. I do not question that for a moment. I am sure that we could think of a lot of other projects which would be equally meritorious; but what about the money to pay for them?

I have made no effort to deal with the merits of projects in any particular State. The amendment states very clearly that the 41 new projects which were not recommended by the President in the budget would be eliminated.

The question has been asked, "Will Congress go ahead and pass these new projects and then expect the President at his discretion to decide which is meritorious and which is not?"

I point out that the decision of the President has already been made. The administration has recommended that construction work start on but nine new projects. It has recommended that construction work on none of these 41 projects be started.

Here we have a situation in which Congress is overriding the recommendations of the administration and adding 41 new projects at a cost of $390 million. They were not recommended and have not been approved by the budget.

If the Senate rejects the amendment

it will be approving expenditures of an extra $389,631,000 at a time when Senators are all expressing concern over the size of the deficit and at a time when we are all expressing concern for the taxpayer, who is confronted with a 10-percent tax increase.

Where do we start? We should decide whether Congress should cut the appropriation or pass the buck to the President. Everyone agrees that the Senate is the place to cut the appropriations. Will the Senate continue to vote for and approve these multimillion-dollar projects and then go home and boast to our constituents of what we have done for them? Then later pass a resolution which tells the President, "You cut expenditures; we just did not have the courage."

Congress has a responsibility. I hope that we will accept that responsibility and agree to the amendment.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having expired, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, a rollcall vote being imminent, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph]. If he were present, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withdraw my vote.

The assistant legislative clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Hollings], the Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan], the Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Talmadge], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell] are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young] are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Brooke], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Griffin], the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Brooke] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen] is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett]. If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois would vote "yea," and the Senator from Utah would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 12, nays 61, as follows:

[No. 289 Leg.]

YEAS—12

Baker
Boggs
Clark
Cotton
Hansen
Pastore
Percy
Prouty
Proxmire
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.

NAYS—61

Allott
Anderson
Bayh
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Cooper
Curtis
Dominick
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hatfield
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Pearson
Pell
Scott
Smith
Spong
Stennis
Symington
Tydings
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—17

Aiken
Bartlett
Bennett
Brooke
Dirksen
Dodd
Eastland
Gore
Griffin
Hollings
Javits
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Lausche
Long, Mo.
McCarthy
McClellan
Metcalf
Morton
Randclph
Ribicoff
Russell
Smathers
Sparkman
Talmadge
Williams, N.J.
Young, Ohio

So the amendment of Mr. Williams of Delaware was rejected.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I had one other amendment which I was planning to offer. The other amendment dealt with nine new projects which were budgeted items; however, recognizing the failure to eliminate the 41 nonbudgeted items, I see no reason to press this second amendment with respect to budgeted items.

There is one question, however, that I wish to ask the chairman of the committee. I had an amendment prepared which dealt with this question, but in talking with the chairman of the committee I understand that this problem may already have been taken care of.

On page 17 there is an allotment of $750,000 for an Ohio project. I wanted to make sure as to whether the approval of this $750,000 in any way endorses continuation of either planning or construction on the so-called Kirwan ditch, officially known as the Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal in Ohio.

If it does I want to offer an amendment to eliminate any part of the money that could be allocated for that project. It is my understanding that the overwhelming recommendation has been that the project was not feasible.

The question I wish to ask is: Is there any money in this bill for that project?

Mr. ELLENDER. There is not.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. There is not.

Mr. ELLENDER. If the Senator will read the report, it states:

> The purpose of the appropriation is to provide funds for a reanalysis of the Grand River Reservoir by the Corps to develop a comprehensive plan for water management for the Mahoning-Grand River Basins.

That is all it is.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Then the answer is that this $750,000 is in no way related to it and is not a part of the $968 million canal project; the approval of that $750,000 item does not provide even one dime of money for the continuation of that project, either planning or otherwise.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. With that assurance I shall not offer the amendment. I have also discussed this matter with other members of the committee, and they are all in agreement that there is not a dime in this bill for that project; there is no need then for the amendment.

(At this point, Mr. Cannon assumed the chair.)

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, it is then my understanding that there are not only no funds in this bill for the Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal, but also, as far as this measure is concerned that canal is a dead issue.

Mr. ELLENDER. I would not say it is a "dead issue." We did not provide any money for it. If the Senator will read the first paragraph of the language on page 23 he will note, and I stated this on the floor of the Senate last year, that unless local interests contribute their share the project will not come into being; and since the Governor of Pennsylvania notified the corps that the State would not provide any money, the House of Representatives proceeded to strike from the bill all money related to the construction or planning of the Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal. If later on the Governor of Pennsylvania were to notify the corps that the State would provide the local cooperation, why of course the situation would change.

For all intents and purposes since the local cooperation will not be provided, the canal will not be constructed.

Mr. BREWSTER. I thank the Senator for his very clear answer.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. With that understanding I withdraw the amendment.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, there will be no more rollcall votes today. When the Senate adjourns at the close of business today it will adjourn to meet tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon, at which time, following the morning business, the bill making appropriations for public works will still be under consideration. The bill will not go to third reading until tomorrow.

CONTROL OF POLLUTANTS FROM MOTOR VEHICLES IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, there is widespread concern in California over the future of our State's program to control the emission of pollutants from motor vehicles. Because of California's pioneering efforts in this field and due to the unusual topographical and meteorological conditions that exist in our largest city, Los Angeles, it has become necessary to impose strict regulations on motor vehicles to control pollutants. The Senate recognized California's special needs in its version of the Air Quality Act of 1967. The House Commerce Committee, unfortunately, saw fit to delete from its version of the bill an amendment that would allow California to set more advanced standards on emissions from motor vehicles. The action of the House committee has brought expressions of concern from most of the major newspapers and radio-television stations in California. In the belief that the arguments raised in these editorials deserve a wider audience, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a series of editorials published in the Los Angeles Times, the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner, the Santa Rosa Press Democrat, the San Rafael Independent Journal, and a KNXT editorial.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Oct. 8, 1967]

SMOG: THE WORSENING CRISIS

"Los Angeles residents have the choice of driving the kinds of autos they now own with current fuels—or breathing. But they won't have the choice for long."

"Already some 10,000 persons are moving from the Los Angeles Basin annually because of air pollution," declared Dr. Joseph F. Boyle, president of the Los Angeles County Medical Assn.

His grim warning, given at a Los Angeles hearing of the Assembly Transportation and Commerce Committee, was by far the strongest statement the medical association has made on the threat of air pollution.

"A critical and worsening health crisis exists in Los Angeles County despite all efforts for its control," Dr. Boyle told the legislators. "The pending crisis is imminent and demands that every appropriate action, however drastic be taken immediately. No further delay can be tolerated with safety."

His pessimism was echoed by the local and state county's air pollution control officer, Louis J. Fuller and by Eric Grant, executive officer of the State Motor Vehicle Pollution Control Board.

Both officials warned that California's present auto emission standards are inadequate and must be strengthened to cope with the continuing increase of motor vehicles.

The "adverse" level of oxidant, or ozone, has been exceeded virtually every day since 1956 in the county, Fuller said.

In terms of the definition by the State Board of Public Health, the Los Angeles Basin is continually under a "substantial threat from air pollution."

Fuller also offered new substantiation for his charge that the smog control devices installed on California cars since 1966 do not meet even the present standards requirements.

He quoted from a report made last March by the State Department of Public Health, which stated: "Projection of surveillance data shows that as vehicle mileage accumulates, the average emissions from vehicles with exhaust control systems will not meet the current standards of 275 parts per million (ppm) hydrocarbons and 1.5 per cent monoxide."

But even this much progress in combatting smog would not have been achieved had not California and particularly Los Angeles County, pioneered in the setting—and enforcing—of standards of air purity.

It seems incredible, therefore, that an effort is being made in Congress to deny California the right to take the stronger action needed to meet its pending crisis in air pollution.

Although the Senate unanimously excluded California from the federal preemption of auto emission standards, the House Commerce Committee decided no exemption should be made.

Any change in the federal standards—which are the same as California's presently inadequate requirements—could only be made by the secretary of health, education and welfare if the House committee has its way.

"Unless the special section is restored," said Grant, "it will be an outright violation of the concept of states' rights and an apparent recognition by Congress that the interest of Detroit auto makers prevails over the interests of California's 20 million people."

If the smog crisis is to be averted in urban California, the allowable amount of hydrocarbons from autos must be reduced to at least 180 ppm, as presently scheduled. Every additional car makes the problem worse, and the number of vehicles is expected to double by 1980.

A spokesman for the automobile industry told the Assembly committee that it is a "difficult technical job" to meet California current standards. No doubt it is, but as Dr. Boyle warned, no further delay can be tolerated with safety.

The health and welfare of the Los Angeles Basin dare not be imperiled by any weakening of the fight for clean air. Emission control devices must be made to meet present standards, and more stringent standards must be adopted as soon as feasible without federal interference.

Despite attempts at control, Los Angeles County suffered three first-stage smog alerts in succession at the end of August, during which the ozone level was the highest in 10 years.

How many persons will have to leave the Los Angeles Basin to find breathing room?

County smog chief Fuller offers little encouragement.

"I have previously stated that the possibility of a major catastrophe from air pollution in this basin was quite remote," he concluded. "I must now say that on the basis of present data, my opinion has changed. There is no margin for error."

[From the Los Angeles Evening and Sunday Herald Examiner, Oct. 2, 1967]

THE SMOG CAUSE

It is the plain duty of the California congressional delegation—Republicans and Democrats alike—to undo the harm done by the House Commerce Committee in approving a national clean air bill.

The committee eliminated from the Senate-passed version a provision which would have permitted California to strengthen its auto emission standards beyond those set for all the other states.

The reason behind the original California exemption is that California, with one of the nation's worst smog problems, already has adopted a stringent antipollution law of its own.

The exemption was removed, however, when the House committee accepted an amendment (from Rep. John Dingell, D-Mich.) which would impose national standardization unless the secretary of health, education and welfare authorizes tougher measures.

Warren M. Dorn, chairman of the Board of Supervisors' Air Pollution Control Committee, sees it this way:

"This means that Los Angeles County . . . can have no stricter requirements for control than some wind-swept prairie town unless the secretary of health, education and welfare approves."

In other words, the House committee action has put the fate of Los Angeles smog control in the hands of one man. We believe that it should be fixed in law and that the California delegation should rally to restore the original exemption.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Aug. 1, 1967]

POLLUTION: SENATE CLEARS THE AIR

"No one has the right to use the atmosphere as a garbage dump," declared the U.S. Senate, as it unanimously approved new and stronger air pollution control legislation.

The Senate bill gives the Department of Health, Education and Welfare additional authority to set clean air standards and to implement them if local and state officials fail to act. A total of $700 million was also authorized for research and demonstrations programs over the next three years.

Although the Administration sought the establishment of national emission standards for certain pollutants, the Senate decided to let the states set their own requirements—within a 15-month period, after which the federal government would move in.

The bill, however, went beyond the Administration's request by giving HEW the power to seek a court injunction against any source of pollution which creates an "imminent and substantial" danger to public health.

California won a highly important exemption that will permit it to impose auto emission standards that are more stringent than the national requirements. Approved at the request of Sen. George Murphy (R-Calif.), the exemption recognizes the pioneering efforts in auto smog control by California and our intention to require tougher standards in 1970.

This year every new car produced in Detroit will have exhaust control devices that meet the standards heretofore only required for autos sold in California.

The House should act without delay on the new legislation and should resist any attempts to weaken an essential program for cleaner air throughout the nation.

[From the Santa Rosa Press Democrat, Aug. 6, 1967]

Air Pollution

That was a good job Sen. George Murphy did in persuading the Senators to include a specific exemption of California from standards to be set by the Office of Health Education and Welfare controlling air pollution by motor vehicles.

It is unusual legislation that exempts one state from something that applies to all others. But in this case there was a good reason.

"I couldn't sit by and allow lower standards to replace those deemed necessary by our state officials," Sen. Murphy explained.

Essentially, the clean air bill passed by the Senate authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare to divide the country into air quality control regions and give states in each region 15 months to accept the federal standards before the Department takes over.

Because of both experience and sheer necessity, the California standards on pollution of air by motor vehicles are both strict and effective.

Federal standards, when and if adopted, may be equally good. But if they are not, the California standards will not be weakened as a result. Sen. Murphy has seen to that.

[From the San Rafael (Calif.) Independent Journal, July 29, 1967]

Marin Played Big Role in Auto Smog Control

The Air Quality Act of 1967, now before Congress, represents a nationwide war against air pollution, with cooperation among federal, state, and local agencies.

The bill would authorize the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare to divide the country into control regions, establish criteria for controlling pollutants, give the states up to 15 months to accept the air quality standards, and authorize the Secretary of HEW to implement standards if states failed to do so.

At the insistence of Sen. George Murphy, California would retain the right to enact its own control on motor vehicle pollution because acute car smog problems in the state require stricter controls.

California has led the nation in efforts to combat air pollution. It entered the auto smog control picture in 1960 with establishment of its Motor Vehicle Pollution Control Board.

And within California, Marin County played no small role in the long and often controversial process of equipping automobiles with anti-smog devices.

Back in 1964 when the first crankcase devices were ordered for used cars, two Marin County residents spearheaded a determined opposition to the devices.

Lester E. Jennings Jr. and Lars Williamson, mechanics by avocation, charged that crankcase devices installed on used cars would be difficult to maintain in top condition, and would be harmful to the car engine.

Their contention was that the little guy, those who owned older model cars, should not be saddled with the extra cost of crankcase devices and the risk of a damaged motor.

They insisted that the responsibility should rest, not on the little car owner, but on the car manufacturers in Detroit.

Jennings and Williamson made many a trip into Sacramento to attend committee hearings and hammer away with their message.

Bearing the brunt of their attack was another former Marinite, Donald A. Jensen, who had been Marin County administrator before taking over as executive officer of the State Motor Vehicle Pollution Control Board.

Jensen and the car pollution control board faced increasing resistance from among used car owners. A law that finally went through the Legislature was considerably less stringent than that which had been proposed originally.

Because of persistent complaints on the high cost of installation and maintenance, a reform measure enacted in 1965 gave further relief to used car owners. Requirement of crankcase devices on 1955 and later models was made to apply only in 10 smog counties and only when car ownership was transferred.

The bulk of the attention thereafter focused on new models, with manufacturers required to install crankcase devices on cars after 1963, and exhaust devices on cars sold in California after 1966.

Jennings and Williamson and other opponents of crankcase devices for used vehicles did not succeed in halting the devices altogether. But they did succeed in getting relief for the older car owners and in focussing attention on the responsibility of the car manufacturer.

Jensen, who took quite a buffeting as executive officer of the state car pollution control board, maintained his composure and humor throughout the exhausting committee hearings.

Jensen has since moved on into the private auto manufacturing business, joining Ford Motor Co. as executive engineer in vehicle emissions and regulations.

In his new job Jensen is concerned primarily with improved crankcase devices and combustion system to reduce pollution from automobile emissions.

Thus, Marinites and former Marinites have been in the forefront on the fight to control auto smog, as California groped its way forward as pioneer in the field of air pollution control.

We take pride in the fact that the sound and fury created in Marin led to practical and meaningful legislation in Sacramento and is resulting in legislation on the federal level.

The Federal Smog Law

(By Karth Hintz, broadcast September 29 and 30, 1967, station KNXT)

Southern California faces the threat of a serious delay in the fight against smog.

A Federal air pollution control bill now before Congress may strip California of its authority to establish strict controls for automobiles.

As you know, California has pioneered in smog control legislation. Progress at the national level lagged far behind. But Congress is now considering ways to bring the national smog law up to standards already in effect in California.

That's all to the good, but California is moving beyond that point. The State has a target date of 1970 for controls that would double the effectiveness of the present automobile devices.

That schedule could be brought to a halt under the national smog bill as amended this week. The House Commerce Committee removed the Murphy Amendment, introduced by Senator Murphy, which would permit California—California alone—to impose stricter rules than would be contained in the national law.

As the proposed law reads now, if the State of California wanted to impose standards tougher than the Federal law, we would have to ask permission of the Health, Education and Welfare Department.

Such a rule could involve prolonged hearings by the Federal bureau. California's smog control schedule would be tied up in red tape that stretched all the way back to Washington.

Southern California needs the Murphy Amendment. We've led the way in smog control for 20 years, and we can continue to set the pace if Washington does not apply the brakes.

NEGOTIATED SETTLEMENT OF VIETNAM WAR

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Negotiation Now is meeting in Washington to organize its friends and rally followers behind a negotiated end to the Vietnam war.

This group has already done an outstanding job of educating the American people to the fact that there are alternatives to our present course in Vietnam. I extend to them my good wishes for a successful meeting.

That the war must be brought to a negotiated settlement seems to me to be the only reasonable course the American people can expect from their Government. Some recent news stories have purported to represent the administration as believing that North Vietnam will have made a great psychological gain and that negotiations more favorable to it will flow from a GOP victory. Therefore, this rationale runs, a defeat of the Johnson administration will be viewed as a victory for Ho Chi Minh and the American people must not allow that to come to pass.

The trouble with this theory is that it assumes the 1968 election is the one North Vietnamese consider the vital one. In my opinion, that is very doubtful. A much more practical and logical course for North Vietnam to be following would be to look to the 1972 election as being the key one.

Ho Chi Minh must appreciate that it would be unusual for the American people to turn out of office a President who seeks reelection. But anyone who can read the Constitution knows that this administration must leave office in 1972, and that it will be succeeded by a new President and a new administration.

Unless this administration finds a way to change its military policy in Vietnam, and seek a negotiated settlement, I see nothing else it can offer the American people except 5 more years of growing war and growing casualty lists; for if North Vietnam has sustained a war effort under the heavy air attack and overwhelming firepower the United States has showered upon it for 2 years, it is hard to see why it cannot sustain such a war for another 5 years—especially when the probabilities are increasing that it will get more and more aid from its allies, China and Russia.

I suggest to the President that 1968 is not the year of decision for North Vietnam, but 1972. I see no reason why North Vietnam, or the Vietcong should surrender to a reelected Johnson administration, when it knows that by 1972, a change in American Government has to take place.

That is why I warn the American people against the notion that if they just hold out through November of 1968, peace can come on our terms. I warn them that unless they insist on prompt negotiations, and upon deescalation of the military scope of the war, it more than likely will proceed on its present course of steady enlargement for some 5 more years at the very least.

That is why I think the work of Negotiation Now is so important. It is helping to bring an understanding to the average American that a war of attrition can be just as costly to us as to the enemy, and that time is not necessarily on our side. In fact, the longer the war has continued, the more it is costing us in both manpower and money, plus the growing erosion of American leadership in other parts of the world.

GREECE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the press tells us that the Greek junta has released from house arrest an elderly leader of Greek political affairs, George Papandreou. It has also undertaken to consult with his son, Andreas Papandreou, on economic problems facing Greece, even though Andreas Papandreou is in jail awaiting trial on charges of treason.

Richard Eder, reporting from Athens for the New York Times, describes these actions as conciliatory moves the junta has made to the Center Union party.

From experience, one has to conclude that whatever else motivates these "conciliatory moves," at least one motivation is the desire of the U.S. Embassy to be able to depict the junta as deserving of a resumption of full U.S. military aid. All the way from Saigon to Athens, our diplomatic policy is concerned far more with appearances than with substance, for behind appearances the real interests of American military power can be advanced in any way we see fit.

I very much regret that the administration seems to have decided to resume our military support of this group of militarists, just as soon as a facade of reasonableness is constructed in front of their iron-fisted rule. Let no one in this country, or in Greece, be fooled about the why we send this aid to Greece. It has nothing to do with democracy; nothing to do with freedom of the Greek people; nothing to do with advancing the cause of personal freedom through constitutional limitations on government action. We do not stand for those things any more in Greece, just as we do not stand for them in many parts of the world.

The only object of our aid program in Greece is to keep a strong pro-American military government in power that will accede to whatever requests the Pentagon makes of it, especially with respect to NATO.

As one who supported the program of aid to Greece and Turkey when it was announced by President Truman in 1948, I can only say that those of us who believed that program would lead Greece, Turkey, and the United States to peaceful progress have now found that we only got on a merry-go-round that comes back to the same place every year.

Greece has retrogressed politically; what economic progress she made with our billions of aid is being dissipated by the actions of the military dictatorship under the junta. If anything, Greece is now more threatened by economic and political upheaval than it was before our aid program started.

The country that only a few years ago was called a showcase for U.S. aid is now a showcase for the futility of U.S. aid, insofar as its contribution to political and economic growth is concerned.

Here the American taxpayers are supporting through a misguided administration, dominated by the military power of the Pentagon, the use of tax dollars to support a dictatorship in Greece; yet we have an administration that considers a $70 billion defense budget—the largest in the history of the Republic—to be untouchable.

It is out of this budget that $7½ billion saving should come, and thus avoid getting us into the very serious political issues that will develop, if the administration continues to insist upon yoking the American taxpayers with a 10-percent surtax charge.

But I do not doubt that the aid will be resumed in full. There will be another 20 years of heavy U.S. taxpayer contributions to Greece. But they will not have my support, for they will do no more for the well-being of the Greek people than have the last 20 years and $3.5 billion worth of U.S. money which we have poured into Greece.

Here is a place where great savings can be made on behalf of the taxpayers. We have before us a public works bill at the present time on the floor of the Senate.

Let me respectfully point out to the administration that the expenditure of money for the benefit of our domestic economy is sorely needed by the American people in order to keep strong the greatest defense weapon we have; namely, the economic security of the Republic.

RECOGNITION OF SENATOR SMATHERS OF FLORIDA AT THE CLOSE OF MORNING BUSINESS TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the close of morning business on tomorrow, the distinguished junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] be recognized for not to exceed 30 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PUBLIC WORKS AND ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11641) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission, the Delaware River Basin Commission, Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Water Resources Council, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I am concerned, as I stated in connection with the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] a short while ago, about the failure to make any significant cuts in the public works and Atomic Energy Commission appropriation bill now pending before the Senate.

It is well known that I have been of the view that the fiscal crisis in this country is very serious indeed. It seems likely, unless the House Ways and Means Committee changes its mind, that we will not have a tax bill. We may be confronted with a deficit so huge that it will be necessary to sell some $30 billion worth of U.S. Government bonds in the next calendar year.

Such an action on the money market is sure to cause very tight money, extremely high interest rates, and would slow down the normal growth of the economy.

It is likely also to have an inflationary effect, because of the immense cash flow which will be thrown into the economy as a result of the enormous deficit.

Last week I argued strenuously for substantial additional authorization for the poverty program; and I am very proud that I made that argument, because, as I said during the course of that debate, the problem with us is to put first things first. Where is our sense of national priorities?

We are confronted with very serious problems. The war in Vietnam, which is costing us $2.5 billion a month and is costing hundreds—indeed, thousands—of American lives and American casualties of the flower of our youth. Yet there seems no end to it. That war will cost, in the current fiscal year, practically the same amount as the anticipated deficit if there is no tax increase—namely, $30 billion.

It has been one of my duties as a Member of the Senate to follow very closely both the poverty program and the education program; I serve as chairman on one and as a member of the other subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare charged with the processing of legislation in the poverty and educational area. To me these matters should have the highest possible priority. Therefore, I have supported, and will continue to support, all the authorization we are able to press through a reluctant Congress to see that every boy and girl in America gets the best possible education, and that something effective is done to improve the economic, social, and, indeed, educational status of the one-fifth of the Nation, almost 30 million Americans, who are ill-fed, ill-housed, and ill-educated.

One may well ask the question, how can one advocate increased appropriations in these social areas in the face of the deficit which confronts us? My answer is that the cuts have to be made in the less important matters, in programs of lower priority, in addition to cuts in the fat of the military appropriations requests.

With respect to the military, I have made as good a record as I could. When the appropriations bill was before the Senate, I tried to make a cut of something in excess of $3.5 billion. I had only six votes in support of my amendment.

This morning I made a strong plea to the President not to spend the $5 billion which it is anticipated will be spent in construction of an utterly inadequate anti-ballistic-missile system at a great cost to our taxpayers.

Now, in a far less dramatic setting, we are confronted by the public works and atomic energy appropriation bill. I was happy to support the Senator from Delaware in his effort to cut back the appropriations for public works by eliminating all the new starts for the Corps of Engineers. I shall not repeat the argument I made in that regard only a short time ago.

We come now to the Atomic Energy Commission. There the total of appropriations recommended for both operating expenses and construction is in the neighborhood of $2.5 billion. In view of the strains placed upon our economy as a result of the costs of the war, I believe we must seek out and discover places to cut this item. I would be prepared to support cuts in the military research and development areas of the Atomic Energy Commission. I believe such cuts can be made with no prejudice to our national security.

In addition, they would signal to the Russians our desire for a downturn in the arms race, with mutual reductions in weaponry. But I have no illusions on that score. I am perfectly confident that my colleagues in the Senate would not support me in that regard.

So I return to the area of peaceful uses of atomic energy. I find that, under the heading of "Reactor Development," we appropriated last year a total of $467,720,000. This is a huge sum for activities which, while desirable, are less essential to the well-being of our country than aid to our beleaguered cities and other programs which I could name. Moreover, they are expenditures which can have no possible impact on our military program.

Therefore, I would be prepared to support an amendment which would cut back the $509,058,000 which the Senate committee has recommended in this area of peaceful reactor development to the figure of $467,720,000, which was appropriated last year.

It is my understanding that the Senator from Delaware will propose such an amendment tomorrow. I intend to support it.

I would be prepared to support an even greater cut in this field, but to me it would seem unrealistic to hope that such a cut could be successfully pressed through the Senate.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I have listened with interest to what the senior Senator from Pennsylvania has said. He has touched on a subject which should be the concern of every Member of this body—and of every American. We are being asked to increase the tax burden of the country by 10 percent. We are told that this is necessary to sustain our fighting forces in Vietnam. But if we are to ask the American people to make this sacrifice, we must be ready to stand before them with the firm and sincere reassurance that every penny we spend is in the national interest.

But economy cannot be the only measure of our decision. The distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania has raised the issue of the health and welfare of the American people. To build the civilian reactor plants for the production of electrical energy, as the AEC would have us do, is playing nuclear roulette with the future of this country.

I am moved to recall the words of W. A. Boyle, the president of the United Mine Workers union in his recent Labor Day address. He spoke of the 6,000 uranium miners condemned to a slow death by cancer, of the transport through our cities of deadly atomic waste, of the burial of this waste where it can pollute and has polluted the soil of this Nation with radioactive poisons. The Atomic Energy Commission, in its testimony before committees of this Congress, has admitted that it has not yet solved the problems of handling the deadly by-products of nuclear power.

Mr. President, if we give serious thought to what the president of one of this country's oldest and greatest unions has said; if we study what the AEC itself has unwittingly disclosed; if we listen to what the scientists tell us about the primitive state of our understanding of the nuclear arts—then we must, in all conscience subscribe to what the senior Senator from Pennsylvania has said.

There will be plenty of time for this body to sanction the wholesale proliferation in this country of nuclear power—but only when the Atomic Energy Commission and the scientific community know precisely what they are about. Meanwhile, there are ample means, through the use of other energy-producing materials such as coal, to supply this country with all the electric power that it needs—and at a cost far lower than what the AEC can offer.

I would be the last man in this great body to deprive the Atomic Energy Commission of a single penny that would be devoted for research and development in instruments to guarantee this Nation's security. But I would be remiss in my duty if I did not stand behind the statement by the Senator from Pennsylvania. I submit that the interests of this country and of its people require us to question, and even limit, the civilian expenditures of the Atomic Energy Commission until such time as we know with absolute certainty that we are not taking a foolish and willful gamble.

I will join the Senator from Pennsylvania in supporting the amendment which it is anticipated will be offered by the Senator from Delaware on tomorrow.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Yes, I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I congratulate the Senator from West Virginia on the statement he has just made. Pennsylvania, like West Virginia, is a State where coal mining has been the backbone of our economy. It has fallen upon perilous times, but is now staging somewhat of a comeback. I hope very much that the coal industry and the unionized miners who work in that industry in my State, in both hard coal and soft coal, will be able to look forward to more prosperous days ahead.

If there is a real threat that the atomic energy program is, in fact, as the Senator from West Virginia suggests, creating a serious danger to the health and well-being, and perhaps the lives, of millions of Americans, it certainly is time to stop, look, and listen. It seems to be essential that we assure ourselves, before we move forward with the development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy by building a large number of atomic reactors, that we are not, by so doing, endangering the lives of untold thousands of our fellow citizens.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, before moving to adjourn, I ask the distinguished Presiding Officer, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is H.R. 11641, an act making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense and other departments and agencies.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Is it correct that the bill will be open for further amendment on tomorrow?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The bill will be open for further amendment tomorrow.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the Presiding Officer.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate today, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Tuesday, October 10, 1967, at 12 noon.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate October 9, 1967:

U.S. ATTORNEY

Asher E. Schroeder, of Iowa, to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of Iowa for the term of 4 years, vice Donald E. O'Brien, resigned.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Report From Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 9, 1967

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report which I have made to my constituents this day:

Most Congress-watchers agree that President Johnson has failed to present a convincing argument for raising taxes. His so far unsuccessful effort to win a 10 percent surtax on top of your normal federal income tax is rooted in another failure: The Administration's failure to control spending.

As living costs climb steadily, the President continues to bombard Congress with new ideas for spending money. This is why so many members of his party have joined Republicans in refusing to consider a massive tax rise in the face of mounting evidence of wasteful extravagance on domestic programs.

Congress is showing its concern over inflation in many ways. Just this week the House of Representatives rejected an appropriation bill for the U.S. Departments of Labor and of Health, Education and Welfare because, although the $13.3 billion total was some $148.1 million less than President Johnson's budget requests, it represented a $259.5 million increase over last year's appropriation for the same departments. In short, the trimming job did not go deep enough for 226 of us who voted for more economy against 173 House members who backed the bill that came out of a House-Senate conference committee.

Housewives see the visible results of the federal government's deficit spending every time they buy food for the family table. Dads see it everytime they consider the purchase of a new car, a television set or a needed appliance. Yet few consider that the higher prices they are forced to pay for goods of all kinds actually amount to an invisible tax that robs everyone but is particularly hard on people living on fixed incomes.

President Johnson scored inflation in his economic report of 1966 as "the most unjust and capricious form of taxation" but that year economists calculated the inflationary rise to be $25 billion. The Labor Department's cost of living index has risen almost every month since then. Almost every issue of your daily newspaper carries company announcements of price increases for consumer products.

Increases in advertised prices are only part of the inflation story. Every person's living costs also are affected by prices set by competitive bidding or through negotiation between buyer and seller. A recent survey showed substantial rises in these unlisted prices, affecting a variety of items from pencils to electric generators. For example:

A Southern contractor is bidding 10 per cent more than last year on a plant construction project in the $5–15 million range.

A Midwest contractor reported his bids are averaging 10 per cent more than last year on jobs to be completed in 1967 and 20 per cent more on jobs to be finished in 1968.

The Chicago Board of Education reported sharp increases in prices not only for pencils but also for all supplies purchased through competitive bidding.

Airplane jet engine repair jobs are costing 8 percent more than a year ago.

Many companies selling under long-term contracts are demanding "escalator" clauses that will permit them to raise prices if their costs go up while they are filling the contract.

These are some of the reasons that Congress is calling a halt to inflationary federal spending programs and why even members of the President's own party, including Congressman Wilbur Mills, Chairman of the powerful House Ways and Means Committee, are reluctant to approve his tax proposal.

They know that the hand that signed the tax boost request is also the hand that controls the spending spigot.

Partnership in Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 9, 1967

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to emphasize anew my satisfaction in the partnership for health legislation passed by the House. It marks a milestone in Federal-State-local relationships.

Our interest in the health of all the people has been evident for many years in the legislation passed to support growing State and local programs addressed to many health problems. But we were beginning to be uneasy that this Federal support might be imposing upon States and local areas a selection of programs that might not be the most effective in terms of their special needs.

In passing the Comprehensive Health Planning and Public Health Services Amendments of 1966, Pubic Law 89–749, we felt we were taking a step toward correcting the situation. This year, when the President recommended extension of this legislation for a true partnership for health, we gave it our careful attention. I believe, with the President, that the legislation passed last week, while not ideal in every detail, will be a long way toward strengthening State and local programs of planning to meet State and local health needs. It permits flexibility in the use of Federal funds so that they can most effectively promote the health of the people.

I believe that the President's recommendation and careful examination of the issues invloved by the Members of this House have resulted in legislation which deserves our full confidence and support.

Majority of TV Audience Opposes Stricter Firearms Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 9, 1967

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, it was gratifying to me to learn that a high percentage of residents of the National Capital area registered opposition to the enactment by the Congress of a stricter firearms law in a recent audience poll by WMAL–TV, channel 7. This is truly significant, because the people in the Washington environs have been exposed to an almost continuous barrage of newspaper stories and cartoons and radio and TV programs that have focused attention on the misuse of firearms in the commission of crime. Concerned efforts have been made by some segments of the public and of the news media to show that firearms are the cause of crime, and I would like my colleagues to know that this poll shows that intelligent people appreciate that criminals are not deterred from committing violent acts by the mere violation of another law. We have had the Federal Firearms Act and the National Firearms Act on the books for 30 years, but what good are laws if they are not rigidly enforced?

At approximately 8 p.m., Tuesday, September 26, I received a telephone call from a friend who informed me of a poll being taken by WMAL–TV, channel 7. The polling apparently had started with the news broadcast at 7 p.m. and continued until 10 p.m.

At the close of each scheduled program between these hours, the question: "Should Congress enact a strict gun control law?" was projected for approximately 1 minute. Two telephone numbers—one for a "yes" vote, and one for a "no"—were provided for each political subdivision in this area—District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia.

No comment, editorial or otherwise, was made by the announcers, except for the oral repetition of the question, although the scheduled "N.Y.P.D." police drama program at 9:30, apparently through coincidence, had a theme that could be construed as being strongly antifirearms.

Upon calling the number listed in my area for the registering of a "no" vote the recorded voice replied: "Thank you for voting no in the WMAL–TV listeners' poll," or words to that effect. Votes were tallied electronically.

The results of the poll, announced at 11:30 p.m., and confirmed by a telephone call to the station the following day were:

No, 62 percent; yes, 38 percent.

I learned that 4,282 calls had been completed, and that the combined percentage totals for Maryland and Virginia alone actually showed 62 percent "no" and 34 percent "yes."

Examples of Wasteful Federal Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 9, 1967

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, in light of the President's recent request for an increased 10-percent surcharge on income tax, I would like to cite just a few examples of how the taxpayers' dollars are currently being spent.

It has been brought to my attention that the Office of Education has granted $3.5 million for library research, under title II–B of the Higher Education Act of 1965. This particular funding is concerned with research in the use of library resources; the development of library and information services; and the training of librarians and other information personnel. Of the 38 projects which have been commissioned, the size of the grants ranged from a little over $1,000 to well over $400,000. Consider the following:

First, at Hampshire College in Amherst, Mass., a $64,408 grant will be used to investigate the possibility of a dial-access communications system to bring library resources to dormitory rooms; thus, saving the college students a walk to the library.

Second, $33,169 will be spent to find out what the citizens of Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont think of their local public libraries.

Third, at the University of Maryland, $235,190 will be used for a study of the methods for the hiring of librarians.

Fourth, a study of the social origin, social and professional activities, and educational background of those teaching in library schools will cost the taxpayer a mere $10,983.

Fifth, $50,000 will be used by the University of Wisconsin to determine what materials are now available for the improvement of adult reading.

With these examples of wasteful Federal spending, it is understandable that our national debt is so staggering. At a time when our American citizens are financially burdened with the war in Southeast Asia, it is inconceivable that the administration should conduct such frivolous Great Society programs. Indeed, more discretion must be exercised in the appropriation of our tax dollars.

Mendon, Mass., Tercentenary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 9, 1967

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year it was my good fortune to be able to participate in the impressive community exercises marking the 300th anniversary of the founding of the town of Mendon, Mass., in my district.

On June 24 I was privileged and highly honored to deliver the tercentenary address at the anniversary banquet held at the Lakeview Ballroom in this lovely old New England community. For me this was a most inspiring and memorable occasion and I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my remarks, in part, at this affairs.

The material follows:

REMARKS, IN PART, OF CONGRESSMAN PHILIP J. PHILBIN AT THE BANQUET CELEBRATING THE 300TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TOWN OF MENDON, MASS., JULY 24, 1967

Mr. Toastmaster, Reverend Clergy, Chairman Clough, Chairman Dudley, outstanding members of the General Court, my able and distinguished friends, Senator Kelly, Representative Kenney, Representative Gould, former distinguished Representative, our friend, Mrs. Gladys Crockett, distinguished town officials, Committee members, our distinguished friend, Mr. Elmer Nelson, honored guests, friends, and fellow Americans:

I am happy, highly privileged and honored to join you tonight in celebrating the 300th anniversary of your lovely New England town of Mendon, one of the oldest and finest in the nation.

As your Congressman and friend, I proudly extend my personal congratulations to the officials and people of Mendon upon this distinguished occasion, and to wish for you, and your wonderful American community, a truly glorious future.

As I have already had occasion to note in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that from earliest days, Mendon has been devoted and dedicated to profound religious and patriotic loyalty.

This town was founded by resolute, God-fearing people, hardy souls who did not know the meaning of the word fear or doubt, who were unalterably devoted to their belief in Divine Providence and were determined to live under conditions of freedom, liberty and peace.

This town has seen some extraordinary changes. Our forefathers lived in a veritable wilderness, beset by beasts and savages, hemmed in by unfriendly forces on every side, except for a narrow strip along the coastline.

They were governed from across the Atlantic Ocean by a mother country, intent upon royal domination and management of their affairs.

Economically, the early colonists, settlers lived here under primitive conditions. Their rock-strewn farms were meager openings in the vast expanse of forest, their villages separated by intervening woods and wilderness.

But from hilltop to hilltop, majestically rose their meeting houses, the center of their community lives, the habitat of their religious spirit and their fierce determination to establish places of worship in communities of law and order and free democratic government.

But these primitive conditions were not destined to be long continued. The powerful spiritual strength, and the incredible faith and courage, the amazing resourcefulness, determination and sacrifices of the early pioneers, their persistency and never-say-die spirit, in time, triumphed over the forces of repression which seemed to surround them.

I need not recite the rest of this wonderful story because it is set in golden letters in the history books recording the growth of ordered, civil liberty, economic growth and strength, and the spiritual uplift of this great nation.

Today we may all be proud to note that our country is the giant of the North American Continent, the most powerful, richest and most advanced nation in all the world, rich almost beyond contemplation, powerful in ways that stagger the imagination, rich with accumulations of industry and the returns of commerce and the highest standards of living that the world has ever known.

Gone are the wild beasts and savages, fleeing before a way of civilization that could not be stayed.

Gone is the military dictatorship, the imperialistic control, the harsh trappings of tyranny.

With material progress has come unprecedented progress in the arts, the sciences, civilization, religion, spiritual development, industrial advancement, and all these have their proud temples and impact in this beautiful town of such historic worth and fame, and in other towns, villages and cities spread from coast to coast, north, south, east and west, all over this great nation.

Truly, a miracle has taken place in the astonishing transformation that is everywhere to be seen. God has smiled on the wilderness and it has become a garden. He has blessed our people beyond measure and given us the opportunity to live in the greatest of all countries the world has ever known.

In this vast creative work, vigorously undertaken and pursued by those who have come before us. Mendon has played its part, a moving, impressive part for the benefit of her people, her deep, Amercian traditions and convictions and the high purpose and ideals of the early settlers.

In war and peace, Mendon has had an outstanding record of patriotism, devotion to the nation, and proud participation in the great work of shaping and advancing this greatest of all civilizations.

A frontier town beset by Indian raids, many struggles, hazards and setbacks, at times far removed from its neighbors, its people were never deterred and persisted in the struggle for freedom, for law and order, for economic advancement and for spiritual values.

Think of it, my friends, three hundred years of existence as a community. What a glorious record of achievement, support of family and community life and unstinted sacrifices for the values in which your people and the American people have devoutly believed.

Down through the long, unbroken channels of history, you sons and daughters of Mendon have held the torch high, you have remained at your posts of duty, you have given example to the country and the world of what it means to live as loyal, industrious citizens, upholding each other, advancing the interests of your community, and loyalty supporting the principles and safety of your country.

From Bunker Hill to Korea and Vietnam, where we now hope and pray there will be early peace, Mendon has shown its mettle. It has demonstrated its allegiance to the proud standards of freedom, to the demands of progress in this changing world, in this age of terrible, destructive power, fabulous advancement and untold potential yet to be realized.

Truly, this is an inspiring record that your forebears and you of this generation have made. It is a tremendous contribution to this nation, enduring testimony of the quality of your patriotism and love of country and your high resolve to live as free Americans.

Yet, today, what a paradox it is, rich in material rewards as we are, powerful beyond measure, that we should face greater problems and greater difficulties than ever before, because in a very real sense it is true that the institutions which the early forebears founded here and elsewhere in our land with such valor, intelligence, resolution and sacrifice, and which have been defended with blood and treasure by so many generations, are challenged as never before.

Today we must draw inspiration from this glorious past, even as we recognize that we can never turn back the clock, that the nation and the world must go forward, must go upward to broader, higher goals, must adapt to the incredible revolutionary changes that are taking place all around us, and the pressures that are being exerted upon us by those who are seeking to destroy our way of life and impress upon us the rigors and slavery of the collective state.

To be sure, we must be very thankful, with hearts overflowing with everlasting gratitude for the blessings of the Creator, for the marvelous work of those who have preceded us, whose blessed memory we honor with such fond recollection and deep gratitude tonight.

It is an axiom that each generation must labor, struggle and strive to sustain itself, to better its lot, to move forward in changing times, and, if it is necessary, to fight for human liberties, for freedom and the right to enjoy democratic government, free enterprise, free religious and civil rights and all the precious rights and privileges Americans enjoy.

It is for us of this generation to leave nothing undone to uphold our gleaming heritage of ordered liberty and profound faith, so that we can and will overcome and conquer every obstacle, threat and danger that confronts us along the way.

Thank God our nation is powerful and great, that it is pledged to a peaceful world, to peace at home and abroad. Fortunately, even as we gather here, some of the shadows seem to be lifting and there are some signs of hope.

But we must persist with all our strength, power and might to protect and preserve our beloved free country, to keep our hearts and minds responsive to the national purpose, the goals and needs of our people, to live in the spirit of those who shaped our free institutions with the endowments of understanding, brotherhood and compassion that come to us from the spiritual truths and moral precepts of those who established our way of life.

In that way, God willing, if we but strive to the best of our ability and strength to make this nation and this world a better place in which to live for ourselves and for all people, in our time, we will have contributed something worthy of our glorious past, worthy of the present and our own best instincts as patriotic defenders and preservers of the greatest nation on earth, and worthy of the future perpetuation of everything noble and good that our nation stands for.

Our hearts are grateful tonight for the encouragement and sustaining strength which Mendon has contributed through 300 years of this great crusade for freedom, humanity and justice represented by our country.

I hope and pray, in a most reverent spirit, that in the next three hundred years, and in all the time to come, Mendon and its loyal people will grow and prosper and achieve even higher goals under free democratic government and in the ways of independence, liberty and peace, and that all its people will continue to live in prosperity and happiness, not only in the material sense, but in the spiritual graces that have always been a part of this splendid American community.

In this way, and in this spirit, we can best be assured of passing safely, with freedom and security unimpaired, through the trials and tribulations of the present and all the years ahead and keep this nation, what it was intended to be, and what it must continue to be, a safe, free, secure dwelling place for the human spirit, a sanctuary for those unalterably dedicated to human freedom and pledged to human survival progress and peace.

Again with my heartiest congratulations and very best wishes for the future, and my warm thanks for the high privilege of being with you tonight.

SENATE

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 10, 1967

The Senate met at 12 noon, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, grant us, we beseech Thee, the grace of toiling in these fields of time in the sense of the eternal. We bring our stained lives to the holiness that shames our uncleanness, to the love that forgives our iniquities, to the truth that reveals our falseness, to the patience that outlasts our fickleness.

In the brooding silence of this still moment before the rush of another day, may open windows of faith flood our darkness with light, that in Thy sunshine's blaze our life may brighter, fairer be. Give us inner greatness of spirit and clearness of vision to meet and match the large designs of this glorious yet demanding day, that we may keep step with the drumbeat of Thy purpose which is marching on.

Make us patient and thoughtful one with another in the fret and jar of these difficult days, remembering that each comrade by our side fights a hard fight and walks a lonely way. Teach us a gentler tone, a sweeter charity of words, and a more healing touch for all the smart of this wounded world.

In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, October 9, 1967, be dispensed with.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements during the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SESSION TODAY

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees may be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of measures on the calendar, beginning with Calendar No. 563 and the succeeding measures in sequence, to and including Calendar No. 571.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF THE HIGHWAY SAFETY ACT OF 1966

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1552) to amend the Highway Safety Act of 1966 which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works, with amendments, on page 2, line 12, after "(A)" strike out "(ii)"; after line 13, strike out:

"(ii) the terms of office of members first taking office after the date of enactment of this section shall expire as follow: twelve at the end of one year after such date, twelve at the end of two years after such date, and eleven at the end of three years after such date, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, and".

And after line 20 insert:

"(2) (A) Each member appointed by the President shall hold office for a term of three years, except that (i) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term of which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term, and (ii) the terms of office of members first taking office after the date of enactment of this section shall expire as follows: Twelve at the end of one year after the date such committee members are appointed by the President, twelve at the end of two years after the date such committee members are appointed by the President, and eleven at the end of three years after the date such committee members are appointed, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, and (iii) the term of any member shall be extended until the date on which the successor's appointment is effective. None of the members appointed by the President who has served a three-year term, other than Federal officers or employees, shall be eligible for reappointment within one year following the end of his preceding term."

So as to make the bill read:

S. 1552

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 404 of the Highway Safety Act (23 U.S.C. 401 et seq.) is amended by—

(1) striking subsection (a) (1) thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(a) (1) There is established in the Department of Commerce a National Highway Safety Advisory Committee, composed of the Secretary or an officer of the Department appointed by him, who shall be Chairman, the Federal Highway Administrator, and thirty-five members appointed by the President, no more than four of whom shall be Federal officers or employees. The appointed members, having due regard for the purposes of this chapter, shall be selected from among representatives of various State and local governments, including State legislatures, of public and private interests contributing to, affected by, or concerned with highway safety, including the national organizations of passenger car, bus, and truck owners, and of other public and private agencies, organizations, or groups demonstrating an active interest in highway safety, as well as research scientists and other individuals who are expert in this field."

(2) striking subsection (a) (2) (A) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) (A) Each member appointed by the President shall hold office for a term of three years, except that (i) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term of which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term, and (ii) the terms of office of members first taking office after the date of enactment of this section shall expire as follows: Twelve at the end of one year after the date such committee members are appointed by the President, twelve at the end of two years after the date such committee members are appointed by the President, and eleven at the end of three years after the date such committee members are appointed, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, and (iii) the term of any member shall be extended until the date on which the successor's appointment is effective. None of the members appointed by the President who has served a three-year term, other than Federal officers or employees, shall be eligible for reappointment within one year following the end of his preceding term."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 581), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SUMMARY OF THE BILL

S. 1552 would increase the size of the National Highway Safety Advisory Committee, created pursuant to section 404, title 23, United States Code from 29 to 35. This increase in size would be for the purpose of including among the membership of that Committee, representatives of "national organizations of passenger car, bus, and truck owners." The committee amendment incorporates in S. 1552, the language of S. 2092 relating to the reappointment of those persons appointed to serve on the Committee for a term of less than 3 years.

SCOPE OF THE LEGISLATION

The Highway Safety Act of 1966 (23 U.S.C. 401 et seq.) created within the Department of Transportation a National Highway Safety Advisory Committee appointed by the President to advise, consult with, and make recommendations to the Secretary of Transportation on matters relating to the activities and functions of the Department in the field of highway safety. As presently constituted, the Committee, while composed of capable and knowledgeable individuals, does not have on it representatives of major highway users whom the Committee on Public Works feels can make a significant and substantial contribution to the work of the National Highway Safety Advisory Committee. In addition, because of the large number of public and private organizations concerned with highway safety, there is at present only token representation on the advisory group from State legislatures and police officials.

Since State legislatures and police officials are most directly concerned with the creation and implementation of effective State and community safety programs called for under the terms of the Highway Safety Act of 1966, stronger representation from these groups is vitally needed.

The Committee on Public Works is also concerned by the fact that due to the understandable delay in forming the Advisory Committee, appointments to it for the initial 1-year term were made in April of 1967 and that term expired in September 1967. The present statutory requirement barring reappointment of any member other than a Federal officer or employee until the expiration of 1 year following such service will deprive the Advisory Committee of competent individuals who have only had an opportunity to begin their work. To offset this unintended result S. 1552 would change the law so that the 1-year hiatus will only apply to appointees who have served a 3-year term.

The issues resolved by S. 1552, as reported by the Committee on Public Works, were discussed during the recent hearings on highway beautification and safety held in June and July of 1967.

COMMITTEE VIEWS

The Committee on Public Works believes that S. 1552, as amended, will enable the President to broaden the membership of the National Highway Safety Advisory Committee to include representatives from groups which can significantly contribute to the meaningful achievement of the Advisory Committee's objectives. The committee is of the belief that the increase in membership would not create so large a group as to make it unwieldly and that it would strengthen the membership thereof.

The Committee on Public Works recommends the enactment of S. 1552, as amended.

COMPULSORY SCHOOL ATTENDANCE AND TAKING OF SCHOOL CENSUS IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (S. 768) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for compulsory school attendance, for the taking of a school census in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed as follows:

S. 768

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of section 1 of article II of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for compulsory school attendance, for the taking of a school census in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved February 4, 1925 (43 Stat. 807; sec. 31–208, D.C. Code), is amended by striking therefrom "all children between the ages of three and eighteen years permanently or temporarily residing in the District of Columbia, and annually thereafter or" and inserting in lieu thereof "all children under eighteen years permanently or temporarily residing in the District of Columbia."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 582), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The purpose of this bill to amend existing law so as to assure an accurate school census and to provide a greater source of data for anticipatory planning purposes with respect to zoning and school construction in the District of Columbia. The bill would specifically accomplish the following:

(1) Provide that all children below the age of 18 years be listed in the taking of the school census, instead of the present requirement that only those between the ages of 3 and 18 years be listed. The committee was informed that this provision is desirable and would be very helpful to the Board of Education in making projections of future enrollments. It would also be of assistance in anticipatory planning with respect to zoning and school construction, with the ultimate result benefiting the District financially; and

(2) Provide that the census be made in accordance with such frequency as the Superintendent of Schools and the Board of Education find necessary and desirable instead of annually, as required in present law. This provision was recommended to the committee on the basis of a more economical use of funds than is possible under existing law.

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia favor enactment of the bill. They informed the committee that enactment of the measure could result in a financial saving to the District, and that, in any event, passage would involve no additional expense.

The Subcommittee on Public Health, Education, Welfare, and Safety held public hearings on the bill on March 10, 1967. No one appeared in opposition.

Similar bills passed the Senate in the 85th, 86th, 87th, 88th, and 89th Congresses, respectively.

PUBLIC CREMATORIUM IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (S. 770) to amend the act to provide for the establishment of a public crematorium in the District of Columbia was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 770

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2 of the Act approved April 20, 1906, as amended (34 Stat. 123; § 27–130, D.C. Code), is amended (1) by deleting from the first sentence ", and for the incineration of such other bodies as may be presented for that purpose by the persons having custody thereof"; (2) by striking from the second sentence the comma immediately after "crematorium" and inserting in lieu thereof a period, and striking the remainder of the sentence; and (3) by striking the third sentence.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 583), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the reported bill is to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An Act to provide for the establishment of a public crematorium in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes" approved April 20, 1906, as amended (34 Stat. 123; § 27–130, D.C. Code), to delete language which presently requires the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to prescribe and collect fees for the incineration of bodies, and by special order, waive, or reduce the usual charges when enforcement of such charges would be burdensome or oppressive upon those responsible for the disposal of the remains. This would allow the District to operate the crematorium only for public health purposes.

BACKGROUND

The act approved April 20, 1906, provided for the establishment in the District of Columbia of a public crematorium and authorized and directed the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to operate the crematorium for the incineration of all bodies that could not, except at public expense, be disposed of within a reasonable time after death and for the incineration of such other bodies as may be presented for that purpose by persons having custody thereof. The act further authorized the Commissioners to prescribe and collect fees in such amounts as may be required to defray the cost of incineration. The Commissioners could, by special order, waive or reduce the usual charges whenever, in their opinion, to enforce such charges would be burdensome or oppressive upon the persons responsible for the disposal of the remains.

When this act was passed over 60 years ago there were no crematories in the District of Columbia. At the present time there are numerous privately owned crematoriums for use by persons who are able to pay for the services of a crematorium. The District crematorium is presently being used only as an adjunct of the District of Columbia General Hospital and for the disposition of bodies for reasons of public health by direction of the Director of Public Health or the coroner. If the District crematorium had continued to accept bodies for cremation upon payment of a fee, the District crematorium would be operating in competition with privately operated crematoriums. Since the District crematorium is now being used only for public health purposes the requirement that the Commissioners make specific waivers of fees is unnecessarily burdensome and creates needless administrative problems.

This bill relieves the Commissioners of the requirement to prescribe and collect fees for incineration and to waive or reduce fees where they are determined to be burdensome or oppressive. This amendment of section 2 of the act will authorize the crematorium to be used only for public health purposes.

HEARING

A public hearing was conducted by the Subcommittee on Public Health, Education, Welfare, and Safety on March 10, 1967. There was no opposition to the bill. The District of Columbia Commissioners and the District of Columbia Department of Public Health recommend enactment of S. 770.

TRANSPORTATION OF SCHOOLCHILDREN IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (S. 1631) to raise the maximum age limit of schoolchildren entitled to transportation in the District of Columbia at a reduced fare was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1631

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the regulation of fares for the transportation of schoolchildren in the District of Columbia", approved August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 616, D.C. Code, sec. 44–214a), is amended by striking out "eighteen" and inserting "twenty".

Sec. 2. This Act shall take effect on the first day of the first month which follows its approval by at least thirty days.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 584), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to amend the first section of the act entitled "An Act to provide for the regulation of fares for the transportation of schoolchildren in the District of Columbia", approved August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 616, D.C. Code, sec. 44–214a), by increasing from 18 years of age to 20 years of age those schoolchildren eligible for transportation to and from schools in the District of Columbia at a reduced fare.

NEED FOR LEGISLATION

Existing law provides that schoolchildren not over the age of 18 may travel by street railway and bus going to and from public, parochial, or like schools in the District of Columbia at not more than one-half the cash fare established from time to time by the Public Service Commission for regular route transportation within the District of Columbia. Your committee was advised that this bill is in the spirit of the national and local programs of encouraging school dropouts to finish their education. There are 3,723 schoolchildren in the District of Columbia between the ages of 18 and 20 in the present school year who could ride public transportation at reduced fare if this legislation is enacted. In many instances the economic condition of the family is one of the major contributing causes for a student to drop out of school. Passage of this legislation would be an encouragement for those between the ages of 18 and 20 to remain in school and those who are dropouts to return to school. It is the committee's intent that the benefit of the bill shall be limited to students attending elementary and secondary schools, and not extend to those attending colleges and universities.

Existing law provides that should the net operating income of a common carrier required to furnish reduced-fare transportation to schoolchildren fall below the rate of return established in its last rate case, the carrier is entitled to a subsidy to bring the earnings of the carrier up to the established rate of return. If the carrier's rate of return is less than that established in its last rate case, the carrier is entitled to a subsidy computed on the difference between the fare paid by schoolchildren, which is 10 cents, and the lowest adult fare of the carrier in the District of Columbia. The subsidy may not exceed the difference between the carrier's actual and authorized rate of return.

The District of Columbia Commissioners have advised the committee that if all the 3,723 schoolchildren between the ages of 18 and 20 years rode D.C. Transit System buses it is doubtful that any cost would be incurred by the District government because it is probable that, based on past experience, D.C. Transit will earn a sufficient annual return to preclude any payment. If all these 3,723 additional schoolchildren were to ride WMA Transit Co. buses, which is unlikely, and the carrier's rate of return falls below that established in the company's last rate case, the cost to the District government could run approximately $204,000. In 1965 WMA Transit Co., which operates between Prince Georges County, Md., and the District, received $31,745.50 under the school fare subsidy law. To date, D.C. Transit System, Inc. has received no subsidy payments under the law.

HEARING

At a public hearing conducted by the Subcommittee on Public Health, Education, Welfare, and Safety on July 11, 1967, representatives of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the Superintendent of Schools testified in support of the bill. There were no witnesses in opposition.

AMENDMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC SCHOOL FOOD SERVICES ACT

The bill (S. 2012) to amend the District of Columbia Public School Food Services Act was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2012

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the last sentence of section 5 of the District of Columbia Public School Food Services Act (65 Stat. 369; sec. 31–1404, D.C. Code, 1961 edition), is amended by striking the comma following "motor trucks" and inserting in lieu thereof a period, and by striking the remainder of such sentence.

Sec. 2. The first sentence of section 6 of such Act, as amended (sec. 31–1405, D.C. Code, 1961 edition) is amended to read as follows: "Appropriations are authorized for all necessary expenses of the Office of Central Management, Department of Food Services, in the public schools of the District of Columbia, including the payment of compensation for personal services and Government contributions to related insurance costs; for the acquisition, maintenance, and replacement of equipment used or acquired for use in the conduct of the Department of Food Services in the public schools of the District of Columbia, and for reimbursement of the District of Columbia public school food services fund for lunches served in accordance with section 9 of the National School Lunch Act (60 Stat. 233, title 42, sec. 1758, U.S.C., 1958 edition), to children without cost to such children or at reduced cost."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimus consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 585), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purposes of this bill, S. 2012, are (1) to authorize appropriations of public funds to pay salaries and related costs of operating the Office of Central Management of the

Food Services Department in the public schools and (2) to provide for appropriation of public money to pay for lunches furnished to all needy elementary and secondary public school children whose parents are not recipients of public welfare.

Under existing law (65 Stat. 369) the expenses, salaries, and related costs of conducting the Office of Central Management of the Department of Food Services of the public schools in the District of Columbia are paid from the food services fund. This fund is a revolving account into which all revenues from the operation of food services in the public schools are placed. These receipts are used for the "purchase of foods, supplies, and all other services and expenditures of whatever nature which are necessary for the conduct of the Department of Food Services, including personal services, the operation and maintenance of motor trucks, *and the expenses of conducting the Office of Central Management.*" [Emphasis supplied.]

In reporting on the bill, the Board of Commissioners made the following statement concerning the need for striking the above italicized language from the existing law:

"Experience has shown that these costs cannot continue to be borne by the school lunch program (salaries and related insurance costs of employees of the Office of Central Management) without this assistance. The Superintendent of Schools reports that conferences with officials of the Department of Agriculture and with food services directors of other cities and States tend to the conclusion that such costs should not be borne by the students any more than the other costs of administering the school system. The Superintendent points out that the staff of the Office of Central Management of the Food Services Department serves in a dual capacity of State and city administration for three Federal programs; namely, the national school lunch program, the special milk program, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture donated-commodity program for District of Columbia schools and institutions. The Superintendent further notes that comparable functions in the States are administered by State officials of education, and administrative staff salaries are paid from State appropriated funds, whereas the District of Columbia school lunch program is forced to bear this expense."

In the District of Columbia public schools elementary needy lunch program, authorized by Public Law 86–104, all students certified as needy by the school principal, whether or not their families are receiving public assistance, have their lunches paid for from public funds. In the secondary school program there is a distinction made between lunches served to needy pupils whose families receive public assistance and lunches served to needy pupils whose families do not receive public assistance.

Public Law 85–901, enacted by the 85th Congress, provides authorization for reimbursement to be made to the secondary schools only in cases where free lunches are served to children of families who are recipients of public assistance granted by the government of the District of Columbia.

There are three factors which cause financial crises in school lunch programs. One is a decrease in value in the type of U.S. Department of Agriculture donated commodities. The value of these commodities has decreased since 1962 from approximately 5½ cents per meal to approximately 2 cents per meal. Food costs went up in 1966 about 4 percent. The cash sudsidy from the Agriculture Department has diminished since 1962 from an average of 9 cents per meal to approximately 5 cents per meal. The need and desire to bring services up to a decent level has also increased costs.

The committee is advised that the expenses of the Department of Food Services have been exceeding its revenues for some time. The excess of costs over receipts in school year 1966–67 was $50,000, and $59,000 the previous year. Thus far, these losses have been absorbed by diminishing revenues in the public school food services fund built up in earlier years.

In an effort to increase revenue, the price of a school lunch was raised 5 cents last year. The result was a decline in participation. Even a minor rise in price places certain children in the position of not being able to buy a lunch. They go hungry. The committee agrees with the school system that such price increases are undesirable, and not the way to relieve the financial problems of the food services fund. The better approach is to relieve the fund of central management expenses as proposed in the bill.

The cost of the Central Management Office for fiscal year 1968 is estimated to be approximately $100,000 for salaries and related insurance costs of the Director, two assistant directors, and 10 other employees. The cost of providing free lunches to needy secondary school pupils whose parents do not receive public assistance payments from the District will be $80,000 making the total estimated annual cost of the bill $180,000.

HEARING

At a public hearing conducted by the Subcommittee on Public Health, Education, Welfare, and Safety on July 11, 1967, representatives of the Superintendent of Schools of the District of Columbia supported enactment of S. 2012. There was no opposition testimony. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia also recommend its enactment.

Identical bills, S. 3314, S. 1078, and S. 1312, passed the Senate in the 87th, 88th, and 89th Congresses, respectively.

AMENDMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TRAFFIC ACT AND THE MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY RESPONSIBILITY ACT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 765) to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, and the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia, as amended, so as to bring within the provisions of such acts any person, operating a motor vehicle while under the influence of a drug rendering such person incapable of operating the motor vehicle safely which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with an amendment, on page 2, line 10, after the word "him" insert "or unless he can establish that he was not aware that the administration of a drug to him imposed on him an obligation not to operate a motor vehicle until such time as the effect of the drug was dissipated."; so as to make the bill read:

S. 765

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of subsection (b) of section 10 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended (43 Stat. 1124; 68 Stat. 734; sec. 40–609(b), D.C. Code), is amended to read: "No person shall, while under the influence of any intoxicating liquor or narcotic drug, or while under the influence of any other drug to a degree which renders such individual incapable of safely driving a vehicle, operate any vehicle in the District of Columbia. The fact that any person charged with a violation of this subsection is using or has used a drug without violating any other statute or regulation applicable in the District of Columbia shall not constitute a defense against any charge of violating this subsection, unless such person can establish that he had no knowledge of the effect of any drug which he had taken or which had been administered to him, or unless he can establish that he was not aware that the administration of a drug to him imposed on him an obligation not to operate a motor vehicle until such time as the effect of the drug was dissipated. As used in this Act, the term 'drug' means (1) articles recognized in the official United States Pharmacopoeia, official Homoeopathic Pharmacopoeia of the United States, or official National Formulary, or any supplement to any of them; and (2) articles intended for use in the diagnosis, cure, mitigation, treatment, or prevention of disease in man or other animals; and (3) articles (other than food) intended to affect the structure or any function of the body of man or other animals; and (4) articles intended for use as a component of any article specified in clauses (1), (2), or (3) of this subsection; but does not include devices or their components, parts, or accessories."

Sec. 2. Subsection (d) of section 10 of such Act, as amended (sec. 40–609(d), D.C. Code), is amended by striking "narcotic".

Sec. 3. The third proviso of subsection (a) of section 13 of such Act, as amended (sec. 40–302(a), D.C. Code), is amended by striking "narcotic drugs" and inserting in lieu thereof "a drug".

Sec. 4. Subsection (a) of section 37 of the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia, approved May 25, 1954, as amended (72 Stat. 955; sec. 40–453 (a), D.C. Code), is amended by striking "narcotic".

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 586), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of S. 765 is to amend existing motor vehicle laws in the District of Columbia to provide that it shall be an offense to drive while under the influence of drugs, not classified as narcotics, that render the individual incapable of safely driving a motor vehicle.

NEED FOR THE LEGISLATION

Existing law in the District of Columbia prohibits driving under the influence of narcotic drugs. With the development of several new drugs, not classified as narcotics, but which may have the effect of rendering a person under the influence of such a drug incapable of driving a motor vehicle safely, it has become necessary that persons using these drugs be prohibited from driving while under their influence to the extent that driving ability is impaired.

Hearings on S. 765 were held before the Subcommittee on Public Health, Education, Welfare, and Safety on March 10, 1967, to update testimony from the hearing during the 89th Congress on S. 2954, which was identical to S. 765.

By the terms of S. 765, driving while under the influence of nonnarcotic drugs to a degree that the person is incapable of driving his car safely will be unlawful, together with the presently prohibited driving under the influence of intoxicating liquor or narcotic drugs. This bill, patterned after the Uniform Vehicle Code sponsored by the National Committee on Uniform Traffic Laws, is similar to the laws of approximately 32 States.

The committee believes that there is a possibility of danger to the public arising out of the excessive use of nonnarcotic drugs that are readily available in many instances over the counters of drugstores. The object of this bill is to make known to the public that there is a danger in the excessive use of nonnarcotic drugs and that people who use these drugs in amounts to impair their driving ability may constitute a menace to themselves and to the public.

Several categories of drugs may cause impairment of driving ability. These categories and their effects are as follows:

1. *Sedatives and hypnotics.*—These drugs have a depressant effect on the central nervous system and are used in the treatment of tension, insomnia, anxiety, and epilepsy, for muscle relaxation and in conjunction impairment of mental facilities, and other symptoms that characterize alcoholic intoxication.

2. *Tranquilizers.* — Mild tranquilizers are used as muscle relaxants and for treatment of mental and emotional illnesses characterized by anxiety and nervousness. In low dosages, they have mild and infrequent side effects, but may produce drowsiness, blurred vision, and dizziness. Because tolerance develops to the sedative effects, chronic users may increase their dosages; and as dosages are increased, impairment of performance similar to intoxication may occur.

3. *Antihistamines.*—These compounds are used in the treatment of allergic conditions such as hay fever, for motion sickness, and Parkinson's disease. They are also used in insomnia and cold preparations that do not require a prescription. Antihistamines have a depressant effect on the central nervous system, and may cause drowsiness, dizziness, lack of coordination, and irritability. The effects vary from person to person, and occurrence is unpredictable.

4. *Stimulants.*—These drugs are widely used to curb appetites, to treat mild forms of depression, and to counteract drowsiness. Side effects of stimulants may include tremor, irritability and dizziness. They may obscure the danger signals of fatigue, and may narrow the focus of attention and create a fictitious sense of self-confidence. Excessive use may result in physical exhaustion and lack of response to normal stimuli.

5. *Hallucinogens.*—The primary effect of hallucinogens, such as LSD, is distortion of perception, accompanied at higher dosages by hallucinations. Other effects include nausea, and enlargement of the pupils.

6. *Anti-infectives.*—This group includes antibiotics and sulfa drugs. Among the side effects may be dizziness, nausea, and impaired hearing.

7. *Other drugs.*—Several other commonly used drugs may have side effects that could impair driving ability. Antidepressants and indirect stimulants taken for treatment of depression may cause hypotension or hypertension, dizziness, drowsiness, blurred vision, and nausea. Preparations for gastrointestinal disorders generally contained drugs with atropine-like effects which can adversely affect vision. Also, the visual impairment caused by eye drops used in eye examinations may persist for several days. Anticonvulsants used in treatment of epilepsy and antidiabetic drugs can seriously impair driving ability. Even aspirin, if excessively used, may impair driving ability through dizziness, confusion, and impairment of vision.

8. Finally, there is a problem caused by combinations of drugs. Certain drugs, which might not affect driving ability when taken moderately and alone, may seriously impair driving ability when taken in combination with other similarly "safe" drugs or in combination with alcohol.

PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

The first section of S. 765 amends the District of Columbia Traffic Act to make it an offense, along with driving under the influence of narcotics and intoxicating liquor, to drive while under the influence of any other drug to a degree that renders the individual incapable of safely driving a vehicle.

The legal use of such drugs will not be a defense against a charge of driving in violation of this section. The inclusion of this provision is a recognition of the fact that legal use of drugs, like legal use of alcohol, is not being attacked, but that their legal use may cause impairment of a driver's mental or physical functioning to the extent that he becomes a danger to the community, and that such use is the target. However, the bill also provides a defense to persons charged with violating the section if the person can establish that he did not know the effect of a drug he had taken or which had been administered to him. This exception is to cover the situation in which a patient of a doctor or dentist is administered a drug that could affect his driving ability, and he is not told what the effect might be.

Section 2 amends the Traffic Act to provide for the revocation of the operator's permit or driving privilege of persons convicted in the District of driving in violation of the act as amended by S. 765.

Section 3 provides that driving privileges will remain revoked or suspended during the pendency of an application for review of a revocation order pursuant to the provisions of S. 765.

Section 4 amends the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act to provide for the suspension of license and registration of vehicles registered in the name of any person who violates the provisions of S. 765, until the owner gives proof of future financial responsibility.

AMENDMENT

The committee has approved an amendment to the first section of S. 765 to provide that, in connection with the defense of lack of knowledge of a drug's effect, it shall be a defense to establish that the driver was not aware that the administration of a drug to him imposed on him an obligation not to operate a vehicle until the effects of such drugs had worn off. The purpose of this amendment is to make clear that the act is not intended to apply to the driver who has received medication but was not aware that he might experience side effects that could impair his driving ability or that he should not drive for awhile after being treated with a drug.

HEARING

At a public hearing conducted by the Subcommittee on Public Health, Education, Welfare, and Safety on March 10, 1967, representatives of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the Director, District of Columbia Department of Motor Vehicles, supported the enactment of S. 765. There was no opposition to the bill.

CONCLUSION

Your committee believes that the enactment of S. 765 will help to alleviate a danger to the public caused by the operation of motor vehicles by drivers who are under the influence of lawfully taken drugs and medicines which render them incapable of safely operating their vehicles. The committee recommends Senate approval of S. 765.

REGISTRY OF BLIND PERSONS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1224) to establish a register of blind persons in the District of Columbia, to provide for the mandatory reporting of information concerning such persons, and for other purposes which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with an amendment, on page 3, after line 12, insert a new section, as follows:

Sec. 6. Effective on the effective date of this Act or on the effective date of part IV of Reorganization Plan Numbered 3 of 1967, whichever is later, and notwithstanding section 401 of such plan, the function vested in the Commissioners under this Act relating to the prescribing of regulations shall be deemed to be vested in the Council established pursuant to part II of such plan, and any function vested in the Commissioners or Board of Commissioners by any other provision of this Act shall be deemed to be vested in the Commissioner appointed pursuant to part III of such plan.

So as to make the bill read:

S. 1224

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall establish and maintain a register of blind persons residing in the District of Columbia. Such register shall, under regulations prescribed by the Commissioners, provide information of such nature as will or may be of assistance in the planning of improved facilities and services to the blind and in the restoration and conservation of sight.

Sec. 2. Each health, educational, and social service agency or institution operating in the District of Columbia and having in its care or custody, either full or part time, or rendering service to, any person who is blind within the meaning of this Act, and each physician and osteopath licensed or registered by the District of Columbia who has in his professional care for diagnosis or treatment such a blind person, and each optometrist licensed by the District of Columbia who, in the course of his practice of optometry, ascertains that a person is blind, shall report in writing to the Commissioners the name, age, and residence of such person and such additional information as the Commissioners may, by regulation, require for incorporation in the register referred to in the first section. Such register and reports shall not be open to public inspection: *Provided,* That the Commissioners may make available in the form of statistical abstracts or digests information contained in such register and reports: *Provided further,* That the identity of persons referred to in such register or reports is not disclosed in such abstracts or digests.

Sec. 3. For the purpose of this Act, (1) the term "blind person" means, and the word "blind" refers to, a person who is totally blind or who has impaired vision of not more than 20/200 visual acuity in the better eye and for whom vision cannot be improved to better than 20/200, or who has loss of vision due wholly or in part to impairment of field vision or to oher factors which affect the usefulness of vision to a like degree, and (2) the term "Commissioners of the District of Columbia" and the word "Commissioners" means the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia or its designated agent.

Sec. 4. Any person who in good faith makes a report pursuant to this Act or pursuant to regulation promulgated under the authority of this Act, shall not, by reason thereof, be personally liable in damages.

Sec. 5. This Act shall take effect on the first day of the first month which follows its approval by at least thirty days.

Sec. 6. Effective on the effective date of this Act or on the effective date of part IV of Reorganization Plan Numbered 3 of 1967, whichever is later, and notwithstanding section 401 of such plan, the function vested in the Commissioners under this Act relating to the prescribing of regulations shall be deemed to be vested in the Council established pursuant to part II of such plan, and any function vested in the Commissioners or Board of Commissioners by any other provision of this Act shall be deemed to be vested in the Commissioner appointed pursuant to part III of such plan.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 587), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to establish a register of blind persons in the District of Columbia and provide for the mandatory reporting of information concerning such persons. The accumulation of statistical and factual information on blind persons in the District will enable agencies and institutions to better plan facilities, programs of assistance, medical care, counseling, guidance, training, and vocational rehabilitation for the blind.

The bill requires health, educational, and social service institutions, physicians, osteopaths, and optometrists rendering service to blind persons in the District of Columbia to report in writing to the Commissioner, for inclusion in a register, the name, age, and residence of any blind person coming to their attention, and such other information as may be required by regulations promulgated under the bill. The Commissioner would be authorized to make available statistical abstracts or digests of information contained in the register, but the identity of the persons referred to may not be disclosed, and the register would not be open to public inspection.

While the bill provides for the mandatory reporting of information concerning blind persons, it does not contain penalties for not reporting such information and does not impose coercive pressure on persons who do not comply with the law. Some physicians and agencies serving the blind consider information about blind persons whom they are serving to be confidential and the release of information about such blind persons a violation of confidence. The bill further provides that any person who in good faith makes a report pursuant to the act or pursuant to regulation promulgated under the authority of the act, shall not be personally liable in damages.

NEED FOR THE LEGISLATION

At the present time there are both publicly and privately established and financed programs in the District for the purpose of aiding blind persons to overcome the handicapping conditions of their disability. There are an estimated 1,000 blind persons residing in the District who are not receiving help from these programs because they are not known to the agencies. Blind persons are only discovered by chance or accident. These unknown blind are being denied adequate training and education to equip themselves to live a successful, self-dependent, and contributory life. They are being denied a sound and sensible understanding of their impairment, its restrictions and limitations, and the limitless possibilities of achievement and the specialized help available to them to overcome the difficulties and disadvantages of blindness.

Registers of blind persons have been established in 39 States and are successfully bringing together blind persons in need of special help with organizations available and qualified to help and assist them. At the present time in the District those organizations who formulate plans and administer programs must now guess as to needs and estimate as to numbers and possible costs.

The Biometrics Branch of the National Institutes of Neurological Diseases and Blindness, which is a part of the National Institutes of Health, is responsible for attempting to get established in various sections of the country model reporting areas, the primary purpose of which is to promote uniform reporting as to statistics about blindness which can be used for research. Your committee was advised that the Biometrics Branch has agreed to finance the establishment of such a blind register at a cost of $13,000, as a part of its national effort. The cost of maintaining such a register is estimated at $8,017 per annum. Of this amount $3,411 is reimbursable by the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, leaving a net cost to the District of $4,600.

HEARING

At a public hearing conducted by the Subcommittee on Public Health, Education, Welfare, and Safety on July 11, 1967, representatives of the Commissioners for the District of Columbia and the District of Columbia Department of Vocational Rehabilitation approved and supported enactment of the bill. The bill also has the support of the National Federation of the Blind.

AMENDMENT

The committee approved an amendment the effect of which is to appropriately transfer to the new Commissioner of the District of Columbia and the District of Columbia Council established pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1967 the functions vested by the bill in the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, on the effective date of the reorganization plan.

CONCLUSION

The committee recommends the approval of S. 1224 as amended.

PUBLIC DAY CARE SERVICES AND FOSTER HOME CARE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 318) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish and administer a plan to provide for the care and protection of children through public day care services, and to provide public assistance in the form of foster home care to certain dependent children which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments, on page 2, line 6, after the word "Columbia." insert:

The Commissioners are further authorized to establish and enforce rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of this title, including, without limitation, such standards of eligibility as will authorize the providing of day care only in cases in which they find that a need for such care exists, and that the provision by the District of Columbia of public day care services is in the best interests of the child, its mother, and the District.

After line 16 strike out:

(1) for the administration of such plan by the Department of Public Welfare, which shall set standards requiring operation of the program by personnel professionally trained in the fields of welfare, education, and health;

(2) for cooperative arrangements by the Department of Public Welfare with the Department of Public Health, Board of Education, Department of Recreation, and the National Capital Housing Authority to assure their maximum utilization in the provision of necessary services for children receiving day care and in the setting of standards for day care agencies;

(3) that the Department of Public Welfare may purchase care from private organizations or individuals which are licensed by the District of Columbia and which are operating under standards approved by the Department of Public Welfare;

(4) for the payment by the parent of that portion of the fee which the Department of Public Welfare determines that the parent is able to pay; and

(5) that the Department of Public Welfare shall give priority to members of low-income groups and in particular to such members who are in work training programs.

And, in lieu thereof, insert:

(1) for the establishment of standards requiring operation of the program by personnel professionally trained in the fields of welfare, education, and health;

(2) for cooperative arrangements between the Department of Public Welfare, the Department of Public Health, Board of Education, Recreation Board, and the National Capitol Housing Authority to assure their maximum utilization in the provision of necessary services for children receiving day care and in the setting of standards for daycare agencies;

(3) that the Commissioners may purchase care from private organizations or individuals which are licensed by the District of Columbia and which are operating under standards approved by the Commissioners;

(4) for establishment by the Commissioners of fees to be charged parents for day care services, and for the payment by the parent of that portion of the fee which the Commissioners determine that the parent is able to pay; and

(5) that the Commissioners shall give priority to members of low-income groups and in particular to such members who are in work-training programs.

And on page 5, after line 21, to insert a new section, as follows:

Sec. 203. Effective on the effective date of this Act or on the effective date of part IV of Reorganization Plan Numbered 3 of 1967, whichever is later, and, notwithstanding section 401 of such plan, the functions vested in the Commissioners under this Act relating to the establishing of rules, regulations, standards, and fees shall be deemed to be vested in the Council established pursuant to part II of such plan, and any function vested in the Commissioners or Board of Commissioners by any other provision of this Act shall be deemed to be vested in the Commissioner appointed pursuant to part III of such plan.

So as to make the bill read:

S. 318

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I—PUBLIC DAY CARE SERVICES

Sec. 101. (a) In order to provide adequately for the care and protection of children whose parents are, for part of the day, working or seeking work, or otherwise absent from the home or unable for other reasons to provide parental supervision, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized, within the availability of appropriated funds, subject to the provisions of section 102 of this title, to establish and administer a plan providing for public day care services in the District of Columbia, including the provision of day care in facilities (including private homes) which are licensed by the District of Columbia. The Commissioners are further authorized to establish and enforce rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of this title, including, without limitation, such standards of eligibility as will authorize the providing of day care only in cases in which they find that a need for such care exists, and that the provision by the District of Columbia of public day care services is in the best interests of the child, its mother, and the District.

(b) Any plan established by the Commissioners under subsection (a) of this section shall, subject to the provisions of section 102 of this title, provide—

(1) for the establishment of standards requiring operation of the program by personnel professionally trained in the fields of welfare, education, and health;

(2) for cooperative arrangements between the Department of Public Welfare, the Department of Public Health, Board of Education, Recreation Board, and the National Capital Housing Authority to assure their maximum utilization in the provision of necessary services for children receiving day care and in the setting of standards for day-care agencies;

(3) that the Commissioners may purchase care from private organizations or individuals which are licensed by the District of Columbia and which are operating under standards approved by the Commissioners;

(4) for establishment by the Commissioners of fees to be charged parents for day care services, and for the payment by the parent of that portion of the fee which the Commissioners determine that the parent is able to pay; and

(5) that the Commissioners shall give priority to members of low-income groups and in particular to such members who are in work-training programs.

SEC. 102. In establishing any plan pursuant to this title, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall do so with a view to having such plan qualify for Federal funds under part 3 of title V of the Social Security Act.

TITLE II—FOSTER HOME CARE FOR CERTAIN DEPENDENT CHILDREN

SEC. 201. The District of Columbia Public Assistance Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 914; D.C. Code, sec. 3-201), is amended by inserting immediately after section 22 the following new section:

"SEC. 22A. In administering the provisions of this Act relating to aid to dependent children, the Commissioners shall provide public assistance in the form of foster home care to dependent children who are described in subsection (a) of section 408 of the Social Security Act and who are considered to be dependent children under this Act. In providing public assistance to such children, the Commissioners shall meet all the requirements contained in such section 408, as a condition to Federal payments under title IV of such Act on account of expenditures with respect to such children; except that the Commissioners shall not deny such assistance to any child otherwise eligible therefor because of the failure or refusal of the unemployed parent of such child to seek or accept employment or to participate in any program of vocational education, training, or rehabilitation."

SEC. 202. Nothing in this Act shall be construed so as to affect the authority vested in the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia by Reorganization Plan Numbered 5 of 1952 (66 Stat. 824). The performance of any function vested by this Act in the Board of Commissioners or in any office or agency under the jurisdiction and control of said Board of Commissioners may be delegated by said Board of Commissioners in accordance with section 3 of such plan.

SEC. 203. Effective on the effective date of this Act or on the effective date of part IV of Reorganization Plan Numbered 3 of 1967, whichever is later, and, notwithstanding section 401 of such plan, the functions vested in the Commissioners under this Act relating to the establishing of rules, regulations, standards, and fees shall be deemed to be vested in the Council established pursuant to part II of such plan, and any function vested in the Commissioners or Board of Commissioners by any other provision of this Act shall be deemed to be vested in the Commissioner appointed pursuant to part III of such plan.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 588), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

S. 318 is divided into two separate titles and has a twofold purpose as follows:

(1) Title I provides specific authorization for the government of the District of Columbia to provide public day care services for children in such manner as to enable it to qualify for allotments of Federal funds under part 3 of title V of the Social Security Act; and

(2) Title II amends the District of Columbia Public Assistance Act of 1962 so that in administering its provisions relating to aid to dependent children, the District government shall provide public assistance in the form of foster home care to the dependent children described in section 408(a) of the Social Security Act, as amended.

Hearings were held before the Subcommittee on Public Health, Education, Welfare, and Safety on March 10, 1967. S. 318 is similar to S. 2212, which passed the Senate during the 89th Congress.

TITLE I—PUBLIC DAY CARE SERVICES

Title I of the bill authorizes the District of Columbia government to establish and administer a plan to provide public day care services for children whose parents are working, seeking work, enrolled in training, or otherwise absent from home, or who for other reasons are unable to provide adequate and proper supervision.

Title I provides (1) that the day-care program shall be administered with personnel professionally trained in the fields of welfare, education, and health; (2) that Government agencies will cooperate to assure their maximum utilization in providing necessary services and setting standards; (3) that day care may be purchased from licensed private organizations or individuals; (4) that fees will be established for day-care services and collected according to the parents' ability to pay; and (5) that priority shall be given to members of low-income groups, especially those who are in work-training programs.

This bill limits any day-care program to available appropriated funds, but directs the District government, in establishing a day-care plan, to do so with a view toward having the plan qualify for Federal funds under the provisions of the Social Security Act relating to day care.

The effect of title I is to provide substantive legislation for initiating a comprehensive program to broaden and improve day-care services to replace the existing but severely limited program. The present program, pursuant to appropriations in the last several years, has been made available to the children of mothers in receipt of aid to families of dependent children under public assistance who are in training or actively seeking work.

The committee endorses and supports legislation which will make permanent an authorization for the provision of such day care services. The type of day care program which would result from the enactment of S. 318 will tend to maintain and strengthen family life by assuring adequate care and protection of children whose parents are necessarily absent from the home, and will encourage and enable additional parents to seek employment or work training, thereby increasing the possibility of reducing welfare rolls.

The Congress, in enacting the Social Security Amendments of 1962, envisioned a broad use of day care services. Day care is a relatively inexpensive form of public assistance. Particularly is this the fact when compared with direct welfare grants.

Aside from the monetary saving that will in all probability accrue to the community from this type of assistance, the benefit to the family will be immeasurable. The important point is that day care assistance will aid in producing a breadwinner, thus strengthening the family and giving renewed hope and initiative to the parent. It will also assure that children will not be neglected while their parent is out of the home during the day.

Title I provides for the District of Columbia an effective day care program and a program of sufficient scope to carry out the concepts of the day care program included in the Social Security Act.

TITLE II—FOSTER HOME CARE FOR CERTAIN DEPENDENT CHILDREN

Title II amends the District of Columbia Public Assistance Act of 1962 so as to require the Commissioners, in administering the aid to dependent children program established by such act, to provide public assistance in the form of foster home care to the dependent children described in section 408(a) of the Social Security Act, as added by the Social Security Amendments of 1962. Under this provision, the District program of aid to families of dependent children would be extended to include dependent children who are removed from the home of a parent or other relative as the result of a judicial determination that continuation in such home would be contrary to the welfare of the child, and who is subsequently placed in a foster family home or a private child-care institution.

In providing public assistance to recipients, the District government shall meet the requirements of section 408 of the Social Security Act. It is also provided that the District government shall not deny foster home care to any child otherwise eligible therefor because of the failure or refusal of the unemployed parent of such child to seek or accept employment or to participate in any program of vocational education, training, or rehabilitation.

COST

The committee is advised that the cost of the title I day care program proposed for fiscal year 1968 will be approximately $419,000, depending upon available appropriations. This includes funds appropriated for the District day care program, funds supplied by the Federal day care program, and Federal and local funds provided under the work and training opportunity center program. As of July 31, 1967, a total of 623 children were being provided day care services.

The committee is advised that proposed cost of the foster home program authorized by title II would be minimal, as only a relatively few children would be involved in the program who are not already covered by existing foster home care programs.

HEARING

A public hearing was conducted by the Subcommittee on Public Health, Education, Welfare, and Safety on March 10, 1967. There was no opposition to the bill. The District of Columbia Commissioners and the District of Columbia Health and Welfare Council recommend enactment of the bill as reported by the committee.

AMENDMENTS

The committee agreed to amend the bill to delineate the authority of the District government to set standards of eligibility for day care based on need for such care and in the best interests of the child, its mother, and the District. The committee also agreed to amendments which would vest the administrative functions of the day care program in the highest levels of the District government to be delegated to the appropriate operating agency, rather than in the subordinate Department of Public Welfare as originally proposed.

The committee also approved an amendment which appropriately transfers to the new Commissioner of the District of Columbia and the District of Columbia Council established pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1967 the functions vested by the bill in the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, on the effective date of the reorganization plan.

CONCLUSION

The committee recommends unanimously that S. 318, with the committee amendments, be approved.

AMENDMENT OF THE HEALING ARTS PRACTICE ACT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 3973) to amend the Healing Arts Practice Act, District of Columbia, 1928, and the act of June 6, 1892, relating to the licensing of dentists in the District of Columbia, to exempt from the licensing requirements of such acts physicians and dentists while performing services in the employ of the District of Columbia which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with an amendment, on page 3, after line 21, insert a new section, as follows:

> Sec. 3. Effective on the effective date of this Act or on the effective date of part IV of Reorganization Plan Numbered 3 of 1967, whichever is later, the functions vested in the Commissioners by this Act shall be deemed to be vested in the Commissioner appointed pursuant to part III of such plan.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 589), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Exemption From Licensing Requirements for Physicians and Dentists Employed by the District of Columbia

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of H.R. 3973 is to authorize the District of Columbia Government to employ qualified physicians and dentists who are licensed in a State or other jurisdiction of the United States, but who are not licensed to practice in the District of Columbia.

These physicians and dentists are to be employed to perform medical and dental duties solely under the administration of the District of Columbia Department of Public Health.

BACKGROUND

The District of Columbia Healing Arts Practice Act and the act to regulate the practice of dentistry in the District of Columbia presently forbid the practice of medicine and dentistry in the District of Columbia by persons not licensed to practice by the District of Columbia Department of Occupations and Professions. Exceptions to these licensing requirements do exist, however, in the case of medical officers of the Federal Government practicing in Washington in the discharge of their official duties, and of dentists in the employ of the Federal Government also in performance of their official duties here. These exceptions provide also a means by which physicians or dentists may visit the District of Columbia in the capacity of consultants.

Thus, qualified physicians not licensed by the District of Columbia are permitted to practice in the District in facilities of the Veterans' Administration, the U.S. Armed Forces, the Public Health Service, and St. Elizabeths Hospital; and dentists not licensed by the District may practice in facilities of the Armed Forces, U.S. Public Health Service, and the Veterans' Administration. However, in all cases these practices are limited to the performance of official duties.

Your committee is informed that the District of Columbia Department of Public Health frequently receives applications from qualified medical specialists and dentists who are licensed in other States, and that in many instances these applicants are trained and skilled in special medical fields in which the District of Columbia Department of Public Health is desperately short handed. However, before any such applicant may be employed by the Department he must be licensed by the District of Columbia. In some cases, these physicians and dentists are not eligible for a license under existing District of Columbia law. In other instances, such an applicant may be required under District of Columbia law to take an examination in order to secure licensure, even though he may have been in practice for many years and have achieved national recognition in a specialty field. In these circumstances a physician or dentist would be handicapped in such an examination by reason of having been out of school for some years, and would naturally be extremely reluctant to take refresher courses for the purpose. And even in those cases where there is no impediment to District of Columbia licensure by reciprocity, the time interval for this procedure is such that many physicians will prefer to accept other positions rather than to wait for the reciprocity to be accomplished.

Thus, the District of Columbia, in addition to being beset by problems in the recruitment of a sufficient number of qualified physicians and dentists to fulfill its functions properly, by reason of a serious nationwide shortage of dentists and of physicians in such specialties as radiology, pathology, psychiatry, public health, obstetrics, ophthalmology, and anesthesiology, is prevented because of this licensure problem from recruiting and employing many well-qualified physicians and dentists who are available and who would like to come to the District of Columbia.

Your committee is informed that many States now have authority to employ physicians within the State government without their possessing a license in that State. This is true particularly in the case of the employment of physicians employed to work in State institutions where there are difficulties in recruiting qualified physicians. There are also instances in which States may employ a physician pending his acquisition of a license in that State, which procedure also is not permitted in the District of Columbia. Further, some States have authorization to grant limited or temporary licenses, under which they may employ physicians without a State license. In some such cases, the temporary license can be renewed for a period of years, or even be made indefinite. None of these procedures is presently permitted in the District of Columbia.

PROCEDURE IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

With respect to this problem, your committee feels that the situation in the District is more comparable to that of the Federal Government than to any of the States, for the following several reasons:

First, the Nation's Capital is the center of a metropolitan area containing a relatively large number of Federal institutions employing many physicians and dentists. This puts the District of Columbia Department of Public Health in direct competition with these Federal agencies in the matter of recruiting these vitally needed personnel. For example, St. Elizabeths Hospital, which is actually the State mental institution for the District of Coulmbia with nearly 5,000 District patients, employs physicians and dentists who are not required to be licensed in the District of Columbia. Having a license in any State, they can treat these District of Columbia patients. Should any of these doctors and dentists wish to become employed by the District of Columbia Department of Public Health, however, and thus treat perhaps these same patients, he must obtain a District of Columbia license.

Second, other States are able to employ physicians and dentists who are retired from Federal service, and this is a very important source of recruitment. This is not feasible in the District of Columbia, because the District of Columbia government is in fact a part of the Federal civil service system, for which reason a retired Federal employee stands to lose most of his retirement benefits during any time of employment with the District of Columbia government.

NEED FOR THE LEGISLATION

This situation poses a very real problem for the District of Columbia Department of Public Health in its function of supplying a wide range of medical and dental services to thousands of residents of the Nation's Capital.

At a public hearing before the Subcommittee on Public Health, Education, Welfare, and Safety, on May 11, 1967, the Director of the District of Columbia Department of Public Health testified that the Department at that time had budgeted positions for 371 physicians and 31 dentists. Of these 402 positions, 200 are for interns or residents, who, of course, are not required to possess District of Columbia licenses. Your committee was advised further that as of April 6 of this year, the Department had 70 vacancies for physicians and four vacancies for dentists; and that positions for medical and dental specialists frequently remain vacant for more than a year.

In the face of this situation, the District of Columbia Department of Public Health has had applications for employment from physicians and dentists, well qualified in their specialty field, from numerous other States including New York, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Florida, California, and Pennsylvania. There certainly is no reason to believe that the standards these professional men had to meet for licensure in these States were in any way less rigid or less demanding than those provided for licensing in the District of Columbia. And yet, because these requirements may differ in some detail, these physicians and dentists often are required to stand a local examination.

A case in point is a senior physician at a State hospital in New England. This man was a board-certified internist. He became interested in psychiatry. He has had full residency training in psychiatry. He has served with a Veterans' Administration facility in California, where he was chief of professional services. He returned to New England to be with his family. He is interested in the challenge of our program and would like to come to the District of Columbia but will have to take the licensing examination. He does not wish to do this and, therefore, is not available to us, although licensed in Massachusetts and acceptable to the Veterans' Administration for senior responsibilities.

There is another physician, licensed in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and California, who would be available to the Department if licensure could be obtained.

As another illustration of the problem, the District of Columbia Department of Public Health has had a vital position vacant for more than 4 years, for a highly qualified dental officer with supervisory and administrative experience. At recent meetings of the American Dental Association in San Francisco and Dallas, several well-qualified dentists were interviewed and expressed interest in this position. However, when they learned that licensure in the District is a requirement, they promptly declined.

This situation, in the opinion of your committee, militates against the physical and mental well-being of the thousands of citizens of the District of Columbia to whom the ever-expanding services of the District of Columbia Department of Public Health are essential.

Physicians and dentists employed by the District of Columbia pursuant to this bill will be required to confine their practice to facilities of the District of Columbia government. They could not under any circumstances engage in private practice without obtaining a District of Columbia license.

Physicians and dentists employed under the provisions of this bill would have to meet the same qualifications as do other persons in their professions. However, they would not be required to possess a District of Columbia license if they already possess a license in another State or territory of the United States.

PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

The first section of the bill amends the Healing Arts Practice Act to exempt from the licensing requirements of that act practitioners discharging official duties while employed by the District of Columbia government who are not less than 21, and of good moral character, have studied the healing art for 4 years in an approved school, have had at least 1 year of training in an approved hospital, and are duly licensed in another State or jurisdiction in the United States.

Section 2 amends the act regulating the practice of dentistry to permit the Commissioners to issue a special license to dentists who hold a license in another State or jurisdiction of the United States, who have not had a dentistry license revoked or suspended, who have graduated from an approved dental college, and who have successfully completed any practical or theoretical examination required by the Commissioners.

HEARING

The Subcommittee on Public Health, Education, Welfare, and Safety conducted a public hearing May 11, 1967, on Senate bill S. 767, a bill comparable in purpose to the reported bill, at which time changes were proposed by the medical and dental societies of the District of Columbia. H.R. 3973 reflects these changes, and as passed by the House of Representatives on June 1, 1967, and reported by your committee the bill is supported by the Medical Society of the District of Columbia, the District of Columbia Dental Society, and the District of Columbia Department of Public Health. There is no opposition to the bill.

AMENDMENT

The amendment approved by the committee will transfer functions imposed on the Commissioners in accordance with Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1967.

CONCLUSION

H.R. 3973 will give the District of Columbia government the same authority which is currently extended to Federal agencies such as the Armed Forces, the Veterans' Administration, the U.S. Public Health Service, and St. Elizabeths Hospital, operating in the District of Columbia, to employ physicians and dentists who have been duly licensed in other States and who are otherwise fully accredited on the basis of specialty training, quality experience, and high professional recommendations.

The committee recommends that H.R. 3973 be enacted.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, that concludes the call of the calendar at this time.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 6527. An act to amend title 12, District of Columbia Code, to provide a limitation of actions for actions arising out of death or injury caused by a defective or unsafe improvement to real property;

H.R. 9059. An act to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act to provide that employer contributions do not have to be made under that act with respect to service performed in the employ of certain public international organizations;

H.R. 10213. An act to amend the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia, approved June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. 1125);

H.R. 11395. An act to amend the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965 authorizing the prosecution of a transit development program for the National Capital region and to further the objectives of the act of July 14, 1960; and

H.R. 11638. An act to amend title II of the act of September 19, 1918, relating to industrial safety in the District of Columbia.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 678. An act to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Upper and Lower Chehalis Tribes of Indians in Claims Commission docket No. 237, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3979. An act to amend section 6409(b)(1) of title 39, United States Code, which relates to transportation compensation paid by the Postmaster General; and

H.R. 11722. An act to authorize certain construction at military installations and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H.R. 6527. An act to amend title 12, District of Columbia Code, to provide a limitation of actions for actions arising out of death or injury caused by a defective or unsafe improvement to real property;

H.R. 9059. An act to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act to provide that employer contributions do not have to be made under that act with respect to service performed in the employ of certain public international organizations;

H.R. 10213. An act to amend the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia, approved June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. 1125);

H.R. 11395. An act to amend the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965 authorizing the prosecution of a transit development program for the National Capital region and to further the objectives of the act of July 14, 1960; and

H.R. 11638. An act to amend title II of the act of September 19, 1918, relating to industrial safety in the District of Columbia.

PETITION

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the city of Monte Sereno, Calif., favoring the enactment of some form of a Federal tax-sharing program, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. MONRONEY, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, with amendments:

S. 2303. A bill to provide a uniform system for fixing and adjusting the pay of employees in recognized trades or crafts, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 592).

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce:

Francis H. McAdams, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the National Transportation Safety Board.

BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts:

S. 2513. A bill to amend the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963 to provide assistance for the specialized training of physical educators and recreation personnel for mentally retarded and other handicapped children, and for research and demonstration projects relating to the physical education and recreation of such children; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. RANDOLPH (for himself and Mr. BYRD of West Virginia):

S. 2514. A bill to grant the consent of Congress to the Wheeling Creek Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention District Compact; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JACKSON (for himself, Mr. KUCHEL, and Mr. BIBLE):

S. 2515. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 2516. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jose A. Sierra; and

S. 2517. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jose Salazar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK (for himself, Mr. Fulbright, and Mr. Percy):

S. 2518. A bill to amend the John F. Kennedy Center Act to prohibit the erection of any building within 1,000 feet of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts in the District of Columbia without the approval of the Center's Trustees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SPARKMAN (by request):

S. 2519. A bill to amend the reserve requirements of the Federal Reserve Act and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. Sparkman when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HARRIS (for himself and Mr. Monroney):

S. 2520. A bill to provide for the conveyance of so-called scattered tracts in Oklahoma, acquired under the act of June 26, 1936 (49 Stat. 1967); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Harris when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S.J. Res. 115. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation commemorating the 50th anniversary of Dundalk, Md.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

PROPOSED ESTABLISHMENT OF A UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING FORCE

Mr. CLARK (for himself, Mr. Brewster, Mr. Hart, Mr. Hatfield, Mr. Javits, Mr. McGee, Mr. McGovern, Mr. Mondale, Mr. Morse, Mr. Young of Ohio, and Mr. Percy) submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 47) relative to the establishment of a United Nations peacekeeping force, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Clark, which appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF MENTAL RETARDATION FACILITIES AND COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH CENTERS CONSTRUCTION ACT OF 1963

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would amend the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963.

This bill would authorize Federal financial assistance of two types:

First. For grants to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher learning for the specialized training of physical educators for mentally retarded and other handicapped children; and

Second. For grants to States and other public and nonprofit institutions for the development of research and demonstration projects relating to the physical education or recreation of mentally retarded or other handicapped children.

This bill is identical to S. 3562, which I introduced in the last Congress on June 28, 1966. S. 3562 was incorporated as section 10 of S. 3008, which passed the Senate on October 3, 1966, but was not included in the conference bill which became Public Law 89–749.

I reintroduce this bill this year because the need for it is even clearer than it was last year, when the Senate adopted it. There is mounting evidence of the direct connection between bodily activity and the learning process. Several studies, for example, have reported increases in the IQ level of retarded individuals following a carefully planned program of physical education and recreation activity. Further, physical education activities have markedly improved the ability of the retarded to perform work at the skill levels required in industry or in sheltered workshops.

There can be little question of the need to plumb deeper into the connection between motor activity and mental ability, but available evidence indicates overwhelmingly that positive benefits do ensue from an increased program of physical activity.

The programs authorized in the bill mark a small beginning, but one of importance and meaning. The grants for training could, in the first year alone, result in training over 160 professionals, in 100 professional summer traineeships, and in 20 special study institutes around the country. In addition, there would also be $1 million for research and development activities.

Some may quarrel with the establishment of a special program for training physical educators of the mentally retarded and handicapped. To those, let me say that physical education is an important part of the curriculums of many of our largest colleges and universities, and the courses are designed to develop well-trained instructors for a healthy child. For the healthy child, physical activity is recreation and play, so important that each of the 50 States requires it. But for the retarded child, physical activity is a vital necessity if educational development is to help him find his way to a fuller life.

Mr. President, the Senate should once again this year include the provisions of this bill in our specialized educational assistance programs. We have only recently begun to develop sophisticated programs for the retarded, but we must push ahead in doing so if we are to include them as active participants in our society.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2513) to amend the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963 to provide assistance for the specialized training of physical educators and recreation personnel for mentally retarded and other handicapped children, and for research and demonstration projects relating to the physical education and recreation of such children, introduced by Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

AMENDMENT OF RESERVE REQUIREMENTS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE ACT

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, earlier this year, I introduced, at the request of the Federal Reserve Board, a bill, S. 1298, to establish a graduated system of reserve requirements for all commercial banks whose deposits are insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. While the Federal Reserve proposal is a controversial one, I felt that it should be available in order that representative industry groups could consider carefully its impact upon the economy and the banking system and to make alternative proposals should they be developed.

The American Bankers Association has developed an alternative recommendation which I have just received from Mr. Charles R. McNeill, director of the Washington office. By letter dated October 10 and on behalf of the American Bankers Association, Mr. McNeill has requested that I introduce this proposed bill. I am pleased to do so.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I introduce, by request, a bill to amend the reserve requirements of the Federal Reserve Act and for other purposes.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Mr. McNeill be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2519) to amend the reserve requirements of the Federal Reserve Act, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Sparkman, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The letter presented by Mr. Sparkman is as follows:

The American Bankers Association,
Washington, D.C., October 10, 1967.

Hon. John Sparkman,
Chairman, Senate Banking and Currency Committee, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Sparkman: On March 15 of this year, you introduced, by request of the Federal Reserve Board, S. 1298, a bill proposing the establishment of a graduated system of reserve requirements against the demand deposits of of all federally insured commercial banks. On the occasion of the introduction of S. 1298, you made it clear that your purpose was to make the details of this Federal Reserve proposal generally available for the full and careful consideration of the Congress, the banking system and the public.

The American Bankers Associtaion, having now given the Federal Reserve Board's proposal its careful analysis, has developed an alternative recommendation respecting a system of graduated reserve requirements for member banks of the Federal Reserve System. I am transmitting this alternative proposal in bill form. We hope that you may deem it appropriate to introduce this proposed bill, so that it may likewise be made generally available for the careful consideration of the Congress, the banking system and the general public.

The basic goal of this legislation is to achieve more uniform reserves on member banks at a lower level than now exists. At the same time, the legislation recognizes the problems faced by small banks, and provides for lower reserve requirements on these banks. The small banks have a tendency for lower profitability—an inability to attain economies of scale such as those associated with larger size loans and opportunities for unit cost reduction through automation, skill specialization, etc.

The draft legislation sets the range of reserve requirements on demand deposits for all member banks from 5 to 12 percent. On the first $5 million of any bank's deposits the ratio would be set at a low level ranging between 5 and 8 percent. Approximately two-thirds of the member banks are in this size category and for these small banks a figure in this low range would be the reserve requirement. The portion of a bank's demand deposits in excess of $5 million would be subject to requirements of 8 to 12 percent.

For time and savings accounts, the reserve requirements would range between 0 to 6 percent. This is an ample range for such accounts. While present law allows ratios up to 10 percent for time and savings accounts, the Federal Reserve has never exceeded 6 percent for such accounts.

The rationale for reserve requirements on demand deposits has changed considerably in recent decades. For one thing, open market operations have assumed the leading role in monetary policy while reserve requirements serve more or less as a "fulcrum" to transfer the monetary policy impact to member banks. This "fulcrum" is a fixed point through which the influences of discount and open market operations are transmitted to the banking system. The requirements do not have to be high in order to perform this particular function; there is no sound economic basis for the present high levels of reserves.

Moreover, in current monetary theory, geographic differences in reserve requirements cannot be justified, and should be eliminated. Geographical distinction is a carry-over from earlier years when reserve balances were required as a source of bank liquidity and liquidity requirements were thought to be highest at the national and regional financial centers. However, banks provide for their reserves by means of working balances and secondary reserves which have to be maintained on top of their legally required reserves. Legal reserves contribute very little to liquidity. In fact, they are probably among the least liquid of all bank assets.

The draft bill recognizes this modern view of bank reserve requirements. It eliminates the reserve city distinction, yet maintains the "fulcrum" for bringing the impact of monetary policy to the banking system. At the same time, it recognizes the lower profitability of smaller banks by establishing lower reserve requirements on such banks.

In contrast to S. 1298, introduced at the request of the Federal Reserve Board earlier this year, the draft legislation does not extend reserve requirements to nonmember banks. Such banks are left free to voluntarily join the Federal Reserve System if they so desire, but they are not compelled to comply with the System's requirements as provided in S. 1298.

Thank you for your consideration of our request that the enclosed draft bill be introduced in the Senate.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES R. MCNEILL,
Director, Washington Office.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS IN OKLAHOMA

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, for myself and my senior colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the conveyance of the so-called scattered tracts in Oklahoma, acquired under the act of June 26, 1936—49 Stat. 1967.

The need for this legislation was brought to my attention by Mr. Charlie Flute, of Marble City, Okla., during a recent task force trip to four counties in eastern Oklahoma by various Federal officials, Senator MIKE MONRONEY, Representative ED EDMONDSON, and me.

The Oklahoma Indian Welfare Act of June 26, 1936, authorized the Secretary of Interior to acquire interest in lands, water rights, or surface rights to lands then owned by Indians which were being used for agricultural and grazing purposes. It also provided that the lands should be held in trust by the United States, and during such time, they should be tax free, except for a gross production tax to be collected by the State of Oklahoma.

The bill I introduce today would authorize the Secretary of Interior to give clear title of this land, including mineral deposits, to the life tenant or his heirs. It is left up to the Secretary of Interior to determine whether or not the deed shall provide that the land be free of restrictions and its tax-exempt status or subject to restrictions and its continued tax-exempt status.

Mr. President, I am hopeful that appropriate action will be taken on this legislation at the earliest possible date. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD, together with a letter I received from Mr. Earl Boyd Pierce, addressed to Representative ED EDMONDSON, who is general counsel of the Cherokee Nation, and other letters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letters will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2520) to provide for the conveyance of so-called scattered tracts in Oklahoma, acquired under the act of June 26, 1936 (49 Stat. 1967), introduced by Mr. HARRIS (for himself and Mr. MONRONEY), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2520

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey to the life tenant, his heirs, devisees, successors, or assigns, title to the entire interest in lands and improvements thereon, including mineral deposits, that were acquired by the United States in trust for a designated individual Indian for his lifetime and thereafter in trust for the Tribe, pursuant to the Oklahoma Indian Welfare Act of June 26, 1936 (49 Stat. 1967): *Provided,* That the Secretary shall determine in each instance, that it is in the best interest of the intended grantee to convey, and the deed shall so provide, such land either (a) free of restrictions and its tax-exempt status, or (b) subject to restrictions against alienation and its continued tax-exempt status as provided under such Act of June 26, 1936.

The letters presented by Mr. HARRIS are as follows:

MUSKOGEE, OKLA., *April 3, 1967.*

Hon. ED EDMONDSON,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR ED: Immediately following the closing of the Task Force Meeting in Tahlequah, Mr. Virgil Harrington suggested that I make an effort to solve the Charlie Flute land problem.

Mr. Flute and his Mother, Mrs. Mollie Flute, came to the office early this morning and with maps, relevant Bureau letters and other documents completely clarified the title picture. Later Mrs. Merzl Schroeder, an extremely able attorney with the Bureau and Tahlequah Superintendent, Johnny Walker, arrived with the "Flute File" giving more exact information concerning the history of the title in question. Attached hereto is a photostat copy of the Bureau letter dated March 14, 1956, addressed to Mr. Flute spelling out the essential facts, except that the land description constituted the original allotment of Charlie's Grandmother, Esther Flute, Full Blood Cherokee, Roll Number 25718, now deceased. The Government paid the taxes on the land described in the Bureau letter on January 14, 1942, and by separate Deeds, in each case from the Grandmother Esther, approved title was conveyed as shown in said letter to the individuals, all of whom were Full Blood Cherokees, fee title being placed in the United States in Trust for each individual, during life time, then in Trust for the Tribe, "until such time as the use of the land is assigned by the Secretary" to either "a cooperative group" or to an individual Indian and then "in Trust for such group or individual". Some of this language employed in the granting clause was authorized by the Act of June 26, 1936 (49 Stat. 1967).

In any event it is plain that under the granting clause of the Grandmother, the Secretary was given authority at the instant of Mr. Flute's death to bypass the Cherokee Tribe, as a remainderman, and place the beneficial use of the property directly and immediately in either a cooperative group or in an individual Indian, at the discretion of the Secretary.

Thus, Mrs. Schroeder and I have agreed that Congress alone has the authority to dispose of lands where the title is held in the United States, and it is believed that the attached proposed Bill, if enacted, will enable Mr. Flute and all other Cherokees similarily situated to receive, if the Secretary so determines, a restricted fee title along with exemption from advalorem taxes. Mr. Flute's case, and I am satisfied that there are a few others in the same situation, would certainly justify the consideration afforded to him by this proposed Bill. At least the discretion is left with the Secretary as to both items, and we are assured that with the passage of the Bill Mr. Flute will have no trouble obtaining adequate credit from either the Bureau or the Tribe, sufficient to satisfy his housing and other reasonable needs. Both Mrs. Schroeder and Mr. Walker share these views.

We understand that there is a particular urgency about this matter and that it was Mr. Harrington's wish that the Bill be sent immediately to you with copies to our Senators, provided Mrs. Schroeder was satisfied with the proposal.

It is understood, of course, that the Departments will be called upon for reports and if by chance any important legal points have been overlooked the same will be corrected by the experts in the Departments. We understood that the Task Force would be intolerant of any unusual delay in bringing to Mr. Charlie Flute positive and effective relief. My personal expression of gratification for the timely appearance and good work of the Task Force will come later.

Sincerely yours,

EARL BOYD PIERCE,
General Counsel,
Cherokee Nation.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS,
Muskogee, Okla., March 14, 1956.

MR. CHARLIE FLUTE,
Rt. 1, Bunch, Okla.

DEAR CHARLIE: On our last Field Day in Sallisaw, you requested that we send you descriptions and plats of land deeded to the United States in Trust for Charlie, Johnnie Mack, Nancy, Bettie, Sarah, Thomas and Homer Flute. The land is described below:

	Acres
Charlie Flute: Lot 2 and SW NE of sec. 1–13–23	80
Johnnie Mack: Lots 3 and 4 and SE NW sec. 1–13–23	120
Nancy Flute now Christie: Lot 1 and SE NE and N2 NE SE 1–13N–23	100
Homer Flute: NW NE of sec. 12–13N–23	40
Homer Flute: W2 NW of sec. 11–13N–23	80
Bettie Flute: S2 NE and E2 SE sec. 10–13N–23	160
Sarah Flute: NW of sec. 10–13N–23	160
Thomas Flute: N2 SW and NE SE SW and NW SW SE, sec. 12–13–23	100
Thomas Flute: NE NE SE and NW NE SE sec. 11–13N–23E	20
Total acres	860

You also requested a description of the land of John Flute, Jr., Cherokee #25719. His land is described as: E2 SW and W2 SE of sec. 11–13N–23E, 160 acres.

You asked whether or not the land, that had been deeded in Trust to you children could be sold? In a lot of cases where land is deeded to the United States in Trust for people can be sold by issuing a (Patent in Fee.) Your Deeds do not come under this. They state: To the United States in Trust for "You Flutes" named above, during his lifetime, then in Trust for the Cherokee Tribe of Oklahoma." This means, that all you have is a Life estate in the land, described opposite your names, then the land reverts to the Cherokee Tribe at your death.

We are enclosing 4 small plats of the above described land and 1 large plat showing all the land.

If there is anything further that we can do for you, please advise us.

Sincerely yours,

H. Nicholson
Field Representative.

HN:hm

UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators Brewster, Hart, Hatfield, Javits, McGee, McGovern, Mondale, Morse, Young of Ohio, and Percy, I submit a concurrent resolution dealing with the subject of United Nations peacekeeping and peacemaking, and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, under the rule, the concurrent resolution will be printed in the Record.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 47) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

S. Con. Res. 47

Whereas Congress has urged that there should be developed permanent organization and procedures to enable the United Nations promptly to employ suitable United Nations forces for such purposes as observation and patrol in situations that may threaten international peace and security (H. Con. Res. 373, Eighty-fifth Congress, second session); and

Whereas the need for such forces has been demonstrated by past experience and will be even greater in the future; and

Whereas United Nations impartial peacekeeping forces will continue to be a major instrument for the maintenance of international peace and security: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress reaffirms its support for United Nations peacekeeping and peacemaking and urges:

(a) That, as an immediate objective, the United States Government—

(1) encourage and support the earmarking and specialized training of units by United Nations member states for employment in United Nations peacekeeping operations;

(2) be prepared to make available to the United Nations transport, communications and logistical personnel and facilities; and,

(3) be prepared to advocate or support on all appropriate occasions proposals for guidelines to govern the financing, training, equipping, and duration of peacekeeping forces for effective use, as well as guidelines to govern concomitant machinery for peacemaking where peacekeeping forces are in use.

(b) That, as part of the long-range development of the United Nations as a more effective instrument for building and keeping peace, the United States Government encourage and support the creation of a permanent, individually recruited force under United Nations command for impartial peacekeeping duties.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the recent crisis in the Middle East focused attention once again on the role of U.N. forces in preventing international conflict. Debate on the rationale of the withdrawal of U.N.E.F. troops continues. But underlying all debate is the recognition that first, a U.N. force is a vital component in the effort to develop effective machinery for peaceful settlement of disputes; and second, that there is a critical need to develop sound rules for the effective use of U.N. forces.

Much has been said about the unwisdom of the United States assuming the role of "policeman of the world." I agree that the United States cannot and should not assume such a role. But what are the alternatives? Some say the United States should intervene unilaterally wherever the peace is threatened; some say that a return to isolationism is the only answer. But neither extreme is appropriate in today's world of rapid transportation and instant communication, where the possibility of worldwide nuclear holocaust looms large whenever there is a disruption of the peace at any point on the globe.

By taking initiatives within the United Nations, I believe the United States can fulfill its responsibilities to the maintenance of world peace in a way properly fitting our role as the world's most powerful nation by providing specific recommendations for the creation of a permanent U.N. peace force with rules to guide its effective use and financing.

Under the present system, as we have seen, U.N. forces are pulled together on an ad hoc basis in the heat of conflict with confused regulations as to their use, and their existence may be abruptly terminated just when they are most needed. Indeed, it is a wonder that they have been as successful as they have been. Certainly, the time has come to take a hard look at what can be done to assure the development of an effective arm of enforcement for the principles contained in article I of the United Nations Charter.

As a minimal step in this direction, I have submitted the Senate concurrent resolution which I have just sent to the desk. Its companion measure, House Concurrent Resolution 130 and 131, has already been introduced in the other body by 63 Representatives.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of the bill (S. 2321) to supplement the antitrust laws of the United States in order to prevent anticompetitive practices, by providing for just compensation upon termination of certain franchise relationships, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson] be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy], I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Hatfield] be added to the bill (S. 2394) to amend the Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act with respect to the labeling of packages of cigarettes, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President on behalf of the Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy], I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Hatfield] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2395) to direct the Federal Communications Commission to establish regulations prohibiting certain broadcasting of advertising of cigarettes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy], I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Hatfield] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2396) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to tax cigarettes on the basis of their tar and nicotine content.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL CONFEREES ON H.R. 11456

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on the Department of Transportation, of the Committee on Appropriations, I ask unanimous consent that the following named Senators be added as conferees on the part of the Senate to the conference to be held on the bill (H.R. 11456) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes: The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore] the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Monroney], and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. Smith].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WHAT DO WE DO ABOUT THE ARABS?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it was with interest that I read an article in the September 1 issue of Fortune magazine, by an old friend and a very excellent reporter, Mr. Dan Cordtz. The article is entitled "But What Do We Do About the Arabs?"

I believe it would be worthwhile for the Senate to give the article due consideration, because of the difficulties which exist, which have existed, and which may well exist in the Middle East for some time to come, so that collectively as well as individually we may achieve a better understanding of the problem.

I ask unanimous consent that this pertinent piece of information be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUT WHAT DO WE DO ABOUT THE ARABS?

(By Dan Cordtz)

(NOTE.—*The strategic importance of the Middle East to the world's industrial nations often gets overlooked in close-in debate over the Israeli-Arab war. In the first three articles of this issue* FORTUNE *assesses the high stakes involved in terms of people, geography, and—by no means least—oil.*)

Two decades ago, in the eyes of nearly all Arabs, the U.S. towered over every other major power. Today America is a curse on the lips of many of the most intelligent and moderate in their ranks. "At this moment," claims an embittered Princeton-educated former Jordanian minister, "there is no Arab more extreme than the other. What I say about the U.S. is being said by every Kuwaiti, Saudi, or Libyan. Like Churchill, we are ready to make an alliance with the devil to keep ourselves alive." An American historian declares flatly that "not since the Boxer Rebellion has there been as rapid and ubiquitous a revulsion against a foreign power as there has been against the U.S. in the Middle East." And a man who once helped formulate our Arab policy sadly acknowledges that "our ability to play a role in that region has never been less than it is today."

This gloomy assessment is shared by many well-informed people in the U.S.—in government and outside. Some knowledgeable specialists in the State Department are very concerned about the precipitous decline in our influence. So are the most respected academic experts on the Middle East and, when they are willing to discuss it, American businessmen with interests and long experience in the Arab lands. Their fears, together with the outrage and despair of Arabs who were once among America's closest friends, suggest the time has come for a realistic, full-scale reappraisal of our objectives in the Arab world, their priorities, and the means by which they can best be attained.

The stakes are great, and go far beyond our obvious interest in the safety of Israel. In a world of intercontinental ballistic missiles, the Middle East has lost some of its historic value as a strategic geographic area. Some, but not all. For the region is still the fastest, cheapest transportation route—by air or sea—between Western Europe and Asia. And still more important, beneath its desert sands, lie close to 300 billion barrels of petroleum, about three-fourths of the non-Communist world's proved reserves. Daily production of the Arab wells total more than nine million barrels. According to oil consultant Walter Levy, the complete loss of this oil could not be made up by any combination of other sources within a decade—if at all. Western Europe imports 5,600,000 barrels of Arab oil each day, 65 percent of its requirements, and Japan 1,200,000 (60 percent). If the Russians should achieve domination of the Arab countries, as many Arabs now fear they will, they could blackmail both Western Europe and Japan by threatening to turn off the taps and cripple their economies. The ultimate price for assured oil supplies, some American diplomats grimly speculate, could well be a sharp diminution of U.S. influence in Europe and Asia.

The major goal of most of our efforts in the Middle East is to keep that from happening. There are serious doubts today that we are succeeding. The Communist camel poked his nose under the tent in 1955 when Egyptian President Nasser, rebuffed by the U.S., turned to Czechoslovakia for weapons. In the years since, the beast has steadily made new encroachments. None of the Arab countries can yet be labeled Red satellites, but the Russian gains have been impressive and worrisome. In Syria, where a series of coups d'etat has wiped out layer on layer of educated leaders and many of those who remain are leftist, the army is Russian equipped and largely directed by Soviet advisers. Egypt, its economy almost bankrupt and its expensive military machine shattered, is more dependent than ever on Russian assistance. Two years after the elimination of Premier Ben Bella, Algeria still truculently proclaims its close friendship with Russia. And these are three of the weightiest Arab nations.

Underlying elements of strength remain to us: only recently escaped from colonial rule, the Arabs are not anxious to hand over their independence; even Nasser has kept local Communists under control and has moved quietly to restore communication with the U.S. And Communism, as an ideology, is incompatible with the Arabs' dominant Islamic faith. That said, though, reemergence of the dormant Arab-Israeli conflict has so polarized Middle Eastern politics that there is danger that nearly all the Arab countries will ally themselves with the Soviet Union in opposition to Israel and its protector, the U.S. Anti-Communist Arabs frantically warn that this is already happening. According to a Lebanese statesman whose pro-Western credentials are beyond reproach, "The U.S. must ask itself this central question: 'Are we ready to hand over the Middle East to the Russians?' "

Measured against the U.S. Government's own formally enunciated goals, our present approach can hardly be termed a rousing success. We have failed to keep the Russians out or under control. We were unable to prevent an outbreak of hostilities. The Suez Canal is closed once more. Continued access to the oil, on acceptable terms, remains in doubt. It can even be argued that Israel's long-term security and prosperity, far from being enhanced, are today in greater jeopardy.

Some of these aims, it must be conceded, are so ambitious as to be almost unrealistic; perhaps no policy devised by human ingenuity can ever attain them all. Washington officials warn that "the first thing to remember is that we aren't God." One observes: "We found out in this latest Middle Eastern crisis that even we and the Soviets together couldn't give orders and expect people to snap their heels and come to attention." There is much to this. The Arab world is not a "world" but a sprawling, diffuse collection of thirteen states with little in common but language. Our goals there are sometimes contradictory, as we seek to remain friendly with states antagonistic to one another. Our tools are limited: our military strength is unusable, our aid programs are hedged with restrictions demanded by Congress, and persuasion is often ineffective. In a sense, moreover, our efforts are subject to a double veto: Israel and its supporters can establish one boundary to our policy, and the oil-producing Arab states another.

THE LOUD, PERSUASIVE VOICE

The U.S. is actually confronted with two different though related sets of problems. The first, ever present in the background and at times totally overshadowing the other, arises out of our very special friendship with Israel. Virtually all the Arab countries' leaders came to power after Israel's establishment, and therefore began relations with the U.S. tacitly accepting our close ties with the Jewish state we had helped create. While the Middle East is quiet those ties can usually be ignored in the interests of cooperation. But when periodically the two sides clash, as they did over passage through the Gulf of Aqaba, U.S. support of Israel produces a poisonous Arab reaction.

The second group of complications have their origin in the frequently waspish relations among the Arab nations themselves. For a number of years this has really meant relations of each of the other nations with Nasser. Other regimes must come to grips with the Egyptian leader because he is, however much they may deplore it, the most popular political leader in the Arab world and the only Arab to whom *both* the big powers pay much attention. And he has evinced ambitions about his and Egypt's role in the Arab world that almost inevitably pose threats to leaders of the oil-producing lands, where our greatest material interests lie.

Nasser appears to be aiming for eventual unification of the Arab world under his domination. Part of his motivation is probably personal ambition. But he also seems to persuade millions that the welfare of Egypt and even the other Arabs will thereby be served. Wealth and population are unevenly distributed in the Middle East; Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, and Libya have lots of oil and few people, while Egypt is poor and crowded. Thus a combination, Nasser believes, would benefit everyone. And the region's political power, he reasons, would be enhanced if it spoke on the world stage with one voice. In his efforts, though, Nasser has run afoul of the nationalist aspirations of other Arab rulers, who are unwilling to submit to his leadership. While his appeal to the masses is great and extends to literally all of the Arab lands, he is regarded as a threat by many of their leaders—especially King Hussein of Jordan, King Faisal of Saudi Arabia, King Hassan of Morocco, and President Bourguiba of Tunisia.

In his drive to unify and lead the Arabs, Nasser has tried a number of different tactics. He joined with Syria and, later in 1958, Yemen, to form the United Arab Republic, then sadly watched its dissolution three years later after a Syrian Army revolt. He has been accused by other Arab chieftains of plotting to overthrow or assassinate them. He has employed Radio Cairo to pour out a steady stream of vilification on those who opposed him. He intervened in Yemen's civil war to gain a foothold in the Arabian Peninsula and to ensure a friendly regime in Aden when the British depart. More recently, of course, he used the tension of the confrontation with Israel to force Hussein into a military pact. None of these stratagems has really been successful. From time to time, disappointed and chastened, Nasser retires behind his own borders vowing to concentrate on Egypt's internal economic problems. But an American acquaintance suggests that those problems are so staggering that Nasser can bear to look at them for only six months or so and then begins longing again for his old foreign adventures.

The official U.S. attitude toward Nasser has swung wildly from ardent cultivation to near-ostracism. A former government official who knows the Egyptian president well contends that we have always handled him exactly wrong—wooing him when we should have been firm and hitting him too hard when the wooing didn't work. Thus in the early days of the Kennedy Administration, he suggests, we were overgenerous in granting aid to Egypt, then too precipitate in withdrawing it four years later when Nasser displeased us. Egyptian resentment was heightened by the fact that in the year before withdrawal 98 percent of the aid was food, which made it appear that we were condemning Egypt's poor to starvation out of spite.

There are those who believe, however, that we had lost any hope of getting along with Nasser long before that. They label the Israeli raid on the Gaza Strip in February, 1955, the beginning of the end. Nasser was appalled to discover, when the Israeli troops poured into Gaza, that they could just as easily have swept on to Cairo. He demanded that the U.S. sell him arms to counterbalance the Israeli strength. After months of unsuccessful haggling, he announced a deal with the Czechs for weapons in amounts and varieties far greater than anything he had asked from the U.S. In July, 1956, President Eisenhower, Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, retaliated by backing down on commitments to help build the high dam at Aswan. A week later Nasser seized the Suez Canal, and three months after that Israel, Britain, and France invaded Egypt. Ultimately, of course, the U.S. played a major role in forcing the invaders out. But Dulles' legalistic rationalizations fanned little warmth in Egyptian breasts; some Egyptians blame us for bringing about the crisis in the first place.

In our dealings with other Arab countries, we have always been influenced by the thought of Nasser in the background. Thus we have quickly cooled to Arabs who seemed to share Nasser's radical aims: Syria, the Yemeni Republicans, sometimes Iraq. And we have been solicitous of those who appeared potential counterweights to Nasser. The most striking example, of course, is Jordan, where we have poured millions into an effort to create a viable economy in a state almost without resources. The weakness in this balancing policy has always been the Israeli question. When the Middle East is evenly divided between the revolutionaries and the conservatives, our material interests are reasonably protected. But where Israel is concerned, no Arab leader is secure enough to stand by us while we maintain a posture of favoritism. It seems fair to ask if we might improve our prospects in the Arab world, and indirectly further Israel's best long-term interests, by a more visibly evenhanded approach.

A COMMITMENT ABANDONED

Evenhandedness, of course, is not always easy to attain. At times it is impossible. When Nasser announced the blockade of the Gulf of Aqaba, there was no middle ground. The U.S. had to accept it or oppose it; we opposed it. Similarly, when an intransigent Arab leader puts us in a position that challenges our commitment to Israel's existence, we have no room for maneuver. But there have been many examples of less inevitable partiality in the past that had already conditioned the Arabs to regard us as completely in the Israeli camp when trouble came. Official government aid to Israel ($1.1 billion), for example, almost equals that given Egypt over the past two decades—although Egypt has eleven times as many people. In that same period another $1 billion in private aid, by means of tax-deductible contributions to the United Jewish Appeal, has tipped the balance even more. And while the U.S. Government seldom hesitates to threaten the cutoff of aid when Arab regimes displease us, only at the time of the Suez invasion of 1956 did we use that stick on Israel. Much as we deplored the Israeli attack in June, we did not employ all the pressure available to us to head it off. After the cease-fire, moreover, the U.S. posture in the United Nations was plainly on the side of Israel. However compelling our reasons, we abandoned an unconditional seventeen-year-old commitment—reaffirmed as recently as May 23 by President Johnson—to the territorial integrity of all the states in the Middle East. We also abstained on the Pakistani resolution deploring Israel's take-over of Jerusalem, although we had publicly criticized such action. Not surprisingly, even the more moderate Arabs were outraged.

Some studies of what can be done to restore our badly damaged position are under way in the government, but there is reason to doubt that they are as searching and critical as the situation may require. Early in the crisis, President Johnson appointed a special task force run by former White House aide McGeorge Bundy, giving the impression that Washington was taking a hard new look at our policies. But Bundy has now gone back to his duties at the Ford Foundation and is spending only part time on the Washington project. Officials are at pains, moreover, to deny that any criticism of the past was implied by the task force's appointment. It was designed merely to help coordinate operations related to Middle Eastern problems, they explain.

"OPINION IS A VERY FLEXIBLE THING"

The fact is that Washington policy makers, while they insist they are not complacent, seem remarkably unalarmed. Consoled by what they call disastrous Soviet losses, they discount the view of moderate Arabs that our own losses have been even more severe. They appear to regard Arab emotions as not truly a factor in the equation, or at least as too unreliable to consider in planning future action. Some speak confidently, and even condescendingly, of how fickle those emotions are. ("Opinion is a very flexible thing in the Arab world," a responsible official remarks. "An Egyptian journalist once told me that it takes three days to change public opinion in Egypt.") They count heavily on the traditional divisions of the Arab world and fear of Communism to send some of its leaders scurrying back to us for aid and protection.

They also recognize the formidable built-in political resistance to any consideration of new directions in American Middle Eastern policies. The overwhelming majority of U.S. citizens neither know nor care anything about the region. Most of those who do care are emotionally partial to Israel, and many of these are effectively vocal in their support. Few of the remainder can or will make themselves heard. Either they are dissuaded by fears of being labeled anti-Semitic, or their small voices are lost in the void of public indifference.

This near-unanimous backing for Israel handicaps U.S. diplomats in the Arab world. In the recent fighting, certainly, Israel benefited from the fact that the Syrians and Egyptians had provoked the crisis and had made noisy threats about their intentions. But the American public's sympathy for Israel has been obvious throughout the little country's history. "There's nothing we can do about that partiality," says a former U.S. ambassador to a major Arab capital. "It's the great embarrassment of the official policy in the Middle East."

The one-sided attitude of the American public, moreover, reflects more than their sympathetic feelings about the Israelis. Americans react negatively to their image of the Arabs as backward, cruel, largely uncivilized desert dwellers—an image, according to one Arab scholar, derived from dimly recalled, badly taught Sunday-school stories and unconscious religious hostility toward Islam. There is no real knowledge to counter the myths. Certainly there is little awareness of the Arabs' illustrious history, a fact that infuriates them. And far too often the Arabs, as some of them admit, have been their own worst enemies. Many of their leaders have offended U.S. voters and their representatives. Extravagant language is much admired in the Arab world, for example, but Americans tend to take it at face value.

On the other hand, we have made no effort whatever to look at the problems of the Middle East through Arab eyes. To do so is to begin to discern the dimensions of their grievances. There are many—not all of them entirely realistic. Many Arabs believe we want the militarily weak and divided, which may well be true so long as Nasser remains the obvious candidate to lead a united Arab world. They suspect we want to retain, through our aid programs and other means, much of the influence of the old colonial powers. They charge that we have brought them into the cold war by forcing Egypt to turn to the Communists for weapons and by labeling neutrality immoral. They complain that our assistance to them is niggardly and motivated not by friendship but by self-interest. These grievances have long existed, but they have been given special force by dramatization of the more serious Arab charge that we are blatantly partial where Israel is concerned. So strongly do they feel about this that many who reject Nasser's charges of direct U.S. involvement in the war regard our financial and diplomatic support of Israel as almost equally reprehensible.

THE IRREPLACEABLE OIL

Only the complaint about Israel is universal. But it has inflamed even basically pro-Western Arabs so much that many are now inclined to endorse the other accusations as well. And the compulsion to strike back jeopardizes, to a greater degree than ever before, our stake in the Arab countries' oil. There is considerable reluctance, on the part of American oilmen no less than government officials, to make much of this stake in public. They realize that it is all but impossible, in a nation with the popular traditions of the U.S. to suggest that material interests should be weighed along with such human considerations as Israel's welfare. It is senseless, however, not to face up to the very real possibility of the loss of the oil and the implications of such a loss.

In ten years, development of alternative sources of energy could reduce Arab oil's importance drastically. But for now it is quite literally irreplaceable. Even the present partial boycott has created serious hardships for Britain. The added transportation costs and higher prices for substitute oil amount to roughly $1 million a day. The U.S., whose Arab petroleum imports amounted to only 350,000 barrels a day, has not suffered, but individual American companies have been hurt. As a group, U.S. oil firms have a gross investment of nearly $3 billion ($1.5 billion net after depreciation) in the Arab lands, and their profits from production there last year amounted to more than $1 billion.

It is by no means clear what the oil companies' fate will be. The largest Arab oil-producing states, thus far, have not shown great enthusiasm for the total shutdown advocated by some Arab countries. The measures they have taken, in fact, were the least they could do as members of the Arab world. But oilmen still have their fingers crossed. An unhappy executive in Beirut says, "It would be difficult for me to lay a bet on our being here five years from now, and if we are the situation won't be easy."

Yet immediate nationalization of the fields and expulsion of the foreign operating companies is unlikely. The idea has long appealed to many Arab leaders, including some whom the U.S. Government regards as friends. Even splitting the proceeds about sixty-forty with the companies, and selling at the lowest prices in the world ($1.59 per barrel for Kuwaiti oil compared with $2.27 for Venezuelan crude), the oil-producing countries take in an estimated $2.5 billion a year in royalties and taxes from the oil firms. If they could keep all the selling price, and could agree among themselves to raise that price, the wealth generated—for economic development or weapons—would be staggering. Nationalization, however, would be far from easy to carry out. Arab experts agree that all the countries would have to take the step together and this just doesn't seem to be in the cards under the present circumstances.

Even if the countries could coordinate nationalization, they would face the formidable problem of selling their oil. The marketing outlets in the major oil-consuming regions are in private hands. Unless the evicted companies agreed to buy the oil, foregoing their share of the most profitable phase of the business, the Arabs would have almost no place to turn. "It would be very difficult to replace the financial resources of the Western World," admits an Arab petroleum expert.

If nationalization is only a remote threat, however, some form of painful squeeze on the companies is probable. A continuation of the crisis, in fact, seems likely to bring unwelcome changes in the structure of the industry. The French are vigorously seeking to convert President de Gaulle's stance into material advantage by improving their position in the Arab oil fields. And the Italian Government oil agency, E.N.I., which has long coveted access to Arab oil, now seems within sight of its goal. Talks between E.N.I. and the Iraqi Government have been going on since 1961, when Iraq announced the expropriation of about 99 percent of the Western consortium's acreage. Now the Italian Government reportedly is dangling a $70-million low-interest loan in exchange for a development contract for E.N.I. American oilmen are resigned to seeing both the French and the Italians achieve some measure of success.

It appears certain that the companies will have to settle for a smaller share of the oil revenues. Three weeks after the cease-fire, Beirut's authoritative *Middle East Economic Survey* noted that "Arab oil producing countries, to fulfill their role as financiers of the Arab world, will have to insure a steady increase in their oil revenues, not only in terms of over-all payments but also in terms of per-barrel payments." Even if the situation quiets down, therefore, the outlook is for slimmer profits and more painful headaches in the oil business. And if large-scale fighting should break out once more, with the U.S. sympathetic to the Israelis, expulsion of American firms would be a real possibility, no matter how self-destructive that might be.

WHAT'S GOOD FOR ISRAEL?

In spite of its importance, if our interest in the oil conflicted directly with our concern for Israel, we would probably regretfully have to watch the oil go down the drain. But our stake in both may well call for some shift in our position. A good case can be made that Israel, for reasons easy to understand, has been pursuing a course that is not in its own best long-term interests. It could further be argued that the U.S. has encouraged these unwise policies by failure to view the Middle East from a more dispassionate and balanced position. Thus the U.S. alienated the Arabs and was unable to dissuade Israel from action that may have made its existence all the more precarious. The shock waves from Israel's victory are still sweeping across the Middle East. Ironically, U.S. officials say, they threaten most damage in the very lands that had been most tolerant toward Israel. The tiny Jewish state's long-range security, moreover, may not truly be enhanced by boundary changes or declarations of an end to belligerency or even free passage through the Gulf of Aqaba. Ultimately, Israel can prosper only if its Arab neighbors can be reconciled to its presence.

In the long sweep of history the Arabs have a lot going for them. The Western world tends to view Israel even now as the underdog—a tiny Jewish David facing the Arab Goliath. This is true in terms of total populations (2,500,000 Israelis versus 110 million Arabs) and geographic area, but today the Israelis are almost a match for the Arabs in terms of citizens able to play a constructive role in modern society—those in good health, educated, skilled, and possessed of high morale. The Arabs are not likely to remain forever industrially backward, unable to employ the tools of destruction effectively. In spite of many mistakes and setbacks, a remarkable amount of progress has already been made in education in the past decade. By 1990, moreover, the Arabs are expected to number more than 200 million to Israel's six million, at present rates of growth. If the tensions cannot be eased somehow, Israel one day *will* face overwhelming force. Even protected by nuclear weapons or foreign allies, it will then only be able to emulate Samson and destroy its enemies along with itself.

In spite of this prospect, there has been almost no progress toward defusing the explosive animosity. Israeli policy seems directed above all else at forcing the Arabs formally to admit defeat and, by implication, to accept as settled many issues still outstanding. But viewed in long-range terms, this reverses the logical order of events. First, the issues that divide the antagonists should be resolved; then a formal end to hostilities could follow almost as a matter of course. Arab leaders now find it impossible to acknowledge Israel under duress. And even if they can be forced to do so, their signatures on a peace treaty will never prevent further warfare while the basic causes of Arab hostility remain. After almost two decades of no progress toward reconciliation, Israelis and their American well-wishers should examine soberly the possibility that a change of strategy could bring better results.

A POSSIBLE NEW APPROACH

It is obviously far easier to criticize past policies than to formulate new ones. There are no dramatic new initiatives to propose, and no one can say with assurance that this or that program will work. But what might offer some hope is a new *approach*, one that focuses not on securing controversial and possibly unessential Israeli "rights" but on helping the Arabs regain their self-respect. Over the long run, this can be done only by the Arab countries themselves, by means of development that enables them to view themselves as the economic and political equals of Israel. For the shorter term, however, there are at least two offenses to Arab pride that could be eliminated: the unhealed sore of the refugees from the 1948 violence and the presence on Arab soil of conquering Israeli soldiers. By persuading the Israelis to take a generous attitude on these two issues, moreover, the U.S. could demonstrate its impartiality in a way that would strengthen the hand of its own embarrassed Arab friends—e.g., Hussein of Jordan, Faisal of Saudi Arabia, *et al.*

The form and dimensions of the refugee problem may have been altered substantially by the outcome of the fighting. The Israeli forces overran, and now occupy, territory where about half of the refugees lived before the war started. It is impossible to predict how many will end up in Israeli-occupied territory. An undetermined number fled to areas still in Arab hands and, although Israel has agreed to permit some of them to return, it is still unclear how liberal the Israeli Government will be about their repatriation. But it is certain that Israel has under its jurisdiction a large share of the refugees.

There has been speculation that Israel will now move to integrate them into the economic life of the captured lands. In this there may be some wishful thinking. For the west-bank region of Jordan, although already developed to a considerable degree, was crowded before its occupation. It may be impossible to absorb all of the refugees there, and thus far Tel Aviv has shown no willingness to take them back into pre-war Israel. Signs of Arab resistance to Israeli rule in Old Jerusalem, moreover, cast doubt on the assumption that many Arabs will live willingly under the government of Israel. It is conceivable that events may prove to have diminished the refugee problem. On the other hand, it may turn out that the situation has only been complicated further. Certainly the way in which the Israeli-controlled refugees are treated could play a part in determining the future attitude of reasonable Arabs. And the U.S., by insisting on fair and considerate treatment, could help regain its position among these Arabs.

THE "OLD" REFUGEE PROBLEM

But there still remains the "old" refugee issue, which has been nagging the conscience of the world since 700,000 refugees fled Palestine when Israel was established. In nineteen years their numbers have swollen to 1,300,000 and they lived, before the latest fighting broke out, in Lebanon, Syria, Jordon, and the Gaza Strip. Some exist in the worst squalor; the luckiest occupy monotonous, crowded, but relatively livable camps operated by the United Nations Relief and Works Agency. Even they are housed, clothed, fed, and inadequately educated on a daily allowance of 10 cents per person.

The U.S. contributes the lion's share toward their subsistence; it has given $403 million of the $599 million donated to refugee care through last year. Private citizens recently formed a Near East Emergency Donations Committee (NEED) to channel additional corporate and individual donations to the agency in the current emergency. Periodically, U.S. officials have attempted to promote a settlement. Invariably, rebuffs from one side or the other have made us throw up our hands. Israel has attempted to use the refugees as bargaining counters in its campaign to force Arab recognition. The Arabs have seen them as their strongest claim on the decency of the West—their only good card in the propaganda game.

Israel has much to gain from elimination of the problem. Besides being pitiable, the refugees are extremely dangerous. From their ranks have come most of the commando-type raiders who periodically cross into Israel and stage terrorist attacks. It is their presence, as an organized, easily manipulated pressure group, that has kept Arabs of good will at the mercy of lowest-common-denominator politics. If, as Arab extremists suggest, Israel is to be turned into "another Vietnam," it will be refugees who provide the guerrillas.

Working out a detailed plan will be difficult, the more so as such a plan may well face Arab attempts to sabotage it by pressure on the refugees. But it surely is not beyond human capability. Its provisions will presumably have to include acceptance by Israel of a sizeable portion of the refugees as repatriates (although this requirement could perhaps be satisfied by continued occupancy, of Israeli territory by the refugees now there), generous compensation for the others, invitations to many to resettle in the U.S. and other countries, and intensive training designed to make them attractive as human resources throughout the Arab world. If the plan is generous enough, and reasonable enough, it will be extremely difficult for the most intransigent Arab leader to refuse it, standing up indefinitely to the combined pressure of world opinion, his own citizens, and the refugees themselves.

In the excitement of Israel's overwhelming military success, it may be easier to persuade the Israelis to tackle the refugee problem than to give up the leverage of their territorial gains. But it might be well for the U.S. to encourage them to consider withdrawal—and without some of the prior conditions on which they now insist. It is by no means obvious that the terms sought by Israel will really contribute to the future peace of the area and hence to its own ultimate interests. Such a withdrawal might seem a return to the conditions that brought on the fighting, and a pointless abandonment of hard-won fortified defense positions. But it could be argued that the Arab fortifications on the Syrian heights and the massed troops in the Sinai Desert were symptoms, not causes, of the hostility. Arab resentment of Israel's presence—the basic cause of the fighting—has been intensified by Israeli occupation of Arab territory. Some diplomats believe that from its present position of strength, Israel could well afford to hand back some of the land, undercutting Arab charges that it is aggressive and expansionist.

U.S. officials argue that it is too early to expect the Israelis to mitigate their conditions. Internal political considerations make it difficult for Prime Minister Eshkol to do so at the moment. In 1956, American diplomats point out, even under the combined pressure of the U.S. and the Russians, Israeli troops remained four months in the Gaza Strip and at the mouth of the Gulf of Aqaba before withdrawing. Publicly, however, we have given no indication that we wish to see the Israelis withdraw—except on their own original terms, which American officials concede would be dangerous for any Arab leader to accept. And if we have been active behind the scenes, no effects are visible.

REGIONAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

If by whatever means, the immediate crisis can be damped down and the attention of the Arabs directed away from revenge, the prospects for eventual development of the region are good. The impact of the war has, at least temporarily, revived the goal of unified effort and shown Arab leaders how badly they need to strengthen themselves. If ever a section of the globe cried out for regional development, it is the Middle East. Of the oil-rich countries, only Iraq has the resources to become a balanced agricultural-industrial state. Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Abu Dhabi, and Libya combined have about ten million residents, and almost all their land is desert. Yet their oil resources generate tremendous amounts of capital, most of which cannot be constructively employed within their own borders. So great are the returns from oil that the Middle East, given technical assistance and encouragement, could probably finance its own development with almost no foreign financial aid.

Kuwait has for six years shared some of its great oil wealth by way of loans and bank deposits totaling nearly $700 million. Some expanded version of the Kuwait Fund for Arab Economic Development, with other oil-producing countries joining in support, is probably the most promising vehicle for development. Dr. Talha Yaffi, economist and general manager of Kuwait Investment Co., has worked out in some detail how such an inter-Arab fund could be financed and the large sums of money that it could provide for development. Under his proposal, all oil-producing countries would be obliged to contribute 5 percent of their oil revenues, to be matched by an equal contribution by the private foreign companies holding the oil concessions. If the organization were started this year on that principle, he says, it would immediately have $308 million at its disposal. By 1990, he estimates, it would have taken in $14 billion. Such amounts dwarf the $3.8 billion in American economic and military aid to the Arab countries over the last decade.

Consideration is also once more being given to the establishment of a Middle Eastern Development Bank. From the standpoint of the U.S. this would offer an opportunity to play a direct role in development of the region. Involvement in such a scheme at this time might be difficult to sell Congress, because it could commit the U.S. to large-scale support of programs devised in considerable degree by others. But it would help convince the Arabs that we are not determined to force an American solution to Middle Eastern economic problems.

IRRIGATION AND ELECTRICITY

Spending all the funds wisely, of course, would be anything but automatic. Planners and developers can be hired, however, and patterns have already been set elsewhere. A notable example is the integrated regional-development program being carried out in Iran's Khuzestan province by the Development & Resources Corp. of New York. Formed in 1955 by David Lilienthal and Gordon Clapp, two former Tennessee Valley Authority chairmen, the company has reclaimed 50,000 acres from the desert and plans eventually to turn an additional 200,000 acres into productive agricultural land. Farm output in the province has already increased two and a half times as a result of the large-scale irrigation and hydroelectric-dam systems. Development & Resources is carrying out fourteen other projects around the world, and its officials are more than willing to take on part of an Arab development program.

A dramatic possibility for development is the plan devised by Rear Admiral Lewis Strauss, former chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, and strongly supported by former President Eisenhower. It calls for the construction of three huge nuclear-powered plants to produce electricity and to convert seawater into fresh water. The water would then be used to irrigate thousands of acres of land that is now desert. Strauss estimates the cost of the project at around $1 billion and has proposed that the U.S. put up half of the initial $200-million capitalization.

By any standard, the U.S. has a huge stake in the tranquility of the Middle East. As a high-ranking State Department official puts it: "We can't have another one of these wars every few years. It's too costly and it's too damned dangerous." Among other things, this is probably the last war the Arabs and Israel can fight without employing fearfully destructive and sophisticated weapons. The escalation from 1956 is itself sobering.

The obstacles that confront the U.S. in its efforts to play a constructive role are admittedly greater than at any time since it moved onto the Middle Eastern stage, and it will take time to restore our exhausted credit with the Arabs. But the effort must be made. Our own safety is too intimately involved to write off the Arabs. And if we are not to write them off, our policy makers may well have to move visibly into a posture of more balanced friendship with both sides. The war, and our pro-Israeli stance, have cut the ground from beneath those Arabs who were our advocates. If they are to take a public position favorable to us again, we must give them something to rally around. It is equally true that the Arabs will have to respond positively. Our commitment to Israel's existence is not negotiable.

From our own point of view, the beginning of wisdom is to understand that we are in serious trouble in the Arab lands, and that we cannot just wait patiently for them to get over their anger. If we make no moves, our adversaries could win the game by default.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONTOYA in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Is there further morning business?

FEDERAL SPENDING AND EXECUTIVE REORGANIZATION

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, growing public pressure for new Government services coupled with the inevitable bureaucratic tendency to expand has pushed Federal spending to enormous proportions in recent years. Despite an obvious need for a large part of this budgetary increase commonsense tells us that much of it is wasted. The administration, the Congress, and the American people generally agree that the economic pressures of the Vietnam war require that unessential domestic spending be curbed and that wasteful programs be eliminated.

If significant improvements are to be made, however, this unanimity or purpose must become swiftly translated into action. But unfortunately it seems as though Federal spending is becoming merely a convenient topic of conversation like the weather, with everyone talking about it, but no one controlling it.

Part of the problem here is that detailed information about the strengths and weaknesses of Federal programs that is so necessary for making intelligent budget savings is simply not available.

On January 11 of this year I introduced a bill (S. 47) to develop this much needed information by establishing a Hoover-type Commission on the Operation of the Executive Branch. This blue-ribbon panel would be authorized to survey the organization and programs of the Federal bureaucracy for a 2-year period and to report its findings and recommendations to the President and the Congress. Forty-one of my colleagues have since joined in cosponsorship of this measure.

More recently a similar proposal (S. 2116) was put forth by the distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] and cosponsored by 20 fellow Senators. Thus 63 Senators have expressed a desire for such a study.

This evidence of concern is most heartening. For if domestic Federal spending is truly to be limited a thorough review of executive organization and administrative procedures is an absolute necessity. And only a professionally staffed review commission with unstinting official support can perform the complex examination required. Such a comprehensive and integrated study cannot be undertaken directly by the Congress. Its workload is too heavy and its responsibilities too divided. Neither is it likely to be undertaken by the bureaucracy itself, which has a vested interest in maintaining the status quo. A special commission would best be equipped to provide the expertise and devote the continuing attention necessary to get good results.

Mr. President, spending cuts to be effective must be made selectively. And to be made selectively, a great deal of knowledge is required. While such detailed knowledge is not as yet available, enough illustrations have come to light to give ample cause for concern. For example, in recent years the field of manpower development has become a fertile one for Federal bureaucrats. Certainly some federally sponsored programs are needed if the vicious cycle of unemployment and poverty is to be broken. Yet these projects have grown with such abandon that today 15 different Federal departments and agencies find themselves administering 79 different training and education programs. In addition, nine different programs deal with job recruitment and at least five subsidize on-the-job training projects.

Mr. President, illustrations such as these, thought provoking as they may be, yield no ready answers. They merely underscore the need for better coordination and less duplication by the Federal bureaucracy. If these situations are to be effectively prevented in the future, a thorough examination of the executive branch is required now. For it is only through such a comprehensive study that genuine long-term improvements can be made. It is far better to forestall unproductive programs than to prune them after they have become entrenched. In fact, if such a review had been inaugurated when this bill was first introduced in 1965, perhaps we would not be contemplating a 10-percent tax surcharge and emergency cuts in Federal spending today.

A poet once said, "The chaos is come of the organized disorder." A brief look at the multitude of overlapping and inefficient Federal programs that have sprung forth in the 12 years since the last Hoover Commission submitted its report would certainly add credence to these words.

If order is really to be brought out of chaos, if effective programs are to be expanded and ineffective ones eliminated, and if urgent domestic needs are to be met with the limited funds available, then bureaucratic inefficiency and shoddy organization can no longer be tolerated. Tempting as they may be, a few hasty spending cuts in the twilight of the legislative session will do no more than give temporary relief. If real progress is to be made, a complete review of all facets of Federal spending and organization must be undertaken. The sooner it is begun, the sooner it will be finished, and the sooner the American people will receive the benefits of improved Government service.

MODERN AIRLINE TECHNIQUES—SPEECH BY ROBERT F. SIX

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, on September 26, 1967, Mr. Robert F. Six, president of Continental Airlines, addressed the Aero Club of Washington. Mr. Six's speech was devoted to the nuts and bolts of airline management—the cost-cutting and belt-tightening programs that are essential to profitable airline operations today. Mr. Six is one of commercial aviation's pioneers with whom I have worked for almost 30 years during my tenure in the U.S. Congress. I have always found him imaginative, cooperative, and aggressive. His speech before the Aero Club was certainly in the same tradition.

Mr. Six stressed the importance of efficiency, scheduling, aircraft utilization and marketing practices as the fundamentals to successful airline operation. And, to him successful airline operation means not only profits to his company, but low fares and high levels of service to the public.

Indirectly, many of the suggestions made by Mr. Six in his speech, especially those relating to off-hour scheduling and increased aircraft utilization, will go a long way to help relieve the congestion which exists already at our airports and to prevent it from increasing anymore. They should provoke the CAB and other airline managements to review existing industry practices. He has put these suggestions into practice at Continental and is doing a fine job in providing a needed service to the public in the areas Continental serves, including my own home State of Oklahoma.

I ask unanimous consent to have his speech printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY ROBERT F. SIX, PRESIDENT, CONTINENTAL AIRLINES, BEFORE THE AERO CLUB OF WASHINGTON, SEPTEMBER 26, 1967

I am delighted to be here today speaking to this distinguished group of experts in our industry. I am particularly happy to look around the room and see four distinguished members of the CAB. With all the oral arguments and legal briefs they have had to deal with recently—I am sure it will give them some assurance to be reminded that I am not a lawyer—and what I have to say here today will not be an oral argument.

The airline bug bit me a number of years ago, about the same time that the distinguished Chairman of the CAB, Charles Murphy, started to draft the original Civil Aeronautics Act. No single industry has equalled the dynamic growth of the airline industry in the intervening years. It is an exciting industry, one in which change and the ability to react and deal with change is the rule rather than the exception. It is an industry where to advocate the status quo is to go backwards—where not to make a decision is a decision in itself because you will certainly be left behind.

It is with this growth and change in mind that I appear here before you today. As experts in the field of aviation you will find nothing startling in what I say—and the newsmen will have to dig hard to find a news lead—because this is not the time in aviation for startling pronouncements or headline seeking. Rather, it is a time when we should candidly appraise what past growth has done to our industry—and future growth is likely to do to it. It is a time to talk about rather mundane sounding subjects like efficiency, cost control, utilization, congestion and a myriad number of other vital subjects, many of which are the direct results of success and change, and which today are threatening to move this industry into a period of profitless prosperity. This is time for us to critically study our industry and see how we can make it work better, how we can continue to offer the best possible service to our travelers and shippers at the best possible price—not the time to shrug off mounting costs and figure out the way we can pass them on to the consumer.

When I speak of profitless prosperity—it is not as a prophet of doom. I am as enthusiastic about the future of commercial aviation as I was when I began in this business 30 years ago. But because I have had those 30 years of experience, I am also realistic about the strong and weak points of our industry—and if history and experience have taught me anything, it is that problems must be foreseen and dealt with before it is too late or tackle them on other than a panic or crash basis.

The success, growth and the contribution that commercial air transportation has made to the economy and our national defense is well known and generally accepted. I need not cite statistics to prove it—some of you are the very people who develop and publish those statistics regularly. All of you know them. And, those of you in the government, the airlines, the airplane manufacturing industry and related aviation service fields can take pride in a job well done—in our substantial accomplishments to date.

Now that air transportation is regarded as a dynamic, growth industry, it is all too easy to lose sight of one important managerial responsibility—a responsibility with major public interest aspects—and that is the responsibility to operate with maximum efficiency. The interests of travelers, shippers and airline stockholders coincide when it comes to realizing the benefits of efficiency. It is efficiency, coupled with creative marketing, that enables a carrier to both maximize profits and reduce rates. This is the general subject I have elected to talk about because as I see the future, it is perhaps the biggest challenge. Assuredly, future growth will depend upon the extent to which we can improve the economy of our operations.

WHAT IS EFFICIENCY?

What is airline efficiency? How is it measured? How is it achieved? And, why is it so vital?

Webster defines efficiency: "Effective operation as measured by a comparison of production with cost in energy, time, money, etc." In other words, efficiency is getting the most out of the resources a company has, and that, in turn, means getting the most out of its equipment, facilities, and personnel, including management, capital and routes. Fundamentally, those are the ingredients of an airline, and except for route authority, it is not unlike any other enterprise.

Getting the most productivity out of these elements does not come from any one decision. I thought our Sr. Vice President of Operations and Technical Services, Dick Adams, recently summed it up well when he stated that Continental's achievement of unprecedented low costs and high equipment utilization "comes from a combination of things, including a management determination to operate in this manner, a pride on the part of the employees in making the difficult operation successful, and a high level of overall Company knowledgeability in that special expertise which is required to carry it off as a sustained performance." These three basic elements are all required in achieving efficiency.

First and foremost, however, is a management determination to achieve optimum efficiency. When one compares the varied utilization rates of like equipment among domestic trunks, it is apparent that there are different managerial approaches. I have heard it said that average stage length of operation is critical. Admittedly, it is a factor, but hardly governing. For example, Continental, with an average DC–9 stage length of 324 miles, has a utilization rate of 9:30 hours. Another carrier which has higher density routes than Continental has a DC–9 stage length of 376 miles but obtains only 6:10 hours utilization.

Some carriers tend to operate the maximum number of flights at so called prime departure times. For example, at O'Hare Airport there are 19 scheduled departures at precisely 5:00 p.m. each day. One of the major airlines has 10 of these departures. It is obvious that such schedules increase airport congestion and air traffic problems. A closer look at the O'Hare picture—and this one is particularly dramatic—underlines this problem. O'Hare traffic control estimates that under clear conditions it can handle an average of 80 take-offs and departures in a one-hour period. A study of the O'Hare pattern reveals that there are 9 one-hour time segments during the day which have 80 or more take-offs and landings. Two of these time segments, 6:00–7:00 p.m. and 7:00–8:00 p.m., show more than 100 scheduled take-offs and landings inside a one-hour period, and two of the major airlines each account for 20 or more take-offs and landings during these periods. Such scheduling invariably reflects itself in operating costs, and the question arises whether the convenience is worth the pressure which will invariably be brought to raise airline fares.

AIRPORT CONGESTION

Speaking of airport congestion and traffic control delays, I would like to digress for a moment. In Los Angeles, we have too frequently incurred delays approximating an entire day's Boeing 707 utilization. Put in other terms, had we not incurred such delays, we could have operated our schedules with one less seven-million-dollar piece of equipment. Each 30-minute air traffic delay—and we had more than 1,000 last year in Los Angeles and O'Hare—increases the operating cost of the airline $500 or a minimum total for the year of one-half million dollars. As the congestion problem increases, the need for increasing utilization and spreading the operation of equipment throughout each 24-hour period becomes more imperative. And, in the major city centers in which we operate, congestion is increasing with alarming rapidity. Not only do we have air traffic congestion, but airport ground congestion is getting more serious by the month. Last year, for instance, at Los Angeles there were two radio alerts warning people to stay away from the airport because of traffic problems and filled parking spaces.

SCHEDULING PHILOSOPHY

The philosophy of scheduling that concentrates departures at prime times not only adds to airport congestion, but by limiting utilization raises over-all costs and break-even load factors, and automatically creates a pressure for maintaining yields. This, in turn, results in a carrier viewing the market in inelastic terms. There is so-to-speak no "give" and it tends to result not in further development of a market, but rather a preoccupation on the part of the carrier with the relative market share. In this context, we see how utilization can influence, if not determine, a carrier's approach to marketing.

On the other hand, if a carrier operates at high utilization rates with low costs and comparatively low load factors, that carrier has a far greater incentive to take the necessary steps to generate new traffic. By virtue of low costs, it can afford to experiment with fares. By virtue of load factors, it has a constant incentive to fill those otherwise empty seats. And, by virtue of spreading its schedules, it has an incentive sales-wise to level the flow of traffic throughout the day and night as opposed to accentuating peak traffic hours. Each of these "incentives," which are profit incentives, has in my opinion significant public interest benefits.

UTILIZATION AND WHAT IT TAKES

Utilization becomes increasingly important as the cost of our aircraft rises. Aircraft, and the airline's manufacturing plant, not only are becoming increasingly expensive, but represent by far the largest portion of a carrier's capital investment. For example, in terms of Continental's year-end 1966 balance sheet, flight equipment less depreciation accounted for 55.% of our total assets, and that excludes new equipment purchase deposits.

The average utilization rate of this equipment thus is an accurate measurement of the airline's ability to use its principal capital plant. A number of factors influence this willingness and/or ability, and among them are: as I mentioned earlier, a management decision, a willingness and/or ability on the part of its personnel, the degree to which its route structure is integrated, how well suited its equipment is to the nature of its operation, engine efficiency, flight planning, the location of its main overhaul or maintenance facility in relation to its route system and the proximity of that facility to the company's general office, the effectiveness of its maintenance programming, and production control. There are, of course, additional factors too numerous to mention.

Aside from the management decision to obtain maximum utilization of equipment, the next most important element is the willingness and ability of people to realize efficiency. Brief turnarounds, short down times, programmed maintenance, and tight scheduling require a high degree of dedication on the part of all employees. Earlier this year, I told my bosses—Continental's more than 13,000 stockholders:

"While new equipment, route expansion and domestic international growth are of great importance to your company, it is equally important that we maintain and, wherever possible, improve the quality of service to our customers—I know that your Company's employees take a great deal of pride in their jobs and in Continental. This pride and dedication to superior service are most important factors in attaining the goals we have set for the future."

And, I meant every word of what I said.

About two years ago we changed advertising agencies. We became convinced that the motive and quality of advertising is so important because in reality it reflects in large part what a carrier's management regards as important—or more accurately, what a carrier's management believes is important to its actual and potential customers. It is not accidental that our new program has featured "feel the difference pride makes." The agency we ultimately picked did an in-depth comparative study, and insofar as the general public was concerned, the pride and dedication of our people, and the ramifications thereof, were the outstanding characteristics of our company. This dedication and pride ranged from our flight crews, maintenance personnel, and sales people to station employees and managers at all echelons. Without this dedication, it would be most difficult to realize 30-minute turnarounds with large, four-engine jets! And, I am sure if we did not have this esprit de corps and attempted to operate in the manner we have chosen, the "in-box" on my desk would be cluttered with letters of complaint from customers. What we have done has involved our employees in our advertising campaign so that the advertising face we present to the public reflects itself in the service face which the public finds when it flies our airline.

Similarly, we recently undertook a management study conducted by an outside consultant and after interviewing our executives he concluded almost precisely the same thing as our advertising agency—namely, that our executives have widely divergent backgrounds and varying experiences and the only common denominators, so-to-speak, among them are their dedication, knowledgeability and willingness to make the airline operate effectively.

A SYSTEM APPROACH

The third major element in attaining high efficiency is use of the most up-to-date tools. In recent years, we have heard a great deal about "systems" approach to complex problems whether those problems be airport congestion, integrated transportation, traffic control, or a host of other problems. The problem of maximizing efficiency for an individual airline also requires a system approach, and it takes the form of instituting and administering a series of systems. In our own case, we have placed a great deal of emphasis on this systems approach, and accordingly, have a system of budgeting, a system of reporting, a system of training, a system of daily profit and loss information, a system of sales programing, a system of production planning, a system of aircraft utilization, a system of flight planning, a system of engine monitoring, a system of flight costing, etc. Each of these systems produces the necessary accurate information upon which day-to-day, as well as longer-range, management decisions can be based. All of this is aimed at removing or minimizing the judgment element from decision-making and substituting in its place hard, factual material. I might add that to a very great extent, this type of systems approach to efficiency was made possible by the advent of advanced computers.

In the near future, we, as well as others, will be operating 747s. These aircraft have a price tag of approximately 20 million dollars each. Their potential is exciting. They can be the most efficient and productive aircraft ever built. The large capital investment represented by these aircraft, however, makes it imperative that they be operated in the optimum fashion, and that means at high utilization rates. The scheduling process for 747s will be even more critical than it is today, and computerized scheduling and flight planning almost becomes a necessity for sound operation.

There is one essential system that we at Continental place great emphasis upon, and that is a system of encouraging new ideas and ways of doing things. One might call it an innovations system. In any event, only by the development of new approaches, new solutions to problems and new concepts can progress be attained. Let me cite a specific example.

Our fiscal year 1966 utilization rate of 15 hours and 19 minutes in MAC contract operations across the Pacific was close to five hours greater than the next most productive carrier. For seven of the twelve months of calendar 1966 we set utilization levels of over 16 hours a day, and in four months of this period, the utilization of our high-time individual aircraft even exceeded 17 hours a day. This was an unprecedented accomplishment in the entire history of air transportation. It was accomplished by persistence in seeking new methods of operating effectively, including such elements as early use of Doppler, an inflight navigation system to optimize the flight path, and computerized flight planning. I believe we might have been entitled to borrow a lyric of Rogers & Hammerstein's hit song from the show, "Oklahoma!" and say, "Everything's up to date in Kansas City—we've gone about as far as we can go." But we believe that efficiency can always be improved upon, and we have recently uncovered another way to obtain greater utilization through innovation. As of October first, all of our MAC charter flights, except those which are otherwise directed by MAC, will be one-stop flights from the West Coast to Southeast Asia. They will operate with only one intermediate stop at Wake Island, and on return from Southeast Asia, they will make only one enroute stop at Okinawa. This will save approximately an hour and 35 minutes on each flight and reduce in-transit time, and the flight time saved will increase our productivity by allowing us to fly one additional round trip per month per aircraft.

MEASURING EFFICIENCY

What difference does efficiency make? In terms of profits, the spread between costs and revenue is what counts, or to put it in accounting terms, it determines the operating margin.

Jet aircraft have resulted in decreasing costs per available ton mile. Nevertheless, there is a pressure on profit margins resulting from increases in individual cost elements such as labor, landing fees, equipment, interest on borrowed funds, etc. Airline management, in my opinion, has a responsibility to protect profit margins through cost control as far as they can. In the modern airline age, management's ability to deal with the problem of efficient cost control seems to me to be the most effective yardstick by which management's success or failure can be judged. It seems to me that such an objective is far more preferable and more in the public interest than protecting profit margins through increased rates.

EFFICIENCY AND THE INVESTMENT BASE

A carrier's equipment utilization rate is the most influential factor in determining its investment base. Obviously, the lower the utilization, the more equipment a carrier needs to operate a given number of schedules. That is a matter of simple arithmetic.

Several months ago I reviewed comparative utilization rates of turbine-powered aircraft operated by trunk carriers. I noted that other carriers required from 20% to 50% more aircraft than Continental to do the same job. This being the case, clearly we do not have comparable investment bases upon which any meaningful analysis can be obtained.

To be a bit more specific, one often sees reference to comparative rates of return on investment—the data which appears in the CAB's so-called "Yellow Book" which is published quarterly. Such data is often used for purposes of comparative economic analysis. The rates of return contained therein are not meaningful because some investment bases are inflated—others are deflated, depending on what standard or level of efficiency a carrier has attained. The regularly published data is not adjusted for any standard. I would like to suggest that a standard utilization rate be adopted—and that investment bases be adjusted accordingly. This standard utilization base should be developed at a level where airlines will clearly feel they can obtain a benefit from scheduling trips at off hours and not bunching their trips at peak hours, as the previous examples I have cited so clearly demonstrate. I am not suggesting that any one carrier's operation be the standard. As to whether or not a carrier attains that standard is, of course, a management challenge.

The suggestion I have just made is not without precedent. Standards have been established by the government in other areas, for example, over-booking, realistic scheduling, times between overhauls, allocation of mail, etc.

THE OTHER SIDE OF THE COIN—MARKETING

I have talked about cost control and the importance of efficiency. In fairness, this is only one side of the coin. The other side is marketing—the matter of filling seats, cargo bins and pallets. Efficiency without effective marketing is only half of the over-all task.

An important element of marketing is fares. While this is a subject for a separate speech, I would like to make two observations:

(a) First, the development of imaginative rate-making is to a large degree, although not wholly, dependent upon a carrier's efficiency. Reduced costs in the long run mean reduced prices to the public under conditions of effective competition. Higher costs, regardless of the cause, inhibit, if not preclude, bringing the advantages of air transportation to more people than would otherwise be the case.

(b) Second, there has been some consternation voiced about the growing complexity in the fare structure. Everyone would agree that simplification is desirable and a worthy objective. But in the case of fares, the question is, what is the sacrifice which airlines and the public must make for simplification? We believe the sacrifice is creative marketing. Complexity in the fare structure is not a cause—it is an effect. The cause is the complexity of the market. Penetrating new markets while minimizing dilution from existing traffic is the reason for complexity. Unlike other areas of merchandising, an airline seat, once it leaves the ground, can no longer be sold. In other words, we do not have the luxury of keeping our merchandise around until we find the right buyer. We therefore, must have a variety of prices to meet a simultaneous mass sales situation of 165 seats in the case of the largest jets we presently operate, and tomorrow this will be almost 400 seats per flight with the 747. Last month I noted with particular interest the public statement of a large travel agency—the American Express Company—which said:

"Thanks to a wonderful variety of discount plans such as the Family Fare plan, Group fares, Excursion fares, the Military Stand-by programs, and the 'Discover America' plan—more people are traveling at lower cost than ever before."

CONCLUSION

In closing, let me say that I think it is essential to keep striving individually and as an industry to find more effective means of maximizing our production—of using our major capital plant to the maximum extent practicable. This will permit us to spread traffic more evenly and thereby provide some relief to the rapidly growing airport congestion problems. And, it will permit us to continue to operate at the lowest costs enabling us thereby to provide lower fares and better returns to the public as well as maximize our profits.

THE AIRPORT CRISIS

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, recently the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, William F. McKee, gave a significant speech before the Airport Operators Council's international meeting in Boston on the subject of airports and airport planning. Administrator McKee's speech outlined the magnitude of the airport needs of the Nation and described the long-range planning his Government agency is undertaking in order to cope with this growing problem.

With leadtimes of 7 to 10 years for the construction of major airport terminals, long-range planning is the keystone to mapping and developing a national airport system adequate to meet the needs of the 1970's and the 1980's. As chairman of the Aviation Subcommittee, which held hearings in August to determine what our future airport needs are, I am looking forward to receiving from Administrator McKee the results of the studies his agency has undertaken. I believe these studies will be of great help to the subcommittee in its development of airport legislation.

I ask unanimous consent to have Administrator McKee's speech printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks by William F. McKee, Administrator, Federal Aviation Administration, to the Airport Operators Council International, Boston, September 14, 1967

There are many stages to a problem. The first is one which everybody talks about and says, "Isn't it terrible!" The next comes along when somebody sits down and defines it. The third stage occurs when an expert redefines it—but this time in very scientific terms with charts and graphs. The fourth stage comes when some simple and direct genius asks quietly, "Fine, fellows, but how are we going to get ourselves out of this dilemma."

Aviation has a problem today—a problem of prosperity. A lot of people want to ride in airplanes right now. Many, many more are going to want to ride in them in the future.

This single problem has been the subject of numerous articles and editorials—in the *New York Times, Time Magazine,* the *Washington Post* and just about every other major daily newspaper. There have been many speeches given defining the problem. Many technical papers—with graphs—have tried to redefine it. And leaders in both government and the industry are asking, "Who's going to pick up the tab?", "Where does the money come from?"

To the FAA, the demand for air travel is a serious problem indeed. It affects us in just every way. It means more facilities (computers, radar, instrument landing systems, runway lighting & towers), more controllers, more of everything.

For you, it means more runway capacity, more terminal space, more baggage counters and more passenger gates. How much more, I shall mention later.

Our FAA planning efforts for airports have centered around the National Airport Plan. This five-year projection—required by law—identifies what the nation will need in airport development to meet future demands. This plan gives Congress the needed documentation to assist it in determining the extent of federal aid necessary and it guides FAA in the allocation of funds under the Federal-Aid to Airports Program.

The National Airport Plan is based on our forecast of aviation demand—the types of aircraft and the number of operations.

This plan has until recently provided the government a good guideline for the future. The growth of aviation, however, has been so phenomenal that additional forecasting efforts are needed. We have, accordingly, made some changes.

We shall, in next year's National Airport Plan, look beyond the five year period and attempt to tell communities what new airports they will be needing ten and twenty years from now. We shall also be advising these communities as to what they will need in the way of future runway length.

The purpose of this new approach is to encourage local communities to plan ahead and to set aside land for future use. One of my staff members reports reading an estimate that the cities and towns of the nation are gobbling up one million acres a year of their surrounding open country. It is difficult even now to find sufficient land for airport needs. It will be practically impossible in the future.

The inclusion of the land provisions in the future National Airport Plan does not mean necessarily that the new airports and the runway lengths described will be eligible for Federal-Aid Airport grants. They are intended, rather, as planning assistance to local communities.

Our major new planning effort, however, has been an in-depth study of the demand for airport service at 22 of our largest hub areas through 1980. We have taken these 22 metropolitan areas and projected the number of operations and passengers that will be using their air terminals. We have, at the same time, translated this demand into all the facilities that will be needed—apron area, gate positions, ticket counters, baggage counters, parking space, etc.

It is our hope that this study shall assist you operators in drawing up comprehensive long-range airport master plans for both your own use and for your local government planning officials.

The 22 large hub areas included in our study account for 68% of all our domestic enplaned passengers. We cover in the report 173 airports—including the large carrier airports and surrounding reliever airports. These 22 hub areas showed a total of nearly 70 million enplaned passengers in 1965. In 1980, they will account for some 370 million—a gain of 433%. This is the kind of problem we face.

I should like to take one hub area—Miami—and list a few of the projections. The Miami area study included 6 airports in addition to Miami International.

In 1965, these seven airports accounted for about three million, three hundred thousand enplaned passengers. In 1980—about twelve years from now—they will have nearly 19 million enplaning passengers. To accommodate this tremendous growth, the Miami area will need 5 times the total air carrier terminal space it now has. It will need 4 times the amount of apron area for carrier aircraft—4 times the present cargo building space—6 times the amount of existing cargo apron area. The projections for the 21 other hubs we studied are just as dramatic.

Now 1980 seems far distant. But is 12 years sufficient lead time to build new terminals? And at the same time, triple the amount of cargo space? This is the size of the problem that lies ahead for the nation's large cities. I remind you, also, that all this is not going to happen January 1, 1980. It is happening now and will accelerate in the future.

From our study of these hub areas, the major problem will be accommodating the vast crowds of air passengers. We anticipate that air carrier operations in these 22 cities will show an increase of 143% in the 1965–1980 time period. But passengers will increase by 440%. On the other hand, general aviation operations will increase twice as fast as carrier operations. This means that general aviation operations in hub areas will require almost three times the aircraft parking and servicing areas of that required by the air carriers.

This 1980 report emphasizes strongly the need for reliever airports in the hub areas. But not enough is being done in this regard. With few exceptions, operators of the large hub terminals have not been active in promoting these reliever airports. We are well aware that the jurisdictional problems in our metropolitan areas are many—that the proposed location of reliever airports often lies outside the metropolitan political boundaries. But we are equally aware that valuable time is passing and reliever airports are not even being planned.

This report covering the projected needs for the 22 hubs will be published soon. Then we will begin preparing a report on the 1980 projections for 33 medium hubs.

This long range planning—which we must have if we are to be prepared for the future—is taking on increased importance in FAA. I have recently upgraded our agency planning effort and named one of our top operations men—Oscar Bakke—to head our plans and policy staff. He will take over his new job next week with the title of Associate Administrator for Plans, and the nation's airport problems are going to occupy a lot of his time.

I should like to return for a moment to the people problem of airports—the accommodation of the vast number of passengers that will be frequenting our terminals. There are many ways of dramatizing this. For example, if faster methods of servicing passengers are not developed, it will take all the tickets counters the Atlanta terminal now has just to process passengers for 2 departing 747's.

These same two high capacity jets could, at the same time, be carrying a thousand pieces of baggage. The point is that each and every step in processing the passenger must be speeded up, It must be made simple and more efficient.

Another side of the people problem is already evident—in the paralysis of surface traffic that has already occurred at several of our major terminals. The access problem is already critical in the large metropolitan areas. It will become more serious because of a number of non-aviation developments. Rapid urbanization is increasing costs of highway rights-of-way. At the same time suburban real estate development is providing new traffic to utilize the newly built freeway and highway systems. Now add to this our same two high capacity jets. They could add 250 taxis to the peak hour rush—or as many as 700 private cars.

I mention access roads because they, too, are in integral part of the terminal. There is little value in increasing our terminal capacity 400% if we do not increase the capacity of our presently congested access roads.

The big question now is how to devise a plan to pay for all this. And, again, we are not talking about some projected need in the future. I think the figures on this year's Federal-Aid Airport Program are indicative. We received a total of 778 requests from local sponsors. They were seeking a total of nearly $340 million in Federal matching funds. We were able to assist in 386 projects with a total of $70.2 million in Federal matching funds.

The suggestions for financing future airport development made to Senator Monroney's committee were many and varied. Some argued for a Federal loan program; others suggested an increase in FAAP grants; and a number, including the AOCI, urged the imposition of user charges—either through a head tax, fuel tax, ticket tax, etc.

We must be fully aware, however, of the fact that proposed funds for airport development are competing with other needs—both in your own communities and on the national scene. These requirements for airports are also competing with aviation and I am sure that airports will not create the only demand for extra taxes.

This airport problem, as I've noted, has been receiving a large share of public attention. This is most important because the solutions required will involve a large share of the public. We are seeing for the first time a widespread interest in aviation from segments of the public who were not previously concerned. But I am not happy with the nature of some of the public comment—the repetition of the word crisis. I do not anticipate that we shall be defeated by success—or that we shall fail because of too much prosperity. The aviation industry has never been in better shape. It is providing swift and safe travel. It is employing hundreds of thousands of persons and taking on new employees every day. It is operating in the black and showing profit. I have no doubt whatsoever that this tremendous industry will devise a formula for meeting the needs of an even more prosperous future.

Thank you.

VIETNAM WAR NO LONGER INCREASING ECONOMIC PRESSURES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President an article published in the September Labor Review entitled "The Employment Effect of Defense Expenditures," by Richard Oliver is very helpful reading for anyone contemplating whether the economy needs a tax increase.

Scratch a pro tax increase enthusiast and he would like to tell you that we need a tax increase to counterbalance the inflationary impact of Vietnam war spending, that we cannot have guns and butter, and that we must pay for the war or suffer inflation.

Mr. President, these arguments are without merit and the Oliver article shows why. This article is directly concerned with the impact of the Vietnam war effort on employment. It is clear it is here the prime inflationary effect would be likely to come. More workers pulled into producing for Vietnam would mean fewer available to meet the growing civilian demands of the economy. The Oliver article shows that this is just what did—and I stress did—happen between July 1, 1964, and July 1, 1966. The article shows that defense-related civilian employment increased over 1 million during this period. Furthermore, the proportion of private employment generated by military expenditures also increased from 3.9 percent in fiscal year 1965 to 5.2 percent in fiscal year 1967. Mr. Oliver breaks down all these elements by industry.

For the future, the story is not only different, it is also opposite. The most recent defense indicators would indicate a decline in Vietnam-related private employment. The tremendous impact on the economy and on employment of the Vietnam buildup between fiscal years 1965 and 1967 occurred because of the sharp rate of increase. The rate of increase is the important point and I cannot stress it enough. It is not the general level of expenditures but the change in expenditures that affects the private economy so much.

The present defense indicators show no growth trend in expenditures, and because of the accelerator principle, a leveling off of expenditures signals a declining impact on the private economy. We will recall that the accelerator principle describes the effect of subsequent economic changes on net private investment. Net private investment for military production will only keep rising as defense expenditures keep rising; that is, as added productive capacity is required. We already have the capacity to support current levels of expenditures, and this is one reason investment is lagging this year. As defense contractors reduce their orders for new equipment, this, of course, exerts downward pressure on the economy because defense suppliers cut down on their production and employment.

Consequently, absent a new rise in defense spending above the current levels, the impact on the economy and on employment will be negative.

Here again, Mr. President, is why Senators should be cautious and careful in considering the administration's proposed tax increase. Its wisdom depends on whether the economy is likely to be too exuberant without it. The Oliver article is an expert, specific, and scholarly analysis—not an appeal to fears or threats of a shambles—but an objective study that should carry weight in assessing whether we need a tax increase now or not.

Mr. Oliver derived his estimates by using an interindustry model and techniques developed as part of the interagency growth project. Thus, the employment increments which he attributes to military expenditures include both the direct employment necessary to produce the final goods and services purchased, and the indirect employment required in all levels of supporting industries which provide materials, components, transportation, and distribution services ultimately embodied in the final purchase.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE EMPLOYMENT EFFECT OF DEFENSE EXPENDITURES

(By Richard P. Oliver*)

In Mid-1965 defense expenditures began to increase to meet our expanding commitments in Vietnam. In the next 2 years military expenditures rose from a monthly low of $3.3 billion at the beginning of fiscal year 1965 to a high of $6.7 billion in March 1967, as our troop strength in Vietnam rose from about 25,000 to about 500,000. Defense expenditures in fiscal 1965 amounted to $47.4 billion, while in fiscal 1967 they were about $68.4 billion, an increase of $21.0 billion in current dollars. Expenditures of this magnitude, of course, have a major effect on employment and produce varying results in different industries.

---

*Of the Division of Economic Growth, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

This article presents estimates of the employment generated in each industry by Department of Defense (DOD) military expenditures in fiscal years 1965 and 1967, and that portion of employment in fiscal year 1967 that might be attributed to the Vietnam buildup. These estimates were derived by using an interindustry model and techniques developed as part of the Interagency Growth Project.[1] Detailed estimates of military purchases of final goods and services were processed through the model to obtain the total of direct and indirect output necessary to produce these purchases. Estimates of defense-generated employment were obtained by converting industry outputs to employment using productivity factors for 1965 and 1967.

EMPLOYMENT EFFECTS, 1965–67

The total employment generated by these expenditures, including military personnel and DOD civilian employees, is estimated at about 5.7 million persons in fiscal year 1965 and 7.4 million in fiscal year 1967. Military personnel, the largest single component of this total, increased to 3.4 million from 2.7 during this period. Government and private defense-related civilian employment rose from about 3.0 to 4.1 million, an increase of 1,045,000. This increase amounted to about 23 percent of the total increase in civilian employment during the period. DOD civilian employment in the United States for military functions increased from slightly more than 900,000 to nearly 1.1 million. Estimated employment of wage and salary workers in the private sector attributable[2] to military expenditures rose from about 2.1 million in fiscal year 1965 to 3.0 million in fiscal year 1967. This increase raised the proportion of private employment generated by military expenditures from 3.9 percent of the total in fiscal year 1965 to 5.2 percent in fiscal year 1967.

Each billion dollars of defense purchases from the private sector was estimated to create 82,000 jobs in fiscal year 1965 and 73,000 jobs in fiscal year 1967 with the decline due to higher prices and productivity increases. Holding prices constant, the aggregate productivity per worker, associated with all DOD purchases of final goods and services from the private sector, increased from fiscal year 1965 to fiscal year 1967 by 5.8 percent—about average for the private nonfarm economy in this period.

The proportion of employment attributable to military expenditures varied considerably from industry to industry. However, the employment estimates shown in table 1 indicate that only three of the aggregate industry sectors were heavily dependent on military purchases in both 1965 and 1967.

---

[1] See *Projections 1970: Interindustry Relationships, Potential Demand, Employment* (BLS Bulletin 1536, 1967). See also "Interindustry Employment Requirements," *Monthly Labor Review*, July 1965, pp. 841–850, for a description of methods of deriving employment estimates.

[2] Employment attributable to military expenditures includes both the direct employment necessary to produce the final goods and services purchased and the indirect employment required in all levels of supporting industries which provide materials, components, transportation, and distribution services ultimately embodied in the final purchase. The indirect employment estimates do not include the income multiplier or accelerator effects which induce further consumption and investment purchases.

TABLE 1.—ESTIMATED EMPLOYMENT ATTRIBUTABLE TO DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EXPENDITURES,[1] FISCAL YEARS 1965 AND 1967, AND THAT ATTRIBUTABLE TO THE VIETNAM BUILDUP IN 1967[2]

Industry No.	Industry	Fiscal year 1965				Fiscal year 1967				Employment attributable to buildup			
		Total employment	DOD-generated employment			Total employment	DOD-generated employment			Number	As percent of DOD-generated employment	As percent of total industry employment	Percent distribution
			Number	As percent of total	Percent distribution		Number	As percent of total	Percent distribution				
	Federal Government	5,067	3,635.4	72.0	------	6,016	4,437.5	73.8	------	798.8	18.0	13.3	------
	Military	2,716	2,716.0	100.0	------	3,350	3,350.0	100.0	------	634.0	18.9	18.9	------
	Civilian	[3] 2,351	[4] 919.4	39.1	------	2,666	1,087.5	40.8	------	164.8	95.2	6.2	------
	State and local government	[3] 7,462	12.6	.2	------	8,569	19.3	.2	------	6.0	31.1	.1	------
	Total, civilian public and private	64,296	3,033.2	4.7	------	68,905	4,078.3	5.9	------	1,179.6	28.9	1.7	------
	Total, public and private	67,012	5,749.2	8.6	------	72,255	7,428.3	10.3	------	1,813.6	24.4	2.5	------
	Total, private	54,483	2,101.2	3.9	100.0	57,670	2,971.5	5.2	100.0	1,008.8	33.9	1.7	100.0
	Agriculture, forestry, and fisheries	5,034	48.5	1.0	2.3	4,075	75.0	1.8	2.5	32.8	43.7	.8	3.2
1 2	Livestock and livestock products Other agricultural products	4,848	45.9	.9	2.2	3,869	69.9	1.8	2.4	30.4	43.5	.8	3.0
3	Forestry and fishery products	62	1.1	1.8	.1	69	2.4	3.5	.1	1.3	54.2	1.9	.1
4	Agricultural, forestry, and fishery services	124	1.5	1.2	.1	137	2.7	2.0	.1	1.1	40.7	.8	.1
	Mining	634	29.9	4.7	1.4	620	40.0	6.5	1.3	13.1	32.8	2.1	1.3
5	Iron and ferroalloy ores mining	28	1.6	5.7	.1	29	2.2	7.6	.1	.8	36.4	2.8	.1
6	Nonferrous metal ores mining	53	3.8	7.2	.2	56	5.6	10.0	.2	2.0	35.7	3.6	.2
7	Coal mining	145	4.5	3.1	.2	140	6.2	4.4	.2	2.1	33.9	1.5	.2
8	Crude petroleum and natural gas	291	16.4	5.6	.8	276	20.9	7.6	.7	6.4	30.6	2.3	.6
9 10	Stone and clay mining and quarrying Chemical and fertilizer mineral mining	117	3.6	3.1	.2	119	5.1	4.3	.2	1.8	35.3	1.5	.2
	Construction:												
11 12	New construction Maintenance and repair construction	3,119	60.0	1.9	2.8	3,277	67.9	2.1	2.3	5.0	7.4	.2	.5
	Manufacturing	17,604	1,390.2	7.9	66.2	19,318	2,021.6	10.5	68.0	737.7	36.5	3.8	73.1
13	Ordnance and accessories	227	106.1	46.7	5.0	284	183.9	64.8	6.2	92.9	50.5	36.6	9.2
14	Food and kindred products	1,752	20.3	1.2	1.0	1,767	31.7	1.8	1.1	12.6	39.7	.7	1.2
15	Tobacco manufactures	90	.4	.4	------	83	.7	.8	------	.3	42.8	.4	------
16	Broad and narrow fabrics, yarn and thread mills	574	14.8	2.6	.7	599	41.6	6.9	1.4	27.6	66.3	4.6	2.7
17	Miscellaneous textile goods and floor coverings	110	2.2	2.0	.1	117	4.3	3.7	.1	2.2	51.2	1.9	.2
18	Apparel	1,394	16.1	1.2	.8	1,457	46.5	3.2	1.6	30.8	66.2	2.1	3.1
19	Miscellaneous fabricated textile products	158	4.4	2.8	.2	168	10.2	6.1	.3	6.1	59.8	3.6	.6
20	Lumber and wood products, except containers	571	12.5	2.2	.6	572	26.3	4.6	.9	14.1	53.6	2.5	1.4
21	Wooden containers	34	1.3	3.8	.1	36	7.0	19.4	.2	5.8	82.9	16.1	.6
22	Household furniture	302	7.7	2.5	.4	330	9.5	2.9	.3	2.1	22.1	.6	.2
23	Other furniture and fixtures	117	2.5	2.1	.1	131	3.9	3.0	.1	1.5	38.5	1.1	.1
24	Paper and allied products, except containers	435	13.2	3.0	.6	468	19.3	4.1	.6	6.7	34.7	1.4	.7
25	Paperboard containers and boxes	196	6.6	3.4	.3	215	12.4	5.8	.4	6.1	49.2	2.8	.6
26	Printing and publishing	965	29.2	3.0	1.4	1,051	39.5	3.8	1.3	12.5	31.6	1.2	1.2
27	Chemicals and selected chemical products	420	19.3	4.6	.9	459	38.7	8.4	1.3	21.7	56.1	4.7	2.2
28	Plastics and synthetic materials	187	7.4	4.0	.4	210	12.9	6.1	.4	6.3	48.8	3.0	.6
29	Drugs, cleaning and toilet preparations	218	3.2	1.5	.2	241	10.2	4.2	.3	7.4	72.5	3.1	.7
30	Paints and allied products	65	3.1	4.8	.1	67	4.0	6.0	.1	1.2	30.0	1.8	.1
31	Petroleum refining and related industries	182	10.9	6.0	.5	182	14.5	8.0	.5	4.4	30.3	2.4	.4
32	Rubber and miscellaneous plastic products	454	19.0	4.2	.9	527	32.5	6.2	1.1	14.5	44.6	2.8	1.4
33	Leather tanning and industrial leather products	35	.6	1.7	------	34	1.4	4.1	------	.8	57.1	2.4	.1
34	Footwear and other leather products	315	4.1	1.3	.2	318	11.3	3.6	.4	7.4	65.5	2.3	.7
35	Glass and glass products	166	6.9	4.2	.3	182	9.9	5.4	.3	3.4	34.3	1.9	.3
36	Stone and clay products	454	16.2	3.6	.8	454	21.9	4.8	.7	7.1	32.4	1.6	.7
37	Primary iron and steel manufacturing	934	55.2	5.9	2.6	943	82.8	8.8	2.8	30.3	36.6	3.2	3.0

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—ESTIMATED EMPLOYMENT ATTRIBUTABLE TO DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EXPENDITURES,[1] FISCAL YEARS 1965 AND 1967, AND THAT ATTRIBUTABLE TO THE VIETNAM BUILDUP IN 1967 [2]—Continued

Industry No.	Industry	Fiscal year 1965				Fiscal year 1967				Employment attributable to buildup			
		Total employment	DOD-generated employment			Total employment	DOD-generated employment			Number	As percent of DOD-generated employment	As percent of total industry employment	Percent distribution
			Number	As percent of total	Percent distribution		Number	As percent of total	Percent distribution				
	Manufacturing—Continued												
38	Primary nonferrous metals manufacturing	343	34.3	10.0	1.6	382	52.0	13.6	1.7	19.2	36.9	5.0	1.9
39	Metal containers	72	1.4	1.9	.1	72	3.2	4.4	.1	1.8	56.2	2.5	.2
40	Heating, plumbing, and structural metal products	443	14.6	3.3	.7	481	18.6	3.9	.6	4.9	26.3	1.0	.5
41	Stampings, screw machine products and bolts	302	25.2	8.3	1.2	352	35.8	10.2	1.2	11.2	31.3	3.2	1.1
42	Other fabricated metal products	408	20.4	5.0	1.0	458	29.5	6.4	1.0	10.3	34.9	2.2	1.0
43	Engines and turbines	88	7.7	8.8	.4	98	11.3	11.5	.4	4.3	38.1	4.4	.4
44	Farm machinery and equipment	130	1.7	1.3	.1	150	3.3	2.2	.1	1.7	51.5	1.1	.2
45	Construction, mining and oil field machinery	172	3.5	2.0	.2	192	11.0	5.7	.4	7.5	68.2	3.9	.7
46	Materials handling machinery and equipment	75	3.3	4.4	.2	86	6.6	7.7	.2	3.5	53.0	4.1	.3
47	Metalworking machinery and equipment	293	24.0	8.2	1.1	342	38.3	11.2	1.3	16.5	43.1	4.8	1.6
48	Special industry, machinery and equipment	186	3.3	1.8	.2	204	4.9	2.4	.2	2.0	40.8	1.0	.2
49	General industrial machinery and equipment	251	13.8	5.5	.7	282	21.7	7.7	.7	9.2	42.1	3.3	.9
50	Machine shop products	180	28.4	15.8	1.3	221	51.4	23.3	1.7	23.3	45.3	10.5	2.3
51	Office, computing, and accounting machines	179	15.4	8.6	.7	227	21.9	9.6	.7	8.0	36.5	3.5	.8
52	Service industry machines	111	3.1	2.8	.1	118	4.5	3.8	.2	1.9	42.2	1.6	.2
53	Electric industrial equipment and apparatus	349	33.0	9.5	1.6	418	47.1	11.3	1.6	18.1	38.4	4.3	1.8
54	Household appliances	164	2.3	1.4	.1	182	3.4	1.9	.1	1.1	32.4	.6	.1
55	Electric lighting and wiring equipment	165	9.8	5.9	.5	192	15.3	8.0	.5	6.1	39.9	3.2	6
56	Radio, television, and communication equipment	533	182.0	34.1	8.7	666	221.7	33.3	7.5	49.3	22.2	7.4	4.9
57	Electronic components and accessories	280	71.5	25.5	3.4	379	99.0	26.1	3.3	31.1	31.4	8.2	3.1
58	Miscellaneous electrical machinery, equipment, and supplies	95	6.6	6.9	.3	109	9.0	8.3	.3	3.3	36.7	3.0	.3
59	Motor vehicles and equipment	787	14.4	1.8	.7	841	29.4	3.5	1.0	14.4	49.0	1.7	1.0
60	Aircraft and parts	602	365.9	60.8	17.4	[5]803	474.2	59.1	16.0	141.6	29.9	17.6	14.0
61	Other transportation equipment	260	69.8	26.8	3.3	[6]285	64.2	22.5	2.2	--------	------	------	-------
62	Scientific and controlling instruments	252	31.6	12.5	1.5	292	41.6	14.2	1.4	13.8	33.2	4.7	1.4
63	Optical, ophthalmic, and photographic equipment	124	12.7	10.2	.6	152	15.6	10.3	.5	4.2	26.9	2.8	.4
64	Miscellaneous manufacturing	404	7.3	1.8	.3	439	10.2	2.3	.3	3.6	35.3	.8	.4
	Services	28,092	572.6	2.0	27.3	30,380	767.0	2.5	25.8	220.2	28.7	.7	21.8
65	Transportation and warehousing	2,504	144.3	5.8	6.9	259.3	204.9	7.9	6.9	74.9	36.6	2.9	7.4
66	Communications, excluding radio and TV broadcasting	759	24.6	3.2	1.2	834	31.7	3.8	1.1	10.2	32.1	1.2	1.0
67	Radio and TV broadcasting	105	3.9	3.7	.2	114	5.9	5.2	.2	1.8	30.5	1.6	.2
68	Electric, gas, water, and sanitary services	619	19.5	3.2	.9	639	24.2	3.8	.8	6.7	27.7	1.0	.7
69	Wholesale and retail trade	12,414	121.0	1.0	5.8	13,423	166.3	1.2	5.6	50.2	30.2	.4	5.0
70	Finance and insurance	2,424	32.4	1.3	1.5	2,570	52.2	2.0	1.8	20.1	38.5	.8	2.0
71	Real estate and rental	563	5.8	1.0	.3	567	7.6	1.3	.3	2.3	30.3	.4	.2
72	Hotels; personal and repair services, excluding auto	1,787	25.4	1.4	1.2	1,980	37.1	1.9	1.2	12.4	33.4	.6	1.2
73 74	Business services Research and development	1,778	91.2	5.2	4.4	1,970	126.5	6.4	4.3	35.7	28.2	1.8	3.5
75	Automobile repair and service	329	4.0	1.2	.2	365	5.9	1.6	.2	2.0	33.9	.5	.2
76	Amusements	578	7.1	1.2	.3	640	9.0	1.4	.3	2.2	24.4	.3	.2
77	Medical, educational services and nonprofit organizations	4,232	92.5	2.2	4.4	4,685	95.6	2.0	3.2	1.7	1.8	------	.2

[1] Employment estimates cover wage and salary employees in the United States attributable to Department of Defense military functions. They do not include the self-employed, domestic workers, or U.S. citizens employed abroad other than military personnel. However, farm employment does include self-employed and unpaid family workers.

[2] Total employment estimates for FY 1967 are based on first 9 months results.

[3] Includes Government enterprises.

[4] Includes domestic civilian employment of the Department of Defense (military functions) and some small employment effect on government enterprises.

[5] The impact of Department of Defense expenditures on the aircraft industry reflects a cutback in missile engine work in 1967, resulting in an understatement of the Vietnam employment increase.

[6] Expenditures in constant dollars declined slightly between 1965 and 1967.

The effect of DOD spending on employment in the aircraft, ordnance, and communications equipment industries is illustrated in chart 1. [Charts do not appear in RECORD.] It should be noted that although defense purchases increased sharply between 1965 and 1967, purchases of civilian aircraft increased at a higher rate, thus resulting in a decrease in the defense share of total employment. The actual increase in conventional ordnance was somewhat greater than is shown here. Part of this increased output was provided by Government-owned and operated arsenals which are not included in this sector. Also, DOD purchases of completed missiles, produced in the ordnance industry, declined somewhat from 1965 to 1967 reducing the effect of the increase in conventional ordnance on total sector employment. A decline during fiscal year 1967 of purchases of completed space vehicles by the National Space and Aeronautics Administration contributed to the increase in the proportion of industry employment generated by DOD spending. In the communications equipment industry, though the number of jobs rose during the period, there was a slight decline in the ratio of employment attributable to defense spending due to the sharp increase in civilian demand for radio and television.

Regarding other industries, new construction and shipbuilding were the only ones to show a decline in estimated employment generated by defense expenditures. While military construction expenditures increased from 1965 to 1967, this increase was due to construction abroad, principally in Vietnam, and not domestic military construction which declined slightly. However, total domestic construction employment generated by the Department of Defense increased somewhat due to a rise in maintenance construction. Defense-generated employment in the "other transportation equipment" sector, which includes shipbuilding, declined from about 70,000 jobs or 27 percent in 1965 to about 54,000 in 1967, as expenditures were shifted from shipbuilding to higher priority Vietnam functions. Most of the defense purchases from this sector were for shipbuilding with much smaller expenditures on railroad equipment, motorcycles, and other transportation items. A direct comparison of defense-generated employment from shipbuilding expenditures with employment in the shipbuilding industry would show a much higher, although still declining, relationship.[3]

The total employment generated by defense purchases in the private sector was fairly broadly distributed by industry in both fiscal years. The few industries with 5 percent or more of defense-generated employment accounted for only about 40 percent of the total in both years.

Industries with 5 percent or more of defense-generated private employment—Percent of total defense-generated private employment

	1965	*1967*
Aircraft	17	16
Ordnance	5	6
Communications equipment	9	8
Transportation	7	7
Wholesale and retail trade	6	6

EFFECTS OF VIETNAM BUILDUP

The amount of defense-generated employment in the private sector in fiscal year 1967 which was estimated to be due to Vietnam military expenditures is shown in table 1. These estimates indicate that of the 3 million jobs generated by military expenditures, about 1 million may be attributed to Vietnam. This should not be interpreted to mean that 1 million jobs would be lost if the conflict in Vietnam were to end. Declines in this employment would be affected by a number of elements including the nature and timing of the reduction in military expenditures and the size of the Armed Forces, the fiscal and manpower policies developed to cushion the transition, the shifting of personnel in defense work to civilian production, and reduction in overtime hours of work.

---

[3] In interpreting table 1, it should be noted that the estimates of defense-generated employment as a percent of industry employment are affected in varying degrees by the particular classification system used. The interindustry sectors are usually an aggregate representing several related industries, which DOD purchases may have been predominantly from just one, resulting in misleading comparisons, for example, shipbuilding is part of a sector called "other transportation equipment," (railroad equipment, motor cycles, etc.), with the result that the high proportion of shipbuilding employment attributable to defense expenditures is included with other activities which have only negligible sales to DOD. This particular sector is probably affected more than any other by the consolidation of industries with wide variation in defense sales.

The estimates of the private employment generated by the buildup were derived by assuming that the increase in military expenditures in constant prices from fiscal year 1965 to fiscal year 1967 represented an approximate measure of the size and composition of expenditures related to Vietnam. This is approximate because some of the 1965 base expenditures have probably been shifted from lower priority items to meet more urgent Vietnam needs, and some of the increase in 1967 may have been for items not directly related to Vietnam. The increment in purchases was assumed to be the amount of expenditures in each industry in fiscal year 1967 which were due to Vietnam. Employment requirements were then generated separately for these incremental purchases using current input-output and productivity factors.

It should be noted that the employment due to the Vietnam buildup was not estimated by simply taking the difference between defense-generated employment in fiscal years 1965 and 1967. That increase in employment would reflect two components which are partially offsetting: the increase in employment due to the defense buildup and the reduction in employment due to the increased productivity in defense industries and their suppliers. The net effect of these two factors would show an increase of less than 900,000 in defense-generated private employment, rather than about 1 million.

Chart 2 shows the incremental employment generated by Vietnam as percents of industry employment and total defense-generated employment in fiscal year 1967 for the aircraft, ordnance, and electronics industries. While these industries were most affected by the Vietnam buildup, they did not experience general labor shortages, although temporary problems did exist in some cases.

In a number of industries, the increase in defense-related employment due to the buildup was more substantial, but this increment remained a small proportion of total employment in the industry. About 66 percent of the total defense-generated employment in the apparel industry in fiscal year 1967 was attributable to the buildup, but this buildup employment was only 2 percent of total employment in the industry. Similarly, over 70 percent of the defense-generated employment in the drug industry in fiscal year 1967 was estimated to be due to the buildup, but this was only 3 percent of total industry employment.

The industry distribution of the Vietnam-generated employment generally followed the total defense employment patterns of fiscal years 1965 and 1967. The employment effects of Vietnam were spread over a wide range of industries with few industries accounting for more than 5 percent of the total.

Industries with 5 percent or more of Vietnam-generated employment—Percent of Vietnam-generated private employment

Aircraft	14
Ordnance	9
Communications equipment	5
Transportation	7
Wholesale and retail trade	5

NOTE ON PROCEDURE

The estimates of employment attributable to military expenditures were derived in three stages: (a) DOD military expenditures were examined in considerable detail to identify goods and services actually purchased, (b) these purchases were processed through an interindustry model to determine total generated production in each industry, and (c) the industry production levels were converted to employment estimates.

Basically, an interindustry model provides a means of calculating the production requirements levied on all supplying industries throughout the economy by a purchase of final products. Purchase of aircraft, for example, implies a demand for engines, airframes, electronics, and other components. The production of each of these components generates requirements for their inputs, each of which, in turn, generates further chains of input requirements back through the more basic stages of production, distribution, and transportation.

The basis and classification of the interindustry model used were consistent with the Office of Business Economics 1958 interindustry study. However, coefficients were revised by the Interagency Growth Project to account for changes from 1958. Estimated DOD expenditures for the most part corresponded to national income definitions and procedures, except that food and clothing provided in kind were not treated as compensation, but rather as purchases from the food and clothing industries. In addition, the estimates differ from national income treatment of military expenditures in that they account for expenditures or payments when made, rather than when the end items are delivered. Also, construction differs from the input-output convention by being limited to contract, construction, excluding force account or DOD construction labor which here appears in Government employment. The output of Government-owned and operated shipyards and arsenals were not considered as purchases from the shipbuilding and ordnance industries, but were treated as Government purchases of materials and services consumed and as Government employee compensation.

DERIVATION OF DOD EXPENDITURES

Defense expenditures were considered as covering only the military expenditures of the Department of Defense and the Military Assistance Program, excluding DOD civilian functions and Atomic Energy Commission purchases. Expenditures were developed separately for the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Defense Agencies and the Civil Defense and Military Assistance Program. Expenditures of each of the military departments and defense agencies were distributed by the functional titles or budget sectors of Military Personnel, Operations and Maintenance, Procurement, Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, and Construction, Civil Defense, Family Housing, Military Assistance, and Revolving and Management Fund purchases were treated separately. DOD expenditures estimates were available for these sectors by military department for both years DOD accounts for each budget sector were then analysed to distribute each of these totals with the greatest possible degree of detail. While considerable expenditure detail was available for fiscal year 1965, for fiscal year 1967, obligations, with some timing adjustments, were used to estimate more detailed expenditures for each sector. Expenditures were then coded at a 4-digit Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) level, based on product identification and combined by the same SIC for each budget sector.

Various adjustments were required to bring DOD stated expenditures closer to actual purchases. These included adjustment of some procurement expenditures for Government-furnished equipment (GFE) or component items purchased directly by DOD and provided to a contractor for assembly. In the case of aircraft, missiles, ships, and vehicles, DOD generally contracts directly for major components and has them assembled by a prime contractor who otherwise would have purchased them under subcontracts. Since DOD accounts show only expenditures for the completed weapon, it was necessary to subtract the amount of components purchased under GFE and assign them to the actual component SIC. Also, purchases from Industrial Fund activities, such as shipyards, arsenals, transportation, and overhaul functions, had to be subtracted from the product or service provided and distributed to the actual purchases of labor and materials.

The revised list of expenditures was then converted to a national income basis by eliminating certain expenditures which do not represent current production, such as retired pay and purchases of land and other existing assets. However, not all national income adjustments were made. Timing adjustments required to put expenditures on a delivery basis, principally affecting long leadtime items such as shipbuilding, were ignored since current payments provide a better basis for estimating employment. Similarly, receipts were not subtracted from expenditures since this would have had the effect of reducing the actual amount of employment required. DOD expenditure estimates for 1965 were checked, where possible, against the Bureau of the Census Survey, MA-175, "Shipments of Defense-Oriented Industries, 1965," which provides information on sales to the Department of Defense by 4-digit SIC. Individual industry price deflators were then applied to convert expenditures to 1958 dollars, the basis required by the interindustry model.

Table 2 presents the estimated military purchases of final goods and services for fiscal years 1965 and 1967. These estimated expenditures are in 1958 dollars and have been converted from purchasers' to producers' prices.[4] National income and input-output conventions have been followed, with the exceptions noted earlier. However, this list differs from the 1958 input-output approach in the way research expenditures were treated. Research and development (R&D) performed in manufacturing establishments was left in the originating sector's sales to the DOD. In the 1958 study, this type of R&D was considered an intermediate or secondary product of the producing industry and was transferred to the R&D sector. Residual R&D, therefore, represents purchases from commercial R&D establishments.

These expenditures were processed through the interindustry model to generate total direct and indirect production requirements. Production levels attributable to defense were checked against total production in each industry for reasonableness. Production levels were then transformed into industry employment requirements. Productivity factors used to convert output to employment reflect the unit employment requirements for each industry in fiscal year 1965 and fiscal year 1967. Employment estimates were derived for wage and salary employees, excluding the self-employed, except for farm workers. However, the number of self-employed persons in industries selling to DOD is believed to be insignificant. The employment estimates obtained were checked for reasonableness against industry employment figures obtained in a DOD survey of major defense contractors. Employment estimates provided in this article do not include the income multiplier or accelerator effects which induce further consumption and investment purchases, nor employment outside of the United States generated by offshore procurement or direct hire of civilians.

---

[4] Producers' prices exclude the distribution costs of transportation and trade. The sum of trade and transportation costs associated with each purchase appear as aggregate purchases from the trade and transportation sectors.

TABLE 2.—ESTIMATED DEFENSE EXPENDITURES, FISCAL YEARS 1965 AND 1967

[Millions of 1958 dollars producers' prices][1]

Ind. No.	Industry	1965		1967		
		Defense purchases	Percent distribution	Defense purchases	Percent distribution	Percent change 1965–67
	Total	$40,017.5	100.0	$54,372.9	100.0	35.9
	Agriculture, forestry, and fisheries	2.6	-----	3.1	-----	19.2
1	Livestock and livestock products	.2	-----	.3	-----	50.0
2	Other agricultural products	1.2	-----	1.2	-----	-------
3	Forestry and fishery products	---------	-----	---------	-----	-------
4	Agricultural, forestry and fishery services	1.2	-----	1.6	-----	33.3
	Mining	16.6	-----	21.6	-----	30.1
5	Iron and ferroalloy ores mining	---------	-----	---------	-----	-------
6	Nonferrous metal ores mining	---------	-----	---------	-----	-------
7	Coal mining	.3	-----	.3	-----	-------
8	Crude petroleum and natural gas	---------	-----	---------	-----	-------
9	Stone and clay mining and quarrying	16.2	-----	21.3	-----	31.5
10	Chemical and fertilizer mineral mining	.1	-----	---------	-----	−100.0
	Construction	248.2	.6	275.2	.5	10.9
11	New construction	---------	-----	---------	-----	-------
12	Maintenance and repair construction	248.2	.6	275.2	.5	10.9
	Manufacturing	18,840.7	47.1	29,265.6	53.8	55.3
13	Ordnance and accessories	2,052.7	5.1	4,200.4	7.7	104.6
14	Food and kindred products	520.6	1.3	877.2	1.6	68.5
15	Tobacco manufactures	18.0	-----	35.0	.1	94.4
16	Broad and narrow fabrics, yarn and thread mills	94.3	.2	370.5	.7	292.9
17	Miscellaneous textile goods and floor coverings	3.7	-----	18.6	-----	402.7
18	Apparel	149.9	.4	488.7	.9	226.0
19	Miscellaneous fabricated textile products	61.2	.2	165.3	.3	170.1
20	Lumber and wood products except containers	26.2	.1	113.9	.2	334.7
21	Wooden containers	8.7	-----	107.1	.2	1,131.0
22	Household furniture	7.2	-----	10.2	-----	41.7
23	Other furniture and fixtures	28.2	.1	52.6	.1	186.5
24	Paper and allied products, except containers	19.3	-----	22.9	-----	18.7
25	Paperboard containers and boxes	3.1	-----	20.1	-----	548.3
26	Printing and publishing	73.7	.2	105.8	.2	43.6
27	Chemicals and selected chemical products	203.9	.5	670.2	1.2	228.7
28	Plastics and synthetic materials	13.7	-----	16.0	-----	16.8
29	Drugs, cleaning and toilet preparations	61.0	.2	368.2	.7	503.6
30	Paints and allied products	28.9	.1	30.9	.1	6.9
31	Petroleum refining and related industries	954.7	2.4	1,306.4	2.4	36.8
32	Rubber and miscellaneous plastic products	82.4	.2	186.5	.3	126.3
33	Leather tanning and industrial leather products	.4	-----	1.6	-----	300.0
34	Footwear and other leather products	34.5	.1	105.0	.2	204.3
35	Glass and glass products	5.9	-----	12.5	-----	111.9
36	Stone and clay products	111.2	.3	150.8	.3	35.6
37	Primary iron and steel manufacturing	84.7	.2	99.0	.2	16.9
38	Primary nonferrous metals manufacturing	87.7	.2	124.6	.2	42.1
39	Metal containers	6.6	-----	42.6	.1	545.5
40	Heating, plumbing, and structural metal products	160.5	.4	259.7	.5	61.8
41	Stampings, screw machine products and bolts	17.6	-----	39.9	.1	126.7
42	Other fabricated metal products	30.6	.1	54.2	.1	77.1
43	Engines and turbines	148.8	.4	249.7	.5	67.8
44	Farm machinery and equipment	$15.7	-----	$43.2	0.1	175.2
45	Construction, mining and oil field machinery	57.1	.1	215.3	.4	277.1
46	Materials handling machinery and equipment	48.6	.1	116.0	.2	138.7
47	Metalworking machinery and equipment	87.5	.2	226.7	.4	159.1
48	Special industry machinery and equipment	26.1	.1	39.0	.1	49.4
49	General industrial machinery and equipment	80.8	-----	160.4	.3	98.5
50	Machine shop products	35.7	.1	50.6	.1	41.7
51	Office, computing and accounting machines	310.7	.8	457.5	.8	47.2
52	Service industry machine	57.7	.1	97.5	.2	69.0
53	Electric industrial equipment and apparatus	314.7	.8	562.7	1.0	78.8
54	Household appliances	14.1	-----	26.4	-----	87.2
55	Electric lighting and wiring equipment	37.5	.1	84.9	.2	126.4
56	Radio, television and communication equipment	3,449.3	8.6	4,257.8	7.8	23.4
57	Electronic components and accessories	218.6	.5	236.6	.4	8.2
58	Miscellaneous electrical machinery equipment and supplies	69.3	.2	112.8	.2	62.8
59	Motor vehicles and equipment	401.0	1.0	867.9	1.6	116.4
60	Aircraft and parts	6,945.5	17.4	9,655.7	17.8	39.0
61	Other transportation equipment	969.8	2.4	906.0	1.7	−6.6
62	Scientific and controlling instruments	354.2	.9	523.5	1.0	47.8
63	Optical ophthalmic and photographic equipment	230.1	.6	296.0	.5	28.6
64	Miscellaneous manufacturing	16.8	-----	23.0	-----	36.9
	Services	4,287.4	10.7	5,643.0	10.4	31.6
65	Transportation and warehousing	1,499.2	3.7	2,371.2	4.4	58.2
66	Communications, except radio and TV broadcasting	216.6	.5	306.2	.6	41.4
67	Radio and TV broadcasting	---------	-----	---------	-----	-------
68	Electric, gas, water and sanitary services	313.3	.8	362.0	.7	15.5
69	Wholesale and retail trade	676.5	1.7	812.2	1.5	20.1
70	Finance and insurance	7.8	-----	38.9	.1	398.7
71	Real estate and rental	118.6	.3	126.7	.2	6.8
72	Hotels; personal and repair services, except auto	103.2	.3	153.1	.3	48.4
73	Business services	427.1	1.1	533.8	1.0	25.0
74	Research and development	322.4	.8	350.0	.6	8.6
75	Automobile repair and service	11.7	-----	13.7	-----	17.1
76	Amusements	30.0	.1	35.0	.1	16.7
76	Medical, educational services and nonprofit organization	561.0	1.4	540.2	1.0	−3.7
	Government enterprises	.2	-----	.2	-----	-------
78	Federal Government enterprises	---------	-----	---------	-----	-------
79	State and local government enterprises	.2	-----	.2	-----	-------
	Imports:					
80	Imports	1,494.0	3.7	2,019.2	3.7	35.2
80A	Directly allocated imports	---------	-----	---------	-----	-------
80B	Transferred imports	---------	-----	---------	-----	-------
	Dummy industries	20.9	.1	24.2	.1	15.8
81	Business travel, entertainment, and gifts	4.0	-----	3.0	-----	−25.0
82	Office supplies	16.9	-----	21.2	.1	25.4
83	Scrap, used and secondhand goods	---------	-----	---------	-----	-------
84	Special industries: Government industry	15,106.9	37.8	17,120.8	31.5	13.3

[1] Figures are on a national income basis with the exceptions of subsistence and clothing provided in kind and timing and receipts adjustments, as noted in text.

L. B. J. OVERALL ECONOMIC RECORD: A SMASHING SUCCESS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, with all the pro- and anti-tax increase talk, the grim warnings of a super tight credit crunch and cruelly high interest rates, the threat of an economy in shambles and hair-curling inflation, too many of us in the Senate and throughout the country have overlooked the one big, assured economic fact of life, and that is the miracle of the American economy's performance for the past 7 years.

We are now enjoying the longest period of economic expansion in all American history, the biggest boom this Nation or any nation has ever enjoyed.

Whatever happens in coming years, the period from 1961 through 1967 will be looked back on as a truly golden age of American economic progress.

This morning's Wall Street Journal documents this story brilliantly.

In an article by Alfred Malabre, Jr., the stunning success of our economy is spelled out in meticulous detail.

One of the many remarkable attributes of our economic gain has been that it has been gradually across the board. The number of those suffering from poverty has been greatly reduced. The wages of workingmen in real terms—that is, after fully allowing for inflation and taxes—have raced ahead at a remarkable rapid and steady rate—and provide the solid base on which our prosperity is based.

But workingmen have not been alone. American capital has been even more richly rewarded. Since 1961, corporate profits are up a whopping 71 percent after taxes, dividends 71 percent, and interest income a mammoth 87 percent.

This is not to say that there are no serious economic problems. Of course, there are. Farm income is much too low. The farmer has not shared adequately in prosperity. The homebuilding industry has been a starving Orphan Annie. Tight money, inflation, higher taxes, are proper and deep concerns.

But when the brickbats are tossed at our embattled President, as they are being tossed with such vigor these days, all Americans ought to recognize that he deserves bouquets for an overall performance in economic policymaking that is good—solidly and irrefutably good.

Most Americans do not appraise a President on the basis of the motives his political opponents try to hang on him, or on subtle, intellectual daydreaming about what might have been. They assess a President and an administration on one basis: Results.

And, Mr. President, on the basis of results, I submit that the economic story of the past 7 years deserves enthusiastic support. After all, what is wrong with the Kennedy and Johnson administration—which since 1961 has achieved the biggest economic success in the history of the Nation?

This is not the assessment of a Democratic Senator; this is the assessment that I am sure every fairminded Republican, Democrat, and independent must conclude after reading today's lead story—not in some pro-L. B. J. or pro-Democratic newspaper—but in today's Wall Street Journal.

I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have referred in this morning's Wall Street Journal be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROFILE OF A BOOM: ECONOMIC EXPANSION ENTERS 80TH MONTH, MATCHES OLD RECORD—GNP SOARS 49 PERCENT SINCE 1961—PROFITS, PERSONAL INCOME RISE EVEN MORE SHARPLY—PROBLEMS: HOUSING AND GOLD

(By Alfred L. Malabre, Jr.)

If the current business expansion continues through next month, it will enter the record books as the longest boom in American history.

Even the more pessimistic forecasters are convinced that the expansion will indeed set a record. The longest expansion until now has been the 80-month business boom that went on during most of World War II, ending in February 1945. The current expansion, which began in February 1961, is now entering its 80th month. Altogether, there have been 26 previous U.S. business expansions, according to records kept back to 1854 by the nonprofit National Bureau of Economic Research. The average length: A mere 30 months.

The full dimensions of the current expansion can be gauged by reviewing some of the changes that have taken place in the U.S. economy since 1961. The magnitude of these changes is impressive, as the following review shows.

GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT

At more than $775 billion annually, the nation's output of goods and services has risen some $255 billion since 1961. The gain alone dwarfs the annual GNP of such major nations as the United Kingdom, West Germany and France. The table below translates America's multibillion-dollar economic growth into percentage terms and also shows how rapidly the major components of the GNP total have risen during the great boom.

[In percent]

	Gain since 1961
Gross national product	49
Consumer spending	46
Government spending	63
Business spending	47

Within the fast-expanding governmental category, the sharpest rise since 1961 has occurred in Federal nonmilitary expenditures, which have soared 77% in the period. Federal outlays for defense have climbed 52%, and overall Federal expenditures are up 56% since 1961. Spending by state and local governments has risen 70%—much faster than total Federal outlays.

Inflation, of course, accounts for part of the GNP rise since 1961. If "growth" stemming simply from higher prices is discounted, the "real" GNP increase since 1961 works out to 34%, rather than 49%.

The consumer-spending category is by far the largest of the various GNP components. This spending breaks down three ways—for durable goods such as appliances and autos, for nondurables such as food and clothing and for services such as medical care and rent. The table below shows how the three subcategories have fared since 1961.

[In percent]

	Gain since 1961
Durable goods	64
Nondurable goods	39
Services	48

Although spending for durables has risen fastest, the consumer still spends a good deal less for such products than for nondurables or services. Currently, consumers devote about 44% of their budgets to nondurables, 41% to services and only 15% to durable goods. Overall, the statistical breakdown for consumer spending indicates that the economy has not become as "service oriented" as is often suggested. In 1961, consumers spent about 40% of their budgets on services.

The 47% rise in business spending, of course, has brought a big increase in the capacity of the country's factories. U.S. plant capacity has grown by about a third since 1961. This admittedly is less than the dollar rise in business spending, but the capacity rise is based on physical volume of goods and therefore isn't "inflated" by rising prices.

As a result of the 33% capacity increase, U.S. manufacturers are able to produce a far greater volume of goods now than in 1961 without putting undue strain on their production facilities.

At present, U.S. factories are using about 85% of their capacity, on average, well below the 90%-plus operating rates at which severe strains traditionally begin to show up. At operating rates above 90%, overtime costs rise sharply, and many producers are forced to use inefficient facilities that would otherwise stand idle or be scrapped.

PERSONAL INCOME

The rapidly rising earnings of most Americans have supplied much of the fuel for the economy's long climb since 1961. The personal income of Americans now exceeds $631 billion annually, some $215 billion more than the 1961 income total. The rise reflects a variety of factors, not just the steadily climbing wages and salaries of all sorts of workers. The table below lists the key income sources of Americans and shows how rapidly each category has risen since 1961.

[In percent]

	Gain since 1961
Total personal income	51
Wages and salaries	53
Fringe benefits	66
Dividends	71
Interest income	87
Income from rent	26

As in the case of service spending noted above, the income record since 1961 holds some surprises. Landlords' income from rent has risen only half as fast as overall income, a fact that should surprise many tenants. And income from interest and dividends on investments has climbed much faster than income from wage and salary payments, a fact that may give some second thoughts to people who worry that labor is getting far more than its share of the income pie; fringe benefits paid to workers, however, have risen much faster than wages and salaries.

At present, dividend and interest payments make up about 11% of total personal income. This compares with only 9% in 1961. Wage and salary payments make up 67% of the total, about equal to 1961.

The overall rise in consumer income is considerable even if rising prices and an increasing population are taken into account. After-tax per-capita income in the second quarter reached a record annual rate of $2,388 in terms of 1958 dollars. This was 25% higher than the comparable 1961 per-capita figure. In the view of many economists, this income measurement comes as close as anything to a "standard-of-living" index for the U.S.

Accompanying the big rise in consumer income has been a big rise in consumer savings. These savings have recently been running at an annual rate of about $36 billion, up 70% from the 1961 level (a sharper rise than the 65% increase in consumer credit outstanding over the same period). Time deposits in commercial banks have attracted the largest share of these savings.

The rise in consumer income reflects a massive improvement in the U.S. employment picture during the economic expansion. Many more jobs exist, workers toil longer hours and pay levels are considerably higher.

Today, there are more than 76 million civilian jobs in the U.S., up from less than 66 million in 1961. The increase exceeds the population of New York, the nation's largest city. The rise in jobs not only has opened up work for the country's increasing population—there are 15 million more Americans now than in 1961—but has given work to millions who couldn't get jobs early in the decade. Unemployment in the nation is below the 3 million mark; in 1961, it was close to 5 million.

Employes generally work a longer week now than in 1961. In manufacturing, the average workweek of nearly 41 hours is almost a full hour longer than the 1961 workweek. In the construction trade, the average workweek has recently exceeded 38 hours, up from less than 37 in 1961. An exception: retailing, where the average has dropped from more than 38 hours in 1961 to less than 36 recently. Factors in the retailing trend, say analysts, include the increasing use of part-time employes and self-service in stores.

Most employes, moreover, are receiving much more pay per hour. The average hourly pay level in manufacturing is about $2.80, up from $2.32 in 1961. In construction, the average is nearly $4.10 an hour, some 90 cents higher than in 1961. In retailing, the average pay level is about $2, up from $1.68 at the start of the expansion.

CORPORATE PROFITS

The climb of corporate profits during the long boom has been even more spectacular than the rise of consumer income. The before-tax earnings of U.S. companies currently total nearly $80 billion a year, up from $50 billion in 1961. Within the broad corporate category, however, there has been considerable variation between different types of industries. The table below shows the overall profits rise, plus the gains for particular groups.

[In percent]

	Gain since 1961
Total corporate profits	57
Durable-goods makers	85
Nondurable-goods makers	49
Transport and utilities	51
Finance and miscellaneous	44

In 1961, the profits of durable-goods makers totaled some $500 million less than those of nondurable-goods producers. Currently, however, durables firms are earning some $3.3 billion a year more than nondurables companies. The big boom in auto-buying in recent years is a major factor in the profit rise for durables. It should be noted, however, that the durables group traditionally fares extra well in expansion periods and extra badly in recessions. The other categories listed above generally react less dramatically to changes in the overall course of business.

A footnote to the profits story: since 1961, the after-tax earnings of corporations have climbed 71%, a considerably faster rise than the 57% gain in before-tax income. This, of course, reflects the 1964 income tax cut.

To be sure, the economic record of the U.S. since 1961 is not without blemishes.

LAGGING HOME STARTS

New-home starts last year totaled less than 1.2 million units, actually down from the 1961 level of 1.3 million units and far below the 1963 level of 1.6 million. In recent weeks, housing has shown some signs of a pickup, but the industry's record still stands in bleak contrast to the general economic boom since 1961.

In part, the housing industry's trouble reflects overbuilding at least of middle and upper-income housing in the earlier post-World War II years. The mortgage funds for home building have been relatively scarce at times during the boom. Ironically, if other segments of the economy hadn't been so strong in recent years, there doubtless would have been more money available for home building, and the industry almost certainly would have fared better.

The U.S. gold supply also has declined during the long expansion. The Government's coffers now hold some $13 billion of gold, down from more than $17 billion at the beginning of the expansion.

Technically, this drop has occurred because the U.S. has been spending more dollars abroad than it has been taking in from foreigners. Foreign governments, in turn, have been buying U.S. gold with many of these dollars at the Treasury's offering price of $35 per ounce, a price that many foreign officials apparently feel is a bargain.

But the deeper cause of the gold drain involves the growth rate of the U.S. economy. If the economy hadn't grown so fast in recent years, there probably would have been less price inflation, and the U.S. trade surplus—the excess of exports over imports—would no doubt have held up better, thereby curbing the outflow of dollars and gold. The U.S. trade surplus actually has declined about 5% since 1961. Without a trade surplus to bring some dollars into the country, the flow of U.S. funds abroad to support foreign-aid projects, troops overseas and other foreign programs would reach intolerable proportions, most economists believe.

Perhaps the most lamentable blemish in the boom is the high unemployment rate for teenage Negroes—25% in 1961 and 25% in boom-time 1967. Another dismal statistic: Some 7.8 million Americans are on relief at present, about 600,000 more than in 1961.

PUBLIC WORKS MISALLOCATION: THE RAPPAHANNOCK DAM A CASE IN POINT

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. Mr. President, yesterday, I presented an economic analysis showing why I oppose the pending public works appropriation bill. I pointed out that present policies employing unrealistically low discount rates in cost-benefit analysis lead to gross overinvestment in public works and contribute to inflationary pressures and slower overall economic growth.

In the hearings on the planning-programing-budgeting system—PPBS—held by the Economy in Government Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee, witnesses emphasized that this country already is overinvested in water resources projects. Today, I invite the attention of the Senate to an article by Luther J. Carter which was published in the Potomac magazine section of the Washington Post dealing with proposals to dam the Rappahannock in Virginia. The total cost of this project—a project which is not needed for any pressing water or power demands now or over the next 30-some years—is $79.5 million, of which $67.1 million would be Federal funds.

The interest rate applied to the Rappahannock Dam is the low 3¼ percent—the historical coupon rate at issue of long-term Government securities—which I have been criticizing as being wasteful and causing serious dislocations. Were a more realistic discount rate employed, for example, the 10-percent rate which is seen as the prevailing minimum rate utilized in the private sector, the costs of this dam would make such an investment marginal at best.

Once again I remind the Senate that it is our duty to insist on efficient resource allocation. Policies which create unneeded strains on the economy should be eliminated now.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article, "The Rappahannock: High Dam or Wild River?" from the October 1, 1967, Washington Post be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RAPPAHANNOCK: HIGH DAM OR WILD RIVER?

(By Luther J. Carter)

Any tumbling, free-flowing stream is likely to challenge the dam-builders of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and for the last three decades the Corps has kept an interested eye on Virginia's Rappahannock River. Now it appears probable that sometime within the next few years the Corps, urged on by the politicians and Chamber of Commerce stalwarts of the Fredericksburg area, will come to the Rappahannock and begin massive handiwork. Another wild river will be made into a placid lake and delivered to the real estate speculators and hoards of recreation seekers—motorboaters, water-skiers, picnickers, beer drinkers, litterbugs and large numbers of often luckless anglers gamely putting in what government cost-benefit analysts call "fisherman man-days."

The dam, if built as recommended by the Corps, would be erected about 5½ miles above Fredericksburg at the Salem Church site, where the river has cut deeply into the Piedmont plateau and runs between steep valley walls. Partly in the name of flood control, the Corps would flood 21,300 acres. Rising 203 feet above the river bed and 263 feet above sea level, the Salem Church dam would create a reservoir extending 26 miles up the Rappahannock and 27 miles up the Rapidan, the Rappahannock's major tributary. The wildest and most attractive part of the Rappahannock lies between the dam site and the head of Kelly's Ford rapids, five miles below Remington. This entire stretch of the river would be flooded.

The project's total cost, including the cost of a small streamflow reregulating dam below the big dam, as well as recreation areas and the dam's power plant, would be $79.5 million. All but about $12.4 million would be born by the federal taxpayer.

To be sure, the Salem Church project is not to be dismissed as simply another costly instance of pyramid building, for the benefits from the dam will be substantial. In dam-builder's parlance, Salem Church is a multi-purpose project, providing flood control, water supply, water quality control, recreation, hydro-electric power, and—by allowing unusually large releases of fresh water during the dry summer months—salinity control of benefit to oyster production in the Rappahannock estuary.

The question is whether the benefits sought are worth the sacrifice of the wild river, part of which could be saved if essential water needs were met through construction of a number of smaller dams in the Rappahannock basin and by other means. However, those who question the Corps' plans—and they seem to be in the minority—are at a distinct disadvantage. The massive studies and technical papers prepared or assembled by the Corps over the years tend, by their very bulk, to give the Salem Church project an aura of inevitability.

Moreover, the proposal for the high dam, by a process familiar to students of the way in which water projects are promoted, has gained strong support . . . from the elected officials of Fredericksburg and of the nearby counties; Representative William L. Scott, of Fairfax, who represents Fredericksburg and most of that part of the Rappahannock basin to be affected by the dam; Virginia's Department of Conservation and Development and Gov. Mills E. Godwin, Jr., and even the U.S. Interior Department's Bureau of Outdoor Recreation and other Federal agencies.

Thus, partisans of the Salem Church project may well see their goal realized. The administrative review process has been completed and the project has been submitted to Congress for authorization without objection from the Bureau of the Budget. As a member of the Senate Public Works Committee, Virginia's Sen. William B. Spong, Jr., if he pushes the project, should have little difficulty having it included in next year's rivers and harbors bill.

Getting the project into the President's budget and obtaining an appropriation could take longer, but, ultimately, the money very likely would be forthcoming. The benefit-to-cost ratio computed by the Corps for the project is 2.1 to 1 ($2.10 in benefits for every dollar invested), which is quite favorable.

Fredericksburg and the neighboring counties all will eventually require major expansions of their water supply. This has given the Salem Church project extra impetus. The high dam is not, however, essential for meeting water requirements. A study made for Fredericksburg by a consultant engineering firm concluded that, by investing $1 million in three small impoundments on minor tributaries of the Rappanhannock, the city could satisfy its water needs through the year 2000.

"This (the Salem Church project) is more of a dam than Fredericksburg needs," says Charles S. Rowe, editor of Fredericksburg's *Free Lance-Star*. Rowe has been opposing a high dam on the Rappahannock for the past 18 years, believing that essential water supply, together with water quality and flood control needs can be met without sacrificing the Rappahannock.

But Fredericksburg's Mayor, Josiah P. Rowe, manager of the *Free Lance-Star* and editor Rowe's brother, is solidly behind the high dam. The same is true of politicians in the Fredericksburg area generally. Some local enthusiasm for the high dam clearly comes in part from the expectation that land values around the reservoir site will be enhanced—a prospect not overlooked by the Corps in advocating the project. In fact, some real estate men already have bought property in the vicinity of the proposed reservoir, hoping eventually to sell by the waterfront-foot what they purchased by the acre.

The political build-up for any water project usually begins the moment the Corps makes its first surveys. Landowners, real estate operators and others begin counting their possible gains, and local government start thinking of increased property-tax revenues. This process has long been under way in the case of the Salem Church project. The Corps first considered the idea of a high dam in 1933, and the idea gained momentum after a flood on the Rappahannock in 1942. In 1946 Congress authorized construction of a dam somewhat smaller than the one now recommended. The Corps' present proposal is based on a study began in 1955 and completed last year.

Recreation and hydropower represent nearly two-thirds of the annual benefits expected from the Salem Church project as currently planned. Recreation alone accounts for more than 40 per cent of the projected benefits. Interior's Bureau of Outdoor Recreation (BOR) believes that the reservoir, with suitable parks and facilities along its shores, could accommodate up to 6 million day-visitors a year and that within 37 years the capacity use would be attained.

This would be true, BOR has indicated, even if the Corps were allowed to carry out the 1963 plan of its Baltimore district engineer to build 16 major dams in the Potomac basin, including a high dam at Seneca. But even BOR doesn't contend that these swarms of visitors to the Salem Church reservoir are going to have much fun. The typical "recreational experience," BOR says, will be only of "average" quality and of a kind for which a person wouldn't pay more than 50 cents to $1.50.

Some opponents of the high dam believe that, if protected as a wild river, the Rappahannock would hold out something better than the prospect of a mediocre recreation experience. The most vocal and active of the high dam's opponents is Randolph (Randy) Carter, a white-water canoeist and Fauquier County's building inspector. Carter, 63, still has the physique and vigor necessary for making a hard portage or negotiating a twisting, churning stretch of white water. In the spring and early summer, Carter and his wife, Miriam, often make the exciting 1¼-mile run through Kelly's Ford rapids, pausing midway for a cookout on the sandy beach. Carter has been promoting the idea of establishing a public park along these rapids. Although both Fauquier County and the Virginia Commission of Outdoor Recreation have been interested, the rapids would be drowned by the waters rising behind the Salem Church high dam.

Farther downstream, the rapids at Snake Castle and at the confluence of the Rappahannock and the Rapidan also would disappear. Destroyed along with the white water would be some of the country's best smallmouth bass fishing and an excellent heavily-wooded river bottom habitat for deer, wild turkey, and smaller game. (In mid-summer, when the river is low, canoeing through the rapids is not possible, but then the bass fishing often is at its best.) Much of this area is wild and remote, for no highway crosses the river between Kelly's Ford bridge, at the foot of the rapids, and Interstate 95, just above Fredericksburg.

The extensive acreage required for the reservoir and for buffer and recreation areas is disturbing to the boards of supervisors of Fauquier and Culpeper counties. In these countries, at the upper end of the proposed impoundment, the reservoir would spread over wide areas and in many places would be relatively shallow.

In time of high water the reservoir might rise 10½ feet above its normal 240-foot elevation, and, from its 21,300-acre "conservation pool," spread out over an additional 6000 acres. Altogether, 47,453 acres would be acquired, through purchase or condemnation, for the Salem Church project. Forty-four per cent of this acreage, including most of the productive farm land to be taken, would be in Fauquier and Culpeper counties. In both counties, the supervisors are opposing the high dam.

While the reservoir could prove a bonanza for landowners at the lower end of the reservoir, it is not likely to be one for many at the upper end. A substantial "draw-down" of the water level usually would be necessary in late summer and fall for the project to provide the multifarious benefits being used to justify it to Congress. At that time of year thousands of acres of mud flats may become exposed, particularly in Culpeper and Fauquier counties.

Hydrology studies show that, had the proposed project operations been carried on during the 56-year period from 1908 through 1964, a drawdown of 10 feet or more would have occurred at least once during each of 40 of those years.

In the formulation of water projects, the Corps' general policy of maximizing "benefits" can result in playing down esthetic and intangible values. In the case of the Salem Church project, one of the alternatives rejected is a lower dam, creating a reservoir normally rising only to the 213-foot contour. Such a reservoir would flood less than 10,000 acres (sparing part of the Kelly's Ford rapids), and drawdown effects would be greatly reduced. But, with the lower dam, the production of hydropower and salinity control would be ruled out and the claimed recreation potential would be reduced, although the cost-benefit ratio still would remain favorable.

From the viewpoint of a dam builder, the Corps' attitude is not unreasonable. Every dam proposal meets some questioning and opposition. Justifying a big, costly project for which large benefits are claimed may be no harder than defending a more modest proposal.

The possibility of preserving the wild river never has been thoroughly considered, not by the Corps, the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, nor any other public agency. The Virginia Commission of Outdoor Recreation has commented on the project, but, with Governor Godwin supporting the high dam, the commission was scarcely free to oppose it. Nevertheless, Fitzgerald Bemiss, chairman of the commission, still questions the project's justification. "The feasibility formulas of the Corps of Engineers make me uneasy," he says.

If the natural river could be protected and made more accessible to the public, Bemiss adds, "we would have something a lot more distinctive than a reservoir with 60-horse outboards racing around." Bemiss recently expressed this viewpoint in an "unofficial" letter to Sen. Spong.

A "development man" reviewed the Salem Church project for Interior's BOR. Richard G. Leverty, who made the study, spent a couple of weeks around the site, but devoted virtually all of his time to looking for potential recreation areas adjacent to the proposed reservoir. "We've got to do some developing to take care of these mobs of people," says Leverty.

The Rappahannock was not one of the 67 rivers considered by BOR for possible protection as a wild river under legislation now before Congress. The director of the wild rivers study says, however, that the Rappahannock and a number of other attractive streams were left out of the initial BOR survey simply because there was not time to look at them.

If the recreation benefits claimed for the Salem Church project are debatable, so too, are the benefits from hydropower production. The power plant would have an average annual "dependable capacity" of only 71,000 kilowatts. The Virginia Electric Power Co. will meet a peak load of 3,580,000 kilowatts this year and one of 4,730,000 kilowatts in 1970. Obviously, the lights are not going out if Salem Church power doesn't come on the line.

Power from Salem Church would be sold (at subsidized rates, Vepco says) through the Interior Department's Southeastern Power Administration, rural electric cooperatives and public bodies being the priority customers. Predictably, SPA has endorsed the project's hydropower feature, as has the Federal Power Commission. Vepco contends, however, that it will be able to produce power for peak-hour use more cheaply than Salem Church could do it.

A major investment in a multipurpose water project represents a long-term commitment to meet water and power needs by methods which advancing technology may render obsolete. A revolution in the power, water-resource, and waste-disposal fields is, in fact, now expected by a number of leading scientists. According to Glenn T. Seaborg, Nobel laureate and chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, the development of "breeder" reactors may make possible the production of very low-cost nuclear energy, which, in turn, should permit highly economical processes for desalting sea water and recycling waste water.

Construction of a project such as Salem Church, designed for a 100-year life, is an irrevocable step. On the other hand, steps to preserve a wild river are not irrevocable. If protected through state or federal acquisition of scenic easements and other measures, the Rappahannock would still be available for development years hence if a compelling need arose.

Last spring, Congressman Scott polled his constituents on a number of questions, including the Salem Church project. Of 150,000 questionnaires mailed some 18,000 were returned. Ninety-three per cent of the respondents turned out to be staunch Virginia conservatives who felt government spending should be cut. But 83 percent favored the $79.5-million Salem Church project. (Even 63 percent of the Fauquier County respondents wanted the high dam, Scott says.)

However representative this poll may be of Scott's district's sentiment, the question of the high dam is not solely a local political matter. National interests are at stake: tax dollars and the fate of a highly perishable resource—a wild, free-flowing, unpolluted river, of which the nation has far too few.

UNITED STATES HAS DROPPED THE TORCH OF LEADERSHIP IN HUMAN RIGHTS FIGHT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in his historic American University speech in June of 1963, President John F. Kennedy gave emphasis to that which is the profound truth of our age—the indivisibility of peace and human rights. The furnaces of war were and are stoked by those who are driven by the ideology of hate and violence, by those that hold man and his God-given dignity in utter contempt. From Nuremberg to the ovens of Auschwitz and to the holocaust of World War II were only short steps.

For men of good will everywhere, the world that was to come into being from these agonizing experiences would be one in which the rule of law on an international scale would be established; and that law was to be instilled with a profound respect for the rights of man. At the United Nations, and in its various specialized agencies, there were painstakingly hammered out legally binding conventions that aimed at erecting a sturdy edifice to the dignity of man. Acts committed with an intent to destroy in whole or in part an ethnic, racial, or religious group were branded an international crime—the crime of genocide; forced labor was outlawed, as were various forms of labor akin to slavery; the political rights of women were secured; the freedom to associate and organize with whomever one desired was guaranteed.

It was hardly surprising that the United States would, in the immediate postwar years, champion the efforts to create a new legal order, dedicated to the advancement of human rights. With Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt acting as our representative and chairing the Commission on Human Rights, the United States had an eloquent and forceful exponent of the ideas so endemic to our culturally pluralistic society and to the traditions upon which it was grown.

Yet, during the 18 years since President Truman transmitted the Genocide Convention to this body, nothing has been done to give effect to this new direction. We have not yet ratified a single one of these treaties as adopted by the United Nations and the International Labor Organization.

We in the Senate have not fulfilled our obligation to the international community.

RURAL AND URBAN POVERTY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on July 13 I introduced Senate Concurrent Resolution 33, on behalf of myself and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt], calling upon the Joint Economic Committee to investigate the growth and movement of population in the United States. The Senator from South Dakota and I felt that such a study would provide an important guide to the formulation of policies and programs to cope with our urban-rural economic problems.

Obviously, our difficulties in the cities and our problems in rural areas are, to a large extent, two sides of the same coin. Our metropolitan areas continue to attract an inflow of workers because of the apparent economic advantages of the city. On the other hand, our rural areas are declining economically as they continue to lose population.

This morning's lead editorial in the Washington Post, entitled "Rural and Urban Poverty," provides an excellent analysis of this relationship. It concludes by saying:

> The inescapable logic behind it [this approach to the poverty problem] ought to enlist the support of more thoughtful and reflective people.

Mr. President, we should not overlook this fruitful approach and should act promptly to pass this resolution. I ask unanimous consent that the Post editorial be printed in the Record; as well as a superlative article entitled "An Urbanization Pattern for the United States," by Oliver Winston.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Oct. 10, 1967]

Rural and Urban Poverty

More and more voices are being raised in support of an idea to which Secretary of Agriculture Freeman again reverted last Friday when he declared that urban problems need to be attacked in rural areas. The folly of making urban poor out of the rural poor is being more widely recognized. Instead of accepting the notion that rural emigration is inevitable—or even admirable—the idea is arising that megalopolis may not be the answer to all our social and economic and political problems.

The Office of Regional Resources and Development at Ithaca, N.Y., has been putting forward for consideration a proposal that larger metropolitan centers be decentralized. The director, Oliver C. Winston, has pointed out that many of the larger cities are reaching a point at which it is "almost impossible to deal with human problems on a human scale." This office has urged the study of ways to develop the potential of the country's 300 cities with 50,000 residents. And it has urged that we explore what might be done with 5000 towns of between 2500 and 50,000 people. Emigration off the farms has to be accepted as a technological inevitability, but emigration from rural to urban areas should not be accepted as unavoidable.

Senator Proxmire and Senator Mundt have introduced a resolution directing the Joint Economic Committee to study the question of population movements. Senator Monroney proposed an amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act, providing funds for a study of ways to "assure a more effective use of human and natural resources of rural America." The Republican Coordinating Committee recently produced a task force paper on "revitalizing our rural areas."

Practical measures to disperse some industries once heavily concentrated in urban areas are also under way. The canning industry and the meat packing industry lead in decentralizing their production. Much American industry, no longer dependent on heavy raw material, locally generated power, access to pools of traditional crafts or availability of local markets, is beginning to explore relocation to areas where employes can live better lives for less money.

The Secretary of Agriculture gave one rough illustration of alternative costs when he suggested that it would be better to subsidize a rural family at the rate of $1000 a year for 20 years than it would be to build an urban dwelling for them at a cost of $20,000. This homely figure helps to point the financial case for checking the flood of poverty that is inundating urban centers. The larger case, of course, is to be made in all the other advantages of a good life that could be provided in a rural setting and that no amount of expenditure can provide in some urban slum settings.

This is a hopeful trend of thought. The inescapable logic behind it ought to enlist the support of more thoughtful and reflective people.

An Urbanization Pattern for the United States: Some Considerations for the Decentralization of Excellence

(By Oliver C. Winston)

This article, in its original form, was a paper presented at a Symposium sponsored by the Building and Research Institute of Roorkee, India in December 1965. Although the ideas which were presented related primarily to the United States, it was hoped that they would offer some consolation or inspiration to those who are similarly involved in the vast problems of human environment in many other areas of the world. One of the objects of that paper was to dispel the idea that the development of suitable living environments might be easier in the United States simply because of the relatively high economic status of its people. Just the opposite is nearer the truth. In rewriting the paper for home consumption and for the eyes of those who have given even more thought and study to the problems of urbanization, I am sticking my neck out and my head is on the block—an habitual predicament of planners.

The belief is that our society is known and will be remembered for its blatant affluence rather than for its contributions to refining the concept of human habitation and environment. I would like to begin with a presumption that, unless we all enlist in the legion of the nihilists, we must recognize that there are limitless opportunities left for the application of intelligence, imagination and skill in developing the kinds of environment which can offer hope for future generations to mold the kind of human society worthy of this life's experience. To entertain this presumption is, to me at least, not naive optimism but controlled and cautious hope—a necessary ingredient if we would look anywhere but backward.

The population growth of the United States is now taking place primarily in urban and large metropolitan areas and, by the year 2000, if the present trend continues the vast majority of our people will be concentrated in and around these huge centers.

All of this has raised some very serious questions not only about the impact upon the physical needs to be met but about the kind of society it implies. Is the multi-million population urban agglomeration likely to offer the kind of physical, social and aesthetic environment which will stimulate a rise in the cultural level of the individual and awaken his latent talents for participation in social, political and intellectual activities? Will such agglomerations achieve societies of high quality and enduring vigor? Does this kind of development offer enough variety and choice for people of the next two generations?

It seems that for the next generation or so our society must concern itself with the element of quality even more than the element of quantity in providing for the physical, cultural, aesthetic and spiritual needs of people. An urbanization pattern which offers choices and encourages a striving for excellence seems to be worth serious study. I would like to present some ideas and convictions which I have developed over the years on this subject.

These basic facts, known to us all, are pertinent; at the present time the population of the world is estimated at somewhat over three billion people; the present population of the United States is about 190,000,000 or about 6% of the world population; by the year 2000 it is estimated that the world population will be around six billion and that of the United States around 300 million or 5% of the world population. We know, too, that since the middle of the 19th century our population has become increasingly urban in composition and that more than 80% of the increase in population from now until the year 2000 will occur in urban areas.

The impact of these facts upon the quantitative physical needs—housing, land use, transportation, schools, hospitals, and other community services is quite obvious and overwhelming to all of us. It is my chief concern that in our obsession with seeking solutions for these physical needs we are usually not giving enough thought to the real, and more long range effect upon the development of the individual and consequently upon the character of society. To me this seems to be the great gap in our thinking and planning—we are offering superficial answers to deep and growing needs. John Osman, as Vice President of The Fund for Adult Education of the Ford Foundation, has said, "It is easy to pile up people and to stack up buildings in a shapeless and formless mass. It is not easy to give civic structure to this mass."

Is the multi-million population agglomeration—called "megalopolis" by some—

likely to offer the kind of physical, social and aesthetic environment which will stimulate a rise in the cultural level of the individual and awaken his latent talents for participation in social, political and intellectual activities? Here I have in mind as an example that developing megalopolis on the eastern seaboard of the United States from Maine to Virginia. Will such agglomerations achieve societies of high quality and enduring vigor? Does this kind of development offer enough variety and choice for our people in the near and predictable future?

I am convinced that "megalopolis" as it is now developing is not really acceptable although it may be unavoidable in certain instances. I am convinced, and it seems that a number of our professional and political leaders share this view, that for the next generation or two we as a nation must be more concerned with the means by which our growth and development as a society are influenced by "quality" rather than by "quantity" considerations. Our "affluent society" must be developed with far greater depth and far deeper appreciation of the more lasting values of life. If such a hope is to be realized there must be created, over the years ahead, a kind of physical environment for our cities and our communities which is conducive to the development of the more significant values of life—those values which can carry us forward to an adult civilization. Much more consideration must be given to the "civic" nature of our cities rather than the merely "urban"; more concern must be shown for an environment in which our cultural interests can be stimulated and in which design is responsive to our aesthetic sensibilities. There is a sizeable segment of our urban society which has already recognized this problem and there are a number of cities and some smaller communities which not only recognize the problem but are struggling to recreate their environment to accommodate the kind of civilization we can and should achieve.

Many people's energies today are wasted, perhaps unknowingly, in an effort to escape from the drabness and ugliness of the community or neighborhood in which they live. In many cases their escape turns out to be futile for in only too short a time the places to which they have "escaped" become spoiled and polluted by the same kind of shortsighted, opportunistic and tasteless development from which they fled.

We must be more concerned with the current lack of real depth in so much of our planning. We must first determine and then be sensitive to the inherent cultural potential of the specific communities for which plans are being made. We must find and put to use the techniques which can make it possible for our cities to respond to the needs and latent desires of man for appropriate counterbalance of exciting, vigorous, inspirational activity as well as serene or quiet visual harmony.

There is no doubt that in the near future our large cities will become even larger. By the year 2000 it is estimated that about half of our United States population will be living in about 41 huge metropolitan areas of over a million population each. Programs for the replanning, the reorganization and the rebuilding of our larger cities are well under way and there are some signs that we may be successful, over the years, in making or recreating such cities into creditable and attractive urban environments—suitable for tomorrow's comfortable living and accommodated to modern technology in the affairs of commerce, communications and civic institutions.

The replanning and redevelopment of these larger cities is a problem all of its own. It will require two or more decades to determine if the solutions which are now being applied have been found to fully satisfy the aspirations of the people who will occupy them. At present the outlook is anything but clear, even to the most aggressive optimists. Nevertheless, there will always be those millions of people who prefer living in the large city with the advantages it can offer provided the city has kept up to date in its developing form. There will always be others who live in smaller communities who would like to enjoy periodic visits for those advantages and attractions which only the "million-plus" cities offer. An additional "advantage" to them is the strengthening of their conviction of the superior day-by-day living they are enjoying in their community. There will undoubtedly also develop many new satellite towns around these great metropolitan centers. A number of these are under way now and quite a number are in the early planning stages. The new town of Reston in Fairfax County, Virginia and the new town of Columbia in Howard County, Maryland are examples to be watched carefully as clues to what we can expect. These new towns, if they are in reality complete towns and not just suburban real estate developments, can offer a type of living and working environment which can satisfy a rather wide variety of human needs, both quantitatively and qualitatively. By the year 2000 the other half of the population, some 160,000,000 people, will be living in the remainder of our communities—communities which range in size from small rural hamlets to cities of less than one million population.

Here, there seems to me to be an equal or even greater need for concern, was to the potential offered for imaginative and intelligent planning. This brings me to the principal thesis which I would like to set forth in this paper—regional patterns of urban development based on existing smaller communities in congenial and harmonious settings with emphasis on the "civic" aspirations of man. There are at present in the United States some 312 communities in a population range of 50,000 to 500,000—a good number of which so appropriately located and have such fundamental characteristics as to make them likely nuclei for developing into a kind of environment which could satisfy the broadest scope of human needs. People who would prefer this kind of environment are those who seek more intimate association and participation in cultural, political and economic life and who feel the need for close association with symbols of stability—heritages of the past. In addition, there are over 5,000 smaller communities of 2,500 to 50,000 people which offer additional considerations for imaginative and intelligent civic grouping.

Using carefully selected smaller communities as nuclei, there is a prospect of developing within the various regions of the United States a kind of environment for industry, commerce, living and the arts which could offer maximum satisfaction for those who desire a life of quality and participation—civic identification. In the very near future no such community is likely to be more than an hour or two by travel time from one of the major metropolitan centers, making it possible for periodic enjoyment of the unique attractions in such a center. The smaller communities could provide all of the fundamental amenities of daily modern life to satisfy the most sophisticated person and permit him to pursue a life which is based upon the pursuit of quality and the satisfactions of personal recognition.

I would like to support my thesis in two ways: first, to give a specific example or model of the type of community I am proposing; and second, to outline the kind of research, exploration and planning which I feel must be undertaken to lend further substance to the thesis and to achieve the purposes set forth. My move to Binghamton, New York in 1959 offered a challenge and an opportunity to test out my belief that the future urbanization of this country and the real needs of our people could best be accommodated by building upon carefully-related, strategically-located and well-established smaller urban centers of actual or potential "civic" character and a heritage of stability. Binghamton, in Broome County, the hub of the Southern Tier of New York State and the core of a metropolitan area of some 200,000 people, was just such a center. As Director of the newly established Valley Development Foundation in Broome County I felt much could be learned that would be useful in developing similar patterns in other regions of the United States.

The Binghamton area is typical in many ways of numerous other communities of about its size in the United States. It is well located geographically, both in its setting of natural beauty at the confluence of two rivers and surrounded by wooded hills and small lakes and in its relative distance from major metropolitan areas of New York City, Philadelphia, Buffalo and, even closer, Rochester and Syracuse. It has a strong base of diversified industry with prospects for sound future economic growth—not rapid but steady growth. It has a population which is a veritable prototype of the so-called American "melting pot"—from an ethnic and sociological viewpoint.

In some respects, however, Binghamton is more than just a typical small urban center. Herein lies its special value as an example to be emulated elsewhere. Simply stated, it is the development there in the last twenty years of a fairly broad cultural base which is increasing in scope and depth until it even now offers a wide range of opportunities for participation and expression in all the arts. This is achieved to a great extent through the means of an Arts and Science center, known as Roberson Museum Center, which serves an eleven county area with all the services of a museum, educational center and arts council. The Center is more than buildings, program and staff. Through a Program Council and a plan of interlocking memberships it unites eleven constituent organizations whose range of interests encompasses most intellectual pursuits. Beyond these focal units are over forty community groups affiliated with and assisted by Roberson Museum Center but independent as to control. The constituent organizations are the Museum of Fine Arts, the Broome County Historical Society and Museum, the Potters' Guild, Astronomical Society, Civic Theatre, Folk Dancers, Musical Arts Society, Photographic Center, Garden Center, Fine Arts Society and World Affairs Council. Among the community groups affiliated with the Center are: American Guild of Organists, the Chamber Music Society, Choral Society, Community Symphony, Naturalists Club, Aquarium Society, Society of Photographic Scientists and Engineers, Tri-Cities Opera, Susquehanna Players and many others.

Furthermore, the programs offered by the various performing arts groups and educational center are of extraordinarily high caliber. As one of my friends from New York City said to me after spending some time in Binghamton and looking into our cultural programs, "This is truly a decentralization of excellence."

It is now widely recognized that it is not necessary that top quality theater, opera, music and art be found only in New York, Philadelphia, Boston and other large cities. It is not necessary, either, that the smaller communities try to duplicate in scale what is done in the larger cities. But it is necessary to provide basic high quality ingredients in order to satisfy the "other than bread and butter" needs of people of increasing sophistication in tastes and desires.

In spite of all this, Binghamton, like so many cities of its size in America, has become old and tired in its general physical and aesthetic aspects. Its physical environment, both of the central city area and much of its older residential areas, is in great contrast to the thriving new industrial plants and the highly developed technology which they represent. New employees are moving into the community—a good number of whom are from top echelons of science and technology; and their families, in order to lead a life of fulfillment, will require an environment of esthetic quality and all the amenities which permit a wide range of intellectual and artistic expression.

Binghamton does not yet offer the environment to meet the needs of a truly sophisticated 20th-century people. It has individual character and personality and enough of symbolism in its general setting and in some of its older buildings to form a solid basis upon which to develop a satisfying community. Through an ambitious urban renewal program now under way the entire central city area of some 350 acres is being redeveloped to offer an attractive, magnetic central core—a truly modern complex in atmosphere but representing architecturally a sensitive blending of the old and the new—the old furnishing the necessary symbolic anchors to a social order in transition.

In applying my experiences and observations in this city as a measure to the opportunities in other communities of comparable size and character, I cannot help but feel more strongly than ever that the development of urban patterns based more on the sound smaller communities than on "new towns" and metropolitan "sprawl" is essential. Not that "new towns" should not be built—we shall need them too if they are conceived and planned with deeper understanding of the fundamental needs of their inhabitants and built with an appreciation of values other than pure economics and/or architecture. Developing and redeveloping metropolitan centers will go on too, to serve the changing social order. But the range of choice for our people can be considerably broadened by a very special consideration to the potential of the existing, older and smaller communities. They can be nuclei for clusters of well ordered, vigorous, attractive and soul-satisfying environments able to accommodate man's more intimate needs for a life of fulfillment and offering easy and continuous access to the recreational opportunities and the seclusion of the natural countryside around him.

In order to give further substance to the thesis presented here it will be necessary that thinking, planning, research and experiment be carried out on a regional basis. There are already in the United States a number of good beginnings in regional planning. New York State in 1961 set up an Office of Regional Development to assist in and promote serious and continuing studies of the most intelligent means of meeting the future growth and development of the various regions of the State. Although the organization has now been dissolved its work is included and continued in the more recently established Office of State Planning Coordination. Cornell University has just recently established as a part of the organizational structure of the University an Office of Regional Resources and Development, the chief purpose of which is to draw upon the vast resources of that great university in guiding the future development of every aspect of the larger geographical region of which Cornell is a center. In 1958 there was established one of the largest regional planing groups of all—the Upper Midwest Research and Development Council, a nonprofit, non-political corporation—to stimulate the economic growth of the region consisting of Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Northwestern Wisconsin and Upper Michigan. At Boston University the Area Development Center represents an intelligent effort to assist with research and leadership in guiding the future of the Boston region.

In all of these regional planning and research programs the problems of urbanization must be given high priority and the study of appropriate clustering around existing communities could produce some very interesting and useful possibilities for sound patterns of urban development. It often seems too easy for the planner to throw away the opportunities offered by existing but complex communities and to rush out into the seemingly easier field of designing and building entirely new towns: I say "seemingly easier" because it is really not easier if one pauses to contemplate the more profound, the more meaningful values in planning and building communities to serve all the needs of human beings. Now, just what are some of the specific things which we must know or find out as we approach the comprehensive planning of a region, with special concern for its urbanization pattern? What are some of the major questions which must be answered?

First, and quite obviously, we must develop some realistic concept of the economic potential of the region—even the part it may play in the national economic scene. The industrial, commercial, and recreational potential must be assessed. The prospects for gainful employment and the nature of employment opportunities should be determined. What is the "mix" of employment skills or types which is in prospect? And then the specific areas within the region must be studied for the part that each will play in the future development pattern of the region.

Then, sociologically, we must develop a good idea of the general characteristics of the people now living in the various communities of this region—their cultural heritage and their aspirations. What kind of people are likely to be brought into these communities by new or expanding industries, businesses and services? How will they be absorbed in the existing population? What new cultural or recreational amenities may be needed to create an environment for this changing society?

We must understand that tensions are increasing because of the complexity and the tempo of life in the United States. We must find out more about the implications for our society of the new computerized age. Will masses of people be relegated to the role of passive spectators to the technological drama being played by a comparatively few highly trained actors? If so, what happens to their time, their lives and to their inherent need for identification and participation? What kind of living environment will most likely be responsive to this kind of society? Daily pressures are creating a need for people to have more time to spend in the quiet harmony of the open country—to commune with nature, so to speak. Opportunities for maximum interaction between the city and open countryside must be provided. We must ascertain what are the real symbols of the various communities in the region—what are the things which make a community unique or give it the elements of character and stability. The role of the small hamlet, sometimes isolated, sometimes a satellite, should be studied as a fitting supplement to the overall urban pattern—offering another kind of choice in a broad regional texture.

We must also ask if we are sufficiently aware of the deeper, inner feelings of people; of their more spiritual needs or their latent desires for creative participation in the drama of life. Do we know enough of the life drama itself as it might unfold in different ways in different regions of the world? Do we know enough to plan and build the appropriate stage setting to inspire the best in this social drama of such variety and such scope?

It is not necessary or even desirable that any so-called regional "master plan" be developed as an exhibit to display. Such a display could be the very thing to jeopardize, by premature exposure, intelligent future development. But there must be information obtained from studies in depth of all of the aspects which have any bearing on future potential or alternates of direction for the region. Only with such information and with such sensitive studies of all alternates can efforts be directed towards intelligent development of the kind of pattern which suits foreseen needs. Our great universities must be used to a much greater extent in providing much of the research and imaginative thinking so fundamental to achieving the kind of urbanization pattern which will best serve our future generation.

We have seen some interesting examples in recent years of modern urbanization patterns developed as an extension of the physical and historic texture of older communities of small to medium size in Europe, in England, and in the Middle East. I am encouraged to see so many signs that we are not about to abandon such centuries of investment, so much that is sound and good, in order to achieve the planner's or architect's dream of a perfect new town—perfect for whom? We in the United States have much to learn from the older cities and communities in other parts of the world. We have much to gain in watching closely the philosophy and techniques being employed in creating new communities in the underdeveloped areas of the world. Perhaps we have something to contribute to them if it is only the fact that we ourselves are a comparatively new country born of revolution and developed in a comparatively short time through all the adversities of a pioneering people in the raw wilderness of a new and strange world.

With our present day technology and with our present broader approach to the real purposes of community planning we cannot afford to waste time in deploring the results of the past few centuries and in building up dreams of how we "should" have done it.

Neither can we proceed so blindly as to overlook the sociological importance of that sense of security which comes from association with recognizable symbols of historical transition. I don't think we are going to fail to recognize that ubiety and ecology are key considerations in present thinking on urban patterns. I don't think we are going to plan without more profound understanding of the hopes and aspirations of people for more participation in the cultural, political and economic affairs of their community. I think our plans will be directed at nurturing such aspirations, not in frustrating them.

We must take full inventory of the real values which have been created and use these wisely in developing an urbanization pattern commensurate with the potentials for an urban civilization worthy of the name. We must come to understand that bigness of itself does not mean excellence—that "excellence" applies to the more important and lasting values to which people aspire. Excellence can be nurtured, achieved and regenerated by decentralization. What I am trying to say was so well said by one of my favorite authors, Lewis Mumford. Mr. Mumford, in delivering the first annual Purves Memorial Lecture before the 1965 A.I.A. convention in Washington, D.C., closed with this admonition: "In taking possession of the Western Hemisphere our ancestors mistakenly thought they could trade time for space. All too eagerly they turned their backs on the past, so that they might make a fresh start; and too many thought not only that mechanical progress would be a positive aid to human improvement, which is true, but that the mechanical progress is the equivalent of human improvement—which turns out to be sheer nonsense. The time has come to restore man himself, once more, in all his cumulative historic richness, his regional individuality, his cultural complexity, to the center of the picture, so that he may play his part once more as dramatist, scenic designer, actor, and spectator in the unfolding drama of life. And the cities we build must give all of their citizens, at every state in their development, a role to play and a dialogue to participate in."

Planning has been defined as "intelligent cooperation with the inevitable." Now, all we have to do in each of our areas of concern is to determine what is inevitable—or is it inevitable?

THE TRUTH ABOUT REPUBLICAN ATTACKS ON THE PRESIDENT

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, the politics being played by the opposition on Vietnam has taken on many of the brutal characteristics of the war itself.

The primary target of these partisan attacks is, of course, President Johnson, who is being portrayed as devious, militant, and destructive, a stubborn leader who refuses to negotiate for peace and relishes the violence and bloodshed in that war-torn country.

Those of us who know the President know how unfair these charges are. We also know why they are being made. It is obvious that the critics are seeking to capitalize on America's abhorrence of war by fanning public indignation against the administration.

I am glad to report that this tactic has been roundly condemned by a distinguished Republican, Editor William Randolph Hearst, Jr.

Mr. Hearst rightly notes that by accusing the President of "a credibility gap," the faultfinders are condemning him "in fancy words of not telling the truth."

But he also asks for candor from these detractors themselves:

> If they want their party to campaign on a program to get the United States out of the war, they should come right out and say so. And if they think the President of the United States is lying to the American people, they should come right out and say that in plain English.

Mr. Hearst goes on to say that high ranking members of the administration—men like Secretary Rusk, Ambassador Goldberg, Walt Rostow, and Averell Harriman—have never had their credibility challenged.

It is incredible to these distinguished Americans, he says, that charges of dishonesty are being hurled at the President.

> They are proud to serve the President because they know from experience the kind of man he is. And so do I. A wily politician he is. A liar he is not.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Hearst's excellent column, entitled, "On War and Politics," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAR AND POLITICS

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

Looking up words in a dictionary for their definitions is an old and rewarding hobby of mine. Lots of times people—and especially politicians—use fancy words to gloss over what they mean. And since it is sometimes difficult to know what politicians are up to, the dictionary can be invaluable for nailing down exactly what—at least—they said.

Take the expression, "credibility gap." Armchair critics of President Johnson for some time have been saying he's got one, especially in his statements on Vietnam. During the week, the expression took on an important new political significance when two top Republican Senators—Clifford P. Case of New Jersey and Thurston B. Morton of Kentucky—reversed previous positions on the war and began throwing the two words at the White House.

According to my Webster's Second New International Dictionary, which I prefer to the Third, the word credible means "capable of being credited or believed; worthy of belief." The word gap is defined as "an opening in anything made by breaking or parting; breach." In plain English, therefore, a person who is accused of having a credibility gap is being accused in fancy words of not telling the truth.

The expression now has taken on important new political significance precisely because it has been taken up by two men who are long time policy makers in the GOP. That Sen. Morton and Sen. Case would make such a charge in the looming shadow of a presidential election year automatically makes it a political issue.

Perhaps the two Senators didn't intend it that way. Perhaps Sen. Case was speaking solely for himself when he told Congress on Tuesday that the President has "squandered his credibility" and thus produced a "crisis of confidence" over Vietnam. Perhaps the same goes for Sen. Morton when, the very next day, he told a group of businessmen that Mr. Johnson has caused a "crisis of confidence and credibility." If so, their choice of words was a remarkable coincidence.

It is too early in the 1968 White House sweepstakes to tell just how important a role Vietnam and the President's credibility will play in the Republican campaign. Yet already we see some of the party leaders painting themselves into a corner by taking an unequivocal position. Since their declarations do have such important political implications, whether intended or not. I think Senators Case and Morton should go further.

If they want their party to campaign on a program to get the United States out of the war, they should come right out and say so. And if they think the President of the United States is lying to the American people, they should come right out and say that in plain English.

Both the Senators, in deploring continuation of the Vietnam struggle, called for a halt in our bombing as a first step toward eventual peace talks with the enemy.

Kentucky Colonel Morton had the audacity to tell General Westmoreland (ex-Commandant of West Point) that his "search and destroy" ground tactics should be abandoned also. There is nothing on the record to show that this unsuccessful leader in one defeat after another of the Republican Party could lead a Boy Scout Troop out of Central Park.

It is ironic, to say the least, that British Foreign Secretary George Brown at almost the same time should be strongly supporting President Johnson's policies in a speech to the United Nations. In it he noted how Hanoi has failed to grasp "the many opportunities to negotiate that have been offered them and still remain open."

The spectacle of two leading Republicans almost simultaneously attacking the President for his credibility and for his conduct of the war—in contrast to the support voiced by Great Britain—was more than some other GOP leaders could tolerate. One of these was Senate Republican Leader Everett M. Dirksen, of Illinois, who said of the Case speech:

"It is not a very happy thing to say, but when you're engaged in mortal, bloody conflict you don't give the enemy any comfort—not a bit."

Sen. Dirksen made no mention of the political implications in the speeches of his two fellow party leaders. This was put in perspective, however, by White House Press Secretary George Christian. Asked to comment on the GOP attacks, he said: "I have learned a long time ago not to debate with Senators, particularily in the political season."

There is another aspect of the Case-Morton speeches which also needs to be put in perspective—the automatic encouragement they gave to Ho Chi Minh in his obvious belief that home-front division will cause the U.S. to stop fighting. Secretary of State Dean Rusk did this in a speech in New York on Wednesday when he said: "The most important question of credibility is to make sure that our adversaries believe the United States means what it says."

In all candor it must be admitted that President Johnson, being the kind of a man he is, inadvertently encourages speculation on his credibility not only about Vietnam but on other controversial issues as well. He is himself a super politician who is a great believer in being able to exercise options. He hates to be outguessed or anicipated. By not telling people in advance what he plans to do he keeps open the field for various alternatives.

This trait does not necessarily make Mr. Johnson his own best friend. But there is nothing dishonest about playing your cards close to the vest. Another President who always went to great lengths to avoid being boxed in was Franklin D. Roosevelt. It was a sheer delight to him to keep people guessing. With him (as with President Johnson) people who didn't understand this political technique suspected they were being misled.

Another big reason for all the talk about a credibility gap is the incredible situation presented by the war itself. It doesn't make sense to a lot of people that a comparatively few Communists in the wilds of a little country like Vietnam can withstand for so long the forces of the world's mightiest nation. And it doesn't make sense that the enemy would keep turning down sincere offers for peace talks.

But the truth is that, because of the help being given them by Russia, the Red Chinese and the stop-the-bombing crowd, the enemy is resisting thus far. And the fact is that the enemy does continue to turn down offers for peace talks. The latest was a flat rejection issued by the North Vietnamese early this week.

President Johnson has working with him a number of men whose credibility has never successfully been challenged. In addition to Mr. Rusk I think of men like his Roving Ambassador Averell Harriman, United Nations Ambassador Arthur Goldberg and Special White House Assistant on Foreign Policy, Walt Rostow. All these eminently credible men are suffering from incredibility these days.

What is incredible to these men of long experience is the belief being expressed by so many that we should stop the bombing because then the enemy would begin to talk peace. They know the Communists and they know there still is no real peace in Korea after 15 years. They know that Communism and aggression, one place or another, are synonymous.

But what is most incredible of all to these men of the highest integrity are the charges of dishonesty being hurled at President Johnson—charges now being repeated by Republican political leaders. They are proud to serve the President because they know from experience the kind of man he is. And so do I.

A wily politician he is—a liar he is not.

WASHINGTON POST ADVISES TO MAKE NO PLANS FOR WAR OR FOR PEACE IN VIETNAM

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the hope of the country lies in our Government retaining the wisdom it has so far shown in Vietnam to appraise the many conflicting counsels offered and to continue to press the war there on the basis of necessities, waging the war on a scale proportionate to the ends sought.

This requires careful consideration of the demands we hear so often for greater escalation, or for a halt to our present bombing of North Vietnam. Those who offer either of these alternatives to our present policy of sustained but measured pressure have the obligation to present a sound, reasonable basis for following their advice. As the Washington Post said in its lead editorial on Sunday, they must offer more than conjecture on what will follow in the wake of their proposals if they are followed. The Post editorial, written in the form of a question, as to whether we should give more credence to General Giap, the North Vietnamese Defense Minister who has been quoted as saying the war will be protracted, or to Swaran Singh, the Indian Defense Minister who told the United Nations he was confident a halt to bombing would lead to peace, is in itself an answer. Writes the Post:

> We will be well advised to make no plans for peace and no plans for war on either the hopes of Swaran Singh or the warnings of General Giap.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Washington Post editorial of October 8 be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHICH DEFENSE MINISTER?

> On the same day that Gen. Vo Nguyen Giap, Defense Minister of North Vietnam, was quoted in Hong Kong dispatches as saying the war would be protracted, Sardar Swaran Singh, India's Defense Minister, told the United Nations in New York he was confident that a halt in U.S. bombing would lead to peace.
>
> That presents the government and the people of the United States with a choice. They can believe either one they wish to believe. Since it is Giap and not Singh who is in command of the North Vietnamese armed forces there is a certain practical consideration that invests Giap with the higher degree of credibility. Sardar Swaran Singh tenders a conjecture founded upon unnamed sources obtained in unspecified places and uttered at times not disclosed.
>
> If the Swaran Singh forecast suffers the debility of anonymous speculation, however, the Giap summons to a longer war and ultimate victory is also a little mortgaged by the conventions of diplomatic necessity. Whatever the North Vietnamese intend to do, they certainly will indicate an intention to fight on forever until five minutes before negotiations.
>
> So neither defense minister really proffers any very dependable basis on which to make a forecast or on which to found a policy. We will be well advised to make no plans for peace and no plans for war on either the hopes of Swaran Singh or the warnings of General Giap.
>
> Many would like to respond to the hopeful conjectures of Swaran Singh by suspending the bombing; and others would like to respond to the bellicosity of Vo Nguyen Giap with increased bombing. There is a longing in the country for a change in our predicament in South Vietnam. It probably would be politically rewarding to respond to it with a dramatic suspension of the war or a dramatic escalation of it. But our course, should not be set by every rumor from abroad or every clamor from at home. It must be set by the necessities of a war that is waged for limited ends by limited means. In such a war, the impulse to escalate hostilities is bound to alternate with the impulse to suspend them.
>
> The hope of the country lies in the government having the wisdom to appraise all such conflicting counsels by looking beyond immediate to ultimate objectives. Those who wish to suspend military operations must be required to offer something better than mere conjecture as to what will happen after the suspension of bombing. The failure of such a suspension to elicit any satisfactory response from North Vietnam would produce a very dangerous situation. It could have direct and tragic consequences to combat troops in Vietnam. And it could produce in this country, after an interval of frustration and rising anger a demand for a resumption of hostilities at a level of intensity unprecedented in this conflict.
>
> Those who counsel immediate escalation of the war also must be required to offer something better than mere conjecture as to what will follow the resort to their proposals for a wider war.

GOP AGRICULTURAL CRITICISM IS NOT MATCHED BY THEIR RECORD

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, a few weeks ago, as I listened to my friends on the other side of the aisle try to make a political case out of our Democratic farm policy, I thought of an ancient maxim from Alexander Pope:

> Those who act the least, upbraid the most.

Then my thoughts went back even further to the words of the philosopher Zexius, who said, some 400 years before the birth of Christ:

> Criticism comes easier than craftsmanship.

I do not intend to criticize today, for I have a certain amount of sympathy for a party whose most recent Secretary of Agriculture was Ezra Taft Benson, and whose whole modern experience with agriculture has been one of unrelieved disaster.

It is not easy for Republicans to speak convincingly on farm matters, and I understand this. The record shows that farm income has gone down in every Republican administration—except one—in the last half century, and that farm income has gone up in every Democratic administration, again, except one, in the same period. And so I am charitable.

In 1952, inheriting a national net farm income of $14.1 billion a year, the opposition party put its "craftmanship" to work in this House and in the White House.

Over the next 8 years, under the patient bludgeoning of Secretary of Agriculture Benson, farm income sank to a postwar low of $11.7 billion, down $2½ billion a year from the high of the previous Democratic administration.

And the pocketbook disaster—were it not enough—was accompanied by a crisis in public confidence.

The word "farm" in the fifties seldom appeared without the modifier "mess" behind it, and it was widely believed that there was no answer at all to what people called the farm problem.

Our biggest worry, back then, was what to do with half a billion bushels of grain that might rot on the ground—because there was no place to store them. This was no idle fear. If 1961 production levels had continued unchecked, it was certain that grain surpluses would soon overflow all the elevators and bins we had.

Back then, we had 2 billion bushels of corn in storage and enough grain sorghum to last us a year and a half. We had wheat coming out of our ears too—enough to meet our domestic needs for over 2 years, packed into every conceivable storage space, with another 100 to 200 million more bushels piling up each year.

All the signs were bright red with danger signals. Feed grain prices were declining each year; the "standing room only" signs were hung out on grain bins all over the Nation and more grain was on its way. Unless legislation could provide an answer, feed grain stocks would mount another 300 or 400 million bushels within the year. The consequences for farmers, feeders, the industry and rural America in general would have been dire.

But an emergency feed grain bill was adopted in early 1961, setting up a voluntary program that provided acreage reduction and price supports for corn and grain sorghum. It authorized payments to farmers for diverting feed grain acreage to soil-conserving uses. With some modification, this basic, voluntary program still serves us today.

In swift succession other farm problems were attacked. The year 1963 saw passage of another feed grain program, the Agricultural Act of 1964 was passed the next year, and the great, 4-year, Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 won passage just 2 years ago. In all, five major farm bills were passed during the first 6 years of this administration. But, sad to report, House Republicans—almost to a man—fought against every one them. Out of a total of 1,494 possible votes, they voted "yes" only 82 times, while voting "no" 1,412 times.

This is what Mr. Pope meant, Mr. President, when he said:

> Those who act least, upbraid most.

With the impetus of this legislation, with the cooperation of farmers in their voluntary programs, and with the help of two great Presidents and a Secretary of Agriculture dedicated to making the programs work, progress has been substantial on all fronts.

In contrast to the sliding downward scale and mandatory, rigid programs of the Benson years, the agricultural market is freer of Government control now than it has been for 30 years, and nearer supply-demand balance than it has been for half a century. Most of our farm programs are now voluntary.

The surpluses of the fifties are gone. As the 1967 harvest season approaches, the Commodity Credit Corporation investment in farm commodities is down to $3.59 billion, a reduction of $2.39 billion from the previous year, and about $5 billion less than the peak investment years of 1956 and 1959. And equally important, the surpluses were worked off without depressing farm income. Instead, prices of commodities in surplus moved steadily up as the surpluses were put into use. In short, American farmers have had 6 years of steady progress. The contrast between the last 6 years and the 8 that preceded them—1953 to early 1961—are startling.

INCOME

In the 8-year period ending with 1960, net farm income dropped $2.4 billion—a loss of 17 percent. In the 6 years since 1960, net farm income rose $4.6 billion—a gain of 40 percent.

In the Benson years, gross farm income rose only 3 percent. Since 1960, it has risen 31 percent.

Net income per farm, between 1952 and 1960, rose by 9 percent; in the 6 years since, it rose 70 percent.

EXPORTS

Six years ago, U.S. agricultural exports had climbed to a then alltime high, $4.8 billion. Last fiscal year our exports were $6.7 billion—up 44 percent—and rose above $6.8 billion in 1967, despite increasingly stiff competition from abroad and less tonnage in certain commodities.

Our dollar sales have grown rapidly, from $3.3 billion in 1960 to $5.1 billion in 1966—nearly a 60-percent gain. We set a new dollar record of $5.4 billion this year—more than our total shipments amounted to in any year prior to 1963.

A decade ago, domestic farm policy was largely out of tune with exports—and our exports showed it. One of the important goals since 1960 has been to design and administer wheat, feed grain, and cotton programs to encourage a maximum flow into world trade, for the benefit of U.S. producers.

During the past fiscal year, we exported the produce of 1 acre out of every 4 harvested, over 60 percent of our wheat—the equivalent of 47 percent of our cash receipts from the feed grains—42 percent of our soybeans and bean-equivalent-of-oil, 20 percent of our cotton. We now have some 37 percent of the world wheat trade—almost half the world feed grain trade—and over 90 percent of the world soybean trade.

DOMESTIC FOOD PROGRAMS

The programs enacted during the past 6 years also enable us to make better use of abundance. At least 45 million Americans—12 million more than in 1960—are now being helped to better diets, better nutrition, better health, through various food distribution programs.

In 1961 the food stamp program was launched on a pilot basis in eight areas. It is now operating in about 838 communities and serving 1.8 million persons. This summer the minimum required to participate in this program was drastically reduced to allow more of the very poor to use its benefits.

School lunches are being served to 19 million children this year compared with about 13 million in 1960. The dollar amount of food made available to the schools increased $22 million over last year—from $117 million to $139 million. On January 1, under provisions of the Child Nutrition Act, about 100,000 undernourished children started getting good breakfasts, some of them for the first time in their lives.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT

And many rural communities are enjoying something for the first time also: pure, safe, central water systems and adequate disposal systems, made possible through community facilities and loans. In 1960 less than $1 million was loaned for this purpose; last year, $197 million. Since the program got into high gear, in 1961, more than 1.7 million people have benefited with some $438 million in long-term loans and grants.

Other loan programs of direct benefit to rural America have increased apace under this administration:

In 1960, only $40 million was loaned for rural housing. Last year the total had increased tenfold, to $439 million.

Farm ownership loans increased sixfold in over the same period, from $43 to $260 million. Since January 1, 1961, nearly $1.9 billion of short-term operating credit has been extended to farm families unable to get credit elsewhere, $779 million more than was advanced in the previous 6½ years.

In all, the Department of Agriculture has pumped more than $5.6 billion in credit into the rural economy from January 1961, through the end of the last fiscal year.

This, in short, is the solid record of progress in rural America under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson.

It is a record of substance, not shadow, and all the carping of the critics cannot erase it, try as they may.

But because we are Democrats, and are interested in the future, we are not resting on our laurels. We know that all the problems of rural America are not yet solved, and we know there is legitimate reason for concern on the part of farmers today.

LATE DEVELOPMENTS

Since August of 1966, the old problem of too much supply, too little demand, has once more appeared in some nonprogram commodities. For the first 6 months of 1967, hog slaughter was 16 percent higher—at one time 25 percent higher over a year earlier—and prices were down 21 percent. Beef production was up 6 percent, grain-fattened cattle production up 7 percent, and cattle prices down 4 to 8 percent.

Egg production increased 6 percent and prices decreased 16 percent. Production of oranges increased 34 percent over the same period a year earlier, and a 30-percent reduction in prices followed.

In July, the oversupply tide began to ebb. Hog slaughter that month was only 6 percent above a year earlier. Beef production was only 3 percent greater. As marketings move closer to the level of the previous year, prices are also moving toward last year's levels. Hog prices in July were only 8 percent below a year ago, while beef prices were 6 percent higher.

By contrast, however, egg production in July was 7 percent higher than a year earlier, and prices remained 16 percent below prices of the corresponding month.

The Johnson administration is doing everything it can to even the peaks and valleys in supply and demand. Section 32 purchases, for the school lunch and other domestic programs, and food-for-freedom purchases, are pointed toward $2½ billion this year.

That is a lot of buying power, and it is being used skillfully to strengthen farm prices. But under present law and marketing practices, there is not much more the Government can do. In these no-program commodities, the farmer is essentially going it alone in the market. And some 60 percent of farmers' cash receipts come from the sale of crops and livestock not covered by farm programs. Here the responsibility for maintaining supply-demand balance, and therefore, strong prices, rests primarily with the farmer himself.

But much can be done by farmers themselves to gain muscle in the marketplace.

BARGAINING POWER

One approach is "farmer bargaining power," a concept that has been in the wings a long time but has now moved center stage. Perhaps it is an idea whose time has come.

Farmers are increasingly aware that they are producing for a system where more and more of the bargaining power rests with the fewer and larger firms making up the marketing sector of the industry.

Bargaining power is now being discussed throughout agricultural circles. It might take several forms, depending upon the wishes of producers. One idea is a National Farm Bargaining Board, which could at the request of producers hold elections and certify bargaining agents for farmers to negotiate with buyers. Or the present system of marketing orders might be broadened to include new commodities and new concepts.

This is something that will have to be thrashed out among farmers and their organizations, for the idea is now in its formative stages. But when and if this happens, the ideas of farmers themselves will receive sympathetic consideration from members of the party that has pioneered other farm legislation ever since the days of the New Deal.

Certainly we reject one measure being sponsored by a member of the other party that would, in effect, repeal our present programs in the grains—for a starter—and quite possible lead to the aboiltion of programs covering other commodities.

To learn the result if this does occur, we can turn to a recent study by Dr. Walter Wilcox, the distinguished economist of the Library of Congress, now the Department of Agriculture's Director of Agricultural Economics.

He and his associates, after consultations with leading economists at nine universities, concluded that rising production, in the absence of adjustment and price-support programs, would drive prices down rapidly. By 1970, corn would fall to around 70 cents a bushel, cotton to 18 or 20 cents a pound. Soybean prices would probably drop to around $1.90 to $2 a bushel. Wheat would fall to about $1 to $1.10 per bushel.

Within a year or two, livestock supplies would also overburden the market and prices would fall. Prices would drop most heavily in hogs and poultry, less in dairy, with the effect on beef prices somewhere in between.

By 1970, the decline in the price level for livestock would be almost 10 percent. The overall price level for crops would decline more than 20 percent, but farm production expenses would continue to rise.

Without programs, net farm income might well fall by one-third, some $5 billion below the 1966 figure of $16.4 billion, or back to about 1957 levels.

In short, farmers would lose all of the income gains of a decade, and then some. A crippling drop in land values would follow.

Frankly, I do not think the Nation can afford this kind of a debacle and, in the end, I am sure the Congress will reject any program that would lead to it. Yet, losing our farm programs is a very real possibility.

Their enemies are well-heeled, tenacious, and clever. They are quick to exploit any division within the ranks of rural people, and to create rifts where none before existed. In the face of this massive and well-financed campaign against farm programs, unity among farmers themselves—who now comprise just over 6 percent of the population—is needed as never before.

Understanding is needed, too. Farmers face a vastly different marketing situation today than in previous decades. With surpluses gone, yearly production is keyed to needs over the entire marketing year. This means larger supplies are available from the current crop than when production was being held in check to work off surpluses.

Government stocks no longer provide the stabilizing market force they did when there was a market shortfall from yearly production that had to be made from the surplus.

Now virtually all of the needs in commercial channels are coming from free stocks.

This new challenge to farmers requires more active orderly marketing. It requires restraint on the part of farmers in the quantities of a commodity moving into the market at any one time. The price-support program helps in the holding process. With a reseal program for on-the-farm and warehouse storage, farmers can hold on to their products and make the market work for them, rather than against them. Price supports and payments strengthen their holding power also. Direct and diversion payments in many of the basics make it possible for them to compete in world markets and, at the same time, maintain their income.

With these things going for us, with greater bargaining power coming to the forefront as a national issue, I am confident that we can continue the progress we have made since 1966. There may well be interruptions of the type we have suffered since last August, but these can be overcome, if we care enough.

If we persevere, if we continue the search for new answers to ever-changing conditions, we can have even greater progress in the future than in the past.

FRAYED ENDS OF PEKING-DJAKARTA AXIS SNAPPED

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, this week the last frayed ends of the former Peking-Djakarta axis snapped; and Indonesia broke off diplomatic relations with the mainland Chinese Government. This development is but the latest in a long series which indicate that China, indeed, has few friends left in Asia, as an editorial from today's Washington Daily News points out, adding that "to know China's rulers, apparently, is to despise them."

China is left with but two allies in Asia—North Vietnam and North Korea. The depth of their allegiance to chairman Mao is, in fact, questionable.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Daily News editorial entitled "Moa's Ex-Friends" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News, Oct. 10, 1967]

MAO'S EX-FRIENDS

"The Thoughts of Chairman Mao" is, of course, the all-time best seller in Communist China. But if Mao wants another smash hit, we have a title picked for him: "How to Lose Friends and Infuriate People."

As late as mid-1965, Indonesia under President Sukarno was cheek-by-jowl pal of Red China and the Peking-Jakarta axis looked like a formidable fact in Asian affairs. Indonesia's communist party was the largest outside the bloc.

But the Chinese got caught aiding and abetting the communist-led Indonesian conspirators who, but for the army, would have seized power two years ago. Since then Peking incessantly has castigated the new order in Jakarta as a "reactionary military dictatorship." And Red Guards in Peking were sent to harass Indonesian diplomats.

This week the Indonesian government, set up and pressured by patriotic students also, broke diplomatic relations with Peking. The last frayed strand of the Peking-Jakarta axis was broken.

Indonesia thus joins the list of China's Asian ex-friends. To know China's rulers, apparently, is eventually to despise them. Mao's Asian pals now are North Vietnam and North Korea (sort of). That's it. From there it is a long jump to Albania.

PETER KIEWIT RECIPIENT OF NCCJ'S BROTHERHOOD AWARD

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, last week, in Omaha, the National Conference of Christians and Jews presented its annual Brotherhood Award to Peter Kiewit, one of Nebraska's and the Nation's foremost citizens.

Mr. Kiewit's company is a giant in the construction industry; he is one of the world's largest builders. But he builds more than bridges and dams; he builds brotherhood, through a quiet and unobtrusive dedication to, and concern for, his fellow man.

The dinner, attended by 1,500 persons—the largest attendance for a city of Omaha's size in the history of NCCJ brotherhood banquets—was the work of a 40-member executive committee headed by V. J. Skutt of Mutual of Omaha and Morris E. Jacobs of Bozell & Jacobs. They were assisted by a centennial dinner committee composed, as was the executive committee, of 240 Omaha civic, business and professional leaders.

Dr. Sterling Brown, president of NCCJ, presented the award to Mr. Kiewit, and the principal address of the evening was made by Dr. John Sloan Dickey, president of Dartmouth College, Mr. Kiewit's alma mater.

I ask unanimous consent that a brief description of Mr. Kiewit's activities, together with his inspiring acceptance response to the Brotherhood Award, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Peter Kiewit has been described as "one of the world's great builders" by Fortune Magazine. The company he heads is consistently among the nation's largest construction firms.

Mr. Kiewit also is a builder of education, racial harmony and Omaha's future.

He started as a water boy for the company founded in 1884 by his father and, working on Saturdays and school vacations, advanced to timekeeper, carpenter's helper and apprentice bricklayer. By the time he was graduated from high school he was a journeyman bricklayer.

After a year at Dartmouth College he returned to Omaha to go to work for the company as a foreman. At one point, he was hospitalized nine months and was told by his doctor his physical condition was such that he wouldn't be able to carry a normal workload the rest of his life. He brushed aside the warning and returned to work.

In 1931 he became company president. He has expanded Peter Kiewit Sons' Co. into a global operation. Commented the Kansas City Star: "Peter Kiewit takes the measure of a job and then determines the best and quickest way to do it. He has moved mountains and changed the course of rivers."

His humanitarian efforts have included substantial contributions to Creighton University, the Clarkson Hospital School of Nursing, Dartmouth and other schools.

As co-chairman of a bi-racial committee, he was successful in getting major Omaha businesses to employ several hundred members of minority groups in positions not previously open to them.

The evening of the day he purchased the World Publishing Company he sold aprons at the Children's Hospital Bazaar.

He is president of the Clarkson Hospital board, a trustee of the Eugene C. Eppley Foundation, the Omaha Industrial Foundation, the Joslyn Liberal Arts Society and the United Presbyterian Foundation; a director of Junior Achievement of Omaha, a regent of Hastings College and a governor of the Boys Clubs of Omaha. He was named King of Ak-Sar-Ben in 1959.

ACCEPTANCE TALK FOR NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CHRISTIANS AND JEWS AWARD

(By Peter Kiewit)

I am deeply humbled by this great honor you are bestowing upon me this evening. Evelyn and I are most grateful—and I'm sure Peter, Jr., his wife Barbara, and my cousin, Miss Margaret Kiewit, who are here this evening, are also appreciative of your kindness.

If I would now say "thank you" and sit down, all of you would have something to be grateful for. Unfortunately for you, however, our distinguished Chairman has insisted that I say a few words. The "few" came through loud and clear—I will try to be as brief as my heartfelt emotions will permit me to be.

This award rightfully belongs to others, and I accept it on their behalf. It belongs to many of you here tonight, and to many who are not here. It belongs to all those who have labored long and hard in this great and growing city of ours to promote better understanding between religious and ethnic groups, men and women who are dedicated to the principles of brotherhood.

The first group I should like to mention consists of those who have adopted as a part of their life's work the task of bringing closer the day when people of all races, colors and creeds may live in harmony with equal respect, equal rights and equal opportunities. These people are giving of themselves because they are convinced that it is better to give than to receive. We find them in the churches of all faiths, in the ranks of the Salvation Army, in the Red Cross, in the Urban League, and many other organizations too numerous to mention. To all these people we owe a great debt of gratitude.

The second group I want to mention consists of the army of volunteer part-time workers on whom Omaha largely depends to accomplish the objectives of brotherhood in its numerous civic undertakings, men and women who devote a part of their valuable time to help their fellow man. I am thinking of business and professional people, housewives, salaried and hourly paid workers. To these people we also owe a great debt of gratitude.

The third group I want to mention consists of those who give financial support, including men and women in the first two groups and thousands of others. They give through the United Community Services, through churches, through civic and fraternal organizations, and in countless other ways. To these people we also owe a great debt of gratitude—for the work of brotherhood always has, and always will require financial assistance.

There is a fourth group that is the most important of all, in my opinion. This group consists of those who have formed deep and abiding convictions concerning equal respect, equal rights and equal opportunities for all men, and who practice these convictions without fear or favor in their business, social, religious and political activities. These people come from all walks of life, all races, and all creeds. They are found among the fortunate, and the less fortunate. They are found in minority and majority groups alike. I would like to suggest that each of us ask ourselves how close we come to qualifying as members of this fourth group. These are truly brothers of their fellow man and all of them, wherever they may be, share with me in this honor.

In spite of what any of us may have done in the past to promote the ideals of brotherhood, we can and must do more in the future. In particular, I want to stress the importance of helping others to help themselves. Although there will always be those among us who need personal assistance and financial aid to cover all or most of their needs—the crippled, the old, and the orphaned young—the great majority of those who are underprivileged, for whatever cause, can be helped best by giving them encouragement and providing them opportunities.

I have been impressed with the brotherhood work of Archie Moore, retired light-heavyweight boxing champion, which was mentioned in recent newspaper columns throughout the country, and the subject of an editorial in the "local daily"—I hope you will pardon me for this short commercial. Archie has organized and is heading an organization called ABC, which stands for "Any Boy Can", and is intended to help young people of all races. Through this organization he tells the boys how he and other youngsters in the tough St. Louis neighborhood in which he grew up, became jazz musicians, doctors, lawyers and sports figures, because as Archie put it, "We had a goal and were willing to work to accomplish it." He teaches dignity and self-respect which are the most important building blocks any brother can give a fellow brother, in my opinion.

This ABC organization, along with the Boys Club, the YMCA, Jewish Community Centers, Catholic Youth Organization, and other similar organizations are doing an outstanding job of providing encouragement, motivation, and at the same time, fostering its dignity and self-respect. Each of us should look for the time to help such organizations, and in addition, we should look for opportunities to work individually.

Providing opportunities is more than a moral issue—I believe it is an economic necessity if we are to continue to raise our standard of living and compete in world markets. In this day of shortages among professional, skilled craftsmen and technicians, discrimination based on church affiliation, country of origin, pigmentation of the skin, or any other irrelevant, emotional bias is an unnecessary waste of human resources. It is good business to judge people on the basis of personal traits, attributes and abilities, to place them where their talents can be best utilized, and to promote them on the basis of their proven ability to handle additional responsibilities. Within the foreseeable future, if not now, the demand for competent trained people will exceed the supply, and we cannot afford to by-pass anyone who shows promise.

We must recognize the tremendous reservoir of untapped talent among minority groups and among the underprivileged in the general population. Many of these people need training in the various skills where shortages exist. We must encourage and assist in the training effort on the job and in the classroom. In this connection, I think it is extremely important that we put forth our best efforts to make sure the training provided is properly administered, is adequate, and is directed towards fields where opportunity exists.

Omaha has been called the Can-Do City by our Chamber of Commerce. Omaha, as you know, was the home of Father Flanagan, founder of Boys Town—a man I was privileged to know, and one who exemplified the Can-Do spirit in the field of human relations. The statue at Boys Town carrying the inscription "He Ain't Heavy, Father—He's My Brother" has become a symbol of brotherhood throughout the world, tying Omaha closely to the brotherhood concept. As a consequence, we have a reputation to live up to.

We can improve the core area—we can attract more industry to provide additional employment—and we can create work opportunities for more of our citizens. But more to the point, we can do the grass roots job here in Omaha of establishing a social order in which the ideals of brotherhood and justice shall become the standards of human relationship. This, as I am sure most of you know, is the objective of the National Conference of Christians and Jews. This objective is a challenge worthy of our great city and of all its citizens.

I want to thank each of you for coming here tonight, and to say again—I am deeply grateful.

PILOT PROGRAM TO INTEREST PRIVATE SECTOR IN UNEMPLOYMENT PROBLEMS

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, today business and industry face acute shortages of skilled workers while thousands of untrained men and women languish in the ghettos, living the humiliating life that welfare has thrust upon them. Many of these unemployables want desperately to experience the dignity of earning their own way—but, unskilled and uneducated, they dare not even hope for a job.

Last week the President announced a pilot program to interest the private sector in the employment problems of the ghettos. Forty million dollars has been allocated from existing funds so that the Government can assume the extra cost of training these unemployables and underwrite the added risks of doing business in slum areas.

As the Baltimore News American pointed out in an editorial on October 5:

> The project blends social progress with faith in private enterprise. This is an unbeatable combination, and merits the support of all concerned.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTO THE GHETTOS

> The Johnson administration has announced a new and challenging program for the relief of unemployment and other social ills in the nation's riot-prone urban slum areas. Private industry is to be encouraged to invest in rebuilding such areas, with the inducement of various types of government assistance as insurance against undue risk.
>
> "To succeed in this venture will take more than promises of good intentions," President Johnson said in a memorandum to eight federal agencies involved in the project. "It will require, on an unprecedented scale, the concerted action and involvement of the private sector, working closely with the federal government."
>
> Insisting the program be headed by an individual who would command the respect of "big business," President Johnson has chosen William E. Zisch, vice chairman of Aerojet-General Corporation, as the project's first administrator. It will be Mr. Zisch's task to embark on a project designed to take the fear of vandalism, theft and rioting out of investment and to create instead an atmosphere conducive to greater employment, expanded construction and job training in depressed areas.
>
> Most importantly, the plan could alleviate unemployment, perhaps the core of ghetto ferment. With such alleviation could come a decline in the number of persons subsisting on welfare payments, a form of livelihood combining humiliation and loss of morale for recipients with crushing burdens for city budgets. The face of ghetto areas could be transformed from their present garbage-strewn hideousness to new vistas of residential and commercial structures.
>
> The project blends social progress with faith in private enterprise. This is an unbeatable combination, and merits the support of all concerned.

PRIVATE WILMINGTON GROUP TO BUILD LOW-RENT HOUSES

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, there is general agreement that a key problem in our cities is the absence of sufficient low-rent housing.

It is also generally agreed that providing this housing is a responsibility shared by all levels of government and by private groups and citizens as well.

In Delaware we are fortunate to have an organization like the Greater Wilmington Development Council, a bipartisan, not-for-profit public interest group which works for the betterment of northern New Castle County.

It is an organization incorporated to identify and analyze the physical, economic, social, cultural, and governmental problems of the area; to determine the priority for dealing with these problems; to develop solutions to these problems for the long-range good of the people and the community; and to bring action to bear on the recommended solutions.

This decision by the Greater Wilmington Development Council to put its resources behind an effective program to meet the demand for moderate income housing is an outstanding example of private response to a public need. It might well serve as a guide for similar groups elsewhere.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a article about the plan, published in the Wilmington Evening Journal, and an editorial about it, published in the Wilmington Morning News, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wilmington (Del.) Evening Journal]

Moderate Income Class—GWDC To Build and Rent Housing

Greater Wilmington Development Council today announced plans to create a nonprofit corporation to construct housing for families of moderate income—about $4,000 to $8,000 a year.

At the same time, GWDC disclosed a general reorganization of its staff.

The need for low-rent housing is one of the major recommendations made this week by the governors committee investigating civil unrest.

GWDC authorized creation of the nonprofit corporation in August, according to Allan C. Rusten, associate executive director.

He said it has not yet been named, and no directors have been selected since the project is still in the preliminary stages. Additional developments are expected within a couple of weeks, he said.

In one of the staff shifts, James H. Gilliam will direct staff activities of the housing corporation.

Gilliam since 1965 has served as director of GWDC's neighborhoods and housing services.

GWDC said the new corporation probably will use various federal programs providing long-term, low-interest loans for nonprofit sponsors. The below-market interest rates enable construction of housing at lower cost and lower rentals than are normally available.

The corporation will operate in the Greater Wilmington area, which GWDC defines as that section of New Castle County north of the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal.

Rusten said the corporation will be able to build homes or rental housing of all types, including apartments, within the income limits set by the executive committee resolution.

Introduction of GWDC's resources housing field is viewed as a significant boost to the community's efforts to meet what is generally recognized as heavy demand for moderate income housing.

Under the reorganization, Paul A. Wilhelm will continue as executive director of GWDC. He has been executive director since 1961.

Rusten will become associate executive director. He will supervise GWDC's activities in the social action field, including the Neighborhood Improvement Program and the education committee.

Rusten also will handle the administrative duties of GWDC and continue to direct its public information and community relations programs.

Mrs. Wagner D. Jackson will join the staff Nov. 1 to assume Gilliam's duties on the neighborhood program—a privately funded, three-year experimental project developed by GWDC and implemented early last year.

Mrs. Jackson has a master's degree in social work at Howard University and has been a community volunteer in Greater Wilmington.

[From the Wilmington (Del.) Morning News, Oct. 9, 1967]

GWDC Set To Show the Way

Though the Greater Wilmington Development Council's announcement was short on detail, the mere fact that the community organization intends to establish a non-profit corporation to build moderate income housing is good news.

The revitalization and renewal of life in urban America cannot await federal action. Private groups like GWDC, which plans to take the lead in providing housing in Greater Wilmington for families with incomes between $4,000 and $8,000 a year, the so-called moderate income group, must assure an increasingly greater share of the load.

David Rockefeller, president of the Chase Manhattan Bank, told a Senate committee last November that private capital on an immense scale will be needed—an estimated $5 of private capital for each dollar of public funds—if the nation is to improve its cities. This need is no less great in Wilmington. One sets some idea of the size of the private investment that is needed locally, when it is realized that $11,351,687 in public money has been put into the city's fledging urban renewal program to date.

The GWDC plan obviously won't come close to that. Its value should be comparable to that of the pioneer; it will show the way to go. Its effect will be even greater, however, if the council is able to move quickly. Too often in the past, announcements of exciting projects have not been followed by exciting deeds. Whether justified or not, the general feeling in Wilmington today is seeing is believing when it comes to renewal. The people have had enough plans, architects' drawings, maps and schemes. They're looking for buildings with people using them and the quicker the GWDC can translate its plans into action the better.

It would also be desirable if a significant number of those first housing units were built outside the city. Many responsible and concerned citizens are cautious about moving outside the city limits with low-cost housing projects, but this resistence must be broken if Wilmington is once again to become one community instead of two. The GWDC could show the way in this regard, just as it has in other areas of development within Greater Wilmington.

THE AMERICA'S CUP AND THE COAST GUARD

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the 1967 America's Cup challenge is over, and once again the cup stays home. We are naturally proud that the U.S. crew has marked up its 20th win since the cup races started in 1870. I would like also to pay tribute to the valiant Australian crew for displaying the high level of sportsmanship that one traditionally associates with this great sporting event.

Skipper Jock Sturrock, of the Australian entry, *Dame Pattie*, certainly deserves credit for the valiant effort he and his crew made. And as for the American crew and skipper, Bus Mosbacher, they have apparently been rightly labeled as the best yachtsmen in the world.

Despite the impressive four-win sweep by the U.S. crew, the New York Yacht Club, which has been the cup's home for the last 117 years, has been contacted by possible challengers for a series of challenge races in 1970. When a formal challenge is extended and accepted, we in Rhode Island look forward to hosting the races off Newport in the waters of Narragansett Bay.

I particularly wish to call attention to the activities of the U.S. Coast Guard which brilliantly performed a very difficult mission at the cup races: to patrol the races without a serious mishap among the hundreds of spectator craft despite heavy fogs and high winds from an approaching hurricane.

The vast armada of spectator craft included thousand-passenger ferries and steamers, luxurious yachts, weatherworn scows, and tugboats, Boston whalers, sailing vessels, and tiny outboard motorboats. They moved at various speeds and maneuvered on every conceivable course, each trying to get the best view possible of the competing yachts. Without an efficient patrol squadron to shepherd them safely around the perimeter of the course, there would undoubtedly have been numerous collisions and interferences with the races.

To perform the monumental task of marking a course for the competing yachts, keeping it clear of spectator craft, and enforcing special local regulations, one of the largest group of Coast Guard units ever assembled in peacetime formed the America's Cup Patrol Squadron. The service had 33 of its vessels and two of its helicopters, assisted by four Navy destroyers in the Squadron.

During the third race a dramatic rescue was carried out before the eyes of thousands of on-the-spot eyewitnesses, and through the news media, before the eyes of the world. A 13-foot catboat wandered onto the course and tipped over directly in the path of the competing yachts. Many newsmen erroneously reported that the small sailboat was blown over by the rotors of the Coast Guard helicopter coming to warn them to clear the course, but investigation proved that the boat tipped before the helicopter approached close enough to create any turbulence.

At other times during the races, the cabin cruiser *Block Island*, a Navy barge, the cabin cruiser *Anna Bell* and the fishing boat, *North Star*, became disabled and were towed by Coast Guard vessels. The cabin cruiser *Tinkerbell* almost sank, but was pumped out and towed to port. The cabin cruiser *Evalina* became disabled; but an engineman from the cutter *Hamilton* repaired the engine on the spot so that occupants did not have to miss the race. The excursion steamer, *Bay Belle*, ran aground in heavy fog on the way to the fourth race. Several Coast Guard vessels rushed to the scene before the steamer managed to free herself.

Capt. Richard E. Hoover, of Derry, N.H., was patrol commander, responsible for the entire operation of the patrol. His squadron included three high endurance cutters, one of which was the new 378-foot cutter, *Hamilton*, largest vessel ever built for the Coast Guard. The *Active* and *Vigilant*, new 210-foot vessels with helicopter flight decks, were among the four medium endurance cutters. There were two 125-foot cutters, four 95-foot patrol boats, five 82-foot patrol boats, 16 40-foot utility boats, and two helicopters. Four Navy destroyers were also in the squadron—the *Charles H. Roan, Zellers, Forrest Sherman,* and *Warrington.*

In order to cover this sports event, Lt. M. R. Dumas, public information officer for the squadron, assigned spaces on suitable vessels to 250 cameramen, photographers, and writers. As a result, there was much more extensive nationwide and worldwide coverage of this sports event which has such a significant influence on national prestige.

Mr. President, I consider that our Coast Guard has earned a resounding "Well done."

SOUTH VIETNAM'S ARMED FORCES

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, an interesting article concerning South Vietnam's armed forces was published in many newspapers yesterday. The article, written by Peter Arnett, of the Associated Press, probably the most experienced and knowledgeable of the hundreds of American reporters now in Vietnam, paints a very bleak picture of the leadership, spirit, and capacity of the Vietnamese forces. It quotes Secretary McNamara as saying in February 1964:

> I don't believe that we as a nation should assume the primary responsibility for the war in South Vietnam.
>
> It is a counterguerrilla war, it is a war that can only be won by the Vietnamese themselves. Our responsibility is not to substitute ourselves for the Vietnamese, but to train them to carry on the operations that they themselves are capable of.

Instead of a force eager to win the war for "themselves," Mr. Arnett concludes that:

> A reluctance to come to grips with the enemy has characterized the Vietnamese military effort since the war began in earnest in 1961 . . .
>
> Whatever the reasons, there can be no question that the Vietnamese army has failed completely in its mission of overpowering the Communist guerrilla movement.

With American casualties totaling nearly twice those of the South Vietnamese so far this year, there is little doubt about whose soldiers are bearing the primary burden of fighting this war. Mr. Arnett does not give Americans any reason to hope that the South Vietnamese are taking the steps necessary to "assume the primary responsibility" for the war—a responsibility which the United States voluntarily assumed only 1 year after Secretary McNamara said we must not do so.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star Sept. 17, 1967]

SOUTH VIETNAM'S ARMY FOUND INCREASINGLY INEFFECTIVE

(By Peter Arnett)

SAIGON.—The dispirited Vietnamese army, shot through with inefficiency, often lacks the will of combat and is increasingly prone to let the Americans do the fighting.

Fighting statistics and a detailed survey of field operations bear out this observation. In much of the country the Vietnamese military effort has steadily tailed off as that of the Americans increased.

The size of the South Vietnamese army has doubled since 1962, yet the number killed has held constant at about 10,000 a year. In the first six months of 1967, the army lost 5,495 men. The statistics are so constant from year to year as to raise questions about their validity.

By contrast, U.S. forces, having lost 2,532 killed in the first six months of 1966, lost 4,909 in the first six months of 1967, when the number of Americans engaged had doubled.

Nowhere in the country can the South Vietnamese military be said to have made real gains against the enemy. Meanwhile allied forces, including the Americans, the Koreans and the Australians, have wrested vast areas from direct Communist control.

Events have shown clearly that the Vietnamese army must play its role, and play it well, if there is to be any hope of lasting success against the Communists. The U.S. Army is clearly limited in the depth it can reach into the countryside to crush the foe and hold ground.

In no instance, however, have the allies been willing to hand over surveillance of any of the territory won to Vietnamese units. Allied commanders fear the Communists would be in charge again within weeks.

COSTS U.S. LIVES

An extensive survey of the situation established these points:

South Vietnamese military ineffectiveness costs American lives—in the ambushing of convoys on roads supposedly cleared by Vietnamese troops, in the mortaring of U.S. installations by squads that slip past sleeping Vietnamese sentries, in sniping by guerrillas who move freely past Vietnamese outposts.

Most South Vietnamese troops insist on a 5½-day week, taking Saturdays and Sundays off, while their allies and the Viet Cong go on fighting.

American battalions seeking to break up enemy units operate through the night hours. So do the Viet Cong. The South Vietnamese quit when the sun goes down.

Many South Vietnamese operations are staged in areas where no guerrillas are known to be. Huge troop concentrations are deployed in areas where small numbers of the enemy are hidden. Outnumbered, the Communists decline to stand and fight.

Only two of the 44 generals in the South Vietnamese forces in 1963 are still holding their rank. The others have been purged. This has sharply impaired morale in the command echelons.

Desertions from the South Vietnamese army are running at the rate of 10,000 a month and are expected to total more than 400,000 by the end of the year. This is twice as many men as the service lost to battle casualties.

Corruption is common at all levels of the army.

The loss of American lives traceable to Vietnamese inaction or incompetence can be expected to rise directly in proportion to the depth U.S. forces deploy in the countryside. American battalions already are operating independently in districts and villages. This trend is expected to continue.

ASK COMMAND SHIFT

Some Americans are demanding that the United States be given a command role over the Vietnamese army, similar to that held over South Korean forces during the Korean War.

Relays of senior officials from Washington, visiting Vietnam, are being told, "If we have to see the war through, we will have to assume command responsibility eventually. Why not start now?"

There has been an affirmative response to these views by most of the Washington visitors, a reliable source reported. But no indications of pressure on the Vietnamese at the top levels of government have come to light.

"No one will pick up the ball and run with it," one frustrated U.S. official exclaimed.

Part of the high-level reluctance might stem from the perennial official viewpoint that the Vietnamese armed forces are performing satisfactorily and up to expectations.

In February 1964, Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara predicted that the United States would pull out most of its troops the following year.

"I don't believe that we as a nation should assume the primary responsibility for the war in South Vietnam," McNamara said then.

"It is a counterguerrilla war, it is a war that can only be won by the Vietnamese themselves. Our responsibility is not to substitute ourselves for the Vietnamese, but to train them to carry on the operations that they themselves are capable of."

On Aug. 14 this year, Gen. William C. Westmoreland, the U.S. commander in Vietnam, struck out at critics of South Vietnamese military effectiveness.

"I can say categorically that the Vietnamese armed forces are making steady progress," Westmoreland told an interviewer. "They are far better than they were a year ago and this is evident from their discipline, their performance on the battlefield and the successes they are enjoying against the enemy."

Last month Gen. Wallace M. Greene, Jr., commandant of the Marine Corps, said that six visits to Vietnam had convinced him that "the South Vietnamese forces are doing a first class job" and "are carrying their share."

CASUALTY LISTS

Frequent visits to the field with Vietnamese units, talks with Vietnamese and American officers and men, and a close examination of results of operations give no indication that the Vietnamese military has changed much since the days when it was fighting the Communists alone and getting beaten.

A typical week of the war shows this trend all too clearly.

In this particular week, ending Aug. 5, the 80 American combat battalions in Vietnam suffered 186 dead and 1,064 wounded in operations that ranged from just south of Saigon to the demilitarized zone.

The 100 battalions of Vietnamese regular troops operating in these same regions lost 32 dead and 60 wounded.

In that same week, U.S. Marines operating in the 1st Corps region lost 110 men killed.

The 30 Vietnamese battalions in the corps area lost 6 killed.

More than 60 percent of Vietnamese killed that week were not in the Vietnamese regular battalions. These deaths occurred at the lowest level of the war among the neglected, low-paid regional and popular forces.

The mission of these forces, who comprise nearly one-half of the total Vietnamese armed forces, is to defend towns, villages and bridges against the Viet Cong.

They perform this mission from mud, brick, or concrete outposts, often cringing in fear at an approaching enemy, only occasionally attempting to fight off an attacking force, and usually dying after throwing their weapons away and attempting to run, hide or surrender.

Such an outpost was overrun three times in this manner on Route 4—major artery from Saigon to the Mekong delta, in three nights in late July.

The statistics indicate that only one-third of the Vietnamese killed in the war lose their lives in offensive operations against the enemy. This one-third comes from the regular Vietnamese units arrayed in 10 infantry divisions, one armored division, an airborne division and 20 ranger battalions. These total 285,000 men.

The remaining losses come from the 283,000 regional and popular forces who live and die in their thousands of outposts scattered across the face of Vietnam.

AMERICAN LOSSES

Nearly all American losses are taken on offensive operations. The official kill ratio of 1 U.S. dead to 10 of the enemy reflects this aggressive stance.

The regular Vietnamese army claims a 1-3.6 ratio against the enemy and the popular forces about 1-1. These ratios are based on enemy killed counts that often are fanciful.

Americans battalions stay out in the field at night as a matter of course to achieve their results. All the battalions of the 2nd Brigade, U.S. 25th division, based out of Cu Chi, northwest of Saigon, were out 28 nights each in July.

None of the battalions of the nearest regiment of the Vietnamese 25th division stayed out a single night that month.

One of the best regiments in the Vietnamese army, the 33rd of the 21st Division in the southern delta, spent only 46 battalion days in the field in July out of a possible 120 battalion days—that is, 30 days for each of the regiment's four battalions. At no time did a battalion stay out at night, not in the operational area anyway. Night duty for a Vietnamese battalion is guarding the perimeter of an outpost or a town.

A reluctance to come to grips with the enemy has characterized the Vietnamese military effort since the war began in earnest in 1961 with 15,000 armed Viet Cong guerrillas exploding into action, terrorizing villagers, blowing bridges and overrunning outposts.

In the days of President Ngo Dinh Diem, field commanders were recalled for suffering too many casualties. The practice of operating judiciously to keep casualties at an acceptable figure may well have continued.

Whatever the reasons, there can be no question that the Vietnamese army has failed completely in its mission of overpowering the Communist guerrilla movement.

Official statistics over the years would have one believe otherwise. But there are statistics and statistics.

Walls of all the numerous U.S. advisory commands are dizzy with green, red and yellow lines that spiral ever upward, always indicating greater and greater progress within the Vietnamese army.

At the headquarters of the 4th Corps Region at Can Tho, a smiling American colonel, an adviser to Vietnamese forces, says, "Our percentage of major operations (one battalion or larger) are dropping off this year, but the percentage of contact is increasing. Better intelligence, you know."

The statistics don't say that in all these operations, the enemy was given the field of battle each evening because government forces in the delta like to get home before dark.

How, then, can progress be measured in a place like the Mekong Delta, still mostly in the bailiwick of the Vietnamese military?

One index is the estimated enemy strength, 80,000 at last count. At least half of them are considered tough, skilled fighters.

The enemy estimate is the same as last year, but twice as high as the previous year, which was twice as high as the year preceding that. With the kind of progress being made in the delta these days, the Vietnam war could last indefinitely.

Last July, half as many government troops were killed as in July 1966. The number of enemy killed halved, also.

The truth in the delta seems to be that a status quo exists, with the Saigon government hanging on to the province and district capitals and the immediate environs and with the Viet Cong holding out in their lairs.

The canals and roads are contested on occasion but generally the Viet Cong leave them open and collect tribute for their use.

As has been shown in the rest of Vietnam, only the infusion of American troops is likely to upset the status quo. This has happened in Gia Dinh Province, which surrounds Saigon, in Long An Province to the south and in Hau Nghia Province to the west.

By relentless operations, day and night, American troops have managed to break down the enemy battalions into small groups. They have them on the run, and search for them continuously.

The Vietnamese army has failed to achieve this result anywhere in the country. It does, sometimes, have major battles with the enemy, killing many and capturing sizable caches of weapons.

And some of the elite Vietnamese marine and airborne units compare with American battalions.

But the sustained effort that brings results has not been forthcoming from the Vietnamese. U.S. authorities now are talking about the need for two divisions of U.S. troops to help pacify the delta.

PERFORM SPOTTILY

The preformance of Vietnamese regular battalions has hardly varied over the years.

The 20 highly trained ranger battalions still perform spottily. Only five of them killed more than 100 Viet Cong last year, and the highest had 255 kills. U.S. officers believe that, if properly utilized, a Ranger battalion should kill 600 to 900 enemy a year.

How can the Vietnamese be persuaded to utilize their units better? Many Americans argue for a joint command, with an American at the top.

Short of that, they would like a strong voice in the selection of commanding officers.

An outspoken Vietnamese province chief commented, "The one big mistake the United States made when it sent combat troops into Vietnam was not to demand the right to relieve and appoint Vietnamese officers. You are paying for it now."

"There are plenty of young, aggressive, honest officers around," one U.S. official commented. "I have a list of them."

U.S. military commanders in the field resort to various and subtle techniques of leverage.

A senior American in the delta entices his three-star general Vietnamese counterpart into taking field trips with him, casually discussing area problems within his earshot.

This technique apparently satisfies the general's ego to the degree that he sometimes comes around to his American adviser the next day with a solution.

An American corps commander presents his Vietnamese counterpart with a list of five problems, no more no less, each Friday. By resubmitting the same problems he hopes that eventually he will get something done about them.

LOGISTICS TROUBLES

Logistics problems in the Vietnamese army remain almost insoluble.

"The army is organized on American lines except for the logistics," one U.S. general explained. "Under the crazy French system they use, if an armored vehicle has its tires blown off in the foothills, the driver has to take the tires to Saigon so he can get new ones.

"There is equipment lying all over this country that could be repaired easily if the red tape was cut."

Vietnamese commanders are military dilettantes when it comes to running an operation.

A division commander generally will deploy and control his battalions himself, unwilling to trust them to his chain of command.

If he goes off for lunch or to a political conference, the operation will collapse because no one else dares give orders.

There are no long-range patrols made in the Vietnamese army, even though these patrols have proved most effective in every American unit in the country.

"We could never get any volunteers to go out in enemy territory in groups of four or five men like the Americans do," a regimental adviser said.

Political loyalty still dominates in the appointment of officers. "There are majors in Saigon more powerful than generals in the field," one U.S. adviser commented. Leadership remains one of the great weaknesses.

ADMIT CORRUPTION

There is corruption at all levels. A province chief, holding the rank of colonel, commented, "Of course there is corruption. My salary is 17,000 piasters (about $150) each month.

"With that I have to feed, clothe and educate my family, support myself and pay for your breakfast and all the other breakfasts and dinners that I, as province chief, have to give.

"Can I be anything else but corrupt when the Americans pay 20,000 piasters salary each month to just an interpreter?"

Vietnamese troops, particularly the low-grade regional and popular forces personnel, are poorly paid.

Said a regimental commander, "My men live like pigs, in shacks, in squalor. They are forced to make love under the trees when their wives visit them. How can they be motivated with so little?"

A Vietnamese division commander complained, "American troops have helicopters, much artillery, many aircraft. Give us all these things and let us try. If we cannot do the job, then you can take over."

Vietnamese soldiers conduct themselves as their armies have for decades in much of the country, stealing and looting in the villages.

A regimental commander remarked, "I will not condone my soldiers stealing chickens, but I accept it. Our logistics system is so bad, what else will they eat?"

There are elaborate plans afoot for the improvement of the Vietnamese military, including the addition of 60,000 new troops, most of them militiamen.

There is talk of breaking down some divisions into mobile groups, similar to those used by the French.

TRAINING PLANS

Elaborate new training programs are being devised, with a four-year curriculum instead of a two-year course, at the Military Academy in Dalat.

Next year Vietnam will begin its version of a national defense college patterned after the U.S. War College.

American units are beginning to work with Vietnamese battalions. But at no time have the Vietnamese been prepared to relinquish even a fraction of command. And the benefits of having Americans near at hand can boomerang.

An adviser with one of the Vietnamese ranger battalions working with the U.S. 199th Brigade commented, "This integration has ruined any chance there was that my battalion would ever operate independently. Now they depend completely on the U.S.

"They know what Americans will do for them. All I do now is settle disputes between them and the Americans."

Rach Kien, a district town in Long An Province south of Saigon, was pacified by successive battalions of American troops who operated day and night in the paddy fields and the swamps of the district.

A Vietnamese battalion, from the 25th Division, worked with the Americans and, according to senior Americans, "caught fire with enthusiasm."

In early August, American commanders judged the time was almost ripe for the Vietnamese battalion to take over security of the area itself. The U.S. unit would move on.

At the last minute, the Vietnamese division commander pulled his battalion back to home base for security guard, with no explanations.

The American battalion was left in Rach Kien to continue the tough endless task of seeking the guerrillas in the paddy fields and in the leach-infested swamps.

THE REASONS FOR AMERICAN INVOLVEMENT IN VIETNAM HAVE NOT CHANGED—THE PRESIDENT AT SAN ANTONIO RESTATES THE U.S. POSITION

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, in a logical manner, the New Orleans Times-Picayune analyzed President Johnson's recent address on Vietnam and called it—

> An effective presentation—the kind of review needed to keep the public informed and mindful of the issues and the nature of the task.

The President, in his San Antonio speech, restated the reasons why we are there. Those reasons have not changed from the days when Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy committed the United States to help South Vietnam.

The President repeated his public offer to Hanoi of negotiations anywhere at any time. That offer has not changed.

The President underscored a widely shared belief that—

> By seeing this struggle through now in Vietnam, we are reducing the chances of a larger war.

He has said that before. And those who lived through a former era might recall Munich and the Nazis, and China and Korea, and the Japanese.

Aggressors are rarely satisfied with just a little "living space." They must have large chunks of the world.

The Times-Picayune concluded its editorial by saying:

> The speech probably will not convince Ho of anything, but it should help a good many unsure Americans to adjust to the fact that despite the frustrations of this kind of war, there is a job that must be done.

I ask consent to have printed in the Record the editorial entitled "War Reasons Still the Same," published in the Times-Picayune October 2, 1967.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

War Reasons Still the Same

President Johnson's answer to doubters about the Vietnam war is that all the elements that induced the United States to enter the fight are still valid and present, that the U.S. goals must be reached regardless of the time it takes, and that the armed forces will be provided with all that it takes to do the job.

The speech at San Antonio was an effective presentation. If there was little of anything new, it was, nevertheless, the kind of review needed to keep the public informed and mindful of the issues and the nature of the task. New, perhaps, was the strongly conciliatory note which emphasized that the U.S. is not only willing to stop bombing and naval bombardment if Hanoi will refrain from taking advantage of it, but that the President is ready to talk peace with Ho Chi Minh "tomorrow".

Three presidents, Mr. Johnson pointed out, have judged the attack on South Vietnam, to be outright, unadulterated Communist aggression; that the leaders of free Southeastern Asia nations, including the Philippines, Indonesia, Thailand, Australia and New Zealand have pronounced Hanoi's aggression a threat to the freedom of the whole area; that Communist guerrillas or cadres are now engaged in Thailand, Laos and Burma. For its own protection, and for the independence of small nations which ask assistance, he said, the United States has committed itself by treaties and the actions of Congress to resort to such force as necessary to repel attack.

"I am convinced," declared Mr. Johnson, "that by seeing this struggle through now, in Vietnam, that we are reducing the chances of a larger war—perhaps a nuclear war."

To the "can't win" complainants in the U.S., the President answered that there is progress: The military victory almost within the adversary's grasp in 1965, has been denied; the proportion of the people in South Vietnam living under Viet Cong control has been reduced to under 20 per cent; the secure proportion has grown from about 45 per cent to 65 per cent; in the still contested areas "the tide continues to run with us." Due to the skill of American medicine, said Mr. Johnson, some 79,000 out of the 85,000 U.S. wounded have returned, or will return shortly, to duty.

Signs of progress, the President held, included the elected, representative government that is about to take over at Saigon.

Omitted in the address was any discussion of the escalated bombing (Haiphong), and such things as the attitude of Russia or Red China.

Nothing in the address suggested that the war will not be a long one. But the President did maintain that it was futile for Hanoi, in view of the military and political progress in the South, and the burden of the bombing of the North, to enter into a contest of endurance. It has been the costly habit of totalitarians, he averred, to think they could outstay free countries but they have been wrong.

The speech probably will not convince Ho of anything, but it should help a good many unsure Americans to adjust to the fact that despite the frustrations of this kind of war, there is a job that must be done.

COMPUTER PRIVACY: A "SWORD OF DAMOCLES"

· **Mr. LONG of Missouri.** Mr. President, a recent report of the Commission To Study the Organization of Peace makes the recommendation that computers and privacy, and electronic invasions of privacy, are future problems which must be considered by the United Nations.

The Commission urges that it is extremely important to consider the advisability of any national data center. If such a data center is, in fact, established, the Commission suggests that it be provided with "sufficient safeguards with respect to the maximum accuracy of the data, their confidentiality, access to them, and the permissibility of their use in situations involving an invasion of individual privacy."

Presently, the Commission reports:

> The multiplicity of agencies and procedures and the resulting redtape protect the individual against undue invasion of his privacy by making it more difficult for various Government officials to know enough to cause real trouble.

But, says the Commission, if the information is gathered together into a Federal data bank, "a 'sword of Damocles' is going to hang all the time over the head of everybody."

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the relevant portions of the 18th Report of the Commission To Study the Organization of Peace, and also an editorial published in the Kansas City Star of September 11, 1967, which discusses these same problems.

There being no objection, the report and editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The United Nations and Human Rights

(The 18th report by the Commission To Study the Organization of Peace)

(Excerpts from report, pp. 41–43)

2. COMPUTERS AND PRIVACY

There is another immediate problem raised by the machine age. Recent hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress have given us a glimpse into the relationship between computers and the privacy of the individual. The subcommittee considered proposals for a National Data Center into which would be poured all the information about each person in the United States which has been collected in the past by various Federal and state agencies. Subcenters would also be established though which qualified persons would obtain access to the information thus collected. It is quite obvious that a large amount of the data thus collected would not consist of hard facts but would include a lot of unverified and unverifiable information obtained through interviews, conversations, electronic eavesdropping, or paid or voluntary informers. There is also the grave danger that unauthorized persons might gain access to this information for personal use, including the possibility of blackmail. But even authorized use by the government itself of this mass of data raises the specter of a government which knows all or which, having found that it does not know enough, devises further methods of obtaining the portion of the data which is still missing. One of the important features of a democratic government is the doctrine of the separation of powers which makes it difficult for any branch of the government to jeopardize the fundamental rights of the individuals. Certainly, at present, the multiplicity of agencies and procedures and the resulting red tape protect the individual against undue invasion of his privacy by making it more difficult for various government officials to know enough to cause real trouble. But if all the available data are integrated and stored in a computer in a way permitting instantaneous access to the record of each person, a sword of Damocles is going to hang all the time over the head of everybody. Even the best of us have done something which can be easily blown up out of proportion, or have offended somebody who would be glad to deposit a little misinformation in our file.

In addition, there is always the possibility of misfiling, of mistaken identities, or pure spite and vindictiveness of casual acquaintances with warped personalities. On the other hand, it seems quite impossible to envisage a process which would purify the data in the computer through properly protected legal proceedings. Considering the effort required to check the incomplete data which are now available to various agencies, when they have to decide on the employment of persons in positions which are sensitive from the point of view of national security, one can easily see that there are not enough investigators, funds, and, in case of dispute, judges to deal even with one hundredth of the problem. It is, therefore, doubly important to consider the advisability of the whole scheme and, in case of its execution, to provide sufficient safeguards with respect to the maximum accuracy of the data, their confidentiality, access to them, and the permissibility of their use in situations involving an invasion of individual privacy.

3. ELECTRONIC INVASIONS OF PRIVACY

Another technological development which has already started to cause justified apprehensions is the development of electronic devices which can spy on all conversations whether conducted through telephone or in one's home or office. Future adaptation to similar spying tasks of microtelevision cameras which would be able to see everything happening within a private room, would create even a more intolerable invasion of privacy. The matter is already of great concern in many countries, especially because of its application in business espionage, and safeguards are needed against both governmental and private use of these devices.

[From the Kansas City Star, Sept. 11, 1967]

Computerized Life: But Who Shall Govern the Governors?

The warning has come from an impressive source. A long-established American commission has called upon the United Nations as a matter of urgency, to study the implications of the computer and similar scientific-technological developments as they affect the basic rights of the individual.

In substance, the issue posed by the 74 commission members who signed this year's annual report boils down to whether such mechanisms and procedures shall be the servants of humanity—or its master. Those who concurred in the report—and they include some of our country's leading citizens—are not at all sure of the ultimate result. But they appear agreed on one point: Unless we, the people, carefully protect our rights, certain recent lines of "progress" could spell a collective disaster.

"There is," the report declares, "a cumulative danger involved in the merry march of technology and science without adequate consideration of the social effects of their findings . . . New arrangements will have to be devised to control the precious few who know how to run the machines and on whose wisdom and impartiality the fate of mankind may depend."

For instance, the commissioners view with deep concern the potentially massive invasion of privacy and freedom of choice that might flow from comprehensive data processing, plus investigatory techniques, at the government level, already being enthusiastically proposed. Not only would the individual thus be (or believe himself to be) under surveillance at every turn. The whole system could invite attempts, on the part of necessarily fallible programers, to plan our personal lives in the minutest detail and even make our public decisions for us, as well.

The report expresses a similar apprehension, should various opportunities inherent in new genetic discoveries be employed so as to reshape the human race to conform with values which happen to be held by a handful of scientists. "A dangerous combination of government officials and experts might thus start prescribing, in the name of the greatest good for all, who can marry whom and for how long, who cannot have any children and who should have the maximum possible."

An ignorant nightmare? Look at the list of signers—Frank P. Graham, Clark M. Eichelberger, Walter Reuther, Norman Cousins, Luther Evens. . . . A reactionary demand to "turn the clock back"? By no means. Only a vivid reminder that essentially the same considerations apply here that have led intelligent men and women through the ages to reject tyranny dressed up as more efficient rule by a superior elite. Modern methods of mass repression allowed Adolf Hitler to enslave a nation and drive it to near-destruction. All the commission's report says, in effect, is that we must take care not to permit the abuse of automation and scientific knowledge to drive us into a comparable—and perhaps still more insidious—dilemma.

Power, whether political or technological, corrupts. And the more absolute the power, the more absolutely it corrupts.

RURAL-TO-URBAN SHIFT IN POPULATION

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, again this morning, an editorial in the Washington Post calls attention to the need in America to slow down the rural-to-urban shift of our population. The editorial mentions several efforts now being made in Congress and elsewhere to focus attention on this problem.

As a joint sponsor with the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] of the Rural Job Development Act of 1967, now pending in the Committee on Finance, I am pleased to see this additional call for national discussion of this serious national problem. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Rural and Urban Poverty

More and more voices are being raised in suport of an idea to which Secretary of Agriculture Freeman again reverted last Friday when he declared that urban problems need to be attacked in rural areas. The folly of making urban poor out of the rural poor is being more widely recognized. Instead of accepting the notion that rural emigration is inevitable—or even admirable—the idea is arising that megalopolis may not be the answer to all our social and economic and political problems.

The Office of Regional Resources and Development at Ithaca, N.Y., has been putting forward for consideration a proposal that larger metropolitan centers be decentralized. The Director, Oliver C. Winston, has pointed out that many of the larger cities are reaching a point at which it is "almost impossible to deal wtih human problems on a human scale." This office has urged the study of ways to develop the potential of the country's 300 cities with 50,000 to 500,000 residents. And it has urged that we explore what might be done with 5000 towns of betwen 2500 and 50,000 people. Emigration off the farms has to be accepted as a technological inevitability, but emigration from rural to urban areas should not be accepted as unavoidable.

Senator Proxmire and Senator Mundt have introduced a resolution directing the Joint Economic Committee to study the question of population movements. Senator Monroney proposed an amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act, providing funds for a study of ways to "assure a more effective use of human and natural resources of rural America." The Republican Coordinating Committee recently produced a task force paper on "revitalizing our rural areas."

Practical measures to disperse some industries once heavily concentrated in urban areas are also under way. The canning industry and the meat packing industry lead in decentralizing their production. Much American industry, no longer dependent on heavy raw material, locally generated power, access to pools of traditional crafts or availability of local markets, is beginning to explore relocation to areas where employes can live better lives for less money.

The Secretary of Agriculture gave one rough illustration of alternative costs when he suggested that it would be better to subsidize a rural family at the rate of $1000 a year for 20 years than it would be to build an urban dwelling for them at a cost of $20,000. This homely figure helps to point the financial case for checking the flood of poverty that is inundating urban centers. The larger case of course, is to be made in all the other advantages of a good life that could be provided in a rural setting and that no amount of expenditure can provide in some urban slum settings.

This is a hopeful trend of thought. The inescapable logic behind it ought to enlist the support of more thoughtful and reflective people.

LETTER FROM 1ST LT. THOMAS F. REGAN, FALLS CHURCH, VA., BEFORE HIS DEATH IN VIETNAM

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, Sunday's Washington Post carried a moving letter written by a young Marine officer, 1st Lt. Thomas F. Regan, of Falls Church, Va., who died on September 18 in the swollen waters of the Camlo River in Vietnam. This young lieutenant wrote his parents:

> I am in the right place at the right time. If anyone asks you about why I am here or tries to tell you that I just happened to be in the wrong place at the wrong time and it's all very unfortunate, show them this letter.

Mr. President, Mr. and Mrs. John M. Regan have done just that. They have shown their son's letter to all Americans who care, and I think we in the Senate should pay heed. I ask unanimous consent that Lieutenant Regan's letter, as it appeared in the Washington Post on October 8, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"I Am in the Right Place at the Right Time"

(NOTE.—The accompanying letter was written by 1st Lt. Thomas F. Regan, 23, of 3812 Foxwood Nook, Falls Church, about a month after he arrived in Vietnam last May. On Sept. 18 he was drowned when he and seven other Marines were caught in the swollen Camlo River. He died trying to help the others, according to a letter from his commanding officer to his parents, Mr. and Mrs. John M. Regan.

(Lt. Regan was a graduate of the Marine Platoon Leader Training Program at Quantico and served as a forward artillery observer. He also was a sociology graduate of Wheeling (W. Va.) College in June, 1966, and had worked for several summers with retarded children.

(His brother Michael, 26, served ten months in Vietnam as an Army first lieutenant. He also leaves a 19-year-old sister, Mary. His father is a lawyer in the General Counsel's Office of the General Services Administration.)

DEAR FAMILY: Another short letter to let you know that everything is O.K. with me.

In a couple of days we are going out in a company-size operation where we have been before. We made no contact in this particular area before but hope to have better luck this time. Even if we don't find anything, we are still making it difficult for the NVAs to mass together, and this is one of the main reasons why they aren't making any great military progress (or any other, for that matter).

In one section of The Post that you sent me, there was an article which said that this war may be unwinnable. This is true of any war if you let it be. I am not too sure of the feelings of the people in the States, but there is no doubt in my mind—and I think the same applies to Ho Chi Minh—that we are winning.

Our progress is slow but positive. The enemy's is sliding and negative. To be more specific, we are beating them clearly militarily and, most important, we are winning the people. The NVAs are losing this most important part of the war. Proof of this is their resort to violence and terror to control the people. This can do nothing but alienate the people.

In this part of the war, our progress is very slow because we just don't have the troops to protect all the people and chase after the NVA. But gradually we are winning this because we can give the people a better way of life—one free of the fear of having the village leaders killed, the males impressed into servitude and an unfair amount of their rice taken away.

This "resolution" is not a popular one with the South Vietnamese. Many have been forced into it. Don't be fooled for a minute by those who say we are interfering with the Vietnamese people's right to self-determination. We are interfering with a minority's option to do this, but that same minority is interfering with the majority's right not to choose a life offered by Ho.

The only thing I am really worried about is the fact that some people are becoming annoyed at our slow progress and that American support for this effort may dwindle as time goes on. I think that this is Ho Chi Minh's big hope. Is our country suddenly going to find the price too high to pay for the ideal that we pledged to support before it started actually affecting us?

If anyone ever asks you why Americans should fight over here when it's not really affecting America, tell them that our country pledged its support to the cause of a free South Vietnamese people. This was given the approval of Congress, the representatives of the people. If the people didn't want this to happen, they could have said so then. It's easier to say "Why let Americans die over there now?" than it was to say then, "No, we won't pledge American support for the Vietnamese people because it may cost us too much."

I don't mind honest protest by individuals with unselfish motives, but the selfishness expressed in a lot of newspapers and magazines by "respectable" people bothers me. It can poison the minds of others.

I know that there is nothing black or white that can really be said about this, but we should keep in mind that this is supposed to be for the Vietnamese people. My reason for being here is not to protect America from some future war because the rest of the world has fallen to communism. I have no great fear of this. My reason for being here is so the Vietnamese people can live with freedom—the kind we have in America.

If anything should happen to me, I want you to know that I am over here voluntarily. I want to be here and I know exactly why I want to be here. I feel that it would not be a waste or tragedy if anything happened to me.

I think that this cause is as worthy as any that we have fought for. We knew that Hitler was wrong and was butchering the Jews but we didn't enter World War II—until it threatened us. Over here, we have not that much to gain for ourselves but we can do so much for the Vietnamese.

I don't particularly enjoy my work here, but neither does the guy who collects trash in the morning. Both jobs are necessary and the trashman can take pride in his job as I do in mine.

I guess I got a little carried away in telling you why I am here and my views about this. I didn't want there to be any doubt in your mind.

I know that from reading the papers and listening to the radio and watching TV, you can get very confused about this war because so many different things are said and because a lot of it doesn't seem to tie in together. I don't expect this letter to help any of you to understand all the different things said about this war but I hope it gives you as clear a picture as possible of why I am here.

If anyone asks you about why I am here or tries to tell you that I just happened to be in the wrong place at the wrong time and it's all very unfortunate, show them this letter and tell them that I think I am in the right place at the right time and want to be here.

Well, so long for now, and pray that I do my best.

Love,

Tom.

A NEW INSTRUMENT FOR PEACEFUL COOPERATION

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, 10 years after the world entered the age of space, President Lyndon Johnson has placed his signature on a treaty which guarantees that 84 nations will work together for the peaceful development of space.

Today is a historic day for all those who have worked arduously on this fine document.

But no person could have been more proud than the President himself.

More than any other American, Lyndon Johnson moved his country forward steadily and wisely into the age of peaceful space exploration.

Nine years ago, President Johnson said:

> Until now our strivings toward peace have been heavily burdened by legacies of distrust and fear and ignorance and injury. Those legacies do not exist in space. They will not appear there unless we send them on ahead.

Today, the President demonstrated that the United States does not intend space to be a theater of war or conflict; rather, it will be an arena of trust and cooperation and joint scientific adventure.

The President has followed the journey of the Outer Space Treaty from its first days as a hopeful idea to its present status as a signed and accepted treaty covering almost three-quarters of the nations of the civilized world.

A month after the dramatic orbiting of the first Russian sputnik, the then Senator Johnson, as chairman of the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee, took the initiative and led the first congressional hearings on the status of the U.S. satellite program which resulted in a new comprehensive space research effort.

Later, as Vice President Johnson, and chairman of the Space Council, he was responsible for fostering our lunar exploration program and perfecting a communications satellite.

A decade ago, the United States was not a leader in space exploration. Today, it is.

A decade ago, there was no treaty binding nations together for the peaceful exploration of space. Today, there is.

The facts clearly dictate that much of the credit for America's role in space, and much of the credit for this treaty must go to the President himself.

I commend the President and the Senate for fashioning this new instrument of peace.

GUN CONTROL LEGISLATION

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, an editorial published recently in the Louisville Times opens with the observation that:

> Opposition to the gun-control bill now before Congress is more noise than numbers.

The editorial goes on to point out that according to a nationwide survey conducted by the Louis Harris organization, 66 percent of the American people now favor strict gun-control legislation. Indeed, a large majority of Americans would go far beyond the present administration proposal and favor registration of firearms and gun permits.

In spite of this overwhelming popular support, however, until recently there has been precious little activity in Congress on this vital question. Not until President Johnson made his forceful address to the International Association of Chiefs of Police in Kansas City and followed it up with personal appeals to the Vice President and the Speaker of the House did Congress begin to move.

Now, however, the climate has changed. Activity on gun control legislation, fanned by the editorial pages of our great newspapers across the country, is finally gaining momentum.

I regretfully agree with the editors of the Louisville Times that "the opposition's campaign of misrepresentation so far has enjoyed more success than it deserves." It is time Congress looked behind the "noisy" few who oppose effective gun controls to the million of Americans who want, and desperately need, the protection this legislation would afford.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Louisville Times editorial, entitled "Gun Registration Finds Support," be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Gun Registration Finds Support

Opposition to the gun-control bill now before Congress is more noise than numbers. This is borne out by polls showing public sentiment heavily weighted in favor of effective restrictions on firearms sales. Even among gun-owning white Americans this sentiment prevails by a two-to-one margin, according to a survey just announced by the Louis Harris organization.

This is a sizable segment of the population, representing 54 per cent of the nation's homes. The poll did not cover nonwhites, nor did it seek out the attitude of anyone not now in possession of a gun of some sort.

Among the gun-owning whites, the pollsters found "a decisive 66 per cent . . . favor a law that would require all persons to register all gun purchases no matter where they buy them." This actually is more than is required in the pending bill, which is aimed primarily at curbing the existing loose traffic in mail-order gun sales.

These findings are a clear indication that an overwhelming majority of Americans are not being fooled by the campaign of misrepresentation being waged by a highly vocal lobby of opponents. The latter have tried to plant the impression that the proposed legislation would hamper sportsmen and others having a legitimate use for firearms. Nothing could be further from the truth.

As President Johnson pointed out in a message to Congress in February: "This legislation will not curtail ownership of firearms for sport or self-protection. But it will place a valuable restraint on random trade of handguns—the use of which has more and more characterized burglaries and other crimes." In short, it "will help to keep lethal weapons out of the wrong hands."

The section of the bill that would prohibit interstate mail-order sales of handguns and military weapons to individuals specifically exempts rifles and shotguns "of a type and quality generally recognized as particularly suitable for lawful sporting purposes." These and handguns as well would still be available in over-the-counter sales to all legitimate purchasers, provided they met age and residency requirements. The age limits would be 21 for handguns, 18 for rifles and shotguns.

Even so, the opposition's campaign of misrepresentation so far has enjoyed more success than it deserves. If the lobby hasn't impressed many plain citizens with its false propaganda, it nevertheless has been able to influence enough key congressmen in the past to keep the firearms bill bottled up in committees for three years. It is high time these elected public servants caught up with the thinking of their constituents.

VIEWS OF REV. DR. EDWARD L. R. ELSON ON VIETNAM

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the Reverend Dr. Edward L. R. Elson, minister of the National Presbyterian Church of Washington, D.C., recently had the honor of being one of three clergymen who served as representatives of the American people in observing the national elections held in South Vietnam.

Dr. Elson is not without considerable background in Vietnam. At one time, five members of his family were serving in Saigon. His daughter, Beverly, is there now as a teacher of English in the Buddhist University. He has had for years a wide interest, an absorbing interest, in the problems of Asia as they are brought into focus today in Vietnam. Dr. Elson also is a distinguished clergyman, a man of strong faith, great courage, and a sensitive conscience. Last May, the general assembly of his church named him to its committee on social education and action, which was charged with preparing the "Declaration of Conscience."

After returning from Vietnam as an election observer, Reverend Dr. Elson summed up his impressions and his beliefs for his congregation in a remarkable sermon in which he alluded, among many other aspects of today's Vietnam debates, to the demands for both withdrawal and escalation.

> Withdrawal—

He said—

> would be an irresponsible and immoral procedure for this Nation on whom so many other nations depend for world order and stability.
>
> To escalate to the ultimate in order to force surrender by our adversary—

He added—

> is to be spurned on many grounds—material and moral.

Reverend Dr. Elson's view is this:

> To continue to sustain the desires of the South Vietnamese people in the development of a democratic order, to prevent the conquest of the people and the forceful imposition of an order uncongenial to democracy and fraught with calculated terror, to give time for the rehabilitation and re-tooling of the ARVN, and to do it with force in restraint and in proportion to the political objectives desired—and to do this with perseverance, patience and bravery is the least perilous and seems to give most promise of a reasonable settlement conducive to a stabilized order in the Pacific.

In short, Mr. President, Dr. Elson is saying that the job which the United States has undertaken in Vietnam is to win time—to win time for the Vietnamese people and the people of all Asia to achieve a degree of stability so promising for the future of peace in that quarter of our earth and thus conducive to the growth of peace everywhere.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the sermon delivered to the congregation of the National Presbyterian Church by the Reverend Dr. Edward L. R. Elson on Sunday, September 10, 1967, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VIETNAM IN TRANSITION—AN INTERPRETATION FOR THE CHURCH

(By the Rev. Dr. Edward L. R. Elson, the National Presbyterian Church)

"Then I came to them of the captivity at Telābib, that dwelt by the river of Chebar, and I sat where they sat, and remained there astonished among them seven days."

—EZEKIEL 3:15.

Nearly everybody in this congregation knows that members of my family over a substantial period of time have lived and served in various capacities in Vietnam. A son-in-law in the Foreign Service has been a member of our diplomatic mission to Saigon and since his return to the United States has been at work on the Vietnamese Desk at the State Department. Few families, I suppose, have had five representatives in Saigon at the same time, few have been through the experience of welcoming two children and two grandchildren back home on a Saturday night early in February, 1965, as evacuees from imperiled Vietnam. Fewer still lay claim to a grandson born in Saigon. And I suppose there are not many Washington families with a daughter leaving this week for her third period of service in Saigon, as Beverly will be doing when she departs on the 15th of this month for another year under a Fulbright appointment as a teacher of English in the Buddhist University in Saigon. You readily understand, therefore, why this family and this minister have been absorbed for many years in the problems of the Pacific and American relations as they are brought to focus in Vietnam.

Many of you will remember that at the General Assembly of our Church in Portland, Oregon, last May I was appointed to the Committee on Social Education and Action which was responsible for preparing the "Declaration of Conscience."

Later, when the General Assembly adjourned and the Moderator was authorized to appoint a special committee of five persons who would prepare study materials and a study guide for the whole church, I was named to that committee. This fall the results of our work will be published and made available to the millions of Presbyterians throughout the world, as this particular Christian communion seeks a better understanding and Christian response to this crucial problem of our age.

Late in August when the President of the United States asked if I would accept appointment as one of three American clergymen on a team of 22 representatives of American life invited by the Vietnamese Government to observe the Vietnamese September elections, I responded without hesitation in the discharge of what I deemed to be a religious and patriotic duty. Our party of 22 Americans of both political parties from various locations representing diverse views was among 124 official observers from 24 nations. In addition to these observers sent by these nations for this specific purpose, there were the resident members of diplomatic missions from many nations of the world and 600 or 700 newsmen and women roaming every nook and corner of Vietnam during the days before the election, on Election Day itself, and on the days which followed.

Our delegation traveled in one of the President's planes. Among us were three Senators, three Governors, two Mayors, the President of the National Association of Manufacturers, the President of the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, the President of Westinghouse Broadcasting Company, three publishers, the Commander-elect of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the former Commander of the American Legion, the Vice President of the AFL–CIO, Mr. Whitney Young, President of the Urban League, two Professors of Political Science, with Mr. Richard Scammon of the Governmental Affairs Institute. Rabbi Jacob T. Rudin, President of the Synagogue Council of America, and the Most Rev. Robert E. Lucey, Archbishop of San Antonio, were the remaining two American clergymen. Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, Mr. William H. Marsh, Mr. Peter S. Tarnoff and Mr. Richard W. Teare of the State Department accompanied the team, and Mr. William Stinson of the White House staff expedited the mission.

There was intense briefing by Ambassador Lodge and other experts in the short time we were assembled before our departure. Enroute we had available volumes of material to absorb and conference sessions with our efficient Foreign Service officers. On arrival we were received by Ambassador Bunker and General Westmoreland and their staffs, after which more intensive briefings were interspersed with several social events. Each observer was provided with a personal automobile, security attendants, and all the necessary airplane and helicopter services which enabled us to come and go to any part of the nation where such travel could be accomplished at this particular time. Members of the party fanned out in different directions. Sometimes we went in small groups, sometimes alone, and we were free to accept or modify suggested schedules. By the time we were ready to visit various sections of the country we had a fair understanding of the new Constitution, the basic structure of the Government and its operation, an abbreviated history of the nation, and a rather precise understanding of the voting procedures. We visited in cities, provinces and hamlets. We met and talked with the leaders of the Vietnamese Government and with people at every level of life and in many vocations and callings, from the most highly educated and professionally competent to the humblest village laborer or farmer. On Election Day I was in the city of Hue some 530 miles north of Saigon and a few miles south of the Demilitarized Zone in the general area where our U.S. Marines have been in action. Indeed the last part of the journey was made by Marine helicopter. Most of the members of our party traveled in excess of 22,000 miles. Three of our party became ill but were given prompt and expert medical service, several narrowly escaped bombs or grenades. We departed Washington on Monday, August 28; we returned to Washington early Wednesday, September 6, and spent most of that day with the President at the White House. The President asked for and received individual reports from the members of the mission; there was extensive consultation, and the President graciously thanked each person for completing the arduous mission in the service of our country and of the Vietnamese people and the future peace of the world.

Returning to this Washington pulpit one recalls first of all the many Foreign Service officers of all levels, economic and engineering experts, and the host of military personnel who have worshipped with this congregation across the years. Senior American Army Chaplain Colonel Walton G. Sugg, who supervises the 330 Army chaplains, is an old friend and colleague. A happy experience was a visit with General Duke, the former District of Columbia Engineer Commissioner, who escorted Mrs. Elson in the main event when she was D.C. Mother of the Year. There is Commander Jack Fuka, a graduate of the Naval Academy, son-in-law of our sexton, Mr. George Collier, at whose wedding our daughter Mary Faith was flower girl a great many years ago. I presume one of the happiest memories I shall carry with me for many years is that a young man who came out of this congregation and became a Presbyterian minister was assigned as my escort. Jack Phillabaum was enlisted in the Navy when he came in contact with one of our Sunday evening young adult groups, then called "The Searchers." He experienced a radical conversion, made confession of his Christian faith before the Session of our Church, and was admitted to membership in the Church. He immediately began intensive development of the Christian life, participating in our young adult program and teaching in the Church School. Meanwhile, while still in the Navy he completed his undergraduate work for his college degree at the University of Maryland. He married a Washington, D.C. school teacher and upon completion of ten or twelve years in the Navy went off to the Presbyterian Seminary at Louisville, Kentucky. Subsequently he had a year as assistant pastor, after which I had the honor of preaching his installation sermon in a Virginia Presbyterian church. At first he had a commission as a Reserve chaplain in the Navy but soon transferred to the United States Army for active duty. The authorities in Saigon knew nothing of our previous connection. The Army simply looked for a Presbyterian chaplain who might be assigned as my escort and found Chaplain (Captain) Jack Phillabaum, who looked after my requirements very efficiently throughout the tour. And there are hosts of others, friends and acquaintances of the years too numerous to mention, serving God and country in that remote, difficult and turbulent area of the world.

There is a deeper and more profound meaning to this recent experience. To travel hundreds of miles by many modes of transportation, to meet with Vietnamese people in all walks of life and under varying circumstances, to hear them speak, watch them work, and observe them vote, to feel ever so briefly an identification with them as they struggle for self-enhancement, self-fulfillment, and a national destiny is an unforgettable experience. For twenty years they have agonized through one war after another, sometimes moving forward and upward, sometimes patiently waiting, sometimes retrogressing, but always struggling and aspiring for a better order of existence. Now they have had a stabilized order of life for at least two years, after a succession of nine governments within a span of less than one year. Now they are taking a series of steps, beginning in April 1966 when a decision was made to hold a constitutional assembly, which took place September 11 last year and led to the adoption of a Constitution and the process of forming a democratic basis of government in which the recent elections were one step.

Coming out of that land back to this capital city, symbol of the most powerful and responsible nation in the world today, a simple citizen like myself feels somewhat like Ezekiel, the Hebrew prophet of the exile, the chaplain marching with a nation condemned to a place of destruction, who in the midst of captivity heard the heavenly message and spoke a word which was a bridge of hope between captivity and restoration. When the ancient covenant people were thrust between despair and hope, the prophet came to them, stood in the colony of exiles at Telabib near the River Chebar, "And I sat where they sat, and remained there astonished among them seven days." If there is any Biblical situation which correlates with my experience, it is something of the feeling which the prophet had when he entered into the feelings of his own people in pilgrimage: "I sat where they sat, and remained there astonished among them seven days."

For one thing, we should take inspiration from the new Constitution which has been developed by the Vietnamese. The Preamble is worth noting:

"Confident that the patriotism, indomitable will, and unyielding traditions of the people will assure a radiant future for our country;

"Conscious that after many years of foreign domination, followed by the division of our territory, dictatorship and war, the people of Viet-Nam must take responsibility before history to perpetuate those hardy traditions and at the same time to welcome progressive ideas in order to establish a republican form of government of the people, by the people and for the people whose purpose is to unite the nation, unite the territory and assure independence, freedom, and democracy with justice and altruism for the present and future generations;

"We, 117 Deputies of the National Constituent Assembly representing the people of Viet-Nam, after debate, approve this Constitution."

Prof. Carey Joynt of Lehigh University writes:

"The history of Vietnam begins in the sixth century B.C. when several tribes living in southern China migrated to the delta of the Red River. Chinese rule, however, was not to be escaped easily and by 285 B.C. China had conquered the area and it remained under some form of Chinese control for most of the period up to the tenth century A.D. During this epoch of over a thousand years, the Vietnamese adopted Chinese customs and forms of organization, but managed to retain their own language and national identity.

"One of the major legacies from the long centuries was a persistent drive for independence and an amazing ability to maintain their own identity. Regionalism has been a marked feature of their society, derived from the southward expansion and gathered about two major river deltas, one in the north, one in the south. Confucian concepts of loyalty to the family became deeply imbedded. The family or the household is the most important institution and the tax base. The family was an economic unit linked to the village, which is a form of cooperative organization. The village owned property, maintained supplies; a village committee stored rice against a crop failure. Village structures managed burials, weddings and home building. All this has given the people a strong sense of identity. Pride in a long history coupled with a fine fighting ability has produced a social force of great strength and sense of purpose. An important feature of Vietnam's long history has been the growth of clandestine or secret organizations. Several factors contributed to this development: strong feelings of kinship; a sense of racial identity; a technique for evading foreign occupation; the assumption that society contains dangerous social forces with which only secret organizations could deal. These organizations were partly mutual, protective and partly religious. And an individual might be identified with more than one at a time and this identification completely obscured."

Douglas Pike in his description of this system says, "Loyalty may be a virtue but consistency is not. Members assemble around individual leaders rather than around an ideology or a political platform. The best leader is paternalistic, sly, skilled in intrique, master of the deceptive move, possessor of untold layers of duplicity . . . Sagacity in the follower consists in knowing whom to join and when, for timing is all-important." (Vietcong, MIT Press 1966)

The Vietnamese have no experience of central government on a western model. A ruler remained as long as he was courageous, unselfish, good and intelligent—or as long, according to Confucius, as he deserved it. If a ruler became afflicted with galloping senility, was dilatory, or too fat, insensitive, or resorted to brutal police-state methods, there might be a coup or he might be assassinated. These were the ways of getting a change when the ruler did not step down voluntarily. It did not occur to the people that an election was a good way to decide an important question. Thus our American reaction to the Diem assassination several years ago was one of horror; for the Vietnamese it was the norm.

Ambassador Lodge likes to quote a Vietnamese proverb which says that five evils afflict mankind: fire, flood, famine, armed robbery, and central government. Only now are the Vietnamese coming to believe in a central government as indispensable to protecting them against their predatory and aggressive neighbors.

The election on September 3 which we observed was one step in the emergence of a constitutional democracy. Generals Ky and Thieu announced at the beginning that their government was only provisional. And to their everlasting credit they kept their promise to lead the people toward a democratic structure. For two years at least there has been stability and order, while the war continued, and a political, social, and economic development has been fostered.

A preparatory commission was appointed to make plans for an election for delegates to a Constitutional convention. These delegates who were elected September 11, 1966, later held a convention, adopted a constitution providing for a presidential type of government in which the legislative has more authority than it has in the United States.

The Constitution also provides for: separation of the executive, legislative and judicial branches; universal suffrage; religious freedom; and the right to form unions and to strike. It specifically prohibits military men from holding public office after the elections of 1967. The National Assembly and Senate created in the Constitution have broad powers. In addition to voting legislation, ratifying treaties and declaring war, the legislative branches can overturn the executive by a three-fourths vote. They can also reject presidential decrees, choose the membership of the Supreme Court and amend the Constitution by a two-thirds vote. The Constitution also creates a Special Court composed primarily of legislators. This Special Court is empowered to remove high government officials from office, including the President and the Vice President.

The election for President and Vice President and for the Senate (Upper House) took place last Sunday, September 3. Members of the House are to be elected on October 22.

What is the meaning of this election? And its significance?

1. To have an election at all during a war is itself significant. Neither the British nor the French held elections during World War II.

2. In electing a constitutional government the Vietnamese are taking the biggest single step as they move with their strong sense of peoplehood toward a viable modern nation state. If the remaining steps are properly implemented, and the revolutionary development programs succeed, and the security of the country achieved and the Viet Cong terror eliminated, then the Communist thrust will suffocate and the nation will be able to protect itself against aggression. It could turn out that the political events now taking place in Vietnam will be a most important political event for the world in the decade of the 1960's. We may take heart from the societies organized in such countries as the Philippines, Korea, Malaya where Communist aggression has been overcome—in all the edge of free East Asia—370 million people in all—and we should have much inspiration from the sacrifices, industry and progress of the Vietnamese people in their advancement toward self-fulfillment and a free national destiny.

3. How was the election carried out? Could you really observe it?

The plan was laid out in Saigon. There were 8,808 voting places, one for each 600 registered voters; 100,000 people worked on the election; 460 million ballots were printed for 11 Presidential tickets, and 48 ten-man Senate seats.

Here is a sample ballot. Illiterates can vote. Who is qualified to vote? All persons who were 18 as of December 31, 1966, male or female, who registered. The total vote of approximately 4,900,000 votes represented 83 percent of the registered voters. (Our Congressional elections draw about 37 to 39 percent registered.)

This is vastly different from our first elections.

4. How can you observe? We were not there as examiners of elections—or poll-watchers—they had their own. We were there to observe an event in historic perspective. If an illiterate could vote, an observer with a translator could make valid observations. The procedure directed by the Saigon government was observed being executed in widely diverse cities, provinces, villages and hamlets.

Richard Scammon of the Governmental Affairs Institute, a consultant who accompanied us and has observed more than 40 foreign elections, concluded that the elections on September 3 were "reasonably free, reasonably fair and markedly efficient." Certainly it was as good, based upon their history and standards, as many of our elections are, based upon our history and standards.

Later I shall write and speak more about the options which the United States has; about the moral use of force—and the failure to use it at the right time and in the right way which is immoral; about the so-called changing face of Communism—which is simply "face lifting"—a tactical deception; about dissent at home, especially where the dissenter so often thinks that his dissent per se represents a higher morality than assent. Dissent and assent have only the moral quality of their substance.

Military force, to be sure, alone cannot stop an idea or change a man's political philosophy or allegiance—but military action at times is an absolute imperative for abating terror, creating security and tranquility, so as to make possible an atmosphere in which democratic institutions may flourish. The alternative to our presence today would be a blood bath and reign of terror, anarchy and suffering unimaginable, and the possible imposition of a system that demeans all human dignity and imperils free men in the vast stretches of the Pacific.

The alternatives are not simple. An adequate exposition of them would require a full address.

Certainly a unilateral, unconditional withdrawal of American forces before the whole area is stabilized and a secure civilian government respectful of human dignity and justice is established would produce an unimaginable trauma in the whole Pacific of such proportions as to change the whole system of international relations; it would be to abandon friendly peoples aspiring to self-fulfillment to the terrors imposed by Communist barbarity. It would be an irresponsible and immoral procedure for this nation on whom so many other nations depend for world order and stability.

To escalate to the ultimate and complete destruction and the consequent surrender would leave an incinerated and galvanized desert with the remnants wards of the victors who would then be faced with subsidizing rebuilding the whole area of the world and the beginning of a new structure for the surviving society. Certainly that proposal is to be spurned on many grounds—material and moral.

To continue to sustain the desires of the South Vietnamese people in the development of a democratic order, to prevent the conquest of the people and the forceful imposition of an order uncongenial to democracy and fraught with calculated terror, to give time for the rehabilitation and re-tooling of the ARVN, and to do it with force in restraint and in proportion to the political objectives desired—and to do this with perseverance, patience and bravery is the least perilous and seems to give most promise of a reasonable settlement conducive to a stabilized order in the Pacific.

There is, of course, the possibility of stopping the fighting, naming a date by which a satisfactory settlement is to be completed and upon expiration of the time settle it militarily—and build on the remnant.

Every approach and the evaluation of every alternative only emphasizes the colossal complexity of the problem, our own predicament and the rather dismal outlook for an early peace.

"I sat where they sat"—the Vietnamese—feeling their sentiments, their heart, their aspirations.

But I also took pains to visit our troops—Army headquarters, chaplains in the field, soldiers at gun positions, departing and returning from patrols. They are great—and neutralized all our worries of some of the bizarre performers at home. Only one thing concerns them—the attitude of the folks at home. They understand why they are there and so many of us do not and will not.

Hanoi Hannah, the successor to Tokyo Rose, talks to the Negro troops over the radio, saying, "You are last in everything in America, last to be educated, last to hold property, last to get political office, and last to be carried off the battlefield." And both Negro and white troops in warm camaraderie simply laugh at her.

I entered the receiving room of the 63rd Evacuation Hospital. At that very moment a helicopter carefully alighted on the pad outside. On a stretcher came a Lt. Colonel, commander of an infantry battalion, with a rifle bullet through his right leg—the first casualty in his outfit that day. I stooped over him and we talked with the surgical team readied for action. He was Lt. Col. Bruce Wallace from San Antonio. Anybody with that Scottish name just had to be a Presbyterian (or someone had tampered with his religion). And of course he was a Presbyterian. Wounded in World War II, in the Korean War, and now in this one. "Just don't call my wife yet, I'll be well." Then a little prayer.

Just outside that room, the first bed at which I stopped contained a young Negro, Specialist 4th Class David Green. Both feet were gone and there was a shattered arm. He too was a Presbyterian from a small town near Charlotte, North Carolina. He brightened up when I told him I was an honorary citizen of that city. But he was not downcast by his strange new figure and the adjustments which awaited him.

They are great men—not boys—men of strength and courage, of patience and loyalty, of whom we should all be proud. Proud of the bright young Foreign Service officers—proud of all our sacrificial men and women.

And now as never before, the people of this land and the folk who belong to the household of faith are called upon to study, to pray, to keep a sensitive conscience, to speak where competent, to guide where able, to help in every way create the atmosphere which gives the will to persevere until the new day dawns and a better world emerges for them yonder and for us. The call to the Christian is to serve the religious needs of all elements including our statesmen and troops and, above all else, preserve the solidarity of the Christian fellowship.

Today, I wanted you to know something of this experience as I reflect upon the reminiscent words of Ezekiel, "I sat where they sat"—for a season. And let us all be better for it.

REPORT BY JUDGE RAYMOND PACE ALEXANDER, OF PHILADELPHIA, ON HIS MISSION TO GENEVA

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, two events of great moment were held in Geneva during the month of July this year: the World Peace Through Law Conference and the World Assembly of Judges. The official representative of the Philadelphia Bar Association at these events was Hon. Raymond Pace Alexander, of Common Pleas Court No. 4, Philadelphia. Judge Alexander is a distinguished and highly articulate member of the judiciary of my State. I am sure that his report on his mission to Geneva will be of interest to readers of the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MISSION TO GENEVA

(By Hon. Raymond Pace Alexander)

Charter flights in crowded planes to faroff places in the world are just the things for the bold and adventurous, those forgetful of age—and especially for the young in heart. We hope that we qualified for this test in at least one of these categories. After many years of flying "on our own" in various parts of the world, we undertook this, our first "group flight", leaving John F. Kennedy (New York) Airport with 150 others, a capacity crowd, via KLM, of whom at the start we knew perhaps but 10. When we returned to New York late at night on August 1st, after journeying to five countries, we knew everyone—most of them by name, and we enjoyed the company and companionship of all! We recommend such an experience to others, especially for the next conference of this great group of pioneers among the bar and bench from almost every country in the world, seeking the formula, until now so distressingly elusive, for World Peace Through The Process of World Law.

As usual, there were the normal preliminary travel problems. We took all the necessary health precautions; injections and all medical tests. We updated passports, gathered information about expected weather and, having been "expertly" advised to look out for foul, cold, rainy weather in the region of the Swiss Alps and Holland, we lugged raincoats, overcoats, sweaters, etc., which, when we had for the full month perfect "Atlantic City August" weather, we came darned close to throwing all those heavy things overboard. We never used any!

(You notice I have used the pronoun "we" frequently. That's not the poetic use of the word. The "we", as used here, refers to "my" Sadie Alexander, who was my constant and invaluable companion on this trip, and who, as I reflect, has been for quite a number of years.)

I am reminded that this is not a travelogue, so I must get down to the business of the moment. But I only wish time and space permitted me to relate to our bar my experiences at the Hague, where the International Court of Justice presides. That beautiful Peace Palace which also houses the Permanent Court of Arbitration and the Academy of International Law was made possible through the gift of $1,500,000 in 1903 by Andrew Carnegie. It is really one of the most impressive buildings, so functional and efficient for the operation of courts, conferences, public meetings, etc., in all Europe. Our meetings with a score of young lawyers and law teachers from the now independent governments in Africa, viz: Sierra Leone, Nigeria, The Ivory Coast, Niger, Cameroon, Senegal, Gabon, some of whom (six from Nigeria) had studied for three long years in Russia, telling us in great detail their pangs of disillusionment with "all things Russian" left us deeply sensitive to their need for friendly understanding and sympathy. When these brilliant young African students, all in their mid-twenties, the future leaders of their governments, probed deeper into the mystery of racial conflict in our beloved country (Detroit had just followed Newark in rioting and it was over the front pages of all European papers) we found ourselves in an unexpected seminar, not on the agenda of that afternoon's session of the Academy of International Law in the peaceful and quiet city of Hague, in Holland.

The World Peace Through Law Conference and the World Assembly of Judges brought together approximately 2,000 lawyers and 300 judges, representing more than 100 nations from all parts of the world. It is interesting to note that the largest number representing a single country, second only to the United States, came from far-away Australia. Australia and New Zealand together had approximately 100 representatives, excellent by any standard. It would be expected that the United States, the founder and the moving party in this conference on the quest for World Peace would outnumber all other nations. America must have contributed 1,200 persons. In third place was, as expected, the Swiss, followed closely by the United Kingdom, France and, surprisingly, in my judgment, Africa and the Middle East and, not surprising, none came from Russia although two promised to attend but failed to appear. With pleasure, and again with surprise, not only did Yugoslavia send representatives but their spokesmen were men of brilliance and great competence.

The opening day's program, which presented an excellent group of speakers, to which I will devote some space later, was enlivened by a significant address by the Hon. Blazo Jovanovic, President of the Constitutional Court of Yugoslavia. On other days, the representatives from Yugoslavia made equally impressive addresses.

The remarkable and significant thing about the entire conference was that there gathered in Geneva, many thousands of miles from the homeland of the great majority, 2,300 men and women of the law who came this long distance to the seat of the United Nations at the Palais des Nations, to contribute their best effort to the solution of the most complex and vexatious problem of the Ages; viz., How and in What ways can laws be enacted and adopted by All nations of the world that will have sufficiently strong Sanctions that will be binding on All nations that will prevent War from Ever happening again.

The timing of the conference could not have been more perfect, what with the Arab-Israeli War just concluded and a most uneasy truce "simmering"; the break-away of Biafra from Nigeria and the interrupted "vacation" flight of Ex-Premier Tshombe from his luxurious hide-away in Spain, interrupted via kidnapping over Algeria and possibly a oneway return ticket to his beloved Congo for execution which might once more erupt in flames the entire Congo and Sub-Sahara Africa. (Did I fail to mention Vietnam?)

But these men and women in Geneva were there on serious business and went to work earnestly on one of the most thoughtfully prepared programs on World Peace Through Law that man could devise. And let me emphasize that the representatives of our renowned Philadelphia Bar Association, although limited in numbers, I regret to say, rendered very significant services to this problem in this weighty program. Former Governor Harold E. Stassen, a Cochairman of World Law Day, was one of the speakers at the Inaugural Day's Ceremony at the Palais des Nations. He made an excellent speech and was accorded perhaps the most enthusiastic applause of any of the 12 distinguished speakers from the various countries of the world. His strong dissent from our present escalation in Vietnam no doubt accounted for it. I will comment later on the private anti-U.S.-Vietnam feelings of most of the nationals of foreign governments present. Bernard G. Segal, Esq., our own former chancellor, with his good wife Jerri, was present. Mr. Segal was chairman of the Tuesday morning sessions, July 11th, on the subject, "Space Law and International Communications", and handled his assignment very effectively. This session and others were of four hours duration from 8:30 a. m. to 12:30 and no "ten minute" intermissions! (Judges, note that!)

Richard P. Brown, Esq. was "everything" and "everywhere". He has long been a supporter of the World Peace Through Law Movement from its earliest days; he has contributed generously of his own funds and raised large sums of money from many sources, including many firms and members of our own bar. I wish space permitted carrying these names. He has been the strong right arm in this area of the Hon. Charles S. Rhyne, President of the "World Peace Through Law Center" at Geneva and deserves our praise. His lovely and capable wife, Dorothy, was very active in setting up and carrying out the excellent Ladies' program, which was a real feature of this Conference.

Philip W. Amram, Esq., lawyer-author, formerly of the Wolf, Block, Schorr firm, but now practicing very actively at the Washington, D.C. bar, with Emilie Weyl Amram, was present. Phil Amram, Sadie and Raymond Alexander have long been friends. Phil and I were classmates at the great old Central High School of Philadelphia. Then we were separated. Phil went to study agriculture. To my surprise, years later Phil and Sadie became classmates at the University of Pennsylvania Law School and close friends on the Review and graduated together in 1927. (Phil, Sadie and I still argue about who is older, etc.) He was on the program of the World Assembly of Judges at the closing session and did an excellent job.

Clarence E. Hall, Esq., with his good wife, Dorothy K., was present and took a leading part in the work on the Committee Concerning the International Aspects of Probate Law, and Robert B. Ely, 3rd, Esq., now Trust Officer of the Byrn Mawr Trust Company, was also among the lawyers from our great City and contributed well his share toward making this a great and successful Conference. Mrs. Alexander was active in the Working Sessions and Committees concerned with "Human Rights" and "Housing and Urban Development Seminar".

(We always fear an oversight in failing to name someone who may have been present. Forgive us, if this happens. We saw the name of Morris M. Wexler "among those expected" but we did not see him.)

Limitation of space prevents this rapporteur from treating this conference in greater detail. I must tell you something of the history of this organization—how and by whom it was formed and who is responsible for its growth, and something of its future. Charles S. Rhyne, a former President of the American Bar Association, nursed for many years the idea of the need for a World Association of Lawyers in the quest of World Law for Peace. It is by its very nature and purpose, and intentionally, without hard and fast rules governing membership. Its membership is open to lawyers from countries over the entire world. It had its beginnings in Washington and its first World Conference in Athens in 1963. The second Conference, much larger in attendance than Geneva, was held in Washington, D.C., in July of 1965. The impact of the conference in our Nation's Capital which was attended by leading lawyers, statesmen and jurists throughout the world and the steady stream of reports of that conference, the reviews, releases and lectures by those attending the meetings enhanced its standing, both nationally and internationally. The result was the enormous interest shown in the July 1967 Geneva World Conference.

To gain a better understanding of this organization, one should see and read the program of the meetings and seminars, and study the subjects on the agenda and the "work" papers at the July 1967 conference. The 94-page program (only the last six devoted to ads) was filled with these details printed in English, French and Spanish, accompanied by the photographs of some of the officers and prominent participants.

The morning of the first day of the conference (Sunday, July 9th) was taken up with the registration of the 2,300 lawyers and judges attending this joint session. It should be noted that this was the first meeting of the World Assembly of Judges which is an outgrowth and extension of the World Peace Through Law Conference. As indicated above, some 300 judges attended this branch of the conference which, except for a different meeting place, maintained its identity with the World Peace Through Law Conference. The rest of the day was devoted to meetings of various Executive Committees of the two conferences, plus a most interesting reception at the Hotel Intercontinental (ladies invited) hosted jointly by the Presidents of the Swiss Bar and the Geneva Bar.

It will be impossible, as much as I should like to, to give you a fully detailed account of all the really important and truly interesting events on this six-day, jam-packed program. There are some however, of such significance and so colorful and unusual that deserve special attention. The first is the Inaugural Ceremonial Session of Monday, July 10th, held in the beautiful amphitheatre of the Palais des Nations (the United Nations office in Geneva). The colorful World Procession of Judges from countries the world over wearing their robes in various colors (and many their wigs) slowly marching in pairs, down the center aisle, from the rear toward the stage (a distance of one-half the length of our Convention Hall) was a drama which I shall long remember. Only the judges from America were robed in solemn black, traditional with us. Those from Asia: Japan, the Republic of China, Vietnam, Malaysia, Thailand, Singapore, Korea, the Philippines and Pakistan were robed in brilliant colors. Some were crimson, lavender, blue, green, etc., trimmed with either collars or academic capes of contrasting colors. Those from

Korea, Vietnam, Thailand and Malaysia were trimmed down the front with long panels of ermine. These judges and those from India wore small round hats of various colors. The judges from the United Kingdom; Canada, Australia, and former British Colonial possessions in Africa (Nigeria, Ghana, Tanzania, Ruanda) and the West Indies (Jamaica, Trinidad, Barbados, etc.) wore their colorful robes and traditional long wigs which proved to be very uncomfortably warm in the great auditorium during the more than three and one-half hours of that session. The judges from Africa wore very colorful gowns, mostly green, blue and purple, very sedately trimmed. The three judges from Ethiopia, the Chief Justice, a very tall man of spare build, sharp features, gray hair and a neat beard, were impressive, each wearing a long green robe, trimmed in red and a small crown-shaped hat. It remained for us from America to join this beautiful pageant in our dull, sombre, black robes, not even broken by wearing our University, Law, Graduate or Honorary Degree hood. This is something that we in America should seriously consider. A dozen photographs of this assembly will be our "treasure photos" for the future. (Many judges from America, the writer among them, joined the procession without judicial attire.)

The Inaugural Ceremonial Session presented an impressive list of speakers. Simultaneous translation facilities were available at each chair for the large throng of some 2,500 persons present. The majority of speeches were delivered in either English or French. Those in Spanish also had immediate translation. The chairman of the meeting was the Hon. Charles S. Rhyne, President. Seated with him were our own Chief Justice of the United States, the Hon. Earl Warren; the Hon. Andre Pauchaud, President of the Federal Tribunal of Switzerland, the Hon. Blazo Jovanovic, President of the Constitutional Court of Yugoslavia, and the Hon. William S. Thompson, Secretary-General of the World Peace Through Law Conference.

It will be impossible to give even a brief summary of these excellent addresses, valuable and important as they were, for obvious reasons. A full record has been made of each and will appear in a bound volume in the near future. I would be remiss, however, if I did not record here the names of the distinguished speakers and the countries they represented.

First, and out of turn, we were privileged to hear the President of the United Nations General Assembly, the Hon. Abdul Rahman Pashwak, who flew in that morning from New York, and, because of the Arab-Israeli "peace" talks still in a state of great uncertainty, had to fly right back to New York; then, in order, the Hon. Pierre Audeud, President of the Geneva Bar; Hon. Carlo Bonetti, President Swiss Federation of Lawyers; Hon. Andre Chavanne; President of the Geneva Council of State; Hon. Pier Spinelli, Undersecretary of the U.N. (Director of the U.N. office at Geneva), Hon. Ludwig von Moos, Federal Counselor of Switzerland; Hon. Andre Panchaud, President of the Federal Tribunal of Switzerland; Hon. Blazo Jovanovic (Yugoslavia) and our own Chief Justice Warren.

At this point of the program the presentation of the "World Charter for the Rule of Law" was given by the Hon. Rene Cassin, President of the European Court of Human Rights to the conference. Justice Cassin is a handsome man, 83 years of age, small in stature, sharp face and eyes, gray and balding with small goatee, who in receiving the award spoke brilliantly and beautifully with gestures and a feeling characteristic of the eloquent French scholars of past generations.

At these ceremonies, following the above addresses, came the International Observance of World Law Day, at which the following made addresses:

The Hon. Terje Wold, Chief Justice of Norway, Hon. Mastoshi Yokota, Chief Justice of Japan, Hon. Albert Brunois, President of the Paris Bar and, finally, our own fellow Philadelphia barrister, the Hon. Harold E. Stassen who, as mentioned above, received a rousing and prolonged applause for his timely address on present world conditions and fears for the future, unless constructive measures for World Peace Through Law were adopted at this meeting.

All these addresses of brilliant content and vigorous delivery bore an optimistic note on the subject at issue: "World Peace Through Law," but not without the realization of the tremendous difficulties ahead in achieving the same. At the very moment of this meeting the air waves and the printed news media were filled with danger signals foreboding evil days ahead in pursuing our goals. But these speakers and those to whom I shall now briefly refer and their topics were content to think of and keep their ears attuned to the future. Let me pass quickly to the Working Session.

MONDAY, JULY 10

A. The principal topics discussed were: Settlement of International Disputes: International Courts, Arbitration and Conciliation under the chairmanship of the Secretary of State for Tunisia, Hon. Mongi Slim, assisted by the Ambassador of Ecuador to the Holy See, Enrique Ponce y Carbo. The panel consisted of (names omitted) representatives from (1) Yugoslavia, France, two from the U.S.A. and Japan.

B. Disarmament.

Chaired by Hon. Javad Sadr of Iran. Work Paper by Hon. S. M. Zafar (Pakistan). Panelists from Ethiopia, Yugoslavia, India, and Canada.

C. TUESDAY, JULY 11

(8:30 to 5:30 p.m.)

(An hour for lunch!!!)

(1) Space Law and International Communications.

Hon. Chairman, Abdul Kadir, the Attorney General of Malaysia. Active Chairman, Hon. Bernard G. Segal, former Chancellor of the Philadelphia Bar Association. The speakers were from U.S.A. (four in number), and Norway, Netherlands and the Malagasy Republic.

The commentators were the Hon. Nicholas deB Katzenbach, USA and Pierre Lalive, Switzerland.

(2) Research and Legal Information by Computer.

Chairman, Janghir Kerimov, member of Academy of Sciences U.S.S.R.

Work Paper: Colin Tapper (England).

The panelists were from (1) USA (2) Germany (3) Italy (4) Belgium (5) France (6) The U.N.

(3) Industrial and Intellectual Property. (Patents, Trademarks and Copyrights)

Chairman, Professor L. and James Harris, George Washington University. Panelists from (1) Cameroon; (2) USA; (3) Germany; (4) B.I.R.P.I. (5) The U.N.

(4) Transnational Trade and Investments.

Hon. Chairman, the Hon. Gunnar Lagergren.

Chairman, Indo-Pakistan Boundary Case Tribunal.

Chairman, Aron Broches, General Counsel, World Bank.

Work Paper by C. M. Schmitthoff (England).

Panelists from (1) Canada; (2) USA; (3) Yugoslavia; (4) Turkey; (5) Germany; (6) U.N.

(5) Housing and Urban Development Seminar.

Hon. Chairman, the Hon. Vernon F. Wilcox, Minister of Transport, Australia.

Chairman, Hon. Eugene J. Morris (USA).

Panelists from (1) The U.N.; (2) USA; (3) Malaysia.

(6) Development of Law by International Organization.

Hon. Chairman, the Hon. P. G. Menon, Law Minister of India.

Chairman, His Excellency, Mustafa Kamil Yasseen, Ambassador of Iraq to Switzerland.

Work Paper—Karel Vasak (Council of Europe).

Panelists from: (1) Italy; (2) C.I.C.R.; (3) Netherlands; (4) France; (5) the U.N.

D. WEDNESDAY, JULY 12 (9 A. M.)

(1) Impact of Science and Technology on Law.

Hon. Chairman, Hon. Josip Brncic, President, Council of Judicial Affairs, Yugoslavia.

Chairman, Hon. Philip C. Jessup, Judge, the International Court of Justice.

Work Paper: C. Wilfred Jenks, Esq., I.L.O.

Panelist, Howard K. Shapar, Esq., USA.

(2) Legal Aspects of Peaceful Cooperation Among Nations.

Hon. Chairman, Hon. S. C. Silkin, M.P., Chairman of the Council of Europe.

Chairman, Hon. Nagendra Singh, Secretary to the President of India.

Work Paper by Lucien Sfez, Jean Pierre Cot (France), and A. Bolintnineanu (Roumania).

Panelists: (1) Mexico; (2) Australia; (3) USA; (4) Ghana; (5) Tanzania.

(3) Human Rights.

Hon. Chairman, Her Royal Highness, Ashraf Pahlavi, Princess of Iran.

Chairman, Nazir Ahmad Khan, Pakistan (Chairman Khan received the Outstanding Lawyer of the World Award in 1965).

Work Paper: A. H. Robertson (Council of Europe).

Panelists: (1) Yugoslavia; (2) USA; (3) Republic of China; (4) U.N.

(4) Research, Legal Education and Training.

Hon. Chairman, Hon. Antoine Guimali, Minister of Justice, Central African Republic.

Chairman, Carlos A Dunshee de Abramenes, Professor of Law, University of Brasil.

Panelists: (1) Ecuador; (2) Ethiopia; (3) U.N.; (4) England.

(5) World Charter for the Rule of Law.

Chairman, Marc Ancel, Esq., Conseilleur D'Etat.

Sections:

(a) World Law Code.

Prof. Martiel Tricaud, a la Faculte Libre de Droit, Paris.

(b) Computerization of Law.

Lucien Mehl, Conseilleur D'Etat, France.

(c) Effective International Court System.

Manfred Simon, former President, Court of Appeal, Paris.

Louis Pettiti, Avocat, Paris.

(d) Enforcement of Decisions of International Tribunal.

Hon. Phillipe Gastambide, former President, International Union of Lawyers.

Raymond Geouffre, Avocat of the Courts of Paris.

E. THURSDAY, JULY 13

(A) Report of the World Peace Through Law Center.

(B) Organization of Sections of the Center.

(C) Work Program for the Future.

Call to order by: The Hon. Nobuo Naritomi, Vice President of The World Peace Through Law Center.

Presiding Officer: The Hon. Charles S. Rhyne, President, The World Peace Through Law Center.

(D) International Association of Law Libraries.

2:30—5 P.M. Final Plenary Session.

(1) The Reading and Adoption of Reports, Resolutions from the Various Committees.

(2) Approval of the Geneva Documents.

The entire evening of Thursday, July 13th was given over to what I am happy to report, with excellent weather favoring the large assembly, two most interesting and beautiful social affairs.

Hon. Phillipe Gastambide, former President, International Union of Lawyers.

Raymond Geouffre, Avocat of the Courts of Paris.

E. THURSDAY, JULY 13

(A) Report of The World Peace Through Law Center.

(B) Organization of Sections of the Center.

(C) Work Program for the Future.

7 p.m. (a) Reception (ladies present) jointly hosted by the President of the World Peace Through Law Center and Chairman of the World Assembly of Judges at the Hotel Intercontinental, where all meetings were held. This reception was held outdoors on the Terrace surrounding the swimming pool. After a week of very hard work in which the great majority of the lawyers and judges participated with real determination, it is unnecessary to state that the reception and the banquet following were well attended and enjoyed.

8:30 p.m. (b) Banquet (ladies present) Ballroom Hotel Intercontinental (Black Tie).

Chairman of the banquet, the Hon. Orison S. Marden, President, the American Bar Association.

Cochairman, the Hon. Robert G. Storey, President, Southwestern Legal Center.

At this beautiful banquet, attended by some 1,500 ladies and gentlemen there were very few speeches. There was an interesting musical and vocal program after which two awards were presented. The first was to the Hon. Rene Cassin. He was named the Outstanding Jurist of the World, 1967, because of his great work culminating in the adoption of "The World Charter for the Rule of Law". This brilliant and interesting jurist spoke as I have related before, eloquently and vigorously in his beautiful native French which touched the hearts of all who heard him. The second award was to the Outstanding Legal Scholar of the World, 1967. The person honored was an Australian lawyer who was unable to be present. His fellow countryman made an excellent address spiced with good humor and, in recognition of the fact that nearly 100 lawyers attended from that far-away place in the world (combined with New Zealand), the largest attendance present next to the USA, the guests responded with thunderous applause.

I have purposely omitted documenting the many sessions of the World Assembly of Judges which were held concurrently with the sessions devoted to World Peace Through Law. The judges met at the Ecumenical Center, a building within walking distance of the meetings of the World Peace Through Law group, about four city blocks distant. Those interested in both meetings had a great deal of exercise going from place to place to participate in both programs. (That was really for the ambitious.) I feel that a few words should be devoted to the meetings of the World Assembly of Judges, though in much less detail. It should be noted that this was the inaugural meeting of this assembly.

The Chairman of the World Assembly is our own distinguished United States Chief Justice, Earl Warren. The Vice Chairman for Europe is Chief Justice Terje Wold of Norway. The Vice Chairman for Africa is Chief Justice Adetokunbo Ademola of Nigera. The Vice Chairman for the Americas is Ex-Justice Luis Maria Boffi Boggero of Argentina. The Vice Chairman for Asia and Australia is Chief Justice Masatosri Yokota of Japan. The Secretary is Chief Justice Hugh O. B. Wooding of Trinidad and Tobago. The Treasurer is Justice Fritz Haberlin of Switzerland. The Executive Director is Harry Leroy Jones, Esq., USA.

The first session, presided over by Chief Justice Earl Warren, witnessed brilliant addresses by our own Chief Justice and the Chief Justices of Switzerland, Norway, Nigeria, Japan, the United Arab Republic, the Presidents of four International Tribunals and finally, but perhaps the most dramatic, the most forceful and best communicated appeal of any of those who preceded him, by our own Mr. Justice Hugo Black. He is now, as all of you know, a very frail man, approaching, if not actually, 80 years of age. He spoke for 20 minutes without a single note of paper or manuscript. His pungent remarks about his own personal fears for the future of the world, for the survival of mankind, ". . . of you here today and myself . . ." so interspersed with references from the pages of past and current history, so scrupulously delivered, left his audience spellbound with piercing, poignant emotion.

Space and time limitations prevent more than a brief word on the remaining sessions of this important group, which discussed such matters on the following days as:

(a) The Education, Selection and Training of the Judiciary.

With special emphasis on these problems facing the developing countries. We heard the following discuss these subjects:

(1) The Chief Justice of The Philippines.
(2) Justice of the Supreme Court of India.
(3) The Chief Justice of Japan.
(4) Attorney General of Malaysia.
(5) The Chief Justice of Liberia and the Justice of the Supreme Court of South Australia.

The Third Judicial Session discussed:

(a) Court congestion (incidentally, a World Problem—not only in the USA and Philadelphia!).

(b) Modernization of Calendar Control.

(c) Possible use of Computers.

The discussants were from the USA, Italy and the Republic of China.

(d) Operations of Appellate Court.

By representatives from (1) Yugoslavia; (2) France and (3) Venezuela.

(e) Supervisory Functions of Highest Courts.

Discussed by Chief Justices of Canada and Ireland.

This was indeed a working conference of lawyers and judges. These men and women (there must have been at least a hundred women lawyers in attendance, but all too few women judges) were a dedicated lot. The writer, your representative, sensing the need for a long number of years, reenforced by the Suez Canal-Egypt dispute, the Santo Domingo crisis, the Cyprus dispute, the India-Pakistan confrontation in 1965, and the all too recent Israeli-Arab confrontation, prepared and presented a resolution that I thought would point up the weakness of the United Nations and the need for strengthening that great organization to the attention of the world today.

This resolution was as follows:

"To The Geneva World Conference on World Peace Through Law," July 9, 1967:

"We recommend that this Assembly go on record by vote of the numbers assembled to urge the following:

"(1) That the United Nations, at the earliest possible date, meet to consider the desirability of exercising the power reserved to it under the Charter establishing the United Nations, Sec. 109 thereof, to amend the United Nations Charter to bring it up to date with the ever growing and extending needs of this World Organization required by the conditions existing in the world today.

"The necessity for this is made clear by the experience of 22 years since the birth of the U.N. at San Francisco in 1945. During those years tensions have been constant; crises threatening the peace of the world have been frequent and only too recently, one of the bitterest and most costly of wars, costly in the toll of lives taken and property destroyed, has just ended in an uneasy truce.

"These recurring outbreaks, however minor and far distant, can never be dismissed as inconsequential. In these days of proliferation of nuclear weapons capable of the destruction without warning, of the entire civilized world, the United Nations Charter must be amended to include all nations and divisions of nations, of whatever form of established government under which they operate. All of these nations of the world must, by world law, be subject to its power and mandates. With this end purpose in mind, it is suggested and therefore recommended that:

"(a) The United Nations shall under its amended Charter provide for a world court for peace composed of 15 members, presided over by a Chief Justice, appointed by the Heads of the Government of the 15 countries selected by the members of the General Assembly of the U.N. for such terms of office as designated by the Assembly.

"(b) That the said Court shall have power to demand and execute "cease and desist orders" to any of its member countries engaged upon activities of any nature that may be calculated to endanger the peace of the area and therefore the Peace of the World.

"(c) That upon failure to "cease and desist" such activities immediately, the U.N. shall request said "World Court for Peace" to demand that the member countries involved in such threatened outbreak of hostilities to present their respective claims or disputes before this Tribunal for arbitration, with the power to impose such sanctions as may be deemed appropriate, including the dispatch to said troubled area of a suitable and nonrecallable peace-keeping force of soldiers from the membership countries of the U.N. to patrol and safeguard such areas under the command of the U.N. (recallable only upon vote of the U.N.).

"(d) That the U.N. shall have such other powers as may be deemed necessary for keeping the peace and for bringing about a settlement, through the orderly processes of the law and under such rules as may be enacted in order that all such disputes, grievances and confrontations shall be submitted to the "World Court for Peace" and in such manner as the U.N. Charter as amended may provide.

"(2) That with the purpose in mind to end forever such threats to the Peace of the World that occurred and still persist in North and South Vietnam, the not too far ago confrontations in Cyprus, Santo Domingo, India-Pakistan and the only too recent Israeli-U. A. R. conflict and less dangerous, but all too frightening outbreaks in many other areas of the world, this body is urged to recommend to U. N. the inclusion within its membership of both the mainland and Nationalist China, North as well as South Korea, North as well as South Vietnam, and further that no nation shall hereafter have the power of veto to thwart the will of the great majority of the members of the Security Council and the total membership of the U.N. Assembly, but, in its stead, the vote of three-fourths of the members of the Security Council shall be decisive, and, as heretofore, the vote of two-thirds of the members of the entire Assembly shall be determinative of the action of that body.

"Respectfully submitted.

"Judge RAYMOND PACE ALEXANDER."

My hope for a full debate on the many significant and challenging points raised in this resolution was shortlived. And, upon reflection, understandably so. My life-long belief and optimism in direct and prompt action to obtain the desired results had to be relegated to the slow and cautious approach when the subject is the United Nations, a body now consisting of some 110 nations of heterogeneous structure in all parts of the great wide world. We were cautioned at the inaugural sessions of this conference that matters affecting the structure and operation of the United Nations might lead to serious political debate because of the very existence of the current war hysteria dialogue in the U.N. Assembly in session at that very moment. The questions posed in this resolution, admittedly current and important had to give way to something less likely to cause endless and, as some commented, perhaps unprofitable debate.

I regretted this because we should always remember that we worked side by side with the Soviet Union in restricting the power of the Security Council. But that was 22 years ago when we believed that the Security Council was the all-powerful peace keeping instrument of the five great powers acting together but capable only of procedural action and ineffectual debate if one of the great five dissented. The General Assembly was conceived merely as a vehicle of parliamentary or multilateral diplomacy. It has long been my contention that this philosophy needed changing, thus the reason for my resolution. I was prompted in this by the all too frequent Soviet habit of using the veto in the protection of not only its own interests but also the interest of states with which the Soviet Union wanted to gain favor, such as India, the Arabs and some of the emerging African nations. I shall resolve to await the year 1968, when in that year, after twenty long years of effort by the United Nations to give vitality and concrete form to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights will be celebrated. At least the year 1968 is designated by the General Assembly as the International Human Rights Year, although the United States is, regrettably, the chief laggard in translating the global norms of conduct which the U.N. has been struggling with into basic international law.

As I approach the close of this report I must confess great optimism for future conferences of this association. This is due largely to the fact that throughout this meeting and in virtually every address ran the theme that the basis of all hope for peace and world law was the protection of the human rights of mankind. These rights coupled with the free choice of election to political office and equal standing before the law were considered basic to the attainment of world peace.

The lawyers interested in and those specializing in International Law have valuable contributions to make in this effort for World Peace Through Law. As emphasized by Chief Justice Warren, the enormous number of treaties adopted and perhaps a hundred more that must be adopted by the United Nations will be the basic for all future law in this area. These treaties are now more numerous in all fields than ever before in all world history. One speaker, the current President of the United Nations Assembly, went so far as to say that all the States of the World should be compelled to accept jurisdiction of the World Court and be bound by all treaties adopted by this world body.

Within the last 15 years a vast new international universe has emerged which calls for regulation, and hence for rules of international law. The problems of outer space, problems concerning the passage of space vehicles, the damage caused by them, the use of the physical elements of space for the purpose of telecommunications, the hundreds of billions of dollars value of food and minerals and chemicals beneath our seas, all of which were brilliantly and expertly discussed at the conference are only the most obvious. There are a host of other and equally real ones. I raised a question at the conference about the disposal of nuclear as well as the great industrial wastes that threaten the human community, the pollution of our seas and waterways. What to do about this?

What of the future on these and a host of other problems—some of which will be entirely new to us when the next Conference convenes in 1969?

This was a truly great assembly of lawyers and judges from some 100 nations scattered throughout this wide, wide world. Many of these came more than 10,000 miles (from Australia and New Zealand) and the majority of them (from America) covered, both ways, more than 6,000 miles to share in what has been truthfully termed, "A Great Venture for the Future Safety of Mankind the World Over."

Respectfully submitted.

Judge Raymond Pace Alexander.

September 1, 1967.

PRESIDENT HESBURGH OF NOTRE DAME

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I am pleased to invite attention to the "Man in the News" column in today's New York Times. Under the very appropriate heading "Versatile Ecumenist," the Times has examined the career and contributions of one of America's leading educators—Father Theodore Hesburgh, president of the University of Notre Dame.

At a time when the fortunes of Notre Dame football are once again on the rise and the sports pages herald the exploits of the "Fighting Irish," this article commends Father Hesburgh for his steadfast devotion to academic excellence. In the 15 years since he was appointed, at the age of 35, to be president of Notre Dame, the university has "matured in scholarship." A new era in Catholic education has been ushered in under Father Hesburgh's watchful eye. For example, the university's board of trustees is no longer composed primarily of members of the clergy; in fact, at present it consists of seven priests and 29 laymen, several of whom are non-Catholic.

In addition to his numerous academic duties, Father Hesburgh ably serves in many advisory capacities. He is a member of the National Science Board, the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, the President's General Advisory Committee on Foreign Assistance, and a host of other official Government commissions and committees.

As the article notes, and as admirers of Father Hesburgh can attest to, there is a "Hesburgh mystique."

I ask unanimous consent that the "Man in the News" report on Father Hesburgh, together with an accompanying article dealing with the university's development campaign, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Man in the News: Versatile Ecumenist, Theodore Martin Hesburgh

Whenever football fans in the University of Notre Dame stadium look up from the field and gaze northward, they see a huge mural depicting Jesus raising his hands. The fresco adorns a new $9-million high-rise Memorial Library, separated from the sports area by a small lagoon, and known on the South Bend, Ind., campus as "Ted's Mahal."

"Father Ted"—the Rev. Theodore Martin Hesburgh, president of Notre Dame—is more interested in the library than in the stadium. "Actually I have little to do with football," he confided yesterday. "All we do is hire a good coach and let him worry."

However, Father Hesburgh pointed to the university's strong intramural athletic program, which he seemed to consider one of the reasons why the school had no drug and hippie problems—"just a few beards, and I have nothing against beards."

A handsome, intense priest, educator and scholar who routinely works on a 7 A.M.-to-3 A.M. schedule, Father Hesburgh himself is not known for athletic achievement. He gets all the exercise he needs from traveling. In a year he may log 120,000 to 150,000 miles.

He has just returned from Jerusalem, where he met with Jewish, Orthodox and Protestant scholars to discuss the operations of a new interfaith center, and from Vienna, where he attended sessions of the International Atomic Energy Agency. Father Hesburgh is at home both in the ecumenical movement—he was an early advocate of harmony between different faiths—and nuclear research.

HESBURGH MYSTIQUE

As a member of the National Science Board, the United States Commission on Civil Rights, the President's General Advisory Committee on Foreign Assistance Programs and other official bodies, Father Hesburgh devotes about 100 days every year to service for the Federal Government. He tries to spend at least half of his time in South Bend.

When he is on the campus, his door is open to every student, although "they're awed by him—there is a Hesburgh mystique," as the president of the student body, Christopher J. Murphy, a 21-year-old student of government, puts it.

His long working hours and his incessant travels "would be unfair to a family," Father Hesburgh remarked yesterday, as he called himself a supporter of clerical celibacy.

Seemingly thriving on sparse meals, coffee and many Lucky Strike cigarettes smoked through a holder, Father Hesburgh finds rare relaxation in fishing. The last time he found it was during a spiritual summer retreat in a Wisconsin lakeside cabin.

Father Hesburgh was born in Syracuse on May 25, 1917, a son of Anne Murphy Hesburgh and the late Theodore Bernard Hesburgh, an official of a glass company.

A brother, James, is vice president for international relations for The Wheelabrator Corporation of Mishawaka, Ind. He has two surviving sisters, Mrs. Robert O'Neil of Cazenovia, N.Y. and Mrs. John Jackson of Syracuse. A third sister died in 1957.

The Notre Dame president was educated at the South Bend university and in Rome. He was ordained a priest of the Congregation of the Holy Cross on the Notre Dame campus on June 24, 1943.

After winning a doctorate in theology at the Catholic University of America in Washington, Father Hesburgh joined the Notre Dame faculty in 1945. He became head of the theology department in 1948 and executive vice president in 1949. In June, 1952, at the age of 35, Father Hesburgh was appointed Notre Dame's 16th president.

In the 15 years since then, Notre Dame has remained the citadel of the "Fighting Irish" football team, but it has also matured in scholarship and veered toward science and secularism.

The 20 major new buildings on the South Bend campus include a $3-million computer center and a $2.2-million radiation research structure erected by the Atomic Energy Commission.

In 1964, President Johnson awarded Father Hesburgh the Medal of Freedom, the nation's highest civil honor. He has received honorary degrees from 23 colleges and universities.

Father Hesburgh signaled a new era in Roman Catholic higher education last May when he announced that laymen would henceforth control the Notre Dame administration. Its board of trustees is at present composed of seven priests and 29 laymen, including non-Catholics.

Fund Drive Opens for Notre Dame—Interfaith Center Listed in $52-Million Program

(By Paul Hofmann)

The president of the University of Notre Dame said yesterday that the Roman

Catholic institution would seek to engage Hindu, Jewish, Buddhist and other spiritual leaders throughout the world in "conversations."

The educator, the Rev. Theodore Hesburgh, said the exploration of faiths outside Christianity would be carried out through an Institute for Advanced Religious Studies that is to rise soon on the university campus in South Bend, Ind.

Father Hesburgh, whose far-ranging interests include consultation to the Federal Government, suggested that it was "good for the country" to assess spirituality in all its forms.

"We hope to build great bridges," Father Hesburgh said. "The world today is forging toward unity." He stressed that every world problem had "moral, human" aspects that should be thoroughly examined. Father Hesburgh declared in reply to a question that this was true also of the war in Vietnam.

The 50-year-old churchman, who transferred the administration of Notre Dame from exclusively clerical control to a predominantly lay board last May, held a news conference at the Americana Hotel yesterday morning, and elaborated on some of his remarks in an interview later.

FOR INSTITUTE, $3.15 MILLION

He had come to New York to open a campaign for $52 million for a 1967–1972 development program of his 125-year-old university.

Of the total sum, $3.15 million is earmarked for the Institute for Advanced Religious Studies. It is to be housed in a $2.3 million complex, including apartments for the institute's 24 fellows in residence, private studies, a library, conference rooms and an auditorium.

Described as the first organization of its kind in the world, the proposed institute is scheduled to begin working during the current academic year.

Catholic, Protestant, Orthodox and Jewish thinkers are on its advisory council. It is devoted exclusively to research at the postdoctoral level, with procedures similar to those governing the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton and Harvard University's Society of Fellows.

The university plans to spend $20-million for new endowed professorships, new faculty positions and better salaries. The remaining allocations include $6-million for the colleges of science and engineering, $2.5-million for a new Graduate School of Business and Public Administration, $2.25-million for library development, and smaller sums for special research projects.

One of them is a proposed new sociological unit, to be known as Center for the Study of Man in Contemporary Society, for which $500,000 are earmarked.

Notre Dame calls its present campaign Summa, Latin for "the greatest." Dr. O. C. Carmichael, a Presbyterian who is a trustee of the university and national chairman of the fund drive, noted at the news conference that if the target figure was reached, Notre Dame would have raised $100-million in a decade, more than in its entire earlier existence.

The university has an enrollment of about 6,000 undergraduates, and 1,200 graduate students. Father Hesburgh explained that $16-million of the university's $34-million yearly budget came from tuition fees; $7-million to $8-million from "all sorts of grants"; more than $3-million from auxiliary university enterprises, including "a few hundred thousand dollars" from the Notre Dame football team, and the rest from endowment income.

Father Hesburgh said the Summa campaign had started in New York because of the large number of Notre Dame alumni here. He said he and his associates planned to tour 38 other major cities.

SENATOR NELSON — NATIONALLY RECOGNIZED CONSERVATIONST

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] is more than a nationally recognized leader in the fields of conservation, auto and tire safety, and air and water pollution. He is also a dedicated, tireless representative of the people of the State of Wisconsin. He has long fought for a fairer distribution of Federal grants, especially in research and development contracts to universities and colleges, for the entire Midwest and his own State.

A typical example of his energy is found in an article published in the July 1, 1967, issue of Forbes magazine. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GAYLORD A. NELSON: "THEY CAN MERGE WITH ANYBODY"

When Democratic Senator Gaylord Anton Nelson of Wisconsin was tooting a trumpet in the Clear Lake High School band, his classmates used to call him "Happy Nelson." There's one thing Nelson isn't very happy about these days, and that is the perilous state of American Motors Corp., Wisconsin's leading employer, with 16,500 men working at its plants in Kenosha and Milwaukee. Nelson is determined to help keep AMC alive, and, as chairman of the subcommittee on monopolies of the Senate's Committee on Small Business, he thinks he can do something about it.

He is, for example, ready to do anything he can to help AMC merge with a stronger company. He has, he says, already cleared this with Donald Turner, the assistant attorney general in charge of antitrust. Says Nelson: "Turner wants to help American Motors, too. He says the Justice Department would not object to a merger of AMC with any nonauto company in the world. He has said even if it were another auto company, he wouldn't object to a merger with Chrysler, which is only No. Three."

Nelson also feels he can help AMC's dealer situation: It doesn't have enough of them, and the ones it has are rarely effective competition for the Big Three dealers in their areas. Nelson believes this problem could be aleviated if auto dealers were permitted to handle all makes of cars. "What about the possibility of dealers handling both General Motors and American Motors cars?" he asks. "Or Ford and American Motors? Or Chrysler and American Motors? Or any other combination? They do it with television sets and other products. Dealers handle General Electric sets, Westinghouse and others together. Why not cars?"

Meanwhile, Nelson is pressing for AMC to get more "set-aside contracts." These are government contracts specifically earmarked for small companies (and in the auto business, AMC, with less than 3% of industry sales, is considered really small). AMC recently got such a contract for 1,500 trucks from the Post Office Department, and Nelson says he plans to talk with his fellow Wisconsin Democrat, Senator William E. Proxmire, and with Vice President Hubert Horatio Humphrey, from neighboring Minnesota, about helping the company get more.

Nelson's concern over AMC's plight does not arise merely from the fact that its plants are located in his state. He feels very strongly about small businesses in general. He believes his dual-dealership idea could do a lot for them, especially in the tire and oil industries. "Why not have gas stations sell a couple of kinds of gas?" he asks.

THE DEAN OF WISCONSIN'S STATE CAPITAL CORRESPONDENTS

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the September 24 edition of the Green Bay Press Gazette contains a fascinating profile of John Wyngaard, who, after 30 years of covering State government in action, is the dean of Wisconsin's State capital correspondents. John writes a daily column on State government which is published in a great number of daily newspapers throughout the State and provides direct, on-the-spot news coverage to a number of newspapers, particularly the Appleton Post Crescent and the Green Bay Press Gazette.

At a time when public understanding of government institutions is more important than ever before, I think it is worthwhile to study the Wyngaard system and understand what it is that makes him outstanding in his field. John Wyngaard does not report government the way you would report a boxing match. He is no mere conveyer belt to pass on the press releases, charges, and countercharges served up by bureaucrats and office seekers. Rather, John Wyngaard is a serious student of government, having a deep respect for and understanding of our governmental and political processes. We often hear it said in Madison that Wyngaard is not merely a reporter but one of the institutions of the State capital and that is literally true.

It is vital to the success of democratic government to have able, knowledgeable reporters who really know, understand, and respect government and can translate it in understandable fashion to the public back home. All across the country, I know of no reporter who fills this role better than John Wyngaard. I ask unanimous consent that this excellent article on his long years of service be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HE MAKES LAWMAKERS' ACTIONS OUR BUSINESS

(By Bob Woessner)

MADISON.—A kind man would call the office dingy. Piles of newspapers, reams of files and comments, reports, studies and suggestions fill desk and table top space.

One alpine-like heap towers above the rest.

"When it gets high enough to fall over, we have the papers carted away," John Wyngaard said.

He was seated before a scarred desk, punching out a story on the venerable L. C. Smith typewriter he uses. A bulletin board took up much of the wall in front of him. It was tatooed with memos, reminders, telephone numbers.

The rooms are small and the decor less than modern in the elderly Washington Building, just off Capitol Square, but the quarters have been large enough for Wyngaard to produce the stories and columns which have earned the respect of politicians, bureaucrats and fellow newsmen for many years.

But he will soon have to move—the building is soon to be torn down.

Wyngaard, head of the Press-Gazette Madison Bureau, is the "dean of the capitol press corps" a title formalized last Spring in a resolution passed by the Legislature.

It is a title he wears with pride.

"He really is the dean," a young reporter explains. "You don't really compete with John Wyngaard. You just assume that if you are now working on a story he will beat you to it."

Other reporters also have praise for his honesty and accuracy.

The comments bring a smile from Wyngaard.

Now 53, he has described himself as having 40 per cent of his normal hair and 140 per cent of his normal weight. His doctor has enforced a strict diet to control the weight.

Wyngaard was born in Little Chute in 1914. His parents were Dutch, a lineage that shows today in his strong voice, vise-like handshake and work routine.

"He gets a lot of stuff on sheer Holland guts," one lobbyist explained. "He will go places where he is not wanted when he has to."

But Wyngaard seldom finds a Madison situation where he is not welcome.

Paul Hasset, executive assistant to Gov. Warren Knowles, explains why:

"People here know him and trust him. As a result, Wyngaard is privy to the innermost thoughts and plans of the top people."

Much of this advantage comes naturally to anyone who has survived 30 years on a newsbeat. He knows the people, the routine, where the secrets are buried.

G. H. Bakke who heads the highway department, explains that many of the leaders in Madison today are people who first followed state politics in Wyngaard's "Wisconsin Report," which appears six times weekly on the Press-Gazette editorial page and is syndicated to 16 other state papers.

"It really isn't a news column. It is a day-by-day history of state government. It gives continuity of coverage opinion."

The matter of continuity is of concern to Madison's upper echelons.

The press corps there represents the two wire services, Associated Press and United Press International, two Madison and two Milwaukee papers and the Press-Gazette Madison News Bureau, headed by Wyngaard.

The bureau is now a two-man affair. Wyngaard's youngest son, Tim, joined his father a year ago.

The small size of this delegation during most of the year, coupled with the turnover among newsmen, has created a bothersome situation, according to some.

"Controversy often replaces news," Hassett explains. "You get stories on who is for or against a program without a story on what the program is."

Wyngaard calls many of the young reporters the "gee whiz kids."

"There was a young reporter who stalked out of an assembly session one day and told his paper over the phone, 'The Legislature did something today I've never seen before.' He had been here three weeks," Wyngaard said.

But years of experience, according to some, bring about a Wyngaard failing.

"He is not cynical or callous," one explained. "But he has been here a long time and he knows when something will work and when it won't. As a result, he doesn't get too enthused about some ideas."

Miles McMillan, a Green Bay native, now political commentator for the Madison Capitol Times, points to another area:

"Wyngaard, he says, is an outstanding writer.

"If you have to put it down on paper and make it clear, he's the man who can do it," McMillan says.

"He has known everyone who has come along for a quarter of a century. He has watched state government and its practices as close up as you can get."

McMillan also points to Wyngaard's curiosity, his appetite for reading and research. And his sense of humor. "That is important in this type of business. It helps you discern the phony," he says.

Some critics have called his writing style stilted. But even they are quick to point out that he has the expertise and is listened to by the politicians.

Young newsmen chide him for occasional use of his position as dean to deliver printed lectures about their shortcomings or excesses.

His critics come from both sides of the political aisle.

"The Republicans think he is a Democrat, and the Democrats think he is a Republican," was one explanation.

Wyngaard describes himself as a conservative in politics. "Everybody has prejudices. The reporter's best rule is to know what they are, and to conduct himself accordingly," he says.

"He doesn't report things as he sees them, but as they are—there is a big difference," one newsman said.

Patrick Lucey, former Democratic lieutenant governor and his party's state chairman, agrees.

"He won't take unfair advantage. He doesn't have a killer instinct. He has never been less than completely honest with us," Lucey says.

Elected officials, state agency people, lobbyists and newsmen agree that Wyngaard has become an influence in state government. "He is part of the establishment. But he doesn't abuse that position," one reporter said.

"He is sounded out on a lot of things, but he doesn't throw his advice around. He'll say, 'I may be wrong, but you're the one asking the questions'," a lobbyist said.

Wyngaard started asking questions when he came to Madison to attend the University of Wisconsin journalism school.

Fighting the depression years, Wyngaard graduated after a 15-month interruption during which he worked for the Appleton Post-Crescent. He then attempted to set up a Madison bureau to serve the Post-Crescent and the Press-Gazette, then sister papers.

A. B. Turnbull, Press-Gazette general manager at the time, was dubious about the cost ($30 a week) and about letting a youngster cover state government, but he agreed to a trial.

Wyngaard recalls that he splurged on a wire to his wife to announce the news. "She claims that she has it among her mementos, and that I cockily related that 'they met my terms.'"

Settling into the job and probing the depths of Madison, Wyngaard survived the first years. Eventually he suggested a signed column from his Madison vantage point.

The column is a particular pride. Wyngaard points to the fact that, except for vacation periods, he has missed only a handful of publication days since he started.

The work of 30 years has been satisfying, Wyngaard admits.

Colleagues point out that it would be natural for a man in his position to coast. But he doesn't. His working hours, they agree, are as numerous as they have ever been.

Even social life is often a combination of business and pleasure. A favorite recreation is dining out with friends—usually people in government life. The talk, confidants admit, is good.

Wyngaard lives in suburban Madison in a house big enough to have handled his five children and a lawn big and lavish enough for him to indulge his favorite hobby—gardening.

He reads much and widely, and has built a fine library.

"I've seen three governors in that room at John's" one friend said. "They'll have their shoes off and be stretched out on a couch telling him their troubles."

Madison life is stimulating and comfortable, Wyngaard admits. But there is also an advantage for a man with a large family. "My residence here has saved about $50,000 in college fees," he estimates.

Four of his five children are UW graduates:

Tim, his associate in the bureau; Michael, a lawyer for the state Motor Carriers Association; John, a doctorate holder presently working for the Air Force; Judith, a teacher in Milwaukee; and Susan, now a college junior.

Completing the family is Mrs. Wyngaard—Catherine.

She is not officially part of the news gathering team, but her work with and for her husband at political conventions has been helpful.

"She is no mere traveling companion," one associate points out. "She takes telephone messages, stakes out telegraph offices, transportation, places with eatable food."

During the 1964 Republican convention in California, she worked with her husband and with Press-Gazette editorial page editor James Bartelt.

"She had her Wisconsin friends issue her a press badge which described her job as 'runner.' It was the only such designation in all of the thousands of press credentials given out," Bartelt recalls.

The father-son teamwork is new. But not the day-by-day coverage of state events. The two Wyngaards select their coverage with an eye to items of special interest to their two Northeastern Wisconsin employers.

John keeps an eye on political parties, natural resource programs and issues, highways and transportation and his column. Tim concentrates on educational news.

The senior Wyngaard likes the work. "One reason, I suppose, is the comparative independence. I can pick and choose, and rely upon my own judgment. I'm pretty sure that we spend more time working in a typical week than the average newspaperman, but there are compensations in greater freedom of action," he points out.

The "dean" is also proud of the "long tether" given him.

"I am absolutely sure that I have written things and expressed views that annoyed the several editors and publishers who have employed me here. But there has been no interference, which is something that few other correspondents can say."

A talk with Wyngaard covers many topics, and it shows a man of perception and good humor. He is, naturally, more at home in discussions of state government and the role of the press in it.

"I believe a responsible reporter can contribute something to the community, by providing insights and understandings on public affairs in a time when government is the most important force in the average man's life."

He is proud of the amount and depth of governmental news coverage in the state, and feels he has had some part in establishing this.

In the early Madison years, he recalls, he was often alone in coverage of many agencies and boards. Today that is no longer true. The two Milwaukee papers, for example, often have a total of eight men working during legislative sessions.

Madison is a more complex town today than it was in 1937. The first state budget Wyngaard saw enacted was about $70 million. This year the figure will top $1.1 billion.

Thirty years ago, most of the governmental machinery was housed in the capitol. Today it is spread across more than 100 locations in Madison.

Long-term contacts are helpful here, he says. Wyngaard is often able to track down much of his information by phone by knowing who has what he wants and where the source is located.

The growth has changed the reporter's job, too.

"There is now literally too much material; the job is in sorting it out."

Wyngaard also emphasizes the growing impact of state affairs. More than half of the money now spent for local government comes from state treasuries, he reminds.

"The state has a 'cradle to the grave' impact on individuals, and it is steadily growing more important."

"Our social system is governed basically by state statutes," he says, and points to laws on pollution control, education, highways and other areas for support.

Wisconsin's government is generally clean and reasonably efficient, he says. This is due, in part, to inspection of it and the impact of measures such as the Kellett streamlining—a measure which Wyngaard predicted would fail.

"This used to be an old folks' home," Wyngaard said of the Legislature. "Today we have a more representative Legislature, and I believe a more responsible and effective one now than when I arrived."

The job of state coverage has also led him to the national political arena. Wyngaard has covered most national political conventions of the past 30 years.

He has been among the note takers during the campaigns of John Kennedy, Hubert Humphrey, Adlai Stevenson, Estes Kefauver, Robert A. Taft, Harold Stassen, Thomas Dewey, Wendell Willkie, Earl Warren and both George and Henry Wallace.

There were notable men in the group.

"I learned to admire intensely the nononsense style of Taft and his warm personality in close contact," he recalls.

Wyngaard also found the "velvet voice" of Stevenson memorable. But he had his doubts about John Kennedy. "As far as I could discern, Kennedy was not a gregarious fellow. He never could understand why there was so much empty space in Wisconsin.

The list of Wisconsin personalities Wyngaard has covered is long.

He catalogues Julius Heil, the governor who followed Phillip LaFollette, as the most interesting. "He was thoroughly lovable," Wyngaard remembers, "but almost totally ineffective as a leader."

"Walter S. Goodland will probably live longer in the memory of the state, because of his calculated style as a curmudgeon, plus his advanced age.

"He never could remember my name, although we got along nicely. I was 'Wynkoop,'" Wyngaard recalls.

Associates of the governor's confided that the old man was losing his memory and had confused the reporter's name with that of a famous murderess of the 1800s, he explains.

Wyngaard is now in the enviable position of having known many of the state's leaders since they were students or young politicians.

"Gaylord Nelson and I were friends on the UW campus," he points out. "I knew Joe McCarthy before he became a judge."

"I knew such men as Knowles, Rennebohm, Reynolds, Kohler, Thomson and Proxmire in their apprentice days."

Nelson and former Gov. Walter Kohler are highly rated by Wyngaard.

"One measure of the public man, as I see it, is how well he understands the function and responsibility and the problems of the professional political reporter. By that test, the best governors I covered were Nelson and Kohler.

"I'm sure that sometimes they were offended by some of my reports. But in no instance did either of them ever complain, or show any resentment. Both respected the reporter's craft; some politicians don't."

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY UDALL AT BACONE COLLEGE, MUSKOGEE, OKLA.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, last Sunday a new president, Dr. Garold D. Holstine, was inaugurated at Bacone College, Muskogee, Okla. Since Bacone College has traditionally served the needs of Indian people, it was fitting that the Secretary of the Interior, Hon. Stewart L. Udall, should have been invited to be the featured speaker at the ceremonies.

Secretary Udall stressed the new directions currently being taken in education for Indian youth. Since his remarks were both informative and inspirational, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from his speech be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS OF SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR STEWART L. UDALL AT BACONE COLLEGE, MUSKOGEE, OKLA., OCTOBER 8, 1967

As we meet today for the formal inauguration of a new president of Bacone College, there is a feeling of new direction in the autumn air—new paths ahead for the Indian people and, indeed, for all Americans.

These new directions reflect a growing awareness that our society has the ability to do the job of bringing economic and social equality to all of its citizens if we can match our resources with our imagination and energy. It is a colossal task, but our country does the big jobs best. It is blessed with capable, determined men like the man who first called my attention to this ceremony and asked that I attend—your Congressman, Ed Edmondson, whose imagination, initiative and understanding have made him one of the rising leaders of our legislative branch of government, known widely for his ability to recognize a problem and achieve an effective solution.

Bacone's new president, Dr. Garold D. Holstine, brings impressive credentials to his job. He has a fine academic background and wide experience in educating young people, and in college administration. Equally important, I think, is the experience that goes beyond the confines of his job. He has wide experience in community activities, as shown by his background as National Director of Red Cross Youth. He has been active in State, National and international affairs. We can be confident that Dr. Holstine will put this broad background to good use in demonstrating the primacy of education among our endeavors for the improvement of man and his world.

Today, nearly everyone agrees that education is the key to practically all achievement.

In any discussion of any human problem you can name, the statement will be made, "The real solution to this problem is education." Our biggest job today and every day, is to decide how it can be done.

What is happening here at Bacone College will have to happen hundreds of times in Indian education if Indians are to succeed in finding their place in the sun. It is appropriate that new directions in Indian education should begin here in Oklahoma, for there is a unique history here. As many of you know, when the white man came to Oklahoma he found that the groundwork for the State's educational system already had been laid. A whole system of schools had been established by forward-looking tribes for the education of their children. Many of these schools were taken over by local and state authorities in the process of attaining Statehood. Although the Indian origins of many of this State's most famous educational institutions have become obscured with the passing years, I hope that the descendants of those pioneers in the Five Civilized Tribes will keep alive this history of concern for Indian education that becomes more and more appropriate with each passing day.

In recent years, Bacone has been steadily broadening its concept of its purpose as a college. Certainly the emphasis on the education of Indian young people properly remains. But the school now includes many students from several races and cultures. This demonstrates a realization that we are all Americans together, that no success will insure the survival of this Nation and its heritage more than the success of learning to live and work together.

By this I do *not* mean that the object of Indian educational programs should be to move Indians en masse from their traditional homes into our urban society. This should be an option, not an obligation. I mean that to live and work effectively in America today—whether in Manhattan or at Keams Canyon, Arizona—a citizen must understand the variety of attitude and experience that make up our national personality. For most Americans this is not too difficult an educational attainment. We grow up surrounded by a culture rich in the diversity of a melting-pot America. And what we don't experience first hand is brought to us by newspapers, magazines, radio, television and the ease and freedom of travel.

But there are those who do not grow up in such an environment. They learn one culture, often speak a different language, and perceive the other culture that exists around them only in terms of its conflict with their own.

We must create an educational system, and more important, an educational attitude, that will surmount the barriers of isolation, poverty, language and understanding that can so effectively slow down Indian development. We have little time we can afford to lose. H. G. Wells, shortly after the explosion of the first atomic bomb, noted that "human history is a race between education and catastrophe." He was speaking in terms of survival of the whole human race. It would be a catastrophe of comparable magnitude for the Indian people to so reduce their options that their choice is either the abandonment of their heritage or a life of isolation and poverty.

But the things that are happening here and in many places across the Nation convince me that we can be optimistic about the future. We are entering into new and realistic partnerships between government and the Indian people, between industry and the tribes, and between the teacher and the community. These alliances of mutual esteem and mutual assistance are the wave of the future for Indian communities.

Some of this has been going along for some time. I have always been deeply impressed by the ability of a small college in Oklahoma to ignore the usual restrictions of academic credentials and solvency to assist youngsters whose chief asset was a desire to learn, and whose limitations were both financial and educational. It would have been easy to say, "Sorry you don't have enough math to qualify for entrance," or "You don't have enough money to last through the school year." Instead the extra effort was made, the extra confidence placed and through extra hard work, and I'm sure considerable prayer, an education was achieved.

At the present time we are in what I hope is a renaissance in Indian education. The Bureau of Indian Affairs has reached out in many directions to apply many of the new techniques of education and new insights into human development to the education of Indian children. We are pioneering, for example, in programs to teach English as a second language. We are working to make Indian culture a strong support for the development of a child's confidence in his ability to learn. With the Office of Economic Opportunity, we have funded an Indian school that is truly run by the Indian community, draws on the resources of the tribe for instruction in traditional crafts and the preservation and appreciation of tribal history and tradition. This school is not an adjunct to the community—it is a vital part of the community, and we hope that the community will be the stronger for it.

This sort of community involvement is not new for Bacone College, of course. For many years this school has played an active role in community and Indian affairs, and I am sure that much of the progress made in this area in community development—new employment, new social services, new economic growth—can be traced to the fact that you have this dynamic institution in your midst.

And as a result of similar developments in other Indian areas, I predict that greatly increased numbers of Indian young people will be coming to Muskogee, Oklahoma, and to Durango, Colorado, and to Minneapolis, Chicago, and Washington in search of higher education. For many of these young people this will be the first real experience in living both away from home and away from an Indian society. The small college can provide a much more hospitable environment for a successful educational endeavor than can a larger, impersonal university.

And yet the small college is quite often a private institution that each year feels a greater squeeze as rising educational and living costs create more demands on a limited endowment. Certainly, I know that this is the case at Bacone. The tradition of finding a way to help those who want an education, regardless of their means, becomes more difficult each year. But, as many of you know, relief may be in sight, in the form of a bill introduced in Congress by my good friend Ed Edmondson. I have known Ed for many years; we served on the Indian Subcommittee in the House of Representatives together; and I know from long experience that no man has higher aspirations for the Indian people, nor worked harder to make these aspirations realities, than Ed Edmondson.

Ed's bill would repeal a provision in a 1917 law that the Federal Government cannot provide scholarship funds for Indian students attending sectarian colleges and universities. I am proud to report that just last week the Department of the Interior reported favorably on this bill, and urged the Congress to pass it. It seems obvious to me that this legislation would promote exactly the kind of new partnership that I have been talking about. Bacone College has prided itself on its independent status. It is not looking for any massive Federal handout. But a school which can do effectively meet the needs of Indian pupils should not be penalized because of a sectarian association. And surely, the clear-cut distinction that the money is going directly to the student and not directly to the school, which applies to many other Federal scholarship programs, applies here as well.

Last year more than 4,000 Indian students attended college, almost half of them aided by BIA scholarships. The Edmondson bill will not create any more money for scholarships but it will allow a more equitable spread of the funds available. And schools such as Bacone, which can offer the more personal type of attention that may be the difference between success and failure in the effort of cultural adaptation, will have additional opportunity for service to Indian youth. I should hasten to add that a favorable report on a bill is not the same thing as passage, but I do think we should be optimistic in this case, especially with Oklahoma's outstanding delegation pushing for its approval in Congress. Senators Monroney and Harris have always been among the very strongest supporters of progressive Indian legislation in the Senate, just as all the members of the Oklahoma delegation in the House have distinguished themselves individually and as a group in this regard.

Bacone has much that is distinctive to offer a young man or woman in search of a well rounded education. I am looking forward to visiting its fine arts collection at the college museum—and incidentally, I also want to see the Five Civilized Tribes Museum, which deeply impressed my wife, Lee, on a recent visit. Athletics are an essential part of education too, and Bacone has won honors there as well, by producing a baseball team that won the 1967 National Junior College championship.

I have no doubt that, at Bacone and elsewhere, there will be a rising tide of Indian college enrollment. And I have no doubt that a part of this increase can be directly attributable to the effectivenes of the Indian leadership that has developed in recent years, and to the effectiveness of our Indian Buerau programs to make better use of Indian natural and human resources.

What I mean here can be illustrated very well by an experience I had this summer. Early in the season I was visited in Washington by a two-man delegation from the Zuni Pueblo in Western New Mexico. The delegation consisted of Pueblo Governor Robert E. Lewis, whom I would rate as one of the most dynamic of our Indian leaders, and a young college student, Clifford Mahooty. They presented to me a most impressive plan for the all-around development of the potential of the Pueblo.

These plans were practical yet challenging. But I was equally impressed by what these plans meant to young Cliff Mahooty. The plans called for, among other things, industrial development on the reservation, and some meetings had already taken place with an electronics firm toward that end. For a young man soon to graduate with a degree in electrical engineering, the location of such a plant would mean a chance for a job at home in a place that was a part of his very being in a way that many non-Indians cannot understand. Until now, the very fact that he was pursuing this type of education meant that on graduation day he would face the choice of leaving, for good, his home and a way of life that has deep meaning for him or else returning to his home and forgetting about the education he had worked so hard to obtain. I should add, that the plant is under construction at Zuni right now.

There are many similar examples in other reservations across the Nation. Certainly, a life in urban America will still have to be the choice for many young Indians, but we are increasing the options as fast as we can, and those who have ignored the potential of higher education because it meant the certainty of leaving the reservation may now take a second look.

Indian Affairs Commissioner Bob Bennett and I have shared dreams of putting the most dynamic and resourceful aspects of our economy and society at work, using the tools of corporate management and finance, to develop the potential of Indian areas in an optimum, practical, and yet Indian-oriented way. This may seem a big order, and is certainly something that will not be accomplished overnight, but we are beginning and we have both hope and enthusiasm.

The Indian Resource Development Act has been introduced in the Congress and I hope that we may have some action on it, if not yet this year, then early in 1968. In this area, Bob Bennett really made good on his promise to bring Indian leadership into the germinal stages of important legislation. From the many meetings held across the Nation we have developed a much better idea of how Indians perceive their needs and goals and, I hope, the Indian leadership has a better idea of how many different, and conflicting, proposals must be somehow brought together in a unified piece of legislation.

This legislation is not the answer to Indian development problems—there is no answer that can be so neatly identified and labeled. It is not perfect legislation—it does not completely satisfy me, or the Indian leadership or the Bureau of Indian Affairs and I would be worried if it did. But it is a start, a beginning, and I think a good beginning. It can give us something to build on. The capital it can make available to foster Indian economic development, to bring Indian resources into the mainstream of our free enterprise system, can break the barriers that have kept Indians from joining the astonishing march of progress that has made us, in a few short decades, incomparably the richest and most powerful Nation on earth.

As you may know, I have met many of our top industrialists whose firms produce products that fit the production potential of many reservations. My purpose has been to introduce them to the ability of our Indian areas to be a constructive part of their enterprises. The response has been tremendously gratifying. To have these eminently practical men agree that this potential can be developed is a key endorsement to plans for the future.

Perhaps even more encouraging are the developments that begin right on the reservation. It is almost a dream come true when a tribe comes to me, as the Warm Springs Tribe in Oregon did last spring, and say, "We want to create a sawmill-plywood complex to utilize the timber production from our lands and provide jobs for our people and income for the tribe. We know what we want to do, we know how to do it and we intend to use our own money."

Unfortunately, I could also describe some areas where nothing much is happening—yet. But there is ferment, there is movement, there are growing hopes and aspirations. And these developments bring us back to Bacone College and her sister institutions around the country.

These new Indian developments are going to be run by people who understand, in the word of James B. Conant, "both the responsibilities and the benefits which come to them because they are American and are free." Freedom—both the freedom of a Nation and the freedom of a community to develop along lines of its own choosing—depends upon citizens who both understand the uses of the tools and knowledge of their age and have a historical and intellectual perspective on the values that have created and preserved their society. A genius with a library may do this on his own. The rest of us need education. Thomas Jefferson remarked that "If you expect a nation to be ignorant and free, you expect what never was and never will be."

Bacone College celebrates today the formal beginning of the leadership of Dr. Garold Holstine. I am certain that he will continue and will build upon the 87 years of attainment so much in evidence on this campus and in the work of Bacone alumni throughout the Nation. We who share your dreams for the school, and for the future of the Indian people as they move toward full participation in the American dream, offer our support and our enthusiasm for the years to come.

The other day President Johnson expressed the fervent hope that if historians seek a name for this age they call it the "age of education." We cannot prejudge the verdict of history. But the President's words express a full commitment to education as one of the primary goals of our society. With the help—or more precisely, the self-help—of the people as expressed here at Bacone, we can make the prophecy come true.

INVESTIGATION OF PROBLEMS CONNECTED WITH REFUGEES AND ESCAPEES

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, this morning my subcommittee heard some compelling and important testimony concerning the so-called second phase of the war in Vietnam from Dean James R. Dumpson, of Fordham University. Dean Dumpson is one of this country's leading social welfare experts. He has served as commissioner of social welfare for the city of New York, chairman of the National Association of Social Service Workers, and in numerous other professional and administrative capacities.

In July and August of this year, Dean Dumpson headed a four-member social welfare task force recruited by AID "to study social welfare problems in Vietnam and recommend to the U.S. mission and AID Washington policies and programs to meet these problems."

The team returned in late August and its report is in the final stages of being completed.

Dean Dumpson highlighted the team's findings in testimony today. It is my personal conviction that the findings of Dean Dumpson and his team are of vital importance in determining our success or failure in Vietnam. For this reason, I ask unanimous consent that Dean Dumpson's report be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement of James R. Dumpson, Dean, Fordham University School of Social Service, and Chairman, AID Social Welfare Task Force to Vietnam, Before the U.S. Senate Subcommittee To Investigate Problems Connected With Refugees and Escapees

I am pleased, Mr. Chairman, to share my thinking on two or three of the major problems in Vietnam based on the findings and recommendations of the Social Welfare Task Force to Vietnam. As you know, the Task Force went to Vietnam at the request of the Agency for International Development, and, I understand, with the approval of the President. We were asked to go in recognition of the fact that there are serious social welfare problems in Vietnam and that the United States government might not be doing all it could or should to meet these problems. If, in my testimony, I am critical of what has or has not been done to meet the serious and worsening social needs of the people of Vietnam, I am also aware that our government has taken an initiative to meet the needs of the Vietnamese people. It was our purpose first to identify the problems and then to recommend policies and programs to deal with at least the most pressing of them. I had the honor to serve as Chairman of the Task Force which arrived in Vietnam on 24 July, 1967 and returned to the United States on 21 August, 1967. While I served as Chairman of the Task Force, I should like to point out that this testimony is my own. My colleagues on the Task Force have not had an opportunity to review this statement although I have no doubt that it would have their full concurrence.

We are firmly convinced that social welfare is an essential component of national development, in any nation, through the establishment of sound social policy, through the maintenance and improvement of adequate living standards, and the provision of essential social welfare services, within the context, to be sure, of the cultural heritage of its people. In brief, we view social welfare as those institutional patterns designed to prevent social breakdown and personal maladjustment, restoration to social adequacy of those who have become the victims of social disruption, and the care and protection of the aged, the disabled, dependent children, and other dependents in the population. Our findings and recommendations concerning social welfare in Vietnam rest on these premises.

We are convinced and urge our own government and the Government of Vietnam to accept that social welfare represents a significant resource in improving the daily lot of the men, women, and children in Vietnam, in strengthening their sense of total well-being; and in enriching their lives. In fact, without a significant social welfare component, social revolution can well increase inequity, benefiting some but further penalizing others for their already disadvantaged condition. We believe that social revolution cannot be brought to full fruition without giving the highest priority to social welfare policies and programs both as a means to and an objective of social revolution. Social welfare has the potential for maximizing the human return on the investment and sacrifice being made through the war. Sound social policies and social welfare programs are tools that must be employed now in Vietnam's nation building efforts and to help secure lasting security and well-being of her people.

As I discuss our findings and observations and point up the deplorable unmet human needs of the Vietnamese people, the question will understandably arise as to why our government and the other Free World governments who are assisting the Vietnamese people do not directly use their know-how and resources to satisfy these human needs of the Vietnamese people. Nothing, in my judgment, would be more inimical to the best interest of the Vietnamese, to their right to self-determination, and to their viability as a free, independent nation. Basic to the aspects of social welfare that I have identified is the concept of participation, the active intervention of the people themselves in the achievement of their social goals. Self-help, self-determination, and democratic decision-making must be the very core of social welfare activities in Vietnam. We must deliver Vietnam to the Vietnamese and they must take responsibility for doing whatever needs to be done notwithstanding the slowness and errors that come from learning by doing. To do for them will only create dependency and represent a form of benevolent colonialism that must be opposed.

The major groups in Vietnam who represent the target populations for social welfare efforts in Vietnam are (a) displaced families; (b) the thousands of children with or without families, living in conditions that threaten their immediate and future well-being; and (c) the men, women, and children who now live in the worsening conditions of the urban areas of the country.

Since January, 1964, there have been one million nine hundred thousand known refugees, 950,000 of whom are still considered to be in a "temporary" category. By "temporary" is meant that they are receiving the barest requirements of food and shelter, a few piasters a day and 400 grams of rice while they await resettlement or return to their homes. Living in large congregate camp establishments, many are without adequate medical care, adequate sanitation facilities. Families, made up of a mother, an aged relative, and four or five children live in one room with dirt floors, bamboo sides, and aluminum roofing. For the great majority of the children ranging from infancy to 16 years of age, there are none of the basic, minimum facilities and services required for child care. Responsibility for the care and protection of refugees is assigned to the Commissariat for Refugees in the Central Government. After a three month period, the meager assistance of the SCR terminates irrespective of the needs of the refugees. Technically, the refugees then become responsibility of the Ministry of Social Welfare which has neither the funds nor personnel to carry out this responsibility. Aside from the efforts of voluntary agencies which cannot possibly meet the needs of 5 or 6 hundred thousand refugees, these people are left on their own.

Of equal concern, and pressing for attention are those displaced persons who do not go to a refugee camp. Instead, on their own initiative, they have sought haven with friends or families or have decided to try to make it on their own. Their plight is worse, if that is possible, than those in refugee camps. Because they are technically not registered refugees in camps, they are not the responsibility of the SCR. Again, technically they are the responsibility of the Ministry of Social Welfare. And, again, that Ministry is without the resources of personnel to meet even their creature comfort needs.

While conditions vary among and within the four regions of the country, there is an urgent need for improvement in the logistical support at the provincial level; there is still an urgent need to establish a central control system for logistical support for the provision of the basic requirements of people who are displaced whether by GVN–US military activities or the harassment, and terrorism of the Vietcong.

Three weaknesses were glaringly evident in the management of the refugees:

(1) The technical category of "refugees" and the division of responsibility based on a time span between the SCR and Ministry of Social Welfare is an arbitrary, bureaucratic device which has no relation to human need. Vietnam is faced with a monumental problem of displaced persons, estimated at close to 50,000 additional persons a month. Policies and programs must be devised to deal with displaced persons from the point of their displacement until their resettlement has been permanently achieved and sustained rehabilitative efforts have been put into operation.

(2) With the continuing escalation of military activities, the number of displaced individuals and families will increase. Logistical planning and support must be centralized and coordinated. Regional storehouses with supplies and equipment including food and medical supplies with competent personnel to be deployed to meet situations as they arise rather than after they arise must be given equal priority with that given to economic development and military activities.

(3) The GVN and the United States government in its consultative and supportive roles must recognize, accept, and act on the fact that failure to deal promptly, efficiently, and humanely with displaced persons in Vietnam is destroying the effort of nation building, is supporting the efforts of the Vietcong to weaken the will of the Vietnamese and their faith and confidence in the GVN, and is contributing to defeat of the goals sought by all of the military activity. Above all, failure to deal promptly and effectively in meeting the basic human rights and needs of close to 2 million people cannot be condoned under any conditions. Both the GVN and the U.S. government in their respective roles have an inescapable moral and humane obligation to recognize and to respect the human rights of people and to deal with the needs associated with such treatment of people.

The second priority target group within the concern of social welfare in the population of Vietnam includes children, families, and youth. The social needs of this group present a stark picture. Disruption of families caused by dislocation of the population, the absence of the resources to provide the basic necessities of life including adequate health services, housing, and education results in serious neglect of children and youth and threatens the very fabric of Vietnamese life. It is estimated that there are 10,000 full orphans, close to 200,000 half orphans in South Vietnam and 82,000 widows.

While the cultural pattern of extended family relationships represent a source of strength in this country, efforts to build on this strength and to counteract the attacks on it are totally inadequate. Children aged one to fourteen represents 48% of the refugee population which I have already discussed. We saw orphanages all over the country in which there estimated to be 84 in the country. Some have 30 to 35 children in them. Others have several hundred. We visited one in the Saigon area that has 1500 children. We saw orphanages that were adequate in terms of the provision of basic, minimal physical care to children. We visited others where conditions were almost sub-human with pitiful sights of listless, malnourished babies in them. We visited day care centers for children that would do any city in our country proud to have the centers.

Special attention is required for teen-agers and young adults. Indeed, the future of Vietnam may well rest with this group who are maturing at a time of social revolution, and of military turmoil. This group can be the source of future leadership and a dynamic force in the country's development, or an element of anarchy and destruction in democratic nation building efforts. Little is being done for youth in the country. Family dislocations have driven them to the urban centers. Already there are gangs of wandering youth in areas of Saigon. The presence of large numbers of foreign troops has resulted in a mushrooming of bars, "bar girls", and prostitution. There is a "strip" of bars and cafes outside most military installations in all parts of the country. This may be a natural and unavoidable concomitant of war, but, nevertheless, it is one more factor ripping apart the fabric of the Vietnamese social structure. Without the opportunity for education and training, unskilled, and lacking constructive outlets and growth-producing experiences, the youth of Vietnam, especially in the urban areas, present to that nature the serious problems of juvenile delinquency, youth crimes, and a large group of wasted, indeed socially destroyed youth.

Time does not permit me to discuss other areas of social welfare concern. They included the impact of urbanism on individuals and families, rural development, income support, health related programs, manpower training, and voluntary agency relationships. We expect that the final report of the Task Force will be available within the next forthnight.

Let me briefly summarize our overall findings and recommendations.

Our findings briefly summarized included the following:

1. The focus of what social welfare activities are planned or underway is on a short-term, impact programs, designed to meet day-to-day crises. There is absent, any concept of social welfare as a significant resource in nation building, as an institutional form for social development through genuine self-help and self-improvement efforts.

2. The requirement that social development must be integrated with economic development has not apparently gained recognition in Vietnam. Social development planning in any real sense has been ignored while considerable efforts have been initiated in the area of economic development planning.

3. Our A.I.D. structure is not designed nor adequately staffed to give the priority required by social welfare planning and development in its advisory, consultative, and supportive role to the GVN.

4. While American, and international voluntary agencies have made and are making a tremendous contribution in meeting social needs in Vietnam, the full potential of their contribution has not been realized. This is due chiefly to the absence of effective coordination among the voluntary agencies, with the goals and policies of the GVN, and with the goals and objectives of those A.I.D. programs that fall within the social welfare field. Question must be raised as to whether the U.S. government should facilitate entry and provide support to U.S. voluntary groups, however well motivated, operating in Vietnam whose policies are not in accord with those of the GVN and whose professional practices would not be tolerated in the U.S.A.

In summary, I should like to share with this Committee those priority recommendations based on the report of the Task Force which are relevant to the concerns of this Committee. I must state again my conviction that the primary and major responsibility for initiating the implementation of these recommendations rests with the government of Vietnam with substantially increased material and technical support of the United States and the other Free World Nations.

Essential to all of our recommendations is our firm belief that the United States effort must commit itself to a strong social welfare commitment in its assistance to Vietnam. While we accept, of course, the basic need for giving attention to the problems of obtaining security, we are equally committed to efforts that are concerning with the immediate and long term aspects of social development.

1. Our first recommendation therefore, is that the appropriate divisions of USAID be staffed with sufficient, professionally trained social welfare personnel competent to discharge the social welfare function more effectively with the U.S. Mission, and to provide more adequate consultative services to the GVN in its social welfare efforts.

2. With USAID giving professional direction, there should be assigned to CORDS in each of the four regions a professionally competent social welfare advisor to serve as a counterpart to the Ministry of Social Welfare's Regional Chief. Similar strengthening of advisory assistance must be made available at the provincial level.

3. The massive dislocation of families, some living in refugee camps, and others in urban and rural areas, must be the top priority influencing social welfare efforts in Vietnam. In this connection, the following proposals must have the highest priority:

(a) Immediate steps must be taken by GVN to improve the administrative procedure for piaster payments to refugees, and for MACCORDS and the GVN to make quickly available emergency help in the form of food, shelter, medical supplies, etc. when they are needed. There must not be any breakdown in logistical planning and support to assuring short-term assistance to displaced persons; and in developing and executing plans for permanent resettlement of displaced persons, with the services required to facilitate their meaningful readjustment.

(b) The Ministry of Social Welfare must be provided with sufficient funds and personnel to meet the human needs of all displaced persons who do not now fall into the technical category of "refugees", those "refugees" still displaced, and those who are needy after their "refugee" classification benefits have terminated. Immediate attention should be given to the feasibility of centralizing responsibility for all displaced persons in one governmental agency, so that there may eventually be undivided responsibility for the quality and continuity of efforts required to meet the needs of these people. The low priority that appears to have been given to displaced individuals and families in Vietnam must now be reversed by affirmative GVN policy; it must be implemented through realistic and prompt action by the GVN and with U.S. assistance in every region of the country.

4. It is recommended that the GVN take prompt steps to deal with the special plight of thousands of children living with or without their families in conditions that threaten their immediate as well as their future development. In detail, we have outlined the programs and services that we believe must be either improved or established now.

We urge, further, that USAID assume responsibility for supporting the efforts of the Ministry of Social Welfare in establishing and maintaining sound standards of child care, and particularly, endorse the GVN position that children should not be removed from their families and country, except in unusual circumstances where this is clearly in the best interest of the child. This applies to placing children in orphanages, intercountry adoptions, and sending children long distances from home for medical treatment or for training.

Mr. Chairman, we have made a series of additional recommendations dealing with urban and rural development, income support, social welfare manpower training and utilization, and voluntary agency relationships. As these areas are not the immediate concern of this Committee, I shall not detail them there. The full report of the Task Force will be available within a fortnight, and with your permission, it will be sent to the Committee.

As I stated at the beginning of this statement, sound social policies and social welfare programs are tools that must be employed in Vietnam's social revolution and nation building efforts. Support in this area of Vietnam's effort must be increased by all who are committed to a free, independent Vietnam committed to assuring the economic and social well-being of its people. The continued prodding by this Committee particularly concerning refugees and displaced persons, welcomed I believe by many who are working valiantly with the problems we are discussing will assist those committed men and women in U.S.A.I.D. to do the job they as well as you, want to have done.

FREE WORLD ASSISTANCE TO VIETNAM

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, all of us know the old proverb that you can not make a silk purse out of a sow's ear, a proverb that seems to me particularly applicable to the contention that most free world countries are, in some way, supporting the war in Vietnam.

The Congressional Record of October 5 contains a memorandum that was inserted by both the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower]. It is entitled "Free World Assistance to Vietnam as of October 1, 1967." The memorandum begins with the statement:

> Thirty-one nations besides the United States are assisting Vietnam under the Free World Assistance Program.

Neither the Senator from Wyoming nor the Senator from Texas mentioned the source of the memorandum, although it is perfectly obvious that the source is the Department of State.

The memorandum placed by both Senators in the October 5 Congressional Record bears a close resemblance to a paper entitled "Free World Assistance for South Vietnam," issued as a "Vietnam information note" in April 1967, by the Office of Media Services, Bureau of Public Affairs, Department of State. On May 25 I commented on this State Department paper on the floor of the Senate. At that time, I had published in the Record the text of a letter I had written to the Secretary of State and a reply to this letter from Assistant Secretary Macomber. In my letter, I had asked for the dollar value of the aid to South Vietnam being given by the nations listed in the State Department paper. I ask unanimous consent that my letter to the Secretary of State and the reply from Assistant Secretary Macomber, which includes a summary of the dollar value of material free world assistance to Vietnam, be included at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 4, 1967.

Hon. DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It has been brought to my attention that a recent *Information Note* issued by the Office of Media Services, Bureau of Public Affairs, lists, on page one, 36 "other nations giving aid to South Viet-Nam. . . ."

I would be interested in the dollar value of "aid to South Viet-Nam" being given by each of these nations. I note, for example, Turkey's contribution is further described on page four as "medicines and the offer of a substantial quantity of cement" and that Denmark "has provided medical supplies and has offered to train Vietnamese nurses in Denmark." I also note on page six that "Ireland, Israel, Pakistan and Norway contributed money, clothing, and pharmaceutical supplies to the victims of the floods of 1965." Does humanitarian assistance to flood victims constitute an expression of support for our efforts in Southeast Asia or an implied criticism of our actions there?

Sincerely yours,

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, May 15, 1967.

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Secretary has asked me to reply to your letter of May 3 concerning other nations' assistance to Viet-Nam.

In response to your request for the dollar value of aid provided by the *thirty-six* countries listed in the Department's *Information Note* on Free World Assistance to Viet-Nam, I enclose a table of the estimated value of commodity assistance and relief supplies from these countries. It is based on information from our Mission in Saigon which shows the value of this aid for the period of June 1964 through December 1966. Of the total value of nearly 27 million dollars, approximately 17 million dollars were contributed in 1966. We have not attempted to assign a valuation to these nations' contribution to the cost of supporting about 500 non-U.S. civilians and 56,000 non-U.S. military free world personnel serving in Viet-Nam or to the cost of some 3,000 scholarships granted by foreign governments to Vietnamese for study or training abroad during this period.

With respect to your question about the flood relief assistance provided by Ireland, Israel, Pakistan and Norway, we list this aid as well as that of France and Switzerland in a separate category from the Free World Assistance Program. As is explicitly noted in the *Information Note* we do not construe this aid as representing political support by the governments concerned for the free world effort in Viet-Nam. Neither do we believe that one would be justified in construing this humanitarian assistance as representing any criticism of the policy of the United States in Viet-Nam.

If I can be of any further assistance on this or any other matter, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

SUMMARY OF MATERIAL FREE WORLD ASSISTANCE TO VIETNAM (JUNE 1964 THROUGH DECEMBER 1966)

[Value in thousands of U.S. dollars]

Contributor nation	Commodity aid [1]	Relief aid [2]	Total
Free world assistance program:			
Argentina	290	------	290
Australia	5,779	225	6,004
Belgium	--------	12	12
Brazil	70	13	83
Canada	1,908	15	1,923
China	744	31	775
Denmark	--------	26	26
Ecuador	--------	2	2
Germany	11,010	875	11,885
Greece	--------	15	15
Guatemala	--------	8	8
Honduras	--------	10	10
Iran	200	------	200
Italy	250	------	250
Japan	2,050	200	2,250
Korea	--------	------	-------
Laos	--------	6	6
Liberia	--------	50	50
Luxembourg	--------	20	20
Malaysia	--------	10	10
Netherlands	700	3	703
New Zealand	639	56	695
Philippines	--------	11	11
Spain	--------	2	2
Thailand	--------	94	94
Tunisia	--------	------	-------
Turkey	--------	2	2
United Kingdom	387	227	614
Uruguay	--------	22	22
Venezuela	100	------	100
Subtotal	24,127	1,935	26,062
Other assistance:			
France	536	30	566
Ireland	--------	3	3
Israel	--------	5	5
Norway	--------	4	4
Pakistan	--------	5	5
Switzerland	--------	10	10
Subtotal	536	57	593
Grand total	24,663	1,992	26,655

[1] Equipment, supplies, and commodities for all projects and programs other than those dealing with relief program. Medical supplies provided to support free world medical teams are included in this category.

[2] Primarily flood and refugee relief assistance in the form of supplies such as medicines, blankets, foodstuffs, and shelters.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I should like to comment specifically on the dollar value of the assistance provided by 18 nations—13 under the free world assistance program and five under the category of "other assistance"—according to Assistant Secretary Macomber's letter to me. I shall recapitulate the assistance given by these 18 countries in the period June 1964 through December 1966, which totaled $26,000 or less:

Denmark	$26,000
Uruguay	22,000
Luxembourg	20,000
Greece	15,000
Belgium	12,000
Philippines	11,000
Honduras	10,000
Malaysia	10,000
Guatemala	8,000
Laos	6,000
Ecuador	2,000
Spain	2,000
Turkey	2,000

Under the separate category of "other assistance," the following dollar values were provided by Assistant Secretary Macomber:

Switzerland	$10,000
Israel	5,000
Pakistan	5,000
Norway	4,000
Ireland	3,000

Mr. President, I have compared the text of the State Department memorandum of April 1967 with the text of the memorandum placed in the RECORD on October 5 by both the Senator from Wyoming and the Senator from Texas. I find that there has been no change in the description of the assistance given by Denmark, Ecuador, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Luxembourg, Malaysia, the Philippines, Spain, Turkey, Uruguay, Ireland, Israel, Norway, Pakistan, and Switzerland. In other words, there has apparently been no new material assistance given by these countries since December 1966 at the latest. And in some cases it is obvious that the assistance was given well before the end of 1966.

In the case of Austria, for which no dollar value was given in Assistant Secretary Macomber's letter, there has obviously been no change because the April paper stated:

> Austria has offered medical supplies, blankets and tents through the Austrian Red Cross—

And identical language is used in the memorandum inserted in the RECORD of October 5.

As for Laos, while Assistant Secretary Macomber's letter showed a Laotian contribution of $6,000 worth of relief aid, the State Department paper issued in April did not mention Laos. The memorandum placed in the RECORD on October 5 stated that Laos had contributed for flood relief in 1965 and had made a "small cash donation for refugees in 1966." Apparently there has been no assistance from Laos since then.

In the case of Belgium, there has been a change in the assistance given. The State Department paper of April 1967 stated:

> Belgium has provided medicines and an ambulance, as well as scholarships for nine Vietnamese to study in Belgium.

The memorandum inserted in the RECORD on October 5 states:

> Belgium has provided medicines and an ambulance and has given scholarships for fifteen Vietnamese to study in Belgium.

Thus Belgium has increased its assistance—from nine scholarships to 15 scholarships.

Mr. President, some countries are giving substantial assistance to the Republic of South Vietnam. But other countries—many other countries—are not. I would hardly attach any great significance to Ecuador's sending $2,000 worth of medical supplies, or Guatemala's gift of 15,000 doses of serum, or a Honduran contribution of $8,000 worth of drugs and drygoods, or a Turkish gift of $2,000 worth of medicine, or a Laotian donation of $4,000 for flood relief 2 years ago and a "small cash donation for refugees in 1966."

As for the "other assistance" mentioned both in the State Department's memorandum of April 1967 and the memorandum inserted in the RECORD on October 5, it seems to me to reveal a rather desperate state of affairs when it is necessary to list the contributions made by Ireland, Israel, Norway, and Pakistan to assist "flood victims," in some—if not all—cases the victims of floods which occurred several years ago. That kind of assistance is surely basic humanitarian aid and nothing more.

In closing, Mr. President, I would like to state that a few days ago I wrote the Secretary of State asking him four questions.

First, what commitments the U.S. Government has made to the Governments of the Republic of Korea, Thailand, and the Republic of the Philippines in connection with the dispatch of forces by these three countries to South Vietnam.

Second, which countries assisting South Vietnam under the free world assistance program trade with North Vietnam and the amount of such trade in each of the past 3 years.

Third, the years in which assistance to South Vietnam was provided by Austria, Denmark, Ecuador, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Ireland, Laos, Liberia, Luxembourg, Norway, Pakistan, Tunisia, Turkey, and Uruguay.

Fourth, the dollar value of assistance provided in calendar year 1967 by Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republican, Ecuador, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Laos, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Norway, Pakistan, Spain, Switzerland, Tunisia, Turkey, Uruguay, and Venezuela.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PUBLIC WORKS AND ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate H.R. 11641, which will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (H.R. 11641) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission, the Delaware River Basin Commission, Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Water Resources Council, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to the previous order, the Chair recognizes the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender] be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE PROPOSED TAX INCREASE

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, it has been said with a smile that our country set out from the first to erect a government of lawyers, not men. Some credence has been lent to the theory by an observation on the floor of the House of Commons in 1775, that as many copies of Blackstone's Commentaries were being sold in the Colonies as in all of England.

SOME HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

As a result of this structural peculiarity, a good many political questions in the United States tend to become legal questions. Moreover, most of the fundamental issues involving foreign war or domestic tranquillity tend to be debated in terms of the powers of taxation and spending.

Although the current controversy over the proposal for a tax increase involves all of these elements, I believe that the history of the United States and of Great Britain demonstrates that this has been a general characteristic of parliamentary institutions.

The cause that separated our two nations, as we were taught in school, revolved around taxation. In 1763, Britain concluded prolonged and costly wars, of which the American Colonies were the chief beneficiaries. A major argument in favor of the Stamp Act and the tea tax was that the Colonies ought to contribute the the costs of Redcoat regiments because they were protecting our western frontiers.

It is interesting to me that the stamp tax was delayed a year, in hopes that the colonists would come up with alternatives. At the same time, new taxes in Britain were extended to the humblest homes, previously exempt, and this was followed by a series of bread riots. It is worth noting, I believe, that the series of revenue and enforcement measures that precipitated the Revolution were enacted by a parliamentary government which jealously guarded the fiscal powers it had wrested from the King during five centuries of struggle.

While this fragment of history does not provide an exact analogy, it may be instructive.

CONSTITUTIONAL POWERS

As a consequence of these events, those who drafted the American Constitution were most definite about where the powers of taxation and of expenditure should reside.

Article I, section 7, provides:

> All bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives, but the Senate may propose or concur with Amendments as on other bills.

Article I, section 8, enumerating the prerogatives of Congress, begins:

> The Congress shall have the Power to lay and collect Taxes . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States . . .

Article I, section 9, states:

> No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public money shall be published from time to time.

It is pertinent to emphasize that revenue bills must originate in the House of Representatives. Because of this rule, the President cannot even send to Congress a draft of a tax bill he wishes passed. He is limited to sending a message making his recommendations, as he did on August 3 with respect to the surtax.

Further action is then up to the House of Representatives. As we have seen, this distribution of responsibilities is no accident. It was as deliberate a decision as the Constitutional Convention and the American people ever made.

Of course, the House of Representatives can choose to take no action—that is well within its rights.

In this instance, we seem to detect a desire to make consideration of any such bill contingent upon whether the President will take action to reduce the spending of the Federal Government by a figure thought to be appropriate by several Members of the House of Representatives.

EXPENDITURES

It seems to me quite clear, however, from article I, section 9 of the Constitution, that the power to control expenditures is not given to the President. The power to appropriate money is reposed in the Congress.

It might be noted, at this point, that even cutting appropriations for the current year would not result in cutting spending by the same amount. The reason is that there is a large backlog of unspent appropriations from the past. At the beginning of 1967, this carryover amounted to $125.6 billion.

However, what the Congress has given, the Congress can take away. Verily, the Congress can rescind any appropriation for a prior year at any time after it has been passed, and can impose any germane conditions upon its expenditure short of recision. But no official of the executive branch of the Federal Government, including the President, can write a check for any purpose—"but in consequence of appropriations made by law."

THE BUDGET

The President is, of course, in a decisive position to influence the budget requests—both as to specific items and general programs—which are sent to Congress. In a few months, such requests governing spending and programs for the next fiscal year, beginning in July 1968 and ending June 1969, will be sent up to Capitol Hill.

In its turn, the Congress will have the opportunity, and as a matter of fact, has the duty, to review those requests and make appropriations for only so much, and for only those programs, as Congress deems wise.

APPROPRIATIONS

This is exactly what has been happening with the present budget requests, which the President made at the beginning of 1967 for the fiscal year between July 1, 1967, and June 30, 1968.

At the beginning of October of this year, the House had enacted upon 14 appropriations bills. During this session, the House has appropriated $120.3 billion, while at the same time cutting this year's budget requests by $3.8 billion, and last year's fiscal 1967 appropriations by $173 million.

The Senate has, up to this time, passed nine appropriation bills, five less than the House. From these bills, we have cut this year's budget requests by $118 million and reduced fiscal 1967 appropriations by $76 million.

As a matter of fact, each of these items gets a double congressional review—once when the authorization of the program is being considered, and again when it is proposed to spend the money in the form of an appropriations bill.

The House and the Senate can thus not only discourage policies pertaining to next year's appropriations, but can make further reductions in this year's appropriations. If we wish to do so, we can phase down or phase out programs by denying them funds. In short, Congress can stop, start, or reduce any programs recommended by the President. This is within our traditional power, and is within our experience.

As a personal matter, the Senator from Florida is not in favor of changing the Constitution to transfer such a power from the Congress to the Presidency—at this time or any other time. But I am in favor of the Congress recognizing, admitting, and exercising its responsibility.

THE FACTS—SIZE OF THE DEFICIT

As I see it, this is the legal framework surrounding the proposals for higher taxes.

There are also points of reference provided by the facts and figures.

The tax message and the testimony before the congressional committees have made clear the dimensions of the deficit the Nation would face in the absence of increased taxes.

The January 1967 calculations, which included a 6 percent—or $4.4 billion—surcharge on corporate and individual incomes, effective as of July 1, 1967, placed the deficit at $8 billion.

July 1 has come and gone. Expenditures have risen: $4 billion for defense and $2.5 billion for civilian programs. Conventional tax revenues have fallen $7 billion short of estimates. Taking into account all the reasonably foreseeable expenditures, the administration emerges with the estimate that the deficit will range between $23.6 billion and $28.7 billion.

CONSEQUENCES OF INACTION

We have a fair idea of what will happen in the event of a deficit that large. We had a foretaste of it last year, when interest rates rose to the highest level in 40 years. It is now commonly accepted in the financial community that interest rates will rise again, and may level off at 6 to 7 percent, or they may go on up to 7 to 9 percent. Passage of a tax bill will make the difference.

A half million homes that would have been built in 1966 were not built. Those that were lucky enough to find new homes paid more for them. The extra interest costs alone have been estimated at $2.5 billion over the next ten years, and most mortgages run two or three times that long. Then there would be a greater public debt and a higher interest rate on that—which would cost the taxpayer $700 million next year alone.

The Nation in the past has not been as generous as it could have been to some of our domestic programs. This summer there were civil disturbances in more than 40 cities, with an estimated half a billion dollars in property damage and several dozen lives lost.

These are some of the costs that must enter into the equation.

INFLATION

Finally, there is the spector of inflation. We are thankful that this generation has not been ravaged by inflation. This cruel force certainly erodes the living standards of those retired on fixed incomes. It means senior citizens, of whom we have 19 million among us, will suffer immediate deprivations in food, clothes and medical supplies.

Inflation also thwarts the small businessman and the farmer who need credit and cannot readily pass increased costs along to the consumer. It affects individuals and families at all ages, and at all stages, that are trying to better their circumstances and build a secure future. Inflation could blast everyone's plans by taking away more of a raise than a man can gain from his employer in a year of work, and more than he can earn on his hard won savings.

The experts predict that, even if the tax bill is passed, we will have price increases of 2.5 percent next year, and maybe a little less in 1969.

Without the tax bill, I think all the recognized experts strongly feel we will get 4 to 5-percent inflation in 1968, and perhaps considerably more than that in 1969. That means that everyone in the country—without exception—would pay a much higher cost than a 10 percent surtax bill would impose on him.

THE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Another problem which touches few of our people directly, but everyone indirectly is the balance of payments.

Our international accounts have been in persistent deficit since 1958. Our export trade accounts for 70 percent of our foreign earnings, and last year, our trade surplus fell to the lowest point since 1959. Many of us in the Congress and in the administration are attempting to reverse this trend.

Inflation would cripple these efforts. It would undoubtedly price some American exports out of world markets and step up the already worrisome acceleration of imports. Profits and jobs would be shifted to foreign countries in fairly short order, magnifying economic and social problems here at home.

A warning of another kind has been sounded by the world's financial authorities. In the polite language of diplomacy the Managing Director of the International Monetary Fund has been critical of "industrial countries which applied policies of fiscal restraint too late contributing to severe strains in money and capital markets." In plain words, this means the community of nations felt that the United States should have raised taxes last year, in fiscal year 1966 as I and many others recommended should be done.

These men are concerned, not only with the economic health of the United States, but with the reserves of their own countries—some 40 percent of which are held in dollars—and with the whole structure of international trade and investment.

If the worth of the dollar is undermined, this structure will be badly shaken, and all of our friends and allies who have chosen to hold dollars will pay a price for their good will toward us.

I have just returned from a 2-week trip to Europe, including a visit to Geneva where the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade discussions—GATT—were still being held. Every official, every economist I talked with on my visit, had one central question—what is America going to do with her economy?

As one man put it to me, "We wonder whether you Americans have the strength of will, the self-discipline, to face up to the economic realities—or are you going to simply lurch along like some juggernaut without brakes or steering?"

The responsible people of Europe are therefore looking at us and wondering whether we will deal forthrightly with our fiscal problems.

ADDITIONAL PROBLEMS

The most discouraging aspect of a policy of inaction is that our problems at home and abroad will not only still be with us; they will gain in size and perversity. Later on, we will be required to pay even a higher economic and human cost to make any progress against them. By the time we make up our minds to master the situation, we might need, not one 10-percent surtax increase, but a series of increases that could be even steeper. We might even require wage and price controls, with all their attendant drawbacks, irritations, and threat to our liberties.

Under these circumstances, the Senator from Florida, without any hesitation or mental reservation, can say that to allow a deficit of over $25 billion and rampant inflation would cause irreparable damage and needless suffering—not only to our domestic economy, but to our international credit and standing around the world.

THE SURTAX PROPOSAL

To avoid these consequences, which I regard as intolerable, the Congress has been asked to consider postponing certain excise tax reductions and levying a modest surtax, at the rate of 10 percent of the final tax bill which each individual and corporate taxpayer computes. The term "surtax" is rather technical. The actual impact such a tax would be about 1 percent of income for those taxpayers to whom it would apply.

THOSE IT WOULD AND WOULD NOT AFFECT

But, it is important to note that one family out of every four now pays no taxes at all. They would not be affected by a surtax. It is contemplated that 16 million taxpayers in the lowest brackets would be exempt from the surtax.

Those that are left are the middle and upper income classes of this country, enjoying the highest standard of living the world has ever seen.

RECENT GAINS

Our taxpayer's finanical standing has been measurably improved by the uninterrupted prosperity of the past 6½ years, to which my distinguished friend the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] so eloquently referred a moment ago, when he put into the RECORD for the consideration of the Senate and others an article from today's Wall Street Journal which explains in detail the prosperity which our country has enjoyed for the past 80 months. The statistics for this period, which is short in the span of history, but nevertheless matches the record for continued prosperity, show the following remarkable advances between 1961 and 1967:

> Gross National Product, Personal Income, Wages and Salaries, Industrial Production, up more than 50%.
>
> Consumer Expenditures, Retail Trade, up between 40 and 50%.
>
> Pre-Tax Corporate Profits, up more than 75%.

As the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin pointed out earlier today, dividends have increased to the remarkable extent of some 81 percent during these past 6½ years:

TAX REDUCTIONS

In sharp contrast, the federal taxes of the typical citizen have been significantly reduced. The following tables illustrate these decreases in some detail.

AVERAGE SINGLE TAXPAYERS

Income from wages	1963 tax	1966 tax	Percent decrease in Federal tax
$2,000	$242	$163	40.9
$5,000	818	671	18.0
$10,000	2,096	1,742	16.9
$15,000	3,787	3,154	16.7

MARRIED COUPLE WITH NO CHILDREN

$2,000	$122	$58	52.5
$5,000	660	501	24.1
$10,000	1,636	1,342	18.0
$15,000	2,810	2,335	16.9

MARRIED COUPLE WITH 2 CHILDREN

$3,000	$65	$4	93.8
$5,000	420	290	31.0
$7,500	877	686	21.8
$10,000	1,372	1,114	18.8
$15,000	2,486	2,062	17.1

The programs and policies of recent years have brought us these gains, coupled with lower Federal taxes, and, until last year, almost negligible price increases.

In 1962, the 7 percent investment tax credit and accelerated depreciation reduced tax liability $1.3 billion. This was followed in 1964 by the general tax reduction bill totaling $16.9 billion. In 1965, excise tax legislation authorized further decreases amounting to nearly $3.4 billion.

As a result, Americans are paying about $22½ billion less in Federal taxes than they were 5 years ago. Our Federal Government, in fact, collects a smaller percentage of GNP than does Britain, France, or West Germany.

In this light, a surtax increase which would temporarily reclaim 1 percent of income would not appear to be a monumental sacrifice on the part of any individual or corporation.

CURRENT DIFFICULTY

This year, for many reasons, some of which I have described, and which are generally familiar, the country is in trouble.

Our national accounts are out of balance, and a small tax increase is being called for by the best and I think most learned minds on fiscal and monetary problems here and abroad.

Can anyone stand up in the face of these figures and argue that the tax bill is not a necessity or that we cannot afford it?

NATURAL RESISTANCE TO TAXATION

I suppose that the answer to that question is "Yes," because we can always find someone in this country to make an argument against taxes.

The Englishman, Samuel Johnson, advised his countrymen in 1775 along these lines, as follows:

> We are soon told that the Americans, however, wealthy, cannot be taxed; that they are descendants of men who left all for liberty, and that they have constantly preserved the principles and stubbornness of their progenitors; that they are too obstinate for persuasion, and too powerful for constraint; that they will laugh at argument, and defeat violence; that the continent of North America contains three millions, not of men merely, but of Whigs . . . fierce for liberty, and disdainful of dominion; that they multiply with the fecundity of their own rattlesnakes, so that every quarter of a century doubles their number . . .

THE IMPASSE

I suppose that there are elements of this American psychology, along with the complex and frustrating problems of policy, which have brought us to the impasse that we now face in the tax proposal. In my view, this paralysis of our governmental process is the worst aspect of the situation.

What can we do to resolve this impasse? I suggest that the hard issues of policy underlying the present debate will not be settled by the end of this year, or the end of next year, or by waiting a year. They go deep into the marrow of the bones of our society.

Perhaps another voice, raised nearly 200 years ago can give us some assistance in this regard. In an atmosphere full of similar vexations, Edmund Burke urged upon Parliament a spirit of conciliation. He said:

> The proposition is peace. Not peace through the medium of war; not peace to be hunted through the labyrinth of intricate and endless negotiations, not peace to arise out of universal discord . . . not peace to depend on the juridical determination of perplexing questions, or the precise marking of the shadowy boundaries of a complex government. It is simple peace . . . sought in the spirit of peace . . .

LET THE PROCESS CONTINUE

What is most needed today, I feel, is what Burke counseled then. Let us regain our calmness and keep our cool, so that we can put our marvelously devised constitutional institutions back on the right track.

Let us face the immediate problem of the deficit and pull together to resolve it for the good of the country. Then we can fight it out on the underlying policies on other days through the traditional budget and appropriations processes, and even political processes, which are admirably suited to such combat.

In this endeavor, we will welcome the thoughts and contributions of our colleagues in the House committees, in the leadership, and on the House floor. It may be that we in the Senate can be of some help in this matter.

A THOUGHT ON REDUCING SPENDING

Recognizing the abiding concern for the health of our economy which both Houses of the Congress share, I would like to suggest what I believe to the one of several possible ways of dealing with our current dilemma.

I feel that, to some extent, Congress may be painting itself into a corner if it insists that a $5 to $7 billion decrease in spending be a precondition for considering a tax increase.

We have, as we have seen, both the authority to increase taxes and to control appropriations. The Constitution grants these powers to us—to the Congress.

Because we have these powers, why cannot we use them in combination? Why cannot we enact in one bill an effective formula for raising the surtax, while at the same time holding down spending?

I believe we can.

As a practical matter, we know that the tax bill—if we pass a tax bill—will be the last major legislation acted upon by Congress during this session. At that time every appropriation bill will have been cleared through Congress.

I would, therefore, propose that the House Ways and Means Committee resume consideration of the tax bill—to deliberate how much of a surtax increase should be imposed, when it might be effective, and to whom it should apply.

Then, in the same bill, language could be provided which directs the Secretary of the Treasury to place in escrow approximately 3 or 4 percent, or whatever would be the wisdom of the committee, of each and every appropriation which we have passed for fiscal 1968.

The purpose of that set-aside would be to create a reserve of $5 to $7 billion, a fund which could perhaps be called an "economic reserve fund"—as in fact, at least one well-known economist, Dr. Pierre Rinfret, has suggested in his latest advisory letter.

There would be strict limitations attached to the spending of any of the moneys in the fund. The President would be authorized to draw on the fund only when he concludes that an expenditure of all or a part of the fund is in the urgent national interest. An additional condition would be strict notification to the Congress and its committees whenever such expenditures are made, in keeping with article I, section 9 of the Constitution.

In brief, Congress would not give up any of its constitutional powers of the purse. Yet, at the same time, Congress might be able to achieve a $5 to $7 billion economy on the expenditure side.

The addition of such language to a tax bill, I am assured by the renowned Parliamentarian of the Senate, would not be inappropriate.

Such a provision would place squarely on the shoulders of the President the responsibility for holding or spending the escrowed funds and would make crystal clear the stated intention of Congress to hold the spending line.

The 3-percent set-aside would be intended to apply across the appropriations board in an entirely impartial way, without having the burden fall disproportionately upon any one special project or agency of the Government.

In any case, I submit that it is possible for Congress in one legislative package to provide the means for both enacting a surtax and at the same time limiting expenditures further, if they wish to do it. In the meantime, we will be giving additional thought to other alternatives.

Mr. President, we know well that all legislation involves compromise, and that when a legislative impasse, such as the one in which we now find ourselves occurs, conciliation and compromise become the essential bridges across our varying points of view to constructive action.

We are at a time when the well-being of our country calls upon us to erect such bridges.

Clearly, the economic hurricane warning flags are flying. The Economic Weather Bureau tells us the eye of the storm is headed directly at the United States. The winds could be devastating. In our own interest and the interest of the free world, we must act—and we must act now—to keep the process going.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I believe that the Senator from Florida has made a very able presentation of one of the dominant problems facing our Nation. Along with Vietnam, the other major problem, as I see it, is our fiscal situation.

While I have not made the decision that the Senator has made in regard to the President's tax proposal, I have not yet made a decision one way or the other on it. I will be influenced by the recommendation that will be made by the Committee on Finance, of which the Senator from Florida is a distinguished member.

I will be influenced, too, by whether the executive branch of Government makes a determined effort to curb Federal spending.

I believe that the speech of the Senator from Florida today will make an important contribution to the discussion which is taking place at both ends of the Capitol with respect to taxes and spending.

As I listened to the speech of the able Senator from Florida, it occurred to me that he was focusing attention on and dramatizing not only the question of taxes, but also—and more important—the question of total government spending, which, as he has pointed out, is not solely the responsibility of the President, nor do I believe it is solely the responsibility of Congress.

We have a joint responsibility.

We cannot attempt to pass the buck, so to speak, to the President. We in the legislative branch have a responsibility, because only we can appropriate. However, I believe the President, himself, has a responsibility, because he has the great power of the Presidency, and his responsibility is to submit a sensible budget. In my opinion, we have a joint responsibility—the executive branch and the legislative branch.

The Senator from Florida mentioned—I believe I recall correctly—that even if there were a tax increase, there is no assurance that we would not need a series of tax increases, if the overall spending programs of the Government are not brought under control.

As I see it, that is what the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee in the House, Representative MILLS, said the other day. I quote one sentence of his statement:

> We are trying to get this message across. We want to pause in this headlong rush toward ever bigger government.

If we are to pause in this headlong rush toward ever bigger government, Congress itself—the Members of the House and the Members of the Senate—must face its responsibility in trying to keep the budget under control; and the President of the United States, whoever he may be, must exercise his responsibility of not submitting such tremendous programs to Congress.

As I recall the remarks of the Senator from Florida, he mentioned that the House, in handling 14 of the 15 appropriation bills, has reduced the President's budget by $3.8 billion.

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. And the Senate has six additional bills to handle.

Mr. SMATHERS The Senator is correct.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I thank the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia very much for his generous remarks. If I had time, I would compliment him further on his great belief in fiscal and monetary responsibility and for the many actions he has taken, as a Member of Congress, to bring about a sound fiscal program for our Government. I do appreciate the generosity of his remarks.

PUBLIC WORKS AND ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11641) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission, the Delaware River Basin Commission, Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Water Resources Council, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, without losing my right to the floor, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I understand that the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] desires to offer a motion, and I yield to him for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I send to the desk a motion and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read the motion, as follows:

> I move that H.R. 11641 be recommitted to the Appropriations Committee with instructions to report back with total appropriations in the bill reduced from $4,776,064,000 to $4,528, 260,800.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the adoption of this motion would provide for a 5-percent cut and leave to the discretion of the committee where the cut would be made. This would mean a reduction of $238,803,200.

I agree that an excellent argument can be made for selectivity, that we should pick out the particular projects we wish to eliminate from the bill. But we tried that yesterday, and we were unsuccessful in that effort.

At that time the suggestion was made by some that the committee would know best where to apply these cuts, rather than to make a selective cut. Under the motion I have submitted the committee would have the complete jurisdiction to rearrange the cut at its discretion and report the bill back to the Senate.

As it was reported, the bill provides for total appropriations of $4,776,064,000. This would cut $238,803,200 from the total appropriation, or a 5-percent cut.

I believe this is the least we can do if we in the Senate are sincere in wanting these appropriations reduced.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] has just delivered an excellent speech pointing out the responsibility of Congress to reduce expenditures. It was such a tremendous speech and had such an impact so far as I am concerned that I am offering this motion as a first step toward carrying out what he said Congress should do—namely, cut these appropriations if we really want them cut.

I could not make one-tenth as good an argument as the Senator from Florida has made in favor of the pending motion, so I rest my case and say that here is an opportunity for all of us to go on record as to whether we are merely making speeches for economy or will vote for it.

I desire a record vote. I see no need to belabor the Senate with extended remarks. Everyone knows exactly what is involved.

Even if the motion is adopted it would still provide $4,528,000,000, as compared with the appropriation of $4,310,000,000 of last year. It would leave in the pending bill, this year, over $218 million more than was appropriated for the same agencies last year.

Mr. President, I shall ask for a record vote on the motion.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as the manager of the bill I am willing to proceed to a vote without further argument.

However, I do wish to point out to the Senate, as I stated yesterday, with respect to the civil functions portion of the public works bill which aggregates over $1 billion, the budget request for the Engineers already is underfinanced by 9 percent, which is the amount of the reduction for slippages, so that portion of the bill is already reduced by at least that amount. With respect to the Atomic Energy Commission, the budget estimate was $2,646,000,000 and the committee has cut from that appropriation $134 million, a reduction in excess of 5 percent.

Mr. President, as I have pointed out on many occasions, the best investment that Congress can make is for the construction of works to protect and preserve our two most important resources, land and water. For the past 16 years, I have devoted a large part of my time to that end and I think it would be a great pity for the Senate or the Congress, at this time, to cut back on these programs.

As I pointed out on many occasions, the fact that we have spent quite a few million dollars to construct waterways has relieved the railroads quite a bit, and water transportation has increased. As an example, I would refer to the Intercoastal Canal which extends from Brownsville, Tex., all the way to the New England States. When that program was put on the statute books, the amount of tonnage that was supposed to be carried on that great waterway was about 8 million tons. Now the tonnage is in excess of 78 million tons. On the great Ohio River, as I pointed out yesterday, tonnage has increased 2½ times since 1948.

Mr. President, I think it would be the height of folly for us to reduce the appropriations recommended for this great program. We have studies being made for many river basin developments. For example, with respect to the Potomac River, Senators know that last year we had quite a scare about the water shortage, and many people thought that Congress had been slow in taking action to provide funds for the construction of dams to provide water for domestic and industrial purposes in the Potomac River valley.

The fiscal year 1968 appropriations request includes $30,000 for the Potomac River study.

These funds will provide for investigation of survey scope detail to support recommendations of the Corps on projects that are needed and generally acceptable to all concerned, for submission to the Congress. Proposals under investigation include the Sideling Hill, Little Cacapon, Town Creek, Staunton—Verona—and Sixes Bridge multiple-purpose dam and reservoir projects, and the proposal to preserve the Seneca site. Purposes to be served by these projects include water supply for the Staunton-Waynesboro, Va., area, the Fredericksburg, Va., area, and the Washington metropolitan area; improvement of stream quality along portions of the Shenandoah and Monocacy Rivers; sustained minimum flow in the Potomac below the metropolitan area's water supply intakes; and regional recreational needs.

The only authorized project where actual planning is underway and will guarantee necessary water to the city of Washington and many other cities on the Potomac River is the Bloomington Reservoir, Md. and W. Va.

The public works appropriation bill for fiscal year 1968, as passed by the House of Representatives and recommended by the Senate Appropriations Committee in Senate Report No. 574, includes $2,000,000 to initiate land acquisition on the Bloomington Reservoir project.

This project was authorized by the Congress in the 1962 Flood Control Act for construction by the Corps of Engineers. The project will provide low-flow augmentation storage which would increase the dependable flow of the North Branch of the Potomac River at Luke, Md., which is required for municipal and industrial water supply and for water quality control. This will be effective in partially meeting the existing requirements of flow for water quality control in the Washington metropolitan area.

The Bloomington Reservoir will also provide flood control estimated to reduce average annual damages in the North Branch area by about 50 percent.

The provision of flood control, abundant water supply, and the improvement of water quality will create the economic climate for the development that can be expected as part of the Nation's growth.

The project will also provide recreational opportunities.

The estimated Federal cost of the project is $73,500,000. Funds in the amount of $2,740,000 have previously been appropriated to the Corps for preconstruction planning of the project.

Mr. President, we have at least a dozen such studies and projects in the bill for other regions of the country that are deficient in water. I do not believe that we would gain anything by sending this bill back to committee. I think the committee has given the bill ample study, and we have come out with the best bill we could prepare.

I hope the motion will be defeated.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana pointed out the cuts that the committee made in the appropriation as included in the bill that is before us.

I point out that even after they had gotten through with all of the cuts and tabulated them, they still have $465,893,000 more than the same departments received a year ago.

Speaking of old projects, continued and new projects added to the bill before us provides $1,010,823,000. Last year this same bill provided for $967,400,000 in this same category.

Yesterday we tried to eliminate the 41 new projects, and we were unsuccessful.

Mr. President, these continuous increases are responsible for our large deficits. We are going to go broke with this type of "cutting," which always ends with increases. When all of the so-called cuts are tabulated and when all of the increases in this bill are considered, there is still an increase of $465,893,000 over last year's expenditures.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, one argument is made that expenditures under this bill provide the best investment in America. Investment in America is good, but investments are not good when you do not have the money to finance the investment. What are we investing when we are borrowing the money and projecting the payment to the future generations of Americans yet unborn?

Mr. President, I agree with the statement of the Senator from Florida which he made earlier today when he so eloquently said that it is up to Congress to recognize its responsibility and cut spending. Congress has the responsibility to make these cuts. Mr. President, this amendment gives Congress this opportunity to exercise its responsibility.

The motion before us makes a modest cut of $238 million and still leaves this agency $218 million more than it had last year.

Certainly, at some point, somewhere, if this Congress is really serious about cutting expenditures we are going to have to start voting accordingly. This is the opportunity for Congress to exercise its responsibility.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I wish to ask a question of the Senator from Louisiana concerning the Grand River reservoir project, in Ohio. I quote from page 23 of the committee report on the pending bill:

> The House committee approved $750,000 and restricted the use of these funds to the planning of the Grand River reservoir portion of the project solely for the purpose of flood control, water supply, water quality control, recreation, and fish and wildlife.
>
> The Senate committee concurs in the action of the House.
>
> The purpose of the appropriation is to provide funds for a reanalysis of the Grand River

reservoir by the Corps to develop a comprehensive plan for water management for the Mahoning-Grand River Basins. The storage in the Grand River reservoir reallocated in accordance with the House committee report would form an integral part of Ohio's new water plan, which is being developed in cooperation with the State and local interests as well as Federal agencies. The plan would provide flood control, streamflow augmentation and improvement, an adequate water supply of improved quality, and recreation facilities.

My question is this: Am I correct in understanding that the $750,000 which we are considering here for the Grand River reservoir will be used solely for the planning of such reservoir?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, that is what the committee report states.

Mr. SCOTT. That is fine. I merely wanted the Record to show clearly that the clear intention of this section of the bill specifically restricts all usage of these funds to the planning of the Grand River reservoir, in Ohio, and that none of the funds were to be used in any respect whatsoever for a canal which Pennsylvania has clearly demonstrated it neither desires or needs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to recommit with instructions.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams]. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, may I inquire what the question is?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Delaware, which calls for the recommittal of the bill for the purpose of reducing the amount appropriated therein.

Mr. ALLOTT. In other words, a vote "yea" is to support the amendment, and a vote "nay" is to support the committee?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce the the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], the Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy], the Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson], and the Senators from Georgia, [Mr. Russell and Mr. Talmadge] are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Harris], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams] are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Harris], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Jordan] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. Hatfield], the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Griffin] are detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis] is paired with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea" and the Senator from Vermont would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] is paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Hatfield]. If present and voting, the Senator from New York would vote "yea" and the Senator from Oregon would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] is paired with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Jordan]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "yea" and the Senator from Idaho would vote "nay."

If present and voting the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Griffin] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 54, as follows:

[No. 290 Leg.]

YEAS—27

Boggs
Brewster
Brooke
Byrd, Va.
Church
Clark
Cotton
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Fannin
Hansen
Hickenlooper
Hollings
Lausche
McGovern
Miller
Mundt
Murphy
Percy
Prouty
Proxmire
Ribicoff
Scott
Smathers
Thurmond
Williams, Del.

NAYS—54

Allott
Anderson
Baker
Bartlett
Bennett
Bible
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Cooper
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Kennedy, Mass.
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McClellan
McIntyre
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Moss
Muskie
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Randolph
Smith
Sparkman
Spong
Stennis
Symington
Tydings
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—19

Aiken
Bayh
Curtis
Gore
Griffin
Harris
Hatfield
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, N.Y.
McCarthy
McGee
Metcalf
Morton
Nelson
Russell
Talmadge
Tower
Williams, N.J.

So the motion of Mr. Williams of Delaware was rejected.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY HON. PAUL HASLUCK, MINISTER FOR EXTERNAL AFFAIRS OF AUSTRALIA

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I am pleased to announce that with us today in the Senate are two distinguished representatives of the Australian Government.

I am sure that I need not remind my fellow Senators of the fact that in Australia we have a stanch ally. Our two countries are bound together by a common language, a common system of jurisprudence, common aspirations, and common goals, especially the devoted purpose of preserving liberty within the nations in which we respectively live. We are bound together in a common cause by the ANZUS relationship, consisting of the United States, New Zealand, and Australia. We are also both signatories of the SEATO Treaties. But quite apart from those relationships in ANZUS and SEATO, I believe the primary cement that unites our countries is our common heritage and common goals and purposes for our citizens.

I say to these distinguished representatives of the Australian Government that at least speaking for myself—and I am quite certain I speak for my fellow Senators, as well—we recognize that there is an interdependence between the security of Australia and the security of the United States. We want Australia to remain strong, as we want our country to remain strong, because we believe that upon our two countries, and others of similar aspirations, the goals of free men throughout the world depend.

The Honorable Paul Hasluck, the Minister of External Affairs of Australia, has had a long and varied career in public life, beginning in 1941, when he joined the Department of External Affairs. He has served in Parliament for the last 18 years and as a senior Cabinet Minister since 1956. Before his appointment as Minister of External Affairs in 1964, he served with distinction as Minister of Defense and, earlier, as Minister for Territories.

He has been a distinguished legislator and a distinguished executive.

It is my distinct honor and privilege to present to the Senate the Minister of External Affairs of Australia, Hon. Paul Hasluck, who is accompanied by the Ambassador from Australia to the United States, the Honorable John Keith Waller. [Applause, Senators rising.]

RECESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a 2-minute recess for the purpose of meeting our distinguished visitors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will stand in recess.

Thereupon, at 1 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m., the Senate took a recess, and the distinguished visitors were greeted by Senators in the well of the Senate Chamber.

The Senate reconvened at 1:48 p.m., upon the expiration of the recess, when called to order by the Presiding Officer [Mr. Montoya].

PUBLIC WORKS AND ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11641) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission, the Delaware River Basin Commission, Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Water Resources Council, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, on September 28 I was authorized by the Appropriations Committee to move to suspend the rules and propose as an amendment to the fiscal year 1968 public works appropriation bill the language of S. 1004, the central Arizona project bill. That same day, I filed a notice of intention to move for a suspension of the rules of the Senate, so that the public works appropriation bill could be so amended.

Mr. President, during the past 20 years the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has recommended authorization of the central Arizona project four times and the Senate has passed such legislation three times. The last time was on August 7 of this year.

Each time, after Senate action, the House of Representatives has failed to report the bill to the floor for a vote by that body.

The central Arizona project bill, in one form or another, has been before the House Interior Committee as far back as 1947, and has been almost continuously before that committee since June 4, 1963, after the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that Arizona has legal claim to 2.8 million acre-feet of Colorado River water. Extensive hearings were held in August and September 1965, and again in May of 1966. And the House Interior Committee held hearings on legislation containing the central Arizona project early this year. In 1966, the House Interior Committee favorably reported the bill, only to have it die in the House Rules Committee, because the chairman of the Interior Committee did not ask that it be reported.

This year, after the central Arizona project passed the Senate, Chairman Aspinall announced he was adjourning his committee and that there would be no action taken on central Arizona project legislation.

Mr. President, S. 1004 is not of benefit to Arizona only. It is a regional bill in that it would also provide authorization for five projects in Colorado and New Mexico, Utah's Dixie project, Hooker dam and reservoir in New Mexico, and a $1.3 billion lower basin development fund.

Finally, it should be made clear that water supply is not at issue. The central Arizona project has undergone close and extensive analysis by hydrologists in the Department of the Interior and it has been found to be unqualifiedly feasible—physically, financially, and economically.

This method of obtaining congressional authorization for the central Arizona project—that is, by attaching it to an appropriation bill, has ample precedence. More than 40 reclamation projects have been authorized in precisely this way. And they include projects in both California and Colorado.

My goal is to get the central Arizona project to the floor of the House of Representatives for a vote after 20 long years of compromises, hearings, litigation, and patience. The State of Arizona is entitled to have full consideration of this vital issue in the Congress of the United States.

I have just learned that this morning the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs met to inform its members that in the last week in January, or the first week in February next year, the full committee will meet in executive session to mark up and report the central Arizona project bill to the House.

This will provide the opportunity for a House vote. With this definite assurance, I have decided not to propose the central Arizona project amendment to an appropriation bill at this time.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as the distinguished Senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden] has just stated, the committee authorized him to file a motion to suspend the rules for the purpose of proposing, as an amendment to the bill, the language of S. 1004, the central Arizona project bill. I am glad that the chairman has, in view of the action taken by the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, decided not to offer his motion. I want to assure the chairman that I will do anything I can to help him get a vote on his project in the House early in the next session.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am sure the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona knows the depth of affection I bear for him, because I gave him a vote on this project. And I think the Record will so show.

The Record, however, ought also to show the situation that confronts the Senate in view of a suspension of the rules on a proposal to offer the project in the public works appropriation bill. There was nothing more that the Senate could or should do, whatever fault there might be laid to the House of Representatives and with its operations. I have spoken to the Speaker about it. I have spoken to others, and I have tried to point out, not only publicly but also privately, that the House ought to do something about it if one of its chairmen undertakes to arbitrarily adjourn a committee when Congress is still in session and close the door to any other consideration.

There are ways of amending that situation. The House could consider a resolution of censure for the chairman of a committee who had undertaken to obstruct the normal legislative procedures.

I felt that if this matter had been pushed, I would find myself in the uncomfortable position of having to vote against a suspension of the rules in order to do what the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona sought to do.

This matter goes back to the House. Neither body, Senate nor House, can take the position that it is entirely independent of the other. If that were so, there would be no constitutional provision that neither body can adjourn for more than 3 days without the consent of the other. So there is not quite that latitude of independence in either body, and each ought to recognize its responsibilities under the Constitution and certainly under the comity of our relationship that goes back over a long period of time.

I am glad that the distinguished representative from Colorado, who is chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, thought better of it either by reason of the impulses of his own conscience and conduct or by some external force that might have been applied.

In January we will undertake to deal with this matter to the eminent satisfaction of our distinguished friend, the senior Senator from Arizona.

It was said, when this suspension of the rules was proposed, that there was precedent for it. Well, a sin of the past we cannot condone; nor can we pile another sin on top of it and compound it. I think the record has got to show that at least some remonstrance was made at the time in connection with the proposal.

I am more than delighted to let the matter drop right here, because it will be just like the Red Sox dropping the series-winning game at the hands of the St. Louis Cardinals. I shall be very happy about it.

Mr. HAYDEN. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph], for himself and the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Byrd], proposes:

On page 23, line 26, strike out the numeral and insert "$2,101,064,000."

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on the pending amendment there be a time limitation of one-half hour, the time to be equally divided between the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph] and the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender], the manager of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, the effect and purpose of which is to reduce the $509,058,-

000 level of appropriations recommended by the Appropriations Committee for "Reactor development" activities of the Atomic Energy Commission to last year's level of $467,720,000 appropriated. The actual reduction would be $41,338,000. I feel that if there is an area of public spending which can be cut back or deferred in part in these critical times it is the reactor development aspect of the AEC program—especially that part of it which relates to atomic power for nondefense purposes.

Yesterday in this forum, the able senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark] and my diligent colleague from West Virginia [Mr. Byrd] spoke on this subject, and I commend their remarks to all of my colleagues as being timely and cogent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania pertinently remarked that the huge sums—$467,720,000—appropriated for these activities last year, "while desirable, are less essential to the well-being of our country than aid to our beleaguered cities and other programs which could be named," and he added, "moreover, they are expenditures which can have no possible impact on our military program."

I share that view.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I am flattered that the Senator should have made reference to the comments I made yesterday. As I understand it, his amendment would cut back the appropriation for the atomic reactor program to about where it was last year.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Approximately.

Mr. CLARK. Approximately $42 million?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes; approximately.

Mr. CLARK. I commend the Senator for the action he has taken, and tell him that I shall certainly support him in this effort.

As I said yesterday, what we really need is some understanding of national priorities in the appropriating process, and we certainly need to cut back on appropriations in the light of the enormous deficit with which we are confronted. I shall support the Senator in his efforts to do that in an area which I believe should have a very low priority, indeed.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I share the view expressed by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am happy to yield to my distinguished colleague from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I wish to commend my colleague for his leadership in proposing this amendment. As he has already indicated, I made a statement in this regard on yesterday. I am proud to cosponsor the amendment with him, and I am glad to support the amendment by my vote.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank my colleague. I shall make further reference to the remarks that he made in this Chamber on yesterday.

If the orders going out of the White House to the Bureau of the Budget, and to departments and agencies of the executive branch, would center expenditure withholding or threats of deferral more on programs of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Space Administration, and some of the fatty facets of programs of the military establishment, those orders would be received with appreciation by a vast majority of our citizens. I am sure the public reaction to such expenditure deferring would be more affirmative than is the angry response of the Governors of the States and the people to withholdings and threats to cut back such vital activities as those in the areas of highway construction and the building of flood-control works.

It is far more important that we move ahead with the expansion and modernization of our highway system—to reduce if not stop the extent of traffic congestion, accidents, and fatalities—than to accelerate the reactor development program of the Atomic Energy Commission.

It is vastly more necessary, in my view, that we move ahead with flood control, air- and water-pollution abatement, and general water resource development than it is to accelerate atomic reactor development.

And make no mistake about it, the increase of AEC reactor development appropriations from last year's $467,720,000 level to an amount in excess of $509 million represents funding for acceleration at a time when I believe there should be a cutting back.

About $33 million of the increase over the 1967 appropriation proposed in this bill is for purely civilian aspects of the nuclear program. Appropriations for civilian nuclear reactors would be increased by $16 million.

About $11 million would be added to the cooperative power reactor demonstration program.

Thus, Mr. President, much of the decrease proposed in the amendment would have absolutely no effect on our atomic weapons program.

Nuclear power is a commercial reality. Private utilities are building large commercial plants with their own funds.

Surely, it is in the public interest to hold the line on Federal expenditures in this area during a time of budgetary stringency.

I mentioned traffic fatalities and the need to accelerate our highway expansion and construction to make the interstates, the freeways, the expressways, the access roads, and even the city streets modern and much safer. I noted the priority that should be ascribed to the programing and funding of air and water pollution abatement activities in the interest of public health, as well as for other reasons.

But here we are, in this appropriations bill, being asked to increase funds for an activity which my West Virginia colleague [Mr. Byrd] described yesterday as a playing of "nuclear roulette with the future of this country." He spoke, too, of the thousands of "uranium miners condemned to slow death by cancer, of the transport through our cities of deadly atomic waste, of the burial of this waste where it can pollute the waters and has polluted the soil of this Nation with radioactive poisons."

These are conditions to ponder as we plunge ahead with more speed and more dollars to advance nuclear power at a time when even the Atomic Energy Commission, in its testimony before Committees of Congress, admits that many problems incident to the handling of the nuclear power byproduct contaminants remain unsolved.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. Will the Senator enlighten me? Would this cut interfere with the proposed nuclear reactor which is tied in with the latest development in desalination off the Pacific Coast, just south of Los Angeles?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes; it would.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. As a matter of fact, it would interfere with it.

Mr. MURPHY. I should like to point out to the Senator from West Virginia that, in that event, I will have to oppose the amendment, because this matter, along with the clean air provision and the clean water provision, is one of the most important items in the bill.

We know that in the year 2000 there will not be sufficient water to take care of the needs of our population. We know that new sources of water must be found, and we know, after many years of study and experimentation, that nuclear reactors will provide a solution. They could supply water to take care of all of southern California, which the Colorado River will be unable to do.

So I say, respectfully, to the Senator from West Virginia that providing for this nuclear reactor is one of the most important things we could do. We must find a new way to make usable irrigation and potable water. The only way to accomplish this is by an advance in nuclear reactors, which are used to make fresh water from sea water. It will answer the problem that existed in New York, New Jersey, and down through the east coast 2 years ago, and it will answer the problems of the west coast. With the future handling of the water unimpeded by newer developments, it may be the answer to the problem.

In my opinion, adoption of the amendment by the Senator from West Virginia would be a mistake. There are other cuts which could be made which would not impede progress as this one would.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am very glad to support the amendment which has been offered by the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph]. We have served together for years on the Public Works Committee, and I know his sense of responsibility—and his keen sense of priorities.

As the senior Senator from West Virginia has pointed out, the country and the Congress is faced with the reality of a huge deficit, with the prospect of an increase in taxes, with the cost of financing the war in Vietnam. For this reason, I have voted for reductions in appropriations, and in authorizations, for I do not believe it responsible to provide increases for old programs and large amounts for new programs which are continuously proposed and urged upon us—in good faith, I am sure—without the most careful examination in the light of our national requirements, and in view of the difficult present fiscal situation.

Senator RANDOLPH has cited examples such as water pollution control, which is being funded at less than half the authorized level; highway safety, drastically reduced below the allocation to the States; suspension by the Department of Defense of contracting for water resource development projects, and the general reduction in Federal expenditures by all agencies of Government ordered by the President. Yesterday, Governors of the States were notified that the Federal-aid highway program may be cut back by up to 50 percent. These are all programs important to the people of the country, and to its continued development.

During a time of war it may be that even these programs must be deferred for a time. But if this is so, it seems to me only reasonable that the civilian activities of the Atomic Energy Commission for reactor development could at least be held to last year's level of appropriations—as the Senator's amendment to reduce the committee recommendation by $41 million proposes.

I have noted also the comments that there are problems of atomic reactor operations for energy—particularly with respect to the handling of byproducts and residues—which remain unsolved. The Senator pointed out that his amendment would in no way affect the work of the AEC which concerns defense, and is not related in any way to our military program.

I am glad to join with the Senator from West Virginia in urging this reduction in appropriations proposed for civilian reactor development by the Atomic Energy Commission, and hope that the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Senator from Kentucky and I have been in many battles together. We have not always won, but often we have. I thank my friend, and know that he is always moved by his deep concern for the people of his State, and for the needs of the Nation.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield as much time as he wishes to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, with due deference to the dedication of every committee of Congress, I do not believe that any other joint committee or standing committee of Congress is more energetic and more conscientious in analyzing requests made with reference to matters that involve atomic energy. I am speaking now of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

We are dedicated to nuclear progress for peace. We are practical. We know it will have a price—but it will bring a profit beyond all price. We strive to build the economy of America—not destroy it.

We do not seek to supplant any other source of power—only to supplement it.

Mr. President, this is an old chestnut. This is a very, very, very old chestnut. This is the supposed conflict between nuclear energy and fossil fuels. We are not in competition with the coal industry in this country and we do not intend to be. But if America is to maintain its primacy in the industrial world, it must begin to think about a second—a supplemental—source of energy.

That second source of energy is atomic energy. It has been estimated that by the year 2000 we will have to multiply by sevenfold the amount of electricity that we are producing in this country today. It is also believed that by 1980 about 25 percent of our electricity production will come from nuclear reactors.

The main reason the committee added these few dollars—few by comparison to the size of the task that lies ahead—is only because we are trying to fabricate a reactor that will produce more fuel than it consumes, and that is the breeder reactor. In the world at this hour we maintain primacy in the peaceful atom. I hope that we do not let that primacy slip out of our fingers today.

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from California has properly declared that desalting, the making of fresh water out of salt water, is one of the first demands of this Nation. If ever the desert is to bloom we will need water and lots of it. We have devised project after project in order to promote irrigation. There is nothing in scientific sight that can do it better than nuclear power.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, my distinguished colleague, GEORGE MURPHY, and I come from a State that increases in population by 600,000 people every year. Six hundred thousand new people appear in my State and they require, like all human beings, the essentials of life, and none is more vital than water.

The public and private agencies of California put up nearly $400 million. They asked the Federal Government if it would be interested in helping to provide through nuclear power a feasible and economic means by which sea water could be made potable. The Federal Government, this administration, recommended a modest amount of money for this program. It was approved by an overwhelming vote in the Senate and in the House of Representatives. At this point it would be an electrifying Federal farce to cut back on this item. It would completely undercut the progress that has been initiated among all agencies concerned, public and private. Here is an opportunity to find a feasible and economic means of transmutation of salt water into potable water. It could be a major contribution to the peace of mankind, particularly in arid regions such as the Middle East.

Mr. President, for all of these reasons I hope the amendment will be defeated overwhelmingly.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I hope I am not misunderstood. I know the sincerity of my colleague from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] and my good friend, his colleague, West Virginia's Senator BYRD. There are no two men I respect more, admire more, or for whom I have more affection. I know their parochial problem and I do not blame them for pursuing it. Theirs is a coal country.

Time and time again I was instrumental in putting in appropriations and authorizations to find greater uses for coal. But we are not competing with coal in this matter. There is no connection although there are some Senators who may want to give it that connection. There is absolutely no connection.

The world today looks to nuclear power. If we do not use this God-given power for peace then for what are we going to use it? To burn the world? Is that the prospect for civilization or is it to make a better life for mankind? That is what we should be trying to do. I say: Let us build for that better life. Do not blow it today. We talk about pollution. Do not pollute and scandalize the peaceful purpose of the atom.

I hope the amendment is rejected.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one-half minute?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I want to say to the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island that he has spoken from a national viewpoint and he has spoken well. He is never parochial, but during every hour of the day he is a grand representative of New England, whence he and I come.

He knows, as I know, the desperate need in New England for power, and the expense of bringing in oil and coal—although we do wish success to these industries.

The Senator from Rhode Island has made a splendid argument on this matter. I commend him, and I am with him every step of the way.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank my colleague, the Senator from New Hampshire.

Speaking about New England, we have the Yankee Atomic Plant, which is owned by a consortium of utilities in New England at Rowe, Mass. This is producing today about 175 megawatts of electricity. The same consortium is building an installation at Haddam Neck, Conn. I was to have the honor of dedicating this, but because of pressures here, I could not attend.

Our progress in New England is reflected in all the areas of America. Atomic energy is on the march.

We are making tremendous progress to make life a little better. I hope we make that life better for coal miners any time they need help. This amendment is no such step.

What is now being asked to be done here is not good for America, and I hope we will not pursue that course.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. As a former coal miner——

Mr. PASTORE. What a diversified life the Senator has had.

Mr. MURPHY. I have had a very exciting life. I know the problems of the coal miner. The Senator knows that my brother, his associates, and I are working on problems that may help to relieve the plight of the coal miner in West Virginia and western Pennsylvania, where it is not practical to operate some mines.

I am glad the Senator pointed out the consortium. This is a problem to be solved by the Federal Government, the State government, and private industry. I think this partnership is ideal. It would be a shame if this great effort were halted.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. PASTORE. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLINGS in the chair). The Senator is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, there is no Senator more vigorous in his opposition to a proposal he is against, and by the same token no Senator who is more effective in his espousal of a cause he believes in, than the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE].

I do want to emphasize for the record that the Senator from West Virginia cannot be charged in any sense with being provincial because the measures I have been privileged to author and cosponsor in this forum would not so indicate. If the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] were in the Chamber at this time they could document the record of no provincialism by the Senator from West Virginia, even though they oppose our present amendment.

My colleague from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] knows the record on this score. We need not labor that point.

I am grateful, of course, for the assistance which has been given to me many, many times by the Senator from Rhode Island, and to those of us who have particular problems in certain regions of this country.

I would remind Senators that we did not think in terms of an Appalachian Regional Commission alone. We were thinking of the creation of five additional regional development organizations in this country. One of those regions, as the Senator will recall, is New England. Although we started with an Appalachian Regional Development Commission, with a program for some 13 States, I pledged, as I stood on the floor at the time, that we would provide and authorize development programs for other regions of the country. We have done that; so provincialism is not an issue—and ours is not a "provincial" amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. The use of that word was most unfortunate. I regret very much that anyone used it. No one knows the broad point of view of the Senator from West Virginia better than the Senator from Rhode Island. He is an American first. He is an American second. He is an American third, before he is anything else. I will certainly attest to that this afternoon, and I want the record to be abundantly clear on that point.

The Senator has a perfect right to explain the problem in his State. The coal miners of America are wrestling with a very serious problem. There is no question at all about that. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who is on the Committee on Appropriations with me, pointed it out to me, and I was one of the first to see that the money was appropriated so that the research could be made.

The Senator will recall that I was instrumental in getting through an appropriation, at his behest, for the coal industry. We are doing everying possible we can for coal. Let us not spoil something that is so big, so great, and so promising as the peaceful use of atomic energy. If we destroy this program we will not be helping the coal miners of America. If we destroy the program, we will be hurting all of America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired on the other side.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I made these remarks on my own time, I hope.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from West Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I appreciate the generosity of my good friend, the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. President, I conclude by saying that I am not sensitive; I am cooperative. I regret that the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] referred to our amendment as a "Federal farce" if it were to be passed by the Senate. This amendment, I can assure him, is a serious attempt to focus attention in this body on a problem which does not confine itself to one State. The senior Senator from California cannot and should not dismiss this proposal as "a Federal farce." It evidently does not appeal to him. But it has fact written into its presentation.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] speaks about New England. He knows his State well and speaks for it. We know that residual oil has been dumped into New England at any price in competition with coal which is mined in the United States while the residual oil comes in from Venezuela and other countries. But that is another issue—perhaps an issue of another day, and hopefully a day in the past.

Thus, we are able to balance out the situation.

A final word to the Senator from Rhode Island: In speaking of the research programs, not only on atomic energy but also on coal, and so that the RECORD may indicate what has been done, let us recall that last year the rate of research on atomic energy was running about $90 million, whereas research on coal was about $8 million.

It is a fact that those Senators who are today arguing for the amendment have realized the validity of the atomic energy research program. We can wonder why coal research has been permitted to lag so far behind nuclear research in the civilian sector.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from West Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I shall not ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment. My colleague from West Virginia tells me he also will not ask for the yeas and nays.

We know the temper of the Senate. We have brought to the membership a problem that we thought should be explored and clarified. There are Senators who agree with us, I can say to the Senate; but I am very grateful for the attitude, especially of the Senator from Rhode Island, as he discusses this matter not only vigorously but also fairly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield 1 minute?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from West Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Louisiana. I want to express my gratitude, also, to the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE]. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, with him, I have found him always to be most considerate of our problems in the coal industry. He has always supported any efforts I have made to get additional money for coal research, forestry research, and for other research beneficial to West Virginia. Thus, it is not that he is inconsiderate at all. He is, and has been, very understanding and cooperative. I have joined my colleague today believing that we have a problem, and believing that we are justified in presenting it to the Senate. I do not think that either of us has misjudged the situation. We do recognize the temper of the Senate.

I join my colleague, however, in expressing concern over the statement that was made on the other side of the aisle. I do not believe that the Senator who made that statement really thought it through before he made it. I am confident that with more careful reflection he would not have done it. The statement was not characteristic of the Senator.

I congratulate my colleague again on having offered the amendment, and I am glad to have cosponsored it.

I hope that Senators will vote for the amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana withhold for a moment and yield me 30 seconds?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 30 seconds to the Senator from Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized for 30 seconds.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I want to commend the two distinguished Senators from West Virginia for bringing this matter to the floor of the Senate for consideration. This problem deserves careful attention. I am hopeful that, on the basis of the statements made by our two distinguished West Virginia colleagues, this matter will be gone into. The issue involved goes far beyond the simple question of coal versus atomic energy. I think it is well worth consideration and I am pleased that the Senate was able to focus on it today.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I understand that there are no further amendments to be offered to the bill.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, yesterday I rose to congratulate Mr. Kenneth Bousquet and his associate on the minority side, Mr. Edmund King, who have rendered great service to the subcommittee in handling this bill. I want to note at this time equally valuable work of Mr. Paul Eaton who serves Senator HAYDEN on problems of the Bureau of Reclamation and Power Marketing Agencies, and Messrs. Earl Cooper and Harley Dicks, who work with Senator HILL on portions concerning the Atomic Energy Commission and Tennessee Valley Authority. I want the RECORD to show my thanks to each of them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendments, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I want to commend the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Public Works for the magnificent job he has done on this large, complex and objective bill. He, Senator ELLENDER, his committee and the committee staff are thorough, patient, and fair throughout the hearings as well as the marking up of this bill. I can only add to what others have said that he has done it again—given us a bill of which the Senate can be quite proud.

Mr. President, I am indebted to the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] and Mr. Kenneth Bousquet, top staff assistant to the Senate Public Works Appropriations Subcommittee, for what Senator PROXMIRE has characterized as a "succinct rebuttal of the critics' arguments" against the Dickey-Lincoln school project.

I commend the attitude of Senator PROXMIRE in this matter. He is widely respected and noted for being one of the economy champions in the Senate. While he is by no means an opponent of public power, he was not convinced that this project was justified for the requested funds as provided in this bill.

So, with admirable objectivity, he asked some very searching questions. He was very thoughtful in sending me the reply to his inquiry letter made by Mr. Bousquet. Very generously, he made the letter available to me for possible use in debate on the public works appropriations bill, I am deeply indebted to him.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD Mr. Bousquet's letter as well as the one from the Senator from Wisconsin to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
September 19, 1967.

Hon. WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: Senator Ellender has asked me to reply to your letter of August 14, 1967, concerning a number of inquiries you made on the Dickey-Lincoln School Project. Replies to the questions are numbered the same as the questions listed in your letter.

1. The current Corps estimate of the cost for the Dickey-Lincoln School Project is $229.3 million, including $212.1 million for construction and $17.2 million for interest during construction. This estimate was determined in accordance with standards prescribed in Senate Document No. 97, which states that estimates of project costs should be based on price levels prevailing at the time of project analysis. Accordingly, the $229.3 million estimate was based on 1966 price levels and the most recent design studies and, therefore, does not reflect possible escalations in construction costs. Unit price values for other New England and national projects were used and modified as necessary to account for material handling methods, magnitude of quantities and construction conditions, such as climate and length of the construction season. The cost escalation feature is discussed in the last three paragraphs on page 3368 of the fiscal year 1968 hearings before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee and in the first two paragraphs under D.1 on page 393 of the fiscal year 1968 hearings before the House Appropriations Subcommittee. The cost of transmission is not included in the $229.3 million project cost estimate. The total project cost including transmission would be $311.8 million.

The total cost estimate as computed by those in opposition to the project was based on the Corps 1966 estimate of $212.1 million for Dickey-Lincoln School Project escalated by five percent per year for the six and a half year construction period. Interest during construction and transmission costs are added to arrive at the $380–382 million estimate.

2. The Corps of Engineers economic analysis indicates that the Dickey-Lincoln Project is well justified economically and, as confirmed by the House Committee Staff study, that it would be lower in cost than any privately constructed alternatives. Accordingly, there would be no savings resulting from construction of private nuclear and pumped storage alternatives. The cited savings of $16.9 and $14.0 million, therefore, cannot be verified. The figures cited appear to be the total at-market annual cost of the Dickey-Lincoln Project based on a 3-⅛ interest rate and a 50-year period of amortization. The $14.0 million figure apparently is based on the Corps estimated cost of $311.8 million (project cost plus interest during construction and transmission system costs) whereas the $16.9 million figure is based on an escalated estimate of costs of $380 million as discussed in the last paragraph of the reply to Question No. 1 above.

The relative merits of pumped storage vs. conventional hydro-power generation are presented on pages 426 and 427 of the fiscal year 1968 House hearings.

3. The derivation of the Corps B/C ratio of 1.9 was based on standards prescribed in Senate Document No. 97, 3-⅛ interest rate and a 100 year period of analysis. Total project benefits were comprised of at-market power benefits, total downstream energy benefits, flood control and area redevelopment type benefits. Total annual project costs were increased to provide for transmission of power, by adding 50 percent of the cost of a line between the project and Boston. The unit power values furnished by the Federal Power Commission, and used in the computation of power benefits, were based on a pumped storage alternative for that portion of project power expected to be marketed in the Boston area and a base load thermal alternative for that portion to be marketed in Maine.

The Department of Interior computed a B/C ratio based on Corps data and in a similar manner. Their computation differed, however, in that only 50 percent of the downstream energy benefits were credited to Dickey-Lincoln and total costs of the transmission line were included on the cost side of the computation. However, as indicated on page 413 of the fiscal year 1968 hearings before the House Appropriations Subcommittee, Interior concurs in the Corps treatment of downstream energy gains and transmission costs.

The B/C ratio of 0.85 computed by the private utilities group differed from the Corps computation in that a 50 year economic life was used, power benefits were based on their concept of the cost of alternative power, and downstream energy gains were not credited to the project. The values for alternative power sources as estimated by the utilities were based on the estimated cost of a 1969 nuclear plant in Connecticut for base load service in Maine and a 1971 pumped storage plant in Western Massachusetts for peaking service in Boston. The unit power values, based on these alternative sources of power, are substantially lower than those furnished the Corps by the Federal Power Commission. In addition, omissions and incorrect assumptions used in the utilities group computations make a comparison invalid. These factors are discussed on page 412 of the fiscal year 1968 House hearings and page 3379 of the fiscal year 1968 Senate hearings.

The House Committee on Appropriations computation of a B/C ratio of 1.39 differed from the Corps computation in that only 50 percent of the downstream energy benefits were credited to the project, total cost of the transmission line was included and at-market power benefits were not based on values furnished by the Federal Power Commission. For comparative purposes the Committee Staff used the power values used by the utilities but adjusted them upward to account for recognized omissions and incorrect assumptions. These adjustments are discussed on pages 412 and 413 of the fiscal year 1968 House hearings. The unit power values used by the Corps, Interior, utilities and the Committee Staff are tabulated below. A comparison of total project benefits and costs are shown in the tabulation on page 410 of the fiscal year 1968 House hearings:

	Firm load capacity (dollars per kilowatt)	(Maine) energy (mills per kilowatt-hour)	Peakload capacity (dollars per kilowatt)	(Boston area) energy (mills per kilowatt-hour)
Federal Power Commission (corps and Interior)	23.50	3.1	19.50	4.5
Utilities	19.14	1.91	10.91	2.99
Staff committee	25.14	1.91	16.82	2.99

The foregoing differences in computing downstream power benefits, transmission costs, and unit power values for use in determining at-market power benefits accounts for the different B/C ratios. As indicated above, the Corps B/C ratio was derived in accordance with established standards and procedures.

4. Project payout for costs allocated to power is on a 50 year basis. The economic analysis, however, was made on a 100 year basis in accordance with current standards.

5. Repayment of costs allocated to power is governed by Section 5 of the 1944 Flood Control Act which prescribes repayment within a reasonable period of years. As a matter of administration policy, this period has been specified as 50 years.

6. Project benefits and the percentage of the total are as follows:

	Amount	Percent
Flood control	$40,000	0.2
Area redevelopment	467,000	2.3
Power	19,316,000	97.5
Total benefits	19,823,000	100.0

7. Justification for the Dickey-Lincoln School Project is based on economically satisfying regional and area needs for electric power and flood control, at a cost less than by available alternatives. This justification is based on application of the principles and practices proposed in Senate Document 97–87th Congress, which establishes the policies, standards, and procedures for the formulation, evaluation, and review of plans for use and development of water and related land resources. The project will provide needed low cost power in New England, an area now having the highest rates in the country, where a sixfold increase in the demand for power is anticipated before the turn of the century. It would develop the water resources of the St. John River, provide long-term flood protection to the valley, and assist the depressed economic condition of the area.

The project has received the support of the U.S. Senators and Congressmen from the State of Maine. U.S. Senators from other New England States have favorably acted on legislation and appropriations concerning the project, and of the eight Congressmen from the New England States who took part in the debate on the amendment to remove the project appropriation from the fiscal year 1968 appropriation bill, five opposed the amendment, thereby favoring the project. At the time of preparation of the report by the Department of the Interior in 1965, Governors from five of the six New England States submitted letters in favor of the project. Three of these five Governors are still in office and a fourth, the Governor of Maine, has been replaced. The new Governor also favors the project. No attempt has been made to learn the attitudes of the other two Governors.

8. There are a number of ways in which power from Dickey-Lincoln School could be used to serve Southern New England, by displacement, by use of existing facilities, or by new transmission facilities. For purposes of economic evaluation, a transmission system adequate to transmit the entire output allotted to Southern New England has been used in an effort to provide a reasonable estimate of transmission cost.

9. A list of preference customers requesting project power was furnished by Interior and is listed on page 428 of the fiscal year 1968 House hearings.

10. Power systems are normally comprised of a number of types and ages of power installations which have different performance and efficiency characteristics. The performance and efficiency of a system is measured in terms of a composite of the characteristics of all the units comprising the system. It is difficult to make a comparison of the performance and efficiency of a system with that of an individual project and any such comparison would be of questionable value.

11. The objective of ideal system operation is to meet area power demands at least cost to consumers. Therefore, the least costly addition to a region's capacity could be considered as a yardstick for purposes of making a decision regarding such additions. Corps procedures provide for such determination through what has been referred to as an "economic efficiency test". Basically, the test provides for a comparison of the costs of providing an equivalent amount of power from the most economical alternative likely to develop in the absence of the project evaluated on a basis comparable with the determination of project costs (with respect to interest rates, taxes and insurance). The Corps economic analysis on this basis indicates that the annual charge at-market for Dickey-Lincoln power amounts to $10,390,000, while alternative equivalent power charges amount to $11,605,000. This results in a ratio of 1.12 in favor of the Dickey-Lincoln School Project. A discussion of other advantages of the Dickey-Lincoln School conventional hydroelectric facility is included on page 3384 of the fiscal year 1968 hearings before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee.

12. The need for a source of peaking power to assist in the area load supply and the relative merits of conventional peaking power facilities as compared to other alternatives are discussed in the first three full paragraphs on page 3375 of the fiscal year 1968 Senate hearings. As a practical matter, after the cost of a dam and reservoir with lands and appurtenant features is determined, the incremental cost of adding additional power facilities is relatively cheap. Firm load power benefits in Maine from the Dickey-Lincoln School Project are estimated to be $3,440,000. Peak load power benefits in the Boston area are estimated to be $14,826,000. On this basis, the peak power benefit accounts for about 81 percent of the power benefits from generation at the project.

The tabulation on top of page 404 of the fiscal year 1968 House hearings shows the relative cost of peaking power delivered at 10 percent load factor in the Boston area. The proposed rate for 10 percent load factor power from the Dickey-Lincoln School Project amounts to 20 mills per kilowatt hour, as compared to 22 to 27 mills per kilowatt hour from a pumped storage alternate.

In the opinion of the Corps of Engineers, the Department of the Interior, and the Federal Power Commission, the Dickey-Lincoln School Project is a more economical source of power than any available alternative likely to be built in the absence of the project.

Sincerely yours,

KENNETH J. BOUSQUET,
Staff Assistant, Subcommittee on Public Works.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, D.C., August 14, 1967.

Hon. ALLEN ELLENDER,
Chairman, Public Works Subcommittee,
Senate Appropriations Committee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Could you have a member fo your staff reply to the followng questions about the Dickey-Lincoln Project?

I have read the debate on the floor of the House preceding the vote which deleted the planning funds for the Project and was very impressed by a number of the objections to the project which were pointed out in that debate. There were, however, a number of conflicts between those who favored the project and those who opposed it and it will be very helpful if the staff of the Public Works Subcommittee could resolve these conflicts.

1. The proponents of the Dickey-Lincoln Project state it would cost $229 million, including the expected escalation of construction costs.

The opponents charged it would cost $380 million. The difference seems to be the allegation on the part of the opponents that the $229 is, number one, based on 1966 prices and, secondly, omits $82 million for the construction of the transmission system. The opponents say that if you add to the $229 million, the $82 million, you get $312 million and then if you add a 4 or 5% in escalation of construction costs, which is conservative, the evaluation will result in a total cost of $382 million. Is this true?

2. The opponents say that the Dickey-Lincoln hydroelectric project would cost more than alternative methods of supplying the power, specifically by nuclear energy. The allegation is made that this will be a difference of $16.9 million for the Dickey-Lincoln Project and much less than $14 million for an alternative nuclear pump storage plant.

On the other hand, the proponents claim that a staff study authorized by the House Appropriations Committee shows that the Dickey-Lincoln Project would be at a lower cost than any private alternative.

One way of resolving this difference would be that the less than $14 million cost supplying the same amount of power could be achieved by a Federally constructed dam and the higher cost would be by privately constructed facility. Is this true?

3. The proponents of Dickey-Lincoln say that the benefit-cost ratio is 1.9 to 1. The opponents claim that the Department of Interior stated a different ratio, namely, 1.59 to 1. The utilities' figure is .85 to 1 and the staff of the House Appropriations Committee suggested that it is 1.39 to 1.

What are the assumptions on which these varying benefit-cost ratios are based and do they constitute a basis for challenging the alleged 1.9 to 1 benefit-cost ratio?

At one point, the opponents say that the Dickey-Lincoln project shows a 100-year method of payback but at other points a 50-year principle is applied to computing the benefit-cost ratio. Which is the method used?

4. It is alleged by opponents of Dickey-Lincoln that the 100-year method of payback is not in accordance with the law in the case of a hydroelectric plant and that this is because the payback must be in 50 years. Further, that virtually all of the significant benefits are hydroelectric, no other benefits of a significant nature are provided. For example, flood control is only 2/10ths or 1% of the benefits. Is this true?

It is alleged by the opponents of the project that the Congressmen from the area that would benefit from the project are very largely opposed to it. This seems to be true on the basis of the vote on the amendment. What, if any, justification can there be for supporting a project opposed by the Congressmen representing the areas which would benefit?

It is alleged by the proponents of the project that there has been no answer to the following questions: If there is an answer, what is it?

A. How will the power from the project get to Southern New England?

B. Who will buy the power?

It is claimed by proponents of the project that there is no effective yardstick by which to measure the efficiency or performance of private utilities in New England and that this project would constitute such a yardstick. Would this be an effective comparison?

With what utilities now operating in New England could the performance of Dickey-Lincoln and efficiency of Dickey-Lincoln be compared?

It is alleged by proponents of the Dickey-Lincoln project that a principal benefit is the added peaking power. But opponents say this peaking power is going to cost approximately $375 a kilowatt hour at Dickey-Lincoln to build these two dams and to have 750,000 kilowatts available in 8 years. On the other hand there can be built alternative peaking power sources for about $70 a kilowatt hour, at any one of 5 or 6 sites closer to Boston, Massachusetts, by 200 miles, where most of the power is to be used.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
U.S. Senator.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, today the Senate is confronted with the task of considering legislation to continue development of the Nation's water resources.

Since the early years of the Republic, the Federal Government has assumed a role in the protection and enhancement of the Nation's river basins. Initially, that role was limited to river regulation for navigation purposes. Flood control took on an expanded importance as population centers developed along the lower reaches of our rivers. Today's harnessing of our waterways has proved valuable for the generation of electric power, provision of public water supply, stream augmentation for pollution control and development of recreational resources.

Generally where full river basin development has taken place, economic growth has followed. One needs only to review briefly the value of the Tennessee Valley Authority to see the benefits received by that region over the past 30 years. The same case can be made in the Pacific Northwest, in the Missouri River Basin, in the Central Valley of California, and in fact, in every region of the Nation but one. Only in New England has public water resource development been largely ignored.

Except for a few flood control projects, normal navigation activities and beach erosion control, New England's water resources have not been fully utilized. This year and in the next few years that follow, there is a real opportunity to change that pattern.

Recently the New England River Basin Commission was formed. That River Basin Commission is charged with the responsibility to develop sound water resource planning concepts for the region. At the same time, the region can look forward to its first Federal hydroelectric project—if the Congress supports an investment in a sound project on the Upper St. John River, as it has in other regions of the country.

Included in the appropriation bill pending before the Senate today is the final planning money for the Dickey-Lincoln School project on the St. John River, Maine. This project is of significant public value. It meets the economic tests laid down by the Congress in many ways:

First. As mentioned before, Dickey-Lincoln School is New England's first Federal hydroelectric project;

Second. It is the first major Federal investment in New England water resources;

Third. It will provide the first opportunity for power consumers in New England to have the so-called Federal "yardstick" for power rates; and

Fourth. It has the excellent benefit-cost ratio of 1.91 to 1.

Other regions of the Nation have vastly benefited from the existence of a Federal power yardstick and, the propaganda of opponents notwithstanding, private utilities of those regions have prospered as well.

From time to time, the Tennessee Valley Authority has released a graphic example of the competitive effects of low-cost power within the boundaries of TVA on surrounding regions. This same picture could be drawn for all areas in which the "yardstick" exists.

In order to indicate the differential in power cost by regions, I would like to include at this point in the RECORD a table which compares the cost of power purchased by manufacturing industries, by region, with the national average cost to industry:

COST OF POWER PURCHASED BY MANUFACTURING INDUSTRIES, 1962[1]

	Kilowatt-hours purchased (billions)	Total cost (millions)	Average cost per kilowatt-hour (cents)	Percent above or below U.S. average
Total United States	313.7	2,827.1	0.9013	
New England	12.0	180.0	1.4961	+66
West North Central	12.2	151.8	1.2468	+38
Middle Atlantic	47.7	545.3	1.1431	+27
East North Central	81.0	808.8	.9990	+11
South Atlantic	35.4	327.3	.9250	+3
West South Central	20.8	175.9	.8442	−6
Pacific	38.9	277.0	.7121	−21
Mountain	8.5	60.4	.7080	−21
East South Central	57.2	298.5	.5222	−42

[1] Source: 1963 Census of Manufactures, Bureau of the Census, U.S. Commerce Department.

Note: New England: Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut.
West North Central: Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas.
Middle Atlantic: New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania.
East North Central: Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin.
South Atlantic: Delaware, Maryland, District of Columbia, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida.
West South Central: Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas.
Pacific: Washington, Oregon, California.
Mountain: Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, Nevada.
East South Central: Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi.

New England which has suffered from a constant outflow of industry, is faced with the least competitive situation. New England's residential consumers have also suffered. This is apparent from the following table which compares the average residential electric bill for New England consumers with the national average residential electric bill:

AVERAGE RESIDENTIAL ELECTRIC BILLS (JAN. 1, 1966)

	250 kilowatt-hours	500 kilowatt-hours	750 kilowatt-hours
U.S. average	$7.34	$10.34	$14.19
Connecticut	$7.92	$10.93	$15.16
Percent above U.S. average	7.9	5.7	6.8
Maine	$9.03	$12.45	$16.84
Percent above U.S. average	23	20.4	18.7
Massachusetts	$8.77	$11.96	$16.89
Percent above U.S. average	19.5	15.7	19
New Hampshire	$8.74	$11.61	$16.33
Percent above U.S. average	19.1	12.3	15.1
Rhode Island	$8.73	$11.41	$16.22
Percent above U.S. average	18.9	10.3	14.3
Vermont	$7.37	$10.52	$14.76
Percent above U.S. average	.4	1.7	4

Source: "Typical Electric Bills, 1966," a Federal Power Commission publication covering cities of 2,500 population and more served by private and public power systems.

Not only have New England electric consumers paid the highest power rates in the Nation, they have also received the least reliable service from the utilities in the area.

I need not dwell on the power blackout of November 9, 1965. I am sure all of us are well aware of that disaster. The blackout only serves to indicate another value of hydroelectric power. You will recall that one of the great difficulties encountered by the utilities within the area of the blackout was the inability to restore their generating capacity because of a lack of electricity required to start the generators. Since the 1965 blackout there have been a number of less publicized blackouts within New England.

Hydroelectric projects do not require this backup generation. They can be started instantly and can be of major assistance in periods of power failure. I am not saying that Dickey would have averted the blackout, but had it been constructed, with its related transmission facilities, it might have significantly reduced the delay in restoring service following that power failure.

Mr. President, in the 8 years in which I have been in the Senate, and especially in the 8 years that I have served on the Public Works Committee, I have consistently supported water resource projects which have favorable benefit-cost ratios.

Many of those projects have had benefit-cost ratios considerably lower than Dickey-Lincoln School. For example, of the projects included in the House Committee's version of S. 2300 in 1965, 52 of 78 flood control projects for which benefit-cost ratios were listed in the committee report had a benefit-cost ratio below 1.91 to 1. This was also true for 21 out of 47 navigation projects, and five out of nine beach erosion projects.

In this regard, Dickey-Lincoln School is completely justified in the report authorized last year by the House Appropriations Committee in which the following statement appears:

> The extensive investigation conducted by the Committee staff has confirmed that the project is economically feasible, with a benefit-to-cost of 1.9 to 1, and would provide efficient hydroelectric power at reasonable rates for peaking purposes as well as firm power to the preference customers in Maine.

The benefit-cost ratio for any project may not be indicative of the overall value of that project. As an example, it is anticipated that Dickey-Lincoln School will return $1.91 for every $1 of Federal investment and will pay for itself in full with interest in 50 years. But, Dickey-Lincoln will have a useful life far beyond 50 years. Dickey-Lincoln School will benefit many future generations, and at such time as the initial investment is amortized, will be an even more valuable development.

There are many more arguments which favor construction of this project, and there are numerous responses to the case against Dickey made by the private utilities in New England. But to air the arguments for or against would be both a waste of the Senate's time and might be interpreted as lending credence to arguments manufactured out of unenlightened self-interest.

The record has been made. Dickey-Lincoln School is a worthwhile, valid investment and no amount of logic, statistics, or rational reason will convert those private utilities which view with terror the concept of competition.

I, therefore, urge, Mr. President, that the planning of this project be completed, that the Senate conferees stand fast in their desire to appropriate funds for the project, and that we begin to look to next year's legislation when Dickey-Lincoln School will receive its first appropriation for construction.

Finally, Mr. President, I would like to congratulate the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. ELLENDER, and my colleague, Mrs. SMITH, for their continuing support and active effort on behalf of this project. Without their interest and diligence, Dickey-Lincoln School would be much further from reality.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, the $1,676,000 in this bill for planning the Dickey-Lincoln School dam and reservoir project is important to New England and to Massachusetts.

It is important because New England, as a region, lags far behind the rest of the country in the development of low-cost electric power. This means that New Englanders pay higher rates, all across the board, than do consumers of electric power in the rest of the country. For example, residential consumers served by private power companies in New England paid 34 percent more than the national average for electricity. Commercial and industrial consumers, respectively, paid 45 percent and 62 percent more.

One reason for the higher rates paid in New England is the lack of any federally produced power to provide a "yardstick" of competition to the private power producers. Every other region of the country has this yardstick, and it has been a material benefit to the consumer and to the economy. To quote from a recent editorial in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch:

> Consumers of electricity in the Tennessee Valley saved some $269 million in the last fiscal year through the operations of the Tennessee Valley Authority and its retail distributors. This figure represents the difference between their actual bills and what they would have paid at average national rates. Savings on residential electric bills averaged $80 a customer. In 28 years total savings stand near $2.5 billion. These are indeed massive infusions of purchasing power into the economy of the region. And they benefit not only consumers but a wide range of enterprises with goods and services to sell. For every dollar saved in electric bills is a dollar released for spending with some other business than the utility. That is why the lowest-priced electricity feasible is good for business in general as well as good public service.

That editorial is, I think, an excellent brief of how low-cost Federal power can bring an upsurge across the whole range of business activity. But introduction of a Federal yardstick also brings an upsurge in the business of the private utilities in the area. For example, in Chattanooga, Tenn., the average yearly residential consumption in a recent year was 14,241 kilowatt-hours; in Eugene, Oreg., it was 13,913 kilowatt-hours; in Dallas, Tex., it was 4,619 kilowatt-hours. The average residential monthly bill for these three locations was, respectively, $5, $3 and $7.62. In Boston, Mass., the average use was 1,813 kilowatt-hours and the average bill was $9.91; in Providence, R.I., the average use was 1,925 kilowatt-hours and the monthly bill $8.85. This is clear evidence that in areas where electricity is cheaper, use is higher. Consequently, lower rates would call for increased production capacity.

The Dickey-Lincoln project is a start in lowering the rates in New England. There are some who claim it will have no effect, but let those people look to the example set in Vermont. On January 1, 1959, residential consumers in Vermont paid an average of $8.90 for 250 kilowatt-Hours, the highest State average in the contintential United States. During 1959, Vermont began importing low-cost public power from the St. Lawrence hydro project, a joint non-profit undertaking of the New York State Power Authority and the Ontario Hydro Commission. By January 1, 1960—1 year later—the Vermont average had dropped to $7.91, and in 1966 was down to $7.37. This is a decrease of over 17 percent. By way of contrast, between 1959 and 1966 the national average bill for 25 kilowatt-hours decreased less than 1 percent, from $7.36 to $7.34.

The senior Senator from Vermont, Senator AIKEN, said recently about Vermont's success in lowering rates:

> All the figures show that when St. Lawrence power was made available by the New York Power Authority, Vermont's rates dropped and there was a corresponding increase in electricity use.

I find those conclusions inescapable.

As to the construction of the Dickey-Lincoln project itself, it has been consistently recommended by the administration. It has been recommended by the House Committee on Appropriations, after an exhaustive staff study completed in June. It has been recommended by the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

What, then, should be the bar to Senate acceptance of it? There should be none.

An examination of the projects included in this bill, listed on pages 8 to 21 of the committee report, shows 42 projects associated with the production of public power—and the only one listed for New England is for Dickey-Lincoln. The United States, except for New England, has long felt the benefits of a Federal yardstick. It is high time New England did.

The preliminary report of the Department of the Interior indicates that the cost of Dickey-Lincoln power delivered in the Boston area will be about $14.60 per kilowatt per year, contrasted with the current wholesale power costs of about $35 per kilowatt per year in Boston. This 50-percent saving should be conclusive evidence of the worth of the project.

I urge acceptance of the amount included for the Dickey-Lincoln project.

THE NEED FOR MORE ADEQUATE FUNDING OF THE FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL CONSTRUCTION GRANT PROGRAM

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, last year the Senate passed a far reaching and critically important measure authorizing major Federal support for the construction of sewage treatment facilities. The Senate voted, on July 13, 1966, a pledge of $6 billion to assist the States and local government in the battle against water pollution.

Later, after a conference with the House, the Senate unanimously agreed to the Clean Water Restoration Act with an authorization of $3.4 billion for construction grants. Of those funds $450 million were authorized for fiscal year 1968, a reduction from our original $600 million authorization for fiscal year 1968. At the time of adoption of the conference report I apologized to my colleagues for not obtaining the full Senate authorization. But the conferees on the part of the Senate and of the House of Representatives agreed that the $450 million figure was an absolute minimum if the water quality program was to proceed with minimum delay.

It is evident that last year's authorization was in large part dictated by budgetary expediency, as it appeared at that time. Since then our international commitments have required a great deal of belt tightening and will require more. Many vital public programs are going to suffer and, candidly, our water pollution fight must share the burden of what the other body now refers to as "recision."

Mr. President, I seriously considered offering an amendment today to increase the water pollution construction grant appropriation to $450 million. But, after thorough review of the present economic and fiscal situation, I cannot in good conscience offer that amendment.

I have carefully surveyed this question among a majority of the Members of this body as to their views on this same problem. Although there are several Senators who think we can justify the full $450 million appropriation, by and large, the consensus seems to be that the course of action I am about to spell out is the sensible one to follow. There are some Senators, including the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], who had planned to offer amendments to appropriate the full $450 million. Upon reflection, they, and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], have agreed to join me in this course.

Fortunately, Mr. President, this year's appropriation need not be considered as a halt to the program. In last year's act, the Congress enacted a prefinancing provision which allows States which proceed to be reimbursed for the Federal share at such time as Congress appropriates essential funds for the program.

Though many States are not in a position to take advantage of this feature at the present time, several have indicated that they will move ahead on their own. I sincerely hope that the Congress does not default on this commitment.

In order that the record may be complete and so that my colleagues may fully comprehend the magnitude of our commitment, I would like to read from the statement of Federal Water Pollution Control Administration Commissioner James Quigley before the Senate Appropriations Committee on April 19 of this year. Mr. Quigley said:

> At the present time there are 1,884 applications (for construction grants) being processed or being prepared with total eligible cost amounting to $13 billion . . .

The Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution has since obtained a breakdown of grant applications being processed or prepared which should be transmitted to the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration before the end of fiscal year 1968. The attached table fully indicates the magnitude of activity and the backlog with which the Federal Government will be confronted due to inadequate funding.

I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed in the Record following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MUSKIE. In order that my colleagues will be able to compare prospective demands with the allocation for their States, I would like to insert a table which indicates the State-by-State breakdown of: First, the budget request which was approved by the House; second, the amount approved by the Senate Appropriations Committee; and, third, the amount authorized last year by the Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that that table be printed in the Record following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, the States are moving ahead. Local communities are planning new waste treatment facilities. Federal water quality standards, now in effect, require secondary treatment as a minimum. All of this will increase costs.

Last year's legislation increased the Federal share of a waste treatment plant to a maximum 55 percent, under certain specified conditions. Several States now appear eligible for that maximum and more are moving, legislatively, to become eligible. In any event, the administration now assumes that the average Federal grant will approximate 40 percent. There no longer are dollar limitations on grants as there were prior to last year's bill. Therefore, if Mr. Quigley's statement is correct, the Federal share of $13 billion will approximate $5.2 billion now in the pipeline.

Mr. President, I summarize this information so that the Senate may be fully aware of the magnitude of the problem which confronts this Nation. I do not, however, intend to be critical of the job done by Senator Ellender and the Appropriations Committee. Under the most adverse conditions the able Senator from Louisiana has managed to obtain an increase over the budget request which the House has already accepted.

In a period of intensive pressure to cut the budget, water pollution control has received essential recognition by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. President, I think it is important that I do not conclude on a distressing note. We all know the need for funds. We are all aware of the fact that the full authorization could be effectively used and, if some were to be left over, the slack would be quickly taken up as the program gains momentum.

I would, however, call attention to the fact that this legislation is not the final word on any public works matter just as other appropriation legislation pending and passed is not the final word. We do have, at the end of every session of Congress and soon after the beginning of every new session, supplemental appropriations requests. The concept behind supplemental requests is that demands, both peaceful and military, are not wholly predictable and that new needs develop or greater demands are made.

Early next year there will be such a supplemental appropriation. I sincerely hope that, at that time, the Public Works Appropriations Subcommittee will call officials from the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration for the purpose of reviewing grant applications and available funds. It may be that it will be essential to appropriate additional funds to keep this vital program alive, and I would hope that the Congress would be more responsive at that time.

I have discussed this point with the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana, and it is on the basis of that discussion that I recommend this course of action to the Senate.

EXHIBIT 1

FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ADMINISTRATION, DIVISION OF CONSTRUCTION GRANTS

GRANT FUNDS REQUESTED FOR PROJECTS PENDING (AS OF JULY 31, 1967)

States	In regional office		In State agency		Reported to be in preparation		Totals	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Alabama	1	$54,600	2	$1,227,000	22	$959,370	25	$2,240,970
Alaska	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Arizona	1	14,850	0	0	14	2,528,080	15	2,542,930
Arkansas	0	0	1	44,768	30	4,687,256	31	4,732,024
California	12	3,938,500	143	41,297,260	0	0	155	45,235,760
Colorado	15	1,200,653	1	38,700	72	3,318,100	88	4,557,453
Connecticut	2	2,571,000	1	840,250	2	184,500	5	3,595,750
Delaware	0	0	0	0	1	450,000	1	450,000
District of Columbia	1	228,930	0	0	3	1,188,900	4	1,417,830
Florida	3	324,348	31	5,830,818	0	0	34	6,155,166
Georgia	1	1,200,000	433	6,549,685	3	1,060,000	47	8,809,685
Hawaii	1	507,510	0	0	15	3,220,000	16	3,727,510
Idaho	0	0	2	102,896	2	750,600	4	853,496
Illinois	3	1,350,290	105	14,065,505	56	------------	164	15,415,795
Indiana	4	1,609,363	13	906,044	0	0	17	2,515,407
Iowa	3	285,177	13	413,966	24	1,337,129	40	2,036,272
Kansas	6	2,307,291	6	1,607,818	21	720,123	33	4,635,232
Kentucky	1	84,300	1	58,000	10	605,270	12	747,570
Louisiana	2	57,090	10	3,477,505	14	5,353,000	26	8,887,595
Maine	1	616,500	4	2,349,979	7	3,955,400	12	6,921,879
Maryland	4	700,200	0	0	1	35,000	5	735,200
Massachusetts	1	254,000	2	1,518,000	16	16,175,000	19	17,947,000
Michigan	0	0	98	61,143,644	0	0	98	61,143,644
Minnesota	4	1,336,848	22	4,958,069	0	0	26	6,294,917
Mississippi	7	362,360	0	0	5	202,500	12	564,860
Missouri	14	6,063,460	17	1,864,462	39	13,671,623	70	21,599,545
Montana	1	43,950	1	120,660	2	42,930	4	207,540
Nebraska	2	594,255	21	627,700	19	434,100	42	1,656,055
Nevada	1	97,779	0	0	0	0	1	97,779
New Hampshire	2	1,151,500	2	2,736,570	2	759,000	6	4,647,070
New Jersey	1	153,783	22	12,973,551	11	1,978,300	34	15,105,634
New Mexico	0	0	6	81,410	12	758,013	18	839,423
New York	5	435,966	23	268,730,850	68	325,331,700	96	594,498,516
North Carolina	1	388,500	27	3,257,210	45	4,959,000	73	8,604,710
North Dakota	2	28,140	9	292,920	4	41,000	15	362,060
Ohio	5	1,856,029	10	5,332,374	0	0	15	7,178,403
Oklahoma	1	206,586	15	846,994	19	556,720	35	1,610,300
Oregon	1	56,635	3	1,198,740	39	12,292,510	43	13,547,885
Pennsylvania	6	6,386,610	93	17,816,320	0	0	99	24,202,930
Rhode Island	0	0	1	190,000	2	763,000	3	953,000
South Carolina	7	433,700	0	0	6	1,277,000	13	1,710,700
South Dakota	4	315,213	7	83,846	23	379,154	34	778,213
Tennessee	7	1,117,894	0	0	42	5,123,780	49	6,241,674
Texas	3	1,240,923	4	211,770	36	2,046,100	43	3,498,793
Utah	1	117,340	6	1,038,750	0	0	7	1,156,090
Vermont	0	0	0	0	3	549,476	3	549,476
Virginia	5	2,205,880	0	0	57	12,470,000	62	14,675,880
Washington	1	216,734	10	1,362,010	46	7,586,130	57	9,164,874
West Virginia	4	993,300	1	375,000	19	1,900,000	24	3,268,300

EXHIBIT 1—Continued

FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ADMINISTRATION, DIVISION OF CONSTRUCTION GRANTS—Continued

GRANT FUNDS REQUESTED FOR PROJECTS PENDING (AS OF JULY 31, 1967)—Continued

States	In regional office		In State agency		Reported to be in preparation		Totals	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Wisconsin	3	$240,248	48	$4,508,524	0	0	51	$4,748,772
Wyoming	1	2,250	5	36,891	10	$130,800	16	169,941
Guam	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Puerto Rico	2	91,500	0	0	1	60,000	3	151,500
Virgin Islands	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	153	43,441,985	829	470,106,459	823	439,840,564	1,805	953,389,008

EXHIBIT 2

State	State allotment under total authorization $450,000,000 (fiscal year 1968)	State allotment under Senate allowance $225,000,000	State allotment under the budget and House allowance $203,000,000
Alabama	$8,403,950	$4,329,100	$3,697,760
Alaska	1,184,500	894,700	521,400
Arizona	3,773,200	2,187,700	1,660,120
Arkansas	5,207,400	2,959,700	2,291,080
California	35,254,400	15,814,200	15,511,760
Colorado	4,650,900	2,505,600	2,046,440
Connecticut	6,212,850	3,093,200	2,733,720
Delaware	1,589,750	1,104,600	699,600
District of Columbia	2,277,000	1,341,000	1,001,880
Florida	11,814,500	5,693,200	5,198,600
Georgia	9,764,500	4,847,800	4,296,600
Hawaii	2,190,050	1,370,700	963,600
Idaho	2,474,600	1,619,800	1,089,000
Illinois	22,871,300	10,395,700	10,063,240
Indiana	11,079,250	5,292,800	4,874,760
Iowa	6,935,700	3,529,800	3,051,840
Kansas	5,674,400	2,930,900	2,496,560
Kentucky	7,816,650	4,022,000	3,439,480
Louisiana	8,289,300	4,221,600	3,647,160
Maine	3,118,950	1,942,600	1,372,360
Maryland	7,547,550	3,730,100	3,321,120
Massachusetts	12,036,750	5,691,700	5,296,280
Michigan	17,989,450	8,291,300	7,915,160
Minnesota	8,377,550	4,141,200	3,686,320
Mississippi	6,248,750	3,510,500	2,749,560
Missouri	10,307,450	5,013 400	4,535,080
Montana	2,386,300	1,560,600	1,049,840
Nebraska	3,975,600	2,238,700	1,749,440
Nevada	1,248,650	922,600	549,560
New Hampshire	2,214,450	1,445,300	974,160
New Jersey	14,040,400	6,524,300	6,177,600
New Mexico	3,103,500	1,912,100	1,365,760
New York	37,588,750	16,839,000	16,539,160
North Carolina	11,129,500	5,489,400	4,897,200
North Dakota	2,352,150	1,594,800	1,034,880
Ohio	22,149,650	10,141,300	9,746,000
Oklahoma	6,120,150	3,241,100	2,692,800
Oregon	4,695,050	2,508,200	2,065,800
Pennsylvania	25,716,750	11,718,600	11,315,480
Rhode Island	2,716,200	1,625,400	1,195,040
South Carolina	6,502,100	3,536,400	2,860,880
South Dakota	2,516,550	1,741,200	1,107,480
Tennessee	8,981,300	4,559,200	3,951,640
Texas	22,033,100	10,173,300	9,694,520
Utah	2,894,000	1,788,500	1,273,360
Vermont	2,822,200	1,348,900	801,680
Virginia	9,677,800	4,758,200	4,258,320
Washington	7,054,400	3,522,000	3,103,760
West Virginia	5,166,650	2,909,600	2,273,480
Wisconsin	9,531,050	4,645,000	4,193,640
Wyoming	1,537,650	1,183,300	676,720
Guam	1,603,150	1,478,100	705,320
Puerto Rico	6,625,950	3,675,500	2,915,440
Virgin Islands	1,526,350	1,444,500	671,440

May I at this time, if the distinguished Senator from Louisiana will endulge me, put this question to him?

In the Senator's report accompanying the public works appropriation bill the following statement appears:

> In view of the budgetary situation and the uncertainty of the actual need at this time, the committee recommended a token increase of $22 million to indicate its support for the program.

Prior to that statement, the report quotes Assistant Secretary Di Luzio as saying:

> We expect, therefore, that after a moderate start during the first and second quarters of fiscal year 1968, the equivalent rate of grant awards in the third and fourth quarters will be far greater, perhaps equivalent to an annual rate of $300 to $350 million.

On this basis does the Senator anticipate the subcommittee will give careful and sympathetic attention to a request for a supplemental appropriation for the sewage treatment construction grant program?

May I say that I have been joined in this request by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], and the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART].

Mr. ELLENDER. The response to the Senator's question is in the affirmative. In the meantime, I would suggest that the distinguished Senator from Maine try to get a budget estimate for whatever amount is required for construction grants in excess of the appropriation up to the full authorization of $450 million.

Mr. President, while I am on my feet, I wish to state that the distinguished Senator from Maine appeared and made a very valid argument for the full amount authorized, and presented splendid testimony, which would have justified the committee recommending the full amount. But it was argued that if the committee acceded to the request of the Senator from Maine, we would be bringing to the Senate a bill over the amount of the budget requests by more than $125 million, and an increase of $247,000,000 in the item for construction grants.

So, as the Senator stated, in order to show our interest in this program, the committee agreed to an increase of $22 million or about a 10 percent increase, making a total, included in the appropriation bill, of $225 million. I was glad that the committee agreed to that amount, and I believe the Senate as a whole will also agree to it. I hope that the Senator from Maine will be successful in getting a budget estimate; and if, as, and when the supplemental bill does come before the Senate, I shall do all I can to provide whatever is required up to the full amount of the authorization.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I am grateful for that response from the Senator from Louisiana, which is typical of his generosity. All he is asking us to do is to make the case again after the first of the year, which is a reasonable request. We will make that case, as the facts dictate.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the statements I made on the two occasions I appeared before the Public Works Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, to be sure that our position will be clear in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR EDMUND S. MUSKIE, OF MAINE, BEFORE THE PUBLIC WORKS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE, MAY 10, 1967

Earlier this year, when the Congress received the administration's proposed budget for 1968, I took the Senate floor to note that that document grossly underestimated the cost associated with the water pollution control needs of this country. At that time I committed myself to request an opportunity to appear before your committee to request that the full $450 million authorized by the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966 for fiscal year 1968 be made available for waste treatment grants in 1968.

As you will recall, last year the Senate unanimously agreed to legislation which would have authorized $6 billion over a five-year period for grants to construct waste treatment facilities. For a variety of reasons, including the fact that the other body authorized considerably less money in their bill, the figure finally agreed to was $3.4 billion for a period of four years. This was below what our information indicated to be the national need. It was, in fact, a minimum figure.

The final figure of $450 million for 1968 represented a $150 million cut below the initial Senate recommendation. The Senate conferees knew, in accepting the lower figure, that it would be imperative that no less than $450 million be appropriated for fiscal 1968 to demonstrate to the States and their local units of Government that the Federal Government was fully prepared to keep the commitments set forth in the Clean Water Restoration Act.

Last year's action provided an incentive program designed to encourage the States to step up their own water improvement programs, by providing a portion of the cost of municipal waste treatment facilities and by establishing enforceable statewide water quality standards. The Federal share of any approved project's cost was set at a flat 30 percent without dollar limitations. This amount increases to 40 percent if the State provides 30 percent of the project's cost and to 50 percent if the State sets the aforementioned water quality standards and provides 25 percent of the project's cost. There was no change in the existing provision of the water pollution control act which provides for a 10 percent increase in the Federal grant if the project is consistent with a metropolitan area plan.

In essence, Mr. Chairman, this means that if a State takes maximum advantage of Federal incentives a waste treatment project could receive a Federal grant of 55 percent.

In order to accomplish the purpose for which the incentives are designed many States must enact water quality standards and matching grant legislation; some State legislatures are now in session. If we are to achieve the goal of encouraging maximum State activity, those State legislatures must be assured that the Federal Government intends to honor its commitments. There is no doubt in my mind that their response will be somewhat less than wholehearted if the Congress leaves the budget request as it stands and inadequate funds are made available.

But there is more than just a psychological factor involved in justification for increasing the appropriation over the administration's request.

The allocation formula in existing law is such that many states will not receive their full share under the Federal grant formula even if the full $450 million were to be appropriated. Information supplied the committee indicates that $179,585,532 will be spent in 1968 in New York City alone. Therefore, even if all of New York's money were allocated to the city of New York, that city would receive only a little over 20 percent of its total cost. And in New York because the state provides a 30 percent matching grant the Federal share would be at least 40 percent. New York is also moving to establish enforceable state-wide water quality standards which would mean that New York City is potentially eligible for 50 percent of its costs.

Mayor Ralph Locher testified before the committee last year that it would cost the city of Cleveland $900 million to eliminate water pollution. Mayor Locher noted that this sum is the equivalent of 15 years of the city's general fund budget of $62 million. It is worth noting that the public health service reports that Cuyahoga River, which flows through Cleveland, is so polluted that it has become a fire hazard. The city has found it necessary to construct firebreaks out into the river to facilitate sectioning off the fires when they occur. There was a fire on the Maumee River, which flows through the neighboring city of Toledo, in March of 1962.

There are many other examples which are illustrative of the problem which the attached chart demonstrates. I would like to have the chart included in the record at this point. In addition, Mr. Chairman, I would like to have inserted in the record several letters which I have received from communities alarmed because of financial problems which will be caused by congressional concurrence in the administration's budget request.

A week ago this past Sunday, the President announced the decision to go ahead with the supersonic transport, the SST, and recommended that $198 million be made available in fiscal year 1968 for this project. In the week prior to this announcement, in hearings before the House Committee on Public Works, the Secretary of the Interior and representatives of the Federal water pollution control administration justified the water pollution budget request on the basis of our international commitments.

Mr. Chairman, I have no philosophical objections to construction of a supersonic plane, but I cannot in good conscience accept a decision which suggests that we spend nearly $200 million next year to increase the rapidity by which one can go from Washington, D.C., on the polluted Potomac, to smog-ridden Los Angeles when at the same time a decision has been made that we cannot afford to take essential steps for the protection and enhancement of the quality of our environment.

I make this point, Mr. Chairman, to indicate my concern over what appears to be a case of putting short-term budgetary expediency ahead of public responsibility in the area of environmental quality, while at the same time making that budget flexible for a single-purpose transportation vehicle. If we can do one, we can do the other.

I do not believe that there is any question in the minds of the members of this body, those of us who voted 90–0 last year for a $6 billion water pollution program, that we must move rapidly to preserve, and in many instances to reclaim, the quality of the nation's rivers, lakes and streams. But if there is any question I would like to quote from the statement of Mr. James M. Quigley, Commissioner, Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, which was delivered to this committee on April 19.

On page 16 of Mr. Quigley's prepared text appears the following statement: "At the present time there are 1884 applications being processed or being prepared with total eligible cost amounting to $13 billion and requiring over $255 million in Federal grants, based on existing provisions. In contrast we have available $76 million for this purpose."

That statement contains two important items. First, it tends to verify the information received by the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution that there is a huge backlog of needed waste treatment facilities—our estimate is somewhat in excess of $20 billion.

The second point, Mr. Chairman, is that that statement contains a little double talk. The $255 million figure stated as the federal share of that amount is not valid. As of July 1, 1967, there will be no dollar limitations on waste treatment projects. Those projects, if only eligible for the minimum 30 percent, would require $3.9 billion worth of Federal funds, and if eligible for the full 55 percent would require $7.1 billion.

According to the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration the average grant will be approximately 40 percent. Therefore, I think we can assume that $13 billion worth of projects will cost the Federal Government no less than $5.2 billion. We are asking less than 10 percent of that amount this year.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Public Works, the Senate, and the House are unanimous in the belief that the Federal Government has an obligation to improve the water quality of this nation. I urge the Committee on Appropriations to take the next major step in seeing that we move as rapidly as possible down the road toward achieving that goal.

Testimony by Senator Edmund S. Muskie, of Maine, Chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution, Before the Public Works Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, July 31, 1967, S. 126, U.S. Capitol

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to appear for the second time this year before your committee to discuss construction grant appropriations for the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration.

On the 18th day of July, the other body passed the bill now pending before this committee without improving on the request of the President for water pollution construction funds. There was an effort on the floor to reinstate the full $450 million authorized last year but that effort was to no avail. However, Mr. Chairman, a solid record of need was developed and many members of the other body gave evidence of their concern.

The inadequate request by the administration and the action by the House once again places a severe burden on the Senate to take the necessary steps to secure needed funds to carry forward this vital social program. Once again we are called upon to back up our actions with dollars.

Mr. Chairman, last year the Senate voted a $6 billion authorization for five years for water pollution control. That amount was pared by conference to an absolute minimum of $3.4 billion for four years. The conference action was accepted unanimously by both sides. Many words were spoken about the need and the obligation of the Congress to respond to that need. At that time I pledged that I would make every effort to see that that need did not go unmet.

Because of my pledge, I have been bombarded, during the past six months, with letters from cities, from counties and from States, appealing to me to work for improvement on the President's budget request. I want to assure this committee that I intend to honor that commitment. That is why I am here today and that is why I will continue to fight for appropriation of the full $450 million authorized for fiscal year 1968.

I recognize that the House committee based its recommendation on the 1967 rate of expenditures. That argument does not take into account the backlog of projects and proposals which were waiting for the new formulae which took effect July 1, 1967.

I have previously detailed to this committee the reasons for appropriating the full authorization. The record of your hearing of May 10 adequately indicates the needs of the major cities of this country and how those needs relate to the inadequate recommendation of the administration.

I think it may be helpful to the committee if I recall part of my testimony from the May 10 hearing. At that time I said:

"I do not believe that there is any question in the minds of the Members of this body, those of us who voted 90–0 last year for a $6 billion water pollution program, that we must move rapidly to preserve, and in many instances to reclaim, the quality of the Nation's rivers, lakes and streams. But if there is any question I would like to quote from the statement of Mr. James M. Quigley, commissioner, Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, which was delivered to this committee on April 19."

"On page 16 of Mr. Quigley's prepared text appears the following statement: At the present time there are 1884 applications being processed or being prepared with total eligible cost amounting to $13 billion and requiring over $255 million in Federal grants, based on existing provisions. In contrast we have available $76 million for this purpose.

"That statement contains two important items. First, it tends to verify the information received by the subcommittee on air and water pollution that there is a huge backlog of needed waste treatment facilities—our estimate is somewhat in excess of $20 billion.

"The second point, Mr. Chairman, is that that statement contains a little double talk. The $255 million figure stated as the Federal share of that amount is not valid. As of July 1, 1967, there will be no dollar limitations on waste treatment projects. Those projects, if only eligible for the minimum 30 percent, would require $3.9 billion worth of Federal funds, and if eligible for the full 55 percent would require $7.1 billion."

"According to the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration the average grant will be approximately 40 percent. Therefore, I think we can assume that $13 billion worth of projects will cost the Federal Government no less than $5.2 billion. We are asking less than 10 percent of that amount this year."

I would like to cite three new and striking examples.

The first example involves the State of Louisiana. There are, at the present time, 43 sewage treatment construction grant requests for Louisiana communities for fiscal year 1968 in the Federal Water Pollution Control Agency Regional Office, in the State agency or in preparation at the local level. The 43 project requests would require Federal grants totaling $8,887,595. If the House passed appropriation stands, Louisiana would have available from FY 1968 allocations and the balance from its FY 1967 allocation $4,181,600, or less than 50 percent of its needs. A full appropriation of $450,000,000 for this program would allow a FY 1968 allocation of $8,289,300 for Louisiana which, when added to the FY 1967 balance, would make available $8,661,100 for the Louisiana projects.

The second example relates to the State of Oregon.

Earlier this month I received a copy of a letter written to Representative Al Ullman from the Oregon State Sanitary Authority. I would like to insert that letter in the record at this point and highlight the important points:

1. Oregon has enacted legislation enabling that State to receive incentive grants for projects constructed within that State, in some instances such grants to be as high as 55 percent.

2. Oregon is eligible in 1968, under the ad-

ministration request, for $2,262,550 and, under the authorized amount, $4,695,000. The State Pollution Control Authority has processed grants for FY 1968 which will require $14,324,788 of Federal funds. And the State of Oregon is prepared to put up $7,461,738.

3. The very best Oregon can hope to do, even if the full amount authorized is appropriated, would be nearly $10 million short of their authorized share under the new grant formulae.

My third example, Mr. Chairman, is that of my own state of Maine. Just this past week I was informed that Maine's request for grants for FY 1968 would require $4.5 million in Federal funds if the Federal commitment were implemented in accordance with the matching grant formulae. Under the President's request Maine would be eligible for only $1,785,950 and, under the authorized amount, only $3,118,950. In other words, Mr. Chairman, Maine will be prepared in fiscal year 1968 to spend at a level for which Federal grant funds will not be available until 1969.

I ask unanimous consent that a chart containing additional examples be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that 16 states (including Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands) have authorized programs which will make them eligible for the incentive assistance provided in the Clean Water Restoration Act, and 13 other states have legislation pending which would make them eligible also.

I doubt that any of these States will have grant requests less than their allocation. All of the States are now required to meet water quality standards which were filed on July 1 of this year. Also I am reliably informed that the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration is receiving grant applications at a phenomenal rate due to the elimination of the dollar ceilings as of July 1, 1967.

More is involved than the relationship between the grant requests and available funds, Mr. Chairman. In 1965 and 1966 the Congress, and particularly the Senate, served notice on States, local governments and private businesses to accelerate the rate of pollution control and abatement. Time after time we were challenged by witnesses on the question: Will funds be available from the Federal Government if we do our share? The States and localities are gearing up to do their share, Mr. Chairman. If we do not make available the funds authorized in the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966, serious doubts will be raised as to our intentions in making good our pledge to the country. A serious blow will be delivered to this program, which is vital to the health and welfare of our country.

In light of all of these factors, I strongly urge you to include, in this appropriation bill, the full $450 million authorized for 1968.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the instinctive response to the idea of cuts in Federal spending is one of unadulterated joy. My constituents—probably most constituents—are calling for a halt to Federal spending, a halt to rising taxes.

Until we get down to the so-called nitty-gritty. What cuts? What programs reduced?

There is no more dramatic case in point, insofar as Michigan and the Great Lakes area are concerned, than the program of matching Federal grants to States for construction of sewage treatment plants.

We know the story. The Congress in 1966 authorized a program of $450 million for fiscal 1968; the House allowed an appropriation of only $203 million, on the grounds that the States had not sufficiently geared up to use a larger sum.

For the record it should be clearly stated that Michigan is geared up to use its full share of the $450 million authorized—and more. The eligible applications on file with the Michigan Water Resources Commission as of June 28, 1967, call for a total cost estimate of $202 million of which the Federal share, on a 30-percent basis, would be $60 million.

Mr. President, I ask that this tabulation be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HART. Mr. President, Michigan needs this money. We have good State water pollution legislation and we have an efficient, capable State agency to enforce it. But the local communities—90 or more of them—are being turned down for lack of Federal funds.

The 1966 amendments to Public Law 84–660, which removed the dollar ceiling on Federal grants available to individual projects, mean that a smaller number of projects at the top of the priority list will exhaust the funds allocated to Michigan. Conceivably a single project could exhaust all of the Federal funds designated for Michigan.

Mr. President, water pollution control is a No. 1 priority item in the Great Lakes area. Our economic well-being, our spiritual well-being, and indeed our very lives, depend upon it.

This is a perfect example of how dangerous and destructive certain cuts can be. I commend the Senate Public Works Appropriation Subcommittee and its chairman, the able Senator from Louisiana, for raising the House-passed figure to $225 million. The able Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] has detailed the events which bring us to this point.

I was aware of Senator MUSKIE's plan to offer an amendment to bring the figure to $435 million. I supported the effort, but agree with Senator MUSKIE that our wisest course is the one he now proposes.

I ask unanimous consent to insert at the conclusion of my remarks an article from the Detroit News of September 14, 1967, which gives a picture of the Michigan situation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

STATE OF MICHIGAN WATER RESOURCES COMMISSION CONSTRUCTION GRANT PROGRAM, 1967–68 (FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT)—PRIORITY ASSIGNMENT IN RECOMMENDED ORDER OF PRIORITY, JUNE 28, 1967

Order of priority and applicant	Project No.	Total points	Project cost estimate	30 percent grant	Cumulative grant total
1. Wayne County (Huron Township et al.)	1166	24.4	$1,464,000	$439,200	$439,200
2. Detroit	1146	23.2	111,500,000	33,450,000	33,889,200
3. Grand Rapids	1191	23.0	1,028,000	308,000	----------
4. Port Huron	1125	23.0	185,450	55,635	----------
5. Kent County (N. Kent sewerage disposal system)	1193	21.6	2,091,900	627,570	----------
6. Stevensville	1118	21.0	429,600	128,880	----------
7. Delta Township, Eaton County	1163	19.0	507,000	152,100	----------
8. Genesee County (Linden)	1174	19.0	1,800,000	540,000	----------
9. Genesee County (Goodrich)	1179	19.0	1,087,000	326,250	----------
10. Kalamazoo	1157	18.6	640,000	192,000	----------
11. Crystal Falls	1143	18.2	420,000	168,000	----------
12. Oakland County (Walled Lake-Novi)	1104	18.2	791,400	237,420	----------
13. Montcalm Community College	1121	18.2	272,990	66,897	----------
14. Wayne County (Flat Rock)	1167	17.2	150,000	45,000	----------
15. Genesee County (Grand Blanc Township)	1175	17.2	4,995,000	1,498,500	----------
16. Oakland County (Lake Orion)	1101	16.8	506,200	151,860	----------
17. Genesee County (Otisville)	1182	16.8	310,000	93,000	----------
18. Kent County (Gaines Township)	1201	16.6	83,100	24,930	----------
19. Luna Pier	1134	16.0	498,000	149,400	----------
20. Flushing	1154	16.0	123,000	36,900	----------
21. Oakland County (Clinton-Oakland)	1109	15.6	15,297,500	4,589,250	----------
22. Dimondale	1145	15.4	288,000	86,400	----------
23. Allouez Township, Keweenaw County	1117	14.8	580,000	174,000	----------
24. Jonesville	1122	14.8	800,000	240,000	----------
25. Wayne County (Brownstown Township)	1169	14.2	132,500	39,750	----------
26. Genesee County (Grand Blanc)	1177	14.0	969,302	290,790	----------
27. Forsyth Township, Marquette County	1103	13.8	285,600	85,680	----------
28. Monroe	1135	13.4	3,126,000	937,800	----------
29. Ovid	1107	13.4	125,700	37,710	----------
30. Harrison	1195	13.4	207,000	62,100	----------
31. Genesee County (Genesee Township)	1178	13.0	4,950,000	1,485,000	----------
32. Kent County (Grandville)	1202	12.8	208,000	62,400	----------
33. Chesterfield Township, Macomb County	1188	12.4	$1,147,000	$344,100	----------
34. Genesee County (Fenton)	1172	12.4	145,390	43,617	----------
35. Northport	1132	12.2	145,430	43,629	----------
36. Vermontville	1137	12.0	111,600	33,480	----------
37. Bellevue	1155	11.6	202,040	60,612	----------
38. South Rockwood	1133	11.4	116,300	34,890	----------
39. Brooklyn	1200	11.4	150,300	45,090	----------
40. Durand	1114	11.2	455,000	136,500	----------
41. Three Oaks	1110	11.2	316,780	95,034	----------
42. Dryden	1196	11.2	124,000	37,200	----------
43. Port Sanilac	1152	11.2	290,350	87,105	----------
44. Sparta	1120	11.0	318,000	95,400	----------
45. Sterling Township, Macomb County	1161	10.8	155,000	46,500	----------
46. Genesee County (Fenton Township)	1173	10.8	250,000	75,000	----------
47. Quincy	1123	10.8	400,000	120,000	----------
48. Perry	1203	10.8	166,000	49,800	----------
49. Genesee County (Burton Township)	1176	10.8	7,884,510	2,365,353	----------
50. Breckenridge	1113	10.4	120,000	36,000	----------
51. Mulliken	1144	10.4	218,000	65,400	----------
52. Concord	1158	10.4	93,100	27,930	----------
53. Trenton	1111	10.0	74,760	22,428	----------
54. Beulah	1126	10.0	95,000	28,500	----------
55. Laurium	1116	10.0	600,000	180,000	----------
56. Westphalia	1204	10.0	60,300	18,090	----------
57. Grayling	1131	9.8	44,000	13,200	----------
58. Harrison Township, Macomb County	1189	9.6	1,282,900	384,870	----------
59. Bellaire	1187	9.6	120,000	36,000	----------
60. Rose City	1115	9.6	63,000	18,900	----------
61. Carson City	1136	9.6	171,000	51,300	----------
62. Hesperia	1197	9.4	170,000	51,000	----------
63. Coleman	1139	9.0	169,500	50,850	----------
64. North Branch	1151	8.8	257,780	77,334	----------
65. Centreville	1205	8.6	201,000	60,300	----------
66. Owosso	1162	8.4	2,844,000	853,200	----------
67. Grass Lake	1199	8.4	172,600	51,780	----------

STATE OF MICHIGAN WATER RESOURCES COMMISSION CONSTRUCTION GRANT PROGRAM, 1967-68 (FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT)—PRIORITY ASSIGNMENT IN RECOMMENDED ORDER OF PRIORITY, JUNE 28, 1967—Continued

Order of priority and applicant	Project No.	Total points	Project cost estimate	30 percent grant	Cumulative grant total
68. Chocolay Township, Marquette County	1159	8.4	$288,000	$86,400	----------
69. Wayne County (Rockwood)	1168	8.2	150,000	45,000	----------
70. Parma	1112	8.2	83,000	24,900	----------
71. Genesee County (Flint Township)	1180	8.0	3,887,500	1,166,250	----------
72. Bay County (Kawkawlin and Fraser Townships)	1150	8.0	105,000	31,500	----------
73. Genesee County (parts of Clayton, Flint, Flushing, and Mount Morris Townships, and city of Flushing)	1181	7.8	5,515,200	1,654,560	----------
74. Kinde	1153	7.6	141,600	42,480	----------
75. Mayville	1185	7.6	155,000	46,500	----------
76. Litchfield	1198	7.4	158,200	47,460	----------
77. Galesburg	1105	7.2	126,700	38,010	----------
78. Middleville	1148	7.2	300,000	90,000	----------
79. Manton	1156	7.2	141,700	42,510	----------
80. Southern Michigan Prison	1108	7.0	500,000	150,000	----------
81. Fowler	1164	7.0	110,000	33,000	----------
82. Hopkins	1149	6.8	85,400	25,620	----------
83. Genesee County (district No. 6, phase 2)	1184	6.6	12,168,000	3,650,400	----------
84. Richland Township, Saginaw County	1102	6.6	84,000	25,200	----------
85. Powell Township, Marquette County	1119	6.4	$49,800	$14,940	----------
86. Reading	1130	6.4	164,900	49,470	----------
87. Genesee County (Thetford Township)	1171	6.4	110,000	33,000	----------
88. Marcellus	1128	6.2	91,400	27,420	----------
89. White Pigeon	1124	5.8	146,000	43,800	----------
90. Chassell Township, Houghton County	1206	5.8	93,000	27,900	----------
91. St. Charles	1106	5.6	156,200	46,860	----------
92. Decatur	1127	5.2	220,100	66,030	----------
93. Laingsburg	1192	5.2	118,860	35,658	----------
94. Genesee County (district No. 6, phase 1-E)	1183	5.0	2,567,000	770,100	----------
95. Macomb County (Washington Township	1160	4.8	97,600	29,280	----------
96. Millington	1186	4.4	153,300	45,990	----------
97. Genesee County, Mount Morris, and Mount Morris Township	1170	4.0	319,500	95,850	----------
98. Leoni Township, Jackson County	1165	3.0	449,140	134,742	----------
Total	----	----	202,479,480	60,743,844	----------

EXHIBIT 2

[From the Detroit (Mich.) News, Sept. 4, 1967[

U.S. FUNDS CUT STYMIES TOWNS' POLLUTION WAR

(By James L. Kerwin)

LANSING.—Michigan's communities that are hard pressed for funds to clean up water pollution face the same situation as a horse being baited with a luscious carrot.

No matter how hard they try, local officials find the lure—in their case, federal funds—is just out of reach.

State authorities responsible for curbing pollution complain that programs to control the problem are being jeopardized by huge cutbacks in money that had been promised by President Johnson and Congress.

On the one hand, the federal government is pressing state officials to crack down hard on violators, with a goal for cleaning up most of the mess in the state's waterways by 1971.

But the money that was offered both as an incentive and to perform the job is not forthcoming.

Under the clean water act passed a year ago, Congress authorized the spending of $450 million in the first year to help local communities restore clean water.

That amount, however, was cut in half by Mr. Johnson, who said he was pressed by the cost of the Vietnam war and other vital domestic programs.

Despite the pleas of state officials and conservationists, the house last week backed the President and approved only $203 million for fiscal year 1968 for grants to build pollution control facilities.

"Some one will have to reconcile the pollution abatement programs with the money available," cautioned Loring F. Ooeming, executive-secretary for the State Water Resources Commission.

"We're being made the whipping boy. The federal government isn't providing us with the funds they promised to carry out the job. They are just leaving us hang there."

Both small communities and large cities in Michigan find pollution control programs periled by the federal fund cut.

Officials from Breckenridge, a small rural community in Gratiot County in the central part of the state, told the commission they were informed that the federal government had approved a grant and loan of $700,000 for sewers and a treatment plant.

But the Farmers Home Administration said the community would have to wait—probably five years—for the money.

Detroit, too, faces a problem with its ambitious $114 million program designed to attack the pollution problem on a regional basis, including control programs for parts of Macomb and Oakland counties.

Gerald J. Remus, general manager of the Detroit Water Department, which is directing the regional program geared his plans to a formula under which the federal government would provide 50 percent of the cost, the state another 25 percent, with the balance financed with local funds.

But a bill authorizing the state to put up its 25 percent share died in a state Senate committee after being passed by the House.

Remus sent a telegram to Gov. Romney asking that the bill be revived for the Oct. 10 special session of the Legislature.

Even if the measure is revived and passed, however, another hurdle remains.

The Legislature appropriated only $1.8 million for use in helping local communities to build pollution control facilities. To meet the 25 percent contribution, that amount would have to be doubled.

"I don't hold much prospect for that happening," said Oeming, "what with the schools asking for more money and requests for aid to repair riot damage in Detroit."

To meet the problem, Oeming said, an effort will be made to "serialize" the Detroit program with what federal and state funds are available.

"That would not only reduce the impact on the funds available but would provide money for other pollution control programs outstate," he said.

A spokesman for Remus said the metropolitan regional project could get by the first year but that at least $38 million would be needed in the following years—five times the amount the entire state will receive in federal grants this year.

"Something has to give," the spokesman said. "Either the timetable for getting the job done must be revised or more money must be provided."

"We're right down in the box we were afraid we'd get in when we decided we would take on the regional program."

If the federal government complains that the state is failing to meet its pollution control deadlines, Oeming is expected to waste little time in shifting the blame back to Washington for not fulfilling promises of funds to carry out the job.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I would like to express my support of the public works and Atomic Energy Commission appropriations bill for fiscal year 1968.

In these troubled times, it is essential for the national interest that we have a strong America. This bill will assure that construction of the projects that are vital to the strength and well being of our Nation will continue at a progressive and economical rate.

In my State of Utah a drop of water has often been likened to a nugget of gold. From the early days of settlement water has been the lifeblood of Utah. The State's citizens have been looking forward for years to the time when water from such rivers as the Colorado could be made available to meet the needs of parched areas throughout the State. On May 31, 1967, I had the privilege of attending the ceremonies signaling the start of construction of the Bonneville unit of the central Utah project. This project will make the big change in Utah's water picture and will serve to supply the last link between the Colorado and other rivers with the parched farmlands and water taps of the Bonneville basin. It will provide the water and the stimulus for the State's industrial growth and economic future. In large measure, this historic event was made possible by the action of the Senate and House Appropriations Committees last year when they expressed their concern over the treatment afforded the central Utah projct by the Bureau of Reclamation by directing that the full proportionate fund allocation be made to the project in fiscal year 1967. Because of this action, this project may soon be back on schedule.

The $8.3 million figure in the bill this year is to be combined with $2.8 million of fiscal year 1967 carryover funds. These totals for the first time in many years represent a realistic fund request for this project, and I fully support them.

The authorized initial phase of the central Utah project includes the Vernal unit which has been completed, the Bonneville unit, on which construction has just begun, and the Upalco and Jensen units for which definite plans are being prepared. The Uintah and Ute Indian units of the ultimate phase have not yet been authorized.

I also support the budget requests for $188,500 for the Jensen unit and $126,000 for the Upalco unit for advanced planning; $270,000 for the reconnaissance studies on the ultimate phases of the central Utah project, exclusive of the Uintah unit; and $87,426 for a feasibility investigation of the Uintah unit, in order that the necessary planning on this unit and the Ute Indian unit can be completed prior to 1972 so the State of Utah and the Department of the Interior will be able to meet their commitment with the Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah-Ouray Indian Reservation.

By far the largest and most complex of the authorized units is the Bonneville unit. The Central Utah Water Conservancy District has recently expanded its boundaries to include the Sevier River Basin, which has been plagued by a series of prolonged droughts. With this addition, 12 counties containing more than 60 percent of the State's population will be served by the project.

The key feature of the Bonneville unit plan is the transfer of surplus water in the Uintah Basin to the State's heavily populated areas along the Wasatch front. The project will develop some 300,000 acre-feet of water for municipal, industrial and agricultural use in the two-basin area.

INSUFFICIENT FUNDS FOR WATER POLLUTION ABATEMENT

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, today we are faced with an appropriation for one of our most important domestic problems, water pollution abatement. Vice President HUMPHREY recently told a conference of marine resources at the University of Rhode Island that this problem is as important as city slums.

The national concern for immediate action for water pollution abatement reaches to most States and hundreds of municipalities. Indicative of this concern, is a recent call by Gov. Otto Kerner, of Illinois, for a water pollution conference with the Governors of Illinois, Michigan, Indiana, and Wisconsin to discuss the pollution of Lake Michigan.

At this point it is not necessary to call attention to the dimensions of this problem, except to say that we could talk endlessly about places like the Hudson River, which was once a pleasant place to swim, fish, and boat. But today it is a running sore on our landscape, largely wasted, and avoided as dangerous to the touch.

Congress has already expressed our concern for this critical problem, by passing the Water Pollution Control Act unanimously last year. Today we must decide whether we are to honor the commitments we have made to local and State governments in fighting water pollution. Here briefly is the sad picture:

First. The gross national need is today approximately $13 billion which requires a Federal contribution of $5.2 billion on a matching fund basis.

Second. Current applications in process in local, State, and regional water pollution control offices exceed $900 million.

Third. The Water Pollution Control Act authorization is $450 million.

Fourth. And incredibly, the appropriation today is $225 million—or $203 million in the House-passed bill—less than one-fourth our immediate needs and less than one-half our authorization.

I have already expressed my deep concern to Senator ELLENDER, chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee and asked for an increased appropriation for the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration.

I have followed the debate of this problem very closely. I have heard some suggest that the full appropriation is not necessary because many States could not use the full amount allotted to them under the $450 million authorization. They contend that the funds used for planning during the first half of the authorization will be minor.

This is certainly reasoning in a vacuum. I wish to call attention to two letters which I have received which refute this argument. The first is from Robert N. Wilentz, a New Jersey assemblyman who was the principal sponsor of New Jersey legislation designed to maximize benefits from Federal water pollution control programs to local New Jersey communities. He is closely connected to New Jersey's water pollution control effort.

Mr. Wilentz' feeling about the New Jersey program is illustrated when he says:

> I submit that the urban states, and especially New Jersey, need more than "a good start." We are ready to move and we need all the help that we can get as quickly as possible. My information indicates that New Jersey can use every cent of the $14 million which it would have gotten if the appropriation had been $450 million as authorized. I know of no budgetary or other consideration of sufficient importance to require this lower level of expenditure voted in the House.

I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PERTH AMBOY, N.J.,
July 27, 1967.

Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: The House of Representatives recently passed a public works appropriation bill which included an item of $203 million for construction grants under the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966. The authorization provided in that Act was $450 million. The purpose of this letter is to ask that you take whatever steps you deem appropriate in order that the Senate, when acting on this measure, vote to appropriate the entire amount authorized.

I'm sure you are aware of the steps New Jersey has taken in anticipation of the implementation of this Act, and the federal aid provided for therein. In addition to the crash program completed by the State Department of Health for the purpose of fully qualifying our state for maximum aid, the Legislature, for the first time in its history, authorized state construction grants for water pollution control projects and appropriated sufficient funds to match the total amount then recommended in the President's budget. Governor Hughes indicated in his Budget Message that in the event the full authorization was appropriated by Congress, New Jersey would supply additional matching funds by using its surplus.

It is apparent that our state is committed to full participaion in this program, and participation at the level contemplated by the original auhorization. I have been advised that other urban states have indicated a similar commitment. Under the circumstances I deem it unthinkable that the pace of construction of control projects should be retarded, as it inevitably will be, by this action of the House.

I am aware of the arguments addressed to the House Appropriations Committee as stated in its report which indicate that the present activities of the states and localities will not be seriously affected by the size of the appropriation in view of the carry over of funds from the prior year and the fact that there will be a considerable preoccupation with study and planning work during the first half of the fiscal year, the conclusion being that "Where states and cities are now ready with their plans, we are certain that the available funds . . . will make a good start to meet the immediately essential needs." (H.R. Report #505, Committee on Appropriations, at p. 82). I submit that the urban states, and especially New Jersey, need more than "a good start". We are ready to move and we need all the help that we can get as quickly as possible. My information indicates that New Jersey can use every cent of the $14 million which it would have gotten if the appropriation had been $450 million as authorized. I know of no budgetary or other consideration of sufficient importance to require this lower level of expenditure voted in the House.

As sponsor of the New Jersey legislation mentioned above, I urge that the appropriation be increased to the authorized level. After many, many years of education by interested people, the public has been aroused and is ready to support this program in full, and is, in my opinion, prepared to pay whatever price is necessary; the localities, the states, the regional bodies are similarly committed and ready to act. This is absolutely the worst time for the federal government to weaken the support for this program.

Very truly yours,
ROBERT N. WILENTZ.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, Mr. Wilentz' opinion is confirmed by the many letters I have received from my constituents and from other officials in New Jersey. Of particular interest is the second letter from Mr. John S. Elliot, chairman of the Northwest Bergen County Sewer Authority. His letter points out the admirable progress of that authority in bringing some control measures to northwest Bergen County. Planning has gone on for about 10 years and much progress has been made; however, to go on for another year would be a waste and loss of momentum. The time to do something has arrived.

I would also emphasize Mr. Elliot's statement about the total effect of a reduced appropriation. Each Federal dollar that is deleted from the appropriation renders a matching dollar in the State or local water pollution control agency ineffective. Our total loss in the entire program will then be in excess of $500 million with the appropriation as it stands. I cannot emphasize too much that the States are counting on the commitments we have made to them.

I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORTHWEST BERGEN COUNTY SEWER AUTHORITY,
Waldwick, N.J., July 27, 1967.

Hon. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr.,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: I wish to commend and express my support for your stand and that of Representative James Howard condemning the reduction, made by the House Appropriations Committee, in the allocation of funds for use under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act in fiscal 1968.

As chairman of the Northwest Bergen County Sewer Authority, I speak from the experience of some ten years in formulating and marshalling support for a water pollution control program within the area under the jurisdiction of this Authority. During this period (we have gained public support for an initial program of construction of sewerage facilities in unsewered areas which are in critical necessity of relief from present practices in waste disposal.) Construction of this project will be started within the next few weeks.

To this date we have received no financial benefit from Federal or State programs since there were none under which our activities could be qualified. However, (in approaching the construction phase of our project we have been highly encouraged by the expectation of assistance under the construction grant features of the Water Pollution Control Act which has in turn spurred the recent enactment of a matching fund program by the State of New Jersey as well as other states. Consequently, I am dismayed at the action of the House Appropriations Committee in reducing this appropriation. Moreover, the extent of this reduction is so drastic as to be of serious concern.)

A reduction in the amount of Federal construction grants automatically reduces the money to be made available from State funds under the matching fund features of the Federal program to which the State programs are geared. Thus for every dollar in reduction of Federal funds two dollars are lost in the availability of funds for construction of water pollution control projects. Therefore, the reduction of $247 million in the allocation for the Federal program might well mean an actual loss of some $500 million in construction funds for water pollution control in 1968 as the result of the drastic action of the Appropriations Committee.

It is obvious that this will be a serious setback to pollution control programs throughout the nation. Rising costs curtail what can be accomplished with available funds. To meet our goals in the face of rising costs, available funds must be increased if possible, but certainly not decreased.

In view of the lengthy struggle of the Northwest Bergen County Sewer Authority in bringing a pollution control program to construction the action of the Committee is most discouraging. (I urge you and all other members of the Congress to restore the funds for water pollution control, which were reduced by the Committee, and to assure that this program is adequately funded in the future.) Speaking for my area, what we have accomplished so far is just a beginning; to finish the work we look to the assistance of the Federal and State programs.

Very truly yours,

JOHN S. ELLIOT,
Chairman.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, lest some of us become smug and complacent by thinking that New Jersey is regrettably different from their States, I ask unanimous consent that the following excerpts from the public works appropriations for 1968 hearings before the House Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Public Works, be inserted in the RECORD at this time.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF STATE RESPONSES TO NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION TELEGRAM COMPARED TO PROBABLE APPORTIONMENTS UNDER THE $200 MILLION APPROPRIATIONS PROPOSED IN FEDERAL BUDGET FOR 1968

Alabama, $3,879,800.

Alabama does not have a law providing assistance to municipalities for waste treatment facilities construction. Whether such legislation will be passed during current legislative session is an unanswerable question at this time. Under these circumstances Alabama's ability to use full amount Federal grant funds authorized for fiscal 1968 doubtful. Large expenditures by Jefferson County not anticipated until fiscal 1969 or beyond. Arthur N. Beck, Water Improvement Commission.

Alaska, $863,600.

We anticipate need for 1968 Alaska State allotments in the amount of at least $800,000 more than the currently programmed $863,600. A total of $1,663,600 would be necessary to match balance on Anchorage project and to provide funding for Juneau and Valdez projects. It is entirely possible that other requests may be forthcoming during 1968. Amos J. Alter, Alaska Division of Public Health.

Arizona, $2,008,600.

Arizona has traditionally been able to meet all requests for construction grants within their allotment. We feel that the demand for construction grant funds in the coming fiscal year may considerably exceed the amounts expended in recent years. Our estimates of current needs indicate that the cost of projects eligible for PL 660 funds in fiscal year 1968 may be well in excess of $10 million. Preliminary estimates of projects that we are reasonably certain will be undertaken in the coming fiscal year indicate that the applications for PL 660 funds will be in excess of the $2 million currently proposed in the budget. We urge that the total authorized appropriation of $3.7 million be included in the Department of the Interior budget to ensure the fulfillment of Arizona's water pollution control needs.

Arkansas, $2,714,050.

Anticipate approximately $5.0 million needed for FY 67–68 grants in Arkansas. S. L. Davies, Arkansas Pollution Control Commission.

California, $13,652,550.

California has exhausted its 1967 allocation for waste treatment construction grants. We will have a carryover of potential reimbursable grants totaling about $4 million to be certified when 1968 funds become available. In addition, we are now processing applications for 1968 grants totaling almost $45 million. Although same of these applicants may not proceed with their projects, the need for grant funds will far exceed the present estimated allocation of less than $14 million. Robert M. Cousins, California State Water Quality Board.

Colorado, $2,364,350.

As of this moment, we have over $817,000 of next year's funds already committed to Colorado projects; we are expecting a request for some $450,000 from the City of Aurora to connect to the Denver Metropolitan Sewage District plant; and consulting engineers have informed us that there are a number of small communities that will be coming in with requests in the very near future. Consequently, we definitely feel that we could use more funds. It has been our experience in the past that all of our funds have been allocated within a short time after Congress had appropriated such funds. Frank J. Rozich, Colorado Water Pollution Control Commission.

Connecticut, $2,744,550.

Delaware, $1,043,250.

District of Columbia, $1,235,950.

D.C. allocation for waste water treatment construction for fiscal year 1968 under P.L. 89–753 (Act of 1966) is $1,226,250 based on Federal appropriations of $200 million. We could match and use in fiscal 1968 an allocation of $4.3 million or $2 million more than D.C. allotment of $2,277,000 based on Federal appropriations of $450 million assuming all proposed works qualify for maximum construction grants. Norman Jackson, D.C. Department of Public Health.

Florida, $5,012,150.

Florida can use more P.L. 660 funds than indicated: approximately $10 million in 1968. Florida's overall degree of domestic sewage is 70% Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD) removal, with a total of 1,755 sewage treatment plants. Florida's major needs center around two or three large cities and updating present plants to provide an overall treatment of 90 to 95% BOD removal. David B. Lee, Florida State Board of Health.

Georgia, $4,305,450.

Now have on file grant requests totaling $8,857,098. Deadline for filing applications for FY 1968 funds is May 15. Applications now in preparation which will be in prior to deadline which will increase the total grants requested to over $15 million. Also need $2 million to fund applications, already in FWPCA office and for supplemental grants. This would deplete almost half of funds proposed. Proposed failure to make full appropriation will seriously hamper entire program. R. S. Howard, Jr., Georgia Water Quality Control Board.

Hawaii, $1,283,650.

Idaho, $1,528,000.

Illinois, $9,009,150.

Total Federal grant request for fiscal 1967 were $20,137,051 compared to the Federal grant allotment for Illinois for fiscal 1967 of $6,200,000. The $14,000,000 worth of request not covered by the 1967 allotment for Illinois will be carried over for evaluation for fiscal 1968 funds. This carryover of requests plus new applications are expected to exceed the $20 million in grant requests received for fiscal 1967. C. W. Klassen, Illinois Sanitary Water Board.

Indiana, $4,651,500.

Here are about 25 municipalities with final plans ready now or that could have them ready in July, with project costs totaling approximately $40 million. The total grant requests for these projects are estimated at $15.9 million at 50 percent Federal aid. Some of these projects may fall by the wayside, however. It is indicated that our grant requests could utilize Indiana's share ($11,075,250) of the $450 million authorized for 1967–68 and still carry a backlog into 1968–69. The 1967 Indiana General Assembly appropriated $3.65 million for state grants on a 25-percent basis for 1967–68 and $4.95 million for 1968–69. These figures will support an appropriation for the Nation of $300 million in 1967–68 and $400 million in 1968–69. If Congress should appropriate more than $300 million in 1967–68, we can carry some projects past July 1, 1968, and use the State money appropriated for 1968–69. Blucher A. Poole, Indiana Stream Pollution Control Board.

Iowa, $3,150,500.

Iowa's share of the $200 million, which is estimated to be approximately $3,143,200, will probably be sufficient for grants to aid in the construction of anticipated sewage treatment works for the fiscal year 1968. P. J. Houser, Iowa State Department of Health.

Kansas, $2,631,250.

Kansas has 19 FWPCA grant applications on hand or in process of being prepared for a total of $3,275,000. Additional projects applications for $300,000 anticipated. J. Lee Mayes, Kansas Department of Health.

Kentucky, $3,604,100.

Louisiana, $3,773,700.

Maine, $1,809,300.

With the anticipated grant level increase from 30% to 50% it would take nearly full funding to stay even in work supported for FY 68. Full funding in FY 68 for the State of Maine would reflect only a 23% increase in its construction program. With the above as backup data and considering the State's backlog of waste treatment facilities construction projects, this Agency contends that it very easily can absorb the increased construction program that would result from full funding of Public Law 89–753, the 1966 amendments of the Federal Water Pollution

Control Act. George C. Gormley, Maine Water Improvement Commission.

Maryland, $3,303,700.

Maryland grant eligible projects now to 1971 total $184,000,000. On basis of actual project applications for 1968, State could use $20,700,000 in Federal funds. Law just signed by Governor guarantees 75 percent State-Federal grant. James B. Coulter, Maryland State Department of Health.

Massachusetts, $4,983,600.

It is expected that Massachusetts could utilize approximately $20 million of Federal funds for the construction grants program in fiscal year 1968. Thomas C. McMahon, Massachusetts Department of Natural Resources.

Michigan, $7,215,350.

Michigan proposing appropriation of $7 million for State's share of construction grant program in fiscal 1968. State could match $14 million Federal funds under 25% State-50% Federal match formula. Loring F. Deming, Michigan Water Resource Commission.

Minnesota, $3,671,650.

Total requests for last year were about $8 million. When applications are received on July 5, 1967, we expect the same amount to be requested this year. Minnesota's allocation has never been great enough to meet the demand for funds under the program. With the increased emphasis by the Minnesota Water Pollution Control Commission on municipal plant construction, we expect the 1968 requests for aid to be about $10 million. The State presently has no matching program for funds. Lyle H. Smith, Minnesota Water Pollution Control Commission.

Mississippi, $3,210,950.

We feel proposed apportionment for State of Mississippi will be adequate for our needs for the fiscal year 1968. Robert S. Wright, Mississippi Air and Water Pollution Control Commission.

Missouri, $4,419,250.

Montana, $1,467,800.

Nebraska, $2,044,600.

Nevada, $883,350.

Nevada has already approved projects totaling over $8,200,000 for which grants still due total $1,580,000. We anticipate two major projects within the next fiscal year which will total approximately $5.5 million and which will be eligible for approximately $1,650,000 in participating funds. Several smaller projects are anticipated but we have no knowledge of the dollar value. E. G. Gregory, Nevada Department of Health and Welfare.

New Hampshire, $1,361,850.

This Commission's budget request for fiscal 1968 would allow for matching of full Federal authorization of $450 million. Sufficient projects on hand to use approximately $3.5 million of Federal grant funds. William A. Healy, New Hampshire Water Pollution Commission.

New Jersey, $5,689,900.

This Department is prepared to match the full $14 million Federal apportionment if this is allocated for the coming year. Richard J. Sullivan, New Jersey Division Clean Air and Water, State Department of Health.

New Mexico, $1,781,300.

We cannot use any more than next year's appropriation for construction of sewage treatment and quite possibly we will not be able to use this much. All New Mexico communities that have sewage systems have secondary sewage treatment. John Wright, State Department of Health.

New York, $14,530,900.

During fiscal year 1968 New York State expects to encumber $175 million of Federal funds based upon full 55% grants. Nassau County Project alone will cost $90 million and New York City's North River project will cost $190 million. Federal share of these two is $154 million. Dwight F. Metzler, New York State Department of Health.

North Carolina, $4,862,750.

Thirty P.L. 660 applications on file requesting a total of $9.8 million in grants covering construction estimated to cost $41.3 million. Can readily use State apportionment if full $450 million is appropriated. E. C. Hubbard, North Carolina State Stream Sanitation Committee.

North Dakota, $1,507,850.

With our population of 600,000 people, the $1,507,850 is adequate for our needs. However, I do not feel that North Dakota is a representative state and I know of some of the more populated states are still working on a very tight priority system. We in North Dakota have been able to give grants to all eligible projects and have 1967 fiscal funds still available. We also have 88% of our communities and industries with adequate treatment and eight very small communities with no treatment, who will be receiving grants during this fiscal year to correct their deficiencies. W. Van Heuvelen, North Dakota Department of Health.

Ohio, $8,806,350.

It is estimated that Ohio could match $27 million Federal dollars in this category. Detailed construction plans are completed, or near completion, and construction schedules set for more than 50 municipal and county projects costing over $80 million. Our matching estimate is figured on a basis of 30 percent Federal funds and 70 percent local funds—for treatment plants and intercepting sewers only. There is the possibility, of course, that Federal matching may be higher for some projects. Dr. E. W. Arnold, Ohio Director of Health.

Oklahoma, $2,920,850.

The amount of water pollution control matching money needed in Oklahoma for fiscal year 1968 will be governed by the approval of financing by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Farmers Home Administration, and the Economic Development Administration in which water pollution control projects constitute a part of the total project. Another factor that will govern needs to a major extent will be the success or failure of major capital improvements in bond issues by the cities of Oklahoma City and Tulsa which we understand are being planned for calendar year 1967. Our estimate of the situation at this time is that one or more of the bond issues will be voted and that applications could be filed during the latter part of the fiscal year 1968 which may exceed grant funds available, assuming a Federal appropriation of $200 million. However, the Clean Waters Restoration Act contains a reimbursement clause and, we do not foresee any necessity for delay of construction should the appropriation be $200 million. If the appropriation for fiscal 1968 is approximately $200 million, a substantial increase in this amount will probably be necessary for fiscal 1969 and 1970, assuming municipal waste treatment works construction moves ahead at the rate now contemplated by city officials and this office. Loyd F. Pummill, Oklahoma Department of Health.

Oregon, $2,265,000.

Oregon State Legislature currently considering bill to provide $3 million for State grants. Expect request for Federal grants to total $4.5 million for fiscal year 1968. Kenneth H. Spies, Oregon State Sanitary Authority.

Pennsylvania, $11,161,890.

After the 1966 Federal pollution control amendments were enacted, we were advised that our communities would be authorized to receive up to $25 million in FY 1968 for waste treatment grants. We now understand that the proposed budget has reduced our share to only about $10 million, a reduction of 60%. We are now processing 107 applications for projects requiring 30% basic grants, totaling $25.1 million. Congress should appropriate the full amount authorized for such construction for fiscal year 1968. Wesley E. Gilbertson, Pennsylvania Department of Health, in a statement presented earlier before the Congress.

Rhode Island, $1,507,200.

An administrative supported bill is currently being considered by the Rhode Island State Legislature which would provide state aid in the amount of $6 million for sewage treatment works construction for fiscal 1968 and 1969. If the bill is acted upon favorably by the Legislature, authority to issue bonds will be asked of the electorate at a special election in June, 1967. It is expected that $2.9 million of Federal aid could be used for sewage treatment plant construction in Rhode Island during fiscal 1968. Carleton A. Maine, Rhode Island Department of Health.

South Carolina, $3,208700.

South Dakota, $1,647,600.

Tennessee, $4,068,600.

Tennessee has applications on file for PL 660 grants for construction to cost $24,589,462. At 30% grant this would be $7,376,800 Federal grant. At 50% grant this would be $12,295,000 Federal grant. All state that construction can start by June 30, 1968. If we tried we could obtain applications for at least $5 million more project construction cost for 1968 FY. We do not know, yet, if Tennessee General Assembly will match with State funds but either way we could use about $9 million PL 660 grants in 1968 or more. We have had too many applications to encourage marginal projects to file. S. Leary Jones, Tennessee Stream Pollution Control Board.

Texas, $8,855,800.

Matter is presently under consideration by Texas Legislature and the outcome is not now known. Hugh C. Yantis, Texas Water Pollution Control Board.

Utah, $1,666,000.

It is our considered opinion that the probable apportionment of $1,666,000 will be ample to serve construction grants in Utah during the period 1967–68 fiscal year. Howard M. Hurst, Utah State Department of Health.

Vermont, $1,295,250.

Anticipated fiscal year 1968 waste treatment plant construction program will require Federal grants of $1.8 million. Same program will require State grants of $1.97 million. State money has been made available by Vermont Legislature. Reinhold W. Thieme, Water Resources Department.

Virginia, $4,212,600.

A preliminary review of applications that the Board has received from municipalities and other governmental agencies for construction grants shows that there are 46 applicants requesting Federal grants of approximately $11 million. The total value of these 46 projects is about $36 million. If the full $450 million were to be appropriated, Virginia's share would presumably be proportionately increased. Virginia has no State grant program for sewerage construction. A. H. Paessler, State Water Control Board.

Washington, $3,129,500.

Applications received to date for fiscal year 1968 construction grants indicate $6,300,000 needed to supply 30 percent Federal portion of project. Legislature has authorized $25 million bond issue for State aid to be submitted November, 1968, election. Roy M. Harris, Pollution Control Commission.

West Virginia, $2,653,750.

West Virginia's 1967–68 allotment of $2,056,000 is exhausted. Clean waters restoration provides up to 50% if matched by State's 25%. On basis of 50%, West Virginia's needs could approach the $5 million previously assigned. Edgar N. Henry, West Virginia Department of Natural Resources.

Wisconsin, $4,101,500.

From the sum appropriated by this session of the Congress we must first pay the second installment of the total grant due to the municipalities receiving $1.8 this year. From the added $200 million appropriation now

> included in the budget before you, Wisconsin will receive only $4.1 million. This leaves $2.3 million for new projects. To the extent Wisconsin is eligible for 55 percent grants in 1968, we would be able to fully fund only $4.2 million in new construction out of the backlog of $9.3 million in pending applications and more requests are being filed each week. Freeman Holmer, Wisconsin Department of Resource Development, in statement already presented to the Congress.
>
> *Wyoming, $1,137,900.*
>
> Wyoming has had surplus construction grant funds since the first year of the program. If all small communities interested in sewage systems and existing needs were constructed in FY 68 it would require $200,000. Arthur E. Williamson, Wyoming Department of Public Health.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, these telegrams are in response to telegrams sent by Thomas L. Rimball, executive director of the National Wildlife Federation, to every State and the District of Columbia. He inquired as to how much more money could be matched by the States beyond the House-passed appropriation, and how much more money could be used in 1968 for water pollution abatement. It only takes third-grade arithmetic and simple reasoning to see what is going to happen if we do not restore this appropriation to the full $450 million authorization.

Mr. President, with this background information, it was my intention to join my distinguished colleague, Senator MUSKIE, in introducing an amendment to increase the appropriation for sewerage facilities construction to $450 million which the Senate and House authorized unanimously last year. The committee bill contains only $225 million. Indications, however, are that such an amendment would not have sufficient support to be adopted at this time.

It is regrettable that water-pollution abatement and all of our other domestic programs are feeling the effects of a tight budget due to the war in Vietnam. I regret that this is the consensus of our thinking at this time, for I am sure that we will reap the effects of our inaction at a later date.

In spite of the small appropriation in this bill today, I am hopeful that we will have an opportunity, in an early supplemental appropriation bill, to restore at least a sizable portion of the $450 million authorization. I also hope that the pressures on the budget because of the $66 million a day expense in Vietnam will be substantially reduced to permit a more favorable response to this and other important issues pressing us at home.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I rise in support of the appropriation of $750,000 to continue planning of the Grand River Reservoir, Ohio, portion of the Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal project. The proposed reservoir is solely for purposes of flood control, water supply, water quality control, recreation, and conservation of fish and wildlife. This is the amount for this purpose included in the public works and Atomic Energy Commission appropriation bill, 1968, as it passed the House and recommended in the report of the Senate Committee on Appropriations accompanying the bill now before the Senate. As the report of the House Committee on Appropriations points out:

> This feature of the project, a part of the Ohio Water Plan, is urgently needed in this area and its development is fully justified as an independent feature of this project.

The Ohio Department of Natural Resources in its "Water Inventory of the Mahoning and Grand River Basins," report No. 16, Ohio water plan inventory, stated:

> The Grand River Reservoir has been studied by the Corps of Engineers as part of a proposed Lake Erie to Ohio River Canal, recommended as desirable and economically feasible. Navigation is not the concern of this inventory. * * * The economic decline of 1960–61 has focused attention on high transportation cost and water shortage as competitive disadvantages of the area. Even without the transportation feature, however, the Grand River Reservoir should be built on its merit as a complete solution for the area's problem in water supply, low flow regulation, flood control and recreation. A reservoir of such proportions would meet the water needs of the Mahoning-Grand River basins for many years and probably for all time, assuring economic growth and a long period of prosperity for the area. Development possible under any alternative proposal would be inadequate for the area's needs.

Testifying before the Public Works Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee this spring, Mr. John D. Hadden, chairman of the Board of County Commissioners of Lake County, Ohio, had this to say with regard to the Grand River Reservoir:

> In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, prompt action on the part of the U.S. Government in entering upon the Grand River-Mahoning Reservoir portion of the Lake Erie-Ohio River Interconnecting Waterway, is imperative for increased industrial efficiency, full employment, sound economic expansion and wholesome outdoor recreational facilities. The delay of this project would insure us of frequent floods, a continued water pollution problem and lack of adequate outdoor recreational facilities, a stream that dries in summer, and a lack of commerce which we could enjoy. A delay would keep Northeastern Ohio from realizing its full potential.

Mr. President, I respectfully submit that there can be no serious doubt as to the wisdom of proceeding with planning of the Grand River Reservoir in Ohio, including a reanalysis of the reservoir's design and operations to make maximum provision for water resource purposes other than navigation. Having carefully read the bill as reported from the Appropriations Committee and having studied the committee report, and in addition having listened to the debate on this appropriation bill, I report that I regard this as necessary and needed legislation, and I am glad to support this appropriation bill.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Appropriations Committee for its excellent work on the 1968 public works appropriations bill. I am particularly gratified by the inclusion of $6.5 million for the southern Nevada water project and $4.6 million for the Washoe project.

The southern Nevada water project was authorized in 1965 and initially appropriated for in 1966 with preconstruction planning funds. It will consist of a system of distribution pipelines and related facilities to pump Nevada's share of Colorado River water from Lake Mead to Clark County, where the population is expanding at an unprecedented rate and Federal installations are engaged in priority AEC, NASA, and Department of Defense activities. The priority list is headed by Nellis Air Force Base, the only weapons center for the Tactical Air Command.

Such municipal, industrial, and national defense growth is clearly depleting an underground water supply that must be augmented by the 300,000 acre-feet of Colorado River water to which Nevada is entitled. The appropriation in the bill under consideration will bring this water closer to arid Clark County by providing for final planning and the initial construction of pumping plants, canals and conduits, laterals and operating facilities.

I am confident the Senate will sustain the budgeted and House-passed committee recommendation for the southern Nevada water project, thereby keeping the pledge it made in 1965 and renewed in 1966 to support the project upon which the growth and prosperity of southern Nevada depend. I also urge the Senate to sustain the budgeted and House-passed committee recomendation for the Washoe project, thereby facilitating the construction of urgently needed flood control facilities, the Stampede Reservoir and the Watasheamu Dam and Reservoir, on the Truckee River in western Nevada.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I wish to express my thanks to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Works of the Committee on Appropriations, for his leadership in placing in this appropriation bill the $1 million recited on page 24 of the report.

The committee recommended a $1 million increase under "Channels and harbors" to permit the Corps of Engineers to initiate the clearing of inlets and channels that have been silted as a result of Hurricane Beulah and the subsequent floods. The committee took this action under the recommendation of the senior Senator from Louisiana, on my motion, on the morning of September 28.

I had been to Texas on September 24, 25, and 26, and flew in an Army helicopter over Corpus Christi, along the intercoastal canal, south to Brownsville, north to Aransas County and Aransas Pass to Rockport. The crest of the Nueces River had not yet reached the coast; it reached the coast that day. The volume of the water was so great that the level rose in Corpus Christi Bay 2 or 3 feet, for the first time in history.

Along the canals you could see water pouring over their edges, very muddy, silted water. You could actually see debris silting into a channel. I spoke with a brigadier general of the Army Engineers on the spot, and he said it was impossible to estimate the damage. The Senator from Louisiana had checked into that matter and stated before the committee that it was impossible to know how much damage had been done, but he knew it would be more than a million dollars. This would be a starter, to clear out the bays, the harbors, and the intercoastal canals, to make them navigable as they were before Hurricane Beulah, the most destructive hurricane, in terms of monetary damage, in Texas history.

The distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana is better informed than any other Member of Congress about the harbors, bays, and intercoastal canals of this Nation; he knows their lengths and their depths. Because of his knowledge, this amount of money was included in the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I am glad that this distinguished Senator from Texas has brought this matter to the attention of the Senate.

As I said to the Senator from Texas when he made his proposal, I thought the amount of money requested to be appropriated was very modest. I felt certain that eventually much more money would be required, and as I said at the time I would await his further reports from the Corps of Engineers as to the total amount that would be required. I told him that if it is necessary to provide more money in order to remove the debris from the intercoastal canal and other navigable waters in that area, we could consider requests for further appropriations in the supplemental bill.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I thank the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

We knew that it was a very modest request, but we wanted money to get the work started. We discussed the possibility of a supplementary appropriation bill this year, after the initial money was used to start the new and unscheduled work that arose after the appropriation bill first had been considered by the Subcommittee on Public Works.

As Hurricane Beulah entered the United States and Texas near the mouth of the Rio Grande on the early morning of September 20, it went northward for a day and, on a hairpin turn, went back south across the Rio Grande and into Mexico, dumping unusual amounts of water on the landscape, the rainfall being up to 30 inches in some places, causing floods and silting without precedent.

This morning I received a phone call, and I was told that in the town of Lyford, Tex., the water is still standing in the houses and the streets. Yesterday I received telegrams from Rockport, Tex., reporting that the debris was still uncleared, days after the waters had receded. The land is so flat in the Lyford area that the water has not run off yet in that area.

As a result of the leadership of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, $1 million was added to the appropriation bill on the morning of September 28. I returned to Texas that afternoon with President Johnson, on his inspection tour of the area, and the water still stood high in the houses in Harlingen and a number of other cities.

As we know, this appropriation is only the beginning. But the committee was very understanding. The great knowledge of the senior Senator from Louisiana about our harbors and canals enabled the committee to understand the needs for the beginning money which is required for the rebuilding program.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is my belief that the good people of Texas should know that their Senator was not asleep. As a matter of fact, before the storm abated, he was before the committee, requesting that funds be provided in order to assist the people in that area.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I want the Senator from Louisiana to hear what the people of Texas said about him. They said, "We hope you can get for us what Senator ELLENDER and Senator LONG got for Louisiana after Hurricane Betsy in 1965. You be as diligent as they were after Hurricane Betsy that did a billion dollars worth of damage in 1965."

I appreciate the thoughtfulness of the Senator from Louisiana, and I thank the Senator for yielding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the questions is, Shall it pass?

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], and the Senators from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL and Mr. TALMADGE] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 82, nays 3, as follows:

[No. 291 Leg.]

YEAS—82

Allott
Anderson
Baker
Bartlett
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Brooke
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Gruening
Hansen
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hollings
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Percy
Prouty
Randolph
Ribicoff
Scott
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Spong
Stennis
Symington
Tydings
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—3

Proxmire
Thurmond
Williams, Del.

NOT VOTING—15

Aiken
Curtis
Gore
Griffin
Harris
Hatfield
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Metcalf
Morton
Nelson
Russell
Talmadge
Tower
Williams, N.J.

So the bill (H.R. 11641) was passed.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments and request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes thereon, and that the Chair be authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. HILL, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. MUNDT, and Mrs. SMITH conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senate's overwhelming adoption of this measure that funds the construction and planning of many vitally important facilities throughout the Nation represents an outstanding tribute to the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. As the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee charged with overseeing the allocation of money for such a vast endeavor, he has consistently discharged the task with the highest degree of skill and efficiency. By now, everyone in this body is well aware of this immense responsibility Senator ELLENDER has been assigned. Even more, every Member appreciates the extremely fine manner in which the task has been accomplished. The Senate and the Nation are in his debt.

On this appropriations bill the senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] also deserves high commendation. His strong support and splendid cooperation were amply demonstrated. As the ranking minority member on the subcommittee, he too performed an outstanding service with his efforts, and we are deeply grateful.

We are grateful also for the contributions of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. As always, they expressed their views with great sincerity and articulate advocacy, as did the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE]. The senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] deserves commendation for the exemplary manner in which he cooperated to assure swift and efficient Senate action. He offered amendments to the measure and expressed his own sincere views on its merits. His action, however, in no way impeded final disposition today and the Senate is most grateful.

The Senators from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH and Mr. BYRD] also deserve praise for focusing attention on an issue that certainly deserves the attention of the Senate.

Finally, to the Senators mentioned, to the Senators from Maine [Mrs. SMITH and Mr. MUSKIE], to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and to the many others who participated in the discussion, I wish to express the gratitude of the leadership for joining to assure a thoughtful and enlightening debate; and for assuring expeditious action with full regard for the views of each Member.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS, 1968—ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, before the Chair recognizes the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], may I say it is my understanding that it is very possible that later this afternoon the conference report on the Agriculture Department appropriations bill will be brought to the Chamber and be ready for a vote.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON SIGNS THE OUTER SPACE TREATY

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, today, in ceremonies at the White House, President Johnson signed the protocol, putting into force on the part of the United States, the Outer Space Treaty.

Thirteen other nations joined in this signing ceremony in Washington, while others were similarly signing in London and Moscow.

Thus, the world has taken a major step toward insuring that man's adventures in space will be peaceful and cooperative.

This treaty is in large measure a tribute to President Johnson's longtime interest in the commitment to the pioneering field of space.

During his years in the Senate, Lyndon Johnson was a leading force in the establishment of an American space program. Later, as Vice President, he led the Space Council during the formative years of NASA's growth and development. And as President, he has continued to provide sound and effective leadership for our overall space effort.

In his remarks at the signing ceremony, the President once again called on the world community to cooperate in space exploration. He noted that the first decade of space travel "witnessed a kind of contest." But the next decade, he noted, "should increasingly become a partnership—not only between the Soviet Union and America, but among all nations under the sun and stars."

In signing the treaty, Mr. Johnson said:

> I see in it a hopeful sign that mankind is learning, however slowly, that wars are not inevitable; that national rivalry is not a permanent barrier to international understanding; and that a world of hostility and hate need not be the abiding condition of mankind.

To these sentiments, I think, we would all add a prayerful "Amen."

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD President Johnson's remarks at the signing of the Outer Space Treaty.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF THE REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT THE CEREMONY ON THE OUTER SPACE TREATY

The Age of Space began just ten years ago last Wednesday. I am sure Ambassador Dobrynin does not have to be reminded of that date—nor do any of us.

The world will never forget the intelligence, determination, and courage that placed Sputnik into orbit, and launched man's great adventure into space.

That adventure has unfolded, during the past decade, with miraculous speed and scope. Man has probed the moon and reached out to other planets in the solar system. And he has done all this in a spirit of peaceful exploration.

We are here today to proclaim the intention of 84 nations that this exploration shall remain peaceful. By adding this Treaty to the law of nations, we are forging a permanent disarmament agreement for outer space.

It outlaws the weapons of mass destruction from man's newest frontier.

It forbids military bases and fortifications on the moon and other celestial bodies.

It prohibits the testing of weapons in space.

It means that when man reaches the moon, he will land in a field of peace—not a new theater of war.

The spirit of international cooperation that has achieved this agreement is a beacon of hope for the future. It is a credit to all our peoples. If we had sought for excuses to postpone agreement, we could have found them with ease. Instead, we expended our efforts in achieving agreement—and we have succeeded.

The Treaty was negotiated in six short months. For this, I gratefully thank Arthur Goldberg—who represented our country—and all the wise and constructive statesmen of many lands who shared in that accomplishment.

The Senate of the United States gave its unanimous consent—and I can assure our distinguished friends from abroad that this is not something that happens every day.

That unanimous action testifies to the depth and sincerity of the American people's support for the purposes of this Treaty.

This unity is not new. Nine years ago, when I was serving in the Senate, I appeared at President Eisenhower's request before the General Assembly of the United Nations to make these remarks:

"Until now our strivings toward peace have been heavily burdened by legacies of distrust and fear and ignorance and injury.

"Those legacies do not exist in space. They will not appear there unless we send them on ahead.

"To keep space as man has found it, and to harvest the yield of peace which it promises, we of the United States see one course—and only one—which the nations of earth may intelligently pursue. That is the course of full and complete and immediate cooperation to make the exploration of outer space a joint adventure."

That was our position nine years ago. It is our position now. I want to renew, today, America's offer to cooperate fully with any nation that may wish to join forces in this last—and greatest—journey of human exploration. Space is a frontier common to all mankind; it should be explored and conquered by humanity acting in concert.

We have urged cooperation in exploring the planets, or any portion of the solar system, in the use of tracking facilities, so that brave astronauts and cosmonauts may fly with greater safety, in mapping the earth, in exchanging bio-scientific information, and in international satellite communications.

We renew these offers today. They are only the beginnings of what should be a long cooperative endeavor in exploring the heavens.

Whatever our disagreements here on earth, however long it may take to resolve conflicts whose roots are buried centuries-deep in history, let us at least agree on this. Let us determine that the great space armadas of the future will go forth on voyages of peace—and in a spirit, not of national rivalry, but of peaceful cooperation.

The first decade of the Space Age has witnessed a kind of contest. We have been engaging in competitive spacemanship. We have accomplished much, but we have also wasted much energy and resources in duplicated or overlapping effort.

The next decade should increasingly become a partnership—not only between the Soviet Union and America, but among all nations under the sun and stars.

The hard business of foreign relations requires a certain optimism. One must be convinced that, in time, men and nations can direct their affairs toward constructive ends.

It is with optimism that I greet this Treaty. I see in it a hopeful sign that mankind is learning, however slowly, that wars are not inevitable; that national rivalry is not a permanent barrier to international understanding; and that a world of hostility and hate need not be the abiding condition of mankind.

VIETNAM

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, in the orchestration of the administration's counterattack against the critics of its conduct of the Vietnam war, the heavy hand is considerably more in evidence than the subtle touch.

Obviously, acting on the principle that the best defense is a counterattack, the administration first sought to smother all criticism by charging it is unpatriotic, gives aid and comfort to the enemy, and undercuts our fighting forces.

Another transparent move to stifle criticism was made yesterday when the Democratic national chairman accused those opposed to the President of doing so for partisan purposes.

He should recognize partisanship when he sees it, for he is perhaps the greatest living embodiment of partisanship in its purest form—and it is most appropriate that the national chairman should be precisely that.

Be that as it may, those of us who believe the President has failed thus far in the conduct of the Vietnam war will not be silenced.

My chief concern is whether or not I can in any way help to put our country on a sounder course than the one it has been following in Vietnam.

President Johnson the other day said, in substance, that those opposed to his conduct of the war want "to take the easy way out"—either by way of withdrawal or escalation—implying that if one is not for escalation or withdrawal he must be for President Johnson.

I am not for the easy way out. What I want is the right way, and the issue, as posed by the President, is a false issue.

I want to win the war in the south, and by win the war I mean bring about the creation of a South Vietnamese nation whose citizens support their Government and the society in which they live, a government which is capable of giving South Vietnam protection against outside aggression and leadership internally in those reforms which are essential to bring that nation into the modern world.

This, as I have said before, is a job which only the South Vietnamese can do. Our Government's failure in South Vietnam is that we have attempted to do this ourselves with American manpower and American material resources and have failed to get the South Vietnamese to do the job themselves.

Despite continuing administration claims of progress, impartial observers continue to report that progress is minimal, if it exists at all, with respect to the pacification program, to the efforts to improve the South Vietnamese Armed Forces, and, indeed, to the conduct of the purely military side of the war itself.

It seems to me time that someone pointed out the extraordinary fact that almost without exception the first-rate press reports from South Vietnam give, and have given, a gloomy picture in direct opposition to the rosy reports by military and civilian agencies of our Government.

The more I look into the matter, the more I become convinced that our reporters are right, and that their view of reality is far closer to the truth than the official version.

The administration, it seems clear, has been unwilling to look at the facts and the realities. It has not encouraged the public or the Congress to do this either.

But we can never hope to make progress in South Vietnam unless we are willing to face reality and to deal with things as they are, not as we would wish them to be.

MAX M. KAMPELMAN—A DISTINGUISHED PUBLIC SERVANT

Mr. McGOVERN. President Johnson has been justly praised in the Nation for having—against strong odds—brought modern government to the District of Columbia.

He has also been justly praised for the caliber of men he has chosen to manage the new government of our Nation's Capital.

Nowhere is that high caliber better seen than in the man chosen by the President to be Chairman of the new Washington, D.C., City Council—Max M. Kampelman.

Max Kampelman is a man of talent and deep human compassion. He is a man educated in political science, trained in the law, experienced in government.

He is a Washingtonian of long standing with a deep interest and commitment to the problems and prospects of his city. He is just the kind of man President Johnson was looking for when he sought to make Washington a model city for the Nation.

I commend the President for his nomination of Mr. Kampelman to head the District of Columbia City Council.

I am proud that such a distinguished civil leader is willing to give more of his time to his community and government.

And I am proud of Congress for having joined the President in a move which will one day make Washington a city worthy of our National Capital in the 20th century.

URBAN AND RURAL TURMOIL MUST BE ATTACKED SIMULTANEOUSLY

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, recently I had occasion to speak in the Senate about the necessity for realizing that urban and rural turmoil and their root causes are cut from the same cloth and must be attacked simultaneously. Certainly, the idea is one on which we hear a number of voices being raised these days. Foremost, perhaps, among those stressing the proposition that urban problems must be attacked in rural areas has been Secretary of Agriculture Freeman. But we need more recruits for what the Washington Post today calls this hopeful trend of thought. The Post adds:

> The inescapable logic behind it ought to enlist the support of more thoughtful and reflective people.

Happily, the trend is growing, as the editorial itself points out by citing the proposals of the Office of Regional Resources and Development at Ithaca, N.Y., and the resolution offered in the Senate by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], which calls for a study of the question of population movements by the Joint Economic Committee.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "Rural and Urban Poverty," published in today's Washington Post, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RURAL AND URBAN POVERTY

More and more voices are being raised in support of an idea to which Secretary of Agriculture Freeman again reverted last Friday when he declared that urban problems need to be attacked in rural areas. The folly of making urban poor out of the rural poor is being more widely recognized. Instead of accepting the notion that rural emigration is inevitable—or even admirable—the idea is arising that megalopolis may not be the answer to all our social and economic and political problems.

The Office of Regional Resources and Development at Ithaca, N.Y., has been putting forward for consideration a proposal that larger metropolitan centers be decentralized. The Director, Oliver C. Winston, has pointed out that many of the larger cities are reaching a point at which it is "almost impossible to deal with human problems on a human scale." This office has urged the study of ways to develop the potential of the country's 300 cities with 50,000 to 500,000 residents. And it has urged that we explore what might be done with 5000 towns of between 2500 and 50,000 people. Emigration off the farms has to be accepted as a technological inevitability, but emigration from rural to urban areas should not be accepted as unavoidable.

Senator Proxmire and Senator Mundt have introduced a resolution directing the Joint Economic Committee to study the question of population movements. Senator Monroney proposed an amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act, providing funds for a study of ways to "assure a more effective use of human and natural resources of rural America." The Republican Coordinating Committee recently produced a task force paper on "revitalizing our rural areas."

Practical measures to disperse some industries once heavily concentrated in urban areas are also under way. The canning industry and the meat packing industry lead in decentralizing their production. Much American industry, no longer dependent on heavy raw material, locally generated power, access to pools of traditional crafts or availability of local markets, is beginning to explore relocation to areas where employes can live better lives for less money.

The Secretary of Agriculture gave one rough illustration of alternative costs when he suggested that it would be better to subsidize a rural family at the rate of $1000 a year for 20 years than it would be to build an urban dwelling for them at a cost of $20,000. This homely figure helps to point the financial case for checking the flood of poverty that is inundating urban centers. The larger case, of course, is to be made in all the other advantages of a good life that could be provided in a rural setting and that no amount of expenditure can provide in some urban slum settings.

This is a hopeful trend of thought. The inescapable logic behind it ought to enlist the support of more thoughtful and reflective people.

TRADE WITH COUNTRIES WHICH AID OUR ENEMIES—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MUNDT

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, on August 27, 1967, the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] addressed the Foreign Relations Committee of the American Legion, at its 49th national convention, on the subject of U.S. trade with countries which aid our enemies. Senator MUNDT has presented a convincing argument against such trade. I ask unanimous consent that the text of his speech be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR KARL E. MUNDT TO THE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE, THE AMERICAN LEGION 49TH ANNUAL NATIONAL CONVENTION, BOSTON, MASS., AUGUST 27, 1967

May I say first of all that Senator Harry Byrd, who expected to accompany me on this trip, but at the last minute couldn't make it, asked me to convey his regards to you and to tell you that he associates himself with the point of view which I am about to express.

I want to talk a little bit about a sequel to an event in which you were very much interested; that is, the conflict, and the contest, and the argument that we had in the Senate earlier this year over the ratification of the so-called Consular Treaty with Russia. The Legion and Warren MacDonald especially, did a tremendous job of presenting some of the realities of life to members of the Senate and to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

You as an organization performed valiantly, and we finally ended up just three votes short of defeating a ratification which, at the time, was expected to go through with less than 6 votes in opposition. The argument that Warren presented and the argument that those of us who were against having the Consular Treaty ratified at this time reinforced, was primarily the argument that it was a step in the direction of expanding East-West trade in time of war. Such trade, I think, should more appropriately and honestly and accurately be defined as "trading with the enemy." So, I can say that while we lost that skirmish, I think we are about to win the battle which was then in the background.

You have been following, I'm sure, recent events in the Congress which, it seems to me, tend to verify that generalization that having lost the skirmish, we planted the seeds which are going to enable us to win the battle. About two weeks ago, in acting upon a comparatively uncontroversial measure to expand the loaning authority of the Export-Import Bank, the United States Senate accepted two amendments on which Harry Byrd and I were associated—by overwhelming votes of better than 2 to 1 in both instances; and thereby took steps to express the sentiment of the Senate that we did not believe it was appropriate or conducive to victory, or a step toward peace, for our country to be supplying credits or materials to Russia at the time Russia is supplying the weapons of war to North Vietnam.

One of the amendments which we adopted overwhelmingly said that none of the credits provided by the Export-Import Bank should in the future be made available to any country engaging in the shipment of supplies of any kind to North Vietnam while the war prevails. The other was a specific denial of the requested authority to expend 50 million dollars of your money and mine for the purpose of financing an automobile plant to be built on the Volga River, to be run by the Fiat automobile company. It was the sense of the Senate, as I am confident it is the sense of most of you, that the closest thing you can build to a munitions plant without building one is an automobile plant. Automobile plants in our country and around the world in time of war traditionally have been used for conversion and diversion to the development and building of war materiel. In time of war, it's so easy to switch from a truck to a tank, for example. And, of course, automobile plants are built with a plethora of machine tools, and machine tools have that faculty of being able to reproduce themselves. You put 50 million dollars worth of machine tools and the production lines which use them into Russia, and you have built a factory which can reproduce its capacity to make almost anything.

We don't know what the House of Representatives is going to do with that amendment or those two amendments, but if I were to venture a guess on a Sunday morning, I would guess that they would uphold the Senate on both points. And I know they will if the Legion posts around the country express their determination that that should be the result. House members have indicated how they feel in votes they took just last week on the Foreign Aid Bill. They wrote into the Foreign Aid Bill that there should be no aid provided to any country, communist or non-communist, friendly or inbetween, which also is trading with the enemy.

So, I think we are beginning to pound some reality into the thinking in high places in Washington about what is an appropriate posture for a country like ours to take when 500,000 of its youth are fighting for survival and for freedom in Vietnam. I think that what we have been calling the "kiss and kill" war strategy of the present Administration is coming under terrible scrutiny and direct attack by the thinking people of America at the grassroots level all over this country; people who don't like to see us kiss the hand of the enemy whose hands are building, if you please, every solitary, sophisticated weapon being used by the Communists in Hanoi to prolong the war, to increase our American casualties, and to increase the stubborn obstinacy of Ho Chi Minh not to come to the conference table.

He believes he is winning the war. He knows he is getting today from the Soviet Union and its European satellites, plus a little trickle of stuff coming in from rebellious China—that he is getting without charge, from the Communist bloc of countries today—more supplies than he was able to buy before the war began. If you sat where Ho Chi Minh sits, with his comparative lack of knowledge about the strength and status of this country, and you saw your enemy helping his friend aid him, and you're getting without payment more supplies and fancier goods and better food and better clothing than you were getting when you had to pay for it before the war, you, too, might hesitate a long time before saying, "I guess we're losing the war and so we are going to go to the peace table and we're going to call it off."

That in brief is the situation which we confront as we now face up to a big challenge; because the Administration has said that it proposes to come to us with an East-West trade measure which would expand even further the right of American corporations and American exporters to ship, without limitation and without license, supplies to the Soviet Union and to the satellite bloc. I come to urge you to become increasingly and continuingly active in this particular contest, because it seems to me it goes down to one of the gut issues in the war. Most of you, and surely I, believe that when you are in a war, there are only two possible results: one is victory and one is defeat. And most of you believe, as I believe, that having been in a war against communism for five years, defeat for us is unthinkable, because of the consequences which would come of it.

We belong to a country, happily, which has won a lot of wars but which has never lost one. We entirely lack experience about how to adjust ourselves to a defeat and what flows from defeat. But, we're pretty well aware of the fact that when you're up against a colossus like global communism, *you dare not lose.*

And, if we are defeated by half a country, if we are defeated by a population of 18 million—if we are defeated by 18 million people occupying half a country where there isn't a single automobile plant, where there isn't a single plant capable of making rockets, or planes or trucks or heavy artillery—does anybody really believe that there would be anything left of American world leadership?

If you were the communist propaganda guy, and you could point out that the strongest country in the world, presumably, had been brought to its knees and had to tuck tail and run out—had been defeated by half a country of that kind and character, it also seems to me that you could shoot out of the saddle in twenty-four hours any possible semblance of American world leadership from now on in. It's an interesting situation to meditate about.

Those little countries don't follow big countries once they've become losers and, once we're shot out of the saddle of world leadership, who's going to take our place? Would you believe deGaulle? Would you believe Great Britain? Would you believe Norway? Or Denmark, or Italy or West Germany? Of course not, and neither would I. So this great schismatic struggle in which we've been involved, since we first became aware of the vicious, global, aggressive, godless desires of communism, would find nobody left to ride herd on the free world and to lead it, and the communists would have enjoyed a tremendous victory.

Some little slap-happy guy who may rise up out of the turmoil which is going on in China today—trying to consolidate his forces by pointing to a common enemy, and now possessed of nuclear weaponry and seven hundred million men—might very well start out at once to attack us and our interests. In fact, how could he enjoy leadership in that communist colossus without doing it? When propagandists all around point out that "18 million North Vietnamese did it. You've got seven hundred million. They did it with an area smaller than Michigan; you can do it with a mighty empire as big as China. They did it without any manufacturing plants; you've got them. They did it without an atomic bomb; you have it." I doubt that any dictator who might emerge—and eventually one must from the throes of the current Chinese controversy—would be able to resist the pressure of the hotheads who'd say, "Let's take America on now while she's so vulnerable."

So, it's a difficult situation which we confront. Nobody likes this war. They argue on the Senate floor day after day, week after week, whether we should have gotten in or not. I think that's a debatable question, but I don't think this is the time to debate it. Five years after the fact is a bit late to start arguing whether we should be in or not. You've got to pick up the parade of history wherever it is. What do we do now? We're in; we have been in for five years. The casualties are tremendous, the stakes are high, the security of our future is involved.

What does it avail men to go around debating whether we should have gotten in or not? That's something to be resolved later. Even though we were to admit unanimously, "we should never have been involved," that doesn't change at all the idea of what we ought to do now, in my opinion.

The question is now, do we win or do we fold up? We know something about what victory means. It carries with it a heavy responsibility, but it also gives us a chance to help shape the pattern and the attitudes and the ideals of the world.

I recall visiting with a fellow one time who lost a war. We have to get our experience about losing from other countries, other nations and other leaders because we have never lost; and let's pray to God we never do. Alben Barkley, whom all of you remember, a delightful gentleman, and I, were on a tour of Europe right after World War II, trying to establish what finally became known as the Smith-Mundt Act; the program of propaganda and publicity, and information to try and turn back a little bit, if we could, the propaganda from the other side. We were visiting in Helsinski, Finland, talking with Passikivi, a distinguished old gentleman who had been the President of Finland for a long time. He was 82, 83, 84 years of age, and had a weak and quavering voice, but he was the President. And great, old bubbling Alben Barkley, as we left, gave him the old Paducah treatment: shook hands with him and patted him on the back and said, "I want you to know that we in the United States have great respect for honest little Finland. Sure, we were at war with you for awhile, but also true, even while we were at war with you, you smuggled in across the lines, your interest money, to keep your debt payments up-to-date (which they did). And we respect you for that!" "And," he said, "we want you to know we're mighty glad to see you making a recovery." I'll never forget what Passikivi said. He looked at me and he looked at Alben and he said, "Thank you very much. I surely appreciate very much the friendship we got with America." And then he said, "It's true, we were at war, we've been involved in war. Wars are awful bad," he said, "especially if you lose 'em."

I've often thought about that. There was a fellow who lost one. "Especially if you lose 'em," he said, but bad any way you look at them. So, if after all the sacrifice, you come home having surrendered, you have just begun the agony.

Now, let's relate that to Vietnam. If we agree that we should not accept defeat there, then we agree that we have to fight on until some other answer is found. We don't talk in terms of victory in that kind of war because there isn't any real thing that we're fighting to obtain except the right of a free people to maintain their freedoms, and, at the same time, to protect our own national security by signaling to the communist world that we are not ready to be picked off and that, when we get involved in something like this, we won't take defeat.

Now then, let's relate that to what I think is one of the most unexpected and unprecedented and indefensible war-time developments in the history of this Republic. After Congress had established a forbidden list of hundreds of items which nobody in America could ship to any communist country sending supplies to the enemy, President Lyndon Johnson, on October 12, 1966, by Executive Order—in defiance of the expressed intentions and desires of Congress—opened up for unlimited and unlicensed shipment over 400 items of supplies to Russia and her satellites in Europe; and, in February of this year, increased it by another 40. So, we have about 440 of those items now being shipped. The argument is: "we're building bridges." My answer is that when you build a bridge, you ask yourself first of all: where does it lead? To what destination does it take you? And the bridge built toward disaster, in my opinion is worse than no bridge at all.

Well, they say, these are non-strategic supplies; this will show them we are kind of friendly fellows; this will keep the dialogue going. "We have a detente," says Secretary Rusk. If we have a detente, he has never been able to point it out to us; he has never been able to define it for us. He talks about it in vaporous terms—about the detente. If we have a detente, that means sort of a rapprochement, does it not, Mr. Secretary? That means that we've sort of got a friendly relationship of some kind, does it not? If he says "yes," where is it then? Show us something specific somewhere, someplace that the communists have done friendly for us. For every one you show, we'll pick out a dozen different items that they are sending to Hanoi to prolong the war and to aggravate the biggest problem that we have.

Bernard Baruch says there is no such thing as a non-strategic item in time of war. I happen to be one who goes along with that. But let me talk to the skeptics who say that it's all right to ship these 440 items. Let's see some of the things involved. Well, we've shipped them herbicides and insecticides and pesticides and, in the process, we have increased the grain yield per acre in Russia from 5 to 12 bushels per acre. That ought to help them in a time of war. Russia today is providing virtually every drop of petroleum required by the communists in North Vietnam to project themselves into the war with mechanized equipment. Russia can manufacture, pretty well, drilling bits for shallow oil wells. But for deep wells and the big producers and the gushers, they need diamond-pointed bits, diamond-equipped bits. They don't make them, we make them; so, we ship them to Russia and have been shipping them without license or restraint since October 12 last year. We've also been shipping them an interesting little chemical called diethylene glycol. It's a component of solid rocket propellants, used in air-to-air missiles. If that's a non-strategic weapon, you're listening this morning to the Chinese Pope. We're shipping them chemical wood pulp. It's a compound of nitrocellulose which is an important ingredient for solid rocket fuel.

It doesn't sound much like non-strategic stuff to me. We've been shipping them polyvinyl butyral which is used in the making of bullet-resistant glass.

We have shipped them two—we were successful in the Senate in stopping the shipment of another—Worden gravity meters—the world's best—which are used in determining the accuracy and trajectory of rockets. They've got SAM missiles over there, and they've got ground-to-ground rockets over there.

So, we find items of that kind, over 50 different industrial chemicals, that we're shipping to Russia today; scarcely breakfast food for the kids, scarcely to be served at an afternoon tea party at the Kremlin. In this day and age, any chemical you ship is a strategic material.

Most of you remember, I'm sure, the great debate in the 1940's and 1941. We were worrying about the possibility that maybe perhaps Japan would get arrogant and tough and cocky enough to attack us. Some said she would, some said she would not. But those who exported scrap iron in this country found an opportunity to turn junk peddlers into millionaires, and shipped and shipped scrap iron in ever-increasing amounts for the two years preceding the war, despite the fact that some Senators then, and I was among them, were touring the country saying, "This is economic nonsense. This is like playing Russian roulette. Why do we send scrap iron to Japan when we are told by the people on high that she may be attacking us soon?" Scrap iron is important to a munitions industry.

We lost the debate, and we lost 3,000 men on a Sunday morning in December 1941 at Pearl Harbor. When they picked the little pieces of metal from the bodies of those brave American men in uniform, they were picking out the scrap iron that we'd sent over in a traffic of blood—for dollars.

I never happened to be one of those who voted for FDR. That was my political prejudice, I suppose, but I want to say this about him: while he resisted our efforts to stop the shipment of scrap iron until they had attacked us at Pearl Harbor, at least let it be said for him that the next Monday morning, by Executive Order, he prohibited the shipment of anything else to Japan including scrap iron—got it done before we declared war at two o'clock that afternoon.

But now, on October 12, 1966, when we were in the fourth year of another war, pressures were applied from someplace, and our present Commander-in-Chief issued an Executive Order permitting the unlicensed and unchecked shipment of supplies to Russia, including our old friend, scrap metal. So, I say this is something new in history. Never before in a war has any Commander-in-Chief ever opened up the avenues of trade and encouraged exportation of supplies to an enemy involved in the war against us by supplying everything it takes to continue the fighting.

If that decision is wise, every previous Commander-in-Chief in American history was wrong because they always prohibited the would-be profiteers from shipping anything at all over there. That, in the main, is the issue that disturbs us. How do we convince our President, who I believe honestly must want to be convinced, that those who counsel him that you can feed and fight and defeat an enemy all at the same time, have to be wrong? How do we convince him? We tried in our awkward way in the Senate by rolling up these two to one votes—they did it in the House. But we need some outside support.

We need especially the support, if our thinking is right and if you think that it's right, of veterans who have been in wars—who understand how these supplies can be used against them; who recognize that in winning a war, it isn't just a question of killing off the other fellow, it's a question of an economic squeeze; it's a question of interdicting his lines of supply; it's a question of creating shortages so serious that he can't continue to fight, as they'd have to quit in Hanoi without, for example, petroleum.

Take the matter of anti-aircraft weapons that have been shooting down so many of our wonderful boys these days and the MIGS—200 MIGS, all of them from Russia. Over seven thousand modern anti-aircraft weapons, and within the last two or three weeks, they have improved the quality of the MIGS and the anti-aircraft weapons and have shipped in newly-trained North Vietnamese and Russian advisers to increase their accuracy. You know the result. The toll in the American Air Force gets larger.

Let me tell you one other thing. For those who would say, well, you've mentioned industrial chemicals, diamond bits and scrap metal and things of that type, but maybe out of the 440 items there are 300 items, let us say, that aren't directly or indirectly useable in making weapons. Why not ship them those? I'll tell you why I don't think we ought to ship them. The communist bloc nations are in an economic pinch, consumer-wise. Their people are getting restless. They look over the old wall between East Berlin and West Berlin and see the automobiles and the bicycles and the TV—the higher standards over there—and they creep back to their communist camp in East Berlin deprived of most of them. It's hard to keep ideas from getting across that border now. And so, in Russia, the people are getting restless; they demand more consumer goods, but their leaders are so busy providing the weapons of war for themselves, for Hanoi, for Egypt and Nasser and the Arab states—where they kicked up a side war while we were fighting the big one—that their people are getting restless. So, they have to step up the supply of consumer needs. Thus, when we ship them something, whether it's a rocking chair or a bicycle or plumbing equipment or TV sets, anything we ship the Russians to satisfy their consumer needs, we take off the pressure on their war-industrial machine. Everything we send them important enough so they'll buy it and pay for it, takes off some pressure from the manpower pool, labor, materiel stockpile, the available equipment, the production lines, so that they can divert their productive capacity has been supplying the consumer needs to the manufacturing of war supplies, thereby enabling them to step-up even further what they have been sending to Hanoi and to the Arab states and to the other areas of the world where they have been stirring up trouble, not to overlook our old friend Cuba, down by Florida. That's the practical issue that we confront: to be able to convince the President that he is wrong. I can't understand how he arrives at this conclusion, but I know something of the pressures and the pulls and the counsel he gets, and he needs something on the other side.

I can't think of a better organization in the world to provide it than The American Legion.

If you agree with the thesis that Harry Byrd and I have been trying to put across in these amendments and with that which the House has been doing, what a tremendous impact you could have on the course of the war. If we could just shut off completely everything we're shipping to the Russians and tell them, "Look chum, if you want a detente, it starts by stopping shipping supplies to our enemy. We're not asking much, not asking that you get on our side. You can spread all the propaganda that you want, but we don't like to have you sending all those MIGS and all those weapons and ground-to-ground rockets (you name it, they've shipped it) so as to prolong the war."

I want to add one other thing. There has been recently a real encouraging sign and that is the fact that there was organized a couple of months ago in the country, an entirely new organization for a specific purpose, the organization that calls itself CEASE—the "Committee to End Aid to the Soviet Enemy"—only that and nothing more. It has its headquarters down at the National Press Building in Washington. It is in the business of trying to get some ten million signatures, a pretty big target, on petitions which simply say, "We don't want any more aid to the Soviet enemy in time of war." If they get half that many I think they'll change the policy.

It's well led. The National Chairman is John Davis Lodge, a neighbor of Boston's—just up in Connecticut—a former Governor, a former Ambassador to Spain, a former Member of the House of Representatives. He and I made a trip around the world together one time when he was in the House of Representatives. He's a real fine young American; brother, of course, of Henry Cabot. John Franklin Carter is the Secretary and staff director; Bob Manuel, who used to be an investigator for the McClellan Committee, on which I serve, is the Chief Counsel. Let me tell you some of the Directors: Admiral Arleigh Burke, scarcely a pansy, scarcely somebody who doesn't know anything about war—the great and good Admiral Arleigh Burke whom I'm sure all of you admire; Admiral Arthur W. Radford, former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs. There's a man who knows about war. I suspect he's as smart as the previous Joint Chiefs and as smart as the present Joint Chiefs. He says this is an abhorrent thing, to think that we're sending boys over to an endless treadmill, while we help to supply the production lines, to send the stuff that kills them. "I want to register a protest against that," he said, and he's associated with men like former Senator William Knowland, Oakland, California publisher. They've got an old friend of yours on the Board, too; General Arthur Trudeau, former Chief of the Army Weapons Development System. And so it goes. They've organized groups in the Senate and in the House. The Senate group is led by Senator Norris Cotton of New Hampshire, and in the House by Congressman Ross Adair of Indiana.

I would hope that perhaps in conjunction with your fine Posts scattered around, you might be helpful in encouraging that fine group of American patriots to get on with their work and of producing these petitions and getting out the facts. Because, as one who has stood by the President in his courageous determination not to accept defeat, I grow more and more uncertain every day about the effectiveness of my position. I have about convinced myself this is a war we can never win as long as we insist upon providing materiel to help the communist bloc; as long as they send such an abundance of war equipment to Hanoi that it is very difficult—given the present conduct of the war—for us ever to convince Ho Chi Minh that he ought to quit.

But, because I believe we can't accept defeat, it seems to me we have to build up a collateral policy that gives us a chance to win; wars that never end are almost as bad as wars which you never win.

I appreciate this opportunity to share with you the viewpoints of Harry Byrd and me, on one of the big issues of our time.

THE INCREASING TORMENT OF THE AMERICAN CONSCIENCE ABOUT THE IMMORALITY OF U.S. ACTIONS IN VIETNAM

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, from every indication increasing numbers of Americans are being assailed by doubts as to the legality and morality of the military actions of the United States in Vietnam.

It is about time.

For 3½ years, both on the floor of the Senate and elsewhere, I have been denouncing the illegal, immoral, and unconstitutional military involvement of the United States in Vietnam.

The greatest torment of conscience faced by any American citizen is that faced by the young men drafted to fight in such a war when they believe, as I do, that the United States is the aggressor there against the Vietnamese people.

These young men face a real dilemma. Convinced as they are that the United States is fighting an immoral war in Vietnam, how can they in all good conscience join in such a fight?

This is the first time in our history that American youth have faced such a problem.

It is not a question of their patriotism or cowardice. Few of them are "draft dodgers" in the accepted sense of the word, for they would gladly fight for their country in a just war where the security of our land was truly at stake, as indeed they should.

That is not the case in Vietnam. The United States was not attacked. Rather, the United States intruded in a civil war there, which it had a large part in precipitating, and has steadily escalated its military commitment, contrary to its own national and international legal obligations, in violation of the treaties of which it was a signatory.

Recognizing the dilemma of conscience-stricken draftees, a group of concerned citizens have issued "A Call To Resist Illegitimate Authority" and have cogently stated their reasons for so doing in an advertisement published in the New Republic for October 7, 1967.

I ask unanimous consent that the advertisement be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the advertisement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Call To Resist Illegitimate Authority

To the young men of America, to the whole of the American people, and to all men of good will everywhere:

1. An ever growing number of young American men are finding that the American war in Vietnam so outrages their deepest moral and religious sense that they cannot contribute to it in any way. We share their moral outrage.

2. We further believe that the war is unconstitutional and illegal. Congress has not declared a war as required by the Constitution. Moreover, under the Constitution, treaties signed by the President and ratified by the Senate have the same force as the Constitution itself. The Charter of the United Nations is such a treaty. The Charter specifically obligates the United States to refrain from force or the threat of force in international relations. It requires member states to exhaust every peaceful means of settling disputes and to submit disputes which cannot be settled peacefully to the Security Council. The United States has systematically violated all of these Charter provisions for thirteen years.

3. Moreover, this war violates international agreements, treaties and principles of law which the United States Government has solemnly endorsed. The combat role of the United States troops in Vietnam violates the Geneva Accords of 1954 which our government pledged to support but has since subverted. The destruction of rice, crops and livestock; the burning and bulldozing of entire villages consisting exclusively of civilian structures; the interning of civilian noncombatants in concentration camps; the summary executions of civilians in captured villages who could not produce satisfactory evidence of their loyalties or did not wish to be removed to concentration camps; the slaughter of peasants who dared to stand up in their fields and shake their fists at American helicopters;—these are all actions of the kind which the United States and the other victorious powers of World War II declared to be crimes against humanity for which individuals were to be held personally responsible even when acting under the orders of their governments and for which Germans were sentenced at Nuremberg to long prison terms and death. The prohibition of such acts as war crimes was incorporated in treaty law by the Geneva Conventions of 1949, ratified by the United States. These are commitments to other countries and to Mankind, and they would claim our allegiance even if Congress should declare war.

4. We also believe it is an unconstitutional denial of religious liberty and equal protection of the laws to withhold draft exemption from men whose religious or profound philosophical beliefs are opposed to what in the Western religious tradition have been long known as unjust wars.

5. Therefore, we believe on all these grounds that every free man has a legal right and a moral duty to exert every effort to end this war, to avoid collusion with it, and to encourage others to do the same. Young men in the armed forces or threatened with the draft face the most excruciating choices. For them various forms of resistance risk separation from their families and their country, destruction of their careers, loss of their freedom and loss of their lives. Each must choose the course of resistance dictated by his conscience and circumstances. Among those already in the armed forces some are refusing to obey specific illegal and immoral orders, some are attempting to educate their fellow servicemen on the murderous and barbarous nature of the war, some are absenting themselves without official leave. Among those not in the armed forces some are applying for status as conscientious objectors to American aggression in Vietnam, some are refusing to be inducted. Among both groups some are resisting openly and paying a heavy penalty, some are organizing more resistance within the United States and some have sought sanctuary in other countries.

6. We believe that each of these forms of resistance against illegitimate authority is courageous and justified. Many of us believe that open resistance to the war and the draft is the course of action most likely to strengthen the moral resolve with which all of us can oppose the war and most likely to bring an end to the war.

7. We will continue to lend our support to those who undertake resistance to this war. We will raise funds to organize draft resistance unions, to supply legal defense and bail, to support families and otherwise aid resistance to the war in whatever ways may seem appropriate.

8. We firmly believe that our statement is the sort of speech that under the First Amendment must be free, and that the actions we will undertake are as legal as is the war resistance of the young men themselves. In any case, we feel that we cannot shrink from fulfilling our responsibilities to the

youth whom many of us teach, to the country whose freedom we cherish, and to the ancient traditions of religion and philosophy which we strive to preserve in this generation.

9. We call upon all men of good will to join us in this confrontation with immoral authority. Especially we call upon the universities to fulfill their mission of enlightenment and religious organizations to honor their heritage of brotherhood. Now is the time to resist.

A PARTIAL LIST OF SIGNERS

Nelson W. Aldrich, Jr., Edwin B. Allaire, Gar Alperovitz, Emile de Antonio, Richard Ashley, David Bakan, Richard J. Barnet, Inge Powell Bell, Rev. Philip Berrigan, S.S.J., Rev. James Bevel, Norman Birnbaum, Robert Bly, Samuel Bowles, Harry M. Bracken, Robert McAfee Brown, Robert Brustein, Henry H. Bucher, Jr., Alexander Calder, Louisa James Calder, Haydn Carruth, Jerome Charyn, Noam Chomsky, Allen Churchill.

Rev. William Sloane Coffin, Dr. Arnold M. Cooper, Robert Coover, Frederick Crews, Alfred Crown, William Davidon, Martin Davis, Jean Davidson, R. G. Davis, Stanley Diamond, Dr. James P. Dixon, Rev. Thomas Dorney, S.J., Douglas Dowd, George P. Elliott, Lawrence Ferlinghetti, W. H. Ferry, Eliot Friedson, Dr. J. W. Friedman, Norman D. Fruchter, Allen Ginsberg, Rabbi Robert E. Goldburg, Mitchell Goodman, Paul Goodman, Norman K. Gottwald, Robert Greenblatt, Balcomb Greene, Barbara Guest, John G. Gurley.

Roger T. Hagan, William Hamilton, Chester W. Hartman, Richard O. Hathaway, Jules Henry, Nat Hentoff, Edward S. Herman, Hallock Hoffman, James G. Holland, Leo Huberman, Karl Hufbauer, Dell Hymes, Christopher Jencks, Donald Kalish, Herbert Kelman, Roy C. Kepler, Fr. David Kirk, Herbert Kohl, Gabriel Kolko, Hans Koningsberger, Ivor Kraft, Jean-Claude van Itallie, Burton Lane, Christopher Lasch, Irving Laucks, Paul Lauter, Sidney Lens.

Jerome Lettvin, Denise Levertov, Jack Levine, Robert Lowell, Elliott Lieb, Walter Lowenfels, Staughton Lynd, Dwight Macdonald, Herbert Marcuse, Kenneth O. May, Arno J. Mayer, Everett Mendelsohn, Seymour Melman, Thomas Merton, Ashley Montagu, Ira Morris, Barrington Moore, Jr., Rev. Richard Mumma, Otto Nathan, Jay Neugeboren, Jack Newfield, Dr. Martin Niemoller, Michael Novak, Conor Cruise O'Brien, Carl Oglesby, Richard Ohmann.

Wayne O'Neil, Grace Paley, Victor Paschkis, Linus Pauling, Bishop James A. Pike, Richard H. Popkin, Hilary Putnam, Philip Rahv, Anatol Rapoport, Marc Raskin, Peter V. Ritner, Henry Robbins, Gordon Rogoff, Philip Roth, Muriel Rukeyser, Robert J. Rutman, Marshall Sahlins, Franz Schurman, Richard Seaver, John R. Seeley, Wilfred Sheed, Stanley K. Sheinbaum, James Shenton, Philip Siekevitz, Edgar Snow, Theodore Solotaroff, Susan Sontag.

Raphael Soyer, Dr. Benjamin Spock, Charles Stein, Grover C. Stephens, Elizabeth Sutherland, John M. Swomley, Jr., Albert Szent-Gyorgyi, Paul Sweezy, Daniel Talbot, William Taylor, Karl V. Teeter, Harold Tovish, Tomi Ungerer, William Vickrey, Gerald Walker, Immanuel Wallerstein, Brendan Walsh, James E. Walsh, Arthur Waskow, Howard Waskow, Anthony West, Gilbert White, Richard Wilbur, Sol Yurick, Robert Zevin, Paul R. Zilsel, Howard Zinn.

RIOTING AND BROADCAST COVERAGE

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, last summer, at the height of rioting and other civil disturbances throughout the country, I sent letters to the presidents of the major broadcasting networks, suggesting that the news media draw up a code of emergency procedures to be followed in covering such events. The concerns which I expressed were explored in depth in a thoughtful article written by Mr. Neil Hickey and published in the September 76 issue of TV Guide. The article is entitled "Do Cameras Add Fuel to Riot Flames?" Although the immediate danger has perhaps passed with the end of summer, the issues raised are of such continuing importance that I commend the article to all Members of Congress and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DO TV CAMERAS ADD FUEL TO RIOT FLAMES?

(NOTE.—America is taking a long, sober look at television coverage of violence in the streets.)

(By Neil Hickey)

A new law of television journalism is emerging in the atmosphere of civil protest, picketing, parades, demonstrations, labor strikes and the broad spectrum of public expression of discontent which has become a central aspect of American life in the last several years, and—more immediately—in the violent summer we have just weathered.

Stated most starkly, the law is: "Television, by its very presence, *creates* news."

Never before today has the law been more operative. Only in recent months have legislators, police officials and TV newsmen come to a suspicion of the full impact of television upon the news it is covering; of TV's power to shape events it chooses to record; of the medium's rather frightening capability of creating a cause, a public figure or a news story where—but for the cameras—none might otherwise exist.

The charge sheet against TV news is shaping up this way:

That the presence of cameras frequently transmutes a potentially violent situation into an actually violent one, and that mischief-makers often show their most troublesome selves at the sight of television crews.

That TV pictures of looting, destruction and mayhem create a contagion—far more so than radio or newspaper reports—which causes riots to feed upon themselves.

That TV stations and networks give too much time to the flashier and more vocal extremists—such as Stokely Carmichael and H. Rap Brown—whose words foster violence, and not enough to the less theatrical but saner voices of moderation.

That pressure groups of all types have become extremely "savvy" in manipulating television by staging protests and parades specifically for the cameras and thereby achieving an inflated importance for their private, special pleading.

These are only a few of the complaints—some of which have been denied by broadcasting executives—being aimed at TV news in the current controversy. TV Guide asked Detroit police commissioner Ray Girardin about the effects of television's presence in his city during this summer's terrible strife in which 43 people died. His response was firm and unequivocal: "The showing of films of scenes from riot-torn areas seemed to arouse the curiosity of hundreds of people who wanted to see for themselves what was happening. Almost immediately, the streets were crowded with curiosity-seekers hampering law-enforcement officers.

"TV could have performed a civic duty," Girardin added, "by informing people to stay away from the dangerous sections. Many innocent people were injured and some killed by snipers because they wandered into the troubled areas to see the action."

Police officials in Newark, another scene of recent strife, are similarly disturbed about TV's riot coverage: "We were very disappointed by the behavior of TV crews," a spokesman says. "Doubly so since we had called a meeting as far back as June 23 and invited about 20 news organizations—both local and national—to discuss an informal 'code of ethics' for reporting trouble, should any arise. Three attended the meeting."

Sen. John McClellan (D., Ark.) plans to include testimony on TV's riot coverage in hearings currently in progress before his Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

Congressman Torbert Macdonald (D., Mass.), chairman of the Communications Subcommittee, also is eager to call TV industry executives to Washington for hearings on the medium's capacity for exacerbating troublesome situation and creating new ones. Congressman Macdonald told us: "I'm not saying that Congress should interfere, but I wonder about the wisdom of what TV does in this area. Is it really news if one Negro gets up and shouts, 'Burn Whitey!'? I'd like to find out if the networks and stations have policies on these matters and what instructions they give their reporters."

The disturbances in the streets amount to rebellion, Macdonald added. "I'd like to know if this rebellion is being fed by television and radio. Television may have to take a share of the blame for spreading dangerous doctrines. I'd like to find out what steps they're taking to live up to their responsibility to their audiences."

Sen. Hugh Scott (*R., Pa.*) entered the controversy on Aug. 2 with a statement that he was "greatly concerned about the newspaper and radio and television coverage of the recent riots and civil disturbances throughout the country. I believe that the news media, in many instances, inadvertently contributed to the turmoil."

That salvo elicited return fire from all three networks. Dr. Frank Stanton, president of CBS, Inc., insisted that "so far as the news presented over our radio and television networks . . . goes, I can find no evidence that this is true. On the contrary, there is considerable evidence that the exact opposite is the case." At the same time Stanton admitted that "serious problems" attend television's handling of civil disorder and that his own news officials had been duly warned of the "unsettling effect on a stimulated crowd that the presence of cameras may have."

NBC president Julian Goodman echoed Stanton's disfavor of any "code of emergency procedure" (as suggested by *Scott*) that might impinge upon TV's freedom to cover the news as it sees fit. ". . . A code cannot exercise judgment," said Goodman. "It cannot foresee all the variables in the fast-breaking events with which newsmen must deal."

Another quick response to *Scott's* statement came from James C. Hagerty, vice president of American Broadcasting Companies. In a "Dear Hugh" letter, Hagerty defended his network's news practices while adding that the whole subject has "been a matter of continuing concern to all of us here. . . . The danger that news coverage can influence or inflame an event is foremost in our thoughts."

Other criticism of TV news has come from pundits and private-interest groups. Columnist Max Lerner says: "Americans seem to have struck a Faustian bargain with the big media, by which they have received total and instant coverage and have in turn handed themselves over to the vulnerable chances of crowd psychology and of instant infection."

Henry Lee Moon, public relations chief of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People told TV GUIDE: Negroes have generally been unhappy about the way television has played their affairs. It's damaging to the cause of civil rights to give a forum to somebody shouting 'Kill Whitey' and cast him as a Negro leader when he represents no substantial part of the Negro population."

TV newsmen are as sensitive as anybody else to such dangers. ABC News executive William Sheehan says that he thinks "it's no coincidence that the flourishing of the civil-rights movement has occurred at the same time that television news has reached the point where every evening it literally saturates the country with reports on world happenings."

Another TV executive recalls that during the AFTRA strike of last March, when TV reporters were idle for two weeks, a sharp diminution in protests and picketing for peace and other causes was apparent. "Nothing seemed to be happening," he says. Then the TV news directors realized that—in the absence of cameras—the protestors had concluded it was pointless to mount a protest.

TV people become aware of their own influence in a variety of ways. Cindy Adams, a glamorous reporter for WABC–TV in New York, recalls the time she accepted a telephone call in her newsroom and was informed that a private group planned a demonstration at the Dominican Republic's UN mission headquarters to protest U.S. involvement in that country's affairs. "Can you cover it?" asked the lady caller.

"Well, I'm not sure," Cindy said. "How many of you will there be?"

"How many do you need?" the woman answered.

A bit startled, Cindy replied that it wasn't exactly her place to say. "What time will you be demonstrating?" the reporter then asked.

"Maybe right away. That suit you?"

"Well, we have no crews here right now," said Cindy.

"We'll have as many marchers as you want out there any time you say," the caller assured her. WABC did indeed cover the demonstration, moving Cindy Adams to recall recently: "That woman knew what she was doing, she was savvy in the ways of TV news." An increasing number of social and political activists are learning that it is impossible to manipulate TV news to their own interests."

Similarly, TV people have been known to attempt the manipulation of an incipient news story to *their* own interests. When James Meredith was testing the University of Mississippi's exclusion policy, a potentially volatile situation grew out of the student body's tension and anger over his presence. A TV reporter from a Southwestern station drove onto the campus one day, hoping for some exciting newsfilm, and was disappointed that the students' mood seemed taut but controlled. He leaned from his car and shouted to a group of them: "Hey! Where's the action? I heard there was *action* going on around here!"

That triggered them. First, they turned the newsman's car over and burned it, sending him scrambling; the violence spread from there. At the end of it, two men were dead.

Many observers are sure that TV news (as well as newspapers) fanned the embers which erupted into the bitter riots of the Harlem and Bedford-Stuyvesant section of New York in the summer of 1964. During spring and early summer, almost daily interviews with "Negro leaders" predicting a holocaust were visible on television. Many of these men were spokesmen without a following, ambitious activists eager for exposure. But their words created an air of tension and expectancy, convincing the ghetto dwellers that violence was indeed imminent. Nobody was surprised when it came.

In Los Angeles in 1965, mobile TV vans moved into riot areas of Watts and showed live pictures of looting even before the police had arrived. A police official remembers: "Television served as a terrific guide for potential looters who wanted to know where to go for some action."

Still, there's no gainsaying that TV reporters as a class are well aware of the effect of their presence on an evolving story. We asked a number of network correspondents—experienced in coverage of street demonstrations—for their thoughts:

Tom Jarriel, ABC: "There's no doubt that a camera causes pickets to act up more vigorously. They know the power of TV exposure; all these people want their story told. The camera is an attraction. The problem is to keep it from becoming a bigger story than the one you're covering.

"We often leave our cameras on the seat of the car and stand to one side while a situation is developing. When something actually happens, we film it."

Jarriel feels that the TV presence also can have a moderating influence. "I doubt that James Meredith would have completed his most recent march in Mississippi unmolested if the cameras hadn't been there. People didn't heckle him; they stayed away so as not to cause a major incident on nationwide TV."

John Laurence, CBS: "More trouble is caused by young and inexperienced wire-service reporters than by TV men. They can make a quick phone call and in minutes a bulletin is going out on their wires. The presence of a TV camera often tends more to keep a situation honest than to aggravate it. If a camera is on a policeman and his prisoner, chances are the policeman won't beat the prisoner and the prisoner won't attack the policeman."

Don Oliver, NBC: "Once a public disturbance has begun, cameras have very little effect on its progress, but in the early stages—where the possibility for violence exists—the sight of a TV crew can have a bad effect. Police and TV people work well together most of the time; but as a riot goes into its third or fourth day, the police get edgy and angry and start feeling that the cameras are drawing attention to them."

Bill Matney, NBC: "Cameras have very little effect while a disturbance is actually going on. In Detroit, I interviewed two fellows while they were actually looting, and later filmed their arrest. On one day, while whole sections of the city were going up in smoke, the TV people refrained from reporting it so as not to make it worse. That was an independently-arrived-at decision by the local stations."

CBS's Midwest bureau manager, Dan Bloom, had the job of setting up that network's riot coverage in a number of cities during the summer. "It boils down to the fact that the equipment is sometimes a magnet," he says. "But our policy is simple. If a reporter has any suspicion that a performance is going on just for the camera, we immediately pack up and move away. This is rigidly enforced. On the other hand, if you have a peaceful demonstration that goes on for 60 minutes and a bomb is thrown in the last two minutes, where is the story? We'd be remiss if we didn't put that part of the action on the air. We make a very deliberate attempt at setting the proper balance."

Before this past summer, many TV newsmen were understandably reluctant to admit television's influence on evolving news, but the proliferation of protests and riots, as well as the thoughtful criticism of lawmakers and private citizens, are forcing the subject onto center stage, where it must now be examined in full public view, and some firm conclusions arrived at. CBS News president Richard S. Salant, for example, admits, "It is certainly true that a great many events—almost all except tornadoes—are, at least to some degree, designed in time or in place or even in nature for *all* of the mass media . . . But our job is to report news, not to shape it."

And there are no easy, self-executing rules applicable to all situations, Salant adds. "We know that one cannot simply ignore these events because indeed they *are* news. And we have come to the conclusion, then, that the wise policy is a policy of restraint and awareness of what the problems are."

For the last several years, the U.S. Justice Department's Community Relations Service has been working quietly in cities across the country getting TV people together with police officials and helping them agree on voluntary guidelines for the reporting of civil disorders. Together, they've come up with solid recommendations aimed at keeping good order in the streets while not raising the ugly specter of censorship. Scores of TV stations have agreed to:

Hold off reporting mass violence until police establish some modicum of control.

Use unmarked cars, hand-held cameras, no bright lights, and expose the cameras to public view only when there's something to film.

Avoid reporting rumors, trivia and wild statements.

Use command posts set up by police in strife areas as clearinghouses for news breaks, and not cruise about the streets aimlessly.

Refrain from using the word "riot" unless there's simply no other word to describe what's happening.

The networks and many local stations try to do many of these things out of common sense, and not from official nudging. But it's apparent that no guidelines nor agreements can replace the dispassion and detachment of a seasoned TV newsman who is determined to convey—soberly and untheatrically—the full sense of a public disorder; whose eye is not upon competing newsmen nor on the aggrandizement of his own reputation; and who is sensitive to the effect of his words upon an anxious audience.

A part of television's difficulty in this area is inherent in the nature of the medium and will never be absolved altogether. But the opinion is now abroad that networks and stations must do a great deal more than they're doing to ensure that the medium 1) does not alter the shape of events it touches and 2) does not let itself be manipulated by the show-business appeal of special pleaders.

It is apparent that the adaptation of rigid "codes" is not the answer. But, if, indeed, television's self-generating potential for news is an operative unwritten "law" of broadcast journalism, it is a law in need of prompt and drastic—unwritten but nonetheless effective—amendment.

RATS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the September 1967 issue of Reader's Digest contains an article entitled "Most Destructive Creature on Earth"—the common rat.

In view of certain recent debates about whether funds should be appropriated for rat control legislation, the article is most pertinent and timely. It points out:

> Everywhere he goes, the rat spreads contamination. He is a health menace as deadly as a nuclear warhead. Rats carry as many as 35 different diseases . . . In the United States last year, the Food and Drug Administration was forced to destroy 417,000 pounds of rodent-damaged contaminated foods.
>
> (And) in India . . . overall losses of grain from rats (is estimated) at 25 percent of the crop in the field plus an additional 25 to 30 percent in storage.

I do not believe we can continue to ignore this problem in the hope that it will go away.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOST DESTRUCTIVE CREATURE ON EARTH

(By Fred Warshofsky)

Two rats cross the henhouse floor toward the nests. There one seizes an egg between its forepaws and rolls onto its back. The other takes hold of the eggsnatcher's tail and drags him, egg protectively clutched to his bosom, back to their den—where they enjoy the egg's contents together. This story, though it may be more myth than fact, has been told, with slight variations, since the 13th century.

Save for man himself, the rat is probably at once the cleverest, most destructive and adaptable animal on the face of the earth. From near the frozen arctic to the blazing desert, this animal, with its remarkable instinct for survival, has not only survived man but at times threatened him with extinction; rat-borne diseases may have killed more people than all of the wars in history.

Of the more than 550 species of rats, most live in forests, fields and jungles, far from civilization. But eons ago, a few species made a historic decision: to link their destinies with that of man. They went where man went, ate what he ate, learned his ways and became more domesticated than even the horse or cow.

By the Middle Ages, Europe was overrun by *Rattus rattus*, the black rat or roof rat. Then, according to legend, an enormous horde of another species—the brown rat—appeared out of the east in 1727, swam the Volga River, and inundated Europe. Shortly afterward, they arrived in England, where they were given the name *Rattus norvegicus*, Norway rat. Both species came to America by ship, *rattus* with the Pilgrims, *norvegicus* about 1775. Heavily built, with small ears and a thick tail that is shorter than the length of his body, a Norway male may weigh as much as a pound and measure nine inches in length, not counting the tail. By contrast, *rattus* is more delicate, with large ears and a long, slender tail. He rarely weighs as much as two thirds of a pound.

So fierce has been the assault of the Norway rat that his smaller cousin is now limited mostly to port cities and southern climes. Unlike *rattus*, which can dance up wires to enter buildings several stories above the ground, the Norway rat is a burrower and can squeeze through openings one and a half inches square or swim half a mile through flooded sewers to surface in someone's house through the plumbing.

Rats are social animals and live in colonies. In laboratory experiments, if a strange adult male is placed in a pen containing a colony he will be attacked. But this is not a fight in the human sense. A colony rat arches his back and leaps, moving his forelimbs and often nipping at the invader's ears and tail. The stranger never retaliates; and the bites are not effective because of the rat's thick skin. After a few such "bouts," each lasting only a few seconds, the invader is often left stretched out limply, breathing rapidly and irregularly. Anywhere from 90 minutes to a few days after these seemingly futile attacks, the invader usually dies. No organic cause, no serious wound or internal bleeding has yet been discovered to explain the death.

Although a caged rat could live to a doddering old age of three years, wild rats ordinarily live only about nine months, almost never more than two years. They can breed any month of the year. The number of babies in a litter is generally five to ten, but litters as high as 17 have been recorded. Under ideal conditions, a single one estimate, 350 million descendants in three years! Exterminators have used every poison known; yet, even with kill rates of 95 percent, the rat population of a given area seems to replace itself within about a year.

The rat is a driven animal—driven by his teeth. His chisel-bladed incisors, which appear eight or ten days after birth, begin to grow immediately at a rate of five inches a year. They must be continually filed down by chewing; if an upper tooth is lost or knocked out of line, the bottom one opposite the gap may grow through the upper jaw and pierce the brain. Rats have created pocket blackouts in New York City by gnawing through the lead sheathing of electric cables. On a gnawing spree in a warehouse, a rat may tear into and burrow through dozens of sacks in an hour—flour, grain, feed, coffee, anything.

Everywhere he goes, the rat spreads contamination. He is a health menace as deadly as a nuclear warhead. Rats carry as many as 35 different diseases. Their fleas spread bubonic plague, which killed at least one out of every three persons in Europe in the 14th century and is still endemic in the Far East and Africa. It has stricken at least 4000 people in South Vietnam since the American involvement began. The fleas also carry typhus. Epidemic for four centuries, this disease has killed at least 200 million people.

But plague and typhus are not all. The rat's foraging habits take him from sewer to warehouse to home, tracking disease germs every step of the way. His habit of urinating and leaving droppings wherever he goes provides him with an enormous capability and range for contamination, for in his blood and intestines are organisms that cause amebic dysentery, tularemia, salmonellosis, jaundice, rabies, and other killer diseases. His droppings cause almost unbelievable damage. In the United States last year, the Food and Drug Administration was forced to destroy 417,000 pounds of rodent-contaminated foods.

Countries that can least afford the loss of food suffer the most. In India, *rattus* and *norvegicus* are joined by a particularly destructive field rat. There, Dr. H. A. B. Parpia, director of the Central Food Technological Research Institute at Mysore, estimates overall losses of grain from rats at 25 percent of the crop in the field plus an additional 25 to 30 percent in storage. During a two-year period, one expert declared, upward of half of the cornmeal exported from the United States to Brazil for a school-lunch program was contaminated en route by rats.

Although the rat does have dietary preferences, he will eat an incredible variety of food. On the other hand, nature has equipped him with a special characteristic which aids greatly in his survival. On his own hunting grounds, anything new, such as poison bait, is instinctively avoided. After the strange food has been ignored for a while, however, it becomes familiar, and the rat samples it in minute amounts. If it is poisoned, the ill effects of a small dose may be noted without lethal consequence. Whereupon the rat stops feeding completely and may sprinkle the food with his urine or feces to warn other members of the pack.

Amazing tales of rat intelligence abound. Indeed, in some cases, the rat seems almost to qualify for the anthropologist's definition of man: a tool maker. C. A. W. Monckton, a New Guinea magistrate, tells of spending a night on what was a seemingly lifeless coral atoll in the Trobriand Islands. He was kept awake most of the night by rats crawling over him. Next morning, he scouted the area trying to find what it was on that barren island that could support such a large rat colony. He saw no sign of fruit, nuts, insects or other food.

"Then," said Monckton, "I noticed some rats going down to the edge of the reef—lank, hungry-looking brutes with pink, naked tails. There, at the edge of the coral, rat after rat dangled his tail in the water. Suddenly, one rat gave a violent leap of about a yard and, as he landed, I saw a crab clinging to his tail. Turning around, the rat grabbed the crab and devoured it, then returned to his perch. Meanwhile, other rats were repeating the same performance."

Half a century ago, an English zoologist wrote, "The rat is probably the most injurious and universal pest of the human race. It does not appear to have a single redeeming feature." In one small sense, the writer was wrong. Though man has not been able to conquer the wild rat, he has bred from him the white-furred, red-eyed laboratory rat—one of the vital biological weapons in our scientific arsenal. No one knows how many lives have been saved by drugs developed and tested on laboratory rats, by surgical procedures tried first on rats, by new insights gained into man's life processes through study of the biology of the laboratory rat. Thus, the hated rat may at last be paying man back for some of the death and destruction it has caused.

MR. MILLS MAKES A POINT

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in today's Wall Street Journal, the lead editorial, "Mr. MILLS Makes a Point," is an excellent commentary on the present conflict between the administration and Congress over the proposed spending cuts and the proposed tax increase.

However, one paragraph in the editorial states:

> One of the more discouraging aspects of the current situation, in fact, is that almost everyone in government, from the President on down, has frequently spelled out the need for better budgetary control. Up to now, though, no one has done much toward that aim.

I would invite the writer of that editorial to review the record and note that under the leadership of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], joined by, as I recall, more than half of the Members of the Senate as cosponsors, in each of the last several Congresses the Senate has passed a bill to establish a Joint Committee on the Budget, only to find that it has been pigeonholed in the House of Representatives. So far as the Senate is concerned, I believe that this indicates that somebody has been trying to do something on this point.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Oct. 10, 1967]

MR. MILLS MAKES A POINT

The House Ways and Means Committee certainly startled the Administration last week when it voted to pigeonhole the proposed tax increase. Chairman Wilbur Mills, however, is fearful that the committee's message was not fully understood.

Obviously enough, the Ways and Means group does want the Administration to outline immediate cuts in spending. Yet, as Mr. Mills stressed, that objective is less important than progress toward keeping outlays under reasonable control in the future.

The Arkansas Democrat's concern may have been increased by the fact that the Administration's only important move toward lower spending recently has been a temporary freeze on several projects considered nonessential. Desirable as delays may be in these and other cases, they do nothing to limit the long-run outlay figures.

If Rep. Mills and other economy-minded Congressmen accept a few temporary spending cuts as evidence of Administration good faith, and then approve a tax boost, the very real danger is that outlays would grow enough to eat up any added revenues. The budget thus would be as badly out of kilter as ever and inflation would be very much with us; sooner or later, demands would be heard for still another tax increase.

To avert such a development, says Mr. Mills, Congress and the Administration must do some determined weeding among Federal programs.

"All of us know only too well," he declared, "that the present budget contains programs that may have lost their justification, and that we are called upon to approve others and vote vast sums for their operation without having any information about what their current objectives are and how well they are performing them or are likely to in the future."

One of the more discouraging aspects of the current situation, in fact, is that almost everyone in Government, from the President on down, has frequently spelled out the need for better budgetary control. Up to now, though, no one has done much toward that aim.

The basic changes needed are simple and sensible: Once the Government decides what it would like to do it should take a realistic look at available resources and then set hard priorities. Moreover, the Government should consider a number of approaches to any spending project, selecting the one that promises to deliver the most for the least cost. Finally, both the Administration and Congress must constantly check on existing programs, scrapping or revamping those that aren't doing the job.

As the Committee for Economic Development suggested some time ago, better fiscal control probably would call for beefed-up and better-coordinated budget staffs in the departments and agencies. The Budget Bureau quite possibly should also have greater power to ride herd on the agencies' requests and to review accomplishments or lack of same.

Then, too, Congress should have a chance to consider the budget in its entirety instead of piecemeal as the appropriations requests trickle in. The budget should also be broken down by programs so that it would be easier to spot the oft-occurring duplication of efforts among the multitude of agencies.

There are many other changes that are long overdue. As noted in these columns recently, the accounting practices of several agencies are sadly deficient, even by Federal standards. Perhaps, as the CED has proposed, the General Accounting Office should run regular audits of all the agencies.

Neither Mr. Mills nor anyone else is under any illusion that the Federal budget can be brought firmly under control overnight; there are, for one thing, too many political pressures for retaining the status quo. But he clearly sees that temporary spending cuts offer the economy no better sanctuary than a spot in the eye of a hurricane.

If the Administration doesn't get that idea, too, it will have missed the whole point of Mr. Mills' protest and set the stage for further financial deterioration.

THE OTEPKA CASE

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in the October 4 issue of the Des Moines Register appeared an article by the distinguished reporter Clark Mollenhoff on the Otto Otepka case, in which it is pointed out that in the brief filed in behalf of Mr. Otepka by his attorney, Mr. Robb, there is brought out the fact that there were 18 cases of major laxity in the State Department so far as security clearances are concerned.

Mr. President, one of the root causes of the Otepka case was the use of the emergency clearance procedure by the State Department. Revelations of the type that appear in this article cause a loss of confidence by the general public and the State Department, the vast majority of whose employees are dedicated, efficient, hardworking public servants. It is fortunate that there are public servants such as Mr. Otto Otepka who are willing to run the risk of abuse and personal hardship for the sake of the security of our country, but it is unfortunate, and worthy of condemnation, that it was necessary for him to do so.

I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLAIMS STATE DEPARTMENT CONDONED SEX SCANDALS—OTEPKA CITES 18 CASES OF MAJOR LAXITY—RAKES PROGRESSIVE ATTITUDE ON SECURITY

(By Clark Mollenhoff)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The State Department has approved or condoned major laxity by foreign service officers including homosexuality, deliberate hiding or security violations and the delivery of classified information to Communists, according to a brief filed with State Department hearing officer Edward Dragon.

The allegations of "progressive" and "lax" security procedures are made by Attorney Roger Robb in defense of Otto F. Otepka, the former chief security evaluator for the State Department who is fighting an ouster action.

It is contended in Robb's brief that Otepka refused to bend to the political expediency of the Kennedy administration or to conform to what was called "progressive," forward-looking security policies, and thus became the target of a "get Otepka" drive.

In defending Otepka against a charge of "insubordination" filed by former Deputy Assistant Secretary of State John F. Reilly, Robb has painted a sordid picture of sex scandals and general laxity that it is claimed were approved and condoned by high political officials of the John F. Kennedy administration.

The charge of insubordination is based on the fact that Otepka gave three State Department documents to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee to prove that he was telling the truth about laxity in security matters under Reilly, a Kennedy appointee.

EIGHTEEN CASES

The Otepka brief outlines at least 18 cases of alleged laxity based on sworn testimony by Otepka in a still-secret hearing, together with testimony and documents given to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

The alleged cases include the following 14:

1. A foreign service officer who sexually violated his own daughter but was never disciplined, and in fact later was designated a part-time security officer at a post that did not have a full-time security man.

2. A foreign service officer who borrowed money from the State Department Credit Union and forged the endorsement of a fellow employe on his application for the loan. The individual later was given an important assignment in the White House.

3. A foreign service officer who admitted he furnished 18 documents, some of them classified "secret," to Philip Jaffe, the publisher of Amerasia magazine and on whom there was a considerable record of Communist activities and affiliation. The officer was permitted to take an honorable retirement with pension.

4. A security division technician who went on drunken rampages at several embassies in foreign countries and whose misconduct was condoned and covered up by Reilly. Reports of the misconduct actually were kept out of the personnel file.

5. A security officer stationed in Athens, Greece, who failed to report a large number of security violations yet was appointed deputy chief of the Division of Security Evaluations at the State Department.

6. A person nominated by President Kennedy for a high position who publicly assaulted his wife and threw her clothing on the lawn, shrubbery and street. The information was ordered eliminated from the personnel record by a "progressive" security officer who said such details of a public family fight had nothing to do with security or suitability of a high public official.

7. A man dismissed as a security risk by the Mutual Security Agency and characterized as having "a rotten file," who was appointed to a State Department position and given full security clearance.

8. A foreign service officer stationed in Mexico and Caracas, Venezuela, who was guilty of a series of incidents of sexual misconduct, including an affair with the wife of the ambassador of another nation. His conduct was excused by State Department politicians.

9. A security officer who withheld information from his superiors concerning the loss of classified documents by an American ambassador. The officer was not censured and was promoted to be a top lieutenant of Reilly.

10. A security officer stationed in Moscow who permitted himself to be enticed into the apartment of a Russian woman, an agent for the secret police. The secret police used concealed cameras to photograph the American and his nude companion and tried to get him to spy for the Soviet Union. He never was criticized or disciplined.

11. A foreign service officer who admitted to security officers and State Department medical authorities that he had engaged in homosexual acts. The medical officers found him unfit to serve abroad because in their judgment his homosexual tendencies made him a potential security risk. He was sent abroad, however, and was assigned to a critical post behind the Iron Curtain.

12. A foreign service officer who, on his application form and in interviews, concealed the fact that he had been a member of the Young Communist League and the Communist Party. He was not disciplined and still is employed in the State Department.

13. A foreign service officer stationed in an eastern European post who admitted homosexual tendencies and other personal misconduct but who was given responsibility for supervising the Marine guard personnel and protecting all safe combinations at the American embassy. His negligence permitted foreign agents to have access to classified reports at the embassy. He was not disciplined and received normal promotion. He still is in the State Department.

14. A foreign service officer, formerly a security officer, who owned two automobiles but was authorized to have only one shipped to a new post at government expense. He had the second automobile concealed in a lift van and represented it on the invoice as a household furnishing. His case was referred to the Department of Justice for prosecution for fraud, but there was no prosecution and he was not disciplined.

These cases, with names and full details, were among those cited by Otepka in the record of the still-secret hearing to demonstrate a pattern of laxity that allegedly was developing under the so-called "progressive" attitude on security introduced by the Kennedy administration.

INFURIATED OFFICIALS

It was such testimony that infuriated Reilly and other State Department officials. Later, Otepka's room was bugged, his telephone wiretapped and his office safes broken open and searched.

Among the most sensitive cases on which Otepka declined to budge was that of Walt Whitman Rostow, now an assistant to President Johnson in charge of national security affairs. The Eisenhower administration on three occasions made adverse rulings on Rostow on ground that he was a possible security risk.

The White House declined Tuesday to discuss the Rostow matter, except to state that all White House personnel have been subjected to periodic reviews since Mr. Johnson became president and that Rostow is in good standing by present standards.

The Kennedy administration did not try to get Rostow cleared by either the State Department, where Otepka was chief security evaluator, or by the Defense Department, where there had been an adverse ruling by the Air Force. Instead, Rostow was hired by the White House where security decisions could be made by the President or his designate without regard for agency precedent.

George Christian, White House press secretary, said Tuesday that Kenneth O'Donnell, then an aide to President Kennedy, was in charge of security in 1961 when Rostow was first brought into government.

The Otepka briefs revealing the Eisenhower administration rulings against Rostow in 1955 and 1957 gave no indication of the nature of the derogatory information.

THE POSITIVE SIDE OF THE VIETNAMESE WAR

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in a very lucid lead editorial, the Wall Street Journal of Tuesday, September 26, sets out the case for the United States being in Vietnam.

It declares:

> If the war is being fought to contain Communist China and to stabilize non-Communist Asia—and we have always thought it is—then there is no lack of evidence it is helping to accomplish its overriding purpose.

The editorialist warns that "any decision that the price has become too high" should be made after deliberate and sober calculation—not from a "fit of national despair."

I believe the editorial merits the attention of the Senate and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE POSITIVE SIDE

The positive side of the Vietnamese war is outside Vietnam.

That side may be worth a brief look, if simply because in some quarters American anxiety over the war is approaching panic proportions. In any event, Vietnam never was important as a piece of real estate; the relevant question is whether the war there promotes U.S. security by reducing instability throughout Asia. A number of commentators have recently concluded it does.

"One of the generally unrealized benefits of the war in Vietnam," writes respected Asian correspondent Robert Shaplen in the current issue of Foreign Affairs, "has been an awareness on the part of Asian leaders—as best expressed so far by Singapore's Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew—that the United States has bought time in Vietnam for the rest of Southeast Asia to get together and avoid another Vietnam.

The nations of non-Communist Asia are in fact putting that time to good use, as Richard M. Nixon writes in the same magazine. Partly out of confidence drawn from the U.S. stand in Vietnam, for instance, they have started regional cooperation in the new Asian and Pacific Council. There is obvious truth in Mr. Nixon's conclusion that Asia is undergoing "an extraordinarily promising transformation."

The leading example of the new trend in Asia was the Communist debacle in Indonesia, and both of these commentators believe the American presence in Vietnam played an indirect but important part. Mr. Nixon says it "provided a shield behind which the anti-Communist forces found the courage and capacity to stage their countercoup." In the New York Times Book Review, Mr. Shaplen writes that the Communist coup failed in Indonesia largely because it was staged several years ahead of its originally planned date, and that its timetable was advanced because of the unexpected U.S. resolution in Vietnam.

Even more important, the Vietnamese war may be taking its toll of mainland China's ambitions. "By frustrating the 'people's war' which Mao Tse-tung proclaims invincible, the American effort in Vietnam has cast doubt on every aspect of (Mao's) doctrine," China-watcher Robert S. Elegant writes in the Los Angeles Times. "The anti-Maoists do not wish to pursue a policy which would put them on a collision course with the United States. They have learned from American resolution that we are no 'paper tiger.' "

Mr. Elegant adds, "If the Chinese had attained possession of a formidable nuclear arsenal in the early 1970s still believing themselves invincible and still determined to liberate the entire world, a nuclear conflict would have been most likely." The ongoing shift in their attitude "already has reduced the danger of a nuclear confrontation and may prove highly beneficial for both China and the rest of the world."

No run of favorable events in the rest of Asia, of course, would necessarily vindicate everything that has been done in the war. The benefits are those of a resolute stand, which might have been accomplished elsewhere at less terrible cost. Indeed, China might have fallen of her own weight even if the U.S. had abstained from Asia.

For that matter, the trends the above analysts cite do not necessarily dictate continuing the war forever and at whatever cost. The benefits must be weighed against their price. Within Vietnam no end is yet in sight, and America cannot be expected to cope indefinitely with the drain on its young men, its resources and its social fabric.

Any decision that the price has become too high, though, should come only from sober calculation. It should not come from a fit of national despair, however understandable those periodic seizures may be. For despair sees only the obvious, which is the immediate sacrifice involved in continuing the war. It overlooks the less immediate but nonetheless real sacrifice involved in any settlement which risks reversing the current trends in Asia.

Even a successful conclusion of the war will certainly not usher in a millennium, but it is myopic to conclude it can accomplish nothing at all. If the war is being fought to contain Communist China and to stabilize non-Communist Asia—and we have always thought it is—then there is no lack of evidence it is helping to accomplish its overriding purpose.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10509) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 9, 31, 37, and 67 to the bill, and concurred therein severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate, and that the House insisted on its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 43, 56, and 63 to the bill.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, AND THE JUDICIARY AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 556, H.R. 10345.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 10345) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I have a few brief remarks to make in connection with the pending bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968.

I believe it is a fairly good bill. The amounts recommended for the various departments and related agencies are, in my judgment, considered sufficient to meet the estimated expenditures for fiscal 1968. This is particularly true in view of the fact that the activities have been operating under the concurrent resolution for the past 3 months and that the allowances recommended for the items are sufficient to cover so-called mandatory increases and will provide for ongoing programs from 1967.

As the report indicates, the amount of the bill is $2,185,870,500. It is $161,932,695 under the total budget estimates considered by the committee. That is a reduction of around 9 percent under the budget. Hearings were held over a period of 9 days and were confined mainly to requests aggregating $79,805,000 above the House allowance. The committee concluded that $20,998,000 of the overall request was justified and also that decreases totaling $29,154,000 were valid in other items, thereby effecting an $8,156,000 reduction below the House bill.

Included in the Senate allowance is the sum of $3,550,000 that was not considered by the House but involved or was covered by supplemental budget estimates submitted direct to the Senate, and included in this supplemental allowance were two items which the committee considered were well justified, namely, $2,500,000 to permit the State Department to finance the emergency evacuation costs of American citizens from the disturbed areas of the Middle East and Africa, and $1,000,000 for the Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice, for expenses to carry out title 2 of the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966.

The first of these items, which is $2,500,000, could not be anticipated at the time the original budget was submitted because the crisis in the Middle East had not developed at that time. Therefore, when it came it created an emergency and this money had to be expended.

A brief summary of items considered to be of special interest to the Members follows:

For the State Department, the committee added $3,905,000. Included in this sum was $980,000 to provide $300,000 for additional personnel in the Passport Office, $500,000 for overseas wage and price increases, and $100,000 to wind up tariff negotiation activities in Geneva. Also allowed was $260,000 to complete the financing of the channel relocation of the Rio Grande at El Paso, Tex., as authorized in the Chamizal settlement; $165,000 for the International Fisheries Commissions; and $2,500,000 to provide for the emergency evacuation costs as mentioned above. For the mutual educational and cultural exchange activities the committee considered the House allowance of $46 million as sufficient to mount the various programs of the agency in fiscal 1968, and increased the foreign currency limitation from $23.5 million to $25 million, as testimony indicated this amount could be utilized by the agency.

For the Department of Justice, the committee approved $1,000,000 for the Bureau of Prisons to carry out the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966, and reduced the House allowance from $10 million to $7.5 million for expenses of the law enforcement assistance programs for fiscal 1968. It was the considered judgment of the committee that such allowance was sufficient to carry out the programs in 1968. The committee recommendation of $7.5 million is $250,000 over the amount appropriated for 1967. I would like to state also the fact that the Congress is now considering legislation which could absorb the existing program of the Law Enforcement Act of 1968.

(At this point, Mr. HOLLINGS took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, for the Department of Commerce, the committee has recommended changes in nine of the appropriations allowed by the House. These changes, resulting in a decrease of $10,097,000, are detailed in the committee report beginning at page 15. Eight of the nine items concern modest increases totaling $14,903,000, whereas one item in the amount of $25 million represents a decrease from $95 million to $70 million in the appropriation for the Appalachian development highway program. The committee found that the lesser sum, $70 million, together with the carryover funds from fiscal 1967, was sufficient to finance projects approved through June 30, 1968.

Included in the committee increases for the Commerce Department are the following items believed to be of significance to the Members.

For the U.S. Travel Service the committee added $1,000,000 to provide a total of $4,000,000 for operations in fiscal 1968. This is the same allowance as provided for in 1967 and although it is $700,000 under the budget request, it was considered ample to finance the on-going programs in the promotion of tourism to the United States.

For the Environmental Science Services Administration the committee recommended a total increase of $9,353,000 over the House allowance in the appropriations for salaries and expenses, research and development, and facilities, equipment, and construction. Included in this sum are funds for the worldwide seismological network, the full request for hurricane and tornado, agriculture weather, and fire weather, as well as funds for the nationwide natural disaster warning system. Some funds were also provided for expansion of the aviation weather service in the Rocky Mountain region and priority items in the marine environment activities. In allowing the increases in the three appropriation items for ESSA, consideration was given to the priority of appeal items presented by the Department and the savings due to the restrictions of operations in the continuing resolution.

For the Office of State Technical Services the committee approved $8 million, an increase of $1,500,000 over the House allowance but a reduction of $3 million under the 1968 request. The allowance, however, is $2,500,000 over the 1967 appropriation, or an increase of approximately 30 percent. The allowance appeared to be ample for a program of grants to State-designated agencies engaged in the promotion of economic growth in the State by placing the findings of science in the hands of American enterprise.

For the Judiciary the committee made a net decrease of $50,000 in the sum total of appropriations. This decrease was reflected in two of the items; namely, a decrease of $100,000 in the appropriation for fees of jurors and commissioners, offset in part by an increase allowed for the customs court of $50,000, a new item presented direct to the Senate because of an increased caseload of the court.

I would commend the Members' attention to page 25 of the report for the Judiciary. The committee expressed a grave concern with the congested calendar conditions and long delays in the disposition of several criminal cases in certain of the courts of the Federal system and urged that steps be taken to alleviate such conditions. The committee felt that the judges in the courts affected could have longer court hours and shorter vacations, and if additional personnel were needed in this regard, the committee would be receptive to a request for a supplemental estimate.

For the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency the committee recommended $9,500,000, an increase of $500,000 over the House allowance and last year's appropriation. Although the allowance is $500,000 below the budget request, it was considered sufficient for planned program operations and contract research in fiscal 1968.

For salaries and expenses of the U.S. Information Agency the committee allowed $157,119,000, an increase of $640,000 above the House recommendation. Here again, the allowance was considered sufficient for expenses of the Agency to carry out its planned programs in fiscal 1968, and for the special foreign currency program of the salaries and expense item, the committee provided $8,604,000, a reduction of $1,554,000 from the House allowance. The Agency advised the reduced amount would be sufficient to meet expenses payable in foreign currencies, which the Treasury Department determined to be excess to normal requirements, in fiscal 1968.

For the Subversive Activities Control Board the committee recommends $295,000. This sum is $35,000 under the 1968 estimate and is the same amount allowed by the House. On July 24, 1967, the Senate passed Senate Resolution 145. This resolution directed the Committee on Appropriations, or a duly authorized subcommittee thereof, to investigate the functions and duties of this Board and to include in its report on the bill now pending its findings and recommendations. These are set forth in the committee report at pages 32 and 33. Also, testimony on this matter will be found at pages 1020 through 1077 of the hearings.

After full consideration of this problem, the committee believes that the withholding of appropriations for this agency is not a solution to the workload problem or determinative of whether or not the duties, functions, and property of the Board should be transferred to another department or agency, or be abolished. The solution to any of these problems requires legislation. As Senators know, S. 2171 is pending on the Senate calendar. This bill is designed to remove some of the restrictions imposed by the courts. Still another bill, S 2146, is also pending on the calendar. This bill seeks to abolish the Board and transfer its functions to the Department of Justice.

Because of the fact that some type of legislation is required and that legislation is before the Senate, the committee recommends the House allowance. If the authority of the Board is broadened, the appropriation will be needed. If the Board is abolished, there will be some savings in this fiscal year.

Mr. President, this is a general, overall statement respecting the contents of the appropriation bill. Most of the items were carefully considered, and I believe that the action of the Appropriations Committee should be sustained.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I wish to commend the members of the subcommittee handling this appropriations bill. That subcommittee not only worked long and hard in its hearings and markup of the bill, but it also did an excellent job in holding the line. The subcommittee's staff was of invaluable assistance in our exploration of the requests for funds in attempting to provide what is necessary for departmental programs and administration but within the bounds of fairness to the taxpayers who provide those funds.

The senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] has done an outstanding job in his leadership and management of this legislation. In his floor statement, he has thoroughly covered the individual items in the bill so well that no elaboration or repetition is required from me as the ranking minority member of the subcommittee.

A point of interest to the full membership of the Senate on this bill is the 11th hour downward revision of the original request of the Department of Commerce following a late night visit to the White House. Both the extremely tardy timing of this action and the action itself are unusual.

It is of particular interest in view of the White House release of August 17, 1967 entitled "Summer Review of the 1968 Budget," which stated in part:

> We have set up machinery so that as each appropriation is enacted the Administration will review it, item by item, to determine how much expenditure reduction or deferral can be accomplished.

I am glad to report that we were able to find even further areas that could be reduced even after the 11th-hour downward revision dictated by the White House to the Department of Commerce.

Let us hope that the spirit of economy can continue to be shared by the Congress and the White House and that it will not soon fade away. But also let us hope that the executive department can be more efficient in its budget planning and presentation and be able to avoid 11th-hour actions and revisions.

After the final enactment of this legislation, should the President find areas for further reductions through the machinery announced in the White House release of August 17, 1967, I urge that he instruct the departments and agencies to keep the Appropriations committees promptly informed, either on a monthly or quarterly basis, as to how much additional reductions or deferrals can be made by area and program.

In fact, to prove our own spirit of cooperation on the goal of economy, I propose that in the event such notification is not given that we include in future legislation a general provision requiring such reporting.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered and agreed to en bloc and that the bill as thus amended be regarded, for the purposes of amendment, as original text, provided that no point of order shall be considered to have been waived by reason of the agreement to this request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 3, line 6, after the word "aids", strike out "$193,150,000" and insert "$194,130,000".

On page 4, line 25, after "(31 U.S.C. 107)", strike out "$1,600,000" and insert "$4,100,000, of which such amount as may be necessary may be transferred to the appropriation under this heading for the fiscal year 1967".

On page 9, line 6, after "1964", strike out "$2,500,000" and insert "$2,760,000".

On page 11, line 10, after the word "Congress", strike out "$1,975,000" and insert "$2,140,000".

On page 12, line 5, after the word "than", strike out $23,500,000" and insert "$25,000,000".

On page 16, line 24, after the word "therewith", strike out "$10,000,000" and insert "$7,500,000".

On page 20, line 14, after the word "Code", strike out "$61,000,000" and insert "$62,000,000".

On page 24, at the beginning of line 23, strike out $20,000,000" and insert "$21,000,000".

On page 25, line 5, after "1965", strike out "$95,000,000" and insert "$70,000,000".

On page 27, line 19, after the word "abroad", strike out "$3,000,000" and insert "$4,000,000".

On page 28, at the beginning of line 5, strike out "$105,000,000" and insert "$110,846,000".

On page 28, line 18, after the word "instrumentation", strike out "$24,000,000" and insert "$26,997,000".

On page 29, line 13, after the word "facilities", strike out "$5,200,000" and insert "$5,710,000".

On page 30, line 14, after "(15 U.S.C. 278d)", strike out "$31,750,000" and insert "$33,750,000".

On page 31, line 8, after the word "States", strike out "$240,000" and insert "$290,000".

On page 31, line 13, after "(79 Stat. 679)", strike out "$6,500,000" and insert "$8,000,000".

On page 38, line 25, after the word "court", strike out "$1,430,000" and insert "$1,480,000".

On page 41, line 7, after "section 3041", strike out "$7,900,000" and insert "$7,800,000".

On page 49, line 13, after "(22 U.S.C. 2589 (a))", strike out "$9,000,000" and insert "$9,500,000".

On page 51, line 20, after the word "organizations", strike out "$156,479,000" and insert "$157,119,000".

On page 53, at the beginning of line 11, strike out "$10,158,000" and insert $8,604,000".

On page 56, after line 12, strike out:

"SEC. 704. Excluding the Federal Bureau of Investigation money appropriated in this Act shall be available for expenditure in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968 only to the extent that expenditure thereof shall not result in total aggregate net expenditures of all agencies provided for herein beyond ninety-five per centum of the total aggregate net expenditures estimated therefor in the budget for 1968 (H. Doc. 15)."

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I have two perfecting or clarify amendments. I ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc, and I send them to the desk and ask the clerk to state them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 31, line 6, after the word "including," to insert the following: "modification of a boiler plant, and".

On page 29, line 9, after the word "facilities," to insert the following: "purchase of one aircraft;".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the amendments en bloc? Without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc.

The question is on agreeing to the amendments en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I assume the bill is open to further amendment. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 13, line 15, after "SEC. 105." to insert "(a)".

On page 13, between lines 17 and 18, to insert the following:

> It is the sense of the Congress that the United States government through its representatives in the United Nations, having advocated economic sanctions against Rhodesia, should initiate and support in the United Nations economic sanctions against North Viet Nam at whose hands the United States has suffered 55,888 casualties during the first nine months of 1967.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I first invite attention to page 13 of the bill. The Senate will note that section 105 expresses the sense of the Congress that the Communist Chinese Government should not be admitted to membership in the United Nations.

That is already in the bill. That was put in the bill some time ago by the Senate, acting in its capacity, and under its responsibility, to help formulate foreign policy.

The amendment which I have sent to the clerk's desk would be section 105(a), expressing the sense of Congress in regard to another matter.

Mr. President, the State Department budget presents one of the few opportunities to focus attention on two matters about which I am greatly concerned. The two are related, although contradictory.

One is the action of the United Nations—with U.S. leadership—in decreeing economic sanctions against Rhodesia. The second is the unwillingness of the United States to seek economic sanctions against North Vietnam.

Rhodesia is a nation at peace. North Vietnam is at war with the United States and, during the past 9 months, has inflicted 55,888 casualties on our troops.

Mr. President, in November 1965, the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations actively supported a British resolution condemning the country of Rhodesia as a "threat to international peace and security," and calling on the Security Council to take steps to put an end to Rhodesian independence.

Pursuant to that resolution, this Government severed diplomatic ties with the Smith government, and called for a voluntary boycott of Rhodesian products. As a result of those sanctions, U.S. exports to Rhodesia were reduced from $23 million in 1965 to less than $7 million in 1966.

These voluntary sanctions worked great hardships on the Rhodesian people, but they did not succeed in forcing the downfall of the Smith government. As a consequence, the Security Council met again on December 16, 1966, to consider its next logical step—the imposition of mandatory economic sanctions under article 41 of the United Nations Charter.

The U.S. Ambassador again actively supported this measure, assuring the Council that the United States would, to use his words, "apply the full force of our law to implementing this decision." The Council voted to invoke article 41—the first such vote, and the only such vote, for mandatory sanctions in the history of the United Nations.

The United States promptly complied. President Johnson issued an Executive order on January 5, 1967, declaring it to be a criminal offense for any American to engage in the import of a wide range of Rhodesian products, and severely restricting U.S. exports to that country.

Mr. President, an economic boycott is a hostile act. Not only does it inflict great hardships on the embargoed country, but it can lead to even more serious and dangerous actions.

Let us ask, What is the next logical step for the Security Council should mandatory economic sanctions fail to bring about the collapse of the Smith government, as it appears certain they will fail? Article 42 of the United Nations Charter makes it clear what that next step may be:

> Should the Security Council consider that measures provided for in Article 41 would be inadequate or have proved to be inadequate, it may take such action by air, sea, or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security. Such action may include demonstrations, blockade, and other operations by air, sea or land forces of Members of the United Nations.

It is generally conceded that economic sanctions have proved inadequate and that armed force will be necessary to bring down the present Rhodesian Government.

This has led to strong new demands that the Security Council proceed to take this next step and invoke armed sanctions; namely, military action, against Rhodesia under article 42 of the Charter.

Mr. President, our Government has joined in condemning Rhodesia as a threat to world peace, and it has participated fully in every action against Rhodesia that has been ordered by the United Nations thus far.

What is more, Ambassador Goldberg has asserted:

> We shall continue to proceed step-by-step, weighing both the legality and the wisdom of each step as we go in the light of the *situation* and of the *United Nations Charter*.

I think the situation speaks for itself. Rhodesia has maintained its independence for nearly 2 years despite the United Nations economic and diplomatic boycott.

As for the United Nations Charter, Ambassador Goldberg has already made it abundantly clear that he believes the charter provides every legal and moral justification for United Nations actions against Rhodesia. So what is the next step in this Government's Rhodesian policy?

Former Secretary of State Dean Acheson has given a clear answer to that question:

> If strangulation does not work, the same incantation by the Security Council—that Rhodesia threatens a breach of the peace—should require the members to join in an armed crusade against Salisbury and throw all southern Africa into chaos.

Mr. President, I feel we should make it clear to the administration that next step should not be taken. This Government should not become involved in any sanctions involving the application of armed force against Rhodesia. This country must not become involved in an African "Vietnam."

There is little justification for this Government's participation in the actions already taken against Rhodesia. Whether we approve or disapprove of that Government's policies is beside the point. The dispute between Rhodesia and Great Britain is an internal matter to be settled by those two countries.

The Government of Rhodesia, unable to come to an agreement with Great Britain on the terms upon which it would achieve full self-government, unilaterally declared its independence in November 1965. Only one other colony in history had broken away from Great Britain in this manner and that was the United States, in 1776.

There is even less justification, I feel, for the finding that Rhodesia continues to constitute a threat to international peace and security.

Mr. President, this is a totally unfounded charge fabricated to lend a thread of plausibility to the unprecedented Security Council action against Rhodesia. Can any Member of the Senate, or any reasonable American, believe that Rhodesia represents a threat to the peace and security of the world?

Not only does Rhodesia lack the resources to pose a threat to international security, but no evidence of any kind was presented during the United Nations debate to show that Rhodesia even contemplated aggression against its neighbors.

The facts of the matter are that Rhodesia was condemned as a threat to world peace not for any aggression on her part, but because some of her neighbors threatened to resort to armed action to put an end to Rhodesian independence.

Mr. President, by this upside-down logic, the state of Israel would have been condemned as the aggressor in the Middle East because its mere existence as an independent state offended some of its Arab neighbors.

By the same logic, the victim of a robbery would be put in jail, not the thief, because it was the victim's valuables that tempted the thief.

Mr. President, this Government is embarked on a dangerous course in its policy toward Rhodesia. The actions it has taken have been without reference to congressional discussion or advice. That is one reason why I raise the issue in the Senate today. In point of fact, all of the actions taken by this Government with regard to Rhodesia were taken while Congress was out of session.

The United Nations is now in session. Already there have been forceful demands that the Security Council take the next step; namely, that of invoking armed sanctions against Rhodesia.

I believe the American people should fully understand the kind of situation we have got ourselves into with our policy toward Rhodesia.

First, it was condemnation. This was followed by the imposition of voluntary sanctions, then by mandatory sanctions. Now, we have reached a point where this Government must back off or take the next step; namely, armed sanctions against Rhodesia.

Unless the American people and Congress are alert to the dangers of the course we are following, we may find ourselves facing another Vietnam in Africa.

Mr. President, my second concern is the failure of the United Nations to pay any heed to the real threat to world peace—the aggression of North Vietnam against its southern neighbor. That is the point to which the amendment which has just been reported is directed.

The U.S. Ambassador has refused to press for United Nations consideration of the Vietnam question, but instead has engaged in an unjustified and unjust attack on the peaceful country of Rhodesia.

How can the United States justify demanding economic sanctions against Rhodesia and refuse to seek United Nations sanctions against North Vietnam, at whose hands the United States has suffered 55,888 casualties during the first 9 months of 1967? I think it is right significant, Mr. President, that from that date, this past January 5, when the President declared an economic boycott against Rhodesia, a nation at peace, up until today, the American people have suffered more than 55,000 casualties at the hands of North Vietnam, against which country no sanctions whatsoever have been sought by our representatives at the United Nations.

Those casualties were suffered in coming to the assistance of South Vietnam, which our Government and the members of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization have declared to be the victim of aggression by its northern neighbor.

Mr. President, 240 ships flying the flags of United Nations members delivered cargo to the port of Haiphong during the year 1966. It is too early to obtain figures for 1967, but Adm. U. S. G. Sharp, commander in chief of all U.S. Pacific forces, has stated that there has been an increase in shipping into the North Vietnamese port of Haiphong.

He said that there was a fourfold increase in shipping through that port in June 1967 over June 1966.

If we hope ever to get this war in Vietnam over with—and, Mr. President, I submit that it is vitally important that we get it over with at the earliest possible time—we must exert every type of financial and diplomatic pressure against those other nations, to keep them from trading with and carrying cargo to the enemy in North Vietnam.

So I ask again, How can the United States justify its demand for United Nations sanctions against the peaceful country of Rhodesia when it does nothing in the United Nations to bring sanctions against North Vietnam?

The United Nations was designed to help keep the peace. Vietnam, not Rhodesia, is where the action is. That is where the war is. And Vietnam is where the United Nations should direct its efforts.

If we are going to continue to keep troops in Vietnam, I feel we must use every diplomatic and financial pressure available to us to bring this war to a speedy and honorable conclusion. Economic sanctions by the United Nations would be one additional pressure.

The amendment which I have submitted would seek economic sanctions from United Nations members against North Vietnam. It seems to me this is a reasonable and fair thing to ask.

Our country and its representative at the United Nations have established the precedents and have sought and obtained sanctions, and mandatory sanctions are now in effect against the peaceful country of Rhodesia.

My amendment seeks to express the sense of Congress that our Government, through its representative at the United Nations, seeks mandatory, economic sanctions against North Vietnam, a nation with which our country is now at war.

Mr. President I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Tydings in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on the amendment of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd], I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I should much prefer to vote for this proposal if it were presented in the nature of a separate resolution. But since the bill contains a section declaring it to be the sense of Congress that the Communist Chinese Government should not be admitted to membership in the United Nations as a representative of China, I assume that this amendment to that section is germane and can be offered.

I am in sympathy with the views expressed in the amendment, and I shall support it, although I should have much preferred that the matter be presented as a separate resolution. However, under the circumstances, since I think the amendment is germane and embodies sentiments that I share, along with many other Senators, I shall support it.

So far as I am concerned, the clerk may call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Virginia. The clerk will restate the amendment.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 13, between lines 17 and 18, it is proposed to insert the following:

> It is the sense of the Congress that the United States government through its representatives in the United Nations, having advocated economic sanctions against Rhodesia, should initiate and support in the United Nations economic sanctions against North Viet Nam at whose hands the United States has suffered 55,888 casualties during the first nine months of 1967.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], the Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Talmadge] are necessarily absent.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Jordan] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. Hatfield], the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Jordan], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] would each vote "yea."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 74, nays 15, as follows:

[No. 292 Leg.]

YEAS—74

Allott
Anderson
Baker
Bartlett
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Church
Clark
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Griffin
Hansen
Harris
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hollings
Hruska
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McClellan
McGovern
McIntyre
Miller
Monroney
Montoya
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Pastore
Pell
Percy
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Spong
Stennis
Symington
Thurmond
Tydings
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—15

Brooke
Case
Cooper
Gruening
Hart
Inouye
Kuchel
McCarthy
McGee
Mondale
Morse
Pearson
Scott
Williams, N.J.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—11

Aiken
Gore
Hatfield
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Metcalf
Morton
Nelson
Russell
Talmadge
Tower

So the amendment of Mr. Byrd of Virginia was agreed to.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I send to the desk a motion to suspend the rules and to offer as amendatory text to the bill the substance of the bill now on the calendar and reported by the Committee on the Judiciary which deals with the Subversive Activities Control Board and its authority.

This motion to suspend the rules was filed last week. It is, therefore, timely and in order.

In connection therewith, I ask unanimous consent to make those technical modifications which resulted from errors in printing the bill. They are all technical in character, relating mainly to the naming of sections and paragraphs.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois repeat his unanimous-consent request?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is just for modifications because of printing errors.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Technical questions; yes. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The modifications are as follows:

> Beginning with line 18, page 3, strike out all to and including line 20, page 3, and insert in lieu thereof the following:
>
> "Sec. 5. (a) That portion of section 10 of the Subversive Activities Control Act which precedes subparagraph (1) thereof is amended to read as follows:".
>
> On page 3, line 21, strike out the subsection designation "(a)".
>
> Beginning with line 10, page 4, strike out all to and including the words "so as to read" in line 13, page 4, and insert in lieu thereof the following:
>
> "Sec. 6. Beginning with the clause designation '(1)' contained in section 11 (a) of the Subversive Activities Control Act, strike out all of that subsection down to and including the words 'register under section 7', and insert in lieu thereof the following".
>
> Beginning with line 16, page 4, strike out all to and including the words "so as to read" in line 18, page 4, and insert in lieu thereof the following:
>
> "Sec. 7. Beginning with the clause designation '(1)' contained in section 11 (b) of the Subversive Activities Control Act, strike out all of that subsection down to and including the words 'register under section 7', and insert in lieu thereof the following".

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays—at this moment, I will take only a few minutes——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator suspend? Is the Senator submitting the amendment for consideration, or ——

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is a motion with an amendment, but the rest are modifications on which I asked unanimous consent, because they are only technical in nature.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the motion.

The Legislative Clerk. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen] in accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, gives notice in writing of his intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of amending the bill H.R. 10345, making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judici-

ary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, with the following amendment:

On page 48, between lines 15 and 16, insert the following: That section 2 of the Subversive Activities Control Act is hereby amended by adding immediately following paragraph (15), a new paragraph, as follows:

"(16) The findings of fact contained in paragraphs (1) through (15) of this section are reiterated. Recent court decisions involving the registration provisions of this Act make it necessary to enact legislation to accomplish the purposes of such Act without the requirements of registration. Disclosure of Communist organizations and of the members of Communist-action organizations as provided herein is essential to the protection of the national welfare."

Sec. 2. Section 5 of the Subversive Activities Control Act is amended as follows:

(a) By changing that part of subsection (a) thereof beginning with the first word of the subsection and continuing down to subparagraph (1) thereof, so as to read:

"(a) When there is in effect a final order of the Board determining any organization to be a Communist-action organization or a Communist-front organization, it shall be unlawful—"

(b) By changing that part of subparagraph (1) of subsection (a) thereof which precedes (A) so as to read:

"(1) For any member of such organization, with knowledge or notice of such final order of the Board—".

(c) By changing that part of subparagraph (2) of subsection (a) thereof which precedes (A) so as to read:

"(2) For any officer or employee of the United States or of any defense facility, with knowledge or notice of such final order of the Board—".

Sec. 3. Sections 7 and 8 of the Subversive Activities Control Act are hereby repealed.

Sec. 4. The caption to section 9 of the Subversive Activities Control Act is amended so as to read: "RECORDS OF FINAL ORDERS OF THE BOARD; PUBLIC INSPECTION; REPORTS TO PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS."; and

Section 9 of such Act is amended so as to read:

"Sec. 9. (a) The Board shall keep and maintain records, which shall be open to public inspection, giving the names and addresses of all organizations as to which, and individuals as to whom, there are in effect final orders of the Board issued pursuant to any of the provisions of subsections (g) through (j), inclusive, of section 13, or subsection (f) of section 13A.

"(b) Copies of the reports and orders of the Board so issued shall be furnished by the Board to any person upon request and upon the payment of the reasonable costs thereof as then currently fixed by the Board.

"(c) The Board shall submit to the President and to the Congress on or before June 1 of each year (and at any other time when requested by either House by resolution) a report giving the names and addresses of all organizations as to which, and all individuals as to whom, there are in effect such final orders of the Board."

"Sec. 5. (a) That portion of section 10 of the Subversive Activities Control Act which precedes subparagraph (1) thereof is amended to read as follows:".

"Sec. 10. It shall be unlawful for any organization with respect to which there is in effect a final order of the Board determining it to be a Communist-action organization or a Communist-front organization—"

(b) The phrase following the colon at the end of subparagraph (1) thereof is amended to read: "Disseminated by ———, an organization determined by final order of the Subversive Actvities Control Board to be a Communist——— organization;".

(c) The phrase following the colon at the end of subparagraph (2) thereof is amended to read: "The following program is sponsored by ——— an organization determined by final order of the Subversive Activities Control Board to be a Communist——— organization."

"Sec. 6. Beginning with the clause designation '(1)' contained in section 11(a) of the Subversive Activities Control Act, strike out all of that subsection down to and including the words 'register under section 7', and insert in lieu thereof the following: 'there is in effect a final order of the Board determining such organization to be a Communist-action or a Communist-front organization.' "

"Sec. 7. Beginning with the clause designation '(1)' contained in section 11(b) of the Subversive Activities Control Act, strike out all of that subsection down to and including the words 'register under section 7', and insert in lieu thereof the following: 'there is in effect a final order of the Board determining such organization to be a Communist-action or a Communist-front organization.' "

Sec. 8. Paragraph (2) of subsection (e) of section 12 of the Subversive Activities Control Act is amended so as to read:

"(2) Upon application made by the Attorney General under section 13(a) of this title, or by any individual under section 13(b) of this title, to determine whether any individual is a member of any organization as to which there is in effect a final order of the Board determining such organization to be a Communist-action organization."

Sec. 9. Section 13 of the Subversive Activities Control Act is amended as follows:

(a) By amending subsection (a) thereof so as to read:

"(a) (I) Whenever the Attorney General has reason to believe that any organization is a Communist-action organization or a Communist-front organization, he shall file with the Board and serve upon such organization a petition for a determination that such organization is a Communist-action organization or a Communist-front organization, as the case may be.

"(II) Whenever the Attorney General has reason to believe that any individual is a member of an organization which has been finally determined under this section to be a Communist-action organization, he shall file with the Board and serve upon such individual a petition for a determination that such individual is a member of such organization. Each petition under part (i) or part (II) of this subsection shall be verified under oath, and shall contain a statement of the facts upon which the Attorney General relies in support of his prayer for the issuance of such order."

(b) By amending subsection (b) thereof so as to read:

"(b) Any organization as to which there is in effect a final order of the Board determining it to be a Communist organization, and any individual as to whom there is in effect a final order of the Board determining him to be a member of a Communist-action organization may, not more often than once in each calendar year, file with the Board and serve upon the Attorney General a petition for a determination that such organization no longer is a Communist organization (in the case of an organization which has been determined under subsection (a) of this section to be one of the types of Communist organizations) or that such individual no longer is a member of a Communist-action organization, as the case may be. Each petition filed under and pursuant to this subsection shall be verified under oath, and shall contain a statement of the facts relied upon in support thereof. Upon the filing of any such petition, the Board shall serve upon each party to such proceeding a notice specifying the time and place for hearing upon such petition. No such hearing shall be conducted within twenty days after the service of such notice."

(c) By amending that portion of paragraph (2) of subsection (d) thereof which precedes the last sentence thereof so as to read:

"(2) Where an organization or individual declines or fails to appear at a hearing accorded to such organization or individual by the Board in proceedings under subsection (a) of this section, the Board shall, nevertheless, proceed to receive evidence, make a determination of the issues, and enter such order as shall be just and appropriate. Upon failure of an organization or individual to appear at a hearing accorded to such organization or individual in proceedings under subsection (b) of this section the Board may forthwith and without further proceedings enter an order dismissing the petition of such organization or individual."

(d) By amending subsection (g) thereof so as to read:

"(g) If, after hearing upon a petition filed under subsection (a) of this section, the Board determines—

"(1) that an organization is a Communist-action organization or a Communist-front organization, as the case may be, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts and shall issue and cause to be served on such organization an order determining the organization to be a Communist-action organization or a Communist-front organization as the case may be;

"(2) that an individual is a member of a Communist-action organization, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts and shall issue and cause to be served on such individual an order determining such individual to be a member of a Communist-action organization."

(e) By amending subsection (h) thereof so as to read:

"(h) If, after hearing upon a petition filed under subsection (a) of this section, the Board determines—

"(1) that an organization is not a Communist-action organization or a Communist-front organization, as the case may be, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to facts and shall issue and cause to be served upon the Attorney General an order denying the determination sought by his petition, and shall send a copy of such order to such organization;

"(2) that an individual is not a member of any Communist-action organization, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts and shall issue and cause to be served upon the Attorney General an order denying the determination sought by his petition, and shall send a copy of such order to such individual."

(f) By amending subsection (i) thereof so as to read:

"(i) If, after hearing upon a petition filed under subsection (b) of this section, the Board determines—

"(1) that an organization no longer is a Communist-action organization or a Communist-front organization, as the case may be, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts and shall issue and cause to be served upon the Attorney General and such organization an order determining that the organization no longer is a Communist-action organization or Communist-front organization as the case may be;

"(2) that an individual no longer is a member of any Communist-action organization, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts and shall issue and cause to be served upon the Attorney General and such individual an order determining that such individual no longer is a member of a Communist-action organization."

(g) By amending subsection (j) thereof so as to read:

"(j) If, after hearing upon a petition filed under subsection (b) of this section, the Board determines—

"(1) that an organization is a Communist-action organization or a Communist-front organization, as the case may be it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts and shall issue and cause to be served on such organization an order denying its petition for a determination that the organization no longer is a Communist-action organization or a Communist-front organization as the case may be.

"(2) that an individual is a member of a Communist-action organization, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts and shall issue and cause to be served upon such an individual an order denying his petition for a determination that the individual no longer is a member of a Communist-action organization."

(h) By amending subsection (k) thereof so as to read:

"(k) When any order of the Board issued under subsection (g), (h), (i), or (j), of this section becomes final under the provisions of section 14(b) of this title, the Board shall publish in the Federal Register the fact that such order has become final, and publication thereof shall constitute notice to all persons that such order has become final."

SEC. 10. The seventh sentence of subsection (a) of section 14 of the Subversive Activities Control Act is amended so as to read: "If the court shall set aside an order issued under subsection (j) of section 13, it may, in the case of an organization, enter a judgment requiring the Board to issue an order determining that such organization no longer is a Communist-action organization or Communist-front organization, as the case may be, or in the case of an individual, enter a judgment requiring the Board to issue an order determining that such individual no longer is a member of a Communist-action organization."

SEC. 11. Section 15 of the Subversive Activities Control Act is amended so as to read:

"SEC. 15. (a) In the case of any organization which by proceedings under section 13 (a) prior to the date of enactment hereof has been finally determined by the Board in carrying out its duties under subsection (e) of section 12, to be a 'Communist-action organization' or a 'Communist-front organization', and as a result of such determination has been ordered to register, the Board shall forthwith modify its previously issued registration order as may be necessary to conform such order to the provisions of section 13(g) hereof, and shall forthwith include such organization on the record maintained under section 9: *Provided, however,* That nothing in this subsection shall be construed so as to prevent any such organization from filing a petition as provided in subsection (b) of section 13.

"(b) In the case of any proceeding pending before the Board on the effective date of this enactment the Board and the Attorney General are authorized to proceed in accordance with the provisions of this Act as herein amended. No suit, action, or other proceeding lawfully commenced prior to this enactment in any court of the United States shall abate by reason of this enactment. The court in any such case may allow such motion or supplemental pleadings as may be necessary to conform the litigation to the provisions of this Act as amended."

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin will state it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Does the motion of the Senator from Illinois require a two-third vote?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It does.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It does.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Then, if the motion is passed, it would then require a majority vote to adopt the motion to the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the motion to suspend the rules is agreed to by a two-thirds vote, then it will take a majority vote to agree to the amendment.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Chair. I thank the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in the pending bill is the money recommended by the Appropriations Committee for the operation of the agency known as the Subversive Activities Control Board? The Board administers the Internal Security Act of 1950.

In 1967, there were two court decisions, one in the circuit court of appeals and one in the Supreme Court of the United States.

The first decision, in effect, stated that the Board could not get a confession from someone alleged to be a Communist whose name had been submitted to the Board on petition by the Attorney General because it might violate his rights under the first amendment.

In the Supreme Court decision, the same view was expressed by the high court with respect to a Communist or a Communist-front organization, and that could not be extricated in the form of a confession without violating the Constitution.

Therefore, it became necessary, if the Board was to operate at all, so to amend the Subversive Activities Control Board Act as to bring it in line with the decisions of the Supreme Court and the circuit court of appeals.

That is all that is involved in this matter. It has been before the Judiciary Committee. It finally found its way to the calendar.

Let me say to the Senate that if it does not approve this today on the basis of a two-thirds vote, then the Senate will have it in the next legislative bill because then we have to have only a majority vote, and I shall keep offering it until something is done.

We are in the unhappy position of having a Board that has the personnel and has the money, but it cannot perform until the act is amended. That is exactly what the text of the motion would do.

Now the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] has relentlessly pursued and resisted this matter. I must express my amazement that a Member of this body goes to the lengths that he has gone, first, to knock out the money from the bill, and then to threaten a filibuster if we call up the bill on the calendar some time later.

I am not asleep. I know what is going on in this body. When they have to be called, they have to be called. He got out a Xerox memorandum which was circulated on this side of the aisle. I do not know whether Senators on this side have a copy of it at this moment. But I have it, and it is signed by Mr. PROXMIRE, by Mr. EDWARD KENNEDY, by Mr. STEPHEN YOUNG, by Mr. GAYLORD NELSON, by Mr. JOSEPH TYDINGS, and by Mr. DANIEL INOUYE. Senators ought to know what is going on. I read what is in this memorandum. It states:

> We are opposed to this motion for the following reasons:
>
> 1. S. 2171—

That is the text of this motion—

> which was introduced on July 27, 1967, and reported by the Judiciary Committee on August 15, 1967, was the subject of no hearings by the Committee.

It was roundly discussed in the full committee. Why have extensive hearings on a matter that is so obvious and take the time of busy people, when there would be difficulty in getting a quorum? All we tried to do was bring this in line with the Supreme Court decision and the circuit court of appeals decision, and nothing more. Why should there be long hearings and why should witnesses be trotted before that committee when that is absolutely unnecessary and would be a futile gesture?

I continue to read from the letter of the Senator from Wisconsin:

> 2. The Committee report on S. 2171 contains no explanation of the bill's provisions, no section-by-section analysis, and no explication of the changes it would make in existing law.

Well, all one has to do is read the text. It speaks for itself. I do not know that one has to compile seven volumes of testimony in order to clarify a law and bring it in line with a court decision.

Continuing to read:

> 3. S. 2171 has not received a favorable report—or for that matter any report at all—from the Executive Branch.

We did not ask for one. That is the reason. I do not think the President sends reports up here unless we ask for them, but I know how the executive branch feels, and I have had several discussions with the President of the United States on this matter. He would like to see this bill passed and see this board go back into action.

Continuing from the letter:

> 4. The Justice Department has neither been asked nor offered its opinion of the bill.

I am going to ask the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee [Mr. EASTLAND] whether we have not tried to get the Attorney General before the committee. We have had very indifferent success. He has shown a disinclination to come.

The letter continues:

> Because we share the concern of all responsible Americans relative to our national security, we believe that legislation in this sensitive area should be the subject of thorough hearings . . .

We did that in 1950, and we have been doing it ever since.

The letter continues:

> In its report accompanying the State, Commerce, Justice Appropriations Bill, the Appropriations Committee itself advanced

> four alternative legislative solutions to the controversy . . .

Certainly, it did, and the first one was to retain the Board and broaden its authority. Why do Senators think the motion is here? To retain the Board and broaden its authority.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have not been able to hear what the Senator has just said.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Am I not talking loud enough?

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator talked to that side.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Well, I cannot talk out of both sides of my mouth.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Who said to retain the Board?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I read this to my friend. The report accompanying the State, Justice, and Commerce appropriation bill, which is the bill before us right now, states, on page 32:

> Therefore, it appears to the committee that there are four possible legislative steps that may be taken by the Senate. These are as follows:
>
> (1) Retain the board and broaden its authority.

That is precisely what I am trying to do.

Mr. LAUSCHE. And I agree with the Senator.

Mr. DIRKSEN. And the President of the United States agrees, and every veterans organization in the country agrees. I have heard from the American Legion. I have heard from the Veterans of Foreign Wars. I have heard from the Disabled American Veterans. I have heard from the American Veterans Committee, better known as AMVETS. If there are any more, I have heard from them, saying they want to see this bill passed. However, a filibuster has been threatened to the bill that appeared on the calendar. So I am given no choice. But if it is not passed today, Senators will still have it, because I have made up my mind that the Senate is going to come to grips with this problem.

The Assistant Attorney General, J. W. Yeagley, appeared before the Appropriations Committee and stated in his testimony that the basic purpose of the Subversive Activities Control Act was disclosure. Certainly that was it. That is what we are asking for—to expose the Reds, to expose the fronts.

As appears on page 1064 of the hearings, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] asked him:

> Have you continued investigations?

Mr. Yeagley said:

> Yes. The appropriations hearings on the House side indicated that there are approximately 100 organizations in which the Communists have been found operating, and on which the FBI checks occasionally, if not investigates.

I did not say that. An Assistant Attorney General, in charge of that division, said it, and I am willing to accept it.

Mr. Yeagley said, further in the hearings, in response to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], as follows:

First, Senator McCLELLAN asked:

> If this is abolished, can the Board supplement and be complementary to the functions of the Justice Department and render an effective and valid service to our Government?
>
> Mr. Yeagley: I don't believe the Justice Department would want these functions.

That is the reason why we set it up that way in the first place. Let the Attorney General go forward, but give the Board a chance to investigate the people. Under the modified bill, they can make a finding. They can make a finding as to a Communist organization or an individual, under the Constitution, but the Board can declare. That is the exposure that is involved.

I have read nearly everything that was said before the Appropriations Committee. There are 57 or 58 pages of testimony and tables. One gets the idea, from a reading of it, that this is not a particular issue. There is no alarm.

Well, I have in my hand an article from the Washington Daily News for Monday, October 9, 1967.

I think the Cardinals won that day, or did they?

Mr. COTTON. I hope they lost.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The article is entitled "U.S. Communist Party Gaining," and is written by Ted Knapp. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD as a part of my speech.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. COMMUNIST PARTY GAINING

(By Ted Knap)

NEW YORK, October 9.—Gus Hall and J. Edgar Hoover agree the Communist Party is moving up in America—in membership, influence and acceptability.

Mr. Hall, longtime leader of the Communist Party, USA, said in an interview that membership has risen to "about 13,000," an increase of 2000 in the last two years. Government sources gave similar figures.

After years of just growing old, the party has recruited about 3000 youths between 18 and 25 years of age since 1965, Mr. Hall said. FBI Director Hoover said the party has found good fishing in the New Left.

What brings Old Red and New Left together is their common opposition to the war in Vietnam.

NEW OPPORTUNITY

More important than its membership gains is the Communist Party's new opportunity to operate openly and exert influence among non-communists.

In Chicago, Cleveland, Detroit, Los Angeles and San Francisco, the party has opened district offices inviting people to walk in off the streets.

And for the first time in 20 years, the party has begun distributing membership application blanks. (There has not been a card-carrying communist since 1947, when membership cards were abandoned as part of the move underground.)

Last month the Communist Party opened a checking account in a capitalist bank here, ending 20 years of transactions strictly by untraceable cash.

DAILY PUBLICATION

The party newspaper, The Worker, will resume daily publication about May 1, Mr. Hall said. It dropped to a weekly 10 years ago and became a semi-weekly three years ago. Paid circulation is 15,000.

Communist delegates were invited and participated openly in the National Conference for New Politics in Chicago last month. Communist Party officials plan to walk under their own banner in the Oct. 21 March on the Pentagon, as they did in the April 15 peace rally here. Arnold Johnson, one of 13 members of the party's executive board, is on the committee of anti-war groups planning the Oct. 21 demonstration in Washington.

(Anti-war and other political action groups which used to shun communist support because it hurt their causes have been shifting in the past year to a policy of excluding nobody.)

What enabled the Communist Party to come into the open was the November, 1965, Supreme Court decision invalidating much of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 which was drafted by congress to force the party and its members to register and disclose the party's financial affairs.

"Some of our members, after years of using the back door, have found it difficult to adjust to going thru the open door," Mr. Hall noted with a laugh.

YOUNG MEMBERS

Mr. Hall said 20 of the 80 national committee members are under 24 years of age. Best known among them is Bettina Aptheker, daughter of Dr. Herbert Aptheker, longtime Communist Party theoretician. "Red Diaper babies" like Bettina used to be the main source of young recruits in the party, but now it is the campus.

The party started a drive in 1961 to have its leaders speak on college campuses, and by the last academic year such appearances had risen to more than 100. Dr. Aptheker and Mr. Hall make most of them.

"The party is eagerly trying to reach the hearts, minds and souls of our young people," Mr. Hoover said in a report on communism this year. "The communists know that the young people of today will be the leaders of tomorrow."

The party's best friends on campus are the W.E.B. Dubois Clubs, which claim 2500 members in 30 chapters. Mr. Hoover has labeled the clubs communist fronts. Mr. Hall denied that the DuBois Clubs are party branches, but acknowledged that the party has "considerable influence" in them.

PHENOMENAL SUCCESS

J. G. Sourwine, chief counsel of the Senate Internal Security Sub-committee, said the party's "phenomenal success" with DuBois Clubs has helped make it "much stronger" than two years ago.

At their national convention last month, the DuBois Clubs resolved to "move in support of the Negro community at times of intensified attack, such as in Newark and Detroit, to mobilize protest against the genocidal practices of police."

Communist delegates to the New Politics convention worked together with black power delegates. The worker features stories about the activities of black power militants Stokely Carmichael and H. Rap Brown.

Ever since it began in 1919, the Communist Party has been trying to lure Negroes into its ranks, with little success. While claiming some recent advances, Mr. Hall said he is "still not satisfied" with Negro recruiting.

The party has been fluctuating between segregation and integration. Originally it favored a separate black belt nation for U.S. Negroes, if they wanted it. This proved unpopular among Negroes, so the party shifted after World War II to a policy favoring integration. Now again it seems to be in alliance with advocates of black power, a separatist movement.

Mr. Hall said the party still believes in integration and supports black power only as a means of improving the Negroes' lot.

Mr. Hall claims recent gains, or at least a softening of opposition, among U.S. Catholics. He attributed it to the Pacem in Terris encyclical of the late Pope John XXIII.

The party no longer reviles religion as the

> "opiate of the masses." Reliable sources said the party softened its stand against religion because of the unpopularity of its position. Mr. Hall contends it is the churches that have softened toward communism.
>
> Mr. Hall insisted the party no longer advocates violent overthrow of the government, and has not for many years.
>
> Government sources said the mellowing of public opinion has placed the party in its most favorable position since World War II. Senate investigator Sourwine said the party remains "our greatest internal menace."
>
> BACKED L. B. J.
>
> Mr. Hall said the party, which backed President Johnson in 1964, will concentrate a major effort on the 1968 election, either supporting a new politics candidate, if there is one, or nominating its own. The party's last presidential candidate was Earl Browder in 1936.
>
> Tho the party is barred from the ballot in 37 states, Mr. Hall said: "It would be an interesting measure of our influence" to run a communist for President next year.

Mr. DIRKSEN. As I said, it is written by Ted Knapp, a Scripps-Howard staff writer. It reads in part as follows:

> NEW YORK, October 9.—Gus Hall and J. Edgar Hoover agree the Communist Party is moving up in America—in membership, influence and acceptability.
>
> Mr. Hall, longtime leader of the Communist Party, USA, said in an interview that membership has risen to "about 13,000," an increase of 2,000 in the last two years. Government sources gave similar figures.

Let me read from a paragraph later in the article:

> What enabled the Communist Party to come into the open was the November, 1965, Supreme Court decision invalidating much of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 which was drafted by congress to force the party and its members to register and disclose the party's financial affairs.

You cannot make them register, but you can get their testimony, and then you can put them on the register yourself and say, "This is what they are." And so you expose them.

That is what is in this bill. It ought to be passed. But our friend from Wisconsin wants to leave us without a weapon.

How long do you think it would take to have a long hearing and to dress up new legislation? How much of a filibuster would there be? How difficult is it to get a quorum, as we move into the shank of the session—even though I have prophesied that we will not get out of here until the 15th of December?

Did my friend from Ohio hear that?

This has been an unusually long session, and Senators get rather weary. I do not think my fellow Senators have a stomach for it at this time, but I want to have a weapon. So does the American Legion. So does the VFW; but not the Senator from Wisconsin. So do the Disabled American Veterans; but not the Senator from Wisconsin. So do AMVETS; but not the Senator from Wisconsin. Let us put it in the RECORD, where we can all see it.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, may we have order? I want to hear the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator may come over and sit on this side. I am talking loud enough, goodness knows.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. It is not the fault of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am sorry.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. It is the fault of those who are causing a disturbance over here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONDALE in the chair). The Senate will be in order.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am sorry. I apologize to my distinguished friend from the Buckeye State, even though his name is on this memorandum circulated by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. President, we are at a time when we have to call a spade a spade in this country. The time for fooling is past. We have 475,000 youngsters and oldsters out in Vietnam. What do you think they think when they read about these things going on in the Senate—people trying to stop the Subversive Activities Control Board from doing its work? Give them the money, but put handcuffs on them so that they cannot wiggle.

What an amazing thing it is. I do not understand it. What is its impact on the morale of the troops? They are out there fighting the Reds; can there be any doubt about that? What does the Senate think the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong are composed of, if they are not Reds? Who do Senators think have killed 15,000 American troops, if it has not been the Reds? Are we going to play ducks with our own freedom, and let them run loose here in this country, or are we going to come to grips with them?

That is the issue. Let the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin say what he likes, and let him vote on it. I want the people of Wisconsin to know about it. His colleague [Mr. NELSON] is also listed on this letter. Let the people of Wisconsin know how both their Senators feel about it. I think the time has come to meet this issue, and I am ready to meet it, and we have got to have a two-thirds vote, and if we do not get it, the matter will be back here as sure as my name is Dirksen.

The name of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is on this list, too. I yield to him.

Mr. TYDINGS. I wonder if the Senator from Illinois would tell the Senate why his subcommittee declined to hold hearings on the bill, why they declined to have the Attorney General testify on the bill, why they declined to have the representatives of the administration testify on the bill, why they declined to go into the merits or demerits of this Subversive Activities Control Board, to determine whether or not it really is a Subversive Activities Control Board, or a $300,000 pork barrel for political appointees of both parties?

Mr. DIRKSEN. A very interesting question. Why do we have to find out from the administration how they feel, when the President of the United States, your President, calls me to the White House and says he wants the bill? Does he speak for the administration? Did he call the Senator from Maryland down there, and say he did not want the bill?

Mr. TYDINGS. I can assure the Senator he did not call me.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Maybe he was not quite sure of the Senator's views on the matter. But he wants the bill.

That answers question No. 1.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will, but I have some questions to ask the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. It is correct, is it not, that the bill before us contains the appropriation to keep in existence the Board?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. Even though the Board at present has no duties.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is the point.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator's amendment would prescribe duties for the Board for which the committee has authorized funds?

Mr. DIRKSEN. We bring them in line with the court decisions, and simply say, "Go ahead with your work." I do not know what else to do.

Mr. COOPER. It would seem to me more logical to strike the funds and abolish the Board, or, if we are to provide the Board with the money, then to prescribe duties as the Senator's amendment could do.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We were about ready to close up with this bill. I think the distinguished Senator from Arkansas was about to suggest a third reading. I heard nobody stand up, on either side of the aisle, and move to strike the money from the bill.

Mr. COOPER. I believe the Senator has made a good case. I will support him. Will the Senator permit me to speak on another point for a moment?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; the Senator can even talk about Vietnam on my time if he wishes.

Mr. COOPER. I should like to refer to the last amendment which the Senate voted upon and approved overwhelmingly. I should like to take a moment to state my own views, since I voted against the amendment.

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] for some time has been urging that the issue of Vietnam be submitted to the United Nations, urging that it is the obligation of the United Nations to assume jurisdiction. That is a proposal which I have supported, and a number of other Senators have supported, and it has received much support throughout the country.

There is great question, however, whether the United Nations will assume jurisdiction—there is serious doubt about it. It is my judgment the adoption of an amendment such as the one the Senate approved a short while ago is another obstacle in the way of the possibility of the United Nations assuming jurisdiction of the crucial Vietnam issue. It is not known that the United Nations would assume jurisdiction of the Vietnam issue, but I am sure that the adoption of such amendments makes it more uncertain, more doubtful, that the United Nations will assume jurisdiction.

If the United Nations accepts jurisdiction, it might take into consideration the position of our own Government. I do not think we can prejudge in advance United Nations decisions. If we sincerely want the United Nations to take jurisdiction and assume responsibility, and surely it is an actual settlement of the war we want, rather than the passage of a futile amendment. I believe it is essentially an exercise in futility. For if the United Nations assumed jurisdiction and ordered sanctions against Vietnam, against whom would those sanctions be directed? The Soviet Union, Communist China, or our allies who, we know furnish a minuscule percentage of the total supplies that go into North Vietnam.

Who would enforce such a sanction? The United States?

We must not be carried to such extremities, to an exercise in futility when the object of all is reason, and bringing the war to a close, by peaceful means.

I wanted to make my reasons clear in the Record.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. In a moment.

We have heard from an Assistant Attorney General. I do not know that we have to have more than an Assistant Attorney General by the name of J. W. Yeagley come out before the Appropriations Subcommittee. I think the Attorney General himself is disinclined. I do not know why, because he is a nice fellow. He does not want to come before the Judiciary Committee and testify. It could be timidity. I do not know. However, we do not eat people over there. We do not dump them in a kettle and get them ready for noon lunch. But the Assistant Attorney General was there.

Do we have to have anything more than for him to come and explain exactly what this is all about? I do not know what else we have to do.

So I think that is ample answer to my friend, the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, would the Senator from Illinois be kind enough to advise the Senate of the functions of a five-man board of political appointees, paid $26,000 a year, with no qualifications other than their friendship or acquaintanceship with persons in high places, in the field of intelligence or internal security? What function could they perform to protect the people of the United States in the field of subversive activities that could not be just as well or better performed by Mr. J. Edgar Hoover and the Federal Bureau of Investigation or an Internal Security Section of the Department of Justice?

Mr. DIRKSEN. In the first place, it is not Hoover's function. In the second place, the Department of Justice said they did not want it.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Department of Justice never testified because they had no hearing at which to testify. The Senator never gave them an opportunity to testify, and that is the whole point.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Read what happened before the Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. TYDINGS. No hearings were held before the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I suggest that the Senator do his homework and read what was done before the Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the Senator from Illinois takes the position that this Board was stripped of its need to exist when the Supreme Court said that under the fifth amendment of the Constitution we could not compel any individual or organization to register as a Communist unit.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; except there was a decision in the Supreme Court and one in the circuit court of appeals.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The position of the Senator from Illinois is that that decision of the Supreme Court which said that an agency cannot be compelled to say that it is Communist does not forbid the Government from creating a board to take testimony and finally register its judgment as to whether the agency is Communist.

Mr DIRKSEN. Exactly.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is the belief of the Senator from Illinois that in the interest of our country the performance of that duty is essential.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is indeed.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I direct the attention of the Senate to page 1038 of the record at which point, while the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Proxmire] was the witness, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan] put the following questions and obtained the following answers:

> Senator McClellan. You have introduced a bill to abolish the Board?
>
> Senator Proxmire. That is right.
>
> Senator McClellan. We have not heard the Board yet, and those supporting it, but it is your position that since the Supreme Court has ruled as it has in cases that challenge the jurisdiction of this Board, it has been so stripped of any authority and its functions have now become so minimal that they are not worth the price we are paying for them.
>
> Senator Proxmire. That is right. And to the extent that there are functions left, I feel they could be transferred to the Department of Justice and handled effectively there.

The Senator from Arkansas then asked this pertinent question:

> Senator McClellan. Does the Senator oppose any agency of Government looking into subversive activities and pinpointing them and identifying those who may be so engaged?

That question is very significant, because it puts before every one of us the very essence of what is involved in this controversy—Shall the Government of the United States pinpoint and identify the activities of Communists who are operating in the country?

The Senator from Wisconsin then answered:

> No indeed. I think that is very important and very helpful. I certainly favor that.

There was then the following question and answer:

> Senator McClellan. What would you offer as a substitute, then, in view of the court holdings? I don't know how we are going to do much about it or have any authority or power to do much about it in view of the rulings of the Supreme Court.
>
> Senator Proxmire. Well, to the extent that subversive activities constitute acts that can lead to espionage or sabotage or overt acts against this country, it seems to me that the FBI has the power, the authority, the expertise, and the competence to investigate them, and the Department of Justice to prosecute them, and the courts to hear them and to find those guilty of such acts guilty and sentence them.

Espionage and sabotage, while they are critical to me, do not constitute the most important aspect of what is happening.

The Senator from Illinois advocates that we should have a board that will take testimony and identify agencies A, B, C, and D, as Communists, if they are Communists.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Then the people of our country, when a Communist comes to speak to them from agency X, will know that he is a Communist and not a friend of the United States.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I give full support without any equivocation about the need for such information in this critical day, so that when a speaker goes into the public forum and exhorts our people to follow a particular course, our people will know who that speaker is.

I thank the Senator very much for allowing me to make these remarks.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, following through on the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Ohio, is it not a fact that it is not just a matter of having the people know who is speaking to them in the public forum? Is it not also a matter of having the people know all about organizations with fine sounding names, which solicit funds for membership, so that they do not find themselves paying for and identifying their names with organizations in which Communists are masquerading as patriotic Americans?

Mr. DIRKSEN. And it happens over and over.

Now, Mr. President, I will not detain the Senate any longer, except to make one other point.

It is said that there are 10,000, 12,000, 13,000, 20,000 Reds—that does not include those in the front organizations—and that that is not important; that is not very many; they cannot do anything to this great country.

Well, I remind the Senate this afternoon that it was 50 years ago this year that they put a man in a sealed railroad car in Geneva, Switzerland. His name was Ulyanov. Maybe that does not mean anything to you, but it will when I say to you that history has come to know him not as Ulyanov but as Nikolai Lenin, whose embalmed body lies in Red Square in Moscow. He was associated with Trotsky, Kerenski, and others, to bring about the liquidation of the czar and his family and to bring about the revolution, and to set in motion this Communist ideological force, with its brutality and its deception, that has placed its clammy hand on every section of the earth. That was Nikolai Lenin.

And if I have to draw on any authoritative source, I sat half a night with

Aleksandr Kerenski in Pittsburgh, while he told me that story, at a dinner meeting and afterward. So I was not guessing.

They started with a handful. And what do you think they got? Count them up: 800 million in China, 200 million in the Soviet Union; add the Middle East; add the eastern group of countries in Europe; add Cuba; add the rest of them. And in 1967 they can count perhaps one and a half billion. That is more people than were on this earth in 1830, because we only reached a billion population in the world by 1830.

You say the little acorn does not mean anything? So far as the size of the tree goes, there is the tree. And it started with one man leaving Switzerland, crossing Germany and Poland, and going to Mother Russia to start the revolution. And there it is.

And we are called upon to disarray our fiscal activities and send half a million youngsters out to Vietnam and send people to Korea and spend $2½ billion of our money every 30 days because of this Red shadow.

You think there is no reason to find them out and expose them to the public? Never was this ideological force more dangerous to our country than it is now. And the Senator from Wisconsin and those who signed this memorandum ought to be rolled back by the Senate this afternoon by an overwhelming force.

I yield the floor.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, every Member of this body opposes communism and opposes it completely and vigorously. I am very much aware of this problem of the menace of internal Communist subversion and the issue of how to combat it most effectively. It has been a big issue in America and in my State. I am especially aware of this because 10 years ago I succeeded Joe McCarthy in this body. I occupy the same seat he occupied.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may request the yeas and nays?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Illinois said that the Senator from Wisconsin does not want us to have a weapon to fight the Communists. Of course I want us to have a weapon to fight the Communists. But I want it to be an effective weapon. I believe every other Member of the Senate wants that effective weapon, also. But I say that we cannot really know whether a weapon is effective, whether the Subversive Activities Control Board, as empowered by this measure, will be effective, unless we have a record, unless we have expert witnesses, unless we have some knowledge of how it will work. I shall come to that matter in a moment.

Mr. President, what makes this motion by the distinguished minority leader so transparently a railroad job is that the proposed legislation has had no hearing, no executive recommendation—although the role of the executive, the Attorney General, is absolutely crucial in making the proposal effective—and in effect no report, a report which would be a joke if it were not so tragic; and what caps the climax is that the minority leader would now ask the Senate to suspend the rules to add the bill to an appropriations measure.

It is always dangerous precedent to suspend the rules that prohibit adding legislation on an appropriations bill. There may be rare exceptions. When a bill has been pending for many months or years, and the other body refuses to give it consideration, and when there is an extraordinarily detailed, well-documented record supporting the legislation, possibly the rule should be abridged. But even under these circumstances many Senators would disagree that we should violate the rules by legislating by this short-cut method.

Certainly, Mr. President, when the proposed legislation meets none of these criteria, when it has had no hearings, when there is no report from the competent executive agency on the bill, when there is no indication of obstruction in the other body—under these circumstances every Senator, regardless of his sentiment on the particular measure must recognize it is a serious disservice to the dignity of this body to suspend the rules in order to attach the proposed legislation.

After all, what is the Senate saying when it does so? Do Senators understand the proposed legislation? How could we? There have been no hearings on it to guide us. The committee report on the bill is a 1-page fiasco. We have no idea whether or not the Attorney General is going to change the attitude—this is crucial—he had had toward the Subversive Activities Control Board once the measure becomes law and cases are initiated before the Board. If he does not change his position, the legislation will be useless. The Board will still be dormant, a ridiculous waste of money, a conspicuous example of Government waste at its worst, a $500-a-week sinecure for five idle Board members.

Certainly, before voting for this bill, Senators should have the answer to the question of what the Attorney General will do. No Senator has that answer now. I do not have the answer, and the Senator from Illinois does not have the answer. The Senator from Arkansas, the chairman of the subcommittee, does not have the answer.

So what is the Senator who votes for this suspension of the rules saying? He is saying he does not know whether the law will work or will not work. He does not know what any expert thinks about the bill, because none has testified. He does not know whether the bill meets the constitutional objections raised by the courts, because there has been no analysis of the bill by competent experts or any other witness, by the committee, by the committee staff, or by anyone else.

What the Senator who votes for this suspension of the rules is saying is that he does not know anything about the bill and he does not care. He is saying that he is willing to suspend the rules, to establish another dangerous precedent of legislating on an appropriations bill—and this time, Mr. President, on a bill on which there have been no hearings and about which nothing is known.

Mr. President, I could not vote for a bill purporting to provide higher parity for dairy farmers in Wisconsin on this kind of record, deeply as I believe in the need for greater justice for our dairy farmers. The procedure in these circumstances is wrong, and every Senator must know it is wrong.

Furthermore, what is the possible excuse for suspending the rules to take up a bill that is on the calendar, not languishing in committee, but on the calendar. There is no problem here of springing legislation from an obstructionist cabal in the Senate. The bill is ready for action. It is on the calendar, and it can be motioned up at once in its own right next week, tomorrow—or today, for that matter.

The bill is supported by the Senate's top leadership. It is guaranteed the most able championing in this body—by the distinguished Senator from Illinois. And I can tell you that it will get the support of the most powerful Members of the Senate. It is not a friendless waif that needs extraordinary treatment to have a chance to survive.

If there is any merit in this legislation it certainly can stand on its own feet with the kind of eloquent, persuasive, and powerful support it can surely expect.

If ever there was legislation that does not need the extraordinary advantage of riding in on an appropriations bill it is this measure.

Let us consider this legislation we have before us and this report.

I believe that this bill represents a reaction to events of recent weeks which have highlighted the ineffectualness of the Board. On July 21 I introduced legislation to abolish the Board and transfer its powers, duties, and functions to the Justice Department. This legislation quite frankly resulted from a widely criticized Presidential appointment to the Board. Although I was not prepared to attack this specific appointment, I did feel after an examination of the facts that the Board had become virtually useless—that the taxpayer should not be asked to pay the five $26,000-a-year Board members such impressive salaries for doing virtually nothing. The Board had held no hearings for 20 months.

The bill we are considering today (S. 2171) was introduced by the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] 6 days after I introduced my legislation, and more than 4 months after a circuit court decision substantially curtailing the authority of the Board. I think one need only look at the dates I have just cited to determine whether the bill is a reaction to a circuit court decision or an effort to keep these five $26,000 sinecures open in the face of a threat that they might be abolished. Yet this effort to sustain these high paying make-work jobs may well be fraught with serious consequences. It is very difficult to pinpoint these possibilities in view of the lack of information contained in the report on this legislation, but first amendment difficulties as well as other deep problems may well be raised by the bill.

In the absence of hearings on the bill we can only look to the report to determine the contents of the bill. The report itself is one of the most inadequate descriptions of major legislation I have ever seen in my 10 years in the Senate. First, we are told by the title of the report that the bill reported is, and I quote, "Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950." We all know that legislation passed 17 years ago, so fortunately we are not misled by this title. It does, however, indicate the unseemly haste with which the bill was reported. Surely there should have been time to describe the bill as "The Subversive Activities Control Act Amendments of 1967" or give it some other such suitable title.

The report then goes on in its first paragraph:

> The Committee on the Judiciary, having considered S. 2171 and the opinion of the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit in the case of *Communist Party U.S.A.* v. *United States of America*, decided March 3, 1967, and having concluded that this decision requires prompt action by the Congress to take due cognizance of the court's findings, reports favorably thereon, without amendment, and recommends that the bill, S. 2171, do pass.

This paragraph tells us exactly nothing about the contents of the bill. It refers to a circuit court decision that is printed in the appendix to the report. It states that this decision requires prompt action. So prompt apparently that hearings could not be held; and so prompt that the committee decided not to ask the Justice Department whether or not it would utilize the legislation to give the Board something to do. And of course the Department is a key figure in this equation, because unless the Department petitions the Board, the Board can do nothing.

Mr. President, Senators should insist on a report from the Department of Justice on how they will use this law. If the Department does not wish to use this new legislation the Board remains useless.

Let us look at the second and third paragraphs of the report:

> The court of appeals decision of March 3, 1967, held unconstitutional that portion of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 requiring registration by the Communist Party U.S.A. under an order of the Subversive Activities Control Board based on its findings that the CPUSA is a "Communist-action organization" within the terms of the act.
>
> The U.S. Supreme Court, in *Albertson* v. *S.A.C.B.*, 382 U.S. 70 (1965) invalidated (on fifth amendment grounds) an order of the Board requiring, in default of registration by the party, registration by persons found to be members of the party.

This is just more history. Nothing about the contents of the bill is contained therein. In fact, there is no attempt to deal with the specifics of the Supreme Court decision. Apparently the committee has endorsed the so-called "case method" of handling legal problems by giving us the court decisions to read in the appendix and letting us draw our own conclusions.

How about the fourth and fifth paragraphs in the report. I now read them:

> The bill herewith reported from the Committee would bring the law into accord with both the 1965 Supreme Court ruling and the March 3, 1967, decision of the court of appeals.[1]
>
> Speedy enactment of this legislation is necessary in order to avoid potentially troublesome litigation, and to enable the Subversive Activities Control Board to continue in the performance of its function without the serious administrative problems involved in attempting to operate under a statute clouded by court decisions rendering it partially invalid.

About the only thing we are told here is that the law must be changed to conform to two court decisions which have not been discussed or analyzed in the report as to their impact on the Board's functions. We are told that the statute has been clouded by the decisions of the courts. Mr. President, I greatly fear that some of this cloudiness has infected the report itself, which is surely one of the "cloudiest" documents I have ever read. The report, in stating that speedy action is necessary to avoid potentially troublesome litigation does not enlighten us as to what this litigation may possibly be. In fact I would think a bill so little understood by the Congress as this bill will be, unless we examine it at some length through the traditional procedures, might give rise to more litigation than it could possibly forestall.

The next paragraph tells us:

> It should be stressed that this bill does not in any way involve a challenge to either of the court decisions referred to above. It is emergency legislation required to reaffirm the intent of Congress that the Communist conspiracy shall be combated by exposure, to preserve the present status of the Subversive Activities Control Board and to enable it to function in consonance with the act under which it was created.

Mr. President, I am delighted to learn that the bill is not a challenge to court decisions in this area since the decisions were rendered on constitutional grounds. A challenge to the decisions would raise extremely serious constitutional questions. However, this paragraph does come closest to describing what the bill is all about when it states that it is to "preserve the status of the Subversive Activities Control Board."

The next paragraph, in two sentences, tries to describe the bill as follows:

> Salient features of this bill are aimed particularly at accomplishing the purposes of the Internal Security Act, so far as possible, without the requirement of registration. Disclosure of Communist organizations and of members of Communist-action organizations as provided therein is essential to the protection of the national welfare.

These two sentences are utterly inadequate in describing this 11-page, 273-line bill. We are told that it is essential to the "protection of the national welfare." Surely none among us is opposed to the national welfare. Yet why, precisely, is it essential? Unless we know what the bill does we can hardly answer that question. Does the committee report tell us what the bill does? It tells us that the salient features of the bill are to accomplish the purposes of the Internal Security Act without registration. It does not tell us how these purposes are to be accomplished—what devices are to be used. It does not tell us enough to enable us to determine what first or fifth amendment liberties might possibly be affected by the new language. In point of fact it tells us virtually nothing.

The next to last paragraph of the report reads:

> Enactment of this bill will enable the Subversive Activities Control Board to function in consonance with the act under which it was created (and with the purposes of the Congress in the enactment of that law), while eliminating from the act the requirement which the U.S. Supreme Court and the court of appeals, respectively, have declared unconstitutional.

This is just another phrasing of paragraph 4 of the report which states:

> The bill herewith reported from the Committee would bring the law into accord with both the 1965 Supreme Court ruling and the March 3, 1967, decision of the court of appeals.

The paragraph says nothing that has the slightest use.

The final paragraph tells us:

> In the opinion of the committee it is necessary to dispense with requirements of subsection (4) of rule XXIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate in order to expedite the business of the Senate.

This is a procedural matter, but one that has a serious substantive impact. Without the Cordon rule, which requires the original act as amended by this bill to be reprinted, it is really impossible to determine where the old legislation leaves off and the new begins. This is a complicated bill, Mr. President. By failing to reprint the 1950 act as amended the committee has simply further confused the issue.

So today we have the motion of the Senator from Illinois for the second procedural shortcut. The first is that we do not have the Cordon rule, and now we are supposed to hitch this on to the appropriation bill, which means of course that the House will have no real opportunity to deliberate on it. The House will either pass appropriations for State, Justice, and Commerce, and at the same time endorse the legislation, or it will have to kill appropriations for three important and vital agencies of the Government. So the House is taken completely out of the act as a deliberative body by this slick Dirksen maneuver. I hope that we will be able to get a great deal more clarification over the next several weeks so that the Senate can exercise its judgment with all the facts at hand.

Earlier today, the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] made a statement in connection with the possibility that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] might ask to suspend the rules to add the central Arizona project to the public works bill. What did the Senator from Illinois say in connection with suspending the rule that would prohibit legislation on an appropriation bill in that connection?

---

[1] **Full texts of these two decisions are printed as an appendix to this report.**

Here is what he said earlier in the day:

> It was said, when this suspension of the rules was proposed, that there was no precedent for it. Well, a sin of the past we cannot condone; nor can we pile another sin on top of it and compound it.

Mr. President, that Dirksen opposition to suspend the rule was precisely the same rule for precisely this same kind of purpose; namely, to permit legislation on an appropriation bill. Senator DIRKSEN earlier this very day opposed suspension of the rules on a bill which has this record—that the central Arizona project had hearings in the Senate in virtually every session since 1947 to date and in the House, in the 81st, 82d, 88th, 89th, and 90th Congresses; with legislation introduced in the House in every Congress from the 80th to the 90th; and over 20 volumes of hearings, including five volumes of hearings in the House with hundreds of witnesses who testified on it; and which passed the Senate in 1950, 1951, and 1967.

In addition, the matter has been litigated in the courts for over 10 years with more testimony and more evidence. Certainly, every Senator has had an opportunity to make up his mind based upon the facts, the evidence, and the expertise concerning the central Arizona project.

What a contrast this is.

The central Arizona project has had hearings many times, not once, not twice, but many times, with 20 volumes of hearings—in other words, a full record. But the Senator from Illinois says that we should not suspend the rules for it. He may be right.

If so, if he is right, then how can he be right when he asks to suspend the rules to add a bill that has had no hearings—not in one session, not in 1 week, not in 1 day, not even in 1 hour—no hearings at all?

The central Arizona project has had witnesses, not one, or a few, but hundreds of witnesses. But the Senator from Illinois opposes suspending the rules to add it to an appropriations bill. Maybe he was right.

If so, how can he be right when he asks to suspend the rules to add a bill that he has not had hundreds of witnesses, or a few witnesses, but no witnesses at all—not one?

The central Arizona project has passed the Senate not once or twice, but three times. It passed the Senate in 1950. It passed the Senate again in 1951. It passed again this year. Here was a bill that had met every Senate test, not once, but three times. The Senator from Illinois—maybe he was right, but if he was right, then how can he be right in asking the Senate to suspend the rules on a bill that has not passed the Senate three times, twice, or once—but never?

The central Arizona project which has passed this body three times, and as I said, had 20 volumes of hearings, has never been reported by the House committee to the floor of the House. The motion to suspend the rules to add it to an appropriation bill was deemed by its proponents to be necessary to effective House action. The Senator from Illinois opposed it. Maybe he was right, but if he was right, Mr. President, how can he justify suspending the rules to adopt legislation on a bill on which the House has had no chance to act and will have no chance to consider in an orderly manner if we slug it onto the appropriation bill?

Mr. President, this motion would attach a bill on which there is no record, no hearings initially, and no report—a bill on which we know nothing. Certainly, if there ever was a time when we should not suspend the rules, it is on this kind of railroad job.

I conclude, Mr. President, by saying, once again, that there is not a Member of this body, Republican or Democrat, who is not opposed to communism at home and abroad.

We are all against communism. It is a matter of how we can fight it most effectively.

Thus, I say, we need hearings on this kind of complicated bill to find out what the bill will do. Certainly, at least we need some competent testimony on it. We need a record. The Attorney General of the United States is in a position where only he can give force to the bill, or make it useless.

Under these circumstances, I hope and pray that the Senate will not suspend the rules and put this bill, which has had no consideration, no sensible consideration at all, and no real consideration, on to an appropriation bill.

I trust Senators will recognize that all of us oppose communism, all of us want to fight it. But we want to fight it with our eyes open, and we do not want to have the opposition to communism used as a phony excuse to keep this idle board—this sinecure for $500 a week do-nothings—alive. The taxpayer deserves a better break than that kind of deception.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I should like to congratulate the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] for his eloquent and, I might say, factual and very direct remarks on the motion.

Like Senator PROXMIRE and all of my colleagues, I agree that there is no Member of this body who is not opposed with all his heart and all his mind to communism at home and abroad. That includes the junior Senator from Maryland. But, that is not the issue, no matter how cloudy the oratory may make it.

Mr. President, the issue before us is a motion to suspend the rules of the Senate, to legislate on an appropriation. The Senator from Illinois has offered this motion in hopes that the Senate will put aside its own rules and enact as part of the pending appropriations bill his own bill, S. 2171, regarding internal security. That bill, which has been brought up, has not been considered in hearings, or adequately explained to the Senate.

I invite the attention of my colleagues to the report which the Senator from Wisconsin has just read. If they will take another look at the report, they will see that it contains no explanation of the effect of the bill. It contains no section-by-section analysis of the provisions. It contains no statement of how the bill would change existing law. The bill has not been sent to the Department of Justice for comment. It has not been sent to any other department of the administration which would have the authority or the responsibility in the administration of the bill, nor have the views of the administraton been sought or presented to the Judiciary Committee.

At this point, Mr. President, I would appreciate it very much if the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] would give me his attention, because it was the Senator from Delaware who first brought this matter to the attention of the junior Senator from Maryland.

The bill that Senator DIRKSEN seeks to suspend the rules to consider would perpetuate the Subversive Activities Control Board, despite substantial evidence that appointments to its $26,000-a-year jobs are being made on the basis of politics rather than the national security, and despite serious suggestions that that agency's functions and responsibilities could be carried out just as effectively and at lower cost to the taxpayers by other Federal agencies, notably the Justice Department and the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

At this point, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article which was published in the Wall Street Journal on July 20, 1967, dealing directly on this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTONIAN WEDS L. B. J.'S EX-SECRETARY AND LANDS SOFT JOB—POST ON SUBVERSIVE BOARD PAYS $26,000, POSES FEW DEMANDS; BREEZING THROUGH THE SENATE

(By Jerry Landauer)

WASHINGTON.—How does a 29-year-old accountant obtain a Presidential appointment to a soft Government job that pays $26,000 a year?

By marrying one of Lyndon Johnson's secretaries.

How does the White House shield the fortunate fellow from risking the questions of Senators who must confirm him?

By arranging to whisk the appointment through the Senate when nobody is looking.

Obviously this question-and-answer scenario doesn't conform with civics-textbook notions of the selection process for ranking Federal officials. But it apparently does describe how Washington resident Simon F. McHugh Jr. got a five-year sinecure as a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board. He'll be sworn in any day unless some Senator asks and obtains unanimous consent to reconsider.

The five-member SACB is the Government agency that determines, on application of the Justice Department, whether a suspected organization should be formally cited as subversive. The workload has been declining since 1965, when the Supreme Court ruled unconstitutional a provision of law requiring registration by Communist Party members. Not one hearing has been held in 20 months, and not one case is pending. New York Democrat John Rooney, chairman of the House Appropriations subcommittee that scrutinizes the board's budget, says the members enjoy "about the best jobs around town."

READING UP ON THE LAW

Mr. McHugh concedes that his employment record doesn't at first glance appear to qualify him for membership on a "quasi-judicial" agency that delves into subversion. But, he observes, "realistically speaking, there aren't many experts." Also, he adds, "you can get a pretty good idea of the procedures by reading the law and the board's reports."

Mr. McHugh's professional preparation for the cushy post consists of a bachelor's degree in business administration earned six years ago at Georgetown University, followed by short stints in four jobs. His career seemed to be moving sideways for the most part until he wooed Victoria McCammon, a tall, attractive White House secretary who, though now employed elsewhere in the Government, remains a particular Presidential favorite. Marriage to Miss McCammon in August 1966 perceptibly perked up Mr. McHugh's prospects.

When the tight mortgage market last year soured certain of Mr. McHugh's real estate investments ("He lost a lot," says a spokesman for B. C. Goods Investments Inc., of which he was a partner and property manager), he moved to the Small Business Administration—as special assistant to Howard Greenberg, associate administrator for investment.

Mr. McHugh began work at the SBA last March 8, quickly won a raise to $17,550 and stayed long enough to earn praise from Mr. Greenberg for being "bright, smart and aggressive." Mr. Greenberg doesn't remember, though, how he came to hire Mr. McHugh.

A SURPRISE TO ME

Seasoned by 15 weeks of Government service and intending to study law at night, Mr. McHugh expresses confidence that he'll manage to switch stride from small business to subversion. But he doesn't remember how he attracted the President's eye for the new $26,000 job. "I really don't know who recommended me. It was as much of a surprise to me as it was to everybody else."

Mr. McHugh's social life has quickened, too. Following a recent weekend visit by the McHughs to the LBJ Ranch, the couple was added by one Washington society writer to "the list of Great Society insiders . . . with whom President and Mrs. Johnson most comfortably spend their spare time."

Further surprises unfolded this week. In the Congressional Record that came out last Friday, a routine notice inserted by Chairman James Eastland of the Senate Judiciary Committee invited interested citizens to submit "any representations or objections" to Mr. McHugh's appointment "on or before Thursday, July 20." He also invited objectors to state "whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled."

But on the same day the invitation appeared, the committee quietly moved Mr. McHugh's nomination to the Senate floor. It was reported to the Senate moments after the opening buzzer sounded at noon Monday, and at 12:05 p.m. it sailed through the chamber without debate. In the haste to put Mr. McHugh to work on an agency whose docket is clear, there wasn't even time to list his name on the Senate calendar of Presidential nominees awaiting confirmation. Confides a Senate source: "I've rarely seen so much whoosh behind an appointment."

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, one of the very few things the proponents of S. 2171 have made clear about that bill is that it is not intended to, and will not, alter the effect of the Supreme Court's decisions affecting the SACB. The effect of those decisions, however, has left the Board, in its own view at least, nothing to do. The Board has rarely met at all during the last 20 months. The Attorney General has not sent it a single case for over a year.

In other words, the Board's continued existence makes a mockery of our pledges of economy. It is shocking that $330,000 of the taxpayer's dollars are spent each year to continue its negligible operations.

The annual appropriation for the Subversive Activities Control Board is $330,000—a handsome sum. This money could support for 2 years the budget of a Headstart program in Baltimore County. Three hundred and thirty thousand dollars could insure that 180 preschool youngsters from disadvantaged backgrounds receive the extra attention and preparation they need to succeed in school. The $26,000 salary of a single member of the Board could finance for a year a remedial reading and preschool training project in Allegany County, Md.

Examples of how this money could be put to better use could be multiplied endlessly. I am sure that each of my colleagues has in his head a list of urgent needs in his State which must be deferred and postponed due to reduced appropriations this year.

There has been in recent days a great deal of controversy and criticism over the appointment of Mr. Simon F. McHugh, Jr., to one of the $26,000-a-year jobs on the Subversive Activities Control Board. I would agree with much of this criticism.

But Mr. McHugh's own qualifications are not really the central question. His qualifications seem to be as good as anyone needs for a job which has no duties, let alone qualifications.

Attention should properly be focused on whether the Subversive Activities Control Board as presently constituted should continue to exist at all. Because it has virtually no functions to perform, I submit that the Board should be abolished.

For this reason, I asked the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] to add my name to the list of sponsors of his bill, S. 2146, which would abolish the Subversive Activities Control Board and transfer its responsibilities to the Department of Justice. The bill would save the taxpayers a third of a million dollars a year, and any residual duties of the Board can and should be handled equally as well by Mr. J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI and the existing staff of the Justice Department and FBI.

Mr. President, I believe that the United States should maintain whatever laws are necessary to protect our national security. I am concerned that the SCAB and its $26,000 a year jobs may actually have become just a political pork barrel, wasting $300,000 a year of taxpayers' money. I think we should consider transferring the functions of the SACB to some other agency of the Government like the Justice Department rather than leaving them to a pork barrel board of political appointees.

Hearings and a reasonable report on Senator DIRKSEN's bill would clarify these questions. If those hearings show S. 2171 to be both wise and necessary to our national security, I will certainly support it. But, especially in light of the controversy about the latest appointment to the Board, I think it would be unwise to pass S. 2171 without the basic consideration any bill should receive—that is, a hearing in the proper committee; namely, the Judiciary Committee of the Senate.

But even if I favored Senate consideration of S. 2171 without hearings or an adequate report, I would oppose suspending the Senate rules to consider it.

Mr. President, in January of this year, this body debated at great length the question of whether it should, in effect, suspend its rules in order to change rule 22, the cloture rule. Mr. President, one of the most compelling speeches delivered during that debate against suspending the Senate rules is particularly relevant to this debate today. That speech against suspending the rules was delivered by Senator DIRKSEN, who today asks us to suspend the rules.

In his speech, Senator DIRKSEN warned of the dangers if this body, the Senate, should begin to suspend its rules. He said:

> There is a rule that you cannot legislate on appropriation bills. In the House we did it with impunity . . .
>
> I know how it works because I have made it work. And it can work again. That is the danger. You will destroy the orderly processes . . .
>
> If we are going to protect the Republic against wild schemes and fantasies and favorite legislative brainchildren, the thing to do is to protect our rules.

Mr. President, I agreed in January with Senator DIRKSEN and many of my distinguished colleagues, and we voted 59 to 37 to protect the Senate rules from being, in effect, suspended. I think Senator DIRKSEN was right to warn in January against suspending the rules, and I think he is wrong today in asking the Senate to do it. I agreed with him in January. I oppose him today.

I urge the Senate to reject this attempt to suspend the rules.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of Senator DIRKSEN's speech in January be reprinted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Vice President, we have heard a lot of quaint doctrine here today. It reminds me of the little girl coming home from Sunday school. When her mother said, "Suzy, what was the lesson about," she said, "Well mother the text was 'the Lord is sneaking through Humbolt Park.' "

Well, her mother was incredulous. She could not imagine that. She was sure it could not be the Lord sneaking through Humbolt Park. So the mother called the Sunday school teacher and asked, "What was the text today?"

She said, "The Lord is seeking a humble heart."

That is altogether different doctrine.

So we have had a lot of quaint doctrine. But two things, Mr. President, will not be gainsaid after all the debate is over. The first one is the endeavor to get cloture by a majority vote. That was standing out so clear that it requires no explanation on my part. And then, of course, there was all the eloquence addressed to the figure of the majority.

Probably history will record that the majority has been wrong oftener than not. I believe there is something to that text, in the book of Exodus in the Old Testament, which says, "Follow not a multitude to do evil." It is in language so crystal clear that it cannot be mistaken, and it has been there for a long, long time.

And it has some weight; because it appeared here, in 1964, that there was a multitude moving the Senate in a given direction in the field of civil rights. It has been said here today that we took 83 days on the issue.

Mr. President, that is the best 83 days that the U.S. Senate ever expended, on that explosive and incandescent issue, because all the while, in my office, for weeks with the Vice President sitting at the table, and the Attorney General, and ofttimes the majority leader and myself, laboriously we hammered out the details of a civil rights bill that started with four titles and wound up with 11. And it works today; that is the important thing. It was full of bugs and worms. I remember talking so many times about it with the late President Kennedy. I do not know how many times the Attorney General was in my office, and I said, "We will not take it; it is defective." But we did not forsake our labors. We worked at it.

But what could we have done if the debate could not have been carried on here, in disposing of the motion to take up? It is true that that occupied the time of the Senate; but all the while the business of perfecting that legislation went on, and it stands on the books today, a credit to everyone who had any hand in fashioning it.

My friend the Senator from Oregon mentioned a moment ago that, of course, if we do not respond to the checks and balances, they will do it over in the House of Representatives.

How do you think the 14(b) business got out of the House of Representatives? They gagged them, Constitution or no Constitution. Those poor 47 tender Congressmen, who were led down the pathway to slaughter and did not come back, could not even amend the bill. They had it rigged so no amendments could be offered on the floor of the House. What do you think they do with tax bills? The Ways and Means Committee comes in under a rule: no amendments except those that are offered by the committee on the floor of the House.

Oh, there are lovely ways to get around checks and balances. Do not be beguiled by all this fancy rhetoric, nor by the fact that my distinguished friend from New York says that since a proposition obtained in 1789, profane hands must not touch it now.

That is not the issue. The question is, Was it right in 1789? If it was sound as a matter of principle then, it ought to be a matter of principle in 1967. You can argue until this domed ceiling falls, but you will never alter the fact that 2 and 2 was 4 in 1789, and it is 4 in 1967. So it is a question of the principle, and how fundamental it is, that is involved.

So, when I think of the majority, I remember, you know, that it was the majority that jeered Christopher Columbus because he had an idea the world was round. They jeered Galileo, and made him recant before they sacrificed him. That was the majority speaking. You have to be pretty careful, and especially so when you are in the field of procedure.

So I want to see no majority cloture. It is dangerous for free institutions.

Now, what was the other proposition? As this thing was set up, it set up a formula, first, to offer a motion to cut off debate, and insist on an immediate vote.

Then, of course, wait for the point of order, and then let it be a constitutional issue. Submit it to the Senate. Otherwise, you get one step deleted and come along with a motion to table in the hope that you have enough votes to beat a point of order.

Now, that is a formula. Well, if it works here in the rules, it works here on legislation.

For how many years have we heard about the item veto? They tried to put it through. What was the objection? The objection was that it would delegate to the President the power to appropriate. It has not ever gone through this body.

The result is what? They try to boot us. Here is the weapon they wanted. Put it on the item veto. Offer it as an amendment to any bill. Get a ruling out of order. Appeal from the ruling of the Chair, and then, of course, get a majority of those who are present and voting.

I have seen the time when appropriation bills have gone through this body with only six or seven Senators on the floor. Those appropriation bills involved billions of dollars. All you need is four, and you will get it stuck on there as an amendment.

There is a rule that you cannot legislate on appropriation bills. In the House we did it with impunity. If I violated that rule once, I did it a hundred times. It worked because I made it work. We have to suspend the rules. There has to be an intervening day. Then there must be a two-thirds vote. Oh, it is said we can circumvent all that. Let us not worry about the rules. Throw the rule book in the rain barrel. Ignore the appropriation bills. Why bother about them? Wait until an agriculture or an Interior appropriation bill comes in. Stand on your own two feet. Offer an amendment, and when the Presiding Officer says it is out of order, you appeal from the ruling of the Chair. You have your soldiers present on the floor.

You do not undertake these efforts unless you are equipped. That is part of the strategy. It always has been. You ask that it be submitted. Oh, there should be a quorum call. You can get them over here.

More often than not, there will not be time enough to acquaint them with what is going on, but if you have enough troops around, you will get the bill amended.

I went so far as to amend an agricultural act. I got the Sugar Act liquidated in the House of Representatives. I had every sugar Representative and Senator rush into my office with stilettos in their teeth to try to do disciplined mayhem on me.

I know how it works because I have made it work. And it can work again. That is the danger. You will destroy the orderly processes.

Senators remember the work-or-fight bill that Bob Taft stopped on the floor. I have said a thousand times that if there is one vote in my whole career that I would undo, that would be the vote. However, there is no piety and no icy finger or anything else that can erase that from my record. That is the one vote that I would undo. Yet, that bill could have been rammed through under this kind of proposal.

It could be done on strike legislation.

Senators remember the Court-packing proposal of a long time ago. It was here that they stopped it. It was here that the Senate stopped the packing of the Supreme Court of the United States. And it was because this institution was free, and one could speak his piece here and was not inhibited or fearful of the fact that a majority was going to put some condign thing upon the statute books for which one would express a deep regret later.

It is not needed. In 1964 I got on my knees on this carpeted floor. I said, "Please, please vote for cloture."

You remember what happened here. You do not have to conceal any names. I begged the Senator from Arizona. I begged him. I guess I was not much of an advocate. I could not persuade him with all the tears in my eyes, the tremor in my voice, and the solicitude I had for the Senator, as much as a mother would have for a tender and gentle baby, I could not persuade him.

You heard the dean of Congress this afternoon, Carl Hayden, who has been on this hilltop for 54 years. He never voted for cloture, mainly because in the fuss that went on here long ago when Arizona tried to get into the Union, New Mexico was standing in the wings.

Had there been a cloture vote, there would have been no Arizona. Had there been no Arizona, there probably would have been a thumping Republican majority in 1964. [Laughter.]

The Vice President. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. Dirksen. Mr. President, take it out of my time.

Seven times out of 36 endeavors, this Senate has voted cloture, going back to 1919. Do not tell me you cannot get it, because I got it, just as others did. You can get it again when you have a case, but when you have a bill of goods to sell to the Senate, a bill of goods that is under suspicion and not in the national interest, it should not be sold.

That is the point. If we are going to protect the Republic against wild schemes and fantacies and favorite legislative brain children, the thing to do is to protect our rules.

As my time runs out, and just before my friend, the Senator from South Dakota, makes his motion to table, let me adjure you now with everything that is in my heart to vote down this motion to table and let the point of order prevail.

We can then approve it today by a voice vote, and when we adjourn tonight that will have erased the confusion. It will have clarified the air, and we will start anew.

I am in the mood now, if they file a cloture motion on Senate Resolution 6 to put my name on it and see where we go.

I would then give assurance to the Senator from South Carolina that I will sit down with him and see if we cannot negotiate a reasonable time to discuss this matter and let it come to a vote.

I do not mind. I am prepared to do it, and surely in the wisdom and genius of this body we can find the right answer without forfeiting the safeguards that have meant so much to this country.

This is the 90th Congress. It is the 179th year in which this body has met without interruption in peace or war.

There is no better parliamentary body.

The reason we are here is because our procedures were safeguarded. Let us safeguard them now. Let us vote down this motion to table and get the air clarified.

Then we will make a start and I am confident that our innate restrain, our intuitive wisdom, and our sense of patience can negotiate a period in which we can bring this matter to a vote, and I shall be delighted to do so.

So I say to you, vote down the motion to table and then we will get to work.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of the prayer and the reading of the Journal, there be a time limitation of 2 hours on the motion of the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen], to be equally divided and controlled by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Proxmire].

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will committees be able to sit?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Montana? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement later reduced to writing is as follows:

Ordered, That after the approval of the Journal on Wednesday, October 11, debate on the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen] to suspend rule XVI, paragraph 4, so as to offer an amendment, legislative in nature, to H.R. 10345, making appropriations for the Departments of State,

Justice, and Commerce, etc., be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Proxmire].

ORDER FOR RECESS TO TOMORROW AT 11 A.M.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business this afternoon, it stand in recess until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING THE SESSION OF THE SENATE TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, with the consent of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee and the minority leader, I would like to announce that there will be no further action on the pending business tonight, and I suggest that it might be a good idea to turn to the consideration of the conference report on the agriculture appropriation bill at this time.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10509) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Mondale in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The assistant legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of October 10, 1967, Congressional Record, p. 28396.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Can the Senator advise whether he anticipates a rollcall vote on the conference report?

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall not ask and I have not heard that any Senator desires one, but it might be that some Senator would desire a rollcall vote.

Mr. McCLELLAN. But as of now, the Senator does not anticipate one?

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not anticipate a vote.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I shall not report on the details of the conference agreement, since the full text of the conference report and the statement of the managers on the part of the House appear in House Report No. 746, and in the Congressional Record of October 10, 1967, page 28396.

Mr. President, the conference agreement deals with 61 different numbered amendments, plus seven amendments reported in disagreement. In several instances individual amendments embody differences affecting numerous individual projects and activities and final agreement was reached after several sessions of the conference committee. The conference committee meetings began last Wednesday, October 4, and continued morning and afternoon with some interruptions for rollcall votes on both sides, except for last Friday.

We resumed again yesterday morning, recessed at noon, and in the afternoon session finally reached agreement on all amendments except amendments Nos. 43, 56, and 63 which will be reported in true disagreement and which I will discuss when they are reported to the Senate after the adoption of the conference report. Four amendments Nos. 9, 31, 37 and 67 were reported in technical disagreement. On those four amendments the House has today receded and agreed to the Senate amendments as amended in conference.

Mr. President, the conference committee has been meeting in an atmosphere of extreme economy. The conferees from the other body have insisted, in view of the limited extension of the existing continuing resolution coupled with the current general feeling of economy in that body, that this year each appropriation item in the bill must be agreed upon at the budget level or below. Upon the insistence of the House conferees, the Senate conferees were thus forced to yield on many important projects and activities.

In general, the President's budget, together with the detailed recommendations thereunder as to the dollar amounts, represents a good base upon which the Committees on Appropriations should begin their consideration, and upon which each body may base its recommendations after hearing the justifications of the departmental officials in support of estimated requirements and other witnesses.

The Senate Committee on Appropriations and every member on that committee has the right—and indeed the responsibility—to exercise an independent judgment and then to make a collective committee determination upon the appropriate level of funding program and administrative activities represented by appropriation items. Such committee recommendations are then subject to the approval or change by the Senate as it debates and votes upon appropriation bills.

In summary, speaking as one Member of the Senate and as the chairman of the subcommittee responsible for handling the appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies, I wish to state emphatically that next year I shall as I have always done heretofore, recommend such increases over, or decreases under, the amounts requested in the budget or carried in the bill as it comes from the other body in those instances where I believe changes are justified based upon the justifications and the needs presented to the committee during its consideration of the budget.

The action taken this year in the conference in bringing each appropriation item to the budget level or below does not represent any precedent so far as I am personally concerned, or so far as the Senate Committee on Appropriations is concerned, but was done simply to meet the exigencies of the current situation.

By acceding to the budget amount or below on the several items in the conference report, I believe we have now reached the lowest level and furnished the minimum amounts essential to the operation of the several program and administrative agencies of the department. In recent days there has been considerable discussion about the initiation of rescission bills following the enactment of the regular appropriation act for the respective departments. It is my view, at this time, that the conference agreement on this bill, if it is agreed to by the Senate, carries all the reductions which should be applied against the conduct of the programs administered by the Department of Agriculture. In fact, it is my opinion that some items have been reduced too much.

Mr. President, the conference report referred to earlier, House Report No. 746, describes in detail the agreement reached in conference on the several appropriation items. At the conclusion of my remarks following the disposition of the amendments to be reported in disagreement, I will offer for inclusion in the record a comparative table showing in detail comparisons between the appropriations for last year, the budget estimate, the House and Senate versions, the conference allowances, and how the conference bill compares with the estimates, the House bill, and the Senate bill.

The total amount of the conference bill is $4,952,945,700, which is $68,151,700 under the President's budget.

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

Mr. President, I want to make some comments on the food stamp program. The budget estimate for fiscal 1968 proposed to appropriate $195,000,000 for the expenses of the food stamp program, a welfare program, by transfer of funds from the section 32 permanent appropriation.

This was clearly an abuse of section 32 which was authorized for removal of surplus perishable commodities.

When the subcommittee made its recommendations in committee markup, I recommended that the full amount of $195 million requested be provided and the funds be appropriated directly from the general revenue fund. This recommendation was adopted by the Senate.

The extension of the Food Stamp Authorization Act was delayed for several weeks on the differing versions of the extension legislation. In the Senate version, I had recommended the inclusion of a provision which would require that funds for operation of the extended food stamp program must be appropriated directly from the general revenue fund. The amended Food Stamp Authorization Act was approved by the President on September 27, and is now Public Law 90-91, and it carries that provision.

There was no difficulty in the conference in getting the House conferees to agree on this method of financing as has been made clear by the new authorization act.

I ask unanimous consent that Public Law 90-91 be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUBLIC LAW 90-91, S. 953

An act to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of subsection (a) of section 16 of the Food Stamp Act of 1964 is amended by inserting after "June 30, 1967;" the following: "not in excess of $200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968; not in excess of $225,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969;".

SEC. 2. Section 16(a) of such Act is further amended by inserting at the end thereof the following: "This Act shall be carried out only with funds appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury for that specific purpose and in no event shall it be carried out with funds derived from permanent appropriations."

Approved September 27, 1967.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the conferees did agree to a smaller amount than was provided earlier by the Senate. The conference amount is $161,800,000 by direct appropriation plus $23,200,000 reappropriation, making a total of $185 million instead of the budget estimate of $195 million.

The failure of the budget officials to submit a revised estimate, pursuant to Public Law 90-91, is regretted since this item is now reported as being $161,800,000 over the estimates. The small reduction of $10 million was readily agreed to by the conference committee in view of the fact that one-fourth of the fiscal year had elapsed and that under the continuing resolution the program has been operating at the annual rate of $140 million as approved last year.

SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM

The Senate receded from its amendment No. 30 to provide a direct appropriation from the general revenue fund of $104 million for the expenses of the special milk program rather than to derive funds from section 32, as proposed in the budget and approved in the other body. In view of the general budgetary situation, the Senate receded from its amendment for the current fiscal year. The report of the statement of the managers on page 8 expresses the view of the conference committee on this subject where it states:

> The conferees are agreed that hereafter the Bureau of the Budget should provide for this program from the general fund of the Treasury by direct appropriation.

Mr. President, unless there be questions from other Senators at this point, I move the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am happy to yield to my distinguished friend, the Senator from Nebraska, the ranking minority member of our subcommittee, of which I have the honor to be chairman, who has worked for a long time, and very hard, on this bill. I wish to say that no one has worked harder, longer, nor more efficiently than has the Senator from Nebraska. I am happy to yield to him.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the Senator is very generous in his remarks, and I thank him.

I associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Florida.

The bill which the Congress sends to the President today reflects the extreme pressures to reduce appropriations which were present when the conferees met to resolve differences between the Senate and the other body. The product of the conference reflects this pressure to a very great degree.

A table which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks graphically illustrates the results.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPONG in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the conference action is more than $2 billion less than was contained in the fiscal 1967 Agricultural Appropriations Act. It is about $1.8 billion less than the Senate bill. There are some meaningful cuts in activities of the department, but in the main the bill merely defers to some unspecified time the cost of the Nation's farm programs.

The bill deliberately defers a $1.5 billion item to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for its losses for fiscal year 1966. This is money which has already been expended. What now happens is that the treasury will have to borrow money—at prevailing interest rates—to finance through the backdoor this part of the cost of the administration's farm program.

Regrettably, the situation will get even worse next year. For fiscal 1967 not quite $4 billion has been spent to cover the cost of the commodity and related programs. The Commodity Credit Corporation is fast running out of unused borrowing authority and will have to suspend its operations—as it did back in 1965—unless Congress appropriates sufficient funds to restore the impairment of its capital.

Mr. President, these agriculture appropriations are about 30 percent below funds which were appropriated by Congress for the preceeding fiscal year; if the Congress and the President can impose this kind of reduction on the farmer, then let them do it for other spending programs as well.

Mr. President, it was a great pleasure to witness the fashion in which the chairman of our subcommittee conducted the conference negotiations. It was a piece of work skillfully done, and showed a great deal of detailed knowledge in every field of this very complex appropriation bill. His conduct in the conference was a continuation of the exemplary manner in which he conducts the work of the subcommittee.

I subscribe to the idea that the action taken this year in the conference, in bringing the appropriations items to the budget level or below, does not represent any precedent as far as I am concerned. On that particular point, I join the chairman of the subcommittee in saying that I preserve my independence of judgment on future budgets submitted in this field, as in other fields as well.

Again, I warmly thank the Senator from Florida for his very generous remarks.

Mr. President, I also compliment the clerk of the subcommittee, Mr. Raymond Schafer, and his able assistant, Mr. Joseph Stewart. They are dedicated and competent professionals. They perform their assigned tasks in outstanding fashion and contribute significantly to our work.

EXHIBIT 1

H.R. 10509, summary of appropriations and comparisons

1967 appropriations	$7,022,571,450
Estimates, 1968	5,021,097,400
House bill	4,770,580,950
Senate bill	6,782,529,789
Conference bill	4,952,945,700

Comparisons, conference bill (+ or −)

1967 appropriations	−$2,069,625,750
Estimates, 1968	−68,151,700
House bill, 1968	+182,364,750
Senate bill, 1968	−1,829,584,089

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am most grateful to my distinguished friend. I wish to say again for myself, I am not granting that our action this year is any precedent binding either on any Senator, on our committee, or on the Senate, because I deem it to be the duty of each Senator and of the Senate, after hearing the testimony of witnesses from the agencies and from the public, to either support, increase, or decrease the budget recommendations. The budget recommendations are simply a beginning point for the consideration of each item.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Florida.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask that House amendments Nos. 9, 31, 37, and 67, which were reported in technical disagreement, be considered en bloc.

They have already been acted upon by the House which has receded and adopted the Senate amendment as amended by the conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, three amendments were reported in true disagreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the first amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

> Page 25, line 1, insert, *Provided*, That agreements entered into during the fiscal year 1968 shall not require payments during the calendar year 1968 exceeding $52,200,000.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, this was a very important amendment, and I am sorry that the House would not agree to it. I shall describe it briefly.

It was an amendment simply providing authority to the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service to enter into contracts to retire cropland up to a maximum cost of $52,200,000.

As the bill came to the Senate from the other body, this language request contained in the budget had been deleted. The Senate restored it and the conference insisted upon retaining it during the course of negotiations with the conferees from the other body. The House conferees were adamant. I feel we are making a mistake in not providing authorization for the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into contracts to take up some of the acreage which is coming out of the soil bank during this year and at the end of 1968 under the old conservation reserve program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter I have received from the Acting Administrator of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, dated June 22, signed by Mr. Ed Jaenke, setting forth some of the needs for continuation of the cropland adjustment program, as authorized in the Agriculture Act for 1965. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a summary tabulation prepared and submitted to the committee by the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service showing the total conservation reserve acreage and the expiring acreage to be released by calendar years.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND
CONSERVATION SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., June 22, 1967.

Hon. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR HOLLAND: Secretary Freeman has asked us to provide you with some additional information regarding the need for continuing the Cropland Adjustment Program in 1968. As you know our farmlands still have a production potential greater than the effective demand for agricultural commodities particularly such crops as feed grains and cotton. Diversions from normal plantings of these crops will continue to be needed for several years to come. While the diversions could be achieved under annual programs this would require a greater outlay in tax dollars per unit of production avoided than can be achieved now under the Cropland Adjustment Program.

The Cropland Adjustment Program brings many benefits to both farm and non-farm people. It helps provide recreational opportunities, it provides better assured erosion control, and it helps State and local governments acquire farmland no longer needed for crops and convert it to uses that directly benefit all the citizens of a particular area.

A further problem that we must consider is that *1.6 million* acres will be released from the Conservation Reserve Program at the end of 1967. An additional *5.9 million* acres will be released at the end of 1968. While some of this land (about 1.3 million acres) has been planted to trees the remainder will be in condition to move immediately back into crops. About 5.7 million acres of conservation reserve land will be available for planting by 1969 in areas of the country where feed grains are grown. While thus far farmers have tended to leave about ½ of the released conservation reserve land in conserving use, an appreciable improvement in the outlook for income from crops could change this relationship to one where most of this land would be planted rather than be left in grass. Of course, some of the released conservation reserve land will be on farms that do not have a feed grain base or a cotton allotment and, therefore, under the present Cropland Adjustment Program the land will not be recontracted. Also we would not recontract land in trees or otherwise unsuitable for crops. However, most of the farms with land coming out from under conservation reserve contracts likely will have some feed grain base.

To discontinue the Cropland Adjustment Program in 1968 would make it very difficult for us to carry out a program in 1969 when most of the remaining conservation reserve land is released. The 1966 Cropland Adjustment Program showed that it is difficult to apply a program effectively in the first year.

I am attaching a table showing a precontract history of the conservation reserve lands released recently and to be released in the next few years.

Very truly yours,

E. A. JAENKE,
Acting Administrator.

(Enclosures.)

PROBABLE ACRES UNDER CONSERVATION RESERVE PROGRAM CONTRACTS WHICH OTHERWISE WOULD BE DEVOTED TO SPECIFIED CROPS, 1963–69, BASED ON ESTIMATED PRECONTRACT HISTORY

[In thousand acres]

Commodity	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969
Cotton	562	450	396	375	305	241	90
Peanuts	116	100	91	89	74	55	22
Tobacco	10	7	5	5	5	4	1
Potatoes	29	23	18	18	17	15	8
Corn	3,997	2,773	2,184	2,148	1,879	1,614	659
Wheat	2,725	2,063	1,724	1,645	1,381	1,214	482
Rice	6	4	3	3	3	2	1
Oats	3,345	2,406	1,938	1,894	1,652	1,394	577
Barley	1,370	1,006	808	788	676	600	238
Grain sorghum	3,080	2,464	2,254	1,982	1,396	1,118	307
Rye	750	552	453	433	361	315	111
Total	15,990	11,848	9,874	9,380	7,767	6,572	2,496
Total conservation reserve acres	24,256	17,538	14,188	13,618	11,364	9,688	3,602

CROPLAND ADJUSTMENT PROGRAM

The productive capacity of American agriculture continues to grow. It is estimated that this growth rate will require some 30 million acres of cropland to be held out of production in the decade ahead, if we are to avoid a build-up of surpluses. This estimate, supported by independent studies, takes full account of increased domestic and export needs. The potential excess production capacity is greatest in feed grains and cotton but touches nearly all of our field crops.

With potential excess capacity of some 30 million acres of cropland during the next decade the question becomes what is the best and least expensive way to keep this land out of production and in consuming uses. The flexibility inherent in the current, annual, voluntary wheat, cotton or feed grains is important and these programs will be needed. However, experience has shown the long-term land adjustment program such as CAP has advantages. First, it is less expensive—about ⅓ less than for the annual cotton or feed grain programs.

Second, it is better suited to older and part-time farmers. Third, it is popular with farmers. This past year applications for the CAP contracts were 300% greater than could be accepted. The request for $52 million advance authorization for the 1968 program (about 2 million acres) will about "hold the line" since 1.6 million acres of Conservation Reserve contracts will be expiring at the end of 1967.

THE NEED FOR CONTINUING THE CROPLAND ADJUSTMENT PROGRAM

The productive capacity of American agriculture on the amount of land already developed for crops far exceeds what our domestic and world outlets likely will take for at least the next decade. This is especially true in the case of feed grains and cotton.

About 1.6 million more acres will be released from conservation reserve contracts at the end of 1967, 6.0 million acres at the end of 1968, and 3.4 million acres at the end of 1969 (a total of 11 million acres in the next 3 years). In addition, agreements will expire by the end of 1969 on more than one-half million acres and by 1970 on almost one million acres, now under cropland conversion and cropland adjustment programs.

In the absence of voluntary programs (or, as an alternative, mandatory programs) to hold feed grain and cotton production and possibly that of some other crops in line with effective demand, surpluses of these crops can build up rapidly. Past experience proves that heavy surpluses are very costly to the Government, as well as price depressing in farm markets.

The necessary diversion probably could be obtained on a year-to-year basis under annual acreage diversion programs. But the cost of diversion payments under annual programs tends to follow general price levels—and there is a trend toward rising prices. On the other hand, the cost of diversion under a long-term agreement is related to prices current as of the time the agreement is made. Thus, diversion agreements made in 1968 and 1969 for a period of years (under the cropland adjustment program authorized by Title VI of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965) should cost substantially less per unit of production diverted than would likely be the cost of buying the same amount of diversion under annual programs three, four, or more years hence.

It is highly unlikely that any of the acreage under the long-term Cropland Adjustment Program will need to be brought back into crop production during the period of the agreements. This acreage is only a little more than one-half as much as that which will be released from conservation reserve contracts from 1967 to 1969. However, if any portion of the acreage under the long-term agreements should need to be released, there is full authority under the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 for the Secretary to terminate or modify agreements with producers by mutual agreement or to adjust payments on account of failure to comply with the terms and conditions of the program.

TOTAL CONSERVATION RESERVE PROGRAM ACREAGE AND EXPIRING ACREAGE TO BE RELEASED, BY YEARS[1]

Calendar year	Acres in reserve	
	As of Dec. 31	To expire Dec. 31
1960	28,660,679	149,153
1961	28,511,526	2,706,972
1962	25,804,554	1,548,826
1963	24,255,728	6,818,327
1964	17,437,401	3,457,730
1965	13,979,671	664,158
1966	13,315,513	2,335,301
1967	10,980,212	1,628,049
1968	9,352,163	5,896,183
1969	3,455,980	3,380,305
1970[2]	75,675	67,457
1971[2]	8,218	7,514
1972[2]	704	704
Total		28,660,679

[1] Source of data: Statistical summary, 1966.

[2] Represents mandatory extensions because tree seedlings were unavailable.

CONSERVATION RESERVE PROGRAM

[In million acres]

	1967	1968
1. Total acreage to be released at the end of year	1.6	5.9
2. Estimated released acreage in trees	.3	.8
3. Remaining acreage—Potential additional crop use in year following release	1.3	5.1
a. Estimated amount of item 3 which will remain in protective cover during year following release[1]	.7	2.7
b. Estimated amount of item 3 to be used for row or grain crops in year following release[1]	.6	2.4

[1] Based on pattern of land use indicated by survey during the spring of 1966 of the 1965 use of land previously under CRP.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the cropland adjustment program is one of the few programs which has been supported by all the major farm organizations. I regret that the Senate conferees were unable to prevail with their position in the conference and to get the House to recede from its disagreement to our amendment. I insisted that this amendment be reported in disagreement in order that I would be in a position to advise the Senate that the conferees made every effort to retain a cropland adjustment program for next year.

Mr. President, the authority for this program has several more years to run—I regret that it is not possible to get agreement from the conferees from the other body or from the House of Representatives itself to continue the program for the current fiscal year. I hope that the Secretary of Agriculture and the appropriate officials will carefully review the need for the cropland adjustment program and if it is deemed to be essential to the agricultural adjustment and supply situation, an estimate to reinstate the program will be included in the budget estimate for 1969.

Mr. President, I have already urged the Secretary of Agriculture to make a supplemental request on this matter to be considered at the time Congress is passing upon the supplemental bill or to resubmit it next year in the regular annual appropriation request because I think it would be unfortunate if the Secretary of Agriculture were left with no machinery and no money with which to retire land out of the several millions of acres which will come back into potential production, as the conservation reserve contracts terminate in the next 2 years.

The Secretary is extremely anxious about this point. He thinks all of our best laid plans in connection with the production of feed grain and other commodities might easily be upset unless there is some machinery put in his hands for land retirement.

Mr. President, the House has already refused to recede from its position. So, regretfully, I must move at this time that the Senate recede from its amendment No. 43.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Florida that the Senate recede on its amendment No. 43.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the next amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Page 31, line 18, strike the numeral and insert $325,000,000.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, this is an amendment which was of very great importance to the Midwest. It was particularly urged by my distinguished friends, the Senator from North Dakota and the Senator from Nebraska who are members of the committee.

The amendment would have provided for an additional $25 million of authorization to make operating loans from the Farmers Home Administration revolving fund. It would not have affected the budget in any way.

It simply would have given leeway to the administrator of the Farmers Home Administration to take care of the needs for production credit of many small farmers who cannot get credit anywhere else. A prerequisite of their getting such a loan is a finding that they cannot get loans from any other institution.

At a time when we are being asked to step up production to take care of an enlarged export of food commodities, it seems very necessary to the committee to include this additional $25 million of authorization.

Again, the other body was not willing to agree to it, and they have earlier in the afternoon refused to recede. So, I now regretfully move that the Senate recede on its amendment No. 56.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Florida that the Senate recede on its amendment No. 56.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Page 34, line 16. Strike the numeral and insert $2,984,856,389.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, this is the amendment spoken of by my distinguished friend, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA].

The sole purpose of the amendment is, by a paper transaction, to restore the borrowing authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation from the Treasury of the United States. No money is involved. The spending budget is not affected.

The law requires that these restorations be made annually. In spite of all we can do, the Bureau of the Budget, which is the agency at fault here, insists upon not requesting restoration annually of the entire deficit for the last preceding year, but, instead, is asking for only barely enough money, that it believes necessary, to get the Commodity Credit Corporation through the year ahead.

In the first place, we are not obeying the law when we adopt that course. In the next place, we are not showing clearly the cost of the farm program. There is a deficit in CCC operations, but it is no fault of the Commodity Credit Corporation. They lose money from warehousing, transportation, spoilage, and for a number of other reasons.

That money should be restored in order for them to have their approved borrowing authority restored so that they will have available the resources which Congress intends them to have.

Unfortunately, the Bureau of the Budget this year simply requested $1.4 billion of the 1966 loss, whereas the actual deficit was more than twice that much. And the amount they did not ask to be restored was $1,584,856,389.

The Senate restored the full amount.

The issue was made upon the floor of the Senate, and with only 17 opposing votes, the Senate approved the procedure which the law requires.

Mr. President, I regret very much that this continued tearing down of the fiscal stability of the CCC is continuing.

A balance of $1,057 million of the 1961 deficit has not been restored. Now we have the balance of $1,584 million of the 1966 deficit, which has not been restored. At the same time, we have a deficit for 1967, already computed and established, of nearly $4 billion.

The fact is that, considering those three items, instead of having a borrowing capacity at this time of $14.5 billion, the borrowing capacity of the Commodity Credit Corporation is down to the figure of $8,044,500,000.

Mr. President, we cannot keep this up indefinitely. We should not keep it up at all, in view of the clear provisions of the law.

I have a prepared statement showing

the history of this matter, showing the history of the law, and showing the fact that CCC is operating on an ever-thinner basis; that, whereas when they introduced the budget last January they reported that they would have available a borrowing capacity of $2,752 million, at the end of the current fiscal year. Their current estimate as of September 21, as supplied to our committee, shows that they actually now estimate an unencumbered borrowing capacity next July 1 of $2,060 million.

The continuation of this wretched way of handling the matter can bring nothing sooner or later but calamity on all concerned.

So the committee desires to call attention to this matter very clearly. We do not blame the House for their position, because the Budget Bureau would not put this amount in the budget; and the House seems to feel that the general public would never understand the inclusion of this largely increased amount, which does not involve the payment of a single dime but does restore the borrowing capacity of the CCC.

Since I became chairman of the subcommittee handling appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies, I have made every effort to bring the impaired capital structure of the Commodity Credit Corporation to a current basis as intended by law.

Public Law 87–155, approved August 17, 1961, authorizes the restoration of capital impairment incurred by the Commodity Credit Corporation by means of annual appropriation rather than by cancellation of notes. It was certainly the intent of Congress in approving this law that the full restoration for losses would be requested in the budget in the year following the close of the fiscal year in which the loss was incurred.

Two years ago, in the processing of the agricultural appropriation bill for fiscal 1966, the Senate sought to provide the full amount of the loss for fiscal year 1964 and by committee amendment added $927 million over the House bill for this purpose. After long delay in the conference, a supplemental estimate of $500 million was transmitted to the Congress and this amount was adopted as a part of the conference agreement on the appropriation bill for fiscal 1966. At that time I was of the opinion that the Bureau of the Budget had finally seen the light and had read the requirements of the law, and would thus fulfill the intent of the law by asking for full reimbursement appropriation each year.

Last year the budget request for fiscal 1967 contained the full estimate of losses incurred in fiscal 1964, totaling $3,048,020,744, together with the unreimbursed balance for fiscal 1965 of $507,834,256 for a grand total of $3,555,855,000.

Thus, a year ago after the processing of the appropriation bill for fiscal 1967, there remained unreimbursed only the balance of $1,057,000,000 for inventory loss in fiscal 1961.

BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1968

When the President's budget for fiscal 1968 was transmitted to the Congress, it only included a request for reimbursement appropriation to the Commodity Credit Corporation of $1,400,000,000 for losses sustained in fiscal 1966 instead of the full loss incurred in that year of $2,984,856,389. During the hearings it was clear from the testimony of the Secretary of Agriculture when he was before the committee that he did request the Bureau of the Budget for permission to include in the Department's estimates for fiscal 1968 the full loss incurred in fiscal 1966, together with the balance of $1,057,000,000 from 1961. It is evident, therefore, that the failure to comply with the law, Public Law 87–155, lies entirely with the President's Budget officials.

Mr. President, under Public Law 87–155, to which I have heretofore referred, it was clearly intended that the annual deficit of the corporation should be reimbursed by appropriation rather than the cancellation of notes as had been the case in earlier years. This procedure is orderly and brings to the attention of the Congress annually the true state of fiscal affairs of the Commodity Credit Corporation, including a full report of its losses by major categories and commodities.

This was the intent of the law and is the more honest way of handling the affairs of the Corporation as required by law.

Thus by committee amendment the Senate added its amendment No. 63, $1,584,856,389. When the Agricultural Appropriation bill was before the Senate last July 13, the Senate by a record vote of 74 to 17 sustained the committee recommendation to provide the full amount of appropriation necessary to restore the capital impairment for fiscal year 1966.

This amendment was discussed a number of times during the conference. I am confident that the members of the conference committee from the other body are sympathetic toward the objective sought in amendment No. 63. However, in the present budgetary and fiscal environment, and because the Budget request contained only $1,400,000,000 of the 1966 losses, the House insists on its disagreement on Senate amendment No. 63.

Mr. President, I have a tabulation prepared on September 21, based upon figures supplied by the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, which shows that under the Senate bill the unrestored capital losses—including the 1967 losses—would have been $4,870,600,000 instead of the $6,455,500,000 under the budget estimate.

Thus, when the Senate recedes from its amendment, the borrowing authority of $14.5 billion would be reduced to just over $8 billion at the beginning of the current fiscal year—namely $8,044,500,000. This creates a dangerous situation which will increase with every year that the clear meaning of the law is violated by the Bureau of the Budget and not corrected by the Congress.

Further, since the budget for 1968 was formulated the estimated unused borrowing authority at the end of this fiscal year has been reduced from $2.7 billion to $2 billion, a decrease of $700 million.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Commodity Credit Corporation, millions of dollars, borrowing authority, $14,500.0

STATUS OF UNRESTORED LOSSES

1961 balance	$1,057.0
1966 total	2,984.9
1967 loss	3,813.6
Total losses unrestored (June 30, 1967)	7,855.5
Budget estimate, 1968 bill	−1,400.0
Estimated balance unrestored July 1, 1967	6,455.5
Senate amendment	+1,584.9
Balance under Senate amendment	4,870.6

ESTIMATED UNUSED BALANCE OF CCC BORROWING AUTHORITY, BY FISCAL YEARS

[In millions]

Fiscal 1967:	
Estimated in budget last January	$3,709.0
Actual	3,361.0
Fiscal 1968:	
As estimated in budget last January	2,752.0
Current estimate	2,060.0

(Based upon figures supplied to the committee by the Department on September 21, 1967)

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate recede from its amendment 63, in view of the earlier action this afternoon in the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Florida to recede from the Senate's position on amendment No. 63.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a comparative table showing the budget estimate, the House, the Senate, and the conference allowances on the various appropriation items in the agricultural appropriation bill for fiscal year 1968.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1967 AND ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN BILL FOR 1968

Agencies or items	Appropriations and authorizations, 1967	Budget estimates, 1968	House bill, 1968	Senate bill, 1968	Conference allowance, 1968	Conference bill (+) or (−)—		
						Budget estimates, 1968	House bill	Senate bill
TITLE I—GENERAL ACTIVITIES								
Agricultural Research Service:								
Salaries and expenses:								
Research	$125,997,500	$136,983,000	$135,587,500	$143,354,800	$136,775,500	−$207,500	+$1,188,000	−$6,579,300
Transfer from sec. 32	(25,000,000)	(15,000,000)	(15,000,000)	(15,000,000)	(15,000,000)			
Total available	(150,997,500)	(151,983,000)	(150,587,500)	(158,354,800)	(151,775,500)	(−207,500)	(+1,188,000)	(−6,579 300)
Plant and animal disease and pest control	82,665,900	85,852,000	84,028,000	90,835,400	85,802,000	−50,000	+1,174,000	−5,033,400
Special fund (reappropriation)	(2,000,000)	(2,000,000)	(2,000,000)	(2,000,000)	(2,000,000)			
Total, salaries and expenses	208,663,400	222,835,000	219,615,500	234,190,200	222,577,500	−257,500	+2,962,000	−11,612,700
Salaries and expenses (special foreign currency program)	4,500,000	15,400,000	7,500,000	15,400,000	8,500,000	−6,900,000	+1,000,000	−6,900,000
Total, Agricultural Research Service	213,163,400	238,235,000	227,115,500	249,590,200	231,077,500	−7,157,500	+3,962,000	−18,512,700
(Total available)	(238,163,400)	(253,235,000)	(242,115,500)	(264,590,200)	(246,077,500)			
Cooperative State Research Service: Payments and expenses	58,776,000	63,113,000	63,113,000	66,214,000	63,113,000			−3,101,000
Extension Service:								
Payments to States and Puerto Rico	78,652,500	81,917,500	81,917,500	83,917,500	81,917,500			−2,000,000
Retirement costs for extension agents	8,305,500	8,818,500	8,818,500	8,818,500	8,818,500			
Penalty mail	3,113,000	3,113,000	3,113,000	3,113,000	3,113,000			
Federal Extension Service	2,728,000	2,753,000	2,753,000	2,753,000	2,753,000			
Total, Extension Service	92,799,000	96,602,000	96,602,000	98,602,000	96,602,000			−2,000,000
Farmer Cooperative Service	1,204,000	1,404,000	1,204,000	1,404,000	1,304,000	−100,000	+100,000	−100,000
Soil Conservation Service:								
Conservation operations	112,430,200	113,995,000	113,053,000	113,995,000	113,500,000	−495,000	+447,000	−495,000
Watershed planning	6,342,000	6,377,000	6,377,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	−377,000	−377,000	
Watershed protection	70,130,700	70,403,000	70,403,000	70,403,000	70,403,000			
Flood prevention	25,695,400	25,753,000	25,753,000	25,753,000	25,753,000			
Great Plains conservation program	18,504,300	16,336,000	16,336,000	18,504,300	16,336,000			2,168,300
Resource conservation and development	4,664,600	7,629,000	6,000,000	7,629,000	6,129,000	−1,500,000	+129,000	−1,500,000
Total, Soil Conservation Service	237,767,200	240,493,000	237,922,000	242,284,300	238,121,000	−2,372,000	+199,000	−4,163,000
Economic Research Service: Salaries and expenses	12,421,000	13,646,000	12,421,000	13,021,000	12,421,000	−1,225,000		−600,000
Statistical Reporting Service: Salaries and expenses	13,821,750	13,864,000	13,821,750	13,864,000	13,830,500	−33,500	+8,750	−33,500
Consumer and Marketing Service:								
Consumer protective, marketing, and regulatory programs	86,072,000	89,522,000	89,010,000	89,522,000	89,310,000	−212,000	+300,000	−212,000
Payments to States and possessions	1,750,000	1,750,000	1,750,000	1,900,000	1,750,000			−150,000
Special milk program	51,000,000			104,000,000				−104,000,000
Transfer from sec. 32	(53,000,000)	(104,000,000)	(104,000,000)	(............)	(104,000,000)	(............)	(............)	(+104,000,000)
Total, special milk	(104,000,000)	(104,000,000)	(104,000,000)	104,000,000	(104,000,000)	(............)	(............)	(............)
School lunch program	168,605,000	198,735,000	198,735,000	190,825,000	182,825,000	−15,910,000	−15,910,000	−8,000,000
Transfer from sec. 32	(45,000,000)	(45,000,000)	(45,000,000)	(45,000,000)	(45,000,000)			
Total, school lunch	(213,605,000)	(243,735,000)	(243,735,000)	(235,825,000)	(227,825,000)	(−15,910,000)	(−15,910,000)	(−8,000,000)
Food stamp program	110,000,000			172,500,000	161,800,000	+161,800,000	+161,800,000	−10,700,000
Reappropriation	(30,000,000)			(22,500,000)	(23,200,000)	(+23,200,000)	+23,200,000	(+700,000)
Transfer from sec. 32		(195,000,000)		(............)		(−195,000,000)		
Total available food stamp	(140,000,000)	(195,000,000)	([1])	(195,000,000)	(185,000,000)	(−10,000,000)	(+185,000,000)	(−10,000,000)
Total, Consumer and Marketing Service	417,427,000	290,007,000	289,495,000	558,747,000	435,685,000	+145,678,000	+146,190,000	−123,062,000
Foreign Agricultural Service:								
Salaries and expenses	21,441,500	22,612,000	21,441,500	22,612,000	22,141,500	−470,500	+700,000	−470,500
Transfer from sec. 32	(3,117,000)	(3,117,000)	(3,117,000)	(3,117,000)	(3,117,000)			
Total available	(24,558,500)	(25,729,000)	(24,558,500)	(25,729,000)	(25,258,500)	(−470,500)	(+700,000)	(−470,500)
Commodity Exchange Authority	1,434,000	1,491,000	1,491,000	1,491,000	1,491,000			
Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service:[2]								
Expenses, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service	129,952,000	152,665,400	137,935,400	144,285,400	137,935,400	−14,730,000		−6,350,000
Transfer from CCC	(76,406,500)	(52,488,600)	(64,728,600)	(58,608,600)	(58,608,600)	(+6,120,000)	(−6,120,000)	
Total available	(206,358,500)	(205,154,000)	(202,664,000)	(202,894,000)	(196,544,000)	(−8,610,000)	(−6,120,000)	(−6,350,000)
Sugar Act program	80,000,000	86,500,000	80,000,000	81,500,000	80,000,000	−6,500,000		−1,500,000
Agricultural conservation program[3]	220,000,000	220,000,000	220,000,000	220,000,000	220,000,000			
Cropland adjustment program (expenses)	62,000,000	90,000,000	80,000,000	84,500,000	84,500,000	−5,500,000	+4,500,000	
Authorization for 1968 CAP program	(80,000,000)	(52,200,000)	(............)	(52,200,000)	(............)	(−52,200,000)	(............)	(−52,200,000)
Conservation reserve program	140,650,000	125,000,000	123,000,000	123,000,000	123,000,000	−2,000,000		
Emergency conservation measures	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000			
Cropland conversion program	7,500,000							
Total, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service	645,102,000	679,165,400	645,935,400	658,285,400	650,435,400	−28,730,000	+4,500,000	−7,850,000
Rural Community Development Service	652,000	450,000	450,000	450,000	450,000			
Office of Inspector General	11,504,000	12,323,000	11,693,000	11,993,000	11,993,000	−330,000	+300,000	
Packers and Stockyards Act	2,569,300	2,789,000	2,569,300	2,789,000	2,569,300	−219,700		219,700
Office of General Counsel	4,325,000	4,740,000	4,325,000	4,525,000	4,325,000	−415,000		200,000
Office of Information	1,882,000	1,928,000	1,928,000	1,928,000	1,928,000			
National Agricultural Library	2,458,500	2,900,000	2,458,500	2,758,500	2,608,500	−291,500	+150,000	−150,000
Office of Management Services	2,667,000	2,749,000	2,667,000	2,707,000	2,667,000	−82,000		−40,000
General administration	4,052,000	4,563,000	4,457,000	4,487,000	4,487,000	−76,000	+30,000	
Total, title I, general activities	1,745,466,650	1,693,074,400	1,641,109,950	1,957,752,400	1,797,249,700	+104,175,300	+156,139,750	−160,502,700

Footnotes at end of table.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1967 AND ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN BILL FOR 1968—Continued

Agencies or items	Appropriations and authorizations, 1967	Budget estimates, 1968	House bill, 1968	Senate bill, 1968	Conference allowance, 1968	Conference bill (+) or (−)— Budget estimates, 1968	Conference bill (+) or (−)— House bill	Conference bill (+) or (−)— Senate bill
TITLE II—CREDIT AGENCIES								
Rural Electrification Administration:								
Loan authorizations:								
Electrification [4]	($375,000,000)	($314,000,000)	($314,000,000)	($324,000,000)	($314,000,000)	(............)	(............)	(−$10,000,000)
Telephone [5]	(117,000,000)	(120,600,000)	(120,600,000)	(135,000,000)	(120,600,000)	(............)	............)	(−14,400,000)
Total, loan authorizations	(492,000,000)	(434,600,000)	(434,600,000)	(459,000,000)	(434,600,000)	(............)	(............)	(−24,400,000)
Salaries and expenses	12,425,800	12,457,000	12,457,000	12,457,000	12,457,000	....	....	....
Total, Rural Electrification Administration	12,425,800	12,457,000	12,457,000	12,457,000	12,457,000	....	....	....
Farmers Home Administration:								
Participation sales authorization	(600,000,000)	(800,000,000)	(800,000,000)	(700,000,000)	(750,000,000)	(−$50,000,000)	(−$50,000,000)	(+50,000,000)
Payment of sales insufficiencies	(3,209,000)	[6] 13,268,000	13,268,000	13,268,000	13,268,000	....	....	....
Direct loan account:								
Real estate loans	(90,000,000)	(110,000,000)	(110,000,000)	(110,000,000)	(110,000,000)	....	....	....
Operating loans	[7] (350,000,000)	[7] (300,000,000)	[7] (300,000,000)	(325,000,000)	[7] (300,000,000)	....	....	(−25,000,000)
Total, direct loan account	(440,000,000)	(410,000,000)	(410,000,000)	(435,000,000)	(410,000,000)	....	....	(−25,000,000)
Rural housing direct loan account	(15,000,000)	(15,000,000)	(15,000,000)	(15,000,000)	(15,000,000)	....	....	....
Rural water and waste disposal grants	26,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	40,000,000	30,000,000	....	....	−10,000,000
Rural renewal	1,200,000	2,000,000	1,200,000	2,000,000	1,600,000	−400,000	+400,000	−400,000
Rural housing for domestic farm labor	3,000,000	4,000,000	3,000,000	4,000,000	3,500,000	−500,000	+500,000	−500,000
Salaries and expenses	52,457,000	58,090,000	54,988,000	56,988,000	55,988,000	−2,102,000	+1,000,000	−1,000,000
Transfer from agriculture credit insurance fund	(2,250,000)	(2,250,000)	(2,250,000)	(2,250,000)	(2,250,000)	....	....	....
Miscellaneous transfer	(500,000)	(500,000)	(500,000)	(500,000)	(500,000)	....	....	....
Total	(55,207,000)	(60,840,000)	(57,738,000)	(59,738,000)	(58,738,000)	(−2,102,000)	(+1,000,000)	(−1,000,000)
Total, Farmers Home Administration	82,657,000	107,358,000	102,456,000	116,256,000	104,356,000	−3,002,000	+1,900,000	−11,900,000
Total title II, credit agencies:								
Loan authorizations	(947,000,000)	(859,600,000)	(859,600,000)	(909,000,000)	(859,600,000)	(............)	(............)	(−49,400,000)
Direct appropriation	95,082,800	119,815,000	114,913,000	128,713,000	116,813,000	−3,002,000	+1,900,000	−11,900,000
TITLE III—CORPORATIONS								
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation: Administrative and operating expenses:								
Appropriation	8,692,000	11,533,000	8,883,000	11,533,000	10,208,000	−1,325,000	+1,325,000	−1,325,000
Premium income	(4,100,000)	(1,600,000)	(4,100,000)	(1,600,000)	(2,850,000)	(+1,250,000)	(−1,250,000)	(+1,250,000)
Tota	(12,792,000)	(13,133,000)	(12,983,000)	(13,133,000)	(13,058,000)	(−75,000)	(+75,000)	(−75,000)
Commodity Credit Corporation:								
Reimbursement for net realized losses	3,555,855,000	1,400,000,000	1,400,000,000	2,984,856,389	1,400,000,000	....	....	−1,584,856,389
Limitation on administrative expenses	(34,300,000)	(31,500,000)	(31,500,000)	(31,500,000)	(31,500,000)	....	....	....
Public Law 480	1,617,000,000	1,772,500,000	1,605,500,000	1,675,500,000	1,605,500,000	−167,000,000	....	−70,000,000
Bartered materials for supplemental stockpile	....	24,000,000	....	24,000,000	23,000,000	−1,000,000	+23,000,000	−1,000,000
Total, title III, corporations	5,181,547,000	3,208,033,000	3,014,383,000	4,695,889,389	3,038,708,000	−169,325,000	+24,325,000	−1,657,181,389
TITLE IV—RELATED AGENCIES								
Farm Credit Administration: Limitation on administrative expenses	(3,133,000)	(3,224,000)	(3,224,000)	(3,224,000)	(3,224,000)	....	....	....
National Advisory Commission on Food and Fiber	475,000	175,000	175,000	175,000	175,000	....	....	....
Total, title IV related agencies	475,000	175,000	175,000	175,000	175,000	....	....	....
Total appropriations:								
Title I—General activities	1,745,466,650	1,693,074,400	1,641,109,950	1,957,752,400	1,797,249,700	+104,175,300	+156,139,750	−160,502,700
Title II—Credit agencies	95,082,800	119,815,000	114,913,000	128,713,000	116,813,000	−3,002,000	+1,900,000	−11,900,000
Title III—Corporations	5,181,547,000	3,208,033,000	3,014,383,000	4,695,889,389	3,038,708,000	−169,325,000	+24,325,000	−1,657,181,389
Title IV—Related agencies	475,000	175,000	175,000	175,000	175,000	....	....	....
Grand total	7,022,571,450	5,021,097,400	4,770,580,950	6,782,529,789	4,952,945,700	−68,151,700	+182,364,750	−1,829,584,089

---

[1] Reported to the House in the amount of $195,000,000, but struck on a point of order on the floor. Senate provided $172,500,000 by appropriation plus $22,500,000 reappropriations, and the conference allowance provides $161,800,000 plus $23,200,000 reappropriation.

[2] Excludes Appalachian region conservation program which is deferred without prejudice pending authorizing legislation.

[3] Advance authorization of $220,000,000 for the 1968 agricultural conservation program also provided.

[4] Contingency reserve as follows: Fiscal year 1967, $30,000,000; fiscal year 1968, Budget—$150,000,000. House committee recommendation—$50,000,000. Senate committee deleted reserve, conference deletes reserve.

[5] Contingency reserve as follows: Fiscal year 1967, $15,000,000; fiscal year 1968, Budget—$50,000,000. House Committee recommendation—$25,000,000. Senate committee deleted reserve, and conference deletes reserve.

[6] Included in Budget as indefinite appropriation; estimated at this amount.

[7] Includes $25,000,000 contingency reserve, but deleted in congressional processing.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, no chairman of a committee or chairman of a group of conferees has ever had more loyal support, both in the reporting of a bill and in its passage through the Senate, where no change was made in it, and in the conference considerations, than the Senator from Florida has had at this time. If the sentiments of the Senate could prevail in this field, Mr. President, the Agriculture Department would be much better off and much better run.

I yield the floor.

PUBLIC HEARINGS AND FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, as an observer speaking for the American people, I believe it is necessary that Secretary of State Dean Rusk and Defense Secretary Robert McNamara appear publicly before the Committee on Foreign Relations to discuss foreign policy and the extent of American commitments to other nations, and specifically the Vietnam issue.

Does the public have the right to know? Very often we hear someone say in a critical tone, "The American people have the right to know," or, "The American people ought to be told." I say "in a critical tone" because these expressions usually imply that the American people are not being informed as fully and as accurately as they ought to be. The administration and the Government as a whole have been charged with a credibility gap, informing the public with something less than the whole truth and nothing but the truth.

In national security matters involving strategic design and timing there are things which cannot be discussed publicly. But these are not the subjects which disturb people. The subjects which disturb people far more are the basic issues of our foreign policy—our immediate position and our long-range goals. There is lack of knowledge, confusion, and consequent frustration with our foreign policy because the basic issues are not publicly examined in depth.

The Secretary of State meets the press from time to time, both here and in other countries; but this is not an examination in depth of our foreign policy and the basic issues which determine that policy. These question-and-answer sessions are useful, and the Secretary of State handles them well, but they do not involve the searching for the truth with cross-examination. These sessions are always limited in time and seem to skip across the surface of the issues.

These limited statements do not satisfy, because they do not unify the American people with the conviction that they know and understand the basic issues of our foreign policy.

This leads me to one very important question. Why does not the Secretary of State publicly discuss these issues of foreign policy with Members of the Senate? To be specific, why does he not examine these issues with the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations?

This is the committee to which the Senate has delegated responsibility in the discharge of its function of advice and consent. This is the committee which we presume to be competent to examine American foreign policies in depth. This is the committee with continuity in foreign policy—a continuity of experience which goes back to the days of Cordell Hull.

Why has not the Secretary of State met in public with this committee?

I have long been an admirer of the question period in the House of Commons. Even as a student, my professors told me of the advantages of the British system by which Ministers of the Government were questioned by representatives of the people in the House of Commons. I have heard it said that the United States is unfortunate in not being able to have representatives of the congressional branch of Government put questions to the President—as the British do to their Prime Minister.

But in the United States we have developed a substitute for the question period in the House of Commons. That substitute is the public appearance of members of the Cabinet before responsible committees of the Senate. Responsible government requires reasonably frequent public accountability to Congress.

Why has not the Secretary of State met in public with members of the Committee on Foreign Relations to discuss the broad range of American policies toward the world? If he has not been properly invited, the time for a committee invitation is overdue.

If he has been invited and does not wish to appear, the time for committee insistence is overdue.

While I am not a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I have much admired the hearings that have been held during recent years. Under the chairmanship of the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the committee has dared to explore in public some of the programs that trouble large numbers of American citizens.

The committee has prodded the administration on its policies in Vietnam. It has pushed the administration toward a review of its policies toward China. It has provoked reexamination of our policies toward NATO.

Admittedly, the hearings of last year were not always pleasant experiences for administration witnesses. But, then, criticism is seldom welcomed by the one who is criticized. Nevertheless, fair but persistent examination of our policies and their underlying assumptions is one of the great strengths of our democracy. The committee has been discharging a fundamental constitutional responsibility. If administration spokesmen cannot stand the heat, to paraphrase a former President, they should stay out of the kitchen.

I would be less than candid, however, to say that I have been happy with the committee hearings held this year—in contrast to those held last year.

Indeed, I have been disturbed to see the Committee on Foreign Relations discussing in public some of the underlying assumptions of American foreign policy only with nongovernmental witnesses; instead of discussing the breakup of the monolith of communism with Secretary Rusk, the committee earlier talked with former Ambassador George Kennan, former Ambassador Reischauer, Harrison Salisbury, and others not of current policymaking status. These are all competent witnesses. But they do not speak for the administration. Thus, these hearings are not crucibles in which to test the validity of administration policy. Rather they are seminars dealing with hypotheses of what administration policies seem to be. They are substitutes for policy testing confrontations which are at the heart of the democratic system.

As I say, I do not know why the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense are not appearing before the Committee on Foreign Relations to speak of these fundamental issues. Perhaps they have not been asked. Perhaps they have been asked, but do not want to appear.

Whatever the reason, Mr. President, I believe the failure of these responsible members of the President's Cabinet to discuss publicly the attitudes and postures of this Government toward the responsibilities of the United States in 1967 with elected representatives is a matter of constitutional significance.

If the committee does not insist upon such public discussion we will see this congressional power, which bears great responsibility to the public, wither away because it is not exercised.

The unwillingness today of a Secretary of State or Defense to engage in a public discussion of foreign policy with congressional committees becomes the precedent for tomorrow.

I suggest that the administration is losing touch with large segments of the American population. One way to renew the dialog will be for a quick reestablishment of relations between the administration and the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I hope, therefore, that members of the Committee on Foreign Relations will take seriously my remarks and consider whether they do not have a duty to arrange at an early time for responsible members of the administration to publicly discuss with them the foreign policy issues that rend this Nation today.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARTKE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Senator has raised a very difficult question for me to deal with. I have tried to avoid appearing to be too antagonistic toward the Secretary of State or the administration. But since the Senator has raised these questions I would like to make a comment or two about the committee's efforts to attain the presence of the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense in open session.

Perhaps I had better review the records, if the Senator will allow me.

Mr. HARTKE. I think it is important to have this information.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Secretary of State has appeared before the Committee on Foreign Relations, its subcommittees, or special groupings thereof 14 times this year.

Anticipating the Senator's question——

Mr. HARTKE. How many times were these sessions public?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am coming to that. This record was put together hurriedly and could possibly, in one or two minor instances, be incorrect; but I asked the staff today to do the best they could do, and I believe this information is substantially correct.

He appeared 14 times, in effect, before subcommittees and the committee. Only four of these appearances were public sessions. Once he discussed the Consular Convention with the Soviet Union, then the Outer Space Treaty, then the Latin American Summit Conference, and finally foreign aid.

The Secretary of State has not been willing to discuss Vietnam in public sessions except in a most collateral way since February 18, 1966.

Mr. HARTKE. That was the hearing of 1966.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. At which time the committee held hearings on the Vietnam supplemental authorization bill. This appearance immediately preceded the hearing to which the Senator alluded, with various public sessions.

The list of appearances is relatively short and I shall read it.

The list of Secretary Rusk's appearances in 1967 is as follows:

A secret hearing on January 16, 1967, was a general briefing, which is customary at the beginning of each session.

On January 23, the subject of an open session was the Consular Convention with the U.S.S.R. I might say that on the 23d, and at my request, the Secretary had agreed earlier to appear in public session to discuss the world situation with special reference to Vietnam. Having had an executive meeting on January 16 I had requested a public meeting and the Secretary said he would do everything that he could to discuss these issues publicly. As the Senator knows, there is always the question of discretion. Just prior to the public session scheduled for the 23d the Secretary got in touch with me and said he wished to change the subject of his testimony on January 23. He wished to submit for consideration again the Consular Convention with the Soviet Union which the committee had approved in the previous Congress. So we made that agreement. He did appear in public session.

On March 3, the Secretary appeared before the Subcommittee on Disarmament and testified in secret session.

On March 7, he appeared with reference to the Outer Space Treaty, and this was in public session.

On March 17, there was a public session with respect to the Latin American summit conference.

On May 3, there was a secret session before the Mansifield subcommittee in connection with the issue of troops in Europe.

On May 23, there was a secret session with respect to the Middle East situation and Vietnam.

On June 1, there was a secret session with Secretary Rusk, the Vice President, and other Senators were invited.

There was a secret session on June 7, with respect to the Middle East.

There was a secret session on June 8, with respect to the Middle East.

There was a secret session on June 9, with respect to the Middle East.

There was a secret session on June 28.

There was a secret session on July 11, with respect to sending military assistance to the Congo.

There was a public session on July 14, with respect to foreign aid.

I have addressed letters to the Secretary, and Mr. Marcy, the staff director, has inquired if the Secretary would be willing to discuss in public session the issues involved in Vietnam.

On May 2, the Secretary wrote to me. I had written to him on April 27. Incidentally, I did not have time to get the originals of these letters but I can later.

Mr. HARTKE. I asked for this information, Mr. President, and only today I informed the chairman that I was going to make these remarks and request this information. I appreciate it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Secretary wrote to me on May 2 as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, May 2, 1967.

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter of April 27.

I would be glad to have a general discussion of our foreign policy, with special attention to Southeast Asia, with the Foreign Relations Committee. It seems to me, however, that the value of such a discussion could be greatly enhanced if it were held in Executive session. It is not easy for the Secretary of State to discuss particular situations in particular countries in public without risking considerable damage to our foreign relations. A public session would carry with it, therefore, many of the inhibitions which attend a press conference. An Executive session would permit a candid exchange of views and could be valuable, it seems to me, both to the Committee and to myself. I would see no objection to a mutual review of the transcript of an Executive session to determine whether substantial portions of it might be made public.

If the procedure is agreeable with the Committee, I would be pleased to appear on Tuesday, May 9 or Tuesday, May 16, whichever would be more convenient for the Committee.

With every good wish,
Sincerely yours,
DEAN RUSK.

As the Senator will notice, we did have a secret session with respect to the Middle East on May 23, but for reasons I do not now recall, we were not able to arrange the meetings on May 9 or May 16. In any event, those meetings would have been secret and I take it that is the Senator's point. I replied to that letter of May 3 as follows:

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
May 3, 1967.

Hon. DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In reply to your letter of May 2, the Committee will be very pleased to have you in Executive Session on May 16 at 10:00 AM.

I regret that you do not wish to appear in public session, as I think the general public would benefit very much by a discussion of our present situation.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely yours,
J. W. FULBRIGHT.

That has been my attitude all along. I think the public and certainly the Senate would benefit by his appearing in public session. He does not wish to do so as he said in his letter of May 2. I think it is too bad.

Very often these things are handled by telephone by the staff when they are instructed to see if an appearance can be arranged. There have been tentative agreements but never has there been willingness to appear in public session to discuss these matters.

I think it is really because the matters are embarrassing for them to discuss.

Mr. HARTKE. I understand. But the point is that the American people are concerned and I speak as an American citizen.

Perhaps the Senator can answer these questions: How can a President find out what is really going on? Can he ascertain through channels how the attack on the vessel in the Gulf of Tonkin took place; or that it was our vessel which was rammed by the Russian ship in the Sea of Japan last year? Of more importance, does he get bad reports from Vietnam as well as good reports from Vietnam?

Are we making progress as the President says we are, or are we really in pretty deep trouble, as the press reports?

What have we been told about U.S. policy in Greece?

How are we containing communism where it is closest to our shores, such as in Communist-controlled Cuba, only 90 miles from Florida?

What is our policy on Communist infiltration of South America?

If as the Government of Bolivia claims, they really did capture "Che" Guevara, do we deny or ignore the presence of Vietcong-like Communist infiltration in South America?

These are questions being asked by the American people. They are also questions being asked by Congress which has been elected by those people.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator will allow me, I feel very much as he does. I think that many of these subjects should be placed on the public record.

We can trust the American people to understand them. There should not be this apprehension about the reaction of the Senate and the American people. Part of the present frustration, I think, is attributable to the feeling by citizens that they do not understand what is really going on because they have not been fully informed yet.

I regret the fact that the Secretary of State is reluctant to come before our committee. I do not know quite what the Senator has in mind as to how I could persuade him and make him more willing to come, as well as the Secretary of Defense, in open session.

Does the Senator have any suggestions?

Mr. HARTKE. I think the Committee on Foreign Relations should meet as a group, possibly, and——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We meet as a group all the time.

Mr. HARTKE. And ask him to come in and report back. If he does not come in, then let us have an explanation. I do not think there is any requirement for the Secretary of State to make public any information outside the bounds of public knowledge which would create a situation revealing anything of a security nature, or which would endanger the United States; but there are many issues on which the Secretary of State could enlighten the American people publicly.

For example, the question of whether there are about 55,000 North Vietnamese in South Vietnam, but none in the delta. Or, are we really fighting a civil war in South Vietnam? These are questions the American people are asking and they certainly have a right to get the answers.

I asked a question on the floor of the Senate the other day, when one Senator was defending our policy in Vietnam—the Senator from California. He did not answer that question. I asked how was it that South Vietnam, with 15 million people, plus 500,000 Americans, cannot deal with its internal problems, as well as the problems which are presented by North Vietnam with only 16 million in population, when since 1954 the United States has given South Vietnam help and training, military equipment, administration, psychological warfare, police department activity, education, and economic assistance; but still South Vietnam is unable to cope with the problem and Americans are being asked to come in there in increasing numbers—and then still nothing happens.

We want to hear about the pacification program. We want to know whether the South Koreans in South Vietnam are actually being paid by us, and as to that, whether there is a payment agreement in force, and whether there is an agreement in force of a similar nature with the Philippines.

I would suggest to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee—and I would suggest to all Senators—that we should be concerned enough, because the American people are certainly concerned enough, to have the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense come to his committee in a public session and testify before it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I say to the Senator that letters and oral invitations have been issued to the Secretary of State, not personally, but from the committee, in pursuance of the committee's responsibility. Earlier, in many cases, we have discussed it in committee and issued invitations. This was done in the regular order of things.

However, we have a meeting scheduled tomorrow and I would be very glad to take this subject up with the committee again; but, in the final analysis, it is extremely difficult to make the Secretary of State come before our committee in public session when he does not care to do so. That goes for the Secretary of Defense as well.

Mr. HARTKE. I commend the Senator from Arkansas for the fine work he is doing on the Foreign Relations Committee. Perhaps it is in the best interests of the administration. I would suggest, most frankly, that possibly the American people think there is something to be hidden, some reason why they cannot get these answers.

Possibly these questions could be cleared up in the Senator's own committee, in order to clear up the question of credibility, about which the American people are talking a great deal.

Perhaps it might be better for administration policy on Vietnam if the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense would come before the Senator's committee in a public session and discuss these questions. I think it would be more to their own advantage, at least to tell the American people what is going on in the foreign relations of this country, especially with so many of our boys being killed and wounded over there.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree with the Senator. I would suggest that perhaps he ask the Secretary of State to come before the Foreign Relations Committee. I would be very glad to receive the Secretary in open session at any time he could come.

As a matter of fact the last time this matter was brought up and both the Secretaries of State and Defense were unable to come in public session for one reason or another, I told the staff director, Mr. Marcy, that he should say to them, "Well, this gets to be a little frustrating to keep issuing invitations to come before the committee. Just consider that you have a standing offer to come at any time you are willing to do so, at your convenience, and we will be very pleased to have you in public session for the discussion of these matters."

That was not too long ago, and I left it that way.

Issuing these invitations and having excuses made each time becomes a little undignified after awhile. I do not know what one can do beyond that.

The Senator from Indiana is so persuasive, if he would undertake to persuade the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense to come before the committee, I can assure him that the committee, even though it is busy with conferences at the moment on the sale of arms, will be very glad to arrange for a public hearing.

Mr. HARTKE. Well, if the chairman of the committee has not been able to persuade them up until now, I am sure that I could not be any more persuasive.

But, let me ask the chairman the number of times in executive and secret session they have been able to discuss with the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense the question of Vietnam this year?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Well, I gave the Senator the full list of the hearings with the Secretary of State, including a number on the Middle East when all Senators were invited. The secret sessions were not all on Vietnam, really only part of two sessions. We did have in January a discussion on the general world situation, which included Vietnam, of course.

On May 23, Vietnam was one of the topics of discussion.

June 1, I must say, was on the Middle East, I believe. That was about the time the trouble in the Middle East broke out—that was mostly on the Middle East. They are not very eager to appear even in executive session, for that matter, and especially not in public session.

Mr. HARTKE. I may say to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations that something so costly, so painful, to American homes should be given the most thorough and careful consideration.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It does not serve that purpose in executive session. It is in public session.

Mr. HARTKE. I understand that. It is important to have public hearings.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I assure the Senator that in the meeting tomorrow morning, I feel certain that the committee will take note of the Senator's remarks. I think that we shall be able to issue another invitation, and perhaps in view of the Senator's interest in this subject, we might have a public session.

Mr. HARTKE. The president of the student council of Harvard, Gregory Craig, one of the young students, said:

> Until our Government returns to a certain elemental faith in our people, our dissatisfaction will increase, and some of America's most loyal and idealistic youth will be left with little loyalty and even less idealism.

Mr. Craig was speaking of the same thing that disturbs me—the lack of public dialog between the administration and the people, speaking through their elected representatives.

On a closely related subject, Mr. President, I also call attention to the fact that witnesses before the Committee on Foreign Relations have not thus far represented a broad spectrum of American foreign policy opinion. I have read criticisms that the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. FULBRIGHT] has packed the hearings—that he invites only witnesses that he likes and who will support his critical analysis of the weaknesses of American policy.

I have read much of the transcript of the hearings before the Fulbright committee and have been pleased to see the free-wheeling views of the witnesses who have appeared before the committee. At the same time, I have been disturbed to see that some of the members of the committee itself seem to feel that the witnesses have been hand-chosen to present a particular point of view.

Again, I do not know if this is true.

I suggest, however, that those who are critical of the caliber and substance of the testimony before the committee have an obligation to propose their own witnesses.

In this connection and others as well. I should like to see the committee call before it some of our ex-generals whose views are frequently given wide coverage. I should like to see Gen. Curtis LeMay called before the committee, as well as General Shoup, General Taylor, General Ridgway, and Adm. Arleigh Burke.

It is not simply that the views of these former public servants should be given attention, but they should be asked to explain their views. This is the democratic process. The American people have a right to see and to hear their views, and to have their representatives test those views in the forum of debate—the U.S. Senate.

I would like to see the Secretary of Defense come before this committee, in public. Frankly, I do not think we can have only the occasional press releases of the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of State, or even the release which was made public just this afternoon, the released testimony of the closed hearings, in which there is a serious question as to whether the Secretary of Defense agrees with the Chiefs of Staff.

Frankly, we can look at the judgments of the Secretary of Defense of the past and see just how good his judgment has been, how good his advice has been. This is the man who has ordered sharp cutbacks in retaliatory forces. These are the judgments he has made. These are the judgments of the head of the Defense Establishment for the past 5 years.

Let us look at some of the things he had to say about Vietnam.

In 1962, the Secretary said on March 22 that Vietnam had taken the offensive. On May 9 of the same year he said:

> There is no plan for introducing Americans in combat in South Vietnam.

The Senate recalls that I said the administration was seriously considering an invasion of North Vietnam. I said President Johnson was under increasing pressure to do that. I said the pattern of the past intensification of the war was being repeated; that there was a trial balloon; and a carefully worded Pentagon denial came out as follows:

> No consideration is being given by the Department of Defense to an invasion of North Vietnam.

How much that sounds like the Secretary of Defense on May 9, 1962, when he said:

> There is no plan for introducing Americans in combat in South Vietnam.

It does not take anyone with any special knowledge today to know that we have Americans in South Vietnam who are dying there.

On May 9 of 1962 the Secretary of Defense said that he was "tremendously encouraged" with the way the war was going.

In 1963 the Secretary advised newsmen—not the Committee on Foreign Relations—that 1962 had been the year of decision, that the "corner had been turned"—typical of the words that a former President made about a depression—that the United States would shortly achieve its goals in Vietnam.

He said, on October 2, 1963:

> The major part of the U.S. military task can be completed by the end of 1965.

He went so far as to announce in Honolulu on November 20, 1963, that American troops would start being withdrawn before the year's end.

In 1964, following the earlier overthrow of the Diem government—with the tacit approval of the U.S. Government—Secretary McNamara said on January 27 that the new Saigon regime "has considerably more support than its predecessor."

He told Congress on the same date that most of the 15,000 U.S. troops in Vietnam should be withdrawn before the end of 1965, and added that he did not believe that the United States "should assume the primary responsibility for the war in South Vietnam."

He said, on March 17, 1964:

> The situation can be significantly improved in the coming months.

On March 29, 1964, he said:

> The training personnel we have assigned there will come back as their training mission is completed—perhaps some can return this year; some next.

He characterized progress of the war on May 13 as "excellent."

In 1965, after many months of intensified U.S. bombing of North Vietnam installations, an increase of U.S. troops from 15,000 to some 175,000, and a loss of some 1,000 American lives, Secretary of Defense McNamara declared on November 29 that "We are no longer losing."

I have heard that statement again this week.

This is the man upon whose judgment rests much of the future security of the United States.

I did not say it, but somebody said it was "McNamara's war." The Secretary of Defense said he did not object to its being called "McNamara's war," because it was a very important war, and I am pleased to be identified with it.

This statement was made on April 24, 1964.

These are not the words of any Senator, but the words of a former chief of staff, General Shoup, in an address which was given by him at the 10th annual Junior College World Affairs Day, at Pierce College, Los Angeles, Calif., which I brought to the attention of the Senate on February 20, 1967. He spoke on the question of the public's right to know. I think it is important to repeat what he said on that day. This came from a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, a Marine Corps general, retired. He said:

> Surely a decision to get this nation into the predicament we're in, trying to stop these creeps, must have been based on an all-inclusive study by those with the greatest of clairvoyance. And there must have been a time-table depicting the untenable position, and irreparable effects upon this nation at the end of 5, 10, 15, 50 years, else our government could not have chosen the present course of action. If such an estimate of the situation was not made, our leaders have been derelict in their duties and responsibilities. If it was done, the public should be informed.

That is the key.

That is not the Senator from Indiana speaking; that is General Shoup.

I continue to read from what General Shoup said:

> I ask you, have you read or been instructed about any time-table of disaster for this nation and her world position if we hadn't done and weren't doing what we are in South East Asia today? I haven't.

Then he goes on with the reasons—and this is at the heart of the difficulty and it is why I speak as a concerned citizen more than as a U.S. Senator:

> The reasons fed to us are too shallow and narrow for students, as well as other citizens. Especially so, when you realize that what is happening, no matter how carefully and slowly the military escalation has progressed, may be projecting us toward world catastrophe.

Then he went back to the same questions which are so pertinent today. He said:

> Particularly is this true when we know that a great deal closer there are essentially the same situations which our leaders say made it impossible for us not to fight and not to escalate the fighting in Vietnam. See if this doesn't sound about the same.

He said:

> (1) Since last July, Peru's national army has been battling red guerrillas in more than half its states.
>
> (2) Red guerrillas run areas in several states of Colombia.
>
> (3) Many businessmen are leaving Guatemala following ransom kidnappings by communists bands.
>
> (4) At least a dozen combat guerrilla brigades are operating in some areas in over half of Venezuela's 20 states, while terrorists blows take place in Venezuelan cities, like the Viet Cong in Saigon.

These are words from General Shoup's speech. I do not see why they should not be considered. If he can make this statement, maybe he should be called, along with others, to explain the situation, perhaps in the interest of the administration itself and the President himself.

It has been said that this is an unpopular war. When the President made a speech before the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, he called it an unpopular war. The Gallup poll has called it an unpopular war. Marquis Childs has said people are responding with, "We have had it. Go away and don't bother us." Certainly that is a way of saying it is an unpopular war. Everybody in this body and in the other body knows, from his mail and from visits to his constituents, that this is an unpopular war.

Some people say we ought to be concerned about the election, about what is going to happen 15 months from now, when we have a possibility, maybe, of a change in the Presidency.

Mr. President, 15 months is a long time, and I deplore the thought of our getting involved in a political campaign now, with the election at least 13 months away. In 13 months, many things can change. Fifteen months ago, only 4,117 people had been killed in Vietnam. As of September 30, 1967, there have been three times that many. In other words, there has been a threefold increase, in that 15-month period, to 13,643 lives lost.

Fifteen months ago, 22,652 had been wounded. On September 30, 15 months later, 86,635 had been wounded. Of course, these figures do not include a figure which ordinarily, in prior wars, has always been included in the casualty lists. That is the 2,705 who have been killed by nonhostile means. Adding that figure, we have had more than 15,000 killed, as reported in the black boxes surrounding the war death figures appearing now more regularly in the newspapers.

I could go on to speak of the cost of this war—now some $4 million an hour. I could mention the deplorable situation here at home, the problem of taxes, the neglect of our unfinished business in the cities, the threats of cutbacks on water projects and on the building of safer highways to save the lives of travelers within the United States.

I say that this is an unpopular war because of the lack of promise, and the lack of reasoned acceptability. I think it is important that the Committee on Foreign Relations ask the people they summon as witnesses to answer the question: Who are our American boys dying for? After all, the South Vietnamese will not even fight to defend themselves in their own homeland. Who are the American boys trying to do something for? For the racketeers, the black marketeers, the skid row, the Mafia of South Vietnam? What are our American boys trying to uphold? The South Vietnamese Government, which is disliked and barely tolerated by the South Vietnamese people themselves?

Is this a war which can save and preserve something precious? Stripping away all sentimentality and make believe, what is there in this situation that is really worth the price, up to this date, of 100,000 American casualties? Is it a war which can create something good?

I believe the worst form of utopian heresy is to believe that militarily you can defeat all enemies and usher in an eternal Pax Americana.

Is this a war essential for our own security? Mr. President, that is a new line, but we are going to hear it more and more. That has been the voice of the Senate during the last few days. Gradually, the consideration of the question of a democratic form of government for

South Vietnam is being cast aside, and this will replace it as the administration answer to the questions of the American people, that now this is a war which is essential for our own security.

But is it? If security calls for power bases, can they not be established without our boys crawling through jungles and slogging through swamps? Can we not have a power base without obliterating North Vietnam by bombing, without search and destroy missions and bombing in the south, and especially without keeping so many of the young men who are the pride of America in daily combat, with higher and higher casualty rates? Is all this essential for our own security?

Mr. President, these are questions that will have to be answered. I think the answers are desperately needed now.

In conclusion, I wish to make it clear, Mr. President, that the views I have expressed today are those of an observer. I have not been privy to the plannings of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I speak as an American citizen who senses that one committee of the Senate is exploring a subject close to the hearts of the American people and to the future of America. As such, I want that subject explored fully, fairly, and publicly.

I think it is urgent that the architects and executors of our foreign policy speak openly and thoroughly; and I think they should have a chance to speak in the manner most acceptable to the American people—through the responsible means available through the Committee on Foreign Relations of the U.S. Senate.

Mr. President, I hope these remarks will be helpful. I yield the floor.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10345) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, no one is more opposed to communism and subversion within the United States than I am.

Moreover, along with other Members of this body, I have long opposed the proliferation, or even the existence, of Government agencies with parallel functions. When two agencies do the same job, one should go.

It is my understanding that the Federal Bureau of Investigation is charged with the task of seeking out subversive agents and activities within our borders, and that it performs this task with commendable efficiency.

Beyond this, the Department of Justice already publishes a list of organizations in the United States suspected of subversive activity.

Therefore, I rise to state my opposition to the continued existence of the Subversive Activities Control Board.

The Board is not so much harmful as it is useless. We do not need it to control subversive activity, because we are fortunate in having a Justice Department quite well equipped to perform just that task.

The Subversive Activities Control Board has nothing to do. It is an anachronism, a dead branch of government that should be snapped off without further ado. Frankly, in this day of streamlined administrative technique, I find it deplorable that we should have allowed it to exist this long. An independent Government agency that serves no function should be abolished.

Furthermore, S. 2171, the bill that the distinguished minority leader proposes to include as an amendment to the pending legislation, is a hastily conceived piece of legislation, reported to the Senate floor with no hearings at all.

I feel confident that if hearings had been held, it would have become apparent to all that the existing responsibilities of the SACB—if there are any—could be transferred to the Justice Department with great ease.

It need hardly be added that such a transfer would save the American taxpayer $300,000 a year—the amount required to keep the Board in operation.

Now is a good time to save that $300,000. The battle of the budget, as it might be called, has reached a feverish pitch, and somewhere, sometime, somebody is going to have to start cutting expenditures.

Frankly, in my almost 10 years in Congress, I have seldom seen anything less essential to the public good than the continued existence of the Subversive Activities Control Board. In wartime especially, when we need to cut every nonessential expenditure, it wastes our resources and constitutes a flaw in our system of government.

So let us act now, quickly and reasonably, to abolish the Board altogether, and put an end to this wasteful dabbling of the U.S. Government in what President Truman called the "thought-control business."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the will of the Senate?

PROGRAM

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is the consideration of H.R. 10345.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, Senators will be reminded that under the unanimous-consent agreement pursuant to the request of the majority leader, following the prayer and the disposition of the Journal on tomorrow, there will be 2 hours of debate on the motion of the minority leader, the time to be equally divided between the minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN] and the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], after which there will be a rollcall vote on the motion.

RECESS UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in recess until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 11, 1967, at 11 a.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 10, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Search me, O God, and know my heart: try me and know my thoughts: and see if there be any wicked way in me and lead me in the way everlasting.—Psalm 139: 23, 24.

O God and Father of us all, let Thy spirit arise within us as we—the representatives of our people—wait upon Thee in prayer. With unfailing wisdom and unfaltering good will enable us to meet the demanding duties of this day and manage the moods that move in our minds. Strengthen us as we sincerely strive to step along straight paths and as we endeavor to do what is right for our country and for our world.

Inspire us with greater faith to climb the heights of national honor and security realizing that the closer we are to the summit of Thy presence the nearer we are together. In periods of strained relations touch Thou our hearts with spirit hand and make us souls that understand. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

CORPUS CHRISTI WEATHERMAN AND HURRICANE BEULAH

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, Hurricane Beulah was one of the most destructive storms in history, with damage estimates reaching to $1 billion. It was also a killer hurricane, although the number of lives lost was not as great as in some other hurricanes in the past. There is little doubt that a primary reason for the relatively low loss of life was the timely warnings issued by the U.S. Weather Bureau. Sixty-four hours before hurricane force winds reached the Texas coast, the Weather Bureau issued a hurricane watch, alerting people to the possibility of danger. Hurricane warnings, which indicate that the storm is definitely expected, were issued by the Weather Bureau 20 hours before hurricane force winds hit the coast. One of the persons responsible for this lifesaving, advance warning was Mr. Russel Mozeney, meteorologist-in-charge of the

Corpus Christi office of the U.S. Weather Bureau. In addition to the fine job Mr. Mozeney performed for the people in Texas, he provided me, in Washington, with briefings on the course of Hurricane Beulah, and on the status of preparations for the storm, by telephone calls during the late night and early morning hours before Beulah struck. I commend Mr. Mozeney and the Weather Bureau for this fine example of devoted public service.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION, 1968—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 10509) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 746)

The Committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10509) "making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 5, 10, 11, 12, 13, 17, 19, 21, 26, 29, 30, 33, 35 36, 39, 41, 45, 46, 48, 49, 51, 53, 57, 64, 66, and 68.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 8, 16, 18, 20, 23, 24, 25, 32, 40, 42, 44, 50, 52, 54, and 65 and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$136,775,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,735,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$85,802,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$8,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$54,965,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,304,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$113,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$6,129,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$13,830,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$89,310,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$22,141,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,608,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$750,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 58: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 59: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 60: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$55,988,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 61: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$10,208,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 62: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,850,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 9, 31, 37, 43, 56, 63, and 67.

JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
W. R. HULL, Jr.,
THOMAS G. MORRIS,
GEORGE E. SHIPLEY,
GEORGE MAHON,
ROBERT H. MICHEL,
ODIN LANGEN,
WILLIAM H. HARRISON,
FRANK T. BOW,
Managers on the Part of the House.

SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
ROMAN L. HRUSKA,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10509) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments; namely, Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Research Service.

Amendments Nos. 1 through 3, research: Appropriate $136,775,500 instead of $143,354,800 as proposed by the Senate and $135,587,500 as proposed by the House, provide $4,735,000 for planning and construction of facilities instead of $2,800,000 as proposed by the House and $5,941,800 as proposed by the Senate, and include Senate language limiting future transfers from section 32 funds for research to $15,000,000.

The total appropriation agreed to by the Conferees reduces funds included in the House bill for staffing and equipping new laboratories by $250,000 and provides $250,000 of the Senate increase for animal disease research on swine. The sum of $150,000 is included for planning of a grassland restoration laboratory at Temple, Texas. The $150,000 provided for certain studies listed on page 18 of House report has been eliminated, since the Department has indicated it can proceed with those not otherwise provided for within total funds available. An amount of $1,000,000 is also provided for the contingency research fund as proposed by the Senate.

The Conferees have agreed to $1,588,000 instead of the $3,000,000 originally agreed upon as follows: Production research on soybeans, $100,000; research on mastitis in milk quality, $100,000; research on avian leukosis, $150,000; weed control research in Pacific Northwest, $50,000; research on dry peas and lentils, $60,000; crop and utilization research on sugarbeets, $100,000; research to improve protein content of cereal and other grains, $63,000; oat breeding and evaluation, $40,000; rice utilization research at Southern Utilization Laboratory, $25,000; sheep production research in Idaho, $75,000; transportation research in Texas, $20,000; research on costs of producing cotton, $275,000; hormone studies of citrus fruits, $80,000; research on citrus and other fruits shipped to

Europe, $125,000; soil-water-atmosphere-plant research team in Florida, $200,000; research on boll weevil under supervision of Boll Weevil Laboratory, $100,000; and maple products research, $25,000.

The following amounts have been approved for financing from the Contingency Research Fund: For additional planning—Morris, Minnesota, $40,000; Ithaca, New York, $40,000; Oregon and Washington, $25,000; Albany, California, $50,000; Orono, Maine, $45,000; and Riverside, California, $50,000. For construction—Genetic Stock Center for Bees, $135,000.

The Conferees have also agreed to the following Senate increases: Dairy herd improvement, $50,000; planning, Livestock Research Center, Clay Center, Nebraska, $250,000; construction, Tobacco Research Laboratory, Oxford, North Carolina, $150,000; construction, Southeastern Laboratory, Athens, Georgia, $1,200,000; and soil and water research, Tempe, Arizona, $100,000.

The Conferees note that additional funds are frequently requested to complete construction projects at a cost much higher than contemplated when originally approved by Congress. They disagree with this practice and direct officials of the Department of Agriculture and the General Services Administration to prepare construction plans in the future on a basis which will allow for projected cost escalations and will permit full completion within the amount of funds provided in the first instance.

The Conferees concur in the feasibility studies requested by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 4 and 5, plant and animal disease and pest control: Appropriate $85,802,000 instead of $84,028,000 as proposed by the House and $90,835,400 as proposed by the Senate and eliminate Senate language authorizing $1,150,000 for construction of facilities at Beltsville, which are postponed without prejudice. The increase of $1,774,000 over the House bill includes $1,000,000 for eradication of the imported fire ant; $50,000 for monitoring pest control; $250,000 for activities under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, Rodenticide Act; $50,000 for detection of trichinosis; $250,000 for activities under Virus-Serum-Toxin Act; $100,000 for plant quarantine and $74,000 for animal inspection at ports of entry. The Conferees have also agreed to $300,000 for pink bollworm control, to be financed from the contingency fund for emergency outbreaks.

The appropriation provides for enforcement of the Laboratory Animal Welfare Act at a cost not to exceed $1,200,000. Enforcement work in the field is to be handled by existing trained personnel as far as possible, and additional funds required are to be provided by transfer from lower priority work considered to be less essential.

Federal funds provided for fire ant eradication in the Southeast and pink bollworm control work in the Southwest should be matched by State and local funds.

Amendment No. 6, special foreign currency program: Appropriates $8,500,000 instead of $7,500,000 as proposed by the House and $15,400,000 as proposed by the Senate.

COOPERATIVE STATE RESEARCH SERVICE

Amendment Nos. 7 through 11, payments and expenses: Appropriate $63,113,000 as proposed by the House instead of $66,214,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount agreed to includes $54,965,000 for Hatch Act funds, from which additional pay costs will be met. In addition, the following sums are provided: Cooperative forestry research, $3,485,000; contracts and grants, $2,000,000, of which $1,000,000 is earmarked for cotton research and $400,000 is earmarked for soybean research; grants for facilities, $2,000,000; penalty mail, $310,000; and Federal administration, $353,000.

FEDERAL EXTENSION SERVICE

Amendment Nos. 12 and 13, payments and expenses: Appropriate $81,917,500 as proposed by the House instead of $83,917,500 as proposed by the Senate. Of this amount, $2,000,000 is made available for additional pay costs.

FARMER COOPERATIVE SERVICE

Amendment No. 14, salaries and expenses: Appropriates $1,304,000 instead of $1,204,000 as proposed by the House and $1,404,000 as proposed by the Senate.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

Amendment No. 15, conservation operations: Appropriates $113,500,000 instead of $113,053,000 as proposed by the House and $113,995,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 16 and 17, watershed planning: Appropriate $6,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $6,377,000 as proposed by the House, and eliminate Senate language limiting new planning starts to 80. The Conferees intend that the funds appropriated provide 100 new planning starts.

Amendments Nos. 18 and 19, watershed protection: Include Senate language providing for the use of $5,000,000 for watershed loans, and eliminate Senate language limiting new construction starts to 80. The Conferees intend that the funds appropriated provide 80 new construction starts.

Amendment No. 20, flood prevention: Includes Senate language providing for the use of $1,000,000 for flood prevention loans.

Amendment No. 21, Great Plains conservation program: Appropriates $16,336,000 as proposed by the House instead of $18,504,300 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 22 through 25, resource conservation and development: Appropriate $6,129,000 instead of $6,000,000 as proposed by the House and $7,629,000 as proposed by the Senate, and authorize the use of $1,500,000 for resource conservation and development loans.

ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE

Amendment No. 26, salaries and expenses: Appropriates $12,421,000 as proposed by the House instead of $13,021,000 as proposed by the Senate. Within the funds provided, the Department is expected to carry out the additional studies on farm labor and land and water resources proposed for fiscal year 1968.

STATISTICAL REPORTING SERVICE

Amendment No. 27, salaries and expenses: Appropriates $13,830,500 instead of $13,821,750 as proposed by the House and $13,864,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount agreed to includes $8,750 for agricultural statistics in Hawaii.

CONSUMER AND MARKETING SERVICE

Amendment No. 28, consumer protective, marketing, and regulatory programs: Appropriates $89,310,000 instead of $89,010,000 as proposed by the House and $89,522,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House bill includes $156,000 for meat inspection, $80,000 for poultry inspection, and $64,000 for market news services in Arizona, Wyoming, and Nebraska.

Amendment No. 29, payments to States and possessions: Appropriates $1,750,000 as proposed by the House instead of $1,900,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 30, special milk program: Provides $104,000,000, to be transferred from section 32 funds as proposed by the House. The Conferees are agreed that hereafter the Bureau of the Budget should provide for this program from the general fund of the Treasury by direct appropriation.

Amendments Nos. 31 through 36, school lunch program: The conference agreement provides a total of $227,825,000 for this program, $182,825,000 by direct appropriation and $45,000,000 by transfer from section 32 funds, as follows:

Cash payments to States	$157, 150, 000
Commodity procurement	59, 325, 000
Operating expenses	2, 100, 000
Special cash assistance	5, 000, 000
Pilot school breakfasts	3, 500, 000
Nonfood assistance	750, 000
Total	227, 825, 000

Amendment No. 31 is reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and agree to an appropriation of $182,825,000. Amendment No. 32 provides not less than $14,325,000 for section 6 purchases as proposed by the Senate. Amendment No. 33 provides $5,000,000 for special assistance to needy schools as proposed by the House. Amendment No. 34 provides $3,500,000 for the pilot school breakfast program instead of $2,000,000 as proposed by the House and $5,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. Amendment No. 35 provides $750,000 for nonfood assistance as proposed by the House. Amendment No. 36 for State administrative expenses has been deleted.

Amendment No. 37, food stamp program: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House intend to offer a motion which will provide $185,000,000 for this program, $23,200,000 from prior year balances and $161,800,000 by direct appropriation. Of the amount provided, $5,000,000 may be used in needy areas in this program where it may be required to meet problems resulting from the need for special consideration for extremely low-income families.

FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE

Amendment No. 38, salaries and expenses: Appropriates $22,141,500 instead of $21,441,500 as proposed by the House and $22,612,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase of $700,000 over the House is provided for market development activities, including trade fair promotion in Japan. The Conferees are agreed that it is essential that additional attention be given to market development activities in those areas which provide the largest dollar markets for U.S. agricultural commodities.

The creation of the European Common Market has centralized in E.E.C. officials in Brussels, Belgium, the policy decisions affecting U.S. trade and trade dealings with its six member countries. With Western Europe our greatest cash market for agricultural commodities, which in turn are our greatest dollar earners, the Conferees agree that it is essential that U.S. representation of this agency at Brussels be strengthened by the addition of technical experts who are qualified as to language, scientific and trade knowledge.

The work of such additional staff should be coordinated with our regular Foreign Agricultural Service as well as other U.S. representatives to the Common Market. Such a staff is essential to the negotiation of agreements as to terms and conditions of trade, including proposed standards on pesticide residues, and to provide a means for settlement of differences as to grade, quality, disputed claims, or other factors concerning U.S. commodities. This is believed by the Conferees to be much more important at the present time than attache posts in some of the smaller countries where trade for dollars, now and in the foreseeable future, is relatively insignificant.

The Conferees have agreed to an additional transfer from the Commodity Credit Corporation of not to exceed $84,125 for ocean transportation assistance and administration of the barter program.

AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION SERVICE

Amendments Nos. 39 and 40, expenses, ASCS: Appropriate $137,935,400 as proposed by the House instead of $144,285,400 as proposed by the Senate, and authorize the transfer of $58,608,600 from the Commodity Credit Corporation as proposed by the Senate instead of $64,728,600 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 41, Sugar Act program: Appropriates $80,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of $81,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 42, cropland adjustment program: Appropriates $84,500,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $80,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 43, cropland adjustment program: Reported in actual disagreement. The managers on the part of the House intend to insist upon their disagreement to the Senate amendment.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

Amendment No. 44, salaries and expenses: Appropriates $11,993,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $11,693,000 as proposed by the House.

PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 45, Packers and Stockyards Act: Appropriates $2,569,300 as proposed by the House instead of $2,789,000 as proposed by the Senate.

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

Amendment No. 46, salaries and expenses: Appropriates $4,325,000 as proposed by the House instead of $4,525,000 as proposed by the Senate.

NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL LIBRARY

Amendment No. 47, salaries and expenses: Appropriates $2,608,500 instead of $2,458,500 as proposed by the House and $2,758,500 as proposed by the Senate.

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT SERVICES

Amendment No. 48, salaries and expenses: Appropriates $2,667,000 as proposed by the House instead of $2,707,000 as proposed by the Senate.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

Amendments Nos. 49 and 50, salaries and expenses: Appropriate $4,487,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $4,457,000 as proposed by the House, and authorize $5,000 for employment of experts and consultants as proposed by the House instead of $10,000 as proposed by the Senate.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Amendments Nos. 51 through 54, loan authorizations: Provide $314,000,000 for electrification loans as proposed by the House instead of $324,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, provide $120,600,000 for telephone loans as proposed by the House instead of $135,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, and eliminate for the year 1968 the contingency reserves established for the electrification and telephone loan programs.

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 55, participation sales authorization: Authorizes $750,000,000 instead of $800,000,000 as proposed by the House and $700,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 56, direct loan account: Reported in actual disagreement. The managers on the part of the House intend to offer a motion to insist on their disagreement.

The Conferees are in agreement with the amounts provided by the Senate for farm ownership and soil and water loans.

Amendment No. 57, rural water and waste disposal grants: Appropriates $30,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of $40,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The Conferees are in full agreement as to the value of this program to rural areas and feel that additional funds above those recommended are fully justified. They call upon the Bureau of the Budget to restudy this program during the coming year with a view to including a more adequate estimate for this program in the 1969 budget.

Amendment No. 58, rural renewal: Appropriates $1,600,000 instead of $1,200,000 as proposed by the House and $2,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 59, rural housing for domestic farm labor: Appropriates $3,500,000 instead of $3,000,000 as proposed by the House and $4,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 60, salaries and expenses: Appropriates $55,988,000 instead of $54,988,000 as proposed by the House and $56,988,000 as proposed by the Senate.

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

Amendment No. 61, administrative and operating expenses: Appropriates $10,208,000 instead of $8,883,000 as proposed by the House and $11,533,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 62, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation fund: Authorizes the use of premium income in the amount of $2,850,000 instead of $4,100,000 as proposed by the House and $1,600,000 as proposed by the Senate.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Amendments Nos. 63 and 64, reimbursement for net realized losses: Amendment No. 63 is reported in actual disagreement. The managers on the part of the House intend to offer a motion to insist upon an appropriation of $1,400,000,000 as proposed in the 1968 Budget and approved by the House. Amendment No. 64 restores language earmarking funds for cotton research as proposed in the House report.

PUBLIC LAW 480

Amendments Nos. 65 and 66: Appropriate $300,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of $370,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, and eliminate the word "surplus" as proposed by the Senate.

BARTERED MATERIALS FOR SUPPLEMENTAL STOCKPILE

Amendment No. 67: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House intend to offer an amendment which will provide $23,000,000 to liquidate existing contracts under this program. The Conferees seriously question the wisdom of negotiating any further contracts under this program, and no funds have been included for this purpose. They feel that, if this program is to be continued, each proposed contract should be reported to and approved by the appropriate committees of Congress prior to the incurring of any financial obligations.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 68.—*Section 501.*—Provides for the purchase of five hundred thirty-seven (537) passenger motor vehicles as proposed by the House instead of five hundred sixty (560) as proposed by the Senate.

DIVERSION OF FUNDS WITHOUT CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OR APPROVAL

The Conferees note with concern the growing practice in the Executive Branch of financing a portion of the cost of various special boards, councils, and commissions created by Executive action from assessments made against appropriations provided for specific programs and projects of the Department of Agriculture. In nine instances during the past year, funds appropriated by Congress for specific programs of the Farmers Home Administration, the Federal Extension Service, the Forest Service, the Consumer and Marketing Service, the Soil Conservation Service, the Economic Research Service, Agriculture Stabilization and Conservation Service, and the Rural Electrification Administration were transferred to finance such organizations as the President's Committee on Equal Opportunity, the President's Council on Youth Opportunity, the Interagency Committee on Mexican American Affairs, the National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty, and the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Recreation and Natural Beauty. In addition, $25,700 in fiscal year 1966 and $450,000 in fiscal year 1967 was charged against funds appropriated to specific programs and projects of the various offices and agencies of the Department to establish 65 Federal Boards of Examiners throughout the United States under the Civil Service Commission. In the opinion of the Conferees, this practice results in duplication and overlapping, permits the establishment of less essential programs at the expense of more valuable activities, and therefore should be discontinued. Each such proposed diversion of funds should have prior review and approval of Congress.

Jamie L. Whitten,
William H. Natcher,
W. R. Hull, Jr.,
Thomas G. Morris,
George E. Shipley,
George Mahon,
Robert H. Michel,
Odin Langen,
William H. Harrison,
Frank T. Bow,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. WHITTEN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the statement on the part of the managers of the House be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 299]

Anderson, Tenn.
Ashley
Baring
Blatnik
Bray
Broomfield
Byrnes, Wis.
Celler
Culver
Dent
Diggs
Downing
Everett
Flood
Foley
Fountain
Fulton, Tenn.
Green, Oreg.
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Holifield
Jonas
King, N.Y.
Leggett
Lukens
Moorhead
Myers
O'Neill, Mass.
Pike
Rarick
Reinecke
Resnick
St Germain
St. Onge
Sikes
Stratton
Sullivan
Utt
Vigorito
White
Williams, Miss.
Willis

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 392 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION, 1968 — CONFERENCE REPORT

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Whitten] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Appropriation Subcommittee on Agriculture, I bring you today a bill which exceeds the House bill primarily in only one instance—the food stamp program, which is offset by returning $195,000,000 additional section 32 funds to the Treasury. This, as you will recall, was included by the House committee prior to final passage of legislation and was eliminated on point of order in the House. The 1968 budget proposed to provide the funds by transfer from section 32.

Subsequent to that, Congress approved the authorizing legislation requiring an appropriation instead of the use of section 32 funds. The Senate then added $195,000,000, including an appropriation of $172,500,000, plus a carryover of prior year funds of $22,500,000.

The conferees agreed to $185,000,000 for this purpose, $161,800,000 by appropriation and $23,200,000 by carryover. Except for this amount which, again, is offset by the return of the $195,000,000 of section 32 funds to the Treasury, our conference report would be $229,951,700 below the budget and $1,991,384,089 below the Senate bill. It would be only $20,564,750 above the House bill for the many programs and activities of the Department of Agriculture.

Every appropriation and loan fund in the bill is at or below the budget amounts, though we would have liked to have increased the amount for water and sewer grants. We have asked the Bureau of the Budget to restudy the need in this area.

The total appropriations agreed to in the conference report are $4,952,945,700, of which $1,797,249,700 is for regular operations, the remainder for price support and Public Law 480 and other programs. This is under the Senate by $1,829,584,089. Considering the food stamp program, it is under the Senate by $1,991,384,089.

The report is under the budget by $68,151,700. Adjusted for the food stamp program, it is under the budget by $229,951,700.

The bill is over the House by only $20,564,750, aside from the food stamp appropriation of $161,800,000, which is more than offset by return of section 32 funds to the Treasury, as I have pointed out.

There are three items in actual disagreement on which I propose to ask for a separate record vote to sustain your House conferees.

The first is on the cropland adjustment program. The bill carries the full appropriation amount needed to meet existing contracts. However, Senate amendment No. 43 provides a $52.2 million authorization to enter into agreements to take 2,000,000 additional acres out of production. The House conferees recommend the elimination of this language in view of the need for adequate reserves and in order to meet the demands of various export programs.

The second is for operating loans of the Farmers Home Administration. Senate amendment No. 56 adds $25,000,000 above the budget for these loan funds. While the conferees are in full agreement as to the need for these extra funds, the House conferees felt the Bureau of the Budget should submit a budget estimate for the increased amount, otherwise we would be above the budget.

The third item is for restoration of capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation. You will recall that that the House bill carried the full budget estimate of $1.4 billion for this item. Senate amendment No. 63 raises this amount to nearly $3.0 billion, an increase of approximately $1.6 billion, all above the budget. The House conferees recommend that the House insist upon its position on this item, pending a budget request, which can be submitted should demands upon the Commodity Credit Corporation require it.

At this point I enter a table which shows the amounts for each appropriation and authorization:

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1967, ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS APPROVED FOR 1968

Item	Appropriations and authorizations, 1967	Budget estimates, 1968	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action	Difference between conference action and—			
						Appropriations and authorization, 1967	Budget estimate	House bill	Senate bill
TITLE I—GENERAL ACTIVITIES									
Agricultural Research Service:									
Salaries and expenses:									
Research	$125,997,500	$136,983,000	$135,587,500	$143,354,800	$136,775,500	+$10,778,000	−$207,500	+$1,188,000	−$6,579,300
Transfer from sec. 32	(25,000,000)	(15,000,000)	(15,000,000)	(15,000,000)	(15,000,000)	(−10,000,000)			
Total	(150,997,500)	(151,983,000)	(150,587,500)	(158,354,800)	(151,775,500)	(+778,000)	(−207,500)	(+1,188,000)	(−6,579,300)
Plant and animal disease and pest control	82,665,900	85,852,000	84,028,000	90,835,400	85,802,000	+3,136,100	−50,000	+1,774,000	−5,033,400
Special fund (reappropriation)	(2,000,000)	(2,000,000)	(2,000,000)	(2,000,000)	(2,000,000)				
Total, salaries and expenses	208,663,400	222,835,000	219,615,500	234,190,200	222,577,500	+13,914,100	−257,500	+2,962,000	−11,612,700
Salaries and expenses (special foreign currency program)	4,500,000	15,400,000	7,500,000	15,400,000	8,500,000	+4,000,000	−6,900,000	+1,000,000	−6,900,000
Total, Agricultural Research Service	213,163,400	238,235,000	227,115,500	249,590,200	231,077,500	+17,914,100	−7,157,500	+3,962,000	−18,512,700
Total, including transfers	(240,163,400)	(255,235,000)	(244,115,500)	(266,590,200)	(248,077,500)	(+7,914,100)	(−7,157,500)	(+3,962,000)	(−18,512,700)
Cooperative State Research Service: Payments and expenses	58,776,000	63,113,000	63,113,000	66,214,000	63,113,000	+4,337,000			−3,101,000
Extension Service:									
Payments to States and Puerto Rico	78,652,500	81,917,500	81,917,500	83,917,500	81,917,500	+3,265,000			−2,000,000
Retirement costs for extension agents	8,305,500	8,818,500	8,818,500	8,818,500	8,818,500	+513,000			
Penalty mail	3,113,000	3,113,000	3,113,000	3,113,000	3,113,000				
Federal Extension Service	2,728,000	2,753,000	2,753,000	2,753,000	2,753,000	+25,000			
Total, Extension Service	92,799,000	96,602,000	96,602,000	98,602,000	96,602,000	+3,803,000			−2,000,000
Farmer Cooperative Service	1,204,000	1,404,000	1,204,000	1,404,000	1,304,000	+100,000	−100,000	+100,000	−100,000
Soil Conservation Service:									
Conservation operations	112,430,200	113,995,000	113,053,000	113,995,000	113,500,000	+1,069,800	−495,000	+447,000	−495,000
Watershed planning	6,342,000	6,377,000	6,377,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	−342,000	−377,000	−377,000	
Watershed protection	70,130,700	70,403,000	70,403,000	70,403,000	70,403,000	+272,300			
Flood prevention	25,695,400	25,753,000	25,753,000	25,753,000	25,753,000	+57,600			
Great Plains conservation program	18,504,300	16,336,000	16,336,000	18,504,300	16,336,000	−2,168,300			−2,168,300
Resource conservation and development	4,664,600	7,629,000	6,000,000	7,629,000	6,129,000	+1,464,400	−1,500,000	+129,000	−1,500,000
Total, Soil Conservation Service	237,767,200	240,493,000	237,922,000	242,284,300	238,121,000	+353,800	−2,372,000	+199,000	−4,163,300

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1967, ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS APPROVED FOR 1968—Continued

Item	Appropriations and authorizations, 1967	Budget estimates, 1968	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action	Difference between conference action and—			
						Appropriations and authorization, 1967	Budget estimate	House bill	Senate bill
TITLE I—GENERAL ACTIVITIES—Continued									
Economic Research Service: Salaries and expenses	$12,421,000	$13,646,000	$12,421,000	$13,021,000	$12,421,000	--------------	−$1,225,000	--------------	−$600,000
Statistical Reporting Service: Salaries and expenses	13,821,750	13,864,000	13,821,750	13,864,000	13,830,500	+$8,750	−33,500	+$8,750	−33,500
Consumer and Marketing Service:									
Consumer protective, marketing, and regulatory programs	86,072,000	89,522,000	89,010,000	89,522,000	89,310,000	+3,238,000	−212,000	+300,000	−212,000
Payments to States and possessions	1,750,000	1,750,000	1,750,000	1,900,000	1,750,000	--------------	--------------	--------------	−150,000
Special milk program	51,000,000	--------------	--------------	104,000,000	--------------	−51,000,000	--------------	--------------	−104,000,000
Transfer from sec. 32	(53,000,000)	(104,000,000)	(104,000,000)	(--------------)	(104,000,000)	(+51,000,000)	--------------	--------------	(+104,000,000)
Total, special milk	(104,000,000)	(104,000,000)	(104,000,000)	(104,000,000)	(104,000,000)	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------
School lunch program	168,605,000	198,735,000	198,735,000	190,825,000	182,825,000	+14,220,000	−15,910,000	−15,910,000	−8,000,000
Transfer from sec. 32	(45,000,000)	(45,000,000)	(45,000,000)	(45,000,000)	(45,000,000)	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------
Total, school lunch	(213,605,000)	(243,735,000)	(243,735,000)	(235,825,000)	(227,825,000)	(+14,220,000)	(−15,910,000)	(−15,910,000)	(−8,000,000)
Food stamp program	110,000,000	--------------	--------------	172,500,000	161,800,000	+51,800,000	+161,800,000	+161,800,000	−10,700,000
Reappropriation	(30,000,000)	--------------	--------------	(22,500,000)	(23,200,000)	(−6,800,000)	(+23,200,000)	(+23,200,000)	(+700,000)
Transfer from sec. 32	--------------	(195,000,000)	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	(−195,000,000)	--------------	--------------
Total, food stamp	(140,000,000)	(195,000,000)	(1)	(195,000,000)	(185,000,000)	(+45,000,000)	(−10,000,000)	(+185,000,000)	(−10,000,000)
Total, Consumer and Marketing Service	417,427,000	290,007,000	289,495,000	558,747,000	435,685,000	+18,258,000	+145,678,000	+146,190,000	−123,062,000
Total, including transfers and reappropriations	(545,427,000)	(634,007,000)	(438,495,000)	(626,247,000)	(607,885,000)	(+62,458,000)	(−26,122,000)	(+169,390,000)	(−18,362,000)
Foreign Agricultural Service:									
Salaries and expenses	21,441,500	22,612,000	21,441,500	22,612,000	22,141,500	+700,000	−470,500	+700,000	−470,500
Transfer from sec. 32	(3,117,000)	(3,117,000)	(3,117,000)	(3,117,000)	(3,117,000)	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------
Total	(24,558,500)	(25,729,000)	(24,558,500)	(25,729,000)	(25,258,500)	(+700,000)	(−470,500)	(+700,000)	(−470,500)
Commodity Exchange Authority	1,434,000	1,491,000	1,491,000	1,491,000	1,491,000	+57,000	--------------	--------------	--------------
Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service:									
Expenses, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service	129,952,000	152,665,400	137,935,400	144,285,400	137,935,400	+7,983,400	−14,730,000	--------------	−6,350,000
Transfer from CCC	(76,406,500)	(52,488,600)	(64,728,600)	(58,608,600)	(58,608,600)	(−17,797,900)	(+6,120,000)	(−6,120,000)	--------------
Total available	(206,358,500)	(205,154,000)	(202,664,000)	(202,894,000)	(196,544,000)	(−9,814,500)	(−8,610,000)	(−6,120,000)	(−6,350,000)
Sugar Act program	80,000,000	86,500,000	80,000,000	81,500,000	80,000,000	--------------	−6,500,000	--------------	−1,500,000
Agricultural conservation program	220,000,000	220,000,000	220,000,000	220,000,000	220,000,000	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------
Cropland adjustment program (expenses)	62,000,000	90,000,000	80,000,000	84,500,000	84,500,000	+22,500,000	−5,500,000	+4,500,000	--------------
Authorization for 1968 CAP program	(80,000,000)	(52,200,000)	(--------------)	(52,200,000)	(--------------)	(−80,000,000)	(−52,200,000)	(--------------)	(−52,000,000)
Conservation reserve program	140,650,000	125,000,000	123,000,000	123,000,000	123,000,000	−17,650,000	−2,000,000	--------------	--------------
Emergency conservation measures	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------
Cropland conversion program	7,500,000	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	−7,500,000	--------------	--------------	--------------
Total, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service	645,102,000	679,165,400	645,935,400	658,285,400	650,435,400	+5,333,400	−28,730,000	+4,500,000	−7,850,000
Total, including transfers	(721,508,500)	(731,654,000)	(710,664,000)	(716,894,000)	(709,044,000)	(−12,464,500)	(−22,610,000)	(−1,620,000)	(−7,850,000)
Rural Community Development Service	652,000	450,000	450,000	450,000	450,000	−202,000	--------------	--------------	--------------
Office of Inspector General	11,504,000	12,323,000	11,693,000	11,993,000	11,993,000	+489,000	−330,000	+300,000	--------------
Packers and Stockyards Act	2,569,300	2,789,000	2,569,300	2,789,000	2,569,300	--------------	−219,700	--------------	−219,700
Office of General Counsel	4,325,000	4,740,000	4,325,000	4,525,000	4,325,000	--------------	−415,000	--------------	−200,000
Office of Information	1,882,000	1,928,000	1,928,000	1,928,000	1,928,000	+46,000	--------------	--------------	--------------
National Agricultural Library	2,458,500	2,900,000	2,458,500	2,758,500	2,608,500	+150,000	−291,500	+150,000	−150,000
Office of Management Services	2,667,000	2,749,000	2,667,000	2,707,000	2,667,000	--------------	−82,000	--------------	−40,000
General administration	4,052,000	4,563,000	4,457,000	4,487,000	4,487,000	+435,000	−76,000	+30,000	--------------
Total, title I, general activities	1,745,466,650	1,693,074,400	1,641,109,950	1,957,752,400	1,797,249,700	+51,783,050	+104,175,300	+156,139,750	−160,502,700
Total, including transfers and reappropriations	(1,979,990,150)	(2,109,680,000)	(1,874,955,550)	(2,103,978,000)	(2,048,175,300)	(+68,185,150)	(−61,504,700)	(+173,219,750)	(−55,802,700)
TITLE II—CREDIT AGENCIES									
Rural Electrification Administration:									
Loan authorizations:									
Electrification	(375,000,000)	(314,000,000)	(314,000,000)	(324,000,000)	(314,000,000)	(−61,000,000)	--------------	--------------	(−10,000,000)
Telephone	(117,000,000)	(120,600,000)	(120,600,000)	(135,000,000)	(120,600,000)	(+3,600,000)	--------------	--------------	(−14,400,000)
Total, loan authorizations	(492,000,000)	(434,600,000)	(434,600,000)	(459,000,000)	(434,600,000)	(−57,400,000)	--------------	--------------	(−24,400,000)
Salaries and expenses	12,425,800	12,457,000	12,457,000	12,457,000	12,457,000	+31,200	--------------	--------------	--------------
Total, Rural Electrification Administration	12,425,800	12,457,000	12,457,000	12,457,000	12,457,000	+31,200	--------------	--------------	--------------

Farmers Home Administration:									
Participation sales authorization	(600,000,000)	(800,000,000)	(800,000,000)	(700,000,000)	(750,000,000)	(+150,000,000)	(−50,000,000)	(−50,000,000)	(+50,000,000)
Payment of sales insufficiencies	(3,209,000)	13,268,000	13,268,000	13,268,000	13,268,000	+13,268,000			
Direct loan account:									
Real estate loans	(90,000,000)	(110,000,000)	(110,000,000)	(110,000,000)	(110,000,000)	(+20,000,000)			
Operating loans	(350,000,000)	(300,000,000)	(300,000,000)	(325,000,000)	(300,000,000)	(−50,000,000)			(−25,000,000)
Total, direct loan account	(440,000,000)	(410,000,000)	(410,000,000)	(435,000,000)	(410,000,000)	(−30,000,000)			(−25,000,000)
Rural housing direct loan account	(15,000,000)	(15,000,000)	(15,000,000)	(15,000,000)	(15,000,000)				
Rural water and waste disposal grants	26,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	40,000,000	30,000,000	+4,000,000			−10,000,000
Rural renewal	1,200,000	2,000,000	1,200,000	2,000,000	1,600,000	+400,000	−400,000	+400,000	−400,000
Rural housing for domestic farm labor	3,000,000	4,000,000	3,000,000	4,000,000	3,500,000	+500,000	−500,000	+500,000	−500,000
Salaries and expenses	52,457,000	58,090,000	54,988,000	56,988,000	55,988,000	+3,531,000	−2,102,000	+1,000,000	−1,000,000
Transfer from agriculture credit insurance fund	(2,250,000)	(2,250,000)	(2,250,000)	(2,250,000)	(2,250,000)				
Miscellaneous transfer	(500,000)	(500,000)	(500,000)	(500,000)	(500,000)				
Total	(55,207,000)	(60,840,000)	(57,738,000)	(59,738,000)	(58,738,000)	(+3,531,000)	(−2,102,000)	(+1,000,000)	(−1,000,000)
Total, Farmers Home Administration	82,657,000	107,358,000	102,456.000	116,256,000	104,356,000	+21,699,000	−3,002,000	+1,900,000	−11,900,000
Total, title II, credit agencies:									
Loan authorizations	(947,000,000)	(859,600,000)	(859,600,000)	(909,000,000)	(859,600,000)	(−87,400,000)			(−49,400,000)
Direct appropriation	95,082,800	119,815,000	114,913,000	128,713,000	116,813,000	+21,730,200	−3,002,000	+1,900,000	−11,900,000
TITLE III—CORPORATIONS									
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation: Administrative and operating expenses:[1]									
Appropriation	8,692,000	11,533,000	8,883,000	11,533,000	10,208,000	+1,516,000	−1,325,000	+1,325,000	−1,325,000
Premium income	(4,100,000)	(1,600,000)	(4,100,000)	(1,600,000)	(2,850,000)	(−1,250,000)	(+1,250,000)	(−1,250,000)	(+1,250,000)
Total	(12,792,000)	(13,133,000)	(12,983,000)	(13,133,000)	(13,058,000)	(+266,000)	(−75,000)	(+75,000)	(−75,000)
Commodity Credit Corporation:									
Reimbursement for net realized losses	3,555,855,000	1,400,000,000	1,400,000,000	2,984,856,389	1,400,000,000	−2,155,855,000			−1,584,856,389
Limitation on administrative expenses	(34,300,000)	(31,500,000)	(31,500,000)	(31,500,000)	(31,500,000)	(−2,800,000)			
Public Law 480	1,617,000,000	1,772,500,000	1,605,500,000	1,675,500,000	1,605,500,000	−11,500,000	−167,000,000		−70,000,000
Bartered materials for supplemental stockpile		24,000,000		24,000,000	23,000,000	+23,000,000	−1,000,000	+23,000,000	−1,000,000
Total, title III, corporations	5,181,547,000	3,208,033,000	3,014,383,000	4,695,889,389	3,038,708,000	−2,142,839,000	−169,325,000	+24,325,000	−1,657,181,389
TITLE IV—RELATED AGENCIES									
Farm Credit Administration: Limitation on administrative expenses	(3,133,000)	(3,224,000)	(3,224,000)	(3,224,000)	(3,224,000)	(+91,000)			
National Advisory Commission on Food and Fiber	475,000	175,000	175,000	175,000	175,000	−300,000			
Total, title IV, related agencies	475,000	175,000	175,000	175,000	175,000	−300,000			
Total appropriations:									
Title I—General activities	1,745,466,650	1,693,074,400	1,641,109,950	1,957,752,400	1,797,249,700	+51,783,050	+104,175,300	+156,139,750	−160,502,700
Title II—Credit agencies	95,082,800	119,815,000	114,913,000	128,713,000	116,813,000	+21,730,200	−3,002,000	+1,900,000	−11,900,000
Title III—Corporations	5,181,547,000	3,208,033,000	3,014,383,000	4,695,889,389	3,038,708,000	−2,142,839,000	−169,325,000	+24,325,000	−1,657,181,389
Title IV—Related agencies	475,000	175,000	175,000	175,000	175,000	−300,000			
Grand total	7,022,571,450	5,021,097,400	4,770,580,950	6,782,529,789	4,952,945,700	−2,069,625,750	−68,151,700	+182,364,750	−1,829,584,089
Food stamp program							−161,800,000	−161,800,000	−161,800,000
Adjusted total							−229,951,700	+20,564,750	−1,991,384,089

---

[1] Eliminated on House floor on point of order.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I wish to stand in support of the future of the cropland adjustment program, and to have it made a part of the RECORD that the House, in declining to appropriate funds for that program in 1968, does not wish in any way to jeopardize the longer term future of the program. We recognize the need for reducing expenditures at present, in view of the pressures of defense and other critical needs. But we would like to make it clear that the CAP should be continued and expanded when the situation permits.

The limited program approved for 1967—while it removed around 2 million acres from unneeded crops and—was far below the demand from farmers. Requests were far in excess of the ability of the Department of Agriculture to complete agreements because of the limited funds. But the program has proved to be popular with farmers and with conservationists. It has proved to be a valuable and worthwhile program that brings cropland adjustment at less cost than the annual programs—and at the same time contributes to other values.

The cropland adjustment program is of special value as a "people" program—providing unique opportunities for rural people, especially older farmers and those just starting out. For the older couples who can no longer carry on a full farming operation, but want to continue living on the place where the family may have farmed for generations, CAP is a godsend. For the younger family which wants to move onto a farm and gradually expand its farming activity, while the breadwinner continues to carry on a job in town, CAP is a golden opportunity.

I have also seen, in my home State of Iowa, the contributions that CAP is making to public recreation. There are, I believe, 20 Greenspan projects in my home State—most of them representing agreements with school districts' county conservation boards to provide recreation areas for smaller cities and towns. This program, the public entity aspect of CAP, has enabled local governments to acquire surplus cropland with Government help. The result in only 2 years is

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

139 Greenspan agreements. These agreements—usually involving only a few thousand dollars of Federal funds—have proved to be real catalysts in getting local recreation projects started and brought to fruition.

Another aspect of CAP that is important to nonfarm people is the opening of many private farms to public recreation. In a number of States, farmers shifting land from crops under long-term CAP agreements have opened their lands to public access without charge. With the incentive of a small additional Government payment, these farmers now give the public free access for hunting, fishing, hiking, or trapping. Under this provision, farmers have signed up for "free public access" something in the neighborhood of a million acres of farmland.

All in all, the cropland adjustment program represents the most modern and progressive concept of land use, developed with the help and support of conservation organizations and enthusiasts all over the country. It recognizes that in the foreseeable future at least, we should not and cannot make full use for crop production all of the cropland resources that we have. It recognizes that we must consider other land use needs, and at the same time protect and develop our reserve capacity for the future that we cannot foresee. Therefore—although the House does not see fit to fund the program for 1968—I want it recognized that CAP continues to be a vital tool in our future land policy, and I would like this fact made a part of the RECORD.

As I said, I think some good has come of this program. It is my opinion that it has done some good in the past years and that it can do good in the future. I understand the pressure that is on this budget and the reasoning which the gentleman from Mississippi uses. However, I want to ask this question: I assume that this being eliminated this year, would not preclude the revival of the program next year or the year after, with the program standing on its own each year?

Mr. WHITTEN. It would not, may I say to my colleague. May I point out that, although we have some problems that are somewhat different than we have had in the past, this does not preclude the reinstitution of the program. This action has been taken in view of our present situation.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman can tell me if the figure which the Senate sought to place in the appropriation bill for the Commodity Credit Corporation would restore fully the impairment of the capital that was sustained in the previous year?

Mr. WHITTEN. It is my understanding that it would have.

Mr. FINDLEY. Could the gentleman give us any assurances that the figure of $1.4 billion, which the House wishes to insist upon, would be adequate to see the Corporation through the coming year?

Mr. WHITTEN. Insofar as assurances are concerned, the gentleman is aware of the obligations that are imposed on the Commodity Credit Corporation by law. It is our information that this amount in the conference bill will be ample to meet the needs as outlined to us by the Department of Agriculture. However, it is the feeling of the subcommittee that if more money is required, the Budget Bureau should submit a budget request. Otherwise we will be blamed around the country for exceeding the budget.

However, again I repeat that we are convinced this will be ample to meet the needs of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Should it prove insufficient then the Bureau of the Budget could submit such a request as might be necessary.

Mr. FINDLEY. I am sure the gentleman well recalls supplemental requests which we have received from the Commodity Credit Corporation soon after New Year's Day in past years. Is there any indication that such a supplemental request will be made next year?

Mr. WHITTEN. No, I have none. I have every reason to believe this will be ample.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MICHEL. To further supplement the remarks of the chairman concerning the statement by the gentleman from Illinois, I believe it should be pointed out specifically here in connection with the insistence of the House conferees that even with this amount of $1.4 billion for restoration of capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation, there will be at the end of 1968 an unused borrowing authority of more than $2.75 billion, which is more than adequate for the current fiscal year.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank my colleague for that information.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I wonder if the gentleman could explain what the conference committee has done with the Laboratory Animal Welfare Act in this bill?

Mr. WHITTEN. We provide the following language:

> The appropriation provides for enforcement of the Laboratory Animal Welfare Act at a cost not to exceed $1,200,000. Enforcement work in the field is to be handled by existing trained personnel as far as possible, and additional funds required are to be provided by transfer from lower priority work considered to be less essential.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. But it is the intention to fund this at the figure of $1,200,000?

Mr. WHITTEN. If required.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, faced as we are with the necessity to look with a keen and almost atavistic eye at any items that are not necessary, and so that we can get down to the barebones in appropriations and in expenditures, there are those in the Nation who are becoming more perspicacious, and eloquent when we take out items that do not fall within this definition of barebones. Then I look in the report and see that the conferees agreed with the Senate in the construction of a genetic stock center for bees in the sum of $135,000, and also for the construction of a tobacco research laboratory at Oxford, N.C., for $150,000. I would say to the gentleman that these are all within the barebones definition, I take it?

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say to the gentleman, I do not know that I have ever seen a bill brought in here as much below the Senate and as much below the budget recommendations as this bill is. Within the funds that were available, we are far below the Bureau of the Budget and far below the Senate. In this bill we have tried to include those items we believe essential for the Congress to recommend.

But with all due deference, the project in North Carolina is underway and it would be unwise not to complete it.

So far as the bees are concerned, I think all of our standards of living are tied up with pollination provided by these insects. So we have within this barebones total, certain amounts rearranged in line with our recommendations to the Congress as to how those items would be distributed.

Mr. CAREY. I thank the gentleman for yielding and would thank him for yielding further. It is just that when last week we sent back to conference the health and education appropriations, all of which in the minds of the conferees represented worthwhile expenditures on ongoing programs for the health and welfare of Americans, it would seem that we are not willing to cut anything where bees, butts, and tobacco are concerned. Yet we will cut even further and forestall some of those projects, which go into research on how to keep life going where health authorities believe they can contribute something to all Americans.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say to my colleagues that there is this distinction: Your conferees attempted to follow the attitudes expressed by the House and you will find funds for research in this bill considerably below the budget and far below the amount included in the other body. So we have followed the record vote that the House had last week.

May I say further, I am sure that when the continuing resolution comes, it shall be my desire to see that whatever action the Committee on Appropriations recommends, it will be across the board and all segments will be treated fairly and equitably.

Mr. CAREY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I do not know that there is any need to elaborate to any great extent on what the chairman has said with reference to the conference report.

I certainly support it and I think the

subcommittee did an outstanding job in upholding the position of the House and I am most happy that on the three specific items that the chairman made reference to that we are bringing them back in disagreement and that we can have a vote here and make it unmistakably clear to the other body that we intend to hold fast to those figures.

Mr. **WHITTEN**. Mr. Speaker, I hope that my colleagues will bear with me in asking for record votes on the three items that were referred to earlier so that we may show the strength of our position on this side and thereby hopefully avoid a further conference. In each of the three instances, I ask that you stand by us as we insist on our cuts back to the budget. I wish to make that explanation so that my colleagues understand the reason for the record votes to follow.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER**. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate Amendment No. 9: On page 7, line 7, strike out "$2,500,000" and insert "$4,000,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. **WHITTEN**. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Whitten moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$2,000,000".

The motion was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER**. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 31: On page 17, line 19, strike out "$198,735,000" and insert "$190,825,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. **WHITTEN**. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Whitten moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$182,825,000".

The motion was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER**. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 37: On page 18, line 11, insert:

"FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

"For necessary expenses of the food stamp program pursuant to the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended, $172,500,000, and in addition $22,500,000 appropriated under this head in Public Law 89–556, approved September 7, 1966, shall be merged with this appropriation."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. **WHITTEN**. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Whitten moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed, insert:

"FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

"For necessary expenses of the food stamp program pursuant to the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended, $161,800,000, and in addition $23,200,000 appropriated under this head in Public Law 89–556, approved September 7, 1966, shall be merged with this appropriation.

The motion was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER**. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 43: Page 25, line 1, insert:

"*Provided,* That agreements entered into during the fiscal year 1968 shall not require payments during the calendar year 1968 exceeding $52,200,000."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. **WHITTEN**. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Whitten moves that the House insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. **WHITTEN**. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 377, nays 8, not voting 47, as follows:

[Roll No. 300]

YEAS—377

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Ayres
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bevill
Biester
Bingham
Blackburn
Blanton
Boggs
Boland
Bolton
Bow
Brademas
Brasco
Brinkley
Brock
Brooks
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson
Burton, Utah
Bush
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cahill
Carey
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clark
Clausen Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Cohelan
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Corbett
Corman
Cowger
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtis
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dellenback
Denney
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Dowdy
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Eilberg
Erlenborn
Esch
Eshleman
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Flynt
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Gallagher
Gardner
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Goodell
Goodling
Gray
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gude
Gurney
Hagan
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hanley
Hanna
Hardy
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Helstoski
Henderson
Herlong
Hicks
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Karsten
Karth
Kazen
Kee
Keith
Kelly
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kleppe
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kupferman
Kyros
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McCarthy
McClure
McCulloch
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
McFall
McMillan
Macdonald, Mass.
Machen
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin
Mathias, Calif.
Mathias, Md.
Matsunaga
May
Mayne
Meeds
Meskill
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Monagan
Montgomery
Morgan
Morris, N. Mex.
Morse, Mass.
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nichols
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen
O'Neal, Ga.
Ottinger
Passman
Patten
Pelly
Perkins
Pettis
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pollock
Pool
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Pryor
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Railsback
Randall
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Riegle
Rivers
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ruppe
Ryan
Sandman
Satterfield
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherle
Scheuer
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Selden
Shipley
Shriver
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Okla.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thompson, Ga.
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Tiernan
Tuck
Tunney
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Waggonner
Waldie
Wampler
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Whalen
Whalley
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams, Pa.
Wilson, Charles H.
Winn
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Yates
Young
Zablocki
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—8

Bolling
Burton, Calif.
Evans, Colo.
Fraser
Kastenmeier
Kyl
Smith, Iowa
Walker

NOT VOTING—47

Anderson, Tenn.
Baring
Blatnik
Bray
Broomfield
Celler
Culver
Dent
Diggs
Downing
Everett
Flood
Foley
Fountain
Fulton, Tenn.
Green, Oreg.
Gubser
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Holifield
Jonas
King, N.Y.
Kuykendall
Leggett
Lukens
McClory
MacGregor
Moore
Moorhead
Myers
O'Neill, Mass.
Patman
Pepper
Rarick
Reinecke
Resnick
St Germain
St. Onge
Sikes
Stratton
Sullivan
Utt
Vigorito
White
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Wilson, Bob

So the motion was agreed to.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Foley with Mr. McClory.
Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Leggett with Mr. Moore.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Reinecke.
Mr. Fountain with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Jonas.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. MacGregor.
Mr. St Germain with Mr. Bray.
Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.
Mr. Vigorito with Mr. King of New York.
Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Myers.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Lukens.
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Kuykendall.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Stratton.
Mr. Resnick with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Williams of Mississippi with Mr. Baring.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Culver.
Mr. Flood with Mr. Everett.
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Patman.
Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Rarick.
Mr. White with Mr. Downing.

Mr. ADAMS changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to state for the record a few facts in regard to the present situation. There is no doubt in my mind but that the additional sum of $25 million for Farmers Home Administration will be needed by farmers next year for the 1968 crop. A greater sum than this may well be needed.

The President did not request the additional $25 million in his budget and there is no indication at this time that he would release the additional funds for use.

My position is that it would be more effective strategy to delete these above-the-budget funds at this time and reopen the issue early next year. We could then urge the President to send up a budget estimate at that time for the funds needed, whether the sum is higher or lower than the present figure. More information would then be available and the chance of securing Presidential and budget approval would be better at that time.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that these remarks will clarify the situation which now confronts the House. I shall do all in my power to be helpful to farmers in need of Farmers Home Administration loans when we can see more clearly what the actual requirements may be.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 56: On page 31, line 18, strike out "$300,000,000" and insert "$325,000,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, the House has just voted on one of the three proposals where we have asked the House to stand by your conferees. There are two others, one where we ask you to stand by the conferees and hold to the budget figure on the Farmers Home Administration. The other has to do with the Commodity Credit Corporation where the other body added something like $1,600,000,000 and we ask that you support your conferees in their recommendation as to that item.

Mr. Speaker, I make this comment at this point for the information of my colleagues and I shall ask for a division on this vote. If Members will cooperate so that the record will show a good standing vote on these two items, we will avoid the time-consuming action of having to ask for a rollcall vote.

So, Mr. Speaker, on the pending motion, I ask for a division.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WHITTEN) there were—ayes 171, noes 5.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count. Two hundred and four Members are present, not a quorum.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 362, nays 24, not voting 46, as follows:

[Roll No. 301]

YEAS—362

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, Ala.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Ayres
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Betts
Bevill
Biester
Bingham
Blanton
Boggs
Boland
Bolton
Bow
Brademas
Brasco
Brinkley
Brock
Brooks
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson
Burton, Utah
Bush
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cahill
Carey
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Corbett
Corman
Cowger
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtis
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dellenback
Denney
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Dowdy
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Eilberg
Erlenborn
Esch
Eshleman
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Flynt
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Gallagher
Gardner
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Goodell
Goodling
Gray
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gude
Gurney
Hagan
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey
Hays
Hébert
Heckler, Mass.
Helstoski
Henderson
Herlong
Hicks
Holland
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Karsten
Karth
Kazen
Kee
Keith
Kelly
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kupferman
Kuykendall
Kyros
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McCarthy
McClure
McCulloch
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
McFall
McMillan
Macdonald, Mass.
MacGregor
Machen
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin
Mathias, Calif.
May
Mayne
Meeds
Meskill
Michel
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Monagan
Montgomery
Morgan
Morris, N. Mex.
Morse, Mass.
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nichols
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen
O'Neal, Ga.
Ottinger
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Perkins
Pettis
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pollock
Pool
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Pryor
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Railsback
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Riegle
Rivers
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ruppe
Ryan
Sandman
Satterfield
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherle
Scheuer
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Selden
Shipley
Shriver
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Okla.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thompson, Ga.
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Tiernan
Tuck
Tunney
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Waggonner
Waldie
Walker
Wampler
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Whalen
Whalley
Whitener
Whitten
Wiggins
Williams, Pa.
Wilson, Charles H.
Winn
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Yates
Young
Zablocki
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—24

Andrews, N. Dak.
Berry
Bolling
Burton, Calif.
Cohelan
Conyers
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hechler, W. Va.
Horton
Kastenmeier
Kleppe
Kyl
Mathias, Md.
Matsunaga
Moore
Morton
Randall
Rees
Reifel
Sisk
Smith, Iowa

NOT VOTING—46

Anderson, Tenn.
Baring
Blackburn
Blatnik
Bray
Broomfield
Celler
Culver
Dent
Diggs
Downing
Everett
Flood
Foley
Fountain
Fraser
Fulton, Tenn.
Green, Oreg.
Hansen, Idaho
Holifield
Jonas
King, N.Y.
Leggett
Lukens
McClory
Miller, Calif.
Moorhead
Myers
O'Neill, Mass.

Pepper
Rarick
Reinecke
Resnick
St Germain
St. Onge
Sikes
Stratton
Sullivan
Taft
Utt
Vigorito
White
Widnall
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Wilson, Bob

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts with Mr. Taft.
Mr. Foley with Mr. Widnall.
Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Jonas.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Flood with Mr. Reinecke.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. McClory.
Mr. Vigorito with Mr. Bray.
Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. King of New York.
Mr. Leggett with Mr. Myers.
Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.
Mr. Fountain with Mr. Lukens.
Mr. St Germain with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Everett with Mr. Rarick.
Mr. Culver with Mr. Celler.
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Resnick.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Stratton.
Mr. Downing with Mr. Baring.
Mr. White with Mr. Anderson of Tennessee.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Williams of Mississippi.
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Fraser.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Blackburn.

Mr. CONYERS and **Mr. RANDALL** changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 63: On page 34, line 16: Strike out "$1,400,000,000" and insert "$2,984,856,389".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 63.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, the House provided the full budget estimate of $1,400,000,000 in capital restoration for the Commodity Credit Corporation. The Senate increased this by approximately $1.6 billion above the budget recommendation.

We are asking here that the Members stay with the recommendation of the House conferees, which is $1.6 billion below the Senate recommendation and stays with the budgeted amount.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi that the House insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 63.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WHITTEN) there were—ayes 225, noes 3.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 391, nays 3, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 302]

YEAS—391

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, Ala.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Ayres
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bevill
Biester
Bingham
Blanton
Boggs
Boland
Bolton
Bow
Brademas
Brasco
Brinkley
Brock
Brooks
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Bush
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cahill
Carey
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Cohelan
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Cônte
Corbett
Corman
Cowger
Cramer
Culver
Cunningham
Curtis
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dellenback
Denney
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Dowdy
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Eilberg
Erlenborn
Esch
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Flynt
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Gallagher
Gardner
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Goodell
Goodling
Gray
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gude
Gurney
Hagan
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Helstoski
Henderson
Herlong
Hicks
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kee
Keith
Kelly
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kleppe
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kupferman
Kuykendall
Kyl
Kyros
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McClory
McClure
McCulloch
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
McFall
McMillan
Macdonald, Mass.
MacGregor
Machen
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin
Mathias, Calif.
Mathias, Md.
Matsunaga
May
Mayne
Meeds
Meskill
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Monagan
Montgomery
Moore
Morgan
Morris, N. Mex.
Morse, Mass.
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nichols
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen
O'Neal, Ga.
Ottinger
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Perkins
Pettis
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pollock
Pool
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Pryor
Pucinski
Quie
Quillen
Railsback
Randall
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Riegle
Rivers
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ruppe
Ryan
Sandman
Satterfield
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherle
Scheuer
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Selden
Shipley
Shriver
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Okla.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thompson, Ga.
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Tiernan
Tuck
Tunney
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Waggonner
Waldie
Walker
Wampler
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Whalen
Whalley
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams, Miss.
Williams, Pa.
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Winn
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Yates
Young
Zablocki
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—3

Andrews, N. Dak.
Bolling
Conyers

NOT VOTING—38

Anderson, Tenn.
Baring
Blackburn
Blatnik
Bray
Broomfield
Dent
Diggs
Downing
Everett
Flood
Foley
Fountain
Fulton, Tenn.
Green, Oreg.
Hansen, Idaho
Holifield
Jonas
Leggett
Lukens
McCarthy
Moorhead
Myers
O'Neill, Mass.
Pepper
Purcell
Rarick
Reinecke
Resnick
St Germain
St. Onge
Sikes
Stratton
Sullivan
Utt
Vigorito
White
Willis

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts with Mr. Myers.
Mr. Foley with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Leggett with Mr. Jonas.
Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Reinecke.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Bray.
Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Lukens.
Mr. Vigorito with Mr. Blackburn.
Mr. Flood with Mr. Holifield.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Moorhead.
Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Baring.
Mr. Resnick with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. White with Mr. Anderson of Tennessee.
Mr. Fountain with Mr. Willis.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Rarick.
Mr. St Germain with Mr. Everett.
Mr. Downing with Mrs. Green of Oregon.
Mr. Stratton with Mr. Fulton of Tennessee.

Mr. COHELAN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea." The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 67: On Page 36, line 14, insert the following:

"BARTERED MATERIALS FOR SUPPLEMENTAL STOCKPILE

"For the expenses during fiscal year 1968 and unrecovered prior years' costs related to strategic and other materials acquired as a result of barter or exchange of agricultural commodities or products and transferred to the supplemental stockpile pursuant to the Act of May 28, 1956, as amended (7 U.S.C.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

1856), $24,000,000, to remain available until expended."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Whitten moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert "$23,000,000".

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the conference report and on the several motions was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that Mr. Pastore, Mr. Monroney, and Mrs. Smith were appointed as additional conferees on the bill (H.R. 11456) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Transportation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes."

PRIVILEGE OF THE HOUSE—IN THE MATTER OF FRANCIS R. SMITH, ET AL. AGAINST JOSEPH J. SCANLON, ET AL. (CASE NO. 117)

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privilege of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania will state the question of privilege.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I have been subpenaed by the court of common pleas of the county of Philadelphia, in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, to testify on Tuesday, October 10, 1967, at 2:30 p.m., and on Monday, October 16, 1967, at 10 a.m., in the matter of Francis R. Smith, and others against Joseph J. Scanlon; and others—case No. 117—and on the earlier date to bring with me certain papers.

Under the precedents of the House, I am unable to comply with these subpenas without the consent of the House, the privileges of the House being involved. I therefore submit the matter for the consideration of this body.

Mr. Speaker, I send the subpenas to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the subpenas.

The Clerk read as follows:

[Subpena No. 35031]

Subpena: Court of Common Pleas, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, County of Philadelphia, October Term, 1967, No. 117

In the matter of: Francis R. Smith, individually and as Chairman of the Philadelphia Democratic Executive Committee; Peter J. Camiel, individually and as First Vice Chairman of the Philadelphia County Democratic Executive Committee, etc., et al., Plaintiff, v. Joseph J. Scanlon, William A. Barrett and Herbert J. McGlinchey, each individually and as members of the Philadelphia County Democratic Executive Committee, Defendant.

To. William A. Barrett, 2324 Reed Street, Philadelphia, Pa. 19146.

1. You are ordered by the court to come to Room 653, City Hall, at Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, on October 16, 1967, at 10:00 o'clock A.M.

Date October 6, 1967.

By the Court:

D. Barlow Burke,
Prothonotary.
Pro D. Dalton,
Clerk.

[Subpena No. 35035]

Subpena: Court of Common Pleas, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, County of Philadelphia, October Term, 1967, No. 117

In the matter of: Francis R. Smith, individually and as Chairman of the Philadelphia County Democratic Executive Committee; Peter J. Camiel, individually and as First Vice-Chairman of the Philadelphia County Democratic Executive Committee on behalf of themselves and all other officers, et al., Plaintiffs, v. Joseph J. Scanlon, William A. Barrett, and Herbert J. McGlinchey, each individually and as members of the Philadelphia County Democratic Executive Committee, Defendant.

To: Hon. William A. Barrett, Finance Bldg. (19102).

1. You are ordered by the court to come to the offices of Freedman, Borowsky and Lorry, Lafayette Bldg., 5th & Chestnut Streets, at Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, on Tuesday, October 10, 1967, at 2:30 o'clock P.M. to testify on behalf of Plaintiff in the above case, and to remain until excused.

2. And bring with you the following: All written material related to the above captioned controversy including but not limited to: (a) All memoranda, notes, documents and/or minutes of the meeting of September 15, 1967, held at the Bellevue Stratford commencing at or about 2:00 p.m. in which the alleged purpose of said meeting was the recall or ouster of Francis R. Smith and others as officers of the Philadelphia Co. Democratic Executive Committee; (b) all written or other records of proxy votes cast at that meeting; (c) all roll calls taken at said meeting; (d) all other papers related to said meeting which are in the possession of deponent.

Date October 9, 1967.

By the Court:

D. Barlow Burke,
Prothonotary.
Pro D. Dalton,
Clerk.

POSTAL REVENUE AND FEDERAL SALARY ACT OF 1967

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 939, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7977) to adjust certain postage rates, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service now printed in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the five-minute rule as an original bill, and read by titles instead of by sections. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereof to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois, [Mr. Anderson], and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this rule calls for 2 hours of general debate for consideration of the bill H.R. 7977, the Postal Revenue and Federal Salary Act of 1967.

The rule is not a usual rule in that it makes in order that the committee substitute shall be considered as an original bill which has, for all practical purposes, the purpose of making any amendments adopted to that substitute subject to rollcalls in the House.

It also waives points of order, which has the effect of making it impossible for a person to make a point of order against that portion of the bill which deals with salary increases, otherwise if these two factors had not been present in the rule it would have been possible to knock out the salary increase as not germane to a rate bill.

It also provides that the bill be read for amendment by titles instead of by sections.

There are two ways one could describe that process. One could say that it made for a more orderly procedure, or one could say that it would expedite the reading. I believe both would be accurate.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POOL. I would ask the gentleman whether under this rule, under title I, which I believe is the title that has to do with the postal rates, it can be amended at any point? Is that the rule?

Mr. BOLLING. That is correct. The rule is entirely open with the exception of the kinds of modifications I have just suggested.

Mr. POOL. I have an amendment on first-class mail to reduce it from 6 cents back to 5 cents, like it is at present, and that could be considered at that time? I take it that is the recognized procedure?

Mr. BOLLING. The present speaker will not be the occupant of the chair.

Mr. POOL. I understand.

Mr. BOLLING. And will not be able to prejudge any rulings of the Chair.

Mr. POOL. But that is the way the rule reads now?

Mr. BOLLING. The rule is an open rule, I will say to the gentleman, and any germane amendment I would believe would be in order.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLING. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr.

Speaker, I support this rule with some reservations. I feel that when the bill gets into the Committee of the Whole it can be improved considerably through raising the rates on third-class mail, and in particular the rates on bulk commercial mail which I believe should be set at 4.5 cents a piece, instead of the 3.8-cent rate contained in the pending bill.

I have two amendments that I will offer when the bill is considered in Committee of the Whole.

One is to provide for a three-tenths of 1 cent surcharge per copy on issues of publications circulating more than 500,000 through the mails. The second amendment is to provide for certain increases in third-class mail rates. One of the important features is to provide a 4.5 cent rate for bulk commercial mail.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the text of these two amendments be included at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The amendments referred to are as follows:

On page 23, line 14, strike out the double quotation marks, the semicolon, and the word "and".

On page 23, immediately following line 14, insert the following:

"(f) In addition to the rates of postage otherwise prescribed by this section, there shall be a charge of 0.3 cent per copy, when more than 500,000 copies per issue of any publication are mailed at the rates prescribed by this section, payable only on—

"(1) each copy in excess of 500,000 copies per issue mailed at the original point of entry; and

"(2) each copy mailed at other than the original point of entry; and".

On page 24, strike out line 15 and all that follows down through the second period in line 14 on page 25, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"THIRD-CLASS MAIL

"SEC. 107. (a) (1) Subsections (a) and (b) of section 4452 of title 39, United States Code, are amended to read as follows:

" '(a) Except as otherwise provided in this section, the postage rates on third-class mail are as follows:

"Type of mailing	Rates		Unit
	Mailed prior to Jan. 7, 1968 (cents)	Mailed on and after Jan. 7, 1968 (cents)	
(1) Individual piece	6 2	6.0 2.0	First 2 ounces or fraction thereof. Each additional ounce or fraction thereof.
(2) Bulk mailings under subsection (e) of this section of—			
(A) Books and catalogs of 24 pages or more, seeds, cuttings, bulbs, roots, scions and plants.	12	18.0	Each pound or fraction thereof.
(B) Other matter	18	24.0	Do.
(C) Minimum charge of—			
(i) Regular	2⅞	4.5	Per piece.
(ii) Qualified nonprofit organizations	1.25	2.25	Do.

" '(b) Matter mailed in bulk under subsection (e) of this section is subject to a minimum charge for each piece. The minimum charge for each piece on such matter is the minimum charge prescribed by this section, as applicable.'."

(2) Subsection (e) of section 4452 of title 39, United States Code, prescribing the annual permit fee for third-class bulk mailings, is amended by striking out "$30" and inserting in lieu thereof "$40".

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I think the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, my colleague on the Committee on Rules, has adequately explained the technicalities of the rule under which the House will consider this bill which started out as a Postal Revenue Act of 1967 and which through the adoption subsequently of a committee amendment or substitute has become something quite different. And because we have relatively a short period of time today to debate this intricate and complex bill—and incidentally a very expensive bill if it is adopted, and because necessarily those 2 hours must be used by members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I should like to take just a few brief minutes this afternoon to discuss some of the reservations I have with respect to this legislation.

Incidentally, they bear on the remarks just made by the preceding speaker, the gentleman from West Virginia who has announced that he is not satisfied with some of the provisions of this bill as they relate to third-class mail and he has at least two amendments that he will offer.

It is not out of disrespect to the members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service that I make this observation that I think despite their diligence and despite the fact that they worked hard and have tried to bring forth a good bill that this bill is nothing less than a concession to political expediency. I say that because we have combined under a single head and we have commingled two matters which ought to have stood separately on their own feet.

We have not considered separately a postal rate increase bill. There is not any question but that the Post Office Department will operate this year at a deficit of over $1 billion and over the next 2 years at a deficit of something like $2¼ billion, and that a postal rate increase is needed. I would be the last one to dispute that.

I also feel that the dedicated and conscientious workers in the postal service and in the classified civil service deserve the consideration from Congress on their just wage demands.

But I find no excuse whatever and I find no justification whatsoever other than political expediency for bringing out on this floor today a bill which combines those two matters, which makes it very difficult for the Members of the Congress who might agree with the one proposition with respect to an increase in salary, to vote against the bill even though other provisions deal with rates that are inequitable. Or the very opposite of that situation might be true, depending on how you happen to feel with respect to this bill.

So I think it is unfortunate that we start with a bad bill in that respect.

I want to take a few minutes to talk a little bit about the provisions of this bill as they relate to third-class mail. You know right away we get into something very emotional when you mention third-class mail. For some reason the epithet "junk mail" comes very quickly to people's lips and they kind of look down their noses at anyone who happens to use third-class mail.

Let me just cite an example. There are 40,000 little businessmen in this country who operate Western Auto stores and 57 percent of their advertising today goes to postage, using direct mail to advertise through their circulars or catalogs the products that they have for sale. I think they resent this epithet of junk mail.

I have a list here that just involves the organizations, in one city alone—in one city alone in the United States for the period of January 1, 1967, through October 5, 1967. It is 15 pages long and I will not take the time to read the list of organizations that use bulk rates provided under third-class mail. But let me just very quickly read a few of them.

There is the Aldersgate Methodist Church, the Amalgamated Meat Cutters & Butchers Workmen of North America, the American Cancer Society, the American Federation of Government Employees, and the American Legion Department of Arizona.

I could go on with 15 pages of organizations of that kind, profitable, nonprofitable, charitable, and otherwise. I think they would justifiably feel some resentment at having their use of the U.S. mail referred to as junk mail.

What does this bill do with respect to the third-class user? It provides that in one fell swoop, in January of 1968, he is going to have to absorb a 32-percent increase in the cost of his mail. That means, to translate it into the actual cost of doing business for the small businessman, a 12-percent increase in the selling cost.

You talk about a full 5-percent wage increase having an undesirable impact upon the economy or an undesirable impact on one of our great industries like the automobile industry; what about the impact of a 12-percent increase on the little fellow, the small businessman who uses the third-class bulk rate of the mails of the U.S. mails to advertise his product?

That is bad enough in and of itself, but when you stop to compare that with the treatment that is given to the second-class user, the fellow who after these rates are adopted will still be paying only 42 percent of the cost of handling his particular product through the mail, this fellow will get only a 21-percent increase. Will he get it all at once? Will it land on him on the 7th of January, 1968? Oh, no. His treatment is far more tender. Only in three stages, the first of which begins in 1968, will we proceed to admin-

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

ister that 21-percent increase; whereas we would tell the little fellow who uses the third-class mails, "You take a 32-percent increase right on the chin, and you take it in one fell swoop in January 1968."

You know, I am here arguing for more than the fact that there are legitimate users of the bulk rates under third-class mail. I am arguing for one of the biggest and most important industries in this country. And those of you from New York and New Jersey might be interested in this. The second largest industry in your particular region is the printing industry of America.

I wish you would go back to the hearings on this bill and I wish you would find the testimony of Dr. Nobel, who is the head of an association of the printing industry in the metropolitan New York area, who was speaking for the printing industry of America, telling what the impact of this rate increase will be on that industry. These are the people that print the circulars, that print the catalogs that go to the third-class user of the mails and that he in turn distributes. These are the people who are writing me, as one did in my district the other day, and said that it was absolutely inconceivable that this Congress could legislate this kind of inequitable legislative monstrosity. He said:

> There is one business after another that will simply go under because they cannot absorb this kind of increase just in one single blow in January of next year.

Let me remind you of one thing, and it is a pretty important point: This very Congress adopted the Postal Policy Act of 1958. And what did Congress say at that time? It said that Congress henceforth, in legislating any increases in postal rate, shall consider the impact that those rates will have upon business in this country.

When the appropriate time comes, when this bill is ready for amendment, I shall therefore offer an amendment which will do this. I am not going to ask you to roll back the 32-percent increase, even though I think it is inequitable, even though under this committee bill your Aunt Minnie will totter down to the post office with her Christmas card and find that even though she does not seal the envelope, she must pay 6 cents instead of a nickel to send her relatives a Christmas card. But I am going to leave it alone. I will leave it at 32 percent because I realize, as I said at the beginning, that the post office needs revenue in view of the deficit it is facing. But I am asking you to do simple equity.

When the time comes, I am going to offer an amendment that will simply stagger that increase over a 3-year period, as we have done in this bill for the second-class mail users. I am going to ask for the same simple justice and simple equity for the small businessman, and the printing industry of this country, and the people who use bulk-rate or third-class mail. I am going to ask that we do for them what we have done for the people who use second-class mail privileges.

I might mention in passing that this includes some of the very wealthy news magazines in this country who get expedited handling. They do not just throw the magazines in, as they do the third-class mail, and let them sit around. The magazines get special expedited treatment.

I brought out some of these points when the distinguished chairman of the committee, whom I see in the Chamber now, was before the Committee on Rules a few days ago. I asked him why it was, when deficiencies on revenue attributed to second-class mail users are greater than those attributed to third-class mail users, why is it that we do not treat the second-class mail users and users of third-class mail more nearly alike. He said, "I could stand up and make the very same speech you have made before the Committee on Rules here today," I will yield now to the gentleman from New York for an affirmation of the remark I just made.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman from Illinois. We should have three phases on the third-class mail. I supported the gentleman's position in our committee, but the committee did not agree.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that assurance.

I hope when the time comes we do not get confused about all the rhetoric on third-class mail. Let us just remember that most of the people who use it are legitimate advertisers who cannot afford to take in one swoop the increase in this bill.

I hope the Members will support the amendment I offer, rather than any others that will be proposed by the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the biggest giveaway is in the second-class mail section as the gentleman has said. This is the newspaper-magazine section. They have those extremely low rates which were set 160 years ago, when there was no other way of getting the news out. They have lobbied long and effectively to retain these low rates. There are many, many other ways of disseminating the news today so this favored treatment should end.

They not only get a low rate, as the gentleman said, but they get first-class high priority treatment. They not only get a ridiculously low rate to begin with, but that mail is handled as first-class priority mail. I had an amendment adopted in the subcommittee that imposed a surcharge on these newspapers and magazines who get this favored treatment, charging them an additional 25 percent for this special handling they receive. When it went to the full committee, that was knocked out. It can be reinstated by amendment and I hope such an amendment, in all fairness to the taxpayer will pass.

There is one newspaper in this country that is sent out largely by mail—about 95 percent of its circulation someone has said is through the mail. It is estimated the subsidy they get from the American taxpayer per year is in the neighborhood of $20 million. This is the Wall Street Journal, which is one of the wealthiest papers in the country. They get the subsidy because of the low rates enjoyed by newspapers and who have a very potent lobby to keep them from paying adequate rates. We know of instances when postmen have had to delay going on their routes, waiting for trains or planes to come in with the out-of-town newspapers, before the postmen go out on their routes. It is really a sad situation. These powerful newspapers and magazines, mostly all of which cry out for economy and continually downgrade public officials to enjoy the biggest subsidy enjoyed by any class in the postal service.

The rumor has it that the users of second-class mail would get only a slight increase in rates—very slight I might say—if they would support the postal rate increase bill. This deal was supposedly made between the newspapers and the Post Office Department officials. I hope this would not be true—but sure enough, they did appear and did support the bill, so draw your own conclusions.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his remarks. I simply affirm what I have said. If we pass this bill as it is reported to the floor today, we are going to be not only perpetuating an inequity, but creating a new one.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, in view of the debate on spending, deficits, inflation, and tax increase proposals that has been the center of attention in the House for the past 3 weeks, it seems to me that it takes an inordinate amount of something or other—I will not call it "gall"—for the Democrat leaderhip to even permit this legislation to come to the House floor today.

It is at one and the same time a tax stamp bill, designed to reach out with one hand and take an estimated $884,000,000 from already hardpressed citizens and taxpayers, and with the other hand dish out $2,600,000,000 in pay increases to the bloated Federal bureaucracy.

In other words, with only 2 hours of general debate, the House is being asked to make a levy of $3,500,000,000 on the public for increased postal rates and for Federal pay raises.

It is difficult to believe, but not once since this session of Congress convened has the full Post Office and Civil Service Committee had the opportunity to question the Postmaster General concerning postal rates and postal service, nor did the full committee ever have the opportunity to question the Postmaster General or any other departmental or agency head concerning the necessity for or the funding of pay increases.

A subcommittee of 10 of the 26 members brought a postal increase proposal to the full committee and promptly proceeded to disavow most of its own recommendations.

We are already hearing this afternoon, not yet having disposed of the rule, that the committee is now ready to accept still another amendment to the bill. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON] is completely right, in that equity ought to prevail in this bill, but there was the opportunity when the bill was considered in the subcommittee and in the full committee to provide equitable treatment for all users of the mails.

Mr. Speaker, there is no justification whatever, as this bill provides, for an increase in first class and airmail which is now showing a profit. Under the pending bill first-class mail will pay 23 percent more than its allocated costs—in other words, it would produce $518,000,000, or more than half the total increased postal revenues. It would mean that first-class letter mail rates had been increased 50 percent within a 4-year period. This, I say again, is thoroughly unjustified, especially when there is not the slightest indication this additional revenue will be used to improve the mail service.

In our report accompanying this bill, we of the minority expressed our agreement with Senator MONRONEY, chairman of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, when he said on February 24, 1967:

> If we are going to increase the price of the first-class stamp by 20 percent, then the American public is entitled to a similar percentage increase in service.

The minority views also note that on September 21, 1967, the same day the committee approved postal rate increases, the Postmaster General announced the expenditure of nearly $300,000,000 in the next 9 months for hardware and mechanized equipment, including 16 closed-circuit TV systems in an attempt to discover faulty mail-handling operations.

On June 1, 1961, Deputy Postmaster General Brawley, ridiculing the Eisenhower administration for similar expenditures, said this:

> It does little or no good to move a batch of mail through a post office on conveyor belts—to have it sorted by electronic eyes and canceled by automatic devices—if, at the end of its breathless and eye-catching journey it must wait overnight for the train or plane which will carry it on its way toward its ultimate destination.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, let us be done with gimmickry and politics in the Post Office Department and get the mail moved, especially before saddling Mr. and Mrs. Average American and their children with a 23-percent premium on their letters and cards.

Again, I thoroughly agree with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON] that this legislation ought to have been considered separately. We ought to have had a postal rate increase bill considered separately from the pay bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield me 3 or 4 additional minutes?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Iowa 4 additional minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, in the matter of pay increases as provided in this combined bill, it will be most interesting to watch the maneuvering of the Democrat leadership in view of their claimed opposition in recent days to any delegation of authority to the Executive.

Under this bill a Commission would be created, effective in 1969, to recommend to the President the pay, allowances, and expenses for Members of Congress, Federal judges, heads and assistant heads of the executive departments and agencies, and other officials. Based upon the Commission's findings, the President would include in his budget his own recommendation to Congress with respect to exact rates of pay and the exact amounts and kinds of expenses and allowances for the Federal officials just listed.

Using the old, familiar back-door approach, the President's recommendations would become effective 30 days after transmittal of his budget unless Congress rejected his proposals.

But this is only half the story. Under the terms of this bill, three of the six pay increases are completely undefined and the authority to determine the amounts of three of the increases is delegated to the President without congressional approval. Nowhere in existing law is there provision for a delegation of powers such as are provided in this monstrosity.

This is blank-check spending and authority at its worst. In view of a Federal debt now standing at nearly $340,000,000,000, and an upcoming deficit estimated at around $30,000,000,000, to project pay increases into the uncertain future of a year and a half from now is not only the height of irresponsibility—it is fiscal insanity.

Mr. Speaker, this supposedly veto-proof legislation represents a masterful job of buckpassing between the administration and the majority members of the committee—with the American public a suffering victim.

Let me say in conclusion that I have had pending since Congress convened months ago bills that would take the Post Office Department out of politics, and transform it into the service organization for which it was intended. For some reason best explained by the majority, the legislation for this purpose languishes in committee.

Mr. Speaker, these combined bills before us ought to be rejected. I urge the House to send these ill-advised proposals back to the committee.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALLECK. I feel constrained to say to my friend from Iowa and to my good friend from Illinois that the joining of these two matters in this bill is not new. Now, possibly it is wrong. I do not think so. If it is, though, then I could not sit here without saying that in the Republican Congress in which I was the majority leader we combined a postal rate increase bill and a postal pay increase bill. For whatever it is worth, I might say to the gentleman from Iowa that at that time the representatives of the postal employees were very much against that arrangement. They came to see me, some 15 or 20 representatives from different States, and they said to me, "We do not think you ought to raise the rates in the Post Office along with our pay." I said, "Why not?" They said, "Well, if you do that, then the people who use the Post Office are going to blame us for the increase in rates." I said, "Well, who is supposed to take that responsibility?"

I only want to point out to the gentleman from Iowa that in the Post Office, as in every business in this country, there is a relationship between wages and prices. You have long heard and I have heard people say that there is no relationship between them. We have that going on now in the strike in Detroit. As far as I am concerned, I am not going to complain about joining these two. They are separate titles, and whatever equity there is in either one of them can be considered and debated in the committee, and it can be corrected if it is wrong. I think that is right. On the other hand, I do think we ought to have these things considered because they are not related. I would not want to see the day come, although it could happen, when some people here would vote for the pay increase but against the rate increases. That would be the easy way out.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has again expired.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Iowa 1 additional minute.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I fail to comprehend what relationship there is between a postal rate increase and a pay increase for hundreds of thousands of Federal employees outside the postal service.

Mr. HALLECK. For what?

Mr. GROSS. For Class Act workers.

Mr. HALLECK. Oh, well——

Mr. GROSS. Well, just a minute.

Mr. HALLECK. Well, we do have the Class Act. If you want to take that out and consider it separately, OK.

Mr. GROSS. That is what I thought. I do not see any relationship between a postal rate increase and an increase in this same bill for Class Act workers and for any number of employees in the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. HALLECK. Well, if the gentleman will yield further, does the gentleman see any relationship between the increase in pay of the postal workers and the increase in rates?

Mr. GROSS. I do not see any such relationship.

Mr. HALLECK. Well, let us stay on that.

Mr. GROSS. No; I do not see any relationship. A rate increase ought to be based upon merit and a pay increase ought to be justified on the same basis. No other department of government charges fees for the purpose of paying its employees.

Mr. HALLECK. Well, I disagree.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman can disagree if he wants to. That is his privilege, I do not believe the pay of postal workers should be predicated on revenue raised by the Post Office Department.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I strongly favor the passage of this rule on H.R. 7977, the Postal Revenue and Federal Salary Act of 1967.

I favor bringing back into some balance the debate now raging over the postal rate provisions of this bill, with the equally, and to me more important, provisions of the bill. These important provisions provide the necessary and long-overdue pay raise for our good U.S. postal workers, and for the Federal employees.

The U.S. Congress must not let action drag on these pay raises, as this has caused these people to be always following much behind the U.S. economy, instead of having the U.S. Government service become an outstanding service where people want to work for the Government. The U.S. Government is operated by these loyal postal workers and Federal employees. Congress ought to pay employees in accordance with these responsibilities and necessary services. The American people need good service and in order to obtain it we in the U.S. Congress are going to have to keep the U.S. pay raises moving right along with the U.S. economy.

Mr. Speaker, I am tired of hearing all the time about the poor postal workers being treated as second-class citizens. I believe in paying all postal workers and Federal employees who are doing a fine job, a good day's pay, for a good day's work.

The U.S. Congress by legislation in 1962 promised the U.S. postal workers and Federal employees full comparability with private business and industry in the U.S. economy. This is the solemn promise of the Congress, and I intend to fulfill that promise by voting for this rule and this bill.

Because of a personal interest, I will not vote on certain amendments on postal rates that would inure to my personal advantage.

However, I do support the increases in the postal rates on second-class and third-class mail which have been recommended by the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and are contained in this bill as reported by the committee. As I have weekly newspapers, I am a large user of second-class and third-class mail. Therefore, I cannot vote on reducing these particular items through any amendments which I understand will be offered from the floor.

In conclusion, may I say that the second-class newspapers do render a public service by furnishing news to those in their area of coverage, so there is a valid reason for the difference in rates between small newspapers on second-class permits, and large third-class mail permits which render no community local service, and do not have the cost of covering local news, local pictures, and local events.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEIGER].

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the distinguished gentleman yielding time to me.

I take this time, because this rule as proposed in House Resolution 939 has overlooked an opportunity for this House to act on something which is now languishing in the Committee on Rules of the House of Representatives. That is the proposal to remove completely politics from the operation of the Post Office Department.

Mr. Speaker, during the consideration of title II of the bill, H.R. 7977, I propose to offer an amendment to remove the political basis on which a postmastership or a rural mail carrier appointment is made.

Mr. Speaker, postal employees should not be placed in the position where obtaining a job or their future in the postal service is determined by the size of or regularity of their political contributions.

The more modern European systems are operated strictly on a professional business basis. They have recognized that in order to give quality service, the operations of these agencies must be divorced from politics. This is in sharp contrast to our own system where postmasters need two paramount qualifications—they must belong to the right political party and they must curry favor with the right politicians. The rule, however, does waive points of order on this matter and, therefore, it may not be possible for the House to give full consideration to this problem, one which I feel is of great importance.

Mr. SPEAKER, there are some 33,000 post offices and 31,000 rural mail carriers in this country. By the adoption of H.R. 7977 without my amendment we will be doing postal employees a disservice and we will be doing the quality of our Post Office Department a disservice. Certainly, every employee coming into the postal service should have an opportunity to rise through the ranks and attain a top supervisory position. This is not the case today and the inequity will be continued unless we take action to stop the politics now played in the post office. The effort made in this bill to attract and hold employees by providing needed wage increases is a step in the right direction. Let us not stop, however, at that point. The American people deserve and are demanding quality postal service. This bill fails to provide adequate assurance of that kind of service even with the increased rates and better pay. One way to move toward better service would be to stop playing politics with postal service by adopting the amendment I shall offer tomorrow.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I think this House of Representatives should have the opportunity to consider this matter. The situation which presently exists in the congressional district which it is my honor to represent is completely absurd. I have a postmaster who was nominated in each of the years, 1960 through 1967—including this year—nominated every year, and twice was the acting postmaster, but he never was confirmed by the Senate.

When this happens it contributes to complete instability in the postal system in each of our localities, and I believe is a bad situation so far as the postal system is concerned.

I certainly hope that the amendment which the gentleman from Wisconsin intends to offer will be considered by the House. An amendment which I intend to offer is very similar to it, and I would hope that this Congress would have the opportunity to consider one of them.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Wisconsin and want to associate myself with his remarks. I have filed similar legislation for several years and as the ranking Republican member on the Subcommittee on the Post Office and Treasury, and I have advocated this proposal to the Postmaster General, not only this one, but the previous Postmaster General. Certainly when the time comes for amendments I hope that such an amendment will be in order, and that it will receive the support of the Members of the House; it sure will have my support.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I appreciate the gentleman's support.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SCOTT].

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I regret the manner in which this bill is being brought before the House today, with the limited opportunity for debate. I am particularly concerned with title II of the bill, the Federal salary increases. The salary portion of the bill consists of pages 35 through 76. This portion of the bill was not considered by the full committee to the same extent as the postal rate increase. Time after time we had motions to cut off debate. The previous question was demanded before we had adequate time in the committee to consider various portions of the pay bill.

As the bill is being presented to the House it provides for a 6-percent increase for the postal workers, and a 4.5-percent increase for the classified employees and for all other civilian employees of the Government. It would be interesting to know when the military pay bill comes before this House whether it will be proposed to give the military a 6-percent increase in pay as is being proposed for the postal workers, or a 4.5-percent increase as is being suggested for all of our other employees.

I intend at the proper time to offer an amendment to provide for a 6-percent increase for all civilian employees the first year and for equality of treatment for the subsequent 2 years. It seems that it is fair and equitable to treat all Government employees in the same manner.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield a minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON].

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on the rule may have permission to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I shall not take the entire 15 minutes. However, I do wish to make a few observations in light of the prior debate.

First, I will say that the best statement made today was made by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], whose leadership I nearly always follow blindly, although occasionally he loses me. I was glad to know that there was precedent for combining a rate and pay bill.

I do not know what is so outrageous about this. I hear mumblings about it, but the gentleman from Indiana put the case precisely that this is the reasonable way to do it. We brought in an expensive pay bill. It happens to be $63 million over the President's budget. The rate bill that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN], presented to raise postal rates is $59 million more than the President asked for.

One cannot be in favor of a big pay raise without being in favor of some means to pay for it. This is what our committee has proposed to do.

As I say, the gentleman from Montana is for it, and I am for it. We have the best pay bill and the best rate bill that has ever come down the pike in quite a long time.

Second, we married these bills, and you can divorce them in the course of the debate if you want to. All it takes is a simple motion to strike title I or title II—that is all that it takes. And if a majority of the Members favor a big pay raise, but do not favor a rate increase, then a simple motion will do that job.

But the second reason that I was finally in favor of joining them—and I opposed it at first—was that this is an assertion of congressional responsibility. Some of us are pretty tired of the Executive sending up every year a Federal pay raise and saying, "Boys, that is all, that is it. You cannot touch it one-tenth of 1 percent."

This is what happened to the Federal employees the last 2 years. We were told that a penny more than 2.9 percent and the whole Constitution was going to crumble. Then we were told that 3.6 percent was the guideline and that was all.

Those of us who have studied it year in and year out think that the Federal employees promise of comparability is long overdue, and that we should go a little bit further and raise some money on the additional rates to cover it within $4 million on the $600 million pay bill; we are within $4 million of covering the excess over the President's budget by these additional revenues.

I want to say that I was a little bit shocked about the gentleman from Iowa. Perhaps he has left the floor—but I saw a magazine just the other day that was put out by one of the Federal employee organizations and his picture was there as one of the heroes—there was the word "hero" under the picture, as fighting in the committee for more of a pay raise than the chairman of the subcommittee wanted to give and that the majority of the committee wanted to give. We were trying to be responsible and to hold down a pay raise to reasonable limits and we, apparently, are to be considered as enemies of the postal clerks and the gentleman from Iowa was listed as one of the heroes.

It seems to me today and I was going to make an inquiry—apparently he is against them now—they are part of this bloated bureaucracy, and now he is against a pay raise for them.

I hope he will have an opportunity to clarify his position as the debate goes on because this has disturbed me quite considerably.

I suggest to the House that this is a good bill—it is a good pay bill and rate bill. It is a responsible piece of legislation. The House is going to have the chance in the next couple of days to work its will and we encourage any of you who think you have amendments that may improve the bill to come forward and help us. But we have a good bill here and I would like to get on with the debate here and see if we cannot resolve this matter this week.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman is in favor of marrying the two bills on postal rates and salaries, do you not think that this would be a good bill also to divorce politics from the Post Office Department?

Mr. UDALL. I will tell the gentleman that I have always favored the nonpolitical appointment of postmasters. Some of my colleagues favor this; many do not. But if this subject is germane to the bill, it can be debated and that is why we have the rule we have.

If that is germane, then it is something that should be considered in the course of the deliberations. My personal opinion is that the gentleman's position is right. I think the majority of our committee probably disagrees and I know many of my friends probably disagree, but I am not going to argue with the gentleman and I suggest we adopt the rule and get on with the business of the debate.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7977) to adjust certain postage rates, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 7977, with Mr. PRICE of Illinois in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rules, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI] will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I shall require.

Mr. Chairman, the committee amendment to the text of H.R. 7977 is the most important, and the most comprehensive, single legislative measure ever reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Title I provides the largest increase in postal revenues—$884 million—that has been brought before this House. Title II represents a highly significant—and long overdue—updating of Federal civilian salaries that affects nearly 2 million employees. Title III writes into Federal statutes new and effective measures to protect postal patrons from pandering advertisements sent through the mails.

Titles I and II, in particular, are carefully worked out and finely balanced revisions in the postal rate and civilian pay structures which are the chief substantive matters in the jurisdiction of our committee. Together with title III, they make up an excellent bill—a bill this body may be proud to approve.

As usual with legislation of such breadth and scope, it has been impossible to write a bill that fully satisfies everyone. Nor have our committee deliberations been a completely happy experience. A number of the provisions of the bill are controversial in at least some regard. But the committee bill represents an honest and realistic compromise, in the truest sense of the word, of the many proposals made by the administration, by users of the mails, by employee groups, and by Members of Congress.

I am especially grateful for the courtesy extended by our committee members to their new chairman throughout the long and difficult sessions in our committee and its subcommittees—and for their extraordinary devotion of time and attention to committee business. Their diligence, perseverance, and constructive cooperation in developing this complex legislation have been most commendable. Few measures are more controversial—more subject to conflicting pressures and opinions—than across-the-board, postal-rate increases. The pressures were further aggravated by the always sensitive problem of fixing salaries for postal and other Federal employees.

Mr. Chairman, there are those who may allege today that our committee gave inadequate consideration to this bill. Any such charge is wholly without foundation in fact. Never have postal rates and Federal pay received more intensive and objective study than was the case this year in our committee. The work of four standing subcommittees has gone into this bill.

The Subcommittee on Postal Rates received testimony covering 838 printed pages in 21 days of public hearings, over the period from May 9 to June 28, and met in seven executive sessions to report postal rate recommendations.

The Subcommittee on Compensation received testimony covering 380 printed pages in 13 days of public hearings, from April 25 to June 22, and wrote the salary provisions of title II on the basis of the wealth of evidence developed there. The salary hearings were supplemented by 9 days of public hearings before the Subcommittee on Position Classification on more than 200 bills to reclassify lower-level postal positions—and give the employees average 15-percent pay raises.

The Subcommittee on Postal Operations conducted public hearings in Washington and in the field on the continuing problem of obscene matter moving through the mails, as a foundation for title III.

The full Committee on Post Office and Civil Service then met together in 18 executive sessions, over a period of 38 days, before reporting H.R. 7977 with the committee amendments now before us.

POSTAL RATES

Title I will increase postal income by $884 million annually when all of the rate adjustments are in effect. This added income is critically needed to avoid enlargement of the already heavy postal deficit and of the $29 billion Federal budget deficit forecast for the current fiscal year.

The committee proposal carries out the postal recommendations of the President in most major respects, but will provide $60 million more revenue than the President's proposal.

The President's major postal rate recommendations were for a one cent increase on first-class and airmail letters and cards; an average 22-percent increase, phased over a 3-year period, on all categories of second-class mail; a single increase averaging 28 percent on all third-class mail; an average 21-percent increase on preferential-rate fourth-class mail—mainly books and records; and a special charge on odd-sized envelopes that cannot be machine processed.

Only two material reductions are made by the bill in those recommendations. The committee has delayed action on the odd-sized envelope charge for further study, and has provided lesser increases on solicitations and other mailings by nonprofit organizations engaged in charitable, religious, or health work.

Although 1967 postal expenses exceeded revenues by $1.148 billion, all of this is not chargeable as postal deficit. In accordance with the Postal Policy Act of 1958, "public service" costs of approximately $557 million are excluded, leaving a net postal deficit of $591 million. The additional $884 million provided by our committee bill will cover this deficit as well as a major part of such other increased costs as can be expected in the near future.

EMPLOYEES' PAY

The President recommended a general 4.5-percent civilian salary increase effective in October of 1967 and, also, that the Congress take the additional steps necessary to achieve full comparability of Federal and private enterprise salary rates over a 2-year period.

The committee adopted the 4.5-percent recommendation for all except postal employees. Postal employees will receive 6 percent in October, followed by another 5 percent in July of 1968. The other employees at that time will receive increases closing one-half of the amounts by which their pay lags behind private enterprise rates. Then, in April 1969, both postal and other employees will receive third-phase adjustments to bring their pay to a par with private enterprise pay rates.

The committee pay recommendations are substantially below many employee group requests, but represent a generous salary "package" that will finally achieve the salary comparability guaranteed by the 1962 Federal Salary Reform Act. The raises are only moderately more liberal than those recommended by the President.

PANDERING ADVERTISEMENTS

Title III is the final product of at least 4 years of dedicated work by our Postal Operations Subcommittee, in response to general public demand for legislative action to afford parents the means to protect their children from advertisements for obscenity and pornography sent through the U.S. mails.

SUMMARY

Mr. Chairman, the vital importance of early enactment of H.R. 7977, with our committee amendments, cannot be overemphasized. The postal rate increases are desperately needed, not only to keep postal incomes reasonably related to expenses but, also, to provide a sound fiscal base for modernization of the postal plant and equipment to give the public the first-rate postal service to which it is entitled. The salary provisions are equally necessary, not only in fairness to the employees but to enable the Government to recruit and retain the high caliber of personnel required for the conduct of our great Government programs.

One further comment on Federal salaries is in order. It is a most regrettable fact that both the administration and the Congress have reneged grievously on their joint commitment to equate Government salaries with those in private enterprise. This policy was written into the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962 with great fanfare and acclaim on both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue, but it has been honored more in the breach than in the observance. Initial enthusiasm of postal and other employees has turned to disappointment, frustration, and enduring bitterness as year after year, for 5 years, has witnessed a breach of our solemn trust.

And let there be no mistake as to the false economy—should the 1968 and 1969 pay adjustments be removed from the bill. This would be penny wise and pound foolish, and would practically guarantee another, far more costly and bitterly contended, pay bill next year—an election year.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the Committee of the Whole House to vote down all amendments to our committee amendments and to give this outstanding legislation overwhelming approval.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DULSKI. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Is there a provision in the bill authorizing the President or some executive officer to fix the salaries of Federal employees in one section of the country at a different level from that applied in other sections?

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DULSKI. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. OLSEN. There is no such provision.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I believe I read of such a report in a newspaper a few days ago. The committee did not include such?

Mr. OLSEN. We did not. We did not include any sectionalizing of postal pay increase or salaries.

I understand an amendment may be offered in that regard, but it is not in the bill.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Let me read this. It says:

> The House unit's pay bill also contains a provision allowing the Post Office Department to pay higher starting salaries for letter carriers and clerks in cities where recruitment for those positions is difficult.

Mr. OLSEN. That is a correct statement.

Mr. ABERNETHY. It is? Then there is a provision in the bill that will allow the Post Office Department to pay higher salaries in some areas than other areas?

Mr. OLSEN. Yes, when they find those facts to be prevalent.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Who will make that determination?

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DULSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. The determination is made under present law by the Civil Service Commission. We had a provision in the bill that was knocked out in the final markup. An attempt will be made to put it back in, I am told, to delegate that power to the Postmaster General.

That power exists right now. It exists in the hands of the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Who will make the determination under this provision of the bill?

Mr. UDALL. The Civil Service Commission, under the provision now in the bill, has the power to make this determination.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Are they doing so now?

Mr. UDALL. Under the present law.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Are they doing so now?

Mr. UDALL. They have been doing very little, if anything, in the postal service. This is Governmentwide authority which they have exercised occasionally in the classified service, for nurses or technicians of a special kind.

Mr. ABERNETHY. This bill carries a special provision for such authority as related to postal employees?

Mr. UDALL. It does not.

Mr. ABERNETHY. It carries general authority?

Mr. UDALL. There is already general authority in the law for the Civil Service Commission to do that.

Mr. ABERNETHY. What is the difference between the provisions in the bill and the present law on this point?

Mr. UDALL. There is one minor change in the present law in this bill. Under the present law if they find a scarcity of employees such as nurses, radar technicians, or in a special category, they can hire them, instead of in the first step of the grade, in the seventh step. This bill would change that seventh step to the maximum step. They could go up to the 10th or 11th, or whatever the maximum was, and start the fellow at the highest step.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Who will make that decision?

Mr. UDALL. The Civil Service Commission.

Mr. ABERNETHY. That is the authority which is carried in this bill?

Mr. UDALL. It is already in the law. This bill does not change the Presidential authority, which he has delegated to the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DULSKI. I yield. This is very interesting.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I go back to my statement. I just read a paragraph from a column written by one of the Federal employee columnists. He said there was such a provision in this bill. The gentleman from Montana agreed. I am trying to find out. Is there such a provision? If so, where is it in the bill?

Mr. UDALL. If the gentleman will yield one more time, the gentleman from Mississippi should not believe everything he reads in these Yankee newspapers.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I know. In fact, there is very little in them I do believe, especially if it is about me.

Mr. UDALL. In the draft bill, which I originally sponsored and had drafted as a compromise, we had a provision on that. That is what they are talking about. The amendment was knocked out, and it is not in the bill.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The gentleman means they took out the Udall proposal?

Mr. UDALL. It wounded my pride, but it is gone.

Mr. ABERNETHY. It is not in the bill now?

Mr. UDALL. That is right.

Mr. ABERNETHY. There is no change in the law now?

Mr. UDALL. The change is from the seventh step to the maximum step.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Would the gentleman advise me of the total amount of revenue that would be raised by this bill?

Mr. DULSKI. It is $884 million.

Mr. OLSEN. That is correct.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Eight hundred and eighty-four million dollars. How much would the bill pay out in salary increases for postal and Federal employees?

Mr. DULSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN].

Mr. ABERNETHY. Did the gentleman say $884 million?

Mr. DULSKI. That is the total revenue.

Mr. OLSEN. The total increase in revenue is $884 million.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Yes.

Mr. OLSEN. The total in pay increases will be $330 million. At the end of the third year the total is $628 million.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Will the gentleman yield for one more question?

Mr. DULSKI. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I read some place the other day that the bill would raise about $880 million.

Mr. OLSEN. That is correct.

Mr. ABERNETHY. And I also read that the outgo the first year would be $865 million, leaving a net of only $15 million, approximately. How accurate is that?

Mr. OLSEN. I misspoke myself and I want to correct it now. You understand when we talk about postal rate increases that we are talking about $884 million. That is earlier in the report. However, when we are talking about the employment cost increases, we have to look at page 61.

Mr. ABERNETHY. All right.

Mr. OLSEN. On page 61 the increase in 1968 is $250 million.

Mr. ABERNETHY. For what?

Mr. OLSEN. Postal employees.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Federal employees?

Mr. OLSEN. Postal employees?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Postal employees?

Mr. OLSEN. Yes. I do not think you can compare any other salaries than postal salaries with the postal rate increase. In 1969 the increase is $649 million. In 1970 the increase in pay is $711 million.

Mr. ABERNETHY. That is postal also?

Mr. OLSEN. Yes. And, of course, the rate increase is $884 million.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Will the gentleman yield for one more question?

Mr. DULSKI. I do not want to consume all of the time. There are others who want to speak.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I just want to ask one more question. How much does this bill raise the salaries over and above the recommendation made by the President?

Mr. UDALL. If the gentleman will yield?

Mr. DULSKI. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. UDALL. No. The President recommended a total pay raise of something like $558 million for the executive branch. This bill is a total of $621 million in this fiscal year for the same employees. We are about $63 million over the President's recommendation which we raised, but the gentleman from Montana raised $59 million more in rates than the President asked for. We closed some loopholes and put on some extra rates, so we are within $4 million when you balance them off of being right on the President's budget—right on the nose.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI].

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, my purpose in asking for time at this point is to pick up the discussion that the gentleman from Mississippi raised and clarify some innocent misconceptions that may have been left by majority members of the committee. In the fiscal year 1968 the pay cost in this bill will come to approximately $630 million, because they are retroactive to October 1, but because of the slow legislative pace the rate revenues will not reach $884 million, but will be somewhat less than $440 million. It is not accurate to use annual figures because the rate bill will not take effect until January as far as most rates are concerned that is the point that the gentleman was getting at.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Then the bill produces a deficit?

Mr. DERWINSKI. The bill produces more than $450 million less revenue than the paper figure of $884 million because of the delayed nature of the rate increase. However, in relationship to just the postal deficit, even assuming the most liberal increase in rates will be $400 million, the pay increase for post office employees in fiscal year 1968 will be $250 million. So $150 million, in effect would be a reduction in the post office deficit, still leaving the post office deficit in excess of $1 billion for fiscal year 1968.

I would also point out to the Members of the House that if they will look at page 61 and check the charts contained thereon, the total cost in this package comes to $2.6 billion by fiscal year 1970, which means we are saddling the President of the United States with over $2 billion in additional budget expenditures for which he has not asked.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, many years ago the chairman of a particular committee came before this body and spoke for about 30 minutes detailing the provisions of a bill which was then under consideration. As he was about to conclude his general statement, a colleague asked him to yield, which he did. The colleague asked the chairman would he please, before he concluded, tell the body whether he was for or against the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I feel somewhat the same way today.

If I went through this bill, section by section, and completely bored everyone, it is my opinion that I would still come out at the end saying that I am not just too certain whether I am for this bill or against it.

Mr. Chairman, there are many features of the bill which I thoroughly disapprove. There are many features of the bill that I thoroughly support.

Now, then, it is my hope that as the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union works its will certain portions of this bill will be improved.

It is my further belief that the other body will make some adjustments in it that will be wholesome.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I am quite confident that the main features of the bill will be written in the conference committee and that when the conference has reported, I hope that we will have a bill that all of us can support with pride and justification.

Mr. Chairman, with reference to the

question of raising salaries and rates being considered under the same title, as the distinguished gentleman from Indiana pointed out, this did happen when the gentleman was the majority leader of the House of Representatives. At that time I opposed it. Normally, I would continue to oppose it because, frankly, there should be no dependence of salaries upon rates. They are distinctly different matters.

What is fair and adequate compensation for postal employees is one thing. What is a fair and proper rate to be charged to the users of the mail is a distinctly different thing.

Now, then, that brings us right to the topic of "deficit." We have heard a lot of talk about brainwashing around here for the last few months. Well, for many, many years certain competitors have hurt other competitors by pointing out the large and growing postal deficit. Now, I think it ought to be told, and told plainly, it ought to be known by everyone that it is no more correct to speak about a deficit in the Post Office Department than it is to talk about a deficit in the Department of Agriculture, a deficit in the Department of Commerce, a deficit in the Department of Interior and Insular Affairs or a deficit in the Department of Labor, or anywhere else. The revenue from the sale of stamps or services does not go to the Post Office Department. It goes strictly to the General Treasury.

And we as a body here appropriate money for the conduct of the postal field service.

So I believe it should be made very clear that this service of the Government, which is probably the finest service rendered by any department, is paid for with appropriated money, and the ascertainment and determination of rates and salaries should not be based on the difference between what is taken in from the sale of stamps and what is spent as a result of appropriations.

We might as well know this clearly, also, that title I of this bill is a stamp tax, purely and simply, and I would be remiss if I did not say that I had a great deal to do with the writing of that policy act of 1958, and it has stood quite unchallenged since that day, and one of the features of that policy statement is that in the determination of rates, the impact of the new rates should be a factor under consideration. If you are going to hit one group of users of the mails with a $300 million increase, certainly you have got to know and understand to some degree how many people that is going to put out of work, how many companies are going to go bankrupt because they cannot afford the increased costs. And here is a cost which the industry has no control over whatsoever. They can control and bargain about labor costs, they can bargain about the cost of materials, but they cannot bargain with the Post Office Department when we say "the cost of your postage shall be x dollars, or x cents." This is an unpredictable and unnegotiable cost, and the impact therefore ought to be very carefully considered.

The gentleman from Illinois said that as regards the 32-percent increase in third-class rates that he is going to move to amend to phase that out in three steps, as the bill does with second-class, as it does with the salaries, if you please—almost everything in this bill is put in phases—because of the fact that we do not want a heavy impact coming at one time. Therefore, I am very happy that the gentleman is going to introduce that amendment, and I am going to support it. That is one of the improvements that can happen in this bill to make it much more palatable, and to make it much less dangerous to an important segment of our economy.

Mr. Chairman, this committee has been at work, as one of the staff members just informed me, for 3 months longer than it took the authors of our Constitution to write our Constitution. Now, that ought to be about enough time. But I do hope that we can proceed here in the next little while and get this bill passed and send it over to the Senate, and hope and strive to come out with a bill eventually that will be highly satisfactory to all of us and to the people who have to pay the bill.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. We will have time under the 5-minute rule for that. As for now I have a lot of time to pass out.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 9 minutes.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HENDERSON].

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI] has ably summarized the chief purposes of this bill. Aside from the major rate and salary proposals, I will touch briefly on some of the excellent improvements in postal activities that will be made by the bill.

In the area of preferred rates for second-class publications of qualified nonprofit organizations, section 104 applies the realistic principle of separate rate treatment for the advertising and the editorial portions of these publications. A schedule of zone-based rates, to be applied in six annual steps, is prescribed for the advertising portions. The minimum charge per piece for nonadvertising portions is increased in three steps, in proportion to increases provided elsewhere for regular, or commercial, publications.

This same section gives desirable consideration to the value of agricultural publications by continuing per pound rates on advertising portions of such publications mailed for delivery in the first two zones outside the county of publication, for publications devoted to promoting the science of agriculture. This rate will apply only when at least 70 percent of the total annual copies go to subscribers in rural areas.

It is noteworthy that sections 103 and 104 continue the traditional policy of the Congress by maintaining a moderately preferential rate structure for small and locally oriented newspapers which are so important in the economic, educational, cultural, and social affairs of rural and small-town America.

Section 112 provides needed relief from present limitations on marks and enclosures permitted on second-class mailings. Subsection (d) will permit messages and notices of a civic or public-service nature to be placed on envelopes or wrappers in which copies of publications are mailed, under regulations prescribed by the Postmaster General, if no extra charge is made for the messages or notices.

In many cases it would be in the public interest for a publication to issue a special edition in honor of a centennial or anniversary celebration of a community, and to have a message or notice identifying the event on the cover or wrapper. Under present law, such a publication would be nonmailable at second-class rates. Also, enforcement of the present law is difficult and an unnecessary administrative burden. There are no similar restrictions on other classes of mail.

Finally, section 118 will give the Postmaster General the means to protect the public from solicitations or orders for services which are prepared by the mailers so as to mislead the addressee into believing they actually are bills for goods and services previously delivered or rendered.

The section makes any such solicitation nonmailable, and prohibits its carriage or delivery through the mails, if it is in the form of, and reasonably could be interpreted or construed as, a bill, invoice, or statement of account due, unless it bears on its face, in conspicuous and legible type, a notice that it actually is a solicitation for an order of goods or services and is not a bill, invoice, or statement of account due.

The actual form of the notice to be imprinted on the solicitation may be prescribed by the Postmaster General.

Mr. Chairman, the practice of such solicitations by shady promoters has grown to alarming proportions. The chief postal inspector reports that his office is currently investigating numerous promotions of this type. The majority operate in and from Los Angeles, Calif., although the promoters will occasionally employ mail drop addresses in other cities throughout the country. There can be no doubt that numerous addressees who receive these forms by mail are deceived into the belief that the form represents a bill for a listing previously requested.

Investigations have disclosed such a serious situation that the State of California recently enacted a law requiring any person who solicits payment of money, by writing that could reasonably be interpreted as a statement or invoice for goods not yet ordered, to place on the matter in 30-point bold face type this warning:

> This is a solicitation for the order of goods or services and you are under no obligation to make payment unless you accept the offer contained herein.

I am also informed that the Federal Trade Commission is gathering evidence with respect to these promotional schemes for possible action under the Federal Trade Commission Act and the postal inspectors are cooperating with the Commission.

Many of you gentlemen may have read a recent article in the Washington Sunday Star describing how Washington area business and professional men are being deluged with official-looking invoices that appear to be bills for listings in the "Yellow Pages" of the telephone directory. According to the article, addressees are paying up to $85 they do not owe under the impression that their listings in the classified pages have come up for renewal or that they neglected to pay for the original listing.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 7977 is certainly the best bill that could be worked out in the very complex and sometimes controversial areas of postal rates and Federal pay. I hope it will be passed without major change.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I understand that while I was off the House floor a few minutes ago trying to help a constituent solve a problem, the gentleman from Arizona saw fit to make some remarks directed toward me. If the gentleman had exercised just a little patience, I would have been back. I suspect that I spend more time on the House floor by accident than the gentleman from Arizona does on purpose.

If the gentleman cares to do so, I would be pleased to hear what he had to say, and I will try to give him an answer.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. I think the gentleman knows that I have a great regard for his sincerity.

Mr. GROSS. Let us dispense with that, if the gentleman does not mind.

Mr. UDALL. No, I think, if the gentleman will yield, I want to say that when I began my remarks, I had observed the gentleman at the back rail, and then I had my attention drawn away. When I finished my first remark and looked around, he was not there, and in order to have any continuity in my thought, I had to finish the thought I began to express.

Very briefly, what I said was that in the gentleman's remarks earlier today he had referred to the salary increase as an outrage and going to a bloated bureaucracy. I remembered that phrase. I said that I had read a postal journal just the other day in which a picture of the gentleman from Iowa appeared under the label "hero" or "friend of the postal worker," and some of the rest of us were apparently labeled as enemies of the common people, the working people. I wondered if the gentleman from Iowa was for this salary bill. I was going to raise that question in light of his comment.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, the gentleman from Arizona, if he heard my remarks during consideration of the rule, knows very well that I am not for the salary provisions of this bill. I hope the gentleman gets this now loud and clear, so there can be no misunderstanding of that portion of his remarks or his question.

Mr. UDALL. I had wondered why, because the gentleman had been publicly announced as supporting a much larger salary increase, and I was kind of shocked in view of the gentleman's stand on economy.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, the gentleman knows better than that. The gentleman knows that I supported reclassification for postal employees. The gentleman, I am sure, knows why. Thousands of postal employees are virtually frozen in the middle levels of 4 and 5, and cannot move. Class Act employees can be promoted entire grades and all the steps in between, but a postal employee must serve out his time in the various steps on the ladder. The gentleman well knows this. I do not have to explain it to him. The postal employees under present conditions are entitled to reclassification. I so voted in the committee, so there will be no mystery about that.

As for the "hero" business, I suspect that the gentleman has had some publicity that he did not order in the newspapers in recent weeks. I cannot very well regulate this "hero" business or what goes into various publications.

Mr. UDALL. If the gentleman will yield once more——

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. The other point I was going to make is that my friend apparently objects to the marriage of these bills, the rate bill and the pay bill. As I recall, a shotgun was held by the gentleman from Pennsylvania to the gentleman from Iowa which caused the gentleman to vote for the marriage of the Corbett amendment to the bill. I was confused on that question.

Mr. GROSS. No, the gentleman is mistaken. I am sure the record will show that I voted against the shotgun wedding of these two bills.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty-seven Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 303]

Ashley
Blatnik
Bray
Broomfield
Dent
Devine
Diggs
Dingell
Downing
Everett
Flood
Foley
Fountain
Fulton, Tenn.
Green, Oreg.
Hagan
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Herlong
Holland
Irwin
Jonas
Leggett
Lukens
Moorhead
Myers
Rarick
Reinecke
Resnick
St. Onge
Sikes
Stratton
Sullivan
Utt
White
Williams, Miss.
Willis

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. Albert) having assumed the chair, Mr. Price of Illinois, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill, H.R. 7977, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 393 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I wish to direct attention to a remark which I believe the gentleman from Arizona inadvertently made just before we were interrupted by the quorum call. As I recall, the gentleman said the reason the rate increase and salary bills are together is because of an amendment I offered in the full committee. Well, that is a very little bit of the truth. I did offer an amendment to reclassify the first five levels of postal workers, whereupon the gentleman from Arizona moved as a substitute for my amendment the salary bill. He prevailed because he had more votes over on his side.

However, I do want it thoroughly understood that I was not in favor of the marriage of the salary and rate increase bills. I was definitely in favor of reclassification. If that is not a correct picture, I would appreciate the gentleman from Arizona correcting me.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is honorable, of course, and always states the truth, and has just now. The difficulty is whether you call reclassification a pay increase. But the subject of giving more compensation by reclassification or pay increase was first raised by the gentleman's amendment. In self-defense the only thing I could do to defeat the gentleman's amendment, which I felt was unwise, was to offer the whole subcommittee pay package as a substitute for it. So I think we are agreed on the facts. We can draw different conclusions. If the gentleman does not want to be the minister who presided over this marriage or said the vows, I apologize.

Mr. CORBETT. I do not even want to be the best man.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Derwinski], a member of the committee.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, it is obvious that in 3 minutes I shall not have an opportunity to straighten out the complete confusion caused by the majority of the committee in producing this bill. I would like to point out to those of you who have the time that if you read page 74 and also start at page 77 of the committee report, you will see some minority views which I think are written with considerable clarity.

I would like to clarify one other item. This bill has a title "Postal Revenue and Federal Salary Act of 1967." Do not be misled for a moment to think that there is a fair relationship between the salary increases and the revenue. There is not. The salary increases over the 3 years will outstrip revenues. And do not be under the illusion that you are wiping out the postal deficit. You are not.

Also—and this I think is the main problem here—do not be under any illusion that you are going to give the American public an improvement in postal service. There is nothing in this bill that will provide an improvement in postal service to the suffering American public. So when this bill is finally voted upon there should be no illusions over what is being done for the public.

Another point is that we will be offering amendments that may clarify some of the dubious provisions of the bill. I believe that the only way you can recruit better personnel to the Post Office Department, especially in the metropolitan areas, is to have a salary schedule based upon the cost of living. The Department pays lip service to this principle but does nothing to implement it. There is nothing in the bill to do it.

One more item I would like to point out to you is the fact that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] and the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. McClure] pointed out in minority views that there is a great deal of confusion caused by the committee and the subcommittee.

There is no relationship between the bill as produced by the subcommittee of our committee and the bill before us. Very often when a committee brings a bill to the floor, there is a tendency of Members to join forces behind the hard-working committee. Our committee worked hard for 8 months, but we did not produce anything too effective, and I do not believe there is anything in this bill that merits blind and automatic support, so I would recommend we give thoughtful amendments very serious consideration, and hopefully we might make some progress in improving this bill.

There is a great deal of discussion about who put what packages together. The gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from Arizona have just exchanged polite platitudes about it. The fact of the matter is they are both wrong. I retract that. They are not wrong. They are both innocent. But they are both guilty of an old art called "buckpassing".

The facts of life are that the gentleman from Pennsylvania authored an amendment to the rate bill that brought up the pay issue. The gentleman from Arizona did not think he had enough votes to beat it head on, because the Department had not twisted enough arms on the majority side. So he came up with a substitute that was a bit more glamorous. It was a matter of strategy rather than fighting it head on. Unfortunately, the gentleman from Arizona felt that the Department had not twisted enough arms on his side. Then, in turn, the gentleman from Pennsylvania had some help on our side. The upshot of it was mass confusion, so the rate bill also became a pay bill, which is really an unhappy marriage, and we might consider separating them at the proper time in the amendment stage.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. Olsen].

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the committee recommendations as included in the committee amendment to H.R. 7977, with one or two minor adjustments that have been brought to my attention since the committee action. I will discuss these amendments at the appropriate time when the bill is read for amendment.

At the outset, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Postal Rates, I want to thank each member of my subcommittee for his very active and faithful service, on both sides of the aisle.

I might say when we marked up this part of the bill in the subcommittee, we not only had attendance of all of the subcommittee on both sides of the aisle, but we had the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Corbett], and the chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Dulski], with us when we marked it up in subcommittee, so we had close attention.

I sponsored H.R. 7, which is a great controversy in the pay business. I am really disappointed that it did not pass the committee. But, as in all committees—and we are all on committees—we do not have our own way, and I did not have my own way, and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. Udall] prevailed with a compromise. He did not have his way either. We ended up with a proposition that I think is fair and reasonable.

I would vote for a higher pay bill, but not today, because I have made my agreement with other members of my subcommittee and with my committee, so I am going to stay with what we call the Udall pay bill.

It is this same thing with the Postal Revenue Act, which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Corbett] wants to call the "Stamp Tax Act," and that is Mr. Cunningham's label too.

I know there is a kind of friendship for the proposition, because I think Members will agree with me that we have done about the best we could do, and we really worked at it hard and long. As a matter of fact, we worked at it for weeks and weeks. We had 21 days of hearings, and for 7 days in subcommittee and 17 days in full committee in markup, and we ended up with an increase in first class and cards of 1 cent.

THE POSTAL REVENUE ACT OF 1967

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Postal Rates, I wish to utilize the remainder of my time discussing with you the provisions of title I of the committee amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I believe our postal service to be the key link of the Nation's commerce. It is the personal communications network of our 200 million citizens. It must be responsive to the needs of the public and to the needs of the business community.

Unfortunately, and all too frequently, many of us here in the Congress, as well as officials of the executive branch, look only to postal revenues to finance modernization of buildings, high speed mail processing equipment, and fair and equitable pay for our postal employees.

This is not right. I may not be old fashioned, but I still believe that fair and equitable pay for postal employees should not be considered in the light of available postal revenues. I still believe in the declaration of policy spelled out by the Congress, in the Postal Policy Act of 1958—39 United States Code 2302(b)—"that the Post Office is a public service."

Today the postal revenues do not even cover normal operating costs. The only conclusion we can draw is that we must bring postal revenues into line with operating costs after giving due consideration to the public service features which Congress has specified.

The President included five major recommendations for postal rate adjustments in his message to the Congress, dated April 5, 1967:

> First-class and airmail: A 1-cent increase for cards and letters.
>
> Second-class publications: An average increase of 22 percent for all categories of second-class mail, phased over a 3-year period.
>
> Third-class: An average increase of 28 percent for all categories of third-class mail.
>
> Fourth-class: An average increase of 21 percent for special rate fourth-class mail, consisting mainly of books and records.
>
> A special charge for odd-sized, nonmachinable mail.

The committee amendment adopts each of these recommendations with three major exceptions.

First, on nonmachinable mail, the committee eliminated all provisions on this matter and delayed for further study the recommendations of the President. While the recommendation was for a charge on mail which was "nonmachinable," we developed a proposal that would define "standard-size mail," but we felt that we should delay any recommendation for enactment of provisions on this subject pending a further study by the committee.

Second, the committee amendment proposes a 2-cent increase on airmail letters.

And third, the committee amendment applies lesser increases than those recommended by the President on the mailings by nonprofit organizations, particularly the mailings for charitable, religious, or general health purposes, and the mailings by nonprofit organizations which solicit funds for charitable, religious, or general health purposes.

The postal rate increases we are recommending, when fully effective, will add more than $884 million to postal revenues. The postal service operating deficit in fiscal year 1967 was $1.2 billion. The estimated public service cost was $557 million, leaving a postal deficiency of $591 million for fiscal year 1967.

The expected additional revenue of $884 million will be sufficient to reduce the estimated postal deficiency and cover such increased cost as can be expected to be incurred in the near future.

Mr. Chairman, the postal rate increases we are recommending recognize the accepted congressional policy of maintaining a historical cost-coverage relationship among the several classes of mail.

I believe in, and strongly support, the policy that has been followed by the Congress from the beginning of the postal service, of maintaining the proper relationship among the several classes of mail.

First-class mail constitutes a preferred service and therefore, the postage for first-class mail should be sufficient to cover the entire amount of the expenses allocated to first-class mail, plus an additional amount representing the quality and the character of the service rendered in terms of priority, accuracy, security, and speed of transmission.

All other classes of mail, particularly second- and third-class mail, should have something substantially less than cost coverage, in that they provide a basis for communication of intelligence, the dissemination of information, the advancement of education and culture, the distribution of articles of commerce and industry, and contribute materially to the growth of many commercial enterprises, and to the national economy and public welfare.

Congress has recognized that all of these principles go to make up "the postal service as a public service."

In establishing any relationship between first-class mail and second- and third-class mail, we must recognize that mailers of second- and third-class mail are required to process and present their mailings as directed by the Postmaster General. We must recognize that the steps involved in the preparation by such mailers represent in most cases at least one-half the mail-handling steps that are performed by the postal employees in the case of first-class mail.

Just to give a major illustration, the mailers of second- and third-class mail must sack, bundle, and sort their mail, and deliver it to the post office, whereas we all recognize that first-class mail can be dropped in the corner mailbox and is picked up and sorted by the postal employees.

I just want to remind my colleagues to bear these policies in mind in the event amendments are offered when the bill is read for amendments to eliminate increases in first-class mail, on the basis that we now have close to 100-percent cost coverage, or to provide increase in second- and third-class mail to bring them close to 100-percent cost coverage.

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED RATE CHANGES

FIRST-CLASS AND AIRMAIL

The committee amendment provides an increase from 5 to 6 cents for first-class letters, and an increase from 4 to 5 cents for cards. We also provide an increase from 8 to 10 cents for airmail letters, and an increase from 6 to 8 cents for airmail cards. These increases will provide a cost coverage of 123.3 percent for first-class mail, and additional revenue of $518.4 million. The cost coverage for airmail will be 138.9 percent, and the additional revenue will be $49.7 million.

Following the rate increase of January, 1963, the revenue surplus from first-class mail dropped from $295 million in fiscal year 1964, to $68 million on a 1966 adjusted basis. Concurrently, cost average dropped from 116 percent to 103 percent. The decline in revenue surplus reflected rising costs, largely the result of salary increases and fringe benefits for postal employees, which represent over 80 percent of postal costs.

The modest surplus is earned mainly on heavier pieces. The 5-cent letter rate today fails to cover the cost on 1-ounce letters. It is the heavier first-class pieces that provide for the modest 3-percent cost-coverage surplus.

The annual volume growth between fiscal years 1958 and 1965 ranges between 0.2 percent and 3.2 percent. In 1966, however, volume surged upward more than 6 percent, reaching a high of 40.4 billion pieces of first-class mail.

Cost coverage for all airmail is currently 121 percent. However, after excluding the highly profitable air parcel post service, cost coverage on all other airmail is only 105 percent. In these circumstances, revenues from most 1-ounce airmail letters are insufficient to cover fully allocated costs.

The rates recommended in the committee bill will restore the cost coverage on first class and airmail to a higher percentage, where it belongs.

SECOND-CLASS MAIL

Within-county rates are increased as recommended by the Postmaster General, to a minimum charge per piece of 0.2 cents, and the pound rate is increased in three steps from 1.25 cents to 1.3 cents in 1968, 1.4 cents in 1969, and 1.5 cents in 1970. Also, the committee amendment discontinues the low per copy rates for publications mailed at post offices other than the original points of entry.

These are the rates that are applicable to small-town newspapers. On a current basis, fully allocated costs exceed revenue for these mailings by about $67 million. There were roughly 1½ billion pieces of mail matter mailed under these rates in fiscal year 1966.

I would like to point out that these newspapers will pay, even under the committee bill, only about 1 cent per piece. However, I would also like to point out that the mailers of second-class publications do perform a lot of the mail-handling steps for this type of mail that postal employees perform in the case of first-class mail.

REGULAR PUBLICATIONS

The committee amendment provides, in effect, for a 23-percent increase in this type of publication, effective in three steps. The existing policy of zone rates for the advertising portion will be maintained. The larger share of the second-class deficiency applies to this category of mail. Cost coverage is higher than second class as a whole—29.3 percent versus 23.3 percent, before public service credits. On a 1966 adjusted basis, the deficiency attributable to publications is $236 million.

When the rates provided by this bill have become fully effective, the cost coverage will be 36.2 percent.

NONPROFIT PUBLICATIONS

The committee amendment provides a new method of computing the postage rates on the advertising portion of nonprofit publications to make the rates more equitable with the rates paid on commercial advertising in other publications. At present, a flat rate of 1.8 cents per pound, with a minimum of 0.125 cent per piece, is charged. Under the amendment, the minimum charge per piece is increased to 0.2 of a cent. Rates on the nonadvertising portion are increased in three stages to 2.1 of a cent in 1970, and a six-step zone rate is provided for the advertising portions.

During fiscal year 1966, there were 2.3 billion pieces of nonprofit organization mail. The total cost to the postal service on this type of mail was over $100 million.

By changing the method of computing the rate on this type of mail, this loss to the postal service will be reduced substantially.

AGRICULTURAL PUBLICATIONS

A new category of second-class mail is adopted for agricultural publications, which retains the existing rate for the advertising portion of these publications mailed in the first and second zones. The current rate, which will be maintained, is 4.2 cents per pound.

CONTROLLED CIRCULATIONS

A three-phase increase in the pound rate and the minimum charge per piece is adopted for controlled circulations, as recommended by the Postmaster General.

THIRD-CLASS MAIL

SINGLE-PIECE RATES

The committee adopted a single-piece rate of 6 cents for the first 2 ounces, and 2 cents for each additional ounce. This rate compares with the 6 cents for 1 ounce in the case of first-class mail.

The annual mail volume in this category for fiscal year 1966 was 3.3 billion pieces, or 16 percent of all third-class mail. The cost coverage will be increased from 86.2 percent to 114.9 percent for this category of mail. The additional revenue involved is approximately $70 million.

BULK RATE REGULAR

The committee amendment provides a per-pound rate increase from 12 to 16 cents for books and similar items, and an increase from 18 to 22 cents per pound for the circular advertising material. The minimum charge per piece is increased from 2⅞ to 3.8 cents.

There were approximately 14 billion pieces of mail in this category in fiscal year 1966, with a revenue deficiency of approximately $277 million, and a cost coverage of 61 percent.

The rates recommended by the committee will provide a cost coverage of more than 80 percent, and additional postal revenue of $154 million.

Once again, I would like to point out that the cost-coverage figures do not take into consideration the many mail-handling steps that are performed by the mailers of this type of mail. If all of these were properly adjusted, the cost coverage under the committee proposal obviously would be 100 percent.

BULK NONPROFIT MAILINGS

The bulk nonprofit rates are 50 percent of the regular pound and minimum rates, except that the existing minimum rate of 1.25 cents per piece is increased only to 1.3 cents per piece for bulk nonprofit mailings of organizations with charitable, religious, or general health purposes, or when bulk mailings by qualified nonprofit organizations consist wholly of solicitations of funds to be used for charitable, religious, or general health purposes.

The revenue deficiency in this class of mail was nearly $100 million in 1966, and represents the mail of at least 82,000 nonprofit organizations which mailed about 2.9 billion pieces. The cost coverage will be increased from 27 percent to

33.4 percent, all of which is covered by a public service item.

SPECIAL RATE FOURTH-CLASS MAIL

The general rate for books, films, records, and other special items, which is now 10 cents for the first pound, and 5 cents for each additional pound, is increased to 16 cents for the first 2 pounds, and 6 cents for each additional pound. This category includes the tremendous mailings by the book and record clubs.

LIBRARY RATE

A special library rate, which is now 4 cents for the first pound, and 1 cent for each additional pound, is increased to 8 cents for the first 2 pounds, and 3 cents for each additional pound.

The postal deficiency in this category was $75 million in fiscal year 1966, and there were approximately 219 million pieces, of which 203 million were mailed at the general rate, and 16 million at the library rate. The cost coverage will be increased from 42.4 percent to 54.1 percent, and the additional revenue will be $12.3 million.

Mr. Chairman, I believe we have maintained the historical pricing policy of the Congress in recommending the postal rate increases in title I. I urge that they be approved here today without major changes.

The expected additional revenue, as I said, is $884 million. It will be sufficient to reduce the estimated postal deficit, and it will cover all of the additional costs for the additional pay increase.

A lot has been made of the figures in the newspapers, that the pay increase would exceed the rate increase. Well, the pay increase for all Federal employees would, yes, but when we talk about the postal rate business we have to relate that to postal pay or relate it to nothing. We cannot relate postal rates to the pay of all other Federal employees.

I say again that the postal rate increase will exceed by a very great deal the postal pay increase. The rest of the Federal employees ought to be and will be covered by the taxpayers.

The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] will point this out better than I can, but the reason is that we have to attract and we have to retain the best kind of leadership we can in the Federal service. If we do not, then we will not remain the leading nation in the world.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to have the attention of everyone. I do want attention now for a few minutes. I am going to make this very short, so I ask Members please to let me have their complete attention.

What is the reason there is a lesser rate for second- and third-class mail? I know everyone wants to know what is the reason.

I have to my right a case of mail. This is called a case, on my right. It is a bunch of pigeonholes. There are 49 pigeonholes here. This is what is called the primary case in New York City. In any city of more than 50,000 population there is a prime area case.

In that case one sorts first to groups of States. I pick out one part in the lower part of this cabinet which is for Southern States; I believe Georgia, North and South Carolina, and Alabama. That is in the New York primary case. When envelopes get into that particular pigeonhole, this only means it has been sorted once.

It has to be sorted a second time to each of the several four States and then sorted a third time to the sectional centers in those four States. The same thing happens when we talk about a group of Western States who happen to be in these 49 pigeonholes. So, when we talk about first-class mail or when we talk about airmail, that is not sorted once. It is sorted at least three times in any major post office, and I am talking about a place of more than 50,000 people. In New York City, for example, it could be more than three times. However, in the case of second-class mail, which is newspapers and magazines, and in the case of third-class mail, which is business advertising circulars, those items never see this case. They are not sorted at the receiving post office at all. The New York Post Office does not see this case with respect to second- and third-class mail. Second- and third-class mail under present regulations they are required to sort, tie off, sack, and ship to the airlines, as the case my be in the case of some second-class mail, but ship to the railroads all other second-class mail and the entire third-class mail. They must all be taken to the railroads. The Post Office Department never sees this mail. At the receiving post office all the post office gets is a check. Of course, there are many, many views as to why and how they get that amount of money.

The sorting of second- and third-class mail is entirely in the delivery post office.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN].

Mr. OLSEN. In the delivery post office this mail, second- and third-class, is sorted for the mailman. Now we come to a new age in the Post Office Department. I will show tomorrow or maybe later tonight, if we get into that detailed debate, how in the case of some second-class and almost all of the third-class mail it is sorted at the place of embarkation for the postman the way he walks his route.

You can see that there is a great deal of saving for the Post Office Department because of the work done by second- and third-class. That is why we have this difference in rates.

We have some figures from the Post Office Department, and they are good figures for what they are thinking. They are talking about what they call a cost ascertainment system. However, this is not really a cost ascertainment system. More positively it is a cost allotment system. They are allotting the cost to one class or another. They tell us that it costs 5.3 cents to move an envelope in first-class weighing 1 ounce or less. Then they tell us that it costs 5.1 cents to move a third-class envelope that is 1 ounce or less. That could not possibly be so when all of these steps in packaging mail have been eliminated by third-class. It just could not possible be so that there is only 0.2 cent difference.

We are planning to go into that difference completely. We looked into it very deeply. We recommend as members of the committee that you take our word for it and that we have done the very best that can be done for the present on the different prices of mail and for the different classes of mail. We trust that the members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union will follow the lead of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. NIX], chairman of the Subcommittee on Postal Operations; the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POOL], chairman of the Subcommittee on Postal Facilities and Modernization; and, myself, chairman of the Subcommittee on Postal Rates. We plan to go more deeply into this question as to what it costs to sort letters. Now, permit me to continue for just a minute on this subject. At some places in the world a postal clerk is reputed to be able to sort, what we call "case" now, but what you and I would say "sort" into this case, 60 letters a minute all day long. However, I do not believe it. In this country they will "case" or "sort" about 39 letters a minute, or, perhaps, 30.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana has again expired.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. OLSEN. Now, Mr. Chairman, with reference to this question of cost ascertainment, have we really determined what it costs to handle a letter at the receiving post office and what it costs to handle a letter at the delivery post office? If we are able to do this, then we will be able to more nearly determine whether every class of mail is paying its own way.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLSEN. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, in my congressional district we have the headquarters of the Columbian Fathers, a worldwide Catholic missionary society. They posed a question to me—and I propose this colloquy for the purpose of legislative history on this bill—and seek some clarification of section 103 dealing with qualified, nonprofit publications.

What I want to ask the gentleman is this: Is it the intention of the committee that house advertisers or, technically, nonpaid advertisers, the category into which this organization falls since they receive no revenue—they put it in there themselves—I ask is it the intent of the committee that this type of advertising for which they receive no revenue should be charged the new zone rates upon the advertising portion of their magazine?

Mr. OLSEN. I think the committee's conclusion was to that effect.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana has again expired.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I wonder if the gentleman would care to comment upon that question?

Mr. OLSEN. I think we settled that in the committee to the effect that in-house advertising was not to be subjected to the increase in the rate for that class of mail.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. It is my understanding that the department downtown decides what is advertising and what is not. I wanted to have the RECORD contain the statement to the effect that it is not the intention of the committee that this "house-type" advertising be subjected to the zone rates.

Mr. OLSEN. I agree with the gentleman absolutely.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I have only a few moments left. On the matter of the display case the gentleman used I would like to pose this question:

It is true, as to what the gentleman said relative to second- and third-class mail—the only thing that the gentleman failed to mention is that even though second-class mailers do a lot of this work themselves, they still receive first-class treatment at the low, heavily subsidized second-class rates.

Mr. OLSEN. I think that in certain instances second-class mail receives first-class treatment. But I do think it is a kind of natural thing and I believe the gentleman agrees with me, because the second-class mail is prepared and it is ready for delivery by the mailman when it gets to the delivery post office.

And that is why it gets first class.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. No, that is why it gets the low, low rate to begin with.

Mr. OLSEN. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. MCCLURE].

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Chairman, the minority views to this bill begin with the understatement of the year in my opinion:

> We believe that the enactment of H.R. 7977 is not in the public interest.

I readily joined in that dissent because this is a rate bill that ignores the rate problem, a classification bill that ignores the problem of reclassification, and a pay bill that say in effect, "Let someone else make the decisions."

Title I lowers the postal deficit and title II raises it again. As the Queen said to Alice:

> It takes all the running you can do to keep in the same place. If you want to get somewhere else, you must run at least twice as fast as that.

If the purpose of increased rates is to make each piece of mail pay its own way, then why is second class paying 29 percent of its costs and third class paying only 82 percent of its costs and—I might add—first class paying 123 percent of its costs?

And why do we ask the users of first-class mail to make up the difference? If we are to subsidize second- and third-class mail users, it would be far preferable to let the taxpayers share that burden equally. The committee must plead guilty to knuckling under to pressures in its final product.

If, on the other hand, we are to assume that the purpose of increased rates is merely to reduce the postal deficit, the committee has failed again. The deficit was reduced only the time it took to add title II.

Perhaps all of this could have been excused had there been any assurance that mail service would be improved. But service never entered the picture. As a matter of fact, a very good case can be made for the fact that it is getting worse. I can refer to no better authority than the Postmaster General himself, who has referred to his Department as "a tottering structure," and has called postal service "self-destructive."

But of all the problems the committee faced in dealing with rates, the one that caused me the most anguish personally was in accepting the cost ascertainment figures supplied by the Post Office Department. I do not pretend to be an authority in this field, but I do not believe anyone else does either.

Time and again these figures were challenged by witnesses before the subcommittee.

That a problem exists is recognized by the United Federation of Postal Clerks, who passed a resolution urging an independent study be made of the mail distribution service.

When this resolution was brought to my attention last spring I asked the chairman of the committee about the value of such a study. He assured me that it was unneeded. Nevertheless, subsequent events have indicated that sufficient doubts persist in the minds of a sufficient number of people to warrant reconsideration of this proposal. If I am permitted to control all the facts used in any given discussion I can pretty well direct the conclusions which will be reached.

I cannot urge too strongly that the cost ascertainment system should be reviewed so we may determine whether or not our figures on the cost of providing service which we use in rate discussions are accurate. This the committee has failed to do.

I realize that the General Accounting Office is making a continued study of postal operations, but it has been some years now since their last report on cost ascertainment. Perhaps the President's Commission on Postal Reorganization will undertake such a study, although I have come to the reluctant conclusion that Presidential commissions as a rule are so much window dressing by which time is purchased against the time in which we must make solutions.

Suffice to say that, had such a study been made before the committee took up the rate bill, it is quite likely we would have a very different measure before us today.

It was the expectation of several of us on the committee that we would first go through the bill section by section and consider each rate category individually and then go back through the entire bill. This makes sense on a bill that deals with matters so intricately and extensively interrelated.

Our decision concerning one section to a very large extent depended on decisions to be made later in another section. Under the procedures adopted by our committee, we failed to go back. We did not give ourselves sufficient opportunity to give that full consideration of the bill.

With all the faults that I find in title I, they are but a ripple on the stream in comparison with my wave of objections to title II.

The procedures by which pay reclassification provisions were added to H.R. 7977 is deplorable. There were no witnesses and practically no discussion.

An average of 15 minutes was allowed for each amendment which was offered—scant time for 26 members to adequately consider such far-reaching proposals. Several members of the committee had amendments they wanted to offer and were denied the opportunity. The majority of the committee had decided in advance to ram through these features and there was little the rest of us could do. As far as I am concerned, it is impossible to say whether or not title II adequately deals with existing inequities in pay and classification. It may be that the Federal workers affected should have more. It may be they should have less. I honestly do not know. I am certain of one thing: When title II came in one door, representative government and free debate flew out the other.

The Subcommittee on Position Classification, who did have responsibility, held hearings on the reclassification bills, but it never did hold executive session or even discuss the testimony that was heard.

The Subcommittee on Compensation, which had no authority in this field, on the other hand, came out with a pay bill which incorporated in it some of the aspects of reclassification. It was this measure that became a part of H.R. 7977.

It seems to me that it is the responsibility of the Position Classification Subcommittee, not the Subcommittee on Compensation, to make these recommendations.

The most serious defect in title II comes in the abdication of congressional responsibility to decide future pay raises. If the bill passes in its present form, that matter will lie with the executive branch.

We have heard a great deal about the matter of congressional responsibility on the House floor lately, and I am really quite surprised to find that those who have been making the accusations should so quickly find that the shoe is on the other foot. The continual delegation of congressional authority to the Executive that has occurred over the years has come from Congresses controlled by the other party. This measure is further proof that they will never be satisfied until they have made the President judge and jury over every Government program in the book.

There is no doubt in my mind that this so-called vetoproof bill was prepared in collusion with the White House. Should this bill pass, a "reluctant" President will sign it into law. He will get the credit for raising salaries and Congress will get the blame for the added deficit.

Had the proponents of title II really been concerned about the postal worker, they would have insisted on an investigation into the opportunities for advancement within the postal field service, with a view toward finding a way by which the aggressive young fellow can be rewarded for his initiative. The present rigidity in the postal system, fostered by the unions and perpetuated by Congress, is a matter that we will eventually have to face up to.

In the end, we have here a bill that is

unfair to the users of the mail for not adequately coming to grips with the rate problem.

We have here a bill that is unfair to the Federal employee for not adequately coming to grips with the reclassification and pay problems.

We have here a bill that is unfair to Congress because it relinquishes our authority to decide matters of compensation.

It is probably the worst-written piece of legislation to come before the House this year, and I fervently hope it will be defeated.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Nix].

Mr. NIX. Mr. Chairman, the only thing I think the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service has to plead guilty to—and it is an honorable guilty plea—although in days gone by I never thought that any guilty plea was honorable, but as I say, the only thing they would have to plead guilty to would be to the following:

That they held hearings from May 9 to June 28—a total of 21 days.

That they were in executive sessions of the subcommittee for 7 days.

That they were in executive session in the full committee for 15 days on postal rates; and for 2 days on pay schedules.

That they heard over 100 witnesses.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would consider that an honorable guilty plea.

Mr. Chairman, in the time allotted to me, it is impossible for me to touch upon the matters in this bill which I think are of the greatest importance. So permit me to just mention a number of the portions of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, the committee amendment to the text is a remarkable achievement in that, for the first time in the history of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, it will adjust postage rates for all major categories of mail to the levels recommended by the Postmaster General on the basis of his review of the postal rate structure.

I am not unaware that we may expect proposals today to impose excessive further charges on regular second-class mail. The history of previous rate legislation tells us this. I would earnestly recommend that problems or objections that may exist with respect to one or a few publications not unduly influence the consideration of general postage rates that are so critically important to America's publishing industry as a whole.

This bill provides substantial but fair increases in second-class rates—a total of 23 percent, in three phases—which compares favorably with the 20-percent first-class mail increase. The extensive evidence developed in our committee rate hearings convincingly demonstrated that the 23-percent increase is the maximum the traffic will bear in second-class rates. To go higher, or to add arbitrary surcharges, could be fatal to many fine publications—with the real loss suffered by the millions of readers who want them and order them.

No doubt the difference between the second- and third-class rates in the committee bill will be questioned. As the Postmaster General testified before our committee, the difference merely represents a restoration of the relationship that existed between these two classes of mail prior to the 1962 Rate Act. Both second- and third-class rates in the House-passed bill that year were sharply reduced in the other body. The committee of conference increased the second-class rates, but not the third-class rates, as written in the other body. The bill now before us corrects that distortion.

Mr. Chairman, the second-class rates in our committee amendment are eminently fair and will contribute substantially to increased postal revenues.

As chairman of the Postal Operations Subcommittee, I will discuss title III of H.R. 7977 which is the result of years of work on the part of Congressman Cunningham and the Subcommittee on Postal Operations. Bills on this subject have passed the House of Representatives in previous Congresses by votes of 360 to 16 and 360 to 19. The Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee did not act on this type of legislation and the bills died. In this case however, the Post Office Department has supported the type of amendment we have in this bill and there is every indication that the Senate will take it up, both because of its inclusion in a postal rates bill and because of the support of the Post Office Department.

In the beginning of this session, two bills were introduced on the subject of obscene mail. One bill used the term "obscene mail" and the other adopted the term "pandering advertising." The pandering advertising formula was worked out by the Post Office Department and a bill introduced. Mr. Cunningham submitted title III as an amendment to the postal rates bill and the amendment had the advantage of combining the best features of both bills, and adopting the language "pandering advertising" which has been used with approval by the Supreme Court in the Ginzburg and Redrup cases.

The amendment is directed against "pandering advertising" a term first defined in the Ginzburg case by the U.S. Supreme Court. This amendment would allow a householder to return mail to the Postmaster with the request that this type of mail not be sent to his home again. The Postmaster General would make a judgment on the material returned to the Post Office Department by the postal patron as to whether or not the material is in fact pandering advertising. This is important in that most offensive material going through the mail consists of advertising rather than books or records.

The Postmaster General will issue an order to a mailer in an appropriate case, requiring that he cease annoying the mail patron with pandering materials. If this order is ignored, the Postmaster General can seek a contempt citation from a district court, which citation would be punishable by the court if it was ignored or violated by the mailer.

In the most recent pronouncement by the U.S. Supreme Court in the spring of this year, the Court took the position that a statute in the obscenity area must be based on a concern for either juveniles, or a concern for privacy, or a concern with pandering advertising. The amendment placed in this bill by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. Cunningham] is based on a concern for all three—juveniles, privacy, and pandering advertising. This title also brings this matter to the attention of the courts and the only enforceable action is taken by the courts; that is, punishment for contempt of court. I urge support of H.R. 7977 without change.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Scott], a member of the committee.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, in my limited time I would like to discuss title II of the bill relating to salaries of Federal employees.

This title, as it now exists, provides a pay increase of 6 percent for postal employees but only 4.5 percent for classified and most other civilian workers. Under the bill white-collar workers will not receive comparability until 1969.

Of course, nothing is provided for the military. The House will later have to decide whether to treat the military in the manner of the postal worker or the other white-collar worker. Certainly I am not suggesting any reduction for postal employees, for which I have the highest regard, but I do believe that we should treat the classified worker, the Foreign Service employee, the Veterans' Administration employee and others as fairly as we treat the postal employee.

A few years ago the Congress determined a policy that Government employees should have pay and working conditions similar to those in private industry. And I believe in this principle of comparability. In the interest of equity to all employees, I shall propose a straight 6-percent increase for all employees for this fiscal year, the same 5-percent increase for next year, as is being afforded for the postal workers, and necessary adjustments to realize comparability in April of 1969.

Mr. Chairman, only last week the Assistant Postmaster General for Personnel, Mr. Robert J. Murphy, testified before the Post Office and Civil Service Committee of the other body regarding this bill in its present form. I quote from page 9 of his prepared text:

> The single most glaring difference is its preferential treatment for Postal employees. Postal employees are given an average increase of 6 percent under the schedule to become effective at the beginning of the first pay period in October, while employees in the other statutory pay systems are given 4.5 percent as recommended by the President. I know of no logical justification for this disparity and cannot support it from the standpoint of the basic principle of equal pay, among employees under the various Federal salary systems, for equal work.

Also testifying before the other body, the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, Mr. John W. Macy, Jr., referred to the bill now under consideration in the House and stated:

> The first and most important reservation is with respect to the 6 percent increase proposed for postal employees, followed in 1968 by a flat guarantee of another 5 percent, neither of which would apply to other Federal workers. There is no rational basis for discriminatory treatment, even temporarily,

between postal employees and all other personnel, military and civilian.

He added that postal salaries have already increased over the last 20 years significantly more than general schedule salaries. In 1945, city carrier salaries were slightly lower than those for GS–4, then CAF–4. They caught up with and generally moved ahead of GS–4, and in 1962 PFS–4 was linked with GS–5.

Mr. Chairman, these are the chief spokesmen for the administration. They recognize the unfairness of this proposed legislation, even though they are arguing for a straight 4.5-percent pay raise.

Because of the limitations of time, I will reserve comments regarding the merits of the 6-percent across-the-board increase rather than the straight 4½-percent increase until the amendment is offered.

However, Mr. Chairman, I would like to add that the committee staff has prepared the amendment under instructions to provide for identical treatment of all civilian workers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, in 3 minutes I cannot discuss any of the details of this bill. Despite the criticisms that have been leveled, I can say to my colleagues in the House that this is the best rate bill of the last 10, 15, or 20 years, and this is the best pay bill I have been associated with during my 7 years on this committee.

They are both sound and forward looking, and they meet the problems we face, and they do it in a responsible manner.

The committee has been criticized today and will be criticized tomorrow, when amendments will be offered about the magazines and newspapers and the alleged favored treatment for some of the second- and third-class people. I first want to pay a little tribute to Congressman OLSEN of Montana and his subcommittee. They were diligent and have produced a sound bill.

To take just one example, if those who complain about second-class mail will look at the table at the top of page 17, they will find the highest cost coverage in that category since 1926 will go into effect if this bill is passed, if the committee's recommendations as to second-class mail are passed. The magazines are not very happy about this. They do not think they have been coddled or that they have gotten any very big break out of the committee.

If we look at the same table on the top of page 17, in spite of all the talk about third-class mail and great favoritism shown them, the third-class mailers do not feel they have been shown great favoritism. If we run down the column for third-class mail, you will find highest cost coverage in that class since 1926 will go into effect after passage of this bill.

So this committee has done a responsible job on rates. I will be opposed to the Hechler amendment as well as any amendment which will retreat from the position of the committee, which is about as fair and tough as third-class mailers can absorb. It will bring that class up essentially to 100 percent of coverage, and that is where it ought to be.

Let me say a word about the pay section of the bill. Every year we have these annual hassles about salaries. I think there ought to be a better system. We are shot at from all sides.

In this, we really deal with three forces. We deal with the Federal employees, who have families to feed and children to educate and all of their problems, and they see things a little bit differently sometimes than others do. They have serious problems and we listen to them. We deal with an administration which always has problems of budget or inflation or priorities, and they are not always too happy about what we do or want to do. Then, we deal with taxpayers—and I am one myself—who will have to pick up the tab for whatever decisions are made by the committee and ratified by the Congress.

It has been said that you can please some of the people some of the time—but in this case we often cannot please anybody. But we have done our best. We have done our best, and I think we have a piece of salary legislation that this House and Congress can be proud of, because it is a piece of legislation that will redeem the pledge of comparability which this Congress made many years ago. This Congress gave a promissory note to the Federal employees in 1962. We said to them, "We will pay you comparable salaries," but for 5 long years the Federal employees have waited for this promise to be kept. Each year there was inflation, or guidelines, or this or that, and we did not do anything about it. In this bill we take care of it.

This is a full comparability bill. We do it in three stages in order to take into account the problems the administration has and the problems the country has this year with the huge deficit. But this will be written into law and we can say to the Federal employees, "The promise has been redeemed. It is written into law." This three-phase pay raise is a fair and equitable pay raise.

Complaints have been made that we have 6 percent in the first phase for the postal employees and 4.5 percent in the first phase for classified employees. Let me tell you why we had to do this. It is part of this delicate compromise I have been describing. We had to do this because it was the judgment of this committee, and 220 Members of the House introduced bills saying the postal people were entitled to reclassification. It was obvious unless we did a little bit of reclassification, the committee decision we reached was going to be overturned on the House floor. So the difference between the two, the 1.5 percent in this first phase is reclassification—not much reclassification, but it is a step toward reclassification.

In the second and third steps, the classified people, who do not get as much of a raise and as much attention in the first phase, will be taken care of, and they will be brought to full comparability. These are people who by and large are in the upper grades and can afford to wait.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. THOMPSON].

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, this bill, of course, is a compromise bill. I certainly support the marriage we have between the rate bill and the pay bill.

I do this for several reasons.

One is I feel that the Post Office employees are entitled to more than a 4½-percent pay increase and without the marriage there is a danger of a veto. Frankly, I would have liked to see this come about through reclassification but this did not work out.

The reclassification which the gentleman from Arizona spoke about a moment ago, and which more than 200 Members introduced bills to bring about—I happened not to be one of them, although I support the concept and believe it needs to be done—was not reclassification in its entirety. It was reclassification of the lower levels.

The reason is, quite simply, that the postal employees in the lower levels are underpaid, and they are underpaid by more than any 6 percent.

It may surprise some Members to learn that it takes a Post Office employee, a clerk or a carrier, about 13 years to make as much money as a bus driver in Washington, D.C., makes the first day he goes to work. After 20 or 21 years he will make about $7,200 a year.

In my own city of Atlanta, Ga., last year there were more than 5,000 exams given for Post Office employees. Less than 10 percent, or fewer than 500 people, passed those particular exams. Why was this? Why did fewer than 500 out of 5,000 pass? The exam is not that difficult. The reason is, quite simply, that the pay being given to carriers and clerks is inadequate to attract the personnel needed by the Post Office Department.

We have one of the most efficient postal services anywhere in the world. If we take the total mail volume we have, and divide it by the number of employees, the average employee of the Post Office Department in the United States handles approximately twice as much as is handled by employees of any of the postal services in Europe.

The committee has done a good job. I am not satisfied with it in its entirety. There are many changes I would like to see. There will be amendments I shall certainly support.

There is one thing I am very firmly in favor of, which is that the postal employees, particularly those in the low grades, deserve and are entitled to more than the 4½-percent raise the President proposed. In fact, if we are going to maintain our postal service and provide the service for business that we should provide, it is going to be necessary that we do provide at least this 6-percent increase.

As to the so-called subsidies which are provided here, which have been talked about, people say, "Let us not have a postal deficit." Frankly, I support the concept that all classes of mail should pay their fair share. I believe this is only just and reasonable. But I consider it totally wrong to say that we are going to penalize the employees by not paying them adequate wages.

It is simply not fair or just that we should penalize the employees of the postal service by saying that there is a postal deficit and, "We do not have enough money to pay you a decent wage, because the rates as established by this Congress are too low, and we are not establishing for second-class mail a rate which pays at least 50 percent of its cost."

I grant that it is not popular to propose higher rates for second-class mail. Those are the rates for the newspapers and the magazines, the people who are going to determine the publicity you will get and I will get to be reelected.

But I feel that we are going to have to, at some time, come face to face with this problem, and certainly it is not fair to the employees to say, "We have got a deficit and you cannot have a raise."

If we have a deficit and the people are doing the work, then the second-class rate should be raised.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Johnson], a member of the committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I am rising today because I am the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Postal Rates. I am also one of the members of the Subcommittee on Compensation. I, too, attended all of the hearings. When the Subcommittee on Postal Rates was not sitting the Subcommittee on Compensation was sitting. We started early in May and we have kept going ever since to the month of October. So this problem has received tremendous study by all of the subcommittees and finally by the main committee.

Now, what were we faced with on postal rates? We were faced with this so-called cost-ascertainment report, wherein first-class mail was indicated as paying 103 percent of its way, second-class mail 29.3 percent and third-class mail 61.2 percent and fourth-class mail roughly 100 percent.

The bill that we considered in our markup sessions, after we held the hearings, was a subcommittee print which had no number on it. What did it do with regard to second-class mail? It made some 23 percent raise in second-class mail, which would take effect at once, the same as on third-class mail. Personally, after having heard the testimony, I felt that that was unfair to the magazine people and the newspapers in view of the fact that their subscriptions have been taken many years in advance. I am the one who made the motion in the subcommittee that second-class mail rates be phased out over a period of 3 years. The subcommittee sustained that. This also prevailed in the full committee. I thought surely when we got to third-class mail some 32 percent increase on third-class mail would rightfully, honestly, and fairly be phased out over a 3-year period also, just as the second-class. However, lo and behold, the long arm of somebody reached into that committee and, while seemingly at first we had support for phasing out the rates on third-class mail, suddenly the majority members of the committee froze, and today we are facing you, in my opinion, with an unfair discrimination, that is to say, third-class mail is going to take their rates all in one fell swoop whereas second-class mail is allowed to phase out over 3 years. Is that fair?

Do not get me wrong in this. I am not saying that it is wrong that second-class mail be allowed to take their increase over a 3-year period, because they have problems, but as we studied the third-class mail problem and saw the detailed work they do in preparing the mail and their contribution to the economy of this Nation and as we saw the wrapping and the sorting and the bagging and the other jobs they do, it certainly seemed fair that 32-percent raise in third-class mail rates should be phased out over the same period of time as the second-class mail.

I want to be fair here. I want to see the 32-percent increase come into full force within 3 years. In my opinion, the third-class mail then will be paying 100 percent of its way.

I am also on the Subcommittee on Compensation. We gave that a tremendous amount of study also. Yes, we studied H.R. 7 and the postal workers rightfully wanted to be raised from levels 4 to 5. I told some of the people who came to my office to see me that if the Classification Committee, after due deliberation, and the full committee after full deliberation and study released to this floor H.R. 7 or a bill just like it, I would support it, and that many of us would support it. I did not support a facsimile or watered down version of H.R. 7 in the subcommittee which I felt was hastily drawn. I do favor the Udall bill which we have here today on the floor before us.

What does that do? It creates a new level 5 for those who wanted it, but it is not a full level 5. It is about a 4.6.

Let me say here that the average letter carrier and postal clerk who might be in level 4 but in step 7 today has a salary of $6,387 a year. Under this bill his salary will be $7,117 next year. This is an increase of $730. Perhaps it should better be said that if the Classification Committee can study the problem of the postal workers and study H.R. 7 and bring a bill here in front of this committee which is feasible and sound and within the realm of the budget of this great Nation of ours. I am sure most of us will support it.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Daniels].

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Chairman, the 1-minute allocation of time is hardly enough during which to really go into the details of this bill. However, I do rise to urge my colleagues to support the committee amendments to this bill.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is truly a credit to all of our committee members and particularly to our chairman, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. Dulski], as well as to our subcommittee chairmen, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. Olsen], and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. Udall].

Mr. Chairman, really, this bill represents a tribute to their unselfish dedication, their perseverance and their concern for Federal employees and the postal service.

Both subcommittee chairmen appeared here today and displayed to the Members of the House their ability and their knowledge on two very important facets of the bill, the postal rate increases and the proposed increase in compensation, which have been merged into one bill.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that in my opinion this is a good bill and by far the best and most realistic and the fairest to all concerned.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I would hope that the rate of compensation for our postal employees as well as for our classified employees were larger. The salary increases in title II surely are small enough recognition of the dedicated services of our postal and other Federal employees.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the Members of the House to support this bill.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ruppe].

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with those individuals who have risen in support of H.R. 7977. I am particularly impressed with the suggestion and arguments that the two bills be combined.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, today we are considering a number of worthwhile proposals—whether they be urban renewal, slum clearance, whether they be aid to Appalachia or further endeavors with reference to the Great Lakes programs—most of which have had to be discarded because of the deficit with which we are faced and the addition to that predicted $29 billion deficit further programs would entail.

Certainly, if we are going to pass a measure which calls for substantial pay increases as well as facility modernization, we have to raise the rates with which to pay for these services to our society.

I would like to say that the pay portion of the bill is a very wise one. I think it does justice to the Members and employees of the Post Office Department who have been promised comparability since 1962 and who, under this bill will finally be granted comparability in 1969.

Certainly, Mr. Chairman, some of the postal employees will receive a more substantial wage increase, than that which is proposed for the general service employees.

On the other hand, Mr. Chairman, these people have been stratified for a great many years at levels 4 and 5, and the opportunity for them to gain stature in the postal service is very limited.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUPPE. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Montana.

Mr. OLSEN. As a matter of fact the postal workers are frozen at level 4, for the most part, for their entire lives.

Mr. RUPPE. In effect; yes. They are very limited in their opportunities to get ahead. They do not have a challenging career in the postal service based upon past operations of the service. On the other hand, the GS people, while they are going to receive a 4.5-percent increase now, will also receive an increase next year, and then a further increase which will bring them full comparability in 1969, a comparability which, after all, has been promised to these employees and stated as the intent of the act of 1962.

Regrettably, Mr. Chairman, the rates had to be increased in first-, second- and third-class mail. I am very sorry, and I think it is regrettable that second- and third-class rate increases were not identical in timing and percentage. There is little reason to increase third-class mail so much at one time and give second-class mail, which is enjoying almost a 70-percent subsidy, 3 years in which to pay projected increases.

In summation, I believe it is a good bill, and I believe it is a fair compromise of the proposals brought before the committee.

I believe I should compliment the committee also in adopting some Republican fiscal responsibility because certainly the bill allots the postal deficit of over $1 billion. On the other hand, after public service it is somewhat less than $600 million. The gain in the next several years of income over the pay proposals of the bill will be, I believe, over $200 million in 1968, over $200 million again in 1969, and a little less than that figure in 1970.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the genetleman from Michigan.

Mr. RUPPE. I thank the gentleman. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, the increases in revenue will more than offset the pay increases, will provide funds for reducing the postal deficit, and will provide additional funds for modernization and for bringing the type of improved postal service that we should and must bring to the American public.

It is unfortunate that the second- and third-class increases were not the same, and that the timing of these increases is not identical, but I believe it is even more regrettable we are not bringing out legislation to take politics out of postmaster appointments. I know many of the Members feel the same way, and I am confident they will join me and other people in eliminating this political injustice from our American scene.

Yes, I do believe one of the great crimes in the postal service is that the postmasters, however qualified and dedicated they are, and other people appointed through politics, deny the regular employees in the Postal Service the opportunity of promotion, the opportunity to move into responsibile and supervisory positions. This unquestionably has reduced the morale and efficiency of the postal service, and certainly should not be tolerated in the future.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANLEY].

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Chairman, there has been a great deal said here today about marriage and divorce, two subjects which are totally unrelated to the issue under deliberation. I, for one, have not exactly been happy with this, I would have preferred separate consideration of rates and pay as the members know, but in all fairness and to be factual, it must be said that the marriage was consummated by my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, through the introduction of the Corbett amendment. The net result here is a bill which I believe is a good one, thanks to the astuteness of Chairman UDALL and Chairman OLSEN and their committees, who I believe have come forth with a bill that suits the purpose in an excellent fashion, so far as pay and rates are concerned, under prevailing circumstances.

I further believe that a great deal of confusion exists with respect to the distinction between classification and pay. And the responsibility of this particular committee—and I refer to the Committee on Compensation—was to come up with a pay bill and not a classification bill. Classification can only be attained by a long-range study. I will say with respect to H.R. 7, and I commend those who sponsored it, because through it they have focused attention upon many inequities which exist in our classification and postal field systems.

It is the intent of the Subcommittee on Position Classification, of which I am the chairman, to go in depth on this matter and eliminate, hopefully, all of the inequities which exist in the classification system and the postal field service. Bear in mind that the efforts of this particular subcommittee were last paralleled about 20 years ago—back in 1945. There has been a great deal of water over the dam in the interim, many aspects of the system are now inadequate and we have a great deal of work to do, and we of the Position Classification Subcommittee intend to do it.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in favor of the enactment of H.R. 7977, a bill to adjust certain postal rates, and for other purposes. In particular, my remarks will be addressed to title II, Federal salary increases.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 7977 represents the recommendations of the majority of the members of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee for postal rates consistent with the request of the President and appropriate to the needs of the public and the Post Office Department, for Federal pay rates that are equitable and due the 2 million Federal employees that carry out the many functions of Government, approved and funded by the Congress.

Both the postal rate and pay provisions of H.R. 7977, as reported to the House, were developed and recommended after long and full hearings by the responsible subcommittees. In my opinion, they represent the best possible proposals that could be brought before the House for its consideration and action on these matters. I believe that the chairman of the full committee and the chairman of the Postal Rate and the Compensation Subcommittees of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee deserve the commendation and thanks of the Congress, the executive branch, the public, and Federal employees for the outstanding jobs they did. As you know, all members of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee were under tremendous pressures from all sides by those interested in the various pay and postal rates under consideration. Yet, with all of those pressures they have brought to the House a bill which we can all be proud of.

The pay provisions contained in the Federal Salary Act of 1967 as contained in title II of the bill before us are deserving of special comment. Many bills were introduced which would have increased the pay of Federal employees. Some would have given increases to all employees, others were designed to increase the classifications of some employees but contained no increases in pay or classification for other employees, and practically all of them were more costly than H.R. 7977.

The Position Classification Subcommittee, of which I am chairman, held full hearings on H.R. 7 and related bills. Over 200 Members of the House introduced companion bills to H.R. 7 which proposed to reclassify only the first four levels of the Postal Field Service and provide other benefits for Postal Field Service employees. H.R. 7 would not have provided any increases for the one and one-half million employees outside the Postal Field Service, and postal employees would not have received equal treatment under the bill. The estimated increase in payroll cost for the Post Office Department alone under H.R. 7 would have been $672 million.

Title II of H.R. 7977 which would provide substantial pay increases to over two million employees will cost $628.8 million for this fiscal year. Under H.R. 7977 all Federal employees whose salaries are fixed by statute except Members of Congress, the President, the Vice President, and members of the Cabinet, will receive pay increases this year. Also this bill will put into effect for the first time the principle of comparability enacted by the Congress in 1962 but never effected by the President or the Congress. The principle of comparability is sound pay policy for the Federal Government. It provides that the pay for Federal jobs shall be fixed at rates comparable to those paid in private business for jobs of the same difficulty and responsibility.

To recruit and retain the highly qualified employees needed to carry on the increasingly complex and technical functions of government and to maintain its high standard of service to the public, the Federal Government has to compete with private business and State and local governments for its personnel. By not bringing its salaries into line with those of its competitors, the Federal Government has been discriminating against itself in recruiting and retaining the best qualified employees. This policy, as any businessman will agree, is penny wise and pound foolish.

To meet its competition for qualified personnel, the Federal Government must pay salaries comparable to those paid by its competitors. The President, the Congress, and the public, agree but we are not doing it. We are not doing it because in the past the cost of bringing Federal salaries up to those of private business, and our other competitors, in any one year has been said to be too high. Title

II of H.R. 7977 overcomes this objection. It provides for full comparability of Federal salaries with those of its competitors in private business in three stages. The first stage provides the increases specified in the bill itself. The second and third stages are to be put into effect by the President in July of 1968 and April of 1969 on the basis of the Bureau of Labor Statistics' studies. Only then will Federal salaries be fully comparable to those in private business.

By the enactment of title II, the Federal Salary Act of 1967, the Congress will carry out its commitment to pay Federal salaries comparable to those in private business, and Federal employees will be assured of fair pay for their jobs without having to plead with and pressure the Congress for them.

Adoption of H.R. 7977, including its provisions for salary comparability, will be a great step forward in the recruitment and retention of high-quality personnel. Its passage will provide fair treatment for Federal employees and an important advance in pay administration.

Mr. Chairman, title II of 7977 includes another significant improvement in salary administration. Section 216 will establish a quadrennial commission on executive, legislative, and judicial salaries. The commission proposed by section 216 is of significance, and a great step forward because it will help overcome the compression of Federal salaries at the top levels.

We all know that the Congress will not fix or allow the salaries of top Federal executives, other than the Cabinet itself, to reach or exceed the rates paid to its members. This policy has resulted in the pay of the top career positions being held at levels which are nowhere nearly comparable with the salaries paid in industry and business for jobs of comparable difficulty and responsibility.

It is the opinion of the committee that salaries paid at all levels in all branches of the Federal Government should honestly reflect the responsibilities of the positions involved. This is understandable, but in terms of its overall responsibilities for the welfare of the Government it is wrong.

The proposed commission would study the entire top salary structure every 4 years and recommend appropriate pay levels and relationships between and among the respective offices and positions and, the appropriate pay relationships between such offices and positions and the top positions subject to the general schedule pay rates. The commission's recommendations would then be subject to consideration and action by the President and the Congress. This procedure will, I feel sure, be acceptable to the taxpayers as a fair and equitable way of meeting the problem of paying their top public servants.

Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to compliment our colleague, Mr. UDALL, chairman of the compensation subcommittee, for his outstanding work in bringing this excellent legislation to the House. I believe the pay provisions of title II of H.R. 7977 are the most significant and important to come before it since the Classification Act and Executive Pay Act of 1949, and the Postal Field Service Classification Act in 1955. It offers each of us the opportunity to vote for a bill which will go down in history as one of the most comprehensive and sound pay bills ever enacted.

I urge every Member to support this outstanding and necessary piece of legislation.

Support for this legislation is further evidenced by the leadership of several postal employee associations per the following telegrams:

WASHINGTON, D.C., *Oct. 9, 1967.*

Hon. JAMES M. HANLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

On behalf of the 200,000 members of the National Association of Letter Carriers we request that you support title 2 of H.R. 7977 providing for postal pay increase when bill comes up for consideration this week.

JEROME J. KEATING,
President.

WASHINGTON, D.C., *October 10, 1967.*

Hon. JAMES M. HANLEY,
Washington, D.C.:

On behalf of more than 320,000 post office clerks I respectfully request and strongly urge your support of an early and substantial salary increase for postal employees. In my judgment Title Two of the bill H.R. 7977 represents the absolute minimum increase required at this time to provide a small measure of justice for these deserving employees. Your support of Title Two when the bill H.R. 7977 is considered by the House on Tuesday will be sincerely appreciated.

E. C. HALLBECK,
President, United Federation of Postal Clerks.

WASHINGTON, D.C., *October 10, 1967.*

Hon. JAMES M. HANLEY,
Washington, D.C.:

The sixty two thousand regular and substitute rural letter carriers of the nation are eagerly anticipating favorable legislative action on pay provisions of H.R. 7977 under consideration on behalf of these dedicated postal employees. May I earnestly seek your support and urge a favorable vote.

CAREY W. HILLIARD,
President, National Rural Letter Carriers Association.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to a former member of our committee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL].

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the arguments being made today pro and con concerning this legislation are the same arguments we have heard over and over again whenever the House has considered legislation to provide for an increase in postage rates or an increase in the salaries of Federal employees.

Frankly, I think we are creating more confusion and misunderstanding concerning the legislation than is necessary. The legislation is quite simple, and if it is considered in its proper perspective it should be noncontroversial.

First, let us talk about the proposed increase in postage rates. No one wants to pay a higher postal rate. We find objections coming from businesses and industries as well as from individual users of the mail.

Higher postal rates are particularly objectionable at this time, when complaints regarding the postal service are greater than they have been for many years. But the cost of providing postal service has gone up. The American people are paying more for all other services and benefits they receive. In addition, there is a great need for modernizing and streamlining the postal system in keeping with this age of modernization. The use of the mails has been increasing by leaps and bounds—at a much more rapid rate than postage rates have increased. In fact, there are 80 billion pieces of mail going through the system this year as compared with 25 billion pieces 30 years ago. In other words, the volume is three times greater. So, if we fail to modernize our postal system, the service will deteriorate to the point that action will be demanded by the American people.

The question, then, seems to be not whether or not our postal system must be modernized, but who should pay for the increases in costs. The Congress in the Postal Policy Act of 1958 answered that question when it was decided that postal revenues should approximately equal the costs of the postal service. In other words, the users of the mail would pay for the service.

Who else is there to pay for this service? The U.S. taxpayers?

Well, if the taxpayers are to pay for the costs, how should the costs be distributed among the taxpayers?

As you know, we are continuously studying more equitable means of distributing the tax load. Obviously the most equitable way of distributing costs among the taxpayers would be on the basis of the use of the mail by the taxpayers—which gets us back to the fact that it is the patrons of the mails who should pay the costs of the service.

You can call postage rates a tax or a payment for services. You can call postal operations a governmental service, a business or a fringe benefit. As the saying goes, a rose by any other name would smell as sweet.

Since the facts of increased costs and need for modernization cannot be changed by changing the name, the increases must be paid for. It is inequitable to pass the cost of today's mail service on to future generations by deficit financing.

Insistence that the postal service be self-supporting is not without precedent in Government operations. The Federal highway program, for example, is paid for out of a trust fund created by an excise tax on gasoline; the services provided to airports by the Federal Aviation Agency are paid for from the aviation fuel tax; and of course, the Federal Housing Administration has always been self-supporting. I feel strongly that whenever possible the beneficiaries of a service should be required to pay for services received.

We will have a deficit this year in the operation of the postal service in the neighborhood of $1.2 billion. This deficit will exist without increasing postal salaries. The bill before us provides a modest increase in postal rates in the amount of $884 million. It is not a perfect bill, but it is the result of a compromise. We can never come to 100 percent agreement on how costs or charges for postal service should be allocated among various classes of mail. But it is still the best bargain in the world today, and this rate increase bill is a step in the right direction toward making the postal service self-supporting.

With regard to the question of salary increases for our Federal employees, many of our colleagues are charging that salary increases will increase the cost of Government, and are asking how we can support this salary increase if we are sincere in our desire to reduce the pending $30 billion Federal deficit for fiscal year 1969.

My response is that it is not, and I repeat, not, salary increase which will increase the cost of Government. It is the cost of living, inflation, that is requiring an increase in pay at this time. It is the adding of new and costly Federal programs, new Federal agencies creating 3 million extra Federal jobs, which has increased the cost of Government.

We can economize by reducing and eliminating some of these wasteful programs and the added number of Federal employees who must administer them. We cannot economize by paying our employees substandard wages.

As a businessman for a number of years before coming to Congress I learned that trying to pay bargain basement wages to employees is false economy. It is bad management to think that Federal employees should work for less than they can get in comparable jobs outside Government. We are going to get exactly what we pay for, either in buying goods or services.

The Congress officially recognized this fact of life in 1962 when it was decided that Federal employees should receive equal pay for equal work, and that it was essential that Federal salaries and wages be comparable with wages paid for similar skills in private industry. That was 5 years ago. We have not yet obtained our objective, but the bill before us today provides for reaching comparability by April of 1969. It provides for no more than what we agreed was essential 5 years ago in pursuit of good and sound personnel management.

I represent a congressional district which includes many thousands of Federal employees. I make no apology for being interested in their welfare. This is consistent with good representative government. I do not feel, however, that my position on this legislation is inconsistent with administrative practices that I would employ if I were in private business or serving as a member of a board of directors in a large private industry.

Many complaints have been made to me regarding the discrimination between the 4½ percent immediate increase provided for classified employees and the 6 percent immediate increase for postal employees. I certainly prefer and insist that all employees be treated alike. At the same time I recognize the give and take that is necessary in arriving at a compromise in the legislative process. I recognize also, that promotions in the postal field service are limited in comparison to promotional opportunities in the classified service. The postal employees have done an excellent job of bringing this to our attention.

I recognize that there are three steps in the salary increases provided in this bill, and that in due course both classified employees and postal employees will receive equal treatment. And I also recognize that we must face the fact that a further increase for classified employees at this time could well result in no increase at all for anyone. Yet this does not justify the discrimination between these two groups.

I repeat, we cannot economize by failing to meet competition in wages and salaries for our own employees. Obviously we cannot economize by cutting salaries, nor can we economize by failing to pass this pending legislation. Indeed, failure to pass this legislation may cost us a great deal more in the long run.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER].

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, we are considering this bill today in entirely different economic conditions from those that prevailed last April, when the administration proposed a 3.8 cents per piece bulk third-class rate. We are in an entirely different economic ballgame. The conditions are radically different. As well as trying to scrutinize rigorously expenditures and appropriations, we have to look very carefully where we can obtain additional revenues. I hope that the committee will accept my amendment to raise the third-class bulk commercial rate to 4.5 cents. This and other increases proposed in the amendment I will offer will bring in an additional $370 million a year, whereas the committee bill, with its 3.8-cent third-class rate, will bring in only $234 million per year. This means that my amendment will produce $136 million of additional revenue beyond the committee bill.

Comment has been made this afternoon that perhaps the committee bill contains a rate which already enables third-class mail to pay its way. Mr. Chairman, I would simply like to point out that when the pay raise goes into effect in this pending legislation, this will drive down the cost coverage for third class as well as other classes of mail. On the 5th of October 1967, the Assistant Postmaster General, Ralph Nicholson, wrote me a letter indicating that cost coverage when including the pay rates in the present bill, and considering ZIP code savings, would be only 91 percent in the Hechler amendment, which sets the rate at 4.5 cents. Mr. Nicholson computed cost coverage for the committee rates on third-class mail at 82 percent, when considering both ZIP code savings and the pay raises contained in the pending legislation.

Mr. Chairman, a businessman who buys a billboard does not expect to get subsidized by the taxpayers when he advertises on that billboard. Why, then, must he be subsidized by the taxpayers of the Nation when he advertises through the use of third-class mail? Is it fair to talk about a tax increase when part of that tax increase would be used to subsidize third-class mail advertising?

Third-class advertisers say they have a $40 billion a year industry. If they have a $40 billion a year industry, they certainly ought to be able to afford to pay their way which means to pay what it costs the Post Office Department and the taxpayers of this Nation to deliver the mail and run the Department.

The annual deficit for third-class mail runs $401 million. My amendment would cut this down by $370 million.

My speech can be best summarized by Herblock's cartoon this morning depicting a meek postal patron buying a stamp. The postal clerk is giving part of the customer's money to a very corpulent character labeled "Junk Mail Users," and the clerk is telling the customer, "Part of what you pay is for what you mail and part is for what he mails to you."

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. I wonder if the gentleman really feels that that is an accurate portrayal of the situation?

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Yes, I do; because I just pointed out to the gentleman from California that cost coverage under my amendment would be only 91 percent. Third-class mail is now subsidized.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to expand my remarks with further comments on postal rates for nonprofit organizations.

Sympathy for a worthy cause is a good old American trait, but it has gone hog-wild in the setting of ridiculously low postal rates for churches, charities and other nonprofit organizations. This is an area which Congress has long regarded as a "sacred cow." In advocating a more rational approach to postal rates, I have been besieged with arguments like the following:

"Would you penalize your poor country churches, struggling to mail out their weekly church bulletins? How can the Little Church in the Wildwood possibly survive if its fund drive is crippled by higher postal rates? Would you slap the crippled children in the face? Are you against the community chest? What about Father Flanagan's Boys Town and the Christmas seals?"

It is high time that Congress take a cold, hard look at the facts. Third-class mail was established as a special category in 1928—39 years ago. In the past 39 years, the rate for bulk mailings of nonprofit organizations have gone up exactly one-fourth cent, from 1 cent per piece to 1¼ cents per piece. In sharp contrast, over the same 39-year period, first-class rates have shot up from 2 cents to 5 cents. First class rates, in other words, have already increased 150 percent during a period when third-class nonprofit rates went up a meager 25 percent. And the administration bill proposes a further increase in first-class rates to 6 cents.

When you consider that nonprofit third-class postal rates have gone up only one-fourth cent in the last 39 years, contrast this with the prices of other items. In 1928, you could buy a pound loaf of bread for 9 cents; today, the cost is about 22 cents. In 1928, you could have a quart of milk delivered to your home for 14 cents; today, the price is doubled to about 28 cents.

HUGE VOLUME INCREASE IN NONPROFIT MAIL

As the postal rates for nonprofit organizations remained extremely low, more and more nonprofit organizations began to take advantage of the situation through larger mailings. These organizations now account for 17 percent of all bulk-rate third-class mail, as compared with only 8 percent in 1952. In the same period, the volume of nonprofit third class mail has shot up 250 percent—from slightly over 800 million pieces to nearly 2.9 billion pieces of bulk-rate nonprofit third-class mail. Now let us contrast that with other third-class mail. During the same period since 1952, commercial bulk-rate third-class mail increased 58 percent, while the total mail volume was going up 52 percent over the same period.

In addition to the volume increase in third-class mail, many new organizations appear to be getting in under the "nonprofit" umbrella. The law defines a "qualified nonprofit organization" as "religious, educational, scientific, philanthropic, agricultural, labor, veterans or fraternal organizations or associations not organized for profit and none of the net income of which inures to the benefit of any private stockholder or individual."

Many nonprofit organizations are now mailing neckties, pins, souvenirs, and other items for which they are seeking monetary contributions. A number of these items are unsolicited. The increased volume of such unsolicited items slows the delivery of mail, and also competes with private enterprise firms forced to pay higher postal rates.

NONPROFIT RATES SHOULD BE 50 PERCENT OF COMMERCIAL RATES

The Postal Policy Act of 1958, which is Public Law 85-426, states:

> Postal rates and fees shall be adjusted from time to time as may be required to produce the amount of revenue approximately equal to the total cost of operating the postal establishment less the amount deemed to be attributable to the performance of public services.

Title II of the 1958 act also prescribed that the minimum charge per piece for third-class matter mailed in bulk by nonprofit organizations should be 50 percent of the charge for commercial mailings. As a result, when the commercial third-class bulk rate was raised from 2 to 2½ cents on July 1, 1960, the rate for other nonprofit organizations went up from 1 to 1¼ cents.

But in 1962, when the rates for commercial mailings were raised in stages to their current bulk-rate level of 2⅞ cents, the bulk rates for third-class mailings remained frozen at 1¼ cents. In addition, the 1962 legislation actually reduced the nonprofit bulk pound rates by about 40 percent. This was accomplished by reducing the pound rate on circulars mailed by nonprofit organizations from 16 cents to 9 cents, and on nonprofit books and catalogs from 10 cents a pound to 6 cents a pound.

I feel strongly that we ought to return to the policy established in the Postal Policy Act of 1958—that rates for nonprofit organizations should be 50 percent of the rates for commercial mailings. That is why my amendment will provide for a bulk rate of 2.25 cents a piece for nonprofit organizations and 4.5 cents a piece for commercial bulk mailings.

Several critics have pointed out that percentagewise the rate increases for nonprofit organizations are steeper than for commercial organizations. But that is only because these rates are initially so low. As Postmaster General O'Brien very fairly pointed out in his testimony on May 9 before the House Postal Rates Subcommittee:

> Even with the proposed increases such organizations would still maintain large and valuable postal preferences. Currently, the public service cost of handling nonprofit mail exceeds $200 million yearly, nearly 40 percent of all public service costs.

ADVISORY PANEL ON POSTAL RATES

In 1965, the Advisory Panel on Postal Rates, headed by former Representative Robert Ramspeck, of Georgia, made some very pertinent observations on postal rates for nonprofit organizations:

> We question whether these subsidies should be intermingled with postal rates. If there is merit in these subsidies, they should be identified and included as direct payments from the budgets on the Federal agencies charged with overseeing public welfare activities. Since rate policy and subsidies are now commingled, the Postmaster General is in a position that compels him to propose rates based on extraordinary welfare considerations as well as on conventional value-of-service and cost criteria. . . . Funds for subsidies should be provided by direct appropriations, to the agency overseeing the welfare activity, rather than as a hidden cost in the postal budget.

Philosophically, the increasing subsidy to the nonprofit organizations has disturbed throughtful students. What it means is that the general taxpayer is forced to pay to make up the postal deficit caused by causes in which he may not believe. "Why should I be taxed to subsidize someone else's religion?" pertinently asked a writer from Pittsburgh. The question well might be raised also whether the Post Office Department, with the prime responsibility of delivering the mail on time—which it increasingly finds difficult to accomplish efficiently and speedily—should also be burdened with extending assistance to all sorts of causes.

Our colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky, Representative **Gene Snyder**, a few months ago gave me a packet of junk mail he had received from one of his constituents, T. A. Hamilton, of 3709 Hillsboro Road, Louisville, Ky. Over a period of several weeks, Mr. Hamilton accumulated packages including three neckties, two throat lozenges, a plastic thermometer, a package of Christmas cards, two packets of name and address labels, a recipe book, a gasoline credit card, numerous catalogs and coupons, and a set of gummed stickers with prayers printed on them.

CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS SHOULD BE FROM THE HEART

All of this material came to Mr. Hamilton unsolicited, and most of it came from nonprofit organizations at the low nonprofit third-class postal rates. Many sent articles of merchandise and asked for a contribution. Mr. Hamilton probably spoke for a great many people when he said:

> I have nothing against charitable organizations. However, I believe that our giving to such organizations should come from the heart, and should not be placed under the pressures of modern-day merchandising.

Under the current rates, it is really fantastic what and how much a nonprofit organization can mail. Up to eight publications can be mailed by these organizations under the nonprofit second-class rates for as little as 1 penny. Furthermore, there is no extra charge for long hauls. For 1 penny, the post office will take these eight publications mailed in New York and deliver them in Hawaii.

If a nonprofit organization wishes to make a fund solicitation through third-class mail, the post office will deliver four fund solicitation letters for only a nickel. These rates have been the same since 1962, although other postal rates were raised in that year.

NEW RATES ON NONPROFIT ADVERTISING

I am pleased to note that the administration bill contains new language to cover nonprofit publications that carry more than 10 percent advertising. There will be a moderately higher rate scaled upward in proportion to the volume of advertising carried by these publications. This is essentially the same postage principle which has long been applied by Congress for commercial publications. Yet under the new proposal, nonprofit organizations would continue to receive huge postage concessions.

As my colleagues are aware, the Internal Revenue Service is looking into the problem of tax exemptions and advertising in nonprofit publications. It is my understanding that Congress will be asked to curb the tax exemptions that permit churches and other charitable organizations to buy up firms which then operate in competition with taxpaying businesses. I believe this is a healthy development, and many prominent church officials have endorsed these moves.

The postal deficit which is caused by third-class mail sent by nonprofit organizations has been rising. The difference between fully allocated costs and the revenues received from nonprofit third-class mailings was $58 million in fiscal year 1963. These costs rose almost 62 percent in 3 years for a total of $94 million in fiscal year 1966, and are now estimated to be running at a rate of about $100 million a year. The deficit caused by second-class nonprofit mailings has risen to about $110 million per year. This means that the annual deficit of second- and third-class nonprofit mailings runs over $200 million annually. Perhaps this could be labeled "How To Fail in Business While Really Trying."

In conclusion, I trust that the Congress will face up to this problem directly and raise the rates on both commercial and nonprofit mailings in the pending legislation.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time, but I will reserve whatever time still remains to our side.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, I have 3 minutes to tell you what is wrong with this bill, and it will be pretty hard to do it in 3 minutes, because it is one of the worst bills ever to hit this Congress. I will limit my comments to two things.

One is, we are getting ready to get every Member of Congress defeated for reelection, because we are raising the first-class rate from 5 cents to 6 cents, and we are going to meddle with Aunt Minnie's mail, and we will get in trouble. We will raise $884 million—or whatever the figure is—for the Post Office Department, and we are not giving the service to the people. That is No. 1.

No. 2 is, we are getting ready to delegate the power of Congress to a commission, and then they can sit and hammer us over the head from now on. We will delegate power to raise the salaries of Congressmen and Justices and executive members of the Government to this little nine-member Commission, three of them appointed by the President and two of them appointed by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. When they get together, what will we have? They will have a majority of five on the Commission.

If I do not say anything else, the Members should remember that, and take this out of the bill or vote against it.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HUNGATE] such time as he may consume.

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 7977.

Without an increase in postal rates, the Post Office deficit this year will be more than $1.2 billion. Even after losses for public services have been deducted from this deficit, the Post Office will spend about $600 million more than postal revenues will bring in.

Under the Postal Policy Act, an imbalance of this magnitude between revenues and expenditures is clearly intolerable. Congress can, if it so chooses, sit back and permit an ever-rising postal deficit to be paid from general tax revenue.

Congress can take this course. But it would be directly contrary to the principles laid down in the Postal Policy Act. It would be unfair to the taxpayers of this Nation. And it would be extremely harmful to the Postal Service.

In addition to reducing the postal deficit, a rate adjustment is essential to improved postal service. A tremendous postal deficit cannot help but stand as a barrier to the appropriation of desperately needed funds for postal modernization.

The Post Office's physical plant is deteriorating badly.

The Post Office's mail processing techniques must be brought up-to-date through the purchase of modern, high-speed mechanized equipment.

And the Post Office's spending on research and engineering must be substantially increased.

As unpleasant as it may be, Congress must face up to the need for an adjustment in postal rates. We must do so not only because of the requirements we ourselves established in the Postal Policy Act, but because to do otherwise would be a disservice to the Nation.

Further, Mr. Chairman, I wholly support the wage increases for Federal employees as set forth in title II of H.R. 7977.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, I view this bill, H.R. 7977, with mixed emotions. I am heartily in favor of the provisions to increase postal rates for second- and third-class mail users who have long been subsidized by the taxpayers. However, I do not believe that first-class mail rates should be increased as first-class mail has been and is paying over 100 percent of its cost. There are those who say the increase is necessary to pay the increased cost of Government salaries, but Government salaries are being increased on the basis of the rising cost of living. If, and when, greater service is given to the taxpayers by the Post Office Department, then, perhaps, a first-class rate increase should be contemplated.

Mr. Chairman, it was my pleasure and honor to serve on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service in the 87th Congress, the Congress which enacted the pledge of comparability—a pledge, I regret to say, that has not been fulfilled.

The pay provisions in this bill have my support, however, they are far from adequate. Until the Federal Government pays its employees salaries in line with those in the private sector, we are going to continue to have difficulties in recruitment and turnover. Much training money is lost when an employee of the Government finds that he must leave the Federal service because he cannot support himself and his family on the salary received.

The time has come to face up to this problem realistically—we must provide better insurance, hospitalization, and leave programs. These are areas in which we can provide benefits for our employees.

The time has come to look at the salaries of our Federal employees on a regional basis. It is a well-known fact that the cost of living varies in different parts of the country, but there is no consideration given to this in the Postal Field Service and the Classified Service of the Federal Government.

The percentage raises provided in the bill before us, as far as a resident of New York City is concerned, will go to pay increased city and State taxes. The average employee will realize very little, if any, increase in his power to purchase for himself. The average Federal paycheck in my congressional district is needed to provide the necessities of life—the average Federal employee cannot afford the luxuries. This same salary would go much farther in the Midwest and the South. Therefore, when we talk about comparability, I believe we should take into consideration the area in which an employee lives and works.

I know there are those who believe that this would be difficult to administer, but it has worked for so-called wage-board employees, and it can be worked out for others.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that the committee and this Congress will in the near future treat our Government employees as first-class citizens and pay them first-class citizens' wages.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I should like to point out that first-class mail now pays for itself. In fact, it presently pays 3 percent above its cost. Under the committee's recommendation it will pay 23.3 percent more than its cost. Similarly, airmail letters and cards, which now pay 5.3 percent above cost, under the committee bill will pay 31.7 percent more than their cost.

These increases in first-class and airmail rates are estimated to yield $575.3 million of the $884 million revenue which H.R. 7977 will produce. This is 65 percent.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that first-class and airmail postage rates should be increased. These categories are already self-supporting and should not bear the burden of the subsidies granted to other classes. If the proposed increase is approved, first-class mail will have increased 50 percent within 4 years.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time on this side.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take 1 additional minute to ask the majority if they can give us any information as to when the Committee will rise tonight.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the full committee advises me, on consultation we had with the Speaker and the minority leader a few minutes ago, that there are several things to consider. No. 1, many Members want to be away on Thursday for Columbus Day festivities, which means that to accommodate them we have to finish by tomorrow night. The gentleman knows there are a great many amendments, so if we are going to meet this deadline, we have to meet tonight. We had contemplated moving that the Committee rise at approximately 7:30, and seeing how many amendments we can handle between now and then.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will read by titles the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 7977

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Postal Revenue and Federal Salary Act of 1967".

TITLE I—POSTAL RATES

FIRST-CLASS MAIL

SEC. 101. (a) Sections 4252 and 4253 of title 39, United States Code, are amended to read as follows:

"§ 4252. Size and weight limits

"The maximum size of first-class mail is one hundred inches in length and girth combined and the maximum weight is seventy pounds.

"§ 4253. Postage rates on first-class mail

"(a) Postage on first-class mail is computed separately on each letter or piece of mail. Except as otherwise provided in this section, the rate of postage on first-class mail weighing thirteen ounces or less is 6 cents for each ounce or fraction of an ounce.

"(b) First-class mail weighing more than thirteen ounces shall be mailed at the rates of postage established by section 4303(d) of this title and shall be entitled to the most expeditious handling and transportation practicable.

"(c) The rate of postage for each single postal card and for each portion of a double postal card, including the cost of manufacture, and for each post card and the initial portion of each double post card conforming to section 4251(c) of this title is 5 cents.

"(d) The rate of postage on business reply mail is the regular rate prescribed in this section, together with an additional charge thereon of 2 cents for each piece weighing two ounces or less and 5 cents for each piece weighing more than two ounces. The postage and charge shall be collected on delivery."

(b) Subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 4169(a)(1) of title 39, United States Code, are amended to read as follows:

"(A) the letter or sound-recorded communication is mailed by the member at an Armed Forces post office established under section 705(d) of this title which is located at a place outside the forty-eight contiguous States of the United States; or

"(B) the member is hospitalized in a facility under the jurisdiction of the Armed Forces of the United States as a result of disease or injury incurred while on active duty; or".

(c) Subparagraph (D) of paragraph (2) of section 4169(a) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(D) the letter or sound-recorded communication is mailed by the member—

"(i) at an Armed Forces post office established under section 705(d) of this title which is located at a place outside the forty-eight contiguous States of the United States; or

"(ii) while hospitalized in a facility under the jurisdiction of the Armed Forces of the United States as a result of disease or injury incurred while in the services with, or in, a unit under operational control of a command of the Armed Forces of the United States; and".

(d) Section 4251(a) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out "and (4)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(4) bills and statements of account, and (5)".

(e) Subsection (d) of section 4251 of title 39, United States Code, relating to the definition of drop letters, is repealed.

(f) The table of contents of chapter 59 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out—

"4252. Weight limit."

and inserting in lieu thereof—

"4252. Size and weight limits.".

AIRMAIL

SEC. 102. (a) Subsections (a) and (b) of section 4303 of title 39, United States Code, are amended to read as follows:

"(a) Except as provided in section 4304 of this title and subsection (b) of this section, the rate of postage on domestic airmail weighing not more than seven ounces is 10 cents for each ounce or fraction thereof.

"(b) The rate of postage on each postal card and post card sent as domestic airmail is 8 cents.".

(b) Subsection (d) of section 4303 of title 39, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(1) The rates of postage on air parcel post are based on the eight zones described in section 4553, or prescribed pursuant to section 4558, of this title in accordance with the following tables:

	"Zones					
	Local 1, 2, and 3	4	5	6	7	8
Not over 1 lb	$0.80	$0.80	$0.80	$0.80	$0.80	$0.80
Over 1 lb. but not over 1½ lbs	.98	1.02	1.07	1.14	1.18	1.24
Over 1½ lbs. but not over 2 lbs	1.16	1.23	1.34	1.47	1.55	1.68
Over 2 lbs. but not over 2½ lbs	1.40	1.48	1.62	1.79	1.91	2.08
Over 2½ lbs. but not over 3 lbs	1.64	1.73	1.90	2.11	2.27	2.48
Over 3 lbs. but not over 3½ lbs	1.88	1.98	2.18	2.43	2.63	2.88
Over 3½ lbs. but not over 4 lbs	2.12	2.23	2.46	2.75	2.99	3.28
Over 4 lbs. but not over 4½ lbs	2.36	2.48	2.74	3.07	3.35	3.68
Over 4½ lbs. but not over 5 lbs	2.60	2.73	3.02	3.39	3.71	4.08."

For each pound or fraction of a pound in excess of five pounds in weight, the additional postage is as follows:

"Zones	Rate
Local and zones 1, 2, and 3	$0.48
Zone 4	.50
Zone 5	.56
Zone 6	.64
Zone 7	.72
Zone 8	.80.";

(2) by deleting paragraph (2); and

(3) by striking out, in paragraph (5), subparagraph (A), (B), and (C) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(A)(i) first-class letter mail (including postal cards and post cards),

"(ii) sound-recorded communications having the character of personal correspondence,

"(iii) parcels of any class of mail not exceeding five pounds in weight and sixty inches in length and girth combined, and

"(iv) second-class publications published once each week or more frequently and featuring principally current news of interest to members of the Armed Forces and the general public,

which are mailed at or addressed to any such Armed Forces post office; and

"(B) parcels of any class of mail exceeding five pounds but not exceeding seventy pounds in weight and not exceeding one hundred inches in length and girth combined, including surface-type official mail, which are mailed at or addressed to any such Armed Forces post office where adequate surface transportation is not available."

(c) Section 4303(f) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out "the Virgin Islands or the Canal Zone" wherever appearing therein and inserting in lieu thereof "or the Virgin Islands".

(d) Section 4301(2) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out the word "eight" and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "7".

SECOND-CASS MAIL PREFERRED RATES

SEC. 103. (a) Section 4358 of title 39, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(a) Except as provided in subsection (b), the rate of postage on publications admitted as second-class mail when addressed for delivery within the county in which they are published and entered is as follows:

"[In cents]

	"Mailed during calendar year 1968	Mailed during calendar year 1969	Mailed after Dec. 31, 1969
Rate per pound	1.3	1.4	1.5
Minimum charge per piece	.2	.2	.2.";

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(d) The rates of postage on publications mailed in accordance with section 4359(a) of this title, of qualified nonprofit organizations, are as follows:

"[In cents]

	"During calendar year 1968	During calendar year 1969	During calendar year 1970	During calendar year 1971	During calendar year 1972	During calendar year 1973 and thereafter
Rate per pound:						
Advertising portion:						
Zones 1 and 2	2.35	2.9	3.45	4.0	4.55	5.1
Zone 3	2.55	3.3	4.05	4.8	5.55	6.3
Zone 4	2.95	4.1	5.25	6.4	7.55	8.7
Zone 5	3.35	4.9	6.45	8.0	9.55	11.1
Zone 6	3.5	5.2	6.9	8.6	10.3	12.0
Zone 7	3.5	5.2	6.9	8.6	10.3	12.0
Zone 8	3.5	5.2	6.9	8.6	10.3	12.0
Nonadvertising portion	1.9	2.0	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.1
Mininum charge per piece	.2	.2	.2	.2	.2	.2

"(e) The postage on classroom publications, mailed in accordance with section 4359(a) of this title, is 60 per centum of the postage computed in accordance with section 4359(b) of this title.

"(f) The postage shall be 4.2 cents per pound on the advertising portion of publications (1) which are mailed for delivery in zones 1 and 2 in accordance with section 4359(a) of this title, (2) which are devoted to promoting the science of agriculture, and (3) when the total number of copies of the publications furnished during any twelve-month period to subscribers residing in rural areas consists of at least 70 per centum of the total number of copies distributed by any means for any purpose.

"(g) In lieu of the minimum charge per piece prescribed by section 4359(b) of this title, the minimum charge per piece for publications (other than publications to which subsections (d) and (e) of this section are applicable), when fewer than five thousand copies are mailed outside the county of publication, is 0.6 cent per piece when mailed during the calendar year 1968, 0.7 cent per piece when mailed during the calendar year 1969, and 0.8 cent per piece when mailed thereafter.

"(h) The publisher of a classroom publication or of a publication of a nonprofit organization, before being entitled to the rates for the publications, shall furnish such proof of qualifications as the Postmaster General prescribes.

"(i) For the purposes of the application of this section with respect to each publication having original entry at an independent incorporated city, an incorporated city which is situated entirely within a county, or which is situated contiguous to one or more counties in the same State, but which is politically independent of such county or counties, shall be considered to be within and a part of the county with which it is principally contiguous.

"(j) As used in this section—

"(1) 'classroom publication' means a religious, educational, or scientific publication entered as second-class mail and designed specifically for use in classrooms or in religious instruction classes;

"(2) 'a publication of a qualified nonprofit organization' means a publication published by and in the interest of one of the following types of organizations or associations if it is not organized for profit and none of its net income inures to the benefit of any private stockholder or individual: Religious, educational, scientific, philanthropic, agricultural, labor, veterans, fraternal, and associations of rural electric cooperatives, and not to exceed one publication published by the official highway or development agency of a State which meets all of the requirements of section 4354 and which contains no advertising;

"(3) 'zones' means the eight zones prescribed in section 4553, or prescribed pursuant to section 4558, of this title."; and

(3) by amending the section heading to read as follows:

"§ 4358. Rates of postage; preferred".

(b) The table of contents of chapter 63 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out—

"4358. Postage rates within county of publication."

and inserting in lieu thereof—

"4358. Rates of postage; preferred.".

SECOND-CLASS MAIL REGULAR RATES

SEC. 104. (a) Section 4359 of title 39, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out subsections (b), (c), (d), and (e) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) Except as otherwise provided in this section and section 4358 of this title, the rates of postage on publications mailed in accordance with subsection (a) are as follows:

"[In cents]

	"Mailed during calendar year 1968	Mailed during calendar year 1969	Mailed on and after Jan. 1, 1970
Rate per pound:			
Advertising portion:			
Zones 1 and 2	4.5	4.8	5.1
Zone 3	5.6	5.9	6.3
Zone 4	7.7	8.2	8.7
Zone 5	9.9	10.5	11.1
Zone 6	12.0	12.8	13.6
Zone 7	12.8	13.7	14.5
Zone 8	15.0	16.0	17.0
Nonadvertising portion	3.0	3.2	3.4
Minimum charge per piece	1.1	1.2	1.3.

"(c) For the purpose of this section and section 4358 of this title, the portion of a publication devoted to advertisements shall include all advertisements inserted in the publication and attached permanently thereto, except such advertisements as are subject to the provisions of section 4656 of this title.

"(d) (1) Publications mailed in accordance with subsection (a), upon request by the publisher or news agent, may be transported by air on a space-available basis, on scheduled United States air carriers at rates fixed and determined by the Civil Aeronautics Board in accordance with section 406 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. 1376). The Postmaster General may authorize the transportation of publications by air pursuant to this subsection only when such transportation does not impede the transportation of airmail, air parcel post, or first-class mail.

"(2) The Postmaster General shall prescribe from time to time charges to be collected for matter transported by air pursuant to this section. The charges—

"(A) shall be in addition to the payment of lawfully required postage;

"(B) may not be adjusted more frequently than once every two years; and

"(C) when prescribed or adjusted, shall equal, as nearly as practicable, the amount by which the allocated cost incurred by the Department for the delivery of such matter by air is in excess of the allocated cost which would have been incurred by the Department had such matter been delivered by surface transportation.

"(e) As used in this section the term 'zones' means the eight zones prescribed in section 4553, or prescribed pursuant to section 4558, of this title."; and

(2) by amending the section heading to read as follows:

"§ 4359. Rates of postage; regular".

(b) The table of contents of chapter 63 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out—

"4359. Postage rates beyond county of publication."

and inserting in lieu thereof—

"4359. Rates of postage; regular.".

(c) Section 4369(a)(4) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out ": Provided, however, That trade publications serving the performing arts need only to furnish such information to the Postmaster General".

SECOND-CLASS TRANSIENT MAIL

SEC. 105. Section 4362 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out "four cents" and inserting in lieu thereof "5 cents".

CONTROLLED CIRCULATION PUBLICATIONS

SEC. 106. Section 4422 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 4422. Rates of postage

"The rates of postage on controlled circulation publications found by the Postmaster General to meet the definition contained in section 4421 of this title when mailed in the manner prescribed by the Postmaster General are as follows:

"[In cents]

	"Mailed during calendar year 1968	Mailed during calendar year 1969	Mailed on and after Jan. 1, 1970
Rate per pound	14.0	14.5	15.0
Minimum charge per piece	1.9	2.9	3.8".

THIRD-CLASS MAIL

SEC. 107. (a) Subsections (a) and (b) of section 4452 of title 39, United States Code, are amended to read as follows:

"(a) Except as otherwise provided in this section, the postage rates of third-class mail are as follows:

"Type of mailing	Rates		Unit
	Mailed prior to Jan. 7, 1968	Mailed on and after Jan. 7, 1968	
	Cents	Cents	
(1) Individual piece	6	6.0	First 2 ounces or fraction thereof.
	2	2.0	Each additional ounce or fraction thereof.
(2) Bulk mailings under subsection (e) of this section of—			
(A) Books and catalogs of 24 pages or more, seeds, cuttings, bulbs, roots, scions and plants.	12	16.0	Each pound or fraction thereof.
(B) Other matter	18	22.0	Do.
(C) Minimum charge of—			
(i) Regular	2⅞	3.8	Per piece.
(ii) Qualified nonprofit organizations	1.25	1.9	Do.

"(b) Matter mailed in bulk under subsection (e) of this secetion is subject to a minimum charge for each piece. The minimum charge for each piece on such matter is the minimum charge prescribed by this section, as applicable, except that the minimum charge is 1.3 cents per piece on such matter mailed on and after January 7, 1968, by qualified nonprofit organizations (1) which are organized for charitable, religious, or general health purposes, and are engaged predominantly in the accomplishment of such purposes, or (2) when such matter consists wholly of solicitations of funds to be used for charitable, religious, or general health purposes.".

(b) Subsection (b) of section 4451 of title 39, United States Code, relating to mailing certain bills and statements of account as third-class mail, is repealed.

SPECIAL RATE FOURTH-CLASS MAIL

SEC. 108. (a) Section 4554 of title 39, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by amending so much of subsection (a) as precedes subparagraph (3) thereof to read as follows:

"(a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, the postage rate is 16 cents for the first two pounds or fraction thereof and 6 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof, except that the rate now or hereafter prescribed for third- fourth-class matter shall apply in every case where such rate is lower than the rate prescribed in this subsection on—

"(1) books, including books issued to supplement other books, consisting wholly of reading matter or reading matter with incidental blank spaces for notations containing no advertising matter other than incidental announcement of books;

"(2) 16-millimeter or narrower width films, and catalogs of such films, except when sent to commercial theaters;";

(2) by striking out in subsection (b)(1) "4 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof and 1 cent for each additional pound or fraction thereof" and inserting in lieu thereof "8 cents for the first two pounds or fraction thereof and 3 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof";

(3) by inserting in subsection (c) "or narrower width" immediately following "16-millimeter"; and

(4) by amending subsection (e) to read as follows:

"(e) Articles may be mailed under this section in quantities of one thousand or more in a single mailing, as defined by the Postmaster General, only in the manner directed by him.".

(b) The section heading of section 4554 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read—

"§ 4554. Books, films, and other materials; preferred rates".

(c) The table of contents of chapter 67 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out—

"4554. Postage rates on books and films."

and inserting in lieu thereof—

"4554. Books, films, and other materials; preferred rates.".

KEYS AND OTHER SMALL ARTICLES

SEC. 109. Subsection (b) of section 4651 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out "6 cents for each two ounces or fraction thereof" and inserting in lieu thereof "14 cents for the first two ounces or fraction thereof, and 7 cents for each additional two ounces or fraction thereof,".

SPECIAL HANDLING SERVICE

SEC. 110. Section 6008 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 6008. Special handling

"Upon payment of a special handling fee, third-class mail and fourth-class mail are entitled to the most expeditious handling and transportation practicable, but such mail is not required to receive the same handling and transportation as airmail.".

SEPARATION BY MAILER OF SECOND-CLASS MAIL

SEC. 111. Section 4363 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 4363. Separation by mailer of second-class mail

"Publishers and news agents shall mail second-class matter in the manner directed by the Postmaster General.".

PRINTING ON SECOND-CLASS COVERS

SEC. 112. Section 4365 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding a new subsection to read as follows:

"(d) In addition to other matter authorized by this section to be contained, enclosed, or inserted in second-class mail, there may be included, in accordance with uniform regulations which the Postmaster General shall prescribe, on the envelopes, wrappers, and other covers in which copies of publications are mailed, messages and notices of a civic or public-service nature, if no charge is made for the inclusion of such messages and notices on such envelopes, wrappers, and covers.".

ADDITIONAL ENTRY POINTS

SEC. 113. Section 4358 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection to read as follows:

"(k) The rates of postage prescribed by subsections (a) and (b) of this section shall apply only to mailings within the county in which the publications have original entry.".

MAIL MATTER FOR BLIND AND OTHER HANDICAPPED PERSONS

SEC. 114. (a) Chapter 69 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out sections 4653 and 4654 thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"§ 4653. Matter for blind and other handicapped persons

"(a) The matter described in subsection (b) (other than matter mailed under section 4654 of this title) may be mailed free of postage, if—

"(1) the matter is for the use of the blind or other persons who cannot use or read conventionally printed material because of a physical impairment;

"(2) no charge, or rental, subscription, or other fee, is required for such matter or a charge, or rental, subscription, or other fee is required for such matter not in excess of the cost thereof;

"(3) the matter may be opened by the Postmaster General for inspection;

"(4) the matter contains no advertising; and

"(5) the matter is mailed subject to size and weight limitations prescribed by the Postmaster General.

"(b) The free mailing privilege provided by subsection (a) is extended to—

"(1) reading matter and musical scores;

"(2) sound reproductions;

"(3) paper, records, tapes, and other material for the production of reading matter, musical scores, or sound reproductions;

"(4) reproducers or parts thereof, for sound reproductions; and

"(5) Braille writers, typewriters, educational or other materials or devices, or parts thereof, used for writing by, or specifically designed or adapted for use of, a blind person or a person having a physical impairment as described in subsection (a)(1) of this section.

"§ 4654. Unsealed letters sent by blind or physically handicapped persons

Unsealed letters sent by a blind person or a person having a physical impairment, as described in section 4653(a)(1) of this title, in raised characters or sightsaving type, or in the form of sound recordings, may be mailed free of postage.

"§ 4655. Markings

"All matter relating to blind or other handicapped persons mailed under section 4653, or section 4654, of this title, shall bear the words 'Free Matter for the Blind or Handicapped', or words to that effect specified by the Postmaser General, in the upper right-hand corner of the address area.".

(b) The table of contents of chapter 69 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out—

"4653. Publications for the blind.

"4654. Reproducers and sound reproduction records for the blind."

and inserting in lieu thereof—

"4653. Matter for blind and other handicapped persons.

"4654. Unsealed letters sent by blind or physically handicapped persons.

"4655. Markings.".

(c) Section 4451(d) of title 39, United States Code, is repealed.

ENCLOSURES MAILED WITH SECOND-CLASS PUBLICATIONS

SEC. 115. Chapter 69 of title 39, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 4556. Enclosure mailed with second-class publications

"Bills or receipts mailed with publications entered as second-class mail, either loose or bound in the publications, and advertising supplements mailed with such publications, shall be charged postage at first-, third-, or fourth-class rates, as appropriate, had such matter been mailed other than with the publications."; and

(2) by adding to the table of contents the following:

"4656. Enclosures mailed with second-class publications.".

MAILING PRIVILEGE OF MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES

SEC. 116. (a) Chapter 57 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 4170. Mailing privilege of members of United States Armed Forces and of friendly foreign nations in the Canal Zone

"(a) For the purposes of sections 4169(a), 4303(d)(5), and 4560 of this title, each post office in the Canal Zone postal service, to the extent that it provides mail service for members of the United States Armed Forces and of friendly foreign nations, shall be considered to be an Armed Forces post office established under section 705(d) of this title.

"(b) The Department of Defense shall reimburse the postal service of the Canal Zone, out of any appropriations or funds available to the Department of Defense, as a necessary expense of the appropriations or funds and of the activities concerned, the equivalent amount of postage due, and sums equal to the expenses incurred by, the postal service of the Canal Zone. as determined by the Governor of the Canal Zone, for matter sent in the mails, and in providing air transportation of mail, under such sections.".

(b) The table of contents of chapter 57 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding—

"4170. Mailing privilege of members of United States Armed Forces and of friendly foreign nations in the Canal Zone."

immediately below—

"4169. Mailing privilege of members of United States Armed Forces and of friendly foreign nations.".

SEC. 117. (a) Chapter 67 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 4560. Air transportation of parcels mailed at or addressed to Armed Forces post offices

"Any parcel, other than a parcel mailed airmail or as air parcel post, not exceeding thirty pounds in weight and sixty inches in length and girth combined, which is mailed at or addressed to any Armed Forces post office established under section 705(d) of this title shall be transported by air on a space-available basis, on scheduled United States air carriers at rates fixed and determined by the Civil Aeronautics Board in accordance with section 406 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. 1376), upon payment, in addition to the regular surface rate of postage, of a special fee to be prescribed by the Postmaster General for such transportation by air. Whenever adequate service by scheduled United States air carriers is not available to provide transportation of mail matter by air in accordance with the foregoing provisions of this section, the transportation of such mail matter may be authorized by aircraft other than scheduled United States air carriers.".

(b) The table of contents of such chapter 67 is amended by inserting at the end thereof—

"4560. Air transportation of parcels mailed at or addressed to Armed Forces post offices.".

SOLICITATIONS IN GUISE OF BILLS OR STATEMENTS OF ACCOUNT

SEC. 118. (a) Section 4001 of title 39, United States Code, relating to nonmailable matter, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) Matter otherwise legally acceptable in the mails which—

"(1) is in the form of, and reasonably could be interpreted or construed as, a bill, invoice, or statement of account due; but

"(2) constitutes, in fact, a solicitation for the order by the addressee of goods or services, or both,

is nonmailable matter, shall not be carried or delivered by mail, and shall be disposed of as the Postmaster General directs, unless such matter bears on its face, in conspicuous and legible type in contrast by typography, layout, or color with other printing on its face, in accordance with regulations which the Postmaster General shall prescribe—

"(A) the following notice: 'This is a solicitation for the order of goods and/or services and not a bill, invoice, or statement of account due. You are not under obligation to make any payments on account of this offer unless you accept this offer.'; or

"(B) in lieu thereof, a notice to the same effect in words which the Postmaster General may prescribe.".

(b) The amendment made by this section shall become effective with respect to matter mailed on or after the ninetieth day following the effective date of this section.

EFFECTIVE DATES

SEC. 119. (a) The first section, sections 101, 102, 105, 107, 108, 109, 110, 114, 116, 117, 118, and this section of this title shall become effective as of the beginning of the first Sunday which occurs after the thirtieth day of following the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) Sections 103, 104, 106, 111, 112, 113, and 115 of this title shall become effective January 7, 1968.

Mr. UDALL (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title I of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute be considered as read, printed in the Record, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POOL

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POOL: On page 13, lines 3 and 4, strike out "Sections 4252 and 4253 of title 39, United States Code, are amended" and insert in lieu thereof "Section 4252 of title 39, United States Code, is amended".

On page 13, line 8, insert double quotation marks after the period.

On page 13, strike out line 9 and all that follows down through the second period in line 4 on page 14.

On page 15, strike out lines 9 to 11, inclusive.

On page 15, line 12, strike out "(f)" and insert in lieu thereof "(e)".

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is the one that reduces first-class postage from the proposed 6 cents back to 5 cents, as it is now. On first-class postage under the present law, the postage received is 103 percent of the cost of handling the first-class mail. This bill will make the rate 123 percent of cost, if we pass the bill as written. My amendment cuts the rate back to the 103-percent figure under present law. I do not think we should sit here and penalize first-class users when they are paying more than cost.

I believe certainly this should be reduced. I hope the House will see fit to adopt the amendment.

This is the best way in the world to get these Post Office boys in line and to get them to quit telling us we cannot change a comma, we cannot do this or do that. The Post Office Department did that all through the hearings in the committee. This will really get them straightened out.

If you want to send it back to the committee to write another bill, that is all right, but put this on in the Committee of the Whole, for goodness sake, even if we do not have a record vote.

I hope the Members will see fit to do this for Aunt Minnie.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty-two Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 304]

Baring
Bates
Blatnik
Bray
Broomfield
Celler
Denney
Dent
Devine
Diggs
Downing
Edwards, Calif.
Everett
Fisher
Flood
Foley
Fountain
Fulton, Tenn.
Green, Oreg.
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Herlong
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Kluczynski
Leggett
Long, Md.
Moorhead
Myers
Pickle
Rarick
Reinecke
Resnick
St. Onge
Sikes
Stratton
Sullivan
Tuck
Utt
White
Whitten
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Wylie

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill, H.R. 7977, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 384 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I am in favor of continuing the existing rate of postage on first-class mail. I hope the Members of the Committee will look at page 20 of the committee report to see the type of mail causing the present deficit. First-class mail is presently paying more than the cost of delivery. It is not causing this deficit, while other classes of mail are paying substantially less than their delivery costs. It is unreasonable to saddle the public with a postal rate increase on first-class letter mail, which will increase the cost coverage to 123 percent, while other classes of mail remain substantially below what it costs the Department to deliver them.

Second-class mail now has a total cost coverage of only 23.3 percent, and even under the proposed legislation, when the rates are fully effective, will be paying only 28.4 percent of its allocated delivery costs.

The same situation exists in the third-class mail category. This class is presently paying 62.9 percent of the cost of handling, and under the bill before us today this will be increased to 82.4 percent of its delivery costs.

Mr. Chairman, it seems unreasonable to increase first-class letter rates until other classes of mail are increased an amount sufficient to cover the costs of delivery.

The bulk of my mail, Mr. Chairman, has been in favor of increasing third-class mail but opposed to increasing the cost of first-class mail. It seems unreasonable to make the users of first-class mail pay more than the cost thereof, and at the same time subsidize all other classes of mail.

Mr. Chairman, I concur with the gentleman from Texas regarding this amendment, which will continue the existing 5-cent rate on first-class letter mail.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Virginia for his support and his statement. As many Members were not here when I introduced my amendment and made by 5-minute talk on the amendment, I would bring to the attention of Members the fact that on page 13 of the report there is shown that first-class mail brings into the Government over $2 billion, and it has been paying 103 percent of cost under the present law. Under the bill before us now, we will be raising the rate to 123 percent of cost. I just do not think it is right to stick first-class users just because we can.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. GROSS to amendment offered by Mr. POOL: On page 13, lines 3 and 4, strike out "Sections 4252 and 4253 of title 39, United States Code, are amended" and insert in lieu thereof "Section 4252 of title 39, United States Code, is amended".

On page 13, line 8, insert double quotation marks after the period.

On page 13, strike out line 9 and all that follows down through the second period in line 4 on page 14.

On page 15, strike out lines 9 to 11, inclusive.

On page 15, line 12, strike out "(f)" and insert in lieu thereof "(e)".

On page 15, strike out line 16 and all that follows down through the colon in line 14 on page 16 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 102 (a) Subsection (d) of section 4303 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out, in paragraph (5), subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:".

On page 17, line 19, strike out, "(c)" and insert in lieu thereof "(b)".

On page 17, strike out line 23 and all that follows down through the period in line 2 on page 18.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POOL], which would strike the increase in the first-class letter rate, but in my opinion, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POOL] does not go far enough.

The amendment I have offered will strike from the committee amendment not only the rate increases on first-class mail—letters and post cards—but also the increases on airmail letters and post cards.

As I said in my remarks earlier this afternoon, an increase in postage rates on first-class mail and airmail at this time is nothing more than the imposition of a stamp tax on the American people.

These are the only two classes of mail that are today paying their own way and actually producing profits to the post office. The rate increases proposed by the committee in these two classes will tax the American people to the tune of $568.1 million per year and produce 64 percent of the total revenue expected from all the rate increases on all classes of mail contained in the bill. If these rate increases are permitted to take effect, first-class mail will be paying 123.3 percent of its cost and airmail will be paying 138.9 percent of its cost—the highest ever since the years of World War II when the entire Post Office Department was actually showing a profit in one of the few times in history.

If we permit these rate increases to take effect, we will have imposed a 50 percent first-class stamp tax increase on the American people in a 4-year period.

I submit that the public, with no organized lobby to fight postal rate increases, is entirely defenseless, in that the Post Office has a complete monopoly in first-class mail. Newspapers, magazines, packages, catalogs, circulars—all matter in the other classes of mail—can all be delivered by other means outside of the postal service. But the letters written by Mr. and Mrs. John Q. Public can only be delivered through the U.S. postal system, and I might point out that there are severe penalties involved for the carriage of letters outside the mails.

It is easy to imagine the philosophy that dictates how the so-called postal deficit should be eliminated in this bill.

It goes something like this: "We've got a monopoly on first-class mail, people have got to use it, this is where the money is, there'll only be a few complaints—no organized resistance, no powerful lobbies trying to keep the cost of mailing a letter down—so let's sock it to them."

Mr. Chairman, there is no more compelling reason why we should here be asked to impose another stamp tax on the American people without first trying to be assured of some economies, than there is to impose a general tax increase without expecting some reductions in spending.

I submit that there are as many, if not more, areas in the sprawling postal system where substantial economies can be made without affecting the service, as there are in other Government departments. We should insist that these economies be effected before we saddle the American people with another stamp tax. If it was right to follow this procedure last week with the President's surtax, it is certainly just as right to follow it this week with the stamp tax.

Let us be consistent and adopt my amendment, and show the American people that we really mean business—that they will not be assessed 20 percent more for using the postal service until or unless there is either a 20-percent reduction in unnecessary expenses or a 20-percent improvement in the mail service.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is with reluctance I rise in opposition to this amendment, but in my personal opinion this is an anti-individual taxpayer amendment, and I will tell the Members why.

I had the honor and responsibility of serving on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service for about 4 years back in the 1950's. I went through some of these rate hearings, and I believe I got a little background from them at that time.

The simple facts are that if we are going to provide an increase in wages for our postal employees—and they need an increase, I am convinced of that—it would be folly to vote for this amendment, which would do away with the majority of the revenue which is going to be used to pay for that increase.

Now I will tell the Members why I believe this is an antitaxpayer amendment.

As to first-class mail, I might say that I am not very impressed with the cost ascertainment system of the Post Office Department. I have gone through that a long time, too.

The only reason why you run a Post Office Department 7 days a week, 24 hours a day, is to deliver first-class mail. If you were just going to deliver second- and third-class mail, you could run it 5 days a week, 8 hours a day, or 40 hours during the week, and it would not make any difference whether it is delivered this week or next. Here is why I think this is an antitaxpayer amendment. Eighty percent of all your first-class mail is business mail. It is put out by the businessman. As a matter of fact, that is a legitimate expense for him. The other 20 percent of first class is taken care of by the 200 million average citizens in the country. When I served on that committee, the average household sent about 13 letters a month. I understand from checking with the committee that it went up to about 20 a month. That is an increase of $2.40 a year. It is that amount for an average household. And let us say there are four in an average household. This amendment would lose $518.4 million worth of revenue.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. Let me finish my statement, and then I will be glad to yield.

Some $518.4 million worth of revenue. Let us say that there are four people in the average household. I would much rather pay it through the postal revenue than through the tax window. It has to be paid somewhere.

Mr. GROSS. Is the gentleman trying to say the businessman will not pass the cost of this increase in mail on to the consumer?

Mr. CEDERBERG. He may. He has to pass it on to everybody else. But we have to look at it from a practical rate point of view. The average man who pays a penny every letter is farther ahead to pay 20 cents a month for his letters than he is on a family of four paying $8 or $10 a year through the tax window. You can take your choice.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HAYS. The gentleman said—and I think I heard him correctly—that an average householder sends 20 letters a month. How do you get $2.40 a year?

Mr. CEDERBERG. Twenty times 12 is 240 and at 1 cent is $2.40.

Mr. HAYS. You are talking about the increase?

Mr. CEDERBERG. Yes, the increase.

Mr. HAYS. I thought you said the total.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I am talking about an increase of $2.40 a household. But if you take it by individuals, the individual, as I read this, with 200 million people in the country, can lose $518 million a year in revenue. That is $2 per individual. If you have 5 in the family, that is $10. If you have a choice, the average taxpayer is much further ahead to pay the increase in the revenue than go through the tax window and let the businessman pay for his mail.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. Yes.

Mr. POOL. You still have not answered the problem when the figures show and we use the Post Office Committee's figures——

Mr. CEDERBERG. That is wrong.

Mr. POOL. You asked me to answer the question. How are you going to explain the 123-percent increase above the cost?

Mr. CEDERBERG. In the first place, I do not believe the 123 percent and I never believed their guess.

Mr. POOL. I know, but that is the payment figure, and the whole bill will be thrown out. That is what we based the bill on.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Where will you raise the revenue if you lose the $158 million to pay the postal employees? You will not raise it on second and third class, and you know it.

Mr. POOL. The post office is giving good service.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Let me tell you. If want to protect the taxpayer, it is better for him to pay it through the stamp window than through the tax window, and do not forget that. The average family will pay $8 or $10 a year through the tax window with this amendment, and he will pay $2.40 a year, and for me that is good business for my constituents.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG] is right. We are making a choice as to whether or not we are going to pay for the operations of the Post Office Department by the use of taxes or by increased rates. That is your choice.

Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion that everyone on this floor today knows that the members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the House of Representatives, under the able leadership of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI], has worked really long and hard on this subject matter. We held hearings for many, many weeks. We had a markup on postal rate part of the bill in the full committee for the period of 15 days.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I challenge anyone who says that this amendment is not completely irresponsible. And, with all due respect to my dear friends who are sponsoring it, the point is that if this amendment were adopted, we would strike from the bill $568 million.

Now, the bill only carries the sum of $884 million.

I have reference to the statement by the gentleman from Indiana to the effect that on this subject we ought to relate the income of the Post Office Department to the expense of its operation. We can do that through the enactment of his bill. We can do this if everyone will bear in mind the fact that 80 percent of the cost of the Post Office Department involves the cost of labor—80 percent of the cost of the Post Office Department is labor. It is my opinion that the people in the Post Office Department are very, very much justified in seeking a pay increase.

Mr. Chairman, this rate increase, of course, will do better than just take care of their pay increase. However, there is another item which I would like for my friends to bear in mind and to bear with me upon its consideration, and that is that we are going to further study this business of "cost ascertainment." I think the cost ascertainment system of the Post Office Department is mislabeled. There really is not an ascertainment. They allocate the cost. Later during the course of the debate I am going to demonstrate the fact that they allocate the cost in an unrealistic manner and that we should really take up a study of the matter in greater depth and determine and demonstrate really what the ascertainment cost of moving pieces of mail represents.

Now, please give me your attention for just one moment on this one point. On a single piece of first-class mail, if it is an ounce or less, it costs 5.3 cents to move it. If it is a postal card, it costs 5.3 cents to move it. We are losing money on moving everything of an ounce or less. We lose money on air mail if it is an ounce or less. We lose money on all of these various categories which have been mentioned—these various classes—first class and air mail rates, which are really highly preferred mail. We should charge them more than the cost involved because of the highly preferential treatment that they receive.

Now, on the other hand, Mr. Chairman, we have a cost-ascertainment system with reference to the cost of moving second- and third-class mail. And, I pledge everyone here—and I know my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Nix], and I know my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Corbett], all agree that we are going to undertake a really exhaustive investigation of the cost of the movement of these classes of mail, including the sorting and distribution of mail in an effort directed toward avoiding a lot of the costs which have been heretofore involved. We are going to review the categories of second- and third-class mail again. But, certainly, with reference to the first-class mail and air mail we must sustain the committee and I ask that this Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union to vote down the amendment which has been offered.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to help the gentleman from Montana, but he would not yield to me. I am for the Pool amendment, and I would like to be for the Gross amendment, and that is hard to be for both, but I believe I have a solution.

If we could consult with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] and the other economy-minded people who thought it was so easy to cut $5 billion out of appropriations and expenditures, and just get them to cut another half-billion out of some place, then we will not have to raise the postal rates, and we can give the increase to the postal employees.

Now, does that not make sense? Is that not a fair proposition?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Pool].

The substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Pool].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments to title I?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CUNNINGHAM

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. Cunningham: On page 28, line 5, insert "(a)" immediately before the word "Upon";
>
> In line 9, strike out the quotation mark and the period at the end of the line;
>
> Insert a new subsection (b) immediately following line 9, to read as follows:
>
> "(b) Upon payment of a special handling fee, publications admitted as second-class mail, published once each week or more frequently, and featuring principally news of interest to the general public, shall be given, upon request by the publisher or news agent, expeditious distribution, dispatch, transit handling, and delivery, commonly referred to as red tag or newspaper treatment. The charge for such special handling is 25 per centum of the postage otherwise applicable.".

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I offer, the so-called red-tag treatment amendment, does nothing more than update postal law relating to second-class news publications so that those who use this class of mail will be required to pay for special handling just as the users of third- and fourth-class mail.

Under present law, section 6008, title 39, United States Code, upon payment of a special handling fee, fourth-class mail is entitled to the most expeditious handling and transportation practicable. In the bill under consideration, we would, in section 110 of title 1, extend this special handling service to the users of third-class mail.

I think, therefore, it is consistent to provide that the users of second-class mail who request and receive special handling of their product, should be obliged to pay for this extra and preferential service. And I emphasize, Mr. Chairman, that under my amendment, this "red tag" treatment would be given only upon the request of the publisher or news agent of the publication and that the charge for such special handling would be 25 percent of the postage otherwise applicable.

Mr. Chairman, in order to better understand the subject with which we are dealing, I include at this point in my remarks a memorandum which details the history of the so-called red-tag treatment which is accorded news publications free of charge at the present time.

In the early days of our Nation, perhaps there was sufficient justification for special and expeditious handling of newspapers and periodicals so that information of general interest could be disseminated swiftly.

However, times have changed, methods of broadcasting news and information have changed, publishing methods have changed, and special handling of second-class publications has proliferated to the point where the taxpayer is shouldering far too great a burden in newspaper subsidies.

The actual dollar value of these subsidies is spelled out in the committee report on this legislation, which I commend to my colleagues' attention. On page 30 of the report we are informed that for 1966 the deficiency attributable to second-class regular rate publications was $236 million. In other terms, the users of this category of mail paid $97.7 million in postage for $334.1 million worth of service.

To quote the committee report on this revenue gap:

> It should be noted that a substantial part of this mail (2nd class regular) receives expedited handling. All newspapers—representing 38 percent of regular rate second-class pieces—receive expedited handling. In addition, news magazines and other time-value publications received the equivalent of "newspaper treatment," without paying any additional charge.

Mr. Chairman, let me cite the rate disparity in another way.

Under this legislation, if passed, first-class mail will be at 123.3 percent of cost coverage; air parcel post will be at 162.4 percent of cost coverage; air mail will be at 138.9 percent of cost coverage; third-class mail will be at 82.4 percent of cost coverage; fourth-class library material—which is more than deserving of a preferred rate—will be at 40.7 percent of cost coverage; and second-class mail will be elevated to a piddling 29 percent of cost coverage. This percentage, incidentally, would be the highest percentage of cost coverage for second-class mail in 41 years. How long, Mr. Chairman, can the general taxpaying public be expected to continue to foot the bill for handling second-class mail?

I submit my amendment is a most modest step toward reducing the revenue gap of second-class mail.

NEWSPAPER HANDLING

Order No. 99, dated January 30, 1924, issued by Postmaster General Harry S. New provided for the expeditious handling of newspapers. Newspapers were described as:

> Publications which are commonly and popularly understood to be newspapers of which the leading and major feature is the dissemination of timely news of interest to the general public, whether published daily or weekly.

The definition did not include "trade papers, periodicals, papers devoted to certain classes, orders, or directed to specific ends."

Publications which could obviously be called newspapers would be circulated principally in the local areas where they were published. Therefore, extensive transportation of large numbers of copies would not be involved.

However, by 1950 a great variety of nationally circulated publications having borderline characteristics of newspapers were receiving newspaper handling. As a result, the instructions issued in connection with readjustment of service order of Postmaster General Jesse M. Donaldson dated April 17, 1950, provided for the discontinuance of newspaper treatment for publications of the second-class other than regular daily and weekly newspapers "of local origin having the characteristics ordinarily recognized as those of a publication devoted to the dissemination of current news of great interest."

The Magazine Publishers' Association, in support of Time, Life, and other news magazines raised such strenuous objections to these instructions that they were modified by means of a letter of Deputy Postmaster General Vincent C. Burke, dated May 18, 1950, so as to provide for the continuance of newspaper handling for publications, other than local daily and weekly newspapers, which had theretofore received such handling. In return, the publishers were to separate into properly labeled "direct" sacks or bundles, according to quantity, all copies for each delivery zone or delivery station or area in cities having more than one delivery unit.

The newspaper-handling question has been given careful study from time to time, but no one has come up with a satisfactory solution. In 1958, the Post Office Committees of Congress considered a proposal to establish a charge for this special service. This proposal was abandoned as impracticable partly, at least, because of the thousands of country newspapers which would object to such a charge.

The mandatory presorting of all second-class publications by ZIP code which is now in effect could lead to all publishers of second-class publications expecting to receive newspaper handling, particularly those who have been told through the years that the refined presorting performed by such publications as Time and Life was one of the justifications for newspaper handling.

The current definition of a newspaper is a restatement of the definition in Order No. 99 of Postmaster General New, and is contained in section 126.4, Postal Manual. It reads:

> Newspapers must be published once each week or more frequently and feature principally news of interest to the general public to be given expeditious distribution, dispatch, transit handling, and delivery, usually referred to as newspaper treatment.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the proposed amendment, which was rejected by the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and which is opposed by the Post Office Department, would impose a 25-percent surcharge on what is commonly referred to as "red tag" treatment, or newspaper treatment.

The amendment, if it became law, would affect hundreds of daily newspapers, thousands of weekly newspapers, and several news magazines and a number of trade journals.

Actually, ZIP code has made red-tag treatment virtually obsolete.

Red tag—and the gentleman's amendment refers to that—originally meant handling in transit, on railway mail cars or in trucks. Now that Post Office rules require presorting of most second-class mail by ZIP code numbers, such en route sorting is no longer necessary. Few, if any publishers, would pay 25-percent extra for service they do not need. Thus, the claim of millions of added revenue is specious.

The National Newspaper Association, a group including 6,700 newspapers in every State, most of them weeklies, wrote on August 25 to members of the postal committee about the "red tag" amendment then pending. The NNA letter explained:

> Our newspapers don't enter the Department's transportation system. They are already sorted, and they go directly out on the routes, at most traveling to and from a Sectional Center already sacked for the routes. In other words, the Post Office does nothing special to our newspapers. The only thing we ask is that they go out on the next available delivery. Letting them lay in the Post-Office would save no money for the Post Office Department, and it makes subscribers furious.

It should be understood, Mr. Chairman, that red-tag treatment is not a one-way street. The Post Office Department imposes a series of requirements that publishers must meet to qualify. These steps, all taken at publisher expense, reduce handling costs of the Post Office Department. The Postal Manual spells out these requirements in section 126.4.

The proposed amendment to impose a surcharge on newspapers and news magazines receiving red-tag treatment is purely punitive legislation, without justification on a cost basis or a potential revenue basis.

The argument that this amendment would bring revenue to the Post Office Department is purely a specious argument and in my opinion has no merit.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment is defeated.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to join my colleague in opposition to the amendment and to emphasize particularly the point that he last made.

This amendment might be appealing to one who thinks or has the understanding that it would bring in substantial revenue to the Post Office Department. But you have to understand what red-tag treatment is to understand that the point that the gentleman from Pennsylvania made is absolutely correct. This is the system that grew up in post offices all over this country to provide that the papers and magazines would get early treament behind first class, which by law must move at high priority, because newspapers and magazines which, by the very nature of the rates that we charge them, perform a great public service. The demand of the American public is that they get their weekly newspaper that may be published on Thursday evening in the first mail on Friday. In order to accommodate that demand, post offices all over the country, without direction from the Postmaster General or from Washington, started putting red tags on the newspaper bundles or the bags and giving them what has come to be known as the red-tag treatment.

Mr. Chairman, I tell you that the American public today is still demanding red-tag treatment. It is not the publisher who is anxious to get that newspaper as quickly as it can be delivered to him after it is delivered to the post office. Thus the American public wants the red-tag treatment, but the publisher is not willing to pay for it.

So the point my colleague from Philadelphia last made, that this amendment will not bring in the revenue which you might think by computing the surcharge on the publications, but will rather leave the choice to the postmaster either not to give the service that he has been giving or to go ahead and do it in violation of some amendment that we might adopt here, is valid. The American public will expect their newspapers to be delivered to them as quickly as they could be after they receive their first-class mail.

For instance, when the Mount Olive, N.C., Tribune delivers its copies to the Mount Olive Post Office, they are already sorted and bundled to the various routes, post offices, and sectional centers to which they are addressed. The local postal employees dispatch these bundles and bags to their destination on the next mail transportation. What else would they do? There would be no point in holding this mail until later, taking up space in the post office.

For the Mount Olive Tribune, then, and virtually all the newspapers in the Nation, this so-called expedited or red-tag handling is simply moving the mails promptly and efficiently, in due course.

It is true that a few publications having nationwide distribution and entering at major post offices request and receive handling more demanding of postal facilities than that of the Mount Olive Tribune. But in terms of the total number of news publications entering the mails, these latter publications are in a small minority.

Further, the advent of ZIP code and sectional center handling make this expedited handling less and less important. In the days of railway post offices and highway post offices, publications were actually sorted while in transit. The so-called red-tag treatment really meant something. But now these same mailers are required to sort their own copies, before submitting them to the post office. At the same time, in-transit handling is being phased out of postal operations. Hence, "newspaper treatment" has progressively less meaning.

For these reasons newspapers tell me that they would not request red-tag handling—that in fact they do not ask for it now, and do not consider the term to have any real substance. They surely question whether it has sufficient meaning to be the subject of a special rate or surcharge.

It would be something akin to a surcharge on airline tickets for safe handling, or on telephone rates for courteous handling. The airlines offer students and servicemen special rates, for good and sufficient reasons. Would it make sense to add on a 25-percent surcharge for safe handling? Safe handling is presumed. It is a sine qua non of air transportation. But, if there were such a surcharge and a passenger declined to pay for this special service, and he were injured or killed, the airline could, and no doubt would, beg off on the grounds that he could not expect safe handling if he did not pay the charge.

This is precisely the concern of newspapers when they hear of the red-tag surcharge. Buying it would not mean anything to them. But their not buying would surely become an excuse on the part of the post office for any slow delivery.

This is no basis on which to ground a postal charge. As a revenue source it would mean very little. If all second class publications eligible were to request and pay for the handling, it would bring in an estimated $10 million. But this makes a most unrealistic assumption. In fact, very few would request it, and the income would, I think, be negligible.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. I support the gentleman in opposition to this amendment. The business of postal ratemaking is a complicated business. I think we could make a pretty good case that we ought to come to the floor with a closed rule, as the Ways and Means Committee does, but we have not. We are here with an open rule. If we start tinkering with a part of this rate structure, we shall have to go back and adjust another part of the rate structure. I hope the Committee will support the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service in the sound decision that was made in this regard and vote down the pending amendment.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. Regardless of the disposition of this amendment, there is one thing I believe all Members ought to keep in mind. Unlike the attitude which the gentleman from Arizona takes, I point out that there is nothing sacred about this bill. In fact, the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Montana, brought a bill into the full committee, and then they marched down the hill on practically every item in that bill. If they could do that in the committee, completely repudiate their own work, I see no reason why we cannot improve this bill on the floor.

The gentleman from Arizona naturally has to hold the position of the committee. If he had only been as effective in committee in keeping the rate and the pay bills separate, I would be supporting him at this point.

But there is not any section of this bill that I think is too sacred to be subject to an honest amendment. We could dabble—if we want to use that word—with any part of this rate structure, and if it is in a constructive fashion it should not automatically be rejected on the grounds of protecting this dubious package.

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to remind the gentleman from Arizona, in regard to the remarks he just made about each change affecting the bill, to the effect that we should go back if we make any changes and consider earlier changes in the bill, that this was exactly what several of us tried to get done within the committee when we were considering it, and it was exactly what the majority in the committee refused to allow us to do.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I think we spent 18 markup sessions on this bill. I have never had a bill of this size where this much time was spent on it. I would like to have spent three months to go back and perfect it. I regret that time ran out on us. The truth is, there would not be a rate or a pay bill on this floor today if some action was not taken to get this on the floor.

I do not say the bill is sacred. I say that Members who are not familiar with the content, and who are not familiar with the effect one part of this has on another part, ought to be pretty careful about taking amendments simply because some amendment is offered on the assumption that no damage will be done to the bill because of them.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, the amendments offered as constructive amendments ought not to be rejected per se, simply because they are amendments, in order to preserve the package.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I supported the open rule so we could offer amendments.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I would say the subcommittee did approve this, and it was the full committee that by a very narrow margin defeated this. The subcommittee spent 8 weeks on this. When we went to the full committee, where they had not heard the testimony, they defeated this. I think we are consistent in trying to get it back in.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I was going to make the same point the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] did, that was in the bill in the subcommittee and was knocked out in the full committee. This is a good amendment, I believe, and I will support it.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I will repeat, I am on my feet to support the honest principle of offering amendments, and I hope we will have a chance to offer them and have them considered, and not just have them rejected per se.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the necessary number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to hit at the admonition of the gentleman from Arizona that we, in offering one amendment or amending one phase of the bill, will adversely affect another phase of it. I would like to inquire, before I offer an amendment, why airmail rates will be increased in view of the fact that airplanes are used to carry first-class mail, and trains are no longer being used or are being gradually phased out. If airmail is being carried the same way as first-class mail is being carried, why should airmail rates be increased?

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, airmail is being increased because it is top-priority preferred mail. But, as the gentleman has related, we are moving first-class mail more and more by air. We are also moving it more and more by truck. Of course, this is because we have experienced a period in American history where 20 years ago there were 10,000 passenger trains every day running in America, but today there are not even 900 passenger trains every day running in America.

We are having to make a transition. As a result of that transition, first-class mail is going by air as well as by trucks. We look forward to the day, within about 2 years, when all mail, first-class and airmail, will go by the fastest method available, and we will eliminate the distinction and will have only one first-class preferred mail, and we will not have airmail any more. We will have a new rate coming about 1969, and that new rate will take care of both first-class and airmail. It will all move the same way, but that has to be another bill in 1969.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, is there any reason then why, in view of the gentleman's explanation, there should be an increase in airmail rates until 1969?

Mr. OLSEN. There has to be now.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Until 1969?

Mr. OLSEN. There has to be, perhaps even until 1970.

Please bear with me. We do not have the option in the Post Office Department of going out to get bids as to how to move the mail with the airlines. When we move the mail with the airlines we have to go to the Civil Aeronautics Board. We have to go there to get our rates set. We do not know what we can get as to rates, or that we can get the rate we want.

In the opinion of some of us, airmail ought to be moving a lot cheaper, but that is not our election. We cannot do that.

I hope that between now and 1969 the Post Office Department will have the power to go out and get competitive bids from the airlines. Then we will move the mail cheaper than we are moving it today. That is the reason why we have to ask for 10 cents. We want to do it cheaper. When there is authority to get bids, then we will move it cheaper. I predict that we will.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I believe a better answer with respect to the increase in the airmail rate is that it is a good, easy place to get the money. There is not any great big lobby down here trying to protect the individual user of airmail and first-class mail, the common garden variety citizen, who is getting socked and socked good. That is the real answer.

It will be quite a day in the history of the country when we will put all of this country on the same level of mail delivery, when we are going to deliver it by plane to the crossroads town in Montana just as we deliver it to the capital city of Montana. That is going to be a great day in the history of this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the distinguished gentleman from Montana, the chairman of the subcommittee, if he will provide some legislative history in reference to the effects of the language on page 31 entitled "Enclosures Mailed With Second-Class Publications."

I have received an inquiry from one of the fine newspapers in my district, which happens to be the oldest newspaper in the United States west of the Alleghenies, the Chillicothe Gazette, editor of which is Robert E. Schaefer.

They raise the question that this provision jeopardizes the basic concept of second-class mail for newspapers.

The publisher says:

> Advertising has for a long time been an accepted component of second-class publications. The advertising supplement provision of the rate bill would change this concept.

Would the gentleman elaborate on that?

Mr. OLSEN. There has been for a long time an established regulation with the Post Office Department for them actually to refuse the mailing of advertising supplements that are unrelated to the newspaper. However, the Post Office Department has not been enforcing those regulations.

On the basis of those long-time standards, this particular provision is in the committee bill. It is not that there would be any prohibition against the moving of supplements in their second-class matter, but that they would have to pay a third-class rate, a minimum of 3.8 cents. They would have to pay that instead of the second-class rate on that insert.

Getting back to the particular inquiry, what is an insert? An insert is something that is unrelated to the newspaper, in that it is not consecutively numbered by pages with the newspaper.

Mr. HARSHA. I understand that.

Mr. OLSEN. Or that it is not printed in the plant of the newspaper.

Mr. HARSHA. This insert could also have certain news value in addition, could it not?

Mr. OLSEN. You have a point. If it has news value or editorial value as part and parcel of the newspaper, it is not a supplement.

Mr. HARSHA. Let us assume that it has editorial and news value but it is not part and parcel of the newspaper in that it is not consecutively numbered, as you point out, but it still has news and editorial value.

Mr. OLSEN. It would not be within this prohibition or not be within the new rate structure. It would travel with the regular cent.

Mr. HARSHA. He also raises the question that there appear to be no guidelines for what would be an advertising supplement. Secondly, he says who would determine this issue as to what is or is not a proper supplement.

Mr. OLSEN. The Post Office Department has determined it in the past. While they have not enforced it, they have determined it. Now, if you will look at pages 46 and 47 of the report, when we get to the bottom of page 46 it says:

> During the course of the hearings, the committee received many exhibits of advertising supplements which were mailed with publications. In the opinion of the committee, it is doubtful whether some of these advertising supplements qualified under the regulations. Some did not have the imprint, "Supplement to", others appeared to be independent "publications," circulars, catalogs, or not germane to the issue.

Mr. HARSHA. I thank the gentleman.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HECHLER OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia: On page 23, line 14, strike out the double quotation marks, the semicolon, and the word "and".
>
> On page 23, immediately following line 14, insert the following:
>
> "(f) In addition to the rates of postage otherwise prescribed by this section, there shall be a charge of 0.3 cents per copy, when more than 500,000 copies per issue of any publication are mailed at the rates prescribed by this section, payable only on—
>
> "(1) each copy in excess of 500,000 copies per issue mailed at the original point of entry; and
>
> "(2) each copy mailed at other than the original point of entry; and ".

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, first I will indicate what this amendment does not cover. This amendment does not cover third-class mail. I will be offering an amendment a little bit later to raise the rate to 4.5 cents a piece on bulk commercial third-class mail.

Many of my friends have importuned me to take a keener interest in raising second-class rates. I have yielded to those many requests and decided to introduce this amendment, which provides a surcharge of 0.3 cent per copy on magazines with circulations of over 500,000. My study indicates that there are some 46 publications with more than a 500,000-per-issue circulation through that would be paying this very modest surcharge. That means that if the circulation were 500,001, the payment would be made only for the one copy over the 500,000, since the first 500,000 copies are exempted. On the average, each of these 46 publications would be paying about $120,000 more, but this payment would range from a few dollars for those magazines that circulate only a few copies over 500,000 through the mails to something over $900,000 for Life magazine, which has the largest total number of pieces mailed annually. This, of course, will increase the cost coverage provided by the second-class section of the bill, which I think is a point that many critics of the present rate structure and the committee rate structure have called attention to. In addition to that, it would bring in more revenue for the Government at a time when we sorely need revenue.

Without my amendment, cost coverage for regular rate publications would move over a 3-year period from the present 29.3 percent to 36.2 percent. The addition of this surcharge would raise this 36.2-percent cost coverage to 37.9 percent. This is an improvement, but still represents a big cost concession to second-class mailers.

In 1962, the Congress provided a lower postage rate for publications with less than 5,000 circulation outside of county. The pending legislation continues a lower rate for such publications. I agree with the principle that publications with small circulations are less able to pay. I also agree with the principle that publications with large circulations through the mail are better able to pay. And I believe that the very large deficiency in postage paid by second-class mailers requires that this class as a whole should pay more than it is now paying.

Mr. Chairman, I would estimate that my amendment would bring in about $5.5 million in additional revenue. The amendment would affect the following magazines, according to my calculations: American Home, Argosy, Better Homes and Gardens, Business Week, Changing Times, Children's Digest, Co-Ed, Ebony, Esquire, Farm Journal, Field and Stream, Flower and Garden, Glamour, Good Housekeeping, Holiday, House Beautiful, House and Garden, Humpty Dumpty, Ingenue, Jack and Jill, Ladies Home Journal, Life, Look, McCall's, Mechanix Illustrated, Nation's Business, Newsweek, Outdoor Life, Parent's Magazine, Playboy, Popular Mechanics, Popular Science Monthly, Reader's Digest, Redbook Magazine, Saturday Evening Post, Sport, Sports Afield, Sports Illustrated, Successful Farming, Sunset, Time, True, True Story, TV Guide, U.S. News & World Report, and Workbasket.

It would not throw any of these publications out of business. All of these publications can afford to absorb this very modest surcharge. I do not believe that this amendment is in any way discriminatory. Many of these publications receive very large subsidies from the Federal Treasury already.

Mr. Chairman, for all of these reasons, I urge that this amendment be given favorable consideration by the Committee.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this has been a field that I have supported. I have supported this problem of a surtax on the expeditious handling of second-class mail. But I have become convinced that we should not impose this charge at this time.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. NIX], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POOL], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT], as well as myself, have all agreed that this is a field that we have got to exhaustively study as to what we should be doing about the expeditious handling of second- and third-class mail.

I feel we ought to go along with this rate increase at this time and that then we ought to go on with a study of it and come back to this House next year with a recommendation that would be more equitable than we can possibly do at this time.

For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me at that point?

Mr. OLSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that the gentleman's opposition to the amendment is sound. The thrust of this amendment is really to the effect that we are going to penalize magazines which are big. In other words, if you have more than 500,000 circulation, we will penalize you; we will penalize you whether you are on the brink of bankruptcy, as some magazines are at this time, or whether you are the Reader's Digest, or Life, or Look, and making money. This is an unsound way to go about it.

Mr. Chairman, the committee considered this question rather carefully. I agree with the gentleman from Montana that the subject needs further study. But, to simply draw an arbitrary line and say that we will penalize the large-circulation magazines, in my opinion would be unwise.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Why do you not raise the rate across the board on all of them?

Mr. OLSEN. We have. We have raised their rates about 23 percent in this bill. Now, if you will bear with me for just one moment, for instance in the case of the Atlantic Monthly, that magazine has not made a profit until the last year for the last ten years. If we raised the rate much more, we would put it out of business.

There are other magazines that we would, perhaps, put out of business if we raised this second-class rate too much.

We would like to study this problem at length and in depth and not be unfair to the public and certainly not be unfair to the mailers themselves.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. OLSEN. I yield further to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] makes a very valid point. There will be amendments offered, I am told, to increase the rates on magazines and newspapers by some rather large amount. Therefore, if you think that the committee has not gone far enough with reference to magazines and newspapers, I say the fair way is to hit them all who mail only several copies, up to 10 million copies, but not pick on just the big ones, because out of the operations of the prosperous ones comes 52 percent of all the money that goes to Uncle Sam in this field anyway.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. OLSEN. I yield further to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Does the gentleman feel that the Federal Government owes any obligation to carry this merchandise—that is what it amounts to—or magazines for these people at a loss? Why should we do that?

Mr. OLSEN. I agree with the gentleman that we should not carry them at a loss, but this has been an experience in this country for about some 200 years, to encourage printed material as a policy of encouraging the democracy that we need this printed material.

Now, I maintain, as I believe the gentleman would, that inasmuch as we have radio and television that we ought to review this thing, and that is exactly what I propose to do. I do not propose to do it in this rate bill. I believe we ought to have a review of the specific problem on whether or not we are going on and continue the subsidy on second-class mail, and we should not do it just in this rate bill.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

This amendment would get more money out of the second-class users of the mails, the publishers, who are really being subsidized by literally millions of dollars by the American taxpayers.

I was hopeful that my "red-tag treatment" amendment would have passed. I did not insist upon a division but I wanted to lay some groundwork having to do with the big steal that is taking place in this country today by the publishers of second-class mail. There is where the big steal is. There is where the big mail robbery is taking place.

So, Mr. Chairman, I can support the gentleman's amendment because at least it gets a few more pennies out of them, and adding all of it together we might get a few million dollars more out of them.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I would ask the gentleman, what are the items that fall into the category of second-class mail besides magazines?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Newspapers.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Newspapers and magazines.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. In this particular section of the bill.

Mr. ABERNETHY. How much loss is the Federal Government incurring annually on second-class mail?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Right now on second-class mail I do not know the percentage.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. If the gentleman would yield, about $400 million.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Yes, about $400 million. It is a tremendous sum.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Indeed it is, if it is $400 million.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. It is said that second class is going to be given a 23-percent increase in rates in this bill. That is true, but it is 23 percent of what? Twenty-three percent of a dollar is one thing, and 23 percent of a penny is another thing. The rates are so low now that 23 percent means very little to these huge publishers. What I am trying to do is to get some more money out of these big publications that are getting this first-class, privileged treatment at these low, second-class rates. I do not know how anybody can be opposed to that.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. I would state to the gentleman in the well that the deficit on second-class mail now is $416 million.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. That is a sizable sum of money. I do not know what the proposed amendment would bring in, but I believe we ought to at least get as much out of them as we can, because they have such a strong lobby, and they have lobbied on this section more than any other section I know of. And that, I am sorry to say, is what happened between the time the subcommittee passed the red-tag treatment amendment, and when the subcommittee bill came before the full committee.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. I would like to say this: I certainly feel Congress should have to do something to reduce the tremendous deficit connected with the second-class mail, that is, the margin of deficit; it is more than half of the total deficit in the postal service. But this is the wrong way to do it, because we are penalizing the big publishers by this amendment; that is not right, and that is not equitable.

So, Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment, although I do support the idea of increasing rates for second-class mail users.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. This is a compromise, I might say to the gentleman. I gave the Members an opportunity to go along with the red-tag treatment amendment, but because of the small papers involved I presume the Members felt they should oppose it.

This amendment eliminates the small publications. It is at least a beginning.

This is a start. Maybe then we can build from this start.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would say I certainly agree with what the gentleman from Nebraska just said, and in response to the gentleman from Arizona who said that this was just picking on the big boys, I would say that this is the premise under which the Government operates with the graduated income tax over the years.

It seems to me to be consistent with the premise that we have been operating on in this connection.

I think the time that we should subsidize the big boys has long since passed and they ought to be paying their own way.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I appreciate the support of the gentleman from Kentucky and also the gentleman from Nebraska.

I certainly agree that this is a principle under which the graduated income tax operates. We are not penalizing bigness. On the other hand, what we are doing is protecting those smaller magazines which otherwise would be driven out of business.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Hechler].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Udall), there were—ayes 98, noes 50.

So the amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DERWINSKI

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. Derwinski: On page 20, line 24, strike out "and associations of rural electric cooperatives,".

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I am only going to take a minute, since the ease with which the last amendment was passed would lead me to believe that any amendment to increase revenues should automatically be adopted. So I am almost inclined to ask for just a repeat vote and go on my way.

But, before I make that point, the thing to keep in mind is that we have now seen dramatic evidence of the fact that the only logical amendment to offer at any point in this bill is to strike out the enacting clause and send it back to the committee.

We had our dear friend, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. Udall], to point out that any amendments that are not based on intimate knowledge of the rate structure should be rejected.

In trying to answer the Hechler amendment, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. Olsen] said that they did not know enough about the amendment in the second-class rate structure and they were going to have to study it.

So here we have the chairman of the subcommittee admitting on two occasions during this debate that his subcommittee does not have enough knowledge of this basic subject. Can you imagine the chairman of any other subcommittee or the chairman of any standing committee coming down and making that admission? It would seem to me we have made an absolute case in bringing out the sheer chaos in this bill. I have a little amendment which is intended to help eliminate some of the chaos.

Back at the time of the last rate bill someone slipped a gimmick into the bill giving rural electric cooperatives the same preferred second-class rate that great organizations such as the Cancer Society and religious groups receive. I am sure that despite any affection any of you may have for rural electric cooperatives, they certainly do not deserve the same mail subsidy which the Cancer Society, the American Legion, the Catholic Church, any Protestant denomination or any other proper organization you may think of receives. So all my amendment would do is to strike from the definition of the second-class nonprofit category rural electric cooperatives.

I do not really know how much revenue this will raise, but it will raise some revenue. Therefore, it ought to be accepted on its merits, plus, I would think you would want to have a distinction between religious, fraternal, and patriotic groups and rural electric cooperatives.

So I hope my amendment will be accepted.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. The gentleman might also wish to point out to the Members of the House who may not recall the fact that the rural electric co-ops get Government money at 2 percent. They already get a great big Government subsidy without this additional subsidy in the way of preferred postal rates.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I would have mentioned that except we are discussing postal rates, and that subject alone is so confusing that to discuss interest rates that the co-ops pay would merely add to mass confusion. As I have said, this is a revenue-raising amendment. It would straighten out an innocent mistake in the past rate bill, and I would hope that it could be adopted with due dispatch.

Mr. DOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DOW. With regard to rural electric co-ops, as a member of the Committee on Agriculture I would like to point out that this year we went through a siege in that committee in which we discussed the proposal to extend credit facilities for the rural electric co-ops. At the end of the discussion, it came to nothing. It seems to me that the rural electric co-ops have had severe treatment at the hands of the Congress this year, and the gentleman's amendment would simply add insult to injury.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Oh, no. My amendment would merely assure that the rural electric co-ops are not confused with the Cancer Society, church groups, patriotic organizations, and legitimate not-for-profit organizations. I certainly would not think of abusing the poor taxpayer. That would be the furthest thought from my mind. Since the amendment would raise revenue, and since the chairman of the subcommittee has admitted that we do not have answers to this entire section, if you would accept my amendment, we could proceed with dispatch.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I do not have to take long to tell you that this particular section permits a preferred rate for the Eagles, the Elks, the Masonic lodges, and the Knights of Columbus as well as educational, scientific, philanthropic, and agricultural organizations. It does provide this exceptional rate for rural electric co-ops, too. But we are not dealing with that subject tonight. We are not dealing with that subject in this bill. We are trying to raise rates. We are not trying to make distinctions between people in a class.

I think that probably the Committee ought to take up the subject of distinguishing between people or between groups in a different class or make differences within a class. But that is not what we are attempting to do at this time. I think that rural electric co-ops should continue to have the same preferred rate as other fraternal organizations until we can review the whole class. We cannot do that in relation to this bill at this time.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DERWINSKI. You could still review that whole class even after my amendment is accepted.

Mr. OLSEN. No; I do not think we can, and I do not think the amendment ought to be accepted. I do not think we ought to do anything about this section of the bill until we take up the whole of that section and make distinctions at another time.

I hope that the amendment is defeated.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I think this amendment is very much out of place.

It is scarcely wise to suggest that we ought to put a special burden on the rural electric cooperatives across the country at the very moment when the farmers of the country—those who are sharing least in whatever prosperity we have today, and for whom the rural electrification cooperatives over the years have fought to obtain the benefits of electricity and modern mechanization for farmers in upstate New York, and elsewhere, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. Dow] mentioned so eloquently a moment ago—are struggling to try to keep their heads above water. We have had dozens of Members of the House who have petitioned the Secretary of Agriculture in recent weeks to help the farmer. Now we are going to single our farmers out for special punishment? This amendment would take it out of the hides of our farmers by increasing the rates for even the small publications of the rural electric cooperatives that have tried so hard to help these farmers.

I think the amendment ought to be overwhelmingly defeated.

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question of the gentleman from Illinois. Would he include SNCC, also, in taking any exemptions from them?

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I certainly would think they do not qualify as a nonprofit organization.

Mr. CABELL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DERWINSKI. May I point out to the distinguished and brilliant and eloquent gentleman from New York this.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois if he wants me to yield to him.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman being perfectly logical when he said we should not take this one iota of postage out of the hides of the cooperatives, what about the taxpayers of the country? The gentleman did not shed a tear over that.

Mr. STRATTON. I do not think the gentleman understands farmers or farm cooperatives, and I think other Members of the House do, and I think they will vote down his amendment.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DERWINSKI) there were—ayes 51, noes 90.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HECHLER OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia: On page 24, strike out line 15 and all that follows down through the second period in line 14 on page 25, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"THIRD-CLASS MAIL

"SEC. 107. (a) (1) Subsections (a) and (b) of section 4452 of title 39, United States Code, are amended to read as follows:

"'(a) Except as otherwise provided in this section, the postage rates on third-class mail are as follows:

"'Type of mailing	Rates		Unit
	Mailed prior to Jan. 7, 1968 (cents)	Mailed on and after Jan. 7, 1968 (cents)	
(1) Individual piece	5 2	6.0 2.0	First 2 ounces or fraction thereof. Each additional ounce or fraction thereof.
(2) Bulk mailings under subsection (e) of this section of—			
(A) Books and catalogs of 24 pages or more, seeds, cuttings, bulbs, roots, scions and plants.	12	18.0	Each pound or fraction thereof.
(B) Other matter	18	24.0	Do.
(C) Minimum charge of—			
(i) Regular	2⅞	4.5	Per piece.
(ii) Qualified nonprofit organizations	1.25	2.25	Do.

"'(b) Matter mailed in bulk under subsection (e) of this section is subject to a minimum charge for each piece. The minimum charge for each piece on such matter is the minimum charge prescribed by this section, as applicable.'.

"(2) Subsection (e) of section 4452 of title 39, United States Code, prescribing the annual permit fee for third-class bulk mailings, is amended by striking out '$30' and inserting in lieu thereof '$40'."

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The **CHAIRMAN.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a motion?

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield tc the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT) having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7977) to adjust certain postage rates, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill, H.R. 7977, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

JUSTICE BY CONGRESSMAN HENRY B. GONZALEZ

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an address by the Honorable HENRY B. GONZALEZ.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, last Friday evening, October 6, my colleague, HENRY B. GONZALEZ, of Texas, was the principal speaker at the annual meeting of the Urban League in the city of Gary, Ind. The following are excerpts from his speech to the citizens of the Indiana Calumet region:

JUSTICE

The pledge of allegiance of the United States says, ". . . one nation under God, with liberty and justice for all." The very foundation of this country is stated in those words—liberty and justice. For you cannot have one without the other; you cannot have justice without liberty, and you cannot have liberty without justice. The question always before us is whether we possess these abstract ideals, whether they really do exist, because we know that when the ideals of liberty and justice perish, so will the American dream, and so will the American experiment.

There can be no doubt that Americans have passionately believed in the principles of liberty and justice; these precepts are spelled out in the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence; they have been tested in the crucible of war; and they have been tested in debate, in suits at law; and in every conceivable way. The question before us now is whether we still believe in these principles, and whether we are willing to support them with our determined energies.

The question faces every American, every day: what is justice; and what will I do to support my belief in it? It is a question that must be answered every day, in a thousand ways and in a thousand places; it is an issue facing judge and juries, schools and cities, states and armies; and the issue hangs in the balance in every choice. Be it in Houston, Boston, Los Angeles or Gary, the issue faces us all. Justice does not always prevail because not all men are just; but it is the mark of honor of our country that more often than not a man can know that here, more than in any other place in the world, he has a fair chance to obtain justice.

I believe that all of us share a common faith and heritage; and our belief is stronger than even we ourselves may suspect. All of us have learned the some phrases from history, the same lines from poetry that express this heritage. And most of us believe words like these:

As for me, give me liberty or give me death; if this be treason make the most of it; If they mean to have a war, let it begin here; We hold these truths to be self-evident—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; Where liberty dwells, there is my country; Liberty and union, now and forever, one and inseparable; Government of the people, by the people and for the people; With malice toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right; I shall never surrender nor retreat; We have nothing to fear but fear itself.

There are those who believe in neither freedom nor justice. There are those who want not simply redress of their grievances, but revenge as well. There are those who are so disillusioned that they prefer to leave this land altogether rather than continue living in it. There are those who would withdraw from society, even though they want the blessings of living in it. These are the voices of despair and the prophets of gloom, and they are made possible only by failure. Wherever there is failure of our society to provide for men's wants, there arises discontent and sometimes disorder. It is the tragedy of failure that makes it possible for the vendors of hate to exist and be heard. But I believe that the American dream is still full of hope for all of us; and I believe in the ultimate and final triumph of good over evil, and I believe that men know the difference between wisdom and folly. I believe, as Carl Sandburg did, when he was moved to write:

> "Across the bitter years and howling winters
> The deathless dream will be the stronger
> The dream of equity will win."

The question for us, I believe, is not whether we believe in equity, or in justice, because I believe that we do. The real question is what this ideal is, and how it can be achieved or realized.

Justice is more than a legal device, or a legal guarantee. In its essence, justice is the right of every man to be judged on his own merits, and not on any other quality.

When all men are accorded this right to be judged according to merit, then we will be closer to a just world and a just society.

But justice must consist of more than just being permitted an honest evaluation. Justice demands equal opportunity—equal opportunity for jobs and for education and for all the benefits of life. Every man must have an equal right to live, to work and to be educated. These are things that cannot be restricted to some men because they are wealthy and denied others because they are not; these are privileges that should belong to all men, not just those who live in the right neighborhood or have the right religion or the right name or the right skin.

I have spent a good part of my life seeking justice; justice for myself, for my children, and for other people. I have known hard times, and I have known deep hurt, and deep resentment; and I have known the anger that stems from being the victim of injustice. But I have also known success, and I have discovered that people are in fact willing to elect for decency over bigotry, and people are in fact willing to elect to judge on the basis of merit rather than any other fact. If this were not true, I would not be here today; I would never have been elected to Congress, or to the senate of the State of Texas; and if this were not true I would never have been elected to the city council of the City of San Antonio.

I have seen campaigns when attempts were made to submerge me in a sea of hatred, or wash me away in a tide of bigotry. But the people who elected me saw through these shabby tactics; they overcame fear, they overcame prejudice; they overcome vicious attacks, and gave me the right to run on my own merits, on my own record, and on beliefs. I have the privilege of being told that I was the better man—notwithstanding all efforts to cloud the issues—notwithstanding anything the opposition could do. I have the privilege of having been the first man with a Spanish surname to be elected to the Texas senate in a period of a hundred years; and one of the few men of such background to have been elected to Congress. I tell you this not because I am bragging; I tell you this not because I am lacking in humility, for I am above all else grateful to the people who have placed confidence and trust in me; but I tell you this because my experience proves that people are fundamentally decent.

Surely there have been those who have threatened me, and there have been those who have called me names; and there have been those who have hated me for no other reason than that I am what I am. But the mass of people have been honest, forthright and decent; and the vast majority of people have been willing to take me at face value. That is justice. It may be unjust that I am sometimes disliked for some irrational reason; but it is pure and simple justice that no man has in my city of San Antonio attempted to run on a platform of hate or bigotry and had any success in the last two decades.

This is an experience every electorate must go through sooner or later. Every electorate has been or will be subjected to the call of the bigot, and will know the words of the purveyors of hate; and every electorate will have to listen at one time or another to a professional racist. The test of our country will be, time and time again, in place after place, whether we will be swayed by the unscrupulous, whether we will elect our public officers on rational or irrational bases. I have complete faith and confidence that there will not be many elections bought by hate or sold by distrust. I believe people will act for what they believe in, and that what they believe in is justice.

But it is not only at the ballot box that elections must be made. Every time open housing is debated the specter of bigotry hangs behind elegant words. It is claimed that open housing will depress property values; but the real truth is that property values go down only if a man doesn't believe in the value in the first place. It is said that open housing would create chaos, but in fact chaos can only come if men accede to the cires of the violent, and shun order for themselves. The real issue will some day be brought out into the open, and debated, and that issue will be this: does every man have the right to live where he pleases to live or does he not? And the answer to that question must be clear, if it is answered with any sense of decency at all. So this is an election that ultimately every man must participate in as well—every man must decide whether liberty is only for a few and not for others, or whether liberty is for one and all. And this election will not be conducted at the ballot box or in the voting booth; it will be conducted in every neighborhood, and by every man who lives in the nation.

Not only open housing must be decided, but a thousand other issues as well—equal employment opportunity; equal promotion opportunity; equal opportunity to participate in the market place of ideas and in the marketplace of commerce; equal opportunity for education. In a few places there must even be a decision about equal access to the graveyard. And in every case this election will be for justice or injustice, for liberty or lack of it; for good will or for animosity; for prejudice or for common decency; for good or evil.

We must all remember this: what affects one man for good or evil also affects other men in the same way. Society is like a pool of water; if you throw a pebble in a pool of water, the effects are spread over the whole surface of that pool, until the whole pond has been affected and disturbed.

I am a man of Mexican extraction. I can say in all honesty that if it had not been for the Negro, and for Negro progress, discrimination would still be as bad against the Mexican-American as it ever was.

Right after World War II it was a common practice to employ restrictive covenants in real estate deeds. These covenants would deny access to property if you were quote "Negro or Mexican." This was discrimination against me as well as my black brothers. In fact this discrimination was so bad that during World War II, a man of Mexican extraction who had been killed in combat was denied a funeral in his home town cemetery—only because he was a Mexican, or "Meskin" as they pronounce it in that town. It took the efforts of strong men to find that dead hero a place to rest, and to shame those who would have denied it to him. I am glad to say that President Johnson, who was then in Congress, was among those who corrected this problem. But suppose no one had acted—how many more men would have been denied even a grave, after having died for their country in a war which ironically enough was directed against fanatical race hatred. This problem is still with us, even today; but I say to you that it is better now, and will become better yet, because the conscience of this country has been touched, and has been found responsive.

Restrictive covenants affected me after World War II, and they affected Negroes also. But I could not afford a lawsuit to challenge the legality of this practice; and the Spanish minority could not organize itself to finance such a suit. It was up to the Negro to lay down the challenge and take the issue to court. And it was done. I remember well that 1948 decision which struck down this barrier. It was not only for the Negro—it was for *all* Americans—Jew and Gentile, Negro and Mexican, Indian and Oriental—all of whom suffered from this odious practice.

Jone Donne wrote three hundred years ago, "no man is an island entire of itself." And it is true, more true now than ever. And so are these words: "Any man's death diminishes me, because I am involved in Mankind; and therefore, never send to know for whom the bell tolls; it tolls for thee."

When there is progress for any segment of America, that is also progress for all Americans. If any ethnic minority suffers an indignity or humiliation, or is the victim of some discriminatory practice, all of society suffers. And if the Negro suffers, I share the suffering, because the same affliction cast on the Negro is cast on me. For all of us are in the same society. Whatever benefits any part of society benefits all of it; and whatever harms some part of society harms all of it. Whenever a man is great, it does not matter who he is or what he is; all of society and all of mankind benefits from his greatness. It did not matter that Einstein was a Jew and Fermi an Italian; what mattered was that they discovered the secret to the keys of the universe. Nor does it matter that Sam Houston was a half breed; what matters is that de did as he saw best, and all of us are the benefactors of his courage. It did not matter that Santa Anna was a Mexican, either—for Mexicans and Anglos alike suffered under him.

Justice is blind, and so is progress. If we believe in these ideals, and we practice them, we all benefit; and if we fail to believe in them and practice them, or if we fail to practice these ideals for everyone, then we have also failed ourselves. And it is not only a matter of believing; we must act on our beliefs.

No one benefits if you believe in progress and the best man and don't vote for your beliefs. All that happens is that you have a guilty conscience and the electorate is denied one good strong voice.

I do not pretend to believe that I know the solution to all the problems of mankind. I am not blind to the fact that injustice and intolerance exist; nor do I underestimate the strength of the obstacles that lie in the path of human happiness and liberty. What I have seen sometimes makes me wonder whether progress is attainable at all; but what I have seen also gives me cause to know that progress is possible, and that it is happening and that it cannot be halted. But justice does not exist simply because we believe in it, and progress does not come only because we want it to; for nothing exists in a vacuum and for anything to move inertia must be overcome.

If a man believes in justice he must exercise that belief. If he sees another man being treated unjustly he must come to that man's defense; and if he sees unreason he must not be content with privately being dismayed or saddened; he must act publicly against unreason. It is not enough to hold private grief against public prejudice. It is not enough for a man to believe if he lacks the courage of his convictions.

You are here because you believe in action rather than apathy, and I congratulate you for that. You will be the movers of your community, and the shapers of public opinion, because you care and you care enough to say that you do. You do a great service, perhaps greater than you even realize by being here, and by working throughout the year in the cause of human dignity and honor.

THE GOP CONSISTENCY GAP VERSUS DEMOCRATIC ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a speech by the President.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, we are witnessing a growing consistency gap among the leading Republican presidential hopefuls who seem to change their positions on the major issues with each phase of the moon and every shift in the public opinion polls.

It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that these Republicans are tailoring their speeches to fit what they believe is the drift of public opinion, particularly in relation to Vietnam and racial problems.

And while there may be one Republican running ahead of other rivals—not one of these candidates has demonstrated the high degree of courage or leadership that would show him capable of being a national leader—out in front of the people.

The kind of politics many Republican leaders are playing can be described—at best—as the politics of hypocrisy. Never in American political history have so many candidates changed their positions so often in so short a period of time.

For example, Governor Romney tells a Negro group that he favors desegregated housing. Then he goes to a group of white suburbanites and tells them he is opposed to open housing laws.

Governor Reagan goes around the country demanding cuts in taxes and big cutbacks in Government spending. But in his first 6 months as Governor of California he has raised taxes 25 percent, the largest tax increase of any State at any time in the history of this country.

Meanwhile, Governor Rockefeller claims to believe that Governor Reagan is doing an excellent job—even though nearly every Reagan State policy is diametrically opposed to Rockefeller's policies in New York.

And, of course, Richard Nixon is up to his old tricks of trying to be on all sides of all issues to please everybody.

Mr. Speaker, if there is one consistent theme in all this Republican verbiage it is that the Democratic administration has done nothing right in the past three and a half years. And whatever is wrong with America or the world can be blamed on Lyndon Baines Johnson.

Some Republicans argue that he is too tough on Vietnam; others that he is too moderate. Some of them charge that he has done too much to help the Negroes and other minorities; others say he is doing too little.

To their minds: The crime rate is the President's fault.

Highway death tolls are the President's fault.

Even deaths caused by smoking are the President's fault.

And so it goes. But, Mr. Speaker, let the record show that these Republicans have yet to offer meaningful alternatives to the President's policies, or any programs of their own.

This kind of negative politics is a Republican trademark. We know it well here in Congress, where it is continually expressed in massive Republican votes against each and every administration program, across the board.

Mr. Speaker, how fortunate Democrats are to belong to a party that practices positive politics—that works to vote for legislation in the people's interest.

I can think of no greater contrast between our two parties than to compare the Republican brand of oratory with the magnificent address delivered Saturday evening by the President at a Democratic dinner here in Washington.

The President has made it clear: We Democrats believe in the politics of accomplishment—in a program of hope to improve the measure and quality of life in our land.

I urge my Republican colleagues to read the text of the President's speech and discover what responsible politics in the 1960's is all about.

I include the President's speech in the RECORD:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT THE PRESIDENT'S BALL, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Thank you so much, Mr. Vice President, Mrs. Humphrey, distinguished Governors and outstanding Mayors of the Nation, Members of the Cabinet, Members of the Congress, and my beloved friends.

This is a very enjoyable evening. It is very thoughtful, to say nothing about how generous it is of you to bring us all together for this most pleasant evening.

I have been watching the polls pretty closely here of late. As you might imagine, I like some of them quite a lot more than I like others. The ones I like best are those that like me best.

But in this era in which we are living, I wasn't too sure of their credibility—so the other day I just went out and had a poll of my own made.

You may be interested. The question went this way:

"If President Johnson were to run against the following nationally known Republican leaders, who would you vote for?"

The first pairing showed:

Lyndon B. Johnson: 73%

William E. Miller: 27%

Then we added another picture that would involve the entire ticket. The second pairing dealt with the ticket of both President and Vice President. Once again I am happy to report that I think we did very well under the circumstances.

Lyndon Johnson and Hubert H. Humphrey—71%

Harold E. Stassen and Ezra Taft Benson—29%

I think I should tell you that we circulated our poll among leading editors throughout the country—and other experts. The response seemed to be very good. One telegram I remember came in from a very important national magazine. It said:

"Congratulations, Mr. President, on a very fine and well conducted poll."

It was signed, "Editor, Literary Digest."

A President, of course, sees a great many expressions of public opinion. The other day someone handed me this evaluation of the state of the world:

"The earth is degenerating these days. Bribery and corruption abound. Children no longer mind parents. Every man wants to write a book and it is evident that the end of the world is approaching fast."

I wondered who the columnist was. Later I discovered that, whoever he was, he wrote what he had to say on an Assyrian tablet almost 5,000 years ago.

You don't have to look far to see the same kind of thing today—much of it is directed at the man in the kitchen that President Harry Truman talked about.

Some people think we are spending too much, and some think we are not spending enough.

Some people think we shouldn't raise taxes, and some think we should have raised them last year.

Some think that we are not doing enough for the people in need, and some think we have done too much already.

Some think we should escalate the war in Vietnam, and some think we should get out of there tomorrow.

There is no lack of advice—however contradictory. In the crises of this hour—as in all others that we have faced since our Nation began—there are plenty of recommendations on how to get out of trouble cheaply and fast.

Most of them in the last analysis really come down to this: Deny your responsibilities.

In world affairs, behave as if you were a small nation with few interests; behave as if the oceans were twice as wide as they really are; behave as if you don't care what happens to people with different tongues or different cultures, or colors of skin—so long as they aren't shooting at your house—just now.

Here at home, behave as if every baby is born with the same chance to succeed in life—although his crib may lie in the squalid back room of a slum. Behave as if rats were funny—too funny to fight with Federal help. Behave as if health and education and jobs were somebody else's concern—not yours. Behave as if the farmer is getting as much as he deserves. Behave as if you have no interest in helping local authorities protect their communities from crime and violence. Behave as if runaway inflation is inevitable—above all, never send up a tax bill designed to fight inflation.

I hear and read a good deal of this kind of advice. It is much more subtle than I have described it tonight, more "reasonable". It is the voice not of the dove or the hawk, but of the ostrich.

Be certain of this—in the time that I have been given to lead this country, I shall not follow that kind of advice.

The Democratic Party has never chosen the road of irresponsibility. In the 1960's, America, under Democratic leadership, has faced up to the poverty and discrimination in its midst. It has not yet mastered them. But it has started—started on the road toward mastery—toward healing and educating and training and employing those whom life was passing by.

This party, and the programs it has inspired and legislated and turned into action, has set a standard in the 1960's by which every Administration that follows must be judged.

For it was we who said poverty must be abolished—a good education must be the birthright of every child, our cities must be made fit for a free people, the environment must be cleansed and protected for every family, our streets must be made safe for law-abiding citizens, and basic human rights must be made real for every man and woman among us.

Let them say that we have aroused expectations. So have all of those who have liberated men from dreamless sleep and sullen apathy—and set them on the way to becoming what their Creator intended them to be.

Let them say that we have not accomplished our goals entirely—that there is still ignorance and misery and despair in our cities and rural towns. Yes, there is—and there always will be, unless America completes the work we have already begun in these seven years.

My friends, next year will be a testing time for America.

The question our people are going to have to answer is clear:

Shall we go on building?

Or shall we become discouraged with ourselves, impatient that the work is not yet finished? Shall we bury all that we have begun—begun with such hope and promise—and bury it in a shroud of inaction and reaction?

You here tonight have come a long way to give your answer. Every State in the Union is represented in this hall tonight.

You are making it possible for the party that believes in building to take its case to the people—to tell them what we promised to do on that August evening in 1964 at Atlantic City we have done—and that America is a richer and stronger and fairer Nation today because Democrats made it so. And we have only begun.

Our party and our country is greater than any of us. It is entitled to the best from all of us.

As for myself, my first and last business is trying to win and trying to secure the peace. That task will take all that I have—and I shall give it gladly.

So tonight I tell you that I will work as hard as any man can work for his country, and I will do everything in my power to build a record for our Democratic Party that America will enthusiastically embrace 13 months from now.

I regret that I cannot predict, this evening, when the issue that most concerns us will be resolved.

I do know that we are following the road of responsibility in Vietnam, as we are here at home. I know—I know probably as well as any man, save those who are fighting for us out there tonight, at this very hour—that it is a rough road to travel. But the road, I think, does lead to a free Asia—and the road does lead, I think, to a freer and a happier and a more secure United States.

I believe the American people will follow its course—not blithely, not cheerfully—for they all lament the waste of war; but they will follow it with a firm determination, now that we have begun it, to see it through all the way.

A very brave man, reflecting on the years that lay ahead for his country, back in 1960, had this to say:

"Now the age of consolidation is over and once again the age of change and challenge has come upon us."

The result, John Fitzgerald Kennedy said, is that

"The next year, the next decade, in all likelihood the next generation, will require more bravery and wisdom on our part than any period in our history. We will be face to face, every day, in every part of our lives and times, with the real issue of our age—the issue of survival."

So we are.

I live with that knowledge.

I live every day with the responsibilities it entails—with those our country bears, because it is the strongest and it is the freest of all nations, and also with those that I bear, because of the office I hold.

If I may, let me speak quite personally to you for a moment.

I have—as you know—spent my entire life in the political arena. I treasure the support of our people. I treasure that support as much, I think, as any man could. And I know, as you must know, that there are many who suggest ways to increase that support—temporarily—by softening or renouncing the struggle in Vietnam, or escalating it to the red line of danger; by giving in and retreating on the tax proposal; by abandoning the fight against discrimination—the fight for the poor—here at home.

Some say there is short term political gain for me, and for our party, if we could follow this kind of a course.

But what about a year from now? What about five years from now? What would choosing that course mean—not just for Lyndon Johnson, not just for the Democratic Party, but for the glorious United States of America?

It would mean, in my opinion, greatly increasing the chances of a major war—not this year, but in the years immediately ahead.

It would mean imposing a far more onerous tax, a tax of inflation, on all of our people—and the poorest among us—not just this year, but next year.

It would mean dooming our cities to angry strife and squalor—in every year yet to come.

So we do have a choice.

We can take the easy road tonight, denying our responsibilities, hoping that a rise in our polls will compensate for what we ought to have done for our country.

Or we can take the harder road of responsibility. We can do what we believe is right for our children's future, though it may mean a great deal of present pain.

I have made my choice. And I pray that I—and we—will have enough of that bravery, unselfishness and wisdom that Jack Kennedy said we would need—to see it through, all the way.

Just an additional minute. I won't be long. You have been here too long already, I know.

This is not in the text, but I want to say it while I have the chance.

This party tonight, this salute, should have been given to the man who really deserves it. The next one that the Democratic Committee gives is going to be for the man who deserves it more than any Vice President who ever served this Nation—Hubert Humphrey.

And to those great Governors of great Democratic states, those outstanding mayors from Chicago, Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, from throughout the country, who have come a long way to be here tonight to give us their support and their inspiration, to those of you who have made sacrifices from your family and your own luxury to come here and make it possible for your country to get the truth message, I want to tell you that we are so grateful.

It gives us such encouragement and strength to know that all of you in this room, and in the other room, would want to do what you have done.

To the National Committee, the Chairman and Vice Chairman, Mr. Bailey and Miss Price, to Mr. Criswell, who has done a remarkable job, want to say thank you very much.

This is not a group of big men, rich men. This is not a group of little men and poor men. This is not a group from the Eastern Seaboard or the West Coast.

This group comes from every state in the Union—more from New York, Illinois, Ohio and Pennsylvania, some of the larger states, than from the smaller ones. But every state has sent someone here tonight.

The person who is most responsible for that, and the person who is most responsible for ridding us of all the troubles and heartaches that come from trying to meet leftover bills, is a quiet, silent, humble man from New York named Arthur Krim, who the people who believe in the Democratic Party owe as much to as any man who ever served the Democratic Party.

Thank you very much.

ADMINISTRATION ATTEMPTS TO DEFEAT ECONOMY DRIVE OF CONGRESS

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in protest to the brazen, transparent attempts now being made by the administration to defeat the economy drive of the Congress through fiscal trickery and verbal chicanery.

From past experience, I am not surprised by what is occurring at present. The administration is threatening once again to resort to its old dodge of withholding highway trust funds and delaying interstate highway construction. This is being done to bring pressure to bear to save the White House from economy drives of the Congress.

Telegrams have gone out from the Transportation Department to the Governors of all the States, inferring that if this Congress continues to press for economy, this may well result in delaying construction of badly needed expressways in urban areas. The inference was oh, so subtle, but the meaning was there.

Next we should expect to hear of the President making cuts in the school lunch program and stating that old-age pension and social security is endangered by an economy-minded Congress. But never do we hear of his calling for a cut in foreign aid or cutting funds to study how to increase trade with Communist countries supplying bullets to kill American boys in Vietnam.

The tactics of the President's administration make it clear that he does not seek true economy, but will attempt to forestall spending cuts in his pet nonessential areas. This he will do by stating that cuts, if required by Congress, will be made where it hurts the most and in the most beneficial programs in an effort to promote an outcry for continued spending.

What would be the effect, the Governors were asked, if Federal highway construction was cut this year by up to 50 percent—from $4.4 billion to $2.2 billion?

The President knows full well what the effect will be even before he asks the question, and the reaction was predictable, and instant. The Governors are replying the States cannot afford any such construction delays. Already the Governors of Maryland, Virginia, Ohio, Iowa, New Hampshire, Nevada, Rhode Island, Maine, Vermont, Illinois, Alaska, New Mexico, Arkansas, and my own State of Georgia have responded in opposition.

If this tactic had not been tried once before, perhaps we could overlook it or even excuse it. But this is the same ploy that was used late last year when the administration found itself in another economy squeeze. It promptly announced a freeze on Federal road construction, and produced the howl of protest we all remember too well. And what did the administration reply so piously? "But you wanted economy and now that I have given it to you, you do not want it." Of course, this is not economy, but sheer blackmail.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but recall an old saying which goes:

> Fool me once, my mistake; fool me twice and seal your fate.

This time, this Congress will not be fooled—and we will not allow the people to be fooled, either. This Congress is not like some giant orchestra which can be made to play any tune the director wants each time the bass drum of protest is boomed. And the chief executives of our States are not going to be treated like a company of "Charlie McCarthy's" who will speak out each time the "Edgar Bergen" in the White House wills them to.

Mr. Speaker, the tactic disclosed in the morning press is despicable and dishonest. Those of us in the Congress know full well that highway trust funds cannot be used for any other purpose. We know that delaying the expenditure of these funds will not produce one jot or tittle of economy, because these funds are not part of the regular budget. But the man on the crowded highways, fuming at his delay, does not know this, nor do many of the chief executives of our States realize this. The administration is once again trying to play upon this lack of knowledge and understanding through outright misrepresentation to whip this Congress into line like a trainer lashing a cage of unruly circus lions into shape, to bend it to its free-spending will.

As for me, I do not plan to jump through the hoop.

Mr. Speaker, I know not what course others may take, but as for me, I say give me honest economy, or give me none.

INFLATION AND THE TAX INCREASE

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the administration has proposed a 10-percent surtax which would average out to about a 1-percent increase in income taxes for the average family.

The President's proposal comes at a time of rising prices and a larger deficit. I believe a tax increase is needed. It is lesser of two evils. Inflation would be a much heavier load to bear.

But I also believe that more strenuous efforts should be made to cut expenditures. The House will tackle this challenge and expects to cut $6 billion from the President's budget request.

I also believe there is a need for tax reforms to plug various loopholes and remedy other inequities, such as the oil depletion allowance.

I have today introduced legislation to plug loopholes and reduce the oil depletion allowance from 27½ percent to 15 percent.

Two articles from the Buffalo Courier-Express, of October 9, 1967, follow:

FISCAL OUTLOOK GLOOMY: FEARS OF INFLATION WORRY WALL STREET

(By Thomas E. Mullaney)

NEW YORK.—Fears of inflation caused concern in Wall Street this week. They were manifest in two ways:

1. Some investors showed no hesitation over paying the highest prices in history for growth stocks.

2. Tension was rising in the bond market, where prices weakened and interest rates soared to their highest levels since the Great Depression.

As a result a mantle of gloom has cloaked the financial community. Wall Street's worries were accentuated when the House Ways and Means Committee last Tuesday deferred consideration of the administration's tax bill in an effort to force agreement between President and Congress on a program for reducing federal spending.

WASHINGTON FIDDLES

Washington was continuing to fiddle while the fires of inflation were gaining intensity.

Price and wage increases were rippling in an ever-widening arc; interest rates were moving up despite the continued easy-money policy, and demand pressures in the economy, sparked by the revival in consumer spending, were assuming greater strength.

One of the most heartening—and at the same time most frightening—of recent business statistics was this week's report on auto sales for September. The month's 9 per cent gain depicted an economy that had thoroughly shaken its springtime sniffles and returned to a state of excellent health—perhaps too robust.

NEW PRESSURE

In combination with the big bulge in consumer installment credit during August (a jump of $344 million, the steepest in nine months), the auto sales gains reflect the ebullient mood of consumers. This could add a new layer of pressure to the economy.

Even before the House Committee's action last Tuesday, the financial community was upset by the disarray in the U.S. fiscal picture with a budget deficit in the range of $28 billion to $30 billion.

"It is no exaggeration," warned Roy L. Reierson, economist for the Bankers Trust Co., "to describe the federal budget as out of control."

It may well be, as administration officials contend, that there is no room for the $5 billion in budget cuts that some members of Congress have been seeking, but it should be possible to trim a few billions from federal outlays for highway, dam, construction and other nondefense, nonurgent programs.

NEW ECONOMICS TUNING FAULTY TO HALT INFLATION

(By Sylvia Porter)

The "new economics" is now failing miserably and the blunt reason why is that the White House and Congress are failing to provide the tools to make it work.

This is a serious accusation in which you and I have a vital bread-and-butter stake. To illustrate, as a result of these failures our cost of living is climbing rapidly, our cost of borrowing money is rising, our dollar's buying power is dwindling, our pensions and savings funds are shrinking in value. But the accusation can be amply documented.

The essence of the New Economics is this:

1. Our national economic goal is a strong, sustained growth which will create high employment, production, paychecks and profits—with reasonably stable prices.

2. When our economy is operating below capacity, it is imperative to give it a combination of fiscal-monetary (tax, spending, credit) policies to speed up the rate of growth.

Among the appropriate stimulating policies would be: income tax cuts to spur consumer and business spending; tax incentives to encourage business investment in plants and equipment; easy and relatively inexpensive credit to stimulate borrowing of money; increasing government expenditures for a wide variety of projects.

3. When our economy reaches the desired rate of growth, the policies should be delicately adjusted to sustain the trend.

4. But when our economy overheats—because of too many stimulants or some overwhelming development such as Vietnam—it is imperative to switch to an entirely different set of tax-spending-credit policies to restrain the rate of growth.

Among the appropriate restraining policies would be: income tax increases to curtail consumer and business spending; suspension of tax incentives to encourage postponement of business investment; tighter credit to limit borrowing of money; stretching out of government expenditures.

Put this way, the New Economics is easy to understand. Actually, economists have been talking in these terms since World War II. The only aspect which is really "new" is that the idea of so fine-tuning the economy has in recent years received recognition at the White House level.

On the upside, the New Economics has worked magnificently. From early 1961 to late 1965, our economy was put into and held in a strong, beautifully balanced expansion by tax incentives, income tax cuts, easy credit, rising government spending.

But in late 1965, with the acceleration of the Vietnam War, the need arose for reversing the policies toward restraint. (This is not 20-20 hindsight! I have the columns in print to prove that top economists began calling for tax hikes, spending cuts and tighter credit back in late 1965-January 1966.)

(The White House, though, did not respond. President Johnson did not ask for tax hikes early in the inflationary upswing. He did not take the lead in cutting back federal spending.

The beautiful balance of our economy evaporated. Although the Federal Reserve System slammed the brakes on credit, price stability was shattered, the basis for inflation was laid.

Now Vietnam is still accelerating and the danger of a 1967 inflation built on 1966's inflation is here and now.

This time, Congress is not responding to Johnson's plea for a tax surcharge. This time each is trying to make the other take the initiative in limiting government spending.

If we mess up our economy because we don't know what to do, our failure is at least excusable. But if we mess up because we won't do what we know we should do, it's inexcusable.

PROFILE OF A BOOM

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to call to the attention of the Members of the House the very thought-provoking article which appeared in today's Wall Street Journal, entitled "Profile of a Boom; Economic Expansion Enters 80th Month, Matches Old Record."

Mr. Speaker, this article outlines the tremendous growth of the American economy since 1961. In my opinion it is worthy of the attention of all the Members of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I include the article at this point in the RECORD:

PROFILE OF A BOOM: ECONOMIC EXPANSION ENTERS 80TH MONTH, MATCHES OLD RECORD—GNP SOARS 49 PERCENT SINCE 1961—PROFITS, PERSONAL INCOME RISE EVEN MORE SHARPLY—PROBLEMS: HOUSING AND GOLD

(By Alfred L. Malabre, Jr.)

If the current business expansion continues through next month, it will enter the record books as the longest boom in American history.

Even the more pessimistic forecasters are convinced that the expansion will indeed set a record. The longest expansion until now has been the 80-month business boom that went on during most of World War II, ending in February 1945. The current expansion, which began in February 1961, is now entering its 80th month. Altogether, there have been 26 previous U.S. business expansions, according to records kept back to 1854 by the nonprofit National Bureau of Economic Research. The average length: A mere 30 months.

The full dimensions of the current expansion can be gauged by reviewing some of the changes that have taken place in the U.S. economy since 1961. The magnitude of these changes is impressive, as the following review shows.

Gross national product: At more than $775 billion annually, the nation's output of goods and services has risen some $255 billion since 1961. The gain alone dwarfs the annual GNP of such major nations as the United Kingdom, West Germany and France. The table below translates America's multibillion-dollar economic growth into percentage terms and also shows how rapidly the major components of the GNP total have risen during the great boom:

Percent gain since 1961

Gross national product	49
Consumer spending	46
Government spending	63
Business spending	47

Within the fast-expanding governmental category, the sharpest rise since 1961 has occurred in Federal nonmilitary expenditures, which have soared 77% in the period. Federal outlays for defense have climbed 52%, and overall Federal expenditures are up 56% since 1961. Spending by state and local governments has risen 70%—much faster than total Federal outlays.

Inflation, of course, accounts for part of the GNP rise since 1961. If "growth" stemming simply from higher prices is discounted, the "real" GNP increase since 1961 works out to 34%, rather than 49%.

The consumer-spending category is by far the largest of the various GNP components. This spending breaks down three ways—for durable goods such as appliances and autos, for nondurables such as food and clothing and for services such as medical care and rent. The table below shows how the three subcategories have fared since 1961:

Percent gain since 1961

Durable goods	64
Nondurable goods	39
Services	48

Although spending for durables has risen fastest, the consumer still spends a good deal less for such products than for nondurables or services. Currently, consumers devote about 44% of their budgets to nondurables, 41% to services and only 15% to durable goods. Overall, the statistical breakdown for consumer spending indicates that the economy has not become as "service oriented" as is often suggested. In 1961, consumers spent about 40% of their budgets on services.

The 47% rise in business spending, of course, has brought a big increase in the capacity of the country's factories. U.S. plant capacity has grown by about a third since 1961. This admittedly is less than the dollar rise in business spending, but the capacity rise is based on physical volume of goods and therefore isn't "inflated" by rising prices.

As a result of the 33% capacity increase, U.S. manufacturers are able to produce a far greater volume of goods now than in 1961 without putting undue strain on their production facilities.

At present, U.S. factories are using about 85% of their capacity, on average, well below the 90%-plus operating rates at which severe strains traditionaly begin to show up. At operating rates above 90%, overtime costs rise sharply, and many producers are forced to use inefficient facilities that would otherwise stand idle or be scrapped.

Personal income: The rapidly rising earnings of most Americans have supplied much of the fuel for the economy's long climb since 1961. The personal income of Americans now exceeds $631 billion annually, some $215 billion more than the 1961 income total. The rise reflects a variety of factors, not just the steadily climbing wages and salaries of all sorts of workers. The table below lists the key income sources of Americans and shows how rapidly each category has risen since 1961:

Percent gain since 1961

Total personal income	51
Wages and salaries	53
Fringe benefits	86
Dividends	71
Interest income	87
Income from rent	26

As in the case of service spending noted above, the income record since 1961 holds some surprises. Landlords' income from rent has risen only half as fast as overall income, a fact that should surprise many tenants. And income from interest and dividends on investments has climbed much faster than income from wage and salary payments, a fact that may give some second thoughts to people who worry that labor is getting far more than its share of the income pie; fringe benefits paid to workers, however, have risen much faster than wages and salaries.

At present, dividend and interest payments make up about 11% of total personal income. This compares with only 9% in 1961. Wage and salary payments make up 67% of the total, about equal to 1961.

The overall rise in consumer income is considerable even if rising prices and an increasing population are taken into account. After-tax per-capita income in the second quarter reached a record annual rate of $2,388 in terms of 1958 dollars. This was 25% higher than the comparable 1961 per-capita figure. In the view of many economists, this income measurement comes as close as anything to a "standard-of-living" index for the U.S.

Accompanying the big rise in consumer income has been a big rise in consumer savings. These savings have recently been running at an annual rate of about $36 billion, up 70% from the 1961 level (a sharper rise than the 65% increase in consumer credit outstanding over the same period). Time deposits in commercial banks have attracted the largest share of these savings.

The rise in consumer income reflects a massive improvement in the U.S. employment picture during the economic expansion. Many more jobs exist, workers toil longer hours and pay levels are considerably higher.

Today, there are more than 76 million civilian jobs in the U.S., up from less than 66 million in 1961. The increase exceeds the population of New York, the nation's largest city. The rise in jobs not only has opened up work for the country's increasing population—there are 15 million more Americans now than in 1961—but has given work to millions who couldn't get jobs early in the decade. Unemployment in the nation is below the 3 million mark; in 1961, it was close to 5 million.

Employes generally work a longer week now than in 1961. In manufacturing, the average workweek of nearly 41 hours is almost a full hour longer than the 1961 work week. In the construction trade, the average workweek has recently exceeded 38 hours, up from less than 37 in 1967. An exception: Retailing, where the average has dropped from more than 38 hours in 1961 to less than 36 recently. Factors in the retailing trend, say analysts, include the increasing use of part-time employes and self-service in stores.

Most employes, moreover, are receiving much more pay per hour. The average hourly pay level in manufacturing is about $2.80, up from $2.32 in 1961. In constructions, the average is nearly $4.10 an hour, some 30 cents higher than in 1961. In retailing, the average pay level is about $2, up from $1.68 at the start of the expansion.

Corporate profits: The climb of corporate profits during the long boom has been even more spectacular than the rise of consumer income. The before-tax earnings of U.S. companies currently total nearly $80 billion a year, up from $50 billion in 1961. Within the broad corporate category, however, there has been considerable variation between different types of industries. The table below shows the overall profits rise, plus the gains for particular groups.

Percent gain since 1961

Total corporate profits	57
Durable goods makers	85
Nondurable goods makers	49
Transport and utilities	51
Finance and miscellaneous	44

In 1961, the profits of durable-goods makers totaled some $500 million less than those of nondurable-goods producers. Currently, however, durables firms are earning some $3.3 billion a year more than nondurables companies. The big boom in auto-buying in recent years is a major factor in the profit rise for durables. It should be noted, however, that the durables group traditionally fares extra well in expansion periods and extra badly in recessions. The other categories listed above generally react less dramatically to changes in the overall course of business.

A footnote to the profits story: Since 1961, the after-tax earnings of corporations have climbed 71%, a considerably faster rise than the 57% gain in before-tax income. This, of course, reflects the 1964 income tax cut.

To be sure, the economic record of the U.S. since 1961 is not without blemishes.

LAGGING HOME STARTS

New-home starts last year totaled less than 1.2 million units, actually down from the 1961 level of 1.3 million units and far below the 1963 level of 1.6 million. In recent weeks, housing has shown some signs of a pickup, but the industry's record still stands in bleak contrast to the general economic boom since 1961.

In part, the housing industry's trouble reflects overbuilding at least of middle and upper-income housing in the earlier post-World War II years. The mortgage funds for home building have been relatively scarce at times during the boom. Ironically, if other segments of the economy hadn't been so strong in recent years, there doubtless would have been more money available for home building, and the industry almost certainly would have fared better.

The U.S. gold supply also has declined during the long expansion. The Government's coffers now hold some $13 billion of gold, down from more than $17 billion at the beginning of the expansion.

Technically, this drop has occurred because the U.S. has been spending more dollars abroad than it has been taking in from foreigners. Foreign governments, in turn, have been buying U.S. gold with many of these dollars at the Treasury's offering price of $35 per ounce, a price that many foreign officials apparently feel is a bargain.

But the deeper cause of the gold drain involves the growth rate of the U.S. economy. If the economy hadn't grown so fast in recent years, there probably would have been less price inflation, and the U.S. trade surplus—the excess of exports over imports—would no doubt have held up better, thereby curbing the outflow of dollars and gold. The U.S. trade surplus actually has declined about 5% since 1961. Without a trade surplus to bring some dollars into the country, the flow of U.S. funds abroad to support foreign-aid projects, troops overseas and other foreign programs would reach intolerable proportions, most economists believe.

Perhaps the most lamentable blemish in the boom is the high unemployment rate for teen-age Negroes—25% in 1961 and 25% in boom time 1967. Another dismal statistic: Some 7.8 million Americans are on relief at present, about 600,000 more than in 1961.

THE LONG BOOM PROMPTS ANALYSTS TO ALTER VIEWS

The long business boom has caused some economists to alter their ideas about business growth.

A recent survey of more than 300 members of the National Association of Business Economists found that the group generally believed the country's gross national product would grow at a yearly rate of more than 4% between now and 1975—even after allowing for "growth" due to rising prices. In a similar survey in 1962, the prevailing view was that "real" GNP would grow only about 3% annually over roughly the same period.

Another change: In the 1962 poll, six of every seven economists favored a tax cut to spur business, while now three of four want a tax increase to cool business off a bit.

FEDERAL GRAND JURY INQUIRY INTO THE POLITICAL SPENDING OF LAWRENCE CALLANAN'S STEAMFITTER UNION

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include pertinent material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, according to an article in the St. Louis, Mo., Globe-Democrat, the Justice Department has sent two of its criminal division attorneys to St. Louis to conduct a Federal grand jury inquiry into the political spending of Lawrence Callanan's Steamfitter Union. This action follows my earlier effort to secure a Federal investigation into alleged violations, by this union, of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act. I trust this investigation will be vigorously pursued and under unanimous consent I insert this article, at this point, in the RECORD:

POLITICAL SPENDING UNDER FIRE: TWO FEDERAL ATTORNEYS HERE FOR STEAMFITTER FUND INQUIRY

The U.S. Justice Department has sent two of its criminal division attorneys to St. Louis to conduct a federal grand jury inquiry into the coast-to-coast political spending of Lawrence Callanan's Steamfitter Union.

This was revealed Tuesday when the two lawyers filed letters of authority with the U.S. District Court clerk here.

The Globe-Democrat disclosed July 21 that the "voluntary political fund" of Steamfitter Local 562 had failed to report to the U.S. on political campaign spending, although it disbursed at least $80,000 in out-of-state races in the 1964 campaign alone.

Letters of authority of the two special attorneys stated the Justice Department has been informed of violations of "laws relative to political campaign contributions, violations of the Internal Revenue Code and perjury statutes and other criminal laws . . ."

The violations, according to the letters, are attributed to "persons, companies, firms, associations and organizations to the department unknown."

SPECIFIC TARGET

It was learned that the steamfitter fund, which has been known to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars during a single campaign year, is a specific target of the grand jury inquiry.

As reported last month, the Justice Department informed Rep. Durward G. Hall (Rep.) of Springfield, Mo., that it was investigating "allegations of possible violations" of the federal corrupt practices act by Local 562.

The two special attorneys, who will work with U.S. Attorney Veryl L. Riddle of the Eastern District of Missouri, are Edgar N. Brown and Robert J. Rosthal.

NO INDICTMENTS

On Sept. 14 a St. Louis circuit court grand jury concluded an investigation of the steamfitter political fund and returned no indictments. It recommended legislation to tighten the present requirements on reporting of political receipts and expenditures.

The federal law on such reporting applies to any political committee which takes in or spends money in two or more states for political purposes. Maximum penalty for wilful violation is two years imprisonment and $10,000 fine.

GURNEY OPPOSES U.S. AID RESUMPTION TO JORDAN, CITES KING HUSSEIN'S MOSCOW VISIT AND CAIRO PACT

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply troubled by the resumption of American aid to the Kingdom of Jordan. Indeed, I understand that the King will visit Washington shortly to seek additional aid.

Despite King Hussein's trip last week to Moscow, his new agreements with the Kremlin, and his discussion of buying Soviet arms, the American taxpayers are now again subsidizing the Jordanian economy to the tune of at least $1 million every fortnight. The Washington Post reported on October 8 from Amman, Jordan, that the King, on returning from Moscow, said he would equip his army with arms "from any source."

Hussein has refused to enter peace talks with Israel or to comport himself in conformity with President Johnson's five points on which our Middle Eastern policy rests. Nevertheless, the United States has just presented Jordan with about $6 million in cash and announced that over $27 million will be given in the course of this year.

The communique issued in Moscow pertaining to the Hussein visit, Mr. Speaker, spoke of the willingness of the Soviet Union to give the Arabs all support needed to "strengthen their defensive capacity." Hussein made overtures to Moscow that were calculated, at the very minimum, to blackmail the United States into giving Jordan additional aid in the form of arms.

I notice, Mr. Speaker, that Hussein was accompanied to Moscow by his army chief of staff, Maj. Gen. Amer Hammash, and the commander of the Jordanian Air Force, Col. Salah Kurdi. They met with Soviet Defense Minister Grechko. They visited a Soviet Air Force base and a Russian armored unit.

Agreements covering various forms of cooperation were signed in Moscow.

Mr. Speaker, are we to subsidize the Jordanian economy so that Hussein can make dollar payments to the Soviet arms industry? Do we encourage Jordan to sign a peace treaty with Israel by ignoring Jordanian intransigence, flirtations with Moscow, and resumption of terrorism against Israel?

King Hussein has not yet abrogated his military pact with Egypt. Since this agreement remains in force, there is really no difference between aid to Jordan or to Egypt. Hussein should sever all military ties with Egypt to qualify for our aid.

King Hussein could have stayed out of the war in June. The Israelis begged him not to join with Egypt and Syria. But he smelled blood, attacked Israel, and now refuses to face the consequences of his aggression. He wrecked his nation and now is acting the role of an innocent victim.

Mr. Speaker, I have written the Secretary of State to say that I oppose all aid in any form to Jordan unless Hussein meets certain preconditions. One prerequisite would be a peace treaty with Israel. Another would be to refrain from entering military supply arrangements with Russia.

Hussein has turned out to be a sort of Moslem Mussolini who is collaborating with Moscow instead of with Hitler as the Italian dictator did.

I have asked the Secretary of State to report on how much we have given or earmarked for Jordan since the end of the war in June. I also asked how this aid was authorized or funded. I feel that the Congress and the American public have a right to know.

INTEGRITY OF CONFIDENTIAL PRESIDENTIAL MEETINGS SHOULD BE PRESERVED

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, from the time of my entry into this great body, I have always thought that one of the essences which we must observe in our contacts with officials of the executive branch has been a sense of courtesy and the preservation of dignity. Certainly, this applies to the Presidency of the United States, whether the President be Republican or Democrat.

The now circulated Republican Congressional Campaign Committee leaflet, a four-page pamphlet, contains what is supposed to be sort of a humorous reference to the President of the United States.

It seems that at one of the recent briefings when the President was bringing in both parties to discuss the serious questions which face us on a fiscal basis, as great men are given to, he made some personal notations on the pad on his desk. Upon the conclusion of the briefing, one of the minority Members, according to the congressional campaign committee leaflet, removed this piece of paper from the desk of the President—not only removed it, but gave it circulation among his colleagues as to what was on this paper. One Member even saw fit, because his name was inscribed thereon, to place some meaning, especially with regard to him, as to what the President had written on this piece of paper.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that from now on the Members of this congressional body when invited to the home or office of the Chief Executive, will preserve the integrity of his personal paper and not give them out for partisan purposes.

However, I do believe we can draw this meaning from what is being done here, as we attempt to achieve some sort of a bipartisan approach to the obvious difficulties we face in the fiscal area. The President is making more sense with his doodling on a piece of paper than the Republicans are with their needling and diddling, I hope that when they take these pieces of paper from the President's desk they will take them home and think about them, because he is trying to achieve something without this kind of foolish peculation and publication which cannot be associated with good politics.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest we extend to the President of the United States, no matter whether it is the present incumbent or any future President, all the dignity and courtesy which is due to that office, and that does not include sniping and picking up pieces of paper from the President's desk.

RED CHINA LOBBY TRIES A NEW TACK

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on numerous occasions I have brought to the attention of Members of this body the workings of what is termed "the Red China lobby," or, those persons or groups dedicated to gaining admission of Red China to the United Nations—at any cost.

In 1966, on several occasions, I attempted to counter the spurious "admission" arguments with facts. Two occasions come to mind, namely, my remarks on April 5, 1966, "Red China Lobby at Work Again," and those of June 28, "The Red China Lobby."

Thus it is not without some knowledge of the problem that today I recommend an article by William F. Buckley, Jr., from the Washington Evening Star of October 9, 1967, entitled "Red China Lobby Tries New Tack."

Evidently we are to be asked, again, to involve ourselves in "a devil's bargain." But as Buckley states, it is time for second thought about the ultimate gains of the bargain.

I submit the article for inclusion in the RECORD:

RED CHINA LOBBY TRIES NEW TACK

(By William F. Buckley, Jr.)

Dr. Walter Judd (is there, by the way, anywhere a more impressive American?) was in Taipei when the news went out that the United Nations Association of the United States had released a report by a "panel of American businessmen and scholars" urging the recognition of Red China.

Judd was understandably chagrined. He thought, as most people would, that this year above all years the lobby to recognize Red China would take a sabbatical.

After all, U Thant himself, who sometimes talked about the recognition of Red China the way some people talk about achieving the Heavenly Kingdom, is on record as considering the season inappropriate for that kind of action, and for perhaps the first time in a half-dozen years it is generally accepted that the conventional agitation to recognize Red China will be confined to the fever-swamps of the United Nations left, a force about as potent as the movement to impeach Earl Warren.

Judd wondered, as might we all, how come the movement to recognize Red China should have arisen this particular moment. The report of the United Nation Association remarked that this is precisely the right historical moment to recognize Red China, i.e., because Red China is in turmoil. Students of the apologetics for recognition will notice the strangely consistent inconsistencies of the Red China lobby.

Back a few years ago when unquestionably in control of all of China, the argument was that we should recognize the Mao government as the de facto ruler of China with which, like it or not, we would have to deal for generations to come, and wouldn't it be better to introduce Mao's representative into polite society at the United Nations and attempt there to deflect him from his militant stances?

No sooner did this argument become accepted as the staple of the recognition forces than Mao Tse-tung's power over Red China began suddenly to slip, so much so that we had reports from Radio Moscow last week that in the course of attempting to maintain his control, Mao has "suppressed"—a word that is widely regarded by students of Communist euphemism as equivalent to "liquidated"—5-million members of the Communist party. If the figures are anywhere near correct, one can get some idea of the scope of the horror going on in Red China.

To suggest at this moment in world history the advisability of throwing the diplomatic weight of the United Nations and, derivatively, of the United States, toward the stabilization of Mao's regime is, to put it gently, crooked.

But the whole episode was symbolic of the fetichistic attitude of some Americans towards the United Nations. Membership in the United Nations is, as far as some of them are concerned, a baptismal experience—grace instantly follows, and wonderful things lope in over the horizon.

It is this that characterizes the liberals' faith that the United Nations is somehow a civilizing experience. And at this point in history, as Judd unquestionably reasoned, although he had the tact not to reason out loud in Taipei—do we really desire such a tranquilization of Mao's control?

If one were guaranteed that by giving Mao a reassured control of China, one might spare the lives of a great many people, one might acknowledge the temptation to hand China over to him. But second thoughts would surely get in the way of such a devil's bargain.

The World Anti-Communist League is a new organization, whose principal officials—veterans of the anti-Communist struggle in China, Korea, Vietnam, Japan, the Philippines—have much less to learn about how to fight the Communists than they do about how to understand the thinking of the putative anti-Communists who exercise so considerable an influence on Western thought.

ENDURING "SUPPORT OF THIS DECLARATION": WALTER KNOTT'S INDEPENDENCE HALL

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, all Americans are aware of the Nation's birthplace in Philadelphia's Independence Hall. Fewer people, perhaps, are aware that there is, on the west coast, an exact replica—exact to the most minute detail—of the historic Independence Hall. This building stands on the grounds of Knott's Berry Farm in Buena Park, Calif. It was built by Walter Knott.

Personally, Walter Knott's Independence Hall, and the tour which guides Americans and persons from other nations through it, is even more inspiring, even more likely to well-up the pride of Americans, than the original. For here Walter Knott, an outstanding American, has re-created a part of outstanding America, just as it stands in the original, and added a 14-track stereotape which re-creates the debates of the men who made the choice between liberty and death. The visitor is thus treated to the words which were spoken by men two centuries ago. Lights dim in the chamber and the words of great Americans seem to come from the chairs in which they sat, debate shifting from one part of the room to another as 56 men embarked on the future of all of us.

When asked why he built Independence Hall, Walter Knott replied:

I was asked that same question 25 years ago when we started "Ghost Town." Mrs. Knott and I were 50 years old then; our restaurant business was just getting started and there were so many places on the Farm that needed improvement, yet we felt stirred by the historical past that Ghost Town was to portray, so we let other things wait while we proceeded to build Ghost Town.

Mrs. Knott and I are 75 and we feel this project can be put off no longer, or it might never be done.

Our Declaration of Independence was worked out and signed there by 56 brave men who closed it with these famous words, "And in the support of this declaration, with a reliance on the protection of divine providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor." Truly great men. Then after nearly ten years of war when victory finally came, other great, and I believe divinely guided, men again met in Independence Hall to decide what kind of government we should have. They too produced one of the world's greatest documents—our Constitution. These two documents are among the greatest ever conceived by man; they have changed the course of liberty.

Independence Hall is a beautiful and stately building and one all of us at the Farm will be very proud of. Like the original in Philadelphia, ours too will house a great Liberty Bell, perhaps America's greatest symbol of freedom.

Over the years millions of Americans will visit our Independence Hall and be reminded of our great American heritage. Each year thousands of school children will come and touch the Liberty Bell and see where our great documents were signed, and will view a short motion picture depicting exciting bits of our history.

I think, like starting Ghost Town 25 years ago, building Independence Hall will be a milestone in the history of the Farm and one we are all going to be proud of. It will be our reminder of some of the greatest events in all history.

The painstaking reproduction started with an extensive study of the original which included many trips east, many photographs and drawings. The 2,080 pound Liberty Bell provided one of the most challenging tasks, since it was to be authentically cracked. Finally, after freezing it in dry ice and heating the crack-area with a torch, the bell cracked, exactly like the original.

The first of 140,000 hand-finished clay bricks was laid December 13, 1965, by Mr. Knott. Then, in turn, the building took shape, through stages of the lower structure, reproducing the furniture and even the chandeliers and silver ink-stand for the speaker's table, through the giant four-faced clock and copper sheeted cupola to the ultimate height of 168 feet.

The reproduction represents a masterful feat of construction but visitors are treated to a tour which is equally superb.

Before entering Independence Hall, visitors are given a history of the original structure and of the men and ideas that made it famous. In nearby Heritage Hall guests view a short film and hear one of the most impressive presentations on America liberty which I have ever experienced.

I submit for the RECORD a transcript of this presentation. It not only relates the meaning of Walter Knott's, and the original, Independence Halls, but it indicates the true dedication and love of American freedom which Mr. Knott possesses and has most successfully passed to future generations.

In an attractive color booklet relating the construction and some of the history of the "new" hall, there are two paragraphs which sum up the importance to Mr. Knott of recreating Independence Hall:

> For many years, Walter Knott sheltered a dream. His dream was to build an Independence Hall at Knott's Berry Farm.
>
> Yet, his dream went much further than merely building an Independence Hall that would be a duplicate of the original in Philadelphia. He wanted each visitor to relive a very important moment of our history, to feel the never-to-be-forgotten experience of being present at the signing of the Declaration of Independence.

Walter Knott can be proud of his achievement.

As an indication of what visitors are treated to, I include at this point a portion of the presentation. It is worth while for all Americans to consider what it says:

> How long has man lived upon the planet, Earth? No one can truly say. But this much is known. . . .
>
> For the thousands of years man has been attempting to build civilization, his efforts at finding a way of lasting peace, prosperity, and happiness have, for the most part, been a failure.
>
> It is an endless cycle: The rise of great civilizations . . . The Fall of great civilizations.
>
> Through the ages, Man has unceasingly sought some great magical power by which he could overcome all his problems and live happily ever after. When, as would inevitably happen, one power failed to provide for his desires, he revolted and sought another.
>
> Old-world revolutions never were true revolutions. They were revolutions only in the sense of substituting one form of government for another, only to find that in the end it was still the same old tyranny, disguised under a new name.
>
> There have been 6,000 years of this, and for 6,000 years, man has suffered torture, starvation, and slaughter.
>
> In 6,000 years of man's history, there has never been but one real revolution. It was the revolution against ancient superstitions, against the idea that some other mortal, possessed of extraordinary power, had the right to control the lives of other men.
>
> It was a revolution for freedom, personal responsibility, and human dignity.
>
> This revolution struggled, as it wove itself slowly and painfully through the faltering attempts of man in building civilization.
>
> It began in part with Socrates, who was condemned to death by the mob cry of Athens. His crime, that of preaching the importance of the individual, and the right to question the gods of the state.
>
> It was carried on in the teaching of Jesus of Nazareth, who emphasized the dignity and moral responsibility of the individual, and proclaimed, "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."
>
> It grew in man's noblest convictions—in his realization that he was created in the divine image—that he was endowed with the right and the ability to govern his own life.
>
> The true revolution found its fulfillment in the American Revolution, for that revolution was far more than one small segment of humanity throwing off and substituting the bonds of one tyranny for another.
>
> It was the cry of the people saying, "Enough, enough of the devine right of kings, the tyranny of the mob, enough of inquisitions, enough of the super planners and the political fanatics."
>
> And in the place of the old superstitions that man must be beholden to, there came these words: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal and that they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights."
>
> Far more than a document that declared our independence from England, the Declaration of Independence was a proclamation that the secret of man's happiness lay not in the hands of all-powerful rulers, but rather within the hearts and hands of man, the individual—if he would but grasp the opportunity and accept the responsibility.
>
> It took ten years of bitter fighting and terrible suffering on the part of both soldiers and civilians before the American colonies could make good their Declaration of Independence. And still the task lay unfinished . . .
>
> In 1787, many of the same delegates who voted independence, returned to Independence Hall, where they drafted the great blueprint for a strong and unified national government.
>
> The Constitution of the United States of America was described by the immortal English statesman, William Gladstone, as: "The most perfect work ever struck off at a given point in time, by the brain and purpose of man."
>
> The cornerstone of its construction is this concept: Let men be governed by laws based upon eternal principles, and not governed by laws based upon the changing whims of man.
>
> Our Founding Fathers had a deep suspicion of all governments, including the one they founded. The majority of these men were deeply versed in the decline and fall of man's past civilizations. They were resolved that ancient mistakes should not be repeated here.
>
> They believed that one of the great threats to a man's life, liberty, and property had always been the government under which he lived. Believed that all governments in time would, if permitted, enslave the people, always with the excuse of "taking care" of the people.
>
> That is why they tried to bind the American Government down with a constitution limiting governmental powers to carefully specified responsibilities, with a system of checks and balances, to keep any one branch from becoming too powerful. Their philosophy was that free men under God could manage their own affairs.
>
> In the words of George Washington: "Government is not reason, it is not eloquence; it is force. Like fire, it is a dangerous servant, a fearful master."
>
> The words of Benjamin Franklin: "They that can give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety, deserve neither liberty nor safety." Thomas Jefferson declared: "That government is best which governs least. The natural process of things is for liberty to yield, and government to gain ground."
>
> Through the profound wisdom of our Founding Fathers, both the bodies and spirits of Americans were free. The age-old chains had been taken off the individual and placed on his government.
>
> Imagine a handful of people living on the fringe of a giant continent with barely a foothold, only the most primitive means of communications, no proper tools, no engines, no capital, no industry.
>
> Knowing that he alone was master of his destiny, the American rose to this challenge. Free to earn what he could, and keep what he earned, he set his eyes to the sky and knew there was no limit.
>
> From the hardships they had endured, the trials and sacrifices, Americans had won something far more precious than land or abundance. They had achieved that supreme self-confidence that comes from having won the good struggle.
>
> Three generations of Americans, with their fierce jealousy for freedom of enterprise, and their belief in limited constitutional government, had created here the most prosperous and remarkable nation on earth. It was not only a matter of what we possessed in natural resources and knowledge. Other people had as much as ours, or more. It was what we did with what we had.
>
> Here was a place where a common man could be uncommon; where a man could become whatever his faith, his energy, his intellect, his manhood combined to make him, and without an oppressive government to hold him down to the common level. This was the challenge, the hope, the American heritage that touched and inspired hearts everywhere. What was America's magical secret? It can be stated in a few words—God-given freedom, personal responsibility, and limited government. Under these standards, men had the incentive to do their best. The twentieth century dawned, and America stepped into another era. At this point in our history, we could look back upon accomplishments, that made all previous efforts of civilization pale by comparison. Freedom has, as its natural and inescapable by-product, given Americans the world's highest standard of living. Freedom is the foundation of all our advantages.
>
> Today, the great Declaration of Independence and the American Constitution are physically the best preserved documents in the world.
>
> Yet, how many realize that these magnificent documents of human freedom, for all their physical protection, will become only faded museum pieces, if we Americans forget their true inner meaning, the significance that lies behind the words on their surface.
>
> Shortly after the Revolution, Thomas Jefferson looked ahead in time, and wondered about future generations, when he said: "Yes, we did produce a near perfect Republic, but will they keep it, or will they in the enjoyment of plenty, lose the memory of freedom? Material abundance without character is the surest way to destruction."
>
> Freedom rests, and always will, on indi-

vidual responsibility, courage, and faith. It does not rest in centralized government, or in the hands of powerful politicians; it rests with you and me.

If we are to keep our freedom, if our revolution is to triumph, its ideals and the understanding of its terms must be born anew in the hearts and minds of each succeeding generation.

Freedom is not ours by simple inheritance—but ours by virtue of our constant willingness to earn it.

James Monroe said it this way: "There is a price tag on human liberty. That price is the willingness to assume the responsibilities of being free men. Payment of this price is a personal matter with each of us." The true revolution for human freedom, the revolution of ideals, which found fulfillment in America, was the only new and glorious change that happened to the race of man in over 6,000 years of agonizing history. And it all began under the eaves of this stately building, six short generations ago.

In a few moments you will be taken on a guided tour of a painstaking brick-by-brick reconstruction of this great shrine to human freedom. As you pass through its corridors into the very room where our nation was born—perhaps you will recall your many personal blessings in being a part of this nation and its great heritage.

But most dramatically of all, perhaps, the thought may occur to you, what if the American Revolution had failed? What if the opponents of Independence had won out? What if the courage of our forefathers had faltered? What if they had not been willing to pay the price of being free men? What then? . . . Where might you be today? . . . What might you be doing now? . . .

NOT ALL LOBBYISTS ARE REGISTERED

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, on September 1 the Associated Press filed an article from Washington that opened with this paragraph:

> Senate Democratic Leader Mike Mansfield has privately passed the word to President Johnson to order lobbyists for government agencies to "keep their distance" from the Senate.

Another paragraph, in reference to the battle on Capitol Hill over the foreign aid bill this year stated:

> When lobbyists set up shop in the Capitol itself, Sen. Wayne Morse, D-Ore., a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, raged: "In room 104 downstairs, for the first time in the history of the handling of the aid bill, AID is maintaining a lobby that is right under the dome."

The latest quarterly report in the Congressional Record devoted 21 pages to presenting, as required by law, the list of organizations and individuals registered under Public Law 601, 79th Congress, title III, Regulation of Lobbying Act, section 308(b).

If only as a public service, Government lobbyists should also be required to register so that taxpayers might understand just how many Federal employees are engaged in the business of trying to influence Congress. The number has grown over the years, and there is a constant stream of lobbyists on both sides of the Capitol from State, Commerce, Treasury, Health, Education, and Welfare, Housing and Urban Development, and all departments. Admittedly, some of them are most helpful in the necessary liaison between the Hill and downtown, but entirely too many are engaged in attempts to cajole, threaten, and bribe Members of Congress into acceding to the wishes of the executive department. I use these terms advisedly, for it has become common practice to promise a new post office or atomic facility to the Member who conforms, to threaten the loss of funds in the district to one who refuses to go along with an administration project.

Neither party is blameless, and the system is objectionable regardless of which side is in power.

Registration of Government lobbyists might not eliminate the evils attendant to the use of executive department influence, but it would at least open the books to those who are paying the bills and might even bring public demand for reform.

POLL SHOWS VOTER ATTITUDE CHANGES

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. Wyatt] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, recently I published the returns of my annual questionnaire in the Congressional Record. This questionnaire was sent out in the early spring of the year and the results reflected the feelings of those polled at that time.

Just last week the Press, a newspaper in the First Congressional District in Oregon, reprinted the section of my questionnaire dealing with the Vietnamese situation. The paper invited readers to submit their answers in order to update the survey.

Although there are several mitigating factors to be taken into consideration in comparing the polls, the change in the public attitude between spring and fall is so significant that I believe it should be brought to the attention of my colleagues. I present it here for their inspection:

Poll Shows: Voters Ask Vietnam Withdrawal

The "doves" are taking over.

That's the conclusion drawn from an examination of preliminary responses to The Press poll on the war in Vietnam compared with answers received to the same questions last spring.

Straw ballot voters favor immediate unconditional withdrawal of the United States from Vietnam. Voters do not favor bombing in North Vietnam. And an overwhelming number protest the increased commitment of American ground troops in the current struggle.

Most startling result is opinion concerning the legal and moral aspects of U.S. involvement in Vietnam. Sixty-two per cent of voters in The Press poll to date voted affirmatively when asked if they believe the war to be "illegal, immoral and completely unjustifiable American military intervention in Asia."

The ballot, which appeared on this page in last week's editions, utilized the same questions posed by Rep. Wendell Wyatt last spring in a questionnaire submitted to his constituents in the First Congressional District. A tabulation of results of the Wyatt questionnaire and The Press poll are printed below for comparison purposes.

Rep. Wyatt's results are based on responses from some 20,000 registered voters in his bailiwick. The questionnaire included questions on issues other than Vietnam involvement. The congressman this week reported nearly one in ten persons in the First District responded.

Preliminary percentages published here are the result of a tabulation of the first 628 responses to The Press poll and subsequent response continues heavy at this writing.

Generally speaking, and although percentages are not overwhelming in every instance, a comparison of results indicates a strong change in public opinion from the more hawk-like response to the Wyatt questionnaire.

Congressman Wyatt's district includes Clackamas, Washington, Yamhill, Benton, Clatsop, Columbia, Lincoln, Polk and Tillamook Counties and Multnomah County west of the Stadium Freeway.

The Press circulation area involves the heaviest populated portions of Multnomah, Washington and Clackamas Counties.

THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Here is a preliminary report on the Vietnam War poll which appeared in The Press last week.

To give a comparison of any change in thinking since Congressman Wendell Wyatt sent out his questionnaire last June, both results are reported. Both polls were worded identically.

1. Should the United States withdraw immediately and unconditionally from Vietnam?

The Press: yes, 52%; no, 48%.
Wyatt: yes, 17%; no, 76%.

2. Do you favor the bombing of Hanoi and of Haiphong and other northern cities thus far exempted from attack?

The Press: yes, 45%; no, 55%.
Wyatt: yes, 59%; no, 25%.

3. Should we continue to increase the commitment of American ground troops to Vietnam?

The Press: yes, 25%; no, 75%.
Wyatt: yes, 47%; no, 39%.

4. In prosecuting the war, should the United States take whatever military actions are deemed necessary to accomplish its goal without regard to the possibility of direct intervention by Red China?

The Press: yes, 42%; no, 58%.
Wyatt: yes, 60%; no, 28%.

5. Do you favor the taking of whatever military actions are deemed necessary to force the North Vietnamese to the conference table?

The Press: yes, 48%; no, 52%.
Wyatt: yes, 69%; no, 19%.

6. Should the United States cease, unconditionally, its bombing attacks upon North Vietnam?

The Press: yes, 52%; no, 48%.
Wyatt: yes, 20%; no, 70%.

7. Should the United States attempt to prompt peace negotiations by another temporary pause in bombing attacks?

The Press: yes, 50%; no, 50%.
Wyatt: yes, 22%; no, 67%.

8. Should the National Liberation Front (the Viet Cong) be included as a party to any future peace negotiations?

The Press: yes, 73%; no, 27%.
Wyatt: yes, 54%; no, 26%.

9. Do you believe the war to be, as one leading critic has described it, an "illegal, immoral and completely unjustifiable American military intervention in Asia?"

The Press: yes, 62%; no, 38%.

Wyatt: yes, 26%; no, 63%.

PRESERVING OUR NATURAL ASSETS—PREVENTING EUTROPHICATION OF LAKES

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KUPFERMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, as the trend toward greater urbanization in the United States continues, we should place at a premium among domestic goals, measures that would preserve the rapidly deteriorating and vanishing natural assets of our Nation. Deteriorating natural assets in great need of our attention are the lakes of our country.

Although the life span of a lake is, under normal conditions, measured in millenniums and eons,[1] the aging of a lake is often rapidly advanced due to the unnatural interference of man. This artificially accelerated aging takes place instead of being slowly brought about through various natural changes of the earth's surface. The Lake Restoration Act of 1967, which I have introduced today, seeks to prevent any further unnecessary aging and deterioration of our Nation's lakes.

A lake reaches old age, or even its demise, when certain plants growing within the lake reach such a proportion so as to cause the suffocation of desireable aquatic life, consume oxygen, and cause the water to lose its capacity for self-purification.[2] The aging of a lake is greately accelerated by eutrophication, the excessive fertilization of algae, and other aquatic plants, with nutrients. Our highly industrialized society has advanced the eutrophication of many of the lakes throughout the United States by the artificial introduction into our lakes of various nutrients which encourage eutrophication. Such nutrients are phosphate in its many forms—a common element found in sewage, human waste, agricultural fertilizers, and industrial discharges—and nitrates.[3]

In a recent release[4] issued by the Department of the Interior, Frank C. Di Luzio, Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Water Pollution Control, stated that "until now, we have not adequately controlled these causes which help to speed the natural processes of eutrophication." It is clear that the detrimental effects of eutrophication and its artificial acceleration have been observed for far longer than justified without adequate defensive steps having been taken.

Eutrophication, which is directly related to the life span of a lake, refers to the rate at which nutrients enter a body of water. It results in the noxious premature aging of bodies of water and is not limited to any one part of the United States. Critical examples of this problem are the Great Lakes, especially Lake Erie, and the marine water surrounding New York City, as well as lakes in California, Washington, Oregon, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Maine, Connecticut, and even the Potomac River.[5]

The effect of eutrophication on a lake's usefulness is both dramatic and costly. The prolific growth of aquatic plants, which can transform a lake into a marshland in a mere two or three generations, not only adversely affects the use of a lake for boating and fishing, but also may completely nullify any use of the lake's shoreline for swimming purposes, due to the formation of a thick slime on the shore.[6] Also, swimming in eutrophic lakes often results in odors on the swimmers' body.[7] The quality of water from eutrophic lakes is also affected. Eutrophication produces foul tasting and smelling water, and the removal of such taste and odor increases the cost of treating water for drinking purposes.[8]

Mr. Di Luzio made it quite clear that the Department of the Interior is "unprepared—legally, institutionally, operationally, and technically—to deal effectively with a major crisis such as the aging and possible death of Lake Erie," and that the Interior Department is "also unprepared to cope adequately with the many smaller cases of euthrophication that continue to contaminate our water."[9]

The Lake Restoration Act of 1967 that I have introduced today seeks to vest with the Department of the Interior the major responsibility for solving this very critical problem. My bill directs the Department of the Interior to encourage local communities and States, through technical assistance and planning grants on a 50-percent matching funds basis, to design comprehensive programs to restore eutrophic lakes. This bill also directs the Interior Department to coordinate the several Federal agency programs relating to the restoration of lakes—for example, the Department of the Interior; the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; the Department of Housing and Urban Development; and the Department of Agriculture—emphasizing the development of new and improved methods of solving eutrophication problems, the restoration of eutrophic lakes, and, whenever feasible, improvement of the shorelands and adjacent areas so that full use of the lakes for recreational purposes is possible.

This legislation further directs the Department of the Interior to expand its efforts to develop: first, more precise knowledge of the eutrophication process; second, more effective programs and methods for the elimination of phosphates, and other substances which encourage unwanted plant growth, from treatment plant effluent; third, better methods of measuring the phosphates and similar substances contributed by industrial waste waters; and fourth, programs to encourage private industry to develop chemical substitutes for phosphate in detergents. To accomplish these aims the Lake Restoration Act of 1967 provides that the Department of the Interior shall develop special research and demonstration programs for preventing the entry of nutrients into, and removing existing nutrients from, lake waters.

For the purpose of such special research and demonstration programs the Natural Resources and Power Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations recommended[10] that funds be appropriated in an amount comparable to the sum which Congress authorized for research on the problems of storm and combined sewers, advanced waste treatment systems, and pollution by industry. Thus, my bill asks for an appropriation of $20 million to carry out the goals of the Lake Restoration Act of 1967.

Many lakes which are today used not only as a source of drinking water supply, but also for recreational purposes, are daily threatened with extinction. Enactment of the Lake Restoration Act of 1967 is a constructive attempt at preventing this threat from becoming a fait accompli.

In the mobile and highly urbanized society in which we live today, a great many people rely on lakes many miles from their homes for recreational purposes. I myself often spend summer weekends in an area of New York State that allows me to take advantage of the recreational facilities of a lake. I know that many of my constituents seek relief from the steel and concrete canyons of Manhattan by vacationing near one of the magnificent lakes located in New York State.

Now is the time to act, and not wait until the word "eutrophication," like "pollution," is a household word.

TAX SHARING AND FISCAL FEDERALISM

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, on which I am privileged to serve together with our distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from North

---

[1] 1967 Journal of Water Pollution 737.

[2] Industrial Water Engineering, Feb. 1966, p. 27.

[3] U.S. Dept. of the Interior Release, Aug. 4, 1967.

[4] U.S. Dept. of the Interior Release, June 15, 1967.

[5] *Ibid.*

[6] Industrial Water Engineering, Feb. 1966, p. 33.

[7] *Ibid.*

[8] *Ibid.*

[9] U.S. Dept. of the Interior Release, June 15, 1967.

[10] Committee on Government Operations, *To Save America's Small Lakes*, H.R. Rep. No. 594, 90th Cong., 1st Sess. 17(1967).

Carolina [Mr. Fountain] and the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. Ullman], has just completed one of the most important and comprehensive studies ever conducted on the fiscal relationships between Federal, State, and local governments—upon the proper balance of which depends our ability to solve our most pressing urban and environmental problems.

The Commission has prepared a press release describing its principal findings and conclusions and summarizing its principal recommendations. In view of the great interest in this subject on the part of our colleagues, I include the Commission material herewith as a part of my remarks:

ACIR Proposes Revenue Sharing and Metropolitan Fiscal Changes

The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations at a two-day meeting October 6 and 7 recommended a wide ranging program of Congressional and State legislative action to improve the fiscal balance among Federal, State, and local levels of government.

The Commission adopted a proposal calling upon the Federal government to broaden the "mix" of Federal aid to States and localities to include not only existing types of "categorical assistance" but also block grants and general support payments—so-called "revenue sharing." The block grants, the Commission urged, should be developed "through the consolidation of existing specific grants-in-aid to give States and localities greater flexibility in meeting needs in broad functional areas." General support payments, the Commission recommended, should be "on a per capita basis, adjusted for variations in tax effort." They would "allow States and localities to devise their own programs and set their own priorities to help solve their unique and most crucial problems." Chairman Farris Bryant did not concur in the Commission's action.

Among the startling findings emerging from the Commission's year long study of "fiscal federalism" are:

An increasing fiscal disparity between central cities and suburbs, particularly in the Northeast and Midwest.

The paradox of central city poverty in the midst of metropolitan plenty is strikingly illustrated by the fact that the country's metropolitan areas account for 65 percent of the population, 70 percent of taxable assessed valuation, three-quarters or more of Federal personal income tax collections, and 80 percent of bank checking accounts; but these areas also account for most of the nation's poverty, crime, delinquency, and civil disorder.

A concentration of "high cost citizens"—children in school, the elderly, welfare recipients—in the central city, and this concentration will increase in the future.

Central city educational expenditures are lower than in the suburbs, not only on a per capita basis, but also on a per pupil basis. Where the need is greatest the support dollars are fewest.

The local tax burden in the central cities, measured against income, is more than 50 percent greater than in the suburbs. Growth in State and Federal aid has not been sufficient to counteract growing disparities in per capita tax revenues between the central city and suburbia.

The Commission also called on the States to equip themselves with a productive and broad-based tax system, including effective but equitable use of the local property tax to enable them to underwrite a major portion of their expanding expenditure requirements.

To facilitate balanced use of property, income, and sales taxes, the Commission recommended that States adopt policies to shield basic family income from sales tax excesses and limit the burden of residential property taxes on low income families.

Major Commission proposals for easing metropolitan disparities call for:

States to establish regional school property taxing districts empowered to levy areawide taxes for allocation among school districts in the region; such arrangements would be for financial rather than operating or policy purposes.

States to provide financial incentives for specialized, multi-district educational facilities designed to meet special high cost educational needs.

Congress to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to permit use of available grant funds for incentives to State action to balance fiscal resources with educational needs in metropolitan areas.

States to add to their school aid formulas appropriate factors reflecting higher per pupil costs among disadvantaged children, especially in heavily populated areas.

States and localities to remove any legal obstacles to greater involvement of private enterprise in the solution of central city problems and to encourage private-public efforts to overcome economic and fiscal deterioration in major cities.

State government to empower a State agency to order, where needed, consolidation or dissolution of local government units within a metropolitan area to minimize continued fragmentation of the tax base.

The Commission took note of population growth patterns which point to further concentration of people in metropolitan areas. The ACIR now has underway a study on "Balanced Urbanization and New Community Development" that explores this problem; a draft report will be considered at the Commission's January 1968 meeting.

The Commission also called for marked improvements in the collection, analysis, and dissemination of social, economic, and fiscal data at all levels of government.

The Commission's action today marks the completion of its wide-ranging study of intergovernmental fiscal arrangements. At its July 21st meeting the Commission adopted a score of recommendations designed to strengthen the Federal grant-in-aid system and to modernize the structure and financial operations of State Government.

The 26-member Commission is a bipartisan body established by Congress to maintain continuing review of the relations among Federal, State and local governments. Its membership consists of governors, mayors, county officials, State legislators, and representatives from both Houses of the Congress, the Federal Executive Branch and the general public.

Farris Byrant, former Governor of Florida is Chairman of the Commission.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Adoption of a flexible combination of federal financial assistance to States and localities to consist of categorical grants-in-aid, general functional block grants, and per capita general support payments. The federal support payments, adjusted for variations in tax effort, could be made to either State or major local units of government; they should not conflict with any existing comprehensive State plan. (Chairman Bryant dissented.)

2. Achieving better balance in State and local tax systems by more effective local use of the property tax, the adoption of broad based State taxes, and the shielding of basic family income from undue burdens of sales and property taxes.

3. Strengthening the productivity of the sales tax, by protecting low-income families from undue tax burdens on sales of food and drugs.

4. Strengthening the productivity of the local property tax by State action to help localities in relieving low-income families from undue property tax burdens.

5. State authorization of regional school property taxing districts to assist in equalizing the property tax burdens of school financing between central cities and suburbs.

6. State authorization and financial assistance for specialized educational facilities on a multi-district basis.

7. Federal encouragement and financial assistance for multidistrict educational arrangements.

8. Addition of factors in State school aid formulas to reflect higher per pupil costs for disadvantaged children, especially in densely populated areas; amendment to Elementary and Secondary Education Act to authorize use of available grant funds in support of such action.

9. Prevention of fragmentation of the tax base by authorizing State agencies subject to public hearing and court review to consolidate or dissolve local governmental units within metropolitan areas, to stop the use of inter-local contracts that contribute to fragmentation, and to reduce State aid to local governments not meeting statutory standards of economic, geographic, and political viability.

10. Fostering neighborhood initiative and self-respect by authorizing counties and large cities to establish, and at their discretion to abolish, neighborhood subunits endowed with limited powers of taxation and local self-government.

11. Federal, State and local financing of neighborhood information centers and referral services to orient in-migrants and others to the demands of urban society.

12. State constitutional and statutory action to remove barriers to private involvement in coping with urban problems and to enhance public-private cooperation.

13. Expansion of Internal Revenue Service statistical reports on income to provide data on individual units of local government within Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas.

14. Establishment of a national system of social accounts, with special emphasis on the development of such data for individual cities, counties and Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas, as well as State and national aggregates.

15. Establishment by existing or new nongovernmental organizations of data facilities to measure comparative performance levels of local governmental units for the major urban functions. This effort should look toward setting optimal standards, and collecting, analyzing and publishing data.

16. Improved coordination, through the Executive Office of the President, of Federal grant programs being administered by a variety of Federal departments and agencies.

17. Decentralization to Federal regional offices of review and approval of plans resulting from Federal formula-type grants to State and local governments. Reduction in the wide variations in boundaries of Federal administrative regions.

18. Bringing Federal Executive Boards under Bureau of the Budget supervision and providing at least one full-time staff member for each of the major Boards.

19. State action to remove restrictions on the length and frequency of State legislative sessions including serious consideration of annual sessions by those States now holding biennial sessions. (Governor Dempsey dissented.)

20. Establishment by State legislatures of machinery for following Federal legislation and for presenting State legislators' views at Congressional hearings.

21. Revision by Congress of Section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 to strengthen comprehensive planning at State, regional, metropolitan and local levels, and to require review and comment by State planning agencies of project proposals impinging upon

State or local comprehensive plans. The Commission took no position on assignment of responsibility within the Federal Government for financial assistance to State and local planning activities.

22. Serious consideration by the States to providing more constitutional flexibility for long-range State financing.

ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Farris Bryant, Chairman (Director, Office of Emergency Planning).

Price Daniel, Vice Chairman, Austin, Texas.

Ben Barnes, Speaker, House of Representatives, Austin, Texas.

William O. Beach, County Judge, Montgomery County, Clarksville, Tenn.

Neal S. Blaisdell, Mayor, Honolulu, Hawaii.

Ramsey Clark, Attorney General.

Dorothy I. Cline, Professor of Government, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque.

John Dempsey, Governor, Hartford, Connecticut.

C. George De Stefano, Member of the State Senate, Barrington, R. I.

Florence P. Dwyer, Member of the House of Representatives.

Buford Ellington, Governor, Nashville, Tennessee.

Sam J. Ervin, Jr., Member of the Senate.

L. H. Fountain, Member of the House of Representatives.

Henry Fowler, Secretary of the Treasury.

Alexander Heard, Chancellor, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.

Jack D. Maltester, Mayor, San Leandro, California.

Angus McDonald, Commissioner, Yakima County, Washington.

Theodore R. McKeldin, Mayor, Baltimore, Maryland.

Karl E. Mundt, Member of the Senate.

Edmund S. Muskie, Member of the Senate.

Arthur Naftalin, Mayor, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

James A. Rhodes, Governor, Columbus, Ohio.

Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor, Albany, New York.

Gladys N. Spellman, Commissioner, Prince George's County, Maryland.

Al Ullman, Member of the House of Representatives.

Jesse M. Unruh, Speaker of the Assembly, Sacramento, California.

THE REAL ISSUE IN THE TAX-SPENDING IMPASSE

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. Dwyer] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, it is a source of considerable encouragement to me, and I am certain to many of our colleagues as well, that there is beginning to emerge from the debate on Federal spending and taxes and from the impasse presently existing between the Congress and the administration a new awareness that the central issue is more than the immediate one of dollars and cents and involves nothing less than the purposes, the structure, and the organization of the Federal Government.

Faced with mounting demands on limited Federal resources, the proliferation of Federal programs to meet those demands, and the increasingly amorphous and unresponsive character of the Federal bureaucracy, we can no longer postpone the effort to reorganize the executive branch and reshape its structure and functions in a more rational way. Only in this way, I believe, can we achieve such objectives as the identification and measurement of national needs, the establishment of priorities, the evaluation and improvement of program effectiveness, the control of expenditures, the elimination of unnecessary delay and duplication, and a generally higher quality of governmental performance, accountability and responsiveness.

The distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, whose statement last Friday has contributed greatly to the reorientation of the debate around this key issue, summed the problem up most clearly and succinctly when he said:

> Let's start now on the big job of making sure our Government does what we want it to, the way we want it to, when we want it to, and as much as we want it to.

The response in the press to the chairman's statement has been immediate and gratifying, and I am pleased to include as a part of my remarks the editorials published in the Washington Post and Washington Star on October 9 and in the Wall Street Journal on October 10.

I also include as a part of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, the text of my current "Report to the People," which I prepared on October 7 for distribution to my constituents this week, in which I have tried to explore some of the implications of the chairman's statement and suggest some legislation which the Congress could immediately begin to consider.

The newsletter and editorials follow:

Economy: A Way To Obtain Better Government

(Congresswoman Dwyer's "Report to the People," 12th District of New Jersey, October 12, 1967)

The distinguished chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee—the group whose great influence stems from its exclusive power to originate revenue (tax) legislation—raised an immensely important issue late last week when he criticized his own Administration for "missing the point" about Congressional insistence on cutting Federal spending this year.

It's not simply that Congress believes it is urgent to reduce the budget in the face of a inflation-producing deficit which could reach $30 billion—welcome as such cuts would be, Chairman Mills pointed out—but it's the more important objective of controlling and shaping the growth of the Federal government and the substance of Federal programs.

What we should be doing, he insisted, is looking beyond the next fiscal year or two and trying to make sure "that the kinds of things the Federal government does—the nature of its claims on the economy (the Nation's productive capacity)—conform with the Nation's changing preferences." Or, as he put it in the final sentence of his statement, "Let's start now on the big job of making sure our Government does what we want it to, the way we want it to, when we want it to, and as much as we want it to."

BY CHANGING THE SYSTEM

In other words, unless the system itself is changed—unless Federal activities and programs are subjected to a systematic and rational process of review and evaluation on a continuing basis—then the growth of Federal spending and Federal influence will become inevitable and unmanageable, contrary to all the canons of democratic theory. It's not a question of black-and-white or good versus evil. It's just the tax-financed programs, directed by officials who believe in those programs and supported by those who benefit from them, have a natural tendency to reproduce and multiply, and that the resulting structure of government—massive, ponderous, impersonal and relatively unresponsive—reduces the self-governing capacity of the people, the power of the people to decide their own future.

None of this is new, of course. But the significance of Chairman Mills' observations rests in the fact that he is one of the most respected and powerful leaders in Congress, a friend (though independent) of the Administration, a key figure in a critical position to influence crucial decisions. That a man of his stature should call attention so compellingly to facts which many would rather ignore, and at a time and place and under circumstances which cannot be avoided, provides hope that something may yet come of it.

There's been no shortage of solutions—only a lack of will. And while the chairman seemed to direct his criticism chiefly at the Administration, he might well have spared a share for his colleagues on Capitol Hill. For it is here, stacked away gathering dust on committee shelves, that some of the most hopeful and constructive devices for improving governmental performance and strengthening the people's control over the Federal establishment can be found.

ADOPTING SPECIFIC REFORMS

As a sponsor of many such measures, I've had occasion to describe them in previous newsletters, so I'll only mention a few in passing. You'll remember, for example, such proposals as: (1) the mandatory, periodic review of Federal grant-in-aid programs so as to eliminate the outmoded and unnecessary, improve the useful, and revise others according to changing needs; (2) the establishment of a new Hoover Commission to conduct a comprehensive and independent study of the entire Federal structure and recommend ways of simplifying, coordinating and re-arranging in a more efficient way the functions and activities of the Executive Branch; (3) the creation of a similar commission to determine how the Federal Government can utilize modern systems analysis and advanced management techniques to resolve problems in such major areas as housing, pollution control, education, etc., more effectively; and (4) the insistence that up-to-date cost accounting systems be installed in all departments and agencies as an essential step in controlling costs and evaluating programs.

And we have also failed to do our part, closer to home, by (a) reforming the creaky operations and outdated rules of Congress, (b) imposing on ourselves the kind of ethical standards and self-restraint which the responsible and representative character of this institution requires, and (c) establishing an oversight, or "watchdog," investigating committee chaired by the minority which could stimulate a higher level of supervision and watchfulness over the Executive Branch by the majority-controlled standing committees of Congress.

These, I believe, are some of the actions Congress could—and should—take as soon as possible to bring the results which Chairman Mills is seeking.

AND APPLYING THE HEAT

The need for such action was illustrated once again this week just four days before the chairman spoke out. In a commendable effort "to help find jobs and provide training for thousands of America's hard-core unemployed," the President launched still another new program—a program poorly timed, administratively clumsy, and of questionable worth. Poorly timed, because the government should be concentrating on quality rather than quantity. Administratively clumsy, because the new program will overlap, duplicate and confuse the 21 other Federal manpower training programs on which $2 billion a year is being spent. And of questionable worth, because the new program fails to include necessary improvements in defining jobs and identifying job openings and because it further postpones the time when a program of maximum effectiveness can replace the less useful programs. I refer to the Human Investment Act which would employ tax incentives to permit private business to provide direct on-the-job training with assurances of follow-up employment. To date, this has been the missing ingredient in Federal manpower programs: training in needed skills for specific job openings, and our bill would do more—dollar for dollar—to accomplish this than anything yet suggested, including the President's new program.

It is this kind of program proliferation and insensitivity to climbing costs that drove Congress in the past two weeks to apply new heat to the Administration in our efforts to achieve some economies. In rapid succession, the House (1) threatened to tie up a resolution permitting Federal agencies to spend funds at last year's levels until this year's appropriations have been approved; (2) secured a promise from the chairman of its Appropriations Committee that legislation will be brought to the floor cutting back appropriations already made; (3) suspended formally its consideration of the President's 10 percent surtax proposal until spending cutbacks have been made; and (4) sent back to House-Senate conference committee the Labor-Health, Education and Welfare Departments appropriations bill with directions to remove another $20 million; while the Senate—ordinarily much more generous—rejected a committee recommendation for an extra $2.8 billion for the poverty program.

No one can say the Administration has not been warned of Congress' determination, a determination born of the people's concern with higher taxes, higher prices, higher interest rates and lower performance of public functions.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 9, 1967]

A New Fiscal Dimension

Perhaps—after the rhetorical gunsmoke settles—the current fiscal encounter between Congress and the White House will prove to be just another in a long series of skirmishes that are resolved by token reductions in Federal expenditures. But Chairman Wilbur D. Mills of the House Ways and Means Committee opened a new dimension of an old dialogue by insisting that effective expenditure control can only be achieved by examining and making basic changes in Federal programs, not by "the broad ax spending slash approach." Surely that argument should be regarded as more than a tactical maneuver in an essentially sterile quarrel.

The real issue in the debate over Federal spending are obscured by ideological fog. "Liberals" automatically support the growth of Federal expenditures, especially those for non-military programs, while "conservatives" are quick to condemn them. But responses that are as predictable as the patellar reflex scarcely do justice to otherwise rational men. They should instead be concerned with two principal issues. How much of the Nation's resources should be transferred by taxation or borrowing from private consumption to public or collective consumption? Here there is question of registering the preferences of the electorate, an admittedly imperfect process. The second issue, assuming that preferences are known, involves the effectiveness of public expenditures. Are Federal programs assigned their proper priorities, and are specific programs achieving their stated goals?

The question of preferences—how much income Americans really want to transfer to the public sector—is at the heart of the dispute between Congress and the President. Mr. Mills maintains that the electorate is alarmed by the rapid growth of Federal spending in recent years and wishes to "curb the momentum of expanding Government activity." The Chairman's judgment could prove wrong. But no light at all is thrown on the issue when the Administration replies that Federal expenditures are below 16 per cent of the gross national product. Expenditures as a percentage of the GNP can decline while the absolute rise is very great, perhaps far greater than desired.

Interest groups frustrate efforts to control expenditures or assure their effectiveness. Once a Federal program is launched, strong, if not ineluctable pressures are exerted to expand it. That is why Congress is reluctant to levy a "temporary" increase in taxes. When funds are available, they tend to be spent, thus assuring the permanence of the increase in the level of Federal expenditures.

There are those who argue that no effort should be made to control expenditures because Congress will only decimate those programs designed to alleviate poverty. But even if that allegation were supportable—the appropriations suggest that it is not—there can be no valid defense of programs that fail to reflect the rational priorities of the society or that persistently fail to achieve their stated goals. Instead of "freezing" the more obvious pork barrel projects, a tactic that will only alter the timing of expenditures, not their amount, the Administration might meet Congressional objections by agreeing to a fundamental evaluation of all Federal programs.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Oct. 9, 1967]

Surtax Deadlock

As things stand, it looks very much as though rhetoric alone is not going to win a tax increase for the President.

On Saturday night, for the third time in as many days, Mr. Johnson made a strong, even emotional, appeal for a 10 percent surtax Addressing a Democratic fund-raising dinner ($1,000 a couple), the President said: "I have made my choice." He meant that despite his slump in the polls, he would not seek temporary popularity by yielding on the war in Vietnam, his tax proposal or "by abandoning the fight against discrimination—the fight for the poor here at home."

The implications of this last point are not going to help him. For his principal opponents on the tax issue, and especially Chairman Mills of the Ways and Means Committee, are not advocating that the fight against discrimination and the poor be abandoned. They will surely resent the President's insinuation to the contrary.

It has been and still is our belief that a tax increase coupled with reduced spending is necessary if inflation is to be held in check next year. The President has made some moves toward curbing spending. But he has not done enough to satisfy Chairman Mills, and the latter is in a very strong position as far as the tax increase question is concerned.

Backed by a 20-to-5 vote of his committee, Mr. Mills has simply tucked the tax increase measure in his pocket. "As of now," he has said, "the tax bill is dead." And he can make this stick if he wants to.

The Arkansas Democrat has not called for abandonment of the Great Society. But he has said that he and those House members who support him are trying to get the message across: "We want to pause in the headlong rush toward ever bigger government." To this end, he thinks the administration should review the 850 or more different government functions, decide which are no longer needed—which, though desirable, can be set aside during wartime—and send appropriate recommendations to Congress.

This does not strike us as an unreasonable attitude. And the President, when the speech-making is all over, ought to make an earnest effort to adjust to it.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Oct. 10, 1967]

Mr. Mills Makes a Point

The House Ways and Means Committee certainly startled the Administration last week when it voted to pigeonhole the proposed tax increase. Chairman Wilbur Mills, however, is fearful that the committee's message was not fully understood.

Obviously enough, the Ways and Means group does want the Administration to outline immediate cuts in spending. Yet, as Mr. Mills stressed, that objective is less important than progress toward keeping outlays under reasonable control in the future.

The Arkansas Democrat's concern may have been increased by the fact that the Administration's only important move toward lower spending recently has been a temporary freeze on several projects considered nonessential. Desirable as delays may be in these and other cases, they do nothing to limit the long-run outlay figures.

If Rep. Mills and other economy-minded Congressmen accept a few temporary spending cuts as evidence of Administration good faith, and then approve a tax boost, the very real danger is that outlays would grow enough to eat up any added revenue. The budget thus would be as badly out of kilter as ever and inflation would be very much with us; sooner or later, demands would be heard for still another tax increase.

To avert such a development, says Mr. Mills, Congress and the Administration must do some determined weeding among Federal programs.

"All of us know only too well," he declared, "that the present budget contains programs that may have lost their justification, and that we are called upon to approve others and vote vast sums for their operation without having any information about what their current objectives are and how well they are performing them or are likely to in the future."

One of the more discouraging aspects of the current situation, in fact, is that almost everyone in Government, from the President on down, has frequently spelled out the need for better budgetary control. Up to now, though, no one has done much toward that aim.

The basic changes needed are simple and sensible: Once the Government decides what it would like to do it should take a realistic look at available resources and then set hard priorities. Moreover, the Government should consider a number of approaches to any spending project, selecting the one that promises to deliver the most for the least cost. Finally, both the Administration and Congress must constantly check on existing programs, scrapping or revamping those that aren't doing the job.

As the Committee for Economic Development suggested some time ago, better fiscal control probably would call for beefed-up and better-coordinated budget staffs in the departments and agencies. The Budget Bureau quite possibly should also have greater power to ride herd on the agencies' requests and to review accomplishments or lack of same.

Then, too, Congress should have a chance to consider the budget in its entirety instead of piecemeal as the appropriations requests trickle in. The budget should also be broken down by programs so that it would be easier to spot the oft-occurring duplication of efforts among the multitude of agencies.

There are many other changes that are long overdue. As noted in these columns recently, the accounting practices of several agencies are sadly deficient, even by Federal standards. Perhaps, as the CED has proposed, the General Accounting Office should run regular audits of all the agencies.

Neither Mr. Mills nor anyone else is under any illusion that the Federal budget can be brought firmly under control overnight; there are, for one thing, too many political pressures for retaining the status quo. But he clearly sees that temporary spending cuts offer the economy no better sanctuary than a spot in the eye of a hurricane.

If the Administration doesn't get that idea, too, it will have missed the whole point of Mr. Mills' protest and set the stage for further financial deterioration.

IMPORTED MEAT LABELING

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, during recent years we have seen a great deal of controversy and substantial economic loss to beef producers throughout the country because of an excess volume of imported meat and meat food products from foreign countries. There has also been much concern expressed with regard to truth in labeling in order that the consumer might not in any way be misled because of a lack of, or misleading, label attached to any given product.

It would therefore seem to be in the best interests of both the producer and the consumer that we require that all imported meat and meat food products bear a label showing the country of origin of such imported meat. It has become even more significant of recent date that the Congress respond with legislation that would require imported meat products to be so identified.

On January 16, the U.S. Supreme Court upheld, without explanation, the decision of the Oregon district court which had held that State's meat labeling law was unconstitutional. This, of course, has the effect of nullifying many such labeling requirements which have been enacted by respective State legislatures.

It is obvious that the livestock industry and American agriculture have recognized and demanded that such requirements be enacted. The fact that many State legislatures have written into State law labeling requirements for imported meat is indicative of adverse market effects and resulting depressed prices having given sufficient cause for State legislative action in enforcing more protection.

Congress should take prompt action to restore the protection and validate the purpose for which 19 States wrote these labeling laws originally.

I have, therefore, joined my colleagues in introducing legislation which is designed to accomplish that purpose. I hope both Houses of the Congress will respond with favor to them.

FUNDING OF THE HIGHWAY BEAUTIFICATION PROGRAM

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COLLIER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, since the Congress and the administration are faced with dealing with the critical problem of the current budget deficit, there is certainly one bill which can be killed this year that will save $85 million. I refer to the funding of the highway beautification program. Not only will defeat of this spending bill contribute to reducing the budget deficit, but it will likewise save a host of administrative headaches at both the State and Federal level.

The ultimate cost of the program will be between $2 and $3 billion by the administration's own estimates, but I predict that it will run substantially higher than that figure in a matter of a comparatively short time.

Confusion with regard to implementation by the States as provided in the original bill is evidenced by the fact that 45 of the 50 States have not yet been able to reach any agreement with the Federal Highway Administrator with regard to advertising control.

LIMITING CATEGORIES OF 1970 CENSUS QUESTIONS

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. WATSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, in the past few years the Federal Government has increasingly become involved in the insidious business of privacy invasion. Evidence of this is clearly seen in the mounting attacks by our colleagues in the House and Senate upon the Government's gathering of data of a highly personal nature.

We hear a great deal these days about civil rights, and yet, often forgotten are individual rights. Especially overlooked in recent years has been an individual's right to enjoy privacy without fear of snooping by the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, it has been held in cases to numerous to mention that the right of individual privacy is sacred under the law. The fourth amendment to the Constitution guarantees our right to privacy, and the Supreme Court has not deviated in its judicial interpretation of that amendment. Historically, the Court has not encountered privacy cases in which a complex interpretation of the fourth amendment was needed since in most instances the issue was cut and dry.

But, the advent of modern scientific and technological achievements in the 20th century have rendered judicial interpretation of the fourth amendment in a broad new light. As is so often the case, scientific achievement in many areas has failed to parallel man's understanding of its advances. For instance, most Americans were amazed to learn just a few years ago that electronic listening devices could be used to monitor private conversations. However, electronic "bugging" was only the beginning of a whole new world of privacy invasion. It has now become an accepted fact that no man is an island as far as many bureaucrats in Government service are concerned. Although unknown to most Americans, some Federal agencies have at their disposal more statistical data on an individual than he knows about himself.

Yes; with pharisaical indignation some Americans are always ready to cry that their civil liberties are being violated while, at the same time, there are few cries about the direct and sinister methods of curtailing individual freedom currently being advanced with the full knowledge of the Federal Government.

Of course one of the most dangerous methods of privacy invasion concerns the increased used of tests for civil service employees. As I have pointed out on numerous occasions, various tests are necessary to determine eligibility for Federal employment, but I am unalterably opposed to personal tests which require an individual to answer questions wholly unrelated to the nature of his employment. The effort of many of these tests is nothing more than a bureaucratic form of employee harassment and an encroachment upon the employees' lives. There are healthy signs that Congress under the able leadership of our distinguished colleague in the Senate, the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], will enact a bill of rights for civil service employees. I have joined many of my colleagues in sponsoring this legislation which is so sorely needed.

Mr. Speaker, another indication that Congress is becoming more aware of Federal snooping occurred just recently when House and Senate committees failed to approve plans by the administration to create a national data bank. Although receiving very little fanfare, the establishment of a national data center with its interchangeable counterpart, a personal dossier bank, would contain fantastic amounts of information about every citizen of this country. During the hearings on this matter, testimony clearly indicated that such a statistical center could, if placed in the wrong hands, result in an effective snooping device on American citizens.

But, the end of the snooping business is far from over. Now, a far-reaching and dangerous method of privacy invasion is being advanced by the Bureau of the Census in its 1970 census forms. After reading a test questionnaire recently mailed by the Census Bureau to 25 percent of the households in New Haven, Conn., I am convinced that this Federal agency's thirst for information completely outstrips its need for it. While I am not advocating that the American people ignore the 1970 census, I am suggesting that many of the questions posed on the New Haven sample forms constitute an invasion of privacy. It is, indeed, ironic that the Census Bureau was also a prime mover in the national data bank scheme.

Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Betts], in a forthright and courageous manner, has called this census questionnaire to the attention of the House. In my opinion it should be carefully reviewed by every Member of this body. In the final analysis I think that most of us would agree the census form is unnecessary, but more important that it is an invasion of privacy. Under existing law, penalties for noncompliance in answering census questions ranges up to 60 days in prison and a fine of $100. It is unconscionable to compel citizens of this country to answer a host of ambiguous and highly personal questions under penalty of law.

Today I am joining my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Betts], in introducing legislation to limit the categories of information to be answered on the census questionnaire. Certainly, legislation of this type is needed to restrict the Census Bureau, or any other Federal agency, from tampering with the private lives of our citizens.

INSURANCE COMPANY CONCEDES NECESSITY FOR CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATION

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Cahill] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I was indeed interested to learn that one of America's largest insurance companies has publicly conceded the necessity for a comprehensive congressional investigation of automobile liability insurance. In a statement of policy appearing in Philadelphia newspapers on Monday, October 10, and signed by the board chairman, the company frankly admitted:

> For the past several years it has become clear that the present automobile insurance system in America is not working to the satisfaction of anyone: neither the consumer, the insurance companies, nor the state and federal governments.

In calling for action by legislators, the policy statement asserts:

> What happened was that the law and auto insurance stood still, while the auto itself and its place in American life changed radically . . . What is needed is an entirely new approach to the problem presented by the victims of auto accidents. . . .

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that this policy declaration will appear in most of the Nation's newspapers and periodicals during the next several weeks. As one who has long been concerned with the social problems presented by the automobile and automobile liability insurance, I have previously expressed the dissatisfaction of policyholders, lawyers, judges, doctors, claims adjusters, independent sales agents, and body repair shop operators with the present system of insurance. This latest declaration by a representative of a major company in the insurance industry should eliminate any lingering doubt that an in-depth congressional investigation of automobile liability insurance is long overdue.

THE "THIN" LINE OF ABM'S

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Chamberlain] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, after years of insisting that an anti-missile-missile system was both unnecessary and undesirable, the President has now found that our country's defense requirements dictate that at least its partial deployment can no longer be postponed. In making this quick reversal of policy Secretary McNamara announced that the go ahead had been given for a "thin" line of antiballistic missiles—ABM's—costing some $5 billion to protect against possible attack from Red China. In view of Peking's apparently rapid development of a nuclear and missile capability coupled with the unpredictable and belligerent attitude of the Mao regime, such a defense system is clearly, although regrettably, warranted. However, McNamara's assurance that this "thin" system would not protect, and is not meant to protect, against attack from the Soviet Union only underscores the concern of many over what may be a growing gap in our defenses. To date there has been no effective response by the administration to the challenge put forth by the Kremlin by deploying an ABM system of its own many months ago. Because the effort to seek a diplomatic agreement has apparently met with no success, the situation demands the closet scrutiny. We cannot look the other way indefinitely. Just hoping the problem will go away, for to do so risks an open invitation to miscalculation.

A recent editorial appearing in the State Journal of Lansing, Mich., of Wednesday, September 20, makes some cogent observations about the administration's ABM decision and I insert it at this point in the Record:

A Partial Victory for ABM Supporters

> After years of debate, the Johnson administration has reached a decision which fortunately represents at least a partial victory for those who have long urged deployment of an anti-missile defense against nuclear attack.
>
> Announcement that the government has finally decided to build a limited $5 billion anti-missile system was made Monday by Secretary of Defense McNamara in a speech described by administration officials as one of the most important statements on U.S. strategic thinking since the start of the Kennedy-Johnson administration.
>
> McNamara said the "thin" line of antiballistic missiles (ABMs) is designed to thwart a Red Chinese attack, protect against any accidental firing of Soviet offensive missiles and to render less vulnerable this country's force of 1,000 Minuteman intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs).
>
> The defense secretary said construction of the new defense system would begin late this year. Other sources in Washington said it would take five to six years to complete.
>
> By that time in the mid-1970s, Communist China is expected to have a modest ICBM force capable of hitting the United States, according to McNamara.
>
> Because of a possibility that Peking might be able to achieve this capability earlier, it would have been better if the administration had not waited so long to decide on the course it disclosed Monday.
>
> McNamara said a nuclear attack by Red China would be insane and suicidal, but "one can conceive conditions under which China might miscalculate and we wish to reduce such possibilities to a minimum."
>
> The secretary said there is no plan for such an anti-missile system buildup against Russia—one that might cost $40 billion—because it is not believed that the Soviet Union, is seriously trying to develop a first strike nuclear capability against this country. It is fervently hoped that his guess as to Russia's intentions proves to be correct.
>
> Monday's announcement recalls a prod administered in June, 1967, by House Republican Leader Gerald R. Ford Jr., of Grand Rapids, who then urged the administration "to get off dead center and get going" on an ABM system.
>
> He said the almost unanimous opinion of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and congressional committees was in favor of proceeding with some form of ABM development.
>
> Taking note of Communist China's first hydrogen bomb explosion earlier in the same month in 1967, Ford commented that "the possession of even one Red Chinese nuclear weapon that can be carried in one conventional bomber radically alters the balance of power in East Asia and the Western Pacific areas . . ."
>
> J. William Fulbright, D-Ark., chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, said the decision announced Monday represented "a very serious failure of diplomacy."
>
> Throughout recorded history it has been demonstrated again and again that diplomacy in behalf of peace cannot be relied upon. If it could, no country would need military defenses.
>
> Because of failures of diplomacy, the United States has no safe alternative to striving to provide and maintain adequate defenses and, in the terminology of bygone years, to "keep its powder dry."

CAPT. EDWARD J. BURKE, JR.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDade] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, it is an undoubted fact of life that the most significant thing in the life of America today is its commitment in Vietnam. We read or we hear daily literally thousands of words on that war, in an ever-widening debate about the wisdom of our commitment or the desirability of bringing the conflict to an early termination. Unfortunately, in an enthusiasm for such debate, we do not often enough look at the men who are fighting in this terrible war, and who are performing acts of bravery and heroism daily.

I would call to your attention, Mr. Speaker, and to the attention of all my colleagues here in the Congress, the recent award of the Air Medal to a distinguished officer in the U.S. Army who is presently serving in Vietnam.

He is Capt. Edward J. Burke, Jr.

Captain Burke is one of those brave men who flies over enemy territory in support of our counter-insurgency efforts in Vietnam. These are the men who become the eyes of the army. They face constant danger on these flights; but because they face this danger, the men who fight below them in the jungles have a far better chance of coming home safe to their families.

I am certain that all of my colleagues here in the House will join with me in commending Captain Burke, not only for the Air Medal which has been conferred on him and the Bronze Star which was awarded him recently for personal bravery, but even more for the example he gives to all of us. It is a wonderful thing to know that the great tradition of bravery in the American fighting man still runs strong.

With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I will append here a short article from the Scranton Times concerning Captain Burke:

OLYPHANT MAN GETS AIR MEDAL—PROVIDED AIR SUPPORT FOR VIETNAM TROOPS

A new honor has been given to an Olyphant Army officer who is serving in Vietnam.

The Air Medal has been presented to Capt. Edward J. Burke, son of Mr. and Mrs. Edward Burke, 200 Mary St., Olyphant, and husband of Nancy O'Malley, 407 Delaware St., Olyphant. Just recently he was awarded the Bronze Star for personal bravery.

The Air Medal was awarded to the officer for "meritorious achievement while participating in sustained aerial flight in support of combat ground forces in the Republic of Vietnam."

The citation accompanying the medal said that from March 6 to July 1 "he actively participated in more than 25 aerial missions over hostile territory in support of counter-insurgency operations."

It added: "During all these flights he displayed the highest order of air discipline and acted in accordance with the best traditions of the service. By his determination to accomplish his mission, in spite of the hazards inherent in repeated aerial flights over hostile territory, and by his outstanding degree of professionalism and devotion to duty, he has brought credit upon himself, his organization and the U.S. Army."

Capt. Burke arrived in Vietnam last February. He is due to return home in four months.

THE CENSUS: INVASION OF PRIVACY

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BETTS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, the right of privacy is a cherished liberty which is given protection by the Bill of Rights. Yet specific constitutional boundaries of personal privacy remain unclear. Development of an industrial society with vast new technology and Government expansion into many facets of the lives of our citizens has resulted in grave concern for the maintenance of individual rights.

Private citizens, educators, public officials, and civil libertarians have drawn attention to important areas of privacy invasion: psychological testing, listening and watching devices, physical surveillance, and collection and use of personal data. Congress, now alert to the dangers of unbridled Government intrusions on privacy, is beginning to act. Perhaps the greatest single agency collecting personal data of all kinds is the Bureau of the Census. Every decade, all who reside in the United States are required by law to comply with a census of population and housing. Over the years the number and type of questions asked have increased to the point where 67 separate subjects are scheduled for inclusion in the 1970 census.

I believe the 1970 census questionnaires violate the constitutional intent of the decennial census as well as constitute an invasion of the privacy of all Americans. It is this belief which has prompted me to relate these two subjects: the census and personal rights of privacy. They are indeed deeply intertwined as the following discussion will illustrate.

THE CITIZEN AND HIS GOVERNMENT

Basic to this inquiry is the concept of the proper relationship between a government and its citizens. A statement by a jurist, Judge Samuel H. Hofstadter, of the Supreme Court of New York State, is significant:

> "In a democracy, we are concerned primarily with the relation of the individual to his government—a just government. And the maintenance of this over-all relationship has greater importance than the isolated search for fact—or even justice—in any specific case.[1]

Another constitutional lawyer and able legislator, U.S. Senator SAM J. ERVIN, has referred to the challenge of preserving individual freedom in an age of scientific technology as:

> . Many learned people have analyzed the legal and scientific issues raised by the needs to meet certain goals of government in a country as vast and diverse as ours. But they have balanced the interests back and forth until they have lost track of the basic issues of liberty involved.
>
> The Founding Fathers drafted a constitution that was meant to protect the liberty of Americans of every era, for its principles are enduring ones. One of the fundamental aspects of our liberty as freemen is the privacy of our innermost thoughts, attitudes, and beliefs; this includes not only our freedom to express them as we please, but the freedom from any form of government coercion to reveal them.[2]

Defining the balance of interests[3] and determining the equities of privacy against Government information requirements is clearly the proposition now facing the Congress. We, in the National Legislature, are often presented with two extremes. On one hand it is clear that "in our recordkeeping civilization, the man whose name is not inscribed on the tab of someone's manila folder simply does not exist."[4] The quest for anonymity—the right to be left alone[5]—is deeply imbedded in the fabric of our culture. It must receive every consideration by all public agencies. Yet no one can reasonably deny the legitimate need for certain data by the Government.

This is one extreme, on the other is ingrained the truisms of Parkinson's laws. Prof. Edward Shils has described the factual hunger of all government bodies:

> As the range of government activities widens, and as they reach more deeply into the structure of society, government departments gather more and more information about the persons whom they provide services or whom they seek to control.[6]

Must ours be a "Naked Society" as author Vance Packard grimly depicts? Can we not strike some median according to prudent needs of Government. I suggest one measure against which Government requirements can be checked is to determine the information sought according to its validity as a "public matter."[7] This method of evaluation, it seems to me, is present in an important bill affecting indiscriminate requirements placed on Federal employees.

PRIVACY AND THE RIGHTS OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Evidence gathered by the Senate Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights revealed that some Government employees and applicants for Government employment are required to disclose their race, religion, or national origin; report on their outside activities or undertakings unrelated to their work; submit to questioning about their religion, personal relationships, or sexual attitudes through interviews, psychological tests, or polygraphs; support political candidates or attend political meetings.[8] Are these "public matters" about which Federal employees should be compelled to divulge information? These disclosures have resulted in passage by the Senate of S. 1035, a bill now pending before the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

If these requirements for disclosure by Federal employees are not public matters how can very similar questions posed by the Bureau of the Census to all Americans be legitimate requirements? Under present law failure to answer all questions on the decennial census of population and housing may result in 60 days in jail or a $100 fine, or both—title 13, United States Code, section 221. There are similar items on the long-form census questionnaire regarding employment, marital matters, income and earnings, and detailed information on a person's household.

---

[1] Letter to *Washington Post,* August 6, 1967.

[2] *Congressional Record,* September 13, 1967, page 25409.

[3] William M. Beaney, "The Right to Privacy and American Law," *Law & Contemporary Problems,* Vol. 31, Spring, 1966, page 256.

[4] Ibid., Kenneth L. Karst, "The Files": Legal Controls Over The Accuracy and Accessibility of Stored Personal Data," p. 342.

[5] See Griswold vs Connecticut, United States Supreme Court in this case defined a right of privacy as an independent constitutional doctrine and granted the people a right to be left alone.

[6] Op. Cit., *Law & Contemporary Problems,* Edward Shils, "Privacy: Its Constitutional and Vicissitudes," p. 298.

[7] Ibid., Kenneth L. Karst, p. 349.

[8] U.S. 90th Congress. Senate. Protecting Privacy and the Rights of Federal Employees, Report No. 534., 1967.

In its report on S. 1035, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights said such legislation was needed to "establish a statutory basis for the preservation of certain rights and liberties of those who work for the Government." The report endorses the views of former Civil Service Commission Chairman Robert Ramspeck, who stated:

> We (the Federal Government) need better people today, better qualified people, more dedicated people, in Federal service than we ever needed before. *And we cannot get them if you are going to deal with them on the basis of suspicion, and delve into their private lives, because if there is anything the average American cherishes, it is his right of freedom of action, and his right to privacy.*[9] (Emphasis added.)

It will be the height of irony if those who work for the Federal Government are given a statutory basis of privacy—and I support this legislation—and the plain old average citizen is denied similar protection.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H.R. 10952, which would limit the mandatory questions to be included in the decennial census. Only the essential data would be allowed. All other extraneous inquiries, as deemed desirable by the Director of the Census, would be voluntary and presented on a separate, plainly identified form. This is in keeping with the constitutional intent of the census as the official enumeration of population for the purpose of determining congressional districting. It would also serve to protect individual rights of privacy.

THE 1970 CENSUS QUESTIONS

Let me list some of the actual questions proposed for the 1970 decennial census of population and housing which will be asked 16 million or more American citizens.

> (If a woman) How many babies has she ever had, not counting stillbirths?
>
> Have you been married more than once?
>
> Did your first marriage end because of death of wife or husband?
>
> Where did you live in April, 1962?
>
> What was your major activity in April, 1962?
>
> Place of birth of parents?
>
> What is the value of this (your) property?
>
> What is your rent?
>
> Last year, 1966, what did sales of crops, livestock and farm products amount to?
>
> Did you work at any time last week?[10]

In my judgment, all of these questions invade personal privacy and have no place on a mandatory, or even voluntary census form.

On October 4, I presented my suggestions on where and how the proposed 1970 census questionnaire should be limited. That statement can be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at pages 27553 to 27555.

The following excerpt from that statement gives a comprehensive list of subjects I feel can be excluded:

> ### Questions To Omit
>
> I would recommend the omission of questions which fall into the following categories: Information of principal use to local communities having little Federal relevance, subjects which are already contained on questionnaires used by other Federal agencies making the need to ask them on a decennial census minimal, questions simply nonessential to a decennial census, and types of information private market research firms should gather because it is primarily of business or commercial interest. A good hard look and each question will reveal that many, if not most, subjects which have been proposed for 1970 fit into these categories. When the long list of questions is separated into smaller units along the lines I have outlined, I believe their omission becomes clearly justified.
>
> Here are the four principal reasons for dropping a large number of questions together with the exact subjects I would omit:
>
> First, questions essentially of local interest: Place of work, means of transportation to work, number of units at this address, sewage disposal, and source of water.
>
> Second, questions for other Federal agencies to provide statistics: Self-employment and income last year, farm income, other income, citizenship and year of immigration, hours worked last week, hours worked last year, and last year in which worked.
>
> Third, questions not significant to merit inclusion on a decennial census: State or country of birth, activity 5 years ago, number of children ever born, mother tongue, year moved to this house, place of residence 5 years ago, married more than once, and date of first marriage.
>
> Fourth, questions of a commercial nature referred to private research organizations for collection of data: Heating equipment, telephone, tenure, vacancy status, months vacant, value, contract rent, trailer, bedrooms, automobile, air conditioning, television, radio, clothes dryer, washing machine, bathroom, dishwasher, and second home.

The complete list of questions contains many more items that similarly could be omitted from at least the mandatory provisions of the census.

THE COURTS AND PRIVACY

Although the fourth amendment to the Constitution serves to protect the liberty and property of the individual from violation against probable cause, it falls short of protecting the people from the activities of the Census Bureau. In my view the fourth amendment should apply to all invasions on the part of the Government and its employees, of the sanctity of a man's home and the privacies of life. It is not breaking of his doors, and rummaging of his drawers, that constituted the essence of this offense; but it is the invasion of his indefensible right of personal security, personal liberty, and private property, where that right has never been forfeited by his conviction of some public offense.[11]

The decennial census in the minds of many citizens is an unreasonable search and seizure of information clearly without probable cause or justification as being a public matter.[12] Mr. Justice Black in his dissenting opinion in the Griswold case interprets personal privacy in a broad, realistic framework:

> Privacy is a broad, abstract and ambiguous concept which can easily be shrunk in meaning but which also, on the other hand, easily be interpreted as a constitutional ban against many things other than searches and seizures.[13]

Litigation will be forthcoming, no doubt, to further clarify the scope and application of matters of privacy for such definition is sorely needed.

USE OF CENSUS DATA

The foregoing discussion referred to but one phase of the issue of the census and personal privacy. Whether questions are public matters and should be included on census forms are solely related to the Government's input of personal data about our citizens. The compilation and utilization of these statistics is a second vital part of the privacy issue. This problem is explained well by my colleague from New Jersey, Congressman CORNELIUS GALLAGHER, a leading spokesman for protecting individual privacy. Congressman GALLAGHER's statement in opposition to a mid-decade census contained this observation:

> When the private citizen is asked to respond to census questionnaires, he is guaranteed by title 13, section 9 of the United States Code that the information he furnishes to the Government will be examined only by "sworn officers and employees" of the Census Bureau; that it will be used only for "the statistical purposes for which it is supplied"; and that it will be compiled in such manner that the data supplied by him cannot be identified as such. The census form itself states that the report "cannot be used for purposes of taxation, investigation, or regulation." But it does not state what census data can be used for, and the question of what this data can be used for is becoming an increasingly serious one.[14]

Concern over the use or potential use of census data has been the subject of hearings under the chairmanship of Congressman GALLAGHER and U.S. Senator LONG of Missouri. Computer privacy, confidentiality and sharing of census information were carefully reviewed by members of these subcommittees.[15] The magnitude of computer collection and processing of data and the growing threat to privacy are exceedingly well analyzed in a new book by Prof. Alan F. Westin, of Columbia University. This book, entitled "Privacy and Freedom," is worthy of personal attention by every member of Congress and their legislative staffs, professor Westing writes:

> The issue of privacy raised by computerization is whether the increased collection and processing of information for diverse public and private purposes, if not carefully controlled, could lead to a sweeping power of surveillance by government over individual lives and organizational activity. As we are forced more and more each day to leave documentary fingerprints and footprints behind us, and as these are increasingly put into storage systems capable of computer retrieval, government may acquire

---

[9] Ibid., p. 3.

[10] From Special Census of Metropolitan New Haven, a pretest for 1970 census, conducted April 5, 1967.

[11] From address by U.S. Senator Sam J. Ervin, Jr., "Privacy and Employment," April 15, 1967, p. 3.

[12] See U.S. v. Rickenbacker, C.A.N.Y. 1962, 309 F. 2nd 462, Cert denied 371 U.S. 962.

[13] Op Cit., Senator Ervin, April 15, 1967, p. 5.

[14] *Congressional Record,* August 10, 1967, pages 22335–22337.

[15] Alan F. Westin, *Privacy and Freedom,* Atheneum, New York, 1967, p. 158.

a power-through-data position that armies of government investigators could not create in the past eras.

Let me make one point clear, I do not challenge the present statute requiring confidentiality of Census Bureau material. I praise the enviable record the Bureau has had in its history of dealing with hundreds of millions of individual cases. In order that the present requirements for confidentiality may be fully recognized, I refer to title 13, United States Code, section 9(2) which forbids, under penalty of fine or imprisonment, any officer or employee of the Department of Commerce or the Bureau of the Census to:

First. Use the information furnished under the provisions of this title for any purpose other than the statistical purposes for which it is supplied;

Second. Make any publication whereby the data furnished by any particular establishment or individual under this title can be identified; or

Third. Permit anyone other than the sworn officers and employees of the Department or bureau or agency thereof to examine the individual reports.

Census Bureau publications on their work scarcely refer to the principal purpose of collecting decennial population statistics. Any mention of counting the people to determine the number of U.S. Representatives for each State is buried with a hundred other uses for this information. I do not imply this is wrong, but pose this question. Are there limits to the uses of population and housing data collected under penalty of fine or imprisonment at taxpayers' expense? To answer that question I refer to three types of Census Bureau uses for population and housing tabulations.

First. This data is sold to Government agencies, private businesses, and anyone else who wishes to purchase it. In fiscal year 1967 the Census Bureau expected to sell $19,021 million in materials to Federal agencies and $4,995 million of such data to non-Federal or private organizations. This includes all types of statistical information on file, not just population and housing reports. These are strictly reimbursements for clerical and printing work. No charge is made to pro rate the cost of the original collection and tabulation of one data. Block-by-block information is available on population and housing characteristics. This constitutes a tremendous pool of market research data for business. Are citizens being exploited by commercial enterprises because such localized facts are released? If ZIP codes are required on 1970 forms will this lead to exploitation of people by mail-order firms or door-to-door salesmen who can pinpoint good market areas?

Second. The national data bank, if created, would result in the consolidation of many statistical centers into one. Should population and housing facts submitted by every citizen be used as a basis for longer dossiers containing reports from the Internal Revenue Service, Federal housing loans, welfare programs, social security, and medicare reports, and personal information collected by other Federal agencies? Senator **Edward Long** noted in hearings earlier this year that—

> The names of American citizens already appear 2.8 billion times in government files: Social Security, 1.5 billion; police records, 264.5 million; medical history, 342 million; psychiatric history, 279 million; court actions, 19 million; security reports, 17.6 million; and others, including personnel and employment questionnaires.[16]

According to Carl Kaysen, chairman of a task force in 1966 which recommended creation of a single statistical agency, information from 21 principal statistical gathering agencies, spending $122 million in fiscal year 1967, would be collected, stored, analyzed, tabulated, and published by such a center.[17] What limits would such a data bank have and how would privacy be protected?

Third. In addition to consolidation of data in a single statistical center, the interchange of facts about particular citizens among or between agencies must be prohibited. At the present time I understand some of the reports filed with the Internal Revenue Service are given to the Census Bureau but that no reciprocal arrangement is possible. Do the citizens have any right to limit the transfer and circulation of decennial census reports? Once the population characteristics have been tabulated, should this information be drawn upon by any other Federal statistical user? These are questions I am not aware have been raised about the many uses of census reports. To me they are relevant to personal privacy and should be answered through hearings by committees of the Congress.

CONGRESSIONAL ACTION IMPERATIVE

A statutory basis is essential to insure that rights of personal privacy are guaranteed. There are three specific courses of legislative action the House and Senate must take, as I see it, to see that rights of privacy will be more than a hackneyed slogan only to be violated by an overcurious government. Except for the bill to protect rights of Federal employees from unwarranted disclosure, action appears distant for other such protective legislation. I see the following three courses of action as most important:

1. LIMIT MANDATORY CENSUS QUESTIONS

The scope of mandatory census questions must be severely limited. This can be done by adopting my bill, H.R. 10952, or by the Congress establishing a clear and binding requirement on the Census Bureau as to subjects for compulsory questioning. A hearing is scheduled on the proposed 1970 census questions on October 18 before the Subcommittee on Census and Statistics, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the House. This may be a start in the direction of curing invasion of privacy through the census.

2. DATA BANK CONFIDENTIALITY

The Gallagher and Long hearings on privacy and computer technology indicate a need for new protection against violation of confidentiality if a data bank is created. The Kaysen report contained this statement:

> At the present time different agencies view the problem of the right to privacy very differently. In some agencies the policy of protecting the privacy of the information reported by individuals and businesses is formally stated and protected by law; in such instances the enforcement of such policies has also been found to be very good. In other instances, formal policies regarding disclosure have not been set up, and in many of these cases the protection depends on the judgment of those who are in charge of the different programs involved. Understandably, the growing decentralization of statistical programs has thus led to considerable unevenness in the nature and enforcement of disclosure rules. It is quite possible that without some overall policy which can be responsibly supervised major violations of individual privacy may take place.[18]

The Joint Economic Committee in a report issued in August called attention to the privacy question, even though the committee recommended establishment of such a consolidated data facility.[19]

These have been the major warnings against deferring action on a National Statistical Center until proper safeguards to protect personal privacy can be enacted by Congress. Plans are moving forward, however, to centralize Federal statistical information. I recently asked Dr. Raymond T. Bowman, Assistant Director for Statistical Standards, Bureau of the Budget, to tell me if studies are currently underway on this proposal, whether legislation is needed to formalize such a data center and when it might be sent to Congress. Dr. Bowman responded as follows:

BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., October 3, 1967.

Hon. JACKSON E. BETTS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BETTS: Below I provide brief answers to the three questions which you raise in your letter of September 27.

1. Currently the Bureau of the Budget—with the participation of the statistical agencies—is attempting to formulate the details of purpose, content, organization and operations of a Federal Statistical Data Center. Particular attention is being given to finding ways to insure that such a Center would not pose threats to personal or business privacy.

2. The Bureau of the Budget has indicated to Committees of Congress that any proposal for a Statistical Data Center would be presented to the Congress for legislative authorization. There is, at this time no target date for advancing a formal proposal.

3. The detailed language of a legislative proposal to insure that a Federal Statistical Data Center would not make available to the public or governmental agencies any information about individual persons or businesses has not been developed as yet.

Please call on me if you have further questions.

Sincerely,

RAYMOND T. BOWMAN,
Assistant Director for Statistical Standards.

Time is short. It would be a tragedy to see a data center initiated before proper confidentiality is assured. Let citizen protection precede establishing a data center, not follow it. Congress must develop legislation to secure the rights of privacy for our citizens from potential misuse of a data bank.

---

[16] New York Times, March 15, 1967, p. 48.

[17] Report of the Task Force on the Storage of and Access to Government Statistics, Executive Office of the President, Bureau of the Budget, October, 1966, p. 3.

[18] Ibid., p. 7.

[19] U.S. 90th Congress, Joint Committee Print, The Coordination and Integration of Government Statistical Programs, Joint Economic Committee, August, 1967.

3. OMNIBUS RIGHT OF PRIVACY BILL

The need for development of an inclusive bill to protect private rights against encroachment or harassment by the Federal Government is at hand. There may be aspects of such legislation which should be considered separately such as the wiretapping issue now under active consideration. Yet no legislation is pending on a number of facets of the privacy issue. Interest and expertise is growing. A well presented challenge to Congress has been advanced by Prof. William A. Beaney:

> Whether legislatures can be induced to maintain a systematic review of administrative behavior affecting privacy is doubtful. It would be helpful, for example, if one or more subcommittees maintained a constant surveillance of the information gathering activities of government. There may be plausible reasons for accumulating more and more information about each citizen, in order to improve efficiency of tax collection or to permit planners and administrators in other agencies to carry out their functions more efficiently, since any government agency operates more rationally when provided with adequate information. But clearly there are data that lie outside the pale of government concern and other matters that must be treated as confidential and with stringent safeguards of confidentiality.[20]

Mr. Speaker, so often the eerie implications of George Orwell's "1984" come to mind. In January of this year author Vance Packard provided a current interpretation of his own to the impending dangers 17 years hence:

> My own hunch is that Big Brother, if he comes to the United States, will turn out to be not a greedy power-seeker but a relentless bureaucrat obsessed with efficiency.[21]

IS THE CREDIBILITY GAP REAL?

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, allegations that the Johnson administration plays fast and loose with the facts are appearing in increasing numbers and couched in blunter and blunter terms.

Nothing could be more blunt than the caption on an article appearing in the September 1967 edition of the Progressive magazine, "The White House Lies." The article is written by two respectable news reporters, William McGaffin, a Washington correspondent for the Chicago Daily News, and Erwin Knoll, White House correspondent for the Newhouse National News Service, who are collaborating on a book about the credibility gap, from which the article was adapted, to be published early next year by G. P. Putnam's Sons.

The article contains detailed examples which the Johnson administration may rebut, if rebuttal is available. The objective reader may also check out the specific examples set out in the article to reach his own conclusions.

The country has experienced in recent years two well organized propaganda campaigns designed to deceive the people on two very important issues affecting their welfare. One, the so-called missile gap, which involved the security of the Nation, and the other, the so-called full employment gap, which involves the economic well-being of our people. The falseness of the missile gap has now been exposed, but what remains unexposed is who participated in this propaganda campaign designed to deceive the people and what were the techniques employed to promulgate it. The falsity of the full employment gap propaganda has not yet been exposed and it lies at the base of ancillary propaganda programs such as the alleged poverty in the United States.

Other well-financed and centrally directed propaganda campaigns are in full bloom in our country. I think of one in particular which has no particular name but is designed to denigrate the U.S. involvement in world affairs when this involvement follows policies contrary to those of Soviet Russia. Another is the campaign to denigrate the Congress as an institution to study, deliberate, and make decisions in behalf of the people.

What I am leading up to is this. The credibility gap is a well-designed propaganda campaign. It does not have its origin as some say in a segment of the "disgruntled press" or as others may think in the Republican Party, although both groups would tend to pick it up and give it momentum. Certainly the news reporters and the Republicans and the general public who are concerned about the truth—and I think this covers the great majority—would be happy about the success of the program if it produces more accuracy in the information released by the Federal Government.

The way to stop the propaganda aspects of this program is to deprive it of ammunition. I think it is very important that this propaganda campaign be stopped short because nothing can undermine the proper functioning of government and an orderly society more than a true credibility gap and nothing can hurt the United States more in world opinion and in world influence than such a gap.

I am inserting in the Congressional Record the article referred to in my remarks. I would be happy to insert a response to it from the Johnson administration:

The White House Lies

(By William McGaffin and Edwin Knoll)

The credibility gap—what a polite, impersonal term! A term with bureaucratic overtones, like "the national debt," or "the balance of payments," or "the nuclear deterrent." A term coined only recently, but one that has passed into the language wherever Americans talk of public affairs. A term whose use is, as Walter Lippmann has observed, "rather like the habit of our Victorian grandparents who spoke of limbs when they were too shy to speak of legs." Newspaper reporters began talking about the credibility gap in the mid-1960s when they were too shy to speak of lies—the lies that increasingly, alarmingly emanate from their Government through its official spokesmen, including the President of the United States.

It is a new idea to Americans—the idea that the Government lies to them—and one that does not go down easily. It runs counter to the American grain. It does not square with what the civics textbooks say about democracy or what the Founding Fathers said about the people's right to know, the people's need to know. But it is a fact. As Washington correspondents we have watched that fact take hold in recent years and become part of the national consciousness. We have seen the Government become attuned to falsehood as a routine way of conducting its affairs, to the point where hardly a day passes without producing its own challenge to credulity. We have listened to official lies on matters large and small, foreign and domestic, and often we have reported them as truth for lack of better information. We have felt the steady erosion of the public's confidence in what it is told by its leaders and the loss of faith in the news media that relay the word.

The President's plans for the coming weekend, the projected size of the Federal deficit—no topic is too trivial or too important to be dealt with deceptively. But truth has been treated most recklessly in official pronouncements about the gravest, most complex and controversial issue of the decade—the war in Vietnam. Each new wave of American involvement in Vietnam has washed up the debris of previous prevarications. To many citizens of the United States—and perhaps more of other nations—the war in Vietnam is the credibility gap.

The Gap was opened, although no one knew it at the time, on August 11, 1964, when Lyndon Johnson, a candidate for election to the Presidency that he had inherited the previous November, addressed himself to the question of the American role in Vietnam. "Some others are eager to enlarge the conflict," he asserted. "They call upon us to take reckless action which might risk the lives of millions and engulf much of Asia, and certainly threaten the peace of the entire world. Moreover, such action would offer no solution at all to the real problem of Vietnam."

The United States had a few thousand "military advisers" in South Vietnam in the summer and fall of that election year, and their orders were to fire only when fired upon. Their mission, as the slogan had it, was to help the Vietnamese help themselves. President Johnson's Republican opponent, Senator Barry M. Goldwater of Arizona, was asking, "Why not victory?" and urging that the war be carried to North Vietnam, but the President counseled a far more moderate course.

On September 28, Mr. Johnson asserted that it was "an illusion that force or the threat of force can resolve all problems." American military power, he said, "cannot be used to compel and frighten others into following our command." The only consequence of such action "would be constant, rising hostility and deepening tensions." The United States, Johnson warned, could not "demand resolution" of all the world's problems. The President was particularly concerned about the perils in Goldwater's proposal for air warfare against North Vietnam. "Before I start dropping bombs around the country, I would want to think about the consequences of getting American boys into a war with 700 million Chinese," he said.

In the Defense Department, as the President spoke, plans for a massive escalation of the war were well advanced. The case for bombing raids and large numbers of U.S. combat forces was being actively argued within the Administration, but there was no hint of this in Mr. Johnson's campaign oratory. Some 190 American lives had been lost in Vietnam, the President said on the stump,

---

[20] Op. Cit., William A. Beaney, page 268.

[21] New York Times Magazine, January 8, 1967.

"but it is not like the 190,000 we might lose if we escalated the war." On October 21, 1964, he told the American people, "We are not about to send American boys nine or ten thousand miles to do what Asian boys ought to be doing for themselves."

The first major step in escalation—the sustained bombing offensive against North Vietnam—began in February, 1965, three months after the election. The initial attack was on an ammunition dump at Dong Hoi, just across the Seventeenth Parallel, and the Administration took pains to deny that it constituted an expansion of the war. The raid, it explained, was a "reprisal" for a Vietcong mortar attack on an American barracks at Pleiku in South Vietnam. As the bombing offensive continued in the weeks and months that followed, officials insisted that there had been no change of strategy, only of "tactics." The air war against North Vietnam became the longest reprisal raid in history.

Escalation on the ground began in March, 1965, when the President sent two battalions of Marines to Da Nang. The troops were dispatched, Secretary of State Dean Rusk explained, "to provide local, close-in security." It was "not their mission to engage in the pacification operations," but merely to protect American installations. Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara offered similar assurances. The Marines, he said, would "patrol within narrow limits of the area and thus should not tangle with the Vietcong." As the air attacks continued and the American troop commitment doubled and redoubled, reporters in Washington asked whether the war was being escalated. "That's an operational matter, not a policy matter," replied White House Press Secretary George Reedy. He referred us to the Pentagon—and the Pentagon referred us back to Reedy.

In May, 1965, two months after the first Marine contingents landed in South Vietnam, an anonymous military spokesman in Saigon acknowledged that the troops were there "to render combat support which includes, if necessary, fighting."A month later, on June 8, this was confirmed by the State Department's official spokesman, Robert J. McCloskey. "American forces will be available for combat support together with South Vietnamese forces as and when necessary," he said.

Other State Department officials reported that an order to this effect had gone out to the American military commander, General William C. Westmoreland, "within the past several weeks." By this time, such official statements merely confirmed the obvious. Nonetheless, they infuriated the President. A White House statement to the press on June 9 firmly denied that there had been any change in the mission of United States ground forces in Vietnam, or that the President had sent any recent order of the kind reported to Westmoreland. Instead, the White House said, Westmoreland had been given "discretionary authority" from the very beginning to use his troops in combat. If this was the case, why had the Secretaries of State and Defense denied that the troops had a combat mission? The White House never said. Neither did Rusk or McNamara.

These were the beginnings of what was to become an undeviating pattern of official concealment and deception about the war. While the United States troop commitment in Vietnam rose into the hundreds of thousands, while casualty totals mounted into the thousands, while great and growing areas of North and South Vietnam were systematically devastated, while the war cast a heavy pall on the President's Great Society at home and on American foreign policy abroad, official spokesmen in Washington and Saigon and at the United Nations in New York continued to disseminate a steady stream of misinformation. And as controversy over the war mounted at home, the President and his aides added insult to injury by charging that their critics lacked the information needed to form intelligent judgments.

By the fall of 1965, the Credibility Gap was no longer merely a specter conjured up by frustrated reporters and crotchety critics of the Administration. The Opinion Research Corporation, in a national poll commissioned by the Columbia Broadcasting System, found that two Americans in three were convinced their Government only sometimes told the truth about Vietnam. Thirteen per cent believed the Government was "almost never" truthful. Historian Henry Steele Commager deplored the "increased trend" in Washington to disguise the truth, and blamed it on "the heavy role of the military." Said Commager, "Countries confronted with military problems act this way. They justify it in terms of national security." And he warned that "the habits of deception carry the danger of self-deception; you can begin to believe your own propaganda."

Truth has fallen casualty to considerations of "national security"—real or imagined—in previous Administrations. In 1960, President Eisenhower was caught in a flagrant falsehood about the U-2 photo espionage plane downed over the Soviet Union. A year later President Kennedy morosely (and privately) referred to his ambassador to the United Nations, Adlai Stevenson, as his "official liar" about United States involvement in the Cuban Bay of Pigs invasion. In 1962, Kennedy's chief lieutenants lied about the Administration's knowledge of Soviet missiles in Cuba, and one of them later publicly asserted the Government's "right to lie" in a national crisis.

Even on purely domestic matters, the Kennedy Administration's record for veracity was far from immaculate. Six days before the 1962 Congressional elections, for example, Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz announced that unemployment had reached a three-year low during October and that the number of unemployed had declined by two million since the Kennedy Administration had taken office. *The Washington Post* cautioned, in an editorial on November 3, that the claims smacked of election eve partisanship. After the election returns were in, Wirtz admitted to James McCartney of the *Chicago Daily News* that his statement had contained "invalid" statistical comparisons because the figures had not been adjusted for seasonal variations.

Wirtz had also claimed, before the election, that "4,500,000 more Americans have jobs than when this Administration took office in January of 1961." This total, too, required seasonal adjustment and shrank, after the votes were in, to 1,224,000. Reporters, of course, had no way of independently ascertaining the correct figures.

The Johnson Administration has engaged in similar juggling of statistics. With appropriate fanfare, the White House announced that personal income in the United States had reached an all-time high in August, 1965. A footnote to the White House release said additional details were available from the Commerce Department. One detail not announced: The rate of farm income had suffered a $1 billion decline. What sets the Johnson Administration apart from its predecessors, in fact, is merely that the dissemination of half-truths and untruths has become a matter of day-to-day routine. The results of this policy of deliberate deception have been far-reaching, abroad as well as at home.

In December, 1965, Adlai Stevenson's successor, Ambassador Arthur J. Goldberg, felt compelled to tell the United Nations that "we have a great problem maintaining our credibility with our own people." In June, 1967, when the United States was accused by Arab leaders of military intervention on the side of Israel in the six-day Middle East war, Goldberg found it necessary to offer elaborate inspection opportunities to support the flat (and truthful) American denial. Even some Washington insiders, inured to the self-serving unreliability of official pronouncements, found it difficult to accept the Government's assurances of non-involvement at face value. But the Middle East war produced its own new widening of the Credibility Gap—the tragic case of the Navy "communications" ship, the *U.S.S. Liberty*, which was stationed so close to the fighting that Israeli planes and torpedo boats attacked it, killing more than three dozen American sailors.

When Congressmen, responding to letters from relatives of the dead sailors, demanded to know why the ship had been so close to the Israeli shore, the Pentagon offered an explanation that *The Washington Post* called "nothing short of ludicrous." It said the position was required so that the *Liberty* could use the moon as a passive reflector for its communications. "How hitting the moon, 238,000 miles away, had anything to do with changing the position of the ship by a comparatively minuscule distance was not explained," George C. Wilson wrote in the *Post*, "When pressed for an explanation last week, the Pentagon fell back on 'no comment.' One Defense official, who winced at his Department's claim, quipped that the *Liberty*—to keep up with the changing position of the moon—'would have had to sail right across the sands of Sinai.'"

In the news release, the Pentagon asserted that the *Liberty's* function was "to assure communications between U.S. Government posts in the Middle East and to assist in relaying information concerning the evacuation of American dependents and other American citizens. . . ." The truth, which leaked out soon enough, was that the ship was a spy vessel, equipped with elaborate electronic surveillance gear and assigned to the National Security Agency, which specializes in breaking the military codes of foreign nations. Presumably, the *Liberty* was monitoring Israeli and Arab battlefield communications. The Pentagon's thin cover stories were the Middle East war's contribution to the Credibility Gap.

President Johnson is understandably sensitive to talk about the Gap, although he tries at times to make a joke of it. "I don't want to appear incredible," he tells reporters when he tries to duck a news conference question, or "I don't want to jeopardize my credibility." If there is any realization on his part that he is largely responsible for the growing lack of confidence in his Administration's veracity, we have not been privileged to observe it. Instead, we have heard him complain that charges of untruthfulness arise from the reporters' personal dislike for their "corn-pone President" or from the captiousness of the "Eastern establishment."

Johnson's lieutenants contend that the Credibility Gap is just a catch phrase invented by disgrunted members of the press corps. Yet there are times when the President and his aides appear to bring a spirit of zestful competitiveness to the game of public deception. One such occasion—by no means unique—arose at a televised news conference on March 9, 1967, when Johnson was asked whether there was any truth to reports that he was searching for a successor to Henry Cabot Lodge as U.S. Ambassador in Saigon. "No, there is no truth that I am looking for a successor," the President replied. Lodge, he added, had told him on several occasions that in due time he would leave his post, but there was "no definite date set at this moment for his departure." Less than a week later, Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker was named as Lodge's successor, and the White House press secretary, George Christian, smugly explained to reporters that the President's news conference reply had been "absolutely accurate"—Johnson was not looking for a successor on March 9 because he had already found one.

"Accurate, perhaps, but not truthful,"

the *Chicago Daily News* protested in an editorial. "In the context of the question, the answer clearly implied that Lodge would stay on. Newsmen were put off the track, the country misled, by a technical escape hatch." The editorial acknowledged that "no great harm was done in this instance," since it mattered little whether the shift of ambassadors was announced one week or the next. But the clearly demonstrated preference for deviousness was disturbing. "If the President, and all the Government spokesmen who follow his orders and example, employ the same tricky sidestep on other, more serious matters, what can we believe?" the *Daily News* asked. "How can we know when we're getting the news straight or in such a form that makes it seem to mean the exact opposite of the truth?" The Administration, the newspaper concluded, had so far undermined its credibility that only massive doses of straight talk could begin to close the gap. No doses of straight talk, massive or minuscule, were administered. The Chicago newspaper, incidentally, was one of very few that bothered to take editorial note of the Lodge-Bunker flim-flam. By 1967, such exercises in the gamesmanship of deception were so routine that they hardly merited comment.

Every correspondent we know has his own favorite examples of the Credibility Gap, and his own favorite definition. Henry L. Trewhitt once defined it in the *Baltimore Sun* as "the degree of refusal by the public to accept at face value what the Government says and does." Such refusal comes slowly and is based on hard experience, but there has been no lack of experience in recent years. An early lesson was provided in Mr. Johnson's first Presidential press conference on December 7, 1963, when he was asked about the size of the Federal budget he would submit to Congress the following January. The President gravely implied that the budget could not be kept below $100 billion. President Kennedy's last budget had come to $98.8 billion, Mr. Johnson pointed out, and he would have to add about $3.5 billion to cover built-in cost increases. The prospect of substantial budget increases was reinforced later that month by high (and anonymous) Administration sources at a briefing for correspondents at the vacation White House in Texas. The reporters were taken in; they believed what they were told, and wrote it. The public was prepared, weeks ahead of time, for the first peacetime budget to exceed $100 billion. The budget that was sent to Congress came to $97.7 billion, and Mr. Johnson was praised for a remarkable achievement in economizing. The White House correspondents thought it was a remarkable achievement, too, but in their view economizing was the least of it.

"Under President Johnson's leadership," Jack Anderson wrote in the January 30, 1966, issue of *Parade* magazine, "many Government departments have issued announcements that tend to mold the facts as the Administration would like them to appear. For example, when the Ranger–6 spacecraft failed in its mission to photograph the moon, the public was told failure was due to a minor malfunction. But a report classified 'secret' said an investigation disclosed 'weaknesses . . . so extensive that in combination they suggest that the present hardware . . . is unlikely to perform successfully. . . .'"

Another hardware failure, and a disastrous one, was the Apollo I moon capsule fire in January, 1967, that claimed the lives of three astronauts. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration, sensitive to charges of mismanagement and perhaps malfeasance in the Apollo program, placed every conceivable obstacle in the path of reporters trying to ascertain the facts. In its 1967 report, the Freedom of Information Committee of the American Society of Newspaper Editors charged that "NASA information not only was late and sparse, but some of it was deliberately misleading, some of it inaccurate. Although the agency knew within five minutes, it took two hours for reporters to learn that all three astronauts were dead."

George Reedy was still the White House press secretary when the *Los Angeles Times* reported on good authority that President Johnson was preparing to ask Congress for a $4 billion reduction in excise taxes. Reedy scoffed at the figure and declared it bore "no relationship" to any decision that had been made. The total reduction eventually proposed by the President, as it turned out, was $3,964,000,000.

Mr. Johnson himself denounced the *Washington Star* for reporting—erroneously, he said—that he would propose a three per cent average pay increase for Federal employees. The pay raise proposal followed shortly after the denunciation; it averaged three per cent.

On January 22, 1965, two days after the Johnson inauguration, a reporter asked Reedy whether the President had executed an agreement with Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey about the procedure to be followed in the event that the President became disabled. (The Constitution had not yet been amended to provide for this eventuality.) "No, we just haven't gotten to that yet," the press secretary replied. A few days later, Johnson was hospitalized for treatment of a respiratory infection and the question came up again. Yes, Reedy said, Mr. Johnson and Mr. Humphrey did have a disability agreement. In fact, he added, they executed it "sometime before the inauguration."

The President's health was in the news again in October, 1965, when Johnson underwent surgery for removal of his gall bladder. Before entering the hospital, he announced to the press that "a thorough examination showed this to be the only trouble." After the operation, however, the surgeons disclosed that they had also removed a kidney stone. Their curiosity aroused, reporters asked whether there was anything else they had not been told. Just another stone which had not been removed, Johnson's personal physician replied. It was lodged in the left kidney, and the doctors had known about it "for some years."

A catalogue of such deceptions, major and minor, could be extended over many pages. Some are, indeed, no more than little white lies—but even little white lies loom large when they are uttered by the President of the United States. Reporters who accompanied Johnson on his trip to the Far East in the fall of 1966 were astonished to hear him tell American troops in South Korea that "my great-great-grandfather died at the Alamo." This was a bit of Presidential family lore that had previously escaped their notice. Richard Dudman of the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* was sufficiently intrigued to ask the Texas Historical Society to look into the claim, and eventually received the report that there was no evidence to support it. Such lapses are of little moment to the conduct of national affairs—except to the extent that they reflect a strong propensity for playing fast and loose with the facts. The reporter who accepts any official statement at face value does so at the peril of misinforming readers who depend on him for an accurate account of the day's news.

The problem has become the topic of a special Washington brand of black humor. It is said that the old Chesapeake & Ohio barge canal, which runs from Washington to the mountains of Maryland, is bounded by the Cumberland Gap at one end and The Credibility Gap at the other. Before he left the White House press office to become publisher of the Long Island newspaper *Newsday*, Bill D. Moyers quipped at a private dinner that "the crisis of credibility has gotten so out of hand that we don't believe our own leaks." Not long ago, White House correspondents devised what they called the LBJ Credibility Test. It went like this: "When the President smoothes down the hair on the back of his head, he's telling the truth; when he strokes the side of his nose, he's telling the truth; when he rubs his hands, he's telling the truth; but when he starts moving his lips, he's lying."

If the rule is overstated, it has its practical applications nonetheless. Many reporters find it prudent to assume that today's denial will turn into tomorrow's confirmed news, and to prepare themselves accordingly. This was what happened, for example, at the vacation White House in Texas over the New Year's holiday weekend in 1967. When Deputy Press Secretary Robert H. Fleming insisted that no announcement was imminent about the proposed supersonic transport plane, careful newspapermen began boning up on the SST. Their wariness was rewarded the very next day, when the Federal Aviation Agency announced that Boeing had been selected as the contractor to build the air-frame for the huge airliner. Even while that news was being released in Washington, however, the President was telling a press conference in Texas that "we don't have any definite date" for the decision on the SST.

This was only the latest instance of news manipulation on the jet transport project—an enterprise that will eventually cost the nation's taxpayers up to $5 billion. At the very outset, Mr. Johnson had secretly assigned a "DX" priority to the SST—a classification usually reserved for defense and space programs affecting the national security. "The suspicion must arise in many minds," *The New York Times* commented when it learned of the secret "DX" priority, "that Mr. Johnson took this course because he wanted to avoid a vigorous public debate about the wisdom of the controversial supersonic transport project." Congress and the nation, the *Times* concluded, "should have been allowed a direct voice in deciding whether to put the giant transport ahead of the War on Poverty and the associated effort to give the Negro full equality."

In the face of this background, White House press secretary George Christian found it possible to tell a nationwide radio audience this year that Mr. Johnson is "a very candid man," who is "rather open in his discussions with the press and with the public."

When the prime minister of Singapore, Lee Kuan Yew, announced in the summer of 1965 that a CIA agent had offered him a $3.3 million bribe five years before, the State Department automatically issued a stiff denial. Unfortunately, Lee produced proof—a letter of apology signed by none other than Dean Rusk. Understandably embarrassed, the Department admitted that Lee was right and explained that its spokesman had been unaware of the facts. It did not explain why Rusk allowed the denial to be issued.

"This city is awash in lies and deceptions of many kinds," Richard H. Rovere wrote in his "Letter from Washington" in *The New Yorker* of March 18, 1967, "and the mere fact that a State Department official says the Department has the evidence to prove that it is telling the truth does not, of course, mean that such evidence exists. Nor would it necessarily mean, in the event that what he said turned out to be false, that the man was himself a liar. It would not be the first time that the truth has been kept from or misrepresented to high Government officials by other high Government officials. In 1960, the U–2 affair, and in 1961, after the Bay of Pigs, a number of respected spokesmen were caught in lies that were the product not of their own mendacity but of their having been deliberately misinformed or left uninformed." If high Government officials can't count on the candor of their colleagues, what chance do the press and the public have?

The press, of course, is not exclusively dependent on official statements (although we must confess that all too often it behaves as if it were). In virtually every instance cited in this article, reporters eventually ascertained the facts, and they were published. As a rule, however, publication came long after the facts had lost their urgency—and after Government decisions had been made without the benefit of informed public discussion. This is the most dangerous aspect of the Credibility Gap. Another peril lies in the persistent undermining of confidence in the established institutions of political life. As much as the Vietnam war or any other specific aspect of U.S. policy, the Credibility Gap accounts for spreading disaffection and alienation among thoughtful citizens. Yet there has been no indication that the nation's leaders are aware of these dangers or ready to cope with them.

J. R. Wiggins, the editor of *The Washington Post*, has observed that "a government that too readily rationalizes its right to lie in a crisis will never lack for either lies or crises." Both lies and crises are in plentiful supply in Washington today.

HOW SECURE IS YOUR SOCIAL SECURITY?

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, on September 27, 1967, my colleague, Mr. Mills, placed in the Congressional Record, pages 27026–27029, an article appearing in the October issue of the Reader's Digest, entitled "How Secure is Your Social Security?" He then placed in the Record a statement by Wilbur J. Cohen, Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in rebuttal to this article.

Mr. Mills stated in reference to the Reader's Digest article:

> I have read the article very carefully and find that it contains a number of half-truths that lead to misleading conclusions.

I, too, have read the article very carefully and although it reaches some conclusions with which I disagree I find that it has raised some important points and challenges some half-truths and misleading conclusions that have been promulgated by the Social Security Administration for many decades. It essentially calls upon the public to put on its own thinking cap and examine into the matter itself. I find few "half-truths or misleading conclusions" and those that occur do not detract from the basic points of the article. The conclusions in the article I disagree with can be expressed by me, or others, forthrightly so the dialogue can be moved forward.

I find the scholarship in Mr. Stevenson's article sound and his syllogisms generally stated fairly, if somewhat too vehemently on one or two occasions. But sometimes vehemence of expression is helpful in putting people in the frame of mind to ask questions that need asking and to seek for honest answers to these questions.

I have also carefully examined Mr. Cohen's rebuttal. I find it seeks to build upon the half-truths and misleading conclusions the Social Security Administration has been promulgating for some time. I find that it does not forthrightly state what the basic differences of opinion are between the defenders of the social security system and its present-day critics so that the public can understand the dialog and reach some conclusions of its own.

I believe the social security system is in serious trouble, primarily because its promoters will not listen to honest criticism and reply to it forthrightly. I think the system can be and must be saved. But I believe if we continue much further along the path we are pursuing by accusing anyone who dares raise these questions of performing "a great disservice to the millions of social security beneficiaries and the millions of people who are counting on social security benefits in the future," the system will be destroyed.

I recall a study I prepared several years ago which I entitled "Politics Can Destroy Social Security," see Congressional Record, volume 107, part 3, page 3292, also see Congressional Record, March 7, 1967, pages 5728–5731. I regard Mr. Cohen's rebuttal as the kind of politics I had in mind in this article.

However, let me state that I am pleased with Mr. Mills' actions in putting both the Reader's Digest article and Mr. Cohen's rebuttal in the Record, even though I disagree with my colleague Mr. Mills' introductory remarks. This should help to move the dialog forward if those who read the article and the rebuttal will cut through the rhetoric to get to the meat of the points raised.

Let me point out, on the same day these materials were placed in the Record by Mr. Mills, I placed in the Record a scholarly editorial from Business Week—Congressional Record, September 27, 1967, pages 27002–27004—which raised one of the basic points raised in the Reader's Digest article; namely, whether the social security system was being moved from one of social insurance to one of welfare. Notably, Mr. Cohen in his rebuttal does not refer to these observations or discuss the points raised but he needs to do so.

I agree with Mr. Mills' observations that the bill we passed out of the Ways and Means Committee, and which passed the House, did "strengthen both the wage related and contributory features of the program." But I think Mr. Mills would agree that the program needed strengthening in this respect because there has been an erosion in this area and even with this strengthening the erosion is still great. I think Mr. Mills would also agree that in other revisions in this same bill we moved in a serious manner away from wage related and contributory features. Medicare benefits, for example, are completely unrelated to wages or contributions. Freezing in people over age 72, and reducing retirement ages, liberalizing the work prohibition clause—which I supported for other reasons which I felt overbalanced the wage relation aspect—certainly weakened this relationship as have many other amendments in the present bill and in prior revisions.

In other words, the concern lest social-insurance become welfare is serious, a concern which all of us on Ways and Means who have studied the system share. It does no good for us to pass off outside criticism on this score as being half-truths and drawing erroneous conclusions. Indeed, we need a great deal more examination into this matter than we have undertaken in the past. Mr. Cohen in his ad hominem defense of the system refers to the various advisory councils which have given Social Security an upcheck. These councils were composed of fine and distinguished men, but notably the written reports of these councils show that they have not done their homework in examining into this aspect of the matter—or into other basic aspects to which I will refer. Furthermore, these councils have not been selected in a manner designed to get a diverse and impartial panel. Indeed the panels chaired by the Director of Social Security have been selected because they were partisans of a particular point of view about the social security system and its development. To say they were partisan is not to detract from their knowledge or their integrity. It is to say that these panels were not well balanced or designed to attract and examine criticism, constructive or otherwise.

Indeed we do need a blue ribbon committee of top experts to study our social security system who have diverse views on the issues involved, as the Reader's Digest article advocates. I have had occasion to criticize in the past the manner in which these councils have been selected and the manner in which they have made their reports and studies on which the reports are based.

See Congressional Record, volume 109, part 7, page 9246, entitled "Social Security Advisory Council Window Dressing," also insert of September 17, 1963, volume 109, part 13, pages 17309–17313, in which I develop the point at some length and insert an exchange of correspondence between Robert M. Ball, Commissioner of Social Security, on the point of the Advisory Council not being representative of a broad and unbiased point of view. Because Mr. Cohen leans so heavily in his rebuttal on the findings of the Advisory Council, I shall insert these two items at the conclusion of my remarks.

The Reader's Digest article points up another serious question: How far can the payroll tax be increased before it reaches the point of diminishing returns? Is it 10 percent of payroll cr what? What are the economic and social problems involved in increasing the rate and the base of the payroll tax—the most regressive Federal tax we have? Many scholars are now seriously concerned about this matter. Notably, the Ways and Means Committee turned down my request for an objective study and/or even an appearance by economists to set forth the issues involved in this serious matter. The most we received this year was a cursory report that the President's Council of Economic Advisers "had studied the matter" and they said there was no problem. The various Social Security Advisory Councils have not studied this matter. Notably Mr. Cohen ignores this issue too in his rebuttal.

In my supplemental views accompanying H.R. 12080—Congressional Record, September 27, 1967, pages 27002–27004—I pointed out the need to relate social security retirement system to the other two basic systems which in conjunction with social security provide for the total retirement of our people. I raised the question in these supplemental views of whether we should not be relying more heavily on funded programs rather than pay-as-you-go systems such as social security. The various Social Security Advisory Councils hardly touch upon this most serious issue. Mr. Cohen touches it briefly by pointing out that since social security, private pension plans have grown remarkably. He fails to point out that the real growth occurred since 1944, when Congress finally revised the Internal Revenue laws so that corporate pension plans could qualify for tax deductions in a practical way. He does not point out that private pension plans have just recently been given the opportunity to grow even more since the Congress extended the tax treatment of corporate pension plans to the self-employed and their employees. This extension, it should be noted, the administration fought bitterly. And he does not discuss how increasing the social security tax rate and base will affect this healthy growth. Yet these are further points that the Reader's Digest article seeks to raise.

Mr. Cohen's rebuttal misses another basic point made by the Reader's Digest article; namely, the amount of benefits young persons in their twenties can get from a funded pension plan vis-a-vis a pay-as-you-go social security plan. What rebuttal there is uses half-truths. The half-truths are hidden in the words "they will pay," "they pay," "their contributions" in referring to what young persons will pay for their private pension plan benefits. The employee pays at most only half. Most qualified pension plans call for the employer paying at least half of the payment—indeed many pension plans require no employee contribution. The employer pays it all. In considering what a pension gets in the way of benefits, the total payments to the plan must be computed, not just what the employee pays. In social security, the employer's payment which is equal to the employee's, of course, is added to compute the benefit. So it should be, and is, with private plans.

The data in the Reader's Digest article which points to the increased benefits a person can get from a private pension plan—because it must be funded—is accurate. The rebuttal of Mr. Cohen is inaccurate.

This leads to the key point at difference in the dialog over the soundness of the social security system. The social security system is not an insurance system. It is a social-insurance system. The words chosen by the promoters of the social security system to describe a system which is based upon entirely different assumptions than private insurance creates the basic confusion in the public's mind about what the system is and what it is not. It is this confusion which brings about erroneous criticism of the system, the erroneous criticism which Mr. Cohen and his group delight in exposing. Some of this misinformed criticism is contained in the Reader's Digest article.

Mr. Cohen and Mr. Mills are eminently correct when they say with emphasis that "the program is actuarially and financially sound." What they do not say, however, is that this depends upon accepting the assumptions on which the actuarial and financial calculations of a social-insurance system, not an insurance system, are made. The points at issue are the validity of and the nature of the assumptions. These assumptions are entirely different from the assumptions upon which insurance, not social-insurance, are based. To be actuarially and fiscally sound, private pension plans meet entirely different assumptions. For example, they must have and do have $90 billion in their trust or reserve funds. If social security were based upon these same assumptions, the social security trust fund would have to have $350 billion in it, not the $23 billion that is in it. The civil service retirement system is based upon the same assumptions as private retirement programs. It has $19 billion in its trust funds—and these funds are critically low. So the critics of the social security are correct in saying that the system is actuarially and financially unsound applying the standards of private insurance.

To state it another way. If social security were to be frozen as of this date—taking in no new entrants, but allowing all those who are already paying in to pay in until they reach 65 and qualify for their benefits, and then it were to pay out all who are now receiving, and all those who will qualify for benefits—the fund would be short $350 billion.

Why is there this difference? Mr. Cohen states it, but obliquely, not forthrightly, so people can grasp its real meaning:

> The article attempts to show that social security is unsound by referring to "unfunded outstanding obligations" of $350 billion and stating that under the Administration bill this amount will rise to $417 billion (pp. 79–80). The $350 billion referred to is the amount that would be needed—if social security were a private, voluntary insurance program—to pay off all obligations on the assumption that there would be no new entrants into the system. The idea of there being a huge unfunded liability in the social security system is wholly meaningless and irrelevant for any practical purposes. There is no need in a Government program such as social security for funding on the basis referred to in the article. It would not only be unnecessary but also unwise to build up such a huge accumulation of social security funds. No life insurance expert nor social security expert, nor business nor labor organization, and no Advisory Council or Committee of the Congress has ever recommended such funding.

Mr. Cohen seeks to throw the inquirer off the track by pointing out the undesirability of having a large trust fund in social security. It is not undesirable as far as the security of a retirement system is concerned, I can assure you. It is undesirable because of the effect this would have on the economy. It would be particularly undesirable to have the Federal Government have control over the investing of these huge sums. Indeed, it is for this very reason, I argue, if we are to have a social-insurance program run by the Government it should be a pay-as-you-go system, not a funded system. But one reason for not relying too heavily on a social-insurance system and relying more heavily on private pensions and savings programs is that they can be funded and bring in desirable economic and social benefits concomitantly. This is what I was seeking to discuss in my supplemental views to the Social Security Act of 1967.

The social security system depends for its fiscal soundness upon the payments of future entrants to pay the benefits to the present beneficiaries. As long as wage scales rise, and as long as Congress increases the wage base upon which social security payroll tax is based, and as long as the population continues to increase, and as long as the system is compulsory, then the social security system is actuarially and fiscally sound. These are the assumptions of a social-insurance system. These assumptions, as anyone can see, include political premises. Perhaps these political premises and the demographic premises are sound, but let us discuss these premises not try to shout down those who raise questions about them. If, indeed, young people are the ones who pay for those who preceded them and came into the system with little or no payment on their part, then it becomes quite obvious why a young person could get more from paying in the same amount for himself into a private funded program. The rebuttal of the Social Security Administration, which Mr. Cohen does not clearly set out, is that the Congresses of the future will increase the benefits for these young people. The anticipatory future increases in the pay-as-you-go system are less than what they can bargain for now. And as young people dominate the voting—and one-half of our population today is under age 26—how long will they keep such a system?

This is where the points made in the Reader's Digest article about the lack of contractual obligation on the part of the Federal Government to pay benefits come in. These are sound points. Again I find that Mr. Cohen's rebuttal avoids the issue and seeks to obfuscate it. Social-insurance benefits are gratuities, the Supreme Court held, not contractual rights. Congress can take away the payments if it chooses. It must take the payments away from all citizens who have qualified equally, but it can take them away. Note the choice of words I use—"citizens who have qualified." The words used by the Social Security Administration are usually "benefits to which they are entitled" and these words are in error.

To illustrate the point further. Civil service retirement benefits are based on contracts. The Government cannot take these away. These payments can be enforced in the Federal courts. Social security payments are not based on contracts, they cannot be enforced in court except on an equal treatment basis.

On this basis, the Internal Revenue

Service held that the payments made to people qualified under social security were not taxable income, they were not earned rights, contractual rights, but gratuities and under the Federal income tax laws gratuities have not been taxed and are not taxed.

From a practical political standpoint the 90th Congress is not going to take away social security benefits—nor any Congress in the next 10 years. But what about Congresses elected by people who do not pay in $1 and get out $20 as those who have received social security did, or pay in $1 and get out $10, as those presently receiving payments did, but by people who are required to make up some of this difference? And who, if they paid in—with their employers—an amount of money equivalent to their social security tax to a funded program would get out twice or thrice as much in benefits and be able to enforce their right to benefits in the courts? I am not so certain. Nor am I so certain, as Mr. Cohen seems to be, that future Congresses will merely increase the benefits these young people are to receive—because increasing these benefits, if the system, on its own assumptions, is to remain actuarially and fiscally sound—will require further increasing the base upon which social security tax is levied and probably further increasing the rate as well.

The half-truths of Mr. Cohen and the Social Security administrators, and, yes, the advisory councils, are basically hidden in the semantics they have carefully employed over the years to make the term "social-insurance" appear to be insurance. They use all the words developed in the insurance field with which the public is familiar, "premiums," "benefits entitlements," "actuarially," and so forth knowing that these terms if they have meaning in social-insurance have different meanings when used in private insurance. Social-insurance is not insurance. It is a totally different concept and it has totally different assumptions lying behind its soundness. People have been taught to believe they have paid into a system, that they have saved, that they are entitled to benefits. This is untrue. Yet they believe it because this has been the propaganda that the Reader's Digest article has dared to contest. As citizens they can qualify for social security benefits established by law and the law if changed can only be changed to relate to all citizens equally. But the law can be changed—at least in theory, if not from a practical political standpoint—to pay all citizens equally, a zero amount.

There is much more than can and should be said about Mr. Cohen's rebuttal and about the Reader's Digest article. I have tried to say just enough hopefully to keep the public dialog which the Reader's Digest article has started going.

I note that on September 28, 1967, the Social Security Administration's bulletin, No. 63, "To Administrative, Supervisory and Technical Employees" prints Mr. Mills' introductory remarks in the Record and Mr. Cohen's rebuttal. What Mr. Cohen is rebutting—the Reader's Digest article—is noticeable by its absence. The fairness exhibited by my colleague [Mr. Mills], in printing both documents so the reader had some opportunity of exercising his own judgment is noticeable by its absence.

Under these circumstances I doubt if this surrebuttal which I have prepared will be sent to the "Administrative, Supervisory and Technical Employees, or the Social Security Administration" in bulletin No. 64, but even so the dialog is not going to be stopped. Time is catching up with us. Let us hope that politics does not destroy social security.

Following are remarks I made in the Congressional Record, volume 109, part 7, page 9246, and in volume 109, part 13, pages 17309–17312, concerning the lack of breadth and objectivity of the Social Security Advisory Councils:

[From the Congressional Record, May 23, 1963]

SOCIAL SECURITY ADVISORY COUNCIL WINDOW DRESSING

(Mr. Curtis (at the request of Mr. Morse) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. Curtis. Mr. Speaker, the other day my attention was called to a news story in the New York Times of May 17 which should be of great interest to every single Member of Congress. This news story was headlined "Wider Benefits Due in Social Security."

Now I would like to quote from this news story which originated from Yonkers, N.Y. It says:

"An expansion of social security taxes and benefits will be drafted by an Advisory Council to be appointed in the next 10 days by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"Commissioner Robert M. Ball, of the Social Security Administration, disclosed the plan here today."

These and other remarks were made by Commissioner Ball before 150 social security employees from New York and New Jersey.

The Council to which the Commissioner was referring is called for in present social security law. It provides that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall appoint before the end of this calendar year "an Advisory Council on Social Security Financing for the purpose of reviewing the status of the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund and of the Federal disability insurance trust fund in relation to the long-term commitments of the old-age survivors and disability insurance program."

The law further specifies that the Advisory Council to be appointed this year shall "in addition to the other findings and recommendations it is required to make, include in its report its findings and recommendations with respect to extensions of the coverage of the old-age survivors and disability insurance program, the adequacy of benefits under the program, and all other aspects of the program."

This Council has not yet been appointed. It must complete its deliberations by the end of 1964, and make its report and recommendations to Congress by January 1965. The Chairman of this Council is the Commissioner of Social Security. This is also specified in the law.

Now this is why I believe this news story is of such great significance. It says that the Commissioner disclosed the plan—for what this Advisory Council—not yet appointed—will draft in its report to us by January 1965. And in this meeting of social security employees, the Commissioner told them the Council will draft an expansion of taxes and benefits. I'm wondering what other social security changes the Commissioner and his staff have already decided this Advisory Council will draft in its report to the Congress.

When I helped to develop this particular amendment to broaden the scope of the Advisory Council's purview back in 1960, I had fully expected that this Advisory Council would be composed of people each of whom would be permitted to make up his own mind, independently, on the basis of the evidence presented. However, the Commissioner is here telling us in May 1963 one of the things that this Council will report to us some 18 months hence. He is in effect saying that this Advisory Council, advisory not to the Commissioner, advisory not to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, but advisory to the Congress of the United States—this Council is in fact a rubberstamp advisory council.

In the light of this, how can any trust at all be put on the report that this Advisory Council will submit to us when the Commissioner is already telling Social Security employees what this Council will report. When this Council is appointed, I intend to write each person appointed to it and send him a copy of this news clipping, and of my remarks, so that each will understand exactly what the Commissioner of Social Security—the Chairman of this Advisory Council—expects from him.

Make no mistake about this news story and its accuracy. A check with the Commissioner's office reveals that he was reported accurately in the remarks he made before this group of 150 Social Security employees.

Perhaps the Commissioner has rendered a great service to all Members of Congress by revealing that this Advisory Council is really "window dressing" for things some of the Social Security staff want put into law.

I might add that this is not the first instance in which the present Commissioner played an important part in setting up an advisory panel to circumvent an explicit directive from Congress. Fortunately, the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, Mr. Robert Byrd, as chairman of a Senate appropriations subcommittee straightened out that situation.

The social security law calls for an Advisory Council of 12 persons and the Commissioner of Social Security. Employers and employees shall be equally represented, plus representation from self-employed and the public.

I would like to know how this Advisory Council is being selected? Has the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare written to organized labor for suggestions? Has he written to the large employer organizations for names of businessmen who would reflect the thinking of the business community? This is the procedure followed for many years by the Secretary of Labor in selecting people for the Federal Advisory Council on Employment Security.

Are we going to have a hand-picked Council of safe people? Perhaps one from Cleveland? And some others who almost perennially have served on Social Security Advisory Councils?

The Commissioner, in his remarks, has cast a deep dark shadow on anything this Council—not yet appointed—will send up to us in 1965, when he, as its Chairman, admits there is a plan of what the Council will report. If the report is already written, we might as well have it now.

"[From the New York Times, May 17, 1963]

"WIDER BENEFITS DUE IN SOCIAL SECURITY

"Yonkers, May 16.—An expansion of social security taxes and benefits will be drafted by an advisory council to be appointed in the next 10 days by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"Commissioner Robert M. Ball, of the Social Security Administration, discussed the plan here today.

"Speaking to 150 New York and New Jersey executives of the department at the Westchester Town House, he predicted that a hospital insurance program would be added to social security by Congress this year, or next year at the latest.

"He said that the hospital insurance would include nursing home care, but no payments to physicians.

"Mr. Ball said that the council would consider increasing the social security base, revising disability payments to cover short-term disability, and gearing benefits to the actual value of the dollar at the time of retirement and after."

[From the Congressional Record, Sept., 17, 1963]

The Ethics of the New Frontier

The Speaker pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] is recognized for 60 minutes.

(Mr. Curtis asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. Curtis. Mr. Speaker, some time ago I called the attention of may colleagues to a story in the New York Times about what the Federal Advisory Council on Social Security Financing will report to the Congress—Congressional Record, vol. 109, pt. 7, p. 9246. This was significant then, because that Council had not even been appointed, and it is not to report to the Congress until January 1965.

Four days after I made my remarks here I received a letter from the Commissioner of Social Security which I will now read for the Record:

"May 27, 1963.

"Hon. Thomas B. Curtis,
"House of Representatives,
"Washington, D.C.

"Dear Mr. Curtis: I have read the remarks you inserted in the Congressional Record for May 23 reflecting on the independence of the members of the next Advisory Council on Social Security.

"Your reaction was evidently prompted by a newspaper report referring to a talk I made in Yonkers, N.Y., to a group of social-security district office managers. If you had checked with me about this brief newspaper report before making the insertion in the Record, I would have told you then, as I tell you now, that it was inaccurate. I did not say that an expansion of social security taxes and benefits will be drafted by the Advisory Council.

"What I did say, and what may have prompted the newspaper report to mention an expansion of social-security taxes, was to remind the district managers that the present schedule of tax rates now in the law will result in increased tax payments over the next 5 years. I did not say that the Council would or would not recommend further increases over those now scheduled.

"I also pointed out to the managers that since the statute calls for the Council to examine not only the financing of the program but also extension of coverage, the adequacy of benefits, and all other aspects of the program, the Council is very likely to take up all of the issues in social security that are currently in the air. I mentioned some of the issues. I did not indicate in any way, however, that the Council will or will not take up any particular issue or will or will not come to any particular conclusion.

"I do not know who told you that my office confirmed the accuracy of the newspaper story but the story is not accurate and, moreover, I can find no evidence that anyone from my office said anything to give anyone a contrary impression.

"I am sure that your sense of fairness will lead you to want to correct the mistaken impression which has been created and which, if allowed to persist, could damage the ability of the Council to carry out its important assignment.

"As you know, the membership of the Advisory Council has not yet been announced but I can assure you that the persons being considered are persons of independence, ability, and integrity and that they are not the sort to be a "rubberstamp" for anyone.

"Sincerely yours,

"Robert M. Ball,
"Commissioner."

Following receipt of this letter, I proceeded to make further inquiry as to the reliability of the New York Times news story even though at the time I made my remarks a check had been made with the office of the Commissioner and it was stated that he was accurately reported. I also am informed that staff of the Social Security Administration, in a position to know, accept that news story as reliable and accurate.

Mr. Robert Garst, the assistant managing editor, wrote that the Times had received no complaints as to the accuracy of the story. However, he rechecked the accuracy of it with the news reporter and was assured the facts as printed were accurate.

Now to the meat of the matter.

When I made my observations originally in May, I asked some questions about this yet-to-be appointed Council on Social Security Financing. I asked how this Council is being selected? Has the Secretary of Health. Education, and Welfare written to the AFL–CIO or to independent labor unions for suggestions? Has he written to the large employer organizations for names of businessmen who would reflect the thinking of the business community? I also asked: "Are we going to have a handpicked Council of people, most of whom are in agreement on the most controversial social security proposal before this or any other Congress? Medicare?"

The specific directive authorizing the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to establish the Council is provided in the Social Security Amendments of 1956. It reads as follows:

"The Council shall be appointed by the Secretary and shall consist of the Commissioner of Social Security, as Chairman, and of twelve other persons who shall, to the extent possible, represent employers and employees in equal numbers, and self-employed persons and the public."

The thinking of the Ways and Means Committee at that time—and I was a member and took a personal interest in developing this language—was that the people selected should represent specific segments of our population—the employers, because they pay almost 50 percent of current social security taxes, employees because they pay a like amount, self-employed persons who are taxed at a rate 50 percent more than employees, and the public because they could take a broader view with respect to benefits on the one hand, the tax burden on the other.

This provision as to Council members who represent these segments of our Nation is all the more important for the new Advisory Council for in the amendments of 1960, we directed them to broaden their study and report on such issues as extensions of coverage, the adequacy of benefits and all other aspects of the program.

You will note that the Commissioner in his letter to me did not see fit to answer the basic questions I raised about the method of selecting people for this Advisory Council which were entirely apart from the grave impropriety of stating what the nonappointed Council would find.

Sunday, June 9, the appointments of the 1963–64 Advisory Council were announced and the first meeting was scheduled for the next day, June 10.

I am still concerned about the criteria employed by the Commissioner and the Department in selecting those who have now been appointed to this Advisory Council and I still wonder about the manner in which such selection was made.

I can report to you that from the detailed check I have made, the Department made no serious effort to follow the directive provided in the law, so far as the selection of employer and self-employed representatives is concerned. I wrote to the leading national organizations of employers to learn whether or not they have been approached officially by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to supply names of businessmen who would represent the employer thinking on social security matters. The Chamber of Commerce of the United States, the National Association of Manufacturers, and the National Small Business Association replied that they had not been approached in any manner whatsoever.

There are three men on this new Advisory Council who ostensibly serve as employer members to reflect the thinking of employers across the country. I cannot regard that employer thinking is represented by these men. One of the men has retired from active business and his only connection with business now is as a member of the board of directors of the company which formerly employed him. Moreover he recently authored an article on the medicare issue in a current magazine—Atlantic Monthly, June 1963—and I am sure that his views on this very important issue would have little, if any, support in the employer community.

This man incidentally will reach his 70th birthday this fall, is retired, and may now be a social security beneficiary.

Another man appointed, ostensibly as an employer member, retired from his company in August of this year at age 67. He can then become a social security beneficiary.

May I say that both of these men are very fine gentlemen and able, and are very familiar with social security. The only point I am making here is to question whether they are suited to represent the views of the employer community on the subject of social security.

I also wrote to the leading national organizations whose members are characteristically self-employed to determine whether they had been approached by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Without exception, each replied that it had not been approached.

The only person appointed to this new Advisory Council who might be regarded as self-employed—and I am sure he is a fine reputable doctor—is the president-elect of the National Medical Association. This organization, the National Medical Association, must not be confused with the American Medical Association. But is it reasonable to believe that this gentleman will represent the social security thinking of the self-employed, such as the farmers—let alone his own profession—whose organization, the American Farm Bureau Federation, has opposed medicare, when the gentleman's organization to which he has been elected president has recently endorsed medicare?

Now when we turn to the five appointees who represent the public, we find four come from the academic field and one from a professional organization of social workers. Every single one of these has gone on public record endorsing medicare. No opinion poll I have heard of has shown 100 percent support by the public for medicare. The most recent Gallup poll I have seen showed only 44 percent endorsed it.

In consequence, I must conclude that the public cannot be fairly represented by the five individuals selected, at least so far as the medicare issue is concerned.

Now let me turn to the three individuals selected to represent employees. I have no doubt that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was in close communication with the AFL–CIO about these appointments. However, I must point out that the

AFL–CIO represents no more than some 14 million employees. Certainly, if this national organization and its legislative objectives were broadly acceptable to the working people across the country, the membership of this organization would be vastly larger—at least two or three times its present size. I cannot conclude that the two selected from international organizations of the AFL–CIO and the one from its staff here in Washington appropriately represent the social security views of the some 50 million employees currently covered by social security. And, of course, these three endorse any kind of health and medical care services paid for by social security.

Thus, of the 12 persons appointed to this Council, 10 are on the public record as committed to support social security medicare, a measure fraught with profound implications to the financial soundness of our existing cash benefits program, and to our unequalled system of health and medical care.

I want nothing that I have said so far to be interpreted as a criticism of a single person appointed to this Advisory Council. I am sure that they are all fine people.

However, I conclude that in its selection of people for this Council, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has chosen to ignore completely the explicit congressional intent in the amendments of 1956 and has in effect packed the jury for narrow partisan reasons. It is the Department which has put these individuals in a most embarrassing position for the Council members will not and cannot with their preconceptions broadly represent the social security views of the more than 50 million employees covered by social security, the several million of self-employed, the millions of employers, and the public. In consequence, the labors of this Council during the ensuing 18 months as far as coming forth with an objective report is concerned is foreordained to failure and will meet with public skepticism, even if the Commissioner had not been so unthinking as to announce some of the major conclusions the Commission would reach even before it was appointed.

Under these circumstances, who can reasonably attach the significance to this Council's forthcoming report and recommendations which the Congress had in mind and the Nation so badly needs?

The failure to follow congressional intent is, in my view, most tragic. During the next 10 years, the two social security cash benefits programs will face the severest tests of financial support. The first of this year an increase in the tax rate went into effect—without any increase in benefits. Further tax increases are now provided in the present law. The first takes effect in 1966 and the second in 1968. These increases are also necessary like the one this year, merely to enable the system to continue paying cash benefits already promised.

Notwithstanding this added financial support, the board of trustees announced in its most recent annual report that both programs, the old-age and survivors benefits program and the permanent and total disability benefits program, are out of actuarial balance. In fact, the intermediate cost estimate of the chief actuary of social security indicates that the trust fund of the latter program will be exhausted by 1971. In consequence, the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Arkansas, Mr. Wilbur Mills, has wisely introduced a bill which will improve the financial support of both programs.

I would like to call your attention, however, to what has been happening in the larger of these two—the old-age and survivors benefits program. In 1950, the trust fund was then $13.7 billion and benefits and other costs were slightly in excess of $1 billion. Thus, the trust fund could have continued benefits for more than 13 years. In 1960, when the trust fund was $20.3 billion, benefits and other costs had increased to $11.1 billion. The trust fund was thus equivalent to no more than 1 year and 10 months of benefits. The most recent figures I have are for June 1963. The trust fund amounted to $18.9 billion and benefits and other costs to $14.7 billion. In 1953 the trust fund was approximately the same, $18.7 billion, but the benefit and other costs were then only $3.1 billion. Thus, the trust fund in 1963 is equal to only 1 year and 4 months of benefits—at the present level of costs for benefits and administration.

I do not mean to imply by these statements that Congress will not see to it that financial support for benefits already promised will be forthcoming when needed, so long as Congress reasonably can. My purpose here is to emphasize that the trust fund today is truly a contingency reserve fund. The system is on virtually a pay-as-you-go basis. In consequence, Congress must in the future examine with extreme care each and every proposal that would increase further the costs under social security.

This is true, even though such Congress also prescribes further tax increases. For there must ultimately be some limit—at least in our lifetime—to the social security tax burden. We can expect American workers willingly to carry just so much social security tax load; and American employers to absorb just so much in additional tax costs, or the American consumer public to pay for it in higher prices. However, today we are beginning to realize that apart from our own will there is a discipline over which we have little or no control entering the picture—the international market place. We cannot just increase prices as we may wish if we are to sell our products and keep our gold reserves.

That is why I was so deeply concerned when I read in the New York Times that the Social Security Commissioner, and now also Chairman of the new Federal Advisory Council on Social Security Financing, had said last May that this Council will draft an expansion of social security taxes and benefits. This is one of the reasons I am so deeply concerned about the Kennedy administration's willful decision to tie the costly and untried compulsory health insurance program to our social security system.

There is one bright spot in this otherwise gloomy picture and the present pay-as-you-go financial status of the old-age benefits program dramatically highlights it. One fundamental difference between Government social security on the one hand and financing of insured retirement benefits by private plans on the other is that private plans are funded, the Government plan is not. Today, when the social security old-age trust fund is equivalent to less than 2 years of benefits, we find an entirely different story with insured private retirement programs. According to the Social Security Administration, private insured pension funds had total reserves in 1961 of $20.2 billion and the annual benefit payments aggregated $440 million. In addition the private trusted pension funds have about $30 billion total reserves and the annual benefit payments are probably of the same ratio. Thus, the reserves were the equivalent to more than 45 years of benefits payments at the present rate.

I think this and other differences between social security and insurance should be told to the American people and repeatedly emphasized. I am aware that the Social Security Act, title II, uses insurance terminology, such as "insured status." I think this is most unfortunate because it has not only led to a misunderstanding by the American people as to the nature of social security, but it has also provided a basis over the years for misleading statements in some of the publications of the Social Security Administration. The social security program is not insurance in the dictionary and legal sense of the word; it is social-insurance which is a new term and to be used correctly and without confusion should always be hyphenated. Far from hyphenating the word, the Social Security Administration in its printed public material and in the speeches of its Administrator and high officials deemphasizes by whatever means it can the fundamental differences between private insurance and social-insurance. It seems apparent that the reason for trying to simulate the label of a superior product is the usual one, to capitalize on the fine reputation that private insurance rightly enjoys in our society.

I would hope that one or another individual on this new Council will want to conscientiously reconsider acceptance of his appointment, since his participation and contribution will be gaged not individually but as part of this group. Certainly the public generally and the Congress in particular should be made well aware of the tactics that are being employed by the Kennedy administration in its zeal to push through the programs it has decided in camera are best for the people, whether indeed straightforward factfinding and debate would support their conclusions or not.

To complete the record, I include at this point in the Record my letter of June 5, 1963, to Commissioner Ball and his reply to me of June 13, 1963:

"Department of Health,
"Education, and Welfare,
"Social Security Administration,
"Washington, D.C., June 13, 1963.

"Hon. Thomas B. Curtis,
"House of Representatives,
"Washington, D.C.

"Dear Mr. Curtis: I have your letter dated June 5 replying to mine of May 27.

"So that there can be no possibility of misunderstanding I should like to repeat: The newspaper story on which you base your charges was inaccurate. I did not say that 'an expansion of social security taxes and benefits will be drafted by an advisory council.' I mentioned some of the issues in social security that are currently in the air and which the Council might take up, but I did not indicate in any way that the Council will or will not take up any particular issue or that it will or will not come to any particular conclusion. I referred in my talk—in the contest of a discussion of public attitudes toward social security—to the tax increases over the next 5 years that are now scheduled in the law. I did not indicate in any way, however, that the Council would or would not recommend further increases over those now scheduled.

"Sincerely yours,
"Robert M. Ball,
"Commissioner."

"June 5, 1963.

"Mr. Robert M. Ball,
"Commissioner, Social Security Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

"Dear Mr. Commissioner: This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter of May 27.

"In your letter, you flatly deny the accuracy of the news story in the New York Times of May 17. You go on to relate what you did say to a group of Social Security district office managers and suggest this remark 'may have prompted the newspaper report to mention an expansion of social security taxes.'

"According to your letter, you were 'reminding the district managers that the present schedule of tax rates now in the law will result in increased tax payments over the next 5 years.'

"It is incredible to me that any person, least of all a news reporter could so misunderstand such simple language as to write in the news story something about what 'the Advisory Council will draft.' Your explanation is based upon a strange premise that you as Commissioner, with many years of close experience with the Social Security district managers, felt they need reminding about the tax increases already in the law.

"This is not a matter of fairness or unfairness as indicated in your letter. Let me assure you that your office was contacted as to the accuracy of the New York Times story. Not only did your office know of this story, but they affirmed that you were accurately reported. If you contend that you were inaccurately reported, it seems to me that you have some responsibility to see that this news item is corrected in the same newspaper.

"Nothing in my remarks could possibly 'damage the ability of the Council to carry out its important assignment' as you indicate—provided this Advisory Council is selected in a manner wholly consistent with congressional intent, clearly expressed in the law. May I refer you to the section (116(b)) which says 'the Council * * * shall consist of the Commissioner of Social Security, as Chairman, and 12 other persons who shall, to the extent possible, represent employers and employees.'

"When I made my remarks to the Members of the House of Representatives, I raised a question about whether those selected would be truly representative. Your failure to comment in your letter on my questions about this reveals far more than it conceals. It is perfectly apparent that you have not, for example, written large organizations representing employers, asking for names for businessmen who would reflect the thinking of the business community.

"Let me assure you that, as a member of the Ways and Means Committee, I do not intend to stand idly by while another effort to circumvent the clear intent of Congress is made, as seems to be indicated by the circumstantial evidence.

"Sincerely yours,

"THOMAS B. CURTIS."

HISTORIC EDUCATOR ENDS CAREER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions I have risen in this distinguished body to speak of my great and good friend, Frank L. Boyden, the beloved headmaster of Deerfield Academy. It has just been announced by the trustees of Deerfield that Dr. Boyden will retire this coming June after serving for 66 years as headmaster of this famous old school. This is a record of distinguished service that is unparalleled in the history of education, and I feel that it is a real privilege for me to pay tribute to him and to the institution which he serves.

In making this announcement to the Congress, it is almost like saying that Gibraltar has melted into the ocean. For generations, Frank Boyden has been one of the most significant influences for good that American education has had. He has trained dozens of college presidents and headmasters. His graduates are located in all of the States of the Union and in nearly every foreign country. Deerfield alumni have distinguished themselves in the public service. Many of you here today in the Congress have been influenced by Frank L. Boyden, either as students, or friends, or both. He, with his wife, Helen Childs Boyden—a chemistry teacher of wide repute—are teachers whose influence will remain eternal. If society is to save itself, these are the kind of teachers we must produce for the future.

Frank Boyden came to Deerfield after graduating from Amherst College in 1902. He took a small New England academy of 14 students and built it into one of the greatest independent secondary schools of America. His honors are legion. Only last April, the President of the United States, at a White House luncheon, presented to him a special citation for distinguished service to the Nation. He serves on dozens of boards; as president of the board of trustees of the University of Massachusetts, he has fought long and hard to bring it to its present high position amongst American universities.

Frank L. Boyden is still a young man—young in heart and young in mind. We will continue to seek out his sagacious counsel for many years to come. I regret his retirement from Deerfield, but at the same time, rejoice that Deerfield Academy and American education have had the benefit of his inimitable leadership for these many years.

Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks the biography of Frank Learoyd Boyden, as well as a bibliography on his works, and articles from the New York Times, the Boston Globe, and the Boston Herald of October 9, 1967:

BIOGRAPHY OF FRANK LEAROYD BOYDEN

Frank Learoyd Boyden b. Foxboro, Massachusetts, September 16, 1879. m. Helen Childs of Deerfield, Mass., 1907. c. John Cary, Theodore, Elizabeth.

B.A. Amherst College 1902—M.A. Amherst 1922—A.M. Williams 1924—A.M. Yale 1926—Sc.D. Colgate 1930—Ph.D. NY State College for Teachers 1931—LL.D. Wesleyan 1933—L.H.D. Amherst 1935—L.H.D. Bowdoin 1936—L.H.D. Williams 1936—LL.D. Kenyon 1937—L.H.D. Princeton 1940—LL.D. Harvard 1947—Litt.D. Tufts 1947—L.H.D. Dartmouth 1949—LL.D. Lehigh 1951—L.H.D. Trinity 1952—D. Pub.Ser. Denver 1952—LL.D. Univ. of Mass 1957—LL.D. Ripon College 1963—LL.D. St. Anselm's 1963—Ed.D. Suffolk Univ. June 11, 1967

Headmaster, Deerfield Academy 1902–.

Trustee of:

Aiken Preparatory School,[1] Aiken, South Carolina.

Amherst College, Amherst,[1] Massachusetts.

Andover-Newton Theological School.[1]

Avon Old Farms,[1] Avon, Connecticut.

Berkshire School,[1] Sheffield, Massachusetts.

Clarke School for the Deaf,[1] Northampton, Massachusetts.

Cushing Academy, Ashburnham, Massachusetts.

Dana Hall,[1] Wellesley, Massachusetts.

Darrow School,[1] New Lebanon, New York.

Deerfield Academy, Deerfield, Massachusetts.

Governor Dummer Academy, South Byfield, Massachusetts.

Hebron Academy, Hebron, Maine.

Heritage Foundation, Deerfield, Massachusetts.

Leland and Gray Seminary, Townshend, Vermont.

Masters School,[1] Dobbs Ferry, New York.

New Salem Academy, New Salem, Massachusetts.

Nichols College Bus. Admr., Dudley, Massachusetts.

The Northfield Schools,[1] East Northfield, Massachusetts.

Northwood School, Lake Placid, New York.

Rogers Hall,[1] Lowell, Massachusetts.

Stoneleigh Prospect-Hill School, Greenfield, Massachusetts.

Suffield Academy, Suffield, Connecticut.

University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts; Chairman of the Board since 2–23–60.

Vermont Academy,[1] Saxtons River, Vermont.

The Winchendon School, Winchendon, Massachusetts.

CLUBS

Century Association, New York City; Yale, New York City; Tavern, Boston; Harvard, Boston; Buckland Historical Society, Massachusetts; State Club of Massachusetts; Princeton Club, New York; Pocumtuck Valley Memorial Association, Deerfield, Massachusetts.

MEMBERSHIPS

Phi Kappa Psi Fraternity; Mt. Sugarloaf Masonic Lodge (50 yr. award 10–63); Honorary Member of Rotary International; Deerfield Republican Town Committee; First Church of Deerfield.

PUBLIC SERVICE

President, New England Assn. of Colleges & Secondary Schools.

Chairman, Franklin County Chapter, Amer. Red Cross 1920–56.

Honorary Member, Board of Trustees, Franklin County Fair.

Director, Franklin County Trust Co.

Former Vice President, Massachusetts Civic League.

National Youth Administration Advisory Committee, appointed by FDR.

White House Conference on Education, appointed by DDE.

Civilian Advisory Committee, U.S. Navy, appointed by HST.

Massachusetts State Constitutional Convention 1917–18.

Former member Massachusetts State Board of Education.

Member, Draft Board, Greenfield, Massachusetts, 1940–.

Jamestown-Williamsburg-Yorktown Commission, appointed by DDE.

Delegate, Republican National Convention, 1960.

Former Constable of Deerfield.

Member and former President of the Headmasters' Association.

Director of the Student Achievement Institute, Inc. Worcester, Mass., Jan. 17, 1966.

Corporator, Franklin County Public Hospital.

Member, Board of Directors—Franklin County, Y.M.C.A.

SPECIAL AWARDS

Presidential Citation: "The President of the United States of America awards this commendation to Frank Learoyd Boyden for distinguished service to the nation. As Headmaster of Deerfield Academy, he has enriched the minds, guided the spirits, and uplifted the aspirations of several generations of young Americans. Through his achievements, his kindly wisdom and his commitment to human welfare, he has encouraged standards of excellence which have enabled America's independent schools to become a continuing source of vitality in American education and quality in American life."—*Lyndon B. Johnson—May 10, 1967.*

Distinguished Public Service Award, United States Navy.

Silver Buffalo Award, Boy Scouts of America.

United States Patriotic Society Award.

Shattuck School Centennial Award.

---

[1] Emeritus

Sportsmanship Award by the Sportsmanship Brotherhood, Inc., 1953.

Special Citation for Distinguished and Exceptional Service by the Mayor of New York, the Hon. Robert F. Wagner.

Distinguished Service Award, Amer. College Pub. Relations Assn.

Harold M. Gore Award in Rec. of outstanding work in schoolboy basketball.

Thayer Academy Award for Distinguished Educational Leadership & Citizenship, 1958.

Williston Academy Citation for significant contribution to the development and success of secondary education in USA, Oct. 17, 1965.

The Reginald T. Townsend Award of the New England Society in the City of New York for 1966. For distinguished achievement and service.

The Silver Medal Citation. Given by the Tavern Club, May 1, 1967.

Adelphia—University of Massachusetts—1962 (Senior Society).

Dedication of Frank L. Boyden Physical Education Building, University of Massachusetts, May 17, 1964.

BIBLIOGRAPHY ON FRANK LEAROYD BOYDEN

MAGAZINE ARTICLES

1936: Fortune, article on American Prep Schools.

Ladies Home Journal, February and June, stories based on Deerfield and Frank L. Boyden by Ben Ames Williams.

1937: The Shield of Phi Kappa Psi, "Frank L. Boyden and Deerfield Academy," by Robert McCollum.

1942: Atlantic Monthly, "Boyden of Deerfield," by Lewis Perry.

1949: Life, "An Old School Celebrates."

1951: Reader's Digest, "The Most Unforgettable Character I Have Met," by John Gunther.

1953: The Morgan Horse, "The Man at the Reins."

Philanthropy, "Deerfield Academy's $3,000,000 Campaign."

1955: Sports Illustrated, August 15.

1957: Newsweek, June 3, "A Wonderful Time."

1962: Newsweek, February 19, "The Head Man."

Life, November 30.

1963: Esquire, "The Select Sixteen."

1966: New Yorker, March, "Profile."

1967: The Shield of Phi Kappa Psi, "Frank L. Boyden—Headmaster Extraordinary."

BOOKS

"The Headmaster," by John McPhee, Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, October 1966.

"The Headmaster," by John McPhee, paperback edition, Scholastic Books.

"The Headmaster," by John McPhee, the Reader's Digest Condensed Book, Winter 1967.

SOME NEWSPAPER ARTICLES

Holyoke Transcript & Telegraph: June 10, 1937; June 9, 1938; June 8, 1939; June 4, 1942; June 11, 1945; June 6, 1946.

"Pleasant Little Man Who Heads Deerfield Has Great Stature," by Alvin Oickle, December 19, 1951.

"Deerfield Headmaster To Be Honored on Anniversary," April 25, 1952.

1951: New York Herald Tribune, November 25, "The Man Who Came to Deerfield," by Fred Hechinger.

New York Times, October 11, "50 Years a Coach," by Michael Strauss.

New Britain, Connecticut, Herald, December 14.

Christian Science Monitor, December 14, "Deerfield Grows with Boyden."

1952: New York World-Telegram, May 6, "Sun Dial," by H. I. Phillips.

Sunday Herald, Bridgeport, Connecticut, March 23.

Springfield Union, October 27.

1953: Springfield Republican, February 1, "State and Local Topics."

Daily Hampshire Gazette, September 19, "Thought for Today."

New York Times, November 2, "Prep School Sports," by Michael Strauss.

New York Herald Tribune, November 15, This Week Magazine, "The Boydens of Deerfield," by Fred Hechinger.

Hampshire Gazette, December 10, "Accent on Youth."

1955: Syracuse Herald-Journal, January 14, "Russian Sleigh Given by Syracuse Alumni."

1957: Springfield Republican, July 14, "A Golden Wedding Anniversary."

1959: Greenfield Recorder-Gazette, November 28, "A man and His School."

The Boston Herald, December 8.

1960: Worcester Telegram, May, "Deerfield Academy's Remarkable Headmaster."

1961: Boston Sunday Globe, October 22, "Frank Boyden Came for Two Years—Stayed for 60."

1962: The Jewish Advocate, June 4, "A Worthy Institution."

Brattleboro Daily Reformer, April 10, "Deerfield's Frank L. Boyden Marked 60 Years There."

1963: Boston Globe, August 15, New England Resort Personalities: "Old Deerfield—An Educator—Academy and Street—All Famous."

1964: Springfield Union, April 25, The Morning Line.

1966: Holyoke Transcript, Summer.

Boston Globe, January 26, "Deerfield's Personal Touch—Mr. Boyden."

1967: Springfield Union, June 12, "Dr. Frank Boyden Rates Salute on Father's Day."

No dates: Albany Knickerbocker News, "Sermonettes of Week," by Norman V. Peale.

Foxboro Reporter, "Dr. Frank Boyden Pays Nostalgic Visit to His Hometown for Big Day."

SOME REFERENCES TO FRANK L. BOYDEN IN MAGAZINES OR NEWSPAPERS

1936: New York American, May 15, "Ministers's Sons," by Bruce Barton.

1937: Springfield Republican, June 13, "Our Hill Town Neighbors," by D. J. Malcolm.

1955: Newsweek, September 19, "The Prep School Now," by Terry Ferrer.

1957: This Week Magazine, November 3, "Cerfboard," by Bennett Cerf.

1959: Philadelphia Inquirer, September 13, "Romance for All," by Norman V. Peale.

1960: Esquire, November, "17 Best Prep Schools in America."

1961: Reader's Digest, "You Are Tougher Than You Think," by Norman V. Peale.

1963: Holiday, June, "New England Preparatory Schools."

1965: Boston Globe, April 19, "A Nickel Tour."

1966: National Geographic, December.

1967: Saturday Review of Literature, April, "Tale of the Headmaster," by Donald Barr.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 9, 1967]

A MASTER HEADMASTER: FRANK LEAROYD BOYDEN

DEERFIELD, MASS., October 8.—In the fall of 1902 a young Amherst graduate took over the direction of a 14-pupil academy here as a way to save money toward a career in law. But the challenge to his instincts as an educator overcame any thought of the law; and now, ready to retire with Deerfield Academy one of the nation's best known preparatory schools, Frank Learoyd Boyden has become a legendary figure in the world of education.

The academy's board of trustees, announcing today that Mr. Boyden planned to step down from his post at Deerfield next June, said that his record of service was "unparalleled by any other educational figure."

The 88-year-old headmaster has no intention of letting retirement remove him altogether from his activities at the academy. There is a $21-million fund drive, for instance, that remains to be attended to, and Mr. Boyden, who has had some experience at that sort of thing, will carry on with this one, too.

Deerfield Academy was chartered in 1797 by Samuel Adams, then Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. It now has an enrollment of 475 pupils, most of them well-informed young gentlemen who are accepted, and even sought after, by the nation's leading colleges and universities.

A FLEXIBLE SYSTEM

Under Mr. Boyden's leadership, the school has had no fixed system of operation.

There is no "plan book" for the faculty, who teach whatever they think is appropriate, and there are no report cards, although both pupils and parents are kept informed by Mr. Boyden of progress or lack of it. Until recently there was no set admissions procedures, with Mr. Boyden personally accepting those boys he thought had good potential.

When Yale University gave him an honorary degree in 1926 (one of 25 he has received) it was for "research into the hearts and minds of boys."

Mr. Boyden was born in Foxboro, Mass., on Sept. 16, 1879, and attended a one-room schoolhouse there until entering Amherst College.

When he took over at Deerfield, the school was a little red brick building on Main Street. Over the years Mr. Boyden transformed it into a 350-acre campus with 20 buildings in addition to 33 restored Colonial homes.

A white two-story pre-Revolutionary structure is the home of Mr. Boyden and his wife, Helen Childs Boyden, a teacher of chemistry and mathematics at Deerfield.

Mrs. Boyden, the daughter of a Deerfield farmer and bridge builder, joined the faculty in 1904 after graduating from Smith College. She and Mr. Boyden were married three years later.

They have three children—Elizabeth, who teaches history at nearby Stoneleigh-Prospect Hill Girls School; Theodore, director of the Center for Business and Economic Education at Georgia State College, and John, director of admissions at Deerfield.

No announcement was made as to whether Mrs. Boyden, who is now 88, will continue teaching or join her husband in fund raising trips around the country.

An indication of Mr. Boyden's stature in the education world came in 1924 when Deerfield was approaching financial ruin because of litigation. The headmasters of Exeter, Andover and Taft schools went on a fund-raising campaign for him and brought back $1.5-million. Among the contributors were classmates from Amherst and the presidents of Amherst and Cornell.

SUCCESSOR IS SOUGHT

The committee chosen to name Mr. Boyden's successor consists of John J. McCloy, former United States High Commissioner to Germany; Harry W. Knight of Darien, Conn., a business management expert; Robert W. Wilson of Washington, vice president of the Potomac Power and Light Company; Charles N. Stoddard, Jr., a lawyer of Greenfield, Mass.; Henry N. Flynt of Greenwich, Conn., president of the Board of Trustees, and Mr. Boyden.

Although Deerfield is not a one-man operation, little goes on that does not come and no major policy decisions are taken without his participation.

Five feet, four inches tall and smaller than some of his pupils, Mr. Boyden still shows great interests in athletics and until recently was coach of many of the school's teams.

He rides about the campus in a horse-drawn buggy when he is not in a hurry, but generally he can be seen darting about in an electric golf cart.

He meets with his students almost daily to discuss their problems and current events.

It has become traditional for the students to sit at his feet on the carpeted floor of the small auditorium. This started, he reminds them, during the days when he did not have enough money for chairs.

He believes in discipline "with persecution" and feels that this gives the students "controlled freedom." Some of his former students confessed that they toed the line because they did not want to hurt his feelings.

[From the Boston Globe, Oct. 9, 1967]

Regretfully, an Era Ends at Deerfield—Father-Adviser to Thousands Retires After 66 Years

(By James Stack)

Deerfield.—Frank Learoyd Boyden, the spry octogenarian whose Yankee charm made him a towering figure in New England's academic community, will step down in June as headmaster at Deerfield Academy.

His departure after 66 years in the post will take from the scholars' ranks a gentle character famed for many things, including a lifelong career of stout resistance to the encroachment of the motor age on American life.

Dr. Boyden, who never could bring himself to admit the automobile was here to stay, relented recently by purchasing an electrically-powered golf cart for his rounds of the picturesque campus at Deerfield.

News of the purchase shocked hundreds of disbelieving alumni, whose fondest memories of prep school days centered around the figure of Boyden, bent over the reins of a fringe-topped surrey drawn by a spirited horse.

Dr. Boyden is now 88, but looks much younger. His bright-eyed countenance, set off by a generous crop of silver-gray hair, has been left unmarked by time.

The Foxboro native is short and slender, with a scholarly bearing marked by the manners of an old-world gentleman. But he has the heart of a boy.

Dr. Boyden, a bookish youth whose love for scholarship caused him to forget his boyhood dream of owning a livery stable, became an educator through an accident.

He graduated from Amherst in 1902 and taught at Deerfield, then an obscure New England academy, to earn enough money to pursue a career in law.

Boyden found at Deerfield a single building accommodating 14 scholars. He will leave it with more than 45 buildings, including a new library, an enrollment of more than 500—and a reputation of high national standing.

More important than the bricks and mortar, or the charm of the campus landscape, though, are the human qualities engendered by Boyden and his wife, Hilda Childs Boyden.

They succeeded in making Deerfield more than a school.

"I've always wanted to run a livery stable," he confided to a friend before his retirement announcement. He is now in a position to fulfill that long-abandoned dream.

"He's got three horses," said Robert D. Crow, Deerfield publicist. "And he's got at least 30 surries, buggies, sleighs and what-have-you to hitch up to his worthy steeds."

"Everything seems simple to me because I was never tied up with the theories of education," he explained.

For years, the Boyden "office" was a desk in front of the fireplace in the main hallway of the school building. It was a center for students in need of advice, consultation or a mere greeting from the sage.

Dr. Boyden, who holds degrees from Amherst, Williams and Yale, has been honored by 18 American colleges and universities.

President Johnson cited him last May for "distinguished service to the nation" in the field of education.

The selection committee has about eight months in which to find a replacement for this man who left his stamp on the school and its alumni.

"He throws a long shadow," a committee member said. "We'll find a replacement, but we'll never find anyone who can take his place."

[From the Boston Herald, Oct. 9, 1967]

Sixty-Six Years as Headmaster: Deerfield Academy Leader Is Retiring

Deerfield.—Frank Learoyd Boyden, at 88 the dean of American schoolmasters, will retire next June after 66 years as headmaster of Deerfield Academy.

Under his direction, Deerfield Academy has grown from 14 boys in 1902, when he took over, to an enrollment of 500 students and some 35 buildings. He accepted the headmastership after graduating from Amherst in 1902.

He originally planned to stay two years—as the only teacher of 14 day students—and then study law. Instead, he stayed to be headmaster to more than 5,000 boys.

He and Mrs. Boyden have every student in for Sunday tea at least once a year, and he is said to be able now to call all 5,000 by their first names.

HORSE AND BUGGY

For years he drove around the academy grounds in a horse and buggy. He regarded as one of his finest gifts the presentation by alumni, in the ballroom of the Waldorf Astoria in New York, of a horse and buggy in observance of his 50th anniversary as headmaster.

At the dinner he told his "old boys" that he was "just a nice, simple country sort of a person who loves boys. Everything seems so simple to me because I was never tied up with the theories of education."

He was born in Foxboro. He obtained his masters degree from Amherst in 1922, and was awarded honorary degrees by Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Dartmouth, Williams, Wesleyan, Amherst and many other colleges. Last May he received a citation from President Johnson.

Dr. Boyden is president of the New England Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, a member of the draft board for the Greenfield area, a former member of the state Board of Education and served on government commissions by appointment of Presidents Franklin Roosevelt, Truman and Eisenhower.

NAME COMMITTEE

The academy trustees in announcing his retirement named a committee of parents and alumni trustees to choose his successor. John J. McCloy, former U.S. High Commissioner to Germany, will be chairman.

Other members are Dr. Boyden; Henry L. Flynt of Greenwich, Conn., president of the Board of Trustees; Harry W. Knight, Darien, Conn.; Dean Mathey, Princeton, N.J.; Robert W. Wilson, Washington; Charles N. Stoddard Jr., Greenfield.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleague from Massachusetts in paying tribute to Mr. Frank Boyden.

Mr. Speaker, it is with mixed feelings of pleasure, honor, and keen nostalgia that I join my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. Conte] in paying tribute to Frank Learoyd Boyden. His belief in the need for patience, encouragement, and lots of hard work for young men has directly influenced over 5,000 lives during his 66 years as headmaster of Deerfield Academy.

Mr. Boyden—despite the fact that he was entitled to be called "Doctor," he preferred the simpler form of salutation—had no secret formula for educating boys in secondary school. Once, when asked what the "Deerfield method" was, he replied succinctly:

> Work 'em hard, play 'em hard, feed 'em to the nines, and send 'em to bed so tired that they are asleep before their heads are on the pillow.

More years ago than I care to remember, I was one of the boys fortunate to experience and benefit from the wisdom of Frank Boyden's philosophy. Some have said that the most important lesson learned at Deerfield is the love of knowledge; I would say that an even more important lesson, instilled in every boy from the day of his arrival, is that of consideration for others. Consideration for others, to the point of going out of one's way to assist a stranger on the schoolgrounds with the thoughtful greeting "Can I help you?" is a character trait common to all men who claim Deerfield as their alma mater.

My ties with Deerfield Academy are deepened by the fact that all three of my brothers also attended the school. All four of us profited from years of character development under the watchful eye of Mr. Boyden. That common experience forged strong bonds of communication and rapport among us which endured long after we had gone on our diverse ways.

Frank Boyden was always available to his students—in fact, his only office was a desk in the main hall, where anyone could stop and talk with him, ask his advice, or get a bit of encouragement when it was needed. From that vantage point, Mr. Boyden kept a tight finger on the pulse of the academy. He seemed to sense, instinctively, the mood of the student body, and was always able to do or say the appropriate thing.

And, Mr. Speaker, as our colleague, Mr. Conte, has said, Mr. Boyden has been greatly aided in his work with boys by a superb faculty and, in particular, by Mrs. Boyden, whose personality and character complimented that of her husband. Together they were wonderful parents to their own children as well as to the thousands of young men of Deerfield.

A few months ago, author John McPhee asked Mr. Boyden what his philosophy is, and received this reply:

> My philosophy—I can't express it really. I believe in boys. I believe in keeping them busy, and in the highest standards of scholarship. I believe in a very normal life. It generally seeps in. I try to do the simple things that a well-organized home does for its boys.

Mr. Speaker, at Deerfield Academy I worked, learned, grew, and played under the guidance of Mr. Boyden. Thus, it is with a warm feeling that I join in today's tribute to one who truly has been a "headmaster extraordinaire." I wish him a long and fruitful retirement, and agree wholeheartedly with those who say, "We will find a replacement, but we will never find anyone to take his place."

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, some of the praise that he will receive as he retires may be intended to make it easier for Frank L. Boyden, one of the great men of American education, to reduce his enormously productive activities at Deerfield Academy, to bring to an end his tireless attention to the needs of his students and their teachers, and, free from the press of academic and administrative duty, to contemplate the lovely Deerfield countryside on long and quiet afternoons.

But praise has never had that effect on Frank Boyden before, and it probably will not now. No honors—and he has had many—and no praise—and he has had much—ever slowed him down during the 65 years in which he has led Deerfield Academy—founded in 1797—to its present distinction as one of the country's outstanding private schools for boys.

In "The Directory of Private Schools," he is described as "possibly the most influential and respected among the 'old school' of dominant headmasters whose institutions directly reflect the personal philosophy of their leadership." It says further:

> Long active in the formulation and encouragement of new approaches which are now accepted by others as well-established ways, Mr. Boyden has played an important part in the reorganization and planning of other schools. Former masters trained by him are following in his footsteps as headmasters elsewhere.

He was born in Foxboro, Mass., the son of Benjamin and Anna Wales "Cary" Boyden. He began his career at Deerfield Academy after his graduation from Amherst. During his long and successful career as headmaster of Deerfield, many honorary degrees were awarded him and many tributes to his character and his achievements were given. Perhaps none of these adequately summed up the nature of his triumph in making Deerfield Academy a showcase of private secondary education in America.

His marriage to Miss Helen Childs in 1907 was blessed with three children, John Cary Boyden—who has assisted his father as an administrative officer of the academy—Theodore Childs Boyden, and Elisabeth Boyden. Mr. Boyden's beloved wife, Helen, taught science and mathematics at the academy for many years.

Deerfield Academy's headmaster is held in the highest esteem and affection by the academy's alumni, by the residents of Deerfield, and by all who have come to know him professionally and socially.

As he retires from a career of true achievement, I join all his many friends in extending the warmest best wishes to him.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, will my distinguished colleague yield?

Mr. CONTE. I am happy to yield to my colleague from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. I commend my friend from Massachusetts for taking this time to record for all those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this tribute to Frank Learoyd Boyden, of Deerfield Academy in our home State.

Mr. Boyden has announced his retirement as headmaster of Deerfield Academy as of June of 1968. At that time, he will bring to a close the remarkable record he has built for his academy. He will ring down the curtain on his own personal active service to that superlative educational institution. I said, Mr. Speaker, "his academy" for no other secondary school in this or any other nation has been so personalized as Deerfield Academy has been by the hand and the mind of Frank Boyden.

When he retires next year, he will have served 66 years as Deerfield's headmaster. That alone is significant but more important is what he has done for this school and all those who have passed through its doors. By his spirit and dedication, by the devotion and respect of those who have been charmed by his personality and persuasiveness, by the affection of all who studied there, he has built a physical plant that ranks with the most beautiful and impressive of secondary academies.

How well he knew that brick and mortar were not what makes a school of learning is attested to by the truly excellent, outstanding faculty that surrounded him. And then, he enriched the young, who came from all parts of the Nation and some from other corners of the world, by his deep personal interest in and guidance of them all during their time at Deerfield.

Mr. Speaker, it has been said:

> Institutions are but the lengthened shadows of men.

If this be so, and I believe it is, then it surely can be said that Frank Boyden is the lengthened shadow of Deerfield Academy.

I am delighted that my friend, Congressman CONTE has recorded in these proceedings the biographical data of Mr. Boyden. It is given to few men to have lived such a life and upon whom so many, many honors, degrees, citations, and tributes have been heaped. I am confident that he is the only man in his particular educational sphere who has won such and so many accolades.

Frank Boyden, Mr. Speaker, has contributed much to his community, to Massachusetts and to our Nation. No matter how occupied he was with his duties as Deerfield's headmaster, he always found time to lend his genius and his talents to the good of mankind. It is no wonder that he has been cited by the President of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson, for his distinguished service. It is readily understood why he has been signally honored by so many colleges, universities, and organizations. It is understandable why he has been the subject of countless stories and articles in all kinds of publications. The uncommon man is always pursued in story and honored by his contemporaries. And, Frank Boyden is, indeed an uncommon man.

Mr. Speaker, I have been privileged to know personally and to admire greatly Frank Boyden. As he finishes his final year at Deerfield Academy, I convey my congratulations to him and wish for him many more years of health and happiness.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, Frank Boyden is the great headmaster of our time.

He has known, worked with, and inspired many generations of boys in his 66 years as headmaster of Deerfield Academy.

He has lived to see their sons, grandsons, and great-grandsons come to Deerfield—and to leave imbued with a certain spirit, a sense of citizenship, and an abiding concern for public responsibility.

Throughout his years of service and accomplishment, Helen Boyden, his devoted wife, has been his helpmate in all things and a teacher of rare quality and sensitivity.

Dr. Boyden will retire in June of 1968, but he will go on as headmaster emeritus; in new endeavors strengthening Deerfield and in the hearts of all who know his wisdom, his understanding of boys, his delight in competitive sports—even baseball—his wry sense of humor, and above all, his belief—not alone in the private secondary school—but in America and the qualities of commonsense and common responsibility that will always carry our heritage forward.

I am sure all Members of this House and the Congress share in saluting a unique American and a great schoolmaster—and in wishing the Boydens much happiness and accomplishment in their important work of new dimensions that lie ahead.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored and pleased indeed to join my able, distinguished colleague and friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Congressman CONTE, in paying appropriate tribute to one of the greatest educators of the Nation who is retiring at the end of the school year next June as headmaster of the famous Deerfield Academy, where he has been so significantly associated for the past 66 years.

Congressman CONTE has touched upon the life and career of this great American with felicity and eloquence and with full recognition of the great place Frank Boyden holds in the hearts and minds of so many people of every field throughout the Nation, particularly former students and their families and friends, who hold this noted son of Deerfield in such high esteem, affection, and gratitude.

Frank Boyden is a great educational leader, a gifted, courageous innovator whose rich contributions to American education have been widely appreciated and preeminent. They constitute a truly precious legacy of noteworthy achievement, profound dedication, and vibrant aspiration fabulously transmuted by this great educator, scholar, and friend into concrete measures truly invaluable to our total educational process in the secondary schools and colleges of the Nation.

Fortunately, his great work will continue in many areas in which he is interested. His counsel, advice, help, and above all his inspiration, will continue to be sought and rendered, as always, with a warm, responsive desire and purpose to give unselfishly of himself in every way he humanly can—with deepest concern for our youth and the interests and well-being of our country so close to his heart.

It is inspired leaders like Frank Boyden who carry forward the torch of learning. Their influence is boundless. It moves from one generation to another through many channels, borne by many eager young men to refresh the fountainheads of civic virtue and patriotism and to serve the public good in many constructive ways.

Frank Boyden is retiring, but he is still marvelously young in spirit and many more conquests lie ahead of him.

As a sincere admirer, who is unceasingly grateful for their tremendous contributions, I am happy and proud to join in wishing Frank and his gifted, gracious wife, all choicest blessings for many years to come.

May they and all their dear ones, in the time before them for many years, enjoy continued good health, success, and satisfaction in their chosen tasks and true happiness, contentment and peace.

The name of Frank Boyden will long be honored, praised, and loved with grateful appreciation for all he has done for our youth and to make our country a better and more rewarding place in which to live. God love him and his devoted wife and family.

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Frank L. Boyden has announced that he will retire from his position as headmaster at Deerfield Academy in June. I want to pay tribute to this great man who is a legend in Massachusetts and in educational circles throughout the United States and around the world.

Mr. Boyden, a native of my State, has been headmaster at Deerfield since 1902. Under his guidance, that academy has grown from a group of 14 students to the well-known and widely respected institution it is today. And Mr. Boyden's accomplishments and his impact on the Nation's education have gone far beyond his achievements at Deerfield. He is a trustee of 25 other educational institutions and his broad public service through the years has gained him the reputation and national stature which he so richly deserves.

Frank Boyden is one of those rare people in our society who truly can be called a "great teacher." To him, as to few others, belongs the surely immense satisfaction which comes from guiding, inspiring and influencing directly the lives of thousands of young men. His professional career has been long and distinguished. All of us who care deeply about the value and progress of education in this country owe him a great debt. Although he is stepping down after 65 years at Deerfield, we hope and expect that he will continue to involve himself in the great unfinished work of education and that our society will benefit from his wise counsel and valuable contribution for years to come.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to join in paying tribute to one of the most renowned educators in this country, Dr. Frank Learoyd Boyden, who at the age of 88 is the dean of American schoolmasters and has just announced his intention to retire next June upon completion of 66 years as headmaster of Deerfield Academy in Massachusetts.

Dr. Boyden has always been in every sense a factual man, a realist who, unlike the theorist, has been close to his school and to the young men who have attended it. Unlike other distinguished institutions of learning, anytime anyone thinks of Deerfield Academy simultaneously the name and deeds of Dr. Boyden come into focus.

Cited by President Johnson only last May, and appointed to Federal commissions by Presidents Franklin Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower, Dr. Boyden's abilities have long been recognized beyond such words as we may express here. He is still president of the New England Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, and he formerly served on the Massachusetts Board of Education. Few men have been privileged to serve so long and so well, and we wish him many more years of good health and happiness.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity of saluting Frank L. Boyden on the occasion of his announcement to retire as headmaster of Deerfield Academy after many years of service to that institution. The lives of countless persons, young and old alike, testify to the beneficial influence of Frank Boyden on their lives. It was always Frank Boyden's desire to contribute to the lives of others through serving them, and I might add there is really no better way for one to live his life than to seek first to be of service to others. Frank Boyden's life is a living testimony that he who would be greatest among us must first be servant of all.

While dedicating his life to the service of young people, Frank Boyden became a legend in his own time. Few men ever attain the record of unselfish public service which he has so notably attained. Dedicating oneself to a worthwhile cause, maintaining a deep conviction in a high set of values, and possessing an abiding faith in mankind are the marks of one who would stand head and shoulders above others while setting a worthy example for others to follow. I am glad to say these are the marks of Frank L. Boyden.

A retirement announcement gives us all pause to reflect on our own lives to see where we have measured up and where we have fallen short. I look upon his life as a model of how each of us should strive to live in unselfish devotion to the good of others. Through following the example of Frank Boyden, all Americans everywhere would help create a better nation and a better world.

This is a special occasion for the House of Representatives to honor a special individual. I want to thank my good friend and colleague, SILVIO CONTE, for spearheading our efforts in the House of Representatives to give proper recognition to one of our Nation's finest gentlemen and a very special person, Frank L. Boyden.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in saying a few words in tribute to Dr. Frank L. Boyden, who this June will retire as headmaster of Deerfield Academy. Frank Boyden is a man who has dedicated a lifetime to the education of the young of our country. He first came to Deerfield in 1902 when it was a small struggling academy of only 14 students. He leaves it now with an enrollment of 500 and as one of the foremost preparatory schools in the Nation. As a trustee of some 13 educational institutions and the president of the New England Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, he has received widespread public recognition for his work, including last May a Presidential citation for distinguished service.

One of his most significant contributions has been in preparing others to take a leading role in the field of education. A remarkable number of Frank Boyden's students and faculty have become the leaders of educational institutions, too numerous to mention. He is truly an educator's educator.

I have had a long and warm association with Frank Boyden. I first came to know him as a student at Deerfield back in the midthirties. He was always ready to offer advice and encouragement to us struggling young scholars. I remember his "office" used to be simply a desk in the main hallway in front of the fireplace, and every student passing on his way to or from class would be greeted by his warm smiling face and his kind words. He took a personal interest in the problems of every student, and for many of us, he became a lifelong friend. Because he has a summer house in my hometown of New London, N.H., it has been my great good fortune to have enjoyed a continuing association with this great man. My early interest in public service and political activity evolved directly from Mr. Boyden's concern that his students participate in public affairs. He encouraged many of us to make a career of public service. He has inspired all of us to try always to do better, and be better.

Mr. Speaker, the inspiration that Frank Boyden has imparted to his students over the generations together with the development of Deerfield Academy into a great and growing institution are moments that will endure. Together with his beloved wife Helen, who is an equally great educator, Frank Boyden has been the life force of this school for 66 years. For Deerfield and her students and countless friends an era will come to a close next June.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, the retirement of Frank Boyden as headmaster of Deerfield Academy should be the occasion for noting the tremendous contribution that he has made to American life through personal inspiration of his students and all with whom he had contact. As we ponder upon the difficult problems and questions of education and training today, we must not overlook the convincing results from great teachers and headmasters like Dr. Boyden, who have established deep and lasting influence on their students. Headmaster Boyden is living proof of the essentially personal nature of the teaching relationship.

The great esteem in which he is held in his own profession was testified to when headmasters of a number of other schools came to the assistance of Deerfield in 1924 and personally conducted a fundraising campaign to assure the continuation of Frank Boyden's work there. Among those headmasters was Horace Taft, founder of the Taft School and close friend and admirer of Mr. Boyden. It is significant that help at that time has been repaid many times over in intangible ways. One of these can be seen in John Esty, a graduate of

Deerfield, the headmaster of the Taft School today. This young school head is a fine example of the inspiration and teaching of Frank Boyden and his imprint upon American education and life.

On the occasion of Mr. Boyden's retirement, thousands of his former students and far greater numbers of his admirers and educational debtors join in recognizing his tremendous contribution and wishing to him and to Mrs. Boyden years of continued service and happiness.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with my colleagues in honoring Frank Learoyd Boyden who will retire in June of 1968 as headmaster of Deerfield Academy.

Mr. Boyden has been headmaster of Deerfield since 1902 when he took over the position to support himself so that he could study law. It is fortunate for education that he never entered the field of law, for America would have lost one of her finest educators.

As headmaster of Deerfield Academy and trustee of over two dozen educational institutions, Frank Boyden has contributed immeasurably to the furtherance of liberal education in Massachusetts and in the Nation. Not only has he personally been responsible for thousands of young men at Deerfield, but many of these young men, inspired by their headmaster, have gone into education throughout the Nation. The love for learning which he imparted to these young men has borne fruit far beyond the normal ability of any one man.

Headmaster Boyden has often said that he has no real philosophy of education, of teaching. But I think we can see his philosophy as reflected in his work. He has looked "into the hearts and minds of boys." And because he has understood boys, he has been able to make them love learning and appreciate knowledge.

He has said:

> I believe in boys. I believe in keeping them busy and in the highest standards of scholarship. I believe in a normal life.

But he has not meant by this an ordinary life, but a rich, full one that combines an awareness of the world with a conscience to do good works.

I do not doubt that this retirement will mean no end of Mr. Boyden's activity; he is too involved in and important to education to really retire. However, in his retirement from Deerfield, I wish him and his lovely wife the warmest best wishes. They will be kept busy giving advice, aid, and information to people involved in education, but I am quite confident that retirement for Frank Boyden could never be any but a change from one activity to another.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be granted 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on the subject of my special order.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

THE JOHNSON BLACKMAIL

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. EDWARDS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the Johnson administration is trying to blackmail the American taxpayer into paying for all of the Great Society's handout programs.

Faced with a public call for cuts in spending, the President threatens to put the ax to legitimate Federal functions of long standing instead of the new and costly, but ineffective, Federal giveaways.

No other interpretation can be placed on the administration's action of yesterday in telegraphing the Governors about possible cuts in the Federal share of highway construction programs. Pure blackmail.

The same was true with the President's weekend reference to school lunch programs. The President said innocently:

> We tried to cut school lunch money, but Congress wouldn't let us.

The President has led us down the primrose path of paying the enormous costs of war while at the same time pouring equally as great amounts of money into wasteful, politically motivated, handout schemes.

Now he appeals to the country to pay for this irresponsible policy of his with a tax increase. Congress says in reply, "Before we raise taxes let us see what nonessential programs we can cut. A responsible cut in spending may be better medicine than a raise in taxes."

With the ball in the White House court, the President comes back and says OK, how about school lunches and highways. Surely the transparent nature of this Presidential ploy will not be lost on the taxpayers.

I will not be blackmailed.

The President is well aware what kinds of handout programs can be cut responsibly. He knows that school lunches and highway construction are phony issues. Federal participation in school lunch money is an infinitely small part of the total budget. The Federal share in highway construction is made through trust funds and so is only indirectly related to the budget. It is a longstanding program which, as the President knows, the States rely on, and which has proven itself as a legitimate Federal function. It helps create jobs and makes a major contribution to the welfare and the security of the Nation.

The real question is whether we are serious about the need to cut Federal spending. If we are, and if we do cut spending, then we will obviously have to tighten our belts, and of necessity some local projects will get hurt along the way. Some will have to be delayed, and I believe responsible people across the country will accept this fact.

But they will ask that cuts be made first in programs that were never justified in the first place, or programs that seemed justified but have proven to be unwarranted: programs where the Federal Government has usurped the functions of State and local government, where giveaways are encouraging laziness, and a no-need-to-work attitude. These are the areas where Federal spending should be cut.

The President is a newspaper reader like the rest of us, and he has read as we all have, about the surplus of Federal programs in some city areas and other poverty-stricken places. In some of these places there are so many Federal programs that the local people do not know what to do with them: they cannot use the money for intended purposes, and instead it ends up in the hands of commercial profiteers or political vote buyers.

The President can read the newspapers and surely he read the speech delivered September 23 by Mr. Daniel P. Moynihan before the national board meeting of the Americans for Democratic Action. Moynihan, brought to Washington by President Kennedy as Assistant Secretary of Labor, said:

> We do not change things very much with a piece of legislation and a bill-signing ceremony in the Rose Garden.

He spoke of the disappointing performances of the new agencies such as the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and the Department of Transportation. He said:

> In these new agencies almost everyone feels there is no greater hindrance to the war on poverty and no greater force for the perpetuation of the slums than the public welfare system administered by the huge, entrenched, and complacent subbureaucracy in HEW.

The thing that frustrates the taxpayers of this country most of all, in my opinion, is that they feel the President is not going to cut back on the Great Society programs. They know that during the last year tens of thousands of people have been added to the Federal payroll, just in order to carry out these unwarranted Johnson programs, while at the same time he glibly has told the Nation he was cutting back on Federal employment.

Perhaps the credibility gap was first noted when the President made a good publicity issue about turning the lights off in the White House to save money while at the same time he began to pour millions of dollars into wasteful handout schemes.

But whenever it started to appear the credibility gap has been greatly widened in recent days.

When the President complains that he cannot cut spending until Congress makes the appropriations, he fails to win much sympathy from the American people. They are smarter than that.

They know that Congress, acting with solid Democratic Party majorities in both House and Senate, appropriates money largely in response to the President's statement of the needs. And they know that appropriations are not the same as spending, that the President spends the money, and can cut this spending as he wishes.

They know that it is the President's spending which has placed the country's fiscal and monetary situation in real trouble. They know we face an inflationary period with or without a tax increase, and that the most effective medicine to combat this problem is reduction in Federal spending.

They know the President tried too long to maintain the fiction that we could fight a war and carry on the Great Society at the same time. Mr. Speaker, I have a feeling that the people of this Nation will not stand still to be blackmailed.

IMMIGRATION BILL TO AID BROTHERS AND SISTERS OF ITALIAN CITIZENS

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Rooney] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, just 2 years ago this week President Johnson, in ceremonies before the Statue of Liberty in New York Harbor, signed into law a new immigration bill which brought an end to 40 years of discrimination. Of that new law President Johnson said:

> This bill says simply that from this day forth those wishing to emigrate to America shall be admitted on the basis of their skills and their close relationship to those already here. It is a simple test. It is a fair test . . . the days of unlimited immigration are past. But those who will come will come because of what they are—not because of the land from which they sprung.

I am happy and proud, Mr. Speaker, that I was able to be a sponsor of the legislation of which the President spoke. But immigration, as we well know, is a knotty problem and one which does not have cut and dried, black and white options. It is, as is any subject that vitally concerns the lives of many, a problem of compassion and understanding as well as a legal problem. In the main, the new law has worked well and righted many injustices—injustices which were created in the first place by fear and the offspring of fear, prejudice. But the new law has also created some problems, particularly for brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens now living in Italy. As it stands now over 100,000 of these relatives and their spouses and children will have to wait 10 years or perhaps longer to enter the United States under a fifth preference immigration status. This category is heavily oversubscribed and I therefore am introducing legislation which I hope will break that logjam. The State Department Bulletin issued August 15, 1967, shows that as the immigration law stands now, Italian families are not being reunited, which was, after all, the purpose of the law. The Bulletin shows that while applicants from other countries whose petitions have been approved prior to July 1, 1966, can be admitted to the United States, petitions for brothers and sisters of American citizens of Italian descent can be admitted only if their petitions were approved prior to March 1, 1955.

I hope that my colleagues will look at the humanitarian aspects of this legislation and support this effort to unite families that are separated by an unfortunate set of circumstances over which they have no control.

I think it is fitting too, Mr. Speaker, in this week in which we celebrate Columbus Day, that we look at the many contributions which have been brought to these shores by the millions of Italians who have adopted the United States as their home. By their warmth, skills, arts and love of life they have made this country a better place to live. I think it only fair at this point, that we do something for them, something which is equitable and needs doing.

INTER-AMERICAN VOLUNTEER CORPS

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ottinger] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, an important new program, with significant implications for Latin American development and self-help efforts, is being carried out in the Dominican Republic. Following the example of the U.S. Peace Corps inspired by the late President John F. Kennedy, six Latin American countries have contributed young men to form the first inter-American Volunteer Corps. They are presently teaching Dominican farmers to improve their agricultural techniques.

The program was organized by the Pan American Development Foundation, a private, nonprofit inter-American organization initiated by the General Secretariat of the Organization of American States, and by its affiliate, the Dominican Development Foundation which is supported by over 100 Dominican private companies and individuals.

The volunteers are providing the arms, legs, and brains to carry modern agricultural knowledge from research centers to the small farmers, applying it in practical ways where it is most needed. Their objective is to help the farmers or campesinos to understand and to adopt modern techniques, thus mobilizing a vital but latent human resource and creating a basis for sustained economic and social progress.

Young Latin Americans have responded enthusiastically to the prospect of volunteer service. Over 200 applicants volunteered within 3 weeks after the call went out. This is a promising reaction to an imaginative program which the governments of the hemisphere should carefully observe. With the assistance of the intergovernmental International Secretariat for Volunteer Service—ISVS—32 volunteers were selected: six from Colombia, two from Chile, three each from Costa Rica, Guatemala and El Salvador, and 15 from the Dominican Republic.

The volunteers, called Inter-American Volunteers for Development, have shown great spirit and initiative in teaching campesinos to raise an improved variety of corn, through proper planting and soil preparation and the use of fertilizers, insecticides, and pesticides, all contributed by private businesses. Through the efforts of the volunteers, and with the help of 110 trained campesinos leaders, demonstration plots were planted and cared for by over 850 farmers. Based on the favorable results, operations are now expanding to include extensive planting by some 4,000 campesinos.

In addition to its attraction for youth, the program has shown that the volunteers are potentially an important factor in the vital area of increasing agricultural output in the hemisphere. They have proven effective in transmitting complex, technical information in simple terms to the Dominican campesinos. The most promising accomplishment for the future of the program is the rapid rapport and acceptance achieved by the Latin American volunteers in the rural communities and their ability to adapt easily to the rigors of rural life. Minimal cultural differences have enabled them to be highly effective in the critical area of promoting attitude changes among the campesinos. The reports from the program indicate that the volunteers are enthusiastic about their ability to participate in development efforts. Through the learning experience and cultural interchange, the program promises to make them more mature Americans who will contribute to the advancement of their respective countries.

I wish to insert in the Record a recent article from Américas magazine which describes the program. This effort should be applauded as an excellent example of private initiative and inter-American cooperation, and the governments of the American nations should be encouraged to build into a strong and effective force for development. The article follows:

INTER-AMERICAN VOLUNTEERS FOR DEVELOPMENT

In the Dominican Republic a group of young volunteers from several American countries is at work in a pilot program that may have far-reaching results for the small farmers of that recently trouble land and for their counterparts in the other countries of the Hemisphere.

The Inter-American Volunteers are teaching a thousand farmers to plant improved corn seeds on their own land and to use chemical fertilizers, insecticides, and pesticides. Modern technology for growing corn is being translated into simple terms and demonstrated in the most immediate and convincing manner possible.

Initial kits of seeds, fertilizers, and insecticides are provided to the farmers as the donations of various private companies operating in the Dominican Republic. Thereafter the farmers, who will be taught the economics of the programs, will have to reinvest part of their income from their increased yield for more seed and fertilizer. The donating firms will follow up the gifts with a distributing system to ensure the availability of the needed materials. And the government agriculture bank is presently working on a system for supplying small crop loans to the participating farmers.

The project is sponsored by the private Dominican Development Foundation and the Pan American Development Foundation, a private, non-profit, inter-American organization initiated by the Organization of American States.

Cooperating in the venture are the Dominican Republic's business community, farmer organizations, agencies of the Dominican Government, the International Center for Maize and Wheat Improvement, in Chapinco, Mexico, which is supported by the Rockfeller and Ford Foundations and the Mexican Ministry of Agriculture, and the International Secretariat for Volunteer Services, an intergovernmental organization with headquarters in Washington.

The Director of Planning for the Dominican Ministry of Agriculture, Father Dorta-Duque, has reported to President Joaquín Balaguer that the program is already an important success because for the first time all of the country's meaningful organizations active in agriculture have been brought together into one coordinated program.

The project is also an important example of practical Hemisphere cooperation. The first volunteers, fifteen in number, are from Colombia, Costa Rica, El Salvador, and Guatemala. They work with counterpart Dominican volunteers. It is the first group of young Latin Americans to join together in an inter-American development program.

The ultimate objective goes beyond increasing the individual farmers' production of corn. The new techniques can later be applied to other crops. By learning how to utilize available credit the farmers will be able to pass from subsistence farming into the money economy. Resulting corn production should increase internal consumption and eventually serve as an export crop to earn foreign exchange.

Dr. José A. Mora, Board Chairman of the Pan American Development Foundation, has called the project just the beginning of a new approach to increase food production all over Latin America and to bring the farmers into the money economy and the national life.

SMALL BUSINESS FIRMS RECEIVE RECORD VOLUME OF SUBCONTRACTS

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, American small business firms received a record dollar volume of subcontracts from the Lockheed Aircraft Corp., for the first half of 1967. The Van Nuys, Calif., Valley News and Green Sheet edition of August 24, 1967, reported this Small Business Administration success story.

It is gratifying that our small business community is enjoying the benefits of the administration's subcontracting policies for small business firms.

Robert C. Moot, SBA's new Administrator, and the SBA deserve special recognition for this small Government agency's procurement program.

I am pleased to bring to the attention of my colleagues the entire text of this news story:

> SMALL FIRMS GIVEN BOOST BY LOCKHEED
>
> The Small Business Administration today had announced reports from Lockheed Aircraft Corp. for the first half of 1967 show that small firms received a record dollar volume of subcontracts from the California-based aerospace firm.
>
> SBA Administrator Robert C. Moot said he was "extremely pleased" with Lockheed's efforts to utilize the capability of small companies.
>
> "The outstanding job Lockheed and many other large prime contractors are doing by subcontracting to small business confirms the flexibility of small firms and their ability to deliver responsively to the needs of prime contractors," Moot said.
>
> Lockheed reported that it subcontracted a total of $228,793,204 with small firms during January through June of this year, up from slightly more than $192,000,000 in the previous six months. "It is a very favorable trend," Moot said, "and one which I hope will continue."
>
> Last year, the Small Business Administration presented Lockheed a special aerospace award for "outstanding leadership in developing design and procurement programs directed at the maximum utilization of small business firms in meeting the needs of the nation's defense and space programs."
>
> Dollar volume of subcontracts awarded small firms by Lockheed during the first half of 1967 accounted for 38.7% of the firm's total outside procurment. This was nearly 10% higher than the 28.9% registered in the previous six months.
>
> The nearly 270,000 orders Lockheed placed with small firms in the first six months of 1967 represented more than two-thirds of all individual orders placed by the firm in the period. Nearly 25,000 small suppliers across the country participated as subcontractors in Lockheed programs.

A GREAT DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENT SPEAKS TO HIS PARTY

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker—

> The Democratic Party has never chosen the road of irresponsibility. This party, and the programs it has inspired and legislated and turned into action, has set a standard in the 1960's by which every administration that follows must be judged—

Thus, did President Johnson address his fellow Democrats Saturday night. It is clear, I think, that the President was speaking to all Democrats in every section of our Nation who share his view that our party is the party of the people.

In his speech, the President defined what is going to be the central theme of next year's campaign.

He declared:

> The question our people are going to have to answer is clear:
>
> Shall we go on building?
>
> Or shall we become discouraged with ourselves, impatient that the work is not yet finished? Shall we bury all that we have begun—begun with such hope and promise—and bury it in a shroud of inaction and reaction?

I believe I know the answer to these questions. I believe that in 1968 the American people will vote overwhelmingly to continue the progress they have achieved under this administration.

They will vote to continue strengthening American education.

They will vote to continue the war on poverty.

They will vote to continue rebuilding our cities.

They will vote to continue to save the soil to light the farms and to bolster the rural economy of America.

They will vote to continue unprecedented economic growth.

They will vote to continue a "can do" administration and a "can do" Congress.

We Democrats in Congress have a very special responsibility to continue supporting the programs and policies of this administration that we have so promisingly begun.

Our goal is to give each man and woman in this country opportunity to be productive and to contribute to this society. The investments we make to create this opportunity will be small in the long run compared to the prices to be paid for poverty, ignorance, discrimination, and crime.

These measures have helped this administration to prove its faith in our people and our free enterprise system.

But the great work of the 89th Congress is not considered an end in itself. It is a promising beginning that must be reinforced and improved by the actions of the 90th Congress.

Today, there are some 50 administration proposals on vital domestic matters that await congressional action. This unfinished agenda of the Nation's business contains the bulk of our Government's response to the pressing needs of our cities, the rising crime rate, the burdens of the poor and elderly, and other major problems confronting the American people.

In answer to the President's question: "Shall we go on building?"—this Congress must be emphatic and affirmative.

We must continue to be a Democratic Congress, a Congress that votes "yes" for the people. If we do, the people will vote "yes" for us. For as President Johnson observed, the party that believes in building is the party that can best take its case to the American people.

THE ITALIANS IN CHICAGO

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an article about "The Italians in Chicago" which appeared in the October 8 edition of Chicago's American, one of the leading newspapers in my city.

This article is poignantly written, with great feeling and forthrightness, by Barbara Tiritilli, who is herself a lifetime resident of the West Side of Chicago about which she writes.

The area described by Miss Tiritilli is the area around our Lady of Pompeii Church, located at 1224 West Lexington Street. I am proud that I was baptized in this church, I received my holy communion and confirmation in this church, and today, I have the honor to represent this whole area, which is the Seventh District of Illinois, in the Congress of the United States.

Reading Miss Tiritilli's article has a certain nostalgia for me, because I was born and raised in this area, and Our Lady of Pompeii Church is located in the center of this area.

Miss Tiritilli was born and grew up in "Little Italy" in Chicago, and received her B.A. degree in journalism from Marquette University at Milwaukee, Wis. As an Italo-American who has grown up in the midst of Italo-American traditions, I feel she is well qualified to give other Americans a keen insight into who the Italian Americans really are and what they represent in this great country of ours.

Because in America today there are over 25 million Italo-Americans, their impact on our culture has been tremendous. They represent the largest ethnic group in my own city of Chicago as well as in many other cities throughout the United States.

Like other immigrants, they came to this haven of freedom, seeking new opportunities and a new way of life. They worked hard in this land of opportunity and contributed much to improving our way of life and to the outstanding growth and progress of our country.

Italo-Americans have served with distinction in every war our country has fought since the Revolutionary War. They have contributed leaders to every field of endeavor, including medicine, law, the arts, and the sciences. They have actually helped to build America as we know it today—a leader among nations and a bastion of freedom in the world.

Their joys and their sorrows, their successes and their failures, their achievements as well as their disappointments, have all been forthrightly recorded by Miss Tiritilli.

I do hope that my colleagues, many of whom have thousands of Americans of Italian descent living in their congressional districts, will read this article in order to gain a more profound understanding of the Italo-Americans and their contribution to the advancement of our American culture.

I do hope also that my colleagues will gain an understanding of the problems and difficulties that faced the early immigrants, like my own mother and father, who came to this country many years ago. This is a true story of America and of the Italo-Americans who pulled themselves up by their own bootstraps to make America one of the most powerful nations in the world. This story is particularly significant because it happened with all of the other ethnic groups who, like the Italian Americans, helped to build America.

The article follows:

The Italians in Chicago

Who are the Italians?

Maybe you laugh, because there is no answer to that the way there is to a Polish joke. Ask a non-Italian and he thinks immediately of pizza, pasta, Sophia Loren, the Mafia, Cosa Nostra, Dagos.

There are 500,000 Italians in Chicago, including immigrants, second and third generation. I am one of them. We are not the Mafia. We don't know if or what the Cosa Nostra is. We in no way resemble Sophia Loren, detest being called Dagos. We do eat pasta.

In the past century, five million Italians left their homeland to come to a new life in this country. There were only 43 Italians living in Illinois in 1850, according to the United States census report. That year, in Illinois, there were 27,000 Irish, 38,000 Germans, 18,000 English, and 4,000 Scandinavians.

After 1900, more and more Italians emigrated here, steadily over the decades, so that now we are one of the largest ethnic groups in Chicago. One statistician reports that one out of every eight persons in America today is Italian. There are more than 20 million Italians thruout the United States.

In Chicago, the Italians settled near Clark and Harrison streets; around Illinois and Wells. Assumption church, the first Italian church here, was built at that corner. Most came from central and southern Italy; a few from Genoa. The immigrants created a Little Italy as they settled along Taylor street and Roosevelt road from Halsted street to Western avenue.

They lived in second and third floor walkups entered thru long dusty gangways. The women, accustomed to drying their laundry in the breeze off the Adriatic sea, soon learned to stretch a laundry line across a clearing between two tenement buildings.

The men worked with their hands, in construction, on railroads. Dirty, but honest work, and they were glad to have it. It was largely a two-stop-a-day life, the job and home. On Saturday nights, the men would gather for a game of bocce, a glass of wine, and conversation about the "old country" and the paesi [hometowns] they left behind.

The Italian women filled the city's slums with a thousand aromas of freshly baked bread, ravioli, home-made wine and sausage. The sound of opera broadcasts [from New York] filled their neighborhoods. If they had no radios, they sang. They staged religious pageants on their streets, and raised many children and grandchildren in this setting.

That is where we came in, the Italian-Americans. We grew up on the streets of Little Italy. There were no Joneses on our block. There were Serritellas, Panepintos, DeVitos, Di Fonsos, and Giagnorios.

Churchbells from Our Lady of Pompeii church, 1224 W. Lexington st., would awaken us, and on hot summer nights, when the windows of our stuffy, crowded apartments were opened, the sound of an accordion would waft from another rotting old porch and lull us to sleep.

Italians never learned the words "ghetto" and "minority"; there were no organizations, no protests. The only marches we ever have are those celebrating Columbus day and the patron saints' feast days.

State Rep. Victor Arrigo, a Sicilian-American, is a life-long resident of the near west side area. Arrigo for years has researched the history of Italians in America, and lectures on the subject. Arrigo said:

"No other racial group has so vitally affected the American way of life with their multiple contributions. One need only look at America's eating habits to bring this into proper focus—from antipasto to tortoni, Italian dishes grace the table of every American home from the Atlantic to the Pacific."

Historically, of course, Arrigo pointed out, the Italians could reach back centuries to a heritage of art, music, literature, law, science, and certain basic concepts of civilization. The roster is long: Michelangelo, DaVinci, Raffaelo, Bernini, Vivaldi, Verdi, Toscanini, Boccaccio, Dante, Pirandello, D'Annunzio, Cicero, Columbus, and on and on.

One paesano of 75 years, who came to Chicago when he was 25, made this remark:

"What's the use of pulling out the old names to prove we're nice people? Chicago is more Italian than parts of Italy. We have made our lives here for 50 years."

It was an Italian civil engineer, Josehua D'Esposito, who built Union station. There was Enrico Fermi, a Chicago Italian, who won the Nobel prize in physics in 1938. And Enrico Tonti, Italian explorer, is cited with the discoverers Father Marquette, Joliet, and LaSalle on a plaque on the Michigan avenue bridge.

The sons of Chicago's Italian immigrants are now doctors, lawyers, educators, businessmen, political leaders, judges. Italian names are on theater marquees, sports pages, television credits. In two generations, the Chicago Italians witnessed what they never would have dreamed possible—Francesca Cabrini, a west side Italian girl, was canonized the first American saint of the Catholic church, and Sam Giancana, a neighborhood bully of the old 42 gang graduated to the crime syndicate, was put behind bars.

There are some 400 Italian-American lawyers and eight judges and magistrates here, including Federal Judge Alexander J. Napoli, a barber's son.

There are Cook County Circuit Court Judges Daniel A. Covelli, George L. Quilici, Pasquale A. Sorrentino, and John J. Lupe; Associate Judges Richard A. Napolitano and Nicholas Bua; and Felix Buoscio, supervising judge of Traffic court. At least five others are on the county's list of magistrates. There are six Chicago area Italians in the Illinois legislature, and Congressman Frank Annunzio (Ill., D., 7th) in Washington.

Little Italy West is all changed now. Fish markets and bakers along Taylor street are gone. The horsedrawn fruit and vegetable pushcart has no more dingy little streets to plod thru, beckoning children from front porches.

These scenes have been replaced by expressways and sleek gray buildings of the University of Illinois Circle campus. New Italian families remain, the Pompeii church is there, and a bigger than life-size statue of Christopher Columbus in ensconced in Vernon Park.

Meanwhile, the move to suburbs has not separated Italians nor interrupted their way of life.

The community's information link is FRA NOI, monthly newspaper published by the Scalabrini league and circulated to 40,000 families here. The name means "among ourselves"; the paper is edited by the Rev. Armando Pierini and the Rev. Paul Asciolla, Scalabrini Fathers. Father Asciolla said:

"Wherever they went the Italians brought with them a joy in living. No matter how trying their problems, they were always ready to put them aside for a feast or party. They found consolation and identification within the group of relatives and friends."

The composite Italian character is now different from that of the immigrant generation's. At this point, it is difficult to define exactly who Italian-Americans are. The Rev. Asciolla said.

"It's time to ask ourselves, 'Will the real Italian-Americans please stand up? And, where do we go from here?'" he added. But we know this much: There are certain traits that quite evidently propel Italian life, right down to the third generation.

These are intense love of family, mothers and children especially, a love of music, cooking, eating, street festivals, and saints days. Italy's currently popular writer, Luigi Barzini, says we are people who feel obliged to make "la bella figura" [or, what the British call "good show"]. Barzini wrote of European Italians, but it also is true of Chicago Italians.

The Italian wedding, christening [especially of the first-born male], confirmation, and sometimes a wake, are the high points of family life. However, any other reason for celebrating between these events is welcome.

No Italian wedding is complete without at least 300–400 guests for dinner, dancing, and confetti. The occasion also requires at least one round of Tarantella, a folk dance, and the wedding could cost as much as $5 or $6,000. An Italian father who really can't afford such a blast will work and save a lifetime to give a daughter such a day.

Man is head of the family—really, not nominally. The Italian wife waits on him, pampers him, and asks him few, if any, questions. The Italian man is a good provider for the important women in his life—his mother and his wife. His mother is generally better informed of his activities than his wife. The wife and children obey him, right or wrong. No other relationship ever threatens the solidarity of an Italian family, and the padre di famiglia is happiest when reigning in his household.

The Italian mother or grandmother [Nonna] is a central figure in a household. She generally lives with one of her children, tho the son or daughter is married.

Some aged Italians are in Ville Scalabrini because they have no children [or other unusual reasons], but there is a continuous traffic of young groups who volunteer visits and entertainment for the residents.

Italian language radio broadcasts are beseiged with requests to play songs dedicated to Mamma. Indeed, the most commonly known exclamation associated with our people is—Mamma Mia.

On Sundays unfailingly, Nonna cooks pasta and bracciole for 10 or 15 persons assembling for family dinners that can last as long as five hours, like modern day orgies.

When Italians are celebrating the feeling is one of complete communion with the world in all its reality, good or bad, come what may. This moment is the one that matters. We want everybody to be happy for today, candidly, warmly. When Italians mourn, they grieve deeply. An older Italian widow still dresses in black from the day her husband dies until she dies.

Italian women do not in any way resemble Sophia Loren or other movie stereotypes.

Chicago's Italian women spend most of their lives washing dishes, cooking dinners, raising families, and washing clothes. Only within the past few years have the women of my generation of Italian-Americans become active in clubs. But even these clubs, such as the ladies' auxiliary of the Joint Civic Committee of Italian Americans, are centered on things Italian and minor activities which do not interfere with the main goals—home and pampering husband.

There are women like Mrs. Mary LaPorte, 74, 1539 N. Leamington st., who has a soft spot for the plight of skid row bums and their bad eating habits. So for the last 20 years Mrs. LaPorte has cooked 60 pounds of pasta and 600 meatballs every year and carted the hot meals to West Madison street. The bums line up and she sees they're all fed. "Poor souls," she says.

Then, there's Mrs. Serafina Ferrara, 64. Mrs. Ferrara is in the front line of every Columbus day parade with Mayor Daley. She came here from Salerno when she was 14 years old, and she and her late husband ran a pastry shop on Taylor street. Mamma Ferrara never learned to speak English, but after her husband, Salvatore, died in 1959, she managed to parlay the small pastry shop into a business empire that now includes a candy company and two catering houses.

One of the houses, Ferrara Manor, is a converted theater which she bought to build a place where Italians could hold arena-size weddings. The west side Italian kids call her Mamma because no youngsters ever left her shop without getting a free pastry in times when there wasn't enough bread to go around at home.

Columbus day remains the biggest local Italian holiday. The parade down State street, Italians believe, equals [even surpasses] St. Patrick's. Recent passage of a bill sponsored by Arrigo makes Columbus day, Oct. 12, a legal holiday in Illinois with schools closed.

St. Joseph's day, March 19, two days after the Irish St. Patrick's day, is the second largest feast. Special pastries [sfingi] are baked in Italian homes, and elaborate buffet tables are prepared to honor the saint. Outsiders, passers-by, everyone is invited in to eat.

Thruout the summer, street festivals are held in various church parishes. Largest of these is July 16, the feast of Our Lady of Mount Carmel in Melrose Park. More than 50,000 persons attended this year from thruout the middle west.

A throng gathered for outdoor Mass. Then, a life-sized statue of the Madonna was carried in procession thru the suburb's streets, Italian women and children followed the statue carrying lighted tapers, some walking barefoot for two miles.

Over the years, and particularly during the time when Capone and his cohorts were running the town, exploiting everyone, Italians included, many Italians sought to detach themselves from their community.

Dr. Mario Rubinelli, president of Joint Civic Committee of Italian-Americans, said there is now an effort to study seriously the formulation and/or effects of the image of Italians as gangsters, i.e., representatives of our community as depicted in movies, and television. The Human Relations committee of the JCCIA is discussing with sociologist Dr. Hans Adler a study of the mass media to determine if such an image exists.

Dan Becco, former assistant United States attorney and chairman of the committee, said:

"If it is not true that Italians are responsible for organized crime, then we should counteract this image with facts intelligently, and not just with defamation cries. We ought to do something constructive, but let's get the facts first."

Trouble is, there are no facts, figures or proofs of discrimination against Italians in employment, etc. Isolated cases turn up from time to time such as the Liuni case in Ulster county, New York, last year in which a welfare department denied adoption of a blonde child by an Italian-American couple because they were "dark-skinned Mediterraneans."

But Chicago's Italians do not rally to such causes, even the newspapers from coast to coast editorialized about the Liuni case as clearly discriminatory. Italians in Chicago are a unique group of dissenting individualists. For example, they were not particularly overjoyed at announcement in May that Frank Sinatra had been named in New York to head up an Anti-Defamation league.

Instead, Italians here are planning a national federation, along the lines of B'nai B'rith and the Greek Ahepa organizations. Midwest regional coordinator for Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, and Wisconsin in this effort is Joseph DeSerto, an insurance company executive and local Italian leader. DeSerto said:

"It's an auspicious step, but such an organization is sorely needed. So far, we have dozens of Italian groups, and not one single, national unifying force."

One purpose of the federation will be to preserve and promote Italian-American culture, and to act as the united voice of our national community, DeSerto said.

Meanwhile, a kind of "cultural renaissance" is happening among those Italian-Americans who shunned learning the Italian language and thought the customs old-fashioned and corny in earlier years. An evident demand by these persons to pick up the pieces of their heritage prompted Peter Scalise, an attorney and former Cultural Affairs chairman for JCCIA, to initiate a weekly program of adult, evening Italian classes at De Paul university. The project was called Sojourn in Italy, and classes and lectures in art, architecture, Italian fashions, etc., drew enrollments of several hundreds.

The '67–'68 Sojourn program is continuing under the name Center for Italian Studies. Evening classes in language and Americanization began is September at De Paul, with lectures in Center theater and the format essentially the same as Sojourn, according to Vincent Lucchese, Center chairman.

"We have combined the best of an old culture with the best America has to offer and infused the Italian-American way of life," Arrigo says.

Four years ago, when mobster Joseph Valachi went before a Senate investigating committee and first used the term Cosa Nostra, Italians were as astonished as everyone else. We knew the words meant "our thing," our affair. But there were few Italians in Chicago who knew what Valachi was talking about when he referred to "an organization of Italian families who dominate large-scale criminal activities." In fact, few here had ever heard of Valachi.

Several months ago, in Oyster Bay, N.Y., a panel of the nation's leading experts in organized crime officially rejected the term Cosa Nostra.

Donald R. Cressey, sociology professor at the University of California, who headed the panel, declared that American gangland operations are "not to be confused" with the Mafia. The Mafia is a Sicilian term referring to a Sicilian organization, and many participants in the American conspiracy are not Sicilian, Cressey said.

"The phrase Cosa Nostra incorrectly implies that all members of the conspiracy are Italian or Sicilian . . . and the term is not even widely known," another panel member said.

That is true, local Italians say. Of course, no Chicago Italian will deny that there have been notorious Italian names in the ranks of the city's underworld. There still are.

But older Italians here who lived thru the Capone era recall that many paesani who had small businesses and taverns were exploited by hoodlums. Newspaper files are filled with stories of victims, fathers of small children and young men who were shot to death—gangland style—on west side streets because they refused to answer the Black Hand letters of blackmail and extortion. These victims also bore Italian names.

They were immigrants, like my own grandparents, newly arrived in Chicago, trying to save a little money from earnings. They spoke no English; they did not know the laws. They would not have known words like "blackmail" and "extortion." There were no organizations to direct them.

These simple people knew only from the old country that when you received a Black Hand letter, the sender meant business. The alternatives were either to pay or to die.

One man here, now 75 years old, came to this city from a town in southern Italy 50 years ago. He recalled the bad old days:

"I worked on construction gangs. By the 1920s I managed to save a little money, but I didn't know how to use the banks. I couldn't speak English. I didn't even trust the bank, because in my town I never heard of a bank. I thought you just gave the bank your money and you never got it back, so we kept my savings at home in the mattress.

"Then, I start getting these Black Hand letters. I was really afraid. They want my money. They threaten my family. I didn't know how to go to the police. So we lived in fear, and finally I pay them everything."

That man's son is now a lawyer. The sons of his paesani are police officers and legislators fighting organized crime, working now to rid the city of these elements that created such fear.

Right now, there are more crime fighters among Italians than there are hoodlums. There are Charles Siragusa, head of the

Illinois Crime Investigating committee, and State Rep. Anthony Scariano [D., Park Forest], a maverick Italian with vehement anti-crime views.

There is Dan Becco, 33-year-old Chicago attorney and former special lawyer in the department of justice in Washington. Becco worked with Sen. Robert Kennedy in crime investigations. There is Joseph A. Lamendella, who was commended by United States Atty. Edward Hanrahan for his work in gaining the conviction returned here May 9 against Sam Battaglia, the crime syndicate's extortion specialist. And there is Anthony Sorrentino, who is with the Illinois youth commission.

The list goes on and on. There is also an association of Italian-American policemen with more than 500 members. We have reached the point where it is just a matter of simple arithmetic—Italian cops finally outnumber the robbers.

The Italian-American community, largest ethnic group in the United States, is "coming of age," said Rev. Asciolla. One symptom of this, he said, is that social scientists are beginning to study us as a group, and analyze our place in the social fabric of United States culture.

"The identity of the Italian-American is still to be discovered. . . . The community has passed thru the pangs of economic assimilation, for Italian-Americans generally have moved thru the lower class into a comfortable conservative middle class. The second phase of change is still with us, and is centered on the business, political, and social," Rev. Asciolla said.

Italian characteristics did, at least, contribute to the "melting pot" myth of the American dream and, in a way, were "the ferment of a way of life which until then had been staid, Victorian, and extremely discreet," he said.

GHETTO FORMULA: JOBS IN PARKS, SCHOOLS, HOSPITALS—WITH THE UNITED STATES PAYING THE BILL

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. REES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I insert into the RECORD Vincent Burke's excellent article taken from the editorial section of the Los Angeles Times of Sunday, September 17. The column discusses major aspects of our complex urban slum problem and suggests affirmative proposals for their solution.

GHETTO FORMULA: JOBS IN PARKS, SCHOOLS, HOSPITALS—WITH UNITED STATES PAYING THE BILL

(By Vincent J. Burke)

WASHINGTON.—While President Johnson stands aloof, a national consensus is gradually forming in support of a new way to alleviate poverty in urban slums.

The approach: create jobs for the slum jobless in public services—hospitals, schools, parks—with the Treasury paying the wage bill.

Despite its high cost to the government this approach has merit and potential appeal for prudent conservatives as well as liberal spenders.

First, it pays due respect to the nation's puritan ethic. (Except for a small minority, including the hippies, some social philosophers and a few of the hard-core unemployed, we all share the conventional wisdom, or prejudice, of our forebears that work is virtuous and sloth is sinful.)

Second, the net cost to society of this approach is low because the ratio of benefits to monetary costs is high. (After all, an idle slum dweller produces no goods or services of value to society, but he still consumes such goods or services.)

Third, it can be portrayed as a truly "conservative" response to the ghetto upheavals which threaten to transform our society in ways most of us do not like. (Which is the more radical course: To try to "conserve" our institutions and values by eliminating root causes of violence or to ignore the smoldering resentments and rely solely on police action, military force, curfews, and, perhaps ultimately, martial law in many of our big cities?)

FINANCES HANDCUFF JOHNSON

Under less abnormal budgetary circumstances President Johnson probably would be making these arguments and leading the citizens' crusade that is forming in support of an emergency program to create jobs.

But a deluge of red ink has drowned his budget and paralyzed the President. He feels he is unable to move in any direction that requires much money.

Backers of a federally-financed job program hope to build up enough public pressure to force the President to move regardless of the budgetary situation.

For the foreseeable future a job-creating program is the only feasible method of getting more money into the hands of the ghetto poor.

The alternatives debated in academic circles—guaranteed income, negative income tax, family supplements, bigger welfare payments—have almost no political support.

Welfare has become almost a dirty word in the political arena. The public, which once viewed welfare as a temporary relief to tide families over misfortunes, has seen welfare become a permanent way of life, from one generation to the next. Even at this time of national prosperity the relief rolls continue to lengthen. Few politicians today are willing to champion bigger welfare payments.

Outside the government, the group supporting a federally financed job program includes more than a dozen captains of industry, along with chieftains of organized labor, civil rights, the clergy and big city mayors. They have organized into a lobbying force called the Urban Coalition.

Inside Congress, the coalition's allies include a majority of the Senate Labor Committee and 79 rank-and-file House members.

These advocates do not yet constitute a national consensus for action. What is significant is that powerful men outside the White House have reached agreement on what should be done.

This makes it likely that their program will sooner or later, in one form or another, become national policy, or at least the policy espoused by Mr. Johnson. The President is not inclined to originate. He searches for consensus.

The Urban Coalition has called for an emergency program to provide 1 million jobs. This would probably cost $4 billion a year. The first political test of strength will come late this month, when the Senate votes on an emergency job program costing $2.5 billion over a two-year period.

Despite White House opposition, the job proposal was added by the Senate Labor Committee to an Administration bill authorizing funds for another year of the anti-poverty program. The job section is almost certain to be erased from the bill on the Senate floor. But the vote is likely to show sizable support for the proposal.

Mr. Johnson cannot yield to the expensive pleas of the Urban Coalition without jettisoning his tax increase bill, pushed in the face of calls for government economy.

JOHNSON WANTS TAX FIRST

The President's strategy apparently is to make concessions to the Urban Coalition in his new budget in January, once the tax increase bill has been disposed of.

But congressional conservatives who want stringent economy may block this escape hatch. Citing voters' opposition to the proposed tax hike, Chairman Wilbur D. Mills (D-Ark.) of the House Ways and Means Committee has indicated he may delay action on the tax measure until January to satisfy himself that Mr. Johnson is serious about government economies.

Essentially, the Urban Coalition has posed this question: Why can't the richest country in the world guarantee a job to every urban dweller who wants to work?

It's an old question and the dream of a society without poverty is ancient.

Plato and Aristotle regarded poverty as a social ailment and said good government would not tolerate it. Plato proposed abolition of extremes of wealth and poverty. Aristotle called poverty "the parent of revolution and crime" and said public revenues should be distributed among the poor "to enable them to purchase a little farm, or, at any rate, make a beginning in trade or husbandry."

But 2,000 years after Plato and Aristotle in much of Western Europe poverty was viewed as a willful sin, resulting solely from refusal to work. Laws were passed that treated paupers as "voluntary" criminals. The British philosopher Thomas Hobbes wrote in 1651 that the poor should be "forced to work," unless physically unable.

The 18th century's Age of Reason revived the Greek idea that poverty is a defect of society. The French philosopher Montesquieu wrote that it was not enough to give alms to the poor. He said a well-regulated government provides for some of the poor such employment as they are capable of performing and teaches others to work.

The U.S. government intervened as an employer of last resort during the Depression of the 1930s, when the free enterprise system was prostrate. To propose that it do so again to help combat the crisis of the cities does not impugn the accomplishments of the private sector.

Business cannot nor should it be required to assure a job to everyone, regardless of qualifications.

As Henry Ford II, a leader of the Urban Coalition, puts it, "business cannot hire more people than it needs or hire people who are not qualified to do useful work or hire people for more than their work is worth."

The ghetto unemployment problem is a complex compound of the cultural disadvantages and lack of education of the slum dweller, overlaid with racial discrimination. Until recently his plight was worsened by society's ignorance. It did not grasp his misery; sometimes it did not know he existed.

This summer total U.S. employment set new records, and unemployment for the nation as a whole was below 4%. By past standards, this reflects an ebullient prosperity. But we now know what is hidden by such statistics.

In nine major cities checked by the Labor Department, the rate of Negro unemployment this summer was 9.4%. And that counts only those Negroes who were actively looking for work. About one in 10 are not even looking; some have given up hope.

Moreover, if "underemployment" figures are included, then one-third of the Negroes in these cities worked only part-time, or received such low pay as to be "poverty" cases.

THE END OF A DEBATE

The emergence of the proposal to make government the employer of last resort signifies the end of a debate over the basic cause of unemployment in the American system. It was a debate that neither side won and that eventually proved almost irrelevant to solving the problem of hard-core ghetto unemployment.

One side argued that unemployment reflected what it called inadequate demand. It urged that fiscal and monetary managers force the economy to run at a faster pace. We have done this. And we have learned that the economy is like a merry-go-round on which the uneducated, unskilled, hard-core unemployed don't have a seat.

When the merry-go-round runs faster, more wealth is created. But the additional work is performed mostly through overtime by regular workers or by drawing middle-class housewives or other educated persons into the work force. This policy will produce intolerable inflation long before it makes a significant dent in unemployment in the ghetto.

The other side contended that unemployment merely is "structural." That is, there are plenty of jobs and the problem is to match people to the jobs. We have tried this. The federal government is running or financing a dozen or more training programs. Although there is some duplication of effort and sometimes people are trained for jobs which don't exist, it is essential to try to equip slum dwellers with job skills.

But to make fast and large inroads into ghetto unemployment requires the creation of new jobs—jobs for people with little or no job experience, people who are unskilled, uneducated, illiterate. Private industry can't create these jobs.

Essentially, it is the job which must be "structured" to fit the worker, not vice versa. That is the philosophy of the public service job approach.

Sen. Robert F. Kennedy (D-N.Y.) and others in Congress have proposed that permanent tax concessions be offered to induce businesses to locate in the ghetto and employ ill-trained Negroes there.

Although it has popular appeal, this approach is laden with "tax-loophole" booby-traps.

ON DANGEROUS TERRAIN

Possibly, a case can be made for limited tax incentives to encourage plants to locate in Negro ghettos. But we walk on dangerous terrain when we try to gear an employer's tax liability to the racial composition, place of residence or educational levels of his work force.

Such an approach is almost certain to prove either ineffective or productive of tax windfalls (public costs far greater than the social benefits obtained).

In the racial crisis now upon us, however, the harsh truth is that no matter what we do to improve conditions in the ghettos, we cannot expect a quick end to violence.

Two years ago in his perceptive book, "Dark Ghetto," Kenneth B. Clark, a Negro sociologist who is probably the country's leading expert on the psychology of the ghetto, wrote:

"It would not be realistic for the white community to expect protest to subside in the face of gains, for the closer the Negro community gets to the attainment of its goals—the removal of the causes and effects of racial exploitation and powerlessness—the more impatient will Negroes become for total equality.

"In the complex turbulence of the Negro ghetto . . . success feeds hope and provides the strength and the motivation for further activity. This, in turn, makes existing barriers even more intolerable."

TEXAS NEWSPAPERS SUPPORT WAR ON POVERTY

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I think that in general, Texas newspapers are as conservative as any in the United States. Yet the Office of Economic Opportunity has been drawing praise from them, not brickbats. These newspapers have cast hard eyes on the antipoverty warriors, and what they have seen is encouraging to them, and should be heartening to all of us.

I believe that the war on poverty is too valuable to be halted or scaled down; and I believe that any honest observer will have to be impressed with the statements I have seen in the Dallas News, the Austin American, and the Houston Chronicle. I offer these statements as statements of honest views from critical observers:

[From the Dallas (Tex.) News, Sept. 18, 1967]

CASE FOR THE DEFENSE

It is generally conceded that the bad apples in the War on Poverty barrel did much to spoil the entire program's image this summer. The Office of Economic Opportunity ran a survey on the situation, and, in all fairness, that side of the story deserves to be heard.

For involvement in the riots, 16 poverty-war workers were arrested; 29,984 were not. Of the 16 suspects, only 6 were employed full-time in the program. None has been convicted.

Walter H. Richter, former state senator and now Southwest regional director for the OEO, recently ticked off what the War on Poverty was doing hereabouts while the riots were going on elsewhere.

In Dallas, in April, quick action by anti-poverty workers was credited with helping to keep a potential police-brutality explosion from occuring.

In Oklahoma City, five boys with police records were put to work with the recreation and police departments. The one with the worst record did the best job, organizing a highly successful trash cleanup campaign in the slums.

In San Antonio, off-duty police played big brother to Negro and Mexican-American youths, taking them to ball games, picnics, swimming pools and the like.

In Corpus Christi, reports the head of the police juvenile bureau, "criminal activity is almost at a standstill in those neighborhoods where the anti-poverty program is operating."

Those are some of the bright spots, but they do not erase the smudges. Allan Maley, who directs Dallas' arm of the poverty war, sought to put it in perspective: "If you really believe that a local community should have the right to run its own programs, then how do you keep the community from having the right to fail as well as to succeed?"

[From the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle, Sept. 25, 1967]

BUM RAP FOR POVERTY PROGRAM

Much was heard during and after the recent spate of urban riots about what the workers for the federal poverty agency might have had to do with fomenting the disorders. Some were accused of actively going out and inciting violence.

As a result of these accusations, Sargent Shriver's Office of Economic Opportunity in Washington conducted an investigation. The findings show the poverty agency has an almost clean record. In fact, of 30,000 workers in city slums, only six were charged with any offense. None were charged in Detroit and just one in Newark.

The report reveals another interesting fact. Of the millions of dollars in property damage caused by this summer's rioting, poverty agency property was damaged only in the amount of $1840. All this was in broken windows. None of the 224 poverty agency buildings was burned or destroyed.

The study found that poverty workers fulfilled a vital role in dispelling rumors and disseminating accurate information in cities where trouble was feared.

Of the 64 cities surveyed, 32 had had riots and 32 did not. All the cities have sizable minority populations and troublesome local problems concerning housing, de facto segregation and poor community-police relations.

Walter H. Richter, OEO's southwest regional director, said the survey "shows that most mayors and police officials felt that OEO summer programs helped to prevent violence in their cities. . . . Not one police chief or mayor in any of the cities—including the 32 where disturbances occurred—said that OEO heightened tensions." And not one mayor asked OEO to discontinue the poverty program. Rather, many requested additional poverty funds to prevent further trouble.

By the nature of their work, poverty employes are susceptible to the charge of inciting riots. Part of their job is motivating the poor and downtrodden. This naturally results in the poor becoming dissatisfied with their lot in life. Ideally, the poverty worker will then try to channel this dissatisfaction into constructive self-betterment projects.

Efforts need to be redoubled to convince the poor that rioting and violence will not help them in achieving equality but rather will set them back.

[From the Austin (Tex.) American, Sept. 27, 1967]

SOME PLUSES FOR WAR ON POVERTY

Despite the blasts of critics, the War on Poverty must be doing something right.

In 32 cities in which there were no riots or civil disorders this summer, most of the local authorities credited the summer programs of the Office of Economic Opportunity for helping to prevent violence.

This is what they told the OEO in a nationwide survey in which OEO inspectors talked to mayors, police chiefs, juvenile judges, heads of local Chambers of Commerce and other leading citizens.

Not one police chief or mayor blamed War on Poverty programs for heightening tensions, and in 15 cities, local Community Action Agencies were praised for calming down bad situations in specific instances.

In 14 cities, municipal police departments and CAAs had joint programs to prevent riots. In eight cities, the juvenile arrest rate went down this summer as a result, it is believed, of increased availability of summer jobs.

There is also negative evidence encouraging to the War on Poverty:

In the 32 cities that did experience riots, only 16 of the more than 30,000 CAA employees in those cities were arrested for taking part in them.

More than $300 million worth of property damage was done in riot cities, says the OEO, yet not one of its 244 buildings in the heart of the riot areas was burned or destroyed.

Total damage to Community Action buildings was $1,840 for seven sets of broken windows.

PRESS SUPPORT FOR THE GONZALEZ BILL TO STRENGTHEN THE RENEGOTIATION BOARD: FIRST IN A SERIES

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Gonzalez] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, many commentators have noted that the Vietnam war has had little effect upon the lives of most Americans. Few belts have been tightened, and the outcry occasioned by the proposed tax increase shows little willingness to accept a wartime economy. Despite the fact that our largely military commitment in Vietnam is costing over $70 million each day, the sacrifices of war have fallen almost entirely upon the servicemen doing the fighting, and their families. Our servicemen are being called upon to face the ultimate sacrifice for their country and its principles of freedom and self-determination, but elsewhere it seems to be "business as usual."

But in one regard, it is not business as usual, but business better than ever. There are more defense contracts as a result of the war in Vietnam, but less of them, proportionally, are subject to renegotiating by the Board charged with limiting war profiteering.

The Renegotiation Board is empowered to review defense contracts to determine if the contractors' profits were excessive. From fiscal year 1953 to fiscal year 1966, the Board has reached total determinations of $936.4 million in excess profits, plus $1.2 billion in voluntary price refunds or voluntary price reductions.

In fiscal year 1966, the Board recovered $24.5 million in excess profits, and its proceedings resulted in another $23.2 million in voluntary refunds or price reductions from contractors. This is despite the fact that the Board's purview has been successively limited by Congress, by exempting from renegotiations more and more defense articles and more and more companies with defense contracts.

Mr. Speaker, the value of prime defense contracts has risen to $44.6 billion, a figure that exceeds the highest year during the Korean war. I believe that this situation alone would call for a renewal of the Board's authority to the Korean war level. This would be accomplished by the bill I introduced, H.R. 6792, on which I have requested hearings by the Ways and Means Committee.

To date, I have received no support for strengthening the Renegotiation Board from any Member of either body. However, several newspapers have supported my position, and I have permission to insert at this point the first of a series of these comments:

[From Labor, Jan. 28, 1967]

A Timely Appeal To Curb Profiteering in Wartime

Hardly mentioned in the daily press was a significant speech that Rep. Henry Gonzalez (D., Tex.) delivered in the U.S. House the other day. He charged profiteering by business on defense contracts and called for a recapture of inflated profits.

Gonzalez cited a sharp contrast in the way that the nation mobilizes human and non-human resources during a war like that in Vietnam.

On the one hand, manpower is conscripted. A young man drafted into service "does not get to bargain or negotiate for his pay and benefits," Gonzalez pointed out. "His compensation is fixed by law and is quite low. . . . This is part of the sacrifice he makes for the country."

On the other hand, property needed in wartime—equipment, arms and other supplies—is "procured"; that is contracts are offered to companies to furnish such material, Gonzalez explained.

"One would suppose," he continued, "that those persons who supply the government with property in time of war would be willing to do it without excessive profits. In light of the heavy sacrifices made by those who do the actual fighting, one would at least hope that those who stay home and do business with the government would not take advantage of the situation by profiteering.

"I am sorry to say, however, that profiteering is taking place," Gonzalez told the House. "Not only have certain private firms taken advantage of the war in Vietnam by gouging the government for excesive profits, but there is evidence that profiteering is on the upswing."

Yet, the one agency that is empowered to oversee defense contracts and to recover excess profits—that is, the Renegotiation Board—has had its hands tied by a series of statutory restrictions and slashes in appropriations, Gonzalez declared. Those who profiteer are trying to wipe out the board entirely, he said. The aerospace industries are in the forefront of this effort, he charged.

The Texas congressman urged that full powers of the Renegotiation Board be restored and that contracts of $250,000 or more be made subject to board scrutiny, instead of just those running to $1 million or more. He also urged other changes to provide more effective curbs on profiteering.

"There is no more heinous offense, in my opinion, than wartime profiteering," Gonzalez declared further. He compared that to "sabotage."

"Social justice and the Great Society will be frustrated if profiteering results in billions of dollars being diverted from the national wealth to private persons," he concluded. The need now, he stressed, is "to strengthen our laws against profiteering."

Most Americans, we are sure, will agree with Rep. Gonzalez that at a time when thousands of young men are making the supreme sacrifice in Vietnam and vast numbers of men are subject to conscription, it is no more than fair and just that business also do a little sacrificing.

Business should and must be satisfied with modest profits. The war should not become a vehicle for the creation of a new corps of millionaires. There should be as much power and authority to conscript dollars as to conscript manpower.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Howard] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, many of us take for granted the Post Office Department and the services it has provided to the people of this Nation since its founding by Benjamin Franklin.

Even more so, people fail to realize how the Post Office Department has helped, in fact, Mr. Speaker, been the basis for much of this country's growth economically, socially, and politically.

Last Thursday, Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien spoke before the National Convention of the National League of Postmasters in Atlantic City, N.J. His address outlined the role the postal service has played in making the United States the most prosperous Nation in the history of mankind.

I call it to the attention of my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record:

Address by Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien at the National Convention of the National League of Postmasters, Atlantic City, N.J., October 5, 1967

I am delighted that your outstanding president, and my good friend, Henry Womack invited me to join you at this National Convention.

Before I left Washington, President Johnson asked me to bring you this message: "At a time when more dramatic priorities, when international tensions and disruption of domestic tranquility command our attention, it is all too easy to lose sight of the importance of other functions of government. The mail service may not be dramatic," the President said, "but I think no American should overlook the important and continuing contribution to better government of a mail system that combines safety, security, and celerity. I can assure the members of the National League of Postmasters that this Administration will not be diverted by other issues from its pledge to assure that our mail service is the best in the world."

That, my friends, is the President's pledge. And, as his Postmaster General, it is a pledge that I intend to carry out to the letter!

And I want you to know that we are, every day, receiving new evidence of the willingness of Americans, from all walks of life, to cooperate with us in this endeavor.

But we have to be very careful how we ask them to cooperate.

For example, a rural letter carrier in Texas found that a post supporting the boxes of three different families was violating regulations by being nine inches too tall. This made it awkward for him to place mail in the boxes without leaving his automobile. So he left a form in each box requesting that the post be lowered the appropriate nine inches.

Next time around, he found that all three had complied, the post had been lowered by 27 inches. And now he complains of nagging back pains.

Sometimes public cooperation produces neither backache nor headache. Sometimes it manifests itself in ideas that serve to advance our mutual concern with better postal service.

Perhaps the finest example of such cooperation was the National Postal Forum held in Washington last month.

I can only say to you what I reported to the President. The Forum was a resounding success. We had 2,300 top-level executives from the private sector, and Congressional and government leaders who pooled their ideas in the interest of better postal service for all Americans. We had distinguished speakers with stimulating proposals. We had meaningful panel sessions.

I think the result of what we learned during that Forum will soon be shown. It will be shown by business mailers in a more cooperative spirit. It will be shown by their greater awareness of our problems and our needs.

And it will be shown by *our* efforts to meet their legitimate complaints.

This was a great creative dialogue.

It was also certainly a splendid reflection of a basic postal tradition, the tradition of seizing the intiative in behalf of more responsive and more effective government.

The pages of American history are full of examples of contributions made by the postal service to national development and to the protection of our most valued institutions.

Let us briefly examine that record. Such an examination can provide answers to a key question, as we seek ways to improve our operations.

That question is: What is the postal service?

On one level it is a channel of communication and a nationwide network for the exchange of ideas and of goods.

This is the way we usually see it.

But there are other, perhaps more basic elements here as well.

Economically, the Post Office Department was once employed as a lever by which Federal assistance could be channeled into infant industries.

When ways were sought to aid roadbuilding, the newly developed steamship, and the infant railroad and airline industries, the Post Office Department was a logical means to get the job done.

Six years after Robert Fulton piloted his *Clermont* up the Hudson River, mail was being carried regularly on steamboats. The first track was laid for the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad in 1828, and just three years later mail bags were being shipped by train.

Strangely enough, the mail delivery potential of the airplane and the subsidizing ability of the Post Office Department did not become engaged until May 15, 1918.

That engagement began with a rather ill omen. The air mail stamp was printed upside down.

Despite this somewhat misdirected beginning, the engagement between the Post Office Department and the airline industry developed into a marriage that has produced many dividends for the nation.

Thus, the postal service has served as a powerful means of supporting industries vital to our development as a nation.

We have also served to strengthen certain basic *political institutions*. I am not now talking about partisan politics, but of the basic political institutions underlying our continuance as a free people, and a people able to solve its problems through political and not violent means.

Perhaps the most obvious, and most important of these institutions, is that of freedom of expression. We take for granted that we can write anything we please in a first-class letter, knowing that it can be opened only as the result of a court order, and that such court orders are difficult to secure, and should be.

As early as 1792, postal rates were fixed at a minimum of *six cents* for letters and one cent for newspapers. This policy of low rates for newspapers made for a more informed and intelligent electorate; it had a powerful effect on uniting a nation despite the forces working for its dissolution; and, since many papers in those days were the organs of parties and factions, the low rates also had a great influence on the development of our political party system.

And the postal service still tries to have something for everyone. For those of you who like the good old days . . . we are trying to bring back that 6 cent rate.

In addition, the postal service has made, and is making, a basic contribution to the social structure of our nation. That our American sense of voluntary assistance and voluntary cooperation is aided by our postal rates is well known. But not as well known or understood are other important contributions to *social justice* and *social morality*. This we are doing in many ways, including equal job opportunity, aid to needy students, summer jobs for students, employment of the handicapped, non-discrimination among our contractors, consumer protection, and jobs for veterans.

And, finally, the postal service is making a major contribution to the problem of maintaining the rural communities and small towns of America. Without an effective mail service, areas outside our urban centers would participate far less fully in the mainstream of American life, and their attractiveness as places to live and work would be greatly diminished.

This has an important bearing on one of the nation's major problems today—the urban crisis.

Too often we, who every day must grapple with the enormous pressures that beset our decaying cities, forget that many of these pressures can be relieved outside the cities. Our urban problems of air pollution, of traffic strangulation, of noise, of violence, of crime in the streets, of rising welfare rolls and declining tax rolls, of the need for better schools, of the thousand and one problems that make the job of a big city mayor a kind of inferno, can to a great degree be solved by making areas outside our cities more attractive.

America's cities have acted for generations like sponges; they have taken millions upon millions from overseas, the homeless, tired, tempest tossed; they have absorbed refugees from war and from communism; they have sought to find jobs for the millions of internal immigrants, who moved, often reluctantly, from the farms as they were displaced by changing farm technology.

This great human wave has dashed itself against our urban centers and combined with the normal population growth in the cities themselves, to place new and heavy burdens on community facilities.

These facilities staggered under the pressure. The hospitals, the schools, the libraries, the mass transportation, the very streets became full, flowed over, with the endless, pushing, teeming, growing masses of men.

As the demands grew beyond the ability of the cities to meet, eyes turned to the States. As the demands grew beyond the ability of the States, eyes turned to the Federal Government. The Federal Government has responded, has responded vigorously and with great imagination.

But, my friends, to focus on the urban crisis alone is not enough. It is almost like a doctor looking at a symptom and ignoring the cause of the sickness.

Our cities are but islands in the sea around them. We ignore that sea at our peril, we neglect that sea at great cost to the nation.

The postal service is not ignoring that great heartland of America. Recently I announced the extension of rural delivery service to less-densely populated areas of the nation. This is one small step aimed at the improvement of rural life. Each contribution that you as postmasters make toward improving postal service in your communities helps make those communities more attractive places to live and to work. Therefore, though many of you may live outside our great cities, you are, by making life in rural areas and small communities more attractive, also serving to relieve the crushing pressure on those cities.

Ladies and gentlemen, I have traced some of the ways, past and present, by which your postal service has acted as a mighty instrument of economic, political, and social improvement.

With our society undergoing swift, almost revolutionary change, we must protect, preserve, and nurture every institution that contributes to preventing change from becoming convulsion.

We are standing fast in Vietnam to halt the spread of communism, while our President continues his intensive quest for peace, and extends the olive branch to North Vietnam.

We are seeking and finding ways to halt violence and crime in our cities.

And in our own service we are playing an important part in assuring the continuance of progress and prosperity.

This we are able to do because in our postmasters we possess a great resource of leadership and of devotion to community and national problems.

Certainly, one of my most striking experiences during almost two years as Postmaster General is the realization of how important a leadership role Postmasters play in communities throughout the nation.

People look up to you.

People see you as the leading representative of the Federal Government.

People expect a lot from you. And by and large their expectations are met by your effectiveness and understanding.

In these critical days in the life of our nation, we simply must have that leadership. Not only for good service, but for the health of the land in which we live, the Post Office depends on the cooperation of every concerned American—and I am thankful that so many concerned Americans are here tonight, men and women who, as postmasters, as community leaders, as citizens, have enlisted their creative energies in behalf of a better postal service and a better America.

THE CONSUMER

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Rosenthal] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate that we recall, in the midst of striking national and international problems, that there are common human interests which bind the peoples of the world despite their many divisions. One such interest is that of the consumer.

Whether one lives in Indonesia or Iowa, the process of considering goods for their relative values and prices is similar. And in every situation when the consumer confronts a choice, he needs reliable information if he is to choose wisely.

Commissioner Mary Gardiner Jones, of the Federal Trade Commission, recently described some consumer information programs in other countries. I include below extracts from her excellent speech:

"Consumerism" and the Role at Marketing—A Comparative Analysis of the Consumer Abroad and at Home

To label the role of consumers in our economy as "consumerism" is somehow to treat the consumer as if he or she is a kind of subversive element in our society. Yet the role of the consumer in our economy is hardly a subversive one. On the contrary, the effective working of our free enterprise system depends essentially on the extent to which the consumer can and does play an effective and informed role in the marketplace.

Few businessmen would disagree with the basic principle that informed consumer choice is an essential precondition to the effective functioning of our free enterprise system. Unless consumers are able to make rational choices between the various products, services and terms and conditions of sale available to them in the marketplace, competition cannot play its central market role of ensuring that consumers will receive the proper mix of the highest quality goods at the lowest possible prices. Yet today, efforts on the part of consumers to become more informed about the marketplace seem too often to be met by some businessmen with cries of "consumerism", "politics", or similar disparaging epithets, or, in the case of more thoughtful businessmen seeking to be responsive to what they read into these consumer efforts, with company oriented consumer information programs designed primarily to reassure the consumer and the general public about the wonders and miracle of American business techniques and the free enterprise system. I think both reactions are wide of the mark.

Consumers' increased self-awareness and self-assertiveness in the marketplace, in my judgment, does not reflect any overall disenchantment with our free enterprise system or with American business as a whole. Consumers are fully aware and appreciative of its innovative genius. Rather, I think it is reflective of the American consumer's desire to be treated as a mature and rational individual with a genuine concern to participate intelligently in the marketplace, to make purposeful decisions about the myriad of choices which that marketplace offers and to act on the basis of knowledge and self-interest rather than simply to react on the basis of the emotional appeal of an advertising message.

I thought it might be of interest to you to look at the American consumer in perspective, and to this end, to take a look at the role which consumers play in other countries in the western world which share with us a concern for the rights and welfare of the individual and also pride themselves on their democratic institutions through which to implement these concerns.

A comparison of the role of government vis-a-vis the consumer in the United States with the role of government in Great Britain and Canada and in various Western European countries leave one with the impression that "consumerism" is much more advanced abroad than it is in the United States and that governments abroad play a much more active role than the United States in support of consumer interests, in furnishing consumers with information and in engaging in various types of product testing programs.

At the same time, it would appear that direct government intervention to protect the consumer from frauds and deceptions, from misleading advertising and from the impact of anticompetitive activity on the part of business is much more advanced in the United States. Antitrust legislation as you know is of relatively recent origin in these countries and their antitrust philosophy seems to tend far more in the direction of regulation and supervision of business conduct in the interest of promoting competition rather than of outright prohibition of anticompetitive business actions. Consistent with this approach towards regulation of business activity, these governments have taken a far more affirmative role towards ensuring that business is responsive to the needs and demands of consumers.

Looking at the role of consumers in Great Britain and Canada and in Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Belgium, Holland, France, Switzerland and Germany, it is immediately apparent that the consumer in these countries is far more directly represented within government or has a more formalized channel—frequently governmentally financed—through which to voice his needs and demands than he does in the United States. Similarly, government action on behalf of the consumer in the fields of product testing and dissemination of consumer information appear to be far more extensive in these countries than in the United States.

Let me give you a few examples.

In Norway and Sweden, consumers have been directly represented in the government by a separate Cabinet department since 1953 and 1954 respectively. In addition, both countries have consumer councils whose members are appointed by the government from among nominations submitted by various consumer organizations.

Consumer interests in Denmark are represented in the Ministry of the Interior by the Danish Home Economics Council, an eighteen-member body originally established in 1935 and reorganized in 1960, consisting of representatives appointed by the government upon the nominations of some 13 consumer organizations and 5 government agencies.

In France, consumers have been represented since 1960 by the National Committee on Consumer Problems, an integral part of the Ministry of Interior and in 1966, the French government enacted legislation establishing a National Institute of Consumers. Implementing regulations under this legislation are due at the end of this year.

Holland has just recently established a special Board for Consumer Affairs whose members are drawn from both consumer and industry organizations, and in 1963 and 1964 respectively, Great Britain and Belgium established Consumer Councils whose members, appointed by the Board of Trade and Ministry of Economic Affairs respectively, represent both consumers and industry.

Great Britain has also established consumer consultative bodies for each of its nationalized industries.

In February 1966, Switzerland established a permanent government Commission known as the Federal Commission on Consumer Affairs under the Ministry of Public Economy.

In 1963 the Canadian government organized an Advisory Council of Consumers to advise the Minister of National Health and Welfare on all matters of interest to consumers in the administration of Canada's Food and Drug and Patent Medicine Acts, and in 1966 Canada's Economic Council recommended that the government take several steps to strengthen its support for consumer interests.

In general the responsibilities assigned to these various Consumer Councils and Commissions is to coordinate the various governmentally sponsored or initiated consumer programs, to act as liaison between the government and private consumer organizations or generally to advise the government on consumer matters and make recommendations for government action in the consumer field.

In addition to the political recognition which is given to consumer interests in these countries, all of these governments engage in extensive consumer information and product testing activities, either directly on their own initiative or indirectly through extensive subsidization of private consumer organizations engaging in these activities.

In contrast to these best buy or quality standard programs, several of the European countries have adopted instead a system of informative labeling in order to assist consumers to make informed decisions about the products which they purchase. Such informative labeling programs are in operation in Sweden, Denmark and Norway, and to a more limited extent, in England and Holland.

The information programs conducted directly by these governments or by governmentally sponsored organizations is of considerable variety. In general, these consumer education programs encompass the preparation and distribution of consumer information in monthly or quarterly publications, in individual pamphlet form and in weekly and monthly radio broadcasts. They also encompass the sponsorship of various speakers and panelists for interview programs or panel discussions, encourage local or regional discussion forums and prepare educational kits and other exhibition materials for dissemination throughout the country to consumer groups, schools or media desiring to put on consumer programs. Most of the publications include material on various product testing activities of the organization involved and on performance and use characteristics of various products principally in the fields of household equipment, food and nutrition, clothes and clothing materials, laundry and detergents, residential construction materials and furniture. Information has also been disseminated on more general subjects such as credit purchases, the care of various fabrics and types of equipment, kitchen floor care and a host of other problems of household and finance management. Examination of some of these educational materials indicates that they are essentially factual in makeup and objective in outlook. The product testing results are published with a dry impartiality quite devoid of emotional or critical overtones.

It seems to me that even this cursory survey demonstrates the seriousness with which these countries treat the problems which confront consumers in our 20th Century marketplace with its dearth of informed sales personnel, its myriad of products, and the technical complexity of many of the products which are offered. I think it is also important to note that interest in promoting the consumer's interest has not apparently had any adverse effect on government-business or business-consumer relations. The consumer literature emanating from these countries demonstrates a complete absence of any hostility towards business by either government or the consumer organizations active in these countries. Indeed one gains the impression that the very existence of these consumer Councils, product testing institutes and the like has increased the rapport and understanding of mutual problems between consumer and business because of the closer contacts which these various programs have engendered between them.

While in many cases American business itself has sought to fill the information gap and to furnish more objective and informative data about product performance, use and characteristics and to make available to consumers other information about the marketplace, the cooperative programs conducted by government, business and consumers abroad should stimulate our thinking in this country as to other techniques which we might adapt in order to meet the needs of consumers to be able to make more informed choices in the marketplace.

PHILIPPINE POLICY STATEMENT

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, my good friend, Hon. Diosdado M. Yap, editor of Bataan, a Philippine news magazine, introduced me the other day to Hon. Narciso Ramos, Secretary of Foreign Affairs for the Philippines. Bataan magazine once selected Secretary Ramos as the Man of the Year, in consideration of the wonderful work this able statesman has done in cementing the bonds of friendship between our country and our sister country, the Philippines. He fought side by side with Americans as a guerrilla in World War II, and he fights side by side with all Americans today in seeking peace and freedom throughout the world. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at

this point, the address made on September 25 by my new friend, the Honorable Narciso Ramos before the United Nations General Assembly, which address reads as follows:

[Philippine delegation to the XXII regular session of the United Nations General Assembly, Plenary Meeting, September 25, 1967]

PHILIPPINE POLICY STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE NARCISO RAMOS, SECRETARY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS, CHAIRMAN OF THE PHILIPPINE DELEGATION

Mr. President, Mr. Secretary-General, Distinguished Delegates: Allow me on behalf of my delegation to extend to you, Mr. President, our warm congratulations on your election to preside over the deliberations of the 22nd session of the General Assembly. Your election as the first representative from the Socialist countries of Eastern Europe to head the General Assembly is a significant event in the history of the United Nations. It symbolizes the gratifying degree of maturity, tolerance and understanding which the United Nations has attained since San Francisco and through the period of the cold war. We have come to realize that although our countries may profess divergent political beliefs, this should not deter us from devising a practical working relationship that would enable us together to strengthen the fabric of peace in the world and to advance the welfare of mankind.

I would like also to associate myself with the expressions of sincere admiration and appreciation which preceding speakers have addressed to the outgoing President of the Assembly, Ambassador Abdul Rahman Pazhwak of Afghanistan, for the able and statesman-like manner in which he guided the deliberations of this body during one of the most critical periods of its existence.

Allow me now, Mr. President, to outline the views of my Government on some of the crucial issues confronting the international community.

Of the gravest concern to us is the situation in Vietnam. We are concerned not merely because of the geographic proximity of the Philippines to that country but because that land has become the testing-ground for the free world's determination to resist acts of subversion and aggression masquerading as wars of national liberation. The triumph of Hanoi and the Vietcong in South Vietnam would mean that movements of the same nature could with impunity be started anywhere in the world and pursued to success. It would give a new and more dangerous dimension to subversion and aggression, and no country anywhere would be immune. In the interest of our own national survival we do not wish to see this happen.

Let me pause at this juncture to say that we endorse the proposal of Mr. Andrei Gromyko, the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union, in his policy statement last Friday, "on the necessity of accelerating the elaboration of the definition of aggression in the light of the present international situation. We reject, however, his charge that my country together with the United States, Australia, New Zealand, Thailand and the Republic of Korea is an aggressor in Vietnam.

The Philippines, like the other allied nations, is in Vietnam in response to the plea of a sister-nation for help in its life-and-death struggle to preserve its liberty and national identity against subversion from within and aggression from without. My country maintains a civic action contingent in South Vietnam. It is there in a non-combat capacity. It is engaged in medical, engineering and civic action projects, and seeks to assist the Vietnamese people in their task of national reconstruction. We are in Vietnam to help, not to obstruct; to save, not to kill; to build, not to destroy.

The Vietnamese people have endured war for nearly a quarter of a century. Today, the situation in their country constitutes a serious threat to the security of Southeast Asia and to the peace of the world. We, therefore, anxiously desire an end to the Vietnam conflict. It has become clear that a political settlement would be the speediest and most practical method of ending the war, and we would welcome an agreement to that end. Indeed, the President of the Philippines, Mr. Ferdinand Marcos, stated before this Assembly last year, that the Philippines eagerly looks forward to a negotiated settlement in Vietnam whereby both North and South, together with their respective allies, would agree to a cessation of hostilities until such time as the Vietnamese people themselves can freely determine their own destiny in accordance with the principle of self-determination. This continues to be our policy. We continue to support any initiative that could bring the war in Vietnam to the conference table. We agree with the Japanese delegation that the world should cease arguing as to which side is right and which is wrong, or which is the aggressor and which is the victim of aggression. What is urgent is that negotiations commence in order to bring this dangerous conflict to a speedy end. It is a matter of regret that in the past year, efforts toward a pacific settlement failed to produce any positive results.

We would, however, emphasize that any peace negotiations must necessarily involve mutual accommodation. The suggested withdrawal of the allied forces from South Vietnam without a corresponding movement on the part of Hanoi can only lead to the aggravation of the situation, and hence must be rejected. We cannot agree that peace must be purchased at any price. The liberty and national identity of a valiant people are not commodities that can be traded, no matter how tempting the offer, in the marketplace of peace.

Nor is it wise to worry only about how *soon* the peace negotiations can begin; we must give some thought also to the question of how *long* the talks might last. The talks that ended the war in Korea lasted nearly two years, and so for two years longer the fighting went on and blood continued to flow. We must ask ourselves whether or not we want to see this kind of marathon peace talks in Vietnam.

We are encouraged by the progress which the Republic of Vietnam has made in the task of national reconstruction and in restoring civil government. Especially noteworthy are the results of the recent elections held there in the midst of a tragic war of national survival. The Soviet Foreign Minister has derisively described these elections as mere "comedies". We wonder, however, if the term is not more accurately descriptive of the elections held in certain countries where only one political party exists, where only one slate of candidates is permitted, and the winning candidates garner an astonishing 99 per cent of the vote. In South Vietnam, there were eleven slates of candidates and the winning slate garnered only 35 percent of the vote.

At this point, I wish to refer again to Mr. Gromyko's policy statement. He spoke at great length about the conflict in Vietnam and about the problem of Germany. We thought it strange that Mr. Gromyko should have one prescription for peace in Europe and an exactly opposite prescription for peace in Southeast Asia. Thus, he denounced the "demands for re-carving of the political map of Europe" and the failure to understand "the realities of present-day Europe" and to respect "the inviolability of the boundaries that have taken shape there" as dangerous threats to the peace of Europe. His formula for peace in Europe appears to be as follows: do not act in disregard of the present-day realities in Europe, do not disturb existing political settlements, do not attempt to impugn or attack the inviolability of boundaries, especially the boundary between West Germany and East Germany, and including the wall that cuts Berlin in two. In short, Mr. Gromyko warned one and all not to disturb the *status quo* in Europe, lest the balance of forces on which rests the peace of that continent be dangerously tilted and upset.

For Southeast Asia, on the other hand, Mr. Gromyko seems to favor a contrary formula. He proposes, in effect, that the present-day realities in Southeast Asia be disregarded, that existing political settlements be set aside, that the political map of Southeast Asia be re-carved and existing boundaries between the two Vietnams (and perhaps the two Koreas as well) be obliterated, if necessary, by the force of arms. He does not want to preserve the *status quo* in Southeast Asia, nor is he interested in maintaining a balance of forces on which the peace of the region could rest.

Without necessarily accepting as valid his prescription for peace in Europe, of which the principal ingredient is the permanent division of Germany, one is bound to ask by what logic—other than the logic of the selfish interests of the Soviet Union and of the international Communist movement—does he argue that an entirely contradictory set of principles is best for peace in Asia? Why is the principle of the inviolability of frontiers valid for Germany but inapplicable to Vietnam?

The Soviet Government, according to Mr. Gromyko, is committed to the permanent division of Germany and favors the admission of the two Germanys into the United Nations. We do not subscribe to such a policy whether as regards Germany or as regards Korea and Vietnam. We consider the truncation of these countries to be temporary, and we share the hope that someday their peoples will have the opportunity to decide freely the issue of unification as part of a negotiated political settlement. But, meanwhile, we entirely agree with the Soviet view that existing boundaries and demarcation lines must be respected, and we maintain that this applies as much to Korea and Vietnam as it does to Germany.

This analysis would seem to indicate the existence of an inconsistency or contradiction in the Soviet policies towards Europe and towards Asia. Yet, on further analysis, there may not be any inconsistency or contradiction at all. The Soviet Union stoutly supports the *status quo* in Europe because it is clearly in its interest to do so. But the Soviet Union is not interested in supporting the *status quo* in Southeast Asia, firstly, because it does not wish to furnish proof of Peking's fantastic allegation of United States-U.S.S.R. collusion in Vietnam; secondly, because the Soviet Union does not wish to oppose openly Peking's view that the *status quo* in Southeast Asia must be violently overthrown in the interest of expanding the frontiers of the Communist world; and thirdly, because the Soviet Union probably does not feel any particular obligation to help arrest a conflict that could lead to a direct confrontation between the United States and Communist China.

If this analysis of Soviet motives is either partly or wholly mistaken, we are ready to stand corrected. But how else is it possible to explain the persistent refusal of the Soviet Union to discuss and to seek a solution to the question of Vietnam in the United Nations or to reconvene the Geneva Conference?

No less serious as a threat to the peace in Southeast Asia and of the world at large is the situation in mainland China. We note with dismay the disturbing events occurring in that unhappy land. Communist China's recent nuclear explosions and the shrill threats of nuclear war which it now directs to the whole world are well known. We are also painfully aware of the recent violations of international law, particularly the blatant infractions of traditional diplomatic immunities which have occurred in that country. That the incidents there appear to carry the sanction, nay the encouragement of the regime in Peking is a matter for concern. No less disturbing is the inability or unwillingness of the States concerned to take a firmer stand against these violations. If respect for law is to be upheld and if international justice is to be maintained as the basis of relations between States, we cannot let these transgressions pass unchallenged, lest by our indifference we contribute to a general breakdown of international law and order.

But even more pernicious are the miniaturized cultural revolutions which the political upheaval in Communist China has triggered in many lands of Asia and Africa. It would seem that Communist China has perfected a new version of an old Communist export commodity—revolution. This is an export product the world can very well do without.

All this makes the question of Chinese representation in the United Nations quite academic. A regime that openly flaunts the basic rules of international law and disregards the traditional norms of diplomatic conduct, that engages in nuclear blackmail, rejects the principle of peaceful co-existence and proclaims the doctrine of perpetual revolution and the inevitability of war obviously has no place in this organization. Certainly my delegation has no reason to change its stand on this issue.

While the excesses of the Red Guards in connection with Mao Tse-tung's "cultural revolution" have caught the attention of the world, this is but a transient phase in that country's long and turbulent history. What constitutes a truly wholesome revolutionary development in Asia is the cooperative endeavor of the Southeast Asian nations which have united themselves to secure peace, stability and progress for the peoples of the region. The movement towards regional organization and cooperation in Southeast Asia represents an important milestone in the history of Asia. It holds out the promise of a better future for the nations of Asia and merits the support of the United Nations.

In Asia, the need for economic and social development has received more attention than ever before. The Asian peoples have come to realize that there is no substitute for regional unity and cooperation. Thus, we in Southeast Asia have gone beyond our national frontiers to broader horizons of regional cooperation; we are looking beyond our shores in search of friends and partners in the task of economic development. And we have achieved a measure of success. Thus, we now have the Asian Development Bank, with headquarters in Manila.

The Association of Southeast Asia, composed of the Philippines, Malaysia, and Thailand, has been reactivated. Within our modest resources many projects have been initiated, and since 1966 various conferences on economic, social and technical matters have been held in each of the three ASA countries.

Only last month, the Philippines, Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore and Thailand established a new regional grouping—the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN). Since this organization's purposes and membership coincide with those of the Association of Southeast Asia, it has been decided that the older and smaller group would eventually be absorbed into the newer and larger one.

Our region has also seen the organization of the Asian and Pacific Council of nine members whose activities are being geared to new needs in the economic, technical and social fields. Recently, the ASPAC held its second meeting in Bangkok, and the member countries reaffirmed their determination to pursue the goals of the organization. All these regional groupings in Asia have been organized in pursuance of the United Nations Charter.

Then we have the Conference for the Development of Southeast Asia which held in 1966 its first meeting in Tokyo, and its second conference this year in Manila. To the credit of Japan it should be pointed out that the Japanese Government has decided to earmark an amount equivalent to one per cent of its gross national income for the economic development of the region. This is the goal recommended for the United Nations Development Decade, but a goal still far from being achieved.

We now turn to the situation in the Middle East. The Philippines maintains friendly relations with the Arab States and with Israel, and sincerely hopes that peace based on justice will soon be established in the area. The Philippines supports the efforts and decisions of the United Nations to solve the problems brought about by the hostilities. We are grieved by the sad plight of the refugees, innocent victims of war, who now live in refugee camps, destitute, homeless and uncertain of the future. We share the general concern for the preservation and the protection of the holy places in Jerusalem, and we would like to see the adoption of effective arrangements for such preservation and protection.

We must address ourselves to two principal objectives in the Middle East: first, we must insist upon observance of the principle that the United Nations does not and cannot condone any territorial gains achieved by force of arms, whatever the cause or provocation; and secondly, we must equally insist upon the establishment of conditions that would guarantee the political and territorial integrity of all the States in the area, and encourage peaceful co-existence and fruitful cooperation among them.

We hope and pray that the Middle East, cradle of civilizations and birthplace of religions, will once more become a haven of peace, tolerance and progress. We urge all Member States to refrain from making the Middle East, which is the geographic crossroads of three continents, a chessboard for Great Power ambitions. Instead of encouraging hate, fear and conflict between the peoples of that area, let us support their right to live together in peace, prosperity and freedom.

We have followed with great interest the efforts of the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee in Geneva to deal with a problem which has haunted us since the birth of our organization. We hail its success in reaching agreement on a draft treaty to halt the spread of nuclear weapons. We know that no less than twenty other countries possess the capability and the resources to become members of the nuclear club. Time, therefore, is of the essence. The gravest of perils would confront mankind if the draft treaty submitted by the United States and the Soviet Union for consideration by the General Assembly were to be unduly delayed or to fail of adoption. We hope, therefore, that the treaty will soon take its place as another milestone on the long and difficult road to general disarmament, together with the Antarctic Treaty of 1959, the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty of 1963, and the Outer Space Treaty of 1967.

My delegation has also followed closely the efforts of the Special Committee on Peacekeeping to resolve the differences that divide our membership on the question. On the basic constitutional question, our position is well known. We believe that whenever the Security Council, which is vested with the primary responsibility under the Charter for the maintenance of international peace and security, should fail for any reason to discharge its responsibility, the General Assembly is clothed with residual authority and competence to take necessary measures to that end. We are pleased to note that the principle of the complementary roles of the Security Council and of the General Assembly has been confirmed by recent developments. During its fifth emergency special session, the General Assembly, at the request of the Soviet Union, took over the question of the Middle East crisis after a stalemate had developed in the Security Council. This development foreshadows a possible breakthrough in the solution of the constitutional issue, and should lead to a generally acceptable formula on the financial aspects of the question. It is also our hope that while the search for such a formula goes on, the highly developed countries will make good their solemn pledge to offer voluntary contributions in order to meet the deficits that have been incurred by the United Nations in its peacekeeping operations.

We now turn to the question of colonialism. While we are gratified to note the accelerated pace of decolonization in recent years, we view with deep concern the continuing deterioration of the situation in Southwest Africa, in Southern Rhodesia and in the Portuguese territories in Africa. We are of course pleased to see that the United Nations has terminated the mandate of South Africa over Southwest Africa and, as a first step towards the achievement of independence and self-determination by its peoples, has established the United Nations Council for Southwest Africa. We are equally happy to see that that Council has been organized. The Council however, faces a serious challenge and the Philippine delegation will support any proposal calculated to strengthen the Council in discharging its responsibilities.

The racial tension and strife in some countries underline the relevance and urgency of the work of the United Nations in combatting racial discrimination and *apartheid*. The International Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination constitutes the inspiration and guiding force behind these efforts. The Philippines recently became the 14th Member State to ratify this historic convention and expresses the hope that it will soon come into force.

Once again we must declare our strong opposition to the policies of *apartheid* of the Republic of South Africa which constitute the most pernicious and revolting form of racial discrimination known to man. So long as the policies of *apartheid* exist, just so long will the door remain open to the danger of an international racial conflagration. The United Nations must unrelentingly press forward to overcome the resistance, indifference and ignorance which have prevented many countries from harmonizing their politics with the principles of the Charter and the objectives of many resolutions against racial discrimination and *apartheid*.

And now I would like to consider with you the most appalling and anachronistic spectacle of our time, the spectacle of a world divided into rich countries and poor nations, in which the rich are getting richer while the poor are becoming poorer still.

This situation was anticipated by the Founding Fathers when they incorporated in the Charter provisions for international cooperation to promote higher standards of living, full employment and conditions of economic and social progress. Have we been faithful to these objectives of the Charter? In all candor, we cannot answer in the affirmative. Many Member States have approached the problems of economic and social development with doubts and reservations, with ambivalent and equivocal actions. They have not offered the necessary remedies with sincerity and resolution. They have met the mounting needs of the developing nations half-heartedly, if not with deliberate indifference.

That certain modest gains have been achieved cannot be denied. The United Nations Technical Assistance Program has evolved into the United Nations Development Program. The United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, the United Nations Industrial Development Organization, and the United Nations Capital Development Fund have been established. There is intensified activity in the training of scientific, technical and administrative personnel in the developing nations; there is a more vigorous campaign on behalf of the World Food Aid Programme; and the specialized agencies of the United Nations are doing their share of the massive task of alleviating the lot of the world's sick, ignorant and hungry. But the basic need remains unsatisfied namely, the need for more development capital made available to the developing countries on easier credit terms. Unfortunately, the developed countries, socialist as well as capitalist, with abundant resources to spare, have shown little readiness to respond to the need.

We are aware that the developing countries, many of which are politically emancipated but not yet economically decolonized, must learn to rely on their own efforts and resources. But even when they have done so, the developing countries will fall short of their objectives. On the other hand, since the developed countries cannot long endure as islands of prosperity surrounded by a sea of want and misery, it is clearly in their own interest to transfer more substantial resources to the developing countries in order to provide a firm foundation for an expanding world economy.

We have been told that the modest goals of the Development Decade, now in its seventh year, cannot be achieved. Thus, what promised to be a decade of development may yet turn out to be a decade of retrogression. There is danger in the seeming apathy of the developed nations towards the massive, sustained effort which is required to prevent the permanent division of the world into rich and poor nations. We must strike at the roots of this apathy and convince ourselves anew that we are members of one human family inhabiting One World and that we must act sincerely in the light of that conviction.

In conclusion, Mr. President, permit me to recall that between this session and the preceding regular session, the General Assembly was convened in the 5th special session and in the 5th emergency special session. The two special sessions left the world greatly discouraged by their failure to adopt effective practical solutions to the problems which called them into being.

As a result of these successive frustrations of the General Assembly, disparaging remarks about the United Nations have been heard: that the organization was ineffectual in discharging its responsibility to maintain international peace and security, that it was impotent and a failure.

As we begin the work of this regular session, these harsh judgments tend to darken our view. Yet, this general debate in which we are now engaged should provide evidence of our renewed faith in the organization and of our determination to live up to our responsibilities under the Charter. In spite of temporary setbacks and failures, no delegation sitting in this Assembly today would agree that our organization has outlived its usefulness. We believe in the continuing validity of our Charter and in the enduring worth and value of our organzation. We are confident that with patient and determined effort we can overcome our difficulties and problems.

The United Nations remains the primary guardian of man's universal conscience. Despite its idealism, or perhaps because of it, this organization is still mankind's best hope for peace and progress. As long as the United Nations exists, man's dream of a freer and more abundant life for all remains capable of fulfillment. Let us, therefore, strive to keep this organization a living and dynamic body ever responsive to the needs and aspirations of mankind. This we must do for our own sake and for the sake of generations yet to come.

ATTACK FATAL TO SELMA'S EDDY GILMORE

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Nichols] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend, the Nation and the world mourned the death of a great international journalist, Eddy Gilmore. Eddy Gilmore was born in Selma, Ala., but his career took him to the major capitals of the world. After spending 11 years in Moscow following World War II, he went to London as a correspondent for the Associated Press.

Eddy Gilmore had a talent for reporting the good news of the world as well as the bad. That talent endeared him to many millions of Americans who still have faith in the human race. In this day and age when most of our news is bad, Eddy Gilmore will be missed.

Mr. Speaker, I insert this article from the Birmingham News outlining the career and the many accomplishments of Eddy Gilmore in the Record.

Attack Fatal to Selma's Eddy Gilmore

London.—Eddy Gilmore, whose writing for The Associated Press brought sparkling humor as well as light to the world for 32 years, is dead at 60.

But so long as Tamara Chernashovaya Gilmore, his wife, lives on, one of the great love stories of our time will continue.

The romance of the balding, round writer from Selma, and the lovely Russian ballerina was a warm and glowing happiness that they shared unabashedly with everyone.

He had been with the AP since 1953, and was a newspaperman and wire service reporter since 1929.

Gilmore was AP correspondent in Russia during the dark days of World War II and the sinister rule of the late Premier Stalin.

He covered the Battle of Stalingrad and the funerals of both Stalin and of Prime Minister Winston Churchill of England, among the greatest stories of his life.

But when a Birmingham News reporter asked him one day what had been his greatest thrill, he answered instantly, "Marrying the girl I got."

Gilmore met Tamara on a blind date in Moscow. It was love at first sight. Years later he remembered every detail of that night, the dishes of the lavish dinner they ate and the haunting music of "Two Guitars."

The Russian secret police harrassed Tamara and her family and refused to permit the marriage until the late Wendell Wilkie, American unofficial good will ambassador to Moscow, interceded directly with Stalin in the midst of the war.

Even after their marriage the secret police annoyed Tamara. Once they took her off the street and talked to her all day, urging her to divorce Gilmore.

"I told them they could do with me what they wanted to," she sobbed to her husband, "but I'd never divorce the man I love and the father of my children."

Gilmore was born in Selma, and began his career there as a newsboy delivering The Selma Times-Journal.

He hobnobbed with kings and ate with relish the finest dishes around the world. But he also told The News that his favorite meal still was Alabama ham, hot biscuits, and grits.

Gilmore won the Pulitzer Prize in 1947 "for a distinguished example of telegraphic reporting on international affairs and many other professional honors. But he had his own evaluation of his contributions.

Asked in Selma three years ago about the reaction to his writings in Russia, he said the Russians didn't want him back, growling, "He spit on us." On the other hand, he said, the editor of a popular U.S. magazine decided not to run a condensed version of a book Gilmore wrote on Russia—he thought it was too nice to the Russians.

"I must be doing all right," Gilmore said thoughtfully.

Roswell Falkenberry, a longtime friend and now publisher of the Selma newspaper, said of Gilmore, "He wined and dined with kings, but he kept us informed."

Another Selma friend of Gilmore and Tamara, Dallas County cattleman Joe Callaway, was flying to London to be with the bereaved family. Callaway and his wife visited the Gilmores last year.

The body will be flown to the United States for burial.

Details of the burial and a memorial service to be conducted here are being worked out by the family.

The London Evening Standard in a lead article containing photographs of Eddy and his wife paid tribute to Gilmore under the caption "Death of a Fine Journalist."

The Standard wrote: "He brilliantly combined the two assets most necessary to a journalist—the ability to write amusingly and well, and the ability to write at high speed."

MAJ. CLIFTON CURTIS WILLIAMS, JR.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Nichols] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, last week, America lost another of its brave young men who had volunteered to explore the far reaches of outer space. Like several other astronauts before him, Maj. Clifton Curtis Williams, Jr., gave his life to his country without leaving the earth's atmosphere. But had he been called upon to ride one of our capsules to the moon or beyond, he would have been ready to go.

Major Williams, a native of Mobile, Ala., was a graduate of Auburn University, and the first Alabamian to be selected for the U.S. space program. He was a credit to his family, his school, his State, and his Nation. Major Williams will long be remembered for what he accomplished during his lifetime, but also for what he would have been willing to do had his country called on him.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the following article from the Birmingham News, which outlines Maj. Clifton Williams career, in the Record:

Alabama and Nation Mourn Death of Mobile Astronaut—Williams Killed in Jet Trainer Crash in Florida

Tallahassee, Fla.—If Marine Corps Maj. Clifton C. Williams Jr. had been the first astronaut to land on the moon, the first human words ever spoken there would have been "War Eagle."

He once said that space flight was safer—"really more so"—than traveling in an airplane.

Perhaps he was right. He was killed near here Thursday as he flew in a jet trainer from Cape Kennedy toward his parents' home at Mobile. The impact blasted a large crater and the T-38 disintegrated.

The plane plunged straight into the earth soon after he had radioed a distress May Day signal about 2 p.m. Then he may have blacked out, since informed sources said he had reported an oxygen deficiency.

The enthusiastic Auburn University alumnus had once promised friends at Auburn that if he was the first man on the moon, his first words would be "War Eagle," Auburn's famed shout of triumph—or defiance.

The 35-year-old pilot became the eighth American astronaut to die accidentally, the fourth in the crash of a jet plane. Three burned to death in a spacecraft fire at Cape Kennedy earlier this year.

The nearest Williams came to space flight was when he acted as backup pilot for last year's Gemini 10 mission. Since then he had specialized in the Lunar module, the craft in which the two Apollo astronauts will actually land on the moon.

Alabama's grief at the tragedy was expressed in messages to the wife and parents of the astronaut by Gov. Lurleen Wallace.

And when the Auburn band played the school's Alma Mater song at the Auburn-Kentucky pep rally Thursday night, it was dedicated to Williams. Students and faculty members bowed their heads in silent tribute.

"We're shocked and grieved to learn of your husband's untimely death," Mrs. Wallace said in a telegram to Williams' wife, Beth, at Houston, Tex.

"On behalf of the people of Alabama, we extend to you our deepest sympathy," the governor said in a telegram. "All of us were very proud of Maj. Williams because he was one of our finest young men. May God comfort you during this sad time."

The telegram also was signed by the governor's husband, former Gov. George C. Wallace.

In her message to the parents, Gov. Wallace said: "We extend to you our heartfelt sympathy on this sad occasion. As parents, we share your grief in the loss of your fine son.

"He was a credit to the state and nation and will be missed by his friends and family. Our thoughts and prayers are with you."

Mr. and Mrs. Clifton C. Williams of Mobile, the parents, immediately prepared to fly to the astronaut's widow, although the father had been in ill health. He is superintendent of Mobile City Water Works.

Williams frequently visited his father and mother during his travels between space facilities. He called home to Mobile in March, 1966, to tell them he had been picked as a backup crewman for the Gemini 10 flight.

"I just wanted you to know about it before you read it in the papers," he said then.

The Manned Spacecraft Center at Houston said it would be late today before funeral arrangements are announced.

At Auburn, Dean James E. Foy described Williams as "a likeable person who would always speak and one whom anyone would like. Several other professors remembered the astronaut as a "good student". A loyal fan, he followed Auburn football games on radio and television, and was a member of a Houston alumni club.

Williams told the Auburn Plainsman—the student newspaper—last year: "As to memories of my Auburn career, I would have to say that it is certainly an excellent school. It provides as good an education as you can get anywhere. I've always felt quite well-prepared and adequate in my work."

Attending Auburn on a Navy ROTC scholarship, Williams graduated in 1954 with a degree in mechanical engineering, and opted for the Marine Corps. He was vice president of the School of Engineering in his senior year.

If he were the first man on the moon, Williams said, "I'd be very delighted and proud, needless to say, that I had been the pilot elected for that notable mission. I wouldn't say that this is the most important mission because every mission builds on the experience of the preceding mission. But it will certainly be the most notable at that time.

Williams radioed the distress May Day signal about 2 p.m., and 10 minutes later a helicopter rescue crew from Moody Air Force Base at nearby Valdosta, Ga., arrived at the scene on a plantation near Miccosukee, Fla., 15 miles north of here.

"The plane disintegrated and the body disintegrated with it," said Air Force Maj. Joe Johnson of Moody.

Johnson said the plane dove down so straight it singed trees but plunged between pines 100 feet apart without touching them.

A board of inquiry headed by the first American spaceman, Navy Capt. Alan B. Shepard, was named to investigate the crash by James E. Webb, administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Other members of the inquiry team dispatched were astronaut Joe H. Engle; Dr. John F. Zieglschmidt of the Manned Spacecraft Center; Ralph Keyes, flight crew support division of the center; H. E. Ream, aircraft operations; James Powell of safety office; and Paul Haney, public affairs officer.

Like the other astronauts, Williams was eager for space flight.

"I'd like to go on every one," Williams had said. "Of course, if you said which mission I would most like to have, I'd say the first lunar flight you can make from the standpoint of personal satisfaction and accomplishment."

Williams, who had responsibilities in the area of range operations and crew safety, said the crew of the spacecraft was "99 per cent safe."

As safe as in an airplane?

"Really more so," he replied.

Williams had been scheduled to spend Thursday at the Grumman plant in Bethpage, N.Y., where the Lunar module was under construction. A spokesman at the space center said Williams flew instead to Grumman's plant Wednesday, and went to Cape Kennedy Thursday for an astronauts' meeting.

But the Cape Kennedy meeting was canceled, sending him on the flight which ended in his death.

Williams and his wife, the former Jane Elizabeth Lansche of New Bern, N.C., had one child, Catherine Ann, born in January.

They were married after his selection as an astronaut in 1963. When the six-footer was asked about his wife's reaction to the prospect of a space journey, Williams said:

"Certainly I have the advantage over most—well, all of the other people—in that she knew what she was getting into when we married."

Mrs. Williams was at a luncheon at the home of neighbors in Dickinson, Tex., when astronaut Jack Lousma and his wife brought her word of her husband's death.

ADDRESS OF SENATOR ROBERT F. KENNEDY, WORLD TRADE CONFERENCE OF ATLANTA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, ATLANTA, GA., SEPTEMBER 29, 1967

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, no Member of the House of Representatives or the Senate has given more imaginative leadership in stimulating American business and industry to assume a greater role in attacking the problems of the urban ghetto than the distinguished Senator from New York, ROBERT F. KENNEDY.

Senator KENNEDY is the sponsor of two legislative proposals designed to encourage the construction of low-income housing and to encourage industrial investment in the ghetto areas.

On September 29, 1967, Senator KENNEDY discussed his proposals in a significant and perceptive address to the World Trade Conference of the Atlanta, Ga., Chamber of Commerce.

To use Senator KENNEDY's language to the business and industrial leaders of the South whom he addressed:

> There is today an underdeveloped nation within our borders, and it is our great task to bring the same energy and potential of private enterprise we have used in the South to our most pressing domestic crisis in a hundred years—to find the tool to bring you—profitably and realistically—into our other America.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the text of Senator KENNEDY's address in Atlanta at this point in the RECORD:

ADDRESS OF SENATOR ROBERT F. KENNEDY, WORLD TRADE CONFERENCE OF ATLANTA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, SEPTEMBER 29, 1967

Twenty-two years ago, a conference on world trade would have been, a grim joke. From Japan, across Western Asia and Europe, to the Atlantic, the world's industrial might lay shattered with her cities and her people. Only brick and rubble remained of a productive economic life; and in Europe, the birthplace of the modern age, industrial capacity was dead.

Today this once-barren landscape is flourishing. Last year the United States exchanged more than $15 billion in goods with Europe—and this trade, if development of the promise of the Common Market and the Trade Expansion Act is fulfilled, is yet to grow.

This rebirth did not come from kind words or good intentions—nor from studious reports. It came from a fusion of vision, and the effort this vision required. The men who shaped the Marshall Plan knew that only massive resources could rebuild Europe; they knew their vision would be scorned as impractical or costly; but they also knew that unless they dared greatly, they could not achieve the great purpose of breathing life into a dormant continent.

AMERICA MUST JOIN IN A GLOBAL REVOLUTION

The triumph of the Marshall Plan—not in its details, but in its daring—should be a touchstone for us as we look out on a new and turbulent world; a world of proud, new nations, who are part of a global revolution which we must understand—and which we must join.

This is not a revolution of ideology. It is a revolution for individual dignity, in societies where the individual feels submerged in a desperate mass. It is a revolution for self-sufficiency, in societies which have been forced to rely on other stronger nations for their manufactured goods and their education, their cotton textiles and calculus texts. And above all, it is a revolution to bring hope to the children.

The population of this globe grows every day, and nowhere faster than in the underdeveloped nations. In the next fifteen years, the population of Latin America alone will be fifty per cent greater than it is now. Already more than half the world's people are under the age of 25; within a few years, the majority will be under 18.

I ask you to consider what kind of world awaits these children if their societies remain unchanged.

If they live beyond infancy—and half of all the people buried in Latin America never reach their fourth year—these children face, in nation after nation, only the prospect of wretched, weary lives; lives of endless toil, without joy, without purpose, "where day follows day with death the only goal." They are part of societies without the structures for diversified economics; societies whose fortunes rise or fall with the price of a single commodity; societies where the average worker earns 75¢ a day, as in Latin America, and where per capita yearly income, as in East Africa, is less than $100.

They are societies where adequate health is non-existent—where the average East African does not live beyond his 35th year, and where there are fewer doctors now for every Asian than there were a decade ago. They are societies where families live crowded into hovels unfit for human habitation; shacks built into the hills and the cities, where they have come for jobs that do not exist, and hope that swiftly dies.

AMERICA CANNOT REMAIN AN ISLAND OF AFFLUENCE IN A WORLDWIDE SEA OF POVERTY

It may seem tempting to ignore these nations, and their people, and their massive problems. It may seem prudent to retreat to the developed world; confining our trade and enterprise to Europe and industrialized Asia; trading and working with each other, as fortresses of stability amidst turbulence, and leaving to government the task of economic and social development in these unhappy lands.

But this temptation is as futile as it is heartless. For I believe we cannot endure as an island of affluence in a world-wide sea of poverty. A generation from now, a world so divided will be even more turbulent and dangerous than the world today. And when we remember that this division will not be one simply of wealth and power, but of color also, we can understand the disastrous cost of our indifference. We will not be left alone to prosper while others starve; we will not be able to involve ourselves with world commerce, if we are indifferent to the world's concerns.

And more important, we must have the vision to see, in their developing lands, the contours of a great new source of economic vitality. We cannot trade with a non-existent economy. But if we have the wisdom and the will to help these nations build their economic lives, we shall have built new partners for ourselves, even as we give hope to the children of others. Who would have dared predict, 30 years ago, that we would exchange more than $2 billion a year with Africa—not as exploiters of her resources and her people, but as economic partners? Yet we trade that much now—and if we help educate their children, help develop new regions, help local businesses, hire local executives, encourage participation in economic life, new and vital societies will open.

The ingenuity of the private sector has been proven equal to this task. Companies like Kaiser, and Smith, Kline and French have worked in other lands to build these economies; our assistance program borrows the techniques and personnel of private enterprise to develop nation's economies; and guarantees investments of mutual benefit to company and country. But we must apply this vision and effort on a far greater scale. For if we do not, these nations of despair will not maintain order; and we shall find ourselves embroiled again in alien battle—a battle we could have prevented with thoughtful planning and bold action.

MAJOR RESPONSE NEEDED TO ANSWER THE CRY OF POVERTY IN AMERICA

For even as we struggle halfway around the world in the name of freedom and progress, these other nations are losing their own battles for dignity and opportunity; and even after Vietnam, these other battles must be fought—both abroad, and here at home. If we do not dare to act, we and the next generation of Americans will be fighting once again—in strange lands, and in the streets of our cities.

For we have seen the savage, bloody evidence that there is today an underdeveloped nation within our borders—its people too long denied a share in our affluence, almost without hope for improvement; no longer willing to live out a nightmare distortion of the American dream.

This is the other America which lives today in our crowded, modern cities, with a legacy of deprivation and indifference. It is a land where less than two of every five men work above poverty wages; where 43 percent of housing is substandard; where seven of every 10 children do not finish high school; and where those that do have an even chance of gaining no better than an eighth grade education and where 14,000 people are treated each year for rat bites.

Many in this nation are not even granted the dignity of a statistic. The Census Bureau, the Labor Department, the draft boards—our whole government apparatus—cannot locate between one-fifth and one-third of the adult men we know inhabit the ghetto. They are separated from society, as though they were of no greater concern than so many sparrows or spent matches. They are the living proof of John Adams' remark that the poor man suffers the greatest possible humiliation: "He is only not seen."

And in this nation within a nation, our Department of Labor tells us, and I quote, "conditions are getting worse, not better." In one City alone more than 100,000 new units of blighted housing were added in the last five years, the gap between white and ghetto school performance has widened after 30 years of effort; and among our urban, unskilled poor, joblessness is increasing. And as conditions worsen, despair rises—until it explodes in desperate acts of defeated men.

We know we must have order; we know that a violent few cannot be permitted to threaten the safety of the many; we know that those who lead others to loot and riot must feel the full force of the law. Yet we also know that punishment is not prevention; that force cannot long suppress latent grievance. Without rapid change, there will be no order.

SOCIAL PROGRESS REQUIRES SOCIAL CHANGE IN OUR PRIVATE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM

We know we must act, not just because inaction will bring further violence, but because we must give some encouragement to those who still believe that progress is possible within our established institutions. The men who toil for progress in order—men like Mayors William Hartsfield and Ivan Allen in this city, and men of all colors and classes across America—must know that their toil will bring fruit. We cannot denounce extremists who reject our social system if we do not prove that the system is capable of helping people lead a better life.

To begin this change requires the same vision, and the same effort, that we found in rebuilding Europe, and that we must employ abroad today. And it requires, most of all, the use of a vast, untapped resource of social change—our own private enterprise system. Whatever government must do—and I am one of those who believe it must do more—there is no more promising asset we have today than the skills, the resources, and the inventiveness of our private sector.

You of the South have shown what this effort can produce. Nearly 75 years ago, a great Southerner, Henry Grady, used to tell of a poor Arkansas farmer. When they buried him, said Mr. Grady, the coffin wood was from Oregon, the iron nails from Pittsburgh, his shoes from Boston, his shirt from Cincinnati, and his suit from New York. All the South contributed, said Mr. Grady, was the hole in the ground. Yet today the South—and this vibrant city of Atlanta—are offering their services across the world. This region, once a permanently depressed area, has become a vital economic key in America's life.

HOUSING AND INDUSTRY: TOOLS AGAINST BLIGHT

It is thus our great task to bring the same energy and potential of private enterprise we have used in the South to our most pressing domestic crisis in a hundred years—to find the tool to bring you—profitably and realistically—into our other America. Two bills which I introduced recently in the Congress will, I believe, help accomplish this goal.

These two bills—one to encourage low-income housing, one to encourage industrial investment in the ghetto—are based on a single premise: that the private sector can help turn these blighted areas into places of purposeful work and promising lives. Through a series of economic devices—accelerated depreciation, tax credits, and tax deductions—these bills provide industry with the opportunity to treat our blighted neighborhoods as investments—not as burdensome obligations.

The bill to spur industrial investment includes:

A 10 percent credit on machinery and equipment, instead of the normal 7 percent credit;

A 7 percent tax credit for construction expenses;

A 3 year credit carryback and a 10 year carryover;

A special 25 percent additional deduction for salaries paid to the previously unemployed.

The housing bill uses similar tools:

A tax credit, linked to the owner's equity investment, of between 3 and 30 percent;

An accelerated depreciation on a sliding scale—again, linked to equity investment, from 20 down to 7 years;

And an insurance fund to protect the capital investment.

These bills recognize the uncertainty of investment in this troubled, other America—and thus compensates those of you with the courage to dare. Extra tax deductions for hiring the unemployed and unskilled, for example, make it realistic to provide opportunity—for a youth who has learned only bitterness and futility. Accelerated depreciation makes it profitable to build housing for low-income families—who have known only fetid slums or the bleak depression of public housing.

Most important, these bills provide no single solution; they offer projects as diverse and flexible as the private sector itself. They offer purposeful employment—instead of a rigid welfare system which drains initiative and feeds hostility. They offer a partnership between industry and community to rebuild neighborhoods—instead of destroying them through shortsighted policy or wanton chaos. They can turn these dark corners of the American portrait into places of work and living and hope.

CHALLENGE FOR A RENDEZVOUS WITH DESTINY

This is the challenge that I have come to offer you—whether you are willing to apply the flexibility of our fiscal and economic tools to the great task of rebuilding our nation's shame—and providing promise to the next generation of the poor, now dying slow quiet deaths in our nation. I do not suggest my proposals are the only way—indeed, I am convinced that your suggestions may well be better than mine. Indeed, you can find that out—through a series of meetings among yourselves, back in your own regions. You can discover what fiscal tools are best suited to your own cities, your own communities, your own states. I offer what help I can, but I am confident that with the daring and energy you have shown, you can and will help unlock the skill and resources of the other America.

For this is the task of our generation of Americans—this is *our* rendezvous with destiny. To bring your power and your talent to bear on these awesome dilemmas will not be easy—but it is the job that must be done, if the fabric of our society is not to be torn asunder.

For my part, I believe we are equal to the task. For you have transcended artificial boundaries and wide oceans in your search for new tasks and new challenges. Now, even as you continue your work abroad, you must turn toward home; to bring light and hope into the dark streets and the dreary homes of our own emerging nation. You have the power—you have the talent. If you bring to this your vision, and your effort, we shall have redeemed the heritage of our nation—and we shall all be the better for it.

REMARKS OF PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON AT THE CONFERENCE ON WORLD EDUCATION, WILLIAMSBURG, VA., OCTOBER 8, 1967

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, one of the distinguishing characteristics of President Lyndon B. Johnson is his lifelong dedication to education. The extraordinary record of education legislation passed during the administration of President Johnson to date is concrete testimony of his deep personal commitment to expanding educational opportunity for the American people and for other peoples in the world.

An eloquent example of President Johnson's strong feeling about the role of education in the life of men and nations is the address delivered by the President on October 8, 1967, at the conference on world education in Williamsburg, Va.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the text of President Johnson's remarks on this occasion at this point in the RECORD:

REMARKS OF PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON AT THE CONFERENCE ON WORLD EDUCATION, WILLIAMSBURG, VA., OCTOBER 8, 1967

Dr. Perkins, Dr. Gardner, most distinguished ladies and gentlemen, I know that all of you share with me the feeling that we are all deeply in the debt of Dr. Perkins for his leadership and this memorable conference which you have launched here. I think in the years to come will be remembered as one of our most necessary and desirable movements of this period.

It was in this town almost two centuries ago that a revolution began which swept around the world. And it was here that Thomas Jefferson submitted to the Virginia legislature a "plan for the diffusion of knowledge."

The men who founded this country were very passionate believers in the revolutionary power of ideas.

They knew that when a people commit themselves to learning, a revolution begins which will never stop.

Now, here once again, the winds of change seem to be blowing. And once again, we have come here to gather to consider plans for spreading knowledge.

I am no historian. Certainly I am no prophet.

But for a good many years I have been an observer and a participant in some of the affairs of the world. I have watched man at work; I have seen his creative power—and I have seen his awesome talent for destruction.

In this century, during my lifetime, man has spent literally trillions of dollars on the machinery of death and war. The cost of World War II alone has been estimated at $1 trillion 154 billion—taking no account whatever of any property damage.

In those years, nearly 100 million people have died in the maiming and disease and starvation which came with war.

Yes, we can take no pride in the fact that we have fought each other like animals. And that is really an insult to the animals who live together in more harmony than human beings seem to be able to do.

ILLITERACY STILL REMAINS A MAJOR WORLD PROBLEM

There are other facts that trouble me, too, tonight.

In the world in which we live today, four adults in ten cannot read and write. That is one of the reasons you are here.

There are whole regions in this world in which we live where eight out of ten people are illiterate.

Even now, most people end their lives unable to write "cat" or "dog".

These are most disturbing facts in the Twentieth Century, in this the richest age that man has ever known.

They are facts which I think cry out "Shame on the world, and shame on its leaders."

A sarcastic writer once gave this definition of history: "the account, mostly false, of events, mostly unimportant, which were brought about by rulers, mostly knaves."

Naturally, I do not agree with all of that statement.

PREDICTION FOR AN AGE OF EDUCATION IN AMERICA

If future historians, as I said the other day, should seek a name for this period in America, I hope that they will give consideration to calling it the age of education.

If our children's children want to measure what we tried to achieve, I hope they will remember one thing:

The American Government in only three years multiplied its commitment to education and to health four times over. Congress passed more laws and committed more funds to education and health in the last three years than in all previous history.

The Federal commitment for education and training alone has risen from $4 billion 700 million in the United States in 1964 to $12 billion 300 million in the United States in 1967.

We plan to emulate this commitment in the American program to help others fight these age-old enemies of ignorance and disease.

In 1966, about one-third of our entire economic aid program was directed toward agriculture, health, and education. This amounted to more than $800 million in one year.

This year our budget calls for $1 billion 300 million for these three objectives. That is about half of the entire United States aid program for agriculture, for health, and for education.

We may be wrong, but as a former school teacher of a small rural school, I have had the feeling that if we could help the people of the world to maintain a good, sound body, and if we could provide them with appropriate, proper education, with a good mind and a good body they could build their own steel mills.

We have been trying to concentrate our energies in that direction—in the direction of educating the mind, improving the body and providing food for their sustenance.

When other forms of United States assistance are added to America's program for foreign aid to agriculture, education, and health, namely, our food program, that exceeds some $3 billion this year. But when it comes to education, every nation—including this one, I think—is still very much a developing country.

KNOWLEDGE IS A TREASURE TO BE SHARED

We have so much to learn from others. That is one of the primary reasons you are here—to help us sort what there is to do and to make an agenda for it. We firmly believe that the knowledge of our citizens is one treasure which grows only when that treasure is shared. So we must find ways to extend the treasure to lands where learning is still the luxury of the few.

One lesson of our experience in economic and social development is quite clear: Education is the greatest single bottleneck. Development means that men and women can put to use in their own societies, in their own lives, in their own time, what modern science and technology can provide to help them. But that requires education.

At the level of basic education the truth of the matter is that we may be falling far behind. It takes so long these days to train a teacher, and yet it is so relatively easy to produce a student that we are not even holding our own in basic literacy.

At higher levels of education we are making progress. This year there will be one million young American boys and girls in the colleges of this country who will be there because of the legislation that we have passed providing for scholarships, grants and loans during the last few years.

MODERN TECHNOLOGY METHODS MUST BE FULLY EXPLOITED

But we have only just begun to exploit fully the possibilities that modern technology opens to us.

I can see no reason in the world why modern technology cannot, for example, permit the best professor in the world to teach students all over the world in a field where the vocabulary and the concepts and the standards are uniform; and this is true of many fields, I think—science, natural and social.

Moreover, our capacity to produce microfilm and distribute information should make it possible for a young scholar or researcher at any place in the world to have the same basic library facilities that are available in the British Museum, the Library of Congress, or at one of the great university libraries.

Therefore, I would like to suggest to you this evening some consideration be given to some of these challenges: How can we use what we already know about educational television to accelerate the pace of basic education for all the children of the world? How can we use modern technology to economize on that most essential and that most needed educational resource: The good teacher?

How can we make the good teacher available to the maximum number of students in the world through television?

How can we make the best scholars and teachers in the world available to all universities—wherever they may be—through satellite communications?

So often have I thought of the wonders that could have been brought to those young, struggling minds with warped bodies that I taught back when I was in that little rural school on the United States-Mexican Border if we had had satellite communications, and the best scholars and best teachers had been able to invade those classrooms, to expose those Mexican children to the English language?

STRONG CREATIVE EFFORT NEEDED TO COORDINATE WORLD EDUCATIONAL SYSTEMS

How can we use, too, the latest methods of communications and microfilming to provide those who are doing scholarship and research everywhere the best library facilities that are anywhere?

We seem to need more facts. We seem to need to put a program together.

I was quite impressed with a statement in your conference document which said: "If the world's financial systems were forced to function with no better facts than those which educational systems live by, a financial panic would swiftly seize all capitals of the world."

We could have that in the offing anyway.

That is one of the reasons I thought it would be very desirable that we have this conference this year. It gives me a great deal of satisfaction, as Dr. Perkins observed, to know that you have come here upon our invitation, and that you have come here to chart an education strategy for the future.

I should not be presumptious enough to try to outline that strategy, I content myself with observing a contribution here and there.

EDUCATION MUST BECOME A PRIMARY WORLD GOAL

If I may suggest another idea, you might consider calling on the United Nations to set a target time for reviewing our goals and planning new progress, and make an international education year for the world.

Don't limit your efforts. Here, and you leave this place, I hope that you will take these plans and really face up to the tough questions:

The real tough question of all is how can we persuade the governments of 131 other nations to make it their primary objective to give every boy and girl born in the world—anywhere—all the education he or she can take?

How can we get the world's leaders to convert man's tragic will to destroy into a determination to build?

How can we shape a world in which men employ their minds in projects of peace—instead of sacrificing their all, their bodies, their lives, on a field of battle?

Can we train a young man's eyes to absorb learning—as eagerly as we train his finger to pull a trigger?

No gathering that has ever assembled has a subject that I think is more urgent than yours—more compelling, more necessary, and more productive.

Here tonight you leaders of educational thought from more than 50 nations—almost half of all the nations of the world—must realize that you are dealing with the dynamite of our times.

Thomas Jefferson said that we should spread the disease of liberty around the world when this Nation was very young. The men of Jefferson's day associated this place where you are meeting tonight with liberty, and also with learning.

Tonight in Williamsburg, I am pleased to observe that you apparently have the same concern. I hope our commitment will be as great as theirs—and I hope that your achievements will be as worthy of remembering.

One more word, if I may be personal.

A President must call upon many persons—some to man the ramparts and to watch the far away, distant posts; others to lead us in science, medicine, education and social progress here at home.

I especially want to commend this great educational leader—Dr. Perkins—for having answered every call that his country has made, and having apparently done it quite well here.

Thank you.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION AMENDMENTS OF 1967

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, on October 3, 1967, President Johnson signed into law the Vocational Rehabilitation Amendments of 1967. It was a heartwarming occasion in the East Room of the White House, to see so many people witnessing the signing who had such a deep interest in the rehabilitation of the handicapped. Some of those attending were persons with severe handicaps who were rehabilitated, and who were determined to share in this moment which assured the growth of this important program.

It was my privilege to be chairman of the subcommittee which developed the bill which was eventually signed into law as well as a member of the Education and Labor Committee which has developed so much of the important domestic legislation during the past several historic years.

At this signing, President Johnson said:

> If historians seek a name for this age in the United States, I hope that they will call it the Age of Education.

He also indicated the strength of the commitment we have made. He said:

> The American people, in three years, multiplied their commitment to health and education four times over. They passed more laws and they committed more funds to the education of our children—and to the health of our people—in three years than in all the previous history of America put together.

The President has placed his confidence in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to use these moneys well, and it has not failed the Nation. This major Department has responded to the great demands thrust upon it, during the last few years, in an exemplary way.

The full statement of the President follows:

Remarks of the President Upon Signing H.R. 12257, the Vocational Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1967, in the East Room

Secretary Gardner, Under Secretary Cohen, Mrs. Switzer, Members of Congress, Ladies and Gentlemen:

Eight years ago in Portage, Pennsylvania, a 20-year-old machinist dived into a swimming hole and struck his head. Thus, he was paralyzed for life.

Even before that accident, he was handicapped; he had been partially deaf since his birth. Now he was not only deaf, but he was sentenced to another kind of life imprisonment. In many ways, that seemed to be a very, very hopeless case.

Today, that "hopeless case" is a very successful draftsman. He makes a good living with a design firm near Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. He pays his taxes. He is a member of a community—instead of its helpless ward.

All of that was true because he was helped, helped right from the start by a counselor from the Pennsylvania Bureau of Rehabilitation.

The law that I am going to sign today makes such stories as this possible. It brings them into reality. Thousands of them. Half a million exactly in the last four years. Since Woodrow Wilson's day it has helped more than two million Americans who—in one way or another—would be equally "hopeless cases."

As much as any law on the books, this law reveals what great possibilities every person has—and what, I believe, a great heart we have in America.

Last year, we helped restore 173,000 people to useful lives. Three-fourths of them had been unemployed—20 percent of them were already on welfare.

Today, every one of them are taxpayers. This program reaps five tax dollars for every dollar that we sow. And measured in human happiness, its value is beyond all of our counting.

So this moment is more than just a ritual. Today we express again our purpose in America: fulfillment for the individual. We aim to knock down every barrier that keeps a child or a man from realizing his full potential in our country.

The history of these years, I believe, when it is written, will be the story of how we in America accomplished that goal.

A rather bitter writer once gave this definition of history: "The account, mostly false, of events, mostly unimportant, which were brought about by rulers, mostly knaves . . ."

I disagree with him on all counts.

History, I am convinced, will remember these years as a great awakening in America.

In these years, we discovered poverty in the midst of plenty—and we did something about it—not as much as we would like—but we did all that we could get a majority to do.

If historians seek a name for this age in the United States, I hope that they will call it the Age of Education.

Our government guarantees to all of its citizens all the education that he or she can take.

In the past six years, the number of young people going to college from poor homes has risen by more than 12 percent.

In six years, the number of high school dropouts has dropped—from 25 percent to only 18 percent of our young people between 16 and 24.

I regret we have 18 percent. But I would much rather have 18 than 25 that we started with.

If men in the future want to suggest the range of our achievements, I think they could do it in only two sentences:

"The American people in three years, multiplied their commitment to health and education four times over. They passed more laws and they committed more funds to the education of our children—and to the health of our people—in three years than in all the previous history of America put together."

Junior colleges are now being founded in America at the rate of one per week.

By 1965, new Federal programs were helping 500,000 young people go to college and without that help, they might not have had a chance. Next year—I want all of you to get this—**we will be helping 1,200,000; so we have** doubled the number that we helped go to college—more than doubled it in the last two years—500,000 to 1,200,000.

Those to me are not just numbers. They are miracles. They represent human lives which are being changed and human lives which are being enriched.

They mean that a new idea is already at work here in America.

Once, we thought of rehabilitation as something for the physically handicapped. This law is evidence of that. But now we have learned that other handicaps yield to the same treatment. The handicap of ignorance for example. Mental handicaps are another. The handicap of poverty is another.

Rehabilitation, in fact, has become a basic idea in our country. We act on the belief that every man—no matter what his color, no matter what his bank account, no matter what his handicap or no matter what his I.Q.—has abilities which America needs.

That is a new idea. But it is a great idea. It is like discovering a new country right in our midst—the territory of human promise. That idea promises not more welfare, but more well-being for all—well-being for our people—the people we have selected to serve.

So we come here to the East Room of the White House this afternoon to continue this program. To continue it—and to add much to it that is new:

This law extends rehabilitation service to migrant laborers—the poorest among us, the most needy among us.

It increases Federal support for rehabilitation here in our Nation's Capital.

And finally, it strikes at one of the most baffling and heartbreaking handicaps that we can imagine: the double handicap of deaf-blindness. For years, that problem seemed too difficult for us. Now, by establishing a National Center for Deaf-Blind Youth and Adults, we hope to change all of that.

To all the supporters of this law in Congress, to all the Members of the House and Senate who are here this afternoon on behalf of all the Nation, I want to say the Nation owes you a debt of thanks.

I would like to call each of your names. I am sure I would overlook some and make some of you offended. But I must refer to Senator Hill, who is always in the limelight to anything that is good for health and education in this country—to Congressman Perkins, to Congressman Daniels, and to their committee members.

They give this law dedicated—and bipartisan—support.

In the next few years, this law will turn hope into achievement for thousands of our people.

And it will prove something to us in history: that in America there is no such thing as a "Hopeless Case."

Before I conclude—because I couldn't go to the Capitol yesterday—I want to pay my respects, my very great esteem and affection to that grand young man who was 90 yesterday, Carl Hayden.

I have never known a better public servant. I have never known a better human being. And I have never had a better friend. I am so glad he could be here today.

THE PRESIDENT ON VIETNAM: LOGICAL, COHERENT, STRAIGHTFORWARD

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Byrne] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Philadelphia Inquirer described President Johnson's San Antonio speech on Vietnam as "a coherent, logical and well organized defense" of present policies.

It went on to say that the President's position on Vietnam is precisely the same as it has been for years: we are willing to talk, but we will not barter away the freedom of South Vietnam by reneging on our commitments.

The Inquirer has hit the nail on the head. What is there really new that the President can propose on Vietnam? All the issues have been laid out. The United States knows why it is fighting. It knows why the Communists are fighting. The immediate prize is South Vietnam. The long-range prize is Southeast Asia. Why do the critics believe that a solution to the Vietnam war must come from America rather than from Hanoi.

The United States did not begin the Vietnam conflict. The Communists did, just as they started the Korean war, and just as they turned civil conflict into general war in Greece in the 1940's.

This country does not relish bloodshed, and it did not invite it. But we can not now be asked to turn over 17 million people to the Communists just because we are tired, or the critics are getting under our skins.

The President's statement in San Antonio was straightforward and intelligent.

Let us hope the response from Hanoi is likewise.

I insert in the Record an editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer of October 2 entitled, "A Straightforward Position on Vietnam":

A Straightforward Position on Vietnam

Those who have termed President Johnson's weekend address on the Vietnamese War "more conciliatory" than remarks in the past have, we believe, missed the point—and possibly mixed their own wishes with what they heard.

For Mr. Johnson's position—and America's—is precisely the same as it has been for years: We are willing, even eager, to talk peace with the Vietcong and their North Vietnamese masters, but we will not barter away South Vietnamese freedom and we will not crawfish out of obligations we have assumed.

The President's warning about errors Hanoi might make about noisy "protest" marchers in America was explicit and on target, we believe. "It is the common failing of totalitarian regimes," he noted, "that they cannot understand the nature of our democracy. They mistake dissent for disloyalty. They mistake restlessness for a rejection of policy. They mistake a few committees for a country. They misjudge individual speeches for public policy."

The President did not understate the seriousness of our involvement in Southeast Asia; he did point out the precedents for our present position, and he did note that for the heavy sacrifices we have made there have been substantial gains to show.

Although the speech must be considered a defense of present policy, and—as Moscow, among others, was quick to note—contained no "new" elements, it must also be rated a coherent, logical and well organized defense. Whether the enemy's response to it will be equally intelligent remains the question. The key is in Ho Chi Minh's hands, if he will but turn it.

It is certain beyond question that this country does not relish continuing bloodshed and is willing to go more than halfway to stop it. But there should be equally little question that anger and confusion in some quarters will not move this great Nation from its well reasoned conception of duty to freedom and to fellow man, struggling to achieve freedom, though half an earth away.

WICS HELP LIGHTEN THE DARK

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Casey] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, this coming Tuesday, October 17, will be observed by many of the major cities across the United States as WICS Day. This intriguing name stands for Women In Community Service, a little-known, dedicated organization of women who have volunteered during the past year to recruit and train 16- to 21-year-old girls in the poverty areas of our Nation, with the idea of getting them into Job Corps training so that they may, by the result of better education and training, become worthwhile, contributing members of our society.

We, of Houston, Tex., are indeed proud of our WICS organization, for as a result of their hard work, over 300 girls from the Houston area are now in training in 15 of the 17 centers for women in the United States, and I believe that tribute should be paid to the women in the Houston area who are devoting their time in the very worthwhile endeavor. These WICS, the Catholic women under the leadership of Mrs. L. McGoughran, the Jewish women under the leadership of Mrs. G. A. Fazekas, the Negro Women led by Mrs. Tracy Thompson, and Church Women United led by Mrs. C. Swartsfager, are truly letting their light shine in the interest of the young girls of this Nation. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the fine women of Houston are typical of the women of WICS throughout our Nation, and I urge my colleagues in making due recognition and expressing appreciation to this great volunteer organization.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON ADDRESSES CONFERENCE ON WORLD EDUCATION AT WILLIAMSBURG, VA.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. Green] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, on October 8, President Johnson addressed an international conference of educators at Williamsburg, Va. As he has often done in the past, the President developed a powerful and eloquent argument for education as a key means to resolve some of the problems which haunt mankind. He wisely suggests that modern technology—the creation of educated minds—be put in the service of education itself, the world over, for, as he states:

> The knowledge of our citizens is one treasure which grows only when that treasure is shared.

This is a theme which the President has stated before and which bears endless repeating.

At one time in our national history, Mr. Speaker, we found it impossible to continue half slave and half free. Ignorance is a different kind of bondage, but one that is hardly less cursing to the human spirit. We live in a world where more than half are slaves to illiteracy and terrible want, and it is right to question if the world can continue so ruinously divided any more than this Nation could. The President believes—and I think rightly—that it can not. In earlier speeches on international education he has stated that—

> Ideas, not armaments, will shape our lasting prospects for peace.

First, there must be literacy if these constructive ideas are to flourish, a good example of the latter being the President's suggestions in his Williamsburg speech for using modern technology in the service of international education.

Mr. Speaker, I include the full text of the President's speech at this point in the Record:

Remarks of the President at the Conference on World Education, Williamsburg, Va.

Dr. Perkins, Dr. Gardner, most distinguished ladies and gentlemen:

I know that all of you share with me the feeling that we are all deeply in the debt of Dr. Perkins for his leadership and this memorable conference which you have launched here. I think in the years to come will be remembered as one of our most necessary and desirable movements of this period.

It was in this town almost two centuries ago that a revolution began which swept around the world. And it was here that Thomas Jefferson submitted to the Virginia legislature a "plan for the diffusion of knowledge."

The men who founded this country were very passionate believers in the revolutionary power of ideas.

They knew that when a people commit themselves to learning, a revolution begins which will never stop.

Now, here once again, the winds of change seem to be blowing. And once again, we have come here to gather to consider plans for spreading knowledge.

I am no historian. Certainly I am no prophet.

But for a good many years I have been an observer and a participant in some of the affairs of the world. I have watched man at work; I have seen his creative power—and I have seen his awesome talent for destruction.

In this century, during my lifetime, man has spent literally trillions of dollars on the machinery of death and war. The cost of World War II alone has been estimated at $1 trillion 154 billion—taking no account whatever of any property damage.

In those years, nearly 100 million people have died in the maiming and disease and starvation which came with war.

Yes, we can take no pride in the fact that we have fought each other like animals. And that is really an insult to the animals who live together in more harmony than human beings seem to be able to do.

There are other facts that trouble me, too, tonight.

In the world in which we live today, four adults in ten cannot read and write. That is one of the reasons you are here.

There are whole regions in this world in which we live where eight out of ten people are illiterate.

Even now, most people end their lives unable to write "cat" or "dog."

These are most disturbing facts in the Twentieth Century, in this the richest age that man has ever known.

They are facts which I think cry out "Shame on the world, and shame on its leaders."

A sarcastic writer once gave this definition of history: "the account, mostly false, of events, mostly unimportant, which were brought about by rulers, mostly knaves."

Naturally, I do not agree with all of that statement.

If future historians, as I said the other day, should seek a name for this period in America, I hope that they will give consideration to calling it the age of education.

If our children's children want to measure what we tried to achieve, I hope they will remember one thing:

The American Government in only three years multiplied its commitment to education and to health four times over. Congress passed more laws and committed more funds to education and health in the last three years than in all previous history.

The Federal commitment for education and training alone has risen from $4 billion 700 million in the United States in 1964 to $12 billion 300 million in the United States in 1967.

We plan to emulate this commitment in the American program to help others fight these age-old enemies of ignorance and disease.

In 1966, about one-third of our entire economic aid program was directed toward agriculture, health, and education. This amounted to more than $800 million in one year.

This year our budget calls for $1 billion 300 million for these three objectives. That is about half of the entire United States aid program for agriculture, for health, and for education.

We may be wrong, but as a former school teacher of a small rural school, I have had the feeling that if we could help the people of the world to maintain a good, sound body, and if we could provide them with appropriate, proper education, with a good mind and a good body they could build their own steel mills.

We have been trying to concentrate our energies in that direction—in the direction of educating the mind, improving the body and providing food for their sustenance.

When other forms of United States assistance are added to America's program for foreign aid to agriculture, education, and health, namely, our food program, that exceeds some $3 billion this year. But when it comes to education, every nation—including this one, I think—is still very much a developing country.

We have so much to learn from others. That is one of the primary reasons you are here—to help us sort what there is to do and to make an agenda for it. We firmly believe that the knowledge of our citizens is one treasure which grows only when that treasure is shared. So we must find ways to extend the treasure to lands where learning is still the luxury of the few.

One lesson of our experience in economic and social development is quite clear: Education is the greatest single bottleneck. Development means that men and women can put to use in their own societies, in their own lives, in their own time, what modern science and technology can provide to help them. But that requires education.

At the level of basic education the truth of the matter is that we may be falling far behind. It takes so long these days to train a teacher, and yet it is so relatively easy to produce a student that we are not even holding our own in basic literacy.

At higher levels of education we are making progress. This year there will be one million young American boys and girls in the colleges of this country who will be there because of the legislation that we have passed providing for scholarships, grants and loans during the last few years.

But we have only just begun to exploit fully the possibilities that modern technology opens to us.

I can see no reason in the world why modern technology cannot, for example, permit the best professor in the world to teach students all over the world in a field where the vocabulary and the concepts and the standards are uniform; and this is true of many fields, I think—science, natural and social.

Moreover, our capacity to produce microfilm and distribute information should make it possible for a young scholar or researcher at any place in the world to have the same basic library facilities that are available in the British Museum, the Library of Congress, or at one of the great university libraries.

Therefore, I would like to suggest to you this evening some consideration be given to some of these challenges: How can we use what we already know about educational television to accelerate the pace of basic education for all the children of the world? How can we use modern technology to economize on that most essential and that most needed educational resource: The good teacher?

How can we make the good teacher available to the maximum number of students in the world through television?

How can we make the best scholars and teachers in the world available to all universities—wherever they may be—through satellite communications?

So often have I thought of the wonders that could have been brought to those young, struggling minds with warped bodies that I taught back when I was in that little rural school on the United States-Mexican Border if we had had satellite communications, and the best scholars and best teachers had been able to invade those classrooms, to expose those Mexican children to the English language?

How can we use, too, the latest methods of communications and microfilming to provide those who are doing scholarship and research everywhere the best library facilities that are anywhere?

We seem to need more facts. We seem to need to put a program together.

I was quite impressed with a statement in your conference document which said: "If the world's financial systems were forced to function with no better facts than those which educational systems live by, a financial panic would swiftly seize all capitals of the world."

We could have that in the offing anyway.

That is one of the reasons I though it would be very desirable that we have this conference this year. It gives me a great deal of satisfaction, as Dr. Perkins observed, to know that you have come here upon our invitation, and that you have come here to chart an education strategy for the future.

I should not be presumptious enough to try to outline that strategy. I content myself with observing a contribution here and there.

If I may suggest another idea, you might consider calling on the United Nations to set a target time for reviewing our goals and planning new progress, and make an international education year for the world.

Don't limit your efforts. Here, and you leave this place, I hope that you will take these plans and really face up to the tough questions:

The real tough question of all is how can we persuade the governments of 131 other nations to make it their primary objective to give every boy and girl born in the world—anywhere—all the education he or she can take?

How can we get the world's leaders to convert man's tragic will to destroy into a determination to build?

How can we shape a world in which men employ their minds in projects of peace—instead of sacrificing their all, their bodies, their lives, on a field of battle?

Can we train a young man's eyes to absorb learning—as eagerly as we train his finger to pull a trigger?

No gathering that has ever assembled has a subject that I think is more urgent than yours—more compelling, more necessary, and more productive.

Here tonight you leaders of educational thought from more than 50 nations—almost half of all the nations of the world—must realize that you are dealing with the dynamite of our times.

Thomas Jefferson said that we should spread the disease of liberty around the world when this Nation was very young. The men of Jefferson's day associated this place where you are meeting tonight with liberty, and also with learning.

Tonight in Williamsburg, I am pleased to observe that you apparently have the same concern. I hope our commitment will be as great as theirs—and I hope that your achievements will be as worthy of remembering.

One more word, if I may be personal.

A President must call upon many persons—some to man the ramparts and to watch the far away, distant posts; others to lead us in science, medicine, education and social progress here at home.

I especially want to comment this great educational leader—Dr. Perkins—for having answered every call that his country has made, and having apparently done it quite well here.

Thank you.

REPORT FROM ISRAEL

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Multer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, a mission of American Jewish Congress leaders visited Israel this summer to study at firsthand the new political, social, and economic problems facing the country following its lightning military victory over the Arab nations that sought to destroy the Jewish state. The mission met with Government officials, military leaders, refugee spokesmen, and Jews and Arabs from many walks of life. The American Jewish Congress group traveled extensively along the west bank of the Jordan, visited Gaza and El Arish in Sinai, and traveled from Jericho overlooking the Dead Sea as far north as Kuneitra and the Syrian heights.

Their report from Israel follows:

Both the government and the people of Israel seem unable fully to believe that the whole of Eretz Yisrael in its traditional borders from the Jordan to the sea and from the Gaza strip to the Golan heights is now in Jewish hands. The first component of the *matsar ruach*, the general mood that I sensed, was wonder; the second, relief. For the first time in 19 years their lives are not being threatened by Arab marauders and Arab guns. Israel's farms and cities are now out of range of Arab artillery.

The third component is sobriety. There is no air of triumph or arrogance. Israel's citizens are solemnly determined to shoulder the obligations imposed by their military victory. They are cognizant of the overwhelming problems that must be solved; they are equally determined to build a morally responsible plan which will deal with those problems, and they will not be rushed into premature decisions of a long-range nature as they supply the immediate human needs.

Their sobriety is deepened by their losses. In absolute numbers the casualties were small, but in proportion to the population of the State the casualties were heavy—equivalent to some 65,000 American dead in less than a week of fighting. The impact of the war was brought home to us by the many government and other officials we met who had lost sons in the brief campaign.

Everyone we spoke to was deeply sensitive to the need to improve the situation of the displaced Arabs both in Gaza and in the West Bank area. We even met a few high placed officials convinced that Israel should absorb these areas and give their residents full citizenship—even in the face of the strong possibility that the character of the country might be transformed from that of a Jewish state to a bi-national state, with a rapidly-growing Arab population threatening to become the majority within a generation, and with the huge social problems which the introduction of so large a depressed proletariat would entail.

The idea of minority status is unthinkable to most Israelis. All the pain and labor that went into the building of the Jewish state were borne for the purpose of providing *some* place in the world where Jews would constitute the majority culture group—so that Jewish life, Jewish culture, the Hebrew language, and Judaism itself could flourish. This is the heart of the dilemma. No citizen of Israel wishes to give up what has been painfully achieved; hardly anyone is immune to the influence of Jewish values or free of some degree of commitment to the idea that human beings are of supreme importance.

This does not mean that the army of Israel is made up of angels. It is composed of the entire *kibbutz galuyot*, an ingathering of exiles which includes large numbers who came from Arab lands. I do not doubt, therefore, that there were occasional lapses. Arabs in the Gaza strip told us that some Israeli paratroopers had bullied them and "appropriated" watches and the like. Such incidents are not beyond the realm of possibility, but they are certainly atypical if they occurred. More typical were the acts of kindness and concern which Israeli soldiers performed and concerning which we heard unimpeachable testimony. In Hebron, synonym of Arab cruelty since the massacre of the Jews in 1929, not one Arab civilian was killed. In the entire occupied area, there was not one recorded case of rape.

Particularly striking are the natural and friendly relations between Arabs and Jews in the markets, on the streets and in the cafes as they explore each other's sites and cities. We saw Arab families rubbernecking in the New City of Jerusalem and Israelis from Dan to Beersheba taking snapshots and shopping for souvenirs in Arab towns and cities where no Jew had walked for nearly a generation. The fact that sightseeing began so soon after the fighting stopped is an indication of the genuine good will which Israelis bear toward their Arab neighbors . . . and of the readiness of so many Arabs to resume the normal ways of peace. I snapped a picture of a sign on one Arab restaurant in the Old City that read in Hebrew: *m'sadat hashalom biyerushalayim hash'lema*: Peace Restaurant in Reunited Jerusalem.

It quickly became evident that Israel's Arab problem is really three different problems. First there are the approximately 500,000 Jordanians who remain in the Old City of Jerusalem and in the towns and villages along the West Bank of Jerusalem. Here the main concern is economic: how to raise what has always been a depressed area into some form of self-sufficiency.

Then there are an estimated 150,000 who left their homes and fled into Jordan. Some of us in the AJCongress mission saw these people crossing over the Allenby Bridge into Jericho carrying their pots and pans, beds and sofas, clothing and chickens into Jordanian territory. Many thousands have already returned.

Finally, there are those who were dislocated by the way in 1948—an estimated 400,000 persons who remain without permanent homes because the Arab countries in which they found themselves were content to let them remain as "refugees" rather than help them begin life anew as citizens.

By far the most serious aspect of the Arab problem facing Israel is in the Gaza strip, where some 300,000 homeless Arab men, women and children have been fed a diet of hatred and vengeance against Israel since 1948.

In the beach camp for displaced Arabs in Gaza, the coffee we were served and the surface hospitality accorded us did not hide the resentment simmering beneath. Indeed, the twenty-year-old Arab who acted as my interpreter took leave of me after warm handshakes and expressions of friendship with the words, "I hope to see you in Palestine with Ahmed Shukairy!"

Shukairy, demogogic leader of the Palestine Liberation Army, has sworn the destruction of Israel. He has been in complete charge of the training of the former Palestinian Arabs in Gaza since 1948; at Khan Yunis in the lower Gaza strip we saw visual evidence of what that training has been. In a girl's secondary school the walls were covered by an exhibit of paintings by both the instructor and her charges—the bloodiest pictures I have ever seen, not excluding the so-called art of the Nazis. In one, a boot carrying the colors of the Palestine Liberation Army was crushing the chest of an Israeli soldier as gore poured from his prostrate body. In another painting, Arab soldiers were shooting down a large group of opposing soldiers, each of whom wore a huge Star of David. This was the "art work" of children in a school. But their education was not confined to artistic representation. We also saw the rifle range on which girl students had practised for the invasion of Israel.

Contrast this training with the fact that never since the founding of Israel nearly twenty years ago have Jews been taught to hate Arabs or to covet additional territory. The closest Israel Jews come to irredentism was an abiding love for Jerusalem—a love enshrined in the Psalms, in the poems and songs of ancient and modern Israel, and now in Israel's most popular song: "Jerusalem of gold . . . let me be the harp to sound your songs!"

Compared with the camps in the Gaza strip, the West Bank refugee centers we visited were as day to night. We walked informally into a camp on the road to Nablus and were received with genuine friendliness, curiosity and hopefulness. These were people whose poverty was apparent and among whom the ravages of disease and neglect touched us deeply; a child with a suppurating ear infested with flies, adults whose sight had been impaired or destroyed by trachoma, beggar children looking for coins or bread. These are human needs which demand attention—and everything we were told by members of the Israel government leads us to believe this attention will be quickly given.

It is a task which demands the assistance of all men of good will. It demands resettlement as well as rehabilitation; economic programs as well as medical aid, far beyond the minimal and grudging sustenance that has been given during the last nineteen years. And it requires some form of international support to supplement the programs that Israel is prepared to undertake. We left the camps with the strong impression that the stagnation of 19 years has been ended; that Israel is determined to deal equitably—and effectively—with people who have been used as political pawns for nearly two decades.

"The sword comes into the world," says the Talmud, "when justice is delayed, when justice is perverted and when those responsible for maintaining justice make wrong decisions." Israeli leaders understand how delicately the peace of the world hangs on peace in the Middle East; they recognize that this peace will not be sustained by injustice to the Arabs now living under the Israel flag. The Israelis ask only that the world be patient. Egypt, Jordan and Syria sat on the problem for nearly 20 years and never felt the pressure of civilized opinion for a solution; it hardly seems fair that the world should expect Israel to solve the problem overnight.

The cry over the holy places has the same ring of insincerity. No one complained during the last two decades that the Church of the Nativity in Bethlehem and the Church of the Holy Sepulcher (among others) were under Moslem control. The commercialization and filth that surrounded many of these sites sacred to Christians, and to which we were eyewitnesses, did not testify to a significant measure of Jordanian concern for these places.

As for the sanctity of Jewish holy sites, the Jordanian authorities were completely indifferent. The tomb of Rachel was allowed to decline into a disgraceful condition. Jewish cemeteries on the Mount of Olives were desecrated; the very tombstones were used to build Arab military barracks. In the Old City of Jerusalem we saw pious Jews searching in vain for the locations they remembered as the burial places of their parents and grandparents; we saw synagogues that had been either destroyed or used for secular purposes. Against the Western Wall—the only remainder of the ancient Temple and thus the place most sacred to Jewish memory—the Arabs had permitted the building of a public lavatory.

Yet in our travels throughout Israel and the occupied areas we saw mosque after mosque—even where there had been bitter fighting—preserved and clean and obviously the objects of public protection. The demands of equity cannot be entirely disregarded by mankind.

The people of Israel are confident of America's friendship, and grateful for the support they have received in the UN from our government. Yet they know—more profoundly than they have ever known—that in the final test they can rely only on themselves and on the ties that bind them to the Jewish people. They are certain, they tell you, that if the Arabs had done what they had planned to do and had knocked out Israel's air force, the United States would have done something. But it would have been too late.

They have little doubt what their fate would have been had the Arab states been able to bomb Tel Aviv and Haifa and send their columns advancing into Israel territory. Friends of mine told me that their womenfolk were preparing to take poison should it become necessary. They were, literally, ready to die to the last man, woman and child. It is understandable that they feel an equally profound satisfaction in the removal of the threat by the seemingly miraculous effectiveness of their own military power. And it is not surprising that they now insist that the Arab nations deal with them directly at the peace table.

"We must stand where we are, have strong nerves and wait for the opportunity to deal with the Arabs directly," we were told. In this they recognize the great problem of Arab shame and humilitation. I believe there is greater understanding of Arab psychology in Israel than any place else in the non-Arab world. After all, almost half the population of the State as it was before June 6 is composed of Jews who were refugees from Arab countries. Perhaps this offers hope for the future.

Meanwhile, Israel is prepared to restore the dignity of those Arabs who have become their wards. Already Arab workers in the Old City are being invited to become members of Histadrut, Israel's labor union movement, where they will earn equal pay for equal work with their Israeli fellow union-members. Already, Israel has reconnected water pipes severed by the Jordanians so that the residents of the Old City of Jerusalem, for example, can enjoy running water seven days a week; before the fighting in June there was water only twice a week. In the Gaza strip, Israel is drawing plans to build up the fishing industry, improve agricultural productivity, provide new jobs with new light industry and engage in a dynamic program of rehabilitation.

The most pointed and intense appeal of Israelis to Western Jews is for an immediate and substantial immigration from the Americas. This sounds like the old, old song, but it has new and vigorous tones. The larger the number of young, educated and committed Jews Israel receives from the West, the more readily Israel can absorb as full citizens the hundreds of thousands of Arabs it has acquired along with the new territory. "Give us 250,000 to 500,000 young Jews from the United States over the next 10 years," we were told, "and we could integrate all the Arabs in the occupied areas, for such an *aliyah* would assure the Jewish character of our country and preserve a Jewish majority for the foreseeable future as the state's existence is made secure."

The Israelis and we agreed above all that this is a time in which Jewish fraternity and solidarity are more necessary than ever. If the vaunted Jewish capacity for creativity and imagination in human relationships really exists, this is when it must be called into action. The situation is not frozen; the main actors must not be inflexible. Plan after plan, bold new idea after bold new idea must be put forward, until the Arabs tire of saying "No" and the world unites on redeeming the Middle East for the sake of the redemption of mankind.

MAJOR BENEFITS OF THE CROPLAND ADJUSTMENT PROGRAM

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Anderson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the cropland adjustment program established under the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 provides many benefits to both farm and nonfarm people. And an indication of the farmer interest in the program is the fact that nearly 75,000 farmers offered about 6 million acres of their land to the program this year. Available funds permitted acceptance of only 2,012,556 acres from 30,810 farmers.

Among those offering land to the program were many older farmers wishing to retire, others growing old and desiring to reduce their farming operations, and still others with new interests, wishing to shift from farming to other endeavors. In the administration of the program, the Department of Agriculture gave preference to these groups, making it possible for some to retire from farming and remain on the land, and for others to take part-time or full-time off-farm jobs.

These new opportunities for farm people through the cropland adjustment program point up the important social and economic implications of this significant activity.

But not only are farmers benefited by CAP, city people as well share in the advantages it provides. Of the 2 million acres accepted into the program this year, about a fourth are open to public access, bringing the total acres under CAP now open to the public to 984,000 acres. This land is open to city folks free of charge for hunting, fishing, trapping, and hiking.

The basic objective of CAP, of course, is to maintain farm income, while shifting land out of crops in plentiful supply and into such conservation uses as open space, recreation, beautification, wildlife habitat, and abatement of air and water pollution.

However, despite the economic and social benefits of this program to both rural and urban people, in the face of a tight budgetary situation, this important activity may be temporarily suspended. But as soon as the situation eases, this program should be resumed to continue improving the quality of our environment while maintaining in reserve the productivity capacity for meeting additional food and fiber needs at home and abroad as these arise.

MASS PRODUCTION OF TAX-DODGING FOUNDATIONS TO BE INVESTIGATED

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Patman] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce that the Subcommittee on Foundations, Select Committee on Small Business, will start hearings on October 30, 1967, to take testimony on the mass production of foundations, an activity that could conceivably wreck the Treasury.

The first witnesses will be trustees and members of a recently discovered organization known as Americans Building

Constitutionally—ABC—Barrington, Ill., which allegedly instructs its members in how to avoid taxes by establishing their personal, tax exempt foundations.

Witnesses from Illinois and New York will be heard first, but before we are through, we may have to hear witnesses from many other States. We are not sure how widespread these operations are now, but we do know they could reach epidemic proportions.

Americans Building Constitutionally, for example, pitches its appeal to the upper-middle income group—doctors, lawyers, and other professionals.

Officials of this outfit are quite frank to admit they are attempting to mass-produce the tax-dodging specialities that were once associated only with millionaires. It looks like this group has set up a mammoth assembly line for turning out foundations.

If ABC continues to operate, and, if its success is what I think it could be, other groups will undoubtedly go into the same business. Tax-exempt foundations will be as commonplace in this country as bath-tub distilleries were during the prohibition era.

This could be the beginning of complete chaos for the Nation's tax structure.

ABC's tuition for instruction in tax-avoiding techniques comes high, possibly as high as $14,000 for tutoring in the mechanics of how to set up a foundation.

If ABC's claim of 800 members is correct, then it is entirely possible that the organization had gross receipts of at least $3 million and perhaps as much as $8 million in the past year, its first year of operation.

In my opinion, this will be one of our most important studies of tax-exempt foundations because it gets right into the possibility of massive and popular tax-dodging. When millionaires set up tax-dodging foundations, that is bad enough, but when foundations become as common as the model T once was, then the Government's income faces a real and grave peril.

America's political dream used to be a chicken in every pot and a car in every garage. If we ever reach the point where there is a tax-exempt foundation in every home and assets, such as a home and a car, are transferred to that foundation—that will be the beginning of a nightmare for Federal, State, and local governments and their tax collectors.

I must admit that the logic of the ABC system is difficult to dispute. The promoters of ABC take the position that the benefits of tax-dodging—via the foundation gimmick—should not accrue solely to the Rockefellers, the Fords, the Mellons, the Carnegies, and other millionaires. They believe that, even though that activity has its inception in the salons of financial buccaneers, the ordinary business and professional man should be allowed to do the same thing on a smaller scale.

It is an argument that is hard to answer. If the rich can minimize their taxes with the foundation gimmick, everyone else should have the same privilege. Obviously, there must be a reform of the tax-dodging foundation device from top to bottom.

For 5 years, the Subcommittee on Foundations has been compiling data on foundation activities. The subcommittee was the first to uncover the use of private, tax-exempt foundations by the Central Intelligence Agency. The subcommittee's investigations have also uncovered the widespread use of self-dealing foundations, whereby highly profitable businesses are operating under the guise of charity. Seven of the 600 foundations under study have been assessed about $28 million in taxes by the Treasury. In all, the subcommittee has issued five studies totaling more than 2,500 pages.

We have focused attention, not only on the abuse of tax laws by individual foundations but also on the lax attitude of the Treasury, whose officials have testified at previous subcommittee hearings that they have no idea how many foundations there are in the country. Treasury officials have also admitted that they audit only a small fraction of the foundations each year.

We shall also take testimony from Secretary of the Treasury Henry H. Fowler and Sheldon S. Cohen, Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service, in the upcoming hearings. After repeated goadings from our subcommittee, in February 1965 the Treasury finally proposed some foundation reforms to the tax-writing committees. But, even though those watered-down reforms represent only a minimum effort to curb abuses of tax-exempt foundations, the Department has not pushed for action on them. Indeed, over 2½ years have elapsed, and no legislation, in support of those proposals, has as yet been submitted by the Treasury.

The record speaks for itself. The Treasury must bear full responsibility for the proliferation of foundations and their use as a vehicle for abuse of public trust and tax evasion. Unfortunately, it has no more knowledge today of what goes on in the world of foundations than it had at the time of our hearings in 1964.

This continued erosion of our tax base has, of course, far-reaching effects on millions of taxpaying small businessmen who are forced to carry a still heavier tax burden while other Americans enjoy opportunities to reduce taxes. If the Treasury continues to ignore meaningful reforms, we will be faced with a revolt among those millions of taxpayers who are unable to take advantage of such contrivances.

Perhaps this investigation will propel the Treasury into action—for, they may now see the light. They may now see that the tax gimmicks available to the rich can soak down to the grassroots of the Nation and completely erode our tax base. For years, we have been trying to persuade the Treasury that the corruptive influences of the multimillion-dollar, tax-exempt foundations would eventually destroy the entire tax system. This present situation shows that our warning was no exaggeration.

I am hopeful that the upcoming hearings will prompt Congress to take swift and effective reform action. For, unless the Congress moves in that direction, the spread of foundations and their inherent accommodation to planned deception will create undreamed-of problems that Federal, State, and local governments will find impossible to cope with.

The following are among the witnesses who have, thus far, been asked to testify:

Mr. Robert D. Hayes, trustee, Americans Building Constitutionally, Post Office Box 575, Barrington, Ill.

Mr. James R. Walsh, member, Americans Building Constitutionally, Post Office Box 575, Barrington, Ill.

Dr. Michael R. Saxon, medical director, the Saxon Foundation, 143 South Lincoln Avenue, Aurora, Ill.

Mr. George Schuyler, president, Philippa Schuyler Memorial Foundation, 11 West 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the Reader's Digest has published in its October issue an article by Charles Stevenson which makes an unfair, unsound, and vicious attack on the social security program.

I join with Chairman WILBUR MILLS in saying that the half truths and misrepresentations in the article are a disservice to the millions of social security beneficiaries who depend upon the social security program.

I urge that every Member read Chairman MILL's splendid statement and the forceful point-by-point rebuttal of Mr. Stevenson's distorted presentation by the able Undersecretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Wilbur J. Cohen. Under Secretary Cohen has answered Mr. Stevenson's false charges.

Those who receive social security benefits and those who pay social security taxes should not fear for the soundness or integrity of the social security program. The benefits accruing to beneficiaries are secure and will continue to be so.

For the information of our colleagues and those who read this RECORD, I would like to insert Under Secretary Cohen's remarks in the RECORD at this point:

STATEMENT BY WILBUR J. COHEN, UNDER SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Mr. Charles Stevenson's article on "How Secure is Your Social Security?" in the October issue of the *Reader's Digest* is misleading, and, in my opinion, creates anxiety and fear about the financing of our social security system that are groundless.

I state categorically that:

The social security system is soundly financed.

Present and potential future beneficiaries of social security will get the benefits provided by the social security law.

I

Mr. Stevenson begins his article by saying our "social security insurance is in trouble." This is not so.

The subtitle of Mr. Stevenson's article

says that "Recent disclosures are raising grave doubts as to how much—if anything—today's taxpayer will get back when his time for retirement comes." Use of the words "disclosures," "grave doubts" and "if anything" can only result in worry to millions of people who are now drawing social security benefits or expect to draw them in the future. This worry is wholly without factual basis.

The article seeks to depict Chairman Wilbur D. Mills and the ranking minority member, Representative John W. Byrnes, of the House Committee on Ways and Means as profoundly alarmed about the basic design and fiscal integrity of the social security program and about the course that the program is taking. The facts, however, are that as recently as 5 weeks ago these men jointly supported legislation in the House of Representatives, the Social Security Amendments of 1967 (H.R. 12080), which builds upon the present social security program and, with careful attention to actuarial soundness, makes needed improvements in the benefits of the program.

The implication that Representative Byrnes, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, agrees with the charges made by Mr. Stevenson flies in the face of the fact that Mr. Byrnes was a co-sponsor of the social security bill now before Congress and is contradicted by his remarks on the floor of the House of Representatives during the debate on the bill. At that time he stated:

"I personally do not feel that the burdens imposed by this bill are greater than the taxpayers will be willing to pay. After all, today's taxpayer is tomorrow's beneficiary. I was very glad to join the chairman of our committee in sponsoring the social security bill—a bill which gives due consideration to the needs of our elderly citizens as well as those who are called upon to pay the taxes."

Representative Byrnes went on to say that: "Everyone paying taxes today can do so with the knowledge that he is participating in a sound program of social insurance which will provide commensurate benefits in the event of his death or disability."

The House Committee report on H.R. 12080, which was signed by 24 out of 25 of the members of the Committee on Ways and Means, bears ample witness to the care and thoroughness which the Committee has devoted to assuring the continued soundness of the social security program.

The proposals contained in H.R. 12080 were considered during 18 days of public hearings over a period of 6 weeks, and during 64 executive sessions over a period of 16 weeks. Following debate, the House approved the bill by the overwhelming non-partisan vote of 415 to 3. The bill reaffirms the soundness of the contributory, wage-related social security program.

The soundness of the social security system has been examined a number of times by groups of independent, nongovernmental representatives of business, insurance, labor, and the public.

In 1957, under the Eisenhower Administration, an Advisory Council on Social Security Financing was appointed by Secretary Flemming. It reported as follows:

"The Council finds that the present method of financing the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program is sound, practical, and appropriate for this program. It is our judgment, based on the best available cost estimate, that the contribution schedule enacted into law in the last session of Congress makes adequate provision for financing the program on a sound actuarial basis."

Among the members of the Council who made this statement were the President of a Federal Reserve bank, two actuaries—one from a private insurance company and one from a university—and representatives of business, labor and professional groups.

The most recent Advisory Council on Social Security, again made up of outstanding experts in the field, examined thoroughly all of the issues connected with the "security" of social security. Like the preceding council they concluded, in their report of January 1965, that the social security program is soundly financed and that its income—out into the long range future—will be sufficient to meet its obligations.

Both Advisory Councils took note of such charges as those made in the article to the effect that social security taxes are used for purposes other than social security, that the trust funds contain only IOU's, and that the system is "in the red" by hundreds of billions of dollars. Both Councils found these charges to be without foundation.

II

The article says that the social security program puts a "squeeze on the young." This is not so. The fact is that even without taking into account that social security benefits have been and will continue to be increased from time to time as changes occur in wage levels and cost of living, young workers as a group will get social security protection worth 20 to 25 percent more than they will pay in social security contributions. This is the case under present law and would be the case under the House-passed bill and under the Administration's proposal.

Young workers could not buy comparable insurance protection from private insurance companies at anywhere near the amount they pay for their social security protection.

The article takes no account of the fact that the benefits provided by the present social security law are very much lower than the benefits that will actually be paid when today's young workers reach retirement age. As wages rise—as they have throughout the history of the country—benefits can be increased *without increasing the contribution rates*. This is because the contributions are a percentage of covered payroll and because, as wages go up, income to the system increases more than the corresponding liabilities.

As a matter of fact, if benefits were *not* increased as wage levels rise over the years, the contribution rates scheduled in present law would be too high, and they could be reduced. Whether benefits are increased or contribution rates are reduced the result would be the same, namely, more protection in relation to contributions than is shown by analyses that assume no change in wage levels and in benefits.

The calculations referred to in the article assume that the covered employee would have within his control an amount of contributions paid by his employers equal to the amount of his own social security contribution. This assumption rests on a misconception of the nature of the social insurance program and indeed the nature of private group insurance. If such an assumption were used, the whole fabric of private group life insurance, annuity insurance, and other forms of group insurance in this country would have to be regarded as inequitable.

As a general rule, under private group insurance plans the employer contribution is not allocated to each employee in an amount related to the employee's own contribution. On the contrary the employer contribution, as in the case of social security, is what makes it possible to pay larger benefits to workers and their survivors who are in the upper age brackets when the group insurance plan goes into effect than could be paid only on the basis of the worker's own contributions.

I believe it bears repeating that even without taking into account the fact that benefits will be increased in future years, even young workers covered under social security will get insurance protection worth 20 to 25 percent more than the value of their contributions, and moreover, they will actually do much better than that when account is taken of the fact that social security benefits can and will be increased as wage levels go up without any need to increase the contribution rate.

In deciding whether younger people get their money's worth it must be kept in mind that social security provides not only retirement protection but also survivors and disability insurance protection. While Mr. Stevenson's figures do take into consideration the fact that social security provides protection against loss of income due to death and disability and also provides hospital insurance protection at age 65, most of his discussion ignores the importance of these parts of the program. That importance may be illustrated by an example: The value of the social security survivors insurance protection provided under the House-passed bill in the case of the worker whose earnings are about the median earnings of regularly employed men ($550 per month) who dies at age 35 leaving a wife aged 32 and two small children is about $56,000. Were this worker to become disabled at age 35, the value of the disability insurance protection to him and his family would be about $59,000.

Social security is a sound and equitable program for the young and the old.

III

Mr. Stevenson's article contains nearly two columns on the so-called *Nestor case*, decided by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1960 (pp. 76–77). Mr. Stevenson distorts the legal issues. He has several quotes which to a lawyer and a general reader would appear to be from the Court's decision. But they are *not*. He not only does not quote from the Court decision but fails to mention that the Court decision reversed the contention of the Justice Department brief (prepared in the Eisenhower Administration) that the program is not an insurance program. What the U.S. Supreme Court actually said was:

"The Social Security system may be accurately described as a form of social insurance, enacted pursuant to Congress' power to 'spend money in aid of the general welfare,' whereby persons gainfully employed, and those who employ them, are taxed to permit the payment of benefits to the retired and disabled, and their dependents."

The fact is that the Supreme Court decision rejected many of the contentions made in the brief and stated that: "The interest of a covered employee under the [Social Security] Act is of sufficient substance to fall within the protection from arbitrary governmental action afforded by the due process clause."

Thus, as the Supreme Court stated, although the Congress can modify rights granted under the statute, it cannot do so in an arbitrary way. The right to benefits under social security, as the Court has said, is protected under the due process clause of the United States Constitution against denial or diminution by arbitrary Government action.

IV

The article attempts to show that social security is unsound by referring to "unfunded outstanding obligations" of $350 billion and stating that under the Administration bill this amount will rise to $417 billion (pp. 79–80). The $350 billion referred to is the amount that would be needed—if social security were a private, voluntary insurance program—to pay off all obligations on the assumption that there would be no new entrants into the system. The idea of there being a huge unfunded liability in the social security system is wholly meaningless and irrelevant for any practical purposes. There is no need in a Government program such as social security for funding on the basis referred to in the article. It would not only be unnecessary but also unwise to build up such a huge accumulation of social security funds. No life insurance expert nor social security expert, nor business nor labor organization, and no Advisory Council or Committee of the Congress has ever recommended such funding.

The most recent Advisory Council on Social Security—an independent group of experts in the field which reviewed all aspects of the social security program over a period of 18 months—stated in its 1965 report:

"The Council is in agreement with the previous groups that have studied the financing of the program that it is unnecessary and would be unwise to keep on hand a huge accumulation of funds sufficient, without regard to income from new entrants, to pay all future benefits to past and present contributors. A compulsory social insurance program is correctly considered soundly financed if, on the basis of actuarial estimates, current assets plus future income are expected to be sufficient to cover all the obligations of the program; the present system meets this test. The claim sometimes made that the system is financially unsound, with an unfunded liability of some $300 billion, grows out of a false analogy with private insurance, which because of its voluntary character cannot count on income from new entrants to meet a part of future obligations for the present covered group."

V

The article is in error in saying that the social security changes recommended by President Johnson would take persons out of poverty "partly by raising the Federal income taxes" of other people over 65. (p. 79). Under the President's proposal, over 2 million persons would be removed from poverty (1.6 million aged 65 and over and 0.5 million under age 65) by the increase in the amount of the social security benefits—especially the increase in the minimum benefit from the present $44 a month to $70. There is no truth in the statement in the article that the method of removing these people from poverty would be through raising income taxes.

The article speaks disparagingly of the improvement of social security benefits for the purpose of reducing the number of persons on assistance or relief. But this has been the objective of the social security program since it was enacted in 1935! This was the original congressional intent. In fact, the carrying out of this intent has been one of social security's great achievements. The proportion of the aged on welfare has decreased from about 22 percent in 1950 to about 10 percent today. We hope to decrease the proportion to 5 percent. Increasing the level of social security benefits will aid in this objective.

VI

One more of the many inaccuracies contained in the article is the allegation in the article that social security contributions are put into the "Treasury's general fund." (p. 76). The fact is that the contributions are automatically appropriated by law to the social security trust funds, which are kept separate from one another and from the general funds of the Treasury and can be used only for the payment of the benefits and administrative expenses under the social security program.

VII

Mr. Stevenson says that the Government is discouraging beneficiaries from augmenting their incomes by collecting social security contributions with no comparable increase in benefits and by withholding benefits from those beneficiaries who earn over $1500 a year. (p. 79)

The purpose of the social security program as determined by the Congress is to pay benefits when there is a loss of earnings because of death, disability, or retirement. The law prescribes a test—generally referred to as the retirement test—for determining whether such loss of earnings has occurred. The amount of the retirement test and whether there should be any retirement test is certainly a question which warrants discussion.

What Mr. Stevenson didn't say in his article is that eliminating the retirement test would increase the cost of the program by $2 billion a year. The additional cost would be incurred to pay benefits to about 2 million people, many of whom are fully employed and earning as much as they ever did. The vast majority of social security beneficiaries—some 20 million other persons—either are unable to work or cannot find a job and therefore would not be helped one iota by the elimination of the retirement test. Would this be an intelligent and equitable way to spend $2 billion a year additional?

The author's statement that beneficiaries who work and pay social security contributions get "no comparable increase" in benefits may give the impression that this work cannot increase their benefits or that, if it can, the benefit increases are insignificant. The fact is that the beneficiary who works can get a benefit increase if he has even just a single year in which his earnings are more than his earnings in any one of the past years that were used in computing his benefits.

In short, Mr. Stevenson didn't tell a full or fair story on the retirement test.

VIII

The article concludes that further study of and basic changes in social security are called for. Some of the concluding remarks are repetitions of misleading assertions made earlier and some go further.

The article raises a number of questions about what will happen to the social security program in the future after whatever "temporary tinkering the House and Senate may do regarding the President's program"—as if the House and Senate are not comprised of the elected representatives of the American people and as if the President is not responsible to the American people. It is through such processes as the article calls "tinkering"—studied proposals such as those made by the President, and congressional deliberation and debates—that this Nation builds its public programs, orders its economy, and carries on the affairs of Government, and this will doubtless be true in the future.

The article goes on to suggest, on the basis of the increases in social security contribution rates that have been enacted over the years, that private pensions may not be able to remain "afloat." Such scaremongering ignores the fact that social security has not prevented the rapid growth of private pensions. Private pensions have made tremendous strides since the 1930's, when social security began. There were only about 400 private pension plans in 1935 when social security was enacted. Today there are over 60,000!

With regard to Mr. Stevenson's proposal to establish a "blue ribbon commission," over the years since the Committee on Economic Security submitted its report to President Roosevelt and the original Social Security Act was enacted in 1935, there have been numerous independent studies of social security by advisory councils composed of highly respected and knowledgeable citizens. For instance there was an Advisory Council Report in 1939, 1948, 1959, and 1965. Since 1956, studies by advisory councils have been provided for in the social security law itself, and there have been periodic studies by these councils. Through the councils, consisting of representatives of employees, employers, the self-employed, and the general public, the social security program has had the benefit of a great deal of intelligent and thoughtful examination. Under the law, the next advisory council, scheduled to be appointed in 1968 (under the bill recently passed by the House, it would be appointed in 1969), will review all aspects of the social security program, including the status of the social security trust funds in relation to the long-range commitments of the program and will make a report of its findings and recommendations to the Board of Trustees of each of the social security trust funds and to the Congress.

IX

Mr. Stevenson has not clarified any fundamental issues. He has not pointed out the great unmet social needs. What he has done has been a great disservice to the millions of social security beneficiaries and the millions who are counting on social security benefits in the future. He has obfuscated and confused the major policy issues in social security. A critical and constructive review of social security would be welcome. A glib and superficial attack on a program so important to millions of Americans is not a contribution to the American people.

IS THERE A BRAIN DRAIN?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Cohelan] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, recently we have heard considerable discussion of the scientific "brain drain," or, from the point of view of the United States, the "brain gain." This is the phenomenon which attracts to our country persons with highly developed skills and training who add considerably to our wealth of human resources.

Our very distinguished colleague, the Honorable Henry Reuss, of Wisconsin, long has been interested in this phenomenon and as chairman of the House Research and Technical Programs Subcommittee, has initiated an analysis of both the obvious benefits and the potential handicaps of the practice.

That these gifted scientists, engineers, physicians, and other professional workers greatly enrich our lives, is undisputed. They also add significantly to the quality and volume of our national product, and it is a great tribute to our Nation that so many talented persons are drawn to the United States in pursuit of their careers. But the report of Mr. Reuss' subcommittee also points out that in our effort to help underdeveloped countries, the "brain drain" may be at odds with our stated foreign policy goals and may require modification of our exchange programs.

The results of this report have attracted considerable comment, and I call to the attention of my colleagues the following press notice from the October 2 edition of the Wall Street Journal:

The Outlook: Appraisal of Current Trends in Business and Finance

While the United States has been losing its dollars and gold to foreigners at a fast clip during most of the postwar period, our nation has been attracting a significant share of the world's skilled human capital. Partly because the balance-of-payments deficit lends itself to more precise documentation, the outflow of such measureable wealth has received much publicity. In the somewhat intangible area of human resources, less has been said about the U.S. being the major gainer in the global movement of scientists, engineers, doctors, teachers and other such skilled people.

The "brain drain"—the term used to describe this movement of top-level manpower from Western Europe and developing countries to the U.S.—is not a new phenomenon, of course. To take only the nuclear and space fields, Americans are well acquainted with the heavy contributions of such skilled emigres as Einstein, Fermi and von Braun. But only recently has there been much study devoted to the dimensions of the migration of talented manpower and to the ramifications for the U.S. and other economies.

In the Government's breakdown of immigration figures, "professional, technical and kindred workers" are separated in one category. Using this as a measurement of the "brain drain," one finds that, in fiscal 1966, 30,039 such people, or 9.3% of the total of 323,040 U.S. immigrants that year, took up residence in this country. The 30,000 represented a 58% increase over the influx a decade earlier.

The growing magnetism the affluent U.S. has for the highly skilled is even more apparent when, among the professions, one isolates figures for the immigration of just scientists, engineers and physicians. A recent report by the House Research and Technical Programs subcommittee showed this so-called scientific immigration in fiscal 1966 was a whopping 77% higher than in 1956. The 1966 gain over 1965 was 32% alone.

The "brain drain"—or, from the U.S. viewpoint, the "brain gain"—is a sore subject to many foreign governments, economists and businessmen. They show little inclination to accept the U.S. Administration's view that the problem has been exaggerated. Instead, the foreigners, with support from many American analysts, believe the U.S. is benefiting hugely at their expense in the area of human resources.

In a recent London speech, Prof. Richard M. Titmuss of the London School of Economics said: "Since 1949 the U.S. has absorbed—and to some extent deliberately recruited—100,000 doctors, scientists and engineers from developed and developing countries. In about 18 years the U.S. will have saved some $4 billion by not having to educate and train, or train fully, this vast quantity of human capital." In such "borrowing" of skilled talent, he added, "no payment is made to the lending country, there are no interest charges and there is no intention of repaying the loan."

America's seeming boon goes far beyond escaping the cost of training the talented immigrants. The new arrivals almost always are instant producers-consumers, adding to our GNP by their production of goods and services and by their outlays for housing, cars, food and so on. And the influx of this talent has helped ease the critical shortage of technical skills that has marked much of this country's current economic expansion, which this month will equal the record 80-month expansion that spanned World War II.

Though the actual numbers may seem small, the impact of the "brain drain" is severest on developing countries. As the House report notes, some advanced countries have large reserves of professionals; and some, such as Britain and Canada, benefit from an inflow of talent from other lands. But the loss of even a few highly skilled persons can be a serious blow to countries struggling to climb the development ladder and achieve higher living standards.

A UNESCO report shows that in 1962 the 18 Chilean engineers who came to the U.S. were a fifth of Chile's new engineering graduates that year. The Dominican Republic in 1962 supplied 72 physicians and 44 engineers to the U.S.—more than a third of that nation's new doctors and two-thirds of its new engineers. The 30 Israeli physicians who came here that year were an astonishing 41.7% of its new doctors.

Helping spur the influx is the liberalization of U.S. immigration policy; recent acts, among other things, give preference to aliens who have skills that are in short supply in this country. Further steps this year and in 1968 in the abandonment of national origin quotas for immigrants are expected to increase greatly the inflow of scientific talent, especially from Asia.

Opinions about the "brain drain" vary widely. Some people, the House report notes, say the whole subject is just so much "hullabaloo" and that the U.S. should not be misled into treating scholarly migration as a problem. Others believe the migration is really a boon for all parties; they argue that, as with international trade, movements of "human capital" eventually maximize benefits for all participants; thus a Dominican engineer in the U.S. may make an advance that in the long run will benefit his homeland.

But there appears to be growing opinion that the drain is a serious problem—and not just for the lands losing their skilled. For the U.S. there is this vexing question: Are we spending billions to aid struggling countries while at the same time siphoning off those specialists needed to make the aid effective?

Evidence in the House report indicates the U.S. indeed may be undermining a major foreign policy objective. The main targets of our aid program have been 13 developing nations. These lands supplied the U.S. with 2,563 scientific professionals in fiscal 1966. In terms of training costs, this amounts to an involuntary gift to the U.S. of more than $50 million. This "reverse foreign aid" more than offset the $40 million the U.S. spent that year to give technical training to persons in the same countries.

—Sterling E. Soderlind.

JOBS

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Cohelan] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, all too often bold and imaginative programs of the Federal Government are criticized for failing to provide immediate and total solutions to age-old problems rather than being praised for their ability to accomplish meaningful, if only partial solutions. It would be unfortunate and utterly unfair if such were the case with President Johnson's newly announced program to mobilize the total resources of private industry and the Federal Government in a partnership to find jobs and provide training for thousands of America's hard-core unemployed.

Since this administration began its war on poverty great strides have been made in the education and training of the disadvantaged, the unemployed, and underemployed. But much remains to be done. That is why I wholeheartedly welcome this new forward step to aid the disadvantaged and eliminate from our ghettos what we have come to call the hard-core unemployed.

I find this idea, as spelled out by the Secretaries of Labor and Commerce, most appealing, indeed. It will mean that private enterprise will be encouraged either to set up new operations or to expand its old operations, with the hard-core jobless being trained and hired to fill the new jobs. With the Government agreeing to take up the slack against any possible financial loss, I am sure this not only can but will go far toward providing employment for those who have for much too long been the occupational outcasts of our increasingly technological society.

It will mean a concentration and consolidation of the many antipoverty programs. It will mean on-the-job training for those who need it most, exactly where they need it most.

It represents an important extension to the existing concentrated employment programs which have already had committed some $95 million in Federal funds for manpower development and training programs and other special projects to aid the disadvantaged.

I think the President and his administration should be commended for this imaginative step forward in tandem with private enterprise.

THE TRUE ISSUE IN VIETNAM

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Monagan] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, in my judgment there is some substance to the charge that spokesmen for the administration have tended at different times to stress different reasons for our military commitment in Vietnam. I am not sure that the President himself has always kept the main purpose of our involvement in the forefront of his advocacy.

Certainly this is not an easy thing to do and yet it is vitally important. That is why President Johnson's recent speech—September 29, 1967—in San Antonio, Tex., is so particularly pertinent. Its significance does not lie in the fact that it will still all criticism or solve all doubts about our course, but it will tend to place the debate where it should be and make the issue the security of the United States rather than the many other fringe issues that have been raised from time to time.

In this connection, an editorial in the Wall Street Journal of October 6, 1967, seems to be highly pertinent; and since it expresses this point of view so effectively, I append it to these remarks:

The True Issue in Vietnam

The Administration's latest round of comments on Vietnam is noteworthy, it seems to us, principally for its heavy emphasis on how the war relates to the security of the United States itself.

Most of the public attention has focused instead on hints of a slightly softer attitude toward a bombing pause. But there is probably less to this shift than meets the eye, and the only upshot may be another teapot tempest about what the Administration has or has not said. The emphasis on security considerations, by contrast, could actually help sweep away a few of the cobwebs that clutter the Vietnam issue in the national mind.

The Administration's stated goals in the war, admittedly, have always included discouraging aggression to prevent a larger war later, which obviously relates to America's long-range security. But until now its spokesmen have never given this goal the nearly undivided stress it deserves. Too often the President and his aides have spoken of helping the unfortunate people of Vietnam, and of building an entire Asian order "worthy of American dreams and . . . worthy of our brave men who are dying."

A lot of the public agony over the war today is backlash from that kind of talk. The man in the street sees that the Vietnamese elections aren't any better than Cook County's. He learns that corruption is rampant in Vietnam. He hears that too often the Vietnamese army won't fight to defend its own countrymen. He senses that all this isn't worthy of his dreams, and understandably asks why American boys should die to build that.

It happens to be true, we are convinced, that for all its blemishes South Vietnamese society will turn out better in the long run if the Americans succeed there than if they fail. We are equally convinced that American success in Vietnam would be a good thing for the people of Thailand, Japan, Australia and even ultimately mainland China. But these benefits must always remain incidental ones; no amount of altruism can begin to justify any President's decision to draft American boys and send them to war.

If America is right to send soldiers to Vietnam, it is not for these reasons but for those President Johnson outlined so cogently the other night: "I cannot tell you tonight as your President that a Communist conquest of South Vietnam would be followed by a Communist conquest of Southeast Asia. . . . Your American President cannot tell you with certainty that a Southeast Asia dominated by Communist power would bring a third world war much closer to terrible reality. . . .

"But all that we have learned in this tragic century strongly suggests to me that it would be so. And as President of the United States, I am not prepared to risk the security—indeed the survival—of this American nation on mere hope and wishful thinking. I am convinced that by seeing this struggle through now, we are greatly reducing the chances of a much larger war—perhaps a nuclear war."

There is plenty of room for argument over this conception, as Senators Dirksen and Fulbright demonstrated in their debate this week. Ho Chi Minh, after all, presents scant menace to America. Any real danger comes from mainland China, which threatens to combine a significant nuclear arsenal with undamped world-conquering ideology. Perhaps that China may collapse under its own ideological fantasies. Perhaps a Communist but nationalist and anti-Chinese Vietnam would itself contain China in Southeast Asia. Perhaps some other theater than Vietnam is, or at least was, the logical place to demonstrate that Maoist myth is wrong in seeing support of "wars of national liberation" as a cheap and riskless method of conquest.

These possibilities, though, are by and large not what the Administration's critics are talking about. They talk about the travesty of destroying traditional South Vietnam, about Premier Ky and such being unworthy of our affection. The critics are trying to tell America it should withdraw from Vietnam on the grounds that it has failed in its altruistic mission. Yet that mission and the arguments derived from it are simply beside the point.

The Administration, whether or not you are persuaded by its arguments, at least has started to talk directly and unmistakably to the real point. The issue to debate about Vietnam is America's own security and nothing else.

PREFERENCE FOR NEWSWEEK

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. Olsen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have received a telegram from Mr. Gibson McCabe, the president of Newsweek magazine in which he disassociates his magazine from the refreshing and learned viewpoint expressed by Prof. Milton Friedman's recent column entitled "The Post Office." I insert Mr. McCabe's telegram at this point in the Record so that the Members of the House will understand his viewpoint:

Newsweek,
New York, N.Y., October 6.

Hon. Arnold Olsen,
House of Representatives,
Longworth Building, Washington, D.C.

In reference to your statement in the October 4 Congressional Record concerning the Milton Friedman article in the October 9 issue of Newsweek entitled "The Post Office" I cannot object to your allegation that we recognize that users of second class mail receive preferential rates. I do object to the implication in your remarks that Newsweek and Professor Friedman are in complete agreement on what he has to say in that article. Newsweek has for many years used signed opinion by various columnists with whose views we have not necessarily either agreed or disagreed. We have not attempted either to censor their articles nor have we failed to publish those articles with which we may not have agreed. An example of this is our publication of Mr. Friedman's assertion that publishers of periodicals and newspapers prefer the status quo to a situation in which they would be forced to defend the subsidy they receive directly and openly. Professor Friedman's statement is not only incorrect on his part but your remark that it is factual is questionable indeed. Postmaster General O'Brien's proposal for an entirely new concept of the postal service originally made at a luncheon at Magazine Day in Washington last spring received the wholehearted support of most magazine publishers including newsweek.

The editor of the Congressional Record was totally incorrect in headlining your statement in the October 4 Congressional Record "Magazine Recognizes Postal Subsidy." Surely you must recognize the difference between the views of a columnist and the views of the management of a magazine. I trust that you will set the record straight by disassociating Newsweek from Professor Friedman in this matter.

Cordially,

Gibson McCabe,
President, Newsweek.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Foley (at the request of Mr. Adams), for Tuesday, October 10, 1967, on account of official business.

Mr. St. Onge (at the request of Mr. Adams), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Edwards of Alabama (at the request of Mr. Steiger of Arizona), for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Schwengel (at the request of Mr. Steiger of Arizona), for 30 minutes, on October 12; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. Perkins.

Mr. Whitten during the consideration of the conference report on H.R. 10509 and to include tables and related material.

Mr. Hanley to include extraneous matter during debate on the bill H.R. 7977.

(The following Members (at the requests of Mr. Steiger of Arizona) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Teague of California.

Mr. Horton.

Mr. Edwards of Alabama.

Mr. Robison.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 678. An act to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Upper and Lower Chehalis Tribes of Indians in Claims Commission docket numbered 237, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3979. An act to amend section 6409 (b)(1) of title 39, United States Code, which relates to transportation compensation paid by the Postmaster General; and

H.R. 11722. An act to authorize certain construction at military installations and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 43 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 11, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 5910. A bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Pawnee Indian Tribe of Oklahoma; with amendment (Rept. No. 747). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 7820. A bill to cancel certain construction costs and irrigation assessments chargeable against lands of the Fork Peck Indian Reservation, Mont.; with amendment (Rept. No. 748). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. H.R. 1499. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 300th anniversary of the explorations of Father Jacques Marquette in what is now the United States of America; with amendment (Rept. No. 749). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. H.R. 10105. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the founding of the State of Mississippi. (Rept. No. 750). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. H.R. 10160. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding of the American Legion (Rept. No. 751). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. H.R. 13212. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 200th anniversary of the founding of San Diego (Rept. No. 752). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 809. An act for the relief of Dr. Youssef (Joseph) Selim Hasbani (Rept. No. 753). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DOWDY: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1592. A bill for the relief of Dr. Rene Jose Triay (Rept. No. 754). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3516. A bill for the relief of Andres Mauricio Candela, M.D.; with amendment (Rept. No. 755). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CAHILL: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3525. A bill for the relief of Israel Mizrahy, M.D.; with amendment (Rept. No. 756). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DOWDY: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3528. A bill for the relief of Isaac Chervony, M.D. (Rept. No. 757). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5186. A bill for the relief of Dr. Armando Cobelo (Rept. No. 758). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DOWDY: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4974. A bill for the relief of Dr. Manuel A. Turbat; with amendment (Rept. No. 759). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3866. A bill for the relief of Dr. Eduardo Enrique Ramos (Rept. No. 760). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ROONEY of New York:

H.R. 13388. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 13389. A bill to study the advisability of establishing an International Development Corps; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 13390. A bill to require reports to Congress of certain actions of the Federal Power Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 13391. A bill to extend the tariff quota treatment for certain stainless steel table flatware; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 13392. A bill to amend section 521(f) of title 38, United States Code, so as to provide that the retirement income of a veteran's spouse will not be imputed to the veteran for pension purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 13393. A bill to provide assistance to institutions of higher education to establish programs for the training of law enforcement officers, and to establish fellowships to encourage students to pursue careers in law enforcement; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 13394. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide special assistance for the improvement of laboratory animal research facilities; to establish standards for the humane care, handling, and treatment of laboratory animals in departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States and by recipients of grants, awards, and contracts from the United States; to encourage the study and improvement of the care, handling, and treatment and the development of methods for minimizing pain and discomfort of laboratory animals used in biomedical activities; and to otherwise assure humane care, handling, and treatment of laboratory animals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARSHA:

H.R. 13395. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on whole skins of mink, whether or not dressed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.R. 13396. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to establish research and planning programs with respect to the prevention and restoration of eutrophic lakes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 13397. A bill to protect consumers by requiring that imported meat and meat food products made in whole or in part with imported meat bear a label showing the country or origin of such imported meat; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 13398. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LLOYD:

H.R. 13399. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on whole skins of mink and plates made of whole skins of mink; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H.R. 13400. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to raise needed additional revenues by tax reform; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 13401. A bill to authorize certain foreign governments to proceed with their plans for chanceries in the District of Columbia in accordance with their agreement with the government of the District of Columbia entered into in 1958; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 13402. A bill authorizing the use of certain buildings in the District of Columbia for chancery purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 13403. A bill to amend the act of October 13, 1964, to regulate the location of chanceries and other business offices of foreign governments in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 13404. A bill to amend the act of October 13, 1964, regulating the location of chanceries in the District of Columbia, to permit five large tracts of land in the District of Columbia to be used for chancery purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PICKLE:

H.R. 13405. A bill to amend the Nurse Training Act of 1964 to provide for increased assistance to hospital diploma schools of nursing; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WATSON:

H.R. 13406. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to limit the categories of questions required to be answered under penalty of law in the decennial censuses of population, unemployment, and housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ZWACH:

H.R. 13407. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act in order to authorize comprehensive pilot programs in lake pollution prevention and control; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 13408. A bill to amend the John F. Kennedy Center Act to prohibit the erection of any building within 1,000 feet of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts in the District of Columbia without the approval of the Center's trustees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland:

H.R. 13409. A bill to amend the John F. Kennedy Center Act to prohibit the erection of any building within 1,000 feet of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts in the District of Columbia without the approval of the Center's trustees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 13410. A bill to amend the John F. Kennedy Center Act to prohibit the erection of any building within 1,000 feet of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts in the District of Columbia without the approval of the Center's trustees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 13411. A bill to amend the John F. Kennedy Center Act to prohibit the erection of any building within 1,000 feet of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts in the District of Columbia without the approval of the Center's trustees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.R. 13412. A bill to amend the John F. Kennedy Center Act to prohibit the erection of any building within 1,000 feet of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts in the District of Columbia without the approval of the Center's trustees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BURKE of Florida:

H.R. 13413. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide special assistance for the improvement of laboratory animal research facilities; to establish standards for the humane care, handling, and treatment of laboratory animals in departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States and by recipients of grants, awards, and contracts from the United States; to encourage the study and improvement of the care, handling, and treatment and the development of methods for minimizing pain and discomfort of laboratory animals used in biomedical activities; and to otherwise assure humane care, handling, and treatment of laboratory animals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 13414. A bill to amend the Nurse Training Act of 1964 to provide for increased assistance to hospital diploma schools of nursing; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 13415. A bill to amend section 1114 of title 18, United States Code, so as to extend its protection to postmasters, officers, and employees of the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13416. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make it unlawful to assault or kill any member of the armed services engaged in the performance of his official duties while on duty under orders of the President under chapter 15 of title 10 of the United States Code or paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 3500 of title 10 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13417. A bill to extend the tariff quota treatment for certain stainless steel table flatware; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 13418. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make it unlawful to assault or kill any member of the armed services engaged in the performance of his official duties while on duty under orders of the President under chapter 15 of title 10 of the United States Code or paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 3500 of title 10 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 13419. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States to permit the free entry of certain cellophane membrane; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 13420. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to improve the classification of civilian positions of security guard at stations and installations of the military departments under the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McDADE:

H.R. 13421. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make it unlawful to assault or kill any member of the armed services engaged in the performance of his official duties while on duty under orders of the President under chapter 15 of title 10 of the United States Code or paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 3500 of title 10 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHEN:

H.R. 13422. A bill to amend section 1346 of title 28, United States Code, to permit suits against the United States arising out of contracts entered into by nonappropriated fund activities of or under departments and agencies of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORTON (for himself and Mr. CAREY):

H.R. 13423. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, to permit the free entry of citizens of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands into the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 13424. A bill to amend the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966, as amended, to extend the period of time within which the Commission on Marine Science, Engineering, and Resources is to submit its final report and to provide for a fixed expiration date for the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 13425. A bill to extend to volunteer fire companies and volunteer ambulance and rescue companies the rates of postage on second class and third class bulk mailings applicable to certain nonprofit organizations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 13426. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to provide that monthly social security benefit payments shall not be included as income for the purposes of determining eligibility for a pension under title 38; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 13427. A bill to extend to volunteer fire companies and volunteer ambulance and rescue companies the rates of postage on second class and third class bulk mailings applicable to certain nonprofit organizations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 13428. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to provide that monthly social security benefit payments shall not be included as income for the purposes of determining eligibility for a pension under title 38; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.J. Res. 879. Joint resolution creating a Federal Committee on Nuclear Development to review and reevaluate the existing civilian nuclear program of the United States; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H.J. Res. 880. Joint resolution creating a Federal Committee on Nuclear Development to review and reevaluate the existing civilian nuclear program of the United States; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.J. Res. 881. Joint resolution to provide for a study of the resources of the ocean floor by the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development, and prevent certain premature actions which might adversely affect the interests of the United States in such resources; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.J. Res. 882. Joint resolution creating a Federal Committee on Nuclear Development to review and reevaluate the existing civilian nuclear program of the United States; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. Con. Res. 523. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the elimination of the Castro Communist regime of Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BLACKBURN:

H. Con. Res. 524. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the elimination of the Castro Communist regime of Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. Con. Res. 525. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the elimination of the Castro Communist regime of Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. Con. Res. 526. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the conduct of the struggle in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 527. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States should take all military measures involving the use of nonatomic weapons as are necessary to secure a complete and rapid military victory in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 528. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States withdraw from South Vietnam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 13429. A bill for the relief of Rosaria Ilardi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 13430. A bill for the relief of Chee Chui Lum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IRWIN:

H.R. 13431. A bill for the relief of Iolanda Clara Masotta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHEN:

H.R. 13432. A bill for the relief of Ledi Papadakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 13433. A bill for the relief of Dr. Julio Epifanio Morera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 13434. A bill for the relief of Nicola Gemmiti and his wife, Michela Gemmiti, and their child, Piero Gemmiti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 13435. A bill for the relief of Francois E. Alouf; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of New York:

H.R. 13436. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Giuseppa Patane; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 13437. A bill for the relief of Milica Ralic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 13438. A bill for the relief of Caridad Suarez-Amparo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

174. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the city of Monte Sereno, Calif., relative to sharing Federal income tax revenues with States and local agencies, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Congressman Horton Condemns Captive Status of Baltic States and Asks Special Stamp To Commemorate 50th Anniversary of Their Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 10, 1967

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the saddest commentaries on the respect according to the United Nations International Covenants on Human Rights is the plight of the three Baltic States—Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. These countries were ruled by the Russian czars from the 18th century until shortly after the Bolshevik revolution. On November 15, 1917, the Soviet Government decreed that all minorities in the former czarist empire would be granted full self-determination. Following this decree, the Baltic States declared their independence—Lithuania on December 11, 1917; Estonia on February 24, 1918; and Latvia on November 18, 1918.

A period of nationalistic development and outstanding agricultural and commercial growth ensued. Literature, art, and music indigenous to the respective populations flourished. Agrarian reforms were widespread, as distribution of arable land reached the majority of the people. A sophisticated cooperative system of processing and distributing certain products was formulated. International trade was extensive, due to steadily rising agricultural and industrial production and the excellent seaports on the Baltic Sea.

The Baltic peoples enjoyed their freedom for only slightly more than two decades. The Soviet Union brutally occupied their countries and absorbed them into its territory on June 16, 1940. Thereafter, a tragic and cruel program of Russification and communization was imposed upon the Baltics. Hundreds of thousands of people were seized and murdered or deported to slave labor camps in Siberia. Art, literature, and music were censored. All creative or nationalistic people and the mass media were forced to adhere strictly to the party line.

Every effort has been made to brainwash the Baltic peoples into the Soviet sphere. Unlike the satellite countries, they are Soviet constituent republics. Hence, they have no political or economic policies of their own. Moscow either determines all important directives or assigns such decisions to the increasingly large number of Russians who have emigrated to these countries and who hold high positions in their governments. It is startling to find that by 1965, as a result of the resettlement of Balts and the influx of Soviet colonists, at least 20 percent of the population of the Baltic States was Russian. Furthermore, this percentage seems to be rising.

Most Western countries, including the United States, do not recognize the forcible annexation of the Baltic States by the Soviet Union. One of our basic foreign policy principles is the right of every country to self-determination.

This coming year will mark the 50th anniversary of the independence of the Baltic States. In honor of the courage of these subjugated people and in support of their efforts in the struggle against repression, I have written to the Postmaster General, proposing the issuance of a commemorative stamp in 1968. I believe that this stamp would serve as a reminder that the Baltic people fervently desire to fulfill their goal of independence. It would also reaffirm our country's moral interest in and ultimate hope for self-determination for the Baltic States.

Clifton C. Williams, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 10, 1967

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, for most of us, the death of a young man is one of the hardest and most tragic of all circumstances. When the young man is a leader, a man who has excelled in his every endeavor, we feel the loss even more deeply when he is taken from us.

On Thursday last week our country lost such a young man in Clifton C. "Curtis" Williams, Jr., of Mobile, Ala. He was an astronaut in NASA's manned space flight program, and a major in the U.S. Marine Corps.

Curtis Williams exemplified everything that is meritorious in young American manhood. As a native of Mobile, Ala., he was the kind of man of whom any community would be proud.

Last week, just 9 days after his 35th birthday, Curtis Williams died when his airplane crashed to the ground in Florida. Yesterday morning he was buried with full military honors at Arlington National Cemetery and it was my privilege to be present at the very impressive ceremony.

Curtis Williams was brought up in Mobile, and attended the Murphy High School. He went on in his education to attend Spring Hill College in Mobile and then received a bachelor of science degree in mechanical engineering at Auburn University.

His career was distinguished as a test pilot of both land-based and carrier-based aircraft. He accumulated more than 2,500 hours of flying time, including more than 2,100 hours in jet aircraft.

At the time of his death he was one of the third group of astronauts selected by NASA in October 1963. He was a backup pilot for the Gemini 10 mission, and was an expert in the launch operations and crew safety aspects of manned space flight.

In his home town of Mobile, Curtis Williams was thought of as the kind of hero who serves as a model for younger boys and men. His character, his achievements, his ability, and his promise, all merited that kind of admiration and appreciation.

Our deepest sympathies go out to Mrs. Williams, Jane, and to their 9-month-old daughter, Catherine Ann, and to Curtis Williams' parents, Mr. and Mrs. Clifton C. Williams, of Mobile.

Their loss is a very personal one. For the rest of us, we know that the Nation has lost a leader, while at the same time we are grateful that men like Curtis Williams have seen fit to devote their lives for the welfare and the security of our country.

"Who Killed Cock Robin?"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 10, 1967

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, do you remember that old bit of doggerel that goes:

> "Who killed Cock Robin?"
> "I," said the sparrow,
> "With my bow and arrow,
> I killed Cock Robin."

And, then:

> "Who saw him die?"
> "I," said the Fly,
> "With my little eye,
> I saw him die."

But the question of the moment—and its answer is of more than passing importance—is: "Who killed the tax increase bill?"

Of course, such a question presumes the fact that the President's surtax proposal is really dead—a presumption that brings to mind Mark Twain's cable from London to the Associated Press, back in 1897, when he answered reports of his sudden demise by advising:

> The reports of my death are greatly exaggerated.

But, Mr. Speaker, we have been given rather ample evidence of the fact that the tax-increase bill is dead—at least for now.

Whether or not it can somehow be revived before rigor mortis sets in remains to be seen, but I should imagine that there are more than a few around here who would be perfectly content to let that process run its usually inevitable course—who are perfectly content with the present situation in that, at the very least, it has postponed for them the necessity to cast what would surely be one of the most difficult votes of this, or any recent, congressional session.

However, I happen to find the present stalemate an unsatisfactory one from several aspects, chief among which is the fact that it is only further unsettling an already unsettled economy—only further confusing an already confused public.

The President, himself, touched on one facet of all this in his homey little talk last Friday to Federal Home Loan Bank officials and others at the White House. According to news reports of that talk, he mentioned the fact that interest rates have been going up in recent months—as indeed they have in the bond market since the Ways and Means Committee shelved the tax increase bill. And this, with the Federal Government expecting to be required to borrow as much as $12.2 billion from the public in 1968—which would be about $9 billion more than during 1967—if, note, the President gets his tax increase, is something to worry about. If the President does not get his tax increase, he may have to borrow as much as $20 billion to finance the then anticipated deficit.

So, you see, Mr. Speaker, that the current shadow boxing that is going on around here—the "Alphonse-Gaston" kind of act we have been putting on—is contributing to an inflationary psychology which is already too assertive in the business community and elsewhere. And we ignore that fact only at our common peril.

Mr. Speaker, under normal conditions the Nation could afford the luxury of a debate between the President and the Congress as to whose responsibility it is to act first in the politically unpalatable task of making reductions in Federal expenditures. It may well be that the Congress has the ultimate responsibility—and that is a responsibility I do not wish to duck—but in the near crisis situation in which we find ourselves, it does seem to me that the President has the primary responsibiltiy.

In addition to that, rightly or wrongly—and I believe rightly—this House has already clearly expressed its belief that, rather than alleviating the inflationary pressures that are all around us, an income tax increase now, unless the same is coupled with a near comparable reduction in Federal spending, might merely aggravate those pressures.

Several times, now, a message to this effect has been sent by this body down to the White House—but the occupant of that mansion continues to ignore that message in favor of going on with the currently unproductive debate, and one would have to go back 20 years to the near institutional breakdown between President Truman and the 80th Congress to find a comparable impasse to the one that has now developed here.

Now, how can this impasse be solved—this deadlock broken?

By the House, virtually on its own since the other body seems to be headed in an opposite direction, looking over such appropriation bills as we have thus far considered and seeing what items therein contained are susceptible to rescission?

It seems to me not—though I am sure of the sincerity with which the chairman of our Appropriations Committee [Mr. MAHON] approaches this difficult task he has set for himself—and for us.

Whatever the true answer, however, a new—and, I believe, salutory—dimension has now been added to that on-going debate by the statement released last weekend by the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the able gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS].

Mr. Speaker, I hope every Member of this House will obtain copies of Mr. MILLS' statement, and consider carefully what he has said.

I am particularly gratified by his defense of the actions thus far taken by this House in bringing this matter to a head. In his words:

> Contrary to the impression that is sometimes given by intemperate critics of the Congress, these actions are not irresponsible, bullheaded, or spiteful nor are they maneuvers for partisan advantage.
>
> They are, on the contrary, an expression of the anxiety which many members of Congress feel—fortified by the uneasiness they found in their constituencies over the recent Labor Day recess—about the recent sharp rise in Federal outlays and the proliferation of Federal Government activity.

And, then, Mr. MILLS makes this point—and are you listening, Mr. President?

> We are trying to get this message across: We want to pause in this headlong rush toward ever bigger Government.

Mr. Speaker, to our colleague's considerable credit, he has put the current debate into better focus than it has been heretofore. He has turned our attention away from expenditure reductions in fiscal 1968—important though those may be—by pointing out that our emphasis on them is only a protest, the point of which has evidently been as much missed by the White House as it has by many of us. And he does this, saying:

> The level of expenditures in fiscal 1968 or 1969, in itself, is not our greatest concern. Our focus, properly, is on controlling the growth of Federal claims on the Nation's production capability over the years and on making sure that the kinds of things the Federal Government does—the nature of its claims on the economy—conform with the Nation's changing preferences.

And finally, after referring to the fact that—

> This kind of buckpassing (that has been going on) makes it all the more difficult to come to grips with our real problem.

Mr. MILLS concludes:

> What is required is a clear-cut acknowledgment by *all* of us who participate in Federal policy-making that our objective is establishing firm control over the course of fiscal developments, i.e., over the amount and *character* of Federal spending in the *future*. For this purpose, spending cuts this year are not the basic ingredient, welcome as they will be. What is essential, rather, is change in spending programs. We have to focus sharply on *what* the Government is to *do* as well as on how much it is to *spend*.

And, Mr. Speaker, regardless of on whose shoulders may have rested the primary responsibility for ending that impasse I have mentioned, in the form in which it was previously understood by many, it now seems doubly clear that only the President can actually move to give the Congress—and the people—the kind of reevaluation of all Federal programs both seem to be demanding. And I was especially glad to note the rather surprisingly objective analysis of this fact as made, editorially, by the Washington Post yesterday morning and, under leave to do so, its comments are now set forth:

A NEW FISCAL DIMENSION

> Perhaps—after the rhetorical gunsmoke settles—the current fiscal encounter between Congress and the White House will prove to be just another in a long series of skirmishes that are resolved by token reductions in Federal expenditures. But Chairman Wilbur D. Mills of the House Ways and Means Committee opened a new dimension of an old dialogue by insisting that effective expenditure control can only be achieved by examining and making basic changes in Federal programs, not by "the broad ax spending slash approach." Surely that argument should be regarded as more than a tactical maneuver in an essentially sterile quarrel.
>
> The real issues in the debate over Federal spending are obscured by ideological fog. "Liberals" automatically support the growth of Federal expenditures, especially those for non-military programs, while "conservatives" are quick to condemn them. But responses that are as predictable as the patellar reflex scarcely do justice to otherwise rational men. They should instead be concerned with two principal issues. How much of the Nation's resources should be transferred by taxation or borrowing from private consumption to public or collective consumption? Here there is question of registering the preferences of the electorate, an admittedly imperfect process. The second issue, assuming that preferences are known, involves the effectiveness of public expenditures. Are Federal programs assigned their proper priorities, and are specific programs achieving their stated goals?
>
> The question of preferences—how much income Americans really want to transfer to the public sector—is at the heart of the dispute between Congress and the President. Mr. Mills maintains that the electorate is alarmed by the rapid growth of Federal spending in recent years and wishes to "curb the momentum of expanding Government activity." The Chairman's judgment could prove wrong. But no light at all is thrown on the issue when the Administration replies that Federal expenditures are below 16 per cent of the gross national product. Expenditures as a percentage of the GNP can decline while the absolute rise is very great, perhaps far greater than desired.
>
> Interest groups frustrate efforts to control expenditures or assure their effectiveness. Once a Federal program is launched, strong, if not ineluctable pressures are exerted to expand it. That is why Congress is reluctant to levy a "temporary" increase in taxes. When funds are available, they tend to be spent, thus assuring the permanence of the increase in the level of Federal expenditures.
>
> There are those who argue that no effort should be made to control expenditures because Congress will only decimate those programs designed to alleviate poverty. But even if that allegation were supportable the appropriations suggest that it is not—there can be no valid defense of programs that fail to reflect the rational priorities of the society or that persistently fail to achieve their stated goals. Instead of "freezing" the more obvious pork barrel projects, a tactic that will only alter the timing of expenditures, not their amount, the Administration might meet Congressional objections by agreeing to a fundamental evaluation of all Federal programs.

And so, Mr. Speaker, before deciding who it was that really "killed Cock Robin"—if, in fact, he is dead—I imagine the people would like to hear next from their President.

President Johnson's Leadership in International Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL D. PERKINS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 10, 1967

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, the world has learned that there can be no economic and social progress without developing sound educational systems. Yet, two-thirds of mankind is struggling to cope with widespread illiteracy, ignorance, and superstition, ancient enemies that hold a people in bondage.

If we are truly to attain a peaceful and productive community of nations in our time, new ways and new efforts must be initiated to use modern technology to advance education and make its benefits available across the globe.

Under President Johnson's leadership, the United States is making a major commitment to education and health, not only in our own land, but in sharing its benefits with others in the world.

In an address to the Conference on World Education, at Williamsburg, Va., President Johnson once again declared our Nation's willingness to be a helpful partner in international education.

The President suggested greater use of microfilm in the distribution of educational materials around the world; acceleration of basic education through educational television; and more imaginative use of the satellite television communications system to make available to all universities the world's great scholars and teachers.

The President also suggested calling on the United Nations to help set goals and planning for progress in international education—perhaps creating an International Education Year.

But, as the President noted, the crucial question in international cooperation in education is:

> How can we persuade the governments of 131 nations to make it their primary objective to give every child as much education as he wants and needs and can absorb?

America stands ready to do its share.

I insert in the Record the text of President Johnson's address to the World Education Conference:

Text of the Remarks of the President at the Conference on World Education, Williamsburg, Va.

In this town nearly two centuries ago, a revolution began which swept around the world. And here Thomas Jefferson submitted to the Virginia legislature a "plan for the diffusion of knowledge."

The men who founded this country were passionate believers in the revolutionary power of ideas.

They knew that when a people commit themselves to learning, a revolution begins which will never stop.

Now, once again, the winds of change are blowing. And once again, we gather to consider plans for spreading knowledge.

I am no historian. Certainly I am not a prophet.

But for a good many years I have been an observer and a participant in the world's affairs. I have watched man at work: seen his creative power—and his awesome talent for destruction.

In this Century, man has spent literally trillions of dollars on the machinery of death and war. The cost of World War II alone has been estimated at one trillion, 154 billion dollars—not including property damage.

In those years, nearly 100 million people have died in the maiming and disease and starvation which come with war.

We have fought among ourselves like animals. And that is an insult to the animals who live together in more harmony than men.

Other facts trouble me.

Today in the world, four adults in ten cannot read and write.

There are whole regions of the world where eight in ten people are illiterate.

Even now, most people end their lives unable to write "cat" or "dog."

These are shocking facts in the Twentieth Century, the richest age of history.

They are the facts which cry out "Shame on this world! Shame on its leaders!"

A sarcastic writer once gave this definition of History: "the account, mostly false, of events, mostly unimportant, which were brought about by rulers, mostly knaves."

Naturally, I do not agree with him.

If future historians should seek a name for this period in America, I hope they will call it the age of education.

If our children's children want to measure what we tried to achieve, I hope they will remember one thing:

The American government in only three years multiplied its commitment to education and health four times over. Congress passed more laws and committed more funds to education and health in three years than in all our previous history.

But when it comes to education, every nation—including this one—is still a developing country.

We have much to learn from others. And we firmly believe that the knowledge of our citizens is one treasure which grows only when it is shared. We must find ways to extend the treasure to lands where learning is still a luxury for the few.

One lesson of our experience is economic and social development is clear: Education is the greatest bottle neck. Development means that men and women can put to use in their own societies in their own lives, in their own time, what modern science and technology can provide to help them. That requires education.

At the level of basic education the truth of the matter is that we may be falling behind. It takes so long to train a teacher and it is so relatively easy to produce a student that we are not even holding our own in basic literacy.

At higher levels of education we are making progress but we have not even begun to exploit fully the possibilities provided by modern technology. There is no reason why modern technology cannot for example, permit the best professor in the world to teach students all over the world in a field where the vocabulary and concepts and standards are uniform; and this is true of many fields of science, natural and social.

Moreover, our capacity to produce microfilm and distribute information should make it possible for a young scholar or researcher at any place in the world to have the same basic library facilities that are available in the British Museum, Library of Congress, or at one of the great university libraries.

Therefore, I place before you this afternoon these three challenges: First, how can we use what we already know about educational television to accelerate the pace of basic education for our children? How can we use modern technology to economize on that most essential and most needed educational resource: the good teacher? How can we make the good teacher available to the maximum number of students through television?

Second, how can we make the best scholars and teachers in the world available to all universities—wherever they may be—through satellite communications?

Third, how can we use the latest methods of microfilming and communication to provide to those doing scholarship and research everywhere the best library facilities that there are anywhere?

All of us need more facts. I was impressed by the statement in your Conference document which said: "If the world's financial systems were forced to function with no better facts . . . than those which educational systems live by, a financial panic would swiftly seize all the capitals of the world."

That is why we called this Conference. It gives me great satisfaction to know that you are charting an education strategy for the future.

If I may suggest an idea, you might consider calling on the United Nations to set a target time for reviewing our goals and planning new progress: an International Education Year.

Don't limit your efforts. Here, and when you leave this place, tackle the really tough questions:

How can we persuade the governments of 131 nations to make it their primary objective to give every child as much education as he wants and needs and can absorb?

How can we get the world's leaders to convert man's tragic will to destroy into a determination to build?

How can we shape a world in which men employ their minds in projects of peace—instead of sacrificing their bodies on the field of battle?

Can we train a young man's eyes to absorb learning—as eagerly as we train his finger to pull a trigger?

No gathering anywhere has a subject more urgent than yours.

You are dealing with the real dynamite of our times.

The men of Jefferson's day associate this place with liberty—and learning. Tonight in Williamsburg, we have the same concern. I hope our commitment will be as great as theirs—and our achievements as worthy of remembering.

Thank you.

In Praise of Sam Davenport

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 10, 1967

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, recently the House of Representatives was informed that services performed by its coordinator of information have been discontinued. Therefore, we have now lost our "Mr. Information" himself, Sam Davenport.

Although most of us anticipated that

we would miss Sam's friendly personality and his amazing composure, I believe it is only now, in the first few days of his absence, that we truly appreciate how many things he had been doing for us so well. I suppose the real test of a person's usefulness to an organization is how much he is missed when absent.

Someone has said:

> Next best to knowing a fact is knowing where to find it.

That quotation seems to sum up Sam Davenport's unique service. For if he could not find a piece of information in his own storehouse of knowledge, he could always refer us to another source where it could be found.

So, we shall continue to miss you, Sam Davenport, but we wish you the very best of success in whatever endeavor you attempt and the happiness which you so richly deserve.

SENATE

Wednesday, October 11, 1967

(Legislative day of Tuesday, October 10, 1967)

The Senate met at 11 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, again we turn to this wayside altar of prayer! but we come, not that we should commune with Thee only at this particular time and place, but to so open our lives to Thee that Thou wilt be the companioning presence of every hour, facing with us what we face, going with us where we go, sustaining, guiding, correcting, empowering, until our brief day's work is done.

Our Father, we cannot adequately face such a world and make our humble contribution to the healing of its open sores unless we keep untarnished our faith in Thy power to make even the wrath of man praise Thee, and in the ultimate victory of Thy purpose—

Lord, in this hour of tumult;
  Lord, in this night of fears,
Keep open, O keep open,
  Our eyes, our hearts, our ears.

In the dear Redeemer's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, October 10, 1967, be approved.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which the clerk will state by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (H.R. 10345) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order entered yesterday, debate on the pending motion of the Senator from Illinois is limited to 2 hours, the time equally divided between the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Proxmire].

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me 1 minute?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider the nomination on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Francis H. McAdams, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the National Transportation Safety Board.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CREDIT UNIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendars Nos. 572 and 573, S. 1084 and S. 1085, in that order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on Monday, October 9, the Committee on Banking and Currency reported favorably on S. 1084 and S. 1085.

S. 1084 would authorize payroll deductions for Federal employees. As originally introduced the bill would have authorized payroll deductions for deposit in credit unions. However, during the course of the hearings it became evident that there is no valid grounds for discriminating between credit unions and other financial institutions, such as savings and loan associations, banks, or mutual savings banks. I, therefore, introduced an amendment which was approved by the committee to broaden the scope of the bill to cover all financial institutions.

Senator Bennett, the ranking Republican member, has been extremely helpful in developing this legislation. Senator Bennett offered an amendment in committee which made it possible for Federal employees to have two payroll deductions for savings instead of one. This means an employee could send a portion of his check perhaps to a credit union, a second portion to a savings and loan association, and deposit the remainder in his checking account.

I believe the experience in private industry has confirmed the benefits of the payroll savings plan. Most progressive employers permit employees to save regularly through automatic payroll deductions. This benefits the employer since fewer employees get into financial difficulties if they save regularly. As a result, the employer has a more productive and stable work force and receives fewer complaints from creditors seeking to collect bills from employees.

The bill also will benefit the Federal employees to insure a ready source of cash to meet financial emergencies or to finance unusual expenditures. Hopefully, this will reduce the cost of borrowing for thousands of Federal employees who when financial trouble strikes, are forced to borrow money at high rates of interest.

The bill will also benefit the national economy by encouraging thrift and savings thereby easing some of the possibilities of inflationary pressures.

Mr. President, I urge the Senate to adopt S. 1084. I believe it is in the best interest of the Federal Government, it is in the best interest of the Federal employees, and in the best interest of our national economy.

Mr. President, the Banking and Currency Committee also reported S. 1085 to modernize Federal credit union operations. The bill would permit three significant improvements in existing Federal credit union procedures.

First of all, the bill would permit Federal credit unions to delegate a loan officer the authority to approve loans. At the present time, loan officers can approve unsecured loans under $750 or other loans secured entirely by shares. However, all other loans must be approved by the credit committee. Since the credit committee consists of unpaid volunteers and since it is difficult for the credit committee to assemble on short notice, it has been difficult to meet the rising volume of loan applications. The ability to delegate loan approval authority to a loan officer will speed up the processing of loans and will enable the credit union to serve its members more effectively.

Second, the bill would permit credit unions to pay dividends on a quarterly basis as opposed to the present law, which only permits semiannual dividends. This provision is designed to bring credit unions up to date and in accord with the practices of other financial institutions. The payment of quarterly dividends will permit credit unions to continue to compete for savings, thereby sharing a source of low cost credit for their members.

Three, the bill permits credit unions to apply a full month's dividend credit to funds received during the first 10 days of the month. The present law permits such credit only for funds received during the first 5 days of the month. Once again, the change is necessary to bring credit unions up-to-date in order to match the practices of other financial institutions. This will assist the average credit union to continue to attract funds so that it can provide its members with the credit they need.

Mr. President, I recommend the adoption of S. 1084 and S. 1085. These bills were approved unanimously by the committee. I believe they will go a long way in modernizing Federal credit unions and encouraging savings and thrift on the part of Federal employees.

Mr. President, when hearings were held on S. 1084 we heard testimony from representatives of the executive branch. At that time, the committee did not explore the effect of the bill upon the payroll operations in the House and the Senate. Although the bill would apply to House and Senate employees as well as all other Federal employees. It has recently come to my attention that the payroll procedures of the House and Senate may be unique and contain problems not experienced by any other governmental agency. For example, the House and Senate disbursing offices are required to send checks to the employees in all 50 States. These in turn are scattered through many congressional districts. By way of contrast, most executive branch payroll operations are concentrated in a single area. Since this special problem was not considered in committee, I am hopeful that the House committee will give special attention to it.

The House hearings may develop the need for special procedures for application to the payroll operations of the House and the Senate. Should this develop, I believe the Senate would be willing to reconsider its position and to support such a recommended change. However, since the question of the House and Senate payroll operations came up after hearings had been concluded, I believe the best course of action would be for the Senate to enact this measure with the understanding that the House will look into the special question of its applicability to House and Senate employees.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I feel that the two bills, S. 1084 and S. 1085, just explained by the Senator from Wisconsin, should be approved by the Senate. These proposals were reported without opposition by the Banking and Currency Committee.

The primary purpose of S. 1084 is to encourage Federal employees to develop the habit of regularly saving a part of their earnings. The bill as introduced would have provided the opportunity for Federal employees at their discretion to have a deduction from their earnings for the purpose of purchasing credit union shares. Other financial institutions recommended that if the authorization was given to make deductions for credit union shares, it would be only appropriate that a similar authorization be given for deductions to their institutions. Present law authorizes payroll allotments for such purposes as Department heads throughout the Federal Government deem appropriate. Under this authorization, deductions have been made for union dues, charitable purposes, savings bonds, and in the case of those in the military service, for credit union shares. These deductions, however, are at the discretion of the Department head, and because of Treasury opposition, Department heads have been very restrictive.

Treasury opposition is not without merit. Each additional deduction adds to payroll costs and to an increase in Federal expenditures. The Treasury also testified that deductions for various types of savings deposits or accounts could have a deleterious effect on purchases of savings bonds by Federal employees. A further reason for opposition was that next to taxes, savings bonds are the most noninflationary way to finance Government expenditures because savings in other forms are eventually reflected in additional spending. Despite these objections, the bill on balance should be approved.

We have provided in the bill that the Treasury would be reimbursed for any additional expenses incurred in making the deductions authorized.

I am sure that it was the intent of the committee that the Treasury not incur additional expenses as a result of the deductions authorized in this proposal. As the committee report indicates, the Civil Service Commission has established a standard service charge of 2 cents per individual deduction exclusive of any postage costs. The view was expressed that this would be adequate but since we have had no experience on which to base such a charge in a situation where employees may at their pleasure alter deductions, 2 cents per deduction may not prove to be adequate. If it is not we would expect an adequate figure to be established.

Second, the committee was not convinced that permitting deductions for other types of savings than savings bonds would result in a decline in the purchase of savings bonds by Federal employees. Even if it did, it would simply reflect the determination of employees that they preferred to put their savings in some other form than savings bonds. Given an equal opportunity for deductions, it may prove that the higher rates paid by other competitors for savings will draw some of the funds which now are going into savings bonds. Since the sale of savings bonds to individuals is an inefficient method for the Treasury to obtain the funds it needs anyway, I am not disturbed by this possibility, and I am of the opinion that employees should have equal access to other methods of saving through payroll deductions. I can see no reason for private financial intermediaries being held at a competitive convenience disadvantage to the Federal Government in their efforts to attract savings. If the Federal Government must compete with private institutions for the saver's dollars, let it do so on an equal basis. The Treasury Department has supported truth in lending. It should be equally as important to support truth in saving.

It was for this reason that I suggested that two deductions, in addition to the major portion of the paycheck, be permitted and that these two could be sent to any combination of institutions requested by the employee. This means that a person, if he so requested, could have as many as three checks sent in any combination he chooses to commercial banks, savings and loan institutions, savings banks, or credit unions. Since the Federal Government is already bearing the cost of one check, the bill requires only that the cost of providing two additional checks, if they are requested by an employee, be reimbursed. The reimbursement is made by the financial institution receiving the check. In order that there would be no controversy over which of the checks would require reimbursement, the smaller check or checks would be considered to be the deductions and the larger check would not require reimbursement.

The third Treasury argument regarding the deflationary effect of savings bond purchases, as opposed to other types of savings, is not too significant in relation to the situation which we now face of a possible $30 billion deficit in the Federal budget. Savings bond purchases are not considered an effective anti-inflationary tool.

It is my hope that this legislation will encourage saving and reduce inflationary pressures in our economy. By making it equally as convenient to save at any desired institution, it should encourage competition and result in the saver being paid the highest return for his dollar.

The matter of the application of this proposal to the legislative branch of the Federal Government, mentioned by the Senator from Wisconsin, has also been brought to my attention, and I agree that if there is any undue hardship presented by the bill because of unique payroll handling responsibilities of the House and Senate Disbursing Offices, we should certainly be willing to adjust to those unique differences. I, too, expect that the House would go into this matter, which was not brought before our committee.

S. 1085, which was also reported without objection, permits credit unions to operate in a more efficient manner and more in line with the practices of other institutions with which they compete for savings.

I am not convinced that the credit committee of a credit union should be required to approve all unsecured loans above $750, as is now the law. If the credit committee desires to make all such decisions, that is fine, but if it does not, it seems to me that a qualified loan officer should be able to handle such requests.

Quarterly dividends are issued by other

financial institutions, and I am aware of no reason why credit unions should not also be allowed the same privilege if they determine it will be in their interest in better serving their members.

The third provision in this bill is to allow funds received any time during the first 10 days of a month to be considered as received on the first for dividend purposes. This also is a competitive practice used by other institutions, and no reasons have been advanced that it should be denied to credit unions.

Other parts of the original bill have been deleted by the committee on the basis that further study is necessary before a rational decision can be made as to their desirability and effect on credit union operations.

I support both of these bills, S. 1084 and S. 1085, and recommend that they be approved by the Senate.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I am pleased to support S. 1084 and S. 1085 reported by the Banking and Currency Committee on Monday, October 9.

S. 1084 would authorize automatic payroll deductions for Federal employees. At the present time, Federal employees can save through the payroll savings plan, however, under the rules established by the Civil Service Commission such savings may only be in the form of U.S. savings bonds. I have been a strong supporter of the savings bonds program; but, I also feel that Federal employees should have a wide variety of savings opportunities.

The Federal Government now authorizes savings deductions for the United Givers Fund and for union dues in addition to deductions for savings bonds. If deductions for union dues are to be allowed, I see no reason why similar deductions for shares in a credit union should not be permitted.

I believe this bill will be helpful in encouraging thrift on the part of Federal employees. I am hopeful that it will stimulate increased savings thereby easing somewhat the upward pressure on interest rates.

S. 1085 would make a number of improvements in existing credit union procedures. In 1959 I sponsored legislation to modernize credit union operations and permit the limited delegation of loan approval authority to loan officers. The 1959 legislation also authorized the payment of semiannual dividends and the crediting of funds for dividend purposes received during the first 5 days of the month.

Since 1959 a number of changes have been experienced by financial institutions and the need for further modernization is apparent. S. 1085 builds upon the legislation I introduced in 1959 and permits credit unions to operate effectively in today's competitive market.

First of all it would speed up the processing of loans by permitting credit committees to delegate additional authority to loan officers.

Second, it would authorize the payment of quarterly dividends and,

Third, it would credit savings received by the 10th of the month. All these changes will streamline Federal credit union procedures and permit credit unions to compete effectively in today's market.

These bills have been reported unanimously by the Banking and Currency Committee. Senator Proxmire, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions, held hearings on the bills last July. Senator Proxmire and Senator Bennett, the ranking Republican member of the committee, worked most closely on this legislation. I believe we have recommended legislation that should meet with the approval of every Member of the Senate. I urge the Senate to act favorably on S. 1084 and S. 1085.

PURCHASE OF SHARES OF FEDERAL- OR STATE-CHARTERED CREDIT UNIONS THROUGH PAYROLL ALLOTMENT BY FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1084) to permit Federal employees to purchase shares of Federal- or State-chartered credit unions through voluntary payroll allotment which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That subsection (b) and (c) of section 3620 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 492), are amended to read as follows:

"(b)(1) Notwithstanding subsection (a) of this section or any other provision of law, and under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, the head of an agency shall, upon the written request of an employee of the agency to whom a payment for wages or salary is to be made, authorize a disbursing officer to make the payment in the form of one, two, or three checks (the number of checks and the amount of each, if more than one, to be designated by such employee) by sending to each financial organization designated by such employee a check that is drawn in favor of the organization and is for credit to the checking account of such employee or is for the deposit of savings or purchase of shares for such employee: *Provided*, That the agency shall not be reimbursed for the cost of sending one check requested by such employee but shall be reimbursed for the additional cost of sending any additional check requested by such employee by the financial organization to which such check is sent. For the purposes of the foregoing proviso, the check for which the agency shall not be reimbursed shall be the check in the largest amount.

"(2) If more than one employee to whom a payment is to be made designates the same financial organization, the head of an agency may, upon the written request of such employee and under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, authorize a disbursing officer to make the payment by sending to the organization a check that is drawn in favor of the organization for the total amount designated by those employees and by specifying the amount to be credited to the account of each of those employees.

"(3) In this subsection, the term 'agency' means any department, agency, independent establishment, board, office, commission, or other establishment in the executive, legislative, or judicial branch of the Government, any wholly owned or controlled Government corporation, and the municipal government of the District of Columbia; and the term 'financial organization' means any bank, savings bank, savings and loan association or similar institution, or Federal or State chartered credit union.

"(c) Payment by the United States in the form of more than one check, drawn in accordance with subsection (b) and properly endorsed, shall constitute a full acquittance for the amount due to the employee requesting payment."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 590), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of S. 1084 is to permit Federal employees to save through the payroll savings plan. The bill would permit Federal employees to have up to two payroll deductions for deposit with commercial banks, savings banks, credit unions, or savings and loan associations. The bill would also permit the remainder of an employee's check to be deposited in a checking account or other savings account. The Government would be reimbursed for the additional cost of providing the payroll deductions by the financial institution receiving the deduction. The system would be administered pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury. The bill would apply to Federal employees of the executive, legislative, and judicial branches as well as to independent regulatory commissions and Government corporations.

Under present law, the head of each department has authority to authorize payroll allotments "for such purposes as such department head deems appropriate" (5 U.S.C. 3075). Under this authority, payroll deductions have been authorized for savings bonds, contributions to the Combined Federal Campaign, union dues, and in the case of military personnel, payments for credit union shares. However, there is no uniform system for payroll deductions which applies to all Federal employees, and in the case of most civilian employees, deductions through the payroll savings plan are not permitted except for Federal savings bonds. Under the bill recommended by the committee, the Federal Government would be required to make payroll savings deductions for deposit in banks, savings banks, savings and loan associations, and credit unions upon the written request of a Federal employee.

HISTORY OF LEGISLATION

The bill was introduced, by request, by Senator John Sparkman on February 27, 1967. As first introduced, the bill would have amended the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1751) by authorizing payroll deductions only for the purchase of credit union shares. Hearings were held on the bill before the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions on July 11, 1967, under the chairmanship of Senator William Proxmire. Statements were received from the American Bankers Association, the U.S. Savings & Loan League, and the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks recommending that the payroll deduction provisions be expanded to cover payments to all savings institutions. Testimony was received from the Credit Union National Association in support of the bill and from the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions and Department of the Treasury in opposition to the bill. The Treasury opposed the bill on the grounds that it might adversely affect the sale of savings bonds to Federal employees and would unduly complicate the Federal payroll system.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The committee approved an amendment offered by Senator Proxmire to expand the scope of the bill to cover payroll deductions for savings to be deposited in banks, savings banks, savings and loan associations, or credit unions. The committee also approved a further amendment offered by Senator Bennett to authorize payroll deductions for deposit in two savings institutions. In other words, an employee might have one deduction for deposit in his savings account at a savings and loan association and another deduction for deposit with a credit union. The remainder of his check might still be sent to his checking account at a commercial bank or for deposit with another savings institution. The Government would be reimbursed for the cost of the two deductions, but the remainder of the check could be deposited with a financial institution without charge. In order to avoid disputes over which financial institution would provide reimbursement, the bill provides that if an employee elected to have his check sent to two or three financial institutions the check in the largest amount would not require reimbursement while the remaining checks would. In effect, the smaller checks would be considered to be the deductions and the larger check would be considered to be the employee's basic pay.

NEED FOR LEGISLATION

The committee believes that payroll deductions are an effective and efficient way of encouraging additional savings and will benefit our economy. The bill should facilitate the flow of funds to financial institutions, thereby easing credit conditions and removing some of the upward pressure on interest rates. To the extent the bill encourages greater thrift, it would remove funds from the direct spending stream thereby helping to reduce inflationary pressures. Promoting greater saving can be a most effective and painless way of fighting inflation.

The committee also believes that payroll deductions will benefit the Federal Government as an employer. Many progressive employers in business and industry have payroll savings plans and these have come to be recognized as a sound employment practice. The encouragement of regular saving assures a source of funds for employees to meet emergencies or to finance large purchases. This should result in fewer employees who overextend themselves and get into financial trouble. This in turn should lead to a more productive and stable work force and fewer complaints to the Federal Government from creditors concerning Federal employees in financial difficulty.

Finally, the committee believes the bill will benefit the Federal employee. It will make it easier and more convenient for the average employee to save on a regular basis. As previously mentioned, it will tend to assure a ready source of funds and reduce financial problems. It will particularly benefit employees of moderate income, who, when financial trouble strikes, are often forced to borrow at high interest rates.

The committee is mindful of the Treasury argument that payroll deductions for other forms of savings might undercut Treasury bond sales to Federal employees. Although such a possibility exists, the committee does not believe it is likely. Many private employers authorize deductions for both Federal savings bonds and other forms of savings. For example, 80 percent of the employees of Lockheed Aircraft have credit union payroll deductions, but 99 percent have savings bond deductions.

The committee also recognizes the argument that additional deductions complicate Federal payroll operations. However, in view of the benefits to be derived by encouraging saving, and in view of the computerized nature of most Federal payroll systems, and in view of the fact that the Government would be reimbursed for the additional cost of providing the deductions, the committee feels the bill would not represent any significant burden on the Federal Government.

With respect to cost, the committee understands the Civil Service Commission has already established a standard service charge of 2 cents per individual deduction exclusive of any postage cost. The committee expects such a charge should be adequate to cover all additional costs associated with payroll savings deductions authorized under the bill.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend section 3620 of the Revised Statutes with respect to payroll deductions for Federal employees."

AMENDMENT OF THE FEDERAL CREDIT UNION ACT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1085) to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to modernize the loan, investment, dividend, and reserve provisions; to require the establishment of an education committee; and for other purposes which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with an amendment, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the third sentence of section 15 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1761c.) is amended by striking out "up to the unsecured limit, or in excess of such limit if such excess is fully secured by unpledged shares".

SEC. 2. Section 18 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1763) is amended—

(1) by striking out "Annually or semiannually" and inserting in lieu thereof "Annually, semiannually, or quarterly"; and

(2) by striking out "five" in the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "ten".

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 591), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of S. 1085 is to modernize Federal credit union procedures to accord with present day lending practices. The bill would improve Federal credit union procedures in three ways:

1. The credit committee of Federal credit unions would have unlimited authority to delegate lending authority to a loan officer. Under present law only $750 in lending authority can be delegated if the loan is not secured by shares.

2. Federal credit unions could pay dividends quarterly in lieu of twice a year as permitted by existing law.

3. Federal credit unions could credit funds received during the first 10 days of a month for the entire month in computing dividends. Present law restricts such computations to dividends received during the first 5 days of the month.

HISTORY OF LEGISLATION

The bill was introduced, by request, by Senator John Sparkman on February 27, 1967. Hearings were held before the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions on July 11, 1967, under the chairmanship of Senator William Proxmire. Testimony was received from the Credit Union National Association and the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions.

NEED FOR LEGISLATION

The committee recommends three changes in the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1751) to modernize its present operations.

First, the committee recommends that the credit committee of a Federal credit union be given authority to delegate any of its loan approval authority to a loan officer. The original Federal Credit Union Act required all loans to be approved by the credit committeee. In 1959, Congress approved an amendment authorizing the credit committee to delegate loan approval authority to a loan officer in the amount of $750 for an unsecured loan and in an unlimited amount for loans secured by shares. However, loans over $750 secured by other than shares must be approved by the credit committee.

The reason for recommending a further change is to reduce the overwhelming burden placed upon credit committees who must handle a large and continually increasing volume of loan activity. The credit committee is made up of volunteer members who are not compensated and who have often found it difficult to meet frequently on short notice. The change will thus speed up the processing of loans and enable credit unions to serve their members more efficiently. However, the authority to delegate loan approval authority to a loan officer is purely discretionary. A credit committee could retain some or all of its present approval functions if it so desired.

Second, the committee recommends Federal credit unions be given the authority to pay quarterly dividends in lieu of present law which only permits semiannual dividends. Prior to 1959, credit union dividends could only be paid annually. In 1959, Congress authorized semiannual dividends. Quarterly dividends will make it possible for Federal credit unions to continue to compete for savings in today's market. Quarterly dividends have attained widespread acceptance by other financial institutions. The committee believes credit unions should have the same ability to compete for savings in order to continue as a source of credit for their members.

Third, the committee recommends that Federal credit unions be permitted to apply a full month's dividend credit to funds received during the first 10 days of the month. The present law, which was approved by Congress in 1959, permits such credit only for funds received in the first 5 days. Once again, the necessity for a change is dictated by modern day practices of other financial institutions. Many other savings institutions provide a 10-day dividend credit and some even have a 20-day credit. If credit unions cannot compete in today's market, they will suffer a drop in their savings inflow and be unable to provide low-cost credit to their members, which of course is the purpose for which they were originally chartered.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The committee deleted a number of provisions from the bill which were opposed by the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions. These included—

(1) A provision to permit Federal credit unions to invest up to 25 percent of their regular reserve in a credit-union-controlled organization which would use such funds for "establishing and maintaining the liquidity, solvency, and security of credit unions." Since such an organization would have been tantamount to a central bank for credit unions, the committee felt this matter deserved further study.

(2) A provision which would permit Federal credit unions to purchase the notes of members of liquidating credit unions. The

Bureau of Federal Credit Unions felt this provision could put credit unions in a new and unfamiliar business. The committee agreed to defer the matter.

(3) A provision requiring Federal credit unions to establish an education committee. Since many credit unions have voluntarily established an education committee and since many credit union members questioned the advisability of a mandatory committee, the Credit Union National Association recommended this provision be deleted from the bill. The committee agreed.

(4) A provision reducing required reserves from 10 percent of shares to 7 percent of loans. The Bureau of Federal Credit Unions is conducting a study of credit union reserves and requested that the item be deferred until the study is completed. The committee agreed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to modernize the loan and dividend provisions."

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10345) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of Virginia in the chair). Who yields time?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, with the time to be taken equally from both sides. I withhold that request.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I would prefer, under the circumstances, to preserve the time that we have.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, with the time not to be charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, very definitely I am opposed to communism, just as I am opposed to fascism and all forms of totalitarianism. Communists govern by decree. Likewise, Fascists, such as Franco in Spain and those generals and colonels who overthrew the constitutional government in Greece, govern by decree. I am as bitterly opposed to Communists and communism as any Senator. Unfortunately, there now seem to be a resurgence of witch hunting in this country. Some of its momentum may have afflicted the Senate. We again behold attempts by some people to play God with their neighbors' patriotism. We again hear talk about a Communist apparatus infiltrating our Government, the clergy, and our universities. They would be hard put to name even one Communist or Communist sympathizer in the State Department, on the faculty of any university, or in the clergy.

I support the proposal of the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] to abolish the Subversive Activities Control Board, which has not had a meeting in nearly 2 years. The principal, if not only, activity of its members has been to receive high salaries. What is this claimed Communist menace to our Government? It was stated in this debate that Gus Hall, a ragtag secretary of the Communist Party, claims a membership of 13,000 in the entire United States. He certainly would be more likely to exaggerate the numbers than to minimize them. Furthermore, who knows how many FBI agents have infiltrated the Communist Party and are posing as card-carrying Communists?

According to J. Edgar Hoover, who should know, the Communist Party in the United States has lost 90 percent of its membership since reaching its numerical strength peak 23 years ago. The FBI report is that there were 80,000 Communists in the United States in 1944. The Soviet Red Army was crushing Hitler's supermen in Europe, and in America there was tolerance for homegrown Communists. At present, the FBI estimates the numerical strength of the Communist Party has nosedived and is between 8,000 and 10,000. At most, there is one Communist in the United States for every 21,000 non-Communist, the odds in favor of free institutions being 21,000 to 1.

Recently, 80,000 people crowded in the Cleveland stadium to watch the Cleveland Browns win a professional football game. According to J. Edgar Hoover's calculations, three persons in that crowd would be Communists, and more than 80,000 would not. Should we be afraid that those few will harm the rest of us? Furthermore, we have on our side the city and State police, the FBI, the Army, Air Force, and Navy—never forgetting the Marines. Do we need the five men on the Subversive Activities Control Board feeding at the public trough to the extent of $26,000 each per year to gallop to our aid? If it is claimed that we no longer are the land of the free, let us at least be the home of the brave. I am reminded of a couplet:

> Last night I saw upon the stair
> A little man who was not there.
> He was not there again today,
> Oh, how I wish he would go away.

Mr. President, in my judgment it is unthinkable that the rules should be suspended to permit consideration of the amendment introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. This proposed amendment was originally introduced as a bill, S. 2171. Although no hearings were held by the Committee on the Judiciary on this legislative proposal, it was reported favorably by the committee last August. The committee report contains no explanation of the bill's provisions, no section-by-section analysis, and no explanation of the changes that it would make in existing law. The Justice Department was not asked for its opinion of the bill nor did it offer any, nor for that matter, did any other agency of the executive branch.

Any legislative proposal to strengthen or perpetuate the outmoded Subversive Activities Control Board should be the subject of thorough hearings before it is brought before the Senate for debate and vote.

The Subversive Activities Control Board is part of that debris of the witch hunts, the so-called period of McCarthyism, that is still with us. The continued existence of this vestigal agency is ridiculous. This relic of the McCarthy era is not only insulting to Americans, but is also a complete waste of taxpayers' money.

We have recovered somewhat from that era, which we should like to forget, of pointless suspicion, fear, character assassination, and ruined careers, and the ridiculous and utterly false claims that there were thousands of Communists on the faculties of universities, in the Protestant clergy, and in the State Department. All of these allegations were entirely untrue at the time they were made, but, unfortunately, were believed by many Americans.

Much of the rubbish of that period has been cleaned up, but it may take a generation to remove all the debris. This remainder of a shameful chapter in our history, the Subversive Activities Control Board, should be abolished unwept, unhonored, and unsung.

In 1950, when President Truman vetoed the McCarran-Walter Act which created this bureaucratic monstrosity, he said:

> The provisions of the act are not merely ineffective and unworkable; they represent a clear and present danger to our institutions.

His warning has been validated in numerous Supreme Court decisions which have all but nullified the effectiveness of that legislation.

Mr. President, when the Constitution was first proclaimed, there was an uproar from liberty-loving Americans who had won the Revolutionary War. They forced down the throats of the reactionaries of that period the first 10 amendments to the Constitution. They made the adoption of these amendments a condition for the ratification of our Constitution. Throughout the years, we have affectionately termed those first 10 amendments to our Constitution the Bill of Rights.

So it is for us today to fight for the preservation of these rights. I believe it would be well for the people of the United States, our fellow citizens, to re-read those first 10 amendments. I am certain that those lunatic fringe extremists, right-wing splinter groups such as the so-called Liberty Lobby, the Manion Forum, and the John Birch Society—or "Birchsaps" or "Sons of Birches" as our colleague the senior Senator from California, the assistant minority leader, has termed them—have never read or would like to forget those first 10 amendments.

Mr. President, about 30 years ago, Chief Justice of the United States Hughes said:

> The greater the importance of safeguarding the country from incitements to the

> overthrow of our institutions by force and violence, the more imperative is the need to preserve inviolate the constitutional rights of free speech, free press, and free assembly in order to maintain the opportunity for free political discussion, to the end the government may be responsive to the will of the people and that changes, if desired, may be obtained by peaceful means. Therein lies the security of the Republic, the very foundation of constitutional government.

The Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 has constituted one of the greatest threats to our civil liberties since the alien and sedition laws of 1798.

The proposal to amend the original act, which the Senate will consider should this motion carry, demands the opposition of all who cherish liberty, free expression, and freedom of thought. Loyalty cannot be coerced or compelled.

Those supporting this proposed amendment claim that it would put the original Subversive Activities Control Act in line with recent Supreme Court decisions. This, of course, is facetious, for the powers of the Subversive Activities Control Board would continue to remain unrestricted and vague. It is a blatant attempt to revise the SACB and give it even greater power. It bears the taint of McCarthyism as it gives a politically appointed Board the right to freely smear and libel any group or organization.

When the SACB was created in 1950, it was a bad idea. Nothing has happened since to change my opinion. Instead, the evidence shows an effort to introduce totalitarian uniformity into political thinking. The existence of the Board continues to be a challenge to the basic principles of our democratic way of life.

The Board is redundant and unnecessary. The laws of our land without violating the spirit of the Constitution have always adequately safeguarded the security, dignity, and the sovereignty of this great Nation of ours.

Mr. President, since 1965, taxpayers have spent nearly $2 million for the virtually defunct Subversive Activities Control Board. It has not held a formal hearing in those 2 years. There are no cases pending before it. This boondoggle will cost taxpayers more than $330,000 this year alone. Only 18 employees remain, and they are virtually sinecures. The average salary of each is $11,000 a year—one of the highest in the entire Federal bureaucracy. This Board has not made a single substantial contribution to the national welfare since its creation. To the contrary, its very existence is a symbol of all that is repulsive to freedom-loving Americans.

The Subversive Activities Control Board has five Board members, each appointed by the President subject to confirmation by the Senate. Each member has a personal administrative assistant. Then there are eight other employees whose function, I imagine, is to keep track of the first 10. These 18 people have the softest jobs in Washington. In fact, they have no real duties at all, except the trouble they expend once or twice a month to draw their salaries.

They do nothing of value whatever except perhaps write memos or messages to one another and publish annual reports of what they have not accomplished. To perpetuate the sinecures, as the proposed amendment would do, makes a transparent sham of any claim by Congress of an interest in real economy in Government.

The continued expenditure of taxpayers' money for this absurd boondoggle is unconscionable at a time when we are looking for ways to save taxpayers' money in order to finance the fantastically expensive civil war in which the administration has involved us in Vietnam, a war which has now become an American ground and air war in Southeast Asia. It is a war that is costing the American taxpayers more than $2 billion every month—money that is being blown up in smoke.

Mr. President we must hold fast to our heritage as free men and women. We must renew our confidence in each other, our tolerance and our sense of being good neighbors. We must repudiate the fearmongers, those men of little faith, or no faith whatever, who are plotting the inquisition and investigations into our schools, colleges, churches, and all institutions of our free society.

Last month I joined with the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] in introducing legislation which would abolish the SACB. This bill, S. 2146, is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary. It would transfer to the Justice Department all Board activities and it would authorize the Attorney General to designate an independent officer or agency within the Department to handle these activities. Frankly, in my view, that is the legislative proposal we should be considering.

Mr. President, if the same energy that is being put behind the proposed amendment were devoted to the enactment of the administration's programs to alleviate poverty, to promote civil rights, and to provide for a better standard of living for all our citizens, this country would be better served.

As one who despises Communists, communism, and Communist methods, I join with other Senators in expressing strong opposition to the pending motion to suspend the rules to permit consideration of the proposed amendment at this time.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, again I suggest the absence of a quorum, with the time not to be taken out of either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as a member of the subcommittee which reported the pending business, including the funds for the Subversive Activities Control Board, I support the motion to suspend the rule made by the distinguished minority leader.

First, I think I should say for the RECORD, so that there will be no misunderstanding, that it is a happenstance that the Chairman of the Subversive Activities Control Board is a Montanan; but I do not join the distinguished minority leader on that basis. I believe there is a need to continue this Board—a board created under the McCarran-Walter Act of 1950—but which, unfortunate, and through no fault of its own, has little or no business before it at the present time. However, if the motion to suspend is defeated, the bill will still contain a $300,000 appropriation for the Board. Then, if I correctly understand what is to happen, an amendment will be offered to eliminate the $300,000. In my opinion, that amendment will not prevail.

Thus, we are faced with a situation in which the Subversive Activities Control Board, at the moment, has little or nothing to do because of decisions by the Supreme Court affecting its jurisdiction.

If the motion to suspend does not carry, it is my belief—I reiterate—that the funds appropriated in the bill will be allowed by the Senate, and then we will have the sorry picture of funds being appropriated to an agency which has very little to do.

The question has been raised as to why the Board's functions have not been transferred to the Department of Justice. That question was answered by Assistant Attorney General Yeagley. During the course of the hearings he indicated that this authority should not be placed in the Department of Justice.

He also said, if I read the RECORD correctly, that this agency should be continued, preferably with additional powers. That is what the distinguished minority leader is attempting to do now. If the rules are suspended, the way will be clear to enact the bill he introduced, a bill reported by a large vote of the Judiciary Committee.

I should point out also that the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] introduced a resolution last July which directed the Appropriations Committee, or a duly authorized subcommittee thereof, to investigate the functions and duties of the Subversive Activities Control Board and to include in its report on the bill making appropriations for this Board, the findings and recommendations of the committee. Specifically, Senate Resolution 145 directs the committee to determine whether, first, the current and prospective volume of business of such Board warrants the continued exercise of its powers, and the continued performance of its functions and duties by a separate agency of the Government; and, second, the powers, duties, functions, and property of such Board should be transferred to another department or agency of the Government in the interest of efficiency and economy in the conduct of Government operations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Pursuant to this resolution, the subcommittee, under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan], did carry out its responsibilities in that respect, and made the following four recommendations:

(1) Retain the board and broaden its authority.

That is what the distinguished minority leader is attempting to do.

(2) Reestablish the Board as a quasi-judicial body such as the National Labor Relations Board, which would allow the Board to initiate cases on its own motion.

It cannot do so at the present time, because it is subordinate to the Department of Justice.

(3) Transfer the functions and duties of the Board to a department or agency other than the Department of Justice.

That, I think, would be ill advised.

(4) Abolish the Board by repealing the act that created it.

There is other material in the report, appearing on page 33, and I ask unanimous consent that the rest of the report dealing with the Subversive Activities Control Board, beyond the four recommendations, be incorporated at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the extract was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Paragraph (1) of Senate Resolution 145 directs the committee to determine whether the current and prospective volume of such board warrants its continued existence. Without further legislation, the chances that the board's workload will materially increase is remote. However, it should be emphasized that the work of the board cannot be judged solely on number of cases handled. During the hearing, representatives of the Department of Justice testified that the value of the board should also be judged on the point that as long as such a board exists, it preserves the possibility of the imposition of sanctions contained in the Internal Security Act of 1950, as amended, 50 U.S.C. 783, et seq., and is a mechanism for the public disclosure of Communist action and Communist front organizations.

The workload of the board is almost totally dependent on the Attorney General filing petitions. The board has no statutory authority to bring cases before it on its own motion. The only other way that a case may arise is through the voluntary action of an organization or an individual. This latter is a remote possibility.

At the present time the board has no cases. The chances that this situation will change is dependent upon (1) the Attorney General filing petitions in cases that can be brought under the act as presently interpreted by the courts, or (2) the passage of legislation that will increase the scope of authority of the board and thus result in the Attorney General filing more petitions.

Paragraph (2) of Senate Resolution 145 directs the committee to determine whether the powers, duties, functions, and property of the Board should be transferred to another agency. Serious constitutional problems of due process are posed if the powers, duties, and functions of the Board are transferred to the Attorney General.

The mere transfer of the Board as now constituted into another agency will not increase the Board's workload as such would still be almost totally dependent upon petitions filed by the Attorney General. The assignment of the powers, duties and functions of the Board to another agency is a legislative possibility. However, such would have to be an independent agency in order to meet the requirements of due process.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think it should be noted that there are three recommendations or suggestions, all of which are to retain the Board or its functions—that is, carry on and continue this function of Government—whereas, if one does not favor the Board and if he does not favor the investigation of subversion, then he will want to abolish the Board and establish nothing in lieu thereof. Is that correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. So one has a choice of either continuing the Board and giving it additional power necessary by reason of the Court decisions, or simply hereafter forgetting about taking any governmental action, except actual violations of law, against the Communist conspiracy.

In this way, however, we are able, through the Board, to hear testimony and develop the facts, and thus present to the country and acquaint the people with activities that may not be crimes, yet tend toward subversion in our Government.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, indeed. The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee has stated the case clearly. Either we should have a board with expanded authority, or we should have no board at all.

May I point out that if the motion to suspend is defeated, then we will have before us a board which will have a $300,000 appropriation, but with little or nothing to do.

I repeat, it is my understanding an amendment will be offered in that case to knock out the funds for this Board, thereby leaving it payless as well as powerless. In my opinion, I do not believe the amendment will be adopted.

So if we are going to have a board of this nature, as I think we should, then I strongly urge the Senate to give it the additional authority contained in the Dirksen proposal. Only in that way can the Board do the work it was set up to do under the mandate contained in the McCarran-Walter Act of 1950.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, on my time?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Will the distinguished majority leader indicate why he thinks the Dirksen proposal will give the Board something to do?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Because the Dirksen proposal widens its responsibilities in line with the Supreme Court rulings, gives it authority which it does not have now, and makes it less dependent upon the Department of Justice for the referral of cases.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it not a fact that with the Dirksen proposal it is still true that unless the Department of Justice initiates a case and brings it before the Board, the Board would have no basis for action?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would leave the answer to that question to the author of the proposal.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the answer is simple. In view of the two Court decisions, the Department of Justice has not felt it ought to file any more of these cases with the Board until the act is cured so the Board can function as is indicated in the text of the proposal.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Then, the Senator from Montana and the Senator from Illinois think the Board will have no function unless the Department of Justice initiates action, in the view of the Senator from Illinois—which may not be the view of the Department of Justice, that these cases will be initiated—but I say, certainly before we act on the legislation, we ought to have a report from the Attorney General. We have no idea whether the Department of Justice will change its position.

It is true that Mr. Yeagley testified, but he is not the Attorney General. He was meticulous and careful in testifying to say he was not speaking for the Attorney General; that he was simply giving his off-the-cuff views.

Is this not true?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Indeed, it is not. He was the Assistant Attorney General, and in the hearing on August 15 he said:

It has been my view that an important function of this Board has been the disclosure that has resulted in the 23 front organization cases that were brought before the Board.

He said further:

I believe the Subversive Activities Control Board has performed a valuable service.

He said further:

I certainly could not support anything in the form of abolishing the Board.

I do not know what one needs to make it clear to the Senator how the Department feels about this.

Mr. PROXMIRE. May I say, with all due respect to the Senator from Illinois, that it seems to me what we need is a statement or a letter or some indication by the Attorney General. The Attorney General can tell Mr. Yeagley, the Assistant Attorney General, or any other employee from the Department of Justice, whether to come down and what to say when he does. Only the Attorney General can state what is really the position of the Department of Justice.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think Mr. Yeagley was speaking for the Attorney General, because he was there in a capacity representing the Department of Justice. I believe he was asked by the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan], if he was representing the Attorney General.

Mr. PROXMIRE. As appears on page 1070 of the hearings, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan] said:

I thought this was a good opportunity to have some expression from the Department of Justice about it.

Mr. Yeagley said in reply:

> This was my personal expression. I don't know that anyone would disagree with me, but it is an off-the-cuff opinion.

So it was made clear that he was speaking for himself, and in an off-the-cuff opinion, and it was not necessarily the opinion of the Attorney General, Mr. Clark.

Mr. MANSFIELD. He was there nevertheless, as the official representative of the Department of Justice; but may I say to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin that we face a clear-cut issue here. It will take a two-thirds majority of those present and voting to suspend the rule for the purpose of calling up the Dirksen proposal. If that fails, then it will take only a simple majority to knock out the funds to be appropriated for this Board. And if that fails, we will have an agency operating on the same basis as now, without the additional authority and responsibilities which the distinguished minority leader seeks to establish through the proposal the Senate may act on if the motion is adopted.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I understand the dilemma of the Senator from Montana. I think he has stated it well and fairly. However, it seems to me if we are going to do it through this bill, whether we do it today or next week, whether we act on the suspension of the rule or not, we certainly ought to have word from the one man in the Government who will determine whether or not this agency is going to work.

We do not have that position. I do not ask that we send the bill back for weeks of hearings. I suggest we ask for a letter or some indication from the Attorney General as to whether or not he would welcome this legislation and seek to make it effective.

I think that is a reasonable request. As the Senator from Montana knows, we have the bill pending on the calendar. It can be motioned up by him or by the Senator from Illinois at any time. I have no intention of filibustering the bill. However, I do think that without a record, I should take a day or two or more, if necessary, to put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the most comprehensive information I can as to what the bill would do. I think that would be a service to the Senate.

If we suspend the rules and add this legislative amendment without hearings, and it goes over to the House of Representatives as a part of this appropriation bill, there will be no House hearings, either. There have been no Senate hearings, and this is a 13-page, complicated bill on which, with no hearings, we have little or no information.

It seems to me this is not a fair and sensible procedure, in keeping with the best traditions of either the Senate or the House of Representatives.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, everything the Senator from Wisconsin has said is not only fair, but eminently fair. He has certainly never indicated, to my knowledge, that he intended to filibusted this measure. He has always indicated that he intended to make the RECORD clear. He has, and he has done so in the most impartial and fairminded manner. I commend him for the exemplary manner in which he has handled himself in the presentation of this difficult and important subject.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the majority leader. I wish to make one further point with regard to Mr. Yeagley's testimony as to whether or not, if the bill passes, the Subversive Activities Control Board will have anything to do. He said:

> In reference to the possible volume of business that might be placed before the Board if the law is changed, we would have to see the bill or the law to say that there would be no more cases or a lot of cases.

After all, we do not know. Even Mr. Yeagley, who has been cited over and over again as the star witness in favor of this proposal—and, incidentally, he was not appearing on it at all; he appeared before the Appropriations Committee—said he does not know whether the law would have any effect; they would have to see it and examine it first. They have not had an opportunity to do so. The Attorney General has not had this proposed legislation before him.

The Senate has no way of knowing whether we would be making the Subversive Activities Control Board effective and forceful, or not.

It seems to me that here, once again, is a bill which has powerful support in the Senate; it is not locked up in committee; it can be called up and disposed of in a day or so at any time; but it could be done in a way which would give the House of Representatives a chance to have their own hearings on it, and not by suspending the rules, to put it on an appropriations bill and in effect closing out any competent legislative record as is sought to be done at the present time.

Mr. President, I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from New York.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I, too, am concerned about the effect of the proposed legislation. While I was Attorney General, we had a number of dealings with the Subversive Activities Control Board, and tried to utilize the Board as it was established by Congress and had been in existence for some 10 years. We tried to use it, and I believe that we presented the only major case ever to come before the Subversive Activities Control Board, which concerned the registration of the Communist Party. So the Subversive Activities Control Board was active at the beginning of my administration as Attorney General.

However, portions of the legislation under which the Board had been created were declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court in a number of different cases during that period of time, so that, after a period of time, the Subversive Activities Control Board became virtually inoperative. It was no longer a board or a group of men able to function at all actively. Because of the court decisions, it became really an ineffective adjunct to the Department of Justice or to the investigation of communism.

And, after all, the investigation of communism, it seems to me, is and has been conducted by the Federal Bureau of Investigation with a great deal of skill and ability. In view of the record of what has transpired over the period of the last 6½ years, where there has been a diligent effort to meet the aims of Congress and use the Subversive Activities Control Board, but due to court decisions the Board is now in fact inoperative and does not function, it seems to me that to move in the direction of trying to put it back into existence is likely to raise greater questions that it will resolve.

I do not see that it would make easier the fight against communism. Having worked closely with the Federal Bureau of Investigation and with Mr. Yeagley's division—Mr. Yeagley was head of that division before I came in, but he was reappointed by President Kennedy upon my recommendation, and I believe he is a very able man—I cannot perceive that the struggle against internal communism would be assisted in any way by reactivating the Subversive Activities Control Board.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I say to the distinguished Senator from New York that what he has stated would seem to me to be unanswerable, in the absence of a record. We have absolutely no analysis whatsoever of the court cases which are said to make this legislation necessary. We have a report that is a one-page joke; it does not tell us anything. The Cordon rule was waived, so we do not know how this legislation would affect the basic law. There has not been a single witness, either from the Department of Justice or any other department.

Under those circumstances, I do not know how the Senate can act intelligently. Whether Senators agree or disagree with the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from New York, it would seem to me that we should ask for testimony, so that we might know what we are doing. Those who are most anxious to have the Subversive Activities Control Board reconstituted and revitalized should certainly find out whether or not this measure would do the job. There is apparently serious question whether it would have that effect.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. That is what disturbs me. I would at least like to hear, in depth, what the present Attorney General feels about the Board, whether he believes the suggested changes in the legislation would really help or hinder the fight against communism, and whether in fact the legislation deals effectively with the serious constitutional questions that have been raised by the Supreme Court.

For instance, the proposed legislation would leave the definitions of "Communist-action" and "Communist-infiltrated" groups the same as they were in 1950. These definitions raise serious questions about vagueness, about what groups are included and what groups are not. The Supreme Court's loyalty oath decisions have strongly suggested that vague definitions of "subversive" groups are not constitutionally permissible, because such lack of clarity discourages people from associating with legitimate groups. Yet section 782 of the act—which would not be affected by S. 2171—uses language of the most general sort.

Second, although the Board's activities would be investigatory, there are a number of severe restrictions on members of "tainted" organizations which would apply once the Board made its determination of Communist action or Communist infiltration. The groups themselves are denied tax deductions—their mail must be stamped—their activities are subject to heavy supervision. Thus, the Board still has functions which are inherently punitive—and which may well be a violation of the privilege against self-incrimination. In addition, the increased protection given political associations by the Supreme Court in recent years makes this kind of Government supervision open to serious doubt under the first amendment.

Therefore, some of the same problems that were raised by the Supreme Court regarding the Board—which impelled the Court, in the cases that were brought by the Department of Justice prior to the time I was Attorney General and during my time as well, to arrive at decisions which hampered the Board's functioning—would still exist, in my judgment, with the proposed legislation unless the Attorney General and other experts come in and testify about the language contained in the measure, it seems to me we would be taking a major chance, in passing legislation such as this, without holding detailed hearings.

Finally, the self-incrimination problem may be greater under this bill than under the existing act. What happens if an individual refuses to answer political questions before the Board? Can he be punished for contempt? Is failure to testify evidence of subversive activity? If the Board's final determination results in severe restrictions on groups, is this not a use of investigatory power to punish?

My point is not that these problems cannot be met with legislation. Perhaps we can work out some legislation. Rather, my point is that these points require careful and detailed legislative work. We cannot circumvent our own rules and rush through legislation merely because the subject concerns national security. Indeed, that is reason for care—so that we can best reconcile national security with our constitutional liberties—which is the reason, after all, for preserving our national security.

I therefore join the Senator from Wisconsin in urging the Senate not to suspend the rules, but leave the bill to be considered further by the Judiciary Committee.

It does not seem to me that, based on our record and the efforts we have made in the past, we should have to go through it all again by disregarding what the courts have had to say over the past 4 or 5 years.

Why should we not study the matter carefully, have the experts in, have the Department of Justice testify, work out the language carefully and minutely, and then present legislation to the Senate so that we can debate it and determine whether it makes some sense and will, in fact, deal in an appropriate and meaningful way with the danger that we feel is facing the country?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Senator from New York speaks with great and unusual authority. He is a recent former Attorney General of the United States.

The distinguished junior Senator from New York has had experience with the Subversive Activities Control Board. He, after all, is in a position to know more about the functioning of that agency than any other Senator would be.

When the Senator from New York asks these questions and indicates that we should have expert testimony and competent, qualified, constitutional lawyers come in and tell us what effect this very delicate and difficult constitutional issue will have, it seems to me that his statement should carry great weight with the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, we have only one speaker, and I expect to close.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask unanimous consent that the time not be charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Who yields time?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I believe it is not inappropriate, now that we have heard from a former Attorney General, that we hear from a former assistant district attorney. I should like to take just a few minutes this afternoon to comment on the pending motion.

Mr. President, we are not voting today on anticommunism. There is not a single Member of this body who is not totally opposed to Communist infiltration and subversion in the United States.

The date has long since passed when any measure proposed in the name of anticommunism automatically received substantial support regardless of its merits. We are saner, and our constituents are more sophisticated. We can meet our obligations calmly, responsibly, and thoughtfully by treating such proposals just as we would treat any other measures.

We can look back to the original passage in 1950 and consider President Truman's warning that the bill was opposed by all our security agencies—this point has been brought out time and time again by Senator PROXMIRE, by Senator KENNEDY of New York, by Senator TYDINGS, and other—that it had serious constitutional flaws, and that it would in general help the Communists rather than hurt them.

President Truman's warnings have been proven true. After spending millions of dollars and man-hours running the Board and litigating its cases, we have nothing at all to show except judicial opinions rendering the act almost useless. More likely than not, the act will be further gutted in court. Thus, there is a question as to whether an entirely new direction in this field is called for.

In any event, I believe we should also seriously consider whether there are other means of achieving and accomplishing the ends about which all of us are concerned—that is, the protection of the internal security of this country.

Thus, even if the general basis of the act is still relevant, we should be able to find more efficient means. Certainly, the professionals in the Justice Department, both in the Internal Security Division and the FBI, can do the job without the help of a politically appointed board of laymen. This is the practical effect of the act as it stands now, since most of the damage to an organization is done as soon as the Attorney General initiates the case. His procedure for the selection of cases has been outlined on the floor of the Senate during the course of this debate; and it certainly is apparent to all of us who are aware of the procedure that the real effect—assuming this effect is what is desired—is when the Attorney General files the initial recommendation with the Subversive Activities Control Board on a case.

As a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, I join with the other members of the committee who express reservation about the procedure we would be following in the Senate if this motion carries. There have been no hearings on the bill, there has been no explanation of it, there has been no comparison of its provision with present law. There really is no report to speak of. When the proponent of the measure was asked about this yesterday, he just said, "Read the report; read the report." In reviewing the report, all we see is a collection of cases and just a page and a half of the most general statement of the purpose of the legislation.

This matter affects the Attorney General of the United States, and it affects him directly. In spite of this, we have no request or recommendation or comment by the Attorney General of the United States. He has not expressed a view with respect to this measure, nor has he expressed a legal opinion about it. In any matter which directly affects the Attorney General of the United States as significantly as this measure does, we have a responsibility to insure that we hear from him—and we have not.

Therefore, I believe there has been a lack of adequate and full consideration in the committee and a lack of information that has been given to us on the floor of the Senate. There is ample reason to vote against this measure on that basis alone.

Another reason for voting in the negative on this motion is that there is no special emergency. That case has not been made by the distinguished minority leader. There are no special conditions which require haste. We cannot and should not decide this important measure on a hasty basis. We waited a number of weeks for action in the Committee on the Judiciary, and no case has been made on the floor of the Senate for going through these extraordinary procedural gymnastics to have immediate consideration of this matter and a vote on it.

Mr. President, if Harry Truman, in 1950, could have the strength, courage, and foresight to veto the original bill in spite of the Nation's preoccupation with the threat of communism at that time, in the early postwar years, we, in the enlightened and self-confident period of the sixties, can surely take the necessary steps to prevent an unjustified and unconsidered bill from receiving the expedited and extraordinary action which is sought for this bill on the floor of the Senate.

I know that some of the points I have raised have been raised and discussed previously, but I believe they are important and I believe they dictate to the Members of the Senate that they should vote in opposition to the motion of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished former assistant district attorney for his very helpful remarks. I especially appreciate the fact that he underlined the unwisdom of this procedural action. As he pointed out, there have been no hearings, no witnesses have been heard, there is no record, there could be no knowledge by any Member of the Senate as to whether or not this proposal would work.

As the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts has said so well, there is no emergency, there is no rush. There may be times when the Senate must act precipitously. National security may be at stake; there may be a threat from a foreign power.

We may have to act at once to save the Republic, but everybody knows that is not the case with this issue. We know that we can take another couple of weeks and certainly wait for a letter from the Attorney General, or some word from the Attorney General, as to whether or not he intends to make this proposal effective if it becomes law. We have to have that if we are going to act with knowledge.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. In the Committee on the Judiciary I repeatedly requested that we have the opinion of the Attorney General before acting on this matter, and I still believe he should speak on this question. I raise this point for one reason. If there were a sense of urgency and danger, if there were some real crisis in the United States at this time, it would seem to me that the Attorney General would on his own initiative make this fact known to us in such a way as to indicate his full support for this measure. He has not done so and the lack of any strong and urgent plea by him for this bill until now is itself the most convincing evidence of the absence of any great need for it, regardless of what he might say about it in the days to come.

Those of us who have reservations about the motion would say that if he who would bear the prime responsibility in implementing this legislation, and who has the facts which would establish or negate the need for it, does not really support it or give it any priority, serious questions are raised as to whether the points raised by those who do support it can possibly be justified.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I am shocked that my beloved friend, the able and distinguished minority leader, for whom I have the highest regard and, indeed, veneration, should have chosen this unusual, radical, one might say, and unconventional procedure to attach this iniquitous bill to an appropriation bill by moving to suspend the rules.

My friend is a stickler for the customs, manners, habits, and procedures of the U.S. Senate, and I would have thought that were his cause as just as I am sure he believes, he would have followed a more normal and conventional procedure to bring this matter before the Senate.

Now I see my friend looking carefully through the rules of the Senate. To allay the concern of the Senator I might say that I full well realize that what he is doing is entirely legal. It may be that if he goes back through the annals of the U.S. Senate, back to the days of the then Senator from Pennsylvania, William Maclay, he will find a precedent, and perhaps two or three precedents for this peculiar, unusual, and odd procedure.

Having had my fun with the Senator from Illinois, who I am sure in due course will rise to his feet and literally leave me in legislative shreds and pieces, I wish to say that this is really a serious matter. Let me begin by recalling that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] succeeded Joseph McCarthy as the Senator from that great State. Now we find Joe McCarthy riding again, back from the grave, in this procedure which is before us.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] is careful of his words. He is not one for diatribes or unusual and violent language. Yet, when he says that this is a proposed "railroad job" I must say I find no milder words to use in connection with it. There have been no hearings, no executive recommendation, no word from the Attorney General, but there is a report which would be a joke if it were not so tragic. The dangerous precedent of attempting to suspend the rules to put a legislative rider on an appropriation bill is a shortcut method, if ever we had one.

I suggest, as I have heard my good friend from Illinois suggest in other matters where we did not find ourselves in agreement, that this procedure does a serious disservice to the dignity of the Senate.

I make a second point. We are talking, as usual, to a practically empty Senate Chamber, and I wonder whether Senators who will come into the Chamber when the roll is called will have the slightest understanding of what they are voting on. How could they?

As the Senator from Wisconsin said, the committee report is a one-page fiasco. We do not know what the Attorney General thinks. I suggest that Senators who come in to vote, as they will in another 45 minutes, must ask themselves whether they really know what they are voting for. Look at the bill which is sponsored by the Senator from Illinois. There is not even any indication in the bill or in the report as to what changes are made in the existing legislation. How could any Senator know what he is voting on?

I hope we will not be stampeded, I say in all candor, by a Joe McCarthy tactic, in taking this thoroughly unsound and unwise action to reconstitute this Board, with respect to which I would say, let it die—spurlos versenkt.

I hope the position of the Senator from Wisconsin will be approved.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum and I ask unanimous consent that the time not be taken from either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY of New York in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, how much time remains to both sides?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has 50 minutes remaining; the Senator from Wisconsin has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, we have only one speaker on this side. Under the rule, I think I am entitled to close the debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time will be running, equally divided.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. I ask unanimous consent that the time for the quorum call be charged to neither side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 293 Leg.]

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Baker
Bartlett
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Griffin
Gruening
Hansen
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hatfield
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hollings
Hruska
Inouye
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Mansfield
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Percy
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Scott
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Spong

Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell] is necessarily absent.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Brooke], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson], and the Senator fron. Idaho [Mr. Jordan] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Who yields time?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mrs. Smith].

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, it is neither pleasant nor easy to oppose the leader of my own party in the Senate. And usually it is futile.

But I shall vote against his motion to suspend the rules to permit legislation on this appropriations bill.

I am convinced by the logic set forth by the senior Senator from Wisconsin and the junior Senator from Maryland in the two speeches that they made yesterday in opposition to his motion—and I am convinced as well by the statement yesterday by the distinguished minority leader when he expressed his opposition to a possible request for suspension of the rules on the public works appropriations bill that we acted upon yesterday immediately preceding taking up this appropriations bill.

I listened with great interest to the speeches yesterday and I consider the speeches of Senator Proxmire and Senator Tydings to be two of the most impressive essays of logic that I have heard in my nearly 19 years in the Senate.

In January of this year I supported the minority leader when he opposed suspension of the rules as destruction of the orderly processes and called for protection of "the Republic against wild schemes and fantasies and the favorite legislative brainchildren" by protecting our rules.

Only a few days ago I raised a point of order against a provision in the independent offices appropriations bill that was legislation on appropriations in that it sought to give retirement promotions to a select six Reserve officers holding executive positions in the Selective Service System. My point of order was so well accepted that no attempt was made to obtain a suspension of the rules.

Let me make it quite clear that I am inclined to favor S. 2171 introduced by the minority leader and which he seeks to place as a rider on this appropriations bill. I do not oppose his bill. Instead I oppose the manner in which he seeks by suspension of the rules to have the Senate pass it.

Let me make it also quite clear that I am inclined to oppose S. 2146, the bill of Senator Proxmire proposing the abolition of Subversive Activities Control Board.

But I feel very strongly that both S. 2171 and S. 2146 should proceed through the orderly processes for which the minority leader made such a strong and effective plea in January of this year, and that there should be thorough committee hearings and reports on such legislation before it is acted upon by the Senate—rather than through the shortcut method of tacking legislation on to appropriations by the method of suspension of the rules.

I commend Senator Proxmire and Senator Tydings for their courage in taking the stand that they do in this matter for I know of the character attacks they must now expect from the extreme right because of their stand and of the inevitable charges against them of being "soft on communism."

I know from my own personal experience when 17 years ago I took issue with the predecessor of Senator Proxmire in what was called a declaration of conscience and which prompted the extreme right to label me as a "left-winger," a "fellow traveler," and "soft on communism."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Maine.

Mrs. SMITH. Among the retaliatory vindictive actions was a smear book against me—whose authors and publishers I ultimately forced to retract their charges, make public apologies in newspapers, and pay damages through a successful libel suit. It took me 4½ years to get them to trial.

I know because such retaliatory vindictive action was even taken against me in the U.S. Senate when, in violation of all custom, tradition, and courtesy in the history of the Senate and in violation of the seniority system, Senator Proxmire's predecessor expelled me from the Senate Permanent Investigations Subcommittee and his action was upheld by the parent then Senate Executive Expenditures Committee, now the Senate Government Operations Committee, over my protest.

So that every Senator who votes against the motion to suspend the rules must face and accept the fact that his vote will be distorted by the extreme right as a vote against investigating, detecting, and apprehending Communists and their activities—even though such charges are false.

No, it is not easy to vote against this motion to suspend the rules. But I shall do so.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mrs. SMITH. I am happy to yield to the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished senior Senator from Maine. Her speech today does her great credit, as did her declaration of conscience some 15 or 16 years ago.

Perhaps it is true that the connotation she fears will be placed upon the action of those who vote against suspending the rule; but I would hope that the patriotism of no Senator, regardless of party, would ever be questioned on the basis of a vote which he cast in good conscience.

I commend the Senator for a magnificent statement.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I appreciate the words of the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

I join the majority leader in commending the Senator from Maine. I remind the Senate that she speaks as a member of the Appropriations Committee and the Subcommittee on the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce. She holds the respect of every member of our committee, for we know that she is as diligent a Member as the Senate has, and certainly as intelligent.

I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss].

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield me one-half minute?

I associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished majority leader [Mr. Mansfield]. The Senator from Maine has been a beacon of reason and courage to many Americans these past two decades, and she still stands for everything that is fair, decent, and wise in this legislative body. I think it is wonderful that we have her with us.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

First, let me say that I, too, associate myself with the remarks of the senior Senator from Maine, who speaks with the great authority of long experience, and I admire her succinct statement here today. The thing that I wanted to point out was somewhat similar to what she had to say.

Yesterday this body was confronted with a proposed motion to suspend the rule and attach to an appropriation bill a legislative authorization. In fact, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations was fortified, in that instance, by a vote of his own committee that he make such a motion to suspend the rule. But he withdrew his motion, indicating that he would follow the orderly procedure of a hearing in the other body on the measure, and await its action.

Following the withdrawal of his motion by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], it was the Senator from Illinois who stood up to fortify the legislative record by saying that he thought that this was the correct procedure; and he said, among other things:

> It was said, when this suspension of the rules was proposed, that there was precedent for it. Well, a sin of the past we cannot condone; nor can we pile another sin on top of it and compound it. I think the record has got to show that at least some remonstrance was made at the time in connection with the proposal.

Within an hour, the Senator from Illinois was on his feet, asking the Senate to suspend the rule and attach to an appropriation bill a legislative proposal that has not had hearings in this body nor been reported by a legislative committee, and sweep it through as a rider to an appropriation bill.

I know that all of us cannot act with complete consistency all of the time, but I have seldom seen inconsistency follow so swiftly—from one position to its opposite within an hour's time.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am moved to speak, first, because I am very much in sympathy with the position expressed in the moving statement of the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], and second, because of respect for my distinguished minority leader.

I must identify myself, as has the Senator from Maine, with those who will have to vote against the motion of the Senator from Illinois, and, like other Senators, take whatever consequences follow, because that is my basic philosophy; but because I have such deep regard for the minority leader, I would not wish simply to vote "no" without stating my reason.

My reason, Mr. President, is this: If we convert the Subversive Activities Control Board into a Senate investigative agency, we would be doing, in effect, what I think the Senate has successfully avoided for a long time—having some type of Un-American Activities Committee here. We have always left such matters in the hands of the Committee on the Judiciary, which has its Internal Security Subcommittee, and at least there we have had the basic safeguards of law and lawyers, so that the situation cannot run wild. We have seen examples of that in the very investigations to which the Senator from Maine referred, which involved the late Senator McCarthy.

There has been trouble about that in the other body, I say again. I am cognizant of the fact that investigations could be and would be made of the ultra right as they would be of Communists. I understand that. But I still believe that the constitutional processes would be much better served if, in the absence of a registration statute, we did not have just a broad "hunting license."

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I hope the Senator from New York will clarify which Senator McCarthy he is talking about.

Mr. JAVITS. I think it is very clear. The Senator from Minnesota need not be self-conscious about that at all.

There should not be "hunting licenses" for this agency in the absence of substantive administrative responsibility. So I think the proposal of the Senator from Illinois would be unwise. Therefore, I should like to associate myself with the Senator from Wisconsin, and shall be voting with the opponents of the motion of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the distinguished Senator from New York.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I urge rejection of this motion to suspend the Senate rules. As I pointed out yesterday, no one has more eloquently or forcefully highlighted the danger in suspending the rules than Senator DIRKSEN himself, who warned us during the rule 22 debate in January as follows. He said:

> There is a rule that you cannot legislate on appropriation bills. In the House we did it with impunity. . . . I know how it works because I have made it work. And it can work again. That is the danger. You will destroy the orderly processes. . . . If we are going to protect the Republic against wild schemes and fantasies and favorite legislative brainchildren, the thing to do is to protect our rules.

Mr. President, what reasons does Senator DIRKSEN now offer to justify our ignoring his sage advice of 9 months ago against suspending the Senate rules? What is there about his bill (S. 2171) which ought to exempt it from hearings, an adequate report, and debate in accordance with the regular order of the Senate?

Senator DIRKSEN says hearings are unnecessary on this 11-page, 263-line bill, because it would be hard to get a quorum and everyone is too busy. I say that if this bill is important enough to take the extraordinary step of suspending the rules to consider it, it is worth one morning's time to hold hearings on it so we can find out what it is about, how it might be improved, and whether, in fact, it does adequately protect our national security.

But, Senator DIRKSEN says, the hearings held before the Appropriations Committee on the Subversive Activities Control Board budget this year are hearings enough to justify this bill. But those hearings were not on Senator DIRKSEN's bill, S. 2171, but on whether to cut back or eliminate the Subversive Activities Control Board appropriation. Senator DIRKSEN did not testify at the hearings and his bill was mentioned only in passing. In fact, the hearings themselves did not take place until the morning of August 15, the very same morning and at the very same time the Judiciary Committee was meeting and reporting S. 2171, Senator DIRKSEN's bill.

So there have been no hearings on this bill. And the report on it contains no explanation of the bill's effect, no section-by-section analysis of its provisions, and no statement of the changes it would make in existing law.

But Senator DIRKSEN says that despite this total lack of legislative history or orderly procedure on his bill, we should take the extraordinary step of suspending the Senate rules to consider it because the President has told Senator DIRKSEN he wants the bill. Senator DIRKSEN says "Why do we have to find out from the administration how they feel, when the President of the United States, your President, calls me to the White House and says he wants the bill?"

Well, Mr. President, all I can say to that is that this Senator does not vote for bills just because someone in Washington tells him to. If the President wants this bill, let him send one of his representatives to Capitol Hill and tell us so, tell us why, and tell us exactly what this bill will do. If Senator DIRKSEN wants this bill, let him hold hearings on it so we can be sure of what it does and that it protects our national security most effectively.

Mr. President, no one in this body is more anxious than I to protect this country against communism, at home and abroad. If hearings on S. 2171 show that bill to be both wise and necessary, I will certainly support it. But the people of Maryland did not send me to the Senate to vote blindly on a bill just because another Senator, or even the President of the United States, tells me to. I intend to exercise independent judgment on this bill, and I will oppose voting on it until the Senate is given a record of testimony and an adequate report upon which to base such a judgment.

I urge the Senate to reject this motion to suspend the rules.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I shall vote against the pending motion—not because I oppose the amendment which the motion would make in order—but because this is not the way to legislate on such an important and complex matter.

Experience has demonstrated over and over again that legislation to control subversive activities must be drafted with the utmost care if it is to survive the rigid tests of constitutionality imposed by the Supreme Court.

A bill to accomplish the purpose intended by the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] should be considered by the Committee on the Judiciary in a much more thorough manner than the record reflects. Hearings should be held. Testimony from the Attorney General and the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation should be taken, and the position of the administration should be made clear in the record.

If the pending motion to set aside the rules is defeated, I hope the Committee on the Judiciary will then proceed very carefully and deliberately to give the proposed legislation the consideration in depth which it deserves.

Like the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], I am inclined to favor the legislation which our beloved minority leader now advocates. But I am convinced that unless we follow the orderly procedures wisely established for transacting Senate business, there can be no assurance that legislation enacted in this field will be both constitutional and effective.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; the Senator from Wisconsin should close now.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Well, let us vote.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if I have to, I will take all the 50 minutes I have remaining, if that is the way the Senators wants it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I do not want to be stubborn about this.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Well, you are.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Perhaps I am, but I should like to say to my good friend from Illinois that, after all, he has 50 minutes left—five zero—almost an hour. I have 1 minute left.

I certainly intend to have the Senator from Illinois close. He should. It is his motion that we are considering. But I would hope that he would let me have 1 minute, perhaps 10 minutes, before he is through. Then he could make one of his great perorations, which I am sure will have great effect on the Senate. I do not think that that is asking too much—50 to 1. What does that amount to?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin started earlier today to get me to take time and he made as if he were going to close this debate. The proponents are entitled to close, Mr. President, and I suggest that we should.

First of all, I will try to summarize what is before us, and I will show the invalidity of so many things that have been said on the floor.

First, the very congenial Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] said that this is a very extraordinary procedure. Go back and read rule 40. That rule was in the rule book long before I ever came here. It will be there for much longer.

As to whether it is unusual, we had the Renegotiation Act, the authorization for the construction of the New Senate Office Building, the Anti-Deficiency Act, the bill to establish the Joint Committee on the Budget, the authorization for the construction of the Rayburn House Office Building, the creation of the Commission for the Extension of the U.S. Capitol and the construction of the east front of the Capitol, the extension of the Commission on Civil Rights, the Philippine Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1963, the National Guard airlift groups, the Ready Reserve, the numerous TVA dams. These were all legislative proposals that were added to appropriation bills. So, what is unusual about it?

The point was made this morning that maybe the Attorney General is not going to enforce this. Why did they not go back and read the act?

I read the act to them:

> Whenever the Attorney General has reason to believe that any organization—

Which has not registered under subsections (a), (b), and so forth—

> is a Communist-action organization or a Communist-front organization, he shall file with the Board and serve upon such organization a petition for a determination that such organization is a Communist-action organization or a Communist-front organization, as the case may be.

The Attorney General does not have to file it if he does not want to do so. That provision was in the act when it was passed. And when Truman vetoed it, we overrode his veto. But even then, in 1950, that language was there. And we do not propose to change it.

The distinguished Senator from Utah and the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin either found it convenient or worthwhile not to hear the whole story or tell the whole story about the Hayden proposal to an appropriations bill.

Why did they not say that we passed the central Arizona project a year ago? I voted for it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, we passed the project three times.

That is the point I tried to make.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There is no inconsistency whatever. The central Arizona project was passed here, and it got stuck on the other side. It was then proposed to repass the measure here and stick it in another committee on the House side. That is an unusual position, and there is not the slightest validity in what the distinguished Senator from Utah said.

The point was made yesterday that there was not any report of any consequence, on the Court decisions or in the report.

With reference to this measure, we had plenty of discussion in the Judiciary Committee. Let me say to the Senate that the measure was voted out by a vote of 11 to 2. There were only two Senators on the Judiciary Committee who opposed it. And the names of those two Senators appear in the Xerox copy that was circulated in the Senate yesterday.

It is very strange, is it not, that this matter could get 11 votes, and yet they tried to go along with the idea of abolishing the Board.

A bill has been introduced to abolish the Board. The Senator from Wisconsin introduced such a bill. And then he tried before the Appropriations Committee to cut out the money, to gut this operation. I think the country is entitled to know about it.

It would be strange indeed if we were to appropriate money and then not give the Board any work. What is the consistency of such a position?

The money is there. It is contained in the bill now, unless the Senate undertakes to strike it.

So, there will be money. But, it will be Congress and not the Court that will tie the hands of the Board. And I think the country is entitled to know this.

The Assistant Attorney General testified at great length with respect to the bill. His testimony is found in the hearings. He said:

> It has been my view that an important function of the Subversive Activities Control Board has been the disclosure that has resulted in 23 front organization cases that were brought before the Board.

He said further:

> I believe the Subversive Activities Control Board has performed a valuable service.

It certainly has performed a valuable service.

With respect to the act whereby the Board was created in 1950, this is testimony from Mr. Herbert A. Philbrick, who has been an informant for the FBI:

> I am most interested in the statements made by some alleging that the Communists have mellowed and changed. I am intrigued as to where their source of information might be to form such an opinion.

This testimony was given on May 9, 1967, before the Internal Security Subcommittee.

He said further:

> There is no question but that the law the Communists fear the most, the law that they fought the longest and hardest to overthrow was the Internal Security Act of 1950. The Communists fought that measure tooth and nail, in court and out, week in and week out, for 15 solid years.

If we do not give that Board the necessary latitude in conformity with the court decisions, then of course they have money, but they cannot perform their duties as they should.

It was mentioned here yesterday that these were political appointees on the Board. Well, on a board like this, or an independent agency, there are always political appointees.

The distinguished Chairman of the Board comes from Montana, and he is a former national commander of the Disabled American Veterans.

Mr. Patterson, a member of the Board, was at one time Deputy Veterans Administrator for a good many years. And he was a Deputy in the Office of War Management.

Mr. Sweeney was on the Board. He died recently. He was at one time one of the faculty of Northwestern University.

I do not know where we would get better people than those. I think that pretty well covers what has been said with respect to the character and attributes of the members of the Board.

I ask, who wants this? I am pretty confident that the President of the United States wants it. I will not put any words in his mouth.

I gather from Mr. Yeagley, the Assistant Attorney General, that Justice wants it. And I reemphasize that the basic act does not require the Attorney General to submit a petition to the Board if he does not want to do so.

The FBI does not very often interfere in legislative matters of this kind. However, I am pretty sure that if I had a chance to make contact with J. Edgar Hoover, I could quickly get his answer.

The 11 members of the Judiciary Committee voted to report this measure to the Senate as against two Senators who were opposed.

The American Legion wants it. The VFW wants it. The AMVETS want it. The Disabled American Veterans want it.

Who does not want it?

It would appear that some Senators do not want it. I do not reflect upon their judgment.

I am thinking in terms of the problem that is before the country. I am also thinking of one other thing, Mr. President, and that is that we have 475,000 people mostly in uniform, 12,000 miles from here. They are fighting a war against the Reds, and I do not think anybody can make anything else out of it.

These things get into the service papers, papers like the Stars and Stripes. It will be a great day when a couple of corporals will be setting there alone out in the timber or in the wasteland somewhere and one of them says: "What are we doing here fighting the Reds? It would appear that back in Washington they are not very interested in our case. They do not give us very much support in fighting the Reds."

That would be a singular thing to happen, but obviously it could happen, as a matter of fact.

Now, there is ample reason for this motion to be sustained and to pass by a good vote in this body, and that is precisely where I am going to rest the case, without any more speeches on my part. After my friend, the Senator from Wisconsin, uses his minute, I shall use 1 minute, and then I will yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Illinois has not answered the basic question; and the basic question is, Will the Attorney General use this act to give real force to the Subversive Activities Control Board? If he does not use this act, then the proposed measure will do nothing. The very least we should insist upon is some kind of answer from the Attorney General, and we have not received it.

Mr. President, we should realize, when we are asking to suspend the rules and to put this measure on an appropriation bill, that we mean there will be no further hearings in the House. There have been no hearings in the Senate. We have no testimony on this matter from any kind of expert.

Under these circumstances, if ever there was a case for maintaining the precedent of not suspending the rules, it would seem to me that it is clearly in this case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPONG in the chair). Who yields time?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield myself 1 minute.

It is rather singular that the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin does not go back to the basic act, which does not require the Attorney General to do it, unless he has reason to believe that any organization which is not registered, and so forth—and then petitions the Board. That is the whole story.

There has not been an argument on this floor that would hold water against this proposal. And the former Attorney General who spoke here this morning, insofar as I know, never lifted a finger, when he was Attorney General, to get this Board abolished. I do not know why, but he did not.

So, Mr. President, I add one other thing. I just make it clear that the majority leader in this body is definitely for this proposal.

With that, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the motion has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MONRONEY (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the distinguished senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. If he were present, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the requirement for pairs on this vote is 2 to 1.

Mr. RIBICOFF (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. If he were present, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD (after having voted in the affirmative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. If he were present, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea."

I understand that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN] would vote "yea." Therefore, I withhold our votes.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote, the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and I have a pair with the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. If the Senator from Oregon were present, he would vote "nay." If the majority leader and I were permitted to vote, we would vote "yea." We therefore withdraw our votes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, that abrogates the announcement made earlier relating to the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN].

The assistant legislative clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] is necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE] would vote "nay." Also, if present and voting, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN] would vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 47, nays 38, as follows:

[No. 294 Leg.]

YEAS—47

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Baker
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Cannon
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Eastland
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Hansen
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hollings
Hruska
Jordan, N.C.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, La.
McClellan
Miller
Montoya
Mundt
Murphy
Pearson
Percy
Prouty
Randolph
Scott
Smathers
Sparkman
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—38

Bartlett
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Case
Church
Clark
Ellender
Fulbright
Gore
Griffin
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hatfield
Inouye
Javits
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Long, Mo.
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Mondale
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Smith
Spong
Symington
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—15

Brooke
Byrd, W. Va.
Carlson
Hayden
Jackson
Jordan, Idaho
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
Metcalf
Monroney
Morse
Morton
Ribicoff
Russell

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two-thirds of the Senators present and voting not having voted in the affirmative, the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is rejected.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, to paraphrase MacArthur, I say to the Senate: "I'll be back, and S. 2171 will be back, and it won't be very long from now."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] proposes an amendment on page 48, beginning with line 9, strike out all down to and including line 15, as follows:

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Subversive Activities Control Board, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, not to exceed $3,500 for expenses of travel, and not to exceed $500 for the purchase of newspapers and periodicals, $295,000.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. Attachés will withdraw to the rear of the Chamber.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I supported the Senator from Illinois in his motion to suspend the rule. I regret that we were unsuccessful in that effort. Had it been successful I would have supported his proposed bill to confer upon the Board legislative authority whereby it could perform the functions and duties which Congress intended. However, the motion was rejected, and we are now confronted with this situation: We have a Board with 18 members and an appropriation in the bill for $295,000 to pay their salaries—salaries of employees who for 17 months have had no duties whatsoever to perform and who for the next several months will still have no duties to perform, except to cash their checks.

I will be supporting the Senator from Illinois when his bill comes before the Senate for legislative approval. If it is passed by the Senate and the House certainly they will need personnel, and I would then support restoration of the necessary money to pay the salaries of the personnel to perform the duties which may be assigned to them.

Mr. President, I am not quarreling with the work that this agency was designed to perform, but it does not and has not had any duties to perform.

Under this proposal it would have five employees drawing $26,000 a year; one general counsel at a salary of $23,425 a year to advise them on how to do nothing, an assistant to that general counsel at $19,371, who would help him advise this Board on nothing; one GS-12 employee drawing $12,064; one employee at $9,221; six drawing a total of $57,438, which is a little better than $9,000 a year; one employee at $9,001, one at $5,850; and one at $4,845—a total of 18 employees with a total payroll of over $270,000 plus other benefits.

I understand that at the present time they have only 13 employees, but the budget request and committee amendment allows $295,000, or enough for 18 employees as enumerated above. Apparently they plan to hire five more employees this year. What they will be doing is anybody's guess.

Mr. President, at a time when we are supposed to be trying to curtail Federal expenditures, Congress certainly cannot justify carrying these 18 employees on the payroll when we all recognize not only that under the existing law they are not performing any functions but also that under the law there are no duties for them to perform. The committee report confirms this point.

Therefore, I propose to strike from the appropriation bill all the money for this particular agency.

I conclude by stating that if and when the bill proposed by the Senator from Illinois comes before the Senate I will support it, and if it is enacted I will support the necessary appropriation to finance and pay for the personnel to operate the agency.

In the meantime I think we should strike this money from the pending bill.

I want a yea and nay vote on my amendment, Mr. President, unless the chairman is willing to accept it.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I can appreciate and I share the concern of the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] with respect to making an appropriation from which we may get very little service. It would take at least $100,000, if the Board is terminated, to liquidate its affairs and pay the termination costs, including severance pay of the employees.

In my judgment, if we act today to strike the appropriation under the conditions that now prevail in the situation which confronts us, we will be striking a death blow to the Board and to the functions which we have heretofore pursued with respect to exposing Communist subversion in this country. I think it would be tragic to do that.

I was most reluctant to support the distinguished minority leader's motion to suspend the rule. I did so only because of the peculiar circumstances that attended the situation at the moment.

Mr. President, can we, and will we, today repudiate the efforts we have made in the past to do something about Communist subversion in this country?

Kill this Board, deny it any funds, advertise to the world that we have failed in this effort and that we no longer intend to pursue it, then what kind of message will that carry to our boys fighting in Vietnam at this hour?

We have already done enough that is calculated to discourage our fighting men from feeling reassured that they have the support of their people here at home.

It is time we began to take more aggressive action and to let them know that, irrespective of the issues involved, irrespective of how we may have gotten into the conflict in Vietnam, we are with our fighting boys today all the way, and that we propose to see them through to victory, or until an honorable settlement of the conflict is achieved.

I do not propose, by my vote, or by any expression of mine on the floor of the Senate, in public, or otherwise, to lend the least comfort, the least encouragement, to the enemy. Such action today, in my judgment, would be interpreted as that. Let us retain the money recommended in the bill. Let us pursue further at this session of Congress the effort to enact legislation to expand the powers of the Board within the Constitution as interpreted by Congress. Let the Board resume its functions. Instead of wondering whether the Attorney General would enforce a law, let us not wonder. If necessary, let us write into the act that the Attorney General shall carry out its provisions.

I am not ready to start to apologize for our efforts in this field. I realize what motivates the Senator from Delaware in offering the amendment. It is economy. I am for economy. We should have economy. If we cannot reestablish the Board and give it the expanded powers it needs, we should not, of course, support it financially. But at this critical moment, after what has happened in the Senate this afternoon, when we consider even what that action may convey, in its import, to our soldiers abroad, I think it would be a compounding of an error for us now to strike from the bill all of the funds necessary to realize the hope and the expectation that we will act affirmatively to put the Board back into commission and into action. I hope it will be aggressive action.

Let no one delude his thinking and come to the erroneous conclusion that communism is no longer active in this country. What have we witnessed this summer? Is there a single Member of this body who at this moment doubts that the enemy communism had its finger in some of those activities? Are we always going to retreat? What has happened to this country's determination and resoluteness to fight communism?

Mr. President, I cannot accept the amendment. I share the objective that motivates the Senator from Delaware in submitting it. But that motivation is transcended by the import and the impact that the amendment could have. It is a move, in my judgment, in the wrong direction. It is a negative action, whereas we ought to be taking the positive action that we attempted to take a little while ago.

I hope that, upon reconsideration, the Senator from Delaware will withdraw his amendment. If he will not do so, I plead with the Senate to reject it.

We have just had a minority vote by which, under the circumstances, some Senators voted against the suspension of the rule. They did not vote against the Board; they did not vote against the services it performs; they simply voted on a matter of procedure.

Now we are coming down to the fundamental issue: Do we support the Board by making appropriations, or do we incapacitate it completely and destroy it—in effect, abolish it? To me that is a retreat. This is not the hour, this is not the time, this is not the place to begin a retreat. I hope the amendment will be rejected.

I may call attention to one other fact. One-fourth of this $295,000 has already been expended, and it will take at least another $100,000 to liquidate it. So we are not saving much. Perhaps $100,000 is involved in this amendment. That is what is actually involved, not the $295,000 carried in the bill.

I hope my friend will reconsider.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I respect the position of the Senator from Arkansas. There are few men I have met whom I respect more highly, but I disagree with him on this point.

I call attention to the fact that on July 24, 1967, this issue was first raised, at which time I introduced a resolution instructing the Appropriations Committee to survey the past activities of this Board and to report on its prospective work in the future. The committee's own report, on page 33, confirms that this Board has no duties. I read excerpts from this report:

> Without further legislation, the chances that the board's workload will materially increase is remote.
>
> The board has no statutory authority to bring cases before it on its own motion. The only other way that a case may arise is through the voluntary action of an organization or an individual. This latter is a remote possibility.

For 17 months this Board has performed no duties whatsoever. There is no prospect that it will have any duties in the future until Congress passes the necessary legislation. I stated earlier that I will support the proposed legislation of the Senator from Illinois. I will support his bill if it is brought up this afternoon. After that bill has been enacted into law I will support an appropriation for it. I will even sponsor an amendment to add an appropriation to a supplemental bill, if that is the wish of the Senate, but I will not support a $295,000 payroll for a group of political appointees who have no duties to perform except to cash their checks. Congress is not fighting communism by supporting a board with 18 employees who have no duties to perform. We are not kidding anyone that we are fighting communism merely by carrying these men on a panel with no assigned duties.

This is a ridiculous situation, and it has existed for the past 17 months. What is even worse is that we are now asked to perpetuate the farce.

The question might well be asked, "Why has this Board been allowed to continue for 17 months without any duties?" Speaking for myself, I never knew the Board was without duties until I heard about it last July. Apparently the Board members were satisfied with having nothing to do for 17 months except draw their pay and cash their checks; so why should they alert Congress that they were tired of playing pinochle in their offices and ask for duties to be assigned to them?

I will accept my part of the responsibility for not knowing about this situation, but we do know about it now. We know they have five men with no work to perform, who are drawing salaries of $26,000. We know this Board has two men as attorneys to advise them on how to loaf at the taxpayers' expense. Altogether they will have 18 employees who have nothing to do if this amendment is defeated.

As to the statement that it will take $100,000 for their severance pay should the Board be abolished is actually an argument for this amendment. Are we now being told that it will cost the taxpayers $100,000 to get rid of a small group of employees who for the past 17 months have been drawing approximately $25,000 in monthly salaries for doing absolutely no work at all?

Is that any argument for keeping these drones on the payroll?

How are we going to win the battle against communism, either at home or abroad, by carrying on the payroll a dead agency—one with 18 employees who have no work to do? If that is a constructive step in the fight against communism why not double or triple the Board, put 1,000 drones on the payroll, and really lick the problem? Certainly we do not accomplish anything by keeping people on the payroll with no duties to perform.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. In the event the Senator's amendment carries and the funds to carry on the Board are voted out of existence, does that mean that in the event the minority leader brings up his bill later on and it passes, there will have to be a new commission appointed?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The President could appoint a new commission. I have said that I would support an appropriation to pay their salaries if a law were passed whereby the agency would function. I do not see that we achieve anything, from the standpoint of our opposition to communism and certainly not from the standpoint of sound budgetary practices, by continuing an agency which for 17 months has not had anything to do. The committee report confirms that they have had no work. The committee report confirms that there will be no duties that can be assigned to the Board until Congress has passed legislative authority conferring such duties on that Board.

Had the proposal of the Senator from Illinois, which I supported, been enacted, as I stated, I would not have proposed any action to strike money from the bill. But the Board is dead in everything but name.

If that is the way we are going to fight communism we can take the sign from the door, put it across Constitution Avenue, and give it a lot more display without costing anything. I do not see any sense in supporting any agency which is dead as far as the past, present, and future are concerned. What about the poor taxpayer who has to underwrite its cost?

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I have profound respect for the distinguished Senator from Delaware, and many times—I think most of the times—in the fights he has waged on this floor, I have supported him. I regret to say that today I cannot help but feel that he is completely wrong in the effort that he is making, although he is making it, of course, with all sincerity.

Mr. President, this Board, in the opinion of the Senator from New Hampshire, is not dead. In the last 2 or 3 minutes the distinguished Senator from Delaware has repeated five or six times that it was dead; that there was no opportunity of its coming to life. I do not agree.

We should remember that in the vote just taken, 47 Senators voted for the motion with the amendment to extend the powers of this Board, and only 38 Senators opposed it. There were a number of pairs. It took two pairs in the affirmative to match one pair in the negative. So that more than 50 Senators, more than half the entire membership of this body, indicated that they were supporting this Board.

A bill to extend the powers, or at least to bring the powers into conformity with the decisions of the Supreme Court, is on the calendar. It is said that it will be filibustered against. That may be so. But on those who choose to conduct that filibuster will be the responsibility for so doing.

I remember, Mr. President, in the years that I served in the House of Representatives, the correspondence that I received, year after year, demanding that I vote to abolish the Un-American Activities Committee. That correspondence always came from the same sources. It came from people within my State and outside my State, whom I came to know, and to know, I think, their hidden motive. In most cases they wanted the moral victory—if you want to call it a moral victory; I would call it an immoral victory—of having the word go out to the Nation and to the world that that committee was abolished.

I have not approved of all the activities of that committee. Many times I have strongly disapproved. But I came to understand the context, every single session: It was a desire to get the Congress of the United States to repudiate, reject, and abolish an agency designed to protect this Republic from subversive activities and from those who seek to destroy it.

In the same way, useless as this Board has been for a long time past, handicapped, shackled, and handcuffed as it has become, it has stood as a symbol, just as the House Un-American Activities Committee has stood as a symbol, of the resolution of Congress not to suppress anybody's convictions, but to bring facts out into the open, so that innocent people in this country cannot be solicited for funds by this organization or that organization, without being made aware of the true character of the organizations soliciting their support.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. COTTON. Certainly.

Mr. AIKEN. I was late coming into the Chamber, but I heard the Senator say that this Board had been handicapped and prevented from doing anything.

Will the Senator tell us who has done the handicapping? Who has prevented the Board from functioning?

Mr. COTTON. I shall be very happy to answer that question.

Mr. AIKEN. As I understand it, the Board has quite a considerable number of political employees drawing money for doing nothing.

Mr. COTTON. That is certainly the truth.

Mr. AIKEN. Somebody is responsible for that. Who is it?

Mr. COTTON. I will tell the Senator who it is. I sat for years on the Independent Offices Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives, long before I came to the Senate, and I have been in the Senate 13 years. This Board was then in being. We had to provide the appropriations to maintain it; and year after year, the Chairman of the Board came before us and said, perfectly frankly, that they could not do their job effectively while there were cases pending in the courts and before the Supreme Court as to the validity of the law that created them, and as to the validity of the functions that the law had conferred upon them.

Those cases dragged along, literally, for years—at least the last 2 or 3 years that I was in the House of Representatives. They continued to drag on for years longer; in fact, for a whole decade. The Board could not function. It would have been foolish for it to attempt to function, when its very existence, its powers, the scope of its authority, and the validity of its actions were being challenged before the Supreme Court of the United States.

Now, at last, the Supreme Court has acted. It has defined the Board's powers. It has acted, and I have no comment to make upon its decision. It has acted in such a manner that we now know the score. We now know how the Board can effectively act in conformity with the decisions of the Supreme Court; and at this point, after it has been shackled all these years—and I am sorry that the vote came up as it did—Congress now has the opportunity to make this Board effective within the scope of the decisions of the Court, to make it effective in such a manner that all the rights of individuals and all the rights of organizations, carefully defined in the Court decisions, shall be respected.

I agree with the distinguished Senator

from Arkansas, who so eloquently and so pointedly brought out the impact; and I say that the moral effect on the people of this country and the people of all countries of having us, at this point, do anything but hold the present situation until the bill can be acted upon, would do inestimable harm.

Mr. President, it may be a tragedy to have members and personnel of this Board idle for the necessary few weeks that it will now take to get an affirmative decision one way or the other by Congress. But I call to the attention of the Senator from Delaware—and I know that he will be the first to agree with me—that they are not the only ones downtown who are playing pinochle. If we could eradicate all the Federal employees who are sitting around downtown, taking coffee breaks and working only half the time, we could save untold millions of dollars for this Government. Now, it suddenly becomes a tragedy if we pay this particular group for a limited time, in order that we do not take action here today that, in the words of the Senator from Arkansas, would constitute a retreat.

Mr. President, in this case I simply hope that the Senate will reject the proposed amendment, no matter how worthy and meritorious are the motives behind it, because there is too much at stake to worry about the money involved in this particular amendment. I hope that the bill will come before the Senate; and if it is necessary to combat a filibuster, I hope that we will sit up the necessary number of nights and hold the necessary number of sessions to accomplish it. Mr. President, while it is easy to talk about communism and there are those disposed to see a Communist hiding under every bush, and while it is true that there is an unfortunate tendency on the part of some people to say that anyone who happens to disagree with them is a Communist, and while there has been much injustice done—I do not mean in the courts, I mean in the public mind—nevertheless, I believe the dangers of subversive, hidden, creeping communism were never so great as they are in this year of 1967. Nothing could be more disastrous than for the Senate to falter in its resolution to make sure that, while observing all of the rights of the individual and the individual freedoms given by the Constitution, we are not going to be party to conspiracies designed to overthrow the last hope of liberty in the world today.

I hope the pending amendment will be rejected.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

VISIT TO THE SENATE OF PARLIAMENTARY DELEGATION FROM INDONESIA

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, we have been privileged to have before the Subcommittee on Far Eastern Affairs of the Foreign Relations Committee some visitors, some of our friends from Indonesia.

Included in that group was the Ambassador of Indonesia to the United States, His Excellency Suwito Kusumowidagdo, two Members of the Parliament of Indonesia, Mr. Hardi, Vice Chairman of the PNI—Nationalist Party—and Mr. Hartono, member of the NU—Orthodox Moslem Party—and Maj. Gen. Taswin Natadiningrat, Chief of General Suharto's personal staff and recently named Ambassador to the Netherlands. We were also honored to have Mr. Ali Alatas, Counselor, Embassy of Indonesia.

Mr. Hardi and Mr. Hartono, the Members of the Parliament, are now present on the floor of the Senate.

We are delighted to have these friends visit us. We are pleased with the way Indonesia is coming out of the most difficult situation that it has been in.

We all join in extending a welcome to these visitors today.

(The distinguished visitors rose in their places and were greeted with applause, Senators rising.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is very happy to welcome you here today.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10345) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I hope that the amendment of the Senator from Delaware will not prevail, but will be defeated.

I have thought for a long time that there is a place in our form of government for a bipartisan board which is not part of the legislative system and is not directly attached to any of the departments of the executive system to look into the questions of those activities that are aimed at the destruction of our country, whether they be from communism—and that is giving us most concern—or nazism or other forms of activities which tend to destroy our free government.

Mr. President, I am one of those who sat up through several nights and several days—and the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] is one also—while we debated up and down the wisdom of the course of establishing such a bipartisan agency to defend this country against subversion.

I remember that we passed that bill by a substantial vote, and that it was vetoed by the President. Then, I recall that in a memorable night session we overrode the veto.

Mr. President, I am not about to take the position now that we are abandoning that effort, and I think that the adoption of this amendment—whether so intended or not, and I do not believe it was so intended—would make it look as if we had sold out on any hope of preserving this Board and giving it the additional powers that it needs, and as if we are simply going to take the appropriation off the books.

I have not given up hope at all of the passage of this corrective legislation.

When we voted on the effort to waive the rules a few minutes ago, 47 Senators voted to waive the rules, four Senators were paired for that side, and many Senators were not present.

Aside from that, two Senators have told me since the vote that, though they voted not to waive the rules, they were very strongly for the extension of this legislation and for giving to this Board the additional powers that it needs.

Mr. President, when we passed this law we knew that, under decisions of the Supreme Court and under certain acts passed by Congress and by some States earlier, we were dealing in a field in which unsettled legal procedures and policies were involved. The Supreme Court has decided that.

We are now giving the chance to repair the damage done by what was contained in the opinion of the Supreme Court, and I think and hope that very shortly we are certain to pass this law that gives to the members of the Board the powers which they need.

Incidentally, the number of personnel is not the same as my distinguished friend, the Senator from Delaware, has understood it to be. There are four members of the Board and nine employees. That is a total of 13 in all.

Mr. President, the fact of the matter is that if we should vote now to do away with this appropriation, I think in the first place that we would be rather humiliated by the attitude of the House in conference, because I do not think for a moment that they would consider taking such action.

Let us remember that they have time after time maintained the position of the HUAC and that they have declined repeatedly to knock out that committee.

This Board operates in the same field. And I have no doubt at all that the House would not agree to the omission of this appropriation.

Aside from that entirely, and disregarding anything that the House might do, it seems to me that we should preserve this operation with the belief and the hope that the Board will soon be given the additional strength and machinery which it needs, by the passage of the legislation.

We had a majority a few minutes ago, and I know there is a great deal larger majority in the Senate than was indicated by that vote for the passage of the act.

It seems to me that, though not intending to do so, the distinguished Senator from Delaware was asking a majority of the Senate to march up the hill a few minutes ago and is now asking them to march back down the hill by abolishing the appropriation.

I hope that we will not seriously think of abolishing the appropriation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have discussed this matter with the distinguished majority leader and also with the Senator from Wisconsin.

We expect within the next few days to call up a bill which is on the calendar, a bill which is identical with what was offered this morning.

In view of the vote, I am certain that the Senate will approve it. Then, of course, we will have to restore the money if it is necessary. But I do not know whether constitutionally we can take this money away, to begin with.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am glad to have the remarks of the distinguished minority leader.

I understand the distinguished minority leader to say in his earlier remarks of yesterday that if his motion to waive the rule was not adopted, he would offer the bill as an amendment to other proposed legislation which would not require a waiver of the rule, or call up the bill, if permitted to do so, and see that the matter was brought to a vote.

I stand with the distinguished Senator in that desire and assurance.

I think we would be doing exactly the opposite if we were to vote to cut out this appropriation. I think that by retaining it, we show that we have every hope, as we have a right to have, for the early passage of the Senator's legislation and an early giving of other powers to the Board—in a constitutional way, certainly, and in a way which is indicated by the decision of the Supreme Court as being constitutional—so that they can proceed with their activities which will defend us against communism and nazism and various other activities, some of the extreme right and some of the extreme left, all of which are gnawing at the vitals of the country.

I shall certainly be with the Senator in support of his position. I am glad to hear that the majority leader has assured the minority leader that his measure will soon be given a chance on the floor.

I hope that the Senate will reject the pending amendment, because the assurance just given makes it very clear that if we knock it out it would probably be reinstated in conference or we would have to pass a special appropriation bill within a few days after the conference had completed its work.

I thank the Senator for his remarks.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I discussed briefly with the majority leader the prospect of having this issue considered as legislation during this session. He has assured me that it is his intention to bring up this month the bill that is on the calendar. If that is done, the issue as to whether this Board shall be continued can be settled so far as the Senate is concerned. The bill offered by the distinguished minority leader is on the calendar. When it is made the order of business and called up, the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin would be privileged to offer his bill, as a substitute, which would abolish the Board.

The issue can then be clearly drawn, and the vote will be up or down, either that one favors continuing the Board, with the authority and functions prescribed in the bill of the minority leader, or that he favors abolishing the Board, and would tell the Department of Justice—as does the bill of the Senator from Wisconsin—that they can transfer it to any agency of the Government they wish. When it is transferred around, I do not know what we can do, unless we give it some authority and power.

Mr. DIRKSEN. And money.

Mr. McCLELLAN. And money. So what are you fighting about here? We can take this money away; but the Board has been created by statute, and until the Board is abolished, its members can draw their salaries. They could go before the Court of Claims. I do not know that they would do it.

With respect to this issue, we are actually concerned with approximately $100,000, at most; and that amount is insignificant compared with what is at stake and what the impact would be, if the Senate today should go on record as saying that it will not give financial support to the Board, the only governmental agency that has the power to investigate and expose Communist subversion. That power should be enlarged, in view of the Supreme Court decision. That is what we hope to do.

I do not believe there would be a dollar saving in what the distinguished Senator from Delaware is attempting to do. As I have said, if any real benefit were to flow from the proposal, it would not, in my judgment, be to the taxpayers. The benefits that would flow from such action would serve to encourage those whom we have engaged in battle on foreign soil, where 500,000 of our finest troops are today committed to prevent the advance of communism in Southeast Asia.

I hope that this effort will fail and that the leadership of this body will, as soon as practicable, as soon as it can be arranged expeditiously, bring up for consideration the bill of the distinguished Senator from Illinois. The issue then will be fought squarely on whether we will abolish the Board and abandon our efforts to expose communism and its subversive activities in this country, or will, in effect, revitalize the Board, give it the financial support necessary, and equip it with the essentials to enable it to carry out its functions.

I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I shall be brief.

I appreciate the position of the Senator from Arkansas and the other Senators who have spoken against the proposed amendment. I respect their sincerity. Not for one moment would I question it.

It has been pointed out that a bill is on the Senate Calendar and that the leadership will take up this bill before we adjourn. I recognize that, and I will be supporting that bill. If there is an attempt to filibuster the bill I will stay here with the others to help break the filibuster. I repeat, I will support and vote for the bill because I believe it should be enacted, and then after the House has enacted the bill and it has been signed into law I will support the necessary appropriation for the salaries of the personnel to perform the duties prescribed in the bill.

In the closing days of this session, just as in every other session, we will have a supplemental appropriation bill. It will be just about the last measure on which we will act, and through it we can restore the money if the bill is passed by that time. If it is not the payroll should be abolished.

We all realize that, notwithstanding what may happen in the Senate, the bill must pass the House also, and it must be signed by the President. So we have to go through those various steps. In the meantime what is being proposed is to carry 18 people on the payroll at a monthly salary totaling $25,000 with absolutely no functions to perform except to sign their names once a month on their paychecks. Why not mail their checks to their homes and save the office rent?

Let us face it: For 17 months—all of last year and 5 months in addition—these employees have been drawing their salary every month for doing nothing. This is not my statement; I quote from the committee's report which accompanies the bill. No one denies this point.

I quote from the committee report:

> Without further legislation, the chances that the board's workload will materially increase is remote.

I quote further:

> The board has no statutory authority to bring cases before it on its own motion. The only other way that a case may arise is through the voluntary action of an organization or an individual. This latter is a remote possibility.

We are not fighting communism by continuing this agency, and I say that as one who respects the position of the other Senators.

The suggestion has been made that this would be marching down the hill. I was one of those marching up the hill in voting for the motion of the Senator from Illinois to suspend the rules, and I will be with him the next time the bill is offered. I am not marching up the hill or down the hill. I am merely stating that we are not accomplishing our objective by carrying on the payroll 18 people with no duties to perform—at least, that is my position.

The statement has been made that we have the House Un-American Activities Committee and the Senate Internal Security Committee and that over the years there has been an effort to abolish those committees. That is no comparison. I have consistently supported the appropriations to the Senate Internal Security Committee, and I will continue to do so. The House Un-American Activities Committee, of course, is handled by the House, but I will say this about either of those committees: If the time ever comes when they sit around for 17 months and do absolutely nothing I will help abolish them, too.

I see no need for carrying on the books a useless committee or agency which has no work to do, just because it has a high-sounding name.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I notice that recently the President has become very much concerned over the financial condition of this country. I believe he is very properly concerned about the financial condition and the suspending of costs for various projects here and all over the United States.

Here is an agency with no work to do. I would like to ask the Senator: Does the President have any authority to correct the lack of operations of this Board and also suspend salaries until the necessary legislation has been passed?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. He has, and I would say he could certainly cooperate a little more in assigning duties to them.

With all due respect to the President's position, the fact remains that it takes legislative action by Congress to confer on this Board certain jurisdiction and duties. Until we do that they do not have any work.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I believe I am correct that Congress has to act affirmatively; otherwise no matter what is done by this legislation they would be entitled to draw their salaries with no limitation. Therefore, I am trying to urge that we act and that we get up these bills.

Judging from the vote on the previous motion to suspend the rule, I am persuaded that a majority of the Senate wants this Board continued. I could be wrong but that vote so indicated to me, because I think some Senators voted against the motion to suspend the rule on procedural grounds.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. We have heard of recess appointments, and I am just wondering if in this case, with 18 people doing absolutely nothing——

Mr. McCLELLAN. If the Senator will permit me to interrupt, for the record there are only 13.

Mr. AIKEN. There are 13 people doing nothing but drawing their pay. I wonder whether the President could not just give them a recess and suspend them for the time being until there is legislation.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I say that if we are unwilling to give them the powers to function and to serve the interests of our country, if Congress is unwilling to do that, the Board should be abolished, and we should have the courage to do it. We have the initial responsibility. The Board was created by Congress. If we do not want the service performed, we should go to the core of the matter and end it there and not do it in this fashion.

Mr. President, the issue is, Do we want this service for this country? If we do want it, give them the power to function. If we do not want it, then abolish the Board and make no apologies for it. Let us stop it and end all this foolishness. That is my point of view. There is not much middle ground.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I would like to subscribe to the thoughts of the Senator from Arkansas. The occasion will arrive soon when that decision can be made.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In the absence of the Senator from Nebraska, I was permitted to give that assurance from the leader; that it is his intention to bring these bills, and the bills of the distinguished minority leader, before the Senate this month.

Mr. HRUSKA. At that time we can take the bill up and decide the route to travel.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is the issue.

Mr. HRUSKA. I give the Senator from Delaware credit for watching over the financial resources of our Republic. He has demonstrated that many times. Yet, I wonder if it is timely to urge this particular amendment at this time.

If I had my choice between an interim where the Board is not engaged profitably in its originally assigned duty, and the nonexistence of the Board, the greatest evil would be to abolish this Board. With abolishment goes the opportunity to function properly within the meaning of the original statute.

The only thing standing in the way of that performance is the enabling statute which has been partially voided by the Supreme Court. It would not take much to remedy that situation and permit the Board to function in a highly beneficial and necessary way.

Subversion is still here. As matters stand, the expressed policy of the Congress is in favor of a procedure whereby subversive and front organizations will not only be identified, but also exposed to the public so the public will know with whom it is dealing. Subversive activities are still a very large problem in this Nation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I respect the position of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], but I point out that this peculiar situation has existed for 17 months already. Now the Senator wants to continue on the same basis.

The report which the Senator's committee has before us today clearly states that there is not a remote possibility that the Board will have any work until this legislation is enacted. In the meantime, these employees continue just to loaf.

The majority leader has indicated, and I accept his assurance, that this bill will be brought before the Senate at this session. I am hopeful that the Senate will act on it affirmatively, and I shall support it. But we have no assurance that the House of Representatives will act. If both Houses act, we could put the money in the supplemental appropriation.

Mr. President, in the meantime I do not see how we are achieving anything by retaining on the payroll, at a cost of $25,000 per month, a staff having no duties to perform. This is not the first time such a situation has developed.

I wish to cite one case in which I had experience involving the U.S. Spruance Corp. In that instance we had an appropriation covering the salaries of a president of the corporation, his secretary, and a chauffeur, and a car was being furnished. I inquired what that corporation was doing with that staff. Upon investigation we found they had been carrying on for a number of years with no duties except to draw their pay. I introduced an amendment at that time providing that none of the money in the appropriation bill could be used to pay the salaries of those people. My amendment was agreed to and in 30 days they were off the payroll. Do not worry, if the money is taken away they are off the payroll.

How are we going to achieve anything in fighting communism by merely carrying on the payroll some deadheads who over the past 17 months have not had any function to perform except cashing their checks at the end of the month?

I support the objectives of this particular agency if and when they get authority. But I am not going to support any agency, department, or committee if there are no duties performed to justify the payroll.

We now have a Federal payroll that is costing the Government billions of dollars. We are going to have to stop this spending somewhere. When we find employees who for 17 months have been drawing checks and doing nothing, something should be done. I recognize that there was an adverse Court decision and Congress has not implemented that decision with corrective legislation. I am not going to vote to continue on the public payroll five employees at $26,000 a year who have no duties, a counsel at $23,425 who has no duties, an assistant counsel at $19,371 to advise that counsel so he can give proper advices to the Board on how to do nothing. Surely they know how to achieve nothing without being advised by counsel.

How ridiculous can Congress get? What possible good can the Board do until a bill is passed authorizing them to go to work? If and when such a bill is passed I will help implement with the necessary money to pay their salaries, but in the meantime we are not achieving anything except pouring more money down the same rathole.

While I respect the position on the other side, so far as I am concerned, that is my position. I do not question the motives of anyone. I merely state my position.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a list of the employees which the Budget Bureau submitted to Congress in support of this legislation, along with their projected salaries. This list calls for 18 employees during this fiscal year. I understand this is five more than they have at present.

Think of it—add five more employees to do nothing but draw their paychecks.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD—SALARIES AND EXPENSES

	Number	Total salary
Chairman and Board members (at $26,000)	5	$130,000
General Counsel	1	23,425
Assistant General Counsel	1	19,371
GS-12	1	12,064
GS-11	1	9,221
GS-10	6	57,438
GS-9	1	9,001
GS-7	-------	-------
GS-5	1	5,850
GS-3	1	4,845
Total permanent	18	-------

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, if this action is taken, assuming that the Board—and I assume that it would, although it possibly would not be required to do so by law—would immediately resign and thus not incur any further obligation to have to pay their salaries—although they were created by statute and are thus creatures of the statute and they would continue until an act abolishing the Board, I assume, was passed.

What will we have done? I ask every Member of this body to read the record taking into account the conditions that prevail in the world today in our efforts in regard to the necessity to stem the tide of aggressive communism. Read this record and ask ourselves the question, with $100,000 involved in a $140 billion budget: What are the stakes and would saving $100,000 offset the harm that would be done?

Mr. Yeagley, Assistant Attorney General, appeared before the Appropriations Committee, in carrying out the mission that was assigned to us, to make an investigation of the Board as to its need and whether it should be continued or abolished.

I questioned Mr. Yeagley, and asked him the following questions:

Senator McClellan. I am trying to find out if this Board is necessary. If it is not, we ought to abolish it.

Mr. Yeagley. The Communist Party is still in existence in this country.

Senator McClellan. Is it active?

Mr. Yeagley. It is active.

Senator McClellan. Is it aggressively active?

Mr. Yeagley. I think Communists are more aggressive politically than most followers of other political creeds.

I would say, that is saying a whole lot when we take into account the aggressiveness with which the two major political parties campaign.

Continuing to read:

Senator McClellan. Is there any doubt about its efforts at subversion in this country, in your judgment?

Mr. Yeagley. No; not at all, sir.

Senator McClellan. There is no doubt about it.

Mr. Yeagley. Right.

Senator McClellan. Then, in your judgment, should there be an effort to combat it by exposure?

Mr. Yeagley. I believe that it offers an excellent means of attacking the Communist method in this country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the testimony of Mr. Yeagley as it appears on pages 584 through 588 of the hearings on the Subversive Activities Control Board.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Mr. Yeagley. 1955. There have been various reasons for that, all of which have been explored by the various Attorneys General that have served during that period, the most important one being the constitutional questions that are inherent in a program of that sort.

These were litigated to some extent in the *Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee* case prior to 1955, in which the due process question was raised, and efforts were made to improve the hearing procedure in the Department.

But to give the type of due process hearings that a court would sustain as valid would require complete confrontation of witnesses in the course of putting in the Government's case on the organization, and any other evidence. We have no subpena power, for example, under this procedure.

Senator McClellan. Does the Justice Department or the Attorney General, have the authority, to subpena witnesses, to hold a hearing, and to make a judicial determination?

Mr. Yeagley. We could hold the hearing but we have no power of subpenaing witnesses. It would be voluntary witnesses only that we could bring into a hearing of this kind.

Senator McClellan. You cannot require attendance of witnesses?

Mr. Yeagley. We cannot require attendance of witnesses. No, sir; we cannot.

Senator McClellan. You would have to rely altogether on voluntary statements?

Mr. Yeagley. That is right.

Senator McClellan. And would that be held to be due process as against the respondent?

Mr. Yeagley. Provided we carried the burden of proof, it conceivably could be, if we could get the witnesses to come in. I think you will recall yourself——

Senator McClellan. Suppose he says, "I want you to subpena another witness who knows that is not true," and you do not have the power to do it. Would that constitute due process?

Mr. Yeagley. The respondent or the person involved could claim he was unable to produce his witnesses for lack of subpena power.

Senator McClellan. Would that then constitute due process?

Mr. Yeagley. No.

Senator McClellan. That is the point I am making. You cannot insure due process with the authority that you now have.

Mr. Yeagley. That is absolutely right.

Senator McClellan. Why are you not filing any proceedings now with the Board?

Mr. Yeagley. We filed one in March of 1966 against the DuBois Clubs as having been organized and controlled by the Communist Party. We have not filed others, because we did not have cases in shape to carry the burden of proof that is required since the court of appeals decision in the case involving the National Council of American Soviet Friendship.

Senator McClellan. Have you continued investigations?

Mr. Yeagley. Yes. The appropriations hearings on the House side indicated that there are approximately 100 organizations in which the Communists have been found operating, and on which the FBI checks occasionally, if not investigates. But this, of course, is far from establishing the direction, domination, and control that the law and the courts require us to show.

In other words, we have to carry a high burden of proof.

Senator McClellan. I will insert in the record a table appearing at page 338 of the House hearings which gives a breakdown of new matters received by the Internal Security Division during fiscal years 1964, 1965, 1966, and 1967 and the estimate for 1968.

(The table follows:)

INTERNAL SECURITY DIVISION—NEW MATTERS

	Actual			Estimated	
	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968
Foreign Agents Registration Act	2,035	1,619	1,588	1,700	1,700
Matters involving unauthorized disclosure of Government information, possible violations of the espionage statutes or of the Atomic Energy Act	180	232	184	190	190
Matters relating to the destruction of supplies and equipment, including possible violations of the sabotage statutes	131	104	113	115	115
Atomic energy matters (possible false statements on personnel security questionnaires)	15	5	14	15	15
Other false statement or perjury matters	792	726	695	700	700
Communist Party front matters	162	131	99	100	100
Matters relating to subversive individuals including Smith Act subjects, matters affecting international organizations and diplomats, miscellaneous companies, contempt of Congress, neutrality, sedition, trading with the enemy	5,229	4,620	4,916	5,000	5,000
Civil actions involving internal security	23	32	24	30	30
Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959	13	5	0	0	0
Total	8,580	7,474	7,633	7,850	7,850

Senator McClellan. If this is abolished, can the Board supplement and be complementary to the functions of the Justice Department and render an effective and valid service to our Government?

Mr. Yeagley. I don't believe the Justice Department would want these functions. I believe they are a part of the prosecutive arm of the Government. We would be the prosecutor, jury, and judge, I suppose.

Senator McClellan. If you do not want them, as suggested by Senator Proxmire, to go beyond that, is there any occasion or necessity for the maintaining of this Board? Will the Justice Department find occasion to use it enough to justify the cost of it, and will the results that can be anticipated from its proper function warrant the expenditure?

Mr. Yeagley. I personally would think so. But I am in the awkward position of not giving the Board business on a large scale.

Nonetheless, it has been my view that an important function of this Board has been the disclosure that has resulted in the 23 front organization cases that were brought before the Board. Many of those organizations were rather influential in the country. Many of them were large. And I believe that the disclosures that ensued through the hearings against those front organizations was beneficial, both to the unsuspecting member and to the public generally.

Senator McClellan. I am trying to find out if this Board is necessary. If it is not, we ought to abolish it.

Mr. Yeagley. The Communist Party is still in existence in this country.

Senator McClellan. Is it active?

Mr. YEAGLEY. It is active.

Senator McCLELLAN. Is it aggressively active?

Mr. YEAGLEY. I think Communists are more aggressive politically than most followers of other political creeds.

Senator McCLELLAN. Is there any doubt about its efforts at subversion in this country, in your judgment?

Mr. YEAGLEY. No; not at all, sir.

Senator McCLELLAN. There is no doubt about it.

Mr. YEAGLEY. Right.

Senator McCLELLAN. Then, in your judgment, should there be an effort to combat it by exposure?

Mr. YEAGLEY. I believe that it offers an excellent means of attacking the Communist method in this country.

Senator McCLELLAN. Of course. But in other words what I am asking you in effect is: Should the Board be abolished, or should we keep it and try to revitalize it, in a sense, and strengthen its powers and functions, within the framework of the Constitution?

Mr. YEAGLEY. I certainly could not support anything in the form of abolishing the Board because, as I have indicated, I feel it has been beneficial in the past. It has been valuable. I feel that there may be business in the future. I feel the Communist Party is a continuing threat as long as it is in existence and active here. And I know of no alternative in this area to the present functions of the Board.

Senator McCLELLAN. Let me ask you: Is the Communist Party more or less active now than in the past, in your judgment, as to subversive activities?

Mr. YEAGLEY. I would have to say it is less.

Senator McCLELLAN. It is less. What has contributed to the diminishing of its activities?

Mr. YEAGLEY. Probably there have been several factors. I don't know how much of an expert I am in this field. But the party has lost membership since the Second World War, maybe from 80,000 down to whatever it is today. It has been estimated at from 8,000 to 10,000. This has been a continuing drop, particularly after, say, 1948 or 1950 on down.

Obviously, we must recognize that the improved economic factors in the country have given the Communists less ammunition. I personally have felt that the exposure involved in these Board proceedings, particularly, as I have indicated, as to the 23 front organizations, the exposure in the original case against the Communist Party, in which voluminous evidence was given as to its purposes and its foreign control, have all been highly detrimental to the party. And I can advise the committee, as I believe you may have been informed before, that the leaders of the Communist Party themselves have been of the opinion over the years that the functions of this Board have been highly detrimental to their organization.

Senator McCLELLAN. That is your belief and your findings?

Mr. YEAGLEY. That is right.

Senator McCLELLAN. Well, if this Board has contributed to the lessening of Communist activities and Communist effectiveness in its purpose of subversion and so forth in this country, then it is your belief as I understand it that because of that effectiveness and its potential usefulness in the future it should not be abolished?

Mr. YEAGLEY. That is my view.

Senator McCLELLAN. I judge from his testimony that Mr. Hoover believes that the Communists are still very active and seek every opportunity they can to exploit any disturbances or discords that they can seize upon to cause this trouble, this internal trouble and strife.

Mr. YEAGLEY. Yes. This brings up a point that I probably should comment on, Mr. Chairman, as mentioned in the article. There are a lot of radicals and revolutionaries active in the American society today. They are not, however, all Soviet oriented, such as one might have found 15 or 20 years ago. They may be Marxists of various sorts and degrees. Some look upon the Soviet-oriented Communists as being too restricted in their activity, too controlled, without enough freedom of individual action. These would probably consider themselves more revolutionary with a tendency to more violence than the Soviet-oriented Communists.

Senator McCLELLAN. They are more dangerous, would you say, than the Soviet-oriented Communists?

Mr. YEAGLEY. They can be. However, they have not been able to agree affirmatively on a program so that they could organize into one group. They have agreed to disagree with our present system. That is about as far as they have gone so far. They are split up into small groups.

Senator McCLELLAN. They also all agree that our system should be destroyed?

Mr. YEAGLEY. That is what they are publicly expressing, as a matter of fact, many of them.

Senator SMITH. As I understand it, the Subversive Activities Control Board is dependent on the Justice Department for its cases.

Mr. MAHAN. That is correct.

Senator SMITH. I understood Mr. Yeagley to say he felt guilty, in replying to some question, because he sent so few cases over to the Board.

Mr. YEAGLEY. I perhaps should not have said, if I did, that I feel "guilty." I said when I am not furnishing business to the Board it is not as easy to favor the Board's continuance, but that nonetheless I take that position. We do have a large number of cases under investigation, but they are a long way from the substantial direction, domination, and control of the Communist Party that the present law, as interpreted by the courts, require.

We would have one case that we are working on and will continue to work on, to see if the informants are available, and if after interview they would make a case, then we would recommend to the Attorney General that one be filed at once after it is made.

There are others approaching that point, but frankly, the proof does not meet the requirements of domination and control. In other words, the Court said if we merely prove there are Communists acting as officers of the organization, that does not carry the burden. We must go beyond that and prove that they are under the direction of the Communist Party in their activities in that particular organization.

Senator SMITH. You think because of the Supreme Court ruling, if the Board were abolished, that this would go back up again? The Communist numbers would go back?

Mr. YEAGLEY. I don't know, frankly. All I can say is that I think the Board has been a deterrent. I think the Board has affected the party's operation adversely in the past. What the party's success would be without the Board. I don't know. I know that the party has been tremendously worried about this law, and the Board over the years has said that it has hampered their operations tremendously, and it has been No. 1 or No. 2 among the objectives over the years, in the party line.

They won finally on the membership clause and they made statements, such as, "Now we are going to come out and run for elective office, come out and be more open in our activities."

I think they even said they would start issuing membership cards and keep membership lists again which they have not done for a good many years. So they are at least hopeful of and planning for bigger operations. But to speculate on whether they will succeed—I don't know. I do think the American public is much better informed on U.S. and international communists than it was perhaps 20 years ago.

Senator HRUSKA. From your statements, I gather that you consider the Board sort of an insurance as we do the military forces?

Mr. YEAGLEY. Yes, I think that would be a fair statement.

Senator ELLENDER. Now, I notice your appropriation for the House allowance was $295,000 and you have 17 permanent employees. Does that cover all the expenses of this Board?

Mr. MAHAN. $295,000? Yes.

Senator ELLENDER. Even the printing of the decisions?

Mr. MAHAN. Everything. We needed the other money Senator Smith spoke of, we thought, to try the *Du Bois* case. Then we found we did not need the money.

But over the course of the years you will see in the statement I have prepared and sent to you that we have returned to the Treasury around $850,000, money we have not used, because we didn't need it.

I wanted to also show you, Senator—I think there are some copies there—the employees separated since this case came about, that stopped the Attorney General from sending us cases.

You will notice that we have separated all of these people.

Senator ELLENDER. That is since you had been organized?

Mr. MAHAN. No. These are the people who have let go since the *Albertson* case.

Senator ELLENDER. I am talking about the amount you returned to the Treasury.

Mr. MAHAN. That is right. That is since we organized.

Senator ELLENDER. That is how much?

Mr. MAHAN. About $850,000. I think I have a chart on it.

Senator McCLELLAN. These two charts, the employees separated during the period from June 30, 1965, to July 30, 1967, may be printed in the record, and also the other chart showing the hearings of the employees, ages, and so forth, and funds expended, may be printed in the record.

(The charts follow:)

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD—EMPLOYEES SEPARATED DURING PERIOD FROM JUNE 30, 1965, TO JULY 30, 1967

Name	Position	Date separated
Sheila H. Feinstein	Clerk-stenographer	Sept. 17, 1965
Patricia R. Harris	do	[1] Dec. 17, 1965
Robert K. Thurber	Executive secretary	[2] Dec. 30, 1965
James H. Jeffries III	Attorney	[3] Feb. 11, 1966
Frederick G. Smithson	Hearing examiner	[3] Mar. 6, 1966
Carllacy Wilson	Messenger	[4] June 25, 1966
Helen W. Cain	Clerk-stenographer	[5] June 30, 1966
Peter Paul Hanagan	Attorney	Do.
Anna L. Hurley	Stenographer	Do.
Robert L. Irwin	Hearing examiner	Do.
Dorothy E. Daugherty	Fiscal clerk	[5] June 30, 1967
James E. Stuckey	File clerk	Do.
Rosemary S. English	Administrative assistant.	[6] July 21, 1967

[1] Resigned voluntarily.

[2] Retired in contemplation of reduction in force.

[3] Transferred after receiving reduction in force notice.

[4] Drafted into armed services while reduction in force was pending.

[5] Involuntary by reason of reduction in force.

[6] Retirement. Annual leave used from June 30 to July 21 1967.

Note: Total employees as of July 1, 1965, was 22; total employees as of July 30, 1967, was 9.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, someone has suggested that if we get up the bills, we might as well go ahead and abolish the Board so that it will not get that money, otherwise there will be a filibuster.

Maybe so. Those who want to filibuster in the face of reality and thus lead a retreat will have the privilege of doing so if they desire. But I would think that this is an issue so vital and so important to our country, and there is so much at stake, that each Senator would be willing to take a clear-cut position and vote either up or down to continue the Board with the clarifying authority that would be given it.

At any rate, filibuster or no filibuster, each one of us must answer to ourselves and to our constituents, on the vital issue of whether we will support, maintain, and preserve the effort to combat Communist subversion in this country.

I realize that some of those who are supporting the motion and the amendment to reduce this, as well as the offer of it, would support legislation to continue the Board if given an opportunity to do so. They say they assume that the legislation will pass. What will have been accomplished in the next month or two by simply and effectively denying payment of salaries which have been put in question? I think it is a mistake. I think we are going overboard in the name of economy, which will permit a situation to develop which will retard and hinder the pursuit of Communist exposure and do great harm to this country.

I hope, Mr. President, that the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to ask the Senator whether this is a motion to abolish the Subversive Activities Control Board.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No; it is not. All the amendment would do would be to stop the payroll of the employees until such time as they have duties to perform.

Mr. AIKEN. Then that would depend on when Congress gave them such a law under which they could operate; is that not correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct. I shall be supporting such a law. If and when a law is passed I will be supporting the necessary appropriation to finance the cost of personnel in the agency.

Mr. AIKEN. Will the same members continue?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The President could appoint the same ones if he wishes. That is up to the President, and then it will be up to Congress to confirm them.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not see why they should continue to do no work and get good-sized salaries for doing nothing. They can do nothing until Congress enacts legislation. Thus, I think we should be as careful of a $200,000 or $300,000 appropriation as we are of one for $10 billion. The same principle holds true.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I agree with the Senator. It is the $200,000 and $300,000 appropriations that make the millions, and the millions make the billions.

We have got to start somewhere to reduce unnecessary costs. I will be supporting the legislation proposed just as enthusiastically and as strongly as Senators who are speaking against the amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. I cannot see why approval of the Senator's amendment will cause a sleepless night in Moscow or in Communist headquarters in the United States, because they evidently have the situation pretty much to their liking right now. The members of the Board are drawing salaries and doing nothing for it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I agree. I do not think the Communists will be concerned. The only ones who will have sleepless nights will be those who have been drawing their paychecks for doing nothing and now find they will have to go to work for a living.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I would like to make one observation. It is said that the Board is not doing anything. I think some of the statements which have been made might be interpreted as meaning that the Board has been derelict. I hope that was not the intent.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I think I made clear the fact that the Board had no functions to perform as a result of the Court's decisions and that the responsibility for conferring duties on it rests with the Congress. I am casting no aspersions on the Board at all.

For a Board with no duties to perform for the past 17 months and with no duties to perform in the foreseeable future they have been doing an efficient job of cashing their paychecks.

I am stating a fact which has been confirmed by the Senators' own committee, that there has been no work for some time and that there will be none in the future. If Congress rejects this amendment and leaves the money in the bill and there is no legislation enacted, as far as the members of the Board are concerned they will have no functions and its members may as well enjoy it. The taxpayers, however, may not think the situation too funny.

I hope we can pass legislation before we go home this year, but it has to be passed by the House and the Senate and signed by the President before the Board can have any duties.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I hope so, but I think refusing to make an appropriation, if no further action is taken after that, is tantamount to abolishing the Board so far as any action or function of the Board is concerned.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If they are to do no work that would be a good thing.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I cannot see any wisdom in taking action that is tantamount to abolishing the Board when we have the necessary proposed legislation on which we can take action. We have the promise that it will be taken. If the action is not taken, we have supplemental bills coming up. If we cannot get action on the Board, then there should be an appropriation in here to liquidate the Board.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senators from Washington [Mr. JACKSON and Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON].

If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon would vote "yea" and the Senator from Washington would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] is necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE] is paired with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN].

If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea" and the Senator from Idaho would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 54, as follows:

[No. 295 Leg.]

YEAS—37

Aiken
Baker
Bartlett
Bennett
Boggs
Brewster
Cannon
Church
Clark
Cooper
Curtis
Dominick
Fulbright
Gore
Griffin
Gruening
Hansen
Hart
Hartke
Hatfield
Inouye
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
McGee
McGovern
Mondale
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Proxmire
Scott
Tydings
Williams, Del.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—54

Allott
Anderson
Bayh
Bible
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Case
Cotton
Dirksen
Dodd
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Harris
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hollings
Hruska
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McIntyre
Miller
Monroney
Montoya
Mundt
Murphy
Percy
Prouty
Randolph
Ribicoff
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Spong
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—9

Brooke
Carlson
Jackson
Jordan, Idaho
Magnuson
Metcalf
Morse
Morton
Russell

So the amendment of Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware was rejected.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague from California [Mr. MURPHY], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], and myself, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 11, line 10, strike out "$2,140,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,375,000".

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, this amendment relates to an item approved by the Bureau of the Budget. The Bureau of the Budget recommended, for appropriation now, $235,000 to be devoted entirely for research on skipjack tuna. I regret that the item was not included in the bill.

During the last several years, the tuna-fishing industry based on the Pacific coast and on Puerto Rico has encountered recurring and multiple difficulties in carrying on fishing off the coasts of some of the Central American nations, particularly Ecuador, which, among others, contends seaward jurisdiction for all purposes as far as 200 miles.

In the last several months, American tuna clippers have been seized on the high seas by units of the Ecuadorean navy, in the attempt by that nation, as one example of several, to assert a sovereignty far beyond the limits of international comity.

Tuna in rather large supply have been located in areas far seaward of South American countries. The United States belongs to an international commission which is charged with researching and studying at sea, in an attempt to find new areas which would be productive for commercial fishing operations. The Tuna Commission arrives at a quota for each of the member nations. The costs of the research which the Commission carries on are borne in direct proportion to the amount of fish allocated to the member nations.

The tuna industry believes, with the Commission, that in the area of the Pacific far to the west and away from the South American Pacific area, skipjack may be located and fished commercially by the tuna clippers which fly the American flag. Indeed, it has been suggested that a harvest of skipjack of from $30 million to $50 million a year will be developed if the Commission is permitted to carry on its research. Therefore, the administration and the Bureau of the Budget recommended $235,000 to inaugurate a new program. It would help to eliminate the possibility of conflict and improve a worsening and degenerating situation off the coast of Equador. It would also develop new opportunities to harvest the sea.

The amendment perhaps can be criticized by some as being parochial. It affects fishing opportunities on the west coast. However, I suggest that the Bureau of the Budget and the administration were correct in making the recommendation, for, if scientific surveys, oceanography and research to cost less than $250,000 can help create an industry worth from $30 million to $50 million, a ratio of annual return greater than 100 to 1, I suggest it is in the national interest that this recommendation be approved by the Senate.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I heartily commend my colleague for this most enlightening and specific explanation of the proposal.

I ask my colleague if it is not true that all indications point to a world food shortage in the coming years?

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator is completely correct, and that situation is staring us in the face in the future.

Mr. MURPHY. Is it not also true that the most enlightened people throughout the world on this matter have felt for some time that we must look to the sea as a further source of necessary food material in order to sustain life?

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator is eminently correct.

Mr. MURPHY. Then, would it not follow quite logically that of all things that could be done—and certainly I have listened to many proposed investments of the taxpayers' dollar—we could propose few other investments that would have a ratio of return in favor of the people, to compare with the suggested investment advanced by the distinguished senior Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator is completely correct. And I am glad to join with him and with our colleague, the distinguished Senator [Mr. BARTLETT], who represents the great State of Alaska, in urging that the Senate approve the amendment.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my colleague on this measure and I recommend it to all other Senators in the Chamber. I am sorry only that more Senators are not present to hear this debate, because the tuna industry is an important one which we must not only protect but seek means to advance so that skipjack tuna will be enjoyed by people throughout the United States. The benefits of this proposal will extend to the people in all of the States.

I most enthusiastically join my colleague in urging that the Senate approve of this measure.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I thank my colleague.

I yield to the able and distinguished senior Senator from Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the budget approved the item of $235,000. It was not removed by the Senate Appropriations Committee or the subcommittee headed by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas.

The subcommittee, and then the full committee, went along with the elimination to be made by the House. Is that correct?

Mr. KUCHEL. Substantially, although the unhappy fact is that the committee did add the other budgeted items for Commission activities, leaving this item as the sole exception.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I hope that the amendment of the Senator will be approved, because it is of great importance.

The money is urgently needed for further investigation, and there is every good reason why the money should be restored.

I hope that the Senator from Arkansas will accept the amendment.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank my able friend, the distinguished senior Senator from Alaska, very much.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I assure my distinguished friend, the senior Senator from California, that I have no prejudice against fishing in the Pacific. One of the happiest 30 minutes that I have ever enjoyed fishing was trying to land—and I finally succeeded in landing—a 110-pound sailfish in the Pacific. So, whatever I say about the Senator's amendment is certainly not motivated by any prejudice against fishing in the Pacific.

Mr. President, there are two or three reasons why I feel I should not accept the amendment. The House did not include it in the bill. That would not be a sufficient reason.

As has been stated here, this would be the start of a new project, so to speak. And I have had to say to other Senators that I could not support amendments that would initiate some new projects.

We have a lot of projects already in progress that are now threatened by curtailment of appropriations or by a freeze of appropriations that would stop the projects while they are in progress.

I feel that if we were to accept amendments that would add additional new programs, we would hardly be taking into account and giving proper consideration to conditions that now prevail.

I wish the situation were different. I wish I could accept the amendment. I am generally in sympathy with what is sought here to be done. However, I come back again to the fact that I do not believe there is a State in the Union that will not feel the impact of this freeze situation on appropriations that has been put into effect for projects already under construction.

I do not feel that I would be justified under these circumstances in accepting the amendment. However, if the Senate agrees to the amendment, the amendment will go to conference. I do not know what the reaction of the House will be.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I urge the Senate to agree to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from California.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I now have the honor of moving to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

JUSTICE DELAYED IS JUSTICE DENIED

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to a pertinent section of the Appropriations Committee's report on the judiciary.

The section, which is found on page 25 of the report, deals with the congested calendar conditions and long delays to be found in the disposition of cases in the Federal district and appeals courts.

If I may take just a moment to read this section, it is not long:

> The committee wishes to express its grave concern with the seriously congested calendar conditions and long delays in the disposition of even criminal cases in certain of the courts of the Federal system. While the committee

> is quite mindful that this is not a general condition throughout the system, and has only praise for the dedication and diligence of so many of its judges, where such conditions do exist their effect is so damaging to justice and to the whole attitude toward law and order, that it is hoped the judiciary, by whatever means are available, will take whatever steps are necessary to alleviate such conditions. The committee feels that, at least until conditions have been improved, the effort employed should include sacrifices on the part of the judges in the courts affected in the form of longer court hours and short vacations. If additional personnel is needed in this connection, the committee would be most receptive to requests in a supplemental bill.
>
> The action of the committee with respect to the individual requests for the judiciary is set forth below.

This problem is not a new one. A recent book, "The Courts, the Public, and the Law Explosion," published by the American Assembly, a nonpartisan educational institution points out that—

> Court congestion—delay, strictly speaking—is not something that came in with sputnik. Hammurabi denounced it, Shakespeare immortalized it: Hamlet, in compiling his dolorous list of the burdens of man, sandwiched the "laws delay" between the "pangs of dispriz'd love" and the "insolence of office." And English Chancery delay made Bleak House one of the best known edifices in English literature and made Dickens a leading law reformer.

In recent years, because of the tremendous burgeoning of cases, this problem has become much more acute.

Unfortunately, despite all the formal bewailing of the subject and the uniform statements that "something must be done," and even the attempts to get reform started, the situation becomes worse instead of better.

For example, identical statistics from the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts for fiscal year 1965 and fiscal year 1967 show that in fiscal year 1965 the total number of cases pending before the U.S. District Courts was 71,941; and, of these, 6,626, or 9.2 percent, had been pending 3 years or more.

In 1967, on the other hand, the total number of cases pending was 77,575—up almost 6,000; and, of that number, 8,130, or 10.5 percent of the total, had been pending 3 years or more.

Or, to cite other statistics, in fiscal year 1965 the elapsed time from when a civil case was brought to the court and when it finally came to trial, was, on the median, 11 months. Ten percent of the cases took less than 1 month to be tried and 10 percent took more than 37 months.

In fiscal year 1967, the median time had increased to 12 months.

One month was still the low figure for 10 percent of the cases, but the 10 percent, which were the longest cases, now took an average of 40 months before coming to trial.

The aggregate of all these statistics is a good deal more revealing yet. For that reason, I ask unanimous consent that they be inserted in the RECORD following my remarks, as exhibits A, B, C, and D.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibits A, B, C, and D.)

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, exhibit A is a tabulation of civil cases pending as of June 30, 1965, before U.S. district courts, excluding land condemnation cases. The table lists the courts and the length of time pending.

Exhibit B is the same table, only the figures are as of June 30, 1967.

Exhibit C is a tabulation of the time interval from issue to trial of civil cases in which a trial was completed during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1965.

Exhibit D is the same table, only the figures are for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1967.

I believe that even a cursory scanning of these four tables and a comparison of them will point out that despite all the talk about improving the machinery of justice, it is still creaking along at its usual pedestrian pace and delays have simply risen accordingly.

Now, I do not feel that all the blame should fall upon the shoulders of our judges. Taken en masse, they are as hard a working group of men and women as we find anywhere. And, considering the fact that there are only 322 Federal district court judges and 88 Federal appeals court judges for the entire Nation, perhaps we must marvel that they are doing as well as they are.

I believe that a far-reaching attack on this problem is necessary if we are to begin clearing away the massive backlog that now jams our courts.

It will take a great deal more than the modest suggestion written into the language of this report calling for "longer court hours and shorter vacations," though this is needed.

It will take an increased number of Federal judges.

It will take a thorough review of present judicial procedures—a review to determine where current systems can be revised.

And, I think, it will take an effort on the part of our Supreme Court to undo some of the damage the Court itself has caused. I believe the Court has opened doors to judicial delay through many of its recent decisions. I am speaking of those decisions which allow every conceivable type of technicality to be used to frustrate the ends of justice. The Supreme Court should do its part to speed, rather than slow up, the wheels of justice.

I believe if we—as lawmakers—do our part, we can work hand in hand with the members of the Federal judiciary and members of the bar, and I am sure that solutions can be arrived at so that eventually this serious delay of justice that plagues us will become a thing of the past.

EXHIBIT A

U.S. DISTRICT COURTS—CIVIL CASES PENDING ON JUNE 30, 1965, BY DISTRICT AND LENGTH OF TIME PENDING (LAND CONDEMNATION CASES ARE OMITTED)

Circuit and district	Total	Length of time pending: Less than 1 year	1 to 2 years	2 to 3 years	3 years and over: Number	Percent
Total, all districts[1]	71,941	40,113	16,861	8,341	6,626	9.2
District of Columbia[1]	4,001	2,035	942	642	382	9.5
1st circuit	2,526	1,385	623	282	236	9.3
Maine	93	75	13	3	2	2.2
Massachusetts	1,334	737	344	136	117	8.8
New Hampshire	149	70	38	14	27	18.1
Rhode Island	404	167	92	78	67	16.6
Puerto Rico	546	336	136	51	23	4.2
2d circuit	13,973	6,190	3,494	2,203	2,086	14.9
Connecticut	647	301	189	80	77	11.9
New York:						
Northern	500	227	115	89	69	13.8
Eastern	1,829	822	494	403	110	6.0
Southern	10,171	4,360	2,498	1,550	1,763	17.3
Western	541	262	152	70	57	10.5
Vermont	285	218	46	11	10	3.5
3d circuit	10,210	4,944	2,580	1,571	1,115	10.9
Delaware	430	166	75	114	75	17.4
New Jersey	1,143	817	232	72	22	1.9
Pensylvania:						
Eastern	6,025	2,185	1,658	1,242	940	15.5
Middle	500	319	131	41	9	1.8
Western	1,430	1,046	330	44	10	.7
Virgin Islands	682	411	154	58	59	8.7
4th circuit	5,030	3,148	1,068	450	364	7.2
Maryland	1,256	698	284	190	74	5.9
North Carolina:						
Eastern	359	211	82	30	36	10.0
Middle	132	99	24	7	2	1.5
Western	204	153	35	11	5	2.5
South Carolina:						
Eastern	649	411	164	46	28	4.3
Western	383	196	150	24	13	3.4
Virginia:						
Eastern	1,147	815	157	80	95	8.3
Western	223	168	34	11	10	4.5
West Virginia:						
Northern	196	101	39	19	37	18.9
Southern	491	296	99	32	64	13.0
5th circuit	12,814	7,685	2,760	1,265	1,104	8.6
Alabama:						
Northern	445	384	43	6	12	2.7
Middle	95	78	13	3	1	1.1
Southern	477	296	128	36	17	3.6
Florida:						
Northern	175	122	45	7	1	.6
Middle	1,099	688	252	80	79	7.2
Southern	678	557	82	18	21	3.1

See footnote at end of table.

EXHIBIT A—Continued

U.S. DISTRICT COURTS—CIVIL CASES PENDING ON JUNE 30, 1965, BY DISTRICT AND LENGTH OF TIME PENDING (LAND CONDEMNATION CASES ARE OMITTED)—Continued

Circuit and district	Total	Length of time pending				
		Less than 1 year	1 to 2 years	2 to 3 years	3 years and over	
					Number	Percent
Georgia:						
Northern	584	394	125	55	10	1.7
Middle	214	176	26	8	4	1.9
Southern	308	221	69	13	5	4.6
Louisiana:						
Eastern	3,929	1,613	1,005	676	635	16.2
Western	876	555	218	63	40	4.6
Mississippi:						
Northern	243	162	72	9	--------	--------
Southern	514	330	98	36	50	9.7
Texas:						
Northern	573	442	96	16	19	3.3
Eastern	439	353	56	25	5	1.1
Southern	1,466	871	279	162	154	10.5
Western	492	290	115	40	47	9.6
Canal Zone	207	153	38	12	4	1.9
6th circuit	6,163	3,796	1,568	541	258	4.2
Kentucky:						
Eastern	458	306	97	38	17	3.7
Western	348	240	58	32	18	5.2
Michigan:						
Eastern	1,745	1,171	422	122	30	1.7
Western	320	186	82	23	29	9.1
Ohio:						
Northern	1,439	775	436	163	65	4.5
Southern	782	418	244	88	32	4.1
Tennessee:						
Eastern	378	306	46	8	18	4.8
Middle	419	179	140	60	40	9.5
Western	274	215	43	7	9	3.3
7th circuit	4,674	2,860	1,097	425	292	6.2
Illinois:						
Northern	2,016	1,297	462	201	146	6.9
Eastern	272	147	69	39	17	6.3
Southern	327	174	93	20	31	9.5
Indiana:						
Northern	644	425	172	33	14	2.2
Southern	624	471	118	27	8	1.3
Wisconsin:						
Eastern	473	221	131	62	59	12.5
Western	228	125	52	34	17	7.5
8th circuit	3,059	2,102	596	190	171	5.6
Arkansas:						
Eastern	238	196	27	7	8	3.4
Western	112	100	10	2	--------	--------
Iowa:						
Northern	130	90	25	11	4	3.1
Southern	175	116	39	14	6	3.4
Minnesota	678	493	124	51	10	1.5
Missouri:						
Eastern	365	283	56	13	13	3.6
Western	692	424	139	47	82	11.8
Nebraska	417	239	121	33	24	5.8
North Dakota	121	76	27	4	14	11.6
South Dakota	131	85	28	8	10	7.6
9th circuit	7,143	4,298	1,615	667	563	7.9
Alaska	133	89	31	10	3	2.3
Arizona	704	380	177	88	59	8.4
California:						
Northern	2,300	1,259	566	269	206	9.0
Southern	2,030	1,231	446	159	194	9.6
Hawaii	171	90	57	15	9	5.3
Idaho	163	119	26	9	9	5.5
Montana	289	157	75	39	18	6.2
Nevada	184	97	58	13	16	8.7
Oregon	463	366	80	14	3	.6
Washington:						
Eastern	223	162	35	18	8	3.6
Western	441	307	64	32	38	8.6
Guam	42	41	--------	1	--------	--------
10th circuit	2,348	1,670	518	105	55	2.3
Colorado	468	345	103	10	10	2.1
Kansas	658	439	164	32	23	3.5
New Mexico	339	250	76	9	4	1.2
Oklahoma:						
Northern	137	106	25	4	2	1.5
Eastern	116	90	24	1	1	.9
Western	402	267	89	36	10	2.5
Utah	173	126	32	10	5	2.9
Wyoming	55	47	5	3	--------	--------

---

[1] Omitted are 47 District of Columbia mental health cases.

EXHIBIT B

U.S. DISTRICT COURTS—CIVIL CASES PENDING ON JUNE 30, 1967, BY DISTRICT AND LENGTH OF TIME PENDING (LAND CONDEMNATION CASES ARE OMITTED)

Circuit and district	Total	Length of time pending				
		Less than 1 year	1 to 2 years	2 to 3 years	3 years and over	
					Number	Percent
Total, all districts	77,575	41,430	18,893	9,122	8,130	10.5
District of Columbia	4,051	2,191	1,053	514	293	7.2
1st circuit	2,772	1,481	688	303	300	10.8
Maine	103	78	19	4	2	1.9
Massachusetts	1,401	718	391	149	143	10.2
New Hampshire	163	75	43	22	23	14.1
Rhode Island	360	123	69	72	96	26.7
Puerto Rico	745	487	166	56	36	4.8
2d circuit	14,576	5,813	3,858	2,381	2,524	17.3
Connecticut	648	302	192	87	67	10.3
New York:						
Northern	516	247	112	71	86	16.7
Eastern	1,666	736	426	244	260	15.6
Southern	10,917	4,054	2,964	1,889	2,010	18.4
Western	548	250	121	82	95	17.3
Vermont	281	224	43	8	6	2.1
3d circuit	11,855	5,182	3,177	1,929	1,567	13.2
Delaware	307	110	84	51	62	20.2
New Jersey	1,430	922	352	107	49	3.4
Pennsylvania:						
Eastern	6,825	2,119	1,836	1,526	1,344	19.7
Middle	583	396	132	47	8	1.4
Western	1,881	1,163	589	109	20	1.1
Virgin Islands	829	472	184	89	84	10.1
4th circuit	5,209	3,241	1,094	410	464	8.9
Maryland	1,384	716	327	163	178	12.9
North Carolina:						
Eastern	385	213	101	43	28	7.3
Middle	181	123	43	4	11	6.1
Western	279	166	83	25	5	1.8
South Carolina	760	527	147	44	42	5.5
Virginia:						
Eastern	1,233	873	197	67	96	7.8
Western	270	206	39	11	14	5.2
West Virginia:						
Northern	221	150	30	17	24	10.9
Southern	496	267	127	36	66	13.3
5th circuit	14,499	8,484	3,258	1,342	1,415	9.8
Alabama:						
Northern	430	341	63	17	9	2.1
Middle	100	82	13	2	3	3.0
Southern	525	295	143	59	28	5.3
Florida:						
Northern	281	135	103	31	12	4.3
Middle	1,172	782	229	111	50	4.3
Southern	1,269	906	330	25	8	.6
Georgia:						
Northern	724	477	165	28	54	7.5
Middle	178	149	22	2	5	2.8
Southern	342	246	67	23	6	1.8
Louisiana:						
Eastern	4,320	1,705	1,046	655	914	21.2
Western	947	563	244	84	56	5.9
Mississippi:						
Northern	281	152	89	31	9	3.2
Southern	431	266	98	35	32	7.4

EXHIBIT B—Continued

U.S. DISTRICT COURTS—CIVIL CASES PENDING ON JUNE 30, 1967, BY DISTRICT AND LENGTH OF TIME PENDING (LAND CONDEMNATION CASES ARE OMITTED)—Continued

Circuit and district	Total	Length of time pending				
		Less than 1 year	1 to 2 years	2 to 3 years	3 years and over	
					Number	Percent
Texas:						
Northern	746	590	102	36	18	2.4
Eastern	509	383	84	22	20	3.9
Southern	1,661	1,000	378	138	145	8.7
Western	380	259	66	29	26	6.8
Canal Zone	203	153	16	14	20	9.9
6th circuit	6,870	3,899	1,782	755	434	6.3
Kentucky:						
Eastern	472	241	150	48	33	7.0
Western	365	247	80	21	17	4.7
Michigan:						
Eastern	1,968	1,046	563	236	123	6.3
Western	357	236	72	31	18	5.0
Ohio:						
Northern	1,602	855	470	192	85	5.3
Southern	978	519	262	136	61	6.2
Tennessee:						
Eastern	352	323	21	4	4	1.1
Middle	435	172	104	74	85	19.5
Western	341	260	60	13	8	2.3
7th circuit	4,538	2,811	1,083	385	259	5.7
Illinois:						
Northern	1,912	1,234	439	153	86	4.5
Eastern	266	163	59	17	27	10.2
Southern	333	162	78	46	47	14.1
Indiana:						
Northern	739	435	228	64	12	1.6
Southern	575	431	110	24	10	1.7
Wisconsin:						
Eastern	503	256	115	68	64	12.7
Western	210	130	54	13	13	6.2
8th circuit	2,954	2,053	559	190	152	5.1
Arkansas:						
Eastern	282	220	45	10	7	2.5
Western	123	102	19	2	--------	--------

Circuit and district	Total	Length of time pending				
		Less than 1 year	1 to 2 years	2 to 3 years	3 years and over	
					Number	Percent
Iowa:						
Northern	117	92	18	2	5	4.3
Southern	203	135	46	13	9	4.4
Minnesota	669	468	156	34	11	1.6
Missouri:						
Eastern	276	240	19	4	13	4.7
Western	510	330	93	41	46	9.0
Nebraska	452	264	103	50	35	7.7
North Dakota	160	105	30	14	11	6.9
South Dakota	162	97	30	20	15	9.3
9th circuit	8,134	4,707	1,964	812	651	8.0
Alaska	226	156	56	13	1	.4
Arizona	703	342	170	97	94	13.4
California:						
Northern	2,501	1,373	686	265	177	7.1
Eastern	786	412	221	93	60	7.6
Central	1,637	877	375	186	199	12.2
Southern	280	165	68	14	33	11.8
Hawaii	257	116	79	45	27	10.1
Idaho	156	100	36	17	3	1.9
Montana	247	176	38	19	14	5.7
Nevada	213	114	67	13	19	8.9
Oregon	476	377	70	21	8	1.7
Washington:						
Eastern	121	91	21	4	5	4.1
Western	461	349	77	24	11	2.4
Guam	60	59	--------	1	--------	--------
10th circuit	2,117	1,568	377	101	71	3.4
Colorado	425	349	62	7	7	1.6
Kansas	681	407	170	63	41	6.0
New Mexico	246	206	34	4	2	.8
Oklahoma:						
Northern	144	113	24	3	4	2.8
Eastern	91	77	9	5	--------	--------
Western	286	216	51	11	8	2.8
Utah	175	144	16	7	8	4.6
Wyoming	69	56	11	1	1	1.4

EXHIBIT C

U.S. DISTRICT COURTS—TIME INTERVAL FROM ISSUE TO TRIAL OF CIVIL CASES IN WHICH A TRIAL WAS COMPLETED DURING THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 1965, BY DISTRICT[1]

Circuit and district	Total trials				Nonjury trials				Jury trials			
	Number of trials	Time interval in months[2]			Number of trials	Time interval in months[2]			Number of trials	Time interval in months[2]		
		10 percent less than	Median	10 percent more than		10 percent less than	Median	10 percent more than		10 percent less than	Median	10 percent more than
Total, all districts	6,385	1	11	37	3,394	1	9	33	2,991	3	12	41
District of Columbia	349	1	20	40	172	4	14	33	177	1	32	43
1st circuit	193	4	14	31	92	3	11	25	101	4	18	35
Maine	16	--------	--------	--------	7	--------	--------	--------	9	--------	--------	--------
Massachusetts	116	5	14	26	58	4	12	25	58	6	15	26
New Hampshire	12	--------	--------	--------	1	--------	--------	--------	11	--------	--------	--------
Rhode Island	14	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	14	--------	--------	--------
Puerto Rico	35	3	13	25	26	3	13	25	9	--------	--------	--------
2d circuit	696	5	33	54	348	2	30	52	348	8	35	56
Connecticut	50	1	22	44	35	1	26	44	15	--------	--------	--------
New York:												
Northern	33	1	17	37	12	--------	--------	--------	21	--------	--------	--------
Eastern	84	1	33	42	54	1	31	43	30	12	33	40
Southern	417	16	39	57	211	12	33	55	206	20	43	60
Western	27	11	25	37	9	--------	--------	--------	18	--------	--------	--------
Vermont	85	1	9	17	27	1	3	27	58	4	9	14
3d circuit	580	3	16	43	239	1	10	37	341	9	19	43
Delaware	18	--------	--------	--------	10	--------	--------	--------	8	--------	--------	--------
New Jersey	100	4	12	24	39	2	11	23	61	8	14	26
Pennsylvania:												
Eastern	183	1	41	49	73	1	25	42	110	39	42	50
Middle	38	2	17	29	13	--------	--------	--------	25	4	18	31
Western	197	5	14	21	64	2	7	19	133	9	15	21
Virgin Islands	44	1	10	28	40	1	9	22	4	--------	--------	--------
4th circuit	613	2	10	27	341	2	10	29	272	4	11	25
Maryland	120	1	11	27	82	1	9	27	38	1	13	27
North Carolina:												32
Eastern	38	3	17	61	23	--------	--------	--------	15	--------	--------	--------
Middle	39	2	8	17	28	2	8	21	11	--------	--------	--------
Western	38	3	12	23	21	--------	--------	--------	17	--------	--------	--------
South Carolina:												
Eastern	107	4	16	28	60	4	15	30	47	3	16	28
Western	40	2	13	27	14	--------	--------	--------	26	3	13	23

See footnote at end of table.

EXHIBIT C—Continued

U.S. DISTRICT COURTS—TIME INTERVAL FROM ISSUE TO TRIAL OF CIVIL CASES IN WHICH A TRIAL WAS COMPLETED DURING THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 1965, BY DISTRICT [1]—Continued

Circuit and district	Total trials				Nonjury trials				Jury trials			
	Number of trials	Time interval in months [2]			Number of trials	Time interval in months [2]			Number of trials	Time interval in months [2]		
		10 percent less than	Median	10 percent more than		10 percent less than	Median	10 percent more than		10 percent less than	Median	10 percent more than
4th circuit—Continued												
Virginia:												
Eastern	149	4	9	18	83	2	8	20	66	6	9	14
Western	44	1	5	14	14	----------	----------	----------	30	2	5	14
West Virginia:												
Northern	3	----------	----------	----------	1	----------	----------	----------	2	----------	----------	----------
Southern	35	2	10	44	15	----------	----------	----------	20	----------	----------	----------
5th circuit	1,366	1	7	25	742	1	6	22	624	1	8	29
Alabama:												
Northern	169	1	5	11	32	1	4	11	137	1	5	11
Middle	15	----------	----------	----------	8	----------	----------	----------	7	----------	----------	----------
Southern	29	1	9	26	16	----------	----------	----------	13	----------	----------	----------
Florida:												
Northern	32	1	7	13	14	----------	----------	----------	18	----------	----------	----------
Middle	71	1	10	19	48	1	7	18	23	----------	----------	----------
Southern	113	3	8	15	82	2	7	15	31	4	10	14
Georgia:												
Northern	103	1	10	19	49	1	8	20	53	3	11	18
Middle	51	1	6	18	17	----------	----------	----------	34	1	7	20
Southern	35	6	13	22	11	----------	----------	----------	24	----------	----------	----------
Louisiana:												
Eastern	125	2	30	47	52	1	27	41	73	4	31	49
Western	87	1	7	21	61	1	5	19	26	4	11	22
Mississippi:												
Northern	39	1	9	17	31	1	7	17	8	----------	----------	----------
Southern	83	1	6	20	54	1	5	18	29	1	6	27
Texas:												
Northern	97	1	3	13	46	1	4	12	51	1	2	13
Eastern	62	1	5	10	31	1	5	10	31	1	6	11
Southern	125	1	10	29	82	1	10	29	43	1	11	29
Western	44	1	10	22	21	----------	----------	----------	23	----------	----------	----------
Canal Zone	87	1	1	7	87	1	1	7	----------	----------	----------	----------
6th circuit	591	2	10	29	258	1	9	29	333	3	10	29
Kentucky:												
Eastern	35	3	12	26	14	----------	----------	----------	21	----------	----------	----------
Western	48	1	8	19	11	----------	----------	----------	37	1	9	20
Michigan:												
Eastern	119	4	13	31	55	1	11	26	64	8	17	31
Western	35	1	17	44	23	----------	----------	----------	12	----------	----------	----------
Ohio:												
Northern	67	7	23	33	29	1	17	31	28	18	26	45
Southern	53	1	15	34	38	1	11	31	15	----------	----------	----------
Tennessee:												
Eastern	144	2	6	13	56	2	5	17	88	3	6	12
Middle	18	----------	----------	----------	11	----------	----------	----------	7	----------	----------	----------
Western	82	1	5	11	21	----------	----------	----------	61	1	5	11
7th circuit	480	1	12	30	209	1	10	35	271	3	13	28
Illinois:												
Northern	230	1	11	30	104	1	7	33	126	1	13	29
Eastern	34	6	13	32	6	----------	----------	----------	28	6	12	25
Southern	34	4	11	20	10	----------	----------	----------	24	----------	----------	----------
Indiana:												
Northern	66	4	17	27	23	----------	----------	----------	43	2	17	27
Southern	92	2	9	24	47	1	9	25	45	5	9	23
Wisconsin:												
Eastern	20	----------	----------	----------	17	----------	----------	----------	3	----------	----------	----------
Western	4	----------	----------	----------	2	----------	----------	----------	2	----------	----------	----------
8th circuit	475	1	7	19	223	1	7	21	252	1	7	17
Arkansas:												
Eastern	51	2	7	16	34	1	7	16	17	----------	----------	----------
Western	32	2	4	10	19	----------	----------	----------	13	----------	----------	----------
Iowa:												
Northern	22	----------	----------	----------	11	----------	----------	----------	11	----------	----------	----------
Southern	46	2	7	19	24	----------	----------	----------	22	----------	----------	----------
Minnesota	99	1	6	17	40	1	8	18	59	1	4	14
Missouri:												
Eastern	73	1	5	12	36	1	4	9	37	1	6	12
Western	65	2	9	24	28	2	11	22	37	1	8	25
Nebraska	56	6	14	28	21	----------	----------	----------	35	6	14	18
North Dakota	19	----------	----------	----------	5	----------	----------	----------	14	----------	----------	----------
South Dakota	12	----------	----------	----------	5	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
9th circuit	647	3	10	28	518	3	10	28	129	5	12	33
Alaska	18	----------	----------	----------	16	----------	----------	----------	2	----------	----------	----------
Arizona	54	1	8	28	36	1	7	28	18	----------	----------	----------
California:												
Northern	1	5	21	41	88	3	20	38	23	----------	----------	----------
Southern	3	3	10	25	165	3	10	22	18	----------	----------	----------
Hawaii	4	----------	----------	----------	10	----------	----------	----------	4	----------	----------	----------
Idaho	6	----------	----------	----------	10	----------	----------	----------	6	----------	----------	----------
Montana	16	----------	----------	----------	16	----------	----------	----------	6	----------	----------	----------
Nevada	36	1	6	21	28	1	6	21	6	----------	----------	----------
Oregon	94	4	8	17	73	3	8	17	21	----------	----------	----------
Washington:												
Eastern	7	5	8	16	18	----------	----------	----------	9	----------	----------	----------
Western	84	3	7	18	51	3	6	14	13	----------	----------	----------
Guam	14	----------	----------	----------	7	----------	----------	----------	7	----------	----------	----------

See footnote at end of table.

EXHIBIT C—Continued

U.S. DISTRICT COURTS—TIME INTERVAL FROM ISSUE TO TRIAL OF CIVIL CASES IN WHICH A TRIAL WAS COMPLETED DURING THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 1965, BY DISTRICT [1]—Continued

Circuit and district	Total trials				Nonjury trials				Jury trials			
	Number of trials	Time interval in months [2]			Number of trials	Time interval in months [2]			Number of trials	Time interval in months [2]		
		10 percent less than	Median	10 percent more than		10 percent less than	Median	10 percent more than		10 percent less than	Median	10 percent more than
10th circuit	395	2	9	23	252	2	8	22	143	3	11	23
Colorado	77	2	10	21	52	4	9	27	25	1	11	16
Kansas	59	3	12	28	31	2	11	28	28	6	13	26
New Mexico	67	1	9	28	43	1	5	18	24	------	------	------
Oklahoma:												
Northern	41	2	6	16	27	2	7	16	14	------	------	------
Eastern	20	------	------	------	16	------	------	------	4	------	------	------
Western	74	3	13	25	51	1	13	26	23	------	------	------
Utah	33	4	7	14	19	------	------	------	14	------	------	------
Wyoming	24	------	------	------	13	------	------	------	11	------	------	------

[1] Excludes land condemnation cases, habeas corpus cases, deportation reviews, and motions to vacate sentence. Also excludes all civil cases where the time interval was 3 days or less. Intervals shown are for the median time and for the range of the middle 80 percent of the trials.

[2] Time interval computed only where there are 25 or more trials.

EXHIBIT D

U.S. DISTRICT COURTS—TIME INTERVALS FROM ISSUE TO TRIAL OF CIVIL CASES IN WHICH A TRIAL WAS COMPLETED DURING THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 1967, BY DISTRICT

[Excludes land condemnation cases and hearings on prisoner petitions, including habeas corpus and motions to vacate sentence under 28 U.S.C. 2255. Intervals shown are for the median time and for the range of the middle 80 percent of the totals]

Circuit and district	Total trials				Nonjury trials				Jury trials			
	Number of trials	Time interval in months [1]			Number of trials	Time interval in months [1]			Number of trials	Time interval in months [1]		
		10 percent less than	Median	10 percent more than		10 percent less than	Median	10 percent more than		10 percent less than	Median	10 percent more than
Total, all districts	6,341	1	12	40	3,161	1	10	37	3,180	3	15	41
District of Columbia	383	1	27	47	146	2	19	39	237	1	30	49
1st circuit	189	7	20	43	100	7	19	43	89	8	21	43
Maine	14	------	------	------	7	------	------	------	7	------	------	------
Massachusetts	109	8	18	37	54	7	15	35	55	10	19	41
New Hampshire	8	------	------	------	2	------	------	------	6	------	------	------
Rhode Island	36	12	40	47	24	------	------	------	12	------	------	------
Puerto Rico	22	------	------	------	13	------	------	------	9	------	------	------
2d circuit	642	6	33	53	288	1	32	54	354	7	34	50
Connecticut	46	1	13	41	22	------	------	------	24	------	------	------
New York:												
Northern	29	8	24	71	13	------	------	------	16	------	------	------
Eastern	109	1	31	43	71	1	25	42	38	26	37	43
Southern	350	17	38	56	164	14	38	57	186	19	40	54
Western	21	------	------	------	7	------	------	------	14	------	------	------
Vermont	87	3	9	14	11	------	------	------	76	6	9	14
3d circuit	718	2	23	46	203	1	10	41	515	9	27	46
Delaware	19	------	------	------	9	------	------	------	10	------	------	------
New Jersey	99	2	16	30	41	1	13	30	58	7	17	29
Pennsylvania:												
Eastern	276	1	41	51	50	1	20	51	226	36	42	51
Middle	56	2	18	31	10	------	------	------	46	7	20	31
Western	227	4	20	27	58	1	9	23	169	8	21	27
Virgin Islands	41	1	6	23	35	1	6	20	6	------	------	------
4th circuit	529	1	10	25	272	1	8	25	257	5	11	23
Maryland	100	1	15	39	67	1	10	39	33	3	21	35
North Carolina:												
Eastern	35	7	16	41	26	6	14	25	9	------	------	------
Middle	20	------	------	------	13	------	------	------	7	------	------	------
Western	18	------	------	------	6	------	------	------	12	------	------	------
South Carolina	109	1	9	25	47	1	7	25	62	4	10	20
Virginia:												
Eastern	158	3	8	18	81	1	7	17	77	6	10	18
Western	46	2	5	13	18	------	------	------	28	2	8	13
West Virginia:												
Northern	15	------	------	------	6	------	------	------	9	------	------	------
Southern	28	5	14	26	8	------	------	------	20	------	------	------
5th circuit	1,300	1	8	27	685	1	7	26	615	2	9	29
Alabama:												
Northern	196	2	6	12	47	2	8	14	149	2	5	11
Middle	14	------	------	------	8	------	------	------	6	------	------	------
Southern	11	1	14	23	13	------	------	------	18	------	------	------
Florida:												
Northern	6	------	------	------	5	------	------	------	1	------	------	------
Middle	67	2	12	24	37	1	10	24	30	9	15	27
Southern	125	4	9	17	94	3	8	15	31	5	10	17
Georgia:												
Northern	84	1	11	21	37	1	3	22	47	9	15	20
Middle	47	1	6	15	18	------	------	------	29	1	5	15
Southern	15	------	------	------	1	------	------	------	14	------	------	------
Louisiana:												
Eastern	123	1	27	47	65	1	24	45	58	7	29	47
Western	56	4	11	20	35	4	11	20	21	------	------	------

See footnote at end of table.

EXHIBIT D—Continued

U.S. DISTRICT COURTS—TIME INTERVALS FROM ISSUE TO TRIAL OF CIVIL CASES IN WHICH A TRIAL WAS COMPLETED DURING THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 1967, BY DISTRICT—Continued

[Excludes land condemnation cases and hearings on prisoner petitions, including habeas corpus and motions to vacate sentence under 28 U.S.C. 2255. Intervals shown are for the median time and for the range of the middle 80 percent of the totals]

Circuit and district	Total trials				Nonjury trials				Jury trials			
	Number of trials	Time interval in months[1]			Number of trials	Time interval in months[1]			Number of trials	Time interval in months[1]		
		10 percent less than	Median	10 percent more than		10 percent less than	Median	10 percent more than		10 percent less than	Median	10 percent more than
5th circuit—Continued												
Mississippi:												
Northern	11				8				3			
Southern	64	1	5	21	36	1	5	26	28	1	3	14
Texas:												
Northern	94	1	5	15	50	1	5	14	44	1	4	15
Eastern	89	1	5	10	44	1	3	8	45	1	6	11
Southern	116	1	15	40	84	1	13	41	32	4	22	39
Western	91	1	10	27	33	1	9	21	58	1	11	33
Canal Zone	71	1	1	8	70	1	1	8	1			
6th circuit	527	1	11	31	233	1	11	34	294	3	12	30
Kentucky:												
Eastern	28	3	13	31	6				22			
Western	38	1	9	20	18				20			
Michigan:												
Eastern	63	3	21	40	34	1	20	41	29	11	23	36
Western	36	4	16	33	13				23			
Ohio:												
Northern	99	1	19	33	51	1	11	33	48	5	23	33
Southern	70	1	18	40	47	1	18	40	23			
Tennessee:												
Eastern	123	1	6	12	41	1	5	15	82	2	6	12
Middle	10				4				6			
Western	60	1	7	17	19				41	1	6	17
7th circuit	427	2	14	31	202	1	12	36	225	4	16	31
Illinois:												
Northern	187	2	14	37	91	1	12	38	96	3	17	34
Eastern	31	2	12	27	9				22			
Southern	19				6				13			
Indiana:												
Northern	67	2	16	22	35	1	13	24	32	4	18	22
Southern	69	3	9	17	28	3	9	19	41	3	9	17
Wisconsin:												
Eastern	26	2	18	38	21				5			
Western	28	2	22	44	12				16			
8th circuit	466	1	7	21	213	1	7	24	253	1	7	19
Arkansas:												
Eastern	52	1	7	14	22				30	4	7	12
Western	33	2	6	17	16				17			
Iowa:												
Northern	27	5	14	36	15				12			
Southern	30	1	10	17	19				11			
Minnesota	114	1	5	15	41	1	5	19	73	1	5	11
Missouri:												
Eastern	78	1	5	15	35	1	4	11	43	1	6	16
Western	39	1	8	26	17				22			
Nebraska	53	6	17	31	21				32	7	17	28
North Dakota	20				14				6			
South Dakota	20				13				7			
9th circuit	726	3	11	31	543	2	10	31	183	3	12	33
Alaska	11				9				2			
Arizona	30	1	14	37	15				15			
California:												
Northern	156	3	17	40	132	1	16	40	24			
Eastern	42	1	12	52	33	1	11	37	9			
Central	143	4	13	27	113	3	12	25	30	8	17	32
Southern	18				15				3			
Hawaii	14				9				5			
Idaho	27	3	7	14	17				10			
Montana	29	3	14	40	17				12			
Nevada	12				9				3			
Oregon	109	3	8	20	77	3	8	19	32	2	8	21
Washington:												
Eastern	32	4	9	13	22				10			
Western	83	2	7	21	61	1	6	21	22			
Guam	20				14				6			
10th circuit	434	3	9	21	276	2	9	21	158	4	9	21
Colorado	94	4	9	13	56	2	9	13	38	6	8	12
Kansas	63	3	18	32	37	3	16	32	26	6	20	30
New Mexico	61	1	6	15	45	1	6	13	16			
Oklahoma:												
Northern	44	3	8	15	27	3	8	13	17			
Eastern	21				17				4			
Western	92	3	10	22	67	3	10	25	25	4	9	18
Utah	38	4	4	14	15				23			
Wyoming	21				12				9			

---

[1] Time interval computed only where there are 25 or more trials.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, with reference to the appropriation for the Department of State, I was pleased to note that the Committee on Appropriations approved the amount included in the budget for the Great Lakes Fishery Commission.

Sea lamprey are predatory parasites which, prior to a program initiated by the Great Lakes Fishery Commission in 1958, had largely eliminated valuable fish stocks from the Great Lakes. The Commission, composed of United States and Canadian representatives, was formed in order to reverse what had appeared to be an almost hopeless trend.

The Commission has been responsible for significant progress. The effort to eliminate the sea lamprey is an ongoing, established program of proven success. Both Canada and the United States are continuing to reap impressive economic benefits from a comparatively modest investment.

Through chemical treatment of infested streams, the Commission has facilitated the re-emergence of high-value fish in the Great Lakes, including coho salmon, whitefish, and trout. Such quality stocks are helping to curtail the alewife which plagued the shores of Lake Michigan this summer.

Canada has already committed her percentage share of operating funds for this fiscal year, and I am glad that the Committee on Appropriations has seen the wisdom of providing for U.S. participation.

In order to secure the gains already made, and extend the lamprey control programs to Lake Huron, the Great Lakes Fishery Commission must be adequately supported. I compliment members of the Appropriations Committee for recognizing this fact, and I urge the Senate conferees to insist upon their position in conference.

As recently as October 6, the Washington Post reported that the population of sea lamprey in Lake Superior is down nearly 94 percent since control measures were first applied. The Commission can point to concrete results in support of its endeavors which, I believe, warrant our continued endorsement.

Mr. President, in support of the appropriation voted by the Senate for the Commission, I have in hand a resolution passed by the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan; a letter from the Great Lakes Commission, dated August 3, 1967; a report prepared at my request by the U.S. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries concerning the sea lamprey control program; and two tables prepared by the Great Lakes Fishery Commission which show, first, a breakdown of 1967 expenditures, and second, the budgetary effects of the House-passed appropriation bill on expenditures. I ask unanimous consent that these items be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 234

A resolution memorializing Congress to reinstate the money deleted from the appropriation for the Lamprey control program

(Offered by Representatives Swallow, Prescott, Robert W. Davis, Jowett, Rohlfs, Hoffman, Varnum, O'Neill and Suski.)

Whereas, The reestablishment of lake trout in Lake Superior, the increase in abundance of whitefish in Lake Michigan, the recovery of the steelhead, and the exciting success of our coho salmon introduction can all be attributed to the progress made in sea lamprey control in Lakes Michigan, Superior and Huron; and

Whereas, A cut of $100,000.00 in the United States contribution to the Great Lakes Fishery Commission has been recommended by the House Sub-Committee on Appropriations, which, if approved, means a reduction of $45,000.00 in the Canadian contribution, making a total reduction of $145,000.00; and

Whereas, Last year, extension of the control program to Lake Huron which both countries share was welcomed by Canada and brought immediate support from the Canadian Government after a 1963 reduction in the United States appropriation required concentration in Lake Superior and Lake Michigan and places an obligation upon the United States Section to continue operations on Lake Huron and make whatever reductions are necessary to meet the cut in the United States Program; now therefore be it

Resolved by the house of representatives, That its members by these presents respectfully urges the United States Congress to restore the money that was deleted from the appropriation for the Lamprey control program so that this program so essential to a large segment of both Canada and United States may be continued in all its vigor; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the presiding officers of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives and to each member of the Michigan delegation to Congress.

Adopted by the House July 11, 1967.

T. THOS. THATCHER,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

GREAT LAKES COMMISSION,
Ann Arbor, Mich., August 3, 1967.

Hon. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN,
U.S. Senator,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRIFFIN: It is understood that the budget request for the Great Lakes Fishery Commission, included in the budget of the Department of State, was originally in the amount of $1,057,000 for the Fishery Commission's expenses for FY 68, and that this amount was reduced by $100,000 to $957,000 by Committee action.

The Great Lakes Commission recommends restoration of the contemplated cut, and approval of the full budget amount of $1,057,000 for the Great Lakes Fishery Commission.

Over the past several years the Great Lakes Fishery Commission has been the coordinating and guiding agency—internationally, the U.S. and Canada—for the program which has been most effective in bringing under control the sea lamprey, a parasitic predator which has been largely responsible for the almost total extinction of lake trout, whitefish and other high-value species in the Great Lakes. Results of the Commission's work have been most encouraging, but the program must be continued to further reduce the number of sea lamprey and to keep them under control. Almost a chain reaction ensues: eliminate the sea lamprey; allow the high-value fish (coho salmon, lake trout, steelhead) to establish or reestablish themselves; make these high-value fish available for the angler and sports fisherman; and, in satisfying their appetites these fish will assist in reducing numbers and bringing under control the alewives which now plague us as a health menace in Lake Michigan.

In our view the Great Lakes Fishery Commission, with U.S. and Canadian representation and participation, should be continued and funded adequately.

Attached is a copy of the resolution adopted by the Great Lakes Commission, June 28, 1967, in support of adequate funds for the Great Lakes Fishery Commission.

Should you desire any further information, please contact me.

Sincerely yours,

LEONARD J. GOODSELL,
Executive Director.

FUNDING OF SEA LAMPREY CONTROL PROGRAM

(Approved by Fisheries and Wildlife Committee, June 6, 1967)

Whereas, the Great Lakes Fishery Commission has carried out a very successful program of sea lamprey control since its inception; and

Whereas, this sea lamprey control program is responsible for the recovery of many valuable sport and commercial predator species in Lakes Michigan and Superior; and

Whereas, this sea lamprey control program now needs to be expanded to include other Great Lakes as well as continuing on Lakes Michigan and Superior; and

Whereas, this program is so essential to the future development of the fisheries of our Great Lakes resource through the reestablishment of the lake trout and the introduction of new species such as the coho and chinook salmon.

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the Great Lakes Commission strongly urges the Congress of the United States to reconsider its action which reduced the appropriation to the Great Lakes Fishery Commission for the sea lamprey control program; and

Be it further resolved that the Congress fund the Sea Lamprey Control Program at the level originally recommended by the Great Lakes Fishery Commission.

SEA LAMPREY CONTROL PROGRAM OF THE GREAT LAKES FISHERY COMMISSION

HISTORY

Attempts to control sea lamprey began in 1946, but it was not until 1956 when the Great Lakes Fishery Commission was formed that a large scale effort was undertaken. Under the Convention between the United States and Canada, the percentage contribution of funds to the Commission was based on the average value of landings in each country over a 10-year period. On that basis the United States contributes 69 percent of the Commission's budget and the Canadian Government 31 percent.

The initial control measure consisted of the use of mechanical and electrical barriers on lamprey spawning streams. This method proved ineffective because of high water levels in the spring which permitted lampreys to bypass the barriers, plus difficulties experienced by power failures. The method now in use, developed by scientists of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, consists of the application of a selective chemical to streams containing several generations of lamprey larvae. The chemical kills the developing larvae without injury to other fish life.

STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 1968 BUDGET

The Commission budget in FY '67 was $1,547,000, which provided for the maintenance of lamprey control on Lakes Michigan and Superior and a start on lamprey control in Lake Huron. A similar budget was requested by the Commission for FY '68. The Canadian Government approved their share, but the House Subcommittee for the Department of State budget recommends a $100,000 reduction in the United States contribution. If this is not reinstated by the Senate the Canadian Government will reduce its share by $45,000. A total reduction of $145,000 in the Commission budget will require termination of sea lamprey control operations in United States waters of Lake Huron this fiscal year. The Commission has determined that the cost of maintaining lamprey control on Lakes Michigan and Superior would preclude operations in Lake Huron unless the full budget request is granted.

By discontinuing lamprey control on Lake Huron this fiscal year we may expect the following consequences:

(1) It will delay for at least 1 year the date when trout and salmon could be introduced into the lake. Fingerling salmonids cannot be stocked unless the lamprey population is brought under control since lampreys would destroy them. In view of the success achieved in stocking lake trout and coho salmon in Lakes Michigan and Superior, both Canadian and the United States sport and commercial fishing interests are pressing for rapid lamprey control of Lake Huron.

(2) Delaying control will extend the period of time adult lampreys from Lake Huron will migrate into Lakes Michigan and Superior to prey on lake trout and coho salmon. We know lampreys from Lake Huron migrate to these lakes from tagging studies. Until lamprey control is achieved in Lake

Huron, we can expect losses of stocked salmonids in other lakes from this source of lampreys.

(3) In Canadian and United States hatcheries splake (a cross between lake trout and brook trout) are now being reared for stocking in Lake Huron. The first massive stocking effort is scheduled for 1970. If the effort and cost of establishing a brood stock of splake and of rearing the young to planting size is not to be wasted, lamprey control in the lake must be achieved by 1971. It will be difficult to realize lamprey control by that date with a cessation in control efforts this fiscal year.

ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE GREAT LAKES FISHERY COMMISSION

Lake Superior

All lamprey infested streams in Lake Superior (over 100) were treated chemically by United States and Canadian biologists by 1963. Retreatments of streams are scheduled when reinfestation of lampreys occurs. Results of the control efforts are as follows:

1. The abundance of lampreys has been reduced 93 percent of the average for the 5 years (1958–61) prior to control.

2. Less than 2 percent of the lake trout bear lamprey wounds as compared to 10 percent prior to control.

3. Catch per unit of effort of marketable lake trout has increased over 200 percent in most areas since 1961.

4. Sampling has shown that since 1964 natural spawning of trout is occurring—the first since 1959.

Lake Michigan

Treatments of the 99 infested streams were completed in the fall of 1966. Evidence of a reduced lamprey population is indicated by an increase in the whitefish catch and low incidence of lamprey scars of whitefish. Also we can contribute part of the success of lake trout and coho salmon stocking program to reduced abundance of lampreys.

Lake Huron

Treatments of Lake Huron streams began in 1966. It is expected that it will require at least 3 more years to complete treatments of about 100 infested streams. Since the beginning of fiscal year 1968 all work on Lake Huron has stopped pending a decision on the proposed budget cut by the House.

TABLE I.—EXPENDITURES FOR SEA LAMPREY CONTROL AND RESEARCH IN FISCAL YEAR 1967 (PRELIMINARY FIGURES)

	In Canada	In United States	Total
Chemical treatment operations:			
Lake Superior	$187,700	$301,300	$489,000
Lake Michigan		343,800	343,800
Lake Huron	98,200	83,100	181,300
Total	285,900	728,200	1,014,100
Barrier operations for assessment:			
Lake Superior	80,100	106,200	186,300
Lake Huron	50,000		50,000
Total	130,100	106,200	236,300
Research on lamprey		236,900	236,900
Total	416,000	1,071,300	1,487,300
Unexpended			[1] 4,700

[1] $2,300 transferred to "Administration and general research" to support study of Lake Erie walleye fishery.

TABLE II.—A COMPARISON OF ESTIMATES FOR PROGRAM IN FISCAL YEAR 1968 AS ORIGINALLY PROPOSED AND PROGRAM REDUCED TO ACCOMMODATE CUT IN ALLOCATION

	Estimates		Difference
	Original	Revised	
Chemical treatment operations:			
Lake Superior	$351,700	$363,100	+$11,400
Lake Michigan	447,000	419,900	−27,100
Lake Huron	238,000	156,400	−81,600
Barrier operations (assessment of control):			
Lake Superior	156,000	155,400	−600
Lake Huron	53,000	50,400	−2,600
Research on lamprey	245,000	201,000	−44,000
Total	1,490,700	1,346,200	−144,500
U.S. share:			
Lamprey program (69 percent)	1,028,850	928,850	
Commission headquarters (50 percent)	28,150	28,150	
Total	1,057,000	957,000	−100,000

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? [Putting the question.]

So the bill (H.R. 10345) was passed.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and request a conference with the House of Representatives on the disagreeing votes thereon, and that the Chair be authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. McClellan, Mr. Ellender, Mr. Holland, Mr. Pastore, Mr. McGee, Mr. Fulbright, Mrs. Smith, Mr. Hruska, and Mr. Cotton conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the measure just adopted makes appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968. The manager of this funding proposal, the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan], applied the same strong advocacy this year for its passage as he has so often in the past.

Senator McClellan demonstrated his unsurpassed dedication and his monumental efforts in bringing to the floor of this Chamber a bill fully acceptable to the entire Senate. We are again grateful; we are again deeply indebted to him. He has again achieved a magnificent success.

Joining Senator McClellan to assure such overwhelming support was the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. Smith], the ranking minority member of the subcommittee. In her supporting statement yesterday she mentioned the long and hard work of all of the subcommittee members in preparing this proposal. I certainly join in those sentiments and note further that her work, her strong efforts in behalf of this legislation, were certainly unsurpassed. We are most grateful.

We are grateful also to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd] for offering and successfully urging an amendment to the proposal. Commendation also goes to the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen], the able and distinguished minority leader, whose participation was characteristically of the highest caliber. The same may be said for the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Proxmire], the Senators from Ohio [Mr. Lausche], Maryland [Mr. Tydings] and Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy] and the many others who joined the discussion. The Senate also appreciates the contributions of the Senators from California [Mr. Kuchel and Mr. Murphy] and they are to be commended for focusing our attention on a most important matter.

The Senate may indeed be proud of another fine achievement and for accomplishing it with such a high degree of efficiency and expedition.

AMENDMENT OF THE SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL ACT OF 1950

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 498, S. 2171. I do this so that the bill will become the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title.

The Assistant Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 2171) to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 so as to accord with certain decisions of the courts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that S. 2171, which is presently the pending business, be modified in the same way I modified it and as it appeared today, because there were some printer's errors in it; and I ask that the bill in modified form be reprinted and treated as original text for the purpose of further amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the importance of the pending business, S. 2171, which is a bill to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act, is transcendent, in my opinion. In order that Members of the Senate may have more detailed information on the contents of the measure I engage in this additional description of its purpose and of its structure. It really is not as profound a bill as some would like to describe. It has a simple purpose, one made necessary to correct the impact of a Supreme Court decision on only one aspect of the present statute.

This bill is designed fully to disclose to the American people, within the constitutional requirements set forth in court decisions, the Communists and their organizations that are operating in the United States. It conforms the 1950 act to the invitation of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit that—

> There is very much indeed that Congress may do in the single purpose to regulate the Communist Party by the device of disclosure.

Disclosure is accomplished by eliminating the requirement that Communist organizations and individuals must register themselves, and substituting a scheme of Board determinations rather than registration orders. Provisions which regulate and restrict the activities of Communists and their organizations are modified to make such provisions applicable to those individuals and organizations that the Board has "determined" to be Communist.

In brief, S. 2171 follows a scheme for disclosing and restricting Communist-action and Communist-front organizations and members of "action" organizations which is similar to the scheme established in the Communist Control Act of 1954 for identifying and restricting Communist-infiltrated organizations. The various sections of S. 2171 may be briefly summarized as follows:

Section 1 reiterates findings in the 1950 act to assure continued applicability, by adding new paragraph (16) to section 2 of the act.

Section 2 makes technical changes in section 5 of the act relating to employment of members of Communist organizations so as to conform section 5 to the new scheme of disclosure by determinations.

Section 3 eliminates requirements that Communist-action and Communist-front organizations and members of action organizations must themselves register, by repealing sections 7 and 8 of the act.

Section 4 revises section 9 of the act relating to the keeping of public registers of organizations and individuals that come within the terms of the act. Because of the elimination of compulsory registration, section 4 provides that the Board—instead of the Attorney General—maintain public records giving information on organizations and individuals that have finally been determined to be of a type defined in the act. Adds Communist-infiltrated organizations to make the system of disclosure complete.

Section 5 makes technical changes in section 10 of the act relating to identifying as emanating from a Communist organization its publications or sponsored radio and TV programs. Needed because of elimination of compulsory registration. Adds language to guard against possible unconstitutional interpretation.

Section 6 makes technical changes in section 11(a) of the act relating to denial of tax deductions for contributions made to or for the use of any action or front organization. Needed because of the elimination of compulsory registration.

Section 7. Same as section 6 but applicable to section 11(b) of the act relating to claims for tax exemptions by Communist organizations.

Section 8 revises section 12(e)(2) of the act relating to the Board's duty to determine who are members of action organizations. Technical change needed because of eliminating compulsory registration of action organizations.

Section 9(a) revises section 13(a) of the act relating to proceedings before the Board to provide for proceedings for determinations whether organizations are Communist-action or Communist-front rather than for orders requiring such organizations to register.

Section 9(b) revises section 13(b) of the act relating to the right of organizations and individuals to obtain relief from the continued application of the provisions of the act to them. Provides means for organizations and individuals once determined under the new disclosure scheme to come within the act to have their status redetermined. Simplifies the procedures.

Section 9(c) revises that part of section 13(d)(2) of the act which now authorizes issuance of a registration order by default if an accused organization fails to appear at a hearing, to provide that the Board shall proceed to receive evidence and then make an appropriate determination. This is to guard against possible holding that present provision denies due process. Retains authority for Board to deny a redetermination without taking evidence if the organization or individual seeking it does not appear.

Sections 9(d) through (g) are technical to conform the provisions for written findings and orders of the Board to the scheme of determinations rather than registration.

Section 9(k) provides for publication of final determinations of the Board. This is a technical change in section 13(k) of the act because of the elimination of Board orders requiring registration.

Section 10 revises section 14(a) of the act relating to the authority of the courts to require the Board to enter orders determining that an organization or individual no longer comes within the provisions of the act, to conform with the new approach of determinations rather than registration orders.

Section 11 assures the continuing in effect of determinations already made by the Board in the form of registration orders by authorizing the Board to modify such orders to conform with the new provisions. Also authorizes modifying any actions pending in the Board or the courts to conform with the new approach to disclosing and restricting activities of Communist organizations and individuals.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate on Thursday, Friday, and on Saturday of this week, if there is a session on Saturday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business, beginning now, and that statements made therein be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3973) to amend the Healing Arts Practice Act, District of Columbia, 1928, and the act of June 6, 1892, relating to the licensing of dentists in the District of Columbia, to exempt from the licensing requirements of such acts physicians and dentists while performing services in the employ of the District of Columbia.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11641) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission, the Delaware River Basin Commission, Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Water Resources Council, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. Kirwan, Mr. Evins of Tennessee, Mr. Boland, Mr. Whitten, Mr. Morris of New Mexico, Mr. Mahon, Mr. Rhodes of Arizona, Mr. Davis of Wisconsin, Mr. Robison, and Mr. Bow were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PUBLICATION OF FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a publication entitled "Statistics for Interstate Natural Gas Pipeline Companies, 1966" (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1945

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 13 of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPLY TO REPORT OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the president, the National Association of River and Harbor Contractors, Baltimore, Md., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a reply to a report of the Comptroller General of the United States on the need for improving policies and procedures for estimating costs, evaluating bids, and awarding contracts for dredging (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

RECEIPT OF PROJECT PROPOSAL FROM THE HAIGHT'S CREEK IRRIGATION CO., KAYSVILLE, UTAH

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the receipt of a project proposal from the Haight's Creek Irrigation Co., of Kaysville, Utah, under the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate resolutions adopted by the City Council of the City of Redlands, Calif., and the City Council of Turlock, Calif., favoring the enactment of some form of a Federal tax-sharing program, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CHURCH, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 2121. A bill to extend the provisions of the act of October 23, 1962, relating to relief for occupants of certain unpatented mining claims (Rept. No. 593).

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

H.J. Res. 516. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution of March 25, 1953, to increase the number of electric typewriters which may be furnished to Members by the Clerk of the House (Rept. No. 594);

S. Con. Res. 46. Concurrent resolution to provide for the printing of additional copies of certain hearings of the Special Committee on Aging (Rept. No. 595);

S. Res. 170. Resolution to provide additional funds for the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; and

S. Res. 174. Resolution to print additional copies of hearings on the "Costs and Delivery of Health Services to Older Americans" (Rept. No. 596).

By Mr. BURDICK, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 948. A bill for the relief of Seaman Eugene Sidney Markovitz, U.S. Navy (Rept. No. 597);

S. 2178. A bill for the relief of Dennis W. Radtke (Rept. No. 598);

S. 2200. A bill for the relief of Homer T. Williamson, Sr. (Rept. No. 599);

H.R. 1653. An act for the relief of Omer Penner (Rept. No. 600);

H.R. 1674. An act for the relief of Frank I. Mellin, Jr. (Rept. No. 601);

H.R. 2477. An act for the relief of John J. McGrath (Rept. No. 602);

H.R. 3498. An act for the relief of D. M. Dew & Sons, Inc., and Dewey Campbell (Rept. No. 603);

H.R. 6189. An act for the relief of Fred W. Kolb, Jr. (Rept. No. 604);

H.R. 6663. An act for the relief of Jesse W. Stutts, Jr. (Rept. No. 605); and

H.R. 6666. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marilyn Shorette (Rept. No. 606).

By Mr. BURDICK, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

H.R. 2757. An act for the relief of Comdr. Albert G. Berry, Jr. (Rept. No. 607).

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S.J. Res. 85. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the 7-day period comprising the first full week in October of each year as "Spring Garden Planting Week" (Rept. No. 608).

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

H.R. 8629. An act to amend the act of July 4, 1966 (Public Law 89-491) (Rept. No. 609).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 362. A bill for the relief of Sofia Dorr (Rept. No. 610);

S. 1395. A bill for the relief of Dr. Brandla Don (nee Praschnik) (Rept. No. 611);

S. 1556. A bill for the relief of Dr. Orlando O. Lopez (Rept. No. 612);

S. 1865. A bill for the relief of Bertha Iturrioz Arteche (Rept. No. 613);

S. 1968. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jose Ernesto Garcia y Tojar (Rept. No. 614);

S. 1979. A bill for the relief of Carlos Fernandez (Rept. No. 615);

S. 2005. A bill for the relief of Dr. Anacleto C. Fernandez (Rept. No. 616);

S. 2071. A bill for the relief of Dr. Antonio M. Tagle (Rept. No. 617);

S. 2078. A bill for the relief of Dr. Alberto DeJongh (Rept. No. 618);

S. 2081. A bill for the relief of Jacqueline Whang-Peng (Rept. No. 619);

S. 2119. A bill for the relief of Dr. Octavio Suarez-Murias (Rept. No. 620);

S. 2139. A bill for the relief of Dr. Angel Trejo Padron (Rept. No. 621);

S. 2167. A bill for the relief of Dr. Rolando Pozo y Jiminez (Rept. No. 622);

S. 2176. A bill for the relief of Dr. Edgar Reinaldo Nunez Baez (Rept. No. 623);

S. 2192. A bill for the relief of Dr. Rafael de la Portilla Lavastida (Rept. No. 624);

H.R. 1572. An act for the relief of Mercedes De Toffoli (Rept. No. 625);

H.R. 7324. An act for the relief of Alfredo F. Mendez, M.D. (Rept. No. 626); and

H.R. 8254. An act for the relief of Jan Drobot (Rept. No. 627).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 772. A bill for the relief of Dr. Violeta V. Ortega Brown (Rept. No. 628);

S. 1490. A bill for the relief of Yang Ok Yoo (Maria Margurita) (Rept. No. 633);

S. 1808. A bill for the relief of Miss Amalia Seresly (Rept. No. 632);

S. 1828. A bill for the relief of Susan Elizabeth (Cho) Long (Rept. No. 631);

S. 1829. A bill for the relief of Lisa Marie (Kim) Long (Rept. No. 630); and

S. 2023. A bill for the relief of Virgilio A. Arango, M.D. (Rept. No. 629).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments:

S. 1147. A bill for the relief of Mariam Mantzios (Rept. No. 634);

S. 1690. A bill for the relief of Juan Andres Lliteras and his wife, Engracia Heydrich Bellido Andres Lliteras (Rept. No. 635); and

S. 2022. A bill for the relief of Dr. Mario Jose Ramirez DeEstenoz (Rept. No. 636).

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 1440. A bill to include in the prohibitions contained in section 2314 of title 18, United States Code, the transportation with unlawful intent in interstate or foreign commerce of traveler's checks bearing forged countersignatures (Rept. No. 637).

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

H.R. 10932. An act for the relief of Gilmour C. MacDonald, colonel, U.S. Air Force (retired) (Rept. No. 638).

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 552. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code in order to provide that committing acts dangerous to persons on board trains shall be a criminal offense (Rept. No. 639); and

S. 2216. A bill to establish a National Commission on New Technological Uses of Copyrighted Works (Rept. No. 640).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. SMATHERS, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

William A. Meadows, of Florida, to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of Florida; and

Guy W. Hixon, of Florida, to be U.S. marshal for the southern district of Florida.

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Lawrence A. Whipple, of New Jersey, to be U.S. district judge for the district of New Jersey; and

Juan B. Fernandez-Badillo, of Puerto Rico, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Puerto Rico.

By Mr. LONG of Missouri, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Calvin K. Hamilton, of Missouri, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of Missouri.

By Mr. FONG, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Yoshimi Hayashi, of Hawaii, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Hawaii.

By Mr. HART, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Damon J. Keith, of Michigan, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Michigan.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Erwin N. Griswold, of Massachusetts, to be Solicitor General of the United States.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 2521. A bill for the relief of Charles O. Schick; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 2522. A bill to prohibit the use of the mails in selling or giving, or offering to sell or give, cigarettes, cigars, and tobacco to individuals in violation of State laws; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 2523. A bill to amend section 1011 of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 so as to authorize the Director of the U.S. Information Agency to issue educational materials guaranties; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. McCarthy when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. Pell, Mr. Brooke, Mr. Case, Mr. Clark, Mr. Hart, Mr. Inouye, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. McGee, Mr. Mondale, Mr. Morse, Mr. Muskie, Mr. Proxmire, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Ribicoff, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, Mr. Yarborough, Mr. Young of Ohio, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Scott, and Mr. Javits):

S. 2524. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MUSKIE:

S. 2525. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to control pollution from vessels within the navigable waters of the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. Muskie when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF U.S. INFORMATION AND EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE ACT OF 1948

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 1011 of the U.S. Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 so as to authorize the Director of the U.S. Information Agency to issue educational materials guaranties.

This proposal is somewhat similar in structure to the informational media guaranty program. Earlier this year the Senate voted not to shift the method of financing the informational media guaranty program from Treasury borrowing to a $10 million revolving fund. Unless a modified program is enacted, the program will be terminated.

One objection to the informational media guaranty program was that it was too broad and could be used for materials for entertainment and other purposes. This bill provides a modified program which is strictly limited to educational materials such as textbooks, reference works, technical publications, and educational films and filmstrips. The bill also reduces the amount of the revolving fund to $7.5 million. Any losses from the basic fund would have to be filled by appropriations by Congress, not by Treasury borrowing as formerly provided.

The purpose of this program is to make educational materials available to citizens in countries which have foreign exchange restrictions and problems. Under these circumstances U.S. publishers will not ordinarily make sales. The bill establishes a revolving convertibility fund through which the local "soft" currencies received by publishers can be converted into dollars. The publishers would still have all the same risks as they have in making sales in this country or any other nation where there are not foreign exchange restrictions and problems. The U.S. Government would not assume any credit risks. It would make no guarantee of payments or collections. It is not an investment guarantee. The fund only provides a kind of insurance in certain designated countries against the uncertainties of converting local currencies.

This program is designed to be a part of our broad educational effort in behalf of citizens of other nations where local conditions of currency would otherwise exclude sales of educational materials. Instead of supplying them through USIA or AID and having the Government pay the full cost, this program encourages the private publishers to take the normal commercial risks and make the sales. It is a relatively inexpensive way for the Government to assist in making available U.S. educational materials to citizens in other countries, and it is my view that we should adopt this program both to assist these people in obtaining educational materials and in the national interest.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2523) to amend section 1011 of the U.S. Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 so as to authorize the Director of the U.S. Information Agency to issue educational materials guaranties introduced by Mr. McCarthy was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, in behalf of myself and Senator Pell, and Senators Brooke, Case, Clark, Hart, Hartke, Inouye, McCarthy, McGee, Mondale, Morse, Muskie, Proxmire, Randolph, Ribicoff, Scott, Williams of New Jersey, Yarborough, Young of Ohio, Javits, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act. A companion bill is being introduced in the other body by the chairman of its Judiciary Committee, Representative Emanuel Celler of New York.

Mr. President, little more than 2 years ago, President Johnson signed into law the Immigration Act of 1965. This act, which resulted from President Kennedy's recommendations to Congress in July of 1963, repealed the discriminatory national origins quota system as a basis for selecting immigrants.

I said at the time that a measure of greatness for any nation is its ability to recognize past errors in judgment, and its willingness to reform its public policy. Through the act of 1965, we made a good beginning in our basic policy governing those who seek admission to our land.

The accomplished reform broadened a central theme in American history—equality of opportunity. It stands with legislation in other fields—civil rights, poverty, education, and health—to reaffirm in the 1960's our Nation's continuing pursuit of justice, equality, and freedom.

But this was only the beginning of an important task. President Kennedy recognized this in his message to Congress, and during the floor debate on the immigration bill, the administration assured Senators that additional recommendations would be sent to the Congress at an early date. Throughout 1966, I made repeated inquiries into the status of new recommendations, and as late as November, was assured they were under active consideration. Early this year, after another inquiry, the Department of Justice informed me that no bill would be sent to the Congress in the foreseeable future.

Because I believed—along with many Senators—additional immigration reform was long overdue, I felt it was extremely important to develop a congressional alternative. In preparing the bill I introduce today, I worked closely with many Members of Congress. The distinguished junior Senator from Rhode Island, especially, has made important contributions to the development of the legislation. I also sought the advice and counsel of outside experts, including representatives of the American Immigration and Citizenship Conference and its member organizations.

Mr. President, I believe the enactment of the bill we introduce today, will go a long way in continuing the reform effort initiated in 1965. It will go a long way in removing the remaining inequities in our immigration and naturalization policy—those remnants of a harsher period in our country's history.

The bill accomplishes these objectives. First, it refines the application of our belief in human dignity and equal opportunity under law by reestablishing a Board of Visa Appeals and a statute of limitations on deportation. Second, it strengthens immigration objectives to reunite families. Third, it expedites the naturalization of aliens serving in the Armed Forces during the Vietnam conflict. Fourth, it establishes a new humanitarian policy of asylum for refugees and victims of natural calamity. And fifth, it provides necessary adjustments in the nationality and naturalization law, and establishes a Select Commission on Nationality and Naturalization to evaluate the fairness of our general policy in this extremely important, but overlooked, area of public concern.

I would like to elaborate on these objectives by referring to specific sections of the bill.

Section 2 reestablishes a Board of Visa Appeals to review the denial of an immigrant visa to relative of a U.S. citizen or a permanent resident alien. There are many cases on record in which the denial of a visa by an American consul abroad has raised justifiable skepticism. Some of these denial cases have been finally settled through the enactment of private immigration bills. It is true that an informal appeal process currently operates within the Department of State, but regardless of the Department's findings, the final decision rests with the consul abroad. I believe an independent Board of Visa Appeals—under law—will help assure a more equitable treatment of denial cases.

Section 5 of the bill redefines the seventh preference, currently allocated to refugees. In place of refugees, the seventh preference visa will be made available to desirable groups of aliens, not requiring labor certification, who currently are admitted on a nonpreference basis.

The availability of nonpreference visas is very limited, however, and all but precludes the admission of these aliens. Included in the new seventh preference are retired persons, private investors, fiancees of U.S. citizens, and members of religious denominations who seek admission to perform duties to carry out objectives of their denominations.

Section 6 of the bill establishes a new humanitarian policy of asylum for refugees. In practice, our country has always been generous in providing resettlement opportunities to refugees, but our permanent immigration law has never included a comprehensive asylum policy. As chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Refugees, I believe it is extremely important that our law fully recognize refugee resettlement needs throughout the world. The bill I introduce accomplishes this objective. First, it provides for the issuance of 12,000 immigrant visas annually to qualified refugees throughout the world. Second, it authorizes the Attorney General to parole into the country alien refugees, if he determines it to be in the public interest. This merely confirms what we have done over the last decade in admitting those who have fled from Hungary and Cuba. Third, it provides a permanent authority to adjust the status of refugee parolees to that of permanent residence, and thus avoids the need for special legislation of the kind required for Hungarians and Cubans.

Section 8 reestablishes a statute of limitations on deportation. It is an established principle of law that justice requires a time limit, within which authorities must commence proceedings against an individual for any alleged crime or violation of law. We recognize this principle in the criminal code, the exceptions usually involving capital cases. But in matters involving the deportation of a lawfully admitted resident alien, this elementary principle does not apply. The alien may have resided in this country since childhood, or for 20 or 30 years or more. He may have been a product of our society—but he is denied its justice, and its equity under the law. The absence of a statute of limitations from the basic immigration law is a tragic shortcoming—a glaring injustice which has caused undue personal hardship and anxiety in the lives of many. All Senators are familiar with such cases.

The bill I introduce is a modest attempt to remedy the situation.

Section 14 of the bill expedites the naturalization of the noncitizens who have served honorably with the Armed Forces during the Vietnam conflict. This opportunity has been extended previously to such persons who have served in former wars, including the Korean hostilities.

Section 17 of the bill establishes the select commission on nationality and naturalization. As stated in the bill:

> The purpose of this commission is to "make a full and complete study and investigation of all matters relating to the policy and operation of title III of the Immigration and Nationality Act; including, but not limited to, the effect of Federal judicial decisions in recent years on any of the provisions of such title, and an analysis and evaluation of the fairness of the nationality and naturalization policy of the United States."

Mr. President, such a review is long overdue. This important segment of public policy has been ignored and overlooked by the Congress, since the codification and amendment of nationality and naturalization laws of 1952.

There is little doubt that many provisions in the basic statute are products of a harsher period in our history, which should have no place in the public policy of a free society. But aside from this, court decisions in recent years have altered the statute considerably. A recent decision handed down by the Supreme Court, Afroyim against Rusk, last May 29, declared unconstitutional inadvertent expatriation—loss of citizenship—through voting in foreign elections. Undoubtedly, the full effect of this decision has yet to come; for there are similar grounds of expatriation. Events since 1952 urgently demand a comprehensive review and evaluation of our so-called nationality and naturalization policy. I strongly believe this will be more easily accomplished through the effort of an independent select commission.

Finally, section 18 of the bill provides for the issuance of special immigrant visas to clean up the backlog of petitions accumulated under the discriminatory national origins quota system. This would apply only to the fifth preference for brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens. In Italy petitions date back as far as March of 1955. To provide relief for qualified fifth preference visa applicants who still wish to join their family in this country, is humane and just.

Moreover, I believe the removal of this last vestige of the national origins system, will permit a more efficient and effective administration of the new system established in 1965.

Mr. President, I am extremely hopeful that early hearings will be held on the bill I introduce today. But I would be remiss in my comments if I did not urge that the Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration consider, as well, two other matters—both relating to the Immigration Act of 1965.

The first involves the administration of the act's labor clearance procedure for employable visa applicants without a family preference. I am sure this has been a matter of some concern to nearly every Member of the Senate. In a speech in this Chamber over a year ago, on May 25, 1966, I expressed my view that the Department of Labor was not carrying out the intent of Congress in the administration of the labor clearance provision.

I believed the Department was unduly restrictive in its operations. Since then, these operations have become more flexible. But problems remain, and the labor clearance procedure requires a continuing review by the appropriate committees of Congress.

The second problem involves the preference system established by the act of 1965. There is growing evidence to suggest that the allocation of visas among the seven preferences is not meeting immigration needs today, or what we can anticipate in the future.

Statistical information compiled by the Visa Office indicates, for example, that of the 34,000 visas allocated to the first preference for unmarried sons or daughters of U.S. citizens, the current and anticipated demand is approximately 2,000. On the other hand, the 17,000 visas allocated to the third preference for professional persons, scientists and artists, are fully utilized. In fact, the anticipated annual demand in this preference exceeds the number of visas available by some 27,000. It is estimated that by June 30, 1968, the third preference will carry a backlog of nearly 50,000. Additionally, the pool of nonpreference visas traditionally used by applicants in Ireland, Germany, the Netherlands, and other European countries, is expected to decline rapidly in the numbers available during the months and years ahead.

The developing problems in the allocation of visas in the preference system also requires a thorough review by the appropriate committees of Congress.

Mr. President, there is work to do in perfecting the policy which governs the oldest theme in our Nation's history. I urge Senators tc join the movement for continuing reform.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill I introduce today, and a brief summary of its provisions, be printed at this point in the RECORD, as well as a recent issue of interpreter releases published by the American Council for Nationalities Service. The issue discusses the Supreme Court decision handed down in Afroyim against Rusk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD together with the summary and the interpreter releases.

The bill (S. 2524) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2524

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Immigration and Nationality Act of 1967".

SEC. 2. Section 104 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1104) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g)(1) There is hereby established within the Bureau of Security and Consular Affair a Board of Visa Appeals (hereinafter in this subsection referred to as the 'Board'), to be independent of the Visa Office. The Board shall consist of five members to be appointed by the Secretary of State, who shall designate one member as Chairman. The practice and procedure before the Board shall be in accordance with this subsection and, subject to paragraph (4), such regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe.

"(2) Upon petition by any citizen of the United States claiming that an alien outside the United States is entitled to a preference status by reason of the relationships described in paragraph (1), (4), or (5) of section 203(a), or to an immediate relative status under section 201(b), or by any alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence claiming that an alien outside the United States is entitled to a preference status by reason of the relationship described in section 203(a)(2), the Board shall have jurisdiction to review any determination of a United States consular officer refusing an immigrant visa, or revoking an immigrant visa issued, to any such alien outside the United States who has applied for classification as a preference immigrant described in any such paragraph or as an immediate relative. Each alien shall be informed of the review procedure available under this subsection when a determination refusing or revoking an immigrant visa to him is made by a consular officer. No petition for review may be filed with the Board more than sixty days after the date of notification to an alien of the making of the determination with respect to which review is sought.

"(3) Any review by the Board under this subsection shall be conducted solely upon the basis of the visa application and any other supporting documents submitted in connection with such application by or on behalf of the alien concerned, and any other documents, materials or information, in the possession of and considered by the consular officer, together wtih any briefs, memorandums, or arguments submitted in writing by or on behalf of the alien. No alien, solely by virtue of a petition for review by the Board under this subsection, shall be entitled to entry or admission into the United States.

"(4) The decision of the Board in each case shall be in writing and shall be communicated to the petitioner and the alien concerned. Decisions of the Board under this subsection shall be final and conclusive on all questions of law and fact relating to the issuance or revocation of a visa and shall not be subject to review by any other official, department, agency, or establishment of the United States, or by any court by mandamus or otherwise; but nothing in this subsection shall be construed to limit the application of section 221(d)."

SEC. 3. Section 203(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1153(a)(2)) is amended by striking out "who are the spouses, unmarried sons or unmarried daughters of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence" and substituting "who are the parents, spouses, unmarried sons or unmarried daughters of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence: *Provided,* That in the case of parents, such lawfully admitted permanent resident alien must be at least twenty-one years of age."

SEC. 4. (a) Section 201(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1151(a)) is amended (1) by inserting, immediately after "section 101(a)(27)," the following: "of alien refugees specified in section 207,"; and (2) by striking out "or who may, pursuant to section 203(a)(7) enter conditionally,".

(b) Section 202 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1152) is amended as follows:

(1) In subsection (a) strike out "and the number of conditional entries".

(2) In subsection (a), immediately after "section 201 (b)", insert "or an alien refugee as described in section 207 (a) or (b)".

SEC. 5. (a) Section 203 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1153) is amended as follows:

(1) That portion of subsection (a) which precedes paragraph (1) is amended by striking out "or their conditional entry authorized, as the case may be".

(2) Paragraph (7) of subsection (a) is amended to read as follows:

"(7) Visas shall next be available, in a number not to exceed 6 per centum of the number specified in section 201 (a) (ii), to qualified immigrants who are—

"(A) aliens engaged solely or principally by any religious denomination who are seeking admission to the United States to perform duties which are related to the religious objectives of such denomination; or

"(B) aliens who affirmatively establish that they will not seek employment in the United States and will not have to earn a living; or

"(C) aliens seeking to enter the United States to engage in a commercial or agricultural enterprise in which they will invest a substantial portion of the capital commodities, services, patents, processes, or techniques invested in such enterprise; or

"(D) the fiancees of citizens of the United States or of aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to such citizens or lawfully admitted permanent residents and who affirmatively establish that they will not seek employment in the United States and will not have to earn a living."

(3) Paragraph (8) of subsection (a) is amended by striking out "paragraphs (1) through (6) and less the number of conditional entries and visas made available pursuant to paragraph (7)" and substituting "paragraphs (1) through (7)".

(4) Paragraph (9) of subsection (a) is amended by striking out "or to conditional entry".

(5) Subsection (d) of such section is amended by striking out "paragraphs (1) through (6)" and substituting "paragraphs (1) through (7)".

(6) Subsections (f), (g), and (h) of such section are hereby repealed; except that the provisions of such subsections shall continue in force and effect with respect to any alien who conditionally entered the United States as a refugee pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a)(7) of such section in effect prior to the effective date of this Act.

SEC. 6. (a)(1) Chapter 1 of title II of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1151 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"REFUGEES

"SEC. 207. (a)(1) Notwithstanding the numerical limitation specified in any other section of this Act, immigrant visas shall be made available, in a number not exceeding 12,000 in any fiscal year to alien refugees (as described in subsection (c)) who are not firmly resettled, who apply for admission to the United States while in any non-Communist or non-Communist dominated country, and

"(2) Visas issued pursuant to paragraph (1) in any fiscal year shall be issued to eligible immigrants in the order in which a petition in behalf of each such immigrant is filed with the Attorney General as provided in section 204.

."(b)(1) In addition to the authority conferred upon him by section 212(d)(5), the Attorney General may in his discretion parole into the United States under such conditions as he may prescribe for emergent reasons or for reasons deemed strictly in the public interest any alien refugees (as described in subsection (c)) or class of alien refugees who are not firmly resettled and who apply for admission to the United States while in any non-Communist or non-Communist dominated country.

"(2) The Attonrey General shall submit to the Congress a report containing a complete and detailed statement of the facts in the case of each alien refugee paroled into the United States pursuant to this subsection. Such reports shall be submitted on or before January 15 and June 15 of each year. If within ninety days immediately following the submission of any such report, either the Senate or the House of Representatives agrees to a resolution stating in substance that it does not favor the continuation of the authority vested in the Attorney General under this subsection the Attorney General shall, not later than sixty days thereafter, discontinue the parole into the United States of alien refugees pursuant to this subsection.

"(3) Any alien who was paroled into the United States as a refugee, pursuant to this subsection, whose parole has not therefore been terminated by the Attorney General pursuant to such regulations as he may prescribe, who has been in the United States for at least two years, and who has not acquired permanent residence, shall forthwith return or be returned to the custody of the Immigration and Naturalization Service and shall thereupon be inspected and .examined for admission into the United States, and his case dealt with in accordance with the provisions of sections 235, 236, and 237 of this Act.

"(4) Notwithstanding the numerical limitations of this Act, any alien who, pursuant to paragraph (3), is found, upon inspection by the immigration officer or after hearing before a special inquiry officer, to be admissible as an immigrant under this Act at the time of his inspection and examination, except for the fact that he was not and is not in possession of the documents required by section 212(a)(20), shall be regarded as lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of his arrival.

"(c) The term 'alien refugee' means (1) any alien (A) who has fled or shall flee from and is unwilling to return to any Communist or Communist-dominated country or area, due to persecution on account of race, religion, or political opinion, or (B) who has fled or shall flee from and is unwilling to return to any country due to a well-founded fear of persecution or danger to his life or civil liberties, or (C) who has been uprooted by natural calamity or military operations and who is unable to return to his usual place of abode, and (2) the spouse and children of any such alien, if accompanying or following to join him."

(2) The table of contents of chapter 1 of title II of the Immigration and Nationality Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"Sec. 207. Refugees."

(b) Section 204 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1154) is amended as follows:

(1) In subsection (a) immediately after "section 203(a)(6)," insert "or any alien desiring to be classified as a refugee immigrant under section 207(a)".

(2) In subsection (b), immediately after "section 203(a)", insert "or is an alien refugee under section 207(a)".

(3) In subsection (e), immediately after "section 201(b)", insert "or as an alien refugee under section 207(a)".

(c) Section 221(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1207(a)) is amended by inserting "alien refugee," immediately after "immediate relative,".

(d) Section 222(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1202(a)) is amended by inserting ", or an alien refugee under section 207(a)," immediately after "section 201(b)".

(e) (1) The section heading of section 224 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1204) is amended to read as follows:

"IMMEDIATE RELATIVE, ALIEN REFUGEE, AND SPECIAL IMMIGRANT VISAS"

(2) The text of such section 224 is amended by inserting ", alien refugee," immediately after "special immigrant", at each place it appears therein.

(3) Section 224 of the table of contents of the Immigration and Nationality Act is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 224. Immediate relative, alien refugee, and special immigrant visas.".

(f) Section 244 (d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1254(d)) is amended by inserting "or is an alien refugee under section 207 (a) or (b)," immediately after "section 101(a)(27)(A),".

SEC. 7. Section 245 (c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1255 (c)) is amended by inserting, immediately preceding the period, the following: "*Provided*, That the Attorney General may, in his discretion, adjust the status of any such alien pursuant to this section if it shall be established to the satisfaction of the Attorney General that the limitations of this subsection would result in exceptional hardship to such alien".

SEC. 8. (a) (1) Chapter 9 of title II of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1151 et seq.), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"LIMITATIONS ON DEPORTATION

"SEC. 293. (a) No alien lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence, other than an alien who obtained such status by fraud, concealment, misrepresentation, or other misconduct shall be deported solely by reason of any conduct or event occurring or condition existing more than ten years prior to the institution of deportation proceedings against him.

"(b) No alien lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence before attaining the age of fourteen years, other than an alien who obtained such status by fraud, concealment, misrepresentation, or other misconduct, shall be deported if he has resided continuously within the United States for a period of at least ten years immediately preceding the institution of deportation proceedings against him and after having been lawfully admitted for permanent residence, including as part of such period at least nine years of physical presence in the United States.

"(c) No alien lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence, other than an alien who obtained such status by fraud, concealment, misrepresentation, or other misconduct, shall be deported if he has resided continuously within the United States for a period of at least twenty years immediately preceding the institution of the deportation proceedings against him and after having been lawfully admitted for permanent residence, including as part of such period at least eighteen years of physical presence in the United States.

"(d) The benefits of this section shall be applicable to any alien notwithstanding (1) that any of the facts by reason of which subsection (a), (b) or (c) may be applicable, including the date of admission for permanent residence in the United States, occurred or existed prior to its effective date, or (2) that the status of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence was erroneously or illegally granted to such alien through no fault of his own: *Provided*, That this section shall not be applicable to aliens as to whom deportation proceedings are pending on its effective date.

"(e) Any alien whose deportation is prevented under this section and whose status as an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence was erroneously or illegally granted through no fault of his own shall remain in that status notwithstanding any other provision of this Act."

(2) The table of contents of chapter 9 of title II of the Immigration and Nationality Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"SEC. 293. Limitations on deportation."

(b) Section 340 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1451) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(k) No proceeding under this section shall be instituted more than ten years after a naturalized citizen has been admitted to citizenship."

SEC. 9. The first proviso contained in paragraph (1) of section 312 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1423) is amended by striking out "or to any person who, on the effective date of this Act, is over fifty years of age and has been living in the United States for periods totaling at least twenty years" and by inserting in lieu thereof the following: "or to any person who, on the date of the filing of his petition for naturalization as provided in section 334 of this Act, is over fifty years of age and has been living in the United States for periods totaling at least twenty years".

SEC. 10. Section 316(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1427(b)) is amended as follows:

(1) In the second sentence thereof (A) insert "or is employed by an accredited American philanthropic agency or organization, or is the sole owner or proprietor of" immediately after "recognized as such by the Attorney General,", and (B) insert "or to be employed by such accredited American philanthropic agency or organization," immediately after "such firm or corporation,".

(2) At the end thereof insert the following new sentence: "The granting of the benefits of this subsection to a person who has established to the satisfaction of the Attorney General that he will be employed in a capacity described in this subsection shall extend to the spouse, children, and unmarried sons and daughters of such person who, after being lawfully admitted for permanent residence, are physically present abroad as members of the household of such person during the period that such person is absent from the United States in the capacity for which such benefits are granted.".

SEC. 11. Clause (1) (B) of section 319(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1430(b)) is amended by inserting "of an accredited American philanthropic agency or organization, or is the sole owner or proprietor or in the employment" immediately preceding "of an American firm".

SEC. 12. Sections 320 and 321 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1431–1432) are amended by striking out "sixteen years" at each place it appears in such sections and substituting "eighteen years" at each such place.

SEC. 13. Section 323(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1434) is amended by inserting "of an accredited American philanthropic agency or organization, or is the sole owner or proprietor or in the employment" immediately preceding "of an American firm".

SEC. 14. (a) Subsections (a) and (b) of section 329 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1440) are amended by inserting "or during a period beginning February 28, 1961, and ending on the termination of the Vietnam hostilities, as determined by the President," immediately after "1955," at each place it appears in such subsections.

(b) (1) The heading of such section 329 is amended by inserting "OR THE VIETNAM HOSTILITIES" at the end thereof.

(2) Section 329 of the table of contents of such Act is amended by inserting "or the Vietnam hostilities" immediately preceding the period.

SEC. 15. The third sentence of section 336(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1447(c)), relating to final hearings upon petitions for naturalization, is amended by striking out "sixty" and substituting "thirty".

SEC. 16. Section 338 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1449) is amended by substituting for the words "and personal description of the naturalized person, including age, sex, marital status, and country of former nationality", the words "and personal description of the naturalized person, including age, sex, and marital status".

SEC. 17. (a) There is hereby established a Select Commission on Nationality and Naturalization (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission") to be composed of nine members. The President shall appoint the Chairman of the Commission and two other members thereof. The President of the Senate, with the approval of the majority and minority leaders of the Senate, shall appoint three members from the membership of the Senate. The Speaker of the House of Representatives, with the approval of the majority and minority leaders of the House, shall appoint three members from the membership of the House. Not more than two members appointed by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, respectively, shall be members of the same political party. A vacancy in the membership of the Commission shall be filled in the same manner as the original designation and appointment.

(b) The Commission shall make a full and complete study and investigation of all matters relating to the policy and operation of title III of the Immigration and Nationality Act; including, but not limited to, the effect of Federal judicial decisions in recent years on any of the provisions of such title and an analysis and evaluation of the fairness of the nationality and naturalization policy of the United States.

(c) (1) The Commission shall make a preliminary report to the President and the Congress on or before the first day of the seventh month after the expiration of thirty days following the date of the enactment of this Act. The Commission shall make a final report to the President and the Congress not later than six months after the submission of its preliminary report. Such reports shall set forth the results of its study and investigation and include the recommendations of the Commission as to what legislative and operational changes, if any, are needed in title III of the Immigration and Nationality Act in the light of its study and investigation.

(2) The Commission shall cease to exist sixty days after the submission of its final report.

(d) All Federal departments, agencies, and instrumentalities shall cooperate fully with the Commission to the end that it may effectively carry out its duties.

(e) (1) Each member of the Commission who is not otherwise in the service of the Government of the United States shall receive compensation at the rate of $100 for each date he is engaged in the performance of his duties as a member of the Commission and shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, while away from his home or regular place of business, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code.

(2) Each member of the Commission who is otherwise in the service of the Government of the United States shall serve without compensation in addition to that received in his regular employment, but shall be allowed travel, transportation, and subsistence expenses, while engaged in the performance of his duties as a member of the Commission, as authorized by subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code.

(f) The Commission may appoint such staff personnel as it deems necessary in accordance with the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and shall fix the compensation of such personnel in accordance with the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates.

(g) The Commission is authorized to obtain the services of experts and consultants in accordance with section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, but at rates not to exceed $100 a day for individuals.

(h) There are authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

SEC. 18. Any alien who is eligible for a quota immigrant status under the provisions of section 203(a) (5) of the Immigration and

Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1153) on the basis of a petition filed with the Attorney General prior to December 1, 1965, and the spouse and children of such alien, if accompanying or following to join him, shall be held to be special immigrants and if otherwise admissible under the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act, shall be issued special immigrant visas: *Provided*, That, upon his application for an immigrant visa and for his admission into the United States, such alien is found to have retained his relationship to the petitioner and status as established in the approved petition.

SEC. 19. This Act shall become effective on the first day of the first month after the expiration of thirty days following the date of its enactment.

The summary and interpreter letters are as follows:

Section 1 designates the bill the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1967.

Section 2 establishes a Board of Visa Appeals as an independent office within the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs of the Department of State. The Board will consist of five members, including a chairman, to be appointed by the Secretary of State. The Board shall have jurisdiction to review the denial of an immigrant visa to a relative of a United States citizen or permanent resident alien, upon the petition of such citizen or alien. The Board's decision will be final.

Section 3 gives parents of permanent resident aliens second preference status. Currently covered by this preference are spouses and unmarried sons or unmarried daughters of such aliens.

Section 4 technical amendments.

Section 5 removes refugees from seventh preference status. The bill will make available to specified groups of aliens, not currently requiring labor certification, some 10,200 immigrant visas annually on a first come, first served basis. Such aliens currently enter the United States on a nonpreference basis. Aliens who will benefit by a redefinition of the seventh preference, include:

(1) those, such as nuns, monks, missionaries, teachers, nurses, etc., who are engaged solely or principally by a religious denomination and seek admission to the United States to perform duties to carry out the objectives of such denomination (ministers of religion, rabbis and priests are currently accorded special immigrant status and are admitted to the U.S. without numerical limitation);

(2) retired persons;

(3) private investors;

(4) fiancees of U.S. citizens and permanent resident aliens.

Section 6 establishes a new Sec. 207 in the basic statute, to provide for the admission of refugees from all over the world. A refugee is defined as one who has fled from a Communist-dominated country or area, or has fled from any country and is unwilling to return "due to a wellfounded fear of persecution, or danger to his life or civil liberties"; or has been uprooted by natural calamity or military operations and is unable to return to his usual abode. Section 207:

(1) will provide 12,000 immigrant visas annually to qualified refugees throughout the world, notwithstanding any numerical limitations of current law;

(2) will specifically authorize the Attorney General to parole into the U.S. under Sec. 212(d) (5) of the basic immigration statute, alien refugees, if such is deemed to be in the public interest of the U.S.;

(3) will provide a permanent authority to adjust the status of refugee parolees to that of permanent residence.

Section 7 provides adjustment of status, in cases of exceptional hardship, for natives of Western Hemisphere countries. They are currently barred from adjustment procedures.

Section 8 establishes a new Section 293, entitled, "Limitations on Deportations". The Statute of Limitations would prevent the deportation:

(1) of aliens lawfully admitted to the U.S. for permanent residence solely by reason of any conduct or conditions which occurred or existed ten years prior to the institution of deportation proceedings;

(2) of aliens lawfully admitted to the U.S. for permanent residence if such aliens entered the U.S. prior to age 14 and have resided in the U.S. for a period of ten years immediately preceding the institution of deportation proceedings;

(3) of aliens lawfully admitted to the U.S. for permanent residence if such aliens have resided continuously within the U.S. for a period of at least 20 years immediately preceding the institution of deportation proceedings against him.

The Statute of Limitations will not apply to aliens who received their resident status illegally.

Section 9 facilitates the naturalization of persons over 50 years who have been living in the U.S. for at least 20 years.

Sections 10 and 11 facilitate the naturalization of permanent resident aliens employed overseas by an accredited American philanthropic organization, or the alien spouse of a U.S. citizen employed by such organization.

Section 12 permits the derivative acquisition of citizenship by a minor child, through his parents' naturalization, through 18 years of age instead of 16 as currently provided.

Section 13 facilitates the naturalization of an alien child adopted by a U.S. citizen parent who is employed overseas by an accredited American philanthropic organization.

Section 13 facilitates the naturalization of permanent resident aliens serving with the armed forces during hostilities in Vietnam.

Section 15 provides that final hearings upon petitions for naturalization can be held as late as 30 days before a pending general election, rather than 60 days as currently provided.

Section 16 eliminates the question of "Country of former nationality" from the naturalization certificate.

Section 17 establishes a Select Commission on Nationality and Naturalization to "make a full and complete study and investigation of all matters relating to the policy and operation of Title III of the Immigration and Nationality Act; including, but not limited to, the effect of Federal judicial decisions in recent years on any of the provisions of such title and an analysis and evaluation of the fairness of the naturalization policy of the U.S." The Commission shall be composed of nine members—three from the Senate, three from the House, and three appointed by the President—and shall file its final report one year following enactment of this bill.

Section 18 to clean up the backlog in fifth preference (brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens), accumulated under the national origins quota system of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, this section provides for the issuances of special immigrant visas to an applicant whose petition for admission was filed prior to December 1, 1965, the effective date of the Immigration Act of 1965.

Section 19 enactment date.

[Interpreter releases from the American Council for Nationalities Service, June 9, 1967]

U.S. SUPREME COURT DECLARES EXPATRIATION PROVISION UNCONSTITUTIONAL AND STATE DEPARTMENT PROMPTLY IMPLEMENTS DECISION

On May 29, 1967, the United States Supreme Court handed down *Afroyim* v. *Rusk*, a decision of greatest importance to the nationality law. This decision proclaims that the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution protects United States citizens from inadvertently expatriating themselves by voting in foreign elections. The decision will benefit many thousand persons who over the past years have been expatriated. Although the decision specifically declared unconstitutional sec. 401(e) of the Nationality Act of 1940, the State Department stated in its instructions on June 1, 1967 to all its diplomatic and consular posts on the effect of the decision, that its immediate effect is also to void sec. 349(a) (5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 which also provides for expatriation of persons voting in a political election in a foreign state or participating in an election or plebiscite to determine the sovereignty over foreign territory.

Supreme Court rules that 14th amendment protects U.S. citizens from expatriation by voluntary voting in foreign elections if there is no evidence of voluntary relinquishment of U.S. citizenship.

In *Afroyim* v. *Rusk* (465) 35 L.W. 4503, Justice Black, for the majority with Justice *Harlan* writing a dissenting opinion in which he was joined by Justices *Clarke, Stewart* and *White*, established an important new principle in nationality law, namely, that under the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution a United States citizen cannot inadvertently "lose" his citizenship by voting in a foreign election. This ruling explicitly overrules the opposite ruling in *Perez* v. *Brownell*, 356 U.S. 44.[*]

Afroyim, a native of Poland, came to the United States in 1912 and became a naturalized American citizen in 1926. He went to Israel in 1950 and in 1951, according to the facts as stated in the Supreme Court decision, "he voluntarily voted in an election for the Israeli Knesset, the legislative body of Israel. In 1960, when he applied for renewal of his United States passport, the Department of State refused to grant it on the sole ground that he had lost his American citizenship by virtue of sec. 401(e) of the Nationality Act of 1940 which provides that a United States citizen shall 'lose' his citizenship if he votes 'in a political election in a foreign state.' Petitioner then brought this declaratory judgment action in federal district court alleging that sec. 401(e) violates both the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment and sec. 1, cl. 1, of the Fourteenth Amendment which grants American citizenship to persons like petitioner."

The Court summarized the position of the petitioner who stated that neither the Fourteenth Amendment nor any other provision of the Constitution expressly grants Congress the power to take away citizenship once it has been acquired and that even before adoption of the Fourteenth Amendment views were expressed in Congress and by the U.S. Supreme Court that under the Constitution the Government was granted no power to determine what conduct should and should not result in the loss of citizenship. Congress based its right to take away citizenship for voting in a foreign country on its implied power to regulate foreign affairs, the reasoning which a five-to-four divided Court had followed in *Perez* v. *Brownell*. In overruling *Perez* v. *Brownell* the Court said:

"The fundamental issue before this Court here, as it was in *Perez*, is whether Congress can consistently with the Fourteenth Amendment enact a law stripping an American of his citizenship which he has never voluntarily renounced or given up. The majority in *Perez* held that Congress could do this because withdrawal of citizenship is 'reasonably calculated to effect the end that is within the power of Congress to achieve.' 356 U.S., at 60. That conclusion was reached by this chain of reasoning: Congress has an implied power to deal with foreign affairs as an indispensable attribute of sovereignty; this implied power, plus the Necessary and Proper Clause, empowers Congress to regulate voting by American citizens in foreign elections; involuntary expatriation is within the 'ample scope' of 'appropriate modes' Congress can adopt to effectuate its general regulatory power. Id., at 57–60. Then, upon summarily concluding that 'there is nothing . . . in the Fourteenth Amendment to warrant drawing from it a restriction upon the power otherwise possessed by Congress to withdraw citizenship,' id., at 58, n. 3, the majority specifically rejected the 'notion that the power of Congress to terminate citizenship depends upon the citizen's assent.' id., at 61.

---

[*] *Perez* v. *Brownell* was reported in *Interpreter Releases*, Vol. 35, No. 15, April 28, 1958, pp. 106–113. In the *Perez* case the majority opinion which has now been overruled was written by Justice Frankfurter, with Justices Warren, Black and Douglas writing separate dissents and Justice Whittaker, who has retired from the Bench, writing a partial dissent.

"First we reject the idea expressed in *Perez* that, aside from the Fourteenth Amendment, Congress has any general power, express or implied, to take away an American citizen's citizenship without his assent. This power cannot, as *Perez* indicated, be sustained as an implied attribute of sovereignty possessed by all nations. Other nations are governed by their own constitutions, if any, and we can draw no support from theirs. In our country the people are sovereign and the Government cannot sever its relationship to the people by taking away their citizenship. Our Constitution governs us and we must never forget that our Constitution limits the Government to those powers specifically granted or those that are necessary and proper to carry out the specifically granted ones. The Constitution, of course, grants Congress no express power to strip people of their citizenship, whether in the exercise of the implied power to regulate foreign affairs or in the exercise of any specifically granted power. And even before the adoption of the Fourteenth Amendment, views were expressed in Congress and by this Court that under the Constitution the Government was granted no power, even under its express power to pass a uniform rule of naturalization, to determine what conduct should and should not result in the loss of citizenship. On three occasions, in 1795, 1797, and 1818, Congress considered and rejected proposals to enact laws which would describe certain conduct as resulting in expatriation. On each occasion Congress was considering bills that were concerned with recognizing the right of voluntary expatriation and with providing some means of exercising that right. In 1795 and 1797, many members of Congress still adhered to the English doctrine of perpetual allegiance and doubted whether a citizen could even voluntarily renounce his citizenship. By 1818, however, almost no one doubted the existence of the right of voluntary expatriation, but several judicial decisions had indicated that the right could not be exercised by the citizen without the consent of the Federal Government in the form of enabling legislation. Therefore, a bill was introduced to provide that a person could voluntarily relinquish his citizenship by declaring such relinquishment in writing before a district court and then departing from the country."

The Court discusses the Congressional debate in 1817–1818 which considered certain expatriation provisions. The opinion also discusses later Congressional debate on the same point:

"To uphold Congress' power to take away a man's citizenship because he voted in a foreign election in violation of sec. 401(e) would be equivalent to holding that Congress has the power to 'abridge,' 'affect,' 'restrict the effect of,' and 'take . . . away' citizenship. Because the Fourteenth Amendment prevents Congress from doing any of these things, we agree with the Chief Justice's dissent in the *Perez* case that the Government is without power to rob a citizen of his citizenship under sec. 401(e)

"Because the legislative history of the Fourteenth Amendment and the expatriation proposals which preceded and followed it, like most other legislative history, contains many statements from which conflicting inferences can be drawn, our holding might be unwarranted if it rested entirely or principally upon that legislative history.

But it does not. Our holding we think is the only one that can stand in view of the language and the purpose of the Fourteenth Amendment, and our construction of that Amendment, we believe, comports more nearly than *Perez* with the principles of liberty and equal justice to all that the entire Fourteenth Amendment was adopted to guarantee. Citizenship is no light trifle to be jeopardized any moment Congress decides to do so under the name of one of its general or implied grants of power. In some instances, loss of citizenship can mean that a man is left without the protection of citizenship in any country in the world—as a man without a country. Citizenship in this Nation is a part of a cooperative affair. Its citizenry is the country and the country is its citizenry. The very nature of our free government makes it completely incongruous to have a rule of law under which a group of citizens temporarily in office can deprive another group of citizens of their citizenship. We hold that the Fourteenth Amendment was designed to, and does, protect every citizen of this Nation against a congressional forcible destruction of his citizenship, whatever his creed, color, or race. Our holding does no more than to give to this citizen that which is his own, a constitutional right to remain a citizen in a free country unless he voluntarily relinquishes that citizenship.

"Perez v. *Brownell* is overruled. The judgment is *Reversed."*

The Dissent: The dissenting opinion, written by Justice *Harlan,* and joined by Justices *Clark, Stewart* and *White,* criticizes the majority for overruling the 10-year-old *Perez* decision and asserts that the reasoning of the Court based on the congressional history is incomplete. The dissent points out that prior to the passage of the Fourteenth Amendment Congress passed two expatriation provisions which failed to become law because they were not signed by President Lincoln but that his failure to sign the laws was not based on his believing them to be unconstitutional. The dissent concludes:

"It seems to me apparent that the historical evidence which the Court in part recites is wholly inconclusive, as indeed the Court recognizes; the evidence, to the contrary, irresistibly suggests that the draftsmen of the Fourteenth Amendment did not intend, and could not have expected, that the Citizenship Clause would deprive Congress of authority which it had, to their knowledge, only recently twice exercised. The construction demanded by the pertinent historical evidence, and entirely consistent with the clause's terms and purposes, is instead that it declares to whom citizenship, as a consequence either of birth or of naturalization, initially attaches. The clause thus served at the time of its passage both to overturn Dred Scott and to provide a foundation for federal citizenship entirely independent of state citizenship; in this fashion it effectively guaranteed that the Amendment's protection would not subsequently be withheld from those for whom it was principally intended. But nothing in the history, purposes, or language of the clause suggests that it forbids Congress in all circumstances to withdraw the citizenship of an unwilling citizen. To the contrary, it was expected, and should now be understood, to leave Congress at liberty to expatriate a citizen if the expatriation is an appropriate exercise of a power otherwise given to Congress by the Constitution, and if the methods and terms of expatriation adopted by Congress are consistent with the Constitution's other relevant commands.

"The Citizenship Clause thus neither denies nor provides to Congress any power of expatriation; its consequences are, for present purposes, exhausted by its declaration of the classes of individuals to whom citizenship initially attaches. Once obtained, citizenship is of course protected from arbitrary withdrawal by the constraints placed around Congress' powers by the Constitution; it is not proper to create from the Citizenship Clause an additional, and entirely unwarranted, restriction upon legislative authority. The construction now placed on the Citizenship Clause rests, in the last analysis, simply on the Court's *ipse dixit,* evincing little more, it is quite apparent, than the present majority's own distaste for the expatriation power.

"I believe that *Perez* was rightly decided, and on its authority would affirm the judgment of the Court of Appeals."

PASSPORT OFFICE IMPLEMENTATION

On June 1, 1967, only three days after the United States Supreme Court had handed down its historic ruling, the Passport Office instructed all diplomatic posts to review their citizenship card files or other available records for the purpose of reactivating cases of persons who were the subjects of prior adverse determinations under the sections of law ruled unconstitutional. As soon as that is done a letter of notification will be mailed to the individuals involved which will include the following text:

"A copy of a certificate of loss of nationality of the United States was sent to you on (date). The loss of nationality was based on Section (applicable section) of the (applicable law). That decision is now invalid under the Constitution of the United States in view of the May 29, 1967 decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *Afroyim* v. *Rusk.*

"In order to determine whether you have retained your United States nationality you should complete the enclosed application and return it to this office. Pending a decision on your nationality status you should refrain from performing any of the acts of expatriation noted in the enclosed circular. Performance of such acts may affect your nationality status."

Although this first step will be taken by the State Department, claim to citizenship can also be initiated by the claimant. If he wishes to do so, he must complete an application prepared by the Department, a copy of which is appended to this *Release.* Once this application has been received by the Passport Office, arrangements will be made by that office to process the case further. If in the course of the processing it appears that other acts of expatriation have taken place *prior* to the date that the person was officially notified of his loss of nationality, a certain other form will be prepared. Expatriation acts, which took place *after* the date the person was officially notified of his loss of nationality will not be considered.

The Department issued the following additional instructions to all diplomatic posts and consulates:

"Reconsideration of a citizenship claim may also be initiated by a derivative claimant. Such person should also complete the Application given at the end of this Instruction. Upon completion of that Application arrangements should be made to have the person execute a Form FS–176. If the processing of the case indicates the performance of an act of expatriation prior to the date the person was officially notified of his loss of nationality, then the Questionnaire set forth as an **Exhibit at 8 FAM 224.12** Procedures should be completed in full detail.

"In view of the thousands of cases of persons involved in the Department's previous determinations of expatriation under the cited Sections of law, it is not practical to refer all of them to the Department for review. Therefore, posts may extend full validity documentation upon application without reference to the Department in any case where the Consular Officer is satisfied that the person did not perform any expatriating act prior to the date he was officially notified of his expatriation under one of the cited sections of law. Acquisition of a foreign nationality or other acts performed subsequent to such notification of loss of nationality are not expatriating and shall be disregarded. Also, full documentation may be issued in cases where expatriating acts were performed after voting but prior to notification of loss if the Consular Officer is satisfied that under current procedures expatriation did not result.

"The Department considers that an individual who performed an act of expatriation prior to receiving a copy of the certificate of loss of nationality by voting in a foreign political election but after being refused documentation or after being notified by a Consular Officer that he had ceased to be a United States citizen should *not* be considered as having lost his United States citizenship. Posts may extend full validity documentation to such individuals, without reference to the Department, where the consular officer is convinced that refusal of documentation or notification of loss preceded the act of expatriation. Such action must be fully supported by the officer's opinion in the Form FS–176.

"The use of a foreign passport *subsequent to the date of notification of loss* shall be considered involuntary for the purposes of Section 350 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (See 8 FAM 243.65 and 243.66, Procedures). The affidavit required by the latter section is not required in these cases.

"The statement of Form FS–176 regarding acts of expatriation should be prefaced by the words 'Prior to' followed by the date of notification of loss by voting in a foreign political election. For example, where the applicant was notified on February 15, 1958 that he had lost nationality under Section 349(a)(5) the statement should read 'Prior to February 15, 1958, I have not (and no other person . . .'

"Cases of derivative claimants over the age of 21 applying for documentation for the first time should be forwarded for the Department's decision. Any other case in which the Consular Officer requests the Department's assistance may be forwarded with the officer's opinion after full development of the case.

"Special processing procedures have been set up in the Department to handle *Afroyim* Decision cases. All cases sent to the Department for filing or for decision must be identified by the words 'Afroyim Decision' written on top of the Form in large red letters. Cases on which posts have taken action should be clearly identified by completing the box in the upper right-hand corner of the application. Cases requiring action by the Department should be forwarded under cover of an operations memorandum or by attaching the yellow label reading 'Requires Passport Office Action'.

"The legal questions concerning the applicability of the *Afroyim* decision to other subsections of Section 349(a) and other provisions of the 1952 and 1940 Acts are being considered and will be the subject of further instructions. Individuals who inquire regarding loss of nationality on these other grounds should be advised that the matter is under consideration.

"Posts should reproduce the following Application for immediate use in handling *Afroyim* decision cases. The format is designed to provide a simple and uniform method of initiating reconsideration of the loss of nationality decision. It may be mailed to interested persons and it will be helpful to those posts which must set up appointment schedules. The form may be varied to suit local needs. Any derivative claim noted on this Application should be supported by an application for passport or registration executed by the derivative claimant before submission for the Department's decision."

APPENDIX

EXHIBIT I

Application to vacate certificate of loss of nationality under Afroyim v. Rusk decision and to have present nationality status determined

Name --
Birthplace ---------------------- Date ------

I request the Department of State to vacate the certificate of loss of nationality of the United States previously issued in my name, or in the name of ------------------ (name of parent through whom claiming). I am submitting the certificate for this purpose.

If certificate is not submitted furnish the following information

I (my parent) was notified that I (he, she) had lost United States nationality by voting in a political election on ---------------- by the American Consular Office at (city) ---------------- (country) ----------------.

I am furnishing the following information about my children to find out whether or not they acquired United States nationality. (Complete this section only if children are making Concurrent Claim).

Name *Date and Place of Birth* *Residence*

For the purpose of having my present nationality status determined, I desire to apply for

[ ] U.S. Passport
[ ] Registration as U.S. citizen

(Signature) --------------------

(Address) --------------------

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. My good friend from Rhode Island is a principal sponsor of this legislation along with me, and I am delighted to yield to him.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I thank my good friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. President, in view of the continuing inequities in our Immigration Act, I am very glad to cosponsor, with the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], an omnibus bill to correct some of the remaining, glaring injustices that are worked on aliens under the present legislation.

I congratulate the Senator from Massachusetts, too, on all the work he has done on this subject, and on the very real leadership he has shown in this field of immigration and naturalization legislation.

It is a particular pleasure for me to work on and introduce this measure, since my father, when he was a Member of Congress at the time of the introduction of the original unfair first quota law, did what he could—although he was unsuccessful—to block it and mitigate its effects.

I have become particularly conscious of the need for this legislation through my own work in past years as vice president of the International Rescue Committee and as treasurer and a director of the American Immigration Conference.

Our bill addresses itself particularly toward the unfair discrimination that exists against citizens of foreign birth, those who have become Americans by choice and not by the accident of birth.

Our first suggestion is that there be established within the Department of State a board of visa appeals which will be an independent office set up to review all decisions of U.S. consular officers who have either refused an immigrant visa or revoked one already issued to an alien outside of the United States who has applied for such a visa and who is an immediate relative of an American citizen. The purpose of this board, of course, is to provide a more objective method for determining the right of alien relatives of U.S. citizens to enter the United States. In a matter of such personal importance, I believe strongly that applicants who have families in this country should have the right of recourse.

Second, we are calling for liberalization of visa policy which will include the admission of parents of an alien who is legally a permanent resident, since the present law already provides favorable consideration of spouse and unmarried sons and daughters. I cannot understand why the parents should be excluded from this category.

Third, we are asking for further latitude in admitting family members in the section of the Immigration Act which stipulates that working aliens only can be accepted when there is a need for the type of labor they can provide.

Fourth, at present those aliens who are fulfilling the continuous resident requirement are penalized by losing from their accumulated time in the United States any time they spend working abroad for American philanthropic organizations, working for an American firm, or even serving in a military capacity for the United States in Vietnam. Our bill will correct this unfair situation for aliens who are thus employed, as well as their immediate families.

At present, deportation proceedings can be instituted with any naturalized citizen, regardless of how long he has been an American.

Now, there are several decisions made recently by the Supreme Court which declare certain provisions of the Immigration Act to be unconstitutional. In order to underline the gross unfairness of these provisions already noted in the Court decisions, we are recommending that these provisions be definitely repealed. They include the provision that a naturalized citizen will lose his citizenship if he resides overseas for 3 years in the country of his birth or former nationality or if he lives for 5 years in another non-American area or if one's parents become expatriots.

Throughout the present law on these subjects it appeared that the Immigration Act sees the naturalized citizen as a second-class American. In my view, if we are going to grant full rights and privileges of citizenship to foreigners who make this choice and work for acceptance, we are guilty of false and misleading advertising. I do not need to emphasize that this country's strength and success have arisen from the talents and character of aliens from all over the world becoming Americans. It is an immoral and unreal posture to maintain that the foreigner who becomes an American today is in any way less worthy than the immigrants of earlier generations or the native-born American. There are many other inequities in this act, but I urge, Mr. President, that the corrections suggested in Mr. KENNEDY's and my omnibus bill be soon adopted by this body in order to end a continuing shame in our immigration law.

In conclusion, I offer my congratulations to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] for the leadership he has shown in his field and also for the very real work he has done in the Judiciary Committee on all these matters.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I appreciate the kind comments of the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island. The matters which are brought up in this legislation are matters in which the Senator from Rhode Island has been interested, and matters about which he, the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and many other Senators have been concerned. Most of them are questions which were brought up during the course of the consideration of the 1965 act. We were given some assurance at that time that a comprehensive and omnibus bill would be forthcoming. Unfortunately, it has not been. I know that the Senator from Rhode Island, as well as myself and other Members of this body, are distressed because it has not been forthcoming. It has been in response to that lack of action that we have introduced this legislation today.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I want to commend the senior Senator from Massachusetts for the initiative he has taken in introducing this legislation of which I am proud to be a cosponsor. I know that many months of painstaking effort went into developing this bill, and as the one who was honored in introducing the bill to carry out the earlier recommendations of President Kennedy and President Johnson, I can appreciate the time consuming and complex nature of the Senator's effort.

In my book, every effort should be made to get early consideration of the bill. I hope hearings will be held within the near future. The urgency of many provisions in the bill finds a telling story in my files as it must in the files of many of my colleagues.

A compelling priority in any reform bill is the urgent need to facilitate the reunion of families. Senator KENNEDY's bill meets the objective through the Board of Visa Appeals, the according of preference status to parents of permanent aliens, and other provisions as well—including the section which will wipe out the backlog in the fifth preference for brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens, which accumulated under the national origins system.

The bill's stress on broadening the scope of individual rights and equity, especially through a statute of limitations on deportation and the anticipated overhaul of nationality and naturalization policy, is reason enough the bill should claim broad support. It serves no useful purpose to keep a void in our deportation policy, or to continue the statutory attitude of second-class citizenship toward naturalized aliens in our midst.

Thirdly, I am especially pleased to note the provision to expedite the naturalization of noncitizens serving in our Armed Forces during the Vietnam war. Here it is just a question of bringing the law up to date.

And finally, the bill reflects a needed concern and sensitivity to the continuing problem of refugees throughout the world. As a former chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Refugees, I can assure my colleagues that the authority provided in the bill is a needed instrument in our foreign policy. Additionally, it is a true reflection of all America's concern for the homeless and the oppressed.

In conclusion, let me add my support to Senator KENNEDY's belief that the labor clearance and the allocation of visas in the preference system get the close scrutiny of the Immigration Subcommittee. On the first matter, I raised my concern on the floor of this Chamber and with the Secretary of Labor early last year.

Mr. President, hopefully the Congress will respond to the bill in a way which will further perfect a significant area of public policy.

CONTROL OF WATER POLLUTION FROM VESSELS

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966 directed the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with other concerned Federal agencies, to conduct an investigation of the extent of pollution of navigable waters of the United States from watercraft wastes, methods of controlling pollution from that source, and to report to the Congress with his recommendations for any necessary legislation.

The Secretary's report, entitled "Wastes From Watercraft," is a cogent statement of the problem and of the measures required to cope with it, and has been printed as a Senate document (S. Doc. No. 48, 90th Cong., first sess.).

The report points to a widespread problem. Watercraft frequent all the Nation's navigable waters and, at any point along their path as well as wherever they anchor, they cause pollution. The problem is as varied as the products, technologies and watercraft of our times—for example, nuclear-powered ships and submarines, large tanker and cargo vessels, with such cargoes as chlorine gas, oil, organic chemicals, and pesticides—small sailboats, yachts, naval vessels motorboats, and the floating cannery operations of commercial fishing vessels.

The problem is new in the sense that watercraft, particularly pleasurecraft, have increased sharply in numbers as a result of our affluent society and hence in their contribution to the total pollution problem. This factor is compounded by a mounting public concern about pollution of the Nation's waters by boats and ships of all kinds.

The nature of the watercraft pollution problem is such that it, like motor vehicle pollution, must be handled on a national basis. The report makes specific recommendations for the control of pollution from vessels caused by sewage, ballast and bilge water, and litter and other related substances. It urges that prohibitions against polluting discharges apply not only to navigable waters of the United States but to the waters of the Contiguous Zone, the 9-mile zone beyond the territorial sea established by the Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone.

I introduce for appropriate reference a bill, transmitted in draft by the Secretary of the Interior, to implement the recommendations of his report. I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary's transmittal letter and the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The bill would add two new sections to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, one on control of vessel pollution of navigable waters, the second on control of vessel pollution of waters of the contiguous zone.

In essence, the bill would:

First, direct the Secretary of the Interior, first, to issue regulations having reasonable compliance schedules which govern sewage discharges from any vessel or class of vessels into navigable waters; second, to issue regulations governing discharge of ballast and bilge water from commercial vessels into navigable waters; and third, to issue regulations governing the discharge of litter, sludge, garbage, or other substances—except oil or dredge spoil—from any vessel into navigable waters. He would be required to consult first with other Federal officials, the States, and affected industries, and to correlate the regulations with measures to control pollution from other sources taken under the act or other provisions of the law. The regulations also would apply to vessels owned and operated by the United States.

Second, prohibit vessel pollution or discharges in violation of the regulations after their effective date.

Third, provide for enforcement by Interior, Coast Guard, and other Federal personnel, and encourage arrangements with the States for administration and enforcement of the bill's provisions.

Fourth, provide for the voluntary certification of devices for the control of sewage discharges from vessels.

Fifth, prohibit the discharge from any vessel of sewage, ballast and bilge water, sludge, garbage, or other substances into the waters of the contiguous zone which may pollute or contribute to the pollution of waters of the territory or the territorial sea of the United States, except in case of emergency imperiling life or property, or unavoidable collision, stranding, or accident, or under regulations prescribed by the Secretary. He would be directed to prescribe such regulations for all substances—except dredge spoil—originating on board any vessel or transported thereon into the waters of the contiguous zone. The penalties, enforcement, jurisdiction, and definitions relating to vessel pollution of navigable waters of the United States would also apply to such pollution of the waters of the contiguous zone.

The bill would not affect the authority of the Secretary of the Army with respect to impediments to navigation. Nor does this bill deal in particular with the problem of oil pollution. The latter is the subject of related but separate legislation presently being considered by the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution.

As problems in water pollution control are newly defined, the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution will give attention to the changes in the law which are required to come to grips with those problems. I believe that this bill on water pollution by vessels merits our early and close consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, letter, and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2525) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to control pollution from vessels within the navigable waters of the United States, introduced by Mr. MUSKIE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2525

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (70 Stat. 498), as amended, is amended—

(a) by redesignating sections 11 and 12 as sections 13 and 14 and renumbering succeeding sections; and

(b) by inserting after section 10 two new sections to read as follows:

"CONTROL OF POLLUTION FROM VESSELS USING THE NAVIGABLE WATER OF THE UNITED STATES

"SEC. 11. (a) The Secretary, after taking into consideration technological feasibility, economic costs, the types of vessels, their operating patterns, and such other factors as he deems appropriate, shall prescribe in the Federal Register—

"(1) Regulations establishing standards for the control of sewage discharges from any vessel or class of vessels into the navigable waters of the United States for the purpose of preventing the pollution of such waters. The Secretary shall prescribe standards that apply, to the extent feasible, uniformly to each class of vessels under similar circumstances. Such regulations shall prescribe reasonable schedules for compliance, after taking into consideration the cost of compliance. The schedules for compliance shall distinguish between new and existing vessels, and shall give special consideration to vessels conforming to any State requirement or recommended levels of control set forth in the Handbook on Sanitation and Vessel Construction, Public Health Service, 1965.

"(2) Regulations governing the discharge of ballast and bilge water into the navigable waters of the United States from vessels engaged in commercial activities.

"(3) Regulations governing the discharge from any vessel of litter, sludge, garbage, or other substances of any kind or description, other than oil or dredge spoil, which originates on board a vessel or which is transported thereon into the navigable of the United States. Where the Secretary of the Army acting through the Chief of Engineers determines, after the effective date of any regulations issued under this paragraph, that the discharge of such substances from a vessel may constitute a potential obstruction to navigation, a permit to discharge such substances shall be issued solely by the Secretary of the Army or his designee in accordance with existing authorities and consistent with such regulations.

"(b) Regulations to carry out the provisions of this section shall prohibit discharges in quantities, under conditions, and at times and locations deemed appropriate by the Secretary, after taking into consideration the deleterious effects of such discharges on the public health, recreation, and fish and wildlife.

"(c) Regulations to carry out the provisions of this section:

"(1) may exempt classes of vessels from all or part of a regulation for such periods of time and under such conditions as the Secretary deems appropriate.

"(2) shall apply to vessels owned and operated by the United States unless the Secretary of Defense finds that compliance would not be in the interest of national security.

"(d) Before any regulations under this section are issued, the Secretary shall consult with the Secretary of State; the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare; the Secretary of Transportation; the Secretary of Defense; the Secretary of Commerce; other interested Federal agencies and the States and industries affected. The Secretary shall also correlate any regulations issued under this section with efforts to control or eliminate other sources of pollution under this Act and other provisions of law. After regulations are issued, the Secretary shall afford all interested persons and public and private agencies and organizations a reasonable opportunity to comment thereon before they become effective.

"(e) Any manufacturer of a device which is designed to control the discharge of sewage from vessels or classes of vessels in accordance with the standards prescribed under subsection (a) of this section may request the Secretary to issue a certificate of conformance for such device on such terms and conditions and for such period as the Secretary deems appropriate. The manufacturer shall perform such tests as the Secretary may require and make the results thereof available to the Secretary. The Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall from a safety standpoint prescribe regulations relating to the design, construction, alteration, and repair of, and the materials used in, any such device. Whenever the Secretary of the Interior determines that the device will control the discharge of sewage from vessels or classes of vessels in accordance with such standards, and the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating determines that the device is satisfactory from a safety standpoint, the Secretary of the Interior shall issue the certificate. Any device manufactured under said certificate which is in all material respects the same as the certified device shall be deemed to be in conformity with such regulations. The manufacturer of a certified device shall maintain such records and provide such information and reports as the Secretary deems appropriate and shall permit any employee of the Secretary to have access to and copy such records during business hours. All information reported to, or otherwise obtained by, the Secretary or his representative pursuant to this subsection which contains or relates to a trade secret or other matter referred to in section 1905 of title 18 of the United States Code shall be considered confidential for the purpose of that section, except that such information may be disclosed to other officers or employees concerned with carrying out this subsection. It shall be unlawful for the manufacturer of a certified device to sell a device pursuant to such certificate if the device is not in all material respects the same as the certified or to violate the terms and conditions of such certificate.

"(f) After the effective date of any regulations issued hereunder, it shall be unlawful for any vessel to pollute the navigable waters of the United States or to make any discharge from any vessel into such waters, except in accordance with such regulations.

"(g) Any person who knowingly violates the provisions of this section or any regulations issued thereunder or the conditions of any certificate issued thereunder shall, upon conviction, be punished by a fine not exceeding $2,500 or by imprisonment not exceeding one year, or both.

"(h) Any vessel violating the provisions of this section or any regulations issued thereunder shall be liable for a penalty of not more than $10,000. Clearance of a vessel liable for this penalty from a port of the United States may be withheld until the penalty is paid or until a bond or other surety satisfactory to the Secretary is posted. The penalty shall constitute a lien on the vessel which may be recovered by action in rem in the district court of the United States for any district within which the vessel may be found. This penalty shall not apply to a vessel owned and operated by the United States, or a State, or, except where such vessel is engaged in commercial activities, a foreign nation, or to any vessel subject to the provisions of subsection (i) of this section.

"(i) In the case of any vessel which is required by the Federal Boating Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 1754), as amended (46 U.S.C. 527–527h), to have a number and which violates the provisions of this section or any regulations issued thereunder, such number may be suspended by the appropriate enforcement agency administering the 1958 Act in each State for such period of time as that agency deems reasonable, and the owner or operator of such vessel shall, in addition to any other penalty incurred under this section, be liable to a penalty of $100 and such vessel shall be held liable and may be proceeded against in the district court of the United States where such vessel is found.

"(j) Anyone authorized by the Secretary to enforce the provisions of this section may (1) board and inspect any vessel within the navigable waters of the United States, except a vessel owned and operated by the United States or a State, or, except where such vessel is engaged in commercial activities, a foreign nation, to insure compliance with the provisions of this section, (2) with or without a warrant arrest any person who violates the provisions of this section or any regulation issued thereunder in his presence or view, and (3) execute any warrant or other process issued by an officer or court of competent jurisdiction.

"(k) The provisions of this section shall be enforced by employees of the Secretary of the Interior and by personnel of the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating, and the Secretary may utilize by agreement with or without reimbursement law enforcement officers or other personnel and facilities or other Federal agencies to carry out the provisions of this section, including the enforcement thereof. Law enforcement officers of any State enforcing a numbering system approved under the Federal Boating Act of 1958, as amended, shall also enforce the provisions of this section which are applicable to vessels covered by that Act. The Secretary is also encouraged to enter into agreements or other arrangements with any State in carrying out the provisions of this section, including the enforcement thereof.

"(l) As used in this section,

"(1) the term 'person' includes an individual, company, partnership, corporation, or association who is the owner, charterer, operator, master, officer, or employee of a vessel, and any individual on board such vessel, but does not include a person on board a vessel owned or operated by the United

States or a State, or, except where such vessel is engaged in commercial activities, a foreign nation.

"(2) the term 'United States' includes the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands.

"(3) the term 'discharge' includes spilling, leaking, dumping, pumping, pouring, emitting, emptying, throwing, or depositing.

"(4) the term 'sewage' includes wastes from sanitary facilities on board vessels, such as toilets, wash basins, and laundries, and other contaminated waters.

"(5) the term 'manufacturer' means any individual, corporation, partnership, or association engaged in the manufacturing or assembling of a device to control the discharge of sewage from vessels, or in the importation of such device for resale, or who acts for or is under the control of any such individual or organization in connection with the distribution of such device, but shall not include any dealer of such device.

"(m) In the case of Guam actions arising under this section shall be brought in the district court of Guam, and in the case of the Virgin Islands such actions shall be brought in the district court of the Virgin Islands. In the case of American Samoa such actions shall be brought in the district court of the United States for the district of Hawaii and such court shall have jurisdiction of such actions.

"CONTROL OF POLLUTION FROM VESSELS WITHIN A ZONE OF THE HIGH SEAS CONTIGUOUS TO THE TERRITORIAL SEA OF THE UNITED STATES

"SEC. 12. (a) After the effective date of any regulations prescribed under this section, it shall be unlawful to discharge from any vessel sewage, ballast and bilge water, sludge, garbage, or other substances of any kind or description into the waters of the Contiguous Zone established under Article 24 of the Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone which may pollute or contribute to the pollution of the waters of the territory or the territorial sea of the United States, except in case of an emergency imperiling life or property, or unavoidable collision, stranding, or accident, or except under regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

"(b) The Secretary shall prescribe regulations governing the discharge from any vessel of sewage, ballast and bilge water, sludge, garbage, or other substances of any kind or description, other than dredge spoil, which originate on board such vessel or which are transported thereon into the waters of said contiguous zone in such quantities and under such conditions and at such times and places as, in his judgment after consultation with other interested Federal agencies, will not be deleterious to health or marine life, or dangerous to persons or property within the territory or the territorial sea of the United States. Where the Secretary of the Army acting through the Chief of Engineers determines, after the effective date of any regulations issued under this paragraph, that the discharge of such substances from a vessel may constitute a potential obstruction to navigation, a permit to discharge such substances shall be issued solely by the Secretary of the Army or his designee in accordance with existing authorities and consistent with such regulations.

"(c) The penalties prescribed by section 11 of this Act for violations of that section or regulations issued thereunder shall apply to violations of this section or regulations issued thereunder. The provisions of said section 11 with respect to enforcement, jurisdiction, and definitions shall be applicable to this section.

"(d) Regulations prescribed pursuant to this section shall apply to vessels owned and operated by the United States unless the Secretary of Defense finds that compliance would not be in the interest of national security."

The letter and statement presented by Mr. MUSKIE are as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed pursuant to the provisions of section 17 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, is this Department's report on pollution from vessels using the navigable waters of the United States. This report was prepared in consultation with the Department of Defense; the Department of Transportation; the Department of Commerce; and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Also enclosed is a draft of a proposed bill "To amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to control pollution from vessels within the navigable waters of the United States."

We recommend that the proposed bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration and we recommend that it be enacted.

The report covers all sources of the watercraft pollution problem, including commercial Federal, and recreational watercraft. It points out that wastes from vessels often cause significant pollution problems. It could be quite serious if we do not act soon to cope with it. Clearly, we must not ignore these problems, particularly when the Nation is making a great effort to control wastes from land-based sources.

The report recommends a three-pronged program for the control of pollution from vessels, including commercial vessels, foreign and domestic, recreational watercraft, and public vessels of the United States. The proposed program is designed (1) to control the discharge of sanitary wastes from vessels through the establishment of standards, (2) to control the discharge of ballast and bilge water from such vessels, and (3) to prevent the discharge of litter, garbage, sludge, and other substances from such vessels. The enclosed bill will implement this program.

From the standpoint of vessels engaged in international voyages, this legislation represents a national approach that would not be inconsistent with our international legal obligations. We would recognize and encourage, however, multilateral action by interested maritime nations as another acceptable approach to the problem of controlling pollution from vessels engaged in such voyages.

The enclosed draft bill amends the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended by adding two new sections to the bill.

The first section covers the discharge of sewage, ballast and bilge water, and litter, garbage, and other substances from vessels.

The second section prohibits such discharges in the 9-mile Contiguous Zone established under Article 24 of the Convention of the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone where they pollute on contribute to the pollution of our territorial waters.

Enclosed is a detailed statement of the principal provisions of the bill.

The Bureau of the Budget advises it has no objection to the submission of the enclosed draft bill and that its enactment would be consistent with the Administration's objectives.

Sincerely yours,

STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior.

Enclosures.

STATEMENT OF PRINCIPAL PROVISIONS OF VESSEL POLLUTION PROPOSED LEGISLATION

The principal provisions and our comments thereon of the enclosed draft bill relative to the control of pollution from vessels are as follows:

1. The bill directs the Secretary to establish by regulation standards for the control of sewage emitting from vessels into the navigable waters of the United States. The bill does not establish any date for issuing these standards, because we believe that flexibility is needed to develop workable and effective standards that will prevent pollution and will not be an unreasonable burden on vessel owners. The enclosed report, however, estimates that approximately 18 months will be needed to perform this task.

The standards will be developed after an extensive investigation and research effort is carried out to examine the efficiency and effectiveness of various systems for the treatment of sewage from vessels, including a careful study of the costs of installing, operating, and maintaining such systems on various classes of vessels.

The standards will be as uniform as possible for various classes of vessels within similar circumstances.

The regulations shall set reasonable compliance schedules. These schedules will distinguish between new vessels and existing vessels. Special consideration will be given to those vessels that included sewage control system on board to meet State requirements or the voluntary levels of treatment established in the 1965 Handbook on Sanitation and Vessel Construction of the United States Public Health Service.

2. The draft bill also directs the Secretary to prescribe regulations governing the discharge of ballast and bilge water into such waters from vessels engaged in commerce. These regulations will not apply to recreational or pleasure craft. They will, however, apply to all commercial-type vessels. The regulations will limit the quantity of such discharges and the time and place of the discharges. The regulations will not prohibit all such discharges in all our waterways.

3. The bill directs the Secretary to issue regulations governing the discharge of litter, garbage, sludge, and other substances, other than oil and dredge spoil, from vessels whether such substance originates on the vessel or is transported by the vessel.

At present, section 13 of the Refuse Act (33 U.S.C. 407) which is administered by the Corps of Engineers provides that it is unlawful:

> ". . . to throw, discharge, or deposit, or cause, suffer, or procure to be thrown, discharged, or deposited either from or out of any ship, barge, or other floating craft of any kind, or from the shore, wharf, manufacturing establishment, or mill of any kind, any refuse matter of any kind or description whatever other than that flowing from streets and sewers and passing therefrom in a liquid state, into any navigable waters of the United States, or into any tributary of any navigable water from which the same shall float or be washed into such navigable water."

This statute applies both to vessels and shore-based facilities.

Similar authority is contained in other statutes administered by the Corps, such as the Act of June 29, 1888, as amended (33 U.S.C. 441-451b).

Both this Department and the Corps believe it is desirable to have one agency responsible for the administration of water pollution control activities, of which this function is a vital part. Under this approach the United States Coast Guard would have the major role in enforcing these regulations, as well as the other regulations mentioned above. Nothing in this bill, however, will affect the authority of the Corps to prevent discharges potentially harmful to navigation. The Corps, and not the Secretary of the Interior, will issue permits for this purpose. Also, the Corps will continue to administer the pollution aspects of the Refuse Act until these regulations are adopted.

Such regulations would not be issued for oil or dredge spoil. Oil is now covered by the

Oil Pollution Act, 1924. Dredge spoil is covered by sections 10 and 13 of the Act of March 3, 1899 (33 U.S.C. 403 and 407) and the recent Memorandum of Understanding between the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Army.

4. Before the Secretary issues any regulations, he must consult with the Secretaries of State; Commerce; Health, Education, and Welfare; Transportation; and Defense, as well as other interested Federal and State agencies and representatives of various interested industries. Also, he will correlate the regulations with other on-going efforts to control both water-borne and land-based pollution. After the regulations are issued, the Secretary is required to give everyone a reasonable opportunity to comment before they become final.

5. The bill authorizes the Secretary to exempt certain classes of vessels. Defense and other Federal vessels must comply with the regulations, except where national security is involved.

6. Once the standards are issued, a program for certifying the adequacy of various devices will be initiated. Under this program, manufacturers may request the Secretary to consider a particular device together with the manufacturer's test data to determine whether such a device if installed on a vessel and used and maintained properly will enable the vessel to conform with the standards. Once certified by the Secretary, the manufacturer will be able to sell all devices that conform to the certification.

In addition, the Secretary of Transportation operating through the United States Coast Guard must also certify the device from a safety standpoint. The Secretary of Transportation will issue regulations on this subject.

7. After the effective date of the regulations it will be unlawful to pollute the navigable waters of the United States from vessels and to make any discharges from vessels into such waters, except in accordance with the regulations.

8. The bill establishes a maximum penalty of $2,500 or one year imprisonment, or both, for anyone knowingly violating this section. It also provides a penalty of $10,000 against a vessel violating this section or the regulations issued thereunder. This latter penalty will not, however, apply to Federal vessels or public vessels of a State or foreign nation or vessels subject to the Federal Boating Act of 1958.

9. Any vessel subject to the 1958 Act that violates this section or the regulations issued thereunder may have its number suspended by the agency responsible for enforcing the vessel numbering system under that Act. The number would be suspended to insure compliance with this section. The owner or operator shall also be liable for a $100 penalty.

10. The bill gives the Secretary and the Coast Guard primary responsibility for enforcement, except in the case of vessels subject to the 1958 Act. In those cases, the States which are now enforcing that Act will be expected to enforce this section also. The Secretary is also authorized to use other Federal employees to enforce this section, and he is encouraged to use the services of the States to the greatest extent possible.

11. The definition of a "person" excludes persons on board a public vessel of the United States, or a State, or a foreign nation.

12. Article 24 of the Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone provides:

"1. In a zone of the high seas contiguous to its territorial sea, the coastal State may exercise the control necessary to:

"(a) Prevent infringement of its customs, fiscal, immigration or sanitary regulations within its territory or territorial sea;

"(b) Punish infringement of the above regulations committed within its territory or territorial sea.

"2. The contiguous zone may not extend beyond twelve miles from the baseline from which the breadth of the territorial sea is measured.

"3. Where the coasts of two States are opposite or adjacent to each other, neither of the two States is entitled, failing agreement between them to the contrary, to extend its contiguous zone beyond the median line every point of which is equidistant from the nearest points on the baselines from which the breadth of the territorial seas of the two States is measured."

The Department of State advises that the Convention itself established this zone when it entered into force for the United States on September 10, 1964. The bill, therefore, authorizes the Secretary to issue regulations governing the discharge of sewage and other substances, including oil, but not dredge spoil, into the water of the established zone. The purpose of these regulations is to prevent the discharge of pollutants that adversely affect the sanitary controls established to prevent pollution in our territory and our territorial waters. As in the case of the waters within the 3-mile belt, the Corps will continue to prevent potential obstructions to navigation through the issuance of permits.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENTS NOS. 394 AND 395

Mr. McCARTHY submitted two amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 12080) to amend the Social Security Act to provide an increase in benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to provide benefits for additional categories of individuals, to improve the public assistance program and programs relating to the welfare and health of children, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 396

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me, to H.R. 12080. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record, and that it be printed and appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the Record.

The amendment (No. 396) was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

On page 181, between lines 11 and 12, insert the following:

"ASSISTANCE IN THE FORM OF SERVICES IN PHYSICAL CARE FACILITIES

"Sec. 250. (a) Title XI of the Social Security Act (as amended by sections 209 and 249 of this Act) is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

" 'ASSISTANCE IN THE FORM OF SERVICES IN PHYSICAL CARE FACILITIES

" 'Sec. 1121. (a) Any State which has in effect a plan for old age assistance, approved under title I, a plan for aid to the blind, approved under title X, a plan for aid to the permanently and totally disabled, approved under title XIV, or a plan for aid to the aged, blind, or disabled, approved under title XVI, may, on or after January 1, 1968, modify such plan to include therein benefits in the form of care in physical care facilities for individuals who are entitled, under such plan, to assistance in the form of money payments.

" '(b) Any such modification shall provide that—

" '(1) benefits in the form of care in physical care facilities will be provided only to individuals who—

" '(A) are entitled under the State plan to aid or assistance in the form of money payments, and,

" '(B) because of their physical or mental condition (or both) require living accommodations and care—which, as a practical matter, can be made available to them only through institutional facilities; and

" '(C) do not have such an illness, disease, injury, or other condition as to require the high degree of care and treatment which a hospital or skilled nursing home (as that term is employed in title XIX) is designed to provide.

" '(2) payment for benefits in the form of services in physical care facilities shall be on a reasonable cost basis (as determined in accordance with standards approved by the Secretary and included in the modification to the State plan),

" '(c) Payments to any State which modifies its approved State plan (referred to in subsection (a)) to provide to the recipients of aid, or assistance thereunder, benefits in the form of services in physical care facilities shall be made in the same manner and from the same appropriation as payments made with respect to expenditures under the State plan so modified, except that, with respect to expenditures made by the State in paying the reasonable cost of benefits in the form of services in physical care facilities for any quarter, the Secretary shall pay to each State an amount equal to the Federal medical assistance percentage (as defined in section 1905(b)).

" '(d) Except when inconsistent with the purpose of this subsection or contrary to any provision of this subsection, any modification, pursuant to this section, of an approved State plan shall be subject to the same conditions, limitations, rights, and obligations as obtain with the respect to such approved State plan.

" '(e) For purposes of this section, the term "physical care facility" means an institution which is licensed as such under State law and which meets such standards of safety and sanitation as may be prescribed by regulations of the Secretary.' "

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, many nursing homes in the United States, and many of our citizens who depend upon nursing homes for their care, face a crisis. By January 1, 1970, unless a change is made in the law, all nursing home care must be under title 19 of the Social Security Act—as distinguished from "extended care" under title 18.

The only institutions qualified to provide care under title 19 are hospitals and "skilled nursing homes." A skilled nursing home within the meaning of title 19 and the very stringent regulations issued by HEW is a facility offering a level of care which is comparable in many ways with the care received by long-term hospital patients. Some examples of the regulations which have been adopted for "skilled nursing homes" will illustrate the very high standards with which nursing homes must comply. The nursing home must employ a full-time administrator, a director of nurses, other than the administrator, who is a registered professional nurse, a staff of nursing personnel, other than the director of nurses, having exclusively nursing duties and having a ratio to patients of about 1 to 4, a supervisor of food service, and a consultant for food service if the supervisor is not a professional dietitian, and a food service staff, which has no other duties than food service. These regulations relate only to required employees of a facility. Other regulations concerning its operation and physical plant are equally stringent.

Mr. President, high standards are a commendable objective, and I would not disagree that quality care should be provided medicaid recipients. However, high level nursing care is not necessary in many cases, and it is expensive. The Federal and State Governments often wind up paying $300, $400, $600, and even more each month for "skilled nursing home" care for a patient who could be adequately and properly cared for in a different type of facility for $150 or $200 a month.

It is unnecessary to point out that many elderly and disabled persons are, from a medical standpoint, relatively healthy; but physically they are unable to live alone and care for themselves. If they do not have relatives or friends to care for them, and they are without means to hire others to do so, a nursing home is an economical and adequate expedient. But they do not require highly skilled medical service, and it is a waste of money and facilities to provide it. I am advised by the American Nursing Home Association that, of all welfare patients now residing in nursing homes, approximately 50 percent fall within this category. If the law is not changed, this 50 percent must either be denied the necessary care they are receiving, or it must be provided for them in "skilled nursing homes" at two, three, and four times the present cost.

There are several thousand nursing homes in the United States which are ready, willing, and able to render needed services of a quality standard but not at the highly skilled level. It would be a major mistake to fail to utilize them, and it would be an injustice to many welfare recipients to deny them the care which they require but which they could not receive because these facilities cannot qualify as "skilled nursing homes."

Many of these quality nursing homes are in smaller communities and would be required to make a hard choice: modify their facilities to comply with the present standards under title 19 and thereby be forced to increase their rates to such an extent that their patients of moderate means could not afford them; or forgo participating in the medicaid program and thereby deny the community advantages which are enjoyed in larger urban areas, forcing patients to move many miles away to receive service—assuming they can find a qualified facility with an opening.

Mr. President, I do not believe that this should be the intention of Congress, and I am offering an amendment which would correct it. My amendment would make it possible for any State to modify its program of old-age assistance, aid to the blind, or aid to the permanently and totally disabled, to include among the benefits provided under such program the benefit of services in a physical care facility. A new matching formula, which is the same as that utilized under title XIX, would be applicable to expenditures of the States in providing care for individuals in need of physical care services—services which would not be of the highly skilled category but would nevertheless be needed.

Full medicaid type reimbursement would be available for this second level of care. It would minimize the tendency to keep patients in expensive, medically oriented institutions merely because they are not physically able to care for themselves. At the same time, proper care for the physically dependent would be available.

I am not talking about diluting the high standards envisioned for "skilled nursing homes." On the contrary, my amendment would facilitate the maintenance of these standards by avoiding the necessity of having patients served who need only physical care facilities. Senator Moss' amendment (No. 294) to H.R. 12080 provides for the formation of professional medical review teams, whose function it would be to visit nursing homes periodically to determine whether or not the patients are located in the proper facility and whether the care they are receiving is adequate or unnecessary. I would expect that, if both Senator Moss' and my amendments are adopted, these medical teams would include under their responsibilities the physical care facilities which I propose. Thus, the patients requiring skilled nursing home or hospital care would be assured of receiving it; and those who do not require skilled care would be transferred to less-expensive physical care facilities.

These physical care facilities should meet standards which are appropriate for a nonmedical facility. Accordingly, my amendment would require that they be licensed by the State as a "physical care facility" and that they meet certain standards of sanitation and safety prescribed by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. President, my amendment would alleviate a crisis which faces many of our elderly and disabled citizens. It would also result in substantial savings to the Federal and State Governments. Finally, it would contribute to the development of an integrated system of extended care service responsive to actual needs of our older citizens.

AMENDMENT NO. 397

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to title II of the Social Security Act to permit insured individuals to retire at age 60 with actuarial reductions in the amount of their benefits.

I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, under existing law beneficiaries of old-age, wife's, and husband's benefits who retire at age 62 or later, but before age 65, suffer actuarial reductions in the amount of their benefits. Under existing law, individuals who are entitled to widow's, widower's, or parent's insurance benefits may receive such benefits, without any actuarial reduction, at age 62; and individuals entitled to widow's insurance benefits may at age 60 or later, but before age 62, elect to receive such benefits on an actuarially reduced basis.

Under my amendment, individuals who elect to receive widow's, widower's, or parent's insurance benefits at age 60 or later, but before attainment of age 62, will suffer a reduction in their benefit equal to five-ninths of 1 percent for each month in the period beginning with their attained age and ending with the month in which they attain age 62. This five-ninths of 1 percent is the same reduction factor as obtains under existing law with respect to the old-age benefit of individuals who retire prior to attaining age 65.

Mine is an amendment to H.R. 12080. Section 104 of H.R. 12080 permits disabled widows and widowers to receive actuarially reduced benefits upon attainment of age 50. Nothing in my amendment alters the substantive provisions of such section 104; however, inasmuch as such section 104 amends some of the same provisions in title II of the Social Security Act as are necessary to be amended to carry out the policy of the instant draft, section 104 was taken into account, in a technical sense, in the preparation of my amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 398

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, a problem has arisen with workers who retire on company pension programs before attaining social security retirement age. Such early retirement affects, deeply and seriously, their social security eligibility because those benefits are computed to include earnings for all years right up to age of retirement on social security.

Therefore, I introduce today an amendment that would allow retirees to add an additional year for each 10 years of covered employment to the 5 years now dropped in computing retirement benefits under social security.

It is becoming more and more common for workers to retire before the age at which they would be eligible for social security benefits. An example of this would be the recent growing trend in collective bargaining agreements to permit earlier retirement for those who have completed a certain number of work years.

Under present law, the five lowest wage-earning years are dropped in figuring benefits. But if a man retires 5 years or more early, say at 58, he will likely have 2 years of no or very low earnings figured against him, reducing his benefits merely because he retired before he was eligible for social security. These years of no or very low earnings will take the place of the years that would otherwise have been subtracted from the benefit calculating process. Thus those years will drag down the average of total earnings considered in computing benefits.

The penalizing of early retirees is unfair for those who complete say 30 years with the company and must eke out an existence solely on a company pension. But the injustice is increased when those out of work are the victims of a plant closing, technological change or other events over which those now out of work have no control or exercised no choice.

This problem, Mr. President, would not be of such import if those retired from employment were able to find jobs for the 7 or 8 years before becoming eligible for social security. But the plain fact is that for a person over 50 to find a good paying job is practically impossible, particularly when they have spent 30 years or so at a trade which they find they must leave for the reasons I have discussed above.

Adding a year for every 10 years or 40 quarters of employment would enable a worker retired after 30 years employment at age 58 to deduct the low 5 years of earnings plus 3 more years. Thus the total of 8 years would see him from 58 to 65 without invoking a penalty for early retirement.

Mr. President, I believe this amendment is eminently fair. It will correct a situation that is out of step with the social and economic mainstream of American life. Let us act to erase this penalty to an already forced inactivity on the part of those who during many years of hard work added to the economic growth and pre-eminence of the country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendment (No. 398) was referred to the Committee on Finance.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON COSTS AND DELIVERY OF HEALTH SERVICES TO THE ELDERLY ON OCTOBER 19, IN NEW YORK CITY

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Health of the Special Committee on Aging, I wish to announce that the subcommittee will conduct a hearing in New York City on October 19. The subject will be: "Costs and Delivery of Health Services to Older Americans."

This hearing is the first of several to be conducted in selected cities. It will continue the work begun on June 22 and 23 at an introductory hearing in Washington, D.C. At that time, the subcommittee received impressive testimony clearly indicating that—even with the advent of medicare and medicaid—grave problems still persist in the organization and delivery of health services of special importance to the elderly.

Our field hearing on October 19 will be conducted in the William Hodson Community Center at 1320 Webster Avenue in the Bronx. The subcommittee will receive direct testimony about the health needs of older persons who live in that area, and it will also visit neighborhood medical care demonstration projects, funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

In addition, the subcommittee will hear from representatives of the city of New York, hospital administrators, and other individuals who are well aware, not only of the many inadequacies in health care today, but are also knowledgeable about promising pilot projects intended to end such inadequacies.

Mr. President, the New York City hearing will, I am sure, give the subcommittee insights into the often intense problems faced by the elderly in central urban areas where old patterns of health care are being swept aside or profoundly altered by dynamic metropolitan change. I am sure that we will have a productive and informative hearing. I hope that the elderly and the others who live near the center will feel free to come to the auditorium and observe the public proceedings.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON LABOR COURT BILL (S. 176)

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, as chairman of the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, I wish to announce a set of hearings for the consideration of S. 176. This bill provides for the establishment of a U.S. Court of Labor-Management Relations which shall have jurisdiction over labor disputes which result in work stoppages that adversely affect the public interest of the Nation to a substantial degree.

The hearings will be held on October 17 and 18, 1967, at 10 a.m. and 2 p.m. in the Judiciary hearing room, room 2226, New Senate Office Building.

Any person who wishes to testify or submit a statement for inclusion in the record should communicate as soon as possible with the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, room 6306, New Senate Office Building.

NOTICE OF BUSINESS AND COMMERCE SUBCOMMITTEE OF SENATE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COMMITTEE

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, as chairman of the Business and Commerce Subcommittee of the Committee on the Ditsrict of Columbia, I wish to announce that a hearing will be held on November 1, 1967, regarding S. 1910, a bill to strengthen the enforcement provisions of the District of Columbia Housing Code. The hearing will commence at 10 a.m. in the District of Columbia Committee hearing room, 6226 New Senate Office Building. Any person who wishes to testify or submit a statement for inclusion in the record regarding this bill should communicate as soon as possible with the District of Columbia Committee, room 6222, New Senate Office Building.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. BIBLE:

Remarks by Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall at presentation of Registered National Historic Landmark Certificate and Plaque, Georgetown Historic District, October 7, 1967.

NATIONAL CO-OP MONTH

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that this is National Co-op Month.

Farmers, along with other co-op members of this Nation, are celebrating October as Co-op Month, by a proclamation issued by the President. Farmers have particular reason to celebrate. They—through their own initiative—are increasing their own net incomes this year by some $500 million.

Through cooperative self-help they are getting higher returns for the farm products they sell, and they pay lower prices for the farm supplies they must buy.

In New York, an estimated five out of every six farmers hold membership in two or more co-ops, and I should like to mention several examples of what they are accomplishing.

Agway Inc., located in Dewitt, a suburb of Syracuse, is owned by 97,000 farmers located primarily in New York and five other States. They do an annual business of some $500 million. They employ about 8,500 people in their northeast territory. They have more than $48 million invested in their business. They rank 186th among the Nation's top industrial concerns.

Agway provides supply, purchasing and distribution services, and farm product processing and marketing services. It is a prime example of what farmers can do when they join in a cooperative venture.

The National Grape Cooperative Association at Westfield, N.Y., made up of grape growers of New York and other States, had sales last year amounting to $58 million. This represents an increase in sales volume of five times the amount in 1952, when they acquired the Welch Grape Juice Co.

These grape producers have introduced new products on the market and have put their dollars in prime television time and other merchandising promotion. They are demonstrating what producers can do by merchandising their own products.

Dairymen's League Cooperative Association, with headquarters in New York City, has 15,000 members in 6 northeastern States. It markets nearly 4 billion pounds of milk a year. This cooperative markets a full line of dairy products under its Dairylea brand. Since 1907, the league has taken a leading role in developing and often maintaining the milk marketing structure of the northeast. The association is now meeting at Syracuse, where I was scheduled to speak at lunch today, from which they graciously excused me so that I could carry on the necessary business on the Senate floor.

Eastern Milk Producers Cooperative Association, of Syracuse, keeps constant vigil over the interests of its 186 co-op locals, with some 10,000 farmer members. Eastern is interested in improving milk marketing conditions throughout the territory it serves. Its representation at Federal milk order hearings and its programs in the field of milk pricing, checking weights and tests, market information, and field services have brought many gains to dairymen of New York and Eastern's territory.

The Northeast Dairy Cooperative Federation Inc., with headquarters in Syracuse, is another co-op that is helping to improve milk marketing conditions. It is a federation of local dairy cooperatives with a total membership of some 13,000 dairymen. Northeastern represents farmers of its member cooperatives at Federal milk order hearings, and it also operates one of the most modern processing plants in the Northeast—thus assuring its membership a market for milk.

Mr. President, all of these farmer cooperatives in New York do an annual gross business of some $1 billion.

Many other types of cooperatives contribute to the general well-being of many citizens of New York. These include cooperatives for housing, credit, health plans, and consumers.

This is not in derogation of the great enterprise system and its profitmaking activities, in which I believe, and which I have sought to implement in many ways in the Senate.

EMERGENCY FOOD AND MEDICAL ASSISTANCE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call attention to a most unfortunate situation we face in connection with the bill which was passed in the Senate, authored by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Stennis], a bill intended to fight hunger wherever it might exist, and to level bureaucratic barriers which stood in the way of getting food to people who needed it.

The estimate is that there are 4 million people who may need assistance due to malnutrition, sickness, and for various reasons. One-third of our 1,000 poorest counties have no food programs.

The Senate passed this bill by voice vote less than 2 weeks after it was introduced and it went to the other body. There, the Committee on Agriculture thought it unwise to continue with it and did not act on it. They said it was tabled without prejudice, and I am sure they mean that.

An effort is going to be made to revive the legislation by Representative Quie, of Minnesota, by adding it to the antipoverty bill.

Mr. President, I believe efforts will also be made here. I have asked the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff], as chairman of the Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization, if the committee would consider transfer of the food stamp program to HEW or the Office of Economic Opportunity. I hope the committee will take action on this matter.

The preferable result would be if the other body changed its mind and proceeded with the substantive idea, which is all I plead for, very much as it did in connection with the rat-control bill which it then passed on a second effort.

I hope very much that may be the outcome of this measure which has such urgent appeal to those of us who investigated poverty in the United States and have seen the effects of poverty and who believe that this is a necessary measure.

One would think that this would not be necessary since certainly our laws should cover cases of malnutrition. However, we found that they did not. The Secretary of Agriculture felt he could not move and that he had to have legal authority. We sought to give him that authority here. I hope that we may find a way with the cooperation of the other body to do this.

ANNOUNCED POSITION ON VOTES

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, on September 26 and 27 I was absent on leave from the Senate. During this period I missed certain votes on which my official position has not been announced.

These three votes were all on amendments to S. 2388, the antipoverty amendments of 1967, and are as follows:

First, No. 266, legislative, to provide at least 40 percent of the male Job Corps enrollees be assigned to conservation centers.

Second, No. 268, legislative, to provide that $200 million of the authorized funds for OEO is fiscal 1968 be authorized instead for the Department of Labor to carry out "human investment job training."

Third, No. 269, legislative, to transfer the Headstart program from OEO to the Office of Education effective July 1, 1968.

Mr. President, had I been present and voting I would have voted "yea" on each of these amendments.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the permanent copy of the Congressional Record show these announcments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

AIR EXPLORER SQUADRON NO. 13, PHOENIX, ARIZ.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, most Members of this body, indeed most Americans, are familiar with the good works of the many young men who participate in scouting. Their efforts and achievements are legendary.

One such group which should be singled out for praise is the Air Explorer Squadron No. 13 of Phoenix, Ariz. The Air Scouts of this squadron have accomplished many worthwhile projects, but the foremost among them was the construction of the world's largest air marker, which helps guide aircraft toward the Phoenix airport. For more than 11 years the marker has been a welcome sight to pilots, many of whom credit it with helping to prevent possible tragedies.

The marker, which is located on the south side of the Usery Mountains, approximately 20 miles east of Phoenix, is readily visible from the air. The white letters spelling the word "Phoenix," together with the accompanying directional arrow, stand out against the desert landscape. The letter "I", for example, is 100 feet long and 12½ feet wide. To make the marker, it took the Air Scouts 5½ years, 300 pounds of dynamite and 550 gallons of paint. It truly was a gigantic undertaking.

But their work did not end upon completion of the job. Far from it. They have maintained the marker and soon will repaint it.

Also to be praised is their leader, Charles Merritt, who has worked continuously with Boy Scouts for more than 47 years. He, and the countless other men like him, is one of the reasons that scouting is such a success, such a rewarding activity. He has made a fine contribution to the lives of many young men. And those young men, especially members of Air Explorer Squadron No. 13, have made a fine contribution to their community, their State, and their country.

I extend them every good wish for continued success.

NOMINATION OF ERWIN GRISWOLD AS SOLICITOR GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, in nominating Dean Erwin Griswold to be Solicitor General of the United States, President Johnson has brought forward a man of great integrity and stature. As the chief Government advocate before the Supreme Court, the Solicitor General has central importance in our constitutional scheme. Dean Griswold, a scholar and public servant of distinction, will discharge with high aptitude the duties of the Office of Solicitor General.

Dean Griswold's qualifications are well set out in a number of newspaper editorials and articles, lauding his nomination. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Oct. 2, 1967]

The Solicitor General

The President's nomination of Erwin N. Griswold to be Solicitor General of the United States will be met by knowledgeable Americans with satisfaction. Coming on the eve of the new Supreme Court term, and the beginning of Justice Thurgood Marshall's service, it highlights the drama of constitutionalism as practiced in the United States. Dean Griswold leaves the Harvard law school to return to his first place in the Federal Government: soon after he graduated with the Harvard LL.B. in 1928 he went to work in the Solicitor General's office and showed his prowess at once.

Perhaps the sharpest watershed in American constitutional history was the 1937 proposal by the executive branch to reorganize the Supreme Court. American lawyers sorted themselves out in their reaction to this undertaking. Mr. Griswold resisted it in testimony which mingled constitutional learning with a nice sense of public morality and its place in politics. Years later in another time of stress he reminded Americans in a short book on the Fifth Amendment that the constitutional defenses are available even to those who flout every assumption of constitutionalism. In another few years Dean Griswold spoke of the decisions outlawing formal school prayer in a way which indicated his faith that the first requirement of justice was self-restraint among the justices.

And it is in his relationships with the Supreme Court that the Solicitor General is ultimately tested. Here Dean Griswold is on record in an uncommonly acute and moving appreciation of the court and the difficulties of the judges' role. "It is on the whole," he wrote, "fairly easy to cut through to a decision that seems pleasing and in accordance with one's predilections, and then to compose a workmanlike form of words to justify it. It is far more difficult to start without any conclusion, to analyze issues, dissect and assemble facts, explore hypotheses, consider competing arguments, and finally come to a resolution which, in terms of the law as it has been received and understood, and with as litle personal admixture as possible, seems to be sound."

Justices bear the prime burden in this ordeal, but counsel is there to help, and a Solicitor General can help a good deal.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post and Times Herald, Oct. 3, 1967]

Highest Legal Office

The Solicitor General of the United States has traditionally been one of the country's great men of the bar. This is highly appropriate because his special task is to speak for the United States in the Supreme Court. Though the office is widely considered the highest honor that can come to a lawyer within his profession, short of appointment to the bench, it is a working position demanding a high degree of judgment and discretion as well as learning in the law.

Four men who won distinction in the office were later promoted to the Supreme Court—William Howard Taft, who became President as well as Chief Justice; Stanley F. Reed, Robert H. Jackson and Thurgood Marshall. Two eminent Solicitors General later served in the United States Courts of Appeals—Simon Sobeloff and Charles Fahy. Several others who have held the office are known as eminent leaders of the bar, including John W. Davis, Frederick W. Lehmann, Charles Evans Hughes, Jr., and Archibald Cox.

The new Solicitor General-to-be, Erwin N. Griswold, fits comfortably into this tradition. Though he is best known as dean of the Harvard Law School, he is no stranger to public service. Indeed, he spent five years in the Solicitor General's office as a young lawyer and in more recent years has been an outspoken and vigorous member of the Commission on Civil Rights.

An expert in tax law, Mr. Griswold once proposed the creation of a tax appeals court to ease the burden of the appellate courts and the Supreme Court in this highly specialized area of the law. He has not hesitated to criticize the Supreme Court when he has felt that it has wandered into tangential spheres. As Solicitor General, he may be expected to speak for the country with dignity, a breadth of experience in the law and a large measure of common sense.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 1, 1967]

Dean to No. 1 Solicitor: Erwin Nathaniel Griswold

BELMONT, MASS., October 1.—In the role of professor, fund-raiser and administrator imposed on him by his position as dean of the Harvard Law School, Erwin N. Griswold is used to keeping on the move. But yesterday was something special.

Early in the morning, he and his wife left their pine-shaded home here and drove to the airport in Boston. She left him there and he caught a plane to Washington and picked up the Attorney General. They flew to Texas and ate lunch with President Johnson.

A little later, the President called in reporters. The portly, gray-haired man at his side was the dean of the Harvard Law School, Mr. Johnson said, and had agreed to become the nation's new Solicitor General.

A little after that, Dean Griswold was on a plane headed back for Boston. He and his wife arrived at about 8:30 P.M. at a dinner for 1962 graduates of the law school. He gave a speech. At about 10 o'clock, they left for home.

FINALLY—A NEW JOB

And he was up early this morning to play golf.

"Everybody's pleased," his wife said later. "After 21 years as dean, he has a new job."

But the surroundings will be familiar. Except for a brief time in private practice with his father's law firm in Cleveland, his first real job after graduation from Harvard Law School in 1928 was as a lawyer in the Solicitor General's office.

He was a Republican appointee, but he stayed on through the first Roosevelt years, leaving in 1934 to return to Harvard Law as an assistant professor.

He had become such an expert in tax law that Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes said his departure would cost the Government millions of dollars.

EXERTED DEEP INFLUENCE

It would be worth every penny of it, commented an associate in the Solicitor General's office. The young Mr. Griswold was known there more for his brilliance than his charm.

At Harvard, he became a full professor in 1935, dean in 1946.

Over the years, he came to have an immense influence in the legal community.

In the early 1950's, when Senator Joseph R. McCarthy was denouncing use of the Fifth Amendment by persons accused of Communist links, Dean Griswold spoke out forcefully in its favor.

"If we take these rights for granted," he said at Mount Holyoke College in 1954, "if we accept them as a matter of course, we may simply fritter them away and end by losing them, and possibly we deserve to lose them."

Two years ago, when public opinion was swinging against the Supreme Court for what some said were "criminal coddling" decisions, Dean Griswold made a speech entitled "The Long View," which detailed how years of neglect and injustice in state courts had forced the Supreme Court to step in and make them improve their procedures.

OUTSPOKEN ON LEGAL ISSUES

At Harvard, he told an in-Law School prepared to celebrate its 150th anniversary, he was particularly happy over development of courses in two areas: International legal studies, which includes a study of various national legal systems, and urban legal studies, which began a year ago and seeks to train lawyers to meet the increasingly important problems posed by urbanization.

Dean Griswold has been speaking out for years on legal issues, often in pungent language, frequently with wit.

Shortly after the controversy over President Roosevelt's effort to "pack" the Supreme Court, he appeared before the Senate Judiciary Committee with two suggestions for getting rid of judges. One way would be to shoot them, he said the other to keep them on the payroll but not count their votes.

In 1965, as a member of the United States Civil Rights Commission, he was at a hearing in Jackson, Miss., questioning a white county official. Several Negro witnesses had testified that they had been asked to interpret sections of the State Constitution when they tried to register to vote.

SEEKS AN INTERPRETATION

Dean Griswold asked the official to interpret a section of the constitution.

The official began reading the section. Dean Griswold interrupted. What he wanted he said was interpretation.

"On the ground," asked Dean Griswold, "that you might incriminate yourself?"

"Yes," said the official.

Erwin Nathaniel Griswold was born on July 14, 1904, in Cleveland. He was graduated from Oberlin College in 1925, from Harvard Law school in 1928.

In 1931, he married Harriet Allena Ford. They have a son, William, a transportation expert with a management consultant firm, and a daughter, Mrs. Hope Murrow, a part-time social worker. There are four grandchildren.

Mrs. Griswold, who was crippled by polio when the children were small, has managed nonetheless a career almost as active as her husband's. She brought up her family, now serves as her husband's hostess, and travels to speak to groups of the handicapped, a busy schedule that has forced her to abandon a career as a writer and reviewer of children's books.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Oct. 4, 1967]

New Solicitor General

The President achieved one of those surprises that delight him so when he announced that Erwin N. Griswold, dean of the Harvard Law School, would succeed Thurgood Marshall as solicitor general.

At first blush it seems unlikely that Dean Griswold would be interested in the post. For while other men have moved from the solicitor generalship to the Supreme Court or other high judicial office, Dean Griswold is 63 years old, and that is a factor which might well rule out a career on the bench. On the other hand, he has been dean of the law school for 21 years and is close to Harvard's mandatory retirement age. Perhaps this was a consideration which made public service attractive.

At any rate, this should prove to be an excellent appointment. Dean Griswold certainly is well qualified for the post in terms of character and scholarship. He is also a forthright man, and though on the "liberal" side in his thinking he has not hesitated to criticize the Supreme Court when he thought constructive criticism was in order.

In 1963, for example, he spoke out vigorously against the court's decision in the New York prayer case. In the first place, he said, this was not the kind of case that should have been accepted for review by the court. Once accepted, the nondenominational prayer should not have become a victim of the absolute views of the court majority. "I would like to suggest," Dean Griswold said, "that the Supreme Court has, in recent years, been engaged in certain types of cases in a species of absolutism in its reasoning which is more likely to lead us into darkness than to light. It is, I think, a thoroughly unsatisfactory form of judging."

It will be interesting, to say the least, to watch his performance in the court.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Herald Traveler, Oct. 3, 1967]

Solicitor General Griswold

President Johnson is reported highly pleased by his success in luring a leading academic figure, Erwin N. Griswold, to Washington as Solicitor General. So should the nation be pleased, not to mention our community, which has a particular claim on Griswold because he has been Dean of Harvard Law School since 1946.

Dean Griswold is more than a campus catch for Mr. Johnson. He is a man who has all the makings of a good Solicitor General. Besides being a student of the law as well as a teacher of it, he has the advantage of having had practical experience in the Solicitor General's office. He began his career there in 1929 as a staff lawyer, and soon became a specialist in tax cases. As the government's principal trial lawyer, charged with supervising preparation of cases before the Supreme Court, the Solicitor General needs both extensive knowledge of the law and practical experience in it.

Nor has Dean Griswold limited his activities to the campus or the courtroom. He is known as an outspoken champion of personal liberties and forthrightness has marked his comments on many issues. He should make an interesting as well as an effective Solicitor General, and the Senate ought not delay in confirming his appointment.

[From the Plain Dealer, Oct. 2, 1967]

Keen-Minded Griswold

President Johnson made a brilliant choice when he named Harvard law dean Erwin N. Griswold to be U.S. solictor general.

Dean Griswold was born here in East Cleveland. He got his early schooling here and at Oberlin College. That gives us an extra reason for applauding this nomination—local pride.

But the principal reason is that Dean Griswold is a keen and powerful legal mind, a Republican with a firmly built liberal philosophy which he has demonstrated as a member of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

Last year the civil rights commission analyzed Cleveland's civil rights atmosphere. Dean Griswold was one of the most powerful questioners on the panel all through a week of hearings.

The dean dug into bad housing, into unions that block Negroes from getting jobs in construction trades, into Ohio's taxing policies and a dozen other facets of the citizen rights problem.

He has written books which certify him to be an expert in taxation, trusts and the use of the Fifth Amendment. He has been awarded honorary degrees by major universities; not just Harvard and Columbia and their type but by Brandeis, Notre Dame and by Canadian and Australian ones.

Dean Griswold is a man of stature in jurisprudence. He is excellently qualified to be the top trial lawyer for the federal government.

HON. DAVID BRUCE, U.S. AMBASSADOR TO GREAT BRITAIN

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, on Friday, October 6, the Charleston News & Courier published a column entitled "Our Man in London," written by the noted columnist, Holmes Alexander. The subject of the article is the Honorable David Bruce, our Ambassador in London. I am in complete agreement with the description of Ambassador Bruce given by Mr. Alexander when he said:

> His views have the realism of a man who has written history and lived it. And above all, he is a senior Ambassador—serving in Bonn and Paris before coming here—who is too experienced to take on the coloration of his posts, as too many envoys do. Mr. Bruce is neither transplanted nor uprooted, but is a strong-hearted American on a mission for his country.

This is a characterization that all our foreign officers can, and should, aspire to. However, I think the real significance of the article lies in Ambassador Bruce's assessment of the Vietnam war as reported by Mr. Alexander. He quoted the Ambassador as getting "pretty annoyed at the carping of foreign leaders and foreign publics who have every reason to know that we are fighting their war for them."

I believe the great majority of American people share this annoyance, as well as his impatience "toward American Senators, generals, and admirals who sound off against the Vietnam war policies, and give encouragement to the Communist and pacifist belief that we will not stick this one out."

I recommend this article to every Member of the Senate and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR MAN IN LONDON

(By Holmes Alexander)

LONDON, ENGLAND.—There are times in national as in personal life, when everything goes dead wrong, and when there is no remedy save one, perhaps the most courageous of all, simply to live through it.

You could call this not a quotation by any means from the Hon. David Bruce, our Ambassador in London, but an impressionistic rendition of an interview, more valid than a verbatim report, I think. Mr. Bruce, soldier, scholar, diplomat and man of elegance, has the air of antique Roman stoicism, although there is nothing precious about him. He is Old Baltimore, Southern style, made urbane by years of international banking and public service at home and abroad, under both our political parties.

His views have the realism of a man who has written history and lived it. And above all, he is a senior Ambassador—serving in Bonn and Paris before coming here—who is too experienced to take on the coloration of his posts, as too many envoys do. Mr. Bruce is neither transplanted nor uprooted, but is a strong-hearted American on a mission for his country.

As such, he is fully aware that the USA is out of favor wtih its former Allies, and is locked in a struggle that has no foreseeable outcome. But he knows from his studies and observations that we are in the classic position of many a great nation which has had to take on military responsibility, with or without the approval of its friends and dependents.

A respect for the opinion of mankind is all very well, but Ambassador Bruce can get pretty annoyed at the carping of foreign leaders and foreign publics who have every reason to know that we are fighting their war for them.

He is equally impatient "toward American Senators, generals and admirals who sound off against the Vietnam War policies, and give encouragement to the communist and pacifist belief that we will not stick this one out." It saddens him that the effigy of President Johnson, a good one in terms of energy, attractiveness and domestic accomplishment should be "obscured" by the Vietnam policy—Johnson's by necessity and not by choice.

Somehow it doesn't come through to the ruling personalities and political parties that LBJ and the USA have practiced an admirable "restraint" under circumstances that might well have ignited a far greater conflagration than we have in Southeast Asia.

So these are depressing times. Little can be done except to endure the annoyance and frustrations until they slide off into the past. The British Liberal Party has denounced the American War, and a short while ago the Trade Union Council, a tail that often wags the dog of the Labour Party urged Prime Minister Wilson to disassociate his government from it.

The upcoming Labour Party Conference may put still heavier pressure on Wilson, who is shaken by Conservative gains and voter apathy in recent by-elections. It isn't probable that the Prime Minister will do anything drastic—he's proving to be a political dud—but Anglo-American relationships are more apt to worsen than to improve.

This is true despite the fact that British officialdom fancies itself as a go-between in the interest of peace. But from the Ambassador's listening post, the Hanoi leadership has been convinced by the antiwar fanatics around the world that America is a House divided which will collapse into surrender at the 1968 elections.

Since the bombing has not cracked North Vietnam morale, and since the Russians cannot or will not talk Ho Chi Minh into negotiations, the Ambassador sees no change in sight for at least a year or more. He is impressed with British military opinion, fortified by much experience in Asian warfare, that our search-and-destroy tactics are not going to turn the trick. An optimum alternative would be for the new Saigon government to put its army at work in guerrilla operations, and to give back as much terrorism as the South Vietnam provinces have been receiving.

Diplomacy, the Ambassador has previously said, is not a system of moral philosophy. He is not overly concerned with justifying the rightness of the American position. History will do that, if it's to be done. He understands diplomacy in its dictionary definition: "the management of international relations by . . . intelligence and tact."

Never was patience more of a virtue, and seldom have we had a more sophisticated practitioner than Mr. Bruce, who inwardly is less long-suffering than his aplomb makes him appear.

HIGHER BILINGUAL EDUCATION PIONEERING IN NEW MEXICO

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, when the first sputnik went up, it sent a shock through the entire Western World. One of the major areas singled out for self-criticism was our educational system. In addition to weaknesses in sciences and mathematics, language instruction was also brought under the closest scrutiny and fire.

It was revealed to our shame that in Europe and the Soviet Union the average student absorbed knowledge of and mastered a foreign language much faster than most American youngsters. Much fanfare and bellowing has ensued since. Not enough material progress has been made. But there are many bright spots.

One of them is at a fast-growing institution in Artesia, N. Mex., known as the College of Artesia. Its aim is nothing less than to make of itself the first completely bilingual institution of higher learning in the Nation.

This college is rising out of the ground in many ways, and is ivy-free rather than ivy-ridden. Innovation seems to be the order of the day, and its bilingual education program as expressed in the following article would seem to be worth noticing and reading. It is from El Vendaval, the college's regular publication. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BILINGUAL PROGRAM BEGINS

Working on the theory that if a student speaks English he can learn to speak another language, The College of Artesia begins with the fall trimester the initial phase of a program designed to make this a bilingual institution of higher learning—the first of its kind in the United States.

Using an auto-instruction program together with special electronic devices and teaching aids, Dr. F. Rand Morton will implement the college-wide program, utilizing for the first time a special application of closed circuit television in a mechanization approach to language learning which he has developed. Dr. Morton, Chairman of the Division of Language Arts, is also Dean of the Core Curriculum.

Dubbed "Project Sphere," the program's goal is that each graduate of the College will have useful fluency of a second language during a significant portion of their undergraduate study.

Because of the college's location in the Southwest, Spanish will be the second "campus-wide language," with other languages, such as French, German, Russian and Chinese to be offered as the program expands. Long-range plans include students living at least one full term in a Spanish speaking country.

In addition to regular course work in

Spanish, all students in the last two years of their schooling will use Spanish in extracurricular activities with a frequency equal to that of English, according to plans announced by Dr. Morton.

"In a word," he explains, "Spanish will not be a foreign language. But rather a college-wide second language." It is also anticipated that staff and faculty will become involved in the program, as well as numerous visiting professors from Spain and Latin America.

Dr. Morton explains that the planned program will make it possible for students to specialize in any one of three basic language areas.

These are the study of the literature and culture of one or more languages, the study of the structure and functioning of the language together with a near-native mastery of its spoken form; or, the scientific study of methods by which languages are taught and learned and the type of linguistic research that is necessary to show how this may best be achieved.

"We hope to establish The College of Artesia as one of the best language training centers in the United States by regularly offering the kind of intensive language training not normally found in the United States," the Dean added.

The program as initiated this fall will emphasize the spoken language and its cultural background. Each student will work at his own pace. Some will reach proficiency in a relatively short time; others will require more. Neither slow or fast moving students will be penalized in either credit or grades. If the student is willing to work, Dr. Morton assures, there is no doubt that he can learn and will master the language.

Individual carrels (or learning booths), equipped with audio-video facilities, are being installed currently to be ready for use by the fall trimester. These will be available to students during extended hours so that they may use the facilities according to their own schedules for the necessary laboratory practice.

PULASKI DAY

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, 188 years ago, Count Casimir Pulaski, a native of Poland, died as a result of wounds received during the American Revolution. On the anniversary of his death, I wish to commemorate his memory and his dedication to the cause of liberty and American independence.

October 11 is celebrated throughout the United States as Pulaski Day, in tribute to Pulaski's remarkable achievements. This is also a fitting occasion to salute the generous and continuing contribution which Americans of Polish descent are making to our national life.

A true patriot and ardent nationalist, Pulaski as a young man fought the First Partition of 1772, whereby Poland was dismembered by Russia. He continued to resist until forced to flee to Turkey. Eventually he came to Paris and met Benjamin Franklin, who influenced him to join the American Revolutionary Army in 1777.

Pulaski's valiant military service during the American Revolution is unquestioned. He sacrificed his life for liberty and independence in America, his adopted land.

Americans of Polish heritage are justly proud of Pulaski's courage and devotion to freedom. He set an example which endures and carries meaning for the modern world. I join with millions of fellow citizens who are today honoring the memory of Pulaski and his unique contribution to the cause of freedom and human dignity.

THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF EVERETT, MASS.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President I wish to give public recognition today to the city of Everett, Mass., on the occasion of its 75th anniversary.

Everett is a thriving community north of Boston. It was first settled in the year 1630 and became a town in 1870. Everett was incorporated in 1892; thus this year marks its 75th year as a city.

It has changed from a farming community in its early days to a residential and industrial one today. It now provides a home for a number of important firms and contributes greatly to the economy of Massachusetts.

During this week the citizens of Everett are observing this very significant landmark in their city's history. The ceremonies include displays by the industries which are located in Everett, programs for the city's young people, observances by local churches, and a parade on Sunday.

It is my privilege to pay tribute to the ciizens of Everett during this important week. I am sure we all can join in wishing Everett a future which is just as successful as its past.

NOMINATION OF CALVIN K. HAMILTON TO BE U.S. ATTORNEY FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, our country has a constant need for outstanding and dedicated men to fill important positions. The President has nominated such a man for the position of U.S. attorney for the western district of Missouri. He is Mr. Calvin K. Hamilton of Platte City, Mo.

Mr. Hamilton brings to this office extremely worthy credentials. He possesses a fine academic background. In 1949, he was graduated second in his class from Drury College in Springfield, Mo., and first in his class from the University of Kansas City School of Law in 1956. For more than 6 years, Mr. Hamilton has served as first assistant to the district attorney in western Missouri. During that period he distinguished himself by handling a wide variety of difficult cases in an exemplary manner, earning the high respect of both lawyers and judges, not only in Missouri, but across the Nation.

Now recognized as one of the top first assistant district attorneys in the Nation, his nomination has been received with great enthusiasm. Missourians take great pride in Cal Hamilton. Based on his ability and dedicated service, I know he will be an outstanding district attorney.

Mr. President, I am pleased that the Committee on the Judiciary approved the nomination this morning. I urge the Senate to take early action in confirming the nomination of Calvin K. Hamilton as U.S. attorney for the western district of Missouri.

TO SAVE AMERICA'S SMALL LAKES

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, pollution is a mounting threat to America's 100,000 inland lakes.

The problem of preserving the value and natural beauty of lake waters is not only complex and costly, but technical know-how is still lacking to develop and implement restorative plans. Regrettably, there is abundant evidence that current efforts to combat pollution are not keeping pace with the deterioration of water quality.

Impounded waters have relatively little movement, and thus they are susceptible to accumulations of mineral nutrients which fertilize algae and organisms.

In many cases, the final result is swampland and ruination of the lake. Needless to say, the economic consequences can be severe. Property values decline, resort areas become ghost towns, fishery and navigation are extinguished.

Unlike fast-flowing rivers, closed bodies of water lack the regenerative capacity to fight off the natural aging process. At the same time, this aging process, known as eutrophication, is compounded by the manmade inflow of industrial and municipal waste.

Stagnant waters undergo nutrient formation which contributes to the growth of vegetation and the loss of oxygen. These factors, among others, determine the lifespan of a lake.

The impact of industrialization, recreational use, and lakefront construction has accelerated the anticipated life cycle of lakes both large and small. The major destructive components of manmade pollution are well known: municipal and industrial discharge, sewage waste material, agricultural runoff, and siltation due to soil erosion.

In my own State of Michigan, the preservation of our 11,000 small lakes, their economic and aesthetic value, is of paramount importance. Yet, unless an effective and practical program is undertaken to reverse the ominous pollution trend, a great many of the Nation's lakes are literally threatened with extinction.

On August 23, 1967, the House Committee on Government Operations issued a report entitled "To Save America's Small Lakes." The report drew this conclusion about the alarming plight of our lake waters:

> The small lakes of America are threatened by a shortening lifespan. Their accelerated march toward extinction is caused primarily by man's activities.
>
> Some small lakes are already in the throes of death. They are virtually open cesspools, carpeted with green scum and formations of slime. Their waters are grossly turbid and unpleasant in taste and odor. These lakes, once blessed with the highest forms of aquatic life, have been thoughtlessly pillaged by man.

During the past few years, the Federal Government has launched several significant projects in this field which, if effectively implemented, hold promise of help in alleviating this critical situation.

The Federal Water Pollution Control Administration has annually increased the amount of funds allocated toward researching the problem of eutrophication. For instance, in 1966 only $150,000 was earmarked for development programs directly associated with lake aging and pollution; the estimate for fiscal year 1968 is $3 million. In addition, some aspects of the overall Federal water quality program relate to lake eutrophication.

As part of the Government's lake purity effort, technical assistance was provided to study nutrient sources at Sebasticook Lake in Newport, Maine. A 1966 report resulting from the study included recommendations regarding industrial waste disposal, phosphate removal, dredging and other factors.

Current research projects on accelerated eutrophication are underway at lakes in Minnesota and Oregon. The programs are focusing on possible methods to prevent harmful nutrients from reaching lake waters. But, as Commissioner James M. Quigley of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration concedes, very little has been done to develop techniques for reclaiming the thousands of badly despoiled lakes which are rapidly becoming murky marshland.

The report of the House Committee on Government Operations emphasizes that sufficient knowledge of the eutrophication process is lacking, and that more efficient and less costly technology is required in order to stem the alarming trend.

Nonetheless, there are some encouraging signs to this generally bleak outlook. Earlier this year, in August, the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution of the Senate Committee on Public Works held hearings on S. 1341, a bill aimed at broadening the Federal role in lake pollution abatement. The legislation would authorize $5 million to develop, through local and regional programs, improved methods for the prevention and removal of pollutants from small lakes.

I understand that the subcommittee has taken favorable action on a general pollution bill incorporating major features of S. 1341. This will pave the way toward concentrating more of the Federal water quality program on our inland waters. Specific legislation to assist in the control of small lake pollution is essential, and I hope Congress will enact such a measure during this session.

OUTER SPACE TREATY—STATEMENT BY SECRETARY OF STATE RUSK

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, almost 10 years ago, mankind was thrust into the space age. The question was raised at that time whether man would conduct his activities under law or whether anarchy would govern in outer space.

Through the beliefs of interested states and as a result of the interest of the United Nations, the Outer Space Treaty was drafted to insure that the rule of law will govern the activities of man and states in outer space. The culmination of this effort was the entry into force of the Outer Space Treaty on October 10, 1967, in the White House. At this historic occasion, the Secretary of State discussed the contents of the treaty and its significance for all countries. His remarks merit our careful attention. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by the Secretary of State at the Space Treaty Entry Into Force Ceremony, October 10, 1967

Mr. President, Excellencies, Distinguished Senators and Congressmen, Ladies and Gentlemen, we know, Mr. President, how much personal satisfaction you must derive from what we do here today. As Senator nine years ago you carried the message of the peaceful use of outer space to the United Nations on behalf of President Eisenhower; as Vice President and Chairman of the National Aeronautics and Space Council you pressed vigorously for peaceful cooperation in outer space; as President you directed and followed intently the negotiation of this Space Treaty in which Ambassador Goldberg so ably represented us.

We are happy to have joining with us in signing the Protocol of Deposit of this space treaty the Ambassadors of Australia, Bulgaria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, Hungary, Japan, Niger, Sierra Leone, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

We are confident that the overwhelming majority of the members of the international community will ratify the Space Treaty, which has now been signed by eighty-four countries.

The Treaty calls for cooperation in the conduct of scientific studies; consultation concerning experiments that may have potentially harmful effects; assisting and returning astronauts and space vehicles; opening installations on the moon and other celestial bodies to visits by astronauts of all countries; reporting to the United Nations on the nature, conduct, locations and results of space activities.

The Treaty also takes steps to limit and reduce the competition in armaments, a terrible burden on peoples everywhere. It prohibits orbiting nuclear or other weapons of mass destruction around the Earth, and forbids installing such weapons on the moon or any other celestial body. It raises a permanent bar against establishing on any celestial body military bases, installations or fortifications, testing any type of weapons, or holding military maneuvers.

Our meeting here today signals an important and constructive development at a time when many world problems still await resolution. It is evidence that men and nations can, in fact, achieve the maturity necessary to embody in binding form their points of agreement, despite political differences in other areas. It is evidence of the vitality of the United Nations system. The Space Treaty is testimony to the fact that nations can anticipate, negotiate, and agree upon a system of law to regulate their activities in the new environment of space beyond the Earth. We note this year the 10th anniversary.

Mr. President, the Space Treaty is ready to be proclaimed as in force between the United States and those who have deposited ratifications. I now present the Proclamation to you for your signature.

PAINTING FOR PLEASURE

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, last week I had the pleasure of helping to unveil a fine selection of paintings which are the work of Michigan residents. The 12 paintings now hang in the reception room of my Senate office, and will remain there for another 4 weeks.

This impressive display was created by housewives, career women, and grandmothers who take brush in hand during their spare time to paint as a hobby. Our exhibit is called "Painting for Pleasure."

The paintings featured in my office are the work of students of the Famous Artists Schools in Connecticut. Fletcher Martin, the well-known artist and founder of the school, was on hand when our display was opened to the public.

Art in its many forms serves to enrich our lives and to make our society more meaningful. Painting is an important segment of that expression, and I am delighted to assist in recognizing the large number of citizens who contribute to the Nation's culture while they paint for pleasure.

Mr. President, it is a privilege to be able to display the paintings of 12 outstanding Michigan artists whose creations were judged by Fletcher Martin and the faculty of the Famous Artists Schools to be worthy of inclusion in the exhibit.

I am pleased to extend an invitation to my colleagues in the Congress and to the members of their staffs to view this art exhibit in the weeks ahead.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names and certain information about the talented Michigan artists to whom I have referred be set forth at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the names were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Mrs. Winifred Blacklock, L.B. 36, Macatawa—"Autumn at Saugatuck on the Kalamazoo River."

Mrs. Margaret Bradfield, 485 Barton Drive North, Ann Arbor—"Old Court House, Ann Arbor."

Mrs. Katharyn A. Coolman, 309 South Washington Avenue, Ludington—"Woodland Trail."

Mrs. Constance O. Dunklee, Route 1, Box 124, Kewadin—"Portrait of Nancy."

Mrs. Almeda Everett, Box 152, Munising—"Winter Shadows."

Miss Marjorie Goodyear, 1595 Albany, Ferndale—"Happy Hours."

Mrs. Bertha I. Johnson, Route 1, Box 305, Iron River—"Pentoga Trail."

Mrs. Dorothy Keopke, 701 Kenton Drive, Saginaw—"Tulips."

Miss Daisy Lanshaw, 203 Elwell, Alma—"Fall."

Mrs. Leota Laws, 20800 Lange, St. Clair Shores—"Contentment."

Mrs. Fannie Metz, 11170 Lansing Avenue, Rives Junction—"High Level Fishing Conference."

Mrs. Barbara Todd, Walsh Road, Montague—"June."

THE ARIZONA REPUBLIC INTERVIEWS BARRY GOLDWATER

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, on September 17, 1967, Arizona magazine, the Sunday supplement of the Arizona Republic, carried a lengthy and informative interview with the former U.S. Senator from Arizona, Barry Goldwater. Subjects covered in the question-and-answer period ranged from why he became the 1964 Republican presidential candidate, to Vietnam, to his future political plans. The article makes very interesting reading.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article

was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REFLECTIONS AND PROJECTIONS OF A FORMER PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE

(NOTE.—Three years ago the only Arizonan ever to campaign for this country's highest office was making headlines in the world press. Although he was decisively defeated, even his opponents now admit many of the things he discussed and advocated have since occurred and been put into operation. Reflecting on that eventful fall three years ago, Barry Goldwater discusses the subjects on which he was proven right, as well as the mistakes of his candidacy and campaign. In this interview he projects into the future on important political, national and international affairs.)

Question: Do you feel that President Johnson is in any way following the "Goldwater position" in Vietnam?

Goldwater: I wouldn't call it the Goldwater position, but it is the position I advocated in my campaign, and he is following it almost to the letter.

Question: *Almost* to the letter? What would you do in Vietnam that the President isn't doing?

Goldwater: The only thing he's not doing, which we advocated then and still advocate, is destroying the piles of supplies lining the port of Haiphong.

I don't think we should necessarily destroy the port; mind you, that was done several times in World War II. And I don't believe a blockade is necessary right now. But when I was over there in January. I was shown reconnaissance photos of the supplies and was told at that time that by summer these supplies would prove to be a very decisive factor against us, as now they are.

These are the rockets that are being used against Da Nang and other bases. They have been stored dockside at the port of Haiphong. I would destroy those supplies, just by strategic and tactical attacks.

Question: The administration has given high priority to combatting crime in the streets. You also gave high priority to this in your campaign. Do you consider the administration's policy in this matter a vindication of your campaign speeches of 1964?

Goldwater: Well again, I don't have a feeling of vindication. I still think I was right in trying to make crime in the streets an issue. This was done on the advice of friends who, like me, were very concerned that crime was approaching the point of anarchy in this country. Now I think it has reached that point, and had the President been willing to discuss it in 1964, just as had he been willing to discuss the war, I think the American people would have been better informed as to what might be coming, and would be thinking about possible remedies.

Question: Some of your critics have said that the issue of crime in the streets was merely a short-hand appeal to racist impulses. How do you feel about this?

Goldwater: I disagree completely. In fact, you might recall that I went to visit the President even before I started campaigning. I told the President I was going to try to make crime in the streets an issue and I wanted to assure him that at no time would I mention, or in any way connect, civil rights with crime in the streets.

I can't see where civil rights has had anything to do with the riots we've had in this country. It's actually been Negro against Negro. The people who've suffered as a result of these riots are the Negroes. I'm not solely concerned now, nor was I then, about crime in the ghettos or slums. I'm talking about the general increase in crime.

Question: Do you feel the federal government dealt effectively with riots and rioters, as in Detroit, Newark, etc.?

Goldwater: Well, of course the federal government is limited somewhat by the Constitution. The governor or the state legislature has to ask for troops unless there's a violation of a federal court order, then the President can send the troops in.

Now disregard the squabble Romney and Johnson had about who did what and when; the President did send troops into Detroit. He was using a weapon he had.

Question: How specifically would you, as President, have combatted crime in the streets? How would you inculcate respect for the law?

Goldwater: I feel that the President, being the mayor de facto of Washington, D.C., could make a model city of the District. I said in my campaign that he should improve police conditions there and insist on respect for law and order.

I think this example of respect for the police would have impressed the American people. Then I would have met with all elements of our society to seek solutions.

I have been critical of the President for not going to Detroit, not going to Newark. He didn't have to get down where they could shoot at him, but go into those cities and say 'Let's talk about this, see what the trouble really is.' Because I don't think we really know what the trouble is. The trouble that starts rioting is just lawlessness,—the Stokely Carmichaels and Rap Browns.

What I said in my campaign is true today: we have to enforce the law.

Question: Do you think that any of the recent Supreme Court decisions involving crime and criminals—for example, the Mallory case, the Gault case, Escobedo—do you think they have either brought about disrespect for law and order or have handicapped policemen?

Goldwater: I think very definitely that these decisions have handicapped policemen.

Now whether they had anything to do with the recent riots, I doubt it. But certainly criminals, who are active in riots, have been encouraged by these decisions.

We see Rap Brown inciting a riot one night, threatening to shoot Lady Bird, all other kinds of things. Then he's arrested and he can't be held. He's turned loose and arrested under another charge. There's a great deal of question about what can be done. Are there adequate laws?

Question: Do you think that your criticism, during your campaign, of the inequitable military draft led the administration to reassess its own position on the draft?

Goldwater: Right after I made that speech in Prescott calling for abolition of the draft, the President said he was appointing a committee to study the draft. That committee finally reporterd, but the report didn't recommend much more than what we already had, so we still have largely the same old draft law.

I don't think the President has any great concern about the draft. He didn't have then, he doesn't seem to have now. I'm glad to see that my suggestion has created a real interest among non-political groups in this country.

Question: Do you still favor abolition of the draft, or merely overhaul and reform?

Goldwater: You can't overhaul the draft very much. I think the draft could be abolished and replaced by a professional military system. At least we should try.

Question: This has been proposed by one of your advisers, Milton Friedman (University of Chicago economist), hasn't it?

Goldwater: Yes, Milton Friedman, and believe it or not, even the Ripon Society (a group of Eastern liberal Republicans), which has no use for me.

Question: We're talked about Goldwater proposals that President Johnson has seemed to come to favor to some degree: The "Goldwater position" in Vietnam, in restudying the draft, in his concern with crime in the streets. They could possibly be considered triumphs in defeat for you.

But what were some of your biggest mistakes in 1964, mistakes that, looking back, seem to have been in error and that you would avoid were you to have it to do over?

Goldwater: Well of course my biggest mistake was running for the presidency. We knew it at the time. Defeating Johnson with a Republican in '64 just wasn't in the cards. However, I did think we would show a better result than we did, even though the day I was nominated, in my room I was shown a poll the national committee took and it showed that after we nailed down all the votes, I would get 20 per cent, Johnson would get 80.

It was a mighty, dull, dismal day, I'll tell you, having to make an acceptance speech after looking at that. But the fact that we picked up 20 points and Johnson lost 20, indicates to me that the campaign was a little better than most people thought it was.

Now what would I do different? I would not have gone into primaries. I was opposed to this and I didn't yield on it until the last week before the New Hampshire campaign when they talked me into going in there. That was my first mistake.

Then there was my naivete of how the national press operates in a presidential campaign. I made many mistakes with the press, both in trusting some reporters, not trusting others, and in having too many press conferences.

But the biggest mistake was made by Republicans, (New York Gov. Nelson) Rockefeller and (then-Pennsylvania Gov. William) Scranton. I think the action of those two men, but especially Rockefeller, was the reason for my not winning 6 to 8 million more votes than I did, Republican votes.

They so cut me up that all Johnson did—and his tacticians told me this; they're good friends—was take Rockefeller's and Scranton's television tapes, remake them a little bit, put Johnson and Humphrey in, and used the original material.

Question: Did you or the party make any other tactical mistakes?

Goldwater: Yes, we both did. I made a major tactical mistake in not recognizing that I had the convention sewed up. Up until ten days before the convention I really didn't believe that the people who said they'd go with me would stay with me.

As a result, the day after the nomination I had, in effect, no staff. This is both my mistake and a tactical mistake of the national party that I'm hoping to correct. The national committee should be building a staff so that no matter who is nominated, the staff is there except for whoever the nominee wants to add.

I had the time between July 15 and September 1, about six weeks, to put together speech writers, television experts, radio experts, lay out a campaign itinerary, acquire all the vast equipment needed. And when you consider that we spent $13 million in that campaign, you can see that we didn't approach it as a business proposition.

Question: Did you raise any issues in your 1964 campaign that you would avoid if you had it to do over?

Goldwater: No, I don't think so. I can think of some I wish had not come up the way they did—the nuclear issue, for instance. But I still think the American people would be better off today had Johnson and I engaged in one or two discussions about the whole question of nuclear weapons.

The American people are still very fuzzy about nuclear weapons—what we have, what we don't have, what the possibilities are, what our allies are developing in this field, what our enemy has that can be used against our men.

I think it would have been a very healthy debate. It might not have helped me any, but I have never cared particularly about that aspect of campaigning. If we can get a message across to the people and they understand it, I think that's of value.

Question: Are there any issues you didn't use that you would use if you were running again?

Goldwater: Well first of all, I don't think there was anything I could have done that could have beaten Johnson. I'd have to say I don't think there was an issue that we could have discussed that would have won for me. However, I think a proper discussion of the nuclear issue, or a reasoned discussion of my position on Social Security, which has always been in support of Social Security, would have brought me more votes.

Question: Some critics have said you deliberately raised the wrong issue in the wrong place at the wrong time. For example, going into New Hampshire to discuss Social Security, into Tennessee to discuss TVA. You have replied that there is no need to avoid telling the truth. Would you still act accordingly?

Goldwater: First of all, whoever makes those statements——

Question: One person who made them is Teddy White (T. H. White, author of "The Making of the President" series).

Goldwater: Teddy White was wrong, as I told him.

Someone said I went into St. Petersburg and discussed Social Security. I didn't. In St. Petersburg my speech was crime in the streets. They said I went into Tennessee and talked about TVA. I didn't. I forget what subject I used in Tennessee, but I did answer a Congressman's letter, written long before the campaign, asking whether I would sell TVA. And I said yes I would, and I still would. If I lived in Tennessee I would want that belonging to the state of Tennessee, or to a private outfit which could pay taxes.

I didn't go into those states to discuss those things, so would I do it again? I didn't do it in the first place. I did go into West Virginia and discuss the war on poverty—that I did do, and I would do it again.

And I went to Ft. Worth, Texas, and there was a full page ad challenging me to repeat my remarks about the TFX (controversial supersonic airplane) which was being made two blocks down and I told them I thought it was a bad deal, it was wrong, it smacked of crookedness.

The congressional reports since then admit that it's a bad deal, so why be dishonest? I may be very naive, and maybe I should keep my mouth shut, but I wouldn't evade that or any issue.

Question: Some people have said that Bill Miller was less well known than many other candidates you could have picked as your running mate. If you had it to do over, would you—knowing how far you trailed Johnson in the polls—have picked someone with a wider reputation?

Goldwater: Picking the vice presidential candidate is not just the responsibility of the presidential nominee. I went to the best source of advice I had, members of the Congress, and they were unanimous in saying that I should pick Bill Miller.

However, before Bill Scranton wrote that Godawful letter—he didn't write it, but before that letter came to me over his signature—I had wanted Scranton to be my running mate because I knew Bill. I had great admiration for him. We served together in the Air Force and in spite of his letter and other antics, I still like him. But if I had asked him to be my running mate, I doubt that he would have accepted. And had he accepted, I think it would have caused all sorts of problems in addition to those we already had.

And then, who was Adlai Stevenson's running mate? John Sparkman, remember?

I heard Hubert Humphrey pull one of the funniest gags he's ever pulled, this year at the Gridiron Dinner. He stood up and read off a list of names that nobody had ever heard of. And then he got down to the last two, Johnson and Humphrey, and everybody knew these were the vice presidents.

Question: How about Dean Burch. Would you still have made him national chairman?

Goldwater: Yes, I still would have, although I had leaned toward Ray Bliss initially. But Ray Bliss had not come into my camp early. And when he came in, I had the feeling that he did because of his professional feeling that it was his job to come in.

I was the first one who pushed for Ray Bliss for national chairman, right after the Nixon campaign. In fact, I was the one who made the overture to him to come into the job, but he wouldn't do it at the time.

Now as to Dean Burch, he did something no other national chairman has ever done: He left the national committee in the black. This has never happened.

Question: Was there ever a time when you honestly believed you did not want to become President of the U.S.?

Goldwater: Yes, right after Jack Kennedy was assassinated. I told Peggy, 'Well, that's it.' I had looked forward to campaigning against Jack because I knew he would discuss the issues and I told her that I didn't think Johnson would ever show his face in public debate, and that my chances of becoming President, while they weren't exceptionally good against Kennedy, were probably less against Johnson. Because I knew that the American people would not be in the mood to have three Presidents in two years.

Up until about the middle of December 1963, I was still very undecided and then it was put to me that if I didn't run I'd be letting down a large segment of the Republican party who had long clamored for a conservative candidate; I'd be letting down the young people. So again I asked my advisers. Their advice was that I couldn't avoid running. So then I just said, all right, I'll run. And then naturally I wanted to be President. Because I don't ever go into things unless I try to win and want to win.

Question: Any guess as to how you think you would have done against JFK?

Goldwater: That's pure speculation, of course. But I think I would have gotten between 45 and 55 per cent, probably closer to 50. I would have had a lot of the votes that Nixon lost, and I would have had the anti-Kennedy votes which were growing at that time.

Question: You said you feared collectivization of the U.S. if LBJ were elected. Do you still fear that?

Goldwater: Yes, I do. I have a feeling that he fears it, too. I have a feeling that he didn't realize the amount of power that resides in that office today, and that unless it's treated with a great deal of care and caution it can do irreparable damage to our democratic processes.

I think that more and more people are beginning to fear this. We're hearing more about a new federal relationship. In fact I'm working on a thought which I've discussed with a great many Republicans around the country and it's creating much interest. I haven't made anything public on it yet. It's merely a way to get the states to do more in the areas where the federal government is functioning, so that some day we can return to the states the functions of the welfare state, functions of preserving our forest lands, our national parks and monuments.

When the states demonstrate that they can maintain these things as well as the federal government, then the federal government can return to the states the money it takes to run those operations.

Businessmen who sort of laughed at me in 1964 are now becoming aware of the power of the federal government. Ordinary citizens faced with a multiplicity of forms to fill out are realizing that what I said was true. And people who were great advocates of elementary aid to education are all beginning to realize what I was warning against—not just Goldwater warning against; the Republican party has been warning against this since the day of Roosevelt, and I hope that it will continue to do so.

Question: Have you had an opportunity to read the essay by Richard Goodwin (former JFK adviser and speech writer) which appeared in Commentary magazine, and which reads in part as though it could have been written by Barry Goldwater?

Goldwater: Yes, Richard Goodwin and I have had some correspondence, although I don't know him well, and I don't know him personally at all. We're beginning to see in this country the emergence of some true liberals. For example, Max Lerner is a man I've been on a platform with and traveled with, and he is to me a true liberal in that he and I share many common beliefs.

Goodwin and I find ourselves in agreement on points where Goodwin would be out of tune with a liberal like (Sen. Wayne) Morse or (Vice President Hubert) Humphrey, or any of the liberals who I have so long said were not liberals but radicals.

I think there's a place in American politics for liberals, just as there's a place for conservatives. But there's no place for a phony liberal, or a phony conservative.

Question: In your campaign speeches you often denounced Defense Secretary Robert McNamara. Was this just campaign oratory or is he as bad a defense secretary as you charged?

Goldwater: I think it's becoming increasingly obvious that McNamara has not done a good job, is not doing a good job, and can't do a good job. He doesn't have the knowledge. His basic exposure to big business was limited. No one's ever been able to find what he really did at Ford. He denies responsibility for the Edsel. He never had any military background except as an administrator. Then he gets into the Pentagon and he refuses to take advice about strategy from military men.

I recognize and respect the place of the civilian, who should always be supreme to the military man on public issues. And military men themselves feel that way. But when McNamara refuses to take advice, he opens himself to some dreadful mistakes.

Question: If you had been an average voter, not committed to liberalism or conservatism, would you have voted for the Goldwater whose image was projected during the 1964 campaign?

Goldwater: If I was someone who had never heard Goldwater, or seen him, or depended entirely on what the press, the magazines, and the newscasters said, No, I wouldn't have voted for Goldwater.

Question: Who among the magazines, columnists do you consider the worst distorters of your remarks?

Goldwater: The New York Times, the Washington Post, the San Francisco Chronicle, St. Louis Post-Dispatch, just to mention the major newspapers. Look magazine. The newscasters, I would say, were almost universally opposed to my candidacy, and made it very obvious.

Question: Are you saying that the most important members of the liberal press completely lost their objectivity where Goldwater was concerned?

Goldwater: They went insane. And I think if they read back now what they wrote then, what the cartoonists drew, they must realize that they were completely off base.

And while it won't do me any good, perhaps their having done this distorting will improve the American press, because I've felt for a long time that too many of our top newspapers and newsmen had lost their objectivity. Maybe this will jolt them back. At least it may lay the groundwork for the next Republican candidate. It may have taught them what to expect from certain members of the press. The continued misquoting that I endured forced me, in the primaries, to go to televised press conferences. Television is about the only way that you can keep the written word honest.

Question: If you run against Carl Hayden for the Senate seat from Arizona next year, you'll in effect be asking Arizonans to send you to Washington to replace a man who has been in Congress 55 years. Assuming that voters vote in what they consider to be their best interest, why is it in their best interest to vote for Barry Goldwater and against Carl Hayden?

Goldwater: Well, that's a problem I recognize, of course. It would be a question I would logically ask if I were not the candidate.

The Republican party has to run a candidate. We just can't say that Carl Hayden, an old man approaching 90 years of age, is entitled to a free ride for another term. I think I would be that logical candidate.

And I think there are issues. Carl hasn't been home to campaign in about 12 years, and I think Arizona people have a right to expect him on the hustings. I think they have a right to ask him questions. I think the Arizona voters have indicated by voting for me in three elections involving federal office that they rather lean to the conservative philosophy, and yet Carl has voted almost right down the line—starting with the Roosevelt years through today—for many issues that I have campaigned against and won votes for.

And keep in mind that there are literally hundreds of thousands of people in this state who have never seen or heard Carl Hayden. And I think it's incumbent on him as a candidate to come back home. I know he'll be limited but this will be a clean campaign. I'm not going to put any burdens on him, or put any worries on him about answering any charges, because there's nothing to charge him with, unless it's a matter of issues supporting proposals Arizonans have indicated they're opposed to.

Question: What will be any Republican presidential candidate's chance in 1968?

Goldwater: I've said repeatedly that if the election were held tomorrow I don't think the Republican would win. But I also say that there is a growing reaction against Johnson.

Of course the President's popularity can go up and down like a daily thermometer. He's done some things the American people can see through and resent. This continuing credibility gap is reaching the point where the American people almost don't trust Johnson, don't trust what he says.

And while I think we're doing better in Vietnam, if this isn't clear to the American people next year . . . if we're plagued with strikes, plagued with more riots, or if we encounter any economic setback, which I don't think we will, then I think Johnson can be beaten.

Now what kind of candidate can beat him? You've got to remember that I got 27 million votes. And had the nuclear and Social Security issues—both of them phonies—if they hadn't been in there, I probably would have gotten 35 or 36 million votes.

I think that a non-liberal Republican can start with that base, and I know that he will get more votes. Whether he can get enough to beat Johnson, no cne knows. That man that I'm supporting now is Nixon. However, if Nixon backs out and Reagen says he wants to run, I'll back Reagan. But he tells me he doesn't want to run. But I'll know more about that soon. The combination of Nixon and Reagan would be a very attractive team. But right now Nixon seems to be the man.

Question: It has been reported that you've said that under no circumstances would you support Nelson Rockefeller for the presidency. Is that correct?

Goldwater: I can't see how any Republican could support Governor Rockefeller for the presidency. There's such a thing as loyalty. Jim Farley (postmaster general under FDR) said to me one day during an airplane trip together that if a prominent Democrat had done what Rockefeller did, he wouldn't even be recognized as a Democrat today. Rockefeller dumped Nixon and me, so I just frankly can't see how any Republican can support him.

Question: Do you feel the same way about George Romney, who also refused to support you?

Goldwater: No. I talked to George Romney about this and told George frankly, "Your big problem is not Goldwater, because I'll vote for you, I'll support you, and I'll guarantee you that Arizona will vote for you—will vote for any Republican nominee with the exception of Rockefeller, and I don't think he can be nominated. Your problem is the percentage of the 27 million who resent your not having supported me."

Question: What is your biggest regret about running for the presidency?

Goldwater: Oh, there was nothing really great in the way of regrets. There were some few individuals outside of Arizona who deserted me. These were people I had thought were close personal friends, people who had told me that they would support me and then didn't. This, however, is a personal feeling, it's not a political feeling.

No, I have no regrets about it. As I say, I think any Republican would have lost. I think my defeat might in the long run have helped the Republican party. While our losses in the Congress in 1964 were not as great as some we've suffered in the past, it wasn't the catastrophe it was made out to be, because it jolted the Republican party.

I don't know whether it was Goldwater who jolted them or the defeat of the candidates that jolted them. But we've come back. We now have 25 governors, we picked up 46 seats in the House, we picked up a Senate seat. I think in 1968 this is going to continue. I think we're going to have a tremendous sweep into the House and a goodly number in the Senate. We'll pick up more governors. We'll strengthen our position in parts of the country where we've just begun to exert strength.

So I have no regrets at all. I don't look on the campaign as a personal sacrifice, or anything of the sort. I enjoyed it, I learned a lot, I learned an awful lot about the American people. Everyone I met was a new experience. My three years since then I've kept busier than I've ever been in my life..

For example, last year I answered 19,000 letters by personal dictation, and mailed out another 40,000 to 50,000 form letters. I've made more than 400 speeches in Arizona and I'll make more than that this year. On top of that I made about 100 speeches outside our state, which, frankly, I have to do to augment my income.

I've kept up my contact with the Republican party around the country and I've enjoyed life. I hold no regrets. I'm not bitter at anybody.

Question: What is the greatest satisfaction you derived from running for the presidency?

Goldwater: I think there's great satisfaction just in being the nominee for the presidency of the U.S.

And I'm proud that my state can add this distinction to the many distinctions it already has. I think that my being a candidate—I don't say this to sound conceited—I think it brought more attention to the state of Arizona than anything that's ever happened here. I know this from the mail we get, I know it from others' comments. It was a surprising thing to have a candidate from a small state, and I'm very happy that I was able to run and do my part for my party, my country, and my state.

THE AMERICAN LEGION RESOLUTION ON VIETNAM

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, yesterday I invited the attention of the Senate to the American Legion resolution, adopted at its 49th annual convention, opposing Soviet trade with North Vietnam in U.S. lend-lease ships. Today, I wish to call attention to Resolution 456, adopted by that same annual convention. This resolution deals more directly with the issue of the war in Vietnam itself.

I think it should be pointed out that the Legion, in its experience, agrees with the judgment of our military leaders with regard to the conduct of the war. I particularly cite paragraphs 7, 8, 9, and 10 of the resolution which demand the end of the enemy's use of sanctuary in Cambodia, Laos, and the DMZ; which demand an immediate lifting of the restrictions on the military judgment as to the nature and scope of strategic targets; which support intensified attacks on hostile installations and airfields and to the war machinery in North Vietnam; and which recommend strongly the closing of the port of Haiphong by whatever military means are considered most feasible and effective. These issues are so urgently pressing at the moment that it is good to have the affirmation of their validity by the American Legion's 49th Annual Convention.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Resolution 456 be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 456

(Adopted by the 49th Annual National Convention of the American Legion, Boston, Mass., August 29, 30, 31, 1967)

Committee: Joint Foreign Relations-National Security Subcommittee on the Vietnam War.

Subject: Vietnam.

Whereas, the United States is engaged in a war in Vietnam against forces under the control of communist North Vietnam; and

Whereas, our commitment there is based on solemn agreements concerning defense of South Vietnam from outside aggression, and on the basic and essential United States policy against communist expansion by armed force; and

Whereas, it is essential that we achieve our political and military objectives in Vietnam in the shortest possible time with the least possible losses; and

Whereas, North Vietnam's leaders have made clear they do not intend to enter into negotiations for peace until and unless forced to do so; and

Whereas, that communist regime is enabled to continue its aggression against South Vietnam only because of massive assistance from the Soviet Union, its satellites, and Red China; and

Whereas, North Vietnam also enjoys the advantages of restrictions placed on our military forces—as regards the selection of targets in North Vietnam, and as regards enemy sanctuary across South Vietnam's borders; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by The American Legion in National Convention assembled in Boston, Massachusetts, August 29, 30, 31, 1967, That The American Legion:

(1) reiterates its strong support of United States assistance to the people of South Vietnam in their struggle against communist aggression;

(2) reaffirms its conviction that the defense of South Vietnamese territory and the defeat of communism's so-called "war of national liberation" there is in our vital national interest;

(3) commends our fighting men in Vietnam for their magnificent performance under most difficult and dangerous circumstances, and extends to them our profound gratitude and our continued, unqualified support;

(4) expresses its deep concern over our increasing casualties in Vietnam, with no apparent end in sight while the existing political limitations apply to the conduct of the war;

(5) insists that these limitations must be removed so that our military forces can bring this war to an early and successful conclusion;

(6) urges that our military commanders be promptly given whatever men, materiel, and authority are required to accomplish this end;

(7) calls for the termination, by military means as military judgment determines appropriate, of the enemy's use of sanctuary across South Vietnam's borders, in Cambodia, Laos and throughout the "Demilitarized Zone" (DMZ);

(8) demands an immediate lifting of the restrictions now placed on the military as to the nature and scope of strategic targets which should be destroyed in North Vietnam;

(9) supports repeated and intensified bombing or shelling, as military judgment deems appropriate, of all hostile installations and military air fields in North Vietnam, and all unloading, storage, transportation, power, and manufacturing facilities there; and

(10) recommends strongly the closing of the port of Haiphong by whatever military means are considered most feasible and effective, with adequate and firm notice to all shipping nations.

THE ALLEGED POSTAL SUBSIDIES

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, most Senators not only know Mr. Raymond Moley personally, but have followed his column, books, and articles with admiration for his keen analytic mind, even if we do not always agree with his conclusions. This is one of the great characteristics of the United States—able journalists and authors who can exercise the right of free speech with periodic reviews of time-honored premises. Mr. Moley, in his recent column in Newsweek, has once again exhibited his unique ability and has raised questions not only concerning the postal bill pending before this body but with the basic premises on which the bill is founded.

I ask unanimous consent that his column entitled "Those Alleged Postal Subsidies," and published in Newsweek for October 16, 1967, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Those Alleged Postal Subsidies

(By Raymond Moley)

A House bill to raise postal rates and increase the pay of postal employees (H.R. 7977) has been passed by the Post Office Committee and cleared for floor action by the Rules Committee. This bill is a hybrid. Originally there were two bills—one to comply with the President's demand for higher postal rates and the other to raise the pay of postal employees. The latter, however, gave employees a raise higher than the President's guidelines for Federal employees. And so, to avoid a veto of the pay bill, the House committee combined the two into one piece of legislation. Thus, the present bill is a product of a political manuever, a practice which from time immemorial has characterized almost everything related to the postal service.

Moreover, this bill is being rushed through despite the fact that a commission of distinguished people was appointed by the President to study the postal service and will not report until next year. The chairman of that commission is Frederick R. Kappel, former chairman of AT&T. The commission was no doubt appointed at the instance of Postmaster General O'Brien, who declared that the "archaic" postal service is "ponderous, creaking, erratic, costly."

THE BURDEN UPON USERS

Instead of waiting for the Kappel commission's report, which may well show how the Post Office can be reformed to the extent that most of the postal deficit can be eliminated, the House Post Office Committee chose to increase the present scale of rates and thus throw the burden upon the users of the mail service.

My argument here deals with what is called a "subsidy" for users of second- and third-class mail. According to the figures in the House committee report, first-class mail in 1966 showed a surplus of $67.7 million. But second- and third-class mail provided deficits of $416.2 million and $40.2 million respectively. For a long time figures like these have been used to claim that users of second- and third-class mail have enjoyed a huge Federal subsidy.

I have had reason to feel the effect of this claim, for whenever over the past twenty years I have in my pieces in this magazine commented upon subsidies in government agencies and programs, I have received letters taunting me about the "subsidy" enjoyed by periodicals. Until now, I have not replied to those charges in print. But since responsibile journalists have now accepted the Post Office figures and have joined the chorus, I choose to show how deceptive those figures are. For I have always believed that these claimed subsidies have been based upon a wholly unsound system of allocating costs in the postal system.

BAD ACCOUNTING

The report of the House committee itself in its labored explanation of what are called "cost ascertainment" figures comes close to admitting their unreliability. The cost system does not, it admits, take account of the importance of the priority given to first-class mail as compared with the deferment imposed upon other classes of mail. Delivery of first-class mail is intended to be prompt and almost immediate. Second class should take two or three days, and third class about eight days. Calculations based on the sale of stamps or use of meters cannot be segregated by classes. They are used for all kinds of mail. And the whole basis of assigning costs to the three classes is based upon random samples. The minority report on the bill said: "The full committee had no opportunity whatever to study the cost ascertainment figures on which the rate increases are based . . . all rate adjustments are suspect because they are based on questionable and dubious statistics."

I have become so accustomed to government accounting in other fields that I have grown even more suspicious of the Post Office figures. In the benefit-cost ratio in some big water projects such as dams and water supply, the assumptions are ludicrous. In the Department of HEW there are twelve accounting systems, and none of these has been approved by the Comptroller General office.

Common sense should tell anyone that since the same men and women, the same buildings, mail trucks, trains, boats and even in some cases horses and mules are used for all classes of mail in varying volume, an allocation of respective class costs is substantially impossible.

In the postal service, 80 per cent of the costs are for labor, and labor is largely used in handling, carrying and sorting mail. Under the Zip Code system, magazines must do much of this handling at their own expense. A first-class item is handled on the average fifteen times by postal employees. Magazines do nine of those handlings at their own expense.

Despite this continual pushing of rising labor costs upon the users of second- and third-class mail, the rate increases on second-class (122 per cent) and third-class (188 per cent) over fifteen years have been far more than for first-class mail (67 per cent).

Finally, it should be noted that the rate increases in the present bill fall relatively most heavily upon periodicals of small circulation. To the bigs, the increases are an unjustified burden, but to the smalls the proposed rates are a tragic blow. And these smalls include hundreds of special periodicals—cultural, religious, scientific, professional and fraternal.

Here is the example of The Atlantic. Its publisher, Frank M. Herbert Jr., told the Post Office Committee that the present bill would add to his costs $8,800 for first-class mail, $26,250 for second-class mail and $52,800 for third-class mail. In all, this is $87,850. His average profits over five years have been $22,795. Thus, at one blow The Atlantic would either be destroyed or go deeply into debt. And this situation might well apply to hundreds of lesser-known periodicals.

THE BILL SHOULD WAIT

The reason why The Atlantic as well as many other magazines of small circulation use third-class mail is that their prospects are in limited categories and they cannot afford to solicit subscriptions in media with mass coverage. Mr. Herbert said that a one-page ad in the Reader's Digest, with a general circulation of millions, would cost $50,000, but if he used that $50,000 he could appeal through third-class mail to 800,000 selected individuals who would be suitable prospects for The Atlantic.

For these reasons, Congress should defer this bill until the Kappel commission reports on postal operations generally and recommends reforms such as are suggested by the Postmaster General. The billion-dollar postal deficit may be due to inefficiency and waste in the Post Office system itself. Certainly if the system is modernized and if it is possible to have an accurate accounting system, the stigma of "subsidies" should be removed from users of second- and third-class mail.

ANALYSIS OF THE M-16 RIFLE AFTER A FIRING TEST

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, Mr. Howard Brisco, of the Houston Post, has recently written an analysis of the M-16 rifle after a firing test of the weapon which I was pleased to help him arrange with Army officials at Fort Polk, La.

The Post presented Mr. Brisco's story as a major interpretative article, accompanied by a second well-written article on the M-16 by Post Washington correspondent Charles Culhane.

I believe that Senators will be interested in reviewing the thoughts of these two writers. I ask unanimous consent that the articles be printed in the Record.

Having fired the M-16 myself in Vietnam under field conditions, I regard it as the best available weapon for our men there.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Pentagon Hotly Defends the M-16

(By Charles Culhane)

WASHINGTON.—"We want every U.S. Marine going into combat to have the very best equipment and support we can give him. We believe the M-16 rifle meets this requirement."

This is the position of Gen. Wallace M. Greene Jr., commandant of the U.S. Marine Corps, on the rifle which has stirred controversy and criticism both in South Vietnam where it is widely used by American combat troops and in Washington.

Many high officials in the Pentagon share Gen. Greene's opinion of the M-16. They say that its light weight, high fire power, accuracy, ease of opertaion and the light weight of the ammunition make it an excellent weapon for combat.

Some officers believe the complaints from Vietnam about the rifle jamming and malfunctioning have resulted because some soldiers have failed to keep the guns clean and give them proper maintenance.

The rifle was first issued in large quantities to the troops in Vietnam in August, 1966, at the request of Gen. William Westmoreland. Colt Industries, Inc. now produces more than 25,000 of the guns a month at its plant in Hartford, Conn., working around-the-clock.

Robert A. Brooks, assistant secretary of the Army for installations and logistics, said the M-16 "has been well received by U.S. Army personnel and has been by far the most popular individual weapon to be introduced in the recent history of the army.

"To my knowledge, U.S. Army combat commanders in Vietnam are unanimous in their opinion that it is an excellent weapon for the combat conditions there."

Lt. Col. John D. White, of the office of the deputy chief of staff for personnel, said combat units under his command in Vietnam in July, 1965, used the M-16 and liked it.

"It was the first choice by every man that used it, hands down," Col. White said. "It is simple, easy to maintain in the field, accurate, light weight. An individual can carry as much ammunition at one-half the weight he could carry with the weapon it replaced.

"If I were to go back (to Vietnam) tomorrow, with my choice of weapon, or unit choice of weapon, it would be the M-16."

A special house armed services subcommittee headed by Rep. Richard Ichord, D-Mo., has been investigating the rifle for several months.

A staff member of the subcommtitee went to Fort Benning, Ga., shortly after the investigtaion started and interviewed men who had used the gun in combat in Vietnam.

One officer told him that the M-16 was easier to maintain, easier to take apart and easier to carry than the M-14. He said, in his opinion, the rifle was the best weapon available in Vietnam.

A sergeant told him the M-16 was much better for use in Vietnam than the M-14 "if you cleaned your gun as often as possible."

Another officer he interviewed said "it was his opinion that the weapon packed a tremendous wallop, leaving a sizable hole if they hit the enemy."

A captain who had spent a year in Vietnam said he thought the M-16 was "an outstanding weapon" although it was slightly more delicate than the M-1 or the M-14. He said the jamming and other malfunctions some combat soldiers complained about are caused by failures to keep the rifle clean.

Hugh E. Witt, deputy for supply and maintenance for the assistant secretary of the Air Force, said, "We have not received any reports of any major problems during our use of the rifle. In fact, all the tests that we have conducted have shown that the malfunction rate is very low."

Kanemitsu Ito, a field engineer for Colt Industries and a recognized expert on the M-16, was dispatched to Vietnam last October at the request of the Army to determine the cause and solution for the large number of malfunctions experienced with the gun.

"During the first trip over to Vietnam, I was shocked," Ito said. "I had never seen equipment with such poor maintenance."

Ito said he also made two more trips to Vietnam earlier this year to check out the performance of the M-16 and that he found maintenance of the rifles had improved. He also said Colt started making some modifications in the weapon after he returned from these trips.

Rep Ichord's subcommittee is expected to report its findings and recommendations on the M-16 to the public shortly.

However, Ichord made it clear at one point during the subcommittee's hearings that he was not satisfied with the explanation from some officials who claim the malfunctions in the rifle come from poor maintenance and cleaning.

"One thing I am certain of at this time, the difficulties that have been experienced with the M-16 may be partially due to maintenance and cleaning but we have established much more difficulty than cleaning and maintenance," Ichord said.

The congressman said his subcommittee, the Congress and the American people want a solution which will correct excessive malfunctions in the M-16.

"They cannot be tolerated, period," he told a military man. "I don't care what you do to the gun. I cannot buy some of these reports that I have seen that it is entirely the fault of the men out there in the field not cleaning their weapons."

The M-16: Lethal to Whom?

(By Howard Brisco)

(NOTE.—Howard Brisco, a lifelong rifle enthusiast and for 15 years a contributor to Outdoor Life, Field and Stream and Sports Afield, has tested the controversial M-16 rifle used by U.S. forces in Vietnam and evaluated its qualities and shortcomings. The Post writer received special permission from the Pentagon to test fire the weapon at Fort Polk, La.)

A young American soldier, muscles taut and eyes roving, sidled into a clearing in the Vietnam jungle. He had looked it over from a screen of vegetation and had detected nothing alarming. He had not seen the small, tattered figure in the brush across the open space. Nor had the Viet Cong seen him.

But now, suddenly, they saw each other and froze like bird dogs on point. For an instant only. Then, instinctively, their rifles were brought to bear. Kill or be killed.

There was no time for aiming from the shoulder. This was hipshooting from full-automatic weapons, in which bullets are sprayed as if from a garden hose. Their first shots—as do many, if not most, hip-shots—went wild.

Then the American's rifle stopped bucking. He glanced, horror-stricken, at the jammed mechanism that had condemned him to death. He dived toward the brush. He was much too late. The Russian rifle in Charlie's hands, vastly more powerful than the GI's and in this case, at least, more reliable, still stuttered.

The rifle which gave GI Joe no chance for his life was one of the most controversial of military weapons. It was the .22 caliber M-16, now a standard arm for infantry men in Vietnam. Increasing reports of its mechanical failures have brought it to the attention of the man in the street. A storm kicked up by people whose sons are being killed by its inadequacy buffets the Pentagon.

"Believe it or not," a Marine wrote his parents from Vietnam, "you know what killed most of us? Our own rifles . . . Practically every one of our own dead was found with his rifle torn down next to him where he had been trying to fix it."

Another Marine wrote his mother that "these new M-16 rifles aren't worth a damn."

These opinions, quoted on the floor of the House of Representatives, are those of men who must live or die with the weapon placed in their hands by the people who run the greatest military power in the world. They merit careful consideration despite a steadfast defense of the new weapon by military brass.

The bitterness in the Marines' letters was occasioned by the catastrophic possibility that the M-16 would jam and become useless when only it stood between a man and death. This, of course, is a serious matter. Nothing could be more serious.

But the fact is critics of the M-16 claim it has other shortcomings not yet well known to the public.

As far back as 1960 a ripple of sardonic amusement ran through civilian rifle enthusiasts and professional gun writers. These are people who know rifles and ammunition as very few soldiers ever come to know them. They study ballistics tables more intently than any baseball fan ever pored over batting averages. There are a great many of these people. And, to a man, they were aghast at what they regard as a campaign of almost total falsehood with regard to the capability of the M-16 rifle.

Stories began appearing about a fantastic new caliber, designated .223, or 5.56 mm. The rifle firing this ammunition by the military, laid waste to the countryside and everything that crept or crawled upon said countryside. It killed by a mysterious force called "hydraulic shock." It was more destructive than the .30-06 or the .308 (because of hydraulic shock). It demolished concrete blocks and pulverized steel. It was lethally accurate to 600 yards.

The incredulous gun buff scratched his head and had a look at the vital statistics of this holy terror, this blaster-to-perdition. And that's when he chuckled. For it became apparent that the absurd, hysterical hullabaloo had been brought about by a rifle firing a slightly modified version of the little .222 Remington cartridge, which was neither new nor particularly frightening.

The gun buff had been using a bolt action .222 for about 10 years. He knew it as a "varmint" rifle. Neither he nor his gun-knowledgeable friends would ever have thought of using it on anything as large even as a Texas deer. They used it to shoot crows and jackrabbits, for which it was admirably suited.

Regardless of the weird properties attributed to it by its proponents, the M-16 has been branded by many gun writers an inadequate military weapon, ballistically as well as mechanically. Its performance—a 55-grain bullet driven at about 3,200 feet a second—is approximately that of the .222 Remington Magnum.

"Given the same sort of rifle and scope," says Jack O'Connor, one of the world's most respected gun writers, "there would not be a dime's worth of difference between the .222, the .222 Magnum and the .223."

The rifle that the M-16 appears destined to supplant is the M-14, which fires the 7.62 mm (.308 caliber) cartridge adopted by the NATO countries in 1955. It replaced, as a standard, the .30-06, the finest military cartridge ever used by this country or any country. Slightly less powerful than the .30-60, the .308 had the advantage of a shorter case more suitable for automatic actions.

The editors of Shooting Times, along with the rest of the gun fraternity, found it impossible to believe that the M–16 was what its proponents said it was.

So last year the magazine's technicians tested the M–16 against the M–14 in all aspects of performance significant in combat. The striking power of the rifle was not actually in question, since this is a matter of ballistic computation. The M–16 delivers less than half the foot-pounds of energy, 1,330 against 2,750 for the 150-grain M–14 bullet.

Shooting Times found that the .223 cartridge "produces at least twice the dispersion (deflection) of the 7.62 mm when fired through a screen simulating heavy brush or jungle vegetation."

"Since much of the .223's reputation has been built upon its alleged capability to break through concrete blocks," the report said, "it seemed we ought to chew up a bit of concrete to see what would happen . . . the 7.62 removed many times as much concrete, tossing fist-sized chunks as far as 30 yards, the .223 . . . just lacked the punch to do much damage."

As for the accuracy, the M–16 "seemed to be able to do not better than 12-inch, 10-shot groups at 200 yards. Flyers as much as a foot from point of aim were not uncommon. The M–14 checked out as far more accurate."

"This difference in accuracy," Shooting Times continued, "coupled with the .223's far greater susceptibility to deflection caused by wind and intervening brush or other material means simply that the fellow shooting the 7.62 cartridge has a far better chance of hitting a precise target at almost any range than his M–16-armed compatriot."

The M–16 jammed 11 times during the tests. There was no mention of malfunctions by the M–14.

Col. James D. Anders, in charge of M–16 instruction at Fort Polk, La., permitted me to test fire the rifle, two of them, in fact.

Because of their light recoil and mild report, the rifles were pleasant to shoot. Neither jammed in either semi-automatic or full-automatic fire, and I saw no evidence of malfunctions along the firing line.

But I found their accuracy much inferior to what one has a right to expect from any rifle worthy of its oil. The one I fired on the 25-meter range, with a rocksteady hold from a bench rest, spread its bullets over a two-inch circle. At that distance, almost any old rifle should link the bullet holes together. This bore out what the Shooting Times tests had indicated.

Col. Anders and other Fort Polk officers with whom I talked consider the M–16 entirely satisfactory. They said malfunctions had been rare. Anders thinks that infantrymen will fire the M–16 more effectively than the M–14 because it is lighter in weight, recoil and muzzle blast. This could be.

But it appears to me that the military has decided that it can save time and expense by scaling the rifle down to the soldier rather than building the soldier up to a more adequate rifle.

Much of the praise about the .223 has to do with reportedly horrible wounds inflicted, the stories say, because the bullet, instead of drilling straight through, headon, tumbles end over end upon impact. Most civilian gun experts doubt that this happens.

But if it does happen, they say, then the rifle must have a low order of accuracy indeed. For a bullet that poorly stablized could strike near the target only by accident. The wildest story of them all has the little .223 bullet tumbling all the way from the muzzle to wherever it is going. Bro—ther!

Proponents of the M–16 point out, quite correctly, that it is three pounds lighter than the M–14 and that the ammunition is lighter and less bulky. An infantryman can carry 400 rounds for the M–16 and only 200 for the M–14. The recoil is less. The M–16 is more pleasant to shoot.

True again. But these considerations could be cold comfort to a GI engaged in a shootout through brush or at extended range against a Viet Cong armed with a heavier Russian or Red Chinese rifle. For the .223 is at best, a 200-yard rifle and no brushbucker, whereas the 7.62 bullet is accurate past 500 yards and not easily deflected.

The M–16, designed by a man named Eugene Stoner and now manufactured by Colt, has come about because of the military's concern with "firepower" as opposed to marksmanship.

The generals fiercely defend the M–16 and insist that it has worked well in Vietnam. Maybe. But evidence remains that it sometimes kills the wrong people.

In the works now and almost certain of adoption by the military is a thing called the Stoner System, which is a sort of package deal of machine guns and rifles all wrapped up together and all bored for the same crow-busting .223 caliber.

In time all American troops except those assigned to NATO will be armed with the M–16 rifle. This indicates that the brass has concluded that the little rattler measures up as a general purpose, all-range weapon.

Cross your fingers. The M–16 is no such thing. Some unhappy day the taxpayers will be called upon to pick up the tab—a big one—for design and production of another infantry weapon. This time in a man-sized caliber.

INSTALLATION OF CRASH LOCATOR BEACONS ON PRIVATE AIRCRAFT

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two news articles, both published in the Washington Post and dated October 3 and October 4, respectively, be printed in the Record. They add additional strength to the argument that the FAA should require crash locator beacons on all private aircraft.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Oct 3, 1967]

Diary Records Losing Fight for Life by Girl, Mother in Crashed Plane

Redding, Calif., October 2.—A 16-year-old girl and her mother fought for two months a losing battle for their lives in the freezing carcass of their plane after it crashed on a snowy mountain peak in March, a makeshift diary disclosed tonight.

"Today is my 16th birthday. I wanted to be rescued today," the girl scribbled in the back of an airman's guide 50 days after the crash. "I hope you are happy, Search and Rescue. You haven't found us yet."

That was on April 30, and rescue never came for Carla Corbus or for her mother, Phyllis. Their scattered bones were found near the plane today. Many animal tracks were nearby.

Search parties found no trace of her stepfather, Alvin Oien, a 59-year-old hotel owner from Portland, Ore., who left the plane six days after it crashed on March 11 to seek help.

A deer hunter discovered the wreckage of the single-engine Cessna 191 about 4000 feet up the summit of Bully Choot Mountain, about 35 miles west of Redding and a mile from a seldom-used road. Search parties had been concentrating their hunt for the missing plane miles north of the site where it actually crashed.

The three victims were on their way to San Francisco to visit Oien's oldest son, Alvin Jr., 32. The son, an airline pilot, spent 107 days in Northern California after the crash. But, he recalled here Monday, during most of that time the weather was so foul he could not fly to hunt for the lost plane.

(In Portland, the Civil Aeronautics Authority said Oien was the object of a search over Montana in 1956 on a flight from Minneapolis to Portland after he changed plans en route. In 1954 he was fined for reckless flying after taking off from and landing in Vancouver, B.C., only by the light of automobile headlights.)

"On leg of journey to Red Bluff (Calif.)" said the diary's first entry. "Plane on left side in snowbank, 12:15 p.m. Fuselage broken. Door ajar. Windows on right side were broken as well as windshield."

The diary, with entries by both mother and daughter, then described the injuries suffered in the crash.

"Al" suffered a cut on the chin, three cuts on the forehead, a broken arm, crushed ribs on the right side, and "pain in his vertebrae."

Phyllis was "delirious one day," suffering a broken left arm, cuts on the right hand, a broken left ankle and many cuts and bruises, plus frost-bitten feet.

Carla was less seriously hurt. The diary noted she "hurt in the back near her left kidney. Sore right ankle. Cut on her left knee."

Three days after the crash Carla tried to walk through the snow but turned back "because her feet were frozen and she had lost her shoes."

Six days after the crash, the diary said Oien left the crash scene at the 5000-foot level of the mountain.

"Al shouted ok. He crossed the gully. He was on his way for help."

A week later, an entry written by Mrs. Oien said: "Fear Al did not make it for help. Getting weak."

The diary said they melted snow for water but made only one reference to food—the day Oien left. It said simply: One glass of jelly left."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Oct 4, 1967]

Diary Says Three Starving in a Plane Made Game of Talking About Food

Redding, Calif., October 3.—A family of three facing death from starvation in the wreckage of their plane on a snow-covered mountain last spring made a game of talking about food and gifts they would like, it was disclosed today.

And they played pinochle with playing cards fashioned from upholstery of their shattered little plane.

The story of the games was told in a makeshift diary kept by Carla Corbus, 16, and her mother, Mrs. Alvin Oien Sr. of Portland, Ore. Their bare bones were found nearby when a hunter discovered the plane Sunday.

Alvin Oien Jr. told of the diary entries after leading a 13-man posse on a futile five-hour search through rain-soaked manzanita brush today for remains of his father.

The diary recounted two months of survival and told of the 59-year-old hotelman and outdoorsman wading off through the snow last March to try to find help.

His son, an airline pilot, said the diary listed all the kinds of food the stranded fliers wished they had to eat and the gifts they would like to get. He said he couldn't remember what they were. But the three made games of wishing to keep their minds occupied, he said.

Only parts of diary have been disclosed. Young Oien said the full diary may be read to the family by Mrs. Oien's attorney in Portland. Oien said it is en route to the attorney, George Campbell, who will relay it to Mrs. Oien's brother in Illinois.

The airline pilot, 32, expressed more interest in organizing a larger search party to comb the area where the little gray plane crashed March 11.

Another brother, trustees from the Shasta County Jail and Federal and county officials made up today's search party. They hunted in bright sunshine but returned thoroughly wet from beating through wet rain-soaked brush.

TRUE GOALS OF CIVIL RIGHTS ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, during the tragic events of the past summer, many people tended to overlook and ignore the true goals of civil rights advocates.

The hopes and dreams of true equality and integration, that were born in the early 1960's, have been obscured by those who have turned their backs on the Negro people.

But the aspirations of those early days must not be abandoned. The struggle for justice must continue.

An editorial published recently in the Sheboygan Press has stated the need to maintain a proper perspective of these aims. The writer shows the need to guard against prejudiced thinking that all civil rights activities are bad or are violent. How many meetings and marches have been held where nothing occurred other than the meeting or the march itself?

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

No Violence Was Involved

"A local Sheboygan service club adjourned its noon luncheon today without incident. No shots were fired and police present at the scene indicated that there was no disturbance and that the situation was under control. No arrests were made."

The above paragraph could be used as an accurate and truthful lead, reporting the activities of any Sheboygan organization. If it were used, however, we feel sure there would be a howl and cry from the members of the organization concerned to the effect that they were being insinuated against. They, of course, would be right, the lead paragraph, though accurate, is full of insinuation. We make this observation with the civil rights movement in mind.

How frequently in the past months have news reports indicated that a civil rights meeting was held and "no violence was involved." This is not unlike a loudly voiced congratulation to your neighbor across the back fence for "coming home sober last night."

The civil rights movement in the state has not been without its public disturbances. As often as not, however, the disturbance is caused by others than those who are promoting the observance of civil rights. In the mind of the public there is a tendency to associate the disturbance with the movement and this is further emphasized by the negative reporting that "no violence was involved." We have attempted to guard against this type of reporting in our own news columns but point out to our readers this tendency in recent reporting in order that improper insinuations do not become the seeds of equally improper prejudices.

BROADCASTING MEDIA REPORTING OF RIOTS AND CIVIL COMMOTIONS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the American Broadcasting Cos., Inc., have sent me a recent address by Elmer Lower, president of ABC News. It is evident that the broadcasting media are examining with care their responsibility in the difficult area of reporting riots and civil commotions.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Lower's address entitled "Racial Stress and the Mass Media: Reflections on a Long, Hot Summer," be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Racial Stress and the Mass Media: Reflections on a Long, Hot Summer

(An address by Elmer W. Lower, president, ABC News; Sigma Delta Chi, Buffalo, N.Y., Sept. 21, 1967)

About nine months ago, one of your prominent members, while he was visiting New York City, asked me whether I would break bread with you gentlemen some night and talk on a subject of current, journalistic interest. Hoping that, if I said yes, he would promptly forget about it, I did agree. Last August while I was sunning myself on the sands of Westhampton Beach, a telephone call traced me down. My friend had not forgotten. So here I am.

Thirty days away from the office is wonderful medicine. I recommend it to all of you. I don't often figure out how to get that much time in one stretch. In fact the last time I had a month's vacation was exactly twenty years ago. I was working for Life Magazine in Paris. On that occasion my wife and I decided to go sit atop the Jungfrau in the Swiss Alps. But whether it's the Jungfrau or Westhampton Beach, isolation from the contemporary scene is good medicine. It's wonderful for clearing the cobwebs from the brain. And all those problems that pile up as each day's mail floods the "in" box, they all seem much less important.

I suppose that there is never a time when we, as journalists, don't have a long list of vital topics—serious shoptalk—that warrant thought and discussion. And as I sat at the beach, mulling over what topic might be suitable for our meeting this evening, I thought of several. Coverage of the war in Vietnam is always sure-fire when newsmen get together. Then there's the upcoming 1968 presidential election. And the use of computers to make projections is of current interest. The Pastore Committee in the Senate conducted hearings on this in July and the representatives of all three networks, among others, testified. But it seemed to me that the newest subject of current journalistic interest on the horizon was the coverage of the racial situation by the mass media, meaning newspapers, press associations, radio and television. So, fellow journalists, that is my subject tonight. And I would like to share with you not only my own thoughts, but those of my colleagues at ABC, and those of several of our competitors as they have been publicly expressed.

My thesis tonight is that, in the main, the mass media established a creditable, responsible record in covering the tragic events of the long, hot summer of 1967. Now, I do not wish to pose as some omniscient big brother who has his finger on every radio station, every television station, every newspaper, every press association bureau in the two score or more cities which experienced race problems this summer. I do know intimately the record of ABC network news, and the record of the news departments at the stations owned and operated by ABC. In preparing for this occasion, I have read widely on the record of our network competitors and of independent organizations. I have just come from the national convention of the Radio and Television News Directors Association in Toronto, where this was the subject of a long panel discussion. And I am convinced that the picture is far more positive than negative.

The negative, of course, makes a better story for some publications than the positive. It is easier to get a story printed and read if you put a headline on it, "Do TV Cameras Add Fuel to Riot Flames?" than to proclaim in the headline that he Chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, Warren Magnuson, believes that the major news media generally seemed to act with a high sense of responsibility. It is easier to use a negative quote from an unnamed Newark police executive, who failed to prevent a riot, than a positive one from the New York City Police Commissioner, Howard R. Leary, who has paid tribute to the media for material aid in containing outbreaks.

I am not here to tell you that in all of this long, hot summer everyone in the mass media in general, or radio and television in particular, has conducted himself perfectly. But my inquiry has convinced me that the media made a great effort to keep from provoking trouble and, in those cases where it did break out, they tried hard to keep from fanning the flames.

Now I think that all of us here tonight could agree on certain facts. The first is that racial problems are the biggest news of this generation. The second is that any organization which says that it is in the news business owes it to its readers, viewers and listeners to cover this story thoroughly.

The third is that the turn of events taken this summer by racial unrest was completely different from any of our previous experiences, save perhaps for the Watts uprising two years ago. And because of this violent turn of events, it became necessary for all news media to adapt themselves to the situation.

All right, what kind of internal rules do the mass media follow in these highly inflammable situations? What are the feelings of the men who cover the stories in the ghettos? There is a popular phrase today—tell it like it is! And I would like for you to share some of the feelings of our staff members and of some of our colleagues and competitors. Let's let them "tell it like it is!"

Here is Bill Sheehan, vice-president and director of television news for ABC News, laying it out for the staff on July 10, 1967, before either Newark or Detroit:

"We cannot be too careful in our coverage this summer of riots, disturbances and incidents. Our purpose must be to keep the stories in perspective so that a scuffle doesn't become a riot in its reporting."

"Please keep in mind these guidelines and see that the questions are answered in our coverage:

"Describe the nature and extent of the problem with precision. We don't want to give the impression a whole city is aflame just because someone has started a bonfire.

"We must know the reasons for the trouble insofar as they are discernible. This requires some follow-up reporting after the initial trouble. Talk to civil rights leaders, merchants and residents in the area who were not directly involved in the disturbance. If the issue that triggered the problem is not clear, let's say so.

"The police are not the sole source in stories of this kind. Neither are those on the street leading the demonstration."

"It may be stating the obvious, but I feel it's worth repeating: ABC News wants nothing to do with staged stories. If you miss an element, don't ask for a repeat. Be careful that the cameras are not the cause of a demonstration."

"Our coverage of civil rights problems has been of the highest order this year. Let's keep it that way."

I think that you will agree that Bill Sheehan's statement is evidence of our concern and our responsibility. But what about the follow-up? What do the reporters, the cameramen, the soundmen do when they get in the field? Let's listen to Ed Silverman, director of news for WABC–TV, our flagship station in New York:

"Our crews and reporters have standing orders that we don't send a car and a crew up to a tense area to sit around and wait for something to happen. We don't try to anticipate. Our presence up there would contribute to the situation. We sit and wait. During riots, themselves, we use no lights. We work with the police command posts as closely as possible and exercise great care in the selection of material that does go on the air. I do not believe in live television coverage of a riot. It may be a hell of a news story, but such coverage can certainly produce more harm than good."

What about our competitors? In a letter to Senator Hugh Scott on August 9, 1967, CBS President Frank Stanton outlined some of the steps which CBS News has taken to avoid contributing to the escalation of events. Here they are:

"1. We use unmarked cars, with very few exceptions, when carrying news equipment and personnel to the scenes of riots.

"2. We do not use lights when shooting pictures, because they attract crowds.

"3. Reporters and technicians have standing orders to obey the police—even in the occasional cases when their orders may seem unreasonable or unduly restrictive.

"4. Extreme caution is exercised in estimating the size of crowds.

"5. Eyewitness reports are checked for accuracy.

"6. Statements by riot participants or apologists are balanced by reports by responsible officials.

"7. Rumors are run down, and if unfounded, are refuted with the facts."

All sound journalistic procedure, well expressed by Dr. Frank Stanton, and guidelines which we also practice. And I might add a word here about the use of lights at night. There are a number of reasons why they should not be used, but one of the most important to the cameraman and soundman is the simple rule of survival. A frezzo light makes them a perfect target for rooftop snipers.

This question of the use of lights arose last summer right here in Buffalo. Correspondent Jim Burnes and a camera crew were about a block away from the point where a police officer was blasted down by a shotgun. They rushed to the spot, saw the officer on the ground, heard his screams of pain. His brother officers huddled around him. Should Burnes' crew flick on the lights and film the tragic scene? Wasn't it their duty to record on film the horror and tragedy of that moment? And yet . . . to turn the light on might expose an innocent person to a second shot. This is a typical situation which can face a television news man during a riot. To the credit of Burnes and his colleagues they did not turn on their lights until the police told them it was safe to do so—and then only for five seconds.

The guidelines used by NBC News are well expressed by Reuven Frank, executive vice-president of NBC News, in a memo to the staff dated August 21, 1967. He wrote:

"We cover events. We report them, we do not arrange them, modify them, stage them or schedule them. We do not re-enact them. . . . If a rally is to take place and the sponsors ask us when is the best time for us, we are to have no opinion."

The most unexpected riot of this past summer occurred in Detroit. Unexpected because many Negroes in Detroit have had better opportunities than in many other cities.

But the power structure of the city apparently was out of touch with the young turks of the ghetto. ABC owns and operates both a radio and a television station in Detroit. Both are extremely community conscious and pillars of responsibility. Let's hear the two news directors of those stations testify.

First question: Did the mass media in general, radio and television in particular, have any direct part in starting the riot? The answer: No. The trouble started shortly after 4 a.m. on a Sunday morning when the police raided an illegal, after-hours "blind pig." There were no newsmen on the scene.

Second question: Did the mass media fan the flames? The answer: No. The facts are these. About 6:30 a.m. that morning, the news editor on duty at WXYZ Radio was informed of the trouble. Shortly after that, he received a telephone call from Damon Keith, Co-chairman of the Michigan Commission on Human Rights. Mr. Keith asked that we refer to the trouble as a disturbance to permit police a chance to get the outbreak under control. We co-operated, calling it a disturbance in our radio news broadcasts between 7 and 10 a.m. By noon our reporters on the edge of the riot area saw that it truly was a riot. Not to have reported such at that time would have been abdicating journalistic responsibility. Let me quote Frank Tomlinson, news director of WXYZ Radio and an experienced journalist who has worked in Detroit for eight years:

"In the wake of the Detroit riots it became apparent that radio and tv played a major role in helping to keep what semblance of order there was. The continuous flow of information to the area informed riot victims where they could obtain aid, locate lost relatives and various other emergency information. I believe radio and tv helped in keeping unwanted people out of the riot areas, despite the fact that once things started cooling off, 'tourists' started arriving. All Detroit radio and tv showed great restraint in reporting. Perhaps some of the reports, pictures and interviews caused some of the irresponsible to continue rioting and looting, feeling they were, in a sense, 'showing the establishment.' On the other hand, I feel that the reporting served to fire up the responsible citizens to take what immediate action they could, and to start planning programs to prevent any recurrence. . . . I seriously doubt that broadcast coverage prolonged the Detroit riots. If anything, it might have shortened them by arousing responsible citizens."

Bill Fyffe, news director of WXYZ–TV, is one of those devoted news professionals who is agonizing over whether we may have contributed to the trouble. "In Detroit", he says, "we sat fat, smug and happy. Confident that it couldn't happen here. But it did. And it shook us up. Radio and television news didn't strike the spark, gather the tinder or fan the flames. At worst, we told the world what the people in the ghetto already knew. A fire was burning and there was plenty of fuel."

But what did others think about this coverage? Let me quote some of them. Leonard W. Moss, professor at Wayne State University in Detroit and chairman of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology, proposed to the Pulitzer Prize Committee of Columbia University that WXYZ–TV be given a Pulitzer award. Here is what he wrote:

"The careful analysis of news during a distress situation marks this organization as public-serving rather than self-seeking. Having witnessed their newsroom operation and having been privy to at least one major editorial decision, I am overwhelmed by their integrity and objectivity."

The distinguished radio-television critic of the Washington Post, Lawrence Laurent, happened to be spending the summer in Detroit as a visting lecturer at Detroit University. On his return to Washington in August, Mr. Laurent wrote:

"Three of the Detroit television stations—WJBK–TV, WWJ–TV and WXYZ–TV—have my gratitude. I came to admire in particular WXYZ–TV, which is owned and operated by the American Broadcasting Company. The coverage was a model of restraint."

It did not take a professor or a television critic to recognize the high degree of responsibility which our stations showed. John Campbell, TV Vice President and General Manager, and Charles Fritz, his opposite number in radio, were literally deluged with letters from viewers and listeners who expressed their gratitude. Running through baskets of mail I find such phrases as—

"Our tensions and minds were somewhat eased. . . ."

"You gentlemen really cared about what you were reporting. It was your city, too, and you were as upset as the rest of us."

"I am the wife of a national guardsman and it was wonderful to have the latest news always at hand. It is hard to be at home and know your husband is in the middle of something like that."

"I should like to compliment . . . Mr. Bonds. His serious, yet unalarming, manner of presenting the news copy at hand, and that of his own ad-lib, were well received."

"We found your coverage devoid of hysteria, editorial comment, and exaggeration of a situation needing none. We never left your station for the entire time."

"In my opinion, your good work helped to enable law-enforcement and fire-fighting personnel to do their work more effectively by informing the public of the serious situation that existed and by requesting that people who were not trained or equipped to help stay out of the riot areas."

Let's take a look at New York City which came through the summer with relatively little difficulty. Certainly part of the credit should go to Mayor John V. Lindsay who went out in the streets to talk to the dissatisfied people and find out what was bothering them. Mayor Lindsay also was foresighted enough last spring to invite news executives from newspapers and radio and television stations to Gracie Mansion for a session in their continuing dialogue. He and Police Commissioner Howard Leary gave the news executives a candid assessment of where trouble could be expected. They discussed what radio and television could do to prevent the presence of mobile units and cameramen from fanning the flames of threatening situations. No formal code resulted. The understanding was strictly a voluntary one. But it worked. In a letter to News Director Ed Hardy of WABC Radio, dated August 3, 1967, Commissioner Leary wrote:

"I wish to express my deep appreciation and that of all police officers for the fairness and restraint which has been exhibited by the radio and television industry in covering recent disorderly incidents in New York City.

"Thus far, there have been no serious outbreaks and I am certain that the sane and understanding way that the incidents have been covered has aided the police materially in containing them.

"Among the measures taken, from my observation, has been restraint in the use of lights and the elimination of tripods on the tops of vehicles and on streets in favor of hand cameras carried by a cameraman on foot. And perhaps equally important, refraining from touring the troubled areas in marked vehicles easily identifiable as television mobile units.

"There has also been widespread acceptance of the position that first reports of trouble, which often prove unfounded, should be held up until the incidents can be properly assessed. This sober, factual reporting has done a great deal to prevent the spread of rumors which would only serve to exacerbate an already tense situation.

"This type of restraint—and I'm sure there are many more examples which you yourself could identify—is in the true spirit of public service. The public safety owes a great deal to the city's communications media."

Now let's turn to New Jersey. The witness is Nick Archer, Director of Basic News for ABC. It is his job to cover the world in words and film, the good and the bad.

"In Newark the first night of mob rioting and violence took place with no television cameras present at all in the beginning. In Plainfield, New Jersey, a policeman was killed by a mob of rioters and there were no television cameras present during that incident. Also in Plainfield, we were prevented from going into the riot area by the police. And considerable looting, damage and rioting still took place."

But all of the trouble didn't take place in the big cities and in the east. Let's listen to Layhmond Robinson, one of our ace reporters, who drew a vacation relief assignment in Chicago. Layhmond is one of the most respected reporters in New York, having served 15 years on the New York Times covering Albany and City hall. It so happens that he is a negro. Here is his Cairo, Illinois, story.

"The desk awakened me at 3:00 a.m.", Layhmond told me, "and said to charter a plane for Cairo, Illinois. One of the wire services had sent out a story with a byline that negro youths had gone on a rampage, burning, pillaging, and looting. Also reported was that bands of youths were firing rifles around a housing project. A camera crew was sent in by charter plane from Atlanta.

"We all arrived early in the morning, rented cars at the airport and dróve in to town to find one old warehouse burned, two store windows broken, reports of some shots fired around a negro housing project and one National Guardsman guarding the negro project. The rest were out to lunch. Result: I reported to New York that there was no rioting in Cairo, only excess vandalism, and that the wire service had caused us to spend a hell of a lot of money. But it really wasn't for nothing. Because we went to the source and saw there was no riot, we avoided putting an exaggerated story on the air."

Robinson tells about some of his experiences in a bigger city, Chicago:

"One night when I was there this summer, I took a crew out to the White Sox Park on the South Side. We had been alerted to a demonstration around the park. When we got there we found almost a thousand Negroes chanting Black Power and threatening to burn down the park (the Sox were playing a doubleheader inside). But the police isolated the trouble makers in the crowd and the doubleheader ran until three-o'clock in the morning (both games went extra innings). We did not put this on the air, although it was worth putting on the air. The point is nothing happened and we did not try to push this story, though any reasonable journalist would feel that this story belonged on the air. This was the case of newsmen operating in a tense, even explosive atmosphere and trying to bend over backward to avoid igniting a riot (this happened while the Detroit riot was in progress). There was a reason for our decision that night.

"Of course, almost any reporter and camera crew that shows up on a scene is going to attract a crowd, especially in a place where something has happened the day or night before. But one night I had a cameraman with me on Chicago's West Side where we had some trouble (but not much). He wanted to get out on the street and set up and light up to wait for 'something to happen'. I ordered him back into the car and later told him to go back to the office; that I would call him if I needed him. Camera crews looking for something to happen can sometimes fan the flames of a tense situation."

Milwaukee is a city which has had disturbances of two types: the rioting which started Sunday night, July 30th . . . and the Fair Housing marches—the Father Groppi marches, which have now been going on for several weeks. The latter have involved some violence and destruction, though far from the scale of the July riots.

The rioting in July was brought under control with relative swiftness, within about three days. The National Guard was moved in by Monday, and authorities sealed off the city and its trouble spots.

At this point, some background: Early in July a number of the city's radio and TV news directors had talked to each other about the handling of the riots—if and when the Hot Summer arrived in Milwaukee.

They realize now that they had made a good start in handling such touchy situations on a sort of cooperative basis—but that they started a little too late, and plans were still incomplete, when the rioting broke out.

Most of the city's news directors took part in this plan—and a committee of five was established. This group met—and started to work out some guidelines. They did not, at this point, talk to authorities. The object was not to consult the authorities—but, rather, to advise them of the broadcasters' plans. The broadcasters were not seeking leadership from officials. The riots started before such a meeting could take place. Some weeks later—August 28th—the Father Groppi marches got started and as of today (21st of September) these have been going on for 25 straight days. As a result, newsmen as well as city officials have been too involved in the immediate problems, to get together again.

Radio News Director, Don Froelich, of ABC affiliate WISN, gave me this chronology:

The rioting started Sunday night (July 30th), at 9:45. There were no immediate or clear indications that Milwaukee was in for large-scale trouble. This came at 11:30 p.m., when police asked stations to put out a call for off-duty police to report for duty. These announcements, in turn, aroused the public—which started calling the stations in large numbers, to find out what was going on.

WISN, which normally signs off at midnight—did sign off at the normal hour. It signed back on, at 5:30 a.m. During those pre-dawn hours—at 3:30 a.m.—the Mayor of Milwaukee, Henry Maier, declared a State of Emergency. After going back on the air in the morning, WISN stayed on the air continuously, until the State of Emergency was lifted days later.

When WISN went back on the air, in the morning—and during the hours and days which followed—it made a point of reporting all facts relating to the rioting, within a framework of reporting the activities of the authorities. Thus, the news reportage was not concentrated on the sensational elements of the story. WISN did not broadcast any rumors, nor did the station broadcast any information which could not be checked out with absolute certainty.

At this point, too, the aforementioned cooperation, involving the various news directors came into play. These men realized that theirs was a serious responsibility . . . that what their stations said, played back or showed, could have a direct influence on inflaming or subduing the riots.

They called each other via phone—and consulted on what they would do and what they would not do.

Carl Zimmerman, News Director of ABC's Milwaukee affiliate WITI–TV, cited a specific example: a member of CORE was filmed, charging that a negro had been *murdered* by authorities. It was decided, in concert with other news directors, that the charge was highly inflammatory, and could do much to rekindle the rioting. As a result, it was decided to report the charge, but NOT to use the film, because the film was too strong . . . too inflammatory.

In most cases, the broadcasters did not report specific riot activity while it was going on—but rather, waited till it was over, and then reported it in the past tense. Presumably, this helped to prevent potential rioters from being guided to Where The Action Was.

An interesting sidelight was the role played by O. C. White, a Milwaukee negro disk jockey (of station WAWA), who is said to have a tremendous following among the young people of Milwaukee's negro population. O. C. White used that influence—asking those in his audience to "cool it"—telling the young people that violence and destruction would get them nowhere.

Radio News Director Froelich has told me that he has had personal words of thanks from Milwaukee's Chief of Police, Harold Breier, for the sense of responsibility which his station has shown.

To sum up the Milwaukee situation: there was serious trouble but broadcasters feel that they did their part in keeping the public informed—while, at the same time, keeping the trouble from becoming bigger. They did this through a good deal of self-control and self-regulation, coupled with inter-station newsroom cooperation. They do not feel that they gave up any of the prerogatives of a free press.

In the major areas of trouble, where we had reporters present this summer, I have been unable to find evidence that the presence on the scene of radio and television mobile units, tape recorders and cameras caused the demonstrations or seriously aggravated them. If there is positive evidence to that effect, I will be the most interested party to receive the details of it, and if ABC is involved, we will prevent its recurrence.

This is not to state that civil rights demonstrations have not been staged in the hope that they will receive mass media exposure. But so have demonstrations for and against the Vietnam war, for and against free speech and free love, for and against flouridation of the water supply. It seems to me that the demonstration has become a part of the American scene. But we are not talking about this type of agitation for political or social action. We have been talking about serious racial unrest which threatened to turn into riot or insurrection. We in the radio and television news business—and, in fact, responsible people in all the mass media—are well aware of the potential influence we have. We are also aware of our responsibility to the public. We think that by and large we played a responsible role this past summer and we are determined to continue our efforts along this line.

Now, let us turn to another question which comes up time and again. Who created Stokely Carmichael? Who created Rap Brown? I really believe that these two agitators have gotten under the skin of the white man more than any other colored person in memory. And by their irresponsible behavior they have caused irreparable damage to the legitimate civil rights movement. But who created them?

Let's listen to a top-flight reporter of the racial scene. He is Tom Jarriel, an ABC correspondent who was born and raised in the South, and covers the South for us. To those who lay the blame for the creation of Carmichael and Brown at the doorstep of radio and television, Jarriel says this is "naive nonsense" and I agree with him. Here's how he sees it:

"The critics say an obscure speech by Carmichael in Mississippi is amplified nationwide to Negroes who might otherwise not get the message. Such thinking is naive nonsense. The Carmichaels and Browns are not speaking for the benefit of television news. In fact, we often have considerable trouble covering one of their speeches, either in finding them or getting past the militants to set up the cameras. We cover the speech, and shortly thereafter we are showing the nation what the militants are saying. Significantly, their words are going to *all* people who are interested . . . Negroes, whites, congressmen, law officers, the President of the United States . . . anyone who is concerned and everyone should be.

It's presented just that way for the public to put in its mental hopper to digest. Certainly the words do reach into ghetto homes, but don't be misled to think the message would not get through anyway . . . The young people were attracted to them before they received exposure on television."

There are moderate, responsible Negro leaders who feel that too much exposure in the mass media has been responsible for Stokely Carmichael and Rap Brown. Bill Fyffe, news director of our television station in Detroit, disagrees. He says:

"We are not that powerful. After all, for years we have covered the activities and filmed the speeches of the very men who are now making the charges. And we apparently haven't turned them into leaders powerful enough to stop the rioters. If a man is to be a leader, somebody has to be ready to follow, and apparently many young, dissatisfied radicals in the ghetto were ready to follow Brown and Carmichael."

Richard Salant, president of CBS News, views the situation this way: "Stokely Carmichael today, like Senator McCarthy of a decade ago, would hardly be as notorious were there no press—print or electronic . . . We have come to the conclusion that our test must not be whether we approve of the event or agree with the individual we are covering, but whether they are legitimate news. . . . It would be a dangerous business indeed for us to assume an omniscient role—and try to decide whether an event is good or evil, or an individual is a hero or a villain, and to make our news judgments turn on that kind of social evaluation."

One might now ask, has Carmichael not taken the rope that was handy and hung himself? Is he not almost totally discredited in the Negro community? Is not Rap Brown going in the same direction? And isn't SNCC itself amost washed away by the publicity it has received? The mass media presented their words and actions without comment. The public has drawn its own conclusions. I recognize that they make a lot of television viewers livid with rage, but in so doing have they not destroyed themselves?

An analysis of logs kept of network news in the period just before and during the Newark and Detroit riots last summer showed that the views of responsible leaders, both white and Negro, were carried far more often than the utterances of Brown and Carmichael. It is the job of seasoned producers and editors to decide what news goes in news broadcasts and to make certain that the doctrine of Fairness and Balance enunciated by the Federal Communications Commission is strictly observed. I am convinced that we have succeeded in doing this.

The Associated Press, long noted for the balance and objectivity of its news report, feels strongly that various views in racial news must be carried. AP General Manager Wes Gallagher says:

"We could not agree that we not carry the views, extreme, moderate or conservative, on the racial problem any more than we could agree to restrict the coverage of the national debate on Vietnam, where there are also the same range of opinions. We must cover the news, whether disagreeable or not, but objectively, accurately and responsibly."

In the past month or two various suggestions have been made that the mass media subscribe to a code which would be followed in the coverage of racial problems. Executives of the mass media have universally rejected such a proposal, although in many cities voluntary agreements do exist. Here is how we view this proposal. First, Wes Gallagher.

"I do not believe that any useful national or semi-governmental code could be drawn up that would meet all national situations nor be enforceable. Our 1965 and 1967 instructions on racial coverage . . . fit the tradition of the Associated Press, but they might not fit others, nor should they be imposed on them."

Julian Goodman, president of NBC, reacted similarly. "It is difficult for me to see how a code could be effective in these circumstances," he said. "It's very preparation would be a formidable problem, because those involved would each see the problem quite differently, from quite different vantage points. But more importantly a code cannot exercise judgment. It cannot see all the variables in the fast-breaking events with which newsmen must deal. It is not self-executing, for if a newsman or editor is irresponsible or has poor judgment, a code will not correct the fault, and if responsibility, integrity and judgment are exercised, a code will not add to them."

Dr. Frank Stanton, president of CBS, was even stronger in his rejection of a proposed code.

"Any proposal, however high its purpose, to get the press to decide in concert what it will report," he said, "and how it will do it, would establish a precedent of the most hazardous implications. With the possible exception of wartime, such a practice not only is abhorrent in principle, but also would cast doubt on the validity and thoroughness of all news. As a result, speculation of the wildest sort would arise as to what was being suppressed, or handled by prearranged argreement, or 'managed' on the grounds that the people cannot be trusted."

ABC News agrees with these views. While we have no objection to the News Departments of ABC-owned stations entering into voluntary, informal agreements with local officials, responsibility for what news is covered and broadcast must remain with the news director at the local level, and at the national level with the responsible executive in charge at ABC News, New York.

I would like to call to your attention the views of two distinguished men who are keen observers of the state of broadcasting affairs, and who have the advantage of a national perspective. They are Senator Warren Magnuson of Washington, chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, and Jack Gould, long-time radio-television critic of the New York Times. Observing that the mass media "generally seemed to act with a high sense of responsibility," Senator Magnuson said: "But the riots were not the creation of the news media, who, on the whole, amid incredible difficulties, strove to tell the whole story, with balance, objectivity and without the condescension of trying to protect the public from the true dimensions of some grim episodes."

Senator Magnuson said he had seen and read accounts of some broadcast newsmen who failed to meet their responsibility, but he felt that these should not detract from the generally admirable service the broadcast media performed.

Gould noted that "the sheer nature of radio and television unquestionably raises problems not shared in like degree by the print media." True indeed. "The conduct of television in the Watts riot of 1965 admittedly was highly questionable," he wrote in the August 13 edition of the New York Times. "But this summer, under difficult physical circumstances, there has been far more restraint, such as the use of unmarked cars for camera crews, putting caps over camera lenses if misleading antics were obvious, and, in some cases, the delay of news bulletins to minimize alarm." In conclusion, he said:

"Whatever the room for improvement in TV coverage and other media, the home screen served an essentially constructive purpose in showing the riots quickly. The policy has focused attention on the causes of the disturbances; more information, be it disturbing or reassuring, is the first step toward elimination of the riots. Congress, one would hope, would not conduct an examination of a mirror because of the disquieting images that it beholds."

During the course of a year we receive a fair amount of mail at ABC News. By reading it I can pretty much tell what is on the minds of viewers and listeners and what is disturbing them. A year or so ago their big concern was the Vietnam war. More recently it has been racial disturbances.

Never before has the agony of war been brought with such brutal and unremitting force into our own living rooms, intruding almost hourly into our lives. And never before has a social revolution—the civil rights revolution, intruded so insistently into our lives—visually, for all of us to see. No wonder that so many people are upset by what they see on television.

For one thing it is something they have never seen before. It is raw stuff, to say the least. And it burns itself into the minds of viewers. It may even stimulate them to discuss the subject and to change their minds about it—which is a difficult thing for many people to do. And television, like the psychiatrist, is alternately loved and hated by the patient.

For most people sitting in their relatively comfortable living rooms, the furious sights and sounds of racial unrest are a disturbing experience. It is highly distasteful to see fists shaking at you and faces charged with violence. It is more reality than most people want. But to give these people less than the truth on radio and television would be the violation of a public trust.

All of us hope that the long, hot summer of 1967 is over. And we likewise hope that during the long, cold winter ahead both government and private industry will find some answers that will prevent the recurrence of violence. Of course, there is no guarantee that trouble will be confined to the summer.

It is the province of broadcasters—indeed, all the mass media—to report the progress in this field, but we are not the experts in developing remedial action. As I say, that is for the leaders of national, state and city government and business to hammer out.

As far as reporting the news of the civil rights revolution is concerned, all of us in the mass media have time now, we hope, to catch our breath, reflect on the accomplishments and the shortcomings of our coverage in the past few months, and make plans how we can do an even better, an even more responsible job in the months and years ahead.

Speaking for myself—but my guess is that almost all newsmen share my views—speaking for myself, I feel that the past summer of violence has served to emphasize the tremendous responsibility we bear in reporting this social revolution—a revolution which sometimes takes the form of lawlessness, sometimes of cleaning up a neighborhood, sometimes of looting and killing, sometimes of running a job campaign for high school dropouts.

I am firmly convinced that our citizens must have all of the facts concerning this revolution, reported to them responsibly, accurately and with deep enough background that they can understand what is taking place. The timing with which this information is reported to the public by the instantaneous broadcast media is of the greatest importance. But in studying the case histories of a number of the summer riots, I have not found any one sure-fire formula that is applicable to every situation. Experienced, responsible news executives, reporters, editors and producers, as they have in this country since it was founded, still must exercise their own seasoned judgment in reporting and editing the news. In all of our history the mass media have not failed the public in time of stress. I am sure that they will not do so now.

We are indebted to William Allen White, the great journalistic sage of the Kansas plains, for this counsel. And I quote:

"You say that freedom of utterance is not for time of stress, and I reply with the sad truth that only in time of stress is freedom of utterance in danger. No one questions it in calm days, because it is not needed. And the reverse is true also; only when free utterance is suppressed is it needed and when it is needed, it is most vital to justice."

FORMER SENATOR MAURINE NEUBERGER SAYS: "WE OUGHT TO GET OUT" OF VIETNAM

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, former Senator Maurine Neuberger, who, while in office, did yeoman service in behalf of the citizens of Oregon and the Nation has now changed her stand on U.S. military involvement in Vietnam and, after considerable thought and talking to many military and civilian experts on the war in Vietnam, believes that the United States "ought to get out" of Vietnam.

By now—

She states—

> it's been proved that our approach has been a failure. I don't think we should keep repeating our mistakes. We have to admit that this little country has stalemated us in spite of all our men and materials. We ought to get out.

Senator Neuberger made this statement in an interview with a reporter for the Harvard Crimson on the occasion of her taking the position as head of Radcliffe's South House. Radcliffe is to be highly commended for obtaining the services of Maurine Neuberger for the academic world.

I ask unanimous consent that pertinent excerpts from the interview with former Senator Maurine Neuberger as it appeared in the Harvard Crimson for October 4, 1967, be inserted in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Harvard Crimson, Oct. 4, 1967]

SENATOR NEUBERGER REFLECTS ON CAPITAL AND POLITICS

(By Anne de Saint Phalle)

Former Senator Maurine D. Neuberger, an Oregon Democrat, has made formal her transition from Washington Politics to Cambridge academia by becoming Head of Radcliffe's South House.

The move was natural because Senator Neuberger, elected in 1960—to finish her late husband's term—became friendly with such New Frontier advisors as John Kenneth Galbraith, Paul M. Warburg Professor of Economics, and Richard E. Neustadt, now director of the Kennedy Institute. Working at the Institute, Senator Neuberger met Mary I. Bunting, president of Radcliffe, and developed the association which led to her present position.

The tall, thin Senator did not enter Congress without experience. A self-reliant school-teacher who had never been east of the Mississippi until she spent a year in Rhode Island on an exchange, she met and married the noted journalist Richard L. Neuberger, who was to become the first Democratic Senator Oregon had elected in 40 years. She shared her husband's interests enough to become the only woman in the Oregon State Legislature. It was not a big leap from the State House to the Senate seat she took amidst a standing ovation.

Last week, the former Senator informally discussed some of the issues that concerned her in Washington, and which interest her still in Cambridge.

From the beginning, Senator Neuberger felt most at home with domestic problems, especially those of the consumer. She assumed the lead in truth-in-packaging, -lending, and -labelling legislation and spurred President Kennedy into incorporating consumer legislation in his State of the Union message. "The voice of the consumer will be heard and the public looks to a woman to hear it," she says in justification of the efforts that led colleagues to call her "Mrs. Consumer."

She has not let her interest die since leaving the Senate. As consultant to the Food and Drug Administration, she has influence in preventing frauds and ensuring purity in consumer goods.

Senator Neuberger was generally not a front-page figure—with one exception. That was the long and vehement tobacco fight which resulted in legislation requiring cigarette packages to carry warnings that smoking is hazardous to health. The fight has currently been revived by Senator Robert Kennedy's announcement of plans to press for stronger legislation.

Senator Neuberger, for whom passage of the bill was an incomplete but significant triumph, has waged battle against the tobacco industry for several years. Her husband was interested in cancer research and died of the disease. She herself was a smoker but gave it up on doctor's orders thirty years ago. Some time later Sir Robert Platt, head of Britain's Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons, came out with a statement on the causal link between smoking and cancer. Senator Neubreger listened, was convinced, and "took up the cudgeon."

She faced long odds. "If this tobacco had been marijuana or spinach we wouldn't have had any trouble in passing legislation against it," she said recently. "But you were tampering with a $2 billion-dollar industry." The government's ambivalent policy epitomizes the conflict involved. With one hand it poured millions of dollars into the National Institute of Health's cancer research programs, and with the other it subsidized tobacco growers.

But as reports from the Surgeon General and the U.S. Public Health Department detailed rising incidences of lung cancer and mounting evidence for the cause-effect relationship, Senator Neuberger's efforts neared realization. On June 17, 1965, the Senate passed a bill requiring a warning on cigarette packages. Senator Neuberger remembers with acerbic amusement the long arguments in committee. There were bitter fights over the wording of the warning. "May" or "will" was settled as "Caution: Cigarette Smoking May Be Hazardous to Your Health."

In all other respects as well, the bill as finally submitted to Congress was weaker than Senator Neuberger and her backers, Senators Robert Kennedy and Joseph P. Clark (D.-Pa.), desired. They wanted to require warnings in advertisements on television and in magazines. They also wanted to require cigarette packages to indicate the tar and nicotine contents. Senator Neuberger authored an amendment to the bill which stipulated that one year after it went into effect advertising must include warnings, but the amendment was defeated by a large vote.

Just before voting on the bill proper began, Senators Kennedy and Clark told Senator Neuberger that they would vote against it since it was only a skeleton of the legislation they thought necessary. Although she approved their stand, she voted for the bill. She wanted to support it, she said later, "because it was the first time the great government of the United States was going to recognize that smoking is bad for you."

Today Senator Neuberger is just as adamant against smoking. Her ostensible stand is that only advertising, not cigarettes themselves, should not be banned. But she says about smokers, "I've had lots of people light up in front of me and then remember. 'Oh, you're . . .' they say. But I don't mind. I tell them, 'I don't mind. It's only yourself you're hurting.' Cancer is a terrible thing. You don't die just like that. It's death by inches—a long, lingering, painful, expensive death."

Her feelings about tobacco extend to an aversion for all drugs or narcotics, including alcohol. Senator Neuberger says she is following the marijuana legality proceedings with great interest but cannot yet make up her mind on the pros and cons of marijuana. "I just don't know enough about it," she says. "This summer I was on a BBC show in London. They called it *canabis* for the first ten minutes and I didn't know what they were talking about.

"It seems to be in a gray area whether it's habit-forming or addictive. Marijuana may not be addictive, but it has a soporific effect, like any drug. When you're on it, you get up in the morning, go to work, sit around, all in a haze. My inclination is to be against it."

In October, 1965 Senator Neuberger announced that she would not seek re-election. She gave as her primary reason the high cost of political campaigning. In a speech before the Women's National Press Club she decried campaign procedures, saying "this is not morality in government." She said it was demeaning to candidates to have to raise enough money to wage an effective campaign. "He who pays the piper can never find the tune. The person who gave you a thousand dollars can never find the door of your office closed to him and he knows that as well as you do." She argued that expense is one of the great deterrents to women in politics and deplored the fact that her departure from the Senate would leave only one woman. . . .

Senator Neuberger felt her constituents' displeasure at another point in her Congressional career. That was over her silence on the Vietnam war. But, she says now, "I wanted to be responsible, not just stand on the sidewalk and shout. "How could I tell General Westmoreland what to do?" Besides, she added, her Oregon colleague Wayne Morse was exceptionally voluble in his opposition to the administration's stand.

She decided to wait and watch, "knowing that President Johnson wasn't a tyrant, that he of all was most affected by the outcome of the war—in his future, his prestige—and that he was undoubtedly patriotic." But as she talked to military and civilian experts on the war, she hardened her position enough to join 14 other Senators in signing a letter to Johnson urging an indefinite extension of the bombing pause going on in January, 1966.

Today she says, "By now it's been proved that our approach has been a failure. I don't think we should keep repeating our mistakes. We have to admit that this little country has stalemated us in spite of all our men and materials. We ought to get out." While she sees Communism as a poor alternative to republican government, she thinks it preferable to continued bloodshed. "Every time I see pictures of Vietnamese civilians once more picking up their belongings to move from the fighting once more I think maybe they'd be better off under a Communist rule. . . . There are already millions of people living under Communism."

Her opinion of Johnson has also changed. "I think he's bullheaded about his position." She feels that he is too much under the influence of the military, an attitude she says is partly explicable by the glorification of the military that is part of American history. Senator Neuberger mentions the romantic image of West Point, the glamor of the Navy, and the pride of the military tradition. It is easy for a President to listen to the Pentagon experts, she says, "President Kennedy, for example, was in office only four days when the Cuba crisis broke, had no one but the military to listen to. They were wrong, but he never blamed them."

She is acutely aware of the influence of politics on policy decisions.

Partly because of such political motives there must be a change in the administration's policy before the next election, she predicted—a prediction that seems at least partly confirmed in President Johnson's speech last Friday night, evincing the administration's softest line to date. For political, humane, economic and diplomatic considerations there must be a change in the war before the Democratic convention," Senator Neuberger has said. "If not, LBJ can pack up his ten-gallon hat and go home."

TAX CREDIT FOR COLLEGE TUITION

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, in a time when much has been said about the gradually rising costs of living, comparatively little mention has been made of the skyrocketing costs of higher education. A distinguished educator, Dr. Elvis J. Stahr, president of Indiana University, warns of the danger of pricing higher education out of the reach of many deserving young men and women.

I have introduced a bill in the Senate to allow taxpayers who are supporting students in college to claim additional exemptions or credits on their income tax. It is particularly welcome at this time to read an editorial published in the Indianapolis Star supporting the view of President Stahr and pointing out the advantages of a tax exemption or credit.

Because of the special need of continuing low-cost university education in our increasingly technological society, I ask unanimous consent that the Star's editorial of October 3 be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CRISIS ON CAMPUS

Dr. Elvis J. Stahr, president of Indiana University, in an article under the above caption in the September issue of the I.U. Alumni magazine, says there is danger of pricing higher education out of the reach of many deserving young Indiana men and women.

Dr. Stahr says that student charges, primarily tuition, have increased 80 per cent nation-wide in the last decade, while the cost of living has risen 17 per cent.

The average student at I.U. now must spend nearly $2,000 per nine-month year for tuition, fees, books, board and room and incidentals, Dr. Stahr says. The median 12-month income for all families in Indiana in 1966 was $9,155, meaning half of all families were below that level.

This leads to his big question: "Is it reasonable to expect that a family with even the median income can spend nearly $2,000 of it for the education of just one child?" He adds, "Obviously, even supposedly 'low cost' public higher education is becoming too heavy a burden for many Hoosier families."

There are, of course, many aid programs for worthy students, as well as the traditional business of working one's way through. But Dr. Stahr points out that in 1966–67 only 15 per cent of all I.U. full-time students received scholarships or grants. The average amount of such assistance was $396, less than 20 per cent of the cost for the academic year.

It is possible for a student to borrow money to help pay his college costs. These loans place a future burden on the student, Dr. Stahr reminds. As for "working your way through," it is becoming more difficult. Increasing enrollments have not proportionately increased the number of student jobs available.

Dr. Stahr asks, "How can we calculate the cost to the nation in services not rendered, goods not produced, commodities not purchased, taxes not paid by those whose lack of education leaves them unfit for employment in today's technological society? How can we really calculate all the enormous direct and indirect costs of great numbers of unemployables in time of shortages of skills?"

One way to help the situation would be to act favorably on one of the bills in Congress, including one by Indiana Senator Vance Hartke, which would allow taxpayers who are supporting students in college to claim extra exemptions or credits on their income tax.

It has been pointed out that the present $600 exemption is wholly unrealistic for everyone in this inflationary time. It is much more so for the parents who must foot the bills for higher education. They should have tax relief.

Another Federal grant or subsidy program would only place more of a tax burden on the already overburdened back of America's citizens. A realistic tax exemption or credit that recognizes what college costs are could do a far better job with far less bureaucratic interference.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF REPUBLICAN GOVERNORS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, it is a well-known fact that since the Republican sweep in the 1966 elections, 25 of the Nation's 50 States have Republican administrations. Another fact, not realized by many people, is that a majority of the American population lives in these 25 Republican-administered States. Republicans control the governorships of States with over 108 million people, while the Democrats govern in States with a total population of 80 million.

Another fact not generally realized by the average citizen is the tremendous gains made by Republicans in the last elections in the State legislatures and at the local level throughout the land.

Republicans gained 503 seats in State legislatures in the 1966 elections. As a result of 1966 and subsequent by-elections, Republicans control both houses of legislatures in 17 States, and have a majority in one house only in eight other States. This means that Republicans control at least one, if not both, houses in 25 of the 48 States which have partisan legislatures—two States elect State legislators on a nonpartisan basis.

Some other generally unknown facts which deserve attention are the following: In major elected State constitutional offices other than Governor, such as Lieutenant Governor, attorney general, and so forth, Republicans won 69 of 136 contests in 1966, with the Democrats winning 67. This was a net gain of 30 such offices for Republicans.

Republican candidates also received a majority of the national vote for Governor and Senator in 1966.

Republican Governors and local officials have piled up impressive accomplishments and have come forth with fresh and exciting ideas and programs. The voters have responded. In 1968, I believe that response will be nationwide and will herald the beginning of a new era of creativeness in Washington.

The foundations for effective government and workable programs are now being established across the Nation by Republican leaders. Let me cite highlights of the record, based on information received from the Governors' offices or from spokesmen for the Governors.

PENNSYLVANIA

In my own Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Gov. Raymond P. Shafer has continued and embellished upon the great record made by former Gov. William Scranton. Pennsylvania has recently established a department of community affairs—the first in the Nation. Governor's branch offices have been established in areas of unrest to disseminate information to the people who most need to know of the State's various aid and self-help programs.

In response to the recent urban riots, when there was little leadership from Washington, Governor Shafer met in New York with a number of other Republican Governors to draw up a plan of action for State leadership to meet the growing problems of social injustice and lawlessness. In addition to Governor Shafer, those participating in the development of this program were Governors Agnew, Maryland; Boe, South Dakota; Cargo, New Mexico; Chafee, Rhode Island; Evans, Washington; Love, Colorado; McCall, Oregon; Rockefeller, New York; Romney, Michigan; and Volpe, Massachusetts. This remarkable 60-point document includes plans for State action to transform the physical environment of slum areas, to increase job opportunities, to improve educational opportunities, to improve services to individuals, to bring about flexibility, speed, and realism in Federal programs, and to encourage individual citizen and private institutional participation.

Here is a creative blueprint for action drawn by men who are close to the problems and share the greatest responsibilities.

Governor Shafer's administration has initiated a State model cities program, without waiting longer for the Federal Government to act, to bring immediate aid to those communities which want to act now to solve the problems which plague them. Again, the first in the Nation.

Other new programs include a comprehensive mass transportation program and establishment of a department of transportation, a beefed-up urban renewal program, with the State's participation increased from $10 to $14.5 million, and a $500 million land and water conservation program.

MARYLAND

In neighboring Maryland, Gov. Spiro T. Agnew has undertaken vigorous action to deal with urban problems. Baltimore, the State's major population center, was a chief beneficiary of a fiscal reform program enacted by the legislature under administration sponsorship, which included special grants for urban schools and, for the first time, State aid for police protection. Governor Agnew has also inaugurated a crash jobs program to provide additional employment and relief of racial tensions, and is planning air and water pollution control programs which will be the largest such effort ever undertaken in Maryland.

NEW YORK

The accomplishments of Nelson Rockefeller, the senior Republican Governor, hardly need reciting. They are recognized by all. Now in its third term, the Rockefeller administration has most recently inaugurated several highly significant programs to ease hard-pressed urban areas.

A nonprofit urban development corporation, to mobilize private capital and expertise in rebuilding blighted city core areas, has been proposed. It would be empowered to draw on the combined talent and resources of the State and the private sector to initiate development and redevelopment projects, to a degree not now possible, in furtherance of State and local objectives for the renewal and healthy growth of metropolitan areas. The Rockefeller administration has also taken the lead in expansion of job and promotion opportunities and extension of manpower development programs.

RHODE ISLAND

In Rhode Island, the administration of Gov. John Chafee has made statewide planning an important part of its successful operation. A planning program, involving the heads of major State departments, local governmental leaders, and private citizens has been established, with the purpose of preparing a comprehensive and long-range guide for the orderly development of the State. Under study are population growth, industrial development, and tourist potential. The information will be used to decide highway routes, recreation areas, and other State participation programs. There is also a statewide green-acres program to preserve remaining open land and a new water resources board with broad powers to formulate long-range plans and programs for the development of water sources and transmission of water supplies. This type of planning is extremely useful in such a densely populated area.

MASSACHUSETTS

Massachusetts is one of many States where bankrupt, debt-ridden treasuries have been rescued by Republicans with no loss in services and benefits to the citizens. The record of Gov. John Volpe has been one of expanded service to the people coupled with budgetary surpluses, a phenomenon in our times. The Governor is behind a reorganization of the entire welfare structure in his Commonwealth, which will upgrade the efficiency of welfare administration. All of his programs and plans are backed up with adequate funding. Governor Volpe overcame substantial opposition to the institution of a 3-percent limited sales tax, the entire proceeds of which are returned to the cities and towns. These funds are distributed through a highly progressive formula according to taxable property per school child. The result is a channeling of a larger proportion of funds to those communities with the greatest need. This Governor's desire to provide a solution to his State's problems is matched only by his unflagging insistence upon fiscal responsibility.

FLORIDA

Claude R. Kirk, Jr., is Florida's first Republican Governor in nearly a century. He has tackled the mobsters with his war on crime—and Florida's crime rate for the first time is falling. He has held the line on taxes and yet produced, through economy measures, additional millions for spending—including the biggest pay raise ever received by Florida teachers.

He confronted Rap Brown at a hate rally in Jacksonville and turned the all-Negro audience against the rabble-rousing Rap, who immediately left town.

He has flair that is capturing the imagination of Americans who have never even been to Florida.

He is a "take charge" Republican who can solve problems, but would rather head off the problems before they even crop up.

OHIO

Gov. James A. Rhodes took office in 1963, inheriting an $83 million deficit, a lethargic economy, and an unemployment rate exceeding 5 percent. Reflecting Republican philosophy that government can be efficient and economical, he eliminated the deficit in his first 2 years of office, trimmed costs of State government and planted the seeds for unprecedented industrial-growth. Rhodes' programs have created over 502,000 new jobs and attracted a total $5.5 billion in new manufacturing plants and equipment to Ohio. By establishing a system of State university branches and community colleges, Governor Rhodes put higher education facilities within 25 miles of every young person in his State. Ohio will be the first to complete its share of the Interstate Highway System.

MICHIGAN

Michigan is another State where debts have been turned into surpluses. Under the able and talented leadership of Gov. George Romney, Michigan is moving ahead on every front. Production is up and unemployment down. Under Governor Romney's leadership, Michigan now has a new State constitution, and the only constitutionally established civil rights commission. Aid to education and mental health have been greatly increased. A State income tax introduced this year will help provide increased benefits for the citizens. Modernization has increased efficiency. The executive branch has been reduced from 140 autonomous agencies to 19 principal departments. George Romney has clearly demonstrated his abilities as an administrator and shown the kind of leadership qualities which appeal to a wide spectrum of public opinion.

WISCONSIN

During his second term, Gov. Warren Knowles has proposed a department of local affairs and development to coordinate State, local, and Federal efforts in urban affairs, and introduced a far-reaching package of civil rights legislation. To bring greater efficiency to government, he initiated a massive governmental reorganization program which reduced State departments and agencies from 85 to 27. Under his leadership, some of the most significant education legislation in a century was passed, including two new State universities, expanded vocational education programs, and additional financial assistance for students. Under Governor Knowles, the first comprehensive traffic safety program in his State's recent history was developed. Continuing progress in Wisconsin reflects the policy making wisdom of its Governor.

MINNESOTA

Since he took office this year, Gov. Harold E. LeVander has already made notable contributions in various areas throughout Minnesota. He has created a unique metropolitan council to coordinate planning and development of the Minneapolis-St. Paul area, which contains more than 300 separate local governmental units. Through his efforts, the newly created State department of human rights has been instrumental in the strengthening of fair housing laws. Pollution and mass transportation are two other problems which are high on the list of priorities of this extremely able and effective Governor.

ARKANSAS

Winthrop Rockefeller, the first Republican Governor of Arkansas in 96 years, won the election on a reform platform which includes insurance regulations, law enforcement, government reorganization, and prison reform. Republican leadership is bringing Arkansas into the 20th century.

For the first time in Arkansas history, illegal gambling has been stopped. The present constitution, which was adopted in 1874, is now being rewritten by a constitution revision study commission. Governor Rockefeller established the office of State administration to streamline the government, which had grown to 184 agencies, and make it operate efficiently.

OKLAHOMA

The administration of Gov. Dewey F. Bartlett has concentrated 70 percent of recent budget increase on education. Reorganization of the penal system and judicial system has been accomplished. The Governor's management study commission has been created to bring greater efficiency to State government. A master plan for vocational-technical education has been developed and a full employment commission created to find jobs for unemployed minorities. Unemployment benefits have increased, and a truth-in-lending bill was passed. An impressive record for a first-term Governor.

NEBRASKA

Gov. Norbert Tiemann of Nebraska brought about important legislation which returned State tax revenues to municipal and county governments on a large-scale basis, which is beneficial to the people of his largely rural State. He requested and secured education legislation which provides incentive payments for summer schools, and special programs to help culturally and educationally deprived children as well as gifted children. He secured the passage of a minimum wage law and saw the establishment of a division of urban affairs within the State's new department of economic development.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Nils A. Boe, now in his second term of Governor of South Dakota, is steadily achieving the goals he set forth in his first inaugural address in 1965. He has firmly guided the State to a healthier agricultural economy, increased aid to education at every level, increased aid for welfare and mental health, and has pushed forward with an expanded highway program. While accomplishing this, his sound fiscal policies permitted a tax saving which was rebated in cash payments directly to South Dakota taxpayers. With taxes rising throughout the Nation, South Dakota, under Nils Boe, is another Republican State where progress is made while government operates within its budget. His record is, indeed, unique.

MONTANA

Gov. Tim Babcock was reelected in 1964 by an easy majority and continues in his second term backed by a record of sound fiscal policies. His attempts to initiate a needed sales tax have been rebuffed by the Democratic State legislature. He has been successful in pushing a strong workable air pollution control plan through the reluctant legislature.

WYOMING

Governor Hathaway is attracting industry to his State through the Wyoming Industrial Development Corporation which is now a working reality in that State. Some 150 of the Nation's leading businessmen conferred with the Governor at his request early in August. Through that meeting, the Wyoming Industrial Development Corporation gained pledges of about $1 million to capitalize the corporation.

COLORADO

Colorado's Republican Governor has been endorsed by the resident "hippie" populace as their favorite prospect for President because of the image projected in his name. Gov. John Love, however, has much more than a name to fall back on when recognition is given for achievements under Republican leadership. He is currently president of the Republican Governors' Association.

Now in his second term as Governor of Colorado, he has led successful drives to improve the stature of Colorado's educational institutions. His first term of office brought a 51-percent increase in State support to local and public schools, and for the first time in Colorado's history, full implementation of the Public School Foundation Act. Higher education benefited by a 45.5 percent increase in State support to colleges and universities, along with capital construction funds allocated for the first time to junior colleges.

Governor Love has headed the "sell-Colorado" delegations promoting industrial expansion and relocation in Colorado. These efforts have led to major expansions in businesses, as well as new lows in unemployment. In the campaign against crime in Colorado, Governor Love was instrumental in winning the legislature's support for forming the Colorado Bureau of Investigation this year to coordinate criminal investigation throughout the State. One of the most striking examples of new ideas and concepts being implemented was the signing into law of the Nation's first liberalized abortion law last April. Governor Love, despite heavy opposition, wielded his pen, leading the way for breaking down barriers formerly insurmountable across the Nation.

NEW MEXICO

Since the beginning of the year, Gov. David Cargo already has deactivated close to 50 of the 214 cumbersome and archaic boards and commissions in his State. He formed a department of transportation, which previously was a duplication of five State agencies. He has established a council to handle the important subject of tourism, which previously had been a political football. With a Democratic-controlled legislature pushing for a budget of well over $200 million, he has held the line at $186 million.

ARIZONA

Gov. Jack Williams who has been at the helm of Arizona government for little more than 8 months has signed some 134 bills into law. Following former Gov. Paul J. Fannin, who is now a U.S. Senator, as the fifth Republican Governor in the history of the State, Governor Williams continues in the Republican tradition to fight crime and corruption through government reform. The Williams administration reorganized the State liquor department and State fair commission, established tougher penalties for bribery and corruption of public employees and legislators, and transferred powers of investigation of fraud, and enforcement of narcotics laws, from the liquor department to the office of attorney general.

CALIFORNIA

In one of the Nation's largest and fastest-growing States, Gov. Ronald Reagan has done a highly competent job coping with the problems inherited from the previous administration. He has cut spending, reduced the number of State employees, and insisted on responsible fiscal policies. He was faced with a gap of $500 million between expenditures and income, more than $4 billion in outstanding bonds, and a $386 million cash deficiency in the State general fund. Since taking office, Governor Reagan has cut $100 million in departmental spending from the proposed budget left by the outgoing administration and reduced their projected budgetary increases by 50 percent. He has raised taxes and balanced the budget.

NEVADA

Gov. Paul Laxalt has made significant improvement in regaining State control over legalized gambling in Nevada. He has been extremely successful in formulating an industrial development procurement plan to attract new industry to the State. Under his administration, Nevada's first air-pollution law was passed. He has called a special session of the legislature to deal with the problem of pollution in Lake Tahoe, the State's major body of water. In conjunction with the private sector, he has established special summer camp programs, which last summer served 450 children.

IDAHO

Executive branch reorganization has been the key to Gov. Donald W. Samuelson's administration. The State departments of finance and insurance have been strengthened and improved. New programed budgeting has been instituted by a professionalized budget staff. Substantial progress has been made in reorganization of the State prison system and improving State traffic safety programs. Governor Samuelson has stressed improved Federal-State coordination and intergovernmental relations.

OREGON

Since taking office in January 1967, Gov. Tom McCall has personally met with over 35,000 citizens in his office during his daily public open house. He has taken his administration to the people through a series of townhall meetings to hear firsthand the local problems and needs of the community. He reports to the people weekly over 32 radio stations and once a month over TV. This brings government where it belongs, to the people. Governor McCall has successfully filled the office vacated by his able predecessor, Senator MARK HATFIELD.

WASHINGTON

Through his State planning and community affairs agency, Gov. Daniel J. Evans maintains direct contact with the local community governments. He has secured a $25 million appropriation for direct aid to the communities to help them deal with their individual problems. He has obtained passage of a Department of Air Resources Pollution Act, which is a model for the Nation, and has significantly strengthened the State Water Pollution Act. He has also made tremendous strides in conservation and highway safety. Daniel Evans took over the Governor's seat in a State which was $32 million in the red. Today, the State of Washington is experiencing the greatest boom in its history, and has an economic surplus of $115 million—further proof that responsible government is possible.

ALASKA

Gov. Walter J. Hickel is pioneering in his State of Alaska and has given highest priority to the establishment of a railroad from Fairbanks to Nome, to open that highly mineralized area. Recalling that in addition to opening the West, the continental railroad of the United States benefited every area along its route, Governor Hickel tagged the Alaska railroad as the major long-range goal of his administration. The pioneer spirit to get things done, which still exists in the 49th State, is what gained victory for Governor Hickel. That same spirit is infusing Republicans in every other part of the country. There is still a wilderness to be conquered—a wilderness of redtape, bureaucracy, disinterest, and ineffectiveness which prevents government from operating at its peak efficiency for the benefit of all the people. Republicans, axes burnished, intend to continue hacking through that wilderness in 1968.

A SHORT-TERM TAX BREAK WILL MORE THAN BE RECOUPED

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, tax legislation has recently been introduced, and designated as S. 2262, which for the next 2 years would enable certain domestic corporations to make more effective use of net operating losses.

This legislation, which has also been introduced in the House as H.R. 12218, would directly benefit American Motors Corp., which has suffered heavy operating losses for the past 2 years.

Although American Motors is a small corporation in the context of the automotive industry, it is a corporation of very substantial size in terms of American industry in general. As an employer, manufacturer, and taxpayer, it makes a significant contribution to the economy.

American Motors is particularly significant in terms of business done in the State of Indiana. In addition to the sales and services provided by American Motors dealers in Indiana, sales made to American Motors by Indiana manufacturers and suppliers was substantially in excess of $100,000,000 in the corporation's 1966 fiscal year. Among the major Indiana plants doing substantial business with American Motors are the Warner Gear Division of Borg-Warner at Muncie, the Budd Co. plant at Gary, the Great Lakes Steel plant at Portage, and the Bendix Corp. plant at South Bend.

Mr. President, American Motors is the last independent domestic producer of significant size left in the passenger automobile field. Because of operational losses during the past 2 years, it has had to incur substantial amounts of short-term debt and it has recently been suffering under a shortage of working capital.

However, its future prospects are excellent if it can now secure, through a quick tax refund, speedy relief necessary to continue full-scale competitive operations.

The company has just completed an extensive plant modernization program. It has a large and valuable dealer organization. Moreover, the present management of American Motors, which has been in office only since the first of the year, has attracted widespread favorable notice in its moves to improve the company's position. As part of this policy, American Motors is concentrating its efforts on the type of product which the American automotive industry, in general, is not emphasizing—good, inexpensive smaller cars.

The success of this policy is indicated by the fact that sales of the company's low-priced "American" line have increased substantially, following price cuts made earlier this year. The company's new model—the Javelin—has been well received by the automotive press.

If the proposed legislation is adopted, American Motors would receive speedy relief by way of an income tax refund, with which it should be able to recapture a larger share of the passenger automobile market and to function as a meaningful fourth competitor in the automotive industry.

The proposed legislation will provide that net operating losses could be carried back and applied against income of each of the 5 preceding taxable years, then carried forward and applied against the income of the three succeeding taxable years, in place of the present 3-year carryback and 5-year carryforward now in effect. However, the total carryover period will continue to be 8 years.

This legislation would apply only to corporations which cannot absorb their losses in the present 3-year carryback period and would otherwise have to wait for relief until they could carry such losses forward to future income years. Qualifying corporations must also have made very very substantial investments in plant and equipment in the past 5 taxable years and must be engaged primarily in a business in which 85 percent of all of total domestic production is provided by three or fewer competitors.

Mr. President, I would like to emphasize that the cost of the tax refund which this legislation will give to American Motors will be far outweighed by the contributions in the form of tax revenues, jobs and less direct benefits that will be produced by such relief.

During the past 5 years, the operations of American Motors have generated Federal, State, and local tax payments from the corporation, its employees, dealers, subcontractors and suppliers which have been estimated to average $295 million a year.

Additionally, because American Motors has no foreign plants, and consequently exports all of its products sold abroad, it has contributed more than $150 million to a favorable national balance of trade during the past 5 years.

It has also been estimated that the company's operations, over the same 5-year period, have resulted in an estimated annual average of $1.4 billion in retail sales, $784 million in total payrolls and related employee benefits and 100,000 jobs.

During its last fiscal year alone, American Motors paid approximately $230 million in wages, salaries, and related benefits to its own employees.

The value of these contributions greatly exceeds the revenue loss involved in the refunds which the proposed legislation would give to American Motors.

If this corporation should now, by unfortunate circumstance, be forced to reduce substantially the scope of its operations, significant economic dislocations will follow inevitably in localities heavily dependent on American Motors business. Those of us from Indiana remember too well the economic problems which followed the closing of the Studebaker factory at South Bend to want to go through a similar experience.

Mr. President, in order to avoid this result and to assist an enterprise that is a valuable source of jobs and tax revenues, I am supporting this legislation. No one who is interested in a healthy economy and in promoting maximum employment should oppose it.

WILDERNESS SOCIETY OF AMERICA CITES JUSTICE DOUGLAS ON BIG THICKET OF TEXAS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the latest, spring-summer 1967, edition of the Living Wilderness, a magazine published by the Wilderness Society of America, contains an excellent review of the recent book entitled "A Farewell to Texas," by Justice William O. Douglas. Written by Peter A. Gunter, of the University of Tennessee Philosophy Department, the review not only provides a good survey of the book itself, but also approaches knowledgeably and feelingly the plea that the book embodies, a plea for the saving of the vanishing wilderness of Texas.

With the feeling of a true devotee of the great American wilderness, Mr. Gunter makes the contention about the precious Big Thicket area:

> Immediate action is necessary if the Big Thicket, with its incredible variety of plants and animals, is not to become a mere memory.

I commend both the author and the magazine, the Living Wilderness, on a fine review and on this interest in the Big Thicket and other areas of Texas. The passage of S. 4, the bill to create a Big Thicket National Park, becomes every day more urgent, and this support of conservationists everywhere is appreciated.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Gunter's review of "Farewell to Texas," published in the "Among the Books" column of the Living Wilderness, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the review was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMONG THE BOOKS

FAREWELL TO TEXAS

Farewell to Texas: A vanishing Wilderness. By William O. Douglas. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company. 1967. (First volume of the American Wilderness series of which Justice Douglas is General Editor) xiv+242 pp. (9¼×6¼ in.) including full color frontispiece, 1 double page map, 30 pen-and-ink sketches, 2 halftones, Appendix (List of Ferns and Fern Allies Found in the Big Thicket and in Northeast Texas, prepared for the author by Dr. Donovan S. Correll), index. $6.95.

(Reviewed by Pete A. Gunter)

Farewell to Texas is Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas' plea for the preservation of Texas' vanishing wilderness areas. Douglas' plea, however, is haunted by a lament, for the forces in Texas opposed to the conservation of natural beauty are powerful and deeply entrenched, while time is running out on the public.

With a rhetoric which is apt to become heavy-handed, Douglas compares the despoilers of wilderness areas to the Ahab of the Old Testament who wished to take away from Naboth the Jezreelite the vineyard which had been given him as an inheritance. The Ahabs of Texas are public utilities, who lay pipelines through wilderness, stockmen, who overgraze their land. Federal agencies, which build needless dams, as well as lumber barons, oil companies, poachers and vandals.

Douglas finds Ahabs destructively at work in three widely separated areas of the Lone Star State: the Big Thicket, the Trans-Pecos region, and the hill country of President Johnson. These three regions by no means constitute an exhaustive survey of Texas wilderness. They are, however, broadly and effectively representative of what Texans must labor to protect, if their State is to retain even fragments of its precious natural heritage.

The Big Thicket, a dense forest in southeast Texas, originally contained more than three million acres. Today it is reduced to three hundred thousand acres, and though Senator Yarborough has introduced a bill to make the area into a national park, by the time the bill has a chance of passing the Big Thicket will have been whittled down to one hundred and forty thousand acres:

> Land that in 1960 sold for $50 an acre [is] selling for $300 in 1966. Big development programs, in the form of subdivisions

composed of small lots, are spreading everywhere. They and the ruthless cutting programs of lumber companies are appropriating the modern Naboth's Vineyard to an end that these wondrous pieces of God's creation do not deserve.

Douglas insists that if remaining Thicket lands come into the hands of lumber companies, not only will the woods be cut down, but thousands of birds will die when woods are sprayed to kill hardwoods and make room for pines. Immediate action is necessary if the Big Thicket, with its incredible variety of plants and animals, is not to become a mere memory.

The West Texas Trans-Pecos region is dry, rocky, marginal. Yet, as Justice Douglas demonstrates, it contains much that is beautiful and unique. It may interest some readers to discover that the Big Bend National Park (established 1944) was made possible through land misuse. Area ranchers had so depleted the countryside through overgrazing that most were going bankrupt and had to be "bailed out." Happily, land owners were glad to find any prospective buyer, even the Federal Government, which in Texas is sometimes rumored to be a Communist organization. Douglas chronicles the history, geography, flora and fauna of the Big Bend, concluding with an eloquent description of a raft trip down the rugged canyons of the Rio Grande.

The Davis Mountains, with their widely varied plant and animal life and their long history as an American military outpost, rise abruptly out of a desert environment. Better-watered, less forbidding than the Rio Grande country to the south, they are nonetheless now undergoing the same mistreatment which once dessicated the Big Bend. Douglas, amid climbs to the highest mountain peaks, speculates that someday this area may become so mutilated that many of its ranchers will also have to be bailed out. Not until then will the Davis Mountains be put to "the highest use, which is recreation."

The Davis Mountains are so formidable a natural feature that no account of Texas' wilderness areas could fail to consider them. Tucked away in an inconspicuous corner of the desert, however, Capote Falls might pass entirely unnoticed were it not for books like *Farewell to Texas*. Douglas' description of the falls, with its secluded canyon, its beautiful plant life and its two-hundred foot cliffs, is memorable, as well as timely, for a new Federal highway will soon put the once-isolated falls in the public domain:

> It should become an urgent Federal project. . . . The combinations of the Painted Desert, the creek, the falls, the *ciénega*, the escarpment, and the rolling top country will make it one of the most powerful magnets in the Southwest.

Douglas' enthusiasm is, however, tempered with sadness, for drought and livestock mismanagement have already combined to diminish the lush upland marshes which nourish the falls.

The Guadalupes are a rugged mountain chain stretching northward from Texas into New Mexico. Their southernmost range culminates in El Capitan mountain, the highest peak in Texas. The flanks of El Capitan are cut by deep canyons, two of which, North and South McKittrick Canyons, Douglas describes at length, dwelling on their floral ecology and their scenic grandeur. Though El Capitan and its wild canyons have recently been transformed into a national park, this in itself is no guarantee that they will not be abused. The National Park Service, rather than protecting remote areas, today has a policy of invading and "developing" them. Thus a whole city has sprung up in Yellowstone, the Smokies are to be laced by still another highway, and in Rocky Mountain National Park unique areas of tundra vegetation have been trampled out of existence. Conservationists will have to struggle to save Guadalupe National Park from a similar fate.

Midway between the western deserts and the lush Big Thicket lies the central Texas hill country, famous as the home of President Lyndon Johnson. The hill country should be utilized for camping and hiking. Deep limestone springs water its many clear, tree-bordered rivers, while its ridges afford beautiful views and respite from the summer heat. Douglas suggests that the area should be utilized for camping and hiking:

> I see in my mind's eye a trail system of several hundred miles with spurs down lateral ridges. I see this trail system linking up with trails along some of the rivers.

Engaging as this prospect may seem, Douglas is the only person who, to my knowledge, has envisioned it. There are few trails in Texas today, and the hill country's springs and rivers are menaced by those who would tap its underground waters and transport them miles away.

Though explorations over a period of six years went into its preparation, *Farewell to Texas* has the appearance of a hurriedly written book. Its descriptive passages often seem to consist of series of jotted notes, while its repetitions are too numerous to be overlooked. Thus it is asserted at least twice that Texas has more species of cactus than Arizona, that mule deer dress out at two hundred pounds, that Texas State parks are known largely for their dance facilities, that there are hot springs along the Rio Grande, etc.

Nonetheless, these faults should not blind the reader to the value of Justice Douglas' book. No one else has taken pains to examine Texas' wilderness areas with an eye towards their conservation. Few others have explained, clearly and unmistakably, the urgency of the task. In this respect, *Farewell to Texas* is an effective and important book, for which all those interested in the cause of conservation should be grateful.

SUPPORT FOR CREATION OF SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON TECHNOLOGY AND THE HUMAN ENVIRONMENT: SENATE RESOLUTION 68

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, in early August, the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie] and I informed a number of the country's leading scientists about Senate Resolution 68, "to establish a Select Senate Committee on Technology and the Human Environment."

On August 28 I placed in the Record, at page 24312, several of the replies we received.

We now have received more than 100 responses to our joint letter, and I am happy to say that not one disapproves of, or even seriously questions, the purposes of the resolution.

In fact, it is fair to say that most, if not all, of the scientists with whom we have corresponded are enthusiastically in favor of creating a committee which would provide a forum where scientists and legislators can face each other and discuss the critical environmental problems ahead and what science and technology can do to solve them. Our correspondents, almost to a man, see an information gap between the legislators and the scientists and also see Senate Resolution 68 as an important and practical means of narrowing the gap.

Because the letters which have arrived since August 28 are as useful and thoughtful as the first group which I placed in the Record, and because I think the passage of the proposed legislation is so crucial, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining responses which Senator Muskie and I have received be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Graduate College,
University of Illinois,
September 16, 1967.

Senator Edmund S. Muskie,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Muskie: I am most happy to respond to your appeal regarding Senate Resolution 68 "To Establish a Select Senate Committee on Technology and the Human Environment."

Such a Select Committee, it seems to me, could contribute greatly at this stage of America's development. As the full import of science and technology becomes more realized and as the advances of science and technology become even more rapid, it is essential that knowledgeable individuals anticipate problems and, insofar, as possible, have solutions available. Certainly, every man's identity must somehow be assured and safeguarded, lest man succumb as a victim to his own creations.

It might also be suggested that deliberations on technology and the human environment include experts from the non-science community. Legal and evaluative implications, for example, are already inherent in much of the recent scientific and technological advances, and such implications will undoubtedly match the growing complexities and subtleties of the new discoveries and inventions.

As you may know, the University of Illinois has given some attention to these profound problems through our inter-disciplinary Center for Human Ecology and our Water Resources Center. I am asking Professor Frederick Sargent II and Professor Ben B. Ewing, directors of the above Centers, to submit ideas they may have concerning your proposal.

In closing, let me reiterate my hope that such a Select Committee would have a profound and beneficial effect on the future of the nation. I thank you personally for soliciting my views and if I can be of any assistance in thefuture, please do not hesitate to call upon me.

Sincerely yours,

Daniel Alpert,
Dean.

The Institute for Cancer Research,
Philadelphia, Pa., August 24, 1967.

Re S. Res. 68 To establish a Select Senate Committee on Technology and the Human Environment

Hon. Howard H. Baker, Jr.,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: I am grateful to you for letting me know of the purposes and status of Senate Resolution 68.

This seems to be an admirable effort to look ahead and plan for man's future. Our world is being changed by technology at a rate that is much more rapid than the rates of evolutionary processes. Evolution has required millions of years to produce human beings that can actively hunt, fish, fight, and farm with the aid of a few simple tools of their invention. Now suddenly in the last fifty years man's discoveries in science have led to a technology that is drastically changing his environment and mode of life. Our genes cannot adapt to such rapid changes. We shall instead have to modify our new technologies to make them compatible with our nature. This will require just the kind of study and planning proposed for the Select Committee on Senate Resolution 68. I would therefore like to go on record as supporting it.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS F. ANDERSON,
Senior Member, The Institute for Cancer Research, Professor of Biophysics, The University of Pennsylvania.

DEPARTMENT OF AERONAUTICS AND ASTRONAUTICS, STANFORD UNIVERSITY,
Stanford, Calif., August 22, 1967.

Mr. EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
U.S. Senate,
Committee on Government Operations,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MUSKIE: I have just recently received your letter of August 12, 1967 regarding Senate Resolution 68 "To Establish a Select Senate Committee on Technology and the Human Environment." The Select Committee indeed appears to be an excellent idea for establishing closer relationships between the Senate, and the scientific/technological community in a joint effort to solve critical environmental problems regarding man's future.

I must also add that I, too, feel that a study group of this nature would provide a very useful source of information for all concerned.

Sincerely yours,

HOLT ASHLEY,
Professor, Aeronautics and Astronautics.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, DEPARTMENT OF APPLIED ELECTROPHYSICS,
San Diego, August 22, 1967.

Senators EDMUND S. MUSKIE and HOWARD H. BAKER, Jr.,
Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, Committee on Government Operations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: In reply to your letter of August 12, 1967, I should like to give my strongest support to a proposal to establish a Select Senate Committee on Technology and the Human Environment. I agree that the establishment of such a select committee would make an immeasurable contribution by developing a closer relationship between the Senate and the Scientific and Technological Community in a joint effort to solve critical environmental problems.

Yours sincerely,

HENRY G. BOOKER,
Chairman.

(Signed in Dr. Booker's absence.)

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
MOLECULAR BIOLOGY INSTITUTE,
Los Angeles, August 25, 1967.

Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
Chairman, U.S. Senate Committee on Government Operations, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MUSKIE: I was pleased to learn from your letter of August 12 that progress had been made toward establishment of a Senate Committee on Technology and the Human Environment.

From your letter, it appears that your inquiry may be broad enough to include the impact of developments in modern biology and biochemistry on the future of mankind. Although such developments may be slow in coming, and the next 50 years may see only the true beginnings, we are clearly on the threshold of a biological revolution. As for the impact on man this is likely to have more effect than all the ramifications of the industrial revolution with the culmination in atomic energy and its applications.

I have enclosed with this letter a copy of an article that appeared recently in the Chemical and Engineering News. It indicates in an inadequate way some of the possible relationships of molecular biology to the understanding and control of biological systems.

I would be interested in learning the details as well as the fate of the legislation you propose.

Very truly yours,

P. D. BOYER,
Director, Molecular Biology Institute.

BROOKHAVEN NATIONAL LABORATORY, ASSOCIATED UNIVERSITIES, INC.,
Uptown, N.Y., September 26, 1967.

EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
U.S. Senator,
HOWARD H. BAKER, Jr.,
U.S. Senator, Committee on Government Operations, Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: This is to reply to your letter of August 12, 1967 regarding S. Res. 68 "To Establish a Select Senate Committee on Technology and the Human Environment".

As an institution engaged in fundamental research sponsored by Federal funds, Brookhaven National Laboratory has a special interest in both anticipated environmental problems and the goals to be established for the proposed Select Senate Committee on Technology and the Human Environment. We endorse the mission of the Select Committee and feel that much benefit can be derived from a forum where scientists and legislators would explore critical environmental problems to determine those problems whose solution would be enhanced by the collaborative efforts of the scientific and governmental communities.

If we can provide any information pertinent to S. Res. 68, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

V. P. BOND, M.D.,
Associate Director.

WHITMAN COLLEGE,
Walla Walla, Wash., August 30, 1967.

Re Senate Resolution 68.

Attention: Hon. EDMUND S. MUSKIE, *U.S. Senator,* Hon. HOWARD H. BAKER, Jr., *U.S. Senator,*
U.S. Senate, Committee on Government Operations, Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: Thank you for your letter of August 12 in regard to the proposed Select Committee on Technology and Human Environment. As a result of attending several symposiums on the impact of science and technology on our society, such as the one held last fall at the 75th Anniversary of California Institute of Technology, I have come to certain general conclusions in regard to the proper role of the scientist or engineer. In our society and political system, it is certainly improper for either of them to dictate in any manner the direction that our society should take.

I strongly believe their proper role should be the following one: When political action is necessary for the solution of critical problems in our society and proposals are put forward for the solution of these problems, often the proposal adopted has an *unforeseen impact* on our society. While it may alleviate the immediate problem, it often creates other problems even more serious. The proper procedure for the scientist or engineer would be to consider and study all such proposals and try to predict within the limits of our understanding what the over-all impact of each proposal would be. They might well come up with one or more different proposals, also with predictions as regards their probable consequences. From such studies our society, our voting public, would have, through their elected representatives, a chance to make an informed choice. It is my firm conviction that the professional scientist or engineer should never be in a position of dictating the choice; that the choice should always be made by society through normal political action.

The trouble at present is that often there is only one proposal or if there are alternatives, the choice has to be made without much knowledge or understanding of what the results will be. The role of science is the development of concepts that give us understanding of how things happen. This understanding, where applicable, should be used to suggest other alternatives and to offer informed predictions regarding the over-all effect that adoption of any one might have on our society.

It is also my firm belief that since our concepts are not perfect, the predictions will not always prove accurate and the choices made will not always be the best ones. Nevertheless, I do believe that in the long run our society and political system will make the proper choices. The function of the expert is to provide the information necessary to aid society in making its choice.

Finally, I want to say again that it is up to society, to the body politic, to take the responsibility and make the choice. The role of the expert, the scientist or the engineer should never go beyond that of advice and prediction to the best of his knowledge and ability, and that this point of view is not original with me. Others have expressed similar view points.

Insofar as your proposed Select Committee might accomplish and implement these suggested procedures, I am highly in favor of it.

Sincerely,

WALTER H. BRATTAIN.

SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT CORP.,
Santa Monica, Calif., August 23, 1967.

Hon. EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
Hon. HOWARD H. BAKER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATORS MUSKIE and BAKER: Thank you for your letter of August 12 in which you discuss SR-68 "To Establish a Select Senate Committee on Technology and the Human Environment." It seems to me that the proposal contained in your resolution is most worthwhile, and points to a problem which is becoming more and more acute in American society. Certainly, your effort to establish a dialogue between members of the Senate and scientists and technologists is urgently needed. Not only must this dialogue involve high government officials and legislators, but we also need to extend this exchange of information and the implications of science to the public at large. I was particularly impressed with a short comment in today's paper. Mayor Addonizio of Newark is quoted as saying:

"Affluent Americans are gripped more by the need to buy a vacation home, a sports car for their college-bound son and a second color television set than they are with sharing their affluence with the poor. It is the cruelest of myths . . . that middle-class America has an interest in saving cities."

Unfortunately, I think there is some truth to the Mayor's comments, and it illustrates so well the extent to which technology—which makes possible color television, sports cars, etc.—not only satisfies the materialistic needs of our culture, but shapes the attitudes and value systems of all classes. The poorly understood process by which the opinions, motivations, values, and goals of the American people are shaped by technological developments is a matter needing serious study. Things of a technical nature which we value often carry with them hidden side effects which we either ignore or fail to understand. If the forum you contemplate helps in exploring this problem, it will have served a most useful purpose.

As you probably know, the System Development Corporation is one of the country's largest organizations involved in the design and system analysis aspects of computer applications. Many of us here have tried to assess the long-range impact on society of the computer and information processing technology. We believe that this impact is as yet only dimly understood, but also believe that in the long run it will be one of the major shapers of the human environment. I hope that as a part of the considerations of the Select Committee you will discuss this new information processing technology and how it will be affecting the human environment.

Sincerely yours,

Launor F. Carter,
Senior Vice President.

University of Miami,
August 25, 1967.

Senator Edmund S. Muskie,
Chairman, Subcommittee of Intergovernmental Relations, Committee on Government Operations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Muskie: Your memorandum regarding the favorable reporting of S. Res. 68 from your Subcommittee to the full Committee on Government Operations is appreciated. This Resolution concerns an area in which I have a great interest, and I compliment your efforts to bring a better degree of understanding of the interrelationship of technology and man in his environment to the Senate. Earlier this year I was priviledged to take part in discussions within the Science & Technology Committee of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States regarding the formation of a Joint Committee on Science & Technology of both Houses.

It is becoming apparent the population increases in certain parts of the country are creating incompatibilities with the natural environment. Atmospheric and water pollution are the most obvious manifestations of this situation. Yet to single out any one contributor to the deteriorating progression, no matter how significant its contribution in the negative sense and force cessation, would, in the absence of adequate study and understanding, do violence to the concept of multiple use. This is not to preclude such action when warranted, but the social and economic values must be considered along with the physical and esthetic. Moreover, there is room for invention in this sphere because by definition everything man does pollutes the natural environment. Pollution can have a beneficial effect on the physical environment as well as a detrimental one. The facet of the problem needing understanding and research concerns means for making the waste products of multiple users complimentary to one another and to the general environment. Precedence for this in Nature is everywhere, and man can profit from the example.

The establishment of a Select Senate Committee on Technology and the Human Environment would materially aid in creating the intellectual climate in which matters of this consequence could be discussed. It could quite conceivably stop otherwise precipitous legislative action in this field.

I am enclosing a recent paper on the general subject of expanding man's environmental horizons. It seems to me that the Federal Government will one day have to organize a branch which deals with the total environmental question, whether it be land, sea or space and man's existence in it. Again the Select Committee could provide the forum for discussing the problem.

Sincerely,

John H. Clotworthy,
Chairman, Division of Ocean Engineering.

Department of Bacteriology and Immunology, Harvard Medical School,
Boston, Mass., September 13, 1967.

Mr. Edmund S. Muskie,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Muskie: I am grateful to you for telling me about Senate Resolution 68 to establish a select Senate Committee on Technology and the Human Environment. I believe, as you evidently do too, that such a committee to plan for the future not only in preventing disaster but also perhaps in channeling effort would be very fruitful for the nation.

I earnestly hope that the Senate will establish such a committee and I would be grateful to read the proposal in its present form if copies are available.

Sincerely yours,

Albert H. Coons, M.D.

Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Department of Aeronautics and Astronautics,
Cambridge, Mass., August 29, 1967.

Hon. Edmund Muskie,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Muskie: I was very pleased to receive your letter of August 12, 1967. As a professor at M.I.T. for some thirty years, and an active worker in the pioneering regions of technology, I have long been concerned with the reactions of our race to its environment.

I am enclosing some papers and articles that I have written on the general subject of mankind's interactions with the environment and possible ways of dealing with the situations as they exist now and will develop in the future.

Sincerely yours,

C. S. Draper,
Director.

University of California,
San Diego, August 24, 1967.

Hon. Edmund S. Muskie,
Hon. Howard H. Baker, Jr.,
U.S. Senate,
Committee on Government Operations, Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: Thank you very much for the information about the Select Committee on Technology and the Human Environment. This appears to be a most valuable committee, particularly if it operates as a study group and confers with the knowledgeable members of the scientific and technological community.

As you undoubtedly know, the American Academy of Arts and Sciences has initiated a similar study and issued an interim report in the recent issue of *Daedalus*. This Academy would therefore seem to be a very appropriate channel through which your Committee can establish relationship with the many people who can help it in its work.

Again, thank you very much for informing me of the establishment of this Committee.

Sincerely yours,

Carl Eckart,
Professor of Geophysics.

State University of New York, Upstate Medical Center,
Syracuse, N.Y., August 28, 1967.

Hon. Edmund S. Muskie,
Committee on Government Operations,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Muskie: This is in reply to your letter informing me of the establishment of a "Select Senate Committee on Technology and the Human Environment."

I can conceive of no more noteworthy involvement for the legislative branch of our government. All of us realize that the positive benefits to be derived from the advances in science and technology achieved in the past generation, and which will be expanded even further in the future, call for the deepest and most intensified intellectual efforts of our most capable scientists. These advances perhaps represent the greatest contributions of America to the world in general and thus offer positive improvement in health and standards of living for not only our own citizens but for those who live in other countries as well. The importance of the task which your subcommittee has assumed for itself may well be without parallel as a service for our citizenry.

Sincerely,

Harry A. Feldman, M.D.,
Professor and Chairman.

National Research Council, National Academy of Sciences, National Academy of Engineering,
Washington, D.C., August 23, 1967.

Hon. Howard H. Baker,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: Thank you very much for your letter on S. Res. 68 "To Establish A Select Senate Committee on Technology and the Human Environment". May I assure you of my wholehearted support of your advocacy of the formation of such a Committee, and I agree that it could contribute to the development of a closer relationship between the United States Senate and the scientific and technological community.

There can be no doubt of the timeliness, or even urgency, of undertaking joint efforts in this area. In support of the need thereof, permit me to call your attention to the editorial by Marshall W. Nirenberg, which appeared in the 11 August 1967 issue of Science, page 633.

Finally, may I suggest for your consideration that the Select Senate Committee be established jointly with the National Academy of Sciences.

Respectfully yours,

P. J. Flory.

State University of New York at Buffalo,
August 24, 1967.

Senator Edmund S. Muskie,
U.S. Senate,
Committee on Government Operations,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Muskie: This is in response to your letter of August 12 concerning the establishment of a Select Senate Committee on Technology and the Human Environment. You requested comments.

I feel that this is an excellent development which you and Senator Baker are promoting. Certainly the whole subject of the impact of technology, not only in the United States but throughout the world, is one of the most difficult and important problems which now face us, hence I certainly endorse the idea of the establishment of such a select committee. I feel it is important, however, that false hopes shall not be developed. Although the deliberations of such a committee, if composed of able and responsible participants, will be useful, it should not be anticipated that it will come out with exact and effective solutions. In other words, it would be unfortunate if the general public were led to believe that some magic solutions would be forthcoming.

As you are well aware, the Senate is not alone in surveying the technological landscape and proposing remedies for future unfortunate situations. There is, of course, Congressman Miller's committee on Science and Astronautics. There are the serious committee deliberations of the National Academy of Science and the National Academy of Engineering on national policy for science and technology. There are other groups, such as some foundations that are attempting to advise on policies and programs in the area of the crowded crystal ball of the future. I believe that any device which will lead to the earnest consideration of the best minds available on the present and future problems is very worthwhile, however, I think it is very important that the various groups not work without knowledge of the other's activities or carry out efforts that are at cross purposes. I am merely suggesting that when your select committee is established that a great deal of attention be given to appropriate "coordination," even though that has become a rather tiresome word. The effectiveness of such coordination will depend primarily on the perceptiveness and the quality of the work of the supporting staff of the committee, hence I would suggest that major attention be given to the recruiting of the best possible staff for the committee which I trust will materialize.

Sincerely yours,

C. C. FURNAS,
President Emeritus.

THE CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL MEDICAL CENTER,
September 25, 1967.
Hon. EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MUSKIE: This is in reference to your communication of August 12, 1967 on S. Res. 68.

Although I was not previously aware of the steps that had been taken toward the establishment of a Select Senate Committee on Technology and the Human Environment, I regard the existence of such a permanent body within the Senate as highly desirable, indeed, essential. For it is a moot question in the minds of some of us whether men in their social and political relationships can adjust sanely enough and quickly enough to the chaotic environmental changes being effected by the accelerating rate of scientific and technological development to enable them to survive in a civilized state.

Certainly, however, every attempt should be made to make such adjustments. A Permanent Study Committee within the Congress could, I believe, contribute in a major way toward this goal, if, as proposed it will confine itself in all cases to impartial examination, free discussion and disinterested recommendation for political action when this is clearly indicated. My only reservation in giving complete support to the resolution rises from the fear that it may be difficult or impossible to restrict the activities of the Committee to these functions.

I should appreciate receiving a copy of S. 68 if this is available.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN F. ENDERS,
Ph. D, Chief, Research Division of Infectious Diseases, The Children's Hospital Medical Center, University Professor, Harvard University.

NATIONAL ACCELERATOR LABORATORY,
Oakbrook, Ill., August 24, 1967.
Senators EDMUND S. MUSKIE and HOWARD H. BAKER, Jr.,
Committee on Government Operations, Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATORS MUSKIE AND BAKER: I very much appreciate the information you sent to me with regard to Senate Resolution 68 "to establish a select Senate Committee on Technology and the human environment." I believe that it is of critical importance to improve communications between the scientific and technological sector of our society on the one hand, and the political-economic sector on the other. I have been deeply concerned for many years, now, about what I consider to be a broadening gap in understanding and communication between the scientific community and the rest of our society. Paradoxically this is occurring at a time when the impact of science on all phases of our highly industrialized society is more obvious than ever.

My particular concern tends to focus on the role of fundamental science and on the public understanding of it. As our technology and our industry become more and more sophisticated, the coupling between fundamental science and the development of new technology and the improvement of standard of living becomes more and more obscure. In spite of this fact, it is my conviction that the latter cannot and will not thrive without the continued growth of the roots which are inherent in the former.

It is because of my concern for these matters that I have accepted the position of Chairman of the Division of Physical Sciences of the National Research Council and recently have agreed to serve on the new committee on Physics and Society of the American Institute of Physics. In the deliberations of these groups I am continually impressed by the difficulty of pondering the imponderable. Sooner or later questions surrounding the relationship between government and science tend to focus on dollar costs and dollar values, but what is the dollar value of current research. How much is it worth to know the age of the earth? Although we are everywhere surrounded by the fruits of the science that has been pursued during the past century, the potential product of today's science can never be so clearly identified.

I have often argued that in order to deal with the whole patient instead of with some isolated symptoms, it would be interesting to bring together not only people in science and technology with people bearing the responsibility of government, but also to include in such discussions some professional people from the social sciences, particularly some theoretical economists who may be able to see the apparent problems of the future from a different point of view and to provide a fresh approach to the matters that concern us all in common.

Thank you once again for informing me of the status of your activities in this area. I am very much interested in these matters, and I wish you the very best of luck in obtaining favorable consideration of your resolution.

Sincerely yours,

EDWIN L. GOLDWASSER,
Deputy Director.

AEROSPACE CORP.,
Los Angeles, Calif., August 29, 1967.
Hon. EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Thank you for your recent letter concerning Senate Resolution 68 "To Establish a Select Senate Committee on Technology and the Human Environment."

We, at Aerospace Corporation, working in the very forefront of science and technology related to ballistic missiles and military space programs, are extremely interested in such activities. Any proposal to promote better understanding of the scientific advances and accomplishments, particularly as to their impact on man's future, is significant. Only through such understanding can the expanding technologies be fruitfully employed for the betterment of mankind.

Thank you very much for informing me of the status of the Senate Resolution. I will be most pleased to assist you and your Committee in any way I can.

Sincerely,

IVAN A. GETTING.

HEWLETT-PACKARD CO.,
Palo Alto, Calif., September 20, 1967.
Hon. EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
Hon. HOWARD H. BAKER, Jr.,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: I am sorry to have been so long in answering your letter of August 12th relative to Senate Resolution 68 "To Establish a Select Senate Committee on Technology and the Human Environment."

Unfortunately, I know very little about the practical organization of the Senate, and therefore, the method of operation of the proposed Select Senate Committee on Technology and the Human Environment is not clear.

In view of the increased importance of science and its impact on today's society, such a committee could be in a position to provide a valuable input to the Senate.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM R. HEWLETT.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE,
Arlington, Va., September 22, 1967.
Hon. EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
Chairman of the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MUSKIE: I was pleased to receive your informative memorandum regarding Senate Resolution 68 which seeks to establish a select Senate committee on technology and human environment.

You and members of your subcommittee are to be commended for having taken this action to improve communications between the scientific-technical community and the Senate. Such a forum, where the interchange of ideas and critical analyses of the impact of technology on our society could be developed, will have far reaching implications.

In the conduct of my own responsibilities as Chief of the Kidney Disease Control Program, National Center for Chronic Disease Control, we are coming to grips with just such a technological challenge. The artificial kidney, and programs designed to bring this costly and complex care to the many thousands of citizens of this country who require it each year, is but the first of many similar problems which will result from further development of artificial organs useful in the extension of human life and productivity.

I certainly hope that the Senate will consider this resolution favorably and I, as well as my scientific colleagues, will consider it a very real privilege to be able to participate in any way in the deliberations of this study group.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE E. GOODMAN,
M.D., Chief, Kidney Disease Control Program, National Center for Chronic Disease Control.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY, DIRECTOR OF NAVY LABORATORIES,
Washington, D.C., August 24, 1967.
Hon. EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Operations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MUSKIE: This is to endorse strongly your intention to establish a Select Senate Committee on Technology and Human Environment.

In view of the possible strong effects of developments in science and technology on our society, I believe it is absolutely essential that we explore as fully as we can, in advance, all of the possible ramifications. I am sure your action has been dictated by the numerous problems that have developed from the Atomic Energy programs, stream and river pollution, smog, and strip mining, to name a few.

I wish you well in this endeavor and will help any way you see possible.

Respectfully,

GERALD W. JOHNSON.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS,
DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY,
Estes Park, Colo., August 23, 1967.
Hon. E. S. MUSKIE,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MUSKIE: Thank you for one of the memoranda from yourself and Senator Baker containing the news that S. Res. 68 "To establish a select Senate Committee on Technology and the Human Environment" is now moving toward a very important stage in its Senate consideration.

Although I have seen no draft of the resolution, I am happy to express my enthusiasm for the idea of establishing such a Select Committee. It would provide a mechanism whereby investigators and innovators within the various domains of science and technology might communicate their expertise on matters all too often left only to lobbyists with axes to grind.

The title of the resolution suggests that the emphasis will be on the technologies deriving from the physical sciences. While it is quite true that some of the most important changes in human environment derive from these technologies, the solutions for the problems they raise almost invariably call for the expertise of representatives of the medical, the behavioral, and the social sciences.

While chairing one of the presidential task forces last year, I learned that the advances in agricultural technology have brought the industrial revolution to the farms. As you undoubtedly know, more people have moved from the farms to the cities since the end of World War II than moved from the farms to the cities from the time of the landing of the Pilgrims till the end of World War II. Whereas roughly 90% of our population lived on farms and in towns of less than 2,000 at the turn of this century, only about 10% now live under these conditions. This spurt in the rate of migration to the cities derives from developments rooted in the physical sciences, but the solution for the problems of the cities calls for the expertise of medical, behavioral, and social sciences. It is lack of their participation in the slum-clearance programs and the housing programs that has aggravated the problem. In these programs, we have destroyed the functional social relationships in our slums. In denying a place to the small businesses that flourished in the slum neighborhoods, particularly on the first floors of buildings, we destroyed controls on the youngsters growing up. We destroyed the interdependence of people in neighborhoods. We denied youth the opportunity to have these business people as models for their own futures. In the neighborhoods of these housing programs, nuclear families live alone and largely without friends upon whom they can depend. When both parents have to work, the children are left to shift for themselves. In consequence, the standards of conduct they imbibe are largely those of the peer-group gang. We are reaping the consequences in the outbreaks of violence. We are reaping other consequences in the incompetence of the slum-reared young.

As a representative of the behavioral sciences, I must admit that we have no pat solutions. My colleagues and I are often in disagreement about how best to proceed toward solution. On the other hand, we have learned how to submit our hypothesis to tests. Ordinarily, we are limited to laboratories where many of the conditions of society do not operate. I happen to believe that we could go a long way toward reestablishing the interdependence among families in neighborhoods through encouraging cooperation in the operation of child-care facilities. The parents of the slums love their children as much as do you or I, but they lack both the know-how and the facilities to help them develop their potential. Work supported by the Applied Research Branch of the National Institute of Mental Health in which psychiatrists, psychologists, and social workers have tried to alter the childrearing practices of slum parents by counsel has failed utterly. On the other hand, work in which parents are brought in as teachers' helpers in nursery schools where they have an opportunity to see, first hand, the ways of the teachers and the consequences in the behavior of their children and to get these ways explained has shown great promise. Not only do the younger children of these parents show improvements in intellectual tests as large as the children who participate in the nursery schools, but the children of near-by neighbors also show improvements that suggest that these parents can communicate changes in child-rearing practices better than can professionals who merely talk. I submit these examples as instances where innovative attempts to contribute toward the solution of some of our social and educational problems are beginning to tell us what kinds of innovations to avoid and what kind to bet on. I am confident that representatives from these human sciences could, with practice, become capable of communicating our educated guesses and their bases to the gentlemen of the Senate. In the process, we of the behavioral sciences could become partners with the gentlemen of the Senate in challenging enterprise of developing solutions for the problems which we are creating for ourselves with our technological advances.

Let me urge you to make a place on the Select Committee for representatives of the behavioral sciences, the medical sciences, and the social sciences.

Sincerely,

J. McV. Hunt,
Ph. D., Professor of Psychology.

University of California,
Department of Chemistry,
Los Angeles, Calif., August 24, 1967.

Hon Edmund S. Muskie,
U.S. Senate, Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, Washington, D.C.

My Dear Senator Muskie: I think the Senate Resolution 68 "To Establish a Select Senate Committee on Technology and the Human Environment" is a very good idea.

In the atomic and space programs, we have been very careful about protecting the environment, but this has not been so with all technological projects. If your committee would improve the chances of preventing further environmental, and particularly atmospheric, contamination, it would do an invaluable service.

I would be pleased to be helpful in any way I can.

Sincerely yours,

W. F. Libby.

Stanford University,
Stanford, Calif., September 12, 1967.

Senator Edmund S. Muskie,
Senator Howard H. Baker,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senators Muskie and Baker: I greatly appreciate your kindness in sending me a description of Senate Resolution 68: "To Establish a Select Senate Committee on Technology and the Human Environment." I had heard that such a move was in the wind, but I was not aware that you have carried it so far toward realization.

Ordinarily I am less than enthusiastic about setting up ever more committees, but I think this one would have a real point. It sounds like an excellent way to attack the increasingly serious problem of getting more cooperation between scientists and government on matters of importance to society.

More specific comments are hard to make when I know so little about details of the proposal. The best I can do is to commend your efforts and hope that the Resolution will be favorably acted on by the Senate.

Sincerely yours,

Konrad B. Krauskopf.

Stanford University School of
Medicine, Stanford Medical
Center,
Palo Alto, Calif., September 11, 1967.

Senator Edmund S. Muskie,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Muskie: This is in reply to your memorandum of August 12 concerning Senate Resolution 68.

I have been following the newspaper accounts of the progress of your Subcommittee with great interest. I would, in fact, be very grateful if you could ask your staff to give me any convenient priority for receiving continuous information from your Subcommittee on this subject.

As you might readily perceive from some of my enclosed writings, some of which you may perhaps already have encountered, I share with you the sense of need for long range consideration by the Congress, of technology and the human environment in the future.

My main question has to do with the effectiveness of a generalized, on-going staff study which is divorced from pragmatic authority to allocate resources and undertake other legislative action. The most nearly comparable analogue in the Executive Branch is the Bureau of the Budget and the Office of the Science Advisor, the staff the President must have if he is to make wise decisions about resource allocation. For these reasons I have favored placing the authority for the kind of study your Subcommittee recommends as the major responsibility of the Committee on Appropriations. Even better than that might be a fundamental reorganization of the Senate Committee's system like that recommended in the final report of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, Senate Report #1414 of the Eighty-ninth Congress Second Session.

However, since there seem to be irremediable political obstacles towards a fundamental rationalization of the planning functions of Congress to match those of the Executive, your Subcommittee's proposal may have to be regarded as the most realistic expedient to do a job that badly needs to be done. The main function of the hearings envisaged for the new Select Committee will, of course, be educational, an encouragement to criticism and innovation, crucial steps in the legislative process. The establishment of a regular annual cycle of such hearings may gradually bring about the requisite level of public attention. In the last analysis the value and visibility of these hearings will depend on the quality of the witnesses called to testify.

Even without the leverage of responsibility for appropriations the Committee on Government Operations could certainly exert a very salutary pressure on the Executive Branch to demand an appropriate investment in long range planning and the exposure of these plans for the widest public debate. If there is to be a Select Committee on Technology it is important that it establish at least a comparable degree of authority to elicit the appropriate executive response. This in turn will depend to a large degree on the stature of the members appointed to such a Committee and on the extent to which they actually identify themselves with its affairs and its probing.

The past two Administrations have seen a revolution in the zeal of Congress to exert its authority for the solution of our most urgent National problems. This zeal has much of its past and future strength from the kind of relationship between the Congress and the scientific and technological community that your proposed new Committee could do a great deal to cultivate.

Sincerely yours,

Joshua Lederberg,
Professor of Genetics.

The Connecticut Agricultural
Experiment Station,
New Haven, Conn., September 11, 1967.

Senator Howard H. Baker,
Senator Edmund S. Muskie,
Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Gentlemen: Having returned from vacation, I have your letter of August 12th concerning Senate Resolution 68 "To Establish a Select Senate Committee on Technology and the Human Environment."

As a scientist and as an administrator of science, I find this an intriguing idea. I must admit that I am embarrassed sometimes to find such frequent comments from laymen that "science will save us." I do hope that we in science can solve the technical and human problems that arise in a technological society.

I have had a very good year serving on President Johnson's Commission on Food & Fiber dealing with the food problems of the country, domestic and foreign. It was also my pleasure to serve on the World Food Panel of the President's Science Advisory Committee in making a report to President Johnson. Certainly the problems are numerous and varied, and I wish you "good hunting" in solving them.

Thank you for writing.

Yours sincerely,

JAMES G. HORSFALL,
Director.

LEHIGH UNIVERSITY,
Bethlehem, Pa., September 5, 1967.

Hon. HOWARD H. BAKER, Jr.,
Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BAKER: This is in reply to your letter of August 12, 1967 concerning Senate Resolution 68 "To Establish a Select Senate Committee on Technology and the Human Environment." The letter was waiting for me when I returned to my desk after taking part in a summer study activity.

My major comment is that I would regard the creation of such a committee with enthusiasm. What the Senate does clearly has a major impact on the future of our country. I believe that scientists and engineers can be helpful in foreseeing certain kinds of problems and in recommending solutions to them. Therefore such a committee could provide a mechanism for vitally important discussions.

A second comment is that I would urge those responsible for forming the committee to add to it, not only pure scientists in the narrow sense of the word, but also people who are accustomed to using science for the benefit of man. In other words, applied scientists, engineers and possibly an economist.

Another comment is that I have seen many more committee meetings of scientists and engineers than effective ones. The effective ones are generally chaired by someone who knows quite well what is desired from the meeting and includes collectively people who are prepared to provide it. They may be prepared because they are already experts but more often because they have done their homework on the subject at hand or at least had someone do it for them.

Another comment is probably unnecessary and that is that the prestige of the Senate is great and you could undoubtedly get eager cooperation from many sources for such a committee. The best people would remain truly eager to the extent that they feel they are really making a contribution.

A final comment, probably also unnecessary is that the National Academies of Science and Engineering might be able to give good advice on the format and scientific and technical membership of such a committee.

Sincerely and respectfully yours,

W. DEMING LEWIS.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY,
Ithaca, N.Y., August 23, 1967.

Hon. EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MUSKIE: Cornell University has noted with very great interest the proposal which I gather has originated with you and Senator Baker to establish a Select Committee of the Senate on Technology and the Human Environment. The establishment of such a Committee could be exceedingly helpful to universities like Cornell and I am writing to endorse your proposal formally.

A number of groups within Cornell University are already involved in programs of advanced training and research on areas which relate to the human environment. The public health activities of the Cornell Medical College represent an obivous case in point, but there is almost equal interest within the University at Ithaca. Specifically, we have very recently established a new Center, the Center for Environmental Quality Management, which is set up to permit us more effectively to integrate our interdisciplinary strengths. We hope this effort will expand greatly in the coming few years.

Studies on the environment represent to Cornell both a very interesting opportunity and something of a problem. Faculty members who work in allied fields, for example those in engineering and agriculture, always wish to work on problems which relate closely to the important problems of the outside world and to them the enormous problems of the environment are of great attraction as areas to study. Cornell's systems analysts find this area of study particularly exciting since it so clearly involves numerous variables and interactions.

Along with this great interest there are two sorts of difficulties. A first is that the environment is a research area where the linkage with action programs is likely to be particularly close and universities need always to approach commitments to outside public service programs with some mixture of interest and caution. It is good for universities to participate some in public service activities; it is bad for them if their participation overwhelms the normal programs of teaching and research. Studies of the environment have an added complexity since to be effective, they must be interdisciplinary, i.e. they must involve contributions from engineers, sociologists, lawyers, biologists and doctors. Interdisciplinary research is attractive to most university faculty but it often requires new instruments and this really is the point of our new Center for Environmental Quality Management.

In this important and complex area, a forum within which the universities could discuss their problems as well as their results with legislators and through them with members of the federal agencies, could be most helpful. This could help us insure that in our public service activities we were concentrating on the problems of greatest significance. Equally it could give us a place where we could early bring to your attention any problems of organization or support which universities may be encountering. We very much hope that your proposed Senate Select Committee is established.

Sincerely yours,

F. A. LONG.

AUGUST 28, 1967.

Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
U.S. Senate, Committee on Government Operations, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATORS MUSKIE and BAKER: I am delighted to learn that the Senate has established a Subcommittee to consider the problems of the effect of our advancing technology on the human environment. For the past year a Committee on Resources and Man of the National Research Council has been concerned with much the same problem as that which your Subcommittee plans to investigate. Our Committee (CRAM) is made up of members of the National Academy and a few specialists in pertinent fields who are not members of the Academy. So far, we have operated with an arrangement that is most informative to the ten permanent members of the Committee: for each conference we spend about three days with eight to a dozen specialists in fields that are germane to the study in order to find out the areas of agreement and disagreement among the many knowledgeable specialists that attend these meetings. The first meeting was in Tucson where we were concerned primarily with sounding out specialists in the fields of demography, physical anthropology, and various aspects of human ecology relating both to the natural environment and to urban problems. The second meeting was directly concerned with geographic factors such as recreational areas and the economics of developed and underdeveloped countries in terms of the foreseeable future. The third meeting was concerned wholly with renewable resources such as fisheries, forest, and farms. Our last meeting before writing a summary report will be held in the middle of September when we plan to devote several days to a discussion of the future demands on mineral resources, both the energy resources and the non-renewable nonenergy resources of the world.

We realize that much of the concern of the Committee over the human environment during the next fifty to a hundred years has been shared by other groups of high competency, but some members of the National Academy have felt it well to take a hard look at the rather optimistic conclusions, generally voiced by the more vocal members of the scientific community.

This is not to say that we plan to come out with a pessimistic report but only that we wish to look at the available evidence as carefully as possible without any commitment to make either a "good" report on the plenitude of our natural resources or the converse. The Chairman of our Committee, professor Preston Cloud of the Department of Geology of the University of California at Los Angeles will not be available to comment on your interesting letter until after he returns from a field trip into British Columbia, just before our September meeting at Vancouver. I am confident, however, that he will be happy to keep you informed of the progress of our final report which we hope will be ready for the attention of the Committee on Science and Public Policy next spring. He is in Washington frequently and if you wish him to get in touch with you, there should be no problem.

Wishing you success in attaining your Committee's objectives, I am,

Sincerely yours,

T. S. LOVERING,
Department of Geology, University of Arizona, Tucson, Ariz.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
Berkeley, Calif., August 29, 1967.

Hon. EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
Hon. HOWARD H. BAKER,
Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the proposed Senate Committee on Technology and the Human Environment.

I am convinced that such a committee would serve an extremely useful and valuable service to the country. We are accustomed to believe that any advance in technology is automatically an advance in our standards of happiness, health, and living. This may be true for a short time, but it is becoming more and more apparent that technological advances may also bring great dangers in the long run.

The "wonder drugs," for instance, which are heralded as a means af eradicating infectious diseases, have actually caused the development of some more resistant strains of bacteria, which are immune to the drugs and which are more dangerous than the old ones.

The recent racial troubles are principally caused by technological unemployment and only secondly to racial "bias." The tractor and mechanical harvester and now the chemical weed killers have taken over the work that farm hands used to do with the result that hundreds of thousands of farm workers can find no work and have migrated to the cities. The unskilled worker is the first to be replaced by a machine, and as many unskilled workers are Negroes, they have suffered the most. This is primarily the result of technological advance and only partly of "racial bias."

Technological unemployment will increase steadily and plans for the future must be based on that premise. It is possible and even probable that in the foreseeable future the only men needed to support the economy will be those who design and construct machines. As a result, half or more of the population will have no work to do. Instead of having to learn to work for a living, they will have to learn to live without working.

Sincerely,

John H. Northrop.

University of Kentucky,
Lexington, Ky., August 29, 1967.

Hon. Edmund S. Muskie,
Hon. Howard H. Baker,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Muskie and Senator Baker: It is with much interest that I have followed the progress of Senate Resolution 68 "To Establish a Select Senate Committee on Technology and the Human Environment". Development of such a Select Committee deserves the careful consideration of the Senate in that it is related to a matter of great importance to the Nation's future.

One of the critical challenges facing our Nation's scientific community is the lag between the time when technical advances are achieved and their full implementation is realized. The most critical impediment to diminishing the severe waste of resources which such a lag represents is the lack of clear understanding of how man perceives his environment and his behavioral responses to its modification. Indeed, this problem would receive much benefit from the attention provided in Senate Resolution 68. I wish to respectfully record my support for this resolution.

Sincerely yours,

Alvin L. Morris, D.D.S., Ph. D.,
Dean.

The University of Texas,
Austin, Tex., September 27, 1967.

Hon. Edmund S. Muskie,
Senator from Maine, Chairman, Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, Committee on Government Operations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Sir: Your memorandum of August 12, 1967 asks for comments on Senate Resolution 68 which would establish a Select Senate Committee on Technology and the Human Environment.

The Congress must determine the magnitude of appropriations for research and development as well as the general directions which will be followed by the scientific community. To this end it is essential that there be personal contacts between scientists and engineers on the one hand and members of Congress on a scale not heretofore envisioned. No longer can scientists hope to have money appropriated without careful scrutiny.

For these reasons I believe the formation of such a committee to be advisable. Scientists may make requests but decision making can not be in their hands.

Very sincerely yours,

W. Albert Noyes, Jr.,
Ashbel Smith Professor of Chemistry.

Lamont Geological Observatory
of Columbia University,
Palisades, N.Y., August 28, 1967.

Hon. Edmund S. Muskie,
Hon. Howard H. Baker, Jr.,
U.S. Senate, Committee on Government Operations, Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, Washington, D.C.

Dear Sirs: This is in response to your letter requesting comment on the proposal to establish a Select Senate Committee on Technology and the Human Environment.

I feel that the creation of such a committee at such a high level within the legislative branch of the government is a significant and a valuable step which should be taken without delay.

Over the last few decades our society at all levels has been affected by the beginning of a technological revolution that certainly will increase in importance over the next few decades. It is, and will be, essential that our political leaders maintain an informed position on the impact of that technology and of its future potential.

The National Academy of Science's Committee on Seismology, of which I am currently chairman, is attempting to examine the role of seismology in the society of the future. It is quite clear from this study that as the population expands, as civilization develops, and as man is forced to devise, to operate, and to maintain more and more complex closed systems of enormous scale to feed, clothe, and house himself and to satisfy his other demands, technological developments will assume an immense importance and acquire enormous complexity. Malfunctions of these huge systems, whether they be caused by earthquakes, by technical breakdowns, or by administrative errors, may produce unprecedented disaster. It is clear that in the future man will have the opportunity to control his environment and influence his destiny more than ever before.

To proceed wisely and without disaster, he must make every effort to understand, better than ever before, the processes and the interrelationships of the processes he controls. Nor can this understanding be confined solely to the scientists and technicians. It must include leaders of all elements of society. Particularly, it must include the political leaders. I believe the Select Senate Committee on Technology and the Human Environment will be an important step in this direction.

Sincerely yours,

Jack Oliver,
Professor of Geology.

The Rockefeller University,
New York, N.Y., September 12, 1967.

Hon. Edmund S. Muskie,
Hon. Howard H. Baker, Jr.,
U.S. Senate,
Committee on Government Operations,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: I write in answer to your letter concerning Resolution 68 "To Establish a Select Senate Committee on Technology and the Human Environment".

I believe that the immediate future of technology will be determined in no small part by those who had demonstrated their possession of the unusual abilities to contribute to fundamental or basic research. This statement requires a definition of basic research.

Successful research often points the way to new discoveries and may be said to be basic. The work is often applied to proposed research in order to obtain for it financial support. Such research may succeed or fail and was basic or fundamental if history has proved that it pointed the way to new discovery. It may be said that investigators need training but what is often regarded as training is the elimination of those who lack the ability to make new discoveries. The large number of persons who undertake postgraduate study with a purpose of obtaining the degree of Doctor of Philosophy represent those who wish to make significant contribution to science but under conditions such as those that exist in this country, the ability to present a thesis proving this ability is quite insufficient.

It is a difficult task to select by elimination of the unsuccessful those who are capable of succeedng but it can best be done by those who previously have come along the same path. Such selection is often a painful task and requires a group of senior investigators.

In order to accomplish the broad purpose of the committee which looks into the next 50 years it seems essential that the proposed committee contain members who have successfully followed this narrow path.

May I suggest a change in the name of the committee? A committee on science, technology and human environment during the next 50 years.

Very truly yours,

Eugene L. Opie.

RCA Laboratories,
Radio Corporation of America,
August 30, 1967.

Senator Edmund S. Muskie,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Muskie: This is in response to your letter of August 12, 1967 with respect to the establishment of a "Select Senate Committee on Technology and Human Environment".

In this connection, I would like to make a suggestion in the field of applied science.

There is today a great shortage of top scientists and engineers in the field of applied science concerned with the general consumer. In general, the problems in applied science are more difficult than in pure science.

The space and other government sponsored programs employ the top applied scientists. As a consequence, there are not enough for the tasks that your proposed committee has in mind, namely, health work, living habits and individual security. Therefore, one of the major problems is that of providing enough top applied scientists to carry out the programs that you have in mind. It seems to me that this is one of the first problems to be solved in this fine program that you have in mind.

Sincerely,

Harry F. Olson.

Washington University,
St. Louis, Mo., September 8, 1967.

Senator Edmund S. Muskie,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Government Operations, Committee on Government Relations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Muskie: I am responding to your memorandum of August 12 concerning Senate Resolution 68.

I strongly encourage the proposed Select Committee, for precisely the purpose indicated in your memorandum: "developing a closer relationship between the Senate and the scientific and technological community in a joint effort to solve critical environmental problems."

The proposed Select Committee would do more than meet that purpose; it would also set a pattern for such a relationship with the scientific and technological community in other areas of equally vital interest to the nation. The Executive Branch has, through the President's Science Advisory Committee (of which I happen now to be a member), a reasonably adequate means for developing the necessary relationship with the scientific community on problems of national concern. I believe your proposed select committee mechanism for the legislative branch is also very seriously needed to deal with critical national problems in the defense area, in the strengthening of our scientific and technological base for national economic growth, and especially in the area of our faltering support for the training of the scientists in all categories. These scientists will be needed to meet national goals in *all* of the other problem areas, and our present patchwork quilt of support is coming apart at the seams.

Sincerely yours,

George E. Pake,
Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost.

U.S. Department of the Interior,
Geological Survey,
Washington, D.C., August 28, 1967.
Hon. Edmund S. Muskie,
Hon. Howard H. Baker, Jr.,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Muskie and Senator Baker: This is written in response to your announcement dated August 12, 1967, with reference to Senate Resolution 68 "To Establish a Select Senate Committee on Technology and the Human Environment."

As a member of the National Academy of Sciences, a career scientist with 28 years of continuous Federal service, and Director of one of the foremost Bureaus in science and technology within the Federal Government, I heartily endorse the formation of a Select Committee of the Senate that would provide a continuing dialog and study on the interaction of science, technology, and human environment. Traditionally, the Geological Survey has been the foremost research Bureau in the Department of the Interior and, since its inception in 1879, has enjoyed intimate relations with Universities, State Geological Surveys, and Industry. Insofar as the environment of land is concerned, its benefits, hazards, and uses, engineering expression, its resources of water, minerals, fuels, and rock, I consider the geologist and his coworking geoscientists and technologists as key performers in any dialog reaching into man's future.

The economic structure of modern Society has been built upon the foundation of the resources produced from the crust of the Earth. As Science has advanced, along with increase in population and increased competition for land use, many long-standing technical practices now appear to be in conflict with the very Society that needs to be sustained. Prudent planning and management require some course between the extreme laissez faire of the task and the extreme constraints of environmental preservation. Studies of the Select Committee can certainly provide the right kind of a climate for such dialog.

Sincerely yours,
W. T. Pecora,
Director.

Eleanor Roosevelt Institute for Cancer Research and the Department of Biophysics, University of Colorado Medical Center
Denver, Colo., August 24, 1967.
Hon. Howard H. Baker, Jr.,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Baker: Thank you for your extremely interesting letter of August 12, about the establishment of a Select Senate Committee on Technology and the Human Environment.

I greatly applaud your resolution. Indeed, such action should have been taken 25 years ago.

I greatly hope that the committee selected will be carefully chosen and will be empowered to make deep-seated studies and far-reaching recommendations on this subject which now threatens to overwhelm mankind, if not properly controlled.

My only suggestion would be that the National Academy of Sciences be consulted in the selection of the committee, so as to insure that it will be made up of persons with adequate training for this difficult task. I hope, too, that after such a committee is appointed, the U.S. Senate will continue to support its activities and demand from it vigorous, forthright, and intelligent action.

With warmest good wishes, I am,
Yours sincerely,
Theodore T. Puck, Ph. D.,
Director, Institute for Cancer Research,
Professor of Biophysics.

Jet Propulsion Laboratory,
Pasadena, Calif., August 31, 1967.
Re: S. Res. 68 "To Establish a Select Senate Committee on Technology and the Human Environment."
Senators Edmund S. Muskie and Howard H. Baker, Jr.,
U.S. Senate, Committee on Government Operations, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senators Muskie and Baker: All thinking scientists are deeply concerned with the social problems created by technological advances based on scientific discoveries. Air pollution, ecological effects on insecticides and pesticides, soil and crop damage by water pollution are all problems of serious public concern. Unless a mechanism is established whereby the potential effects of certain technologies can be reviewed before their use, and not after the damage has been done as in the case of Lake Erie, the consequences to society could well be fatal.

A Select Committee of the Senate on Technology and the Human Environment is certainly a step in the right direction. In my opinion, it is long overdue. I would hope that such a committee once established could be instrumental in initiating legislation designed to protect the natural environment from pollution and damage thereby protecting society now and in generations to come.

Sincerely,
W. H. Pickering.

Hughes Aircraft Co.,
Culver City, Calif., August 25, 1967.
Hon. Edmund S. Muskie,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Mr. Muskie: In your letter of August 12 you described proposed legislation now under consideration by your committee for the purpose of establishing a select Senate Committee on Technology and the Human Environment, and inquired about my thoughts on the matter.

I have not seen the resolution, and therefore can comment only in a most general manner. You are clearly touching upon a subject of most vital importance to all of us, both in the technical and the nontechnical community. Many academicians today feel strongly that the technical community has failed to develop sufficient strong connections and interrelations with the other aspects and institutions of our society. At the same time, it is an extremely broad subject and one in which a study group could easily go adrift unless carefully steered towards thoughtful and specific objectives.

As a most general thought, the very process of creating a forum in which men from scientific and technical communities can be brought together with people from government or other areas will tend to expand ideas and develop the interrelations which we need. I can see the possibility that the select committee which you describe could make important contributions in this direction.

Sincerely yours,
Allen E. Puckett.

University of Illinois,
Urbana, Ill., September 21, 1967.
Senator Edmund S. Muskie,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Muskie: Dean Alpert of the Graduate College has requested that I respond to your communication concerning Senate Resolution 68 "To Establish a Select Senate Committee on Technology and the Human Environment." I am pleased to do so, for in recent years I have written much concerning the need for scientists and legislators to come together to work out the solutions to the problems arising from the impact of technology on the human environment. Reprints of three recent and relevant papers are enclosed. A fourth article entitled "Adaptive Strategy for Air Pollution" will appear in *BioScience* in October.

In thinking about these matters I have become increasingly anxious about the tremendous duplication of effort that has emerged. There has been a veritable flood of reports dealing with deteriorating quality of the environment. The problems have been ranked and reranked, but their solutions seem no closer. The diversity of reports suggests that there has been inadequate communication within the hierarchy of federal agencies. In my opinion the problems have been adequately defined. The important task is to take the next steps that lead to realistic and strategic solutions. In developing the strategy, there needs to be a consortium of community, government, industry, and university. This viewpoint, of course, has been admirably stated by Representative Daddario in his perceptive report on "Environmental Pollution."

It seems to me that the Senate Resolution has much in common with the recent report of the Linton Committee entitled "A Strategy for a Livable Environment." S.R. 68 calls for a Select Committee. The Linton Report calls for a Council of Ecological Advisors. Perhaps both groups will have a necessary role, the former will work with legislators and the latter with the executives. If both groups are created, assuredly communication must be a first priority.

I do strongly favor the creation of the type of committee the resolution visualizes. The only means of implementing the solutions to problems that technology has created in the human environment will be through the drafting of perceptive legislation drafted by men fully aware of the ecological implications of the courses they propose to follow. I agree with Dean Alpert that such a committee must include representatives from the non-science community.

I appreciate this opportunity to write to you. If I can be of further assistance in this important task, please do not hesitate to call on me.

Yours sincerely,
Frederick Sargent, II, M.D.,
Professor of Physiology, Director, Center for Human Ecology.

The Garrett Corp.,
Phoenix, Ariz., September 1, 1967.
Hon. Edmund S. Muskie,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Muskie: In reply to your request of 12 August, 1967, for comment, I feel the Select Committee on Technology and the Human Environment proposed in Senate Resolution 68 of the 90th Congress appears to have a very useful and highly desirable function. There is not now in existence any group attempting to assess on a whole systems basis the effects of new technological possibilities. It has become increasingly obvious that it is highly undesirable to introduce any major innovation without examining thoroughly its effects on all facets of our society. While I am quite sure we would not have in the beginning rejected the automobile because of the smog conditions of today, it might, nevertheless, have dictated quite different engine and fuel development programs had we predicted in the early Twenties that automotive engine emissions would become such a problem.

There are, of course, many difficulties in the way of any realistic attempt to predict what the world will be like fifty years from now. The true innovations cannot generally be predicted by extrapolation from what currently exists. As one simple example, the airplane had not yet flown when I was born. Yet, fifty years later we were moving people by air across continents and oceans at speeds wholly incomprehensible to the people of that earlier day. It would have taken remarkable prescience indeed on the part of someone of that era to have predicted such an eventuality. In addition, there is a tendency on the part of long-range forecasters to confuse possibilities with probabilities. Too often a predicted innovation is not innovation at all. It is merely a different way of doing something which is already being done satisfactorily by a method which can be rendered more efficient by being periodically brought up to the state-of-the-art. It is quite possible that had the railroads not vegetated for half a century, the transcontinental truck lines might never have existed.

It is possible to predict from present trends some things which are likely to come about in the next fifty years. For example, there is certain to be a growth in the number of people in the world. Whether or not the total population can be predicted by simple extrapolation of current growth curves is very much open to question. Generally speaking, nature seems to recognize some optimum population for a given area and provides a method for maintaining that optimum whether it be by some catastrophic means or simple limitation on birth rate. Again, assuming that the population will grow at some rate whether it be that predicted or not, how will we house, feed and provide employment for our increasing population? I do not believe that higher density is a solution to the housing problem. Recent experiments with animals seem to indicate that there is a limiting density which, if exceeded, leads to chaotic and maniacal reactions. This would seem to indicate that the growth pattern of future cities is more likely to follow that of Los Angeles than New York City.

There are some questions that will require the most careful consideration and objective thought. As examples, should we strive, as we are now doing, to lengthen the life span of people who are beyond their periods of usefulness to the world? If not, who decides when a person's usefulness is at an end? This question could become critical indeed if it eventuates that our population exceeds the ability of the world to maintain. Again, it is predictably possible to control genetics in such a way as to design people to our needs. Will this be permitted? And, if so, who will establish the rules?

While these latter questions may seem beyond the intent and scope of the proposed committee, they are questions which must be answered in the not too far distant future. It would seem better to have the elected representatives of the people lead our thinking on these matters rather than to leave the solution to our theorists.

Getting back to the stated purposes of the Committee, there is a strong necessity for an objective viewpoint on the emphasis to be put on new technologies by the government whether through direct support, regulation, or persuasion. Recommendations must be truly objective, however, and not influenced by political considerations, unless they are clearly overriding, nor by overpersuading salesmanship. Again, we must not confuse possible with probable. Sooner or later we will reach the limit of our ability in terms of qualified manpower, time and money to support all possible technological innovation and we will be forced to make choices between alternate things that can be done. It is well that we train ourselves now to say "no" when no is called for. For this reason I would recommend that scientists from industry have a major voice in advising the Committee on programs for the future.

Most of us who are responsible for research and development in industry have both short and long range programs. Generally the short range programs cover up to the next five years and are reasonably firm insofar as one can be absolute considering the indeterminable nature of this type of work. The long range programs are generally much more indefinite and usually cover only areas of interest rather than specific projects. No industrial research and development director would recommend spending the company's money on projects whose anticipated payoff is fifty years away. It is most certainly true that basic research is timeless but applied research and development are equally certainly not. It would seem, therefore, that the proposed Committee could well have short and long range programs in mind. Short range could be defined as those programs in which current investment is justified, long range as those fields in which we should have a continuing interest but which do not presently justify large scale expenditures of manpower and other resources. In either event, the part that a particular project will play in the overall system which is our society must be fully and objectively evaluated, and developments which must be concomitant if that system is not to be adversely affected recommended for initiation at the same time.

As one final comment, the determination of timely and informed introduction of technological innovation is not a one-shot affair. It is, rather, a continuing need. I believe it evident that we have not handled this kind of thing too well in the past as is evidenced, for example, by our air and water pollution problems. I would recommend, therefore, that the proposed Committee not be faced with an absolute dissolution date. Perhaps its charter might include a provision for a biennial review of its accomplishments and continuance if found desirable.

Thank you for inviting my comment. I hope what I have said will be of some value to you.

Respectfully,

S. B. Spangler,
Vice Admiral, U.S. Navy, Retired.

Harvard Medical School,
Massachusetts General Hospital,
Boston, Mass., August 29, 1967.

Re Senate Resolution 68 "To Establish a Select Senate Committee on Technology and the Human Environment."

Hon. Edmund S. Muskie,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Muskie: This is in reply to your communication of August 12 concerning Senate Resolution 68, which interested me very much indeed.

I am certain that a closer liaison between the scientific community and our National Legislature has been properly identified as an important objective, and I know very well from personal experience that there are many matters of immense importance which could be encompassed by the wording of the above resolution. Obviously one of the most trying aspects in this area will be the essential consideration of priorities. Here I know that your decisions will be of the highest importance, and I am genuinely delighted that your distinguished Committee is going to address itself to these issues.

Thank you for letting me know about this. I shall watch the progress of your work with great interest.

Sincerely yours,

Paul S. Russell, M.D.

Washington University
School of Medicine,
St. Louis, Mo., August 23, 1967.

Re S. Res. 68.

Edmund S. Muskie,
Committee on Government Operations, Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Operations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Muskie: I was delighted to learn that the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations has recommended favorably to the Government Operations of the Senate that a Select Senate Committee on Technology and the Human Environment be established. As you will recognize, there is an extraordinary and urgent need to consider now those critical environmental problems which we will be facing in the future, and any mechanisms for establishing a closer relationship between the Senate and the scientific and technological community in such a joint effort is both advisable and necessary, if not mandatory.

The establishment of an organizational structure which can more clearly define these problems is an important first step, and S. Res. 68 would be most helpful in this respect.

Sincerely yours,

Sol Sherry, M.D.,
Professor of Medicine.

August 28, 1967.

Hon. Howard H. Baker, Jr.,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Baker: I was delighted to get your letter of August 12 about Senate Resolution 68, "To Establish a Select Senate Committee on Technology and the Human Environment."

I agree that the establishment of such a select committee could make a significant contribution by developing a closer relationship and better communication between the members of the Senate and the scientific and technologic community to solve the many difficult and critical environmental problems that are facing man in his efforts to continue living on planet earth. I hope, therefore, that the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, to which the resolution was referred, will be supported by the full Committee on Government Operations of the Senate and that the Senate will in due course and without too much delay adopt it.

After the committee becomes a fact and its membership and method of functioning are established, I am sure I will want to establish more intimate contact with it in the hope of contributing toward its effective functioning.

With my best regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

Philip Sporn.

General Electric Co.,
Philadelphia, Pa., August 25, 1967.

Hon. Edmund S. Muskie and Hon. Edward H. Baker, Jr.,
United States Senate, Committee on Government Operations, Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senators Muskie and Baker: This relates to your letter of August 12 relative to Senate Resolution 68 to establish a Select Senate Committee on Technology and the Human Environment. Let me first apologize for the delay in this reply; I have been out of the country.

I very much appreciate having an opportunity to express myself on this resolution. As a scientist having been deeply involved in the development of science and technology for the past twenty-five years, I doubt that we have many more important considerations for the long term or perhaps even for the short term; many of the grave national problems we face today have deep roots in the interaction and effects of Technology on Life and Society. From the point of view of technology the concern is urgent for we have arrived at a level of development where the question no longer is whether things can be done but whether and why things should be done and the resulting impact.

I should like also to relay the views of Mrs. Steg and her professional community (Dr. Doreen Steg, chairman, Department of Human Behavior and Development, Drexel Institute of Technology). Here again, the impact of technology on the environment, particularly in the educational field and communications and generally in the Humanities, is of paramount concern. A forum for interchange between the Humanities, Technology, the Congress, and the Public at large does not exist and is badly needed.

The Resolution, therefore, addresses itself to perhaps the most outstanding Human question of the century, that of coming to terms with technology.

Both Mrs. Steg and I are deeply pleased with the Resolution. We would hope that people in the Humanities such as in education and philosophy could become deeply involved for they have a leading role to play. We would derive a deep sense of satisfaction and contribution from participation; please call on us if we can help.

Sincerely yours,

Dr. Leo Steg,
Manager, Space Sciences Laboratory.

North Carolina State University,
Raleigh, N.C., August 24, 1967.

Hon. Edmund S. Muskie,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Muskie: Thank you for your information concerning Senate Resolution 68—the establishment of a Select Senate Committee on Technology and the Human Environment. In common with most people engaged in scientific research, I am very aware of the pressing need for the establishment of such a study committee coincident with the "scientific explosion" which is taking place today.

You invited me to express any comments or suggestions connected with the proposed legislation. My chief comment, I am sure, must have been made previously by many scientists; it is the problem of *dwindling communication* which accompanies specialization in rapidly evolving areas of research. In such areas scientific knowledge has expanded at a phenomenal rate during the past two decades, largely as the result of revolutionary technological discoveries. The mastery of specialized techniques requires more specialized training and experience, and a young man entering these fields achieves this mastery by sacrificing breadth in education. Consequently the total area of science today is becoming occupied not by an "integrated" population of scientists but by a collection of individually segregated groups. There are more disciplines, and communication between disciplines is much more difficult than it was in the past. The member of one discipline cannot evaluate progress in another—still less, perhaps, can the educated general public evaluate the relative importance of the various disciplines to the nation as a whole. There is a problem then in achieving perspective; in distinguishing between fundamental growth and bandwagon expansion; in deciding between the relative advantages of rapid short-term gains and long term slow accretions.

It seems to me that the recognition of this and other general problems, and the setting-up of machinery to study them is very pertinent in our times.

Sincerely yours,

S. G. Stephens,
Professor of Genetics.

Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Public Health Service,
Bethesda, Md., September 18, 1967.

Hon. Edmund S. Muskie,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Muskie: Thank you for sending me your announcement of August 12 that S. Res. 68 has been favorably reported to the full Committee on Government Operations of the Senate.

This is good news. I want to offer you my congratulations and best wishes on this accomplishment. As you know, I am greatly interested in the establishment of this Select Senate Committee on Technology and the Human Environment.

Sincerely,

William H. Stewart,
Surgeon General.

Australian National University,
Canberra, Australia, September 4, 1967.

Hon. Edmund S. Muskie,
Hon. Howard H. Baker,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Gentlemen: Your letter of August 12, 1967, re S. Res. 68 was forwarded to me in Australia, where I am holding a Fulbright grant for five months.

The establishment of a Select Committee on Technology and the Human Environment would serve a very useful purpose. I would expect that one result of such a committee exploration would be an appreciation of the need for some kind of permanent institution to study in detail and in depth the problems alluded to. These problems are so complex and cut across so many areas of human knowledge and activity that a legislative committee would have great difficulty in getting into them without converting itself into the directorate of a research institute. I have long thought that the National Institutes of Health should have divisions concerned with this sort of problem. Undoubtedly other governmental bodies should be involved. The ovation of the proposed Select Committee would be a very desirable first step in finding out how best to approach these problems at the research and forecasting level, and would provide an indispensable organ for making policy respond in some satisfactory way to the independent conclusions of research.

The problem of unexpected innovations renders policy formulation extremely difficult. However, as a scientist, I think that it is perhaps somewhat easier now than it was 25 or 50 years ago to see ahead for a relatively short time (say 10–15 years). And in any case, even the most startling discovery takes many years to convert into a major factor in human existence. The discovery of means of using atomic and nuclear energy is a case in point, if its impact on diplomacy and the military art are put aside for the purposes of the present discussion.

Respectfully yours,

Marshall H. Stone,
Professor of Mathematics, University of Chicago.

The University of Texas,
Austin, Tex., September 12, 1967.

Hon. Edmund S. Muskie,
Hon. Howard H. Baker, Jr.,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senators Muskie and Baker: Thank you very much for being kind enough to send me the copy of the Hearings on Senate Resolution 68. I hope that this is supported in the Senate and that a Committee will be formed which will be useful to you in your judgment of what is needed.

Yours sincerely,

Wilson S. Stone,
Professor of Zoology.

The University of Texas,
Austin, Tex., August, 25, 1967.

Hon. Edmund S. Muskie,
Hon. Howard H. Baker, Jr.,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senators Muskie and Baker: I was glad to receive the information on the possible establishment of a Select Senate Committee on Technology and the Human Environment. These are very important areas which need serious study and careful legislation by our Congress. I hope that the scientists and other persons chosen to advise the Committee can provide you with adequate information from which to make rapid decisions to help our environment and to make very rapid use of our new technological inventions.

Yours sincerely,

Wilson S. Stone,
Professor of Zoology.

University of California,
Livermore, Calif, August 25, 1967.

Hon. Edmund S. Muskie,
Hon. Howard H. Baker, Jr.,
U.S. Senate, Committee on Government Operations, Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, Washington, D.C.

My Dear Senators: Thank you for your communication of August 12th concerning Senate Resolution 68. It seems to me that the establishment of a Select Senate Committee on Technology and the Human Environment is timely and will fill a great need. I would be most anxious to be of any assistance of which you might think possible in connection with your proposed work.

Sincerely yours,

Edward Teller.

University of California, San Diego,
La Jolla, Calif., August 28, 1967.

Re Senate Resolution 68 "To Establish a Select Committee on Technology and the Human Environment."

Hon. Edmund S. Muskie,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, Committee on Government Operations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Sir: Regarding your memorandum dated August 12, 1967 concerning the establishment of a select Senate Committee on Technology and the Human Environment, I would like to assure you that I am extremely interested in the subject matter of concern, and delighted by the prospect of having a special committee of the Senate of the United States investigate the broad field of the effects of science and technology on the future of man.

It becomes increasingly obvious that certain environmental problems are becoming more and more critical, but also that the present measures of encountering possible hazards are not fully adequate. There are the various pollution problems, both local and world-wide in scope; in particular, pollution of air by industrial fuel exhausts, the pollution of water by pesticides and by industrial wastes, and the pollution of food by various artificial products. Undoubtedly, these hazards are recognized as of immediate local, national, and international concern.

I would like to draw attention to the even more general, perhaps less imminent, but still most serious possibility that human activities may gradually change environmental conditions of the whole earth.

Scientific observations during the past few years, from satellites and by other means, are showing that the conditions of the earth, in particular the climate, change rather markedly as a consequence of changes in the state of the sun. There can be little doubt that in addition to the natural changes in climatic conditions, which undoubtedly occur and which should be studied, there will be changes due to human activity caused by the release of large amounts of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere, by the injection of dust particles, and of artificial radioactivities into the stratosphere. This may not be considered a too serious matter as far as the next fifty years are concerned, but may become evident within a century or two, possibly at a time when it is too late to do anything about it. I am, therefore not sure whether your committee should limit its concern to the next fifty years or extend its interest in inquiries spanning a full century. I believe that the United States should take the lead in the investigation of such global developments which are induced by human activities and which will affect our environment, perhaps not during our lifetime, but surely during that of our children or grandchildren.

May I express my deepest appreciation for your efforts and concern in these matters and assure you of my most sincere desire to contribute in any way possible.

Very truly yours,

HANS E. SUESS,
Professor of Geochemistry.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
Los Alamos, N. Mex., September 5, 1967.
Hon. EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
U.S. Senate, Committee on Government Operations, Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MUSKIE: Thank you very much for your letter of August 12, 1967 and your suggestion for comments about the legislation (S. Res. 68).

The Resolution seems to me of very great importance and the Committee might become most important and useful. The importance of closer relationship between the scientific and technological community and the Senate of the U.S. has been increasing exponentially and will still do so, in my opinion, in the near future.

Please let me know if there is any way in which I could be of help. I shall be most glad to be of service. I have had many occasions in the past to be involved with some of the work of the Senate concerning science and technology, especially with Senator Clinton Anderson on matters of atomic energy and also on matters of space programs.

With my very best regards,

Sincerely yours,

S. M. ULAM.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY,
Berkeley, Calif., September 1, 1967.
Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
Committee on Government Operations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MUSKIE: I was happy to learn that the resolution to establish a Select Senate Committee on Technology and the Human Environment is moving forward. The problems that the Select Committee will study are indeed important and complicated. Their scientific and technological components are presumably soluble, provided that the necessary effort is put into their solution. Their political and social components, however, may require a considerable amount of thinking and planning of a new kind to which the Select Committee could make an invaluable contribution. I wish you the greatest success.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN VERHOOGEN,
Professor of Geophysics.

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS,
Austin, Tex., August 23, 1967.
Hon. EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
Hon. HOWARD H. BAKER, Jr.,
U.S. Senate, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATORS MUSKIE AND BAKER: This is in answer to your letter of August 12. Since the matter under consideration is closely related to one I have been very much concerned with for the past 25 years, I will comment as follows:

1. The work of such a committee will turn out to be broader in scope than the name of the committee suggests, because the "human environment" can by no stretch be adequately considered without taking into account the diverse character of the human beings who are to live in the environment.

2. If the nature of the human beings to be accommodated is left out of the picture, or it is assumed that all human beings are inherently identical, the efforts to reach solutions will of necessity be futile.

3. Problems involving human beings cannot be solved on the false premise that what is needed is a clearer and clearer picture of the statistical average man and a careful delineation of an environment that will suit him.

4. A committee which recognizes the validity of what is said in the preceding three paragraphs, could be one of inestimable value.

It happens that I have a new book *You Are Extraordinary* to be published by Random House, which sets forth my ideas in detail. I have arranged to have sent each of you an advance copy as soon as it is available in a few weeks. It will become apparent to you that if human beings were built all the same (and hence require identical environments) then all talk about love of liberty and freedom to live our respective lives in our own way, is poppycock.

Hoping for success to your endeavors I am,

Sincerely,

ROGER J. WILLIAMS.

CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE "COMMITTEE VETO"

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, since I believe that the subjects under consideration by the Special Subcommittee on Separation of Powers are of great importance to the entire Congress and of wide interest both within and outside of it, I have followed the practice of placing in the RECORD from time to time some of the statements received during our hearings. Today I would like to insert several excellent statements received during the subcommittee's recently completed hearings on the "committee veto," a highly controversial form of congressional review and oversight of the administration of the laws by the executive branch.

The "committee veto" is a statutory device under which certain administration decisions or proposals made pursuant to delegatory statutes are required to be submitted to the Congress for some form of committee clearance before being implemented. Controversy over the device has resulted in a direct confrontation between the Congress and the President on the fundamental question of where the lawmaking function of the Congress ends and the executive function of administration of the laws begins. The President has refused to execute four statutes enacted by the Congress on the grounds that the committee veto provisions in them involve an unconstitutional encroachment on the powers of the President. The four statutes are the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act of 1954, the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956, the Public Buildings Act of 1959, and the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1965. The acts grant authority to the executive branch to formulate plans for natural resources and public works projects, including dams and other flood control devices, Federal office buildings, and land reclamation projects. But each act provides that no appropriation may be made for any such project until the plans have been submitted to the Congress and approved by designated House and Senate committees.

The President objects to this requirement on the ground that it involves Congress in the execution of laws in violation of article II of the Constitution which gives that responsibility to the President, and on the additional ground that Congress cannot properly delegate to its committees the final legislative decisionmaking authority vested by article I of the Constitution in the whole Congress.

Members of Congress, particularly the committee chairmen involved, insist that the committee veto is a proper form of legislative oversight of the administration of programs authorized by the Congress to assure that they are being carried out according to the standards and objectives enunciated by the Congress. They contend that the Congress can properly delegate its functions to its duly authorized committees, and that it can condition the appropriation of funds for programs it has authorized upon whatever terms it deems proper, including the requirement that proposed project expenditures be approved in advance for compliance with the law. They point out that the only examples of committee disapproval of watershed projects over the 12 years the program has been in operation involved projects that clearly did not comply with the requirements of the law. They also point out that the Watershed Act, now criticized by President Johnson as an "intolerable infringement" on the powers of the President, was drafted and sponsored in the Senate by Senator Lyndon B. Johnson in 1953 and 1954.

Mr. President, it is important to keep in mind that the ramifications of the current controversy extend well beyond the four programs directly involved. The committee veto is only one of various methods the Congress has devised to retain an effective control over proposed administrative acts. The format ranges from the committee veto described above to provisions that lodge the power of approval or disapproval in one or both Houses of the Congress, and provisions that require merely that proposed administrative acts be reported to the Congress or designated committees a specified number of days before implementation. One form or another of the congressional veto may be found in some 25 acts of Congress, including the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and related acts, the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1966, and the Foreign Assistance and Related Agencies Appropriation Act of 1967. Significantly, the Executive Reorganization Acts, which have been accepted and enthusiastically utilized by the President—most recently in the reorganization of the government of the District of Columbia, contain a veto procedure which empowers either House of the Congress to reject, by simple resolution, any reorganization plan proposed by the President.

It is also important to keep in mind that the committee veto was developed by the Congress in an effort to perform effectively the function of legislative oversight. The Constitution assigns to the Congress two related functions: first, the determination of governmental policies and programs and the formulation of laws to carry those policies and programs into effect; and, second, oversight of administration in order to see that the laws are faithfully executed and to hold the executive branch to the standards and objectives enunciated by Congress. The increasing scope and complexity of government and the resulting press of business have lessened significantly the detailed delineation of policy objectives that Congress is able to incorporate in its legislation. The result has been that large amounts of discretionary authority have been delegated to the executive branch, in many cases without clear and precise standards to guide administrative decisionmaking. In this context, continuing and effective congressional oversight of administration has become increasingly important.

Proponents of the committee veto insist that it provides a constitutional and effective means of preserving congressional authority when broad delegations of decisionmaking power are required and a means of augmenting congressional control in areas that presently are not subject to effective control through Congress' traditional oversight weapons. The President and other critics of the device insist that it is both unconstitutional and practically undesirable.

The statements I shall place in the Record contain excellent and thorough discussions of both sides of the controversy. The constitutional issue is discussed in great detail by Prof. Arthur Maass, of the Harvard University department of government, who favors the committee veto, and by Prof. Alexander Bickel, of Yale Law School, who opposes it. Assistant Attorney General Frank M. Wozencraft discusses the problem from the standpoint of the executive branch. Senator Allen J. Ellender, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and Representative James C. Wright, chairman of the Watershed Development Subcommittee of the House Committee on Public Works, discuss the problem from the point of view of the congressional committees involved in the operation of the affected programs.

I believe these selected statements are sufficient to convey a general understanding of the committee veto controversy and the importance of its resolution on a basis acceptable to both the President and the Congress. I urge my colleagues to read them and to formulate their own views as to the constitutionality and usefulness of this device for congressional oversight.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statements to which I have referred be printed in full at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement of Senator Allen J. Ellender Before the Subcommittee on Separation of Powers of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate Concerning the Constitutionality of the Committee Approval Provision of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act of 1954

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee, I am pleased that this Subcommittee is looking into the constitutionality of the committee approval provision of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act; and I am pleased to have this opportunity to present my views on the subject.

The provision is contained in section 2 of the Act and provides in part as follows:

"*No appropriation shall be made* for any plan involving an estimated Federal contribution to construction costs in excess of $250,000, or which includes any structure which provides more than twenty-five hundred acre-feet of total capacity unless such plan has been approved by resolutions adopted by the appropriate committees of the Senate and House of Representatives." (Emphasis added.)

The balance of the provision specifies the appropriate committees on the basis of size of the project. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, of which I am chairman, is the appropriate committee for the smaller projects.

I believe that this provision is constitutional. It imposes no restriction whatsoever on the authority of the President, nor does it purport to do so. It prohibits no executive Act. It prohibits a legislative Act, the making of an appropriation. The making of an appropriation can only be done by Act of Congress. Since the Watershed Act prohibits appropriations for projects not having the requisite committee approval, proposed appropriations for that purpose are not authorized by law and are subject to points of order under the rules of the House and the rules of the Senate. If, however, such appropriations are proposed and approved, without any point of order being raised, the Secretary of Agriculture may use the funds as he sees fit, without regard to the committee approval provision.

The language of the provision is clear. It says "No appropriation shall be made." The making of an appropriation is a legislative act. The provision limits legislative action and legislative action only. There is no executive action described or prohibited by it.

Prior to enactment of the Watershed Act, Congress authorized each individual project, and under the Senate and House rules no appropriation could be made for any project until authorizing legislation had been passed, except on motion of a standing or select committee of the Senate or one of the other bases provided for by the rules. This was a cumbersome procedure and, with the passage of the Watershed Act, a part of this authority was delegated to the Executive, but the delegation was restricted to small watersheds. No authority was delegated to the Executive at that time for projects containing structures having more than 5,000 acre-feet of flood detention capacity.

Various provisions for committee or Congressional authorization of projects containing structures providing up to 5,000 acre-feet of flood detention capacity were considered. At the same time that Congress was considering the Watershed Act, it had before it the so-called lease-purchase bill, which involved a similar problem. Both bills were stalled in conference on this point. On May 6, 1954, Congressman Dondero, Chairman of the House Committee on Public Works, sought the advice of the Attorney General, Herbert Brownell, Jr., and on May 13, the Attorney General submitted a memorandum discussing the constitutionality of certain proposed provisions on this subject. This memorandum was carefully studied, further discussions were had with the interested departments, and a provision worked out which removed the constitutional objections of the executive departments and retained an appropriate degree of legislative responsibility. This provision, adapted to the particular bill, was incorporated in the conference agreement on each of these bills, fully explained to both Houses of Congress, and agreed to by both Houses of Congress and by the President. The Parliamentarians of both Houses of Congress advised that under the procedure established by each of these bills a point of order could properly be made and sustained to a proposed appropriation to carry out a project not having the requisite committee approval; and there can be no doubt but that this was the precise effect intended by Congress.

I would like to say a few words about the administration of this provision. While that cannot affect its constitutionality, I think it should be understood.

Appropriations heretofore made to carry out the Watershed Act have generally been construed as violating the committee approval provision and providing funds for projects without regard to whether they have had committee approval. Since no point of order has been raised, the Senate and House rules have not been enforced and funds have been available for projects not having committee approval. This situation was recognized by Mr. Heimburger, Counsel for the House Committee on Agriculture, and Mr. Hughes, Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget, in a hearing before the Subcommittee on Conservation and Credit of the House Committee on Agriculture on July 11, 1966, as follows:

"Mr. Heimburger. These projects have been approved by the Department of Agriculture, submitted to the Bureau of the Budget, and presumably included in their 1967 budget. The point of order has not been raised on the floor. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, presumably the House has already approved these projects in effect by appropriating the blanket appropriation for this work in 1967. Is this not correct, Mr. Hughes?

"Mr. Hughes. The funds are in the bill, that is certainly so."

While funds have been appropriated for projects not having committee approval and the Secretary of Agriculture has therefore had the authority and funds to proceed with such projects, he has not chosen to exercise this authority. Projects have been transmitted to Congress as required by law and have been considered and approved by the appropriate legislative committees. This arrangement, which has worked well, could be followed even though the committee approval provision were not contained in the law. However, the committee approval provision provides a legislative framework for this type of consideration, and affords any member of Congress, as a matter of legislative procedure in the appropriation process, the opportunity to raise a point of order to any appropriation of funds for larger projects which have not had favorable consideration by appropriate Congressional committees. I would like to insert in the record at this point the provisions of the Senate and House rules under which such a point of order might be made.

EXHIBIT A

APPLICABLE SENATE AND HOUSE RULES

Senate Rule XVI, Paragraph 1

1. All general appropriation bills shall be referred to the Committee on Appropriations,[1] and no amendments shall be received to any general appropriation bill the effect of which will be to increase an appropriation already contained in the bill, or to add a new item of appropriation, unless it be made to carry out the provisions of some existing law, or treaty stipulation, or act, or resolution previously passed by the Senate during that session; or unless the same be moved by direction of a standing or select committee of the Senate, or proposed in pursuance of an estimate submitted in accordance with law.

House Rule XXI, Paragraph 2

2. No appropriation shall be reported in any general appropriation bill, or be in order as an amendment thereto, for any expenditure not previously authorized by law, unless in continuation of appropriations for such public works and objects as are already in progress. Nor shall any provision in any such

---

[1] As amended, S. Jour. 86, 55–3, Jan. 28, 1899, S. Jour. 140, 66–1, July 23, 1919.

bill or amendment thereto changing existing law be in order, except such as being germane to the subject matter of the bill shall retrench expenditures by the reduction of the number and salary of the officers of the United States, by the reduction of the compensation of any person paid out of the Treasury of the United States, or by the reduction of amounts of money covered by the bill: *Provided*, That it shall be in order further to amend such bill upon the report of the committee or any joint commission authorized by law or the House Members of any such such commission having jurisdiction of the subject matter of such amendment, which amendment being germane to the subject matter of the bill shall retrench expenditures.

These provisions also serve as a precedent for conditioning legislative action with respect to appropriations on prior committee action.

Because of its importance, I would also like to review at this point a short legislative history of the committee approval provision. The excerpts from the Statements of Managers on both the Watershed Act and the lease-purchase bill, and more particularly the floor statements of Senator Holland, who served as a conferee on both bills, make it clear that both Houses of Congress and the Executive gave extensive consideration to this provision and found it to be constitutional before it was enacted into law.

EXHIBIT B

HISTORY OF COMMITTEE APPROVAL PROVISION OF WATERSHED ACT

H.R. 6788, 83rd Congress, as passed by the House, required the Secretary to come into agreement with the House and Senate Agriculture Committees with respect to the plan before any installation involving Federal assistance was commenced. The Senate amendment deleted this provision and required that any dam providing in excess of 2,000 acre-feet of total capacity be approved by Act of Congress. The conference substitute for these provisions provided that no appropriation could be made for any plan which included a structure providing more than 2,500 acre-feet of total capacity unless the plan had been approved by resolutions adopted by the House and Senate Committees on Agriculture. In subsequent years the provision was amended to apply to additional plans and to provide for approval of dams in excess of 4,000 acre-feet by the Public Works Committees instead of the Agriculture Committees.

The substitute was explained in the Statement of Managers as follows:

"Under the new conference language, committee approval must be obtained before the necessary funds can be appropriated for a plan for works of improvement including a structure providing more than 2,500 acre-feet of total capacity. If an appropriation should be proposed without such committee approval such appropriation would be subject to a point of order. Although the conferees feel that such a proposal would not be made, it is their intent and understanding that a point of order can be made and sustained against appropriations for plans lacking committee approval."

In agreeing on this substitute, the conferees relied on the precedent set by the conference substitute on the so-called lease-purchase bill, H.R. 6342, on June 24, 1954, H. Rept. No. 1923, 83rd Cong. The Statement of Managers in that report stated:

"Two amendments, each being similar in character, one being in title I and the other in title II presented the most concern to the conferees. These are the amendments dealing with prior approval of the Committees on Public Works before any lease-purchase project can proceed. Certain questions concerning the constitutionality of these amendments were raised by the executive departments. Although the Senate conferees were not convinced of the validity of those questions, they have agreed to alternative language which it is understood will remove the constitutional objections of the executive departments and which still retains the same degree of legislative responsibility as in the Senate amendments. This is accomplished by prohibiting the appropriation of funds for lease-purchase projects which have not been approved by resolutions adopted by the Committees on Public Works. The original Senate language prohibited the execution of any lease-purchase agreement unless the Administrator of General Services or Postmaster General has come into agreement with the Committees on Public Works. Under the new conference language, committee approval must be obtained before the necessary funds can be appropriated. If an appropriation should be proposed without committee approval, such appropriation would be subject to a point of order. Although the conferees feel that such a proposal would not be made, it is their intent and understanding that a point of order can be made and sustained against appropriations for projects lacking committee approval."

On July 19, 1954, Senator Holland, who had been a conferee on both H.R. 6342 and H.R. 6788, explained the conference report on the latter as follows:

"As to projects between 2,500 acre-feet and 5,000 acre-feet, the conference report differs from the provisions of both the Senate and House bills in that we have adopted the same machinery which the Congress adopted in the so-called lease-purchase bill. In an effort to relieve the full Congress of further details in this matter, it was decided, instead, to provide machinery under which the Senate and House committees alone would be given the power to authorize, which power would have to be affirmatively exercised before any appropriations could be made for projects coming within those sizes.

"Senators will remember that in the lease-purchase bill we were so advised by the parliamentarians of the House and the Senate that it is clear that under such a provision a point of order can be made if an appropriation is proposed for a project between the 2,500 acre-feet size and the 5,000 acre-feet size, without its having first been submitted to and authorized by the appropriate committees."

Senator Holland made the following remarks in support of the conference report on H.R. 6342, 83rd Congress the so-called Lease Purchase bill. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 100, pt. 8, p. 10016)

"Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am sure every Senator realizes that this Act is a distinct departure. Certainly the committee members who handled it in the beginning made no pretense that it was not and the conferees now state that the act will be a real departure from earlier practices. The fact of the matter is that the Congress finds itself so overwhelmed with details that it has become increasingly impossible to handle, in the antiquated fashion, special authorizations of the many, many building projects which are now required because of the present size of this Nation.

* * * * *

"The other two principal changes made in the Senate bill are, first, the one which seeks to substitute a new method of authorization for that which has heretofore prevailed as a part of the legislative process. Senators will recall that when the bill was passed by the Senate it contained a provision which would have granted to the committees of the two Houses the power to have submitted to them the plans and projects of executive agencies for their approval. Their agreement to any proposed project was a condition precedent to any further action taken thereon.

"By whatever name it may be called, that procedure was a kind of veto upon the executive in its activities in carrying out the provisions of the act. Lawyers objected to that provision as being unconstitutional. As to the soundness of their objection, the courts alone could say. But certainly there is some substance to the objection.

"So the conference report carries out the same intent as effectively as did the Senate bill, by requiring that, as a legislative procedure, any plan or any project, to become a part of the whole operation under this act, before any appropriations for use in the project are ever made, must have been submitted to and approved by the appropriate committees of the two Houses. For the first time, at least, so far as I know, authorization by the two committees will become a condition precedent to the inclusion of that item as such, or of a general item including that and other items, in an appropriation bill. Any efforts to bypass this requirement can be made the subject of a point of order. I shall read into the RECORD three sentences from the statement of the Managers on the part of the House because they so clearly state the situation:

" 'Under the new conference language, committee approval must be obtained before the necessary funds can be appropriated. If an appropriation should be proposed without committee approval, such appropriation would be subject to a point of order. Although the conferees feel that such a proposal would not be made, it is their intent and understanding that a point of order can be made and sustained against appropriations for projects lacking committee approval.'

"I may say that the Parliamentarians of the two Houses have been checked on the matter, and the conferees were advised that this was correct procedure, and that a point of order could properly be made and sustained under the procedure which is established by the bill."

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE JAMES C. WRIGHT, CHAIRMAN OF THE WATERSHED DEVELOPMENT SUBCOMMITTEE, COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. Chairman, I am honored by the invitation to engage in this discussion with you respecting the division of powers between the Executive and Legislative Branches.

By way of credentials, I suppose I should mention that as a member of the House Committee on Public Works and Chairman of the Watershed Development Subcommittee, I have had the opportunity to maintain close and intimate contact with the operation of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, the Watershed Protection and Flood Control Act of 1954 as amended, and the Omnibus Rivers and Harbors bills, which have come up since I first came to Congress fourteen years ago.

It is my very strong conclusion that the Executive Branch is mistaken in its assertion that these laws duly passed by Congress constitute some form of invasion of the Executive prerogative. I suppose also I should confess that I have a prejudice pro-Congress, but perhaps that is counterbalanced by a prejudice pro-Johnson. I am an unashamed Johnson partisan. I have been for many years. I still am.

Nevertheless, if the Chair would permit me, I should like to address my thoughts to the operation of these three laws, and to my conviction that they are effective, efficient, popular, and in every sense proper exertion of the legislative prerogative.

The Public Buildings Act of 1959 has been the vehicle by which more than 600 needed public buildings throughout the country have been either built or remodeled and improved. The Watershed Protection Act has resulted in the development of comprehensive work plans for some 444 upstream watersheds throughout the United States since its inception in 1965, and of course the Omnibus Rivers and Harbors Bill is the result of a time-honored procedure which dates back to 1902, and indeed has antecedents that date back well into the nineteenth century and what then was called the Civil Works Act.

I believe that each of these acts has certain advantages to the Congress and to the Nation. I believe the procedures by which the Congress has, in a sense, appointed its committees to perform certain oversight functions for the Congress was dictated by experience.

I am convinced that the procedures of permitting the committees concerned with the operation of these particular acts to exercise a regular systematic review over the precise plans and projects that are authorized by these acts serves the convenience of the Congress. It permits us to operate much more expeditiously. It saves us the necessity of considering in the whole Senate and in the whole House each of these separate measures. It saves us the inconvenience of having to put all of them into an Omnibus Bill, to authorize them specifically, and I believe that it has worked very effectively both from the standpoint of the convenience of the Congress and the convenience of the Administrative Branch.

Secondly, I am sure it is demonstrable that these procedures have served the Nation by expediting the program which the Congress wanted expedited. If it were necessary for us, for example, to amass a great number of these projects in an Omnibus Bill once every three or four years, obviously it would be necessary for the people who are served by these projects to wait quite a considerable time before they could be commenced.

In addition to this, I believe that it serves a very useful purpose in providing the means for a continuing legislative oversight in a very healthy atmosphere, not a hostile or unfriendly atmosphere, into the manner in which the administrative branch is carrying out the functions assigned to it by the Congress.

Now, I think we should examine briefly the alternatives to the system of committee approvals set up in these laws. Incidentally, I regard the term of committee veto to be something of a misnomer. Rather than its being a committee veto, I think the procedure creates a system of committee approval.

In no sense can I see that it impinges upon the Executive authority. The alternatives would be either, first, to have individual bills introduced and considered by the House and by the Senate for each of these projects, and surely we can see the unwieldy impossibility of this when we contemplate that, in these two acts, the Public Building Act and the Watershed Act, there have been more than one thousand individual projects. I am quite certain also that they are of a type which receive more deliberative consideration from the parent committees who sponsor the programs under which these projects are advanced than were they to come before the whole House or Senate.

Senator Ervin. If you will pardon the interruption at this point, aren't those committees composed in substantial part of members of the Congress who have served for considerable periods of time on the committees and, by reason of that, have acquired an expert knowledge in relation to these matters which is not possessed by the average Senator or Congressman?

Mr. Wright. Mr. Chairman, it is indeed true that most of the members of the Public Works Committee, and I confine my remarks primarily to this, because this is one with which I have the greatest familiarity, have been in Congress for a number of years. If there be anything to the business of legislative craftsmanship and specialization, we would have to presume that they were more expert in their knowledge of these particular fields of subject matter than the average member of Congress.

I think the other alternative would be to place all of the projects in an Omnibus Bill. We already have touched upon how difficult that would be.

One third alternative occurred to me, and that seems to be the one that the Administration favors. That is to give the Administration what would amount to a complete blank check to begin and expedite and prosecute only those projects that it desired, and to do them in the order that is desired. I have read the testimony given to this committee this morning by my very good personal friend, Frank Wozencraft, who also is a Texan, and for whom also I have the greatest admiration. But I must say, Mr. Chairman, that I regard his proposed solution, namely that the Administration would furnish to the Congress a list of its projects and give the Congress 30 days in which to ask them to come up and discuss them with us, as being quite meaningless from the standpoint of providing the systematic, regular, intelligent Congressional review that was contemplated in the parent legislation.

I believe there are reasons why Congress should maintain this type of review. In recent years I can mention several specific fields of law which have a direct bearing upon the committee, my primary committee in the House, wherein it is my personal opinion that the Administration has blithely ignored clear congressional intent. May I mention just three of these items.

Occasionally I know that Congress in creating a new program will intentionally confer broad discretionary powers upon the Executive agency, and sometimes admittedly there are honest differences as to just what Congress intended. But sometimes there can be no question at all. Zealous administrators increasingly have evaded, avoided, and in some cases utterly ignored congressional enactments. This is not only philosophically wrong, Mr. Chairman, in my view it is just as illegal as a burglary.

Let me mention Item Number One, because it is recent and because its aftermath is current. A very flagrant example of Executive usurpation has occurred in my opinion in the Highway Beautification Act of 1965. This bill was sponsored by my committee. I happened to be one of the floor leaders in the presentation of the bill to the House, and an advocate of the legislation.

Congress authorized a program to set aside and beautify certain areas along the Nation's highways, to screen junk yards and permit intelligent control over the proliferation of billboards. But in the city areas where there is not much natural beauty, Congress decreed that any standards on such things as size and spacing and lighting of these billboards would comply with customary use. This is the language of the statute: "customary use." This means obviously that outsized, abnormally cluttered signboards would be required to come down, but that the others, those that conformed to accepted practice would remain.

The Federal Bureau of Public Roads has utterly ignored this requirement. It has promulgated standards which, if followed, would destroy approximately 80 per cent of all the properties owned by our legitimate American outdoor advertising interests throughout the whole country. Now, this obviously does not conform to the congressional enactment. It is not a question whether it is philosophically right or wrong. It is a question of its being legal or not, and I am convinced that it is not legal.

Even after the effect of the administrative dicta had been called to the attention of the appropriate Executive agency early this year by legislators who actually wrote the law, the Bureau persisited, and hearings have been held in the Senate and in the House, the Public Work Committee, demanding to know why federal administrative establishments so cavalierly ignored the law.

Another item which comes quickly to my attention relates to an insistent demand last year by the Bureau of the Budget, in an attempt to change by administrative fiat the time-honored rules for evaluating waterway projects. Conferences between the Executive and top congressional leaders, the most experienced in this field, the Chairmen and ranking majority and minority members of the House and Senate Public Works Committees and the Senate and House Subcommittees on Appropriations, which deal and have purview with this matter, had no result. We tried without avail to explain to the President and to his Budget Director what violence was being attempted to congressional intent. Finally we resolved it in a measure by an additional congressional enactment, by an amendment to the Department of Transportation Act last year. Even so, subsequent to that, attempts have been made by the Bureau of the Budget, and, acting in its behalf, by the Secretary of the Army, to superimpose additional criteria, neither authorized nor desired by the congressional committees or by the Congress, upon the evaluation of these projects. This is a continuing battle.

I could mention others, for example, the Economic Development Administration, which was created by a law, the Economic Development Act of 1965, which emanated from the committee on which I serve. In that Act, Congress clearly stipulated that no government loans would be made to start new businesses in fields where the present demand is, and I quote from the law, "not sufficient to employ the efficient capacity of existing competitive commercial and industrial enterprises."

Of course, the rationale to that was that we did not want to create unemployment in one place in an effort to relieve unemployment somewhere else. But EDA administrators, notwithstanding this injunction, have authorized in some instances federal loans which would have the effect of creating direct competition and result in unemployment for existing firms.

I do not intend this to be a recitation of areas in which the Congress and the administrative branch have come into disagreement. I mention these three solely as illustrative of the fact that Congress, if it is not zealous, easily finds itself in the position of a body which has written the law only to find the law being ignored and improperly carried out.

Now, I cannot see any way in which the procedures authorized in the Public Building Act of 1959, as amended, the Watershed Act of 1954, as amended, and the Omnibus Rivers and Harbors Act impinge upon or invade the Executive authority. In the first place, the initiative for submitting prospectuses remains with the Executive. Congress does not initiate prospectuses considered under these acts, except for the one instance in which, by a committee resolution, we may direct the Corps of Army Engineers to conduct a survey and an investigation to determine the feasibility of flood correction or other protective measures with regard to a specific area. But in considering the prospectuses, we await the Executive pleasure. Therefore, the initiative remains with the Executive.

Secondly, as a practical matter, Congress has required a favorable report from the Executive agency, before the committees have acted to authorize these specific projects. In none of these acts can I recall, in the past fourteen years, a single instance in which the oversight committee has authorized a project which the Administration did not want.

Mr. Chairman, that has been my experience, and I am sure the experience of all of our colleagues in both Houses of Congress. The only possible way in which it could be said that this procedure deprives the Executive of any of the powers he otherwise possesses would be to contend that the Congress, by permitting a committee action to authorize a project, deprives the President of a right to veto that authorizing action. But as a matter of practice, the President does not possess the right of item veto with respect to projects authorized in the Omnibus Bills. His choice is either to sign the Omnibus Bill, which encompasses a great body of these projects, or to veto the entire package. And as a matter of general practice he usually signs the bill. Therefore, he is not losing anything by failure to give him the right to veto a project in its authorizing stage, which he and his appointees already initially have recommended to the Congress.

Beyond this, the initiative for funding still remains with the President. It is the Executive agency which presents to the Congress the budget annually. It is the Executive which assembles those projects to be considered in the annual budget submission, and so he retains that power. Beyond this, assuming that the Congress were to authorize and later to appropriate moneys for a given project not desired by the Executive Branch, the Executive Branch retains the right not to spend the money. I have had some experience in that, Mr. Chairman.

In 1961, it was largely through my initiative that the House and then later the Senate authorized and appropriated $525 million additionally for the procurement of bombers not included in the Presidential budget request for that year. We authorized it. We appropriated for it. But it was not spent. The Executive, standing by its prerogatives refused to spend the money because it was not felt we needed additional bomber procurement that year. This is a well-established point of law. We can drive the horse to water, but we cannot make him drink.

Therefore, the President loses absolutely no Executive prerogative in this procedure. He still has the initiative from the beginning to the end of the program.

I find quite strained and beyond my comprehension the apparent concern of the Executive Branch over the delegation by the Congress of its authorities to its committees, which are creatures and servants of the Congress. It seems to me that this falls clearly within the rules of the House under which each House is to be considered the final arbiter of its own rules of procedure, and if, in the wisdom of the House and of the United States Senate, we desire to confer upon one of our creature committees, one of our constituent parts, a responsibility to advise the Congress, then I see nothing inconsistent with the legislative prerogative, and certainly it is not a concern of the Executive. It is a concern internally of the Congress.

If it is said that we are delegating authority, it is not Executive authority that we are delegating. It is legislative authority, and the whole body of cases bearing upon the right of the Congress to delegate its authority has held with the Congress, to the effect that it may require many things contingent to the authorization of the specific program. I will not go into a recitation of cases that have been heard in the courts. They are well known to the Chairman and to the committee. Certainly if it has been held, as it has been held, that Congress has the power to delegate a certain determination to an Executive before a given project be authorized under enabling legislation, and if it can be held that Congress possesses the power to confer the authority to make such a finding upon a private citizen or a group of private citizens who are neither Executive nor legislative, as in the case of some of the agricultural legislation that requires a vote by certain people and a finding by certain others prior to the effectuating of a procedure established in the enabling legislation, then surely the Congress can confer upon one of its own committees a part of its authority, or can require one of its own committees to make a finding upon which would be conditioned the authorization of a project otherwise authorized under an enabling act. It seems to me that this is purely an internal matter with the Congress, and that the Executive would be rather well advised to concern itself with its delegation of authority within the Executive Branch, and to permit the Congress to operate as it historically has operated within the legislative branch.

STATEMENT OF ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL FRANK M. WOZENCRAFT, OFFICE OF LEGAL COUNSEL, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee: I am pleased to appear in response to your request that the Department of Justice present its views as to the constitutionality of so-called "coming into agreement" provisions, which limit executive actions under a statute by requiring approval or permitting veto of such actions by Congressional committees. These provisions take several forms. You have asked us to comment particularly on section 2 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act of 1954 (the "Watershed Act"), which provides that "no appropriation shall be made" for any plan in excess of a certain size "unless such plan has been approved by resolutions adopted by the appropriate committees of the Senate and House of Representatives."

The issues raised by this kind of provision involve a vital constitutional principle. As James Madison stated on the floor of the House of Representatives in 1789:

"If there is a principle in our Constitution, indeed in any free constitution, more sacred than another, it is just that it separates the legislative, executive, and judicial powers." (1 Annals of Congress 581.)

This basic concept is inherent in the first three Articles of our Constitution. Article I, section 1, provides that "All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives." Article II, section 1, provides that "The executive Power shall be vested in a President of the United States." Article III provides for an independent judiciary.

The essential functions of the three branches were summarized by Chief Justice Marshall in *Wayman* v. *Southard,* 10 Wheaton 1, 46 (1825):

"The difference between the departments undoubtedly is that the legislature makes, the executive executes, and the judiciary construes the law."

Within this framework, there are necessarily situations where these functions may overlap. Congress has the initial choice of legislating in terms of broad statements of policy to be implemented by the Executive, or with such particularity that little discretion is left to the Executive. Once the Congress has legislated, however, it is for the Executive branch—not the Congress—to implement the legislation.

This is not to say that enactment of a statute marks the end of Congressional power with respect to that statute. Congressional committees can perform a valuable service in reviewing executive actions under the statute and focusing the attention of the public and the Congress on the execution of the laws. Congress can exercise control through corrective legislation or subsequent appropriations. But it is not consistent with the Constitution to require approval or permit veto of specific executive actions by Congressional committees.

Efforts to superimpose committee approval or veto upon the legislative process have become increasingly frequent during the past few years. The result has been direct confrontations between the President and the Congress on issues which by their very nature must be settled between those two branches, without resort to the courts. Sometimes statutes have actually been enacted which contain such provisions. In the long run, however, an accommodation of the valid and competing interests of the President and the Congress has usually been reached.

I am filing with the Subcommittee as an appendix to this statement a summary of veto messages and signing statements by Presidents Wilson, Hoover, Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson rejecting committee approval measures as unconstitutional.[1] I will not lengthen this statement by quoting these materials here, but I earnestly invite the attention of the Subcommittee to the eloquence and conviction with which these Presidents, and also the members of Congress and Attorneys General quoted therein, have defended the separation of powers against this kind of encroachment. It is also enlightening to note the response of the Congress, and the various ways in which accommodation between the President and the Congress has been achieved in these instances.

In considering the constitutionality of these "coming into agreement" provisions, it is vital to keep in mind the distinction between committee action as an integral step in the legislative process and committee action after that process has culminated in legislation. Committee action can be the very keystone of the legislative process, but it cannot itself have legislative effect.

As Attorney General Mitchell stated in the administration of President Hoover, "Action by a committee is not legislation, and a committee of the Congress can not legislate." 37 Op. A.G. at 60–61.

When committee action is a step in the legislative process, it is subject to review by the Congress as a whole. In sharp contrast, a "coming into agreement" provision gives to one committee in either House a stranglehold over executive action to implement legislation already approved by the entire Congress.

As President Wilson stated in 1920:

"The Congress has the power and the right to grant or deny an appropriation, or to enact or to refuse to enact a law; but once an appropriation is made or a law is passed, the appropriation should be administered or the law executed by the executive branch of the Government. In no other way can the Government be efficiently managed or responsibility definitely fixed. The Congress has the right to confer upon its committees full authority for purposes of investigation and the accumulation of information for its guidance, but I do not concede the right, and certainly not the wisdom, of the Congress of endowing a committee of either House or a joint Committee of both Houses with Power to prescribe regulations under which executive departments may operate."

Attempts to square such provisions with the Constitution founder upon an inescapable dilemma. The action of the committee must be considered either executive or legislative in nature. If it is considered executive, then it is clearly an incroachment upon executive authority in violation of separation of powers. If the committee action is considered legislative, then it amounts to a shortcutting of the legislative process contrary to Article I of the Constitution.

In section 7 of Article I, our founding fathers provided that before a bill becomes law it must have passed both the Senate and the House of Representatives—not just their committees. It must then be presented to the

---

[1] Appendix not included here. May be read in the office of the Senate Subcommittee on Separation of Powers, room 1403, New Senate Office Building.

President for approval or veto by him—not just his designee. Nothing in Article I, or in its philosophical or historical basis, suggests that final authority as to any step in this process can be delegated.

This is the legislative process provided by our Constitution. It contains measured and balancing protections which would be lost if the process were cut short.

In this connection, it has been suggested that "coming into agreement" provisions might be supported by analogy to the procedure for Congressional approval provided in the Reorganization Act of 1949. However, there are crucial differences. The Reorganization Act operates only in the area of organization of the Executive branch. Within this area, where the President has special knowledge and responsibility, the Reorganization Act gives him authority to initiate the process without prior Congressional action. Thus his approval, normally safeguarded through his veto power, precedes his submission of the reorganization plan to the Congress. The plan cannot be amended by either or both Houses, but either House can defeat the plan by disapproval, just as it can block the enactment of legislation by disapproval. Moreover, the House and Senate act as a whole on the plan, not simply through committee.

If I understand correctly the testimony of the distinguished Chairman of the Senate and House Agriculture Committees at these hearings, they have no disagreement with the principles and authorities that I have referred to so far. Both Chairmen have acknowledged in their testimony that once a general appropriation for watershed projects has been made, their Committees have no legal authority to interfere with executive decisions as to what projects will be undertaken with the funds thus appropriated.

At the same time, I feel that the Secretary of Agriculture would surely agree that it would be folly not to keep these Committees fully informed of the projects which he plans to undertake.

With this genuinely large area of agreement in mind, let us examine the relatively limited area of disagreement concerning the "no appropriation shall be made" clause contained in the Watershed Act. It has been contended that this language is nothing but an internal rule of the Congress affecting the relationship between the Appropriations Committees and the substantive committees involved.

I must respectfully disagree. To accept this argument in its entirety would enthrone form at the expense of substance. Yet, as Madison so clearly recognized, separation of powers has to be a matter of substance, not merely of form, if constitutional government is to be preserved. In the *Federalist* No. 48, he warned that the legislative department was in a particularly strong position to make encroachments on the authority of the executive and the judiciary:

"The legislative department derives a superiority in our governments from other circumstances. Its constitutional powers being at once more extensive, and less susceptible of precise limits, it can, with the greater facility, mask, under complicated and indirect measures, the encroachments which it makes on the coordinate departments. It is not infrequently a question of real nicety in legislative bodies whether the operation of a particular measure will, or will not extend beyond the legislative sphere."

The constitutional question before this Subcommittee is truly one of "real nicety." Section 2 of the Watershed Act is a "complicated and indirect measure" which encroaches on the constitutional prerogatives of the Executive branch to the same extent as a "committee approval" provision because, in substance, that is exactly what it is.

The legislative history set forth in Exhibit B to Senator Ellender's statement to the Subcommittee makes this clear. The House version had required the Secretary of Agriculture to "come into agreement" with the House and Senate Agriculture Committees before commencing a project. Section 2 in its present form was fashioned by the conferees as a substitute for this provision, in an avowed effort to circumvent the obvious constitutional problems which it raised. The conferees recognized that this was a distinct departure from customary procedures.

On its face, it may seem plausible to consider this provision as simply an internal rule of Congress permitting a point of order to be raised to block an appropriation. Indeed, President Eisenhower raised no objection to this provision when he signed the bill in 1954, even though in other bills he objected to direct committee approval provisions. Apparently he was willing to go along with the conferees who had substituted this provision for the House version.

In actual practice, however, this provision has been treated, not as an element of the appropriation process, but as a means of subjecting executive action under the Act to the will of particular Congressional committees—with exactly the same effect as the committee approval provision for which it was substituted.

This is clearly demonstrated by the process which has been employed in funding activities under the Watershed Act. In each budget since its enactment there has been a general item based on estimated expenditures, including projects still in the planning stage. Neither the budget explanation nor any other document before the Appropriations Committees identifies any of the projects on which the funds will be spent. The appropriations process reflects no concern with whether individual projects have been approved, and no point of order has ever been raised.

The Department of Agriculture has advised us that there have been 444 projects approved by the appropriate committees under the Watershed Act. In 389 such projects, funds have been expended within the fiscal year in which they received committee approval. Of these projects, 384 did not complete the committee approval process until after the appropriations bill for that year originally passed the House; and 347 did not complete that process until after original passage of the bill in the Senate as well.

Just as the appropriations process has proceeded with no attention to the committee approval provisions, so the committee approval process has proceeded with no attention to what projects will be funded by what appropriations act. The action by the legislative committees has been the trigger for executive action to go forward with an approved project out of whatever funds are available.

On these facts, it seems abundantly clear that section 2, regardless of its form, is not in substance an internal rule. Unlike the rules of the House or the Senate, it provides no means of review by the whole body. Rather it is a statutory provision that places final and unreviewable authority in Congressional committees, with the direct purpose of controlling executive action.

As Chairman Poage acknowledged after he summarized his view suporting the present section 2 of the Watershed Act:

"The very real problem still remains as to how this constitutional impasse between two components of the federal trinity is to be resolved."

I thoroughly agree. The Executive branch is at least as anxious as the Congress to resolve this impasse in a way which accommodates the legitimate interests of both branches. The Watershed Act has the full endorsement of this Administration. We would consider it tragic if this highly desirable program were to founder upon this impasse.

It would be equally tragic, however, if the basic principle of separation of powers were eroded by looking to form instead of substance. Whether a particular device for committee approval complies theoretically with the Constitution really should not be our question. Rather the question should be whether, in the factual setting of the particular situation, the provision is consistent with the spirit of separation of powers so basic to our Constitution.

As the examples in our appendix show, different problems of this kind have produced a considerable range of solutions. In some instances, the Congress has acceded to the President's position, relying on its general powers of oversight. In others the statute has been amended to provide for authorization of specific projects, singly or in groups, by legislation.

Recently a compromise has evolved which resolves this kind of impasse by substituting for the committee approval provision a requirement of thirty days' notice to the Congress before a project is undertaken pursuant to the legislation. This assures the Congress and its committees of an opportunity to review these projects without giving the committees the unreviewable veto power which they would have under a committee approval provision. Even if the Congress is not in session, the committee chairman and staff can advise the Executive Department of any questions or problems they have concerning a particular project. I am confident that any Secretary would hold that project in abeyance until the committee's questions had been explored—not only in a spirit of comity, but in recognition that future legislation and appropriations will necessarily be affected by the relations of his department with the committee.

I should emphasize, as President Johnson did in vetoing the Military Construction Authorization Bill of 1965, that this form of compromise can be accepted by the Executive branch only when the waiting period is of reasonable duration in relation to the matters involved. It is particularly troublesome to have a waiting period measured by a number of days of continuous session of Congress, since that interval is measured not by the need for speed in undertaking the project but by the duration and frequency of Congressional recesses. In most instances a period of thirty days would seem appropriate. This should allow ample time for the appropriate committee to review and discuss the proposals with the Executive branch, without unduly restricting the ability of the Executive to act with reasonable dispatch.

In keeping with the statements of President Johnson quoted in our appendix, the Administration has transmitted to the Congress this year proposed legislation adopting this compromise approach in the five instances where current statutes include "no appropriation shall be made" provisions: (1) the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956; (2) the Flood Control Act of 1965 (Title II of the Rivers and Harbors Act); (3) the Watershed Act; (4) Section 101 of the Agriculture Act of 1962 (Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act—loans for rural renewal); and (5) the Public Buildings Act of 1959, as amended.

S. 862, which would amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956 by replacing the "no appropriation" language with a thirty-day "report and wait" clause of the kind described above, was passed by the Senate on August 3, 1967. The House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported the same bill favorably on August 31, 1967, differing only on the length of the waiting period. Thus the bill seems well on the way toward enactment.

I earnestly hope that this form of compromise will provide a pattern which the Congress will follow in connection with the other bills transmitted by the Administration. If the Agriculture Committees and Public Works Committees adopt the same spirit of accommodation as the Interior Committees, the impasse will be resolved. These eminently desirable programs can then be carried out through procedures which comply in substance, as well as form, with the basic principles of our Constitution.

Statement of Prof. Arthur A. Maass, Department of Government, Harvard University

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am sorry that I have not had time to prepare a statement for you to read, but with your permission I would like to speak from some rough notes. I shall try to respond to the several queries in your letter to me of the 12th of August, relating to the so-called legislative veto.

I shall speak first, and not at very great length, on the question of the constitutionality of the legislative veto, second on the wisdom of the veto as a technique of legislative oversight, and third on the legislative veto provisions in the statutes like the Small Watershed Act, with which your committee has been concerned.

First on constitutionality, let me say simply that I do not believe that any of the several forms of the legislative veto that have been used is unconstitutional. The interesting questions relate therefore to wisdom rather than to constitutionality on the legislative veto.

The principal constitutional argument against the legislative veto is that it violates the separation of powers doctrine. Those who make this argument rely on an interpretation of this doctrine that bears little resemblance to the U.S. Government that we know today. Relying on Articles I and II of the Constitution, these critics define the respective roles of Congress and the Executive according to the following principles:

All legislative powers are vested in the Congress; all executive and administrative powers are vested in the President and the departments.

These basic assignments of power may be modified, however, by what have been called checks and balances; but in any case, so the argument goes, Congress should not interfere with the execution or administration of government programs.

Yet these principles, however they may be qualified, are not useful today for understanding executive-legislative relations, nor for determining what is unconstitutional in this regard.

At the risk of being too elementary, perhaps, allow me to present an alternative definition for the respective roles of Congress and the Executive. First I should like to distinguish the Administrative process of government on the one hand, and the legislative process on the other. By legislative process, I mean simply laying down, usually by statute, the basic objectives and standards that are to govern the government's activities in any area. In the administrative process, these objectives and standards are refined into what we call performance criteria, frequently by administrative orders, and the activities or programs are carried out. The stamps are sold at the post office window.

The President has great influence in the legislative process, as much as, or more than, the Congress. The President normally initiates the process. It is the President's agenda to which you principally devote your time. There are good and sufficient reasons, of course, for Executive initiative of the legislative process, quite apart from the advantage that the voters thereby are able to pinpoint responsibility for leadership. The early stages of the legislative process are significantly a matter of reducing alternatives and concentrating on the more promising possibilities. And this requires, among other things, access to great stores of data and expertise. The Executive is better able to provide these than is the legislature. The early stages of the legislative process are also significantly a matter of insuring that policy proposals in one area are coordinated and consistent with those in other areas. This requires central direction of the policy-initiating process, and this the Executive is better able to provide than is the legislature.

Similarly, Congress is and should be very much involved in the administrative process. In the American system of government, we have always relied on the legislature to subject the bureaucracy to popular influence and popular control.

Thus we cannot define the roles of Congress and the President by saying that the legislature legislates and the Executive executes. The Congress plays a role in both enactment and execution, in both policy and administrative performance, in both the legislative process and the administrative process, and the President does likewise. He plays a role in both the legislative process and the administrative process.

The basis for distinguishing the roles of the two branches of government is, it seems to me, rather this: In the normal situation the President initiates or exercises leadership in both processes, and the Congress oversees or exercises oversight in both processes. In the legislative process, oversight means that the Congress takes the Executive's proposals, examines them in the light of alternatives, alternatives that might be suggested by the Executive agencies or by outside witnesses; and accepts, modifies, or rejects what the Executive has proposed.

These, then, are the normal roles of the two branches of government. But I should be quick to modify the model for the abnormal situation where Presidential leadership is not forthcoming. There is no question but that when there is a leadership vacuum in the White House, the Congress can and often does take the leadership in the legislative process. On these occasions, there is a leadership reserve in the Congress, and it is one of the principal strengths of the American system of government. However, this reserve is located largely in the committees and in their leaders. It can be used with success episodically. Congress is not and in my view need not be organized to exercise initiative regularly.

With this definition of the related roles of Congress and the President, with this interpretation of the doctrine of separation of powers, for this doctrine involves simply a definition of the roles of the branches of government, I can find nothing unconstitutional in the legislative veto. One can argue that the legislative veto is an unconstitutional violation of the separation of powers only if he uses an abstract analytical interpretation of that doctrine that has little to do with American government today.

A subsidiary constitutional question that has been raised is more technical, and relates to the nature of the veto action itself. It is a "legislative" action, so the argument goes—and here I use legislative in quotation marks; and as a legislative action it is unconstitutional. The Constitution provides in Article I, Section 7 that all bills, resolutions, orders and votes must be submitted to the President for his approval; but in the legislative veto, the President is denied the right of approval or veto.

On this point I subscribe to the view of my colleague, Professor Joseph Cooper, in his authoritative article in the George Washington Law Review, March 1962, that the legislative veto action is not legislation in the meaning of Article I, Section 7. The legislation is the act which authorizes the use of the legislative veto, the Small Watershed Act, for example. Furthermore, if the legislative veto action were legislation in the sense of Article I, Section 7, then all forms of the veto, the two-House, the one-House, as well as the committee form, would be unconstitutional, for the action is not submitted to the President for his approval in any of these cases. Perversely, some of the principal critics of the constitutionality of the committee form of the legislative veto are the most ardent advocates of the Act under which the President submits reorganization plans to Congress which can be vetoed by a majority vote in either House.

If the legislative veto action is not legislation in the meaning of Article I, Section 7, then, say some critics, it must be executive, and if it is an executive action, then clearly it violates the separation of powers doctrine of the Constitution. That argument, as you, Senator Ervin, know so well, is much too facile. Congress acts in many ways that are not covered by Article I, Section 7. It holds hearings, it conducts investigations, and, as Senator Ellender likes to emphasize, it sets rules governing the manner in which funds are to be appropriated.

To conclude this brief discussion of constitutionality, the claim that the legislative veto is unconstitutional because it violates in a broad and general sense the separation of powers, is untenable in my view. The more limited claim that the veto is unconstitutional because it violates Article I, Section 7 of the Constitution is equally untenable.

I turn next to my second topic, the wisdom or desirability of the legislative veto as a technique for legislative oversight.

Right off let me say that the President, as much as the Congress, has a right and a duty to consider the desirability of the legislative veto as a matter of policy, and to oppose or veto legislation that authorizes the use of the legislative veto if he thinks that it is unwise—for any number of reasons, including the reason that it reduces his power vis-a-vis that of the Congress.

The legislative veto, as you know, has developed largely since 1950. Its origin goes back further than that, to be sure, but it is since 1950 that Congress has put the veto into a large number of authorizing acts. The veto is in the Atomic Energy Act, it is in the National Aeronautics and Space Act, it is in the Small Watershed Act, and one could name another 25 acts in which Congress has used the veto as a new technique of congressional oversight.

Congress has used the legislative veto for oversight of both the legislative process and the administrative process, and Congress has used various forms of the veto.

It has used the negative form. Under this Congress authorizes the use of the veto. The Executive initiates the plan. The plan goes into effect in x days unless the Congress negates it. And the negating authority was in one instance both Houses, but in most cases it is one House or one committee of Congress.

Another form of the veto is the waiting period form. Again Congress authorizes the President to draw up plans. The Executive initiates the proposals. The proposals go into effect after they have laid before Congress for x days; no further action of Congress is necessary. But to prevent the plan from becoming effective, Congress would need to pass a bill or joint resolution which would then be subject to Presidential veto.

A third form of the veto is the so-called affirmative form, although this is a contradiction in words. In this form Congress authorizes the President to draw up plans, the President initiates the plans, and before these plans go into effect the appropriate committees of Congress pass resolutions approving them.

Let me now evaluate the veto and its several forms in terms of the roles that I have defined for the two branches of government.

The legislative veto can be used effectively, it seems to me, for oversight of policy—that is, in the legislative process—in those cases where the more usual techniques of oversight fail to provide adequate legislative control. This will be the case most frequently where Congress is unable to define standards clearly in the authorization legislation. I should like to give an illustration of this.

In 1953 Congress passed the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act. That act was to authorize the government to dispose of rubber plants that it still owned as a consequence of World War II. At that time, there were two standards that Congress wanted to apply for disposal. One was that Congress wanted the government to get its money's worth out of the plants. The other was that Congress did not want to dispose of the plants in a way that might promote monopoly in the rubber industry. Now, it was very difficult for Congress to balance these two standards unless it knew who was going to bid on the plants. And one could not know who was going to bid on the plants until legislation had been enacted authorizing their disposal.

It seems to me that Congress hit on the ideal solution in this case, namely to authorize the President to receive bids and to draw up plans for the disposal of the plants, keeping in mind the two standards, and then to submit the plans to Congress. They would go into effect if within 60 days, I believe, one House of Congress did not veto them. The bids were solicited, the plans were drawn up, and the congressional committees, particularly the Senate committee, held hearings on them. The committees found the plans to represent an adequate adjustment of the two standards, and so reported to their respective Houses. The plants were then disposed of.

In situations like this, where the President and Congress are not able to define standards clearly in the authorizing legislation, the legislative veto has great significance, I believe, as a technique in support of Congress' oversight role, and at the same time in support of Presidential leadership.

And there are two other types of situations in which the legislative veto can be significant in the legislative process. One is those situations in which Executive proposals are, for technical or quasi-technical reasons, so delicately balanced that they should be either accepted by the Congress as presented, or rejected entirely. And at the same time Congress is likely to be subjected to great pressures to modify or amend the proposals. For this type of situation, the nonamendable character of the legislative veto is especially useful. The principal justification for using the legislative veto device in reorganizations of the executive branch, the so-called Reorganization Plans, is precisely this.

Finally, the legislative veto can be significant in the legislative process in situations where there is agreement among major parties that legislation for a program is vitally needed, but there is a temporary political stalemate, either within the Congress or between the Congress and the Executive, that makes it close to impossible to reach agreement on the specific provisions of the legislation. Here the program can be enacted in general terms, and the detailed provisions can be considered subsequently when the President initiates his plan. But I should think that use of the veto for this purpose would be rare.

The legislative veto cannot be used effectively, however, for oversight of administrative performance; that is, in the administrative process. The problem here is that in order to be implemented, the veto has to be tied on to something. When the veto is directed to policy, it is relatively easy to attach it to some broad policy provision, such as the plans for disposal of rubber-producing facilities. When the veto is directed to administrative operations, however, the only hitching points are isolated details, and it is hard to find specific details, specific actions, through which a department's efficiency can be checked. In short, the task of holding an administrator accountable for general administrative performance requires a type of flexibility that the veto does not have.

You may remember that in 1964 Congress passed the Water and Resources Research Act. Title II of that Act, which related to water resources research in non-land grant colleges, included a legislative veto to the effect that no research contract could be financed until it had been presented to the House and Senate Committees on Interior, and they had approved it by resolution. In signing the bill, President Johnson said he considered that provision to be unwise, and that he would not request any money for Title II until the provision was eliminated by Congress.

I happen to have a professional interest in water resource problems, and for that reason I wrote to Chairman Aspinall at that time, requesting that he hold hearings on legislation to modify Title II. The point I tried to make was this: that I was entirely sympathetic to the desire of his committee to keep a careful eye on what happened under this new program, particularly in its early years. But certainly the best way to oversee the new program was not to require that the committee approve every $500 or $1,000 research contract that the Interior Department might enter into with an individual researcher to study, for example, the formation of scum on a lake in Oklahoma. A better way to oversee or keep track of this program would be for the committee annually to hold general hearings where it reviewed the administration of the program in terms of a large number of contracts that had been let and the influences and prospective influences of these.

So much then for the types of situations in which the legislative veto in general is especially significant.

Turning next to the relative desirability of the several forms of the veto, it seems to me that the committee form is probably unwise in most cases, for it vests in committees of Congress powers of final decision which should be made by the Congress as a whole. Clearly Congress would not vest in its committees powers of final decision over legislation. On the other hand, the Congress is willing to grant to its committees final powers with respect to selecting witnesses for their hearings, for example. Veto actions lie obviously between these two extremes. But if the legislative veto is used in accordance with the standards that I have just suggested, it will normally concern a matter of such import that the whole House should be given an opportunity to review the work of its committees if it wishes to do so.

The question is not whether or not the committees should perform an important function in situations where the legislative veto is used for oversight. Clearly they should, and they will, regardless of the form of the veto. Thus, if the form is one-House veto, the committees will hold hearings on resolutions of disapproval. They will make recommendations to the House on whether the President's plans should be vetoed or not.

The question is, as I have said, whether the whole House should deny itself the opportunity to review the decisions of its committees, thereby making them final in all cases. The one-House form of the legislative veto and the waiting period form do not suffer from this limitation. As between the two, the Congress and the President, in the legislative process, should choose one, depending on the type and vigor of control that is needed. Obviously, the waiting period provides the least control, the one-House veto the most.

At the same time, there may be some few situations in which the committee form, despite its limitation with respect to the whole House, is more sensitively attuned to congressional control, or to the congressional control that seems appropriate to the situation, than is either the one-House or the waiting period form.

I now turn to my third and last topic relating to the legislative veto. How do the general considerations that I have been discussing apply to the legislative veto provisions of the several national resources and public works acts—the Watershed Act, the Small Reclamation Projects Act, the Public Buildings Act, the small projects provisions of the 1965 Rivers and Harbors Act? The President has taken exception to these veto provisions, and I understand that you are particularly interested in them.

First, the veto provisions of these acts are not unconstitutional. I think that the President is wrong when he claims that they are.

Second, Congress has used the legislative veto in these cases as a technique of oversight in the legislative process, not for oversight of administration, and as such it is appropriate.

Third, on the facts of the cases, the President is wrong when he says that these legislative veto provisions seriously erode the powers of the President's office. In his Message to the Congress on the 1965 Rivers and Harbors Act, the President said that the veto provision "would dilute and diminish the authority and power of the Presidency," and that he had not been elected to his office "to preside over its erosion." If it were true that the disputed provision would erode and diminish to any significant degree the authority and powers of the Presidency, then it might be unwise; so let us look at the facts in the case of the Rivers and Harbors Act, for example; and I should add right here that the facts of this case are similar to those of the other resources and public works acts.

The present procedure for water projects of the Corps of Engineers is as follows: The Corps prepares a survey report on a proposed development. This report is reviewed by other interested Federal and State agencies. The Corps' report and the recommendations of the other agencies are then scrutinized for the President by the Bureau of the Budget. If the Bureau finds that the report or any part of it is objectionable, the Corps will typically make modifications to gain Budget approval, and will then submit the report to Congress, with the recommendation that the project be authorized. The Corps may, however, stick to its original report, providing it informs the Congress that the Budget Bureau has objected to it and why it objects.

Every two years on the average, the congressional Committees on Public Works hold hearings on all project reports that have been submitted since they last held hearings, and they put together an omnibus bill authorizing the reported projects that they approve. This is called Congress's biennial pork-barrel bill" by most critics. It should be noted, however, that the Rivers and Harbors bill is more the President's bill than is much legislation that passes Congress, for almost all of the projects included in it have been recommended by the President through his Budget Bureau, or they are projects to which the President has no objection. Congress hardly ever includes in the legislation a project on which the Corps has reported unfavorably, and seldom one which the Corps favors over objections of the Budget Bureau.

The appropriation of funds to build authorized projects is a subsequent process in which the President again has the initiative. Many more projects are authorized than can be funded at any time. The President selects from all authorized projects those that are to be included in his budget. The Congress reviews the President's proposals, cutting some and adding others. The President can veto the appropriations bill if he is sufficiently displeased with the Congress's changes in his proposals to justify so drastic a move. If not, the President has established the right to impound the funds for a project that he considers undesirable.

Now, this is the present procedure.

Senator ERVIN. And if one wants to be extremely technical, he might say that the President is exercising power he does not possess under the Constitution to veto, make an item veto as distinguished from the power to veto an entire bill.

Professor MAASS. That is a subject that I trust your committee will become involved in.

This, then, is the present procedure. Now, what changes in this procedure did the new provision of the 1965 Rivers and Harbors Act make—the provision to which the President objected in such strong language? The only change was in the procedure that Congress can use to authorize, or make eligible for appropriations, small projects that cost less than $10 million. These small projects can either be included in the biennial omnibus bill, or they can be approved by resolutions of the Public Works Committees of both Houses. Clearly Congress's reason for adopting this alternative was not to "dilute and diminish the authority and powers of the Presidency," but rather to expedite the consideration of small projects—to use for them an authorizing procedure less ponderous than that required for large developments. Recalling that the reports that will be before the committees for their approval will be those that the President has recommended, that the President's objections will be well known and documented if any reports to which he objects were to be submitted to the Congress under this new procedure—and I am not sure that any would be—and that the President will retain all of his discretion with regard to the budget and the right to impound appropriated funds, it is hard to find in this disputed section of the 1965 Act the dangers that the President fears. By no stretch of the imagination would the President be presiding over the erosion of his office if he were to comply with it.

Fourth, the committtee form of the veto in these bills is probably unwise for the reason that it denies to the whole Congress the opportunity to review the decisions of its committees. *For this reason I recommend that there be substituted for the committee form a one-House veto, which can be formulated in a way that will, I believe, meet the legitimate desires of the Congress to oversee the Executive's initiatives in resources and public works, do this in an expeditious way, and at the same time provide an opportunity for the whole House to control its committees.*

The one-House veto could be made to work in this way: First, projects submitted by the President that the relevant committees have approved would be authorized and would go into effect in x days without any further action by Congress, unless a member of Congress were to introduce a resolution of disapproval. In that case, the committee would report the resolution to the House unfavorably, and the House would vote on it.

Second, where the committee has disapproved projects that the President has recommended, the committee would report resolutions of disapproval to the House favorably and the House would have to adopt them by majority vote within x days. Otherwise the plans would go into effect. As a matter of practice, however, I should imagine that in most cases, where a committee objects to a President's report in this area, the Executive agencies will withdraw the reports and re-submit them with changes designed to meet the committee's objections, so that resolutions of disapproval will be few.

Finally, on the question of timing, with a one-House veto the President's plans go into effect unless vetoed by either House in x days. It may turn out that a committee is so occupied with other matters when the President submits his plans that it cannot get around to hearings within the time prescribed. For this contingency, it seems to me that the law could provide that the period for action could be extended, within limits, by a simple resolution of the committee.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes the comments that I have on the legislative veto.

STATEMENT OF PROF. ALEXANDER M. BICKEL, CHANCELLOR, KENT PROFESSOR OF LAW AND LEGAL HISTORY, YALE LAW SCHOOL, YALE UNIVERSITY

I am very glad of the committee's invitation to appear here today, and of the opportunity to express my views on these very important issues that the committee has taken under consideration.

The general problem that this Committee is examining seems to me of fundamental importance to the continued operation of our federal government in a manner that is both effective and responsible. If I may say so, it is a mark of effectiveness and responsibility in the Congress that there exists a subcommittee of the Senate which is charged with this problem.

Of immediate concern to the Committee, I am given to understand, are the so-called "coming-into-agreement" provisions, found in the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act of 1954, and in a number of other statutes. I will not trouble the Committee by repeating the substance of the provisions, because I know you have been hearing testimony about it, nor will I bother to review the constitutional position, at least the textual constitutional position, because again I am quite certain the committee is fully aware of it. We start, of course, with Articles I and II, with a division between the legislative and Executive functions. In addition, there is Section 7 of Article I, which inserts the President into the legislative process by requiring his concurrence, his approval not only of bills but of orders, regulations, and votes which themselves require the concurrence of both houses.

As an exception of sorts, or as a separate parallel arrangement, the Congress is free to run its own house, and indeed each House of Congress may run itself, or they may concur in setting common procedures, and in practice at least, although scarcely on a literal reading of the Constitution, they may often do so without Presidential approval. They are also I think clearly each independent, and perhaps can act independently together, in exercising their investigative power.

It may be said that such a provision as Section 2 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act may be viewed as nothing more than an internal congressional procedural arrangement, a rule, that is, that in certain circumstances a point of order shall be effective in either House to prevent the voting of an appropriation. By the same token, I suppose, it could be argued, each House can make for itself, or both Houses could make for themselves together, rules about germaneness, let us say. In this view, there is no trespass on any Executive function, and Congress might well have been free to enact such a provision by resolution not subject to Presidential veto. But such a view requires a greater insistence on the formal aspect over the substantial than I, for one, can yield to. For in substance, this provision, Section 2 and like provisions, which have come into some currency in recent times, in substance this provision amounts to a retention by Congress of a veto power over the administration of law. A retention of a veto power over administration, if one at all, it may be argued, not by way of a usurpation of the Executive function, but by exercise of the classic legislative one. Therefore, the argument would run, it is a kind of reservation of a veto over administration that is sanctioned by the Constitution. Nothing more clearly belongs to Congress, after all, than the authority to appropriate—or not to appropriate—money for stated purposes. And Section 2 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act is simply an invocation of this authority to appropriate.

Again, however, this is more purely formal an argument than I am able to accept. It is one thing, it seems to me, for Congress to refuse to appropriate money for a given project; it is quite another for Congress to bind itself ahead of time not to make appropriations in cases in which the assent of a committee to a given project—an assent that may be granted or withheld entirely in the committee's discretion—was not obtained by the Executive.

The Executive is to take care that the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as much as any other statute, is faithfully executed, and the Executive has the function to decide upon and formulate the details of projects authorized by that Act.

It cannot appropriate the moneys to carry out any project; Congress must do that. But here Congress, by using the bludgeon of its appropriation power, so to speak, has attempted to have its committees share the Executive function of formulating and planning projects. And I repeat that the committees' discretion is apparently obsolute, and that no aspect of the Executive function under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act and under like statute is immune to exercise of a committee's veto under Section 2, but all aspects of the Executive function may, in the committee's discretion, be shared by it.

It may be said that in all circumstances the appropriation power brings about necessarily a sharing of the Executive function with the Congress, and that this is an inescapable concomitant of the money power, which the Constitution, of course, explicitly and exclusively grants to Congress.

Congress must approve always of the purpose for which any appropriation is made, and it may inquire into the purpose in such detail as it chooses—as appropriations committees, of course, customarily do. Any wise Administration which wants Congress to appropriate money will tailor its purposes to the wishes of Congress.

Surely that is so, but in the normal appropriation process, Congress is forced to consider the purposes of appropriations in fairly-by-and-large fashion—many purposes, some clear and immediate, some distant and vaguer, and large amounts of money are involved, and it is impossible, inconceivable, to focus the attention of both Houses of Congress on the myriad details. It would, indeed, be impossible even to apply the method of Section 2 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act across the board to all appropriations. Thus normally, owing to practical constraints which inhere in the institution, and were undoubtedly foreseen, the money power does not obliterate the line of separation between the legislative and executive functions.

But it is practically possible to delegate to one or two committees with respect to one or two discrete areas of administration the function of participating in the very details of administration. That is what Section 2 does, and that is quite different from the normal exercise of control over administration through money bills; and it seems to me improperly to cross the line of separation and override the normal system of checks and balances.

To repeat the point briefly. In sum, the normal congressional sharing of the Executive function through the process of appropriations is balanced by the absolute practical incapacity of Congress to become involved in the details of administration. Congress normally exercises, therefore, a general policy control, which we can quite realistically classify as legislative, within the meaning of the Constitution.

Here, in Section 2 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, we have a delegation by Congress to one of its committees of control over the minutest details of administration, a delegation therefore of authority to share the executive function in a manner that is not normal, not easily classifiable as legislative, not restricted to general policy control. I think this runs counter to the spirit of the Constitution.

I wish to say a word also about the problem of delegation of power by Congress to its committees, but let me first notice one or two additional arguments that might be made in favor of the constitutionality of Section 2 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act. Section 2, it may be said, was signed by the President together with the rest of the statute. He has therefore consented to the procedure provided by Section 2. There can, therefore, be no usurpation of his power here, rather merely a somewhat unusual method of administration, which is agreeable to him. The underlying premise of this position would be that virtually all the meaning of the Constitutional separation of Executive from legislative powers, so far as it relates to safeguarding the integrity of the Executive power, all the meaning is contained in the provision giving the President his veto. Anything that he does not veto is pretty well ipso facto no infringement by Congress upon the Executive function. It is, rather, always simply a method adopted by the Executive in the discharge of his function.

The essential answer to this contention seems to me to be that the Constitutional separation of powers is not ordained for the convenience of the separate branches of the government, as they may from time to time conceive it, but is intended to ensure observance of certain principles, which the Framers believed would conduce to effective and responsible government, consistent with the liberties of the people. Hence neither the Congress nor the President may choose to suspend these principles when convenient.

If this were not so there would, for example, never be any obstacle to the delegation of legislative power by Congress, because each such delegation will have been made by Congress itself, and would therefore constitute consent by Congress to the diminution of its own power.

I agree on this point, as well as agreeing in general, with the excellent article by Robert W. Ginnane, "The Control of Federal Administration By Congressional Resolutions and Committees," in Volume 66 of the Harvard Law Review, page 569 (1953).

Mr. Ginnane, I think, also disposes of yet an additional point which might be considered somewhat relevant to Section 2 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, namely, the argument that the Section merely establishes a factual condition precedent, which must be fulfilled before the statute can come into operation. No doubt Congress can make the operation of a statute contingent upon the fulfillment of some condition; but if it retains control over that fulfillment itself, then the question becomes one of the separation of powers, and the form of words that is used in crossing the line of separation is scarcely decisive.

The analysis I have presented has been directed at the issue whether Section 2 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act constitutes a proper exercise of legislative power, or is an invasion of the Executive function. I have spoken throughout of Congress as such, assuming that whatever the two committees named in Section 2 do is done by Congress. I set aside a moment ago the quite separate issue of the delegation of power by Congress to committees.

May I now just remark very briefly that this issue seems to me also quite serious; that Congressional committees, representing at best only haphazard fragments of the country, cannot be identified with Congress as a whole; that I, for one, read Watkins v. United States, 354 U.S. 178 (1957), which curbed in some respects the power of the House Un-American Activities Committee, as a delegation case, as holding that Congress cannot constitutionally delegate, without standards, as much power as was delegated to that committee; that I am thoroughly in agreement with the holding of the Watkins case, and that I think it is relevant to Section 2 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act of 1954—quite aside, that is, from the other analysis, centering on separation of powers, that I presented earlier.

I have taken up probably as much time as it is proper for me to take, and all of it I fear more negatively than I would have hoped, for I am of the general opinion that the balance of policy-making initiative in the federal government ought in some measure to be redressed in favor of Congress. But, in my view, this highly desirable objective should be accomplished less by attempting to involve the Congress in the administration and execution of law, and more by tightening the lines of policy that are laid down by Congress to begin with. Congress, in other words, in my judgment, ought to do more reviewing and rewriting of its laws in light of their administration, than reshaping and redirection of the administration of its laws. What is the matter with the Federal Communications Commission, the Federal Power Commission, or the Federal Trade Commission, for example, is not that they are disregarding legislative policy, but that at many of the most important junctures in their activities they have no legislative policy available to regard or disregard. The fault of Congress is not in exerting too little control over the administration of the organic statutes that these agencies have in charge, but in failing to rethink and rewrite these statutes so that they express a workable policy relevant to present conditions.

In light of this approach, let me dwell for a moment, in part, again, I am afraid, rather negatively, on S. 1384, the bill introduced by Senator Hartke to establish an Office of Legislative Attorney General—at least, that is what it is called in the version of the bill I have seen. I am not enamored of that title, and I understand it has undergone some revision. But I think such an officer could perform very useful functions for the Congress.

I think also, however, that they are in largest part not the functions described in this bill. To be sure, appearances as amicus in behalf of Congress, such as are provided for by Section 2(a)(4) in the version of the bill that I have seen, have been fairly customary where an interest of the Congress separable from that of the Executive, and not subsumed in the Executive's duty to take care that the laws are faithfully executed, is present. But I think it constitutionally very dubious, and in any event quite unwise, to have Congress represented either as amicus and certainly as of right by its own lawyer in any case in which the validity or interpretation of an Act of Congress is involved, as provided also by Section 3(a).

Enforcement of the law is part of its execution, and litigating its constitutionality or interpretation is part of its enforcement. I do not think Congress can take over or, as of right, share these functions. Sections 2(a)(5) and 3(b) in the version that I have seen, providing that the Legislative Attorney General shall displace the Attorney General of the United States as counsel for any member or officer of either House of Congress in defending any official action seem to me perhaps constitutionally more supportable, but also of dubious wisdom.

What Congress does sorely need, it seems to me, by the name of Legislative Attorney General or any other name, is an officer whose duty it would be routinely to review actions of courts and of administrative agencies which lay bare, as they do by the dozen each year, points of policy either omitted or made insufficiently clear in existing legislation. Such an officer could take the initiative in starting up the legislative process to supply omissions in existing legislation, or to review questionable constructions of existing legislation. He could present Congress at each session with an agenda of necessary law revision. By thus systematically coordinating the work of Congress with that of the courts and of the administrative agencies, such an officer could vastly enhance the policymaking authority of Congress. Some four decades ago, the late Justice Cardozo proposed creation in New York of what he called a Ministry of Justice, and what became, in New York and in one or two other states, a Law Revision Commission.

It offers no perfect analogy to what I have in mind here, for it answered to purposes that are not all relevant. But a fruitful general analogy it does present, I believe. "Today," Cardozo said, "courts and legislative work is separation and aloofness. The penalty is paid both in the wasted effort of production and in the lowered quality of the product."

There is too much separation and aloofness today also between courts and administrative agencies and the Executive, on the one hand, and Congress on the other, and much policy made in the former that should be laid down by the latter. The default of Congress is owing in some measure to separation and aloofness. An officer whose function it was to put before Congress regularly and systematically problems unearthed by litigation, and temporarily solved by courts and administrative agencies, might do much to enable Congress to see to it that the policy that is pursued by the federal government is the policy Congress wants.

Congress, it seems to me, ought to restore the balance of power in its favor not by going out to defend its prerogative, but by exercising it. It needs, therefore, not an advocate to speak for it, but internal counsel to help it.

That is the end of my prepared statement, Mr. Chairman.

SAD DAY FOR ADVOCATES OF HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS—CLVI

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, today was a very sad day for all advocates of U.S. ratification of human rights conventions. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee, in executive session, voted to report out favorably and unanimously the supplementary Convention on Slavery.

However, the Foreign Relations Committee, at the same time, voted to table further consideration of the Human Rights Conventions on Forced Labor and Political Rights of Women.

I am deeply disappointed by the committee's action. It is a total mystery to me why the United States, of all nations, should fail to be a party to international treaties outlawing the practice of forced labor and guaranteeing the political rights of women.

The rights established by these international conventions are merely an attempt to establish minimum universal standards of human dignity. Already every American citizen has far greater rights by virtue of his birth. Certainly there is no justifiable reason either in our Constitution or our Federal statutes for the United States to fail to ratify all the Human Rights Conventions.

I solemnly urge the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to reconsider its action of today and put the United States once and for all squarely on record on the vital question of human dignity. I urge the Senate to ratify the Human Rights Conventions on Forced Labor, Freedom of Association, Genocide, Slavery and Political Rights of Women during this session of the 90th Congress.

FRANK L. BOYDEN

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, at a time when so many forces threaten the dehumanization of the individual, it is not often one is privileged to know a man of such character, vigor, stature, and sensitivity that he is able to leave a personal and significant stamp upon the work that represents the investment of his life. Such a rare man is Frank L. Boyden, who this week announced his retirement after 65 years as headmaster of Deerfield Academy in Deerfield, Mass.

At a time when shortcut, and sometimes faulty, methods of education are often frantically pursued as the panacea for the problems of our age, Mr. Boyden stands as a monument to the idea that good education is never cheap, quick, or easy. The realization of an educational dream, as Frank Boyden's life attests, requires personal dedication, expense, and a very long-range commitment.

Coming to Deerfield in 1902, a fresh, young graduate of Amherst College, Boyden found a dilapidated community school with a prospective enrollment of seven, and with the weight of community opinion in favor of its abandonment. Over the period of the last 65 years, Frank Boyden has built Deerfield into one of the country's proudest private, preparatory institutions, sending its graduates into the country's leading universities, and then on to positions of responsibility and leadership.

The sacrifice and commitment of Frank Boyden to work his educational wonder is a matter of record. He gave up his chosen career in law to commit his life to the practice of education. And it is reliably reported that more than one boy has attended not only Deerfield, but also college, with financial backing from Deerfield's headmaster.

For Frank Boyden education is not a stereotyped, impersonal activity to be approached with guide books and rule books. It is as personal and varied as 400 different boys can be. For him education means much more than academics. It means first the building of human character, and he and his wife have been doing that wonderfully well for generations of young Americans.

The Boyden philosophy assumes that the secondary school has certain incomparable services to render in the development of a boy, lessons to offer a young man that life may never again find time to duplicate. These lessons include the spiritual, the social, the ethical, as well as the academic.

At Deerfield, Frank Boyden has striven to create an atmosphere in which boys may develop individually and to their maximum potential. Great patience, understanding, and involvement are required of a school staff to produce such an atmosphere for growth, and for that reason Frank Boyden has required and received from his exceptional faculties exceptional effort. His own involvement in the life of all students is symbolized by the placement of the headmaster's desk which for so long sat in the middle of the hallway before the main door of the academy's central building.

It has been said of Frank Boyden that he is an "educator by intuition." His idea that Deerfield should operate in a personal style might seem unsophisticated in a world of educational computers and television teachers. The tight and individual rein which he has maintained over Deerfield and its activities may seem impractical for most schools and might not have been successful in the hands of a lesser man.

But Frank Boyden's method of education has worked where others have failed. His reputation as one who could save boys when other headmasters had ceased to try has gained him the regard and gratitude of students and educators alike. So high is the esteem of his fellow schoolmen and so essential have they found his contribution that it is recorded that, at one period of financial crisis at Deerfield, the headmasters from other schools solicited funds from their own alumnae to save Deerfield.

For these and so many other reasons we honor Frank Boyden in this his final year as headmaster of Deerfield. The impact of the work he has done is incalculable; the number of lives he has influenced, including that of my own son, is beyond measure. And while any man certainly deserves his retirement after 65 years on the job, there is every reason to hope and believe that Frank Boyden's contribution to American education will continue. Certainly the mark he has left on American education will not fade with his retirement, nor for generations to come.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I am more than glad to join those who have known Deerfield Academy and its headmaster, Frank L. Boyden, certainly American education's "Man of the Century."

Inasmuch as Mr. and Mrs. Boyden's influence on my immediate family has been through my son, Jim—Deerfield class of 1945—I would like to merely quote the closing passage of his speech to the Deerfield fundraising dinner, September 30 of this year:

> The game was over. He was the first on the field to congratulate the other team. In fur-collared coat and rumpled hat, he turned and raised his arms for silence and the song. Its notes lifted into the quiet cooled sky. Then through darkening shadows the breeze went back, back to the books, the hopes, the dreams that a great school is made of. Leaves scuffed up mixed with those drifting down, like old values meeting the new and finding themselves the same.
>
> He remained for a moment, clearing his spectacles. Was it mist or memory? For here were old touchdowns, goal-line stands, impossible catches, and a stifled pain of boys becoming men.
>
> The game was over. Who won? No matter; the victory, in any case, was his. And so it ever will be in every life he has touched.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I am happy to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to a most remarkable man, Mr. Frank L. Boyden, who has been a leader for 65 years, not only as the headmaster of Deerfield Academy, but also in the educational system of this country. The scope of Frank Boyden's efforts in bringing the youth of this country into productive efforts to solve our problems has been truly remarkable. I am sure that retirement will in no way adversely affect his efforts in this respect, and I join with thousands of others in wishing him well and in admiration of his work to date.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, my able colleague, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Brooke] was not able to be on the floor at this time. I ask unanimous consent that his statement be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator Brooke

Frank L. Boyden is one of those rare men who is, in truth, a legend in his own lifetime. When the definitive history of American education comes to be written, there can be no doubt whatsoever that Deerfield Academy's Headmaster Boyden is certain of a secure place as one of the real giants.

It is not only because Mr. Boyden has served as Headmaster at Deerfield for the past sixty-five years that he is entitled to an honored niche in education's Hall of Fame, although his incredible length of service must be virtually unique in the annals of American secondary schools.

Frank Boyden has earned his special rank in the field of education because he is, above all, a truly wonderful human being, a widely respected scholar, a natural teacher, skilled administrator, and born leader, as well as a man who has consistently demonstrated a sensitive affinity to and an understanding of the problems of youth. He has cared deeply about these problems, and as much as any man I have ever known, has devoted most of life to giving several generations of boys the benefit of his wisdom and his zestful love of life, marked always by a profound dedication to the highest standards of moral and ethical excellence.

The news that Mr. Boyden is stepping down from the Headmastership of Deerfield Academy generates a reaction not unlike one's feelings if told that Plymouth Rock were retiring. But if any man ever earned a grateful "Well Done," it is indisputably Frank L. Boyden. He is a great man in every sense of the word. I welcome this opportunity of saluting him with deepest respect and affection, and of wishing him all of the best, now and always.

INDIANA MAY BECOME DEPOSITORY FOR LAKE MICHIGAN POLLUTION

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, since August 6 the Chicago Tribune—guardian of Lake Michigan—has raised the hue and cry against pollution.

On September 20 the Tribune called to the attention of the Midwest a huge oil slick—massive oil pollution.

Congratulations to the Chicago Tribune.

What these reporters and editorial writers are doing in the antipollution series which began in August is pointing up the confusion among all these Great Lakes commissions, Federal-State responsibilities, municipal-industrial waste disposal problems, interstate compacts, marine law and individual citizens' disregard for a natural resource—Lake Michigan.

The blame has gone to the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration and the Army Corps of Engineers for dumping a majority of their dredge wastes into the lake. However, undesirable this practice may be, at least the corps is using some onshore dumping sites for disposal of this filth and is probably not the main contributor to pollution of the Great Lakes. The problem is more complex than this. It is, simply stated, a lack of clear directives in combating water pollution.

My own State of Indiana has an even greater stake in the abatement of pollution on Lake Michigan, though we have the smallest shoreline.

During a hearing which I chaired as a member of the Commerce Committee in August on the alewife fish menace, I learned that our area—the southern tip of the lake—had the greatest concentration of these fish; dead, alive and dying. The Federal Water Pollution Control Administration did not consider these fish pollutants even though they add to the nastiness by rotting in it. FWPCA did consider the alewives pollution potential because the stinking fish kept people from using the beaches.

Why was the concentration of the fish so heavy on the Indiana shoreline? Why does our Indiana Stream Pollution Control Board maintain so many water quality monitoring stations in this area? Why are we so concerned about pollution from Hoosier communities and industry? Probably this concern is intensified because there is considerable evidence that the water of Lake Michigan at its toe, that is, the southern tip, barely moves. Currents and winds carry pollution to us, not away from us. Whatever pollution we create does not move swiftly out to deep water.

This is one of the reasons why I was so persistent last year and again this spring that the Army Corps of Engineers find onshore dumping sites for dredge materials especially that filth from the Chicago River. The corps at my insistence found sites or diked areas for some 263,000 cubic yards from the Calumet River dredge operations. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to include in the RECORD the October 6 report by the Army Corps of Engineers on dredge activities and disposal.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DREDGING REQUIREMENTS, CALENDAR YEAR 1967

Project	Spoil disposal area	Pollutants
Calumet Harbor, Ill. and Ind	Lake Michigan—Deep water	FWPCA has been requested to furnish degree of pollution in all harbors of Great Lakes. Information not received to date.
Calumet River, Ill	Onshore diked areas	
Indiana Harbor, Ind	Lake Michigan—Deep water	
Two Rivers Harbor, Wis	do	
Kenosha Harbor, Wis	do	
Waukegan Harbor, Ill	do	
Michigan City Harbor, Ind	do	
Manitowoc Harbor, Wis	do	
Sturgeon Bay and Lake Michigan ship canal, Wisconsin	do	
Racine Harbor, Wis	do	
Port Washington Harbor, Wis	do	
Sheboygan Harbor, Wis	do	
Kewaunee Harbor, Wis	do	
Muskegon Harbor, Mich	do	
Ludington Harbor, Mich	do	
Frankfort Harbor, Mich	do	
St. Joseph Harbor, Mich	do	
Green Bay Harbor, Mich	Diked areas	
Grand Haven Harbor, Mich	Lake Michigan—Deep water	
Manistee Harbor, Mich	do	
Manistique Harbor, Mich	do	
Holland Harbor, Mich	do	
Charlevoix Harbor, Mich	do	
Milwaukee Harbor, Wis	do	
South Haven Harbor, Mich	do	
White Lake Harbor, Mich	do	
Pentwater Harbor, Mich	do	
Saugatuck Harbor, Mich	do	
Menominee Harbor, Mich. and Wis	do	

Note: The total yardage of material involved in the above projects, dredged or to be dredged, is approximately 3,000,000 cubic yards.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I would hope that we could have on-shore or diked areas to dispose of the entire 3 million cubic yards.

Not only will Indiana have trouble getting rid of its own treated—diluted wastes, if the lake is virtually immobile at its southern end, but the Hoosier State can well become the depository for a majority of our neighbor States' pollution: sewage, industrial wastes, marine refuse, dredge deposits, silt fill, garbage, and gummy oil.

The oil slick, it is my understanding, which threatened Lake Michigan ports and cities September 20 has been tested by the FWPCA as No. 6 fuel oil. Officials are unable to match it with corps dredge materials. No. 6 fuel oil as defined by the Petroleum Products Handbook is "the cheapest grade of residual fuel and is the grade normally used by powerplants and most industrial customers." Since this definition is so specific and our lack of directives so uncertain with regard to abating pollution on Lake Michigan, I have sent the following letter to James Quigley, Administrator of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration:

U.S. SENATE, COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., October 11, 1967.

Mr. JAMES QUIGLEY,
Administrator, Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, U.S. Department of Interior, Washington, D. C.

DEAR JIM: The pollution of Lake Michigan greatly concerns me. There are two questions which, at this time, I consider most serious (1) the source and extent of the oil slick which appeared September 20 and (2) the availability of technical studies which rank pollutants of the Lake in order of their contamination seriousness.

Information has reached me that the oil slick tested out as #6 fuel oil. The #6 fuel oil is most generally used by power plants and industrial customers. Therefore is it not possible that the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration can determine the sources of the oil slick by: comparing tanker schedules of Lake Michigan shippers; waste system failures of industries or power plants bordering on the Lake, which may have resulted in overflows into the water of this dimension; or possible leakage of storage tanks for #6 located close to the Lake or on one of its major tributaries? In view of Congressional interest in amendments to the Oil Pollution Act of 1924, I would appreciate a report on this matter as soon as possible.

I note that the March 1967 *Report on Water Quality Criteria Lake Michigan Basin* by the State of Indiana Stream Pollution Control Board lists the principal sources of water pollution as industrial wastes, municipal sewage—and sewer overflows. Accidental wastes are listed as spills from storage tanks and barges, wastes from Lake vessels, barge tows, and pleasure craft and residue from dredging operations. I would like to see a comparison of the damage caused by the Corps' dredge activities and dumping in contrast to other pollution sources. How much damage does the 3,000,000 less that amount deposited on shore actually do?

Is it possible to rank the Lake Michigan pollutants in acordance with their danger level? I am very much interested in this as it seems important that we establish priorities for attacks on these pollutants since the cost of the war in Vietnam is liable to allow us only one or two goals in the water pollution abatement operations for this fiscal year.

Your personal attention to this matter is greatly appreciated.

Best personal regards.

Sincerely,

VANCE HARTKE,
U.S. Senator.

It seems very important to me, Mr. President, that we do have a report on pollutants in order of their seriousness.

The Indiana Stream Pollution Control Board seems to be concentrating on municipal sewer systems and industrial waste problems. I ask unanimous consent Mr. President to include part of that report in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPENDIX 3.—MUNICIPAL WASTE TREATMENT STATUS, LAKE MICHIGAN BASIN

Municipality	1960 population	Type of treatment	Year completed	Design flow (million gallons per day)	Present flow (million gallons per day)	Receiving stream
Chesterton	4,335	Activated sludge, chlorination	1963	1.50	1.06	Little Calumet River, Burns Ditch, Lake Michigan.
Crown Point	8,443	do	1966	1.80	.90	Beaver Dam Ditch, Deep River, Little Calumet River, Lake Michigan.
Dyer	3,993	do	1966	.60	.30	Plum Creek, Little Calumet west to Grand Calumet in Illinois.
East Chicago	57,669	do	1960	20.00	11.50	Grand Calumet River, Lake Michigan.
East Gary	9,309	Trickling filter, chlorination	1960	1.30	1.00	Burns Ditch, Lake Michigan.
Gary	178,320	Activated sludge, chlorination	1965	[1] 60.00	[1] 42.50	Grand Calumet River, Lake Michigan.
Hammond	111,698	Activated sludge (chlorination under construction).	1964	36.00	35.10	Grand Calumet River west to Illinois.
Griffith	9,483	Served by Hammond Sanitary District.	------	------	------	
Highland	16,284					
Munster	10,313					
Whiting	8,137					

[1] Plus 20 additional primary capacity.

1960 population	Type of treatment	Year completed	Design flow, million gallons per day
18,680	Activated sludge chlorination.	1962	2.00
36,653	do	1956	10.00
2,189	None	------	------
2,875	Activated sludge, chlorination.	1965	.86
15,227	do	1954	2.00

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, Porter, a small community, has been ordered to install a sewer treatment system. The case is now before the attorney general of the State of Indiana.

We have ordered our industries to clean up many by 1968—others by 1970. Indiana was the first State to ratify the Great Lakes pollution control compact. We who have the smallest shoreline are willing to do our share.

Without clear directives and priorities water pollution control measures will continue in the welter of confusion that the Chicago Tribune has pointed up. I call upon the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration of these directives and an establishment of priorities.

CONCLUSION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be excused from sessions of the Senate from October 17 through October 20 and October 23 through October 25.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I believe it was yesterday that the distinguished minority leader, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], was reported in the press as having given me a lecture in history relating to the difference between our presence—the United States presence—in Vietnam and that of the French. I think, in the previous exchange we had a few days ago, reference was made to our presence there being not unlike that of the French, and the distinguished Senator from Illinois took exception to that, suggesting that our motives are different from those of the French.

I confess that there are differences of motives. I have never asserted that we were there in the same role as the French.

Bearing on this matter, some time ago in the New York Review, the distinguished scholar John K. Fairbank, writing in an article entitled, "How To Deal With the Chinese Revolution," said:

> On the long thin coast of Vietnam, we are sleeping in the same bed the French slept in even though we dream different dreams.

Because I think that article is interesting in itself as it relates to this area of the world, and that it would do no harm, and be educational, to put it in the RECORD, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I also make the same request with respect to an article in the same publication by Jean Lacouture, one of the leading French authorities on Vietnam, entitled "Vietnam: The Lessons of War."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, these are reasonably current articles by two outstanding authorities on Vietnam, and I believe they would be interesting to my colleagues in the Senate.

Mr. President, as I referred earlier to an exchange that I had with the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the minority leader, on Tuesday, October 3. I wish to make a few comments relating to the exchange.

In his speech in the Senate on October 3, the distinguished minority leader expressed a number of provocative ideas. Among these he developed certain themes which strike me as being of special significance. I refer to the Senator's concept of the President's powers as Commander in Chief under the Constitution, to his definition of the purposes for which we are fighting in Vietnam, and to his brief reference to the United Nations. I should like to comment on each of these.

The Senator takes a most generous view of the President's powers as Commander in Chief—generous, that is, to those in the executive branch who wish to conduct foreign policy without any interference from Congress. He said that, in making the President Commander in Chief, the Constitution "tendered to him the sword of the country. And that includes not only the conduct of our foreign relations, but also the conduct of any struggle or hostility in which we might be engaged." At first I thought this statement might be an inadvertency on the Senator's part, but later in his speech he said:

> I have found as yet no delimitation on the powers of the Commander in Chief under the Constitution.

There are in fact significant delimitations on the President's powers as Commander in Chief, and one does not need to look for Supreme Court cases to spell them out. They are set forth, most explicitly, in the Constitution itself. I refer to the military powers entrusted to Congress under article I, section 8, including the power to declare war; to raise and support armies; to provide and maintain a navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the Armed Forces; to provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws, suppress insurrections and repel invasions; to provide for organizing, arming and disciplining the militia; and to make all laws necessary and proper for executing the foregoing powers. These, it seems to me, are important delimitations indeed on the President's powers as Commander in Chief.

The Senator says that he has "no hostility toward criticism," but that it must be "within due bounds." He goes on to make it clear that he considers criticism of the conduct of the war in Vietnam and of the purposes for which it is being fought as being out of "due bounds." Such criticism, in the Senator's view, is unacceptable because, he says, "we must not arrogate to ourselves the conduct of an external struggle," because criticism of the Presidents judgment "does not sound good' and "does not look good" and might "demean him in the eyes of the people abroad."

I wonder whether the Senator considers that Senator Taft was "within bounds" or outside of bounds when, on January 5, 1951, he said that—

> President Truman had no authority whatever to commit American troops to Korea without consulting Congress and without Congressional approval.[1]
>
> The President—

Said Senator Taft—

---

[1] *Congressional Record*, 82nd Congress, 1st Session, vol. 97, pt. 1, January 5, 1951, p. 57.

> simply usurped authority, in violation of the laws and the Constitution, when he sent troops to Korea to carry out the resolution of the United Nations in an undeclared war.[2]

In conceding the President the right to commit the country to war and then to conduct the war virtually without criticism, the minority leader is being most generous, all the more so since his generosity is toward a President not of his own party. The trouble is that he is being generous with something that is not his—or any other Senator's—to give away; namely, the responsibility for foreign military commitments entrusted to Congress by the Constitution. As Alexander Hamilton wrote in Federalist No. 69:

> The President is to be commander in chief of the army and navy of the United States. In this respect his authority would be nominally the same with that of the king of Great Britain, but in substance much inferior to it. It would amount to nothing more than the supreme command and direction of the military and naval forces, as first General and admiral of the Confederacy, while that of the British king extends to the *declaring* of war and to the *raising* and *regulating* of fleets and armies—all which, by the Constitution under consideration, would appertain to the legislature.[3]

It is clear beyond doubt that the framers of the Constitution intended the power to initiate war to be vested not in the President but in the Congress. In a letter to James Madison in 1789, Thomas Jefferson wrote:

> We have already given in example one effectual check to the Dog of war by transferring the power of letting him loose from the Executive to the Legislative body, from those who are to spend to those who are to pay.[4]

I turn now to the Senator's definition of the purposes of the war in Vietnam, which I think is the most significant passage in the exchange. The Senator says that he "was not made a Senator to preside over the liquidation of the holy fabric of freedom." Amen. Neither was I, nor any other Senator. With that established, the question remains just what the war in Vietnam is doing to sustain the "holy fabric of freedom."

In Vietnam that fabric is threadbare indeed. A small beginning has been made toward the establishment of constitutional government, but the fragile institutions which have been created survive at the pleasure of the Saigon generals, who in turn survive because half a million American soldiers are shielding them from their enemies while their own army is reluctant to fight. Nor is the fabric of freedom strengthened by the blasting to bits by bombs from B-52's of villages suspected of harboring the Viet Cong, any more than it is strengthened by the terrorism of the Viet Cong. Far more could be done to strengthen freedom in Vietnam—or, more accurately, to create some hope for it—by a compromise peace and arrangements for self-determination which all the contending parties would pledge themselves to respect regardless of the outcome.

Nor can it be said that this endless and unsuccessful war is doing much to strengthen freedom in our own country. On the contrary, it has given rise to an unhealthy atmosphere of suspicion and recrimination, both within the Government and in the country at large. More important still, more dangerous and more tragic is the choking off of domestic reform as a result of the costs and anxieties set loose by the war. I was impressed in this connection by an article in this morning's paper reporting what appeared to be a very critical statement made by the Secretary of State relating to those in Congress who had recently criticized the administration. It is indicative of how recrimination is mounting in various circles. At exactly the moment when it seemed that, at long last, we were about to take those long overdue measures which might bring freedom of opportunity to those millions of Americans who have not achieved it, the war put an abrupt end to domestic reform, claiming first priority on our resources and energies, turning the Great Society into a sick society.

The Senator from Illinois is concerned with the strategic security of the United States as well as with the "holy fabric of freedom." He regards the war in Vietnam not as a civil war, or even as a regional war, but as a "Red threat," as part, that is, of a global design for Communist conquest. He says that we have a defense perimeter that run from Korea to Vietnam. The war, he says, is a "Communist threat" to that defense line, and he adds:

> I do not want to see that line broken so that all of the rest of Southeast Asia is exposed, because if it is, then the whole Pacific coastline of this country will be exposed.

Later in his speech the Senator declares that "communism is threatening the world. If it is not, then why this imbroglio in Vietnam?"

This view of the Vietnamese war as part of a global design for conquest simply does not stand up under examination. It is a known fact, attested to by virtually every student of Communist affairs, that the Communist world—if one can speak of a Communist world—is not a monlithic monster directed from Moscow or Peking and is as diverse and disunited as the rest of the world. It is made up of diverse nations with diverse national ambitions. Its two foremost powers, Russia and China, are deeply hostile to each other. How such a group of nations could conceivably pursue a unified design for world conquest is beyond my understanding. I very much doubt that the distinguished minority leader, perceptive observer of world affairs that he is, would seriously contend that such a unified conspiracy exists. There may indeed have been such a conspiracy in Stalin's time, but that time, and the conditions of that time, are past. All that remain of them are the obsolete ideas which still seem to dominate the thinking of some of our policymakers.

That being the case, the war in Vietnam must be considered in its own terms and not as part of a global conspiracy. If there is a threat to our security in Vietnam, that threat arises not from the theoretical writings of Marx and Lenin, nor from the twisted mind of a dictator who died 14 years ago, but from the jungles and rice paddies of Vietnam. It is incumbent upon those who regard this war as vital to our national security to show exactly how and why events in those jungles and rice paddies are of such enormous importance to American security, exactly how and why the breaching of the line referred to by the Senator from Illinois would expose the whole Pacific coastline of America to some nameless threat. I do not think the Senator from Illinois can do that. I cannot bring myself to believe he has so little faith in the U.S. Navy and Air Force.

I turn now to the third significant theme in the minority leader's speech, his brief reference to the United Nations. He is, like the administration, pessimistic about the chances for peacemaking action in the United Nations. He fears that "we could not energize the members of the Council to take a real interest in it."

The United Nations has not only the right but the duty, under its charter, to act to restore peace in Southeast Asia. I believe that we can and should "energize" the Security Council or the General Assembly to take effective action by promising to comply with any recommendation the Security Council or General Assembly might make for ending the war. One cannot predict in advance what the United Nations might propose, but a logical course of action might consist of an immediate cease-fire, followed by a reconvening of the Geneva Conference on Vietnam to restore and revise the agreements of 1954, which both sides have said would be an acceptable basis of peace.

The question of peace in Vietnam could be put on the Security Council's agenda at the initiative of any member or at the initiative of the Secretary General, who is empowered under article 99 of the charter to call to the Security Council's attention any matter which he regards as a threat to peace and security. The Soviet Union has objected to United Nations action on the ground that North Vietnam and China are not members. This objection can be met: under article 32 of the charter any nonmember which is a party to a dispute can be invited to participate in the Security Council's consideration of that dispute. Being a matter of procedure, such an invitation to North Vietnam and to China would not be subject to veto. The South Vietnamese Government could of course participate in the same way, as could the National Liberation Front.

The essential purposes of United Nations action would be a cease-fire, the establishment of a group or body to oversee the cease-fire, and the reconvening of the Geneva Conference. The placing of these matters on the Security Council's agenda, being procedural, would not be subject to veto and could be accomplished by the votes of any nine members. Any action taken by the Security Council, being substantive, could be vetoed, but there is a strong possibility that that could be avoided if the United States would commit itself in advance to accept the Council's recommendations. Should there be a veto nonetheless, the whole matter could, by one of a number of established procedures, then be referred to the General Assembly. The General Assembly could then call for a cease-fire, the establishment of a truce supervisory organization, and the reconvening of the Geneva Conference. As the distinguished international lawyer Leo Gross has pointed out, there is no question that the Assembly has the necessary authority to take such action under articles 10 and 11 of the charter.

---

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] *The Federalist* (Henry Cabot Lodge, ed., New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1908), pp. 430–431.

[4] *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson*, 17 vols. (Julian P. Boyd, ed., Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1955), vol. 15, p. 397.

It is difficult to see how the United Nations could refuse to act on so grave a threat to international peace and security as the war in Vietnam. At present it is deterred from action by the opposition of the Soviet Union but even more, I think, by the failure of the principal belligerent, the United States, to encourage it to act. The critical step, I emphasize again, would be a promise on the part of the United States not to use its veto in the Security Council and to accept and carry out any recommendations which might be made by the Security Council or the General Assembly, provided only that the other parties involved would also accept the recommendations of the United Nations. As Professor Gross said in a letter to the New York Times last May:

> Unless the Assembly chooses to shirk its responsibility and bury its head as if it were in sand like the proverbial ostrich, it can do no less than take the necessary steps designed to end the hostilities in Vietnam and recall the Geneva Conference to confirm, and when necessary, adapt the Geneva Accords.

Mr. President, this morning I sent a copy of my remarks to the distinguished minority leader. I had hoped that possibly he would be able to engage in a further discussion on this subject, particularly on the point concerning our purpose and policy in Vietnam and what do we seek to achieve.

This purpose, it seems to me, is still obscure. I thought in our previous debate, the senior Senator from Illinois made a contribution to this matter.

The Senator is, as we know, a very close and confidential friend of the President of the United States and, insofar as we can get authoritative statements outside of those in the executive branch, I thought the Senator made a real contribution.

I believe if we could find a way to clarify this purpose, and if that purpose proved to be a justifiable one, it would do much to calm down the apprehensions of the people of this country and to bring about a much greater unanimity of action and unanimity of thought and, hopefully, some action or some new policy which might bring about a negotiated peace in Vietnam, a peace which I believe would be in the interest of not only the United States, but also of all the rest of the world.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the New York Review, Feb. 17, 1966]

HOW TO DEAL WITH THE CHINESE REVOLUTION

(By John K. Fairbank)

The Vietnam debate reflects our intellectual unpreparedness. Crisis has arisen on the farthest frontier of public knowledge, and viewpoints diverge widely because we all lack background information. "Vietnam" was not even a label on our horizon twenty years ago. It was still "Annam" (the old Chinese term), buried within the French creation, "Indo-China."

Our ignorance widens the spectrum of debate: Everyone seeks peace but some would get it by fighting more broadly, some by not fighting at all, and some by continuing a strictly limited war. Everyone wants negotiations. But to get them some would bomb North Vietnam and others would pause or stop.

Behind the cacophony of argument some hold the Europo-centric view that Vietnam is far away and in the Chinese realm, not in our realm. Others argue for a more global view that the balance of power and international order can be preserved only by containing the Chinese revolution as we are already doing in Korea and the Taiwan straits. Yet here the problem arises that it is not the Chinese whom we face in South Vietnam, but rather their model of revolution, Chairman Mao's idea. And how does one stop a revolutionary idea?

How to deal with the Chinese revolution depends on how we understand it—specifically, what is the Chinese revolutionary influence in Vietnam? And behind that, what is the nature of the Chinese revolution itself? Can we ultimately deal with it in any way short of war? But where would war get us?

A long view is needed, an historical framework within which to see all the actors, including ourselves. (What are we doing so far from home?) Yet our knowledge of East Asian history is so meager it can mislead us. "History" is used as a grab-bag from which each advocate pulls out a "lesson" to "prove" his point. Some recall Manchuria in 1931: We failed to stop Japan's aggression and it led on to Pearl Harbor. Others recall our drive to the Yalu in 1950: We ignored China's vital interest in her frontier and got ourselves into a bigger war. Again, what was the "lesson" of Dien Bien Phu in 1954—were the French strategically over-extended or merely tactically deficient in air-power?

"History never repeats itself" means that one can never find a perfect one-to-one correspondence between two situations. Each must be viewed within the long flow of events, not as an isolated "lesson." Brief articles (like this one) can offer only limited wisdom. Nevertheless certain main outlines emerge from an historical survey. The Vietnamese and Chinese have had their own specific ways and interests, traditions and attitudes, and their own East Asian pattern of contact, not in the Western style.

THE TRADITIONAL MODEL FOR VIETNAM

China's revolutionary influence on Vietnam comes from a long past. In the first place, Vietnam grew up as part of Chinese culture—the East Asian realm which included not only China in the center but also the peripheral states of Korea and Vietnam and Japan as well. All these countries took over the Chinese writing system in ancient times and with it the Chinese classical teachings, the bureaucratic system of government, and the family-based social order, so eloquently advocated in the Confucian classics. These countries have an ancient common bond in philosophy, government, and cultural values.

In Vietnam's case, this Chinese heritage was imposed by a thousand years of Chinese rule in North Vietnam, the ancient homeland of the Vietnamese before they expanded southward into the Mekong delta. Independence from Chinese rule was gained by fighting in the tenth century A.D., but Vietnam then continued for another thousand years to be "independent" only within the Chinese realm and tribute system. Down to the 1860s, Vietnamese tribute missions, going over the long post route to Peking, acknowledged the superior size and power, the superior culture and wisdom, of the Chinese empire and its rulers. This filial or younger-brother relationship was broken only a few times when Chinese armies again invaded Hanoi (for example, in 1406 and 1789), only to be thrown out by the Vietnamese resistance, whereupon tributary relations were resumed. There were only these alternatives, to be ruled by China or to be "tributary," in the Chinese cultural-political-psychological sense, taking China as a model. This went to the point of using the same structure of government and copying the Chinese law codes verbatim, with the same terminology, in Chinese characters, which were the official writing system.

Vietnam's growth in the shadow of China was eventually balanced by the arrival of sea-invaders from the West. The early Portuguese adventurers and the later Dutch and British East India Companies landed their ships at Danang (Tourane), where our marines are today. This sea contact with the expanding West climaxed in the French takeover of the 1860s and '70s. French colonialism during its eighty years brought both exploitation and modernization, in a mixture that is hotly debated and can hardly be unscrambled.

We Americans have thus had predecessors (even the Japanese in 1940–45) on the long thin coast of Vietnam. We are sleeping in the same bed the French slept in, even though we dream very different dreams.

Western sea power in Southeast Asia goes back 450 years. Europeans expanded westward into the empty Americas very slowly. They went east into populous Asia more quickly and easily. The resulting colonialism in Southeast Asia has now been superseded by the new relationships we are trying to work out in the name of national self-determination. We are on an old cultural frontier between the international trading world and Asia's land-based empires. Vietnam, like Korea, has been caught in the middle and pulled in two.

Vietnamese patriots reacted against the French by learning modern nationalism from them. In so doing they continued to be influenced by the Chinese example to the north. The Chinese reformers of 1898 had their counterparts in Hanoi. Sun Yat-sen operated from there in 1907–08. When his Chinese Kuomintang reorganized itself on Soviet lines in the 1920's, a Vietnamese Kuomintang followed suit. In the same era, the Chinese Communist Party set a model for the growth of a Vietnamese Communist movement in the 1930s. The rise of Ho Chi-minh illustrates this trend. Both the French and Soviet Communist movements and Chiang Kai-shek's Whampoa Military Academy were in his background.

By the time the Chinese Communists came to power in 1949, they were in an even better position to give the Vietnamese the encouragement of example. Viet Minh patriots of the united front were trained to fight against the French in the sanctuary of South China. When the People's Republic of North Vietnam eventually emerged in 1954 after the defeat of France, it was indebted to Chinese help but, most of all, to the Chinese Communist example.

Today in South Vietnam, the "people's war of liberation" has developed from the Maoist model that took shape in China during the struggle against the Nationalists and the Japanese. Mao's formula is to take power through a centralized Leninist party that claims to represent the people. This begins with establishing a territorial base or "liberated area," inaccessible and defensible. From this base, the party organizers can recruit idealists and patriots in the villages and create an indoctrinated secret organization. Once under way, this organization can begin to use sabotage and terrorism to destroy the government's position in the villages and mobilize the population for guerrilla warfare. Shooting down unpopular landlords or government administrators has a wide "demonstration effect." When guerrilla warfare has reached a certain level, it can escalate to fielding regular armies, strangling the cities, and completing the takeover.

One appeal of this Maoist model is its do-it-yourself quality. The organizing procedure is carried out by local people with only a minimum influx of trained returnees and essential arms. The whole technique cannot be understood apart from the local revolutionary ardor that inspires the movement.

HISTORICAL MAINSPRINGS OF CHINA'S REVOLUTION

In China today we confront a revolution still at full tide, an effort to remake the society by remaking its people. Chairman Mao spreads a mystique that man can overcome any obstacle, that the human spirit can triumph over material situations. For fifteen years with unremitting intensity the people have been exhorted to have faith in the Chinese Communist Party and the ideas of Mao Tse-tung. With this has gone a doctrinaire righteousness that has beaten down all dissent and claimed with utmost self-confidence to know the "laws of history."

Mao's revolution puts great stress on the principle of struggle. The class struggle has made history. Each individual must struggle against his own bourgeois nature. China must struggle against Khrushchevian revisionism. The whole world must struggle against imperialism led by the United States.

Out of all this struggle among the 700 million Chinese has come a totalitarian state manipulated largely by suasion. Individuals work upon themselves in the process of thought reform, criticizing their own attitudes. Residential groups maintain surveillance on one another, as children do on their parents, as part of their national duty. Terror is kept in the background. Conformity through a manipulated "voluntarism" fills the foreground. No such enormous mass of people has ever been so organized. The spirit of the organization continues to be highly militant.

The sources of China's revolutionary militancy are plain enough in Chinese history. The Chinese Communist regime is only the latest phase in a process of decline and fall followed by rebirth and reassertion of national power. China's humiliation under the "unequal treaties" of the nineteenth century lasted for a hundred years. An empire that had traditionally been superior to all others in its world was not only humbled but threatened with extinction. Inevitably, China's great tradition of unity, as the world's greatest state in size and continuity, was reasserted. In this revival, many elements from the past have been given new life—the tradition of leadership by an elite who are guardians of a true teaching, the idea of China as a model for others to emulate.

Because the Chinese empire had kept its foreign relations in the guise of tribute down to the late nineteenth century, China has had little experience in dealing with equal allies or with a concert of equal powers and plural sovereignties. Chairman Mao could look up to Comrade Stalin. He could only look down on Comrade Khrushchev. An equal relationship has little precedent in Chinese experience.

Because China has been a separate and distinctive area of civilization, isolated in East Asia, the Chinese people today have a very different political heritage from the rest of the world. The most remarkable thing about China's political history is the early maturity of the socio-political order. The ancient Chinese government became more sophisticated, at an earlier date, than any regime in the West. Principles and methods worked out before the time of Christ held the Chinese empire together down to the twentieth century. The fact that this imperial system eventually grew out of date in comparison with the modern West should not obscure its earlier maturity. As in her scientific discoveries and technology, China's inventions in government put her well ahead of Europe by the time Marco Polo saw the Chinese scene in the thirteenth century. Perhaps this early Chinese advancement came from the continuity of the Chinese effort at government, carried on in the same area century after century, and dealing with the same problems until they were mastered. In contrast, Western civilization grew up with a broader base geographically and culturally, but this very diversity of origins and the geographical shift from the Mediterranean to western Europe may have delayed the maturing of Western institutions.

Thus the ancient Chinese had a chance to concentrate on the problem of social order, staying in the same place and working it out over the centuries. Their solution began with the observation that the order of nature is not egalitarian but hierarchic. Adults are stronger than children, husbands than wives. Age is wiser than youth. Men are not equally endowed: "Some labor with their minds and govern others; some labor with their muscles and are governed by others." This common-sense, anti-egalitarian approach tried to fit everyone in his place in a graded pyramid of social roles.

At the top of everything was the Chinese ruler, whose virtuous example commanded the respect and obedience of all beholders. The Chinese monarchy institutionalized the idea of universal kingship atop the human pyramid. The emperor functioned as military leader, power holder and ethical preceptor at the apex of every social activity. An able emperor would recruit the best talent, use men in the right jobs, render the legal decisions, and even set the style of connoisseurship in art, while carrying out the sacrifices to heaven and superintending all aspects of official conduct. The monarchy became omnicompetent, not equalled by any other human institution.

Even before the Chinese unification of 221 B.C., ancient administrators had worked out the basic principles of bureaucratic government. They selected for their ability a professional group of paid officials who were given overall responsibility in fixed areas, instructed and supervised through official correspondence, and rotated in office. The Chinese empire thus very early embodied the essentials of bureaucracy which the Europeans arrived at only in modern times.

One of the great inventions of Chinese government was the examination system based on the contribution classics. It produced an indoctrinated elite who could either provide local leadership as holders of imperial degrees or else could be appointed to official posts and carry on administration anywhere at a distance from the capital. In either case, the products of the examination system, versed in the classical principles of government, were supporters of orthodoxy and authority on established lines.

Other innovations, like the censors who functioned as a separate supervisory echelon, added to the devices of Chinese "statecraft." Chinese government also used the family system, confirming the special status of parents and elders over the young, and of men over women. The famous "three bonds" or "three net-ropes" (*san-kang*) tied together superiors and subordinates—parents over children, husbands over wives, and rulers over subjects. In effect, this was a doctrine of obedience, to be manifested through the virtues of filial piety, chastity, and loyalty, respectively. Within the family, the patriarch was like an emporer, while ordinary family members, each in his own status, depended on the group for their livelihood, their education and social life, and even for a religious focus through reverence for their ancestors.

As the Chinese socio-political order matured and grew, its influence radiated outward over the "Chinese culture area." Because China was the center of civilization in East Asia, it served as the model for smaller states like Korea and Vietnam, whose rulers naturally became subordinate to the Chinese emperor. This hierarchic relationship was expressed in the tribute system already noted. But the rise of nomadic warriors like the Mongols on the grasslands of Inner Asia posed a new problem, for they were non-Chinese in culture and yet their military capacity enabled them to invade North China and eventually conquer the whole empire. The result was another Chinese political invention, under which it became possible for powerful non-Chinese peoples to participate in Chinese political life. This they did either as allies and subordinates of strong Chinese rulers or, in case of Chinese weakness, as the actual rulers of China itself. Thus the ancient Chinese empire again showed its political sophistication. Invaders who could not be defeated were admitted to the power structure. The Mongols in the thirteenth to nineteenth centuries could even seize the imperial power, but they had no alternative to ruling China in the old Chinese fashion.

When Westerners arrived on China's borders in early modern times, they also began to participate in the Chinese power structure. They were generally given status as tributaries and until 1840 were kept under control on the frontier. Thereafter, under the so-called "unequal-treaty" system, the Westerners had to be allowed to participate in the government of China. This they did with special privileges in treaty ports protected by their gunboats and under their own consuls' extraterritorial jurisdiction. In its beginning, this nineteenth-century treaty system followed Chinese tradition.

Eventually of course, Western contact brought in new ideas which undermined the old Chinese order. But not all the new ideas of modern times were wholly accepted. Christianity found only a limited following. Ideas of the sacred rights of the individual and the supremacy of law were not taken over. China picked and chose what it wanted to accept from the West. Scientific technology and nationalism were in time taken as foundations of economic and political change. But Western-style republicanism and the election process did not take hold. As a political device to take the place of dynastic rule, the Chinese eventually accepted Leninist party dictatorship. On this basis, the Kuomintang rose to power in the 1920s. Later the Communist success established the doctrines of Marxism-Leninism and techniques of Soviet totalitarianism and industrialization. The Sino-Soviet split now represents a triumph for hypernationalism geared to a revolutionary faith.

CULTURAL DIFFERENCES AND CONFLICTS

Even a brief sketch of the historical experience of the Chinese people indicates their cultural differences from the West. Some of these inherited differences have been selected and reinforced by the new totalitarian rulers. Chinese tradition is, of course, very broad. It affords examples of a Confucian type of individualism and defiance of state control. Some day these examples may be invoked for democratic purposes, but that time has not yet come.

Today we see these cultural differences affecting the status of the Chinese individual. The old idea of hierarchic order persists. "Enemies" of the new order, as defined by it, are classed as not belonging to "the people" and so are of lowest status. On the other hand, party members form a new elite, and one man is still at the top of the pyramid. The tradition of government supremacy and domination by the official class still keeps ordinary people in their place.

The law, for example, is still an administrative tool used in the interest of the State;

it does not protect the individual. This reflects the commonsense argument that the interest of the whole outweighs that of any part or person, and so the individual still has no established doctrine of rights to fall back upon. As in the old days, the letter of the law remains uncertain and its application arbitrary. The defense of the accused is not assured, the judiciary is not independent, confession is expected, and litigation frowned upon as a way of resolving conflicts. Compared with American society, the law plays a very minor role.

The differences between Chinese and American values and institutions stand out most sharply in the standards for personal conduct. The term for individualism in Chinese (*ko-jen chu-i*) is a modern phrase invented for a foreign idea, using characters that suggest each-for-himself, a chaotic selfishness rather than a high ideal. Individualism is thus held in as little esteem as it was under the Confucian order. The difference is that where young people were formerly dominated by their families, who for example arranged their marriages, now they have largely given up a primary loyalty to family and substituted a loyalty to the Party or "the people." In both cases, the highest ideal is sacrifice for the collective good. Similarly, the modern term for freedom (*tzu-yu*) is a modern combination of characters suggesting a spontaneous or willful lack of discipline, very close to license and quite contrary to the Chinese ideal of disciplined cooperation.

The cultural gap is shown also by the Chinese attitude toward philanthropy. Giving things to others is of course highly valued where specific relations call for it, as when the individual contributes to the collective welfare of family, clan, or community. But the Christian virtue of philanthropy in the abstract, giving to others as a general duty, quite impersonally, runs into a different complex of ideas. Between individuals there should be reciprocity in a balanced relationship. To receive without giving in return puts one at a serious disadvantage: One is unable to hold up one's side of the relationship and therefore loses self-respect. American philanthropy thus hurts Chinese pride. It has strings of conscience attached to it. The Communist spurning of foreign aid and touting of self-sufficiency fits the traditional sense of values. American aid does not.

Cultural differences emerge equally in the area of politics. In the Chinese tradition, government is by persons who command obedience by the example they set of right conduct. When in power, an emperor or a ruling party has a monopoly of leadership which is justified by its performance, particularly by the wisdom of its policies. No abstract distinction is made between the person in power and his policies. Dissent which attacks policies is felt to be an attack on the policy maker. On this basis, no "loyal opposition" is possible. The Western concept of disputing a power holder's policies while remaining loyal to his institutional status is not intelligible to the Chinese. Critics are seen as enemies, for they discredit those in power and tear down the prestige by which their power is partially maintained. (This idea also crops up in Taiwan.)

Another difference emerges over the idea of self-determination. This commonplace of Western political thinking sanctions the demand of a definable group in a certain area, providing they can work it out, to achieve an independent state by common consent among themselves. This idea runs quite counter to the traditional idea of the Chinese realm that embraces all who are culturally Chinese within a single entity. Thus the rival Chinese regimes today are at one in regarding Taiwan as part of the mainland. Both want to control both areas. Similarly, they are agreed that Tibet is part of the Chinese realm without regard for self-determination. A supervised plebiscite would seem so humiliating that no Chinese regime would permit it.

Both the Chinese party dictatorships of modern times are also believers in elitism and opponents of the election process, except as a minor device for confirming local popular acquiescence in the regime. Elections on the mainland are manipulated by the Party. Taiwan has developed a genuine election process at the local level, but the old idea of party "tutelage" is far from dead at the top. Here again, a case can be made for the Chinese practice. Our point is merely its difference from that of the West.

Perhaps the most strikingly different political device is that of mutual responsibility, the arrangement whereby a designated group is held responsible in all its members for the conduct of each. This idea goes far back in Chinese history as a device for controlling populous villages. At first five-household groups and later ten-household groups were designated by the officials, ten such lower groups forming a unit at a higher level, with the process repeated until a thousand households formed a single group. In operation this system means that one member of a household is held accountable for the acts of all other members, one household for the acts of its neighbors, and so on up the line. This motivates mutual surveillance and reciprocal control, with neighbor spying on neighbor and children informing on parents. Communist China uses this ancient device today in its street committees and other groups. It directly denies the Western idea of judging a man by his intentions and condemning him only for his own acts.

Cultural differences lay the powder train for international conflict. China and America can see each other as "backward" and "evil," deserving destruction. We need to objectify such differences, see our own values in perspective, and understand if not accept the values of others. Understanding an opponent's values also helps us deal with him. The old Chinese saying is, "If you know yourself and know your enemy, in a hundred battles you will win a hundred times.

All this applies to our present dilemma in Vietnam where our military helicopter technology is attempting to smash the Maoist model of "peoples' war." We face a dilemma: Appeasement may only encourage the militancy of our opponents, yet vigorous resistance may pose a challenge that increases their militancy. Fighting tends to escalate.

MANIPULATING PEKING IN A MORE-THAN-MILITARY COMPETITION

One line of approach, quite aside from military effort, should seek to undermine the militancy of our opponents. Why not pay more attention to their motivation and try to manipulate it? Having seen how Mao Tse-tung has manipulated Khrushchev and Chiang Kai-shek has manipulated us, can we not do some manipulating ourselves? There are several elements to use. One is China's enormous national pride, the feeling in Peking that this largest and oldest of countries naturally deserves a top position in the world. In the background lies the fact that China was indeed at the top of the known world for more than 3,000 years of its recorded history. The Chinese attitude of cultural superiority is deep-rooted and still plays a part in foreign contact.

A second element is the need of any Chinese regime for prestige. Peking rules an incredibly vast mass of people by means of an enormous and far-flung bureaucracy. The prestige of the leadership and the morale of the populace and bureaucracy are intertwined. The rulers must seek by all means to bolster their public image, show themselves successful, and make good their claims to wisdom and influence. For sixteen years Peking has buttressed its prestige by attacking "American imperialism," but its need for prestige is more basic than any particular target of attack. Are there other ways to strengthen itself than by denouncing and "struggling against" the biggest overseas power?

Another element is the converse of the above—the accumulated fatigue of revolution. Chairman Mao's exhortations to continued struggle and austerity betray his lively fear lest the new generation grow tired of "permanent revolution." His eventual successors may respond differently to opportunities abroad. Finally, there are the concrete problems of the Chinese state, its need for foreign capital goods and food supplies, needs that may grow.

A program to take advantage of these elements, recognizing the realities of cultural difference, would seek to enlarge Peking's international contact and work out a greater role and responsibility for China's rulers in the world outside. Many express this in wishful terms—"If only China would join the international world." Realists point out Peking's reiterated refusal to do so on any feasible terms. What I am advocating here is not a single gesture but a continuing program, not an alternative to present policies but an addition to them. It is too simple to say that one cannot oppose an avowed enemy on one front while also making an accommodation with him on other fronts. On the contrary, this is what diplomacy is all about. The whole idea of manipulation is to use both pressure and persuasion, both toughness and reasonableness, stick and carrot, with an objective calculation of the opponent's motives and needs. This is not foreign to President Johnson's thinking.

On the issue of Communist China's entry into the United Nations, one objection is that Peking in repeated declarations has set impossible terms. Peking demands that "America get out of Taiwan" and that the Nationalist Government leave the UN entirely if the Peking government enters any part of it. These are terms we cannot accept. They are thus tough bargaining positions. But we should never expect Peking's entry into the UN to be achieved by a single cataclysmic act. It can only follow a long and tortuous negotiation, probably involving the whole organization. Negotiations of a sort are already under way.

The most practical objection to Peking in the United Nations is the trouble it will cause. The Communist capacity for impeding orderly procedures, obstructing and sabotaging collective effort, is well known. The prospect of getting mainland China into the international organization is not one to gladden the heart of any official who must deal with the resulting situation. No one should assume that our China problem will be easier. The argument for getting Peking in is simply one of choice between evils. The trouble it brings will be less grievous than the warfare that seems likely if Sino-American relations remain on their present track. We have learned to prefer small limited wars to big nuclear disasters. So we should try to substitute diplomatic wrangling and nasty competition with China all across the board in place of a prolonged military showdown.

In short, Peking's presence in the UN is no panacea nor is it likely to seem to be a great improvement. It may at first seem like a disaster, and this has deterred every administration in Washington. But the presence of China in the UN offers a prospect of diversifying the struggle and diverting it from the military single track. Can we afford to let the Chinese revolution remain in its partly imposed, partly chosen isolation, hoping it will eventually lose its militancy?

One major stumbling block in this approach is Taiwan. There is no way for the United States to withdraw from Taiwan or cease to support its independence. Taiwan today is one of the larger and more prosperous members of the United Nations. We cannot turn our backs upon it, either morally or strategically. Indeed, any future Taipei regime that sought to join the mainland ought to meet our opposition for reasons of essential power politics.

But we can do much more to deal with the Chinese revolution than merely shoot at its protagonists to contain it militarily. The need for disarmament and for worldwide cooperation over population and food supply are only two of the forces pushing us toward a more active China policy.

What conclusion emerges from a survey of China's revolutionary history and the cultural differences that separate us?

First, we are up against a dynamic opponent whose strident anti-Americanism will not soon die away. It comes from China's long background of feeling superior to all outsiders and expecting a supreme position in the world, which we seem to thwart. Second, we have little alternative but to stand up to Peking's grandiose demands. Yet a containment policy which is only military, and nothing more, can mousetrap us into war with China. Our present fighting to frustrate the Maoist model in Vietnam is a stopgap, not a long-term policy. We should add to this policy, and if possible substitute for it a more sophisticated diplomatic program to undermine China's militancy by getting her more involved in formal international contact of all kinds and on every level.

The point of this is psychological: Peking is, to say the least, maladjusted, rebellious against the whole outer world, Russia as well as America. We are Peking's principal enemy because we happen now to be the biggest outside power trying to foster world stability. But do we have to play Mao's game? Must we carry the whole burden of resisting Peking's pretensions? Why not let others in on the job?

A Communist China seated in the UN could no longer pose as a martyr excluded by "American imperialism." She would have to deal with UN members on concrete issues, playing politics in addition to attempting subversion (which sometimes backfires). She would have to face the self-interest of other countries, and learn to act as a full member of international society for the first time in history. This is the only way for China to grow up and eventually accept restraints on her revolutionary ardor.

EXHIBIT 2

VIETNAM: THE LESSONS OF WAR

(By Jean Lacouture)

"On the long thin coast of Vietnam," wrote John K. Fairbank in the last issue of this paper, "we are sleeping in the same bed the French slept in even though we dream different dreams."

The dreams of course are very different but so are the beds and the dreamers themselves. Let us compare them and see when the end of the night may come.

Nothing could be more valuable for American leaders at the moment than a close examination of the disastrous errors made by the French in Indo-China from 1945 to 1956. To know the faults of a friend may not cure one's own, but from France's experience America might well learn something of what has gone so dreadfully wrong in Vietnam today.

The French had three great dreams for Indo-China and each led them into a different and more ugly phase of the war. At first, in 1946, they clung briefly to the dream of re-establishing their pre-war empire in Indo-China. Indeed, for one hopeful moment they seemed to be on the verge of a promising new colonial policy: General Leclerc, sent out to "reconquer" the territory, decided instead to negotiate with the Vietnam revolutionary leader, Ho Chi Minh. Leclerc recognized Ho's Vietnam as a "free state," connected with France, but controlling its own diplomacy, army, and finances. This was the first agreement made between a European colonial power and the Asian revolution—and one of the shortest-lived and saddest in retrospect. For within weeks the intrigues of colonialists in Saigon and Paris and extremists among the Vietminh and its nationalist allies succeeded in scrapping it. The way was now open for France to plunge into full-scale colonial war. But it soon became clear to everybody that this would have been a hopeless venture, doomed from the start by the half-ruined state of France, the lack of an air force and navy, and the disapproval of the Russians and Americans.

At this point the French conceived their second Indo-Chinese dream which led them into a second war, lasting from 1948 to 1951. Now they would transform their colonial struggle into a Civil War. Against Ho's Vietminh they would set in opposition the "independent" Emperor Bao Dai, encouraging him to cultivate his own anti-Communist but nationalist leadership—a policy described by the distinguished scholar Paul Mus as "nationalist counter fire."

Perhaps it might have succeeded if the nationalist had been given a chance to make it work. But their power and prestige and autonomy were always limited. While Vietnamese and French troops died courageously, Bao Dai preoccupied himself with tiger hunting, his ministers with profiteering. The Vietminh methodically liquidated Bao Dai's officials, dominated the countryside, and organized its soldiers into divisions soon after the Chinese Communists arrived on the Northern Frontier in 1950.

After this decisive event and the outbreak of the Korean War, France dreamed once again of transforming the nature of the war in Vietnam, this time into an international conflict with Communism. In September 1951 General de Lattre arrived in Washington to argue that France, faced with Vietminh subversion supported by Communist China, now needed and deserved to have its risks shared. He was given both credits and weapons. But later, in 1954, on the eve of Dien Bien Phu, the French government demanded far more: It requested that several hundred American bombers be ordered to attack the enemy from Manila. To these requests, Washington finally responded that "Indochina does not fall within the perimeter of the area vital to the defense of the United States."

We can now admire the wisdom which led President Eisenhower to reject both the agitated appeals of the French and the advice of Admiral Radford and Vice President Nixon, both of whom recommended intervention. But we may well ask why a country not considered of "vital importance" to American interests in 1954 became so in 1965. The Communist camp, after all, is no longer a monolithic force able to exert unified global pressures as had been the case in 1954. In Korea, moreover, Chinese had recently been fighting American soldiers, something they have since refrained from doing; and missile strategy has meanwhile diminished the importance of local airforce bases. One can only conclude that the diplomatic views of American leaders have hardened during these years. In the light of Mr. Rusk's performance the diplomacy of John Foster Dulles must be reconsidered and credited with an admirable flexibility.

Thus France launched three wars in Indo-China and lost them all. Its allies having refused to provoke a brutal extension of the war in order to avoid a local defeat, France's dream of an International anti-Communist "crusade" collapsed at Dien Bien Phu in the spring of 1954. General Giap destroyed France's main combat force; the Vietminh controlled two-thirds of Vietnam; and neither Hanoi nor Saigon were protected from attack.

Ho Chi Minh had offered negotiations six months before this débacle and had been ignored. Now Moscow and Peking were agreeable to an international détente and Washington seemed prepared to accept the consequences of its failure to intervene. Thus at the Geneva conference table in 1954 the Western powers benefitted from a certain complicity on the part of Molotov and Chou En-lai: The West succeeded in wresting from the victors half the territory and the larger part of the material wealth of Vietnam. Ho agreed to fall back to the north in exchange for a promise that elections preparing the way for unification would be held in 1956—elections that he had no doubt of winning.

A great deal of confusion surrounds this Geneva settlement. It must be emphasized that the only texts signed at Geneva were the armistice agreements between the French and the Vietminh. No one at all signed the "final declaration" of the conference—both the United States and South Vietnam had reservations about it—and it carried only the force of suggestion. But apart from the North Vietnamese, the French were the only nation that formally guaranteed to carry out the Geneva accords that provided both for partition at the 17th parallel and for elections.

And now France committed a new error (its last?), dreaming this time that it might finally leave Vietnam and forget it altogether. Diem, now installed as dictator in the South, wanted the French to quit his country as soon as possible. This was not only because certain French interests were intriguing against him—something that helped strengthen his position as a nationalist leader—but also because the French Army was the only force that could compel him to hold elections in 1956. In the event the French quickly yielded and the last of their army departed in April 1956.

The consequences of this final French error were, and remain enormous. Diem was now free to declare himself free of all the Geneva obligations and soon did so with American encouragement. The South could now be reorganized as an anti-Communist bastion, from which a reconquest of the North could eventually be launched. The Diem government in fact soon created a Committee for the Liberation of North Vietnam, which, beginning in 1958, parachuted agents into the North, notably into areas such as Vinh, where Ho's agrarian reform had provoked violent peasant uprisings. But meanwhile the North, considering itself cheated by Saigon and Washington (with France's cooperation), began preparation to exploit the political and social discontent in the South to establish a base for subversive operations. And Hanoi was to show itself far more adept at this political game than Saigon.

Could the French have resolved this Vietnam problem? In fact, they were confronted by two immensely volatile forces whose demands would have shaken any Western government, as they are shaking the United States today. First, the demands of a people thirsting to overthrow colonialism and to recover their national identity, their freedom of maneuver, and their unity. But also the demands of a revolutionary group, supported by one of the great power blocs, which claims the right to impose its authority on the entire nation in the name of a Communist doctrine highly suspect to the majority: a group nonetheless, whose heroism, discipline, and ruthlessly effective methods seem to assure its success.

It is the deep and constant intermingling of these two forces which have made the Vietnam problem seem so hopeless and defeating to the West. How can a Western government successfully sponsor an independent "nationalist counter fire" when the strongest feelings of many Vietnamese have been invested for many years in the local civil war; and when one finds among those who have rallied to the Vietminh, and then the Lao Dong and the NLF, a great many patriots, drawn to the organization because they believe it to be the hope of Vietnamese nationalism, capable of defeating colonialism and Western domination.

Perhaps it might have been possible for the French to disassociate the nationalist inspiration in Vietnam from the Communist organization. But to do this would have been very difficult. For to gain the confidence of the nationalists I believe the French aid to Vietnam would have had to meet three extremely demanding conditions: that the donor of the aid would have no right to intervene directly in the government; that the aid would be given to the most worthy leaders; and that it would not lead to the creation of oligarchies of profiteers and a climate of corruption.

By all these standards the French failed. If they ever had a chance to survive the Asian revolution, they lost it, basically, because they were unwilling to alter their patronizing colonialist attitudes and deal with Asians with some sense of mutual respect or cooperation. For the most part they preferred instead to appoint and then control the manageable, the incompetent, and the operators, many of whom made fortunes out of the corrupt French aid program.

Opposed in Vietnam, then, were a coherent, principled, and implacable revolutionary movement of militants organized in the villages—the country's fundamental social and economic unit—inspired by an evident nationalism and posing as defenders of stern justice and equality; on the other hand, a regime obviously supported and controlled by foreign powers, partly composed of former Colonial officials, disdainful of peasant claims, tolerant of a social order where the influential and successful were frantically engaged in profiteering—preparing for the arrival of the inevitable catastrophe. The only possible result was a catastrophe on the scale of Dien Bien Phu.

How relevant is the French experience to Vietnam today? Certainly the American situation is different in important respects, but really how different? For example, the United States has no colonial past in Vietnam, no strictly imperialist drive for economic gain. But its objectives are, curiously, both more altruistic and more imperious than those of its predecessor. After all, a country seeking colonial profits is quite capable of making a compromise to preserve at least some of its endangered wealth. But what of a country that supposes itself to be defending a selfless principle? In fact, the United States does seem to have several fairly concrete motives: e.g., to prove to certain nations that it is faithful to its alliances; to show the underdeveloped peoples of the Southern Hemisphere how costly it can be to choose "Marxism-Leninism." There would seem to be sufficient elements of calculated self-interest here to make realistic bargaining possible—on the basis of spheres of influence, for example.

A second difference concerns the size and power of the forces involved. General Westmoreland not only commands a good many more troops than General Navarre (750,000 as compared with 500,000) but he is also relatively free from the financial, logistical, and transport problems that plagued the French. A far greater advantage, however, lies in America's enormous fire power as well as its air force and complete mastery of the sea. It is no exaggeration to say that the United States and South Vietnamese forces are now twenty times more powerful than the army of General Navarre (which had no more than eighty combat planes at its disposal during the battle of Dien Bien Phu). The small size of the present theater of operations in South Vietnam thus becomes a favorable factor of great importance: The French forces were charged with the defense of all Indo-China, a territory four times the present size of South Vietnam.

But given these advantages can it be said that the United States is now succeeding where France was forced to retreat? Of course, one answer must be yes, in the limited sense that it is impossible to imagine the United States suffering a major defeat in the present circumstances. During the past year President Johnson has been able to dispatch enough American troops to Vietnam to avoid another Dien Bien Phu, but beyond this the situation is less than hopeful. The arrival of over 100,000 troops has done no more than stabilize a deteriorating military situation; it did not result in a sharp swing of military advantage to the Western side, as certain observers had expected. The military map published on January 30 in *The New York Times* showing four-fifths of the South "under Vietcong influence" must be regarded as accurate, notwithstanding contrary claims by officials. (Incidentally, this map recalls the military charts the French press did not dare to publish twelve years ago. The American public has recently been getting far more information on the Vietnam question from the press, television, Senate hearings, etc., than was ever available in France.)

The fact is that American policy in Vietnam, although originally inspired by very different intentions, now resembles all too closely the disastrous policy of the French. The United States has also failed to solve the problem of providing support to genuine local leaders without excessive intervention in the country itself. Indeed, it can be said that the French—perhaps hypocritically—did nevertheless succeed in transferring some responsibilities to the Vietnamese: These were quite feeble ones in military matters, rather more important in politics, and nearly total in such administrative work as tax collecting. By contrast, we are now seeing the progressive Americanization of both the war and the country itself: The influence of the local military headquarters grows weaker; the efficiency of the government in Saigon continues to decay; American experts have taken over a great many local functions. Of course one understands the concern for efficiency, but the psychological effects are hardly calculated to encourage the emergence of authentic nationalist leaders at the present time, as Roger Hilsman forcefully pointed out in his recent testimony before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Certainly the Americans have done no better than the French in finding worthy non-Communist leadership. There is no need to reexamine now the tragic liquidation of Diemism, an event made inevitable by the sectarian religious isolation and the oligarchic obstinacy of the Ngo family. But since then, what decadence! Sad mandarins from certain conservative milieux in Saigon—courageous and outdated men—are followed in office by juntas composed of young generals-of-fortune who add a new star to their shoulders after each defeat in battle.

As for the moral climate in Saigon, one can only say that the corruption which dominated the life of the city's elite in 1953 has now been democratized. Shady dealings having to do with aid and military programs are no longer confined to people in high places, but seem to involve every kind of business. Testifying before the Senate on February 4, Mr. David Bell, the Director of Foreign Aid, said that he knew of no black market in Saigon—which only shows that a brilliant and hard-working official has had no time to stroll along the streets of a town where someone begs you to break the law at every step.

It would be wrong to predict a priori that President Johnson's new "counter-insurgency" and "pacification" programs, based on plans for economic and social developments in the Southern villages, will fail as totally as did the quite similar plans sponsored by the French and later by the Diem regime. Can they produce a qualitative change in Vietnamese attitudes toward the present government and the United States? What *can* be said is that any efforts by political and army leaders in the South, however doubtful their results, will surely be more effective than the current bombing of the North. I will not take up the moral aspects of these attacks. It should be sufficient to examine their diplomatic and military results thus far. According to predictions made in January 1965, several weeks of daily raids would bring the North to its knees and thence to the negotiating table. In fact, Messrs. Ho and Dong have since toughened their demands, passing from the relatively flexible "four points" of March 8th to the recent letter of January 31, which refers to the NLF as the "only representative of South Vietnam"; until then, Ho had mentioned only the NLF "program."

As for military results, we must realize that the bombing of the North has no overwhelming impact on a people who only recently emerged from a resistance movement and are now being trained to return to one; for the most part their lives are not greatly affected by the destruction of a bridge or a truck depot. On the other hand, in January 1965 there were two Northern regiments in the South, while now in February 1966 there are eight. Furthermore, the combat reserve forces in the North are numerous enough to permit the dispatch of more Northern troops to General Giap in the South every time the United States escalates the bombing. The American public has been told that the North is being bombed to save American lives. But, on the contrary, it seems clear that the bombing in the North only increases the pressure on General Westmoreland's troops: The American foot soldier must pay for the destruction caused by the American Air Force. And if Hanoi itself is bombed, we may be sure that the Vietcong forces have well-laid plans to take atrocious vengeance on Saigon, a city they have both infiltrated and surrounded. The adversaries have now sunk their claws into each other and so long as the ground fighting continues, we may expect that each blow will be followed by damaging reprisals.

Thus a political solution becomes all the more urgent—although unlike the settlement of 1954, it will not be preceded by a military disaster. But here American diplomacy is the victim of its own myths. Because the United States government has decreed from the first that the war in the South was originally provoked by invasion from the North, it has insisted that a solution must be negotiated with Hanoi, and only Hanoi.

A false historical analysis has led to a political impasse. For a careful study of the history of South Vietnam over the last ten years will show that from 1956 onward, strong resistance groups, the surviving members of political-religious sects crushed by Diem, were in active opposition to the regime in the South; they were in fact already called "Vietcong" by the Diem regime at that time. Furthermore, this essentially nationalist dissident movement gained added support as a result of the rural discontent which led Diem to suppress the elected municipal councils in 1957; it spread further after the promulgation of the terrible law of 1959 which prescribed the death penalty for all "accomplices of Communists"—and Communism comes cheap in South Vietnam. At this time the resistance was composed of nothing more than Southern groups organized in self-defense against Diem. Hanoi had made no connection with them. The North Vietnamese did not begin to exploit this situation and infiltrate agents until 1959; and it was only after pressure from a Southern congress of "former Vietminh resistants" in March of 1960 that they prepared to intervene. At the Northern Communist Party Congress in September of the same year the Hanoi government gave direct encouragement to the revolutionary activities in the

South. Still, it was not until November 11, 1960, following an attempted military *Putsch* against Diem, that the Vietcong—feeling the pressure of competition from military nationalists—gave itself formal identity and established a political headquarters by creating the National Liberation Front.

Today it is clear that the NLF leaders are closely linked to Hanoi, on which they depend for much of their supplies and arms. But anyone concerned with a peaceful settlement in Vietnam should be aware of both the local origins of the Front and its strong persisting regionalism—its attachments to the milieux, traditions, economy, and countryside of the South which give it a fundamental autonomy.

And yet, notwithstanding the fact that the Southern origins of the Vietcong insurrection have been carefully confirmed, no element of the Vietnam problem has been so neglected, especially in American official circles. We may be astonished, for example, that the immense, spectacular, and probably sincere efforts of recent American diplomacy to persuade Hanoi to negotiate finally produced, after thirty days of pause in bombing, a single defiant letter. Yet America is dealing here with a small and poorly armed country; its allies are reluctant to give it aid too openly, fearing a crushing American response. Certainly it is a Communist government, but one presided over by a man who in 1946 and 1954 was able to prove to the French his willingness to accept compromise. And of the four points posed as conditions by Hanoi last year, Washington now accepts three. Why then doesn't Ho play Lyndon Johnson's game? In a conference the North Vietnamese would hold so many trumps that their present position is hard to understand.

But perhaps they were not in a position to negotiate at all. If we look back over the history of the NLF we find support for the view that Hanoi is not able to speak for the Front. First for psychological reasons: The published program of the NLF expressly mentions the possibility of an independent South Vietnam; and it looks forward to forming an alliance with Laos and Cambodia only. Thus it seems more unlikely that the Front would consider itself adequately represented by the Northern government. Finally, there may be a purely practical reason. Combat conditions in the South are such that it is by no means certain that a decision or an agreement even if approved by the NLF would be supported by all the fighters in the field.

If we are to undertake a serious and credible search for peace in Vietnam, we must take account of this diversity of the Southern resistance; we must recognize that it is in fact a federation of *maquis* of different ages and differing inspiration, and that it is not as yet completely unified.

There is not as much geographic and psychological distance between the typical Southern military chief and Ho Chi Minh as there is between Ho Chi Minh and Mr. Kosygin. But to be effective now in Vietnam diplomacy must certainly take account of the *maquisard* and his part in the war. It must also attempt to understand the role of the Central Committee of the NLF, where Maoist influence is strong but where all tendencies coexist; of the Lao Dong party in Hanoi, with its pro-Chinese and pro-Russian factions; and the Political Bureau in Peking, with its cast of performers, both civilian and military. And finally we must comprehend the very complex position of the Soviet Union, which is quite unwilling to sacrifice either its policy of peaceful coexistence or its commanding position as leader of the Communist world. If the diversity of governmental levels, alliances, and forces involved in the war present difficulties, it also offers many more chances for an alert diplomacy than were available during the monolithic conflict of the Cold War.

It is true that American leaders now argue that to recognize the Vietcong is to admit defeat. A curious intellectual position indeed—to refuse to recognize your adversary for what he is. Perhaps it is worth recalling that in December 1953, after Ho Chi Minh had first announced himself ready to negotiate, the French Socialist, Alain Savary, suggested to Georges Bidault (then Foreign Minister, now living in Brazil) that he seek Ho out for talks. "You only make them bigger by talking to them," said Bidault—who did finally talk with Ho's delegate at Geneva, but after the fall of Dien Bien Phu.

"Recognizing" the Vietcong certainly will not solve the problem of peacemaking in Vietnam at a stroke. It would neverthless be an extremely constructive idea to focus diplomatic attention firmly on the South at the present time—without meanwhile ceasing efforts both to make contact with Hanoi and to assess Communist Chinese intentions.

But to bring about peace it will not suffice simply to recognize the existence of a powerful revolutionary organization supported by the North and already in control of the largest part of the national territory. More important is the task of reestablishing the constitutional legitimacy which Diem embodied for a brief period—reactionary as he was—and which has since vanished. The NLF is an essential element of this legitimacy because it is the heir to the revolt against Diem's totalitarianism as well as the principal force of resistance to foreign intervention. But there are others who make up the social and political society as well—the Buddhists, the Catholics, and also the Army, a bourgeoisie in uniform.

An effective policy to bring about a peaceful settlement should begin by making it possible for each of these groups to return to an active political role. While General Ky, after having won his sole victory of the war at Honolulu, occupies the stage, we may be sure that the other groups are ready in the wings, waiting for the protection and encouragement the U.S. could still supply. And from such a revived political life we could expect an authoritative leadership to emerge whose lot it would be to debate with the NLF on the future of the South and to establish a coalition government to represent South Vietnam in future peace conferences. While the NLF is the largest force in the South it recognizes that it is obviously not the only force, reserving a large fraction of the seats on its Central Committee for groups who do not belong to the NLF. The democratization of power in South Vietnam is not a fantasy. The destruction of the small democratic movements struggling to survive under Diem was among the factors that led to the Civil War.

French colonial policy was only too familiar with these very diverse political factions and brilliantly played them off, one against the other. But to divide and rule became a pathetic policy as France's control became more feeble. An American policy which seeks a peaceful settlement must take account of both the socio-political pluralism of South Vietnam and its extraordinary capacity for finding original—and local—solutions to its problems. Surely it is time for American leaders at last to confront the people with whom they have become so inextricably involved.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, on the magnificent statement he has just completed.

The Senator has made a very important speech. I am certain it cannot be refuted by anyone. The Senator has pointed the way to a possible end of our involvement in an ugly civil war in South Vietnam, a war which has grown into the most unpopular war in which our Nation has ever engaged. With the exception of our Revolutionary War, the present war is now the longest war in the history of the United States.

Many years ago, approximately 121 years ago, a great man who was then a Representative from Illinois in the House of Representatives—and I think of him because the distinguished Senator from Arkansas alluded to the minority leader and completely refuted the statements made the other day by the Senator from Illinois, the minority leader, spoke out against our involvement in a war of aggression against Mexico. That Representative was Abraham Lincoln.

We are now trying to seek a way out of our involvement in a war in Southeast Asia. We should never have entered it in the first place. Certainly we, the most powerful Nation that ever existed under the bending sky of God, do not need to continue our aggression against North Vietnam and the dropping of bombs and burning by napalm of thousands of civilians in Vietnam, a faraway country that is of neither strategic nor economic importance to the United States. It never has been and it never will be.

We have not a single friend from among the Asiatic countries actually fighting on our side with the exception of the fine Korean soldiers. Of course, our Chief Executive has given the South Korean Government much more than $100 million a year in additional aid as a quid pro quo for these troops whom we are paying and maintaining.

We did succeed in prevailing upon the Philippine Government to assist us, by an additional $100 million in aid to that government. What did we get as a result? Two thousand noncombat engineers were sent to South Vietnam, men whom we are now maintaining at American taxpayers' expense. Recently, Clark Clifford and Gen. Maxwell Taylor, while making a trip to Southeast Asia as the President's personal emissaries, intended to bypass the Philippine Republic because it was in the midst of a congressional campaign, and very definitely President Marcos did not want to have any warhawks from this administration in his country at a time when the strong opposition party was denouncing him for giving that little, infinitesimal aid, 2,000 noncombat engineers, for which assistance we are paying.

Unfortunately, the plane carrying General Taylor and Clark Clifford encountered difficulties and had to make an emergency landing at Clark Airbase, less than half an hour's flight from President Marcos' official residence. They were not received or visited by him. Our two envoys just sat at the airbase and waited until the plane was repaired. Then, in embarrassment, they went on their way.

I point out in passing that in our Revolutionary War, King George III of England, through Lord North, his Foreign Minister, paid to the Duke of Hesse-Cassel and other German princelings $20 million for the services of some 30,000 mercenaries. Most of them were Hessians. These men were armed and equipped by the German dukes who had hired them out as mercenaries. They were brought over on English frigates and maintained by England.

I have heard Dean Rusk, our Secretary of State, deplore the fact that the VC had made a despicable sneak attack in the darkness of night on our forces in Pleiku in the highlands of South Vietnam and killed and wounded many of our soldiers.

I do not know whether Dean Rusk seeks to rewrite the history of the Revolutionary War, but we Americans are very proud of the fact that in the darkness of the night on Christmas night 1776 George Washington crossed the Delaware with a few thousand soldiers and marched his men on Trenton and there suddenly assaulted 2,000 drunken Hessians, defeating them and killing their commander, General Rahl.

We consider that was not a sneak attack and not despicable in any way. It was a turning point in the Revolution. I merely mention that in passing.

The distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee has shown the way to our administration, and if that course is followed, I think we would shortly have peace in Vietnam.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I, too, commend the Senator from Arkansas, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, for the well-tempered, sane, and mature comments he has just made about the war in Vietnam and his persuasive answer to what was said by our beloved minority leader, whose views on this subject, I fear, were well referred to by the Senator from Arkansas as obsolete.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I yield to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator from Ohio for his reference to my comments.

.For many months, of course, the Senator from Ohio has taken a great interest in this matter and has made very pertinent observations, as he has just made with regard to Washington crossing the Delaware. I believe his comments tend to put the entire matter in a little better perspective, and his comments are a real contribution to the ongoing debate on the subject of Vietnam. I hope the Senator will continue his efforts.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I thank the distinguished chairman. He and I will certainly agree that, unfortunately, we Americans are fighting on the side of the Vietnamese tories. The military junta in power in Saigon consists of 10 generals, nine of whom fought on the side of the French against their own liberty-loving people during their war of liberation from the French colonial oppressors. Vice President Ky was in training in the French Air Force at that time. Unfortunately, we are now supporting what our Revolutionary forefathers, whom we revere, termed tories—those colonists who fought on the side of the English in our Revolutionary War. We are maintaining in power the Saigon junta who were the tories in their nation's war for independence.

CIVILIAN HEALTH AND CASUALTY PROGRAMS IN VIETNAM

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, for the past 8 weeks, the General Accounting Office has been conducting an investigation of the civilian health and casualty and the refugee programs in South Vietnam.

Today, the director of the GAO's International Division testified as to the findings of the investigation thus far.

I believe the GAO's reports reveal a shocking failure in the so-called second phase of the war in Vietnam and the effort to gain the support and allegiance of the people in that belabored country. These reports show a lack of any sense of urgency in the civilian side of our program, which, I believe, seriously impairs our efforts to bring the war in Vietnam to a successful conclusion.

I believe there is little disagreement that the war in Vietnam is in good part dependent on winning and maintaining the support of the people of that country. The GAO reports cast doubt on our success in this effort, or, perhaps more important, on the question of the priority being given this aspect of the war.

I ask unanimous consent that the testimony of Mr. Oye V. Stovall, Director of the International Division of the General Accounting Office, and the two reports of the GAO be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF OYE V. STOVALL, DIRECTOR, INTERNATIONAL DIVISION U.S. GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE PROBLEMS CONNECTED WITH REFUGEES AND ESCAPEES, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, U.S. SENATE

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee: We are pleased to appear before you today to discuss the initial phase of the inquiry we are making at the request of your Subcommittee's Counsel into the refugee program and the civilian health and casualty program for Viet Nam.

The results of the Washington phase of our inquiry have recently been transmitted to the Subcommittee in two reports, and we are continuing work in Viet Nam.

This statement presents highlights of the reports submitted. It is primarily a presentation of the facts as represented in the information we have been able to obtain in Washington. Much of the specific data originated in Viet Nam where we are now continuing our checking, and it will be subject to further development or change depending on what we find there.

Some of the principal areas of program difficulties dealt with in our inquiry relate to:

For the refugee program—

Need for more reliable data for management.

Slow release of funds and refugee allowances.

Unclear priorities.

For the civilian health and casualty program—

Inadequate facilities and staffs.

Unsatisfactory system for obtaining and distributing medical supplies.

Unclear priorities.

REFUGEE PROGRAM

Our Washington inquiry into the Refugee Program has been directed primarily to an updating of our prior reports made to the Subcommittee in September and November 1965, in terms of the principal problems discussed in those reports and the corrective actions undertaken or proposed by the Agency for International Development (AID).

Organizational changes

Before commenting on specific matters, it is appropriate to mention some organizational changes which have occurred in Viet Nam since 1965 which have a significant bearing on the conduct of the refugee program.

The Agency for International Development then had and still has primary management responsibility for this program in Washington. Until about December 1966, its Mission in Viet Nam was responsible for United States aspects of program operations and management in the field. However, at that time, the Office of Civil Operations (OCO) was created under the United States Embassy and responsibility for the program in Viet Nam was transferred to OCO. In May 1967, OCO was merged into the Office of the Assistant Chief of Staff for Civil Operations and Revolutionary Development Support (CORDS), under the Commander, United States Military Assistance Command, Viet Nam. It is our understanding that the organizational effects of the May merger are still in a transition stage, and not fully measurable. We expect to develop further information on this in Viet Nam.

Updating of significant matters

Numbers of Refugees

For calendar year 1967, the numbers of new refugees reported appear to be within the overall numbers expected by AID in its program planning. For example, through the first 7 months of 1967, the GVN's Special Commissariat for Refugees (SCR) reported an average of 38,200 new refugees monthly, as opposed to a monthly average of 41,667 (500,000 annually) anticipated by AID. However, the refugees were not distributed as originally anticipated. For example, AID anticipated about 145,500 new refugees in Region I for all of calendar year 1967; by the end of July 1967 the SCR had already reported 136,900 new refugees. Information in Washington also indicates that the Commissariat's Region I figures may be significantly understated. For example, between April 1 and mid-August 1967, CORDS' Region I Refugee Officer reported 150,000 new refugees. The SCR provisionally reported only 25,028 new refugees between April 1 and July 31, 1967.

Slow Release of Funds

The problem of slow fund releases for the refugee program continues to exist, but apparently not on the scale which we reported upon in 1965. For example, of the approximately 1 billion piasters ($8.6 million)[1] budgeted for refugee relief during calendar year 1966, records indicate that about 44 percent of these funds had not been expended. Overall figures for 1967 were not available, but evidence indicates that fund releases are still, in many cases, slow. For example, in one province in Region I, 5,280,619 piasters had been expended as of August 15, 1967, or 26 percent of the total funds budgeted for 1967.

Awareness of the Refugee Problem

In 1965 we reported a lack of awareness of the magnitude of the problem. In connection with the refugee needs in Region I this year,

---

[1] Calculated at the rate of 118 piasters to the dollar which is the official rate of exchange for import transactions. This conversion rate is used uniformly throughout this statement.

Washington officials have indicated that they were not aware of the magnitude of the problem building up in this area until it appeared in the press in July 1967.

In June 1967, cognizant AID/Washington personnel were reporting to top management that there were no unusual refugee problems in Viet Nam. After stories started appearing in the news media and after the Subcommittee started making inquiries into the status of the refugee program, one of AID/Washington's top officials went to Saigon to get first hand information on conditions and to make recommendations.

Eligible Refugees Not Receiving Allowances

Since 1965 the Government of Viet Nam has had a policy of providing allowances to refugees for a temporary period, payable partly in cash and partly in commodities. These recently have been at a daily rate of 6 piasters in cash and 400 grams of rice. Also each refugee is to receive a resettlement allowance of 5,000 piasters (about $42) plus a 6-month rice supply.

There are a number of indications that the system is not fully functioning and refugees are not always receiving their allowances, particularly in Regions I and IV. An August 1967 briefing paper on Region I reported that (1) less than 25 percent of the refugees had received resettlement grants, rice, and other essential materials, and (2) less than 50 percent had received their per diem allowances.

Earlier the May 1967 CORDS evaluation report of the refugee program reported that 244,000 eligible refugees had not received their per diem allowances, out a total of 573,000 eligible persons. Information from that report indicated.

[Number in thousands]

	Number of eligible refugees	Those receiving their per diem allowances	
		Number	Percent
Region I	233	85	36
Region II	174	167	96
Region III	83	57	69
Region IV	83	20	24
Total	573	329	57

Degree of Concern for Refugees

One major accomplishment in the past 2 years was the establishment, in February 1966, of a Special Commissariat for Refugees within the Government of Viet Nam and the vesting of responsibility for all aspects of the refugee program with the Commissariat. Within a year's time the organization had developed a staff of something over 600 people, most of whom are working with refugees in the provinces.

Our review of the information available in Washington indicates that in certain provinces, refugee officials are described as competent and dedicated and that the program is proceeding smoothly. In other areas, there are references to shortages of trained personnel and the incompetence or dilatoriness of provincial refugee officials. The current conditions in Regions I and IV add to the difficulties.

United States Dollar Assistance Programmed

The amount of direct United States dollar assistance programmed or proposed totals $29.8 million for FY 1967 and $35.6 million for FY 1968.

In addition, the equivalent of $6.8 million and $12 million in counterpart funds were programmed for fiscal years 1967 and 1968 respectively.

Actions planned by AID in 1965—Current developments

In our 1965 reports several areas were noted in which actions by AID were planned. The principal of these are commented on below.

Provision of Excess Property

Summary records show the dollar value, at acquisition cost, of excess property furnished during fiscal year 1966 to support the refugee program to be $4.9 million; for fiscal year 1967 it is estimated to be $2.4 million.

Support of Voluntary Agency Programs

By August 1967 there were 22 American and third-country voluntary agencies listed with the AID Mission in Viet Nam, employing some 436 persons.

Over one-half of the agencies had substantial refugee assistance programs and roughly one-third of the personnel were primarily engaged in refugee assistance activities. This contrasted with the situation in the summer of 1965 when only two agencies were engaged in commodity support for refugees and an additional seven were engaged in activities not specifically related to refugees. The activities of the voluntary agencies are coordinated by a central committee in Saigon, with a permanent secretariat. AID provided direct assistance of $1 million for fiscal year 1967, and $2 million for fiscal year 1968 has been proposed.

U.S. Coordination and Staffing

There was a Refugee Coordinator in the AID Mission prior to the establishment of OCO. This concept has been carried forward into the new CORDS organizational scheme.

The records in Washington indicate that the United States refugee staff for work in the field is about two-thirds filled; also, that refugee personnel in some instances were not being properly used. As of August 23, 1967, 45 personnel were authorized out of 86 requested by the field and of the 45 authorized, 32 were on board. In July 1967 it was reported that in Regions I and II about one-half the refugee staff members had been reassigned to other work. AID/Washington has requested the Mission to review the situation and return personnel to refugee duty whenever feasible.

Lack of Adequate Statistical Data

Neither AID/Washington nor the Mission in Saigon appears to have adequate data regarding the refugee population. Much vital information seems to be lacking and the information that is available is sometimes conflicting and inconsistent. We understand that there have been exchanges of communication on this problem, and new reporting formats are being considered.

Tangible accomplishments during 1966 and targets for 1967

Examples of tangible accomplishments reported for calendar year 1966 and targets for 1967 included the construction of housing units, the drilling of wells, and the furnishing of vocational training.

Housing Units

AID/Washington officials advised us that housing units at temporary refugee camps are intended to accommodate one family each. Since an estimated additional 28,000 families were added to the temporary camp population during 1966, an additional 28,000 housing units were apparently needed, exclusive of any accommodations for an estimated 45,000 out-of-camp families. SCR reported that 4,347 units were constructed during 1966.

The SCR established a target of 120 new temporary refugee centers for 1967, but no capacity figures were available. Documents we reviewed indicate that 116 camps had been constructed as of August 14, 1967.

Wells

SCR reported that 133 wells were drilled in 1966. It seems that requirements for the increased number of refugees in camp were for 560 wells. The SCR target for 1967 is 600 wells.

Vocational Training

AID/Washington reports that the first cycle of vocational training for refugees was completed in February 1967, and that 838 students sponsored by SCR completed various short-term courses in masonry, carpentry, automotive mechanics, and other technical subjects. In addition, available documentation indicates that an undisclosed, and probably unascertainable, number of students attend technical schools near refugee camps. A target of 3,200 SCR-sponsored graduates was established for 1967.

Comments on program management

A major continuing problem of management in both Saigon and Washington is the difficulty in obtaining reliable working data. Much of the refugee data which have been obtained must be discounted for management planning and decision purposes. Conflicting and inconsistent data are prevalent. Until means can be developed in Viet Nam for more reliable management information, it appears that the direction of the United States participation in the refugee program will continue to be faced with this added handicap.

Program management has been delegated largely to the field. AID/Washington participates in the planning and modification of the program, backstops the field, and responds to inquiries from the Congress, the news media, and others regarding this program. It also exercises some degree of control over the field, since AID funds support the program.

Under the conditions prevailing in Viet Nam, it seems that clear program priorities are essential so that management in the field will have guidance in allocating limited personnel resources to those programs requiring the most counseling of GVN agencies. It appears that a greater relative urgency of attention to other programs starting late in 1966 resulted in reduced attention to the Refugee Program by management both in Washington and the field. We believe this has contributed to both the undermanning of the refugee staff and the use of refugee personnel for other than refugee matters.

In 1965, we expressed the view that a system of timely and meaningful reports to AID/Washington was essential to permit it to discharge its management responsibility. A monthly statistical report has been initiated relating to the various components of the Pacification Program, including the Refugee Program. While it undoubtedly has some imperfections, it constitutes a significant start. We noted, however, that the report has been late in arriving in Washington. For example, in late September 1967, the latest report received by Washington covered June 1967 operations. Also, the June report omitted any reference to the Refugee Program.

We believe that further development of analytical management data and its interpretation in Saigon is needed as a regularly established procedure, to provide information needed in Washington for current management planning for refugee needs and priorities.

CIVILIAN HEALTH AND CASUALTY PROGRAM

Identity and size of program

There is no separate civilian casualty program as such in Viet Nam. Rather, it has been mainly submerged in the Public Health Program of the Agency for International Development (AID). The Department of Defense has a number of medical teams in the field ministering to general health needs of the Vietnamese populace, including war-related casualties.

For fiscal years 1967 and 1968, AID proposed expending $21.3 million and $27.7 million, respectively, for public health purposes. The Department of Defense proposed expending about $15.8 million in fiscal year 1967 for general health purposes related to Vietnamese and about $6.8 million in fiscal year 1968. In addition, subject to the availability of funds, the Department will expend about $17 million to construct three hospitals specifically to accommodate war-related civilian casualties.

AID advises us that the Government of Viet Nam (GVN) has budgeted about two billion piasters ($17 million) on public health in 1967 of which about 400 million piasters ($3.3 million) originate from counterpart funds generated by other programs of United States assistance.

Program management

The Agency for International Development has primary management responsibility for public health although there has been some division of responsibility between AID and the Department of Defense, particularly with relation to war-related injuries.

AID/Washington participates in program development and modification, and backstops the field and responds to inquiries from the Congress, the news media, and others regarding this program.

In Viet Nam, the Public Health Division of AID's Mission had principal management responsibility until about December 1966, when the Office of Civil Operations (OCO) was organized under the American Embassy. OCO was assigned responsibility for all United States personnel outside of Saigon, including the medical officers that were formerly directly attached to the AID Mission.

Information in Washington indicates that working through the OCO mechanism in its formative period caused a general slowdown in program performance because of lack of effective communication between the Public Health Division in Saigon and representatives in the field. OCO also appeared to place greater emphasis on other revolutionary development efforts. This reportedly created difficulties in supporting the medical programs and the civilian casualty effort. In May 1967, OCO was merged into the new CORDS organization. We have no evidence at this point in Washington as to whether the major OCO-associated problems have been resolved.

The number of United States personnel in Viet Nam assigned to the Public Health Division of the AID Mission has increased significantly, from 95 at June 30, 1965; to 137 at June 30, 1966; to 228 at August 14, 1967.

U.S. policy

AID activities are conducted within the United States policy of rendering assistance through the Government of Viet Nam.

As noted above, the care of war-related civilian casualties is merged primarily into AID's Public Health Program. In turn, the rural aspects of the Public Health Program are part of the overall Pacification (or Revolutionary Development) Program.

AID tells us that it considers the care of war-related civilian casualties to be the single most important part of the Public Health Program. However, there has not been any specific priority established regarding the Public Health Program in the total context of the Pacification Program. It seems that until March 1967, health and civilian casualties were not considered as urgent as other aspects of the pacification effort. The record is not clear, however, regarding what particular aspects were considered of more importance, except security.

An indication of AID's position relative to casualties and health is shown in this excerpt from a Guam Conference bringing paper in March 1967.

"Neither the U.S. Mission in Saigon nor the GVN advocates a radical acceleration in the presently planned steady expansion of the civilian medical assistance effort. They do not consider the present overcrowding of hospitals or limited access to medical treatment in remote areas critical to our success in the political-psychological side of the war effort. They assign much higher priority to improving Vietnamese capacity to respond to popular needs for local security and other aspects of the revolutionary development effort. They have not sought to give hospital construction and airlift priority over certain military requirements which have generally preempted military capacity to meet these civil needs.

"Pressure for urgent remedying of inadequacies in medical care of civilians, particularly war casualties, has originated almost entirely in the United States. While some criticisms have reflected opposition to U.S. policy in Viet Nam, many (such as those voiced by Senators Edward Kennedy and Symington and Congressman Reid) appear to represent humanitarian conviction that the United States has a responsibility to reduce suffering caused by military operations to an absolute minimum.

"The present program will not relieve extreme overcrowding in the half-dozen provincial hospitals where this is chronic. Nor will the present program provide adequate long-term restorative care to certain types of surgical cases, including severe burns, paraplegic and polio cases. A decision now to provide these service in Viet Nam would, at best, produce facilities and staff to do the job no earlier than October-November 1967."

DOD program for expansion of hospital facilities

Shortly after the Guam Conference, the Department of Defense was assigned responsibility to construct, equip, supply, and staff three civilian casualty hospitals in Viet Nam, and to admit a limited number of Vietnamese with war-related injuries to United States military hospitals.

The total number of civilian casualties is unknown. It seems that an average of about 3,800 Vietnamese were admitted monthly to GVN hospitals during the first seven months of 1967, because of war-related injuries. These constituted about 10 percent of total admissions to these hospitals. A small number (around 100 a month) were admitted to United States military hospitals during April, May, and June. The AID Mission further reports that civilian war casualties in Regions I and IV represent approximately 65–70 percent of total nationwide civilian casualties, because of the high level of military operations in Region I and the dense population in Region IV.

The program for construction of the civilian casualty hospitals by the Department of Defense was initially approved by the President in April 1967 and subsequently refined within the Department of Defense. In August 1967, the Secretary of Defense approved a plan for building three hospitals with a total capacity of 1,100 beds costing about $17 million, and making a total of 300 beds available for use by Vietnamese civilians in two existing United States military hospitals. The original plan approved by the President called for three intensive-care surgical facilities costing a total of about $3.6 million and planned to be completed between December 15, 1967, and April 15, 1968. As of September 14, 1967, funds had not yet been committed.

Problem areas associated with health and casualty needs

The primary difficulties encountered in connection with the health programs in Viet Nam, other than those associated with combat and its related destruction, can be identified broadly with three components—manpower, facilities and logistics. Following are brief observations and information regarding certain aspects of these three elements.

Manpower

One of the greatest needs in the GVN's Ministry of Health is for trained personnel in all areas. This has been recognized by AID. Various United States and free world medical personnel have been sent to Viet Nam. Efforts have also been made to train Vietnamese. However, the development of an in-country capability through active training has been described as a failure by a former top-ranking United States official in the field. This apparently has resulted in part from frequent changes in the Ministry of Health, a lack of GVN interest in training paramedical personnel, a lack of appreciation of what is needed on the part of the physicians in Viet Nam, low prestige, and an unattractive wage scale for this type of worker.

It goes without saying that the military demands on manpower have imposed severe strains. The GVN has reportedly conscripted over 700 Vietnamese physicians, leaving fewer than 200 to care for about 16 million civilians.

Facilities

There have been efforts to improve and expand facilities in the following areas.

Surgical Suites

As part of the AID-sponsored program, 29 of the 44 provincial hospitals in Viet Nam were provided with modern surgical suites over a 4-year period starting about 1962. While under GVN control, there were a number of problems including lack of power and water and in some cases lack of a surgeon. These facilities are now staffed by United States and other free world medical teams.

Impact Hospitals

In an effort to bring medicine to areas lacking needed facilities, it was suggested by the AID Mission, and concurred in by the GVN's Ministry of Health, that nine hospitals would be built in so-called "impact" areas. A number of these areas were those in which previously no health facilities existed; others were areas possessing primitive facilities requiring extensive reconstruction. The first contract was let in July 1967 for beneficial occupancy by December 1967; all nine facilities are due for completion in April 1968.

Basic Sciences Complex

A four-building Basic Sciences Complex in Saigon was dedicated in November 1966. A shift in priorities in the GVN's Health and General Mission Program caused the postponement of construction of a related teaching hospital. It is now proposed that the teaching facility be constructed as a private American-Vietnamese foundation. In the meantime, five Saigon hospitals are used for teaching purposes.

Renovation of provincial hospitals

In 1964, the AID Mission recognized that it would be necessary to complement surgical suites with the renovation of hospitals in key provinces. However, these renovations were not implemented as fast as originally envisioned; later, renovation which was initially planned to cost $3 million for 15 hospitals required $9 million for nine hospitals. Interviews with responsible officials in AID/Washington indicate that many problems were encountered during the renovation period that led to extended completion dates and additional costs.

Rather than beginning any more large-scale renovations requiring American dollars, it was agreed by both United States and GVN officials that an architectural and engineering survey would be undertaken of the remaining provincial and prefectural hospitals before further committing funds. Contracts were awarded for these surveys in September 1967.

A recent report by a top-ranking AID Mission official states that overall improvement has been marginal in the GVN's Ministry of Health facilities because of poor construction and maintenance. The report further states that there has been a rapid deterioration of the renovated facilities discussed above. The reasons given are lack of maintenance due to lack of personnel and lack of funds.

Medical logistics requirements

The basic deficiencies in the GVN's logistics system have been reported by a top-ranking United States official to be:

1. Lack of consumption data on which to base procurement action.
2. No medical supply catalogues.
3. No inventory control.
4. No sub-depots nor distribution points.

To improve the lagging procurement of medical supplies AID engaged the Defense Supply Agency, to provide supplies for both military and civilian health needs through a single channel. Although it was initially thought that the arrangement could become operative in July 1966, the first requisitions through the Defense Supply Agency were made in October 1966. The system did not become fully operational in a requisitioning sense until February 1967 and is still not in full operation for distribution. This has been due in part to the difficulties in getting warehousing teams into the field as well as the continuing lack of understanding on the part of the Vietnamese of our requisitioning procedures. The system is reportedly improving, due to additional staffing of the Medical Logistics Branch in the AID Mission and to the work undertaken under an AID contract awarded in March 1967 to a supply management firm.

[U.S. General Accounting Office, October 1967]

INQUIRY CONCERNING THE CIVILIAN HEALTH AND CASUALTY PROGRAM FOR VIETNAM

We are submitting this report on the results of our inquiry in Washington into the handling of civilian war-related casualties in Viet Nam.

Our inquiry was undertaken at the request of the General Counsel for the Subcommittee to Investigate Problems Connected with Refugees and Escapees, Senate Committee on the Judiciary, dated August 9, 1967. During a series of subsequent meetings with the General Counsel, it was agreed that our work would be performed both in Washington and Viet Nam, with separate reports to be submitted on each phase.

The information which follows relates to the initial Washington phase of our inquiry. The aggregate information we accumulated relates to operations in Viet Nam, and is subject to further development there. This we plan to do in connection with our field work now in progress.

Due to the limited time available, we were unable to review all records and relied mainly on documents and interview information relating to the key elements of program operation and management.

IDENTITY AND SIZE OF PROGRAM

There is no separate civilian casualty program as such in Viet Nam. Rather, it has been mainly submerged in the Public Health Program of the Agency for International Development (AID). The Department of Defense has a number of medical teams in the field ministering to general health needs of the Vietnamese populace, including war-related casualties.

There is, as noted below, one program specifically geared to civilian war casualties—a proposed expansion of civilian casualty hospital facilities within Viet Nam by the Department of Defense.

Because facts relating to civilian casualties are intertwined with overall efforts in the public health field, we of necessity made inquiries into those portions of the public health effort having a bearing on war-related casualties.

For fiscal years 1967 and 1968, AID proposed expending $21.3 million and $27.7 million, respectively, for public health purposes. The Department of Defense proposed expending about $15.8 million in fiscal year 1967 for general health purposes related to Vietnamese and about $6.8 million in fiscal year 1968. In addition, subject to the availability of funds, the Department will expend about $17 million to construct three hospitals specifically to accommodate war-related civilian casualties.

AID advises us that the Government of Viet Nam (GVN) has budgeted about two billion piasters ($17 million) on public health in 1967, of which about 400 million piasters ($3.3 million) originate from counterpart funds generated by other programs of United States assistance.

PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

The Agency for International Development (AID) has primary management responsibility for public health although there has been some division of responsibility between AID and the Department of Defense, particularly with war-related injuries. We were advised that AID and Department of Defense officials in Washington confer on occasion but there seems to be no clearly defined focal point in Washington for management of this function. Field operational responsibility in Viet Nam since May 1967 rests with the Assistant Chief of Staff for Civilian Operations and Revolutionary Development Support (CORDS), under the Commander, Military Assistance Command, Viet Nam.

AID/Washington participates in program development and modification, and backstops the field and responds to inquiries from the Congress, the news media, and others regarding this program.

In Viet Nam, the Public Health Division of AID's Mission had principal management responsibility until about December 1966, when the Office of Civil Operations (OCO) was organized under the American Embassy. OCO was assigned responsibility for all United States personnel outside of Saigon, including the medical officers that were formerly directly attached to the AID Mission. Under this arrangement it appears that the role of the AID Mission regarding program management was somewhat diminished since it no longer had direct control over personnel associated with rural activities. The AID Mission did retain a certain degree of control because it controlled funding; also, the AID Mission continued to deal with its counterpart GVN agencies in Saigon.

Information in Washington indicates that working through the OCO mechanism in its formative period caused a general slowdown in program performance because of lack of effective communication between the Public Health Division in Saigon and representatives in the field. OCO also appeared to place greater emphasis on other revolutionary development efforts. This reportedly created difficulties in supporting the medical programs and the civilian casualty effort.

In May 1967, OCO was merged into the new CORDS organiztaion. We have no evidence at this point in Washington as to whether the major OCO-associated problems have been resolved.

The number of United States personnel in Viet Nam assigned to the Public Health Division of the AID Mission has increased significantly, as shown below:

Date	Positions authorized	On board
June 30, 1965	131	95
May 31, 1966	215	117
Aug. 14, 1966	390	137
Aug. 14, 1967	390	[1] 228

[1] Plus 100 personnel in process.

In addition, 32 voluntary physicians from the United States were serving in Viet Nam as of August 14, 1967, and the number of such physicians was to increase to 50 by October 1967.

UNITED STATES POLICY

AID activities are conducted within the United States policy of rendering assistance through the Government of Viet Nam.

As noted above, the care of war-related civilian casualties is merged primarily into AID's Public Health Program. In turn, the rural aspects of the Public Health Program is part of the overall Pacification (or Revolutionary Development) Program.

AID tells us that it considers the care of war-related civilian casualties to be the single most important part of the Public Health Program. However, there has not been any specific priority established regarding the Public Health Program in the total context of the Pacification Program. It seems that until March 1967, health and civilian casualties were not considered as urgent as other aspects of the pacification effort. The record is not clear, however, regarding what particular aspects were considered of more importance, except security.

An indication of AID's position relative to casualties and health is shown in this excerpt from a Guam Conference briefing paper in March 1967:

"Neither the U.S. Mission in Saigon nor the GVN advocates a radical acceleration in the presently planned steady expansion of the civilian medical assistance effort. They do not consider the present overcrowding of hospitals or limited access to medical treatment in remote areas critical to our success in the political-psychological side of the war effort. They assign much higher priority to improving Vietnamese capacity to respond to popular needs for local security and other aspects of the revolutionary development effort. They have not sought to give hospital construction and airlift priority over certain military requirements which have generally preempted military capacity to meet these civil needs.

"Pressure for urgent remedying of inadequacies in medical care of civilians, particularly was casualties, has originated almost entirely in the United States. While some criticisms have reflected opposition to U.S. policy in Viet Nam, many (such as those voiced by Senators Edward Kennedy and Symington and Congressman Reid) appear to represent humanitarian conviction that the United States has a responsibility to reduce suffering caused by military operations to an absolute minimum.

"The present program will not relieve extreme over-crowding in the half-dozen provincial hospitals where this is chronic. Nor will the present program provide adequate long-term restorative care to certain types of surgical cases, including severe burns, paraplegic and polio cases. A decision now to provide these services *in Viet Nam* would, at best, produce facilities and staff to do the job no earlier than October-November 1967."

DOD PROGRAM FOR EXPANSION OF HOSPITAL FACILITIES

Shortly after the Guam Conference, the Department of Defense was assigned responsibility to construct, equip, supply, and staff three civilian casualty hospitals in Viet Nam, and to admit a limited number of Vietnamese with war-related injuries to United States military hospitals.

The record is unclear as to precisely what the needs are for the care of civilian casualties, since the total number of such casualties is unknown. From the evidence available, it seems that an average of about 3,800 Vietnamese were admitted monthly to GVN hospitals during the first seven months of 1967, because of war-related injuries. These constituted about 10 percent of total admissions to these hospitals. A small number (around 100 a month) were also admitted to United States military hospitals during April, May, and June. The AID Mission further reports that civilian war casualties in Regions I and IV represent approximately 65–70 percent of total nationwide civilian casualties, because of the high level of military operations in Region I and the dense population in Region IV.

The program for construction of the civilian casualty hospitals by the Department of

Defense was initially approved by the President in April 1967 and subsequently refined within the Department of Defense. In August 1967, the Secretary of Defense approved a plan for building three hospitals with a total capacity of 1,100 beds costing about $17 million, and making a total of 300 beds available for use by Vietnamese civilians in two existing United States military hospitals. The original plan approved by the President called for three intensive-care surgical facilities costing a total of about $3.6 million.

The three new hospitals were to be completed between December 15, 1967, and April 15, 1968. As of September 14, 1967, funds had not yet been committed. Department of Defense officials advise us that funding these projects will depend on whether the Department's request for a $200 million contingency fund for military construction is approved by the Congress.

A Medical Appraisal Team of United States physicians expressed its reservations, in September 1967, as to whether these facilities were needed. The Team felt that most of these cases were receiving care in exisitng facilities. AID/Washington personnel also expressed the view that better management of admissions and bed space would allow for increased overall admissions to GVN hospitals.

The Medical Appraisal Team also questioned the proposed use of United States medical manpower to staff these hospitals on the grounds that it would probably require extending the drafting of United States physicians.

The additional 300 beds in United States military hospitals were planned to become available by August 1, 1967, but this target was extended to mid-November 1967 by the Secretary of Defense. Objections have been raised by United States military officials regarding the accommodation of Vietnamese in United States military hospitals. This centers on the question of setting aside a sufficient number of beds to facilitate treatment of United States military casualties in the event of an emergency.

PROBLEM AREAS ASSOCIATED WITH HEALTH AND CASUALTY NEEDS

The primary difficulties encountered in connection with the health programs in Viet Nam, other than those associated with combat and its related destruction, can be identified broadly with three components—manpower, facilities and logistics. Following are brief observations and information regarding certain aspects of these three elements.

Manpower

One of the greatest needs in the GVN's Ministry of Health is for trained personnel in all areas. This has been recognized by AID. Various United States and free world medical personnel have been sent to Viet Nam. Efforts have also been made to train Vietnamese. However, the development of an in-country capability through active training has been described as a failure by a former top-ranking United States official in the field. This apparently has resulted in part from frequent changes in the Ministry of Health, a lack of GVN interest in training paramedical personnel, a lack of appreciation of what is needed on the part of the physicians in Viet Nam, low prestige, and an unattractive wage scale for this type of worker.

It goes without saying that the military demands on manpower have imposed severe strains. The GVN has reportedly conscripted over 700 Vietnamese physicians, leaving fewer than 200 to care for about 16 million civilians.

Facilities

There have been some efforts to improve and expand GVN facilities in the following areas.

Village Health Stations

Under this category, costs were incurred mainly in counterpart funds. At most, 50 percent of these stations were used because of diminished security and a lack of trained personnel in the rural areas of Viet Nam.

Surgical Suites

As part of the AID-sponsored program, 29 of the 44 provincial hospitals in Viet Nam were provided with modern surgical suites over a 4-year period starting about 1962. While under GVN control, there were a number of problems, including lack of power and water and in some cases lack of a surgeon. These facilities are now staffed by United States and other free world medical teams.

Impact Hospitals

In an effort to bring medicine to areas lacking needed facilities, it was suggested by the AID Mission, and concurred in by the GVN's Ministry of Health, that nine hospitals would be built in so-called "impact" areas. A number of these areas were those in which previously no health facilities existed; others were areas possessing primitive facilities requiring extensive reconstruction. The first contract was let in July 1967 for beneficial occupancy by December 1967; all nine facilities are due for completion in April 1968.

Basic Sciences Complex

A four-building Basic Sciences Complex in Saigon was dedicated in November 1966. A shift in priorities in the GVN's Health and General Mission Program caused the postponement of construction of a related teaching hospital.

It is now proposed that the teaching facility be constructed as a private American-Vietnamese foundation. In the meantime, five Saigon hospitals are used for teaching purposes.

Renovation of Provincial Hospitals

In 1964, the AID Mission also recognized that it would be necessary to complement surgical suites with the renovation of 15 hospitals in key provinces (those in which the Viet Cong had had a major effect on health requirements). These renovations, which were reportedly subcontracted through the United States Secretary of the Navy, were not implemented as originally envisioned; later, renovation which was initially planned to cost $3 million for 15 hospitals required $9 million for 9 hospitals. Interviews with responsible officials in AID/Washington indicate that many problems were encountered during the renovation period that led to the extended completion date and additional costs.

At this point, the Director of the AID Mission's Health Division suspended further renovation of the hospitals pending a determination as to the essential need for reconstruction at the six other sites. By the fall of 1966, it was determined that at least a tenth hospital (Banmethuot) would be renovated. This renovation, programmed to cost $700,000 is under way.

Rather than beginning any more large-scale renovations requiring American dollars, it was agreed by both United States and GVN officials that an architectural and engineering survey would be undertaken of the remaining provincial and prefectural hospitals before further committing funds. Contracts were awarded for these surveys in September 1967.

A recent report by a top-ranking AID Mission official states that overall improvement has been marginal in the GVN's Ministry of Health facilities because of poor construction and maintenance. The report further states that there has been a rapid deterioration of the renovated facilities discussed above. The reasons given are lack of maintenance due to lack of personnel and lack of funds.

MEDICAL LOGISTICS REQUIREMENTS

The basic deficiencies in the GVN's logistics system have been reported by a top-ranking United States official to be:

1. Lack of consumption data on which to base procurement action.
2. No medical supply catalogues.
3. No inventory control.
4. No sub-depots nor distribution points.

The evidence suggests that the fill rate of requisitions for needed medical supplies was unsatisfactory although no fully reliable statistics are available. To assist in speeding the supply of needed goods into Viet Nam, AID engaged the United States General Services Administration (GSA) to perform this task. By the spring of 1966, however, it became obvious that GSA was not able to meet logistical requirements of the enlarged health program. Procurement was delayed and apparently some essential drugs were unavailable to GSA. A major factor causing the lag in the GSA system was the priority allocated to the Defense Supply Agency in terms of both availability and transport of supplies.

As a solution to this part of the problem, AID then engaged the Defense Supply Agency thereby providing supplies for both military and civilian health needs through a single channel.

In setting up the new system, the United States and free world medical teams operating in Viet Nam were given 20 days to submit quantity and cost estimates as to supply needs. The record indicates, however, that the program submitted was not subjected to a tailored review.

Although it was initially thought that the new system could become operative in July 1966, the first requisitions through the Defense Supply Agency were made in October 1966. The system did not become fully operational in a requisitioning sense until February 1967 and is still not in full operation for distribution. This has been due in part to the difficulties in getting warehousing teams into the field as well as the continuing lack of understanding on the part of the Vietnamese of our requisitioning procedures. The system is reportedly improving, due to additional staffing of the Medical Logistics Branch in the AID Mission and to the work undertaken under an AID contract awarded in March 1967 to a supply management firm.

A report prepared by CORDS which discusses June 1967 operations in the field, and which summarizes the subjective judgment of United States provincial representatives, states that only 22 percent of the representatives reporting rated the Medical Logistics Program as satisfactory. The dominant reason given for the remaining 78 percent was "Saigon GVN inaction." Until we have developed the matter further in Viet Nam we do not know what standards or criteria were followed by the United States provincial representatives in making their assessments.

[U.S. General Accounting Office, October 1967]

INQUIRY CONCERNING THE REFUGEE PROGRAM FOR VIETNAM

We are submitting this report on the results of our inquiry in Washington into the handling of the Refugee Program for Viet Nam.

Our inquiry was undertaken at the request of the General Counsel for the Subcommittee to Investigate Problems Connected with Refugees and Escapees, Senate Committee on the Judiciary, dated August 9, 1967. During a series of subsequent meetings with the General Counsel, it was agreed that our work would be performed both in Washington and Viet Nam, with separate reports to be submitted on each phase.

The information which follows relates to the initial Washington phase of our inquiry. The aggregate information we accumulated relates to operations in Viet Nam, and is subject to further development there. This we plan to do in connection with our field work now in progress.

During meetings with the General Counsel it was agreed that our work would be directed primarily to an updating of our prior reports made to the Subcommittee on September 28 and November 24, 1965, in terms of the problems discussed in those reports and the corrective actions undertaken or proposed by the Agency for International Development (AID).

Due to the limited time available, we, in developing this report, have relied mainly on documents and interview information available in Washington relating to certain key elements or problem areas of program operation and management, as brought forward from our previous reports.

ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGES

Before commenting on actions initiated or accomplished with respect to specific matters, it is appropriate to mention some organizational changes which have occurred in Viet Nam since we furnished our previous reports to the Subcommittee in September and November of 1965, and which can have a significant bearing on the conduct of the refugee program.

The Agency for International Development then had and still has primary management responsibility for this program in Washington. Until about December 1966, its Mission in Viet Nam was responsible for United States aspects of program operations and management in the field. However, at that time, the Office of Civil Operations (OCO) was created under the United States Embassy and responsibility for the program in Viet Nam was transferred to OCO. In May 1967, OCO was merged into the Office of the Assistant Chief of Staff for Civil Operations and Revolutionary Development Support (CORDS), under the Commander, United States Military Assistance Command, Viet Nam. It is our understanding that the organizational effects of the May merger are still in a transition stage, and not fully measurable. We expect to develop further information on this in Viet Nam.

UPDATING OF SIGNIFICANT MATTERS FROM OUR 1965 REPORTS

The sections which follow are directed to the more significant matters and problem areas referred to in our reports made to the Subcommittee in September and November 1965. Under each caption we have stated the essence of the particular point drawn from the prior reports, and then proceeded with supplemental data and comments developed from our current work:

1. Assistance through the Government of Vietnam

The distribution of assistance to refugees was primarily the function of the Government of Viet Nam (GVN) with the exception of assistance provided by voluntary agencies. The concept which AID adopted was to continue to operate through the GVN but on a basis of increased positive AID participation to fill voids in that Government's capabilities.

AID's policy is still to support and assist refugees through the Government of Viet Nam, except in those tactical situations where refugees are generated without advance warning and thus require direct assistance from United States Forces. The record in Washington indicates that United States Forces have been active in rendering such assistance and that planning for refugees is apparently considered in the planning of military operations. The record further indicates that such planning can only be undertaken when the initiative for military action lies with Free World Forces.

Aside from this positive participation by United States military elements, the record in Washington does not indicate that other United States personnel in Viet Nam have participated in actual program operations in the field other than on an advisory basis.

2. Numbers of refugees

The influx of refugees into areas controlled by the Government of Viet Nam sharply increased during 1965 over what had previously been experienced. Apparently, the number of refugees was far in excess of the number expected by AID in its program planning (600,000 actual vs. 100,000 planned).

There were no planning figures available in Washington for calendar year 1966, since there was no Country Assistance Program document prepared covering this period.

For calendar year 1967, the number of new refugees appears to be within the overall number expected by AID in its program planning. For example, through the first 7 months of 1967, the GVN's Special Commissariat for Refugees (SCR) reported an average of 38,200 new refugees monthly, as opposed to the monthly average of 41,667 (500,000 annually) anticipated by AID. It seems, however, that the refugees were not distributed as originally anticipated. For example, AID anticipated about 145,500 new refugees in Region I for all of calendar year 1967; by the end of July 1967 the SCR had already reported 136,900 new refugees.

Evidence in Washington also indicates that the Commissariat's Region 1 figures may be significantly understated. For example, between April 1 and mid-August 1967, CORDS' Region I Refugee Officer reported 150,000 new refugees. The SCR provisionally reported only 25,028 new refugees between April 1 and July 31, 1967.

3. Slow release of funds

As of mid-1965, AID's Mission in Viet Nam reported that incomplete reports from the provinces showed that only about 7 percent of the GVN's refugee budget had been expended. Since the United States provided the GVN with budgetary support, we considered that the piasters provided by that Government for refugee relief were provided in part by the United States.

The problem of slow fund releases for the refugee program still continues to exist, but apparently not on the scale which we reported upon in 1965. For example, of the 1,016.6 million piasters ($8.6 million)[1] budgeted for refugee relief during calendar year 1966, records indicate that about 44 percent of these funds had not been expended. Overall figures for 1967 were not available, but evidence indicates that fund releases are still, in many cases, slow. For example, in Thua Thien Province in Region I, 5,280,619 piasters had been expended as of August 15, 1967, or 26 percent of the total funds budgeted for 1967. The adverse effect of this situation was reported by the CORDS' Senior Province Advisor to be a number of children sick from malnutrition.

4. Awareness of the refugee problem

In 1965, it appeared clear that for a good part of the time that the refugee problem was becoming increasingly severe, neither the Government of Viet Nam nor the AID Mission was fully aware of its extent or the magnitude to which it would grow.

Almost an identical situation resulted in connection with the refugee situation in I Corps (Region I) this year. Interviews with Washington officials indicated that they were not aware of the magnitude of the problem building up in this area until it appeared in the press in late July 1967.

In June 1967, cognizant AID/Washington personnel were reporting to top management that there were no unusual refugee problems in Viet Nam. After stories started appearing in the news media and after the Subcommittee started making inquiries into the status of the refugee program, one of AID/Washington's top officials went to Saigon for about a 10-day period in order to get first hand information on conditions and to make recommendations.

5. Eligible refugees not receiving allowances

As a result of general price increases, the GVN adopted a policy of giving each refugee a daily allowance of 400 grams of rice plus 3 piasters. Previously, this allowance was 7 piasters.

The allowance is apparently payable for 2 months. The cash portion of this allowance has now been doubled. Also each refugee is to receive a resettlement allowance of 5,000 piasters (about $42) plus a 6-month rice supply. Previously, the resettlement allowance was 3,500 piasters.

There are a number of indications that refugees are not always receiving their allowances. An August 1967 briefing paper on I Corps reported that (1) less than 25 percent of the refugees had received resettlement grants, rice, and other essential materials, and (2) less than 50 percent had received their per diem allowances.

The May 1967 CORDS evaluation report of the refugee program reported that 244,498 eligible refugees had not received their per diem allowances, out of a total of 573,546 eligible persons which we calculated as follows.

	Total	Region I	Region II	Region III	Region IV
Total temporary refugees	667,634	283,132	179,438	85,174	119,890
Less eligibility expired	94,088	50,100	5,785	1,954	36,249
Total eligible	573,546	233,032	173,653	83,220	83,641
Total not receiving	244,498	147,885	6,709	25,786	64,118

The CORDS report showed the following percentage of provincial representatives rating this program as satisfactory:

[In percent]

	Country-wide	Region— I	II	III	IV
Overall	81	67	83	90	79
Performance of SCR officials	68	60	58	89	67
Temporary refugee center operations	66	50	60	78	69

The record in Washington does not show what standard(s) were applied in arriving at these assessments.

6. *Degree of Concern for Refugees*

One of the key aspects of the problem in 1965 was a lack of genuine concern for the refugees on the part of the Government of Viet Nam. This lack of concern was due in part to the belief that the tactical situation would soon improve sufficiently to permit the refugees to return to their former homes. Also, the AID Mission expressed concern over the possibility that as a result of refugee relief activities, a class of "professional refugees" might develop which would tend to perpetuate the program and create discord on the part of nonrefugees.

One of the major accomplishments in the past 2 years was the establishment, in February 1966, of a Special Commissariat for Refugees within the Government of Viet

---

[1] Calculated at the rate of 118 piasters to the dollar which is the official rate of exchange for import transactions. This conversion rate is used uniformly throughout this report.

Nam and the vesting of complete responsibility for all aspects of the refugee program with the Commissariat. Both the Mission and AID/Washington believe that top management of this agency is capable and dedicated. The Commissioner started with no budget, staff, offices, vehicles, etc., and within a year's time developed a staff of something over 600 people, most of whom are working with refugees in the provinces.

The capability and dedication of refugee personnel in the field is another matter. Our review of the record indicates that in certain provinces, refugee officials are described as competent and dedicated and that the program is proceeding smoothly. In other areas, there are references to shortages of trained personnel and the incompetence or dilatoriness of provincial refugee officials.

7. *United States Dollar Assistance Programmed*

Neither in its planning for the fiscal year 1965 program for Viet Nam nor during the program's implementation, did AID provide for a separate refugee program as such. Rather, United States dollar input was included in the budgets of other technical assistance projects, i.e., Public Health, Social Welfare, Rural Construction, Agriculture.

Refugee relief is now shown as a separate line item in AID's Country Assistance Program.

The amount of direct United States dollar assistance programmed or proposed for fiscal years 1966 through 1968 is shown below:

[In millions of dollars]

	Assistance for refugees		
	Fiscal year 1966	Fiscal year 1967	Fiscal year 1968
Refugee relief project	$10.4	$16.6	$19.5
Costs attributable to refugee relief included in other projects	4.1	7.4	1.1
Public Law 480 commodities, title II [1]	7.9	5.8	15.0
Total	22.4	29.8	35.6

[1] The foregoing assistance under Public Law 480 is exclusive of the distribution of Public Law 480 commodities by U.S. voluntary relief agencies.

In addition, the equivalent of $6.8 million and $12 million in counterpart funds were programmed for fiscal years 1967 and 1968 respectively.

ACTIONS PLANNED BY AID IN 1965—CURRENT DEVELOPMENTS

In our 1965 reports several areas were noted in which actions by AID were planned. The principal of these are stated below with comment on their current status:

1. Provision of excess property

Provision of excess property as may be available and suitable for refugee relief.

Summary records show the dollar value, at acquisition cost, of excess property furnished or to be furnished during fiscal year 1966 to support the refugee program to be $4.9 million; for fiscal year 1967 it is estimated that the total will be $2.4 million.

2. Support of voluntary agency programs

Establishment of a group to support programs of voluntary agencies operating in Viet Nam by providing services such as warehousing, inland transportation, and administrative support on a unified basis for all agencies operating in Viet Nam.

By August 1967 there were 22 American and third-country voluntary agencies listed with the AID Mission in Viet Nam, employing some 436 persons.

Over one-half of the agencies had substantial refugee assistance programs and roughly one-third of the personnel were primarily engaged in refugee assistance activities. This contrasted with the situation in the summer of 1965 when only two agencies were engaged in commodity support for refugees and an additional seven were engaged in activities not specifically related to refugees. The activities of the voluntary agencies are coordinated by a central committee in Saigon, with a permanent secretariat.

Refugee activities of United States voluntary agencies are being financially supported by the AID Mission in Viet Nam. Direct assistance of $1 million for fiscal year 1967 and $2 million for fiscal year 1968 has been proposed. In addition, the AID Mission is providing storage facilities and transportation support for various voluntary teams in the field. The Government of Viet Nam is to provide 6 million piasters in each of the calendar years 1967 and 1968 in support of voluntary agencies. These funds are United States-generated counterpart funds and are equivalent to about $51,000 annually.

3. United States coordination and staffing

A refugee directorate was to be established in the AID Mission to administer refugee affairs for AID and to work with the Government of Viet Nam. Also, United States personnel who were to devote full-time attention to refugee matters were to be placed at all levels of the administratvie structure, including refugee camps.

There was a Refugee Coordinator in the AID Mission prior to the establishment of OCO. This concept has been carried forward into the new CORDS organizational scheme.

The records in Washington indicate that the United States refugee staff for work in the field is about two-thirds filled; also, that refugee personnel in some instances were not being properly used. As of August 23, 1967, 45 personnel were authorized out of 86 requested by the field and of the 45 authorized, 32 were on board. In July 1967 it was reported that in Regions I and II about one-half the refugee staff members had been reassigned to other work. AID/Washington has requested the Mission to review the situation and return personnel to refugee duty whenever feasible. AID/Washington has also offered to make 38 persons available for arrival in Viet Nam during October and November 1967.

4. Lack of adequate statistical data

The AID Mission would attempt to obtain statistical data regarding the makeup of the refugee population, such as sex, age, skills, distribution, and origin.

Neither AID/Washington nor its counterparts in the field appear to have adequate data regarding the refugee population. Much vital information seems to be lacking and the information that is available is sometimes conflicting and inconsistent. We understand that there have been exchanges of communication on this problem, and new reporting formats are being considered. It is too early to evaluate these developments.

In large part, the inadequacy of information can be attributed to the rapidity of change occasioned by the war and to shortcomings in SCR's staff. The extent to which personnel shortages on the AID/CORDS side have contributed to this situation is not determinable in Washington. It seems reasonable to suppose that such shortages have had a retarding effect on the ability of the United States refugee staff to dispense advice and urge changes on SCR personnel, particularly at the working level.

5. Stockpiling

Stockpiling of foodstuffs and other needed commodities near refugee centers.

The record in Washington is not clear as to whether stockpiling activities are still being carried on. We have information that there was a critical shortage of aluminum roofing in I Corps and that AID/Washington authorized the airlifting of tent material. Also, it appears that scarcity of warehouse space in some areas caused substantial quantities of commodities to be distributed through forced issue. There are mixed references to the availability of foodstuffs, with some communications reporting adequate supplies and others reporting shortages. We expect to obtain further information on this in Viet Nam.

6. Movement of supplies

Dredging harbors at port cities where refugees were congregated so that supplies could be transported by ship and thus avoid problems inherent in land transportation in Viet Nam. Also, the creation of a junk fleet to provide interim water transportation, and additions to the airlift capacity.

Current information was not available regarding the dredging of harbors and the use of junks. There are references, however, to the use of trucks in transporting refugee supplies. One problem seems to be a shortage of airlift capability, both helicopters and cargo planes; another is a shortage of vehicles. For example, it seems that the AID Mission had been waiting over a year (as of August 1967) for some 75 vehicles for the SCR.

TANGIBLE ACCOMPLISHMENTS DURING 1966 AND TARGETS FOR 1967

Our review indicated a number of tangible accomplishments reported for 1966 in the form of the construction of classrooms, public sanitation facilities and housing units, the drilling of wells, and the furnishing of vocational training. Moreover, the SCR had established targets for these functions for 1967. Our comments on these accomplishments and targets are as follows.

Classroom construction

Based on SCR figures and criteria, we understand that about 280 new classrooms were needed to accommodate the increase in the number of refugees residing in temporary camps during 1966. Records indicate that 200 were constructed. There may also have been additional needs for about 75,000 families resettled to new locations during the year, about 45,000 families added to out-of-camp refugees, and unsatisfied needs from prior years. A target of 120 new classrooms was established by SCR for 1967.

A refugee program status report as of December 31, 1965, estimated that only 15–20 percent of refugee children were in school, as opposed to 60–70 percent in the general population.

Public sanitation facilities

Information in Washington indicates that about 5,600 more facilities were needed for the increased number of persons in temporary refugee camps during 1966; there may also have been requirements for resettled refugees and those living outside the camps. The AID Mission reported that 1,164 facilities were constructed during 1966. The 1967 target of 3,600 will be sufficient only if the overall camp population decreases, and if no facilities are needed for resettled persons or those residing outside of camps.

Wells

SCR reported that 133 wells were drilled in 1966. It seems that requirements for the increased number of refugees in camp were for 560 wells. The SCR target for 1967 is 600 wells.

Housing units

AID/Washington officials advised us that housing units at temporary refugee camps are intended to accommodate one family each. Since an estimated additional 28,000 families were added to the temporary camp population during 1966, an additional 28,000 housing units were apparently needed, exclusive of any accommodations for an estimated 45,000 out-of-camp families. SCR reported that 4,347 units were constructed during 1966.

The SCR established a target of 120 new temporary refugee centers for 1967, but no capacity figures were available. Documents we reviewed indicate that 116 camps had been constructed as of August 14, 1967.

Vocational training

AID/Washington reports that the first cycle of vocational training for refugees was completed in February 1967, and that 838 students sponsored by SCR completed various short-term courses in masonry, carpentry, automotive mechanics, and other technical subjects. In addition, available documentation indicates that an undisclosed, and probably unascertainable, number of students attend technical schools near refugee camps. A target of 3,200 SCR-sponsored graduates was established for 1967.

COMMENTS ON PROGRAM MANAGEMENT IN WASHINGTON AND VIETNAM

A major continuing problem of management in both Saigon and Washington is the difficulty in obtaining reliable working data. Much of the refugee data which have been obtained must be discounted for management planning and decision purposes. Conflicting and inconsistent data are prevalent. Until means can be developed in Viet Nam for more reliable management information, it appears that the direction of the United States participation in the refugee program will continue to be faced with this added handicap.

Program management has been delegated largely to the field. AID/Washington participates in the planning and modification of the program, backstops the field, and responds to inquiries from the Congress, the news media, and others regarding this program. It also exercises some degree of control over the field, since AID funds support the program.

The United States organization in Viet Nam responsible for program management since May 1967—CORDS—is in the Department of Defense's more than AID's, chain of command. In that connection it is our understanding that the new single line of responsibility may result in some increased access to supplies from military sources for uses relating to care of refugees.

Under the conditions prevailing in Viet Nam, it seems that clear program priorities are essential so that management in the field will have guidance in allocating limited personnel resources to those programs requiring the most counseling of GVN agencies. It appears that a greater relative urgency of attention to other programs starting late in 1966 was translated into reduced attention to the Refugee Program by management both in Washington and the field. We believe this has contributed to both the undermanning of the refugee staff and the use of refugee personnel for other than refugee matters.

In 1965, we expressed the view that a system of timely and meaningful reports to AID/Washington was essential to permit it to discharge its management responsibility. A monthly statistical report has been initiated relating to the various components of the Pacification Program, including the Refugee Program. While it undoubtedly has some imperfections, it constitutes a significant start. We noted, however, that the report has been late in arriving in Washington. For example, in late September 1967, the latest report received by Washington coverd June 1967 operations. Also, the June report omitted any reference to the Refugee Program.

We believe that further development of analytical management data and its interpretation in Saigon is needed as a regularly established procedure, to provide information needed in Washington for current management planning for refugee needs and priorities.

NEED FOR RURAL REDEVELOPMENT

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, Vice President Humphrey is speaking today in Kansas City to the national Future Farmers of America Convention. A member of the press just showed me a copy of the Vice President's speech. In his typically lucid, heartwarming style, Vice President Humphrey lends his forceful prestige to the growing interest in rural redevelopment as a means of halting the disorder and decay of our cities.

Last week the Senate adopted amendments I offered to the Office of Economic Opportunity Act which would give that agency an opportunity to undertake new rural redevelopment programs immediately. In his speech today, the Vice President points out that the proportion of people without jobs is twice as high among agricultural workers as it is for industrial workers.

His analysis of the problem, and of the opportunity we now have to redirect our efforts along meaningful new lines in rural America, is complete with some suggested courses of action. I quote:

> There is a lot that government at all levels can do to help. We can use the economic weight of the Defense Department and other government contracts for research, development and production. We can offer tax incentives, subsidies, new programs of cooperative partnership between government and private enterprise, such as we are putting to work in our big cities.

I would remind the Senate that a bill has been introduced by myself and others to provide tax incentives to industries located in rural areas. My distinguished colleague from Oklahoma, Senator Harris, has spoken effectively on this measure as he is one of the chief sponsors.

Vice President Humphrey's remarks in Kansas City add significant new viewpoints to this dialog. In recent days, important statements in the same vein have come from the First Lady, Mrs. Johnson, following her recent tours through Midwestern poverty areas, and from the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Freeman.

The Vice President's speech deserves our careful attention. I ask unanimous consent that it appear in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks of Vice President Hubert Humphrey, Future Farmers of America, Kansas City, Mo., October 11, 1967

This 40th anniversary of the Future Farmers of America is a great occasion for me. I can make a claim none of you young people can—I have followed your progress for the full forty years.

Just a few weeks ago I had an excellent progress report from your national officers who visited me in Washington.

Let me hasten to add that I cannot remember the passage of the Smith-Hughes Act for vocational trainnig in agriculture which got this whole movement started.

Because of what I know about you I have the greatest confidence in your future.

I am confident primarily for one reason—I feel that you have always had, and continue to have, a sense of the tremendous and exciting opportunities open to you. Despite a bad impression created by a very few, I know that faith in the future is a characteristic of most of your generation. And since half of our citizens are under 25 today, it is a hopeful sign for this nation.

What kind of a future are we going to build for ourselves and for America? (I say "we" because I fully expect to be in this with you for a long time).

One thing is certain: Whatever path we choose, we will have a lot to work with.

Our country is rich, and it is going to grow a lot richer as we move through the last third of this twentieth century.

American farms produce a greater abundance than any other farms in the world, and that abundance will surely increase.

Planes and cars will be faster, communications quicker, life longer. Our astronauts will move farther out into space, our oceanographers will probe the depths of the sea.

By every measurement of quantity, size and speed we shall move forward.

But what about the quality of American life? How are we going to use our abundance?

A great American President—and citizen of this state—Harry Truman—once said: "Democracy is based on the conviction that man has the moral and intellectual capacity, as well as the inalienable right, to govern himself with reason and justice."

Is it reasonable and just when smoke and waste from our automobiles and industries poison the air we breathe and pollute our water?

Is it reasonable and just when one family in seven in this rich country doesn't have enough to eat, enough to wear, a decent place to live?

Is it reasonable and just when young people your age cannot share your hope in the future because they were born in poverty . . . because they had to leave school too soon . . . because they grew up in broken homes?

Is it reasonable and just that rural America should lose precious human resources while at the same time our cities grow ever larger, more congested, more burdened with slums?

It is that last question I especially want to discuss with you today—as young people who have a personal stake in finding the right answer . . . who have a stake in proving that Americans do have the "moral and intellectual capacity" to govern themselves with reason and justice.

What are the hard facts of the emigration from rural America?

Between 1950 and 1960, 11 million Americans moved from the countryside to the city. During that time, the population of our rural areas was static. All the growth of American population occurred in the cities, and that trend has continued. We can expect to have 100 million more Americans by the end of this century—just over thirty years from now. And if the present trend continues, they are almost all going to be jammed together in a few sprawling metropolitan areas.

People leave the country for many reasons. Poverty is one. Many who leave are Negro Americans who see their only chance in the city.

But they don't have the skills they need to hold a city job, and they know nothing about city life. They find themselves confined to crowded, run-down apartments and neighborhoods . . . humiliated and frustrated in an alien world of unemployment, welfare and crime. And their dream of hope turns into a nightmare of despair.

But these Americans are only part of the story. A lot of people leave perfectly comfortable homes in our small towns and on our farms because they think they have to go to the big city to enjoy a decent standard of living . . . get a good education . . . provide a better life for their families.

Most of those people are under thirty, and by far the largest group are young people who have just finished high school—people about your age whose whole productive lives are ahead of them.

It is sad but true that those people often pack up and move with good reason.

One third of the Americans who live on farms, live in poverty. The figure is only one-seventh in the cities—not good, but a little better.

The average rural teenager completes about 9 years of school. The figure is over 12 in the cities.

The proportion of people without jobs is twice as high among agricultural workers as it is for industrial workers. Some 73 percent of urban households, headed by a man with a job, have an automobile, telephone, hot-and-cold running water, and sound housing. The figure is 60 percent in rural towns, and less than 50 percent on the farm.

Only a small percentage of small or middle-sized towns offer live theater, an art gallery. an orchestra, first-rate medical care, a variety of stores and shops. Almost all our metropolitan areas do.

We know these facts are misleading and do not tell the whole story. But they do point to reasons why rural America continues to lose some of its best people.

They leave, and what does it mean?

It means there are fewer people to pay taxes in the rural areas . . . that the schools cannot afford the most modern equipment . . . that shops and businesses close. More people leave, and the vicious cycle continues.

A recent Gallup Poll showed that half of the American people would prefer to live in the country or in a small town; but most do not. They simply feel they do not have a choice.

By now, most of you are probably saying, "I didn't know we had it so bad."

Well, don't worry. My speech is not over, and before I am done you may feel a little better about it.

Because there is something we can do about the quality of life in America—both urban and rural America.

Unlike any other nation in history—unlike almost any other nation in the world today—we have the technology and the resources to extend all the benefits of modern living to every American, regardless of where he chooses to live.

We can have real freedom of choice in America.

The challenge is to put our technology and resources to work in the right combination, in the right places.

The problems which we see in our cities need treatment now. Slums . . . pollution . . . congestion . . . crime . . . unemployment . . lack of education, require a direct attack.

They cannot be treated indirectly with trickle-down progress.

But many of our urban problems have their roots in the rural problems which I have mentioned.

We cannot save our cities by creating a better life in the country. It is far too late for that.

But it does mean that if we make up for our past neglect of farm communities . . . and of the middle-sized towns of 10-thousand, 30-thousand, 50-thousand people that dot this country, we will be building a better America for all Americans, wherever they live.

I am not talking about recreating those mythical "good old days" down on the farm. I lived those good old days—dust storms, mortgage foreclosures, isolation, the one-room schoolhouse, life on the fringe, and dreams turned away.

I am not even talking about unpolluted air and the smell of fresh cut hay.

There is more to life than that and I think we can all share the best.

In the 1930's modernizing rural America meant rural electrification and a movie theatre in every town.

In the 1940's, it meant many and well-paved roads.

Now, it means airports capable of handling short-hop jets . . . community colleges . . . modern hospitals and good doctors . . . the very best in elementary and secondary education.

It means golf courses and ballparks, it means drama groups and art classes in addition to quilting bees.

We know it can be done, because we have seen it done. To make my point, let me give you an extreme example: Huntsville, Alabama.

Huntsville used to be a small Southern town—a place where people were born and died, but where they spent little time in between.

Then the TVA went into action. Huntsville got access to electric power. It got access to water for transport and for recreation.

Then scientific and space installations moved in. Other industries followed. New stores began to meet the needs of new customers. New taxpayers built new schools.

Huntsville is today a good place not only to be from, but to be.

But Huntsville is the exception and not the rule.

It tells us what can be done, if all things come together in the right way.

A basic ingredient of success is obviously jobs—jobs based not only on agriculture but on medium and small industry . . . on research facilities . . . on distribution centers . . . on enterprises which do not have to be in large metropolitan areas to prosper and grow.

There is a lot that government at all levels can do to help. We can use the economic weight of the Defense Department and other government contracts for research, development, and production. We can offer tax incentives, subsidies, new programs of cooperative partnership between government and private enterprise, such as we are putting to work in our big cities.

We can help provide the same things, on a smaller scale, that have made Huntsville such a positive example.

But other initiatives will have to come from those who live in rural America—and especially its young people.

You can work through rural community development groups to attract the kind of job-producing enterprises your communities need.

Sell businessmen on the natural resources and recreation opportunities available in your town. Tell them about the manpower available—manpower that has handled machinery since childhood.

Show them clean communities. Show them active civic groups. Show them schools, churches and parks—the things that prove you care about your future.

For in the last analysis it is the people themselves who know their own needs best and can best build the kind of future they want.

You have the chance now, as future leaders of your towns and communities, to help build an America that truly does offer freedom of choice:

Where young people can find a rich and rewarding life in every community.

Where stimulating work . . . the best in education and health care . . . sports and recreation . . . music and the arts, are as much a part of everyday life in Kansas as in Chicago, Nebraska as in New York.

And, by so doing, you have the chance to help restore, too, to urban America the sense of community and of neighborliness . . . the human values that have been so much a part of American heritage.

In the words of President Johnson:

"History records a long hard struggle to establish man's right to go where he pleases and live where he chooses. It took many centuries—and many bloody revolutions—to break the chains that bound him to a particular plot of land, or confined him within the walls of a particular community.

"We lose that freedom when our children are obliged to live someplace else . . . if they want a job or if they want a decent education.

"Not just sentiment demands that we do more to help our farms and rural communities . . . the welfare of this Nation demands it."

I have no doubt that we shall meet this challenge of providing a true life of choice for all Americans.

That is the opportunity history has given us in the last third of the Twentieth Century.

We can do it.

In the words, again, of Harry Truman: "It is not our nature to shirk our obligations. We have a heritage that constitutes the greatest resource of this nation. I call it the spirit and character of the American people."

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR JAVITS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately after the transaction of routine morning business on tomorrow, the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] be recognized for not to exceed 30 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE NATION NEEDS A NEW ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the Comptroller General recently issued a scathing report on the management of and control over expendable supplies and materials under the jurisdiction of the Architect of the Capitol. This report is further evidence of the fact that the time is long past due for replacing J. George Stewart, the Architect of the Capitol, who in truth and in fact is not even an architect.

The report found that the Architect has established no guidelines for carrying out his responsibilities; that adequate physical security of supplies was not maintained; and that recordkeeping of inventories has been almost nonexistent.

Officials of the General Accounting Office discovered that unauthorized personnel had access to storerooms; that there was no adequate system of inventory control; and that general ledger accounts and proper records were not maintained. They could find no uniform system of stock classification, nor were there individual store cards to show quantities on hand. They reported that inventories were not taken in an orderly, consistent manner; that the method of counting the various inventory items varied from building to building, and that there were deficiencies in each of the methods used. They estimated that many stored items with a value of approximately $100,000 were in excess of the needs of the Architect.

The GAO report states that—

> The Architect's physical inventory instructions for fiscal year 1965, as well as for previous years, mentioned the need to determine excess inventory but provided no clear-cut criteria for determining which items should be declared excess.

These are just a few of the criticisms of the Architect of the Capitol made in the Comptroller General's report of July 27, 1967.

Mr. President, the official culpable and responsible for these deplorable conditions is the so-called Architect of the Capitol, J. George Stewart. What are his qualifications for the position in which he has supervised the spending of more than $200 million of taxpayers' money? The answer is, No qualifications. He served in the House of Representatives from 1935 to 1937. This certainly does not qualify him as an architect. He attended the University of Delaware, class of 1911, and received his bachelor of science degree in civil engineering in 1958, 47 years later. In other words, as an alumnus, he was honored nearly half a century after he attended classes. He served as a member of the clerical staff of the Senate District of Columbia Committee from 1947 to 1951. I do not believe that qualifies him to be Architect of the Capitol. Immediately prior to his appointment in 1954 by President Eisenhower as Architect of the Capitol, he was head of the speaker's bureau of the Republican National Committee.

None of this experience—absolutely none—qualifies him for the important post which he has held for the past 13 years.

Mr. President, the Architect of the Capitol is appointed by the President of the United States and serves at the pleasure of the President. The position pays $27,000 a year. Until recently, it was a little-known post and had been regarded as a haven for a deserving politician such as this ex-Congressman appeared to be to President Eisenhower.

Mr. President, that great American, Patrick Henry, once said:

> I have but one lamp by which my feet are guided, and that is the lamp of experience. I know no way of judging of the future but by the past.

One has only to look at the Rayburn House Office Building, a J. George Stewart project and in all probability the most stupendous architectural monstrosity of all time, to realize the ineptness of the so-called Architect of the Capitol. It is ugly. It is wasteful. Its Mussolini-style pomp and embellishment and its vulgarization of classical architecture make it quite possibly the worst building costing the most money in the history of the construction of public buildings anywhere in the world. It took more than 7 years to build, costing at least $22 million more to complete than originally estimated, largely as a result of expensive miscalculations. This functional monstrosity is nothing more than sheer mass and boring bulk.

Now, this same Architect, so-called, recommends the defacement of the west front of the Capitol.

As one result of these fiascoes, citizens question the ability of their Representatives and Senators to supervise properly the spending of taxpayers' money. I am expressing the hope that any actions taken by J. George Stewart during his term of office have not been intentionally wasteful. However, good intentions are not good enough when such huge sums of money are involved.

Mr. President, the recent General Accounting Office report indicates once again the incumbent Architect of the Capitol operates his office in a manner that would really make a country storekeeper blush for shame. It is obvious that he is not aware of even the most rudimentary modern management techniques. Benjamin Franklin once said: "Experience keeps a dear school, but fools learn in no other." J. George Stewart, as Architect of the Capitol, should be replaced by a competent experienced architect, and as soon as possible. He should not have been appointed in the first place. It was a political appointment made by President Eisenhower to reward a defeated Congressman who had occupied a high political position in that grand old party of which I am not a member.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORE in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, what is the pending business before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business before the Senate is S. 2171.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to, and (at 4 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 12, 1967, at 12 noon.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate October 11 (legislative day of October 10), 1967:

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

Francis H. McAdams, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the National Transportation Safety Board for the term expiring December 31, 1972.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 11, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

And I say unto you, ask and it shall be given you; seek and ye shall find; knock and it shall be opened unto you.—Luke 11: 9

Let us pray.

O Lord, our God, infinite in wisdom, power, and love, we come to Thee conscious of our needs and with the confidence that Thou art with us to lead us in Thy way, to strengthen us to do Thy will, and to be our inspiration as we do our duty and make ourselves ready for the responsibilities of this day.

May the blessings of health, courage, and moral strength be ours and may our lives show their gratitude by good conduct motivated by genuine motives.

Bless our country and all the institutions of our beloved land. Increase the faith of our people in our Government and may we the leaders prove ourselves worthy of their trust. Forgive our shortcomings, save us from hypocrisy and from forever justifying ourselves. Simply let us do our best and leave the rest to Thee. In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 3973. An act to amend the Healing Arts Practice Act, District of Columbia, 1928, and the act of June 6, 1892, relating to the licensing of dentists in the District of Columbia, to exempt from the licensing requirements of such acts physicians and dentists while performing services in the employ of the District of Columbia; and

H.R. 11641. An act making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission, the Delaware River Basin Commission, Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Water Resources Council, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 11641) entitled "An act making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission, the Delaware River Basin Commission, Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Water Resources Council, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. Ellender, Mr. Hayden, Mr. Russell, Mr. McClellan, Mr. Hill, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. Holland, Mr. Stennis, Mr. Bible, Mr. Pastore, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Kuchel, Mr. Hruska, Mr. Young of North Dakota, Mr. Mundt, and Mrs. Smith to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10509) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 318. A act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish and administer a plan to provide for the care and protection of children through public day care services, and to provide public assistance in the form of foster home care to certain dependent children;

S. 765. An act to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, and the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia, as amended, so as to bring within the provisions of such acts any person operating a motor vehicle while under the influence of a drug rendering such person incapable of operating the motor vehicle safely;

S. 768. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for compulsory school attendance, for the taking of a school census in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved February 4, 1925;

S. 770. An act to amend an act to provide for the establishment of a public crematorium in the District of Columbia;

S. 1224. An act to establish a register of blind persons in the District of Columbia, to provide for the mandatory reporting of information concerning such persons, and for other purposes;

S. 1552. An act to amend the Highway Safety Act of 1966;

S. 1631. An act to raise the maximum age limit of schoolchildren entitled to transportation in the District of Columbia at a reduced fare; and

S. 2012. An act to amend the District of Columbia Public School Food Services Act.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON THE PUBLIC WORKS AND ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 11641) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission, the Delaware River Basin Commission, Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Water Resources Council, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. Kirwan, Evins of Tennessee, Boland, Whitten, Morris of New Mexico, Mahon, Rhodes of Arizona, Davis of Wisconsin, Robison, and Bow.

THE DANGER OF INFLATION

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the President for taking the hard road of reality and not the soft road of inaction. Fortunately, we do not have to shout: "Wake up, Mr. President." He is very much awake and aware of the danger of inflation. Our job is to support him and match his courage. We cannot shirk our duty of explaining the facts of economic life to our own constituents.

The American economy must not be sacrificed on the altar of political expediency.

The issue we must explain to our constituents are these:

The 1-cent tax increase will prevent a creeping and cruel inflation tax.

The 1-cent tax increase is a fixed and measured levy, which does not fall upon the poor. The inflation tax is open ended, which feeds most heavily on those least able to bear the burden—the poor, the elderly, the small businessman.

The 1-cent tax increase is controllable by Congress. It can be voted away later. The inflation tax is uncontrollable. It cannot be legislated out of existence once it starts its runaway spiral.

If ever there were a clear and present danger, it is now.

If ever there were a time for an act of political courage, it is now.

If ever the people needed the facts, it is now.

If there were ever a time when legislation is needed, it is now.

TIME IS RUNNING OUT FOR ACTION ON THE TAX BILL

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned—as I am sure many of the other Members are—with the problem confronting the House of Representatives today in connection with the tax problem and its effect on the Vietnam situation.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that we are confronted with one of the most serious problems we have ever been faced with in connection with the whole question of increasing taxes. Unless we enact the necessary tax legislation there will be a disastrous effect on our older people with fixed incomes, and there will be an unjust effect on many of our people because of wage controls and price controls. I most strongly urge the House of Representatives to take this matter under careful consideration, and to act now.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come to raise a fundamental question about the attitude of the 90th Congress toward the administration's request for a tax surcharge:

Will we be guilty of political thumbsucking while the forces of inflation gather and threaten to overwhelm us all?

There are those in the House, Mr. Speaker, who seem to be able to sleep securely while knowing that time is no longer on our side if we are to continue to maintain a soundly managed economy.

We have dreamed and delayed long enough. Ahead lies the possibility of an alarming price rise in 1968 if the tax bill is not enacted, a rise that would hit millions of families—especially in the lower brackets—whose incomes are fixed.

With the tax increase we have hope of beginning to work our way back to stable prices. Without it, prices would skyrocket.

There is no question, Mr. Speaker, that if we fail to enact a tax increase this year, we may be forced to consider wage and price controls next year.

If we fail to enact this increase, we shall pay a high price for our lack of political courage. For millions of Americans it will mean the erosion of their accumulated savings, a return to tight money and high interest rates, and a real possibility of economic recession.

Mr. Speaker, I say to those trying to sabotage the President's tax proposals: We can quickly repeal the surcharge; but we cannot repeal an inflationary spiral.

We must have this tax increase. And we must have it now.

UNJUST ATTACKS AGAINST THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I believe all of us will agree that in the last few weeks the salvos of attacks against the President of the United States because of his conduct as Commander in Chief of the war in Vietnam have been comparable to the barrage of shells which have fallen on Conthien. Some of them have been B-52 assaults from the Republicans; some of them have been waspish raids from the ADA; some of them have been salvos of dissent from the Democrats; then there have also been contributions to the bombing from the so-called opinion polls of the country.

Mr. Speaker, all of this volume of dissent and denunciation, much of it bitterly personal in its character, no matter how laudable the intentions of those who have spoken, has inevitably given encouragement and confidence to Hanoi and Ho Chi Minh that if they will just hold out long enough a divided American public will stop the conduct of the war.

Mr. Speaker, I do not profess knowledge superior to that of our Commander in Chief. Therefore I cannot say whether we should or should not stop the bombing of North Vietnam.

But I can say with a moral certainty and conviction that we should at least halt the bombing of the President of the United States and our Commander in Chief in the Congress of the United States for at least 30 days.

I would say further, Mr. Speaker, that the American people should refrain not only from destructive dissent but from meaningless denunciation as well for a similar period and declare a cease-fire of attacks of a vitriolic character against our President.

Mr. Speaker, if we will exercise such commendable restraint in Congress and in the country even for 30 days, then the real voice of the American people who are saying that we do not want this war and want to get out of it, but we are not going to stop until we can bring it to an honorable conclusion and substantially achieve the ends for which so many have already died, will clearly reach the ears of Hanoi and the sooner will Hanoi come to the negotiation table.

VIETNAM

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, like many of the Members of this body, I am becoming more and more alarmed at events transpiring in Vietnam. American casualties have now gone beyond 100,000. Our forces in the field have surpassed 500,000 and the risks they take continue to grow, because the South Vietnamese army declines to fight. Our expenditure is between $2 and $2½ billion a month, dollars which we desperately need for our problems here at home. Yet the war goes no better. We are winning no decisive successes on the ground. In the air we are bombing both North and South Vietnam to rubble without the slightest sign that, on the enemy's part, either the will or the means to resist has faltered. Meanwhile, in Saigon we back a government that, at best, has a minority of popular support and cannot bring itself to enact essential reforms.

I believe that the time has come to reexamine profoundly both our political involvement and our military practices in Vietnam. In the past, I have publicly declared my confidence in the President's efforts to achieve peace. But now I believe that circumstances call for a fresh approach. Perhaps if we cannot get the authorities in Hanoi to the bargaining table, talks can be commenced with the Vietcong either by our representatives or the representatives of the newly elected Government of Vietnam. All the evidence indicates that escalation as a policy is bankrupt. I urge the President, as a first step, to stop the bombing of North Vietnam. I do not believe that such a cessation will unduly hamper the efforts of our soldiers on the battlefield. On the contrary, I believe that such a cessation will, in the long run, save the lives of far more of our boys. The world will applaud this country if it stops the bombing. I urge this step on the President in the interest of the United States and in the interest of peace.

NOTED ECONOMIST, WALTER HELLER, SAYS CASE FOR SURTAX SEEMS AIRTIGHT

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker—

> The economic case for the surtax seems airtight.

Those were the clear and unmistakable words in Detroit early this month of the nationally known economist Walter Heller, who calls them as he sees them.

Because Mr. Heller is not an apologist for the Johnson administration, we ought to listen very carefully to his justification for the President's surtax proposal.

Heller ticks off the economic results: a new inflationary push with demand and prices skyrocketing; a negative foreign trade balance and a renewed call for protectionism; an even worse credit squeeze than we saw last year, and a cheapening of our money.

But Heller hits hard at something larger than the negative economic results of not voting for a surtax now when every fair economist and almost every objective businessman agrees it is necessary.

The real issue, Heller said, is whether modern fiscal policy in practice is going to be a two-way street. Government has the ability to expand and speedup an economy when needed. Government also has the power to slow down and restrain the economy when that is needed. Every economic indicator has told us for months that this economy must be slowed down, cooled, restrained.

Will Congress allow the Government to do what must be done?

I address this question to my colleagues, paraphrasing Mr. Heller's words. Will the Congress do its economic duty? Or will it run for cover or hide behind political smokescreens such as blindly directing the President to slash billions across the board from his 1968 budget—a directive more likely to result in meat-axing vital programs rather than paring nonessentials?

In short, this is the time when Congress must rise to its responsibilities and vote the President's tax measure.

ATTRIBUTE SINCERITY TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, there are some who wear their criticism of the administration's Vietnam policy as if it were a badge of intellectual superiority. Intellectual superiority? I ask how many have truly examined the premise of the criticism, a premise whose bedrock is isolationism.

There are those who smugly hug to themselves the belief that they and only they possess integrity, truth, and reason. They yield not an inch to the thought that possibly, just possibly, there may be some integrity, some truth and reason on the part of the President and his supporters. They dismiss, if indeed they mention at all, the intransigency, the openly stated aims of Hanoi, the continued aggression, the unconcernable acts of terror of the enemy. No, all their ugly slogans and debased phraseology are directed at the person of the President.

I do not quarrel with reasoned criticism. I am, however, completely dismayed at the vituperative access to which in many quarters the so-called debate have fallen.

To the cruel and frenetic critics of the President I apply an old Turkish saying: "The dogs may bark but the caravan moves on."

MAX M. KAMPELMAN AND CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, the city of Washington and indeed the entire metropolitan area have suffered a loss in Max M. Kampelman's reported withdrawal of his name as the nominee for President of the District of Columbia City Council.

This loss can be measured by the long list of Mr. Kampelman's civic contributions, including his leadership in bringing educational television to Washington; his service as president of the District of Columbia Science Association, president of the Friends of the National Zoo, and currently chairman of the board of trustees of the Greater Washington Educational Television Association; his work with the Washington

Home Rule Committee; and his experience as a political scientist.

The loss can also be measured in the delay caused in our transition to a more modern and effective form of government for Washington.

Finally, the loss can be measured in the added confusion which has been created by the raising of questions about the application of the Hatch Act and the conflict-of-interest regulations which apply to Federal officials.

I believe that these questions ideally should have been sifted and resolved earlier, but they were not, and now we have to deal with the situation as it is. Thus I believe that, as the distinguished chairman of the House District Committee has predicted all along, the Congress is going to have to legislate, particularly on the complex question of conflict of interest.

In my judgment, service on the District of Columbia City Council is a unique type of service, not to be compared with any other type of federally related service. This is essentially a municipal post, not a Federal one. Moreover, it is a part-time position which, although very demanding, was not intended to replace all other forms of employment for Council members.

To apply the strict and sweeping Federal conflict-of-interest regulations to Council members would clearly deprive the District of Columbia of the abilities and experience of many of the best-qualified individuals in Washington. While obviously Council members should not become involved in outside professional activities directly related to the city's government, it would be difficult to bar all federally connected outside work without defeating the cause of good government by eliminating many able citizens.

Clarification of the Hatch Act's applicability to the new Commissioner and Council members is an essential task, but it is simple compared to the difficulty of defining sensible and workable conflict-of-interest principles here. Yet these definitions must be made without delay. If the confusion and uncertainty persist, the new government of Washington will have a very difficult time operating.

I hope that the House will give immediate attention to this problem.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point an editorial by WTOP, as one of the many statements praising Mr. Kampelman's experience and record of public service:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COUNCIL NOMINEES

(This Editorial was broadcast on September 28 and 29, 1967 over WTOP Radio and Television.)

This is a WTOP Editorial.

The President has settled at least one weighty problem of the new DC government. He's fixed the titles of the two top men, Walter Washington is not the DC commissioner, he's the "mayor." And Thomas Fletcher isn't the deputy commissioner, he's the "deputy mayor."

Having had that clearly established, Mr. Johnson did a good deal more at the well-attended swearing-in ceremonies for Washington and Fletcher in the White House East Room. In a typical Johnsonianism, he seized the occasion to spring the anouncement of his nominees for the nine-member DC City Council.

What the President has come up with is a sound and solid group of citizens. The choice of Max Kampelman to be Council Chairman is nothing much less than a master stroke. Mr. Kampelman is a man of experience and civic devotion. If he can't do a good job, we doubt that anyone can.

The assistant Council Chairman will be the Reverend Walter Fauntroy, who is perhaps best known for his association with the Southern Christian Leadership Conference. We've always found Reverend Fauntroy to be a level-headed activist in matters of race relations. He, too, looks like a good choice.

The other seven Council members are a middle-and-upper-class cross section of the Washington community. All the nominees have a great deal of education; six are from Northwest, two from Southeast and one from Northeast.

The President could have taken any one of several tacks in selecting a Council. He has chosen to be safe and sane. We have no fault to find with that. The new government needs all the ability it can muster; that, and all the acceptance, particularly on Capitol Hill. Of course, it goes without saying that Mayor Washington and all his partners in the District Building will have to work hard and fast to establish effective communication with all segments of the community they represent—including the many thousands whose poverty, ignorance and alienation constitute the crisis of our city.

This was a WTOP Editorial, Jack Jurey speaking for WTOP.

THE WITHDRAWAL OF MAX M. KAMPELMAN AS PRESIDENT'S NOMINEE TO BE CHAIRMAN OF THE WASHINGTON, D.C., CITY COUNCIL

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the published report that Max M. Kampelman, the President's nominee as Chairman of the new City Council for the Nation's Capital, has decided to withdraw his name is interesting, although not entirely unexpected by those who knew about certain of his fascinating activities.

The obvious reason for his decision to withdraw is simply that the last thing in the world he wanted was to be sworn in as a witness before a committee of the U.S. Senate where all his dealings, past and present, could be spread on the record.

It is inconceivable that the President would have put this man forward for such a position in the first place.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON CREATES A LEGACY FOR THE FUTURE IN OUTER SPACE TREATY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has signed a protocol marking U.S. participation in the historic Outer Space Treaty of 1967—the most significant step ever taken to prevent the arms race from spreading into outer space.

The treaty will make the heavens the home of all nations; allow only peaceful uses for outer space and provide safe passage for the space explorers of all nations; prohibit military bases on celestial bodies, as well as orbiting and testing of nuclear weapons systems; open all installations on celestial bodies for inspection.

As President Johnson remarked at the ceremony formally ratifying the treaty:

> The spirit of international cooperation that has achieved this agreement is a beacon of hope for the future.

Already 84 nations have signed the treaty. The way is lit for all the nations of the world to work for peace above the earth.

Man has never succeeded in casting aside the weapons of destruction from his own planet. But, as the President has urged, "we can at least keep the virus from spreading."

This is precisely what the Outer Space Treaty has done.

It will assure voyages of peace not cruises of war into outer space.

It will leave the moon and stars as havens of peace not appendages of earth-bound conflict and competition.

It will preserve the purity of the heavens untarnished by the fallout of nuclear testing.

This disarmament treaty for outer space—for this it surely is—has long been a personal goal of Lyndon Johnson. As a U.S. Senator, he spoke for the United States before the United Nations General Assembly to urge the peaceful uses of outer space. Now, 9 years later as President, he has witnessed the fruition of his hopes for world cooperation on outer space.

President Johnson and the 84 signatories have left a legacy which future generations will cherish as long as men love peace.

TO AMEND THE HEALING ARTS PRACTICE ACT, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, 1928, AND ACT OF JUNE 6, 1892, RELATING TO LICENSING OF DENTISTS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill, H.R. 3973, to amend the Healing Arts Practice Act, District of Columbia, 1928, and the act of June 6, 1892, relating to the licensing of dentists in the District of Columbia, to exempt from the licensing requirements of such acts physicians and dentists while performing services in the employ of the District of Columbia, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

On page 4, line 2, insert:

"SEC. 3. Effective on the effective date of this Act or on the effective date of Part IV of Reorganization Plan Numbered 3 of 1967, whichever is later, the functions vested in

the Commissioners by this Act shall be deemed to be vested in the Commissioner appointed pursuant to part III of such plan."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I query the distinguished chairman of our committee on the District of Columbia, as to whether or not the Senate amendment changes the substantive content of the bill as passed by the House?

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted the gentleman asked me that question. The gentleman was of great assistance to the House District Committee in passing this legislation. The only change the Senate made was to change it from "Commissioners" to "Commissioner," to one Commissioner instead of three.

The amendment added by the Senate will transfer the functions vested in the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to the single Commissioner in accordance with Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1967.

This is deemed necessary language in view of the said reorganization plan which went into effect after the passage of H.R. 3973 by the House on June 1, 1967.

The purpose of H.R. 3973 is to authorize the District of Columbia government to employ qualified physicians and dentists who are licensed in a State or other jurisdiction of the United States, but who are not licensed to practice in the District of Columbia.

The House Committee on the District of Columbia concurs in the Senate amendment.

Mr. HALL. In other words, the Commissioner would be able to continue these temporary licenses, instead of all three of the Commissioners? Is that the way the amendment of the other body reads?

Mr. McMILLAN. This makes it conform to the new Reorganization Act.

Mr. HALL. And it is clearly satisfactory to the distinguished chairman?

Mr. McMILLAN. Yes.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE RIGHT OF DISSENT—AND RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, we hear a lot about the right of dissent, and nobody questions the right of anyone to dissent. But with the right to dissent there is the responsibility of exercising that right.

I would never exercise my right of dissent based upon my responsibility if I thought that anything I said might directly or indirectly be adverse to the national interest of my country. I would withhold my remarks.

I do not intend to get into any lengthy remarks, to violate the 1-minute rule on this occasion, but I have before me the New York Times for October 10, which carries a news item of statements made not by an American but by the Minister of Defense of North Vietnam, General Giap.

A most amazing statement is made by him, which ought to awaken everyone, particularly the critics, to a realization of responsibility on their part.

I am not asking them to change their minds, but they have a responsibility in talking and exercising their right of dissent when the national interests of our country are involved and when the remarks—unintentionally, it is true—result in being adverse to the best interests of our country and of our boys fighting in South Vietnam.

What did Giap say? Among other things, in talking about the opposition to the war in the United States, he said it is "a valuable mark of sympathy"—a valuable mark of sympathy to North Vietnam. Those words should be imprinted on the minds of everyone.

The right of dissent I do not attack. It is unattackable. But the responsibility of exercising it rests upon each and every one of us.

This is the Minister of War, the Defense Minister of North Vietnam, stating that the opposition to the war in America—which means statements and speeches made in and out of Congress; though I am proud of the record of the House, it means speeches made in and out of Congress, and I do not confine that to any particular party—are a valuable mark of sympathy to North Vietnam.

If I were one of those, my conscience would be such that it would disturb me the rest of my life.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 305]

Ashley
Broomfield
Dorn
Downing
Everett
Fisher
Fountain
Fulton, Tenn.
Hansen, Idaho
Jonas
McCulloch
Moorhead
Rarick
Resnick
Rivers
St Germain
St. Onge
Sikes
Smith, Calif.
Sullivan
Teague, Tex.
Utt
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Wydler

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 406 Members have answered their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

THE LATE STANLEY BANYAN

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, my good and distinguished friend from the district in Michigan where I was born [Mr. HUTCHINSON], has informed me of the death of Stanley Banyan, editor and publisher of the Benton Harbor News-Palladium, and the deep grief of the community over the passing at the age of 80 of an outstanding newspaperman, a native son of Benton Harbor whose brilliant career in peace and war was highly noteworthy.

Stanley was the younger brother of Willard and Walter Banyan, both of whom are gone. Willard and I played together on the Benton Harbor High School football team in 1899. Walter was a poet of note, a little younger than Ben King, but the names are linked together as the poets laureate of the old and beautiful St. Joe River and the twin cities at its mouth, St. Joseph and Benton Harbor.

No brothers ever contributed more on so many cultural and material fronts to any community than Willard, Walter, and Stanley Banyan to the home of my boyhood, Benton Harbor. I join with my colleague, Mr. HUTCHINSON, in deep condolence to the family and the community in the passing of the last of these gifted brothers.

OCTOBER 12: LEGAL HOLIDAY

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, in support of my cosponsorship of H.R. 2372, a bill declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday, I would remind my colleagues of President Kennedy's remark:

> We are a nation of immigrants.

For the RECORD, I would like to explore briefly the meaning of President Kennedy's words.

The North American Continent is the home of peoples from every continent. The continent has absorbed and nurtured men and women who—for reasons as diverse as their origins—saw here promises that were absent or muted in their prior experience. So when we speak of ourselves as a nation of immigrants, the pronoun "we" extends in time to encompass not just the numbers of dreamers and doers who came to this continent and Nation; no, the small word "we" encompasses the dreams and deeds themselves.

Christopher Columbus was flesh and bone, and dream and deed. His dream and deed serve as mnemonic symbol of our commitment to the ideal that men are brothers. We need not, we should not, indulge in argument about the national composition of Columbus' crew. Nor does illumination occur in lengthy arguments about who came first to this hemisphere. We—and I mean the word in its historic sense—will be judged not by whether we established the authenticity of the Kensington stone or whether we proved beyond doubt that the first mate on the *Santa Maria* was of definable national origin. A true judgment of us must rest on whether we permitted men to dream and do, in a matrix of brotherhood.

I propose, therefore, that to declare a national holiday in the name of this ideal is part of our task as transmitters of the dream. Declaring the holiday is to remind ourselves of our task. It will not achieve it. But if this holiday contributes to our sense of ourselves as freemen pursuing diverse purposes within the pattern of common respect for diverse purpose, then it will have served its intent.

"We are a nation of immigrants" means that we are a nation of dreamers and doers, a nation in which dreamers and doers are at home in the vision of universal brotherhood.

POSTAL REVENUE AND FEDERAL SALARY ACT OF 1967

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 7977) to adjust certain postage rates, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 7977, with Mr. PRICE of Illinois in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, it had agreed that title I of the committee substitute, ending on page 35, line 18, would be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point, and the amendment of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER] had been reported.

The gentleman from West Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HECHLER OF WEST VIRGINIA

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia: On page 24, strike out line 15 and all that follows down through the second period in line 14 on page 25, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"THIRD-CLASS MAIL

"SEC. 107. (a)(1) Subsections (a) and (b) of section 4452 of title 39, United States Code, are amended to read as follows:

"'(a) Except as otherwise provided in this section, the postage rates on third-class mail are as follows:

"'Type of mailing	Rates: Mailed prior to Jan. 7, 1968 (cents)	Rates: Mailed on and after Jan. 7, 1968 (cents)	Unit
(1) Individual piece	6	6.0	1st 2 ounces or fraction thereof.
	2	2.0	Each additional ounce or fraction thereof.
(2) Bulk mailings under subsection (e) of this section of—			
(A) Books and catalogs of 24 pages or more, seeds, cuttings, bulbs, roots, scions, and plants.	12	18.0	Each pound or fraction thereof.
(B) Other matter	18	24.0	Do.
(C) Minimum charge of—			
(i) Regular	2⅞	4.5	Per piece.
(ii) Qualified nonprofit organizations	1.25	2.25	Do. '"

"'(b) Matter mailed in bulk under subsection (e) of this section is subject to a minimum charge for each piece. The minimum charge for each piece on such matter is the minimum charge prescribed by this section, as applicable.'."

(2) Subsection (e) of section 4452 of title 39, United States Code, prescribing the annual permit fee for third-class bulk mailings, is amended by striking out "$30" and inserting in lieu thereof "$40".

Mr. OLSEN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I do so because we all know tomorrow is quite a day for many people. I should like to know, before we grant a lot of extensions of time, just what the program is for consideration of this bill. Obviously we could be here talking about it for a long, long time. If that is the program, so far as I am concerned I will just be here. I believe it might help the membership to know just what the plans are.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. OLSEN. I believe we should be charitable toward our dear friend, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER], and let him have an extra 5 minutes, but not after this. After this he should not have an extra 5 minutes. I believe he should now, because he has made a lot of study of this subject. Of course, we want to resist him on our side, and I believe someone on the other side wants to resist him. He ought to have the extra 5 minutes now.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, there is going to be a substitute offered for this amendment. If I do not object now, I am going to object in the future to any requests for additional time, because the time has come when we should do more voting and less talking.

This amendment has been splashed all over the papers and talked about everywhere.

Mr. Chairman, I do object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman make his request at the end of the first 5 minutes? Then we will know the value and the pith of his remarks. I am sure we will yield to him.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my request at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, postal rates concern all people. I believe too much discussion of third-class postal rates has centered around how these rates will affect those who mail this material and very little attention has been paid to the millions of individuals who receive third-class mail, the postal employees who handle it, and the taxpayers who have to make up the postal deficit, which is increased by third-class mail.

Mr. Chairman, this is a people's amendment. It is a consumers' amendment. It is an amendment which represents the outraged outcry of millions of Americans who are somewhat fed up with the clutter which fills their mailboxes, which they have to help pay for in their taxes.

This is an amendment which helps the mail carrier, the postal clerk, and postal workers everywhere who have to handle the mountain of third-class mail which is growing in volume faster than any other class of mail, threatening to clog our entire postal system and slowing down delivery of first-class and other important mail.

I wish I could share with Members the thousands of letters, telephone calls, and telegrams that have poured into my office from every State of the Union. These come from many people who write that this is the first time in their lives they have written to a Congressman. They have no big lobbyist or organization to speak for them. I say to the Members, lobbyists have been more than active in opposing this amendment. I have been shocked by some of the examples of lobbying revealed by third-class mail organizations in order to thwart the will of the people.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I have had long experience with lobbyists. I believe they have a place in politics. In fact, most of the lobbyists whom I know I respect and consider to be honest and dedicated people.

But I want to report a piece of lobbying on this particular legislation that is unique in my experience in Congress.

My legislative assistant got a call yesterday from a Harry Maginnis who, I believe, is president of the Associated Third-Class Mail Users, who said his only contact with me was in connection with solicitation to attend a fundraising dinner, but that he wanted the Congressman—meaning me—to vote against this Hechler of West Virginia amendment. My legislative assistant said she would be glad to tell the Congressman this and he would certainly consider it. He said that he did not want me just to consider it. He said, "I want his warm body over there to vote against it." Now, this is the kind of lobbying we can do without. The Members of this body ought to know the type of pressure that the Congressmen are up against. I do not know at this moment how I am going to vote. I am going to listen to the debate. But this kind of lobbying predisposes me at this moment to vote for the Hechler of West Virginia amendment.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Maryland for that comment and for the startling illustration he has supplied. I would say once again that it is the obligation of the Members of this Committee and the Members of the House not to listen simply to those with the most bulging briefcases, the most raucous voices, and the best financed lobbies back of them. We are representing the American people here and have to think of the taxes they pay. Also we must consider the deficit which the Post Office Department is now incurring largely as a result of third-class mail.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 7977 must also be considered in relation to the entire economic situation which faces the United States. We are not legislating piecemeal here nor in a vacuum. All members of the House Committee on Appropriations, all members of the House Committee on Ways and Means, all members of the House Committee on Banking and Currency and the Joint Economic Committee and in fact all Members of the House should be particularly concerned with the way that this bill relates to all appropriations, expenditures, and revenues. That is why I ask you to look closely at the fact that the committee bill will bring in $234 million in revenue from third-class mail. The pending amendment which I propose will bring in a total of $370 million in annual revenue. Should you turn up your nose on this additional $136 million in annual revenue at a time when we are spending $2 billion a month in Vietnam and we are in an entirely new economic ball game from the time last April when the administration proposed the 3.8-cent rate on third-class bulk mail?

This is no arbitrary or capricious amendment. Although I am not a member of the committee, I have spent countless hours with officials of the Post Office Department, with Postmaster General O'Brien, with Assistant Postmaster General Ralph Nicholson, and with various specialists who know the facts.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 4 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I object. If the gentleman wants to ask for 3 minutes, as he indicated he would before, then I will not object.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I modify my request and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the Post Office Department has indicated that if you take into consideration the pay raise contained in the pending legislation, which drives up the cost of delivering all mail, and if you also include the savings to the Department due to ZIP coding by the third-class mailers, the cost coverage in my amendment will be 91 percent. This means there is still a margin of 9 percent subsidy in my amendment.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from West Virginia yield?

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say to my good friend from West Virginia that I support his amendment. I want to commend him for the fine job he has done in preparing himself for the presentation of this amendment. I hope that the amendment is adopted.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I thank the gentleman from Florida for his kind remarks and for his helpful support.

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. GUDE. I would like to commend the gentleman for his interest in this work. As he says, this is work in the interests of citizens who do not have a lobby here. I think that the sheer abundance of this third-class mail in every citizen's letterbox is an indication of the validity of his remarks.

As everyone knows, we are faced with an enormous Federal deficit. The Post Office Department accounts for some $1.2 billion of that deficit. This method of postal financing certainly runs counter to the well-established precedent of the 1958 Postal Policy Act which decided that postal revenues should nearly equal the costs of postal service. Thus, if we are going to adhere to this prudent policy—and I think we should—then obviously we are going to have to increase the postal rates. And if we are not willing to raise the rates, then we are going to have to find the money elsewhere—probably in the form of higher taxes.

The most logical and equitable way to do this is to make each user pay, insofar as possible, his fair share of the postal costs. Presently, the citizen using the first-class mail is paying more than his fair share of the cost to send a letter: he is subsidizing the users of third-class mail. More often than not, he is subsidizing the very mail which he is going to get but which he did not solicit and does not want. Now, we do not ask our citizens to subsidize advertising on billboards, television, and the like, so we certainly should not ask nor expect them to subsidize advertising by mail.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, this is a $40 billion a year business according to those who engage in third-class mailing. If it is a $40 billion-a-year business, it should certainly be able to afford to pay its way. Mr. Chairman, why should second-class rates be phased over a 3-year period unlike third-class rates?

The answer to that is simple, Mr. Chairman, because second-class publications are subscription contracts which frequently run over 1 year in length. That is the necessity for phasing them over a 3-year period.

Mr. Chairman, this is not simply a battle between various forms of advertising. It goes deeper than that. It is a fight between those who want and demand subsidized advertising and the taxpayers of this Nation who are looking on today to see what action we will take.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask any member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to answer me this simple question: Does an advertiser when he purchases a billboard, expect to be subsidized by the taxpayers? Of course not. Then why does an advertiser expect the taxpayers to foot part of the bill simply because he advertises through the mail?

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from West Virginia yield?

Mr. HECHLER of West Virgina. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. OLSEN. I am a member of the Committee on Public Works and a member of the Subcommittee on Public Roads of that committee. Of course, we subsidize the billboards. We build the highways for them.

For goodness sakes, do not compare the Post Office Department with billboards.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I regret to respond that whenever any business about which I know pays an advertising rate on a billboard he pays 100 percent of the advertising. He does not expect the taxpayers to pick up the tab for that billboard.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, he does not pay for the highway.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, it has been stated here that since third-class mail does not get preferential treatment like first-class mail, therefore the rates for third-class mail should be much lower. It has also been contended that if the rate for third class is so close to the first-class rate, then third-class users would rather go first class than to ZIP code, sort, and perform the other functions now done outside the post office by third-class mail users. First, I would like to point out that although the original version of my bill, H.R. 99, contained a single-piece rate of 5 cents for nonbulk mailing, the amendment which I am sponsoring today supports the committee in setting the single-piece rate at 6 cents for nonbulk mailing.

The second point I would like to make is that there is indeed a clear differential between the third-class bulk rate of 4.5 cents which I am proposing, and the 6-cent, first-class rate contained in the pending legislation. As a matter of fact, there was also a 1½-cent rate differential between first-class rates and third-class bulk rates in effect between July 1952 and August 1958, when the third-class bulk rate was 1½ cents and the first-class rate was 3 cents. Also, there was a 1½-cent rate differential in effect between July 1960 and January 1963, when the first-class rate was 4 cents and the third-class bulk rate was 2½ cents.

So there really is a clear differential pricing involved in my amendment and the way in which it relates to the first-class rate.

Mr. Chairman, just who formed this great country of ours?

The preamble to the Constitution of the United States says: "We the people of the United States."

Not the third-class mail lobbyists, not the big campaign contributors, but the people—ordinary people who receive third-class mail and send first-class mail, consumers, housewives, and average people who wish they didn't have to help subsidize this clutter of junk mail.

Why are we assembled here in the Congress of the United States?

Article I, section 2 of the Constitution of the United States clearly says:

> The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States.

We are chosen by the people, and not by the lobbyists for the third-class mail users or anyone else. We are sent here to represent people, people who receive mail, and will in the future be paying one more cent of tribute in their higher first-class mail rates, and perhaps their higher taxes to subsidize the third-class mailers.

And so today we have an opportunity to speak out for people.

Nobody else is here to speak out for people. Nobody appeared before the committee to testify as a representative only of people. That is why you, my colleagues, have to seize that responsibility.

Even though the people did not come here to speak in the hearings before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I say that the people are watching what we do here today.

And the people have very long memories on a subject which is very close to them, which affects what they get in their mailbox, the service they get through our postal system, what they pay for, and how their Representatives in Congress truly represent their wishes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ANDERSON OF ILLINOIS FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HECHLER OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment for the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER].

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois as a substitute amendment for the amendment offered by Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia: On page 25 immediately following line 2, strike the table and insert in lieu thereof the following table:

"Type of mailing	Rates: Mailed prior to Jan. 7, 1968 (cents)	Mailed on and after Jan. 7, 1968 and prior to Jan. 5, 1969 (cents)	Mailed on and after Jan. 5, 1969 and prior to Jan. 4, 1970 (cents)	Mailed on and after Jan. 4, 1970 (cents)	Unit
(1) Individual piece	6	6	6	6	First 2 ounces or fraction thereof.
	2	2	2	2	Each additional ounce or fraction thereof.
(2) Bulk mailings under subsection (e) of this section of:					
(A) Books and catalogs of 24 pages or more, seeds, cuttings, bulbs, roots, scions and plants.	12	14	15	16	Each pound or fraction thereof.
(B) Other matter	18	20	21	22	Do.
(C) Minimum charge of:					
(i) Regular	2⅞	3.2	3.6	3.8	Per piece.
(ii) Qualified nonprofit organizations.	1.25	1.6	1.8	1.9	Do.

Mr. OLSEN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the substitute amendment be considered as read, printed in the RECORD at this point, and open for amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, would the gentleman from Montana undertake in making that request to explain the fact that this is the amendment about which I talked when I spoke under the rule on yesterday, that would simply phase over a 3-year period the recommendations that the committee has made for a 32-percent increase for third-class mailers?

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Certainly.

Mr. OLSEN. The amendment speaks for itself.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Would the gentleman agree that this is the amendment, and if so, I shall withdraw my reservation of objection?

Mr. OLSEN. Oh, yes. However, the gentleman from Illinois can speak for himself.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman and my friend, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER], has said that the amendment which he has offered, which if adopted, would raise third-class rates 56 percent on January 7, 1968, is a consumers' amendment. I do not for 1 minute think that that is the correct description of it. This is simply an anti-small-business amendment. It is not a consumers' amendment at all.

What the gentleman from West Virginia failed to tell you is the fact that if you adopt his amendment you will be raising by 80 percent, third-class rates for all nonprofit associations in this country by increasing the bulk mailing rate from 1¼ to 2¼ cents. That is what you will be doing if you adopt the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from West Virginia. You are going to penalize the volunteer firemen's association, the churches, the parent-teachers association, and you will be saying to them that they have got to pay this 80-percent increase—for nonprofit organizations and a 56-percent increase for the business mailers come January 1968.

And I am not talking today for any association—I never discussed with Mr. McGinnis before I came on the floor—yesterday the fact that I was going to offer this amendment. Indeed, I had never talked to Mr. McGinnis in my life.

I put my cards on the table. I said that under the Postal Policy Act of 1958 the Congress was mandated to consider the effect of postal rate increases on business. And that is all I was going to ask you to do when I suggested phasing these increases over 3 years. I was talking primarily, as I do today, for the printing industry in America. I told you yesterday that the second largest industry in New York and New Jersey is the printing industry, and that across the country there are at least 260,000 people who earn their livelihood by printing catalogs and circulars that go into the mail. For the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER] to make an emotional argument that this is all junk mail, that this is all simply literary refuse that is thrown into the U.S. mails, is just not in accord with the facts.

I would suggest that before we get swept away by emotion that we ought to consider that we are going to put out of business the third-class mailers if we adopt the Hechler amendment. We ought to consider the impact that it is going to have upon the churches, upon the PTA's, and on other civic associations, and on the perfectly legitimate business organizations of this country.

What the gentleman from West Virginia has proposed is nothing more or less than an anti-small-business amendment.

I also want to remind the Members of the House of one further thing, and that is that the distinguished chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI], said on yesterday that he would support this amendment.

I am not trying to do violence to the rate structure of this bill. I am not taking away any revenue. I am simply saying give these people an opportunity to adjust.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Yes, I yield to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. DULSKI. Does the gentleman remember when I appeared before the Committee on Rules? I said I took the same position the gentleman from Illinois has mentioned. I concur. I introduced a similar amendment in the committee. But this is all a package deal, and I am supporting the committee on the 3.8-cent rate. While personally I am wholeheartedly agreeing with the force of the gentleman's argument, we have a complete package that I presented for our committee.

Like the chairman of our Compensation Subcommittee said, this bill was wedded, and I happen to be the bridegroom for the whole bill.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I understood the gentleman to say and to mean that he would support my substitute to the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia which, of course, is not in accordance with the bill that was reported out of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

I suggest again that we will be penalizing the small businessman who uses as much as 57 percent of his advertising budget for postage to use for direct mailing, who uses third-class mail, and the bulk rates that apply to third-class mail. He is the fellow who is going to be penalized.

To me it makes just about as much sense as to say that because maybe the hippies like to congregate in the public parks, as they did up in the Sheep Meadow of Central Park a few months ago, and we had a rally of antiwar people and draft card burners, that we ought to close down the parks simply because the wrong kind of people are using them. That is the same kind of logic if you use this blunderbuss approach of the gentleman from West Virginia. If you say today we are going to put out of business all of these people who use the third-class bulk rates, then you are using just about as much logic as the example I cited.

Of course, if the Members will examine the record of the hearings that were held before the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, they will find references to statements of people like Mr. Keating, who is the head of the letter carriers' union. They will also find a reference to a statement by Mr. Hallbeck, President of the United Federation of Postal Clerks Union, and they all testified that third-class mail is perfectly legitimate, the postal workers do not object to normal third-class mail. Quite to the contrary. I urge the Members to support the substitute amendment that I have offered to the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. Chairman, this proposal to raise third-class rates even more than the very sharp increase in the committee bill would harshly punish one group of mail users for the benefit of another. It would capitalize on the disgraceful outpouring of self-serving newspaper editorials and stories demeaning third-class direct-mail advertising as "junk."

Newspapers and direct mailers compete for the advertiser's dollar. A tremendous increase in third-class postage rates might make that form of advertising economically unattractive to an advertiser and influence him to spend his money instead on newspaper advertising. These papers are not interested in discussing the merits of a legitimate public issue; they are interested in economic advantage.

This proposal to raise third-class rates to 4.5 cents per piece means more than a 50-percent increase in rates for this category of mail. It would mean a one-shot 50-percent hike at a time when second-class rates are going up only 23 percent over a 3-year period and first-class rates are being raised only 20 percent.

This huge increase would be in addition to the substantial postal expenditures third-class mailers have had to make to comply with the Post Office's mandatory ZIP code presorting requirements.

Some of the most specious arguments I have ever heard have been used against third-class mail. It is said that people who receive third-class advertising matter do not ask for it and do not want it. A great deal of advertising is sent out by first-class mail. It is not solicited by the postal patron either, but the outcry is always against third-class mail. And do the people who receive their newspapers in the mail request the advertising supplements that are being stuffed into them in ever-greater numbers? They do not.

The proposal to increase the minimum rate on third-class bulk mail to 4.5 cents would do severe damage to a fine industry that contributes greatly to the Nation's economy. The chief drumbeaters for this punitive recommendation are interests which would reap an unfair and unwarranted economic advantage if it is adopted.

The bill recommended by our Postal Rates Subcommittee called for a 3.5 cent per piece rate for third-class mail, to be reached in three annual steps. The full committee raised this to 3.8 cents to be effective in one step next January. This is an increase of 32 percent. It is 50 percent higher than the increase called for in the bill for the other major categories of mail.

Under the circumstances, the committee proposal is far more justified than the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia. Anything in excess of this committee increase would be grossly inequitable to an important and honorable industry and injurious to the national economy. This amendment should be rejected.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER]. I must say that I think the logic pointed out by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON] is well taken, and very well founded.

The fact of the matter is that third-class mail does not cost us as much per piece as first-class mail.

I have asked these people to bring in this primary sorting case again which you see here on my right. You and I would probably call it a bunch of pigeon holes, but this is a case. It is a clerk's case and it is the primary case in New York City. It means in this case in New York City a clerk must use 49 holes—not 50 but 49 holes. So several States are put together but in one instance four States, four Southern States are put together and they are—Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Alabama.

After they are put in that particular pigeon hole, then they have to be sorted once more. Then after that they have to be sorted a second time. And then there is a third time.

In many instances first-class mail has to be sorted four times at the sending station. That does not happen to third-class mail. With third-class mail we are only concerned with it at the receiving or delivery stations.

Then let me show you what happens. I have here some IBM cards to give you an example of what happens at that station. These IBM cards happen to be for Buffalo, N.Y., for a particular third-class mailer. This third-class mailer happens to be stationed in Albany, N.Y. He sends to Buffalo and he sends to many cities in America the IBM cards and the IBM cards are sorted by the delivery carrier—by the carrier himself. He sorts these cards the way he walks the route. Then those cards go back to the third-class mailer and then the third-class mailer does that sorting exactly the way the carrier walks the routes.

So you see they have eliminated all of the steps of sorting in third-class mail. The postmaster general is authorized to do this—and absolutely requires it.

This is exactly what will happen not only on third-class mail but on second-class mail because, of course, they know where they are going to send their mail in third-class—they know the subscribers, in second-class mail and they may be required to sort to the carrier's route the way he walks it.

Now that certainly should be given a lot of credit. This is exactly what the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER] has neglected. Of course, I do not mean to criticize the gentleman from West Virginia because we are close personal friends. But I just wish that he was on the committee with us and that he had been there for the 9 weeks that I was there and that he had listened to all of the testimony. Then I think he would not have offered the amendment.

So, Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia and I favor the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Is the gentleman from Montana opposed to the bill?

Mr. OLSEN. I am in favor of the committee bill.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. You are in favor of the committee bill?

Mr. OLSEN. That is with the 3.8-cent minimum rate provision.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. And you are in favor of the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON]?

Mr. OLSEN. I am in favor of the committee bill.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. But you oppose the original committee bill; is that correct?

Mr. OLSEN. The original committee bill provided 3.8-cent minimum rate to be effective in January 1968.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I understand all the details.

Mr. OLSEN. I introduced that bill.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Did you favor the committee bill, by which the increases shall all go into effect on January 1; or shall go into effect in three stages over 3 years? Which do you favor as a member of the committee?

Mr. OLSEN. I am in favor of the committee bill that goes into effect in January.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Then you are opposed to the Anderson amendment?

Then you are opposed to the Anderson amendment?

Well, now, which is it?

Mr. OLSEN. I am in favor of the committee bill and I am against the Hechler amendment.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. You said that before.

Mr. OLSEN. Thank you very much.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. How do you stand on the Anderson amendment?

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support to the Anderson of Illinois substitute amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, the Anderson substitute very strongly appeals to me because practically everything in this bill, particularly the provisions with relation to second-class rates, are phased out in order that the impact of a very high rate increase will not occur in one fell blow. It is bad enough to ask the users of third-class mail to pay $232 million in addition to the $225 million they are estimated to have spent putting in ZIP code procedures. This is very, very high.

It seems to me that if the Anderson substitute prevails, we can get rid of this vicious Hechler amendment in one fell swoop. That amendment, along with practically wiping out third class, has another really bad feature in it. It raises the rates for nonprofit organizations, for charitable, religious, and philanthropic organizations, by as much as 80 percent. Most of them simply would not be able to continue in business with this amendment. They so testified before our committee.

Likewise, as the gentleman from Illinois pointed out, the impact of the Hechler amendment would be felt primarily by small businesses that advertise with direct mail, by printing shops, by the employees thereof, and the like.

We must simply be reasonable when we are levying stamp taxes on the people. If it should prove in years to come, or even next year, that we have not raised the rates high enough, we can do it again. There is nothing to prevent this Congress from adding to rates if it so desires. But to propose right now an increase in third-class rates to 4½ cents is utterly preposterous.

I submit that the gentleman from West Virginia, who has stated he has studied these rates closely, should not have stood here as an authority and said that third class is the big loser. He recognized lately that he was in a bad position for not having advertised a Hechler amendment for second class. He came in here yesterday and proposed an amendment to increase the rates on about 45 magazines and 1 newspaper for any of their editions over 500,000. That amendment prevailed.

But if he really wants to wipe out the deficit in the Post Office, he must do something to raise second-class rates, the same as he is trying to do with third.

Mr. Chairman, I do hope that we can go along with the Anderson substitute, adopt it, and get on with the business.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HORTON. I wanted to ask a question of the gentleman from Pennsylvania with regard to the Hechler amendment. As I understand, many weekly newspapers use second- and third-class mail. One of my concerns has been that the increased cost of many of these small weekly newspapers might put them out of business.

Is the Hechler amendment so worded that it would affect adversely the small-town newspapers, these weekly newspapers?

Mr. CORBETT. Speaking for the gentleman, I think it applies not at all to the weekly newspapers.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, yesterday it was pointed out we were losing annually about $426 million per year on second-class mail. How much are we losing on third-class mail?

Mr. CORBETT. I think right now about $401 million, and this bill as written, when it is in effect, when it gets to 3.8 cents, will increase the revenue by about $238 million.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, of course, when we are using that figure, we are using Post Office cost-ascertainment figures, that no one really accepts, not even the chairman of the Postal Rates Subcommittee, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN].

Mr. CORBETT. I would like to say further, in conjunction with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON] remarks, that when I said $401 million, that included the loss of the preferential rates granted to philanthropic and nonprofit organizations.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I will accept the gentleman's figures. I do not care whose figures they are, just so they are accurate, whether they be the figures of the Post Office or the gentleman in the well or the chairman of the committee. What are we losing, in the gentleman's opinion, on second-class mail?

Mr. CORBETT. Four hundred and sixteen million dollars.

Mr. ABERNETHY. How much on third class?

Mr. CORBETT. I would say, with the passage of this bill, approximately $50 million.

Mr. ABERNETHY. How much of that goes to the philanthropic and religious organizations?

Mr. CORBETT. I do not know how much.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Why any subsidy at all to them?

Mr. CORBETT. Because it is a law that the Congress passed.

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I support the Anderson of Illinois substitute amendment and I oppose the Hechler of West Virginia amendment.

Mr. Chairman, before my colleagues vote on Mr. HECHLER's amendment, I feel they should have the benefit of a few additional facts concerning third-class mail, the cost incurred in handling it by the Post Office Department and its role in our economy.

First. It is my understanding that Mr. HECHLER's amendment will leave the single-piece rate the same as recommended by the committee. However, with respect to the "bulk rate regular" classification; that is, commercial mailings, he proposes a 4.5-cent rate whereas the committee would increase it to 3.8 cents. In terms of percentages, the committee bill would increase this rate approximately 20 percent but Congressman HECHLER's amendment would constitute a 60-percent jump.

Second. As the minority views point out, the figures on the cost of handling various classes of mail furnished by the Post Office Department left much to be desired. Third-class bulk is deferred service mail which can be handled during slack hours when all other categories of mail are out of the way. Thus, it makes a substantial contribution to the Post Office by bringing in cash income for fill-in work during periods when the plant is not operating at full capacity. My colleagues who were in business, I am sure can appreciate the favorable effect this has on overhead.

It is my understanding that this factor was not given much weight in assessing the cost of handling of this type of mail.

Third. The Government cost figures are not completely accurate in that they do not take into account the increased cost to mailers of approximately 20 percent for ZIP coding and presorting mailing by ZIP code nor do they show the reduction in post office handling costs for this contribution.

Fourth. I believe also we should seriously consider the effect such a dramatic increase would have on direct mail business establishments. Mr. Chairman, how many businesses are there that could stand a 60-percent jump in costs on its largest item of expense? If this amendment is adopted, once again, we have the Government going two ways at the same time. President Johnson is attempting to establish programs which will create jobs and should this amendment be enacted, it could very well result in the unemployment of hundreds of people.

Mr. Chairman, I know my colleagues share with me the concern that if the committee bill is adopted, first-class mail will be carrying 123.3 percent of its cost. However, under the committee bill, third-class mail will pay 90 percent of its cost. But my main concern is this: If the Hechler of West Virginia amendment is adopted and drives the direct-mail advertisers out of business, where will businessmen advertise? The answer to me is obvious. Since businessmen have to advertise, they will rely more heavily on newspapers and periodicals. This will throw more advertising into our most heavily subsidized class of mailing, second class, which carries only 42.8 percent of its cost.

Mr. Chairman, it would be my hope that my colleagues take these facts into consideration when voting on the Hechler of West Virginia amendment.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the necessary number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to explain, as I see it, what is at stake here. I oppose the Hechler of West Virginia amendment. I oppose the Anderson of Illinois substitute for the Hechler of West Virginia amendment. In other words, I am suggesting we support the committee bill, because it is the fair and reasonable solution to this complex and emotional problem.

Right now the rate is 2.8 percent. That is the present rate. The committee increased it to 3.8, effective this coming January. That is 3.8 percent. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER] says, 4.5 percent. He would place a rate of 4.5 percent in effect in January, all in one shot. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON] says 3.8, the committee rate, is about fair, but let us give them 3 years to get adjusted to it.

Of those solutions, I think the right solution is to support the committee and adopt the 3.8 rate effective in January.

I came to this committee 6 years ago with the same ideas the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER] has about making all classes pay their way, that junk mail is an outrage, and so forth. The more I have seen of it, the more I have learned about it, the more I have changed my views. I do not play games with any third-class-mail lobbyists. I fought them in the committee. I fought against their phasing, and I talked frankly and openly to them.

Here is what I see is at stake. This is a form of advertising. It is a legal form. I do not like it, but it is legal. I do not like billboards, but they are legal. I do not like a lot of television commercials, but they are proper and legal. Sometimes I do not like third-class mail, but they have a right to send it, and the public and the taxpayers and the Members of Congress have a right to ask one thing. We do not have a right to put them out of business, and this is what the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER] is suggesting. We do not have a right to keep them from stuffing our mail boxes. We have a right to ask them to pay a fair rate and that taxpayers not subsidize them, so that people in newspapers and billboards and other advertising media are not put at a disadvantage by a tax-paid subsidy.

This is the test and the question here. It is the judgment of this Member, who sat through all these weeks of hearings and who has listened to the arguments of industry and who has talked on many occasions to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER], and listened to his testimony, that, when the committee rate goes into effect, we will have a 100-percent rate on third-class mail. They will be paying their share. They will be paying their cost.

The third-class-mail rate has been increased 188 percent in the past few years. In this bill, we are tacking on 33-percent more.

If the Members will look at the report, on page 17, they will see that the cost coverage, even under the Post Office system, which I question, will be at the highest point since 1926. The cost coverage of third-class mail will be at the highest point it has ever been.

How much further do Members want to go? Do they want to put legitimate people out of business because of emotional arguments, or do they want to be fair and make them pay 100 percent?

That is the real question. That is what the committee has done.

Do not be mesmerized by this cost accounting business. Simple cost accounting is not an answer to the rates. That is only the beginning. Even the Post Office Department's official publication on the cost accounting system says that it is a statistical cost accounting process and does not take into account factors other than cost which are generally to be considered in the adjustment of postal rates and fees under policies established by law.

That says the Congress, as the ratemaking body, starts with the cost accounting.

The fellow who sits on a back seat in an airplane, who has paid the economy use fare, does not pay the same amount as the fellow who sits in the first-class seat, up in front, but if we applied cost accounting to the pilot's salary, it would cost just as much for one as it would for the other. The same would be true for the cost of the fuel. The cost of the ticket office would be the same. The only difference might be a couple of shots of booze and a little better lunch of some kind.

But the Post Office Department will say that cost accounting is only where one starts, and even there it is 80 percent with the committee bill. I say that any ratemaking body in the world will say that third-class mail will be 100 percent, if the Members support the committee.

On phasing, one can argue.

I believe the fair thing to do is to put this increase into effect in January. I have told the industry I believe they can live with it. I believe they have to live with it.

Let us not be punitive and try to destroy an industry.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

First, Mr. Chairman, before I get to the issue, I should like to tell the Members who are interested that the Red Sox are leading 1 to 0 in the third inning.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield for a question to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER].

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the gentleman from Illinois what the current cost coverage is under the committee bill for third-class mail?

Mr. DERWINSKI. If one assumes that the cost-ascertainment figures of your Post Office Department—"your" meaning the majority party Post Office Department—are correct, then, as the gentleman from Arizona just pointed out, the new third-class rate would cover the cost of handling.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. By letter of October 5, 1967, from Assistant Postmaster General Ralph Nicholson, I was informed that the Post Office Department estimates that cost coverage under the third-class rates proposed by the committee is now 82 percent and not 100 percent as indicated by the gentleman from Arizona. The 82-percent figure includes the fact that postal salaries are being raised under the pending legislation, and also computed in the 82-percent figure are the savings as a result of ZIP coding by the third-class mailers.

Second, I was told my amendment would bring cost coverage up to 91 percent, when one considers the fact that the postal salary raises in this bill will drive up the cost.

Mr. DERWINSKI. But we are taking into account the public service feature.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr OLSEN. The really big item which

is not taken into consideration on that particular 82- or 83-percent cost-coverage figure is the ZIP coding and presorting. When one takes that into consideration there is conjecture, but that conjecture was not involved in the gentleman's figure.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the ZIP code saving was taken into consideration in the October 5 letter from the Assistant Postmaster General.

Mr. OLSEN. Well, it was not taken into consideration in our figures.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. The Assistant Postmaster General says it in writing. That is what he says in his letter of October 5, 1967.

Mr. DERWINSKI. May I have the microphone back? In just a minute I will yield again to the gentleman from Montana.

In the game, the score is now 2 to 1, St. Louis.

I want to apologize to my good friend from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER], since a number of the speakers, including those who use this microphone, referred to his amendment in less than complimentary terms. Technically this is so, but should not be put in a personal sense. As a matter of fact, why should we in any way pick on poor Mr. HECHLER? We have to appreciate the fact that KEN is still a bachelor. Therefore, not having a wife who shops, he does not really appreciate the importance of third-class mail.

I ask you: What is junk mail? Junk mail is only a mail piece that you are not interested in. The moment that the housewife picks up the mail and is told of a bargain and she is attracted to an advertising display, it is no longer junk mail but is welcome, profitable, and practical mail. So you have to appreciate the entire concept of the third-class-mail industry, which is to help sell products and to keep our economy moving.

The gentleman from Arizona, who is extremely eloquent, and the gentleman from Illinois, in an especially eloquent fashion, explained that an entire industry involved with printing, advertising, and sales, has been built up through the advertising-mail medium. You just do not cut it off in one fell swoop without a thoughtful, long-term approach to it. Despite all of the problems and preoccupations with the Post Office Department, you should know that the Hechler amendment, as well intended as I know it to be, actually does a great disservice to the Post Office Department, and to the broad and almost indefinable industry which is the American sales promotion system.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in support of the Anderson of Illinois substitute to the Hechler of West Virginia amendment and in opposition to the Hechler of West Virginia amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to add my voice to those who oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER].

It seems to me that we are losing sight of the objectives and aims of the Government's handling of the mail when we confuse revenue with service. I deplore any attempt by any group to punish the only people who actually provide this Nation with a gross national product—the entirety of American industry.

Let us remember that industry provides the taxes which keep this Government in business. Few, if any, of the companies throughout the Nation who would be forced to carry the additional burden imposed by this amendment would be forced out of business by an abrupt raise in postal rates. They would be forced to pass on the additional cost to the customers, thereby adding more fuel to the inflationary fire.

Let us not confuse the costs of a bureaucracy with the services essential to the maintenance of an efficient postal service. The two are no more comparable than an orange and an apple. I am not convinced that the increases proposed by the committee are entirely warranted, but I am convinced that the increases proposed by this amendment are unreasonable.

It is unfortunate that this bill lumps revenue and service together, as all of us have certainly seen sufficient evidence of a need for the upgrading of the postal service through more equitable pay scales for postal workers, and, because of this, I will vote for the bill. However, I fail to see the need to penalize industry even further when it is already carrying an enormous burden which must pay for a war, give assistance all over the world, support a fantastically large poverty program here at home, and create jobs for our expanding population.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to associate myself with those Members supporting the substitute amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON].

This amendment offers the most reasonable approach to the difficult problem which faces us. While I would prefer the stability of postal rates which we enjoyed during the Eisenhower administration, I recognize the political fact that rates and raises have been lumped together in order to place Members of Congress right between a rock and a hard place. I feel that this amendment is a sensible effort in behalf of responsible government, and I certainly support it and urge its passage.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, I recognize what the gentleman says is true as to some of the mail delivered to the household being useful. Also, as the gentleman points out, a lot of it is not. A lot of it is truly junk mail. I am wondering if the committee gave any consideration to any remedy the homeowner and householder would have in order to eliminate that part of the mail such as the outrageous pornographic literature which is sent out. My question is, did the committee give any consideration to any remedy on the part of the householder to eliminate that which they do not want?

Mr. DERWINSKI. Yes. Specifically referring to pornography, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] is the author of title III of this bill, which is aimed at pandering matter.

Mr. CAHILL. I mean any kind of material that is objectionable to the householder.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I wish to point out to the Members that with all good intentions of the gentleman from Arizona his strategy at the moment is a bit befuddled. May I say his argument against the Hechler of West Virginia amendment and for the committee bill is sound, but for the purposes of good strategy what we should do is first support the Anderson of Illinois amendment. If that carries, then we can still reject it. I do not think it is practical, if you are opposed to the Hechler of West Virginia amendment, to risk a parliamentary bind. The logical thing is to support the Anderson of Illinois amendment, which is a progressive step. Then you have immediately foreclosed the Hechler of West Virginia amendment, which is really a regressive step.

One other point I wish to emphasize. I think this is the heart of the entire argument. You must remember you are dealing with a situation which is far greater in impact than the limited picture in a postal rate bill. You must take that into account.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Anderson substitute and in opposition to the Hechler amendment.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Briefly.

Mr. CAHILL. I thank the gentleman. I did not receive an answer to the question I asked of the gentleman from Illinois. I wonder if the chairman of the committee or the gentleman in the well could answer that question.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. What was the question?

Mr. CAHILL. The question is "Did the committee consider any action that the homeowner and the householder can take to get rid of third-class mail that they do not want?"

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Well, you can always send it back to the Post Office Department. That privilege is contained in the law. However, I must proceed.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, is that the committee response?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I have several points to make, and if I have any time left, I shall be glad to respond to the gentleman's interrogation.

Mr. Chairman, I think one thing that ought to be brought out here is the fact that if the Hechler of West Virginia amendment is adopted we would have a compression of rates. At the present time the third-class mailers have to do all of the work that the Post Office Department would ordinarily do, including mandatory ZIP coding, presort, sack and deliver to the post office and there are other steps they must take at their expense.

It is my recollection that the cost to the third-class mailers was something like $174 million in the change over demanded by the Post Office Department. This is a continuing and tremendous expense which the third-class mailers must absorb. So, if you adopt the higher rates as proposed by my dear friend, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER], there would be such a little difference between those rates and first-class rates that these mailers, many of them, would go to sending their mail by first-class and thus they would not have all the additional work and expense which they now must do.

If this happens, the Post Office Department will be required, it has been estimated, to employ an additional 200,000 clerks and letter carriers in order to handle this load that would arise if these third-class mailers, with the little difference between what the Hechler amendment costs would be and the first-class rates—if they go to first-class rates which I think many of them would do—it would cost the Post Office Department a tremendous sum of money. I thought that fact ought to be brought to the attention of the members of the Committee.

Mr. Chairman, someone has mentioned "lobbyists." I have been here for 11 years. I might say that in all of my life I have never been influenced by lobbyists and in all of my time here I have never had a fund-raising dinner. So, lobbyists do not bother me. But there are a lot of lobbyists. When we went to the various committee meetings we had at least 50 lobbyists were hanging around the door as we went into the meeting, lobbyists who hoped to pull us one way or the other. But, I do not think we ought to bring in this matter of lobbyists on behalf of third-class mailers because the second-class people are the real potent lobbyists. I have been trying to get increases in second-class rates and have succeeded, to a limited degree. I supported the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER] yesterday in his effort to obtain a modest increase in second-class rates, after my more severe proposed increase in second-class rates was defeated.

But, if anyone wants to talk about lobbyists, one can look as I have mentioned to the second-class mailers. That is where one will find them, but not in the third class.

What we are doing here—and in order to make it simple and understandable—is this: In the subcommittee we had 8 weeks of hearings and then had the markup of the bill. Third-class increase in rates was phased out over a 3-year period just as the other classes of mail were phased. When it got to the full committee, it was changed to take effect all at once.

So, what we are simply saying here, if we adopt the Anderson substitute amendment, is that we want to treat the third-class people just as we are treating the other people and phase their increase out over a 3-year period.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have some understanding as to how long we will proceed on this particular amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the Hechler of West Virginia amendment and on the substitute amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

Mr. SNYDER. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HERLONG. I object Mr. Chairman.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the Hechler of West Virginia amendment and on the substitute amendment and all amendments thereto conclude in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SNYDER and Mr. JONES of Missouri) there were—ayes 65, noes 38.

So the motion was agreed to.

PREFERENTIAL MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SNYDER

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. SNYDER moves that the Committee do now rise, and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky for 5 minutes in support of his preferential motion.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I want to apologize to the members of the committee for having to use this method to secure 5 minutes, but I feel as though there has been plenty said here in opposition to the Hechler amendment, so those of us who want to say something that might be in favor of it should be given that same consideration without having to speak so hurriedly.

Mr. Chairman, this is a matter that the gentleman from West Virginia has given a lot of time and effort to, and I believe that the arguments of the proponents ought to be heard.

The only thing I would really disagree with the gentleman from West Virginia about is that he says the public does not have any lobby here. I would suggest that the reason I have to take the well of the House today is because they have had a lobby on this particular subject, and his name has been KEN HECHLER.

I, like many Members of this House, sent out a questionnaire. I sent out a questionnaire to the people of my district early in the year and I asked a question that had nothing at all to do with bulk mail or third-class mail or junk mail.

The question was this: "Would you vote for the President's proposed increase in postal rates to reduce the postal deficit?"

Over 25 percent of the people who answered that questionnaire—of their own initiative—wrote comments like this and I would like to read to you a few excerpts.

One wrote:

> Why not discontinue low rates for junk mail? High rates would discourage such mailings, I hope.

Another wrote:

> Raise the rates on junk mail only. I know from personal experience as a letter carrier that the Post Office caters to bulk mailers at the expense of first-class mail.

Another person wrote:

> Do away with all of the junk mail. Our mailbox is crowded with this stuff . . . It goes into the garbage can. The advertising lobby is responsible for putting this over with their influence.

Over 25 percent of the people took it upon themselves to speak out on what they regard as "junk mail".

One particular constituent, I might say, and I have permission to use his name, T. A. Hamilton, bundled up his bulk mail that he received over a period of 2 or 3 weeks and put $1.55 worth of postage on it and sent it to me.

It included—three neckties, two throat lozenges, a plastic thermometer, a package of Christmas cards, a recipe book, a gasoline credit card, numerous catalogs and coupons, and a set of gummed stickers with prayers printed on them.

Gentlemen, I suggest to you if these people can send so many give-away items, they ought to at least pay their own way. The point has been made here that this is penalizing business. The truth of the matter is that postage is deductible from their income tax and most of the corporations are in the 52-percent income tax bracket. So they are really only hurt to the extent of one-half of the increase that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER] proposes.

I feel that his argument about free enterprise not being subsidized in regard to billboards and TV advertisements and things of that nature certainly is somewhat compelling and we should consider it.

I am not here because I have any bone to pick with any of these people. As a matter of fact I am somewhat in the position of the gentleman from Maryland. I have had some financial contributors to my campaign who have talked to me in opposition to my position. I do not know whether the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LONG] was actually able to sell $100 tickets to the gentleman who called his office yesterday—he did not tell us that. But I would say that I have some contributors who do contribute to my campaigns, but I must speak for the majority of my people on this issue.

I am here telling you this now because the mail I received as a result of the questionnaire and the ensuing newsstory about the questionnaire. This matter brought me more mail during that period of time than did Vietnam.

I would say that in total, this has been the second largest source of mail—second to Vietnam.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Kentucky yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Is it not true that the gentleman has heard from some of his constituents who have also been pressured by the direct mail organizations to write letters against my amendment?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes, there was a newsstory at the time of the questionnaire which produced a lot of mail. I may say more of it, by far, was in favor of the Hechler amendment than opposed to it.

A couple of mailing houses in Louisville and Cincinnati both of which have residents in my congressional district, did get their people to write. I got some 30 letters, and since the gentleman has brought that up, I would like to read one of them, and about 12 of them went like this.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the preferential motion and will yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SNYDER] if he wants to read that one letter.

Mr. SNYDER. I thank the gentleman and appreciate it so much.

The letter is as follows:

JUNE 30, 1967.

Hon. GENE SNYDER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SNYDER: I am writing in regard to the bill H.R. 99 on postal rates for 3rd class mail. My understanding is that the rates would be increased in an attempt to get rid of a lot of junk mail and obscene literature. While I personally feel this would be a very good thing, the company I work for says it would affect us a great deal should it be passed. Therefore we were given orders to write letters to our Senators and Congressman in an attempt to stop this bill. We were also given free envelopes paper and postage with our orders. Since I resent being told I have to do something. I am writing contrary to company orders for, not against this bill.

Sincerely,

———— ————.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Chairman, I wish to state at this time that I do not believe that what we are talking about is junk mail. It is valuable mail, as the gentleman from Illinois has so well stated.

But let me give you a personal example to demonstrate what I mean. A few years ago I was running for reelection to Congress. At that time it so happened that my family were owners of the Herlong Lincoln-Mercury Agency in my hometown. With that name prominently displayed, they engaged in a lot of this bulk-mail advertising.

About a week or two before the election, a number of people bundled these advertisements that the Herlong Lincoln-Mercury Co. had sent out and sent them back to me. They said, "Is this what you are doing—what you are advocating? You are asking for our vote for Congress when you are doing this?

Immediately when I received this bundle I called up the manager of our place and asked, "What do you mean by sending out this type of advertising?"

He said, "Let me tell you something. Dollar for dollar we get more value out of this type of advertising than any other type of advertising that we do."

I said, "Well, that is just fine. If you get more value out of it, my friend, you ought to pay for it."

Now, people are sitting around here with their hearts bleeding for these businesses that are "going out of business." Let me say they are not going out of business. It is the best paying enterprise in the advertising field, and I do not see any reason why they should not pay the proper postage like everyone else. They admit it is worth it to them. Why should the rest of the taxpayers subsidize them?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERLONG. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I think the gentleman knows, since I talked with him previously, that the Reader's Digest, which is subsidized by around $400,000 on their postage, has now gone into the direct-mail business to sell merchandise. Four times in the month of September I received literature from the Reader's Digest, which I hold in my hand.

These were two identical mailings indicating that my name is on their mailing list twice. Mailed from Rutland, Vt., under a bulk postage rate, third class, it carried Pleasantville, N.Y., as the return address of the Reader's Digest. They were trying to sell me some merchandise in the form of the Reader's Digest record albums and their great encyclopedic dictionary. But they also said that I had been selected as one of the lucky persons in the Arlington area chosen to receive not one, but two lucky numbers in their national lottery. I was not only lucky on one occasion but I got four numbers that month.

But then I confused their computer. They sent two envelopes on which the statement appeared, "Do you want the encyclopedic dictionary? If you do, enclose the lucky numbers in the envelope that says "Yes." If you do not want the encyclopedic dictionary, enclose the stamp in the "No" envelope.

I took the "Yes" envelope because I knew that my lucky numbers would not be opened if it came to them in the "No" envelope. I know it would have been thrown in the wastebasket. I mailed my lucky number in the "Yes" envelope, but I wrote on the outside, "Yes, I want to get in on the free deal but I don't want your merchandise. Don't send it to me."

On the particular one which I sent in in that way they were selling records. Although I did not order the records, in a few days here came a bunch of records from the Reader's Digest, which is now getting into the merchandise business. They are using this bulk-mailing third-class rate to get into that kind of business. But they are not alone. Most of the major oil companies as well as other magazines have gotten into the lottery business to sell merchandise, unrelated to their regular business.

The Reader's Digest is a fine magazine. I read it all the time, as I am sure most of you do. But I do not believe they have any business getting into merchandising, and particularly operating a lottery, which is against the law. The Post Office Department is not only permitting them to carry on a lottery through the Post Office Department but is helping by permitting them to use third class bargain rates to distribute the lottery tickets. I was in the newspaper business at one time and their regulations were so strict at that time that I could not even report who won a lottery, let alone advertise it. I could not even carry a news item informing the public as to the winner of a drawing at the county fair.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Post Office Department is a party to the lottery by permitting the distribution of lottery tickets at third class postage rates, as well as the "come on" gimmicks that go with it.

I would respectfully suggest that the Postmaster General have someone to check into the conduct of these lotteries to see if the "No" envelopes are opened and the lottery stubs checked to see if the person mailing in the stub "has been a winner" as the advertising material suggests.

Mr. Chairman, I think the Hechler amendment should be adopted as it will raise more revenue and cause third class mailers to pay their share.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the preferential motion be withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MEEDS].

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the constructive amendment offered by my colleague, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER.]

His proposal is simple and to the point.

It seeks to close the deficit gap generated by the tons and tons of third-class mail wedged into American mailboxes.

Third-class mail is presently accountable for $401 million of the Post Office deficit.

While I applaud the committee for bringing out a bill that would retrieve an additional $234 million, I feel that we can do better.

Since first class and airmail are already paying their own way, there is no reason why we cannot boost rates on third-class mail, which is currently paying only 62 percent of its handling costs.

Mr. Chairman, we are talking about a difference of $136 million in the Hechler of West Virginia amendment, and the committee bill. I think it is a good thing in these times that we think about what can and should be done with $136 million. The Hechler of West Virginia amendment is still calculated only to cover 91 percent of the cost of third-class mail. The Hechler of West Virginia amendment would bring in $370 million of revenue. I think we should stop and think about this difference.

For $136 million, Mr. Chairman, we would be almost equal to the appropriation we have approved for the Library Services and Construction Act.

This amount would be twice what we have allocated for air pollution control.

The $136 million is 2½ times greater than the funds we gave to educational services for handicapped children.

It would be three times greater than the sum we authorized for rat control.

And $136 million is six times greater than what we appropriated for highway safety and twice the amount for demonstration cities.

Since the Congress has determined to cut spending in many areas, it might be helpful if we had more revenues to support existing programs.

We can acquire more revenues if we approve Mr. Hechler's amendment to put third-class mail on a pay-as-you-send basis. I think the Hechler of West Virginia amendment should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ruppe].

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out my opposition to the Hechler amendment and opposition to the amendment offered by the gentlemen from Illinois. The committee has done a responsible job in increasing postal rates for second- and third-class publications. Yet, there is no reason why, under the Hechler amendment, the third-class mail user should have to pay not 100 percent but, after public service, well over 100 percent of the cost of mail service. We cannot levy a 67 percent increase in third-class rates while second-class rates are increased only 26 percent and cover only 45 percent of the cost of service.

The gentleman preceding me talked about gaining $130 million additional revenue for the service. That is true. But we should not forget that the committee raised third-class rates well over $200 million annually, a 28 percent increase to take effect January 1, 1968.

We must not just consider the revenues to be gained by increases imposed upon second- and third-class publishers. Rather we must consider the users of these services. With adoption of the Hechler amendment, we would, in effect, be stating that advertisers who are national in scope and can use national magazines or major city newspapers should pay for only 45 percent of the cost of distributing their advertising while the local hardware store or drugstore would be compelled by the Hechler amendment to pay well over 100 percent of the distribution cost of advertising. This amendment would be unfair, unjust, and potentially ruinous to thousands of small businesses throughout America.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. Van Deerlin].

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute amendment. After all the unkind things I have heard and read in recent months about third-class mail, I came to the debate yesterday to discover, if possible, what redeeming social importance makes it worth a subsidy ranging from $50 to $200 million in public funds. I learned the answer, in part, was that this provides make-work for postal clerks during the slack hours, during times they might otherwise be playing cribbage or listening to the World Series.

I checked with my San Diego city post office this morning to ascertain whether this was indeed true. I was advised that more than twice as much time is required to process large-size envelopes of flat mail and the sample packages that commonly go third class.

In the San Diego office, officials figure each clerk can handle 1,042 pieces of letter-sized mail per hour, most of it first class, but only 714 of the large third-class "flats" and only 475 of the packaged third-class samples that clog our postal system.

Roughly the same ratios apply in the "casing" of mail by individual carriers. Business in the San Diego Post Office is predicated on the assumption that a carrier can case 18 letters per minute, more than double the bulk mail average of eight pieces.

I was also advised that bulk mail is generally harder to handle than first class, and is the cause of more industrial accidents.

Rather than being just an incidental activity, then, it is clear that the processing of bulk mail has become a major—and expensive—function of the post office.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Wyman].

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Anderson substitute. I want to make just one point, which is that the committee after long hearings has recommended 3.8 cents. They did not recommend 4.5 cents. I think the committee's recommendation is entitled to the credence that is its due.

Even the 3.8 cents increase is 32-percent increase for this class of mail service. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Anderson] says, "Let us stretch it out." There is no doubt the impact at one fell swoop will hurt these businesses. The impact of this will be very adverse upon them economically. I think they are entitled to the stretchout which the Anderson substitute proposes, and I support it.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WYMAN. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, I support my colleague and the remarks he made.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Anderson of Illinois substitute and concur with the position of my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Wyman], and thank him for yielding.

The arguments of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Anderson], as he has eloquently and logically presented them, are clearly entitled to support. All he is asking for is reasonable time for users to adjust to substantial increases in third-class rates.

It seems to me that his position is based essentially on considerations of fairness and basic economics affecting numerous and significant groups such as small businessmen, nonprofit, civic and religious organizations. I am concerned that the logic and fairness of my colleague's position seems to be falling victim to misstatements or misunderstandings wrapped up and lumped under the label, "junk mail."

It is regrettable that we so often find ourselves legislating by lump and by label. On the facts we have here, I submit Mr. Anderson's substitute should be approved.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Fuqua].

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Anderson of Illinois substitute and in support of the Hechler of West Virginia amendment.

The net effect of the Anderson of Illinois substitute is to make a bad situation, stretched out, even worse over a 3-year period.

A great deal has been said about what it is going to do to small business. I have a news release from the National Federation of Independent Businesses, Inc., dated June 5.

In a poll taken all over the United States, small businessmen reported that 82 percent favored an increase in the rates for third-class mail.

In my own State of Florida the figure was 82 percent for increasing third-class rates, 13 percent opposed, and 5 percent undecided.

In every State in the Union the small businessmen who were polled favored this increase.

I believe, as pointed out by my colleague from Florida [Mr. Herlong], that this is big business. These people do make a profit from this. They are entitled to pay their own way the same as the first-class and other types of mail. I certainly hope we will not stretch out the bad situation we already have over 3 years and that we will go ahead to adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Hechler].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Riegle].

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Hechler]. I do not believe we can afford to continue the present $400 million loss on third-class mail, when we are having to tighten our belts to fight the war in Vietnam and have many serious problems at home to solve.

Tax money must be used for the most important things, and subsidizing junk mail is something I do not believe we can afford. The people are tired of seeing their tax dollars used to subsidize the delivery of junk mail, much of which they do not want and do not read, and which usually goes directly from their mailbox to their wastebasket.

This amendment will generate a minimum increase in revenue of $136 million. This is money we need and could better spend in other areas.

I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Hechler] on that basis.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. Stratton].

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Hechler of West Virginia amendment, and in strong support of the Anderson of Illinois substitute, which would apply the third-class rates provided in the committee over a longer, phased-step period of time. It is a little surprising that in a body like the House of Representatives, where so many of us rely on a third-class mail, postal patron approach for sending out newsletters and questionnaires, there seems to be so much opposition to the use of third-class mail by others and so much reference to this as "junk" mail. Perhaps we ought to begin to realize that what we are talking about is an industry and people and jobs are involved and we ought to consider them before we vote.

I happen to have a mail-order establishment in my home city of Amsterdam. Let me point out that this was a city which for years was in desperate economic straits, because some 12,000 jobs in the carpet mills had moved out. An effort was made to try to bring new industry into the community, and to expand existing ones. As a result of these efforts our mail-order operation has increased and now employs several hundred people.

We all know that when costs go up production goes down. If we are going to make it more costly for these mail-order people to operate, then we are certainly going to take some jobs away from them. Does it make sense to take jobs away from a community which is trying to help itself, and which has received Federal aid for that purpose?

Mr. Chairman, I am not against an effort to have third-class mailers carry their fair share of the costs of our mailing operations. But the Hechler of West Virginia amendment goes far beyond all reasonable limits.

Since 1951, third-class rates have already been raised 188 percent, while second class went up only 181 percent and first class rose only 66 percent. Now the gentleman from West Virginia would raise third-class rates still another 56 percent over these previous increases.

This would be sheer discrimination against a legitimate business operation, a burden far beyond what the committee itself determined was fair and proper.

Incidentally, this bill also provides pay increases for postal and other Government employees. I think it ought to be pointed out that many of these mail-order businesses provide off-duty employment for postal employees. We all know these employees need better wages. Are we then going to wipe out these jobs that are available to supplement the incomes of those we maybe want to help?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Latta].

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, it grieves me deeply to have to disagree with my good friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Anderson], but I cannot support his substitute and I must support the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Hechler].

Next to Vietnam, one of the most serious problems this country faces, without question, is the fiscal crisis. By the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia we have an opportunity to increase revenues by $136 million annually.

My good friends, in the next few days we are going to hear more about the struggle between the Congress and the President over reducing costs and increasing revenues, et cetera. It seems to me if the Congress is going to be consistent with its stated position it will support the amendment of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Hechler]. By so doing we will also do the people a favor by relieving them of some of the cost of subsidizing third-class mail users.

I agree with the statements made that this is big business and they do make profits by using third-class mailing privileges. I do not believe it is fair for the users of first-class mail to continue to subsidize these profitmaking businesses.

I also object to the provision in this bill which would cause the creation of a Commission to increase salaries of certain Government employees—including Congressmen—every 4 years.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Cahill].

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, I asked for this time because I understand the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. Udall] is prepared to make a statement in response to the question I asked. For the benefit of the Committee, I would like to say the question is this: What, if anything, has the committee considered and what did they recommend for assisting the householder to reject mail which is truly junk mail which they truly do not want?

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAHILL. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. The committee has given this a lot of consideration over the years. There is no foolproof system. There are under consideration a number of bills in this field. The problem is that 90 percent of the people do not resent receiving it. They like it. Maybe it is the only letter that a patron gets if she lives on a rural delivery route. She is glad that people know she is there. Other people are vehemently against it. One idea is to have the Cahill blue eagle distributed. You put it on your mail box, then they do not deliver it. The other idea is to write to the mailer who is sending this mail and ask that your name be removed from his list. Then when he receives your letter he is required to take your name off the list.

There is another amendment that one gentleman is going to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Jones].

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I would like to continue a little bit along the same line as when the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Herlong] yielded to me a while ago. I think the Reader's Digest will support the Hechler of West Virginia amendment, because editorially and through their articles and in every other way they have indicated that they are against all of the farm subsidies and other subsidies. They are among those getting the greatest subsidy of the national magazines. Therefore, I feel sure they would support this amendment.

I would like to know, has anybody heard from the Reader's Digest saying that they are opposed to getting any of this subsidy? Has any member of the committee heard from them? I presume they have not. So the Reader's Digest and I guess all of the other big magazines are opposed to other subsidies, so they would also be opposed to a subsidy for themselves. I hope they will help to support this.

Incidentally, Mr. Chairman, I will vote against this bill unless we can get it divided up and have a chance to vote twice on it. If that amendment is offered, I want a chance to vote on that. I hope we will get a chance to get on record on it.

This "shotgun marriage" has taken a lot of nerve on the part of those who say they will not give us an opportunity to vote on postage rates which have needed revising for some time, unless we are also willing to vote for pay increases for some classes of employees which are unwarranted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. McClure].

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Chairman, I want to raise just about three points in the brief time allocated to us.

To those of you who felt a little badly that the time was limited I can only say "Welcome to the club." The time was more severely limited in the committee. If you think we have not discussed all of the ramifications of the bill on the floor, I can assure you that we have not done so in the committee.

I would like to correct one misstatement which was made a moment ago in a remark by the gentleman in the well that congressional mail goes out under this provision of the law. It does not. Congressional mail, if it is properly so, goes out as first-class mail and is not affected by this section of the bill.

I would point out again, as I attempted to do in the committee and on the floor, that we are guessing as to what these figures are with respect to cost coverage. The gentleman from Arizona mentioned the fact that under the bill being presented to us third class will be brought up to 100 percent of cost coverage. The gentleman from West Virginia said under his figures it is 83 percent. This is the figure given by the Post Office Department, but we are merely guessing as to whether or not this is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Snyder].

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I have only one additional observation with respect to the remarks I made awhile ago. There seems to be considerable controversy about what this does toward making bulk mail pay its own way. According to the letter that the gentleman from West Virginia got from the Assistant Postmaster General, if the Hechler of West Virginia amendment is adopted and if the pay increases in this bill are adopted, third class will pay 91 percent of its way. I would say that those who disagree with that are disagreeing with the Post Office's method of figuring what the costs are.

The only thing I can say about that is that I have no way of knowing whether they are right or wrong. However, they are the best estimates we have submitted to us by the people employed to do these things. If there is a better or more accurate figure around, I think the committee ought to come up with it.

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RUPPE. I would like to point out the fact to the gentleman from Kentucky that this figure of 91 percent is before "public service" is included. In other words, "public service" should be added on to it and thus it would come to substantially more than 91 percent, with that feature added.

Mr. SNYDER. The letter says that it does include the ZIP code feature.

Mr. RUPPE. But not "public service."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. Cunningham].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, we can kick this around the lot, but the plain fact of the matter is that the newspapers who want a monopoly upon all advertising have turned to junk mail and have editorialized thousands of times upon the thousands of dollars which it costs the taxpayers of this country to handle. They simply want to destroy the competition.

Mr. Chairman, I make the categorical statement that third-class mail in this bill pays 100 percent of its way when one considers all of the costs involved that they are required to bear in preparing their mail.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder where many Members were yesterday when I tried to increase the second-class rate upon these people who are getting by with the biggest steal in the postal rate system?

And I might say in conclusion that there are many senior citizens who have no friends or relatives with whom they can correspond, and their life is lonely, their morale is low. They look every day in their mailbox to see if they receive any mail. The only mail they receive is this advertising mail. And, boy, that gives them a big thrill. They read it from cover to cover. It helps them a great deal to consume the time which they have on their hands in their senior years.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I take this time only to remind the managers of this bill on the majority side that when you appeared before the Committee on Rules and asked for 2 hours of general debate on this complicated and far-reaching bill, there was the understanding that there would be no attempt to unduly cut off debate during consideration of amendments on the floor. I simply want to offer a reminder that the Members of the House have a right to expect ample time for the consideration of amendments, in view of the limited amount of time that was granted for general debate on a combined bill of this enormity.

Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to prolong consideration of this bill, but I hope you will not in the future cut off debate arbitrarily.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Johnson].

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Anderson].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I take this time merely to remind the members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union that the substitute amendment which I have proposed, if adopted, would do no violence to the rate structure that has been very carefully and conscientiously worked out in this bill by the members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. Chairman, this is something quite different from the amendment which was offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Hechler] whose amendment would increase these rates to the extent of 56 percent, as against the proposed general increase of 32 percent which under my amendment I am proposing to phase over 3 years. In other words, the Hechler of West Virginia amendment would increase the rates for nonprofit organizations up to 80 percent. Now, I ask the members of the Committee to go home and explain that action to the members of the parent-teachers' association, the church groups, and the various civic groups and clubs that use bulk mail.

Mr. Chairman, I am not proposing to do any of those things in the substitute which I have proposed. I am merely suggesting that in fairness and equity we abide by what we said we would do in 1958 when we passed the Postal Policy Act which stated that we would give consideration to the impact of any rate increases which would have a bearing upon business.

Mr. Chairman, I can sympathize with the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Latta] who does not want to see any segment of the American business community given an unfair subsidy by the taxpayers of this country.

However, I repeat again that the assertion that the cost coverage of third-class rates is only some 66⅔ percent is based on highly questionable methods of accounting.

This is based upon cost ascertainment data that has been repudiated even by members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I have a statement here which I took from the record of these hearings by a man who ought to know what he is talking about. He is the former dean of the Business School of Ohio University. He has a Ph. D. degree in differential cost accounting, and here is what he said:

> Assurances that third-class mail revenues were covering less than 70 percent of the cost are based upon cost accounting methods which are now recognized by many recognized authorities in this field as being misleading.

So do not be taken in by all of these percentages that have been floating around here so very glibly by the gentleman from West Virginia and others. There just is not the proper cost accounting foundation for the charge that this industry is getting this tremendous subsidy.

Let me also say I can sympathize with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Jones], that he received some phonograph records he did not want through the mails, but let us take another analogy——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Steiger].

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. As I understand it, Harper's and Atlantic Monthly are just two of the publications which enjoy a second-class mailing privilege. A privilege, incidentally, which produces, if you are going to use Mr. Hechler of West Virginia's figure, a $401 million revenue deficit. The same mailing privilege under second-class mail goes to Playboy and to all of the girlie magazines, and everything else in that category, but I have not heard anybody suggest that because they did not approve of this or that or some other publication that we should just wipe out second-class mailing privileges.

Well, it makes just as little sense, in my opinion, to say because a Member has had an unsatisfactory experience with a third-class mailer that in one fell swoop we should lower the boom and decapitate an industry that is producing business in this country that is important to the welfare of the printing industry, as I have pointed out, that employs thousands and thousands of people in this country.

All we are asking is that you give this industry some time to absorb the impact of this 32-percent increase that otherwise would go into effect in January of 1968. That is all the substitute amendment will do, and I urge support for the substitute amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Green].

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, before the debate concludes, I want to reiterate my solid judgment and opinion on this question of subsidies. The committee bill will end third-class subsidies and will bring this class of business up to 100-percent rate, so I do not believe there will be a subsidy any longer. That is my judgment and opinion.

I concur in what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Anderson] has said with regard to the cost accounting system because the Post Office Department itself says that it is not to be used for recommending changes.

Mr. Chairman, it is my judgment that the committee has done the best job that could be done. I agree with what the gentleman from Illinois has said today, that this is not aimed just at the big business people, it is aimed at the nonprofit people, the churches, and the PTA, and the like. One of the biggest churches, and I believe the Members from the northeastern section of our country will be interested in this, would have an $18 million increase added to the cost of their mailing under the Hechler of West Virginia amendment.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge the members of this Committee to vote down the Anderson of Illinois substitute amendment and to vote down the Hechler of West Virginia amendment, and stay with the opinion of the committee that it is a sound position and deserves their support.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Scherle].

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Harsha].

Mr. HARSHA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the author of the Anderson of Illinois amendment if he can tell the Committee how much his amendment will cost the Government? As I understood the debate yesterday, the increase in postal rates will come within $4 million of meeting the additional increase in wages that this bill will cover.

Now, if we spread out the increased rate on this bulk mail, and collect it piecemeal over a 3-year period, how much will that leave this package bill short of meeting the increased expenditures?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARSHA. Yes, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I have here the committee print explaining the revenue impact of the committee bill, and they give $234 million as being the amount of revenue that would be raised by the changes that they have proposed for third-class mail. This would split the $234 million over 3 years. That is the best answer I can give to the gentleman's question.

Mr. HARSHA. How much would that leave us short the first year and the second year?

Mr. UDALL. The first year $117 million would be lost, according to the figures I have. The Hechler of West Virginia's amendment would supposedly raise that much—but it will not.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Thompson].

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the substitute amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I only wish that all Members had the opportunity to be in the full committee hearings, as I was, in order that they could have gone into this matter thoroughly because we did go into this matter thoroughly.

One thing that distresses me about the committee action is that we were not fair to third-class mailers in phasing. We phased second-class mail and it is only fair and equitable to give the same treatment to third-class mailers.

We had a motion to reconsider this. It required a majority of the members to sign it, and we did not get it.

But basically what we have here is a battle between two types of advertisers, second class and third class.

Yesterday in the Washington Post there was a cartoon. It was timed to coincide with the deliberations by this body of this matter. If that is not the pot calling the kettle black, then I have never seen a case which is, because second-class mail causes the largest deficit. Third-class mail is not, in my opinion after the rate increase, causing a deficit. Second-class mail is causing the deficit and we should be fair to third-class mail.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Corbett].

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I just want to reiterate that the Anderson of Illinois substitute amendment is very equitable and fair.

In all the years that we have been increasing rates—and it has happened very, very often—we have tried to do it in such a way that the person who pays the bill can meet the bill. That is exactly right.

My good friend, the gentleman from Missouri, spoke about getting the Record through the mail. He got them fourth class and did not get them third class.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. The gentleman can look that up.

I just want to say to the Committee that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Anderson] has performed a real service in offering this substitute amendment. I hope it will prevail here and in the other body, or both. If the exponents of pricing third-class mail out of the market want to do that, they should do the same thing to second-class mail.

I do hope that the Committee supports the Anderson of Illinois amendment and that we move on to other matters.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Daniels].

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Chairman, it is time to brush away the window dressing on this amendment and recognize it for what it is—an ill-disguised attempt to drive third-class advertising out of the U.S. mails once and for all.

With such an objective, it would be more seemly if the proponents had the courage to come out and say what they mean, instead of pussyfooting around under the guise of a purported rate adjustment. If they really want to eliminate this great class of mail, they should lay their plan before this body in a forthright manner—as was done in an amendment by a former Member 12 years ago to abolish third-class mail altogether.

Many Members will recall that when Postmaster General Summerfield heard of that proposal—and he was never known as a great friend of third-class mail—he used all of his not inconsiderable powers of persuasion with congressional leaders to reject that amendment.

Like every other Postmaster General, he knew it would have been disastrous—that the postal service would be thrown into chaos—if it lost the half-billion-plus revenue from third class and faced diversion into first class of billions of pieces of advertising.

But, Mr. Chairman, there is an even worse hidden bomb in this amendment. It would slap a killing 80-percent increase on third-class mailings of qualified nonprofit organizations—the churches, the charitable groups, the veterans organizations, and religious organizations that the Congress traditionally has protected from excessive postal charges.

The amendment also would hike the third-class permit fee to $40, and seriously damage thousands of small civic and public service groups, such as volunteer fire, ambulance, and rescue squads.

If the gentleman offering the amendment wants to run counter to this longstanding policy, it is his privilege. But others should realize what he is doing.

Mr. Chairman, this is a dangerous amendment that very probably would do irreparable damage to an important segment of mail patrons and well could cause serious disruption in postal operations. We should support the well-balanced Post Office and Civil Service Committee recommendations for substantial but fair rate adjustments, and defeat this amendment.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DANIELS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to take note of the fact that the committee did meet and hold hearings since the 9th day of May. We had 21 days of hearings. Then we had 7 days in executive session in the subcommittee and following that we had 15 days in executive session in the full committee.

We came up with a proposition that it be 3.8 cents for third-class mail as a minimum piece rate.

We came to the conclusion, as the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. Udall] so eloquently stated that third class will pay 100 percent of its own way.

I think you ought to have some faith in the committee system. This Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service has members on that committee just like yourselves on the other committees, and we ask you to rely on us because we did conscientiously come to the conclusion that we are bringing to the floor for your consideration the best possible bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Daniels] has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana [Mr. Olsen].

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, we have worked hard and I urgently recommend to the committee that you rely on the subcommittee and upon the committee, that 3.8 cents is a fair minimum rate for third-class mail and that it will pay 100 percent of its own weight.

Do not be angry at third-class mail because you are angry at some other class of mail. Third-class mail will pay its way. Do not be a censor. Do not be eliminating some mail because you do not like it. Let us just set a fair rate. That is what your committee recommended as a fair rate. We recommend 3.8 cents. Therefore I ask the Committee to vote down the Anderson of Illinois amendment, vote down the Hechler of West Virginia amendment, and vote for the proposition of the subcommittee and the full committee and vote for the bill.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, how many of us can go back to our districts and face our constituents when we are raising first-class rates to 6 cents at the same time as we are not raising third-class rates so that that class of mail will pay its way?

Various Members have indicated on the floor that my amendment would drive people out of business. Since the Sherman Antitrust Act, every piece of regulatory legislation, every tax bill, every minimum wage bill, every law affecting our economy has resulted in scare words that so-and-so would be driven out of business if it were passed. That is just par for the course—and it rarely happens. In 1958, at the Senate hearings, Harry Maginnis, president of the Associated Third-Class Mail Users, said:

> It is my firm opinion that third-class volume will drop from 16 billion to 10 billion pieces under the impact of a rate increase.

There was an increase and the annual volume rose to nearly 18 billion in 1961. Today's volume is greater than 20 billion. No class of mail is increasing in greater volume than third-class mail. Twenty years ago, less than one out of every six pieces of mail was third class. Now more than one out of every four pieces of mail is third class.

Mr. Chairman, there is simply not enough time in 1 minute and 15 seconds to explode all the false information which has been spread here today about nonprofit organizations and their postal rates. In 1928, the rate per piece for third-class bulk mail of nonprofit organizations was 1 cent. Do you know how much it has gone up in 39 years? Exactly one-fourth cent, from 1 cent to 1¼ cents. The committee bill has taken the nonprofit rate and divided it into two categories: for charitable, religious, and health organizations, the rate is set at 1.3 cents—which really is not an increase, but is just a rounding off of the 1.25 cent rate to 1.3 cents. Then for other nonprofit organizations, the rate is set at 1.9 cents.

My amendment merely restores the historic relationship between profitmaking organizations and nonprofit organizations as established by the Postal Policy Act of 1958, which states that nonprofit postal rates should be 50 percent of regular third class rates. Yesterday at page H13140 in the RECORD, I went into great detail on why we should raise the rates to a reasonable and equitable level for nonprofit organizations.

These organizations now account for 17 percent of all bulk-rate mail, whereas they had only 8 percent in 1953. The deficit caused by nonprofit mailing now runs to $100 million a year, and it is rising rapidly as the volume of nonprofit third-class mail rises and more and more organizations are striving to get in under this umbrella. This has gotten to the point where the Postmaster General's Advisory Panel on Postal Rates, headed by former Congressman Robert Ramspeck of Georgia, stated in 1965:

> We question whether these subsidies should be intermingled with postal rates. If there is merit in these subsidies, they should be identified and included as direct payments from the budgets of the Federal agencies charged with overseeing public welfare activities. . . . Funds for subsidies should be provided by direct appropriations, to the agency overseeing the welfare activity, rather than as a hidden cost in the postal budget.

Mr. Chairman, I urge opposition to the Anderson substitute, which would make the rates on third-class mail even more heavily subsidized than those reported in the committee bill. I certainly hope that this Committee will reject the Anderson substitue and then take the wise course of action and adopt the amendment which I have proposed.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON] for the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois) there were—ayes 55, noes 115.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois and Mr. OLSEN.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 69, noes 145.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia) there were—ayes 64, noes 147.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. THOMPSON OF GEORGIA

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia: On page 35, immediately following line 18, add a new section as follows:
>
> "DISCLOSURE OF SUBSIDY ON MAIL MATTER
>
> "SEC. 120. Chapter 53 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end of such chapter the following:
>
> "'§ 4061. Determination of subsidies
>
> "'(a) Prior to February 1, 1968 and every two years thereafter, the Postmaster General shall estimate the actual cost of handling each class of mail, and each subclass thereof, and he shall promulgate in percentage of cost the results thereof setting forth the percentage subsidy each class and subclass of mail receive.
>
> "'(b) Each mailer of second-, third-, or fourth-class mail shall print, or cause to be printed on each item of such mail in form legible to the normal unaided eye and on the same surface on which the mailee's address appears, a statement detailing the class of mail being used, and stating the percentage of the subsidy received by that class or subclass of mail, as applicable, as last promulgated by the Postmaster General.
>
> "'(c) The Postmaster General shall refuse to deliver any mail of such classes which does not contain the information required by subsection (b) of this section.'."

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, we have heard a great deal in the past few days about truth in congressional ethics, truth in interest rates, truth in packaging, and truth in campaign expenses.

Mr. Chairman, this is an effort to bring truth to mailing. I feel that the public is entitled to know the true facts about the mail matter that they receive. They are entitled to know whether or not they are subsidizing the delivery of this mail and, if so, to what extent. This is really a very simple amendment. It does not affect revenue in any way whatsoever. There is no revenue gained or lost by this amendment. But this amendment does follow the pattern which this Congress has been establishing in truth and disclosure and in letting the public know what is going on.

What does it do? It basically provides that the Postmaster General shall promulgate the percentage of subsidy each class of mail receives. This will enable every mailer, second, third, or fourth class, to go in and talk to the Postmaster General and give him their side of the story. Then, by February 1 of each year, he will determine on a cost accounting basis what subsidies are being received. Then simply these mailers will have to display on their stamp the class of mail and the subsidy received. I feel this is in the interest of the American people and certainly in keeping with the pattern which this Congress has established. I urge its adoption.

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment not because it may not have substance or merit as proposed, but it seems to me that this is not the vehicle to consider it at the present time. This is not a vehicle where we should consider anything having to do with truth in terms of disclosure of a subsidy. It may be very right and proper on every peanut produced in Georgia that we do have written on it the truth-in-subsidy statement as to how much subsidy is involved in the growth and sale of every peanut. In California, where I come from, it may be meritorious to establish on every can of oil the amount of subsidy involved before the consumer purchases it.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALDIE. In just a moment I will. It seems to me before we make those careful determinations required in a broad truth-in-subsidy bill, we ought not to include it in a bill which is not essentially dealing with the very critical subject of truth and subsidy.

For that reason I oppose the amendment.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. WALDIE. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. I would like to say in reply to the gentleman that we are not considering a peanut bill here or any other bill, but we are considering a mail matter here. If there were going to be a disclosure of subsidy, it would have to be on a mail bill and not one that has to do with peanuts.

Mr. WALDIE. It seems to me in response to the gentleman that his proposal goes beyond mailing. It is a proposal that I do not decry in terms of merit and the subsidies that taxpayers are paying to private industry. They should be disclosed. His proposal in effect has great merit to it, but we ought to consider all of the subsidies at one time and not just consider this in terms of business people that mail particular material.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WALDIE. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. I would like to say that the subsidies we are talking about amount to quite a bit. Second class is in excess of $416 million. Third class runs into hundreds of millions of dollars. So this ain't peanuts.

Mr. WALDIE. Yes. It surely is not. I do not know much about peanuts, but I do know something about oil, and I know the subsidy granted the oil industry ain't peanuts, either, but I would not be willing to vote on this or on any other bill that subsidies be disclosed on every oil can until I have had the opportunity to consider these subjects in much greater detail.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to applaud the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. THOMPSON] for an interesting and novel idea. I suggest that if it is defeated, as it may very well be, it will only be because the truth hurts.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. THOMPSON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia) there were—ayes 36, noes 52.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCHWEIKER

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as folows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCHWEIKER: On page 35 immediately following line 18, add a new section as follows:

"SEC. 120. (a) Section 4359(e)(2) of title 39 of the United States Code is amended by inserting after the word 'fraternal,' the words 'volunteer fire companies, volunteer ambulance and rescue companies,'.

"(b) Section 4452(d) of such title is amended by inserting after the word 'associations' where it appears in the first sentence a comma and the words 'and volunteer fire companies, volunteer ambulance and rescue companies,'."

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Chairman, I introduce an amendment to this bill which would extend to volunteer fire, ambulance, and rescue companies the second- and third-class bulk mailing rates now available to many other nonprofit organizations.

This amendment, if passed, would give reduced mailing rates to approximately 20,000 volunteer fire, ambulance, and rescue companies in this country which daily act to protect the lives and property of our citizens.

More than 1 million men volunteer their services to these organizations. Without such voluntary participation, the communities would have to go without these services or finance professional units at great cost.

Of course, even volunteer organizations of this type need money to support their activities and maintain their equipment. To obtain these funds, they rely in large part on mail solicitation of contributions from the people in the areas which they serve.

It would extend to volunteer fire, ambulance, and rescue companies the same reduced postage rates now enjoyed by all qualified religious, educational, labor, scientific, fraternal, veterans, and rural electric groups and associations.

Mr. Chairman, the other body last year passed a similar version of this legislation. The House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service amended and reported that measure to include the provisions of my bill, which was identical to the one I introduced earlier this year, and which I offer as an amendment today. I would hope that these organizations whose men risk their lives and who use the fire ax to save many lives each day would not in turn be axed this day in Congress.

I hope that my colleague would agree that we should help make these lower postage costs available to these organizations, which contribute so much to the welfare and safety of so many Americans. It seems only fair that they receive the same mailing rates now enjoyed by many other worthwhile organizations.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWEIKER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, first of all I wish to indicate to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCHWEIKER] and to the other members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union my support of this amendment. I introduced a bill designed to accomplish this purpose in the 88th Congress and again in the 89th Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCHWEIKER], which would extend second- and third-class bulk mailing privileges to volunteer firefighters, rescue squads, and ambulance companies. This amendment would extend to these groups the preferential rates now enjoyed by religious, educational, scientific, labor, fraternal, and veterans groups.

In each of the past two Congresses I have been among the several sponsors of legislation to provide this financial assistance to the some 250,000 volunteers across the Nation who daily risk their lives to protect the lives and property of others in their communities.

One of the great problems which confronts these dedicated volunteers is the shortage of money for the purchase of much-needed equipment. As all taxpayers know, the sophisticated and specialized firefighting equipment which is essential to the present-day fighter is extremely costly. Unlike his counterpart in the municipally supported fire departments and rescue squads, the volunteer firefighter must rely on the generosity of the community he serves.

To explain his need to his neighbors and to elicit their financial support the firefighter must frequently rely on the mails. It is estimated that the enactment of this measure will reduce the postage bill of the volunteer fire departments to approximately one-quarter its present level, thus making available for the purchase of additional equipment substantial sums of money which would previously have been expended on postage.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWEIKER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania for bringing to the attention of this Committee the inequity which presently exists and which should be corrected, and would be corrected were his amendment to be adopted.

I support the amendment wholeheartedly. There can be little question but that all volunteer fire departments throughout this country provide a very real service. They render a service above and beyond the call of duty, without compensation, and it seems to me that this amendment would be an honest, equitable and fair method of treating the work that they do by giving them the same type of treatment that we give to so many very worthy, nonprofit organizations.

Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment and urge its adoption.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot begin to decorate a Christmas tree here, and give away exemptions in a rate increase bill. For that reason I oppose this amendment very strenuously.

If we are going to start giving an exemption to this group, then I am sure there are many, many meritorious groups, including the Boy Scouts and the Girl Scouts and the Camp Fire Girls that do a great deal of good work in their communities. But when they go to the telephone company or the power company they pay the whole rate.

We have already given these people a very good rate in that they are in a fraternal or beneficial association. I do not think we ought to back up one little bit. We have got to pass this bill the way it is. If the fire companies are entitled to some special benefit, I think they ought to go to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and get an appropriation from them to pay their postal bill. They should not be coming in here and asking to ride on the back of the Post Office Department.

Now, let us stay with the subject. The subject is increasing postal rates, and let us do it as equitably as we can.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I support the gentleman from Montana in his opposition to this amendment. I am sympathetic with the fire companies. We have had this bill before the committee and given consideration to it over the past few years. I love the PTA and the Girl Scouts and the Elks and the Moose and the Gold Star Mothers.

It is not as though we had denied these people the right to disseminate information. Suppose under the committee's new rate that there was a little bulletin that the local fire company wanted to send out on a regular basis, and supposing they had 2,000 messages. They would take those 2,000 messages down to the post office. Under the rate that they get now what do you suppose that they would have to pay for those 2,000 copies? Two dollars and sixty cents. The postmaster has to handle each one of those, the clerks, and the letter carriers, all of those 2,000 pieces of mail for $2.60, even under the new rate, the raise that the committee gives them.

So I suggest, at a time of possible large Federal deficit, and when we are trying to raise money, that this amendment ought to be defeated.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman why he has a change of heart on this proposal? I have in front of me a copy of a report of July 14, 1966, from the Post Office Committee in which the committee recommended that this bill be passed. There was no dissent. I do not see why there is objection to it. I do not understand why, if last year it was the recommendation of the committee that this be passed, then why the change of heart at this present moment?

I would also ask how the gentleman felt about it last year?

Mr. OLSEN. The change of heart is for this reason: that we had many weeks of hearings. We had 9 weeks of hearings. We had 7 days of markup in the subcommittee, and 9 days of markup in the whole committee, and we decided that we just cannot have a Christmas tree, we cannot permit any more gifts.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. This is not a Christmas tree decoration.

Mr. OLSEN. That is why we have explained just how cheap it already is for these fraternal and beneficiary organizations. They send it for half of the bulk rate. Just a few moments ago we were talking about how cheap the bulk rate is, it is 3.8 cents in the bill, and these people will get the bulk rate for half that price. The new rate is 1.3 cents apiece. For goodness sake, we cannot make it any cheaper than that.

Mr. Chairman, I believe we should vote this amendment down.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I merely wish to point out in behalf of the gentleman who offered the amendment that if the gentleman from Montana had an elementary sense of logic, he should support this amendment, since the very figures he gave really favor the Schweiker amendment because he quoted the beneficial rate.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point? I am talking about the increases in rates now and I am stating it exactly correct.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Let me remind the gentleman that yesterday I offered an amendment to remove from this special category the rural electric co-ops and everyone spoke about the poor farmer. Certainly, if you can shed tears for the poor farmer and for the nonfarmer who is a member of the rural electric co-ops, you ought to shed tears for the poor members of the voluntary fire departments who stand ready to save the stock and the barns of the co-ops from burning down.

I say that the gentleman from Pennsylvania should be supported in his amendment.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Delaware?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCHWEIKER].

Few, if any, local organizations render greater service to their communities than volunteer fire, ambulance, and rescue companies. That they perform these vital community services at no little risk and inconvenience to the members goes without saying. Yet, unlike other charitable, and nonprofit organizations, volunteer fire, ambulance, and rescue companies are not accorded second-class mailing privileges.

Mr. Chairman, in Delaware only one city, Wilmington, maintains a paid fire and rescue service. The remaining four-fifths of the State's population relies upon their friends and neighbors serving as volunteer firemen and ambulance drivers for protection of life and property.

Although they receive financial support from local and State governments in many cases, these volunteer organizations must rely upon private contributions to make ends meet. In seeking these outside funds, however, they compete with other nonprofit groups which can use preferred-rate, second-class mailings to approach potential contributors.

The amendment under consideration, similar to a bill I introduced earlier this year, will allow volunteer fire, ambulance, and rescue companies to reach these same people, and better enable the organizations to meet their expenses.

Mr. Chairman, the fire research and safety bill has passed the Senate and now awaits action by the House. The President, earlier this year, sent to the Congress a message calling on us to enact legislation to improve firefighting technology and our knowledge of the causes of fires. Worthwhile as this proposal is, the heaviest burden of accomplishment still rests with the local firefighters. Second- and third-class bulk mailing privileges will, I am convinced, prove useful in enabling the local volunteer companies to afford better equipment and supplies, and training and facilities. Ultimately, adoption of this amendment will mean better firefighting and rescue service throughout the Nation. I strongly urge its adoption.

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCHWEIKER]. The kind of service rendered by the fine men and women who serve in some risk and for no pay makes life in thousands of our communities safer than it otherwise might be. Their service deserves our appreciation and our support.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCHWEIKER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SCHWEIKER), there were—ayes 20, noes 48.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MEEDS

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MEEDS: On page 26, immediately following line 2, insert the following:

"(c) Section 4452 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

" '(f) Matter mailed in bulk under subsection (e) of this section shall bear the return address of the sender. Such matter may be refused by the addresee and marked with his request for the return of such matter to the sender. The Postmaster General shall return to the sender all matter so refused and marked by the addressee at a charge to the sender which shall be prescribed by the Postmaster General but which shall not be less than the cost of handling the return of such matter.'."

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, third-class bulk mailers are now using the U.S. mail as a blunderbuss to blast unsolicited third-class mail into every corner of this Nation. Aside from the fact that it is not paying its own way, most of it is unwanted.

What this amendment seeks to do is to allow John Q. Postal-Patron at his mailbox the opportunity to let the bulk mailer know that he does not want his material. It seeks to change the blunderbuss to a well directed rifle shot to those who actually want this mail.

Why is this necessary? It is necessary because bulk-mail advertisers, and I certainly do not mean all of them—but many of them are taking advantage of the long suffering postal patron. They are playing the averages—betting that the discontent caused by indiscriminate mailings will not be greater than the favorable response which they receive. Perhaps in individual cases they are winning their bets.

It seems to me that the sum total of this indiscretion may well be their undoing. John Q. Postal Patron is getting fed up. He wants an effective way to get off the bulk-mailers list. This amendment provides that way, a way which will provide the impetus for the third-class mailer to clean up his lists and quit firing indiscriminate blasts.

What would the amendment do? First, it would require that the third-class matter mailed in bulk bear the return address of the sender. This is not presently required.

It further provides that the receiver may refuse this mail at his mailbox and return it to the sender at the sender's expense, and that this expense or cost will be determined by the Postmaster General. But the charge will not be less than the actual cost of handling.

Why do I say, "Let the Postmaster General determine the cost of handling"? I am not trying to punish the bulk third-class mailers. It may be that the Postmaster General can devise a schedule which will take into consideration zones, and that it would cost some of them less to return it than others. I merely wish to see that it is returned at the cost, and that the Post Office Department does not have to bear further expense.

Perhaps the Postmaster General can devise this system. But in no event will this amendment impose a further cost or further financial burden on the Post Office Department. I think it provides an effective and efficient method for John Q. Patron to get off the bulk-mailer's list when he does not want to receive it.

I think the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL] asked a perfectly legitimate question when he asked, in effect, "Have we really considered an effective, costless way to get people off the mailing lists, or to allow a patron the right to refuse mail"?

This amendment would give him that right, and it would give the right to him at the cost of the sender. He will get the message in a hurry, and the names will be removed.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good amendment and I hope it will pass.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. The fact is the amendment would add cost to the Post Office Department. The point of fact is that we can have a raise like 3.8 cents minimum per piece charged for third-class only because we have eliminated expenses by ZIP code requirements and by regulations requiring certain kinds of acts by the mailers. This is the only reason we can afford a 3.8-cent minimum per piece charged in third-class, and there is no other reason. If we then have to sort it for return to the mailer, the cost will be out of this world.

The reason we think people will eliminate the use of their name on the third-class is that they will throw it away. The free enterprise system will determine whether or not the bulk mailing is profitable. These people are not crazy. They do not send out bulk mail merely to lose money. If they lose money, they quit that kind of mailing.

We are interested in only one thing—we are interested in the Post Office Department getting paid for the whole cost of moving every class of mail, particularly first, third, and fourth, and someday I hope we will be interested in the full cost of the service.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. Earlier today I said that I have been searching for a way to enable those sincere people who are really offended by third-class mail to get off mailing lists. I would like to commend the very able gentleman from Washington in this search. I think we will find a way sooner or later, and we will continue to look. But this is not it.

If we want a bloated bureaucracy, if we just want to add Federal employees for nothing, then we should support this amendment, because we are going to employ tens of thousands of people to do a useless thing.

For example, I mail, in Arizona, all over the country a circular that people should buy some of this delightful cactus candy. Under the amendment, the receiver puts it in the mailbox to return to me, and instead of putting it in his mailbox in Montana and coming directly to me, there have to be 30 sortings to get it back to my mailbox. We will add to the Post Office burden and to the deficit.

I do not think this is the solution we will be looking for, and I hope it will be defeated.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, the third-class mail, if it is not wanted, will be thrown in the wastebasket, and the free enterprise system will take care of this.

I recommend voting down this amendment.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman and in opposition to this amendment. I do believe the search ought to go on for something of this sort, but this is not properly considered and we have no idea what the expense and inconvenience will be.

I think the amendment should be defeated.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman agree it will be a great expense to the Post Office Department if we have to re-sort all this third-class mail, which we do not sort in the first place? It will be a terrible burden to put this on the Post Office Department.

Mr. CORBETT. I do agree. That is why I said I would like to be associated with the gentleman in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have taken this time to commend the gentleman who sponsored this amendment for, at the very least, making a constructive suggestion and pointing out to the Congress the need for some affirmative action.

I have great respect for the gentleman from Arizona and the gentleman from Montana. I recognize there may be in the gentleman's amendment some problems that perhaps he and those of us who are not thoroughly familiar with the Post Office Department may not fully comprehend. I can understand that the amendment as proposed may create some problems, but I do believe it is a clear indication that the Committee should take notice that the American public wants some way found to eliminate the undesirable junk mail from being delivered to their homes.

The gentleman from Nebraska says "Throw it away." What do we do when it is delivered to the home and the youngsters in our homes, find it and read it before we throw it away? What do we do? Do we just tell the youngster who comes to us with some of the outrageous mail that is delivered to our homes, "Just throw it away," and just wait until the next batch comes?

Let me confirm what has already been said by another Member of the House of Representatives. I had one of my constituents come to my home with the collected third-class mail which he had received over a period of 1 month, and his statement to me was: "Here is a more dramatic statement of the need to do something than anything I can write or tell you." He showed me a collection such as was described by the gentleman from Missouri.

My point is this: Something must be done. I realize the problems. I recognize the dedication of members of the committee. I realize they are much more knowledgeable than the gentleman in the well. But I say to the Members that the American public wants a way to eliminate the delivery of this type of mail in the first instance.

I do not think it is enough to say they should throw it away. I do not think it should be permitted to come into the home if the homeowner does not want it. I hope the Committee, if they do not approve of this particular amendment, will in the very near future suggest one that will be approved.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAHILL. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has stated the sentiments of the committee, but we do have a real problem of eliminating mail because of the requirements of the Constitution and the first amendment regarding freedom of speech. Time and again regulations in the Post Office Department and laws passed by the Congress have been eliminated by the courts because they have been too restrictive.

We are trying once again in this bill. Title III of this bill has to do with the pandering of pornographic literature in the mail. We believe this is constitutional. We believe we have written a bill that the courts will agree with.

In any event, we are moving in the direction of wanting to restrict mail, but we cannot do it in violation of the Constitution. The courts just will not allow it. I agree with the courts, but I also agree with the gentleman, and the committee agrees with him, and we will keep moving in that direction.

Mr. CAHILL. All I can say to the gentleman from Montana is that in my humble opinion unless the committee does find a way to eliminate this type of junk from the mail he will find that the public is going to insist that we take prohibitive and perhaps punitive action against the users of third-class mail.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I should like also to reply to the gentleman from New Jersey and say that in title III, we have worked out legislation, over a period of 6 to 8 years, which passed the House overwhelmingly in the 88th and 89th Congresses but received no action in the other body, having to do with obscene and pornographic advertising type material. Title III will take care of that, and it is in this bill.

So far as other mail matter not of this nature is concerned, that is something the Committee has to study, to meet the general text of the gentleman's statement.

So far as what we can do with this "smut" material that comes into the home unsolicited, it will be well taken care of in title III.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CAHILL. Does the gentleman agree that this is a duty the Committee should perform in relation to all mail that is undesirable?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Yes. I believe we ought to study that.

Mr. CAHILL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment and move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I feel this is a very good amendment. I have had a number of very dramatic examples called to my attention in the course of my research in support of the ill-fated amendment which was defeated earlier today, which I offered.

I wrote to every postmaster, rural carrier, and clerk in the entire State of West Virginia, and I have received a number of letters, only three or four of which opposed the position taken. There are a number of examples included in these letters which illustrate why we should support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington.

For example, Richard W. Goodwin, postmaster of Beaver, W. Va., points out that his is only a third-class office, with revenue of slightly less than $10,000 a year, including all salaries, contracts, rentals, utilities, and so forth, and "We burn an average of a ton of junk mail."

In addition to that, I received a very dramatic letter from a widow who wrote me. Her husband had been dead for 18 years. She had been trying to get his name off of various mailing lists. She sent me the latest letter she had received from a company which persisted on keeping him and her, too, on the mailing list. This letter did not have the dignity of being typed out personally. It was a form letter. Her name was at the top, along with that of her late husband. It simply said, in a form message, "If you don't like the material that we are sending you just ignore it in the future."

Now, that is impudence which I believe is an insult to the dignity of any person. Something ought to be done to give people a sure way to get off mailing lists. I believe the gentleman from Washington has offered a good formula for accomplishing this objective.

The gentleman from Arizona said many years ago that he was going to do something to help the recipient of unsolicited mail to refuse or return it, or at least cut off the flow effectively.

What is the committee doing about it?

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from West Virginia yield?

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MEEDS. The example that the gentleman gives of the widow trying to get her dead husband's name off the mailing list is a very good example of what we are trying to accomplish here. Is it not a fact that in many instances it is less expensive for the bulk mailer to go on mailing to people rather than to purge his list and bring it up to date?

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. This is certainly what the bulk mailers contend, I would say to my good friend from Washington. And that is what makes this whole business so frustrating.

Now I would like to yield to the gentleman from Arizona since I mentioned his name.

Mr. UDALL. Let me say to you that we are going to lick this. We will lick it in the next couple of years. The way we will do it I think—and I tried to do something on it, and we have all tried, but being fairminded, you do not do something to an industry without asking them to come in so that you can find out what objections they have to the legislation. You look at them with a jaundiced eye, but you should know what they have to say about a conscientious proposal such as this one. I think the way to lick this and the way we finally will lick it is through electronics. You get to the point where you have a magnetic tape and are using punch-out cards. You can put these punch-out cards on this magnetic tape and then get to the point where we can electronically get these names off the mailing list. In that way it can be done efficiently and economically. I believe we will solve this problem in that manner so that the people who have written to you and who really resent having their names on these lists can get off the mailing lists that they have not been able to get off.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I read a lengthy article in the New Yorker magazine about the attempts of the gentleman from Arizona along this line which brought out some of the problems that he said existed in trying to solve it.

Mr. UDALL. I asked them, if I dropped dead, could I get off the list, and they said, "No, not for a while."

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from West Virginia yield?

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. OLSEN. It just so happens that I tried to get off the mailing list of Life magazine because I did not want to pay for it any more. It took a whole year to get off that list. You cannot argue with a computer. But for goodness sake, do not visit this problem on the Post Office Department, because they have to deliver this stuff. Let us in the committee toil with it for another year, and believe you me, KEN, before we are here again this time next year we will have some solutions to this problem of getting off the mailing lists.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MEEDS. I would like to point out about putting the burden on the post office service that in this bill it provides it will be returned at a cost of not less than the cost of delivery. Therefore, if it is a burden on the postal system, it will be paid for by the people causing the problem.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I think the gentleman from Washington makes a very excellent point. It will not cost the taxpayers any money under the amendment he proposes.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of the amendment of the gentleman from Washington.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MEEDS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MEEDS) there were—ayes 18, noes 47.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the attention of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN].

Yesterday in my colloquy with the distinguished gentleman he seemed to attach some significance to consecutively numbering the pages in the newspaper. I would like to ask this question:

As the gentleman knows, newspapers commonly number their editions by sections. The sections are then given letter designations. Then the pages within the section are numbered from 1 through as many pages as are contained in the section.

Now, does this come within your definition of consecutive numbering?

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me at this point?

Mr. HARSHA. Yes, I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. OLSEN. The consecutive numbering, actually, is a requirement placed upon magazines rather than upon newspapers.

But I must read to the gentleman from the postal regulations and I must correct my statement of yesterday. The postal regulations say nothing in this regard. The regulations of the Post Office Department say nothing about the consecutive numbering of newspaper pages. The regulations of the Post Office Department are with respect to magazines.

Now, then, on page 46 of the committee report there is a long paragraph which reads in effect that under existing regulations an advertising supplement may be mailed with a second-class publication, subject to certain conditions, and then there is the citation thereon from the postal manual. In other words, the supplement must be germane to the issue and prepared in order to complete the issue. The supplement must bear the title of the publication preceded by the words "supplement to."

In other words, the regulation provides that publications which are distinguished from newspapers or magazines but which carry matters not germane to the issue, not be handled in this fashion.

Also, under the regulations publications publishers must be paid the advertising rates and charges for carrying free printed advertising supplements germane to the issue with which they are mailed.

So, the problem really is a kind of nebulous and hazy one in that it is a judgment on the part of the Department to determine the germaneness of the supplement to the publication.

Mr. HARSHA. Certainly advertising has been considered to be germane in the newspaper business. Historically it has been considered germane to a second-class publication. Advertising, certainly, is germane to the second-class mail publication, is it not?

Mr. OLSEN. It certainly is. But I think there has to be some kind of editorial material involved in the advertising supplement in order to make it germane to the issue.

Mr. HARSHA. Well, then, whether or not it is consecutively numbered, as the gentleman indicated yesterday, makes no difference?

Mr. OLSEN. It does not. As I now read the regulations with respect to newspapers.

Mr. HARSHA. But if it does contain some news value or editorial comment, then it does come within the germaneness issue?

Mr. OLSEN. Absolutely.

Mr. HARSHA. I would cite to the gentleman this as an example: If the advertiser includes in this matter reading material presented in a news format, and this material has informational value that is not advertising, is this the kind of news value or editorial value which will render the matter not an advertising supplement within the meaning of section 115?

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I do not like to make this type of legislative history in this detail on the floor of the House.

Mr. HARSHA. This is why I am asking these questions, because the subject needs some explanation or determination in order that we may know where we are going on this question. There is a great deal of confusion and uncertainty about this issue.

It seems obvious to me that the purpose of this section of the bill is to eliminate entirely or to exclude all advertising supplements from being mailed with newspapers.

Mr. OLSEN. No.

Mr. HARSHA. That is not the intent of this section?

Mr. OLSEN. The intent is not to eliminate anything. There is no censoring in here at all. It is simply to assure, if one is going to enjoy a second-class permit, then one has got to be a second-class sort of qualifier.

And if you are going to qualify——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(On request of Mr. OLSEN, and by unanimous consent, Mr. HARSHA was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. HARSHA. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. OLSEN. As I started to say, if you are going to qualify for second-class rates, then you ought to include editorial material and you should not be a third-class mailer at second-class rates. You should not be sending bills out with your paper at second-class rates. First-class material such as a bill, ought to pay first-class rates. And if you send some advertising out that is third class, you ought to pay the third-class rate, and for whatever is second class, then you ought to pay the second-class rate. But there is no objection about what you send. It is just that we want the rate to be appropriate for whatever material you are sending.

Mr. HARSHA. I have no objection or quarrel about sending a bill in this manner, certainly, but there is a great difference as to what constitutes advertising, and what is a legitimate practice under this provision, and what have been considered legitimate advertising practices in the past.

Let me ask the gentleman if the material is printed, such as in a newspaper or a magazine, by someone other than the publisher, but is consecutively numbered—no, that would not apply except on magazines since you say there is no such requirement in respect to newspapers.

If the matter is printed by someone other than the publisher of the magazine, but is consecutively numbered, within your definition of this numbering, or contains some material of news or editorial value, will it then be considered to be a part of the publication and not an advertising supplement within the purview of the meaning in section 115?

Mr. OLSEN. I say that if it contains editorial material and retains its identity as second class, then it absolutely travels as second-class mail, and it is charged at the second-class rate.

Mr. HARSHA. To what extent can advertising rates charged for a supplement by a newspaper vary from that carried in the body of the newspaper?

Mr. OLSEN. We are not concerned here with the rates paid for the advertising. We are concerned with the fact that often in second-class matter there is a catalog which is purely third-class mail, and ought to be paying the higher rate. And that if it has editorial material and can qualify as second-class material it should go as second class, but if it can not qualify as second-class material, which is so frequently what we find, then it should be paying the third-class rate.

Mr. HARSHA. Then we have this problem: In a number of small weekly newspapers there is one publisher or printer printing the classified ad section, and that same section is used in half a dozen different newspapers, but it contains nothing but classified ads such as if a farmer wants to sell a plow—or a tractor. And these small newspapers for economic reasons have one printer print this section for all of them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(On request of Mr. OLSEN, and by unanimous consent, Mr. HARSHA was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. HARSHA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Then all of this classified ad section is printed by one printer and disseminated to half a dozen different newspapers who use it in their papers, but it contains absolutely no news matter or editorial material of any kind; it is simply classified ads. Does the gentleman mean to say that under this section those weekly newspapers then cannot take advantage of the second-class rates?

Mr. OLSEN. They will have to pay the higher rate which is still quite a nice rate, they will have to pay the third-class rate.

Mr. HARSHA. In other words the small weekly can't combine to cut costs and have his classified section, which is historically part of his newspaper, printed at bulk rates and take advantage of the second-class rates. But if he prints his classified ad section at his own plant or separately in conjunction with and attached to his news items he can comply with this new provision.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WOLFF

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLFF: On page 35, immediately below line 10, insert the following:

"COST ASCERTAINMENT STUDY

"SEC. 118A. In order to provide the Congress with an accurate basis for the future determination of postal rates, the House of Representatives is authorized and directed to enter into a contract with a firm of certified accountants in private industry under which such firm will conduct for the Government a comprehensive study of the cost ascertainment system of the Post Office Department and ascertain the costs to the Department for handling each class and category of mail. Such study shall be completed within six months after the contract is entered into and the Post Office and Civil Service Committee shall report to the Congress the results thereon within ninety days after the completion of the study."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLFF. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, there is no objection to this amendment on this side.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, the debate on mail rates has been raging here for many months. The issue is clouded because of questions raised about the validity of the Post Office Department's cost ascertainment procedures, raised here by every sponsor today. Although the debate has been muddied by disagreement over cost ascertainment, two points remain clear: a justified increase in mail rates is in order and mailers should pay the full cost to the Post Office of handling their mail.

To help bring clarity into this matter

last spring I held an informal discussion in my congressional district and invited all of my constituents to participate.

I said at that time that, excepting those mailers such as newspapers, periodicals, charitable groups, and religious institutions that deserve reasonable Government mailing subsidy, that excepting those groups, postal rates should be equal to the Post Office Department's cost of handling mail.

Commonsense indicates that the present cost ascertainment system may not be a reliable gage for setting postal rates. In fact, in March of 1954 the U.S. Comptroller General, Lindsay C. Warren, stated he was "not prepared to endorse the flat use principle of cost allocation as it is applied in the cost ascertainment system."

Because of the inaccuracy of cost ascertainment the Comptroller General suggested that the Post Office Department work with "appropriate committees of Congress to develop an authoritative and definitive set of assumptions from which bases of allocation may be drawn for application to such cost data in determining the cost of various classes of service for ratemaking purposes."

The unsatisfactory nature of the present cost ascertainment system was further demonstrated when, in 1958, Deputy Postmaster General Maurice Stans stated that $200 million had been charged against second- and third-class mail that should have been charged elsewhere. Thus the sharp increase in first-class rates in recent years. The inaccuracy of present cost ascertainment becomes strikingly clear.

Thus I am offering this amendment. What I propose is simple, and it will clear away the confusion that has been bred by present cost ascertainment. I propose an independent audit of the Post Office Department's costs of handling each class of mail. The purpose of this independent and complete cost ascertainment study would be to enable the Congress to set equitable rates whereby all mail users would pay their own way.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to rise in opposition to an amendment which has been presented by as good a friend of mine as the gentleman from New York who has studied this subject rather carefully and, I think, has some very sound ideas on the postal system.

My problem with this amendment and I think the problem of this Committee should be: Why should the Congress of the United States turn to an outside organization for an independent audit when we have already charged the Post Office Department to protect the public interest? Why should we abdicate our responsibility and turn it over to some outside organization?

I would add also in the testimony before the committee on page 49 of the hearings, Assistant Postmaster General Ralph W. Nicholson, indicated, and I quote directly:

> I can think of no criticism of the cost ascertainment system that has not been answered before, not only to the satisfaction of the Congress but to the satisfaction of public accounting firms and many other independent authorities. They found no basic flaw in the system, although there were frequent suggestions that the data could be produced faster and at less cost—a valid obvservation to which we responded by introducing improved scientific sampling methods.
>
> The only criticisms that persist come from those who have a vested interest in opposing rate increases.

I would point out also, Mr. Chairman, that the Postmaster General's Advisory Panel on Postal Rates headed by a very distinguished former Member of this body, Hon. Robert Ramspeck, of Georgia, made a report in 1965 after very thoroughly reviewing the cost ascertainment system and gave that cost ascertainment system a clean bill of health. For these reasons I feel that if we have set up an agency of Government to protect the public interest, it is a wrong procedure for us here in Congress to turn to an independent, outside agency, irresponsible to Congress, and expect them to protect the public interest.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from West Virginia yield?

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HENDERSON. First, I would like to join the gentleman from West Virginia in expressing my reluctance to oppose an amendment which has such a laudable purpose and aim. But I think this is a very dangerous precedent. It would be dangerous for us to authorize the House of Representatives to enter into a contract to make an investigation or study for us. If it were directed at the Executive or the Postmaster General, my first impression would be to support the amendment, but certainly without the committee giving full consideration to all the ramifications of the proposal, we would be very ill advised to enact the amendment. I think we need to know what we are doing.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. The gentleman from North Carolina has made a good point. The committee has not had any hearings on this proposal. It ought to be reviewed carefully by the committee. That is an argument which the committee keeps making against amendments that come up. Why not apply it to this amendment? Why does the committee not hold hearings and air a proposal like this instead of suddenly embacing it here on the floor?

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from West Virginia yield further?

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I gladly yield to my friend from North Carolina.

Mr. HENDERSON. I have talked to the gentleman about the cost ascertainment system. I am not satisfied with it. But I do not believe that we ought to authorize the House of Representatives to enter into a contract for someone other than our committee to study that question.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I agree completely with the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WOLFF. I have asked the gentleman to yield for the purpose of determining whether or not he thinks the present cost ascertainment system is correct in its entirety.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I feel that the cost ascertainment system as charged by Congress to the Post Office Department to set up and carry out, is the best possible system that we have devised. It is in the public interest and it has been reviewed and raked over by independent auditing and accounting firms and found flawless in its basic features. What could be gained by now having an outside private agency do our job for us?

Mr. WOLFF. How do you account for the confusion that has existed on the floor today and yesterday on the part of very well recognized authorities in the Post Office and Civil Service Committee who could not give us the answers to many of the questions regarding costs that were involved in the handling of various classes of mail?

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I would say the confusion was the reason my amendment was defeated. If the gentleman can figure the answer to that question, I think it is unfortunate that Members do not understand and differentiate between the defenders of the public interest in the Post Office Department and the exponents of private and special interests elsewhere.

Mr. WOLFF. Perhaps the reason your amendment was defeated was because of the fact that the base that has been established did not satisfy every member of the committee.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, it is wrong to say that the referee is at fault when the referee does not come up with the right figures to satisfy a special interest. I think that is essentially what we are doing here. I respect the motives of the gentleman from New York, but I hope the amendment is defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WOLFF].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HORTON

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. HORTON: On page 27, immediately following line 9, insert the following:
>
> "(b) Section 4554(a) of title 39, United States Code, is amended—
>
> "(1) by striking out the word 'and' at the end of subparagraph (7);
>
> "(2) by striking out the period at the end of subparagraph (8) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word 'and'; and
>
> "(3) by adding at the end thereof the following subparagraph:
>
> "'(9) photographic prints when mailed by amateur photographers to nonprofit photographic exhibitions, photographic societies, and photographic print study groups, as described in subsection (b)(3) of this section, or when mailed by nonprofit photographic exhibitions, photographic societies,

and photographic print study groups, as described in subsection (b)(3) of this section, to amateur photographers, or when mailed by a nonprofit photographic exhibition, photographic society, or photographic print study group, as described in subsection (b)(3) of this section, to another such exhibition, society, or group.'.

"(c) Section 4554(c) of title 39, United States Code, is amended—

"(1) by inserting '(1)' immediately following '(c)'; and

"(2) by adding at the end thereof the following paragraph:

"'(2) Photographic prints may be mailed at the rates prescribed in subsection (b)(1) of this section when mailed by amateur photographers to nonprofit photographic exhibitions, photographic societies, and photographic print study groups, as described in subsection (b)(3) of this section, or when mailed by nonprofit photographic exhibitions, photographic societies, and photographic print study groups, as described in subsection (b)(3) of this section, to amateur photographers, or when mailed by a nonprofit photographic exhibition, photographic society, or photographic print study group, as described in subsection (b)(3) of this section, to another such exhibition society, or group.'."

On page 27, line 10, strike out "(b)" and insert in lieu thereof "(d)".

On page 27, line 14, strike out "(c)" and insert in lieu thereof "(e)".

Mr. HORTON (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with and that the amendment be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I do not seem to have a copy of the amendment.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I say to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN], there are copies. I furnished one to him yesterday, myself, and I gave one to the chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would permit photographs to be mailed at the fourth-class rate when mailed by an amateur photographer to a photo exhibition sponsored by a nonprofit group, or when returned to the photographer by the sponsors of the exhibition.

My amendment would also permit these photographs to be mailed at the fourth-class rate when they are being sent from one such exhibit to another.

The inequity of the present postal rate was first called to my attention by Mr. J. Lawrence Hill, Jr., who is the exhibitions chairman of the Photographic Society of America, Inc.

The society and its nearly 1,000 affiliated camera clubs includes nearly 45,000 members in this country. I think the following excerpt from one of Mr. Hill's letters to me quite concisely states the case for the amendment I am offering. In December of 1965, Mr. Hill wrote me as follows:

> For many years the amateur photographers of our country have been subjected to excessive costs in mailing their photographic prints to the various salons and exhibitions and to "Print Portfolios" or print study groups which are a part of PSA. At the same time, Record Clubs, Book Clubs and many other organizations have been allowed the privilege of mailing merchandise under the "library" or "educational" postal rate.
>
> This practice is most unfair, for the amateur photographers send their prints for study, analysis and judging. If found worthy, they are hung for public exhibition for periods usually 2–4 weeks. The Salon or Exhibition must then pay the high price of return.

Mr. Chairman, this brief excerpt points out the fact which makes the present rate structure inequitable. Nonprofit organizations are being denied the rate advantages which are accorded to some of the Nation's largest retailers. Thus, merchandise is being mailed at lower rates than parcels containing works of art or photographs.

Only a limited number of people will benefit from acceptance of this amendment, but it would eliminate one of the inequities of our present rate structure as it applies to amateur photographers and nonprofit organizations.

A secondary benefit of this is that it would encourage amateur photographers from every area of the country to participate in photographic exhibitions.

I might say I realize I am treading on thin ground when I ask for an amendment to open up and include another group in the fourth-class mailing privilege. I realize also this is one of the areas in which there is more support by the taxpayer than in any other area. But it does seem to me the Photographic Society of America and those amateur photographers who are attempting to exhibit and have their prints analyzed and studied and exhibited at various art groups around the country—and in many instances church organizations or religious organizations—would benefit. Also there are cases of exhibits at various museums and art and photographic museums across the country. I have a letter from the Photographic Society of America, whose headquarters is in Philadelphia, Pa., and from the office of the president, Mr. Joe Kennedy, from Tulsa, Okla. Colonel Kennedy in October of this year has indicated the support of this society and its members for this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will be accepted by the Committee and included in the fourth-class mailing privilege.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

There is no more conscientious and able Member of the House than the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON], and it pains me to oppose his amendment, but this is another Christmas tree-type amendment. We voted down the volunteer firemen, and now we are asked to let in a fine, though small, group of photographers who have exhibited.

The fastest growing subsidy in the whole postal structure is the fourth-class postage rate. We are losing $75 million a year now in this classification, and I would be reluctant in this time of budgetary crisis to add still another item to this already extended list. I can see some merit in granting this type of rate to people who really need it. These people do not need it. They have a preferential and fairly solid rate right now.

Mr. Chairman, I want to correct my friend on one point. The constituent who wrote and talked about the record companies getting a subsidized rate had a legitimate gripe, but we took care of the record companies in this bill.

We took care of them in this bill. They will no longer get that preferential rate which we give to books and libraries and things of that kind.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield,

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HORTON. I will mention that the letter was written in 1965, when the point was made.

Mr. UDALL. That is right. This bill closes a lot of loopholes. We are proud of that. The record loophole was one we plugged up.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. OLSEN. The point of fact is that we want to plug up many of the loopholes in the fourth class. In fact, the sense of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service was that we should restrict these preferential book rates to sendings between schools, from publishers to schools, and between libraries. We did not want anyone else to participate in this kind of subsidy. I believe that is what we are finally going to as our goal, and we are going to get there. We are not going to expand the subsidies. We want to restrict them to between the publishers and schools, between schools, between libraries and publishers.

Mr. UDALL. A lot of the book publishing companies, like the Reader's Digest, which the gentleman from Missouri objected to a while ago, will have some additional postage to pay under this bill.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HORTON. I am not in disagreement with the efforts of the gentleman and of the committee in trying to cut down on the use of fourth-class privileges. I am not here at this time saying any of the privileges granted now under the bill, or which have been granted in the past, should be changed. I do not take issue on that.

I am merely trying to include the amateur photographers and the nonprofit exhibitions where they have to send the prints. It is expensive to send these prints. I believe it does deter people from sending prints to the exhibitions and to the various other organizations which study and analyze the prints.

Mr. UDALL. I love these people, and if we had unlimited subsidies I would be glad to give them one, but we are out of money. We need more money.

Mr. HORTON. I should like to ask the gentleman a question. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield.

Mr. HORTON. In June of 1966 and in January of 1967, after the introduction of my original bill, the Post Office and Civil Service Committee sent to the Director of the Budget a request for a report, and also sent one to the Post Office Department. Does the gentleman have any figures or information with regard to how much the Budget Director estimates this would cost? In my judgment, it is not going to be very much.

Mr. UDALL. The gentleman is undoubtedly correct. It is the precedent and the principle involved which causes the trouble. I doubt this would cost more than a few tens of thousands of dollars a year. But we would have to let the volunteer fire company people in, and many others in.

Mr. OLSEN. We cannot open it up.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. THOMPSON OF GEORGIA

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia: On page 22, line 16, strike out "first-class mail" and substitute in lieu thereof "air transportation of first-class mail on a space available basis."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to the amendment. It just carries out the principle we have in the bill. There is no objection on this side.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CORBETT. First, I want to join in not objecting to this particular amendment.

I should like also to ask the gentleman what became of our oral agreement to try to close debate on title I at 4 o'clock?

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on title I and all amendments thereto close at exactly 20 minutes after 4.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, the gentleman made it originally 4 o'clock. Now he is making it 4:20. I will not object if he will modify his request to 4:10.

Mr. DULSKI. I will agree to making it 4:10.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman make that request?

Mr. DULSKI. I make that request, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, because the amendment has been accepted by both sides here and this merely clarifies the intent of the bill, I ask for a vote on my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. THOMPSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the limitation of time, the Members will have about 1 minute apiece.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL].

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, it would seem there is no way that Congress can act in a vacuum on this measure today. The costs associated with this bill cannot be divorced from the fiscal crisis in which the Nation finds itself. How can Congress put itself in the position of approving a measure which contains fixed costs of more than $2 billion over the next 2 years? How can we insist that the President adopt a belt-tightening posture, and then ourselves be vulnerable to his argument that Congress itself is loosening the belt?

The issue was perhaps best stated this morning by CBS newscaster Roger Mudd when he said:

> Congress has the chance today to "Put Up or Shut Up," to use the elegant phrase in its budget-cutting drive. . . . The net effect of the bill will be to increase the Federal deficit each year. . . . If the welded together and double pay plus postal increase clears Congress, it will give the President a perfect opportunity to blast the Congress for preaching one thing and voting another.

Frankly, I personally believe he might veto it, and would not that be a paradox between the Congress and the Executive?

There are other arguments against the bill in its present form, such as the combining of the postage rate increase and the Post Office and civil servants' pay increase in one bill, the certainty that a military pay raise of even greater scope will almost certainly follow, the constantly mounting deficit in Post Office Department operations now increased by salary increases, the unfair burden that is placed on the user of first class mail who already pays a greater percentage than his fair share, and the use of a Presidential Commission to preempt congressional responsibility in the matter of establishing pay scales and expenses, for all branches of the Federal Government. But the most compelling argument remains the budget issue put forth by Roger Mudd, which I insert at this point in the RECORD:

ROGER MUDD, OCTOBER 11, 1967, CBS NEWS

> Congress has the chance today to "put up or shut up," to use the elegant phrase, in its budget-cutting drive.
>
> Before the House today is a $2.6 billion pay increase for Federal employees and $884 million postal rate increase, the net effect of the bill will be to increase the Federal deficit plan each year, and in the present circumstances the pay bill couldn't have come at a worse time for the Federal workers.
>
> The Democrat leadership is nervous about its chances, although last night the House rejected two amendments—one holding the present first class postal rate at 5 cents, the second freezing the first class, air mail and post card rates.
>
> If the double pay and postal increase clears Congress, it will give the President a perfect opportunity to blast the Congress for preaching one thing and voting another. He supports the mail increase but has threatened to veto the pay boost as inflationary.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RYAN

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. RYAN: On page 35, after line 18, add a new section to read as follows:
>
> "SEC. 120. Subparagraph (6) of section 4554(a) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by inserting 'playscripts and' immediately following '(6)'."

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York, the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to this amendment on this side of the aisle.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I object to it.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the willingness of the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to accept this amendment.

Due to an omission under section 4554 of title 39, United States Code, playscripts have been excluded from those educational materials which qualify for fourth-class rates.

My amendment would add "playscripts" to subsection 6, which presently includes manuscrips for books, periodicals, and music. I have introduced legislation to accomplish this in this Congress (H.R. 3330) and in past Congresses.

In the 89th Congress a report dated February 10, 1966, from the Bureau of the Budget acknowledged that my bill would "remove a discriminatory feature of the present law," and that "The volume of playscripts is limited and therefore no significant revenue loss would be involved."

The Postmaster General in his report of February 14, 1966, said:

> Since the proposed legislation would remove a discriminating feature of the present law and lessen operational and rate problems for postal employees pricing such matter, we would have no objection to the enactment of H.R. 6579.

Neither the Post Office Department nor the Bureau of the Budget has any objection to this amendment, and it would remove a burdensome discrimination against one small category of educational material.

I urge the adoption of my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RYAN) there were—ayes 17, noes 34.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARSHA].

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this time to point out the problem with this section 115. Yesterday we were informed that if the pages in a newspaper were consecutively numbered, this would exempt the newspaper from this prohibition or this restriction in the bill. Now we find that that is not so, but if the insert or supplement contains certain news value or editorial value, then it is exempted. We also find out that if an establishment such as Sears, Roebuck puts out a large supplement of a great many pages but only 25 percent of it contains some news items, it is exempt under this provision. However, if several little weekly newspapers banded together for the purpose of publishing classified ads, they have one printer print this section for them all then they are no longer exempt and have to pay a higher rate. This higher rate for that type of operation, Mr. Chairman, I submit, will drive these newspapers out of business. They cannot afford the additional burden of separately printing their classified ad sections or the increased postage costs. The report tells us that the purpose of this section is virtually to exclude the use of all advertising supplements. Yet the chairman tells us this is not the purpose. Obviously there is a great deal of confusion and misunderstanding and this section should be deleted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL].

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, it is most unfortunate that there is a limitation of time imposed against title I or the postal rate section of H.R. 7977. When consent was obtained to cut off debate, I was in the process of preparing an amendment to strike out section 115 of this bill in an effort to be of some assistance to the fine weekly newspapers, in the smaller cities of our district.

In the limited time, I have Mr. Chairman, I want to attempt to make some legislative history concerning those publishers covered in section 103, or nonprofit publications now to be subjected to zone rates. I have reference to some denominational or church-owned publications. In the district which it is my privilege to represent is the home of the publishing division of the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints where they publish the Herald at Independence, Mo., and also the home of the principal publishing plant of the Unity School of Christianity at Lee's Summit, Mo.

The question which I hope can be answered by some member of the committee is whether these church publications which carry some small block or space of advertising to sell books and pamphlets on religious subjects produced by the church in the same printing plant where the magazine is published are going to be required to pay and in what amount according to the changes provided in this bill? In other words, if only one-tenth or one-twentieth of the proportion of the magazine is devoted to advertising to promote the sale of religious literature and church supplies, is it true that only this part or portion will be subjected to the new zone rates?

The established congressional policy has been that second-class publications falling in the religious field were entitled to preferential rates. I want to be sure and certain that this preference is not disturbed except perhaps as to the ratio or proportion of the advertisements published bears to the total space in the magazine. I am hoping for an answer to these questions.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. OLSEN. They will have to pay the regular commercial second-class rate, but on the basis of the publication's benefit to be derived therefrom. Otherwise, they would not qualify to come under this section.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HENDERSON].

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HENDERSON

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HENDERSON: On page 35, insert a new section at the end of title I to read as follows:

"SEC. 120. Subsection (a) of section 4106 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"'(a) The Postmaster General shall notify the sender or addressee upon request by the sender or addressee, when mail is undelivered as addressed, of the reason for nondelivery, and in the case of the notice to the sender, the new address of the addressee if known. The Postmaster General shall prescribe a uniform charge to be collected for the service performed pursuant to this subsection.'"

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is desirable. It represents a service that is performed for second-class users and represents no cost to the Department. I think it is a very wholesome amendment and it is my opinion that we should accept it.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDERSON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, on this side of the aisle we have no objection to the amendment.

I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HENDERSON]. This was brought to our attention by our colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS]. This is a change that is needed. This service must be paid for by the mailers and charges for this service will be set by the Postmaster General. It seems to me that the overall and long-range effect of the amendment could be beneficial to efficient mail service. I urge its adoption.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HENDERSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL].

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, the section regarding the rates for second-class publications should be stricken from this bill. Obviously, however, it cannot be stricken this afternoon through the amendatory process. However, I hope that when the other body considers this legislation, it will be able to pay attention to this matter.

As written, the section cannot be enforced with any fairness or consistency. It would be a tremendous headache to the Post Office Department on the one hand and it will not raise any additional revenue on the other hand. It would do great damage to the small daily and weekly newspapers of this country. This present language should be stricken from the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. MCCLURE].

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. M'CLURE

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MCCLURE: On page 26, strike out lines 23, 24, 25, and 26.

On page 27, strike out lines 1 and 2.

On page 27, line 3, change the "3" to "2" and on line 5, change the "4" to "3".

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Chairman, all this amendment seeks to do is to restrict the library rate to the existing rate, rather than the increase that is projected under the provisions of this bill. While we are under this bill perpetuating the second class subsidy or increasing second-class mail cost to 29 percent of the cost involved, we are asking the small country library operating within the framework of an interlibrary loan, where books are exchanged between libraries and obtained from central libraries, to pay an increase up to 40 percent. This, I think, is wrong.

I believe that the amount of money that is involved under this amendment that I am offering is not very great, and I believe we ought not at this time increase the cost to the small libraries. There is a very real increase in the rates under the bill, and it is not the simple change from a one-pound rate to a two-pound rate as the gentleman from Montana would have you believe. Above two pounds the rate is tripled, and this is a very substantial problem for the majority of small libraries that operate on very small and very tight budgets.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

It is the same situation with the same language. We are just saying it is eight cents for the first two pounds instead of four cents for the first pound, and the rate is the same except that we are giving recognition to the fact that most material moved by libraries is of a heavier weight, and we are not letting people move lightweight material at the four-cent rate, they are going to move the lightweight material at the 8-cent rate.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. Is not this provision the one that makes the records pay a higher rate instead of under the library rate?

Mr. OLSEN. No.

Mr. McCLURE. What this does is raise the 1 cent to 3 cents per pound, is that not three times as much per pound? That is exactly what is hitting the small libraries.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. UDALL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. McClure].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments to title I, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE II—FEDERAL SALARY INCREASES

SHORT TITLE

Sec. 201. This title may be cited as the "Federal Salary Act of 1967".

EMPLOYEES SUBJECT TO THE GENERAL SCHEDULE

Sec. 202. (a) The General Schedule contained in section 5332(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"GENERAL SCHEDULE

"Grade	Annual rates and steps									
	1	2	3	4	6	6	7	8	9	10
GS-1	$3,776	$3,902	$4,028	$4,154	$4,280	$4,406	$4,532	$4,658	$4,784	$4,910
GS-2	4,108	4,245	4,382	4,519	4,656	4,793	4,930	5,067	5,204	5,341
GS-3	4,466	4,615	4,764	4,913	5,062	5,211	5,360	5,509	5,658	5,807
GS-4	4,995	5,161	5,327	5,493	5,659	5,825	5,991	6,157	6,323	6,489
GS-5	5,565	5,751	5,937	6,123	6,309	6,495	6,681	6,867	7,053	7,239
GS-6	6,137	6,342	6,547	6,752	6,957	7,162	7,367	7,572	7,777	7,982
GS-7	6,734	6,959	7,184	7,409	7,634	7,859	8,084	8,309	8,534	8,759
GS-8	7,384	7,630	7,876	8,122	8,368	8,614	8,860	9,106	9,352	9,598
GS-9	8,054	8,323	8,592	8,861	9,130	9,399	9,668	9,937	10,206	10,475
GS-10	8,821	9,115	9,409	9,703	9,997	10,291	10,585	10,879	11,173	11,467
GS-11	9,657	9,979	10,301	10,623	10,945	11,267	11,589	11,911	12,233	12,555
GS-12	11,461	11,843	12,225	12,607	12,989	13,371	13,753	14,135	14,517	14,899
GS-13	13,507	13,957	14,407	14,857	15,307	15,757	16,207	16,657	17,107	17,557
GS-14	15,841	16,369	16,897	17,425	17,953	18,481	19,009	19,537	20,065	20,593
GS-15	18,404	19,017	19,630	20,243	20,856	21,469	22,082	22,695	23,308	23,921
GS-16	20,982	21,681	22,380	23,079	23,778	23,477	25,176	25,875	26,574	--------
GS-17	23,788	24,581	25,374	26,167	26,960	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------
GS-18	27,055	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------"

(b) Except as provided in section 5303 of title 5, United States Code, the rates of basic pay of officers and employees to whom the General Schedule set forth in the amendment made by subsection (a) of this section applies shall be initially adjusted as of the effective date of this section, as follows:

(1) If the officer or employee is receiving basic pay immediately prior to the effective date of this section at one of the rates of a grade in the General Schedule, he shall receive a rate of basic pay at the corresponding rate in effect on and after such date.

(2) If the officer or employee is receiving basic pay immediately prior to the effective date of this section at a rate between two rates of a grade in the General Schedule, he shall receive a rate of basic pay at the higher of the two corresponding rates in effect on and after such date.

(3) If the officer or employee is receiving basic pay immediately prior to the effective date of this section at a rate in excess of the maximum rate for his grade, he shall receive (A) the maximum rate for his grade in the new schedule, or (B) his existing rate of basic pay if such existing rate is higher.

(4) If the officer or employee, immediately prior to the effective date of this section, is receiving, pursuant to section 2(b)(4) of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1955, an existing aggregate rate of pay determined under section 208(b) of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1111), plus subsequent increases authorized by law, he shall receive an aggregate rate of pay equal to the sum of his existing aggregate rate of pay, on the day preceding the effective date of this section, plus the amount of increase made by this section in the maximum rate of his grade, until (i) he leaves his position, or (ii) he is entitled to receive aggregate pay at a higher rate by reason of the operation of this Act or any other provision of law; but, when such position becomes vacant, the aggregate rate of pay of any subsequent appointee thereto shall be fixed in accordance with applicable provisions of law. Subject to clauses (i) and (ii) of the immediately preceding sentence of this subparagraph, the amount of the increase provided by this section 208(b) of the Act of September 1, 1954, to constitute a part of the existing rate of pay of the employee.

(5) If the officer or employee, at any time during the period beginning on the effective date of this section and ending on the date of enactment of this title, was promoted from one grade under the General Schedule contained in section 5332(a) of title 5, United States Code, to another such grade at a rate which is above the minimum rate thereof, his rate of basic pay shall be adjusted retroactively from the effective date of this section to the date on which he was so promoted, on the basis of the rate which he was receiving during the period from such effective date to the date of such promotion and, from the date of such promotion, on the basis of the rate for that step of the appropriate grade of the General Schedule contained in the amendment made by subsection (a) of this section which corresponds numerically to the step of the grade of the General Schedule to which such officer or employee was promoted as in effect (without regard to this title) at the time of such promotion.

(6) If the officer or employee, at any time during the period beginning on the effective date of this section and ending on the date of enactment of this title, became subject to the General Schedule and his rate of basic pay was set above the minimum rate of the grade on the basis of a previously earned rate above such minimum rate, his rate of basic pay shall be adjusted retroactively to the date on which he became subject to the General Schedule on the basis of the rate of the appropriate grade of the General Schedule contained in this section which corresponds numerically to the rate of the grade at which the pay of such officer or employee was set at the time he became subject to the General Schedule.

LIMITATION ON NUMBERS OF CERTAIN POSTAL POSITIONS

Sec. 203. Section 3301 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out "salary levels 19 and 20" and inserting in lieu thereof "salary levels 20 and 21".

CHANGES IN KEY POSITIONS IN POSTAL FIELD SERVICE

Sec. 204. (a) That part of chapter 45 of title 39, United States Code, under the heading "POSITIONS" is amended by striking out section 3512 and inserting in lieu thereof the following new sections:

"§ 3512. Positions in salary level 1

"Cleaner. (KP–51)

"(1) Basic function.—Performs a variety of light cleaning and housekeeping tasks in connection with the custodial maintenance of a postal installation.

"(2) Duties and responsibilities.—

"(A) Sweeps, mops, dusts, washes, and otherwise performs light cleaning and housekeeping tasks to maintain offices, washrooms, lobbies, corridors stairways, and other areas of the building in neat and orderly condition.

"(B) Performs such duties as dusting, waxing, and polishing office furniture, sweeping and mopping floors, vacuuming rugs, emptying wastebaskets and trash, washing interior window and partition glass and fixtures which can be reached without use of ladders or scaffolding.

"(3) Organizational relationships.—Reports to a foreman or other designated supervisor.

"§ 3521A. Positions in salary level 2

"Custodian. (KP–1)

"(1) Basic function.—Performs manual laboring duties in connection with custody of an office or building.

"(2) Duties and responsibilities.—

"(A) Performs any combination of the following duties:

"1. Moves furniture and equipment.

"2. Uncrates and assembles furniture and fixtures, using bolts and screws for assembly.

"3. Loads and unloads supplies and equipment.

"4. Removes trash from work areas, lobbies, and washrooms.

"5. Tends to lawns, shrubbery, and premises of the post office and cleans ice and snow from the sidewalks and driveways.

"6. Stacks supplies in storage rooms and on shelves, and completes forms or records as required.

"(B) May perform cleaning duties as assigned.

"(3) Organizational relationships.—Reports to a foreman or other designated supervisor.".

(b) Each salary level number in the headings of sections 3513 to 3531, inclusive, of title 39, United States Code, and each other numerical reference to such salary level number in any other provision of such title (including the table of contents of chapter 45) which is not otherwise increased by this title, is increased by 1.

(c) Each employee in the postal field service on the date of enactment of this title, whose position is placed in salary level 2 of the Postal Field Service Schedule by reason of the enactment of this section and section 205(e)(1) of this title, shall remain in salary level 2 of such schedule so long as he remains in such position or occupies, without break in service of more than thirty days, a position of a comparable level of duties, responsibilities, and work requirements in such salary level. When the employee leaves any such position, the position shall be appropriately ranked in accordance with chapter 45 of title 39, United States Code.

(d) The table of contents of chapter 45 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by inserting—

"3512A. Positions in salary level 2."

immediately below—

"3512. Positions in salary level 1.".

POSTAL FIELD SERVICE EMPLOYEES

Sec. 205. (a) Section 3542(a) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) There are established basic compensation schedules for positions in the postal field service which shall be known as the Postal Field Service Schedules and for which the symbol shall be 'PFS'. Except as provided in sections 3543 and 3544 of this title, basic compensation shall be paid to all employees in accordance with such schedules.

“POSTAL FIELD SERVICE SCHEDULE I

“[To be effective for the period beginning on the 1st day of the 1st pay period beginning on or after October 1, 1967, and ending immediately before the effective date of Postal Field Service Schedule II set forth below]

“PFS	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1	$4,118	$4,255	$4,392	$4,529	$4,666	$4,803	$4,940	$5,077	$5,214	$5,351	$5,488	$5,625
2	4,460	4,607	4,754	4,901	5,048	5,195	5,342	5,489	5,636	5,783	5,930	6,077
3	4,826	4,984	5,142	5,300	5,458	5,616	5,774	5,932	6,090	6,248	6,406	6,564
4	5,215	5,391	5,567	5,743	5,919	6,095	6,271	6,447	6,623	6,799	6,975	7,151
5	5,651	5,838	6,025	6,212	6,399	6,586	6,773	6,960	7,147	7,334	7,521	7,708
6	6,044	6,246	6,448	6,650	6,852	7,054	7,256	7,458	7,660	7,862	8,064	8,266
7	6,482	6,697	6,912	7,127	7,342	7,557	7,772	7,987	8,202	8,417	8,632	8,847
8	6,939	7,170	7,401	7,632	7,863	8,094	8,325	8,556	8,787	9,018	9,249	------
9	7,515	7,764	8,013	8,262	8,511	8,760	9,009	9,258	9,507	9,756	------	------
10	8,128	8,398	8,668	8,938	9,208	9,478	9,748	10,018	10,288	10,558	------	------
11	8,846	9,146	9,446	9,746	10,046	10,346	10,646	10,946	11,246	11,546	------	------
12	9,775	10,109	10,443	10,777	11,111	11,445	11,779	12,113	12,447	12,781	------	------
13	10,815	11,183	11,551	11,919	12,287	12,655	13,023	13,391	13,759	14,127	------	------
14	11,951	12,364	12,777	13,190	13,603	14,016	14,429	14,842	15,255	15,668	------	------
15	13,173	13,631	14,089	14,547	15,005	15,463	15,921	16,379	16,837	17,295	------	------
16	14,564	15,066	15,568	16,070	16,572	17,074	17,576	18,078	18,580	19,082	------	------
17	16,090	16,650	17,210	17,770	18,330	18,890	19,450	20,010	20,570	21,130	------	------
18	17,803	18,425	19,047	19,669	20,291	20,913	21,535	22,157	22,779	23,401	------	------
19	19,642	20,294	20,946	21,598	22,250	22,902	23,554	24,206	24,858	25,510	------	------
20	21,758	22,484	23,210	23,936	24,662	25,388	26,114	26,840	------	------	------	------
21	24,126	24,932	25,738	26,544	26,960	------	------	------	------	------	------	------

“POSTAL FIELD SERVICE SCHEDULE II

“[To be effective on the first day of the first pay period beginning on or after July 1, 1968’

“PFS	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1	$4,324	$4,468	$4,612	$4,756	$4,900	$5,044	$5,188	$5,332	$5,476	$5,620	$5,764	$5,908
2	4,687	4,841	4,995	5,149	5,303	5,457	5,611	5,765	5,919	6,073	6,227	6,381
3	5,068	5,234	5,400	5,566	5,732	5,898	6,064	6,230	6,396	6,562	6,728	6,894
4	5,476	5,661	5,846	6,031	6,216	6,401	6,586	6,771	6,956	7,141	7,326	7,511
5	5,938	6,134	6,330	6,526	6,722	6,918	7,114	7,310	7,506	7,702	7,898	8,094
6	6,348	6,560	6,772	6,984	7,196	7,408	7,620	7,832	8,044	8,256	8,468	8,680
7	6,807	7,033	7,259	7,485	7,711	7,937	8,163	8,389	8,615	8,841	9,067	9,293
8	7,286	7,529	7,772	8,015	8,258	8,501	8,744	8,987	9,230	9,473	9,716	-----
9	7,891	8,153	8,415	8,677	8,939	9,201	9,463	9,725	9,987	10,249	------	-----
10	8,535	8,891	9,103	9,387	9,671	9,955	10,239	10,523	10,807	11,091	------	-----
11	9,289	9,604	9,919	10,234	10,549	10,864	11,179	11,494	11,809	12,124	------	-----
12	10,264	10,615	10,966	11,317	11,668	12,019	12,370	12,721	13,072	13,423	------	-----
13	11,356	11,743	12,130	12,517	12,904	13,291	13,678	14,065	14,452	14,839	------	-----
14	12,549	12,983	13,417	13,851	14,285	14,719	15,153	15,587	16,021	16,455	------	-----
15	13,832	14,313	14,794	15,275	15,756	16,237	16,718	17,199	17,680	18,161	------	-----
16	15,293	15,820	16,347	16,874	17,401	17,928	18,455	18,982	19,509	20,036	------	-----
17	16,895	17,483	18,071	18,659	19,247	19,835	20,423	21,011	21,599	22,187	------	-----
18	18,695	19,348	20,001	20,654	21,307	21,960	22,613	23,266	23,919	24,572	------	-----
19	20,625	21,310	21,995	22,680	23,365	24,050	24,735	25,420	26,105	26,790	------	-----
20	22,848	23,610	24,372	25,134	25,896	26,658	27,420	27,800	------	------	------	-----
21	25,333	26,179	27,025	27,871	27,900	------	------	------	------	------	------	-----”.

(b) Section 3543(a) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(a) There are established basic compensation schedules which shall be known as the Rural Carrier Schedules and for which the symbol shall be ‘RCS’. Compensation shall be paid to rural carriers in accordance with such schedules.

“RURAL CARRIER SCHEDULE I

“[To be effective for the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period beginning on or after October 1, 1967, and ending immediately before the effective date of Rural Carrier Schedule II set forth below]

	“Per annum rates and steps											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Fixed compensation	$2,531	$2,658	$2,785	$2,912	$3,039	$3,166	$3,293	$3,420	$3,547	$3,674	$3,801	$3,928
For each mile up to 30 miles of route	94	96	98	100	102	104	106	108	110	112	114	116
For each mile of route over 30	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25

“RURAL CARRIER SCHEDULE II

“[To be effective on the first day of the first pay period beginning on or after July 1, 1968]

	“Per annum rates and steps											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Fixed compensation	$2,668	$2,804	$2,940	$3,076	$3,212	$3,348	$3,484	$3,620	$3,756	$3,892	$4,028	$4,164
For each mile up to 30 miles of route	99	101	103	105	107	109	111	113	115	117	119	121
For each mile of route over 30	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25”.

(c) Section 3544 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as folows:

“§ 3544. Compensation of postmasters at fourth-class offices

“(a) The Postmaster General shall—

“(1) rank each position of postmaster at a post office of the fourth class in salary level 6 of the Postal Field Service Schedule; and

“(2) establish, and adjust from time to time, the annual rate of basic compensation, for each such position of postmaster so ranked, in an amount which bears the same ratio to the annual rate of basic compensation for full-time service in a position (other than postmaster at a post office of the fourth class) in the same step of salary level 6 of such schedule, as the total number of hours of service which the Postmaster General determines necessary to be performed by such postmaster to operate the post office, in the light of the postal needs of the patrons of the office, bears to the total number of hours of such full-time service.

Actions and determinations by the Postmaster General under this subsection shall be final and conclusive until changed by him.

“(b) A person who performs the duties of postmaster at a post office of the fourth class where there is a vacancy, or during the absence of the postmaster on sick or annual leave or leave without pay, shall be compensated at the rate of basic compensation for step 1 of salary level 6 of the Postal Field Service Schedule, determined under subsection (a) of this section.

“(c) When required by the Postmaster General, a postmaster at a fourth-class office shall, and any other postmaster in PFS level 6 when permitted by the Postmaster General may, furnish quarters, fixtures, and equipment for an office on an allowance basis. The alowance for this purpose shall be an amount equal to 15 per centum of the basic compensation for step 1 of salary level 6 of the Postal Field Service Schedule.”.

(d) Each postmaster at a post office of the fourth class on the effective date of Postal Field Service Schedule I shall be placed in salary level 6 of the Postal Field Service Schedule at the lowest step which provides a rate, determined under section 3544(a) of title 39, United States Code, which is at least equal to his rate of basic compensation in effect immediately prior to such effective date plus 6 per centum thereof. If there is no such step in salary level 6, he is entitled to his rate of basic compensation in effect immediately prior to such effective date plus 6 per centum thereof. For the purposes of this subsection, basic compensation in effect immediately prior to the effective date of Postal Field Service Schedule I shall be determined after giving effect to any change in salary step or revenue units category which would have occurred on the effective date of this section without regard to the enactment of this title.

(e) The basic compensation of each employee subject to the Postal Field Service Schedule or the Rural Carrier Schedule immediately prior to the effective date of Postal Field Service Schedule I shall be determined as follows:

(1) Each employee subject to the Postal Field Service Schedule shall be assigned to the same numerical step for his position, placed in the next higher salary level, which he had attained immediately prior to such effective date.

(2) Each employee subject to the Rural Carrier Schedule shall be assigned to the same numerical step for his position which he had attained immediately prior to such effective date.

(3) If changes in levels or steps would otherwise occur on such effective date without regard to enactment of this Act, such changes shall be deemed to have occurred prior to conversion.

(4) If the existing basic compensation is greater than the rate to which the employee is converted under paragraph (1) or (2) of this subsection, the employee shall be placed in the lowest step which exceeds his basic compensation. If the existing basic compensation exceeds the maximum step of his position, his existing basic compensation shall be established as his basic compensation.

(f) The advancement of any employee to a higher salary level of the Postal Field Service Schedule by reason of the enactment of this section shall not be deemed to be an equivalent increase within the meaning of section 3552(a) of title 39, United States Code.

(g) The basic compensation of each employee subject to the Postal Field Service Schedule or the Rural Carrier Schedule immediately prior to the effective date of Postal Field Service Schedule II shall be determined as follows:

(1) Each employee shall be assigned to the

same numerical step for his position which he had attained immediately prior to such effective date. If changes in levels or steps would otherwise occur on such effective date without regard to enactment of this title, such changes shall be deemed to have occurred prior to conversion.

(2) If the existing basic compensation is greater than the rate to which the employee is converted under paragraph (1) of this subsection, the employee shall be placed in the lowest step which exceeds his basic compensation. If the existing basic compensation exceeds the maximum step of his position, his existing basic compensation shall be established as his basic compensation.

(h) Each employee whose position, by reason of the enactment of this section, is placed in a level of the Postal Field Service Schedule shall be entitled, for purposes of section 3560 of title 39, United States Code, to credit for time served in the postal field service prior to the effective date of this section.

(i) The table of contents of chapter 45 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out

"3544. **Fourth Class Office Schedule.**"

and inserting in lieu thereof

"3544. Compensation of postmasters at class offices.".

CONFORMING AMENDMENTS

SEC. 206. (a) Section 3560(a) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out "(3) revenue unit category, with respect to the Fourth Class Office Schedule" and inserting in lieu thereof "(3) minimum hours of service with respect to postmasters in fourth-class post offices.".

(b) Section 3560(f) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out "(1) reductions in class or revenue unit category of any post office, or" and inserting in lieu thereof "(1) reductions in class or revenue units of any post office or in the minimum hours of service for a fourth-class post office, or".

(c) Subsections (b) and (c) of section 3573 of title 39, United States Code, are amended by striking out "level PFS–10" and "level PFS–11", wherever appearing therein, and inserting in lieu thereof "level PFS–11" and "level PFS–12", respectively.

(d) Subsection (a) of section 3575 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out "level PFS–15" and inserting in lieu thereof "level PFS–16".

(e) Any reference to a level of the Postal Field Service Schedule in any order, rule, regulation, or statute (other than title 39, United States Code) which is in effect on the effective date of this section shall be deemed to refer to the next higher level of the Postal Field Service Schedule.

SPECIAL SALARY RATE RANGES

SEC. 207. (a) Section 5303(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking out "seventh pay rate" and inserting in lieu thereof "maximum pay rate".

(b) Section 5303(d) of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(d) The rate of basic pay established under this section and received by an individual immediately before a statutory increase, which becomes effective prior to, on, or after the date of enactment of the statute, in the pay schedule applicable to such individual of any pay system specified in subsection (a) of this section, shall be initially adjusted, effective on the effective date of the statutory increase, under conversion rules prescribed by the President or by such agency as the President may designate.".

EMPLOYEES IN THE DEPARTMENT OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY OF THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 208. Section 4107 of title 38, United States Code, relating to grades and pay scales for certain positions within the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 4107. Grades and pay scales

"(a) The per annum full-pay scale or ranges for positions provided in section 4103 of this title, other than Chief Medical Director, Deputy Chief Medical Director, and Associate Deputy Chief Medical Director, shall be as follows:

"Section 4103 Schedule

"Assistant Chief Medical Director, $27,055.

"Medical Director, $23,788 minimum to $26,960 maximum.

"Director of Nursing Service, $18,404 minimum to $23,921 maximum.

"Director of Chaplain Service, $18,404 minimum to $23,921 maximum.

"Chief Pharmacist, $18,404 minimum to $23,921 maximum.

"Chief Dietitian, $18,404 minimum to $23,921 maximum.

"(b)(1) The grades and per annum full-pay ranges for positions provided in paragraph (1) of section 4104 of this title shall be as follows:

"Physician and Dentist Schedule

"Director grade, $20,982 minimum to $26,574 maximum.

"Executive grade, $19,576 minimum to $25,444 maximum.

"Chief grade, $18,404 minimum to $23,921 maximum.

"Senior grade, $15,841 minimum to $20,593 maximum.

"Intermediate grade, $13,507 minimum to $17,557 maximum.

"Full grade, $11,461 minimum to $14,899 maximum.

"Associate grade, $9,657 minimum to $12,555 maximum.

"Nurse Schedule

"Assistant Director grade, $15,841 minimum $20,593 maximum.

"Chief grade, $13,507 minimum to $17,557 maximum.

"Senior grade, $11,461 minimum to $14,899 maximum.

"Intermediate grade, $9,657 minimum to $12,555 maximum.

"Full grade, $8,054 minimum to $10,475 maximum.

"Associate grade, $7,033 minimum to $9,139 maximum.

"Junior grade, $6,137 minimum to $7,982 maximum.

"(2) No person may hold the director grade unless he is serving as a director of a hospital, domiciliary, center, or outpatient clinic (independent). No person may hold the executive grade unless he holds the position of chief of staff at a hospital, center, or outpatient clinic (independent), or comparable position.

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the per annum salary rate for each individual serving as a director of a hospital, domiciliary, or center who is not a physician shall not be less than the salary rate which he would receive under this section if his service as a director of a hospital, domiciliary, or center had been service as a physician in the director grade. The position of the director of a hospital, domiciliary, or center shall not be subject to chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code.".

FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS; STAFF OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

SEC. 209. (a) The fourth sentence of section 412 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 867), is amended to read as follows: "The per annum salaries of Foreign Service officers within each of the other classes shall be as follows:

"Class 1	$24,944	$25,776	$27,055				
Class 2	20,280	20,956	21,632	$22,308	$22,984	$23,660	$24,336
Class 3	16,616	17,170	17,724	18,278	18,832	19,386	19,940
Class 4	13,507	13,957	14,407	14,857	15,307	15,757	16,207
Class 5	11,120	11,491	11,862	12,233	12,604	12,975	13,346
Class 6	9,267	9,576	9,885	10,194	10,503	10,812	11,121
Class 7	7,816	8,076	8,336	8,596	8,856	9,116	9,376
Class 8	6,734	6,959	7,184	7,409	7,634	7,859	8,084 .

(b) The second sentence of subsection (a) of section 415 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 870(a)) is amended to read as follows: "The per annum salaries of such staff officers and employees within each class shall be as follows:

"Class 1	$16,616	$17,170	$17,724	$18,278	$18,832	$19,386	$19,940	$20,494	$21,048	$21,602
Class 2	13,507	13,957	14,407	14,857	15,307	15,757	16,207	16,657	17,107	17,557
Class 3	11,120	11,491	11,862	12,233	12,604	12,975	13,346	13,717	14,088	14,459
Class 4	9,267	9,576	9,885	10,194	10,503	10,812	11,121	11,430	11,739	12,048
Class 5	8,351	8,629	8,907	9,185	9,463	9,741	10,019	10,297	10,575	10,853
Class 6	7,524	7,775	8,026	8,277	8,528	8,779	9,030	9,281	9,532	9,783
Class 7	6,905	7,135	7,365	7,595	7,825	8,055	8,285	8,515	8,745	8,975
Class 8	6,125	6,329	6,533	6,737	6,941	7,145	7,349	7,553	7,757	7,961
Class 9	5,575	5,761	5,947	6,133	6,319	6,505	6,691	6,877	7,063	7,249
Class 10	4,995	5,161	5,327	5,493	5,659	5,825	5,991	6,157	6,323	6,489".

(c) Foreign Service officers, Reserve officers, and Foreign Service Staff officers and employees who are entitled to receive basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at one of the rates provided by section 412 or 415 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 shall receive basic compensation, on and after such effective date, at the rate of their class determined to be appropriate by the Secretary of State.

AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION COUNTY COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

SEC. 210. The rates of pay of persons employed by the county committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (16 U.S.C. 590h(b)) shall be increased by amounts equal, as nearly as may be practicable, to the increases provided by section 202(a) of this title for corresponding rates of basic pay.

SALARY RATES FIXED BY ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION

SEC. 211. (a) The rates of basic pay of assistant United States attorneys whose annual salaries are fixed pursuant to section 548 of title 28, United States Code, shall be increased, effective on the effective date of section 202 of this title, by amounts equal, as nearly as may be practicable, to the increases provided by section 202(a) of this title for corresponding rates of basic pay.

(b) Notwithstanding section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), the rates of pay of officers and employees of the Federal Government and of the municipal government of the District of Columbia whose rates of pay are fixed by administrative action pursuant to law and are not otherwise increased by this title are hereby authorized to be increased, effective on the effective date of section 202 of this title, by amounts not to exceed the increases provided by this title for corresponding rates of pay in the appropriate schedule or scale of pay.

(c) Nothing contained in this section shall be held or considered to authorize any increase in the rates of pay of officers and employees whose rates of pay are fixed and adjusted from time to time as nearly as is consistent with the public interest in accordance with prevailing rates or practices.

(d) Nothing contained in this section shall affect the authority contained in any law pursuant to which rates of pay may be fixed by administrative action.

IMPLEMENTATION OF SALARY COMPARABILITY POLICY IN 1968 AND 1969

Sec. 212. In order to complete the implementation of the policy of the Congress set forth in paragraph (2) of section 5301 of title 5, United States Code, the President, after seeking the views of such employee organizations as he considers appropriate and in such manner as he may provide, shall—

(1) effective on the first day of the first pay period beginning on or after July 1, 1968, adjust the rates of basic pay, basic compensation, and salary, as in effect by reason of the enactment of the provisions of this title other than this section and sections 205, 210, 213, 214, 215, 216, and 222—

(A) by amounts equal, as nearly as may be practicable, to one-half of the amounts by which such rates are exceeded by rates of pay paid for the same levels of work in private enterprise as determined on the basis of the 1967 annual survey conducted by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in accordance with the provisions of section 5302 of title 5, United States Code, or

(B) by 3 per centum,

whichever is greater; and

(2) effective on the first day of the first pay period beginning on or after April 1, 1969, adjust the rates he has established under subparagraph (1) of this section, and the rates established by Postal Field Service Schedule II and Rural Carrier Schedule II (contained in the amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) of section 205), by amounts equal, as nearly as may be practicable, to the amounts by which such rates are exceeded by rates of pay paid for the same levels of work in private enterprise as determined on the basis of the 1968 annual survey conducted by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in accordance with the provisions of section 5302 of title 5, United States Code.

Adjustments made by the President under this section shall have the force and effect of statute. The rates of pay of personnel subject to sections 210, 213 (except subsection (d)), and 214 of this title shall be adjusted, by amounts which are equal, insofar as practicable, to the amounts of the adjustments made by the President under subparagraphs (1) and (2) of this section, by the following authorities—

(i) the President pro tempore of the Senate, with respect to the United States Senate;

(ii) the Speaker of the House of Representatives, with respect to the United States House of Representatives;

(iii) the Architect of the Capitol, with respect to the Office of the Architect of the Capitol;

(iv) the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, with respect to the judicial branch of the Government; and

(v) the Secretary of Agriculture, with respect to persons employed by the county committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (16 U.S.C. 590h(b)).

Such adjustments shall be made in such manner as the appropriate authority concerned deems advisable and shall have the force and effect of statute. Nothing in this section shall impair any authority pursuant to which rates of pay may be fixed by administrative action.

JUDICIAL BRANCH EMPLOYEES

Sec. 213. (a) The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in or under the judicial branch of the Government whose rates of compensation are fixed by or pursuant to paragraph (2) of subdivision a of section 62 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 102(a)(2)), section 3656 of title 18, United States Code, the third sentence of section 603, sections 671 to 675, inclusive, or section 604(a)(5), of title 28, United States Code, insofar as the latter section applies to graded positions, are hereby increased by amounts reflecting the respective applicable increases provided by section 202(a) of this title in corresponding rates of compensation for officers and employees subject to section 5332 of title 5, United States Code. The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees holding ungraded positions and whose salaries are fixed pursuant to such section 604(a)(5) may be increased by the amounts reflecting the respective applicable increases provided by section 202(a) of this title in corresponding rates of compensation for officers and employees subject to section 5332 of title 5, United States Code.

(b) The limitations provided by applicable law on the effective date of this section with respect to the aggregate salaries payable to secretaries and law clerks of circuit and district judges are hereby increased by amounts which reflect the respective applicable increases provided by section 202(a) of this title in corresponding rates of compensation for officers and employees subject to section 5332 of title 5, United States Code.

(c) Section 753(e) of title 28, United States Code (relating to the compensation of court reporters for district courts), is amended by striking out the existing salary limitation contained therein and inserting a new limitation which reflects the respective applicable increases provided by section 202(a) of this title in corresponding rates of compensation for officers and employees subject to section 5332 of title 5, United States Code.

(d) The first paragraph of section 603 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the compensation of the Director and the Deputy Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, is amended to read as follows:

"The salary of the Director shall be the same as the salary of a United States District Judge. The salary of the Deputy Director shall be in the same amount as the rate of basic pay for level V of the Executive Schedule in title 5.".

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH EMPLOYEES

Sec. 214. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this title, each officer or employee in or under the legislative branch of the Government, whose rate of compensation is increased by section 5 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946, shall be paid additional compensation at the rate of 4.5 per centum of his gross rate of compensation (basic compensation plus additional compensation authorized by law).

(b) The total annual compensation in effect immediately prior to the effective date of this section of each officer or employee of the House of Representatives, whose compensation is disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives and is not increased by reason of any other provision of this section, shall be increased by 4.5 per centum.

(c) The rates of compensation of employees of the House of Representatives whose compensation is fixed by the House Employees Schedule under the House Employees Position Classification Act (78 Stat. 1079–1084; Public Law 88–652; 2 U.S.C. 291–303), including each employee subject to such Act whose compensation is fixed at a saved rate, are hereby increased by amounts equal, as nearly as may be practicable, to the increases provided by subsection (a) of this section.

(d) Except as provided in the last sentence of section 219(a) of this title, the additional compensation provided by this section shall be considered a part of basic pay for the purposes of subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, relating to civil service retirement.

(e) The per annum rate of compensation of the Chief of Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation shall be the same as the per annum rate of compensation of the Legislative Counsel of the House of Representatives.

(f) The third paragraph under the heading "Office of the Architect of the Capitol" and the subheading "Salaries" in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1960 (73 Stat. 407), is amended by striking out "$7,700" and inserting in lieu thereof "$8,200".

(g) This section shall not apply with respect to the compensation of student congressional interns and the compensation of employees whose compensation is fixed by the House Wage Schedule under the House Employees Position Classification Act.

INCREASES IN BASIC PAY RATES FOR LEVELS III, IV, AND V OF EXECUTIVE SCHEDULE

Sec. 215. (a) Section 5314 of title 5, United States Code, relating to the basic pay rate for level III of the Executive Schedule, is amended by striking out "$28,500" and inserting in lieu thereof "$29,500".

(b) Section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, relating to the basic pay rate for level IV of the Executive Schedule, is amended by striking out "$27,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$28,750".

(c) Section 5316 of title 5, United States Code, relating to the basic pay rate for level V of the Executive Schedule, is amended by striking out "$26,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$28,000".

COMMISSION ON EXECUTIVE, LEGISLATIVE, AND JUDICIAL SALARIES

Sec. 216. (a) Establishment of Commission.—There is hereby established a commission to be known as the Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission").

(b) Membership.—

(1) The Commission shall be composed of nine members who shall be appointed from private life, as follows:

(A) three appointed by the President of the United States, one of whom shall be designated as Chairman by the President;

(B) two appointed by the President of the Senate;

(C) two appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and

(D) two appointed by the Chief Justice of the United States.

(2) The terms of office of persons first appointed as members of the Commission shall be for the period of the 1969 fiscal year of the Federal Government, except that, if any appointment to membership on the Commission is made after the beginning and before the close of such fiscal year, the term of office based on such appointment shall be for the remainder of such fiscal year.

(3) After the close of the 1969 fiscal year of the Federal Government, persons shall be appointed as members of the Commission with respect to every fourth fiscal year following the 1969 fiscal year. The terms of office of persons so appointed shall be for the period of the fiscal year with respect to which the appointment is made, except that, if any appointment is made after the beginning and before the close of any such fiscal year, the term of office based on such appointment shall be for the remainder of such fiscal year.

(4) A vacancy in the membership of the Commission shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

(5) Each member of the Commission shall

be paid at the rate of $100 for each day such member is engaged upon the work of the Commission and shall be allowed travel expenses, including a per diem allowance, in accordance with section 5703(b) of title 5, United States Code, when engaged in the performance of services for the Commission.

(c) PERSONNEL OF COMMISSION.—

(1) Without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title, relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, and on a temporary basis for periods covering all or part of any fiscal year referred to in subsection (b) (2) and (3) of this section—

(A) the Commission is authorized to appoint an Executive Director and fix his basic pay at the rate provided for level V of the Executive Schedule by section 5316 of title 5, United States Code; and

(B) with the approval of the Commission, the Executive Director is authorized to appoint and fix the basic pay (at respective rates not in excess of the maximum rate of the General Schedule in section 5332 of title 5, United States Code) of such additional personnel as may be necessary to carry out the function of the Commission.

(2) Upon the request of the Commission, the head of any department, agency, or establishment of any branch of the Federal Government is authorized to detail, on a reimbursable basis, for periods covering all or part of any fiscal year referred to in subsection (b) (2) and (3) of this section, any of the personnel of such department, agency, or establishment to assist the Commission in carrying out its function.

(d) USE OF UNITED STATES MAILS BY COMMISSION.—The Commission may use the United States mails in the same manner and upon the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the United States.

(e) ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT SERVICES.—The Administrator of General Services shall provide administrative support services for the Commission on a reimbursable basis.

(f) FUNCTION.—The Commission shall conduct, in each of the respective fiscal years referred to in subsection (b) (2) and (3) of this section, a review of the rates of pay and the amounts and kinds of expenses and allowances, including requirements, conditions, and other matters relating thereto, of—

(A) Senators, Members of the House of Representatives, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico;

(B) offices and positions in the legislative branch referred to in subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d) of section 203 of the Federal Legislative Salary Act of 1964 (78 Sta. 415; Public Law 88-426);

(C) justices, judges, and other personnel in the judicial branch referred to in sections 402(d) and 403 of the Federal Judicial Salary Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 434; Public Law 88-426); and

(D) offices and positions under the Executive Schedule in subchapter II of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code.

Such review by the Commission shall be made for the purpose of determining and providing—

(i) the appropriate pay levels and relationships between and among the respective offices and positions covered by such review, and

(ii) the appropriate pay relationships between such offices and positions and the offices and positions subject to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates.

(g) REPORT BY COMMISSION TO THE PRESIDENT.—The Commission shall submit to the President a report of the results of each review conducted by the Commission of the offices and positions within the purview of subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), and (D) of subsection (f) of this section, together with its recommendations. Each such report shall be submitted on such date as the President may designate but not later than January 1 next following the close of the fiscal year in which the review is conducted by the Commission.

(h) RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PRESIDENT WITH RESPECT TO PAY, EXPENSES, AND ALLOWANCES.—The President shall include, in the budget next transmitted by him to the Congress after the date of the submission of the report and recommendations of the Commission under subsection (g) of this section, his recommendations with respect to the exact rates of pay and the exact amounts and kinds of expenses and allowances, including any specific requirements, conditions, and other matters relating thereto which he deems advisable, for those offices and positions within the purview of subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), and (D) of subsection (f) of this section. As used in this subsection, the term "budget" means the budget referred to in section 201 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, as amended (31 U.S.C. 11).

(i) EFFECTIVE DATE OF RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PRESIDENT.—

(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection, all or part (as the case may be) of the recommendations of the President transmitted to the Congress in the budget under subsection (h) of this section shall become effective at the beginning of the first pay period which begins after the thirtieth day following the transmittal of such recommendations in the budget; but only to the extent that, between the date of transmittal of such recommendations in the budget and the beginning of such first pay period—

(A) there has not been enacted into law a statute which establishes rates of pay, amounts and kinds of expenses and allowances, and requirements, conditions, and related matters other than those proposed by all or part of such recommendations,

(B) neither House of the Congress has enacted legislation which specifically disapproves all or part of such recommendations, or

(C) both.

(2) Any part of the recommendations of the President may, in accordance with express provisions of such recommendations, be made operative on a date later than the date on which such recommendations otherwise are to take effect.

(j) EFFECT OF RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PRESIDENT ON EXISTING LAW AND PRIOR PRESIDENTIAL RECOMMENDATIONS. — The recommendations of the President transmitted to the Congress immediately following a review conducted by the Commission in one of the fiscal years referred to in subsection (b)(2) and (3) of this section shall be held and considered to modify, supersede, or render inapplicable, as the case may be, to the extent inconsistent therewith—

(A) all provisions of law enacted prior to the effective date or dates of all or part (as the case may be) of such recommendations (other than any provision of law enacted in the period specified in paragraph (1) of subsection (i) of this section with respect to such recommendations), and

(B) any prior recommendations of the President which take effect under this section.

(k) PUBLICATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PRESIDENT.—The recommendations of the President which take effect shall be printed in the Statutes at Large in the same volume as public laws and shall be printed in the Federal Register and included in the Code of Federal Regulations.

SALARY INCREASE LIMITATIONS

SEC. 217. Except as provided in sections 213(d), 214, 215, and 222, and subject to the operation of section 216 of this title, no rate of compensation shall be increased, by reason of the enactment of this title, to an amount in excess of the salary rate now or hereafter in effect for level V of the Executive Schedule in section 5316 of title 5, United States Code.

NIGHT, STANDBY, AND IRREGULAR DUTY DIFFERENTIAL

SEC. 218. Section 5545(c)(1) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking out "not in excess of 25 percent" and inserting in lieu thereof "not less than 20 per centum or more than 30 per centum".

PAYMENT OF RETROACTIVE COMPENSATION

SEC. 219. (a) Retroactive pay, compensation, or salary shall be paid by reason of this title only in the case of an individual in the service of the United States (including service in the Armed Forces of the United States) or the municipal government of the District of Columbia on the date of enactment of this title, except that such retroactive pay, compensation, or salary shall be paid—

(1) to an officer or employee who retired, during the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period which began on or after October 1, 1967, and ending on the date of enactment of this title, for services rendered during such period, and

(2) in accordance with subchapter VIII of chapter 55 of title 5, United States Code, relating to settlement of accounts, for services rendered, during the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period which began on or after October 1, 1967, and ending on the date of enactment of this title, by an officer or employee who died during such period.

Such retroactive pay, compensation, or salary shall not be considered as basic pay for the purposes of subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, relating to civil service retirement, or any other retirement law or retirement system, in the case of any such retired or deceased officer or employee.

(b) For the purposes of this section, service in the Armed Forces of the United States, in the case of an individual relieved from training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States or discharged from hospitalization following such training and service, shall include the period provided by law for the mandatory restoration of such individual to a position in or under the Federal Government or the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

RETIREMENT COVERAGE FOR EMPLOYEES ON LEAVE WITHOUT PAY SERVING WITH LABOR ORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 220. (a) The first sentence of section 8332(k)(1) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting "or of a 'labor organization' as defined by paragraph (3) of this subsection," immediately following "section 8331(1) of this title,".

(b) An employee who, on the date of enactment of this subsection, is on approved leave without pay and is serving as a full-time officer or employee of a "labor organization" as defined by section 8332(k)(3) of title 5, United States Code, may make the election provided for by the first sentence of section 8332(k)(1) of such title, as amended by subsection (a) of this section, within sixty days after such date of enactment.

(c) For the purpose of the second sentence of section 8332(k)(1) of title 5, United States Code, the word "employee" includes—

(1) an employee who, on July 18, 1966, was on approved leave without pay and serving as a full-time officer or employee of an organization composed primarily of employees as defined by section 8331(1) of such title and who, before September 17, 1966, filed an election similar to that prescribed by section 8332(k)(1) of such title; and

(2) an employee who, on the date of en-

actment of this subsection, is on approved leave without pay and is serving as a full-time officer or employee of a "labor organization" as defined by section 8332(k)(3) of title 5, United States Code, and who, before the close of the sixty-day period prescribed by subsection (b) of this section, files an election under such subsection (b).

(d) The last sentence of section 8332(k)(1) of title 5, United States Code, is hereby repealed.

(e) The first sentence of section 8332(k)(2) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting "or of a 'labor organization' as defined by paragraph (3) of this subsection" immediately before the period at the end thereof.

(f) Section 8332(k) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) For the purposes of this subsection, 'labor organization' means any organization of any kind, or any agency or employee representation committee or plan, in which employees participate and which exists for the purpose, in whole or in part, of dealing with employers concerning grievances, labor disputes, wages, rates of pay, hours of employment, or conditions of work, and includes a national or international organization of which such labor organization is a member.".

(g) Section 8348(g) of title 5, United States Code, does not apply with respect to annuity benefits resulting from the enactment of this section.

(h) The foregoing provisions of this section shall not apply in the cases of persons retired or otherwise separated prior to the date of enactment of this section. The rights of such persons and their survivors shall continue in the same manner and to the same extent as if this section had not been enacted.

GROUP LIFE INSURANCE AND HEALTH BENEFITS COVERAGE FOR EMPLOYEES ON LEAVE WITHOUT PAY SERVING WITH LABOR ORGANIZATIONS

Sec. 221. (a) The first sentence of section 8706(e) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting "or of a 'labor organization' as defined by section 8332(k)(3) of this title," immediately following "section 8701(a) of this title,".

(b) The first sentence of section 8906(e)(2) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting "or of a 'labor organization' as defined by section 8332(k)(3) of this title," immediately following "section 8901 of this title,".

(c) An employee who, on the date of enactment of this subsection, is on approved leave without pay and is serving as a full-time officer or employee of a "labor organization" as defined by section 8332(k)(3) of title 5, United States Code, may elect, within sixty days after such date of enactment—

(1) to continue any insurance status or health benefits enrollment, or both, which he has on such date of enactment,

(2) to reacquire any insurance status or health benefits enrollment, or both, which he may have lost while on leave without pay, or

(3) to acquire an insured status or enroll in a health benefits plan, or both, if he were never previously eligible to do so, by arranging to pay currently and continuously into the Employees' Life Insurance Fund and the Employees Health Benefits Fund, as appropriate, through his employing agency, both employee and agency contributions.

The employing agency shall forward such payments to the Employees' Life Insurance Fund and the Employees Health Benefits Fund, as appropriate. If the employee does not make any of the elections set forth above, his insurance status and health benefits enrollment will continue and terminate in the same manner as for other employees in a nonpay status, or he will remain ineligible for insurance and health benefits, as the case may be, as though this subsection had not been enacted. The United States Civil Service Commission may prescribe regulations to carry out the purposes of this subsection.

Sec. 222. Section 203 of the Federal Legislative Salary Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 415) is amended as follows:

(1) in subsection (b), by striking out "28,500" and inserting in lieu thereof "$29,500";

(2) in subsection (c), by striking out "$27,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "28,750";

(3) in subsection (d), by striking out "$25,500" and inserting in lieu thereof "$27 500"; and

(4) in subsection (e), by striking out "$23,500" and inserting in lieu thereof "$25,000".

EFFECTIVE DATES

Sec. 223. (a) Except as otherwise expressly provided, this title shall take effect as follows:

(1) This section and sections 201, 207, 212, 216, 219, 220, and 221 shall become effective on the date of enactment of this title.

(2) Sections 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 208, 209, 210, 211, 213 (except subsection (d)), 214, and 217 shall become effective as of the beginning of the first pay period which began on or after October 1, 1967.

(3) Sections 213(d), 215, 218, and 222 shall become effective at the beginning of the first pay period which begins on or after the date of enactment of this title.

(b) For the purposes of determining the amount of insurance for which an individual is eligible under chapter 87 of title 5, United States Code, relating to group life insurance for Federal employees—

(1) all changes in rates of pay which result from the enactment of this title (except Postal Field Service Schedule II, Rural Carrier Schedule II, and sections 207, 212, 213(d), 215, 216, and 222) shall be held and considered to become effective as of the date of such enactment; and

(2) all changes in rates of pay which result from the enactment of section 212 of this title and which take effect retroactively from the date on which the adjustments thereof are actually ordered under such section, shall be held and considered to become effective on the date on which such adjustments are actually ordered.

Mr. DULSKI (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title II be considered as read, printed in the Record, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. UDALL

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Udall: On page 69, strike out lines 3 to 7, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"UNCONTROLLABLE OVERTIME DUTY

"Sec. 218. Section 5545(c)(2) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking out 'not in excess of 15 percent' and inserting in lieu thereof 'not less than 20 percent or more than 30 percent'."

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, this is simply a technical clerical amendment to correct an error in drafting by the staff of the committee.

The hardest-hit people among the classified employees of this country, insofar as overtime is concerned, are the FBI agents, the Border Patrol people, and some other law-enforcement types who receive no credit for regular overtime that applies to the Government bricklayers, the sheet metal workers, and others.

In drafting this amendment to give them at least 20 percent overtime instead of the present rule which gives them up to 15 percent—in many departments this is taken to mean nothing, zero and zero being not less than 15 percent—we have run into some serious difficulty. We were trying to amend paragraph 2, but by a clerical error it came out as subsection 1. The language of my amendment is identical to the language in the bill except it changes the reference to subsection 2.

I discussed this with the minority, and I do not believe there is any objection to the amendment.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say we have no objection to this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. Udall].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. UDALL

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Udall: On page 76, following line 6, add a new section to read as follows:

"Sec. — (a). Section 5542(b) of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read:

"'(b) For the purpose of this subchapter, unscheduled overtime work performed by an employee on a day when work was not scheduled for him, or for which he is required to return to his place of work, is deemed at least 2 hours in duration.'

"(b) Subchapter V of chapter 55 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting the following new section after section 5542:

"'§ 5542a. Time in travel status

"'(a) For the purpose of this subchapter and except as provided by subsections (b) and (c) of this section, time spent by an employee in a travel status away from his permanent duty station is hours of work only if—

"'(1) the time spent is within the days and hours of his regularly scheduled administrative workweek, including regularly scheduled administrative workweek, including regularly scheduled overtime work;

"'(2) the travel involves the performance of work while traveling; or

"'(3) the travel is carried out under arduous conditions.

"'(b) For the purpose of this subchapter, time spent by an employee in actual travel outside his regularly scheduled administrative workweek, including regularly scheduled overtime work, is hours of work, if—

"'(1) the employee is required to travel for a substantial distance because of an emergency arising from an event that could not be scheduled or controlled administratively; or

"'(2) in the case of an employee in a grade of the General Schedule below GS–10, or an employee in a position not subject to the General Schedule the minimum rate for which is less than the minimum rate for GS–10, he is required—

"'(A) to travel from his regular place of work at his permanent or temporary duty station to a work assignment, or travel from a work assignment to his regular place of work, and the travel does not require him to stay away from his permanent or temporary duty station overnight;

"'(B) to travel from his home to a 1-day assignment at a place away from his permanent duty station, or travel to his home from such a 1-day assignment, but not including the equivalent of the time normally spent going from home to work or work to home which, for this purpose, may be considered 1 hour;

"'(C) to travel from his lodgings at a temporary duty station to a 1-day assignment away from his temporary duty station, or travel to his lodgings after such a 1-day assignment, but not including the equivalent of the time normally spent going from lodgings to work or work to lodgings which, for this purpose, may be considered 1 hour;

"'(D) to travel from his permanent duty station to a place where he will stay overnight, but only the time spent in actual travel during the first 4 hours after his departure;

"'(E) to travel from a place where he stayed overnight to his permanent duty station, but only the time spent in actual travel during the last 4 hours before his arrival; or

"'(F) to travel, in connection with going to or returning from a place where he stays overnight, on a nonworkday during the hours that correspond to his regularly scheduled hours of work on a workday.

"'(c) For an employee in GS–10 or a higher grade of the General Schedule, or an employee in a position not subject to the General Schedule the minimum rate for which is equal to or greater than the minimum rate for GS–10, the head of an agency may consider time spent in actual travel outside the regularly scheduled administrative workweek, including regularly scheduled overtime work, as hours of work, if—

"'(1) he considers it necessary to afford equitable treatment to the employee; and

"'(2) the travel time would be hours of work for an employee under subsection (b)(2) of this section.

However, the head of the agency may determine that each hour spent in actual travel shall count as only one-half hour of work.'

"(c) The analysis of chapter 55 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting the following new item after item 5542:

"'5542a. Time in travel status.'

"(d) The amendment made by this section shall become effective 90 days after the date of enactment."

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, this also is an amendment which I believe will not be controversial.

Because of the budget situation and because of the problem of costs this year, we attempted in the committee to avoid adding any fringe benefits to the bill. By and large, we have avoided doing that. However, because classified employees receive in the first stage, for a number of reasons that have been discussed, only a 4.5-percent increase instead of 6 percent which is accorded to the postal workers, we consulted with these people to find out which fringe benefit amendment they feel is the most urgent, which would cost the least, and which would give justice to their people.

After some conference with these people and with other members of the committee, and because of the very modest cost involved, I have offered this travel pay amendment which is only a first initial step toward getting some of the classified people premium pay for duties incurred in a travel status.

There are U.S. marshals, for example, who are required to travel here on weekends to take a prisoner to Kentucky. And because of the present law they may leave home on Thursday, return on Sunday and then have to report to work on Monday. They get overtime for this but they do not get any premium pay.

This amendment picks up the fair labor standards provisions that apply in private enterprise and attempts to make a beginning to link the Government treatment of overtime and premium pay for overtime involved in the cost of travel to private enterprise standards.

I am advised that the administration has no objection to this amendment. It was worked out with them and the cost is very modest. I think the amendment should be adopted.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. OLSEN. I want to congratulate the chairman of the subcommittee on this particular amendment. It is an important first step to achieve a legislative goal of the American Federation of Government employees and that has long needed remedying. This has been an injustice to our employees under the old system and I think this is really a good step forward and I compliment the gentleman.

Mr. UDALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SCOTT. I commend the gentleman for his belated concern for the classified employees. I would hope that the gentleman will show the same concern for an amendment that I will offer as soon as I can get the floor which would give equal treatment to the classified employees such as the postal workers are afforded.

Mr. UDALL. I thank the gentleman very much. I have as much concern for the classified employees as anyone in this Chamber. The compromise bill that I drafted, after about six efforts, will give the classified employees full comparability. This is a full comparability bill. It will give them full comparability that they are not getting right now, in the next 18 months.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I am looking at the RECORD of yesterday wherein the gentleman asserted:

> I can say to my colleagues in the House that this is the best rate bill of the last, 10 or 15 or 20 years. This is the best pay bill I have been associated with during my 7 years.

Mr. UDALL. And I stand by those statements.

Mr. GROSS. I am wondering about the amendments that the gentleman is now offering—if this is such a perfect bill.

Mr. UDALL. I said that this is the best bill in the last 10 or 15 years—and it never hurts to try to make a good bill better. That is what we are trying to do and I know that I will get the help of my friend, the gentleman from Iowa, as we go along.

Mr. GROSS. In view of what the gentleman said yesterday, I am surprised today to find the gentleman offering amendments to this bill which at least on two occasions he said is well-nigh perfect.

Mr. UDALL. It is a mighty good bill, but it is not quite perfect. We are trying to perfect it and I am sure the gentleman will be in favor of amendments that are trying to make the bill perfect.

Mr. GROSS. How much money is involved in the last amendment that the gentleman has offered?

Mr. UDALL. The administration could not estimate that, but they thought it would be very modest and not add anything substantially to the cost of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Is there a report from the Bureau of the Budget with respect to this?

Mr. UDALL. No, I regret I do not have that.

Mr. GROSS. So, apparently, we are asked to adopt the amendment on faith and in the dark?

Mr. UDALL. The administration has fought tooth and nail, and they are not happy with this bill and they think it goes too far in the spending of money, but they are willing to accept an amendment to correct an injustice to a small group of Federal employees like the FAA people and others who occasionally have to travel in an overtime status, but do not get paid for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. Udall].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. Gross: On page 61, strike out line 17 and all of section 216 that follows, down through line 19 on page 68; and make the appropriate conforming changes in, and omissions of, section numbers and references.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would strike from the bill section 216, which delegates to the next President extraordinary powers over pay, expenses, and allowances of Members of Congress, Federal judges, heads and assistant heads of the executive departments and agencies, as well as other Government officials.

Section 216 provides that, beginning in 1970 and every 4 years thereafter, the President is to submit to the Congress in his budget message his recommendations regarding adjustments in the pay, expenses, and allowances of the foregoing Government officials, and these Presidential recommendations become law unless the Congress by affirmative action rejects them within 30 days.

I must emphasize that no standard is prescribed for, or required of the President in setting these salaries, expenses, and allowances. He could lower one judge's salary and raise another judge's salary. He could raise salaries of the Federal Power Commissioners and lower the salaries of the Interstate Commerce Commissioners. He could raise the salaries of some members of the Cabinet and lower the pay of other Cabinet members. He could establish any salary or, as I understand the bill, raise or lower office allowances for individual Members of Congress, based on seniority or committee assignments as his purposes might suit him.

This unwarranted delegation of power to the President amounts to an abdication of our congressional responsibilities. We might as well delegate to the President all power of appropriations, taxes, and Government policies, generally, as to give to the Chief Executive our right to establish our own salaries, expenses, and allowances.

This section of the bill assumes that future Congresses will have no courage and no integrity, and will lack the ability to judge properly the pay, expenses, and allowances of its Members.

Are we so weak and lacking in courage in this 90th Congress that we must let some future President decide our pay, and our allowances so that we become wards of the executive branch?

Have we reached the stage in our political thinking that we are ready to give the Chief Executive the power of determining the pay of every Federal judge in the Nation?

Are we prepared to grant authority and responsibilities to executive departments and agencies, including the quasi-judicial boards and commissions, after having relinquished to the President the power over the pay, expenses, and allowances of the heads and assistant heads of these Federal agencies?

I believe the answer to these questions must be an unequivocal "No."

The establishment of the so-called Quadrennial Commission under the terms of section 216 serves no useful purpose. Indeed, it would amount to an unnecessary duplication by piling commission upon commission for endless and unprofitable studies. There is a Presidential Commission report now in existence concerning pay for Federal executives in the top levels, which has not been made available to the Congress. What purpose is served by creating another commission for almost the same purpose, when the Congress does not have benefit of studies made by the Commission now in existence?

There is not one scintilla of evidence or testimony that the President desires such broad powers over salaries and expenses of Federal judges, Members of Congress, or even his own appointees in the executive branch.

Moreover, such Presidential power over the pay, expenses, and allowances of the top officials of our Government could lead to abuse and intimidation. In some future administration, judicial decisions could be influenced, executive branch policies could be altered, decisions of quasi-judicial boards or commissions could be changed and undue pressures could be brought to bear on the Congress if such powers were abused either by the Chief Executive or by his assistants who pretended to speak for him.

This section 216 should be eliminated from this legislation and I hope the Members will support this amendment.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to my friend from North Carolina.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman for offering this amendment. I am reminded that just last week here on the floor of this House, in a rather spirited debate, the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee challenged this Congress not to abrogate its constitutional responsibility and authority to the Federal Government.

I do not see how any member of this Committee can in good conscience and morality fail to support this essential amendment to this bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much for his observation and for his support.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is a crucially important amendment, which involves a lot of thought and effort on my part, and I would like to tell the House and the committee precisely what is at stake. In the first place, all these fears about a President raising the salary of one Member of the Congress and not another, and influencing judicial decisions is a lot of nonsense. He cannot do that under the Constitution. He cannot take one of a class and not another. We would veto it in a minute, if he would try to do that. The President does not have that power. This is a delegation to a commission.

Most of the opposition is from people who do not know and understand what is in this bill. We talk about delegations to the President. This is delegation to an independent commission. We hear a lot of talk about a pay raise at this time. This is not a pay raise. This involves a regular study about what a pay raise ought to be. It involves the question of whether there ought to be a regular periodic study of congressional and judicial salaries and some machinery to implement those studies.

It is argued that this is something vicious and something unprecedented and something outrageous. Let me just explain what is involved. There is nothing tricky and there is nothing devious and there is nothing hard to understand. We need a more rational system of fixing the pay in this Federal Government. I have been working on it for 4 or 5 years. We have made some progress, but this is the critical reform if we are ever to get out of the annual struggle on the pay that we are fighting today, with people and clerks lobbying in our offices.

This is a crucial reform. We will never have it unless we get this kind of machinery in the Federal Government. How will you like it if next year we will not have a pay bill? It will be the first election year I can remember when we will not have a pay bill—if this bill passes today. But this is part of that reform, to get a three-stage package, and then go beyond that next year and get some regular machinery so we will make some orderly adjustment in all Federal pay on a regular basis, instead of the jungle we have now. That is what is involved.

This is the big step we need to take to complete that action. What happens under this provision? Next year the Speaker of this House appoints two people, and the President of the Senate and the Chief Justice each appoint two, and the President appoints three. These are high-level people. It will be a nonpartisan commission, as required by the law. They will make an orderly study about what happened during the last 4 years in State pay and private enterprise and industrial pay. Then they will come up with a recommendation and submit it in January each 4 years, and it will go to the President. The President could reduce those figures but he could not increase them. It would go into effect automatically unless the Congress vetoed it—and we would veto it if it had any of the things in it which the gentleman has mentioned. This Commission might recommend a pay cut. This Commission might recommend that we restore some of the 5 percent that some of the committees are talking about cutting in congressional salaries. We may want that machinery around one of these days. This Commission could recommend an increase in the $3,000 reduction, which is inadequate, that so many of the Members talked to me about.

In the Federal Establishment and in the Congress, we have raised pay seven times since 1787, since the time of George Washington. They went for 78 years before they raised it from $6 to $8 a day, because they were afraid of what some demagog opponent might say about it. The average has been 20 years.

As to this $30,000 pay, the raise which we got 3 years ago, your pay is down now. It is not up. It is down by inflation to about $28,000.

Do the Members believe that Congress is going to vote for a pay raise this year, next year, or the year after that? The pay is going to remain in the place it is now for the next 10 or 15 years, if history is any guide. It will remain there for the judges and the executives.

This is not just a congressional pay Commission. This is a Commission for all of the top people.

If we want a strong Federal Government, if we want people doing their jobs, rather than having "hacks" and bureaucrats, about whom my friend complains, we have to compete with private enterprise. And we must have an orderly way to adjust the pay.

Even if this succeeds, there will be no pay raise for Congressmen or for anyone else in this year. There will be no pay raise next year. There could be a modest pay adjustment in 1969, 3 years from now.

Would the Members rather wait 20 years, or 15 years, and then have to swallow the kind of pay raise we had before?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. UDALL was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, are we going to have a kind of modest pay raise every 4 years, that will keep us in adjustment, the way we keep the Federal employees in adjustment?

There have been three Federal pay raises since the congressional salary adjustment. Three more increases are provided in this bill. Under the present system, there will be about nine more, before we see another one.

I should like to see this regular machinery set up.

Complaints are made here about a delegation of power. Ordinarily I object to the delegation of congressional power. That is bad. There are exceptions to every rule, and this is a case where the delegation of power is good.

If H. R. GROSS should sue me in court, and if he came to the court and it turned out that I was the judge, on my own case, people would say, "This is a conflict of interest. This is wrong."

Of the 3 million people in the Federal service, only 535 have to sit on their own pay, or be the judges on their own case. This is a case in which we need the delegation of power in the public interest. We need someone else participating in the fixing of congressional pay besides the Congressmen.

This is good political science. It is good judgment. It is good sense. It is good logic. It ought to be adopted.

This is a case in which the public is entitled to have someone else participating in these important decisions.

As I have pointed out, this is not a delegation to the President. It is a delegation to this Commission. Then it will give the President and the Congress a role to play. The final gun will always be in the hands of Congress. We can always adopt language or a statute inconsistent with what the Commission decides.

This is not unprecedented. If the Members will ask students of the Federal salary systems what is the best system of all for fixing salaries, do they know what they will say? It is the wage board system. We have had it for 100 years.

This is a delegation of congressional power to fix the salaries of Federal employees in a situation where there is no conflict of interest. What I am trying to do is to pick up this proved system and to apply it here. We have a lousy system of adjusting pay for the top people in the Federal Establishment.

This is what is ruining the State legislatures all over the country. In my State they get $600 a year. And some demagog will defeat them if they raise the salary to $700.

This is a place where we ought to share this power, where we ought to share this responsibility on a regular and periodic basis with a high-level commission.

I say that we should give this system a try. We can try it for one time, or for two times, and if it does not work it can be repealed, and we can say the system failed. The old system has failed. It has failed because in 180 years we have had seven judgments in top pay in the Federal establishment. That is wrong.

So I urge that this long-overdue reform be voted in. It does not take any particular courage. It cannot be shot at. Members can just vote their conscience on this thing. It is in the bill now. It takes this amendment to get it out. If it is passed, we will have achieved a long overdue reform.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I want to ask the gentleman from Arizona a simple question.

This delegation is not anywhere near the delegation we have given to the Wage Board, is it?

Mr. UDALL. Oh, no; 600,000 people have their pay fixed regularly in a sensible, noncontroversial fashion. They do not come in here to lobby Congress every year, with big pay fights about sheet metal workers and bricklayers. That is delegated to the Wage Board.

Mr. OLSEN. And there is an opportunity there we do not have, with the Wage Board, unless we take up a bill. We have an opportunity.

Mr. UDALL. To veto it.

Mr. OLSEN. It is not nearly as great a delegation as in the Wage Board case.

Mr. UDALL. Not at all.

Mr. OLSEN. It is very highly desirable. I have one other question.

There is not a possibility, is there, of discrimination within a class?

Mr. UDALL. No, sir. In my judgment, it would be unconstitutional, it would be arbitrary, and it would be vetoed by this House with 5 minutes of debate if any President were to try it. I will tell you what will happen if this system goes into effect. All of our Presidents are realists, and we are going to ask the Speaker and the President of the Senate and the minority leaders of both bodies to consider this. They will discuss it and will come to some conclusions on their findings before they do something outrageous that will embarrass the Members. This will work quietly and will work periodically and will take care of a situation that is pretty sick.

Mr. OLSEN. You think, of course, that the House of Representatives, the U.S. Senate, and the Supreme Court, and the President's office are going to work together, then, do you not?

Mr. UDALL. Certainly.

Mr. OLSEN. And we will call upon good, responsible citizens to work with this commission?

Mr. UDALL. Certainly.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. JOELSON. The author of this amendment was arguing that we should give the President complete discretion and authority over the spending of $5 billion only a few days ago. He is here before us now complaining about what he says is a delegation. It has been said that consistency is the hobgoblin of small minds, but I must say that the gentleman from Iowa must have a very large mind, because he is definitely inconsistent this afternoon.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOELSON. I am sorry. I do not have the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. I also cannot approve of Congress delegating to a Commission the function of determining the pay of Federal judges, Federal executives, and Congressmen; and thus give to the Commission the power of life and death over the legislative branch as well as the judiciary and executive branches of our Government. In my opinion it is contrary to the democratic philosophy of separation of powers and coequal branches of our Government. The judiciary, the executive, and the legislative branches should operate separately and certainly in the matter of expenditures of the taxpayers money; Congress itself should have the responsibility of deciding how this compensation shall be determined.

Mr. Chairman, I have voted for pay raises for Members of Congress on this floor. I went back home and withstood the attack of my opponents—and I think it was five at the time—and all five of them spoke about this and said the very first thing I did when I came to the Congress was vote myself a pay raise. I went across the State campaigning for Congressman at large, and I accepted this challenge to my voting record on that particular subject with this answer. I went back and told the people, "Yes, I voted for a pay raise for myself. The reason why, is I think I am worth it. If they do not think they are worth it, then they should not be running for Congress."

Certainly the Members of Congress should stand up and be counted on something like this. They should either vote for or against a pay raise. They have the responsibility to make this decision. All of you know that the pay of the Congressmen determines the pay of the executive and judicial branches of Government. That is a part of their responsibility in voting on their own pay raise as to whether or not they are going to raise the Federal judges and members of the executive branch of the Government. I think certainly we should not delegate this power to some Commission, three of them appointed by the President, two of them by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and two by the President of the Senate, and two by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. Any two of those can get together with the other three from the executive and thus control the Members of Congress on their pay. They can reduce as well as raise our pay. That puts us at a terrible disadvantage in trying to operate a democratic type of representative government which is representative of the people. I certainly support the gentleman from Iowa in his amendment.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to express my concern and my views on the proposed Postal Revenue and Federal Salary Act of 1967, which we are now considering.

We all recognize that the employees affected by this legislation are deserving of a pay raise. The need for this raise again reflects the serious problems we face associated with the deficit. While we all realize that the cost of living is rising faster than we can increase benefits, I want to go on record now by saying that my voting pattern in the future will be geared toward doing what is best over the long haul.

My primary reservation with the Postal Revenue and Federal Salary Act of 1967 lies with the provision in title II of the bill dealing with the President's Quadrennial Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries.

This provision, which would give the President unrequested sweeping powers over the pay and expenses of Federal officials—including his own appointees—in my judgment, jeopardizes passage of the bill. More important, however, is the violation of the time-honored doctrine of the "separation of powers."

What is to be accomplished by creating yet another Presidential commission to do precisely what the Chief Executive is already empowered to do? Namely, the President's authority and responsibility to recommend legislation which he believes will improve the operation of the Federal Government. As a result, quite frankly, I see no need or justification to burden the passage of this needed pay raise with such a doubtful provision.

While I have the floor, Mr. Chairman, permit me to say a word about comparability. I have long supported a pay equalization factor to permit Government to compete with industry for highly skilled and professional employees.

The administration has been promising comparability for a long time. In 1964, the President said that only a false economy offered salaries that attracted the mediocre but repelled the talented. Now, I agree completely with the President in this regard and I submit that it is time we, in the Congress, translate that philosophy into meaningful legislation.

Comparability is democracy in action because it embodies the principle of "equal pay for substantially equal work." While industry has benefited greatly from "incomparability," the need in Government has now become acute. Our goal, in considering this bill today, should be a fair, reasonable, and comparable salary for all who serve the American public.

Despite the many positions which I have outlined here, Mr. Chairman, there remains the underlying and overriding problem we face in attempting to deal with a deficit approaching $30 billion. It is, indeed, regrettable that the administration has gotten this country and the Congress into such an impossible fiscal situation. Their inaccurate estimates and mistaken belief that we can afford both "guns and butter," has placed us in the position of being unable to meet pressing obligations that are rightfully the responsibility of the Federal Government—obligations like giving these Federal employees their long overdue pay increase. This administration has promised too much to too many people.

This Congress has a solemn obligation to the people of this country to check inflation before it is too late, and I feel strongly that we must do everything necessary to fulfill that obligation.

My voting pattern today will be to help whoever offers the motion to recommit, to see that the postal workers and the other Government employees get their raise. The section pertaining to establishing a Presidential commission should be deleted, and by so doing put the administration on notice that they are going to have to pull back on the new, nonessential programs that we simply cannot afford while our men are making the supreme sacrifice in Vietnam.

If this approach is followed, it will be a great day for the postal and Government workers affected. If it does not prevail, all of America loses.

Keep one thing in mind, these Government workers are taxpayers too, and with their fixed incomes, they are just as anxious as we are to see that inflation is checked because it will serve no one's purpose to give them a raise today and have it eaten up by rampant inflation tomorrow.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Gross amendment. Though I have supported salary increases for Congress in past years and believe that our responsibilities and workload justify an increase, I cannot vote for a device which would achieve this result at this time.

A war is costing the lives of American boys and more than $2 billion each month. A deficit of nearly $30 billion is certain and inflation is imminent.

This is not the time for Members of this body to take an action which will result in raising their own salaries.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I came here in 1943 at a time when the salary of a Congressman was $10,000 per year. It was that way for 11 years. Then we were given $15,000—rather, it was $12,500 and we had an allowance of $2,500, which brought the total up to $15,000.

Mr. Chairman, we remained at that level—and this was right after the war, 1949—until 1955, a period of time during which we had quite a bit of inflation. In 1955 our salary was raised from $15,000 to $22,500. In 1964 we raised our salary to $30,000, after another 9 years.

Mr. Chairman, I voted for every one of those raises. I was not like some of the demagogs who fought those raises and then were the first in line to pick up their check when the raise came through. And, Mr. Chairman, I know certain people who did it. I could name names if I wanted to, but I shall not.

Mr. Chairman, this question of raising one's own wages in a public elective office is a pretty rough one. However, it was not too rough for me. I voted for it. If I thought a raise were due now and if it were brought out for the consideration of this body by the proper committee, I would vote for it again. I see nothing wrong in the principle involved in letting a bipartisan commission, a blue-ribbon-type commission or committee, look at our salaries and make the decision to recommend salary raises.

Certainly, any time we vote for a raise in our wages we are accused of conflict of interest because we have done something for ourselves.

If you believe in avoiding conflict of interest, and if you believe in reducing the question of conflict of interest and removing yourselves from that sphere of conflict of interest, what is wrong with a bipartisan, top-level commission studying this situation and bringing in its recommendations? If the recommendation is wrong, we can veto it. We still have the power to veto it. If it is wrong, the Congress can act upon it, in our good judgment. If we do not think there should be a raise, we can vote against it.

Mr. Chairman, as has been previously explained there is not only involved here the Members of Congress, but members of the judiciary and top executive positions as well.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Does the gentleman from California now make the point that by the actions of this Commission we will escape a vote on the question of raising our salaries? I cannot conceive of this Commission coming back with a recommendation for an increase in the President's budget without our having to consider a disapproval resolution which would be filed by someone and which would call for a vote thereon.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I do not seek the privilege of not voting on a salary raise. I seek the judicial evaluation as to whether we should have it or not, an evaluation to be determined by an impartial body outside of ourselves. That is what I seek. I do not mind voting upon it. I have done it heretofore. And, I shall be happy to do so again.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois has referred to the fact that this question would have to be voted upon in any event if this Commission should recommend an increase in pay. It is true that they would have to vote on a pay raise for a Member of Congress and that they will have that opportunity.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Why, of course.

Mr. UDALL. If they want to vote for it they will have an opportunity to vote for a reasonable proposal as recommended by this Commission every 4 years instead of every 20 years as has been the custom in the past. However, in voting on the question one would have something behind him, the findings of a bipartisan group making the recommendation, instead of being accused of dreaming up something for his own personal benefit.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Arizona says, this proposal does not mean that we will have to vote upon a pay raise this year, next year, or the following year, but when the time comes I shall be pleased to vote on accepting or rejecting a Commission recommendation. When I voted on congressional pay raises upon previous occasions, my opponent said, "You voted to raise your own salary." I said, "Yes, I thought I was worth it, and if my people do not think I am worth it, then they ought to elect an amateur to do the job which I have been doing."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DERWINSKI

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DERWINSKI: On page 60, line 25, immediately after the word "of" insert "the Postmaster of the House of Representatives and of".

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, if I may have the attention of the leaders on that side of the aisle, this is a simple amendment in view of the fact that the amendment that was just offered and rejected, theoretically might have worked to keep Federal high-level salaries down.

My amendment would save approximately $1,088. All my amendment says is that the Postmaster of the House of Representatives will not receive a raise in this pay bill. Why? At the present time the Postmaster of the House of Representatives receives a salary of $23,764. There is only one postmaster in the country, and that is the postmaster of Philadelphia, who draws a higher salary.

To give the Members a further idea—and our Postmaster is a fine, lovable gentleman, even with his salary—he has 85 employees under his jurisdiction. The postmaster of New York, whose salary is $2,500 less, has 39,791 employees under his jurisdiction. The postmaster of Chicago, where mail was stacked up 6 weeks late at Christmas 2 years ago, has a salary of $21,895, $1,900 less than our own dear Postmaster. He has to supervise 27,100 employees.

The postmaster of Washington, D.C., has a salary of $900 less than the House Postmaster, and he supervises 10,900 employees. I could go on and on and on.

For example, in St. Louis, the salary is $22,200, $1,500 a year less than our House Postmaster.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Is the gentleman suggesting that if we reduce the salary of this one postmaster, it is going to immediately bring happiness and glee to all of the other terribly underpaid postmasters the gentleman has been describing?

Mr. DERWINSKI. Not at all, but I was waiting for someone to offer a rebuttal so I could get to my punchline. My punchline is this: We know as Members of the legislative branch that we are subject to a great deal of unnecessary ridicule from the fourth estate. The very fact we have great concern over raising our own salaries is based primarily on ridicule from the fourth estate. Well, here is a chance to show our critics that we are a responsible body, we are not raising the salary of our own postmaster because we know he is well paid, he does not have that much volume of mail, and $23,700 is a fine salary. It is the principle that I am interested in. It is the principle of putting some restraint on runaway salaries even in the legislative branch of the Government. And most of the Members will confide privately that many staff people are drawing high salaries from us.

Over on the Senate side their administrative assistants do as well as House Members.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will stand up, I will give him his rebuttal so he can get on with his punchline in just a minute.

I have to concede that salaries around here are higher than they are in other places, and this has been a matter of some concern to me. I believe we can only justify it on the fact that these are political appointments; they live by the sword and die by the sword, and their bosses may be shot down by the irate voters every 2 years.

But the objections I would have is, why single out this man, this fine officer of the House of Representatives? Why not the Sergeant at Arms, who runs the bank here? He probably earns more than the president of a comparable small bank. How about the Clerk of the House? How about your own administrative assistant or my AA? Or how about the other people who work in the House of Representatives? If you are going to cut salaries down to a more reasonable level, let us do it in a sensible fashion and in a broad fashion instead of singling out the lovable Postmaster of the House of Representatives, saying, "You go first."

Now I yield to the gentleman from Illinois for his punchline.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I would say that the gentleman has made a very convincing argument and perhaps I ought to withdraw my amendment. I will do that if the gentleman will support my next amendment, which states that the House employees, like the Senate employees, will not receive the pay raise, but that it would only come to them by affirmative action of the individual Members. So in that way we would treat everybody in the legislative employee structure alike and a pay raise would not be automatic, but we would have to allow it to them in a positive way. That would answer all your criticism of this amendment. If you want to make that kind of a deal, I will withdraw this amendment if the gentleman will support my next amendment.

Mr. UDALL. The gentleman from Illinois is such a statesman and so sound that I always accept his amendments even before they are read. However, in this case I am unable to make the arrangement that he is suggesting.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. OLSEN. With regard to the second amendment, I think that would be completely out of order when you consider the fact that the pay increase is going to be given to everybody that we do not even know—the 2.5 million employees of the Federal Government who are going to get a pay increase. Here you are proposing in your next amendment that you would cut off the very people that you do know. I think not only is the amendment you have offered out of order, but the next one I think is ridiculous.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I would like also to say that now in addition to what I previously said, having the gentleman from Montana argue against the second amendment, therefore implies that the first amendment is proper.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KYL. I would think the gentleman from Arizona would vote for this amendment because here the House Postmaster is the only one who would have an increase in business as the result of what we do here today.

As a matter of fact, just a few days after we pass the postal rate bill and the postal pay bill, the Committee on Appropriations and the administration, I understand, is going to start closing more post offices, and limiting city deliveries and limiting rural free deliveries to 3 days a week and cutting out some deliveries so that the average postmaster will have far less work to do. I think it is important that we should give some consideration to our beloved Postmaster because he probably will be the only one to bear an additional burden.

Mr. UDALL. He is the only one in the country who has to put up with the complaints of 435 Members.

Mr. KYL. Yes, and put up with FRANK and JOHN and MORRIS.

Mr. UDALL. I think we ought to retain his salary and I ask that the amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DERWINSKI

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DERWINSKI: On page 61, immediately following line 2, insert the following:

"(h) The basic compensation of each employee on the rolls on the date of enactment of this Act whose compensation is paid from the clerk hire of a Member of the House of Representatives or the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico is hereby adjusted, effective on the first day of the first month following the date of enactment of this Act, to the lowest multiple of $5 which will provide a gross rate of compensation not less than the gross rate such employee was receiving immediately prior to such first day, except that the foregoing provision of this sentence shall not apply with respect to an employee if, on or before the tenth day following the date of enactment of this Act, the Member of Resident Commissioner by whom such employee is employed transmits to the Clerk of the House of Representatives written notice to the effect that he does not wish such provision to apply to such employee. No employee whose basic compensation is adjusted under this subsection shall receive any additional compensation under subsection (a) for any period prior to the effective date of such adjustment during which such employee was employed in the office of the Member or Resident Commissioner by whom he is employed on the first day of the month following the enactment of this Act. No additional compensation shall be paid to any person under subsection (a) for any period

> prior to the first day of the month following the date of enactment of this Act during which such person was employed in the office of a Member or Resident Commissioner (other than a Member or Resident Commissioner by whom he is employed on such day) unless on or before the fifteenth day following the date of enactment of this Act such Member or Resident Commissioner notifies the disbursing office of the Clerk of the House of Representatives in writing that he wishes such employee to receive such additional compensation for such period. If, before the expiration of the period within which such notice may be given, such Member or Resident Commissioner dies without having transmitted such notice, such notice shall be considered to have been transmitted."

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I admit to having offered the previous amendment in part to draw some support for this one. The gentleman from Arizona knows that I tend to be devious at times.

The point is that under the provisions of this bill, when the Federal pay raise is voted, the employees, in your individual offices will receive a 4½-percent raise.

Over on the Senate side that will not be so. Under the Senate procedures every Senator must notify the clerk of the Senate that he wishes to give his employees that amount of pay raise or some other amount. In other words, on this side we are less flexible in comparison to the august Members of the other body, since under our procedure, our employees get this raise automatically under the bill. It is being given to them by general legislation. On the Senate side the Senator takes the affirmative action of writing to the clerk stating that that employee should receive the raise.

The last time we processed a pay bill we momentarily adopted such a provision in our committee. Then we reversed the move and this amendment was defeated.

I believe this amendment would help every individual Member of the House to maintain proper discipline and respect in his office. Instead of taking this pay raise for granted, the individual employee will know that he received it from you, that you are appreciative of his efforts, his or her ability and loyalty, and therefore you are granting the pay raise.

I think that this amendment would be helpful to every House Member in working with his staff. It would give us the same procedures they follow in the other body.

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BRASCO. Is the gentleman suggesting that there is someone on his staff that he would like to get rid of? If so, I would then suggest that he fire the individual and not complicate the pay raise bill.

Mr. DERWINSKI. No, I am not suggesting that at all. But you may have arrangements with your employees to pay them a certain salary. Then you have to take the negative step of reducing their base under our provisions. I have an administrative assistant at home with whom I agree to provide a flat salary. Every time there is a pay raise, I reduce his base to keep that salary. Many of you may have the same problem.

My amendment would give you an opportunity to take a positive step when increasing your employees salaries.

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KAZEN. Would you not have the same effect by your vote right here and now?

Mr. DERWINSKI. No, because this is limited to House legislative employees, and merely provides that they receive the same pay raise that all classified employees will receive. We would approve it for them as opposed to it being automatic.

Mr. KAZEN. That is true, but you are actually giving them the pay raise when you vote for the bill on the floor.

Mr. DERWINSKI. You are also giving the pay raise to 3 million other civilian employees. In this way—and I reemphasize the point—under my amendment you would establish a relationship to your employees in pay allowances just as the Senate. I would think that it is just good office management to accept this amendment.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. JOELSON. I believe the amendment of the gentleman provides that if the Member should expire it will be deemed that he shall have given consent that his employees be paid the increase. I wonder if such a provision would not fan homicidal thoughts which might already be in the minds of our employees.

Mr. DERWINSKI. The gentleman has a keen sense of humor.

I am sure the gentleman knows this is proper technical language used in the other body.

Incidentally, I wish the gentleman a long life.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think there are other more burning questions before the Nation than the mechanics of how we put into effect a pay raise for the members of the congressional staffs. This old chestnut has been kicked around with every pay bill I have had anything to do with. Everyone knows what is involved. There are strong feelings on both sides. Some of my friends are for this, and some of my friends are against it, and I am for my friends.

I have tended to think we would be better off having such an amendment as proposed by the gentleman from Illinois, but in past times when this amendment has come up it has always been beaten by a fairly substantial majority.

We can do under the present system precisely what the gentleman wants to do in his amendment. What we can do, on the first payday when it goes into effect, is get the payroll and juggle the base pay. If we have a young girl who has been with us only a few weeks and does not deserve the pay raise, we can juggle it so she gets just what she did before. If we have an old faithful employee, who deserves it, we can let him have the pay raise.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask a question. I was somewhat persuaded by the gentleman from Illinois. He is devilish and persuasive. It seems to me if there is some personnel practice which is effective for us, then it ought to be effective for the Federal Government departments. I wonder if the gentleman could give us any estimate of the cost of implementing this for all of the Federal employees if we put the Federal supervisors in a position to do this?

Mr. UDALL. I do not know what it would do to the cost, but I have an idea what it would do to morale.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I would like to help my friend the distinguished gentleman from Illinois. I would not like to learn that someone in his office put poison in his Kielbasa some lunchtime, so I am going to vote against his amendment.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I want to say I do not think there is in our Government a more dedicated body of employees than those who work in the offices of the Members of this House. I would not want by adoption of this rather unique and strange amendment to infer that they are any less competent or less entitled to the automatic increase than those who work in the executive departments of our Government.

I do not want to call on their goodwill. I do not want them to feel grateful to me. All I want them to do is a good job, so that I can here in this Congress better represent my district.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say I compliment my colleague from California. When he spoke of the dedicated employees of Members of this House, he took the words right out of my mouth.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I do not know about the gentleman from Illinois. He might not have a competent staff. I happen to think I have a competent staff, and I happen to think they deserve a raise just as much as anybody in the executive branch. They work longer and harder and they are more faithful, not just to me as the Representative in Congress but also to the constituents I have.

I think any Member of Congress who has a staff that is not that good should fire them, because then they are cheating the taxpayers. I think if the gentleman from Illinois happens to have that problem, he ought to clean up his own mess, and let us, who think our staffs work effectively in the public interest, give them the raise we think they deserve as decent, hardworking, honest, effective, and faithful employees working in the public service.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I know the gentleman from Michigan to be a clever debater, but I know the gentleman knows there is not a shred of logic in what he said.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I think there is every logic in what I said.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, this has nothing to do with competency of my staff or any others. I happen to think I have the best staff on the Hill.

The point is, one is a better supervisor if he gives his staff a pay raise, rather than have it go to his staff automatically. Under my amendment, we will put ourselves on a par with the Members of the other body.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say we are poles apart here.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment and move to strike the requisite number of words.

As the gentleman from Arizona indicated, this is not a very important matter, and I hesitate to take this time. However, it seems to me that what we have heard is a series of speeches, all on the time of the gentleman from Arizona—and I do not include his remarks—which simply developed a strawman and proceeded to beat it down.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] offered a reasonable amendment. It is based simply on the thought that each employer, each Congressman in this case, be in a position to determine the amount of money the employees in his office would receive. When a pay raise passes, he then could allocate that portion they would receive, if he wished, or if his district requirements were such that the funds could be better used to add a needed secretary, he could do that instead.

As has been suggested, if a new employee should come on the staff, and a pay raise should be passed, it might not be appropriate to give that person a pay raise immediately.

To suggest that there is something wrong with the staff of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI], or that there is something wrong with the other congressional employees here on the Hill I believe was not the case. I know that the Members of the House have staff members who are hardworking. In many cases they do deserve pay increases. However, I for one believe it would be better from a procedural standpoint, for individual Members to make that decision.

I commend the gentleman from Arizona for his thoughtful comments on this. I believe they were pertinent and well said.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUMSFELD. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. I believe the gentleman has made a good point.

My other friend from Illinois, for whom I have an abundantly high regard, I wish the membership to know, may have it come perhaps as some surprise to him to be told that he has such power right now. This amendment is not necessary to accomplish the stated goal of the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Let me respond to the gentleman. The gentleman is quite correct. He has that power, but, as the gentleman from Illinois said, what he has to do is to go through a series of steps of reducing each one of his employees' pay by adjusting the base amounts downward so that the gross amount would remain the same. All he is suggesting is that it be reversed, so that positive action would not be necessary to keep salaries where they are.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUMSFELD. I am happy to yield to the ranking minority member.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the gentleman from Illinois, I am sure their staffs, and my own, would be quite competent to make out a letter to the proper authority stating that they were to receive this pay raise, and then we could sign it.

Mr. RUMSFELD. I do not understand the gentleman.

Mr. CORBETT. I was merely saying that the staff of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] would be quite capable of writing out an order saying that they were to get a 4½-percent pay raise, which would go to other people, and all he would have to do is sign it.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUMSFELD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MOSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I merely wish to observe that I do not want my staff to regard me as some beneficent Santa Claus, having a feeling of strong gratitude because I approve each and every one of their individual raises when everyone else in the Government is going to get one automatically. I believe we should give to our staffs, as we are to the staff members who work in the executive branch of the Government, the automatic increase. If there is a persuasive reason to the contrary, we have the authority already to reduce, to dismiss, or to take whatever corrective action is necessary.

Mr. RUMSFELD. The gentleman misses my point and is referring back to the author of the amendment's statement.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUMSFELD. I yield to the gentleman for Illinois.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I want to observe to the gentleman and to the chairman, as I tune my ear to the mood of the Committee it is obvious that most Members do not want me to help them with this amendment. I feel like the prophet without honor. Someday when Members come in and have a personnel problem, rather than say "I told you so," they should remember this good old amendment they turned down this afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. SCOTT

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. SCOTT: On page 36 strike out the table immediately preceding line 1 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"GENERAL SCHEDULE

"[To be effective for the period beginning on the 1st day of the 1st pay period beginning on or after October 1, 1967]

"Grade	Annual rates and steps									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
GS-1	$3,826	$3,956	$4,086	$4,216	$4,346	$4,476	$4,606	$4,736	$4,866	$4,996
GS-2	4,161	4,302	4,443	4,584	4,725	4,866	5,007	5,148	5,289	5,430
GS-3	4,526	4,679	4,832	4,985	5,138	5,291	5,444	5,597	5,750	5,903
GS-4	5,063	5,233	5,403	5,573	5,743	5,913	6,083	6,253	6,423	6,593
GS-5	5,651	5,838	6,025	6,212	6,399	6,586	6,773	6,960	7,147	7,334
GS-6	6,219	6,429	6,639	6,849	7,059	7,269	7,479	7,689	7,899	8,109
GS-7	6,838	7,064	7,290	7,516	7,742	7,968	8,194	8,420	8,646	8,872
GS-8	7,492	7,742	7,992	8,242	8,492	8,742	8,992	9,242	9,492	9,742
GS-9	8,158	8,435	8,712	8,989	9,266	9,543	9,820	10,097	10,374	10,651
GS-10	8,927	9,233	9,539	9,845	10,151	10,457	10,763	11,069	11,375	11,681
GS-11	9,775	10,109	10,443	10,777	11,111	11,445	11,779	12,113	12,447	12,781
GS-12	11,583	11,985	12,387	12,789	13,191	13,593	13,995	14,397	14,799	15,021
GS-13	13,646	14,121	14,596	15,071	15,546	16,021	16,496	16,971	17,446	17,921
GS-14	16,013	16,568	17,123	17,678	18,233	18,788	19,343	19,898	20,453	21,008
GS-15	18,603	19,247	19,891	20,535	21,179	21,823	22,467	23,111	23,755	24,399"
GS-16	21,280	21,991	22,702	23,413	24,124	24,835	25,546	26,257	26,968	--------
GS-17	24,126	24,932	25,738	26,544	27,350	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------
GS-18	27,444	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------

On page 50, strike out line 7 and all that follows down through the period in line 3 on page 52 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"§ 4107. Grades and pay scales

"(a) The per annum full-pay scale or ranges for positions provided in section 4103 of this title, other than Chief Medical Director, Deputy Chief Medical Director, and Associate Deputy Chief Medical Director, shall be as follows for the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period beginning on or after October 1, 1967:

"SECTION 4103 SCHEDULE

"Assistant Chief Medical Director, $27,444.

"Medical Director, $24,126 minimum to $27,350 maximum.

"Director of Nursing Service, $18,603 minimum to $24,399 maximum.

"Director of Chaplain Service, $18,603 minimum to $24,399 maximum.

"Chief Pharmacist, $18,603 minimum to $24,399 maximum.

"Chief Dietitian, $18,603 minimum to $24,399 maximum.

"(b) (1) The grades and per annum full-pay ranges for positions provided in paragraph (1) of section 4104 of this title shall be as follows for the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period beginning on or after October 1, 1967:

"PHYSICIAN AND DENTIST SCHEDULE

"Director grade, $21,280 minimum to $26,968 maximum.

"Executive grade, $19,854 minimum to $25,821 maximum.

"Chief grade, $18,603 minimum to $24,399 maximum.

"Senior grade, $16,013 minimum to $21,008 maximum.

"Intermediate grade, $13,646 minimum to $17,921 maximum.

"Full grade, $11,583 minimum to $15,201 maximum.

"Associate grade, $9,775 minimum to $12,781 maximum.

"NURSE SCHEDULE

"Assistant Director grade, $16,013 minimum to $21,003 maximum.

"Chief grade, $13,646 minimum to $17,921 maximum.

"Senior grade, $11,583 minimum to $15,201 maximum.

"Intermediate grade, $9,775 minimum to $12,781 maximum.

"Full grade, $8,158 minimum to $10,651 maximum.

"Associate grade, $7,134 minimum to $9,276 maximum.

"Junior grade, $6,219 minimum to $8,109 maximum.

On page 52 strike out the table immediately following line 19 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"FOREIGN SERVICE SCHEDULE

"[To be effective for the period beginning on the 1st day of the 1st pay period beginning on or after October 1, 1967]

"Foreign Service Officers	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Class 1	$25,372	$26,217	$27,444	--------	--------	--------	--------
Class 2	20,493	21,205	21,917	$22,629	$23,341	$24,053	$24,765
Class 3	16,792	17,375	17,958	18,541	19,124	19,707	20,290
Class 4	13,646	14,121	14,596	15,071	15,546	16,021	16,496
Class 5	11,239	11,629	12,019	12,409	12,799	13,189	13,579
Class 6	9,374	9,697	10,020	10,343	10,666	10,989	11,312
Class 7	7,922	8,188	8,454	8,720	8,986	9,252	9,518
Class 8	6,838	7,064	7,290	7,516	7,742	7,968	8,194"

On page 53 strike out the table immediately following line 2 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"To be effective for the period beginning on the 1st day of the 1st pay period beginning on or after Oct. 1, 1967]

"Foreign Service Staff	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Class 1	$16,792	$17,375	$17,958	$18,541	$19,124	$19,707	$20,290	$20,873	$21,456	$22,039
Class 2	13,646	14,121	14,596	15,071	15,546	16,021	16,496	16,971	17,446	17,921
Class 3	11,239	11,627	12,019	12,409	12,799	13,189	13,579	13,969	14,359	14,749
Class 4	9,374	9,697	10,020	10,343	10,666	10,989	11,312	11,635	11,958	12,281
Class 5	8,453	8,742	9,031	9,320	9,609	9,898	10,187	10,476	10,765	11,054
Class 6	7,634	7,889	8,144	8,399	8,654	8,909	9,164	9,419	9,674	9,929
Class 7	7,011	7,243	7,475	7,707	7,939	8,171	8,403	8,635	8,867	9,099
Class 8	6,205	6,415	6,625	6,835	7,045	7,255	7,465	7,675	7,885	8,095
Class 9	5,662	5,849	6,036	6,223	6,410	6,597	6,784	6,971	7,158	7,345
Class 10	5,063	5,233	5,403	5,573	5,743	5,913	6,083	6,253	6,423	6,593"

On page 59 strike out "4.5 per centum" in lines 17 and 25 and insert in lieu thereof "6 per centum effective October 1, 1967".

Mr. SCOTT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply provides that a pay raise of 6 percent effective October 1 of this year be given to all employees covered by the bill rather than the initial 6 percent for postal workers and 4½ percent for all other employees. It does not relate to the action taken in 1968 or 1969 which is covered in another portion of the bill because none of us are aware at this time of what action the House will take on these portions of the bill. Therefore, this amendment is related only at the initial phase.

What the committee bill says, in effect, is that postal workers are entitled to "more comparability" than any other group of Government employees. I find no justification for this suggestion.

In a pamphlet printed last year by the committee entitled "Salary and Retirement Amendment Increases of Federal Classified and Postal Employees, 1945–66," there is a table on page 1 indicating all of the pay raises received from July 1, 1945, to date, and it indicates that classified workers' pay has been increased by 100.2 percent. A similar table on page 2 relates to postal employees for the same period of time, and it indicates they have received increases totalling 139.4 percent. I have these tables with me if any member would like to look at them. Mr. Chairman, I am not arguing to give postal employees less but to give classified workers more. The report of the committee on this bill contains a message from the President which states on page 3 that an increase of 7.2 percent is necessary to close the comparability gap.

However, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, this 7.2-percent gap existed in March 1966. Between March 1966 and July 1967 pay for private industry increased an additional 5 percent, bringing the comparability gap not to 7.2 percent but to 12.2 percent at the beginning of this fiscal year.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope that each Member of this body wants to be fair to all Government employees and does not respond, as some of the newspapers have indicated, by giving greater increases to those employees who have the most effective lobbyists on the Hill. Now, Mr. Chairman, I do believe in economy in government and will continue to vote against many of the spending programs. There is no question but that we must have a system of priorities in Government spending. However, these are employees of our Government. They are the people we and the public deal with daily. I believe they are entitled to fair and equal treatment. The amendment was prepared by the committee staff with instructions to give identical treatment to all employees. It is the right thing to do. I urge its adoption.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendments.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard a lot of talk around here about economy and you are going to have a chance to cast an economy vote on this amendment because the amount carried under this proposed pay bill is over the President's budget as a result of the compromises which we have had to make. In other words, you are going to add $157 million more if you adopt this amendment.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me tell the members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for just a moment why this is true.

Mr. Chairman, the committee decided to give an increase of 6 percent to postal workers and an increase of 4.5 percent in this first phase to classified workers. It is important that the members of the Committee understand this. We were faced with a tremendously difficult job and problem. We were shot at by the postal unions who have a real grievance. We were under fire also by the administration which has a real budget problem. We had one serious problem with reference to the classified people who have been promised comparability for a period of at least 5 years. In other words, we were dealing with a very fragile situation or, in other words, a stool which rested upon three legs. In the first place the first leg was represented by the administration budget and the problem of the deficit with which we are confronted. We had to hold the impact of this proposal down and limit it to what could be be expended upon pay raises. As a result of this, we came down somewhere between $300 and $400 million.

Second, 220 Members of this House of Representatives have said that the postal people have a real grievance and as an indication of that grievance, 220 bills were introduced, bills designed to reclassify postal employees. We had to do something about it. We had also to do something about full comparability for the classified people. So the compromise was that this year in the first phase we will make it 1½ percent extra for the postal people, but not as an expression of favoritism for one group, but as a reclassification action as well.

Mr. Chairman, in the classified service

grade changes go on all the time. In other words, you can change a GS–9 to a GS–10 or you can change a GS–6 to a GS–7. However, you cannot reclassify a postal employee under the same guidelines as you can a classified employee. So, the postal employees are getting 6 in this phase, 5 next year, for a total of 11 percent. And, by doing that we reclassify them and give them this level 5, an action which the majority of this House has said they are entitled to.

But, next year, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Scott's classified employees will begin to get the bigger raises and they will have full comparability in 1969. I would like to give them full comparability this year, but we cannot do it. So, we propose to handle it in three phases. We see that they get to the point where eventually they will have their comparability. There is something in this proposed pay raise for everyone.

However, Mr. Chairman, we have a delicate compromise which is involved here represented, as I stated earlier, by a three-legged stool, and I hope the members of the Committee will not pull this one leg out from under me.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment ought to be defeated on those grounds and on the ground of economy.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CORBETT. If we were to increase the classified employees' rates by 1½ percent this year, it would mean that next year they would get a 1½ percent less raise?

Mr. UDALL. Precisely, under the formula.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I think, like others of the committee who have suffered under the constant accusation that there is something discriminatory in this carefully balanced bill. A bill that attempts to give equity and special attention to those who need it most. Consider for the moment the employees involved and what they would like, but remember what you are trying to do through this legislation to strengthen the postal service, and you must realize that we are in trouble. One of the places where we are in trouble, and everyone recognizes it but we have not done much about it is the glaring deficiency of postal wages in high wage areas where the postal service cannot hire and retain the kind of people we need for the ever-increasing burden which this essential service is carrying. We cannot continue to compete for his labors when the letter carrier or clerk finds himself living on a block where his earnings are so far below that of the parents of children who are the contemporaries of his children and all of the kids who go to school with his children. In other words, we are in serious and deep trouble.

We have more women carrying mailbags today than ever before because it has become a less desirable job than ever before when compared with other jobs and unfortunately women are still getting the toughest and lowest paying jobs in many parts of our country. One cannot make enough money as a letter carrier to compete with the buying power of other persons having similar jobs in private industry in that area. But more important than anything else is this: There is no discrimination with regard——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Udall was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. WIlLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. There is no discrimination with regard to comparability under this bill as it was written by our subcommittee and adopted by the full committee. Every Federal employee is to reach comparability on the same day. That is the beauty of the Udall bill. It is true that the postal employees will receive 6 percent this year, and 5 percent in July of next year, but the amount that they receive in April of 1969 will be based on comparability the same as any other class of employee. All they can receive in April of 1969 is that amount necessary to bring them to comparability. It is true that we are taking the letter carriers and the clerks and other postal employees to their first step toward comparability a little bit quicker than the other employees, but there are good and sound reasons for doing this. And on April 1, 1969, every single employee of the Federal Government will have reached comparability if the administration carries out the intent and purpose of this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLURE. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Scott].

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, in response to the comment that was made by the gentleman from Michigan, certainly I have no intention of discriminating in any way against the postal workers, but I do suggest that it is fair to give equal treatment to all employees. This amendment does not only relate to classified workers, it relates to those legislative employees which so many tears were shed about on the other side of the aisle a few minutes ago, these competent assistants of ours; it relates to the Veterans' Administration employees, and to all of the other white collar employees covered by the bill.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Arizona referred to Mr. Scott's classified employees. I would say for the benefit of this House that the staff furnished me with a list of the number of classified employees in every State of our Nation, and in every State there are at least twice as many classified employees as there are postal workers. So these are your employees as well as Mr. Scott's employees.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Brasco] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Scott amendment. Over 80 percent of the postal employees are in the first five levels of the pay scale. These employees are mostly mailhandlers, clerks, and carriers. A large proportion of these positions are held by married men with families to support on comparatively low salaries. There is little or no opportunity for them to be promoted to higher pay levels. Therefore, the greatest need at this time is for action which will give them a substantial increase to help them meet the greatly increased cost of living, and make it possible for them to come closer to supporting a decent standard of living for their families.

Employees in other services have greater opportunity for promotion and, generally, are single employees entering the service right out of school at salary levels the equivalent of those paid married postal employees with many years of service.

In the opinion of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee these facts justify the additional 1½ percent being granted postal field service employees in the first stage increase.

Bear in mind that title II of H.R. 7977 in the second- and third-stage pay increases places all employees—postal field service, Classification Act, and all other groups—on the same basis. It provides that they all receive salaries comparable to those paid by private business for the work they are performing.

I would hope that the House does not disturb this delicate balance and would vote down the Scott amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Scott].

The amendments were rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STEIGER OF WISCONSIN

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin: On page 75, immediately below line 2, insert the following:

"APPOINTMENT OF POSTMASTERS BY POSTMASTER GENERAL

"Sec. 223. Section 3311 (relating to method of appointment of postmasters) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

" '§ 3311. Method of appointment

" '(a) The Postmaster General shall appoint postmasters at post offices of the first, second, and third classes in the competitive civil service without term. He shall make the appointments in accordance with the civil service laws and rules by—

" '(1) competitive examinations; and

" '(2) promotions from within the postal service.

" '(b) The Postmaster General shall appoint postmasters at post offices of the fourth class without term.

"'(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Postmaster General shall make each appointment to a position of postmaster at a post office of any class without regard to any recommendation or statement, oral or written, with respect to any person who requests, or is under consideration for, such appointment, made by—

"'(1) any Member of the Senate or House of Representatives (including the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico); or

"'(2) any official of a partisan National, State, county, or municipal or other local political party.

"'(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a person within the purview of subparagraph (1) or (2) of subsection (c) of this section is hereby prohibited from making or transmitting to the Postmaster General, or to any other officer or employee of the Federal Government, any recommendation or statement, oral or written, with respect to any person who requests, or is under consideration for, appointment to a position of postmaster at a post office of any class. The Postmaster General and any other officer or employee of the Federal Government—

"'(1) shall not solicit, request, consider, or accept any such recommendation or statement; and

"'(2) shall return any such recommendation or statement, if written, received by him, appropriately marked as in violation of this section, to the person making or transmitting the same.

"'(e) A person who requests, or is under consideration for, appointment to a position of postmaster at a post office of any class is hereby prohibited from requesting or soliciting any such recommendation or statement from any person within the purview of subparagraph (1) or (2) of subsection (c) of this section. An applicant making such solicitation or request, knowing the same to be in violation of this subsection, is disqualified for appointment to the position of postmaster concerned.

"'(f) Each application form of the Federal Government used in connection with an application for appointment to a position of postmaster at a post office of any class shall contain appropriate language, in conspicuous and legible type in contrast by typography, layout, or color with other printing on such application form, informing the applicant of the provisions of this section.'.

"VACANCIES IN POSITIONS OF POSTMASTER

"Sec. 224. Section 3315 (relating to the filling of vacancies in positions of postmaster) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(d) The prohibitions, restrictions, and related provisions of section 3311 of this title governing the appointment of postmasters also shall apply with respect to the interim appointment, assignment, or designation of any person in accordance with subparagraphs (1) to (4), inclusive, of subsection (a) of this section.'.

"VACANCIES ON RURAL ROUTES

"Sec. 225. Section 3338 (relating to the filling of vacancies on rural routes) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(g) The prohibitions, restrictions, and related provisions of section 3311 of this title governing the appointment of postmasters also shall apply with respect to the appointment of any person to a position of rural carrier and the application and assignment of any rural carrier with respect to any rural route.'.

"SAVING PROVISION

"Sec. 226. The amendments made by sections 223, 224, and 225 of this title shall not affect the status or tenure, on the effective date of such sections of—

"(1) postmasters in office;

"(2) persons appointed, assigned, or designated in accordance with subparagraphs (1) to (4), inclusive, of section 3315(a) of title 39, United States Code; and

"(3) persons holding positions of rural carrier."

On page 75, line 4, strike out "Sec. 223." and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 227.".

On page 75, immediately following line 15, insert the following:

"(4) Sections 223, 224, 225, and 226 shall become effective on January 1, 1968."

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendment be dispensed with, and that it be printed in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona reserves a point of order on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, briefly, this amendment is designed to remove the appointment of postal officials from political patronage. The amendment is identical to legislation which has been introduced in this session by a number of Members and calls for the transfer of the authority and procedure for post office appointments to first-, second-, and third-class offices and rural mail carriers from straight political patronage to the Civil Service system.

The amendment is aimed at creating more efficiency in the Post Office Department by allowing the appointment of the best-qualified personnel at the top level of the Department.

Today we use the position of postmaster as an award for political accomplishments.

In the process of awarding appointments to political friends, we are creating in my judgment one of the most ineffecient post office operations in the world.

In our drive for efficiency, we must start at the top with those who are charged with seeing that the mail is delivered promptly. There is no reason for not filling those jobs with the most capable personnel. This is what this amendment is designed to do.

Mr. Chairman, we have talked in the course of our deliberations here yesterday and today about the quality of our employees, about trying to give them comparability, about trying to improve the efficiency and operation of our Post Office Department and about raising the rates necessary to pay for the operation. But nowhere in this legislation—unfortunately and regrettably—do we really begin to provide a method by which we can improve the operation of the Post Office Department. I think there has to be a fundamental change in the manner in which this Department is operated, and the most effective and most efficient step that can be taken is simply to stop playing politics with the Post Office Department. We can play politics here on the floor of the House of Representatives, but I do not think we can afford any longer with a post office that delivers 75 billion pieces of mail a year to play post office politics in 1967.

I trust the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. May I ask the gentleman from Wisconsin, is not this a part of the Congressional Reorganization Act?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. There is no question about it. It is part of the congressional reorganization bill.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Are there not many instances where appointments have been made and they have failed to be confirmed by the Senate year after year after year, thus creating a situation of complete instability in post offices around the country?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. I would like to point this out.

In my district I have a postmaster who was named acting postmaster in 1960 and who was reappointed in 1961, but he was not confirmed. He was again appointed in 1962 and he was acting postmaster for a time. He was again reappointed in 1963, 1964, 1965, and 1966 and again this year. But he never was confirmed. Finally, this year, he was confirmed as postmaster. I think this situation in my district points up the complete absurdity of the present system of the appointment of postmasters and of the rural carriers.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman for his support. I appreciate also the support of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Conte] and the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Rumsfeld], both of whom have been leaders in this fight to improve postal service by removing political influence.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RIEGLE. I want to associate myself with the remarks that have just been made. The gentleman's proposal here I think is a sound one and is long overdue. We have a situation right now in my district in Fenton, Mich., where we have a bad situation and where we have needed a postmaster now for months. Because the local political party there cannot solve its own in-house problems, they cannot agree on a postmaster. The result is that the postal service has suffered, postal morale has suffered, and the situation is going from bad to worse. I think this is typical of the kind of problem that occurs under conditions as they are today. We ought to take these postmasterships out of the political arena. I believe it is wrong to run the Post Office Department on the basis of political patronage.

I think the gentleman's amendment deserves bipartisan support because this is a step ahead for the people, and I support it enthusiastically.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HANNA. I would like to state to the gentleman that so far as my own experience is concerned, I have in most situations recommended appointment within the post office. But my experience in this has led me to believe that if these appointments are to be kept in politics, we ought to give that honor of naming the postmasters to the losing political party. In each instance I have found that I have made several enemies and one ingrate. I, therefore, would be in favor of that kind of change which would place this matter of appointment as a burden upon that party which fails to get sufficient votes of the people in an election.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] insist upon his point of order?

Mr. UDALL. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I do. I am reluctant to do so because I favor the gentleman's amendment. But this is a matter of great moment and not to be decided here on the floor in the Committee of the Whole but it should be decided in a more orderly fashion and heard in committee. So, Mr. Chairman, I insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Arizona state his point of order.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is not germane to the title of the bill now under consideration and is not germane to the bill itself.

The bill now under consideration deals with salaries of the classified service, the Foreign Service, and other salary systems and procedures. There is nothing here about the appointment of Federal employees.

This amendment would involve amendments to the Hatch Act, to the Civil Service Act, and to many other statutes which are not before us at this time and, therefore, I think the amendment is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I do wish to be heard on the point of order. I beg to differ with my eloquent and learned friend from Arizona. The bill H.R. 7977 purports to adjust certain postage rates, and for other purposes. Title II of the bill, in various and sundry places in that title, at pages 75 and 76 particularly, title 39 of the United States Code, which is the very title to which my amendment is directed, would be amended. Therefore, it would seem to me most appropriate that this bill is open to amendment in relation to title 39, since the bill itself is aimed at that very title.

I suggest to the Chair that the point of order is not well taken.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. I would like to support the gentleman in the well on the point of order. I join with him in the fond hope that we will be able to remove at least the accusation of politics, if not the fact, from the selection of postmasters. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that in examining his amendment, he would substitute a new political arena for the existing political arena, and rather than, as the gentleman says, getting politics out of the selection of postmasters, he would inject an entirely new behind-the-scenes and out-of-the-public-view type of politics for the present pleasant open-patronage system, which I find eminently more desirable than his proposed new political system.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. I support the gentleman in the well in his response to the point of order. I would point out to the Chairman and the members of the committee that on page 39 of the bill reference is made to the title to which the gentleman refers. The gentleman from Wisconsin has offered an amendment which would amend title 39, section 203 of the bill. I have a practically identical amendment at the desk presently. Some research has been done on this point of order. I think the point of order made by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL], should not be sustained.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. The Chair has examined the language of the amendment. The title under consideration deals solely with compensation of governmental employees. The amendment deals with the appointment of postmasters by the Postmaster General. The Chair therefore holds that it is not germane to the title under consideration and sustains the point of order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 42, strike out lines 10 to 15, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(a) There is established a basic compensation schedule for positions in the postal field service which shall be known as the Postal Field Service Schedule and for which the symbol shall be 'PFS'. Except as provided in sections 3543 and 3544 of this title, basic compensation shall be paid to all employees in accordance with such schedule."

On page 42, in the parenthetical matter immediately below line 15, strike out ", and ending immediately before the effective date of Postal Field Service Schedule II set forth below".

On page 42, immediately below the parenthetical matter following line 15, strike out "Postal Field Service Schedule I" and insert in lieu thereof "Postal Field Service Schedule".

On page 43, strike out all of Postal Field Service Schedule II immediately preceding line 1.

On page 43, strike out lines 3 to 7, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(a) There is established a basic compensation schedule which shall be known as the Rural Carrier Schedule and for which the symbol shall be 'RCS'. Compensation shall be paid to rural carriers in accordance with such schedule."

On page 43, immediately below line 7, strike out "Rural Carrier Schedule I" and insert in lieu thereof "Rural Carrier Schedule".

On page 43, in the parenthetical matter below line 7, strike out ", and ending immediately before the effective date of Rural Carrier Schedule II set forth below".

On page 43, strike out all of Rural Carrier Schedule II at the bottom of the page.

On page 45, line 14, strike out "Postal Field Service Schedule I" and insert in lieu thereof "the Postal Field Service Schedule".

On page 45, lines 24 and 25, strike out "Postal Field Service Schedule I" and insert in lieu thereof "the Postal Field Service Schedule".

On page 46, lines 6 and 7, strike out "Postal Field Service Schedule I" and insert in lieu thereof "the Postal Field Service Schedule".

On page 47, strike out lines 8 to 24, inclusive.

On page 55, strike out line 3 and all that follows down through the period in line 16 on page 57.

On page 57, line 18, strike out "Sec. 213." and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 212.".

On page 59, line 13, strike out "Sec. 214." and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 213.".

On page 61, line 5, strike out "Sec. 215." and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 214.".

On page 61, line 19, strike out "Sec. 216." and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 215.".

On page 68, line 21, strike out "Sec. 217." and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 216.".

On page 68, lines 21 and 22, strike out "213 (d), 214, 215, and 222" and insert in lieu thereof "212(d), 213, 214, and 221".

On page 69, line 4, strike out "Sec. 218." and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 217.".

On page 69, line 9, strike out "Sec. 219." and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 218.".

On page 70, line 19, strike out "Sec. 220." and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 219.".

On page 73, line 4, strike out "Sec. 221." and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 220.".

On page 74, line 18, strike out "Sec. 222." and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 221.".

On page 75, strike out line 4 and all that follows down through the period in line 6 on page 76 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 222. (a) Except as otherwise expressly provided, this title shall take effect as follows:

"(1) This section and sections 201, 207, 215, 218, 219, and 220 shall become effective on the date of enactment of this title.

"(2) Sections 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212 (except subsection (d)), 213, and 216 shall become effective as of the beginning of the first pay period which began on or after October 1, 1967.

"(3) Sections 212(d), 214, 217, and 221 shall become effective at the beginning of the first pay period which begins on or after the date of enactment of this title.

"(b) For the purposes of determining the amount of insurance for which an individual is eligible under chapter 87 of title 5, United States Code, relating to group life insurance for Federal employees all changes in rates of pay which result from the enactment of this title (except sections 207, 212(d), 214, 215, and 221) shall be held and considered to become effective as of the date of such enactment."

Mr. UDALL (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, the effect of my amendment is to strike from the committee amendment the provisions that would give postal employees a further automatic 5 percent salary increase next July 1; that would delegate authority to the President to give all other Federal employees salary increases in yet undetermined amounts on the same date; and that would give the President authority to make further unknown salary increases to all Federal employees, including postal employees, on April 1, 1969.

The provisions in the committee amendment are completely at odds to what I hope is the present mood of this House. The committee would have Congress completely abdicate its obligations and responsibilities in the field of Federal salaries and it would, in effect, be giving the President a postdated blank check to be cashed in the future in any amount. In view of what has happened here lately, we cannot afford the luxury of such irresponsibility.

It is absolutely imperative that the Congress maintain constant control over the Federal payroll, which now exceeds $20 billion a year. This is not the time to be issuing blank commitments that would add almost $3 billion to the total payroll by 1970. The times in which we live, if never before in our history, require extreme fluidity in meeting the day-to-day challenges that threaten our society. We simply must not shackle the American people with a burden that could be intolerable by the year 1970.

There is no reason whatsoever why the Congress should abdicate its authority over Federal salaries to any President. There is even less reason to mandate the President to raise salaries regardless of what conditions might be at the time—whether in 1968 or 1969.

The authority over Federal salaries must remain in Congress. Since 1962, five pay raises have been enacted for Federal employees, and if additional pay raises in 1968 and 1969 are right and proper they can be enacted at those times with full consideration not only to the welfare of the employees involved, but to the welfare of the country and the taxpayers.

There is another aspect to these so-called automatic comparability catch-up provisions that I find intriguing. Because the committee amendment intends no further upward pay adjustments until 1970 for Federal executives, the $28,000 salary for executive level V will continue to be the ceiling for all career salaries. Since the President, in effect, is being mandated to raise career salaries in two steps to achieve so-called full comparability by April of 1969, yet is limited to the ceiling of $28,000 per year, the effect is going to be to completely distort all four statutory salary systems so that a large number of employees in the upper grades will, regardless of grade or duties, be all making approximately the same salaries.

If it is intended to try to keep some pay distinctions in the levels by not giving all employees the exact percentage increases they should have to achieve so-called comparability, then I submit that the entire comparability catch-up provision is a fraud and a sham. Its only justification in the bill, according to its authors and according to the report, is to assure the employees now being shortchanged that they will definitely achieve comparability by 1969.

Mr. Chairman, there are simply too many flaws in these provisions and too many imponderables in the future for the Congress to relinquish any control over this critical area of Federal spending.

The gentleman from Texas, the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, a week ago last Friday on this floor, discussing the continuing resolution, admonished the House not to dodge its responsibilities by saying that it is incompetent to decide what funds are to be spent. He said it would be "an abdication by Congress, a downgrading of our responsibility, and the wrong approach." If my amendment is not adopted and if this complete abdication of congressional responsibility remains in the committee amendment, the majority may as well forget any further appeals on the basis of responsibility.

I urge the adoption of my amendment.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I want at this time to express my support of this attempt to bring comparability to postal employees. There is no justifiable reason for treating our letter carriers and postal clerks differently from employees in private industry.

No long statement on my part is necessary. I intend to do my speaking with my vote which will be a loud and clear "aye."

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, first of all, on the proposition of delegation of authority or control, as far as the postal field service is concerned, there is no delegation on the second phase of the postal field service raise. The table is printed on page 43. This is not delegation of any congressional power. This is what we ought to be doing. We say to the President and to the Federal employees, "We are going to have full comparability." We promised it 5 years ago, and they are going to get it after 2 years from now. We are going to put it into effect in three stages.

Any third-rate bookkeeper can take the figures from the Bureau of Labor Statistics and get the comparability adjustments in the next 2 years and put into effect the formula Congress writes into this bill. So there is no delegation of power. We are declaring a policy and telling the President and his people to get some calculating machines and carry out that policy in two stages.

This amendment is proposed in part as an economy amendment. Let me say it is not economy. It will not save money. It will cost money.

I pointed out a little while ago that if this bill is passed we are going to have something very unusual and something very delightful around here next year. That will be the first election year in my memory when there will not be a Federal pay bill before Congress. I believe that is a pretty good thing.

I had an amendment similiar to this in 1965. We ended up with a bitter and divisive fight in 1966, after that three-phase thing was stricken out by the other body and we concurred.

This is an orderly three-phase salary adjustment which will redeem the promise Congress made in 1962 that we were going to pay comparable salaries to Federal employees.

I said in my argument against another amendment a little while ago that the compromise this year was a very fragile one. Everyone got something he had to have. The thing we gave to the classified employees was full comparability in the second and third stages. We said, "You do not get as much as the postal workers in the first stage. You do not need it as badly. But you will get more in the second and third stages."

So if we take away the part of that compromise which is valuable to 1.3 million classified workers, by knocking out the second and third stages as this amendment would do, it would be a serious mistake.

I believe we have a sound pay bill. I urge the committee to support the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service in this excellent compromise we have worked out.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in vigorous opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's charge of unidentified increases in 1968–69 contained in title II are unfounded.

Title II provides that the increases in those fiscal years shall be as follows:

In 1968 one-half of the amounts by which such rates are exceeded by the rates of pay paid for the same levels of work in private enterprise.

The gentleman knows that these amounts are based upon annual studies by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, authorized and directed by the Congress for the specific purpose of determining the differences, if any, between Federal salaries and those paid in private enterprise for the same work.

In 1969 the bill directs that Federal salaries should be increased in an amount necessary to bring them up to comparability with those in private industry. This, of course, will be on the basis of Bureau of Labor Statistics as we directed.

The Congress has broken faith with the Federal employees. It promised comparability 5 years ago. In my opinion it is time we kept our promise. Even if we approve these increases to catch up with the salaries in private enterprise 7 years will have elapsed since the Congress adopted the policy. This, in my opinion, is grossly unfair to the Federal employee and the taxpayer.

Also, I would like to point out to the Members—if we do not provide for these increases now this body will be faced with pressures for pay increases each year that you can be sure will be far more costly than those provided for in this bill.

In 1962, the Congress said:

> Statutory pay systems have failed to meet the needs of today's Federal Service. Absence of an accepted standard for Federal salaries and a procedure for periodical review and adjustment coupled with rigid statutory rules of pay administration, deprive the systems of the adaptability so essential in a period of rapidly changing conditions. Major inequities exist between the Federal employee and his equals throughout the national economy.

The Federal Salary Reform Act established a basic, uniform pay policy that covers all four of the major statutory pay plans. The policy as stated in section 502 of the act is as follows:

> The Congress hereby declares that, whereas the functions of a Federal salary system are to fix salary rates for the services rendered by Federal employees so as to make possible the employment of persons well-qualified to conduct the Government's programs and to control expenditures of funds for personal services with equity to the employee and to the taxpayer, and whereas fulfillment of these functions is essential to the development and maintenance of maximum proficiency in the civilian services of Government, then, accordingly, Federal salary fixing shall be based upon the principles that—
>
> a. There shall be equal pay for substantially equal work, and pay distinctions shall be maintained in keeping with work and performance distinctions; and
>
> b. Federal salary rates shall be comparable with private enterprise salary rates for the same levels of work.
>
> Salary levels for the several Federal statutory salary systems shall be interrelated, and salary levels shall be set and henceforth adjusted in accordance with the above principles.

Annual surveys conducted by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor, furnish private enterprise salary data for occupations representative of positions in the Federal Service.

Also applicable to the four major statutory pay plans is a feature of the Salary Reform Act which permits the President to establish special salary rates to relieve recruiting or retention handicaps. Whenever the Civil Service Commission, under authority delegated by the President, finds that private enterprise salary rates are so substantially above Federal rates as to handicap significantly the Government's recruitment or retention of well-qualified persons, it may establish higher minimum rates of pay for the occupational levels and geographic areas concerned and may make corresponding increases in other rates of the range or ranges concerned. And I intend to offer an amendment to authorize this same practice in the postal service.

Since 1962 the Bureau of Labor Statistics has been making studies of positions of the same levels of work in Government and industry to determine how their salaries compare. Consistently the Bureau has found that Federal salaries lag behind those for comparable levels of work in private enterprise.

Never since 1962 has the Congress taken the action to honor the commitment made at that time to close the pay gap. It is about time we did so. H.R. 7977 honors that commitment. It provides for closing the comparability pay gap by April of 1969—7 years after Congress said that it should be done and committed itself to do so.

I urge all Members to be honorable in our commitment to Federal employees and vote for the provisions of H.R. 7977 as reported by the committee.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment because it is an outright violation of the pledge we gave to Federal employees in 1962. Yes, it is now 5 years since Congress pledged itself to achieve and maintain the goal of comparability of Federal pay rates with those in private industry. At last, after 5 years, we have a pay bill—H.R. 7977—which will realize this goal by April of 1969. Justice requires that we fulfill our moral obligation to Federal employees by passing this legislation, and that we do not permit any mistaken notion of economy to persuade us to shortchange the men and women who serve the U.S. Government so loyally and effectively, and who have done so through the years at rates of compensation considerably below wages and salaries paid by private industry for comparable work.

In 1962, Congress recognized how unfair it is that Federal civil service personnel serve their Government and their country at an economic sacrifice. And in that year, we passed Federal salary legislation which included a provision by which Congress assumed the obligation to raise Federal pay rates until Federal employees receive compensation equal to that received by people in private industry for work requiring comparable competence and responsibility.

That was in 1962, Mr. Chairman. Now, in 1967, we are in process of realizing for the first time the principle of equal pay for equal work, to which we pledged ourselves 5 years ago.

One difficulty under which we have labored during the past 5 years is that of providing ourselves with sufficiently current figures of wages and salaries in private industry.

The 1962 Federal pay bill provides for an annual survey of pay scales in private industry. Wages and salaries in private industry are then to be compared with what the Federal Government pays its civil servants for performing work requiring comparable ability. On the basis of this comparison, the President is to report to Congress every year on the lack of comparability between pay rates in private industry and in the public service, and he is to recommend whatever adjustment of Federal pay rates may be necessary to bring Federal pay into line with what business and industry are paying their people.

This should be a reliable procedure to follow as a means of achieving comparability and of maintaining comparability once achieved. But the success of this procedure is conditional upon obtaining up-to-date figures for wage and salary scales in private industry. It is a fact that pay rates in the private sector of the economy go up on an average of 3.6 percent per year. Evidently, then, a lag of even a few months in obtaining these figures as a basis of comparison with Federal pay would mean that adjustments of Federal pay rates would never suffice to attain comparability.

In his message on Federal pay this past April, President Johnson reported to us that wages and salaries in the Federal service are, on an average, 7.2 percent below those which private industry pays for work requiring comparable competence.

The comparability gap is far greater today than it was in April. In fact, it was far greater in April than the President reported it to be. The figure of 7.2 percent represented the average lack of comparability in February and March of 1966. Assuming—as it is accurate to do—that wages and salaries in private industry rise about 3.6 percent per year, the comparability gap in April of 1967 was probably closer to 10.8 percent than 7.2 percent. And if the first step of the Government pay raise goes into effect as of October 1 of this year, the average lack of comparability on the date of this first-step raise would probably be between 12 and 13 percent.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics is the agency responsible for collecting data regarding pay rates in private business and industry. Mr. John Macy, chairman of the Civil Service Commission, has reported that the Bureau of Labor Statistics is working out new techniques for collecting statistics, so that the annual comparison which the President makes will be based on figures 6 or 7 months old instead of a year old. It is urgent that the Bureau give us as up-to-date figures as possible.

Despite the lack of current data, the Post Office and Civil Service Committee has approved a pay bill which should insure that comparability will be achieved eventually. This bill does not guarantee that comparability will be maintained thereafter—maintaining comparability is a continuing duty which neither the President nor Congress must relinquish. H.R. 7977 provides that between October 1 of this year and April 1, 1969, pay rates for classified Federal workers will be raised by 17.2 percent, those of Foreign Service personnel by 21.8 percent, salaries of personnel in the medical and surgical services of the Veterans' Administration by 20.3 percent, and pay of postal workers by 12.3.

But I regret very much, Mr. Chairman, that neither the President nor the committee has seen fit to propose a more adequate pay raise this year as a longer step toward full comparability. The bill provides no more than a 4.5 percent pay raise for classified employees this year. I should think fairness dictates that the first step toward comparability be the longest. Federal workers have been waiting for years to receive what is due them. They must wait 18 months more—or longer, if the administration succeeds in delaying the third and final raise for an additional number of months. I think it is true to say with regard to Federal wages and salaries that justice delayed is justice denied. This being so, it is certainly regrettable that the pay raise to go into effect this year is so inadequate.

I keenly regret, Mr. Chairman that for the second time in 2 years the President has vetoed legislation to provide liberalized life insurance for Federal employees.

No workingman is providing adequately for his family unless he is making provision for his survivors. I think it is a sorry thing that the Federal Government does not help its workers to provide their survivors with more adequate life insurance. The provisions of the life insurance bill which the President vetoed this year would have meant a great deal to widows of Federal workers who—especially if they have minor children—must face new economic problems.

The legislation this year was carefully designed by both Houses to be noninflationary—indeed, the annual cost of this year's legislation would have been about $60 million, which is one-third less than the yearly cost of last year's bill.

While I have the floor, although unrelated to the amendment I do want to hail this bill for another provision in it that is much merited and I trust it will be retained. This year's bill would help Federal workers to provide more adequately than they can now for the security of their survivors.

In the first place, the minimum insurance for employees earning less than $7,500 a year would have been raised to $10,000. This is certainly a minimal sum to a widow entering a difficult period of replanning her life. The legislation would have raised the maximum insurance to $40,000, which is surely justifiable. I strongly supported raising coverage from 100 percent of the Federal worker's pay to 133 percent. The President called this increased coverage "an unwarranted" and "unnecessary expense." Most widows of Federal workers would take a less casual view of the matter, I believe.

The provision of the life insurance legislation which would have raised the Government's share of premium payments from 33⅓ percent to 40 percent—and the President objected to this also—this increase in the share of the premium which the Government pays would have made the Government's insurance program bear a little more resemblance to the practices of private business. The Bureau of Labor Statistics reported 2 years ago that among private corporations which have group life insurance programs, 58 percent of these corporations pay the total cost of the premium.

Both in regard to pay rates and in regard to life insurance, the United States fails to be the model employer that it ought to be.

To get back to the amendment of the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, I feel it is unfair; it is a violation of our clearly declared word and it is not in the public interest. I trust it will be overwhelmingly defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to seek an agreement on a limitation of time. Before I make a unanimous-consent request I should like to ask those Members who have amendments to offer to title II to stand.

Mr. Chairman I ask unanimous consent that all debate on title II and any further amendments to title II close at 6:15 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I do not know how long it will take for the amendment of the gentleman from Florida. Can the gentleman give us any idea?

Mr. GURNEY. There are only two more amendments to be offered; is that correct?

Mr. UDALL. I counted three over here, I believe. We should have adequate time, at 6:15.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, how many amendments are pending at the desk to title II?

The CHAIRMAN. There are six at the desk. The Chair does not know whether they will be offered.

Mr. GURNEY. May I ask the gentleman from Arizona how many he counted who wanted to offer amendments to title II?

Mr. UDALL. I thought there were three total.

To resolve this, Mr. Chairman, I amend my previous unanimous consent request. I think we could beat this time, but I ask unanimous consent that all debate on title II and all amendments thereto cease at 6:20 p.m., with the understanding that we will try to work everything in.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CORBETT

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Corbett: On page 76, following line 6, add a new section to read as follows:

"ABSORPTION OF COSTS

"Sec. 224. (a) That part of the total amount of the increases provided by this title for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, for officers, employees, offices, and positions in the executive branch of the Government which is in excess of the total amount of allowances in the budget of the United States Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, for increases in pay for civilian officers, employees, offices, and positions in the executive branch of the Federal Government shall be absorbed by the departments, agencies, establishments, and corporations in the executive branch (other than the postal field service); and no amount beyond the additional sum for such compensation increases proposed in the budget for the fiscal year 1968 is authorized to be appropriated by any provision of this Act. The total amount of such absorption shall be allocated by the Bureau of the Budget among such departments, agencies, establishments, and corporations (other than the postal field service) in such manner and to such extent as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget deems appropriate in the light of their essential functions.

"(b) Pursuant to the objective of this section, heads of the executive branch activities concerned are directed to review with meticulous care such vacancy resulting from voluntary resignation, retirement, or death and to determine whether the duties of the position can be reassigned to other employees or whether the position can be abolished without seriously affecting the execution of essential functions.

"(c) Nothing contained in subsection (a) of this section shall be held or considered to require (1) the separation from the service of any individual by reduction in force or other personnel action or (2) the placing of any individual in a leave-without-pay status."

Mr. UDALL (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with and that it be printed in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, the amendment requires each department and agency of the executive branch, with the exception of the postal field service, to absorb the full cost of the pay raises provided in the bill for fiscal 1968 that are in excess of the amounts contained in the fiscal 1968 budget.

In his budget for fiscal 1968, the President included the sum of $1 billion for both civilian and military pay raises. The pay raise bill submitted by the President himself for civilian employees would have cost $547.3 million for fiscal 1968. The pay raises provided for in title II for the executive branch will cost $625 million in fiscal 1968.

Accordingly, the amendment will require absorption of costs that exceed the President's recommendations of $547 million, or approximately $78 million.

Under the amendment, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget will have the authority to allocate among the executive agencies, with the exception of the postal field service, the cost absorptions in such manner and to such extent as he deems appropriate in the light of their essential functions.

The amendment specifically provides that no employee shall be separated or placed in a leave-without-pay status by reason of the cost absorption.

Mr. Chairman, I say to you that this particular amendment can easily be accomplished by absorption and will have the net result of having this pay raise occur without increasing the deficit.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I am happy to yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, we are ready to accept the amendment on this side and we have no objection to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Corbett].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Machen].

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MACHEN

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MACHEN: On page 36, strike out all of the General Schedule immediately preceding line 1 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"GENERAL SCHEDULE

"Grade	Annual rates and steps									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
GS-1	$3,790	$3,918	$4,046	$4,174	$4,302	$4,430	$4,558	$4,686	$4,814	$4,942
GS-2	4,121	4,261	4,401	4,541	4,681	4,821	4,961	5,101	5,241	5,381
GS-3	4,484	4,635	4,786	4,937	5,088	5,239	5,390	5,541	5,692	5,843
GS-4	5,015	5,183	5,351	5,519	5,687	5,855	6,023	6,191	6,359	6,527
GS-5	5,598	5,783	5,968	6,153	6,338	6,523	6,708	6,893	7,078	7,263
GS-6	6,160	6,368	6,576	6,784	6,992	7,200	7,408	7,616	7,824	8,032
GS-7	6,774	6,998	7,222	7,446	7,670	7,894	8,118	8,342	8,566	8,790
GS-8	7,421	7,668	7,915	8,162	8,409	8,656	8,903	9,150	9,397	9,644
GS-9	8,081	8,355	8,629	8,903	9,177	9,451	9,725	9,999	10,273	10,547
GS-10	8,842	9,145	9,448	9,751	10,054	10,357	10,660	10,963	11,266	11,569
GS-11	9,682	10,013	10,344	10,675	11,006	11,337	11,668	11,999	12,330	12,661
GS-12	11,474	11,872	12,270	12,668	13,066	13,464	13,862	14,260	14,658	15,056
GS-13	13,521	13,991	14,461	14,931	15,401	15,871	16,341	16,811	17,281	17,751
GS-14	15,863	16,412	16,961	17,510	18,059	18,608	19,157	19,706	20,255	20,804
GS-15	18,431	19,068	19,705	20,342	20,979	21,616	22,253	22,890	23,527	24,164
GS-16	21,080	21,784	22,488	23,192	23,896	24,600	25,304	26,008	26,712	--------
GS-17	23,898	24,696	25,494	26,292	27,090	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------
GS-18	27,185	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------"

Mr. UDALL (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD.

The **CHAIRMAN.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona.

There was no objection.

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to propose an amendment to section 202(a) of H.R. 7977 to substitute a 5-percent pay increase for Federal classified workers instead of the 4.5-percent increase now provided for in the bill.

I do not believe I need go into a detailed explanation of why this additional one-half percent is necessary. In view of the wealth of information available on what pay increase is needed to bring Federal classified employee salaries to the point where they are comparable to those paid in private industry, I believe it is obvious that while a 5-percent increase is not nearly enough, it is certainly better than 4.5 percent.

In his message last April, President Johnson indicated that, based on a survey conducted by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor, a 4.5-percent raise for all Federal employees was in order. The report the President referred to was dated February-March 1966. It has now been over 18 months since material for that report was gathered. During that time wages paid by private industry have again increased. Therefore, I believe that the 5-percent raise I propose for Federal classified workers, coupled with the 6-percent postal workers' raise provided for in the bill we are now considering, represent the bare minimum we can, in good conscience, offer our Federal civil servants.

Through the years, this Nation has built up a corps of public servants whose ability and dedication is unequaled. Our career employees are well trained and experienced. They are, in more and more instances, skilled professionals. They include not only administrators and managers but doctors, lawyers, diplomats, and a broad spectrum of others who are critically needed now more than at any other time in the Nation's history to continue to provide the topflight services which taxpayers rightfully demand.

Very few of these men and women come to the Federal service by chance. They come because they see the challenge of the many varied and far-reaching problems which the Nation faces today on the domestic as well as the international scene. They come because the Federal service offers them a chance to take a hand in building a greater America through creative federalism.

The principle that Federal employees should receive salaries at least equal to those of employees in the private sector of the economy doing similar work has been with us for some time. The Federal Pay Reform Act of 1962 extended to these employees the promise that pay comparability would at last be reached. This, as we all know too well, was 5 long years ago.

Year after year the annual survey of the Bureau of Labor Statistics has shown plainly that salaries of like positions in private enterprise were above those paid in the Federal service. Year after year, our employees have been told that this was not the year to take up all the slack, that this was not the year to pay the debt which in effect, the Federal Government owed them.

Each time the Federal pay raise question is considered, our employees have hoped that perhaps at last the 1962 pledge of pay comparability would be redeemed. However, it is only human nature to grow weary of yesterday's guarantees which have become only today's assurances of a better tomorrow. Federal employees are now becoming impatient, as I am becoming impatient, and I believe they have every right to feel that their employer has, in a sense, let them down.

Last year, and the year before, we were forced to accept token raises for Government employees because of the threat of a veto. I had hoped that this year pay comparability would at last be reached and I introduced a bill early in this session which would have reached this end.

However, the bill we are considering today represents a compromise between the President's initial request of 4.5 percent and pay comparability by October 1969, and what many of us strongly believe is needed.

Therefore, the amendment I propose today represents a greater step toward comparability but one that is economically feasible. In view of our longstanding pledge to meet the goal of full comparability, I urge my colleagues to accept my amendment for a 5-percent Federal classified pay raise.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MACHEN].

The amendment was rejected.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GURNEY].

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GURNEY

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GURNEY: On page 76, following line 6, add a new section as follows:

"SEC. ——. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title, officers and employees of the Office of Economic Opportunity shall not receive any increase in basic salary by reason of the enactment of this Act, and such officers and employees shall continue to receive compensation at the same rate of compensation in effect on the day immediately before the effective date of the salary increases provided by section 202."

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, what this amendment would accomplish is simply this: It would provide that there would be no pay raise in this bill, which we are considering in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, for officers and employees of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. GURNEY. Not at this point.

Mr. Chairman, this is a somewhat unusual amendment singling out a particular agency of the Government for no salary raise, but I believe unusual problems call for unusual treatment.

I believe it is fair to say there has never been a more unusual agency in the history of the Federal Government than the Office of Economic Opportunity. Everyone in the House knows of the extraordinary pay situation in the ranks of the poverty warriors. Paraphrasing what Winston Churchill once said, "Never have so few Federal employees received so much pay."

As a matter of fact, there are 25 on the payroll of the Office of Economic Opportunity who receive more basic pay than that of General Westmoreland, who commands half a million troops in South Vietnam. These fellows here command only a few thousand.

Let us compare their pay, for example, with the Office of Education, which is a fair comparison, I believe.

In the highest top salary there are 12 in the Office of Economic Opportunity who receive a salary of $25,382. There are only three in the Office of Education. There are six in the poverty war ranks who receive over $25,382. There is only one in the Office of Education.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. GURNEY. Not until I finish my statement.

There are five in the Office of Economic Opportunity who get more pay than the Commissioner of Education.

For example, in the Office of Economic Opportunity last year they had 2½ times the number of permanent employees that the Office of Education has, although the Office of Education has almost twice as much money that it spends.

Here is a figure that the House ought to listen to carefully. Last year $4 out of every $100 appropriated to the Office of Economic Opportunity went for salaries. In the Office of Education only 70 cents out of every $100 went for salaries.

Take a look at the ratio of supergrades in the poverty workers' headquarters. There is one supergrade person, that is GS–16 to GS–18, to every 43 in grades 1 to 15. Now, in NASA, which is filled with engineers, topflight technical people, there is only one supergrade person for 105 of the other grades.

Over in the Justice Department—and there are many who are lawyers in the House of Representatives here—there is a ratio of one in the Justice Department to 148, as opposed to one to 43 in the Office of Economic Opportunity.

I could go on down through and give you similar examples.

Let us talk, for example, about one of the Job Corps camps, this came out in the testimony in last year's bill, where we had 208 staff personnel at Camp Gary Men's Job Center making $9,000 a year or more, and that meant at that figure that many of those 208 personnel had their salaries doubled over what they were receiving before.

Mr. Chairman, we have a problem in education——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly want to compliment the gentleman from Florida for offering this amendment. As I am sure the gentleman knows, I offered a supergrade amendment at the last session which passed in the House and was taken out in the Senate. I certainly hope that through his method we can accomplish the same purpose.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to make two more points: One point in the area of education. All over the country today we are having a problem with teachers' salaries. We have them in my own State of Florida. We have had them in New York City, we had them in Detroit, and I believe the reason why we do have these problems is because so many other people are being paid more money than are teachers.

In this same Camp Gary down in Texas, for example, 154 of the 208 staff people were former teachers who were teaching school before the Job Corps people bought them off with more money. Is there any wonder why we have problems in education?

Mr. Chairman, there is one other point I would like to make, and it is a very important point:

I suppose that when the opposition will come to this amendment the argument will be made that we ought to wait on this matter and not handle it until the poverty war bill comes on the floor.

Let me remind the Members of the House of Representatives that the scuttlebutt going around in the halls and on the floor even today is that we may never see the poverty war bill this year at all. You know that is a possibility as well as I do. So I say to you, if you want a chance to vote on poverty war salaries, here is the chance right now. I think it will be a very popular decision with the people back home.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. I want to compliment the gentleman in the well who has just submitted this amendment.

I think that time has proved, if public reaction is any guide, that the purse-string approach to this war on poverty which benefits the warriors and not the poverty stricken, and an approach which eliminates the supergrades in a program which costs $7,700 per Job Corps employee, to say nothing of the bad situations that have been found and discovered in many of the OEO installations; as I say, the time for that purse-string kind of approach is here.

This amendment is now apparently the only way that it can be done. I would say that in the sad event that the poverty war bill does get on the floor at some future date in this session, the only thing that would be better than limiting the automatic pay raise to those people who are poverty warriors and thus separate them from those who would be helped by general legislation, would be to eliminate the entire bill.

I think the public is demanding this. I compliment the gentleman from Florida on his amendment and appreciate the gentleman from Ohio yielding to me.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. OLSEN. I want to say that we should defeat this amendment because obviously the amendment is talking about cheaper pay for people instead of giving them comparability. The whole issue on the floor here is to try to get comparability for people. We do not want to reduce teachers or reduce anybody—we want comparability.

Our friend, the gentleman from Arizona, has worked hard on this problem and I think we ought to support him and defeat the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] has expired.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman that time has been limited by unanimous consent, and the gentleman's name is not on the list of Members who sought to be recognized at that time.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GURNEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. UDALL), there were—ayes 86, noes 68.

So the amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WILLIAM D. FORD

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD: On page 49, following line 25, add subsections (c), (d), and (e) to section 207, to read as follows:

"(c) Section 5303 (a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately before the semicolon at the end of subparagraph (2) thereof ', except positions in the postal field service which are unique to the service'.

"(d) That part of the text of chapter 45 of title 39, United States Code, under the heading 'Salary Steps and Promotions' is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"'§ 3516. Higher minimum rates; Presidential authority

"'(a) When the President finds that the pay rates in private enterprise for one or more occupations in one or more areas or locations are so substantially above the rates of basic compensation of those positions in the postal field service which are unique to that service as to handicap significantly the Government's recruitment or retention of well-qualified employees for such positions, he shall establish for such positions in the areas or locations higher minimum rates of basic compensation for one or more levels and shall make corresponding increases in other step rates of the pay range for each such level.

"'(b) Within the limitations of subsection (a) of this section, rates of basic compensation established under that subsection may be revised from time to time by the President.

"'(c) An increase in rate of basic compensation established under this section is not an equivalent increase in compensation within the meaning of section 3552 of this title.

"'(d) The rate of basic compensation established under this section and received by an individual immediately before a statutory increase, which becomes effective prior to, on, or after the date of enactment of the statute, in the compensation of employees in the postal field service, shall be initially adjusted, effective on the effective date of the statutory increase, under conversion rules prescribed by the President.

"'(e) All actions, revisions, and adjustments under this section have the force and effect of statute.

"'(f) The President may authorize the Postmaster General to exercise the authority conferred on the President by this section.'

"(e) The table of contents of chapter 45 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by inserting—

"'3561. Higher minimum rates; Presidential authority.'

immediately below—

"'3560. Salary protection.'."

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with and that it be printed in the Record. I will try to explain it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Compensation worked very carefully over a provision that would have streamlined, in my opinion, our policies with regard to the setting of pay in the postal service, by providing a means whereby the very special problems encountered in the recruitment and retention of personnel in our post offices in the relatively high-wage areas of the country are encountered. This language was stricken in the full committee on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa. I am sure it will be opposed here for the same reasons set forth at that time.

During the hearings, which were long and very exhaustive, we learned that nowhere in the country is the postal service in more trouble than in the high-wage areas that are in and around our major cities in this country. We have reports that show comparison of the wages which are being paid in the areas in which the postal workers are employed. We have examples of employees leaving the post office with 10 years of seniority because they can start work in a factory adjoining or in the near vicinity of the post office in which they have been employed at better wages than they were receiving after more than 10 years in the post office.

The amendment will not raise anyone's pay at this particular time. I wish that it did. But it does not. What it does do is to make it incumbent upon the executive branch to make a determination as to where in this country the postal pay is far out of line with wages for comparable occupations in that area and it is not possible for the postal service to recruit and retain the people that we need.

There are two points of view involved in this entire legislation. One is the point of view of management. As Members of Congress we have to occupy, temporarily at least, the position of management in considering this legislation. I would like to address myself to you first as representatives of management. As representatives of management you ought to be for this amendment, because it will place in the hands of the executive branch and, as a matter of fact, it will mandate the executive branch to raise wage levels in those particular step levels where it will do the most good to that level that is needed to recruit and keep people.

Mr. Derwinski mentioned a little while ago that a post office in Chicago almost shut down last winter. It would not surprise us greatly if some of the big-city post offices did break down at Christmastime this year, for the conditions are no better this year than last year, and the very small pay raise we are giving the postal workers through this legislation will not solve the problem.

I submit that comparability is only comparability if the man is making the same wages as his neighbor who has comparable duties on his job. This is a sound management principle applied in private industry, and I think it is sound for the postal service.

However, as Congressmen you must also represent the employees of the Federal Government. The plain facts, as I stated them from this floor a few moments ago, should convince any fair-minded person that the gross deficiency of postal wages, particularly for clerks and carriers, when compared with private industry in our high-wage industrial areas, is little short of criminal. We cannot talk comparability and have it mean anything unless we begin comparing wages in the immediate area.

My amendment will permit pay increases in areas such as I represent in Wayne County, Mich., over and above the raises provided in this bill—this could really mean "comparability."

SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. UDALL

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. Udall for the amendment offered by Mr. William D. Ford: On page 49, following line 25, add subsections (c), (d), and (e) to section 207, to read as follows:

"(c) Section 5303(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately before the semicolon at the end of subparagraph (2) thereof ', except positions in the postal field service which are unique to the service'.

"(d) That part of the text of chapter 45 of title 39, United States Code, under the heading 'SALARY STEPS AND PROMOTIONS' is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"'§ 3561. Higher minimum rates; Presidential authority

"'(a) When the President finds that the pay rates in private enterprise for one or more occupations in one or more areas or locations are so substantially above the rates of basic compensation of those positions in the postal field service which are unique to that service as to handicap significantly the Government's recruitment or retention of well-qualified employees for such positions, he may establish for such positions in the areas or locations higher minimum rates of basic compensation for one or more levels and may make corresponding increases in other step rates of the pay range for each such level. A minimum rate so established may not exceed the maximum rate prescribed by statute for the level. Increases above the maximum rate may be made only to the extent that the minimum rate is increased to an amount greater than the fourth step of the level. For the purposes of this section, the word "level" includes occupational groups and subdivisions of levels and occupational groups.

"'(b) Within the limitations of subsection (a) of this section, rates of basic compensation established under that subsection may be revised from time to time by the President.

"'(c) An increase in rate of basic compensation established under this section is not an equivalent increase in compensation within the meaning of section 3552 of this title.

"'(d) The rate of basic compensation established under this section and received by an individual immediately before a statutory increase, which becomes effective prior to, on, or after the date of enactment of the statute, in the compensation of employees in the postal field service, shall be initially adjusted, effective on the effective date of the statutory increase, under conversion rules prescribed by the President.

"'(e) All actions, revisions, and adjustments under this section have the force and effect of statute.

"'(f) The President may authorize the Postmaster General to exercise the authority conferred on the President by this section.'.

"(e) The table of contents of chapter 45 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by inserting—

"'3561. Higher minimum rates; Presidential authority.'

immediately below—

"'3560. Salary protection.'."

Mr. UDALL (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the substitute amendment be dispensed with and that it be printed in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I would like to hear the amendment. I object.

The Clerk resumed reading the substitute amendment.

Mr. CORBETT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the substitute amendment be considered as read and printed in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. Udall].

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 7977. I think this is an excellent bill. The committees and subcommittees that worked so diligently and so devotedly have a right to be proud of their product. This measure provides changes that are necessary and overdue. This bill would adjust postage rates to the level recommended by the Postmaster General on the basis of his comprehensive review of the entire postal rate structure.

Yesterday there was a great deal of discussion on the merits of this postal rate change. I will not now repeat them. Let it suffice to say that I agree wholeheartedly with the statements made by the distinguished chairman of the committee and the distinguished chairmen of the subcommittees.

There are certain points with regard to pay raises that I would like to make because I think they are extremely important, and because this pay raise is necessary for the maintenance of a high caliber of Government service.

I think some points should be emphasized. The first is that post office employees on the lower levels are shamefully underpaid. As the distinguished gentleman from Georgia remarked yesterday, it takes a clerk or a carrier about 20 years to make $7,200 a year. Twenty years seems to be a long time in one job to reach a satisfactory salary—it is almost half a working life.

This is a situation that must be remedied, and I hope we do so today.

Every family in this great Nation is entitled to a decent standard of living providing more than just the basic necessities. We must provide the opportunity for every family to have a saving wage, enough money for the requirements of life, and for those things such as advanced education, vacations, and leisure time, that are increasingly becoming regarded as essentials of the humane and human life.

I would also like to mention one other thing about pay raises. In 1962 we made a promise of comparability to Federal employees. This was a practical measure and not a charitable one. We, in this body, realized that if we wanted to attract and hold the qualified people necessary for the efficient and important work of the Government, we had to pay salaries comparable to that paid by State and local governments, and by private industry.

Gentlemen, that was 5 years ago and we still have not provided comparable salaries. The Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962 has not been followed up. I think we need to improve upon this situation. The caliber of Government programs is only as good as the people who carry them out. We must be able to attract and retain highly trained and qualified people to work in the Government. A salary increase is one way of doing this.

Even this measure before us today would not provide full comparability until 1969, but gentlemen we must begin now.

I am strongly in favor of this measure and hope it will pass today with a great deal of support. Federal employees must have reasons to stay with the Government, and there must be forms of encouragement for prospective employees. I do not think we have time to be stationary and thus atrophy.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, because of the time limitation and because there are some Members who are opposed to this amendment, I am going to say just a few words to explain my substitute and then I will yield whatever time I have so others can be heard.

This substitute I have offered takes us back to the subcommittee bill in this respect. This gives the Postmaster General the authority in high-wage areas, where the Government cannot hire postal people, to hire them, instead of at the first step, at any place up to the maximum step. This will give us a tool so we can meet the problem in the big cities where there is a problem in the post offices, where they have to compete for employees.

The substitute does not require the Postmaster General to do this. It says he may do it. The objection to the Ford amendment is that it says the Postmaster General must do it.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support for the substitute amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, was this amendment not defeated in the committee?

Mr. UDALL. It was indeed.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I made the motion to delete it in committee. And it is a further delegation of power on the part of Congress.

Mr. UDALL. No. This simply says the Postmaster General is the recipient of that delegated power.

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to state I am decidedly opposed to the amendment. I think we are calling for higher wages in accordance with a wage scale based on studies all over the country. If the wage scale is not presently high enough, it should be raised for all, all over the country. I cannot believe we should call for raises for a few selected post offices, while we let the rest of the country go short. In the committee it was pointed out that wages are higher in certain cities. That is true, but the cost of living is not higher in Detroit than it is in Houghton, Mich. To give one group a higher increase would be depriving other employees of fair treatment.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DERWINSKI TO THE SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. UDALL

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DERWINSKI to the substitute amendment offered by Mr. UDALL: On page 76, immediately following line 6, add a new section as follows:

"SEC. 224(a) The President shall direct such agency as he considers appropriate to prepare and submit to him on or before July 1, 1968, revisions of the General Schedule and Postal Field Service Schedule for each metropolitan area, as may be determined by him, reflecting in each case the cost of living and the prevailing wage rates in such metropolitan area.

"(b) Such pay schedules as prepared in accordance with subsection (a) shall be submitted by the President to the Congress not later than September 1, 1968."

Mr. DERWINSKI (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my substitute amendment be considered as read, and I will expiain it in 30 seconds.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] in support of his amendment.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. CONTE yielded his time to Mr. DERWINSKI.)

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my offering this amendment is merely to dramatize two things.

First, we have run out of time at a time when we have a very vital amendment under consideration.

The way to resolve this question is to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD]. I believe that will clarify the situation.

Here are the facts of life. In any major metropolitan area the post office cannot get enough qualified clerks and carriers. The wage scale is not competitive enough. However, out in Tombstone, Ariz., for example the postmaster is one of the better paid men in town.

It is impractical not to give the Postmaster General some tool to meet the competitive situation in our large metropolitan areas.

I believe the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD] has a very practical and logical amendment. His amendment should be supported.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding, even though I am in opposition to his position.

What we are doing is creating different wage levels in different parts of the country. The job a man does is worth so many dollars, regardless of whether it is performed in a small town or a large town. Those Members who support the minimum wage level certainly should not support legislation which is going to create a favored class in certain areas and provide that in certain areas certain people will receive more money for doing the same job other people do in different areas.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The substitute amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Iowa: After the period at the end of line 2, on page 75, insert a new provision limiting salary payments as follows:

"For the purposes of this Act—

"(1) 'Department' means each department, agency, establishment, or other organization unit in or under the legislative, executive, or judicial branch of the Government of the United States or of the municipal government of the District of Columbia, including a

Government-owned or controlled corporation.

"(2) 'Public official' means any officer or employee of the Government of the United States or of the municipal government of the District of Columbia, whether elected or appointed, in whom is vested the authority by law, rule, or regulation, or to whom such authority has been delegated, to appoint, promote, or discharge persons in connection with employment with any such government or to recommend persons for appointment or promotion.

"(3) 'Relative' means any person who is related to a public official as father, mother, son, daughter, brother, sister, uncle, aunt, first cousin, wife, niece, nephew, father-in-law, mother-in-law, brother-in-law, sister-in-law, stepfather, stepmother, stepson, stepdaughter, stepbrother, or stepsister.

"Sec. 2. (a) A public official shall not appoint, employ, or recommend for appointment, employment, promotion, or advancement to a position in the department in which he is serving or over which he exercises jurisdiction or control any person who is a relative of such official.

"(b) Any relative appointed, employed, promoted, or advanced in violation of this section shall not be entitled to compensation, and no money shall be paid from the Treasury of the United States as compensation to any relative so appointed, employed, promoted, or advanced."

Mr. SMITH of Iowa (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendment be dispensed with and that it be printed in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is identical with my bill, H.R. 1315, which is a bill dealing with the hiring of relatives. This is the same bill which has been introduced for the past 6 years.

I believe the best way to deal with this problem is to deal with all branches of service at the same time, instead of trying to do it through an ethics bill where we would deal with only one branch.

I believe the primary place one will find the kind of violations which we should deal with, is in the smaller post offices. Many postmasters in smaller offices will not take a permanent clerk unless their wife is on the eligible list. They have ways to maneuver to hire their relatives on a temporary basis periodically until the list permits them to do what they want.

I have discussed this with some members of the committee, and I believe at least some are favorable.

This is bad for morale where it is practiced. Many of these relatives, including some on congressional payrolls may do a good job, but the overall interest of the Government is against the practice and those good employees can get a job in some office on their merits rather than using relationship as a leverage.

This bill applies prospectively unless an employee is reappointed or promoted, otherwise it would not be practical.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. This does not apply to people now on the payroll, but it would prevent the hiring of additional people?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. It would apply prospectively.

Mr. UDALL. This is the kind of antinepotism statute many States have?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. That is correct.

Mr. UDALL. I wish to say that personally my own State has a provision. I favor this kind of amendment. I know many people in the House do not favor this sort of thing.

I wish to say, for myself, I believe this is a good amendment.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, for the information of the House, I believe the gentleman will agree that the Subcommittee on Manpower of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, of which I have the honor to be the chairman, has agreed to hold hearings on the gentleman's bill as soon as we can reach the legislation.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. That is correct. I know the committee has been so busy it has not been able to reach it this year, but this bill has been around for 6 years.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Smith].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Smith of Iowa) there were—ayes 49, noes 33.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Chairman. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE III—PROHIBITION OF PANDERING ADVERTISEMENTS

Sec. 301. (a) Chapter 51 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end of such chapter the following new section:

"§ 4009. Prohibition of pandering advertisements in the mails

"(a) Whoever for himself, or by his agents or assigns, mails or causes to be mailed any pandering advertisement which offers for sale matter which the advertisement represents as erotically arousing or sexually provocative shall be subject to an order of the Postmaster General to refrain from further mailings of such pandering advertisements to designated addresses thereof.

"(b) Upon receipt of notice from an addressee that he has received mail matter, determined by the Postmaster General to be of the character of a pandering advertisement, the Postmaster General shall issue an order, if requested by the addressee, to the sender thereof, directing the sender and his agents or assigns to refrain from further mailings of such matter to the named addressees.

"(c) The order of the Postmaster General shall expressly prohibit the sender and his agents or assigns from making any further mailings of pandering advertisements to the designated addressees, effective on the thirtieth calendar day after receipt of the order. The order of the Postmaster General shall also direct the sender and his agents or assigns to delete immediately the names of the designated addressees from all mailing lists owned or controlled by the sender or his agents or assigns and, further, shall prohibit the sender and his agents or assigns from the sale, rental, exchange, or other transaction involving mailing lists bearing the names of the designated addressees.

"(d) Whenever the Postmaster General believes that the sender or anyone acting on his behalf has violated or is violating the order given under this section, he shall serve upon the sender, by registered or certified mail, a complaint stating the reasons for his belief and request that any response thereto be filed in writing with the Postmaster General within fifteen days after the date of such service. If the Postmaster General, after appropriate hearing if requested by the sender, and without a hearing if such a hearing is not requested, thereafter determines that the order given has been or is being violated, he is authorized to request the Attorney General to make application, and the Attorney General is authorized to make application, to a district court of the United States for an order directing compliance with such notice.

"(e) Any district court of the United States within the jurisdiction of which any mail matter shall have been sent or received in violation of the order provided for by this section shall have jurisdiction, upon application by the Attorney General, to issue an order commanding compliance with such notice. Failure to observe such order may be punished by the court as contempt thereof.

"(f) Receipt of mail matter thirty days or more after the effective date of the order provided for by this section shall create a rebuttable presumption that such mail was sent after such effective date.

"(g) Upon request of any addressee, the order of the Postmaster General shall include the names of any of his minor children who have not attained their nineteenth birthday, and who reside with the addressee.

"(h) The provisions of subchapter II of chapter 5 (relating to administrative procedure) and chapter 7 (relating to judicial review) of part I of title 5, United States Code, shall not apply to any provisions of this section.

"(i) For the purposes of this section—

"(1) mail matter, directed to a specific address covered in the order of the Postmaster General, without designation of a specific addressee thereon, shall be considered as addressed to the person named in the Postmaster General's order; and

"(2) the term 'children' includes natural children, stepchildren, adopted children, and children who are wards of or in custody of the addressee or who are living with such addressee in a regular parent-child relationship.".

(b) The table of contents of chapter 51 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof—

"4009. Prohibition of pandering advertisements in the mails.".

Sec. 302. The provisions of this title shall become effective on the one hundred and twentieth day after the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. UDALL (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of title III be dispensed with, that it be printed at this point in the Record, and that it be open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALDIE

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Waldie: Strike out beginning with line 14 on page 76 and all that follows down through line 14 on page 77, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(a) Whoever for himself, or by his agents or assigns, mails or causes to be mailed any pandering advertisement which offers for sale matter which the addressee in his sole discretion believes to be erotically arousing or sexually provocative shall be subject to an order of the Postmaster General to refrain from further mailings of such materials to designated addressees thereof.

"(b) Upon receipt of notice from an addressee that he has received such mail matter, determined by the addressee in his sole discretion to be of the character described in subsection (a) of this section, the Postmaster General shall issue an order, if requested by the addressee, to the sender thereof, directing the sender and his agents or assigns to refrain from further mailings to the named addressees.

"(c) The order of the Postmaster General shall expressly prohibit the sender and his agents or assigns from making any further mailings to the designated addresees, effective on the thirtieth calendar day after receipt of the order. The order of the Postmaster General shall also direct the sender and his agents or assigns to delete immediately the names of the designated addressees from all mailing lists owned or controlled by the sender or his agents or assigns and, further, shall prohibit the sender and his agents or assigns from the sale, rental, exchange, or other transaction involving mailing lists bearing the names of the designated addressees."

Mr. WALDIE (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment involves title III, which is the laudable attempt by my good friend and colleague [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], to prohibit or at least to restrain the receipt in your mailbox of literature and material that, in the view of the recipient, is objectionable because of its being salacious in nature, and so forth. My disagreement with the approach Mr. CUNNINGHAM has taken involves the fact that I believe it runs afoul of the First Amendment to the Constitution. He suggests that the Postmaster General must make a determination as to whether the literature and the material concerning which he has received a complaint runs afoul of the Supreme Court decision concerning pandering. If he so determines, then the matter being sent through the mail can be prohibited. My amendment suggests that should not be a determination of the Postmaster General at all but a determination of the individual who receives the material. The standards of conduct that I enforce in my particular household are not those that the Supreme Court has laid down in terms of materials that are available for my children's consumption. I am the supreme court in the particular household in which my children reside, and there is no appeal from that determination. So I have said in my amendment that if you receive literature in your household that you consider objectionable for the reasons Mr. CUNNINGHAM states, then in your sole discretion you can inform the Postmaster General to have your name stricken from that mailer's mailing list. If he does not do so, he violates that order, and the only determination left for the discretion of the Postmaster General, is did he or did he not remove your name from the mailing list. Then you are able to prevent that man from making any further mailings to you, but the sole determination as to whether the literature you receive is objectionable or not is within your discretion and you are not second-guessed on that discretion.

The bill that is before us severely limits your right to refrain from receiving objectionable material, because you must then refrain from receiving only material from the shipper that the Supreme Court has held to be objectionable. I suggest that the standards you may desire for your children and the standards that I desire for my children are far more strict than the standards that the Supreme Court has set in terms of controlling governmental censorship. By removing from this section, the right of the Government to involve itself in any determination of the content and nature of these objectionable materials precludes the first amendment from having any application whatsoever.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALDIE. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. What is the penalty for the mailer, after he has been notified to take your name off the list and withdraw it? Would the provisions of your amendment withdraw his mailing privilege from then on?

Mr. WALDIE. No. In one of the amendments that is being considered on the floor, that is the penalty. The penalty in my amendment is precisely the penalty that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] wants.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Well, what is the penalty?

Mr. WALDIE. It is punishment for contempt if the mailer refuses to obey the order of the court.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Well, if the gentleman will yield further, who assesses the punishment?

Mr. WALDIE. The court sets the punishment.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. In other words, he could get the matter into court and keep operating for a period of 10 years while the matter is being decided and thus delayed?

Mr. WALDIE. No; he could not, because there is an injunction that prohibits him from mailing the material. He can go to court and seek to have the injunction lifted. But if he has mailed material in violation of the order of the Postmaster General and then the Postmaster General seeks an injunction and obtains it, if the mailer fails to abide by that injunction, then he can be held in contempt of court and would be subject to the penalties provided for herein.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALDIE. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, just recently I received a letter from a man whose 19-year-old son received the filthiest publication I have ever seen, through the mail, and I was told by the Postmaster General that they could not do anything about the sender of that piece of material on account of the decision of the Supreme Court.

Mr. WALDIE. One of the problems is that the Supreme Court has set very high standards in terms of Government's right to abridge a citizens right to publish and to disseminate information. In my opinion, that is proper, from the standpoint of the Federal Government and from the standpoint of the individual in his desire not to be oppressed by an overeager Government. However, I avoid that question by saying, in effect, that I am an individual who is making this determination and it is not being made by the Government. In other words, I am not held to the standards that the Supreme Court holds the Government to because this represents an individual decision to be made by me under the provisions of my proposed amendment.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleague from California [Mr. WALDIE]. I believe that most of the Members of the House know the history of this proposed title III.

This particular type of legislation which I authored passed this House in the 88th Congress and in the 89th Congress overwhelmingly. However, it was not acted upon in the other body.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation has been looked over by at least two or three dozen constitutional lawyers and other attorneys. We put it in this bill because the American people are demanding action on this severe problem and they want it now. If you will read the report you will see that during this past year one-quarter million complaints have come into the Post Office Department with reference to this type of pandering advertisement that I hold here in my hand.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe there is any one of us present who has not had a constituent, or dozens of constituents, write us and tell us that they had received such type of mail which was dumped or placed in their mailbox. They feel, as I do, that this represents an invasion of their privacy.

Mr. Chairman, what this simply says is that if you or your minor child receives some of this obscene, sexually provocative advertising—pandering advertising—by having it dropped into your mailbox—either you or your minor child—you have the right to petition the Postmaster General saying that you do not want any more of this type of mail brought into your home and to notify the sender to remove your name from his list. Then the Postmaster General is to notify the mailer to take your name off the list, or any other list on which he is connected through interchange of mailing lists. If the sender does not do it, the Postmaster General is empowered to take this matter to the Justice Department, and they in turn are empowered to take this matter to the U.S. district court and ask for a cease-and-desist order.

If the mailer then continues to send you additional mail, he is subject to contempt-of-court proceedings.

Mr. Chairman, this House has voted, as I said, overwhelmingly for this particular bill. The gentleman from California [Mr. WALDIE] has suggested that it be changed in its wording and he feels that it will strengthen it more than is contained in title III. I have no real argument with the gentleman about it. I would only say that the particular wording that is in title III, so far as the description of pandering is concerned, follows the most recent Supreme Court decision in the Ginsberg case, and was written by the Post Office Department and has the support of the Post Office Department. The changes the gentleman from California [Mr. WALDIE] suggests are his own changes, and they are worthy of consideration. I have no substantive argument with them. I only say that the Post Office Department wrote the language which the gentleman from California [Mr. WALDIE] seeks to amend, and I feel that I must bring that to the attention of the Members.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. WALDIE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. **ROONEY** of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. ROONEY of New York was permitted to speak out of order.)

OUR AMERICAN ECONOMY

Mr. **ROONEY** of New York. Mr. Chairman, yesterday's Wall Street Journal carried a front-page article by Alfred L. Malabre, Jr., giving a masterful summary of a subject which is of utmost importance to every American. The observations made and statistics set forth in this article should cause every one of us to set up and take notice.

The presentation is a complete verification of President Johnson's fiscal and economic policies. The facts set forth and the most significant conclusions drawn constitute an impressive tribute to efforts which the President has been making to prevent ruinous inflation.

But this article is also of great importance because it reveals to a careful reader just how close we are to the brink of a devastating inflation if we fail to enact the essential control measures which the President has proposed.

I am highly gratified to read each assurance of our present economic well-being, but being a realist—not an alarmist—I want to call the attention of my colleagues to our need to take whatever measures are necessary to safeguard this country against inflation. Let us not forget that we in this body hold a front line position to stem the tide of an economic onslaught which will leave millions of our people cold and hungry—stripped of their carefully and often painfully acquired savings. Every Member of Congress should read this article and ponder the probable future of this Nation if a booming economy is not held in reasonable check.

Every labor leader and every working man should consider the painful situation into which we may be plunged if reasonable caution is not observed.

Every employer, every manufacturer, every producer, and every farmer should give heed to the facts which clearly indicate the direction and the disastrous destination toward which we could go.

Every doctor, every lawyer, every artisan, and every professional man should familiarize himself with our economic and fiscal plight and try to foresee what inflation would mean to him personally if his patients or clients are caught in the whirlpool of devalued money.

Mr. Chairman, as we proceed day after day into the longest boom in American history, as we ponder the magnitude of the changes occurring in our economy for the past 80 months of this boom we should give heed to the warnings of our great President.

I wish that every critic of President Johnson's fiscal and economic policies would read and weigh objectively this article. I am sure that many of them would revise their thinking and join him in his courageous but unpopular fight to prevent inflation.

Let us not forget who are the first victims to feel the crushing blows of inflation. They are the American housewives from our low- and middle-income families who are already trying to stretch their dollars to provide enough food of the right kind for their families. They are already skimping to get shoes and clothes to keep their children in school. They have already started on the required practice of utilizing "hand-me-downs" and making last year's items do service again. These devoted mothers and wives will be the first hit if the value of our money begins a rapid reduction.

I am concerned, too, for our senior citizens who must stretch an already inadequate fixed income to meet their daily requirements. Whether they rely on frugally amassed savings, or on pensions, or on public benefits, any serious imbalance in the purchasing power of their limited dollars would deal them a crushing blow.

Tragic as would be the impact of inflation upon investors and those who have long enjoyed the fruits of ownership, it is the wage earner who would be among the first of our citizens to suffer from runaway economic development.

And, Mr. Chairman, the dire results of inflation in this country would not be confined to our 50 States. The entire world would suffer and our relationships between the nations of the world would be catapulted into serious jeopardy. For many long years the American dollar has been and is still today looked upon as a symbol of integrity. "As sound as a dollar" is still a byword not only in this land but in farflung areas of the world. With world tensions what they are today—with the demand for continued American leadership in meeting the world's most pressing problems, we can ill afford to create new and more devastating problems by upsetting the economic stability of our country and that of other nations as well.

President Johnson has sounded the alarm time after time. He has placed before this Congress firm proposals to preclude inflation. His tax proposal is but one of them. It is our responsibility to consider all his proposals and unless we can improve upon them to enact the necessary legislation which will protect our people. Those who are most in need of that economic protection are the housewives, laborers, veterans, pensioners, and the others who make up the bulk of our society.

Mr. Chairman, I include with these remarks this article by Alfred L. Malabre, Jr., so that maximum reference to it can be made. May the prophets of doom be hushed by the current well-being which it conveys, may the cautious take new courage, may the pessimists find rays of optimism and may all of us take a careful look at what might happen if we do not act quickly, courageously and sympathetically on the proposals laid before us by the President.

Using his words spoken in a masterful address to the Presidents of the Federal home loan banks on October 6, he gave us great assurance when he said:

> We are very, very proud of our economic system in this country, our free enterprise system. We think that it is primarily responsible for our leadership in the world and primarily responsible for our strength. We want to keep it that way.

But he also stressed the things we need to do to keep that economic system from being undermined. With reference to this task he said:

> We have to face up to these things unpleasant. Let's do it and let's do it reasonably—not politically—being able to justify it from the economics that we know.

The article referred to, follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Oct. 9, 1967]

PROFILE OF A BOOM: ECONOMIC EXPANSION ENTERS 80TH MONTH, MATCHES OLD RECORD—GNP SOARS 49 PERCENT SINCE 1961; PROFITS, PERSONAL INCOME RISE EVEN MORE SHARPLY—PROBLEMS: HOUSING AND GOLD

(By Alfred L. Malabre Jr.)

If the current business expansion continues through next month, it will enter the record books as the longest boom in American history.

Even the more pessimistic forecasters are convinced that the expansion will indeed set a record. The longest expansion until now has been the 80-month business boom that went on during most of World War II, ending in February 1945. The current expansion, which began in February 1961, is now entering its 80th month. Altogether, there have been 26 previous U.S. business expansions, according to records kept back to 1854 by the nonprofit National Bureau of Economic Research. The average length: A mere 30 months.

The full dimensions of the current expansion can be gauged by reviewing some of the changes that have taken place in the U.S. economy since 1961. The magnitude of these changes is impressive, as the following review shows.

Gross national product: At more than $775 billion annually, the nation's output of goods and services has risen some $255 billion since 1961. The gain alone dwarfs the annual GNP of such major nations as the United Kingdom, West Germany and France. The table below translates America's multibillion-dollar economic growth into percentage terms and also shows how rapidly the major components of the GNP total have risen during the great boom.

Gain since 1961

	Percent
Gross national product	49
Consumer spending	46
Government spending	63
Business spending	47

Within the fast-expanding governmental category, the sharpest rise since 1961 has occurred in Federal nonmilitary expenditures, which have soared 77% in the period. Federal outlays for defense have climbed 52%, and overall Federal expenditures are up 56% since 1961. Spending by state and local governments has risen 70%—much faster than total Federal outlays.

Inflation, of course, accounts for part of the GNP rise since 1961. If "growth" stemming simply from higher prices is discounted, the "real" GNP increase since 1961 works out to 34% rather than 49%.

The consumer-spending category is by far the largest of the various GNP components. This spending breaks down three ways—for durable goods such as appliances and autos, for nondurables such as food and clothing and for services such as medical care and rent. The table below shows how the three subcategories have fared since 1961.

Gain since 1961

	Percent
Durable goods	64
Nondurable goods	39
Services	48

Although spending for durables has risen fastest, the consumer still spends a good deal less for such products than for nondurables or services. Currently, consumers devote about 44% of their budgets to nondurables, 41% to services and only 15% to durable goods. Overall, the statistical breakdown for consumer spending indicates that the economy has not become as "service oriented" as is often suggested. In 1961, consumers spent about 40% of their budgets on services.

The 47% rise in business spending, of course, has brought a big increase in the capacity of the country's factories. U.S. plant capacity has grown by about a third since 1961. This admittedly is less than the dollar rise in business spending, but the capacity rise is based on physical volume of goods and therefore isn't "inflated" by rising prices.

As a result of the 33% capacity increase, U.S. manufacturers are able to produce a far greater volume of goods now than in 1961 without putting undue strain on their production facilities.

At present, U.S. factories are using about 85% of their capacity, on average, well below the 90%-plus operating rates at which severe strains traditionally begin to show up. At operating rates above 90%, overtime costs rise sharply, and many producers are forced to use inefficient facilities that would otherwise stand idle or be scrapped.

Personal income: The rapidly rising earnings of most Americans have supplied much of the fuel for the economy's long climb since 1961. The personal income of Americans now exceeds $631 billion annually, some $215 billion more than the 1961 income total. The rise reflects a variety of factors, not just the steadily climbing wages and salaries of all sorts of workers. The table below lists the key income sources of Americans and shows how rapidly each category has risen since 1961.

Gain since 1961

	Percent
Total personal income	51
Wages and salaries	53
Fringe benefits	86
Dividends	71
Interest income	87
Income from rent	26

As in the case of service spending noted above, the income record since 1961 holds some surprises. Landlords' income from rent has risen only half as fast as overall income, a fact that should surprise many tenants. And income from interest and dividends on investments has climbed much faster than income from wage and salary payments, a fact that may give some second thoughts to people who worry that labor is getting far more than its share of the income pie; fringe benefits paid to workers, however, have risen much faster than wages and salaries.

At present, dividend and interest payments make up about 11% of total personal income. This compares with only 9% in 1961. Wage and salary payments make up 67% of the total, about equal to 1961.

The overall rise in consumer income is considerable even if rising prices and an increasing population are taken into account. After-tax per-capita income in the second quarter reached a record annual rate of $2,388 in terms of 1958 dollars. This was 25% higher than the comparable 1961 per-capita figure. In the view of many economists, this income measurement comes as close as anything to a "standard-of-living" index for the U.S.

Accompanying the big rise in consumer income has been a big rise in consumer savings. These savings have recently been running at an annual rate of about $36 billion, up 70% from the 1961 level (a sharper rise than the 65% increase in consumer credit outstanding over the same period). Time deposits in commercial banks have attracted the largest share of these savings.

The rise in consumer income reflects a massive improvement in the U.S. employment picture during the economic expansion. Many more jobs exist, workers toil longer hours and pay levels are considerably higher.

Today, there are more than 76 million civilian jobs in the U.S., up from less than 66 million in 1961. The increase exceeds the population of New York, the nation's largest city. The rise in jobs not only has opened up work for the country's increasing population—there are 15 million more Americans now than in 1961—but has given work to millions who couldn't get jobs early in the decade. Unemployment in the nation is below the 3 million mark; in 1961, it was close to 5 million.

Employes generally work a longer week now than in 1961. In manufacturing, the average workweek of nearly 41 hours is almost a full hour longer than the 1961 workweek. In the construction trade, the average workweek has recently exceeded 38 hours, up from less than 37 in 1961. An exception: Retailing, where the average has dropped from more than 38 hours in 1961 to less than 36 recently. Factors in the retailing trend, say analysts, include the increasing use of part-time employes and self-service in stores.

Most employes, moreover, are receiving much more pay per hour. The average hourly pay level in manufacturing is about $2.80, up from $2.32 in 1961. In construction, the average is nearly $4.10 an hour, some 90 cents higher than in 1961. In retailing, the average pay level is about $2, up from $1.68 at the start of the expansion.

Corporate profits: The climb of corporate profits during the long boom has been even more spectacular than the rise of consumer income. The before-tax earnings of U.S. companies currently total nearly $80 billion a year, up from $50 billion in 1961. Within the broad corporate category, however, there has been considerable variation between different types of industries. The table below shows the overall profits rise, plus the gains for particular groups.

Gain since 1961

	Percent
Total corporate profits	57
Durable-goods makers	85
Nondurable-goods makers	49
Transport and utilities	51
Finance and miscellaneous	44

In 1961, the profits of durable-goods makers totaled some $500 million less than those of nondurable-goods producers. Currently, however, durables firms are earning some $3.3 billion a year more than nondurables companies. The big boom in auto-buying in recent years is a major factor in the profit rise for durables. It should be noted, however, that the durables group traditionally fares extra well in expansion periods and extra badly in recessions. The other categories listed above generally react less dramatically to changes in the overall course of business.

A footnote to the profits story: Since 1961, the after-tax earnings of corporations have climbed 71%, a considerably faster rise than the 57% gain in before-tax income. This, of course, reflects the 1964 income tax cut.

To be sure, the economic record of the U.S. since 1961 is not without blemishes.

LAGGING HOME STARTS

New-home starts last year totaled less than 1.2 million units, actually down from the 1961 level of 1.3 million units and far below the 1963 level of 1.6 million. In recent weeks, housing has shown some signs of a pickup, but the industry's record still stands in bleak contrast to the general economic boom since 1961.

In part, the housing industry's trouble reflects overbuilding at least of middle and upper-income housing in the earlier post-World War II years. The mortgage funds for home building have been relatively scarce at times during the boom. Ironically, if other segments of the economy hadn't been so strong in recent years, there doubtless would have been more money available for home building, and the industry almost certainly would have fared better.

The U.S. gold supply also has declined during the long expansion. The Government's coffers now hold some $13 billion of gold, down from more than $17 billion at the beginning of the expansion.

Technically, this drop has occurred because the U.S. has been spending more dollars abroad than it has been taking in from foreigners. Foreign governments, in turn, have been buying U.S. gold with many of these dollars at the Treasury's offering price of $35 per ounce, a price that many foreign officials apparently feel is a bargain.

But the deeper cause of the gold drain involves the growth rate of the U.S. economy. If the economy hadn't grown so fast in recent years, there probably would have been less price inflation, and the U.S. trade surplus—the excess of exports over imports—would no doubt have held up better, thereby curbing the outflow of dollars and gold. The U.S. trade surplus actually has declined about 5% since 1961. Without a trade surplus to bring some dollars into the country, the flow of U.S. funds abroad to support foreign-aid projects, troops overseas and other foreign programs would reach intolerable proportions, most economists believe.

Perhaps the most lamentable blemish in the boom is the high unemployment rate for teenage Negroes—25% in 1961 and 25% in boom-time 1967. Another dismal statistic: Some 7.8 million Americans are on relief at present, about 600,000 more than in 1961.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. NELSEN was permitted to speak out of order.)

POLITICAL SOLICITATION OF POSTAL WORKERS

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to inquire of the Committee if there is any provision in this bill to protect the postal workers of our country from the arm-twisting campaigns on political solicitations that have so consistently been increasing.

Is there any provision in the bill to protect these employees from this practice? If anybody wishes to respond, I will be glad to listen to their answer.

Would my friend from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] care to state if there is any provision for protection in this bill to protect the post office employees from the practice that has become so prevalent when they are asked to make contributions in the way of dinner tickets which are used for political purposes, and in some cases a pressuring and an arm-twisting has been applied to make the solicitation a possibility.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSEN. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I would say in reply to the gentleman that, this being a postal rate bill, a salary bill, and an antiobscenity bill, I know of no provision that is in here to cover that.

Mr. NELSEN. Frankly, I did not suspect that there was. I believe this matter definitely needs the attention of the House. I have been sitting in on the hearings concerning the Hatch Commission, and certainly this prevalent practice needs to be stopped because it is coercion, and it is unfair to the Federal employees, and I believe it should be stopped.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Chairman, with the postal rate increase bill now pending it seems appropriate to ask why the Post Office Department is in the business of printing envelopes at prices which cannot possibly cover the cost in direct competition with private printing businesses.

An excellent column by Mr. Robert J. Boyle, editor of the Pottstown Mercury points out that the Post Office Department will sell you 500 stamped envelopes for $28.65. And for an extra $2.25, or just $30.80, the Post Office will imprint your name and address on each of the 500 envelopes.

Let me point out, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. Boyle has no ax to grind. The Pottstown Mercury, one of Pennsylvania's outstanding daily newspaper, does not do job printing. Mr. Boyle acts solely in the role of a responsible journalist and the point he makes is a good one.

This quiet sideline printing business of the Post Office Department is almost certainly costing the taxpayers money to subsidize. And at the same time it is in direct competition with the small job printers, who also just happen to be taxpayers.

An envelope costs about a penny. That is $5 for 500 envelopes. And 500 5-cent stamps runs the cost to $30 for 500 envelopes with postage. How in the world could a job printer ever afford to print names and addresses on 500 envelopes for a total of 80 cents to match the Post Office Department's deal of $30.80 for 500 stamped and imprinted envelopes?

The answer, of course, is that no printer could afford it. Not only would he make no profit, he would end up bankrupt. The time has come, Mr. Chairman, to find out what is going on in the Post Office Department.

Mr. Boyle and the Pottstown Mercury have done a good job of shedding a bit of light on the situation.

For the benefit of our colleagues, I would like to include at this point Mr. Boyle's column, "A Different Slant":

A DIFFERENT SLANT: POSTAL DEPARTMENT HAS A SIDELINE

(By Robert J. Boyle)

Looking for a printing bargain? Try the United States postoffice.

If you think, the postoffice is only concerned with the delivery of mail and the selling of postage you're wrong.

The postoffice not only will sell you stamped envelopes at a bargain price but it'll give you stamped envelopes with your name and address printed on them at a rate cheaper than most job printing firms.

Owners of small job printing shops can't compete with the prices offered by the postoffice.

The Postoffice department currently is asking for an increase in postal rates to meet expenses. Despite cutbacks in service, the cost of mailing a letter is rising but the non-postal work done by the postal department isn't.

A stamped envelope costs the individual 7 cents. That's $35 for 500 when not purchased in bulk.

But the postoffice will sell you 500 stamped envelopes for $28.65.

And, here's the bargain, if you have them imprinted with your name and address, the postoffice will only charge you an additional $2.25 for the printing. So for $30.80 you can buy 500 printed, stamped envelopes from the government.

Instead of buying the envelopes one at a time, a user could save himself $4.20 by buying a lot of 500 and the government will toss in the printing.

This price is for the smaller envelopes. The larger envelopes will cost you $29.10 for 500 but with your name and address the price goes to $31.45.

The Mercury recently received an offer to job work envelopes from a New York firm.

The cost of 500 envelopes was $5.92. These were the smaller envelopes. Add a 5 cent stamp to each envelope and your cost is $30.92. The government is charging 12 cents less than this.

A local job printer who is trying to earn a living said, "I can't compete with the prices offered by the government. No small job printer can. It costs me more to cast one line of type than the government charges for three.

"The government is hard to beat. Why would anyone come to me for envelopes when they can get the same thing cheaper from the post office. And with my envelopes they'd have to attach the stamp.

"It's not fair to the small businessman. I can't compete with those prices. What I can't figure out is why the post office is so concerned about costs and then they undercut us. There can't be a profit in the envelope printing business for the government. I'm sure the price they charge is less than the price it costs them.

"An envelope itself costs 1 cent each. For 500 it would be $5. Plus a 5 cent stamp. That totals $30. So the printing comes down to just 80 cents. Where in the world can you get a printing job for that price today."

The printer said that the only reason more people don't use the government's printing service is because the government doesn't advertise it.

"Not even some postal workers know about it," he said.

The Mercury checked with some of the employes. The majority said, "Yeah, I think there's something like that but I don't know the prices of anything."

One postal worker said, "No. We don't do anything like that but I'll check to be sure."

Within a day he called back and said, "You're right. We do sell printed envelopes cheaply. This whole place is fouled up, though."

He explained that he was sorting mail on Oct. 3 advertising an event that occurred Oct. 1.

"I don't see why people stand for it. Here's mail that should have been in and out of the post office by the 29th of September to do the advertiser some good. Now it's just being sorted on the 3d. It'll be another day or two until it's delivered."

He also said that printed tabloid sheets advertising sales frequently are delayed.

"One store has a coupon which states that if the tabloid was delayed in the mail until after the sale, that the sale price would be honored if the customer brought the hand-out to the store."

"I think junk mail is supposed to be in and out of a postoffice in 72 hours. That's not the case here. It often just sits."

"The whole system is goofy," he said, "we get mail in Pottstown and it's sent to Morristown, canceled and sent back to Pottstown for delivery.

"Suppose there's a mailbox in front of your house and you sent a letter over the weekend to next door neighbor. Do you know how many hands it goes through? It'd be picked up and driven to the Pottstown postoffice where it'd be sorted. The sorted mail will then be shipped to Norristown where your letter will be canceled. It's resorted and shipped back to Pottstown. Here it's unpacked and sorted to the carrier and he sorts it for his route. If your lucky, the letter will arrive at your neighbor's mailbox Monday or Tuesday."

"I'm not suggesting that the letter carrier should look through the mail at the box and rush it to our neighbor immediately, but the system could be improved."

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Chairman, it is with deep reluctance that I rise in opposition to this bill. With all due respect to the great committee, I am forced to the conclusion that this legislation which puts into one package, postal rate increases, pay increases for postal workers and thousands of Federal employees outside the postal services, and restrictions on mailing obscene material is ill conceived. Combining such diversified matters into one package simply in an attempt to forestall a Presidential veto of the postal pay increase is not a good way to legislate.

There are many Members, I am sure, who like myself favor parts of this package and are opposed to other parts so that it is impossible for us to express our true convictions whichever way we vote.

I am definitely in favor of an increase in pay for postal workers. They are entitled to it through prior commitments to them by previous Congresses and because they need it to bring their pay scales in line with those paid for comparable services in private industry. However, I cannot in good conscience accept the other parts of this bill. For instance, it is unfair to tax further the users of first-class mail while at the same time we deal so gently with those who use other classes of mail.

Postal rates and wages for postal workers should not be contained in the same bill. It is wrong to establish the concept that the wages of postal workers should be tied to the income of the Post Office Department. If we do establish that concept there may come a day when postal workers will find themselves facing a loss of revenue because of greater deficits in the income of the Post Office.

Another part of this package to which I am violently opposed is the open end authority given to the President to establish Federal salaries in the future. Under the authority the President would be able to include in his budget, salary increases for Federal workers, even Congressmen, for whatever amount his Commission proposed and unless Congress vetoed his proposal such salary increase would become effective.

Granting such authority to the President is giving him authority which should, under the Constitution, be retained by Congress. I am against that, yet if I voted for this bill in order to help postal employees, I would be condoning what I believe to be an unconstitutional action. Also, I firmly believe that Congress should face up to its responsibilities, especially in the matter of Federal salaries. If the time ever comes when salaries of Members of Congress are to be increased, we should stand up squarely and face the people instead of putting a provision into the law, as contained in this bill, which would allow us to back into increasing salaries through the device of letting the President do it.

For these very compelling reasons I am going to be forced to vote against this bill. I think the proper way to handle this legislation is to send it back to the committee and have them bring in separate bills so that we may honestly vote our convictions on each of these very important matters.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, yesterday's debate on postal rate increases prompted me to review again the history of rates applied to newspapers. Let me say I am particularly concerned about the health and survival of newspapers, because I know how vital they are to their communities. In this day of complex governmental relationships—local participation in Federal and State programs as well as a proliferation of local districts and municipalities—the citizen has more need than ever before for his local newspaper. In rural areas the newspaper is one of the key institutions holding communities together. I suspect that the same is actually true of suburban and urban areas.

I find that newspapers have accepted and absorbed rate increases in the years 1952, 1953, 1954, 1959, 1960, 1961, 1963, 1964, and 1965. They have accepted as equitable the increases proposed in H.R. 7977 for 1968, 1969, and 1970. That means that during a period of 18 years they will have adjusted to postal rate increases 12 times.

Further, it should be noted that for the smallest newspapers, the rate increase in 1968 is 60 percent, not the 23 percent which applies to larger publications. So let it not be said that newspapers have been overlooked in the increases of the past, or in H.R. 7977. They are accepting their share of the higher costs of postal operation.

I want to add one more comment which might otherwise be overlooked. Newspapers have made a major contribution to the success of the new ZIP code system. They have given the Post Office Department full cooperation, by meeting requirements in their own mailing and by carrying the ZIP code message to the public. Selling this revolutionary system to nearly 200 million Americans has been a monumental task. Newspapers did their part, even though in some cases the conversion to sectional center distribution has disrupted delivery to their readers. They felt that ZIP had to succeed to save the U.S. mail system, and they helped make it succeed.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Chairman, I earlier stated that it is most unfortunate that this bill confuses revenue with service. I am fully convinced that there is no legitimate connection between postal rates and postal pay increases. Why not place the blame for post office deficit where it belongs—not on the worker but on inefficiency caused by political expediency and poor administration. The pay increases are essential to help bring about the upgrading of the service we receive, and there is absolutely no doubt but that the post offices throughout the Nation are undermanned, understaffed, and overworked because of the low pay scales offered by the Department. That the postal service is as efficient as it is presently, is a tribute to the dedication of the men who have made the postal service a career, and who have remained at their jobs in spite of substandard compensation.

Postal pay should be raised, but postal rates should be held at a more stable level as they were during the 8 years of the Eisenhower administration. The annual deficit of the Post Office could be absorbed with ease if the administration would stop making mini-cuts in its spending and take a few big bites out of programs which could be reduced or held in abeyance until the war in Vietnam has been terminated.

I shall vote for the recommittal motion, not because it is what I believe it should be, but because it does give the postal employees a 6 percent instead of the 4.5 percent increase in salary this year and because it will prevent a Presidentially appointed commission from setting salaries for Congressmen and civil service employees—a clear obligation of Members of Congress—elected by the people. Should the recommittal motion fail I shall vote for the bill with the regret that the H.R. 7, which I supported was not before the House for consideration.

Mr. Chairman, I believe our postal workers are again the victims of political maneuverings.

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Chairman, at the time the Waldie amendment to H.R. 7977 was being considered, I had at the Clerk's desk the following amendment to the same title:

Amend H.R. 7977 on page 76 by striking all after line 7 and by striking all on page 77 and all on page 78 through line 24, and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"TITLE III—PROHIBITION OF PANDERING AND OBJECTIONABLE ADVERTISEMENTS

"SEC. 301. (a) Chapter 51 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end of such chapter the following new section:

"'§ 4009. Prohibition of continued sending of matter objected to by recipient

"'(a) Any recipient of advertising matter through the mail which is unsolicited and is of a character which the recipient finds objectionable may notify the sender thereof that the advertising matter is objectionable to him and that the sender should refrain from further mailings of such matter to the named addressee. If the sender does not thereafter desist from further mailings of such matter to the named addressee, such addressee may notify the Postmaster General of his objection and of the sender's refusal to discontinue mailings, whereupon the Postmaster General shall expressly prohibit the sender and his agents or assigns from making any further mailings of advertisements to the designated addressee effective on the thirtieth calendar day after receipt of the order. The order of the Postmaster General shall also direct the sender and his agents or assigns to delete immediately the names of the designated addressees from all mailing lists owned or controlled by the sender or his agents or assigns and, further, shall prohibit the sender and his agents or assigns from the sale, rental, exchange, or other transaction involving mailing lists bearing the names of the designated addressees.

"'(b) Whenever the Postmaster General believes that the sender or anyone acting on his behalf has violated or is violating the order given under this section, he shall serve upon the sender, by registered or certified mail, a complaint stating that the sender is violating the said order and should thereafter cease and desist from further mailings of such matter to the named addressee.

"'(c) Intentional failure of any sender to comply with the order or orders of the Postmaster General respecting such further mailing of such matter objectionable to the addressees shall constitute a lack of compliance with the requirements for qualification for sending mail at any bulk or reduced rates. The sending of 25 or more pieces of such matter which has been objected to by addressees after receipt of orders from the Postmaster General as above provided shall constitute prima facie showing of an intention to violate such orders. If the Postmaster General, after appropriate hearing, if requested by the sender, and without a hearing if such a hearing is not requested, thereafter determines that the order given has been intentionally violated, he is authorized to deny to the sender the use of bulk or reduced rates respecting any further mailings by the sender for a period not exceeding one calendar year after the date of the determination.

"'(d) Receipt of mail matter thirty days or more after the effective date of the order provided for by this section shall create a rebuttable presumption that such mail was sent after such effective date.

"'(e) Upon request of any addressee, the order of the Postmaster General shall include the names of any of his minor children who have not attained their nineteenth birthday, and who reside with the addressee.

"'(f) When the addressee is a child, the parent may act for the child.'"

I objected to the Postmaster having nonreviewable authority to determine what is "pandering" matter. To some extent the Waldie amendment corrected this. I do not think it cured the fault altogether but since my amendment dealt with a part of the same matter, it would not have been appropriate after the passage of the Waldie amendment. I had not offered my amendment as a substitute because it might have jeopardized the chances of considerable improvement accomplished by the Waldie amendment.

I am for H.R. 7977. However, I cannot let my vote for the bill stand without registering my protest against the waiving of judicial review under the Administrative Procedure Act as provided in title III, section 4009(h) on page 78 of the bill. Further, I feel that title III provides really an impractical procedure, because individual injunctions brought at discretion of the Postmaster General will not afford a sufficient discouragement to panderers operating through third-class mail. I feel that a much more effective method would be the threat of loss of bulk or reduced rates. Perhaps the machinery of my amendment may be of some use to bodies further considering the problem.

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct my remarks briefly to title II of this bill, the title dealing with salaries in the civil service and the postal service. I strongly support the provisions of this title, as the most feasible steps which we can take right now toward the long-postponed goal of fully equitable compensation for our public servants.

The quality of our Government depends directly on the quality of our civil servants—from the top to the bottom of every department and agency. We have never needed the best Americans in public service more than we need them today. Yet for too long we have discouraged the most talented and experienced from entering or remaining in the civil service and the postal service, largely because we have not offered them individual opportunities for advancement and compensation as great as the opportunities held out to them by the private sector.

The Congress and the President pledged civil servants full comparability of salaries 5 years ago. We have not yet fulfilled this pledge, but this bill for the first time since 1962 gives us the means for doing so. In previous years we have simply approved a single percentage increase in salaries in each successive bill. This year, for the first time, we are going beyond that short-range approach, and establishing the machinery for determining the future increases required to attain comparability by April of 1969.

I am very pleased that the committee, in shaping this legislation, did recognize the particular difficulties faced by members of the postal service, whose opportunities for promotion are often severely limited, and whose salaries have lagged especially far behind those of counterpart jobs in the private sector. The grade raises contained in this bill are similar to those recommended in legislation which I introduced earlier this year, and represent an important step in the continued improvement of our postal service.

Mr. Chairman, as the size and complexity of our Federal Government has increased, we have heard many calls for reductions in overhead, reform of administrative methods and procedures, and general reorganization. We have no hope of achieving these goals unless we can enlist the services of the very best among our citizens. I am convinced that title II of this bill will contribute a great deal to enhancing Federal services by giving just compensation to the 3 million civilians who conduct the public's business.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the postal and civil service employees of our Federal Government and the members of our Armed Forces. In the forefront of our thinking is the GI sitting in a rain-soaked foxhole.

A man's time is worth as much in the Federal service as it is in private industry, and our goal should be to establish a Federal pay system which provides the employee with "a dollar received for a dollar's worth of value given." For how can we demand excellence from Federal employees when we short change them on payday.

My position on the need for economy in the Government is well known, but this posture is not an indiscriminate one. Good investments, whether Federal aid to education, with more local control; research and development, our space effort; and fair wages for our Federal employees, receive my full and affirmative support. Economy at the expense of Federal employees is false economy. We must do everything in our power to attract and retain highly qualified people to serve our country for in the long run this would be far less expensive than the continual retraining of replacements.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, a great deal of public attention has been focused upon titles I and II of H.R. 7977, which provide for increases in postal rates and Federal salary scales. This is as it should be. These provisions are extremely important and should be subject, in the fullest measure, to public discussion and debate.

No less important, however, in my view, is title III of H.R. 7977 which would establish a procedure for halting the flow into our homes of advertisements for erotically arousing or sexually provocative matter. For the first time, individuals and parents will be able to take steps to protect themselves from the affront to their sensibilities of receiving this pandering material. As is well known, much of it comes addressed, by name, to young children, whose lack of sophistication and experience has become the target of mail order profiteers, trafficking in filth. I have seen shocking examples of pornographic literature which has been sent to residents of my district, and who in turn have sent it to me with an appeal for protection from such intrusions. I am convinced that we must provide the protection requested, by Federal law.

Objection to this title has been raised by some who see in it a threat to freedom of speech or other constitutional guarantees. It should be noted, however, that no official action can be initiated until a recipient himself notifies the Post Office Department of his desire not to receive such material. Further, the provisions of title III have been the subject of study by legal experts, and of extensive hearings. They have been carefully drafted to accord with such recent Supreme Court decisions in this area as *Ginzburg* v. *U.S.*, 383 U.S. 463 (1966).

At present, every American stands defenseless against assault by unsolicited, provocative advertising matter. This legislation will help to erect a modest defense and is urgently needed to protect our homes and our children.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, I have always voted for Federal employees to have comparable pay to that of industry. I regret that I am prevented from voting for their pay raise at this time. If their pay raise were a separate bill I would have been able to vote for it. I cannot vote for an increase in first-class mail when it is already paying 103 percent of its cost. I cannot vote for a delegation of the powers of Congress over the pay of judges, executive employees, and Members of Congress. The delegation to a commission of this power violates the separation of powers constitutional provisions set up by our Founding Fathers.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the proposed postal pay raise bill.

This bill is long overdue. I regret that it does not go as far as we would like in legislating salary comparability for Federal civil service and postal workers, but I recognize the need for compromise. We have a President in the White House who does not like to spend money. He runs a tight budget which is going to be only $28 billion in the red this year. Evidently, the President is going to take it out of the hide of the Federal civil servants and postal workers. He has already vetoed the Federal employee insurance increase bill, even though he has proposed contributing another $200 million to the Asian Development Bank. Either we have a budget problem or we do not. But we should not have one budgetary standard for foreign giveaways and another for hard-working Federal employees.

I am also sorry that the postal pay bill had to be tied to the postal rate increase bill to get it past the White House. I am against the postal rate increase, more particularly on first-class mail. It is beginning to seem like the postal rate goes up every few years. Maybe we would not have to raise postal rates if we were to throw a few dictators off the foreign aid gravy train or clean out the $20,000 a year radicals and agitators from the phony antipoverty war. Maybe then we could afford to operate the Post Office with reasonable rates.

With some misgivings, I support the distinction which the committee has seen fit to draw between postal workers and other Federal employees. Under normal circumstances, I would oppose any such distinction between groups of workers as discrimination, but in this case, I think that the special 6-percent raise for letter carriers and other postal workers is justified. Consider the letter carrier: he spends all his working days in one grade. He cannot look forward to grade level increases like other Federal employees. All he can hope for are ingrade pay raises. In the last few years, he has been painfully burdened by inflation—a result of the spending policies of that same President who is now vetoing Federal employee legislation while proposing bigger handouts in Southeast Asia. I think that the 6-percent raise for postal employees is necessary.

I must admit that I would like to see the rest of our Federal employees get larger raises. The goal of comparability for civil service people and private industry is getting farther and farther away. Inflation keeps mounting and mounting. Private industry's pay scales are escalating, but those of the Federal Government certainly are not keeping pace. Comparability has become a broken promise, not a reality.

Quite frankly, I do not see how President Johnson intends to try to attract high caliber civil servants into the Government. First of all, the salary scales are poor and there is no sign that the President is really committed to comparability. Second, from his attitude in giving handouts to domestic and international agitators and peanuts to civil servants, particularly his veto of the insurance bill, Mr. Johnson is conveying an attitude that civil servants are second-class citizens. Then third, we have the shakedown that is practiced on civil servants to get them to buy tickets to dinners or buy Government bonds.

All of this is making the civil service more and more unattractive to young people and we have only the administration to blame. Of course, the entire civil service has not suffered—there are a few programs with fat budgets, high grades, and plush treatment; namely, the war against poverty.

I hope that the Members of this House will not dilute this bill. If anything, it gives too little to the civil service workers who are already suffering from inflation and total lack of comparability. I am glad that two additional steps of increase are provided for, although I am afraid that by the time these subsequent increases come due, inflation will have made further inroads on national purchasing power, and that once again comparability will be a broken promise.

I support this bill, but with regret that it had to be pared down and lumped with a postal rate increase bill in order to get past the President. In the balance, however, I urge passage of this package. It is better than nothing and it will help our civil servants to regain some of the purchasing power they have lost in the last few years.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 7977, which has been entitled "Postal Revenue and Federal Salary Act of 1967." In some of the levity interjected into the debate, this package made up of postal rate increases and salary increases was frequently referred to as a marriage. It was recalled it was not a convenient or pleasant union but a marriage of necessity. For some of us this sort of description of the package is not very amusing. It is a most serious matter to raise postal rates. It is equally serious, however, to disregard our deserving postal employees and all our other career employees who are well trained, experienced, and dedicated people, but are underpaid.

In the area of postal rates, there have been charges and countercharges thrown back and forth during the lengthy debate as to what classes of mail pay their own way and what classes are so burdensome that they should pay more than their present rates. Certainly there was adequate debate on the emotional third-class mail issue. I was in hopes the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON] which would spread out the increase on third-class mail more equitably than the committee version would have prevailed.

Certainly one who listened carefully to the debate could not help but realize the amendment of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER] would put many small direct mail firms out of business. His amendment would result in considerable if not widespread unemployment in certain large publishing centers of our Nation. We all agree that third class must pay a fair rate so that outdoor advertising and the newspapers will not be put at a disadvantage because of the third-class subsidy.

But Mr. Chairman, there is another area of greater concern for many of us who represent districts containing smaller newspapers who will suffer sharp increases in rates for these second-class publications. It is my privilege to represent 11 counties in a congressional district where there are about 40 very excellent weekly newspapers. You will recall the subcommittee had earlier proposed increases that were as much as 300 percent. Naturally these papers reacted to these unfair and unreasonable increases. The original administration proposal was much more reasonable and the final committee draft seemed to be acceptable to the representative of most of our newspapers which happens to be the National Newspaper Association.

I think it is proper to comment briefly upon the importance of these newspapers of our smaller cities. Their rates must not be increased over the amount of the committee recommendation. Smaller papers must use the mails. Big city papers are largely carrier-delivered while the smaller newspapers are completely dependent upon the mail.

The importance of these papers, outside the urban areas lies in the fact something must be done to stop the migration of the population from the rural to the urban areas. We cannot accept it as an inevitable fact that there will be nothing but several great megalopolis. We must stabilize those towns between 2,500 and 5,000 population. We cannot accept it as inevitable or even unavoidable of this emigration from rural to urban areas. Herein lies the importance of these smaller papers as an instrument of information and a source for stability in these smaller communities.

There is a long tradition in this country by the Congress seeking to encourage business enterprises dedicated to informing and educating the public. I am sure that is why we establish preferred second-class mailing privileges in the first place. The small town weekly newspapers will continue to play a valuable role in our society. Nothing can replace them. They report local community news in a way no other media can and it gives the citizens of these smaller cities a sense of participation that the large anonymous mass media can never approach.

When limitation of debate was imposed there was no time to properly argue the elimination of section 115 which in my opinion should be taken out in its entirety. Hopefully, the other body in its consideration of this bill will strike out this section. This is the part of the bill which would require our small newspapers to pay the much higher or third-class rate for that portion of the publication which in some instances is called the "peach" section because of the peach color paper it is printed on. In all fairness, these advertising supplements should be carried as second-class matter because in many instances there is a fair mixture of classified advertising with display advertising.

It would seem to be fair to permit our small papers to continue to be charged second-class rates as long as they comply with the present postal regulations of what is called the 25-percent rule. Such a guideline permits second-class rates to apply so long as at least 25 percent of the paper is other than advertising copy. In other words, present law specifies the total package of the newspaper in order to qualify for second-class material must add up to at least 25 percent news.

Section 115 is not acceptable to our smaller papers because there are no guidelines established as to just exactly what constitutes an "advertising supplement." We are unfortunately being asked to accept a section where complete reliance is placed in the Post Office Department to provide definition and procedure by which this section can be administered. This means that postal employees will be charged with responsibility to determine what portions should be charged second-class rates and what portions should go at third-class rates.

As a revenue measure, section 115 will mean virtually nothing because the smaller papers will simply leave the inserts out of their mail copies. A bad result might be to drive some of these advertisers in the third-class field and create further postal problems in that classification.

It goes without saying there is hardly a Member that does not regret having to increase first-class mail rates. Historically and as a postal rate-fixing policy, such first-class mail has been regarded as a preferred service and therefore the postage for such first-class mail should be sufficient to cover the entire amount of the expense allocated to such a class of mail, plus an additional amount to represent the quality and character of the service rendered in terms of priority, secrecy, security, and speed of transmission.

Our Post Office Department carries a heavy burden. However, if the various classes of postal rates are raised, the Department will have no choice or alternative but to give good service to all of its patrons. All present services must be maintained. There can be no further talk of a suspension of Saturday deliveries, or limiting business deliveries to one per day. Hopefully this legislation will provide the funds for some postal modernization and perhaps even restoration of 6-day-parcel-post service. Hopefully also this legislation may lead to some door delivery in residential areas now served by roadside boxes.

Title II of the bill deals with Federal salary increases including those in the general classified grades as well as our faithful postal employees. We have public servants in this country that are unmatched by any other country anywhere in the world. We expect and demand of them unusual dedication. Certainly they have a right to expect in return from their Government compensation which will match their unselfish service. We must work out a pay scale that will approach that of private industry. In the past few years the Congress has improved retirement and other fringe benefits which compare favorably with such benefits in private industry. Yet what Member of Congress can argue that we have yet achieved comparability with private industry?

How can we forget that these postal and Government employees have families to clothe, house and feed and children to educate and all of the problems and expenses of other Americans. The members of the postal clerks organization and the letter carriers organization of our congressional district, in their correspondence to our office have pointed out how many are compelled to "moonlight" on a second job, working their regular 8-hour day and then sometimes working several hours at another job. The recent tragedy in Detroit involved a postal employee who killed his wife. This was a man who had been moonlighting. Police found his two baby girls had died of malnutrition, which is another way of saying they may have starved to death.

Members of our letter carriers group and the clerks organization have pointed to the increases that have been granted to building craftsmen because they are organized and can bargain effectively for an increase in wages. These same constituents point out how our own State legislators passed a pay increase for their membership. They have not been hesitant to mention in their letters the current strike in the automobile industry. These same postal workers have noted that all municipal employees of the city of Kansas City have been awarded a 5-percent pay increase by the city council of that city.

As one Member, I cannot blame these postal workers for calling to the attention of their Congressman the fact that when nearly everyone whether in industry, in the employ of the State, and even city employees receive wage increases why should there be any hesitancy to grant a fair and equitable increase in pay to postal workers and other Government employees. It is impossible of course to satisfy everyone and the pay raises contained in this bill may be below the request by some employee groups. The raises are somewhat more liberal than recommended by the President. The pay raises are however fair and realistic. They represent a step toward the achievement of comparability between Federal workers and those in private industry.

It would be inexcusable to further neglect or delay just and fair pay for our most deserving postal workers and classified employees.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I hope that the House, after thorough debate and full consideration of any amendment improvements offered, will accept and endorse the substance of this bill before us, H.R. 7977, the Postal Revenue and Salary Act of 1967.

The basic purposes of this legislation are to increase postal rates in order to provide postal revenues approximately equal to postal operating costs after the deduction of public service expenses; to increase the salaries of postal and other government employees in order to bring Federal salary schedules to levels comparable to those in private industry; to improve the mailing privileges for members of the Armed Forces; to modernize the regulations affecting the forwarding of mail matter to the blind; and to regulate, in reasonable solution, the harassing and vexing problem continuing to trouble great mumbers of our citizens, especially in the protection of their minor children, of mail reception of unsolicited, undesirable, and morally offensive matter.

Mr. Chairman, the managers of debate on this bill, on both sides, have already fully and carefully explained the meanings and effects of the various provisions of the bill and repetition would only and unnecessarily prolong our discussion here. Of course some differences of opinion exist on various provisions in the bill and many of us are still very deeply concerned about inequities that may be yet contained in the postal rate adjustments recommended by the committee. However, all of us realize that differences of opinion, not involving high principle, must be resolved if we are to achieve here any measure of progress, admittedly needed, in this difficult legislative area. It is further realized there is no such thing as a perfect bill so we are inclined to accept what we think is the best majority judgment that can be obtained and pledge to improve, by appropriate future amendment, any deficiencies that become apparent through experience.

Mr. Chairman, in summary projection, this bill is a combined rate and pay bill providing limited salary advances for postal and Federal employees and some postage rate adjustments to obtain additional revenues in paying for it. This type of legislative action has been commended as an assumption and assertion of congressional responsibility that has long been desired.

The salary schedules now urged in this bill are in full accord with modern business practices and they are essential in our purpose to give further faith and implementation to the prudent policy, practically universally recommended by recognized authorities, of comparability of Federal and private industry salaries.

Mr. Chairman, I submit it is only practical commonsense to realize, in these challenging times, that if our faithful and efficient postal and Federal employees are reasonably encouraged in meeting their family obligations, whose costs are, unfortunately but ever, increasing, they will face the future with renewed economic confidence and there will be little doubt about their effective duty performance, their loyalty as good Americans, and their repudiation of any and all extremist appeal detrimental to the national interest. It is also good commonsense to provide reasonable inducements for recruitment, now and in the future, of the most faithful and capable individuals for career Federal Government service.

Mr. Chairman, as I have already indicated, neither this bill, nor any other of which I am aware, can be termed perfect, but it does represent the majority conscientious recommendations, after long and extended hearings and study, of those Members of Congress and experts outside the Congress, who are most knowledgeable and best versed in this legislative field. The overall provisions of this bill are undoubtedly designed for the best national interest and I hope this House will soundly approve the bill.

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Chairman, a new member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is subjected to quite a baptism by fire, particularly when he is assigned to serve on the Subcommittee on Postal Rates and an all-time high record rate bill is proposed. As one who left a post as a newspaper editor when elected to Congress, I thought I knew a good bit about postal operations before I came here. I soon learned my knowledge was inadequate to the task of helping shape a complex postal rate increase bill. I have acquired a considerable education in the past 5 months.

One of the first things I learned is that the postal deficit is not what it is supposed to be. While the Postmaster General sometime speaks of a $1.2 billion "deficit," the true revenue deficiency is only about half that much. The law in effect since 1958 recognizes that there are certain necessary, desirable, and expensive functions performed by the Post Office Department which do not belong in the deficit.

For example, there are post offices located in practically every hamlet, for the convenience of area residents. The postmaster's salary in many of these third- and fourth-class offices often exceeds the revenue received but as a matter of public policy these losing operations are continued. Obviously, the cost of operating such offices would not be continued if the postal service were run as a purely business operation. Logically, the Congress has determined that such costs are not properly chargeable to users of the mails and should be borne by taxpayers generally.

The operation of small post offices in hamlets is just one example of many that have been earmarked by Congress as public service costs. The total bill for public services by the post office is now about $600 million, and this sum needs to be subtracted from the alleged deficit of $1.2 billion. So the true deficiency is about $600 million, not $1.2 billion. Anybody who uses the $1.2 billion deficit figure is ignoring the law of the land, the Postal Policy Act of 1958, as amended in 1962. The pending bill, H.R. 7977, would make no change in that law. The Postmaster General did not recommend any change, and the committee did not vote for any change.

In his testimony before the Subcommittee on Postal Rates last May, Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien discussed public services in these words:

> In the last analysis, postal services are paid for by the people of the United States, either directly, through the purchase of our services, or indirectly, through taxation. For the nation as a whole, there is and can be no postal deficit. The cost of postal service has to be paid one way or another. The major question throughout the entire history of the postal service has been one of equity—what proportion of the cost should be borne by those who use the mail, and what proportion should be borne by the people generally? Should these deficits be paid from general tax receipts or from the earnings of those whose demands for postal service caused the deficits?
>
> The Postal Policy Act of 1958, as amended in 1962, went far to answer that question. It specified certain types of postal service as legitimately the concern of the nation as a whole, the cost of which should not be borne directly by the postal patron, and should not be considered in calculating rates, but rather should be paid from the general Treasury.

Testimony was presented to the subcommittee by mailers that there are a number of public services that have not been identified and included in the set-aside, with costs to be borne from general revenues instead of recovered from mailers in the form of higher rates. I believe it would have been fruitful if the subcommittee had explored this area. I hope that such an investigation can be made before the next rate increase bill is presented to Congress.

For example, the cost of maintaining rural routes and star routes is only reflected under present practice to the extent of 10 to 20 percent of their cost. And the law enforcement activities of the Postal Inspection Service—necessary and fruitful as they are in the war on crime—are not included among public services at all. I am convinced that a thorough study would uncover other costs incurred for public welfare purposes that should be included in the public service category.

We have to recognize that the Post Office is much more than a mail-delivery service. It does many things having nothing to do with the mail, such as register aliens, sell savings bonds, report forest fires, and sell duck stamps. It is proper that these activities be carried out as a part of the public policy. However, these costs should not be included in the price of mailing a letter, a newspaper, a magazine, a catalog, a book, or a parcel.

The Post Office is an essential national communications network. The fact that it recovers about 80 percent of its operating costs through charges and fees makes it less expensive to operate than any other Government department, even without the increased revenue we are about to vote in this pending bill.

To a newcomer who has taken a crash course in postal economics all summer, a primary lesson has been the realization that public services consume a considerable share of the postal expense dollar and that legislation we enact should properly reflect that fact. Since our subcommittee concluded hearings, Postmaster General O'Brien has supplied another example of the public service role of the Post Office. He has announced that rural delivery service has been extended to less densely populated areas. Now mail is delivered in areas where the population density is only 1.5 families per mile.

The previous minimum to receive mail delivery service was two families per mile. This is a perfect example of a public service. Naturally the cost of this additional service will exceed the extra revenue generated. Of course, if the postal system were operated purely as a business, remote families would not receive delivery service. That day should never come and to keep that day from ever arriving, we should once again engrave on stone the fact that "Postal service is public service."

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, for several years I have called on the House to report and consider postal pay increases in separate legislation. Postal employees, postal users, and the public will only receive fair and equitable consideration in this way. Postal employee legislation continues to be used as a vehicle to carry and pass civil service pay increases, congressional pay increases, cabinet members pay increases, Federal judges pay increases and now a 20-percent first-class postal rate increase, as well as rate increases for second- and third-class postal rates.

The postal employees of my district through their representatives and in many letters from them and from others in Wisconsin have asked me to vigorously oppose the use of their pay legislation as a means of accomplishing certain objectives that could not be accomplished if required to stand on their own merits.

The debate for the past 2 days has been listened to with great interest by me and once again we are proving the mistake in loading down a postal pay bill with poorly considered and in some cases unpopular additional programs and amendments.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that this legislation will pass today but in keeping with my commitment to oppose the use of postal pay legislation as a means to accomplish that which could not pass this House on its own merits, I will vote no in protest to this procedure.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 7977, the Postal Revenue and Federal Salary Act of 1967, with the committee amendments.

As a former member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I have a great deal more than academic interest in this legislation. I have listened very carefully, during yesterday's general debate and today's consideration of the various amendments which have been offered, to the statements of my friends on both sides of the aisle. I am satisfied that the committee has placed before us one of the most difficult pieces of legislation to reach the floor this session. The supporters of this legislation are quick to admit that it has weaknesses. Its opponents readily concede its strengths.

Irrespective of whether a position pro or con is taken, the fact remains that the reported measure represents weeks of the most intensive study by the full Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and, before that, it required literally months of consideration by the Subcommittee on Postal Rates, the Subcommittee on Compensation, and the Subcommittee on Postal Operations, each of which labored exhaustively on one of the three titles into which the committee amendments are divided. The result, as the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI], has stated, is "the most comprehensive, single legislative measure ever reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service."

Title I—postal rates—of the committee amendment to the text of H.R. 7977 provides much-needed postal revenues. It also carries out the President's basic recommendations on postal rate legislation. Any quarrel with a specific provision of title I pales into insignificance by the major overall effort to bring postal revenues into line with operating costs.

Title II—Federal salary increases—deals with one of the most important responsibilities which regularly falls upon Congress. This is the periodic review and adjustment of salaries paid to employees of the Federal Government. We know, of course, that the compensation of postal, classified, and many other categories of Federal employees is determined by Federal law rather than by the general economic condition of the country. It is therefore incumbent upon Congress to see to it that the salary of every Government worker reflects as accurately as possible the responsibility of the work he is doing, the services he is rendering to his country, and is comparable to the compensation being paid for similar work in private business and industry.

It is this principle of comparability—since 1962 a specifically stated policy of Congress though not yet a fully realized goal—that necessitates our present consideration of legislation that will advance the civil service toward this objective.

Title II of the committee amendments does represent, in my opinion, a reasonable and fiscally sound compromise between what we would like to do, that is, the immediate attainment of full comparability, and what is within our fiscal capacity. The provisions of title II promise a moderate raise this year to postal employees and other Government workers. Although title II does not provide for the attainment of full comparability in 1967 or 1968, it does give strong hope and assurance that this goal will be reached in 1969.

The thrust of title III—prohibition of pandering advertisements—can easily be appreciated by parents with young children at home. Obscenity has no place in the mails, and protection by law ought to be afforded our citizens against advertisements of indecent nature. A man's right to the privacy of his home ought to be protected against unwelcome intrusion, whether it be through the mails or in the person of an uninvited stranger.

Mr. Chairman, the combination of titles I, II, and III gives us a package of legislation which may not be completely free of flaws, but it nevertheless provides for definite improvement in three important areas of our national life.

I urge a favorable vote for H.R. 7977.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, the supply of amendments has been exhausted and we are now approaching the end of this bill.

I expect to offer the motion to recommit. It will provide for a 4.5-percent increase for Federal workers other than postal employees, who would be given a 6-percent increase as under the terms of the pending bill.

The recommittal motion will also provide for striking out the two-phase increases from the pending committee bill; and for the reason that these increases are projected into the unknown economic and financial future in undetermined amounts.

Last but not least the recommittal motion will seek to strike from the bill the unthinkable provision for the creation of a Commission to establish in the future the salaries for Members of Congress, the Federal judiciary, and the executive branch of Government, together with the allowances and expenses that are provided the offices of all these officials.

I can think of no greater delegation of power than to give a presidentially appointed Commission composed of three members appointed by the President, two from the House, and two from the Senate, and two appointed by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. I am unalterably opposed to giving the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court the power to appoint two members of this Commission which will give a President a 5-to-4 vote on the Commission to establish salaries for the Members of Congress, Federal judges, Cabinet members, and thousands of other officers of the Government.

Mr. Chairman, this will be a sad day in the House of Representatives if the Members now surrender and delegate to a President their power to fix their own salaries. What a confession it would be to the public if Members have now become so comfortable that they are willing to be labeled as wards of a future President.

Let me reiterate what I said earlier this afternoon: this unwarranted delegation of power to the President amounts to an abdication of our obligations and responsibilities. We might as well delegate to the President all power of appropriations, taxes, and Government policies as to give the Chief Executive our right to establish our own salaries, expenses, and allowances.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am pleased to yield to my friend from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. As I understand it, the gentleman's motion would provide for a 4.5-percent increase for those employees of the Government outside of the Post Office and for a 6-percent increase for those within the Post Office Department?

Mr. GROSS. That is correct.

Mr. MILLS. And you are eliminating any further increase beyond that at this time?

Mr. GROSS. That is right.

Mr. MILLS. I find myself in the position of supporting the gentleman's motion. I am not one usually who votes for a motion to recommit. But under the circumstances that prevail at the moment, with all of us in the frame of mind that we need to exercise a greater degree of control than we are presently exercising, I cannot put myself in the position of saying that the President of the United States should be required to cut back on spending and then increase spending in an area where he could not exercise any control whatsoever.

I know that some features of the bill are desirable, but I do not believe we can do everything now under the circumstances that exist that we may determine to be desirable.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means. I know of no one who is more conversant and more concerned with the fiscal affairs of this Government than the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], whose committee has the responsibility for providing most of the revenue to operate the Government.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Michigan, the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I, too, intend to support the motion to recommit. I think it is fiscally responsible. It will reduce the payroll commitment, through the elimination of phase 2 and phase 3, by approximately $2 billion.

I would like to point out that inasmuch as the committee bill does anticipate increasing the revenue over and above what the President has recommended through postal rates, I believe we can justify the differential between the civilian employees and the postal employees. As I understand the figures, under the anticipated schedule that we can foresee, and for the full fiscal year, the committee bill would bring in about $884 million.

Mr. GROSS. That is correct.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Under the President's recommendations the revenue from the rates would be about $825 million. In other words, on a 12-month basis there would be approximately a $60 million add-on over and above the President's proposed revenue. If you take it on a 12-month-a-year basis, the extra percent for postal employees is about $60 million, according to information given me.

The additional revenue from the rate bill does certainly cover all of the anticipated costs of the payroll for the Post Office Department.

(By unanimous consent, on request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD, Mr. GROSS was permitted to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. In other words, when you add up the revenue and the payroll costs, I think we are in balance, and we are doing the responsible thing from the point of view of fiscal year 1968. We certainly are doing the responsible thing for fiscal year 1969 and fiscal year 1970 by this motion to recommit.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the minority leader for his observations and urge the adoption of the motion to recommit.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

In my judgment, this Committee today has produced the best pay bill in modern times. I hope it will not be wrecked, as it will be wrecked, by the adoption of the proposed motion to recommit.

I am for economy this year. I support the gentleman from Arkansas and the gentleman from Michigan, who have been trying to do some things about the budget this year. But the cold fact, if you read the motion to recommit, is that it does not save a dime in this fiscal year. Let us get that straight. The bind is right now in this fiscal year. This leaves the pay raises for this fiscal year exactly as they are. There is no indication that we are going to be in a fiscal bind in the next fiscal year or the fiscal year beyond that, and these are the pay raises that you are striking out.

Let me tell you some other things you are voting for if you vote for this motion to recommit. I explained earlier today that for the first time next year, if this bill passes, we will not have an election year pay bill. Will that not be nice? Should you knock out the 1968 pay raise that is in this bill right now, the postal workers, who started out this year requesting 14 percent—that is what they wanted—we got them down to 6 percent this year and 5 percent next year, and on this reclassification that 220 of you, along with about 100 from the minority side voted for, and you are going to kill this reclassification if you adopt the motion to recommit.

So a vote for the motion to recommit is a vote against the postal workers and it is a vote against economy. Let me tell you why. The election year pay raise you will have next year will not be any little modest 5 percent that we provide for now. They will be back here for 10 or 15 percent, and we will be compromising for 8, 9, or 10 percent. So you are voting against the postal worker. You are voting against every classified Government worker in this country, because this confirms what we have said to the classifieds, "Boys, you wait this year. We will give more to the postal people because they need it. But you will get the raises that will bring you up to full comparability in the next two phases." And you knock that out, you will find that it is a vote against comparability, if you vote for the motion to recommit. This is a vote to welsh and renege on the promises that this Congress has made for 5 long years: We were going to give you comparability, and at long last we have it in the bill. This is really a vote to spend more money and not less. It is a vote to spend exactly the same amount in this fiscal year, but it is a vote for higher and bigger pay raises down the line under the unfair influences of an election year psychology that we will have next year.

So I urge members of the committee and of the House to hold the line and vote down the motion to recommit. It is well intentioned and it is presented as an economy measure, but it is not an economy measure. It is a move which in my judgment will result in spending several hundred million dollars more in the 3-year phase that we have tried to cover in this bill.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chariman, I would like to say to the Committee I have been voting pretty much a straight economy line this year and last. I have voted for the Bow amendment every time it has come up. But we have to face the fact that the cost of living has gone up, along with the fact that we have not kept our promise on comparability. I believe definitely if we want to economize, we ought to economize on things and services and not on the welfare of our people.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I just cannot conceive of Members of this House of Representatives, supposedly the greatest legislative body in the world, giving to a committee appointed by the President of the United States and the Supreme Court of this country the right to say to Members of this House of Representatives that they will take over the authority to set the pay of the Members of the Congress of the United States. I think that no man in this Committee who has taken an obligation such as we have here, should vote for a bill of this kind that will absolutely hogtie and handcuff the Members of the Congress of the United States. I would think every Member of the House of Representatives would resent any such bill being brought to the floor of the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee substitute amendment, as amended.

The committee substitute amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Price of Illinois, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7977) to adjust certain postage rates, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 939, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the committee substitute amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole?

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the so-called William D. Ford amendment, as amended by the Udall substitute, on page 49.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the so-called Gurney amendment, on page 76.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the so-called William D. Ford amendment, on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 49, following line 25, add subsections (c), (d), and (e) to section 207, to read as follows:

"(c) Section 5303(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately before the semicolon at the end of subparagraph (2) thereof ', except positions in the postal field service which are unique to the service'.

"(d) That part of the text of chapter 45 of title 39, United States Code, under the heading 'SALARY STEPS AND PROMOTIONS' is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

" '§ 3561. Higher minimum rates; Presidential authority

" '(a) When the President finds that the pay rates in private enterprise for one or more occupations in one or more areas or locations are so substantially above the rates of basic compensation of those positions in the postal field service which are unique to that service as to handicap significantly the Government's recruitment or retention of well-qualified employees for such positions, he may establish for such positions in the areas or locations higher minimum rates of basic compensation for one or more levels and may make corresponding increases in other step rates of the pay range for each such level. A minimum rate so established may not exceed the maximum rate prescribed by statute for the level. Increases above the maximum rate may be made only to the extent that the minimum rate is increased to an amount greater than the fourth step of the level. For the purposes of this section, the word "level" includes occupational groups and subdivisions of levels and occupational groups.

" '(b) Within the limitations of subsection (a) of this section, rates of basis compensation established under that subsection may be revised from time to time by the President.

" '(c) An increase in rate of basic compensation established under this section is not an equivalent increase in compensation within the meaning of section 3552 of this title.

" '(d) The rate of basic compensation established under this section and received by an individual immediately before a statutory increase, which becomes effective prior to, on, or after the date of enactment of the statute, in the compensation of employees in the postal field service, shall be initially adjusted, effective on the effective date of the statutory increase, under conversion rules prescribed by the President.

" '(e) All actions, revisions, and adjustments under this section have the force and effect of statute.

" '(f) The President may authorize the Postmaster General to exercise the authority conferred on the President by this section.'.

"(e) The table of contents of chapter 45 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by inserting—

" '3561. Higher minimum rates; Presidential authority.'

immediately below—

" '3560. Salary protection.'."

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BATTIN. Is the vote now to occur on the William D. Ford amendment or on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Gurney]?

The SPEAKER. The vote will occur on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. William D. Ford].

The question is on the amendment.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the so-called Gurney amendment, on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 76, following line 6, add a new section as follows:

"Sec. —. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title, officers and employees of the Office of Economic Opportunity shall not receive any increase in basic salary by reason of the enactment of this Act, and such officers and employees shall continue to receive compensation at the same rate of compensation in effect on the day immediately before the effective date of the salary increases provided by section 202."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question now occurs on the committee substitute amendment, as amended.

The committee substitute amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GROSS. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Gross moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 7977, to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendments: On page 42, strike out lines 10 to 15, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(a) There is established a basic compensation schedule for positions in the postal field service which shall be known as the Postal Field Service Schedule and for which the symbol shall be 'PFS'. Except as provided in sections 3543 and 3544 of this title, basic compensation shall be paid to all employees in accordance with such schedule."

On page 42, in the parenthetical matter immediately below line 15, strike out ", and ending immediately before the effective date of Postal Field Service Schedule II set forth below".

On page 42, immediately below the parenthetical matter following line 15, strike out "Postal Field Service Schedule I" and insert in lieu thereof "Postal Field Service Schedule".

On page 43, strike out all of Postal Field Service Schedule II immediately preceding line 1.

On page 43, strike out lines 3 to 7, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(a) There is established a basic compensation schedule which shall be known as the Rural Carrier Schedule and for which the symbol shall be 'RCS'. Compensation shall be paid to rural carriers in accordance with such schedule."

On page 43, immediately below line 7, strike out "Rural Carrier Schedule I" and insert in lieu thereof "Rural Carrier Schedule".

On page 43, in the parenthetical matter below line 7, strike out ", and ending immediately before the effective date of Rural Carrier Schedule II set forth below".

On page 43, strike out all of Rural Carrier Schedule II at the bottom of the page.

On page 45, line 14, strike out "Postal Field Service Schedule I" and insert in lieu thereof "the Postal Field Service Schedule".

On page 45, lines 24 and 25, strike out "Postal Field Service Schedule I" and insert in lieu thereof "the Postal Field Service Schedule".

On page 46, lines 6 and 7, strike out "Postal Field Service Schedule I" and insert in lieu thereof "the Postal Field Service Schedule".

On page 47, strike out lines 8 to 24, inclusive.

On page 55, strike out line 3 and all that follows down through the period in line 16 on page 57.

On page 57, line 18, strike out "Sec. 213." and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 212.".

On page 59, line 13, strike out "Sec. 214." and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 213.".

On page 61, line 5, strike out "Sec. 215." and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 214.".

On page 61, strike out line 17 and all of section 216 that follows, down through line 19 on page 68; and make the appropriate conforming changes in, and omissions of section numbers and references.

On page 68, line 21, strike out "Sec. 217." and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 216.".

On page 68, lines 21 and 22, strike out "213(d), 214, 215, and 222" and insert in lieu thereof "212(d), 213, 214, and 221".

On page 69, line 4, strike out "Sec. 218." and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 217.".

On page 69, line 9, strike out "Sec. 219." and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 218.".

On page 70, line 19, strike out "Sec. 220." and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 219.".

On page 73, line 4, strike out "Sec. 221." and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 220.".

On page 74, line 18, strike out "Sec. 222." and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 221.".

On page 75, strike out line 4 and all that follows down through the period in line 6 on page 76 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 222. (a) Except as otherwise expressly provided, this title shall take effect as follows:

"(1) This section and sections 201, 207, 215, 218, 219, and 220 shall become effective on the date of enactment of this title.

"(2) Sections 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212 (except subsection (d)), 213, and 216 shall become effective as of the beginning of the first pay period which began on or after October 1, 1967.

"(3) Sections 212(d), 214, 217, and 221 shall become effective at the beginning of the first pay period which begins on or after the date of enactment of this title.

"(b) For the purposes of determining the amount of insurance for which an individual is eligible under chapter 87 of title 5, United States Code, relating to group life insurance for Federal employees all changes in rates of pay which result from the enactment of this title (except sections 207, 212(d), 214, 215, and 221) shall be held and considered to become effective as of the date of such enactment."

Mr. UDALL (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the motion be dispensed with and that it be printed in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 199, nays 211, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 306]

YEAS—199

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, Ala.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Ayres
Baring
Bates
Battin
Belcher
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bevill
Biester
Blackburn
Blanton
Bolton
Bow
Bray
Brock
Broomfield
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burleson
Burton, Utah
Bush
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Carter
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Cleveland
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Cowger
Cramer
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dellenback
Denney
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, La.
Erlenborn
Esch
Eshleman
Evins, Tenn.
Findley
Flynt
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Fuqua
Gardner
Gathings
Gettys
Goodell
Goodling
Gross
Gurney
Hagan
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Hammerschmidt
Hansen, Idaho
Hardy
Harrison
Hébert
Herlong
Hull
Hungate
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Keith
King, N.Y.
Kornegay
Kuykendall
Kyl
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, La.
Lukens
McCarthy
McClory
McClure
McCulloch
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
McMillan
MacGregor
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin
Mathias, Calif.
May
Mayne
Michel
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Minshall
Mize
Montgomery
Moore
Morton
Mosher
Myers
Nelsen
Nichols
O'Konski
O'Neal, Ga.
Passman
Pelly
Pickle
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Price, Tex.
Pryor
Purcell
Quie
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Rhodes, Ariz.
Riegle
Robison
Rogers, Fla.
Roth
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
Sandman
Satterfield
Schadeberg
Scherle
Schneebell
Schwengel
Scott
Selden
Shriver
Skubitz
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Okla.
Snyder
Springer
Stanton
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stratton
Stuckey
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, Ga.
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Vander Jagt
Waggonner
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Whalley
Whitener
Whitten
Williams, Pa.
Wilson, Bob
Winn
Wylie
Wyman
Zion

NAYS—211

Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Ashley
Aspinall
Barrett
Bell
Bingham
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Brademas
Brasco
Brinkley
Brooks
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Broyhill, Va.
Burke, Mass.
Burton, Calif.
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Cahill
Carey
Casey
Celler
Clark
Clawson, Del
Cohelan
Conte
Conyers
Corbett
Corman
Culver
Cunningham
Daddario
Daniels
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dow
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Eilberg
Evans, Colo.
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Fino
Flood
Foley
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Galifianakis
Gallagher
Garmatz
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Grover
Gubser
Gude
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Wash.
Harsha
Harvey
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Helstoski
Henderson
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Hunt
Irwin
Jacobs
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, Ala.
Karth
Karsten
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kee
Kelly
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kleppe
Kluczynski
Kupferman
Kyros
Leggett
Long, Md.
McDade
McFall
Machen
Madden
Mathias, Md.
Matsunaga
Meeds
Meskill
Minish
Mink
Monagan
Morgan
Morris, N. Mex.
Morse, Mass.
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Philbin
Pike
Pollock
Price, Ill.
Pucinski
Quillen
Railsback
Randall
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Reinecke
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ruppe
Ryan
St Germain
Saylor
Scheuer
Schweiker
Shipley
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Stafford
Staggers
Stubblefield
Tenzer
Tiernan
Tunney
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Waldie
Walker
Wampler
Whalen
White
Widnall
Wiggins
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Yates
Young
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—22

Curtis
Downing
Everett
Fisher
Howard
Jonas
Macdonald, Mass.
Miller, Calif.
Moorhead
Multer
Rarick
Rivers
St. Onge
Sikes
Smith, Calif.
Sullivan
Thompson, N.J.
Utt
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Wydler
Zwach

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Everett for, with Mr. Rivers against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Multer with Mr. Curtis.

Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Utt.

Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Wydler.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Jonas.

Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Smith of California.

Mr. Sikes with Mr. Zwach.

Mr. Howard with Mr. Rarick.

Mr. Fisher with Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts.

Mr. Williams of Mississippi with Mr. Moorhead.

Mr. Willis with Mr. Downing.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 319, nays 89, answered "present" 1, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 307]

YEAS—319

Adair
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Ashley
Aspinall
Ayres
Baring
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Bell
Bevill
Biester
Bingham
Blackburn
Blanton
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton
Brademas
Brasco
Brinkley
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Cabell
Cahill
Carey
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Cohelan
Conable
Conyers
Corbett
Corman
Cramer
Culver
Cunningham
Daddario
Daniels
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dellenback
Denney
Dent
Diggs
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dow
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Eilberg
Erlenborn
Esch
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Flood
Foley
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Gallagher
Gardner
Garmatz
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Grover
Gubser
Gude
Gurney
Haley
Halleck
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Heckler, Mass.
Helstoski
Henderson
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Hungate
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kee
Kelly
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kleppe
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kupferman
Kyros
Leggett
Lloyd
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McCarthy
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
McFall
MacGregor
Machen
Madden
Mailliard
Mathias, Calif.
Mathias, Md.
Matsunaga
May
Meeds
Meskill
Miller, Ohio
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Monagan
Moore
Morgan
Morris, N. Mex.
Morse, Mass.
Mosher
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Myers
Natcher
Nedzi
Nichols
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Pollock
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Railsback
Randall
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reinecke
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Ruppe
Ryan
Sandman
St Germain
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherle
Scheuer
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Shipley
Shriver
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Snyder
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Steed
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Tenzer
Thompson, Ga.
Thomson, Wis.
Tiernan
Tunney
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Vigorito
Waldie
Walker
Wampler
Watkins
Watson
Whalen
Whalley
White
Whitener
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams, Pa.
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Winn
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wyman
Yates
Young
Zablocki
Zion

NAYS—89

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adams
Andrews, Ala.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Belcher
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bow
Bray
Brock
Buchanan
Burleson
Bush
Byrnes, Wis.
Collier
Colmer
Cowger
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Devine
Dickinson
Dorn
Dowdy
Edwards, Ala.
Flynt
Ford, Gerald R.
Gathings
Goodell
Goodling
Gross
Hagan
Hall
Hammerschmidt
Hansen, Idaho
Hechler, W. Va.
Herlong
Hull
Jarman
Jones, Mo.
Keith
Kuykendall
Kyl
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Lukens
McClure
McMillan
Mahon
Marsh
Martin
Mayne
Michel
Mills
Montgomery
Morton
Nelsen
O'Neal, Ga.
Passman
Poage
Poff
Pool
Pryor
Reifel
Rhodes, Ariz.
Riegle
Robison
Roth
Rumsfeld
Satterfield
Schneebeli
Selden
Smith, Okla.
Springer
Steiger, Ariz.
Stuckey
Teague, Tex.
Tuck
Waggonner
Watts
Whitten
Wylie

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Derwinski

NOT VOTING—23

Conte
Curtis
Downing
Everett
Fisher
Howard
Jonas
Macdonald, Mass.
Miller, Calif.
Moorhead
Multer
Rarick
Rivers
St. Onge
Sikes
Smith, Calif.
Sullivan
Thompson, N.J.
Utt
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Wydler
Zwach

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Rivers for, with Mr. Everett against.

Mr. Conte for, with Mr. Derwinski against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Multer with Mr. Curtis.

Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Utt.

Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Wydler.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Jonas.

Mr. Sikes with Mr. Zwach.

Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Smith of California.

Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Fisher.

Mr. Howard with Mr. Downing.

Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. Willis.

Mr. BURTON of Utah changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. COLLIER changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE]. If he had been present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to adjust certain postage rates, to adjust the rates of basic compensation for certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and to regulate the mailing of pandering advertisements, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZATION TO MAKE APPROPRIATE CONFORMING CHANGES IN H.R. 7977

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to make the appropriate conforming changes in, and omissions of, section numbers and references in the bill (H.R. 7977).

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill H.R. 7977, and include extraneous material therein.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PRESIDENT OF NIGER SAYS PEACE CORPS IS BEST GIFT UNITED STATES HAS MADE TO HIS COUNTRY

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the bill to continue the good work of the Peace Corps is expected soon to be reported out by the Committee on Foreign Affairs and to reach the floor of the House this month. I anticipate its passage by a vote unanimous or close to that.

In this connection I am happy to call the attention of my colleagues to the following address by his Excellency Diori Hamani, President of Niger, at the Virgin Islands Training Center, St. Croix, Virgin Islands on September 28, 1967.

Mr. Governor, Madame Governor, Ambassador Ryan, ladies and gentlemen, and my young friends of the Peace Corps: during the discussions I had with President Johson at the White House, we talked at one point about the possible shortening the length of my stay in the United States. The President asked me, "If your trip is shortened, will you be able to go to the Virgin Islands?" I said, "Mr. President, if I must sacrifice one part of my program in the United States, it would certainly not be my visit to the Virgin Islands, since it will be an occasion for me to renew contact with the Peace Corps, to see in person the work which is being done there."

I must confess to you, and I believe that this feeling is shared by the members of my delegation, I would never have imagined that to be a Peace Corps Volunteer one must submit to so difficult a test; to a training program harder than that of a school or university; to a training program perhaps more difficult even than the training of youth in national armies.

It is a lesson for us in Niger, for the leaders of Niger. Every year, as my Peace Corps friends know, I speak at the National Lycee, at the awarding of honors to the secondary schools for boys and girls. I say to my young Nigerien friends that the Chief of State and head of government is a political student—he learns each day.

I can assure you that today I have learned a great deal from Peace Corps training, and that I have retained much of the positive things you do here. To Mr. Neager Djuvara, my advisor, who is also a teacher at our school of administration, I was saying, we must be inspired by the pragmatism of American Peace Corps training. In training the young classes of our school of administration, we must get away from the academic concepts. As the director of the Peace Corps training center has pointed out, great teachers dominate learning and often make very long and very tedious lectures, whereas here the Peace Corps training is done in a practical manner.

Being a Volunteer—this word is a whole program. To be a Volunteer is to make a free choice; to take the option; to give service to one's neighbor. And this is remarkable.

For those who know the situation in the United States; the comfort one finds there for the young; the ease of living in the universities, schools and workshops; when one stops to compare certain of your fellow countrymen who at the age of 22 or 23 prefer parties on Sundays; where they dance the "jerk" or the "be-bop"; and when one sees these young people abandon all that to come to the Virgin Islands to undergo painful and hard training and climate, I am obliged to tell you that I admire you greatly—you and your decision to accept such sacrifices.

In Washington, a reporter of the United Press asked me, "Mr. President, what do you think of the Peace Corps?" And the answer I gave him was the following:

I consider the Peace Corps the best gift that the United States has made to Niger. For when one is 22 to 25 years old with his future before him and accepts to come work in the difficult conditions of Niger, in total selflessness, for such young men and women one can have only admiration, consideration and esteem for that generation.

The selflessness of these young people equals their youthful zeal and it is for this reason that in the rediscovery of men, in short, in the rediscovery of brotherhood, which has been the dream of humanity, I believe that the founders of the Peace Corps promoted this generous and ingenious idea as the means to rediscover universal brotherhood, brotherhood among people.

I believe that after a few years, when a great number of Peace Corps Volunteers have come back from Africa, Asia, Latin America, they will gain importance and consideration in the United States. Peace Corps Volunteers will be members of Congress, leaders in business, educators in universities, lawyers and governors. When this happens something will have changed, not only in the United States but on the face of the world in the sense of this rediscovery of brotherhood, of happiness, of men in general. It is for this rediscovery of man, of this brotherhood of human dignity that I say, Long Live the Peace Corps!

THE OUTER SPACE TREATY

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I join the distinguished majority leader [Mr. ALBERT], in marking the historic signing of the Outer Space Treaty at the White House yesterday.

This treaty is a landmark in international cooperation and a sign of hope in deeply troubled times.

It promises that mankind will explore outer space and the planets in a spirit of peace and cooperation.

It promises also that arms control agreements can be achieved despite the difficult political problems which mark our times.

At the signing, the Secretary of State, the Honorable Dean Rusk, made a few most appropriate observations on the significance of the treaty and its implications for world peace and security.

Because his remarks sum up well the meaning of the Outer Space Treaty to the future of mankind, I am pleased to insert them at this point:

Statement for the Secretary of State at the Space Treaty Entry Into Force Ceremony, October 10, 1967

Mr. President, Excellencies, Distinguished Senators and Congressmen, Ladies and Gentlemen: We know, Mr. President, how much personal satisfaction you must derive from what we do here today. As Senator nine years ago you carried the message of the peaceful use of outer space to the United Nations on behalf of President Eisenhower; as Vice President and Chairman of the National Aeronautics and Space Council you pressed vigorously for peaceful cooperation in outer space; as President you directed and followed intently the negotiation of this Space Treaty in which Ambassador Goldberg so ably represented us.

We are happy to have joining with us in signing the Protocol of Deposit of this space treaty the Ambassadors of Australia, Bulgaria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, Hungary, Japan, Niger, Sierra Leone, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

We are confident that the overwhelming majority of the members of the international community will ratify the Space Treaty, which has now been signed by eighty-four countries.

The Treaty calls for cooperation in: —the conduct of scientific studies; —consultation concerning experiments that may have potentially harmful effects; —assisting and returning astronauts and space vehicles; —opening installations on the moon and other celestial bodies to visits by astronauts of all countries; —reporting to the United Nations on the nature, conduct, locations and results of space activities.

The Treaty also takes steps to limit and reduce the competition in armaments, a terrible burden on peoples everywhere. It prohibits orbiting nuclear or other weapons of mass destruction around the Earth, and forbids installing such weapons on the moon or any other celestial body. It raises a permanent bar against establishing on any celestial body military bases, installations or fortifications, testing any type of weapons, or holding military maneuvers.

Our meeting here today signals an important and constructive development at a time when many world problems still await resolution. It is evidence that men and nations can, in fact, achieve the maturity necessary to embody in binding form their points of agreement, despite political differences in other areas. It is evidence of the vitality of the United Nations system. The Space Treaty is testimony to the fact that nations can anticipate, negotiate, and agree upon a system of law to regulate their activities in the new environment of space beyond the Earth.

Mr. President, the Space Treaty is ready to be proclaimed as in force between the United States and those who have deposited ratifications. I now present the Proclamation to you for your signature.

REDUCTION NECESSARY IN DEPLETION ALLOWANCE FOR OIL AND GAS

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution which will bring to the floor the bill, H.R. 655, to reduce the depletion allowance for oil and gas from 27½ percent to 15 percent.

I urge the Committee on Rules to report this bill at the earliest date. Failing this, after 7 legislative days have passed, I will file a discharge petition to bring H.R. 655 to the floor.

In recent days we have heard many statements in the House concerning a proposed 10-percent income tax increase for our people and we have heard mention about reducing this year's Federal deficit by cutting billions from programs that have already been authorized, but we have heard very little about increasing our revenues to support these programs and closing the obvious tax loopholes that exist.

Eliminating or reducing the depletion allowance has been discussed for years. Under the provisions of the discharge petition there will be permitted 3 hours of debate and under an open rule amendments will be in order so those who feel that the allowance is justified or who feel there should be an elimination rather than a decrease in the allowance will have ample time to debate it or amend it but I feel that before we ask the people of America to dig into their own pockets more deeply for extra taxes, we should show them that we are willing to eliminate tax inequities that now exist.

I make no claim to be a tax expert, although I would like to point out there are many in the membership of this 90th Congress, but when the Atlantic Refining Co. can reap a $113½ million net profit last year and pay no income tax, when the Marathon Co. can have a $38 million net profit and get a $2.2 million tax credit as they did in 1962, and when Standard Oil of New Jersey, who had a net profit last year of $1,091 million is in a 6.3-percent tax bracket—then something is wrong. Would not our $5,000-, $6,000-, and $7,000-a-year constituents like to be in 6.3-percent tax bracket?

I am inserting in the RECORD following my remarks the tax status or lack of it of the 20 major oil companies in the United States for the years 1962 through 1966.

I urge the Rules Committee to report this very necessary bill.

TAXES OF 20 MAJOR OIL COMPANIES, 1962-66

Company	Year	Net income before tax	Federal tax	Percent	Foreign, some States, tax	Percent	Profit after tax
Standard (New Jersey)	1962	$1,271,903,000	$8,000,000	0.6	$423,000,000	33	$840,903,000
	1963	1,584,469,000	69,000,000	4.3	496,000,000	31	1,019,469,000
	1964	1,628,555,000	29,000,000	1.7	549,000,000	33	1,050,555,000
	1965	1,679,675,000	82,000,000	4.9	562,000,000	33	1,035,675,000
	1966	1,830,944,000	116,000,000	6.3	624,000,000	34	1,090,944,000
Texaco	1962	546,371,000	13,000,000	2.3	51,700,000	9	481,671,000
	1963	615,768,000	10,250,000	1.6	58,850,000	12	545,668,000
	1964	660,761,000	5,500,000	0.8	77,900,000	11	577,361,000
	1965	726,198,000	10,000,000	1.3	79,500,000	11	636,698,000
	1966	845,466,000	32,500,000	3.8	103,100,000	12.1	709,866,000
Gulf	1962	488,351,000	19,389,000	3.9	128,871,000	26	340,091,000
	1963	540,065,000	30,870,000	5.7	137,842,000	25	371,353,000
	1964	607,343,000	52,443,000	8.6	159,782,000	26	395,118,000
	1965	655,727,000	53,559,000	8.1	174,935,000	26	427,233,000
	1966	813,868,000	90,008,000	11.0	219,098,000	26.9	504,762,000
Mobil	1962	379,339,000	8,300,000	2.1	128,700,000	33	242,339,000
	1963	437,352,000	23,000,000	5.2	142,500,000	32	271,852,000
	1964	464,660,000	27,700,000	5.9	142,800,000	30	294,160,000
	1965	508,016,000	33,900,000	6.6	154,000,000	30	320,116,000
	1966	555,412,000	23,200,000	4.4	176,100,000	31.7	356,112,000
Standard (California)	1962	348,181,000	5,800,000	1.6	28,600,000	8	313,781,000
	1963	356,568,000	2,900,000	0.8	31,600,000	8	322,068,000
	1964	393,188,000	8,300,000	2.1	39,600,000	10	345,288,000
	1965	455,425,000	9,000,000	1.9	55,200,000	12	391,225,000
	1966	515,118,000	29,800,000	5.7	61,300,000	11.9	424,018,000
Shell	1962	173,555,000	7,200,000	4.1	8,680,000	5	157,675,000
	1963	211,575,000	19,100,000	9.0	12,623,000	5	179,852,000
	1964	213,575,000	2,800,000	1.3	12,585,000	5	198,190,000
	1965	274,507,000	26,600,000	9.6	13,876,000	5	234,031,000
	1966	313,085,000	46,100,000	14.7	11,785,000	3.7	255,200,000
Standard (Indiana)	1962	168,843,000	3,105,000	1.8	3,381,000	2	162,420,000
	1963	208,022,000	22,182,000	10.6	2,748,000	1	183,092,000
	1964	204,817,000	8,486,000	4.1	1,480,000	0.7	194,851,000
	1965	263,098,000	39,578,000	15.0	4,248,000	2	219,272,000
	1966	300,531,000	(1)	----------	49,672,000	----------	255,869,000
Phillips	1962	158,320,000	48,000,000	30.3	3,365,000	2	106,955,000
	1963	160,954,000	52,000,000	26.2	3,491,000	2	105,463,000
	1964	152,197,000	32,229,000	22.2	4,950,000	3	115,018,000
	1965	165,876,000	31,745,000	19.1	6,415,000	4	127,716,000
	1966	218,382,000	59,163,000	27.0	7,595,000	3.4	15 ,624,000
Conoco	1962	73,477,000	1,065,000	1.4	3,335,000	5	69,077,000
	1963	99,665,000	9,143,000	9.2	3,157,000	3	87,365,000
	1964	112,009,000	8,725,000	7.7	3,175,000	2	100,109,000
	1965	142,051,000	6,865,000	4.8	39,035,000	27	96,151,000
	1966	204,632,000	24,670,000	12.0	64,330,000	31.4	45,632,000
Cities Service	1962	84,143,000	20,773,000	24.7	3,185,000	3	60,185,000
	1963	101,976,000	20,188,000	21.4	4,283,000	4	77,505,000
	1964	113,405,000	27,925,000	24.7	967,000	0.8	84,513,000
	1965	137,118,000	33,000,000	24.0	976,000	0.7	104,118,000
	1966	195,328,000	52,663,000	38.4	901,000	0.4	141,794,000
Union	1962	59,421,000	8,000,000	13.5	5,500,000	9	45,921,000
	1963	73,028,000	13,100,000	17.7	6,000,000	8	53,928,000
	1964	87,564,000	13,300,000	15.2	7,200,000	8	67,064,000
	1965	119,214,000	15,604,000	13.2	8,840,000	7	94,770,000
	1966	170,782,000	18,398,000	10.7	10,144,000	5.9	142,240,000
Sun	1962	66,395,000	[2] 200,000	0	13,400,000	20	53,195,000
	1963	79,976,000	1,300,000	1.9	17,460,000	22	61,216,000
	1964	88,577,000	2,400,000	2.7	17,670,000	20	68,507,000
	1965	113,405,000	10,300,000	9.0	18,220,000	16	84,835,000
	1966	131,544,000	16,600,000	12.6	14,370,000	10.9	100,574,000
Marathon	1962	36,064,000	[2] 2,200,000	0	205,000	0.5	37,889,000
	1963	50,058,000	(3)	0	933,000	2	49,125,000
	1964	63,220,000	(3)	0	2,844,000	4	60,376,000
	1965	97,416,000	(3)	0	37,345,000	[4] 38	60,071,000
	1966	130,927,000	2,400,000	1.8	59,700,000	45.9	68,826,000
Atlantic	1962	61,110,000	0	0	14,844,000	24	46,266,000
	1963	56,747,000	0	0	12,734,000	22	44,013,000
	1964	61,081,000	0	0	14,005,000	22	47,076,000
	1965	105,299,000	0	0	15,188,000	14	90,111,000
	1966	127,384,000	------------------	----------	13,900,000	12.7	113,484,000
Sinclair	1962	57,936,000	------------------	----------	10,586,000	18	47,350,000
	1963	85,731,000	[2] 1,200,000	0	10,201,000	12	75,230,000
	1964	66,444,000	[2] 3,119,000	0	10,827,000	15	58,736,000
	1965	96,072,000	4,100,000	4.4	15,299,000	15.9	76,673,000
	1966	123,232,000	13,996,000	11.3	14,892,000	12	94,344,000
Standard (Ohio)	1962	37,235,000	9,275,000	25.0	3,738,000	10	24,222,000
	1963	54,008,000	15,225,000	28.1	4,896,000	9	33,887,000
	1964	70,252,000	21,150,000	30.2	5,334,000	7	43,768,000
	1965	82,848,000	26,300,000	31.7	6,836,000	8.3	49,712,000
	1966	84,481,000	21,200,000	25.0	6,345,000	7.5	56,936,000
Tidewater	1962	35,191,000	228,000	0.6	2,387,000	6	32,576,000
	1963	42,795,000	[2] 63,000	0	3,384,000	8	39,474,000
	1964	40,508,000	377,000	13.7	4,426,000	11	35,705,000
	1965	60,397,000	58,000	0.9	3,783,000	6	56,556,000
	1966	80,542,000	3,350,000	4.1	5,301,000	6.5	71,891,000
Ashland	1962	24,324,000	6,201,000	25.8	2,799,000	11	15,324,000
	1963	28,769,000	10,556,000	37.7	104,000	.3	18,109,000
	1964	36,385,000	9,672,000	26.8	2,977,000	8	23,735,000
	1965	50,594,000	15,500,000	30.6	2,440,000	5	31,594,000
	1966	69,324,000	20,830,000	30.0	5,570,000	8	42,924,000
Sunray DX	1962	41,203,000	3,850,000	9.3	1,152,000	3	36,201,000
	1963	49,727,000	6,533,000	13.3	1,328,000	3	41,866,000
	1964	29,357,000	[2] 7,115,000	0	1,290,000	4	35,182,000
	1965	43,367,000	353,000	0.8	1,572,000	4	38,592,000
	1966	55,367,000	8,847,000	15.9	1,710,000	3	44,810,000
Skelly	1962	22,674,000	1,260,000	5.7	250,000	1	21,164,000
	1963	27,479,000	3,025,000	7.7	275,000	4	24,179,000
	1964	26,601,000	785,000	1.2	275,000	2	25,551,000
	1965	39,995,000	5,625,000	14.0	375,000	.9	33,995,000
	1966	42,762,000	5,300,000	12.3	500,000	[4] 1.1	36,962,000
Pure	1962	27,680,000	[2] 2,546,000	0	1,276,000	4	28,950,000
	1963	28,582,000	[2] 1,212,000	0	27,000	.01	29,767,000
	1964	32,282,000	600,000	0	164,000	.5	31,518,000
Richfield	1962	36,615,000	6,000,000	16.6	0	0	30,615,000
	1963	29,767,000	1,300,000	4.4	773,000	3	27,894,000
	1964	26,255,000	[2] 629,000	0	5,429,000	21	21,455,000

Footnotes at end of table.

TAXES OF 20 MAJOR OIL COMPANIES, 1962–66—Continued

Company	Year	Net income before tax	Federal tax	Percent	Foreign, some States, tax	Percent	Profit after tax
Total	1962	$4, 198, 161, 000	$164, 500, 000	4	$838, 891, 000	20	$3, 194, 770, 000
	1963	4, 923, 081, 000	246, 660, 000	5	950, 540, 000	19	3, 662, 375, 000
	1964	5, 179, 036, 000	240, 529, 000	4	1, 064, 383, 000	20	3, 873, 836, 000
	1965	5, 816, 298, 000	404, 087, 000	6. 9	1, 200, 083, 000	20. 6	4, 209, 144, 000
	1966	6, 809, 111, 000	585, 115, 000	8. 5	1, 445, 313, 000	21. 2	4, 778, 802, 000

[1] Standard (Indiana) didn't show its foreign taxes in the 10K filing for 1966, but SEC Secretary Orval DuBois said SEC staff will contact Standard about the omission.

[2] Credit.

[3] Marathon has not shown in its SEC folder the breakdown for foreign and U.S. taxes for these years as yet.

[4] About $22 million went to Libya, but beyond that, the record doesn't show U.S.-foreign split.

[5] State income taxes.

Note.—Not to be reproduced by any means without prior written permission. Subject to copyright of Aug. 14 issue of Oil Week of which it's a part. Additional copies available from the publisher. This table supersedes all previous tables on this subject because of later material not available when earlier tables were prepared.

REMOVING THE OIL DEPLETION ALLOWANCE

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I was interested just a few moments ago in listening to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWARD] advise the House that he was introducing legislation to eliminate the 27.5 percent oil depletion allowance and making the statement that if the Committee on Ways and Means did not report out his bill, he was going to file a discharge petition.

I would merely remind the gentleman from New Jersey that the Ways and Means Committee has a majority of his party and that the House of Representatives is also constituted by a majority of his party. Therefore, I see no purpose or necessity for him to file a discharge petition if, in fact, the President of the United States and the leadership of his party are indeed interested in removing the oil depletion allowance. I would only read into his statement that he anticipates filing a discharge petition, a clear implication, and admission that the President, the leadership of the Committee on Ways and Means, and the leadership of the Democratic Party is opposed to the removal of this allowance.

I, for one, will be pleased to assist the gentleman and be delighted to sign the discharge petition and urge others to do likewise.

SOME STRAIGHT FACTS FROM THE ORRVILLE COURIER-CRESCENT

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the Orrville, Ohio, Courier-Crescent recently ran a column by Al Musser which contained a variety of facts on our Government and our society in general. It contains succinct probes into several areas, including labor demands—questioning at the same time how men lived before they expected to get many things for "nothing"—increased size and cost of the Federal Government, and lack of constructive criticisms from constituent to Congressman.

The column indicates several things, including the facts that people are concerned about these situations and, second, that facts about this gigantic Government are getting out to the people. It also indicates that we as Congressmen bear the weight of decisions for the people.

I include the Courier-Crescent article at this point. Al Musser has given the readers of the Courier-Crescent a few straight facts and indicated that anyone looking for someone to blame should look to both constituent and legislator.

MUSING WITH MUSSER

(By Al Musser)

We note that labor unions have come up with still another new idea—and by now some unions must be having as difficult a time coming up with new ideas in the line of wage increases and fringe benefits as politicians are having with finding new items to tax.

Now it's bonus pay for vacations. Yes, you read it correctly—bonus pay for vacations! Just plain paid vacations for anywhere up to 13 weeks a year or longer are old stuff.

The unions pointed out what everyone already knows—or should know if they have ever taken a vacation—and that is that going on a vacation is more expensive than going to work—and they figure that the employers make up the difference.

The Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, according to Carl W. Reinig, editor of The Weekly Labor Forecast & Review, is suggesting 50 per cent bonus added to regular wages for vacation—"to provide employes with additional cash in pockets."

Railroads, quite understandably, have taken a dim view of such an idea and say that it's "costly, silly and certainly not a serious proposal." Nevertheless, the recent Chicago truck drivers' settlement includes 45 hours of pay for each 40-hour work of paid vacation and the Labor Department reports that these extra-pay vacation demands are showing up more and more in bargaining talks.

The whole thing leads us to wonder whatever happened to the old idea of saving up for vacations and other special goals—but probably we're just too old-fashioned.

CRADLE TO GRAVE SECURITY

You've heard a lot in recent years about "cradle-to-the-grave" security. Well, two Teamster unions in Salinas, Cal., have actually made it—believe it or not!

A new contract with employers there provides a maximum funeral payment of $1,000 for any member who worked at least 80 hours in the month preceding his death.

What was it we said about new ideas?

RISING FEDERAL BUDGET

There are some important facts that all should know—facts which will help us to prevent a vastly higher level of federal spending in the future. They are facts that are going up and up.

For example, did you know that since 1960 the personnel comprising the civilian payroll of the federal government has grown by 25 per cent?

Did you know that since 1960 the cost of government payrolls—including the military—has grown by 75 per cent?

Did you know that since 1960 non-defense expenditures of the government are up 97 per cent?

And, still speaking of the year 1960, only seven years ago—did you know that expenditures for national welfare and health programs are up 210 per cent?

These are just a few items that all Americans should be considering. These are facts that show there is a strong probability that the government spending will double again in the 1970's—unless a sensible major change in attitude takes place.

It's predicted that we will have a $300 billion federal budget by 1975. Do the people really want this much government? Are we willing to pay the price for it? Can we pay for it? We wonder. Don't Gripe—Write!

Have you written your congressman lately? Have you ever written your congressman? Do you even know your congressman? More important—does your congressman know you?

Many complaints are being heard on Capitol Hill that the folks back home must not be interested or concerned in the vital issues of the day. The congressmen say that they depend on the reactions of their constituents to help them determine how to vote—but they are not getting these reactions!

Your congressman want to know how you feel about things—and in your own words! Form letters do not impress him in the least—for he knows that some organization with an ax to grind is lobbying for a point. It's your opinion—the opinion of you as an individual—that he is seeking.

Not only does he want to hear your complaints, but also about the actions which you approve. After all, he is representing you and is making important decisions for you. He needs your guidance.

TEACHING PEOPLE TO RIOT

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, for some time I have been saying that our poverty programs are having results which are the direct opposite of what they were set up for. Now a recent statement by Bayard Rustin echos my sentiments.

The Washington Evening Star of October 8 reported on a Rustin speech to a convention of the American Institute of Planners in which he said:

> This nation is teaching the poor that the people ought to riot lest they get nothing. It is teaching that [the] way to get something is to go to OEO (Office of Economic Opportunity) in the spring and tell them you are going to riot in the summer.

Some of us have been pointing out this poverty blackmail for a long time, but now we hear it from one who has worked from the inside of the movement to distribute poverty funds and the conclusion is the same.

I submit the article from the Star:

[From the Washington Star, Oct. 8, 1967]

PLANNERS HEAR RUSTIN ON RIOTS

(By Robert J. Lewis)

Recent urban rioting represents a "failure of this society" Bayard Rustin told a planners' conference at the Shoreham yesterday.

Addressing the 50th-year convention sessions of the American Institute of Planners, the executive director of the A. Philip Randolph Institute said that no "meaningful" solution can be "put into action in the present political atmosphere."

"We in America reject planning except for the private sector of the economy, so what we have is democratic socialization for the rich and rugged individualism for the poor," he said.

Urging organized planning and a "reordering" of government priorities, the Negro leader asserted:

"This nation is teaching the poor that the people ought to riot lest they get nothing. It is teaching that the way to get something is to go to the OEO (Office of Economic Opportunity) in the spring and tell them you are going to riot in the summer."

On the same program, Robert M. Hutchins, president of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, said more schools are segregated today than in 1964.

"We can't have integrated schools and segregated Negroes," he said.

"Good schools in slums will accomplish very little. The decisive factors are poverty, discrimination, family background, the condition of daily life—all matters outside the control of schools."

Sebastian de Grazia, author of "Of Time, Work and Leisure," said disaffection of some people can be attributed to too much free time.

"Among the young there is a vocal minority whose antipathy to work is more ideological than the bum's or the philosophic hoboes once was," he asserted.

Disinclination to work could very well spread to older persons in the future, he said.

He said "there is reason to fear, as some do, that more free time, forced free time, will bring on the restless tick of boredom, idleness, immorality and increased personal violence."

Earlier, a New York-based dissident planning group succeeded in gaining the floor for an attack on existing government policies and programs and what it called "failures of American democracy to provide equality of opportunity to all Americans."

The criticism came in a resolution adopted by the Planners for Equal Opportunity.

COMMENDATION OF THE HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE IN PROVIDING CONGRESSIONAL REPRESENTATION FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the House Judiciary Committee for the excellent job they have done by reporting out legislation enabling the District of Columbia to have voting representation in Congress. This is legislation which I have long maintained is overdue. It will correct a historic injustice and will bring the citizens of the District of Columbia closer to having their full rights as citizens of the United States.

The U.S. Constitution has been a model for the world as a democratic document. Yet in our Constitution, we failed to provide representation in Congress for our Nation's Capital. Other capital cities across the world allow their citizens representation. The French, who drew so much inspiration from our Constitution, gave the citizenry of Paris full representation and equal rights.

I would like to note six major countries which have federal cities as capitals similar to the District of Columbia. These six are: Argentina, Brazil, India, Mexico, Venezuela, and Australia. Apart from Washington, D.C., and Brasilia, Brazil, all these federal cities are represented in some fashion in their national legislatures. Brazil had full representation for its capital city until 1960 when its capital was moved from Rio de Janeiro to Brasilia. Representation has not yet been granted to Brasilia.

The United States is behind the other major nations which have federal cities. Mexico, our neighbor to the south, has a Federal capital city which is fully represented in both houses of their legislature. New Delhi, India, also has full representation, elected by the citizens, in both houses of Parliament. Caracas, Venezuela, another Federal city, elects representatives to their Senate in the same manner as the rest of that Republic, and several deputies based on population.

Although the Argentine Constitution has been suspended at this time, Buenos Aires is a Federal district which was accorded full representation in the Argentine Constitution of 1853.

Australia's capital city, Canberra, had one nonvoting delegate in the House of Representatives until 1966. In November of that year this delegate was given full voting rights.

In examining the experiences of other nations in the world, there appears to be no problem or question as to granting voting representation to the citizens of their capital cities.

We can show our belief in our democratic system and our pride in our Capital City by giving representation to the 800,000 citizens of the District. We in the 90th Congress can make a great contribution to the history of our Nation by taking this step. I hope that we will give an overwhelming vote in support of the legislation reported by the Judiciary Committee.

MORE MONEY IS NOT A CURE FOR WASTE

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the Derrick, Oil City-Franklin-Clarion, Pa.:

VIRUS IN COST-OF-LIVING

Like a fever thermometer, the cost of living index continues to indicate the presence of a virus in the U.S. economic system. That virus is inflation, and there is no cure for it except a strong dose of reform in the high-living habits of government.

There is talk of a substantial tax increase to help offset a deficit in the federal budget that some have estimated as high as $25 billion for the fiscal year that began July 1. But, a tax increase will not cure the virus of inflation nor curb the harassing monthly increases in living costs until people one day realize that the annual decline in the value of the dollar cannot stretch on into infinity with prices continuing to move inexorably upward.

At some point, there must be control of government spending or the dollar will cease to exist as a medium of exchange. That is the grim terminal diagnosis which the cost of living fever thermometer portends.

Curbing nonessential spending at all levels of government is more essential than ever before in our history.

The observation reflects a growing public resistance to the administration's proposal for adding to the Nation's tax burden, for it is now obvious that an increase through surcharge or under any other label would only encourage continuation of Federal waste and extravagance.

You cannot expect to check spending sprees by providing more money any more than you would attempt to cure an alcoholic by making more liquor available to him. Bureaucratic excesses will be curbed only when government is deprived of the finances which make them possible.

Congress can make available all the funds needed for military purposes without raising additional revenue or exerting inflationary pressures if the administration will adopt a measure of frugality in its domestic programs, for the Nation cannot afford gingerbread in its guns and butter program.

Regardless of the Labor Department's attempt to make a tax increase more palatable through its report that the war in Vietnam has created more than a million jobs in this country during the past 2 years, the taxpayer is not so gullible as to accept this statistic as justification for the administration's transparent money-raising scheme. If America must depend upon a prolonged conflict to sustain the domestic economy, then it is time for a complete reappraisal of the national objective. There is nothing commendable about high employment rates that come about through exposing our brave servicemen to enemy fire. There is no substance in an economy that relies on conflict.

Despite the growing opposition to the

surcharge plan, a group of businessmen have gone on record with the House Ways and Means Committee in favor of a tax rise. Obviously, this isolated segment of our populace includes industrialists and bankers whose added obligations would have little significance in comparison with the extreme hardship that would endure in most of the Nation's homes through another deduction in income. It would seem more appropriate for industry leaders to demonstrate their concern for nonessential spending even if such a commendable stand should imperil their Government contracts.

As the Derrick points out, there must be control of Government spending or the dollar will cease to exist as a medium of exchange. That control rests with Congress, which must recognize that the Nation cannot expect to enjoy the luxury of the Great Society's master plan so long as we have a war bill of $60 billion for a single year. Until the fighting stops, some of the promised programs must be curtailed and all that remain must be conducted in the most rigidly economic manner.

CONGRESSMAN HORTON INTRODUCES BILL TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL EYE INSTITUTE

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to establish a National Eye Institute within the National Institutes of Health. This bill, which I also sponsored in the 89th Congress, would establish a separate organization to conduct research into one of this Nation's most critical health problems: blindness.

Despite the fact that this Nation possesses the financial resources and scientific capability to provide our citizens with the best protection in the world against disease, 80 percent of the cases of serious visual impairment are caused by disease rather than accidents. This fact indicates to me that there is a serious deficiency in our present programs to prevent and treat blindness.

The fact that most people regard accidents as the major cause of blindness indicates that there is also a serious deficiency in the public's understanding of blindness. This is further illustrated by the fact that fewer than one-half of our fellow Americans even identify glaucoma as an eye disease. Yet this illness is responsible for a very substantial portion all the cases of blindness in this country.

This ignorance of the facts concerning glaucoma is particularly tragic because more than 40 million persons in the United States are suffering from the disease without being aware of it. These people could be treated rather effectively for the disease were they to become aware of it early enough and undergo proper care.

An analysis of governmental expenditures for the aid of blind and partially blind persons reveals the cause of these two closely related deficiencies in our efforts to combat blindness.

Public assistance payments to the blind average approximately $100,000,000 annually with the Federal Government providing about one-half of this sum. The Federal Government also contributes an additional $8 or $9 million per year to State rehabilitation programs. The Veterans' Administration provides another $26,000,000 per annum to some 10,000 veterans who are totally blind.

That these are worthwhile expenditures cannot be disputed but when we compare these sums with the amount being spent by the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness on research into vision failures, a stark contrast appears. Last year the Institute spent somewhat more than $15 million for all of its activities related to blindness, slightly over two-thirds of which amount was devoted to research into the causes of vision failure.

If blindness is to be effectively combatted this Nation must launch a vast and well coordinated research effort to determine the causes of blindness and develop treatments for it. This must be followed with a massive educational campaign to better inform the American public about this dread condition. To achieve this goal I believe a separate administrative unit should be created within the National Institutes of Health which will devote its full efforts and resources to this campaign.

The disadvantages which might result from administrative fragmentation caused by putting vision research into a distinct Institute under the National Institutes of Health would be greatly overshadowed by the promise of progress in the prevention of blindness which a full-scale operation could accomplish. Such an Eye Institute would attract the most talented and dedicated men of the ophthalmic science because it would offer them the unique opportunity to be effective in the struggle to wipe out the causes of visual defects. Such an institute would also bring about a more realistic balance between financial support of the blind and vision research for prevention of blindness. No change could offer more hope for the improvement of a situation which is now only becoming worse every year.

At the present time the leaders in the field of visual research are private groups such as the Lions International who are the prime instigators of the notable eye bank movement in this country. Seventy-five percent of the 80 eye banks located throughout the country are sponsored financially by the Lions Clubs.

As a matter of fact, the Lions operate a vision care center in my home community of Rochester, N.Y. Through their activities there, the Lions provide needed services and health assistance to individuals throughout the central New York area. I know that all of us here in the Congress are well aware of the outstanding work being done by institutions such as the vision care center in Rochester. We all owe a great debt of gratitude to these operations and to the local Lions Clubs which support them.

Since this movement began in New York City in the late 1940's, there has been considerable progress made in the use of corneal tissue to restore sight to the blind. This organization is effectively seeking a means for the cure of visual defects, especially through research into the causes of glaucoma and retinal detachment. In many of the Lions-sponsored institutes affiliated with hospitals and universities research scientists are developing ways to make more effective use of eye tissue.

The Federal Government should give this worthy endeavor a needed boost by accepting a greater responsibility in the field of eye research. We can no longer afford to ignore this governmental responsibility or refuse to admit it exists. The sight of many thousands of people could be saved through more aggressive governmental action.

The private sector cannot assume this burden alone. It is time the Federal Government entered the picture in a more than token fashion. It is now time to establish the National Eye Institute. I hope that the wisdom of Federal involvement will be appreciated by all of the Members of Congress and that this measure will soon be adopted.

CONGRESSMAN HORTON PAYS TRIBUTE TO STUDENT COUNCILS

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a joint resolution designating the last week in October of each year as National Student Council Week. I know from my own contact with student councils in the high schools and junior high schools of the 36th Congressional District of New York that these organizations make a very substantial contribution to the citizenship training which the young people of my area receive. I think it is most appropriate for the Federal Government to recognize that student councils across the country similarly play a most constructive role in building the character of American youth.

In honoring student councils we also acknowledge that the vast majority of our young people are exemplary citizens who are constantly seeking to develop the human qualities which will allow them to make the maximum contribution to our society.

Many of today's leaders in every field have in the past served as student council representatives in their secondary schools. In fact, I imagine that a large portion of our colleagues in this chamber today began their careers as elected representatives by serving on student councils.

I urge each of my colleagues to join

me in offering this tribute to America's youthful leaders.

CONGRESSMAN HORTON INTRODUCES BILL REQUIRING THE ELIMINATION OF ARCHITECTURAL BARRIERS TO THE HANDICAPPED IN PUBLIC BUILDINGS

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill requiring that all public buildings constructed with the help of Federal funds or financed through loans which are guaranteed by a Federal agency be designed so as to minimize architectural barriers to the handicapped.

In recent years business and industry has come to recognize increasingly that handicapped employees, because they desire to demonstrate their ability, are frequently among a firm's most dedicated and productive workers. This has increased the purchasing power of our handicapped citizens and many new products have been developed which are tailored to their unique needs. As a result of these and other factors, the handicapped person has become increasingly integrated into the social, economic, and cultural life of his community.

However, certain activities and areas are still "off limits" to the handicapped individual because he is unable to overcome physical obstacles to his participation or movement. For instance, in most cities public transportation; places of assembly such as auditoriums, gymnasiums, and stadiums; and even governmental buildings are designed in such a manner as to preclude the handicapped from using these facilities without great inconvenience, assistance, and advance planning.

Thus it is frequently a major undertaking for a handicapped person to cross town to visit a relative or to shop. It is often equally difficult for him to attend a baseball game or conduct his business with various agencies of the local, State and Federal governments.

This situation is particularly unfortunate because in many cases improved building and vehicle design could eliminate these physical barriers at little or no additional cost to their owners. In order to assure that these barriers are not perpetuated in certain public buildings constructed in the future, the bill I am introducing requires the General Services Administration to withhold approval of any architectural plans for public buildings which do not make maximum provision for convenient access by physically handicapped persons.

The need for this legislation was called to my attention by the letters of several constituents, including one from my good friend, Hon. Stephen May, a member of the Rochester, N.Y., City Council, who also serves on the Rochester Architectural Barriers Project Committee. Councilman May is today being honored by the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped for his excellent work with the Rochester committee.

I urge my colleagues to study this bill carefully and to support the inclusion of this much needed criteria in the design standards for public buildings constructed with Federal funds or financed with loans guaranteed by a Federal agency.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON SIGNS A NEW TREATY TO INSURE PEACEFUL USES OF OUTER SPACE

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include the remarks of the President at the ceremony of the Outer Space Treaty.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, in ceremonies at the White House on Tuesday, October 10, 1967, President Johnson signed the Outer Space Treaty which commits the United States and other countries to limit space activities for peaceful purposes.

In signing this treaty, President Johnson declared:

> It is with optimism that I greet this treaty. I see in it a hopeful sign that mankind is learning, however slowly, that wars are not inevitable; that national rivalry is not a permanent barrier to international understanding; and that a world of hostility and hate need not be the abiding condition of mankind.

The American people support these sentiments. And I believe that this treaty will become a landmark among the accomplishments of the Johnson administration.

This treaty is a major step toward world security and peaceful relations among nations. It is based on the concept of international cooperation, where, hopefully, nations will work together to extend mankind's frontiers to the planets and beyond.

I am glad to note that the President has once again extended our Nation's willingness to participate in such cooperative ventures. Noting that the first decade of space exploration witnessed intensive rivalry between the United States and the Soviet Union, the President declared:

> The next decade should increasingly become a partnership—not only between the Soviet Union and America, but among all nations under the sun and stars.

I share the President's view that the Outer Space Treaty is only the beginning "of what should be a long and cooperative endeavor in exploring the heavens."

Perhaps we may all hope that if mankind learns to work together in the heavens above, we may also learn to live in peace on the earth below.

I insert into the RECORD the President's remarks at the signing of the Outer Space Treaty at the White House:

TEXT OF THE REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT THE CEREMONY ON THE OUTER SPACE TREATY

The Age of Space began just ten years ago last Wednesday. I am sure Ambassador Dobrynin does not have to be reminded of that date—nor do any of us.

The world will never forget the intelligence, determination, and courage that placed Sputnik into orbit, and launched man's great adventure into space.

That adventure has unfolded, during the past decade, with miraculous speed and scope. Man has probed the moon and reached out to other planets in the solar system. And he has done all this in a spirit of peaceful exploration.

We are here today to proclaim the intention of 84 nations that this exploration shall remain peaceful. By adding this Treaty to the law of nations, we are forging a permanent disarmament agreement for outer space.

It outlaws the weapons of mass destruction from man's newest frontier.

It forbids military bases and fortifications on the moon and other celestial bodies.

It prohibits the testing of weapons in space.

It means that when man reaches the moon, he will land in a field of peace—not a new theater of war.

The spirit of international cooperation that has achieved this agreement is a beacon of hope for the future. It is a credit to all our peoples. If we had sought for excuses to postpone agreement, we could have found them with ease. Instead, we expended our efforts in achieving agreement—and we have succeeded.

The Treaty was negotiated in six short months. For this, I gratefully thank Arthur Goldberg—who represented our country—and all the wise and constructive statesmen of many lands who shared in that accomplishment.

The Senate of the United States gave its unanimous consent—and I can assure our distinguished friends from abroad that this is not something that happens every day.

That unanimous action testifies to the depth and sincerity of the American people's support for the purposes of this Treaty.

This unity is not new. Nine years ago, when I was serving in the Senate, I appeared at President Eisenhower's request before the General Assembly of the United Nations to make these remarks:

"Until now our strivings toward peace have been heavily burdened by legacies of distrust and fear and ignorance and injury.

"Those legacies do not exist in space. They will not appear there unless we send them on ahead.

"To keep space as man has found it, and to harvest the yield of peace which it promises, we of the United States see one course—and only one—which the nations of earth may intelligently pursue. That is the course of full and complete and immediate cooperation to make the exploration of outer space a joint adventure."

That was our position nine years ago. It is our position now. I want to renew, today, America's offer to cooperate fully with any nation that may wish to join forces in this last—and greatest—journey of human exploration. Space is a frontier common to all mankind; it should be explored and conquered by humanity acting in concert.

We have urged cooperation

In exploring the planets, or any portion of the solar system.

In the use of tracking facilities, so that brave astronauts and cosmonauts may fly with greater safety.

In mapping the earth.

In exchanging bio-scientific information.

And in international satellite communications.

We renew these offers today. They are only the beginnings of what should be a long cooperative endeavor in exploring the heavens.

Whatever our disagreements here on earth, however long it may take to resolve conflicts whose roots are buried centuries-deep in history, let us at least agree on this.

Let us determine that the great space armadas of the future will go forth on voyages of peace—and in a spirit, not of national rivalry, but of peaceful cooperation.

The first decade of the Space Age has witnessed a kind of contest. We have been engaging in competitive spacemanship. We have accomplished much, but we have also wasted much energy and resources in duplicated or overlapping effort.

The next decade should increasingly become a partnership—not only between the Soviet Union and America, but among all nations under the sun and stars.

The hard business of foreign relations requires a certain optimism. One must be convinced that, in time, men and nations can direct their affairs toward constructive ends.

It is with optimism that I greet this Treaty. I see in it a hopeful sign that mankind is learning, however slowly, that wars are not inevitable; that national rivalry is not a permanent barrier to international understanding; and that a world of hostility and hate need not be the abiding condition of mankind.

PULASKI DAY

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today is the 192d anniversary of the death of Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

Each year the President of the United States officially proclaims a memorial day in honor of Gen. Casimir Pulaski. By order of the President, all appropriate Government officials assure that all Government buildings display the flag in honor of the memory of this incomparable hero of our Revolutionary War.

The defense of liberty for which Casimir Pulaski fought and died is just as important to each and every one of us today as it was to the men and women in colonial days who sought to be free.

President Johnson emphasized this in his Pulaski Day memorial proclamation of September 26. He said:

> General Pulaski held the conviction that freedom is a nation's most cherished possession—that erosion of freedom anywhere weakens freedom everywhere. Americans have fought for that conviction many times. We are fighting for it today in Vietnam.

When George Washington was facing bitter opposition in the hours and days when he should have had the full support of his fellow Americans, there came to his aid a brilliant young officer—a Pole passionately dedicated to the cause of freedom in which Washington was so deeply engaged.

It must have helped and encouraged Washington in the midst of the enormous struggle gripping the Colonies to have the help and friendship of Pulaski. Washington was fighting a war not only against a powerful enemy military force, but a war against the complacency and open hostility of the Americans in whose behalf the war was being fought. Pulaski gave his heart and his hand to Washington's cause.

As President Johnson said, in referring to Pulaski:

> In memory of a gallant defender of our Nation, let us rededicate ourselves to the principles for which he gave his life—principles which millions of Polish immigrants to America have defended and strengthened over the years.

Our country is engaged in a conflict whose magnitude will be fully realized by future historians. Our President is right to maintain our presence in far-off South Vietnam. He needs more men and women with the courage and vision of a Casimir Pulaski to stand besides him in spirit and in deed in these difficult years.

Some years ago another great patriot, Adlai Stevenson, said:

> What counts now is not just what we are against, but what we are for. Who leads us is less important than what leads us—what convictions, what courage, what faith—win or lose. A man doesn't save a century or a civilization, but a militant group wedded to a principle, can.

So might Casimir Pulaski have spoken 192 years ago.

We honor a man here today who refused to compromise on principle.

His stubborn refusal can serve as an inspiration to President Johnson himself, for the President also today refuses to compromise on principle.

Mr. Johnson quite properly pointed out that he could improve his standing in the current rash of public opinion polls by ending the bombing of North Vietnam. But those who advocate this course must keep in mind that a bombing pause in North Vietnam would release a half million Communist soldiers to wage an all-out assault against our troops.

Those who urge a bombing pause with no guarantees that the Communists will not take full advantage of it must be prepared to accept the full blame for the consequences which, in my judgment—would release up to half a million Communist troops from North Vietnam—would send our own casualty lists to new heights.

It is easy enough to call for an unconditional end to the bombing, but I submit that this course ignores the consequences of such an action.

The reason why Hanoi is demanding an unconditional end to the bombing is because, in my judgment, Hanoi wants to send its crack troops from North Vietnam into South Vietnam: stage one huge lightning attack against the American forces—perhaps at Conthien—with the hope of destroying our forces and then agreeing to negotiations from a position of strength.

The Communists have not given President Johnson a single response to his many assurances that he is willing to end the bombing if they will assure the world they will not move their troops into South Vietnam during the pause.

Until such an assurance is forthcoming from the Communists, just as Washington had no alternative but to pursue the battle of the revolution, so President Johnson has no alternative but to continue the war against Hanoi.

ELIMINATION OF THE CASTRO-COMMUNIST REGIME OF CUBA

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 525 expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the elimination of the Castro-Communist regime of Cuba.

The resolution points out that the Castro regime, despite the negative sanctions imposed by the Organization of American States and its warnings, persists in abetting terrorism, sabotage and guerrilla warfare aimed at the violent overthrow of democratic institutions in this hemisphere and the imposition of Communist regimes.

The resolution states that it is the sense of the Congress that the Government of the United States should formulate and present to the Organization of American States a positive program for the elimination of the Castro-Communist regime in Cuba by whatever means may be necessary. The United States should undertake these measures in cooperation with other nations of this hemisphere if possible, but alone if necessary.

I hope that the resolution will obtain the immediate consideration of Congress. I am hopeful that the Organization of American States will take heed.

We can not tolerate in this hemisphere a regime which enslaves the Cuban people and threatens the freedom and security of the people of other nations of the Western Hemisphere.

Among the measures which could be effective are the immediate closing of seaports in the United States to ships trafficking with Cuba, many of these ships flying the flags of our so-called friends. And, Mr. Speaker, the seaports should also be closed to ships trading in any manner with North Vietnam. Furthermore, I think we should stop, right now, with what ever means are necessary, the delivery of goods by any ships to the ports of North Vietnam.

Our so-called friends should be helping us in our fight for freedom. But some are carrying on a brisk trade with the active enemies of freedom, both in the Western Hemisphere and in Southeast Asia.

How can we permit them to profiteer with American goods at the same time they are giving assistance to our enemies?

We are in a battle against communism and for freedom. It is no time for a business-as-usual policy. Close our ports to these false friends, take whatever other measures may be required to end the threat of communism in this hemisphere and to bring freedom to peoples elsewhere.

This is an important resolution. I call for immediate support from this Congress on its enactment.

AIR QUALITY ACT OF 1967

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HARVEY].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, within a few days we will consider S. 780, the Air Quality Act of 1967, which was ordered reported from the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on October 3.

There is an apparent misunderstanding or misapprehension over the amendment made in committee to section 208 (b) of this bill as it relates to control of automotive emissions.

Our committee, in reporting the Clean Air Act of 1965, recognized the uniqueness of the problem of mobile emissions. We knew then that the most effective control of air pollution by automobiles would be realized by improvement of the internal combustion engine. Engineering, within the automobile industry, had made substantial progress since 1965. The 1968 models now in the market have reduced the exhaust emission of hydrocarbons, on the average, from 900 parts per million in uncontrolled vehicles to 275 parts per million, and they have reduced by about 50 percent the emissions of carbon monoxide from these 1968 models.

The uniqueness of mobile emissions and the success of the industry in meeting HEW emissions standards for hydrocarbons and carbon monoxide have resulted in a Federal preemption of the setting of emission standards for vehicles, as expressed in section 208(a) of the bill, S. 780. This subsection is identical in both the House and Senate versions.

Both the House and Senate recognized that one State, California, has a unique problem in air pollution abatement. The greater Los Angeles area, by reasons of geography and topography, generates a photo-chemical smog which exists in like intensity and frequency in none of the other 49 States. The Senate version of S. 780 provides that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, may, after notice and hearing, waive the application of national emission standards for California so that California can adopt, with approval of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, more stringent emissions standards for that State alone. The House committee, equally mindful of California's unique and acute problem, gives authority to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, to prescribe, after notice and hearing, more stringent automotive standards for California alone. The House committee went a step further in authorizing the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, under this procedure, to set an automotive emission standard for California alone on a particular pollutant where no national standard exists.

Several problems arise in the approach of the Senate. It is unclear, for example, once California is exempted from the preemption provision of section 208(a), whether the Secretary would have the authority to terminate that exemption and, if so, under what conditions. Moreover, it is not altogether clear from the Senate approach whether the exemption would permit California to set standards with respect to pollutants which do not constitute a clear and compelling danger once the exemption has been granted. Furthermore, it is not sufficiently established, as far as I am concerned, that in the event of an inconsistency between testing and other enforcement procedures of the State of California and the Federal Government, whether the State testing and enforcement procedures would be permitted to stand. As far as I am concerned, in that situation, the Federal testing and enforcement procedures should prevail. But as long as the issue is not finally and firmly resolved, a manufacturer is presented with a severe problem.

Mr. HARVEY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DINGELL. Yes; I am happy to yield to my colleague from Michigan.

Mr. HARVEY. Is it your understanding that, in effect, the more stringent emissions standards which may be needed by California can be obtained in equal degree under either the Senate or House versions of section 208(b)?

Mr. DINGELL. Yes; under either version California can achieve its need for more stringent standards.

Mr. HARVEY. Am I correct in assuming that the press in California and, perhaps, a committee of California's Assembly believe that California can cope with its problem if the Senate version of section 208(b) prevails, but cannot cope with its problem under the House committee version?

Mr. DINGELL. I believe your assumption is entirely correct, and it is this misunderstanding which I want to clarify. California is given, by both the House committee and the Senate, an exception to meet its demonstrably unique smog problem.

California can arrive at more stringent emissions standards, under either the House or Senate version by procedures promulgated by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The House version is, in my opinion, better because it affords a single administration for the two programs—one for California and one for the other 49 States. It assures uniform testing and enforcement procedures for these two programs. And it confers the further privilege upon California's acute need in that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare can prescribe an emission standard for California where no national standard exists.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask the majority leader to give us what information he can about the program for the balance of this week and for next week, if he has that information.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the distinguished acting minority leader, we will have no further legislative business this week. I am not ready to announce the program for next week, except I will say this: We will have Consent Calendar day and suspension day on Monday, and one or more conference reports. We expect a number of the conference reports on the appropriations bill early next week, and the continuing resolution on appropriations next week, and we will have other business.

Mr. ARENDS. In other words, we might expect some rollcalls on Monday?

Mr. ALBERT. I should expect we will have rollcalls on Monday.

If the gentleman will yield further, we will announce the program tomorrow and will then ask to go over until Monday next.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

HOUSE REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE URGES THE CREATION OF AN INDEPENDENT FEDERAL MARITIME ADMINISTRATION—H.R. 159

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the House Republican policy committee supports H.R. 159. This bill would create an independent Federal Maritime Administration which would be headed by a Federal Maritime Administrator. All of the present duties of the Secretary of Commerce under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 would be transferred and vested in the Administrator and the three-member Board. In the 89th Congress, and again at the outset of the 90th Congress, the Republican leadership and the House Republican policy committee warned of a major crisis in the maritime industry and urged that steps be taken to correct what could become a disastrous situation. The enactment of H.R. 159 would be an important first step in revitalizing our maritime industry and restoring this country to its former position among the maritime nations.

In February 1962, the then Deputy Chief of Naval Operations, Vice Adm. John Sylvester, stated:

> The strategic importance of ocean transportation in wartime dictates that the United States must have under its control sufficient active merchant type shipping to promptly meet our emergency sealift requirements.
>
> The slow rate of progress made in the replacement of aging vessels has left us with a largely obsolescent Merchant Marine. Orderly shipbuilding programs and replacement programs should be instituted without further delay.

On September 28, 1967, Adm. Thomas H. Moorer, Chief of Naval Operations, warned that the swift expansion of Soviet naval power poses a "challenge to our free use of the seas—that is here for all to see."

The Johnson-Humphrey administration has not met this challenge. The President's promise in 1965 of a "new policy for our merchant marine" has not been fulfilled. There has been indecision rather than action. As a result, the percentage of U.S.-flag ships in the world's merchant fleet is one-half of what it was three decades ago. The percentage of American goods moving overseas on American ships is at an alltime low. In 1966, the United States put only 13 new ships into service. The Soviets took delivery of 62 ships in the last 6 months of 1966 alone. Some 80 percent of the Soviet fleet is less than 10 years old while nearly 70 percent of the U.S. fleet is more than 20 years old.

Under the provisions of H.R. 159, an independent Federal Maritime Administration with a Maritime Administrator at its head would be created. A Maritime Board composed of three members would be established within the Administration. The Federal Maritime Administrator would be the Chairman of the Board. All functions, powers, and duties of the Secretary of Commerce and of the offices and officers of the Department of Commerce under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 would be transferred to or vested in the Administrator. H.R. 159 also requires that the Maritime Board submit to the President and to the Congress, within 1 year after enactment, a report surveying the condition of the merchant marine, evaluating the effectiveness of existing law, and making appropriate recommendations.

It is unfortunate that the Johnson-Humphrey administration is opposed to H.R. 159. Action must be taken to reverse the downward trend of recent years. The creation of an independent Federal Maritime Administration is a logical first step. It would break the present stalemate. It would underscore the importance of our maritime industry. It would place Congress on record as being in favor of a merchant marine that can meet our defense commitments and once again carry the American flag to all the world ports of trade.

Once an independent Maritime Administration is established, the maritime industry would cease to be a political football that is kicked from department to department. Moreover, the new Maritime Administration would have an opportunity to prepare a report which would contain long-range solutions to the many problems besetting the maritime industry. In its recommendations, it could propose a course of action that would provide this country with a modern merchant marine and a revitalized and modernized shipbuilding industry.

A reasonable and forward-looking maritime program must be developed. The neglect, confusion, and inactivity of recent years must be ended. The Republican-sponsored and supported bill, H.R. 159, was reported from committee on August 31, 1967. It was given a rule on September 27, 1967. It should be scheduled for floor action without further delay.

WHITHER AMERICA?

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago I had the privilege of attending a meeting of the Printing Industries of America here in Washington, where Mr. E. J. Triebe, president and chief executive officer of Kingsport Press, Inc., delivered a most outstanding address.

Mr. Triebe, who lives in my hometown of Kingsport, Tenn., has spent almost all his working life at the Kingsport Press—this year marking his 40th with the company. At one time or another, he has done with hand, heart, and mind every job there is to be done in a plant which takes raw paper and ink and turns them into hard-bound books.

The Kingsport Press is the largest book manufacturing plant in the world and is one of Kingsport's and the Nation's most respected industries.

I first met Ed Triebe back in 1934 when I worked at the Kingsport Press as a young man just out of high school. Mr. Triebe was then, as he is now, a gentleman in every sense of the word. His dedication and leadership have guided the Kingsport Press through many difficult and trying times.

The son of German immigrants of modest means, Ed Triebe was raised in Queens County, N.Y., and attended the New York City public schools. He spent 1 year at New York University's School of Engineering before entering the U.S. Naval Academy. At Annapolis, he became business manager of the annual, The Lucky Bag. In life's strange way, editing The Lucky Bag in 1924 started Ed Triebe on the steep path which led to the top of the hill for him—the presidency of Kingsport Press in 1960.

His biography reads like a Horatio Alger success story. A list of his many accomplishments follows:

EDWARD JAMES TRIEBE

(President and chief executive, officer, Kingsport Press, Inc., Kingsport, Tenn.)

Born in Oswego, New York, September 15, 1902.

Educated in New York City grade and high schools.

Attended Engineering College of New York University, New York City, and the United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland.

1924–25: J. F. Tapley Company, New York City.

1925: Secretary, Bookbinders' Guild, New York.

1926–: Kingsport Press, Inc.

1926–31: American Red Cross Life Saving Instructor.

1926–: Honorary Member Bookbinders' Guild New York.

1931–34: President, Kingsport Press Credit Union.

1931–: Director, Kingsport Press Credit Union.

1934–37: Chairman, Kiwanis-Rotary Student Loan Fund.

1939–40: President, Tennessee Credit Union League.

1939–40: Director, National Association of Credit Unions.

1939–42: Director, Tennessee Credit Union League.

1942: Director, Salvation Army Board of Kingsport.

1942: Director, Tennessee Tuberculosis Associaton, and Chairman of Seals Sales.

1943–46: Chairman, Kingsport Recreation Commission.

1945: Originator of City of Kingsport Ordinance establishing Kingsport Public Welfare Commission.

1949: Vice-President, General Superintendent, and Director of Kingsport Press, Inc.

1949–50: Chairman, Research Committee, Book Manufacturer's Institute.

1950–51: Chairman, Planning Committee and Ways and Mean Committee of the Research and Engineering Council of the Graphic Arts Industry, Inc.

1950–54: Member, Technical Advisory Committee of the Graphic Arts Research Foundation.

1950–58: Member, Executive Committee, Research and Engineering Council of the Graphic Arts Industry, Inc.

1951: Second Vice-President, Book Manufacturers' Institute.

1951: Second Vice-President, Kingsport Chamber of Commerce.

1952–54: President, Research and Engineering Council of the Graphic Arts Industry,

1953–57: Member, Research Committee, National Association of Manufacturers.

1953: Who's Who in America.

1954: Executive Vice-President and Treasurer of Kingsport Press, Inc.

1954: First Vice-President, Kingsport Chamber of Commerce.

1954: Director, Holston Valley Community Hospital.

1954: Guest Member, Court of Honor, Holston District, Sequoyah Council, Boy Scouts of America.

1954: Chairman, Kingsport Girl Scouts Camp-Establishing Committee.

1954–55: Director, Community Chest of Kingsport.

1955: Co-Chairman, Committee to Fluoridate Kingsport's Water Supply.

1955–57: Chairman, Operations and Extension Committee, Holston District, Sequoyah Council, Boy Scouts of America.

1956–58: Chairman, Binding and Finishing Committee, Research and Engineering Council of the Graphic Arts Industry, Inc.

1957–58: Chairman, Letterpress Research Committee, Research and Engineering Council of the Graphic Arts Industry, Inc.

1958: Awarded "Inland Printer" Certificate for being an Outstanding Leader of the Commercial Printing Industry of the United States. One of 75 so honored in their Diamond Anniversary Issue.

1960–: President of Kingsport Press, Inc.

1964–: Chief Executive Officer of Kingsport Press, Inc.

1964: President, Kingsport Press Credit Union.

1965: Member, National Advisory Council, Girl Scouts of the United States of America.

1965–: Director, Graphic Arts Technical Foundation.

1965–: Member of Policy and Plans Committee, Book Manufacturers' Institute, Inc.

1965–: Member, Executive Committee, Research and Engineering Council of the Graphic Arts Industry, Inc.

1966–: Member, Industry Relations Group, Book Manufacturers' Institute, Inc.

1966–: Member, Advisory Board, Southern Highland Handicraft Guild.

1967: Industry Chairman for National Bible Week.

Mr. Triebe's thought-provoking address, "Whither America?" was one of the most interesting and enlightening speeches I have had the pleasure of hearing in many years, and I want to pass along his remarks for the benefit of my colleagues and the readers of the RECORD.

WHITHER AMERICA?

(By E. J. Triebe, president, Kingsport Press, Inc., Kingsport, Tenn.)

This audience would doubtless prefer to have me concentrate on our 4½-year labor dispute which recently ended after receiving the full treatment by professional labor leaders, full exposures to Federal Labor Laws, and walking the narrow corridors permitted to management by the National Labor Relations Board. However, before accepting the invitation to participate in your program, I tried to make it clear that I would not engage in post-mortems. The facts surrounding our strike are now in the public domain from whence they should be withdrawn for study, debate, inferences, and conclusions only by those who possess the special talents of lawyers, historians, social scientists, and students of government at all levels.

Nor will I debate negatively the theory of unionism with which—strange as it may sound—I have no quarrel. My oft stated beliefs are so simple they might well have eluded the union professionals who concentrated too closely on the strategy and tactics of the "Economic War" which they declared against Kingsport Press. They could have missed the forest because of the trees.

My beliefs are simply this:

Free from coercion, intimidation or threats of any kind, every American citizen must defend his individual right to decide:

1. To work or not to work.
2. To join or not to join a union.

However, I assure you that I will not discuss something completely foreign. My experiences of the past four years—still close to the surface—lead me to hope you might be interested in a worm's eye view of his total surroundings. A worm that has been stepped on, that is.

I see:

Democracy drifting from the self-reliance which our forefathers exercised. They studied and recorded nature, passed from generation to generation sage advice about when to shingle the barn, dog-days, and goose-grease. The almanac was second only to the Bible. They begot and raised children to regard work as a right, and discipline as a duty.

These traits were then called foursquare; today, square.

Today:

Goose-grease replaced by chemicals and pharmaceuticals.

The almanac a droll conversation piece.

The Bible read—occasionally.

Drifting away from God and Church.

Family life has changed from begetting and raising children, to begetting, but somebody else raises them.

Children-raising relegated to systems of schooling from head-start to college, and baby-sitters pinch-hitting for parents.

Draft-dodging, a sign of sophistication. Flag and draft-card burning a popular sport.

Discipline and duty matters of moods of the moment.

Sympathy about riots and lawlessness elsewhere, but refusal to believe it will happen where I live.

Labor caught between economics, and professional union power.

Shrinking from politics—as if it were leprosy.

While learned jurists beat the devil around the legal stump of free speech, rabble-rousers preach class hate, sedition, and riot. A few may get tagged for income tax evasion, not sedition.

Orating about devotion to the principle of democracy, we sacrifice thousands of lives and billions of assets to plant it—elsewhere.

Fellow Americans are risking and losing lives in Viet Nam, as in Korea, as in World War II, and as in World War I. The World War I slogan was "Make the World Safe for Democracy," and for Viet Nam the slogan is the right of "Self-Determination" for all nations.

Our advertised posture is that democracy is the best of all forms of government. We want everybody to have democracy, and we are in the business of exporting it.

"Physician, heal thyself," cries the old proverb!

Amidst huge commitments of lives and resources to the exportation of democracy, it is going down the drain in our own county. Observant listeners must be shaking their heads over our stupidity, cupidity, blindness, and artlessness.

How can we logically claim that we have a functioning democracy when we constantly relegate to federal and other types of absentee control, decisions about what we eat, drink, see, hear, where we live, where we work, how much to produce, and for how much pay?

But, if we can't defend the claim that ours is a functioning democracy, we parade distractions, such as:

The only alternative to total control is total chaos.

We have the highest standard of living.

We are affluent and secure.

We live longer.

Such distractions are partly true, and partly rhetoric. There's another side to the coin:

We pay staggering taxes and pile up huge debts for unborn generations to pay. How will these unborn generations pay off our debts and have anything left to eat, or to solve their own social problems? Will their only salvation lie in repudiating our debts?

We practice the habit of ignoring uncomfortable and worrisome circumstances in which we are not personally involved. The habit is growing at an alarming rate. It feeds on appetite for the affluent society, and total security. My affluence, and my security—that is.

Because we personally feel the tax bite, we are beginning to protest. But largely unnoticed, except by prophets such as Herbert Hoover, is the surrender of a piece of individual liberty in exchange for each piece of personal security.

From my view, I also see:

Democracy lives because it is the only system of government which provides for the exercise of individual freedom, and has within itself the mechanism to change the mistakes of yesterday. By its very nature, it can never be exactly right at any given day or time. It swings like a pendulum, and pendulums swing beyond mid-point. For example, the current condemnations against our being in Viet Nam. It isn't too long ago when isolationism was condemned as unintelligent, unsophisticated and un-American.

Democracy is prey to virulent outside onslaughts, such as the constant beating of "have-nots" against a nation of "haves." It is reported that nearly 75% of the people of North, Central, and South America are "have-nots," meaning they don't have enough to fill even their stomachs, let alone reach for the wants which come after hunger. The 25% who "have" is concentrated in the United States, which makes us the target of every demagogue.

Democracy, depending largely on its past batting averages, and hopes for the future, also has virulent internal destroyers, such as:

Public apathy and indifference.

Freedom exchanged for security.

Over-extension of human, physical, and financial resources.

Pie-in-the-sky and Pied Piper schemes.

Minorities infiltrating and controlling our society and our government.

Control, by one minority after another, has oft occurred in our country; but, when the minority grows too abusive, the majority can, if it will, wake up and slap down the abusers with corrective legislation. This is sometimes effective, and sometimes ineffective. It is ineffective when the majority goes back to sleep too soon.

For a case in point, examine the history of the organized labor minority which functions today like a monopolistic trust.

To control the greed of those whom Theodore Roosevelt called "Malefactors of Great Wealth," Congress passed the Sherman Anti-Trust Act in 1890. In a democratic society this was then—and is today—basically sound legislation if applied universally and impartially.

Twenty-four years later, doubtless in the mood to help the then hard pressed, struggling and fledgling labor movement, Congress passed the Clayton Act which insulated organized labor against anti-trust provisions of the Sherman Act. Another 18 years later, the Norris-LaGuardia Act again insulated organized labor, this time against certain injunctive proceedings. And again, the Wagner Act presented them with extensive advantages in organizing, and in member control. With the stage thus set, was not gravitation predictable from "Malefactors of Great Wealth" to "Malefactors of Great Power"? Who is to say which of the two is the lesser evil? Must the too late decision rest until historians of the 25th Century sift the ruins of a 20th Century democracy?

I do not see the "New Deal" as the origin of minority control, huge bureaucracy, nor class struggle between labor and management. But Franklin Roosevelt's delicately tuned political ear did motivate him to provide most favorable growing climate for seeds planted long before his time. And, he did provide multipliers resulting in the controls which professional labor leaders today exercise over government, courts, management, workers, and economic life.

Not surprising, therefore, was the later legislative reaction to the excesses spawned by earlier legislation. Nineteen states passed "Right-to-Work" laws, and Congress passed the Taft-Hartley and Landrum-Griffin Acts.

But equilibrium has not been restored, and will not be restored so long as political and economic control is permitted to flourish under the doctrine of "protected activity."

The public is harassed by subway, airline, railroad, police and school teacher strikes; management has a choice between strike, or forcing their workers to join unions; workers have a choice between union membership or loss of job; and union members have a choice between obedience to union professionals, or face expulsion and fines. Such Hobson's choices of being damned if you do, and damned if you don't, certainly do not reflect the legislative intent nor language of the Taft-Hartley and Landrum-Griffin Acts, nor the life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness supposedly guaranteed by the Constitution. They are over-ridden by the climate of boards appointed by the Executive Branch of Government, who perform like players instead of impartial umpires; courts refusing cases on the grounds Congress has preempted expertise to Executive Boards; the President and Congress frozen into immobility through fear of organized massive political revenge.

Under the doctrine of lawful "protected activity" organized labor enjoys wide safe harbor in such vital areas as anti-trust, informational picketing, and injunctive procedures. Activities which are patently illegal or subject to damage suits if attempted by anybody else, are a "protected activity" if the transgressor is a government anointed professional labor organization. One of the more amazing results of this situation is that it can serve as a curtain behind which labor organizations can surface in the market place as an ally of some competitor paying lower wages than yours.

Insulated as a "protected activity," this tax-free multiphased trust moves forward on an ever widening front, as in industry-wide, area and multi-plant bargaining. Also termed "Coalition Bargaining" a recent publication warns against this critical excursion in the following words:

Quote:

"We cannot, however, depend upon management's having sufficient bargaining power in many cases to withstand union pressure for coalition bargaining. Therefore, the most important management action to be taken against coalition bargaining is an aggressive drive to achieve basic reforms in our labor laws."

Unquote.

COPE, the political arm through which the AFL–CIO undertakes to reward friends of professional labor, has been described by the House Minority Leader as the best, most efficient, most astute, and most broadly organized political machine in history. It's probably also the best financed. Its function is to consolidate and spread professional union power by "educating" union members about who and what COPE says is good for them. It "educates" to only one point of view, and nobody expects this kind of "education" to be unbiased.

COPE'S start and solid growth did not just happen to coincide with the retreat of the businessman from active politics. Its growth was a direct result of this retreat. Businessmen left a clear and unchallenged field to COPE.

Businessmen went into their sulk because Franklin Roosevelt was having such a high old time using first bankers, and then all business, as his favorite whipping boy for all social ills. During this period of sulk, class distinction was intensified by the premise that whatever political candidate a businessman is for, his employees are automatically against. It was said to be the "Kiss of Death" for any candidate to be caught being supported by business.

Maybe COPE itself planted that "Kiss of Death" slogan, because it certainly silenced opposition during the crucial years COPE was sowing and cultivating its garden of political power. But the slogan blew apart when businessmen in droves attached their names to full page newspaper ads in support of presidential candidate Lyndon Johnson.

The Constitution declares for three equally balanced branches—Executive, Legislative, and Judicial. It was conceived as an equilateral triangle; but, today it is a most irregular triangle with the Executive Branch stretched by far into the longest leg. Laws passed by Congress and administered by Executive appointed boards, commissions, departments, and bureaus, have been stretched way beyond the legislative history of the law, and in some cases even beyond the plain English of the law itself.

Sometimes a Board changes its rules without notice, or hands down rules favoring the political or social climate of the moment. You don't like the rule and insist on playing at democracy? The Chairman of one Board said to a gathering I attended, "You can appeal our findings to the court," which, to my mind was his indictment of one of the great faults in the way we practice democracy today. In making this taunt to "take it to court," he knew very well that courts had already abdicated hearing some phases of the law his Board administers, and—even if the court does agree to review—it can be years before the case is decided with irreparable damage done in the meantime.

Democracy in action is described by Abraham Lincoln in these words:

"All people can be fooled some of the time; some people can be fooled all the time; but all people can't be fooled all the time."

These words warn us of the existence of a time fuse, time for "all" people to get wise and correct; and time is one thing democracy hasn't got enough of. In every democracy so far, time ran out before "all" people got around to realizing they had been "taken," and moved for correction.

Greece, the cradle of democracy, is today described as follows in an editorial which appeared in the Kingsport Times, on August 14, 1967:

Quote:

"In Greece the government is in the hands of a trio and they have put an end to all political squabbling and popular disturbances by the simple process of ending democratic processes. They have no freedom. They live under strict regulation down to minute detail.

"The keynote of life in Greece today is the remarkable statement of General Patakos, the Big One of the Big Three. 'When people are afraid, they behave themselves.'

"This is Greece, the cradle of human liberty.

"Many people are saying that the Greeks brought this on themselves by abusing the freedoms they once enjoyed. They forgot that freedom must go hand in hand with self-discipline. The democratic process has failed in the country that gave it birth."

Unquote.

I have reviewed some alarming phases of our society, such as citizen apathy, indifference, security worship, flight from freedom and democracy, burgeoning control by Executive bureaus, boards, and commissions, the spawning, care and feeding of professional union power. These movements relate and interconnect.

Whereas, other speakers may concentrate largely on one phase, I have assembled several into a mural focussed on a central theme—the frightening withdrawal from reality of millions of citizens who maintain that politics is a dirty word, and claim that voting is useless and stupid. Unless twice as many well-informed people begin going to the polls, and do it regularly, the preservation of democracy is impossible.

We must achieve an 80% turn-out of an informed and active electorate. It is the only way to stop control by organized minority, of the headless and heedless majority. It must occur at all legislative levels—city, county, state, and federal; and, when the well-informed active majority recaptures ballot box control, the message will ring loud and clear through every Executive bureau, commission and board, legislature, and court. The "majority" herein referred to is the total of all citizens eligible to vote, and not the pitifully small percentage who do vote.

Note that I have specified a well-informed majority. Information from all sides and of all shades is the cornerstone of being well-informed. One-sided pressurization is brainwashing.

Each of you, in your plant and office, can launch a grass-roots return to the polls of the well-informed majority. If you give it your serious support, it will fan out like the ripples of a stone thrown into a placid lake. I definitely do not recommend that you break out in a rash of enthusiasm and energy just a few days before election. You will be too late, because emotions will already have hardened along party lines.

At Kingsport Press, we began a political education program for employees about a year ago and have since run through one state and one local election. We should have started years ago.

Our program—like a science lab course—begins by dissecting and studying the framework of constitutional governments, and the structures of election laws at all levels. The study group, quickly sensing the ease with which a willful minority can establish a beachhead, infiltrate, and capture control of any part of this framework, starts perking up its interest and concern.

Definitely not a lecture course, each participant acts as the discussion leader of an assigned topic. There is a seminar leader or chairman, whose job it is to keep discussions on track, and to rule out excursions into partisan politics. You may find it advisable to invite an outsider to chairman the first group; but from then on the program will develop its own leadership. And, I predict that you will be greatly surprised by the intelligence and talents which surface in these sessions, especially amongst younger employees whom you know less well.

Each seminar consists of eight weekly two-hour breakfast sessions, of no more than 20 participants, topped off by a ninth session at which participants query a panel composed of local party leaders, city, state, and federal elected representatives, and—when an election is due—candidates. These panels are always bipartisan. Seminars must not be held only before elections. They must continue during the dry months between elections.

Company officers and supervisors were our first seminar participants; but for subsequent sessions hourly workers, men and women, are volunteering in increasing numbers. So far, we have had six groups, totaling 107 participants.

In the two elections which occurred during our first six seminars, it was most gratifying to see the large number of employee participants who became block and precinct leaders for the party of their choice. Both Democratic and Republican party leaders were doutbless gratified, surprised, and sobered by this new breed of party workers.

We strongly believe that democracy and capitalism cannot be rescued, nor is corrective legislation possible, without a major change at the grass-roots level—the precinct.

In the face of already entrenched power it is useless to fume about the annoyances, inequities and tragedies currently rampant. The drain on freedom and democracy must be stopped at the point where it began—the ballot box. The hand-picked, prodded, herded, and doubtfully informed voting minority must be replaced by large armies of virulent, active, and well-informed, voters.

At Kingsport Press, we have started to make this change amongst 2,500 employees. In doing so, our start was greatly helped by literature available from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, called "Action Course in Practical Politics." Write it down! I strongly recommend this to your attention and use.

Can we, like Greece, lose democracy? We can and we are!

Lincoln, in words too long ignored, clearly predicted as follows:

Quote:

"The world never had a good definition of the word liberty, and the American people are much in want of one. We all declare for liberty; but in using the same word we do not all mean the same thing.

"What constitutes the bulwark of our . . . liberty and independence? . . . Our defense is in the preservation of the spirit which prizes liberty as the heritage of all men. Destroy this spirit, and you have planted the seeds of despotism around your own doors.

"At what point is the approach of danger to be expected? It must spring up amongst us. If destruction be our lot, we ourselves must be the authors and finishers."

Unquote.

We have most certainly been our own authors, and done our own seed planting. Now, unless we—all the people—decide we won't be fooled all the time, Lincoln's total prophecy will come to pass. We, ourselves, will have authored, planted, and finished the destruction of our freedom and democracy.

U.S. TEXTILE EXPORTS TO JAPAN

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to

the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the idea of exporting American textile products to Japan may appear to some as foolish as the old idea of exporting "coals to Newcastle," but it is not an unrealistic prospect, as Americans have shown by their efforts to compete in Japan in the area of electronic equipment. And, in fact, Americans do seem to be exporting textiles to Japan. An article in the Fairchild publication, Women's Wear Daily, of September 21, points out that—

> In July of 1967, American cotton textile exports to Japan amounted to 472,000 square yards compared with only 167,000 yards in the same period a year earlier.

In terms of total U.S. production, this may be a relatively insignificant amount, but it does prove that in certain specialty, or made-up textile items, there is a potential market for American textile exports.

But what about increasing these export sales? Here the Women's Wear Daily article, based on interviews with U.S. textile exporters, reports that in Japan the imported textile product blocked by high tariff and nontariff trade barriers, the latter mostly in the form of sumptuary taxes on "luxury" textile items. These high barriers make textile sales difficult, even though the Women's Wear Daily reports that—

> Most exporters said getting their products into the country was relatively simple since the Government eased limitations on foreign goods.

Some complaint was recorded about the unfriendly attitudes of Japanese businessmen toward foreign textile competition.

What it seems important to note here is, first, the fact that the United States does actually now sell, and has the potential for more sales of textiles to Japan. This represents some degree of progress, progress which can be built upon to create the conditions for fair two-way textile trade if the Japanese will show a willingness to decrease their own barriers to U.S. textile exports. The United States has its own nontariff barriers on cotton textile imports in the form of quotas, but at least some of the argument for perpetuating and tightening those quotas rests on the idea that other nations do not permit fair import trade to take place.

The article referred to follows:

LOWER WAGES IS STRONG SUIT FOR JAPAN TEXTILE INDUSTRY

NEW YORK.—The Japanese textile industry holds the trump card in its lower labor cost.

Even an easing in their restrictions against imports into Japan is an empty gesture as far as the United States textile industry is concerned because it cannot compete there under any circumstances.

At a time when the Japanese are exerting efforts to prevent erection of further limitations on United States imports, the situation in Japan comes into sharper focus.

The recent, much publicized Japanese action in easing strict limitations on imports was of no help to American mills. They say they simply cannot compete with the lower costs of the Japanese.

While exports from this country might rise in the next year or two, it is doubted here that it will ever reach volume proportions.

In July of 1967, American cotton textile exports to Japan amounted to 472,000 square yards compared with only 167,000 yards in the same period a year earlier, according to the Textile Export Association of the United States.

This was dismissed by mill men here as being insignificant.

There is a limited market there for towels, sheets, pillowcases, some denims and flannels.

Most exporters said getting their products into the country was relatively simple since the Government eased limitations on foreign goods. One or two complained of the requirements for putting up deposits against the license but others said this was a relatively minor point.

One company president here, who asked that his name be withheld, said he had conducted a modest business in Japan but had found the attitude of the Japanese businessman about competition at home anything but friendly.

A business can be built up around a brand name or a well-planned promotion, he declared, but he has found it difficult to operate there on a permanent basis when laws discourage even partial ownership.

A second textile man who has sold home fabric to Japan said that as in the textile states here, there have been sporadic attempts in Japan to get a Buy Japan movement started.

Japanese tariffs and nontariff barriers on textiles vary with the commodity. On carpets and rugs there is a commodity tax of 10 per cent—applied only as room decorations. There also is a 10 per cent tax on embroidery on felt and felt articles, nonwoven fabrics, knitted and crocheted fabrics, shawls, scarfs and mufflers there is a 20 per cent tax—applied only on special luxury types; on apparel accessories the tax is 20 per cent with the luxury stipulation; also 20 per cent on rugs, and blankets if they have a heating device; linen goods with a heating device has a 10 to 20 per cent tax. Other madeup textiles have a commodity tax of 10 per cent if considered ornamental.

On carpets and rugs there is a quantitative restriction. This also applies to narrow fabrics.

In addition to these nontariff trade barriers, here are the actual tariffs on a few selected textile items: Synthetic fiber material varies from 12 to 25 per cent; cotton yarn 7½ per cent; terry toweling from 20 to 25 per cent and nonfill, strip 30 per cent.

MANMADE FIBER PRICES FIRMING

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, during the last half of 1966, because of overcapacity and sudden new imports, American producers of manmade fibers decreased prices in an effort to maintain markets and sales. In spite of their efforts, the temporary overcapacity situation resulted in decreased earnings for several of the large chemical corporations deeply engaged in fiber production. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 24, 1967, pages 19913–19932, is further exploration of these textile trade trends.

As many predicted during the first quarter of this year, the prices of various manmade fibers are now firming. An article in the Fairchild publication, the Daily News Record, of September 19, makes this clear:

> One thing fiber men are unanimous about: Business is better, prices are firmer, and everyone is much more optimistic than just a few months ago.

This important economic development is closely related to another area of economic policy; that is, trade policy. Some fiber producers in this country have strongly reacted to increased fiber imports with attempts to cut them off by means of quotas and licenses, partly because of the depressed prices and lower profits they experienced in 1966. It should be interesting to gage the reaction of these same companies to the now brighter prospects for manmade fiber sales this year and next.

The article referred to follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Daily News Record, Sept. 19, 1967]

FIBER PRODUCERS BEAMING AS PRICE INCREASES LOOM

(By Doug Hall)

NEW YORK.—Fiber producers are changing their tunes. Only the opening bars have been heard, but already it's clear there's been a switch to a firm upbeat in the market.

Some fiber men are even talking about raising prices, but no one will talk about specific increases in apparel deniers despite recent rises in nylon and polyester carpet fibers.

Claude S. Ramsey, president of American Enka Corp., said he "wouldn't be surprised, if there were price increases in the first quarter."

Stanley Rose, marketing manager of American Viscose Division of FMC Corp., talks of an eventual rise in fiber prices and adds, "we may have a price announcement shortly."

One thing fiber men are unanimous about: Business is better, prices are firmer, and everyone is much more optimistic than just a few months ago.

Why the turnabout? Mainly because retailers are doing better than had been expected. "There is an unusually strong retail business. This unusual surge has led to new optimism for spring, 1968," comments Joseph H. Anderer, vice-president for apparel marketing at Celanese Fibers Marketing Co.

Du Pont, the king of the fiber makers, had some guarded comment on this new wave of optimism. A spokesman gave the following rundown:

Orlon—there is moderate improvement.

Nylon—the volume is up modestly.

Dacron—both staple and filament have shown significant improvement.

Asked about reports that Du Pont had been selling 150 denier Dacron filament for knit dresses 10 cents off list and has now restored this item to list in the face of a firming market, this spokesman replied:

"The filament market—not only polyester but all types—has been very fluid. Fluctuations in price have followed the general trend of the market in the past and probably will in the future. At present, Dacron filament business is excellent, and this recent improvement in most segments of the business is reflected in increased fiber prices."

The Du Pont spokesman confirmed that 150 denier Dacron had returned to list price at $1.58 a pound. He added that business in September and fourth-quarter orders for Dacron filament were "excellent."

Bruce Roberts, director of merchandising for Eastman Chemical Products, Inc., says, "There's no question about it—business is better. Gray goods are sold ahead better.

Prices are firmer on lightweight goods in polyester. Business in general has firmed up. The manufacturers are in a good position. We're selling a lot of fiber."

Walter Polett, director of marketing for Allied Chemical Corp., commenting on the nylon market, says, "sales are firm and prices are firm. (It's the apparel fiber market) not the same situation as in the home furnishings market (where some deniers have really gotten tight) but I see a trend for good volume."

Higher prices of good quality long staple cotton are seen creating a more favorable position for rayon and polyester by some fiber producers.

A spokesman for Beaunit says this situation has increased volume on Beaunit's bright luster Vycron Tough Stuff polyester.

Mr. Rose sees a broadening application of rayon because of the tight situation in long staple cotton.

He is "quite optimistic" for all fibers, however. Citing "tremendous retail business," he views the polyester market as "changed materially."

He also points to the high cost of money the past year as having kept mill inventories slim and he sees the retail boom causing the mills to start buying.

Mr. Ramsey warns that the "import situation looming over the market could kick the props out from the market again," but he seems basically optimistic.

Mr. Ramsey calls the firming "long overdue," citing excessive price attrition, rising production costs and surplus capacity.

He points to a firmer situation in housing, the auto industry (despite the Ford strike) and apparel as giving the whole fiber picture new health.

Mr. Anderer says business is being given a boost by "continued growth of the durable press concept."

The hottest spot in this optimistic picture is knits, according to Mr. Anderer, who adds, "we have an awfully big stake in that.

"Bonding is better than last year and we do pretty well in that too," he comments.

As for polyester staple, Mr. Anderer says, "There's plenty of it, but its manageable. There's no shortage or price increases but business is very good."

A check with Monsanto Co. brought the comment: "There is no doubt the fiber industry is in better shape now than in recent months. The market is firming and there's a strong feeling of renewed confidence."

DO-NOTHING BOARD WINS BUDGET OK

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Gardner] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I propose that the Subversive Activities Control Board be abolished. This would be done in the interest of economy and because this Board does not serve a useful purpose.

The 17-year history of the Board is one of inaction and a decline in the Boards declared purposes. The SACB has not held a formal hearing since 1965. That means the taxpayers have paid each of the five Board members nearly $52,000 since their last hearing, 2 years ago. Congress has appropriated nearly a million dollars in the last 2 years. The SACB has been inactive for 2 years and prospects are that they will remain inactive because there is no truly active cases before the Board.

At this time I insert in the Record an article entitled "Do-Nothing Board Wins Budget OK":

Do-Nothing Board Wins Budget OK

Washington.—The Subverse Activities Control Board, which has not held a hearing in two years, apparently is going to remain in business for at least another year.

The Senate Appropriations Committee announced Thursday that it has approved a $295,000 budget for the five-member board during the year that ends June 30, 1968.

The House already has voted that sum, and the full Senate is expected to go along. The board sought $330,000. Sen. William Proxmire, D-Wis., recommended that the board get no money.

The board has been under congressional fire for three months, since President Johnson named Simon F. McHugh Jr., who married a former White House secretary, to a $26,000-year job on the board.

"This board is a costly anachronism," Proxmire said, "Its only service is in providing sinecures for political cronies. The shameful fact is that each of these five board members has been collecting $500 a week for the past two years for doing absolutely nothing, and that they continue to draw down that fat salary is a frightening waste of the taxpayers money".

MOST-FAVORED-NATION TREATMENT FOR POLAND

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I was distressed today to read the text of a State Department attack on an amendment I successfully sponsored to the House version of the 1967 Foreign Assistance Act. The text came to me from unofficial sources, after I had been informed officially that it was not available for public use and was intended only for the private reference of the House-Senate conferees.

Under the amendment, which has been rejected by conferees, the President is directed to suspend most-favored-nation treatment from Poland until he determines that that country is no longer supplying military aid to our enemy in Vietnam.

The State Department argument against my amendment is a shocking example of official indifference to the plight of our military forces—many of them of Polish extraction—who are fighting in Vietnam.

The heart of the argument is commerce, pure and simple. The State Department is concerned lest the United States lose some export business—perhaps as much as $53 million a year. To me, this is insignificant compared with the safety of our military forces.

Zenon Kliszko, Poland's No. 2 Communist, credited last June Hanoi antiaircraft weapons supplied by Poland with shooting down or damaging 40 U.S. aircraft. The Polish Defense Minister in a public speech in August said weapons supplied by Poland are being used effectively in Vietnam.

Instead of ceasing aid to Vietnam, Poland seems to be increasing it.

On September 10, three Polish ships simultaneously docked in Haiphong—the *Konopicka*, 11,779 deadweight tons; the *Benowski*, 12,395 deadweight tons; and the *F. Ceynowa*, 10,300 deadweight tons. Another Polish ship, the *J. Krasicki*, had been unloading her cargo just before the three vessels docked.

Based on past evidence, we may reasonably assume these shipments included military gear.

The critical issue before us is military, not commercial advantage. Should we close our eyes to arms aid by a nation receiving favored tariff treatment from us, or suspend the favor until the arms aid stops?

As long as American men are fighting and dying in Vietnam, the Congress has the duty to utilize every available economic means to punish those who furnish weapons to the enemy.

This punitive action may not halt the aid, but it will be beneficial warning to other nations enjoying favored tariff treatment not to arm our enemy.

No doubt the enactment of my amendment will disappoint some elements within Poland and even impair Poland's ability to pay its debts to the United States. Actually, these debts are being largely renegotiated to the advantage of Poland. But, regardless, should not our debt to American men killed or wounded by Polish weapons claim our first priority? Many of these casualties are Americans of Polish ancestry.

The fact that most-favored-nation treatment was not suspended when Polish arms aid was first publicized illustrates the tragic lack of priority assigned to the war in our national life and perhaps suggests why, so far, it has been a costly stalemate.

Following is the text of the State Department argument as presented to House-Senate conferees:

Raising discriminatory tariffs against Poland will not make the U.S. task easier in Vietnam. No hard evidence has come to light indicating that Poland's military assistance to North Vietnam is of any great magnitude. Withdrawing most-favored-nation (MFN) treatment will not force Poland to renounce support for a fellow Communist state. Nor will it significantly weaken the Polish economy. Indeed, it may result in countermeasures by Poland to reduce growing U.S. commercial exports to Poland, which totaled $53 million in 1966.

The President has determined that continuing MFN for Poland is important to the national interest and promotes its independence from dominance or control by international communism. We provide no assistance to Poland, and trade is the major instrument we have to promote this independence. Poland, with U.S. encouragement, is about to become a member of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, an organization in which each member is pledged to extend MFN treatment to every other member. The Polish decision to apply for membership was not lightly taken and represents a victory for those in the policy leadership who seek closer ties with Western Europe. To withdraw MFN treatment now would be a slap in the face to those leaders and an embarrassment in the eyes of our European allies. Upon Poland's accession to the treaty, the United States as a contracting party would also be put in the position of being unable to meet its GATT obligations.

Moreover, the granting of MFN treatment to Poland in 1960 involved the implicit understanding that Poland would conclude a $40 million claims settlement agreement with the United States. The payments are being made in 20 annual installments of $2 million. MFN tariff treatment is also an important element in Poland's ability to pay an average of over $20 million annually on its other long-term obligations to the United States Government.

The effect of the House version will be a hostile gesture which will undermine the President's efforts to improve relations with the countries in Eastern Europe. The position of those in Poland who seek better relations with this country will be undermined and the position of those who say that there is no future in good relations with the United States will be strengthened.

CUT SPENDING FOUR WAYS

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the hundreds of questions that have been asked of me in recent days by those seeking clarification of our recent debates on economy indicate that an effort to set the record straight is in order at this time. Perhaps this will make future debates even more meaningful.

Part of the difficulty arises out of the confusion of terms such as appropriations, obligational authority, authorizations and expenditures. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Laird] has given us an excellent "primer" on this subject, on page 27659 of the Record for October 3. In order to simplify the problem, I intend to use only the terms appropriations and expenditures today.

The easiest way to say it is that the Congress appropriates so that the President may spend.

The amount that the Congress appropriates in any 1 year is not directly related to the amount the President may spend that same year.

Over a period of years the Congress can and does control total spending by its action on appropriations.

But our action on appropriations at this session of Congress cannot control the amount the President will spend in the current fiscal year.

The President will spend in this fiscal year some money that he has left over from the appropriations we made in 1965 and some money that we appropriated in 1966 and some money we appropriate in this session of Congress.

If we wish to attack the fiscal problem squarely, we must deal with appropriations and we must deal with expenditures.

APPROPRIATION CUTS

The House has done a creditable job on appropriations. As many of us had pointed out, we have cut appropriation requests by $4 billion on the bills remaining. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. Mahon], chairman of our Appropriations Committee, has had subcommittees at work, as he promised, looking for ways to reduce still further the appropriation bills we have already passed. In recommitting the conference report on Health, Education, and Welfare and Labor, the House demonstrated that it does not wish to exceed the budget estimate on even the most appealing of projects.

The fact remains, however, that these appropriations cuts, as the gentleman from Texas has agreed, will be reflected in spending cuts of from only 50 to 70 percent of the amounts involved. We would need appropriations cuts of from $7.5 billion to $10 billion to reduce expenditures by $5 billion. We simply are not reaching this goal nor do I believe we can or will as a result of hasty reconsideration of the committee work of the past 9 months.

SPENDING CONTROLS

That means that an effective economy drive requires a hard look at the other side of the picture—expenditures. If we are to discharge our responsibility in this time of fiscal crisis, we must give the President direction on expenditures. That is what I propose to do with the Bow resolution or amendment. We will simply tell him that regardless of our action on appropriations, and no matter how much money he may have from prior appropriations, he is to spend no more than $131.5 billion and that is it.

The House demonstrated its approval of this spending limit when we voted 202 to 181 against the "spending as usual" continuing resolution 2 weeks ago. The Bow spending cut had been ruled out of order, but it was the real subject of the afternoon's debate and most people believed that the House vote was a vote to cut spending as I proposed.

There is a very significant difference between the Bow spending limitation and the so-called freezing of appropriations about which we hear so much discussion. The Secretary of Defense announces a moratorium on military construction contract awards. The Secretary of Transportation inquires about freezing part of the highway trust fund. The junior Senator from Florida suggests that 3 percent of each appropriation bill be frozen, the money to be released only when it is urgently required in the national interest. I recall to you that the President froze $3 billion after we adjourned a year ago. The freeze made headlines. The thaw passed unnoticed. By the end of the year only a few hundred million of the frozen funds remained in the icehouse. Presidential freezes are only deferrals. They have no effect on the amounts that may be spent ultimately, and that is why the President's people are so opposed to the Bow expenditure limitation. I do not say "freeze." I say cut spending $5 billion and put that $5 billion back into the Treasury where it can never be available again unless it is reappropriated by the Congress. That is a real deep freeze that will result in a real saving, a real control of spending. It is the only way that Congress can control the $50 billion or so that is in the President's bank account, unobligated from former year authorizations.

There is a great deal of cynical comment in the news about the reluctance of Congressmen to lose appealing projects in their home States and districts. There is a great deal of talk about buckpassing. We have an opportunity to put that kind of talk to an end. We can enhance the reputation of the Congress if we attack this problem squarely, for I am certain that the people of this country, faced not only by inflation but also with the tremendous burden of taxes, State, local, and Federal, are ready, willing and anxious to accept curtailment of Federal operations if we can show them that these are reasonable and necessary. They will, of course, resist the obviously political grandstand play that freezes highway trust funds or tries to make all of the savings in the school lunch program. The American people have been down that road before and they are impatient with political ploys when the Nation's economy and the integrity of the dollar are at stake.

THE SENATOR AND THE PRESIDENT

There was a great economy debate in Congress in 1957 when President Johnson was the Senator from Texas and the majority leader of that body. He was harshly critical of President Eisenhower and various Cabinet members.

Senator Johnson suggested that the Congress might consider a "4, 5, or 6-percent cut in each appropriation bill," a proposal his leadership now deplores.

Senator Johnson demanded that President Eisenhower send him a bill of particulars, a list of priorities so that Congress could cut the budget as President Eisenhower had recommended. President Johnson now insists that such a list cannot be supplied to Congress and he tells us that when he has all of the appropriation bills on his desk, he will decide where cuts will be made.

Senator Johnson in that debate in 1957 said:

> It is possible to convince some of the people all of the time that this administration has an economy and a spending record. It is possible to convince all of the people some of the time that this administration has an economy and a spending record. But it is not possible to convince all of the people all of the time that an Administration can both economize and spend at the same time.

Ten years later it can be said that the Johnson administration has failed to convince anyone that it is for economy. It stands openly for all to see as the greatest spending administration in history. President Johnson spent during the first 2 months of the current fiscal year at a rate more than twice as high as the 1957 budget that gave Senator Johnson such grave concern and alarm.

FOUR WAYS TO CUT

I have endeavored to keep this debate nonpartisan, for I believe it is too important for politics as usual. I am still hopeful that we can work together harmoniously to bring spending under control, head off the threat of inflation. To do so it is necessary for us to continue the effort to cut appropriations. We must carefully review every Government function as the gentleman from Arkansas has observed. We must be very cautious with any new legislation involving future commitments. And we must establish an absolute ceiling on spending during the current fiscal year. Only by pursuing diligently each of these avenues of attack can we meet and overcome the grave threat to our fiscal stability.

HIGHWAY CUTBACKS AGAIN—A CYNICAL, POLITICAL AND LARGELY INEFFECTIVE RESPONSE INTENDED TO BLUDGEON CONGRESS INTO PASSING A SURTAX

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, on October 8, 1967, Secretary of Transportation Alan S. Boyd sent a telegram to the Governors of each of the States proposing a crushing cutback in the Federal-aid highway program. In his telegram, Mr. Boyd stated that this might become necessary "in view of recent congressional discussion on the substantial reductions in Federal expenditures."

This proposal is an obvious sledgehammer tactic to bludgeon the Congress into passing the tax surcharges the President has recommended, instead of reducing unnecessary Federal expenditures.

It is a meaningless gesture. Cutting back on the Federal-aid highway program, which is financed on a pay-as-you-go basis out of the Highway Trust Fund, not the general fund, will have no effect whatsoever on the estimated expenditures in the administrative budget nor the deficit of about $29 billion which the President has forecast.

It is an unwarranted and unthinking attack on the Federal-aid highway program which the President himself has described as being "one of our best investments."

The Republican Members of the House of Representatives have proposed that Federal spending from the general fund be reduced by $5 billion. I am sure that most of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle are sincerely concerned about the critical financial condition of the United States and the prospect of a $29 billion deficit. The Committee on Ways and Means, under the able leadership of the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas, has taken the position that no surtax bill will be reported unless there is a $7 to $10 billion reduction in Federal expenditures. Yet the cynical response of the President to this sincere concern on the part of the Members of the House is to propose a destructive cut in an established program which benefits every citizen of the United States and is essential to both the national economy and national defense.

At the same time, the President continues to press for more money to spend on such controversial, questionable, and relatively new programs such as antipoverty, demonstration cities, rent supplements, the Teacher Corps, and highway beautification. In the highway beautification program, most of the requested funds are to be spent for the acquisition of interests in land outside the highway right-of-way.

The proposal to cut the Federal-aid highway program is in no way responsive to congressional demands for substantial reductions in Federal spending.

In the budget for fiscal 1968, submitted to the Congress last January, expenditures of $135 billion were estimated. In his message transmitting his recommendations for increased taxes, the President estimated expenditures of up to $143.5 billion and a deficit of nearly $29 billion. Republican efforts to reduce expenditures have been directed toward these budget estimates.

Expenditures for the Federal-aid highway program are not included in these expenditures and cuts in this program will not decrease the prospective deficit.

The Federal-aid highway program is financed out of the Highway Trust Fund which is the depository of amounts equivalent to several highway user taxes paid by the motoring public. The Federal-aid highway program is not financed out of the general fund. Consequently, expenditures for the Federal-aid highway program are not included in the budget estimates and the prospective deficit announced by the President.

The principal result of a cut in highway construction will be to disrupt—again—the highway program, which is most essential to the Nation's well-being and which must be conducted in an orderly fashion if it is going to be successful.

I would like to remind my colleagues of the chronology of events that have converted the Federal-aid highway program, which Congress intended proceed in an orderly manner without peaks and valleys, into a yo-yo program of ups and downs, and the Highway Trust Fund into a fiscal manipulation gimmick.

In October 1966, Federal-aid highway funds totaling $4.4 billion were apportioned to the States for fiscal year 1968. On the justifiable assumption that this amount would be available for obligation, the State highway departments proceeded to prepare plans and programs for construction projects.

In November of 1966 a $1.1 billion cutback in the program was abruptly announced.

On February 27, 1967, during joint Senate and House hearings on the highway cutback, Secretary Boyd announced a release of a part of the frozen highway funds and stated that "a full annual program level of $4.4 billion will be put into effect with the start of the new fiscal year on July 1."

On August 29, 1967, Federal-aid highway funds totaling $4.74 billion were apportioned to the States for fiscal year 1969, most of which is included in the $4.4 billion obligation rate planned for fiscal year 1968. Again, in reliance upon the fact that the funds were apportioned for obligation by the States, and, in reliance upon the statement of Secretary Boyd which I just quoted, the States began planning for the use of these urgently needed highway funds.

On October 8, 1967, Secretary Boyd informed the Governors of the States that it might be necessary to cut the Federal-aid highway program by as much as 50 percent.

An effective Federal-aid highway program simply will not exist if it continues to go up and down like a yo-yo with every fluctuation in the economic situation. Whether the proposed cutback is put into effect or not, Secretary Boyd's announcement that up to a 50-percent reduction is being considered has already seriously damaged the highway program. The State highway departments, the highway contractors, the suppliers of equipment and materials, and all of their employees, must be able to plan ahead in order for the program to work properly. Uncertainty as to what will happen in the highway program next week, next month, or next year has a severely damaging impact. Such fluctuations, along with increased wage demands upped by the President's relaxation of wage increase guidelines, result in inflated future construction costs.

Last summer the Special Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway Program held exhaustive hearings on the relationship of toll facilities to the Federal-aid highway program. The report of the Committee, which was issued last August, clearly pointed out the conclusion that "uncertainty on the part of the States in regard to what future Federal highway planning and financing would be encourages a State to plan a toll facility."

Certainly, the repeated ups and downs in the highway program will further encourage the proliferation of toll roads.

On August 13, 1964, when President Johnson signed the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1964 into law, he said some very nice things about the highway program. Let me quote some of the things the President said about the program, which his administration now suggests may be cut in half:

> With this legislation, we are helping to do justice for the most important but often the most neglected member of our society—the American motorist.
>
> For much too long, the man who owns and drives an automobile has been treated like a stepchild. We require him to pay for the highways he uses and we require him to pay in advance. We divert his taxes to other uses but we delay the building of the roads that he deserves. We denounce him for getting snarled in traffic jams not of his own making. We complain about what he costs us but we never thank him for what he adds to the worth and wealth of our economy. We could not get along without him, but we often talk as though we can't live with him.
>
> I hope and I believe that our attitudes are changing. Today, as never before, the Federal, state and local governments are working together to meet the highway needs of this Nation on wheels.
>
> It [the highway program] has put more than one million Americans to work. It is

already saving 3,000 lives a year and, by 1972, it will be saving 8,000 lives a year.

It is saving dollars—$6 billion in user benefits last year; $11 billion a year 8 years from now; and the program is not costing the General Fund of the United States Treasury a single cent.

This is one of our best investments, and I think most of the informed leaders of this country will agree on that point.

I say that this morning because I want the American motorist to know that things aren't so bad that we must sell off our public roads to the highest bidder for Uncle Sam to stay liquid.

I do not know just what the President had in mind when he said that "things aren't so bad that we must sell off our public roads to the highest bidder for Uncle Sam to stay liquid." In my opinion, however, cutting back the highway program as Secretary Boyd has suggested, is just one step short of selling off our public roads to the highest bidder.

At the beginning of this fiscal year, on July 1, 1967, Florida had an unobligated balance of funds previously released for obligation in the amount of $27,195,329, which is available for obligation during fiscal year 1968. In addition, Florida is to receive quarterly releases of additional obligational authority during this fiscal year of $95,634,377, two quarters of which have already been released. Thus, without the suggested cutback, Florida will have available for obligation during this fiscal year a total of $122,829,706. Approximately the same amount of funds would be available to Florida for obligation during the 12-month period beginning November 1, 1967. Under one of the alternatives being considered, the State of Florida will be allowed to obligate only $47.7 million during that 12 months. This would be a $75,000,000, or 61-percent, cutback in the funds available to Florida for needed highway improvement.

I have said it before and I will repeat it here again: It is a most peculiar set of priorities which would dictate the expenditure of huge sums of money for beautification and other cosmetic and luxury programs while we are facing a $29 billion deficit, and while citizens of the United States are bleeding and dying in Vietnam and on our inadequate highway system.

I for one cannot and will not accept this kind of priority system, which, for example, gives the highway beautification program priority over the highway safety program, despite the fact that 53,000 people died in traffic accidents last year. I will do everything I possible can to see that no further cutbacks are made in our highway programs or in any other program essential to the national security and well-being, and will do everything I possibly can to bring about the reduction or elimination of unnecessary programs, experimental programs, and programs which can be deferred.

The cuts in the highway program put into effect last November were restored following joint House and Senate hearings. Those hearings were not adjourned, but were recessed. It is my intention to urge the chairmen of the House and Senate Committees on Public Works to reopen the hearings immediately for the purpose of exploring this latest highway cutback proposal.

Secretary Boyd's telegram to the Governors, and figures indicating the proposed alternate cuts for each of the States, follow my remarks:

Secretary Boyd's Wire to Governors

October 8, 1967.

Dear Governor: In view of recent Congressional discussion on substantial reductions in Federal expenditures, it may become necessary to impose ceilings on the Federal-aid highway program in the immediate future. If this action becomes necessary, I would propose to establish quarterly ceilings on the obligation of Federal-aid highway funds effective November 1, 1967.

Under consideration are three alternative levels of reduction in your authority to obligate Federal-aid highway funds for new projects for the next 12 months. The alternative levels of reduction nationally and for your State are: $2.2 billion (———), $1.0 billion (———), and $600 million (———).

Procedurally, each State would receive a quarterly ceiling which would be 25 percent of its annual apportionment of Interstate and ABC (primary, secondary and urban) apportionments (at a $4.4 billion national rate) less a quarter of its share of the total reduction. Any reduction would be prorated among the States in the same ratio as the apportionment of Interstate and ABC funds.

Under this procedure, your State could submit new Federal-aid projects for approval up to the obligational ceiling for each quarter. Within the ceiling, projects could be submitted for (1) preliminary engineering, (2) acquisition of rights-of-way, and (3) advertising for bids for construction.

Existing unobligated balances would not be a factor because the quarterly ceiling on obligations would be 25 percent of your annual apportionment of funds less your share of a selected reduction.

It is my desire to receive from you as rapidly as possible your comments as to the impact this will have upon the programs of your State as well as on your economy. I also would like to receive your comments and/or suggestions on the above proposed procedure for carrying out a reduction in the Federal-aid highway program in the event it is necessary. Your cooperation is appreciated.

Alan S. Boyd,
Secretary of Transportation.

DISTRIBUTION OF ALTERNATIVE LEVELS OF REDUCTION OF FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY FUNDS BASED ON FISCAL YEAR 1969 APPORTIONMENT UNDER ALTERNATIVES I, II, AND III

[In millions of dollars]

State	Alternative I, $2.2 billion	Alternative II, $3.4 billion	Alternative III, $3.8 billion
Alabama	46.0	20.9	12.5
Alaska	18.5	8.4	5.0
Arizona	32.3	14.7	8.8
Arkansas	19.6	8.9	5.4
California	195.3	88.8	53.3
Colorado	27.7	12.6	7.6
Connecticut	41.0	18.6	11.2
Delaware	5.0	2.3	1.4
Florida	47.7	21.7	13.0
Georgia	35.1	16.0	9.6
Hawaii	16.9	7.7	4.6
Idaho	14.3	6.5	3.9
Illinois	117.9	53.6	32.1
Indiana	48.0	21.9	13.1
Iowa	30.3	13.8	8.3
Kansas	21.9	10.0	6.0
Kentucky	43.4	19.7	11.8
Louisiana	50.8	23.1	13.9
Maine	10.7	4.9	2.9
Maryland	33.3	15.1	9.1
Massachusetts	45.0	20.5	12.3
Michigan	66.7	30.3	18.2
Minnesota	50.9	23.1	13.9
Mississippi	25.7	11.7	7.0
Missouri	53.9	24.5	14.7
Montana	24.2	11.0	6.6
Nebraska	16.7	7.6	4.5
Nevada	14.8	6.7	4.0
New Hampshire	10.3	4.7	2.8
New Jersey	54.2	24.6	14.8
New Mexico	26.5	12.0	7.2
New York	114.2	51.9	31.1
North Carolina	26.5	12.1	7.2
North Dakota	12.9	5.8	3.5
Ohio	124.0	56.4	33.8
Oklahoma	26.5	12.1	7.2
Oregon	36.6	16.7	10.0
Pennsylvania	102.8	46.7	28.0
Rhode Island	12.0	5.4	3.3
South Carolina	16.9	7.7	4.6
South Dakota	20.8	9.4	5.7
Tennessee	46.7	21.2	12.7
Texas	133.5	51.6	30.9
Utah	30.4	13.8	8.3
Vermont	14.1	6.4	3.0
Virginia	62.4	28.3	17.9
Washington	49.0	22.3	13.4
West Virginia	44.1	20.0	12.0
Wisconsin	24.8	11.3	6.8
Wyoming	21.1	9.6	5.7
District of Columbia	25.4	11.6	6.9
Puerto Rico	3.0	1.4	.8
Reductions	2,172.5	987.5	592.5
Administrative costs	27.5	12.5	7.5
Total reductions	2,200.0	1,000.0	600.0

DIPLOMA NURSING SCHOOLS NEED HELP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Kazen). Under a previous order of the House, the chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. Halpern] for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, for years, the Nation has faced a critical shortage of trained nurses, but we have yet to face up to it fully.

We have taken steps to help the colleges offering degrees in nursing under terms of the Nurses Training Act of 1964, but we have neglected to help fill the income gap which is driving diploma nursing schools to the wall.

Last year, diploma schools—which certificate registered nurses, but do not award baccalaureate or associated degrees—accounted for 26,278 of the Nation's 35,125 graduating nurses, or about 75 percent of the total.

Yet, though we depend so heavily upon these schools to train the nurses we need, we have stood by while school after school has been forced to close its doors because of financial difficulties, and others have reduced enrollment.

Back in 1959, there were 918 diploma nursing schools in the United States, and since then, 121 of these have been forced to suspend operations. In almost all cases, the basic reason for inability to continue their educational programs has been rising costs.

Every diploma nursing school incurs deficits ranging from $1,200 to $2,000 a year per student. Attempts have been made to bridge the gap by raising tuition costs and passing on part of the deficit in the form of higher bills to patients in the sponsoring hospitals. As a result, students are discouraged from enrolling and hospitals are discouraged from recruiting new students.

Under terms of the 1964 Act, diploma schools must show projections of enrollment growth in order to qualify for construction assistance. With training costs rising and enrollments falling, they have been hard put to qualify.

They have no way of guaranteeing enrollment over a period of years, because most diploma schools cannot tell from year to year whether they will be able to continue at all.

I was happy to be a sponsor of the 1964 Act, and I have been gratified to see that since it was enacted, it has served as an important factor in helping to build up America's nursing forces. However, its greatest effect has been to benefit schools with baccalaureate or associated programs, and these schools, at their current rate of growth, cannot fill the shortage of nurses.

Since 1964, diploma schools have declined. The increase in graduates of degree schools has not been enough to make up for that decline. As a result, we find that there were 35,259 nursing graduates from all schools in 1964, but only 35,125 in 1966.

A few years ago, the Surgeon General of the United States appointed a consultant group on nursing, and this group found that there were 550,000 practicing professional nurses in 1962. The consultants estimated that 850,000 nurses would be needed by 1970.

Here we are in 1967, with the war in Vietnam increasing the demand, and only 640,000 active registered nurses in all the United States. Where are we going to get anywhere near 210,000 more by 1970—or, for that matter, even by 1980? Certainly, not by sitting back and hoping. Certainly not by watching the diploma schools shrivel and die for lack of support.

We have seen how Federal aid can help the baccalaureate and associated degree programs. That is good and it must continue. But we can wait no longer to stimulate and support the diploma schools.

I was glad to be able to join the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROONEY] and others of our colleagues in introducing H.R. 13096, which would go a long way to restore diploma nursing schools to a firm financial footing, make it possible for them to increase enrollments, and keep them in the business of providing the trained nurses the Nation needs.

It would do this, first, by providing direct annual grants to help support and expand training resources and staff recruitment. These grants would range from $12,000 per school, for a full-time student enrollment of at least 50, to $24,000 for schools with a full-time enrollment of 201 or more students.

As a second means of assistance, the bill would provide matching fund grants of up to $6,000 a year per school for expanded library resources.

It would help reduce training deficits and lessen the increase in tuition costs through $400 per student grants to diploma nursing schools.

The Surgeon General would be authorized to participate in determining eligibility of diploma schools for assistance. And, finally, the program would stimulate the development of comprehensive plans for nursing education, including the development of additional facilities and plans for recruiting students.

The Congress has been prompt to enact legislation for increased medical research, for better hospital care, and for related assistance to the healing arts.

It cannot be reasonable to allow a key function in healing to fall by the wayside, for lack of assistance to the diploma nursing schools.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to act promptly to bring H.R. 13096 to speedy enactment, for we cannot delay any longer in helping to overcome the Nation's deficit in nurses.

MALNUTRITION AND STARVATION IN THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE], is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, the news media has carried substantial coverage of a study made by Members of the other body where individuals were found who were suffering from malnutrition and starvation. How widespread this is amongst Americans no one knows, but the fact that some individuals do exist in this plight indicates that help is needed.

We know that all Americans do not have sufficient income from employment to live above the poverty level, and the advances made in welfare programs have originated from a strong desire to provide all Americans with the minimum needs of food, clothing, and shelter. In order to assist in meeting food needs, a direct distribution program has been in operation for some time and greatly strengthened with the Commodity Distribution Programs Amendments of 1949. In 1964 the food stamp program was reinstituted. While I have some reservations about the operations of this program, one would expect with all of this Government help that malnutrition and hunger due to lack of food would be nonexistent in the United States. This, evidently, is not the case.

We do know that many who received food under the direct distribution program no longer receive any subsidized food from any source since, for one reason or another, the food stamp plan does not reach them.

Two things need to be done: No. 1, action should be taken on an emergency basis to provide nutritious food and medical services to individuals who are in danger of losing their lives, becoming physically impaired, or are suffering because of the lack of food or medical attention. Secondly, a study needs to be made of the incidence, chronicity, and location of malnutrition and health problems incident thereto. And, I have felt that this Congress should not finish its work without taking positive action on both steps.

Now I come to the reason for taking this special order: There has been criticism of members of the Agriculture Committee on the Republican side and especially of my colleague from Minnesota, JOHN ZWACH. Congressman ZWACH and I have discussed this legislation and find ourselves in agreement with the statement I have just made. When the committee acted the other day, they adopted a resolution which I am enclosing, calling for the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct the comprehensive study and report back in 6 months.

> *Resolved,* That the Committee on Agriculture of the United States House of Representatives respectfully requests the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Secretary of Agriculture, in consultation and cooperation with other officials of the Federal and State Governments, to make a comprehensive study of the incidence and location of serious hunger and malnutrition and health problems incident thereto in the United States and then report their findings and recommendations for dealing with these conditions to the Committee on Agriculture of the United States House of Representatives as soon as practicable but to submit an interim report within six months from the date of approval of this Resolution.

Congressman ZWACH indicates to me that he wanted this investigation to be speeded up, and the report made back to the Congress in 30, 60, or 90 days. He also sought to have State officials involved in such a way as to speed up the process. I know how sensitive and conscientious he is and how concerned he is over the suffering and privation of fellow humans.

I appreciate the fact that Congressman FOLEY of Washington made some comments on the floor on October 9 which begin on page 28175 of the RECORD and that he was joined by our colleague from the State of Washington [Mrs. MAY]. As I go over these remarks, I note that Congressman FOLEY stated that he feels "a temporary authorization, at least, should be given to cope with situations of real hunger and malnutrition discovered in the United States which cannot be cared for by any existing program while we are waiting for additional information." Mrs. MAY states:

> The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Department of Agriculture should give this immediate aid under present programs until we have the facts and figures, to honestly, intelligently, and factually argue in favor of this bill when we bring it before the House of Representatives.

I have some questions from these comments of exactly how much the Departments of Agriculture and Health, Education, and Welfare need in extra authorization to meet this emergency need when stated, as Mr. FOLEY said in his remarks:

> The testimony of the Bureau of the Budget officials was that present authorizations for the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare were sufficient to carry out the purposes of this program.

I compliment my colleague from Minnesota [Mr. ZWACH], for working to prevent this legislation from being killed in the House Committee on Agriculture and for his strong feeling that hungry individuals ought to be helped. My feelings are that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Department of Agriculture are not the only ones at fault. I believe that the Office of Economic Opportunity definitely has a responsibility since this agency was given the responsibility to eliminate poverty in the country. And Sargent Shriver, its director, has many times spoken in favor of its continuance, claiming that it is the command post over all other Federal agencies to help eliminate poverty. When the evidence of the existence of hunger and malnutrition was brought to light, the failure of this agency is again very evident.

It seems to me that there would be no greater need, especially in title II of the Economic Opportunity Act, than to first eliminate hunger and malnutrition. Therefore, when the opportunity arises in the consideration of the Economic Opportunity Act before the House Committee on Education and Labor, I intend to offer an amendment which will require the Office of Economic Opportunity, if they continue to be the agency which has responsibility for community action, or any other agency that community action might be transferred to, that they be required to take such action that may be necessary on an emergency basis to provide necessary nutritious food and medical services, whenever such action is required to prevent the loss of any individual's life, physical impairment, or to avoid suffering caused by lack of nutritious food or medical attention.

Surely, there is no excuse for hunger existing in America today.

CROPLAND ADJUSTMENT PROGRAM

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, it disturbs me that the farm program activity which most directly benefits city residents was the quickest and easiest sacrifice on the altar of economy during our consideration of the Agriculture Department appropriation Tuesday. I refer to that part of the cropland adjustment program which bears the colorful name of Greenspan.

The people who live in our cities and who pay a large part of the cost of farm programs often see no direct return from their money. In many instances, they feel that they give up some short-term advantages, such as bargains or distress prices for surplus products, in the hope of achieving long-term benefits. Many of us who represent urban constituencies recognize the validity of these long-term considerations—the benefits of abundance that can come only from a healthy agriculture—the benefits of good markets that can exist only when farmers are prosperous—the benefits of protection against depression—the benefits of social justice, the strengthening of democracy, when we strengthen those who are too weak in comparison with the people they deal with in the markets.

But, these benefits are intangible, and we in the cities do not see or feel them with our senses.

Greenspan, on the other hand, has given us a feeling of getting something immediately for our money.

This program has provided grants to our cities, school districts, counties, and State agencies to help them put cropland into immediate use for parks, outdoor laboratories for students, and many other worthwhile purposes. These are direct and immediate benefits for town and city people.

In addition, the cropland adjustment program has offered payments to farmers and to open up their fields to hunters, fishermen, hikers, and—in general—all of the people who want to get out and enjoy the outdoors. Already hundreds of thousands of acres have been opened up to city people for use free of charge. We like this. We hate to see the program interrupted just as it is getting well started. We want to resume it at the earliest possible moment.

A TRUE STORY THAT COULDN'T BE TRUE

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I insert an editorial from the Sunday, October 8, 1967, Minneapolis Tribune in the RECORD:

A TRUE STORY THAT COULDN'T BE TRUE

Once upon a time, there was a country rocked by violence in its big cities. Some called them racial disturbances. Others said they were riots. A few called it a revolution.

The nation was shocked, to put it mildly. "The greatest crisis since the Civil War," was how the politicians described it. The pollsters went out and found that the people wanted the government to solve these problems. The politicians responded with a multitude of proposals . . . a Marshall Plan for the cities . . . tax incentives to stimulate ghetto housing construction . . . massive job programs.

Alas, it was all talk. The President was too busy fighting a war in another country to provide any real leadership. He appointed a study commission and announced plans to spend $40 million from existing programs to create more jobs. The Congress was more interested in cutting the budget, although it had second thoughts about its earlier inclination to economize on rat control, rent supplements and the poverty program.

Even in the cities that suffered the upheavals, little was changed. In Los Angeles, where death and destruction were severe, the recommendations of a study commission were largely ignored. In Detroit, scene of another great uprising, there was a great amount of wheel-spinning. In Minneapolis, a city with problems small enough to be manageable, a grand jury worried about undesirable elements in a youth center.

All the while, the gap grew between the haves and the have-nots. Those in the ghettos continued to live in crowded housing, subsisting on menial jobs or no jobs, growing ever more alienated from the affluent society around them, but not of them.

This went on through another winter, into another spring, and then came summer again. The country was rocked by violence even greater than before. The nation was shocked . . . etc.

JOB CORPS PAYS OFF BIG

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most ironic and peculiar aspects of the legislative history of the war on poverty has been the propensity of the program's opponents to launch all-out attacks on component parts of the program at precisely the time when they are emerging as real successes. This has certainly been the case with programs such as Headstart and Upward Bound, which did not interest the opposition too much until they began to win the acclaim of educators and local leaders all across the Nation. And it is proving to be equally true today, when a massive campaign is underway to kill or emasculate the Job Corps, just as this program is becoming the object of praise and support from business, labor, and local leadership almost wherever Job Corps centers are located.

As an example of the type of record Job Corps is compiling in the crucial field of human renewal, I call the attention of my distinguished colleagues to an article by Betty Katz, entitled "Youth's Stint in Job Corps Pays Off Big," which appeared in the Van Nuys News, on September 15.

Mr. Speaker, this article tells the story of a young man named Edmund Lee Whittacre, of Simi, Calif., who found the road to opportunity through the Job Corps. Mr. Whittacre compiled a tremendous record of achievement in the Job Corps, and has won a fine job as an electromechanical assembler at Rantec Corp., in Calabasas. Next year he plans to enroll in college to seek a degree in electronics and engineering. In Ed Whittacre's own words:

> I think the Job Corps is a great program for the boy who will really try to get something out of it.

Mr. Speaker, this is exactly the type of program and the type of success we envisioned when the Economic Opportunity Act was enacted in 1964. We are making solid progress in the war on poverty—as Ed Whittacre's case demonstrates—and, as Look magazine put it several months ago, "we can't quit now."

Mr. Speaker, with permission I insert the article at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Van Nuys (Calif.) News, Sept. 15, 1967]

YOUTH'S STINT IN JOB CORPS PAYS OFF BIG

(By Betty Katz)

An outstanding Job Corps graduate, a high school dropout who had little going for him at this time last year, has impressed state referral agency personnel and one major Valley firm to such a degree that he has been placed on an excellent job in the vocation of his choice.

Edmund Lee Whittacre, 17, of 1548 Anderson St., Simi, is starting Monday as an electro-mechanical assembler at Rantec Corp. in Calabasas and plans to enroll at a college next year to major in electronics and engineering.

One of seven boys and two girls in the Clifford A. Whittacre family, the youth dropped out of school after completing the 10th grade at Simi High School last summer and entered the Job Corps on December 13, 1966.

When he reported this week to the California State Employment Service in Van Nuys which had processed him to Parks Job Corps Center near Pleasanton, he astounded Job Corps specialists in that office.

GREAT PROGRAM

Instead of the customary completion of one general program of training and sometimes a G.E.D. (general education diploma equivalent to high school graduation), Ed showed nine different certificates obtained during his nine months in the Job Corps.

The graduate's enthusiastic avowal:

"I think the Job Corps is a great program for the boy who will really try to get something out of it."

This was underscored by the proof presented to Job Corps specialist Morey Altes.

Young Whittacre not only obtained his G.E.D. but completed programs in basic electronics, resistance welding, manufacturing assembly, job application, job interviewing, Red Cross first aid and life saving. In addition, he earned a driver's certificate enabling him to drive government vehicles including trucks.

RECEIVE TESTS

All this means that during his nine months of Job Corps service, Altes said, Ed left extra leisure hours to other corpsmen and spent a greater portion of his time in the classroom.

Corpsmen, explained Ralph Pile, CSES office manager, receive aptitude tests at the Job Corps centers to help them determine their potential. Then they are allowed to select their own course or courses of study.

For most it is a one-skill training proposition and at best some of the boys also work toward obtaining their G.E.D. Whittacre is one of the most outstanding returnees his office has processed, according to Pile.

BRIGHT YOUNG MAN

Concurring with this high regard for the young man's potential are his new employers, Rantec Corp., which manufactures microwave electronic components, antennaes and sub-systems—an area right down Whittacre's alley of interest.

According to Jeff Allen, administrative assistant in the firm's industrial relations department, "Ed seems like a very bright young man, able to assume responsibility. We are proud to be a part of his development."

POLITICS AND THE PEACE CORPS

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, there has recently been a considerable amount of publicity and discussion over the political expressions of Peace Corps volunteers. This stemmed primarily from the criticism by a group of volunteers serving in Chile over our involvement in Vietnam and the proposed disciplinary action against them.

When this issue first arose, I urged my good friend, Jack Vaughn, Peace Corps Director, to come out on the side of permitting volunteers maximum freedom of expression with respect to U.S. politics and policies within the United States. I did so because I feel this volunteer freedom is important to the reception of volunteers overseas and especially to countering any impression that they could be Government or CIA agents. It is also important to volunteer morale and recruitment. These factors are important enough to override any adverse domestic criticism.

One of the great strengths of the Peace Corps has been its freedom from usual State Department policy restraints. To quote Secretary Rusk's remarks of May 1961:

> The Peace Corps is not an instrument *of* foreign policy because to make it so would rob it of its contribution *to* foreign policy.

Jack Vaughn was clearly faced with a very difficult decision and I am most pleased to commend him for his flexibility, good judgment, and fortitude in reexamining the original policy and in permitting individual volunteers to address U.S. officials and news media on U.S. political issues and to identify themselves as volunteers.

Mr. Speaker, I insert herewith, for inclusion in the RECORD, an excellent article from the September Volunteer, the Peace Corps magazine, which describes this issue and the policies in greater detail:

POLITICS AND THE PEACE CORPS

(By Stuart Awbrey)

(NOTE.—Political expression became an overt Peace Corps issue this summer. It was raised when a group of Volunteers in Chile circulated a petition protesting U.S. policy in Vietnam. Director Jack Vaughn responded with a statement that Volunteers could express individual opinions on U.S. policy if they avoided public identification with the Peace Corps. A Volunteer who persisted in carrying his views to the U.S. and host press was terminated, and his case received widespread attention. Overseas, at training sites and in Washington, the Peace Corps reexamined the nature and risks of political expression by its members. Subsequently, the non-identification statement was amended so as to permit individual Volunteers to address U.S. authorities and journals on U.S. political issues and identify themselves as Volunteers.)

The short, hot, political summer of the Peace Corps reaffirmed the rights of its members to exercise personal discretion in matters of political speech. It also demonstrated that among Peace Corps members the right to speak out on political issues often generates more concern than the issues themselves.

Neither of these conditions is original, or surprising. The sustaining power of the Peace Corps rests less in the hands of its shifting and occasionally indifferent constituencies than in its ideal. The current generation of Volunteers and staff members, no less than their predecessors, considers free speech a cornerstone of that ideal.

IDEAL EXCEEDS REALITY

Thousands of Volunteers have testified through completion of service questionnaires that the idea of the Peace Corps is greater than the actual experience. Thousands of Volunteers and staff members have attempted to enhance that experience by bringing the operational reality of the Peace Corps as close as possible to its ideal. That task never ceases, but in approaching it, Volunteers and staff members love nothing quite so much as a confrontation between the ideal and its application. The subject of free expression provides a natural arena for this confrontation because implicit in the Peace Corps idea is the notion that individuals, by their own actions, including speech, might affect societies in a meaningful way.

This confrontation between the idea and the application, as they relate to free speech on political issues, was both natural and inevitable. It was probably necessary, too, because the right to exercise personal discretion in speech, rather than have that discretion imposed from some other authority, must be won or lost by each generation, which for the Peace Corps might imply as often as every two years. One senior staff member sensitive to the pitfalls of political expression suggested that "Volunteers are always testing the Peace Corps" in this area; it is equally true that the agency's open society is always testing the Volunteers.

INDIVIDUAL AND GROUP

The right to exercise personal discretion, as opposed to the imposition of institutional restraints, applies not only to political speech but to any Peace Corps activity in which the individual might jeopardize the group. An example that comes to mind is in the sphere of social behavior. The dismissal of a Volunteer whose public behavior was judged to have been harmful to the Peace Corps program in Eastern Nigeria created a controversy that surrounded Jack Vaughn during his visit there last fall. The director sustained the judgment of the local staff that the Volunteer's indiscretion, and not his morals (as some contended) warranted his dismissal.

As someone suggested at the forum held in Washington on the subject of political involvement, if and when the Peace Corps ever gets around to writing a White Paper on the topic it should be called a Grey Paper. It could never reflect an absolutist position because the history of the Peace Corps has been compiled by men and women who called themselves, after Kennedy, "idealists without illusions." Their history generally is composed in deed more than in words, but the evidence suggests that they were and are generally judicious in their choice of words, especially their political words.

FREE EXPRESSION

The fact is that for more than six years, and particularly in the past year and one half under Jack Vaughn, members of the Peace Corps have enjoyed as much if not more freedom of expression than members or employes of any private or government institution in the United States, with the exception of the universities and colleges. This freedom has applied especially to speech and writings on matters that relate directly to the philosophy and operation of the Peace Corps. It has also applied to speech and writings on matters of public concern in the United States, particularly but not exclusively on the subject of civil rights. It has not applied to speech and writings on matters of public concern in host countries, where policy and practice have dictated noninvolvement.

A development in Chile this summer challenged the assumption that members of the Peace Corps have a de facto right to public expression of private views on political questions. A group of Volunteers began to circulate a petition protesting U.S. policy in Vietnam, which prompted Jack Vaughn to tell them that Volunteers had a right to express individual opinions to U.S. authorities and the U.S. press so long as they avoided public identification with the Peace Corps. His medium was a letter to Volunteers which concluded:

"I think you will agree that our commitment to the Peace Corps is made as individuals and does not entail subscribing to or endorsing any set of political beliefs. The Peace Corps as an organization has neither the expertise nor the mission to address itself to political matters outside our area of responsibility. It has no position on such matters and no one can, in good conscience, seek to speak, or to permit others to infer that they speak, for its 15,000 members."

One of the Chile Volunteers, Bruce Murray, wrote to *The New York Times* protesting the war in Vietnam and the policy enunciated by Vaughn. *The Times* did not print Murray's letter, but treated the petition and the policy; a wire service picked up the story and it was treated in the Chile press. Though Murray was discouraged from further action by his regional Peace Corps director, he translated his letter to *The Times,* delivered it to *El Sur* in Concepción and had it published. He was terminated on the grounds that he had involved himself in a political issue that is contentious in Chile. Back in Washington, he told Peace Corps staff members that if he returned to Chile he would continue to carry the same issue to the Chilean and U.S. press.

VIETNAM PLATFORM

For at least one newspaper and a handful of individuals in the United States, the Murray dismissal presented an opportunity to use the Peace Corps as a platform for their views on Vietnam, as Murray himself had done. But by far the majority of those concerned with the case gave their attention to the rights of Peace Corps members to address themselves to matters of public concern in the United States. A quintet of Volunteers in Ecuador quickly tested the non-Peace Corps identification edict with a letter to *The New York Times,* which dwelt primarily with the policy and summarily with Vietnam. These Volunteers were not terminated. They had not injected their views on a contentious political issue into the host press. Vaughn followed shortly with an amendment to the earlier ban on identification with the Peace Corps in letters home; he said the right to write individual letters to U.S. authorities and journals on U.S. political issues, using Peace Corps identification or not, was okay with the Peace Corps. This alteration in effect reaffirmed the rights of Peace Corps members to address themselves to public questions at home. Vaughn also reaffirmed the policy of noninvolvement in host national political issues.

DISCRETION REAFFIRMED

On the surface, the Peace Corps was back where it started, perched precariously, as always, on the discretion of its membership. But it had gone through a classic crisis, and some things would not be the same again. The changes, like so many in the Peace Corps, could not easily be measured, primarily because most of them were wrought in the minds and attitudes of participants. The very foundations of the non-political nature of the Peace Corps were re-examined with a clear realization that a new chapter was being written. Returned Volunteers no longer associated with the agency attempted for the first time to exercise group influence on the agency. Returned Volunteers on the staff promoted a forum on political involvement and engaged with senior officials in the largest and longest forum in memory. Thousands of trainees tackled the question in discussion groups.

The chapter, like most of the chapters in the Peace Corps political book, remains unfinished. It is impossible to predict, for example, if the coming generation of the Peace Corps will exercise its powers of discretion so wisely as most of their predecessors. All we know is that they will have the chance to try. The current generation has taught the Peace Corps that it has less to fear from political issues than from restraints on their discussion. That lesson in itself was worthy of the experience.

GENERAL PULASKI MEMORIAL DAY, 1967

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ottinger] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, last month President Johnson signed a proclamation designating Wednesday, October 11, as General Pulaski's Memorial Day.

I am pleased to join with the President and our colleagues in paying tribute to this great Polish patriot and to honor his tireless efforts and dedication to the cause of America's freedom and independence.

Count Kazimierz—Casimir—Pulaski, a nobleman and army officer, was driven into exile from his native Poland. In 1777 he joined the American Revolutionary Army as an officer and organized the first American cavalry unit, known as the Pulaski Legion. He was subsequently made a brigadier general and was appointed chief of cavalry. He served with great distinction and valor in America's War of Independence and his role at Brandywine and Germantown is particularly noteworthy. On October 9, 1779, while leading his cavalry unit in a daring charge during the Battle of Savannah, General Pulaski was mortally wounded—thus giving his life for his conviction that freedom is a nation's most cherished possession.

Not only do we pay tribute to General Pulaski but I believe this is an appropriate occasion on which to honor those many Americans of Polish origin or descent who have defended and strengthened General Pulaski's principles over the years and who have contributed so much to the strength and growth of the United States. There are presently more than 10 million Americans of Polish descent and their many contributions to government, science, the arts and humanities and athletics should be noted with great pride.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that all Americans—regardless of birth or descent—should pause today and rededicate themselves to those principles and convictions which General Pulaski fought and died for—that the erosion of freedom anywhere weakens freedom everywhere.

LEGISLATION TO RESCIND SST APPROPRIATION

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ottinger] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, all of us are aware of the great furor over who is responsible for reducing nonessential spending. The President maintains that the appropriations process is the sole responsibility of Congress, yet he has seen fit to freeze certain military construction and public works projects and just a year ago put a freeze on highway spending. Many Members of this House maintain that the President must take the initiative to reduce spending, yet they consistently go beyond even the administration's budget recommendations in areas such as public works.

Actually, the responsibility for Federal spending is a dual one. The President is obligated to present his budget recommendations to the Congress and to justify them. But only Congress can make the actual appropriations. The President cannot spend what Congress does not give him. In the current dispute, both parties have been at fault. The President has failed to establish reasonable spending priorities in light of current economic and international conditions. In a number of instances, his spending program has served actually to fan the fires of the inflation he is seeking to alleviate by raising taxes. And Congress has further aggravated the situation by going beyond the administration's budget recommendations in some instances and failing to reduce unnecessarily high budget requests in others.

I was pleased to hear the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations state to the House last week that he was looking forward to seeing legislation introduced to rescind appropriations made earlier this year by the House. I am pleased, therefore, to join with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MacGregor] in introducing a bill to rescind the $143 million appropriation for the supersonic transport—SST.

It seems clear that this appropriation is not justified for a project which not only is a potential menace to health, safety, and property but which may well end up costing the Nation several billions of dollars without any demonstrable benefit. I have opposed appropriations for the SST in the past and I will continue to do so. Continued funding of this highly speculative venture means taking an irrevocable plunge down a bottomless pit of expenditure.

If this House really means to reduce nonessential spending, let it act favorably on the legislation introduced by the gentleman from Minnesota and me. And let that be but a start in meeting congressional responsibility to control the appropriations process.

COLUMBUS DAY AS A NATIONAL HOLIDAY

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Hanley] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, last week, my good friend and constituent, the Honorable John F. Nave, appeared before the House Judiciary Committee in support of legislation to establish October 12, Columbus Day, as a national holiday. As a cosponsor of this legislation, I was interested in his testimony and would like to share it with my colleagues.

Mr. Nave is actively working with the National Columbus Day Committee for the passage of this bill, but his appearance before the Judiciary Committee was as legislative chairman of the Grand

Lodge of the State of New York, Order of the Sons of Italy in America. His testimony, in part, follows:

> The Grand Lodge of the State of New York, Order of the Sons of Italy in America, a fraternal non-profit non-political organization, founded, incorporated, and recognized under the Laws of the State of New York since 1911, wholeheartedly favors the enactment of House Bill(s) now before your House Judiciary Subcommittee No. 4 to make Columbus Day (October 12) a legal federal holiday.
>
> This continent was discovered in 1492—475 years ago—and of which the last 191 years we have been a nation.
>
> So much has been said and written since then—down through the centuries—on the discovery of America by Christopher Columbus that any lengthy statement would appear to take on a repetitious and superfluous meaning. Because of this, and to advance our cause, we shall indulge briefly in basic reasoning and in logical contravention of valid objections.
>
> As loyal and devoted American citizens, we believe it is a matter of duty, honor and country that we honor finally this great man—Christopher Columbus—and the deed he performed. Certainly enough time has elapsed to favor this action.
>
> The Federal Government of the United States of America by enacting House Bill(s) now before it at this hearing would be keeping in step with the same action already taken by the overwhelming majority of the 50 States in the Union, including the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, in declaring this day a legal public holiday.
>
> Also, let us not forget that it would add to the Good Neighbor Policy, for Columbus Day is both a legal holiday and great day with our Latin American neighbors.
>
> For the record it should be noted that countries which declare Columbus Day as a legal holiday in South and Central America and the year in which they proclaimed same are as follows:
>
> (1) Argentina, 1917.
> (2) Bolivia, 1936.
> (3) Chile, 1921.
> (4) Colombia, 1892.
> (5) Costa Rica, 1892.
> (6) Cuba, 1922.
> (7) Dominican Republic, 1912.
> (8) Ecuador, 1915.
> (9) Guatemala, 1913.
> (10) Honduras, 1949.
> (11) Nicaragua, 1898.
> (12) Panama, 1945.
> (13) Paraguay, 1939.
> (14) Peru, 1917.
> (15) Salvador, 1939.
> (16) Uruguay, 1937.
> (17) Venezuela, 1921.
>
> Thus, we find by laws enacted in the entire Western Hemisphere that Columbus Day, next to Christmas, is the most celebrated holiday. With this fact in sight, it is hard to conceive that our Federal Government does not follow suit.
>
> Some people in good conscience and with valid reasoning oppose Columbus Day as an added legal federal holiday because it might increase highway accidents. This question was asked to be answered by the Federal Highway Administrator, Bureau of Roads, when submitted to him by a former member of the United States Senate. The Federal Highway Administrator replied with a mass of statistics and concluded as follows: "That highway accidents should not be a major consideration in any decision on the proposal that Columbus Day be made a legal holiday."
>
> Other people object because it would cost roughly over $50 million a year to give each federal employee an additional day off. However, they fail to realize the increase in excise taxes the Federal Government will obtain on the sale of such items as travel fares, gasoline, tobacco and other goods whose consumption rises with leisure and recreational periods. In addition, they fail to note that our business world, some representing very vital segments in industry, such as railroads, airlines, buses, manufacturers, all vital to our economy, stand to gain by additional leisure and recreational time.
>
> Needless to say its good effect will be seen in more job opportunities, more prosperity, more good will, more excise taxes for the federal government, and a better effect on the national health and welfare.
>
> To elaborate further on this point we note that right now Members of the Congress, News Media, and many other Americans are advocating the realignment of most of our current legal federal holidays so as to extend certain two day weekends into three day weekends for the same basic reasons which we have outlined in favor of making Columbus Day a legal federal holiday.

THE MOST REVEREND DAVID F. CUNNINGHAM, D.D., COADJUTOR BISHOP OF THE DIOCESE OF SYRACUSE

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Hanley] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANLEY. Tomorrow, October 12, 1967, in the Cathedral of the Immaculate Conception, Syracuse, N.Y., the Most Reverend David F. Cunningham, D.D., will be formally received as coadjutor bishop of the Diocese of Syracuse. As coadjutor "with right of succession," Bishop Cunningham will become the sixth bishop of the Diocese of Syracuse should the present bishop, the Most Reverend Walter A. Foery retire or become incapacitated. Sharing the sentiments of the people of Onondaga County and the other six counties that comprise the Diocese of Syracuse, I am convinced that this memorable event is deserving of special recognition.

The new coadjutor was born in Walkerville, Mont., but grew up in New York State in the city of Oswego. He was ordained to the priesthood on June 12, 1926. Following graduate studies in canon law at the Catholic University of America in Washington, D.C., he was appointed as Secretary successively to Bishop Daniel J. Curley, Bishop John A. Duffy, and Bishop Walter A. Foery. Under Bishop Foery he was given increasing responsibilities in the administration of the diocese, being appointed chancellor in 1939, vicar general in 1946, and auxiliary bishop in 1950.

During these years the diocese experienced the greatest growth in its 81 years history. The almost doubling of the Catholic population necessitated the establishing of 33 new parishes and the erection of 64 new church buildings. The opening of two colleges, LeMoyne and Maria Regina, of 10 new high schools, and of 38 additional grammar schools, is indicative of the development of the Catholic educational system during this period. Other developments as the expansion of hospital facilities and homes for the aged, the establishing of summer youth camps, an inner city foundation for work among the poor, Newman centers for private and public colleges, retreat houses, and similar community oriented projects are too various to enumerate.

Nor can one measure, but merely affirm, the contributions Bishop Cunningham has made during these years toward the spiritual and moral well-being not only of his own church but of the community in which he has labored. No small part for the intensified spirit of cooperation among all religious groups is the spirit Bishop Cunningham has brought to the community from his participation at the Second Vatican Council.

With the people of all faiths in the counties of Broome, Chenango, Cortland, Madison, Oneida, Onondaga, and Oswego, we join in extending our prayerful congratulations to the Most Reverend David F. Cunningham, D.D., the new coadjutor bishop of the Diocese of Syracuse.

SPEECH BY CONGRESSMAN SAMUEL S. STRATTON—THE COLLEGES AND THE COUNTRY

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Hanley] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday our colleague from New York [Mr. Stratton] delivered the principal address at the 39th annual Founders' Day Convocation of Hartwick College, in Oneonta, N.Y. In addition, Hartwick College conferred on Mr. Stratton the honorary degree of doctor of laws. I commend the good judgment of Hartwick College in conferring this most deserving honor upon my friend and colleague, Congressman Stratton, and extend to him my heartiest congratulations. The citation conferring the honorary degree on our colleague praised him for manifesting "a high sense of responsibility and strongly held personal standards, supporting every man's share in benefiting by, and defending, our constitutional freedoms."

In his address to the college's convocation, the gentleman from New York, a senior member of the Armed Services Committee who has twice personally visited the battlefronts of Vietnam, gave a careful and reasoned analysis of our Nation's policy in Southeast Asia. It is one of the clearest expositions of this policy that I have ever read, and I am, therefore, happy to include that address at this point in the Record and thus bring it to the attention of his colleagues in this House:

THE COLLEGES AND THE COUNTRY

(Address by Congressman Samuel S. Stratton at the 37th annual Founders' Day Convocation, Hartwick College, Oct. 10, 1967)

> President Klinger, Chairman Ryder, Reverend clergy, members of the Faculty, and ladies and gentlemen of Hartwick College:
>
> I consider it a very great privilege and honor to be asked to come here this morning to join in your annual celebration of Founders' Day. In fact, I prize this invitation so

highly that I have even found it possible to be away from Washington on the very day that the House takes up a pay raise bill for millions of Government employees, a measure with an unusual ability to win friends at the ballot box in November. But I do expect to be back in Washington before the final vote is taken—just to be on the safe side.

In the 9 years I have been privileged to serve Oneonta in the Congress I have treasured my warm friendships here at Hartwick. Many of your fellow students have served in my Washington office as summer interns. I have benefited from cordial personal friendships with your presidents and professors. Before he left, President Binder asked me to assure you that the fact that he had left for Yugoslavia just before I came here to speak was purely coincidental. He said he hadn't planned it that way at all.

I have watched with admiration the tremendous growth that has taken place on this hill in these past 9 years, and the increasingly important role that Hartwick College is playing in the educational life of the Nation, especially highlighted this year with the opening of your new center for Latin American studies in Mexico City.

Founders' Day serves two primary purposes here at Hartwick. First, it provides a perfectly normal bit of icing on the academic cake, a brief but well deserved break early in the year's schedule, and a chance for both the college and the community to get another glimpse of the academic pageantry that is so important a part of any thriving college.

But there is a more important reason, too, and that is to give all of us an opportunity to observe the steady progress of this college, to reflect on where we have come from, ponder where we are headed, and remind ourselves again in today's changing world of the principles and faith that brought this College forth almost a half century ago.

What was that faith, what were those principles that made possible here in Oneonta a new, small, liberal-arts college under the aegis of the Lutheran Church? Three things appear to have been uppermost in the minds of your Founding Fathers. First, certainly, was that American men and women could not discharge their responsibilities as Christian citizens effectively in a complex and expanding world without access to all the basic information they could possibly absorb. Hartwick College was created first of all to provide the solid, factual information that the times required, and requires even more today.

But education, as the Founders of Hartwick College also knew, is more than facts alone. Get wisdom, says the Bible, "and with all thy getting, get understanding." Modern man needs more than just an ability to recite the World Almanac by heart from cover to cover. He needs to be able to arrange those facts into some kind of meaningful pattern, to tie one bit to another into some overall concept of the world he lives in, some personal faith or philosophy. This was to be one of the special responsibilities of this new church-related college. The effort to impart a faith or philosophy may not always succeed, even here. But it is well worth the try, for without some fairly coherent view of where the world is or should be heading, many of the nuts and bolts of factual information rapidly lose both their meaning and their usefulness.

Before I became a politician I was a student of philosophy, believe it or not. And one of my special heroes was Spinoza. Spinoza was a master at putting things together into this kind of meaningful framework. He did it by seeing each thing, as he expressed it, "sub specie aeternitatis", under the aspect of eternity. "I have endeavored", Spinoza wrote, "neither to praise nor to denounce men's actions, but to understand them." This may seem a rather detached point of view for today's world, but the pattern that Spinoza had in mind really adds up to the scientific and historical chain of cause and effect between events. So, like the Founders of Hartwick College, Spinoza, too, would have understood the words of that current song hit, "On a Clear Day You Can See Forever." This is what education is really about!

Then there is a third ingredient of a Hartwick education. This College was not created, afterall, to make hermits or recluses, and I see little evidence here that you have been producing any. It was created to turn out active, productive, effective, and responsible Christian citizens—clergymen, missionaries, teachers, leaders in every conceivable secular walk of life. Graduates of Hartwick College were expected to be doers of the Word, not hearers only—to act, to serve, to make their contribution to their community and their country, to carve their own special nitch in the world.

My father was a preacher, not Lutheran but Presbyterian. And I can recall in my early days a certain measure of chagrin at being a preacher's kid. You couldn't quite let go the way the other kids did. I often thought it might be more fun to be a grocer's kid, or a doctor's. But then one day my father pointed out that there were more minister's sons listed in *Who's Who* than the sons of anyone else. And so I started to feel a little bit better. Just why this fact should be I don't know, but I suspect that the mixture of plain living and high thinking that pervades most personages imparts a sense of drive and commitment to those who are a part of it that stays with them for the rest of their lives. In fact, I often wonder whether we in our generation, for all our material progress, are doing half as much to get our own children headed in the right direction. But here at Hartwick you do feel that challenge.

These are the three concepts, as I see it, that underlie education at Hartwick. And when you stop to think of it, they are also principles that should mark all good education in this modern democratic society of ours. For, as some of the more activist student organizations have lately been reminding us in another connection, the college is in the world and in the country, with its own share of responsibility for the success and survival of our special way of life.

Now suppose we try to apply these three principles which I have just outlined to what is plainly the overriding national issue in America today—Viet Nam. I am, of course, aware that this is a controversial subject that has divided our country with an intensity and bitterness not experienced since the months just before Pearl Harbor. I know that my own position on Viet Nam is already fairly well known to anyone who has the time—as you probably don't—to read the Oneonta papers. And I know there are those in town who don't agree with that view—though fewer perhaps here than on another campus. I realize the intensity of feeling runs especially high in the academic community. I have no desire to start an argument here this morning. But if education is indeed relevant to life, and if our colleges do bear their share of responsibility for the success and survival of this Nation and our free way of life, then we must try again and again and again to use the resources and special skills of our colleges and universities to think through the complex and difficult aspects of this baffling and frustrating national problem to a workable solution, not just sloganize about it.

To begin with, there is the fundamental obligation to get the full facts. We in Washington are often amazed at the number of people who seem to have solutions to Viet Nam without any real understanding of the Far East or of the conduct of military operations. Indeed many seem to have very little memory even of world history. And a lot of those who are so ready to find fault with our policy in Viet Nam haven't even been there. "My mind is made up" seems to be the view; "don't confuse me with the facts."

For months we have been reading about the hundreds of thousands of Vietnamese civilians supposedly burned by U.S. napalm. Yet in the past few days a team of distinguished physicians from the A.M.A. has returned from Viet Nam and reported that civilian casualties from napalm are almost non-existent. Day after day the New York Times tells us that the military situation is no better there now than when our troops first landed. Yet two and a half years ago the Viet Cong had cut the country almost in half, while today we have reasonably firm control of about 60 percent of the land area and some 75 percent of the people.

I got a letter recently from a fellow who suggested we get out of Viet Nam right away. "Why don't you fellows just draw a line", he wrote me, "and let the Communists stay on their side of the line and we'll stay on ours?" But that, afterall, is what the fighting is all about now! We drew such a line back at Geneva in 1954, and the Communists didn't stay put on their side of that line.

Actually, we are making progress in Viet Nam, and most people who go there come back with a much more reassuring view of this progress and of the value of the job we are doing there. And it isn't brainwashing, either. Viet Nam is a vastly different kind of war from any we have ever fought before, and many of the cliches which sound so plausible on this side of the Pacific just don't apply over there.

But more is at issue than just facts and figures. What about the pattern? What does it all mean? Where does it all fit into what has been happening in the world these past few years? Don't we have a right to expect our colleges to give us some reasonably coherent account of what has been happening in this world of ours, since the end of World War II, and in the days before? Can one really understand Viet Nam without knowing something of the events that have been shaping history for these past 50 years? Those who refuse to learn from the errors of the past, Santayana said, are condemned to repeat them. Well, what about the costly lessons we learned between World War I and World War II and even afterwards—Manchuria, and Ethiopia, and Czechoslovakia, and Berlin, and Korea, and Lebanon, and Cuba? Have we learned them? Have we indeed even bothered to remember them? Perhaps Mao Tse Tung was not entirely right in saying that all power comes out of the barrel of a gun. But surely we know enough from our past to realize that no country can possibly remain free and independent today without a measure of military force. Surely, we know, too, as Winston Churchill put it, that we do not obtain peace and security for ourselves by throwing tiny countries to the wolves. Everybody wants peace; the problem is how do you get it in today's dangerous and predatory world.

It takes no special clairvoyance to understand what has been happening to the United States. Since before World War II we have played an increasingly greater role in trying to organize a peaceful, orderly world. Not only did our armies contribute mightily to the defeat of Hitler and Tojo, but after that we created the United Nations, the Marshall Plan, and NATO. And in the years since then we gave away literally billions of dollars and thousands of American lives to make a world where order would prevail rather than the law of the jungle. Never before in history has any nation, great or small, made such an outpouring of its own goods and lives to help other people around the world. We didn't do this just because we were altruistic. We didn't take over the task of world leadership because we fancied a policeman's uniform. We did it for the simple reason that it was the only reasonable way to protect our own security. Drawn into two devastating foreign conflicts in less than a generation, we knew that if aggression were ever allowed to succeed again our own freedom and security would be in peril. It was as simple and straightforward as that. And until Viet Nam we have won every confrontation with armed aggression that we undertook, from Iran to Cuba. Are we ready now suddenly to give up on this long and costly and increasingly successful struggle and just call it quits because it's only a small country, and besides it's only in Asia.

One may argue whether we should or shouldn't have gone into Viet Nam in the first place, but that question is totally academic now. The fact is that we are there. The fact is that we have committed ourselves, completely. And having put our hand to the plow, anyone with even an elementary understanding of the forces and factors in the present world knows that we cannot possibly turn back without the most profoundly serious consequences both for ourselves and the whole world. Oh, it may be comforting to imagine that if we just abandoned Viet Nam tomorrow, or even abandoned it in easy stages (as the enclave theory would have us do), our worries would suddenly be at an end and peace would descend on the world. But nothing could be further from the truth. As far as retreating to the placid, easy days before World War I, when America lay secure behind the far-flung power of the British fleet, the plain fact is that we just can't go home again.

This point was made very eloquently only the other day in Look magazine by one of America's most distinguished Far Eastern scholars, Professor Edwin O. Reischauer, of Harvard, until recently our ambassador to Japan—and, incidentally, very far from being a Viet Nam hawk:

"However our withdrawal (from Viet Nam) might be papered over (Ambassador Reischauer writes) it would be recognized everywhere as a defeat for us, and we would have to face the consequences—all of Viet Nam would fall under Communist rule—but this in itself would be only a relatively minor drawback—a far more important consequence of our withdrawal would be the psychological and political impact of our defeat on Southeast Asia and the whole world—such an outcome in the Viet Nam war would send a massive psychological tremor through all these countries, further threatening their stability and perhaps sharply shifting their present international orientation—America's defeat in Viet Nam would seem to be proof positive of the Maoist doctrine that what the Communists call 'wars of national liberation' are irresistible. The old concept that Communism is the wave of the future, at least in the less developed parts of the world, would be strongly revived, just at a time when the wave seemed spent."

Who can say that avoiding such a tragic defeat as this is not a matter of the highest importance to America—a matter indeed of the highest priority?

If this is the situation, as I deeply believe, then what should be the proper response of the college community? What is the course for the educated man or woman to take? If America does stand at the brink, then where do we stand? Can the scholar simply view the passing parade with majestic detachment? Or must knowledge, as the Founders of Hartwick believe, be transformed into appropriate and effective action?

I detect a feeling in many quarters today that the reason the Viet Nam war is so unpopular is that it confronts us with a number of difficult and unpleasant tasks. But history records few nations that have grown great or prospered simply by following the easy, painless course of action. Churchill stood and fought when all he had was a handful of banged up cabin cruisers left over from Dunkirk and the "few" brave men of the RAF fighter command to "whom so many owed so much."

And have we so soon forgotten that President Kennedy—a patron saint today to so many Viet Nam protestors—knew from his own experience that there were no easy, simple, painless answers in today's predatory world. Have we forgotten that it was he who faced Khrushchev over Cuba and faced him down? Have we forgotten that his classic Inaugural Address summoned this Nation of ours not to a life of ease and simplicity but to a "long twilight struggle" against the forces opposing freedom. As a nation he pledged us to "pay any price, meet any hardship, bear any burden, support any friend, oppose any foe, to assure the survival and the success of liberty."

America faces a profound crisis today over Viet Nam. But this crisis is not on the battlefields of Southeast Asia. It is back here in the towns and cities and villages of America. It is not a crisis of weapons, it is a crisis of will and determination. The simple question is whether America has the guts, the strength, the intestinal fortitude to see us through the additional months needed to secure the limited objectives we have set for ourselves. Do we really have the moral courage, as a nation, to make the hard, tough, and painful decisions that must be made to protect our own security? That's the question. Not every nation that faced a similar threat in by-gone days measured up. The Romans were too preoccupied with bread and circuses to defend themselves from the Huns. And they collapsed, not from without but from within. Must we do the same?

A recent visitor back from Viet Nam tells this story: After meeting some of our front-line troops around the DMZ he was deeply impressed, as everybody is, with their courage and quiet professional devotion to duty. Chatting with one young soldier he asked, "Say, do those draft card burners and Viet Nam protesters back in the States bother you fellows much?" The soldier smiled back. "Don't be too hard on them, sir. You see, a lot of them are over here now."

Yes, we can generate courage and devotion on the front lines. But can we also generate them back here at home? Surely our colleges and universities, those institutions which bear such a heavy responsibility for passing along from generation to generation the rich heritage of free, democratic civilization, surely they, too, can recognize these threats to that heritage, and surely they can do their part to mobilize the spiritual strength our people need to resist them?

I, for one, deeply believe, as I am sure you do, that this great democratic system of ours can make the tough, hard, unpopular decisions that must be made if we are to survive, whether it be about the strength of our forces at Con Thien or the health and stability of our economy here at home. Every politician, every public official in a position of responsibility, has an overriding obligation to support those decisions, whatever may be the political consequences to himself. Every citizen, when he knows the truth of our peril, will, I am sure, support those decisions too.

This is the real legacy of the vigorous, courageous, informed, and responsible brand of education to which Hartwick College was dedicated so many years ago. How fitting that in this critical hour we should be pausing once more to pay tribute to the men whose foresight made this idea a living reality here on this hill. And what finer tribute for us, as friends and members of Hartwick College, to pay to them than here to reaffirm our dedication to those same principles, confident that in the months ahead, as so often in the past, an America so sustained and so supported will not only survive, but, under God, will flourish and prosper for many centuries still to come.

PUBLIC BENEFITS FROM THE LIGHT BULB INVESTIGATION OF THE BROOKS SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Fascell] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, U.S. Consumer in the lead article of its October 2, 1967, newsletter describes a 3-year fight led by our distinguished colleague, Jack Brooks, in behalf of the American consumer. As chairman of the Government Activities Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee, Jack Brooks has led the fight for more efficient, longer life light bulbs.

In response to the subcommittee's investigation, the General Electric Co. recently announced that by early next year it will market a line of electric light bulbs with double the life of existing varieties of household bulbs at no appreciable increase in cost. U.S. Consumer estimates that this will result in a reduction of $100 million annually in the light bulb bill of the American consumer, not to mention the added convenience and increased safety which longer life bulbs will bring to the American home.

This improvement in light bulb design is a significant achievement for which Jack Brooks deserves a large share of the credit. His subcommittee's investigation once again demonstrates the continued interest and concern the Congress takes in the welfare of the American consumer. As a member of the Government Activities Subcommittee, it has been my pleasure to participate in this latest effort and to work with our colleague.

Mr. Speaker, the article from U.S. Consumer follows:

Here's a switch that could cut your light bulb costs by about 50% after the first of the year . . . The company that makes most of the household bulbs sold in this country has finally agreed to do what it could have been doing many years ago: make standard incandescent bulbs last twice as long as they do now without increasing the total cost of the bulb and electricity to the consumer.

Here is a consumer victory of the first magnitude. For it means you will not have to continue buying and using two bulbs to do the work of only one. It will end one of the most costly charades ever perpetrated on the American public, one which forced consumers to buy 800 million household bulbs last year when the job could have been done with only half that many bulbs with a slight alteration of bulb makeup. (Possible annual savings to American consumers: $100 million.)

This was no cheerful, voluntary gesture by the industry, however. It was the result of a three-year battle by a persistent Texas Congressman named Jack Brooks. He refused to swallow industry arguments that it could not be done . . . and he vigorously disagreed with executives who said the public would not want it. . . . Brooks merely looked into all the dark corners of the light bulb industry and began to issue public reports on what he found.

As chairman of a House subcommittee on government activities, he issued two reports. . . . One came in 1964, the other a year ago.

The latter, entitled "The Short Life of the Electric Light Bulb," demonstrated the feasibility and logic of producing standard light bulbs that would last twice as long as present ones at virtually no increase in cost to the companies or their customers. He then gave the three companies that make almost all bulbs (General Electric, Westinghouse and Sylvania) a year to come up with one good reason why this could not be done.

Not getting a satisfactory explanation, and fearing that he was being led on, Brooks started to prepare for a public airing of the matter in hearings. That did it. GE, for one, did not want to have the facts come into the glare of such publicity. Its surrender came last week in a company announcement that, for some reason, received almost no coverage by the major news media.

Briefly, here is what GE says it will do: Present bulbs of 15-, 25- and 40-watt sizes will be replaced by longer lasting ones at no increase in price. Bulb life will be boosted from 1,100 hours to 2,500 hours for the 15-watt size, from 1,200 hours to 2,500 hours for the 25-watt size and from 1,000 to 1,500 hours for the 40-watt size. The lumens (units of light given off) will be reduced by 6 to 10 per cent, an amount that will be scarcely noticeable in most lamps.

A separate new line of bulbs will be produced for most of the larger sizes. Bulb life will be 1,500 hours for the 60-watt size, compared to the present 1,000 hours . . . and bulb life for both 100-watt and 150-watt sizes will be raised to 1,500 hours, compared to only 750 hours with present bulbs. Prices for 60- and 100-watt sizes will go from about 28¢ to 32¢ each . . . price of the 150-watt size will be 43¢. The 75-watt bulb will not be changed. . . . It now lasts 750 hours.

Westinghouse and Sylvania are expected to fall in line soon. "Progress" may be GE's "most important product," as the ads say. But it is not very rapid. Bulb brightness has been steadily increased while bulb life has been shortened. Back in 1912, a 100-watt bulb lasted 1,000 hours. . . . Today it lasts 750. So the public is finally getting a bulb to outlast the ones built 55 years ago.

INTEROCEANIC CANAL PROBLEM REQUIRES INDEPENDENT INQUIRY

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in September 1964, the Congress on urgent administrative recommendation, enacted Public Law 88–609 (78 Stat. 990) authorizing the President to appoint a five-man "commission from private life" to make a "full and complete investigation and study" of the "feasibility of, and most suitable site" for what has been in the minds of its advocates, the long predetermined solution for the interoceanic canal problem—the age-old dream of a see-level canal connecting the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans. This enactment required no consideration of the major increase of capacity and operational improvement of the existing high-level lock canal. Beyond any question of doubt this failure to provide was because authors of the bill did not wish any study to be given to any proposal except that of the sea-level design and obviously sought means to prevent it.

Gov. Glen E. Edgerton of the Panama Canal, in a 1944 report to the Secretary of War recommending a proposal for the elimination of Pedro Miguel Locks—terminal lake-third locks plan—for "thorough investigation," stated that the "wisdom of the adoption of the high-level plan in the original construction is completely established" and warned the Secretary that advocates of a sea-level canal would "oppose unjustifiably" any major improvement of the existing canal. In the light of later events, this warning was prophetic—House Document No. 474, 89th Congress, page 430.

Mr. Speaker, what is needed at Panama is patently clear and simple: a double lane ship channel in the summit level with ample lock capacity at each end of the canal in locations to enable navigation with minimum operating problems and least hazards. The excavations for the lock sites at Gatun and Miraflores, together with the current program for enlarging Gaillard Cut, are important steps toward such improvement of the existing canal. These, when completed, will supply the best canal for the transit of vessels at least costs, both construction and indemnification to Panama. Moreover, the increased lock capacity can be supplied in an economic nonhaste program.

The legislative history of the 1964 canal statute is amazingly restrictive and secretive and is covered, in considerable detail with documentation, in two of my addresses to the House in 1965 on the "Interoceanic Canal Problem: Inquiry or Cover Up?" See House Document No. 474, 89th Congress, pages 428–516.

Long before and subsequent to the indicated enactment, several members of the House and I, who have studied the canal subject in considerable depth, introduced companion bills to create a broadly constituted and independent interoceanic canals commission of 11 members. This effort, Mr. Speaker, has been widely supported by experienced engineers and others informed on canal questions, including disinterested organizations, such as the American Legion and other patriotic and civic associations.

Instead of creating such body, the Congress, on most urgent administration recommendations, in the indicated 1964 enactment, authorized an inquiry rooted in executive agencies. The so-called commission from private life is actually only a part-time board of consultants without specific qualifications that should be required for such an important task. Only two of its five members are engineers and none have had engineering experience with the canal. Nor are any of them navigators or line officers of the Armed Forces. Moreover, the bill was passed in the Senate by voice vote without debate; in the House, under a gag rule procedure that prevented adequate discussion and consideration. Nor were the House hearings for it published despite my earnest efforts to secure such publication before the House acted on the bill.

The resulting statute, Public Law 88–609, authorized an appropriation not to exceed $17,500,000 to carry out the provisions of the act and provided for the continuation of the study body until the President determines that its duties are completed but not later than June 30, 1968. Now, identical bills have been introduced in the House and Senate, H.R. 6791 and S. 1566, that would increase the present authorization to $24,000,000 and extend the life of the present inquiry to not later than December 1, 1970.

Following the pattern of handling the 1964 bill, the Senate passed S. 1566 on June 12, 1967, by voice vote without debate and without the benefit of prior printed hearings. This action was apparently taken without all members of the cognizant Senate committee being informed, for two of its members, later on the same day on the floor of the Senate, protested the premature action. See Congressional Record, June 12, 1967, pages 15310, 15332–15333 and 15385–15387.

The hearings in both Houses of the Congress were perfunctory, with only supporters of the measures testifying. In the hearings on May 9 before the Subcommittee on Panama Canal of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and on June 1 before the Senate Committee on Commerce, a Government witness stated that in studying the engineering feasibility of constructing a canal at sea level, the alternatives to be considered would include "meeting traffic demands by modernizing the existing lock canal." See hearings before Subcommittee on Panama Canal, H.R. 6791, 90th Congress, page 11.

This witness did not give an adequate statement of the scope of inquiry needed for such study nor is there any specific provision in the statute authorizing the inquiry to include the subject of modernizing the existing lake-lock canal. Such modernization is a major construction undertaking requiring a great deal of study and planning, and should be started now under congressional authority and not under a mere bureaucratic interpretation of a monstrous statute drawn to foster previously determined objectives.

At present there are six bills before the House calling for the creation of an independent and broadly based Interoceanic Canals Commission, introduced by Representatives Anderson of Tennessee, Bow, of Ohio, Hosmer and Sisk, of California, Rarick, of Louisiana, and myself. The commission called for under these measures would not duplicate the work of the present study group, as has been stated, but would undertake the problems involved in realistic manner. So far there have been no hearings on them despite repeated requests.

Mr. Speaker, it is only natural that inexperienced canal builders and hidden policymakers in executive agencies controlling the current canal inquiry and policy formulation should not wish any independent investigation. This, however, is precisely what is needed and required if the Congress and the President are to be adequately informed and advised in the premises.

After receiving a number of adverse comments on the current bills from routine executive agencies, I addressed a letter to the chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries citing the March 15, 1967, comments of the Comptroller General and enclosing a copy of the notable resolution of the 1966 Annual Convention of the American Legion on the Panama Canal. This letter led to an instructive exchange of correspondence, which, for the purpose of elucidation, will be later quoted.

In these general connections, Mr. Speaker, I addressed the House on June 8, 1967, on the subject, "Panama Canal Issues and Treaty Talks: Defects and Validities," and stressed that the key canal issues must be understood. Because they are not understood, because responsible governmental officials have continuously sought to prevent publicity or even discussion of them, and because they are being ignored in most of the mass news media, I shall state them again. They are:

First. The transcendent responsibility of our Government to safeguard our indispensable sovereign rights, power, and authority over the Canal Zone territory for the efficient and adequate maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the Panama Canal—a responsibility vividly dramatized by recent events in the Near East that have resulted in the closure of the Suez Canal under Egyptian control, seriously upsetting maritime transportation routes and threatening Europe with oil shortage and Asiatic and east African areas with famine.

Second, the question of the major increase of capacity of the existing Panama Canal through the modification of the third locks project—53 Stat. 1409—to provide a summit lake anchorage in the Pacific sector of the canal to correspond with the layout in the Atlantic end, on which work in 1940–42 some $75,000,000 of the taxpayers' money was expended mainly on lock site excavations for a set of larger locks at Gatun and Miraflores. As previously indicated, these excavations, along with the enlargement of Gaillard Cut to be completed in 1970, will contribute materially toward the major improvement of the existing canal. Moreover, such project would not necessitate the negotiation of a new treaty with Panama as it requires no additional lands, waters or authority of Panama and the 1903 treaty is adequate for such improvement—paramount considerations.

Third, the question of a new Panama Canal of so-called sea level design, or modification thereof, to replace the existing canal, and the treaty therefor.

Fourth, the construction of an alternate canal at a site other than the Canal Zone and the treaty or treaties therefor.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that a policy subject of this magnitude is not one for routine officials of executive agencies and a part time consulting board operating under predetermined guidelines but that the task calls for an independent body that can be truly objective and cannot be ignored. Yet the Congress is being called upon to increase both the life and authorized expenditure for the present inquiry. Instead of doing this, we should enact the pending measures for the creation of an independent and broadly constituted body to deal with these vital questions. Such inquiry, it should be stressed again, would not duplicate the work of the present investigators, some of which has been an utter waste of time and money. I refer expecially to the idea of a canal in Colombia via the Atrato and Truando rivers, which would be over 100 miles long in one of the most forbidding climates and insanitary areas in the entire world.

Another consideration that must command attention is the fact that the old Soviet policy avowed in 1917, and which has ever since persisted as regards strategic waterways, is now being revived and vehemently urged for the internationalization of the Panama Canal.

Still another is that the extreme policies of Panama with respect to canal problems make clear that it will not approve any new treaty or treaties unless they are fashioned and phrased for the ultimate extinction of all U.S. authority and control of any canal in the U.S. Canal Zone territory or in Panama. This consideration, in view of the tremendously present perilous condition of world affairs, should preclude the making of any such new treaties. It is obvious that under such conditions nothing could be worse for Panama, the United States, and the free world than the surrender of the substantial provisions of the 1903 treaty. Hence, the wisdom of the major increase of capacity and operational improvement of the existing canal in such manner as to make unnecessary the execution of new treaties with Panama is manifest.

The total investment of the U.S. taxpayers from 1904 through 1966 in the Panama Canal enterprise and its defense is more than $4,889,000,000. If the officials of our country are not competent to hold what we now own, how can we expect them to hold any new canal where we do not have either sovereignty and ownership?

In the past, Mr. Speaker, independent commissions were created and they thus functioned with the result that the Panama site was chosen in preference to all others, the type decided, the canal constructed, and subsequently operated efficiently and successfully. There is urgent need for such independent inquiry today.

The indicated exchange of letters with my very good friend and colleague, the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, follows:

MARCH 27, 1967.

Hon. EDWARD A. GARMATZ,
Chairman, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: With regard to the comments of the Comptroller General of the United States on the Flood-Sisk Bills to create the Interoceanic Canals Commission, five such measures have been introduced in the present Congress as follows:

Wm. R. Anderson, H.R. 3575.

Frank T. Bow, H.R. 6472.

D. J. Flood, H.R. 6786 (Replacing H.R. 571).

Craig Hosmer, H.R. 6119.

B. F. Sisk, H.R. 2148.

The commission thus to be created would be an 11-member independent and broadly-based body of the highest qualifications the members of which would devote their full time to the subject until their task is completed. The present 5-member study group is not such a body but a part time consulting board for an inquiry rooted in the Executive Departments and focused on justifying a predetermined objective provided in Public Law 88–609.

The legislative history of this 1964 enactment, together with summaries of the key canal issues, will be found in two addresses of mine on pp. 428–516 of Ho. Doc. No. 474, 89th Congress under the title "Interoceanic Canal Problem: Inquiry or Coverup?" In examining these addresses, attention is invited to their documentation, especially the statements by Mr. E. S. Randolph. These reflect a lifetime of observation and study of canal problems as the result of many years of vital engineering experience with respect to the canal, that includes the Madden Dam Project of which he was the responsible engineer.

I am sure that President Johnson has not been wisely advised, primarily by the State Department, touching canal problems now arising. The result has been that the President was induced to change entirely his viewpoint in these connections. The State Department has thought only of pacifying radical and communistic elements in Panama and without any regard to how much authority that our nation must have in order to deal with canal problems.

During more than 60 years in the construction of the Panama Canal and its subsequent maintenance, operation and improvement, more than $2 billion have been furnished by the taxpayers of our country. It is now proposed to ignore all these matters, together with the sacrifices of our citizens and those of other nations who contributed to the success of the enterprise, and, without any reimbursement, to surrender our complete sovereignty over the Canal Zone with all the improvements that our Government has made; and also to liquidate our indispensable authority and to place the canal enterprise under the joint authority of the United States and Panama, thus creating a situation where we shall have responsibility without authority.

The value of the canal as an artery of transportation and as a facility for the defense of the Western Hemisphere, including Panama itself, must be prime factors in considering any diminution of our existing control to placate radical and impractical demands on the part of Panama.

For this and many other reasons that could be offered, I believe that we owe it to the American people to provide a broadly-based and objective solution of these problems as provided in the pending bills previously mentioned. Such result cannot be obtained under purely administrative proposals and under a studied and effective blackout by the mass news media of this crucial matter.

As to Panama, I have no quarrel with that country but wish its people the fullest measure of economic growth and prosperity. If we are driven from the Isthmus, as will inevitably be the case if the proposed treaties are ratified, Panama and other Latin countries, like Cuba, will pass into the Soviet orbit, and history will record the result thus eventuating as the most tragic blunder in our diplomatic and military experience. The situation is of such far-reaching character that the Congress cannot evade or elude the responsibility that confronts it.

Furthermore, I am sure that if the present treaty proposals are ratified and become effective, the American people will, in surprise and anger, denounce the action thus taken and all who have participated in bringing it about or acquiesced by silence, with due emphasis on the failure of the Congress to deal with these problems realistically and wisely.

The creation of the Interoceanic Canals Commission as provided in the bills will supply a sound basis for the deferral of all further negotiations with the Republic of Panama until after such commission is created and makes its report.

A copy of the 1966 Panama Canal resolution of the American Legion is attached.

Sincerely yours,

DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Member of Congress.

April 4, 1967.

Dear Dan: I thank you for your letter of March 27 relative to your proposal for the creation of another Interoceanic Canals Commission to supplant the present body.

While I do not agree that such a group would be more effective in solving our many problems, I heartily concur in your analysis of the present situation and the undesirability of the proposed new treaty with Panama as we know it from the few details made available to us. I feel that this approach will greatly diminish the efficiency of the canal operation which, in turn, will result in fewer transits thus making necessary the expenditure of some very large sums of money sooner than would be required were we to retain the present organization.

In view of the position taken by the President on the matter, I cannot concur in the view that the creation of this Commission, were the President to sign your bill, would have any effect on the present treaty negotiations. I am convinced that the present approach is totally unsound, but I regret that I cannot agree that your proposed solution would be effective in any respect.

Sincerely,

Edward A. Garmatz,
Chairman.

April 19, 1967.

Hon. Edward A. Garmatz,
Chairman, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: Thank you for your letter of April 4. I am glad that you concur with my views as to the undesirability of the proposed new canal treaty with Panama, for the situation there is as grave as was that in 1903 at the time of the Panama Revolution. I fear, however, that I did not make myself sufficiently clear in my last letter, as regards the necessity for the proposed independent interoceanic canals commission and, for this reason, wish to stress certain points.

In my studies of Panama Canal history, I find conclusive evidence that the Canal enterprise has suffered in recent years by the failure to have full-time, independent and broadly-based commissions when considering grave questions of policy, such as site, type, increased capacity and major operational improvements. One example is the Third Locks Project fiasco where $75,000,000 of the taxpayer's money was expended without the spenders realizing that their plan was wrong. Another was the 1946–47 investigation by the Governor of the Panama Canal under Public Law 280, 79th Congress, which cost several millions. Its report failed to receive Presidential approval because the main recommendations were based on the fallacious premise of "security" to justify a predetermined objective of a small professional group and it was not acted upon by the Congress. Those studies were altogether ex parte in character and altogether lacking in the breadth and scope that a wisely created and objective commission would have provided. The present canal study is another such ex parte endeavor similarly rooted in the Exective Branch of the Government. History will hold the Congress responsible for the ultimate outcome and the responsibility cannot be evaded.

There is too much at stake in the canal situation to permit any narrow administrative body and routine officials to determine such issues and policies, which many experienced engineers, legislators and others believe would involve the expenditure of billions of dollars on a design or designs that might prove altogether impossible for satisfactory execution and usage. The Congress has a graver responsibility than the administrative officials who are misleading the President and keeping from him knowledge of the essential facts involved. Why should we not protect him and protect ourselves by meeting these problems in the manner which is wise and realistic?

The currently proposed treatise, if ratified, will require implementation by legislative enactment and Congressional appropriations, however objectionable they may be to the Congress. The Congress will thus be placed in a most uphappy posture. Is it not best to anticipate such an impossible situation by doing what may prevent such a state of affairs?

Our people do not have an adequate picture of what is taking place under existing conditions of controlled media in the discrimination of news and silence in the Senate. The Congress certainly owes to the American people decisions made upon the fullest elucidation and publicity of all the facts on which decisions should be based.

Certainly, with the Viet Nam War still undetermined and Red led "wars of liberation" fomented by Cuban-trained revolutionaries now erupting, or about to erupt, in various countries of Central and South America, it would be criminal folly to the United States to be divested of any authority with respect to the Canal. Panama itself would be the first to suffer if our country, in the critical situation now prevailing in world affairs, should surrender any measure of its present authority with respect to the Canal.

To a number of our colleagues and myself what should be done is clear and obvious: suspend all further negotiations with Panama until the previously indicated full time Commission is created, and makes its study and report. This plan of action was advocated by the American Legion in its 1966 resolution on the Panama Canal and in the 1967 minority report (pp. 79–83) of the special report on *Panama Canal Issues and Treaty Talks* of the Center for Strategic Studies, Georgetown University, copy of which is attached.

Sincerely yours,

Daniel J. Flood,
Member of Congress.

May 3, 1967.

Dear Colleague: Thank you for your most interesting letter on the present unhappy situation of the Panama Canal. I concur in your view that the present headlong rush toward a treaty is most undesirable and will undoubtedly prove detrimental to the interests of our country.

However, I am not convinced that the situation would be improved by the creation of a board such as you advocate, since I have great doubts that the President would sign such a bill. Further, I am of the belief that the present sea level canal studies will produce considerable useful information which will be available to the Congress for its consideration, at which time judgment can be exercised with respect to the competitive merits of a sea level canal as opposed to drastic improvement of the present waterway.

I have read with interest the entire report of the Center for Strategic Studies in connection with the Canal, and am impressed by the minority report. In view of your continuing interest in the subject of the Panama Canal, great weight must be given to your opinions, but I regret that I cannot share your viewpoint with respect to the desirability of another Canal Board.

Sincerely,

Edward A. Garmatz,
Chairman.

May 13, 1967.

Hon. Edward A. Garmatz,
House of Representatives.

Dear Colleague: I am glad to have your letter of May 3 and to note that you are impressed with the Minority Report in the recent booklet on *Panama Canal Issues and Treaty Talks* by the Center for Strategic Studies, Georgetown University. Its authors obviously studied their subject until they reached the point of having well digested knowledge before publishing their views.

As to the point in your letter that the current studies will produce considerable useful information, I doubt that they can add much of value about a sea-Level Project to that developed in the 1947 Reports of the Governor on the Panamal Canal under Public Law 280, 79th Congress. That report, as you no doubt know, failed to receive Presidential approval and was not acted upon by the Congress because of its fallacious premises of "security" and "national defense", and was thoroughly discredited.

As regards your statement about "the competitive merits of a sea level canal as opposed to drastic improvement of the present waterway", I do not believe that use of the term "drastic" is the appropriate term. The improvement in mind is not "drastic" but fundamental or basic, supplying the best operational canal at the least cost.

In view of the make up of the present canal inquiry and the propaganda that has flooded the Nation through the mass news media, I do not see how anything but harm can come from it because everything now is being done in exparte manner based entirely on the discredited 1947 report. What I say is directly applicable to the matter of a new canal of sea level design or the major increase of capacity and operational improvement of the existing canal, and new treaty proposals.

The present inquiry is not one by a free and independent body whose members have any special qualifications to perform the gravely important task of determining the type and site of a new canal but one rooted in Executive agencies, and thus strictly controlled toward predetermined lines of a limited professional group.

We, as members of the House, are confronted with tremendous responsibility and challenge. If these great problems are settled without adequate study by the Congress, sooner or later the people of the Nation will learn the facts involved and will hold both the House and Senate as being grossly derelict in their discharge of duty and we cannot escape our obligations to the Nation and our people. I know how patriotic you are in spirit and how dedicated you are in action.

Please think on these things.

Sincerely yours,

Daniel J. Flood,
Member of Congress.

June 7, 1967.

Dear Dan: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of May 13, 1967, which reached me on June 2, and your letter of May 14, containing a copy of Senator Tower's remarks with respect to Panama Canal.

Contrary to your views, I feel that the individuals making up the present Interoceanic Canals Commission are able to evaluate the data that they are developing, and that their report will be of substantial assistance to the Congress in making policy on the very important matter of transisthimian transit facilities.

As you know, the plan of the Commission is to study not only sea-level canal sites in Panama and Colombia, but to consider the means of meeting traffic demands by modernizing the existing canal. In this connection, I call your attention to the testimony of General Harry G. Woodbury, Jr., the Engineering Agent of the present study as contained on page 11 of our hearings on H.R. 6791, a copy of which is attached for your information.

I believe that the prudent course would be to await the report of the Commission and exercise our judgment with regard to the need for further study after careful examination of that report. I can see no need in duplicating the Commission's effort at this time by the selection of another group to fulfill the same function.

In view of your very great knowledge and interest in this subject, I regret that I must disagree with you, but I feel that my position is likely to be the better course for the Congress to follow in securing necessary knowledge in this field.

Sincerely,

EDWARD A. GARMATZ,
Chairman.

JULY 20, 1967.

Hon. EDWARD A. GARMATZ,
Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: In reply to your letter of June 7, 1967, there is little of real consequence that can be added to the facts already presented in my previous correspondence and in my June 8 address in the House on "Panama Canal Issues and Treaty Talks: Defects and Validities." However, it is evident from certain points raised in your letter that I have not made myself sufficiently clear. For this reason, I shall comment on matters requiring emphasis.

As to the ability of the present canal study group to evaluate the data now being developed there are two angles: (1) The guidelines of the inquiry, which, by statute, restrict it to consideration of one proposed solution; and (2) the record of experience of the members. Regardless of what may be the feelings of them individually, the study group will inevitably be limited by the law under which is was created (Public Law 88–609). An examination of their records of experience does not disclose special qualifications on Panama problems. Besides, as stated on other occasions, the group is not an independent, broadly based body. It is only a part-time consulting Board of ex parte character for an inquiry rooted in Executive agencies on whose first two annual reports I have commented at length in statements to the House. (See "Sea Level Canal Commission—First Annual Report, A Monstrosity," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, August 25, 1965; and "Interoceanic Canal Study Commission," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 27, 1966.)

In connection with the testimony of the study group's Engineering Agent on Page 11 of the May 9, 1967, hearings on H.R. 6791 mentioned by you, that is not an adequate statement as regards Panama Canal problems but only a bureaucratic interpretation not authorized by specific provisions of Public Law 88–609, which was drafted to foster one predetermined objective, which objective, I respectfully urge, is absolutely wrong.

Your statement that the present study body will "consider the means of meeting traffic demands by modernizing the existing canal" invites this query: Why did not your Committee in 1964 require such provision in the bill it reported?

To say the least, any amendment to the existing law should require the study of the Terminal Lake—Third Locks proposal and any other deemed worthy of study. To this end, it seems to me that your Committee could and should introduce such amendment and have open hearings thereon, with publication of the testimony adduced.

As previously indicated, the study group, regardless of individual feelings, will undoubtedly comply with the statute and not someone's interpretation of it. Beyond peradventure those who furnished the drafts of the bill for Public Law 88–609 wrote into it the indicated restriction in order to assure that no other plan or design should be considered by the study group.

The extreme importance of the canal subject is such that it ought to be handled by an interoceanic canals commission of the same breadth, character and dignity that characterized like commissions which made the necessary studies and recommendations with respect to the existing canal. As proof of this, I know of no better way to judge the future than by the past. So let us look at the record:

In 1936, Public Resolution No. 85, 74th Congress, authorized and directed the Governor of the Panama Canal to investigate the means for increasing its capacity for future needs of interoceanic shipping. The result was authorization of the 1939 Third Locks Project substantially in accord with the Governor's Report (House Doc. No. 210, 76th Congress) at a cost of $277,000,000. This work, as you doubtless know, was suspended in May 1942 after expending some $75,000,000 largely on lock site excavations at Gatun and Miraflores.

World War II experience conclusively established that this project was navigationally hazardous and operationally unsound in the Pacific sector of the Canal and that the deficiencies involved could be solved only by the elimination of the Pedro Miguel Locks and the consolidation of all Pacific Locks south of Miraflores. This proposal has been, and still is, approved by experienced engineers, navigators and other experts as the sole adequate way to modernize the existing canal. Any proposal for such modernization that does not eliminate the existing Pedro Miguel Locks should not be authorized under any circumstances.

In December 1945, Public Law 280, 79th Congress, authorized the Governor to make a comprehensive investigation of the means for increasing the capacity *and security* of the Panama Canal, including a restudy of the Third Locks Project to meet future needs of interoceanic commerce *and national defense.* As that inquiry was directed toward securing authorization of a predetermined sea level project on the fallacious grounds of "security" and "national defense" as the paramount requirements, its report failed to receive Presidential approval, was transmitted by the President to the Congress without comment or recommendation, was never published, and the Congress ignored its recommendations.

In 1957, under the authority of House Resolution 149, 85th Congress, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries appointed an independent but part-time Board of Consultants to investigate short and long range plans for the Panama Canal. Though the report of this body did develop valuable information, its conclusions were self-contradictory in vital respects and hence inconclusive.

In 1964, as you well know, Public Law 88–609 authorized an Executive appointed five man part-time consulting board, erroneously named a commission, to consider only one pre-determined solution of the Canal problem.

Thus it is clear that since 1936 all major studies of the Panama Canal, with the exception of the 1957–60 Isthmian Canal Studies, have been ex parte in character and, for the most part, entirely futile. The independent and broadly constituted Interoceanic Canals Commission contemplated by the pending bills would not duplicate the work of the present study group but would grapple with the problems involved in a realistic manner.

When reduced to its simplest elements the increased facilities needed at Panama are a double lane ship channel with ample and logically arranged lock capacity at both ends. On completion in 1970 of the enlargement of Gaillard Cut we shall have the two way ship channel. The required summit level traffic reservoirs and lock capacity will be supplied by what is known as the Terminal Lake—Third Locks Plan, all at economic costs of proven operational superiority, with maximum utilization of work so far accomplished and without complicated Treaty involvement. It will supply the best canal for the transit of vessels at least cost, both economic and political. Moreover, the necessity for deepening Gaillard Cut by more than 100 feet for a so-called sea level canal with the inevitability of major slides incident to such deepening would be altogether obviated (see House Report No. 1960, 86th Congress, p. 5, par. 16.).

Today, through the mistaken policies of appeasement of Panamanian mobs and obsession with the age-old sea level dream, we are endangering our control of the Panama Canal, which, if lost, will inevitably fall under Communist domination at a time of gravest peril. The Congress must not allow this to take place. Our Congressional duty impells our grave consideration of the military aspects involved in these matters and the protection of the American taxpayer.

I deeply regret my inability to agree with the ill-considered and dangerous policy of the National Administration in these connections. My long and conscientious study has caused me to reach the conclusions that I have indicated in this and other discussions, in and out of the Congress, and I must persist in my effort to prevent what I have every reason to believe will be fatal in its consequences.

Pardon the length of this letter, but the situation involved in this time of world crisis is so vastly important that I have tried to make a fairly full presentation. I am sure that you will understand.

Accordingly, I reiterate the views expressed in my previous letters and as set forth in extenso in my June 8, 1967, address already mentioned.

With assurances of highest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Member of Congress.

MALICIOUS MISCHIEF

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, never in modern times had an administration been so beset by enemies, doubters, and allegedly sincere critics. Hardly a day goes by without a strident voice decrying the wisdom of President Johnson; and each meeting of the Congress sees further shortsighted restrictions placed on his constitutionally granted obligation to conduct the foreign policy of the United States.

This seems to be the dominant mood within the Congress and it is unfortunately reflected in much of the reporting about the Washington scene. Ancient prejudice and irrelevant outrage seem to blind us to the central facts of the world in which we live. Parochial concerns and fits of pique replace a measured consideration of our coherent global strategy. While the United States remains the single strongest nation on the face of the earth, it is apparent that the conduct of our foreign policy is being subjected to demeaning criticism by those who, when they have hearts at all, are very fainthearted about the challenges of 20th-century life.

Some people seem determined, on issue after issue and in vote after vote, to deny our role as leader of the free world and to punish nations which see their self-interest in slightly different terms than we would wish. The United States reached its current eminence by a singular set of circumstances which cannot be found in other countries. We may be the major power but we cannot dictate the manner in which other governments exercise their responsibilities.

The Washington Post put this very well in an editorial of Thursday, October 5, 1967. I would respectfully suggest to my colleagues that they closely examine the facts and reasoning contained therein before they continue their attempt to deny President Johnson the necessary tools to further the cause of America and the cause of freedom on this troubled planet.

> ### Malicious Mischief
>
> There is malice as well as mischief—and something of the tactics of a hungry wolf pack—in the current Congressional challenge to the Administration's foreign policy. Few members, apparently, are ready to tackle Vietnam head-on, in the way which would really hurt, by withholding support for whatever may be needed for our fighting men. So instead, they are warily circling the vital issue, while nipping and snapping at the flanks—at foreign aid, at free trade, at East-West trade, which in all logic are part and parcel of our fundamental policy.
>
> The result could well be as devastating as a direct attack, if one accepts the broad objective which President Johnson and his Administration have propounded for our struggle in Vietnam. We are there, first of all, to preserve freedom of choice for the South Vietnamese. But we must do this, the President has said, in the frame of a far wider effort to "strengthen free people against domination by aggressive foreign powers." This, needless to say, is also the broad aim of foreign aid, of measures to promote free trade, and even of efforts to knit closer contacts with the Soviet Bloc in hopes that commercial or cultural or diplomatic contacts may lead to profitable collaboration on the really crucial issues of war and peace.
>
> The behavior of assorted Congressional mischief-makers and the reaction of a wider number of their colleagues strongly suggests that there is precious little comprehension of what the Vietnam struggle, as the Administration sees it, is all about.
>
> It is not necessary to enumerate each of the more meddlesome amendments that have been proposed for various Administration aid bills in order to give some idea of the havoc they would wreak. It is sufficient to say that there is serious support for measures which would cut off aid or arms sales or both to all nations trading with North Vietnam; all those in arrears in their United Nations assessments, and all those who felt obliged to severe diplomatic relations during the Mideast crisis last June. Other proposals would put a serious crimp in our military assistance programs. The results could be to cancel some $800 million in arms sales to Britain and other established allies; to cripple our NATO support effort; to cut off humanitarian food shipments to hungry peoples whose only crime is in having governments we don't like; to block help for India which was promised in return for stringent economic reforms the Indians have already carried out at considerable internal political as well as economic pain.
>
> This sort of foreign policy-making by frivolous and irresponsible Congressional amendment is bad enough. Worse, it could lead to such a parliamentary tangle that aid appropriations this year might conceivably not clear Congress at all. At best, the Administration will have a badly dismembered program with which "to strengthen free people against domination by aggressive foreign powers." If this larger purpose of our foreign policy in general, and our Vietnam policy in particular, is not to be fulfilled, perhaps the Congressional wolves can oblige us with some coherent statements of their own on the question of what the war is all about.

THE OUTER SPACE TREATY—A PERMANENT DISARMAMENT AGREEMENT FOR OUTER SPACE

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Gallagher] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, almost every day in the Congress or at the White House, history is made.

Yesterday, the President made a special kind of history. He signed into law an Outer Space Treaty to which 84 nations have agreed, and which was approved unanimously by the U.S. Senate in April 1967.

I was proud to be one of those invited to witness the signing yesterday morning.

This is a remarkable achievement which must, in intention and effect, lessen world tensions and move nations closer together.

The Outer Space Treaty, as you know, provides, among other guarantees, that all signatories shall share the benefits of space exploration; that weapons of mass destruction shall not be used or tested in outer space; and that all nations shall share the knowledge gained from peaceful space exploration.

> By adding this Treaty to the law of nations—

The President said yesterday—

> we are forging a permanent disarmament agreement for outer space.

The United States should be proud of the crucial role which Ambassador Arthur Goldberg and Secretary of State Dean Rusk played in moving this treaty toward approval in 84 capitals around the world.

President Johnson must take deep satisfaction in its approval because his interest in the peaceful and cooperative uses of space has been a matter of public record for more than a decade.

As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I believe this treaty is going to serve as a new bridge between diverse nations of the world—not only between traditional friends, but between nations with strong differences.

The stark technical words of the treaty cannot really express the passion and commitment and concern which went into its creation. Only time will show us what the United States and other nations have fashioned today.

One thing is clear: while men cooperate in space, they cannot fight in space. While men forget about competing and concentrate on cooperating, the world can only benefit.

I heartily agree with the President when he said yesterday morning:

> It is with optimism that I greet this Treaty. I see in it a hopeful sign that mankind is learning, however slowly, that wars are not inevitable; that national rivalry is not a permanent barrier to international understanding; and that a world of hostility and hate need not be the abiding condition of mankind.

EXPORT OF AMERICAN CAPITAL

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Dent] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, the awakening of the slumbering giant of organized labor means a new and drastic change in our trade policy—when the giant finally awakens and counts the consequences of our trade policies in this last generation and especially in the last decade. I offer the following long and illuminating resolution and statement by the AFL–CIO executive council on export of American capital, New York, N.Y., September 12, 1967:

> Government and business policies have actively encouraged the export of American private capital. The sharp rise has been overwhelmingly to industrial nations, like Canada and those in Western Europe, rather than to the developing countries.
>
> The estimated book values of direct private investment in foreign countries skyrocketed from about $12 billion in 1950 to $49 billion in 1965 and considerably more at present.
>
> Outlays of U.S. companies and other private investors for plants and machines in foreign nations jumped from $3.8 billion in 1960 to $8.7 billion in 1966. These investments include outflows from the United States, as well as plowed-back profits and funds raised abroad.
>
> This skyrocketing rise in the export of U.S. private capital has cost American jobs, cut into American exports, and added to imports. Unregulated outflows of U.S. private capital are not in the best interest of the American people. Moreover, if a foreign nation does not want increased U.S. private investment, it is self-defeating for the Government to insist upon it, particularly in nations that have barriers to U.S. exports.
>
> While the AFL–CIO does not oppose the export of private capital as a matter of principle, we do contend that private capital should not have absolute freedom of movement from the United States to foreign countries, regardless of consequences. The freedom of private business to make profits has been conditioned in the United States by a variety of social, legal, and economic restraints—such as health and safety standards, tax policies, and minimum wage laws. Under these measures, our Nation has prospered, business has expanded, and profits have grown. It is now time for Government restrictions on the outflow of private capital.
>
> Therefore, the AFL–CIO urges immediate and thorough congressional investigation of the economic and financial operations of U.S. private investment in foreign countries. Such an investigation is long overdue and has become increasingly urgent. We believe the time has come for Government regulation of private capital outflows to protect the national interest.
>
> ---
>
> ### Background on Export of American Capital
>
> U.S. private direct investment in foreign countries has skyrocketed from a book value of about $12 billion in 1950 to $49 billion in 1965 and increased rapidly in 1966 and 1967. ("Private direct investment" means the government-estimated book value of U.S. investments in overseas industry where the U.S. corporations or other investor holds at least 10 percent of the equity. Often they are wholly-owned subsidiaries of U.S. corporations. See Table I)

This very sharp rise of U.S. direct investment in foreign countries has impacts on American jobs and the balance of payments deficit, as well as on international trade in a wide variety of industrial products.

WHAT KIND OF INVESTMENT AND WHERE?

Manufacturing companies represented 39 percent of this total in 1965, petroleum and mining industries 39 percent and other industries 22 percent.

Canada had the largest share of U.S. private direct investment abroad in 1965, with 31 percent of the total. Europe was a close second with 28 percent, Latin America third with 19 percent and other countries made up the remaining 22 percent.

The amount of U.S. direct investment in Canada was $15.2 billion, in Western Europe $14 billion, in Latin America $9.4 billion, in the Far East $2 billion, in Africa $1.9 billion, in Oceania (including Australia) about $1.8 billion and in the Middle East $1.6 billion. (See Table I)

THE CHANGING PATTERNS

In 1965, petroleum, mining and smelting investments were about 38 percent of the total, roughly the same share as in 1950. But manufacturing investments have increased their share of the much larger total—rising from about 32 percent in 1950 to about 39 percent in 1965.

In the 1960s, manufacturing companies have become the important factor in direct investment spending on machine and factories abroad.

In 1960, all direct investment spending for plant and equipment abroad by U.S. investors was about $3.4 billion, with $1.4 billion in manufacturing. By 1965, however, total spending for new plant and equipment had more than doubled to $7.5 billion, while manufacturing affiliates' spending for new plant and equipment soared to $3.9 billion. In 1966, estimates for direct investment spending on plant and equipment increased further to $8.7 billion, with $4.6 billion spent on manufacturing investment. (See Table II)

A private survey by McGraw-Hill reports that foreign spending by U.S. companies in 1967 is expected to be 7 percent higher than in 1966. (See Table III)

Not all the funds for this foreign direct investment come from the United States, each year. Part of the spending for new plant and equipment is from re-invested profits and dividends abroad and from borrowing in foreign capital markets by U.S. corporations. About half of these soaring investments each year, however, are from the U.S.—outflows of U.S. funds.

In recent years, the major investors in manufacturing plant and equipment abroad have been the chemical, machinery (including electrical) and transportation equipment companies. These manufacturing companies accounted for about 70 percent of U.S. plant and equipment manufacturing expenditures abroad both in 1965 and in estimates for 1966.

THE IMPACT OF TRADE

Foreign investment has an important effect on international trade, both on exports and imports. Businessmen emphasize the importance of foreign investment for exports, through the use of machinery and semi-finished materials shipped from the U.S. and by building markets for U.S. products overseas. Government reports indicate that U.S. major industrial exports are machinery, transport equipment and chemicals. These account for much of America's favorable balance of trade in manufacturers. How much of these exports would exist even in the absence of skyrocketing foreign investments is not known, although it is clear that some of it, if not most of it, would be maintained.

Moreover, foreign production by U.S. subsidiaries and affiliated companies obviously also substitutes for some U.S. exports. Foreign sales by U.S. affiliates abroad have risen much more rapidly than U.S. exports, even in those manufactured products which are our leading exports.

In 1965, foreign affiliates of U.S. manufacturing firms increased their sales about 13 percent to $42.4 billion, while U.S. exports of manufactured products increased less than 5 percent.

Chemical manufacturing foreign affiliates' sales soared from $2.4 billion in 1957 to $6.9 billion in 1965. Machinery sales of foreign affiliates rose sharply from $3.9 billion in 1957 to $9.2 billion and the sales of foreign transportation equipment affiliates skyrocketed from $4.2 billion to $10.8 billion. Exports from the U.S. in these products rose less rapidly: Chemicals from $1.4 billion in 1957 to $2.4 billion in 1965, machinery from $4 billion to $6.9 billion, transport equipment from $1.6 billion to $3.5 billion. Much of the export trade in these products was in shipments—frequently semi-finished products—from U.S. companies to foreign subsidiaries.

In addition, imports into the U.S. are also affected by the operations of foreign subsidiaries of U.S. companies. Imports from U.S. affiliates abroad, as reported by the U.S. Department of Commerce, showed that 22 percent of total chemical imports, 14 percent of non-electrical machinery and 7 percent of electrical machinery, and 23 percent of transportation equipment imports were from U.S. affiliates abroad in 1965. Some of these imports are finished products that compete with U.S.-made goods. In addition, many products that are finished and sold in the U.S. are composed of components made in foreign countries by subsidiaries of U.S. firms.

A significant part of America's foreign trade—both exports and imports—is now composed of trade between U.S. and foreign plants of the same company. Semi-finished products are shipped from the U.S. plant to foreign subsidiaries for completion; the finished product is then often sold in world markets, including the U.S. Components produced in foreign subsidiaries, are shipped to the U.S. plant for assembly and sale in the U.S. Finished products, made by foreign subsidiaries, are sold in the U.S. by the companies' sales agencies, in competition with U.S.-made goods.

Among the international corporate giants, production and sales are often juggled, in this way, among the U.S. plants, the factories of foreign subsidiaries and company sales agencies in the U.S. and foreign countries. Only the companies, themselves, have information on the details of these production, sales and financial operations.

It is clear that the soaring investments of U.S. companies in foreign countries had had an adverse impact on international trade in at least several industries and a large number of products.

IMPACT OF JOBS

Both exports and imports affect jobs. About 3 million jobs are reported to be related to exports, 1.4 million in manufacturing employment.

The chemical, machinery and transportation equipment industries' exports often involve exports to their foreign affiliates and make up a large share of America's export trade. Government reports show that, in 1965, 10 percent of U.S. machinery industries' employment was export-related, for the engine and turbine segment about 20 percent, and about 14 percent of chemical industry employment and 10 percent for aircraft was export-related. However, some of these exports would have existed in the absence of great foreign investments and part of such exports would have been finished rather than semi-finished products.

It is also claimed that foreign activities of U.S. firms add to American jobs through helping to expand markets in other countries. Without U.S. locations abroad it is pointed out, many U.S. products could be shut out of foreign markets. And business reports claim that the interchange among international companies creates jobs in the U.S. through the use of imported foreign-made components.

However, imports of products and components also displace jobs and create unemployment. No specific information about the amount of import-related employment and unemployment is currently available from the government.

Some foreign production of U.S. subsidiaries obviously substitutes for American production and therefore costs American jobs, although there is no government information on this subject.

BALANCE OF PAYMENTS IMPACT

The sharp rise of foreign direct investment by U.S. companies has a direct relation to America's balance of payments deficit.

Since 1958 when the U.S. balance of payments deficit gained much public attention, direct investment outflows have varied from year to year, but the trend has been sharply upward.

Direct private capital outflows from the U.S. soared from $1.2 billion in 1958 and $1.7 billion in 1960 to $3.4 billion in 1965 and $3.5 billion in 1966. (See Table IV.) These outflows represent most of the total U.S. private outflows in recent years (which also includes bank lending and investments in foreign securities, etc.).

Despite the government's program, adopted in 1965, to limit the impact of direct-investment outflows on the balance of payments, this outflow has continued to rise—with a continuing adverse impact on the balance of payments deficit.

TABLE I.—VALUE OF U.S PRIVATE DIRECT INVESTMENT ABROAD BY AREA AND INDUSTRY[1]

[In billions of dollars]

	1950		1965	
	Amount	Percent of total	Amount	Percent of total
Total	$11.8	----------	$49.2	----------
Area:				
Canada	3.6	31	15.2	31
Latin America	4.6	39	9.4	19
Europe	1.7	14	13.9	28
Other	1.9	16	10.7	22
Industry:				
Manufacturing	3.8	32	19.3	39
Petroleum	3.4	29	15.3	31
Mining and smelting	1.1	9	3.8	8
Public utilities	1.4	12	2.1	4
Other	2.1	18	8.7	18

[1] The figures understate investment, but are the only available official figures.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce.

TABLE II.—PLANT AND EQUIPMENT SPENDING OF DIRECT FOREIGN INVESTMENTS 1960-66

[In billions of dollars]

	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966
Total	$3.8	$4.1	$4.6	$5.1	$6.2	$7.5	$8.7
Mining and smelting	.4	.3	.4	.4	.5	.7	.7
Petroleum	1.5	1.5	1.6	1.9	2.1	2.3	2.8
Manufacturing	1.4	1.8	2.0	2.3	3.0	3.9	4.6
Other	.5	.5	.5	.5	.6	.7	.8

Source: Survey of Current Business September 1966 and May 1967 U.S. Department of Commerce.

TABLE III.—OVERSEAS CAPITAL EXPENDITURES BY AMERICAN COMPANIES

[In billions of dollars]

	Actua., 1966	Planned, 1967	Percent change, 1966-67
Manufacturing	$4.6	$4.9	+7
Petroleum	2.6	3.2	+23
Mining	.8	.9	+15
All industries	8.0	9.0	+13

Source: McGraw-Hill Publishing Co. Economic Department.

TABLE IV.—*Private direct investment outflows from the United States*

[In billions of dollars]

1958	1.2
1960	1.7
1961	1.6
1962	1.7
1963	2.0
1964	2.4
1965	3.4
1966	3.5

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce.

HOW MEAT INSPECTORS SAVED LIVES

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, an article by Nick Kotz in this week's Des Moines Sunday Register tells how Federal meat inspectors at a Philadelphia meat inspection plant averted the slaughtering of deceased hogs contaminated with anthrax.

As the article points out, if these hogs had been sent to a plant without Federal inspection, they probably would have been slaughtered and the meat sold for human consumption.

A bill I am sponsoring, H.R. 12145, would strengthen the Federal Meat Inspection Act and extend its coverage to about 6,000 large- and medium-sized plants now slaughtering or processing meat without the protection afforded by the Federal meat inspection program.

This article is further evidence of the need for this legislation, and I hereby include it in the RECORD.

It is as follows:

HOW MEAT INSPECTORS SAVED LIVES—AVERTED OUTBREAK OF ANTHRAX

(By Nick Kotz)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Only the alertness and ability of federal meat inspectors prevented a potential disaster from deadly anthrax, a former packing company official has told The Sunday Register.

"I dread to think what might have happened to scores of people in Philadelphia, Pa., if it hadn't been for federal inspection," related Francis E. Buckman, formerly an executive of John J. Felin & Co. in Philadelphia.

Buckman strongly favors a proposal by Representatives Neal Smith (Dem., Ia.) and Thomas Foley (Dem., Wash.) to expand federal meat inspection to cover large plants now exempt from inspection. At present, federal inspection exists only in plants that sell across state lines.

Buckman's views are significant because many packing company executives who favor the Smith-Foley bill have been either reluctant to come forward or fear retaliation by competitors in the industry.

IOWA BACKING

For example, the president of a large federally-inspected firm in Iowa has told Foley that he strongly favors expanded federal inspection.

Yet, he acknowledged in an interview that he does not want to state his views publicly because he is concerned that the giant firms of the industry might try to damage his business.

This meat firm executive believes that principal opposition to the legislation comes not only from non-federally-inspected plants but from the very largest firms, which have plants that are federally inspected and others that are not.

Swift & Co., the nation's largest firm, operates both federally inspected plants and plants that very carefully do not sell in interstate commerce and thus are not under federal inspection. Swift officials refuse to disclose the number of these plants.

Former meat firm official Buckman said his own experience in the industry has convinced him that only federal inspection guarantees complete protection for the public.

Buckman is now staff director of the United Fund in Philadelphia. Previously, he was an industrial engineer for John Morrell & Co., at Ottumwa, Ia., and for Felin and later was advertising and sales promotion manager for the Felin firm. Felin has since been purchased by Morrell.

One day in 1952 Buckman was startled when the Felin production line which processes 444 hogs per hour suddenly stopped.

Federal inspectors on the line informed him they had never personally seen anthrax, but suspected it in six hogs being processed. The inspectors carefully examined the lymph glands of each hog, and noticed that in six cases the glands were salmon-colored, instead of putty-colored as they should be in healthy hogs.

Inspectors from the regional office were called in and existence of anthrax was confirmed. The hogs were condemned and Felin employees spent the remainder of the day scouring the entire plant to make certain that no deadly anthrax spores were present.

Because of Felin's excellent record keeping procedures, USDA officials quickly were able to pinpoint the exact farm in Ohio from which the hogs had come.

USDA officials have confirmed Buckman's story and agreed that the virulent anthrax germs in the diseased hogs might have been spread through hundreds of packages of sausage or other processed pork products.

USDA officials said humans exposed to anthrax can develop malignant carbuncles, can contract fatal pneumonia from inhalation of anthrax spores, or can develop fatal septicemia from eating contaminated meat.

According to USDA officials, the disease is still rather widespread in cattle, horses, and hogs in South Dakota, Mississippi, Nebraska, Texas, Louisiana and California. It also exists in parts of Vermont, New Jersey, Delaware, Wisconsin, Utah, Nevada, and Oregon.

The Public Health Service notes that there have been 153 reported cases of anthrax in humans during the last 10 years. But officials caution that there are possibly many cases which were not reported.

Buckman said he seriously doubts whether a plant with state or local inspection or with no inspection would have caught the anthrax.

"Those were six of the healthiest looking hogs I have ever seen," he commented. "Without proper federal inspection, those beautiful carcasses would have been made into fresh meat and manufactured goods.

"In a non-inspected house, those goods would have gone into commercial channels out of pure ignorance."

Concerning state and local inspection in Pennsylvania, Buckman said: "It's completely meaningless. Most of this inspection is periodic. It's not constant. In many cases, inspectors are not qualified."

"As long as a plant is operating where one pound of meat can be processed without inspection, you don't have protection."

Pennsylvania is one of 13 states providing for voluntary inspection. Eight states, including Minnesota, have no state inspection system.

THE EXTENSION OF LEGAL SERVICES TO THE POOR

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most meaningful addresses at the recent sesquicentennial celebration of Harvard Law School was delivered by Mr. Gary Bellow, head of the rural legal assistance program in California. This stimulating and challenging address I warmly commend to my colleagues and my fellow countrymen.

I insert Mr. Bellow's able address following my remarks:

THE EXTENSION OF LEGAL SERVICES TO THE POOR—NEW APPROACHES TO THE BAR'S RESPONSIBILITY

(By Gary Bellow, delivered at the Harvard sesquicentennial celebration, September 23, 1967)

At the American Bar Association meeting last month reports were made to the bar by several speakers and committees on the expansion of legal aid to the poor. They stated that with the assistance of federal funds from the Office of Economic Opportunity hundreds of new offices had been created and legal assistance had been provided to thousands of people who previously had no access to a lawyer.

No one who has been involved or concerned with legal aid work can minimize the significance of these reports. From one hundred thirty nine (139) public defender offices in the United States in 1964 the number has grown to two hundred sixty-six (266). There are now over one hundred thirty (130) more civil legal aid offices than there were in 1964. Over one thousand (1000) new positions for attorneys have been created. Cases involving the rights of welfare recipients, the legality of consumer practices, the constitutionality of the actions of government officials—cases in almost every field in which poor people are involved in legal difficulty—have been handled in state after state across the nation. We have begun to make visible a system of injustice which has been so long allowed to remain invisible.

It is therefore with some hesitation that I express the skepticism that I feel today. A great deal has, in fact, been done and much has been changed in three short years. Nevertheless, it seems to me that even in establishing the neighborhood offices, the test case units, the legal education programs—even in creating this whole panoply of legal and supportive services we have made a number of very narrow assumptions concerning the problems with which they deal and the scope of what needs to be done:

1. We have assumed that the provision of legal aid service to the poor is separate from the general problem of the unavailability of legal service to others in our low-income areas and to much of the rest of the nation.

2. We have assumed that, with adequate financing, legal aid services can be fully provided with the present structure and organization of the profession.

3. We have assumed that the provision of legal advice and representation in and of itself will fully fulfill any responsibility that the Bar has to the nation.

In my view these assumptions are in error. They will, as they are pursued, inevitably create new problems which will themselves one day have to be faced and solved. For this reason they deserve examination and questioning.

1. THE FOCUS ON THE DESTITUTE

It is, of course, understandable that in attempting to generate support for the expansion of legal aid we should emphasize initially the problems of the most destitute. Prior to 1964 less than one-quarter of one per cent of the money spen on legal services nationally was spent on legal aid. There were countless communities and cities with no system of legal aid at all. Interest had to be awakened; support from the Bar had to be gained.

Nevertheless, such an approach is at best short sighted. We cannot focus only on those we consider poor nor can we define the problems of the disadvantaged in terms of the destitute alone. We cannot continue to ignore the millions upon millions of people in the ghettos and slums and in this nation who are almost poor, who do not qualify for legal aid and who in reality are without sufficient funds to hire an attorney. The fact that so many of those who stole and rioted in our streets this summer were in fact employed and did own some property should give us some insight into the impossibility of coping with the problems of our cities' slums, legal or otherwise, in terms of any one group or category. Poverty is a relative concept. To assist people to income levels above the "poverty line" where they will find themselves without services previously available to them can hardly lead to any permanent solutions.

Nor can we ignore the impact that our attempt to divide the poor from the non-poor has on the actual operation of legal aid programs. In practice the standards applied by the programs usually set dollar limitations on eligibility without reference to whether the client will ever actually get legal help. In some cases ownership of a car or household goods is itself ground for exclusion no matter how much debt the client is in. The result is that legal aid attorneys are faced with unworkable standards which they administer arbitrarily without reference to priorities or realistic guide lines. Service is rendered or denied with very little basis for distinction and with even less understanding by the client who is turned away. More serious, the limitation that the case not be one that *could* produce a fee, results in cases being handled differently than they'd be handled in private practice. Damages or punitive damages, properly called for by the case, are not sought. Issues which should be litigated are compromised, often because the legal aid attorney feels he will be criticised for handling a fee-generating matter or rendering service to an ineligible client.

We forget that the establishment of the indigency standard is and was more a political than a logical decision. It represented an accommodation with those members of the Bar who were willing to handle cases for very low fees and speculative recovery. If these cases in fact are not being handled, or are being handled inadequately, as many are, it is no answer that this is the price that must be paid for Bar support of legal aid. In the long run we will have to face the implications of competition between legal aid programs and attorneys earning four, five and six thousand dollars a year or willing to handle cases for twenty or thirty dollars a case. We will have to design methods to enhance the economic potential of such attorneys and to increase the competition among them so that there will be some guarantee of quality of service. Most basic, however, we will have to increase the ability of those who do not qualify for legal aid to obtain and pay for the service they need from attorneys of their own choosing. We will have to do so, moreover, without total reliance of government funds if we are to retain the independence the profession now enjoys.

This means the cost of legal service to the client must drastically be reduced. It means, that we should, even now, implement the group legal service proposals that have been made, whether by community organizations, labor unions, or consumer associations. We should seriously explore ways technology can reduce the cost of legal service.

We should systematically encourage arrangements for the use of pooled facilities by lawyers and the establishment of group law practices.

We should forthrightly reexamine our attitudes toward forms of legal insurance.

The cost of legal service will either be reduced or spread among large numbers of people in accordance with risk or it will, as now, be denied. To assume that we can avoid this problem or take less certain steps is to insure that there will never be any basic response to the problem of adequate representation for the disadvantaged.

2. THE ADEQUACY OF THE STRUCTURE AND ORGANIZATION OF THE PROFESSION

The same problems underlie our assumption that the present organization and structure of the profession is adequate to meet the need. We have assumed that among those persons who qualify financially for assistance there can and should be no limitation on who is helped. The legal aid offices which existed prior to 1964 turned away persons in need. This was not to be repeated by the new legal service programs.

In choosing this approach we have virtually ignored the problem of priorities in allocating the limited resources available. We have also chosen an impossible task. No matter how many hours a day the offices remain open, no matter what systems are used to streamline intake and processing, the offices cannot handle the floods of people that come to them for legal help. In many instances the attorneys do try to handle every case, do seek to squeeze the last case into the last ten minutes of an overburdened day.

For this effort we pay an enormous price. The process exhausts the attorneys and exhausts the staff and very, very quickly there develops the same self-protective formality, the same need for categories, the same dehumanization which has been so often criticized in welfare and other agencies working with the poor. In the same manner, the quality of the legal work steadily declines as issue after issue is ignored in the name of a quick compromise and in the face of the growing caseload. Those of us who have worked in such offices know how few depositions are filed, interrogatories taken, appeals sought or equitable remedies utilized in the thousands of cases now being handled. It is no answer that these are simple cases. They are simple, by and large, because they are superficially handled. Of course many problems can be resolved by negotiation or even a phone call. But in how many cases could the client's interests be far more adequately protected if there were time to investigate the facts or research the issues involved? The National Legal Aid and Defender Association has stated that an attorney can handle as many as nine hundred (900) cases per year. No attorney can handle such a case load without doing far less than what needs to be done. Nor is it consistent with the obligation of fidelity owed to the individual client to ask the attorney to do so.

In addition, the volume makes it impossible to train or supervise the young attorneys in the offices. There are too many young lawyers in these programs that have already developed the habits that come with mass production law practice. There are many others who have not been willing to enter legal aid work because they feared that they would not get the supervision they needed in their early years of practice.

It seems to me, hard as it is, that we should stop trying to give every person a little bit of help. We should recognize the price we are paying, the limitations of our resources, and, with the community we serve, attempt to develop some order of priorities for the use of these services. More important, we should recognize that the problem is not merely a problem of resources. The profession, as it is currently constituted, will never be able to cope with the need. There are approximately three hundred thousand (300,000) attorneys in the United States. Last year, civil legal aid offices handled over five hundred thousand (500,000) cases. The National Crime Commission estimates that counsel will be needed in over seventy-five thousand (75,000) felony cases and a half-million misdemeanor cases every year. In cities that have opened legal aid offices, the caseload has increased three and four times. In Washington, D.C., in its first year, the legal service program handled over seven thousand (7,000) cases as compared to approximately one thousand (1,000) the year before. If all the attorneys in the United States did only legal aid work, the resources would still be inadequate.

Must we not recognize that the present system for providing legal service cannot cope with volume of this nature? Must we not ask ourselves how many of the thousands of cases and problems that arise daily could be handled as well by trained laymen as by lawyers? Every day the poor and near-poor have to fill out forms, negotiate agreements, express grievances and challenge public and private decisions without recourse to any adviser or advocate on their behalf. Much of this could in fact be done by non-lawyers—legal technicians, if you will—trained in special undergraduate courses or in a one-year law school program. Some of it can be and even now is done by members of the low-income community themselves. This is, of course, not to say that the Bar would or should relinquish supervision and control. It is merely evident that three years of law school are not needed to calculate a welfare budget or recognize an unfair interest charge.

We can surely supervise the way advice is given on these matters without in every instance giving that advice ourselves.

Were such trained technicians available, could not many of the cases that fill our courts and add to the congestion of the court calendars—domestic relations problems, minor misdemeanors, even issue of fault in tort cases—be resolved outside traditional litigation by mediation and arbitration processes staffed and administered by such technicians? There would, of course, have to be scrutiny of the fairness of such processes. But to provide adequate procedural safeguards in the orderly resolution of disputes does not depend in every instance on the presence of an attorney nor is the court room the only forum in which such disputes could or should be resolved.

We have, as a profession, been granted a monopoly over who can engage in the practice of law. In exercising this monopoly we, by and large, also determine the forum in which disputes will be resolved. For the wealthy, the narrow confines of the unauthorized practice rules have been modified. The use of lawyers and courts to resolve all legal difficulties has proved just too expensive and time consuming. Commercial arbitration and negotiation have therefor provided other forums; accountants, real estate brokers, banks, insurance agents have become alternative to reliance on attorneys in every instance where a legal question is resolved. For the people in the slums of our cities there are no such forums and no such alternatives. Until and unless such alternatives can be developed people in need will not be helped no matter how strong the myth of total representation. To assume that these alternatives are the province of lawyers alone is probably to guarantee that they will not be developed at all.

3. THE IMPACT OF LEGAL REPRESENTATION ON POVERTY

The third assumption—that the Bar's responsibility is limited to the provision of counsel for all—is in many ways the most fundamental. If you have worked in the slums of our cities or in the rural slums of our small towns—if you have felt anything of the isolation and hatred that exists there—I think you would agree that equal representation is not enough. It is not enough to ease the burden of poverty by lifting a wage garnishment or staying an eviction. It is not even enough to change an unjust rule if there is no assurance that the change will be enforced.

We talk of the need for changes in attitudes of the poor and the potential for such changes through contact with lawyers and through exposure of fairer treatment. This may be true. But the changes will not be very lasting if they are not accompanied by some real changes in the political and economic position of the poor as well. The poor are victims of a whole system of injustice well beyond a particular case or litigation. The slum dweller is the victim not only of the slum landlord. He is the victim of inadequate transportation systems, segregated suburban housing, the depreciation allowance of the internal revenue code—all of which give the landlord his monopoly and control. The California farm worker is not merely the victim of the unscrupulous labor contractor. Unenforced labor codes, illegal recruitment of competing foreign workers, exclusion from protective legislation also give the contractor the power that he possesses. The absence of attorneys for the poor is merely symptomatic of the absence of justice. There is no necessary correlation between the provision of lawyers and solutions to the systems of injustice which envelop the poor. If justice is the responsibility of the Bar, as I think it is, then it is the problem of poverty itself in the nation that we must deal with.

To deal with this means that the profession will have to be concerned with more than service to more and more people. It will have to recognize the political nature of the problem of poverty—and the relevance of the law as a political instrument to cope with it. "Poverty law" is more than the legal problems of welfare or retail installment buying. It also involves the internal revenue code, the federal reserve system, grant-in-aid legislation—all those rules, regulations, practices and procedures that affect the distribution of wealth and power in our society. It is on these issues—that legal aid and the Bar must focus.

The law has often in the past served in our nation's history as an instrument of change and reform. The history of the challenges to the income tax by a group of Philadelphia lawyers on behalf of their corporate clients more than fifty years ago is just one such example. The poor need a similar kind of advocacy—an advocacy which will have available to it the legislative as well as the judicial forum—an advocacy which will seek to enhance the organization and political power of its clients.

The law has also many times in our nation's history served to advance the economic interests of particular groups or organizations. Much of the economic history of the United States was influenced by lawyers. Forms of corporate financing, the tax structure, the regulatory machinery of countless administrative agencies are the product of lawyer-work for a whole spectrum of interests. Today attorneys for the wealthy spend far more time in ordering and advancing the financial affairs of their clients than in litigation.

The same must eventually be true for lawyers who work with the poor. Credit unions and other financial institutions can be developed to provide alternatives to loan sharks and unfair retail sellers. Business owned by the low-income community itself can be organized and established to provide a stake in its growth and expansion. Cooperative housing can be made an alternative to the landlord-tenant relationship that exists in the slums. This will take attorneys—trained and oriented to do such jobs and supported by the entire profession.

The Appellate Division of the New York Court of Appeals expressed concern that legal aid lawyers may be providing representation "to groups of social and economic protest."

To me, the degree to which we can effectively do just that is the very question facing our nation. The question is whether we can channel the grievances that are now in the streets into the political and legal process. The question is whether the law and lawyers can be the instrument of the kind of changes that will begin to cope with the conditions that produced the violence of this summer—with automation, unemployment, discrimination, caste, population growth.

There will be, I fear, other nights of violence like the ones we have seen. That they may one day be a part of our history and not a prediction of the future is why, as lawyers, we must look far beyond our work of the last few years. That is the challenge to the profession—and to the nation.

COLUMBUS DAY

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 475th anniversary of an event that has since influenced the history of the entire world. On October 12, 1492, a Genoese sailor who had embarked from Spain touched upon the shores of our continent.

Christopher Columbus discovered the land that was to be America—a nation that has become the richest, strongest, freest of all nations. Sailing forth to find a more direct route from Spain to India, Columbus instead discovered the New World—a land that was to represent hope to the oppressed and the needy, a land where all the peoples of the world were to come together and form one people, a land whose government was to serve as a model for representative governments everywhere.

Columbus had struggled long and hard for the funds to finance this dangerous voyage. He was persistent, he was brave, and he had great vision. It is fitting that such a man was the discoverer of our Nation.

We owe to Christopher Columbus a national debt of gratitude for discovering this New World, and today we should pay homage to his memory and to the importance of his deed.

GREENSPAN, A GOOD PROGRAM

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BURTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of regret that I witness the budgetary knife as it slices off a program that has great promise to make a major contribution toward improving the environment in which we live. I cannot stress too strongly that I hope the deletion of this program will be but for a short period of time.

What I refer to is the "Greenspan" feature of the cropland adjustment program of the Department of Agriculture. Greenspan is a fledgling program—only 2 years old. But in that time nearly 200 cities, towns, and communities have been assisted in setting aside some open space, some "green space," if you please, for their and their children's enjoyment.

This program, now about to be cut out of the appropriations bill, is modest. In its 2 years of operation grants totaling only about $1.5 million have been awarded to take about 10,000 acres out of crop production. This land is now being put to use to meet the urgent needs of our cities and towns for recreation and open space.

Now, by most any standard, Greenspan is not a big program. But it has great promise, and I think it is vitally needed.

We have a great challenge, and I believe we should have a national commitment, to improve the environment in which we live. I wholeheartedly concur with what Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman said recently—that we "are nourishing a time bomb of imbalance in this country." He points out that for the past 20 years we have dumped 20 million Americans from the countryside into the cities, and now today 70 percent of the people are stacked up on 1 percent of the land. This is neither advantageous to the countryside nor the city.

Greenspan is helping to alleviate the problems of this congestion—and is doing so in many ways. It is helping by providing wilderness areas for camping, hiking, hunting, fishing, and horseback riding. It is helping by providing nature trails and marine laboratories adjacent to school grounds. It is providing parks and recreation areas near large and small cities. And through it a variety of projects for beautification, wildlife habitat, open space, and the abatement of air and water pollution have been undertaken.

All of this is important to making purposeful, proper use of space. I believe that we can alter the face of this land—that we can remove the eyesores—and that we can preserve the beauty of this Nation.

Remember that at the turn of the next century—only about 30 years from now—there will be 300 million Americans living on the same amount of land we now have. The question is whether these Americans will be living at ease with each other and with their environment, or whether they will be merely existing in conditions of congestion, pollution, tension, and despair.

The quality of our environment is important. The Greenspan program is helping to improve upon it. I sincerely hope that this budgetary cut can be for the shortest time possible, and that we can soon restore its appropriation so that it can again make a contribution to improve the conditions in which our sons and daughters and their sons and daughters will live.

COUNT CASIMIR PULASKI: SOLDIER OF FREEDOM

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, Casimir Pulaski was Poland's greatest gift and most valuable contribution to our War of Independence. The part this gallant son of Poland played in that war is recognized by all Americans, particularly today, as we commemorate the 188th anniversary of the day on which he gave his life in order that our country might be free.

This gifted son of a Polish nobleman was destined to lead a warrior's life and gladly gave it for a cause close to his heart—for freedom. Foresaking a nobleman's title, comfort, and riches in his native homeland, he fought for the freedom of his country and his people. But he himself, and his countrymen alone, could not cope with the Russian czar's oppressive forces surrounding Poland. Under his youthful leadership, Polish bands harassed and fought the Russians as best they could, but after several years of fighting, these bands were almost annihilated by the Russian forces. Miraculously, a handful of these men managed to escape and flee. Pulaski was thus forced to leave Poland in 1772, never to see his homeland again.

During the next several years he tried to enlist foreign aid for his people abroad, but without much success. These were years of frustration and hardship for him, and finally he arrived in Paris in 1776, and there he heard of the American rebellion against the British.

Through his friends in Paris he contacted the American representatives there, Benjamin Franklin and Silas Deane. They welcomed Pulaski's willingness to serve the cause of liberty, and both wrote letters for him, recommending him to General Washington.

In July 1777, he arrived here, and immediately presented himself to General Washington. Our Commander in Chief was much impressed by him, and recommended to the Continental Congress that Pulaski be placed in charge of our cavalry forces.

On this important assignment, Pulaski did an outstanding job in a short time, and distinguished himself as a resourceful leader in the insuing battle of Brandywine on September 11. Noticing such extraordinary talent in youthful Pulaski, Washington recommended that he be given the rank of brigadier general and the command of our cavalry.

General Pulaski then began the arduous task of reorganizing and improving the American cavalry. So thorough was he in discharging his responsibility that he even prepared a book of drill regulations and rules for officers and privates which still serves as the basis of cavalry drills in the U.S. Army.

Subsequently he and his units took part in many battles, and in all of them, they distinguished themselves under his exceptional leadership. In his final encounter against the enemy, at the siege of Savannah in October 1779, he was mortally wounded.

Pulaski was only 31 when he died, but despite his youth, he had established a brilliant reputation in the field of cavalry and was foremost in the ranks of those wholeheartedly dedicated to the cause of liberty.

Although he did not live to see America win her independence, Pulaski's gallantry in the field of battle and his complete devotion to the cause of freedom helped our country immeasurably in winning the ultimate victory.

It is particularly fitting on this occasion to remember Pulaski's courage in the face of tyranny, his patriotism, and his generosity, for these are all characteristics which the Poles have demonstrated throughout centuries of strife and foreign domination.

I am especially aware of these outstanding qualities of the Polish people, because in my own Seventh Congressional District of Illinois, there are over 30,000 Polish-Americans who, together with Americans of Polish descent throughout the United States, have contributed substantially to the advancement of our culture and the preservation of our Nation.

Today, on the 188th anniversary of his death, we pay tribute to this great and gallant son of Poland, who gladly gave his life in fighting for our freedom. It is with real pride and a deep sense of gratitude that I join my colleagues in the Congress and my fellow Americans in observing this anniversary and in rededicating ourselves to the noble cause for which he died.

OPPOSITION TO H.R. 7977, POSTAL REVENUE AND FEDERAL SALARY ACT

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. TUCK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the bill H.R. 7977, the Postal Revenue and Federal Salary Act of 1967, and am pleased to have this opportunity to explain my position in respect to the proposed legislation.

As to the proposed increases in postal rates, I consider them not in the public interest. It is reported that first-class mail is not only paying its way, but resulting in a profit. I look upon the Post Office Department as a service organization and I would hope an earnest effort would be made to eliminate certain unnecessary spending and attempts made toward adjustments which would stop the obvious deterioration in the service and result in an improvement thereof. To require the public to pay 6 cents to mail a letter, and pay 5 cents for a single postcard, is going entirely too far.

The increases proposed in this legislation will add materially to the ever growing tax burden on the American public. Reliable figures reveal that the tax burden has grown over the past 20 years from $55.7 billion to $218.7 billion.

This burden continues to become greater and we see no sincere effort to curtail expenditures, nor is there any apparent attempt to eliminate nonessential and useless projects now resulting in a flagrant and unconscionable waste of the taxpayers dollars.

We already are witnessing signs of a "taxpayer revolt," and unless there are meaningful and convincing efforts to lighten the burden, I predict an unprecedented demand by the public for fiscal sanity.

I am in favor of fair and adequate compensation for services rendered, but I cannot bring myself to support this proposed increase in the salaries of Federal employees to the extent or in the method proposed by this bill.

The salary increases proposed not only exceed the increase recommended by the executive department, but at the same time a delegation of powers is proposed which would result in an abdication by the Congress of jurisdiction in the field of salaries and pay of Federal employees, and grant to the Executive authority not sought.

PUBLIC TV PLAN WORTH A TRY

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Blanton] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, an editorial published September 25 by the Nashville Tennessean calls attention to two important changes made by the House in President Johnson's public broadcasting bill.

Members will recall that the House provided a 15-man Board of Directors for the nonprofit Public Broadcasting Corporation. Of these 15, no more than eight may be members of one political party. The House bill also prohibits editorializing by the stations.

The Tennessean observes that the bill "seems to settle the fears of some who argued the Corporation would become a Government propaganda machine."

The President himself, in his message to the Congress last February, said:

> Noncommercial radio and television in America, even though supported by Federal funds, must be absolutely free from any Federal Government interference over programming.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the Nashville Tennessean that the President's plan "could prove to be a refreshing change" from the television programs now available, and I place the editorial in the Record at this point:

Public TV Plan Worth a Try

The House has joined the Senate in approving President Johnson's plan for creation of a non-profit public corporation to offer television viewers some alternatives to the present brand of programs they are seeing.

The corporation, headed by 15 directors, is to fund independent production of educational and cultural programs and their delivery to the nation's noncommercial television and radio stations.

The experiment could prove to be a refreshing change from the somewhat stereotyped television fare available on the commercial stations.

The bill seems to settle the fears of some who argued the corporation would become a government propaganda machine. Its provisions limit the number of directors from one political party to eight and forbids any station editorializing.

Some opponents were unconvinced, however. Rep. Albert W. Watson, R-S.C., who worked to defeat the bill, said "This will be a Frankenstein . . . a monster."

The plan may not be perfect, but at least it seems to be worth a try. It may, as Mr. Watson says, turn out to be a "monster." But even at that, the television viewer would be no worse off. He is seeing a number of monsters already.

CINCINNATI POVERTY PROGRAM VINDICATED AFTER REPUBLICAN INSPECTION

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Holland] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, not long ago, my able and dedicated friends, and colleagues on the Committee on Education and Labor, the gentlemen from Ohio [Mr. Ayres and Mr. Ashbrook], visited Cincinnati, Ohio, to take a good look at the poverty programs there and at the community action program in particular. After their visit, the Cincinnati Enquirer assessed the Cincinnati community action program in the context of this visit. The Enquirer's editorial judgment speaks very well for the Cincinnati program, and, by obvious inference, for the war against poverty as a whole. As the Enquirer points out, Mr. Speaker, "Poverty is everybody's problem." Under unanimous consent I place this excellent editorial in the Record at this point:

Poverty Is Everyone's Problem

In this space three weeks ago, as Cincinnati's poverty program was about to undergo a day of scrutiny by two visiting Republican congressmen, we remarked: "If Cincinnati's poverty program is as good as its defenders argue it is, a day or more of investigation will make it look all the better."

The Community Action Commission, the broadly representative agency responsible for directing the war on poverty in the Cincinnati area, seemingly feels that the program has passed the test with its stature notably enhanced. And there is much evidence that the commission's assessment is correct.

Not everyone who appeared before the congressional panel, to be sure, endorsed all that has been undertaken in the name of combating poverty in Cincinnati. Some, indeed, didn't endorse any part of it.

But the differences of opinion that came to light, it seems to us, were differences of philosophy, differences of emphasis and technique.

There were no substantial allegations of fraud or mismanagement or malevolence, no allegations of widespread waste or corruption.

And from the absence of any indictment of its work, the Community Action Commission, whose members rallied to its support in advance of the investigation, has drawn considerable encouragement. From the same set of circumstances, we think, the community can derive a substantial measure of pride.

For no comparable program was ever launched with greater opportunities for ineptness, confusion and waste.

Contrary to what many Americans continue to believe, the war on poverty is essentially a local, rather than a Federal, program. The funding, to be sure, comes largely from the Federal level. But to survey the list of agencies responsible for carrying the Cincinnati war on poverty into action is to see that they are, in the main, long-established and highly regarded parts of the community scene.

The Cincinnati Board of Education, for example, has been the largest single beneficiary in the distribution of poverty funds. Others have been the Hamilton County Board of Education, the Planned Parenthood Association, the Archdiocese of Cincinnati, the Clermont County Board of Commissioners, the Legal Aid Society, the Salvation Army, Talbert House, Inc., and nearly a dozen neighborhood organizations affiliated with the Cincinnati Federation of Settlement and Neighborhood Centers.

The utilization of local agencies to carry forward the war on poverty has both its good and bad features. In Cincinnati, they have been all good because virtually all of the local agencies involved have been manned over the years by conscientious volunteers and competent staff personnel.

Had it been otherwise—had the existing agencies labored in a tradition of wastefulness and ineptness—the poverty program itself would have bogged down in incompetence and futility.

That such is not the case has been amply established in the last few weeks. And the result has not been lost upon the community.

When the Community Action Commission, as an example, sponsored a day-long colloquium to discuss various aspects of the poverty program on September 17, its members were frankly amazed at the public interest and support. The colloquium itself established the needs for additional public inquiries into a number of specialized fields—police-community relations, employment opportunities and job training, the role of the poor in shaping official policies aimed at lessening their plight.

This substantial public interest is perhaps the most hopeful aspect of the entire effort to mitigate poverty in the Queen City, for it is at least a glimmer of hope that Cincinnatians have begun to imagine that poverty is, in a real sense, everyone's problem.

It has been easy in the past to imagine that poverty is the problem of politicians who have ridden into office on a magic carpet of promises.

Or that it is the problem of the community's employers who alone have the power to create job opportunities.

Or that it is the problem of the civil rights organizations, which have asked for and received the most sweeping legislative enactments in the nation's history.

Or that it is simply a problem of our city officials, charged, as they are, with the maintenance of law and order.

Each of these imaginings contains an element of correctness. But it is becoming increasingly clear, we think, that the problem of poverty belongs on the doorstep of every Cincinnatian—rich and poor, white and black, young and old.

We happen to harbor deep philosophical differences with many of those active in directing the war on poverty—differences that make us doubt whether this generation or any future generation can actually drive poverty from the land.

But these differences do not mean that we condemn the effort, or that life in Cincinnati does not stand to be enhanced by programs calculated to convert today's tax consumers into tomorrow's taxpayers.

We believe that Cincinnati—and every other community—must bend every effort to create opportunity where there has been none in the past. We believe this because we do not want to see Cincinnati become an annual battlefield. We do not want to see Cincinnati inhabited almost exclusively by welfare beneficiaries.

We want instead to see Cincinnati continue to be a city of substantial home owners who hold a genuine, personal stake in what happens to the entire Ohio Valley. We want Cincinnati to be a community in which young people of all races, all talents, all economic circumstances can find rewarding work compatible with their aptitudes and preparation. And we want Cincinnati to be a community in which men and women of all political and religious and ethnic persuasions can continue to work together to identify and solve common problems.

Every time Cincinnatians can sit down and air their differences and give voice to their aspirations, that day draws nearer.

SOUTH CAROLINA NEWSPAPER SPEAKS OUT ON "FREEDOM OF CHOICE"

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Holland] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, on the editorial page of the Cheraw Chronicle of Cheraw, S.C., appears the statement, "Chesterfield County's liveliest newspaper." If the Chronicle editorial which I was privileged to read recently is typical, I can believe that it is Chesterfield County's liveliest paper. It would not surprise me if it were the liveliest in all South Carolina—but I will leave that judgment to those who are more familiar with the South Carolina press than I.

I cite as an example of a "lively" editorial one which appeared in the August 24 edition of the Chronicle. In it, the editor points out the flaws in the so-called freedom of choice plan for desegregating the unconstitutional dual school systems which have traditionally been maintained in the Southern States.

The editorial states flatly that freedom of choice "has failed to make much progress toward its intended goal of gradually doing away with the dual school system which has deprived Negroes of equal educational opportunities." Unless responsible school officials make freedom of choice work, the editor warns, they will have to accept the alternative—"total integration in one fell swoop."

Mr. Speaker, the editorial is exceptionally perceptive and deserving of our attention. I congratulate the publisher of the Cheraw Chronicle, A. M. Secrest, and the editor, Edward M. Sweatt, for their forward-looking position on the subject of school desegregation and under unanimous consent I place the editorial at this point in the Record:

Freedom of Choice Is Not Working as Intended

While the "freedom of choice" plan of public school desegregation has offered to determined Negro parents the choice of sending their children to previously all white schools, it has failed to make much progress toward its intended goal of gradually doing away with the dual school system which has deprived Negroes of equal educational opportunities.

For various reasons, Negroes have failed to flock in large numbers to schools formerly attended only by whites, as was expected by federal officials who devised the plan to make the transition as painless as possible.

Drafters of the choice plan thought it would succeed in closing down small, inferior and inadequate Negro schools since it was assumed that most students of these schools would transfer in a minute if given the chance to go to superior white schools.

Where there was one school for whites and another for Negroes in the same district, both with substantial enrollments, it was expected that transfers of large numbers of Negroes would force school officials to eventually mix both schools.

It was naturally assumed that it would be economically foolish to build extra classrooms onto white schools in order to accommodate the transfers when there would be so many empty desks at the Negro schools because of the exodus.

But, with few exceptions, freedom of choice has resulted in only token integration of white classrooms. Faculty desegregation has not even reached the "token" stage in most instances.

Only one of South Carolina's 106 districts is safely within the modest guidelines for the coming school term. Of the 76 districts not yet ruled in compliance, 38 of these are considered "borderline" by the U.S. Office of Education, which has called for a speed-up in desegregation in all 76 districts. The remaining districts are under court orders or already in the process of having funds cut off.

Immediate reaction of school officials and the public is predictable. Most will maintain that by offering a "choice," the schools will have done their part to abide by the guidelines. No one will take any blame for failure of the plan to work.

The disturbing thing about the situation is that school officials who haven't made freedom of choice work will probably be faced one of these days soon with immediate and total integration, which educators claim may cause extreme difficulties to a system of education that already lags behind the nation.

If freedom of choice can't achieve the gradual phasing out of dual school systems, then the U.S. Office of Education—as well as the courts—have no alternative but to require total integration in one fell swoop.

Perhaps freedom of choice never was practical for this state. Maybe court-ordered total integration is the only way to eliminate separate schools for the races in view of the lack of progress made toward that goal. Those who predict disaster if schools are entirely mixed need only to look to the small community of Ruby to see that many of the fears do not exist. Ruby, the only district in the state which has fully met desegregation requirements, will open school doors for the third year this month to students of both races who attend the same school.

School officials who maintain that Ruby's example cannot be followed elsewhere in the state ought to have assumed the responsibility to make freedom of choice work as it was intended. They have had two years now to provide needed leadership in and out of school to create the kind of atmosphere in which freedom of choice could work.

But school officials have failed to admit to themselves—much less to the public—that the days of segregated schools are numbered and that only by making freedom of choice work can the change be accomplished in a gradual, orderly manner.

While there has been no known physical or economic threats held over the heads of Negro parents to keep their children from enrolling in previously white schools, there has been no sincere effort on the part of white school administrations to see that the Negro transfer was made to feel welcome, or any actions taken to help him over the obvious academic hurdles.

It is one thing to say Negroes can come to a white school because the federal government has forced open the doors. It is quite another to admit to the Negro student that he has a right to attend the school which offers him a better education, that he is welcome, and then try to help him overcome any learning gap that may occur when he transfers from a Negro school to a previously all white one.

In the Cheraw school district only 50 Negro students have signed up to attend the three predominantly white schools this fall. This represents no increase from last year, since the number of new transfers is no more than the number of Negroes who attended white schools last year who will return to their former schools this year. The only small increase will be the number of Negro first graders which choose white schools.

While no one can deny that some progress has been made in school desegregation, it is apparent that the freedom of choice plan is not working positively toward the elimination of the dual system. Instead of having from 10 to 12 percent of the Negro students in white schools, there will be less than three percent. There will not be at least two teachers of a different race in each school in the district, as asked in the guidelines. Last year the requirement for one teacher in each school was not met.

There has been no attempt to make the transfer to white schools as painless as possible for Negroes. Instead, many educators and school officials seem delighted when Negro transfer students make a poor academic showing in the white schools.

School officials turned thumbs down on using federal money available several months ago to run summer school programs which could have helped to prepare Negro children to go to white classrooms and to help prepare the community for complete integration at the same time.

The first summer when applications for transfer were accepted from the first group of Negro children, school officials not only failed to help prepare them for the move but refused to cooperate with an effort made in this direction by a local group.

If a sincere effort had been made, the freedom of choice plan would not be under question now. But instead of using the plan as it was intended, it has been used primarily as a tactic to fight integration; not as a device to encourage the orderly desegregation of schools.

School officials have to face up to the fact that the dual system has to go, and proceed to accomplish this in a practical and positive manner. Unless they do, the thing they fear the most—complete and immediate integration—will catch up with them one day soon.

MDTA TRAINING AT CONTRA COSTA COLLEGE, CONTRA COSTA COUNTY, CALIF.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Waldie] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the August 2, 1967, issue of the Martinez News Gazette contained an article relative to an occupational training program under the Manpower Development and Training Act being conducted at Contra Costa County College in my congressional district. The college has made one of the most outstanding contributions of any MDTA program throughout the entire State of California, and I commend officials of the college on that fine accomplishment.

I recommend the reading of the Gazette article to my colleagues in the House, and urge their continued support of the Manpower and Training Act programs in our educational institutions.

The article follows:

MDTA Training at Colleges Lauded

Pleasant Hill.—"MDTA training conducted at Contra Costa County junior colleges literally transforms unemployed men and women from public tax charges into productive taxpayers," reported Milford V. Hankins, Contra Costa College technical education director.

Hankins announced the results of a survey of Manpower Development trainees this week. "Of great significance to county citizens is the fact that 88 per cent of trainees are employed immediately after completing training. Almost 70 per cent of these men and women were receiving some kind of public assistance prior to entering the program," Hankins said.

The junior colleges are now in the fourth year of providing occupational training under the Manpower Development and Training Act. The program is 100 per cent funded by the federal government. Its purpose is to develop new skills among people unemployed or underemployed because of technological developments and economic changes.

The act, commonly called MDTA, since its inception in September of 1962 has been a major weapon in reducing unemployment and is a most successful approach to combating unemployment.

It has been shown that 30 per cent of the money expended by the federal government is returned by the end of the first year through income tax returns from trainees placed on jobs and money saved on unemployment insurance. By the end of five years all money will be returned through collection of added taxes alone from those returned to the work force.

Diablo Valley College has trained unemployed persons for work in the fields of carpentry, drywall construction, nursing, and grocery checking, and will start a machine technology program in September. Contra Costa College has conducted training programs for chemist assistant, household appliance, small engine repair, gardener-groundsman, general sales person, combination welder and general welder, and will offer a nurse refresher course this fall.

Contra Costa College is now developing a program with curriculum designed to teach basic job related skills in communication and mathematics to Mexican-Americans. Research indicates that a lack of these skills is often the only thing that stands in the way of their successful employment.

This particular training program presents the college with a real challenge, since many of the trainees speak little or no English. Class size, for example, has to be limited to facilitate progress of the students.

From the continued success of the colleges' MDTA programs to date, Hankins expects them to continue for some time. "And where a continual need in the training area is apparent, we anticipate programs to be developed as a regular part of our on-going curriculum.

"An additional benefit of the programs, and one which is increasingly apparent to our college MDTA instructors," according to Hankins, "is the personal benefit to the trainee himself. He gains confidence and self-respect in addition to work skills. This acts to the benefit of the community as a whole."

A GUARANTEE FOR PRODUCTIVE EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR THOSE WHO ARE UNEMPLOYED OR UNDEREMPLOYED

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Waldie] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with a number of my colleagues who have previously introduced such legislation in presenting for consideration of the House, a new proposal to provide jobs for those in our cities who are seeking and are desirous of employment.

I recently was privileged to meet with a group of citizens from my district who were representative of a large number of like citizens throughout the country. These people expressed to me their great concern with the present welfare programs. They feel that those programs give them little opportunity to develop the dignity and prestige within their family and community that a job would afford them. They also indicated to me that in their view much of the violence and turmoil in our major urban centers is attributable to the lack of constructive employment of the time available to the young men and women in our cities.

Mr. Speaker, I am becoming absolutely convinced that we must provide as many job opportunities as we can in these areas. We must remove as many people as we can from the degrading system of dole that essentially describes our present welfare programs into productive and constructive employment opportunities.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that enactment of this measure would go a long way in the direction of accomplishing that desirable end.

LIVING IN POVERTY

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Gibbons] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, all of the Members know the Education and Labor Committee is now marking up the 1967 amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act.

It seems to me that slowly but surely an awareness of poverty, its size and its implications, is coming to this country.

In the last 3 years more has been written about mistakes, real and imagined, that have been made in the war on poverty than has been written about the terrible impact of poverty upon our country.

Curing the causes of poverty is not a partisan matter. The elimination of those old programs that have outlived their usefulness is a task that all of us in Congress should be devoting much time to.

In the October 3 issue of the Wall Street Journal there appeared on the front page an excellent article written by the Journal staff dealing with the impact of poverty. It seems to me that everyone in Congress should read this article, and, therefore, I include it at this point in the Record:

Living in Poverty: How Some Americans Scrape by at Bottom of Economic Ladder—Southern Whites in Chicago, Arizona Indians, Eskimos Share Common Problems—"Just a Dead Man Walking"

The five of Mrs. Lillie Harrison's 14 children who still live at home, in rural Madison County, Miss., have never talked on a telephone, been to a movie or ridden a bicycle. The Negro family gets $66 worth of food stamps a month, enough for two meals a day.

John Seczizinski, 76, gets old age assistance of $104 a month. It buys a plate of stew each day and covers the rent on his 12-foot-by-7-foot room in a north Philadelphia flophouse. But, clad in a sweat-stained undershirt and rumpled trousers, he looks up bleakly and says, "The living isn't so good. Sometimes I just sit down and cry."

Twinsburg Heights, Ohio, isn't far from a number of affluent suburbs, and a tall water storage tower belonging to Chrysler Corp. looms within view. But this enclave of Negroes outside Cleveland has neither water nor sewage facilities, and the residents make do with wells and outhouses.

In a migrant labor camp outside Stockton, Calif., William Burns stretches out on a thin, soiled pallet in the single males' barracks. Food and lodgings cost $1.75 a day, and contractors charge $1 or $2 a day for the privilege of working. Even in the best of times, when the tomato crop comes in, Mr. Burns seldom makes much more than expenses.

HIDDEN POVERTY

That some Americans live in poverty has been public knowledge for some time, of course, and lately more than ever. Bloody riots have pinpointed deprivations in the big city ghettos, and a Senate subcommittee recently heard testimony that displaced sharecroppers in Mississippi were starving. But Wall Street Journal reporters around the country find that there still exist pockets of poverty scarcely noticed by society, let alone attacked, although the "war" on poverty officially is three years old. For some families in these localities, the $3,000 annual income generally recognized as breaching the poverty barrier would be a fortune.

Between Independence and Kansas City, Mo., for instance, is a dreary "Dogpatch" city of wooden shacks that is disowned by both municipalities; most residents are unemployed. On a Passamaquoddy Indian reservation in Washington County, Maine, unemployment is 97%. Up to 13 persons sleep in one room at the Gallardo labor camp in Stanislaus County, Calif. Among the poorly housed Eskimos in the hinterlands of southwest Alaska, the average life span is 34.3 years.

The catalogue of difficulties among the people at the very bottom of the economic heap—poor nutrition and housing, inadequate medical and dental care, menial jobs or none, and a prevailing lack of hope—tends to be perpetuated when their children don't finish school, as is often the case. Although antipoverty programs are making inroads in some areas, some of the very poor are beyond the reach of social programs, too suspicious or proud to ask for help, ignorant of their rights or simply apathetic. Almost uniformly, they lack political muscle.

DISBELIEVING OFFICIALS

All the problems are on view among the Mexican-American farm workers in Starr and Hidalgo Counties, Texas, in the Rio Grande valley, and local poverty workers are desperate. "Officials don't believe it," says one volunteer. They say we're only pointing out the exceptional cases. But people are literally starving to death here."

A survey by the Starr County antipoverty program of several impoverished communities showed 71% of 3,339 families with annual incomes of less than $3,000. About 1,000 of those families had incomes below $1,000. Only 4% of children 14 and 15 years old still were in school, and 90% of the men over 14 were unemployed.

The problem is how to break the cycle of deprivation. In the one-room shack of Carlos Ramirez, in La Joya, in Hidalgo County, three generations of poverty are represented. Mr. Ramirez, 70 became a widower two years ago. The chief income for himself, four of his children who usually are at home and a six-year-old granddaughter, is $94 a month in state welfare. Lately this has been supplemented by $50 a month sent from an Idaho Job Corps camp by Carlos Jr., 19.

Carlos Jr. left school after the third grade.

Julia Anne, 26, has a fifth grade education. Last summer she worked hoeing cabbage on a truck farm. Otelia, 22, who was burned badly in a kerosene fire several years ago, still lives in the 12-foot-by-20-foot shack. Juan, 16, has a fourth grade education. Dominga, the granddaughter, was left at the shack by her parents five years ago and never retrieved.

DIFFERENT, BUT THE SAME

Equally resistant, although 1,200 miles distant, are the problems of a poverty pocket in metropolitan Chicago. Much has been said about the migration of Southern Negroes to Northern cities, but little of migration north by Southern whites. "Uptown," a 120-square-block section five miles north of downtown Chicago, contains about 33,000 poor whites from the rural South.

They came from economically depressed areas to make a new start. But Uptown, the port of entry, tends to become the last stop. "You never have enough to get ahead," says one resident. "It takes all your income just to live." An Office of Economic Opportunity study showed that 51% of heads of households either were unemployed or had jobs that paid less than $3,000 a year.

The men get day labor or other short-lived jobs, and the families live in tiny furnished apartments, with the rent paid weekly. A 14-year-old from Tennessee says his father made $35 in the first week in Uptown; $20 went for rent, leaving only $15 to cover other expenses for their family of eight.

The newcomers can't adjust to big city life, social workers say. Some aren't sufficiently literate to fill out an employment application. Others are frightened of such big city appurtenances as buses. An Uptown resident of 10 years standing, one poverty worker says, is still likely to list his residence as "Pike County, Ky."

Services to help them are meager. "Southern whites have no Martin Luther King or Stokely Carmichael," notes Tom Nolan of the Catholic Poverty Committee. Another social worker says: "They get the crumbs of the relief pie." Welfare officials also say the Southern whites often are too proud to ask for help. Typically, a Tennessee mother who finally did go on relief complains: "They question you to death."

Amidst such difficulties, why do they come north? A poverty official who has visited eastern Kentucky, a prime source of Uptown immigrants, says, "Sure, slums in Chicago are bad, dirty and depressing. But a kid can bust out if he's sharp and lucky. Down there it's utterly hopeless. People live in shacks and sit around with blank looks on their faces."

But life in Uptown is poorly geared to "busting out." Changes of residence are so frequent, school officials say, that one grade school reports annual student turnover of 150%. One girl had moved 23 times before her 13th birthday. And education officials say parents are prone to take their children out of school frequently for visits to relatives or to help around the household for a few weeks.

HARD-CORE APPALACHIA

The poverty worker's assessment of Appalachia would seem to be borne out by the Mark B. Smith family in Cremona, Ky. "I'm just a dead man walkin'," says Mr. Smith. Once a coal miner and construction worker, he hasn't been able to work since 1965.

Mr. Smith's disabilities, ranging from back injuries to a nervous condition, don't qualify him for public assistance. He, his wife Clara, and their six shoeless children subsist on a Salvation Army stipend which allows purchase of food stamps worth $82 each month.

The Smiths had a four-room shack, but it burned down during the summer, and they now live with his mother. His children, aged 16 months to 17 years, use pebbles and twigs as makeshift toys while Mr. Smith, thin and unshaven, says. "About the future? I just couldn't tell you. If something doesn't turn up soon, it's a hopeless case."

Poverty workers in the area are stymied. Antipoverty programs, they say, don't get the needed cooperation from local officials or the poor. Edwin J. Safford, director of an OEO community action program, bemoans what he considers meager antipoverty resources and says, "There's no answer for this area until new industry moves in." But, he adds, there is little to attract industrial investment.

Other poverty workers assail what they consider a lack of concern for the Appalachian indigents. "How do you compete with riots in the cities?' asks an OEO volunteer. At a recent meeting of unemployed men at the abandoned mine workers' union meeting hall in Hazard, Ky., a wife rose, and shaking her fist said, "You men oughta go marching like niggers, and tear everything to hell as you go."

A. POLITICAL ORPHAN

Another kind of political impotence blights life in Twinsburg Heights, Ohio, a curious community of 200 Negro families that has no government. Seventeen miles from both Cleveland and Akron, it is a backwater amidst explosive urban and suburban growth (there are at least seven such poverty pockets in Ohio, social workers say).

Technically, the Heights is part of Twinsburg Township, but the 1,200 Negro residents say they have been excluded from representation in local government. Although water lines from both Cleveland and Akron run nearby, the Heights has no water system. Twinsburg Township zoning restrictions forbid commercial establishments, residents say, preventing development of local businesses.

"Most people are apathetic and indifferent," a poverty worker says. In the Heights, crumbling homes occupy tiny plots along dirt streets with no sidewalks. Nearly 40% of the adults don't have an eighth grade education. Their children attend a nearby suburban school, but a social worker says, "There is a stigma attached to the children of the Heights that can't help but affect their school work and outlook on life." Other children make fun of the outhouses in the Heights.

The mold was cast in the 1920s when a real estate developer bought farm land, subdivided it and sold to Negroes, over the objections of local residents. Politically and psychologically, the Heights has been an orphan ever since, and the Negroes are convinced other communities would like to ease them out to make way for industry. "It is a poverty of the spirit more than economic," a social worker thinks.

THE ELDERLY

A poverty of the spirit perhaps even more desolating afflicts the indigent elderly, like Mr. Seczizinski, the man who leads a flophouse existence in north Philadelphia. The 76-year-old Mr. Seczizinski, who came to this country from Poland in 1912, has no friends or relatives.

A large wall clock ticks oppressively in Mr. Seczizinski's room, and a single light bulb hangs on a cord from the ceiling. The linoleum on the floor is wearing thin, and the walls are stained by steam from exposed pipes. The furniture includes four straight chairs, a small bed and a sink.

Rent takes $35 of his $104 monthly income. When other necessities are subtracted, he has about $1 a day for food. Mr. Seczizinski occupies his time wandering about the Market Street area or listening to his small transistor radio.

Mrs. Effie Stokes, a 71-year-old Negro widow who lives about 10 blocks from Mr. Seczizinski, has the same income but remains resolutely cheerful and active. She budgets carefully, but coal bills in winter throw her finances out of kilter. When the money runs out, she sifts the ashes for unburned lumps. "You have to know how to make things last," she says.

POOR MEDICAL CARE

Mrs. Stokes and Mr. Seczizinski share with many of the poor an aversion to doctors and dentists, often found even when they are eligible for Medicare or other help. "I don't go to see no doctor," he says, although he speaks of rheumatism in his legs. Mrs. Stokes says, "I can't recall the last time I've been to a doctor." Nor does she have a dentist. When her teeth hurt, "I rub salt on them and swab them with alcohol. This helps for a while."

Welfare officials can't explain this attitude. A spokesman for the Philadelphia County Board of Assistance says it will pay medical bills for such persons over 65 years of age if the treatment is essential. But many doctors won't accept the Board's $4 payment for an office call. And nursing homes are reluctant to take elderly indigents, for whom the Board will pay only $225 a month.

Other poverty pocket families are equally lacking in medical and dental care. In the Mexican-American town of Lariat, Colo., Richard Naranjo, 13, concedes that he never has brushed his teeth. Dr. William Bradley, a physician who has opened a clinic to help Lariat's adobe dwellers, talks sadly of untreated cases of hepatitis, dysentery, encephalitis and syphilis. "What can you do when the ambulance to Denver costs $125?" he asks. "The medical profession is defeated because there is nothing we can do."

TB AMONG THE ESKIMOS

In the impoverished Hinsdale County area of southern Colorado, there is no hospital. The Dogpatch area between Independence and Kansas City doesn't get public health services from either city. Emil Notti, an Eskimo leader, says 80% of Eskimo children in remote sections of Alaska have active tuberculosis, but few get treatment.

In some poverty pockets, health is being improved. The 2.8 million-acre reservation of the Papago Indians, in the mesquite and cactus-studded Sonoran desert of Arizona, got a 50-bed hospital in 1961, erected by the U.S. Public Health Service. Now 80% of the reservation's babies are born in the hospital, and infant mortality, which was 60 per 1,000 live births in 1955, has declined to about 40 per 1,000 (the national average is about 25 per 1,000).

The USPHS says also that half the Indians now have adequate water and waste disposal facilities, compared with 10% in 1955. But the life span of the Papago still is in the low 40s, at least 20 years less than that of the general population.

The panoply of Federal OEO programs, augmented by local welfare efforts and initiatives by some religious groups, is showing tentative results in some poverty pockets. In Twinsburg Heights, 30 Negro children are in a preschool Head Start program, and 23 teenagers are in Upward Bound classes at nearby colleges, hopefully in preparation for higher education.

FORMER NUNS HELP

The OEO has brought preschool, parent-child and remedial reading programs to the Papago Indians, along with instruction in legal aid, community development and youth opportunity. In Chicago's Uptown, former Catholic nuns who left the Glenmary order and formed their own group are winning the confidence of the Southern white migrants.

But social workers complain elsewhere of a lack of funds, of disinterest among local governments and of an inability to overcome deep-seated problems. Peter Louwerys, director of the Farm Works Opportunity Committee of the American Friends Service Committee, says antipoverty programs haven't measurably bettered living standards of agricultural workers in California.

In Detroit, welfare officials note that a year's residency is necessary to become eligible for relief, and then a migrant has to produce birth certificates for each member of his family. Employers often demand birth certificates, too. In the case of immigrating Negroes, this means a request to a Southern county courthouse. "They're not too anxious to help us," one welfare official says.

In the village of Abram, in Hidalgo County, Texas, the Vega family lives on about $800 a year, the amount daughter Adela, 37, makes on citrus and vegetable farms. Juanita, 22, is a polio victim. Their 56-year-old mother is a widow. Leo J. Leo, mayor of nearby La Joya and a sort of unofficial one-man war on poverty, can't find a single public assistance program for which the family qualifies.

"If ever there was poverty, these people have it," he says heatedly. "My God, something should be done."

DO THINGS COST MORE?

Among the poor, a common complaint is economic exploitation. Mrs. G., a Negro mother who lives in the Detroit ghetto, claims the local supermarket raised prices sharply after this summer's riots (although the city passed, and enforced, an antigouging ordinance). "They wanted $1.78 for a package of six neckbones," she says. "Everything was really high."

The California Farm Labor Office says migrant farm workers get an average wage of $1.40 an hour, but Tom Williams, vice chairman of an OEO program in Ventura County, reads a different story into check stubs supplied by the workers. One man, he says, got $10.37 for nine hours of lemon picking. But after a local growers' association deducted for transportation, glove rental, housing and other matters, net income for the day was $1.12. Such cases aren't unusual, he says.

The poor and uneducated may be vulnerable through lack of information. In Lariat, Colo., a worker for VISTA, the domestic Peace Corps, says Spanish-speaking residents are making installment payments they can't afford at exorbitantly high interest. "People are signing contracts they don't understand," he says.

Like anyone else, the poor person has extravagances, too. Mrs. Lillie Harrison and her five children in Madison County, Miss., have an income of only $75 monthly, in the form of two relief checks. But this spring she squandered almost 7% of the annual income on her daughter Lena Pearl—$28 for a peach-colored party dress for a school dance and $32.60 more for a class ring. But it was a symbolic event; Lena Pearl probably will be the first of her 14 children to graduate from high school.

COOPERATIVES—A TECHNIQUE FOR OUR TIME

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mrs. SISK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the enormous value of cooperatives in rural America. Co-ops have been of benefit to thousands upon thousands of farm people.

Inasmuch as October has been designated as Co-op Month, I feel that it is appropriate to include in the RECORD the address delivered by Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman at ceremonies formally opening Co-op Month.

Secretary Freeman cites a number of instances in which co-ops have undertaken worthwhile projects which have bolstered the local economy and provided work for people who otherwise would be unemployed. The Secretary's remarks follow:

COOPERATIVES—A TECHNIQUE FOR OUR TIME

I am very happy to welcome you to the opening of Co-op Month, 1967. This month-long celebration, which begins in Washington today, marks the fourth year of Federal government participation in an event that began in 1929.

It all started with a co-op in Waukegan, Illinois, that included both small town consumers and dairy farmers. The dairymen wanted a better price; the consumers wanted safe, sanitary milk delivered to their door at a reasonable price. So they organized—and, sure enough, the farmers got a better price, the consumers paid a little less, and at the end of the year they divided the money left over—half to the dairymen, half to the consumers.

The co-op grew, adding food stores, a bakery and a service station to its pasteurizing plant. The people of Waukegan were so proud of what they had done that in 1929 their mayor issued the first known co-op week proclamation.

Soon there were celebrations in Kansas, Massachusetts, Iowa, California, and Wisconsin. I joined in, proclaiming October as Co-op Month, during my years as Governor of Minnesota.

In 1964, a fellow Minnesotan and State Department official suggested to me that the Department of Agriculture should bring the Federal Government into this popular Co-op Month observance, and I was glad to oblige.

The man with the idea was George Jacobson, cooperative specialist for the Agency for International Development, who is with me today, and whose idea launched Co-op Month as a truly national celebration.

The Department of Agriculture was happy to supply the initiative, but we soon learned that Co-op Month was too big for any one Department.

USDA, of course, is concerned with farmers' marketing and purchasing co-ops; with rural electric and telephone co-ops; irrigation and soil conservation districts, grazing associations, and with hundreds of other rural cooperatives of every description.

Yet the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is concerned with credit unions and group health plans; Interior with cooperatives the Indians and the Eskimos have organized; Housing and Urban Development with housing cooperatives. Overseas, the Department of State helps organize cooperatives in the developing nations, and here at home, the Office of Economic Opportunity finds cooperatives help low-income families.

And so Co-op Month, 1967 is truly an ecumenical movement under the sponsorship of 11 Federal Departments and independent agencies; 9 national organizations of cooperatives, and the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization. I am honored to have been chosen as their spokesman on this occasion.

Today, in an era seemingly beset by two problems for every solution, we are witnessing a re-awakened interest in an age-old problem-solving technique—economic cooperation.

In the midst of their difficulties, more and more people are turning to co-ops for answers. A few of them, of course, will turn in vain, for no co-op can be shipped to them, ready for instant assembling on the living room floor. This is not the nature of a cooperative. A cooperative can be put together *only* by the people who use it—piece-by-piece, slowly, laboriously, a step at a time. As a social instrument, therefore, it hasn't much appeal for those who look for overnight solutions to age-old problems. Yet for those who take the longer view, the co-op offers amazing advantages.

Let me tell you about some of the people who have begun using cooperatives skillfully to overcome their difficulties:

In Alabama, 150 rural women have organized the "Freedom Quilting Bee" to cooperatively market their products. Last year—their first—they made and sold a thousand quilts, and received a net return of $8.20 a quilt from their co-op.

They didn't earn top industrial wages as they sewed these pieces of cloth together in their own homes or in church basements. But each lady averaged $547 in extra income last year, a welcome addition to any poor family for work at home.

You can see some of these quilts at an exhibit opening tomorrow in the Smithsonian's Arts and Industries Building.

You can also see products from Mississippi's "Poor People's Corporation," which has organized 15 small, cooperatively owned enterprises composed of 200 rural people. These people sew garments, make rag dolls, work leather and wood, and sell their products in Jackson, Detroit, and New York City. Last spring the co-op's Directors used part of their earnings to have eye examinations for all the co-op's 200 member-workers, and to buy glasses for those who needed them.

In North Carolina, a thousand Macon County farmers whose incomes averaged $1,000 a year as recently as 1964 are winding up their third year of marketing tomatoes cooperatively. Instead of $2 or $3 a bushel, they're now getting $6 a bushel. The average co-op member's net income has more than doubled. Proper grading and packing has opened markets all over the United States and Canada.

Here in Washington, residents of five poor neighborhoods have organized cooperative neighborhood credit unions to avoid exorbitant interest rates and loan sharks.

One woman obligated herself to pay $16.67 a month for a gas stove—more than 10 percent of her total monthly income, and couldn't keep up the payments. Luckily she heard about the credit union, whose treasurer found she was paying 35 percent interest—three times the credit union's rate.

She borrowed enough to pay off the loan, is paying $8 a month to the credit union and she has cut her interest charges by two-thirds. But perhaps more important, she's getting an adult course in consumer economics, thanks to her cooperative.

In many another urban slum, poor people are taking their first steps toward financial responsibility through credit unions. They find—as many millions of Americans before them found—that within any sizeable group of persons however poor, are enough savings to meet members' emergency credit needs as they arise, if they organize.

Farmers discovered this simple truth many years ago.

Through co-ops, they're bargaining for better prices with firms that process their products, and even processing, packaging and merchandising their products for the consumer themselves. Through still other co-ops they're reducing the costs of fertilizer, petroleum products, feed, credit, electricity, and other services that make up their production costs.

I was impressed with what a Delta farmer said just last month when he received the one-hundred-millionth dollar that Mississippi Chemical Corporation has refunded to farmers who bought fertilizer from that co-op. "Without doubt," he said, "my investment in the co-ops is the best investment of any kind I ever made."

In the Southwest, where a cotton co-op pays its members the market price when they bring their crop in from the field, the co-op two months ago mailed these members an additional $7¼ million in dividends, raising the co-op's payment for cotton $6 a bale above the average ginyard price in the region.

A group of 1,100 California growers believe they have increased the prices they've received for their products by 15 percent, as the result of organizing a co-op to can their fruits and vegetables. And, incidentally, they are holding a price umbrella for other growers who are not members of the co-op.

When we realize how much just this one cooperative has contributed to farm income, it is small wonder that for 45 years Congress has encouraged co-op growth and development as a matter of national policy.

Three-quarter million Midwest farmers are building a 5-million bushel, $20 million grain elevator and ship terminal near the port of New Orleans because by exporting—instead of hiring someone to export their grain for them—they expect to increase their net incomes substantially.

And so cooperatives come in all shapes and sizes, from a neighborhood credit union to a terminal elevator complex that will ship Midwestern grain halfway round the world. The people who organized them didn't consciously set out to change the world, but change it they did, nevertheless. And they're still at it.

I am encouraged, for instance, that cooperatives are taking the lead in attacking one of the most serious domestic problems we have ever faced, that of a growing population imbalance between city and country.

It took from 1776 to 1917—141 years—for the United States to become an "urban nation"—to reach the point when at least half our population lived in urban areas.

In the next 50 years—through today—we became 70 percent urban and only 30 percent rural. Today, 140 million Americans live on just over one percent of the land area of the 50 States. In another 30 years, many estimate, another 80 million new Americans will crowd into existing cities, further exacerbating the environmental, social and economic problems that have already reached the flash point in a score of big cities during the past long, hot, summer.

Here again, however, cooperatives are *acting*—in ways big and small—to stem the one-way migration from rural to urban America.

At one end of the scale, 120 low-income farmers in eastern Ohio were about ready to pull stakes and head for Cleveland. Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, or Chicago. They didn't want to, and their skills would barely furnish a meagre living in the big cities. But they couldn't make it on their overgrown, brush-covered hillsides—not with livestock, not with dairy cattle, certainly not with crops.

They had an idea, though, and they decided to stick. The idea was to rehabilitate their pastures. They organized a co-op to buy the heavy machinery to do the job, two bulldozers, a heavy disk, and a seeding drill. They cleared the brush, seeded the land. Now, instead of pasturing one animal on six acres, they pasture six animals on the same six acres.

Here were 120 families who were poor, defeated, about to abandon their land—worth only $10 an acre—and march off to the cities. Today these 120 families are hopeful that they have turned the corner, that they are on their way to an adequate livelihood and a satisfying, rewarding life in rural America. An idea—and a co-op to put that idea into practice—has made all the difference.

We hope much the same thing is happening in southwest Alabama. There, cotton once was king. Today cotton is moving out so fast that where 20 field-hands were needed to harvest the crop 10 years ago, only one is needed in 1967. What are the people who used to pick cotton to do? Can they find economic salvation in Birmingham, Memphis, or Chicago? They doubt it—and so do I.

Eight hundred families have decided to stick, and they've switched to raising cucumbers, peas, and okra. They've organized a co-op to market these products, and this first season they've already sold more than a million pounds of these vegetables to processors and on the fresh market.

Success is not yet within their grasp. But the tool they're using to reach for success is the best available, the cooperative.

Many Great Plains farmers were as poor 30 years ago as these southwest Alabama farmers are now. They also reached for success through a grain co-op, or a production credit association, or some co-op that Farm Security Administration organized—just as these southwest Alabama farmers are reaching for success today. They used the same technique—the cooperative.

Co-ops are opening jobs in rural America. A second quarter survey shows that farmers marketing and purchasing co-ops in those three months of 1967 *invested $95 million* in new facilities outside metropolitan areas—nearly three times as much as they invested within these metropolitan areas.

Just last week four co-ops with headquarters in the cities of Nashville, Richmond, Raleigh, and Atlanta announced they would build a $32-million factory. Where? Near one of those cities? No. They will build it on the rural coastal plain of North Carolina.

This is a big operation but, as I said before, co-ops come in all sizes—so I'm also mindful of the town of Eagle Grove, Iowa, population 4,500, where four co-ops have 200 full-time workers and a million-dollar-a-year payroll, but are also providing decent jobs in rural America.

Only with adequate services can we create opportunities in rural America. We need abundant, low-cost electric power—and we're using cooperatives to get it. We need dependable telephone services—and there too, we use cooperatives. We need water systems and sewage disposal systems—and both are available through cooperatives and public districts.

We will use co-ops to develop these public services, to open up resources, and to build the factories that provide the jobs so desperately needed if we are to maintain and improve opportunities for all Americans to find satisfying productive lives outside—as well as inside—our great cities.

Co-op Month, 1967 is a great occasion. It marks not simply another annual ring in the growth and successful development of the tree of cooperation. It represents a high-water-mark in the tide of enthusiasm for the technique of cooperation.

For the nation's people, now again in a problem-solving mood, are realizing that cooperatives can be very useful in overcoming some of our greatest difficulties; poverty, the need for higher farm income, rural-urban equilibrium. Scratch any of these problems, and again and again cooperatives show up with some of the answers. In short, in the words of President Johnson's co-op month statement, "Cooperatives are testimony that every man and woman can nourish our growth, can increase our wealth, can strengthen our freedoms, and can enrich the quality of the life and the opportunity we share."

My fellow cooperators, thank you.

"THE MOOD OF ECONOMY" NOT A MOOD BUT A NECESSITY

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FULTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, considerable news coverage has been given to what has been termed "the mood of economy" in the Congress.

This phrase is misleading. It is not a "mood." It is a necessity.

There appears little likelihood that the administration's proposal for a 10-percent surcharge on personal and corporate income taxes will be acted upon by the Congress this year.

We are left only one recourse by which the budget deficit can be kept down, and that is through the reduction of Federal expenditures.

In my home district—the Fifth Congressional District of Tennessee—there is a great need for additional space in our U.S. Federal Courthouse. Our Federal employees in Nashville are working under the combined handicaps of lack of sufficient space and facilities in their efforts to serve our citizens. The need for an annex to the present facilities is critical, and certainly does not fall under the category of pork barrel legislation.

Yet it is my conviction that these Federal employees, as well as the citizens they serve in the Fifth Congressional District, agree with me that a delay in the construction of this annex, if economically feasible, will lessen the necessity for a tax increase and ease the budget deficit we now face.

Today I wrote the Honorable Charles L. Schultze, Director, Bureau of the Budget, proposing, if economically feasible, that funding for the construction of the U.S. Federal courthouse annex in Nashville be delayed in the interest of economy and in hopes that this delay will help us improve our budgetary position.

My letter to Director Schultze follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 11, 1967.

Hon. CHARLES L. SCHULTZE,
Director, Bureau of the Budget,
Executive Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SCHULTZE: On September 19, 1967, I wrote the Administrator of the General Services Administration requesting that favorable consideration be given to funding construction of the United States Federal Courthouse in Nashville in fiscal 1969. A copy of that letter was forwarded you, and your reply was dated October 6, 1967.

In the interval between my previous letter and this correspondence, several factors have arisen which have caused me to reconsider my request.

As you are aware, the House Ways and Means Committee, of which I am a member, voted to lay aside the President's proposal for a 10 percent tax surcharge until "the President and Congress reach an understanding on a means of implementing more effective expenditure reductions and controls". The vote on the Committee was 20 to 5, and I voted with the majority.

There is no question that there will be a budget deficit this fiscal year. The only question is, how much. It may well be that the Ways and Means Committee will resume its consideration of the surcharge proposal and report a bill. There is no certainty, however, at this time.

The Federal Courthouse Annex in Nashville will cost an estimated eight or nine million dollars. Already, more than a million dollars have been expended for land acquisition and planning. The final plans are expected to be submitted for approval this year.

Thus, it is logical that funding should come in fiscal 1969 beginning July 1, 1968.

However, this is, also, a logical time to delay the project if it is economically feasible since ground has not been broken.

In my letter of September 19, I cited the probability of increased costs in construction if funding was not approved in the next fiscal year. This was and is, I feel, a valid argument.

However, with the prospect of a tax increase very dim this year, we are going to keep the deficit down only by reducing Federal expenditures.

Therefore, in the interest of economy and the economic health of the Nation, I request that, if economically feasible, funding of the Federal Courthouse Annex be withheld until such time as the budgetary picture becomes clearer, and the demands on the Federal dollar are reduced, if not to a point where the budget is balanced, at least to the point of a reasonable and manageable deficit.

It seems to me, though I cannot speak for each individual, the people of my community and our Federal employees in Nashville, would much rather see a short delay in construction of the Annex if it will lessen the necessity for a tax increase, and ease the frightening deficit which we face.

In closing, I hasten to add that this request is germaine only to a project in my Congressional District. I do not know if such action would be feasible elsewhere, nor am I advocating that any of my colleagues follow suit. However, I do feel that if a delay of this particular project will serve a useful purpose, then, in the interests of economy, it should be delayed.

With every good wish to you, I am,

Sincerely,

RICHARD FULTON,
Member of Congress.

SECRETARY WEAVER OUTLINES NEW DIRECTIONS FOR THE PUBLIC HOUSING PROGRAM

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROONEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today, while addressing the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials in Portland, Oreg., Secretary Robert C. Weaver outlined new policy directions for the public housing program.

Although calling for increased volume of public housing, Secretary Weaver discounted this as the primary goal of a public housing organization. Instead he noted his intention to develop an organization that would be concerned more than ever before about the "quality of life" in public housing. He wants an organization "willing to experiment, congenial to innovation, capable of making decisions."

Also, he made clear the Department's intention to establish new policies against discrimination in public housing. In a frank and open discussion of the development of "white projects and Negro projects," Secretary Weaver said:

> To ignore it, or to let it go on spreading into new construction is simply to duck the racial crisis in the cities today, and to insure that there will still be a racial crisis for our children tomorrow.

And the Secretary recognized that this responsibility not only is a moral issue, but a legal requirement—under the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and earlier Presidential Executive orders prohibiting discrimination in Government-assisted projects.

Mr. Speaker, Secretary Weaver is to be commended for his forthright recognition of problems in public housing projects and for his willingness to reexamine this program. Public housing has served millions of Americans but we know the "quality" of service could be better.

Since I believe that Secretary Weaver's speech outlines some important directions for the public housing program I would like to share it with my colleagues by including it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Before I begin, I have a brief but pleasant mission to perform. President Johnson has asked me to extend his warm and special greetings to you, the members and officers of the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials. The President wanted me to make certain that you know how much he and this Administration and this Nation appreciate the long and energetic and effective support that this organization has given to the efforts and the programs of the national government. As the President has said many times, the test of this Administration and this Century will be what we can do to make our cities and towns and urban areas livable and attractive. Therefore, I am especially happy to be given this opportunity to deliver the President's message of appreciation for your support in what we are all determined to accomplish.

If I have read your program correctly, I am the last of about half a dozen representatives of the Department of Housing and Urban Development to come before this 31st Conference of the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials.

We in HUD could be accused, I suppose, of practicing overkill here in Portland, but the charge would not be warranted.

Those of us from HUD, and its predecessors, and those of you from NAHRO, and its predecessor, have always had a good deal to say to each other. I think it is fair to suggest that there has never been a time when we had more to talk about than we do now.

We have been talking to each other for more than 30 years now. We have been associated, to our mutual benefit and the Nation's benefit, in no small endeavor—the effort to rebuild cities, to provide decent housing to those who did not have it, to create livable urban communities.

Yet, perhaps the most important point that I will make here today is that, in spite of all this effort, there has never been a time over all these years when there was a more pressing need to do more.

There has never been a time when there was greater urgency about getting on with all we have left to do.

What we must determine to do now, and in these next few years, is to make a new response—both in quantity and quality—to human needs that have gone unsatisfied for far longer than any of us can justify.

What makes this new opportunity more promising than any of those going back 30 years, in my view, is that we now know where we have to go and much of what it will take to get there—in tools, in mechanisms, in programs, in resources, in commitment.

I am not saying that there are no false steps, detours, blind alleys, heartaches or headaches in our future. I am not saying we have all the tools, the ideas, the commitment and the resources that we need.

But I am saying that we know the direction and the level of effort that will be required.

That is a beginning and I would assert that there is evidence mounting daily—almost hourly—that we have already gone beyond the beginning.

The members of NAHRO, more than any group in the Nation, understand national urban policy because you helped to create and develop it during your working lifetimes.

We saw urban policy begin with the mammoth fight of the 1930's to create low-rent public housing that now provides dwellings for more than 670,000 of the Nation's poorest families.

We saw urban policy take new shapes and directions in the 1940's and 1950's in an urban renewal program that now constitutes a Federal commitment of more than $6 billion in cities, towns and communities across the Nation.

We have seen that urban policy develop imaginative and, for me, exciting, new dimensions. In just the last few years, we have these examples:

The Model Cities Program will bring together many kinds of urban assistance efforts and apply them in force, quantity variety, and with coordination to neighborhoods where the neglect of the past is compelling and appalling.

The Rent Supplement Program is creating more good, private housing for those who need it most in two ways: by helping people to afford the rent and by involving the powers of private industry to build the housing.

The Turnkey development is an ingenious approach to getting low-rent public housing built more quickly and more cheaply than ever before, again by unleasing the power of private enterprise to do what it does best, namely build the housing and then turn the key over to those who will run it.

But there are even newer developments in the renewed drive to get on with the urban job.

Under President Johnson's leadership, the newest urban programs such as Model Cities and Rent Supplements have been dramatized, defended, and enacted. We are now in the final stages of securing meaningful appropriations to carry them out. Again under the President's direction, the life insurance industry has committed itself to invest $1 billion in ghetto housing. This, in turn was in response to extension of FHA mortgage insurance into our urban pockets of poverty. The first commitments of the insurance companies were for FHA insured mortgages on rent supplement developments. We are now negotiating for their purchase of the rapidly growing volume of FHA insured mortgages on single family homes in the ghettos. All of this and more is a part of HUD's contribution to the war on poverty.

As you know, we in HUD have promised the President that we will—with your help—accelerate the provision of low-rent public housing units this year.

We are searching the Nation for surplus Federal land within cities where many of these additional public housing units and other housing can go. Here again, we will be utilizing the Turnkey method wherever possible.

I could, at this point, mention other new developments such as the refinement of Turnkey under which private firms would operate the housing.

I shall come back to that. For the moment, I want to direct your attention to another development that is both the oldest and the newest in our field.

I am talking about new directions, new goals, new emphases, new rules, new requirements, and new expectations in two of our long-established efforts—namely, urban renewal and public housing.

Something new and significant is going on in both urban renewal and public housing.

I think people in the business know that changes are taking place but the public generally is only beginning to sense it.

As you know, we have been striving for

some time now to modify the emphasis and impact of urban renewal.

I mean of course the new insistence on relocating families, the restraints upon the bulldozer, and above all the redirection of emphasis toward housing the ill-housed.

Today we can show that eight out of ten persons displaced by urban renewal do move into decent, safe and well constructed housing. Today urban renewal upgrades the quality of housing for the vast majority of those who originally lived in the slums and blighted areas that are being renewed. I am not saying that everybody is happy to be displaced. Of course they are not. And that is one of the primary reasons that we stress efforts to preserve and not demolish neighborhoods.

Recently this whole effort was symbolized by our adoption of new policies that set out clearly a new list of priorities in urban renewal. While these are not absolute, in the sense that they are an inflexible list of requirements, they do reflect a shift in emphasis. Their objective is to facilitate balanced local renewal programs, wherein housing for the less affluent will be stressed and counterbalance earlier emphasis upon commercial and higher income residential redevelopment. We are saying that renewal must respond to these national goals:

1. It must conserve and expand housing for low- and moderate-income families.

2. It must develop new employment opportunities for the unemployed and the under-employed.

3. It must emphasize renewal of urban areas that have the most critical needs.

In addition, as many of you know, we have moved to recapture funds tied up in projects in which there has been no action for years.

We have two achievements in mind in all these efforts. One is we want production. But we want production consistent with national goals, too.

The other day figures came across my desk showing the following actions over the past summer:

First of all we cancelled 18 urban renewal projects totaling more than $60 million because they have been in the planning phase for 36 months or more and they do not indicate any significant reason to hope that they are about to get off dead center.

That means $60 million can be redirected to cities and to urban renewal projects that do offer more hope for action.

Secondly, we removed from immediate competition 99 applications totaling more than $419 million because they did not offer significant evidence that they would become elements in a balanced local renewal effort. At the same time we were setting aside these applications, we were also approving 132 other projects totaling more than $507 million that we believe are responsive to national goals and consistent with the objective of balance. I am delighted, of course, that 116 of the 132 are meeting national needs by providing housing for low- and moderate-income families.

Now what about public housing? Here I think there are equally dramatic changes underway. They are not so evident yet as in urban renewal perhaps—but they will be.

I have two kinds of changes in mind. One is a change you know about—the new effort to break down discrimination in public housing wherever it exists. Another change is potentially even more substantial and it is emerging from the work of an internal task force that many of you know about—and I will return to that subject in a moment.

But first let me make clear what we intend by the new policies directed against discrimination in public housing. It is fundamental, of course, that of all the housing in this Nation public housing should never have been developed on the basis of white projects and Negro projects, but it did happen in many areas and we have an obligation to reverse that—all of us whether in Washington or in the local communities.

To ignore it, or to let it go on spreading into new construction is simply to duck the racial crisis in the cities today, and to insure that there will still be a racial crisis for our children tomorrow.

This is not only a moral question, but a legal requirement. We are obliged to adhere to the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and the earlier Presidential Executive Orders prohibiting discrimination in government-assisted projects.

We intend to carry out the letter and the spirit of the laws and orders that exist in this field. Our policies are designed to do that. It is inevitable that those policies will have to be modified periodically to make certain we are doing all we should.

That is precisely the reason for the equal opportunity directives issued early this year. They include new policies in public housing dealing with the selection of sites and the assignment of tenants. In both, we are seeking better distribution and balance. We are saying that no city's public housing program can be balanced if it is all built inside a racial ghetto. We are saying that no assignment policy is reasonable if it permits a prospective tenant to go on forever rejecting vacancies until he comes up with one that fosters segregation.

No rule will ever cover every case, of course, but the intent here is, I believe, clear.

Now let me report on the task force I mentioned a moment ago. As many of you know, we named this study group this summer to take a hard and deep look at our Housing Assistance Administration, which directs the public housing program. It was created because it is obvious to all of us that public housing machinery created 30 years ago is not geared to handle the new needs and new demands.

I am pleased that the Task Force had the eager cooperation of NAHRO representatives among so many others who share our concerns.

A few days ago the Task Force made a preliminary report to me and some of my colleagues. I found it exciting and full of valuable recommendations. But there are so many and they are so wide-ranging that it would be premature for me to discuss them in any detail at this time.

The intent and direction of this effort, however, are clear. We intend to develop an organization that is capable of handling volume production of public housing. But we are not just after more and faster production.

We want an organization concerned more than ever before about the quality of life in public housing, an organization willing to experiment, congenial to innovation, capable of making decisions—and capable of delegating decisions.

It is clear that in public housing, just as in urban renewal, we have to relate our efforts to national policy objectives.

We cannot just concentrate on greater production of public housing units, we need greater production that meets priorities and goals.

We could play it safe by increasing the production of units for the elderly. They are popular. They present fewer cost problems. We could play it safe by increasing production in smaller communities where the political and financial problems are not so severe.

But that would be ducking the issue. The national problem is to increase the public housing available in large cities as well as smaller communities. The national problem is to increase the public housing available to large families, as well as elderly couples. The national problem is to create a balanced supply of low-rent public housing both inside and outside of the existing slum areas and racial ghettos.

One task force recommendation that I know you will find congenial is that we take a cold, hard look at petty procedural supervision and control from Washington. That is, of course, easier to recommend than to accomplish. But I think we can do it. I think we can get away from endless inspections of broken window panes.

I know that we are going to have to get away from petty haggling over details if we are ever going to get this program moving the way it must move.

I am saying to you today that we are serious about trying to do what we know must be done, as serious in this new effort as we have demonstrated we are serious about modifying urban renewal.

I am concerned, of course, about the other end of this process, too. Our efforts no matter how serious and well-intentioned will be meaningless unless there is matching effort in the local communities.

Our willingness to revise procedures and operations will come to nothing unless local authorities are as willing and anxious to use the new devices, new approaches, and new developments whether Turnkey, or leasing, or rehabilitation or any of the others.

On our part, we are indicating our intentions by saying to you that there is no subject, no question that is not open for new discussion and examination.

We know, for example, that if we are ever going to get large volume production for large families we will have to take a new look at the question of the cost we can permit. We are not going to let costs skyrocket, but we are going to examine how to make the cost factor more realistic.

Similarly we are going to take a cold and calculating look at the pipeline of applications in public housing—in much the same fashion as we are doing in urban renewal. The purpose too is much the same. To put it bluntly, our intention is to get the lead out of the pipeline and get the process moving. We certainly do want to find the ways to call back those allocations that are not moving and show no signs of doing so.

We intend to take a new look at the whole question of delegating decisions within HUD and intend to place more authority in the Regional Administrators.

But perhaps as much as anything else we want a new and thorough examination of the quality of life in public housing.

I think that means that we must give more attention than ever before to the economic and social advancement of residents. It means that we give the highest priority to human dignity and privacy and personal safety.

I am sure that it will mean a whole new battery of efforts to build citizenship—by providing the means for airing and settling grievances; by assuring meaningful participation in the decisions that affect the living conditions of the residents. And it means providing opportunities where possible for employment in the operation of the housing.

Surely we can change public housing so that a man who does achieve some advancement in his economic condition is not rewarded for his efforts by an immediate eviction notice.

There are risks involved in all of these efforts. There will be some among us who are hesitant to take them. To some degree, this reflects the inertia of any established organization in government or outside of it.

Already I hear some rumblings about Turnkey. To the critics of this approach, I have two answers. The first is that Turnkey construction is a much quicker process, saving time as well as money. And the time-saving brings the benefits of the program much more rapidly to the needy. Even if it were not more economical, this human dividend, alone, would justify it.

There are also those who complain about the absence of competitive bids. To them I reply that they are not acquainted with the safeguards, involving two independent appraisals of the land and four independent cost estimates of the work. All who perform such tasks are hired by the Housing Authority.

But in addition, experience has already proven without question that the upset price feature, which provides incentive for private enterprise that doesn't exist under the competitive bidding system, is resulting in lower prices. These are ranging from 10 to 15 percent. What are the economic advantages of competitive bidding if the consequences are higher prices?

If this were a new program, or if there were no yardstick of privately built housing to measure by, it might be argued that competitive bidding is required to avoid excessive cost. But local housing authorities are for the most part neither unsophisticated nor uninformed in matters of construction costs. Thus Turnkey can and does result in lower construction costs and provides appropriate safeguards of the interests of the Housing Authority and the Government.

The fact that there is no competitive bidding of the construction work does not mean that there is no competition by developers. There is no reason why several developers cannot submit proposals. Indeed, the system calls for exactly that.

It is true that the Housing Authority and the Housing Assistance Administration have to exercise more judgment because the proposals involve different sites with different problems and different solutions; but I submit that, insofar as public housing is concerned, this means more competition rather than less. This is because the competition is now extended to many more sites rather than being limited as in the past, to contractors who were willing to bid on Government-type contracts for housing construction on a particular site.

We have to remember no system is free from attack or from problems. The choice has to be between the safest and the most effective. I am prepared to select the system that seems to be the most effective, and I urge your cooperation in making it not only the most effective but also the safest.

The recent announcement of Turnkey II, which invites private enterprise to participate in the management of public housing, too, has occasioned some concern. It is asserted that private management will not be responsive to the human and social needs of low-income tenants.

At the outset, it should be made clear that we never contemplated utilizing the conventional real estate rental approach to management. We are experimenting with Turnkey in several cities. In each instance, the basic step is to formulate performance standards which will require the very human and social components that have been discussed. Only if it is demonstrated that the contract gives reasonable evidence of ability to perform them will it be considered. Private management may be able to make a contribution here. I, for one, am prepared to give it a try.

There is, indeed, a unique function that I see for private management. It involves greater tenant participation. A nonprofit group may well be the best instrument for providing the maximum effective occupant involvement in the operation of low-income housing. If we are too timid to experiment in this area, we shall never know its potentials or its limitations.

Finally, permit me to suggest the potentials of the Turnkey approach which offer the most socialy desirable results. One is the development of a 221(d)(3) moderate-income project in combination with Turnkey public housing where the same sponsor builds and manages the entire combined development. Under this type of project we will be able to secure the economic diversification that has long been articulated as a goal. Already there are half a dozen or more proposals from Turnkey builders to do just this.

There is another potential in Turnkey. It can be accomplished under Turnkey III, recently announced for Gulfport, Mississippi, where the tenants will earn ownership through self-maintenance of the units and increasing payments as their incomes go up. Homeownership can also be done by a combination of the leasing program in conjunction with lease-purchase contracts by private owners, or in a cooperative housing project. Even though such arrangements have been difficult to work out, and even though local housing authorities will become involved in technical details and relationships with tenants which may be foreign to them at the outset, I am sure that they recognize that the results to be achieved are well worth the effort.

We are in a new period. This is a time when America is, as never before, conscious of its urban problems and the shelter requirements of its people, especially the disadvantaged. Jointly we are in the center of these problems. Our efforts will be evaluated in terms of what we do to meet the total needs.

These needs will not be met in a year, or in a period of a few years. We need greater commitment, more resources, and more know-how. At all levels of activity, we need, too, more and better trained people.

Today, the immediate requirement is to make more efficient, flexible, and responsive the tools which are already ours. It is to that imperative that my remarks have been addressed. I have spoken to this because I recognize that results depend upon effective cooperation between us. I again invite and urge that cooperation.

ANOTHER STEP TOWARD CLEANER AIR

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Rosenthal] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished group of scientists and business representatives have just completed a report titled "The Automobile and Air Pollution: A Program for Progress."

Convened by the Commerce Department's Technical Advisory Board, this panel worked under joint sponsorship of several other Federal departments and agencies. Secretary of Commerce Trowbridge called this report "an outstanding example of voluntary cooperation in the public interest between the industrial, academic, and Government sectors." I agree.

I call attention to the recommendations of this group and to its members, both of which are listed below, to encourage the work of our congressional committee who have worked so effectively in the past on air pollution problems.

The recommendations below deserve our attention especially as we are about to consider very important improvements in air pollution control in the proposed Air Quality Act of 1967 which I cosponsored.

The material referred to follows:

The Automobile and Air Pollution: A Program for Progress

RECOMMENDATION

Recommendation 1: The national goal for air quality should be the achievement of an atmosphere with no significant detectable adverse effect from air pollution on health, welfare, and the quality of life.

Recommendation 2: The Environmental Science Services Administration of the Department of Commerce should establish a research program to determine the effects of air pollution on atmospheric processes.

Recommendation 3: The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare should develop and promptly implement an expanded program to establish quantitative information regarding the effects of air pollution upon health and welfare of the population.

Recommendation 4: The Federal Government should continue to establish standards for all harmful automotive emissions, and realistic timetables for the achievement of such standards.

Recommendation 5: The Federal Government should immediately establish standards for the lead content in gasoline which will prevent any further increase in the total quantity of lead emitted to the atmosphere. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare should begin an intensive study of the long-term health effects of lead in the atmosphere to determine requirements for future action.

Recommendation 6: The Federal Government should set standards for emissions, including smoke and odor, for gasoline and diesel powered trucks and buses.

Recommendation 7: The Federal Government should increase its support for mass transportation research, development, and demonstration programs related to the reduction of air pollution.

Recommendation 8: All Government standards concerning vehicle emissions should be developed in terms of the total mass of specific pollutants emitted under an appropriate driving cycle, rather than as the percent of pollutant in the exhaust.

Recommendation 9: The creation of effective local inspection mechanisms to enforce vehicle emission standards should be encouraged by the use of Federal matching grants for training, equipment, and operation.

Recommendation 10: The Federal Government should develop cooperative mechanisms to accelerate the worldwide interchange of information relating to air pollution, its effects, and control.

Recommendation 11: The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare should establish primary operating responsibility for the air pollution control program at the highest possible organizational level.

Recommendation 12: The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare should establish a Technical Advisory Board reporting to the Secretary to assist in the development of plans, programs and research activities and to more effectively use the resources of the scientific and industrial communities.

Recommendation 13: A mechanism for coordination of all Federal activities relating to air pollution should be established as a continuing function at a high level in the Executive Branch.

Recommendation 14: The Federal Government should initiate a five-year program, in total amount of approximately 60 million dollars, to support innovative developments useful in the establishment of future emission standards, in the following areas: (a) energy sources for vehicles, (b) vehicular propulsion systems, (c) emission control devices, (d) special purpose urban cars, (e) general purpose vehicles.

Recommendation 15: Federal, state, and local governments should incorporate low emission performance criteria as factors in the purchase of vehicles for their requirements.

Recommendation 16: The National Science Foundation should review its basic research and educational programs in atmospheric physics, electrochemistry and other scientific and engineering disciplines relating to the air pollution problem and ensure that such activities are receiving adequate support.

PANEL MEMBERS

Richard S. Morse, *Chairman,* Alfred P. Sloan School of Management, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Manfred Altman, Director, Institute for Direct Energy Conversion, University of Pennsylvania.

Edward H. Blum, Princeton University (Now with Rand Corporation).

Rolf Eliassen, Professor of Environmental Engineering, Stanford University.

James W. Ford, Director, Economics Office, Ford Motor Company.

Everett Gorin, Manager, Process Research, Research Division, Consolidation Coal Company.

Carl E. Heath, Section Head, Government Research Laboratory, Esso Research and Engineering Company.

Seymour W. Herwald, Group Vice President, Westinghouse Electric Corporation.

Edward O. Johnson, Manager, Engineering-Technical Programs, R.C.A. Electronic Components and Devices.

Peter Kyropoulous, Technical Director, Styling Staff, General Motors Technical Center.

Alan G. Loofbourrow, Vice President, Quality and Reliability, Chrysler Corporation.

David V. Ragone, General Atomic Division, General Dynamics Corporation (Now Professor of Metallurgy and Material Science, Carnegie-Mellon University).

Robert C. Shair, Vice President, Research and Development, Gulton Industries, Inc.

Philip Sporn, Retired President, Director, American Electric Power Company.

Charles W. Tobias, Chairman, Department of Chemical Engineering, University of California, Berkeley.

Myron Tribus, Dean, Thayer School of Engineering, Dartmouth College.

Paul T. O'Day, *Executive Secretary,* Office of the Assistant Secretary for Science and Technology, U.S. Department of Commerce.

(NOTE.—*Edwin A. Gee, Director, Development Department, E. I. duPont de Nemours & Co., served as a member of this Panel until his resignation on September 7, 1967.*)

THE PRESIDENT'S APPOINTMENT OF HOWARD J. SAMUELS AS UNDER SECRETARY OF COMMERCE—AN EXCELLENT CHOICE

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has made another in a series of excellent appointments to high Government posts—the nomination of Howard J. Samuels of New York to be Under Secretary of Commerce.

I have had the good fortune to be able to know and work with Howard Samuels on many projects to improve the quality of life in New York State.

Mr. Samuels is a young, dynamic business executive who has served his country with great distinction both in military and civilian capacities.

He is recognized as a man of energy and resourcefulness who has worked for the President in a number of advisory capacities on employment, youth, and business affairs.

Mr. Samuels' biography reads like the proverbial story of the young American who made good through his own ingenuity and drive. For example, a little over 20 years ago he and his brother began a small corporation which now does $50 million a year in business.

New York State is proud of Mr. Samuels. It is proud of the role he has played in Government, in party politics and in community life in the Empire State.

We know that Mr. Samuels will bring to his new and important post as Under Secretary of Commerce the dedication, experience, and commitment he demonstrated in his varied business and civic activities in New York.

We believe the Department of Commerce is fortunate in getting him, and we compliment the President for having made such an excellent choice of a highly respected and talented citizen and administrator.

I know the Senate will give Mr. Samuels an overwhelming endorsement.

THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND THE MANNED ORBITING LABORATORY

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. WOLFF] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I had the privilege of being present when President Johnson signed the treaty banning military weapons from outer space. This is a great step forward in bringing about true peace between the world powers and I congratulate President Johnson for his important role in making this treaty a reality.

However, concurrent with signing this treaty we are proceeding with development of the Defense Department's manned orbiting laboratory. The MOL program, as constituted in the Defense Department, is an anachronism in light of the treaty signed yesterday.

The most distressing thing however is the fact that the MOL program duplicates existing civilian space programs. Thus, at a cost of tens of billions of dollars the Defense Department is duplicating launch facilities, spacecraft, tracking stations, and all the costly equipment involved in the exploration of space. All this despite the fact that the Defense Department experiments, whatever they are, can be accomplished within the scope of the post-Apollo program.

Mr. Speaker, in light the present fiscal situation and the pleas for economy, can we afford a multibillion-dollar carbon copy of a program we are already well into? Obviously, we cannot.

PRESS SUPPORT FOR THE GONZALEZ BILL TO STRENGTHEN THE RENEGOTIATION ACT: SECOND OF A SERIES

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, there have recently been subcommittee investigations and revelations by individual Members of both bodies concerning the laxities in the Defense Department's so-called competitive bidding system of procurement. It has been held that DOD has violated both the letter and the intent of the 1962 Truth in Negotiating Act by refusing, until recently, to audit certain contracts and by accepting "competitive bids" from single companies.

I commend the vigilance of these representatives of the public wealth, and I support their efforts to strengthen the Truth in Negotiating Act. However, this act basically promotes truth-in-price estimates during the procurement stage of DOD contracts. There exists an independent agency which has proven itself effective in combating profiteering in defense contracts from a broader vantage point. I speak of the Renegotiation Board.

The Renegotiation Board was created as a result of the Korean war as the successor of the War Contracts Price Adjustment Board of World War II. Any contractor or subcontractor whose "renegotiable" defense sales exceed $1 million during a single fiscal year must submit statements of these contracts for the Board's review. These are contracts not only with DOD, but also with AEC, NASA, GSA, and several others. If the Board determines that the profits of a company are excessive, under a broad definition allowing consideration of special circumstances, it attempts to negotiate with the company for a voluntary price reduction or a voluntary refund to the Treasury. If disagreement persists, the Board issues and enters an order stating the amount of the excess profit. This order can be appealed to the U.S. Tax Court, and is reviewable on limited grounds to higher courts.

By reviewing all of a company's renegotiable contracts, the Board is in a position to promote equity for contractors as well as for the public. For example, if a company lost money on one contract, the Board is able to take this into account in reaching a determination of excessive profit on another contract of the same fiscal year.

The Board has been repeatedly praised by Appropriations Committees of both bodies, and congressional reviews in 1960 and 1962 have given it favorable marks.

However, amendments to the original act have successively limited the types of contracts that are renegotiable. Exemptions of certain competitive bids and of standard commercial articles and services are among those which have greatly reduced the Board's purview. And more and more companies have been exempted by the amendments increasing the value of contracts which must be renegotiated from $250,000 a fiscal year to $500,000 and then to $1,000,000.

The extent of this legislative hamstringing can be seen in the comparison of two figures. In fiscal year 1955, the Board issued determinations of excess profits amounting to $167,256,288, as compared to $24,513,962 in fiscal year 1962. And this is despite the fact that defense spending for the war in Vietnam has now exceeded the dollar amount of the highest year during the Korean war.

To date, I have received no support for strengthening the Renegotiation Board from any Member of either body. However, several newspapers have supported my legislation, H.R. 6792, and I have permission to insert at this point the second in a series of these comments:

[From Labor, Mar. 18, 1967]

CURB ON WAR PROFITEERING SOUGHT IN BILL BY GONZALEZ

Back in January, as reported in LABOR, Rep. Henry Gonzales (D., Tex.) gave a significant, but little publicized speech, about profiteering by many companies on defense contracts.

The other day Gonzalcz followed up with introduction of a bill designed to curb such profiteering. His measure would amend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 so as to open the way for greater recapture of excess profits.

"Unscrupulous war profiteers," he said, "spoiled the otherwise excellent record of private industry during all of our major wars in this century."

Gonzalez recalled that during World War II a government board "recovered more than $11 billion in excess profits from private contractors doing business with the government."

He added that the U.S. Renegotiation Board recaptured $800 million from Korea war contracts. In 1966, the same Board recovered $24.5 million and another $23.2 million in voluntary refunds.

Gonzalez said the board's recoveries last year, though small, "are all the more remarkable in view of numerous statutory restrictions that began to hamstring its activities immediately after Korea."

"In view of the sharp increase in (military) procurement as a result of the war in Vietnam, it is time to call a halt to this trend (in restricting the board) and to reverse it," the congressman declared.

He said his bill would rid the Board of many limitations placed upon it and "of many exemptions which special interest groups have obtained for themselves."

"Restoration of the Board's authority to the Korean war level is long overdue," Gonzalez continued. "I consider my measure the minimum step that must be taken if we are to stop the already alarming growth in war profiteering that is going on right now."

THE ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK AND REGIONAL COOPERATION

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the most hopeful developments of recent world history was the establishment of the Asian Development Bank in 1966.

In the months which have ensued, considerable progress has been made in promoting regional cooperation among the free nations of Asia. This cooperation is a heartening sign for those who are concerned about creating conditions of peace and security in that region.

In an address to the Second Asian Newspapers Conference on August 29 in Manila, Bernard Zagorin, the U.S. representative to the Board of Directors of the Asian Bank, outlined some of the progress which has been made.

In view of President Johnson's recent request for additional funds for the Asian Development Bank, to be used for development loans, I believe the remarks of Mr. Zagorin will be of interest to my colleagues and I am inserting his speech at this point in the RECORD:

PROMISE OF REGIONAL COOPERATION

(Statement given by Bernard Zagorin, Director, Asian Development Bank, at Second Asian Newspapers Conference, August 29, 1967, Manila, Philippines)

I feel highly privileged and am most grateful for this opportunity to meet with you and to share with you some observations about regional cooperation.

I feel a little like the student who was given a high grade on his examination and then boldly asked his professor to step down so that he might give the next lecture. It is not altogether facetious for me to say that because, being a resident of Manila, I am guided and informed by the printed word produced by the distinguished host at these proceedings and by other prominent publishers of this country who are participating in this conference. Your very generous grading system has accorded me great honor in allowing me to be here today. Still it is not unknown that in a discussion or dialogue a student may pass on a thought or two to his mentors, and in that vein I should like to speak with you.

I have been engaged in an exciting new venture of regional economic cooperation—the Asian Development Bank. It is a new and strong instrument, forged with the goodwill and resources contributed by thirty-one countries, to promote the economic growth of the developing countries of Asia.

I am privileged to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Asian Development Bank. Notwithstanding our respective nationalities, we form the Board of an Asian Institution, sharing a unity of purpose to help in the enormous task of raising the living standards of the developing countries of Asia; and sharing jointly the responsibility, in the words of our Charter, for direction of the general operations of the Bank.

It is not only that the Member Governments in their official and formal acceptance of the Charter of the Asian Development Bank, jointly endorsed the objectives of the Bank. I can assure you that in the past months during which we have been organizing the Bank and getting it ready for its operational tasks, there has been clear and constant evidence of common purpose in the minds of the Management, staff, and Directors of the Bank—irrespective of nationality, whether from large country or small, from one country of Asia or another, or from within or without the region.

The President of our Bank, Takeshi Watanable, put it well in a recent speech when he said:

"It is our expressed purpose to serve as a clearing house of common understanding; not only between Asian and non-Asian countries, but within our own region as well."

A clearing house, as you know, deals with day-to-day business. Borrowing the phrase from President Watanabe, our great strength, I believe, lies in our dealing with the day-to-day business of common understanding.

I hope you will forgive me for giving such important mention to the Asian Development Bank. I confess that I can't help myself, being so proud of this new undertaking, and this for two main reasons: because it represents a great success in institution-building, a triumph in regional and international cooperation; and because of the way it functions, with our common purpose constantly unfolding in our common concern with economic development in all of the developing countries of Asia.

I also feel obliged to say that it is not only a loan here or a technical assistance project there which will represent, by providing resources to the developing countries, the single value to be measured from our work. The spirit as well as the material substance of cooperation—the process of sharing the concern of other countries—is a very real and valuable part of the whole exercise. You should know, as your newspapers may report the specifics on our operational activity, that this sharing of concern by all in the specific case of any particular country lies behind all of our efforts.

Much of what I am trying to say was eloquently expressed the other night in a small gathering by a distinguished representative of one of the developing countries of Asia, an Ambassador of his country here in the Philippines. He said that the meaning and promise of our new Bank lies not in the specific amount of any assistance his country might get from the Bank. That is not the essential thing. Rather, he said, the Asian Development Bank represents the symbol of unity, cooperation and collaboration among the Asian countries. In that, he went on, it holds the promise for the future of Asia. I wish you could have heard for yourselves the ringing conviction of his belief in regional cooperation.

I do not pretend that the Asian Development Bank is the only regional cooperative effort worthy of mention. Recently in Asia there have been other notable cases of a reaching for cooperative groupings. They all reflect, I believe, a growing recognition that regional cooperation can produce great benefits for all concerned that this approach is obviously preferable to the inertia of isolation and the harboring of animosities which in the past characterized much of the relations among different countries of the world. In fact, I would say that the Asian Development Bank itself is part of the spirit of the times, a manifestation of the increasing acceptance of the idea that regionalism, as a vehicle of common purpose and shared concern, is a resource which will yield great bounty, both material and in other ways, and should be thoroughly exploited just as any new-found deposit of minerals.

I need not recount to you, the observers and communicators in Asia, your recent history. The story would include the ECAFE with its fruitful work during the more than 20 years of its existence and the many cooperative efforts it has spawned including the Asian Development Bank. And in recent weeks, the record will cite the establishment of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations. Even in your own line of activity, this Second Asian Newspapers Conference is a recognition of the value of regional cooperation. That you are aware of the advantages of working with your neighbors is evidenced by your being here today.

Regional cooperation is not a charitable enterprise. Unless there is a certain, even if minimum, amount of benefit for each participant, pursuing his own self-interest if you will, the cooperative effort cannot work effectively. It is important to recognize, however, that such self-interest is not in and of itself in conflict with the concept of cooperation and collaboration. It is perhaps a commonplace thought that the goal of cooperative effort, whatever the size or nature of the grouping, is to produce not only a greater joint product but a greater dividend for each participant. It may well be that at times form, as well as the interest of harmony, would require that an obvious display of self-interest be submerged, but there is no reason to shy away from the idea that self-interest is a necessary ingredient of successful cooperation.

It has often been said that politics is the art of the possible. No doubt there is some art involved, but I would suggest that regional cooperation is the practice of the possible. In a negotiation with another party, perhaps the main point is to discover and test the outside limits of his tolerance. In regional cooperation, I would submit, although again there is some element of negotiation, it is more a question of testing the outside limits of one's tolerance to see how it might fit within the concept of the group's interest. In this way the common good as well as the individual good may be enhanced. It is not always easy to approach a problem from the point of view of testing the outside limits of one's tolerance, and in this circumstance the presence of a structure, an institutional framework, is important. As I mentioned above with regard to the Asian Development Bank, there is not only a constitutional form stating the Bank's objectives, but there is also the continuous process of shared concern which is so very important in nurturing the conviction that group interest and individual interest are not incompatible.

Regarding the tapping of new resources, I note that, as consumers of newsprint, at this conference you will be taking up the question of developing Asian sources of supply of this vital commodity. I am referring to a very interesting proposal to develop within Asia both the forestry and processing capability, so that you may significantly reduce your very great dependence on imports from outside the Asian region for the continually growing requirements of newsprint. This proposal, as I understand it, has arisen from the thinking among Asians deliberating in a regional body, and it may well be that the actual realization of such an important new resource in Asia will require joint action among Asians concerned. In such endeavor I wish you well. I am pleased to note that these efforts to enrich the Asian region by developing new sources of wealth are being facilitated by valuable technical help provided by various United Nations organizations.

I have touched on a few examples of regional cooperation in Asia, including the specific proposal on newsprint. Before closing I should like very briefly to mention that the experience with regional cooperation has proven of great value elsewhere. You are all familiar with the various forms of economic cooperation in Europe since the end of World War II, which have contributed so much to the strengthening of the economics of those countries. In the Western Hemisphere the Alliance for Progress has provided a basis for regional cooperation resulting in substantial economic benefit to the developing countries of Latin America. In a smaller part of Latin America, a more intensive type of regional economic cooperative has taken the form of a Central American Common Market, which has dramatically improved the economic status of the people of that region.

These have been among the successes in regional cooperation elsewhere in the world. But it is not in the there and then, but in the here and now in which Asia must be interested. Vision is a word which does not only mean the distant and the future; it means also seeing what is around you. The growing contemporary awareness of the value of regional cooperation in Asia offers great promise that the vast but latent and hidden potential in the human and physical resources of Asia shall be used.

You, the publishers of Asia, have a most significant role to play in furthering the success of regional cooperative efforts in Asia. You as the conveyors and even the molders of public opinion can do so much in endorsing and awakening an interest in this civilized and civilized concept in human relations. No doubt the success of regional cooperative ventures will depend in part upon the dedication and quality of the efforts of those directly engaged in the task; and I, for one, seriously accept this as applicable to my own line of work. But apart from such efforts by those directly engaged, there has to be a sense of commitment to the idea of regional cooperation, both intellectual and emotional, and it is especially in the widening and intensifying of this sense of commitment in the public that you publishers can contribute so much.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Zwach (at the request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford), for today, and the balance of the week, on account of a death in his family.

Mr. Smith of California (at the request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford), for today, on account of illness.

Mr. Conte (at the request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford), for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Ryan (at the request of Mr. Matsunaga), for 10 minutes, on October 12; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Halpern (at the request of Mr. Brown of Michigan), for 10 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Kupferman (at the request of Mr. Brown of Michigan), for 60 minutes, October 25; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Quie (at the request of Mr. Brown of Michigan), for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Joelson and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Rooney of New York (at the request of Mr. Matsunaga) to include a newspaper article with remarks made in Committee of the Whole today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Brown of Michigan) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Collier.
Mr. Halpern.
Mr. Miller of Ohio.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Matsunaga) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Brasco.
Mr. Kee.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee.
Mr. Jones of Alabama.
Mr. Philbin.
Mr. Howard.
Mr. Carey.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 318. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish and administer a plan to provide for the care and protection of children through public day care services, and to provide public assistance in the form of foster home care to certain dependent children; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 765. An act to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, and the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia, as amended, so as to bring within the provisions of such acts any person operating a motor vehicle while under the influence of a drug rendering such person incapable of operating the motor vehicle safely; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 768. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for compulsory school attendance, for the taking of a school census in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved February 4, 1925; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 770. An act to amend an act to provide for the establishment of a public crematorium in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1224. An act to establish a register of blind persons in the District of Columbia, to provide for the mandatory reporting of information concerning such persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1552. An act to amend the Highway Safety Act of 1966; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 1631. An act to raise the maximum age limit of schoolchildren entitled to transportation in the District of Columbia at a reduced fare; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 2012. An act to amend the District of Columbia Public School Food Services Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 10509. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 12, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1151. A letter from the adjutant general, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, transmitting a report of audit of the books of the quartermaster general of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States for the fiscal year ended August 31, 1967, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 74–630; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1152. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of an application for loan by the Haight's Creek Irrigation Co. of Kayesville, Utah, pursuant to the provisions of section 10 of the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1153. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of the publication "Statistics for Interstate Natural Gas Pipeline Companies, 1966"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1154. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated July 7, 1967, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of the reports on Bristol Harbor, R.I., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted July 29, 1955 (H. Doc. No. 174); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. Senate Joint Resolution 112. Joint resolution extending the time for filing report of Commission on Urban Problems; with amendment (Rept. No. 761). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. House Joint Resolution 859. Joint resolution extending for 1 year the emergency provisions of the urban mass transportation program (Rept. No. 762). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DOWDY: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5187. A bill for the relief of Dr. Hector Alfredo E. Planas-Pina (Rept. No. 763). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6088. A bill for the relief of Dr. Manuel Jose Coto (Rept. No. 764). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DOWDY: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6449. A bill for the relief of Dr. Orlando O. Lopez; with amendment (Rept. No. 765). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6658. A bill for the relief of Dr. Rolando Pozo y Jimenez (Rept. No. 766). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CAHILL: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6659. A bill for the relief of Dr. Pedro Augusto Ruiz y Cue (Rept. No. 767). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 13439. A bill to correct and improve the Canal Zone Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 13440. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Eye Institute in the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 13441. A bill to insure that public buildings financed with Federal funds are so designed and constructed as to be accessible to the physically handicapped; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.R. 13442. A bill to amend section 103 of title 23, United States Code, to authorize additional mileage for the Interstate System; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 13443. A bill making Columbus Day a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 13444. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make it unlawful to injure, intimidate, or interfere with any fireman performing his duties during the course of any riot; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 13445. A bill declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE of Texas:

H.R. 13446. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H.R. 13447. A bill to prohibit electronic surveilance by persons other than duly authorized law enforcement officers engaged in the investigation or prevention of specified categories of offenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RESNICK:

H.R. 13448. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to raise needed additional revenues by tax reform; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 13449. A bill declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 13450. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on whole skins of mink, whether or not dressed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H.R. 13451. A bill declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALDIE:

H.R. 13452. A bill to guarantee productive employment opportunities for those who are unemployed or underemployed; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CELLER (for himself and Mr. FEIGHAN):

H.R. 13453. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN (for himself and Mr. HANNA):

H.R. 13454. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetics Act to include a definition of food supplements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 13455. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the amount payable on burial and funeral expenses; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 13456. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make it unlawful to assault or kill any member of the armed services engaged in the performance of his official duties while on duty under orders of the President under chapter 15 of title 10 of the United States Code or paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 3500 of title 10 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13457. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to establish in the Veterans' Administration a national veterans cemetery system consisting of all cemeteries of the United States in which veterans of any war or conflict are or may be buried; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 13458. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 13459. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to include a definition of food supplements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.R. 13460. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALIFIANAKIS:

H.R. 13461. A bill to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to prohibit support of voter registration activities and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 13462. A bill to extend and otherwise amend certain expiring provisions of the Public Health Service Act to migrant health services; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts:

H.R. 13463. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to include a definition of food supplements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 13464. A bill to amend section 1114 of title 18, United States Code, so as to extend its protection to postmasters, officers and employees of the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13465. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make it unlawful to assault or kill any member of the armed services engaged in the performance of his official duties while on duty under orders of the President under chapter 15 of title 10 of the United States Code or paragraph (2) and (3) of section 3500 of title 10 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 13466. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 13467. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to include a definition of food supplements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 13468. A bill to extend the tariff quota treatment for certain stainless steel table flatware; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GETTYS:

H.J. Res. 883. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as National School Safety Patrol Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.J. Res. 884. Joint resolution designating the last week in October of every year as National Student Council Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.J. Res. 885. Joint resolution designating the 22d day of November 1967, as National Pledge of Allegiance Day, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KORNEGAY:

H.J. Res. 886. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as National School Safety Patrol Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATSON:

H. Con. Res. 529. Concurrent resolution urging the United States to continue opposition to admission of Red China to the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H. Res. 941. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 655 to reduce the depletion allowance for oil and gas; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H. Res. 942. Resolution relating to rescission of appropriations for civil supersonic aircraft development; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H. Res. 943. Resolution to request the Department of Defense to undertake a study of wage areas used to determine wage rates of its employees engaged in recognized trades and crafts; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLANTON:

H.R. 13469. A bill for the relief of Dr. Antonio Matias Rubio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 13470. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Sciarrino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 13471. A bill for the relief of Marcello Mallegni, his wife, Lea Nieves Mallegni, their son Marcello Mauro Mallegni, and their son Dante Alberto Mallegni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 13472. A bill for the relief of Iona Carter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 13473. A bill for the relief of Paolo Bellizzi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. HANSEN of Washington:

H.R. 13474. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Julienne Souvenir and Leonard Quigley, Jr.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'NEILL OF Massachusetts:

H.R. 13475. A bill for the relief of Ana Pimentel Madeiros; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 13476. A bill for the relief of Stanislaw Ciochon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 13477. A bill for the relief of Ezatolla Partovi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

175. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the city of Redlands, Calif., relative to a tax-sharing program with State and municipal governments, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Presentation of National Historic Landmark Certificate and Plaque to the Citizens of Georgetown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALAN BIBLE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 11, 1967

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, on October 7, the Secretary of the Department of Interior, Hon. Stewart Udall, presented a National Historic Landmark Certificate and Plaque to the citizens of Georgetown.

At this ceremony, Secretary Udall cited the history and authority for issuing Historic Landmark Certificates, along with other pertinent remarks.

In preserving the history of Georgetown, Secretary Udall urged local interested citizens of this community to become more interested in preserving their town's identity and historic landmarks.

I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary's remarks be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR STEWART L. UDALL

George Town was a thriving port city for nearly 50 years before the Nation's Capital was laid out on the lowlands to the south and east of it. It was here in Suter's Tavern that President George Washington met with the owners of the land selected as the site of the New Capital City and persuaded them to accept the reasonable terms he offered. It was here that Major Pierre L'Enfant labored over his great design for the new Federal City, as it was then called, and it was here that Andrew Ellicot produced his survey—still the basis for all major Washington planning.

And it was to George Town that many of the officials of the new government came to live, for Washington itself still offered little in the way of comfortable living. So Georgetown grew with the new republic, into a busy and fashionable town. A few mansions on the heights, many streets of fine brick houses in the charming style of the late 18th and early 19th centuries, a thriving business district on Bridge and High Streets, and a busy waterside with wharves and warehouses, taverns and mills, kept busy by foreign and locally-owned ships which sailed up the wide Potomac estuary. Through the heart of it threaded the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal, the result of George Washington's dream to make the Federal City the key port of entry to the heartland of this great continent.

But this lively and fashionable town had sad days ahead of it. With the growth of Washington proper, a new residential area developed east of Rock Creek. Many of the old families of Georgetown held on, but whole blocks of houses were deserted and allowed to decay. Poor immigrants moved into many of them. The quiet local industry along the waterfront was replaced by heavier, uglier, more objectionable uses. The story is that of urban neighborhoods in cities all over the land.

During the 1930's, however, Georgetown's new life began. Many people, newly come to the Capital, were attracted by the historic interest of Georgetown, and by the fine late Colonial and early Federal architecture of its houses. The next 30 years saw the area taking on again the mixture of glamour and quiet respectability it had traditionally possessed. Local citizens, both those from the old families who had never left Georgetown and newcomers who had grown to cherish it, banded together to protect the old town from the uglification which is an unhappy hallmark of what we call "progress" in America.

In 1935, the Congress of the United States—many of whose distinguished members by then lived in Georgetown—passed the Historic Sites Act which, among other things, authorized a national survey of historic sites and buildings. This was carried on by the National Park Service of the Department of the Interior.

After the war, it was realized again that Georgetown, like other areas rich in historic associations and fine architecture, was in danger of losing its identity and character. In 1950, the Congress passed an Act which created the Old Georgetown District, the purpose being to "preserve and protect the places and areas of historic interest" by requiring the review of all plans for new buildings and for restoration of old structures. As a further demonstration of the Federal government's active interest in the physical remains of the Nation's history, in October 1966, just one year ago, President Johnson signed a new historic preservation law, which impowers the Secretary of the Interior to make grants to the States and to the National Trust for Historic Preservation. Just the other day, the Advisory Council for Historic Preservation took action toward supporting the citizens of Alexandria who are trying to prevent the demolition of a large portion of that historic city's ancient downtown area. This action may carry no authority, but it can wield a powerful influence.

The Federal government is now in the historic preservation business—within certain limits. But that does not mean that Uncle Sam will carry the ball from now on. Now, more than ever, the initiative is up to the local citizens and their organizations. The Federal government can provide the necessary legal powers and political organization, and usually half the funds, but it is up to the community to provide the initiative, the drive, the opportunity and a good part of the money.

You people of Georgetown still face many problems; some of them you have worked to solve for many years. But have you, as a community, established a town image of the future? Have you formed this image with the knowledge that change is inevitable? With proper guidance and control, change can enhance a community. Unplanned change is usually for the worse. If you can agree upon a comprehensive plan for Georgetown development, you can always make yourselves heard at "Citv Hall."

The first step is yours. You take it when you design the future plans for Georgetown. Then is the time, through your local governmental channels, to ask assistance. The government can furnish support, but the solutions must be your own.

What are your problems here? M Street is a mess and the hippy joints are keeping you awake at night; Wisconsin Avenue has only a suggestion of the charm it could possess for the shopper. An elevated expressway roars through your waterfront the ground around and beneath it is cluttered with noisy industries and the air is befouled by choking smells.

Except possibly for the hippies—whose long-haired enthusiasms are short-lived anyway—there isn't a problem there that can't be solved by solid community action.

Such action *must* provide for *change*. It must face the fact that the world of tomorrow will be very unlike the world of yesterday. You can help shape that change to your vision.

More than two years ago, following a directive from the President to "clean up the Potomac" and study ways and means to preserve and enhance the beauties of its shores, I asked the American Institute of Architects to appoint a Task Force to carry out this study. Its report to me is now available—some of you have seen it, I'm sure. I endorse it, yet at the same time I do not say that I accept it in all details. However, it sets forth broad principles for the design and control of the portions of the metropolitan area which impinge upon the river. Let me quote a few lines from its reference to the Georgetown waterfront:

> "The Georgetown waterfront surely must and will be redeveloped. . . . Its design character should reflect its cosmopolitan life and its historical continuity. . . . New buildings in this area should be of many kinds and uses, although predominantly residential, in keeping with the character of Georgetown as a whole, although it is unreasonable to expect that many of its traditional single-family dwellings can be accommodated there. . . . The entire area should be conceived of as a logical and natural extension of the Georgetown community. . . . That a major highway will continue to traverse the Georgetown waterfront must be expected, but the highway could take a form consistent with the character of the waterfront. . . . (It) should be either underground or so thoroughly assimilated into the surrounding urban fabric that it neither obtrudes from it nor conflicts with it."

There is the essence of a design concept for the development of your Georgetown waterfront. Put your community associations and their designers and planners to work on it. You have no major problem here that I know of that cannot be solved by concerted community effort. You have a precious community, a precious heritage. Plan so that Georgetown continues to be the gracious heart of our Capital City.

Today I present a marker in recognition of what you *have* done to preserve and restore. You have been good stewards in maintaining the character of the community you inherited. It is not only an ancient town, as towns in this country go, but it is one rich in its historic associations with the founding of our Republic. You can be justly proud of what you have accomplished. We now recognize your efforts and commend them to the Nation. It is my great honor, and my own personal pleasure, to present to you, the citizens of Georgetown, the National Historic Landmark certificate and its accompanying plaque. The certificate reads as follows:

> United States Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C., Georgetown Historic District is hereby designated a Registered National Historic Landmark.
>
> Under Provisions of the Historic Sites Act of 1935, this site possesses exceptional value in commemorating or illustrating the history of the United States of America.

Beyond Recognition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 11, 1967

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, since the Communists took over China in 1949, there has been a comparatively small but very vocal group carrying on a relentless campaign for the recognition of Red China as a legitimate member of the family of nations.

Nothing discourages those who promote the recognition of Communist China as they speak glibly of admitting the followers of Mao to respectable international society. Yet they must know that Comrade Mao has repeatedly said that the Red Chinese would not even undertake membership in the United Nations unless Nationalist China, a showpiece of democracy and freedom in the Far East, were expelled from that body. The campaign of the "Recognize Red China" group did not slow down during the Korean war when they supported our enemy, and strangely it has continued to the present despite the fact that Chinese Communists are assisting in furnishing the wherewithal to kill American young men in South Vietnam.

Last week the Government of Indonesia severed diplomatic relations with Red China, thus handing that nation the worst diplomatic defeat it has suffered since it gained power 18 year ago. What made this action particularly noteworthy is the fact that only 2 short years ago Indonesia was a satellite of Communist China and was on the verge of being taken over by it. The Indonesian Communist Party claimed a membership of 3 million with a total of 21 million supporters in a population of about 107 million. Only the Communist parties of the Soviet Empire and Red China were larger.

What is especially ironic about the termination of diplomatic relations between Indonesia and its huge Asian neighbor is that the events which led to it were set in motion not long after Achmed Sukarno, then president of Indonesia, had said, "To hell with U.S. aid." Apologists for our burdensome foreign aid programs had been telling us incessantly for years that we had to give millions and billions of dollars to foreign countries to keep them from going Communist. What happened after we kicked Indonesia off Uncle Sam's gravy train?

A few months after Sukarno's outburst, an attempt by the Communists to seize power was frustrated by the military, following which a wave of anti-Communist feeling swept Indonesia. The number of Communists who lost their lives during the last 2 months of 1965 and the early part of 1966 has been variously estimated at about 300,000 and 400,000. True, these figures were shocking, but not as shocking as the statistics that tell us about the millions of Chinese who have lost their lives since the Communists seized their country.

Certainly our refusal to provide Sukarno with further foreign aid handouts led to his downfall. At the same time, the firm stand by our forces in South Vietnam has inspired and encouraged the anti-Communist regime that now controls Indonesia. The ousting of the Reds from power in Indonesia cannot do otherwise than give equal inspiration and encouragement to Australia and New Zealand, which the Communists have long coveted. Who knows? It may even influence India away from the Communist orbit.

Surely there is a lesson for the United States in all this. Let us help those who demonstrate their friendship for us and the rest of the free world, but let us cease allowing ourselves to be further blackmailed by those who threaten to go Communist unless we come across with more millions and billions.

The Kee Report: Public Lands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 11, 1967

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include last week's public service television and radio newscast, "The Kee Report."

The subject discussed in this report is "Public Lands." The report follows:

> This is Jim Kee, bringing you the Kee Report.
>
> I believe the public is informed about the role played by the Federal Government in attempting to solve the major problems of these troubled times.
>
> At present, there are four primary fields of Federal action. The Government must cooperate with industry to keep the economy rolling at a high level, it must cooperate with local officials on the war against crime, it must continue to meet the danger of Communist aggression and it must stay ahead in the exploration of outer space.
>
> Because of widespread interest in these subjects, they command the lion's share of public attention.
>
> There is one other activity of the Federal Government which is less spectacular but which is extremely important to the welfare of the American people. This is the preservation and development of our Nation's natural resources. Uncle Sam happens to be the biggest housekeeper in the world.
>
> There are vast areas of forest and woodland, desert and mountain, lakes and rivers, which are owned by the Federal Government. You may be surprised to know that in a few states, more than half of the land is Federally owned. These reserves contain sizeable mineral deposits which have yet to be exploited. They contain valuable timber resources and other assets of great potential value. The proper use of this national treasure is a matter of deep concern to the President and Congress.
>
> In recent years, the accent has been placed upon the development of public parks to meet the need for more recreational facilities. This is a wise policy and one which has

paid handsome dividends in the past. The first public park was Yellowstone and since its creation, millions of visitors have viewed its natural wonders. Here in the East, some excellent strides have been made in park development, but much more needs to be done.

The Federal Government is now helping in the development of the Potomac Valley Park. In a message to Congress this year, President Johnson expressed the hope that this parkland along the Potomac might become a model scenic and recreational area for the Nation. This project would include some of our own State of West Virginia.

There is another conservation and development program which should be rich in historic interest. This is the project to establish a nationwide system of trails. Some of these famous trails were the original footpaths used by the pioneers in exploring and settling the heartland of America. Other trails played a notable part in the Nation's economic development, especially the Chisholm Trial over which the cowboys from Texas moved their cattle to northern railroads.

One other trail recommended for preservation by the White House is the Appalachian Trail extending from Maine to Georgia. This may be the Nation's oldest trail. Part of it has been restored but the states need help in reclaiming the rest.

A few years ago, legislation was adopted setting aside a few wilderness areas to be preserved in their natural setting. The purpose of this is to allow future generations to see the land in its virgin state before the advent of civilization. The national park system is a rare national asset. Its prudent expansion is one of the urgent needs of our times.

Thank you for listening.

Jerry Spiegel Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 11, 1967

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, a major factor in the development of our Nation has been the creative and invaluable work being done by various philanthropic foundations. Of course, we all know of the giant foundations, richly endowed and pouring tens of millions of dollars into the mainstream of American life.

Many of us, however, are not fully aware of the scores of moderate-sized foundations that are really pioneering in worthwhile endeavors. One of these is the Jerry Spiegel Foundation in Hicksville, Long Island.

Among its varied activities this charitable organization, founded 9 years ago, provides college scholarships for deserving and talented high school graduates. The foundation strongly believes that every effort must be made to insure that our talented youth are given every opportunity for development to the fullest potential.

In the same vein, the Foundation has been an active sponsor of the Long Island Philharmonic Society, the Island Concert Hall, and other groups who share an interest in the well being of the youth in their area.

Jerry Spiegel, a leading Long Island builder and philanthropist, and founder of the philanthropic group, has pledged himself to assisting youngsters in need. For this, I salute him.

I am hopeful that other such organizations will join in this effort—so that young people, regardless of race, color, creed, or financial ability—will be able to take their place as the new leaders in our society.

It would be shameful if we were to dissipate our country's best national resource—our youth.

President C. Wilson Harder, National Federation of Independent Business, Stand Strong for Small Businessmen in National Capital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 11, 1967

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, one of the great champions of small business in America today is Mr. C. Wilson Harder, president of the National Federation of Independent Business.

Mr. Harder and his organization do a great work in representing the interests of the small businessmen in Washington. Proposed legislation is carefully evaluated and testimony given before committees which have bills under consideration, affecting the small businessmen of the Nation.

One of the outstanding services of the federation to small businessmen and to the Members of Congress is the continuing mandate polls that are conducted on public issues. The organization's quarter of a million members are polled regularly and the results of these polls are made available to Members of Congress.

I want to commend and congratulate Mr. Harder for the outstanding work of his organization and, specifically, I want to commend him and the federation for the work they are doing to assist our small towns and small businessmen.

The Federation has brought to the attention of small businessmen throughout the Nation the significance of the Tax Incentive Job Development Act of 1967 (H.R. 9060) which I introduced last April and which has aroused much public interest.

The National Federation of Independent Business conducted a recent poll of their membership and determined that the great majority support this proposed legislation.

The Federation has explained the provisions of this bill through its radio program and its information releases to newspapers.

This bill provides for an additional 7-percent investment tax credit for those businessmen who locate plants in our small towns.

The attention which this bill has attracted is due in no small measure to the efforts of the National Federation to make the provisions of this bill known to small businessmen throughout the country.

I want to commend and congratulate Mr. Harder and the staff and membership of the National Federation of Independent Business for their outstanding work and public service which has made them a strong voice for free enterprise and for American small business—not only in the Nation's Capital but throughout the United States.

Casimir Pulaski: Soldier of Freedom (1748–79)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 11, 1967

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, Casimir Pulaski was one of the most famous Poles of his day who lent his name and fame to a noble cause, and sacrificed his life while fighting for that cause—for our independence. This gifted and gallant son of Poland seemed determined from childhood to lead the life of a warrior. He was born to wealth and fame, and with a title of nobility as count, he could have followed in the footsteps of his father as an attorney and thus be assured of a comfortable life even under adverse circumstances. But this precocious son of a well-educated father would have none of that; comfort and wealth, personal glory and fame meant little or nothing to him. The Government of his beloved Poland remained subservient to foreign regimes and his country was losing its independence. Under such circumstances, it seemed almost treacherous to youthful Pulaski to give much thought to personal comfort and private gains. Before he was 15 years old he had vowed to fight the Russian authorities to the end of his life, in the hope of securing freedom for his countrymen. In 1766, when 18, he was already the leader of a band of Poles fighting the Russians. In the following year he and his band of followers were captured and imprisoned by the Russians. On his release in the following year, he organized other groups for the purpose of carrying on the fight. For more than 4 years, until 1772, he and his groups eluded the authorities; but in their last encounter with the Russians, they barely managed to save their lives by fleeing Poland.

The next 3 years of Pulaski's self-imposed exile were years of frustration and hardship. Early in 1775 he was in Paris, and in 1776 he heard of the American Revolution. There he saw his chance to pursue his goal as a fighter for freedom. His friends in Paris put him in touch with Benjamin Franklin and Silas Deane there. With their aid and recommendation he sailed for America, arriving in July of 1777. Here in presenting his letters of recommendations to Washington, our Commander in Chief was favorably impressed by Pulaski's past performance and future promise; Washington recommended to the Continental Congress that Pulaski be placed in command of the cavalry unit. This was done promptly. In the very next battle—of Brandywine of September 11—the courage and tactics displayed by Pulaski did not escape Washington's notice. On his recommendation Pulaski was appointed to the command of the cavalry force, with the rank of brigadier general, thus becoming the father of our cavalry.

His active military career in the service of our cause, his plan for the reorganization of our cavalry forces, his participation in many of the battles with gallantry, his final encounter at the siege of Savannah in October 1779, and his untimely death while fighting there, all these facts are well known to us all. Because of his impressive record while fighting in our War of Independence, because of his extraordinary courage in battles, and also because of his rare ability as leader and organizer, the name of this great soldier of freedom has become a household word in this great Republic. As a gallant fighter for freedom and as a courageous fighter for our cause, we honor the memory of Casimir Pulaski, a most famous soldier for freedom.

Casimir Pulaski Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 11, 1967

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, October 11 is set aside in the memory of Count Casimir Pulaski, the gallant Polish nobleman who died on that day in 1779 in the cause of American independence. Today it is appropriate for all Americans to consider the contributions which men and women of Polish origin have made to the growth and strength of America—contributions for which General Pulaski stands as an archetype and symbol.

Poland has produced more than her fair share of outstanding world citizens—among them the musician and statesman, Ignace Paderewski; the scientist, Marie Sklodowska-Curie; and the author, Henryk Sienkiewicz—all of whom visited the United States at some time during their illustrious careers.

But more directly affecting the development of the American Republic are those Poles who chose America as their adopted land. The list is long and, of necessity, must be selective: Pulaski's military colleague—Thaddeus Kosciusko—served the Revolutionary Army before returning to Europe to continue his fight for Polish independence. The poet and friend of George Washington, Julian Ursyn Niemcewicz, wrote the first original European biography of America's first President. Perhaps the most distinguished 19th-century musician in America was Freidrich Edward Sobolewski, who conducted both the Milwaukee and St. Louis Philharmonic Societies and won considerable recognition as a composer. And Polish men were instrumental in opening the West: Anthony Sandusky pioneered the settlement of Ohio, while Casimir Bielawski was a major figure in the exploration of California following the gold rush.

These are but a few of the famous men and women of Polish extraction who have made lasting contributions to the United States. Their names will remain a permanent reminder that the heritage of Poland is an inseparable part of the heritage of America.

Even more vital, however, than the achievements of these individuals, are the durable qualities of industry, moral soundness, and religious conviction which characterize Polish people in general. These qualities have strengthened the fiber of American national life in measure impossible to calculate, giving truth to the statement that the Polish people are benefactors to the world.

It is, therefore, altogether fitting that I salute, on this day, the legacy of Polish America, of which Casimir Pulaski is so aptly representative.

Mr. Carl T. Jones of Huntsville, Ala.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. JONES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 11, 1967

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, with a great sense of personal loss I report the death of Carl T. Jones, Huntsville, Ala.'s foremost civic worker. An engineer by profession, he devoted countless hours to building of dozens of civic projects to provide a better life for all in the rapidly growing space center of north Alabama. He was an eager and tireless salesman for Huntsville and was responsible for attracting many new industries to the area.

He had a vision of the potential for proper development of the great Tennessee Valley area of Alabama and he had the ability, courage, and determination to work for realization of that vision.

It was a great personal pleasure for me to work with Carl T. Jones in numerous endeavors in the Huntsville area. His knowledge and enthusiasm provided the extra push often so necessary for the accomplishment of a significant goal. No community ever had a more devoted worker for proper progress and development.

As the son of an influential pioneer Madison County family, Carl T. Jones was always interested in building and development. In becoming an engineer, he was following in his father's footsteps.

During World War II, Carl T. Jones served his country with distinction as a combat engineer in Alaska and in Europe. Immediately after the war, he was the only Reserve officer to serve as an instructor at the Army War College.

His service to the community grew as the city of Huntsville expanded at an unprecedented rate during the past 10 years. He was considered a full-time civil servant and a leader in every worthwhile project in the city.

Carl T. Jones served as a founder and early president of the Huntsville Industrial Expansion Committee, a group concerned with attracting new industry to the area; president of the Rotary Club; president of Huntsville Industrial Associates, Inc., an industrial development group; head of G. W. Jones & Sons, consulting engineers; was on the board of directors of the First National Bank of Huntsville and the North Alabama Mineral Development Co.; was a member of the First Methodist Church, Chamber of Commerce, Newcomer Society; Historical Society; Veterans of Foreign Wars; American Legion; Knight Templars of the Masonic Order; Alabama Cattlemen's Association; Alabama Farm Bureau; Ducks Unlimited, and American Society of Civil Engineers. He was also active in real estate, farming, and other business interests.

He received Huntsville's "Distinguished Citizen Award" in 1965.

His unexpected death came October 7 while watching the University of Alabame football game in Birmingham.

As a close personal friend for nearly 40 years, I have extended to his wife and family most heartfelt sympathy at his death.

Because the people of the Huntsville area depended so heavily on Carl T. Jones for the spark of drive and leadership to accomplish worthwhile projects, the family's loss will be shared by the entire community.

William Sauer, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. MILLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 11, 1967

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to commend the achievements and indefatigable spirit shown by Mr. William Sauer, Jr., of Logan, Ohio, who has been named Handicapped Ohioan of the Year, and who this Saturday will receive the President's citation for this honor.

Multiply handicapped since early youth, Bill has overcome formidable physical limitations to lead a normal self-supporting life.

With a tremendous display of courage and ability, Mr. Sauer has actively engaged in the business and social activities of his community. Since his father's death in 1946, he has almost totally supported not only himself but also his mother.

He is locally recognized as Logan's No. 1 sports fan, and is truly a No. 1 citizen in the hearts of the people of his community.

Mr. Sauer personifies the will and spirit to overcome obstacles which has made this great land of ours the most powerful and productive country in the world. His achievements are an inspiration to us all. In behalf of the people of the 10th District of Ohio, I salute him.

Columbus Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 11, 1967

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, on the eve of Columbus Day, I rise at this time to urge the adoption of resolutions designating Columbus Day as a national holiday.

I have been pleased to express to the House Committee on the Judiciary my strong approval and endorsement of this legislation, and I hope and urge that early favorable action be taken.

In my own State of Massachusetts and in many other States, Columbus Day is recognized as a legal holiday and is so celebrated in honor of the great navigator, Christopher Columbus, whose great deeds brought about the settlement of the New World by the Old.

It is quite fitting that the House today be reminded of the inspiring story of Italian immigrants who made their way through our cities, towns, and villages during the early years of this century. These were the youngest of our new immigrants, so typical of those who came to America seeking refuge, opportunity, and the chance to grow in a young country.

More often as not they came with a few earthly possessions, but loving relatives and loyal friends who had come before them provided for their needs until they had found jobs and became used to this new land of opportunity. Here in America they found work, happiness, and the chance to raise their families under advantages of which they never before had dreamed. In less than a half century, the sons and daughters of humble Italian stock rose to places of leadership and great influence in the professions, in the public service, in the religious and business life, and in all the callings of the American people—so much so that they have made distinguished, outstanding contributions to the social, economic, and political institutions of our country.

In New York City at Columbia University, where I received my degree in law, there stands the stately and beautiful La Casa Italiana. Over its portal are the immortal lines of the Poet Byron:

> Italy, mother of arts, thy hand was once our guardian and it is still our guide.

Thus, we in America acknowledge the contributions of our citizens of Italian origin. They have helped to build our railroads, our bridges, our roads, and our cities.

Italian influence, capital, and energy have helped to build America to the industrial giant it is today among the nations of the world. Every schoolboy at an early age recognizes the Italian contribution to our American civilization for it was Cristoforo Colombo who discovered America, Giovanni Cabota who first explored its mainland, and Amerigo Vespucci who gave America its name.

That the Italians have taken a conspicuous part in maintaining our precious American freedoms and saving our cherished form of government no one can deny. The pages of American history glisten with the names and patriotism of such men as Filippo Mazel, the friend of Thomas Jefferson; William Paca, signer of the Declaration of Independence, and many others.

It was Mazzei who wrote in the Virginia Gazette in 1774:

> All men are by nature created free and independent . . . it is necessary that all men be equal to each other in natural rights.

This has been translated by Thomas Jefferson into the Declaration of Independence in the form of the immortal "All men are created equal."

The unexcelled patriotism of these great heroes of the American Revolution was reenacted by the Italians of each succeeding generation whenever our country was in danger. Italian names are on the rosters of all our wars and outstanding military and religious figures of Italian blood furnished inspiring leadership, gallantry, and devotion to every struggle from Bunker Hill, Gettysburg, Flanders Fields to Okinawa, the Bulge, Korea, and now Vietnam. Italian-American patriots have sacrificed their lives in every war to preserve America. Their precious blood has saturated the soil of many countries in the cause of American freedom.

Citizens of Italian origin have been in the vanguard of every fight America has made for liberty and freedom. More than 200 Italian officers served in the Civil War. About 750,000 men and women of Italian extraction served in the Armed Forces of the United States during World War I, reportedly the largest single racial group serving under our colors. An estimated 845,000 men and women of Italian-American descent were in the U.S. Armed Forces during World War II.

An Italian-American boy from our own Commonwealth of Massachusetts was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor, the highest award a grateful nation can bestow, for his heroic service in World War II. Sgt. Arthur F. DeFranzo, of Saugus, Mass., was killed in action in France on June 10, 1944. After rescuing a wounded comrade, although wounded himself, he gave his life to clear a blazing path through concentrated enemy fire. His heroic action spared the lives of scores of his comrades.

Italian contributions have not been confined to the military alone, though all Americans should take pride in the heroic accomplishments of such gallant men as Sergeant DeFranzo, especially when it is a known fact that 20 out of the 500 Congressional Medals of Honor in World War II were awarded to boys of Italian-American descent.

Our Italo-Amercian citizens have influenced for the good practically every phase of American life. They have brought loyalty to America, loyalty to freedom and democracy, loyalty to American institutions, tolerance and justice toward their fellow man.

Here in Washington we are constantly reminded of the contributions of Italian-Americans in the field of art because the Italian genius for the beautiful has found notable expression in the adornment of our National Capitol building. Brumidi, perhaps, is the best known because he is called the Michelangelo of the Capitol, where he has left great artistic treasure as the famous Capitol frescoes Storia del America, Washington at Yorktown, L'Apoteosi de Washington, and Cincinnato all'aratro.

Amateis, another Italian craftsman, made the bronze doors of our Capitol. Franzoni designed and executed the bronze clock in the Capitol with the statue of Storia on its top. The emblematic eagle in the Capitol was sculptured by Valperti. The statue, Liberty Proclaiming Peace, is the work of Causici. The Pere Marquette statue in the U.S. House of Representatives is the achievement of Trentanove. The listing of Italian masterpieces in our Capitol Building could go on and on. They are seen daily by many hundreds of Americans from all parts of the country who visit Washington.

The world owes a great debt to Italy, to her people and to the descendants of the pioneer Italian immigrants to America. It is fitting that we recall the glowing tribute to this great race by my friend, former distinguished president of Columbia University, Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, who once wrote:

> The place of Italy in civilization is best shown by trying to subtract that place from world history. Take away her scientific accomplishments, her statesmanship, her leadership in the world for many years and what have you left? The world looks badly decapitated. You can subtract Italian culture from civilization only by destroying that civilization.

It can well be said, Mr. Speaker, as the Nation is about to celebrate Columbus Day 1967 that the great qualities, high ideals, and firm loyalties of the Italian people have all been and are a very real and moving part of American life and these are priceless possessions indeed.

Since early childhood the Italian people have been close to my heart and very dear to me and many of them have been like members of my own family.

I am grateful beyond measure for their confidence, affection and loyal support, and I am honored and proud, indeed, to hail and salute them on the glorious birthday of their great hero, the intrepid discover of the Western World, Christopher Columbus.

Broyhill Speaks Out on the Middle East—A Forthright, Perceptive Analysis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 11, 1967

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the very significant and timely remarks of my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Virginia, Congressman BROYHILL, who has rendered a vital service to the cause of peace and justice in the Middle East.

Congressman BROYHILL spoke at a meeting of the Maurice D. Rosenberg Lodge No. 1555, B'nai B'rith, at Alexandria, Va.

I think Congressman BROYHILL has done a great service in tracing the events that caused the present situation in the Middle East. His remarks, however, are far more than a historical recapitulation. He calls for definite moves to stiffen the backbone of our own Government to promote a stand against Arab extremism and Communist penetration of the Middle East.

I especially endorse his demand that the administration release the Douglas jet bombers sold to Israel last year. Arab fanaticism and Communist intrigue will only be encouraged if the United States fails to meet its commitments to Israel. If these jets are used as blackmail to force Israel concessions, I think that an aroused public opinion, representing Americans of all faiths, will demand an explanation.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to associate myself with the following remarks by my distinguished colleague:

ADDRESS OF REPRESENTATIVE JOEL T. BROYHILL, REPUBLICAN, OF VIRGINIA, AT MEETING OF MAURICE D. ROSENBERG LODGE NO. 1555, B'NAI B'RITH, ALEXANDRIA, VA., OCTOBER 10, 1967

It is my understanding that we are privileged to meet during the most sacred days of the Jewish religion. I was deeply moved when I learned of the significance of the Jewish New Year, which you observed last week, and the Day of Atonement, which occurs later this week.

These special holy days, I found, are called "the days of awe". They are so called, as you know, because it is a time of self-examination, of stock-taking of one's life and its implications, of one's relationship to his fellow men. One looks at the past with introspection. One looks to the future with resolve for a new and more sound course of action in keeping with the great Judaic teachings of freedom and human justice.

Gentlemen, since the last Day of Atonement, this whole nation, Jew and non-Jew alike, has lived through "days of awe". We saw the awesome spectacle of the mobilized might of world Communism become the instigator of Arab aggression and the open defender of Arab extremism. We saw this vast power combination arrayed against a single nation, a single people . . . a very small people numerically, but a very vital people in terms of contribution to civilization and progress.

The Communists were driving for power in the Middle East, hiding like cowards behind the robes of the Arabs. The Arabs acted with arrogance and open contempt for the basic right of Israel, a free nation, to exist.

Israel was the only factor standing in the way of the Communist Arab clique in its cynical move to exploit America's preoccupation with Viet Nam and weakening of NATO. They planned to use Israel as the scapegoat in a brutal and calculated attempt to expel American influence from the Middle East, and even from the Mediterranean.

Israel was characterized as the stooge of the United States. But Israel proved not only not a stooge, but a nation with the courage and determination that our own Government lacked.

As we, the American people . . . regardless of religion . . . look back in re-examination of those tense days in May, we must face some conclusions. We must face the implications of those conclusions as we chart a firm course for the coming year.

Gentlemen, we saw the Communists and Arabs tempted to reckless deeds not only by their own malice and greed. Another factor was present. I regret that this other factor was the obvious lack of firmness and determination on the part of our own Government.

Israel stood alone during those bleak and tense days in May. Our State Department told us it had somehow misplaced the commitment signed by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles in 1957. It was a solemn undertaking to support Israel if the Arabs closed the Straits of Tiran.

Soviet military equipment of the latest design poured into the Arab States. The Arabs, having sealed the straits without American intervention, saw the commitments so often expressed by the Executive Branch of our Government were meaningless.

They watched the Tripartite Declaration, linking Britain and France with us in preserving freedom in the Middle East, dissolve into nothing.

Arab armies mobilized on Israel's borders. They prepared for the final and fatal blow, the liquidation of Israel. They would ride the crest of success, having closed the straits and brought King Hussein of Jordon into their camp. Soviet strategy backed the Arabs each step of the way. Russian warships sailed into the Mediterranean to neutralize the U.S. 6th Fleet.

The Executive Branch of our Government proclaimed *no* doctrine of "thus far and no further". The commitment held so firmly in Viet Nam was ignored in the Middle East. Was Saigon more sacred than Jerusalem? The State Department boys felt that if Israel had to go, it was a domino that we could spare. They advised against U.S. military involvement on the side of Israel. They told the President that U.S. action in the Mediterranean might offend the Arab world and turn them toward Moscow . . . as if they are not already very far gone in that direction.

The war was thrust upon Israel. Thank God the Israelis were not found wanting. They thrilled the inner heart of every American devoted to human freedom. It was the little guy against the bully. It was a little country of 2½ million against the hundreds of millions of Arabs, Russians, Red Chinese, and so forth. David slew Goliath. We shared Israel's joy and exhilaration in escaping the cruel fate intended for her.

But I seem to remember the State Department proclaiming that we were "neutral in word, thought, and deed". Perhaps the policy-makers were neutral. I was not. I saw a great deal of difference between the independent, free republic of Israel and the pro-Communist Arab dictatorships. I am pleased to report tonight that your Congressman was not neutral in word, in thought, nor in deed.

Let us look back in reflection . . . not in recrimination. If we understand the past we are not doomed to repeat previous errors. We must be grateful that Israel survived and repelled aggression on a do-it-yourself basis. But we must allow Israel to consolidate her victory, in our own American interests as well as for the survival of the Jewish State.

We must guard against any tendency to barter away the fruits of Israel's victory. We must guard against appeasement of the Arabs and Communists in the Middle East, especially at a time when American boys are dying in Viet Nam. We must not permit a vacuum to develop in the Middle East that would again allow the enemies of freedom to miscalculate. Next time the results might not turn out as well as in June. We cannot allow Israel to be turned into another Viet

Only the strongest American posture of defense and openly stated U.S. purpose will shatter the Arab and Communist illusion that they can blackmail Israel at the conference table to achieve what they failed to win on the field of battle.

A dangerous vacuum is developing in the Middle East.

Moscow has resupplied the Arabs with jets and arms of the types lost in the recent war. Moscow has backed the Arabs every step of the way at the United Nations. The Communist bloc has even gone to the extent of persecuting Jews who are unfortunate enough to find themselves residents of Iron Curtain countries. Anti-Zionism has given way to outright anti-semitism.

There is no question of where the Communists stand on the issue of Israel. They despise the brave Israelis for frustrating the Russian timetable for penetration in a vital area.

But where does our own Government stand? That is what is troubling me. I have heard the old Hebrew saying that "the watchman of Israel does not sleep and does not slumber". That would be an excellent slogan for our entire nation.

King Hussein of Jordan jumped like a jackal into the war when he thought the pro-Communist regimes of Egypt and Syria would destroy Israel. We had given him tremendous American aid. We were sold an image of the King as an alleged moderate and friend of the United States. But when the showdown came, Jordan joined Communist-oriented forces of aggression.

Jordan has ignored Israel's practical and generous offer to establish a cooperative relationship with Lebanon and Jordan for the mutual development of all three. Israel envisaged export of Jordanian products through Israeli ports. Israel's genius for technical and agricultural progress would be available to the Arabs. All that was asked of the Jordanians was a firm and fair peace agreement.

The Jordanians gave their answer with bullets and bombs. Terrorists in recent weeks crossed the Jordan River to kill an Israeli child and other people. Jordan behaved at the United Nations like an innocent victim rather than as a beaten aggressor. King Hussein flew to Moscow to improve relations with the Kremlin. He is reported to have made arrangements to purchase Soviet weapons and to cooperate more closely with the leftist Arab camp.

The State Department's response, I regret to report, is the presentation of checks totalling about $6 million to King Hussein . . . to prop up the Jordanian economy. And this is merely a portion of some $27 million we expect to give Jordan this year. We are also said to be studying the grant of new U.S. arms to Jordan.

This can only be interpreted by Hussein as appeasement and softness. I feel it is absurd to help Hussein pay for his new Russian weapons at a time when border infiltrations and terrorism have resumed. If he wants American aid, let him qualify for it by making peace with Israel. Israel told Jordan she would be safe from counter-measures if she stayed out of the war. But Jordan gave vent to her hate and greed. Let her now face the consequences.

I agree with the Israeli Government position that the picture that exists today is entirely new. The clock cannot be turned back to the situation existing prior to the series of wars the Arabs caused. I feel Israel is justified in seeking a face-to-face peace treaty, based on recognition not only of Israel's existence, but of her navigation rights, and of borders corresponding to the requirements of security and the facts of life.

I reject the Communist ultimatum that Israel must withdraw on a unilateral basis before the Arabs will renounce their belligerency. The Arabs unleashed aggression. They now must face the consequences.

Over a hundred years ago, Mexico launched a war of aggression against Texas. Americans were asked to "remember the Alamo". At the end of that war boundaries were different than they would have been if Mexico had not forced the war upon us. I have not heard President Johnson suggest that the United Nations seek ways to return parts of Texas and our Southwest to Mexico.

Japan attacked us with Pearl Harbor treachery. Japan, unlike the Arabs, surrendered and signed a peace treaty. They are now our friends. Nevertheless, I notice that U.S. troops still occupy Okinawa for reasons of security. Americans retain certain rights involving Japan on security questions.

Nazi Germany declared war on the United States. Our troops are still in West Germany. We still have the authority to prevent the Germans from developing nuclear weapons.

The Arabs must realize that there are differences between winning and losing. It would be a dangerous precedent for the world to treat an aggressor with more consideration than the intended victim.

We live in a tough world. The Arabs would have been as cruel as the Nazis had they conquered Israel. The Communists would have shown no mercy. What would we have done? Begged Moscow to intercede with Nassar to save the Jews?

The Arabs played rough and got hurt. Now let them make some amends. If they want some of that territory back . . . not all of it, but enough to resettle the Arab refugees who Israel should not be forced to accommodate . . . let the Arabs get off their high horse.

Syria is oriented somewhere between Peking and Moscow in its fanaticism. The Syrians are training new terrorists for what they say will be a Viet-Cong style war against Israel. They join with Algeria in calling for what the party line calls a "peoples' war" against Israel. I do not think Israel should budge from a single one of those strategic hills from which the Syrians used to fire down into Israeli farms.

Nasser of Egypt would be a comic figure if he had not caused so much tragedy. He is a sort of leftist Mussolini. Despite his loud denunciations of the United States, we went on aiding him. But we still have those who would portray him as a moderate and preferable to any alternative. This is absurd. I would oppose any further cent of U.S. money to Nasser, as I did in the past. If he does not want relations with America, let him jump into the Nile. He once told us to jump into the sea but we went on aiding him nevertheless.

Russian warships are now using the Egyptian ports of Port Said and Alexandria as bases. They have sent missile cruisers and nuclear submarines there, poised at the U.S. 6th Fleet. The Arabs have given the Russians their first bases in the Mediterranean. We are fortunate to have a strong Israel on Egypt's border.

Egypt would have to prove a lot of things to my satisfaction before I would go along with an Israeli withdrawal from the Suez Canal.

Those Soviet ships threaten Israel even more than they do us. Let Nasser get rid of the Russians before the Israelis withdraw. Let him turn the canal over to an international authority that will guarantee access to Israel and all countries on a fair basis. Let Egypt, the most populous of the Arab States surrounding Israel, sign a peace treaty and enter normal relations. That should be a condition for any withdrawal from the ceasefire lines. Even then, I would like to see the Israelis maintain their lines until the Arabs have proven in fact and in deed that they are sincere.

I must report that there are indications that while Russia is resupplying arms to the Arabs, the Administration has failed to fulfill certain contracts with Israel. These contracts cover Douglas A-4 Skyhawk jets, purchased and partially paid for in the Spring of 1966 . . . about 18 months ago. Israel lost about one-fourth of her valiant air force through combat and by operational attrition. She can get nothing more from France because of DeGaulle's policies.

Israel stands as a buffer against Communism. Her fate is our fate. I cannot understand the reasoning behind deferment in delivery of the Skyhawks to Israel. It seems that the planes are being withheld to obtain bargaining leverage to force Israeli concessions.

If the Skyhawks are good for freedom in Southeast Asia, they are maybe even more valuable in a closer area, the Middle East. I will urge, with every bit of persuasion at my command, that these planes be released. By aiding Hussein and reneging on a contract with Israel, we are undermining our friends and rewarding our enemies.

The time has come for the United States to tell the Communists and their lackeys in the Middle East, "Thus far, and no more." I place a high priority on that. If this Administration does not take such a firm stand, they should at least give the Israelis the arms they need.

I think we should refresh our minds on the situation that existed before the actual war erupted. Nasser's official radio spoke on May 23, when Nasser was riding high on the straits controlling the Gulf of Aqaba. What the Cairo radio said was of grave concern then. We should remind ourselves now of the origins of the present situation.

I quote from Nasser's official broadcast:

"We challenge you, Israel. No, in fact we do not address the challenge to you, Israel, because you are unworthy of our challenge. But we challenge you, America. We challenge you, gangsters of the Bay of Pigs in victorious Cuba. We challenge you with death which is claiming your soldiers in struggling Vietnam. We challenge you to come near, with Israel, to our gulf, the Gulf of Aqaba. Our soldiers are there with the most powerful war material known in the Middle East. Behind them stand millions of Arabs, including Fidai workers carrying in their hands explosives to blow up every American presence throughout the Arab homeland.

"For our upcoming generations, we want an honorable, proud life. To Israel and American gangsterism we hold death in store. We are waiting, waiting for you, America, before we are waiting for Israel. This is the age of peoples, and peoples are fighting you, enemy of peoples, enemy of peace, enemy of prosperity."

If anyone has illusions about Arab extremism and continued collusion with Communism let him examine the background of the recent anti-semitism disseminated by the "Black Power" movement in the United States. The so-called Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, known also as SNICK, recently obtained and distributed anti-Jewish and anti-Israel material. The source of the propaganda, SNICK openly admitted, was the Arab embassies in Washington.

Ralph Featherstone, SNICK national propaganda director, defiantly told the press that this was the case.

I raised the question of foreign diplomatic missions in the United States using their status to stir up and exploit domestic racial tensions, prejudices, and violence. I asked the Department of State to examine Arab diplomatic connections with SNICK to determine whether certain Arab diplomats should be declared persona non grata and expelled from the United States. It is my understanding that a study of this situation is now in progress.

I asked the Department of Justice to determine whether SNICK should be required to register under the Foreign Agents Registration Act. I asked the Department of the Treasury to look into the tax-exempt status of SNICK.

There is enough domestic hatred now fomented in America without importing it from the Arab and Communist countries. The Arabs and Communists want to exploit our domestic tensions by turning race against race, religion against religion, group against group.

This is a sophisticated audience. You realize, I am sure, that there was something behind the so-called "Black Caucus" at the "New Politics" Convention in Chicago last month. The Black Power advocates who dominated the convention insisted on a one-sided condemnation of Israel for alleged aggression. They depicted the Arabs and Communists as innocent victims. A resolution reflecting the anti-Israel line was adopted. Within a few hours, it was broadcast over the Voice of the Arabs radio emanating from Cairo.

It was also broadcast in Moscow, Peking, Damascus and Amman.

Let us retrace the recent movements of Stokely Carmichael, former head of SNICK. He went first to Havana, where he urged . . . as you know . . . guerrilla warfare in the United States. Then he went to Hanoi. Next we found him in Algiers. Then he was in Cairo. Last we heard from Carmichael he was in Damascus, Syria. There he issued statements condemning Israel as well as the United States. He urged racial warfare in the United States, revolutions in Latin America, and uprisings along the lines of racial war throughout the world. He identified Black Power with the Arab cause despite all that Israel has done through its aid programs for the African people.

Someone paid for Carmichael's trip. He is not operating in a vacuum. The Black Power movement is being used to advance the Arab cause because that issue is a hot item on the Communist agenda.

Just as any sane person opposes arming the Black Power movement in this country, I oppose arming the Arabs. The United States must give the Arabs neither arms nor aid until they change their attitudes. I see no reason for strengthening the worldwide revolution by Black Power, Arab Power, or any other kind of power except the power of free people to defend their freedom, hopes, and way of life.

The State Department line is that if we don't supply the Arabs, they might turn to Moscow. Perhaps we will next hear someone advocate that we arm the Black Power fanatics or else they might become more dependent on the Communists.

Both Arab Power and Black Power have the capacity to destroy and damage. But they do not have the power to win. They can temporarily cause chaos and refuse to live in peace. So can disruptive children. But I do not think it is the best policy to appease and coddle disruptive children who would bring down the house on our heads.

We could learn much from the no-nonsense policies of Israel. There are times in the life of a nation when firmness and decisions are required. Appeasement of lawlessness and aggression causes lawlessness and aggression to multiply.

Israel has helped bring law and order, as well as justice, in the highest biblical prophetic sense, to her region. The Israelis merit our support. We should emulate their conduct. They are fair, compassionate, generous, but take no foolishness when their nation is jeopardized. We could all learn something from the people who gave God's law to the world.

I would like to end on a personal note. During World War II, I served in the infantry in the Battle of the Bulge. It was my fate to be captured by the Nazis. I know very well the barbarity and enormity of the Nazi's crimes against the Jews and against all humanity.

It seemed to me in May too cruel a prospect that the survivors of Hitler's Europe should have created an island of freedom in the Middle East only to face a new Nazism from the Arabs and their Communist supporters. When the Arabs began closing in to liquidate Israel, I could not help but think back to that tragic period of 1944–45, when I was in a Nazi prison camp.

The Israelis delivered themselves. They also helped to deliver us. The people of Israel drew great encouragement from the support of Americans of Jewish faith and from many other Americans.

I felt great personal satisfaction when the Israelis triumphed. At least one recent chapter in Jewish history must have a happy ending.

But this victory left me convinced that Israel cannot depend on promises. Israel is alive because of her own courage and careful planning.

Accordingly, we . . . you and I and all men of good will . . . must emulate the Israelis and have the courage to speak out for a peace in the Middle East based on a plan of action. We must reject appeasement. We must use all our influence to stiffen the backbone of our own Government. We must tell the Arabs and their Communist comrades, "Thus far and no further."

The enemies of freedom are united and act in concert. Let us unite for the sake of both Israel and America.

Thank you.

The National Rehabilitation Association Celebrates Its 42d Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 11, 1967

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, on October 2 it was my privilege to address the opening session of the National Rehabilitation Association's annual meeting in Cleveland, Ohio.

The National Rehabilitation Association is the social action agency and professional organization that brings together all the workers in the field of vocational rehabilitation—counselors, physicians, workshop specialists, State directors of the public vocational rehabilitation program, and representatives of many private and voluntary groups.

The association was founded in Cleveland, Ohio, on October 1, 1925, when a constitution was adopted on motion of R. I. Bynum, of Tennessee, seconded by Marlow Perrin, of Ohio. Oscar Sullivan, of Minnesota, had chaired the constitutional committee. W. F. Faulke, of Wisconsin, was elected the first president. The organization, known as the National Civilian Rehabilitation Conference, had existed 2 years as a division of the American Society for Vocational Education.

Forty-two years later, the NRA celebrated its founding at its annual meeting in the same hotel in Cleveland on October 2–4, 1967. There were 89 charter members in 1925. In 1967, the total membership is over 28,000 and more than 2,000 attended this conference.

A particularly welcomed innovation at this year's meeting was a most skillful interpreter for the deaf, who translated for the deaf at all sessions. This was dramatic and inspiring for all those interested in the deaf.

Among the highlights of the opening session of the conference was a tribute to our late beloved colleague, John E. Fogarty, delivered by Miss Mary E. Switzer, Administrator of the Social and Rehabilitation Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

I include Miss Switzer's tribute to Mr. Fogarty, her introduction of the Honorable John W. Gardner, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and Secretary Gardner's remarks at this point in the RECORD:

Tribute to John Fogarty

The rehabilitation family will always mourn John Fogarty. It is particularly fitting this morning as we pay our tribute to him that we do so in the presence of his great friend, Congressman Hugh Carey, who in his own person and career typifies what John Fogarty believed was the role of a Member of Congress. Hugh Carey has the same qualities of compassion, enthusiasm, and faith that makes us miss John Fogarty so much.

Although the acute pain that followed his death last January is becoming muted, the sense of loss deepens and grows day by day. That we feel this so keenly is testimony to the immortality of the influence of John Fogarty.

He means something very special to rehabilitation. He was himself a rehabilitant, and perhaps because of this fact, was extraordinarily sensitive to people who had disabilities which rehabilitation was not reaching. He spearheaded the drive for the rehabilitation of the retarded, inspired by the spectacle of the children of friends who would have no future unless the rehabilitation door opened wide. He did the same thing for the deaf, and was one of the sponsors of the legislation which established the National Technical Institute for the Deaf and the Model Secondary School for the Deaf. He would have been in the front line of support for this year's legislation—especially the authorization for the Center for the Deaf-Blind—as he was in all of our significant legislation since he came to the Congress.

The many eulogies spoken and written after his death have given wide recognition to his great influence in providing for the advance of the health research programs and all the humanitarian objectives of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. But the VRA family throughout the country has always felt a personal affection and devotion to this rare Irishman who always seemed to be a "friend in need" to the person in most trouble. He had the warm heart and generous quality that we associate with an Irishman. He had the love of life and the enjoyment of it that is characteristic, too, of the Irish. He had a wonderful sense of fun, and a deep seriousness of purpose and of commitment.

The Vocational Rehabilitation Administration owes him its life, for long, long ago in the early 1950's, it was his skill, when he was a ranking minority member of the Appropriations Subcommittee, that saved our program by one vote. Since then, he has stimulated almost all of the special emphases that have resulted in the broad mosaic of the rehabilitation program throughout the country.

John Fogarty was first elected to Congress in 1940 and re-elected two years later. He resigned at the end of his second term to enlist in the Seabees, where he served throughout the war. After the war, he was elected again, and in 1947 was assigned to the House Appropriations Committee, Subcommittee on Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare. In 1949, he became Chairman of the Subcommittee, and except for one session, when he was the Minority Leader on the Subcommittee, he retained the Chairmanship until his death. In that position, he influenced every program that came before the committee.

His broad humanitarian interests, his ability to see into the future, and to provide the resources to meet the country's needs had been taken for granted before his death. As we express our inner gratitude for the significant groundwork he laid during his lifetime for the development of the health and welfare programs of the country, we should consider, too, the difficulties with which he was confronted because of the setting in which he accomplished his remarkable achievements. It is not always easy to secure the passage of constructive legislation.

A member of the Appropriations Committee—and particularly a chairman of an important subcommittee, such as the one for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, which Mr. Fogarty headed—has to consider the extent of his support in the light of many difficult, almost impossible alternatives. He has to be cognizant of the economic condition of the country, of the fiscal policies of the nation, of the demands upon the national budget and the treasury—and he has to do all these things objectively, and with wise concern for the broad interest of our people within a framework of sensible economics.

Mr. Fogarty had a quality all too rare in the world today—a quality of integrity which made him objective, honorable, and fine in his dealings with all of us. No matter how much he liked an official personally, or believed in the program which that official represented, he was never diverted from seeking the pertinent facts, and making the probing inquiry, which assured that his committee had the information necessary to make a sound judgment. This quality of courage and character is an indispensable ingredient in the responsible promotion of the kind of programs for which we owe so much to John Fogarty. His deep humanity—his broad look on the world horizon—these are infinitely more precious because he had the integrity and inner spirit to honestly pursue his responsibilities.

He received scores of awards from a wide variety of organizations—public and private, local, national, and international, but the one that means most to this Association is the President's Award, which was given to him in 1958. This award, which is given by the rehabilitation workers of the country through their organization, is the highest recognition that they can give to the one who shares their concern for the disabled men, women, and children of this country.

William James once said "The purpose of life is to spend it for something that outlives you." John Fogarty will be with us always because his contributions in the field of health and rehabilitation will continue to reach out and stimulate more and better services to all Americans for years to come.

Introduction of Honorable John W. Gardner

It has been my privilege to present to the annual meetings of the National Rehabilitation Association almost all of our Secretaries of Health, Education, and Welfare. The first Secretary was Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby in Miami in 1951—now almost a lifetime ago. Each Secretary has made distinctive contribution to the development of the Department, and it is an especially happy occasion to be here in Cleveland where our former Secretary, Judge Celebrezze, has contributed so much to everything we have been working for over many years.

Our present Secretary, John W. Gardner, is the right man, in the right place, at the right time. What he brings to his task is a unique quality of leadership growing out of years of exposure to the vast American scene in education, health, and welfare. As a prominent Foundation executive—President of the Carnegie Corporation as well as the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, he had an excellent opportunity to observe where the leaders of our country are and where the young leaders of tomorrow can be found. He came to the Department with a commitment to its purpose, and to organize its programs so that they would be more responsive to the needs of our people over the country.

He has the capacity to make all of us strive to be as good as he thinks we are and can be. He has been a strong personal supporter of me, and a stalwart believer in the rehabilitation movement, which he calls the "Maritime Corps" of our Service. I take pride and pleasure in presenting to you the Honorable Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare—John W. Gardner.

REMARKS BY JOHN W. GARDNER, SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

I want to talk to you today about the recent reorganization in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

This is a time of transition and change in the field of rehabilitation, as in all fields relating to human welfare. I hope you will see the reorganization as an opportunity for growth and for strengthening the public-private partnership that has chalked up such remarkable accomplishments in such a short period of time.

When I am asked to give the reasoning back of the recent merging of three major agencies in my Department, I begin with the basic reason for all reorganization. We owe it to the taxpayers to organize ourselves in such a way that the public business may be efficiently done. We owe it to our professional constituencies and to the people finally benefited by our programs to eliminate unworkable arrangements. It is our duty to make the government manageable.

Poor organization, duplication, cross-purposes and confusion are a source of frustration to good workers and an obstacle to the accomplishment of good purposes.

That this Department has in the past not been efficiently organized is a matter of general knowledge. We have to do better.

And even if the Department had been ideally organized in the past, it would have to be reshaped periodically. Vital programs grow and change.

Whenever a reorganization is proposed, some people object because they have become inseparably attached to old arrangements. Those of you who know my writings know how strongly I advise against such attachments. Put your faith in ideas, ideals, movements, goals. Don't put your faith in organizational forms. Human beings are forever building the church and killing the creed. They give such loving attention to organizational forms that the spirit is imprisoned.

Now as to the specific reasons for reorganization. First, there was strong professional opinion in the welfare field that determination of income eligibility should be separated from provision of services. We have accomplished this separation. The social services that were once all grouped together under Welfare are now assigned to appropriate parts of the new agency. When you see that this puts services to the blind and the disabled in the rehabilitation agency, I think you will sense the logic of the new arrangement.

Another purpose in the reorganization—and a purpose that should interest you considerably—was to place the concept of rehabilitation at the very heart of the new agency. For at least four years now, there has been an increasing emphasis on the idea of rehabilitation in social welfare fields. So this is not a new trend—but I hope that our action will strengthen the trend.

Rehabilitation has taught us much that we are now trying to apply in all the fields of health and welfare. Rehabilitation workers have long recognized that theirs was not a simple, one-step operation. Rebuilding broken lives and bodies requires the knowledge of many disciplines, the work of many hands. Over the years, rehabilitation has built strong alliances with all the professional and voluntary groups which can contribute to the shared goal.

One of the essential elements in the rehabilitation process is finding the right job for the disabled individual and helping him adjust to that job. With the increasing emphasis on training and jobs for welfare recipients, rehabilitation has something special to offer in the field of work analysis and evaluation.

People who work in rehabilitation also know that results are seldom obtained overnight. It takes patient, long-term care to teach a deaf child to speak, a cripple to walk, or to make the mentally retarded self-sufficient.

I believe we can extend the principles and techniques of rehabilitation to many more people in trouble. We can salvage many more lives. We can help restore a sense of belonging to those outside the mainstream of society—the people in urban ghettoes and rural slums, the needy and disadvantaged.

We hope the new organization will give us the tools to do the job.

At the same time, we will continue to emphasize services for special groups—the aged, the handicapped, and children. But the problems of these groups tend to overlap, and so do the groups themselves. The talents and skills required to deal with them, while specialized in some respects, are similar in others.

Trouble for an individual or a family often results from a combination of related problems. Disability and dependency, for example, usually go hand in hand. The solution requires a number of approaches. We want to encourage a unified approach to the problems, with special emphasis on the family. We believe that the new Social and Rehabilitation Service can make this possible and that each of its parts can draw on the strengths of the others so they can be mutually reinforcing.

A word about the separation of cash payments from our programs of service.

We are wasteful of the skills of people trained to provide social services when we require them to spend time in processing welfare cases or in determining eligibility. Our manpower supply is too limited to draw them away from the job for which they were trained and which so desperately needs doing.

Moreover, social services are designed to enhance the quality of life. They aren't necessarily related to income or to income maintenance. People from all walks of life may need emergency help in running a home when the mother is sick or disabled. They may need a companion for an aged parent. They may need counseling or other assistance when family problems interfere with a child's learning.

These services should be universally available and freely accessible.

Yet many people who might otherwise use social services shun them because they are associated with public assistance. On the other hand, social services cannot be really effective when they are linked to financial aid and are viewed as a condition for such aid.

In short, separating the two functions is designed to make the entire process more simple, efficient, and dignified on the one hand, and on the other to free scarce manpower to provide services to those who need them.

Some people have expressed reservations about one aspect of the reorganization—the merging of the crippled children's, mental retardation, and vocational rehabilitation programs. Although they see merit in bringing together services for special groups they feel that the new alignment does violence to the principle of dealing with the "whole child;" that it fragments rather than strengthens our efforts for children.

Let me say first that fragmentation is an ailment that can't be cured by the organization chart. There aren't boxes on the chart big enough to hold all the pieces. Programs that significantly affect the lives of children are conducted in every HEW agency and in several other units of the Federal Government. They always will be. The same is true of programs at the State and local level.

In short, we can never put *all* the activities concerned with children in the same box on the chart. We must group together activities that seem to belong together and then make provision for coordination among the various groupings. This we have done.

In the long run the cure for fragmentation is an ability to see the whole problem, a willingness to work together and to subordinate one's personal interest in favor of the larger goal.

Handicapped children have some very special problems. They need specialized medical attention, in some cases throughout their lives. They may have to undergo long periods of rehabilitation. They and their families may need a variety of social services. They often have to attend special classes. All of these needs can be met in a more efficient, more coordinated way if they are dealt with in a single unit.

We believe that through the new organization we can—provide services to children and youth with a far broader range of disabilities;

Accomplish early identification of handicapping conditions and supply prompt care to prevent a lifetime of disability;

Provide more and better services for the teen-age handicapped, whose problems have been relatively neglected; and

Make better use of limited resources to avoid duplication.

The reorganization should also strengthen our program for the aging.

I know that more older people are benefiting from rehabilitation services, and I applaud this trend. Last year about 46,000 people aged 45 and over were rehabilitated for gainful work out of a total number of close to 175,000—about one-fourth of the total.

But the number of older people in our population is increasing. And in my opinion, we have barely begun to think constructively about the so-called retirement years.

Many people who have reached those years may never be able to return to the world of competitive work. Yet they might continue to be productive in a sheltered environment. We need to provide for such people—perhaps through an expanded sheltered workshop program—for as long as their interest and ability lasts.

Let me give you just one more example where inter-agency cooperation is essential—rehabilitation for handicapped people who file disability claims under the social security program.

When the first social security disability legislation was enacted in 1954, Congress made it unmistakably clear that workers should not only have the security of a regular income when they become disabled but should also be helped to return to work. The legislation contained incentives to rehabilitation while retaining the cash benefits for disabled workers. These provisions have been reinforced and expanded over the last decade, culminating in an even more explicit authorization in 1965 to use money from the disability trust fund to finance the rehabilitation of beneficiaries.

This program can work only if it is a unified effort. Neither the disabled workers nor society will get full value from the program if the payments of benefits and the restorative services represent two separate, independent operations.

This is an area that deserves increasing attention if we are to help more people move from dependency to self-sufficiency.

Finally, I believe it is time for the rehabilitation community to direct more of its thinking to the family. If we are to improve the conditions in which a handicapped person lives, we should be addressing ourselves to his entire family unit, and even to environmental circumstances that extend beyond the family. Those of you who have been working with juvenile delinquents know how important those circumstances can be.

The home environment represents stability and inspiration for some, a place of conflict and frustration for others, and for some, of course, home or family life are nonexistent.

Much of the current effort in rehabilitation is focused on the individual and his disability. If our approach is family centered, and if it takes into account the environment in which rehabilitation must occur, we may be more successful in rehabilitating the handicapped person himself; we may help transform disorganized and distraught families into units of strength and purpose; and we may succeed in building the foundation for a stronger and sounder social order.

I have no illusions about the difficulty of this task. It amounts to asking the rehabilitation workers of this country to extend the concept of rehabilitation, so that it embraces millions of people instead of thousands; to relate itself to some of our massive social problems; and within this larger framework, to maintain the kind of excellence which has marked the emergence of modern rehabilitation programs for the handicapped.

I don't suppose there are many people who have had more varied first-hand contact with all of the so-called helping professions than I have. And I can tell you that of all those fields, none rivals your own in ardent commitment to the possibility of human betterment. You have a never-say-die spirit in these matters that should stand as an example for everyone.

I could point out fields of social effort in which many practitioners are rather easily discouraged about the possibility of human betterment. And of course such people retreat quite readily to goals that are no higher than custodial care or maintenance. In contrast you honor the human spirit by believing that it is equal to truly formidable tasks. And your faith helps it to accomplish those tasks.

This seems to me to exemplify the very best and deepest belief we hold as Americans: the conviction that every person is of value.

I cannot close without a tribute to the distinguished Administrator of the new Social and Rehabilitation Service, Mary Switzer. Mary is inclined to attribute her success to her long bureaucratic experience, and that is certainly an ingredient. She is a pro, if ever there was one. But there are plenty of old pros who use their skill and experience to block progress rather than advance it, so you have to look further to explain Mary's effectiveness.

I have often said that when a top executive is selecting his key associates, there are only two qualities for which he should be willing to pay almost any price—taste and judgment. Almost everything else can be bought by the yard. Mary has both those qualities in high degree.

But even more important, she has the qualities that bring the world alive—zest, enthusiasm, and spirit.

She has taken on an immensely difficult assignment. She has the largest operational responsibility of any woman in government. If you will give her your support and help she will make history for all of us.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 12, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. D. Kirkland West, First Presbyterian Church, Medford, Oreg., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, we invoke Thy blessing on America, especially upon those who lead, that, ruled by Thy spirit, they may have the moral courage and wisdom to stand for the right and resist that which is wrong. May our liberties, bought with blood and sacrifice by our fathers, not be eroded by the selfishness or neglect of us their sons. May this land, discovered and settled by men of stamina and conviction, be so advanced in its spiritual and political heritage that the words, "This Nation, under God, with liberty and justice for all" may not mock our high idealism by our shallow performance.

With gratitude for help in the past and dedication to the tasks of the future we implore Thy help and guidance. In Jesus name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 10345. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 10345) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes," request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. McGEE, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mrs. SMITH, Mr. HRUSKA, and Mr. COTTON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1084. An act to amend section 3620 of the Revised Statutes with respect to payroll deductions for Federal employees; and

S. 1085. An act to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to modernize the loan and dividend provisions.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION APPROPRIATIONS, 1968—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BOLAND submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 11456) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

TRIBUTE TO REV. D. KIRKLAND WEST

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, I should like to state my deep personal pleasure at having had the invocation this morning delivered by Dr. D. Kirkland West, of Medford, Oreg., my hometown.

Dr. West was the minister for some 17 years in the Presbyterian church in which my family and I worshiped for some 10 years. He has been throughout this time a powerful influence in our city and in all of southwestern Oregon for good in the finest and deepest sense of the word.

A man of God in his daily action as well as in word, it has been and is a great pleasure for me to call Kirk West my friend. I am grateful for the opportunity to have had him in the House today, calling all of us to turn to our eternal Lord for sustenance, guidance and strength to make our own actions match our thoughts and our words.

JOINT EFFORT OF PRIVATE INDUSTRY AND GOVERNMENT IN JOB-TRAINING PROGRAMS

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, a newspaper known for its conservative scrutiny of Federal initiatives, has added its editorial voice to those of responsible commentators across the country in commending President Johnson for his recently announced $40 million plan to get private industry involved in job-training programs in urban slums.

As the President has said, this plan will benefit:

> The forgotten and the neglected—those citizens handicapped by poor health, hampered by years of discrimination and bypassed by conventional training programs.

Mr. Speaker, I know all of us wish this new endeavor much success. With the President fully committed to it, and with the application of the marvelous resources of talent and energy possessed by private industry, I think we can look forward to excellent results.

I know my colleagues will be interested to read the Globe-Democrat editorial on this fine new program. It follows:

NEW POVERTY WAR BARRAGE

It isn't the answer to the poor man's prayers, but President Johnson's proposal for a joint effort of private industry and the federal government in finding jobs for and training of thousands of hard-core unemployed seems better than his past barrages in the war on poverty.

Calling on private industry to bring its resources to bear on "a critical national problem," the President has suggested a nationwide effort, backed by $40 million in federal funds, to help train "the forgotten and the neglected—those citizens handicapped by poor health, hampered by years of discrimination and bypassed by conventional training programs."

In many respects this is a creditable idea. Those, who are willing to work but lack certain basic skills and therefore find it more difficult to get a job, should be helped to the fullest extent possible. And the logical ones to train them are the men in private industry who know what they're doing, not textbook theorists who have never practiced what they preach.

As to financing the program, the estimated $40 million expenditure could easily be diverted from some of the vast anti-poverty programs already in existence. It might even supplant some of those multi-billion dollar social experiments if it proved a superior performer in value received.

The potential dangers to the proposal seem to lie in its implementation. If attempted on too high an idealistic plane it is likely to fail. Needed is a practical approach which recognizes that some of the hard-core unemployed are that way by choice, finding it more to their liking to live on public welfare, and that some "bypassed by conventional training programs" have gone out of their way to avoid them.

THE PRESIDENT'S SURCHARGE PROPOSAL IS GOOD ECONOMICS

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's proposed surcharge tax proposal is beginning to get the full and open debate in the Congress which such a serious economic policy merits.

And before charge and countercharge obscure forever the true nature of the President's tax proposal, I would like to call attention to what it is, and what it is not, as I see it.

First and foremost, the 10-percent surcharge is not a tax on total income, but a tax on income liability, and thus much less severe. It is really a 1 percent tax.

Second, it would cost nothing to those 16 million Americans with incomes of $5,000 a year or less.

Third, it would cost most Americans only a few dollars a month.

Fourth, it is temporary and can and will be removed when no longer needed. This may be wishful thinking, but we have seen tax reduction during this administration.

Fifth, it will help stem inflation, halt rising prices, prevent a tight-money market, and avoid new hardships on those living on fixed incomes.

Each day we do not enact this measure, the Federal Government loses millions of dollars, the national deficit becomes larger, the fear psychology of runaway inflation gains momentum, and some 80 months of sustained prosperity are threatened.

The President is saying it. Objective economists bankers and businessmen are saying it. More Members of the Congress are saying it. If a tax is not enacted this session, the consequences of such inaction will be much more injurious to the Nation than this very small tax increase.

The need for the tax will not go away. It will not be chased away by incantations of "cut the budget." It must and will be faced, and it is going to be a test of congressional responsibility. We do need to cut the budget and reduce spending and appropriations. But we also need this surtax. We need both, Mr. Speaker.

Speaking for no one but myself, I say that I intend to vote for the President's surcharge tax proposal because I believe it is sound and proper, and because modern government must have the power to restrain the economy as well as pump prime it. It is not an easy or pleasant thing to recommend any kind of tax—but the alternative is more unpleasant to ponder.

CONSIDERATION OF CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on Wednesday next, October 18, to bring to the House the continuing resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

STATUS OF THE APPROPRIATIONS BILLS

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I think it would be well to say a few things about appropriations and spending. There is a great deal of interest in this subject—and properly so.

Five of the 15 regular appropriation bills have been enacted and cleared to the President. They are Interior, Treasury-Post Office, Defense, legislative, and Agriculture. The agriculture bill has not yet been signed by the President.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] just filed a conference report on the Transportation Agency a few minutes ago. We agreed on it in conference yesterday.

We met in conference this morning on the public works appropriation bill. There is every hope that we will be able to bring the conference report in next week.

Earlier this week we were in conference on the Independent Offices-HUD bill, and on the space program, NASA bill. We made considerable progress. I would say, and it looks like we should be able to conclude those next week.

Mr. Speaker, the appropriation bill for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the judiciary has now passed the other body; we are ready for conference on that bill.

As you know, the appropriation bill for the Departments of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare was recommitted several days ago. We hope to confer on that next week.

It is noteworthy that all of the appropriation bills which have passed the House have also passed the other body, with the exception of the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

This would leave for our consideration, when authorizations therefor are provided, the military construction bill, the foreign assistance bill, and the final supplemental bill which will probably carry funds for the poverty program as well as certain other programs. They have yet to be reported to the House.

I would like to report to the House, if Members wish to recite something of what they are doing to try to achieve economy, that they can tell constituency that this House will, in my opinion, vote to reduce appropriation requests below the President's budget for fiscal 1968 by something close to $6 billion, instead of the $5 billion figure mentioned on several previous occasions. We are moving toward such a $6 billion figure.

We have been holding meetings in conference, and as a result thereof it has been very difficult for the committee to do anything about recisions, postponements, and deferrals when we are constantly in session on these other matters. Yet we have put in some "Saturday" time on this problem and we shall do our best along this line. However, our major contribution toward economy will be in the appropriation bills.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are going to try to recommend some further steps next week toward greater economy. While, as I say, the greatest economies which we shall be able to make will be in connection with the several appropriation bills which we have either already considered or will in a short time be considering, we will nevertheless have further economy proposals to submit to you next week.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD summary tabulations showing more precise information on the appropriation totals.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The tabulations follow:

COMPARATIVE SUMMARY OF APPROPRIATION BILL TOTALS, 90TH CONG., 1ST SESS., AS OF OCT. 12, 1967

Does not include any "back-door" type appropriations, or permanent appropriations [1] under previous legislation. Does include indefinite appropriations carried in annual appropriation bills. All figures are rounded amounts.]

	Bills for fiscal 1967	Bills for fiscal 1968	Bills for the session
A. House actions:			
1. Budget requests for appropriations considered	$14,411,000,000	[2,3] $124,163,000,000	$138,574,000,000
2. Amounts in 14 bills passed by House	14,238,000,000	[2,3] 120,347,000,000	134,585,000,000
3. Change from corresponding budget requests	−173,000,000	−3,816,000,000	−3,989,000,000
B. Senate actions:			
1. Budget requests for appropriations considered	14,533,000,000	[2,3] 124,234,000,000	138,767,000,000
2. Amounts in 13 bills passed by Senate	14,457,000,000	[2,3] 123,374,000,000	137,831,000,000
3. Change from corresponding budget requests	−76,000,000	−860,000,000	−936,000,000
4. Compared with House amounts in these 13 bills	+219,000,000	+3,134,000,000	+3,353,000,000
C. Final actions:			
1. Budget requests for appropriations considered	14,533,000,000	[3] 85,955,000,000	100,488,000,000
2. Amounts approved in 7 bills enacted	14,394,000,000	[3] 84,094,000,000	98,488,000,000
3. Comparison with corresponding budget requests	−139,000,000	−1,861,000,000	−2,000,000,000

[1] Permanent appropriations were tentatively estimated in January budget at about $15,212,066,000 for fiscal year 1968.

[2] Includes advance funding for fiscal 1969 for urban renewal and mass transit grants (budget, $980,000,000; House bill, $925,000,000; Senate bill, $955,000,000) and for grants-in-aid for airports (budget, $75,000,000; House bill, $65,000,000; Senate bill, $75,000,000).

[3] And participation sales authorizations as follows: Total authorizations requested in budget, $4,300,000,000; total in House bills, $1,946,000,000; total in Senate bills, $4,085,000,000; total enacted, $750,000,000.

SUMMARY OF ACTION ON BUDGET ESTIMATES OF APPROPRIATIONS IN APPROPRIATION BILLS, 90TH CONG., 1ST SESS., AS OF OCT. 12, 1967

[Does not include any "back door" type appropriations, or permanent appropriations [1] under previous legislation. Does include indefinite appropriations carried in annual appropriation bills]

	Budget estimates considered by House	Passed House	Budget estimates considered by Senate	Passed Senate	Enacted	(+) or (−), latest action compared to budget
Bills for fiscal 1968:						
Treasury-Post Office	$7,613,787,000	$7,499,230,000	$7,615,148,000	$7,555,167,000	$7,545,641,000	−$69,507,000
District of Columbia:						
Federal payments	63,499,000	59,499,000	----------	----------	----------	−4,000,000
Federal loan appropriation	49,600,000	48,100,000	----------	----------	----------	−1,500,000
Interior	1,443,793,000	1,365,310,150	1,458,218,000	1,399,359,550	1,382,848,350	−75,369,650
Loan and contract authorizations	(30,700,000)	(16,200,000)	(30,700,000)	(16,200,000)	(16,200,000)	(−14,500,000)
Independent Offices-HUD	[2,3] 10,804,642,700	[2,3] 10,013,178,782	[2,3] 10,820,513,700	[2,3] 10,514,830,900	----------	−305,682,800
Contract authorization	(40,000,000)	----------	(40,000,000)	(40,000,000)	----------	----------
Labor-HEW	[3] 13,322,603,000	[3] 13,137,488,000	[3] 13,424,146,000	13,421,660,000	----------	−2,486,000
State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary	[3] 2,342,942,000	[3] 2,194,026,500	[3] 2,347,803,195	[3] 2,186,105,500	----------	−161,697,695
Legislative	231,311,132	228,089,952	276,005,210	275,885,804	275,699,035	−306,175
Agriculture	[3] 5,021,097,400	[3] 4,770,580,950	[3] 5,021,097,400	[3] 6,782,529,789	[3] 4,952,945,700	−68,151,700
Loan authorization	(859,600,000)	(859,600,000)	(859,600,000)	(909,000,000)	(859,600,000)	----------
Defense	71,584,000,000	70,295,200,000	71,584,000,000	70,132,320,000	69,936,620,000	−1,647,380,000
Transportation	[4] 1,718,618,772	[4] 1,530,198,372	[4] 1,718,618,772	[4] 1,651,407,272	----------	−67,211,500
Public works	4,867,813,000	4,622,922,000	4,867,813,000	4,776,064,000	----------	−91,749,000
NASA	5,100,000,000	4,583,400,000	5,100,000,000	4,678,900,000	----------	−421,100,000
Military construction	[5] (2,937,000,000)	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
Foreign assistance	[5] (3,818,736,000)	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
Supplemental (poverty, other deferred items; usual supplementals)	[5] (2,284,949,000)	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
Subtotal, 1968 bills	124,163,707,004	120,347,223,706	124,233,363,277	123,374,229,815	84,093,754,085	−2,916,141,520
Bills for fiscal 1967:						
Defense supplemental (Vietnam)	12,275,870,000	12,196,520,000	12,275,870,000	12,196,520,000	12,196,520,000	−79,350,000
2d supplemental	2,134,932,833	2,041,826,133	2,257,604,652	2,260,246,933	2,197,931,417	−59,673,235
Subtotal, 1967 bills	14,410,802,833	14,238,346,133	14,533,474,652	14,456,766,933	14,394,451,417	−139,023,235
Cumulative appropriation totals for the session:						
House (14 bills)	138,574,509,837	134,585,569,839	----------	----------	----------	−3,988,939,998
Senate (13 bills)	----------	----------	138,766,837,929	137,830,996,748	----------	−935,841,181
Enacted (7 bills)	----------	----------	100,487,943,262	----------	98,488,205,502	−1,999,737,760

[1] Permanent appropriations were tentatively estimated in January budget at about $15,212,066,000 for fiscal year 1968. (All forms of permanent new obligational authority for 1968 were tentatively estimated in the January budget at $17,452,899,000.)

[2] Includes advance funding for fiscal 1969 for urban renewal and mass transit grants (budget, $980,000,000; House bill, $925,000,000; Senate bill, $955,000,000).

[3] And participation sales authorizations as follows: Independent Offices—HUD, $3,235,000,000 in budget estimates, $881,000,000 in House bill and $3,235,000,000 in Senate bill; Labor—HEW, $115,000,000 in budget estimates and House bill; State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary, $150,000,000 in budget estimates, House bill and Senate bill; Agriculture, $800,000,000 in budget estimates and House bill, $700,000,000 in Senate bill; $750,000,000 enacted. Total authorizations requested in budget, $4,300,000,000: total in House bills, $1,946,000,000; total in Senate bills, $4,085,000,000; total enacted, $750,000,000.

[4] Includes advance funding for fiscal 1969 for grants-in-aid for airports (budget $75,000,000; House bill, $65,000,000; Senate bill, $75,000,000).

[5] These are the amounts presently pending consideration in the committee.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and the members of the Committee on Appropriations, for moving in the last 10 days or so with much greater speed in trying to achieve final results on these various appropriation bills. I applaud this action.

Mr. MAHON. Let me say to the gentleman that we had moved much earlier in the session, along in the March–June period. Our schedule was to bring all the bills to the House before the end of the fiscal year on June 30 last. The reason we have been able to move more rapidly in the last couple of weeks is due to the fact that the other body has been passing these bills. There has been no change in our pace except that change which has been made possible by the actions of the other body.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Texas will yield further, I am cognizant of the fact that the other body has been somewhat slow in the consideration of the various appropriation bills. However, now that they have acted more rapidly, I reaffirm what I said a minute ago—that the various conferences between the House and the other body's conferees have been held I would say much more quickly than might have been otherwise if there had not been the pressure from the House to get some affirmative action on appropriation bills.

Also, I think that the House of Representatives has done a good job in reducing the obligational authority provided for in these various bills below the President's budget. I, certainly, wholeheartedly agree with the reductions estimated to approximate $6 billion which have been mentioned by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

I hope that before this session adjourns that we may even go beyond the figure, $6 billion, cited by the gentleman from Texas. The gentleman knows as well as I that a reduction of $6 billion in obligational authority in appropriation bills does not automatically mean that there will be a comparable reduction in anticipated expenditures during the current fiscal year.

Mr. MAHON. But if the gentleman will permit, it does mean there will be a reduction of that amount in expenditures in time, this year, or in succeeding years. A dollar not appropriated is a dollar that cannot be expended.

I would like to point out to the House that, while we are pointing to the magnitude of the reductions in the appropriation requests, that this can—partially, or even wholly—be offset by legislation otherwise that increases rather than decreases demands on the Treasury. We are going to have to subtract from the savings in appropriations the amount that was approved yesterday in the House for additional pay for various Government workers beyond the administration recommendations. That applied not only to the current fiscal 1968, but reached on into future years, and will total, of course, many billions of dollars over time.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Will the gentleman from Texas yield further?

Mr. MAHON. I yield further to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The statement just made by the gentleman from Texas is absolutely accurate and, as the gentleman knows, I as well as he voted to hold the lid on expenditures as the gentleman indicated would be reflected in the pay bill that was approved by the House.

It seems to me that the action taken by the House in the last several weeks, particularly, is having a salutary impact on the various conferences which are being held on the various appropriation bills.

So, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the distinguished chairman, when he meets in conferences that are coming up on appropriation bills, will simply let our colleagues on the other side of the Capitol know that a majority of the Members of the House not only mean business on obligational authority, but also on spending.

Mr. MAHON. I would say to the gentleman that we are not wholly inexperienced in dealing with the other body, and letting the other body know our views. But the comments of the gentleman from Michigan are appreciated.

Of course I would add, Mr. Speaker, so that we may keep the matter of economy and reductions in perspective, that of the approximately $6 billion that we hope to cut from the appropriation requests, $3.816 billion was cut by the House in the several bills not in the last several weeks but in the last several months. Those cuts were made weeks and months before we had the recent economy outbreak. The members of the Appropriations Committee have been in the economy business for many months. And the remainder of the approximate $6 billion or so likely total cut would come—as we have expected right along and as I have indicated a number of times on the floor—from the remaining approximately $9 billion of appropriation requests still pending in the Committee on Appropriations awaiting the legislative authorization bills.

But to repeat, the $3.816 billion reduction thus far made by the House was made long ago. For example:

The Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill passed the House on March 22. It was $114,557,000 below the budget estimates.

The District of Columbia appropriation bill, which passed the House on April 18, was $5,500,000 below the budget estimates.

The Interior and related agencies appropriation bill passed the House on April 27; it was $78,482,850 below the budget estimates for new appropriations and $14,500,000 below the budget estimates for loan and contract authorizations.

The independent offices and Housing and Urban Development appropriation bill passed by the House on May 17, and was $791,463,918 below the budget estimates for new appropriations and $40,000,000 below the budget for contract authorization.

The Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill passed the House on May 25. It was $185,115,000 below the budget requests for appropriations.

The State, Justice, Commerce, and judiciary appropriation bill passed the House on May 31. It was $148,915,500 below the budget requests for appropriations.

The legislative branch appropriation bill passed the House on June 1. It was $3,221,180 below the budget requests for appropriations.

The Agriculture appropriation bill passed the House on June 6, and was $250,516,450 below the budget requests for appropriations.

The Defense appropriation bill passed the House on June 13. It was $1,288,800,000 below the budget requests for appropriations.

The Transportation appropriation bill passed the House on July 18, being $188,420,400 below the budget requests for appropriations.

The public works appropriation bill passed the House on July 25. It was $244,891,000 below the budget estimates for appropriations.

The NASA appropriation bill passed the House on August 22, and was $516,600,000 below the budget requests for appropriations.

These reductions add to $3,816,483,298 in new appropriations and $54,500,000 in loan and contract authorizations.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi, the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the distinguished chairman this question:

May some of us draw a conclusion, hopefully from this colloquy, that now that these money bills are being expedited, and with a tax bill apparently being dead, that maybe somewhere before the snow flies early in November we might look for a final adjournment of this Congress?

I wonder if the gentleman would care to express an opinion about that?

Mr. MAHON. I would yield to the majority leader if he wishes to make a comment on that. I do not feel authorized to talk about the tax bill or about adjournment at this time. But I have understood that probably the poverty authorization bill may be many weeks away. I do not know. And there has been no agreement on the authorization bill for foreign aid. So we are not out of the woods yet, but we are seeing a little light through the clearing, I would say.

Mr. COLMER. If I may comment just briefly on that: It might be a good idea to permit this poverty program and some more of these spending programs to remain out in the woods for some distance in order that we might get our fiscal affairs in better shape.

I am just hoping—as I am sure many Members of this Congress are—that we can see the end somewhere in sight to this rather long and apparently unnecessary lengthening of the session of Congress.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LAIRD. I would just like to say in response to the gentleman from Mississippi that if we continue funding the poverty program on the basis of a continuing resolution, as we are now funding it, we are expending at a higher rate than we will expend under a regular appropriation for the poverty program.

The Committee on Appropriations has not even started its hearings on the poverty program for the fiscal year 1968. The continuing resolution under which the OEO is operating today is funding that program at a much higher level than, I am sure, will be approved by the House of Representatives when the appropriation bill comes up for the Office of Economic Opportunity.

So it is to our advantage to get this thing out on the floor to start our appropriation hearings as soon as that authorization is through, perhaps in 3 weeks, and start our hearings on the appropriation for the OEO so that we can get away from this operation under a continuing basis, which gives the OEO much more money than it would have under the regular appropriation bill.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the appropriation last year for the poverty program, which is the applicable rate under the continuing resolution, was about $1.6 billion. The budget estimate is $2,060,000,000. So while I do not dispute what the gentleman from Wisconsin says, I would like to say that I do not see how the current spending rate could be higher than the rate of last year.

Mr. LAIRD. I would just like to say to the gentleman from Texas that the feeling of this House right now, as far as the poverty program and the operations of the OEO, as it has been demonstrated by two separate votes, I can assure the gentleman from Texas that with his cooperation we can reduce that spending level by at least $400 million.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CRAMER. Can the distinguished chairman indicate what the spending level will be for highway beautification under the continuing resolution which has not been yet authorized for the fiscal year 1968?

Mr. MAHON. That has not come before us yet. Unobligated balances remain from appropriations made in previous years. There is an authorization bill pending, as I understand, but it has not been before the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] expressed his concern, as others have previously expressed their concern, about the prolongation of this session of the Congress. I would only say to the gentleman that a friend tantalized me yesterday with a newspaper picture of some beautiful strings of bass that are being caught in Mississippi. I would like to see this session end promptly so that the gentleman from Iowa could join the gentleman from Mississippi in going after a few of those bass. I would appreciate it if the gentleman from Texas could help us to get together on this.

Mr. MAHON. We will cooperate as much as possible.

PERMISSION TO COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR TO SIT THIS AFTERNOON TO CONSIDER H.R. 8311

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor may be permitted to sit this afternoon to consider the Economic Opportunity Act amendments, H.R. 8311.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DETECTIONS OF VIOLATIONS UNDER THE FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, a news item from Atlanta on October 8, 1967, reports that the Consumer and Marketing Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture has disqualified two Georgia merchants for 90 days from taking part in the food stamp program because of violations.

The complaint charged that the stores sold ineligible items and gave cash as change in food stamp transactions.

The Consumer and Marketing Service is to be congratulated for its diligence in detecting violations and for taking disciplinary action to slow down these abuses. I realize how difficult it is to police this program and am happy to congratulate those who accomplish anything in this field.

COLUMBUS DAY A LEGAL NATIONAL HOLIDAY

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Puerto Rico?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the legislation now pending before this Congress, which would proclaim Columbus Day a legal national holiday in the United States. It so happens that precisely today, October 12, is Columbus Day and a legal holiday in 35 States of the Union and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. Columbus and his brave men are also remembered on this anniversary in Spain and our sister republics of Latin America.

It was exactly 475 years ago that this man of vision, accused of being a dreamer and a charlatan, set sail from the port of Palos to accomplish one of the great feats of history. I believe it is proper that his deed should be commemorated by this Nation, not only to honor the memory of the man, himself, but to recognize that the New World got its civilized start through him. Finally, we should honor the millions of citizens of Spanish and Italian descent in this country, who have contributed richly to the greatness of the United States.

I can think of no better means of recognition than through the bills proposed by our distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON]. These are the identical House bills number H.R. 2372 and H.R. 1300.

> I have given you—

Columbus told Ferdinand and Isabella of Spain—

> a land of innumerable riches, inhabited by people who can be converted to our Christian faith. This will be the land of tomorrow.

Time has proved his prediction.

In honoring Columbus on this anniversary, we should also join together in recognizing the common destiny of all the nations of the Americas, which destiny was born of the faith and bravery and skill of this man of history.

THE PROGRAM OF THE FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, one of the agencies of the U.S. Department of Agriculture issued a very interesting report earlier this year which, I feel, justifies comment and some measure of commendation. The agency is the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, founded 29 years ago by the Congress to give farmers self-help protection of their production costs with insurance against bad weather, plant disease and insects. For most crops, it is all-risk protection. The report referred to is the 1966 annual report to Congress by the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation.

A major point which the report makes is that the American Farmer's out-of-pocket "dollar cost" of farming is skyrocketing and making it riskier each succeeding year to farm in the face of possible weather disaster.

The report further states that farmers today pay large amounts of money for fertilizers, lime, herbicides, hybrid seeds, expensive but necessary machinery, fuel, labor, higher land prices, and higher taxes—most of which were less of a major cost factor 25 years ago.

> The old days of oats for the horses and manure for the oats are no more.

The report summarizes. A chart accompanying the article shows that in 1940, two-thirds of the supplies and materials a farmer needed to grow a crop were "non-purchased"—that is, farm produced. Today, in contrast, a farmer has to lay out cold cash for more than half the things he uses in planting and growing a crop.

According to the report:

> The growing financial risk in farming is bringing the job of the FCIC to the center of the stage.

It also sets forth a tabulation showing that between 1940 and 1966 FCIC expanded from $67 million to $640 million in total protection. I am informed that protection for 1967 is estimated at more than $750 million. The number of eligible counties and the number of acres insured have approximately quadrupled since 1940.

I am proud that Congress had the foresight 29 years ago to provide farmers this kind of voluntary insurance when it was not available anywhere else. Greater investments in farming have made FCIC increasingly important to our farming population—and to the towns and cities whose economies rise and fall with the ups and downs of the farmers.

The latest report by the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation indicates it is doing a commendable job of expanding, revising and modernizing its program proportionate to the farmers' growing need for the vital protection it supplies.

REPUBLICAN MOTIVES IN 90TH CONGRESS QUESTIONED

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, the Republican Members of this House seem determined to write a sorry record for this session. Their action of yesterday, denying a pay increase to Federal civil servants engaged in the antipoverty effort, is a shocking and even imprudent act of irresponsibility.

The United States of America has probably the finest civil service in the world. The men and women who serve this country are, with few exceptions, a competent and dedicated and insufficiently appreciated work force. And I want the people of this country to know that the employees at the Office of Economic Opportunity are just as competent and just as dedicated as any other group of people in the Federal service.

In fact, I would venture to say that there is no Federal agency in which people work harder days and nights and weekends than they do at OEO.

The real issue over this discriminatory denial of a pay increase to the OEO employees is not, as the Republican Members suggested yesterday, totally false assertion that war on poverty employees are overpaid.

Rather, this action is a prime example of the Republican need for a whipping boy, a scapegoat. Their foolish and capricious action is a play to the peanut gallery of misinformed public opinion. The only truthful words spoken by the sponsors of that amendment were to the effect that a slap at Sargent Shriver and his agency would be "popular" with some voters back home.

Mr. Speaker, I begin to wonder about the mission the Republicans have set for themselves in this session. First they work to prevent Federal aid to eliminate rats. They thought rats were funny. Now they slash at civil servants whose only transgression is that they work to help the poor out of poverty. And they do that because it is "popular."

The American people must be unhappy with this kind of conduct, and well they should be.

OPPOSITION BY RUSSIA TO PASSAGE OF ICEBREAKERS IN ARCTIC WATERS

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have contacted the White House and the Secretary of State to urge that a review be made of the U.S. policy of allowing innocent passage to foreign vessels in the U.S. territorial waters, especially as it concerns Russia. As all of you know, I am sure, Russia denied innocent passage through the Vilkitski Straits to two U.S. Coast Guard ships that were on an innocent scientific mission.

Rather than pursue their mission of circumnavigating the Arctic Ocean, the two ships were ordered to return.

In checking into this matter, I am advised that since September 1965 there have been 262 Soviet ships sighted in passage within 12 miles of the Atlantic coast of Florida, for instance, and 25 observed in innocent passage in U.S. territorial waters.

During the past 2 years it has been reported that more than 50 Soviet vessels have passed through the territorial waters of the United States.

It seems logical to me that if Russia refused innocent passage to our vessels, we should refuse innocent passage to her vessels, and I am asking that our policy be reviewed immediately so that no Russian vessel will be allowed innocent passage in U.S. territorial waters until Russia changes its policy and allows U.S. ships innocent passage in its territorial waters according to recognized international law.

PROTECTION OF ANIMALS USED IN RESEARCH

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, since I and 20 of my colleagues introduced H.R. 13168 on September 26, I have received numerous calls and letters requesting information on the bill from concerned people all over the country who wish their Representative to join with the original sponsors in supporting the bill.

Many calls have also come in from the offices of interested colleagues on the Hill. I would like to take this opportunity to briefly explain the bill.

First, I would like to say that the intent of the bill is to give protection to animals used in research which do not have benefit from existing legislation. We went far last year in passing Public Law 89-544, which does regulate dealers, the transport of animals, and prohibits petnapping. These provisions of Public Law 89-544 are not changed or affected.

But in passing 89-544, we still left a large area void of protection—that is the area of the laboratory. The Secretary of Agriculture was given only very limited powers to establish standards and regulations in 89-544. Before I go farther, I would like to quote from that law the point which limits the protection in the laboratory under 89-544:

> SEC. 18. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as authorizing the Secretary to promulgate rules, regulations or orders for the handling, care, treatment, or inspection of animals during actual research or experimentation, by a research facility as determined by such research facility.

This, of course, means that if the research facility deems the animal is in the research or experimental process when he enters the laboratory, 89-544 does not cover him.

Under the provisions of H.R. 13168, those animals once in the laboratory would receive the benefit of humane care as the result of a set of regulations and standards. I believe that the area of the laboratory should be the focal point of concern for humanitarians. The animals used in the laboratories deserve the safeguards of humane treatment which they are not presently afforded under Public Law 89-544.

I would also like to point out that all warmblooded animals would receive those guarantees under H.R. 13168, whereas Public Law 89-544 deals only with six species.

The standards and regulations established in H.R. 13168 are to be promulgated by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, taking into consideration any which were promulgated by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Inspections are called for in H.R. 13168, to make sure that each laboratory is in compliance with the rules and regulations. Accreditation of a laboratory or research facility will be based on these inspections. Inspections will be conducted by the Secretary or his agents, based on the standards set by the Secretary.

To maintain constant compliance with these rules and regulations, a committee within each laboratory is to be established and at least one member of the committee must be a veterinarian. Having a veterinarian on each laboratory committee is an added assurance for those concerned with humane treatment of animals.

I would like to stress at this time that the committee is not responsible for the accreditation or inspection. The Secretary is the sole authority here. The committee only sees to it that between inspections the laboratory is in compliance and make sure that all persons using or caring for animals are qualified to do so. None of these tasks are to the exclusion of inspection by the Secretary.

For a research facility to be accredited and maintain that accreditation, it must pass inspection at any time—not just once.

One of the provisions spelled out in the bill requires the laboratories to use anesthesia or pain-killing drugs in all cases. The only exceptions would be where it would defeat the purpose of the experiment. There presently is no provision for easing the pain of animals used in laboratories for research. And this is an important point. Public Law 89-544 is greatly deficient here and this is a major concern of humanitarians.

Many operations are now performed which would not be affected if the animal was given the benefit of a pain-killing drug. I think these animals should be granted this benefit.

The general purpose of the bill is to grant humane treatment to animals used in research without interfering or impeding research. That purpose will be accomplished in H.R. 13168.

At this time I would like to include a more detailed question and answer sheet for the information of my colleagues as well as an analysis of the legislation:

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS MOST FREQUENTLY ASKED ABOUT THE ROGERS-JAVITS BILL

Q. What effect would this legislation have on P.L. 89-544 (The Dealer's Bill passed in 1966?)

A. None immediately. P.L. 89-544 will remain in full force *for two years* after the new bill is passed in order to insure continuous protection for animals. After that, the work of the Department of Agriculture in enforcing standards within dealers' premises, regulating the procurement of animals, and searching for lost animals both outside *and inside* laboratories will continue as it is being done at present. But at that time, the care of animals within laboratories will be stricken out of 89–544 and transferred to the extended program.

Q. What effect will the introduction of the new bill have on the current appropriations for P.L. 89–544?

A. This bill should make no difference whatever on appropriations for P.L. 89–544 for at least two or three years. After the care of animals in laboratories ceases to come under that law, the appropriations may be adjusted to whatever is necessary to continue the dealer operations.

Q. How will the care of animals be changed when they are taken away from the protection of P.L. 89–544?

A. P.L. 89–544 protects only 6 species of animals in about 1,400 research laboratories out of a possible 10,000, and then only when the animals are not under experimentation. The new program will cover all warm-blooded animals in nearly all laboratories, including commercial plants making drugs, cosmetics, detergents, etc. where some of the most painful work is performed. The standard set up for P.L. 89–544 will serve as a basis for the new standards, with many additions. For example, P.L. 89–544 is strictly limited to regulating only 8 categories of care and housing, whereas the Rogers-Javits Bill will allow the Secretary to make regulations on all matters pertaining to bodily comfort, such as provisions for exercise which are excluded by law from P.L. 89–544. And, of course, there will be many regulations for keeping pain to a minimum in different situations.

Q. If P.L. 89–544 had enough funds and enough time couldn't it do all this?

A. No. More money would only allow for more frequent inspections of the same animals under the same limited circumstances. Coverage for more animals in more laboratories for more purposes can only be done if a new law is passed.

Q. Shouldn't we wait to see how the present law works before branching out into something new?

A. P.L. 89–544 has proved itself to work extremely well in the limited field it covers. What more will a few more years prove while 95% of all laboratory animals get no protection at all?

Q. Why should a laboratory appoint its own committee to implement to the standards and regulations? Isn't this just self-policing?

A. It would be administratively almost impossible for any government agency to appoint committees for 10,000 laboratories. These committees do not take the place of outside inspections, they merely serve between inspections to be responsible for seeing that the laboratory is in compliance with the regulations of the law. They will also see that all persons using or caring for animals are adequately qualified to do so, and to review painful procedures in order to protect the animals from unnecessary pain and suffering.

Q. How can we be sure that these committees perform these duties?

A. The bill provides that at least one member of the committee must be a veterinarian, because a veterinarian can give advice on the proper care of various species of animals. Not only the compliance with regulations, but the judgments which are made by the committee will be periodically reviewed by inspectors who are professionally qualified to evaluate these judgments.

Q. If the "professional body" which is chosen to inspect is the American Association for Accreditation of Laboratory Animal Care, a body which is sponsored by the major bio-medical scientific societies, wouldn't this allow laboratories to be inspected by their own colleagues who would tend to be too lenient?

A. The Secretary may use any accrediting body of his choice to serve only as his agents to make reports on whether a laboratory is complying with regulations and to make recommendations for accreditation. It will have no power to change or ignore these regulations in making its reports and recommendations. If the Secretary suspects that his appointed agents are not making proper judgments, he may send his own employee to review the situation, and any laboratory found not in compliance will face a fine of $500 a day plus loss of the privilege to receive grants or contracts from the government. Nor does any professional body have any power to accredit on its own. Only the Secretary can determine if a laboratory merits accreditation and confer it. Actually P.L. 89–544 has a much more lenient self-policing clause than any in this bill. Under that law any laboratory may totally exempt itself from allowing any inspections at all simply by asserting that all its animals are in some stage of experimentation (as most of them are). The fact that these laboratories have not done so, but rather have complied admirably with the spirit of the law, attests to the high integrity of the scientific community. Why, then, should we fear these same people will have less integrity in an expanded program?

Q. Wouldn't it be better for the Department of Agriculture to administer the expanded program since they have already done such a good job under P.L. 89–544?

A. This is the area on which there is the least agreement. The medical men prefer H.E.W. because an applicant for a grant must fulfill certain requirements for H.E.W. and it would be simpler for the grantee to work through only one agency which would set up all requirements. On the other hand, many humanitarians feel that a check by another department would be extra insurance for the welfare of the animals. The consideration which may have tipped the scales in favor of H.E.W. may be contained in Sections 8 and 9 of the bill. The administrators must do more than just enforce minimum requirements. He must also make studies in, and collect and disseminate information about, improved techniques for reducing pain, for getting better scientific results with fewer animals if possible, to promote the use of less sentient or non-sentient models and many other related subjects. He must also seek more efficient ways for exchanging information about research so as to reduce the duplication or near-duplication of experiments. All of this is somewhat more in the field of H.E.W. than Agriculture. Nevertheless, the program will be so broad that any Department getting the assignment will doubtless have to set up a new "office" with a new staff hired for its competence in these things. Certainly either Department would make a conscientious effort to carry out the intent of Congress in administering this law. The choice of the best Department for this task lies with the Committees who will consider these bills, and who will certainly be glad to receive opinions at the time of the hearings.

ANALYSIS OF A BILL TO REGULATE THE USE OF ANIMALS IN LABORATORIES

The four-fold purpose of the bill is, through the Public Health Service, (1) to provide special assistance for improving laboratory animal research facilities; (2) to establish standards for the humane care, handling, and treatment of laboratory animals in Federal departments, agencies and instrumentalities and by those receiving Federal grants, awards, and contracts; (3) to encourage study and improvement of care, handling, and treatment methods as well as the development of techniques for minimizing pain and discomfort to those animals used in biomedical activities; and (4) to otherwise assure humane care, handling, and treatment of laboratory animals, and for other purposes.

In effect, this bill transfers the limited responsibilities for control of animal care from the Secretary of Agriculture to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and expands these responsibilities.

The Act is to be known as the "Humane Laboratory Animal Treatment Act of 1967."

DECLARATIONS OF POLICY

Section 2 recognizes that good health and high quality are essential features of laboratory animals used for biomedical activities vital to the health and safety of the Nation's people, but establishes a National policy of preventing unnecessary pain and discomfort to the animals used for such purposes.

DEFINITIONS

Section 2, (a)–(h) defines the following terms:

(a) "department or agency", "department and agency"
(b) "Secretary"
(c) "laboratory animal research facility"
(d) "laboratory animal"
(e) "biomedical activities"
(f) "person"
(g) "accredited"
(h) "Committee on Animal Care and Utilization"

GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF LABORATORY ANIMAL RESEARCH FACILITIES

Section 4 amends Title VII, Sec. 706(a) of the PHS Act to provide larger maximum amounts of grants for construction of facilities for research and training in the sciences related to health in those instances where either the facility is to be used primarily or exclusively for laboratory animal research purposes, or if it is a multipurpose facility which includes a laboratory animal research facility. In these instances, the maximum is increased from 50 percent to 66⅔ percent of the cost of construction as determined by the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare or 66⅔ percent of the cost determined to be proportionate to the contemplated use of the facility as 'a laboratory animal research facility.

In addition, the Act would establish 25 percent as a maximum portion of the total grants the Public Health Service, each year, can devote to the construction of health research and teaching facilities involving laboratory animal research.

STANDARDS, REGULATIONS, AND ACCREDITATION

Section 5 directs the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, to prescribe and publish, in the Federal Register, standards and regulations, including minimum requirements for the care, handling, and treatment of laboratory animals, as well as for the accreditation of laboratory animal research facilities. It also directs the Secretary, in formulating such standards to consult certain Federal departments and agencies, the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council, and humane and other certain organizations.

Furthermore, the Act assures that such standards and regulations shall conform to certain prescribed requirements, including,

(1) certain accreditation, inspection, and certification of laboratory animal research facilities.

(2) certain reviews and approvals of policies and procedures governing the care, handling, treatment and use of laboratory animals in such facilities in order to assure adherence to PHS standards and regulations, restriction of their use for legitimate scientific or educational activities and to qualified workers, and to assure the protection of the animals against unnecessary pain and suffering.

(3) the use of adequate anesthesia, with certain exceptions, commensurate with ex-

perimental needs and physiological functions under study.

(4) the observations of adequate conditions and care during and after surgery to minimize post-operative discomfort and infections in the animals, with certain exceptions.

(5) assures proper protection of laboratory animals against bodily discomfort, and also proper care, handling, treatment, feeding, watering, and housing.

(6) specifically calls for protection of laboratory animals against unnecessary suffering and pain when mechanical, electrical, or restraining devices are used.

(7) requires the maintenance of records denoted by the Secretary pertaining to (a) the use and disposition of all laboratory animals as well as (b) the proceedings of each Committee on Animal Care and Utilization which reviews the policies and procedures of the facility, as required in subsection (2) of this section.

The Act requires the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to formulate the above standards and regulations within a year from the date the law is enacted. It also directs him to take into proper consideration any standards or regulations already set forth under P.L. 89–544.

COMPLIANCE

Section 6 requires within and after one year, every laboratory animal research facility (1) to comply with the provisions and policies of this Act as well as with the established standards and regulations resulting from it; (2) to permit certain necessary inspections; and (3) to file certain prescribed reports. Under particular circumstances extensions of time may be granted, in which case the Secretary must issue a provisional accreditation to the facility.

Also requires the Secretary Health, Education and Welfare to notify the facility's policy and review Committee on Animal Care and Utilization of noncompliance, specifying the nature of such and the time within which it must be remedied.

Subjects non-federal laboratory animal research facilities to civil penalties up to $500 for each offense of noncompliance and for each day during which such failure continues; and also renders them ineligible to receive or use funds from Federal grants, awards, or contracts, awarded after the date of enactment, until the Secretary determines that they are complying with the law and regulations. At the discretion of the Secretary, the latter penalty may be restricted to the particular grant, awards, or contract to which the noncompliance offense related.

Directs the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to announce cases of continued noncompliances in the Federal Register.

During the period of the biomedical activity and the period of its post-operative care, holds responsible for compliance with the law and regulations any individual conducting or supervising any biomedical activity involving the use of laboratory animals. Individuals guilty of violations are rendered ineligible to use laboratory animals in any laboratory animal research facility or to receive Federal grants, awards, or contracts involving laboratory animals. However, the Act requires the Secretary to prescribe measures by which such eligibilities may be restored to the individuals.

JUDICIAL REVIEW

Section 7 sets forth procedures for judicial review for persons aggrieved by action under this Act via proper courts of appeal within 60 days. In such events, the courts have final jurisdiction, but if the case is not appealed within 60 days, the determinations by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare become final, or if the Secretary's determination has been affirmed or the petition dismissed by the court of appeals. The Secretary's determination also becomes final after ten days from the date of issuance of the mandate of the Supreme Court if that court affirms the determination of the Secretary or directs that the petition for review be dismissed.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

Section 8 directs the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare to encourage research, promote, and make available funds appropriated by Congress for promoting the efficient and humane care, handling, treatment, and use of laboratory animals through (1) training personnel, (2) developing new and improved techniques, instruments, and methods for animal care, handling, treatment and use; (3) diagnosing, studying, and controlling laboratory animal disease; (4) developing more efficient biological models; (5) developing and maintaining unique and valuable colonies of research animals; (6) improving the operation of institutional laboratory animal resources; (7) reducing pain to laboratory animals; (8) selecting the least sensitive or non-sentient biological models commensurate with particular experimental purposes; and (9) effectively retrieving and using scientific information.

Also authorizes the Secretary to make grants or contracts or assist financially certain bodies for purposes of carrying out the accreditation requirements.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION

Section 9 directs the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare to collect and disseminate, through various media, information relating to the humane care, handling, treatment and use of laboratory animals used for biomedical activities, and, insofar as possible, to provide technical assistance to assure proper care, handling, treatment, and use of laboratory animals by Federal departments and agencies and others in respect to the means of providing related training and necessary personnel.

SAVINGS CLAUSE

Section 10 provides that if any portion of the Act is held invalid, the remaining portions shall still be effective.

RULES AND REGULATIONS

Section 11 authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to promulgate necessary standards, rules, regulations, and orders to carry out the policy and purposes of the Act.

AMENDMENTS TO PUBLIC LAW 89-544

Section 12 amends Public Law 89–544 by eliminating the limited responsibilities of the Secretary of Agriculture for establishing and promulgating standards as well as related inspections, to govern the humane handling, care, treatment, and transportation of animals by research facilities. This Act would, in effect, transfer those responsibilities to the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare.

This section of the Act would not take effect until two years after the date of enactment.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON THE PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL—PERMISSION TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT, OCTOBER 13, TO FILE REPORT

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tomorrow to file the conference report on the public works appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

WIRETAP

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, in the other body, a Judiciary Subcommittee has attached to H.R. 5037 passed by the House on August 8 an amendment which incorporates the essentials of S. 675. S. 675, like its counterpart in the House, H.R. 13275, outlaws electronic surveillance by private citizens, but authorizes its use by law enforcement officers investigating organized crime and other serious offenses, only under strict court supervision.

The House Judiciary Subcommittee concluded hearings on electronic surveillance on April 27, 1967. I urge the distinguished chairman of the committee to schedule the legislation for action by the subcommittee and the full committee as promptly as feasible. Time is of the essence. It is vitally important for the House to have an opportunity to express its will before the other body completes action. Failing to do so, the House will be confronted with a parliamentary problem which would cloud, if not obscure, the issue.

If the House acts first, there will be no room for complaint that the rider attached by the other body is nongermane or unconsidered.

I have just received on my desk a copy of the letter dated September 26, addressed to the chairman of the committee by the Deputy Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, advising the committee that the Judicial Conference of the United States on September 22 approved the provisions of S. 675 with certain amendments necessary to comply with the recent decision of the Supreme Court in the Berger case.

There is no longer any justification for any further delay on the part of the Committee on the Judiciary.

DEATH, THE AEC, AND ATOMIC RATHOLES

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, last Monday, my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. Hosmer], inserted in the Congressional Record the text of a personal letter he had written to a nationally syndicated columnist. With that letter were certain materials prepared by the staff of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

To complete the record—and in fairness to all concerned—I am placing in the Record the three columns by Ralph de Toledano which prompted the reply of the gentleman from California.

The columns referred to follow:

DEATH, THE AEC, AND ATOMIC RATHOLES—I

(By Ralph de Toledano)

At every level of government but particularly in the cloakrooms of House and Senate, there is talk of economy. With billions of dollars melting away in the Vietnamese conflagration, and with billions more being sought to make America's cities safe from extremists, there are just not enough tax dollars to keep the Great Society in blue chips.

Yet in all the debate over ways and means to trim the Federal budget and to reduce the expected $29 billion deficit, not one word is said about the Atomic Energy Commission's $2.5 billion budget request or its fantastically costly drive to "nuclearize" the United States. Nor is any thought given to the consequences to the health and safety of the American people from the AEC's program to replace adequate power facilities with nuclear reactors.

If the Congress and the White House really wish to cure the Federal budget of its chronic elephantiasis, the place to begin might be with the AEC. But this will never be done until the American people are made aware of the atomic rat-hole down which the taxpayer's millions are being poured and of the hazards that the AEC's reactor program are creating. The facts, however, as this series of columns will demonstrate, remain incontrovertible.

It can be demonstrated that—

1. Millions, if not billions, are being wasted in the construction of nuclear power facilities which do not work simply because the engineers have not yet solved the problems that derive from the use of atomic fuels.

2. Lives are being lost and other lives are being jeopardized by the faulty or careless production and deployment of radioactive materials.

3. The AEC and the utilities involved in uses of nuclear energy have not found a safe answer to the problem of disposing of the radioactive waste which is the lethal biproduct of such uses.

In a recent column, I wrote of the tragic death of Robert Peabody as a result of an accident at an atomic energy laboratory, and of the secrecy which the AEC, in violation of Executive orders, clamped down on the case. The AEC, perhaps unaware that I had read its regulations, denied that secrecy existed and argued that, in sealing its files on such accidents, it was merely protecting those involved.

This is simply not so. The attorney for Mr. Peabody's widow was forced to get a Federal court order to allow him to examine AEC's records on the accident—and he is still being balked. This secrecy makes it difficult, but not impossible, to get a clear picture of AEC's operations, errors, and failures. But there is enough on the record to tell the tale.

The AEC's passion for secrecy—and the highly expert propaganda which accompanies it—have obscured the fact that industrial atomic power is an infant science, still unreliable and technologically deficient. At the six "working" atomic plants, as of December 1966, there were repeated interruptions of service. Some of them went out of power production for as long as six months—hardly an encouraging record for those who want to keep America's lights (and freezers and air-conditioners) going.

But these so-called "working" atomic plants are only a small part of the story. After an investment of $111 million, the Enrico Fermi plant near Detroit was taken out of service and replaced by an oil-burning facility. At Oak Ridge, Tennessee, another nuclear power plant was closed down, with $57 million going down the atomic rat-hole. A Hallam, Nebraska, plant, built at a cost of $54.7 million in January 1963 was shut down in August 1965—and the AEC has announced that it will be torn down because of "technical difficulties"—namely that the reactor was too "hot" for safety.

The cause of these multi-million dollar misunderstandings—and I have cited but a few examples—can be summed up simply: Neither the scientists nor the engineers have as yet the full know-how to build nuclear power plants. They are experimenting with the taxpayer's money. But these experiments should be confined to the laboratory, not to populated areas where mistakes can blow your city or mine to Kingdom Come.

DEATH, THE AEC, AND ATOMIC RATHOLES—II

(By Ralph de Toledano)

The Atomic Energy Commission, in its great zeal to "nuclearize" America's electric power facilities, has stated flatly that "in the more than 20-year history of the nation's nuclear program, there have been only seven radiation-associated deaths." In the same "report," the AEC also claims that there have been only "some two-dozen accidents."

In any assessment of the AEC and its practices, these statements command the question: Are they true? They fall by the AEC's own testimony. In a 1965 AEC publication, the figure for atomic accidents was set at 33. This kind of backward arithmetic seems to be par for the course at AEC. The commission's real attitude on such accidents, moreover, may well have been summed up before the Joint House-Senate Atomic Energy Committee on May 4, 1967, when its representatives took the position that "progress" in the nuclear field was far more important than any death-dealing activities.

This view was underscored by Representative Chet Holifield (D.-Calif.), vice chairman on the joint committee and the AEC's champion on Capitol Hill, when he callously dismissed a union official's testimony on the deaths by radioactivity of uranium miners. "Maudlin sentimentality," Mr. Holifield said.

Have there been only "seven radiation-associated deaths" in the potentially lethal atomic power field? The Washington Post reported recently that an estimated 115 uranium miners had died of radioactivity. And United Mine Workers President W. A. Boyle, in a hard-hitting and eloquent Labor Day speech, charged that "the government in Washington has permitted this outrage to go on for more than twenty years . . . It's too late for an estimated 6,000 men—who will die miserable deaths in the next few years."

As to the "two-dozen accidents"—or is it 33?—there is the rebuttal of Leo Goodman, the AFL–CIO's expert on atomic energy problems. "I have tabulated 1,400 accidents," he has said—and all of them invloved radiation hazards. That the facts have been kept from the American people by what the United Mine Workers president calls "a conspiracy of silence" by the AEC and its "stooges on Capitol Hill" is a demonstrable fact. At every turn, the AEC cries out, "Classified!" and quotes its release No. K–158, a document which violates anti-secrecy laws passed by the Congress.

From behind a bastion of self-ordained censorship, the AEC claims that "there have been no civilian reactor accidents which have caused loss of life or endangered public health and safety." Does this statement bear scrutiny? Forgetting its assertions of purity, the AEC in another document admits to "adverse effects" on health and safety as a result of accidents and negligence at a New York nuclear power plant.

Last fall, according to the AEC itself, that New York plant dumped five million gallons of radioactive waste into surrounding waters. Radioactive contamination spread into presumably "clean" areas of the plant. And radioactive gases from the plant's stack were not monitored. The Scientists' Institute for Public Information further contradicts the AEC, noting in a May 1967 report that "there have been 10 serious reactor accidents since 1949, and four reactors have been discontinued as a result." Among those accidents: A "core explosion" at a reactor in Idaho which "resulted in the death of three men and a significant release of radioactivity to the environment."

So far, the United States has not had an accident such as the one at Windscale, in England, which resulted in the release of 20,000 curies of radioactive iodine to the atmosphere. Since the lethal dose of radioactivity is measured in *micro*curies, the meaning of that accident is appalling.

Americans can take less comfort from the conclusions of the Scientists' Institute that "an explosion, meltdown, or other accident resulting in a major release of radioactivity is always possible." The scientists add that any degree of radioactivity is dangerous—so that quibbling about "low level" radioactivity, as opposed to "high level" radioactivity begs the deadly question. It is as tasteless as the old joke about the girl who was just a little pregnant.

The advocates of nuclearized electric power contend that they will eliminate the pollution caused by coal-burning steam generators. But all they propose to do is to substitute one kind of controllable pollution for another, and uncontrollable, pollution. In the debate, the AEC is of no help. It has a vested interest in the proliferation of nuclear power, and it will fight to the last press release to have its way.

DEATH, THE AEC, AND ATOMIC RATHOLES—III

(By Ralph de Toledano)

Eleven foreign experts on nuclear power are in the United States to learn from the Atomic Energy Commission how the United States disposes of radioactive waste. What they discover will depend on their capacity to penetrate the curtain of AEC's joyous propaganda. The Commission's Chairman, Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, has asked Congress to give him $17.9 million—an increase of $1 million over last year—for a delicately stated drive to "increase the number of trained people in the nuclear field and to disseminate information related to nuclear sicence and technology."

How much of that money goes to "public relations" is anybody's guess, and hardly to be forked out of the highly censored AEC testimony before the House Appropriations Subcommittee.

The fact is that the AEC is still "looking for a permanent method of disposal" for the high-level radioactive waste that is a by-product of its vast power-reactor program. (The quoted words are those of George M. Kavanaugh, the assistant manager for reactors of the AEC.)

Let me quote what the Scientists' Institute for Public Information and the Committee for Environmental Information jointly say about this radioactive waste:

"Activity levels in the liquid may be as great as several *thousand* curies per gallon . . . Since typical exposure limits for human whole body doses are of the order of microcuries—millionths of a curie—a *single gallon* of the waste would be sufficient to threaten the health of several million people. One ton of processed fuel will produce from 40 to several hundred gallons of waste depending upon the details of the process used."

The committee adds: "It has been estimated that about five cubic miles of water would be required just to dilute the waste from one ton of fuel to the maximum permissible concentration (MPC). The time required for its longest-lived components, strontium 90 and samarium 151, to reach the MPC by natural decay is from 1000 to 1500 years."

The AEC, when it is cozily closeted with a Congressional committee, is ready to disclose that at Hanford (Washington) alone, there are 83 storage tanks, with capacities of up to a million gallons each, for the storage of radioactive wastes. Other radio-active waste "graveyards"—very appropriately named—are scattered around the country.

Are they safe? The AEC casually informs members of Congress that at Hanford, the "useful storage" is 46.2 million gallons. But F. P. Baranowski, the AEC's director of the Division of Production, says: "That number is arrived at after you take a look at those tanks which are *currently leaking*, subtracting that from the total . . . For example, at Hanford, 10 tanks out of the total number are leakers . . . of highly radioactive materials."

Turn again to the Scientists' Institute for Public Information: "If there are only a few large processing plants in the 'developed' nuclear economy of the year 2000, large amounts of irradiated fuel will have to be transported for processing, with the attendant danger of accidents in transport"—and the need for local disposal of radioactive waste. "If there are many sites, for example, one or more at each population center, then the likelihood of compromises in siting, ready access of leakage to groundwater and individual peculiarities of design is increased."

"Finally," the Institute warns, "the sort of minor accident that occasionally occurs in our present industrial technology due, for example, to natural gas leakage from pipe lines vandalism, and simple human error could be disastrous in a neighborhood nuclear waste plant." That kind of "simple human error" at the West Valley, New York, reprocessing facility led to the dumping of millions of gallons of radioactive waste into surrounding waters.

This is why W. A. Boyle, president of the United Mine Workers Union, in his Labor Day speech, calls radioactive waste "a threat to every man, woman, and child in our nation." That is why he has warned that "trucks and railroad cars are transporting radioactive waste materials at night through urban centers across the states to dump it." One overturned truck, one derailed freight car, could scatter a lethal load on the landscape.

In aid of what? At a cost of how many billions? To bring death into America's cities? To perpetuate the AEC? Or to pour more billions down atomic rat-holes?

M-16 RIFLE PROCUREMENT FOR TROOPS IN VIETNAM

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, rifle procurement for troops in Vietnam is a shameful chapter without parallel in U.S. wartime history. For the first time our men have been sent into combat without full technological support on the homefront.

They have not had the best weapons we can produce in the quantities needed, and therefore have assumed unnecessary risks to their lives because the homefront has not shifted to adequate mobilization. Instead the arms industry continues to this day at an unbelievable business-as-usual pace.

Although a half-million American men in uniform face the never-ending dangers of war in Vietnam, America's massive technology has not been marshaled behind the relatively simple task of providing them with the best available rifles.

Only a part of our forces—not to mention those of our allies—have rifles improved to reduce malfunction problems. The gun and improved parts for it are still produced only by one source—Colt Industries—which was shut down almost completely for 5 weeks in July and August on a combination holiday and strike, which to this day has not received orders to expand production, to the maximum, and which is still shipping guns to a neutral government and negotiating a sale with another one.

Accordingly, I am today urging the Secretary of Defense to take the necessary steps, in order to—

First, place production facilities of Colt Industries, which is now the sole producer of the M-16 rifles, on a three-shift, 7-day basis, without holidays.

Second, expedite the opening of additional sources to operate for the production of gun and component parts on the same uninterrupted basis.

Third, expand as quickly as possible production at all sources.

Fourth, utilize Taft-Hartley in order to prevent work stoppages such as occurred in July at Colt Industries.

Fifth, preempt all production of this gun until needs of allied forces in Vietnam are fully met, which means interdiction of guns sold by Colt to the Singapore Government but not shipped, and denial of a shipping permit on a proposed sale to Brazil.

Sixth, halt troop buildup in Vietnam until all allied forces are fully equipped with the improved M-16.

To illustrate, only 22,000 of the 75,000 marines in Vietnam have M-16 rifles, and almost all of these are the early model which experienced frequent malfunction due to the rate of fire caused by a new type of ammunition in common use.

An improved part called a buffer, which reduces rate of fire and thus stoppage rate, was produced beginning last December. The Marine Corps was notified in January they would receive the buffers in August. If any protest was made over the 6-month delay in delivery, I have no evidence of it. In any event, despite malfunction problems experienced by hard-pressed marines in Vietnam last spring and summer, the first buffers did not arrive in Vietnam for their use until September 22.

As of October 8, 8,437 marine rifles—about one-third of the M-16's in marine hands—had been retrofitted with the new buffer, with the balance to be done by October 15.

A second improvement which a marine official in the Pentagon described as even more important to the proper functioning of the weapon—chrome plating of the chamber—has hardly begun. The project was approved in April but the official go-ahead to the manufacturer was not issued until July, and actually, plating did not begin until last month.

Marines in Vietnam were told they would begin receiving guns with chrome chambers in August, but now the first are expected in November. November and February shipments of new improved M-16's will consist of only 4,500 each, with a final scheduled shipment of 4,500 more next May. Meanwhile old models will be retrofitted with new barrels in the field at a snail's pace of 1,000 each in November, December, and January, 3,000 in February, and 5,000 each in March, April, and May.

Chrome plating of barrels is being done at Rock Island Arsenal as well as Colt, but obviously the pace is far too slow.

The Marine Corps has no idea when all its Vietnam troops will be fully equipped with M-16's. Not even a distant target date could be cited.

Less than one-third of U.S. Marines in Vietnam have an M-16 rifle of any kind. Presumable the same ratio prevails for the Army. South Vietnam forces and South Korean forces have no M-16 rifles and few if any M-14's.

Despite the obvious critical need for improvement of existing M-16's and the manufacture of hundreds of thousands of additional guns, Colt Industries, which is still the sole producer of the guns and the improved buffer, was shut down almost completely for a 2-week holiday early in July and was strikebound for 3 additional weeks in July and August.

In mid-June, Colt officials suggested that the Government use Taft-Hartley authority to prevent the impending work stoppage, and the last week in June changed the suggestion to a request. The answer from Army procurement was that the Government preferred to have the dispute settled between management and labor by free collective bargaining and therefore rejected the proposal that Taft-Hartley authority be utilized to keep work going during a 60-day "cooling off period." On July 19 I urged that Taft-Hartley be invoked. My proposal was rejected.

At no time did any government official suggest or request that Colt forgo the planned 2-week vacation shutdown.

Even today, the plant does no work on Sunday, very little on Saturday, and works only two full shifts 5 days a week. The third shift carries only a partial production load.

Callous indifference is the only appropriate term with which to describe the ho-hum, business-as-usual attitude which obviously governs decisionmaking over these vital matters by our Government. Our men in Vietnam have every reason to be resentful.

SALUTE TO CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS—LET'S MAKE HIS DAY A NATIONAL HOLIDAY

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I take this time today to salute not only the discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus, but also to salute and pay tribute to all Americans of Italian extraction who have done such a tremendous job in developing and contributing to the growth of this great country of ours which Columbus himself discovered.

There have been some references in

the press in recent years, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that somebody else named Leif Ericsson discovered America. But I would like to assure the Members of this House that as far as I am concerned, as far as the people of the 35th District of New York are concerned, and the people of New York State are concerned, Christopher Columbus definitely discovered America, and we know he got here well before Leif Ericsson did.

I also would like to say, Mr. Speaker, I think the best way we could honor Columbus would be to make his day into a national holiday. And even though I am the sponsor, and have been for a long time, of legislation to make all of our holidays fall on Monday, I feel so strongly about the importance of getting Columbus Day established as a national holiday, that I would forgo, at least for the moment, the privilege of having it, too, fall on a Monday, and I would be happy to have it fall on any day, just so long as we can get the Columbus Day bill passed.

Mr. Speaker, not only is it appropriate today to honor the discoverer of America but also to pay tribute to people of Italian descent, people who brought to America the same kind of courage and ability as built this New World of ours after Columbus had discovered it.

Today more than ever before we need something of the same kind of courage and incidentally the same kind of unwillingness to give up in the face of hardships, and even occasionally in the face of the inability of others to see the light at the end of the tunnel, that Columbus displayed so bravely when he made that historic voyage across the open Atlantic.

If Columbus had given up as easily as some people would like us to give up today in the face of other difficulties, America would never have been discovered.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding to me. I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from New York in connection with the recognition of Columbus Day.

I have urged for many years the passage of Federal legislation to declare Columbus Day a national legal holiday. I hope that by next year this country will have enacted appropriate legislation, so that all America will be celebrating the discovery of this New World by the great explorer and the great Italian, Christopher Columbus.

Mr. STRATTON. I certainly appreciate the gentleman's remarks. I agree with them wholeheartedly.

As one who was privileged to have received a degree from Harvard, let me conclude by pointing out that the principal support for Leif Erickson's claim comes from another college by the name of Yale.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader the program for the remainder of this week and the agenda for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader, we have no further legislative business for this week, and will ask to go over until Monday, after announcement of the program for next week.

Monday is Consent Calendar day.

There are five suspensions for Monday, as follows:

H.R. 13048, the Library Services and Construction Act amendments.

H.R. 10583, to provide relief to occupants of certain unpatented mining claims.

H.R. 5161, to designate the San Rafael Wilderness, Los Padres National Forest, Calif.

Senate Joint Resolution 112, to extend the time for filing report of Commission on Urban Problems.

House Joint Resolution 859, to extend for 1 year the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964.

Tuesday is Private Calendar day.

Also on Tuesday there is scheduled for consideration H.R. 159, creating an Independent Federal Maritime Administration, under an open rule, with 2 hours of debate, making it in order to consider the committee substitute as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

And also scheduled for Tuesday is S. 676, obstruction of criminal investigations, under an open rule with 1 hour of debate.

For Wednesday and the balance of the week there is scheduled for consideration:

A House joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, which of course will be subject to a rule being granted, in view of the objection made by the distinguished gentleman earlier today.

And H.R. 13178, safety of Capitol Buildings and Grounds, under an open rule with 1 hour of debate.

This announcement is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and that any further program may be announced later.

For the benefit of the Members, I should like to add it is anticipated that several conference reports on appropriation bills will be called up during next week, and that we probably will have two for consideration on Monday, on the Department of Transportation appropriation bill and on the public works appropriation bill.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to reaffirm this: I am sure the gentleman from Oklahoma said that on Monday we were going to have conference reports on the Department of Transportation appropriation bill——

Mr. ALBERT. Probably.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. And the public works appropriation bill.

Mr. ALBERT. Probably, if it is ready, as I understood the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, OCTOBER 16, 1967

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING CLERK TO RECEIVE MESSAGES AND SPEAKER TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS DULY PASSED AND FOUND TRULY ENROLLED

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Monday next, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

COLUMBUS DAY OBSERVANCE BY THE UNITED ITALIAN-AMERICAN SOCIETIES AND CLUBS OF GREATER SPRINGFIELD, MASS.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, it is timely to reflect that 475 years ago Christopher Columbus first set foot on this continent. In the span of world history, this is a very short time indeed.

And yet, in this 475 years, our land has grown from a wilderness of mountains, dense forests, and vast prairies to become the most powerful and advanced nation on earth.

The work of countless people of many nations has made this phenomenal transformation possible. Interestingly enough, the work of the fellow countrymen of Columbus has been responsible for much of this growth.

Some of the first brave men to follow Columbus were Italians. One of these, Amerigo Vespucci, sailed to the New World only 7 years after Columbus, in 1499. He explored the coast of what we now know as Venezuela and returned to Europe to publish his notion that this was not an unexplored portion of Asia, but a new continent. His writings attracted so much attention in Europe among those people who were interested in exploration and geography, that mapmakers began naming the new continents after him.

John Cabot, although he sailed for the King of England, was born in Genoa, and at the time of his travels was a citizen of Venice. In the course of his voyages, he became the first European to explore the mainland of North America.

The recent construction of the Verrazano Narrows Bridge is an appropriate reminder that it was Giovanni da Verrazano who first sailed into New York Bay.

Other Italians followed Columbus and his compatriots to the New World. A century before the time of the American Revolution, there were Italian settlements from New York to Florida.

When the first rumblings of discontent began in the Colonies, it was an Italian friend of Franklin and Jefferson who publicly urged separation from England. Filippo Mazzei was invited here by his friends and wrote numerous articles which were translated and distributed by Jefferson. They were widely published and read and their message helped to fan the fires of revolution.

Before the founding of this Nation we already owed a great debt to Italy. That debt has grown greater with each advancing era of our history. In each of our wars, from the Revolution to the present time, Italians and Italian Americans have distinguished themselves. Over 200 Civil War officers were Italian, and over 400,000 served in World War II. At least seven of these were awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor for their outstanding courage and sacrifice.

The contributions of the Italians are too numerous to catalog here. Entire books have been devoted to the work of those of Italian descent in America.

In music the list runs from Enrico Caruso to Henri Mancini and Toscanini.

In government and public service, names like Fiorello LaGuardia, John A. Volpe, JOHN O. PASTORE, and former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Anthony Celebrezze lead the list of Italian Americans who have served the public as mayors, Congressmen, Senators, judges, and Federal Government officials.

In business, medicine, sports, the sciences—in every field of endeavor—Italian names are numerous and prominent.

On October 12, as we pay homage to the great Christopher Columbus, we honor also the other brave and visionary explorers, and all those who have come to these shores since Columbus. We remember with gratitude the rich heritage of Italy which we enjoy here in America. In every area of our life, from our food to our music, we can be more thankful for the steady stream of Italians who began moving westward to the New World 475 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, on this day I am pleased to call to the attention of the Members of the House one of the best and most outstanding events to commemorate the memory of Christopher Columbus. This tribute to Columbus in my congressional district is sponsored by the United Italian-American Societies and Clubs of Greater Springfield, and is marked by one of the finest parades that one can witness, followed by the annual Columbus Day dinner.

Over the years I have been pleased and privileged to be invited to participate in these observances. In addition to paying tribute to Columbus, the dinner benefits the combined societies' scholarship fund. These awards are made to outstanding Italian-American students attending high schools in Greater Springfield. I want to take this opportunity to commend the United Italian-American Societies and Clubs of Greater Springfield for their interest in, and their support of, education, and extend my congratulations to the scholarship winners whose names will be announced at the dinner tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks at this point in the RECORD the telegram I sent today regretting my absence from the dinner tonight, and a newspaper story on the gala Columbus Day parade, held last Sunday in Springfield, taken from the Springfield Union of October 9:

OCTOBER 12, 1967.

VINCENT R. CAROLEO,
Toastmaster, Columbus Day Dinner, United Italian-American Societies and Clubs of Greater Springfield, Springfield, Mass.:

Deeply regret congressional business keeps me in Washington today. Permit me to join by way of this wire in extending my best wishes to the United Italian-American Societies and Clubs of Greater Springfield in its tribute to Christopher Columbus.

This event is one of the most moving and outstanding celebrations on Columbus Day. I have attended many of these occasions and have been impressed with their significance.

Please convey my congratulations to the scholarship winners and my best wishes to all.

EDDIE BOLAND,
Member of Congress.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Union, Oct. 9, 1967]

SEVERAL THOUSAND WATCH COLUMBUS DAY PARADE

Several thousand area residents lined Main St. Sunday to watch the marchers in the ninth annual Columbus Day parade wind their way along Main St. in tribute to the man credited with the discovery of America.

LARGEST IN HISTORY

The parade was the largest of its kind in its nine year history with marching units and drum corps from New York, New Hampshire, Maine, Vermont, Rhode Island, Connecticut and this state participating in the two hour march from Memorial Square in the North End to the Christopher Columbus monument in the South End.

Sponsored by the United Italian American Societies of Greater Springfield the parade included representatives of more than 30 Italian societies and clubs from the area proudly displaying the official Columbus Day parade colors of purple and white during the festivities. Columbus himself was portrayed by Tom Vallari.

In the forefront of the contingents of marching units were Mayor Charles V. Ryan, city councilmen and other city officials followed by the more comely Columbus Day Queen, Miss Jo Ann Stirlacci, 17, and her court.

Miss Stirlacci is the daughter of Dr. and Mrs. Joseph R. Stirlacci of 264 Sumner Ave. and is a senior at Technical High School.

HONOR PAST QUEENS

A first for the ninth annual parade was the honoring of past Columbus Day Queens Phylis Quatrano (1963), Carol Casanova (1964), Patricia Albano (1965), and Jean Quatrano (1966) sister of the 1963 queen who added a bit of the charm of Italy to the parade.

The first Columbus Day queen chosen in 1962, Mrs. Louise Fusaro, the former Diane Lauriante, appeared in a 1904 Cadillac touring car owned by Seymour Kramer of Merrick, L.I., N.Y.

One of the highlights of the parade was the Melha Temple Shriners of Springfield with its three colorful marching units; Melha Highlanders, Melha Oriental Band, and the famed mini-auto unit.

The Melha Highlanders paraded to the wheezing of the Highland Fling on bagpipes while their red, white and green checked kilts flapped with the brisk winds.

FLOATS APPLAUDED

The Oriental Band in green pantaloons and yellow jackets its mysterious eastern music while the mini-cars and scooters darted in and out and performed figure eight patterns in front of and behind the unit.

Two floats receiving loud applause from the spectators were the Little Old Italian Wine Maker with its participants sitting at a table enjoying the fruits of the grape, and the Mountain Hillbillies which had "Ma and Pa" and family complete with "jug" and corncob pipes.

The winning float portrayed Columbus and five of the nation's most distinguished past presidents, and was entered by Mrs. DiAgostino.

Some of the fanciest marching in the parade was performed by the "Upsteppers" of Providence, R.I. which went through intricate weaving patterns and pirouettes with musical accompaniment supplied only by the clapping of their hands and the stomping of their boots.

CLOWNS A HIT

A big treat for the children watching the parade were the clowns, most of whom were affiliated with the Melha Temple unit, in outlandish costumes with water-squirting flowers, massive rubber feet, ragged wigs and potato sized noses that tossed small favors of bubble gum and candy to the children.

Several area high school and competition marching units provided the traditional drum and bugle sounds familiar to any successful parade.

Westover AFB 8th Air Force Band, Springfield Blue Hawks, Targets Drum and Bugle Corps, St. George Olympians Drum and Bugle Corps, and the Red Devil's Band of Warwick, R.I. were among the musical units that performed in the parade.

The parade committee includes honorary chairman, the Rev. Peter V. Toretta, C.S.S., pastor of Our Lady of Mount Carmel Church; president of United Italian American Societies, Samuel Cardone; vice-president, John F. Labizalini; marshal, Raymond Gallinotti; float chairman, Anthony Calvanese; chairman of marshal's aides, Leonard Mercier and marshal's aide, Anthony Mazzinino.

CRIME CONTROL

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, recently some Republicans have publicly attempted to discredit every anticrime measure that the administration has proposed this year. Their voting record and their rhetoric suggest that they may be more interested in finding a partisan political issue for next year's campaign than in seeking bipartisan solutions to one of the most critical problems facing our Nation today.

The Republicans who are attacking the administration's efforts in crime control are doing this country a great disservice. They may be furthering their political ambitions, but they also may be weakening our Nation's efforts to reduce criminal acts and to find ways to weed out the root causes of crime.

Apparently, the Republican aim is to make crime control one of the major issues of the 1968 election campaign. They must believe that it has "vote appeal." Yet, Republican Members of the Congress must realize that to play partisan politics with this critical problem is a dangerous game—for the safety and security of the American people are the stakes.

We are today confronted with one of the most serious problems of our generation. The mounting incidence of lawlessness directly or indirectly affects every American. It is as real a national emergency as any we have experienced in this country, and we must face it in the same day we have successfully faced other national emergencies—in a responsible bipartisan manner. If we do otherwise, we are breaking our trust with the American people and placing the war against crime in jeopardy.

Recently, President Johnson said:

> What America needs is not more handwringing about crime in the street. America needs a policy for action against crime in the streets—and for all people of this country to support that policy.

I agree. The 89th Congress, in giving its approval to the Law Enforcement Assistance Act, demonstrated a new, national commitment to the war against crime—a willingness to take a first, major step toward Federal-State cooperation in the anticrime effort. A nonpartisan policy of action against crime was being shaped, based on the principle that, while the responsibility to deal with crime is primarily a local function, the Federal Government can and must assist local efforts to meet this responsibility.

This principle was reinforced by the National Crime Commission in its 18-month study of crime in America. One of the Commission's conclusions was that the Federal Government has an obligation to provide more support for local programs that deal with law enforcement and the administration of justice; that the present level of Federal support provides only a miniscule portion of the resources that States and cities need to bring about meaningful changes.

The Safe Streets and Crime Control Act—later renamed the Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Assistance Act—was brought to the floor for consideration early in August. The bill provided support for and gave substance to the Crime Commission's recommendations. The act provided grants to State and local governments to assist in planning, for implementing innovative concepts, for research and for new facilities. The bill established a new office of law enforcement and criminal justice assistance in the Department of Justice to carry out the provisions of the legislation.

But, how was the bill passed in the House? The Republicans simply cut the heart out of it in a way that substantially changed and effectively diminished the usefulness of Federal funds that State and local governments could receive under its provisions. The bill that passed this House bears little resemblance to the proposed legislation that resulted from the 18-month study of the National Crime Commission.

The Republican amendments provide for block grants to States under the supervision of what is called a State planning agency, whose members are to be appointed by the Governors of States. There is no restriction in the bill on the type of persons who could be appointed to these planning agencies; there is no provision for bipartisan membership. The Governor of a State would have complete control over a planning agency and its decisions because he would control the appointees. It is obvious that there are great dangers here. A State planning agency could become an instrumentality of tremendous power. Moreover, State Governors could be vulnerable to rival political factions within their State. The political powers upon whom a Governor might have to rely for support in the next election could devour a major portion of the Federal anticrime funds allocated to that State. The Justice Department, the FBI, and the national crime experts are clearly in a better position to impartially allocate funds for anticrime purposes.

Furthermore, what the Republicans overlooked when they based the criteria for allocation of crime fighting funds on a State's population is that it is the cities which face the bulk of crime problems within a State, and it is the cities which specialize in police forces—not the States.

Indeed, it is the great city police forces—New York, Chicago, Los Angeles—which have kept in daily touch with the Department of Justice and the FBI, not the State police forces. In fact, most States have no police other than highway patrols. It is the cities which have borne the responsibility and cost of law enforcement over the past hundred years. Few State governments have shown either interest or fiscal responsibility for this task.

But now, suddenly, Mr. Speaker, Governors are to be given vast amounts of money for local law enforcement, when they have neither the personnel, the facilities, nor the expertise for meeting the task of fighting crime.

I would ask my distinguished colleagues to ponder these facts for a moment. And, then I would ask them—how much money do you really believe the Governor of Georgia would allocate to the Atlanta Police Department to fight crime? I believe you would find the answer most distressing.

What will survive of the Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Assistance Act when this session ends is difficult to say.

Responsible nonpartisan action does not always seem to be the most important aim of the minority.

In fact, for all its "hand wringing" about crime, the minority Members of the House are working to deprive the Justice Department of the essential tools it needs to weed out crime in our society. Those who would criticize the caliber of Federal law enforcement while hamstringing Federal efforts to do an effective job in upgrading crimefighting programs are surely guilty of the worst form of hypocrisy.

If the Republicans persist in making a game of the serious national problem of crime, they should at least scratch for a more convincing charge than that which they recently hurled at the Justice Department—to the effect that the Department has been "indifferent to organized crime in the United States."

This charge has been well refuted by one of the least "indifferent" and most outstanding, dedicated, and hard-working public servants our Nation has ever had the good fortune to have—Attorney General Ramsey Clark. The following letter I recently received from Deputy Attorney General Warren Christopher supports the Attorney General's retort that—

> The Department of Justice is mounting an attack on organized crime which is unequalled in its dimensions and unparalleled in its results.
>
> In May of 1966, President Johnson, calling organized crime "nothing less than a guerrilla war against society," directed that all Federal efforts against it be intensified and coordinated by the Department of Justice. Responding to this instruction, the Department of Justice, the FBI, and other Federal agencies—including the Bureau of Narcotics, the Intelligence and Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Divisions of the Internal Revenue Service, the Department of Labor, Bureau of Customs, Secret Service, and the Securities and Exchange Commission—have brought the federal drive against organized crime to a record level of effectiveness.
>
> This collective effort has resulted in numerous prosecutions of key Cosa Nostra members. Nineteen members of Cosa Nostra have been indicted since May of this year. This number includes the heads of two key "families" and the second in command in another. These indictments represent a twofold increase over the average monthly indictment rate since 1961.
>
> The statistics are just as impressive with respect to the broad spectrum of organized crime and racketeering. Never before have prosecutions been as high as they are today. Whereas only 19 prosecutions were handled by the Organized Crime and Racketeering Section in 1960 (the last year of Republican Administration), a record high of 1,198 indictments were handled last year. Correspondingly, whereas only 45 convictions of racketeers were obtained in 1960, more than ten times that number (477) were obtained last year.
>
> FBI investigations alone accounted for 197 convictions of organized crime and gambling figures in fiscal 1967. This figure represents more than a 300% increase over fiscal 1963.
>
> Across the nation evidence of organized crime activities is presently being received by nearly two dozen Federal grand juries. In addition, the Federal investigative agencies have pooled their intelligence and cre-

> ated special integrated units to attack organized crime in selected urban areas.
>
> To support these endeavors, the Department of Justice has dramatically increased the manpower and resources available to combat organized crime. This month the drive on organized crime by the Department's Criminal Division is reaching its highest manpower strength in history, a more than three-fold increase over the 1960 strength. Further, the proposed fiscal 1968 budget for the Organized Crime and Racketeering Section will be the highest in the history of the Section.
>
> Finally, the war on organized crime has not been restricted to Federal agencies and Federal personnel. Increasingly, the Organized Crime and Racketeering Section is furnishing technical assistance to states interested in establishing anti-organized crime units. At the same time, officials of this Department, including Assistant Attorney General Vinson and Chief Henry E. Petersen of the Organized Crime and Racketeering Section, are travelling extensively and conducting meetings throughout the United States with local and regional officials of a number of Federal agencies to further focus our efforts in the organized crime drive.

Mr. Speaker, no one has demonstrated more concern for the problem of organized crime—or any form of crime—than has Attorney General Clark. The success of the Justice Department's activities in the crime war is due to the able leadership of the Attorney General. He has fulfilled all the expectations of those who hailed his appointment earlier this year. His background and experience made him an ideal choice for the post of Attorney General of the United States. His sound judgments and his courage to act on his convictions have made him eminently worthy of the trust placed in him by President Johnson and the Congress in confirming his appointment.

My purpose here today is to set the record straight on the administration's efforts to combat crime and to plead for responsible nonpartisan action on pending legislation that is of vital importance to all the people of this Nation.

If we are seeking a "policy for action" to combat crime, surely it exists in the form of legislation now before the Congress. One measure, the gun control bill, is the subject of much intense lobbying. Many of us have received mail from constituents who fear that this bill will victimize the American sportsman by taking away his privilege to own firearms.

Let us also set the record straight on this issue: The privilege of the American sportsman or the amateur gun collector will not in any way be jeopardized by the gun control bill. The sole objective of this proposed legislation is to prevent the sale of firearms to known criminals, the mentally unstable, and other potentially dangerous users of such weapons. It would limit out-of-State purchase and interstate mail-order sale of firearms. This will allow State and local authorities to exercise such controls as the people of their own communities believe are warranted. Commonsense tells us that passage of an effective gun control statute is desperately needed to provide safety and security for the American people. Let the measure receive the bipartisan support it needs.

There is also legislation pending to protect a citizen's right to privacy by prohibiting wire interception and eavesdropping. The pall of fear which eavesdropping may put upon normal conversation is serious and we must not permit the continuation of such an invasion of privacy. The Washington Post put it well in a recent editorial when it said:

> People who fear that government agents may be covertly listening to all that they say are not free people. They speak under constraint. And where this fear is endemic, freedom of communication is a casualty.

While it is vital to any crime-fighting effort that criminals be detected and prosecuted as vigorously as possible, it is basic to the citizens of a democracy that they be protected in their rights of privacy from unwarranted snooping. Congress has the duty and obligation to protect the privacy of each of us by enacting clear-cut legislation to outlaw wiretapping, public and private, wherever and whenever it occurs, as well as all willful invasions of privacy by electronic devices such as radio transmitters and concealed microphones, with the single exception of those instances where the security of our country is at stake, and then only under the strictest safeguards. Congress has the obligation to prohibit the advertising, manufacture, or distribution in interstate commerce of wiretapping and eavesdropping devices. These provisions are the heart of the bill introduced in the House this past February. This bill will give us the opportunity to maintain an honest standard of justice in our society. Without this standard of justice, we cannot hope for a control of criminal acts.

This is a bill to protect the privacy of each American—and its passage requires bipartisan support.

Mr. Speaker, the administration's legislative proposals would give the Department of Justice additional tools with which to discharge its responsibilities in this struggle. It would give State and local governments the assistance they need to act on what is primarily their responsibility in this fight.

We cannot afford the luxury of partisan bickering in a matter of such vital national importance. We have the resources to control crime—all we need is the resolve and the courage to cut through the political smokescreen which blind us to our obligations.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. JACOBS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleague from California for what I believe to be an excellent analysis of the crime problem in the United States, and of the role of the Federal Government in fighting that crime problem.

I also wish to commend the gentleman on his excellent analysis of the legislation that has been before the Committee on the Judiciary of which both my colleague from California and I are members.

I wish further to add my commendation of the Attorney General of the United States, whom I consider to be one of the great attorneys general in the history of the United States, a man of considerable talent, and I am convinced from my contacts with him, a man of considerable dedication to the fight against crime in this country, and the work against the causes of crime.

I admire the Attorney General for his modesty and the good grace with which he undergoes, what I believe to be most unfair attacks that a few have lodged against him.

So, Mr. Speaker, again I commend my colleague from California for calling the attention of the House to this subject.

Mr. CORMAN. I thank my distinguished colleague from Indiana.

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT: HAS THERE REALLY BEEN ANY, AND WHY?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, when I asked for the special order, I planned to talk during the entire period about an educational bill that I had dubbed "The Iowa Plan for Growth and Progress in Higher Education." That bill has been introduced in the form of H.R. 13255.

However, I would like now, since recent developments, to divert just a moment and talk about an event that happened at the White House yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday morning the President signed into law the Appalachian Regional Development Act Amendments of 1967. This legislation was the product of 9 months of public hearings, by a subcommittee of the Public Works Committee of which I am a member, executive sessions, floor actions, and House-Senate conference committee sessions.

Essentially, the 1967 amendments provide for an expansion of existing Appalachian programs, for the questionable creation of new ones in the region, and for additional authorizations to finance such programs.

The signing of the bill was accompanied by the customary laudatory statements as to the good intents of the Johnson administration and the legislative leadership and the supposed benefits it will have for the Appalachian region and its people.

A Member hesitates to be an "I told you so" Member or to "kick a dead horse," as the expressions go, but I feel compelled this afternoon to take exception to the pronouncements yesterday morning by the White House as to what great assistance the legislation is to be to the region and its people, and to bring certain matters on these points to the attention of my colleagues.

In 1964, when the President first transmitted the Appalachian regional development proposals to the Congress, I served as a member of the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Appalachia of the House Committee on Public Works. Repeatedly, I asked the subcommittee and full committee leadership to authorize an on-site inspection tour of the Appalachian region by the members and staff of the subcommittee; to take testimony from the people; and to develop a program that would benefit the needs of not only those sections of Appalachia which might be impoverished but also to meet the economic development needs of any economically distressed areas.

It was my opinion then, as it continues to be now, that mere governmental action—even combined Federal, State, and local action—would be insufficient and inadequate to meet the demands of Appalachia and its people.

With the failure of the leadership of the subcommittee and the full committee to order an on-site investigation of the region, with the assistance of my own office staff and the minority staff of the full committee, and at my own expense, I made an inspection tour of areas of the region and conducted unofficial hearings of my own. At that time I stated my feelings, based on what I had been in the region, that the proposals were not going to meet the long-range needs of the region and its people.

The Appalachian regional development program proposed in 1964 was not enacted by the Congress that year for various reasons, not the least of which was concern over the programs proposed and the approaches to the problems of the region embodied in those programs.

The following year, however, the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 was enacted. With great fanfare and public pronouncements, the President signed that act into law. The various instrumentalities of the Federal and State Governments involved in the regional development program were "off and running" to cure the ills of Appalachia and its people.

During the opening days of this Congress, the President recommended the extension of the Appalachian regional development programs, and the proponents of the legislation soon came to Capitol Hill to plead their respective cases for the proposed extension of the program beyond the authorizations for appropriations for nonhighway programs provided for in the 1965 act and to argue for certain changes in the 6-year highway program.

As a member of the Committee on Public Works, which has jurisdiction over this program, as the ranking minority member of the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Appalachia, and as a member of the House-Senate conference committee on the bill, I examined this legislation in the greatest of detail, not only for the changes which the administration was recommending in the existing program but also for the long-range view of what way to best solve the problems of the region.

I state this because I feel that if the specific programs embodied in the existing law and those proposed in the 1967 amendments are examined just in and of themselves, a fairly convincing case for their enactment and carrying out might be made. But if the examination is one of the long-range needs of the region, I personally feel that one is hard put to support the program, and, consequently, I did not.

In my opinion, the Appalachian program is, as it is now constituted and administered, unfair to the rest of the Nation. It smacks of what I have referred to as "creative favoritism." It is a program which, in the long run, will not work. But that is not the immediate issue to which I address myself this afternoon.

PROMINENT WRITER SAYS APPALACHIAN PROGRAM A FAILURE

Mr. Speaker, no greater evidence could have been advanced to substantiate my reservations, and those of most of the minority Members of this body and many of the majority Members, about the effectiveness of the present program than that which appeared in the form of a feature editorial article in the Washington Post, of last Sunday, October 8, 1967, only a few brief days before the bill was to be signed into law, thus giving the program the green light for at least another 2 fiscal years.

Mr. Richard Harwood, a Post staff writer, has addressed himself to the problems of the Appalachian region and its people more than once during the past several years. In this revealing and disturbing article, "The Jelly Hasn't Helped Appalachia," Mr. Harwood goes right to the core of the long-range problems of the region. The implications that the present Appalachian regional development program is not working not only pervades the entire article, but the explicit examples—case after case—of the program not working are also set forth.

I quote from the article:

> Despite President Johnson's assertion in 1965 that "the dole is dead" in Appalachia, welfare costs in Kentucky have doubled since 1960. The number of welfare cases has risen 50 percent. There were 22,000 more applicants for welfare last year than the year before, an increase of 60 percent. * * *
>
> The industrial renaissance which was to have eliminated the dole and was to have been brought about by the Area Redevelopment Administration, its successor agency, the Economic Development Administration, and the Appalachian Development Act of 1965 has not materialized.

The author continues, and here, I think, he hits at one of the core issues confronting the region:

> New roads are being cut through the mountains, little airports are being carved out of the hills, dams are being built to control the floods. But the factories are still missing.
>
> There are still more people than jobs. The unemployment rate in eastern Kentucky averages 10 percent (two and a half times the national average) and in some counties ranges up to 33 percent.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Harwood has hit the nail on the head, "The factories are still missing." Unless those administrators, planners, and policymakers within the Federal and State Governments, who have upon their shoulders the responsibility of making this program a successful one or of bearing the scorn of allowing it to become an unsuccessful, run-of-the-mill, make-work failure, just with a different coating to sell it to the American people and their representatives in Congress as being somehow different from the long chain of dismal, make-work failures over the past three decades, realize that only with the engendered support of the private sector of our economy and the independent sector of our society can the people of the region benefit to the fullest and enjoy the fruits of the rest of the Nation, I am afraid this program will, in fact, be charted by the historians of tomorrow's generations as just one more in a series of disturbing failures of the Federal Government to genuinely help the economically distressed.

I feel no need, at this point, to address myself to any political considerations which might have been entertained by the administration as it relates to these poor, backward areas which seek honest hope so desperately.

And what about these economic policy planners? Of them, Mr. Harwood says, and I quote:

> You can't even get the Appalachian reformers to live here. They want to fly in and out the same day. Where is the Appalachian Hospital Commission located? In Lexington. Where is the Appalachian Regional Commission? In Washington.

Mr. Hardwood was quoting in this instance from an interview with a newspaper published in the region.

And what about assistance that has come to Appalachia? Has it been in the form of long-range jobs or short-range, makework Federal dole projects? Of this, the author states:

> Phil Smith, Breathitt County's leading banker, is an example. "Bank deposits in this country have tripled since 1960," he says.
>
> "I'm doubling the size of my bank because we just can't handle the business in the space we've got. You can't get into the lobby to cash a check on the first of the month. It's too crowded."
>
> "Where do the business and the money come from?"
>
> "From these Government programs, of course," says Smith. "It's like living in a socialist state. Since Medicare started, the drug stores can hardly fill the orders. The doctors are so busy it's hard to get an appointment.
>
> "The grocery stores are cashing in on the food stamps. My own business is the same way. From 85 to 90 percent of the checks we clear are Government checks. I don't like it, but we've gone too far now to turn back."

Mr. Speaker, I take issue with whether or not the courses of action there have gone too far to now turn back, but I think this emphasizes, as clearly as anything ever put before our subcommittee or committee, the nature of the assistance these people are receiving. It is short range. It is a dole. When government takes from one man to bestow on another, it diminishes the incentive of the first, the integrity of the second, and the moral autonomy of both. So what is the present program doing to the people of Appalachia? I think the answer is obvious.

And what about the indecision of the policy planners in Washington? Of them, Mr. Harwood says:

> It is often said that studies are a substitute for action. But the study syndrome is also a reflection of the confusion in Washington over what is to be done and by whom. As a result of this confusion, public policy seems to be going in all directions.

Mr. Speaker, the full contents of Mr. Harwood's article are most striking. Under unanimous consent, at this point in my remarks, I include the text of this accurately disturbing article. I think every Member of this body, every staff member of this Congress, every economic and social policy planner, every administrator and official within the executive branch, and every American concerned with the problems of Appalachia should read it, and read it carefully. Most importantly, they should take note of what this article portends of the future of the program itself for the region and its people.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 8, 1967]

THE JELLY HASN'T HELPED APPALACHIA

(By Richard Harwood)

Seven years ago, presidential candidate John F. Kennedy discovered poverty in Appalachia. That discovery led to a bewildering outpouring of public and private benevolence dedicated to the social and economic reformation of a vast mountain region.

Federal billions were committed to the task. Laws were passed, new agencies, councils and boards were created, great plans and studies were commissioned, visionary programs were christened. Social engineers, welfare workers, missionaries, Ivy League professors, college dropouts, unemployed civil rights workers, consulting firms, VISTA volunteers, Peace Corps trainees and apostles of the New Left flocked to the mountains.

"This conglomeration," the Kentucky humorist and journalist Allen Trout observed last week, "came upon us like a mass of jelly the size of Mt. Everest. It has swept over towns, people, rivers, knobs and institutions. Everything in its path has been covered with jelly. But after it passes, nothing has changed. The mountains are the same."

The poverty that shocked Sen. Kennedy in 1960 endures. Family incomes and living standards in the coves, hollows and old coal camps remain substantially lower than those of Soviet factory workers and Saigon hucksters.

In one four-county area in Appalachian Kentucky—Breathitt, Lee, Owsley and Wolfe—75 per cent of the families have incomes of less than $3000 a year. Nearly 40 per cent have incomes under $1000. No area in Mississippi (and no Northern ghetto, for that matter) is quite so poor.

Despite President Johnson's assertion in 1965 that "the dole is dead" in Appalachia, welfare costs in Kentucky have doubled since 1960. The number of welfare cases has risen 50 per cent. There were 22,000 more applications for welfare last year than the year before, an increase of 60 per cent.

The pattern was symbolized in Jackson, Ky., last week by an old man and a teen-ager who could have been his grandson. They walked down a corridor of the Breathitt County courthouse together, pushing brooms for pay under a make-work program.

The industrial renaissance which was to have eliminated the dole and was to have been brought about by the Area Redevelopment Administration, its successor Agency, the Economic Development Administration, and the Appalachian Development Act of 1965 has not materialized.

THIRTY-THREE PERCENT IDLE

New roads are being cut through the mountains, little airports are being carved out of the hills, dams are being built to control the floods. But the factories are still missing.

There are still more people than jobs. The unemployment rate in eastern Kentucky averages 10 per cent (two and a half times the national average) and in some counties ranges up to 33 per cent.

"We thought we were going to get a big gear factory up here a few months ago," said Tom Gish, publisher of the Mountain Eagle at Whitesburg. "It was all set until the plant manager and his wife came up to look around. They didn't like what they saw. The plant is being built in the Bluegrass.

"You can't even get the Appalachian reformers to live here. They want to fly in and out the same day. Where is the Appalachian Hospital Commission located? In Lexington. Where is the Appalachian Regional Commission? In Washington."

Poverty is not the universal condition even in the most depressed rural counties, of course. The pattern of income distribution can be depicted as a pyramid of almost perfect symmetry.

At the bottom are 60 to 70 per cent of the families with incomes under $3000. At the top are 2 to 5 per cent of the families with incomes over $10,000. They represent the mountain middle class—Government workers, office holders, doctors, dentists, coal operators, merchants and bankers who have prospered from Government programs in Appalachia.

BANK DEPOSITS TRIPLED

Phil Smith, Breathitt County's leading banker, is an example. "Bank deposits in this country have tripled since 1960," he says.

"I'm doubling the size of my bank because we just can't handle the business in the space we've got. You can't get into the lobby to cash a check on the first of the month. It's too crowded."

Where do the business and the money come from?

"From these Government programs, of course," says Smith. "It's like living in a socialist state. Since Medicare started, the drug stores can hardly fill the orders. The doctors are so busy it's hard to get an appointment.

"The grocery stores are cashing in on the food stamps. My own business is the same way. From 85 to 90 per cent of the checks we clear are Government checks. I don't like it, but we've gone too far now to turn back."

Contrasts between the middle class and the underclass are apparent everywhere. In counties where 85 per cent of the housing is substandard by Government definition, handsome new schools, office buildings for the bureaucracy, modernistic courthouses and $40,000 to $50,000 homes are springing up.

The coal industry is having the biggest year in its history in Kentucky although mine employment has dropped 75 per cent in the past 20 years as a result of automation. Barely 25,000 miners are employed in the entire state.

STOPS AT PLATEAU

Edward Safford, director of the Office of Economic Opportunity's Community Action Program in Letcher, Leslie, Knott and Perry Counties, asks and answers a central question:

"Who's winning the war on poverty? The local Establishment—the middle class. . . . All we're doing for the poor is making their poverty more bearable."

With certain intellectual variations, that is a view shared by such diverse personalities as banker Smith, academicians of the state government and militant leftists of the Appalachian Volunteers who are trying to organize the mountain poor into an effective political force.

To Smith, the principal effect of Federal programs in recent years has been to strengthen the position of his old political adversaries, the Turner family, which has controlled the politics (and most of the payrolls) of Breathitt County for years. Through its control of the local government, including the school system, it controls "antipoverty" money and the patronage that goes with it.

Ervine Turner, the patriarch of the clan, is the circuit judge. His wife is the school superintendent. A son is the state senator. A daughter is on the Agricultural Stabilization Committee which handles farm subsidies for Kentucky. A cousin is the county judge. A niece is the acting postmaster.

A nephew is an official of the Department of Housing and Urban Development in Atlanta. A son-in-law owns the county's only newspaper and has been board chairman of the Community Action Program. An in-law until recently was associate director of the poverty program. The only strip-mine operation in the county is on coal lands owned by the Turners. They also own the county's new bank.

A MILITANT HANDFUL

Similar though smaller dynasties are found in most of eastern Kentucky's counties. They have been the prime targets of the Appalachian Volunteers, a handful of militant young college students who have been in the mountains since 1964 under the financial auspices of the OEO in Washington.

For their pains, they have been accused of immorality and lawlessness. Gov. Hulett Smith of West Virginia has expressed concern over their alleged "misconduct." Gov. Edward Breathitt of Kentucky has charged that they are "discrediting the whole poverty program" and has demanded that OEO Director Sargent Shriver cut off their money and get them out of Kentucky.

The Turners' newspaper in Jackson accuses them of planting "seeds of anarchy" in their "lust for power." A local grand jury indicted an AV organizer for attempting to "overthrow the government of Pike County"; the formal charge was "sedition." (It was thrown out by a three-judge Federal court.)

Yet they are a minuscule force. Only 23 AVs work in Kentucky, of whom 12 are native sons and daughters. Insofar as they have a coherent program, it is modest: to encourage the poor to demand better treatment at the hands of welfare authorities and other officials; to force improvements in the school system, and to oppose destructive strip-mining.

WASHINGTON A TARGET

Other critics of the poverty war have other targets. David Spaeth, an Appalachian consultant employed at the Spindletop Research Center in Lexington, aims at Washington.

"The Federal bureaucracy," he says, "does not have the answers to the economic problems of Appalachia."

State officials take the same view. Washington, they say has "imposed" impractical programs on the region and has ignored the local "power structure." In their view, Shriver's OEO takes a "Band Aid" approach and regards dynasties like the Turners as "dirty birds" responsible for the plight of the poor.

"These Federal agencies," says Robert Cornett of Kentucky's Area Development Agency, "would like to take over these people and make them their private fiefs. They want to build their own power base and make themselves look good."

Editor Gish at Whitesburg has somewhat the same point of view. "The old colonialism in eastern Kentucky," he says, "was imposed by the coal industry. The new colonialism is imposed by the Federal bureaucracy."

However that may be, it is a fact that the transformation of Appalachia has become a rather large business for the planners and reformers. Thousands of Federal jobs have been created. Universities and private contractors have been paid millions to analyze and plan for the region. The bibliography of Appalachian studies compiled by the Appalachian Regional Commission runs to 582 pages. And there is no end in sight.

CONTRADICTING POLICIES

It is often said that studies are a substitute for action. But the study syndrome is also a reflection of the confusion in Washington over what is to be done and by whom. As a result of this confusion, public policy seems to be going in all directions.

OEO is accused, fairly or not, of trying to

> overthrow the Appalachian "power structure." The Appalachian Regional Commission is said to be trying to preserve it and "work from within."
>
> State officials are trying to halt the migration from the mountains and build up the small towns as "growth centers." Some Federal policies have precisely the opposite objective; they encourage outmigration and public investment in the metropolitan areas on the fringes of the mountains.
>
> The Appalachian Commission's staff director, Ralph Widner, pointed up the plight of the planners recently. "You look around for new ideas," he said, "and there aren't any. It's always the same four or five people talking to each other."
>
> In that sense, Appalachia is merely another example of the gap between performance and good intentions.

Mr. Speaker, the Appalachian regional development program does not appear from this article, as it does not appear from the pages of history, to be the real answer to the problems of the region and its people.

PRESIDENT SHOULD ORDER REDIRECTION OF PROGRAM

The President of the United States should immediately direct those within the executive branch responsible for this and related economic development programs to reevaluate their programs, to make every attempt possible to bring the private sector of the economy and the independent sector of the society into the development of the region. The temporary disruption might be substantial, but the long-range benefit to the region and its people would by far compensate for the disruption in the thrust of the programs. The President should direct this to be done immediately, and he ought to assume the responsibility himself of transmitting to the Congress appropriate recommendations for incentives to bring industry, the long-range builder of all economies, into the Appalachian region. As the President of those people of Appalachia, he owes it to them. As the President of all the people, he owes it to the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, let us answer the needs of this region through the private and independent sectors. They can do the task which needs to be done, and far more efficiently and effectively than can the bureaucracy. That is the only long-range answer. That is the "American" answer.

THE IOWA PLAN FOR GROWTH AND PROGRESS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, educators and thoughtful people know that we live today in an America more conscious of its many flaws than ever before. Whatever has caused this new social awareness—be it the advance of technology, the rise of instantaneous communication, the frustrations of our younger generation, the worry about bigness, or even affluence itself—it has become indisputably clear to Americans in the 1960's that the blessings of our way of life are not unmixed. Despite an ever-increasing prosperity, we in the United States have begun to open our eyes to the many imperfections that blight our record of growth and progress. This decade can be characterized by a growing consciousness of such social ills as unemployment, substandard housing, disease and starvation in our midst, and the entire complex of issues that surround poverty in America.

It is my conviction that future generations will look back to the 1960's as the decade which began the long painful struggle to assure civil rights and to work more seriously for equal opportunity for all Americans. It is this decade that has turned its attention again to the future—showing concern for the development of new nations, and the exploration and use of outer space. The most farsighted among us have begun to examine the long-range problems of social adjustment—what to do with leisure time, how to make our rich culture accessible to everyone—all in search of more meaningful ways to enjoy the Biblical promise for the more abundant life.

Out of this new awareness of social problems has come the generally accepted view that we are dealing with issues that do not have easy solutions. But despite conflicting ideas as to the proper use of various human and material resources, there is one factor that stands out as an integral part in the solving of nearly all our social difficulties. That vital part is education.

Throughout our history education has been considered essential to the viable functioning of representative government. Since colonial times, education of the young has been an acknowledged public responsibility. Today, the responsibility weighs upon us more heavily than ever. To the gifted, education supplies the tools necessary to resolve the problems that beset us. To the underprivileged, it provides the means to escape economic and cultural hardship. For all, education is the key to a richer, fuller life experience.

Our educational needs have grown in proportion to the complexity of our lives. As technology has increased, there has been an accompanying explosion of knowledge in all fields, especially in the sciences. Those who limit their goal to the receiving of a high school diploma have already been left far behind. More and more, education beyond high school is a necessity. It is no more a luxury.

This is confirmed by the fact that 85 percent of all the scientists and engineers who ever lived throughout history are alive today. The writings from their research fill 35,000 technical journals with a literature growing at a rate of over 1 million articles a year. They offer promise of even more exciting discoveries that could be aided and abetted by proper evaluation. Answers are being sought to basic questions about the composition of the atom, the origin of our solar system, the genetic code that controls heredity, and the processes of life itself. The laser, the computer, new metallic or ceramic alloys will put man on the moon and probe the ocean depths.

In 1965, 2,311,429 college age youths attended institutions of higher education. Today the enrollment is 6,971,000 and by 1975 it is expected to be 9,172,000—a conservative figure, other estimates range to 12 million. Obviously, the quality of one's job opportunities will come to depend increasingly on one's educational background, but even more importantly, education beyond high school will become ever more significant in the realization of one's own human potential. Education is the key to developing to the fullest an individual's capacity for reason, reflection, and the development of the abilities that are essential to the exercise of one's responsibilities as a citizen.

Yet with an ever-growing demand for higher education, the costs of schooling are beginning to rise beyond the reach of the average American family. Tuition costs alone at private universities average over $1,200. The total cost of attendance at a private university—including tuition, books, room and board, and additional expenses—now exceeds $3,000 on the average, and the comparable figure for public schools is more than $2,000. Furthermore, since World War II, costs have risen at a rate of about 4 percent per year, and there is no relief in sight. The prescription is clear. What is needed is a new and bold approach to meet the need. A program that will provide assistance to all for education beyond high school and especially to the families of students in higher education. We need a national plan that also provides the kind of massive support to educational institutions that is necessary to meet the growing demands for facilities.

Broadly outlined, the Iowa plan consists of three phases. Phase 1 would grant to parents a $50 tax credit each year for each child until he or she reaches college age, providing that an educational certificate is purchased at a bank, approved savings and loan association, insurance company, or some other financial institution. Money set aside in this manner would earn interest at a rate determined by law and would grow to a fund of $1,200 to $1,400 by the time the child entered college. This would provide $300 to $350 assistance each year to parents financing their child's education.

Phase 2 would grant a $200 yearly tax credit to the person sustaining the major burden of a student's expenses while in college. This would raise the total support available to a student to a minimum of $2,000 over a 4-year period.

Phase 3 would require that a specified percentage of the money set aside for educational investment be used by private banks and other financial institutions for the purpose of loans to educational institutions and particularly to students who need to borrow money for their education. The management of this revolving fund would be the task of a specially constituted State board, which would review the educational needs of the State, and approve loans to students and institutions.

Thus, the Iowa plan assists those who bear the burden of college costs with direct tax credit, and at the same time ample funds are made available to meet the growth needs of the colleges, universities, and vocational schools on very easy terms. Let us examine the plan in closer detail.

The money set aside each year under phase 1 would be deposited in a restricted educational account at any private financial institution meeting the requirement of law. The depositor would receive educational investment certificates valued at $50 per child per year. The amount of money paid for such certificates would be allowed as a credit on the purchaser's Federal income tax. For example, if a man buys three certificates, one for each of his three children, it costs him $150. Let us assume that his Federal income tax, calculated after all deductions are made, comes to $600. He then subtracts the $150 from his total tax liability of $600 and pays the Government $450. In other words, instead of paying the full $600 to the Government, $450 is paid in taxes and $150 is put away for the education of his children.

The certificates would ordinarily be purchased by the beneficiary's parents or legal guardian. But in the event that the parent or guardian did not have sufficient tax liability to purchase a certificate, a relative or some other designated person could make the investment and receive tax credit.

The certificates could be redeemed only when applied to the payment of tuition, books, room and board expenses at an approved institution of higher education. An approved institution is taken to include colleges, universities, junior colleges, professional schools, trade schools, or any other educational institutions beyond the high school level. The money in the student's restricted educational account will be distributed equally over a 4-year period, paid directly to the institution at which the student is enrolled.

The Iowa plan which I proposed is a bold, modern approach to the financing of higher education. It provides much needed help to families at all income levels. It makes possible additional vital support to educational institutions beyond high school. And it avoids massive Federal control which discourages the educational system of its necessary independence and diversity.

As has been shown, the Iowa plan is designed to alleviate the burden of college costs through a program of tax credits on Federal income tax, the fairest and most comprehensive way to provide needed assistance to students and institutions. Such a system of tax credits is not without precedent. In 1962, 1964, and again in 1967, the Congress enacted legislation providing for substantial tax credits for investment made by businesses in new plants and equipment. The Iowa plan would extend the tax credit principle to a far more important type of investment in education—it becomes an investment in our human resources.

The principle of tax credit for education has the support of Senator Abraham Ribicoff, the former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, who feels that "tax credit for higher education is a must."

Herewith we present a complete plan for the solution of problems for both the student and those who want to serve the student in the educational facilities for education beyond high school. It is a viable plan because it will grow with an educational interest and desire. It is a plan that promotes rather than restricts destiny. It is a plan to avoid the church-and-state conflicts and make its advantages available to all types of schools who meet the qualitative tests. It is a plan that extends and encourages a broad interest in education.

"It is our business to make other men wise and better as we can find or make opportunity," is an admonition by a great philosopher. With this new approach we encourage a response to this challenge and we quicken the interest as well as give encouragement to those who are now frustrated in their attempt to move forward toward the ultimate and adequate solution to the problems that are presented in this age of technology.

We invite your questions and comments and most of all we enlist your support.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the distinguished gentleman from Iowa for his leadership in this exceedingly important area.

Mr. Speaker, last weekend I participated in the ground breaking ceremonies for the William Rainey Harper Junior College in Palatine, Ill. This is a new institution which is presently occupying temporary quarters.

In view of the statistics which the distinguished gentleman from Iowa has just given on the number of young people who will reach college age in the coming years, I am sure the gentleman will agree with me that the junior college concept is an exceedingly sound one, and one which the people of this country must encourage and foster.

However, Mr. Speaker, several individuals, after the ceremonies, came up to me and said, "Congressman, when will we see some assistance through a tax credit for the parents of young people who are attending college?"

As the distinguished gentleman from Iowa previously stated, legislation along this line has been introduced upon several occasions. In fact, I have introduced legislation bearing upon this subject since having been elected to the Congress in 1962. Also, my predecessor had introduced legislation to provide in effect the remedies which are sought to be achieved. I must say, however, the bill which I introduced was not as refined as is the one which the distinguished gentleman from Iowa is proposing, and I commend the gentleman for it.

However, the fact is that this type of legislation as we have been talking about passed the other body on at least two separate occasions. But, to my knowledge there have never even been hearings held on the subject in the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from Iowa that I am delighted the gentleman has again called the attention of the House to the need which exists in this area and as to the reasonableness of this proposal.

Our country has seen fit to provide investment tax credits for plants and facilities to encourage the modernization and updating of these facilities. I ask the question, Cannot the House of Representatives during this session hold hearings and recommend a bill to provide for a tax incentive to encourage the academic and intellectual development of the young people of this country?

Mr. Speaker, I certainly wish to associate myself with the very fine thoughts which have been expressed by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa upon the occasion of this special order.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I thank the very distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Rumsfeld] and I want to assure the Members of the House that I am keenly aware of the gentleman's contribution and interest in this field.

Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question that was raised by the party who approached the gentleman from Illinois, let me say this: We answer that question only when the Congress responds with an affirmative program designed and looking toward the solution of this problem. It is my opinion that I know whereof I speak. I feel that I am conversant and cognizant of the problem. Recently, I conducted a survey in the congressional district which it is my honor to represent and in that survey I put the question of a tax credit versus Federal programs in the questionnaire which I submitted. To my complete amazement I found that 72 percent of the people who responded—and over 15,000 of the people did respond—they were very much in favor of the tax credit approach; while 12 percent were in opposition.

So, Mr. Speaker, the answer is when the Congress responds to the people's needs and wants in this regard we should have this approach. I hope it is not delayed too long.

COMMITTEE ON RULES—PERMISSION TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORTS

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Rogers of Florida). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

COLUMBUS DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ryan] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, Columbus Day honors more than one man. It honors every Italian who has come to our shores since that first brave and persistent explorer. It further honors and commemorates the immigrants from every nation, reminding us of our heritage. Except for the descendants of the American Indians, we are all sons of immigrants.

Our greatest strength has been that, ever since the first settlers, we have been able to live together in relative harmony and build a nation together. Each of the groups that came did its part and gave its best. The Italians who came to America seemed determined to live up to the standard that Columbus set for them. From the first days of our discovery, the sons of Italy were to play an important role and become an inseparable part of America.

After Columbus returned to the Old World with the news of his discovery, which he thought to be an unexplored section of Asia, other explorers and eventually settlers began to move westward. The lure of the new land, the hope of freedom, and the spirit of adventure drew many to the New World. Many of the first of them were Italians.

Giovanni Cabota, known in most of our histories as John Cabot, was the first European to explore the mainland of the North American continent. The Italian explorer, Amerigo Vespucci, who explored the coast of South America shortly after Columbus, was among the very first to return to Europe and publish the theory that this was a new continent and not part of Asia. His writings gained him such admiration that cartographers named the new land for him.

Giovanni d'Verrazzano discovered New York Bay; Malaspina explored Alaska, Vancouver, and the coast of California. Fra Marco da Nizza led Coronado's expeditions into the West. Enrico Tonti built the first ship to sail in the Great Lakes, and Alfonso Tonti aided Cadillac in founding Detroit.

Some of our earliest settlers came from Italy; in fact, there were Italians building a glass factory in Virginia before the Pilgrims landed in Massachusetts. Other settlements were made in Delaware, New York, South Carolina, Florida, and Georgia.

When the tyranny of England began to stir the spirit of revolution in the Colonies, Filippo Mazzei was among the first men to urge publicly a split with England. Invited here from Italy by his friends, Jefferson and Franklin, Mazzei wrote articles advocating independence.

One Italian, William Paca, of Maryland, signed the Declaration of Independence, and several hundred Italians gave their lives in the Revolutionary War.

As the Nation grew, the Italians continued to befriend the new country. The money and assistance which Francesco Vigo provided Gen. George Rogers Clark enabled Clark to retain for America what is now Ohio, Indiana, Wisconsin, Illinois, and Michigan.

Over 200 Italian officers served in the Civil War. Italian Americans distinguished themselves in both World Wars; several were awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor for their outstanding bravery and service to their country.

The list of distinguished Italian Americans grows with each generation and swells the roles of every profession and walk of life. In commerce and industry, names like Amadio P. Giannini, founder of the Bank of America; Sebastiano Poli, of Fox Movie Corp.; and Gino Paulucci, of Chun King Corp., stand out. These feats are especially noteworthy when it is remembered that two of these men began life as the sons of poor immigrant parents.

In politics and government, Italians have distinguished themselves as U.S. Senators and Congressmen, as jurists, mayors, and Governors. Anthony Celebrezze became a member of the President's Cabinet as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

In the field of music, Arturo Toscanini, Enrico Caruso, Ezio Pinza, and Anna Maria Alberghetti have enthralled American audiences. Popular singers and actors such as Frank Sinatra, Tony Bennett, and Perry Como lead the long list of Italian Americans who have brightened the land with their entertainment.

In the field of sports, the hall of fame sounds like the Rome telephone book.

In addition to the well-known figures in nearly every field, thousands of Italians, known only to their neighbors, have helped to make America the Nation it is today. Honest, hard work, careful attention to their family life, and a tremendous tolerance, often in the face of tremendous intolerance directed at them, have made the Italians among our most valuable citizens.

The outstanding record of Italian immigrants in America, and the injustice which now forces prospective Italian immigrants to wait at least 10 years before they are granted visas to join members of their families in the United States under fifth preference has prompted me to introduce H.R. 12274. This bill would compensate for the unfair and cumulative results of the old national origins quota system and place Italian applicants in relatively the same position as other aliens. In keeping with the spirit and purpose of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965, it will help to reunite families.

This Columbus Day is an appropriate time for us to consider the Italians who have followed Columbus to the New World and to honor all those who explored and settled this land. We must not forget the great debt we owe to each of these brave men and women.

REPORT ON THE INTER-AMERICAN FOREIGN MINISTERS CONFERENCE ON CUBAN SUBVERSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, from September 22 to late on the night of September 24, delegations from member nations of the Organization of American States convened at the Pan American Union here in Washington. Twenty of the 21 member nations were represented by their Ministers of Foreign Affairs, including Secretary of State Rusk. Haiti's Ambassador to the OAS served as his country's delegate.

The high-level conference, the 12th Meeting of Consultation of Foreign Affairs, was convoked in response to a request from Venezuela under article 39 of the Charter of the Organization of American States. Article 39 provides that:

> The Meeting of Consultation of Foreign Ministers shall be held in order to consider problems of an urgent nature and of common interest to the American States.

The foreign ministers assembled to consider the following official agenda:

> The situation confronting the member states of the Organization of American States as a consequence of the attitude of the present Government of Cuba, which is carrying out a policy of persistent intervention in their internal affairs with violation of their sovereignty and integrity, by fostering and organizing subversive and terrorist activities in the territory of various states, with the deliberate aim of destroying the principles of the inter-American system.

It was my privilege to attend the 12th Meeting of Consultation as a congressional adviser to the U.S. delegation. The other congressional advisers who were designated to attend included Representative WILLIAM MAILLIARD, Republican, of California; Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon; and Senator BOURKE HICKENLOOPER, Republican, of Iowa.

I should like now to report the outcome of the conference.

From the outset of the conference there was never any question of Cuba's guilt. The report submitted earlier by the five-man committee appointed to investigate Venezuela's charges had stated among its conclusions that:

> It is clear that the present Government of Cuba continues to give moral and material support to the Venezuelan guerrilla and terrorist movement and that the recent series of aggressive acts against the Government of Venezuela is part of the Cuban Government's continuing policy of persistent intervention in the internal affairs of other American states by fostering and organizing subversive and terrorist activities in their territories.

Furthermore, the committee responsible for preparing a report on events related to the so-called Tricontinental Conference stated that the First Latin American Solidarity Conference, held in Havana from July 31 to August 8, 1967, "represents a further step in the efforts of communism and other subversive forces in the hemisphere to promote, support, and coordinate guerrilla, terrorist, and other subversive activities directed against established governments" and gives "testimony once again to the efforts of the Government of Cuba to control and direct these subversive activities in our hemisphere."

Although the charges which led to the conference were brought by Venezuela, the Bolivian foreign minister also made a graphic presentation of Cuban intervention in his country. He displayed forged passports, pictures of the guerrillas taken by each other in their hideouts, and operational orders issued to the guerrillas, all captured by Bolivian authorities. The Bolivians were able to identify as Cuban Communists a number of those appearing in the captured photographs and passports by comparing the photos with others appearing in Cuban publications.

Especially dramatic was the disclosure of the presence in Bolivia of Che Guevara, Castro's old comrade-in-arms. The Bolivian Foreign Minister projected enlargements of the captured photographs in which a bald, bespectacled man appears. The foreign minister then showed a captured Uruguayan passport containing a photograph of the same bald, bespectacled gentleman. Comparison of the facial features, especially of the prominent ridges in the forehead, with old pictures of Guevara left little doubt that the man in the pictures was indeed the mysterious Che. In addition, the Bolivians found a copy of the book by Jules Regis Debray, the French Marxist and confident of Castro who is now on trial in Bolivia, with notations in the margins. The writing was identified as Guevara's. The disclosure of the Bolivian foreign minister was substantiated earlier this week when Guevara was killed by Bolivian troops in a skirmish with Communist guerrillas.

The Bolivian Government is to be commended for its successful efforts to assemble the necessary evidence for its presentation to the OAS in the few short weeks since the material was discovered.

Having established Cuba's involvement in the guerrilla and terrorist movements in Latin America, the foreign ministers had to determine what the OAS could do to bridle Castro and his hemisphere troublemaking.

Twice before in the past 5 years the OAS has voted sanctions against Cuba and its Communist government—in 1962, when it expelled Cuba from the OAS, and in 1964, when the OAS called for all members to break diplomatic and economic ties with Havana.

Shortly before the conference, I addressed the House of Representatives in some detail with respect to the circumstances that led to the call for a meeting of consultation. In my remarks of September 20 I reviewed the measures that the OAS had taken previously to stem Cuban subversion, and I noted a prevailing skepticism in the press and diplomatic circles with regard to what further steps the OAS could take to halt Cuban provocations. I stated, however, that I was convinced that the OAS had not exhausted all collective measures, short of armed force, to reduce Cuba's capacity to export violence.

What, in fact, did the conference accomplish?

The foreign ministers adopted three substantive resolutions, resolutions III, IV, and V. Resolution III contains 15 separate provisions. At the conclusion of my remarks I shall insert the entire final act of the 12th Meeting of Consultation.

Resolution III, paragraph (1), forcefully condemns the Government of Cuba for its support of armed bands and other subversive activities directed against other American countries. Twenty in favor, none against, one abstention—Mexico.

Resolution III, paragraph (2), calls upon friendly countries to restrict their trade and financial operations with Cuba and sea and air transport with that country. Sixteen in favor, none against, five abstentions—Mexico, Chile, Ecuador, Colombia, and Costa Rica.

Resolution III, paragraph (3), requests the governments that support the Afro-Asian-Latin American Peoples' Solidarity Organization to withdraw their adhence from the AALAPSO and from the Second Tricontinental Conference scheduled to be held in Cairo in January 1968, and declares that support by countries outside the hemisphere "to activities conducive to subversion in Latin America jeopardizes solidarity among the developing countries, the increasing importance of which is particularly reflected in the efforts being made to reorganize international trade on more equitable bases." The last phrase is a not-so-veiled hint that the Asian and African nations have more in common with the American nations that are seeking peaceful development than with Castro's destructive ideology. Twenty in favor, none against, one abstention—Mexico.

Resolution III, paragraph (4), calls upon the members of the OAS to express to Communist nations that their support of Cuba tends to stimulate the interventionist and aggressive activities of the Cuban regime and that the cause of peaceful relations will be jeopardized so long as those activities continue. This resolution, in effect, warns the Soviet Union and Eastern European bloc countries, which are seeking to expand their trade with the American nations, that Castro's subversive tactics could hamper the establishment of such relations. Eighteen in favor, none against, three abstentions—Mexico, Chile, and Ecuador.

Resolution III, paragraphs (5), (6), (7), (8), and (9), refers to the tightening of security measures within individual countries as well as the strengthening of controls on men, money, and arms to and from Cuba, and more effective coordination of efforts aimed at preventing such movements. Paragraphs (6) and (7) were adopted by a vote of 20 in favor, none against, and only Mexico abstaining. Chile joined Mexico in abstaining on paragraphs (5), (8), and (9) on juridical, not substantive, grounds; in this case, the paragraphs mention recommendations of the special committee to study Communist efforts in the hemisphere, the Lavalle Committee, the creation of which Chile has always contended was contrary to the OAS Charter.

Resolution III, paragraph (10), recommends that the government of the member states decline to ship any governmental or government-financed cargo in any vessel that has engaged in the Cuban trade and, in addition, that they refuse the supply of fuel to any such vessel in their ports. Sixteen in favor, none against, five abstentions—Mexico, Chile, Ecuador, Colombia, and Uruguay.

The remaining five paragraphs of resolution III, which were adopted with only Mexico abstaining, are reiterations of general inter-American policy with respect to economic, social, and political development, and procedural matters.

It seemed to me that the foreign ministers did exhibit refreshing unity and understanding with respect to the perils of Cuban subversion. Gone entirely was the tendency of some earlier OAS conferences to regard Castro as a U.S. problem. Gone too was the frustrating reluctance on the part of some member nations to recognize that Castro's subversive tactics constitute aggression as surely as armed invasion, hence calling for inter-American collective action.

In debate, the inclination of delegates to line up in what the press used to characterize as a "hard line" and a "soft line" toward Cuba, disappeared. While there were differences of opinion with respect to a number of measures, as reflected in some abstentions, the divergencies were largely a matter of degree and not because of substantive disagreement.

In short, sentiment to condemn Cuba for aggression was overwhelming. There was not a single negative vote on any of the provisions of the final act and, despite some abstentions on individual measures, the final vote was 20 in favor, with only Mexico abstaining, on traditional and legalistic grounds.

Even Mexico budged somewhat from its intransigent position. In his final address, the Mexican Foreign Minister once again expressed the Mexican view—born of Mexico's revolutionary experience—that revolutions ought to be allowed to run their course without outside pressures. But Mexico voted with all the other member nations on the separate resolution calling upon members of the OAS to bring Cuba's subversive tactics to the attention of the United Nations. The pertinent points in Resolution IV state:

> Whereas:
>
> * * * * *
>
> Resolution 2131 (XX) of the General Assembly states the following in paragraphs 1 and 2 of its declarative part:
>
> (1) No State has the right to intervene, directly or indirectly, for any reason whatever, in the internal or external affairs of any other State. Consequently, armed intervention and all other forms of interference or attempted threats against the personality of the State or against its political, economic and cultural elements are condemned;
>
> (2) . . . Also, no State shall organize, assist, foment, finance, incite or tolerate subversive, terrorist or armed activities directed towards the violent overthrow of the regime of another State, or interfere in civil strife in another State:
>
> and
>
> Under auspices of the present Government of Cuba, the so-called Latin American Solidarity Organization (LASO), meeting recently in Havana, passed resolutions and adopted agreements to promote subversive movements in the Latin American countries,
>
> The Twelfth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs
>
> Resolves:
>
> 1. To recommend to the member states of the Organization of American States that they bring to the attention of the competent organ of the United Nations the *acts of the present Government of Cuba that run counter to the provisions cited of Resolution 2131 (XX) of the General Assembly.* (Emphasis Added)

I have heard stated that Mexico was motivated to back this resolution in accord with its belief that the Cuban problem is related to the overall cold war situation between the Soviet Union and the United States, hence the United Nations rather than the regional body is the appropriate forum to consider the Cuban problem. Whatever motivated the Mexican position, Mexico's affirmative vote on Resolution IV puts Mexico unmistakably on record as recognizing that Castro's Cuba is indeed guilty of exporting violence in the hemisphere.

While on the subject of resolution IV, which was introduced by Venezuela—the principal victim of Castro Communist tactics—I personally doubt that the proposal to air the problem in the United Nations offers any promise of clipping Castro's wings. Supporters of the resolution apparently believe that a united presentation at the United Nations of hemisphere grievances against Cuba would be an effective way to acquaint African, Asian, and European governments, as well as Communist bloc nations, of the seriousness with which the American countries regard Castro's export of revolution. I hope so. But with Cuba and the Communist nations represented in the United Nations, I think we can expect a vituperative response, with the entire exercise serving no useful purpose.

Other than solidarity, did the foreign ministers' meeting achieve anything concrete?

In my view, the recommendation that the governments of the member states decline to ship any governmental or government-financed cargo in any vessels that call on Cuban ports and that they prohibit the supply of fuel to such vessels, is a helpful advance. The United States has long enforced such measures.

From January 1, 1963, to August 30, 1967, some 270 ships of various flags called upon Cuban ports for a total of 1,479 trips. During discussion of the shipping resolution, some delegates expressed fear that its implementation would adversely effect their trade. But most of the ships still engaged in the Cuban trade are tramp ships. Their runs to other Latin American countries are irregular, hence of relatively minor consequences to the countries involved. On the other hand, the threat of exclusion from Latin America may well influence the ships' owners to decide that their Cuban run is not worth sacrificing the possibilities of business presented by the 21 OAS nations.

The resolution calling upon friendly nonhemisphere countries to restrict their trade and financial operations with Cuba also represents a step forward. Resolution I, paragraph 6, of the Ninth Meeting of Consultation in 1964 addressed the problem in vague terms. It resolved "to urge those states not members of the Organization of American States that are animated by the same ideals as the inter-American system to examine the possibility of effectively demonstrating their solidarity in achieving the purposes of this resolution." The 12th Meeting of Consultation abandons this vague verbiage. Instead, resolution III, paragraph (2) is precise in defining the trade, shipping, and credit guarantee policies which the OAS members want altered.

Whether or not the free world nations who persist in trading and aiding Cuba will be moved by renewed pleas by the OAS, however explicit, remains to be seen.

I realize that the 12th Meeting of Consultation was convoked under article 39 of the OAS Charter and, within this frame of reference, the foreign ministers were limited to making recommendations to the governments of the member states rather than ordering specific sanctions, as provided for by the Rio Treaty.

Even within this limitation, I feel more could have been accomplished. In my remarks in Congress 2 days prior to the foreign ministers' meeting I suggested that the OAS countries agree to boycott those private firms in friendly nonhemisphere nations that engage in Cuban trade. It seemed to me that the measure would tighten the hemisphere policy of economic denial adopted by the Ninth Meeting of Consultation. Awareness by European and other free world enterprises that their products would be excluded throughout the Americas if they persisted in trading with Cuba would surely have given those firms pause before they continued to engage in business with Castro. Such a deterrent, I believe, could have put a sizable dent in the $360 million annual Cuban trade with non-Communist countries.

Communist sources have tried to create the impression that my suggestion was aimed at eliminating European and other nonhemisphere firms from business in Latin America. What nonsense. Refusal by the members of the OAS to deal with a firm, for example, in France that supplies Cuba would in no way affect other firms in France, or anywhere else, that were not engaged in the Cuban trade.

An effort was made at the foreign ministers' meeting to adopt a resolution along the lines I suggested. During the deliberations, the resolution gained considerable support. As the hour grew late, the proposal was withdrawn at the suggestion of the U.S. delegation. Although I realize that the proposal was introduced cold at the Conference and that the respective governments had not had time to consider it, I personally would have preferred that the matter be brought to a vote, but the decision of the U.S. delegation was otherwise.

I still think the idea has merit. If the Conference resolution on Cuban transactions fails to persuade friendly nonhemisphere countries, the proposal lies in reserve.

The resolutions adopted by the foreign ministers remain simply recommendations to the governments of the member states. If they are implemented vigorously, they could help to contain Castro's efforts to export violence to other countries in this hemisphere. Meanwhile, as I stated prior to the Conference, in the last analysis, the capacity of the OAS to guarantee the security of its members and to compel the rule of law in the Western Hemisphere is on trial.

Final Act of the 12th Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, Convoked in Accordance With the First Part of Article 39 and With Article 40 of the Charter of the Organization of American States

The Twelfth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, convoked in accordance with the first part of Article 39 and with Article 40 of the Charter of the Organization of American States, was held at the Pan American Union, Washington, D.C., from June 19 to September 24, 1967.

The Meeting was convoked through a resolution of the Council of the Organization of American States adopted on June 5, 1967, which read as follows:

"Whereas:

"On June 1, 1967, the Ambassador, Representative of Venezuela, addressed a note to the Chairman of the Council, by which his government requested that a Meeting of Consultation be urgently convoked, in accordance with the first part of Article 39 and with Article 40 of the Charter of the Organization of American States, to consider 'the serious situation confronting the member states of this Organization as a consequence of the attitude of the present Government of Cuba, which is carrying out a policy of persistent intervention in their internal affairs with violation of their sovereignty and integrity, by fostering and organizing subversive and terrorist activities in the territory of various states, with the deliberate aim of destroying the principles of the inter-American system';

"The Ambassador, Representative of Venezuela, has provided the information on which that request was based; and

"Article 39 of the Charter provides that 'The Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs shall be held in order to consider problems of an urgent nature and of common interest to the American States. . . .'

"The Council of the Organization of American States resolves:

"1. To convoke, in accordance with the first part of Article 39 and with Article 40 of the Charter of the Organization of American States, a Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the American republics to consider the said situation.

"2. To appoint a committee of nine members, to be designated by the Chairman of the Council, to make recommendations regarding the agenda, date, place, and regulations for that meeting.

"3. To inform the United Nations Security Council of the text of this resolution, in accordance with Article 54 of the Charter of the United Nations."

In accordance with the provisions of paragraph 2 of the operative part of the resolution transcribed above, the Chairman of the Council, on that same day, appointed the delegations of Argentina, Bolivia, Colombia, Guatemala, Peru, Trinidad and Tobago, the United States, Uruguay, and Venezuela to make up that committee, which later elected the Ambassador, Representative of Venezuela, as its chairman.

At the meeting of the Council of the Organization held on June 15, 1967, this committee submitted a report on the agenda, date, place, and regulations for the Meeting (Doc. 5), and a resolution was adopted in which the following agenda was proposed for the Meeting, which agenda was approved by the opening plenary session held on June 19, 1967:

"1. The situation confronting the member states of the Organization of American States as a consequence of the attitude of the present Government of Cuba, which is carrying out a policy of persistent intervention in their internal affairs with violation of their sovereignty and integrity, by fostering and organizing subversive and terrorist activities in the territory of various states, with the deliberate aim of destroying the principles of the inter-American system."

In the same resolution adopted on June 15, 1967, the Council set June 19, 1967, as the opening date for the Meeting and designated the Pan American Union as the place for it.

The deliberations of the Meetings were governed by the Regulations of the Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs prepared by the Council of the Organization on March 1, 1951, and approved by the Meeting with certain transitory provisions applicable to it.

The Meeting was attended, from June 19 through September 21, 1967, by special delegates of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs (Doc. 17), and beginning September 22, 1967, the following members of the Meeting, listed in the order of precedence established by lot, participated:

Ecuador: His Excellency Julio Prado Vallejo, Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Chile: His Excellency Gabriel Valdés S., Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Argentina: His Excellency Nicanor Costa Méndez, Minister of Foreign Affairs and Worship.

Costa Rica: His Excellency Fernando Lara Bustamante, Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Colombia: His Excellency Germán Zea Hernández, Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Uruguay: His Excellency Héctor Luisi, Minister of Foreign Affairs.

The Dominican Republic: His Excellency Fernando Amiama Tió, Secretary of Foreign Affairs.

Venezuela: His Excellency Ignacio Iribarren Borges, Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Guatemala: His Excellency Emilio Arenales Catalán, Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Peru: His Excellency Edgardo Seoane Corrales, Minister of State in the Office of Foreign Affairs.

Mexico: His Excellency Antonio Carrillo Flores, Secretary of Foreign Affairs.

Haiti: His Excellency Fern D. Baguidy, Ambassador, Representative of Haiti on the Council of the Organization.

Bolivia: His Excellency Walter Guevara Arze, Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Panama: His Excellency Fernando Eleta A., Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Paraguay: His Excellency Raúl Sapena Pastor, Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Brazil: His Excellency José de Magalhães Pinto, Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Trinidad and Tobago: His Excellency A. N. R. Robinson, Minister of External Affairs.

The United States: The Honorable Dean Rusk, Secretary of State.

El Salvador: His Excellency Alfredo Martinez Moreno, Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Honduras: His Excellency Tiburcio Carías Castillo, Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Nicaragua: His Excellency Lorenzo Guerrero, Minister of Foreign Affairs.

His Excellency José A. Mora, Secretary General of the Organization of American States, also attended the Meeting.

As established in the Regulations of the Meeting, the Secretary of the Council of the Organization of American States, Dr. William Sanders, served as Secretary General of the Meeting, and the Secretary General of the Organization appointed Mr. Santiago Ortiz as Assistant Secretary General of the Meeting.

In accordance with the Regulations of the Meeting, the Secretary General of the Organization of American States installed the opening session on the afternoon of June 19, 1967. At this session, His Excellency Eduardo Ritter Aislán, Special Delegate of Panama, was elected President of the Meeting. Also, the agreements reached at the preliminary session with respect to the Agenda and Regulations of the Meeting and the membership of the Committee on Credentials and the Coordinating and Drafting Committee were ratified.

At the same opening session, a resolution was adopted, authorizing appointment of a committee "to go to Venezuela to gather additional information and to make such verification as it considers advisable of the events that took place in Venezuela and that were denounced by the government of that country. . . ." Committee I was composed of the special delegates of Costa Rica (Chairman), Peru (Rapporteur), Colombia, the Dominican Republic, and the United States.

At the plenary session held on July 10, 1967, the Meeting resolved to establish an eight-member committee (Committee II), to prepare a report on events related to the so-called Afro-Asian Latin American Peoples' Solidarity Conference that had occurred since the report of October 24, 1966, presented by the Special Committee to Study Resolutions II.1 and VIII of the Eighth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs.

Committee II of the Meeting of Consultation was composed of the special delegates of Peru (Chairman), Trinidad and Tobago (Rapporteur), and Argentina, Colombia, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala, and the United States.

Committee I, appointed at the opening session, was in Venezuela from June 23 to 27, and on July 26, 1967, at the third plenary session of the Meeting, it presented its report on the events that had occurred in that country.

At the fourth plenary session, held on August 2, Committee II, established by the resolution of July 10, presented a report on events related to the so-called Afro-Asian Latin American Peoples' Solidarity Conference that had occurred since the report of October 24, 1966, represented by the Special Committee of the Council of the Organization.

In accordance with the Regulations, the Meeting appointed a Committee on Credentials, composed of Guatemala, Mexico, and Paraguay. It also appointed a Coordinating and Drafting Committee, made up of Brazil, Colombia, Haiti, and Trinidad and Tobago.

In accordance with the transitory provisions of the Regulations, a General Committee was established, made up of all the members. His Excellency Alfredo Vázquez Carrizosa, Special Delegate of Columbia, and His Excellency Ramón de Clairmont Dueñas, Special Delegate of El Salvador, were appointed Chairman and Rapporteur, respectively, of the General Committee. Later when Mr. Alfredo Vázquez Carrizosa, Special Delegate of Colombia, ceased to represent his country at the Meeting, His Excellency Eduardo Roca, Special Delegate of Argentina, was elected Chairman of the General Committee.

At the meeting of the General Committee held on August 3, there was general agreement that most of the ministers of foreign affairs of the member states would be willing to attend the Meeting personally beginning September 22, 1967.

On that date, a new preliminary session was held, attended by the Ministers of Foreign Affairs, at which agreement was reached on the new officers of the Meeting. At the Fifth Plenary Session, held on the same day, His Excellency Héctor Luisi, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Uruguay, was elected President of the Meeting.

At the tenth meeting of the General Committee, held on September 23, 1967, His Excellency Nicanor Costa Méndez, Minister of Foreign Affairs and Worship of Argentina, was elected Chairman of the Committee, and His Excellency Alfredo Martínez Moreno, Ministr of Foreign Affairs of El Salvador, was elected Rapporteur.

At the same meeting, the General Committee also formed a Working Group made up of the delegations of Costa Rica (Chairman), Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Trinidad and Tobago, the United States, and Venezuela, which undertook a study of the various drafts and resolutions presented and submitted its conclusions to the General Committee.

This Final Act of the Meeting was signed at the closing session, which took place on September 24, 1967. This session was addressed by His Excellency Walter Guevara Arze, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Bolivia, who spoke on behalf of the delegations, and His Excellency Héctor Luisi, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Uruguay, President of the Meeting.

As a result of its discussions, the Twelfth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs adopted the following resolutions:

I

The Twelfth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs,

Considering:

The note dated June 1, 1967, addressed by the Representative of Venezuela to the Chairman of the Council of the Organization and in the statement made by the Special Delegate of Venezuela during the plenary session held today,

Resolves:

1. To authorize its President to appoint a committee to go to Venezuela to gather additional information and to make such verification as it considers advisable of the events that took place in Venezuela and were denounced by the government of that country in its note dated June 1, 1967, to the Chairman of the Council of the Organization of American States, which was considered at the special meeting held by that Organ on June 5.

2. To request the American governments and the Secretary General of the Organization to cooperate with the Committee, which will begin to work as soon as it has been constituted.

3. That the Committee shall render a report to the Meeting of Consultation as soon as possible.

4. To inform the Security Council of the United Nations of the text of the present resolution, in accordance with the provisions of Article 54 of the Charter of the United Nations.

II

The Twelfth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs,

Resolves:

1. To establish an eight-member committee to prepare a report on events related to the so-called Afro-Asian-Latin American Peoples' Solidarity Conference that have occurred since the report of October 24, 1966, presented by the Special Committee to Study Resolutions II.1 and VIII of the Eighth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs.

2. To authorize the President of the Twelfth Meeting of Consultation to designate the states that should compose the aforementioned committee.

3. To request the Secretary General of the Organization to give the committee the assistance it needs to achieve the objective stated above.

III

Whereas:

The report of Committee I of the Twelfth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs states among its conclusions that "it is clear that the present Government of Cuba continues to give moral and material support to the Venezuelan guerrilla and terrorist movement and that the recent series of aggressive acts against the Government of Venezuela is part of the Cuban Government's continuing policy of persistent intervention in the internal affairs of other American states by fostering and organizing subversive and terrorist activities in their territories";

Committee II of the Twelfth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, responsible for preparing a report on events related to the so-called First Afro-Asian-Latin American Peoples' Solidarity Conference, stated that the so-called First American Solidarity Conference, held in Havana from July 31 to August 8, 1967, "represents a further step in the efforts of communism and other subversive forces in the hemisphere to promote, support, and coordinate guerrilla, terrorist, and other subversive activities directed against established governments" and gives "testimony once again to the efforts of the Government of Cuba to control and direct these subversive activities in our hemisphere";

During the course of the Twelfth Meeting of Consultation the Government of Bolivia has presented evidence of intervention by the Government of Cuba in the preparation, financing, and organization of guerrilla activities in its territory;

The difficult social and economic conditions under which the peoples of Latin America live serve communism as a means for arousing the internal subversion that distorts the legitimate longings of our countries for justice and for change;

The affirmation that the democratic system is the proper path for achieving the desires of the Latin American peoples must be supported by suitable actions and programs that will promote the structural changes necessary for progress and for the strengthening of the system;

Economic cooperation among the American states to speed up and harmonize development is essential to the stability of democracy and the consolidation of the inter-American system in the face of the subversive aims of international communism;

Respect for and observance of human rights constitute a basic universal as well as inter-American juridical principles essential to the effective security of the hemisphere; and

In spite of this, in practice events occur that are incompatible with the system of protection and guarantee that all countries are obligated to establish in behalf of the individual,

The Twelfth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs

Resolves:

1. To condemn forcefully the present Government of Cuba for its repeated acts of aggression and intervention against Venezuela and for its persistent policy of intervention in the internal affairs of Bolivia and of other American states, through incitement and active and admitted support of armed bands and other subversive activities directed against the governments of those states.

2. To request the states that are not members of the Organization of American States and that share the principles of the inter-American system to restrict their trade and financial operations with Cuba and sea and air transport to that country, especially transactions and transportation conducted through state agencies, until such time as the Cuban regime ceases its policy of intervention and aggression, and to indicate to them that the granting of state credits or credit guarantees to private firms conducting such transactions cannot be viewed as a friendly gesture by the member states of the organization; and to this end to recommend to the member states that, individually or collectively, they reiterate this position to the governments of those states.

3. To request the governments that support establishment of the so-called Afro-Asian-Latin American Peoples' Solidarity Organization (AALAPSO) to withdraw their support or adherence from that organization, and also from the "Second Tricontinental Conference," scheduled to be held in Cairo in January 1968; to denounce these activities as contrary to the sovereignty, peaceful relations, and social and economic development of the peoples; and to declare that support by countries outside the hemisphere to activities conducive to subversion in Latin America jeopardizes solidarity among the developing countries, the increasing importance of which is particularly reflected in the efforts being made to reorganize international trade on more equitable bases.

4. To express to the states that are not members of the Organization of American States that support the Government of Cuba the serious concern of the member states of the Organization, inasmuch as that support tends to stimulate the interventionist and aggressive activities of the Cuban regime against the countries of the Western Hemisphere, and since the cause of peaceful relations will be jeopardized so long as those activities continue; and to this end, to recommend to the governments of the member states of the Organization that they carry out joint or individual representations directed to the states that support the Government of Cuba, to manifest this concern to them.

5. To recommend to the governments of the member states of the Organization of American States that they apply strictly the recommendations contained in the first report of the Special Committee to Study Resolutions II.1 and VIII of the Eighth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, of July 3, 1963, relative to the prevention of propaganda and of the movement of funds and arms from Cuba and other illegal sources to other American countries, as well as to the strengthening of controls on travel to and from Cuba in order to prevent the movement of subversive persons, and that they coordinate more effectively their efforts aimed at preventing such movements and shipments.

6. To recommend to the governments of the member states of the Organization that, in accordance with their domestic legislation, they adopt or intensify, as appropriate, measures of vigilance and control on their respective coasts and borders, in order to prevent the entry into their own territory, or the exit, of men, arms, or equipment coming from Cuba and intended for purposes of subversion and aggression.

7. To recommend to the member states of the Organization that, in accordance with their constitutional and legal provisions, they maintain, within their territory, the most strict vigilance over the activities of the so-called Latin American Solidarity Organization (LASO) and its national committees.

8. To recommend to the member states of the Organization the application, where necessary, of all the recommendations contained in the Report of the Special Committee to Study Resolutions II.1 and VIII of the Eighth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, on the so-called First Afro-Asian-Latin American Peoples' Solidarity Conference and its Projections ("Tricontinental Conference of Havana"), dated November 28, 1966.

9. To recommend to the governments of the member states that they take such steps as they deem pertinent in order to coordinate, among neighboring countries, the measures of vigilance, security, and information set forth in paragraphs 5, 6, 7 and 8 above.

10. To recommend to the governments of the member states that they decline to ship any governmental or government-financed cargo in any vessel that, following the date of this resolution, has engaged in the shipment of cargo to or from Cuba, and that, in addition, the governments of the member states take the necessary measures to prohibit the supply of fuel to any such vessel in their ports, with the exception of cases in which shipments are made for humanitarian purposes.

11. To reaffirm that the maintenance of order and of internal and external security is the exclusive responsibility of the government of each member state, without prejudice to its reiterated adherence to the principle of collective and mutual security for the preservation of peace, in accordance with the treaties on this subject.

12. To express concern that the growth rates of the developing countries of Latin America and the degree of their participation in international trade are not equal to the corresponding rates of growth and expansion of trade of the industrialized countries of the world, and that this situation could result in new and more acute social conflicts that Castro-communism could use to advantage to provoke or intensify subversion and violence and to upset the course of development of the hemisphere.

13. To reaffirm that the principal means of achieving security and prosperity in the hemisphere is development by peaceful and democratic methods, and that the subversion promoted by Cuba disturbs that process.

14. To reiterate its conviction that economic and social development can and should be achieved only within a system that respects democracy and human rights, and on the basis of actions and programs that will coordinate domestic efforts with international cooperation, to satisfy the undeferrable aspirations and needs of the peoples of the Americas.

15. To instruct the Secretary General of the Organization of American States to transmit to the Security Council of the United Nations the texts of this resolution and of the reports of Committees I and II of this Meeting of Consultation, in accordance with Article 54 of the Charter of the United Nations.

IV

Whereas:

Article 34 and the first paragraph of Article 35 of the Charter of the United Nations read as follows:

"*Article 34*. The Security Council may investigate any dispute, or any situation which might lead to international friction or give rise to a dispute, in order to determine whether the continuance of the dispute or situation is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security.

"*Article 35*. Any Member of the United Nations may bring any dispute, or any situation of the nature referred to in Article 34, to the attention of the Security Council or of the General Assembly."

Resolution 2131 (XX) of the General Assembly states the following in paragraphs 1 and 2 of its declarative part:

"1. No State has the right to intervene, directly or indirectly, for any reason whatever, in the internal or external affairs of any other State. Consequently, armed intervention and all other forms of interference or attempted threats against the personality of the State or against its political, economic and cultural elements are condemned;

"2. No State may use or encourage the use of economic, political or any other type of measures to coerce another State in order to obtain from it the subordination of the exercise of its sovereign rights or to secure from it advantages of any kind. Also, no State shall organize, assist, foment, finance, incite or tolerate subversive, terrorist or armed activities directed towards the violent overthrow of the regime of another State, or interfere in civil strife in another State; and".

Under auspices of the present Government of Cuba, the so-called Latin American Solidarity Organization (LASO), meeting recently in Havana, passed resolutions and adopted agreements to promote subversive movements in the Latin American countries,

The Twelfth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs

Resolves:

1. To recommend to the member states of the Organization of American States that they bring to the attention of the competent organ of the United Nations the acts of the present Government of Cuba that run counter to the provisions cited of Resolution 2131 (XX) of the General Assembly.

2. To request, in like manner, of the countries of the Latin American group in the United Nations that are not members of the Organization of American States, that they cooperate in the implementation of this resolution.

V

The foreign ministers meeting here reaffirm the dedication of their governments to the cause of economic and social development of their peoples, within a framework of freedom and democracy, and declare that their efforts in this direction will not be deterred by the aim of any state or organization to subvert their institutions—an aim that those meeting here unanimously repudiate.

VI

Whereas:

This Meeting of Consultation was convoked in accordance with the first part of

Article and with Article 40 of the Charter of the Organization; and

The preparation of the Final Act of the Twelfth Meeting of Consultation in the four official languages requires careful coordination which cannot be accomplished satisfactorily in the limited time available.

The Twelfth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs

Resolves:

1. To prepare the Final Act to be signed in only one of the official languages of the Meeting.

2. To recommend to the Council of the Organization of American States that it constitute a committee of four of its members who will represent the four official languages of the Organization to coordinate the texts of the Final Act in the other three official languages.

3. To authorize the Council to approve those three texts, which shall be considered official texts of the Final Act and shall become integral parts of it as it is signed by the Ministers of Foreign Affairs.

4. That all the official texts of the Final Act shall be equally authentic.

TAXPAYERS TAKEN FOR JOYRIDE BY NAPCO INDUSTRIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, evidence continues to mount that the taxpayers of this country have been taken for a joyride by Napco Industries, Inc., of Minneapolis, and its affiliate, Napco Bevel Gear of India, Ltd., through a machinery deal financed by the International Development Agency to the tune of nearly $4 million.

According to a recent General Accounting Office report, a substantial amount of the machinery shipped by Napco to India was obsolete and some of it little more than junk.

Mr. Speaker, I have a communication from Lloyd G. Ross of Wooster, Ohio, who was hired by Napco Industries, of Minneapolis, and sent to India as works manager for Napco Bevel Gear of India.

Ross states that when he uncrated the machinery in India, he discovered that very little of it had been reconditioned as he was led to believe, and that there were many equipment shortages. Ross further states that—

> It was very apparent that the machines in many cases had been "stripped" before crating for shipment.

Mr. Speaker, what this man alleges is that after Napco Industries persuaded our giveaway agency to finance the unloading of its unprofitable automotive gear factory, quantities of key parts were removed before crating the machines for shipment.

After Ross reported these equipment shortages, he says a Napco lawyer came out to India from Minneapolis and asked him to certify to the insurance company that the missing parts had been stolen in transit. This, he said, he flatly refused to do.

I do not know, and neither does Ross, whether such a certification was later made, but it raises an interesting question. Subsequently, Ross said, he was forced to undergo ulcer surgery, and while a patient in a hospital in India, his services were terminated.

The General Accounting Office report on this freewheeling deal by Napco Industries is bad enough, but this latest allegation ought to be more than enough to convince anyone that the whole affair should be thoroughly investigated and from every angle, including the identity of those in Washington, D.C., who had a hand in promoting this deal.

Mr. Speaker, I am turning the Ross communication over to the Federal Bureau of Investigation with a request that the FBI investigate his allegations to determine if fraud against the Government is involved.

CHICAGO'S COLUMBUS DAY PARADE

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, October 12, 1492, is the memorable day that Christopher Columbus discovered America. Throughout the United States, all our people, regardless of age, race, or creed, will join together with enthusiasm to celebrate the 475th anniversary of this momentous discovery which led to the development of our great country as well as the rest of the Western Hemisphere.

In my own city of Chicago, Columbus Day is celebrated each year with a gigantic parade on our main street, State Street. Over 225 units will march in the parade, representing every branch of the U.S. military forces, school bands, marchers, and drum and bugle corps. Women and children wearing authentic native costumes of Italy will ride on the floats and march in the procession, adding to the color and pageantry of the occasion.

The parade, which attracts over 1 million people, will be televised over WGN-TV for 1½ hours and will have an estimated television audience of an additional 2 million people. State Representative Victor A. Arrigo will narrate the entire parade. Sponsors of the telecast are Anthony Paterno, of the Pacific Wine Co.; Dominick Di Matteo, of Dominick's Finer Foods; and Frank Armanetti, of Armanetti Liquor Stores. The theme of the 1967 parade will be "World civilization owes its greatest debt to Columbus." These words, first written by the eminent Harvard professor and Pulitzer Prize winner, Samuel Eliot Morison, will appear on every float in the parade.

The Attorney General of the United States, Hon. Ramsey Clark, will be the guest of honor and will lead the parade. Joining him in leading the parade will be the honorary chairmen of the parade, Hon. Richard J. Daley, mayor of Chicago, and Dr. Augusto Russo, Consul General of Italy in Chicago. Following the leaders in the line of march will be political dignitaries, civic leaders, members of the judiciary, and businessmen from the community.

Some of the leaders in the Italian community who are participating in the parade are Dr. Mario Rubinelli, president of the Joint Civic Committee of Italian-Americans; Rev. Armando Pierini, P.S. S.C., chaplain; Anthony Bottalla, general chairman of the parade; Dr. James F. Greco, Joseph Bottalla, Anthony Fornelli, Anthony Terlato, special assistants to the general chairman; and Frank Armanetti, Fred Bartoli, Martin R. Buccieri, Victor J. Failla, Nello V. Ferrara, Anthony Paterno, and Arthur S. Pullano, who are cochairmen of the parade.

Also participating are Louis P. Farina, cochairman of the speakers platform committee; Hon. John D'Arco, chairman, and Hon. Peter C. Granata, cochairman, of the public officials committee; Mrs. Carolyn Lucchese, president of the women's division of the Joint Civic Committee of Italian-Americans; Dr. Mary Ellen Batinich, chairman of the authentic Italian costumes committee; John G. Rovetto, chairman, and Sam Canino, cochairman, of the floats committee; Lawrence Spallitta, chairman of the float personnel committee; Livio Petricca, chairman of the bands, marchers, and transportation committee; Joseph De Serto, chairman of the Italian organizations committee; Hon. Victor A. Arrigo, chairman of the program and arrangements committee; Victor J. Failla, chairman, and Frank Esposito, cochairman of the labor committee; Carl Cipolla, chairman of the business and professional committee; Marco De Stefano, grand marshal, and Fred Bartoli, Sam Canino, and Anthony Paterno, assistant marshals, of the parade; Robert S. Tomaso, chairman, and Mrs. Serafina Ferrara, Joseph Fusco, Frank Catrambone, cochairman, of the finance and souvenir book; and Domenick Di Frisco, chairman of the publicity and queen contest.

The other members of these committees are: Dominick Gentile, Mrs. Mary Spallitta, Anthony Parisi, Joseph Tolitano, Peter Barbero, Rudolph Bilotta, Frank Bottigliero, Dr. Nicholas J. Bruno, Joseph Fontana, Peter Realmuto, Miss Virginia Vazzano, Dominick Dolci, Daniel A. Becco, Carl Ferina, Michael R. Fortino, John Spatuzza, Carl La Paglia, Egisto Menconi, Louis Moretti, Dominick M. Alberti, Dr. Joseph H. Di Leonarde, William Fantozzi, Lt. Joseph Giglio, Rosario Lombardo, Amedeo Yelmini, Paul Iaccino, Henry L. Coco, James Coli, Mathew Alagna, Dr. August F. Daro, N. R. Dispenza, Michael Epifanio, Dr. Salvatore J. Glorioso, Albert Litterio, Dr. S. Liturri, Vincent Lucchese, Charles Porcelli, Gerald Sbarbaro, Peter R. Scalise, Horatio Tocco, Dr. John J. Vitacco, Louis P. Farina, Peter Lavorata, Fred Mazzei, Vincent Lucania, and Vincent Saverino.

Miss Josephine Fortunato, who is 20 years old, was chosen as queen of the Columbus Day parade. She resides at 365 North Paulina, Chicago, Ill. The prizes awarded to the queen are a wardrobe and a free trip to Italy, sponsored by the Joint Civic Committee of Italian Americans via Al Italia Airlines.

Chosen as members of the queen's court were Miss Cira Profit, River Forest, Ill.; Miss Kathi Perelli, 14345 Woodlawn, Dolton, Ill.; Miss Rosemarie Lobraico, 728 South May Street, Chicago, Ill.; and Miss Nancy Tomaso, 115 Euclid Avenue, Park Ridge, Ill.

The judges for the queen's contest included Mr. Maurice Fischer, assistant to the editor, Chicago Daily News; Miss Barbara Tiritilli, reporter for Chicago's American; Mr. Al Borcover, assistant travel editor, Chicago Tribune; Mr. Patrick Muldowney, newscaster, WFLD–TV, channel 32; Miss Jeanette Benedetta, representative for Al Italia Airlines; and Mrs. Charles C. Smith, director, Upward Bound Project, Barat College, Lake Forest, Ill.

The winners this year in the authentic Italian costume contest were: First prize, Miss Eileen Riccomi, 1332 South 50th Court, Cicero, Ill., $100 savings bond; second prize, Mrs. Lorraine Perry, 5417 West Gladys, Chicago, Ill., $75 savings bond; third prize, Miss Esther Benetti, 3528 South 55th Avenue, Cicero, Ill., $50 savings bond; fourth prize, Dr. Mary Ellen Batanich, 9215 South Troy Avenue, Chicago, Ill., $50 savings bond; fifth prize, Mrs. Eleana Frigoletti, 7212 West 62d Street, Summit, Ill., $25 savings bond; sixth prize, Mrs. Pat Bruno, 7731 South Walcott Avenue, Chicago, Ill., $25 savings bond; seventh prize, Mrs. Amelia Tomaselli, 228 South Bell Avenue, Chicago, Ill., $25 savings bond; eighth prize, Mrs. Emelia Scarpelli, 2429 West Erie Street, Chicago, Ill., $25 savings bond; ninth prize, Mrs. Concetta Bastone, 1632 North Mason, Chicago, Ill., $25 savings bond; and tenth prize, Miss Adelaide Ventucci, 1713 75th Court, Elmwood Park, Ill., $25 savings bond.

The judges for the authentic Italian costumes contest, in addition to Mr. Fischer, Mr. Borcover, and Miss Tiritilli, included Mr. Fred Mazzei, custom tailor, 203 North Wabash, Chicago, Ill., and Miss Carmella Spina, chairman, home economics department, Steinmetz High School, Chicago, Ill.

The prizes for the costume contest have been donated by the Joint Civic Committee of Italian Americans, which sponsors the Columbus Day parade each year and is the civic organization representing over 500,000 Italo-Americans in the Chicago metropolitan area. Mr. Anthony Sorrentino is the able and hardworking consultant for the Joint Civic Committee of Italian Americans.

The Columbus Day celebration will begin with solemn high Mass at 9 a.m. at Our Lady of Pompeii Church in Chicago, with Bishop Aloysius J. Wycislo officiating, followed at 10 a.m. by a wreath-laying ceremony at Columbus Statue in Vernon Park opposite the church. At 12 noon, the parade will begin at State and Wacker Streets. Following the parade, at 2:30 p.m., another wreath-laying ceremony will take place at Columbus Monument in Grant Park. The festivities will be brought to a close with a reception in honor of Attorney General Ramsey Clark beginning at 3 p.m. at the Sherman House in Chicago. Leaders of the Italo-American organizations from Illinois, Indiana, and Michigan will be at the reception, together with officials from the city of Chicago and from the State of Illinois.

It is a source of pride to know that Americans of all national origins will participate in our Columbus Day parade, an annual patriotic event commemorating Columbus' discovery of America. This year, October 12 has been proclaimed a legal school holiday by Gov. Otto Kerner, and the schoolchildren will be free to participate in this celebration and to view the parade.

Columbus' discovery opened the door to the future, not only of our own country, but of the whole Western Hemisphere as well. It may even be regarded as the greatest historical event of our times in view of the tremendous strides and the great advances that mankind has made since that eventful day, October 12, 1492.

It is entirely fitting, then, that this day be celebrated as a national legal holiday. Toward that end, I have introduced in the Congress, H.R. 3891, and many of my colleagues have joined me in introducing similar measures. Already, House Judiciary Subcommittee No. 4 has completed hearings on this legislation, and I am hopeful that favorable action will be taken in this session of the 90th Congress, so that next year we may celebrate Columbus Day as a national legal holiday, and thereby give this long overdue recognition to the eminent Italian navigator.

It gives me great pleasure to join my friends in Chicago, my colleagues here in Washington, and my fellow citizens all over the United States in honoring America's first and perhaps greatest immigrant—Christopher Columbus.

SLOVENIAN FESTIVAL DAY

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with their long-established tradition, the Slovenian people on October 14 will hold a festival to celebrate the 417th anniversary of the first book printed in Slovenian and the 49th anniversary of their independence from the Hapsburg Empire.

The Slovenes form one of the six south-Slavic groups, known as People's Republics, which make up today's Yugoslavia. Slovenia today has a territory of a little less than 8,000 miles and a population of about 1,500,000. On paper, at least, they have the right of self-government, and the least, as well as the most, one can say is that they seem to be reconciled, for the time being at any rate, to their present lot.

But the courageous Slovenes are not a submissive people. In November 1957, Slovenian coal miners staged a successful sitdown strike. This was the first officially admitted occurrence of an economical strike in a Communist country. It was not a violent rebellion on the part of the Slovenes but it did demonstrate their dissatisfaction under the Communist system and their bravery in expressing this dissatisfaction.

They again demonstrated their dissatisfaction when on December 7, 1966, the Government of the Yugoslav Republic of Slovenia resigned. This was an unprecedented move and was the first time in the history of Communist Yugoslavia that a government resigned after being defeated in Parliament.

Mr. Janko Smole, the Slovenian Prime Minister, able economist and former national bank director, handed in his government's resignation saying he could no longer accept responsibility for economic developments. The immediate cause of his action was a disagreement over a parliamentary bill intended to reduce from 7 to 6 percent the contributions made by factories to the social security program and to make up the difference by having the workers increase their contributions from 1 to 2 percent. This bill had to be approved by the National Assembly before it could become law. One chamber approved it and another rejected it. Under the circumstances, Premier Smole announced his government would not assume responsibility for carrying out the economic reform and resigned.

Finally, when both houses of Parliament passed a bill similar to the one that caused the crisis, the Premier withdrew the resignation because the reason for the original resignation of the government no longer existed.

The Government of the Yugoslav Republic of Slovenia bravely expressed its opinion by resigning when it disagreed with a proposal for economic reform and set a fine example for other Communist-controlled governments to follow.

This modern-day example of Slovenian courage in the face of tyranny is reminiscent of the bravery which Slovenes have demonstrated time and again during their long history which goes back over 1,000 years.

Fortunately, being indomitable fighters for their freedom and for their national traditions, they have never been totally submerged in the sea of other peoples which surrounds their country. Politically, because of their relatively small number, their achievements were bound to be limited, but in other spheres of activity, especially in their intellectual and spiritual attainments, they have been second to none in that part of the world.

Although subjected to alien rule in their homeland, the Slovenes succeeded in printing the first book in their own language in the year 1550. The importance of this event is properly appreciated when one bears in mind that this first printed book in the Slovene language was also the first printed book in any Slavic language.

The story of the Slovenes in the United States began during the first half of the 18th century when a group of people from Yugoslavia sailed for America. The Slovenes, like other immigrants, came to America to enjoy freedom and to have the opportunity to develop their rich and varied natural talents as artisans and artists, as laborers and tradesmen, as men of letters and of science, as politicians in public affairs and dedicated public servants in many professions, and above all, as daring and dauntless fighters for the preservation of the American democratic way of life.

According to the latest estimates, there are over 400,000 Slovenes presently residing in the United States. They are proud and loyal citizens of this great Republic. Through loyalty and pure merit, they have attained high and honored positions in public life. Among such honored individuals are Senator FRANK LAUSCHE of Ohio, Congressman JOHN A. BLATNIK of Minnesota, and Ludwig J. Andolsek, Commissioner of the Civil Service Commission, to mention only a few outstanding public servants.

On this special occasion, I would like to congratulate the many hundreds of Slovenians who reside in the Seventh Congressional District of Illinois, which I have the honor to represent. I am proud that the headquarters of the Slovenian Women's Union of America in Chicago is located in my congressional district. At this time, I would also like to congratulate my good friend, Ludwig A. Leskovar, who is celebrating his 17th anniversary as a Slovene radio broadcaster in Chicago.

The alderman and ward committeeman of the 25th ward, Hon. Vito Marzullo, where hundreds of Slovenians reside, joins me in extending best wishes to the Slovenians on the occasion of their festival day.

It gives me great pleasure to participate in this celebration, and I would like to include at this point in the RECORD, the resolution of Hon. Richard J. Daley, mayor of Chicago, in which he proclaims October 14, 1967, as Slovenian Day in Chicago. The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, Thousands of Americans of Slovenian descent living in Illinois for generations have contrbiuted greatly to the growth and development of our City and State; and,

Whereas, the Slovenians of Illinois have formed and have been active in hundreds of religious, civic, fraternal and patriotic organizations; and,

Whereas, they have contributed in large measure to our American culture, notably in the field of folk-polka music; and,

Whereas, the Slovenian Radio Hour of Chicago, under the direction of Dr. Ludwig A. Leskovar, is celebrating the seventeenth consecutive year of radio broadcasting; and,

Whereas, this year, the Slovenians the world over observe the four hundred seventeenth anniversary of the first printed book, in the year 1550 A.D.; and,

Whereas, this year marks the forty-ninth year since the Slovenian nation gained independence from the Austro-Hungarian Empire, this being on October 29, 1918:

Now, therefore, I, Richard J. Daley, Mayor of the City of Chicago, do hereby declare Saturday, October 14, 1967, to be Slovenian Day in Chicago and urge all citizens to join with the neighbors of Slovenian descent in observance of this time.

IF CONGRESS AND THE ADMINISTRATION ARE SERIOUS ABOUT TAX REFORM AND THE NEED TO DIMINISH THE DEFICIT, HERE IS HOW TO DO IT

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, here is a two-step program for improving the Federal tax system by closing tax loopholes, while at the same time immediately raising Federal revenues needed to reduce the current Federal deficit.

Step 1 is the prompt consideration by the House Ways and Means Committee of H.R. 13490, the Tax Reform Act of 1967, which I introduce today for myself, Mr. REES, Mr. COHELAN, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. DOW, Mr. MEEDS, and Mr. ADAMS. The bill would plug or substantially diminish 10 major leaks in our present tax system, saving the Treasury more than $4 billion annually in lost revenues.

Since the House Ways and Means Committee has voted to table the President's 10-percent tax surcharge proposal, it now has the time, and I hope the energy, to tackle the longstanding task of tax reform.

I recognize, however, that congressional deliberations on this bill would take several months. I also recognize the immediate need for additional revenue to repair in part the revenue deficit facing us. Unless we raise additional revenues immediately, a tight money squeeze with disastrous effects on housing seems inevitable.

Step 2, therefore, is for the House Ways and Means Committee immediately to report the President's 10-percent tax surcharge proposal, amended so that it will terminate on March 31, 1968, for the purpose of providing additional Federal revenues right now during the period in which the tax reform proposal is being considered.

While the House Ways and Means Committee has at the moment balked at enacting the President's semipermanent 10-percent tax surcharge, the Committee should be willing to consider an emergency 6-month version of the proposal, which will meet the Treasury's immediate deficit. The President, by promptly stating those budgetary areas which he believes least essential and thus the appropriations most eligible for congressional rescission, could do his part in breaking the impasse.

By March 31, 1968, when the tax surcharge expires, the Tax Reform Act of 1967 will have had a full hearing, and hopefully will have been enacted. At this time, 6 months hence, the House Ways and Means Committee could consider tax legislation anew in light of the revenue to be raised by the Tax Reform Act and the general state of the economy.

The tax scenario, should create a lobby for tax reform of some 50 billion low- and moderate-income taxpayers. To the extent that revenues are raised through the closing of tax loopholes, the 50 million taxpayers making less than $20,000 a year will be relieved of the additional tax burden.

I strongly urge the administration and the Congress to adopt this two-step program.

Following is a title-by-title description of the Tax Reform Act of 1967:

TITLE I: SHORT TITLE AND PROVISION FOR PERFECTING AMENDMENTS

TITLE II: TAXING CAPITAL GAINS UNTAXED AT DEATH—SAVINGS $2.5 BILLION

The Federal revenues this year will be $2.5 billion smaller because capital gains income on appreciated property when it is passed on from generation to generation legally escapes all taxation. If taxpayer sells for $15,000 stock which he bought for $5,000, his tax—at maximum 25-percent capital gains rates—will be $2,500. If he delays a day and dies owning the stock, neither he nor his heirs will pay any income tax, and Uncle Sam will be out the $2,500.

This loophole greatly favors those who have large amounts of accumulated wealth to pass on to the next generation.

Moreover, the anticipation of a tax-free transfer of appreciated property has the unfortunate effect of locking in investment funds which would normally follow investment opportunities. Instead of selling and reinvesting, older people freeze their investment portfolios to save paying capital gains tax.

This income tax loophole can be closed, accompanied by conforming amendments. It was a part of the tax reform program President Kennedy sponsored in 1962. At one point it was approved by the Ways and Means Committee, only to be subsequently lost before the final version of the bill was reported.

TITLE III: ELIMINATING THE UNLIMITED CHARITABLE DEDUCTION—SAVINGS $50 MILLION

A painless way to raise $50 million is to abolish the little-known unlimited charitable deduction.

The ordinary taxpayer may not deduct more than 30 percent of his income for his contributions to charity, no matter how much he gives. Not so with the millionaire looking for a tax dodge. A special dispensation in the tax law allows him to deduct gifts to charity without limit if in eight of 10 previous years a total of 90 percent or better of his taxable income has been given to charity or paid in taxes.

This provision does not require that the millionaire give away or pay in taxes 90 percent of his actual income for nearly a decade to qualify.

For example, to qualify for the unlimited charitable deduction a high-bracket taxpayer with a taxable income of $1 million may give away and pay in State and local taxes 90 percent of his income, or $900,000. But if he manages his affairs well, his $1 million of taxable income will not include a large amount of tax-free interest which he receives on municipal bonds he owns and/or one-half of his sizable capital gains income from his investments. In this way he can virtually escape paying income taxes, while giving away or paying in taxes substantially less than 90 percent of what he earns.

TITLE IV: ELIMINATING SPECIAL TAX TREATMENT FOR STOCK OPTIONS—SAVINGS $100 MILLION

As a result of the stock option loophole, top executives of large corporations are able to receive part of their pay at favorable capital gains rates.

Here is how it works. If a corporation rewards an executive with a bonus or a raise, he must pay income tax on these at ordinary tax rates. If, however, the corporation rewards him by giving him an option to purchase its stock, the profit the executive receives upon selling the stock is taxed as a capital gain, at a maximum tax rate of 25 percent.

On account of this tax break, stock options have become very popular with large corporations, such as Chrysler

Corp. In 1958, Chrysler gave its top executives options to purchase shares of its stock. They exercised the options in 1963, receiving Chrysler stock on which they realized a profit of nearly $4 million. This doubled the nearly $4 million in salaries and bonuses they had received in the 6 years from 1958 through 1963.

But, instead of having to pay income tax at regular rate up to 70 percent on the $4 million profit they received from the sale of the stock, the Chrysler officials only paid income tax at the maximum 25-percent capital gains rate.

As a result of President Kennedy's 1962 request that the stock option loophole be abolished, the Revenue Act of 1964 tightened up the terms qualifying business executives for this privileged treatment. The privilege, however, still remains. It is time to ring down the curtain on it.

By so doing, the saving to the Treasury could well be $100 million.

TITLE V: ELIMINATING THE $100 DIVIDEND EXCLUSION—SAVINGS $200 MILLION

In 1964, one out of every seven taxpayers got a tax break which his fellow taxpayer did not. The lucky ones were generally the high-bracket taxpayers who invested in stocks. They paid no tax on the first $100 of dividends which they received. By contrast, their neighbors who put their money in savings and loans or in Government bonds, paid income tax on all the interest paid them.

The dividend exclusion was first written into the tax law in 1954. The ostensible reason was to compensate for the "double taxation" of dividends which are taxed first to the corporation as corporate income and then again as a dividend when distributed to the taxpayer.

The logic of the double taxation argument would lead to the conclusion that all dividends should escape tax. Uncle Sam would then lose over $2.4 billion in taxes instead of the $200 million he now loses on account of the $100 exclusion. But even the strongest proponents of the 1954 dividend exclusion did not think this appropriate.

Corporations and their shareholders are separate taxable entities. Enterprises are, in fact, incorporated for the very purpose of limiting the owner's liability by separating his income and assets from those of the corporation. Thus, there is no injustice in taxing the owner's and the corporation's incomes independently.

Double taxation, moreover, is a fact of life. Excise, sales, and use taxes are often pyramided on top of each other. The amount of the sales tax on a car, for example, is in part attributable to taxes on the parts which went into it.

Abolishing this special privilege for shareholders would increase Treasury revenues by $200 million.

TITLE VI: ELIMINATING THE BENEFITS DERIVED FROM MULTIPLE CORPORATIONS—SAVINGS $150 MILLION

A popular way to avoid high tax rates is to divide the income from one source among a number of largely fictional taxpayers. Dividing a single business enterprise into a number of separate parts for tax purposes has long been a disorder of the corporate world. Since the first $25,000 of corporate income is taxed at a 22-percent rate and the remainder at 48 percent, it is a decided advantage, for example, to have four corporations reporting taxable income of $25,000 each rather than one corporation reporting $100,000.

In a June 20 speech, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Stanley S. Surrey said that where a single enterprise is involved, it should be taxed as a single enterprise, regardless of how many subsidiaries it is divided into or of whether the division was made for legitimate business or for purely tax reasons.

Ignoring the multiple corporate parts of a single business enterprise would save the Treasury $150 million annually.

TITLE VII: REMOVING THE TAX EXEMPTION ON MUNICIPAL INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT BONDS—SAVINGS $50 MILLION

Cities throughout the country are today issuing municipal bonds, bearing tax-free interest to finance industrial plants and commercial facilities for private, profitmaking corporations.

The usual method by which cities pass their tax benefits to private corporations is to issue bonds to construct a plant in accordance with the corporation's specifications and then to lease the structure to the corporation, using the rental payments to retire the bond. Because the city's bonds are tax free, their interest rate is lower than the interest rates on bonds which the corporation could issue. The corporation reaps the advantage of the low tax-exempt interest rate.

Unlike ordinary tax-exempt municipal bonds which finance at lower tax-exempt interest rates needed public facilities, such as schools, roads, sewers, hospitals, or airports, these municipal industrial development bonds have no redeeming virtue. They are simply an unintentional Federal subsidy to private industry. Plugging this loophole would save the Treasury at least $50 million a year.

TITLE VIII: REDUCING THE MINERAL DEPLETION ALLOWANCE FROM 27½ PERCENT TO 15 PERCENT ON OIL AND FROM 23 PERCENT TO 15 PERCENT ON 41 OTHER MINERALS—SAVINGS $800 MILLION

The most celebrated of tax loopholes is the oil depletion allowance. This allowance spares the oil millionaire from paying income on the first 27½ percent of the gross income from his oil wells—so long as it does not exceed 50 percent of his net income.

In 1964, as a result of this provision, the five largest U.S. oil refiners paid the following percentages of their income in Federal income taxes: Standard Oil of New Jersey, 1.7 percent; Texaco, 0.8 percent; Gulf, 8.6 percent; Socony Mobile, 5.9 percent; Standard of California, 2.1 percent—these tax payments in a year in which corporate taxes rates were 48 percent.

The percentage depletion allowance runs as long as the oil well is producing, bears no relation to investment, and, as a consequence, permits recovery of tax-free income far in excess of actual investment. In fact, the Treasury has recently disclosed that, on an average, the cost of an oil well is recovered 19 times over by the depletion allowance.

If depletion were not computed on a percentage basis, but were, like ordinary depreciation, limited to the cost of the oilwell, it would not be objectionable. The income tax is a tax on income, not on capital which is used up.

Ideally, then, percentage depletion should be replaced with cost depletion. But since this is a practical tax reform package which can be enacted, this title includes only a provision that the percentage depletion allowance be reduced by less than one-half, from 27½ to 15 percent, the percentage now applicable to over 40 other minerals.

At the same time, this title would reduce to 15 percent the mineral depletion allowance on 41 minerals now enjoying a 23-percent depletion rate. These two reforms would put a ceiling on all percentage depletion of 15 percent.

In his 1950 tax message, President Truman said:

> I know of no loophole in the tax laws so inequitable as the excessive depletion exemptions now enjoyed by oil and mining interests.

He then proposed in that year, and again in 1951, to limit the mineral depletion deduction to 15 percent.

The revenue gain from this modest reduction of a special privilege would be at least $800 million annually.

TITLE IX: ESTABLISHING THE SAME RATE FOR GIFT AND ESTATE TAXES—SAVINGS, $100 MILLION

Present tax law places a premium on a person giving away his property during his lifetime. Three thousand dollars can be given away annually to each of any number of individuals without paying gift tax. Over and above these amounts, $30,000 can be given away by a person during his lifetime without paying gift tax. Finally, any taxable gift is taxed at only three-quarters of the estate tax rate on property which is transferred at death.

Proposed here is a simple 25-percent increase in gift tax rates so that property given away is taxed at the same rate without regard to whether it is given during the donor's lifetime or at his death.

On June 20, Assistant Secretary Surrey called for a major overhaul of the gift and estate taxes in order to eliminate this and other inequities. One hundred million dollars in revenues could be gained quickly by the reform incorporated in this title.

TITLE X: ELIMINATING PAYMENT OF ESTATE TAXES BY THE REDEMPTION OF GOVERNMENT BONDS AT PAR—SAVINGS, $50 MILLION

If upon death a person faces a $100,000 probable estate tax bill and has a smart lawyer, the lawyer will advise his client to buy $100,000 worth of long-term U.S. Government bonds. Why? Because the U.S. Treasury will redeem its bonds at par in payment of estate taxes, no matter what his client paid for them. If his client, for example, buys Government bonds for $80,000 and his estate turns them in at $100,000 the decedent reduces his estate tax bill by 20 percent.

Uncle Sam loses $50 million a year as a result of his little known generosity.

TITLE XI: ELIMINATING ACCELERATED DEPRECIATION ON SPECULATIVE REAL ESTATE—SAVINGS $100 MILLION

This title would repeal section 1250 of the Internal Revenue Code, permitting accelerated tax depreciation on speculative investment real estate.

As the law now stands generally speaking an owner of real estate may take an accelerated depreciation deduction against his ordinary income, sell his real estate, and then receive capital gain income at the lower capital gain tax rate for the difference between the sale price and the depreciated value of the property.

The effect of this provision is to allow income which would normally be taxed at regular tax rates to be taxed at lower capital gains rates.

President Kennedy requested this reform in his tax reform program of 1963.

Mr. Speaker, I include a copy of H.R. 13490 at this point in the Record:

H.R. 13490

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to raise needed additional revenues by tax reform

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 101. Short title, etc.

(a) Short Title.—This Act may be cited as the "Tax Reform Act of 1967".

(b) Amendment of 1954 Code.—Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made a section or other provision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

Sec. 102. Technical and conforming changes.

The Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate shall, as soon as practicable but in any event not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, submit to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a draft of the technical and conforming changes in the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 which are necessary to reflect throughout such Code the changes in the substantive provisions of law made by this Act.

TITLE II—CAPITAL GAINS UNTAXED AT DEATH

Sec. 201. Carryover of basis at death.

(a) Amendment of Section 1014.—Section 1014 (relating to basis of property acquired from a decedent) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) Decedents Dying After December 31, 1967.—In the case of a decedent dying after December 31, 1967, this section shall not apply to any property for which an adjusted carryover basis is provided by section 1023."

(b) Adjusted Carryover Basis.—Part II of subchapter O of chapter 1 (relating to basis rules of general application) is amended by redesignating section 1023 as section 1024 and by inserting after section 1022 the following new section:

"Sec. 1023. Adjusted carryover basis for certain property acquired from a decedent dying after December 31, 1967.

"(a) General Rule.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, if—

"(1) carryover basis property is acquired from a decedent dying after December 31, 1967, and

"(2) the gross estate at death of the decedent exceeds $60,000,

then the basis of such property in the hands of the person so acquiring it shall be the adjusted basis of the property immediately before the death of the decedent, further adjusted as provided in this section.

"(b) Carryover Basis Property Defined.—For purposes of this section, the term 'carryover basis property' means any property acquired from a decedent dying after December 31, 1967, which is property described in paragraph (1), (2), (3), (4), (6), or (9) of section 1014(b), other than—

"(1) property acquired by the decedent before January 1, 1951,

"(2) property (not including property of extraordinary value) which is a personal or household effect,

"(3) property acquired by any person from the decedent before his death which was disposed of by such person before the decedent's death,

"(4) property described in section 2042 (relating to proceeds of life insurance), and

"(5) property which constitutes a right to receive an item of income in respect of a decedent under section 691.

"(c) Increase in Basis.—

"(2) In general.—The basis of carryover basis property in the hands of the person acquiring it from the decedent shall be increased by its proportionate share of the Federal and State estate taxes attributable to the net appreciation in value of all carryover basis properties.

"(2) Minimum increase.—In the case of any decedent, the aggregate increase under paragraph (1) shall not be less than whichever of the following amounts is the greater:

"(A) the amount (if any) by which $60,000 exceeds the aggregate bases of all property included in the gross estate (such bases to be determined after the application of section 1014 but before any adjustment under this section), or

"(B) the amount (if any) by which $15,000 exceeds the amount by which the aggregate bases of all property to which section 1014 applies (such bases to be determined after the application of section 1014) is greater than the aggregate adjusted bases of such property immediately before the death of the decedent.

"(3) Manner of allocation.—

"(A) In general.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the increase under this subsection in the basis of each carryover basis property shall be that amount which bears the same ratio to the aggregate increase determined under paragraphs (1) and (2) as the appreciation in value of such property bears to the aggregate appreciation in value of all carryover basis properties having appreciation in value.

"(B) Special rule for section 303 redemptions.—To the extent the decedent provides by will, the increase in basis under this subsection shall be allocated first to stock which is carryover basis property and which after his death is redeemed under section 303 (relating to distributions in redemption of stock to pay death taxes). Any remaining increase in basis under this subsection shall be allocated among the other carryover basis property in accordance with subparagraph (A).

"(4) Fair market value limitation.—The increase under this subsection in the basis of any property shall not exceed the increase necessary to produce a basis equal to the fair market value of such property.

"(d) Further Increase in Basis for Certain State Succession Tax Paid by Transferee of Property.—If—

"(1) any person acquires carryover basis property from a decedent, and

"(2) such person actually pays an amount of estate, inheritance, legacy, or succession tax with respect to such property to any State or possession of the United States or to the District of Columbia for which the estate is not liable,

then the basis of such property (after any adjustment under subsection (c)) shall be increased (but not above its fair market value) by the portion of such amount which is attributable to the appreciation in value of such property.

"(e) Treatment of Community Property.—

"(1) In general.—The surviving spouse's interest in all community property—

"(A) for purposes of subsections (a)(2) and (c)(2), shall be treated as included in the gross estate of the decedent,

"(B) for purposes of this section (other than subsection (d)), shall be treated as property acquired from the decedent, and

"(C) for purposes of subsections (b)(1) and (e), shall be treated as property held by the decedent.

"(2) Community property defined.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the term 'community property' means property—

"(A) held by the decedent and the surviving spouse as community property under the laws of any State or possession of the United States, or any foreign country, and

"(B) at least one-half of the whole community property interest in which was includible in determining the value of the decedent's gross estate under chapter 11.

"(f) Special Rules and Definitions for Application of Subsection (c).—For purposes of subsection (c)—

"(1) Federal and State estate taxes.—The term 'Federal and State estate taxes' means only—

"(A) the tax imposed by section 2001 or 2101, reduced by (i) any credit allowable with respect to a tax on prior transfers by section 2013 or 2102, and (ii) any credit allowable with respect to State death taxes under section 2011 or 2102, and

"(B) any estate, inheritance, legacy, or succession taxes, for which the estate is liable, actually paid by the estate to any State or possession of the United States, or to the District of Columbia.

"(2) Federal and State estate taxes attributable to net appreciation in value.—The term 'Federal and State estate taxes attributable to the net appreciation in value of all carryover basis properties' means that amount which bears the same ratio to the Federal and State estate taxes as the net appreciation in value of the carryover basis properties bears to the value of the gross estate (as defined in section 2031 or section 2103).

"(3) Net appreciation.—The net appreciation in value of all carryover basis properties is the amount by which the fair market value of all such property exceeds the adjusted basis of such property immediately before the death of the decedent.

"(4) Gifts.—In the case of carryover basis property acquired from the decedent by gift, the increase in basis under subsection (c) shall not exceed the amount by which the increase under such subsection is greater than the increase allowable under section 1015(d).

"(5) Charitable gifts.—If—

"(A) a deduction is allowable under section 2055 or 2106(a)(2) with respect to any property, and

"(B) such property is specifically identifiable as passing from the decedent to a use specified in such section,

then, to the extent of such deduction, such property shall be treated as property which is not carryover basis property.

"(g) Other Special Rules and Definitions.—

"(1) Fair market value.—For purposes of this section, when not otherwise distinctly expressed, the term 'fair market value' means fair market value determined under chapter 11 (including section 2032, relating to alternate valuation).

"(2) Property passing from the decedent.—For purposes of this section, property passing from the decedent shall be treated as property acquired from the decedent.

"(3) Decedent's basis unknown.—If the facts necessary to determine the basis (unadjusted) of carryover basis property immediaitely before the death of the decedent are unknown to the person acquiring such property from the decedent, such basis shall be treated as being the fair market value of such property as of the date (or approximate date) at which such property was acquired by the decedent or by the last preceding owner in whose hands it did not have a basis determined in whole or in part by reference to its basis in the hands of a prior holder.

"(4) Certain mortgages.—For purposes of subsections (c) and (d), if—

"(A) there is an unpaid mortgage on, or indebtedness in respect of, property,

"(B) such mortgage or indebtedness does not constitute a liability of the estate, and

"(C) such property is included in the gross estate undiminished by such mortgage or indebtedness,

then the value of such property to be treated as included in the gross estate shall be the value of such property, diminished by such mortgage or indebtedness.

"(5) Decedents nonresident and not citizens.—In the case of a decedent nonresident not a citizen of the United States—

"(A) this section shall be applied by substituting for the figure '$60,000' wherever it appears the amount of the exemption determined under section 2106(a) (3), and

"(B) subsection (c) (2) (B) shall be applied by substituting for the figure '$15,000' the amount which is equal to ¼ of the amount of the exemption determined under section 2106(a) (3).

"(h) Regulations.—The Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section."

(c) Amendment of Section 1016(a).—Section 1016(a) (relating to adjustments to basis) is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and by inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(22) to the extent provided in section 1023, relating to adjusted carryover basis for certain property acquired from a decedent dying after December 31, 1967."

(d) Amendment of Section 691(c).—

(1) Section 691(c) (2) (A) (relating to deduction for estate tax in case of income in respect of decedents) is amended to read as follows:

"(A) The term 'estate tax' means Federal and State estate taxes (within the meaning of section 1023(f) (1))."

(2) Section 691(c) (2) (C) is amended to read as follows:

"(C) The estate tax attributable to such net value shall be an amount which bears the same ratio to the estate tax as such net value bears to the value of the gross estate."

(e) Information Requirement.—

(1) In general.—Subpart A of part III of subchapter A of chapter 61 (relating to information concerning persons subject to special provisions) is amended by inserting after section 6039 the following new section:

"Sec. 6039A. Information regarding basis of property acquired from a decedent.

"(a) In General.—Every executor (as defined in section 2203) shall furnish with respect to the property of the decedent such information as the Secretary or his delegate may prescribe by regulations relating to—

"(1) the name and last address of the decedent;

"(2) the name and address of each person acquiring property from the decedent or to whom the property passed from the decedent, and a description of each item of such property;

"(3) the adjusted basis (within the meaning of section 1011) of each such item in the hands of the decedent immediately before his death; and

"(4) any other information similar or related in nature to that specified in this paragraph.

If an executor is unable to furnish all of the information required under this paragraph with respect to an item of property, he shall include in his return as much of such information as he is able to, including a description of such item and the name of every person holding a legal or beneficial interest therein, and, upon notice from the Secretary or his delegate, such person shall be treated with respect to such item as if he were an executor for purposes of this section.

"(b) Statements To Be Furnished to Persons Who Acquire Property From a Decedent.—Every executor who is required to furnish information under subsection (a) shall furnish in writing to each person described in subsection (a) (2) such information with respect to each item of property acquired from the decedent or passing from the decedent to such person as is required under subsection (a) and which the Secretary or his delegate may prescribe by regulations."

(2) Penalties.—Subchapter B of chapter 68 (relating to assessable penalties) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 6684. Failure to file information with respect to basis of property acquired from a decedent.

"(a) Information Required To Be Furnished to the Secretary.—Any executor who fails to furnish information required under section 6039A(a) on the date prescribed therefor (determined with regard to any extension of time for filing) shall pay a penalty of 1 percent of the fair market value of the property described in section 6039A(a) (2), or $5,000, whichever is less, for such failure, unless it is shown that such failure is due to reasonable cause and not to willful neglect.

"(b) Information Required To Be Furnished to Beneficiaries.—Any executor who fails to furnish in writing to each person described in section 6039A(a) (2) the information required under section 6039A(b), unless it is shown that such failure is due to reasonable cause and not to willful neglect, shall pay (upon notice and demand by the Secretary or his delegate and in the same manner as tax) $50 for each such failure, but the total amount imposed for all such failures shall not exceed $1,000."

(f) Discharge of Executor From Personal Liability.—Section 2204 (relating to discharge of executor from personal liability) is amended by striking out "notified," where it appears in the second sentence of such section and inserting in lieu thereof "notified or on furnishing of a bond pursuant to section 6165 in circumstances in which the Secretary or his delegate is satisfied that such payment will be made,".

Sec. 202. Effective date.

The amendments made by section 201 shall apply only with respect to decedents dying after December 31, 1967.

TITLE III—REPEAL OF UNLIMITED CHARITABLE DEDUCTION

Sec. 301. Repeal of deduction.

Sections 170(b) (1) (C) (relating to unlimited deduction for certain individuals) and 170(g) (relating to application of unlimited deduction) are repealed.

Sec. 302. Effective date.

Section 301 shall apply with respect to taxable years ending after December 31, 1967.

TITLE IV—REPEAL OF STOCK OPTION PROVISIONS

Sec. 401. Repeal of provisions.

(a) Qualified Stock Options.—Section 422 (relating to qualified stock options) is repealed.

(b) Restricted Stock Options.—Section 424 (relating to restricted stock options) is repealed.

Sec. 402. Effective date.

Section 401 shall apply with respect to options granted after December 31, 1967.

TITLE V—REPEAL OF DIVIDEND EXCLUSION

Sec. 501. Repeal.

Section 116 (relating to partial exclusion from gross income of dividends received by individuals) is repealed.

Sec. 502. Effective date.

Section 501 shall apply with respect to taxable years ending after December 31, 1967.

TITLE VI—MULTIPLE SURTAX EXEMPTION

Sec. 601. Repeal of privilege of groups to elect exemption.

Section 1562 (relating to privilege of groups to elect multiple surtax exemptions) is repealed.

Sec. 602. Effective date.

Section 601 shall apply with respect to taxable years ending after December 31, 1967.

TITLE VII—MUNICIPAL INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT BONDS

Sec. 701. Elimination of exemption.

(a) In General.—Section 103 (relating to interest on certain governmental obligations) is amended by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (e), and by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

"(c) Industrial Development Bonds.—

"(1) Subsection (a)(1) not to apply.—Any industrial development bond (as defined in paragraph (2)) issued after December 31, 1967, shall not be considered an obligation described in subsection (a)(1).

"(2) Industrial development bond defined.—

"(A) In general.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'industrial development bond' means an obligation the payment of the principal or interest on which is—

"(i) secured in whole or in part by a lien, mortgage, pledge, or other security interest in property of a character subject to the allowance for depreciation, or

"(ii) secured in whole or in part by an interest in (or to be derived primarily from) payments to be made in respect of money or property of a character subject to the allowance for depreciation.

which is or will be used, under a lease, sale, or loan arrangement, for industrial or commercial purposes.

"(B) Exceptions.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), property shall not be treated as used for industrial or commercial purposes if it is used—

"(i) to provide entertainment (including sporting events) or recreational facilities for the general public;

"(ii) to provide facilities for the holding of a convention, trade show, or similar event;

"(iii) as an airport, dock, wharf, or similar transportation facility;

"(iv) in the furnishing or sale of electric energy, gas, water, or sewage disposal services; or

"(v) in an active trade or business owned and operated by an organization described in subsection (a)(1).

"(3) Exception.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any obligation issued before January 1, 1969, for a project assisted by the United States under title I of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1450 and following, relating to slum clearance and urban renewal) or under title I or title II of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3131 and following)."

(b) Certain Urban Renewal Bonds.—Section 102(g) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1152(g)), is amended to read as follows:

"(g) Obligations, including interest thereon, other than industrial development bonds (within the meaning of section 103(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954), issued by local public agencies for projects assisted pursuant to this title, and income derived by such agencies from such projects, shall be exempt from all taxation now or hereafter imposed by the United States."

Sec. 702. Effective date.

The amendments made by section 701 shall apply with respect to taxable years ending after December 31, 1967.

TITLE VIII—PERCENTAGE DEPLETION RATES FOR OIL, GAS, AND CERTAIN OTHER MINERALS

Sec. 801. Reduction in rates.

Section 613(b) (relating to percentage depletion rates) is amended—

(1) by striking out "27½ percent" in paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "15 percent"; and (2) by striking out "23 percent" in paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof "15 percent".

Sec. 802. Effective date.

Section 801 shall apply with respect to taxable years ending after December 31, 1967.

TITLE IX—INCREASE IN GIFT TAX RATES TO ESTATE TAX LEVEL

Sec. 901. Increase in rates.

The table in section 2502(a) (relating to computation of tax) is amended to read as follows:

"RATE SCHEDULE

"If the taxable gifts are:	The tax shall be:
Not over $5,000	3% of the taxable gifts.
Over $5,000 but not over $10,000.	$150, plus 7% of excess over $5,000.
Over $10,000 but not over $20,000.	$500, plus 11% of excess over $10,000.
Over $20,000 but not over $30,000.	$1,600, plus 14% of excess over $20,000.
Over $30,000 but not over $40,000.	$3,000, plus 18% of excess over $30,000.
Over $40,000 but not over $50,000.	$4,800, plus 22% of excess over $40,000.
Over $50,000 but not over $60,000.	$7,000, plus 25% of excess over $50,000.
Over $60,000 but not over $100,000.	$9,500, plus 28% of excess over $60,000.
Over $100,000 but not over $250,000.	$20,700, plus 30% of excess over $100,000.
Over $250,000 but not over $500,000.	$65,700, plus 32% of excess over $250,000.
Over $500,000 but not over $750,000.	$145,700, plus 35% of excess over $500,000.
Over $750,000 but not over $1,000,000.	$233,200, plus 37% of excess over $750,000.
Over $1,000,000 but not over $1,250,000.	$325,700, plus 39% of excess over $1,000,000.
Over $1,250,000 but not over $1,500,000.	$423,200, plus 42% of excess over $1,250,000.
Over $1,500,000 but not over $2,000,000.	$528,200, plus 45% of excess over $1,500,000.
Over $2,000,000 but not over $2,500,000.	$753,200, plus 49% of excess over $2,000,000.
Over $2,500,000 but not over $3,000,000.	$998,200, plus 53% of excess over $2,500,000.
Over $3,000,000 but not over $3,500,000.	$1,263,200, plus 56% of excess over $3,000,000.
Over $3,500,000 but not over $4,000,000.	$1,543,200, plus 59% of excess over $3,500,000.
Over $4,000,000 but not over $5,000,000.	$1,838,200, plus 63% of excess over $4,000,000.
Over $5,000,000 but not over $6,000,000.	$2,468,200, plus 67% of excess over $5,000,000.
Over $6,000,000 but not over $7,000,000.	$3,138,200, plus 70% of excess over $6,000,000.
Over $7,000,000 but not over $8,000,000.	$3,838,200, plus 73% of excess over $7,000,000.
Over $8,000,000 but not over $10,000,000.	$4,568,200, plus 76% of excess over $8,000,000.
Over $10,000,000	$6,088,200, plus 77% of excess over $10,000,000.".

Sec. 902. Effective date.

Section 901 shall apply with respect to calendar years after 1967.

TITLE X—USE OF UNITED STATES BONDS TO PAY ESTATE TAX

Sec. 1001. Repeal of authority to use bonds for tax payments.

(a) Repeal.—Section 14 of the Second Liberty Bond Act (31 U.S.C. 765) is repealed.

(b) Prohibition Against Use of Bonds.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no bond or other obligation of the United States may be accepted by the Secretary of the Treasury in satisfaction of any amount of Federal estate tax liability greater than the fair market value of such obligation at the time it is presented as payment of such liability.

Sec. 1002. Effective date.

Section 1001 shall apply with respect to obligations acquired after December 31, 1967.

TITLE XI—GAINS FROM THE DISPOSITION OF DEPRECIABLE REALTY

Sec. 1401. Inclusion of realty as section 1245 property.

(a) Amendment of Section 1245.—Section 1245 (a)(3) (relating to gain from dispositions of certain depreciable property) is amended by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (C) and (D), respectively, and by inserting immediately after subparagraph (A) the following new subparagraph:

"(B) any real property which is or has been property of a character subject to the allowance for depreciation provided in section 167, or".

(b) Repeal of Section 1250.—Section 1250 (relating to gain from dispositions of certain depreciable realty) is repealed.

Sec. 1402. Effective date.

This title shall apply to dispositions occurring after December 31, 1967.

A TRIBUTE TO CASIMIR PULASKI ON THE OCCASION OF PULASKI DAY

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Rodino] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my voice, on this occasion, to the chorus of praise accorded the exploits of Casimir Pulaski, a mighty son of Poland and champion of the democratic cause.

Born to royalty, Pulaski had every opportunity of making the most of status quo conditions in 18th century Europe. Without struggle, without difficulty, he could have lived the life of splendor and magnificence as a member of the Polish Royal Court, in keeping with his family traditions.

Pulaski, however, was a man of great imagination, conscience, and democratic spirit; so much so that he could not tolerate the outrage of tyranny. Joining with others, he was successful, for a time, in establishing effective resistance to foreign encroachment on Polish soil and foreign domination of Polish governmental affairs. Pulaski and his kind were worn down, however, and overwhelmed by an alliance of foreign adventurers and less principled Polish noblemen. Following the overthrow, in 1772, of Polish republican government established under the so-called Confederation of Bar, Pulaski and other Polish patriots were driven from the land, seeking sanctuary. The cause of Polish independence apparently was dead.

Advised of the impending American revolution, Pulaski became the advocate of American principles, and offered his services to American officials in France. A cavalry officer of high degree, experienced in battle, he was of course gratefully received, and by the summer of 1777, was in America, ready for services in the democratic cause.

At Brandywine, Germantown, and Valley Forge, the courage of Pulaski inspired American troops, and following every bold performance he was promoted, until at last he was directed south to lead the Colonial cavalry against the British forces in the South. A dashing figure on the battlefield, a man of fearless determination, he had become, by 1779, a spectacular symbol of foreign participation in the Colonial cause.

At the height of his fame, recognized for valor and ability, he organized and led a cavalry charge against the enemy, at Savannah, in October, 1779. The British resistance was intense and Pulaski was severely wounded in the battle. Several days later, he died.

To every American patriot, the loss of Pulaski appeared in the nature of catastrophe. His dauntless spirit and numerous accomplishments rendered him a hero of unprecedented proportions, and his loss was mourned on a National scale.

On this day, marking the anniversary of his demise, we hail the memory of Pulaski—a man of principle, of courage, and high attainments, and a man to whom the struggle for democracy was the most important motivating factor in the world.

COLUMBUS DAY, 1967

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Rodino] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to again pay tribute to Christopher Columbus, the grand admiral of the oceans who heroically braved the myth and mysteries of the terrifying, uncharted Atlantic to discover America.

That bold and daring venture, a major milestone in the history of mankind, deserves to be remembered anew each year. In and of itself, it is sufficient reason to justify a national celebration in a country that owes its existence to that magical moment of discovery.

This year October 12 has a special significance, for hearings have just been completed on proposed legislation I have introduced to designate Columbus Day as a national holiday. On this day next year, it is my hope that the legislation will be law, and that the entire Nation will join together in commemorating the valiant achievement of Columbus in opening the new world to civilization and settlement.

I do not mind admitting for the record that I have dreamed of such a national holiday since early boyhood, and that I have worked with diligence and dedication to make this dream a reality ever since my election to Congress in 1948.

In pursuit of this goal, it was my privilege to serve as national chairman of the Citizens Committee for Columbus Day.

From this vantage point, I made a wonderful and heartening discovery of my own.

I learned that I was not one of a small group that had embraced this cause; but rather that I was a part of a large, broad-based cross-section of representative Americans from every walk of life who shared a desire to bring about the creation of Columbus Day as a national holiday.

The list of proponents is lengthy, imposing, and impressive, headed by President Johnson and Vice President HUMPHREY. And going back over the years to many others of equal stature, it includes Governor Hughes from my home State of New Jersey, elected and appointed officials, judges, scientists, educators, leaders of business and commerce, labor officials, white collar workers, blue collar workers, and housewives.

It is particularly significant to realize that today 38 of our 50 States are observing October 12 as a State holiday. And these 38 States include the most populous in the Nation, together accounting for all but a tiny percentage of our total population.

Mr. Speaker, such overwhelming numbers and support cannot be ignored. It is especially incumbent upon the Congress of the United States, the basic focal point of representative democracy, to heed the message of these overwhelming numbers and to act in accordance with the will of the majority of the people.

If the Congress is truly and accurately to be reflective of the view of the majority on this question, it should move forward with speed and determination to enact the legislation now under consideration, which is similar to a measure passed by the Senate in the 88th Congress.

As one who has given considerable thought to the question, I would like to outline my thoughts on the objectives of creating a national holiday on Columbus Day.

As I envision it, Columbus Day would me a multipurpose national holiday.

It would, of course, recognize the magnificent accomplishment of the fearless Genovese navigator who sailed ever onward despite the fears and obstacles which continually rose to confront him.

Whether Columbus was actually the first or second, or even the third, voyager to reach these shores is purely academic and totally irrelevant. It detracts nothing from the intrepid admiral's daring and determination. It subtracts nothing from the everlasting significance of his unique and monumental achievement.

This leads me to my thoughts on the second objective of a national Columbus Day observance.

It would, in my judgment, be an ideal day for an annual reaffirmation by the American people of their faith in the future, a declaration of willingness to face with confidence the imponderables of unknown tomorrows.

In the courageous spirit of Columbus, we would pay tribute to the virtue of perseverance against the paralysis of baseless, ill-founded fear.

Further, Columbus Day would be a perfect occasion for the Nation to pause each year to pay homage to the cause and challenge of discovery, invention, and exploration.

It would be a time to review our progress in the search for technological advances to improve our way of life by making it better, safer, and more satisfying; to evaluate our gains in the patient quest for cures to diseases that kill and cripple; to appraise the wondrous probes into the vast and awesome void of outer space.

Finally, Columbus Day would be a day to honor immigrants of all nationalities and acknowledge their contributions to the building of a strong, just, and prosperous United States of America.

President Kennedy correctly called us a nation of immigrants, and the Congress already has acted to establish Ellis Island as a permanent reminder of our indebtedness to those who came from foreign soil and gave their brain and their brawn—and not infrequently, their lives—that their adopted land might grow and flourish.

Just as George Washington deservedly is called the "Father of our Country," so Christopher Columbus deservedly should be remembered as the "Father of Immigration," for on his second, third, and fourth voyages he made the first attempts at colonization in the new world.

And even the first journey had an international character. Let us not overlook the fact that Columbus was an Italian whose fleet was provided by the Spaniards and whose crew was recruited largely from among Portuguese sailors.

From the very beginning, this country was indebted to the courage and sacrifice of the men of more than one nation, and this debt has increased with each passing year.

In honoring our immigrants on Columbus Day we will do more than show our gratitude for their countless contributions. We will be simultaneously striking a powerful blow against discrimination and the intolerable prejudice of those who insist upon measuring a man by where he comes from, or where his parents or their parents came from, without regard for individual ability, integrity, loyalty or any other distinguishing and commendable characteristic.

Discrimination is not compatible with democracy. Prejudice is alien to the principles on which this country was created. Bigotry is foreign to the ideals and truths to which this country was dedicated. The observance of Columbus Day as a national holiday will, I feel sure, prove to be effective in blotting out the vestiges of discrimination, prejudice, and bigotry in the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, in honoring Christopher Columbus today we are also reaffirming our faith in his spirit—one of courage, stamina and determination to continue an unswerving advance, undaunted and unafraid, in the enlightened pursuit of humanitarian goals and honorable objectives.

ORDER SONS OF ITALY IN AMERICA SUPPORTS COLUMBUS DAY LEGISLATION

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, recently House Judiciary Subcommittee No. 4 held hearings on proposed legislation to establish Columbus Day as a national legal holiday. I was very pleased to have the opportunity to read the fine testimony of the Order Sons of Italy in America, the largest organization representing people of the United States, Canada, and Bermuda who are of Italian heritage.

Mr. Michael A. Rivisto, supreme national deputy of the Order Sons of Italy in America, presented an eloquent, effective statement outlining the organization's reasons for supporting this legislation to create a truly unifying and inspiring new national holiday. As Mr. Rivisto states:

> Let Columbus Day be a reminder to all of us what can be done, what can be accomplished, if one is guided by the virtues of determination, resourcefulness, courage and belief in a divine mission which urged Columbus forward to build that first highway across the dark expanses of the Atlantic.

For the information of my colleagues, I include the full text of this statement in the RECORD at this point:

STATEMENT OF MICHAEL A. RIVISTO, SUPREME NATIONAL DEPUTY, ORDER SONS OF ITALY IN AMERICA, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 4 OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C., OCTOBER 5, 1967

Mr. Chairman, and members of this distinguished committee. My name is Michael A. Rivisto. I have the honor and privilege to appear before you as the Supreme National Deputy of the Order Sons of Italy in America and representing the presiding officer of the Order, Supreme Venerable, Peter J. Bertoglio, and the members of this great fraternity which extends throughout the United States, in Canada and Bermuda.

The fraternity of the Sons of Italy is the largest organization representing people of the United States, Canada and Bermuda of Italian heritage.

To speak of the glories of Christopher Columbus can be regarded as superfluous as paying tribute to the sun, the moon, stars, the oceans and all the other natural phenomena of the world. And yet, there are times when we find ourselves defending the regularity of the mighty forces of the universe.

And, so it is, that today the Order Sons of

Italy in America asks this distinguished Committee to accomplish, what I believe is obvious, that is, to report favorably to Congress the enactment of the House Bill which would make Columbus Day a national holiday. It should be most natural, logical and rational that Columbus Day be declared a national holiday. The very national government functions in a land gloriously, poetically and factually entitled the District of *Columbia*. This region, undoubtedly one of the most beautiful in the world architecturally, artistically, and scenically was named the District of Columbia—by whom? By the very founders of our government. The Constitution of the United States, in Article I, Section 8, Subsection 17, provided that the Government of the United States was to be housed in a territory not exceeding 10 miles square, and the First Congress named that territory after Christopher Columbus, the discoverer of this land.

Recently there have been many theories advanced, many abstract ideas discussed, many speculations indulged in, that Columbus was not the first white man to set foot on this continent.

Without seeking to disparage the efforts of some scholars delving into the subject of the discovery of America, I cannot accept that those in the 20th century would know more about the realities of the revelation of this hemisphere than those who lived closer in time to the geographical and historical facts.

The great statesmen of the days of George Washington named the seat of our government the District of Columbia—and so it is the District of Columbia. And I submit to you, Mr. Chairman and members of this distinguished Committee, that it is anomalous that in this very area named Columbia by the godfathers of our nation, Columbus Day should not be a federal holiday when in 37 individual states of the Union, Columbus Day *is* an official holiday.

It is the official position of the Order Sons of Italy in America that Christopher Columbus discovered America, that it was his wisdom, his courage, his heaven-inspired determination that finally tore away the misty curtains which had concealed this part of the world from the rest of the world. Even if it were to be speculated that some seafarer, buffeted by storm and carried by running tides, was blown ashore on these lands prior to 1492, it must be admitted that nothing ever came from that chance swamping in the surf on America's rocky shores. No footprints of history ever marked that hypothetical landing, not a physical marking establishes that supposed, bewildering scrambling in the sands of unrecorded antiquity.

In any case, such a landing, if there was one, was accidental, ephemeral, and nothing ever came of it.

Columbus' landing, on the other hand, was like the building of a bridge. From October 12, 1492, the traffic from the old world to the new has been continuous, ever-augmenting, and unceasing. On October 12, 1492, American civilization began. From October 12, 1492, not a day passed that the human race did not progress, as it had never progressed before—economically, scientifically, sociologically and politically.

Even if it were argued, although I submit it is a foolish and futile argument, that if Columbus had not discovered America somebody else would have discovered it later, it must be admitted that mankind gained in the race for supreme enlightenment all the time that would have elapsed between Columbus's landing and some future, hypothetical landing.

We know that from the day of creation to October 12, 1492, this land we call the United States of America was but a blank page in the archives of human attainment. We know that ever since October 12, 1492, no book records more exciting, dramatic and romantic exploits, no book contains more pages of scientific, cultural, commercial, and educational progress than the book of America October 12, 1492; then marks the beginning of a new era, it records the initiation of a new epoch in the development of man and the progress of man. October 12, 1492, indeed marked the birth of America. October 12th is then the natal day of America. And, as such, it should be celebrated as the birthday of America.

No home rings with more merriment, no home vibrates with more joy than it does when it celebrates the birthday of a member of the family. Let us then, all of us, who are members of this vast American family, celebrate the birthday of America on October 12th. On that day, let there be music, poetry, singing, and dancing, let there be surcease from work, let us put aside the burdens of the office, factory and field for a day. Let there be abandonment to recreation and inspiration. Let there be the reminder, in religious services, sermons, speeches, concerts, and processions of what we owe to the Heavenly Father who guided that brave mariner of Genoa across the uncharted seas to discover the riches of a land to be enjoyed by everybody, not only those born to wealth and affluence; to discover a land that would offer equal opportunity to the poor, that would give asylum to the persecuted, that would guarantee religious freedom, that would assure equality of opportunity to all.

Let Columbus Day be a reminder to all of us what can be done, what can be accomplished, if one is guided by the virtues of determination, resourcefulness, courage and belief in a divine mission which urged Columbus forward to build that first highway across the dark expanses of the Atlantic.

Who can speak against making Columbus a national day, and what arguments can they muster? No one can honestly say that the day does not mark an event of sufficient historical magnitude. No one can say that Americans are not entitled to a day of recognition for this glorious American historic heritage, and to pay homage to an immortal man whose divine guided feat began the first chapter of the history of America. October 12, 1492 is that point in the history of man where he found a new world.

Following the immortal day of October 12, 1492 millions of people of all nations, of all races, of different religions and different ideologies came to rest on the shores that Christopher Columbus found to begin the saga of American history.

We cannot deny or ignore the facts of history that because for Christopher Columbus we are here today.

It may be said that America does not need another holiday. I cannot go along with that line of thinking. The life of today is intense, exhausting, high-pressured, physically and mental fatiguing. Doctors, sociologists, research analysts all testify to the need for the American people to slow down, to take things a little easier. Another holiday would be therapeutic, that is, of course, a meaningful holiday. And Columbus Day is that type of a holiday. It embraces religion and history. Columbus Day qualifies as a day of majesty, dignity and spiritual exaltation.

Columbus Day joins well into the calendar. With Labor Day forgotten, with warm weather on the wane with the thought of wintry days ahead, Columbus Day fits excellently into the chronology of the year, being a wonderful crispy October day for recreation and rest between the first Monday of September and Veterans Day in November.

But above all, America is a land of fairness and of justice. We owe to Christopher Columbus the honor which was denied him in his life. The glory which became his after that first voyage was a very short one. The enemies of ignorance, cowardice, and envy assailed him and they prevailed, even to the extent that they tied with heavy chains those legs which had carried him before kings and queens, financiers and scientists as he sought the ships with which to find a new world; those same enemies placed manacles on those brave hands which had held the tiller which guided the Santa Maria to these lands.

After Columbus conferred riches beyond the dreams of avarice on those who were unworthy of his loyalty, after he opened to mankind the vastest vista for advancement since the Lord separated the land from the waters, he was allowed to languish in illness and poverty. He died at the comparatively young age of 53.

But his deeds are immortal. Let us remember them on October 12th of each year. We owe this to Christopher Columbus, we owe this to the millions of immigrants of all countries who, with their brawn, determination and fidelity have made a mighty contribution and continue to make their contribution to this, the greatest land in the world, the United States of America.

The Order Sons of Italy in America recommends to you, Mr. Chairman, and members of this Committee that you urge upon Congress this honor long overdue to Christopher Columbus, immortal discoverer of America, the land of the free, and the empire of fairness and justice. Thank you, gentlemen.

COLUMBUS DAY

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ADDABBO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, today we celebrate the 475th anniversary of the discovery by Christopher Columbus of the "New World." This date is celebrated in 38 States, including my own State of New York, as a legal holiday. The time has come for Federal recognition of this date as a legal holiday.

There are many celebrations across the Nation today, but I am sure that none is more well known than our Columbus Day parade in the city of New York. This parade is sponsored by the Columbus Citizens' Association, headed by Mr. Fortune Pope, an organization which makes a great contribution to our youths through its scholarship program, a program open to all deserving young people.

We owe a great debt to Christopher Columbus for his discovery of a new world, but the greatest debt we owe him is for the hope and inspiration he gave, through his own success, to others. He was the man who acted and thus gave courage to other men to follow. We owe our very being as a nation to this man.

It is my hope that we will see legislation enacted in this 475th anniversary year to make October 12 a legal national holiday, and I urge my colleagues to support this move.

GEN. CASIMIR PULASKI

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ADDABBO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, October 11, 1967, was the 188th anniversary of the death of a man who contributed greatly in this Nation's fight for independence. I, of course, refer to Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

General Pulaski was in the United States for little more than 2 years when he died fighting for us in the Battle of Savannah, but his contributions to our cause were great and will never be forgotten. He fought for freedom in his homeland of Poland and continued to fight for the principles in whch he believed so deeply when he allied himself with Gen. George Washington and took over the cavalry forces of the Continental Army.

General Pulaski today stands as a symbol of the contributions to the United States made by great numbers of Polish-Americans. In honoring the general, we are also saying "thank you" to them.

COLUMBUS DAY

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Minish] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I rise on the anniversary of the discovery of America to pay tribute to that giant of a man, Christopher Columbus.

In view of my ancestry, this is a day that is close to my heart, but the celebrations taking place throughout the United States today are by no means of interest only to Americans of Italian descent. All of us owe our civilization and way of life to Christopher Columbus, who opened the door to the New World and thus all Americans pay honor to his memory.

Let us reflect today on the courage and determination of the noble Genoese. It can be truthfully said of Columbus that he doubled the size of the known world. If exploration is to be judged by its results, he was the greatest explorer who ever lived, or ever will live, until such time as adventure through space to the other planets. If exploration is to be judged by daring, Columbus, who led an unwilling crew in three small ships into an unknown ocean, peopled with all sorts of legendary monsters and dangers, surely yields to no man in history. If exploration is to be judged by sheer determination, again no man can be ranked higher than Columbus, whose life from boyhood was dedicated to the project of sailing westward to find the Indies; who struggled against poverty, argued with geographers and sailors, and coped with court intrigues until he enlisted the enthusiastic support of a Queen and Court Treasurer; who kept his rebellious and fearful crew on their westward course until his ships reached what he supposed to be the Indies of his dreams. If exploration is to be judged by motive, what motives could be higher than those of Columbus, who without thought of personal gain or power, sailed forth into the void in service of Spain, to mankind, and to God?

Mr. Speaker, at no time were Christopher Columbus' singular virtues more needed than today, as we face new worlds of space, new worlds of scientific discovery, and new worlds of human relationships. Americans should rededicate themselves today to strive to emulate the determination, bravery, and foresightedness of Christopher Columbus.

In this connection, I urge early action on the long-pending legislation to establish Columbus Day as a national holiday. This would be a fitting expression of the significance of the day to all Americans and would give to Columbus the official and permanent national recognition due him. As a sponsor of this meritorious measure, I hope that all Members will lend their full support to its speedy enactment.

GEN. CASIMIR PULASKI

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Minish] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to pay tribute to the noble Polish and American patriot, Casimir Pulaski. Count Pulaski, who fought for his homeland's liberty from Russian domination, laid down his life while aiding the Thirteen Original American Colonies in their struggle to overthrow the enslaving yoke of British colonial tyranny. Pulaski's inspiring life of dedication to liberty and freedom serves as a shining example to all people who love the ideals for which he stood and the cause for which he fought.

Count Casimir Pulaski was born into a family of wealth and status in Padolia, Poland, in 1748. Forsaking the easy life, he fought gallantly to preserve Poland as a sovereign nation against Russian imperialism. Exiled from his own country, he traveled to Paris, where he met Benjamin Franklin. Fired by a burning dedication to freedom, Pulaski made his way to America. To him freedom was not restricted by national boundaries.

Arriving in Philadelphia in the spring of 1777, he volunteered for service in the Continental Army, and distinguished himself almost immediately at the Battle of Brandywine. Just 4 days after that battle, on September 19, 1777, Pulaski was appointed brigadier general by the Continental Congress and put in charge of the cavalry.

After taking part in the Battle of Germantown, he suggested to Gen. George Washington that the Continental Congress form an independent corps of fighting men officered by some of the many foreigners aiding the Revolutionary cause. This request was approved and Pulaski was named to command the new group. "Pulaski's Corps," as they came to be called, rendered invaluable service against the British in the Southern Colonies. In October of 1779, while leading the cavalry in an attack on the British lines at Savannah, Ga., Count Pulaski was shot and fell gravely wounded. A short while later, on October 11, 1779, he died on an American ship in Savannah Harbor.

It is most fitting that President Johnson has issued a proclamation designating October 11 as "General Pulaski Memorial Day."

All Americans should pause to reflect upon, and rededicate themselves to, the principles and ideals of freedom most clearly illustrated in the life of Count Casimir Pulaski. Let us all remember his words:

> Whenever on the globe men are fighting for liberty it is as if it were our own affair.

Mr. Speaker, this occasion also gives us the opportunity to note the contributions to our Nation's well-being of those Americans of Polish descent who continue to this day to uphold the great example of Count Pulaski. There are more than 10 million of these fine citizens, and we are indeed blessed by their outstanding contributions to every phase of our national life. They reflect the superb qualities that have made the name of Count Pulaski honored and revered by all freedom-loving people.

SAVING CITIES

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Dent] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend President Johnson for his efforts to enlist private enterprise in our fight against urban blight and slums.

The life insurance companies have committed $1 billion to rehabilitation of our slums; the California Savings & Loan Association has committed $100 million to help urban slum areas in California. These actions are illustrative of the President's growing concern that both private and public resources be brought to bear on the problems of our cities.

Most recent the President announced a Federal test program to attract more private help in creating jobs in areas of hard core unemployment. This test program will offer government aids to reduce the risks of private industry willing to build or expand in a ghetto area.

Agreeably, these efforts are new and the results not yet in. However, it is my belief that both government and industry will benefit by pooling their resources—not working at odds—on the problems of our cities. The dimension of the cities' problems are too great for us to continue the age-old feud of business versus government, and vice versa. The development of a creative partnership is encouraging.

I would like to share with my colleagues this interesting account of the new efforts to create jobs in areas of hard core unemployment, which appeared in the Patriot, Harrisburg, Pa., by including it in the Record:

SAVING CITIES

(By John Berry)

The Johnson administration has decided to seek the help of private enterprise in meeting urgent requirements of urban slum areas. This is the import of President Johnson's Oct. 2 announcement of a federal test program to attract more private help in creating jobs in areas of hard core unemployment.

Businesses willing to build or expand in a ghetto will find some of the risks reduced by a number of types of government assistance. To succeed, the President said, the venture will require "the concerted action and involvement of the private sector working closely with the federal government."

Riots in a number of cities this past summer make it clear that measures to better the quality of life in slum districts are desperately needed. Federal funds are severely limited by the costs of the Vietnam war—and by the unwillingness of the 90th Congress to step up federal appropriations for antipoverty type programs.

Yet the needs and pressures remain. Under present conditions, the only way to ease them may be for private business interests to lend a hand on a multi-billion-dollar scale.

David Rockefeller, president of the Chase Manhattan Bank, told a Senate committee last November that it was well to recognize that, in improving our cities, capital investment is needed "on an immense scale—an estimated $5 of private capital for each dollar of public funds."

To promote this national support and attract private capital to the slums is the goal of the Urban Coalition, a national group of 800 mayors and business, labor, church and civil rights leaders formed this summer. The group met in Washington on Aug. 24 and declared that the urban crisis requires "a new dimension of effort in both the public and private sectors, working together to provide jobs, housing, education and the other needs of the cities."

The life insurance industry, through its Life Insurance Committee on Urban Problems, announced on Sept. 13 that it was prepared to invest $1 billion in slum real estate. Most of the initial investments will be in projects whose tenants qualify for rent supplements.

President Johnson hailed the companies' announcement and said it was a vote of confidence in the rent supplement program, under which part of a poor tenant's rent is paid by the federal government. However, the House has so far this year refused to appropriate any money for this program. The New Republic on Sept. 30 questioned the true value of the life insurance companies' offer, charging that "The public relations aspect . . . is so far the most explicit thing about it."

The need for inducements to attract private capital to the slums is clear. Historically, profit has been the motivating force behind most private business activity and experience has shown that profits in the slums are scant.

A variety of schemes have been proposed to increase those profits. Sen. Robert F. Kennedy (D-N.Y.) recently introduced a bill in Congress that would provide tax incentives and low interest rates on mortgages in an effort to promote large-scale private investment in low-cost rental housing in the slums.

Established private corporations already are experimenting in the slums. In the Harlem section of New York City, for example, United States Gypsum Co. is renovating tenements.

A DETERMINED PRESIDENT STATES HIS CREDO ON VIETNAM

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, those of us who absolutely want to support the men we have sent to Vietnam should take particular note of the President's speech in San Antonio.

Surely all need not agree on every aspect of this complex problem, but I believe all must support the President, the Commander in Chief, until we can have an honorable peace in Vietnam.

Everyone knows I have sent my private advice to the President. I do not always agree with him, but I do agree that we cannot weaken the support of our fighting men in Vietnam.

The Kansas City Star of October 2 described President Johnson's recent Vietnam speech in San Antonio as "a spine-stiffening speech."

It was not only that. It was a clear restatement of the American position. It was a statement of a President's faith in the ability of his country to continue to bear the burden of the long battle against Communist insurgency.

This is not the first time a President of the United States and the American people have had to bear such a burden.

Still, the American quest for peace is as strong and determined as its resolve to resist Communist force.

The United States is not mindless of its ultimate goals, as some critics assert.

We are not cold to the sacrifices of men and materials, as some proclaim.

We are not 100-percent sure that we are 100-percent perfect.

But, what we must never forget is the basic purpose of our efforts.

We must prevent the political murder of a nation, South Vietnam, just as we would expect free nations to defend the attempted political murder of the United States.

When Americans fought for freedom against the Nazis and the Fascists in World War II, they were fighting to undo the political murders of an alarmingly long list of once free nations. Korea and Vietnam are different only in degree. Communist aggression; Communist takeover is no different from any other takeover—and we must resist it with all our might.

History will demonstrate that the strong Presidents invariably act right when the times call them to make great decisions.

I insert in the RECORD an editorial from the Kansas City Star of October 2, entitled "A Spine-Stiffening Speech: L. B. J. on Vietnam."

A SPINE-STIFFENING SPEECH: L. B. J. ON VIETNAM

It was a strong and clear address, the most forthright and in some ways the most informative that President Johnson has made on the Vietnam war in more than two years. In San Antonio Friday night, Mr. Johnson undertook to stiffen the spine of the American people as the rising casualties of the conflict and the tortuous search for peace continue simultaneously.

The President's defense of United States policy in Vietnam was an updating of the declaration he delivered at Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore on April 7, 1965. Since then he has been far from silent on Vietnam. But, as events have brought change both on the war front and in attitudes toward the fighting both at home and in foreign countries, the President has not reported on developments and clarified the complex subject as much and as often as its importance has warranted.

This inadequacy of explanation by the highest level of the U.S. government has contributed, we feel, to the recent slippage in American public support of the administration's war policy. The President is not only aware of this loss but is concerned about it. In public and in private, he has been testy at times about his dovish critics. Lately he has had to face up to the hard truth that the criticism has grown, even spreading to seemed to be cohesive behind the government's stand in Southeast Asia.

In his Texas address, Lyndon Johnson was imploring the American people not to lose heart. He was telling the nation and the free world that the cause of Vietnam is worthy and that it will not be abandoned.

Yet the President did not speak in absolute terms when he discussed the larger meaning of the struggle. He acknowledged that he could not say "with certainty" that a Communist conquest of South Vietnam "would be followed by a Communist conquest of Southeast Asia." Nor did he presume to assert "with certainty" that "a Southeast Asia dominated by Communist power would bring a third World war much closer to reality." Still he spoke of his conviction that "in Vietnam, we are reducing the chances of a larger war—perhaps a nuclear war."

Scoffers, whose reaction on anything pertaining to Vietnam has become 100 per cent predictable, quickly replied that the President had misread history, that no lightning out of Southeast Asia could ever strike the world with a nuclear holocaust. They said this, but they don't really know.

A limited war in which the great atomic powers have vital interests could lead to unlimited conflict. The objectives of Nazi Germany and Japan professed in 1940–41 were limited at first. With success, these regional goals of authoritarian power became worldwide. The result was global war.

It *could* happen again. In Vietnam the purpose of the United States, in Mr. Johnson's words, is to save an independent country from "political murder" and thereby stand by the obligations of three American administrations. But there is also, here as earlier in Korea, the aim of resisting aggression that constitutes a long-range threat to the entire non-Communist world. Thus the war will go on, with the United States eager to negotiate peace and ready to suspend its bombing of North Vietnam whenever a halt can lead promptly to productive discussions.

Once more the resolve of the United States to stand fast in Vietnam as long as it may take has been reaffirmed. But the door to peace remains open as far as this country is concerned. It's Hanoi's move, and a still-determined President Johnson could not have made that central fact of the war any plainer. He deserves the nation's support.

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST POOR

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, it is with dismay—and some disgust—that I refer today to the action taken yesterday by a small, reactionary minority of the House in striking the lowest blow yet against the national effort that is being made to help those who are poor work their way out of poverty.

In discriminating against the less than 3,000 people who work for the office of Economic opportunity by excluding them from the Federal pay raise the House authorized yesterday, that small minority delivered a slap in the face of every poor person in America.

OEO is the symbol of the Nation's strategy against poverty—a strategy that is working. Because of OEO—and the dedication of its employees—the poor of this Nation know that a war is being waged against poverty.

Is this the slap the House intended yesterday? I think not. I think the House action reflects the feelings of only a few. And I think the wrath of this country will well up against those who are so unconcerned—so uninterested, apparently, in the terrible problem of poverty that exists.

It was charged on this floor yesterday that 25 OEO employees received more basic annual pay than General Westmoreland. No OEO employee—let me emphasize—no OEO employee, including Director Sargent Shriver, receives the compensation that General Westmoreland does.

But the comparison is ridiculous anyway.

What needs to be talked about are the many down-the-line OEO employees—secretaries, typists, clerks—who will suffer because of the political machinations of those who sought yesterday to hit OEO and the war on poverty with another unfair blow.

More than 1,200 OEO employees hold a grade 7 or less in the classification scale. This means they make in the neighborhood of $6,000 or less—most of them less. Are they to be denied the increase that would go to similar employees in all other agencies of Government?

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on in citing the irresponsibility of the charges that were made and the action that was taken yesterday. I will not do so at this time. I will not have to do it in the future.

Those Americans who are concerned about their impoverished fellow citizens—and dedicated to the task of helping them—will rise up and express their own anger about the deplorable action of so few with damage to the aspirations and hopes of so many.

I know the responsible members of the other party will want to disassociate themselves from the minority action that was taken. In this regard, I include an article in last Thursday's Washington Star noting objection to this action by 21 Republican mayors in the RECORD at this time:

BAR OEO CUT, GOP MAYORS ASK REPUBLICANS ON HILL

Twenty-one Republican mayors have urged GOP leaders in Congress to continue or expand programs offered by the Office of Economic Opportunity by voting for the necessary funds.

A telegram on behalf of the group was sent yesterday by Mayor Neal S. Blaisdell of Honolulu to Senate Republican Leader Everett M. Dirksen and House Leader Gerald R. Ford. It was made public by OEO.

Opposing moves to cut back the OEO program in the economy drive in Congress, the telegram said in part:

"We feel the implementation of our local programs as sponsored by OEO are giving great impetus . . . and any slowing up of such programs will greatly deter the progress which has been made thus far."

CONTRIBUTION OF WOMEN

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, in these days of strained appropriations and strained human relations one of the activities of a corporation in my constituency is worthy of attention. This company, Ungar Electric tools, a division of Eldon Industries, located in Hawthorne, Calif., has, with its own funds, launched a nationwide program that has already benefited the entire electronic industry by encouraging improved quality in the manufacture of microelectronic circuits through recognizing the contribution of the women on that industry's assembly lines, without whose skills it could not survive, no less prosper.

There is no doubt that when man reaches the moon it will be because of the many thousands of women whose skills were called upon to assemble the electronic components of the sophisticated circuits of our space vehicles and ground support systems. In fact, it is the women's hands and skills that have made possible our computer way of life.

The importance of quality control in electronic assembly work cannot be overestimated. It is a matter of record that multimillion dollar projects have been aborted because of one faulty hand-soldered connection. To decrease the possibility of this is the basis of the Ungar concept.

The program is founded on the theory that recognition of a technician's skill motivates the desire to live up to that honor. Taking a leaf from the history of World War II when "Rosie the Riveter" became the legendary heroine who assembled the planes and ships of that day, the Ungar program was created to identify the unsung heroines of the electronic age's assembly lines as "Suzie the Solderer."

Inasmuch as a major portion of our Nation's electronic production is an integrated facet of our defense and space programs, it is obvious that any program to increase the quality of these exotic components would in the deepest sense benefit us all.

The idea developed by Mr. Robert Silverstein, president of Eldon Industries, and Mr. William L. Nehrenz, Eldon's vice president and general manager of its Ungar Division, was conceived not only to give status to these women as "Suzie the Solderers" but by so doing encourage improved work habits by awarding the title of "Princess" to the most skilled assemblers in the electronic plants across the country. The title of "Princess" is one that is well deserved—a title exclusively feminine inasmuch as the tasks they do cannot be done by men.

Unlike "Rosie the Riveter" who took her place on the assembly line because of the shortage of manpower, "Suzie the Solderer" is on the job because the average man has neither the psychological attributes or the color perceptivity required for the task. Aptitude tests indicate that while most men have varying degrees of color blindness it is extremely rare in women—and this feminine virtue is extremely important in the reading of color codes essential to circuitry assembly.

Underscoring the fact that it takes a psychologically constituted and dedicated woman to sit hour after hour and day after day, peering through high-powered lenses, assembling thousands of microscopic thinner-than-hair wire connections is that even the tools used on the job are designed for the feminine hand. "Suzie's" assembly tools are dainty enough for a boudoir; her soldering iron, for example, is now called a pen with a pastel turquoise handle as pretty as a lipstick case.

In Ungar's judgment the dramatic story of the contribution women are making to our electronic age would be a vehicle for communicating to the community that the basic skills could be readily learned; that there are available opportunities open in an industry that is ready to welcome and train women; and by this message it was also hoped that the employment shortage, which exists despite the half a million women now engaged in these tasks, could be alleviated, especially from among the unemployed women of the depressed areas of our urban centers.

An "instant" royalty kit was developed which included a rhinestone tiara, a gold-plated soldering iron sceptre, a gold princess bracelet, and a series of quality-motivating in-plant posters which Ungar offered free to any electronic plant desiring to honor its women assemblers.

The enthusiastic immediate reaction of major plants in the electronic industry showed the need for such a program.

The Defense Contract Administration Services, a Government agency responsible for quality control of Government contract production, recognized the concept as a worthwhile motivating factor. Many plants tied in the Princess Suzie crowning ceremonies with their own Government-inspired quality control zero defects program.

Production magazine, a leading publication in its field, featured the effectiveness of the "Suzie the Solderer" theme. In a major article, "Motivating People in Production," the magazine commented that there was "an interesting and noticeable general improvement in the quality of work, a natural result of identification with a worker who has gained status recognition." Absenteeism has also been reduced.

Today there are proud Princess Suzies

in many plants across the country, with more and more awaiting their "instant" royalty kit. The list is a distinguished one. Among them are: Charles Brunig Co., division of Addressograph/Multigraph Corp., Mount Prospect, Ill.; Data Systems Division, Litton Industries, Van Nuys, Calif.; Dorsett Electronics, Tulsa, Okla.; Electronics Specialty Co., Los Angeles, Calif.; Garrett Airesearch, Los Angeles, Calif.; Hughes Aircraft, Culver City, Calif.; Kaman Nuclear, Colorado Springs, Colo.; I.T.T. Marine, Clark, N.J.; Loral Electronics System, New York City; Microwave, San Jose, Calif.; National Co., Melrose, Mass.; National Union Electric Corp:., Stamford, Conn.; Pacific Electricord Co., Gardena, Calif.; Packard Bell, Los Angeles, Calif.; Pickard & Burns, Waltham, Mass.; Sanders Associates, Plainview, Long Island; H. H. Scott, Inc., Maynard, Mass.

And as hoped for, the publicity generated in the community by the program brought new women workers to the assembly lines. A typical example of its effectiveness is the immediate results that took place in the adult occupational training centers of the Los Angeles school systems. Previous classes in the teaching of basic soldering skills were sparsely attended. When the press, TV, and radio told the Princess story, so many new applicants from the ranks of the unemployed poured in to register that a number of additional classes had to be formed.

It is interesting, too, that a gratifying percentage of new enrollees in these classes, registered from the Negro and Mexican-American communities.

In this area of education Ungar has also made its contribution. It initiated, developed, and financed a brochure listing the opportunities for women in electronics and provided them to the Los Angeles Board of Education for distribution at plants and at unemployment centers. Mr. T. Stanley Warburton, associate superintendent of the Los Angeles city school districts, in a letter to Ungar, stated:

> We are greatly appreciative that school and industry has combined to solve a common problem. Your help in this project is another bridge of friendship and good cooperation. Thank you for your efforts in developing a better education program in the Los Angeles schools.

Perhaps most salient in this program is the absence of corporate commercialism. There are no strings attached. Plants tying in with the program understand that crowning a Princess does not mean an endorsement of Ungar's products, nor in fact need they even be used on that plant's assembly lines.

It is natural that such a worthy contribution should be recognized in the community as well as in the electronic industry. The city of Los Angeles, as one example, presented to Mr. Robert Silverstein and Mr. William Nehrenz, a resolution congratulating Ungar Electric Tools on its "Suzie the Solderer" program, in the words of the resolution "benefits the entire industry, motivating a higher quality of performance and encouraging women to seek employment in a field so in need of soldering technicians."

And as must eventually occur, when a new and interesting facet develops on the American scene it was natural that a song "Suzie the Solderer" should be written. Recorded by the Jimmie Joyce Singers on a Warner Bros. label "Suzie the Solderer" could well become the saga saluting the contribution of women to the electronic age as "Rosie the Riveter" was a much whistled tune of World War II.

To paraphrase a once often spoken idea it might, in these days, be appropriate to say that "the hand that rocked the cradle and once ruled the world is now the hand that holds the soldering iron that assembles the circuits that turn on the world."

The efforts of Ungar Electric Tools in this regard could well be an inspiration to the world of business in the understanding of the psychological needs of people so necessary to our free enterprise production economy.

SPEECH OF POSTMASTER GENERAL LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN

Mr. SPEAKER. I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, in a speech delivered earlier this week at the national convention of the National Association of Postmasters, Postmaster General Lawrence O'Brien made some very interesting comments and observations on his bold and imaginative proposal to convert the postal service into a Government corporation. Among other things, the Postmaster General discussed the results of a Roper poll on public reaction to his corporation proposal and on public opinion of the quality of current mail service. These are matters of interest and importance to every Member of the Congress, and I include the Postmaster General's speech to be reprinted in the RECORD.

ADDRESS BY POSTMASTER GENERAL LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN AT THE NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF POSTMASTERS OF THE UNITED STATES, SAN JUAN, PUERTO RICO, OCTOBER 9, 1967

I'm pleased to be able to leave my hardship post up North—and join you here tonight.

On arrival, I was advised on the results of your election. In the tradition of your organization, your election campaign was in the democratic procedure—and I know that now all of you will unite behind your new President, Tom Costin. I am looking forward to working with Tom—as he and I have worked together in the past—and of course with your other national officers and your fine Executive Director, John Carter.

Let me say that for a long time now, I've observed your outgoing President Jim O'Toole. As you know, he is an exceptional man, with the experience, the intelligence, the integrity and the leadership ability that we sorely need in Washington—his Congressman Joe Vigorito shares that view.

About a year ago, I asked Jim if he would be interested in comming to work in an executive position in the Department. To his credit, he turned me down. In a laudable display of character and loyalty, he thanked me, but said his first responsibility was to serve NAPUS in the office to which you had elected him.

Well, Jim has done just that—and I think we can all agree that he has served you in a truly outstanding fashion. Now he is completing his two years as your President, so I've had another chat with Jim. And I am delighted to announce tonight his appointment as Executive Assistant to Assistant Postmaster General William McMillan, in the Bureau of Operations.

In this high ranking position, Jim will supervise the work of the Bureau's fiscal control offices and administrative office. He will also handle its work in Congressional liaison, personnel matters, contract compliance and equal employment opportunity.

Jim has a few things to clear up with NAPUS and at his post office back in Sharon, but he tells me he'll be able to report to duty in the Department next month. We're looking forward to his arrival with us joined by his charming wife, Jean.

As some of you may recall, when we met back on the mainland last year I stated that the Post Office Department is a public service industry in which old ways of thinking, old stereotypes, old traditional patterns are out of date.

This was a hint of some thinking on my part which had almost, but not quite, jelled.

Six months after your Louisville Convention, I announced that, after considerable study, I had come to the conclusion that the post office should be transformed into a more effective instrument of service by removing it from the Cabinet and making it a government corporation.

The reaction to this proposal was always interesting, at times amusing, occasionally painful and, in a few instances, brought me face to face with the world of fantasy. I now know the meaning of psychedelic.

One of the biggest surprises was the amount of support my proposal received from the conservative element.

Raymond Moley liked the idea.

The Chicago Tribune liked the idea.

Barry Goldwater liked the idea and said, "Welcome, Mr. O'Brien."

I appreciate support from such unexpected quarters, but, as a lifetime Democrat, it somehow makes me as uneasy as the Lone Ranger when Tonto invited a number of his Redskin friends to drop by for archery practice.

Actually, these conservative sources extended only partial support—not really support at all. They want me to go much further and get the post office out of government altogether, to turn it over to private industry.

A group representing the stockholders of the giant American Telephone and Telegraph Company proposed precisely that. "Let's buy the post office," they demanded. AT&T Chairman H. I. Rommes, who calculated that his net income and our net deficit just about balanced out, concluded that the stockholders had the wrong number.

By and large the reaction to the government corporation proposal was highly favorable, and there were quite literally hundreds of positive editorials in the nation's press.

Just five days after I made the proposal the President appointed a blue ribbon Commission on Postal Organization, to which were named some of the finest minds in America.

Under the Chairmanship of Frederick R. Kappel, formerly Chairman of the Board of American Telephone and Telegraph, the Commission is proceeding with a vigorous examination of every aspect of the postal service. Its deadline for reporting to the President is next April.

What I want to discuss with you tonight pertains to public attitudes toward the postal corporation proposal.

A year and a half ago, the highly respected firm of Roper Research Associates conducted a scientific poll to determine the attitude of the public toward ZIP Code and the public's acceptance of this new instrument of mail delivery.

The reports of that survey were useful and instructive. Recently the Roper firm did a follow-up survey, based on a valid representative sample of the American people.

The new survey was designed to explore current public opinion of the postal service in general as well as views of the ZIP Code system in particular.

Naturally, I was most interested in learning the reaction of the general public to the widely acclaimed corporation proposal.

Well, the basic finding is that, of the representative sample polled, twenty-eight percent were familiar with the proposal. And they split three ways—about one-third favoring it, one-third opposed and the remainder with no opinion.

The experts tell me that a twenty-eight percent awareness of the proposal is exceptionally good at this time.

But in my view, it is not good enough. We must have greater public understanding and support.

Why weren't more than twenty-eight percent of the people familiar with the proposal?

Part of the answer is suggested in another area of the Roper Survey; part of the answer lies in the brief time that has elapsed since the proposal was made; and part of the answer lies in the complex nature of the proposal itself.

The Roper Study found that the overwhelming majority of the American people are satisfied with the quality of the postal service they are receiving. Seventy-six percent are *"completely satisfied"* and another nineteen percent are *"fairly well satisfied."* That's *ninety-five* percent who are satisfied with our service.

Now, this finding may surprise some who make a hobby of kicking our postal service in the mail bag. It may come as a surprise to those who believe that there is nothing on which the American people would agree by ninety-five percent. But it comes as no surprise to me—or to you.

Since almost all Americans are satisfied with the mail service, it would seem that logic would dictate a reluctance to experiment with an institution already rendering such excellent benefits.

The findings of the survey concerning the corporation idea show that what could have been anticipated in logic is reflected in fact.

Further, so many events have crowded in on the consciousness of all of us since I first broached the corporation proposal last April it is not suprising that the proposal has been submerged by more pressing problems and more urgent concerns.

Amplifying that tendency is a policy I have purposely adopted. As I am sure you know, never once have I asked any member of the postal service to campaign for, endorse, or support the proposal.

But the fact is simply that most people do not understand the corporation idea. For, when given a brief explanation of the proposal, the survey shows that attitudes sharply improve.

Roper reported the study indicates that the more people know about it the more favorably inclined towards it they become.

I think these points deserve careful examination.

First, since the American people are obviously satisfied with mail service and see no need for change, why then do I think change is needed?

This is a basic question.

And I think there is an equally basic answer.

I fully agree that mail service is good *now*. We have said that all along and we are pleased that the American people agree with us.

Also, I fully agree that service has improved.

But we must be constantly striving to further improve our service now. And what about the future?

I have concluded that unless we make some basic changes in our methods of operation, the future will be a bleak one for mail service. That was my belief last April and that is my belief today.

It takes every ounce of our efforts to provide good service at the present time and I look ahead five, ten, twenty years with a sense of sharp foreboding.

You know the figures as well as I do.

Conservative forecasts, based on current trends, clearly show that in twenty more years the total number of pieces of mail will reach 139 billion—an increase of 74 percent over the present heavy volume.

We are running as fast as we can just to keep up with our present volume.

Can we handle an additional 74 percent increase in volume with the present methods?

No one is more familiar with the answer to that question than you.

I don't think we can.

The only constant factor in mail service will be continuing volume increases.

Given those increases, I am convinced that the present structure cannot meet the future postal needs of the American people.

That is why I believe it vital to assure that the public understands the problem before they arrive at any decisions.

And this is where your role as community leaders becomes so important. Postmasters can provide a very real service to the nation by helping to educate business mailers and the mailing public about the problems we face in the future and the possible solutions to those problems.

When I say education I definitely do not mean "propaganda."

Some of you may approve of my idea.

Some of you may disapprove.

Some of you may have an open mind.

So, I am not asking that you favor or advocate the government corporation idea. I am asking only that you generate discussion, dialogue, debate in your communities, among business leaders, with Mail Users Councils, in the public media.

And may I emphasize at this point that just as the President's Commission is not confining its study to the corporation proposal alone, so too I would anticipate that your dialogue with mail users would search out all viewpoints.

The mail service is moving into a new dimension of quality and quantity.

We need new ideas and fresh vision.

I look to you to generate those ideas and those solutions.

But, or course, in this day and age, when so many different sources are clamoring for our attention; possession of a good idea is simply not enough. The good idea will be born to blush unseen unless a strong, well-designed, and highly motivated effort is made to explain its benefits.

I am convinced that the corporation idea is sound and necessary.

I believe the corporation, by issuing its own bonds, would ease the problem of securing funds for badly needed modern facilities.

I believe the corporation would encourage initiative and management continuity.

I believe the corporation would give wide scope to business methods and businesslike thinking.

I believe the corporation would free management from many of the archaic restrictions that now hinder rational planning and optimum use of resources and manpower.

These and dozens of other benefits will stem from a corporation structure. We must not hide the light from these benefits under the bushel basket of inaction.

There is another area where there is a pressing need for information, where there is often more heat than light, more noise than sense, more talk than thought, and more just plain wishful thinking than any issue in recent history.

Of course I am referring to the conflict in Vietnam.

Every day we hear new ideas, new proposals.

These ideas and proposals often have a common root. That root is unfortunately the dangerous fallacy of confusing *what should be* with *what is*.

Other nations should recognize our essential objectives. But some do not.

Other nations should see that we have no desire for territory or expansion. But some do not.

All nations should cooperate in the common interest rather than squabble over selfish interest.

But, there is often far more conflict than cooperation.

This is not the world we would make. This is not the kind of world that makes life easy and pleasant. But we cannot say "Stop the World, I want to get off." The beginning of wisdom is to accept the world *as it is*. Only then is it possible to plan for rational change.

Those who every day urge on the President new plans for peace overlook one elemental fact. The President has time and again offered to stop bombing and, most recently, he said, "The United States is willing to stop all aerial and naval bombardment of North Viet Nam when this will lead promptly to productive discussion."

I think that is a reasonable position, particularly when you are responsible for the lives of American men.

But for the wishful thinkers, those who seem to believe that the other side really wants peace, the reaction of Hanoi—a flat rejection of the President's offer—must have felt like a sudden cold shower.

But perhaps not. For wishful thinkers are difficult to touch with facts.

And I am afraid that the facts seem to point to a desire on the part of the North Vietnamese Communists to secure peace only after South Vietnam falls to Communism.

Therefore, if we act like a third rate power in Vietnam, if we show an unwillingness to carry out our commitments, if we treat our obligations like a meaningless scrap of paper, if we ignore the sacrifice of those who have already died, we are not only dishonoring our national character, we are doing far more. We are, in effect, making the down payment on a mortgage against future peace, and that mortgage will bear heavy interest. It will be paid in blood and in sacrifice, and it will be paid closer to our shores.

No one hates war and killing more than President Johnson. And he has said in no uncertain terms that ". . . any American who rejoiced in war and conflict would be instantly removed from any position of responsibility." But, unfortunately, the world, as it is, and not as it should be, clearly points to the hard reality that only our military power can bar aggression and can make an *honorable* peace and a *durable* political solution possible.

I know there is not a person in this room who despises the Vietnam war more than the President. I know there is not a person in this room who hopes for peace more than the President. And I am certain that there is not a person in this room who is doing more to bring peace about than President Lyndon B. Johnson.

Well, I am not asking you to go to Vietnam. I am not asking you to conjure up some new plan that would make the North Vietnamese see the light. But I *am* asking you to speak out on this issue. Pin down those who substitute wishes for hard thought. Ask them what they would do if the communists continue to refuse to come to the peace table.

You are most often the leading representatives of the Federal government in your communities, and this is the number one international problem faced by our nation today. Speak out and exercise that leadership.

My friends, one of the basic challenges to anyone in public life is contained in a poem written by Oliver Wendell Holmes a century ago.

Holmes wrote:

"I find the great thing in this world it not so much where we stand,
As in what direction we are moving . . .
We must sail sometimes with the wind and sometimes against it,—
But we must sail, and not drift, nor lie at anchor."

I vote for a post office sailing into the winds of the future. And I have a feeling that many of you share my view. Let us join together, not in the line of least resistance, but in the line of the greatest advantage to our Nation—to America—to every single American.

THE FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION, A MAGNIFICENTLY EFFECTIVE FEDERAL AGENCY

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call your attention to a quiet but significant change that is taking place these days in rural America. It is a change for the better—better for the people who live in rural areas, and better, too, for our metropolitan areas.

As all of us know, since the end of World War II, something like 20 million persons from rural America—farmers and people from rural communities, the young and the old—have migrated to the larger cities.

Not only did this massive national rural drift have a disturbing effect on the rural economy and society but it, in turn, imposed additional heavy burdens on the big cities. As Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman has repeatedly pointed out, the resulting urban-rural imbalance now poses a problem of deep national concern.

We can well ask ourselves, why did this massive migration of rural people take place? What caused it?

There are many reasons.

Surely one of the reasons, Mr. Speaker, was the failure of our rural areas to keep pace with modern developments and the amenities of modern living.

For instance, the last U.S. census revealed that there were some 30,000 rural areas in this country which were without central water systems. These people, at best, had to pump their water from wells—many of them open wells. Some even had to haul water for miles because their own wells were polluted, or periodically dry.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, 50,000 to 60,000 rural areas were without safe and adequate central waste disposal systems. This meant they depended on outside toilets, or inadequate septic tanks and cesspools which, in turn, could be sources of pollution.

For those who live in modern towns and cities, it seems incredible that anyone should be without these modern facilities.

It is little wonder that business did not move to rural communities where the most basic facilities were absent, and lacking jobs, it is little wonder that rural people left.

But, Mr. Speaker, I am happy to report that we have definitely reached the "turn-around" point in this problem.

I have here a USDA release of September 7, in which Secretary Freeman announces that during fiscal year 1967 more than 1,100 rural communities, of less than 5,500 population, were able to install or improve modern water or waste disposal systems benefiting some 1.2 million rural people. This was accomplished under the loan and grant program which the 89th Congress enacted in October 1965 and which is administered by the Farmers Home Administration.

Since the Farmers Home Administration was given authority to make these grants and loans under the new program, that agency has financed community water and sewer projects for nearly 2,000 rural communities, benefiting nearly 2 million rural residents.

As Secretary Freeman said:

> This is the kind of healthy, future-building development we need in our rural countryside. These basic facilities provide a fundamental resource in the development of rural business and industry. They help improve health and sanitation conditions—they stabilize and promote more satisfactory family living. It encourages rural people to build or improve their homes and attract others to return to these rural areas to live. And these loans and grants provide immediate employment and new muscle to local rural economies.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, rural communities are being rebuilt and revitalized for tomorrow when this Nation will be even more in need of additional living space to relieve the deadening congestion of our cities. This program is transforming our rural communities.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that this was accomplished by advancing loans of $175.2 million and with grants totaling only $22.5 million. These are loans where funds are provided by private investors and insured by the Federal Government. They will be paid back and the cost to the taxpayer is minimal but the returns to rural economy and rural society are inestimable.

Within the framework provided by Congress, the Farmers Home Administration has done a magnificent job and I only wish it were possible for me to meet personally with each and every FHA employee to express my gratitude for his splendid work.

And in this context, I must add that my own State of Texas continues to be deeply indebted to our superbly dedicated and efficient FHA State director, the Honorable L. J. Cappleman, affectionately known as "Cap" to millions of highly appreciative Texans.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY WILL OPEN BANK CREDIT CARD HEARINGS ON NOVEMBER 8

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Banking and Currency will open hearings on bank credit cards on Wednesday, November 8.

The question of the banks' entry into the credit card field is of growing concern throughout the Nation. It is significant that nearly 1,000 commercial banks instituted credit card plans in the past year.

Mr. Speaker, the widespread use of this new credit device by the banks raises serious legal and policy questions which must be answered by the Congress. Frankly, I am very concerned about the unregulated mailing of millions of unsolicited credit cards by many banks. Many of these cards are completely open-end credit arrangements with no dollar limits.

Obviously, many banks are making no credit checks and have no idea of the total liability of credit extended through the use of the cards. Certainly, this is a highly unsound banking practice.

Mr. Speaker, we plan to hold full hearings. Among the witnesses will be the bank supervisory agencies—the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Reserve, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. In addition, experts in the credit card field, consumers, bankers, small businessmen, and other interested parties will be invited to testify.

JOSEPH ALBANESE HONORED BY NATIONAL COLUMBUS DAY COMMITTEE

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, this evening, my good friend and constituent from Syracuse, Mr. Joseph Albanese, will be honored by the National Columbus Day Committee at a dinner here in Washington. He is to receive an award from the committee for his untiring efforts to bring about enactment of legislation making Columbus Day a national holiday. I am all the more pleased over this honor because, first, I will formally make the presentation and, second, I am a cosponsor of the bill declaring October 12 a national holiday.

Joe Albanese is not only a friend, he is also a serious civic-minded citizen of Syracuse. His charitable activities are legion, perhaps only surpassed by the number of friends he has throughout central New York. Over the years, Joe has been deeply involved in the United Fund of Syracuse, the Rescue Mission Alliance, the Columbus Foundation which gives moneys to schools, the Florence Relief Fund which raised several thousand dollars for flood-stricken Florence, Italy, last year, and the fundraising committee for Boys Town of Italy.

Joe is president of the Weimeraner Club of America, vice president of the Forum Club, a civic, political, and social club for Americans of Italian descent, and a member of the National Columbus Day Committee. In addition to his business interests in the fields of contracting and real estate development, he still finds time to work with numerous religious, social, and fraternal organizations.

Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to salute Joe Albanese and to wish him the best for the future.

PRESS SUPPORT FOR THE GONZALEZ BILL TO STRENGTHEN THE RENEGOTIATION BOARD—THIRD OF A SERIES

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, for over a year and a half I have been struggling in a sea of general indifference to instigate a strengthening of the Renegotiation Board, for it is still inconceivable to me that we in Congress can countenance the sacrifices of our servicemen in Vietnam, the hardships of their families here at home, and the inflationary bite on wage earners and yet perpetrate at the same time a grossly inadequate policing of excessive profits on defense contracts swollen by Vietnam. Have profits become more important than people during wartime?

In March 1966, I presented the first of four major addresses to this body on the crying need to regenerate the Renegotiation Board. Earlier this year, I asked the President to assist in bolstering the hamstrung Renegotiation Board. In the absence of action, I prepared and introduced H.R. 6792 in order to return the Board to the effectiveness it exercised during the Korean war. In July, I urged the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee to schedule hearings on my bill.

To date, I have received no support for my legislation from any Member of either body. However, several newspapers have expressed an interest in my fight to curb war profiteering, and I have permission to insert at this point the third of a series of these comments:

WAR PROFITEERING SENTRY HOBBLED

(By Sanford Watzman)

WASHINGTON.—A government agency that trims war profiteering appears to be withering away despite escalation in Vietnam and a big boom in the defense industry.

Legislation to strengthen the Renegotiation Board and to restore some of its power is being ignored by Congress, which has shown in recent years that it prefers to use a hatchet on the independent agency.

But the board is still breathing. It uncovered $25 million in excess profits during fiscal 1966.

A decade ago—before Vietnam—the board was documenting six times as much fat annually in defense contracts.

The board had 724 employes in 1953. By 1966 it was down to 179.

The Renegotiation Board does not operate under the truth in Negotiating Act, which has been the subject of recent Plain Dealer articles.

Under the "Truth" law, the Defense Department is supposed to see to it that each contract signed is based on information from the company that is current, complete and accurate.

It is up to the Pentagon to discover any inaccuracies and to institute proceedings for recovery of any money in those cases.

The Renegotiation Board, however, does not concern itself with the individual contracts. Rather, it reviews all business dealings between each corporation and the governmental department in the course of a year.

The corporation files with the board records similar to those submitted to the Internal Revenue Service. From these papers, the board determines, under criteria established by law, whether the company's profit from government business has been reasonable.

Rep. Henry B. Gonzalez, D-Tex., is one of the few members of Congress showing concern for the board's strength. In a speech on the floor he said:

"In light of the heavy sacrifices made by those who do the actual fighting in Vietnam, one would hope that those who stay home and do business with the government would not take advantage by profiteering.

"I'm sorry to say, however, there is evidence that profiteering is on the upswing. Despite this, the Renegotiation Board is hampered and unable to do a complete job.

"Amendments to the act which created the board have piled limitation upon limitation and steadily whittled away its authority.

"Exceptions have been created for a great range of materials so that much of what is supplied for the war in Vietnam is no longer covered by the Act.

"Appropriations for the board have steadily dwindled. There have been a number of attempts to abolish the board. There was a major attempt to kill it last year."

Originally, any company that conducted $250,000 or more business with the government in a given year was subject to the act. This was raised to $500,000 in 1954 and to $1 million in 1956.

Gonzalez has introduced a bill to restore the $250,000 standard and to otherwise enhance the board's powers. He is seeking also to make the board a permanent agency rather than one whose life must be extended periodically by Congress.

Under legislation enacted last year, the board will stay alive at least through June 30, 1968. President Johnson said as he signed the extended bill:

"We need this vital measure. It is another important tool in our constant quest to get a dollar's worth of value for every defense dollars spent."

But the administration later rejected Gonzalez's request that it seek more funds for the board.

NEWSPAPERS PRAISE PRESIDENT'S SAN ANTONIO SPEECH

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, the President's address to the Nation from San Antonio was a clear reaffirmation of our policy in Vietnam. It will please neither those who desire unilateral withdrawal nor those who opt for mindless escalation.

The President reiterated the grounds upon which America is prepared to stand. President Johnson stated he would not give up South Vietnam to aggression. Nor, on the other hand, does he want to obliterate North Vietnam from the map. We fight for a limited purpose.

President Johnson has offered to halt bombing if Hanoi will negotiate and not take military advantage of the pause. All Americans await a reply to this offer.

I insert a cross section of editorials praising the President's San Antonio address—from the Minneapolis Tribune, the Denver Post, and the Pittsburgh Press—at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Minneapolis Tribune, Oct. 1, 1967]

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S VIETNAM SPEECH

President Johnson chose his words well when he said in San Antonio Friday night, "There are passionate convictions about the wisest course for our nation to follow" in Vietnam. The passion, unfortunately, has been mostly on the part of those who are in fundamental disagreement with the administration's policy.

It is unfortunate because the seriousness of the problem requires similarly serious, dispassionate appraisal. It may be, as Barry Goldwater said three years ago, that "extremism in the defense of liberty is no vice," but passionate patriotism does not mean simply providing the Joint Chiefs of Staff *carte blanche* to win the war, as some would urge.

Neither does a passionate pursuit of peace necessarily mean that withdrawal from Vietnam would result in achievement of that goal. "Peace cannot be secured by wishes," said the President, or "preserved by noble words and pure intentions." He said, in other words, that an unpopular, restrained but costly war may prevent a larger one.

The speech was an expected justification of present policy and reaffirmation of the President's determination to continue it. The arguments were familiar: quotations from Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy and from chiefs of state of Southeast Asian nations; prevention of the spread of Communist domination; the lack of response by Hanoi to U.S. overtures.

In part it was defensive. The mounting passion of attacks on administration policy must not have gone unnoticed in the White House; Mr. Johnson was described last week by Sen. Clifford Case as "highly irresponsible," and by Sen. Thruston Morton as "brainwashed." The President's response Friday was to point to the error likely to be made by totalitarian regimes, "to misjudge individual speeches for public policy."

In rebuttal to the proposed Senate resolution which seeks to restrict executive authority in foreign policy, the President once more recalled earlier Senate actions which he interprets as support of present policy: the Tonkin Gulf Resolution of 1965 and the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization ratification in 1955. Of the current Senate opposition, he said, "They mistake a few committees for a country."

For a long time to come, the President's San Antonio speech will be interpreted, approved of and criticized. This is as it should be, for it is one of the duties of the Chief Executive to restate and explain his foreign policy to the nation. We cannot agree with all of his reasoning; but we think the statement on Vietnam was needed and that the President presented his position clearly, with appropriate firmness rather than passion.

[From the Denver Post, Oct. 2, 1967]

Why L. B. J.'s Speech Had Nothing New

President Johnson's firm, clear speech on Vietnam in San Antonio Friday night has been unfairly criticized on the ground that it provided "nothing new."

Since the purpose of the speech was to explain again a policy the President said has persisted through three administrations, it could not provide something new unless Johnson were prepared to change the policy.

The President made it clear that he does not intend to change the policy but to persist in it. He served notice to Hanoi that the United States will continue on the course it has been following and that the American people, despite some criticism, will not grow tired and quit.

The reasons the President gave for U.S. involvement in Vietnam are, of course, not new reasons. Some of Johnson's critics may have forgotten or overlooked them, but they are the same reasons which have stood behind our policy all along.

We are in Vietnam, the President said, to prevent all of Southeast Asia from falling to communism. If we were not fighting a limited war to prevent that from happening now, the President suggested we would probably have to fight a third world war later on.

Johnson indicated again, however, that the door to peace is open any time the other side is willing to walk through it. He offered to talk personally with Ho Chi Minh or send Secretary of State Rusk to talk about peace, whenever the other side is ready to talk.

He also offered again to halt the bombing of North Vietnam, if Hanoi will give him some indication it will then come to the peace table and not take military advantage of the bombing halt in the meantime.

President Johnson is, of course, well aware that Hanoi is no more likely to take advantage of his latest offer for peace talks than it has taken advantage of earlier ones.

This is, in part, because Hanoi perceives correctly that the problem in the Vietnam war is not getting to the peace table but reaching an agreement after you arrive.

Nothing in the President's talk suggests any basis for an agreement that would be acceptable to Hanoi. With no satisfactory agreement in sight, Hanoi sees nothing to gain at the peace table. If it came, it would risk giving the impression that it had been bombed into submission.

The only kind of agreement that would satisfy Hanoi is one that would clear the way for the ultimate control of South Vietnam by the forces and supporters of Ho Chi Minh. President Johnson's speech Friday night does not suggest that he is ready to buy that kind of an agreement.

So the war must go on. Its strategic aim is not just to force Ho Chi Minh to sit down and talk. Its aim is to force him to agree to a reasonable settlement in Southeast Asia that will not involve the Communist expansion we are fighting to prevent.

If the President were ready to give up, on the one hand, or to scorch North Vietnam from the map with nuclear weapons, on the other, he might have said something new Friday night. But he intends to persevere in an old policy until someone can show him a better one. We believe the nation will support him in that.

[From the Pittsburgh Press, Oct. 1, 1967]

President Johnson on Vietnam

Suppose for a moment it was North Vietnamese President Ho Chi Minh who had the bombers and was bombing South Vietnam daily. Suppose he also offered repeatedly to stop the bombing—provided the United States halted further reinforcements to South Vietnam. And suppose President Johnson persistently refused that offer.

In that case, we could understand a rising clamor at home, at the United Nations and abroad against LBJ.

As everybody knows, the situation is exactly the reverse. It is President Johnson who has the planes and President Ho who refuses to match the offered de-escalation and sit down to peace talks.

Yet it is President Johnson who is being subjected to that rising clamor to ground his planes permanently and unconditionally and take a chance on what would happen.

It was to answer this upside-down, one-sided demand—made by the North Vietnamese, echoed faithfully by fellow Communists around the world, seconded by a host of gullible "neutral" nations and even urged by an increasing number of frustrated, fearful Americans—that President Johnson addressed the nation Friday night.

The heart of the matter of negotiations, he repeated, is that the U.S. will immediately stop the bombing when it will lead to peace talks, and provided North Vietnam will not take advantage of the stoppage while the discussions go on.

That is as fair and even-handed as the offer can get.

Some may complain the President offered "nothing new." What "new" is there to offer to an enemy who so persistently has rejected the present fair offer?

The only "new" step possible is for Ho Chi Minh to say yes, instead of clinging to his position that the U.S. must first halt the bombing, pull out of Vietnam, recognize the treacherous Viet Cong as the "sole representatives" of the South Vietnamese people, and leave those people to him.

To those Americans growing weary or worried about the cost and casualties of the war, the President had a reminder that two presidents before him also saw the struggle in Vietnam for what it is: a battle for freedom and self-determination, an effort at assuring our own security, an attempt to forestall a bigger, wider war later by fighting this one now.

FEDERAL SAVINGS INSTITUTIONS BILL H.R. 13118

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Multer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Bank Supervision and Insurance of the Committee on Banking and Currency, which I have the honor to chair, recommended to the full committee on September 26 H.R. 13118, the proposed Federal Savings Institutions Act.

This bill—which culminates a 10-year effort to perfect legislation which would broaden the mutual thrift industry—represents the best thinking of the mutual savings banks industry, the savings and loan industry, the Home Loan Bank Board, the Treasury Department, the subcommittee and the staff. The principal is one which has been recommended many times by the leading financial groups of the country including the Commission on Money and Credit, the President's Committee on Financial Institutions, the Council of Economic Advisers and the President in his last two economic reports to the Congress.

H.R. 13118 will eventually result in a unification of the thrift industry on the Federal level. The full Committee on Banking and Currency will take up the bill in open hearings on October 16. For the information of the Members I commend to their attention the following short summary of the bill and the full text of the Federal Savings Institutions Act:

The Federal Charter Bill—A Summary of H.R. 13118

SCOPE AND PURPOSE OF SUMMARY

This is a brief summary of the provisions of H.R. 13118 prepared for the use of the members of the Committee on Banking and Currency. It is not intended as an evaluation of the merits of the bill or as a detailed analysis of its provisions.

INSTITUTIONS AUTHORIZED

The bill would authorize the Federal Home Loan Bank Board to charter and supervise mutual thrift institutions which would be known as Federal savings associations. Their deposits would be insured by the Federal Savings Insurance Corporation (the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation as renamed under the bill). The bill confers on the Board a general regulatory authority which is similar to the authority which the Board has with respect to Federal savings and loan associations under section 5 of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933.

These institutions could be organized de novo or through the conversion of mutual savings banks and savings and loan associations. All Federal savings and loan associations (except those which at the time of application for conversion are the subject of an outstanding cease and desist order or have a similar proceeding pending against them) would be entitled to convert to a charter issued under this proposed legislation. State chartered mutual savings banks and savings and loan associations would be able to convert to a Federal savings association (where state law permits) with the approval of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

DELAY PENDING ISSUANCE OF REGULATIONS

No charter could be issued until the initial regulations under the act had been prepared and had gone into effect. During this period, for which a maximum of 1 year is allowed, the Board would make administrative preparations for the operation of these institutions.

Although the institutions are referred to in the bill as "associations," those formed through the conversion of mutual savings banks would be allowed to retain in their names, the word "bank," "institution," or "society." After December 31, 1972, those words would be available for use as part of the name of any institution existing under the act.

BRANCH AUTHORITY LIMITED BY STATE LAW

Federal savings associations would be authorized to establish branches with the approval of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board but only to the extent that state chartered financial institutions in the relevant State could establish branches or affiliates.

An association could carry out a merger transaction provided the resulting institution was a mutual thrift institution, but only with the approval of the supervisory authority. Mergers would also be subject to provisions similar to those contained in the Bank Merger Act of 1966.

Federal savings associations would be directed by a board of directors elected by the depositors. Associations formed through the conversion of mutual savings banks existing on the date of enactment would be authorized to continue the method of electing directors utilized by them prior to conversion. Proxies are authorized for the election of directors and for other corporate matters, but any proxy given by a depositor would be revocable at any time and, except in the case of a proxy given solely for the election of directors, would expire not later than 6 months after the execution thereof. Proxies given for the election of directors would expire not later than 3 years after execution. The Board is authorized to prescribe regulations governing proxy voting and the solicitation of proxies.

OBLIGATIONS OF DIRECTORS AND OFFICERS

The bill makes clear that the directors and officers of an association would be in a fiduciary relationship to the association and its depositors and directs that before any charter is issued, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board must prescribe regulations respecting that fiduciary relationship. Interlocking directorates with other financial institutions are prohibited except that certain interlocking relationships, if in existence on the date of enactment, may be continued.

DEPOSITS

Associations could accept savings deposits on behalf of individuals and certain types of nonprofit organizations. Time deposits with a maturity of 6 months or more could be accepted from business corporations for profit.

These institutions would be authorized to invest in Government and agency obligations, conventional and Government insured and guaranteed mortgages, and, to a more limited extent, in home improvement loans, loans on unimproved property, corporate bonds and equities, educational loans, and, subject to a statutory maximum of $5,000, in unsecured loans to individuals.

PRIMARY LENDING AREA

In order to emphasize the primary lending orientation of these institutions in residential financing and urban development in their areas, the bill provides that 60 percent of the assets of each institution, other than "liquid assets," must be invested in mortgage loans of the types set forth in the bill on property within its primary (geographical) lending area.

The bill provides that no tax may be imposed by any State on these institutions greater than the least onerous imposed by that State on other financial institutions, and defines activities which are not to be considered "doing business" for the purpose of taxation by a State other than the State in which an association's principal office is located.

Institutions chartered under this legislation would be required to maintain liquid assets of not less than 4 percent or more than 10 percent of the obligation of the institution on deposits and borrowings. The actual requirement would be set within these limits by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board. In addition, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board could require a "special liquidity requirement" of any institution which seemed, in the opinion of the Board, to require such additional liquidity because of asset or liability structure, reserve ratio, etc.

Provisions identical to those of the Financial Institutions Supervisory Act of 1966 are expressly included in the legislation.

H.R. 13118

A bill to authorize the establishment and to provide for the regulation of Federal savings institutions

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the Federal Savings Institutions Act.

TITLE I—FEDERAL SAVINGS ASSOCIATIONS

Chapter Sec.
1. General Provisions 101
2. Establishment and Voluntary Liquidation 201
3. Branching and Merger 301
4. Management and Directors 401
5. Sources of Funds 501
6. Investments 601
7. Corporate Powers and Duties 701
8. Enforcement 801

CHAPTER 1.—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec.
101. Definitions and rules of construction.
102. General powers of Board; regulations.
103. Accounts and accounting.
104. Examination.
105. Reports.
106. Board authority in receiverships and certain other circumstances.
107. Administration.
108. Right to amend.

§ 101. Definitions and rules of construction

(a) As used in this title, the term—

(1) "association" means a Federal savings association.

(2) "Board" means the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

(3) "director", when used with reference to an institution other than an association, includes a trustee or other person performing functions similar to those of a director of an association.

(4) "Federal savings and loan association" means a Federal savings and loan association existing under the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933.

(5) "financial institution" means a thrift institution, a commercial bank, or an insurance company.

(6) "merger transaction" means any transaction between or among any two or more institutions, at least one of which is an association—

(A) which will result in a merger or consolidation, or

(B) pursuant to which any of such institutions, otherwise than in the ordinary course of business, acquires any assets of, or assumes liability to pay any deposits made in, or share accounts of, or similar liabilities of, another of such institutions.

(7) "mutual thrift institution" means a Federal savings association, a Federal savings and loan association, or a State-chartered mutual savings bank, mutual savings and loan association, mutual building and loan association, cooperative bank, or mutual homestead association.

(8) "order", when used with reference to an order of the Board, includes a resolution or equivalent action.

(9) "resulting association" or "resulting institution", used in relation to a merger transaction, refers to an association or other institution (whether or not newly chartered in connection with such transaction) which, after the consummation of such transaction and as a result thereof, carries on the business or any part thereof theretofore carried on by one or more parties to such transaction, and the term refers to such institution as it exists after such consummation.

(10) "State" means any State, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, and any territory or possession of the United States.

(11) "thrift institution" means a mutual thrift institution, a guaranty savings bank, a stock savings and loan association, or a stock building and loan association.

(b) A requirement that a given proportion of the directors of an association vote in favor of a given proposal in order for the proposed action to be taken includes the requirement that the votes be cast at a meeting duly called and held for the purpose of voting on the proposal.

(c) An inference of legislative construction is not to be drawn by reason of the location in this title of any provision thereof, or by reason of the caption or catchline thereof.

(d) If a provision enacted by this title is held invalid, all valid provisions that are severable from the invalid provisions remain in effect. If a provision of this title is held invalid in one or more of its applications the provision remains in effect in all valid applications that are severable from the invalid application or applications.

§ 102. General powers of Board; regulations

The Board is authorized to prescribe regulations (including definitions of terms used in this title) implementing this title to provide for the examination, operation, private management, and regulation of federally chartered mutual savings banking associations not having capital stock represented by shares which shall be corporations existing under the laws of the United States and are refererd to in this Act as Federal savings associations and in this title as associations, and for the administration, enforcement, and effectuation of the provisions of this title.

§ 103. Accounts and accounting

The Board is authorized to prescribe, by regulation or order, accounts and accounting systems and practices for associations.

§ 104. Examination

(a) REGULAR EXAMINATIONS.—The Board shall conduct not less than one and not more than two regular examinations during each calendar year into the affairs and management of each association. The Board shall make one or more assessments in each year on all associations in a manner calculated to yield a total sum approximately equal to the total cost of the examinations authorized by this subsection.

(b) SPECIAL EXAMINATIONS.—The Board may conduct a special examination into the whole or any part of the affairs and management of any association at any time and shall assess the association an amount equal to the cost of the examination.

(c) ADVICE AND COMMENT.—The Board may render to any association or officer or director thereof such advice and comment as the Board may deem appropriate with respect to the affairs of the association.

§ 105. Reports

The Board may require periodic and other reports and information from associations.

§ 106. Board authority in receiverships and certain other circumstances

The Board may provide for the reorganization, liquidation, and dissolution of associations, for merger transactions involving associations, for associations in conservatorship and receivership, and for the conduct of conservatorships and receiverships, and the Board may, by regulation or otherwise, provide for the exercise during conservatorship or receivership of functions by depositors, directors, or officers of the association or any body having authority to elect or appoint directors of the association.

§ 107. Administration

(a) DELEGATION OF FUNCTIONS.—The Board may, in its discretion, delegate any of its functions not vested in the Chairman to one or more hearing examiners or members or employees of the Board or the Federal Savings Insurance Corporation.

(b) NONDELEGABLE FUNCTIONS.—The Board may not delegate—

(1) the function of making rules or regulations.

(2) the authority to terminate the insurance of any institution by the Federal Savings Insurance Corporation.

(3) the authority to remove an institution from membership in a Federal Home Loan Bank.

(4) the authority to place any institution in conservatorship, receivership, or any similar status.

(c) REVIEW BY THE BOARD.—The Board

shall review, after opportunity for a hearing which may be informal, any action at a delegated level—

(1) under chapter 2 or 3 of this title or

(2) upon an application for insurance under title IV of the National Housing Act

upon the affirmative vote of any member of the Board upon an application for review by any person adversely affected by that action, but the action shall not be stayed by the application for review or the granting thereof unless the Board shall specifically so order.

(d) ACTION BY BOARD.—The issuance of an order, the passage of a resolution, or the taking of any other action by the Board may be done with the actual personal concurrence of a majority of the members of the Board, whether or not in their physical presence.

(e) APPLICABILITY OF SECTION.—This section shall apply to all functions of the Board whether or not conferred by this title and whether or not relating to associations.

§ 108. Right to amend

The right to amend or repeal this title is reserved.

CHAPTER 2.—ESTABLISHMENT AND VOLUNTARY LIQUIDATION

Sec.
201. Issuance of charter for new association.
202. Conversion from State-chartered institutions.
203. Conversion from Federal savings and loan associations.
204. Name of association; charter provisions.
205. Conversion of associations into State-chartered institutions.
206. Voluntary liquidation.
207. Distribution of assets upon liquidation.

§ 201. Issuance of charter for new association

The Board is authorized to issue a charter for a new association upon the written application, in such form as the Board may by regulation prescribe, of not less than five applicants. The Board shall not issue a charter under this section unless it determines that—

(1) the association will serve a useful purpose in the community in which it is proposed to be established,

(2) there is a reasonable expectation of its financial success,

(3) its operation may foster competition and will not cause undue injury to existing institutions, including commercial banks, that accept funds from savers on deposit or share accounts,

(4) the applicants are persons of good character and responsibility, and

(5) there has been placed in trust or in escrow such amounts in cash or securities approved by the Board as the Board may require, not less than $100,000, to be transferred to the association for an initial reserve upon the issuance of its charter, in consideration of transferable certificates to be issued by the association in such form, upon such terms, and bearing such interest or other return, as the Board may approve.

§ 202. Conversion from State-chartered institution

(a) The Board may issue a charter for a converted association upon the written application, in such form as the Board may by regulation prescribe, of a State-chartered mutual thrift institution. The Board may not issue a charter under this section unless it determines that—

(1) the conversion will not be in contravention of State law,

(2) the converted institution will serve a useful purpose in the community in which it is proposed to be located,

(3) its operation may foster competition and will not cause undue injury to existing institutions, including commercial banks, that accept funds from savers on deposit or share accounts,

(4) there is a reasonable expectation of its financial success, based upon its capitalization, financial history, and quality of management, and such other factors as the Board may deem appropriate.

(5) the composition of its assets is such that, with such exceptions as the Board may prescribe, the institution will be able to dispose of assets not eligible to be invested in by associations, and

(6) the proposed initial members of the board of directors are persons of good character and responsibility and there is a reasonable expectation that they will comply with the provisions of chapter 4 with respect to the conduct of directors.

A converted association may, to such extent as the Board may approve by order, and subject to such prohibitions, restrictions, and limitations as the Board may prescribe by regulation or advice in writing, retain and service the accounts, departments, and assets of the converting institution.

(b) Before issuing a charter under this section, the Board, making appropriate allowances for differences among types of financial institutions, shall take into consideration the quality of the assets of the converting institution, its reserves and surplus, its expense ratios, its history, and such other factors as the Board may deem appropriate.

§ 203. Conversion from Federal savings and loan associations

(a) The Board shall issue a charter for a converted association upon the written application, in such form as the Board may by regulation prescribe, of any Federal savings and loan association two-thirds of whose directors have voted in favor of the conversion, except that the Board need not issue a charter for the conversion of a Federal savings and loan association if a notice or proceeding under section 5(d) of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 or section 407 of the National Housing Act is pending, or an order under either of those sections is outstanding, in connection with any alleged act or omission with reference to the affairs of that Federal savings and loan association.

(b) After the expiration of the ten-year period which begins on the date of enactment of this title, if the Board determines that the number of Federal savings and loan associations in operation does not justify the continued administration of a separate body of law and regulations, the Board may, without application therefor, issue a charter for a converted association to any Federal savings and loan association.

§ 204. Name of association; charter provisions

(a) The name of every association shall include the words "Federal" and "Savings", and shall include the word "Association", "Bank", "Institution", or "Society", except that prior to January 1, 1973, the word "Bank", "Institution", or "Society" may be used only as part of the name of an association converted from a mutual savings bank whose name, immediately prior to conversion, included that word.

(b) Every charter for an association shall set forth—

(1) the name of the association,

(2) the locality in which the principal office is to be located, and

(3) that the charter is issued under the authority of this title, and that the corporate existence, powers, and privileges of the association are subject to this title (including amendments thereto) and all other applicable laws of the United States.

The charter shall be in such form and may contain such additional material as the Board may deem appropriate, and the Board may make provision for amendments thereto.

§ 205. Conversion of associations into State-chartered institutions

(a) Subject to the provisions of subsections (b) and (c) of this section, upon the written application of an association, the Board shall permit it to convert into a State-chartered mutual thrift institution, if the Board determines that—

(1) two-thirds of the association's directors have voted in favor of the proposed conversion,

(2) the requirements of section 407 have been met,

(3) the conversion will not be in contravention of State law, and

(4) upon and after conversion, the converted institution will be an insured institution of the Federal Savings Insurance Corporation or an insured bank of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

(b) The Board shall not grant any application of an association for permission to convert into a State-chartered institution of any type if, under the laws of the State under whose law the converted institution will exist, a State-chartered institution of that type would not be permitted to convert into an association. If, under the law of that State, the conversion of a State-chartered institution of that type into an association would be subject to conditions more restrictive than those provided in subsection (a) of this section, the more restrictive conditions shall also apply to the conversion of an association into a State-chartered institution of that type, and if such a State-to-Federal conversion would be subject to any discretionary approval on behalf of the State, the approval of the Board of the conversion of an association into a State-chartered institution of that type shall also be discretionary.

(c) No institution into which an association has been converted may, within ten years after the conversion, convert into any type of institution other than a mutual thrift institution which is either a bank insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation or an institution insured by the Federal Savings Insurance Corporation. This subsection shall apply to conversions regardless of whether taking place directly or through any intermediate conversions. If the Board, in the case of an institution which has a status as an insured institution of the Federal Savings Insurance Corporation, or the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, in the case of an institution which has a status as an insured bank of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, determines, after notice and opportunity for hearing, that the institution has been converted from an association through a conversion or conversions (including any intermediate conversions) any one or more of which constituted a violation of this subsection, then that board, by order issued not later than two years after any such violation, may without further notice, hearing, or other action terminate that status. Such a termination of status as an insured institution shall have the same effect as where status as an insured institution is terminated by an order issued pursuant to section 407 of the National Housing Act, and such a termination of status as an insured bank shall have the same effect as where status as an insured bank is terminated by an order issued pursuant to section 8(a) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act. For the purposes of this subsection and section 206 (a), the terms "conversion" and "convert" apply to mergers, consolidations, assumptions of liabilities, and reorganizations as well as conversions.

§ 206. Voluntary liquidation

(a) No association may voluntarily go into liquidation or otherwise wind up its affairs except in accordance with an order of the Board issued under this section.

(b) Upon application by an association, the Board may permit the association to carry out a plan of voluntary liquidation if the Board determines that—

(1) two-thirds of the association's directors

have voted in favor of the proposed plan of liquidation,

(2) the requirements of section 407 have been met,

(3) there is no longer a need in the community for the association, or that there is not a reasonable expectation that the continued operation of the association will be financially sound and successful, and

(4) the plan of liquidation is fair and equitable and in conformity with the requirements of section 207.

§ 207. Distribution of assets upon liquidation

(a) In the event of the liquidation pursuant to section 206 of an association, or in the event of any liquidation of any institution while that institution is subject to the prohibition contained in section 205(c), the net assets remaining after the satisfaction or provision for the satisfaction, in accordance with such rules and regulations as the Board may prescribe, of all proper claims and demands against the association or other institution, including those of depositors or shareholders (but limited, in the case of an institution so subject to section 205(c), to amounts which would have been withdrawable by such depositors or shareholders in th absence of any conversion as defined in section 205(c) while the institution was so subject), shall be distributed to the Federal Savings Insurance Corporation.

(b) In the event of the liquidation of an association otherwise than pursuant to section 206, the net assets remaining after the satisfaction or provision for the satisfaction, in accordance with such rules and regulations as the Board may prescribe, of all proper claims and demands against the association, including those of depositors, shall be distributed to the depositors of the association in accordance with such regulations as the Board may prescribe.

CHAPTER 3.—BRANCHING AND MERGER

Sec.
301. Criteria for establishment of branches.
302. Retention of branches after conversion.
303. Retention of branches after merger transaction.
304. Maintenance of branches.
305. Merger transactions.
306. Charters.
307. Agencies.

§ 301. Criteria for establishment of branches

An association may establish one or more branches, but only with approval of the Board. The Board may grant approval only if it determines that—

(1) there is a reasonable expectation of the branch's financial success, based upon—

(A) the need for such a facility in the locality or localities where it is proposed to be established or operated,

(B) the association's capitalization, financial history, and quality of management, and

(C) such other factors as the Board may deem appropriate;

(2) its operation may foster competition and will not cause undue injury to existing institutions, including commercial banks, that accept funds from savers on deposit or share accounts; and

(3) if the association were a State-chartered commercial bank or thrift institution—

(A) it could lawfully establish the proposed branch, or

(B) an office of an affiliated institution of the same type could be established in the same area.

§ 302. Retention of branches after conversion

With such exceptions and under such conditions as the Board may prescribe, a converted association—

(1) may retain any branch in operation immediately prior to conversion, and

(2) retains any right or privilege, held by the converting institution immediately prior to conversion, to establish or maintain a branch.

§ 303. Retention of branches after merger transaction

(a) Subject to the approval of the Board, which may not be granted later than the effective date of the merger transaction involved, and to the extent permitted by that approval, an association resulting from a merger transaction—

(1) may maintain as a branch the principal office of, or any branch operated by, any other institution party to the transaction immediately prior to consummation thereof, and

(2) acquires any right or privilege then held by the other institution to establish or maintain a branch.

(b) The Board may not grant any approval under subsection (a) of this section unless—

(1) if the resulting association were a State-chartered commercial bank or thrift institution—

(A) it could lawfully establish such a branch,

or

(B) an office of an affiliated institution of the same type could be established in the same area,

or

(2) the Board, in granting such approval, determines that the merger transaction is advisable to prevent a serious risk of failure of one of the institutions involved.

§ 304. Maintenance of branches

An association may not maintain any branch—

(1) unless the branch was authorized to be established or retained, or is authorized to be maintained, by or under this chapter, or

(2) in violation of the terms of any approval granted, or exception or condition prescribed, under this chapter.

§ 305. Merger transactions

An association may carry out a merger transaction from which the resulting institution will be a mutual thrift institution, but only with the approval of the Board. The Board may not grant approval unless it determines that—

(1) every party to the transaction is a mutual thrift institution.

(2) in the case of every party to the transaction which is an association—

(A) two-thirds of the directors have voted in favor of the proposed transaction, and

(B) the requirements of section 407 have been met.

(3) in the case of every party to the transaction which is a Federal savings and loan association—

(A) two-thirds of the directors have voted in favor of the transaction, and

(B) two-thirds of the votes entitled to be cast by members have been cast in favor of the transaction,

at meetings duly called and held for that purpose within six months prior to the time the application is filed with the Board.

(4) in the case of every party to the transaction which is a State-chartered institution, the consummation of the transaction will not be in contravention of State law.

(5) in the case of a merger, consolidation, or acquisition of assets in which the resulting institution is an association, the composition of the assets of the association will be such that, with such exceptions as the Board may prescribe, the association will be able to dispose of assets not eligible to be invested in by associations.

(6) the resulting institution will be an insured bank of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation or an insured institution of the Federal Savings Insurance Corporation.

(7) the proposed transaction is approved pursuant to section 411 of the National Housing Act, if applicable, and section 18(c) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, if applicable.

§ 306. Charters

The Board may, where appropriate, cancel charters of associations which are parties to merger transactions and issue new charters to resulting institutions.

§ 307. Agencies

An association may establish temporary, incidental, or limited purpose agencies for individual transactions and for limited or temporary purposes within limitations prescribed by the Board.

CHAPTER 4.—MANAGEMENT AND DIRECTORS

Sec.
401. Directors required.
402. Functions of directors.
403. Delegation by directors.
404. Initial directors.
405. Election of directors by depositors.
406. Selection of directors of associations converted from State-chartered mutual savings banks.
407. Approval of proposed merger, conversion, or liquidation.
408. Proxies.
409. Proxy voting and solicitation.
410. Fiduciary relationship.
411. Interlocking directors prohibited; exceptions.
412. Residence.
413. Compensation.
414. Indemnification.
415. Attendance.
416. Borrowing.
417. Certain conditions prohibited.
418. Selection of depositary.
419. Purchases, sales, and contracts.
420. Return on deposits.
421. Personal liability.
422. Connection with securities business.

§ 401. Directors required

An association shall have a board of directors consisting of not less than seven nor more than twenty-five members.

§ 402. Functions of directors

The direction and control of the affairs of an association are vested in the board of directors.

§ 403. Delegation by directors

The Board may prescribe regulations governing the management structure of associations. Subject to those regulations, the board of directors of an association may by bylaws or otherwise delegate such functions and duties as it may deem appropriate.

§ 404. Initial directors

(a) NEW ASSOCIATIONS.—The initial directors of a new association shall be elected by the applicants as soon as practicable after the issuance of the association's charter, and shall have such terms as the Board shall by regulation prescribe.

(b) CONVERTED ASSOCIATIONS.—The initial directors of a converted association shall be the directors of the converting institution, except as the Board may otherwise provide (consistent with section 406(b) where applicable), and shall have such terms as the Board may prescribe by regulation or by such order.

§ 405. Election of directors by depositors

Except as provided in sections 404 and 406, the directors of an association shall be elected by the depositors. The Board may by regulation provide for the terms of office of directors, the manner, time, place, and notice of election, the minimum amount and a holding period or date of determination of any deposit giving rise to voting rights, and the method by which the number of votes any depositor is entitled to cast shall be determined.

§ 406. Selection of directors of associations converted from State-chartered mutual savings banks

(a) APPLICABILITY.—This section applies to any converted association converted from a State-chartered mutual savings bank in operation on the date of enactment of this title whose directors were then and thereafter until conversion chosen otherwise than by depositor election, if the converting State-chartered bank filed as a part of (or an amendment to) its application for a charter a description in such detail as the Board required of the method by which and the terms for which its directors were chosen, and if the converted association has not elected, by a vote of its directors, to be subject to section 405.

(b) Rule.—The method of selection and terms of office of the directors of any association to which this section is applicable shall be in accordance with the description referred to in subsection (a), with such changes, subject to the discretionary approval of the Board, as may be made upon application by the association.

§ 407. Approval of proposed merger, conversion, or liquidation

(a) Associations With Depositor Voting.—No association whose directors are elected by the depositors may make application to the Board for approval of a merger transaction, a conversion, or the liquidation of such association pursuant to section 206, unless two-thirds of the votes entitled to be cast by depositors have been cast in favor of making such application at a meeting of depositors duly called and held not more than six months prior to the making of such application for the purpose of considering and voting on the question. The Board shall by regulation provide for the conduct of meetings pursuant to this subsection and for notice and information required to be furnished to depositors with respect thereto, and may by regulation provide for the minimum amount, type of deposit, and a holding period or date of determination of any deposit giving rise to voting rights, and the method by which the number of votes any depositor is entitled to cast shall be determined.

(b) Associations Without Depositor Voting.— No association whose directors are not elected by the depositors may make any application of a type which would require depositor approval under subsection (a) of this section, unless two-thirds of the votes which would be entitled to be cast for the election of directors have been cast in favor of making such application.

(c) Exceptions.—The Board may except from any or all of the foregoing provisions of this section in any case in which the Board determines that such exception should be made because of an emergency requiring expeditious action or because of supervisory considerations.

§ 408. Proxies

(a) In General.—Any proxy given by a depositor in an association shall specify the business to which it relates, shall be revocable at any time, and, except in the case of a proxy given solely for the election of directors, shall expire in any event not later than six months after the execution thereof. A proxy given solely for the election of directors shall expire in any event not later than three years after the execution thereof.

(b) For Approval of a Merger, Conversion, or Liquidation.—Any proxy given by a depositor in an association with respect to a proposal to be voted on pursuant to section 407(a) shall specify whether the holder thereof shall vote in favor of or against the proposal. Any proxy on such a proposal purporting to give the holder discretion with respect to the exercise thereof is void with respect to that proposal.

§ 409. Proxy voting and solicitation

The Board shall, with due regard to standards prescribed for other financial institutions under similar provisions of Federal law, prescribe regulations governing proxy voting and the solicitation of proxies, and requiring the disclosure of financial interest, compensation, and remuneration by the association of persons who are or are proposed as officers or directors, and such other matters as it may deem appropriate in the public interest and for the protection of depositors. The Board shall by regulation provide procedures by which any depositor may, at his own expense, distribute proxy solicitation material to all other depositors, but such procedures shall not require the disclosure by the association of the identity of its depositors. The Board shall by order prohibit the distribution of material found by the Board to be irrelevant, untrue, misleading, or materially incomplete, and may by order prohibit such distribution pending a hearing on such issues.

§ 410. Fiduciary relationship

The directors and officers of an association are in a fiduciary relationship to the association and its depositors. Before issuing any charter under authority of chapter 2 of this title, the Board shall prescribe regulations respecting that relationship. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 102, no regulation issued pursuant to this section shall have the effect of relieving any officer or director of any liability to which he would be subject in the absence of the regulation.

§ 411. Interlocking directorates prohibited; exceptions

(a) General Rule.—Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, no director of an association may be an officer or director of any financial institution other than such association.

(b) Exceptions.—Unless the Board finds, after opportunity for hearing, that there exists an actual conflict of interest, or unless such dual service is prohibited by or under some provision of law other than this subsection a director of a converted association who held office on the date of enactment of this title as a director of the institution from which such converted association was converted, and whose service has been continuous, may continue to be a director of any financial institution of which he has continuously been a director since the date of enactment of this title.

§ 412. Residence

A majority of the directors of any association shall be persons residing not more than 150 miles from the principal office of such association.

§ 413. Compensation

No director may receive remuneration as director except reasonable fees for attendance at meetings of directors or for service as a member of a committee of directors. This subsection does not prohibit the receipt of compensation by a director for services rendered to his association by him in another capacity.

§ 414. Indemnification

To the extent consistent with other provisions of law, the Board may authorize or require associations, subject to such conditions and requirements as the Board may prescribe, to provide for their directors, officers, and employees, and other persons connected with them (including the legal representatives and successors in interest of any such directors, officers, employees, or other persons) indemnification and other protection with respect to any civil or criminal liability incurred by them in their capacity as such.

§ 415. Attendance

The office of a director becomes vacant whenever he fails to attend regular meetings of the directors for a period of six months, unless excused by a resolution duly adopted by the directors prior to or during that period.

§ 416. Borrowing

(a) General Rule.—Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, an association may not make any loan or extend credit in any manner, other than on the security of deposits in that association, to any director, officer, or employee of the association, or any person or firm regularly serving the association in the capacity of attorney at law, or to any partnership or trust in which any such party has any interest, or to any corporation in which any of such parties is a stockholder, and no association may purchase any loan from any such party, or from any such partnership, trust, or corporation, except that with the prior approval of a majority of its board of directors not interested in the transaction, such approval to be evidenced by the affirmative vote or written assent of such directors, an association may, to the extent that it is otherwise authorized by law and upon terms not less favorable to the association than those offered to others, make a loan or extend credit to, or purchase a loan from, any corporation in which any such party owns, controls, or holds with power to vote not more than 15 percent of the outstanding voting securities and in which all such parties own, control, or hold with power to vote not more than 25 percent of the outstanding voting securities. In any such case, full details of the transaction shall be reflected in the records of the association.

(b) Exceptions.—Any association, with the prior approval, evidenced by their affirmative vote or written assent, of a majority of its board of directors and on terms not more favorable than those offered to other borrowers, may make—

(1) any loan on the security of a first lien on a home owned and occupied or to be owned and occupied by a director, officer, or employee of the association, or by a person or member of a firm regularly serving the association in the capacity of attorney at law, in such amount as may be permitted by regulation of the Board,

(2) any loan under authority of section 616 to any director, officer, or employee of the association, or to any member of a firm regularly serving the association in the capacity of attorney at law, and

(3) any other loan, of any type that it may lawfully make to persons not connected with the association in any capacity, to any director, officer, or employee of the association or to any person or member of a firm regularly serving the association in the capacity of attorney at law, but the aggregate amount of loans under authority of this paragraph may not exceed $5,000 to any one borrower.

§ 417. Certain conditions prohibited

No association or director or officer thereof may require, as a condition to the granting of any loan or the extension of any other service by the association, that the borrower or any other person undertake a contract of insurance, or any other agreement or understanding with respect to the furnishing of any other goods or services, with any specific company, agency, or individual.

§ 418. Selection of depositary

No association may deposit any of its funds except with a depositary approved by a vote of a majority of all directors of the association, exclusive of any director who is an officer, partner, director, or trustee of the depositary so designated.

§ 419. Purchases, sales, and contracts

Except as otherwise provided by the Board, no association may purchase from or sell to, or contract to purchase from or sell to, any of its directors, officers, or employees, or any person or firm regularly serving the association in the capacity of attorney at law, or any partnership or trust in which any such party has any interest, or any corporation in which any of such parties is a stockholder, any securities or other property, except that, where permitted by regulation of the Board, an association may make any such purchase from, or any such sale to, any corporation in which any such party owns, controls, or holds with power to vote not more than 15 percent of the outstanding voting securities and in which all such parties own, control, or hold with power to vote not more than 25 percent of the outstanding voting securities. In any such case, full details of the transaction shall be reflected in the records of the association. Nothing contained in this subsection shall be construed as authorizing an association to purchase or sell any securities or other property which the association is not otherwise authorized by law to purchase or sell.

§ 420. Return on deposits

No association may pay to any director, officer, attorney, or employee a greater rate of return on the deposits of such director, officer, attorney, or employee than that paid to other holders of similar deposits with such association.

§ 421. Personal liability

If the directors or officers of any association shall knowingly violate or permit any of its directors, officers, employees, or agents to violate any of the provisions of sections 416, 419, and 420 of this section or regulation of the Board made under authority thereof or (to such extent as the Board may provide by regulation) made under authority of section 410, or any of the provisions of section 212, 213, 214, 215, 665, 1006, 1014, 1906, or 1909 of title 18 of the United States Code, every director and officer participating in or assenting to such violation shall be held liable in his personal and individual capacity for all damages sustained in consequence of such violation.

§ 422. Connection with securities business

No officer, director, or employee of any corporation or unincorporated association, no partner or employee of any partnership, and no individual, primarily engaged in the issue, flotation, underwriting, public sale, or distribution, at wholesale or retail, or through syndicate participation, of stocks, bonds, or other similar securities, may serve at the same time as an officer, director, or employee of any association except in limited classes of cases in which the Board may allow such service by general regulations when in the judgment of the Board it would not unduly influence the investment policies of such association or the advice it gives to customers regardng investments.

CHAPTER 5.—SOURCES OF FUNDS

Sec.
501. Initial reserve.
502. Other reserves.
503. Borrowing.
504. Eligible savings depositors.
505. Classification of deposits.
506. Refusal and repayment.
507. Interest payable only from earnings.
508. Advance notice of withdrawal.
509. Withdrawal procedure.
510. Suspension or limitation by Board.
511. Time deposits.
512. Authority of Board.

§ 501. Initial reserve

An association for which a charter is issued under section 201 may not commence operations until the amount required by the Board pursuant to section 201(5) has been paid to the association for an initial reserve. The initial reserve of an operating association may be reduced only by the amount of losses, or by retirement of the certificates referred to in section 201(5).

§ 502. Other reserves

In addition to any initial reserve, an association shall, when required by the Board, and may, when authorized by the Board, establish, and make such credits and charges to, such other reserves (including valuation reserves) as the Board may so require or authorize, and, subject to such restrictions and limitations as the Board may prescribe, certain amounts as surplus or undivided profits.

§ 503. Borrowing

To such extent as the Board may authorize by regulation or advice in writing, an association may borrow and give security and may issue notes, bonds, debentures, or other obligations or other securities (except capital stock).

§ 504. Eligible savings depositors

An association may accept savings deposits, except from foreign governments and official institutions thereof, and except from private business corporations for profit (other than credit unions and other financial institutions acting in a fiduciary capacity), and may issue passbooks or other evidences of its obligation to repay such savings deposits.

§ 505. Classification of deposits

To such extent and in such manner as the Board may permit, and subject to any restrictions otherwise imposed by law, an association—

(1) may agree to pay an additional rate of interest on any savings deposit based upon its classification with respect to the character, amount, duration, or regularity of the transactions with respect to that deposit if the association pays the same additional rate of interest on all deposits in the same classification; and

(2) may establish classifications of savings deposits on which interest may not or need not be paid.

§ 506. Refusal and repayment

An association may refuse to accept any sums offered for deposit, and may fix, and from time to time alter, a maximum amount for savings deposits, and may repay on a uniform nondiscriminatory basis deposits exceeding such maximum.

§ 507. Interest payable only from earnings

An association may pay interest on savings deposits only from net earnings and undivided profits. The Board may by regulation provide for the time or rate of accrual of any items of unrealized earnings.

§ 508. Advance notice of withdrawal

An association may at any time require that up to sixty days' advance notice be given to it by each depositor before the withdrawal of any savings deposit or portion thereof. An association shall immediately notify the Board in writing whenever it requires any such notice of withdrawal.

§ 509. Withdrawal procedure

Withdrawals shall be paid in the order of actual receipt of applications, except as provided in this subsection. No association may pay any application in full unless it pays every application on file in full, except by paying all applications according to an equitable plan of withdrawals approved by the Board, under which applications are paid from receipts in the order received up to a specified amount, and if any balance then remains unpaid thereon, the application is renumbered and placed at the bottom of the list of applications and handled as though it had been received at that time. Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, the board of directors may pay upon any application not exceeding $200 to any one saving deposit holder in any one month in any order. Saving deposit holders who have filed written applications for withdrawals shall remain depositors so long as their applications remain on file. No earnings shall be declared upon that portion of a deposit which has been noticed for withdrawal, which for earnings purposes is required to be deducted from the latest previous additions to such deposit, so long as such application is on file. In no event shall an association voluntarily or involuntarily delay or postpone the whole or partial payment of the value of any savings deposit pursuant to a written withdrawal application by a savings depositor for a period exceeding sixty days following the receipt of such application without first securing written permission from the Board. An association which, without meeting such terms and conditions as the Board may prescribe, has failed for sixty days after a withdrawal application has been filed with it to pay such withdrawal application in full, shall be deemed to be in an unsound condition to transact business within the meaning of section 814 of this title.

§ 510. Suspension or limitation by Board

If the Board finds that unusual and extraordinary circumstances so require, the Board may suspend or limit withdrawals of savings deposits from any association. The Board shall enter any such findings on its records.

§ 511. Time deposits

An association may accept deposits for fixed periods of time from any depositors other than foreign governments and official institutions thereof, and may issue nonnegotiable interest-bearing time certificates of deposit or other evidences of its obligations thereunder. The Board may prescribe limitations as to amount with respect to any deposit, or the deposits of any depositor, under this section. Deposits may be accepted under this section for periods of time not less than six months in the case of private business corporations for profit, and not less than ninety-one days in the case of other eligible depositors, including credit unions and financial institutions acting in a fiduciary capacity.

§ 512. Authority of Board

The exercise by associations of authority vested in them by or under sections 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, and 511 shall be subject to such rules and regulations as the Board may prescribe, except that nothing in this section shall confer on the Board any authority with respect to interest rates other than the additional rate referred to in section 505(1).

CHAPTER 6.—INVESTMENTS

Sec.
601. Definitions.
602. Authority required.
603. Service organizations.
604. Purchases and participations.
605. Composition of assets.
606. Investments eligible for unrestricted investment.
607. Canadian obligations.
608. Certain other investments.
609. Urban renewal.
610. Conventional loans.
611. Real property improvement loans.
612. Loans on unimproved property.
613. Loan servicing.
614. Loans secured by certain collateral.
615. Unsecured loans.
616. Educational loans.
617. Mobile home loans.
618. Guaranteed or insured loans.

§ 601. Definitions

For the purposes of this chapter, the term—

(1) "general obligation" means an obligation which is supported by an unqualified promise, or an unqualified pledging or commitment of faith or credit—

(A) to pay, directly or indirectly, an aggregate amount which (together with any other funds available for the purpose) will suffice to discharge such obligation according to its terms, and

(B) made by an entity referred to in section 606(1) or 607(a) or by a governmental entity possessing general powers of taxation, including property taxation.

(2) "political subdivision of a State" includes any county, municipality, or taxing or other district of a State and any public instrumentality, public authority, commission, or other public body of any one or more States.

(3) the amount of any securities held by an association at any time shall be measured by the cost thereof, determined in such manner as may be prescribed by the Board.

(4) "eligible leasehold estate" means with reference to any loan a leasehold estate meeting such requirements as the Board may

by regulation prescribe for the purpose of this subsection.

(5) "conventional loan" means a loan (other than such a loan as is referred to in section 618) which is secured by a first lien on a fee simple or eligible leasehold estate in improved real property.

(6) "loan" includes obligations and advances of credit.

(7) "real property" includes an eligible leasehold estate.

(8) "primary lending area" means all territory located within a radius of one hundred miles of the principal office of an association and, in the case of an association converted from a thrift institution, any additional territory within which that institution was authorized to lend on real estate security prior to the date of its conversion.

§ 602. Authority required

An association may make no loan or investment which is not authorized under this title or other provisions of Federal law.

§ 603. Service organizations

Subject to such prohibitions, limitations, and conditions as the Board may prescribe by regulation or advice in writing, the Board may authorize an association to acquire or retain capital stock, obligations, or other securities of a corporation or other organization upon a determination by the Board that such acquisition or retention is necessary or advisable in order to enable the association, in carrying out its lawful functions, to obtain, from or through the corporation or organization—

(1) services or facilities, or

(2) other means of assistance of a character which the association could lawfully provide for itself directly,

but no such acquisition or retention of capital stock may be made or authorized if the aggregate outstanding investment of the association, determined as prescribed by the Board, in capital stock under this subsection would thereupon exceed 1 per centum of the assets of the association.

§ 604. Purchases and participations

Subject to such limitations and requirements as to amounts and as to terms and conditions as the Board may prescribe, an association may acquire by purchase or otherwise any loan or investment, or may acquire by origination or otherwise a participating or other partial interest in any loan or investment, if—

(1) at the time of such purchase or acquisition, the association would have had authority to make that type of loan or investment (up to the amount of the price of or consideration given for the acquisition) itself, and

(2) in the case of a participating or other partial interest, the association's interest is—

(A) at least equal in rank to any other interest therein not held by the United States or an agency thereof, and

(B) superior in rank to any other interest therein not held by the United States or any agency thereof, a financial institution, or a holder approved by the Board for the purposes of this section.

§ 605. Composition of assets

Each association shall maintain an annual average, based upon monthly computations, of at least 60 per centum of its assets (other than currency, demand deposits in banks, assets held pursuant to section 606, and such other obligations as the Board may approve) in loans (or participations therein), except to the extent that the Board may otherwise authorize by regulation or advice in writing, of one or more of the following categories:

(1) a conventional loan, whose initial amount does not exceed $50,000 and whose initial loan-to-value ratio does not exceed 90 per centum, upon the security of a single-family residence within its primary lending area (whether or not detached and whether or not part of a condominium), including its furnishings and equipment.

(2) a conventional loan whose initial loan-to-value ratio does not exceed 80 per centum upon the security of real estate within its primary lending area on which there is located or will be located pursuant to a real estate loan, any of the following: (A) a structure or structures designed or used primarily for residential rather than nonresidential purposes and consisting of more than one dwelling unit; (B) a structure or structures designed or used primarily for residential rather than nonresidential purposes for students, residents, and persons under care, employees or members of the staff of an educational, health, or welfare institution or facility; and (C) a structure or structures which are used in part for residential purposes for not more than one family and in part for business purposes, if the residential use of such structure or structures is substantial and permanent, not merely transitory.

(3) a loan whose initial loan-to-value ratio does not exceed 80 per centum upon the security of urban development real property (including, but not limited to, loans in urban renewal areas).

(4) a loan which meets the requirements of section 618 and which is made upon the security of real property.

§ 606. Investments eligible for unrestricted investment

An association may invest in—

(1) general obligations of the United States.

(2) direct obligations of, and obligations fully guaranteed as to principal and interest by, and any other obligations, participations, or other instruments of or issued by—

(A) one or more Federal home loan banks.

(B) one or more banks for cooperatives, or the Central Bank for Cooperatives.

(C) one or more Federal land banks.

(D) the Federal National Mortgage Association.

(E) one or more Federal intermediate credit banks.

(F) the Tennessee Valley Authority.

(G) any agency or instrumentality of the United States in addition to those specified in subparagraphs (A) through (F) of this paragraph, to the extent that investment therein is approved by the Board.

(H) the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

(I) the Inter-American Development Bank.

(J) the Asian Development Bank.

(3) general obligations of any State.

(4) bankers' acceptances eligible for purchase by Federal Reserve banks.

(5) stock of a Federal home loan bank.

§ 607. Canadian obligations

(a) OBLIGATIONS OF CANADA AND CANADIAN PROVINCES.—Subject to the limitations contained in subsection (b) of this section, an association may invest in general obligations of, and obligations fully guaranteed as to principal and interest by, Canada or any Province of Canada.

(b) GENERAL LIMITATIONS.—Any investment by an association in a Canadian obligation, whether pursuant to section 608(2) or subsection (a) of this section, shall be subject to the limitations and conditions that—

(1) such obligation is payable in United States funds, and

(2) immediately upon the making of such investment—

(A) not more than 5 per centum of the association's assets will be invested in Canadian obligations, and

(B) if the investment is in an obligation of a Province of Canada, not more than 1 per centum of the association's assets will be invested in the obligations of such Province.

(c) DEFINITION.—As used in this section, the term "Canadian obligation" means an obligation referred to in subsection (a) of this section or an obligation of Canada or of a Province of Canada referred to in section 608(2).

§ 608. Certain other investments

Subject to the limitation that immediately upon the making of any investment in any security or obligation under authority of this section, not more than 2 per centum of the association's assets will be invested in the securities and obligations of the issuer or obligor of such security or obligation, and subject to such further limitations as to amount and such requirements as to investment merit and marketability as the Board may by regulation prescribe, an association may invest in—

(1) general obligations of a political subdivision of a State.

(2) revenue or other special obligations of Canada, a Province of Canada, a State, or a political subdivision of a State.

(3) obligations or securities (other than equity securities) issued by any corporation organized under the laws of the United States or any State.

(4) obligations of a trustee or escrow agent acting to meet the requirements of section 201(5) of this title, any certificates issued by an association pursuant to such section, and any subordinated debentures of a mutual thrift institution which is insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation or the Federal Savings Insurance Corporation.

(5) equity securities issued by any corporation organized under the laws of the United States or any State, subject to the further limitations and conditions that at the time of such investment the aggregate of the reserves and undivided profits of the association is at least equal to 5 per centum of the assets of the association and that immediately upon the making of any investment in any equity security under authority of this paragraph—

(A) the aggregate amount of all equity securities then held by the association under authority of this paragraph does not exceed 50 per centum of its reserves and undivided profits, and

(B) the quantity of the equity securities of the same class and issuer then held by the association shall not exceed 5 per centum of the total outstanding.

For the purposes of this section, the Board may by regulation define the term "corporation" to include any form of business organization.

§ 609. Urban renewal

An association may invest not more than 2 per centum of its assets in, or in interests in, real property located within urban renewal areas as defined in section 110(a) of the Housing Act of 1949. Investments under this section are subject to such limitations and requirements as may be prescribed by the Board.

§ 610. Conventional loans

(a) An association may make conventional loans subject to the following conditions and limitations:

(1) No loan to any borrower may result in an aggregate indebtedness by such borrower, directly or indirectly, to the association exceeding 2 per centum of the association's assets at the time the loan is made, or $50,000, whichever is greater.

(2) No loan on the security of any one lien may result in an aggregate indebtedness to the association upon the security of such lien exceeding 2 per centum of the bank's assets at the time the loan is made, or $50,000, whichever is greater.

(3) No loan secured by a first lien in a fee simple estate in—

(A) a one- to four-family residence may exceed 80 per centum, or

(B) any other real property may exceed 75 per centum,

of the value of the property, except under such conditions and subject to such limitations as the Board may by regulation prescribe.

(4) No loan may be made secured by a first lien on a leasehold estate except in accordance with such further requirements and restrictions as the Board may by regulation prescribe.

(b) Loans under this section shall be subject to such restrictions and requirements as to appraisal and valuation, maturity (which shall not exceed thirty years in the case of loans on one- to four-family residences), amortization, terms and conditions, and lending plans and practices as the Board may prescribe by regulation. Such restrictions and requirements may differ according to the purpose, type of property securing the loan, or other factors deemed relevant by the Board.

§ 611. Real property improvement loans

Subject to such prohibitions, limitations, and conditions as the Board may by regulation prescribe, an association may make loans for the repair, furnishing, equipping, alteration, or improvement of any real property.

§ 612. Loans on unimproved property

An association may make any loan not otherwise authorized under this title secured by a first lien on a fee simple or eligible leasehold estate in unimproved property if the loan—

(1) is made in order to finance the development of land to provide building sites or is made for other purposes approved by the Board by regulation as being in the public interest, and

(2) conforms to regulations limiting the exercise of powers under this section and containing requirements as to repayment, maturities, ratios of loan to value, maximum aggregate amounts, and maximum loans to any one borrower or secured by any one lien, which shall be prescribed by the Board with a view to avoiding undue risks to associations and minimizing inflationary pressures on land in urban and urbanizing areas.

§ 613. Loan servicing

An association which invests in a loan where the property securing the loan is a one- to four-family residence more than one hundred miles, and in a different State, from the principal office of the association must retain with respect to that loan, a Federal Housing Administration-approved mortgagee, which has qualified or is otherwise authorized to do business in the State where the property is located, to act as an independent loan servicing contractor, and to perform, with respect to the loan, loan servicing functions and such other related services as are required by the Board.

§ 614. Loans secured by certain collateral

An association may make any loan secured by—

(1) a deposit in itself.

(2) a deposit or share account in another thrift institution or a deposit in a commercial bank, but only to such extent as the Board may permit by regulation, and subject to any limitations and conditions the Board may impose.

(3) a life insurance policy, not exceeding the cash surrender value of the policy.

(4) any obligation or security in which the association might lawfully invest at the time the loan is made, but the loan shall not exceed such percentage of the value of the obligation or security, nor be contrary to such limitations and requirements, as the Board may by regulation prescribe.

§ 615. Unsecured loans

An association may make unsecured loans not otherwise authorized under this title, but only to such extent as the Board may by regulation permit, and subject to such limitations and conditions as the Board shall by regulation impose. No loan under authority of this section may be made or acquired by any association if the effect would be to increase the outstanding principal of such loans by the association to any principal obligor (as defined by the Board) to an amount which exceeds $5,000. No loan may be made or acquired under authority of this section if any obligor on the loan is a private business corporation for profit.

§ 616. Educational loans

Subject to such prohibitions, limitations, and conditions as the Board may by regulation prescribe, an association may make loans for the payment of expenses of business, vocational, professional, or college or university education.

§ 617. Mobile home loans

Subject to such prohibitions, limitations, and conditions as the Board may by regulation prescribe, an association may make loans for the purpose of mobile home financing.

§ 618. Guaranteed or insured loans

Unless otherwise provided by regulations of the Board, an association may make any loan the repayment of which is wholly or partially guaranteed or insured by the United States or a State or by an agency of the United States or of a State, or as to which the association has the benefit of such insurance or guaranty or of a commitment or agreement therefor.

CHAPTER 7.—CORPORATE POWERS AND DUTIES

Sec.
701. General powers.
702. Service as depositary and fiscal agent of the United States.
703. State taxation.
704. Service as trustee of certain trusts.
705. Federal Home Loan Bank membership.
706. Change of location of offices.
707. Liquidity requirements.

§ 701. General powers

(a) SPECIFIED POWERS.—An association shall be a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the United States, and, subject to such restrictions as may be imposed under this title or other provisions of law shall have power—

(1) to adopt and use a seal.

(2) to sue and be sued.

(3) to adopt bylaws governing the manner in which its business may be conducted and the powers vested in it may be exercised.

(4) to make and carry out such contracts and agreements, provide such benefits to its personnel, and take such other action as it may deem necessary or desirable in the conduct of its business.

(5) to sell mortgages and interests therein, and to perform loan servicing functions and related services for others in connection with such sales, if the sales are incidental to the investment and management of the funds of the association.

(6) to appoint and fix the compensation of such officers, attorneys, and employees as may be desirable for the conduct of its business, define their authority and duties, require bonds of such of them as the directors may designate, and fix the penalties and pay the premiums on the bonds.

(7) to acquire by purchase, lease, or otherwise such real property or interests in real property as the directors may deem necessary or desirable for the conduct of its business and sell, lease, or otherwise dispose of the same or any interest therein; but the amount so invested shall not exceed one-half of the aggregate of its surplus, undivided profits, and reserves, or such greater amount as the Board may permit by written authorization.

(8) to act as agent for others in any transaction incidental to the operation of its business.

(9) solely upon the order and for the account of its depositors, to act as agent for the purchase and sale of securities issued by investment companies registered under the Investment Company Act of 1940.

(10) to act as a custodian under the Uniform Gifts to Minors Act or any similar law of any State.

(11) when and to the extent permitted by the Board by advice in writing, to form and hold subsidiary corporations which are, with legally necessary exceptions, if any, such as directors' qualifying shares, wholly owned by the association, for the sole purpose of owning property or conducting activities (other than accepting interest-bearing deposits or making loans) which the association itself might to the same extent lawfully own or conduct. Any corporation held under authority of this paragraph, including its records, property, and personnel, shall be fully as subject as the association itself to examination, supervision, and regulation by the Board. Securities and obligations of any such corporation held by the association pursuant to this paragraph shall not be subject to the limitations prescribed in chapter 6, but shall be subject to such limitations, restrictions, and requirements as the Board may prescribe.

(b) POWERS UNDER OTHER PROVISIONS OF FEDERAL LAW.—An association may exercise any power conferred upon it by or under any provision of Federal law other than this title, but the exercise of any such power shall be subject to such regulations as the Board may prescribe.

(c) IMPLIED POWERS.—In addition to the powers expressly enumerated or defined in this title, an association shall have power to do all things reasonably incident to the exercise of those powers, subject to such regulations as the Board may prescribe.

§ 702. Service as depositary and fiscal agent of the United States

When so designated by the Secretary of the Treasury, an association shall be a depositary of public money, except receipts from customs, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary; and may also be employed as a fiscal agent of the Government; and shall perform all such reasonable duties as depositary of public money and as fiscal agent of the Government as may be required of it.

§ 703. State taxation

(a) No tax may be imposed by any State on any association or its franchise, surplus, deposits, assets, reserves, loans, or income which is greater than the least onerous imposed by that State on any other financial institution (except insurance companies).

(b) No tax may be imposed by any State except the State of domicile on an association whose transactions within that State do not constitute doing business, or on that association's franchise, surplus, deposits, assets, reserves, loans, or income, except that this subsection does not exempt foreclosed properties from ad valorem taxes or taxes based on the income on receipts from foreclosed properties.

(c) The term "doing business" as used in this section does not include any one or more of the following activities when engaged in by an association:

(1) The acquisition of loans or interests therein (including the negotiation thereof) secured by mortgages or deeds of trust on real property situated in a nondomiciliary State.

(2) The physical inspection and appraisal of property in a nondomiciliary State as security for mortgages or deeds of trust.

(3) The ownership, modification, renewal, extension, transfer, or foreclosure of loans secured by property in a nondomiciliary State, or the acceptance of substitute or additional obligors thereon.

(4) The making, collecting, and servicing of loans secured by property in a nondomiciliary State through a concern engaged in that State in the business of servicing real estate loans for investors.

(5) Maintaining or defending any action or suit or any administrative or arbitration proceeding arising as a result of loans secured by property in a nondomiciliary State.

(6) The acquisition of title to property

which is the security for such a loan in the event of default on the loan.

(7) Pending liquidation of its investment therein within a reasonable time, operating, maintaining, renting, or otherwise dealing with, selling, or disposing of, real property acquired under foreclosure sale, or by agreement in lieu thereof.

(d) No political subdivision, taxing authority, or other entity within any State may impose any tax which is forbidden to be imposed by that State under this section.

(e) As used in this section, the term "State of domicile" means the State in which a given association's principal office is located, and the term "nondomiciliary State" means a State other than the State in which that association's principal office is located.

§ 704. Service as trustee of certain trusts

An association may serve as trustee or custodian under any plan which meets the qualifications set forth in section 401(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 or any similar provision of law, and may offer special accounts designed for any such plan. An arrangement which would otherwise be such a trust having an association as the trustee shall not, for the purposes of this section or of any of those provisions, be considered not to be such a trust having the association as trustee on the ground that any property held under the arrangement consists or has consisted of deposits in or obligations of the association. Any exercise by an association of authority under this section is subject to regulation by the Board.

§ 705. Federal home loan bank membership

Upon the issuance of a charter to an association, the association shall automatically become a member of the Federal home loan bank of the district in which its principal office is located, or, if convenience so requires and the Board approves, shall become a member of a Federal home loan bank of an adjoining district. Associations shall qualify for membership in the manner provided in the Federal Home Loan Bank Act for other members.

§ 706. Change of location of offices

An association may not change the location of its principal office or any branch except with the approval of the Board.

§ 707. Liquidity requirements

(a) GENERAL PROVISIONS.—Every association shall maintain liquid assets consisting of cash, time and savings deposits, and obligations referred to in section 606 in such aggregate amount as, in the opinion of the Board, is appropriate to assure the soundness of associations. The requirement prescribed by the Board pursuant to this subsection (hereinafter in this section referred to as "general liquidity requirement") shall not be less than 4 per centum or more than 10 per centum of the obligation of the association on deposits and borrowings. The Board may specify the proportion, maturity, and type of obligations eligible for inclusion in the general liquidity requirement. An association may, at its option, hold cash in satisfaction of any part of any liquidity requirement.

(b) CLASSIFICATION.—The Board may prescribe from time to time different general liquidity requirements, within the limitations specified herein, for different classes of associations, and for such purposes the Board is authorized to classify associations according to type of institution, size, location, rate of withdrawals, composition and quality of assets, composition of deposits and liabilities, and ratio of reserves and surplus to deposits to such extent as the Board may deem to be reasonably necessary or appropriate for effectuating the purposes of this section.

(c) ADDITIONAL LIQUIDITY.—The Board may require additional liquidity (hereinafter in this section referred to as "special liquidity requirement") of any association or associations if, in the opinion of the Board, the composition and quality of assets, or the composition of deposits and liabilities, or the ratio of reserves and surplus to the deposits of the association or associations requires a further limitation of risk to protect the safety and soundness of the association or associations. The total of the general liquidity required under subsection (a) hereof, and the special liquidity required by the Board under this subsection, shall not exceed 15 per centum of the obligation of the association on deposits and borrowings.

(d) COMPUTATION.—The amount of the general liquidity required to be maintained by each association, and any deficiencies in such liquidity, shall be computed on the basis of the average daily net amounts of the association covering such periods as may be established by the Board. Any special liquidity required of any association shall be computed in such manner as the Board may prescribe.

(e) PENALTIES.—For any deficiency in the general or special liquidity, the Board may, in its discretion, assess a penalty which shall be—

(1) the payment by the association to the corporation insuring its deposits of an amount equal to such percentage per annum as the Board may fix, not greater than 1 percentage point above the current rate for short-term advances charged by the Federal home loan bank of which it is a member or in whose district its principal office is located, of the amount of the deficiency computed as provided in subsection (d), or

(2) the making of advances to the association by the Federal home loan bank of which it is a member at the current rate for short-term advances by that home loan bank, and the payment by the association to the corporation insuring its deposits at a rate not greater than 1 per centum per annum on those advances.

(f) REDUCTION OF LIQUIDITY; SUSPENSION OF REQUIREMENTS.—Whenever the Board deems it advisable, in order to enable an association to meet requests for withdrawals and other existing obligations, the Board may, subject to such conditions as it shall impose, permit the association to reduce its liquidity below the minimum amount; and in time of national emergency, the Board may suspend any part or all of the liquidity requirements provided for herein for such period as the Board deems necessary but not beyond the duration of the emergency.

CHAPTER 8.—ENFORCEMENT

Sec.
801. General powers of Board.
802. Issuance of cease-and-desist order.
803. Effective date of cease-and-desist order.
804. Temporary cease-and-desist order.
805. Injunction to suspend order.
806. Enforcement of temporary order.
807. Notice of intention to remove.
808. Notice of intention to remove and prohibition against participation.
809. Temporary suspension of prohibition.
810. Procedure after notice.
811. Injunction against suspension or prohibition.
812. Removal, suspension, and prohibition.
813. Functions of board of directors after suspension.
814. Appointment of conservator or receiver; grounds.
815. Appointment without notice.
816. Remedies exclusive.
817. Conservators.
818. Venue of hearings; judicial review.
819. Judicial review.
820. Orders of Board stayed only by express order of court.
821. Judicial enforcement.
822. Ancillary provisions.
823. Methods of service.
824. Criminal penalties.
825. Criminal penalty for refusal to turn over property.
826. Definitions.

§ 801. General powers of Board

The Board shall have power to enforce this title and rules and regulations made under this title. In the enforcement of any law or regulation, or in any other action, suit, or proceeding to which it is a party or in which it is interested, and in the administration of conservatorships and receiverships, the Board is authorized to act in its own name and through its own attorneys. Except as otherwise provided in this title, the Board shall be subject to suit (other than suits on claims for money damages) by any association or director or officer thereof with respect to any matter under this title or any other applicable law, or rules or regulations thereunder, in the United States district court for the judicial district in which the principal office of the association is located, or in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, and the Board may be served with process in the manner prescribed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

§ 802. Issuance of cease-and-desist order

If, in the opinion of the Board, an association is violating or has violated, or the Board has reasonable cause to believe that the association is about to violate, a law, rule, regulation, or charter or other condition imposed in writing by the Board in connection with the granting of any application or other request by the association, or written agreement entered into with the Board, or is engaging or has engaged, or the Board has reasonable cause to believe that the association is about to engage, in an unsafe or unsound practice, the Board may issue and serve upon the association a notice of charges in respect thereof. The notice shall contain a statement of the facts constituting the alleged violation or violations or the unsafe or unsound practice or practices, and shall fix a time and place at which a hearing will be held to determine whether an order to cease and desist therefrom should issue against the association. Such hearing shall be fixed for a date not earlier than thirty days nor later than sixty days after service of such notice unless an earlier or a later date is set by the Board at the request of the association. Unless the association shall appear at the hearing by a duly authorized representative, it shall be deemed to have consented to the issuance of the cease-and-desist order. In the event of such consent, or if upon the record made at any such hearing the Board shall find that any violation or unsafe or unsound practice specified in the notice of charges has been established, the Board may issue and serve upon the association an order to cease and desist from any such violation or practice. Such order may, by provisions which may be mandatory or otherwise, require the association and its directors, officers, employees, and agents to cease and desist from the same, and further, to take affirmative action to correct the conditions resulting from any such violation or practice.

§ 803. Effective date of cease-and-desist order

A cease-and-desist order shall become effective at the expiration of thirty days after service of such order upon the association concerned (except in the case of a cease-and-desist order issued upon consent, which shall become effective at the time specified therein), and shall remain effective and enforceable, except to such extent as it is stayed, modified, terminated, or set aside by action of the Board or a reviewing court.

§ 804. Temporary cease-and-desist order

Whenever the Board shall determine that the violation or threatened violation or the unsafe or unsound practice or practices, specified in the notice of the charges served upon the association pursuant to section 802 or the continuation thereof, is likely to cause insolvency (as defined in section 814(1)) or substantial dissipation of assets or earnings of the association, or is likely to otherwise seriously prejudice the interests of its savings account holders, the Board may issue a temporary order requiring the association to cease and desist from any such violation or practice. Such order shall become effective upon service upon the association and, unless set aside, limited, or suspended by a court in proceedings authorized by section 805, shall remain effective and enforceable pending the completion of the administrative proceedings pursuant to such notice and until such time as the Board shall dismiss the charges specified in such notice or, if a cease-and-desist order is issued against the association, until the effective date of any such order.

§ 805. Injunction to suspend order

Within ten days after the association concerned has been served with a temporary cease-and-desist order, the association may apply to the United States district court for the judicial district in which the home office of the association is located or the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, for an injunction setting aside, limiting, or suspending the enforcement, operation, or effectiveness of such order pending the completion of the administrative proceedings pursuant to the notice of charges served upon the association under section 802, and such court shall have jurisdiction to issue such injunction.

§ 806. Enforcement of temporary order

In the case of violation or threatened violation of, or failure to obey, a temporary cease-and-desist order, the Board may apply to the United States district court, or the United States court of any territory, within the jurisdiction of which the home office of the association is located, for an injunction to enforce such order, and, if the court shall determine that there has been such violation or threatened violation or failure to obey, it shall be the duty of the court to issue such injunction.

§ 807. Notice of intention to remove

Whenever, in the opinion of the Board, any director or officer of an association has committed any violation of law, rule, or regulation, or of a cease-and-desist order which has become final, or has engaged or participated in any unsafe or unsound practice in connection with the association, or has committed or engaged in any act, omission, or practice which constitutes a breach of his fiduciary duty as such director or officer, and the Board determines that the association has suffered or will probably suffer substantial financial loss or other damage or that the interests of its savings account holders could be seriously prejudiced by reason of such violation or practice or breach of fiduciary duty, and that such violation or practice or breach of fiduciary duty is one involving personal dishonesty on the part of such director or officer, the Board may serve upon such director or officer a written notice of its intention to remove him from office. As used in this section and in sections 808, 809, 810, and 811, the term "violation" includes without limitation any action (alone or with another or others) for or toward causing, bringing about, participating in, counseling, or aiding or abetting a violation.

§ 808. Notice of intention to remove and prohibition against participation

Whenever, in the opinion of the Board, any director or officer of an association, by conduct or practice with respect to another savings and loan association or other business institution which resulted in substantial financial loss or other damage, has evidenced his personal dishonesty and unfitness to continue as a director or officer, and, whenever, in the opinion of the Board, any other person participating in the conduct of the affairs of an association, by conduct or practice with respect to such association or other savings and loan association or other business institution which resulted in substantial financial loss or other damage, has evidenced his personal dishonesty and unfitness to participate in the conduct of the affairs of such association, the Board may serve upon such director, officer, or other person a written notice of its intention to remove him from office and/or to prohibit his further participation in any manner in the conduct of the affairs of such association.

§ 809. Temporary suspension of prohibition

In respect to any director or officer of an association or any other person referred to in section 807 or 808, the Board may, if it deems it necessary for the protection of the association or the interests of its savings account holders, by written notice to such effect served upon such director, officer, or other person, suspend him from office and/or prohibit him from further participation in any manner in the conduct of the affairs of the association. Such suspension and/or prohibition shall become effective upon service of such notice and, unless stayed by a court in proceedings authorized by section 811, shall remain in effect pending the completion of the administrative proceedings pursuant to the notice served under section 807 or 808 and until such time as the Board shall dismiss the charges specified in such notice, or, if an order of removal and/or prohibition is issued against the director or officer or other person, until the effective date of any such order. Copies of any such notice shall also be served upon the association of which he is a director or officer or in the conduct of whose affairs he has participated.

§ 810. Procedure after notice

A notice of intention to remove a director, officer, or other person from office and/or to prohibit his participation in the conduct of the affairs of an association, shall contain a statement of the facts constituting ground therefor, and shall fix a time and place at which a hearing will be held thereon. Such hearing shall be fixed for a date not earlier than thirty days nor later than sixty days after the date of service of such notice, unless an earlier or a later date is set by the Board at the request of (1) such director, officer, or other person, and for good cause shown, or (2) the Attorney General of the United States. Unless such director, officer, or other person shall appear at the hearing in person or by a duly authorized representative, he shall be deemed to have consented to the issuance of an order of such removal and/or prohibition, in the event of such consent, or if upon the record made at any such hearing the Board shall find that any of the grounds specified in such notice has been established, the Board may issue such orders of suspension or removal from office, and/or prohibition from participation in the conduct of the affairs of the association, as it may deem appropriate. Any such order shall become effective at the expiration of thirty days after service upon such association and the director, officer, or other person concerned (except in the case of an order issued upon consent, which shall become effective at the time specified therein). Such order shall remain effective and enforceable except to such extent as it is stayed, modified, terminated, or set aside by action of the Board or a reviewing court.

§ 811. Injunction against suspension or prohibition

Within ten days after any director, officer, or other person has been suspended from office and/or prohibited from participation in the conduct of the affairs of an association under section 809, such director, officer, or other person may apply to the United States district court for the judicial district in which the home office of the association is located, or the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, for a stay of such suspension and/or prohibition pending the completion of the administrative proceedings pursuant to the notice served upon such director, officer, or other person under section 807 or 808, and such court shall have jurisdiction to stay such suspension and/or prohibition.

§ 812. Removal, suspension, and prohibition

Whenever any director or officer of an association, or other person participating in the conduct of the affairs of such association, is charged in any information, indictment, or complaint authorized by a United States attorney, with the commission of or participation in a felony involving dishonesty or breach of trust, the Board may, by written notice served upon such director, officer, or other person, suspend him from office and/or prohibit him from further participation in any manner in the conduct of the affairs of the association. A copy of such notice shall also be served upon the association. Such suspension and/or prohibition shall remain in effect until such information, indictment, or complaint is finally disposed of or until terminated by the Board. In the event that a judgment of conviction with respect to such offense is entered against such director, officer, or other person, and at such time as such judgment is not subject to further appellate review, the Board may issue and serve upon such director, officer, or other person an order removing him from office and/or prohibiting him from further participation in any manner in the conduct of the affairs of the association except with the consent of the Board. A copy of such order shall be served upon such association, whereupon such director or officer shall cease to be a director or officer of such association. A finding of not guilty or other disposition of the charge shall not preclude the Board from thereafter instituting proceedings to remove such director, officer, or other person from office and/or to prohibit further participation in association affairs, pursuant to section 807 or 808.

§ 813. Functions of board of directors after suspension

If at any time, because of the suspension of one or more directors pursuant to this chapter, there shall be on the board of directors of an association less than a quorum of directors not so suspended, all powers and functions vested in or exercisable by such board shall vest in and be exercisable by the director or directors on the Board and not so suspended, until such time as there shall be a quorum of the board of directors. In the event all of the directors of an association are suspended pursuant to this chapter, the Board shall appoint persons to serve temporarily as directors in their place and stead pending the termination of such suspensions, or until such time as those who have been suspended cease to be directors of the association and their respective successors take office.

§ 814. Appointment of conservator or receiver; grounds

The grounds for the appointment of a conservator or receiver for an association shall be one or more of the following:

(1) Insolvency in that the assets of the association are less than its obligations to its creditors and others, including its members.

(2) Substantial dissipation of assets or earnings due to any violation or violations of law, rules, or regulations, or to any unsafe or unsound practice or practices.

(3) An unsafe or unsound condition to transact business.

(4) Willful violation of a cease-and-desist order which has become final.

(5) Concealment of books, papers, records, or assets of the association or refusal to submit books, papers, records, or affairs of the association for inspection to any examiner or to any lawful agent of the Board.

The Board shall have exclusive power and jurisdiction to appoint a conservator or receiver. If, in the opinion of the Board, a ground for the appointment of a conservator or receiver as herein provided exists, the Board is authorized to appoint ex parte and without notice a conservator or receiver for the association. In the event of such appointment, the association may, within thirty days thereafter, bring an action in the United States district court for the judicial district in which the home office of such association is located, or in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, for an order requiring the Board to remove such conservator or receiver, and the court shall upon the merits dismiss such action or direct the Board to remove such conservator or receiver. Such proceedings shall be given precedence over other cases pending in such courts, and shall be in every way expedited. Upon the commencement of such an action, the court having jurisdiction of any other action or proceeding authorized under this subsection to which the association is a party shall stay such action or proceeding during the pendency of the action for removal of the conservator or receiver.

§ 815. Appointment without notice

In addition to the foregoing provisions, the Board may, without any requirement of notice, hearing, or other action, appoint a conservator or receiver for an association in the event that—

(1) The association, by resolution of its board of directors or of its depositors and obligors or members, consents to such appointment, or

(2) The association is removed from membership in any Federal home loan bank, or its status as an institution the accounts of which are insured by the Federal Savings Insurance Corporation is terminated.

§ 816. Remedies exclusive

Except as otherwise provided in this chapter, no court may take any action for or toward the removal of any conservator or receiver, or except at the instance of the Board, restrain or affect the exercise of powers or functions of a conservator or receiver.

§ 817. Conservators

A conservator shall have all the powers of the depositors and obligors or the members, the directors, and the officers of the association and shall be authorized to operate the association in its own name or to conserve its assets in the manner and to the extent authorized by the Board. The Board shall appoint only the Federal Savings Insurance Corporation as receiver for an association, and said Corporation shall have power to buy at its own sale as receiver, subject to approval by the Board. The Board may, without any requirement of notice, hearing, or other action, replace a conservator with another conservator or with a receiver, but any such replacement shall not affect any right which the association may have to obtain judicial review of the original appointment, except that any removal under section 814, 815, or 816 shall be removal of the conservator or receiver in office at the time of such removal.

§ 818. Venue of hearings; judicial review

Any hearing provided for in this chapter shall be held in the Federal judicial district or in the territory in which the home office of the association is located unless the party afforded the hearing consents to another place, and shall be conducted in accordance with the provisions of chapter 5 of title 5 of the United States Code. Such hearing shall be private, unless the Board, in its discretion, after fully considering the views of the party afforded the hearing, determines that a public hearing is necessary to protect the public interest. After such hearing, and within ninety days after the Board has notified the parties that the case has been submitted to it for final decision, the Board shall render its decision (which shall include findings of fact upon which its decision is predicated) and shall issue and cause to be served upon each party to the proceeding an order or orders consistent with the provisions of this subsection. Judicial review of any such order shall be exclusively as provided in this section, section 819, and section 820. Unless a petition for review is timely filed in a court of appeals of the United States, as hereinafter provided in section 819, and thereafter until the record in the proceeding has been filed as so provided, the Board may at any time, upon such notice and in such manner as it shall deem proper, modify, terminate, or set aside any such order. Upon such filing of the record, the Board may modify, terminate, or set aside any such order with permission of the court.

§ 819. Judicial review

Any party to the proceeding, or any person required by an order issued under this chapter to cease and desist from any of the violations or practices stated herein may obtain a review of any order served pursuant to section 818 (other than an order issued with the consent of the association or the director or officer or other person concerned, or an order issued under section 812), by filing in the court of appeals of the United States for the circuit in which the home office of the association is located, or in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, within thirty days after the date of service of such order, a written petition praying that the order of the Board be modified, terminated, or set aside. A copy of such petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Board, and thereupon the Board shall file in the court the record in the proceeding, as provided in section 2112 of title 28 of the United States Code. Upon the filing of such petition, such court shall have jurisdiction, which upon the filing of the record shall except as provided in the last sentence of section 818 be inclusive, to affirm, modify, terminate, or set aside, in whole or in part, the order of the Board. Review of such proceedings shall be had as provided in chapter 7 of title 5 of the United States Code. The judgment and decree of the court shall be final, except that the same shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court upon certiorari as provided in section 1254 of title 28 of the United States Code.

§ 820. Orders of Board stayed only by express order of court

The commencement of proceedings for judicial review under section 819 shall not unless specifically ordered by the court, operate as a stay of any order issued by the Board.

§ 821. Judicial enforcement

The Board may in its discretion apply to the United States district court, or the United States court of any territory, within the jurisdiction of which the home office of the association is located, for the enforcement of any effective and outstanding notice or order issued by the Board under this chapter, and such courts shall have jurisdiction and power to order and require compliance therewith, but except as otherwise provided in this subsection no court shall have jurisdiction to affect by injunction or otherwise the issuance or enforcement of any notice or order under this subsection, or to review, modify, suspend, terminate, or set aside any such notice or order. Any court having jurisdiction of any proceeding instituted under this chapter by an association or a director or officer thereof, may allow to any such party such reasonable expenses and attorneys' fees as it deems just and proper, and such expenses and fees shall be paid by the association or from its assets.

§ 822. Ancillary provisions

In the course of or in connection with any proceeding under this chapter, the Board or any member thereof or a designated representative of the Board, including any person designated to conduct any hearing under this chapter, shall have power to administer oaths and affirmations, to take or cause to be taken depositions, to and to issue, revoke, quash, or modify subpenas and subpenas duces tecum; and the Board is empowered to make rules and regulations with respect to any such proceedings. The attendance of witnesses and the production of documents provided for in this section may be required from any place in any State or in any territory at any designated place where such proceeding is being conducted. Any party to proceedings under this chapter may apply to the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, or the United States district court for the judicial district or the United States court in any territory in which such proceeding is being conducted, or where the witness resides or carries on business, for enforcement of any subpena or subpena duces tecum issued pursuant to this section, and such courts shall have jurisdiction and power to order and require compliance therewith. Witnesses subpenaed under this section shall be paid the same fees and mileage that are paid witnesses in the district courts of the United States. All expenses of the Board or of the Federal Savings Insurance Corporation in connection with this chapter shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses.

§ 823. Methods of service

Any service required or authorized to be made by the Board under this chapter may be made by registered mail, or in such other manner reasonably calculated to give actual notice as the Board may by regulation or otherwise provide.

§ 824. Criminal penalties

Any director or officer, or former director or officer, of an association, or any other person, against whom there is outstanding and effective any notice or order (which is an order which has become final) served upon such director, officer, or other person under section 809, 810, or 812, and who—

(1) participates in any manner in the conduct of the affairs of such association, or directly or indirectly solicits or procures, or transfers or attempts to transfer, or votes or attemps to vote any proxies, consents, or authorizations in respect to any voting rights in such association, or

(2) without the prior written approval of the Board, votes for a director or serves or acts as a director, officer, or employee of any institution the accounts of which are insured by the Federal Savings Insurance Corporation,

shall upon conviction be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both.

§ 825. Criminal penalty for refusal to turn over property

Whenever a conservator or receiver appointed by the Board demands possession of the property, business, and assets of any association, or of any part thereof, the refusal by any director, officer, employee, or agent of such association to comply with the demand shall be punishable by a fine of not more than $5,000 or imprisonment for not more than one year, or both.

§ 826. Definitions

As used in this subsection—

(1) The terms "cease-and-desist order which has become final" and "order which has become final" mean a cease-and-desist order or an order, issued by the Board with the consent of the association or the director or officer or other person concerned, or with respect to which no petition for review of the action of the Board has been filed and perfected in a court of appeals as specified in section 819, or with respect to which the action of the court in which said petition is so filed is not subject to further review by the Supreme Court of the United States in proceedings provided for in that section, or an order issued, under section 812.

(2) The term "State" includes the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

(3) The term "territory" includes any possession of the United States and any place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

(4) The terms "district", "district court", "district court of the United States", and "judicial district" shall have the meanings defined in section 451 of title 28 of the United States Code.

TITLE II

Sec. 2001. The Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation is redesignated as the Federal Savings Insurance Corporation, and all other provisions of Federal law expressly referring to the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation are amended by changing that name to read "Federal Savings Insurance Corporation".

Sec. 2002. Title IV of the National Housing Act is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"Sec. 410. (a) Except with the prior written approval of the Corporation, no insured institution shall—

"(1) merge or consolidate with any other institution;

"(2) assume liability to pay any deposits, share accounts, or similar liabilities of any other institution;

"(3) transfer assets to any other institution in consideration of the assumption of liabilities for any portion of the deposits, share accounts, or similar liabilities of such insured institution.

"(b) Notice of any proposed transaction for which approval is required under subsection (a) (referred to hereafter in this section as a 'merger transaction') shall, unless the Corporation finds that it must act immediately in order to prevent the probable failure of one of the institutions involved, be published—

"(1) prior to the granting of approval of such transaction,

"(2) in a form approved by the Corporation,

"(3) at appropriate intervals during a period at least as long as the period allowed for furnishing a report under subsection (c) of this section, and

"(4) in a newspaper of general circulation in the community or communities where the main offices of the institutions involved are located, or, if there is no such newspaper in any such community, then in the newspaper of general circulation published nearest thereto.

"(c) In the interests of uniform standards, before acting on any application for approval of a merger transaction, the Corporation, unless it finds that it must act immediately in order to prevent the probable failure of one of the institutions involved, shall request a report on the competitive factors involved from the Attorney General. 'The report shall be furnished within thirty calendar days of the date on which it is requested, or within ten calendar days of such date if the Corporation advises the Attorney General that an emergency exists requiring expeditious action.

"(d) The Corporation shall not approve—

"(A) any proposed merger transaction which would result in a monopoly, or which would be in furtherance of any combination or conspiracy to monopolize or to attempt to monopolize the business of thrift institutions in any part of the United States, or

"(B) any other proposed merger transaction whose effect in any section of the country may be substantially to lessen competition, or to tend to create a monopoly, or which in any other manner would be in restraint of trade, unless it finds that the anticompetitive effects of the proposed transaction are clearly outweighed in the public interest by the probable effect of the transaction in meeting the convenience and needs of the community to be served.

In every case, the Corporation shall take into consideration the financial and managerial resources and future prospects of the existing and proposed institutions, and the convenience and needs of the community to be served.

"(e) The Corporation shall immediately notify the Attorney General of any approval by it pursuant to this subsection of a proposed merger transaction. If the Corporation has found that it must act immediately to prevent the probable failure of one of the institutions involved and the report on the competitive factors has been dispensed with, the transaction may be consummated immediately upon approval by the Corporation. If the Corporation has advised the Attorney General of the existence of an emergency requiring expeditious action and has requested the report on the competitve factors within ten days, the transaction may not be consummated before the fifth calendar day after the date of approval by the Corporation. In all other cases, the transaction may not be consummated before the thirtieth calendar day after the date of approval by the Corporation.

"(f)(1) Any action brought under the antitrust laws arising out of a merger transaction shall be commenced prior to the earliest time under subsection (e) at which a merger transaction approved under subsection (d) might be consummated. The commencement of such an action shall stay the effectiveness of the Corporation's approval unless the court shall otherwise specifically order. In any such action, the court shall review de novo the issues presented.

"(2) In any judicial proceeding attacking a merger transaction approved under subsection (d) on the ground that the merger transaction alone and of itself constituted a violation of any antitrust laws other than section 2 of the Act of July 2, 1890 (section 2 of the Sherman Antitrust Act, 15 U.S.C. 2), the standards applied by the court shall be identical with those that the Corporation is directed to apply under subsection (d).

"(3) Upon the consummation of a merger transaction in compliance with this section and after the termination of any antitrust litigation commenced within the period prescribed in this subsection, or upon the termination of such period if no such litigation is commenced therein, the transaction may not thereafter be attacked in any judicial proceeding on the ground that it alone and of itself constituted a violation of any antitrust laws other than section 2 of the Act of July 2, 1890 (section 2 of the Sherman Antitrust Act, 15 U.S.C. 2), but nothing in this section shall exempt any institution resulting from a merger transaction from complying with the antitrust laws after the consummation of such transaction.

"(4) In any action brought under the antitrust laws arising out of a merger transaction approved by the Corporation pursuant to this section, the Corporation, and any State banking supervisory agency having jurisdiction within the State involved, may appear as a party of its own motion and as of right, and be represented by its counsel.

"(g) For the purposes of this section, the term 'antitrust laws' means the Act of July 2, 1890 (the Sherman Antitrust Act, 15 U.S.C. 1–7), the Act of October 15, 1914 (the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. 12–27), and any other Acts in pari materia.

"(h) The Corporation shall include in its annual report to the Congress a description of each merger transaction approved by it during the period covered by the report, along with the following information:

"(1) the name and total resources of each institution involved;

"(2) whether a report was submitted by the Attorney General under paragraph (4), and, if so, a summary by the Attorney General of the substance of such report; and

"(3) a statement by the Corporation of the basis for its approval."

Sec. 2003. (a) Whenever a financial institution which is insured by one insuring corporation (referred to in this subsection as the former insurer) becomes insured by the other insuring corporation (referred to in this subsection as the latter insurer) without any intervening period during which it is insured by neither insuring corporation—

(1) on the date (referred to in this section as the date of change) on which the institution becomes insured by the latter insurer, it shall cease to be insured insofar as the former insurer is concerned;

(2) the obligations to and rights of the former insurer, depositors and account holders of the institution, the institution itself, and other persons arising out of any claim made prior to the date of change remain unimpaired;

(3) all claims not made prior to the date of change but which would have been properly payable by the former insurer if made prior to that date shall be assumed by the latter insurer; and

(4) as soon as possible after the date of change, the former insurer shall pay to the latter insurer the amount determined in accordance with subsection (b) of this section.

(b) The amount payable by a former insurer to the latter insurer pursuant to subsection (a)(4) is the net charges for insurance paid by the financial institution to the former insurer during the applicable surplus accumulation period less the financial institution's pro rata share of the former insurer's expenses and losses, as determined pursuant to subsection (c).

(c) A financial institution's pro rata share of its former insurer's expenses and losses is—

(A) the sum of all costs, expenses, and insurance losses incurred by the former insurer during the applicable surplus accumulation period

multiplied by—

(B) the average withdrawable funds of the institution during the applicable surplus accumulation period

divided by—

(C) the average of total deposits of all financial institutions insured by the former insurer during the same period.

(d) For the purposes of this section—

(1) The term "financial institution" means either an insured bank as defined in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act or an insured institution as defined in section 401 of the National Housing Act.

(2) The term "insuring corporation" means either the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation or the Federal Savings Insurance Corporation.

(3) The meaning of the term "becomes insured" includes the case of a financial institution which is insured by one insuring corporation merging with, selling all or substantially all of its assets to, or consolidating into, any financial institution which is insured by the other insuring corporation.

(4) In the case of any change of insuring corporations such as is described in subsection (a) of this section, the applicable surplus accumulation period is the period commencing on the most recent date on which the institution in question became insured by the former insuring corporation, and ending at the end of that corporation's fiscal year immediately preceding that corporation's fiscal year within which the date of change falls.

(e) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to define any term used in this section and to prescribe the manner in which any calculation or determniation under this section is to be carried out.

Sec. 2004. (a) Section 403(a) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1726(a)) is amended to read:

"Sec. 403. (a)(1) The Corporation shall insure the accounts and deposits of all Federal savings and loan associations and of all Federal savings associations.

"(2) The Corporation may insure the accounts and deposits of mutual savings banks not eligible to make application to become insured banks of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, building and loan, savings and loan, and homestead associations, and cooperative banks chartered or organized under the laws of a State, District, territory, or possession."

(b) The first sentence of section 403(b) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1726(b)) is amended to read: "Application for such insurance shall be made immediately by each institution referred to in subsection (a)(1) of this section, and may be made at any time by any institution referred to in subsection (a)(2) of this section."

Sec. 2005. (a) Section 406(a)(2) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1729(a)(2)) is amended by striking "and loan".

(b) Section 406(b) of the National Housing Act is amended—

(1) by inserting, immediately after "Federal savings and loan associations" the first place it appears therein, "or Federal savings association"; and

(2) by striking, in clause (4) thereof, "and loan".

(c) The first sentence of section 406(c) of the National Housing Act is amended by inserting "or a Federal savings association" immediately after "a Federal savings and loan association".

Sec. 2006. Section 407(a) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1730(a)) is amended by changing "other than a Federal savings and loan association" to read "referred to in section 403(a)(2) of this title".

Sec. 2007. The first sentence of section 5 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1815) is amended by changing "and any State nonmember bank," to read ", any State-chartered mutual savings bank which is a successor of a mutual savings bank which was an insured bank on the date of enactment of the Federal Savings Institutions Act, and any other State nonmember bank except a mutual savings bank which was not an insured bank on the date of enactment of the Federal Savings Institutions Act,".

Sec. 2008. (a) The sixteenth paragraph of section 9 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 333) is repealed.

(b) Section 19(i) of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 371a) is amended by striking "or by a mutual savings bank,".

Sec. 2009. Section 602(d)(11) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 474(11)) is amended by inserting "deposits or" immediately before "savings and loan accounts".

Sec. 2010. Section 5(d)(14) of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 is amended by inserting after "institution" where it first appears "(except a Federal savings association)".

Sec. 2011. (a) Chapter 41 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"§ 878. Defamation of institutions

"Whoever willfully and knowingly makes, issues, circulates, transmits, or causes or knowingly permits to be made, issued, circulated, or transmitted, any statement or rumor, written, printed, reproduced in any manner, or by word of mouth, which is untrue in fact and is directly or by inference false, malicious in that it is calculated to injure reputation or business, or derogatory to the reputation, financial condition, or standing of any Federal savings association, Federal savings and loan association, Federal Home Loan Bank, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, the Federal Savings Insurance Corporation or any institution the accounts of which are insured by the Federal Savings Insurance Corporation, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both."

(b) The table of sections at the beginning of that chapter is amended by adding

"878. Defamation of institutions."

Sec. 2012. (a) Section 212 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"§ 212. Offer of loan or gratuity to bank examiner

"Whoever, being an officer, director, or employee of a bank which is a member of the Federal Reserve System or the deposits of which are insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, or of any member of any Federal home loan bank or any institution the accounts of which are insured by the Federal Savings Insurance Corporation, or of any land bank, Federal land bank association, or other institution subject to examination by a farm credit examiner, or of any small business investment company, makes or grants any loan or gratuity, to any examiner or assistant examiner who examines or has authority to examine such bank, corporation, member, or institution, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both; and may be fined a further sum equal to the money so loaned or gratuity given.

"The provisions of this section and section 213 of this title shall apply to all public examiners and assistant examiners who examine member banks of the Federal Reserve System or insured banks, or members of any Federal home loan bank or insured institutions, whether appointed by the Comptroller of the Currency, by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, or by a Federal Reserve agent, or by a Federal Reserve bank, or by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, or by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, or by the Federal Savings Insurance Corporation, or by any Federal home loan bank, or appointed or elected under the laws of any State; but shall not apply to private examiners or assistant examiners employed only by a clearinghouse association, or by the directors of a bank, corporation, member, or insured institution.

"Nothing contained in this section or section 213 of this title shall prohibit (1) any such officer, director, or employee from making, or an examiner or assistant examiner from accepting, from any such bank, corporation, member, institution, association, or organization, a loan in an amount not exceeding $30,000 which is secured by a first lien on a home owned and occupied or to be owned and occupied by such examiner or assistant examiner, or (2) any officer, director, or employee of any national banking association or State bank which is a member of the Federal Reserve System from making, or any examiner or assistant examiner of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation from accepting, a loan from any such bank under regulations adopted by the Corporation but no examiner or assistant examiner to whom such a loan is made shall, as long as the loan remains outstanding, participate in any examination of the institution by which the loan was made."

Sec. 2013. Section 213 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"§ 213. Acceptance of loan or gratuity by bank examiner

"Whoever, being an examiner or assistant examiner of member banks of the Federal Reserve System or banks the deposits of which are insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, or members of any Federal home loan bank or institutions the accounts of which are insured by the Federal Savings Insurance Corporation, or a farm credit examiner, or an examiner of small business investment companies, accepts a loan or gratuity from any bank, corporation, member, institution, association, or organization examined by him or from any person connected therewith, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both; and may be fined a further sum equal to the money so loaned or gratuity given, and shall be disqualified from holding office as such examiner."

Sec. 2014. (a) Section 214 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"§ 214. Offer for procurement of certain loans or discounts

"Whoever stipulates for or gives or receives, or consents or agrees to give or receive, any fee, commission, bonus, or thing of value for procuring or endeavoring to procure from any Federal Reserve bank, or any Federal home loan bank, any advance, loan, or extension of credit or discount or purchase of any obligation or commitment with respect thereto, either directly from such Federal Reserve bank or Federal home loan bank, or indirectly through any financing institution, unless such fee, commission, bonus, or thing of value and all material facts with respect to the arrangement or understanding therefor shall be disclosed in writing in the application or request for such advance, loan, extension of credit, discount, purchase, or commitment, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both."

(b) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 11 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by changing "Offer for procurement of Federal Reserve bank loan and discount of commercial paper" to read "Offer for procurement of certain loans or discounts".

Sec. 2015. Section 215 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"§ 215. Receipt of commissions or gifts for procuring loans

"Whoever, being an officer, director, employee, agent, or attorney of any bank, the deposits of which are insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, or of a Federal intermediate credit bank, or of any member of a Federal home loan bank, or of any institution the accounts of which are insured by the Federal Savings Insurance Corporation, except as provided by law, stipulates for or receives or consents or agrees to receive any fee, commission, gift, or thing of value, from any person, firm, or corporation, for procuring or endeavoring to procure for such person, firm, or corporation, or for any other person, firm, or corporation, from any such bank, corporation, member, or institution, any loan or extension or renewal of loan or substitution of security, or the purchase or discount or acceptance of any paper, note, draft, check, or bill of exchange by any such bank, corporation, member, or institution, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both."

Sec. 2016. Section 655 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"§ 655. Theft by bank examiner

"Whoever, being a bank examiner or assistant examiner, steals, or unlawfully takes, or unlawfully conceals any money, note, draft, bond, or security or any other property of value in the possession of any bank or banking institution which is a member of the Federal Reserve System or which is insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, or of any member of any Federal home loan bank, or of any institution the accounts of which are insured by the Federal Savings Insurance Corporation, or from any safe deposit box in or adjacent to the premises of such bank, member, or institution, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both; but if the amount taken or concealed does not exceed $100, he shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both; and shall be disqualified from holding office as a national bank examiner, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation examiner, or Federal Home Loan Bank Board examiner, or as an examiner of any such member or institution.

"This section shall apply to all public examiners and assistant examiners who examine member banks of the Federal Reserve

System or banks the deposits of which are insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, or members of any Federal home loan bank or institutions the accounts of which are insured by the Federal Savings Insurance Corporation, whether appointed by the Comptroller of the Currency, by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, by a Federal Reserve agent, by a Federal Reserve bank, or by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, or by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, or by the Federal Savings Insurance Corporation, or by any Federal home loan bank, or appointed or elected under the laws of any State; but shall not apply to private examiners or assistant examiners employed only by a clearinghouse association, or by the directors of a bank, member, or insured institution."

SEC. 2017. Section 657 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"§ 657. Lending, credit, and insurance institutions

"Whoever, being an officer, director, agent, or employee of or connected in any capacity with the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, the Federal Savings Insurance Corporation, any Federal home loan bank, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Farm Credit Administration, the Federal Housing Administration, the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, the Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Farmers' Home Administration, or any land bank, intermediate credit bank, bank for cooperatives, or any lending, mortgage, insurance, credit, or savings and loan corporation or association authorized or acting under the laws of the United States, or any member of any Federal home loan bank or any institution the accounts of which are insured by the Federal Savings Insurance Corporation, or any small business investment company, and whoever, being a receiver of any such institution, or agent or employee of the receiver, embezzles, abstracts, purloins, or willfully misapplies any moneys, funds, credits, securities, or other things of value belonging to any such agency, bank, corporation, association, member, or institution, or pledged or otherwise entrusted to its care, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both; but if the amount or value embezzled, abstracted, purloined, or misapplied does not exceed $100, he shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both."

SEC. 2018. (a) Section 1006 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"§ 1006. Federal credit institution entries, reports, and transactions

"Whoever, being an officer, director, agent, or employee of or connected in any capacity with the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, the Federal Savings Insurance Corporation, any Federal home loan bank, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Farm Credit Administration, the Federal Housing Administration, the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, the Secretary of Agriculture acting through the Farmers' Home Administration, or any land bank, intermediate credit bank, bank for cooperatives, or any lending, mortgage, insurance, credit, or savings and loan corporation or association authorized or acting under the laws of the United States, or any member of any Federal home loan bank or any institution the account of which are insured by the Federal Savings Insurance Corporation, or any small business investment company, with intent to defraud any such institution or any other company, body politic or corporate, or any individual, or to deceive any officer, auditor, examiner, or agent of any such institution or of any department or agency of the United States, makes any false entry in any book, report, or statement of or to any such institution, or without being duly authorized, draws any order or bill of exchange, makes any acceptance, or issues, puts forth, or assigns any note, debenture, bond, or other obligation, or draft, bill of exchange, mortgage, judgment, or decree, or, with intent to defraud the United States or any agency thereof, or any bank, corporation, member, institution, or association referred to in this section, participates or shares in or receives directly or indirectly any money, profit, property, or benefits through any transaction, loan, commission, contract, or any other act of any such agency, bank, corporation, member, institution, or association, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both."

(b) Section 1014 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by striking out "a Federal Savings and Loan Association" and inserting in lieu thereof "any institution whose deposits or accounts are insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation or the Federal Savings Insurance Corporation".

SEC. 2019. Section 1906 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"§ 1906. Disclosure of information by bank examiner

"Whoever, being an examiner, public or private, discloses the names of borrowers or the collateral for loans of any member bank of the Federal Reserve System, or bank insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, or of any member of any Federal home loan bank or any institution the accounts of which are insured by the Federal Savings Insurance Corporation, examined by him, to other than the proper officers of such bank, member, or institution, without first having obtained the express permission in writing from the Comptroller of the Currency as to a national bank or a district bank, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System as to a State member bank, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation as to any other insured bank, or the Federal Home Loan Bank Board as to any member of any Federal home loan bank, other than those the deposits of which are insured in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, or as to any institution the accounts of which are insured by the Federal Savings Insurance Corporation, or from the board of directors of such bank, member, or institution, except when ordered to do so by a court of competent jurisdiction, or by direction of the Congress of the United States, or either House thereof, or any committee of Congress or either House duly authorized, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both."

SEC. 2020. Section 1909 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"§ 1909. Examiner performing other services

"Whoever, being a national bank examiner, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation examiner, farm credit examiner, or an examiner or assistant examiner of members of any Federal home loan bank or institutions the accounts of which are insured by the Federal Savings Insurance Corporation, performs any other service, for compensation, for any bank or banking or loan association, or for any such member or institution, or for any building and loan association, savings and loan association, homestead association, or cooperative bank, or for any officer, director, or employee thereof, or for any person connected therewith in any capacity, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both."

SEC. 2021. The Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 101. (a) The Board shall issue regulations, whose effective date is not later than the last day of the one-year period which begins on the day following the date of enactment of the Federal Savings Institutions Act, in accordance with its authority under that Act before issuing any charters under that Act.

"(b) On and after the effective date of the regulations referred to in subsection (a) of this section—

"(1) no Federal savings and loan association may be incorporated by the Board;

"(2) no Federal savings and loan association may be converted into any other institution except under the Federal Savings Institutions Act or the last sentence of section 5(i) of this Act; and

"(3) no institution may be converted into a Federal savings and loan association."

THE LATE HONORABLE JOHN E. FOGARTY

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. TIERNAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, it was my distinct honor and privilege to attend a dedication ceremony in memory of our late friend and colleague, John Edward Fogarty. John was a member of the Navy's Construction Battalion during the last World War, and on September 23 at Davisville, R.I., one of the Seabees' training centers was renamed Camp Fogarty.

Two of John Fogarty's best friends in this House were special guests at this dedication ceremony, the gentleman from Florida, the Honorable ROBERT SIKES, and the gentleman from Ohio, the Honorable MICHAEL KIRWAN. Representative SIKES, who first suggested that such a center be named in memory of our late friend and colleague, was the principal speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to insert in the RECORD, Representative SIKES' poignant and fitting tribute in memory of the late John E. Fogarty:

DEDICATION OF CAMP FOGARTY

(Exercises naming the Seabee Combat Training Camp, Davisville, R.I., for the late Honorable John E. Fogarty)

It is entirely fitting that during this year which marks the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Seabees, a Rhode Island Seabee installation should be named in honor of the memory of Rhode Island's best known and best liked Seabee veteran, the late United States Representative John E. Fogarty. His mortal remains are buried in St. Ann's Cemetery, Cranston, and it's here in Rhode Island that the memory of this great man remains freshest, the gratitude for all he did is deepest, and that pride in the distinguished career of a man who started out in life as a bricklayer is strongest.

As Chairman of the Military Construction Subcommittee, the Committee on Appropriations, it was my privilege to suggest that this installation be named in honor of John Fogarty's memory. I am pleased indeed that the Navy promptly agreed. Admiral A. C. Husband, Commander of the Naval Facilities Engineering Command, expressed the Navy Department's enthusiasm for the ceremony in which we participate today and I am privileged that we can be together on this occasion to pay tribute to a man who was always embarrassed by praise, who avoided publicity, and who did his job as a Congressman with utter sincerity and with complete dedication—just as do the Seabees.

The biography that appeared for so many years in the *Congressional Directory* under his name was imposing in its simplicity and dignity. It read merely: "John Edward Fogarty, Democrat, of Harmony, Rhode Island, elected in 1940; reelected to succeeding Congresses."

His public papers have been donated through the generosity of his beloved wife, Luise, to Providence College. They constitute a complete record of his great work in the legislative fields of public health and other medical and social problems. A biography of John Fogarty based on these papers would be a contribution to the people's understanding of the problems of government in our time. He gained his understanding of those problems as a bricklayer who began his apprenticeship in January of 1932 during the worst of the great depression, who became a journeyman member of Local 1 of his union in May of 1938, who became president of his lcoal, who was elected to the Congress of the United States in 1940, and who left Congress in time of war to serve his country in a different way in the Seabees.

He was very proud of his union membership; he was very proud of his Catholic faith; he was very proud of his Seabee service, and he was very proud of the position of trust which was his as a Member of Congress. When he died, his family, his Church, his union, and the Congress were all grief-stricken, because they knew quite well the kind of man they had lost.

The Eminent Cardinal Cushing said at the time: "It is significant to me that the Honorable John Fogarty died suddenly of a heart attack. For years, his heart, which was as big as himself, overflowed with love for the poor and the helpless. When it came to legislation pertaining to the physical and mental health of the citizens of this country, he was always in the forefront advocating in his very effective way, Federal aid in behalf of these and other forgotten souls."

The range and quality of John E. Fogarty's public service were demonstrated by the fact that not only the newspapers of his beloved Rhode Island eulogized him and his achievements, but also such nationally known publications as the weekly journal of the American Association for the Advancement of Science and the *New York Times*.

The weekly magazine *Science* said of him: "He helped create the phenomenal budgetary growth of the National Institutes of Health from $46 million in 1950 to the current sum of over $1.2 billion. . . . It is not exaggeration to say that for the past 15 years he was politically the single most important person in medical research in the United States."

Dr. Howard A. Rusk, the medical columnist of the *New York Times* wrote: "Medicare, Medicaid, more nursing home beds, Federal aid for the training of physicians and other health workers, the clinical center of the National Institutes of Health, workshops and classrooms for the mentally retarded, and all of the other tremendous advances in health and rehabilitation in the last quarter century stand as monuments to John E. Fogarty, 'Mr. Public Health.' "

It was indeed true that he worked with unremitting zeal for the appropriations that were to make the public health programs of the United States second to none in the world.

He was born on March 23, 1913. Formal education ended for him when he was graduated from high school. Becoming a bricklayer, he was only twenty-three when elected to the first of his terms as president of Bricklayers Union Local One of Rhode Island. He was twenty-seven when first elected to the House of Representatives, one of the youngest members of the House.

During World War II, he enlisted in the Navy's Construction Corps, known everywhere as the Seabees. He had been a member of the House Committee on Naval Affairs, he wanted to experience at first hand the problems of Navy enlisted men. When he returned to the House of Representatives in 1945, he said that he wanted to make himself "the enlisted man's legman." Shortly afterwards he became a member of the Committee on Appropriations, one of the big three in the House. It was then that he was assigned to membership on the subcommittee dealing with appropriations for labor, health, education, and welfare. He mastered the complexities of that subcommittee's responsibilities and became its able and hard-driving chairman in 1949.

He was honored time and time again for outstanding legislative achievements. He received the Distinguished Service Award of the American Cancer Society in 1952. He received the first award granted by the National Association for Retarded Children in 1956, the National Distinguished Service Medal of *Parents' Magazine*, and the National Rehabilitation Association's annual award. In 1959, he was given a special Lasker Award for "extraordinary public service" by the American Public Health Association, an award usually given only to members of the medical profession.

Rich in honors, blessed with the profound admiration and affection of his colleagues and constituents, he died on the opening day of the 90th Congress. Despite their sorrow at his passing, the members of his bereaved family must feel a very deep and justifiable pride in the record of good works which this great man left to them as a legacy which can never die. This feeling, all of us can share.

With his death, we lost a dear friend, a respected colleague, and a great American. His tremendous efforts over the years won for him his justly deserved reputation as a major architect of the Federal government's program of medical research. In his characteristically modest way, he offered as an explanation of his acquisition of this knowledge the remark: "I live this thing all year round."

On the day of his death, the flags of hospitals, research laboratories, and medical facilities for the aged, the infirm, and the mentally retarded, figuratively or literally, were flown at half mast because they had lost a champion. As an eminent medical columnist wrote of him: "No one in the history of this country has done more to promote more and better health services, more and better health facilities, and more and better health research than Representative Fogarty."

His death came at the beginning of his fourteenth term, as he made plans to carry on during the 90th Congress his wide-ranging activities against mankind's great enemies, disease, disability, and death.

So, to me, it appears particularly fitting that the name of this man who was indeed a champion in the fight for the future of mankind be associated with a base which is part of an organization that has contributed so very greatly to the security of America and that of the free world.

1967 is the 25th anniversary year of the Seabees and the 100th anniversary of the Navy's Civil Engineering Corps.

The Navy's Seabees were less than 6 months old when their first unit came under fire early in World War II. Only 3 weeks after the Marines assaulted the beaches of Guadalcanal in August 1942, Seabees followed them ashore to begin the difficult task of airfield and other construction. Throughout the 3 month battle for Guadalcanal the Seabees performed construction miracles; at one time, continuing their work even when Japanese troops had pushed the Marine front line to within 150 feet of their activities. In all this, the Seabees had to be ready to take up positions in the defensive perimeter in the event of a Japanese landing against the narrow beachhead for fighting also is part of their job. The work of the Seabees on Guadalcanal was only the beginning. Working in close comradeship with the Marines and with other forces, they improvised and made do and accomplished the impossible in every area of the Pacific. I am told that they even made extra money during off-duty hours by manufacturing fake Japanese battle souvenirs and native jewelry for sale to gullible new forces in the theater. They probably are doing it in Vietnam too. More power to them.

By the summer of 1944, advancing U.S. Forces in the Pacific War against Japan had reached the Marianas (where John Fogarty served), 4,000 miles west of Hawaii and less than 2,000 miles from Japan itself. On July 21, they began the invasion of Guam, and only three days later the same Marines that had taken Saipan were swarming ashore on Tinian.

Even before the Marines had officially secured Tinian, Seabees began landing to work on their biggest single job of the entire war—constructing the world's largest air base for the Army Air Corps' B–29 "Superfortress" bombers that would soon begin carrying the war to the Japanese homeland.

One of the very largest jobs ever undertaken by the Navy's Seabees was the construction of a major base for the U.S. Seventh Fleet at Cubi Point, on Subic Bay in the Philippine Islands. Required to support the growing U.S. commitments in the Far East, the Cubi Point base was started at the height of the Korean War in 1951.

Working as many as three shifts a day, six days a week, the Seabees converted Cubi Point's jungle and mountains into a modern base for Seventh Fleet carriers.

An important new part of the Seabee tradition in recent years has been the several types of Seabee Teams, which have proven a valuable addition to U.S. programs aimed at strengthening the free world by helping the people of underdeveloped nations to help themselves.

Utilizing the construction skills of carefully selected men, Seabee Teams have been deployed to locations as widespread as Southeast Asia, South America and Africa, where their skills have been employed in a wide variety of "civic action" construction missions aimed at improving the living conditions of the people of other nations. There are now ten Seabee Teams in South Vietnam.

On the morning of May 7, 1965, in one of the biggest operations of its kind since the Korean War, members of Seabee Battalions MCB–10 landed at Chu Lai with the Marines.

One of the first jobs handed the Seabees when they hit the beach at Chu Lai was the construction of a tactical runway. In only 21 days, high performance Marine jets were flying strikes against the VC from this Seabee built airfield.

The large scale commitment of Seabees to the war in Vietnam has proven the value of the long, hard peacetime deployments and the continuing emphasis on training, mobility, and self-sufficiency characteristic of the Navy"s mobile construction battalions.

John Fogarty knew of the enormity of the tasks yet to be accomplished for the good of mankind and he gave of himself untiringly in the fight to overcome those tasks. So it has been with the Seabees, in peace and in war. The size of the job has never daunted them. Their accomplishments in Vietnam stand as the greatest military construction effort in history. That is the kind of people they are. All of this points to the fact that our nation is a strong one because it has dedicated leadership in many fields. This leadership comes from labor, management, professional personnel, the government employees, military personnel, elected officials, and just ordinary citizens who have the objective of a greater America. Our nation is strong because these groups and their leaders can work as a team for the good of the nation itself. America's leadership in the world today is evidence of the job that has been done.

Yet the fact remains that for our country, there are many serious and unsolved problems. We are in a dirty, lonely, unhappy, unintentional kind of war with an insatiable greed for men, materials, and money. It is half-way around the world in a place where we had not prepared to fight, but where Americans, as is their wont, have fought heroically, worked tirelessly and performed magnificently. It is not a glamorous war and a lot of people want us to get out.

Chairman Mao says power grows out of the barrel of a gun. If this is the kind of world we live in, I want it to be American power out of American guns. America has and must continue to have a powerful defense team—effective, modern, invulnerable—for this is America's security today and tomorrow. Give us this, but guard it zealously and use it carefully as is America's wont. Then our diplomats will have time in which to work and their words will be heeded—and God grant that they can do as well as those in uniform who fight on the field of battle.

And, while this is being done, let us remind ourselves—and the world—that America has not lost its unity or its purpose. Sometimes our objectives are not spelled out with the same detail that confusion and uncertainty are presented to us and the world. Sometimes the voices of those who counsel retreat receive greater play than those who say, "Whatever the cost, we will not haul down the American Flag." Sometimes the efforts of those who seek to build a greater America fail to achieve the prominence of those who lead marches and demonstrations, of the draft-card burners, and the protesting beatniks; and sometimes the world is confused by what it sees here.

We here today know the soul of America is reflected by the glory of its past and the greatness of its present and its dreams for the future of mankind. And we who have no problems in understanding the meaning of America or the significance of its mission know that there may always be unpleasant and unhappy tasks like Vietnam, but we do not fear them. We know that our commitments must go on for as long as it takes to assure the nations of the world that America's dedication to the preservation of freedom is not a part-time obligation. We know that the symbol and the actuality of America are worth all of our efforts. We just want to get on with the job—and get it done.

There is a word for all of this—a word to insure the future of America as we know it. That word is called patriotism. May the God of our fathers help each of us to know patriotism in its richest meaning and to teach it to those around us every day that we live. This is what John Fogarty believed and lived.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION FULFILLING ROLE CONGRESS INTENDED

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, the Small Business Administration has made an impact on the economic growth of my city, El Paso, Tex. In this largest of our border cities, where the Rio Grande links the historic Mexican-American culture to the progressive flare of 20th century trade and industrialization, the Small Business Administration has made 16 loans to small business firms during the current fiscal year, in a total amount of $224,000. These loans have established an effective working relationship between the small business sector of our flourishing economy and the Federal Government.

This close affinity between business and government has enhanced the initiative, the prosperity, and the pride of the small businessmen of our great country. In the El Paso area, it has served in the past and continues to serve today as a healthy stimulant to business productivity. El Paso, the largest city on the United States side of our border, and its sister city, Ciudad Juarez, largest city on the Mexican side, have a combined population of some 700,000, and comprise a flourishing trade center between the United States and Mexico. With a combination of long-term loans and management assistance programs, the Small Business Administration has provided new opportunities for growth, new opportunities to alleviate poverty, and new opportunities to compete in today's space age society.

The Small Business Administration cites the Plaza Empire Shop in El Paso as indicative of the assistance given to struggling small businessmen. Established in 1964 as a partnership between David Ybanez and Angel Beltram, the Plaza Empire Shop was granted a guaranteed loan of $20,000 on September 9, 1965. As a result of this loan, the business, which specialized in gift items and electronic equipment, increased its capital accounts from $46,609 on December 31, 1964, to $97,600 on December 31, 1966. Approximately 80 percent of its sales are exported to Mexico—with 60 percent of them being shipped directly to Mexico City. Through SBA's invaluable assistance, the Plaza Empire Shop has thus become a large volume electronics equipment distributor.

Participation loans such as the one to the Plaza Empire Shop comprise but one type of the services available from the Small Business Administration. A new Small Business service, inaugurated just 3 years ago, is known as SCORE—Service Corps of Retired Executives. This service has put thousands of small enterprises on the road to success. Under this program, the Small Business Administration has enrolled more than 3,000 business and professional leaders in some 800 communities to provide guidance and management techniques to small business.

SCORE personnel encourage small businessmen to use their own initiative and imagination to capitalize on their basic advantage over big business—a more personalized customer relationship. These SCORE experts are volunteers who have long been involved in the small business world, and who know the importance of small business to the American free enterprise system. Their sound advice is proving helpful to several firms in my district today.

President Lyndon B. Johnson has shown a keen awareness and a continuing interest in the welfare of the small business community and its problems. In his proclamation of Small Business Week, May 1967, he renewed his strong support for the 4.8 million small businesses in the United States when he stated:

> We must insure that they will continue to hold a vital place in our society.

Mr. Speaker, the Small Business Administration, under the capable direction of its Administrator, Robert C. Moot, and through its financial assistance and management guidance programs, is fulfilling the role which the Congress intended—the preservation and the fruitful productivity of the small business firms of America.

SECRETARY OF STATE RUSK MAKES CONVINCING STATEMENT ON VIETNAM

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Gallagher] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I have very seldom heard so cogent and convincing a statement about U.S. policy in Vietnam as that of Secretary of State Rusk today. I should like to urge that all my colleagues carefully study it and reflect upon it.

I would particularly like those Members who have been most vocal on the question of Vietnam to consider this extraordinary description of our position by Secretary Rusk.

I have been concerned recently that some of the debate about Vietnam might be misunderstood in Hanoi. The aggressor may very well feel that this discussion within the American political context might somehow signify a lack of will on the part of the American people.

I trust that the other side, too, will reflect on what the Secretary said, and that Hanoi will realize that our national interest and our people's views are such that we will not shirk this difficult burden.

We do an injustice to our country and to our brave fighting men if we are to continue to reduce our noble purpose and our disagreement over means to any implication that we lack the will to persist. At times the debate in this country has suggested that we lack this will. I think it is time to elevate the dialog over our policy in Vietnam and to unite without regard to partisan politics.

My hope is that those who would deny what is best in our country and who make their alienation from current goals into personal vituperative criticism will consider the words of Secretary Rusk. I believe it is time for sober and serious discussion within the framework of traditional American values and not a time for voices of doubt sowing dissension and discord instead of responsible dissent.

HOMEOWNERSHIP—OUR NATIONAL GOAL

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Barrett] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there

objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, high among the unquestionable values of the American way of life is the ideal of homeownership. The security and satisfaction which a home of your own brings provides a special reward over and above simply "housing." Not only does the individual family benefit from homeownership, but it has tremendous value for the community as a whole since ownership of a home gives a family a special stake in the community and special involvement in the life of the city and the neighborhood.

In recognition of these facts, a principal aim of the work of the Subcommittee on Housing of which I have the honor to be chairman, is to make homeownership as widely available as possible. The roots of this policy go far back in American history to the Homesteaders Acts and related legislation. Our first major housing agency was the Federal Housing Administration established in 1934. That agency made a major forward step in the financing of homeownership by encouraging the development of long-term amortized home mortgage loans. Of course at that time they were talking about 20 percent down, 20-year loans. We have come a long way since then so that FHA financing generally provides for 3 percent down on homes selling for up to $15,000 and usually provides 30-year financing and in some cases even longer.

Millions of American families have been able to buy homes which they could not otherwise finance because of the improvements brought about by FHA and later VA. However, we have found that in spite of this step, that there are still many deserving American families who cannot afford homeownership entirely on their own.

Today our drive is to find sound ways to enable more people to become homeowners by providing the necessary margin of financial assistance. An important breakthrough in this was the provision in the 1966 Housing Act which authorized 3-percent loans through the Government to homebuyers of limited income. This cuts the financing cost in half and it must be remembered that over the life of a loan at regular market interest rates, interest usually amounts to more than the cost of the house itself. This high financial hurdle has barred many prospective buyers from the market and the substantial reduction in interest charges can make a basic change in the pattern of homeownership.

At present, this 3-percent financing is still partly experimental in nature. However, because of the solid advantages of homeownership, both for the individual family and for the community, I have no doubt that this program will grow rapidly and that the subcommittee will solve any technical problems which may arise.

These 3-percent loans are made available to prospective homebuyers of modest income through neighborhood nonprofit corporations which agree to undertake certain responsibilities for stabilizing and improving the area. I am pleased to see that the people of Philadelphia, led by civic-minded citizens, have been quick to take advantage of this program. In a city such as ours which has made a national name for itself by its alertness to seek out every means to rebuild and rehabilitate, this is not surprising. I am confident that in years ahead many, many families who could not otherwise afford it will become homeowners because of this new program.

While homeownership occupies much of the time and work of the subcommittee, we are not slighting the need for more and better rental housing within the reach of modest income families. This is particularly important for young people and for the elderly who may not want large homes of their own. It is important as well for people who by their free choice prefer the mobility of renting. In addition, families of lowest incomes may need the aid of public housing and rent supplements while they get on their feet and raise their incomes to the point where they can afford homes of their own in the private market with only limited assistance and eventually entirely on their own.

Taken together these aids will help us to achieve a balanced housing supply to meet every need and every desire with growing emphasis on the goal of homeownership.

GEN. CASIMIR PULASKI

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, as we again honor the memory of Gen. Casimir Pulaski, we in these United States should rededicate ourselves to the struggle against every form of tyranny wherever it may rear its ugly head.

This courageous soldier and freedom fighter devoted his short life to the battle against political tyranny. At a young age he joined his countrymen in an effort to drive the Russians from Polish soil and to liberate Poland from foreign domination. They fought valiantly for several years only to lose, and Pulaski was forced to flee to Turkey.

In 1775, Pulaski was in Paris and there he learned of the colonists' fight for their independence. He seized the opportunity to again join in a struggle for liberation and volunteered his services without charge to help the colonists. He fought with distinction on their side until he was wounded in battle at Savannah on October 9, 1779.

Few men have fought more fiercely for freedom and did more to advance the cause of liberty and justice than General Pulaski. He, along with his fellow countryman, Kosciuszko, were among the best and ablest of the generals who served the young republic. We are indebted to them and to countless others who followed their illustrious example in successive struggles for freedom.

The first known Poles arrived on America's shores in 1608. Today there are millions of Americans of Polish descent. Loyal citizens, courageous and fearless fighters, they have served in every war in which our country has been involved. Hard-working, industrious, and gifted, they have made manifold and continuing contributions in the defense and progress of our great Nation in industry, in professions, and in the arts.

Since 1939, Poland has suffered deeply under both Nazi and Communist tyranny. Despite ruthless oppression, the Poles have not lost faith in the freedom to which Casimir Pulaski dedicated his life. We hope and pray that they will again enjoy the blessings of freedom and liberty in their homeland.

General Pulaski was a great Polish-American patriot who should be remembered not only on October 11 but forever in the hearts of all of us.

COLUMBUS DAY—A LEGAL NATIONAL HOLIDAY

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have sponsored a bill which would make October 12, Columbus Day, a legal national holiday.

Today marks the 475th anniversary of that day in 1492 when Christopher Columbus discovered the New World.

Our country has done little in recognition of this great explorer. I believe there was an exposition in 1892, a commemorative coin, a few statues or monuments, and little more.

Every civilization has honored its great men and marked its significant achievements by designating holidays in their memory. Here in America, the Federal Government recognizes several holidays of national importance including Washington's Birthday, Memorial Day, and Independence Day. But we have forgotten Columbus, the man whose genius and bravery made possible all which followed his discovery.

This is very unfortunate. In these days of great promise and great peril, we have many heroes, living and dead, whom we rightly honor. But the grandfather of them all is Columbus.

Columbus had a vision—a vision then considered ridiculous—that the world was round. He was laughed at by many people, but he persisted until he achieved his goal of finding the men and raising the money for his historic voyage. We here today owe our very existence to the trail Columbus blazed across the pages of history more than 450 years ago.

I am well aware of the controversy raging in the academic world over the identity of the real discoverer of America. Whether or not these claims are true, those who support these various theories miss an essential point. If any men did land here before Columbus, they left nothing on which to build. Their solitary acts of courage faded quickly away into the mists of time.

The reason that Columbus should be honored as one of the towering figures in our history is that he was the first of a long line of leaders who came to the New World to build a new civilization. We have all benefited from the legacy Columbus left us.

Columbus laid a foundation for what has become a great and free Nation. We owe a lasting debt of gratitude to him for seeing what others before him failed to see.

In the final analysis, the true mark of a great man lies in the acceptance of his vision by the generations which follow him. A great man is a builder; and the greatest are those who lay solid foundations upon which others can build.

The time to give recognition to this great explorer and adventurer is long overdue, and Congress should not delay in declaring October 12 a national holiday.

COLUMBUS DAY

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWARD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, today we honor the man who has been known through the centuries since his discovery of America as the Great Navigator. His achievement in sailing into the trackless Atlantic is perhaps charged with greater significance for us than it was for prior generations of Americans, for we face the vastness of outer space just as Columbus faced the vastness of an unchartered ocean. Indeed, our heroic voyagers of the empty reaches of space between the planets may need the courage and determination in conducting their explorations that Columbus demonstrated in his.

Another aspect of the Columbian voyages that has meaning for us today is that the varied ethnic pattern of the United States was foreshadowed in the polyglot nature of the discovery of America. Columbus was an Italian who used Portuguese charts to navigate the Spanish ships that he commanded.

Despite all obstacles, despite primitive navigational aids, Columbus found land and successfully returned to Spain. He achieved the most spectacular and most important geographical discovery in the history of the world. Perhaps reaching and exploring the other planets will mean that some day Columbus' triumph will be surpassed, but those who are to outdo him will have to possess his stubborn persistence despite discouragement, his indomitable skill, his faith in the Almighty, and his magnificent courage.

Those qualities have been shown in the United States by the countrymen of Columbus, the Americans of Italian descent. It is fitting on Columbus Day to pay tribute to their accomplishments in our free society.

In their early days in this country, Italian Americans performed the hardest kind of labor in industry and in the construction trades. Through their powers of will and unflinching determination, through their loyalty to each other and to their families, through their intelligence and unflagging aspiration, they have come to take their rightful place in the business and professional communities of the Nation. In the military service, too, their contributions have been remarkable. More than 845,000 men of Italian descent served in the Armed Forces of the United States during World War II, and thousands upon thousands have served in the Korean conflict and are serving today in Vietnam.

The great hero of Italian Americans, Columbus, was first and foremost a sailor. He was born and reared in Italy's Genoa, one of Europe's oldest seaports, and as a boy he made voyages in the Mediterranean where were bred in ancient times the world's greatest mariners.

In Lisbon, Portugal, the center of European oceanic enterprise, Columbus worked as a chartmaker by the time he was 24. Shortly afterward, he sailed on long voyages under the Portuguese flag. Then it was that he conceived the great adventure that only a sailor could have planned and executed, to reach eastern Asia, "the Indies," by sailing west.

Nothing could deter Columbus from the performance of his mission. Nothing can deter his Italian-American countrymen from the attainment of excellence in every walk of life in the United States. Columbus discovered America, and Italian Americans will ever be hard-working participants in its growth and vigilant defenders of its security.

A REALISTIC VIEW OF THE SOVIET ECONOMY: IMPLICATIONS FOR U.S. TRADE AND BUDGET POLICIES

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, in recent days there has been considerable public debate on our trade and credit controls and on the effect on our national security of the export of American products and technology to the Soviet Union.

The question of budget priorities for our national research and development resources and their allocation among competing demands for space, defense, air and water pollution, transportation, and urban renewal programs has also been foremost in my mind and in the minds of many of my colleagues.

Because our trade relations with the Soviet Union and the allocation of our research and development resources are such salient issues at this time, I am calling to the attention of my colleagues an interview with Richard S. Morse, former Director of Army Research and Development in both the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations. Dr. Morse has been a director of a number of technical enterprices, a president of one, and chairman of another. A physicist with a command of high vacuum technology, he is chairman of the Department of Commerce Technical Advisory Board's Panel on Electrically Powered Vehicles, cosponsored by nine Federal agencies, and he is senior lecturer at the Sloan School of Management, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

The interview, which appeared in the August 14 issue of U.S. News & World Report, magazine of the distinguished spokesman of conservative opinion, David Lawrence, follows:

A BUSINESSMAN SIZES UP RUSSIA: INTERVIEW WITH A MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY

(NOTE.—What are the facts about Soviet industry—its strengths and weaknesses? Can this country learn from the Communists? More important—is the U.S. freezing itself out of a big market?)

(In this interview, Richard S. Morse, a prominent management expert who has just toured Russia, comes up with authoritative answers.)

Q. Dr. Morse, is Russia starting to free its system a little—in effect, heading toward capitalism to get the country moving?

A. There's no evidence of it, despite wishful thinking by some Americans. The Soviets did recently decide to adopt a so-called profit system. I think this was misunderstood because, in fact, their profit system is merely used as a gauge for production efficiency, not to permit individuals to profit or to use capital for profit.

Q. We get conflicting reports about Russia. Some insist its technically oriented industry is stagnant, with no real drive. Other reports say the Soviets are catching up with us. What did you find?

A. I was impressed, in terms of their relative progress. I think Americans have a tendency to believe that science and technology is a unique kind of animal over which we seem to have a monopoly.

The average American certainly did not believe that the Chinese could develop an atomic bomb. One cannot help but be impressed by the fact that the Japanese, whom we used to call "imitators," are now becoming innovators and are using science and technology to develop products—as evidenced by their auto and motorcycle industry, camera, radio and TV business, shipbuilding—and use modern management techniques in combination with science and technology.

This was an area where we always assumed we were preeminent. Other countries have good people, they have access to science and technology, and they are using it for their own good.

Q. Are you saying it is a very dangerous thing to underestimate the Russians?

A. It certainly is dangerous—this applies to Russia or any other country these days. We would be remiss if we did not assume that the Russians can eventually do anything that the United States can do, technically.

Q. Are the Russians at this moment competitive with the U.S. in technology?

A. Certainly not in general, and this varies with the field of endeavor.

In computers, for example, we are several years ahead both in the design and manufacture of computers and certainly to the extent to which we have introduced them into our management system. But the Russians are working extremely hard in this area. We found 400 people engaged in mathematical research relating to computer programing in one city in Siberia.

From an educational point of view I suspect they're doing a good planning job and potentially will have more trained technical people available than we in many fields. On the other hand, we now require fewer engineers in many fields because of our use of advanced design methods and the use of computers and advanced instrumentation.

Q. Where is the Soviet emphasis now?

A. Housing is probably still their biggest problem, and living conditions are still very poor by our standards. The chemical industry represents a very important aspect of their current program. This is in plastics, fibers, agricultural chemicals. They also have a very large power expansion program, particularly in Siberia.

In the consumer field I found essentially no shortage of consumer goods anywhere, at least as evidenced in the stores. The quality leaves much to be desired, but there is now considerable emphasis on styling and sales promotion. Even in Eastern Siberia, we found television sets both plentiful and in use in the smallest villages.

Automobiles, of course, are very few in number. But they have now just completed negotiations for the erection of a plant in collaboration with Fiat of Italy. This will have a production capacity of 400,000 cars per year.

One of the top Russian Government officials stated—for what it may be worth that he would have preferred a deal with a U.S. auto manufacturer, but this was currently impossible because of our relations, and I am sure also because of our reluctance to give credit on terms comparable to those now being offered by European countries.

Q. Have U.S. restrictions on exports to Russia effectively slowed down the Russians' progress?

A. In certain limited areas, our past policy of export control may have slowed them down. I feel very strongly, looking back upon this policy, that we've been wrong. I think the United States, perhaps unknowingly, has now isolated itself from the rest of the world to a far greater extent than we have isolated Russia from us.

You can't stop the flow of technology. You may slow it, but you cannot stop it. In the long run, to some extent as a result of our prohibiting the export of certain technology, we have forced the Russians to develop their own technology. So they are now becoming independent.

At the same time, all the rest of the world is beating a path to Russia. I ran into many Japanese and European industrialists. These countries are developing trade relations with Russia; they are giving longer-term credits than we are willing to give. I think the United States has isolated itself far more than it realizes. I'm not speaking of military, classified information, though I think even there we're also probably kidding ourselves as to our ability to control the flow of technology, products and processes in this area.

Q. Are these other countries moving into a vacuum we created?

A. There is no question about it. The Italians are already building the automobile plant. Imperial Chemical Industries of England is developing a very large chemical complex, giving the Russians good modern technology. The Swedes and Finns have built a 1-million-ton-per-year pulp plant in Eastern Siberia—which we visited—with control instruments made by two American firms, Foxboro and Leeds & Northrop.

Q. What should we be doing?

A. The present stated policy of the United States is to encourage trade with the Russians. But I'm afraid that our current image, and reputation resulting from past actions, will make this more difficult. American industry and the public are not really sure of our true policy, so we are not making real progress.

In the future, if we are going to develop a working trade relationship with the U.S.S.R., we're going to have to play this street both ways, and from a practical economic viewpoint one might well ask: "What has the U.S.S.R. to sell to us?"

One example: The Russians are extremely annoyed—and I'm not sure I blame them—for the decision of the Department of the Interior to exclude their bid on large hydroelectric generators for the Grand Coulee Dam. This is one area in which they believe they have world pre-eminence and great experience. Their question is that if the U.S. really means to develop trade relations, why were they specifically excluded from selling to us?

Q. Exactly where did you visit on this trip?

A. My trip was originally initiated on the basis of an invitation from Dr. [Garmen M.] Gavishiani, who is the son-in-law of [Premier] Kosygin and Deputy Minister for Science and Technology in the U.S.S.R.

We were in Moscow twice, and went far east of the Ural Mountains to Irkutsk. We met there with industrial and academic groups and then flew north to Bratsk, near Lake Baikal, which is a newly created city with the largest hydroelectric plant in the world—4,000 megawatts of power, although it appeared to be operating at about half capacity.

We returned west via Novosibirsk, stopping at Omsk. We visited their so-called Science City, a totally new city of 38,000 people, created on the outskirts of Novosibirsk. I keep saying "we" because the group included Prof. William Pounds, dean of the Sloan School of Management at MIT, and my son Kenneth, a student at MIT.

Q. Were your activities restricted?

A. In Moscow, Leningrad and Irkutsk we were completely free to travel within the city—shop, go to the theaters, etc. Elsewhere, we had a definite feeling of complete restriction and our conversations with all industrialists and scientists were planned and limited by our "constant companion." He was an extremely competent, educated individual, a member of the party and undoubtedly directly connected with the Russian counter-intelligence organization.

Many of our impressions and information have obviously been influenced by our close and detailed discussions with this gentleman, who was intimately familiar with both the Russian and American systems and particularly their respective organizations for science and technology.

Q. Would you say you found a healthy economy throughout Russia?

A. A strange economy would be a better description. It cannot be compared to the United States because of various factors.

No one in Russia may own property; therefore, the concept of capital cost or return on investment is unknown as we would use it industrially. Rents for executives in the Government run from $6 to $16 a month. On the other hand, one can very easily spend $6 for a single meal in the evening—namely, one month's rent.

Jet fuel is sold within Russia at $3.50 a ton and aviation gasoline at $4.50 a ton. On the other hand, a white shirt costs $12. How can one equate this kind of economy to American standards? It's impossible.

Q. Does Russia's highly centralized control strike you as a big advantage, when it comes to production?

A. When you have a country as large as Russia, there is great danger in too much centralization of authority. But in the early stages of industrialization this was undoubtedly necessary. The Russians compare their progress with India's and very properly explain that they have taken action starting with a comparable situation—and they see no reason to help a country that has shown so little ability to solve its own problems. Admittedly, if you have the right man in each job such an organizational concept can be effective, but sooner or later more delegation will certainly be required.

Q. Did you find the Government still running everything?

A. This tends to be done in Russia far more than in any other country. Let me give you an example: They have established by edict a rule that only one computer "language" will be used throughout the entire U.S.S.R. Now, I will admit that this will save duplication of effort. But, conversely, suppose they pick the wrong "language"—and this is a rapidly changing kind of technology. They will have considerable difficulty in reconverting.

When you're in a changing environment such as we have today in the field of science and technology, it can be very dangerous to make didactic decisions of this type. I would far rather see the American system, where we tend to infuse competent people in each of our federal departments, each of whom is concerned with research and technology and will couple this with a particular requirement, whether it be urban renewal or pollution, safety or defense.

Q. Doesn't central direction give them a big advantage in fields such as urban development?

A. Perhaps it should, but, if you look at their construction program or their approach to city planning, it is very evident that either because of lack of direction, or lack of resources, they have failed to take advantage of many aspects of a centralized authority.

The city of Bratsk has 150,000 people. It has been literally built from nothing—unlimited land and power available. They've made no provision, in a real sense, for the automobile, which certainly will be present on the Russian scene in increasing quantities. The architecture leaves a great deal to be desired. The construction methods are not innovative, nor well engineered. Yet, I doubt that it would have cost a great deal more to have really used some new ideas, which in their society one can do by edict. In our society we must use the profit system to force innovating in housing, for example, and it's much more difficult.

Q. Are they running into air and water-pollution problems in the big cities?

A. In the sense that Russia is not as highly industrialized as the United States, they have not yet had to face some of the air-pollution problems with which we are so familiar. In the erection, for example, of the paper plant in Bratsk, there was no attempt made even to approach the water-pollution problem.

In the major industrial centers, such as Novosibirsk, the air-pollution problem is obviously there now, and in spite of the fact that they have, again, a highly centralized procedure where decisions could have been made, they did not face up to this problem.

The auto designs to be employed by Fiat in their proposed large auto-production facility will apparently not include antipollution devices, and yet this would be a great time to make such a decision. We failed to make early decisions on such a program and so now we have 90 million used cars without controls in use in America—a tough problem today.

On the other hand, in the city of Moscow, they have arbitrarily decreed recently that no intercity diesel buses will be allowed to operate because these impair the health and welfare of the people. This was done by edict.

TOP STATUS FOR SCIENTISTS

Q. With all the Soviet emphasis on pushing ahead with science and technology, did you still find a lingering admiration for American methods?

A. We were surprised to find that the Russians were generally less interested in our activities than we were in what they were doing.

The Russians are very confident of what they are doing in science and technology. They have elevated the role of science and technology, both within the Government and within the eyes of the people, to the highest possible level. The Minister of Science and Technology in the U.S.S.R. is one of the four top people, a Vice Premier.

They've established the Russian Academy

of Sciences, which is almost independent of Government control. There is no position in Russia which rates as high as being an academician. This is recognized from the point of view of his position in the community, his stature within the eyes of the public, plus the fact that he gets cold cash and living quarters which are second to no one in Russia.

All basic research is under the direction of the Russia Academy of Science. In their Science City in Siberia they are now also planning to combine basic research and development and engineering activities under the same central authority.

Such an approach is contrary to American practice, where we believe that development programs should be decentralized and coupled closely to market requirements. As a matter of fact, it is in this very area, namely the development of research-management methods, where we have such a decided and proved superiority over other countries.

So I would say that they've used science and technology as a very important ingredient of the whole economy. They are using it as a tool for progress. They are making a great effort to enhance their educational facilities in science and technology and to attract young people into this field.

People in Russia view science and technology as a goal for a better life, place it at a higher level than we do in this country.

One area where I did find keen Russian interest in the U.S. was in industrial management. They were very much interested. They are just now beginning to address themselves to the problem of teaching management and the use of computers and new management tools. I think the Russians are beginning to feel this is the next area to which they should direct their attention.

Q. Have they been lagging badly in that?

A. They have been lagging badly, but, on the other hand, they are willing to recognize this fact, and my guess is that they are going to do something about it.

For example, they have no graduate business schools. On the other hand, there are very few in Europe. This type of educational activity, which we've known in the United States for some time, is only beginning to become apparent in other areas of the world.

The Russians are now wondering how they can use computer technology as a management tool. Such a technique may be even more important in their highly centralized decision-making structure.

With the tremendous emphasis upon education, the ability to attract top-flight students to go to their technical institutes, universities and language institutes, my guess is that they are doing a pretty good planning job in anticipating future needs for an industrialized country.

WHY AUTO OUTPUT LAGS

Q. Over all, how does Russia stack up against Western Europe in moving ahead?

A. Look at it this way: Recently, the biggest single problem in Russia has been housing. In evaluating their lack of success, let's say, in the chemical industry and in automobile production, we've got to realize that they had to attack this housing problem first. In Russia today all land and property is owned by the state, and individuals are limited to 100 square feet of living space per person!

I'm not impressed with the design, architecture or quality of construction. But they are, in fact, building a tremendous number of apartments, so at least the people have somewhere to live. And they have done this at the same time that they have been trying to develop a highly industrialized and scientific society. I think once they are over the housing problem, if they address themselves to other areas such as agriculture, plastics, chemicals, or automobile production with the same vigor, they are going to make a lot of progress.

Q. Did you find that the Russians are addressing themselves as vigorously to their problems of management as the Western Europeans are?

A. Actually, I found more concern with the problem of technical management in Russia that I normally would find in Western Europe. Until fairly recently, I don't believe that the Europeans have viewed the management of a technical society as an important factor in either education or industry—certainly not the way we do here in the United States.

Q. You hear the Europeans complaining bitterly that a "brain drain" and a "technological gap" have been brought about because the U.S. is so big and has so many resources. Are these legitimate complaints?

A. Most of the comments about our part in the technological gap and the brain drain have come from politicians, not from progressive industrial managers or directors of research.

Q. There has been some talk about the U.S. providing a "technological Marshall Plan." Is this necessary?

A. I find very little support anywhere in this country, either in Government or industry, for any so-called technological Marshall Plan. We should realize that research and development per se do not necessarily contribute to economic growth. Research and development must be effectively used to develop products and put them into the marketplace. That is another problem.

The people who have been talking about the "technological gap" in Europe, in many instances, see large expenditures of Government research and development funds in America and assume that these necessarily can be correlated with productivity or the development of products. This is not so, except in limited areas where the scale of research or the market is a dominant factor.

The Japanese prove this point. They have invaded the United States with optical equipment as a result of their own technology. They have entered the shipbuilding business and are now by far the No. 1 producer of ships in the world in terms of tonnage. This was not a question of science, but a combination of good management techniques and the use of modern technology.

As I said before, science hasn't any particular boundary. The problem is to take science and technology and couple those things with a market demand in combination with good management—and produce products. And I think if there is one area where this country perhaps is pre-eminent, it's in our ability to mate science and technology with market requirements at a faster rate than can be done in some other countries, particularly in Western Europe.

Certain aspects of our economy are totally unknown in Europe. I refer, for example, to the concept of American entrepreneurship—the idea of generating new technical enterprises, as we have done to a very large extent in the greater Boston area and in Palo Alto. This idea of "risk taking," either at the management level or the entrepreneur level, is just not known in Western Europe.

In another area—namely, that of education—the Europeans and the Russians are way behind the United States in developing schools of industrial management. The relationships between industry and the universities as we know them in the United States are not known in Europe. The United States is the only country in the world—with the possible exception of Russia, incidentally—which has developed a technique for using the combined academic, industrial and government talents on a compatible basis to look at major national problems. This just isn't done in Europe.

So there are a number of misconceptions with regard to the technological gap. In essence, if there is a gap, it is a management gap.

SPACE PROGRAM: A WASTE

Q. Dr. Morse, how much does industry actually gain from all these big research-and-development programs we have in this country—billions in space and defense and other fields?

A. It is my view that our large Government-funded programs in space and defense may actually be detrimental to our ability to compete in world trade with new technical products on a total over-all effectiveness basis. Two thirds of our technical professional manpower is now tied up in federally sponsored R&D programs and as a result our capability to design, develop and market competitive commercial products probably has been reduced rather than enhanced in terms of our national effort. Some firms in the aircraft industry are selling commercial aircraft, and some aerospace companies have developed new markets via corporate acquisitions. But, almost without exception, no predominantly space or defense-oriented companies have successfully developed and marketed new commercial or consumer products on a substantial scale.

The management-marketing capabilities for successful Government-contract work are not suitable for use in the highly competitive civilian economy.

Q. Are you saying these large Government programs are hindering our competitive situation abroad?

A. I think it would be difficult to prove they are actually hindering it. But we shouldn't have any misconceptions about defense and space programs as a stimulus to civilian production. Actually, I'm more concerned about the people than I am about the dollars. When you take a very large number of people out of the civilian sector, these are people who are not working on products which might be of direct interest to world trade or in improving living standards at home. In fact, we now have a pretty husky scientific WPA in some areas.

Q. We hear so much about "spin-off" from all these Government R&D programs—is it of substantial value?

A. The spin-off that we get from large Government programs—either defense or space—is greatly exaggerated when you try to express it in terms of specific products. From Government activities, we have learned to manage large systems—true. We have expedited the use of certain new forms of technology—true. We have certainly expedited the commercial introduction of transistors and microcircuits, for example.

But the actual number of specific products which can be directly related to spin-off from the space program is extremely small in terms of the total numbers of people and dollars expended in that activity. I would far rather see this effort—and I refer particularly to the manpower effort—directed to more important problems right here on the earth's surface, such as in areas of air pollution, water pollution, urban renewal and transportation.

Unfortunately, many segments of our society have to have some kind of goal, or be mission-oriented—as the Apollo moon-landing program, for example—to either stimulate people's imagination or stimulate Congress to provide funds to get on with the job. I believe this is a gross misuse of the total technical and management resources of the country and we should do a better-integrated planning job.

RUSSIA'S MOON-RACE GAINS

Q. Are the Russians in the same boat? They're in the moon race, too—

A. I think from the Russians' point of view, an Apollo-type program probably had greater significance, because it was essential to their national pride and it established them clearly in the eyes of the world as a leading technological nation. We didn't need to do this in order to be established as a progressive industrial society.

If we had had the guts to bow out of the moon race at the very start, and concentrate on useful space applications, such as reconnaissance, communications, navigation and weather, we would not now have our difficult NASA problems.

I think a large segment of the world's population would have applauded our willingness to use a little more mature judgment and say, "We're going to do things which are good for the world, not good for pride and prestige."

Q. The Germans and Japanese, to take two countries, aren't involved in these Gargantuan government programs. Are they at a disadvantage, being left behind in developing new technology?

A. Obviously, the Japanese are not. The Japanese have been particularly clever in picking up "spin-off," if you will, from our space program and applying it to developing commercial products which have improved their export trade.

You're going to find a certain amount of this done in Europe. Maybe we're big enough to do both useful things and "science for science's sake," but it doesn't seem to me an effective use of our manpower. We can't do everything. We've got to have a better allocation of technological resources for the good of the country—or the world, if you will.

Q. What is going to force a reallocation of our resources—public reaction, or the Government itself?

A. This is a very difficult problem in a democracy, because unfortunately we do not have a good forum for national debate on issues of this type. I have, for example, personally polled a group of people who represented the senior technical executives of perhaps 80 per cent of the commercial sector of our economy and almost without exception found no backing for the current Apollo program—much less a post-Apollo space program in the United States. But our more objective and knowledgeable people are not usually the most vocal.

Our aerospace industry is obviously committed to its existence. Congress has not been willing to face this issue clearly. So we have a built-in, self-perpetuating phenomenon here which is difficult to slow down.

We also have a very substantial investment in Government laboratories with Government employees which should be redirected, from an effort point of view, but this also is difficult. In general, the people who review such programs as our post-Apollo activities are the very people who are associated with space programs, rather than those who should be concerned with the total and more effective allocation of both financial and technical resources in the country as a whole, particularly in time of war—i.e. today.

AFL-CIO CONVENTION CALL FOR PROGRESS

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RHODES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Seventh Constitutional Convention of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations convenes December 7. The federation's convention call, I believe, clearly demonstrates the determination of organized labor to serve not just the interests of union members, but those of the entire Nation. Under unanimous consent I place this document at this point in the RECORD and recommend it for the consideration of all of our colleagues:

This convention, which meets at a time of trial for all America, must both weigh the record of the past two years and plan for the years ahead. In considering the record, the convention could find much satisfaction in the last two years, if our sole criterion was progress for the labor movement.

Since the last convention, paid per capita membership has risen from just under 13 million to nearly 14.3 million. Despite mounting employer resistance, our unions have won broad new gains in wages and social benefits, and organizing breakthroughs have been scored among agricultural workers, teachers, government employees and others.

The second session of the 89th Congress, ending January 2, 1967, enacted a number of measures which were high on the agenda of our last convention. The Congress did enact the strongest Fair Labor Standards bill since the original wage-hour law was passed in 1938, not only raising the minimum wage in two steps to $1.60 an hour but extending the law's protection to some eight million additional workers, including, for the first time, nearly 400,000 in agriculture. The Congress also added the Cold War GI Bill, long pressed by the AFL-CIO, to the educational gains of the previous year, and added a rent supplements program to the housing bill.

Yet the direct gains won by our unions and the 1966 legislative victories are far outweighed by the problems that now beset America. We share in those problems, and it is our mission to lead the fight to overcome them. In this broader role, the impressive gains we ourselves have made are not enough; and we cannot be satisfied with past legislative achievements.

We have urged upon the present Congress a program of action that has not been followed; the result has been a virtual stalemate for progressive legislation, and the neglect of urgent social needs. We have repeatedly told the Congress that:

The sweeping social advances undertaken since 1961 must be fully implemented, with adequate funds, and perfected by additional legislation where necessary.

New programs must be undertaken at once to create rewarding jobs for the urban unemployed.

Housing construction, especially in the cities, must be more than doubled; the new Model Cities and rent supplement programs of 1966 must be fully funded, and the long-standing public housing program must be pressed forward much faster.

Vital to the solution of the housing crisis—and to the realistic achievement of most civil rights goals—is open housing. The right of every American to buy or rent any home he can afford, anywhere he chooses, must be assured by federal law.

Consumers must be protected against usury, misrepresentation and fraud, evils which strike hardest at the poor.

And looking farther ahead, an energetic effort must be undertaken by the labor movement, allied with other farsighted Americans, to elect to federal office in 1968 those candidates who are dedicated to progress. This is not a matter of party affiliation. We say, as organized labor has said since the time of Samuel Gompers, that we will support our friends and oppose our enemies; and our friends are those who stand with us in demanding the improvement of society in America for the full and equal benefit of all.

Two years ago, at the crest of an unprecedented wave of social progress, we could truly say that "at no time in the AFL-CIO's first decade has the present been so praiseworthy and the future so promising."

Those words stand in stark contrast against the background of today's realities.

True, American society is still affluent—for the great majority.

True, the great constructive programs enacted since 1961 are still in being, and are still moving toward the betterment of American society—but they have never been funded adequately.

The bright promise of 1965 has faded; the unfinished business we cited then is, with few exceptions, unfinished still; and many of the problems we underscored at our last convention have grown worse.

Long-neglected urban needs have exploded into a national crisis of shocking proportions.

The historic civil rights legislation of recent years has not been followed up by other essential enactments, such as open housing, and the laws already on the books have not been adequately implemented.

Poverty and unemployment, especially among Negroes and other minority groups, and especially in urban ghettos, remain a moral outrage and an enormous human and economic waste.

Progress toward the ideal of unlimited educational opportunity for American youth—an ideal brought so close to achievement by the 89th Congress—is threatened with a reversal.

Although improvements in the Social Security system are pending in the Congress at this writing, the best bill that can be passed will be only a down payment toward the system as it should be. There is no real movement in the Congress toward legislation to stem the soaring costs of medical care, which could undermine the hard-won medicare program for the aged nor toward medicare's extension.

Agricultural workers are still denied the protection of the National Labor Relations Act, and their efforts to organize are resisted with primitive ruthlessness by powerful farm corporations.

Anti-labor employers are flouting with growing boldness the meager safeguards afforded to other workers who seek to form unions.

The situs picketing bill, urged by four successive Presidents of the United States, still lies dormant at this writing.

This is indeed a catalogue of hopes aroused, only to be dashed by legislative lethargy or worse.

The responsibility is easy to fix. It rests upon the 90th Congress; a Congress which has ignored, evaded or openly rejected its clear obligation to build upon the record of its illustrious predecessor.

Two years ago we warned that continued legislative progress depended upon the preservation and strengthening of the liberal majority in Congress. The 1966 elections weakened, rather than strengthened, the liberal forces, and had a stronger impact upon spirit than upon numbers.

Some have argued that the 1966 elections reflected a public will to slow the pace of social advance. We reject that view. There were no national candidates and no clear national issues in 1966. The very inconsistency of the results is evidence that local rivalries, local issues and local personalities were the dominant influences.

Too many Americans believe there is still a liberal majority in the 90th Congress. This is just not true. The actual majority in the House of Representatives is the conservative coalition composed of members of both parties.

Beyond the domestic issues there remains the grave problem of the defense of freedom in South Viet Nam. It is testing as never before the calmness, the patience and the good sense of the nation.

There are some who cry for a wider, "get it over with" war, regardless of risk. There are others who call for total disengagement, regardless of the impact on freedom's cause.

And from both camps—and many of those that lie between—rises the charge that there must be a choice between war and social progress; that America cannot afford both at once.

Both camps are wrong on all counts. In South Viet Nam—as earlier in Korea—the United States is not in search of conquest or even victory in the classic sense. This country is fighting for the principle of self-determination; the principle that any body of people has the right to decide its own course without outside interference. It was on this principle that the American Revolution was waged; the principle is as valid in the rice-paddies and jungles of Viet Nam as it was at Bunker Hill and Yorktown. The defense of that principle has become an American obligation, unsought and reluctantly shouldered, but unavoidable so long as we cherish human freedom.

With that burden there is the obligation to perfect American society, not only for the benefit of Americans but as an example to the world of freedom's rewards. To sacrifice one for the sake of the other would be to lose both; and no such sacrifice is needed. This vast, rich and growing country has no need to make an impossible choice.

The fight for freedom in South Viet Nam must be carried on, with patient restraint and with continuing efforts to reach an honorable peace. The fight for universal freedom at home must be waged with mounting intensity and without quarter.

It is to that cause and in that spirit that we call this Seventh Constitutional Convention of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations.

THE MERITORIOUS PERFORMANCE AWARD, VA REGIONAL OFFICE, DETROIT, MICH.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Diggs] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely proud to announce to the House that the Veterans' Administration Regional Office, of Detroit, Mich., was this September 21, 1967, the recipient of national VA awards for exceptionally high quality of management operations during the fiscal year of 1967. The awards for meritorious performance in the divisions of loan guarantee, administration, contracts, and finance cite an overall record of performance which gives the Detroit regional office claim to the best managed within the Veterans' Administration field system.

I know that as Members of the U.S. Congress, you are gratified by this obvious diligence in pursuit of the goals, urged upon the Federal service by President Johnson, of "cost consciousness and excellence in performance."

Regional Director, R. M. Fitzgerald, and all of the individual employees who achieved this record have extended a benefit of paramount importance in this time to all citizens.

I take the opportunity to express also, Mr. Speaker, my personal recognition of, and gratitude for, the willingness, readiness, and competence with which the Detroit VA has consistently responded to the many contacts we must make with them in our congressional responsibility on the hundreds of inquiries and problems of veterans which come to us during the course of a session.

I exalt with the Detroit regional office in this proud occasion; extend again personal congratulations; and eagerly look forward to this kind of citation making the full circle of VA regional offices of this Nation.

FROM THE POTOMAC'S MUDDY BANKS

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Schweiker] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of our colleagues a column by Mr. McLellan Smith, in the Delaware State News, Dover, and the York Dispatch, York, Pa., in which he praises H.R. 13207 and H.R. 13208, which I recently introduced. Mr. Smith has done an excellent job of pointing out the need for such legislation. The column follows:

From Potomac's Muddy Banks

(By McLellan Smith)

WORTHWHILE COMMISSION

President Johnson appoints White House commissions to study and consider just about every problem confronting the Nation. He has even appointed one to study crime and "make recommendations." Thus far it has been relatively inert, especially with respect to "crime in the streets."

Comes now proposed legislation that would give up to $25,000 compensation to victims of crimes of violence.

The measure, authored by Rep. Richard S. Schweiker (R., Pa.) and a possible candidate for the Pennsylvania Senate against incumbent Democrat Joseph H. Clark, self-styled liberal, would create a permanent Violent Crimes Compensation Commission for crimes committed in the District of Columbia and "all" Federal installations. The Pennsylvania solon desires that the Federal program become a model to encourage States to set up their own compensation plans for crime victims.

The measure would compensate both the principal victim of a crime and a "Good Samaritan" who is injured while trying to prevent a crime or apprehend the offender.

A companion bill by the same author would shield all "Good Samaritans" in the District of Columbia from law suits which might arise from their helping at the scene of a crime. Nurses and physicians have had this immunity in Washington since 1965. The pending measure would extend this immunity to every citizen as 13 States now do.

About two Americans in every 100 will be victims of violent crime during 1967. (It is now about 15 in 100 in the Nation's capital). The innocent victim of a violent crime is often the "forgotten man" of our society.

Our present system of criminal justice (aided and abetted by the Supreme Court) takes great care to apprehend suspects and punish and rehabilitate those found guilty. But, while society is housing, feeding and trying to rehabilitate its criminals, it leaves crime victims to fend for themselves.

Nary a soul aids the crime victims for expensive medical care. No one replaces earnings they lose. A family that loses its breadwinner in a fatal crime episode has no claim against our slack criminal justice system for the loss.

The compensation commission envisioned in the pending Schweiker bill would compensate crime victims for both out-of-pocket costs and loss of earnings. In the event of the victim's death, dependents would be compensated for their financial loss.

We think the bill is a good one, but fear it would not become law because it would reflect upon the feeble efforts of the White House and the present Attorney General, Ramsey Clark, to "do something" about the growing crime rate in our cities.

PURNELL WRITES OF HAPLESS PLIGHT OF MARINES, VICTIMS OF DUBIOUS POLICY

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Schweiker] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Karl Purnell, a former representative in the Pennsylvania General Assembly and former newspaper publisher, has been in Vietnam as a special correspondent for several months.

I feel our colleagues will be as interested and as terribly disturbed as I am by his recent dispatch to the Sunbury Daily Item which details the horrible conditions under which our marines have been fighting in Conthien.

Today I have asked Secretary McNamara to look into this matter. It is my hope that my request will receive more than the routine assurances which all of us have been given whenever we have raised questions concerning the conditions under which our men are having to fight.

I would also like to share with the House an editorial on this subject by Mr. Henry H. Haddon, the very able managing editor of the Sunbury Daily Item.

Purnell Writes of Hapless Plight of Marines, Victims of Dubious Policy

(Editor's Note.—"This is a story that needs to be written," is the message from Karl H. Purnell, Lewisburg, former newspaper publisher and state assemblyman, who has been in the Vietnam war zone for many months as a special correspondent. He suggests that Daily Item readers clip this story and send it to their U.S. Senators and Congressmen in the hope that "it would do some good." The reader is likely to agree with him.)

(By Karl H. Purnell)

Somewhere in Vietnam.—Con Thien is Vietnam's special kind of hell. Dusty in the dry season and muddy in the monsoons, this forward artillery outpost near the demilitarized zone between North and South Vietnam is a death trap for the reinforced battalion of U.S. Marines stationed here.

Inadequate bunkers and entrenchments have made Marines at Con Thien sitting ducks for North Vietnamese gunners who fire heavy artillery rounds into the outpost throughout the day and night. Since supplies can be brought in only by a limited number of helicopters, GI's here live for weeks on end in mud-soaked, torn uniforms and wet boots because replacements are not available.

Last week at Con Thien, a typical night ended with three GI's killed and a dozen wounded.

I flew into this outpost in a helicopter sent to evacuate the previous days' dead and wounded. Arriving in the early evening, I went up to Observation Post Two where a young lieutenant stood in muddy fatigues and a raincoat, peering through binoculars. He had been at Con Thien only three days and a wedding band on his finger indicated that somewhere back home a wife was just starting the long wait for his eventual return.

"There are six North Vietnamese battalions out there and intelligence says they're going to hit us tonight," the young officer said.

Another Marine with a dirt-streaked face laughed nervously and admitted Con Thien would be overrun if the North Vietnamese decided to attack. "They want this place, they can have it," he said.

As darkness set in I decided to put my cameras in a small bunker ten yards from the lookout post. Half-slipping down the wet sandbags, I climbed into the crowded bunker where several Marines sat on ammunition boxes. Water dripped from the ceiling and only two sputtering candles illuminated the small room.

"Come on in. You picked a good night to visit," a G.I. smiled.

Almost immediately, a series of explosions began to rock the heavy timbers of the bunker.

AWAITING THE ATTACK

"There they go. All we can do now is hope they don't score on us," the Marine said quietly as a barrage of shells from North Vietnam began landing on the Con Thien outpost.

Suddenly a particularly loud bang could be heard and then a desperate voice sounded over the radio from the Observation Post.

"They got us. The Lieutenant, he's dying. . . Get a corpsman quick."

For a few moments, we waited. Then one of the Marines spoke: "There ain't no corpsman up on this hill."

We climbed out of the bunker and for the next two hours, we carried the wounded Marines off the Observation Post to a battalion aid station almost a half-mile away. Shells were still falling at random throughout Con Thien as we slogged through the knee-deep mire with the heavy stretchers. Occasionally, one of us would fall as a wet stretcher handle slipped from our grasp, causing the wounded Marine to sink into mud.

By midnight, the last of the wounded were evacuated. Only the body of the dead Lieutenant was left above ground. For the rest of the night, we dozed and talked, hoping the enemy attack would be postponed for another night.

At 7 a.m., one of the largest barrages in Con Thien's history began exploding throughout the outpost. Within 20 minutes North Vietnamese gunners plastered us with no less than 230 heavy artillery shells. By 7:20, two more Marines were killed and another seven wounded as the charges ripped through the Marine bunkers, most of which are plainly inadequate.

MILTON MARINE QUOTED

Last summer, PFC David Swanger of Milton, who was stationed at Dong Ha which is near Con Thien, summed up the feelings of most of the Marines stationed in this area.

"I'm tired of this place and I want to go home," he said simply. Swanger had been in Vietnam 23 months and was ready to rotate back to the States.

Another young Marine who wasn't so lucky is PFC Stephen Jones, grandson of Dr. and Mrs. Edward Pangburn of Lewisburg. I found this young Marine in a Danang hospital recovering from shrapnel wounds incurred during a mortar barrage in the DMZ.

"I heard the first round land about 100 yards away. Then they just walked the next few shells right into our position. There was no bunker where we could protect ourselves," Jones said. Several of his comrades were killed during the attack.

"I hope I never hear another incoming round again," the Marine said the day before he was slated for evacuation from Vietnam.

PROTECTION LACKING

This lack of proper protection under which Marines are suffering each day along the DMZ is accounting for hundreds of unnecessary deaths. High-ranking military authorities say the constant shelling which the Marines take at Con Thien, for example, is part of the price which must be paid to prevent North Vietnamese troops and supplies from infiltrating into South Vietnam. There are, however, two facts which these Pentagon generals are not facing.

First, the bunkers are woefully inadequate at Con Thien. Steel and concrete is not available so that the entrenchments are supported by heavy timbers with only six or seven layers of sandbags on the top. A rocket or heavy artillery shell landing on almost any bunker in Con Thien usually kills the helpless Marines inside.

Lt. Colonel Gordon Cook, Syracuse N.Y., commander at Con Thien, admits the bunkers are not very good.

"We're so busy trying to fire back at the enemy and run patrols, we don't have time to build better protective bunkers," he says.

The Colonel has been at Con Thien only four weeks and cannot be held responsible for the failure of his predecessors to construct entrenchments which would withstand enemy shells. This has been done at Gia Linh, only four miles away, and it is rare when enemy gunners kill a G.I. in the well-fortified, underground bunkers at that outpost.

Secondly, the whole strategy of placing U.S. Marines in a static position where transportation limits resupply is being questioned by Marines at Con Thien. Washington officials at the Pentagon claim that outposts like Con Thien prevent the North Vietnamese troops from infiltrating supplies through the DMZ. However, the men who are fighting and dying at Con Thien say this official version isn't true.

INFILTRATION UNCHECKED

"They're slipping through all right—small units at a time and there isn't much we can do about it," Lt. Col. Cook says.

Since the North Vietnamese can move freely at night despite artillery barrages launched by the Americans, helicopters landing at Con Thien are often fired upon by gunners who have staked out the coordinates of the landing pad in advance. The recent rains have washed out the roads, so that trucks can no longer bring in the much-needed shells, clothing and food for the surrounded Marines.

"Why did they stick us out here if they knew the rains would wash out the road," one Marine asked.

The fact that these GI's are getting killed and wounded for a policy which isn't working and in many cases, because adequate protection is not available, is causing serious morale problems at Con Thien.

"Man, I just want out of this place, one Marine said, who was willing to fight the enemy but resented being placed in a situation where a random artillery shell could end his life.

Another Marine asked this reporter to "tell the people back home what it's like here," which I promised him I would do.

THE COST IN LIVES

The wife of a young Marine Lieutenant somewhere in the United States will receive word of her husband's death this week. Although she will never know it, her husband was killed by a recoilless rifle which smashed into the thin wall of sandbags and sprayed the hapless officer with shrapnel. Two marines were killed at exactly the same spot three days prior to this, mostly because the observation post did not have the protective covering to save the GI's from a direct hit.

Unfortunately, it is too late to help that young life. However, the Marines at Con Thien are still being killed each day because of the policy of high officials who apparently do not realize what a serious position these young GI's have been placed in. It would be a tragedy if this senseless killing and wounding continues.

A new round of debate on Vietnam underscores the record of 20 erratic years of United States policy in Asia. And since one Republican administration had a hand in this, Senator Dirksen is not going far afield in supporting the stand of President Johnson.

The central aim—halting the tide of communist conquest—cannot be questioned. The question now is what can be done to carry on successfully with this purpose while extricating ourselves from an Asian war and at the same time preserving the integrity and influence of the United States.

Possibilities of a sharp change in policies are very limited, notwithstanding the glib proposals of those who advocate turning tail without regard for the consequences.

The shortsightedness of those who clamor for a halt in the bombing of North Vietnam without similar action by the communist aggressors and the rigidity of Pentagon policy in the face of dubious results are costing American lives, and make no mistake about it. Callous disregard of this face is beyond understanding.

"Con Thien is Vietnam's special kind of hell," Karl H. Purnell, Lewisburg, former Union County assemblyman, writes after living with Marines under constant fire of communists mortars within the so-called demilitarized zone. And he makes a strong case for relief of these beleaguered forces along with greater support for them. Inadequate bunkers for protection, lack of replacements and washed-out roads over which supplies cannot be hauled are elements of the story and understandably, morale is adversely affected.

The debate rages on and will intensify as the presidential election campaign gets fully under way. And far too little attention is being paid to what is happening to America's sons because of policies which create conditions such as those at Con Thien where lives are being sacrificed in a futile effort to halt infiltration of communist troops into South Vietnam. Theory and idealistic thinking are much too prevalent among hawks and doves alike.

THE 188TH ANNIVERSARY OF DEATH OF CASIMIR PULASKI

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Derwinski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, October 11, marked the 188th anniversary of the death of Casimir Pulaski. At the battle of Savannah, Ga., this great Polish patriot, who is remembered in history as the father of American cavalry, gave his life in the American struggle for independence.

Pulaski, the eldest son of Count Joseph Pulaski, was born in Poland in 1748 and fought with his father in the popular uprising against Russian control after Poland had been partitioned by Germany, Russia, and Austria. When the forces of freedom, who had fought so gallantly against enormous odds and with inadequate equipment, were crushed by the Russians, Pulaski dispersed his men and sought aid for their cause abroad. Although a penniless refugee, and having lost his father and brother in the fight for freedom for Poland, he sought help in Prussia, Turkey, and then France. In Paris, Pulaski met Benjamin Franklin, who told him of the need for trained soldiers and leaders in the American Revolutionary War. The Polish hero traveled to the United States, seeing our struggle as another opportunity to fight for freedom, and presented a letter of introduction from Franklin to General Washington.

Pulaski distinguished himself in the battle of Brandywine and was commissioned a brigadier general by Congress and given command of the entire American cavalry. Believing fervently in the cause for which he was fighting, Pulaski led his men for 2 years before being struck down during the siege of Savannah. Seriously wounded on October 9, he died on October 11 at the age of 31, having made an outstanding contribution to the success of the American Revolution.

In paying tribute again this year to General Pulaski, we who now enjoy American freedom must rededicate ourselves to the restoration of freedom to Pulaski's homeland, Poland, which still suffers under the foreign domination of Soviet Russian imperialism.

At the present time, when the Communist government in Warsaw is providing major support to the North Vietnamese Government, the memory of Pulaski's fight for the freedom of Poland and America stands in complete contradiction to the principles of the Soviet-imposed Polish Government. History does repeat itself, and the spirit of Pulaski inspires the Polish people to their quiet resistance against the dictatorial Warsaw regime, and we in the United States must urge the development of a foreign policy that will restore freedom to all countries under Communist control rather than make the tragic mistake of coexistence with the enemy.

SUPPORT FOR FINDLEY AMENDMENT

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

tober 10 issue of the Rocky Mount Telegram, Rocky Mount, N.C., carried an editorial encouraging support for the

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Oc-so-called Findley amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1967. The amendment, accepted by the House, but reportedly dropped by House-Senate conferees, would suspend most-favored-nation status for Poland until that country stops supplying weapons to our enemy in Vietnam.

The editorial encouragement, of course, is appreciated, and perhaps other Members will be interested in it as the time approaches for consideration of the conference report. At that time I will ask the House to insist upon its position supporting the amendment.

Text of the editorial:

OPPOSE TRADE WITH REDS

A group of local citizens are understandably concerned about the U.S. policy of trading with Communist nations, particularly at a time when such trade enables the Communist bloc to sustain the war-making effort of North Vietnam.

In effect, we are helping the Red bloc kill American troops in the Vietnam war. This is difficult for loyal American citizens to understand, yet there are those in Washington who are vigorously pushing for expansion of trade with the Reds. Little wonder Rocky Mount citizens formed a committee called TRAIN, the purpose of which is to gain support from area residents in an effort to get members of Congress to oppose trade deals with the Communists.

Consider, for example, that on Sept. 29 Ted Sorensen, former White House counsel, urged that Congress promptly remove "out-moded and discriminatory" U.S. barriers against "non-strategic" trade with the Soviet Union.

This proposal is indefensible on two counts. First, too much of the trade with the Communists has been anything but "non-strategic." Second, even if such trade were in non-strategic items, it still helps the Reds sustain the war effort of North Vietnam, for by supplying the Soviets with non-military items, we free Russian industry to manufacture war goods for Hanoi.

But consider Sorensen's reasoning: "Engaging in such trade can actually advance our national interest in Vietnam as well as the world at large," he said. Does he really expect anyone to believe such hogwash?

It is this sort of thinking that has diminished America's position and stature in the world today. The Johnson administration and its agents in Congress have succeeded in butchering an amendment that would deny "most favored nation" treatment to some of the Communist countries.

The Findley amendment (introduced by Rep. Paul Findley of Illinois) would have blocked Poland from getting special tariff concessions until it stopped supplying arms and ammunition to North Vietnam. Ironically, as the Senate-House conference committee was killing the Findley amendment, three Polish ships were docking in Haiphong harbor unloading goods to increase Hanoi's war-making capacity.

The leaders of the move to kill this vital amendment were Sens. Albert Gore of Tennessee, J. W. Fulbright of Arkansas and Frank Church of Idaho, all Democrats, the latter two up for re-election next year.

What puzzles Findley—and most loyal Americans—is why the administration would want to lavish favors on Communist Poland when it has been one of the most willing of the Russian slave nations, and has been one of the major suppliers of Hanoi.

Findley points out: Poland is the only nation now enjoying economic advantages of "most favored nation" treatment under U.S. tariff laws which is admittedly supplying weapons to our enemy.

"For example," Findley said, "on June 25, the Associated Press in Warsaw quoted Zenon Kliszko, Poland's No. 2 Communist, as pledging full assistance 'until complete victory' and telling Hanoi: 'We are glad that Polish guns are bringing concrete results to you in your fight. We are giving and we will continue to give material, political and military aid.'

"Kliszko credited a Hanoi antiaircraft unit armed with equipment furnished by Polish workers, technicians and engineers with shooting down or damaging 40 American planes. Shipment of Polish arms to North Vietnam has also been confirmed by the Polish defense minister."

While the State Department and others, like Sorensen, argue that the taking away of trade credits and concessions from Poland may undermine our presence in that country, we should point out that what comes first are American troops in Vietnam.

To permit any country benefitting from U.S. foreign aid programs to give military assistance to our enemy and have us do nothing about it, is to create serious diplomatic complications. For if one nation can do this without fear of our punitive action, others may follow.

Enough pressure from their constituents may convince members of Congress that America is in no mood for such a sellout. While the TRAIN effort here in Rocky Mount may be only one small protest, it is at least trying to arouse concern in a lethargic public. Since protest is getting to be such popular sport these days, let's protest something that is really significant.

TWO SIDES SEEN TO SMOKING DEBATE

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. GARDNER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to insert into the RECORD an article entitled "Two Sides Seen to Smoking Debate":

TWO SIDES SEEN TO SMOKING DEBATE

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

"Get the facts!" said the authoritative voice on the boob tube. "A quarter of a million extra heart conditions. A million cases of bronchitis and emphysema. Eleven million cases of long-term illness. Write for your free copy of 'Smoking and Illness.' "

This free government leaflet, if you're curious, purports to "present the highlights" of a study released in May by the Public Health Service, "Cigarette Smoking and Health Characteristics." If the really curious viewer pursues the matter, and also obtains a copy of this parent study, he may discover at first hand what is meant by a credibility gap.

In plain words, both the free leaflet and the larger study on which it is based, in terms of the impression they seek deliberately to convey, are frauds. Prevaricators, it is said, are divided among three classes—liars, damn liars, and those who misuse statistics. By picking and choosing among some figures that are shaky to begin with, by glossing over necessary qualifications, and by mixing reasoned inference with pure surmise, the authors of these publications have perpetrated a shabby piece of propaganda.

The PHS study, conducted over 52 weeks in 1964–65, was intended to discover the relationship, if any, between smoking and a variety of chronic and acute illnesses. The raw figures were derived from interviews in a random example of 42,000 households.

So far, so good. But the key figures, on which all the conclusions are based, are the figures covering smoking habits. How many cigarettes per day? Did the respondent ever smoke? If so, how many cigarettes did he smoke? What was his heaviest rate of smoking? If these figures are not solid, the whole study begins to fall apart. And the astounding fact, glossed over in the report, is that "data on 60 per cent of the males who had ever smoked were obtained from other persons. The interviewers simply accepted answers from whoever happened to be at home at the time.

The authors of this study kept tripping over the inadequacy of their own data. They were thus reduced to guessing: "It could well be that. . . . Had data been available, it might have been found that. . . . This could indicate that.

Two can play that game. With the same validity, on the basis of the PHS statistics, a critic can assure you that pack-a-day smokers spend fewer days in bed than persons who have never smoked; that the pack-a-day man is likely to have less hypertensions, less arthritis and better hearing than the never-smoked man. Amazingly, men who are presently smoking even have a lower incidence of upper respiratory conditions than persons who have never smoked. And believe it if you will, from Table 21 of the PHS report: Heavy-smokers over 65—the two-pack-a-day volcanoes—spend 8.5 days sick in bed each year, while their counterparts, men over 65 who never have smoked at all, are sick in bed for nearly two weeks. What do you make of that?

INCREASED COMMUNIST ACTIVITY IN SOUTHERN AFRICA

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Watson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, today I want to take this opportunity to report to the House about an extremely dangererous development in southern Africa which could have a devastating effect on the ability of the United States and its allies to keep the vital sea route to the east open.

Of course, we are aware of the critical situation caused by the closing of the Suez Canal during the recent war in the Middle East. That closing has demonstrated beyond contradiction that the sea route around the cape is of vital strategic importance, both militarily and economically. It goes without question that free access to the cape by the maritime nations is essential. But, if a nation unfriendly to the United States should control the cape and seriously restrict, or even terminate, our ability to refuel there, it should be obvious that American influence throughout Africa and Asia will come to a screeching halt.

Fortunately, the present governments of southern Africa are firm friends of the United States. The Communist powers are aware of this friendship, and for this reason have made southern Africa a prime target for extending Communist influence.

Mr. Speaker, I must report that based on extremely reliable sources, that influence in just the past few weeks has taken the form of military involvement by Red China. Although we have not had the advantage of many actual news reports, Communist-trained and equipped guerrillas are swarming into southern Africa for the avowed intention of destroying all Western influence in that area of the world. Evidence of this increased activity is very clear, and I have been advised by those close to the actual scene that the Red Chinese are launching an extensive "war of liberation" in southern Africa.

For instance: Only a few weeks ago, Communist-trained guerrillas staged a pitched battle just inside Rhodesian territory in which 200 of their number were involved, including a Chinese woman instructor versed in the fine art of guerrilla warfare. This was only part of a 2,000-strong force who have been given extensive guerrilla instruction in Communist nations. Their first aim of conquest is Rhodesia, a pro-Western nation which the United States has made every attempt to condemn by the imposition of economic sanctions.

Finances and support from the Soviet Union and Red China are pouring into Africa. Orders have been given to step up training at Tanzanian and Zambian bases for a Communist-trained and equipped force of 6,000 so-called freedom fighters.

But, Mr. Speaker, the most alarming development in Communist subversion in southern Africa is taking place this very moment in Zambia as a result of a pact between that nation and Red China to construct a railroad connecting Zambia with Tanzania, bypassing Rhodesia. Wall posters are cropping up in Peking advertising for Chinese construction workers to go to Africa. These workers are none other than the infamous Red Guards, those fanatical young followers of Mao Tse-tung who stop at nothing to foster terror and violent revolution. Their purpose in going to Zambia is to give instruction in guerrilla warfare to African terrorist gangs. Already these misnamed "technicians" are in Tanzania training African guerrillas to strike into northern Mozambique against Portuguese forces.

Mr. Speaker, certainly all of us are aware of the U.N. sanctions imposed upon Rhodesia. On numerous occasions I have taken great exception to these sanctions as have a number of my colleagues. Of course, there are others who feel that the sanctions should be imposed because of the existence of a white minority in Rhodesia which is in control of the government. But, despite our difference here, it is time for some real soul searching by Congress and the administration in regard to our entire policy toward southern Africa, especially Rhodesia. We cannot afford another Vietnam in southern Africa, but I fear such is our fate unless we drop support for these U.N. sanctions and reevaluate our policy toward Rhodesia.

The United States must look upon the nations of southern Africa as holding the true balance of power and as being the only pro-Western influence of any consequence in sub-Saharan Africa and on the western shores of the Indian Ocean. Rhodesia in a very real sense holds the key to southern Africa. Let Rhodesia fall, and every other nation will follow swiftly.

The present ability of Rhodesia to resist Communist aggression is highly commendable, but she cannot fight the battle alone. In the name of the precious lives of our fighting men, let us avoid another Vietnam. We can do that now by supplying Rhodesia through reciprocating trade agreements with the necessary weapons to defeat this Communist aggression in its early stages. Rather than continue our official policy of vilification and hand-wringing condemnation of Rhodesia, we must make a concerted effort to extend the hand of friendship in a common endeavor—to hold the line against the spread of Communist aggression.

Mr. Speaker, in the very near future our distinguished friend and colleague, the Honorable Barry Goldwater, will be taking an extensive tour throughout Rhodesia. Certainly, his on-the-spot evaluation will be extremely beneficial in formulating a new policy toward Rhodesia and the whole of southern Africa. Additionally, I hope to join a number of our colleagues at a later date in making this same trip.

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN SCHWENGEL CONCERNING HIS VOTE ON THE POSTAL REVENUE AND FEDERAL SALARY ACT OF 1967

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Schwengel] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, my vote Wednesday on the Postal Revenue and Federal Salary Act of 1967 represented a very difficult choice. Like most of my colleagues I found myself in a dilemma regarding this bill and shared their reservations about it. I, like them, would liked to have had a better bill, especially as it relates to the needs for salary of the postal employees, to vote for.

There was no choice but to vote to recommit this bill and I did so. The proposal for salary increases for postal workers in the bill is not consistent with the need to reclassify and upgrade certain postal employees. The salary adjustments represent only another stopgap measure.

In addition this bill delegates to the next President extraordinary powers over pay, expenses, and allowances of Members of Congress, Federal judges, heads and assistant heads of executive agencies, as well as other Government officials. This should not be a part of this bill. The establishment of the Quadrennial Commission is merely duplication, and such Presidential power over pay, expenses, and allowances of top Government officials can lead to abuse and intimidation in the future.

To me it is wrong to have salary increases and a raise in postal rates in the same bill. The two subjects are not related. There was sound reason to separate these matters and that was the main reason why we voted for recommittal.

Perhaps most important, we should observe that what the Post Office Department needs is a thorough study by a competent commission, involving people from both inside and outside the

Government, to find ways and means to cut out duplication, modernize the Department, and take advantage of present-day technology for more efficient operation. By the first of the year, I expect to introduce a bill calling for such an investigation.

The motion to recommit having failed, I reluctantly voted for the bill because I was committed to support improved salaries for postal workers. They have been denied the recognition they deserve, and their salaries have been adversely affected by inflation which is caused more by Government policies than by anything else. Their plight has made it difficult to recruit and train postal employees.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Selden, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. Gross, for 5 minutes today, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. Pucinski in two instances.

Mr. Fulton of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Machen.

Mr. Tenzer.

Mr. Wampler.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Brown of Michigan) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Pollock.

Mr. McEwen.

Mr. Denney.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Jacobs) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Joelson.

Mr. Donohue.

Mr. Kastenmeier.

Mr. Blanton in two instances.

Mr. Nedzi.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1084. An act to amend section 3620 of the Revised Statutes with respect to payroll deductions for Federal employees; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 1085. An act to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to modernize the loan and dividend provisions; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 3973. An act to amend the Healing Arts Practice Act, District of Columbia, 1928, and the act of June 6, 1892, relating to the licensing of dentists in the District of Columbia, to exempt from the licensing requirements of such acts physicians and dentists while performing services in the employ of the District of Columbia.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, October 16, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1155. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report of agreements signed for the use of foreign currencies in July, August, and September 1967, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 85–128; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1156. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 13 of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1157. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a recommendation concerning recapture of Pacific Gas & Electric Co.'s Bucks Creek hydroelectric project located on Milk Ranch Creek, Bucks Creek, and Grisley Creek, tributaries of the North Fork Feather River, all in Plumas County in northern California, pursuant to the provisions of section 14 of the Federal Power Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BOLAND: Committee of conference. H.R. 11456. An act making appropriations for the Department of Transportation for the fiscal year beginning June 30, 1968, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 768). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 944. Resolution for the consideration of H.R. 13178, a bill to provide more effectively for the regulation of the use of, and for the preservation of safety and order within, the U.S. Capitol Buildings and the U.S. Capitol Grounds, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 777). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DOWDY: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6670. A bill for the relief of Dr. Virgilio A. Ganganelli Valle (Rept. No. 769). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6766. A bill for the relief of Dr. Raul Gustavo Fors Docal (Rept. No. 770). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CAHILL: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7042. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jose Del Rio (Rept. No. 771). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7896. A bill for the relief of Dr. José A. Rico Fernández; with amendment (Rept. No. 772). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CAHILL: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7898. A bill for the relief of Dr. Nemesio Vazquez Fernandez; with amendment (Rept. No. 773). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DOWDY: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8256. A bill for the relief of Dr. Hermes Q. Cuervo (Rept. No. 774). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8257. A bill for the relief of Jose Bernardo Garcia, M.D. (Rept. No. 775). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CAHILL: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8258. A bill for the relief of Jorge Gabriel Lazcano, M.D., with amendment (Rept. No. 776). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CASEY:

H.R. 13478: A bill that section 481(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 be amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 13479. A bill to require reports to Congress of certain actions of the Federal Power Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H.R. 13480. A bill to make the proof of financial responsibility requirements of section 39(a) of the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia inapplicable in the case of minor traffic violations involving drivers' licenses and motor vehicle registration; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McDADE (for himself, Mr. Andrews of North Dakota, Mr. Bell, Mr. Cahill, Mr. Dellenback, Mr. Esch, Mr. Findley, Mr. Frelinghuysen, Mr. Harvey, Mr. Horton, Mr. Mathias of Maryland, Mr. Morse, Mr. Mosher, Mr. Reid of New York, Mr. Robison, Mr. Schneebeli, Mr. Schweiker, Mr. Schwengel, Mr. Shriver, Mr. Stafford, Mr. Stanton, and Mr. Whalen):

H.R. 13481. A bill to prohibit the investment of income derived from certain criminal activities in any business enterprise affecting interstate or foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDADE (for himself, Mr. Andrews of North Dakota, Mr. Bell, Mr. Cahill, Mr. Dellenback, Mr. Esch, Mr. Findley, Mr. Frelinghuysen, Mr. Harvey, Mr. Horton, Mr. Mathias of Maryland, Mr. Morse, Mr. Mosher, Mr. Robison, Mr. Schneebeli, Mr. Schweiker, Mr. Schwengel, Mr. Shriver, Mr. Stafford, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Taft, and Mr. Whalen):

H.R. 13482. A bill to prohibit electronic surveillance by persons other than duly authorized law enforcement officers engaged in the investigation or prevention of specified categories of offenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDADE (for himself, Mr. Andrews of North Dakota, Mr. Bell, Mr. Cahill, Mr. Dellenback, Mr. Esch, Mr. Findley, Mr. Frelinghuysen, Mr. Harvey, Mr. Horton, Mr. Mathias of Maryland, Mr. Morse, Mr. Mosher, Mr. Reid of New York, Mr. Robison, Mr. Schneebeli, Mr. Schweiker, Mr. Schwengel, Mr. Shriver, Mr. Stafford, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Taft, and Mr. Whalen):

H.R. 13483. A bill to provide for extended prison terms when it is found that a felony was committed as part of a continuing illegal business in which the offender occupied a supervisory or other management position; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDADE (for himself, Mr. Andrews of North Dakota, Mr. Bell, Mr. Cahill, Mr. Dellenback, Mr. Esch, Mr. Findley, Mr. Frelinghuysen, Mr. Harvey, Mr. Horton, Mr. Mathias of Maryland, Mr. Morse, Mr. Mosher, Mr. Reid of New York, Mr. Robison, Mr. Schneebeli, Mr. Schweiker, Mr. Schwengel, Mr. Shriver, Mr. Stafford, Mr. Stanton, and Mr. Whalen):

H.R. 13484. A bill to amend the Sherman Act to prohibit the investment of certain income in any business enterprise affecting interstate or foreign commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDADE (for himself, Mr. Andrews of North Dakota, Mr. Bell, Mr. Cahill, Mr. Dellenback, Mr. Esch, Mr. Findley, Mr. Frelinghuysen, Mr. Harvey, Mr. Horton, Mr. Mathias of Maryland, Mr. Morse, Mr. Mosher, Mr. Reid of New York, Mr. Robison, Mr. Schneebeli, Mr. Schweiker, Mr. Schwengel, Mr. Shriver, Mr. Stafford, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Taft, and Mr. Whalen):

H.R. 13485. A bill to permit the compelling of testimony with respect to certain crimes, and the granting of immunity in connection therewith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13486. A bill to provide for the abolition of the rigid two-witness and direct-evidence rules in perjury cases; and to provide for the prosecution of contradictory statements made under oath without proof of the falsity of one of the statements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13487. A bill to provide protected facilities for the housing of Government witnesses and the families of Government witnesses in organized crime cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13488. A bill to establish a Joint Committee on Organized Crime; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 13489. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to modernize the loan, investment, and dividend provisions; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. REUSS (for himself, Mr. Meeds, Mr. Rees, Mr. Cohelan, Mr. William D. Ford, and Mr. Dow):

H.R. 13490. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to raise needed additional revenues by tax reform; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 13491. A bill declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H.R. 13492. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.R. 13493. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the independence of the Baltic States (Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DENT:

H.J. Res. 887. Joint resolution creating a Federal Committee on Nuclear Development to review and reevaluate the existing civilian nuclear program of the United States; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. McDADE (for himself, Mr. Andrews of North Dakota, Mr. Bell, Mr. Cahill, Mr. Dellenback, Mr. Esch, Mr. Findley, Mr. Frelinghuysen, Mr. Harvey, Mr. Horton, Mr. Mathias of Maryland, Mr. Morse, Mr. Mosher, Mr. Reid of New York, Mr. Robison, Mr. Schneebeli, Mr. Schweiker, Mr. Schwengel, Mr. Shriver, Mr. Stafford, Mr. Stanton, and Mr. Whalen):

H. Con. Res. 530. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress that a fight against organized crime is inseparable from efforts to reduce urban poverty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CONABLE:

H.R. 13494. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Emma Ciciotti and Mr. Lino Ciciotti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RARICK:

H.R. 13495. A bill for the relief of the heirs of Juan Peralta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 13496. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Irma Ruggeri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

Thursday, October 12, 1967

The Senate met at 12 noon, and was called to order by Hon. Herman E. Talmadge, a Senator from the State of Georgia.

Rev. Edward B. Lewis, pastor, Capitol Hill Methodist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Dear God, our heavenly Father, whose presence and power is in all the world, and whose guiding spirit is with us in this moment, we beseech Thy favor upon these servants and leaders of the people today. Be with the President, all people in high office and responsible citizens of our Nation and the world.

Grant unto all wisdom and strength to know and do Thy will. Fill us with the love of truth and the desire for right. So rule the hearts of these elected officials that we will see their endeavors prosper in good for all men.

Give us today a new vision of law and order, justice and peace to the honor of the highest concepts of life. We pray in the Master's name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. Senate,
President pro tempore,
Washington, D.C., October 12, 1967.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. Herman E. Talmadge, a Senator from the State of Georgia, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

Carl Hayden,
President pro tempore.

Mr. TALMADGE thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, October 11, 1967, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On October 10, 1967:

S. 534. An act for the relief of Setsuko Wilson (nee Hiranaka).

On October 11, 1967:

S. 602. An act to revise and extend the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, and to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965; and

S. 1862. An act to amend the authorizing legislation of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 3973. An act to amend the Healing Arts Practice Act, District of Columbia, 1928, and the act of June 6, 1892, relating to the licensing of dentists in the District of Columbia, to exempt from the licensing requirements of such acts physicians and dentists while performing services in the employ of the District of Columbia; and

H.R. 10509. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

SOLICITOR GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Erwin N. Griswold, of Massachusetts, to be Solicitor General of the United States.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Department of Justice.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of measures on the calendar, beginning with Calendar No. 574 and the succeeding measures in sequence.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNIFORM SYSTEM FOR FIXING AND ADJUSTING PAY OF EMPLOYEES IN RECOGNIZED TRADES OR CRAFTS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2303) to provide a uniform system for fixing and adjusting the pay of employees in recognized trades or crafts, and for other purposes which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with amendments on page 2, line 7, after the word "Committee" strike out "(hereinafter called the 'Committee')"; in line 10, after the word "Services," insert "an elected officer of an organization having a substantial number of members who are employees referred to in section 5341 of this title, who shall be appointed by the President for a term of 2 years,"; in line 14, after the word "Service" strike out "Commission." and insert "Commission who shall be Chairman of the Committee."; in line 16, after the word "shall" strike out "promulgate" and insert "prescribe"; on page 3, line 4, after the word "prevailing" strike out "rates which shall be contiguous geographic areas" and insert "rates"; in line 9, after the word "Board" strike out "which shall consist" and insert "composed"; in line 11, after the word "having" insert "a significant number of"; in line 12, after the word "area" insert "and one representative of an organization having recognition and representing the largest number of such employees in the area"; in line 15, after the word "regulations" strike out "promulgated" and insert "prescribed"; in line 16, after the word "Board," insert "with the technical staff assistance of an agency within the area designated by the Committee," in line 18, after the word "shall" insert "plan and conduct a wage survey, analyze data collected in the survey,"; at the beginning of line 20, strike out "apply" and insert "issue wage schedules based on"; in the same line, after the word "rates" strike out "of pay"; on page 4, line 2, after the word "with," strike out "the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 1060), as amended (29 U.S.C. 201–219)," and insert "chapter 8 of title 29,"; in line 5, after the word "of" strike out "the Act of March 3, 1931 (46 Stat. 1494), as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a—276a–5)." and insert "sections 276a—276a–5 of title 40."; in line 13, after the word "for" strike out "such" and insert "those"; after line 19, strike out:

"(g) When the Civil Service Commission concurs in a finding by the Committee that the number of employees referred to in section 5341 of this title in a wage area is so few as to make prevailing rate determinations impracticable, those employes shall be subject to the provisions of subchapter III of this chapter and chapter 51 of this title which are applicable to positions of equivalent difficulty or responsibility.

And, in lieu thereof, insert:

"(g) Whenever an Area Wage Board determines that there are so few Federal wage board employees in a wage area as to make wage surveys impracticable, it shall notify the Committee. The Committee shall determine the prevailing rates for those positions in accordance with the prevailing rates paid in another wage area.

On page 5, after line 8, insert:

"(h) The Civil Service Commission, after consulting the agencies, shall prepare and publish standards for placing positions in their proper classes and grades. Each agency shall place each position under its jurisdiction in its appropriate class and grade in conformance with standards published by the Commission or, if no published standards apply directly, consistent with published standards.

In line 18, after the word "Council" strike out "(hereinafter called the 'Council')"; in line 21, after the word "sent" strike out "Federal"; in the same line, after the word "organizations" insert "having recognition and representing employees referred to in section 5341 of this title,"; after line 23, strike out:

"(b) The Council may submit reports and recommendations to the Federal Wage Board Committee concerning the determination of prevailing rates and the criteria, standards and regulations used for that purpose; to Area Wage Boards concerning the determination of prevailing rates within a particular area; and to the Civil Service Commission concerning the classification of positions and other conditions of employment for employees under the prevailing rates wage system.

And, in lieu thereof, insert:

"(b) The Council may submit reports and recommendations to—

"(1) the Federal Wage Board Committee concerning the determination of prevailing rates and the criteria, standards, and regulations used for that purpose;

"(2) the Area Wage Boards concerning the determination of prevailing rates within particular areas; and

"(3) the Civil Service Commission concerning the classification of positions and other conditions of employment for employees under the prevailing rates wage system.

"The Council shall submit an annual report of its activities and recommendations concerning the administration of the prevailing rates pay system to the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate and House of Representatives.

On page 7, line 22, after the word "the" strike out "survey." and insert "survey and issue appropriate wage schedules."; in line 24, after the word "the" strike out "Area Wage Board" and insert "employing agencies"; in line 25, after the word "changed" strike out "rates" and insert "wage schedules"; on page 8, line 3, after the word "The" strike out "Area Wage Board" and insert "employing agencies"; and in line 6, after the word "than" strike out "thirty days after ordering the wage survey." and insert "the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the forty-fourth day, excluding Saturdays and Sundays, following the date the wage survey was ordered to be made."; so as to make the bill read:

S. 2303

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subchapter IV of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"Subchapter IV—Prevailing Rate Systems

"§ 5341. Trades and crafts

"Employees referred to in section 5102(c)(7) of this title (but not including such employees of agencies excepted by section 5102(a)(1) (i)-(viii) of this title) shall be paid at rates fixed and adjusted in accordance with the provisions of this subchapter as nearly as is consistent with the public interest in accordance with prevailing rates.

"§ 5342. Federal Wage Board Committee

"(a) There is established a Federal Wage Board Committee composed of the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Labor, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, the Administrator of General Services, an elected officer of an organization having a substantial number of members who are employees referred to in section 5341 of this title, who shall be appointed by the President for a term of 2 years, and the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission who shall be Chairman of the Committee.

"(b) The Committee shall prescribe regulations for the administration of the wage board system designed to accomplish the following objectives:

"(1) Equal pay for equal work for employees referred to in section 5341 of this title who are employed in the same wage area;

"(2) Recruitment and retention of well qualified employees at rates of pay and working conditions comparable to private enterprise in the wage area; and

"(3) Recognition of particular skills, job requirements, or responsibilities in Federal positions which are not present in private enterprise.

"(c) The Committee shall establish wage areas for the determination of prevailing rates. In establishing such areas, the Committee shall consider the nature and similarity of the population, employment, manpower, and industry.

"(d) Within each wage area, there is established an Area Wage Board composed of a chief official of each agency, designated by the head of such agency, having a significant number of employees referred to in section 5341 of this title located within such area and one representative of an organization having recognition and representing the largest number of such employees in the area. Pursuant to the uniform regulations prescribed by the Committee, an Area Wage Board, with the technical staff assistance of an agency within the area designated by the Committee, shall plan and conduct a wage survey, analyze data collected in the survey, determine prevailing rates, and issue wage schedules based on such rates for all Federal employees within the area. A wage survey shall be conducted within a wage area whenever changes in prevailing rates within the area indicate the necessity for a survey, but at least once in each calendar year.

"(e) In making wage surveys, an Area Wage Board shall disregard rates paid to employees who are not covered by, or rates which are not in compliance with, chapter 8 of title 29, and rates which have been determined to be in violation of sections 276a—276a–5 of title 40.

"(f) Whenever an Area Wage Board determines that in private enterprise there is an insufficient number or kind of comparable positions or activities to determine prevailing rates for one or more Federal positions or activities, it shall notify the Committee. The Committee shall determine the prevailing rates for those positions or activities in the wage area in accordance with the prevailing rates paid in another wage area which has a sufficient number of comparable positions or activities and which is determined by the Committee to be most similar in the nature of its population, employment, manpower, and industry to the wage area for which rates are being determined.

"(g) Whenever an Area Wage Board determines that there are so few Federal wage board employees in a wage area as to make wage surveys impracticable, it shall notify the Committee. The Committee shall determine the prevailing rates for those positions in accordance with the prevailing rates paid in another wage area.

"(h) The Civil Service Commission, after consulting the agencies, shall prepare and publish standards for placing positions in their proper classes and grades. Each agency shall place each position under its jurisdiction in its appropriate class and grade in conformance with standards published by the Commission or, if no published standards apply directly, consistent with published standards.

"§ 5343. Federal Wage Board Council

"(a) The President shall appoint a Federal Wage Board Council of seven members, the chairman of which shall be a Commissioner of the Civil Service Commission. Three members shall represent employee organizations having recognition and representing employees referred to in section 5341 of this title, and three members shall represent the general public.

"(b) The Council may submit reports and recommendations to—

"(1) the Federal Wage Board Committee concerning the determination of prevailing rates and the criteria, standards, and regulations used for that purpose;

"(2) the Area Wage Boards concerning the determination of prevailing rates within particular areas; and

"(3) the Civil Service Commission concerning the classification of positions and other conditions of employment for employees under the prevailing rates wage system.

"The Council shall submit an annual report of its activities and recommendations concerning the administration of the prevailing rates pay system to the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate and House of Representatives.

"(c) Members of the Council representing the general public shall be paid at the rate of $100 a day for each day of actual service. Members of the Council shall be paid travel expenses, including a per diem allowance in accordance with section 5703(b) of this title.

"(d) The Council shall upon majority vote appoint an Executive Director. The Chairman may appoint such other employees as are necessary. The Executive Director and other employees may be appointed without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and their pay shall be fixed without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, but their rates of pay shall not exceed the rates payable under such provisions to persons with comparable duties and responsibilities.

"(e) Members of the Council shall serve a term of 4 years. Vacancies shall be filled in the manner of the original appointment.

"§ 5344. Effective date of pay adjustment

"Upon completion of a wage survey, an Area Wage Board shall determine the prevailing rates for the wage area covered by the survey and issue appropriate wage schedules. After a determination that prevailing rates have changed, the employing agencies shall fix and adjust, in accordance with such changed wage schedule, the rates of pay of those employees referred to in section 5341 of this title who are affected by such survey and rate determination. The employing agencies shall also determine the date such changed rates are to take effect, but such effective date shall not be later than the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the forty-fourth day, excluding Saturdays and Sundays, following the date the wage survey was ordered to be made.

"§ 5345. Retroactive pay

"(a) Retroactive pay is payable by reason of an increase in rates of pay referred to in section 5344 of this title only when—

"(1) the individual is in the service of the United States, including service in the Armed Forces, or the government of the District of Columbia on the date of the issuance of the order granting the increase; or

"(2) the individual retired or died during the period beginning on the effective date of the increase and ending on the date of issuance of the order granting the increase, and only for services performed during that period.

"(b) For the purpose of this section, service in the Armed Forces includes the period provided by statute for the mandatory restoration of the individual to a position in or under the Government of the United States or the government of the District of Columbia after he is relieved from training and service in the Armed Forces or discharged from hospitalization following that training and service.

"§ 5346. Crews of vessels

"(a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, the pay of officers and members of crews of vessels excepted from chapter 51 of this title by section 5102(c) (8) of this title shall be fixed and adjusted from time to time as nearly as is consistent with the public interest in accordance with prevailing rates and practices in the maritime industry.

"(b) Vessel employees of the Panama Canal Company may be paid in accordance with the wage practices of the maritime industry."

(b) The analysis of subchapter IV of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"SUBCHAPTER IV—PREVAILING RATE SYSTEMS

"Sec.
"5341. Trades and crafts.
"5342. Federal Wage Board Committee.
"5343. Federal Wage Board Council.
"5344. Effective date of pay adjustment.
"5345. Retroactive pay.
"5346. Crews of vessels."

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 3. This Act shall take effect one hundred and twenty days following the date of enactment of this Act, except that all rates of pay in existence as of the date of enactment of this Act shall remain in effect until the provisions of this Act have been made effective.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 592), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

This legislation has been developed by the committee to provide a new basic framework for setting and periodically revising the rates of pay for blue-collar Federal employees whose salaries are determined according to prevailing rates in private enterprise in the locality where they work.

There are now about 60 different agency systems in the executive branch for determining wage board pay rates. Approximately three-fourths of all blue-collar employees are paid under the Army-Air Force Wage Board or the Navy Wage Committee systems applicable to military installations. The remaining 25 percent are employed in various executive agencies, mainly the Department of the Interior, the General Services Administration and hospitals under the Veterans' Administration.

There are three serious disadvantages characteristic of the present systems.

(1) There is no central authority in the executive branch to develop and apply on a governmentwide basis rules and procedures to be followed by employing agencies for surveying prevailing rates in private enterprise, interpreting data, and establishing wage schedules;

(2) With minor exceptions, employees or their representatives are not permitted to participate in the process of surveying prevailing rates and the establishment of wage schedules.

(3) There is no method whereby special skills or unusual job requirements applicable to Federal employees not found in local private enterprise can be adequately evaluated, or particular occupational characteristics of Federal employment can be equated with comparable positions in private enterprise in localities outside the local wage area.

S. 2303 is designed to resolve these specific problems.

JUSTIFICATION

There are about 700,000 Federal employees whose rates of hourly pay are determined by an agency wage board or a similar administrative pay system in the executive branch. Originally developed to pay employees at navy yards during the Civil War, wage board systems are now applicable to almost all blue-collar employees who work for the Federal Government. There are certain specific exceptions by law, including the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Panama Canal, the Virgin Islands, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Alaska Railroad, and a few others. The payroll for blue-collar employees subject to wage board systems now exceeds $4 billion annually.

Although Congress has from time to time investigated the wage board pay situation, there has been little legislative action in this field. The systems have been primarily administrative since their development and no consideration is given these pay systems in ordinary congressional consideration of pay legislation for postal and classified employees. The lack of proper legislative investigation and action over the years has led to a multiplicity of rules, principles, and pay regulations.

UNIFORM PRINCIPLES GOVERNING PAY

The most frequent complaint registered by employees and their representatives is that pay rates for the same job in the same area in two different agencies may vary substantially. Numerous specific examples have been presented to the committee in its public hearings on this legislation.

For example: In Washington, D.C., janitors in one agency are paid $2.40 an hour, and in another agency $1.61 an hour, a difference of 79 cents. Within the same wage areas outside Washington, rates of janitor's pay varied from $2.36 to $2.76; $2.30 to $2.65; $2.33 to $2.58. In Providence, R.I., pay rates for cooks varies from $2.33 to $2.76 an hour. Journeymen electricians in New York City earn $3.50 an hour in one agency and $3.55 an hour in another agency. Similar interagency pay differences within the same wage area are found throughout the Nation.

These wage differences result from basic differences in philosophy and policy from one agency to another. For example: the Agriculture and Interior Departments have decentralized wage board systems, while decisions in the Army-Air Force Wage Board are centralized at the Pentagon.

The Army-Air Force Wage Board pays food service and custodial employees from their regular wage schedules used for most wage board employees, while the Veterans' Administration uses a separate wage schedule for lower echelon employees.

Different wage board systems have different methods of classification of jobs. The Department of the Navy has 16 separate job levels while the Army-Air Force, which a number of other agencies copy, has 15. The Department of Defense, the Veterans' Administration and the General Services Administration use a three-step pay schedule, while the National Aeronautics and Space Administration uses four steps and the Department of Interior uses one step. The Army-Air Force, Veterans' Administration and the General Services Administration schedules have a 5 percent spread between pay rates within each level, while the Department of the Navy has a 4 percent spread.

All of these factors result in pay differences for the same work at the same level of responsibility in the same wage area, for which there is no justification other than the lack of uniform principles of pay applicable to all employees of the Federal Government.

A veteran's hospital cook, a janitor, a journeyman electrician, a plumber, or a carpenter has more interest in the rate he earns per hour than the particular agency of the Government for which he works. The janitor in Washington, D.C., who earns 79 cents an hour less than another janitor doing the same job in another agency in Washington has a difficult time understanding the administrative complexities of wage board systems that deprive him of $1,643.20 pay per year.

The lack of uniform principles applicable to the gathering of data and ascertainment of rates result in one agency surveying particular kinds of industry utilizing particular pay rates in accordance with its own policy, while another agency will survey other business enterprises in the same area, making inclusions and exclusions according to different criteria in keeping with its agency policy.

An example of this practice is that the Veterans' Administration generally accepts survey and rate determinations made by the Army-Air Force Wage Board above certain levels of employment, but makes its own determinations for low-echelon positions. The committee sees no justification for this policy other than budgetary expediency.

EMPLOYEE PARTICIPATION

With the exception of the Navy Wage Committee, which permits employees to participate in the gathering of data and the recommendation of rates to be established by administrative authority in the Department of the Navy, there is no general participation of employees in the wage board systems.

Evidence presented to the committee indicates that as a general rule, gathering of data from private enterprise firms in a locality and its evaluation by the agency is a confidential process which no employee or employee organization is permitted to participate in or to investigate. This system is contrary to practice in modern private enterprise, in which the processes of collective bargaining are guaranteed by Federal law and practiced throughout industry. Postal and classified employees in the Federal service have presented their views to the committees of Congress concerning Federal pay legislation for many years, and under the terms of the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962, are invited to offer comments and suggestions to the President concerning his recommendations to Congress on salary adjustments.

There is no good reason why employees under the wage board systems should not have a similar right to be represented in the processes which lead to the establishment of their pay rates. There is no good reason for secrecy in the gathering of data or its interpretation by statistical processes to arrive at a prevailing rate.

Executive Order 10988, promulgated by President Kennedy more than 5 years ago, guarantees the Federal employee certain rights for organization and representation in the executive branch. Postal employees are frequently consulted by management concerning postal operations and management decisions. To be represented in the evaluation of evidence leading to the establishment of pay rates is a reasonable extension of the existing policies established by law, tradition, and Executive order.

PROPER COMPARISON OF FEDERAL JOBS TO POSITIONS IN PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

The nature of some positions in the Federal service is such that a reasonable comparison to positions in local private enterprise is difficult or in some cases impossible. This is certainly true when in a nonindustrial area a Federal installation, such as an Air Force base, has highly skilled technicians doing work for which there is no comparable position in private enterprise in the locality.

An engineering technician employed to work on rocket systems cannot be satisfactorily compared to a journeyman electrician or a truck mechanic in ordinary private enterprise. Under present practices, agency wage boards or administrators set a rate at a given figure which attempts to take into account the degree of difficulty or specialization of the job above that of local private enterprise positions.

The committee does not believe that this is a satisfactory solution to the problem. In many instances in areas outside the area for which the rate is being established, there may be comparable positions in private enterprise. Certainly an engineering technician employed at an aircraft manufacturing firm in Marietta, Ga., would be nearer in job qualifications and requirements to an aircraft maintenance employee at Warner Robins Air Force Base, than a truck mechanic at a privately owned garage at Macon, Ga. The present practice of wage board systems does not go beyond the geographic boundaries of the specific wage board area to utilize such data. It would, however, permit agencies to exclude arbitrarily such rates if Marietta were within the wage board area.

The committee does not believe that unreasonable extensions of the geographic area should be made simply to include a job of similar nature at another city. However, the radius of an imaginary circle restricting a wage board survey does not always serve a meaningful purpose in determining prevailing rates. If comparable employment in private enterprise exists for special skills or job requirements in a similar employment area outside the wage area, such evidence should be taken into account in establishing rates of pay for Federal employees. To recruit and retain good employees in such positions is a desirable and necessary goal. To exclude private enterprise rates because they are beyond the specific limits of the wage area defeats attainment of that goal.

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES OF THIS LEGISLATION

S. 2303, as reported, does not establish a national wage board system. It is not intended to erase the authority of Federal agencies to administer long-standing agency policies of personnel administration. It does not require or intend to require that all employees be paid similar pay on a nationwide basis. It does not establish a superbureaucracy to enforce rigid policies for all employees in all areas.

S. 2303 does provide the legislative authority for a basic system so that uniform rules governing pay administration can be applied by individual area wage boards on a local basis to determine prevailing rates in private enterprise and apply them to all Federal employees within the wage board area. To achieve this goal, S. 2303 does the following:

(1) Establishes a Federal Wage Board Committee, composed of the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Labor, the Administrator of General Services, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, and one elected officer of an employee organization appointed by the President for a term of 2 years, to issue uniform wage board pay regulations applicable to all Federal employees paid at prevailing rates.

This Federal Wage Board Committee shall have basic responsibility to see that the kinds of industry surveyed, the kinds of jobs taken into account in a survey, and the statistical methods utilized for evaluation of raw wage data shall be the same for all agencies. Regulations prescribed by the committee shall be designed to accomplish the basic objectives of equal pay for equal work for wage board employees in the same wage area, recruitment and retention of well-qualified employees at rates of pay and under working conditions which are comparable to private enterprise in the wage area, and recognition of particular skills or job requirements in Federal positions which are not present in local private enterprise.

(2) Establishes area wage boards in each

wage area, composed of a representative of each Federal agency in the area having a significant number of wage board employees plus one representative of an employee organization. The area wage board will have absolute responsibility, with the technical staff assistance of a Federal agency within the area designated by the Federal Wage Board Committee, to survey rates in private enterprise, analyze the results of the survey, determine the rates, and issue rate schedules for all employees within the area.

(3) Establishes a Federal Wage Board Council, to serve in an advisory capacity to the Federal Wage Board Committee and the area wage boards as well as to the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service of the Congress. The Council shall be appointed by the President and shall consist of three representatives of wage board employees, three of the general public, and a Commissioner of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, who shall serve as Chairman. The Council shall have an Executive Director and such other employees as are found to be necessary in order to carry out its duties and responsibilities.

The Federal Wage Board Committee shall be the central authority to issue uniform regulations applicable to all wage board employees in all agencies of the Government. At the same time, the maintenance of an area wage board system in order to retain the significant value of a local prevailing rate system will be retained and improved. Agencies which now follow the lead of the Army-Air Force Wage Board of some other "lead agency" concept in establishing rates for their own employees will instead participate actively on each wage board, along with an employee representative, to gather and evaluate data and issue wage schedules for employees in each agency in the area. Variations of rates within an area for the same job will necessarily come to an end.

The participation of an employee representative will go far to meet Government need as a modern employer. The Federal Wage Board Committee, with central authority to administer the system, will include a representative of an employee organization who shall be an active participant and voting member of the Committee. On each area wage board, a representative of the employee organization having recognition and representing the largest number of wage board employees in the wage board area will be an active participant. The Federal Wage Board Council will serve in an advisory capacity but at the same time will have an advisory staff operation in order to fulfill its functions as an advisory body both to the executive branch and to the Congress.

The necessity for going beyond the geographic limits of a particular area in order to compare rates with similar jobs in private enterprise is resolved by permitting the Federal Wage Board Committee in such circumstances to determine rates for particular occupations in the Federal establishment when the area wage board is unable to identify a sufficient number or kind of positions in private enterprise in the locality for a satisfactory comparison. The Committee, with a broad view of all wage board employment, will be in a proper position to apply suitable rates.

THE ADMINISTRATION POSITION

The problems of the wage board systems have existed for many years. For some years, cooperative efforts between various agencies and the Civil Service Commisison to resolve basic policy differences were conducted. In November 1965, President Johnson instructed the heads of certain agencies and the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission to coordinate wage board policy. A special committee to work toward the goal was established. Twenty-three months have passed.

In public hearings before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, Chairman John W. Macy, Jr., of the Civil Service Commission, and representatives of the American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations were asked specifically what progress has been made. Neither Chairman Macy nor the representatives of the AFL-CIO were willing to discuss concrete achievements. No evidence, either in public hearings or in executive discussions with representatives of the Civil Service Commission, has been brought to the committee's attention indicating that a solution of an administrative nature is near.

The committee believes that it is time for Congress to exercise its legislative responsibility toward these 700,000 employees all over the United States under wage board pay systems. The law governing the pay of employees under wage board systems at the present time consists of a single sentence in section 5341 of title 5, United States Code (Public Law 89–554; derived from the Classification Act of 1949, Public Law 81–429). The section reads as follows:

"The pay of employees excepted from Chapter 51 of this title by section 5102(c) (7) of this title shall be fixed and adjusted from time to time as nearly as is consistent with the public interest in accordance with prevailing rates."

The committee believes that it is consistent with the public interest to establish by law a fair and equitable pay system for employees in recognized trades and crafts. The present wage board systems have grown over a period of many years and have developed such distinctive characteristics that coordination of them and establishment of basic Government-wide policies without legislative direction would be most difficult.

The committee believes that the 23 months of work which the Civil Service Commission and other Federal agencies have contributed to the establishment of uniform system of wage board pay may prove particularly useful to the Federal Wage Board Committee and area wage boards. It certainly has not been wasted effort. Those members of the Federal Wage Board Committee recommended in this legislation are the Federal officials now responsible for the administration of the largest individual agency wage board systems. There should be no difficulty in transposing the affirmative accomplishments of their efforts to the new wage board system.

Congress has a direct and continuing responsibility to wage board employees to insure that the pay and working conditions are fair and reasonable and consistent with private employment practices in the area. There is not adequate justification for the present system to continue or to be modified by agency action without specific authority and guidelines.

In his testimony before the committee, Chairman Macy also objected to the following specific provisions of the legislation:

(1) The distribution of authority among the Federal Wage Board Committee, the area wage boards, and the Federal Wage Board Council was not clearly defined.

(2) The authority of the area wage boards to establish rates of pay for employing agencies without actual budgetary and administrative responsibility invaded the prerogatives of the individual agencies.

(3) The effective date of pay adjustments for employees subject to wage board schedules was to be 30 days following the date a survey was ordered to be made. This did not allow sufficient time for the completion of a survey and the issuing of wage schedules.

The committee has amended the bill to meet specifically the Commission's objections.

The division of authority between the Federal Wage Board Committee and the area wage boards has been spelled out. The Committee shall prescribe uniform regulations for the general administration of the wage board system on a nationwide basis, shall establish wage areas for the determination of prevailing rates, and shall set rates in cases when an area wage board determines that there is an insufficient number or kinds of comparable positions or activities in private enterprise to determine prevailing rates for one or more Federal positions or activities.

The area wage boards are vested with the specific authority to survey rates and, with the technical assistance of a Federal agency in the area designated by the Committee, to survey and analyze data, determine prevailing rates, and to issue wage schedules for all employees in the area. The schedules shall be forwarded to the employing agencies and the employing agencies shall take whatever administrative action is necessary to establish such rates of pay.

The effective date of such wage adjustments shall be not later than the 44th day, excluding Saturdays and Sundays, following the date the survey was ordered to be made. This is in accordance with the present wage board effective-date system.

THE POSITION OF ORGANIZED LABOR

Labor organizations representing Federal blue-collar employees are divided in their positions toward the enactment of S. 2303.

The American Federation of Government Employees, which according to 1966 membership figures supplied by the Civil Service Commission represents more than 72,000 wage board employees by exclusive recognition, strongly favors enactment of this legislation. Its national president and regional officers appeared before the committee on two occasions presenting valuable testimony and urging enactment of this legislation. The AFGE is affiliated with the American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Representatives of the AFL–CIO itself appeared before the committee in opposition to enactment of this legislation. Principal affiliates of the AFL–CIO opposed to enactment are the Metal Trade Council, which represents 69,000 blue-collar Federal employees, and the International Association of Machinists which represents 23,206 wage board employees. The National Association of Government Employees, representing 15,000 employees, generally supported legislative action by the committee.

Mr. Andrew J. Biemiller, legislative director of the AFL–CIO, opposed enactment of S. 2303 at this time because:

(1) Negotiations between Federal agencies and labor organizations now in progress should be completed; and

(2) There was no employee representation provided in this legislation as introduced.

The committee's purpose in unanimously recommending legislation at this time has been explained. Further delay or continued reliance on cooperative efforts of executive agencies is unnecessary, undesirable, and an abrogation of congressional responsibility to these 700,000 employees.

The bill as introduced has been amended to provide specifically for labor representation on the Federal Wage Board Committee, each area wage board, and the Federal Wage Board Council to insure that the views and interests of blue-collar Federal employees will be represented.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Public hearings were held before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service for 4 days. In addition, the committee asked the Department of Defense, the General Services Administration, the Department of Labor, and the Veterans' Administration to report on the legislation. Agency reports, except for the Department of Defense (which did not submit a report), are included in this committee report.

RELIEF FOR OCCUPANTS OF CERTAIN UNPATENTED MINING CLAIMS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2121) to extend the provisions of the act of October 23, 1962, relating to relief for occupants of certain unpatented mining claims which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to provide relief for residential occupants of unpatented mining claims upon which valuable improvements have been placed, and for other purposes", approved October 23, 1962 (30 U.S.C. 701), is amended by striking out "five years from the date of this Act" and inserting in lieu thereof "the period ending June 30, 1971".

Sec. 2. Section 6(b) of such Act of October 23, 1962 (30 U.S.C. 706(b)), is amended by striking out "five years from the date of its enactment" and inserting in lieu thereof "the period ending June 30, 1971".

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, S. 2121 is a very simple bill. It extends the provisions of the act of October 23, 1962, relating to the relief for occupants of certain unpatented mining claims, to June 30, 1971.

If we do not act now, Mr. President, the act will expire this month. The House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has reported an identical bill, and I understand the House hopes to consider this legislation next week.

Failure to extend the act will prevent a large number of persons who in good faith have spent considerable sums on improvements on western mining claims, where they have made their principal homes, from seeking relief under its provisions.

The act of October 23, 1962, provides that if an unpatented mining claim is determined to be invalid, the Secretary of the Interior may convey to a qualified applicant title to not more than 5 acres of the claim. In order to qualify an applicant must have been the owner of valuable improvements thereon as of the date of the act. The improvements must have constituted a principal place of residence, which he and his predecessors in interest, were in possession of for not less than 7 years prior to July 23, 1962. Similar provisions apply to a qualified applicant who voluntarily relinquished, to the United States, his rights to an unpatented claim. In both cases, the applicant, under the present provisions of the act, must apply before October 23, 1967. The bill which we now consider would extend this time to June 30, 1971.

The Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, on reporting the bill, amended it to conform to an amendment made by the House committee. The original bills, in both the Senate and House, would have extended the act to 1 year after the date on which the Public Land Law Review Commission submits its final report to the President and the Congress. The amendment changes the termination date to June 30, 1971.

Mr. President, it has been traditional in the Western States that miners built homes and lived on their mining claims. Even though the claims were valid mineral producers, they were often worked out, and the claimants continued to live upon them, minus a patent. Many times such claims were purchased in good faith as a place of residence by individuals who did not understand the restrictions on the use of unpatented claims.

Under the provisions of S. 2121, the land would not be given the qualified applicant. It would be conveyed only upon payment of the fair market value, less the value of the improvements. The Secretary need not grant fee title, but could grant a lesser interest.

Mr. President, the administration favors the extension of this program, and I believe it is only fair to a large number of our western citizens who for various reasons have not applied to vote the extension to June 30, 1971.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 593), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

Purpose of the bill is to extend the act of October 23, 1962 (30 U.S.C. 701), which otherwise would expire October 23, this year, to June 30, 1971.

AMENDMENT

The amendment to the bill changes the expiration date of the act from the proposed "on or before 1 year after the date on which the Public Land Law Review Commission submits its final report to the President and to the Congress," to June 30, 1971.

The committee believed this would provide a more definite termination date for the act.

NEED

Extension of the act of October 23, 1962, would permit a group of individuals, who for various reasons have not applied, to seek relief under its provisions and would also cover invalidations and relinquishments of mining claims occurring between October 23, 1967, and June 30, 1971. The act presently provides that if an unpatented mining claim is determined to be invalid, and the determination is made between October 23, 1962, and October 23, 1967, the Secretary may convey to a qualified applicant title to not more than 5 acres of the claim. In order to be qualified an applicant must have been the owner of valuable improvements on the mining claim on October 23, 1962, and the improvements must have been a principal place of residence for him and his predecessors in interest for not less than 7 years before July 23, 1962. Under the present act, the applicant must also apply before October 23, 1967.

This bill, as amended, would simply extend the life of the act to June 30, 1971, and would not alter or change any of its other provisions.

Since the early days of the West, miners have historically made homes on their claims. Many claims, valid when first occupied, were worked out or for other reasons were not qualified for patent, but their possessors continued to live upon them. Many of these claims were purchased in good faith as places of residence by persons who believed they obtained legal title to the property. Several thousand unpatented mining claims, it is estimated, are being used in the Western States as residential sites.

Under the act, the land is not given to the applicant, but conveyed only for the fair market value, less the value of improvements placed on the land. The Secretary of the Interior need not grant fee title, but may grant any lesser interest.

LEGISLATIVE INTENT

In extending this act, it is not the intent of the committee to create a newly vested right, but only to authorize a continued processing of applications until June 30, 1971, based on property improved as of October 23, 1962, and the other criteria of the act.

COST

No additional budgetary expenditures will be required through the enactment of S. 2121.

INCREASE IN NUMBER OF ELECTRIC TYPEWRITERS

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 516) to amend the joint resolution of March 25, 1953, to increase the number of electric typewriters which may be furnished to Members by the Clerk of the House was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 594), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Pursuant to section 2 of the joint resolution of March 25, 1953, as amended (2 U.S.C. 112a–1), a Member of the House of Representatives is authorized to be furnished, upon request to the Clerk of the House and without charge against his equipment allowance, with not to exceed four electric typewriters (one of which may be automatic) for his official use. If the population of his constituency is estimated by the Bureau of the Budget to be 500,000 or more, he may be furnished under the same conditions with not to exceed five electric typewriters.

House Joint Resolution 516 would amend section 2 referred to above by increasing a Member's electric-typewriter allotment from four to five, or if the population of his district is 500,000 or more, from five to six.

COPIES OF CERTAIN HEARINGS ON SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 46) to provide for the printing of additional copies of certain hearings of the Special Committee on Aging was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. Con. Res. 46

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Special Committee on Aging five thousand five hundred additional copies each of parts 1 and 2 of its hearings of the Ninetieth Congress, first session, entitled "Retirement and the Individual".

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 595), explaining the purposes of the Senate concurrent resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 46 would authorize the printing for the use of the Senate Special Committee on Aging of 5,500 additional copies each of parts 1 and 2 of its hearings of the 90th Congress, first session, entitled "Retirement and the Individual."

The printing-cost estimate, supplied by the Public Printer, is as follows:

Printing-cost estimate

PART 1

5,500 additional copies, at $532.75 per thousand	$2,930.13

PART 2

5,500 additional copies, at $367.20 per thousand	2,019.60
Total estimated cost, S. Con. Res. 46	4,949.73

"COSTS AND DELIVERY OF HEALTH SERVICES TO OLDER AMERICANS"

The resolution (S. Res. 174) to print additional copies of hearings on the "Costs and Delivery of Health Services to Older Americans" was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 174

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Special Committee on Aging two thousand additional copies of its hearings of the Ninetieth Congress, first session, entitled "Costs and Delivery of Health Services to Older Americans".

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 596), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 174 would authorize the printing for the use of the Special Committee on Aging of 2,000 additional copies of its hearings of the 90th Congress, first session, entitled "Costs and Delivery of Health Services to Older Americans."

The printing-cost estimate, supplied by the Public Printer, is as follows:

Printing-cost estimate

2,000 additional copies, at $600 per thousand	$1,200

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

The resolution (S. Res. 170) to provide additional funds for the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 170

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is hereby authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Ninetieth Congress, $10,000 in addition to the amount, and for the same purpose, specified in section 134(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act approved August 2, 1946.

EUGENE SIDNEY MARKOVITZ

The bill (S. 948) for the relief of Seaman Eugene Sidney Markovitz, U.S. Navy was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 948

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Seaman Eugene Sidney Markovitz the sum of $3,067.23 representing compensation for the loss of his household goods and personal effects which were destroyed by fire while stored at the Guardian Van and Storage Company, San Diego, California, following the expiration of his authorized period of temporary storage at Government expense, but during a period the said Seaman Eugene Sidney Markovitz was entitled to additional storage at Government expense, although he was unable to make arrangements for such storage because of the frequent movements in connection with his military service: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 597), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to direct and authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated to Seaman Eugene Sidney Markovitz, U.S. Navy, the sum of $3,067.63, representing compensation for the loss of his household goods and personal effects which were destroyed by fire while stored at the Guardian Van & Storage Co., San Diego, Calif., following the expiration of his authorized period of temporary storage at Government expense.

STATEMENT

A similar bill, S. 2163 of the 89th Congress, was acted on favorably by the committee and the Senate in the 89th Congress. The facts as revealed by Report No. 1132 on S. 2163 of the 89th Congress are as follows:

"The Department of the Navy has no objection to enactment of the bill in its amended form.

"The records of the Department of the Navy disclose that Interior Communications Electrician First Class Markovitz first placed his household goods in permanent storage at Government expense at the Guardian Van & Storage Co., San Diego, Calif., incident to his orders of July 5, 1960, which directed him to report aboard the U.S.S. *Dutton* (TAGS-22) for duty. These orders were later modified to direct Markovitz to report aboard the U.S.S. *Mullinix* (DD-944) for duty. He reported aboard the *Mullinix* on November 5, 1960. As a result of his modified orders Markovitz desired to ship his household goods to Norfolk, Va. His household goods were transferred from permanent storage to temporary storage at the Guardian Van & Storage warehouse pending shipment at Government expense. The goods remained in temporary storage at the request of Markovitz for the maximum limit of 6 months. On April 3, 1961, Markovitz was notified that his temporary storage would terminate on May 4, 1961. Markovitz acknowledged the notice on April 17, 1961, and inquired where to make payment for storage at his own expense. After May 4, 1961, Markovitz had no entitlement to additional storage at Government expense. Regulations provide that a member may make one election for disposition of his household goods under each set of orders. In this case, Markovitz had elected permanent storage under the orders to the U.S.S. *Dutton* and changed this to temporary storage pending shipment under the orders to the U.S.S. *Mullinix*. He, therefore, was not entitled to make a new election for further storage at Government expense at the time the 6 months' temporary storage terminated, since he had not received orders to a new duty station. On June 20, 1961, his household goods were destroyed by a fire at the Guardian Van & Storage Co. warehouse. Markovitz submitted his claim for $4,452.13 in June 1961, and it was denied on March 6, 1962.

"The claim was denied on the basis that the loss occurred while the goods were stored at Markovitz' own expense after the expiration of his authorized 6 months' temporary storage at Government expense. Although the Navy has no authority to pay a claim for loss of household effects which are stored at the owners' expense, for the purpose of this report the Markovitz claim had been adjudicated under procedures that would have been applicable had the Navy Department had cognizance over the claim; and the extent of the loss has been found to be $3,361.63. Markovitz has subsequently received $294 of the adjudicated claim from the Guardian Van & Storage Co.

"In view of the facts in this case, the committee is of the opinion that this legislation is meritorious and recommends that the bill, as amended, be favorably considered."

The committee, after a review of the foregoing, adheres to its former recommendation, and recommends that the bill, S. 948, be considered favorably.

DENNIS W. RADTKE

The bill (S. 2178) for the relief of Dennis W. Radtke was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2178

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Dennis W. Radtke, N90 W17051 Appleton Avenue, Menomonee Falls, Wisconsin, the sum of $100, in full settlement of his claim against the United States for refund of that amount required to be paid by him to the United States on account of his cashing of stolen Canadian money order numbered B-73,156,990, on December 10, 1964, while serving as an employee of the United States Post Office Department. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 598), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to pay to Dennis W. Radtke, N-90 W-17051 Appleton Avenue, Menomonee Falls, Wis., the sum of $100, in full settlement of his claim against the United States for refund of that amount required to be paid by him to the United States on account of his cashing of stolen Canadian money order numbered B-73,156,990, on December 1, 1964, while serving as an employee of the U.S. Post Office Department.

STATEMENT

The Post Office Department has no objection to the enactment of this legislation. The report of the General Counsel of the Post Office Department to the committee states the following:

"Records in the Department show that on December 10, 1964, a Canadian postal money order numbered B–73,156,990 in the amount of $100 was presented to Mr. Radtke for cashing at his window in the Menomonee Falls, Wis., post office. Following cashing procedures established by Postal Manual, part 171.3, Mr. Radtke required the patron to show proper identification. He also examined a presumably current list (dated Nov. 5, 1964) of stolen Canadian money order forms attached to a clipboard near his window to determine whether or not the money order presented was stolen. The money order presented was not on the list, and he therefore cashed it.

"The postmaster at Menomonee Falls verified that the current list (dated Dec. 3, 1964), which showed the money order to be stolen, was detached from his copy of the Postal Bulletin and given to a window clerk to be attached to the clipboard. It was not attached, however, and it could not be determined which window clerk had failed to attach it, and the list could not subsequently be found. On the basis of these facts the postal inspector held Mr. Radtke liable for the loss on the ground that it was his responsibility to make certain that the current list was posted at his window.

"Further investigation, however, disclosed that the list of stolen Canadian money orders is not revised on a regular schedule, but only when there is a change to be made. Accordingly, Mr. Radtke could not be considered to be on notice that the list he consulted was outdated. We believe that Mr. Radtke acted in a prudent manner and took every precaution under the circumstances.

"The Department sought reimbursement for Mr. Radtke through administrative channels in separate letters to the General Accounting Office relying on the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 82a–1 and 39 U.S.C. 2401, respectively. The General Accounting Office held, in letters dated February 2 and May 9, 1967, that the above provisions of the United States Code provide no authority to reimburse Mr. Radtke administratively. In these circumstances, and in the absence of any other statutory authority for this purpose, the Department has no objection to the enactment of private relief legislation for Mr. Radtke such as that proposed in S. 2178."

After study of the foregoing, the committee concurs in the recommendations of the Post Office Department and recommends that the bill, S. 2178, be considered favorably.

HOMER T. WILLIAMSON, SR.

The bill (S. 2200) for the relief of Homer T. Williamson, Sr., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2200

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Homer T. Williamson, Senior, of Warner Robins, Georgia, is hereby relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States of the sum of $490, representing overpayments of salary received by him as a civilian employee of the Department of the Air Force at Warner Robins Air Force Base, Georgia, for the period from September 3, 1963, through April 12, 1965, as the result of administrative error in adjusting the salary of the said Homer T. Williamson, Senior, upon completion of the two-year period during which he was entitled to retain the rate of pay he was receiving prior to a demotion due to a reduction in force. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amounts for which liability is relieved by this Act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Homer T. Williamson, Senior, the sum of any amounts received or withheld from him on account of the overpayments referred to in the first section of this Act. No part of any amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 599), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to relieve Homer T. Williamson, Sr., of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of $409 representing an overpayment of salary received as an employee of the Department of the Air Force at Robins Air Force Base, Ga., from September 3, 1963, through April 12, 1965.

STATEMENT

The Department of the Air Force has advised the committee that it has no objection to the enactment of the bill.

In its report on the bill, the Department of the Air Force sets forth the facts as follows:

"Effective September 3, 1961, Mr. Williamson's pay grade was changed from GS–5 to GS–4. He was entitled to, and granted salary retention under section 5337 of title 5, United States Code. Under Air Force regulations in effect on the date of his change to the lower grade, the rate of pay he would have received in that grade, had he not been eligible for salary retention, was GS–4, step g. GS–4, step g, was the maximum scheduled step rate of the grade at the time.

"At the expiration of the salary retention period, September 3, 1963, Mr. Williamson was erroneously placed in GS–4, step 10, GS–4, step g, (now step 7) plus any step increases he would have earned prior to the end of the salary retention period, was the rate of pay he should have received at the expiration of the salary retention period.

"A factor which may have contributed to the error in establishing Mr. Williamson's rate of pay was the change in the number of scheduled step rates of the compensation schedule upon enactment of the Federal Employees Salary Reform Act of 1962 (Public Law 87–793). That act eliminated longevity step increases and included them in the regular rate range.

"The error was discovered in a GAO audit in 1965. Corrective action was taken on all personnel actions. Mr. Williamson was informed of the overpayment and of his indebtedness to the Government. He repaid the indebtedness at the rate of $10 per pay period and had repaid in full as of April 16, 1967. There is no evidence of lack of good faith on the part of Mr. Williamson or administrative officials.

"Relief was granted by the Congress in a precedent case. Private Law 90–44, 'For the relief of Charles H. Thurston.' The Thurston case involves the identical type of administrative error as that involved in the Williamson case. Overpayments to both employees were questioned by GAO auditors at the same time on the same GAO Inquiry No. 5Q 0188, dated May 27, 1965.

"Based upon a review of the circumstances of the case and the precedent case, the Department of the Air Force interposes no objection to enactment of the bill."

The committee believes that the bill is meritorious and recommends it favorably.

OMER PENNER

The bill (H.R. 1653) for the relief of Omer Penner was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 600), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to direct the payment out of the war claims fund the amount certified by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission as the amount Omer Penner, of San Francisco, Calif., would have been entitled to as detention benefits under section 5 (a) through (e) of the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended by the War Claims Act Amendments of 1954, had a timely application been filed.

STATEMENT

The facts of the case as contained in House Report No. 410 are as follows:

"The Foreign Claims Settlement Commission in its report to the committee indicated that it took no position concerning the bill.

"The information submitted to the committee in connection with the bill indicates that Mr. Omer Penner was captured on December 23, 1941, by the Japanese on Wake Island. He had arrived on the island in October of that year as a civilian employee of a contractor—Pacific Naval Air Bases. He therefore was interned as a civilian and was not a military prisoner of war. In January of 1942, he was taken to China. He spent 18 months there in two camps—Woo Sung and King Wan. In August of 1943, he was transported to Osaka, Japan, where he was interned until about May 1945. At that time he was moved to Honsu Island, where he remained until the war's end. At that time he was taken to Yokohama, and from that port returned to San Francisco.

"In attempting to assert his claim for benefits based upon his detention during the war, Mr. Penner attempted to file a claim under the original provisions of the War Claims Act of 1948. He filed this claim on February 28, 1951, but the claim was denied since the act at that time excluded employees of contractors from receiving benefits. As is noted in the report of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, Public Law 744 of the 83rd Congress, known as the War Claims Amendments of 1954, amended the act so as to include certain classes of civilian American citizens so as to make them eligible for detention benefits. Although Mr. Penner appears to have been within the group eligible under the amendment, he did not become aware of the change in the law. In this connection, the committee observes that Mr. Penner by reason of the prior rejection of his claim was under the impression that he was not eligible for any benefits. When at length he learned of the enactment of the amendments he inquired concerning his eligibility under the amendment. However, his inquiry was made on August 1, 1956, and at that time he was advised that the time limitations under the act barred Commission consideration of his claim.

"While the Commission attempted to advise all potential claimants of the change in the act and further attempted to send notice of the act's provisions and application forms to potential claimants who were known to the Commission, Mr. Penner due to a change of address apparently received no notice of the amendment to the original act. The committee is advised that at the time in question, Mr. Penner was working on various construction jobs in other parts of the country in the time between the enactment of Public Law 744 in 1954 and his inquiry in 1956. The committee feels that Mr. Penner was diligent in attempting to assert his rights. It is entirely possible that the initial rejection of his attempt to file a claim discouraged his further inquiry and it was not until he became aware of the amendment that he had any actual notice of the fact that he might have been eligible to assert a claim. Further, it must be considered that this bill merely permits the filing of a claim. His eligibility and the amount of benefits to which he is entitled will have to be determined by the Commission in accordance with applicable law. Based on the circumstances of this case, it is recommended that the bill, as amended, be considered favorably.

In agreement with the views of the House, the committee recommends favorable enactment.

FRANK I. MELLIN, JR.

The bill (H.R. 1674) for the relief of Frank I. Mellin, Jr., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 601), explaining the purpose of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to authorize an addition of 102 hours of annual leave to the leave account of Frank I. Mellin, Jr., of West Orange, N.J., to compensate him for the loss of an equivalent amount of leave in the period from January 1, 1962, through December 31, 1964, as an employee of the U.S. Post Office in Orange, N.J., due to the fact that he was not credited with leave properly due him in that period.

Section 2 of the bill makes it clear that section 203(c) of the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951, as amended, concerning limitations on leave shall not apply to the 102 hours which would be added in this manner and will not affect the use of accumulation of other annual leave. Section 2 further makes it clear that the leave added under the authority of the provisions of the bill shall not be settled by means of a cash payment in the event of separation or death.

STATEMENT

The facts of the case as contained in House Report 412 are as follows:

"The report of the Post Office Department to the committee on the bill states that it recommends the enactment of the bill with the correction as to the amount of leave which is provided by the committee amendment.

"Mr. Frank I. Mellin, Jr. was employed by the Post Office Department on February 21, 1961, and at the time of his employment was placed in annual leave category 4. Because of his previous military service, at that time he should have been placed in leave category 6; however, this error did not come to light until January of 1965 at the time Mr. Mellin was appointed as a career carrier (substitute). It was in connection with his transfer to career carrier (substitute) from his previous classification as a temporary indefinite carrier (substitute) that the personnel section of the Post Office found that Mr. Mellin was not receiving the proper amount of leave credit. As a result of this error and the 30-day ceiling on the accumulated annual leave (5 U.S.C. 6304), Mr. Mellin had been required to forfeit 38 hours in the calendar year 1962, 56 hours in 1963, and 8 hours in 1964. The total of those forfeitures came to 102 hours of leave which under applicable law could not be credited at the time the error was discovered because of the ceiling on accumulated annual leave.

"It is clear to this committee that the particular circumstances of this case justify legislative relief. Had the leave been correctly credited at the time that it was earned, Mr. Mellin would have been in a position to use that leave as other employees were able to do who were properly credited with their leave. However, when the error was recognized, there was no way in which he could either take the leave or have it credited to his account. The Post Office Department recognizes the equities in this case and states its reasons for recommending the legislation as follows:

" 'There was clear administrative error in this case, and the employee was without fault in the matter. While we believe there is a definite need for general legislation granting agencies authority to correct administrative errors in cases of this kind, we also feel that application of the present law to the particular circumstances of Mr. Mellin's case has resulted in an inequity which can only be corrected by legislative action along the lines provided for in H.R. 1674.

" 'We recommend that the bill be corrected to indicate the proper amount of leave forfeited and, as corrected, receive favorable consideration.'

"In view of the recommendations of the Department and the particular facts of this case, it is recommended that the bill, amended to provide for a credit of 102 hours, be considered favorably."

In agreement with the views of the House, the committee recommends favorable enactment.

JOHN J. McGRATH

The bill (H.R. 2477) for the relief of John J. McGrath was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 602), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to pay John J. McGrath, of Albany, Ga., $879 to reimburse him for the amount he was required to pay the United States for the loss of registered mail stolen on November 13, 1964, from the mailtruck operated by him as an employee of the Post Office Department.

STATEMENT

The facts of the case, as contained in House Report No. 499, are as follows:

"The bill, H.R. 2477, was the subject of a subcommittee hearing on May 11, 1967. The testimony at that hearing established that on November 13, 1964, John J. McGrath was working as a letter carrier in the post office at Albany, Ga. The schedule on that date called for a collection tour of five contract stations. He was driving a truck which was an old box-shaped van which had the left door strapped open to keep it from sliding back and forth and in such a position that it could not be locked. When he reached the last substation, Carrier McGrath placed the satchel containing registered mail on a shelf on the back of the dashboard of his truck. On his first trip out of the substation with a heavy load of parcels, he noticed that the satchel was missing. He immediately reported the theft to the Post Office Department. The report of the Post Office Department to the committee on the bill indicates that a subsequent investigation of the accident by Post Office authorities resulted in a determination that Mr. McGrath was negligent in leaving the satchel in an unlocked, unattended truck while making his collections. It is on this ground that the Post Office Department has questioned relief in this instance.

"It was because of the questions raised by the Post Office Department that a hearing was conducted on this bill for the purpose of further developing the facts of the case. Testimony at that hearing indicated that the burden placed on the carrier in making the collections from the contract stations was such that the additional requirement of carrying the satchel of registered mail back and forth was a difficult and awkward requirement. Further, it was indicated that the carriers in that particular post office had followed the practice of placing the registered mail satchel on the shelf in back of the dashboard as was done in this case. Further it appears that packages had accumulated throughout the day from the various contract stations and fell to Mr. McGrath to collect these packages and place them in his truck.

"The committee feels that the fact that the truck could not be locked under these circumstances should be taken as a mitigating circumstance sufficient to justify legislative relief in this instance. Accordingly, it is recommended that the bill be considered favorably."

After a review of the facts of this case the committee concurs in the conclusions reached by the House committee and accordingly recommends that favorable consideration be given H.R. 2477, without amendment.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H.R. 3498) for the relief of Daniel M. Dew & Sons, Inc., and Dewey Campbell was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over, Mr. President.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

FRED W. KOLB, JR.

The bill (H.R. 6189) for the relief of Fred W. Kolb, Jr., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 604), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to relieve Fred W. Kolb, Jr., of San Francisco, Calif., of that portion of the indebtedness based on an erroneous payment of compensation paid him by the Army in 1960 which is equal to the amount of additional Federal income tax paid by him for that year as the result of having the erroneous compensation included in his income for that taxable year.

STATEMENT

The facts of the case as contained in House Report No. 424 are as follows:

"The Department of the Army in its report to the committee on the bill has indicated that it has no objection to the bill provided it contains language making it clear that any amounts repaid upon the reduced amount of the indebtedness are not to be deductible for Federal income tax purposes.

"Fred W. Kolb, Jr., retired from the Army as a chief warrant officer (W–4) on October 31, 1957, and began drawing retired pay for over 22 years of service. Following the enactment of Public Law 86–324 (73 Stat. 596 (1959)) the Army paid Mr. Kolb $3,852 in readjustment pay on January 20, 1960. Payment was improper because Mr. Kolb was immediately eligible for retired pay when he retired from the Army and also because he had not been involuntarily separated. As a result of the overpayment he was taxed an additional $1,198.44 for 1960. This amount has been verified by the Internal Revenue Service, after determination of the overpayment in 1962 and collection action by the Department of the Army.

"Mr. Kolb on April 14, 1964, filed an amendment to his 1960 tax return seeking a refund of the additional tax for 1960 but the claim was denied. No administrative means have been available to allow a credit for any taxable year for any part of the additional $1,198.44 paid for 1960 because Mr. Kolb as of May 1, 1966, has repaid only $2,015.42 of the $3,852.00 received in readjustment pay. Section 1341(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (26 U.S.C. 1341(a)) requires repayment of more than $3,000 in a taxable year to authorize such a credit. Mr. Kolb is repaying his indebtedness by monthly deductions of $59.58 from his retired pay and is entitled only to a deduction for the amount of the indebtedness repaid during a taxable year if he elects to itemize deductions on his return.

"The Treasury Department advises that Mr. Kolb has not received any tax savings as a result of deductions taken from year to year in repaying the indebtedness, but Mr. Kolb has not completely refunded the overpayment and the possibility of a double tax benefit in 1966 or subsequent years is still present, through both the reduction in the liability of Mr. Kolb called for by this bill and his claiming deductions in the year of repayment. The Army commented that conceivably through a refund claim for earlier years, Mr. Kolb might also still claim deductions for amounts repaid in earlier years. The committee agrees that it is appropriate that a double tax benefit not be permitted.

"The bill introduced in the 90th Congress as H.R. 6189 contains the following language:

" 'No amount repaid by Mr. Kolb in satisfaction of the indebtedness to the United States described in the proceeding sentence shall be allowed as a deduction for purposes of the Federal income tax.'

"The report submitted to the committee on a similar bill in the 89th Congress suggested language which has a similar purpose. The committee has, therefore, determined that the language substantially meets the purposes outlined in the Army report. The Army stated that a possible refund claim might be asserted which would result in a double tax benefit should the relief provided in this bill be extended to Mr. Kolb. The committee agrees that this point should be made clear, however, normally a claim for refund must be made within a 3-year period and it appears that more than 3 years have now passed since the tax was paid on the 1960 income.

"In view of the position of the Department of the Army that it has no objection to the bill and the circumstances of this case, the committee recommends that relief be extended to Mr. Kolb as provided in the bill, which merely relieves him of liability for the amount of additional Federal income tax due to the erroneous payment of compensation. It is recommended that the bill be considered favorably.

"The committee has been advised that an attorney has rendered services in connection with this matter and, accordingly, the bill carries the customary attorney's fee proviso."

In agreement with the views of the House, the committee recommends favorable enactment.

JESSE W. STUTTS, JR.

The bill (H.R. 6663) for the relief of Jesse W. Stutts, Jr., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 605), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to relieve Jesse W. Stutts, Jr., of liability to pay $1,294.40, representing the aggregate amount of overpayment of compensation received by him during the period beginning April 8, 1963, and ending May 29, 1965, both dates inclusive, as an employee of the Department of the Army at Redstone Arsenal, Ala., due to an administrative error which occurred without fault on his part. The bill would also permit the refund of any amounts paid or withheld because of this particular liability.

STATEMENT

The facts of the case as contained in House Report 428 are as follows:

"The Department of the Army in its report to the committee on the bill has indicated that it has no objection to the bill, and the Comptroller General, while questioning individual relief, noted the 'complexities and confusion' involved in administering the laws giving rise to the problem and recommends general relief.

"Erroneous pay determinations were made in Mr. Jesse W. Stutts' case by Government personnel in attempting to apply the saved pay provisions of the Classification Act of 1949 as affected by the Postal Service and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1962. Apparently, the task of the Government personnel involved was complicated by the lack of timely regulations explaining the complex procedures involved.

"The difficulty in this case dates back to April 9, 1961, when a demotion from grade GS–13 to grade GS–12 became effective in Mr. Stutts' case. Having served continuously in a higher grade for 2 years at the time of demotion, he was eligible for and continued to receive the pay of the higher grade for 2 years (72 Stat. 830 (1958)) instead of the pay he would otherwise have received for step 6 of grade GS–12 until October 21, 1962, and thereafter for step 7, as added by the Salary Reform Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 841). Upon the expiration of Mr. Stutts' 2-year salary retention period on April 8, 1963, Army administrative personnel erroneously interpreted the provisions of the Salary Reform Act of 1962, which had increased from six to nine the number of scheduled step increases in grade GS–12, as authority to place Mr. Stutts in step 8, the next higher pay period of GS–12 above his saved rate, and as authority to advance him on September 22, 1963, to step 9. The Civil Service Commission specifically provided, however, in Federal Personnel Manual Letter No. 531–27, dated May 10, 1963, that the increase in the number of steps under the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962 did not authorize an increase above the rate established during the salary retention period. Under this interpretation Mr. Stutts should have been placed in step 7 of grade GS–12 instead of step 8 upon the expiration of his 2-year salary retention period and was not entitled to be advanced to step 9 on September 22, 1963. An audit in 1965 revealed that these errors had resulted in overpayments of $1,294.40 from April 8, 1963, through May 29, 1965.

"The Comptroller General in his report traced the history of the action taken in Mr. Stutts' case, and outlines the steps which should have been taken. The highest step in Grade GS–12 which could have been selected at the time of downgrading as a basis for the salary rate of Mr. Stutts at the expiration of the 2-year retention period was step 6. Following this, on October 21, 1962, he would have been entitled to be granted a constructive within-grade increase to step 7 under section 602(b)(10) of Public Law 87–793, and in April 1963 following the expiration of his saved pay period he would have been entitled to have his salary rate so fixed.

"Upon discovery of the errors the agency corrected or canceled all improper personnel actions subsequent to April 8, 1963. Such action resulted in changing the employee's salary rate from GS–12, step 8, $11,680 to GS–12, step 7, $11,365 per annum on April 8, 1963; from GS–12, step 9, $11,995 per annum, to GS–12, step 7, $11,365 per annum on September 22, 1963; and from GS–12, step 9, $12,620 and $13,090 (statutory increases), to GS–12, step 7, $11,960 and $12,380 per annum as of January 12 and July 12, 1964. On the basis thereof the agency determined that during the period from April 8, 1963, through May 29, 1965, Mr. Stutts had been overpaid in the gross amount of $1,294.40 and upon being so advised he agreed to make repayment and is doing so by means of payroll deductions of $10 per biweekly pay period.

"The committee finds that this is a proper case for legislative relief. In indicating that it had no objection to relief, the Department of the Army stated that its investigation indicated that Mr. Stutts had acted in good faith and did not suspect any irregularity until he was advised of the error in June of 1965. Further the Army report outlined the financial responsibilities of Mr. Stutts in addition to the liability imposed as the result of the Government's error. In this connection, the Army stated:

" 'The Department of the Army does not oppose a bill for private relief when a civilian employee has received in good faith and for services performed an erroneous payment made through administrative error. The overpayments in this case resulted from an erroneous interpretation of the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962, supra, and an oversight of administrative personnel in applying a Civil Service Commission interpretation of the act. There is nothing to indicate that Mr. Stutts did not receive the erroneous payments in good faith and he apparently had no reason to suspect any irregularity until notified of the overpayments by the deputy finance and accounting officer at Redstone Arsenal in June 1965. In a statement submitted to the Department of the Army on August 18, 1965, Mr. Stutts explained that his monthly expenditures exceed his net monthly income. His wife does not work and he is her sole financial support. Since discovery of the overpayments the United States is withholding approximately $30 each pay period to satisfy the indebtedness. In view of these equitable considerations, the Department of the Army has no objection to the bill.'

"In view of the facts outlined above and in the departmental reports, it is recommended that the bill, as amended, be considered favorably."

In agreement with the views of the House, the committee recommends favorable enactment.

MARILYN SHORETTE

The bill (H.R. 6666) for the relief of Marilyn Shorette was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H.R. 2757) for the relief of Comdr. Albert G. Berry, Jr., was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over, Mr. President.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

"SPRING GARDEN PLANTING WEEK"

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 85) to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the 7-day period comprising the first full week in October of each year as "Spring Garden Planting Week" was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S.J. Res. 85

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized and requested to issue annually a proclamation designating the seven-day period comprising the first full week in October of each year as "Spring Garden Planting Week," and inviting the governments of the States and communities and the people of the United States to join in the observance of such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The preamble was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF ACT OF JULY 4, 1966

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 8629) to amend the act of July 4, 1966 (Public Law 89–491), which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 2, after line 4, insert:

4. By deleting in section 2(b)(1) the word "Four" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "Six"; and by deleting in section 2(b)(2) the word "Four" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "Six".

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 609), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF AMENDMENT

The purpose of the amendment is to increase the Senate membership on the Commission from four members to six members, and to increase the House of Representatives membership on the Commission from four members to six members.

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation, as amended, is fourfold: First, it would add the Secretary of Commerce as an ex officio member of the Commission; second, it would extend the date on which the Commission shall report to the President by 1 year—from July 4, 1968, to July 4, 1969; third, it would authorize the appropriation of public funds to finance the work of the Commission; and lastly, it would increase the Senate members on the Commission from four to six, and the House members on the Commission from four to six.

STATEMENT

Public Law 89–491, approved July 4, 1966, established the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission to commemorate the American Revolution. The act required that the Commission submit a comprehensive report recommending to the President an overall program of coordinated commemorative activities on or before July 4, 1968. The congressional members of the Commission were appointed early in 1967, and include Senators John O. Pastore, of Rhode Island, Harry F. Byrd, Jr., of Virginia, Norris Cotton, of New Hampshire, and Edward W. Brooke, of Massachusetts; and Representatives Harold D. Donohue, of Massachusetts, Richard H. Poff, of Virginia, John P. Saylor, of Pennsylvania, and John O. March, of Virginia. The Presidential appointments of the 17 members from private life became effective on February 22, 1967. On that date the first meeting of the Commission was held in Washington, D.C.

At its first meeting the Commission recommended amendments to Public Law 89–491, which would extend the date on which the comprehensive report of the Commission would be due; provide for membership on the Commission for the Secretary of Commerce; and provide for statutory appropriation authorization for such sums as may be necessary for the Commission to carry out the purposes of the act. H.R. 8629 was introduced at the request of the Bureau of the Budget in order to effectuate the changes proposed by the Commission.

It appears that the Commission will consider the question of a major international exposition as part of the bicentennial celebrations. In view of the fact that the Department of Commerce has the major responsibility in the executive branch for fairs and expositions held in the United States, it seems appropriate that the Secretary of Commerce should be an ex officio member of the Commission. The committee is also persuaded that an extension to July 4, 1969, within which to submit its report to the President is warranted.

It was the opinion of many that in view of the great interest of all Americans in the Revolution bicentennial that the Commission should be privately financed. The statute enacted by Congress establishing the Commission specifically requires that it be financed by public donations only. However, in considering H.R. 8629, the committee believes that for the purpose of employing and retaining qualified personnel through the initial 2-year period of planning, coordinating, and report preparation, the assurance of sufficient funds to meet expenses is necessary and that public funds may appropriately be made available for financing the basic planning that the Commission has been directed to do. Therefore, the committee has proposed an amendment to H.R. 8629 to authorize an appropriation not to exceed $450,000 to cover the expenses of the administrative staff through fiscal year 1969 only. The authorization of $450,000, for the period ending June 30, 1969, is based on budget estimates of the Commission for salary and other service expenses which run approximately $225,000 annually. The authorization for appropriations is only through the period fiscal year 1969. The committee believes that Congress should later review the question of whether the Commission should depend on donated funds or Government appropriations to finance its further operations.

The committee believes that H.R. 8629, as amended, has a meritorious purpose and, accordingly, recommends its favorable consideration.

SOFIA DORR

The bill (S. 362) for the relief of Sofia Dorr was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 362

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Sofia Dorr shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 610), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to Sofia Dorr. The bill provides for an appropriate quota deduction and for the payment of the required visa fee.

DR. BRANDLA DON

The bill (S. 1395) for the relief of Dr. Brandla Don (nee Praschnik) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1395

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Brandla Don (nee Praschnik) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of September 29, 1960.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 611), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization.

DR. ORLANDO O. LOPEZ

The bill (S. 1556) for the relief of Dr. Orlando O. Lopez was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1556

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Orlando O. Lopez shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of July 16, 1962.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 612), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization.

BERTHA ITURRIOZ ARTECHE

The bill (S. 1865) for the relief of Bertha Iturrioz Arteche was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1865

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Bertha Iturrioz Arteche shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of October 31, 1960.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No 613), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization.

DR. JOSE ERNESTO GARCIA Y TOJAR

The bill (S. 1968) for the relief of Dr. Jose Ernesto Garcia y Tojar was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1968

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Jose Ernesto Garcia y Tojar shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of November 23, 1961.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 614), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization.

CARLOS FERNANDEZ

The bill (S. 1979) for the relief of Carlos Fernandez was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1979

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Carlos Fernandez shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of March 6, 1962.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 615), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization.

DR. ANACLETO C. FERNANDEZ

The bill (S. 2005) for the relief of Dr. Anacleto C. Fernandez was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2005

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Anacleto C. Fernandez shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of May 31, 1961.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 616), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization.

DR. ANTONIO M. TAGLE

The bill (S. 2071) for the relief of Dr. Antonio M. Tagle was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2071

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Antonio M. Tagle shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of August 28, 1961.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 617), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization.

DR. ALBERTO DE JONGH

The bill (S. 2078) for the relief of Dr. Alberto De Jongh was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2078

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Alberto De Jongh shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of June 12, 1961.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 618), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization.

JACQUELINE WHANG-PENG

The bill (S. 2081) for the relief of Jacqueline Whang-Peng was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2081

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Jacqueline Whang-Peng shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of April 1, 1957.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 619), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization.

DR. OCTAVIO SUAREZ-MURIAS

The bill (S. 2119) for the relief of Dr. Octavio Suarez-Murias was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2119

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Octavio Suarez-Murias shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of May 29, 1961.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 620), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization.

DR. ANGEL TREJO PADRON

The bill (S. 2139) for the relief of Dr. Angel Trejo Padron was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2139

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Angel Trejo Padron shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of May 6, 1962.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 621), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization.

DR. ROLANDO POZO Y JIMENEZ

The bill (S. 2167) for the relief of Dr. Rolando Pozo y Jimenez was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2167

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Rolando Pozo y Jimenez shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of June 24, 1959.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 622), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization.

DR. EDGAR REINALDO NUNEZ BAEZ

The bill (S. 2176) for the relief of Dr. Edgar Reinaldo Nunez Baez was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2176

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Edgar Reinaldo Nunez Baez shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of February 9, 1963.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 623), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization.

DR. RAFAEL DE LA PORTILLA LAVASTIDA

The bill (S. 2192) for the relief of Dr. Rafael de la Portilla Lavastida was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2192

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Rafael de la Portilla Lavastida shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of August 13, 1960.

MERCEDES DE TOFFOLI

The bill (H.R. 1572) for the relief of Mercedes De Toffoli was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 625), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to grant first preference status to the adopted daughter of U.S. citizens, thus enabling her to enjoy the preference of natural-born alien sons and daughters of citizens of the United States.

DR. ALFREDO F. MENDEZ

The bill (H.R. 7324) for the relief of Dr. Alfredo F. Mendez was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 626), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to Dr. Alfredo F. Mendez, doctor of medicine, as of November 5, 1960, thus enabling him to file a petition for naturalization.

JAN DROLOT

The bill (H.R. 8254) for the relief of Jan Drobot, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 627), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to exempt Jan Drobot from the provisions of section 313 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

DR. VIOLETA VORTEGA BROWN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 772) for the relief of Dr. Violeta Vortega Brown, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the word "of" where it appears the first time, strike out "the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the first year that such quota is available."; and insert "October 25, 1962."; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Violeta V. Ortega Brown shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of October 25, 1962.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 628), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization. The bill has been amended in accordance with established precedents.

YANG OK YOO (MARIA MARGURITA)

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1490) for the relief of Yang Ok Yoo (Maria Margurita), which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, section 204 (c), relating to the number of petitions which may be approved in behalf of orphans, shall be inapplicable in the case of a petition filed in behalf of Yang Ok Yoo (Maria Margurita) by Mr. and Mrs. Henry N. Votel, citizens of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 633), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to facilitate the entry into the United States in an immediate relative status of an orphan to be adopted by citizens of the United States, notwithstanding the fact that the prospective adoptive parents have previously had the maximum number of petitions approved. The bill has been amended in accordance with established precedents.

MISS AMALIA SERESLY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1808) for the relief of Miss Amalia Seresly, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of sections 203(a)(1) and 204 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Miss Amalia Seresly shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien unmarried daughter of Mr. Demosthenes Raptelis, a citizen of the United States: *Provided*, That no natural parent of the beneficiary, by virtue of such parentage, shall be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 632), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to enable the beneficiary to qualify for first preference status as the unmarried daughter of a citizen of the United States. The bill has been amended in accordance with established precedents.

SUSAN ELIZABETH (CHO) LONG

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1828) for the relief of Susan Elizabeth (Cho) Long, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, in line 8, after the word "Act" strike out the comma and "subject to all the conditions in that section relating to orphans"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Susan Elizabeth (Cho) Long may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in her behalf by Miss Joyce M. Long, a citizen of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the said Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 631), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to facilitate the entry into the United States in an immediate relative status of the adopted daughter of a citizen of the United States. The amendment is technical in nature.

LISA MARIE (KIM) LONG

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1829) for the relief of Lisa Marie (Kim) Long, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, in line 8, strike out the comma and "subject to all the conditions in that section relating to orphans", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Lisa Marie (Kim) Long may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in her behalf by Miss Joyce M. Long, a citizen of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the said Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 630), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to facilitate the entry into the United States in an immediate relative status of the adopted daughter of a citizen of the United States. The amendment is technical in nature.

VIRGILIO A. ARANGO, M.D.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2023) for the relief of Virgilio A. Arango, M.D., which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, in line 6 after the word "of" strike out "July 11, 1961" and insert "July 12, 1961"; so as to make the bill read:

S. 2023

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Virgilio A. Arango, doctor of medicine, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of July 12, 1961.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 629), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization. The bill has been amended to reflect the proper date upon which he entered the United States.

MARIAM MANTZIOS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1147) for the relief of Mariam Mantzios which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 1, line 4, after the word "Act," strike out "Mariam Mantzios" and insert "Mariana Mantzios"; and in line 7 after the word "said" strike out "Mariam Mantzios" and insert "Mariana Mantzios"; so as to make the bill read:

S. 1147

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mariana Mantzios may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of such Act, subject to the proviso to such section, and a petition may be filed in behalf of the said Mariana Mantzios by Mr. and Mrs. Mike Mantzios, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 204(a) of such Act.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mariana Mantzios."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 634), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to facilitate the entry into the United States in an immediate relative status of the adopted daughter of citizens of the United States. The bill has been amended in accordance with the suggestion of the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization to correct the spelling of the beneficiary's name.

JUAN ANDRES LLITERAS, AND HIS WIFE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1690) for the relief of Juan Andres Lliteras, and his wife which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 1, line 7, after the word "Bellido" strike out "Andres"; and on page 2, line 1, after "1960" strike out the comma and "upon payment of the required visa fee"; so as to make the bill read:

S. 1690

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, (a) Juan Andres Lliteras shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of June 28, 1961; and (b) Engracia Heydrich Bellido Lliteras, the wife of the said Juan Andres Lliteras, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of August 11, 1960.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed

for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Juan Andres Lliteras and his wife, Engracia Heydrich Bellido Lliteras."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 635), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to enable the beneficiaries to file petitions for naturalization. The bill has been amended to correct the female beneficiary's name and to delete reference to the payment of the required visa fee, since the fee was paid at the time of the adjustment of status.

DR. MARIO JOSE REMIREZ DeESTENOZ

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2022) for the relief of Dr. Mario Jose Ramirez DeEstenoz which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, in line 4, after the word "Jose" strike out "Ramirez" and insert "Remirez"; so as to make the bill read:

S. 2022

Be is enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Mario Jose Remirez DeEstenoz shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of July 24, 1961.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Dr. Mario Jose Remirez DeEstenoz."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 636), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization. The bill has been amended in accordance with the suggestion of the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization to correct the spelling of the beneficiary's name.

TRANSPORTATION OF CHECKS WITH FORGED SIGNATURES

The bill (S. 1440) to include in the prohibitions contained in section 2314 of title 18, United States Code, the transportation with unlawful intent in interstate or foreign commerce of travelers checks bearing forged countersignatures was announced as next in order.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I am, of course, most pleased that we are about to act favorably on S. 1440, a bill I introduced early this year to include in the prohibitions contained in section 2314 of title 18, United States Code, the transportation with unlawful intent in interstate or foreign commerce of travelers checks bearing forged countersignatures.

The growth and acceptance of commercial travel check facilities in the past few years has uncovered in our statutes a loophole governing the transportation across State lines of fraudulent negotiable instruments. Due to the inherent nature of travelers checks, we virtually always find the element of interstate commerce involved in their use. State and local laws have proven inadequate to deal with the problem of their criminal misuse.

S. 1440 has the endorsement of our Justice Department and, of course, the Senate Judiciary Committee which has favorably reported the bill.

Mr. President, additional broadening of our criminal statutes in this area may be necessary in the future. It is my intention to look further into this possible necessity.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1440

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2314 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the third paragraph thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"Whoever, with unlawful or fraudulent intent, transports in interstate or foreign commerce any traveler's check bearing a forged countersignature; or".

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 637), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to make it a Federal crime to transport in interstate or foreign commerce, with unlawful intent, traveler's checks bearing forged countersignatures by amending section 2314 of title 18, of the United States Code.

EXPLANATION

Section 2314 of title 18, of the United States Code among other things prohibits the transportation, with unlawful or fraudulent intent, in interstate or foreign commerce of any security knowing it to have been falsely made, forged, altered, or counterfeited.

S. 1440 would enlarge the scope of section 2314 of title 18, United States Code, by adding a new paragraph making it a Federal crime to transport, with unlawful or fraudulent intent, in interstate or foreign commerce, any traveler's check bearing a forged countersignature.

Section 2311 of title 18 of the United States Code includes traveler's checks under the definition of the term "securities" as used in an existing paragraph of section 2314. However, the Attorney General points out in a letter dated July 3, 1967, that the words "falsely made, forged, altered, or counterfeited" have been construed to refer only to the making or execution of an instrument and not to cover a validly executed instrument bearing a forged countersignature (*Streett* v. *United States,* 331 F. 2d 151 (C.A. 8, 1964). Prior to the *Streett* decision the Department of Justice had taken the position that the countersignature on a traveler's check is within the proscription of section 2314.

The American Express Co. states that since the *Streett* decision there has been an increase of reported losses of traveler's checks in excess of 50 percent and a loss increase in dollar amount in excess of 90 percent.

Representatives of the traveler's check industry also state that their records indicate that a great majority of traveler's checks issued are used in interstate commerce. Consequently, lost or stolen traveler's checks are most susceptible to forgeries and illegal transportation.

One firm in the industry states:

"Our files, and those of many enforcement agencies, show conclusively the involvement of organized criminal gangs in the theft and fraudulent encashment of traveler's cheques. In depriving the Federal authorities of jurisdiction, the *Streett* decision has tended to hamper the solution of these crimes, while the stolen traveler's cheques and their proceeds have moved into interstate commerce * * *. The restoration of Federal jurisdiction by the enactment of (this bill) will be an added tool in the hands of Federal authorities in their war on crime and a deterrent to the organized criminals who have profited."

The Attorney General endorses this bill and reports that the Bureau of the Budget has no objections to its enactment.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 10932) for the relief of Gilmour C. MacDonald, colonel, U.S. Air Force, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

DANGEROUS ACTS ABOARD TRAINS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 552) to amend title 18, United States Code, in order to provide that committing acts dangerous to persons on board trains shall be a criminal offense which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 1, line 9, after the word "board" insert "any trains"; in the same line after the word "anyone" strike out "who he believes will" and insert "about to"; on page 2, line 2, after the word "of" insert "such"; and in the same line, after the word "persons" strike out "on board"; in line 4, after the word "employed" insert "on the line of any common carrier engaged"; in line 5, after the word "commence" strike out "by any railroad"; in line 7, after the word "or" strike out " 'both.' " and insert "both."; after line 7, insert:

Upon the trial of any person charged with any offense set forth in this section, it shall not be necessary to set forth or prove the particular person against whom it was intended to commit the offense, or that it was intended to commit such offense against any particular person.

And after line 12, insert:

A judgment of conviction or acquittal on the merits under the laws of any State shall be a bar to any prosecution under this section for the same act or acts.

So as to make the bill read:

S. 552

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 97 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"§ 1993. Committing acts dangerous to persons on board trains

"Whoever willfully, with intent to endanger the safety of any person on board any train or anyone about to board the same, or with a reckless disregard for the safety of such persons commits any act with respect to any train, engine, motor unit, or car used, operated, or employed on the line of any common carrier engaged in interstate or foreign commerce shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both.

"Upon the trial of any person charged with any offense set forth in this section, it shall not be necessary to set forth or prove the particular person against whom it was intended to commit the offense, or that it was intended to commit such offense against any particular person.

"A judgment of conviction or acquittal on the merits under the laws of any State shall be a bar to any prosecution under this section for the same act or acts."

SEC. 2. The analysis of chapter 97 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"1993. Committing acts dangerous to persons on board trains."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 639), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the proposed legislation, as amended, is to amend chapter 97 (Railroads), of title 18, United States Code, to provide that committing acts dangerous to persons on board trains shall be a criminal offense.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

S. 552 was introduced in the first session of the 90th Congress by Senator Burdick, on January 19, 1967. The bill was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, which then referred it to the Special Subcommittee on criminal Laws and Procedures. Late in the 89th Congress, second session, a similar bill had been introduced by Senator Hart, but no action was taken by the subcommittee since departmental reports on the measure were not received before the adjournment of the Congress.

The subcommittee conducted public hearings on S. 552, along with other bills, on March 7, 8, 9; April 18, 19, 20; May 9; and July 10, 11, 12, 1967. At the hearings in April, the subcommittee heard the testimony of Senator Quentin N. Burdick, who introduced the bill. During the July hearings the subcommittee heard the testimony of Mr. J. L. Hastings, manager of special services for the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway System; Mr. E. C. Sloan, district claim agent, and Mr. W. P. Meeker, inspector of police, both with the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.; Mr. D. L. Wood, chief special agent for the Illinois Central Railroad; Mr. T. W. Keating, senior vice chairman, Pennsylvania Lines East of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen & Enginemen, representing the Pennsylvania System General Grievance Committee and the Pennsylvania Reading Seashore Lines; and Mr. Edward L. McCulloch, representing the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, whose membership includes 37,000 railroad employees who operate the Nation's railroads. In addition to representing their employers, Messrs. Hastings, Sloan, Meeker, and Wood also represented the views of the Association of American Railroads, whose membership comprises railroads that operate 96 percent of the total mileage of all railroads in the United States, have annual revenues approximating 96 percent of the total annual revenues of the railroads, and whose employees constitute 95 percent of the total number of railroad workers in the United States.

STATEMENT

Incidents of stoning and shooting at trains, as well as other acts of vandalism, are becoming more numerous in all parts of the country. Despite the efforts of the railroads and local authorities, the situation is growing worse. Although there has been an increase in the number of persons apprehended for vandalizing trains, the number of trains vandalized and the number of persons injured as a result thereof has increased.

Under existing law it is a Federal crime to wreck trains (18 U.S.C. 1922); to injure property moving in interstate commerce (15 U.S.C. 1281); and to steal interstate shipments (18 U.S.C. 659). There is also existing Federal legislation prohibiting the trespass upon or entering of any train within the "exclusive jurisdiction" of the United States to commit any crime against any person or property thereon (18 U.S.C. 1991). At the present time, however, there is no Federal statute making it a criminal offense to injure persons on interstate trains unless the train is within the "exclusive jurisdiction" of the United States at the time the crime occurs.

Passengers and crew members are apprehensive of traveling in certain areas where acts of vandalism are commonplace. It is thought that, although passage of S. 552 will result in the apprehension of more individuals guilty of committing acts of vandalism against trains, its primary function and aim will be deterrence.

In 1966, according to testimony received by the subcommittee, the combined number of windows broken on the Pennsylvania Railroad, the Chicago & North Western Railroad, and the New Haven Railroad, totaled 5,551. As further evidence of the gravity of the problem, it was pointed out, statistics reveal that for the year 1966 and during the first 4 months of 1967, 286 persons were injured riding in trains operated by the Pennsylvania Railroad as a result of shootings and stonings. These figures become all the more ominous when it is pointed out that there are over 80 major railroads in the United States, and myriad smaller ones.

The seriousness of stoning and shooting at trains cannot be overemphasized, as evinced by the numerous instances of serious injuries inflicted on passengers and crew members thus far, and the potential dangers of injury are frightening. Local police do not have the personnel or the investigative facilities to detect and apprehend persons who are committing these acts so dangerous to passengers and crew riding our trains.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE REPORT

The following letter from the Attorney General, dated April 24, 1967, gives the views of the Department of Justice on S. 552:

"OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
"*Washington, D.C., April 24, 1967.*

"Hon. JAMES O. EASTLAND,
"*Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,*
"*U.S. Senate.*

"DEAR SENATOR: This is in response to your request for the views of the Department of Justice concerning S. 552, a bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code in order to provide that committing acts dangerous to persons on board trains shall be a criminal offense.

"The bill would add a new section 1993, to title 18, United States Code, to make it a Federal crime for any person to willfully commit any act with respect to a train, engine, motor unit, or car used, operated, or employed in interstate or foreign commerce by any railroad, with intent to endanger the safety of any person on board or whom he believes will board, or with a reckless disregard for the safety of the persons on board. A violation of the proposed section would be punishable by a fine of not more than $5,000 or imprisonment for not more than 10 years, or both.

"While the bill is framed in broad language and the acts denounced are not specifically defined, Senator Hart stated in introducing an identical measure in the 89th Congress that its provisions were aimed at individuals who throw rocks and other objects at trains (Cong. Rec., Sept. 13, 1966, p. 21412).

"Under existing law, it is a Federal crime to derail or wreck trains or commit acts of depredation against railroad facilities with intent to derail or wreck trains (18 U.S.C. 1922); to destroy or injure property moving in interstate or foreign commerce in the possession of a common or a contract carrier by railroad, motor vehicle, or aircraft (15 U.S.C. 1281); to embezzle or steal interstate or foreign shipments (18 U.S.C. 659); and to embezzle and steal carrier's funds derived from commerce (18 U.S.C. 660). Also, existing law, applicable to the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States, provides Federal penalties for murder, robbery, or acts of violence against train passengers or crewmembers (18 U.S.C. 1991).

"We have no information that the number or nature of the acts to be proscribed are such that they cannot be handled satisfactorily by the States. Moreover, we assume that, unlike the statutes noted above, most of the instances of missile throwing would involve juveniles, making them more appropriately a subject for local action in juvenile court. Accordingly, we are unable to recommend the enactment of S. 552. However, in the event it is determined that S. 552 warrants favorable consideration, we suggest that a provision similar to that found in sections 659, 660, and 1992, title 18, United States Code, be added as follows:

" 'A judgment of conviction or acquittal on the merits under the laws of any State shall be a bar to any prosecution under this section for the same act or acts.'

"The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

"Sincerely,

"RAMSEY CLARK,
"*Attorney General.*"

CONCLUSIONS

The very difficulty of controlling vandalism suggests the necessity to bring every possible pressure to bear, both to apprehend individuals who have committed such acts and to deter, to the extent possible, the commission of vandalism against trains, passengers, and crews. Although Congress has enacted a statute making it a Federal criminal offense to injure property moving in interstate commerce (15 U.S.C. 1281) it is not now a criminal offense under Federal law to injure or kill a train passenger or employee—except when such offense occurs in territory within the "exclusive jurisdiction" of the United States (18 U.S.C. 1991). The committee believes that the public interest with respect to the safety of train passengers and employees far exceeds that for the safe transportation of property, and therefore concludes that S. 552, as amended, would constitute a substantial improvement in existing law and recommends that the bill, as amended, be favorably considered.

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON NEW TECHNOLOGICAL USES OF COPYRIGHTED WORKS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2216) to establish a National

Commission on New Technological Uses of Copyrighted Works which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 2, line 16, after the word "Senate," strike out "representing" and insert "selected from"; in line 20, after the word "Senate," strike out "representing" and insert "selected from"; in line 24, after the word "Senate," strike out "representing" and insert "selected from"; and on page 5, line 6, after the word "any" insert "three or more"; so as to make the bill read:

S. 2216

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

ESTABLISHMENT AND PURPOSE OF COMMISSION

SECTION 1. (a) There is created in the Library of Congress a National Commission on New Technological Uses of Copyrighted Works (hereafter called the "Commission").

(b) The purpose of the Commission is to study and compile data on the reproduction and use of copyrighted works of authorship (1) in automatic systems capable of storing, processing, retrieving, and transferring information, and (2) by various forms of machine reproduction. The Commission shall make recommendations as to such changes in copyright law or procedures that may be necessary to assure for such purposes access to copyrighted works, and to provide recognition of the rights of copyright owners.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 2. (a) The Commission shall be composed of twenty-three members, appointed as follows:

(1) A Chairman, who shall be the Librarian of Congress;

(2) Two members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate;

(3) Two members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives;

(4) Seven members, to be appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, selected from authors and other copyright owners;

(5) Seven members, to be appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, selected from users of copyrighted works.

(6) Four nongovernmental members to be appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, selected from the public generally.

(b) The members of the Commission shall appoint by the vote of a plurality of the total membership, a Vice Chairman who shall act as Chairman in the absence or disability of the Chairman, or in the event of a vacancy in that office. The Register of Copyrights shall serve as an ex officio member of the Commission.

(c) Twelve members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

(d) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers and shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment was made.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) Members of the Commission, other than officers or employees of the Federal Government, shall receive compensation at the rate of $100 per day while engaged in the actual performance of Commission duties, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses in connection with such duties.

(b) Any members of the Commission who are officers or employees of the Federal Government shall serve on the Commission without compensation, but such members shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses in connection with the performance of their duties.

STAFF

SEC. 4. (a) To assist in its studies, the Commission may appoint a staff which shall be an administrative part of the Library of Congress. The staff shall be headed by an Executive Director, who shall be responsible to the Commission for the administration of the duties entrusted to the staff.

(b) The Commission may procure, without regard to the civil service laws or the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized by section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, but at rates not to exceed $100 per day.

EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

REPORTS

SEC. 6. (a) Within one year after the first meeting of the Commission it shall submit to the President and the Congress a preliminary report on its activities.

(b) Within three years after the effective date of this Act the Commission shall submit to the President and the Congress a final report on its study and investigation which shall include its recommendations and such proposals for legislation and administrative action as may be necessary to carry out its recommendations.

(c) In addition to the preliminary report and final report required by this section, the Commission may publish such interim reports as it may determine, including but not limited to consultant's reports, transcripts of testimony, seminar reports, and other Commission findings.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 7. (a) The Commission or, with the authorization of the Commission, any three or more of its members, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, hold hearings, administer oaths, and require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of documentary material.

(b) With the consent of the Commission, any of its members may hold any meetings, seminars, or conferences considered appropriate to provide a forum for discussion of the problems with which it is dealing.

TERMINATION

SEC. 8. On the sixtieth day after the date of the submission of its final report, the Commission shall terminate and all offices and employment under it shall expire.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 640), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation, as amended, is to establish a National Commission to study and compile data on the reproduction and use of copyrighted works of authorship (1) in the automatic systems capable of storing, processing, retrieving, and transferring information, and (2) by various forms of machine reproduction. The Commission is directed to make recommendations to the President and the Congress concerning such changes as may be necessary to assure for such purposes access to copyrighted works and to provide recognition of the rights of copyright owners.

STATEMENT

The Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights of this committee has conducted 17 days of hearings on the general revision of the copyright law. Testimony was received from 150 witnesses, and a number of statements were submitted for inclusion in the hearing record.

Prior to the introduction of copyright revision legislation in the Congress, exhaustive study was given by the Copyright Office and various interested groups to those issues that it was anticipated would require attention by the Congress during the revision program. The current or potential impact of computers and other information storage and retrieval systems on the copyright revision effort was not foreseen and consequently the bill submitted to the Congress did not take into account the significance of this new technology.

The first extensive consideration of these matters in the Congress occurred during the hearings of this committee's Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights on S. 597, the general copyright revision bill. At the same time within the executive branch the Committee on Scientific and Technological Information of the Federal Council on Science and Technology was also exploring these problems. It became apparent during the subcommittee examination of this subject that if the Congress were to undertake at this time to make a final determination concerning the possible necessity of modifications in the copyright law, because of various technological advances. It would delay for at least several years the enactment of a general copyright revision bill. Such a delay would be extremely undesirable in view of the obvious need for revision of the copyright statute, which is essentially that enacted in 1909. More importantly, sufficient information is currently not available to provide the foundation for a sound judgment concerning the future development of the technology and the necessity for modification of the copyright statute.

Another important copyright issue arising from technological developments is the reproduction of copyrighted material by the use of various machines. Photocopying in all its forms presents significant questions of public policy, extending well beyond that of copyright law. No satisfactory solutions have emerged in the limited consideration devoted to this problem during the current revision effort.

Therefore, the establishment of some type of study commission appeared to be both necessary and desirable. On July 25, 1967, under the auspices of the Subcommittee, a meeting to discuss a draft bill to establish a national study commission was attended by approximately 150 representatives of authors, publishers, educators, librarians, computer users and the executive agencies. Unanimous support was expressed for the establishment of the Commission. On August 2, 1967, Senator John L. McClellan, Chairman of the Subcommittee, introduced S. 2216.

VIEWS OF GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

The Library of Congress, in its report dated September 5, 1967, endorsed S. 2216.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON TITLE I AGREEMENTS UNDER THE AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1954

A letter from the Associate Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on title I agreements under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, for the months of July, August, and September 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Recommendation Relating To Recapture of Pacific Gas & Electric Co.'s Bucks Creek Hydroelectric Project, Plumas County, Calif.

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a recommendation relating to the recapture of Pacific Gas & Electric Co.'s Bucks Creek hydroelectric project located on Milk Ranch Creek, Bucks Creek, and Grizzly Creek, tributaries of the North Fork Feather River, all in Plumas County in northern California (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

ESTABLISHMENT OF REDWOOD NATIONAL PARK—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—AUTHORIZATION TO FILE MINORITY VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 641)

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I file with the Senate the report of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on S. 2515. I ask unanimous consent that any minority views which may be filed by Monday of next week be printed together with the majority views as a separate document.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KUCHEL. For the information of the Senate, I may say that I have been informed that, if there are any minority views, they will be filed today; but I have asked consent to continue that permission until Monday in the event it is necessary.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. Kuchel, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Hart, and Mr. Moss):

S. 2526. A bill to amend the Unemployment Tax Act to require State law coverage of certain employees of nonprofit organizations and of State hospitals and institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Javits when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MONDALE:

S. 2527. A bill to encourage the movement of butter into domestic commercial markets; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 2528. A bill for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Satya Paul Pasricha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Mondale when he introduced the first above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HARRIS:

S. 2529. A bill for the relief of A. G. Bartlett Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Harris when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KUCHEL (for himself, Mr. Allott, Mr. Dominick, Mr. Bible, Mr. Cannon, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Moss, Mr. Young of North Dakota, Mr. Hansen, and Mr. Hatfield):

S. 2530. A bill to clarify the relationship of interests of the United States and of the States in the use of the waters of certain streams; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Kuchel when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KUCHEL:

S. 2531. A bill to designate the San Gabriel Wilderness, "Angeles National Forest," in the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Kuchel when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

REVIEW OF FLOOD PROTECTION PROJECT AT GLASGOW, MONT.

Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. Metcalf) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 175) relative to reviewing the flood protection project at Glasgow, Mont., which was referred to the Committee on Public Works, as follows:

S. Res. 175

Resolved by the Committee on Public Works of the United States Senate, That the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors is hereby requested to review the report of the Chief of Engineers on the Milk River, Montana, published as House Document No. 88, 73rd Congress, and other pertinent reports, with a view to determining whether the existing flood protection project at Glasgow, Montana, should be modified in any way, at this time with particular reference to the levee alignment in the vicinity of the Frances Mahon Deaconess Hospital.

COVERAGE OF EMPLOYEES OF NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS AND STATE HOSPITALS AND INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION UNDER THE UNEMPLOYMENT TAX ACT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Inouye], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], I introduce a bill to amend the Unemployment Tax Act to require State law coverage of certain employees of nonprofit organizations and State hospitals and institutions of higher education and ask that it be appropriately referred. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the Record.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2625) to amend the Unemployment Tax Act to require State law coverage of certain employees of nonprofit organizations and of State hospitals and institutions of higher education introduced by Mr. Javits (for himself, Mr. Kuchel, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Hart, and Mr. Moss) was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 2526

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 3304(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by redesignating paragraph (6) as paragraph (7) and by inserting after paragraph (5) the following new paragraph:

"(6) (A) Compensation is payable on the basis of service to which section 3310(a) (1) applies, in the same amount, on the same terms, and subject to the same conditions as compensation payable on the basis of other service subject to such law, and

"(B) Payments (in lieu of contributions) with respect to service to which section 3310 (a) (1) (A) applies may be made into the State unemployment fund on the basis set forth in section 3310(a) (2);".

(b) (1) Chapter 23 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 3310. State law coverage of certain service performed for nonprofit organizations and for State hospitals and institutions of higher education.

"(a) State Law Requirements.—For purposes of section 3304(a) (6)—

"(1) except as otherwise provided in subsections (b) and (c), the service to which this paragraph applies is—

"(A) service excluded from the term 'employment' solely by reason of paragraph (8) of section 3306(c), and

"(B) service performed in the employ of a State, or any instrumentality of one or more States, for a hospital or institution of higher education, if such service is excluded from the term 'employment' solely by reason of paragraph (7) of section 3306(c); and

"(2) the State law shall provide that an organization (or group of organizations) which, but for the requirements of this paragraph, would be liable for contributions with respect to service to which paragraph (1) (A) applies may elect, for such minimum period and at such time as may be provided by State law, to pay (in lieu of such contributions) into the State unemployment fund amounts equal to the amounts of compensation attributable under the State law to such service. The State law may provide safeguards to ensure that organizations so electing will make the payments required under such elections.

"(b) Section Not to Apply to Certain Service.—This section shall not apply to service performed—

"(1) in the employ of (A) a church or convention or association of churches, or (B) an organization which is operated primarily for religious purposes and which is operated, supervised, controlled, or principally supported by a church or convention or association of churches;

"(2) by a duly ordained, commissioned, or licensed minister of a church in the exercise of his ministry or by a member of a religious order in the exercise of duties required by such order;

"(3) in the employ of an educational institution which is not an institution of higher education;

"(4) in the case of an institution of higher education, by an individual employed in an instructional, research, or principal administrative capacity;

"(5) in the case of a hospital (or in the case of a medical research organization directly engaged in the continuous active conduct of medical research in conjunction with a hospital), by an individual as a physician, dentist, osteopath, chiropractor, naturopath, or Christian Science practitioner, or by an individual employed in an instructional or research capacity;

"(6) in a facility conducted for the purpose of carrying out a program of—

"(A) rehabilitation for individuals whose earning capacity is impaired by age or physical or mental deficiency or injury, or

"(B) providing remunerative work for individuals who because of their impaired or mental capacity cannot be readily absorbed in the competitive labor market,

by an individual receiving such rehabilitation or remunerative work; and

"(7) as part of an unemployment work-relief or work-training program assisted or financed in whole or in part by any Federal agency or an agency of a State or political subdivision thereof, by an individual receiving such work relief or work training.

"(c) Nonprofits Must Be Employers of 4 or More.—This section shall not apply to service performed during any calendar year in the employ of any organization unless on each of some 20 days during such calendar year, each day being in a different calendar week, the total number of individuals who were employed by such organization in employment (determined without regard to section 3306(c)(8) and by excluding service to which this section does not apply by reason of subsection (b)) for some portion of the day (whether or not at the same moment of time) was 4 or more."

(2) The table of sections for such chapter 23 is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"Sec. 3310. State law coverage of certain service performed for nonprofit organizations and for State hospitals and institutions of higher education."

(c) Section 3303 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(e) Payments By Certain Nonprofit Organizations.—A State may, without being deemed to violate the standards set forth in subsection (a), permit an organization (or group of organizations) described in section 501(c)(3) which is exempt from income tax under section 501(a) to elect (in lieu of paying contributions) to pay into the State unemployment fund amounts equal to the amounts of compensation attributable under the State law to service performed in the employ of such organization (or group).

"(f) In order to facilitate the orderly transition to coverage of service to which section 3310(a)(1)(A) applies, a State law may, without being deemed to violate the standards set forth in section 3303(a), provide that an organization (or group of organizations) which elects to make payment (in lieu of contribution) into the State unemployment fund as provided in section 3310(a)(2) when such election first becomes available under State law and which has paid contributions into such fund under the State law with respect to said service performed in its employ prior to January 1, 1969 is not required to make any such payment (in lieu of contribution) on account of compensation paid after its election as heretofore described which is attributable under the State law to service performed in its employ, until the total of such compensation equals the amount—

"(1) by which the amount of contributions paid by such organization (or group) with respect to a period not to exceed 10 years prior to the election provided by section 3310(a)(2) exceeds

"(2) the amount of the compensation for the same period either charged to the account of such organization (or group) or attributable under the State law to service performed in its employ, whichever is appropriate."

(d) The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall apply with respect to certifications of State laws for 1969 and subsequent years, but only with respect to service performed after December 31, 1968. The amendments made by subsection (c) shall take effect January 1, 1968.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, up to now, employees of nonprofit organizations and State hospitals and institutions of higher learning have been excluded from mandatory coverage under the Unemployment Tax Act. The only way they have been able to obtain the benefit of the protection afforded to most other workers is when their employers have voluntarily agreed to pay the full contribution required of all other employers participating in the system. Needless to say, few employers have chosen to voluntarily participate on this basis and the result has been that more than 1,800,000 workers have been excluded from coverage.

Last year an attempt was made to rectify this anomalous situation. Last year's Unemployment Tax Act bill included provisions which would have required coverage of employees of nonprofit organizations, and of State hospitals or institutions of higher learning. Although there was initially some controversy over these provisions, a compromise was worked out and identical provisions to achieve this result were included in the bills passed by the House and Senate. Unfortunately, differences wholly unrelated to this issue arose which could not be settled by the House and Senate conferees, and the bill died in conference.

The provisions of the bill which I have introduced today are taken practically verbatim from the House and Senate versions of last year's bill.

Existing law would be changed by adding a provision requiring State laws to provide that unemployment compensation is payable with respect to service performed in the employ of nonprofit organizations and State hospitals and institutions of higher learning. In the case of nonprofit organizations, however, State laws would have to provide them the option of making payments into the State unemployment funds on a cost-reimbursement basis.

Not all employees of nonprofit organizations or State hospitals or institutions of higher education would be covered. The following types of services would be excluded from the mandatory requirements of the act: services performed—

First. In the employ of a church or convention or association of churches, or an organization which is operated primarily for religious purposes and which is operated, supervised, controlled, or principally supported by a church or convention or association of churches;

Second. By a duly ordained, commissioned, or licensed minister of a church in the exercise of his ministry or by a member of a religious order in the exercise of duties required by such order;

Third. In the employ of an educational institution which is not an institution of higher education;

Fourth. In the case of an institution of higher education, by an individual employed in an instructional, research, or principal administrative capacity;

Fifth. In the case of a hospital—or in the case of a medical research organization directly engaged in the continuous active conduct of medical research in conjunction with a hospital—by an individual as a physician, dentist, osteopath, chiropractor, naturopath, or Christian Science practitioner, or by an individual employed in an instructional or research capacity;

Sixth. In a facility conducted for the purpose of carrying out a program of rehabilitation for individuals whose earning capacity is impaired by age or physical or mental deficiency or injury, or providing remunerative work for individuals who because of their impaired or mental capacity cannot be readily absorbed in the competitive labor market, by an individual receiving such rehabilitation or remunerative work; and

Seventh. As part of an unemployment work-relief or work-training program assisted or financed in whole or in part by any Federal agency or an agency of a State or political subdivision thereof, by an individual receiving such work relief or work training.

In addition, the law would not apply to nonprofit organizations who did not employ at least four or more persons on each of some 20 days during each calendar year, each day being in a different calendar week.

Finally, the bill would allow, but not require, the States to permit nonprofit organizations which elect to make payments on a cost-reimbursement basis into the funds of their respective States a credit for the amount of contributions they have made, if any, during the past 10 years, over and above the payments they would have made had they been permitted to participate in this system on a cost-reimbursement basis. This provision is new; it was not in last year's bill.

Mr. President, this bill represents a long overdue reform. It is a reform that should be considered on its own merits and action on it should not be delayed because of differences of opinion which may exist with respect to other reforms of the Unemployment Tax Act. I, therefore, hope that it will receive the speediest possible consideration by the Senate.

MOVEMENT OF BUTTER OUT OF GOVERNMENT STORAGE INTO DOMESTIC COMMERCIAL MARKET

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to encourage the movement of butter out of Government storage into domestic commercial markets.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2527) to encourage the movement of butter into domestic commercial markets, introduced by Mr. MONDALE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, last April I sponsored legislation introduced by my distinguished colleague, Senator McCARTHY, which would provide a dairy price support program through payments made directly to farmers—either for a reduction or an increase in milk production, depending upon the national milk supply situation.

But a substantial segment of the dairy industry—both farmers and processors—does not feel this is the most effective proposal. They believe that dairy farm income could be better strengthened by providing payments to processors, which would enable a decrease in the consumer price of butter—actually a consumer subsidy.

The only question raised in my mind by these sharply different approaches is which bill best meets the common objective we all share—that of strengthening the dairy industry and increasing dairy farm income.

In my judgment, both bills have merit and deserve full and adequate hearings. I am most hopeful that the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee will hold hearings on both proposals as soon as possible, because the dairy farm income situation is very grave today. Low income returns, foreign dumping of dairy products, and drastically reduced exports have combined to place our entire dairy industry in jeopardy.

The dairy bill which I am introducing today is not a major departure from existing dairy programs. It is a supplementary program, designed to prevent butter from piling up in government hands, and to enable butter to move in domestic markets.

Under this bill, the existing dairy price support program would be continued, whereby the Commodity Credit Corporation guarantees a floor, as established by the Secretary, under the return per hundredweight of milk to the dairy farmer.

But this bill adds a significant new feature. If commercial butter markets were so sluggish that the Government was forced to take over ever-increasing quantities of butter, this legislation would enable the Secretary to take remedial action. The retail price for butter would actually be reduced to encourage purchase of all butter production by consumers and consumers would accordingly have the benefit of lower retail prices.

Under present law, the market price is maintained through the purchase of butter by CCC to the extent that consumers fail to purchase this butter at the established support price. Under this proposal, instead of permitting butter to pile up in CCC hands, supplementary payments would enable processors to reduce the retail price of butter until, at the lower level of retail prices, all butter would move into consumption. If this new authority worked as intended, there would be no Government purchases or storage of butter, except to the extent that the Secretary might wish to buy butter to fill Government program requirements.

This program was used during World War II, but for a different purpose. During World War II, it was desired that the production of milk and butterfat be maintained, and even increased, to meet wartime needs of our domestic consumers and our wartime allies, while at the same time holding down prices to combat inflation, and to help implement the wartime price and wage control measures. Prices to plants and consumers were fixed at relatively low levels, and payments were made through plants to encourage dairy farmers to maintain and expand their production.

In 1945, while this program was in effect, the per capita consumption of butter was nearly 11 pounds. At present prices and competitive conditions, per capita commercial consumption of butter is scarcely 5.5 pounds.

I want to pinpoint some of the problems faced by the dairy industry today, problems which are very serious indeed. Dairy farmers have reduced their production of butterfat, but sales of butterfat in milk and dairy products have declined at a more rapid rate. The total milk produced on farms this year will be less than in 1955—12 years ago—when 122.9 billion pounds of milk were produced. Milk production is estimated about 120 to 121 billion pounds for 1967. During this 12-year period, total population has increased from 166 to 200 million, an increase of 20 percent. On a per capita basis, milk production has declined from 744 pounds in 1955 to 611 pounds in 1966, a decline of 18 percent.

The national dairy herd has been showing a steady downward trend and is at the lowest point recorded in this century. For example, in 1945, 27.8 million cows and heifers 2 years old and older were kept for milk on farms. By 1967, these numbers had declined to about 15.2 million head, a decrease of 45 percent. The major reason we are not having a milk famine in this country is the fact that farmers have been increasing milk production per cow. In 1945, production per cow was 4,787 pounds as compared to 8,513 pounds in 1965.

These figures show conclusively that farmers have adjusted their output and have increased efficiency. The problems in the dairy industry are not production oriented, but in fact are due to declining consumption.

The figures on per capita consumption reveal the source of our difficulties in the dairy field.

In 1955, commercial per capita consumption of fluid milk and cream was 340 pounds, as compared to 278 pounds in 1966—a decline of 18 percent.

The per capita commercial consumption of butter, sharply diminished by wartime programs which were designed to channel milk into other dairy products, declined from 8.3 pounds in 1955 to 5.5 pounds in 1966, a decline of about 34 percent. As compared to prewar, per capita butter consumption is down about 67 percent.

Other dairy products show increases. Cheese commercial consumption per capita increased from 7.4 pounds in 1955 to 9.9 pounds in 1966, a very substantial increase of about 34 percent. Ice cream is up very slightly since 1955.

The data given herein show rather conclusively that the surplus problem in dairy products is not production oriented. Rather, it is due to declining consumption, particularly of butterfat at prevailing prices. Butter consumption must be stabilized and improved before there is any real hope of improving markets for dairy farmers.

In this connection, it is to be noted that there is a strong upward trend in the sale of low-fat milk and skim milk in fluid milk marketing. This results in more butterfat being used in the manufacture of butter. This trend to marketing more low-fat and skim milk in fluid form will go far toward offsetting any reduction in milk and butterfat production which manufacturing milk producers might undertake.

This bill would propose a means of revitalizing the commercial market for butter. The butter market is the foundation of the price structure of milk and all other dairy products throughout the United States. A strong butter market is necessary for the maintenance of prices of fluid milk and other dairy commodities for all dairy farmers. Fluid milk and manufactured dairy products, other than butter, compete directly with butter for the butterfat contained in them. Milk and butterfat utilization changes from one commodity to another, depending upon price competition for the raw milk delivered from farms. Whenever the butter market is weak and surpluses are heavy, the price structure for all milk and dairy products is also weakened to the detriment of all dairymen.

This bill asks for a new approach to the problem of dairy farmers. It eliminates surpluses by increasing consumption through more favorable retail prices.

The question may be asked, how the reduction in market prices of butter, which this bill would visualize, would improve the demand for butter. The reasons are very simple.

There can be little doubt that the decline in butter consumption is in large part attributable to the competition of low-priced substitutes. Since World War II, with the advent of colored oleomargarine, the retail price of butter has remained between 40 and 50 cents per pound in excess of the retail price of oleomargarine. This range in price has been one of the major causes, in my opinion, for the decreased consumption of butter. Prior to World War II, butter consumption was 17 pounds per capita. Currently, butter per capita commercial consumption is about 5.5 pounds.

The total consumption of table spreads, that is, butter plus oleomargarine, has declined about 15 percent since prewar days. All of this decline has shown up in the per capita consumption of butter.

It may be the thought of some people that the public is using less fats, primarily for dietary reasons. While it is true that the total consumption of table spreads—butter and oleomargarine—has declined about 15 percent from the prewar level, the fact remains that the per capita consumption of all food fats has increased. Currently, consumers are using more edible fats per capita than they have for many years. Thus, while they were diminishing their intake of table spread fats, such decline has been more than offset by increases in other fat utilization, such as is in salad oils and in prepared foods.

It appears to me to be quite clear that the only way butter sales can be regained is by making butter more competitive. It is at least possible that once the demand for butter has been reestablished, payments to plants under this bill can be reduced or eliminated altogether.

The costs of the present price-support program are paid by the general public through taxes. The general public also pays the higher market prices.

Under this proposed program, the general public still would pay the cost of the program through taxes, but would have the benefit of purchasing larger quantities of butter at much lower prices.

How much would this program cost?

It is very difficult to give any precise comparison of the differences in costs of the proposed program as compared to the present program. About the best we can do is to estimate, on the basis of accepted measures of consumer response to changes in price, just about how much butter will be consumed at different levels in prices, and to compare the cost of encouraging consumers to purchase more through lower prices with the cost of CCC purchases of surplus products.

It is to be emphasized that it would be necessary to continue using the price-support program of the CCC, even though all butter were consumed under this program. The reason is that nonfat dry milk production is quite large in relation to the commercial consumption of that commodity, but nonfat dry milk has been and is a potent weapon of the worldwide war on hunger. Normally, the CCC purchases about one-half of all nonfat dry milk produced. Therefore, to effectuate the price-support program for milk, it is necessary to purchase nonfat dry milk under the price-support program.

If the price of the skim milk were not supported by the CCC through the purchase program, such skim milk values no doubt would sink to practically zero. In fact, the skim milk value to farmers might become a negative value because the volume of production is so large relative to existing domestic demand.

The best estimate made by dairy industry experts is that this program, coupled with CCC purchases of nonfat dry milk, probably would cost somewhat more than the current purchase program of CCC. I ask unanimous consent that at this point two tables prepared by the National Milk Producers Federation at my request be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The tables ordered to be printed in the RECORD are as follows:

TABLE 1.—CALCULATION OF COSTS OF CONSUMER SUBSIDY ON BUTTER AS COMPARED TO CCC PRICE-SUPPORT PROGRAM COSTS

Consumption level (billion pounds)	Retail price of butter at each level (cents per pound)	Subsidy cost, cumulative, by levels (million dollars)	Cost of CCC purchases of nonfat dry milk (million dollars)	Total cost of subsidy program (million dollars)	Retail price of butter under price support (cents per pound)	Cost of CCC price-support program (million dollars)	Difference, subsidy program costs less CCC price-support costs (million dollars)
1.1	80.0	0	78.4	78.4	80	78.4	0
1.2	70.9	109.2	121.4	230.6	80	190.8	+39.8
1.3	63.4	205.4	164.0	369.4	80	302.8	+66.6
1.4	57.4	290.8	206.8	497.6	80	415.0	+82.6
1.5	52.3	367.3	249.6	616.9	80	527.2	+89.7

TABLE 2.—CALCULATION OF TOTAL CONSUMER OUTLAYS UNDER CONSUMER SUBSIDY PROGRAM FOR BUTTER AND UNDER CCC PRICE-SUPPORT PROGRAM

Consumption level under subsidy (billion pounds)	Retail value of butter under subsidy (million dollars)	Subsidy on butter, cumulative (million dollars)	Total retail butter plus subsidy (million dollars)	Total cost of nonfat dry milk purchases (million dollars)	Total cost of butter plus nonfat dry milk purchases (million dollars)	Retail value of butter under price support (million dollars)	Total cost of CCC price-support program (million dollars)	Total retail value plus CCC price supports (million dollars)	Difference between subsidy total value and CCC total value (million dollars)
1.1	880.3	0	880.0	78.4	958.4	880	78.4	958.4	0
1.2	880.0	109.2	960.0	121.4	1,081.4	880	190.8	1,070.8	+10.6
1.3	825.5	205.4	1,030.9	164.0	1,194.9	880	302.8	1,182.8	+12.1
1.4	803.6	290.8	1,094.4	206.8	1,301.2	880	415.0	1,295.0	+6.2
1.5	784.5	367.3	1,151.8	249.6	1,401.4	880	527.2	1,407.0	−5.8

Mr. MONDALE. These tables show estimates of the cost of this program compared to existing programs. In particular, the second table shows that at the highest level of butter consumption, the total consumer outlay for butter at retail and through Federal programs will be less under this bill. It is to be borne in mind that, under this program, the consumer would have the benefit of larger volumes of butter for his own use, at lower prices. Under the price-support program, the consumer would pay a higher price for smaller volumes of butter.

The strength and key to this program lies in its effective ability to encourage an increase in the demand for butter. Such an increase would be of untold benefit to the entire dairy farming industry, since it would strengthen the price structure for all dairy commodities.

I hope the Congress will consider this bill at an early date, together with other proposals to improve the lot of our dairy farmers, who are in desperate shape. Earlier this year, Senator NELSON and I said in a letter on dairy farm income:

> It is one of the ironies of history that the most efficient farm producers in the world are receiving an hourly rate of income less than Congress has insisted be paid to unskilled labor. . . No rational American would ask a farmer with an investment of $100,000 to furnish his labor at less than he could earn washing dishes in a restaurant.

RELIEF OF A. G. BARTLETT CO.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill for the relief of the A. G. Bartlett Co.

This company was base contractor at Williams Air Force Base, Ariz., from May 1, 1966, through April 30, 1967. At the time the bid offer was submitted and accepted, the minimum wage to be paid to employees per hour was $1.25. On September 14, 1966, Congress passed the Minimum Wage Act calling for an increase of wages to $1.40 per hour. As a result, the A. G. Bartlett Co. suffered a loss of $8,718.53. This bill would reimburse the company for the loss it incurred due to the passage of that act.

Mr. President, I am hopeful that appropriate action will be taken on this legislation soon, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD, as well as the letter that I received from Mr. A. G. Bartlett, president of the company, bringing this matter to my attention.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2529) for the relief of A. G. Bartlett Co., introduced by Mr. HARRIS, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2529

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the A. G. Bartlett Company of Tulsa, Oklahoma, the sum of $8,718.53, in full satisfaction of all claims of such company against the United States for reimbursement for losses incurred under contract numbered AF–02 (600) 2590, entered into by the United States with such company, such losses having resulted from increased wage costs arising out of an increase in the Federal minimum wage rate imposed after such company had computed its bid and been awarded such contract: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The letter, presented by Mr. HARRIS, is as follows:

A. G. BARTLETT CO.,
Tulsa, Okla., August 30, 1967.

Hon. FRED R. HARRIS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HARRIS: We wish to invite your attention to our letter dated 28 June 1967.

We were Base Contractors at Williams Air Force Base, Arizona under contract number AF–02(600)2590, from 1 May 1966 through 30 April 1967. At the time our bid offer was submitted, The Service Contract Act of 1965, Paragraph 1, clearly defined the minimum wage to be $1.25 per hour effective 20 January 1966. All bid prices were based on this law with no protection allowed or given for government amendments. On 14 September 1966, after our contract was awarded, The Federal Government passed the minimum wage law raising the rate to $1.40 per hour, effective 1 February 1967. We were compelled to comply with the law which resulted in a great loss to our company through no fault of our own.

We recently made an appeal for relief and amendment of our Air Force Contract, only to be advised that there is no statutory authority to handle such matters. Attention is further invited to the United States Comptroller General's Opinion, No. B-161321 dated 5 May 1967 on Government Contracts, which states: "The U.S. Comptroller General lacks power to authorize or direct an increase in the contract price".

There are numerous small contractors throughout the United States who are doing business with the government and who have sustained great losses due to the government's refusal to allow changes in the contract so that the contractor will be reimbursed in line with the minimum wage. Apparently the only way that this situation can be corrected is for a bill to be introduced before Congress to rectify this injustice to small business.

I urgently request your support in presenting such a bill before Congress in the immediate future. We will greatly appreciate your consideration and assistance in this matter.

Respectfully,

A. G. BARTLETT,
President.

THE WATER RIGHTS ACT OF 1968

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, on behalf of myself and the Senators from Colorado [Messrs. ALLOTT and DOMINICK], the Senators from Nevada [Messrs. BIBLE and CANNON], the Senators from Utah [Messrs. BENNETT and MOSS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HANSEN], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], a bill to clarify the relationship between the interests of the United States and of the States in the use of the water of certain streams over which jurisdictional conflicts exist.

One of the vexing and as yet unsolved problems directly confronting the Nation, and more particularly western America, is the continuing jurisdictional dispute between the Federal and State governments over the waters of many of our country's streams. This conflict has created uncertainty in the minds of those who would develop our Nation's water resources. An individual or governmental agency cannot be expected to expend large amounts of money on water resource development when it is uncertain with which governmental body it is necessary to deal in order to establish meaningful water rights. Such expenditures are also discouraged when there is a possibility that one's State-created water right will be declared ineffective as against the Federal Government. One direct and relatively simple means of removing this impeding uncertainty is to eliminate the jurisdictional battle which exists between our State and Federal governments. The following are situations sought to be corrected by our bill.

While not altogether beyond argument, various court decisions have seemingly provided a basis for the assertion by the United States that it has a priority of appropriation of all the previously unappropriated water arising upon reserved or withdrawn Federal lands by virtue of the mere withdrawal or reservation; the priority arising no later than the date of the relevant withdrawal or reservation. In most of the relevant situations, the pertinent withdrawals or reservations are effected before non-Federal water appropriations were made, often during the initial development of various areas in the West. Under this priority theory, the Federal Government can come in at any time, assert its alleged preferential rights, and use as much water as it desires, most likely to the detriment of downstream users. In many cases, notwithstanding this uncertainty, the developmental needs of the West could not be delayed, and water development has been undertaken at a cost of millions of dollars. While the existence of such preferential water rights probably were not intended by Congress, the mere existence of such ambiguity threatens water development throughout the West. Our bill would disclaim that the mere reservation or withdrawal of public land, without more, thereby reserves the water appurtenant to that land. This would in no way prohibit the Federal Government from establishing water rights by specific declaration, or in any other recognized manner. It would merely require the Federal Government to state exactly what rights to what water in what quantity it is asserting. If the quantity claims were known, the threat of this all-consuming Federal water right would be eliminated.

Since water is a scarce commodity in the arid West, another provision of our bill provides that in the West, projects designed to provide beneficial consumptive use of water shall not be interfered with by Federal navigation projects. While this often has been done on a project-by-project basis, the enactment of my bill would establish the overall policy that nonconsumptive uses would be secondary to such uses as municipal, domestic, stockwater, irrigation, mining, and other consumptive uses.

A further provision of this bill requires that when the United States chooses to base its claim to a water right on State law, such State right shall be initiated and perfected in accordance with the procedure established by the appropriate State law. This does not restrict the Federal Government to relying solely on State-created water rights. It merely demands fair play when the Federal Government asserts an alleged State created and administered right to water. A State law may require that approval by a board or other agency, recording, or similar procedure be followed as a prerequisite to the issuance of a water right. This is done in order to facilitate the orderly management of this scarce resource. I repeat that the Federal Government is under no obligation under the terms of this bill to comply with State prerequisites if it seeks other than a State water right. Compliance with State law is required, however, where the benefits of State procedure—a State-created water right—is sought to be obtained by the Federal Government. It would prohibit the Federal Government from asserting a State water right by virtue of partial compliance with State procedures or prerequisites, but not with them all. This is another step in my efforts to make systematic the acquisition of water rights by the Federal Government.

The bill which we introduce today further provides that when a State-recognized water right, which is a property right, is interfered with by the Federal Government, this taking of property must be compensated. While this rule already applies to projects initiated under the reclamation laws and the Power Act, it does not apply to navigation-oriented projects. The navigation aspect of the project can serve as the justification for the nonapplicability of the "just compensation" provisions of the Constitution. Our bill would protect these private property rights when they are impeded under the guise of navigation in a Federal water project. Our bill also requires that condemnation actions be initiated by the Federal taking authority when the taking of a State-protected water right was other than by agreement. There have been instances where the Federal Government has sought to take, or interfere with, a State-recognized water right but has not initiated a condemnation proceeding. This has forced the injured party to initiate an inverse condemnation action against the United States. If our Government desires to seize private property, fairness dictates that they should not further inconvenience the injured party by forcing him to bring suit in order to acquire compensation, but rather should straightforwardly commence the necessary proceedings itself.

The second section of our bill seeks to preserve many existing situations and prohibits my bill from being interpreted as interfering with the provisions of treaties, interstate compacts, obligations to Indians, and the like.

Mr. President, the clarification of these rights is a longstanding dilemma. The need to clarify the Federal position in connection with water rights was recognized by the Senate Select Committee on Water Resources, of which I was privileged to serve as vice chairman. This clarification as yet has not occurred. By the bill which I introduce today, we seek to achieve a good start on this most necessary clarification. The States of the West demand that the Federal Government play fair and delineate the potential water rights which it may at some future time assert. The fairness and equity of my position demands that action along the lines presented in my bill be taken immediately by the Congress of the United States.

I might add that this legislation has been endorsed by many public agencies in the West, and many groups of distinguished water lawyers; and I send it to the desk for appropriate reference.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2530) to clarify the relationship of interests of the United States and of the States in the use of the waters of certain streams, introduced by Mr. KUCHEL (for himself and other

Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SAN GABRIEL WILDERNESS AREA

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on February 8 of this year, I had the pleasure of introducing a bill, S. 889, which would establish the San Rafael Wilderness Area in the Los Padres National Forest in California. The San Rafael bill is the historic first proposed addition to the Wilderness Preservation System established by the 1964 Wilderness Act. S. 889 passed the Senate on May 2, 1967, and is currently pending in the House, where I understand passage is imminent.

I now introduce for appropriate reference a bill to establish the San Gabriel Wilderness Area in the Angeles National Forest of California. The proposed San Gabriel Wilderness is located in the San Gabriel mountain range in eastern Los Angeles County, approximately 35 miles northeast of the city of Los Angeles. This fine wilderness example lies within 50 miles of approximately 6 million people.

The proposed San Gabriel Wilderness comprises some 36,137 acres, including 34,807 acres currently designated as the Devil Canyon-Bear Canyon Primitive Area. The additional 2,490 acres proposed to be added to the primitive area acreage is contiguous to the primitive area and is also totally within the Angeles National Forest. Thus, no private land nor other public land would have to be acquired in order to establish the San Gabriel Wilderness Area.

Underlying all of the proposed San Gabriel Wilderness is a granitic formation which has been cut to form deep, steep-walled canyons. Elevations range from 2,150 feet on the banks of the west fork of the San Gabriel River to 8,000 feet on Waterman Mountain; a greater portion of the area lies above 5,000 feet. This mountainous area has temperatures ranging from an approximate low of 20 degrees to a high of 100 degrees. Precipitation averages 32 inches a year and primarily occurs between November and March. During this period snow occurs at elevations above 4,000 feet but does not last long because the periods of freezing weather are short. As in the proposed San Rafael Wilderness Area, the proposed San Gabriel Wilderness is most attractive for use in winter and spring, owing to the very hot and dry summer and fall. During the summer and fall the danger of fire is great, the vegetation being explosively flammable, the temperature high, and the humidity low.

The San Gabriel Wilderness is covered primarily with dense chaparral, with some low-grade, noncommercial timber covering approximately one-quarter of the area. While the area abounds in small wildlife, the higher elevations and peaks are part of the natural range of the big horn sheep. Some black bear and innumerable deer reside in the area. Both Devil Canyon and Bear Canyon, located within the proposed wilderness, furnish good fishing for native rainbow trout.

Since fire is a constant threat during the summer and fall months, certain fire control measures are necessary. While closure of the area during critical months is often required, the threat of lightning fires dictates that firefighting forces must be provided good access over trails from the well-maintained peripheral roads and by helicopters which will land on small, hand-constructed clearings within the area. In addition, aerial fire detection activities will be increased and some fireproofing will be done in spots where visitors tend to rest, eat, or camp.

It is encouraging that the proposal which I introduce today has the support of all relevant Federal and State administrative and resources agencies. My proposal is also enthusiastically supported by a very great number of fine national and local conservation groups, including: The Wilderness Society, the Sierra Club, the Southern California Chapter of Nature Conservancy, the California State Division of the Isaac Walton League of America, the Southern Council of Conservation Clubs, many area chapters of the Audubon Society, the Southern California Section of the Society of American Foresters, many local counsels of the Boy Scouts of America, the Desomount Club, the National Parks Association, the California Council of Landscape Architects, as well as many other fine conservation, garden, and riding clubs.

Mr. President, I am honored to propose this fine addition to our ever-growing wilderness preservation system. As I said when I introduced S. 889:

> The preservation of significant areas of land in our country in their natural state is mandatory. These areas provide present and future generations examples of the workings of nature unimpeded by human invasion. The areas are just as they would be if man had never come upon the earth. As the availability of such areas is reduced by the advance of man, the value of retaining them is amplified.

I today echo my belief in those words, and encourage my colleagues to join me in urging the rapid consideration and passage of this most worthy measure.

I ask that the bill be appropriately referred.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2531) to designate the San Gabriel Wilderness, Angeles National Forest, in the State of California, introduced by Mr. KUCHEL, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 399

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference, an amendment to H.R. 12080, the social security amendments of 1967 presently under consideration by the Committee on Finance.

The amendment would completely remove the limitation on outside earnings that is presently imposed by provisions in the law requiring deductions in social security benefits paid to people who earn more than $125 per month or $1,500 per year. Its effect would be identical to that of S. 1894 which I have introduced as a separate measure.

H.R. 12080 does contain a liberalization of the retirement test. The amount of exempt wages and salary earnings would be increased from $1,500 to $1,680 and the monthly limitation would rise to $140 under section 107 of the bill. From that point a beneficiary would lose $1 in benefits for every $2 earned. At earnings of $2,880 the loss would be dollar for dollar, a consequence which occurs now when wages or salaries exceed $2,700.

I am convinced, however, that the time has come to do away entirely with this unconscionable discrimination against people whose only sources of income after the age of 65 are social security benefits and their own labor.

It is clear that the $984 annual benefit received by the average single social security recipient in mid-1966, or the $1,728 received by the average couple, fell far below an adequate standard of living. The increases under consideration now, if approved, would be helpful but would still not approach a decent income level. The need for many to rely on social security alone would still, as at present, account for a high incidence of poverty among older Americans—for the fact that while people over 65 make up only 9 percent of our population, they include 16 percent of all of our impoverished citizens.

Many do not, of course, rely on social security without supplementation. Some have stocks and bonds, rental property, or other investment income. Under the law, happily, these returns can be collected without interference with program benefits. Those who have investment income—of any amount, even millions—receive the full benefit to which they would otherwise be entitled.

But the law takes a strange twist when it comes to the some 750,000 people who depend on their own labor for extra income over and above meager social security. For every dollar they earn in excess of $1,500 their benefits are cut by 50 cents. For what they earn in excess of $2,700 there is a dollar-for-dollar loss.

What this means, in effect, is that for a couple receiving the average mid-1966 benefit, the law imposes a lid of $3,228 on the total income that can be received without penalty. If the working member earned $2,700 on his own, his social security benefits would be docked by $600, leaving a net income of only $3,820. If he earned $3,828 in wages or salary he would lose all of his social security benefits and his net income would be only $8 more than if he earned $2,700. At that point, additional wage income would no longer be harmful because he would have lost all of his social security.

The figures alone indicate the inequity of the present system and its unjust discrimination against wage earners in favor of those who have money to invest. The level of the earnings limitation, both at present and under section 107 of S. 12080, also clearly illustrates the penalty we are placing on numerous older Americans because of their efforts to provide themselves with a decent living.

It is significant, too, that families in these circumstances had no special deductions made in their social security taxes before they reached 65—they paid according to the same schedule as those who have investment income. The fact that they do not, for whatever reason, have savings, rental property, stocks or bonds at retirement age—putting them at a disadvantage in itself—worsens their circumstances even further by reducing payments that they have invested full premiums to receive.

The law clearly ignores the fact that social security is earned insurance for retirement income, not welfare. It should be changed to account for revisions in the cost of living, the economic realities of retirement, and the capacity and desire of many older people to continue earning past 65.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendment (No. 399) was referred to the Committee on Finance.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2494) to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 to prohibit the charging of certain fees thereunder.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] be added as a cosponsor of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 47) relative to the establishment of a United Nations peacekeeping force.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. GORE:

Address entitled "Horizons in Science and Technology," delivered by Senator HOWARD H. BAKER, JR., of Tennessee, before Middle East Institute's annual meeting at Georgetown University, Friday, September 29, 1967.

SUBSIDIZING SLUMS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, in 1964, the Committee on Banking and Currency amended the Housing Act of 1949, requiring cities assisted by Federal programs to maintain an adequate program of local code enforcement. Many of our programs to assist cities can be rendered ineffective if local communities do not enforce their housing codes. Thus, it is national policy, as indicated in the 1964 Housing Act, to encourage local code enforcement.

In view of this national policy, it seems appropriate that our Internal Revenue Code should operate to achieve the same objective. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] has suggested the Code be amended to require that property owners who apply for depreciation deductions on their Federal income tax must certify that the property is being maintained in accordance with local code enforcement standards. This is one way of getting at the problem of slums without costing the Federal Government any money. It would encourage owners to maintain their property in order to obtain the benefit of depreciation deductions. Mr. President, recently, the Milwaukee Journal and station WITI-published editorials with respect to Senator PROXMIRE's proposal.

I ask unanimous consent that these editorials be published in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal, Sept. 20, 1967]

GETTING AT THE SLUMLORD

There is no good reason why a slumlord should be able to profit additionally under the income tax law on property that violates other laws imposing minimum standards of structural upkeep and sanitation. He can so profit now, and does, by taking his tax deductions for depreciation no matter how many violation notices and court orders may be pending against the property.

Sen. Proxmire (D-Wis.) has proposed a simple correction. He would disallow depreciation claims not accompanied by owners' certification that the property meets all housing standards required under urban renewal laws. False certificates would be subject to prosecution for perjury as well as disallowance of the deductions.

An owner of substandard rental housing would thus have to pay not only a token fine now and then, as a minor business expense, but also a substantially higher income tax if he still didn't want to fix up the property. The inducement should be to put the money into needed maintenance instead of taxes, and then get it back by taking the depreciation fairly enough.

Proxmire's appropriately chosen vehicle for this amendment to the income tax law is the housing tax incentive bill of Sen. Robert Kennedy (D-N.Y.), which seeks to induce more private construction of low rent housing. Both its obvious equity and its practical usefulness at no cost to the government ought to sell it to congress.

[Telecast on WITI-TV (Milwaukee, Wis.) Oct. 5, 1967]

SENATOR PROXMIRE'S PLAN TO ELIMINATE TAX LOOPHOLE AND ENCOURAGE BETTER HOUSING SHOULD BE APPROVED

Is it possible that the federal government . . . on the one hand . . . is spending billions of dollars on urban renewal . . . while, on the other hand, is actually encouraging the continuance of slum neighborhoods? It appears that's what's happening.

Because of our present tax laws . . . slum landlords can make bigger profits . . . on sub-standard housing. Why should the landlord improve his property when improvements would cut down on the amount of depreciation . . . for tax purposes . . . faster than the building reaches a condition of complete uselessness. So, the buildings are purchased . . . rented . . . and depreciated by the landlord. After a few years of making a healthy profit . . . he sells the property to another absentee landlord . . . and the depreciation tax write-off starts all over again.

Such investors make out far better on their taxes than a homeowner. After all, a homeowner cannot depreciate his home on his tax form. The homeowner is permitted a loss only if he suffers a loss in re-sale.

Senator William Proxmire wants to put a stop to the tax loophole enjoyed by the slum landlord . . . and, at the same time, encourage that landlord to improve his property.

Proxmire has proposed that no depreciation be permitted on those buildings which do not meet city housing codes. It's a good plan. This could quickly bring the guilty absentee landlords into line. We don't mean to imply that all absentee landlords permit their property to become run down . . . but, apparently, there are enough profiteers around to make Proxmire's plan worthwhile. Depreciation should always be considered when calculating profit. However, that depreciation should be realistic. TV6 hopes Proxmire's plan will be given serious consideration. It could encourage better housing . . . and, at the same time, eliminate a tax loophole.

THOMPSONVILLE, CONN.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, the story I have to tell today is the story of Thompsonville, Conn.

It is the story of a small town facing potential trouble.

Thompsonville, like many towns in America, depends a lot on a basic industry. In this case, that industry is the Bigelow-Sanford Manufacturing plant with 800 employees. It makes Wilton and velvet carpets.

The Wilton and velvet carpet industry is a declining industry.

An escape-clause investigation by the Tariff Commission in 1961 found that the Wilton and velvet carpet industry was suffering serious injury as a result of increased imports. Imports rose from 4.6 million yards a year in 1956–58 to 7 million in 1959 and 812 million in 1960, when they accounted for 25.9 percent of U.S. production. Domestic production declined by 15 percent between 1957 and 1960 and employment dropped by more than 25 percent.

Consequently, President John F. Kennedy ordered an increase in the tariff from 21 to 40 percent, effective June 17, 1962.

As a result of the increase in duty, imports declined sharply, to an average of half a million yards a year in 1965–66. Imports accounted for 2 to 2½ percent of domestic production in this period.

The protection afforded by a higher tariff saved the industry from extinction. But a reduction in the domestic market for Wiltons and velvets caused further contraction in the industry. Production declined by 26 percent between 1960 and 1966 and employment fell by 38 percent. The number of plants in the United States producing Wiltons or velvets dropped from 35 to 24.

The total number of production and related workers employed in plants producing Wiltons or velvets declined from 12,500 in 1960 to 9,000 in 1967. The number engaged in Wilton or velvet production fell from about 7,500 to less than 5,000.

In 1960, the domestic market consumed 40 million yards of Wilton and velvet carpet. With imports at 8 million yards, the U.S. industry produced 32 million yards.

In 1965–66, the market was only 24 million yards, with one-half a million absorbed by imports and 23½ million served by U.S. production.

If the tariff were to return to the 1960 rate of 21 percent and imports rebounded to the 8-million-yard level, it would leave some 16 million yards of domestic products. This would be a one-third cut in the 1965–66 production rate. Such a cut would make it uneconomic for most U.S. producers to operate. It would wipe out the domestic Wilton and velvet industry.

And now, the time has run out and the problem was whether President Johnson would increase the tariff from 21 percent to 40 percent. Under the law, the tariff would today, October 11, revert back to 21 percent unless extended by the President. Many of us were deeply concerned with respect to the impact on so many States the tariff declined.

To most people in this country there would be little to note. Even in Belgium, the major source of U.S. imports, there would be little to note, since the production of Wilton and velvet carpets has increased by nearly 50 percent since 1961.

But in Thompsonville, the result would be disastrous.

It is easy to say, "Let the workers make something else." But the average age of the worker in the Thompsonville plant is 55. And his roots are in the town. His skills are in the plant. Clearly, if this plant closes down, he is out of work for good. And what of the others in the town—the grocery store and the drugstore—the barbershop and the shoemaker? So the town came to me and I, together with other Senators and Representatives, went to the President.

On Sunday last, the White House called and said, "Come back to Washington for a Monday morning appointment"—2 days before the deadline.

So we went and we talked—and the President listened.

He listened closely—with his heart—and with his head.

We already have an unemployment problem in this country, and if the tariff is cut we will throw people out of work.

We already have a welfare problem, and a tariff cut would put people out of work who want to work.

We are concerned about job discrimination against older workers—and a tariff cut would close down an industry in which the age of the average worker is 55.

We are concerned about job training programs—a tariff cut would destroy jobs for which people are already trained.

Mr. President, I want my colleagues to know that the President listened.

And today, he has acted.

He has acted on behalf of Thompsonville, Conn., and the other Thompsonvilles in this broad land of ours.

And there are many other Thompsonvilles in identical circumstances—Saxonville, Mass.; Amsterdam, N.Y.; Little Falls and Hightstown, N.J.; Bloomsburg and Carlisle, Pa.; Glasgow, Va.; Aberdeen and Robbinsville, N.C.; and Landrum and Liberty, S.C.

I am grateful that today the President has extended the escape clause action on behalf of the Wilton and velvet carpet workers to January 1, 1970.

I want to express on this floor today, on behalf of the people of Thompsonville and the State of Connecticut, their heartfelt appreciation for the concern and action taken by the President of the United States on their behalf.

I know I also speak for those in the other towns affected and the other Senators and Congressmen who have joined me in expressing their concern. I am particularly grateful for the efforts, help, and encouragement of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], and my colleague from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], all of whom have a long and distinguished record of deep concern for the people of their State and their country—as well as the 50 other Senators who joined in writing to the President.

The assistance of Congressman STRATTON, of New York, and others in the other body was also particularly helpful.

But again, Mr. President, I wish to express my deep appreciation to the man who had the power and the responsibility and who used it wisely and with heart—the President of the United States.

UNEMPLOYMENT JUMP TO 4.1 PERCENT PROBABLY TEMPORARY, BUT INDICATES NO ECONOMIC BASIS FOR TAX HIKE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, all economic statistics, and especially unemployment statistics, must be considered with caution. The unemployment statistics that have just been disclosed are no exception.

But the big, blunt fact is that they do show a rise in unemployment to 4.1 percent, the sharpest rise in 5 years.

No Senator who is considering the wisdom of voting for a tax increase can ignore this rise. How can a Senator say that the economy is so explosively inflationary—the labor supply so tight—that we desperately need a tax increase to dampen demand and hold back the surging forces of inflation? How can they say this in light of what the cold statistical facts of life tell us?

Now it is true that the statistics must be treated with caution. It is true that the principal reason unemployment climbed last month was because of the extraordinary influx of women into the work force. It is true that the unemployment rate for adult males fell slightly from 2.4 percent to 2.3 percent.

It is also true that the big Ford Motor Co. strike indirectly contributed to the unemployment figure, although the strikers themselves are not counted as unemployed. And it is true that a quirk in the way unemployment has been computed since January 1, 1967, may have had a significant seasonal effect in raising the statistics for September.

Mr. President, there are three points to be made about this big jump in unemployment in relation to the proposed tax increase.

First. It is clear that in the third month of fiscal 1968—September 1967—the fiscal year during which the mammoth Federal deficit was expected to be so inflationary—there has been no stringent demand in the labor market that would justify the tax increase on grounds that the economy needs it to fight inflation.

Second. It is evident that the economy is now drifting along far below the rate of growth the Republican and Democratic members of the Joint Economic Committee set as our target for this year of 3½ percent unemployment. An important element in the failure of our economy to grow adequately this year is the fact that far too many Americans are unemployed and idle. They are not producing in our economy. A tax increase would make that situation worse, not better.

Third. The basic employment situation is, as Commissioner Ross properly says, strong. The relatively high 4.1-percent rate may well be temporary. It will, in all likelihood, diminish somewhat in coming months without a tax increase. I repeat—without a tax increase. But that diminution in unemployment could be fairly substantial without putting any undue demand pressure on the economy; that is, without inflationary pressures. And that drop in unemployment would be wholesome for the growth of our economy, and very important in the human terms of putting Americans who are now idle and, in most cases, suffering inadequate incomes, to work.

But, Mr. President, Senators should realize that with a tax increase the economy may well stagnate and fail to grow. We could have the worst of all possible worlds—a war, rising prices—caused not by excessive demand, because both too much manpower and too many plant facilities would be idle, but caused by a rising costs including the costs of increased taxes—too high unemployment, poor business conditions, and, on top of everything, increased taxes.

The announcement by the Bureau of Labor Statistics that unemployment jumped more sharply last month than in the past 5 years, and now is at 4.1 percent, should make all Members of Congress skeptical about the proposed tax increase.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an analysis of the increase in unemployment by the staff of the Joint Economic Committee, an additional analysis by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor, and selected tables compiled by the Bureau of Labor Statistics showing last month's employment and unemployment by certain categories.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANALYSIS BY STAFF OF JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

UNEMPLOYMENT

The seasonally adjusted unemployment rate in September rose to 4.1 percent, up from 3.8 percent in August. This is almost entirely accounted for by a rise in the unemployment rate for women from 3.9 to

4.9 percent. The rate for adult males fell slightly to 2.3 percent from 2.4 percent, and in the case of teenagers, rose from 13.7 to 13.8 percent.

The increase in the female unemployment rate (seasonally adjusted) should be interpreted with caution since a change in the definition of unemployment was introduced in January 1967. Part of the increase in the seasonally adjusted rate may have been due to an incomplete development of the seasonal adjustment factor stemming from a lack of experience with the new definition.

LABOR FORCE

The female labor force, which is responsive to opportunities in the job market, rose by nearly 1.0 million from August to September—500,000 more than the usual increase. Although female employment also rose strongly, the increase was not sufficient to balance the large influx of women into the labor force.

EMPLOYMENT

From August to September, total employment decreased 100,000 (S.A.). Farm employment fell 300,000. Nonagricultural employment rose 200,000.

Nonfarm payrolls increased by 275,00 between August and September, even though 235,000 more persons were on strike than in August. On a seasonally adjusted basis, payroll employment fell about 100,000.

BUSINESS CONDITIONS

Mr. Ross characterized business conditions as reflecting a "moderate sustained expansion." Employment has expanded significantly since May, after a period of stagnation, or moderate decline after November 1966.

EFFECT OF STRIKES

A striking worker is counted among the employed. He is not included in the figure for payrolls. Secondary effects of strikes may cause unemployment, however. As of September 15, Mr. Ross estimates that the Ford strike had resulted in secondary unemployment of 10,000.

THE EMPLOYMENT SITUATION: SEPTEMBER 1967

Employment remained strong in September, the U.S. Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics reported today. However, an unusually large increase in adult women in the labor force raised the total unemployment rate to 4.1 percent, up from 3.8 percent in August.[1] The jobless rates for adult men and teenagers were unchanged over the month.

Nonfarm payroll employment increased by 275,000 between August and September, even though there was a substantial rise in the number of persons off payrolls because of strikes. About 235,000 more persons were on strike in September than in August, mainly because of the Ford strike and disputes between teachers and school boards in several cities. Although strikers are considered to be employed in the household survey, they are not on active payrolls and are therefore not counted in the payroll employment statistics. For this reason, seasonally adjusted payroll employment declined by about 100,000; it would have risen more than 100,000 except for the increase in strike activity.

The number of adult women in the labor force rose by nearly 1.0 million between August and September—500,000 more than the usual increase. The employment of women also moved up strongly, but not enough to equal the substantial labor force jump. As a result, the number of unemployed women increased by about 250,000 and their jobless rate rose from 3.9 to 4.9 percent.

In contrast, the September unemployment rates for all adult men and married men, 2.3 and 1.8 percent respectively, remained near their record lows. The teenage rate (13.8 percent) was virtually unchanged from the August level. The unemployment rate for nonwhite men moved down to 3.5 percent, the lowest rate since the series began in 1954 and below the rate for all workers for the first time.

TOTAL EMPLOYMENT

Over the month, total employment declined by about 100,000 (seasonally adjusted) because of a sharp drop (300,000) in agricultural employment. Cool and wet weather over much of the country this summer delayed fall harvesting and seeding activity.

Employment in nonagricultural industries showed a seasonally adjusted increase of about 200,000 in September. (In this series, persons on strike are counted as employed.) A substantial increase in nonfarm employment among adult women more than offset a decline for teenagers.

At 74.6 million in September, total employment was up 1.4 million from a year earlier. Agricultural employment continued its long-term downtrend—falling by 250,000 over the year. Employment in the nonagricultural sector rose by 1,650,000 from the September 1966 level.

INDUSTRY EMPLOYMENT

Seasonally adjusted, nonfarm payroll employment was 66.1 million in September, down 100,000 from August. The largest declines occurred in manufacturing, transportation and public utilities, and State and local government, all of which were affected by strikes. The number of secondary layoffs was relatively small (less than 10,000), since the survey week was the first full week of the Ford strike. Most of the layoffs were in "feeder" plants which supply metal parts to the automobile industry.

After seasonal adjustment, manufacturing employment was down by 180,000 over the month, with 160,000 of the decline occurring in the durable goods industries. Nearly all of this decline is attributable to the automobile strike, not only in the automobile industry itself but also in struck plants in the primary metals, fabricated metals, and electrical equipment industries.

Insured unemployment under State programs declined to 890,000 in mid-September. The insured rate was 2.4 percent (seasonally adjusted), compared with 2.7 percent in August and 2.2 percent in September 1966. Secondary layoffs from the Ford strikes were low in mid-September and have remained moderate thus far. The return to work of persons laid off during the automobile model change-over more than made up for any secondary layoffs because of the strike.

Most of the service-producing industries continued to show larger-than-seasonal employment pickups. Trade employment rose by 30,000 over the month, and miscellaneous services had an increase of 45,000. State and local government (the most rapidly growing sector for many years) declined in September because of several labor disputes involving public school systems.

HOURS AND EARNINGS

In September, the average hourly earnings of rank and file employees on private nonfarm payrolls were $2.70—up 10 cents, or 3.8 percent, from September 1966. The workweek averaged 38.3 hours, down 0.5 hour from the September 1966 level.

The average weekly hours of manufacturing production workers were unchanged from August at 40.7 hours (seasonally adjusted). Over the year, the factory workweek was down 0.7 hour; declines occurred in 17 of the 21 manufacturing industries.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Unemployment, at 2.9 million, did not show the usual August-to-September drop this year because of the large increase (250,000) in the number of unemployed adult women. After seasonal adjustment, unemployment was up 200,000 from the previous month. The total unemployment rate, at 4.1 percent, was up from 3.8 percent in August and was at its highest point since November 1965.

The over-the-month increase in the unemployment of adult women was widespread among the various occupations and industries. All of the increase occurred in the short-term jobless group (less than 5 weeks). Unemployment rates moved up for persons whose last jobs had been in the clerical, sales, service, and operative occupations—where female employment is substantial. Similarly, the unemployment rates in trade and in finance and services increased over the month. The unemployment rate in agriculture rose sharply in September, while farm employment declined.

The nonwhite unemployment rate, which had dropped to about 7.0 percent in July and August, moved back up to 7.9 percent in September. The increase was primarily attributable to a substantial rise in the rate for nonwhite women.

TABLE A-1—EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF THE NONINSTITUTIONAL POPULATION BY AGE AND SEX

[In thousands]

Employment status, age, and sex	September 1967	August 1967	September 1966	Seasonally adjusted				
				September 1967	August 1967	July 1967	June 1967	May 1967
TOTAL								
Total labor force	80,982	82,571	78,982	81,259	81,160	80,954	80,681	79,645
Civilian labor force	77,526	79,112	75,753	77,803	77,701	77,505	77,237	76,189
Employed	74,631	76,170	73,248	74,625	74,718	74,489	74,147	73,289
Agriculture	3,931	4,378	4,186	3,676	3,992	3,856	3,727	3,652
Nonagricultural industries	70,700	71,792	69,063	70,949	70,726	70,633	70,420	69,637
On part time for economic reasons	1,883	2,175	1,564	1,977	1,855	2,011	1,939	1,539
Usually work full time	1,073	1,012	841	1,081	992	1,058	1,072	910
Usually work part time	810	1,163	723	896	863	953	867	629
Unemployed	2,895	2,942	2,505	3,178	2,983	3,016	3,090	2,900

---

[1] A January 1967 change in the unemployment definition may have affected the seasonal pattern of adult female unemployment between August and September—a time when many women enter the labor force to look for work as their children enter school. The new definitions include persons seeking work in the previous 4 weeks; under the old definitions, only those looking for jobs in the week before the survey were counted.

TABLE A-1—EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF THE NONINSTITUTIONAL POPULATION BY AGE AND SEX—Continued

[In thousands]

Employment status, age, and sex	September 1967	August 1967	September 1966	Seasonnally adjusted				
				September 1967	August 1967	July 1967	June 1967	May 1967
MEN, 20 YEARS AND OVER								
Civilian labor force	45,600	45,955	44,851	45,476	45,559	45,433	45,314	45,021
Employed	44,761	44,969	43,980	44,435	44,479	44,338	44,156	43,922
Agriculture	2,924	2,909	2,996	2,806	2,835	2,791	2,726	2,753
Nonagricultural industries	41,837	42,060	40,984	41,629	41,644	41,547	41,430	41,169
Unemployed	839	986	871	1,041	1,080	1,095	1,158	1,099
WOMEN, 20 YEARS AND OVER								
Civilian labor force	25,903	24,948	24,829	26,051	25,557	25,516	25,177	24,730
Employed	24,615	23,892	23,873	24,781	24,558	24,421	24,094	23,773
Agriculture	638	802	803	512	705	624	581	537
Nonagricultural industries	23,978	23,090	23,069	24,269	23,853	23,797	23,513	23,236
Unemployed	1,287	1,055	956	1,270	999	1,095	1,083	957
BOTH SEXES, 16 TO 19 YEARS								
Civilian labor force	6,024	8,209	6,072	6,276	6,585	6,556	6,746	6,438
Employed	5,254	7,309	5,396	5,409	5,681	5,730	5,897	5,594
Agriculture	369	667	386	358	452	441	420	362
Nonagricultural industries	4,886	6,641	5,009	5,051	5,229	5,289	5,477	5,232
Unemployed	769	900	676	867	904	826	849	844

TABLE A-2.—UNEMPLOYED PERSONS 16 YEARS AND OVER BY DURATION OF UNEMPLOYMENT

[In thousands]

Duration of unemployment	September 1967	August 1967	September 1966	Seasonally adjusted				
				September 1967	August 1967	July 1967	June 1967	May 1967
Less than 5 weeks	1,810	1,537	1,487	1,889	1,660	1,805	1,649	1,371
5 to 14 weeks	715	1,037	613	945	946	876	919	877
15 weeks and over	370	367	405	437	441	435	444	414
15 to 26 weeks	226	166	226	278	231	265	298	271
27 weeks and over	144	201	179	159	210	170	146	143

TABLE A-3.—MAJOR UNEMPLOYMENT INDICATORS (PERSONS 16 YEARS AND OVER)

Selected categories	Thousand of persons unemployed		Seasonally adjusted rates of unemployment					
	September 1967	September 1966	September 1967	August 1967	July 1967	June 1967	May 1967	September 1966
Total (all civilian workers)	2,895	2,505	4.1	3.8	3.9	4.0	3.8	3.7
Men, 20 years and over	839	871	2.3	2.4	2.4	2.6	2.4	2.4
Women, 20 years and over	1,287	956	4.9	3.9	4.3	4.3	3.9	3.8
Both sexes, 16 to 19 years	769	676	13.8	13.7	12.6	12.6	13.1	12.9
White	2,269	1,954	3.6	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.3	3.2
Nonwhite	626	550	7.9	6.9	7.2	7.8	7.8	7.2
Married men	526	542	1.8	2.0	1.8	2.0	1.9	1.9
Full-time workers	2,086	1,908	3.8	3.6	3.6	3.9	3.5	3.4
Unemployed 15 weeks and over	370	405	.6	.6	.6	.6	.5	.6
State insured[1]	891	756	2.4	2.7	2.8	2.6	2.7	2.2
Labor force time lost[2]	----------	----------	4.6	4.3	4.3	4.5	3.8	4.2
OCCUPATION								
White-collar workers	920	795	2.5	2.2	2.2	2.2	1.9	2.3
Professional and managerial	239	256	1.3	1.1	1.2	1.2	1.3	1.4
Clerical workers	495	407	3.7	3.4	3.2	3.2	2.5	3.2
Sales workers	186	132	4.1	3.2	3.7	3.8	2.5	3.0
Blue-collar workers	1,067	918	4.6	4.4	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.1
Craftsmen and foremen	157	179	2.2	2.4	2.3	2.8	2.8	2.5
Operatives	673	513	5.4	4.8	5.4	5.1	4.9	4.2
Nonfarm laborers	237	226	8.1	7.8	8.0	7.8	8.3	7.7
Service workers	373	387	5.1	4.1	4.5	4.3	4.1	4.4
INDUSTRY								
Private wage and salary workers[3]	2,208	1,795	4.2	3.9	4.1	4.0	3.9	3.8
Construction	122	190	5.4	7.1	7.6	8.6	7.8	8.5
Manufacturing	739	576	4.1	3.8	4.0	3.9	3.9	3.2
Durable goods	389	290	3.7	3.4	4.1	3.6	3.8	2.9
Nondurable goods	350	285	4.5	4.5	4.0	4.3	4.0	3.7
Transportation and public utilities	93	74	2.4	2.6	2.4	2.9	2.7	2.0
Wholesale and retail trade	559	467	5.1	4.2	4.4	4.1	3.6	4.5
Finance and service industries	583	469	4.0	3.5	3.5	3.3	3.5	3.4
Government wage and salary workers	249	247	2.1	1.5	1.7	2.1	1.7	2.3
Agricultural wage and salary workers	98	58	11.1	7.1	7.2	7.8	6.3	6.2

[1] Insured unemployment under State programs as a percent of average covered employment.

[2] Man-hours lost by the unemployed and persons on part time for economic reasons as a percent of potentially available labor force man-hours.

[3] Includes mining, not shown separately.

TABLE A-4.—FULL- AND PART-TIME STATUS OF THE CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE, SEPTEMBER 1967

[Thousands of persons]

Full- and part-time employment status	Total	Men, 20 and over	Women, 20 and over	Both sexes, 16 to 19 years
FULL TIME				
Civilian labor force	67,950	43,845	20,799	3,306
Employed:				
Full-time schedules	63,747	42,154	18,939	2,653
Part time for economic reasons	2,117	932	913	272
Unemployed, looking for full-time work	2,086	759	947	381
Unemployment rate	3.1	1.7	4.6	11.5
PART TIME				
Civilian labor force	9,576	1,755	5,103	2,718
Employed (voluntary part time)	8,767	1,675	4,763	2,330
Unemployed, looking for part-time work	809	80	341	388
Unemployment rate	8.4	4.6	6.7	14.3

TABLE A-5.—EMPLOYED PERSONS BY AGE AND SEX

[In thousands]

Age and sex	September 1967	August 1967	September 1966	Seasonally adjusted				
				September 1967	August 1967	July 1967	June 1967	May 1967
Total, 16 years and over	74,631	76,170	73,248	74,625	74,718	74,489	74,147	73,289
16 to 19 years	5,254	7,309	5,396	5,409	5,681	5,730	5,897	5,594
16 and 17 years	2,113	3,214	2,100	2,246	2,341	2,322	2,363	2,201
18 and 19 years	3,141	4,095	3,296	3,148	3,331	3,402	3,491	3,358
20 to 24 years	8,491	8,967	7,899	8,522	8,612	8,604	8,571	8,420
25 years and over	60,885	59,894	59,954	60,724	60,393	60,128	59,678	59,300
25 to 54 years	47,090	46,385	46,439	46,768	46,709	46,471	46,062	46,044
55 years and over	13,795	13,509	13,514	13,698	13,632	13,563	13,627	13,244
Males, 16 years and over	47,705	49,233	46,991	47,479	47,712	47,555	47,448	47,050
16 to 19 years	2,944	4,264	3,012	3,044	3,233	3,217	3,292	3,128
16 and 17 years	1,291	1,989	1,234	1,409	1,436	1,399	1,403	1,324
18 and 19 years	1,653	2,275	1,778	1,653	1,786	1,810	1,856	1,766
20 to 24 years	4,861	5,238	4,580	4,849	4,891	4,856	4,881	4,750
25 years and over	39,900	39,731	39,400	39,589	39,566	39,468	39,266	39,177
25 to 54 years	30,905	30,811	30,554	30,648	30,638	30,584	30,424	30,402
55 years and over	8,996	8,920	8,845	8,898	8,889	8,860	8,870	8,738
Females, 16 years and over	26,925	26,937	26,256	27,146	27,006	26,934	26,669	26,239
16 to 19 years	2,310	3,045	2,384	2,365	2,448	2,513	2,605	2,466
16 and 17 years	822	1,225	866	837	905	923	960	877
18 and 19 years	1,488	1,820	1,518	1,495	1,545	1,592	1,635	1,592
20 to 24 years	3,630	3,730	3,319	3,673	3,721	3,748	3,690	3,670
25 years and over	20,985	20,162	20,554	21,135	20,827	20,660	20,412	20,123
25 to 54 years	16,186	15,574	15,885	16,120	16,071	15,887	15,638	15,642
55 years and over	4,800	4,588	4,669	4,800	4,743	4,703	4,757	4,506

Note: Due to the independent seasonal adjustment of several of the series, detail will not necessarily add to totals.

TABLE A-6.—UNEMPLOYED PERSONS BY AGE AND SEX

Age and sex	Thousands		Percent looking for full-time work September 1967	Seasonally adjusted unemployment rates					
	September 1967	August 1967		September 1967	August 1967	July 1967	June 1967	May 1967	September 1966
Total, 16 years and over	2,895	2,942	72.1	4.1	3.8	3.9	4.0	3.8	3.7
16 to 19 years	769	900	49.5	13.8	13.7	12.6	12.6	13.1	12.9
16 and 17 years	345	408	24.3	15.6	15.3	14.4	14.0	13.7	14.8
18 and 19 years	424	492	70.0	12.6	12.7	11.4	11.3	12.8	11.2
20 to 24 years	569	513	79.4	6.6	5.5	6.2	5.8	5.2	5.2
25 years and over	1,557	1,529	80.5	2.7	2.5	2.6	2.8	2.6	2.6
25 to 54 years	1,267	1,199	81.5	2.8	2.6	2.7	2.9	2.7	2.6
55 years and over	290	330	76.2	2.3	2.5	2.3	2.3	2.7	2.5
Males, 16 years and over	1,214	1,441	76.8	3.0	3.1	3.1	3.3	3.2	3.1
16 to 19 years	375	455	46.4	12.4	12.4	11.6	12.3	12.9	12.3
16 and 17 years	188	243	27.7	13.2	15.3	14.5	14.2	14.5	14.1
18 and 19 years	187	212	65.2	11.4	10.2	9.2	10.3	11.8	10.2
20 to 24 years	206	244	78.6	4.9	5.0	5.0	5.1	4.9	4.3
25 years and over	633	742	94.3	1.9	2.0	2.1	2.2	2.1	2.2
25 to 54 years	481	538	96.5	1.9	2.0	2.0	2.1	2.0	2.0
55 years and over	152	204	86.8	2.0	2.4	2.3	2.5	2.8	2.6
Females, 16 years and over	1,681	1,501	68.6	5.9	5.1	5.3	5.2	4.8	4.8
16 to 19 years	394	446	52.5	15.6	15.4	13.8	13.0	13.4	13.6
16 and 17 years	157	166	20.4	19.3	15.4	14.3	13.8	12.4	15.8
18 and 19 years	237	280	73.8	13.8	15.4	13.8	12.4	13.8	12.2
20 to 24 years	363	268	79.9	8.8	6.1	7.6	6.8	5.5	6.5
25 years and over	924	787	71.1	4.1	3.5	3.7	3.9	3.4	3.3
25 to 54 years	787	662	72.2	4.5	3.7	4.1	4.5	4.0	3.5
55 years and over	137	125	65.7	2.9	2.7	2.2	1.7	2.6	2.4

CONGRESS SHOULD USE PPB TO CONTROL SPENDING

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the new techniques used in the planning-programing-budgeting system—PPBS—are making possible valuable advances in achieving efficient government. Recently the Economy in Government Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee held a 4-day hearing into the current application and future potentials of PPBS.

An integral tool utilized in PPB systems is that of cost-benefit analysis, and within cost-benefit studies the most important factor is the discount rate employed in the analysis. On Monday I told the Senate that current use of an unrealistically low-discount rate for public works projects is causing major economic dislocations. The advantage of PPBS methods is that alternative means to attain a specified goal are analyzed and evaluated. Congress should use these techniques and insist that alternative interest rates be used in determining spending requests for public works projects.

The executive branch already is widely using PPB systems. In the September

23 issue of Business Week a top official is quoted as saying PPBS will give the Presidency "a more effective management mechanism than it has ever had" and PPBS is termed "a revolution in government management." As the article shows, the agencies will be able to coordinate and allocate by "programmatic" methods.

According to one witness in the PPBS hearings, Congress really has no alternative but to develop PPB systems. At my request the Interior Department and the Department of Defense recalculated benefit-cost ratios on selected public works projects utilizing a series of different discount rates. These calculations showed that significant spending cuts should be made in many long-range public works projects.

Mr. President, Congress has the right to insist that the administration prepare cost-benefit studies with alternative discount rates. If such practices were done throughout the Government, it is probable that more optimal spending patterns would result. And most important, if the Congress develops these techniques we will have much more control over the budget.

I ask unanimous consent that the Business Week article entitled "A McNamara-Style Budget Bureau" be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A MCNAMARA-STYLE BUDGET BUREAU

(NOTE.—The Bureau of the Budget, LBJ's No. 1 watchdog, is being reshaped to coordinate federal programs and to tie in with government-wide systems analysis, cost effectiveness.)

When federal agency heads submit their fiscal 1969 spending plans for review next month, they will find that President Johnson's budget referee has changed its style.

The switch foreshadows a significant increase in the power of the White House to command and control the massive federal bureaucracy. It could lead to abandonment of some federal programs, to shifts in emphasis on others, and to new pressures for realignment of the federal government's structure.

The strategic Bureau of the Budget—which double-checks every agency's annual plans, kibitzes government management practices, coordinates Administration legislation, and performs a variety of extra chores for Johnson—is being reorganized along "programmatic" lines.

WINNOWING

Instead of building the next federal budget on an agency-by-agency approach, the bureau intends to focus on broad program areas, spotlighting programs aimed at the same objectives and trimming out programs that duplicate or run at cross-purposes with one another.

The chief purpose of the reorganization is to cope with the growing interrelationship of independently run federal activities.

Hand in hand with the Budget Bureau reshaping goes the government-wide adoption of Pentagon-style "program budgeting," ordered by Johnson in 1965 and now beginning to take hold in civilian agencies.

The program budget, along with systems analysis and cost-effectiveness, are the tools that are widely credited with giving Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara firmer control over the Pentagon than any of his predecessors. Its spread throughout the government, according to White House special assistant Joseph A. Califano, Jr., will give the Presidency "a more effective management mechanism than it has ever had."

"A premise of our action," says one of the authors of the Budget Bureau reorganization, "is that there is no longer any way to organize programs to avoid 'bridging' problems. The organizational problems of today aren't box-drawing problems. It doesn't make any difference how you structure the government; unless you have a 'Department of Everything' you'll have coordination problems."

To provide better coordination, and to spot conflicts requiring top-level decision, Budget Director Charles L. Schultze last month gave the go-ahead for a profound reorganization of his bureau.

The main thrusts are a restructuring of the divisions that review each agency's budget plans, and the creation of an Office of Executive Management.

Six programs divisions emerged from the reorganization. But there will still be problems in meshing the gears of separate agencies. "They each have a statute that gives them a piece of the pie," notes a bureau official, "and it's supposed to end up in a fluffy-looking meringue."

The bureau has mapped out areas of predictable overlaps, however, and designated which division should take the lead in program areas such as scientific research or energy resources. The first test of how successfully the bureau can provide the bridges between programs will start when departmental fiscal 1969 budget plans begin arriving Oct. 1.

The Office of Executive Management will have broader assignments. Its bailiwick will include: analyzing government structure—and probably recommending agency realignments; helping agencies hone their management systems; overseeing government-wide projects, and coordinating operations with state and local programs.

REVIEW

It also will shoulder special projects, probably including a review of all government-contracting practices. The leading candidate to head the new office is Dwight A. Ink, currently Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

Johnson's fiscal 1969 budget also is expected to get a new look from another direction.

A special Presidential commission on budget concepts has been at work since March trying to hammer out a new format for presenting the federal budget. This year, three different "budgets" were used to detail Administration plans and to provide information on the impact of government activities on the economy. The commission's task was to review the structure and presentation of the budget and recommend needed changes. It has been working toward a single Budget of the United States, and its report is just about ready for submission to the President. The commissions' recommendations are expected to be reflected in the budget that Johnson sends Congress next January.

President Johnson already has demonstrated a tendency to use the Budget Bureau as a prime tool of enforcing policy and bringing pressure against the inertia of entrenched federal programs. If the reorganization achieves its purposes, the Budget Bureau will become an even more effective arm of the White House.

Government-wide adherence to the technique of program budgeting and systems analysis, developed for the Pentagon by Rand Corp. in the 1950s and imposed by McNamara in 1961, will have even more impact.

In Washington, this system has been alphabetized with the four-letter designation "PPBS"—standing for "programming-planning-budgeting system."

From its proponents' point of view, the most important effect of the approach is that it makes departmental chiefs exercise foresight. It forces them to plan ahead, to lay out goals five years or so in the future, and then to organize their current spending plans as coherent efforts to reach those goals. It also employs computer technology to analyze alternative approaches.

PROTOTYPE

Of course, private corporations have planned this way for years. In fact, E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Co. had planning and budgeting procedures based on similar techniques going strong in the 1920s.

William Gorham, Assistant Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, reported to Senator William Proxmire's (D-Wis.) Economy in Government Subcommittee last week that the approach already has brought a basic shift in HEW's budget-building process.

Until this year, Gorham said, HEW's budget request was pieced together largely by just adding up the requests from each individual program chief. New legislation that might be in the planning stage was simply ignored.

LONG RANGE

Now, Gorham told Proxmire, HEW's programs are being considered in the framework of five-year objectives proposed by HEW's component agencies and reviewed and revised by the secretary.

PPBS will not be imposed without opposition. The system has foes in high places.

DOUBTER

"On a cost-effectiveness basis," Vice-Admiral Hyman G. Rickover scoffed in testimony before the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee last year, "the colonists would not have revolted against King George III, nor would John Paul Jones have engaged the 'Serapis' with the 'Bonhomme Richard,' an inferior ship."

But Presidential aide Califano has called PPBS a "revolution in government management."

"What this process can do for a President," Califano says, "is inform his judgment and help assure that his decisions are based on facts, alternatives, and sound analysis. It can show a President how much he will get for what he spends today—and how much more, or less it will cost if he waits until tomorrow."

HOW BUDGET BUREAU SPLITS UP THE GOVERNMENT

National security programs: Defense Department military operations.

International programs: State Department, Agency for International Development, U.S. Information Agency, Ex-Im Bank, Central Intelligence Agency.

Natural resources programs: Defense Department civil operations, Agriculture, Interior, river basin commissions, Tennessee Valley Authority.

Human resources programs: Health, Education and Welfare, Housing and Urban Development, Office of Economic Opportunity, Labor, Veterans Administration.

Science, technology, and economic programs: Transportation, Commerce, regional commissions, regulatory agencies. Small Business Administration, National Science Foundation, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Atomic Energy Commission.

General government management programs: Justice, Civil Service, Post Office, General Services Administration, Treasury, District of Columbia, certain government-wide services.

COLUMBUS DAY, 1967

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, today our Nation honors Christopher Columbus. We honor Columbus not just for what he did, but for the kind of man he was—

a man who refused to accept the conventional wisdom that the world was flat, who turned his back on the defenders of the status quo, who said it could not be done. He was a man who had the courage and steadfastness to follow his vision to its realization.

The life of Christopher Columbus should be an inspiration to the youth of our country, particularly for those young people interested in going into politics and public service. His is the kind of spirit we need in government today, at all levels—Federal, State, and local.

Without the Columbus spirit, we would never have been able to pass the Immigration Reform Act of 1965 which abolished the invidious and discriminatory national origins clause. For years, a lonely minority in Congress—and I am proud to have been one of them—fought to wipe this insulting provision off the statute books. All of the inside dopesters said it would never be done. But we kept up the fight and in the end were victorious. And today all Americans benefit from that legislation. We have 20,000 friends coming to this country each year from Italy instead of one-fourth of that number.

I am also proud to be one of those in Congress who is fighting for national recognition of Columbus Day. And if the Congress finally gets moving on this resolution, people all over the country, not just in Pennsylvania and a few other enlightened States, will be able to take the day off on October 12 next year because it will be a national holiday.

PROGRESS IN NORTHEASTERN MINNESOTA

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, 5 years ago northeastern Minnesota, the Nation's major source of iron ore for more than half a century, was one of the most economically depressed and demoralized areas in the Nation. Today this section of my State is bustling with new vitality and economic activity. The main factor in this upswing is the tremendous investment—now exceeding $1 billion—in taconite plant facilities. The expanding taconite industry not only provides many new jobs but has tended to stabilize the once-seasonal mining industry which has always dominated northeastern Minnesota's economy.

But along with the growth of the taconite industry, northeastern Minnesota has also pursued a second vital goal—industrial diversification. Among the vehicles for this important effort are the Federal Economic Development Administration, the State area redevelopment agency, and the Northeastern Minnesota Development Association—NEMDA—a broadly based, privately financed $1 million industrial development corporation which was formed in May 1964 to help attract new industries to the region and to help expand the ones already there. One of NEMDA's directors, Mr. Arthur C. Barschdorf, of the Minnesota Power & Light Co., recently summed up northeastern Minnesota's progress in a speech to the Minnesota Associated Press Editors meeting, in Duluth. Mr. Barschdorf's statement provides an excellent example of what can be accomplished through a combination of Federal and State efforts and local cooperation, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF A. C. BARSCHDORF, TO MINNESOTA ASSOCIATED PRESS EDITORS MEETING, DULUTH AUDITORIUM, SEPTEMBER 9, 1967

You people are better informed than most groups I address on economic developments in northeastern Minnesota, because it is your business to be informed. And I suspect that you have heard enough of our wailings about our distressed economy and economic problems, that you have expected to find Duluth sliding slowly into Lake Superior. Surprisingly, I have found many persons in the Twin Cities and southern half of the state—whom I thought would know better—expecting to find here a rather depressed area dotted with closed stores and clusters of unemployed.

It's no wonder that this feeling still exists. We have spent so much time publicizing our problems and shortcomings, particularly during legislative sessions, that our pluses have been somewhat overlooked.

I am here tonight to talk about our pluses, about the good that is happening in our area; about perhaps the brightest future this area has ever had; about being an asset area and not a problem area of our state.

Outsiders generally think of this area as one dominated by mining with a fair amount of tourism and wood products, some shipping, and a lot of good water not being used.

Our basic industry is still mining, but it's a different breed. It's a more stable one, not subject to seasonal ups and downs, and with the great bulk of its jobs at higher skills and higher pay. Most important, it is a growing industry. Today's $1 billion-plus investment in taconite plant facilities will grow to $2 billion by 1975 and to $2.6 billion by 1990. Employment by that year will top the highest figure—17,400 jobs—ever reached in Minnesota iron mining. These are not my projections, but those of Dr. Eugene Pfleider, the mining authority at the University of Minnesota, whose knowledge of the industry is well respected.

We had a $400 million wave of taconite plant construction immediately following passage of the Taconite amendment. These projects—the Minntac plant of U.S. Steel Corporation at Mountain Iron; the Butler Taconite plant of The Hanna Mining Company, Inland Steel Company and Wheeling Steel Corporation at Nashwauk; the National Steel Pellet Plant of Hanna and National Steel Corporation at Keewatin; the Eveleth Taconite plant of Ford Motor Company and Oglebay Norton at Forbes; and expansion projects at Erie Mining Company and Reserve Mining Company, all in a relatively small geographic area—are just about finished.

Now most of these firms—and Jones & Laughlin Steel Corporation, which earlier announced a $63 million taconite plant to be built near Biwabik—are poised for a second stage of construction. Hopefully, announcements of specific projects will be coming within the next few months.

All this taconite plant activity has spawned what we call satellite plants. Investment in facilities for explosives, oxygen, steel castings and bentonite alone has reached more than $12 million, and created hundreds of new jobs, and these figures do not include numerous supply type firms which have grown up across the Range; nor the $12 million put into new taconite transport facilities by the Great Northern and Duluth, Missabe & Iron Range railroads.

I realize much of this taconite story is old to you by now, but I think it is well to review briefly these developments as a reminder of the tremendous impact they have had already and will play in the future.

Long range growth prospects are heightened by copper-nickel exploration underway by International Nickel Company, and other national firms which have taken leases on state and federal lands.

INCO—which currently is sinking a regular underground shaft in its exploratory phase—is expected to invest $100 million in its initial plant near Ely. This project will create a mining operation employing 1000 to 1500 persons.

Other firms, such as Kennecott Copper, Phelps Dodge, Amax, U. S. Steel, Cleveland Cliffs, Duval, New Jersey Zinc and Newmont are watching INCO's progress very closely.

Copper-nickel developments—aided as was taconite by enlightened tax legislation—could become almost as big as taconite.

Wood products constitute our state's third largest industry with a value of products each year reaching $500 million. Most of the plants are concentrated in northern Minnesota. In Cloquet alone 3,400 persons are employed in well paying jobs in four plants. It's a steadily growing industry which really has not done a good job of telling its story, and thus, perhaps, is not as much appreciated as it should be.

We are planning to change that situation somewhat this fall with the first Wood Fiber Symposium ever conducted in the Midwest to be held in Duluth October 11 followed by a field trip into the woods the next day. The industry itself is working with the University of Minnesota—and other interested firms, such as the company I work for--to develop a conference that will command the kind of world attention accorded annually to the Mining Symposium.

I hope you editors will find it worthwhile to give the wood fiber symposium coverage with reporters and photographers. I do know that you will be invited to attend.

I said the wood products industry in this area was a steadily growing one, and I document this statement with a figure of $50 million invested in new plants and expansion over the past 12 years. New multi-million dollar expansion projects by major wood products firms are in final planning stages now. A real asset for the future is the modern new $1.2 million research facility opened in Cloquet August 11 by Potlatch Forests, Inc., one of the country's largest wood products firms.

A vital part of expansion plans of The Northwest Paper Company is the $7 million waterline now being built from Superior through Duluth to Cloquet. Industrial areas along the way will be opened for development with an adequate supply of quality water.

The waterline is our first major project related to water and industrial development. There will be others as we learn how better to exploit one of the nation's great, virtually untapped water resources.

A good start has been provided, we think, with completion of the world's first water quality laboratory in Duluth less than a month ago. This $3.3 million national research facility will attract scientists from all over the world, and draw attention to the vast amounts of cool, fresh, high quality water available in our area.

Secretary of Interior Udall, who helped dedicate the laboratory along Lake Superior's North Shore, called the research facility a milestone against water pollution. It represents, as he pointed out, a fresh new attack on a major national problem.

Water for industry, we have. Water for health, we have. Water for transportation, we have in Lake Superior, the other Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence Seaway which have put Duluth-Superior in the ocean commerce of the world.

Our port has long been known for shipping of iron ore in tens of millions of tons, but consider these 1966 figures: 223.5 million bushels—almost 6 million tons—of grain shipped from the Head of the Lakes, 108 million bushels went directly to overseas destinations, and 37 million bushels to Canadian ports for transshipment overseas. In other words, well over half this record shipping of grain went into foreign nations. Last year other general bulk cargo such as oil and fats totaled 417,000 tons, and general type of cargo which, of course, requires more handling and creates more payroll, totaled 108,500 tons. These tonnages represent a great number of the "salties" or ocean-going ships in our harbor during the shipping year.

There's talk—backed with some optimism—that our shipping season can be 11 months instead of some eight months, and efforts are underway to determine how.

In the short space of nine years since the Seaway opened, the economic impact of the port has grown to equal a $16 million annual payroll, or a plant employing some 2,800 persons at an average pay of $108 weekly, something the size of the U.S. Steel plant in Morgan Park, the city's largest employer.

Grain and iron ore shipments are down so far this year, reflecting the slowdown in the national economy, and, in the case of grain, also the threat, and then the actual strike of grain millers. But general packaged cargo already has topped last year's import-export figure, meaning that the most productive, dollarwise, of our shipping continues to grow appreciably.

Water for recreation and tourism we have—in the North Shore of Lake Superior—which we claim is the nation's most scenic drive—and in 13 thousand, maybe 14 thousand lakes and streams.

We haven't done as much, by far, as we can with our recreational resources which also include our forests, and the attraction of great iron mines and taconite plants, an ocean port, and healthy enjoyable weather. But we are learning some lessons from nearby states and from New England that tourism is mighty big business, and produces nearly 100 percent new dollars since little if any expansion of municipal services is needed to serve the visitor.

We need—and we are preparing to stimulate—more luxury resorts such as Sugar Hills, Lutsen, and Quadna Mountain where year around outdoor leisure pursuits are offered to an increasingly growing number of families wanting to participate in, rather than simply watch, sports.

A feasibility study for a luxury all-season resort near Ely to take advantage of the unique attraction of the wilderness, canoe country has been completed. Such a resort will be built. It will create business—as luxury resorts all over have done—for smaller, more modest resorts, and help form a broader base for a visitor season that is year around. This industry is estimated to be a $50 million-a year one now in our area. It should not be difficult to double or even triple that sum.

There is a new dimension to our visitor industry—you have seen it and are now enjoying it—our $6½ million arena-auditorium. It is one of the finest and most functional facilities of its kind in the country, and has lifted us literally into the big leagues of the convention business.

Joe Sturckler, the arena-auditorium manager who has had wide experience in his field, figured that in the first year of the facility, ending only last month, it has pumped more than $8 million into the Duluth-Superior economy. I think his figure is too conservative, based upon attendance of 780,000 persons at arena-auditorium events.

He thinks, and I heartedly agree with him that we are just getting started. We can now handle national and regional conventions where before we could handle only the more modestly-sized state convention groups. We can attract the biggest names in show business, in sports, in entertainment.

Believe it or not, more than 900 persons came up from the Twin Cities to hear and see Andy Williams this summer. At least that many will be coming to hear Jack Benny next Friday when he helps celebrate the arena-auditorium's first birthday.

Ice Capades, considered the world's finest ice show, is so enthralled with Duluth and this facility, that it has signed a five-year contract to create and rehearse its new shows and have here each year its world premiere.

We are having Grand Opera on the scale of the great Metropolitan Opera, Robert Merrill helped open the arena-auditorium last year. Our symphony orchestra is attracting the finest stars for performances.

We have had the Harlem Globe Trotters in basketball, major college hockey, top rodeo, teen singing idols and bands, circuses—which shortly will include the Barnum and Bailey circus—all drawing thousands of people to Duluth.

Restaurants, supper clubs, stores, service stations, hotels and motels, report a noticeable surge in business since the arena-auditorium opened to attest to its economic impact.

But the arena-auditorium has meant much more than that to Duluth in my opinion. It has been a project which has aroused considerable civic pride in our citizenry and helped revive a strong spirit, a new confidence in our people.

The same people who generally were fault finding and negative about almost anything in Duluth are willing today to tackle and are tackling all kinds of community projects.

One example is the small group of business leaders who took on the task of developing the downtown urban renewal area. They have succeeded in attracting a new television-radio studio, future expansion of Bud's own newspaper plant, a new $3.6 million motor hotel to be called the Radisson-Duluth—a high rise apartment building not yet formally announced.

This same group is taking on multi-million dollar downtown parking, and development of an entire central business district block into a new merchandising complex.

Another example is the astounding number of beautification projects developed by individuals and private groups, the Fifth Avenue Mall, the flowers and shrubs which make our civic center of government buildings as eye catching as any, any number of traffic separation triangles and boulevards planted with flowers and trees.

Still another example is the lighting of our aerial bridge paid by funds raised from school children, from all kinds of individuals, from business and industrial firms.

New economic and political leadership has begun to take hold and move the city forward more than I can recall in the 14 years I have lived here.

Unlike in many areas, our people have voted bond issues for new schools, our educational systems, particularly in Duluth, are constantly challenging teaching concepts and attracting more than a fair share of teachers.

The University of Minnesota, Duluth, which this fall term will open with more than 5000 students, will grow to 10,000 students by the early 1970's.

Superior State University across the bay with 2600 students, will grow to 5000 during the same period.

The College of St. Scholastica—relatively small at some 400 students, but with a top national academic rating—is planning for a thousand students. Junior College enrollment at Ely, Eveleth, Virginia, Hibbing and Coleraine will just about double. Duluth's new technical-vocational institute—opening soon—will fill a vital need in this field of post high school education.

In other words, our educational system at all levels is more than keeping pace in an area destined for the kind of gradual population growth which can be absorbed with a minimum of problems in municipal services, also in racial and social tension.

We are not relying on luck for future growth. We are working hard at making things happen, encouraging plant expansion and new plants, notably through the Northeastern Minnesota Development Association. This is a three-year-old organization supported entirely by private funds of more than $200,000-a-year. It includes mining companies, utilities, news media, banks, merchants and unions, not only as financial supporters, but in its leadership.

Our area is still getting special attention from the federal government through the newly formed Arrowhead District Economic Development group and Upper Great Lakes Commission, and from the state through the Economic Development Department.

I think what sets us a bit apart in our area is that we can live a good life: healthy climate, recreation, an absence of the kind of tensions besetting many other areas, and within almost everyone's pocketbook.

What is it worth to have the peace of mind that comes with this kind of life, without the fear which must pervade so many places with unhappy people.

THE FUTURE OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on September 20, 1967, Mr. Irving Stern, director of organization of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters & Retail Food Store Employees Union of Greater New York, spoke to the Greater St. Louis Industrial Relations Corp. on the future of collective bargaining. He pointed out, and I fully agree, that if collective bargaining is to continue to serve us well, it must change from a war between management and labor to more of a cooperative venture.

He also pointed out that an important adjunct of this change must be an effort by labor and management leaders to educate those whom they represent as to the intricacies of the collective-bargaining process and the cooperative rather than the antagonistic philosophy which must prevail if it is to be successful.

The speech is a truly remarkable example of the maturity of outlook which responsible participants in the collective bargaining process are beginning to develop and augurs well for the future of collective bargaining as an institution in this country. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Stern's remarks be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Creative Unionism: A Substitute for Power

(Address by Irving Stern, director of organization, Local 342, at the Greater St. Louis Industrial Relations Club, September 20, 1967)

All serious students of labor-management relations acknowledge that "collective bargaining" faces a crisis.

Not since the enactment of the Wagner Act has this process been subject to such searching analysis.

An analysis brought about by its obvious failure to resolve industrial conflict without lengthy and costly strikes.

If the rash of strikes—(newspaper, airline, public workers, teachers, rubber, oil, auto) are indeed an acknowledgement of weakness and failure—the question must be asked—what is the reason?

Particularly in light of the insistence of bargainers that they want no outside interference or meddling with the process—a sentiment expressed several weeks ago by I. W. Abel, head of the million member Steel-Workers Union in a Labor Day message.

Deploring government intervention in recent labor disputes he suggested:

"Industry and labor themselves have a vital obligation to voluntarily strengthen and bring perfection to our free collective bargaining system. . . . Even before negotiations on new agreements begin, the parties should be able to agree on steps to be taken in event of a stalemate in collective bargaining."

Paul Jacobs of the Institute of Industrial Relations of the University of California, a former AFL–CIO organizer, stated several years ago that in his opinion the traditional collective bargaining process is "archaic."

In his study of collective bargaining titled "Old Before Its Time: Collective Bargaining at Twenty-Eight" Jacobs said: . . . "all (symptoms) point toward two fundamental alterations in industrial society today: *first,* the system of collective bargaining which has operated successfully since the passage of the Wagner Act twenty-eight years ago in 1935 has proved less and less adequate for the solution of some basic problems now faced by unions and management and, *second,* an increasing number of workers remain outside the system with very little possibility that they will ever come into it."

Jacobs cites as one of the examples of the insoluble:

"Automation and the *particular* unemployment it brings to a *particular* plant are problems obviously beyond the capabilities of the union-management collective bargaining. No one can reasonably expect management to continue employing unneeded workers, but no one can reasonably expect unions to concede that they and their members have become superfluous. No one can expect management to absorb all the costs of moving and training displaced workers, but no one can expect the workers (or the unions involved, I might add) to bear those costs themselves."

Scoffing at the "obituary notice" for collective bargaining and unions, George Meany in an address at the Fifth Constitutional Convention in 1963 said:

. . . "I am positive that the American Trade Union movement is a long, long way from outliving its usefulness or achieving its final goals if any of its goals are ever final. We all know that we are not perfect. Our organization is not perfect. *It is a human institution.*"

Ted Kheel, noted mediator, who has helped settle some of the most complex and difficult industrial conflicts has another opinion. Mr. Kheel maintains that he . . . "views the prospect of a strike or lockout as indispensable to collective bargaining and collective bargaining as the best process any society has ever developed for voluntarily settling the relations of workers and their employers." Indeed, the *"prospect"* of a cessation of work is the most effective strike deterrent ever devised even though it doesn't work 100 percent of the time.

However, he notes . . . *"The bargaining process can be improved and the incidence of strikes thereby reduced."*

I suggest that George Meany and Ted Kheel are closer to the mark than Paul Jacobs without demeaning in any sense the merit of his observation that many current conflicts transcend the ability of the negotiators to arrive at an easy and peaceful solution.

I suggest further that recognition of the *limitations* of collective bargaining would be a major step forward in bringing into play those parties and institutions which can effectively assist in reaching solutions resulting from technological unemployment.

In some measure such institutions exist—governmental and private. These agencies can assist in retraining and providing new skills to workers who become jobless because of automation.

What I am concerned about *here* is why the collective bargaining process covering 17.8 million employees in the AFL–CIO (up from 16.8 million in 1964) fail so frequently in resolving conflicts which *are* soluble.

This failure, according to William Simkin, Director of Federal Mediation and Conciliation, has caused a 50 percent increase in the rejection of contracts by union members between 1964 and 1966 where the Mediation Service has been involved.

A study involving more than 7,000 cases showed the proportion of rejections rising from 8.7 percent in 1964 to 14.1 percent in 1966.

A further study, according to Simkin, showed that in most cases *neither side* benefited from a rejection because the second settlement was not sufficiently better to have justified a longer strike.

Perhaps the harshest criticism of the present state of collective bargaining and its practitioners has come from Mr. Abe Raskin of the New York Times, a veteran of the labor beat and now assistant editor of its editorial page.

In an article in the February 1967 issue of the Saturday Review, Mr. Raskin deplored the increasing frequency with which unions, management and sometimes government, are unable to break an impasse.

Mr. Raskin said: "The most disturbing aspect is that in many strategic sectors of industry, no remote relationship exists between the *capacity or social responsibility* of the negotiators and the *degree of damage* they are able to visit on the economy.

People need licenses to drive a taxi cab, practice medicine, install plumbing or clip hair. *Yet, labor-management negotiators who ought not to be allowed to cross the street without a seeing-eye dog are free to inflict hardship on millions of their fellow citizens through sheer incompetence at the bargaining table. And there is not one thing anyone in the community can do to arrest them for reckless use of a dangerous economic weapon."*

I suggest, that while Mr. Raskin includes union as well as industry representatives in his broadside—there is more truth than poetry in his indictment.

Outside of the academic world, in my opinion, there is relatively little insight by negotiators into the social phenomena described as collective bargaining.

There is also, in my opinion, a failure by negotiators to develop the sharply-honed skills required to resolve conflict.

This is not to say that some of the more creative of our colleagues in this field have not engaged in successful experimentation in bargaining. These include the Human Relations Committee and the Kaiser Long Range Sharing Plan in steel; the Armour Automation Committee in the packinghouse industry; the American Motors Profit Sharing Plan in auto and the West Coast Longshore Mechanization and Modernization Agreement.

These and other imaginative and flexible approaches to labor peace have had temporary successes. They cannot in my judgment, however, have lasting value or serve as guidelines for other industries, unless the concomitant skills are developed to pilot them through the shoals they have already encountered.

I refer to the termination of the Human Relations experiment in steel, the dim view in which the Armour Plan is currently held in meatpacking and the declining regard for the American Motors Profit Sharing Plan in view of the company's profit drop.

Let us examine collective bargaining as it is practiced today!

Management is concerned with profit and welfare of its business and desires to keep costs and interruptions to a minimum.

Union leaders, understandably, desire higher wages, better benefits and improved working conditions for our members.

In fact, our collective bargaining is a transaction which determines the price of labor services and the terms and conditions of labor's employment—for a specified time.

In the main, contract resolutions are arrived at through the use of power, threats of strikes and lockouts all of which usually lead to compromises.

As presently practiced certain types of skills, of course, are necessary, including the development of strategy and tactics in the deployment of power toward reaching desired goals.

However, the rough give and take of negotiations seldom provides lasting solutions which carry over to the next contract.

Each post-contract period is devoted, either by one side or the other, to jockeying in an effort to remedy real or imagined advantages gained by the other side.

The union's *gain* is considered *management's loss.*

A management's victory on the other hand, firms up the resolve of the union to make the next *go-to an Armegeddon* for its opponent.

In this context labor-management relations and collective bargaining are a *struggle for power* between contending parties.

The assumption of the opponents is that their major objectives are in conflict and their *common interests are narrow in scope.*

This *Win-Lose-Power* relationship in which one side gains only at the expense of the other, I suggest, lies at the heart of the failures of the collective bargaining process.

If my belief is true, then what is to be done?

Are solutions such as the Human Relations Committee and Kaiser Long Range Sharing Plan, the answer?

Is the UAW-American Motors Profit Sharing the path to peaceful labor relations?

Is the West Coast Longshore pact or the Armour automation concept the formula for other industries?

These, I admit, are all imaginative solutions by creative practitioners of the collective bargaining process.

They may even assist in solving some of the problems confronting negotiators in other industries.

However, I would suggest what is most urgently required is a comprehensive understanding of the ramifications of the collective bargaining process and development of people-handling skills by union and industry bargainers.

Such understanding and skills would help to avoid the Win-Lose-Power traps which result in so many fruitless and costly strikes of *no benefit to either side.*

Such understanding and skills *would not* be a panacea to remedy the social problem of technological unemployment noted earlier in Paul Jacobs critique—although it would help identify problems so the solutions may be sought in the political arena, where they belong.

Not only would it help clarify and define the area and scope of collective bargaining it would also help eliminate the "armed truces" which exist between contracts.

What is also needed, I suggest, is a reeducation of the constituencies affected by collective bargaining.

My own experience in this regard can help clarify such need.

In one of my first ventures in collective bargaining I noted with concern the vigor of the language and table thumping but the virtual absence of discussion and persuasion based on relevant facts.

It did not take too long to conclude that both the union and management negotiators were more concerned with satisfying what they thought were their constituents' demand for toughness than in reaching a fair and equitable settlement.

Both sides refused to acknowledge that the opposite side had raised a point which warranted examination and perhaps would benefit both sides. It was also apparent both felt this would diminish the "hero" role both sides wanted to play in front of their committees.

A settlement, of course, was finally reached, but with great rancor and with sufficient unresolved problems leading later to incessant wrangling during the life of the contract.

The stage was set. The next contract negotiations inevitably had to be a knock-down, all-out struggle.

We, therefore, concluded a change in atmosphere was required.

In the next negotiations, by joint agreement, both the union and management attempted to deal with each other in a more rational manner.

We attempted to restructure our negotiations so that we eliminated the bitter language and examined each other's problems and needs in a more intelligent manner.

We attempted to understand each other's point of view so that perhaps both sides could be satisfied without diminishing our position and prestige with the people we represented. We attempted to create a problem-solving atmosphere.

But we reckoned without our constituencies and how they perceived the role of negotiators.

Soon committees on both sides were questioning the adequacy and integrity of spokesmen on both sides. (Multi-chain Association bargaining.)

This made it clear that unless a complete re-education of our constituencies took place—joint problem-solving negotiations could not succeed.

As a result of this experience the union resolved that in the future when a negotiating committee was elected by the rank and file it would train and educate that committee in the techniques of negotiations.

The union also determined to set the expectations of its members at more realistic levels and to prepare in advance for its major objectives.

Now when contract time approaches, discussions are undertaken with the union staff, Executive Board and membership, months before the submission of the proposals to the industry.

Sufficient time is allowed for thorough examination and review of goals so that extreme proposals can be planed down to more realistic forms.

Discussions are also undertaken with the industry with respect to the union's goals.

In addition we undertook an extensive training program for the staff and officials of the union so that there would be a more thorough understanding of joint-problem solving techniques in bargaining.

This involved restructuring the union to eliminate the "boss" concept and substituting team leadership.

It meant developing new skills for union representatives so they could fill their new roles.

Courses were held to improve their communication skills, handling of groups, conflict resolution and many other qualifications necessary for a leadership role.

The entire staff undertook a sensitivity training course to reduce and eliminate interpersonal barriers and to improve their functioning as team leaders.

The training program has been described in detail in the New York State Department of Labor's Industrial Bulletin of April, 1967, which all of you will receive later.

The union *today* has its major premise that effective leadership means *training and education* instead of *domination and control.*

I believe that one of the greatest needs for negotiators is to understand the behavior patterns in a variety of collective bargaining situations.

In fact this type of understanding has been made available to negotiators by Richard Walton of Purdue University's School of Industrial Administration and Robert McKersie of the University of Chicago's Graduate School of Business in their book "A Behavioral Theory of Labor Negotiations."

This little-known book sets forth a theoretical framework for understanding the negotiating process which the authors describe as an instance of a more general interaction system.

The book analyzes four sets of activities which together accounts for almost all the basic behavior in negotiations.

The first system of activities comprises competitive behaviors that are intended to influence the division of limited resources. This pure conflict subprocess is called *"distributive bargaining."*

This is what was earlier referred to as the *Win-Lose* process.

The third system comprises activities that increase the *Joint gain* available to the negotiating parties. They are *problem-solving* behaviors and other activities which identify, enlarge and act upon the common interests of the parties.

This system is designated as *"integrative bargaining."*

This is the problem-solving path followed in the main by those creative bargainers who have come up with the concept of the Human Relations Committee and other imaginative solutions noted earlier.

Frequently negotiations confront elements of both processes or mixed bargaining issues—pure conflict and problem-solving areas, this is mixed bargaining issues.

The third system comprises activities that influence the attitudes of the parties (union-management) toward each other and affect the basic relationship bonds between negotiators involved. The process is referred to as *"attitudinal structuring."*

The fourth system of activities, which occurs as an integral aspect of the interparty negotiations, comprises the behavior of a negotiator who is meant to achieve consensus with his own organization—in the one case the union—in the other, the company. This fourth process is called *"intraorganizational* bargaining."

The four processes have their own internal logic and utilize the underlying disciplines of economics, psychology and sociology.

I recognize that resolving wage issues will often create conflict in negotiations. It is my belief however, that wage disputes are less frequently the cause of strikes and work stoppages than other questions.

More often than not these struggles are caused by the lack of understanding of the problems and goals of the opposing parties, particularly on the operational level.

This is further complicated I have observed, by the lack of trust in each other's motives.

Other major factors contributing to industrial conflict in my opinion, are:

1. Lack of long range planning.

2. Failure of some management and labor representatives to understand sound economic principles.

3. Lack of maturity in negotiations and playing to grandstand—making the opponent look bad in front of his committee.

4. Flaunting an unequal balance of power between the contending sides.

5. Insensitivity on part of management to the problems of employees when new technology is introduced.

6. Inadequate understanding of the actions, objectives and political problems confronting union leaderships.

It would be foolhardy for any professional negotiator to suggest that conflict, strikes and lockouts can be completely eliminated from labor-management relations.

It would, in my opinion, be equally foolish to maintain that many strikes and struggles are not caused by the inadequacy and lack of skills of the negotiators.

Based on personal experience, I believe, as I have stated, that if we can convert our negotiations from a setting of Win-Lose, to joint problem-solving, many of our tension-full, down-to-the-wire explosions would find peaceful resolutions.

I believe in integrative or problem-solving approaches to collective bargaining and to the extent it is possible I would urge others to follow the same course. My own experience has proved it beneficial for our members and for the industry in which we function.

Here are some helpful guidelines to integrative or joint problem-solving:

1. Identify the problem: Provide a maximum exchange of information about the problems *perceived by each party* in order that these problems can be defined in their essentials. The problem must be formulated in a clear and accurate manner so both parties are talking about the same thing.

2. Search for alternate solutions and their consequences: This is under the assumption that alternate courses of action or potential resolutions are not immediately apparent but rather has to be discovered or created. This step may involve *thorough and accurate gathering of information* about alternatives and their consequences. The parties must attempt to be imaginative in perceiving alternatives and persistent in exploring the fullest range of alternative solutions.

3. Arrange a preference order of solutions and course of actions: This involves identification of the advantages accruing to both sides possible in a situation. The bargaining parties do this by engaging in successive comparisons among alternative solutions.

Among the conditions which facilitate integrative problem-solving are:

1. Motivation—both parties must be motivated to solve the problem and provide sufficient time to discuss it.

2. Information and language—Those participating in problem-solving must have full access to information relevant to each step and be authorized to use it. They must also have the skills of communication to adequately exchange this relevant information.

3. Trust and supportive climate—A supportive and trusting climate facilitates joint problem-solving. Defensive and low-trust atmosphere inhibit the process. A supportive climate is marked by encouragement and freedom to behave spontaneously without fear of sanctions.

It is noteworthy that the very questions which prove most contentious in negotiations are the ones which lend themselves to integrative problem-solving resolution.

For example:

1. Individual Job Security & Management Flexibility
2. Reviewing Jobs & Management Efficiency
3. Expanded Benefits & Limited Costs
4. Institutional & Union Security

Earlier I noted George Meany's comment that unions are a human institution—and so we in labor recognize are companies and their managements.

There are no panaceas which will eliminate conflict. And besides some conflicts are meaningful—the struggle against tyrants and despots, the struggle for freedom, for economic security, for civil rights—the struggle for individual liberty.

To the extent that we understand and apply our knowledge of human behavior—to that extent we will minimize wasteful conflict and deal with industrial relations in a purposeful and productive manner.

THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE EXECUTION OF NICOLA PETKOV

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the last week of September marked the 20th anniversary of the judicial murder of Nicola Petkov by the Bulgarian Communist regime, acting under Soviet orders.

Nicola Petkov was one of a generation of heroes and martyrs who resisted the Communist takeover of the countries of Central Europe, even though the presence of the Soviet Red army foredoomed their fight to failure.

Although many democratic leaders in many countries displayed exemplary bravery in this situation, Nicola Petkov was perhaps the bravest democrat of all. Indeed, on rereading the record, I cannot help wondering whether, in all the annals of parliamentary opposition to the threat of dictatorship, there has ever been an opposition or an opposition leader that can compare with Nicola Petkov and the brave group of deputies whom he led in the Bulgarian Parliament.

If Nicola Petkov were alive today, the lessons he learned would be of priceless value to the free world. For Petkov was an idealist and a liberal who, like many of our liberal idealists of today, believe in cooperating with the Communists. He learned—when it was too late—that the Communists exploit such willingness to cooperate, only to destroy their enemies.

Nicola Petkov's story would be difficult enough to tell within the confines of a single volume. Since I cannot tell it all, I will relate only a few fragments of the story so that my colleagues may know something of the stature of this remarkable man.

The Yalta agreement had held forth the promise that the peoples of the Central European countries would be permitted to elect governments of their own chosing. But to the Soviets the Yalta agreement was only a strategem to throw the Western nations off guard. In all of the countries they had occupied, they immediately embarked on a series of moves designed to destroy the democratic opposition and to install Communist dictatorships under their own control.

The Western allies, regrettably, did not understand the nature of their adversary or the nature of the game this adversary was playing. If we had understood, I believe that we could and would have taken the few steps that would have been necessary to persuade the Kremlin to desist from its design. After all, at the close of World War II the Soviet Union was exhausted. Its economy was in shambles. It was dependent to a very heavy degree on East-West trade for the rebuilding of this economy. The Red army was heavily committed as an occupation force holding down 100 million Central Europeans.

At this juncture, the threat of sweeping economic sanctions, by itself, would probably have been sufficient to compel the men in the Kremlin to agree to elections under United Nations supervision in all of the Central European countries occupied by the Red army.

But instead of applying whatever pressure may have been necessary to compel the Soviet leaders to live up to the letter of the Yalta agreement, the West was outmaneuvered by Moscow to the point where the United States and Britain applied pressure on the democratic opposition leaders in Bulgaria and Rumania and the other occupied countries to enter into coalition governments under Communist leadership.

This was the sense of the agreement arrived at at the conference of the Big Three Foreign Ministers in Moscow in December 1945.

In January 1946, Andrei Vishinsky, Deputy Foreign Minister of the U.S.S.R., arrived in Sofia for the purpose of attempting to implement this decision in respect to Bulgaria. The following account was written by one of Petkov's colleagues:

> At midnight on the day of the Soviet envoy's arrival, a Red army officer visited Petkov and told him that he had orders to take him immediately to Vishinsky's headquarters for a private conversation. The opposition leader answered that he is "engaged in politics, not in conspiracies", and that he would call on Mr. Vishinsky not immediately but on the following morning, together with his fellow-opposition leaders Kosta Loulchoev, Cosiclist, and Prof. Stoyanoff, Independent.
>
> When Petkov entered Vishinsky's office the following morning, the Soviet envoy was nervous and in a bad mood. Their conversation follows:
>
> VISHINSKY. Last night I requested your presence for a meeting and you refused to come. How dare you assume such an attitude? Who do you think you are to conduct yourself in such a manner with a plenipotentiary of Generalissimo Stalin?
>
> PETKOV. Since you called me for a meeting, you no doubt know who I am. However, since you act as if you did not know, then I shall tell you. I represent the strongest political organization in Bulgaria, the Agrarian Union, the organization of the Bulgarian peasants who constitute 85 percent of our country's population. Ours is a democratic organization and a loyal collaborator of the other organizations of the democratic opposition. We engage in politics in the daytime, not at night. Nights are better suited for conspiracies, for which we have no taste at all.
>
> VISHINSKY. Do you know who I am?
>
> PETKOV. Certainly. You are the deputy of the Commissar for Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union.
>
> VISHINSKY. You will have to abide by our decision and join the government.
>
> PETKOV. I and my friends are ready to enter the government if our conditions for a truly democratic government are accepted.
>
> VISHINSKY. You have no right to formulate any conditions. You are to designate two persons who are to enter the cabinet without any conditions whatsoever. Such is the order of Generalissimo Stalin. Do you understand? I have no time to waste.
>
> PETKOV. Mr. Vishinsky, I am not in the habit of receiving orders from any foreign officials. I get orders from my people and my organization.
>
> VISHINSKY. I have seen many like you, just as stubborn and as arrogant. But you can't fight against the Soviet Union. You are too small for that. We will show you what it means to kick against us. You do not know us yet. (Hits the desk with his fist.) You are going to accept and like it too.
>
> PETKOV. We are fighting, Mr. Vishinsky, for our ideas and to defend the rights of our people. This is our trust and no one is in a position to make us deviate from it.
>
> VISHINSKY. You are too insignificant for that, and history will only pass you by.

In the month of August 1946, it was agreed that there would be elections to a constituent assembly on October 20.

For a description of the elections and the events that followed, let me quote from an article by Dr. G. M. Dimitrov, who shared the leadership of the Bulgarian Agrarian Party with Petkov:

> Petkov now began a campaign which, for sheer heroism, is unsurpassed in the annals of any opposition. With the Red Army still in the country, and with the communist-controlled police breaking up their meetings, the opposition attacked the government and the communists and Soviet intervention as recklessly as though they enjoyed the protection of the American Constitution. Petkov's paper, during the pre-electoral period especially, was an inspiration to read. "What our people must show," said the Banner for October twelfth, "is *de l'audace, et encore de l'audace, et toujours de l'audace!*" The following day, under the caption Where Are the Agrarian Deputies? It charged that the Agrarian Party had not been permitted to put up candidates in 25 percent of the constituencies and that of the candidates for the other constituencies, almost fifty were under arrest. "Freedom does not come on a silver platter," wrote Petkov on October fifteenth. "Freedom is something for which you must fight."
>
> To the communists' protestations that they had no intention of taking the peasants' property, Petkov replied with the most devastating slogan of the electoral campaign: "As the wolf cannot watch over your flocks, as the fox cannot befriend your hens, so the communists cannot protect private property. Electors! Vote without any fear against the communist constitution, against the communist dictatorship!"
>
> On October twentieth, the opposition finally was granted permission to hold an open meeting in Sofia—without loud-speakers or lights. Despite all the restrictions, more than 200,000 angry peasants swarmed into Sofia and joined the city workers and middle class in the most impressive demonstration of the entire electoral campaign. "Down with the dictatorship!" they roared. "Down with red Fascism! We want Petkov!"
>
> * * * * *
>
> When Georgi Dimitrov shouted that the future belonged to the communists, Petkov intervened, "The future belongs not to you, Mr. Dimitrov, but to the people. You are not a god, Mr. Dimitrov, though you may deceive yourself on this score by taking into your party only those who accept you as their god. . . . Your program is one word: Dictatorship! Our program is also one word: Liberty!"
>
> On January 30, 1947, Dimitrov made his first direct threat to Petkov. After roaring that "Koev must be hanged!" (Petar Koev was one of Petkov's chief aides) he went on to say that the government possessed documents involving the leader of the opposition. The following is a condensation of the exchange that took place.
>
> PETKOV. Are you a satrap, that you issue such summary condemnations? After all, you are not a god—you are not even a qualified judge. As for the documents of which you speak, I challenge you to produce them.
>
> DIMITROV. Very soon you will receive your documents. When you do, not one of you will remain in this assembly. There is no place in this assembly for foreign agents.
>
> PETKOV. You speak of foreign agents. . . . For twenty years, you, Mr. Dimitrov, were a citizen of a foreign country. You became a Bulgarian citizen only two days before the election. You have no right even to speak as a Bulgarian.
>
> The battle grew in intensity. On April third, one of the opposition deputies got up and made the accusation that under Article 4 of the armistice, the Communist Party was a fascist organization and should accordingly be dissolved. The communists, outnumbering the opposition almost four to one, rushed across the floor and engaged them in a ter-

ribly unequal battle in which many of the opposition were injured. The opposition left the chamber *en masse*, by way of protest.

The next day they were back in their places to renew the struggle. An Agrarian woman deputy charged that the Communist Party was squandering public funds by making all of their members eligible for the special allotments voted to active partisans. Again the communist majority charged the opposition. Again the opposition left the chamber with their heads bloody. Again they came back the following day.

And so it went, until the final arrest of Petkov and the dissolution of his party.

The bulk of the evidence against Petkov consisted of confessions purportedly made by his "fellow conspirators." The most important of these was the "confession" of Petar Koev, the Petkov aide who had been arrested in mid-January, 1947. Koev had been arrested once before, in August, 1946. While he was in prison he had been elected to parliament and, in consequence of parliamentary immunity, he had been released. On his release he sent a letter to his leader, Petkov, which Petkov had the courage to read to the assembly.

"They reduce you to a state of utter moral and physical prostration," said Koev's letter, "in which you become indifferent to your fate and to life itself, so that you desire some solution—any solution—so long as it will put an end to the intolerable suffering. . . . Contrary to normal juridical procedure, you are condemned first, and it is only afterwards that they begin to search for accusations and proofs. These are obtained by means of three types of torture: physiological torture—hunger, lack of sleep, thirst; physical tortures—beatings and being compelled to stand upright for days and nights on end; psychological tortures—insinuations that your family has been incarcerated, etc.

". . . I remained for twenty-one days in solitary confinement without being interrogated. During this time they subjected me to the hunger treatment—a bit of bread and water each day. . . . The obvious purpose of this treatment is to produce physical attrition and a corresponding weakening of your will. At eight a.m. one Saturday they took me up to the fourth floor to be interrogated. The interrogation went on for five days without interruption, twenty-four hours a day. The interrogator was changed every three hours, while I was compelled to remain standing, handcuffed, without sleep, unable to support myself either against the table or against the wall, without food and—what was cruelest of all during those suffocatingly hot August days and nights—without water. Every three hours the same questions were repeated until I became unconscious. . . . My bare feet swelled to unimaginable proportions. The interrogators showed not the faintest pity. . . . On the fifth day they threw me into an empty cell, where I slept like a dead man for more than twelve hours."

On the four succeeding nights Koev was trussed and beaten on the soles of his feet for three or more hours on end, with interludes during which he was questioned by Inspector Zeyev.

"During the balance of my detention," concluded the letter, "I was asked no questions, but I remained the object of a campaign of moral pressure and psychological terror. They applied refined tortures of such a kind—allusions to the fate of my family, the safety of my children, etc.—that I would honestly have preferred physical tortures."

When Koev was deprived of his parliamentary immunity on the occasion of his second arrest, he made this final declaration before leaving the parliament, "I am innocent. I know, however, that through me you are attempting to strike at the general secretary of our party, Nicola Petkov. My final words are that only the declarations which I make before you now correspond to the truth, and that, if it should happen later that, after a period of 'instruction,' I should make some 'confessions,' they will have been extorted from me by means of violence."

Koev made his "confessions" and was sentenced to twelve years. He will never emerge alive. Petkov, though he defended himself heroically and admitted nothing, was sentenced to death.

Finally, I would like to quote from an account of the trial of Petkov by the Bulgarian writer, Asen Slavov, who is now in the United States:

> The last word was given to the defendants. Nikola Petkov spoke first. Again he denied the charges hurled against him. "I want to deny the ridiculous assertions, first that my hands, under the weight of my guilt tremble and that I cannot stand still. I must state that the trembling of my hands is a defect acquired by birth, which fact is well known to those who have been close to me. To prove this I have submitted to the court a medical certificate. Secondly, that due to remorse and shame I have often been seen bowing my head. Regardless of how unpleasant this is to me I will explain the true reason for this fact, which is really very ordinary and prosaic. When they took me from my home, I was not fully dressed. I did not have a belt on my pants. Now, thanks to your kind care and hospitality, I have lost half my weight. I am, therefore, obliged, from time to time, to take care of my appearance, in order not to find myself in an embarrassing situation."
>
> Nikola Petkov continued, "I have already told you that I have not plotted a coup d'etat. However, I have fought against you and will fight until my last breath, because this struggle is a struggle for the restoration of human rights stifled by you. This is a struggle for the liberty and the very existence of the Bulgarian people. And if I die in this struggle, thousands of others will continue it. Today, this is a struggle which is wanted within our country; however, the day is very close, when it will be carried on outside our country, too. Of this I am sure and it is this certainty that gives me the faith and strengtb to endure my evil fate. Fortunately for the Bulgarian people they have succeeded in saving the life of their most trustworthy son, Dr. G. M. Dimitrov. He has mobilized all the forces of the nation abroad and soon, with the assistance of the entire civilized world, he will break the chains of slavery which hold the oppressed Bulgarian people captive. I will die but Bulgaria will be free."
>
> When he finished his speech a complete silence fell upon the court room. Suddenly the silence was broken, like a clap of thunder, by the applause of two sweet looking ladies. The daughter of the prominent agrarian functionary Kurti Kutev and the wife of the attorney Ivan Ganev, who had entered the court room unnoticed, being unable to restrain their admiration of the herioc attitude of their favorite son, were standing with their heads held high, and were applauding. Confusion and disorder broke out.
>
> I stood breathless. One cannot eradicate a people whose sons and daughters have so much courage, will and self-sacrifice. The audience stood motionless and speechless. Then suddenly pandemonium broke. The communist mob descended, like a hurricane, on the two unfortunate women. I could not see for quite some time what was happening to them. Knock down, kicked and trampled upon, they were dragged out to the police vans. Months later I learned that they had been taken to the prison hospital, in a half conscious state, from whence they were sent to concentration camps in Dodrudja.

This was the measure of Nicola Petkov.

The free world owes Nicola Petkov a debt of honor which it can only acquit through a rededication to the cause of freedom for the people of Bulgaria and the peoples of the other captive nations.

ROBERT T. SMITH: PORT BUILDER

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, over the past 8 years a new ocean port has been developed in the heart of America—the port of Duluth. The ocean port of Duluth was made possible by opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway in 1959. Converting this opportunity into the reality of an established seaport has required persistent effort and dedication. Much of the credit for the rapid development of the port of Duluth must go to the hard work and untiring efforts of Robert T. Smith, who recently resigned after 8 years as director of the Seaway Port Authority of Duluth. During these years, I have been privileged to work with Bob Smith and to come to know him as a friend. His contribution to the growth and development of the seaway port of Duluth was recognized recently in an editorial published in the Duluth News-Tribune. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Duluth News-Tribune, Sept. 28, 1967]

Seaport Pathfinder

Departure of Robert T. Smith, the first director, Seaway Port Authority of Duluth, is concluding a chapter in our experience as a seaport. These first years of the St. Lawrence Seaway era have called for many decisions here. Duluth has been obliged to enter several struggles, some of which will go on for a long time.

Our port was utterly new as far as big-tonnage traffic in salt-water ships was concerned, until the spring of 1959. The new director, a seasoned professional, saw several threats to its potential. He strengthened the forces insisting upon a really high High Bridge and helped win that fight. He was able to advise and assist in many ways in the planning and building of the Arthur M. Clure Marine Terminal here, a facility which has earned the highest praise from visitors best qualified to make comparisons with other ports. He was one of those insisting upon the two 90-ton cranes which enable us to share in the competition for some types of cargo.

Smith was a believer in the Terminal tank-farm which has proved its value, handling an important traffic in vegetable and animal oils and fats.

Smith participated in campaigns which got equality in "free time" for railway cars containing export freight, with the coasts, Chicago and Milwaukee. He pressed for the transfer of the Commodity Credit Corp. offices from Cincinnati to the Twin Cities. He got into the fight against diversion of Great Lakes water and for the protection of lake levels—a campaign helpful to all-lakes shipping, too.

He fought and helped to end a rate discrimination against this port by foreign-flag ships. He has hammered away at the injustice and the economically self-defeating aspects of the St. Lawrence Seaway toll plans. Smith is familiar, as few men are, with the widely ranging array of charges and free services encountered by ship operators in the ports of this country.

The first director had to be an educator. The terminal staff, the crews loading and unloading ships, the operators of many facilities have learned what is expected of them.

Duluth has made a good record—outstanding in such things as safety, and very low levels of breakage and pilfering.

We do not get all the freight we ought to have. Old patterns are hard to break, particularly for a small city, whose obtaining of a fair share is not very high on the priority lists of a lot of powerful decision-makers in other cities. We have made some remarkable shipping history, however, in a test which has no exact parallel anywhere. Smith has earned a place in the history of this port and of the Seaway's first years of operation.

CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE: PRELUDE TO REVOLUTION—ADDRESS BY LEWIS F. POWELL, JR.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the Richmond Times-Dispatch on Sunday, October 8, published in full the speech delivered by Richmond attorney Lewis F. Powell, Jr., on "Civil Disobedience: Prelude to Revolution."

Mr. Powell, a past president of the American Bar Association and a member of President Johnson's Crime Commission, delivered the speech last week at Point Clear, Ala.

I ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE: PRELUDE TO REVOLUTION

This will be a lawyer's talk about law and order and civil disobedience. The subject is related to complex social and economic problems—some of the most perplexing of any age. But there is no hope of solving these problems unless an ordered society is preserved.

There is deep concern today about the disquieting trend—so evident in our country—toward organized lawlessness and even rebellion. One of the contributing causes is the doctrine of civil disobedience. This heresy was dramatically associated with the civil rights movement by the famous letter of Martin Luther King from a Birmingham jail.

As rationalized by King, some laws are "just" and others "unjust"; each person may determined for himself which laws are "unjust"; and each is free—indeed even morally bound—to violate the "unjust" laws.

Coming at a time when discriminatory state and local laws still existed in the South, civil disobedience was quickly enthroned as a worthy doctrine. It met the need of intellectuals and theologians for a moral and philosophical justification of conduct which, by all previous standards, was often lawless and indefensible.

Initially, disobedience tactics were directed specifically against discriminatory laws. The sit-ins and demonstrations were aimed primarily at segregated facilities and denial of voting rights—largely in the South. But as the use of disobedience tactics expanded, the relationship between the act of protest and the law protested became increasingly attenuated.

Indeed, as the protest movement expanded to northern and western cities, its objectives broadened from specific discriminatory laws and practices of the South to the age-old social and economic problems of bias, poverty and unemployment. Predictably, disobedience tactics were soon employed in other causes—on the campus and across our country.

Few voices spoke out against civil disobedience. Because of its association with the cause of civil rights, criticism of disobedience and its tactics was largely muted. Many persons of goodwill—including many clergymen and campus intellectuals—were so enchanted by the "causes" that they gave little thought to the means employed or to where the disobedience road would lead.

But all who advocated civil disobedience were not so naive. Political activists and extremists of all kinds were quick to recognize the potential of this doctrine as an extra-legal means of attaining goals—and even of promoting revolution. Moreover, a doctrine which tolerates and justifies disobedience of law—implemented by sit-ins and street mobs—is made to order for cynical leaders promoting rebellion and other extremist causes.

One of the few national leaders, who had both the insight and the courage to speak out against civil disobedience tactics, was Mr. Justice Hugo Black. Writing early in 1966, he said:

"Governments like ours were formed to substitute the rule of law for the rule of force. Illustrations may be given where crowds have gathered together peaceably by reason of extraordinarily good discipline reinforced by vigilant officers. 'Demonstrations' have taken place without any manifestations of force at the time. But I say once more that the crowd moved by noble ideals today can become the mob ruled by hate and passion and greed and violence tomorrow. If we ever doubted that, we know it now. The peaceful songs of love can become as stirring and provocative as the Marseillaise did in the days when a noble revolution gave way to rule by successive mobs until chaos set in . . . It . . . [is] more necessary than ever that we stop and look more closely at where we are going."

It it notable that Mr. Justice Black wrote these prophetic words in February, 1966, before the emergence of black power as an overt doctrine, and prior to the riots of 1966 and 1967.

But few heeded his warning. Despite clearly visible danger signals, political, religious and intellectual leaders continued to tolerate and justify civil disobedience—even after such major eruptions as Watts, Cleveland and Chicago.

There seemed to be a curious unawareness that once lawlessness is tolerated and justified it feeds upon itself and leads either to revolution or violent repressive measures. It has been said wisely:

"Once you give a nervous, hostile and ill-informed people a theoretical justification for using violence in certain cases, it is like a tiny hole in the dike; the rationales rush through in a torrent, and violence becomes the normal, acceptable solution for a problem. . . . A cardinal fact about violence is that once initiated it tends to get out of hand. Its limits are not predictable."

So much for a review—obviously incomplete—of the origin and escalation of contemporary civil disobedience. This brings us to the year 1967—a year of crisis in which the symptoms of incipient revolution are all too evident.

Two movements have been emerging: (1) a militant Negro nationalist movement, summed up in the slogan "black power"; and (2) a radical political movement called the "New Left" or "New Politics," which hopes to change our form of government. The two movements have been converging, and now pursue the common causes of black power and frustration of America's attempt to contain communism in Vietnam. Both of these movements rely heavily upon civil disobedience tactics.

The public is widely aware of the Negro revolt. There is far less awareness of the New Left, its organizations and its radical goals. There are a number of New Left groups with varying degrees of militancy. Although not yet coalesced into a single organization, they are moving toward a united front—certainly on race and Vietnam issues.

Most Americans—of both races—have been shocked and dismayed by a summer of unprecedented discord. The great majority of Negro citizens have been as dismayed as the whites. Yet, the average citizen, preoccupied with his own problems and pleasures, assumes that domestic tranquility is an inalienable right. There is a child-like disbelief that this land of the free—internally secure for 100 years—is actually confronted with strife and violence on a massive scale.

Complacent Americans would be well advised to heed the warnings of the militant leaders. Here are some random examples of what they are saying and planning—quite openly:

Carmichael—Carmichael has allied himself and black power with revolutionary Communism. Speaking at Havana he said: "There are no longer any isolated struggles. They are all correlated. . . . The only solution is armed struggle."

H. Rap Brown—Speaking, of all places, in a Washington Episcopal church with permission of the controlling clergy, Brown is quoted as saying:

"We'll make the Viet Cong look like Sunday school teachers—violence is necessary."

"Get you some guns—(and) burn this town down."

Martin Luther King—The prophet of civil disobedience, King seems bewildered at times by the escalation of his own doctrine. On occasion he has joined moderate Negro leaders in criticizing riots. But he is arm-in-arm with Carmichael and McKessick in slandering his own government and in inciting violation of draft laws. He has said:

"America is the greatest purveyor of violence in the world today."

And he has compared the use of new American weapons in Vietnam to the Nazi testing of "new tortures in the concentration camps of Europe."

King's favorite role is organizing disruptive demonstrations. He is now urging "mass civil disobedience" for the purpose of "dislocating" northern cities. He is planning such "nonviolent" tactics as weekly school boycotts, blocking plant gates with unemployed Negroes, and disrupting governmental operations with sit-in demonstrations in federal buildings.

CORE leaders—Although CORE has recently received a grant from the Ford Foundation, its leaders are now committed to black power extremism.

McKissick, replying to a question by a white reporter as to what the Negro wanted, put it quite simply in the classic terms of revolution:

"The answer is—everything you got right now, and everything you hope to get."

A New York Times story reported that CORE's number two leader, Wilfred Ussery, believes that:

"Armed conflict between black and white can no longer be averted."

Father Groppi—A newcomer to dubious prominence is Father Groppi, a Milwaukee Catholic priest. Working with the NAACP Youth Council, he has organized and led paralyzing demonstrations for open housing. The liberal mayor of Milwaukee, Henry W. Maier, charges that Groppi is "trying to incite riots," and that "rational discussions with him are impossible." Father Groppi has recently been quoted as saying "Morally, I have no argument against the black man's right to use violence."

Dr. Benjamin Spock—Spock, a New Leftist dilettante, also has joined those who condone rebellion. Speaking at the recent convention on New Politics, he said:

"The situation in America is desperate. The principal sign of it is the revolt of our black fellow citizens. . . . The founding fathers declared that people who are oppressed, and can find no other redress, must rebel."

Staughton Lynd—Lynd, a Yale faculty member on leave and an intellectual leader of the New Left, made an unauthorized trip to Hanoi. He insists that representative democracy is outmoded; that we must substitute a "participatory democracy"—which apparently would function through mass meetings and demonstrations. In a revealing article to the New York Times magazine section, Lynd argues that the uprisings in the cities have been "rebellious" and not riots; and—citing the American Revolution and other irrelevant precedents—he justifies the Carmichaels and the Browns and their call for revolution.

The foregoing are only a few—if among the better known—of the leaders of militant civil disobedience. Their roles and views differ, and I do not suggest that each is equally responsible for the lawlessness which threatens to engulf our country. Yet these, and hundreds of lesser known leaders, are men determined to remake America—not by the democratic processes of our institutions but by varying forms and degrees of coercion. The more radical of these leaders, like Carmichael and Brown, are openly advocating revolution.

Let us turn now from the leaders to examples of extremism in action.

The first is Vietnam Week of last April, when tens of thousands marched in New York and San Francisco. Draft cards were burned, placards of hate displayed, and vicious anti-American speeches made by King, Carmichael and Spock.

The initial planning for Vietnam Week took place at a Chicago conference, instigated and dominated by Communists and fellow travelers. The Communist line objectives of Vietnam Week were to undermine United States opposition to communism in Vietnam and to ferment racial discord.

Shortly following these marches, King announced the formation of "Vietnam Summer"—a coalition of opponents to American policy and includes well-known Communist allies and other luminaries of the "hate America" left. The avowed objective is "to organize opposition to the war in ghetto areas", and encourage our youth to "refuse to fight."

As Dean O'Meara of Notre Dame Law School has said, many of those who thus aid the Communist enemy "give themselves away":

"For never once do they condemn the terrorist tactics of the North Vietnamese; never once do they condemn Hanoi's rejection of all peace proposals . . .; never once do they lament the suffering and death borne by our forces in Vietnam. These persons weep only for the enemy."

Having attained some success and notoriety through Vietnam Week, the New Leftists then planned and held what was called "The National Conference for New Politics", attended by some 5,000 delegates. Its stated purpose was to create a united front among groups supporting the black power and "peace" movements. King and Spock were among the principal speakers. The Communist party, as in the case of Vietnam Week, was active in the planning and manipulation.

The conference, dominated by black power militants, condemned "the savage and beastlike character that runs rampant through America as exemplified by the George Lincoln Rockwells and the Lyndon B. Johnsons". It also adopted a straight Communist Party line resolution, which pledged:

"Total and unquestioning support to all national peoples liberation wars . . . particularly in Vietnam."

The flavor of the New Politics Conference was summed up by Walter Goodman, writing in the N.Y. Times Magazine, who said:

". . . it stunk of totalitarianism."

Vietnam week and the Conference on New Politics are chilling examples of growing extremism in this country. The dominant themes of both were hatred of fellow Americans and contempt for our institutions. Their goals are to be attained not by democratic processes but by various techniques of civil disobedience.

One of the major targets is American policy in Vietnam, now under virulent attack. Reasonable men may well differ as to the wisdom of this policy. But only those who are blinded by their prejudices, or who are indifferent to the consequences of lawlessness, will deliberately incite disobedience of valid laws. A most recent example of this irresponsibility is the public demand by a group of some 320 clergymen, educators and writers that churches and synagogues be used as "sanctuaries" for youths who defy the draft law. If thousands of young men refused to fight for their country, as pointed out by Tom Wicker of the New York Times:

". . . the power (of the government) to pursue the Vietnam war or any other policy would be crippled if not destroyed. The government would then be faced, not with dissent, but with civil disobedience on a scale amounting to revolt."

Or, suppose the campaign against payment of income taxes gains widespread support. This is not an illogical possibility, as this relatively bland form of civil disobedience has appeal to a broad spectrum of disaffected citizens. But however appealing it may be, widespread refusal to pay taxes could bring orderly government to a halt.

So much for examples of nonviolent—though potentially disastrous—disobedience. But the greater concern has been the violent eruptions in our cities—where civil disobedience has reached its ultimate form. I do not know whether any of the persons or groups named above was legally implicated in any of these riots. Let us assume no such implication. Yet few can doubt that the cumulative effect of the black nationalist movement, and of the incitements to hatred and disobedience were major contributing factors. As J. Edgar Hoover has said:

"Those who espouse the theory of civil disobedience and authorities who free guilty violators must share a portion of the blame and responsibility for the turmoil in our streets."

There have been riots or major disorders in some 75 cities in 1967. Detroit was the shocker, with 43 killed, 386 injured and part of a great city destroyed. A less likely city for a race riot would be hard to find. Detroit had "no housing ghetto"; its Negro population was largely prosperous, and its race relations considered excellent.

The recent NBC documentary—in which Daniel P. Moynihan participated—contains a frightening analysis of the riot and the future prospects. Although apparently spontaneous in its inception, militant organized groups took over promptly, supplied the weapons, the Molotov cocktails, and directed the sniping and the arson. This was no revolt of oppressed people against local conditions. It was armed rebellion against American society.

Although the underlying causes are complex and deepseated, America's acceptance of civil disobedience was both a cause and a justification. Mr. Moynihan, former assistant secretary of labor, put it this way:

"We have legitimatized opposition to the police and disobedience to law. Now in the North it has become massive opposition to the rules of white society."

The Negro militant viewpoint, gaining increasing support, is that America is "irredeemably racist"; that Negroes should "forget America," and that the only course for Negroes is to bring about a final, violent apocalyptic confrontation of black and white."

The NBC investigating team confirmed that extremists already are planning future violence. Next time, it is said, they will attack and destroy the white sections of Detroit and other cities. As Frank McGee described it:

"These black extremists are willing and eager to risk a bloody showdown with white society."

Sharing the same pessimism, Roscoe Drummond recently said:

"The black militants and their white associates are irreversibly committed to the destruction of American democratic society to achieve their racist goals."

One may hope that the views of these observers—competent as they are—exaggerate the danger. But none can doubt that America faces a crisis of lawlessness with the gravest potential for disaster.

No man knows all the answers, but to me—as a lawyer—some simple truths are self-evident:

An ordered society governed by the rule of law must be preserved. Without law and order none of the liberties guaranteed by the Constitution can be safeguarded—for whites or blacks, radicals or conservatives. History has demonstrated that once a society condones defiance of law and due process, the liberties of all are lost in the excesses of anarchy which follow.

With these truths in mind, and in our cherished institutions are to be preserved, Americans of good will—of both races—must act together to assure the following:

1. Toleration of civil disobedience and justification of lawlessness must end—in government, in the pulpits, among the media and on the ivory towered campuses.

2. Those who incite riots and rebellion should be treated as the most dangerous of criminals and relentlessly prosecuted. The irresolution of our society is attested by the fact that we hasten to put petty criminals in prison and yet permit the Carmichaels and Browns to remain free. Indeed, some still dignify their criminality by inviting them to speak in our schools and churches.

3. Those who participate in riots and rebellion should also be prosecuted with vigor, particularly the arsonists and the snipers.

4. Criminal laws, at all levels of government, should be reviewed and strengthened to deal specifically with the foregoing crimes in light of present conditions. Penalties should be adequate to deter criminal conduct and justice should be swift and certain.

5. Effective gun control laws should be adopted at state and federal levels; sniping at policemen and firemen should be made special offenses with severe penalties; and possession or use of Molotov cocktails should be serious crimes.

6. Those who incite and participate in nonviolent civil disobedience should also be subjected to criminal sanctions. Where needed, laws should be clarified and strengthened with appropriate penalties provided. This is a more difficult area, as First Amendment freedoms must be carefully safeguarded. But rights of free speech and peaceful assembly do not justify incitement to revolt or the wilful violation of draft laws, income tax laws or court decrees.

7. Laws, especially against those who engage in nonviolent civil disobedience, should be enforced uniformly and promptly. A few draft law violators have been prosecuted but most have been ignored—especially the radical leaders who incite draft evasion. Public authorities have also failed to prosecute the growing number of dissidents who wilfully refuse to pay all of their income taxes. How can officials sworn to uphold the law ignore its wilful violation? In justice, how can a Cassius Clay be sent to jail for draft evasion while prominent self-styled intellectuals who refuse to pay their taxes are allowed to remain free?

8. In summary, America needs to awaken to its peril; it needs to understand that our society and system can be destroyed. Indeed, this can and will happen here unless Americans develop a new impatience with those who incite and perpetrate civil disobedience; unless laws against violence and disorder are

strengthened, and enforced with vigor and impartiality; and unless we return once more to the orderly and democratic processes which alone can preserve our freedoms.

Now, a final caveat. I have spoken as a lawyer, deeply conscious that the rule of law in America is under unprecedented attack. There are, of course, other grave problems and other areas calling for determined and even generous action. The gap between the prosperous middle classes and the genuinely underprivileged—both white and black—must be narrowed. Many mistakes have been made in the past, and there is enough blame for all to share. But we have passed the point where recriminations and bitterness will solve problems.

We must come to grips realistically with the gravest domestic problem of this century. America has the resources, and our people have the compassion and the desire, to provide equal justice, adequate education and job opportunities for all. This, we surely must do.

At the same time, we must avoid the mindless folly of appeasing and even rewarding the extremists who incite or participate in civil disobedience. There must be a clearer understanding that those who preach, practice and condone lawlessness are the enemies of social reform and of freedom itself. In short, the one indispensable prerequisite to all progress is an ordered society governed by the rule of law.

ACCOUNT OF VISIT BY DAVID SCHOENBRUN TO NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. David Schoenbrun, a distinguished journalist and former correspondent for CBS, recently returned from a 2-week visit to North Vietnam. An account of some of his conversations there with leaders of North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front is contained in four articles published in the Washington Post. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 1, 1967]

VISIT TO HANOI: PEACE TERMS ARE SET

(By David Schoenbrun)

Hanoi's peace terms have been transmitted to Washington many times this past year, through varied channels, both diplomatic and public, according to North Vietnamese Prime Minister Pham Van Dong, in an interview on Sunday Sept. 3, at the Presidential Palace in Hanoi.

The Prime Minister conceded that there had not been any direct messages from Hanoi to Washington but insisted that Washington knew perfectly well why this was so. "Johnson and Rusk keep saying that they'll increase the pressure until they force us to the peace table. Well, you can note this," the Prime Minister said, "we will not make peace under the heel of the aggressor."

"They know what our terms are," the Prime Minister insisted. He cited as one example the statement made on Jan. 28 this year by his Foreign Minister, Nguyen Van Trinh, in an authorized interview with Australian correspondent Wilfred Burrhett, well-known sympathizer to their cause. The foreign minister "clearly expressed our readiness to begin negotiations after a cessation of bombing and other aggressive acts against us."

The Prime Minister went on to say that his "allies of the Socialist bloc, and most particularly the Soviet Union, were in regular communication with American officials." His allies are completely familiar with his government's views, the Prime Minister said. "Can Washington truly state that it does not know exactly what our policy is?" he asked.

"Washington has never made a sincere offer of peace," the North Vietnamese chief of government charged. "Whenever they carried out a so-called peace offensive, they also intensified their aggression, both in the North and in the South of our country."

His face hardened as he snapped out the words. "It is criminal to deceive people this way. Peace is not a game of politics. Peace is the profound aspiration of all peoples. I am sure that your American people want peace, too. But we will not sell our fundamental right to independence for peace. Independence and national unity are sacred to us. I would have thought that the American people would appreciate this."

"The initiative for peace talk must come from Washington," he said, slowly and emphatically, underlining the "must" with the tone of his voice. To make absolutely sure this was understood, he added: "This is categorical."

The Prime Minister, still speaking slowly and deliberately so that word for word notes could be taken down then said solemnly: "There will be no reciprocity for the cessation of bombing and other acts of war. There will be no bargaining. There will be no blackmail and no ransom will be paid."

In answer to a question calling for a reply to Secretary of State Dean Rusk's oft-repeated challenge, "What will they do if we stop bombing," the Prime Minister curtly stated: "We have been attacked in a most unjust manner. The United States is guilty of aggression against our country. Therefore, the United States must make the gesture required by the circumstances, that is unconditional cessation of the bombing. He indicated dimissal of the subject with a wave of his hand. "Otherwise, it's of no use to talk about this."

In answer to question on what the possible nature and agenda of peace talks might be, if they could come about Prime Minister Pham Van Dong replied:

"This is not a complicated issue. Indeed, the issue is really very simple. If Washington stops its aggression and accepts the reality that it cannot dominate Vietnam, that it cannot set up a puppet regime, if Washington genuinely desires peace, the peace can come about very rapidly."

The Prime Minister then recommended that his speech of Aug. 30, celebrating the anniversary of independence, be read carefully particularly his summary of the terms of a final settlement:

First, an unconditional cessation of bombing and all other acts of war.

Second, recognition of the National Liberation Front as the "only authentic representative" of the South Vietnamese people.

Third, the withdrawal of all American and "satellite" troops from South Vietnam

Finally, the Vietnamese will settle their own affairs. "There is no other way," he asserted.

At one point he smiled (a man of normally good humor, he smiled very little in the course of this interview) and said: "As our beloved comrade President Ho Chi Minh has often said, 'We will strew the path of your departure with flowers.' We do not seek to humiliate the American people. But you must understand that our country is one, our people one people, with the same culture, history, language and aspirations to unite and independence. To think that Vietnam can be divided is a mad illusion. To think we can be conquered and dominated is a grave misunderstanding of our thousands of years of history in which we drove off every would-be conqueror."

The Prime Minister insisted that the way to peace must follow two paths, one that can be opened up to Hanoi by unconditional cessation of bombing, the other leading to peace in the South by recognition of and direct talks with the National Liberation Front.

"If America wants peace in the South it must talk with the Front," he said. "Neither we nor our brothers of the Front will deal with your puppets Thieu and Ky. The so-called elections you've just held are a low comedy. The recently adopted political program of the Front expresses the aspirations of the South Vietnamese people. As for us, we completely endorse the NLF program and will do anything we can to support it."

His remarks about supporting the Front prompted a question about just how many troops and supplies he was sending south. This almost lead to the end of the interview.

In a burst of anger, the Prime Minister's face darkened, his jaws closed tight and the muscles twitched under his skin. "I don't have to account for my actions to you or to anybody," he snapped. After a brief, tense silence, I replied that my question was, in my view, proper for a reporter to ask and that I had meant no offense in asking it. If he did not wish to pursue the subject, I would move on to another area. "Move on, then," he ordered.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 2, 1967]

NORTH VIETNAM INSISTS ON RECOGNITION AND PEACE ROLE FOR LIBERATION FRONT

(By David Schoenbrun)

The Prime Minister of North Vietnam, Pham Van Dong was his country's Chief of Delegation to the Geneva Peace Conference that ended the French-Indochinese War in 1954, and his current attitudes toward peace talks are vitally affected by what happened to the Geneva accords which he had personally negotiated.

The Geneva agreements were violated by the United States. They were torn to shreds, he said bitterly in the course of an interview at the Presidential Palace in Hanoi.

The Geneva accords provided for the independence, unity, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Vietnam.

The Prime Minister gave one significant hint about an obstacle to a new Geneva Conference when he pointed out that "much has changed since 1954. The French are no longer in the South, the Americans are there. Bao Dai, the Emperor at the time of Geneva, was deposed by Diem. The French puppet 'State of Vietnam' has been replaced by the American puppet regime of Saigon. As for the National Liberation Front, the only authentic representative of the South Vietnamese people, it did not exist in 1954. It came into being as a result of the violation of the Geneva accords."

He insisted that nothing could be discussed or accomplished in respect to peace without recognition of, and direct talks with, the National Liberation Front. He expressed his admiration for the Front and said "I want to say that the North of our country has been defended by the South. We know that, if the South had faltered, the Americans were planning to invade the North. Diem's regime had a slogan, 'The March To The North', but our brothers in the South would not let them carry out their criminal plans. Now the South (that is, the Front) is so strong that it strikes terrible blows against American and satellite troops to avenge Hanoi every time the bombers hit our city."

The war has forged tighter links between North and South, he asserted. "We will be reunited when the war is over and the foreign invaders are no longer on our soil." He asserted that he had "no special plan in mind on just how and how fast reunification will take place."

During the course of the interview, a free-running conversation, notes were taken for the Prime Minister by two of his aides: Ngo Dien, chief of press of the Foreign Ministry, and Vu Trong Kinh, of the State Commission for Cultural Relations with Foreigners, who had been assigned to me as interpreter and escort officer for my reporting tour. On my side, notes were taken by my wife and myself. It was agreed that I would draft, from my notes, my version of the interview and that I would then check out the quotes with Ngo Dien to be sure that we had an accurate, agreed version.

Our meeting the next day produced some surprising and significant revelations of their frame of mind and attitudes on the issue of peace talks. There was no dispute about any of the quotations, except for mutual attempts to get the precisely correct English equivalent of a number of French terms. But there were spirited arguments about certain excisions that Ngo Dien demanded, and, most importantly, a long dispute about the way I had edited my draft of the talk.

"You lead your cable to America with the Prime Minister's remarks about our peace terms, and we don't think you should do this," Ngo Dien said for his opening remarks at our meeting.

"I'm not trying to tell you how to write your story," Dien protested, "but you ought to present to the American people an accurate reflection of the entire talk and it is not accurate to lead with peace. You make it look as though the Prime Minister put his major emphasis on peace talks and took the initiative to tell you his peace terms. This is not correct. He began his talks with you by telling of our war effort, of our determination to resist American aggression. He placed his major emphasis on our refusal to be pressured or beaten down by bombing. What he said about peace came late in the talk and only in reply to your prodding him on the question. If you are an honest journalist, you will write your story accordingly."

He finally agreed that I could leave my report as written with peace in the lead, on condition that I add a new second paragraph with this key sentence: "This clarification of peace talks by the Prime Minister came after a detailed exposition and analysis of the current situation, in which the Prime Minister stressed the criminal character of the recent escalation and the determination of his people to fight and overcome the American aggression."

He told me that he was prepared to recommend this version to the Prime Minister but that I was not to file my cable until I had final confirmation. He made it clear beyond doubt, as had every official I had talked to for the entire two weeks that their line was hard and unbending. They wanted peace and were ready to talk, as soon as possible after bombing had stopped unconditionally. But, while the bombing was being escalated, while bombs were that very week falling in the heart of Hanoi, they did not even want to talk about talks. They were fiercely determined not to give the slightest sign that they could be pressured into talks.

"We'll talk," Kinh of the Cultural Commission told me, "when President Johnson stops sending his peace invitations by bomber."

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 3, 1967]

National Liberation Front Insists Only It Can Hold Peace Talks

(By David Schoenbrun)

"If America stops bombing the North, Washington will be able to talk to Hanoi, but that will have no effect on the war in the South. If you want peace in the South, then you must talk with the Front there for it is the Front that is fighting in the South, and you can't end a war except by dealing with the men fighting it."

The speaker, a short, stocky, muscular man in his late forties, was the permanent representative of the National Liberation Front in Hanoi; Nguyen Van Tien, once a teacher of mathematics in a high school in South Vietnam, but for the past 15 years one of the leaders of the independence movement fighting against the French and the Americans.

Nguyen Van Tien insisted that a cessation of bombing in the North was a "step in the right direction towards the path of peace," but would not in itself bring about talks with the National Liberation Front. "You must understand that talks with Hanoi are not the same thing as talks with the Front," he stated. "Hanoi is our older brother, not our father. We are equal members of the same family and will one day be reunited when the foreign invader is chased from our soil. Now and for the foreseeable future, we are separate and independent brothers and Washington must accept this truth and act in consequence of it. Or the war will go on."

NOTHING TO DISCUSS

In answer to questions seeking a clear statement of the Front's peace terms, Tien asserted that no official policy had yet been drafted by the Central Committee of the Front because "there is no sign that America genuinely wants peace, so there's really nothing to discuss."

Some of the necessary "preconditions" to peace talks are obvious, he said: First, Washington must stop referring to the Front as some kind of appendage of Hanoi, and recognize the Front as "the sole genuine (in French 'authentique') representative of the South Vietnamese people"; secondly, there must be a cessation of bombing and cease-fire in the South; thirdly, there must be direct talks between America and the Front, and not through "the ventriloquist dummies" of Saigon.

Tien insisted that these "preconditions" were not part of an "official policy program," which must await a Central Committee and Presidium decision, but that "speaking personally, I feel these are minimum conditions for an approach to a political settlement."

As for the ultimate objective of peace talks, he said bluntly: "The only true peace terms to negotiate are the details and timetable of an American withdrawal of its own and its foreign satellite troops from the South." Although he insisted that on this point he was "speaking personally," in the absence of a Presidium decision, he left no doubt that his personal opinion reflected the thinking of the top Front leadership.

INTERVIEW IN CAMBODIA

Similar expressions, in almost the same words, were made in an interview earlier in Phnom Penh, Cambodia, with the Front representative there, Nguyen Van Hieu, who, until he came out of the underground in June to open the Front "embassy," had been a member of the Presidium.

Both Hieu and Tien asserted that talks could be held without a prior withdrawal of American forces. But they both said that any agreements reached at peace talks must be accompanied by a declaration that American forces will be withdrawn, and no agreements will be implemented, no steps will actually be taken, until that withdrawal is very far advanced if not totally completed.

The Front representatives, and all Hanoi officials, too, frankly state that they have been "traumatized" by the history of agreements made in the past, with the French at the Fontainebleau Conference of 1946 and again with the French and then the Americans at Geneva in 1954.

Tien said: "Every time we Vietnamese made an agreement to cooperate peacefully, as an independent and sovereign nation, recognized as such, our independence and sovereignty were then violated by brutal aggressions, such as the Haiphong massacre in November 1946, by the French Navy, and then the American intervention after the Geneva accords."

HELD AT "EMBASSY"

The interview was held at the Front's "embassy" in Hanoi.

"We have the strength and the capacity to fight on and to win," the Front spokesman said. "The United States will lose heart for his struggle before we will, and the puppet regime in Saigon is doomed. There have been more than a half-dozen shifts in Saigon since the murder of Diem, and the Thieu-Ky gang will go like the others. Time is on our side, as nationalism increases in Saigon and war-weariness in the United States."

The Front does not demand to be recognized as the government. It only insists that elections be held, free of any influence by foreign forces. It does not say how the elections are to be supervised, but Tien said, "not by any foreign power."

The Front spokesman charged: "The fact that Washington repeatedly ignores every signal sent it, that Washington officials constantly make proposals they know have already been rejected, that they pretend they want direct answers from Hanoi rather than from our friends, all this indicates to us that Washington is not seriously seeking peace. Its peace offensives are only designed to mollify its own critical citizens.

WE WILL NOT CHANGE

"We expect, therefore, that the war will go on, until something changes in Washington and in Saigon. You can be sure that we of the Front will not change or crack. We will fight until we win the right to free elections and an independent government without foreign influence of any kind."

"Until that day arrives, the Front," he said, "is the sole genuine representative of the people in the South. We have a Presidium emanating from our basic Central Committee of 49 members. Four of those members are in the Saigon region, organizing, recruiting, preparing for the day of liberation."

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 4, 1967]

Ho, Dean of World's Red Leaders, Sought Friendship of United States in 1945

(By David Schoenbrun)

Nguyen Ai Quoc has been an international revolutionary for more than a half century. He is known under a dozen aliases to the police of Peking, Moscow, Paris, London and New York. He sent petitions to President Wilson at Versailles and to President Roosevelt at Yalta. He has fought against and alongside General de Gaulle. He is a contemporary of Lenin and Trotsky and worked with Borodin in China when Mao Tse-tung was still an obscure seed in the grain of Chinese communism. He is the dean of world Communist leaders in power today. The world now knows him by the alias he finally adopted as his official name: Ho Chi Minh, President of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, at age 77, the oldest Communist leader in the world today.

Ho Chi Minh stepped out of the wings onto the stage of world affairs in August, 1945. With his longtime disciples, his right and left hands, Pham Van Dong and Vo Nguyen Giap, he had organized an underground patriotic movement against the Japanese and their collaborators of the French Vichy regime who ruled Indochina for their Tokyo masters.

He had worked in the underground with American military, naval and intelligence agents and was making his bid for American support of his revolution. He is still convinced today that if Roosevelt had lived through his term, France would never have dared the reconquest of Indochina and that Vietnam would have become a distant but warm friend of the United States. He told me so at length at dinner in my home one night in Paris, in September 1946 at the end of the aborted Fontainebleau conference. He said he had tried hard to get an invitation, even just a visa to Washington, so that he could put his case directly to Truman, but that he had received no answer.

Twenty-one years, almost to the day, elapsed before I saw Ho Chi Minh again, in Hanoi on the night of Aug. 30, 1967. His beard and hair were snow-white, his shoulders hunched, his body so frail that even his very small white cotton blouse hung loosely on him. He seemed in good health.

I had obtained my visa to Hanoi by writing directly to Ho, reminding him of the young American reporter in Paris, asking him whether he would now let me visit his country. When I got to Phnom Penh, Cambodia, the only place through which a Westerner can get to Hanoi, visas were waiting for me and my wife.

My wife and I were sure, therefore, that Ho would return our dinner party courtesy and that we would have a long talk with him. But we did not. We saw Ho only briefly on the night of Aug. 30, on the occasion of the anniversary celebration of the revolution. There was no talk and no dinner given by Ho. Instead he named his Minister of External Commerce, Phan Anh, to give the dinner for us because Phan Anh had been his young aide-de-camp in Paris and had accompanied him to the dinner in my house.

As for Ho himself, I was told by Phan Anh, by several other officials, and finally by the Prime Minister: "Our comrade Ho is tired. At his age he cannot resist the terrible summer heat of Hanoi, and the frequent air alarms. His doctor has ordered him to rest in the coolness of the mountains." He has not been seen in private for any substantive talks by any foreigner since April, as far as can be determined.

The hierarchial structure of the Hanoi state puts Ho at the summit, as President of the Republic and General Chairman of the Lao Dong (Worker's Party). Number two is an ancient venerable, of no political importance, Vice President to Ho, a useful symbol of the Oriental veneration of elders. Number three is a man to be reckoned with as power passes on from aging Ho. He has climbed up in the movement through one of the principal chains of command, the Communist Party. His name is Truong Chinh, and he is now the Permanent President of the National Assembly, after having been Chairman of the Lao Dong.

Truong Chinh worked mainly in clandestinity and does not have the world experience or Western training of such leaders as Ham Van Dong or Vo Nguyen Giap. He is sometimes referred to by specialists as a leader of the "Pro-Chinese" faction in Hanoi, but this is highly unreliable speculation. What is more to the point is the fact that by training, education, culture and experience he is China-oriented rather than pro-Chinese. Almost every Vietnamese, by cultural heritage, is basically anti-Chinese. China exercised suzerainty and for long periods dominated completely its small neighbor to the South.

Truong Chinh looked for a moment as a probable successor to Ho Chi Minh when he took over the Lao Dong. But he committed a grave, costly error that cost him party leadership. It was Chinh who conceived and executed—badly—the "Agrarian Reform" that provoked the peasant revolt of 1956. He carried out collectivation of agriculture with a heavy hand, and without regard for the precedents of disaster in Russia and China. There was fighting throughout the countryside as peasants attacked Communist agents and the army struck back.

But Chinh was not disgraced or broken. He was given a new post as Parliamentary President, number three in the hierarchy. He remains, however, one of the top ten leaders and has been carefully mending his fences in the party.

Number four in the hierarchy, and the effectively functioning number one today, is Pham Van Dong, the Prime Minister. He is Ho's most trusted, most able disciple. He accompanied Ho to Paris for the Fontainebleau conference of '46, scheduled to work out the agreements of March 6 granting Vietnam independence, but actually a stall by the French until they felt strong enough to carry out and sure enough that Washington would not interfere with their real intention of reconquest.

Pham Van Dong still recalls bitterly, "the betrayal of Fontainebleau." He is even more bitter in his memories of the Geneva Conference of 1954, for that time Ho sent him to head up the delegation, and the Geneva accords were to be his monument to peace and independence for his country.

"We had the country won after the victory at Dienbienphu," he recalls, "but we were persuaded to move from the battleground to the ballot boxes. And then the Americans, self-proclaimed champions of free elections, refused to let the elections be held. Even Eisenhower admitted we would have won fairly and freely."

Pham Van Dong has long worked in tandem with Vo Nguyen Giap, Minister of National Defense, conquering general of the historic battle of Dienbienphu. Through Pham Van Dong and Giap the government and the army are united. They work closely together in the Central Committee of the party. But the future control of the party is not clear, for Ho has kept party leadership so far for himself, and it is not clear who, if anyone, has been deputized to carry on while he is resting in the mountains.

There is no reason to believe or to disbelieve that there is a struggle for control of the party, other than the historical precedent in many countries that points to control of the Communist Party apparatus as one of the principal if not the main levers of ultimate leadership. There simply is not yet enough reliable evidence to know.

There is, however, considerable evidence, in the statements of the leaders and in the indoctrination of the people that North Vietnam is geared to a long war. There is no clear sign as yet of any willingness to settle for less than an American withdrawal. There is no sign of compromise, no acceptance of American challenges to send direct messages to Washington.

As of now, Hanoi and Washington are further apart than ever with no meeting of the twain in sight.

FUTURE SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, a paper on social planning, delivered at the 80th annual meeting of the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants on September 27 by Mr. Joseph M. Goldsen, a staff member of the Rand Corp., has come to my attention.

The paper, entitled "Thinking About Future Social Development," represents a constructive exploration of the "future inventing" movement now widely discussed in both the public and private sectors of our society. Mr. Goldsen views future planning as a legitimate and indispensable responsibility not only of public officials but of all informed citizens as well.

Future planning—

He asserts—

is the process of goal clarification, of values to be sought and the assessment of means appropriate to such ends.

Mr. Goldsen also contends that sensible attempts at rational social development are required of every thoughtful citizen.

In his paper, Mr. Goldsen comments briefly on the Full Opportunity and Social Accounting Act—S. 843—on which hearings have recently been completed in the Government Research Subcommittee. His remarks summarize the intent of that legislation very effectively, I believe.

I commend Mr. Goldsen for the excellent contribution he has made to the intensifying effort to plan as best we can for tomorrow's world. He attempts to draw together the traditional American emphasis on personal planning and the possibilities of societywide planning to assure the attainment of well-defined social goals. His remarks are particularly significant, I believe.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Goldsen's paper be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the paper was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THINKING ABOUT FUTURE SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

(By Joseph M. Goldsen [1])

Your theme for this morning is "What Can We Expect?—Prospects in Science and Prospects in Social Development." My instructions were "to give the audience a studied view of possible social and economic developments which will, inevitably, have impact upon the financial and other entities which CPAs serve."

Despite the fact that I work at The Rand Corporation, that I have written about the social and political implications of new science and technology, that by coincidence I live on a street called Oracle Place and that we inherited a dog already named Cassandra—despite all that—I shall not give you a long list of prophecies, forecasts, predictions or guesses about the "future" into which you can fit your professional role or to which you might passively try to accommodate yourselves. I hope that my necessarily sketchy remarks will make clear why I have rejected this opportunty to become known to you as a man of "imagination" by startling you with dramatic scenarios of things to come. There are many kinds of projections developed for various purposes by various people. Some are important intellectual tools whose users are aware of the limited purposes to be served by models of future states of affairs. And there is a lot of crystal ball gazing as a means to mobilize public concern, or to shock or to entertain. But there is no time here for a presumably learned critique of forecasting technique.

Instead, I shall offer some thoughts about how to think about the future.

Let's start with the theme developed by Dennis Gabor in his stimulating book *Inventing the Future:*

"The future cannot be predicted, but futures can be invented. It was man's ability to invent which has made human society what it is. The mental processes of inventions are still mysterious. They are rational but not logical, that is to say, not deductive. The first step of the technological or social inventor is to visualize by an act of imagination a thing or state of things which does not yet exist and which to him appears in some ways desirable. He can then start rationally arguing backwards from the invention and forward from the means at his disposal until a way is found from one to the other."[2]

---

[1] Any views expressed in this paper are those of the author. They should not be interpreted as reflecting the views of The Rand Corporation or the official opinion or policy of any of its governmental or private research sponsors. Papers are reproduced by The Rand Corporation as a courtesy to members of its staff.

This paper was prepared for presentation at the 80th Annual Meeting of the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants held in Portland, Oregon, September 27, 1967.

I would argue for the following propositions:

1. *"The future"* is not pre-ordained and therefore it cannot and will not be "discovered" by any individual genius or massive Manhattan District research project. If "it" were knowable or became known in that sense, our whole conception of human life would be fantastically different and incomprehensible to us sitting here.

2. On the other hand, the future is not a blank void within which anything and everything is equally possible or likely.

3. The future, like the past and the present, is essentially man-made. There is a physical world and there is nature but even these are being deliberately and inadvertently subjected to human management—and mismanagement.

4. What man does, what he dreams, what he thinks, what he consciously and unconsciously remembers has constituted the past, accounts for the present and will shape the future. The ability to communicate and to modify his own and other people's behavior based on language, memory and experience are what differentiates us from animals, minerals and vegetables. There are known or knowable connections between our present but changing perceptions of the past, and these reach out with broad continuities into the future.

5. Because of these continuities, it should be easier to describe "the future" in an aggregate sense than it is to predict discrete technological inventions or to predict in the social world sudden discontinuities, abrupt accelerations or declines in rates of change—especially if you also want to specify the dates, the probabilities and the magnitudes.

6. I have talked about "the future" in quotation marks because man is already creating much of it. Much of "it" is here, perhaps in undramatic or in small-scale outline. And what our many futures will be like in 1984 or by the year 2000, depends to a challenging extent on what we make it by design, by action and by inaction. Or to put it another way, to plan better to solve our present problems will make a significant dent on what the future will be like.

7. I don't believe that there is necessarily or need be a fundamental conflict or contradiction between our democratic and humanistic values and "inventing" our futures. This depends on the kind of future goals we want to achieve. As we shall see later, the choice of goals, the values we seek to enhance and the means to such ends are difficult to decide. In fact the process of goal clarification, of the values to be sought and the assessment of means appropriate to such ends is what inventing the future is, or should be, all about. That is what the task is if we are not fatalists.

I would view as fatalists those who are superoptimists—those who think that the lesser the amount of planning the greater the odds for the system to produce optimal results. And there are also the fatalistic pessimists who are convinced that mankind doesn't have what it takes and that all of his efforts at self-betterment are illusory and doomed to disappointment if not extinction. I'm not sure how to classify the man who says he is an optimist because he believes the future is uncertain.

8. Finally, I believe that an effort to solve presently visible future problems is worthwhile in itself, even if in fact those efforts don't result in the hoped for solution. In fact, it would be most unlikely that the results will ever turn out without surprises, but my contention is that the exercise of planning for the future will compel us to acquire better knowledge about present problems and how to cope with them.

In the past ten years several dozen scholarly institutes and centers have been created, here and abroad, which claim the future as their focus. By now almost every large business, government agency and professional society, including your own, has a long range planning group.

Why this interest in the future—and not just interest in it but anxiety about it?

I think it mirrors the shaken confidence of the capitalist world, particularly in the United States, in the inevitability of progress as it has defined the term since the period of the Enlightenment and the Industrial Revolution. In America, to oversimplify it, we had confidence that the basic rules of the game provided a structure within which all would work out for the best. The main requirement was to minimize the planning function of free government, and to protect free market mechanisms and decentralized instructions.

The impressive record of stable government under the social invention called the U.S. Constitution and the success of the U.S. economic system built upon the virtues and values of the Christian ethic, seemed to justify strong faith that all would work out for the best in this the best country if not the best of all possible worlds. The hostility to social planning for the future, at least as an emotional attitude if not in practice, was and to some extent still is testimony to the faith in a benevolent future if we don't tamper too much with the present.

At the same time, Americans have another strong set of beliefs: your individual future is what you want to make it and what you plan to make it. The absence of a feudal history; the role of the frontier and a richly endowed continent to populate and develop; the freedoms assured by our political, legal and economic systems; the absence of fixed class and caste lines—all made for a faith in individual planning: pick your future, study and work, evaluate your choices and decisions in terms of their pragmatic effect in moving you to your goal—and your chance of achieving it is very good. And in fact if each person plans well for achieving his self-chosen private future, society itself would benefit and progress achieved. But keep the planning to the immediate self or to one's immediate family, group or business. If the planning is done by large institutions—large corporations, or unions or government bodies, that's bad.

But many things happened in the past fifty years to shake national confidence in the semi-automatic yet self-propelled road to progress, success, happiness: the succession of world wars and lesser wars since 1914, the great depression and the anxiety about the economy even when booming were primary faith shakers. Public opinion, despite vigorous opposition, turned to larger institutions to manage things more directly—to preserve peace to insure domestic tranquillity and to regulate the economy—hopefully to create or re-establish an environment which would still foster the real engines of progress—the individual pursuit of personal goals.

My thesis is not that the trend toward what I'll call social planning to distinguish personal and individual planning, has been necessarily good or bad, well done or poorly done—but first to establish that this country has lived from the beginning in a social environment where at the same time planning has been both active and accepted (an anti-fatalist view at the individual or selective group level), and opposed for larger political, economic and social institutions, with a fatalistic certitude that only individual planning will ensure progress.

How does all this square with current interest in "The Future," including the inclusion on the program of this professional society of a half day session devoted to anticipating the future?

As with many other groups and individuals, your confidence has in fact been shaken that all that you do in a short time perspective—day by day or even year by year—will automatically or necessarily be for the best ten or 25 years from now. You probably feel, as does any progress-striving group, that if only you could get a pretty good preview of the future you could do a better job here and now in achieving your present set of goals for progress and success at a later date. In principle that is fine. In fact, there are many pitfalls—depending on how you conceive of the problem of forecasting, prediction, prevision, foresight, planning and purposes. And all of us are aware that our private pursuits are now more closely linked to larger segments of society—not just to family, business or profession, but to the city, the country, the world.

Anyone's preview inventory of America's future social environment probably would resemble an inventory of our current concerns. What we do about them now or fail to do, mainly will determine how these issues will characterize what the next generation will experience as its present. I say "mainly determine" because there is always a probability that some currently unforeseeable developments will occcur with some startling and abrupt consequence. But such discontinuities are as unpredictable as is a "break-through" in a field of science.

What are some of the problem issues which integrally link the present to the future?

My check-list includes at least these gross categories, each of which splinters into innumerable specifics yet all of which interact in most complex and imperfectly understood ways.

World peace and international relations.

Economic growth and stability.

Population: growth rates, composition, geography.

Government operation and organization at all levels.

Technological change: including problem-solving "systems" along with the hardware.

Economic organization: the role of the corporation, private business large and small, Uncle Sam as largest customer, organized labor, the work force, automation, economic growth and stability.

Urban affairs: pollution, transportation, race relations, ghettos, delinquency, crime, drugs.

General welfare: physical and mental health, leisure, education, information.

"Quality of life": the family and the generations, the sense of personal responsibility and conscience, implicit ethical norms, respect for self and for others, the dimensions of privacy.

Obviously I cannot review here the present state of knowledge on any of these areas or extrapolate from such knowledge into the future or suggest preferred "solutions." But I shall offer a few observations of general pertinence to them all.

Better understanding of current conditions entails many things.

A first requirement is better diagnosis. This requires in the longer run a more rapid development of the social sciences and social scientists, including such practitioners as lawyers, public officials and administrators. It means not only specialists but also more and better generalists who by training and diversified experience develop insight into the many interconnections between the proliferating specialists and specialties.

This need for better diagnosis is getting increased attention, not only in the universities where it is a central, centuries-old tradition, but in government and business as well. What is new is an updating of data, a search for hitherto neglected aspects of the problem, refinements in analytical methods and a closer relation between research, policy and action.

---

[2] Dennis Gabor, *Inventing the Future*, New York 1964, pp. 207–208.

Also there seems to be a heightened awareness by planners and researchers of the dangers of hidden and subtle bias in the way a problem is posed. Such biases may stem from the class, profession or psychological background of the analyst and express itself not only in formulation of the problem but in research design, or in the lumping together of seemingly similar factors which in fact conceal important interrelations. There is more awareness today I believe among planners that value preferences need to be laid bare and implicit assumptions be disclosed. One of the most difficult tasks in planning for future development is not only to establish the present preferences, value systems and objectives of differential groups but to understand how these may change and to allow for the likelihood that what we think is wanted or desired today may not in fact be so preferred in the future.

As an example, take the history of many urban renewal and slum clearance programs. Obviously they have not provided better housing for the slum-dweller nor have slum-dwellers who were reinstalled in more hygienic low cost housing projects been unambivalently happy about it. Why? Because left out of the physical rehabilitation was a human conception of what mattered greatly to the people—a sense of neighborhood, a community of easy social contact, a place of life as well as a place to live.

Or take many of the badly understood dimensions of the negro-white problem despite a vast body of important sociological research during the past half-century. It is often believed that discrimination and job opportunities for negroes are most troublesome for the unskilled and those who are high school dropouts. A more careful gathering and analysis of statistical data now suggests that employment difficulties are relatively greater for negroes who are high school graduates and who have had some college education.[3] This seemingly simple re-analysis suggests some modification in current programs, and their "target" choices, and thus in efforts to ameliorate some future problems.

Probably all of you have heard in recent years of "systems analysis" and PPBS: Program Planning Budgeting System as developed by my colleagues at The Rand Corporation, by other researchers, introduced in the Department of Defense in 1961 and by direction of the President two years ago to be employed by all federal agencies in managing and planning their future operations.[4] There is little doubt that the extension of PPBS will of itself have considerable effect on future ways of solving problems, managing organizations and intensifying the trend toward social planning—all of this with what is essentially an old common-sensical idea.

The essence of PPBS, although complex in the doing, is simple: to relate the resources one plans to expend to the accomplishments or outcomes of that expenditure. Or to put it another way, it is a way of systematically weighing my choices in advance by thinking through alternative goals, objectives and programs, in relation to the comparative benefits from alternative paths to such goals—and in relation to realistically estimated costs associated with each.

In social development, "costs" and "benefits" are not adequately measured by such manageable criteria as dollars or units of output. If there is a future for such planning strategies, several intellectual problems have to be solved.

The first I have alluded to: the need for far more detailed understanding of what a given organization, agency or social problem now consists of, what is it, how did it get that way, what preferences, purposes, goals is it advancing or inhibiting. Where dollar profits and losses are not the pay-off, such as what constitutes decent health and social welfare of the aged, it is incredibly difficult to relate dollars expended to results achieved, and thus, to relate sensibly means to ends.

Many of our major national and local efforts proceed, in great earnestness and sincerity, knowing neither what the programs are expected to accomplish, especially for the intended beneficiaries, nor how to evaluate the consequences in order to modify programs, or goals, or both. Witness the frustration of Detroit and New Haven, to name but two battlegrounds of 1967. Housing projects, slum clearance, job training programs, community participation roles shared by negroes—all presumably had been tried, but the ghettos erupted nonetheless. In fact, have such programs failed because, like Christianity, they were in fact too little tried? Or do such programs make utterly erroneous assumptions about the deeper psychological, social and political values and attitudes of lower class negroes? Who really knows? I daresay that the gap in communication is enormous between slum-roots negro and social agencies. The lack of match is cavernous between the values and deep inner needs of slum negroes and how these are perceived by whites who are truly eager to promote social development and who do the planning. And apparently even those negroes who have made it by the standards of successful middle class America are out of touch with the seething resentments of the ghetto masses.

I don't know for certain, but I have a hunch that the leaders of "black power," whatever their private motives, have come closer to the jugular: the craving of a down-trodden minority for self-respect built upon self-accomplishment. However demagogic the language or platforms of "black power," it does seem to have a better insight into the need to repair the damaged sense of self-esteem among many negroes than do the well-meaning conscience-stricken and necessarily paternalistic white Establishments. Until our national and local programs better understand and take into account the emotional make-up and value systems of the urban negro, we won't make much direct headway in reducing the problems of race for the future.

The inadequacy of basic social data and the need for more sophisticated analyses of it has become recognized increasingly not just by scholars but by those trying to change the present to make a better future. The realization is growing that the preferred American style of act first, think second, may not quite suffice in solving big problems for the future. Dozens of programs have been hastily planned, budgeted and adopted in recent years. I do not in this context challenge their purposes nor their need. Many were long and shamefully overdue. But we come to the reckoning. Doubt has grown whether their purposes were adequately defined and consonant with the means established for their accomplishment. I say "doubt" because we don't adequately know what has been achieved, for whom, at what human and other costs with what longer-term implications.

A bill is pending before the Senate, introduced by Senator Walter Mondale of Minnesota, to develop the kinds of data needed for more rational social development and planning by the decision-makers, private as well as public, at federal, state and local community levels. The proposal is to have a counterpart to the President's Council of Economic Advisors which reports on economic developments—a Council of Social Advisors, who will reorganize and develop information systems labeled "Social Indicators" from which reports on the social health of the country can be prepared. Social audits and social accounting are visible needs and in principle represent concepts analogous to your own professional auditing functions. I need not detail the innumerable issues of method and quality which will plague the field of social auditing. There will be good and poorly conceived and performed audits as there are in financial accounting operations, but I am sure that the scale of such ventures in applied social science will be vastly increased over past and present efforts. Hopefully, a better social knowledge will further social development at least in two ways:

To identify things we are now doing which upon awareness we decide we ought to stop doing in order to survive, or to have lives worth living; and

To help think through some of the things we may want to consider doing and to assess in advance the likely consequences of pursuing one or another course of action.

I don't want to leave you with the impression that I have a zealot's faith in science—that science or social science can save us, if given the resources. Nor do I minimize for the future as I do not do for the past the role of chance, of individual impact on social developments, on politics, on cultural accomplishment. In fact, a prime goal for planning, in my view, and a prime criterion for assessing its quality, is the extent to which individual differences and opportunities are nutured, pluralism of ideas and institutions are fostered and opportunities for self-chosen paths of fulfillment are widened. In short, freedom and future planning can and should be mutually supporting.

I don't expect the future necessarily to have any less tension than has been part of our past. No dynamic society is tension- or trouble-free. Only static societies think they are calm, but they too have their outlets in suicide, alcoholism and other ways. I think we shall find, as we already can see, that economic affluence alone is not a "cure." To work on a larger scale to remedy social ills also creates heightened expectations which rarely are met. There will be less tolerance of traditional authority in the family, in the larger community, in the hereafter. The sense of what constitutes a fair share of income, health, education, respect and political power will be perhaps even more controversial than at present. And the resulting tensions will themselves be part of the problem and the efforts at solution. The changers and the resisters of change will have new battlegrounds over new issues and new ideas and these need to be reflected among the costs and benefits in construction of social balance sheets.

Let me conclude by briefly mentioning a few things I would urge you to do apart from perhaps pondering what has already been said. There are things you can do in your role as citizen and as responsible policy advisors.

First, don't sit on your *status quo* by leaving social development to those whose job description so prescribes.

Don't just moan and groan about those bureaucrats, those professors, those politicians. Their problems are yours, and more yours than the mass population's.

---

[3] For an excellent discussion of this and other problems in statistical analysis and interpretation, see "Discrimination Against Negroes," by Otis Dudley Duncan, in *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, May 1967, pp. 85–103. This issue is devoted to "Social Goals and Indicators for American Society." For a comprehensive discussion of many aspects of "the future," see the Summer 1967 issue of *Daedalus*—Journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, entitled "Toward the Year 2000: Work in Progress."

[4] For a description of PPBS and its problems, see *Program Budgeting: Program Analysis and the Federal Budget*, D. Novick, ed., A Rand Corporation Study, Harvard University Press, 1965.

Don't underestimate either your potential influence, affluence or intelligence by taking your marbles out of the game.

No one has a monopoly on ideas, least of all people in government. I should think that the financial and tax stake that you have in urban America would compel you to make the urban problem a challenge to private business. I should think that you could accumulate the resources to analyze in detail your city's problems and develop combined public-private programs which would pay off in more ways than one.

Let me give an earlier example of one possible approach. Some of you may be members of a remarkably foresighted organization of businessmen who during World War II went about the task, independent of government, of preventing and inventing an important part of their future. They organized the Committee for Economic Development to study the problem of postwar industrial conversion to a peacetime economy. They anticipated the possibilities of depression. They worked along with talented scholars to study these possibilities and to develop policies which would prevent the crises which seemed likely. And they made an important impact on their future.

Some of you in this professional society might right now form a Committee on Social Development—not just a discussion body but a serious working group, teamed up with carefully chosen professional research staffs, to compete with public planning groups in the search for better futures. Surely you have the self-confidence to permit such a Committee for Social Development to function in an objective non-trade association manner and thus to attract outstanding talent, nationally and in regional branches.

For members of the financial accounting community to participate in a serious effort at social accounting would put yourselves into the business of acting constructively on the future instead of nervously trying to anticipate and to adjust to a world you never made. For if too many people of your stature pull out, you and the rest of us will have a marvelous future—behind us.

DEFENSE OF VIETNAM POLICY BY THAILAND FOREIGN MINISTER

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, those in this country and in other parts of the free world who oppose our policy in Vietnam and who clamor for one-sided cessation of the bombing would do well to ponder the fact that the many free nations which are close to the conflict understand our commitment because their own security is immediately involved. They would consider it nothing short of a disaster if the administration were ever to succumb to the voices of appeasement and timidity and despair and withdraw from Vietnam on terms that assure a Communist takeover.

Perhaps the most eloquent statement on this point yet made by an Asian spokesman was the statement of Thailand's distinguished Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Thanat Khoman, before the General Assembly of the United Nations this last Thursday.

Speaking about "wars of liberation," Mr. Thanat said the following:

> Let us, smaller and weaker nations, candidly face the facts and realize that the imminent dangers which may descend upon our nations are less likely to come from nuclear deployment—although they can never be ruled out—than from combinations of military and political ventures which their proponents euphemistically call "wars of national liberation", and which, for all intents and purposes, are hardly different from the one which Adolf Hitler launched against the Sudetenland nearly thirty years ago. Such undertakings nowadays may be more insidious but no less lethal to our free and healthy existence. They are even more so when accompanied by devious and variegated forms of propaganda which seek not only to deceive and to dupe the less informed among us, but also to incite and inflame pent-up emotions and to exploit old and new prejudices and hatred. In the process of carrying out their designs, various kinds of aid may be resorted to, including the provision of liberal quantities of arms and other materiel of war which encourage the embittered people to throw themselves into battle and exterminate one another.

Mr. Thanat spoke with bitterness of the "campaign of fallacies and aberations" about the Vietnam war, and with scorn for those "who are always liberal with other people's freedom." Let me quote this passage from his statement in full:

> Of no less or perhaps even greater importance is, in our opinion, the question of the war now raging in Vietnam, for it has given rise to such a campaign of fallacies and aberrations, and about which so many people have unfortunately displayed such lack of candour that there has been created an abysmal chasm between realities on the one hand and the falsehoods and half-truths that the perpetrators of the war and their sympathizers have disseminated. North Vietnam and its supporters in the Communist world as well as its Vietcong agents in South Vietnam wanted the outside world to believe that the war of conquest they have been waging for many years against the small and independent country of South Vietnam is a genuine national uprising or, to use their current terminology, a "war of national liberation". This travesty of the truth has convinced neither the South Vietnamese people nor those who live near the scene of the crime and who are directly or otherwise suffering from its nefarious consequences. Only those who are farther away whose minds are less perceptive of the existing realities and those who are always liberal with other people's freedom or are prompted by less than altruistic reasons allow themselves to fall victims of this crude propaganda. But if questions as to what they think of the conflict in Vietnam were directed to those Asians who have their feet firmly on the ground and whose vision has not been clouded by the outlandish ideology of the frustrated author of "Das Kapital", they would reply in unison that it is in effect an old-styled colonial conquest with only a few renovated outward trimmings . . .
>
> The people in our Asian part of the world are presently amazed at the emergence of negative values and logic. They find it particularly difficult to understand the strong advocacies by some quarters that the aggressors should be appeased and even protected against their crime. Their life and property should not be molested by aerial bombing, while their atrocities in the South and elsewhere evoke hardly any indigation. Thus, for these would-be pacifists and lopsided idealists, the lives of the North Vietnamese and Vietcong attackers seem to have much greater value than the throats and limbs of South Vietnamese and other Asian victims of aggression. That is why they clamour for unilateral and unconditional cessation of bombing, which they contend may bring the aggressive regime of the North in the conference table. It never occurs to them, however, to demand from that regime a positive indication as to what it proposes to do in response to such a gesture. In the meantime, they are acting as spokesman and unauthorized agents of Hanoi while the latter continues to disdain any prospect of meaningful negotiations except on its own terms. . . .
>
> What smaller nations of the Organization and indeed the whole world should look forward to is less the one-sided cessation of bombing which will allow the aggressor to wreak further havoc but rather the ways and means to ensure that there will be no other Vietnams in the future.

Mr. Thanat also contrasted the fraudulent revolutionary claims of communism with the genuine revolution that is now taking place in the countries of Southeast Asia. He said:

> Nations in Southeast Asia and in the vast region of Asia and the Pacific have found it necessary to join together in cooperative efforts to bring about greater well-being and progress for our respective peoples. This is our own concept of a revolution in Southeast Asia, a revolution which seeks to fill the stomachs with food and the hearts with realizable hopes for the future, and not the one which throws the starving people in the street to commit depredations and desecration.
>
> It is also a revolution to destroy the shackles of past domination and dependency. From now on the nations in the areas will be inspired by the spirit of equal partnership and cooperation for the good of each and all. Such efforts would move more swiftly forward were it not for the disruptive Vietnam war which has retarded the development of fuller independence and mutual self-reliance of the nations in the Asian region. That is why all of them without exception earnestly hope that this senseless conflict can be brought to a just and successful conclusion which will open up a new era of greater stability and progress. If South Vietnam is assured of its freedom, smaller nations of the world can look forward to a more secure independence free from interference and encroachment.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the full text of Foreign Minister Thanat Khoman's speech of October 5. I hope that Senators will find the time to read it in its entirety.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Permanent Mission of Thailand to the United Nations, New York, N.Y.]

Statement by Mr. Thanat Khoman, Minister of Foreign Affairs, Chairman of the Delegation of Thailand at the 22d Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, October 5, 1967

The past few months have been, for the United Nations—and for many of our countries—a trying period. For while disturbances in Asia, particularly the war in Vietnam, go on unabated, the brief but devastating armed conflict which broke out in the Middle East last June added a new dangerous dimension to the already acute state of international tension. Confronted with this explosive situation, this fragile Organization of ours stood, as before the Vietnam problem, almost spell-bound watching helplessly the fast moving episodes of a modern tragedy roll by. Only after the shells and bullets ceased to rain, sowing death and destruction, have efforts for peace begun, mostly in the forms of words—not all of them were measured and constructive. Presently, as this Assembly passed from an emergency session into a regular one, it has on its hands at least two burning problems, any one of which has the potentiality of upsetting the peace of wide regions of the world and the well-being of scores of millions of human beings.

While international problems grow in urgency and acuteness, the capacity of the

United Nations to deal effectively with them appears to develop in inverse proportion. As a result of this seemingly unfortunate situation, like many other representatives of smaller countries which constitute the great majority of membership of this organization and which place their faith and reliance on the United Nations as an instrument to preserve and maintain peace in this world, we have come to this important meeting with our hearts heavy and full of perplexity as to the outcome of our present deliberations.

The question uppermost in our minds is whether this Assembly will follow, as previously, the same road which was marked by endless and useless recriminations and invectives, with little, if any, evidence of serious search for more constructive solutions and more permanent settlement. If that is the case, then the forthcoming discussions which, in all probability will go on for the next two or three months, will be fruitless and will yield no worthwhile result for the future peace of the Middle East and Southeast Asia. All of us shall then return home empty-handed, our hopes and desires to see long-lasting peace and tranquillity reign in this world frustrated and the spector of renewed or more intensified conflict will be looming high and large over the horizon. If, on the contrary, we refuse to be taken in by those who pay only lip-service to peace and who actually try to assume the role of angels of peace but whose wings are strangely blackened by gunsmoke and stained with blood, and if instead, we concentrate our efforts on attaining honourable and durable arrangements which will allow many nations to live together without the risk of being dominated or destroyed, then the prospects for world peace and harmony will become infinitely brighter and more promising.

Let us, smaller and weaker nations, candidly face the facts and realize that the imminent dangers which may descend upon our nations are less likely to come from nuclear deployment—although that can never be ruled out—than from combinations of military and political ventures which their proponents euphemistically call "wars of national liberation," and which, for all intents and purposes, are hardly different from the one which Adolf Hitler launched against the Sudetenland nearly thirty years ago. Such undertakings nowadays may be more insidious but no less lethal to our free and healthy existence. They are even more so when accompanied by devious and variegated forms of propaganda which seek not only to deceive and to dupe the less informed among us, but also to incite and inflame pent-up emotions and to exploit old and new prejudices and hatred. In the process of carrying out their designs, various kinds of aid may be resorted to, including the provision of liberal quantities of arms and other materiel of war which encourage the embittered people to throw themselves into battle and exterminate one another.

The foregoing elements may well constitute the root causes of many tragedies now unfolding in our troubled world. We will have therefore to make strenuous efforts and exercise our wiser judgment to protect ourselves against the lurings of false promises and the exhortations of subtle and treacherous propaganda.

This explains why Thailand is unwilling to take sides in the unfortunate situation in the Middle East which for long years has known neither peace nor reasonable hope for settlement, but which last June exploded into destructive clashes, leaving behind them a long trail of desolation and misery. Even now, the conflict is far from being resolved, embers are smouldering and new conflagrations may erupt if fuel is added to arouse new outbursts of the still highly charged emotions. The best those smaller nations which have no peace proposals or formulae to offer can do would probably be to refrain from adding fuel to the fire, and also to the best of their ability, prevent possible exploitation of existing dissensions.

Such was the attitude taken by the Thai delegation during the emergency special session of the General Assembly. It was regrettable that practical substantive measures which might help remove the root causes of the conflict were not then adopted. The principal objective of the Thai Government has always been to see long lasting peace and stability in the Middle East. My delegation therefore believes that basic issues should be faced realistically and not left untouched.

The fact that there has been an outbreak of large-scale war three times in the Middle East in the past twelve years is a clear indication of the explosive situation in the area. Yet previous efforts were mainly directed towards making arrangements for bringing about cease-fire and cessation of hostilities without attempting to resolve the fundamental causes which led to such hostilities. Failures of the United Nations so far to face the problem squarely have been, to quote the Secretary-General, "a major contributing factor to the war last June." Is it therefore advisable for us now to try merely to liquidate the consequences of the war without seeking at the same time to create necessary conditions which could ensure better prospects for more lasting peace in the Middle East? Withdrawal of troops from occupied areas, however immediate and imperative, should, in our view, also be accompanied by additional steps which would remove the basic causes of the armed conflict.

In this connection, my delegation regrets the absence of willingness to negotiate either directly between the parties concerned or through the intermediary of a third party. Likewise, my delegation regrets the refusal of the Government of Israel to heed the call of the overwhelming majority of the General Assembly in regard to the status of the city of Jerusalem. Israel's inflexible attitude on this question will adversely affect the overall situation and will set another barrier to the path of finding an honourable, just, and definitive solution to the Middle East question.

While there is yet no Middle East settlement, the problem of refugees remains a serious concern for us all. My delegation is gratified that at the initiative of the Swedish delegation, Resolution 2252 (ES–V) concerning humanitarian assistance to the Middle East was adopted by the fifth special emergency session. The Government of Thailand is pleased to be able to make a modest contribution of rice for the relief of the suffering as a result of the recent hostilities in the Middle East.

Of no less or perhaps even greater importance is, in our opinion, the question of the war now raging in Vietnam, for it has given rise to such a campaign of fallacies and aberrations, and about which so many people have unfortunately displayed such lack of candour that there has been created an abysmal chasm between realities on the one hand and the falsehoods and half-truths that the perpetrators of the war and their sympathizers have disseminated. North Vietnam and its supporters in the Communist world as well as its Vietcong agents in South Vietnam wanted the outside world to believe that the war of conquest they have been waging for many years against the small and independent country of South Vietnam is a genuine national uprising or, to use their current terminology, a "war of national liberation." This travesty of the truth has convinced neither the South Vietnamese people nor those who live near the scene of the crime and who are directly or otherwise suffering from its nefarious consequences. Only those who are farther away whose minds are less perceptive of the existing realities and those who are always liberal with other people's freedom or are prompted by less than altruistic reasons allow themselves to fall victims of this crude propaganda. But if questions as to what they think of the conflict in Vietnam were directed to those Asians who have their feet firmly on the ground and whose vision has not been clouded by the outlandish ideology of the frustrated author of "Das Kapital," they would reply in unison that it is in effect an old-styled colonial conquest with only a few renovated outward trimmings.

For this so-called sublime liberation with its accompanying paraphernalia is being directed not solely against the Republic of Vietnam but actually against a dozen other countries in Asia and Africa. Also, the liberation is always forcible, never voluntary. Consequently, it invariably elicits strong resistance against the forceful invitation to be liberated and to join the paradise of Marxist bondage.

The people in our Asian part of the world are presently amazed at the emergence of negative values and logic. They find it particularly difficult to understand the strong advocacies by some quarters that the aggressors should be appeased and even protected against their crime. Their life and property should not be molested by aerial bombing, while their atrocities in the South and elsewhere evoke hardly any indignation. Thus, for these would-be pacifists and lopsided idealists, the lives of the North Vietnamese and Vietcong attackers seem to have much greater value than the throats and limbs of South Vietnamese and other Asian victims of aggression. That is why they clamour for unilateral and unconditional cessation of bombing, which they contend may bring the aggressive regime of the North to the conference table. It never occurs to them, however, to demand from that regime a positive indication as to what it proposes to do in response to such a gesture. In the mean time, they are acting as spokesman and unauthorized agents of Hanoi while the latter continues to disdain any prospect of meaningful negotiations except on its own terms. In fact the more the other side shows intransigence and insistence on its unreasonable demands, the more the protagonists of concessions press on with further compromises which ultimately will lead to surrender and delivery of South Vietnam to the North. Indeed, only a few of these advocates have enough courage to admit that South Vietnam is not worth saving but should be handed over to its predators of the North for the sake of temporary peace or even a short-lived truce.

To the millions of suffering people in Asia it seems that the right to call off measures to repel the aggressors such as the bombing of the North should be exercised in consultation with them and not by those apostates of peace who barely suffer at the hands of those cruel enemies of freedom and whose campaign for illusory peace has, twice in a lifetime, led to the tragic disaster of world wars. For those millions of Asians whose life is constantly menaced by the aggressors' guns and terror, the halt in the bombing would gain immediate support and approval if it could lead ultimately to the cessation of hostilities as well as the harrowing reign of terror. Clearly for them the Vietnam war is indeed unpopular, even greatly more unpopular than in Europe or America which enjoys both safety and abundance.

Unlike the Hanoi regime which is unwilling to leave the war-path, they ardently desire to see the war brought to an end provided that in so doing their freedom and independence are not sacrificed, for if peace were to be followed by subjection to alien rule and deprivation of their heritage of liberty, their existence would be without meaning. For them it is deeply painful to watch the agonizing debate stirred up by the instigators of doubt, of confusion and defeatism, who, masquerading as princes of peace, are in fact undermining and damaging the abiding interests of their own countries as well as those of their friends and allies. With a few more grains of wisdom and perspicacity they should be able to realize that the solution to the war in Vietnam can never be found when the defenders of freedom are divided and disunited but only if the latter succeed in closing their ranks and are determined to carry their gallant task to the end. For the aggressive regime of North Vietnam once had the taste of victory snatched from a divided nation and nothing can dissuade it from thinking that it could repeat the performance if it manages to sow doubts, dissension, and disruption both within and among nations which stand in its way to conquest and domination.

In fact the anatomy of the war in Vietnam can be analysed into various elements. In the first place, hostilities may cease altogether when the aggressors, realizing the hopelessness of their adventure, discontinue their infiltration and intervention against their neighbors. They may be persuaded to adopt this course on finding that the cost of aggression in terms of deterioration of their well-being and even their subsistence is far too high, and on the realization of the fact that it is not possible for them to achieve their objective through the use of subversion and armed intervention. Indeed, those who are eager to see peace restored in Vietnam should join together in convincing the Hanoi regime of the futility of their venture and that the peaceful approach is actually more beneficial.

Another possibility would appear to be negotiated settlement. Such solution presupposes some form of negotiations and above all the sincere willingness on the part of the parties involved to enter into negotiations. This the parties concerned may directly do on their own, but hitherto the negative attitude of Hanoi has precluded the likelihood of such direct discussion. A further alternative is a larger conference arranged by interested Governments for the settlement of this outstanding problem. In particular, the Geneva conference on Indochina may be reconvened to pave the way for a negotiated settlement. The first step in this direction would be for both Co-Chairmen of the Geneva conference to act as true peacemakers by fulfilling their avowed duties as Co-Chairmen and to forsake their role of ideological partners in the conflict. Instead of adding further fuel to the flame by supplying more arms to the aggressors, a Co-Chairman would better serve the cause of peace and at the same time perform his part of the obligations by using his influence to persuade Hanoi, the only unwilling party in this case, to come to the conference table. At any rate, the least that should be done would be to show support for the reconvening of such conference.

In all these possibilities, even when negotiations could be initiated either directly or by an internationally arranged conference, a further step would still be to secure a just and durable settlement of the conflict. To achieve this objective either in the process of negotiation or otherwise, one of the prerequisites to be borne in mind by the free nations is for them to remain constantly united and to show their firm determination. Failure to muster such unity or to show firmness may result in superficial settlement entailing transitory peace which is fraught with no less grave danger to peace and security.

The vicious campaigns now being conducted to breed dissension and disunity among us are not completely devoid of usefulness. They opened our eyes to the vagaries of both international and domestic politics in various countries and spurred us to redouble our regional and individual efforts to strengthen our security and defense and to rely more and more on combined endeavours of those who share the same stake and have no doubt as to where their vital interests lie.

That explains why nations in Southeast Asia and in the vast region of Asia and the Pacific have found it necessary to join together in co-operative efforts to bring about greater well-being and progress for our respective peoples. This is our own concept of a revolution in Southeast Asia, a revolution which seeks to fill the stomachs with food and the hearts with realizable hopes for the future, and not the one which throws the starving people in the street to commit depredations and desecration.

It is also a revolution to destroy the shackles of past domination and dependency. From now on the nations in the areas will be inspired by the spirit of equal partnership and cooperation for the good of each and all. Such efforts would move more swiftly forward were it not for the disruptive Vietnam war which has retarded the development of fuller independence and mutual self-reliance of the nations in the Asian region. That is why all of them without exception earnestly hope that this senseless conflict can be brought to a just and successful conclusion which will open up a new era of greater stability and progress. If South Vietnam is assured of its freedom, smaller nations of the world can look forward to a more secure independence free from interference and encroachment. What smaller nations of the Organization and indeed the whole world should look forward to is less than the one-sided cessation of bombing which will allow the aggressor to wreak further havoc but rather the ways and means to ensure that there will be no other Vietnams in the future.

Turning to the present economic situation of the world, I may safely say that in recent decades economists and statesmen have grown more convinced than ever that one of the most serious dangers to the future well-being and security of mankind is the slow and steady drift of 75 per cent of humanity into deeper poverty. Unless certain concrete and positive actions can be taken promptly and effectively to arrest this decline, so that the peoples of developing lands of Asia, Africa and Latin-America can proceed with the implementation of their industrialization programme and accelerate their progress towards self-sufficiency and prosperity, no number of treaties, declarations and resolutions will be sufficient to ward off the eventual breakdown of world order.

Many of the distinguished representatives preceding me have emphatically drawn the attention of the Assembly to the increasingly widening gap between the rich and the poor. This is no new phenomenon. Such discouraging trend has existed for some time. And despite past exhortations and pleadings by developing countries and apparent sympathy and gesture of support from industrially advanced countries, the fact is that for the sixth successive year, there has been little or no improvement in the over-all level of development assistance provided by the high income countries. While the needy are grateful to the increased generosity on the part of the latter, these nations' capacity to help are relatively limited. The main burden, of course, falls on the principal aid-supplying nations, whose assistance level, regrettably, have shown only small increases in recent years.

Many governments of developing nations including that of Thailand, have learned to rely on their own efforts, and by means of sound planning and energetic execution of financial and economic policies, have managed to move their countries forward at a fairly satisfactory pace. For the past ten years, Thailand's rate of economic growth has averaged 7 per cent a year. This is no mean achievement and has given a sense of pride to the government and people of the country. However, the task is only partially done, and our efforts—which provide a major share for our own development—continues to be affected by a shortage of external finance on appropriate terms.

As a primary commodity producing country, Thailand, together with many other countries of similar structure, is deeply concerned with the fluctuations of world prices of primary products. The matter has unfortunately been aggravated further by the periodic releases of stock piles which do much damage to our total efforts and have the effect of slowing down our progress towards better life for our own people. The recent signing of the Final Act of tariff negotiations within the Kennedy Round has provided us with some hope. Although the Kennedy Round negotiations have resulted in a significant lowering of tariff barriers surpassing the reductions made in previous rounds of tariff negotiations, my delegation finds that many products in which the developing countries had focussed their particular interest received an average considerably smaller tariff reductions than did other products. In other words, the product categories for which industrialized countries are the main suppliers received much more extensive cuts. It, therefore, remains my firm belief that much needs to be accomplished before the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development is able to achieve practical results and find adequate solutions. For this reason, the Second Conference to be held in New Delhi should really serve as an effective instrument for a serious quest for solution of the crises—social, economic—which are besetting our world. In this connection, my delegation fully supports the appeals of the Secretary-General of the UNCTAD about the pressing need for agreement on adopting a global strategy for development and the corresponding synchronized practical measures and actions.

We also endorse in principle the proposal made at the Fifth Session of Trade and Development Board of UNCTAD by both the Secretary-General of UNCTAD and Director General of GATT, for a Joint International Trade Centre to help the developing countries in their export promotion efforts. It is our hope that the proposal will be translated into action as early as practicable.

There are still other problems of deep international concern such as disarmament, peace-keeping operations, decolonization and apartheid. In certain fields, progress has been made such as the submission of identical draft proposals on the Treaty for Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. But all these and other problems are currently being overshadowed by the reality of the danger and by the explosive character of the Middle East and Vietnam problems. Concerning these grave issues, the most urgent requirement seems to be to fill the candour chasm and to set aside the political or ideological partisanship. If indeed they can be dealt with with genuine candour and treated with human tolerance and comprehension rather than being problems between East and West, between the Marxist or Non-Marxist world, the chances for reaching accommodation and agreement will notably increase. So far, such a result is not within reach. But if further efforts may be pursued with persistance and determination, something may be gained which will open up new vistas in the arduous search for a durable and worthwhile solution to the present difficulties. If that can be achieved either within this Organization or outside it, real services will be rendered to the anguished mankind yearning for peace and tranquility undisturbed by the shadow of terror and the sudden explosion of death. Let us hope that within the relatively short time we spend during this Session, tangible results may be achieved to fulfill the deep desire of millions of human beings.

CONFIRMATION OF JUDGE DAMON J. KEITH

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to commend the Senate for its confirmation today of the nomination of Mr. Damon Keith to be a Federal judge for the eastern district of the State of Michigan.

The respect and esteem in which Mr. Keith is held in the legal community is amply demonstrated by the quality and the caliber of those who traveled from Michigan to testify in his behalf during the Senate Judiciary Committee's hearings on Mr. Keith's nomination.

Not only did the committee hear from the president of the Detroit Bar Association, Mr. John Feikens; the president of the Wolverine Bar Association, Mr. Louis Simmons; and the immediate past president of the Michigan State Bar Association, Mr. William Ellmann, but also from the very distinguished president-elect of the American Bar Association, Mr. William Gossett, who I am very proud to say is from the State of Michigan.

Needless to say, Mr. Keith's nomination had bipartisan support. Both the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart] and I testified before the Judiciary Committee in Mr. Keith's behalf.

Let me just add, in conclusion, that I believe the appointment of Mr. Keith to the Federal bench to be commendable and consistent with our endeavor to designate men of demonstrated ability and intelligence. His background—indicative of a very high standard of professional competence—is a matter of record.

Mr. President, Damon Keith will make an outstanding Federal judge.

SECRETARY RUSK'S LUCID RESTATEMENT OF THE AMERICAN POSITION ON VIETNAM

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, in his news conference today, Secretary of State Dean Rusk lucidly and objectively restated the American position on Vietnam. It was as clear a statement of our goals and objectives as any I have ever seen. And what's more, there is hardly any rational person who can seriously doubt its truth or accuracy.

Secretary Rusk rightly described the American position as a middle position—a middle position between those who urge an all-out, disastrous general war, and those who want immediate unilateral withdrawal.

Though the American people are troubled by the war, Secretary Rusk is absolutely correct when he says there is no large body of American opinion which supports either of those extremes.

The American position is based on a need to meet our international commitments; a pursuit of limited objectives by limited means; an earnest desire to bring this conflict to a peaceful end as soon as possible.

That, in a nutshell, is what we are trying to do.

I agree wholeheartedly with the Secretary when he said that the word or commitment of the United States would become worthless if we ever reneged on formal treaty obligations—such as SEATO—when the going got too hot.

On the other hand, if we pursued a wild, irresponsible annihilation policy toward Vietnam, the world might rightly say we suffered from the arrogance of power—which we do not. We have, in fact, used our remarkable military power with the most severe restraint.

We have tried to maintain a sense of balance in Vietnam. We have made dozens of overtures for peace discussions, all of which have been rejected by Hanoi.

We have received the support of many Asian nations for our position, for they stand on the front lines facing a hostile Communist China.

I urge all of us and the American people to read and absorb Secretary Rusk's statement of the American position in Vietnam.

It is an excellent document which to my mind is irrefutable in fact and in intent.

It reflects very well on a President who has been consistent from the beginning of our Vietnam commitment to this moment: do not yield 17 million people to communism; use your vast powers with restraint; keep every door open to peace.

I congratulate the Secretary and the President on this excellent restatement of the American position in Vietnam. I ask consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Secretary Rusk's News Conference of October 12, 1967

Secretary Rusk. I should like to begin with a brief comment on the current public discussion of Viet-Nam.

I find no significant body of American opinion which would have us withdraw from Viet-Nam and abandon Southeast Asia to the fate which Asian communism has planned for it. Similarly, I find no serious opinion among us which wishes to transform this struggle into a general war.

We Americans are, therefore, debating variations on a theme—but the theme is a central position resting upon (a) the need to meet our commitments and defend our vital national interests; (b) the pursuit of our limited objectives by limited means, and (c) our earnest desire to bring this conflict to a peaceful conclusion as soon as possible. Hanoi should not misunderstand this debate.

Our commitment is clear and our national interest is real. The SEATO Treaty, approved with only one dissenting vote by our Senate, declares that "Each party recognizes that aggression by means of armed attack in the treaty area . . . would endanger its own peace and safety, and agrees that it will in that event act to meet the common danger . . ." The Treaty says "each party" will act. The fidelity of the United States is not subject to the veto of some other signatory—and five signatories have engaged their forces alongside Koreans and South Vietnamese.

In August 1964 the Congress by joint resolution declared, with only two dissenting votes, that "The United States regards as vital to its national interest and to world peace the maintenance of international peace and security in Southeast Asia." This was not a new idea in 1964. It was the basis for the SEATO Treaty a decade earlier. It is no less valid in 1967. Our several alliances in the Pacific reflect our profound interest in peace in the Pacific, no less vital to us as a nation than is peace in our own hemisphere or in the NATO area.

I have heard the word "credibility" injected into our domestic debate. Let me say, as solemnly as I can, that those who would place in question the credibility of the pledged word of the United States under our mutual security treaties would subject this nation to mortal danger. If any who would be our adversary should suppose that our treaties are a bluff, or will be abandoned if the going gets tough, the result could be catastrophe for all mankind.

It is not easy for our people to wage a struggle by limited means for limited objectives. We Americans are an impatient people—a quality which has helped to build a great nation. The present impatience about Viet-Nam is thoroughly understandable—and is shared by those who carry official responsibility. But our over-riding object is—and must be—the establishment of a reliable peace. It is easy to rush into total catastrophe. It requires courage and determination to act with both firmness and restraint in the interest of peace. An examination of all the crises in which we have been involved since 1945 will show, I think, the supremacy of the objective of a reliable peace.

President Johnson has emphasized, time and time again, his interest in a prompt and peaceful settlement of the present struggles in Southeast Asia. Just two weeks ago, in San Antonio, he said, "The United States is willing to stop all aerial and naval bombardment of North Viet-Nam when this will lead promptly to productive discussions. We, of course, assume that while discussions proceed, North Viet-Nam would not take advantage of the bombing cessation or limitation."

Can there be a more reasonable proposal? Is there anything unfair about such a simple proposition? Is it not clear that if Hanoi is interested in peace it could say "yes" publicly or privately to the President's offer today?

A rejection, or a refusal even to discuss such a formula for peace, requires that we face sober conclusions. It would mean that Hanoi has not abandoned its effort to seize South Viet-Nam by force. It would give reality to captured documents which describe a "fight and negotiate" strategy by Viet Cong and North Vietnamese forces. It would reflect a view in Hanoi that they can gamble upon the character of the American people and of our allies in the Pacific. .

Earlier I referred to variations on a theme. The debate in which we are now involved is a debate about detail—this or that military move, this or that diplomatic step—this or that formulation of what is in fact a common middle position. If that be true, precision is important. People at least should make it clear whether they are arguing with Washington or with Hanoi.

When people talk about a pause in the bombing, they should know that Hanoi calls a pause an "ultimatum". When a Senator says that he wants to stop the bombing but, of course, wishes to continue to bomb in support of our Marines south of the DMZ, he should know that Hanoi categorically rejects any such notion. When people say "Negotiate Now" they should know that the President would meet with Ho Chi Minh and other Chiefs of State concerned, tomorrow—and that I would depart today for any mutually convenient spot if I could meet a representative of North Viet-Nam with whom I could discuss peace in Southeast Asia.

Chairman Thieu and Prime Minister Ky have repeatedly offered to meet with the authorities of Hanoi to arrange a cease-fire and a peaceful settlement. They and we both responded affirmatively to U Thant's proposals of last March. Had there been a similar response from Hanoi, there would have been discussions to arrange a military standstill, preliminary conversations and a convening of the Geneva Conference. Literally dozens of proposals made by ourselves, other governments or groups of governments have been rejected by Hanoi.

I cannot tell you when peace will come. I am encouraged by progress toward peace in South Viet-Nam, but I cannot name a date. But we shall continue our effort both by resisting those who would impose their solutions by brute force and by an unremitting exploration of every path which could lead to peace.

HOW DARE THEY BE UPSET?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, anent the recent Finance Committee sit-in by irate welfare recipients, I wish to insert in the RECORD a letter signed "Negro Taxpayer," which appeared in the September 25, 1967, edition of the Washington Daily News.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW DARE THEY BE UPSET?

Those irate mothers have quite a bit of gall holding an "anger-in." How dare they be upset because they have to support their own children. They had them and they are responsible for their support.

I realize that it is difficult to raise a family alone, but it can be done with a little effort. Believe me. I know what I'm talking about. My parents are divorced, and my mother raised my three sisters and myself to be law-abiding citizens and she worked every day also. We never lived in public housing or received AFDC. We didn't have all of life's luxuries, but we were always clean and well fed.

The prideless action of these women at the mention of work is disgusting. How long do they think they can continue to get something for nothing at the expense of the taxpaying citizen? The new regulations passed by the House should be strictly enforced.

NEGRO TAXPAYER.

NEW DIMENSIONS IN INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS—ADDRESS BY DR. EVERETT KLEINJANS

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, Dr. Everett Kleinjans, Deputy Chancellor for Academic Affairs at the East-West Center, addressed the English-Speaking Union on September 19, 1967, in Honolulu on the subject of "New Dimensions in International Affairs."

Dr. Kleinjans came to the East-West Center after long experience as an educator in the Far East. With the belief that his fresh viewpoints may be of interest to Senators, I ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW DIMENSIONS IN INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

(Presented before the English-Speaking Union, Sept. 19, 1967, by Everett Kleinjans)

I am speaking here tonight in place of Chancellor Jones who regretfully could not make it. The title of the talk, "New Dimensions in International Affairs," is most appropriate for a man who has spent most of his adult years in the foreign service of his country and who has become one of its outstanding diplomats. My credentials are quite different from Chancellor Jones', however. In my undergraduate years, I majored in mathematics and physics. In graduate school, due to certain wartime exposure to and training in languages, I shifted to linguistics and its application to the learning of foreign languages. More recently, for approximately the last six years, I have found myself in educational administration. With a background such as this, I feel that I am quite unqualified to speak to you on a subject as boldly innovating as this title sounds. However, I have spent most of the past 20 years of my life abroad and have constantly attempted to keep up with and analyze events, particularly events affecting relations between the United States and Asia in general, but Japan in particular. Perhaps out of this naive background, a few of the thoughts or ideas that I will be sharing with you tonight will have some ring of authenticity. In any case, my credentials or lack of credentials expose a few of my prejudices and predilections; At the same time, since I claim no expertise on the subject, I feel I will be a little freer to say what I wish about it.

The new dimension in international affairs as I see it is that a government—namely that of the United States of America—has openly admitted in fact, if not in word, that it does not understand the peoples of Asia and it has therefore set up an institution to promote mutual understanding. A prominent Asian diplomat, in residence at the East-West Center as a senior specialist, has written:

"It is clear that the East-West Center is a political creation established for political purposes. If further proof is needed, it is the fact that the Center's budget is part of that of the State Department. Hence the East-West Center has to take all the consequences of being a political institution. Its head has to justify and defend its budget, answer political questions of Congress members in a way satisfactory and acceptable to these politicians. In short, its Chancellor has to have the qualities of a politician. We will see later that he also has to be a diplomat.

"It is equally clear that the Center is an instrument of United States foreign policy. Mentioning it is by no means means as criticism. On the contrary, it is to underline the value and significance of the East-West Center. Because it is first class foreign policy."

This institution was established not to propagandize or to persuade people of the rightness of America's foreign policy, nor was it established to get Asians to like Americans. The particular American policy in effect at a particular time should not be permitted to affect the Center and its programs. For the Center is engaged in long-range planning in an attempt to create a community of people who will in turn create a climate of understanding in which we can live together in peace on this small and ever-shrinking planet. These are our long-range goals. Idealistic, to be sure; but men live by their values and their basic beliefs about man and his nature, and especially by the images they create of reality. By image I mean what Kenneth E. Boulding has described in his book *The Image* (The University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor Paperbacks, 1961). Each person, through his total experience of living, thinking, learning and interacting with other people, develops an image of objective reality. We might call it his "model" of the universe. On the basis of this image, a man responds, makes decisions, and takes action. As Boulding so cogently puts it. ". . . behavior depends on the image."

Unfortunately, our images are often distorted by the immediate situation and by the ideologies and myths which we hold at particular times. The average man's—even the highly-educated man's—concept of foreign countries is usually fuzzy or distorted. We all know and remember too clearly the stereotype of the Japanese people that was built up by the military in the early 1940's in order to create a climate for waging a war against them. This image, unfortunately, still exists today in the minds of many. We also remember vividly our wartime image of the Chinese people, influenced possibly by our concept of Confucius, the wise sage who from his depths of philosophical insight dispensed wisdom which has continued to influence the East over long periods of history. This benign image was transferred to Generalissimo and Madame Chiang-Kai Shek during the war. Our image of the Chinese people at that time was that they were our best of friends. Twenty-five years have passed and now we see the Chinese as the virtual incarnation of the devil, with Mao and his henchmen out to destroy everything we hold dear. What will the international situation be like 25 years from now, or in the year 2000? What will our images of Japan and China be then?

I think it was in the minds of the founders of the East-West Center, and it is the understanding of the people now connected with the Center, that *one* of the reasons for these stereotyped images has been the lack of depth of knowledge of each other and the lack of encounter. As you know, the East-West Center brings people together here in Hawaii to increase knowledge and enhance encounter. Of course, we must realize that encounter by itself may not help people to understand each other, nor necessarily to like each other. The encounter between people may, in fact, create a situation in which people come to misunderstand, dislike, and even hate each other. Winston Churchill has cogently summarized this situation in a speech at the Mid-Century Convocation at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology:

"We entered this terrible Twentieth Century with confidence. We thought that with improving transportation nations would get to know each other better. We believed that as they got to know each other better they would like each other more and that national rivalries would fade in a growing international consciousness.

"We took it almost for granted that science would confer continual boons and blessings upon us. . . . In the name of ordered but unceasing progress, we saluted the Age of Democracy expressing itself ever more widely through parliments freely and fairly elected on a broad or universal franchise. . . . The whole prospect and outlook of mankind grew immeasurably larger, and the multiplication of ideas also proceeded at an incredible rate. . . .

"This vast expansion was unhappily not accompanied by any noticeable advance in the stature of man, either in his mental facilities, or in his moral character. His brain got no better, but it buzzed the more . . . he became the sport and presently the victim of tides and currents, of whirlpools and tornadoes amid which he was far more helpless than he had been for a long time. (Quoted in Roger Shinn, *Christianity and the Problem of History*, p. 4.)

The direction of events in our century exposed the notion of the inevitability of human progress as an illusory image, and we, with Churchill, became disheartened and disenchanted. But the stripping away of illusions is a precondition to coping with reality. In fact, man must constantly perform acts of reality testing in order to produce changes in his image, in order to make his image conform to the world as it is. It became more and more clear, when the euphoria of post-war optimism was shattered again by collisions between nations, that international brotherhood didn't just grow naturally—that it must be cultivated and that its cultivation is hard work. With his realization certain men of vision felt that it was necessary to build a new or different kind of educational institution, one that would provide a framework in which understanding would be more probable than misunderstanding, in which ignorance would be replaced by knowledge and fear by confidence, respect and trust. The East-West Center attempts to provide the milieu where such things are possible.

Most educational institutions are built upon a philosophy dedicated to passing on the culture of the society in which they exist. Furthermore, in mono-cultural schools, both teachers and students are expected to have similar experiences and ways of thinking upon which the philosophy and program of the school can be built. The passing on of these experiences and ways of thinking is believed to insure the continuation of that society. This is why very little attention has been given in schools to the experiences and ways of thinking of other peoples, and that consequently the cultural heritage becomes more rigid often posing a barrier to understanding and living at peace with those of other traditions. Another characteristic of the mono-cultural approach to education is the tendency constantly to look to the past for philosophical foundations, inspiration, and guidance. However, in an international academic institution such as the East-West Center, which is making a very definite attempt to be inter-cultural or cross-cultural, which consciously tries to build into its programs the insights and ways of thinking of many peoples, there is really no such common core to build upon. It is therefore necessary for us to be teleological in our thinking, looking forward into the future, looking to our goals rather than to our past for guidance. Consequently, it is necessary in this context to raise the question of what kind of man, what kind of society we wish to see existing in the twenty-first century. Our answers to these questions must be used as our guidelines. This orientation to the future is extremely difficult, since all of us are such slaves of our past. Modern depth psychology has shown how profoundly adults are influenced by their childhood. It is true that the child is the father of the man. However, the challenge that comes to us, especially as we think of international affairs and of the requirements of the present age, is how men and women can gain the insight and understanding and have the courage to rise above their past, to move beyond their own cultural experiences. What is needed is a new height psychology which will lift our eyes to new potentialities, our hearts to new hope, and our hands to new creativity. It is this stretching out into the future and into the heights that should determine the stance or posture of the East-West Center. This effort will build in part of the "New Dimension in International Affairs."

A second reason for our misguided or stereotyped images is the forms of ideology and myths. Two of the greatest myths in the minds of man today, in my estimation, are embodied in the words "capitalism" and "communism"—two words which possibly should be eliminated from our vocabulary. On the one hand, capitalism is a term that was applied to a system of economics in which working men were exploited with low pay, long hours, child labor, etc., a condition described clearly by Dickens in his novels and also built into a framework of thought by Karl Marx. This same word is applied to the present economic system in the United States in spite of the fact that a gradual revolution has been taking place since the end of the nineteenth century. Anyone who reads of the Morgans, the Rockefellers, and the Carnegies fighting over large empires and amassing huge fortunes, will recognize that such raw dealings have been drastically inhibited under the modified system of today. However, if you ask a Kansas farmer what has given him his farm, his equipment, his car, his television set, and, in general, the good life which he enjoys, his answer will more than likely be capitalism. Ask the same Kansas farmer what is the greatest threat to his country and to his good life, and his answer will more than likely be communism. If you were to ask an older Ukrainian farmer who gave him the benefits he enjoys in his society and what is the reason for the great difference in his life from that of his father, he will more than likely answer communism. Ask him what the greatest threat is to his life and to his country, and he will answer capitalism. Depending on which side of the fence, or which side of the curtain, a man stands, capitalism and communism are only other words for good and evil. But they are part of the ideology by which many of us, to a greater or lesser degree, live. They are part of the image we have of the reality of international affairs, and thus they are charged with emotion.

And so, the East-West Center was established by the United States Government through the Department of State in an attempt to provide experiences which can change our images, and thus to develop and maintain understanding between the peoples of the East and West. Ever since the East-West Center began there has been a constant attempt to recognize and define the needs toward which it would concentrate its efforts. The needs which the countries of the Pacific Basin face are many, and many men are working toward their solution. (Such things as the population and food problem, the learning of a common language for communication, the development of sound economic and social systems in order that men will have roofs over their heads, clothing on their backs, and food to eat.) However, the overriding need recognized by those who have been at the Center, and by those of us now working at the East-West Center, is the need to understand. Yet, even understanding is a concept that cannot stand alone. We must ask, "Understanding for what?" Men have probed the depths of man and have come to a profound understanding of his psychological nature. However, this knowledge can be used for propaganda and brain-washing, or for enhancing mental health and developing more effective ways of teaching and learning. During World War II, a group of anthropologists, headed by Miss Ruth Benedict, was asked to make a study of the character of the Japanese people so that they could be better understood. Its purpose was to enable the American army to predict the effects of various military policies and plans and thus to develop the most efficient military strategy against these Japanese people.

The understanding we are looking for must be used to develop better relations among men and nations so that a world of order and peace may be developed. It is toward these goals then that the programs of the East-West Center (which most of you know something about) have been worked out by which we bring together people from Asia, the Pacific, and the United States for research, education, and training.

One of the biggest problems an administrator faces is to define concepts in an operational way. This is true of *understanding*. I would like to attempt this by using a few words which I hope will be meaningful. The first word is *communication*, which is talking together. However, mere talking together is not enough, so we have developed dormitories for the purpose of "co-domiciling", or living together. I know of no Latin phrase which covers a third concept—co-relaxing or co-playing. It is in periods of relaxation or playing that the humor and pathos, of a culture become clear. The fourth, probably the most operational of all of these concepts, is *collaboration*, which means working together. The Center has recently made a decision to move into problem-oriented programs. Exactly what these programs will be is still uncertain. However, at present we are exploring such problems as population and food, communication and the teaching of language, the impact of rapid social change, etc. Our hope is to bring together people from the various countries of Asia, the United States, and the Pacific islands, to work together toward the solution of some of the major problems facing all of us. It may be that these scholars will be able to play a part in or take a step toward the solution, or at least the clarification, of these major problems, which in itself will be a worthwhile accomplishment. But more important, from our point of view, is the hope that once a certain amount of "success" has been achieved, the men and women collaborating in a program will come to realize that they were able to accomplish this despite differences of language, race, culture, or creed. This experience should play a part in developing a community of scholars and men of affairs in the Pacific Basin who have developed understanding of and respect for each other and each other's ways of thinking, and are thus able to create a climate in which men can live sanely together in this world.

Through working together (collaborating) men learn to sacrifice self-interest for the common good; such acts—or the disposition to perform such acts—we call generosity or benevolence. Unfortunately, these attitudes have rarely been a dominant dimension in international affairs. There have been strong demands for international justice and equality. My question is: Can we speak of international benevolence or international generosity? Certainly we need justice, which sternly and unsentimentally protects the legitimate interests of all. We need equality which recognizes the validity of the aspirations of each. Justice and equality can be demanded; yet benevolence and generosity, like love, are by their very nature not subject to demand. But they are necessary qualities for a community. This is why I feel that it is not only the East-West Center as an institution with programs of education, research and service, which is providing a new dimension in the international community. It is also the people of Hawaii who generously, and may I say benevolently, open their homes and hearts to people from outside Hawaii, thus playing a major role in building this new dimension in international affairs. It is this total milieu—the Center and the Community—which I have come to learn more about in the last three months, which has given me an insight into new Dimensions in living, and which I hope will become a new dimension in international affairs.

THE SOVIET ESPIONAGE APPARATUS

Mr. DODD. The skill and pervasiveness and the ability of the Soviet espionage apparatus to penetrate free world governments at the highest level has again been dramatically illustrated by the case of Harold "Kim" Philby, for many years head of British anti-Soviet intelligence, who has recently let it be known from his Moscow sanctuary that he served as a Soviet agent for more than 30 years.

Philby held a number of diplomatic posts, which enabled him to disclose to Moscow top secret information involving both British and American security. At the time of his defection, as a recent article in the Washington Daily News points out, he was being groomed to head up M–16, as the British counter intelligence service is known, in which capacity he would have been Britain's chief link with the CIA.

Philby enjoyed the confidence of every senior official of the British Government from the Prime Minister down. The Daily News article points out that when in 1955 it named Philby for the first time "as the man who had tipped off British turncoats Guy Burgess and Donald MacLean, enabling them to flee to Russia," no less a person than Foreign Secretary Harold MacMillan came to the defense of Philby, who was at that time serving as First Secretary of the British Embassy in Washington.

As shocking as the case of Philby may be, we in this country are in no position to point an accusing finger at the British. Indeed, if we recall our recent past, there is probably no country in the Western World where more men holding top Government positions have been exposed—but only after many years—as Soviet agents. Among those thus exposed were:

Alger Hiss, who was in charge of the International Organizations Division of the Department of State, and who was a prime architect of the Yalta agreement and of the United Nations Charter.

Harry Dexter White, who as Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, in effect ran the American Treasury and used his position to give the Treasury Department an influence in the conduct of foreign affairs which it had never before possessed.

Frank Coe, a onetime assistant of Harry Dexter White, who later became President of the World Bank, with American approval, and then was obliged to resign when he invoked the fifth amendment in response to the question: "Are you a Soviet agent, Mr. Coe?" Mr. Coe is now working for Red China.

Larry Duggan, onetime head of Latin American Division of the Department of State, who was pushed or jumped from a New York skyscraper window on the eve of his scheduled testimony before a Senate committee.

These were among the best known and the most highly placed of the Soviet agents uncovered as a result of revelations made during the late forties and early fifties. But there were scores of others who held lesser rank but whose capacity for mischief and for the perversion of our foreign policy was almost as great.

The Soviet espionage apparatus is without question the most massive that has ever existed in history. It is also the most professional and the most diversified and the most successful in mounting high-level infiltration in other governments. This confronts us with a situation where the old adage that "eternal vigilance is the price of freedom" applies with tenfold truth.

The Philby experience in Britain, the Colonel Wennerstrom experience in Sweden and our own experience in this country all point to the need for the most stringent security procedures in government employment. Among other things they point to the need for periodically conducted security reviews of all those who hold sensitive government posts—even those at very high levels.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article entitled "Philby Admits Spying for Reds," published in the October 2, 1967, edition of the New York Daily News.

In this connection, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of an article entitled "Foreign Affairs: Where the Spies Are," written by C. L. Sulzberger, and published in the New York Times of September 13, 1967.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Daily News, Oct 2, 1967]

PHILBY ADMITS SPYING FOR REDS

(By Henry Maule)

LONDON, October 1.—Twelve years after British diplomat Harold A. R. (Kim) Philby was exposed in THE NEW YORK DAILY NEWS as the "third man" in a spy case, he has admitted being a Soviet agent for more than 30 years.

An exclusive dispatch from this correspondent to THE NEWS in 1955 named Philby for the first time as the man who had tipped off British turncoats Guy Burgess and Donald MacLean, enabling them to flee to Russia.

The question was raised in Parliament and Harold Macmillan, then foreign secretary, cleared Philby, former first secretary of the British Embassy in Washington, declaring there was "no reason to conclude that Mr. Philby has at any time betrayed the interests of this country or to identify him with a so-called third man."

"I HAVE COME HOME," HE TELLS SON

Philby, 55, has admitted to his oldest son, John, 24, who recently visited him in Moscow, that his allegiance has been to the Soviet Union most of his adult life.

"I have come home," he told the son, declaring himself completely happy in Moscow, where he ostensibly works for a Soviet publishing house.

Two London newspapers, the Observer and Sunday Times, carried today what the Observer called his "unmatched success story in espionage."

They reported that Philby was now known to be the most important spy the Russians ever had in the West, and that for more than a decade, while serving as a Soviet agent, he was a trusted senior officer at the heart of British intelligence.

Philby reportedly was assigned by the Russians in 1934 to infiltrate British intelligence. By 1944 he was appointed head of the British anti-Soviet intelligence.

IN ON BRITISH AND U.S. SECRETS

He was named to diplomatic posts from which he was able to disclose to Moscow the inner secrets of M-16, Britain's counterintelligence service, and of American Central Intelligence Agency, the newspapers said. He was being groomed to head M-16 and be Britain's link with the CIA.

In 1951, Philby risked exposing his position by warning MacLean that he had just been unmasked as a major atomic spy, permitting MacLean to flee with his friend Burgess, who since has died.

Apparently Philby did so because he suspected MacLean and Burgess might break down under interrogation and betray him.

Philby was later exposed by a Soviet intelligence officer who defected to the West in 1961 and told London about him. Philby fled to Moscow in 1963 from Beirut, Lebanon, where he was working for the Observer and, that paper said, for British intelligence.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 13, 1967]

FOREIGN AFFAIRS: WHERE THE SPIES ARE

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

The cold war between tightly knit Soviet and NATO blocs has certainly relaxed. The five years since the Cuban missile showdown have been marked by cautious if persistent efforts to improve relations between Washington and Moscow despite tensions in Vietnam and the Middle East. Loosening of their own alliances, realization of the folly of nuclear war and mutual fear of China have all contributed to this easement.

But this trend should not be permitted to obscure the fact that the two superpowers continue to found policy on each other's assumed intentions and to watch each other's every move. All the time, day and night, Soviet and American spy satellites whizz overhead while their photographic eavesdropping and other electronic devices snoop about the globe.

EXPOSED NETWORKS

Nor has the subsidence of tension reduced conventional espionage. We are only occasionally reminded of this fact by events such as South Africa's recent seizure of a Russian spy named Yuri Loginov or the exposure of a clandestine Soviet network last March when Giorgio Rinaldi was arrested by Italian military intelligence.

Between March 1966 and April 1967 no fewer than 107 Soviet intelligence officers were uncovered around the world. Most of them held diplomatic passports and were simply declared *persona non grata* and sent home.

Loginov has already made a full confession which involves many Russian so-called diplomats. They include Konstantin, Frolov who served in Argentina and Australia; Yuri Lyudin (also called Modin, former Soviet counselor in New Delhi; Vitali Pavlov (alias Kedrov), a counselor of embassy in Western Europe, who was in Ottawa during the Gouzenko spy case; Aleksei Tiblayshin, who once worked at UNESCO in Paris; Yuri Chekulayev, a diplomat in the Middle East; and Boris Skoridov, said to be the same as Boris Zhiltsov, member of Moscow's London embassy.

The highly proficient Soviet espionage apparatus of G.R.U. (military intelligence) and K.G.B. (interior ministry) makes wide use of diplomatic, journalistic and commercial cover. The G.R.U. officer arrested in the Rinaldi case, Yuri Pavlenko, was an attaché in the Rome embassy. Rinaldi exposed Albert Zakharov, embassy secretary in Athens; Boris Petrin, attaché in Nicosia; Nikolai Ranov, Aeroflot airlines representative in Cyprus; Igor Oshurkov, trade representative in Greece; Mikhail Badin, Vienna military attaché; Georgi Balan, military attaché in Italy, then Mexico; Aleksei Solovov, employe in the Rome military attaché's office.

Experts assume no Soviet diplomatic establishment draws fewer than half its staff from G.R.U. or K.G.B. rosters, a figure rising to 80 per cent in some embassies. Of 107 Russian spies exposed last year, 45 had diplomatic cover; thirty were listed as journalists; fifteen commercial representatives; five Aeroflot; six "cultural" representatives.

A vitally important, if more conventional, Soviet espionage network at Bakfjord, northern Norway, did effective work in the NATO area before Norwegian counterintelligence broke it up. This group's agents, trained in Murmansk, were responsible for entrapment of the famous U-2 plane piloted by Gary Powers in 1960. This was shot down over Russia while on a high-flying reconnaissance mission between Pakistan and Norway.

A NEW SUPERSPY

Allied officials are now perplexed by the appearance on the West European scene of a new type of superspy assigned to political action and reporting directly to the Soviet Communist party's International Section, an echelon above K.G.B. and G.R.U. Four diplomats believed to hold such assignments are Sergei Kudryavtsev, Minister-Counselor in Bonn; Pavel Medvedovsky, Counselor in Rome; and Vladimir Feodorov and Georgi Farafonov, Counselors in Helsinki.

Kudryavtsev, also involved in Canada's Gouzenko case, was Russia's first Ambassador to Castro. He supervised installation of Soviet missiles in Cuba. Medvedovsky worked in the K.G.B. before being promoted to his political action job. Feodorov, once deputy chief of the party's International Section, was a political observer in China. Farafanov worked in Stockholm eight years for the K.G.B.

THE WAR GOES ON

One cannot predict how many new names will be added to this roster as a result of Loginov's confession in South Africa, a confession that has already connected five continents in the extraordinary Soviet network. The basic point is that despite the relative thaw between Moscow and Washington, and efforts to work out political and economic accommodation, the spy war goes on.

The watch persists in the skies, on the high seas where trawlers and submarines carry complex electronic devices; along endless frontiers from Norway to Kamchatka; and in the susurrous cellers of embassies about the world. The overt cold war has eased—but not its covert counterpart.

ARTHUR G. McDOWELL

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, a year ago this October 7, Arthur G. McDowell, of Philadelphia, died tragically in an automobile accident.

Art McDowell was known to many people in Washington in several different capacities.

He was known, first, as a lifelong trade unionist and as a champion of every progressive cause.

He was known, second, as an implacable foe of Nazi and Communist tyranny and as the chairman for many years of the Council Against Communist Aggression.

And, finally, he was known as a great-hearted human being who gave of himself without stint to all those causes in which he believed.

In observing this first anniversary of Art McDowell's death I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a poem written after his death by the well-known American author, James T. Farrell. Rather than attempt to embellish Mr. Farrell's majestic tribute to Art McDowell, I simply want to say that I agree with his observation that "forever gone, Art McDowell will belong to the memory of mankind."

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ART McDOWELL: REQUIESCAT IN PACE

Art McDowell was my friend and my comrade. He is no more. Death has gouged a hole out of the future. Some words, now will never be spoken. Some acts will never be taken. Some thoughts will never be. Some experiences have been forever excluded from being actualized, from emerging into our lives. The death of a friend is a loss in the quality of one's future life on this, our temporary planet.

Art McDowell is gone. I have lost. Many who will read these words have lost.

I do not mourn because Art is gone. He was not the kind of a man for whom one mourns.

No, I do not mourn.

Rather than mourn, I have one more incurable anger that I shall carry forward to that time, that day, hour, minute, when I shall reach the end of my destiny, and shall become as Art has become.

II

I would speak
Through the electric fields and spaces
And of air and sky.
I would speak
Across the blue before the beyondness,
That spreads sans boundaries
In a cold and voiceless infinity.
I would speak across
The untracked air of all of the total universe,
And say, a friend is gone;
A comrade is for always fallen.
I hang upon my heels
Touching the turning
The ceaseless and turning earth.
I see not
The stretches of the bare infinity
The unliving and the grave
And I do not know if it be infinity.
I speak, regardless
(To fear death is vulgarity)
Because a friend
Lies rigid in a new dark grave
of awesome, and more awesome
Unliving silence.
This world goes turning, turning
Life moves, changing and changing
And one among us
Who fought to make the change come equal
Is dissolving in the uncaringness
Of all the vast unimaginableness.
I would speak
Of all the wonder of a man
Who comes into all of the uncaringness
Of the silence
That cannot even know its name,
Itself its own silence, deadly silence.
I would speak to say
My friend is gone
My comrade is gone
And I am coldly hard in my anger of life.
Farewell, Friend!
Farewell, Comrade!
Farewell across the spaces.

JAMES T. FARRELL.

III

I met Art McDowell when I was on the Executive Board of the Workers Defense League. I came to perceive that he had the seriousness of distinction. He was always alert, he was concerned.

Concerned with what?

He was concerned with freedom.

And freedom is more majestic than all of that infinity of space beyond in this vast untracked universe.

I bow my head.

In silence of soul, and with head still bowed, I bid farewell, in the silent sadness of forever.

Forever gone, Art McDowell will belong to the memory of mankind.

I say farewell to a comrade, to a good friend, a good friend. He was Art McDowell.

We spoke. We acted with Art in linked conscience of freedom. Art's memorial, our memorial, can only be the freedom of man.

Softly, I say in words of wounded affection:

Farewell, Comrade;
Farewell, Friend;
Farewell, Art!

JAMES T. FARRELL.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN KENNETH GALBRAITH

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, yesterday's Washington Evening Star included among its pages a column by Richard Wilson which amounted, especially in its conclusion, to a tribute to the work and purposes of John Kenneth Galbraith, the most persistent example of what Wilson called the challengers or revisers of the established order. Galbraith, the columnist says, is trying to help us understand the real nature of our society—this understanding being necessary in the first place if we are to create the kind of society we have always boasted we have here in America.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Richard Wilson's column on the work of economist John Kenneth Galbraith be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GALBRAITH'S CALL ECHOES LONG LINE OF SEERS

(By Richard Wilson)

A long line of seers and necromancers reaches back into Washington's past. Some of their names are unknown to a present generation or forgotten by a fading generation.

Rexford G. Tugwell, Gardner Means, Raymond Moley (for a time), Prof. Alvin Hansen, Jerome Frank, Sam Rosenman, Henry A. Wallace, Leon Henderson, Harry L. Hopkins, Paul Appleby, Hugh Johnson, even Alger Hiss, and many others.

These were the challengers or revisers of the established order, most of them from, or on their way to, or compatible with the academic world. They were followed by a somewhat more conventional group: Arthur Burns, Arthur Larson, Malcolm Moos, to name only three, and then by the more spirited Walter W. Heller and Paul Samuelson.

In general these men have had one thing in common. They have been trying to analyze the nature of the established order and redirect and reform it in such ways as will raise the standard of living and the quality of life for the greatest number of people. Therefore some of them have been under suspicion at one time or another as socialists, dangerous radicals, Communist-inclined or muzzy thinkers—regardless of their political affiliations and their generally amiable natures.

One, not above named and not always amiable, has persisted. He is John Kenneth Galbraith of Harvard University, who delights in making other people feel uncomfortable by the use of words. Galbraith is an economist, like most of the others. He was a price fixer during World War II, a volunteer adviser to the Kennedy's administration, and an ambassador to India, among other accomplishments.

His persistence has some considerable significance because now after a long interval following World War II, the nation is beginning to look inward at many of the problems which concerned the seers of the Roosevelt era. During the 25-year interregum the prominent thinking men turned to international affairs and national security. We have heard more of Paul Nitze, Walt Whitman Rostow, Henry A. Kissinger, McGeorge Bundy, and Robert S. McNamara in recent years.

But as the nation turns inward to the agonizing problems which have taken second place to national security and geopolitics in the last quarter of a century we are bound to have to listen more to the Samuelsons, the Hellers and the Galbraiths.

Professor Galbraith, never content to remain silent for long, has written a book which has, astonishingly enough, become the No. 1 nonfiction best-seller although the greatest part of the book is possibly beyond the quick comprehension of people who ordinarily read best-sellers. Like the Sunday New York Times, this book must be visible in intellectual abodes, but it is not necessary to read it all.

The title of the book is "The New Industrial State." Its theme is that the great corporations—General Motors, Du Pont, General Electric and dozens of others—have now in actual fact become part of the government of the United States and will become more so in the future. Professor Galbraith gives us a quick turn on the fears of businessmen of the past three decades that government will take them over. He fears the big corporations will in effect take over government by interacting with it, and that we all shall become totally enmeshed in the "technostructure" unless something is done about it.

What he proposes to do is interpose other standards based upon the quality of life so that the industrial state will become the secondary but necessary means of providing the conditions for the fuller life.

It is not all new. Some of it echoes back to the seers of 30 years ago. But Galbraith makes a good case that the great corporations must operate autonomously, if they are to be successful, in collaboration with a government which permits them to plan on the basis of known costs, prices and demand under predictable economic conditions. The state provides trained or educated manpower, insures a supply of purchasing power, permits the control of prices (mainly through an industry's contracts with its suppliers), and in general acts in collaboration with big industry on large projects.

Galbraith sees a convergence in our kind of system and the Russian system in economic terms, and out of this he draws hope that the Cold War can be replaced by some more benign and stimulating competition between the super powers.

He sees also the methods through which the attack on the great problems of the nation—transportation, housing, the slums—can be started.

A layman would not presume to say that he agreed or disagreed with Professor Galbraith, who commands respect in an occult profession. That is not necessary to recognize that we have again come to a time when inward looking has more urgency than, say, in the immediate postwar period.

Galbraith is trying to help us and himself understand the real nature of our society, and having understood it we can then use our knowledge to create the kind of life we have boasted that we have.

NEW YORK TIMES FIGHTS TO SAVE WORLD'S ENDANGERED SPECIES

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the New York Times of September 9, 1967, contains an editorial which gives me much encouragement. Entitled "Civilization's Prey," the editorial is concerned with the grave dangers being experienced by the world's wildlife.

The approach which the editorial takes, and the approach that is becoming ever more prevalent, is an appeal to the buyer and to the fashion world to recognize the damages that their whim for "exotic"—that is, rare—furs is doing to the endangered species of the world. It must be brought home to all Americans that it is no mark of distinction to wear the skin of an endangered species. It is instead a mark of tragedy for the disappearing species of our world, and it is actually a mark of disregard for the beauties of the natural world. Such an editorial as the one in the New York Times is of great value to America and to the world, for it is a beginning toward making men aware of the danger of extinction presently facing the world's wildlife.

I commend the Times on the service that its editorial rendered to those who are fighting to preserve the beautiful and rare species of life that are disappearing from our world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIVILIZATION'S PREY

The wild creatures that are man's companions on this earth are rapidly disappearing. There are 250 species—the blue whale, the polar bear and the leopard, the fearsome tiger and the humble alligator—now nearing extinction. Man, the giant predator, preys upon these animals recklessly and relentlessly in the pursuit of money.

Fashion and snobbery play a large part. There are excellent imitation alligator products available, but items stamped "genuine alligator" confer more status on the purchaser. As a result, more than 50,000 alligators are killed in Florida in a single year.

In an effort to lessen its dependence upon mink, the fur industry has intensively promoted coats made from more exotic animals. "Fun furs" are now in fashion, and tigers, leopards, ocelots, jaguars and other members of the cat family are in peril.

Tanzania and some of the other newly independent countries have done outstanding work in creating national parks and trying to protect their wild game, but the economic pressures are hard to resist. Exotic pelts bring high prices. It is estimated that a thousand leopards a week are killed in East Africa. No species can survive this kind of depredation for very long.

Senator Yarborough of Texas has introduced a resolution in the Senate calling upon the United States to convene a world conference on means of protecting wild animals. Meanwhile, Americans can help by supporting the Florida Audubon Society's voluntary boycott against articles stamped "genuine alligator." Shoppers can also ponder the cost of that leopardskin coat, a cost far higher than the figure written on any price tag.

CHURCHMEN AND THE VIETNAM WAR

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, yesterday David Lawrence wrote about churchmen and Vietnam contrasting a recent speech by the Anglican Archbishop of Sydney, Australia, in support of the effort in which his nation has joined ours in Vietnam with those statements of some members of the clergy who counsel withdrawal from Vietnam, or at least oppose our presence there in some degree.

Morality, Mr. President, does not basically differ from one city to another, from one nation to another. Mr. Lawence makes a good argument when he cites as a high moral purpose the sacrifices of a powerful nation to protect a weak friend from the ravages of aggression.

I ask unanimous consent that his column, published in the Washington Evening Star of October 10, 1967, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHURCHMEN AND THE VIETNAM WAR

(By David Lawrence)

Many pastors in different churches throughout the United States have criticized American participation in the Vietnam War, but what do churchmen who live in countries close to Southeast Asia say about it?

A press association dispatch from Australia, whose young men are fighting in Vietnam, reports that an Anglican archbishop, M. L. Loane of Sydney, in his presidential address on Monday to the Sydney Diocesan Synod, warned against unconditional withdrawal of the allied forces from South Vietnam. He said it would leave the Viet Cong as masters of the area and would remove Communist inhibitions toward wider activities. He declared that the Allied troops should hold out until a negotiated peace settlement can be achieved. He stated further that the South Vietnamese "may not like the war, or the Saigon ruler, or the foreign intervention—but they like the prospect of Communist domination still less."

This is a succinct statement of the fundamental issue. Many American critics have brushed aside as an "illusion" the idea that the security of Southeast Asia is in danger of being impaired. The peoples of the area, however, who are confronted with the possibility of a Communist takeover, do not regard it as an "illusion" but as a realistic threat to their safety.

President Johnson in a recent speech took pains to quote the prime minister of Australia, the president of Korea, the president of the Philippines, the prime minister of New Zealand, the prime minister of Singapore, the prime minister of Malaysia and the foreign minister of Thailand, who uniformly expressed their belief that the fate of Southeast Asia will be decided by what happens in Vietnam. Johnson himself put it this way:

"I cannot tell you tonight as your President, with certainty, that a Communist conquest of South Vietnam would be followed by a Communist conquest of Southeast Asia. But I do know there are North Vietnamese troops in Laos. I do know that there are North Vietnamese-trained guerrillas tonight in northeast Thailand. I do know that there are Communist-supported guerrilla forces operating in Burma. And a Communist coup was barely averted in Indonesia, the fifth largest nation in the world."

Perhaps the best summary of all, about the Communist threat in Southeast Asia was given in 1959 by President Eisenhower, when he said:

"Strategically, South Vietnam's capture by the Communists would bring their power several hundred miles into a hitherto free region. The remaining countries in Southeast Asia would be menaced by a great flanking movement. The freedom of 12 million people would be lost immediately, and that of 150 million in adjacent lands would be seriously endangered. The loss of South Vietnam would set in motion a crumbling process that could, as it progressed, have grave consequences for us and for freedom."

Those who favor withdrawal from Vietnam seem to think that the people of Southeast Asia should be left to struggle with their own problems, no matter what happens thereafter. Such observations are understandable when they come from the lips of politicians who think they will gain votes back home from the parents of potential draftees. But it is surprising to find the same point of view expressed in sermons by ministers who argue that American participation in the Vietnam war is unmoral.

There are, however, plenty of pastors in the world who justify the necessity to use force in self-preservation. Another religious principle also is involved—the moral and spiritual motivation for acts of unselfishness and altruism. Indeed, when a nation with no desire for territory or material gain makes sacrifices in order to protect a weak nation against the ravages of an aggressor government, it is an example of the highest form of service to mankind.

WHERE DOES THE CREDIBILITY GAP REALLY LIE?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, today the Secretary of State threw the credibility gap back in the faces of the administration's critics on Vietnam. He asked them boldly and clearly whether the word of the United States of America should be kept—or cynically disregarded at our convenience.

These are not matters which change with the wind—

He said.

> Sometimes we are tested and find out what kind of people we are.

There is one question—and only one question—which is important here: Are we a Nation which means what it says? If not, we had better stop pretending to be the leader of the free world—for no one will ever follow us again.

> I have heard the word "credibility" injected into our domestic debate—

Secretary Rusk said this morning.

> Let me say, as solemnly as I can, that those who would place in question the credibility of the pledged word of the United States under our mutual security treaties would subject this nation to mortal danger. If any who would be an adversary should suppose that our treaties are a bluff, or will be abandoned if the going gets tough, the result could be catastrophic for all mankind.

Frankly, Mr. President, I am tired of this debate. We are in Vietnam because we pledged to resist aggression in Southeast Asia.

And it was not just the pledge of President Johnson or President Kennedy or President Eisenhower. It was also the pledge of the U.S. Senate.

None of us likes war. But let us be clear about who started it. And let us be clear about who refuses to end it.

Secretary Rusk's press statement this morning was a clear restatement of U.S. policies and U.S. goals. I commend his remarks to all of my colleagues.

VIETNAM—STOP THE DRAFT WEEK COMMITTEE

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President I have received a telegram which I would like to read to the Members of the Senate:

> Senator GEORGE MURPHY,
> *Sheraton Park Hotel,*
> *Washington, D.C.:*
>
> The criminal and racists war in Vietnam has forced us to take steps to stop the drafting of young men into the Armed Forces. Debate has accomplished nothing, the war must be stopped. If you will not, we will. We plan to shut down the Oakland Induction Center Oct. 17–20. Invite your support.
>
> STEVE HAMILTON,
> *Stop the Draft Week Committee.*
>
> BERKELEY, CALIF.

I am bringing this to your attention and to the attention of the President of the United States in the serious hope that at long last proper steps may be taken so that the orderly process of our Nation may not be disrupted any further by groups—whatever and wherever—who believe that they can put their desires and wishes above the established rules and laws of this Nation.

I call upon the Attorney General of the United States to search his law books most carefully and if it be a criminal act to interfere with the proper process of the Federal Government in such manner, I ask that he apply the law quickly and surely.

I have written to the Attorney General:

> Hon. RAMSEY CLARK,
> *The Attorney General,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: I am enclosing a copy of a telegram I have received which, I believe, demands the immediate attention of your Department and of the Secretary of Defense, to whom I am sending a copy of this letter.
>
> Obviously the group calling itself "Stop the Draft Week Committee" is threatening to obstruct our war effort in Vietnam by closing the Oakland Induction Center. I would request that your Department investigate whether or not this threat in itself constitutes a violation of the law and take appropriate action upon your findings.
>
> I am also writing in order to advise you and other responsible authorities of the possibility that this obstructive action will be taken so that you can make adequate plans to counter it. Certainly none of us can countenance any action such as this which would impede support of our fighting men in South Vietnam and would disrupt the peace and tranquility of our nation.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> GEORGE MURPHY.

These people who are planning this disruptive program are determined by their own statement to impede and destroy the proper progress and programs of the Army induction center.

I believe that every responsible citizen of this country, regardless of his feelings concerning the merits or demerits of the war in Vietnam, wants in every possible way to support our fighting men who are risking their lives in a far away land.

Actions such as are suggested by this telegram unquestionably, in my opinion, impede the proper conduct of the war.

Actions such as suggested in this telegram must certainly constitute giving aid and comfort to the enemy, and I assure you, Mr. President, that if this ill-conceived plan is permitted to take place it will be used by North Vietnam and the other Communist countries as anti-American propaganda.

I sincerely hope that the Attorney General will put into operation the necessary machinery to see that the laws are observed and upheld and that the rights of the law-abiding citizens are properly protected.

In connection with this, I lately have heard many rumors that there will be an organized and concentrated nationwide antiwar demonstration by these destructive elements. It is my sincere feeling that those who are responsible for the plotting and planning of this mischief are operating against the security of our Nation and the best interests of our people and should be so treated.

I have heard rumors about a plan to march on the Pentagon and to make it inoperative. I think it would be shocking beyond reason if such an activity were permitted under whatever guise or pretext is planned.

It further occurs to me that the dates selected for these activities coincide with the proposed ocean cruise meeting of the Governors' conference. If there is a basis to these rumors, I would respectfully suggest that the date of the Governors' conference be changed and that the chief executives of the respective States be at home during this period, be alert to the problems at hand, and be prepared to see that the peace, tranquillity and proper conduct of community life be guaranteed.

I believe the time has come when the patience of the great majority of our law-abiding citizens is about to run out with this kind of nonsense, and it is my sincere hope that the President of the United States, along with the Attorney General, the Governors of the separate States, and whatever representatives and law-enforcement officials necessary—by concerted and cooperative effort—take preventive action against any plan or civil dislocations now or in the future, and that a guarantee of law and order may be restored throughout our Nation. Nothing should be permitted to interfere with the full support which all of our citizens owe to the men and women of our fighting forces in Vietnam so long as their presence is decreed by the official policies of our President of the United States.

ADULT BASIC EDUCATION IN WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I was recently privileged to meet six dedicated educators who are actively engaged in the adult basic education program in my State of West Virginia.

These men—Karl J. Okes, Jarrell Hartsog, Lowell Knight, Jack Dulaney, B. F. McConnell, and Asberry Chrislip—spoke in the highest terms of the success of this program which is funded by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and which has been so beneficial in helping adults to catch up on their educational deficiencies.

The men also left me a copy of a report entitled "Gaining on Opportunity: A Report on Adult Basic Education, West Virginia, 1965–66." And I would like to bring parts of this report to the attention of the Senate in order to illustrate the fine job which adult education is doing in my State.

According to the report, more than 8,900 persons have enrolled in these classes.

Here are some of the comments from the students:

> I am 63 years old and there is little need for me to say I'm going to learn a new trade, for I don't have that much time left. I want to learn to read so that I can read my Bible and be a happy man.
>
> * * * * *
>
> I am really glad this school has started. My little girl started to school this year and when she came home the first day, she wanted me to help her with her words. I couldn't help her because I can't read. Now, I'm going to learn to read.

Another student wrote:

> I'll be here every day even if I have to wade mud and snow barefooted.

Here is what one of the supervisors wrote of their students' interest:

> In many instances, indifference has developed into interest, mere acceptance has developed into active participation and classwork has been carried from the classroom to the job or home. Many of the discussions we have in class are further discussed or "argue" about on the job. . . . Interest is also shown in the fact that several men often spend their break working in class. Surely this is good if a man will give up a smoke break in order to finish what he is working on. Too, they have begun asking for homework. . . . Another change is the improvement in appearance. Many men come to class much cleaner and much neater. Some always apologize because their work required them to be

> in a mud hole or other situation which made it impossible to stay clean until class time.

The comments of the teachers in these courses are perhaps the most exciting of all.

One wrote:

> I am really enjoying working with the men in my class. They are so much easier to teach than children. I think one reason is that these men have a desire to learn and are already motivated.

Another wrote:

> Is such a school worth it all? Judge for yourself on the basis of the following facts.
>
> Several days ago one of our students took a test for a job in Detroit, passed it, got the job, and gave the school credit for it. If he had not had the Adult Basic Education instruction in math, he would not have passed it, he said.
>
> Another student who has an ability to repair television sets had always had a certain problem in one aspect of such repair. It had always been a trial and error method until he learned the division of decimals. In one single lesson the problem was solved.
>
> Still another student, a muscular, healthy looking man of sixty, came after class one day saying so happily "This is the first letter I ever wrote." No, it wasn't the best, but it wasn't the worst either. He had put a stranglehold on functional illiteracy that day.

I believe all these dedicated persons, students, teachers and supervisors alike are to be congratulated for their efforts—the students, for their courage in admitting they need help and for their perseverance in sticking with their course of instruction despite all the other daily chores and cares which we all have; the teachers for their hard work and for their love of their profession, a feeling that knows no age limits; and, finally, the supervisors, upon whose shoulders fall all the multitudinous tasks of organization and supervision of the entire program.

AS WORLD GROWS MORE COMPLEX HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS ASSUME GREATER IMPORTANCE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the ratification of the Human Rights Conventions on Slavery, Forced Labor, Political Rights of Women, and Genocide should follow our adoption of the United Nations' Charter as the Bill of Rights followed the adoption of our Constitution. Our Founding Fathers wrought one nation out of many states on the basis of certain inalienable rights guaranteed to every citizen.

While it is true that our American experience and the world situation today are not fully analogous, there are important similarities. While the diversities and differences are far greater than they were at the time of the Constitutional Convention, the increasing interdependence of the world clamors for a universal recognition of the importance of liberty and justice for every citizen.

In such a world, our only hope for survival is the maximization of international standards and institutions of cooperation directed to the achievement of peace, economic, and social development, and human rights and fundamental freedoms—the three principal purposes of the United Nations' Charter. International cooperation toward these purposes is no longer merely a dream but a practical necessity.

When we adopted the United Nations' Charter, we certainly expected to ratify the Bill of Rights as a matter of course. Yet we have refused for 18 long years to ratify these conventions. Not only have we lost the respect of the world but we have hindered the advance of human rights in developing nations.

We are faced with the fact that declarations, persuasion, and education, all of which are noble and good, no longer have the force necessary to solve present-day problems. The time has arrived for the United States to join with the rest of the world in binding obligations to safeguard human rights, not only because it is important to the foreign policy of the United States, not only because it reflects adversely upon our Nation, but because it is the moral thing to do.

Let the sentiments of President Kennedy become our own, when he said of human rights:

> Simple justice requires this program, not merely for reasons of . . . world diplomacy, but above all because it is right.

AN OUTSTANDING AMERICAN—MAX KAMPELMAN

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, an outstanding American, Mr. Max Kampelman, has found it necessary to decline the President's nomination to the post of Chairman of the newly created District of Columbia City Council.

I have know Mr. Kampelman for many years. He is one of the ablest and most public-spirited men I know, and has contributed selflessly over the years to many efforts to better the condition of his fellow man and his country.

Typical of the opinion of those who know him is that expresed by Carl T. Rowan who commented in a recent column:

> First, Kampelman is no stranger to Negroes, socially, professionally or otherwise. So he will not be burdened by either arrogance (as some congressmen dealing with District affairs are) or the condescension so often revealed by well-meaning whites trying to tip-toe through the bewildering labyrinth of American race relations.
>
> Kampelman has always been one of the most decent, straightforward men I've ever known. To those qualities he has added the knowledge and wisdom that accrue from being right-hand aide and confidant to Hubert H. Humphrey (as senator and vice president), and from serving as a highly successful lawyer and civic leader.

Mr. President, it is most regretable that Max Kampelman will not be able to serve the District of Columbia in the post to which he was nominated. However, he discovered that in order to accept the part-time post of Chairman of the City Council he would have to forgo the practice of law so as to not risk the possibility of a conflict of interest.

This was not an easy or happy decision for him, I am sure, but it is one for which we should applaud him. The concern he has demonstrated in this matter reflects the high ethical standards he believes should be required of those serving in public offices.

But even though Max Kampelman has turned down the chairmanship of the City Council, I know that he will continue to serve both the District of Columbia and the Nation as a concerned citizen and generous human being.

I ask unaimous consent that the Carl T. Rowan article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REGIME CAN SERVE ALL AMERICA

(By Carl T. Rowan)

> WASHINGTON.—I wonder if most Americans are really aware of the implications of the historic changes in the government of this city.
>
> Sure, most people know that President Johnson has named a Negro as mayor and appointed a majority of five Negroes to the nine-member city council here.
>
> But many people seem to think this has national meaning only in that black men will be running a city that belongs to all of a predominantly white nation. This irritates some Americans, but a lot fewer than one would have imagined, even a decade ago.
>
> But the real nationwide significance of the government changes here will be determined by what can be achieved by the new mayor, Walter Washington, in cooperation with a city council chaired by Max Kampelman, a white lawyer. (Kampelman is a former political science instructor at the University of Minnesota and at one time served on a Minneapolis charter reform committee.)
>
> Their challenge is to move with imagination and boldness to improve schooling, housing, job opportunities—to arrest the urban decay that enfolds the nation like some great invisible plague.
>
> The President's choices to lead the new government here were generally excellent, with a notable element of "compromise": He resisted intense pressures to name a "black power" activist to the council, even as he yielded to "black power" demands that he not give a council seat to Sterling Tucker, bright and energetic director of the Washington Urban League.
>
> Even if he were as white as a sheet, Walter Washington would stand eminently qualified for the post of mayor. That he is a black man is merely a factor of *partial* advantage in this city with its Negro majority.
>
> Time will prove that the President showed remarkable sagacity in choosing Kampelman to head the city council. I doubt that Mr. Johnson could have found a man whose personal and intellectual qualities are better suited to the task ahead.
>
> First, Kampelman is no stranger to Negroes, socially, professionally or otherwise. So he will not be burdened by either arrogance (as some congressmen dealing with District affairs are) or the condescension so often revealed by well-meaning whites trying to tip-toe through the bewildering labyrinth of American race relations.
>
> Kampelman has always been one of the most decent, straightforward men I've ever known. To those qualities he has added the knowledge and wisdom that accrue from being right-hand aide and confidant to Hubert H. Humphrey (as senator and vice-president), and from serving as a highly successful lawyer and civic leader.
>
> So Mayor Washington and Kampelman will be able to work together as men, as friends, as equals sharing the responsibility for making the city that symbolizes American democracy gleam, as gleam it should.
>
> The major barrier to their success will remain the U.S. Congress where, for their own benighted reasons, some members will hope that the new leadership makes a royal mess of running the District.

But neither Washington nor Kampelman is a babe in the woods. Kampelman, particularly, knows all about the congressional booby traps.

Along with the deputy mayor, Thomas Fletcher, and the other councilmen, Washington and Kampelman face both a major challenge and an exciting opportunity to serve not merely the federal capital, but the whole nation.

SALUTE TO ITALIAN-AMERICANS

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, today, when we celebrate the 475th anniversary of Christopher Columbus' discovery of America, we are honoring a man whose courage and determination made the American dream possible. But in a far bigger sense, we are honoring the millions of Italian-Americans who, ever since that historic day in 1492, have helped shape the face and character of American life. It was of course another Italian, navigator Americo Vespucci, after whom America is named.

In the beginning, the Italians who flocked here were mostly men of the cloth and of the land, missionaries and farmers. And their influence was great. They brought with them a heritage and culture that went back to the glory of Rome. And we are a better country today for it.

At every stage in our history, and especially during the periods of doubt and crisis, Italian-Americans have served their country well. Many have risen to positions of prominence in almost every field, from government to business, from the arts to sports, from education to the other professions. Their influence has been so incorporated into America that many of our ways of life, and many of the products we use, have a flavor that is distinctly, uniquely Italian. And as a nation we are better for it.

I honor Columbus today for the great deed he did. But I also honor the millions of Americans of Italian extraction who every day make this a better place to live. We are indebted to them.

ELECTION HOLIDAY

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I have long been concerned with making the electoral process more meaningful to the American public. The Senate recently took a major step in this direction with the passage of the Election Reform Act of 1967 revising unrealistic campaign expenditure limitations and disclosure provisions.

Another step toward election reform that merits congressional study and consideration is the declaration of a 24-hour national voting holiday to enable every eligible American citizen to exercise the right to vote in national elections. As pointed out this morning by a Washington Post editorial, limitations of time and distance prevent millions of eligible voters from getting to the polls. While it is the responsibility of eligible voters to express their opinions at the polls, it is also the responsibility of our Government to provide our citizens with the opportunity to express these opinions. An election holiday could be the most effective means of achieving the goal of greater voter participation in national elections, although, as the Post suggests, there may be valid objections to such a proposal.

Mr. President, I want to call to the attention of my colleagues both the pro and con arguments in the Post editorial, and I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 12, 1967]

Election Holiday?

Following the lead of the National Governors Conference, Frank Stanton president of the Columbia Broadcasting Company, has proposed a Nation-wide 24-hour voting holiday for Federal elections. It is designed to get more people to the polls. The subject needs to be discussed in light of the fact that no more than 64 per cent of our citizens of voting age have ever cast bollots in a presidential election and participation in off-year congressional elections usually falls below 50 per cent.

We think the need for longer voting hours is clearly evident. Long lines moving slowly just before the polls close are a common sight in many congested areas. Commuters sometimes lose their vote because they work at points distant from their polling place. Mr. Stanton notes that 20 states do not require employers to give employes time off for voting, and since every election day is a working day this may account for a large number of lost votes.

The chief question about making election day a national holiday is whether this would induce people to go to resorts instead of the polls. If so, the purpose of encouraging participation in the democratic process might be defeated. Elections are not held in the vacation season, however, and if it were made clear that a day off was granted solely to facilitate voting the occasion might acquire a civic and patriotic symbolism.

One purpose of keeping the polls open for the same 24-hour period throughout the country would be to eliminate all danger that the release of early returns in the East might influence voters still going to the polls in the West. That objective doubtless has some importance, but both the uniform timing and the holiday idea seem to us less vital than longer polling hours and compulsory release of employes for whatever period is necessary to cast a ballot.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

AMENDMENT OF THE SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL ACT OF 1950

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 2171) to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, so as to accord with certain decisions of the courts.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, with the full approval of the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland] be recognized for up to 30 minutes when, at the conclusion of his remarks, the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

BLACK POWER AND THE COMMUNISTS

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the drive for Negro revolution in this country is moving toward a climax.

We have seen the pace of this drive greatly accelerated during the present year. Now we face the prospect that a climax may come in 1968.

The forces which have shaped, moulded, and influenced this drive, and which now to a very substantial extent control it, have plans which involve major racial disturbances, of riot proportions, in some 20 cities of this country next year.

These forces to which I have referred are complex in their power structure. From a tactical standpoint, their plans also are complex.

Strategically, their planned objectives are not especially complicated.

The primary objective is acquisition of power by the Communists.

In the long-range view, this objective keys in with the Communist purpose of overthrowing the Government of the United States. In the shorter view, this objective embraces the acquisition of political power both by the Communist Party itself and by other leftwing elements which the party can control or sway as well as an increase in both the scope and force of Communist power and influence among such leftwing elements.

Secondary objectives include breaking down the existing power structure in the United States, and the continued building up of racial tensions until a state of virtual anarchy has been reached.

In furtherance of one or both of these secondary objectives, the Communists have set up a number of subordinate goals.

One such goal is establishment and maintenance of a front which shall appear to be wholly under Negro control, to be used as both a rallying point and a control mechanism for various so-called black power organizations, through which it is hoped to swing a substantial majority of the Negro population of this country into line as servants of the Communist conspiracy.

Another subordinate goal of the Communists is to bring about the collapse of law and order in this country by fostering increased disrespect for law enforcement agencies while at the same time confronting these agencies with major law enforcement problems and, collaterally, seeking to weaken the firmness and resolve of those charged with law enforcement at all levels of government.

Another Communist goal is the strengthening of political power in the hands of extremists, both of the right and of the left; for the Communists know they can gain almost as much through reaction against right extremism as they can through the fulminations of left extremists.

The current and growing emphasis on violence in the so-called civil rights area is an integral part of the Communist program.

The rank and file of most black power organizations in this country, and even many of the leaders of such organizations, still are congratulating themselves on what they believe was a major victory for the black power movement, through what they regard as the success of the so-called black power caucus in winning control of the National Conference for New Politics, at that organization's convention in Chicago last month.

On this respect, these black power organizations and their leaders have been duped. The whole procedure at Chicago, including the so-called victory of the black power caucus, was just window-dressing. It was a maneuver worked out in advance by the real manipulators of the NCNP, with the aid and counsel of Communist tacticians, for the sole purpose of making the National Conference for New Politics appear to be a black-controlled organization, and therefore acceptable, as a rallying point, to both the so-called black power organizations and other Negro organizations, as well as to the unorganized masses of the Negro population in this country.

For many years the Communists have tried to win major influence among Negro groups in the United States. One reason they have not notably succeeded in this effort, until very recent years, has been the failure of the Communist Party to provide adequate black leadership for its attempted mobilization of the Negro community, and the further fact that where in some instances, black leadership has been provided, its clearly Communist character, and the continued control of the Communist Party itself by white intellectuals and activists, have militated against widespread acceptance of the party and its leaders by even a substantial cross-section of the Negro population.

To whatever extent the fancy window-dressing with which the National Conference for New Politics has been provided, through the maneuvers which culminated in the alleged black power victory at Chicago, succeeds in fooling the Negroes of this Nation, and especially the black power organizations and their leaders, the Communists will have achieved their greatest opportunity yet to induce American Negroes to accept leadership which is actually though not nominally, Communist in essence.

The Communists now have substantial footholds in several leftwing organizations in which substantial numbers of Negroes are participating, as well as in various other organizations which are either ostensibly all Negro or ostensibly Negro controlled.

Among the former group—what we might call mixed organizations—in which the Communists exercise complete or substantial control, are the DuBois Clubs, which represent a Communist-front operation; the Socialist Scholars Conferences, which like the National Conference for New Politics had early roots in Santa Barbara, Calif., and still receive nourishment and guidance from sources connected with the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions; the Conference of Racial Equality, which in the area of its operations is in almost complete cooperation with the Communists; the Southern Conference Educational Fund, Inc., which makes substantial contributions to various so-called civil rights organizations, but which is under effective Communist domination; the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, which at the local level is Communist infiltrated in varying degrees, and at the national level is cooperating fully with the Communists; the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party, which in some respects serves Communist purposes as well as an actual arm of the Communist Party; and the National Conference for New Politics, which in spite of the purported takeover of power by the so-called black power caucus remains under the control of white socialists and Communists, and is functioning as an instrument for the attainment of Communist objectives.

Among organizations ostensibly all Negro or Negro controlled which also are instruments of Communists policy are the Revolutionary Action Movement—RAM—whose "chairman in exile" is the ex-patriate American Negro Communist Robert Franklin Williams, who after some years in exile in Cuba is now in Red China; Deacons for Defense, which is Communist infiltrated and has accepted disguised Communist assistance to a substantial degree; the so-called Black Panther movement, in which the Communists have influence through infiltration; and the so-called New Breed, whose present leader, David Reed, was chosen at a secret caucus where Communists not only participated in the vote, but exercised such power that after Reed had been defeated on the first vote, the election of his opponent was declared null and void, and a second vote was taken which resulted in Reed's selection.

Now, Mr. President, let me go back to the subject of the National Conference for New Politics.

The National Conference for New Politics grew out of a meeting of militant leftwing leaders at Santa Barbara, Calif., in August of 1965; a meeting which was hosted and partially subsidized by the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions. One of the leaders at this meeting was Stokely Carmichael, of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, the same Carmichael who in August of this year broadcast to the United States, from a microphone in Cuba, a call for "total revolution" in this country.

Soon after the Santa Barbara meeting, control of organizational activity in connection with the National Conference for New Politics was transferred to the Institute for Policy Studies, in Washington, D.C., run by Arthur Waskow, one of the earliest proponents of adoption by this country of a policy of unilateral disarmament.

The next step was taken when the Committee for Independent Political Action sponsored a nationwide organizational meeting for the NCNP. This meeting was held in Chicago on January 15, 1966. More than 800 delegates, representing a number of important leftwing organizations, participated in what was billed as an "organizing conference" of the Committee for Independent Political Action.

Among the organizations represented at this organizing conference for CIPA were the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee; the Southern Christian Leadership Conference; the Illinois Communist Party; the Chicago Area DuBois Club of America, characterized by the FBI as a Communist Party youth front; the so-called New Breed, a militantly racist, Black Nationalist organization; the Chicago Area Women for Peace, which put itself on record in January 1966 as favoring a ceasefire in Vietnam and recognition of the National Liberation Front, a Vietnamese Communist organization; the black nationalist organization known as Black Panthers; the Deacons for Defense, a Negro paramilitary organization which drills its members in use of firearms; the American Friends Service Committee; Students for a Democratic Society; a Negro organization known as the American Labor Council; an organization called Voters of Illinois, which is an affiliate of Americans for Democratic Action; and two labor unions, the Shoe and Leather Workers Union and the United Packinghouse Workers.

Also in attendance were Congregational, Lutheran, and Roman Catholic clergymen who had been active in the civil rights movement; representatives of the American Friends Service Committee; and a number of individuals who have won national notoriety as a result of their participation in so-called civil rights demonstrations and in agitation against U.S. activity in Vietnam.

Cochairmen of this CIPA organizing conference were Prof. Robert J. Havighurst, professor of education at the University of Illinois, and Dick Gregory, politically ambitious Negro comedian.

Dick Gregory was keynote speaker at the conference. Other speakers included Paul Lauter, a staff worker for the American Friends Service Committee; James Bevel, staff director of the Chicago project of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, and principal lieutenant of Martin Luther King; Robert Rossin of SDS; Sidney Lens, leftwing writer and one of the founders of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee; Lawrence Landry, national chairman of ACT; Associated Community Teams—Charles Cobb, field secretary of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, and campaign manager for Julian Bond; Monroe Sharp, director of the Chicago chapter of SNCC; and Henry Wineberg, chairman of the Chicago Peace Council.

At the CIPA organizing conference, 45 persons were elected as members of the executive committee of the CIPA. Among those so elected were the following:

Richard L. Criley, a former district educational director of the CIO, who once headed the Young Communist

League of California, was expelled from Local 28 of United Packinghouse Workers in October 1945 on the ground that he was a Communist, and who was identified as a member of the Communist Party in sworn testimony given before the House Committee on Un-American Activities in May 1965;

Fred Fine, former member of the National Committee of the Communist Party, U.S.A., who was one of those convicted and sentenced, under the Smith Act, for membership in an organization advocating overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence;

Mrs. Sylvia Woods, a longtime leader of the CPUSA in Illinois, who openly boasted, at the CIPA organizing conference, that she "stole 10,000 votes from the machine" as a candidate for the Illinois Legislature in 1946;

Lawrence Landry, who as national chairman of ACT was reported by the press as one of the main inciters of the 1965 riots in Chicago, and who acted as chairman of a workshop session at the CIPA organizing conference which he opened with what may have been the first recorded mention of "black power" by a Negro leader, when he said:

> Power is something you have to take. I am here to talk about black power.

Nahaz Rogers, another Negro leader who rose to prominence because of his activities in connection with the 1965 Chicago riots, and who followed up Landry's opening declaration at the CIPA workshop meeting by declaring:

> We are not here to do good. We are here to seize power. Don't ask us what we'll do with it when we get it. First we have to get it.

One of the participants in this secret workshop session at the CIPA conference was Frank Ditto, a Negro racist who participated in the march from Selma to Montgomery, Ala., in March 1965, and who in September 1965 was active in Chicago as a leader of almost daily demonstrations under the aegis of the so-called Coordinating Committee of Community Organizations Against Mayor Daley. Frank Ditto's racisim is not confined to the issue of black versus white. He showed up at the CIPA conference in an orange jacket bearing the initials "K.A.K." Jackets bearing this same insignia were worn by Negroes who participated in the riot in the Watts area of Los Angeles. The initials "K.A.K." stand for "Kill All Kikes," and mark any wearer of this insignia as openly and violently anti-Semitic.

At the secret workshop session to which I have referred, which took place during the CIPA conference in January 1966, assurances of financial support were given by Sidney Lens, who was exposed in October 1965 as a leader of the National Teach-In on the Vietnam war and who had admitted before the Internal Security Subcommittee in February 1963 that he had been one of the founders of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee. Mr. Lens' assurance to the CIPA conference that "we can get the money to support our candidates" must have been encouraging to those who knew that the formation of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee had been financed by the Communist Government of Cuba.

Obviously, substantial sums of money were raised. Plans made at the CIPA organizing conference in January 1966, came to fruition when the National Conference for New Politics held its convention in Chicago over the Labor Day weekend this year.

That convention got a good deal of press coverage, and I shall not take the time here to recapitulate what the press reported, because I am sure most of my colleagues are familiar with it. It is unfortunate that most of the press accounts of the NCNP convention missed the real story, and make it appear that black power forces have won a real victory. But I have already made my point in that regard, so let me move on to discuss some conferences which were not nearly so well reported on the NCNP convention.

For 3 years, there has been a so-called Annual Conference of Socialist Scholars in New York City.

The First Annual Conference of Socialist Scholars was held on September 11 and 12, 1965. The Second Annual Conference of Socialist Scholars lasted 3 days, September 9th to 11th, inclusive, 1966. The Third Annual Conference of Socialist Scholars took place on September 9th and 10th of 1967.

There were only a few hundred in attendance at the First Annual Conference of Socialist Scholars. But more than 2,000 were registered at the second conference, and an equal or larger number registered at the third conference.

The first Annual Socialist Scholars Conference was subsidized by the Louis M. Rabinowitz Foundation. This is a family foundation. Victor Rabinowitz, present head of the foundation, is a member of the firm of Rabinowitz & Boudin, which has registered under the Foreign Agents Registered Act, as agents for the Castro Government of Cuba.

The theme of the First Annual Conference of Socialist Scholars was "The Future of American Socialism" and a panel discussion under this title took place on the afternoon of the second day of the conference, under the leadership of Prof. Staughton Lynd, of Yale University.

Among the organizations with which Prof. Staughton Lynd has affiliated have been American Youth for Democracy, cited as subversive by the Attorney General of the United States; the Socialist Worker's Party, cited as subversive by the Attorney General of the United States; and the Progressive Labor Movement, now known as the Progressive Labor Party, which under both names has been operated as an openly pro-Red Chinese organization.

In August 1965 Professor Lynd was arrested for trying to break through police barricades at the Capitol in Washington, D.C., while participating in a demonstration march against U.S. policy in Vietnam.

The three other members of the panel discussing "The Future of American Socialism" at the First Annual Conference of Socialist Scholars were:

Herbert Aptheker, of the American Institute of Marxist Studies, a longtime top-level functionary of the Communist Party, U.S.A., and the father of Bettina Aptheker, who gained national notoriety for her participation in the student riots on the Berkeley campus of the University of California;

Sylvester Leaks, of the Harlem Writer's Guild;

Norman Fruchter, editor of the publication entitled "Studies on the Left" which stated in its spring 1965 issue that it "focuses on specific problems of social revolution in this country" and that this "makes the magazine identify with insurgent forces," defined as "people in the civil rights movement, community unions, trade unions, student organizations, radical intellectuals, and artists"; and

Prof. Eugene D. Genovese, of the history department of Rutgers University, who gained notoriety when he declared, at a so-called teach-in on the Rutgers campus in April 1965:

> I am a Marxist and a Socialist. I do not fear or regret the impending Viet Cong victory in Vietnam. I welcome it.

Leading off the panel discussion on "The Future of American Socialism" at the first Annual Conference of Socialist Scholars, Prof. Staughton Lynd declared that "guerrilla warfare has become a substitute for the breakdown of capitalism" which Marxist theory predicted, and that the only technique for bringing about a better world must be "revolutionary instead of reformist." Urging the "daring and inventive use of civil disobedience," Professor Lynd said it is "reasonable to expect the American Government will wage war at home," and suggested that "every teacher who calls himself a socialist" has "a duty to become a professional revolutionary."

Following Professor Lynd to the rostrum, Dr. Herbert Aptheker praised Lynd's paper, and declared:

> Not in 30 years has there been such interest in radicalism as there is today, such a sense of confidence, of mass involvement in the radicalization of the United States.

Prof. Eugene D. Genovese followed Aptheker and predicted that "American imperialism will become increasingly vicious against the underdeveloped nations and colored peoples," who said that "we have good reason to suspect American imperialism will be pushed back, and who asserted: "We are part of a worldwide movement and our activist allies will help us."

Norman Fruchter, editor of "Studies on the Left," who took the microphone from Dr. Genovese, declared:

> We have a guerrilla movement in the United States now.

Referring to the Watts riot, Fruchter said:

> There will be six or seven more cities kicked off in this way.

I submit, Mr. President, there was a rather knowledgeable prediction to have been made in September of 1965.

The last analyst, who followed Fruchter, was Sylvester Leaks of the Harlem Writer's Guild. Leaks, who had been associated with the Black Muslim leader, Malcom X, started out by declaring:

> I'm not nonviolent. My leader was assasinated.

Leaks declared that the Negroes in this country "should go to war now," and that the slogan they need is "Burn, baby, burn." He said:

> We've got to stop the murderous, barbarous, American-imposed war in Vietnam.

He said:

> I believe we've got to tear the system down, now.

What is needed, Leaks asserted, is "a complete dismantling of the old morality."

> The white man won't dismantle it—

He declared—

> and so the black man has to do it.

Concluding, Leaks declared:

> You had better come to terms with the revolutionary black movement, or else.

At the Second Annual Conference of Socialist Scholars, Communist functionary Herbert Aptheker was again a leading participant. This time his fellow participants included identified Communist and former Soviet espionage agent Victor Perlo; longtime Trotskyite and radical Marxist Isaac Deutscher, from London, England; as well as Prof. Eugene D. Genovese, a veteran of the First Socialist Scholars Conference.

Among other participants at the second Conference of Socialist Scholars in September 1966, were a number of leaders of SDS—Students for a Democratic Society—who were active in circulating the SDS document proposing what they called a radical education project, which was a sort of blueprint for breaking down the morality of American youth.

To give some of the flavor of this second Conference of Socialist Scholars, let me recount just a few of the things that were said at the conference.

Isaac Deutscher, the London Marxist, called for "complete freedom of sexual life that will abolish the family," and called for "destruction of the monogamic bourgeois family as we know it."

An assistant professor of economics named Shane Mage urged that American youth follow the advice of Timothy Leary, who was ousted from the faculty of Harvard University after a marihuana conviction, and used LSD and marihuana to "turn on, tune in, drop out."

Deutscher said that after fatherhood "has come to be regarded only as biological," and parental authority is recognized as merely an outmoded social institution to be gotten rid of, "Socialist man will be exempt from worship and awe," and "the bourgeois form of the patriarchal family" will be obliterated.

A paper prepared by Prof. Herbert Marcuse, of the University of California in San Diego, and read in his absence because he was busy attending a Communist meeting in Prague, urged development of "the moral-sexual rebellion of the youth."

James Petras, one of the leaders of the free-speech movement at the University of California in Berkeley, participating in a panel discussion, said one of the important components of the contemporary revolutionary movement is "the role of the sons of professional and aristocratic families in Latin America as revolutionary warfare guerrilla leaders."

James Haughton, director of the Harlem Unemployment Center in New York City, addressing a panel of the second Conference of Socialist Scholars, said the United States was engaged in "genocide against Vietnam," declared that "American imperialism" is "the enemy of poor people," and charged that "wherever the American octupus reaches out its tentacles, there you will find exploitation, cruelty, poverty, and mass impoverishment."

Haughton told his "Socialist scholar" listeners that "in 1967 the administration will learn about riots in the streets."

> The riots which took place in the 1930's—

He declared—

> won't be anything compared to 1967.

Prof. Richard A. Cloward of Columbia University, who is a member of the Citizens Crusade Against Poverty, a group organized by Walter Reuther, presented a paper calling for a "systematic strategy" of "irregular and disruptive tactics" designed to lead the poor people of this country to "overburden" State and local governments with "demands" so that there will be constantly increasing calls upon the Federal Treasury for welfare funds.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I am glad that the Senator has made reference to Professor Cloward. I have called attention to his program twice—once last year, and once within the last few days.

Mr. EASTLAND. I thank my friend and colleague, the Senator from West Virginia.

This material shows that the agitation and the riots in the country are Communist inspired. The disorder, agitation, and riots are highly organized and are directed by the Communist Party.

Prof. William Ryan, of Yale University, declared himself "enchanted" with what he called "the Cloward strategy of blowing a fuse in the welfare agencies, housing developments, and among unmarried mothers."

Sherman Barr, of Mobilization for Youth, told the Socialist scholars that his organization was using welfare techniques by means of which "further demand is stimulated rather than decreased."

Dr. Frances Piven of Columbia University declared:

> I really only want to make one point—the disruption of the system. Welfare rolls will begin to go up; welfare payments will begin to go up; the impact will be very sharp. The mounting welfare budget will increase taxes, will force cities to turn to the Federal Government. We have to help people to make claims; for this they will organize and act.

The Radical Education Project of Students for a Democratic Society circulated, at the second conference of Socialist Scholars, a letter from its headquarters at Ann Arbor, Mich., dated August 18, 1966, which spoke of creating "a network of people in the United States and abroad, closely tuned to international events, who will serve the movement as quick, incisive sources of intelligence." This letter declared:

> Already we have contacts in Japan, most European countries, Canada, and with Guatemalian guerrillas, Vietnamese rebels and neutrals, African Nationalists, and others. These contacts are being extended, and to them we must add American scholars with specialized knowledge and contacts.

Prof. Eugene D. Genovese, of Rutgers University urged, as his contribution to the second annual conference of Socialist Scholars that American Negroes adopt "a policy of black nationalism."

At the third annual conference of Socialist Scholars, in September 1967, the guest of honor was Owen Lattimore, now of Leeds, England. This is the same Lattimore who was characterized by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in 1952 as having been "a conscious, articulate instrument of the Soviet conspiracy."

Second in importance only to Lattimore, the third annual conference of Socialist Scholars had two guests from the Soviet Union, Timor Timofeev and Yuri Zamoshkin, of Moscow's Institute of World Labor.

Even without counting those guests from abroad, the third annual conference of Socialist Scholars had a higher proportion of open participation by Communists than either of the two preceding conferences.

The official program of the third annual conference of Socialist Scholars carried paid advertisements by various Communist advertisers. It had an ad by the official Communist publishing house, International Publishers, Inc. It had an ad by the Communist publication Science and Society. It also had an ad by the American Institute for Marxist Studies, of which Communist functionary Herbert Aptheker is director.

Interlocking between the National Conference for New Politics and the Socialist Scholars conference was clearly evident from the relatively large number of persons who attended both the Chicago convention of the NCNP, over the Labor Day weekend this year, and the third conference of Socialist Scholars, which took place in New York City the following week.

Here are a few of the things that happened at the third annual conference of Socialist Scholars:

Michael Harrington, chairman of the board of the League for Industrial Democracy, which is the parent organization of Students for a Democratic Society, now one of the most effective pro-Communist organizations on American college campuses, declared:

> We have to make a revolution for the entire society.

And said it is necessary to create—

> a reformist liberal-labor political and intellectual coalition for future success of the American socialist revolution.

Hyman Lumer, national education secretary of the Communist Party, U.S.A., argued for radicalism, rather than reformism, in moving toward national revolution in the United States.

Stanley Aronowitz, chairman of New York City's West Side Committee for Independent Political Action, asserted that "only a revolutionary action group" could attain Socialist objectives in America, and called for destruction of "the existing structure of power and authority" in the United States. Aronowitz attacked the police as "the arm of the ruling class in the ghettos," and called policemen "the oppressors" of Negro communities.

Owen Lattimore told his Socialist Scholar listeners that it is neither the Soviet Union nor Red China, but the United States which is "expansionist," and asserted that present-day subjects of U.S. expansionism include Guam, Japan, and the Philippines.

Lattimore accused the makers of American foreign policy of what he called "amateur geopolitical thinking," which he contrasted unfavorably with what he called "the mature, sophisticated understanding of world politics," by "the great Lenin."

Plans for burning down 20 American cities in 1968 were discussed at a black power panel session of the third annual conference of Socialist Scholars. James Boggs of Detroit was chairman of this session. Other panelists were Ivanhoe Donaldson, who was campaign manager for Julian Bond in Georgia; Gilbert Osofky of the University of Illinois at Chicago; and Raymond S. Franklin of Queens College.

James Boggs defined "black power" as "a force repudiating all existing law and order in this society," and asserted that black power organizations "will force America's present power structure to increase militia and police" beyond its capacity by bringing "military struggle in the streets" to "not a few cities, but to 20 cities" in 1968.

> Either you are with the revolution or you are not—

Boggs declared.

> There is no in between. The United States as a Nation is a counter-revolution.

Ivanhoe Donaldson, who is a member of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee as well as a member of the steering committee of the recent Chicago convention of the National Conference for New Politics, referred to the existing social and governmental structure in the United States with the assertion:

> Our position is, tear it down because we don't want to be a part of it.

Declaring the riots in Newark and Detroit this year had put a "strain" on law enforcement agencies, Donaldson said that—

> Next year two or three Detroits at the same time are going to pin down the American forces.

Donaldson said "revolutionary forces" would be involved in "the struggle" in 20 U.S. cities in 1968, and that these forces would not confine themselves to black areas, but would "go downtown and begin to burn down the white ghetto banks and draft centers."

After this panel session, Boggs announced that a black power meeting would convene immediately, for the purpose of planning "how to do things now and next year." Attendance at this meeting, he said, would be limited to Negroes.

I do not know exactly what was planned at that meeting, from which all whites were barred. But I do know something which may be pertinent.

The secret leaders of the National Conference for New Politics, and the secret leaders of the Socialist Scholars conferences, who are not identical, regard the march on Washington which is scheduled for October 21, under the open auspices of the Student Mobilization Committee of New York, as a probe to determine the nature and quality of resistance at the heart of Government.

This march on Washington, which is being planned to encompass penetration of both the Pentagon and the House and Senate Office Buildings, has been the subject of various estimates, by its sponsors, as to the total number who will participate. These estimates have run as high as 200,000. Probably a much more realistic estimate would be that the total number of demonstrators in this Washington march will range between 25,000 and 40,000.

In coordination with the march, plans have been made for attacks on American consulates and Embassies around the world, which also are scheduled to take place on October 21.

Although the October 21 march on Washington has been publicized as a protest against U.S. policy in Vietnam, a tactic which has gained it much support from various pacifist groups, the real objective is to determine how law-enforcement officials in the National Capital will handle unlawful demonstrations—how much force will be used, when and where it will be applied, and what police tactics will be brought into play for controlling the demonstrators.

Now, Mr. President, I desire to make brief mention of still another conference.

On August 24, 1967, the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, at Santa Barbara, Calif., played host to a conference of alleged "militant student leaders and ex-students." The objective of this conference, according to the Santa Barbara News-Press of August 24, 1967, was "a master plan of how best to destroy the American university system as it is today."

All participants in this conference, according to the News-Press, "were described by the center as having been prominent in demonstrations and movements within their own colleges and universities."

The keynote for the conference appears to have been set by one Devereaux Kennedy, described as president of the student body at Washington University, St. Louis, Mo. According to the Santa Barbara News-Press. Devereaux Kennedy "called for outright revolution and the overthrow of the U.S. Government," and "advocated terrorism on such a scale that it would demoralize and castrate America."

Mr. President, it may seem to some that I have been talking about separate and unrelated activities by separate and unrelated organizations. This is not the case. The organizations to which I have referred are not wholly separate and unrelated. On the contrary, they are in a very real sense merely different manifestations of a major sickness which has gripped this country with increasing virulence in the last few years. They are all a part of the so-called new left. Their efforts are not uncoordinated. On the contrary, they are very well coordinated, indeed; in part openly coordinated, and to a much greater degree, secretly coordinated.

What I have said here is not the whole story. It is only part of the story—just some of the highlights. There is a very great deal more which remains to be told.

It has not been my purpose to try to tell the whole story, or to tell any part of it in full detail. I have sought only to tell enough of the story to make clear to my colleagues the general shape of the threat which confronts this Nation, and to give some idea of its size and scope.

As I said earlier, the structure of the forces of the so-called new left which confront us is very complex. The most obvious thread which binds these forces together is the guidance and support which they receive from the world Communist conspiracy.

In the whole widespread gamut of their activities, mutually helpful one to another, these organizations are operating today in furtherance of the basic Communist purpose of overthrowing the Government of the United States.

The grasp of the new left for political power will, if successful, have the Communist Party as its greatest beneficiary.

The plans of the new left for bringing about a progressive breakdown of law and order in all parts of this Nation: the scheme for temporarily disrupting the normal conduct of business in the Pentagon and in the Halls of Congress on October 21; the program for bringing riot, arson, and bloodshed to a score of American cities in 1968; the almost Machiavellian plan for breaking down welfare services by overloading them with constantly increasing demands; all of these activities of the new left must be regarded as factors which operate to advance Communist objectives.

We must not be like the man who could not see the forest for the trees.

Unless we see this whole picture clearly; unless we recognize this situation as presenting the gravest threat this Nation has faced in a century; unless we can manage to bring about such widespread public knowledge and understanding of this threat that the people of this country demand that their leaders oppose it forthrightly and effectively, so that this whole free Nation may, in Lincoln's words, go forward "with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right," we are quite likely to find ourselves unwilling but helpless spectators at the transformation of this country we love into something tragically different from the free Nation, under God, which our forefathers created nearly two centuries ago, and which the young and the strong in every generation, our bravest and our best, have fought to preserve and protect.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under the order previously entered the Senator from New York is recognized for 30 minutes.

VIETNAM: SUMMED UP

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to speak today on the struggle in Vietnam which has been so great a subject of debate in this Chamber in the past 10 days. It seems to me that a summing up is essential.

How is it that the United States—the world's greatest power—has been unable to achieve its objectives in the Vietnam war despite the enormous effort we have made? It is this paradox which so confuses and divides our Nation. It is a question which requires some reexamination. In my judgment, a great deal of what the administration says about the war—and a great deal that the critics say about the war—is peripheral or irrelevant to the actualities of the situation we face in Vietnam.

Last week the minority leader spoke eloquently in defense of the President's Vietnam policy. I have carefully considered his words, not only because he is my party's leader but because every Senator has learned to respect him. As I understand it, the minority leader based his support of the President on the view that South Vietnam is an essential link in the U.S. defense perimeter in Asia, therefore, if Vietnam should be lost to the Communists there would be a dangerous hole in our defenses and Hawaii, even California would be exposed to Communist Chinese attack.

Nonetheless, I am unable to reconcile my minority leader's position with certain statements of the administration itself.

Secretary Rusk has repeatedly stated that the United States would accept the results if the Communists won control of South Vietnam through free elections. In view of President Eisenhower's judgment that Ho Chi Minh would have won 80 percent of the vote in 1954, Secretary Rusk's statements are of considerable significance. If the United States would accept a Communist victory in South Vietnam achieved through elections, why would Communist domination achieved by other means be an unacceptable rupture of our vital defense perimeter? I am speaking here only in a strategic context. I am not advocating withdrawal from Vietnam.

I shall fight with all of the energy I have against any Communist success, including electoral success, but I think there is an important question here which we have to examine carefully. Is there any reason to assume that an elected Communist government in South Vietnam would be less of a threat to its neighbors and to our security interests than a Communist government which gained power by other means?

I hasten to say that I do not think so. I think an elected Communist government would be just as dangerous to our interest and their neighbors. This does bear on the strategy involved because at a minimum there is a clear implication that Vietnam is not vital per se to the security of the United States. Certainly, we are ourselves prepared for participation in public affairs by all the South Vietnamese if there is peace.

I believe that the United States does have interests in Vietnam that are worth fighting for. But I reject the idea that our stakes in Vietnam are worth any price that we might have to pay. Just what price we are willing to pay in Vietnam has become a very relevant question. I do not believe that constitutionally—or by any other standards—the President of the United States has the sole responsibility for deciding this question. The viability of his office does not require immunity from criticism on this issue. There is no such thing as divine right of kings in this country, and I was frankly disturbed by references to the majesterial and regal qualities attributed to the Presidency by some of my colleagues.

The distinctive quality about the Presidency—indeed the very quality which distinguishes it from monarchy—is the requirement that the incumbent retain the confidence of the people. The burden is on him in this regard and if he fails, he is turned out. The fact is that a majority of the people in this country today do not approve of the way the President is handling Vietnam.

President Eisenhower himself, just the other day, spoke of the need to "formulate a more sensible policy on Vietnam." Therefore, suggestions that debate on this vital issue give aid and comfort to the enemy and border on disloyalty cannot be reconciled with the constitutional responsibilities of the U.S. Senate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield for a few questions?

Mr. JAVITS. Just so the Senator from Arkansas will not "throw" me, I yield happily to him.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from New York is making a great contribution in raising these questions. I am particularly impressed with the point he made as to the inconsistency in our present policy in Vietnam. For example, we have, from time to time said that we believe in self-determination in Indochina. Does the Senator believe that self-determination is so vital that we must hold Vietnam for the future? I think it is certainly important that this issue be clarified.

In connection with the remarks of the Senator, that there should be debate on this matter, certainly that is a very valid point. The criticism that was leveled yesterday by the Speaker of the House and others in recent days, that those who criticize or even seek to clarify our position are, in some way, doing this country harm and are not serving the national interest, is, I think, entirely erroneous. I do not agree with it at all. I think the Senator from New York is rendering a valuable service to point that out. Also, that we are not ruled by a monarchy.

Mr. JAVITS. Let me say to my distinguished colleague that the fact he has been willing to engage in this debate, notwithstanding he could stand on his dignity as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations and speak from a podium where he would be unchallenged, is a source of great admiration on my part. The Senator and I do not always agree, but when it comes to being a man of spirit, I honor and respect him for it. He yields to no one in that regard.

I am neither a dove nor a hawk. I felt it necessary to say this because I am not afraid of doing what needs to be done. I think that the essence of bipartisan foreign policy is that we want our country to succeed. How can we make it succeed better than by expressing our deep and honest views as to the direction policy should take in order to succeed?

I know that the views of the Senator from Arkansas are that we are very much extended in Vietnam. That is also the view of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON]. Does that not deal with the basic and fundamental security of the Nation, I ask the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee? Is Vietnam the only place where we can be threatened?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Exactly. That is not new. General Gavin, who comes with good credentials in this field, made that point effectively and I thought, persuasively, at the hearings before the committee. He said that we were overextending ourselves by putting so many troops into and so much effort and attention on Vietnam. The only justification for this overextension, it seemed to me, would be that it is vital, really vital, to our defense; that we would be threatened and our security would be threatened, if, for any reason, we gave up our position in Vietnam.

I do not agree at all. I think that is a point that should be made over and over again. But it seemed to be implicit in recent statements by spokesmen for the administration that it is vital. If that is true, it should be tested in debate and everyone should make up their minds about it.

Mr. JAVITS. Let me say to my colleague that he enables me to picture in a few sentences what I consider to be my fundamental point:

I think that the security of that part of the world, in military terms, is extremely desirable. It is not absolutely essential. We have already demonstrated our fidelity to our commitment, by the losses and the casualties we have taken. The total security of the United States does not allow us to make an all-out commitment, including mobilization and complete war, so we can eliminate North Vietnam and kill everyone in it. Everyone knows that we could do that. But we are not warranted in doing that because it would be dangerous and unproductive in the context of the totality of our security interests. We limit our commitment.

The President faces us with a situation in which he limits it in word but not in policy. If we follow what he says, then we have got to load in there everything it takes, no matter how long it takes.

That is the contribution I should like to make to the debate, that we limit it by the extent to which South Vietnam can help itself. If it is clear that they are not willing to help themselves, at least to the extent that it is a commitment we can accept—considering our stake there—then we have got to consider disengaging and doing something else.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the Senator has put his finger on the crucial point. I would say again that this is not something new. Up until recently—5 years—as General MacArthur and, I believe, Omar Bradley and others, as well as civilian commentators have maintained, our security in this area depends primarily upon naval and air power. We have the whole Pacific for our bases and we have plenty of protection, having the greatest Navy and airpower in the world. We did not need a land base in Asia—a military base on the continent of Asia. Now there seems to be a new development in our national policy. What has happened, what has changed that view? I would think, and I believe the Senator would agree, that 5 years ago nobody was saying it was essential to our physical security that we have a land base on the continent of Asia. I do not recall anyone saying that——

Mr. JAVITS. Neither do I.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is a new concept. Has there been a great revival of the so-called Communist conspiracy? Has there been a rejoining of China and Russia? Has there been any evidence of a resurgence of the kind of organized effort made under Stalin up until the time of his death? I think the facts are all to the contrary. There is nothing to indicate a change in the balance of power between the great powers which would indicate a radical change in our policy was required. If we intend to maintain a permanent base on the continent of Asia, we shall have taken on a very major undertaking. I think it will be an overcommitment far beyond our capacity to fulfill over the years.

Mr. JAVITS. Let me say to my colleagues that I think the danger was posed to us in 1965. I might not have reacted the same at the time—I do not think I would, had I been President—but the fact is that the President did react. The reaction has resulted in an unlimited commitment. I cannot see that it justifies stripping ourselves of the option of limiting our commitment. That is the essence of my argument.

Now let me say what I think the danger was. It is true our situation has improved through the fact that South Korea is a success and Taiwan is apparently secure. Both of those were in peril, not 5 years ago, but a decade ago.

Communist China has swallowed up Tibet and has moved against India, and showed signs of success which have since been undone. The situation has improved in Indonesia. I am even willing to give some indirect credit to our stand in Vietnam for the reversal in Indonesia. I believe the Senator from Arkansas would, also.

But all of those things do not balance out into the kind of danger that required us to undertake a blank check commitment in South Vietnam.

Let us assume that what was done was, on balance—in the President's judgment—worth doing. We are no longer facing that situation. We have demonstrated our good faith that we would fight for an ally which was remotely willing to fight for itself. Now the question is: Shall the commitment be unlimited? I think if Senators could zero in on that question, the American people could understand much better what the critics are driving at. They certainly do not understand the President's side very much.

I would like to have the comment of the Senator from Arkansas on that.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I would like to comment. I do not wish to open up something irrelevant. Well, it is relevant, perhaps, to bring in the question of Tibet, India, and so forth. We had hearings on that question in 1966 and had some good witnesses. My own conclusions, as a result, were that in the China-India crisis there was a situation in which it was very dubious as to whether India or China precipitated the border clash. It would be very difficult to say which side moved first. But clearly there was no evidence of a determined effort by China to overrun India, because after 3 weeks the Chinese withdrew to the line. This McMahon line goes away back. The British established it. China never considered it a correct border. I do not consider disputes about that line as evidence of a determined aggression against India. I think people like John K. Fairbank supports that, and he is an authority on China.

The Chinese have always felt that that territory belonged to them. We have not felt so strongly that it did not that we would recognize that area as an independent state. This was a dispute between India and China, and I do not think the hostilities there were clear evidence of Chinese aggression.

Then, with regard to Vietnam, the assumption seems to be that this whole war arose out of a Chinese aggression. This is not historically correct. The war in Vietnam arose out of a colonial war against France, to begin with. It began even before, in a revolutionary sense, without actual, open warfare, before the end of World War II. But, beginning in 1946, hostilities there developed into typical colonial warfare, the Vietnamese against the French.

I think the Senator will agree that it was not a case of China seeking to overrun Vietnam.

Mr. JAVITS. No, but I think Ho Chi Minh had identity with the Communist ideology.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes, but he had become a Communist in France. He was not a Chinese and there is no evidence he was a puppet of the Chinese. In fact, Vietnam for 1,000 years had been independent of China before the French occupied that area in 1895. So to say this was a great movement on the part of China is not, I think, historically correct.

For the purpose of argument, if the fighting in Vietnam is not a Chinese movement, but an indigenous effort at independence from colonial rule, then I do not think that what goes on there can be used as evidence that the United States is holding back a great effort of the international Communist conspiracy. We intervened in Vietnam in what was essentially a civil war that resulted from a colonial war. The Vietnamese thought they had won a colonial war in 1954. Almost everyone thought, at Geneva, the Communists were going to take it over. Then we intervened to prevent that. This is a crucial point—the point being whether we are holding back an on-rushing tide of Communists or are involved in an indigenous civil war between two competing factions. If it is the latter, then I think the other point that our purpose is to hold back the Chinese hordes is not valid.

Mr. JAVITS. I do not think the case is that open and shut. That is why I speak of the limitation of our commitment and why we must find a way of phasing it out. I will tell the Senator why. I agree with the Senator's factual development, but it is also a fact that we saw a vacuum of power being created. If Ho Chi Minh succeeded, with the natural alliance of Ho Chi Minh with the Communist Chinese, we felt at that time that vacuum of power would engulf not only Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos, but also might engulf Malaysia, Burma, and Thailand. That is why the President, on a very close question, made the decision he did.

I think we must, as we debate the matter—as lawyers do—give ourselves the worst of the facts in order to see whether, testing it on that score, we are doing the right thing.

I submit that perhaps the Senator places a burden on himself which is too great. The American people are not with him on that—that we merely intervened in a civil war and nothing else was at stake. It was a close decision. I do not know that I would have interpreted it that way, but the President felt that intervention was called for. But, having so decided and having put 500,000 men there, I do not think the American people are saying that we will make this an all-out commitment, win all the way. That is why we have taken the position we are in there, to help the South Vietnamese; but if they will not help themselves, then what power on earth can do it for them?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree with the Senator's putting it that way, but I do think it has some significance, in trying to determine what our policy should be, to determine whether our staying there is because it is essentially a part of our defense perimeter. If it is, that means we are going to stay there come hell or high water. I do not accept that, and I do not think the Senator does.

Mr. JAVITS. That is correct.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it is inherent in the concept of bipartisan foreign policy that there be debate, criticism, and suggestion of alternatives. Traditionally this has not caused any diminution of the stature and prestige of the office of the Presidency. Any diminution of that office is something with which the incumbent has the widest range of power and instrumentalities to deal. No other view of the situation should be permitted to be used to beg the question of what is the best policy for the United States in Vietnam. Nor should it be used to inhibit Members of the Congress who are charged with the very responsibility of discussing such issue freely and openly—always, of course, within the bounds of respect for the office and the President.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] have performed a service in their eloquent testimony to the erosion of public confidence in the administration's handling of the Vietnam war.

They have focused attention on the failures of the administration to pursue all opportunities to initiate negotiations and its incapacity to bring the struggle to a satisfactory conclusion. Their suggestions require action by us and by others, with no assurance that the others will respond. While we pursue those lines, we need also a fundamental policy which is in our own power to shape and which gives us the full range of options to which we, as the major power engaged in the war are entitled.

In that regard, Mr. President, the majority leader has sent to all Senators a very eloquent letter with relation to the possible intercession in this matter of the United Nations. Without seeking to join him in any way—which it would be most unfair to do—with the views of the Senator from New Jersey and the Senator from Kentucky as to the performance of the administration, it is, nonetheless, a fact that here is another suggestion which should also be explored. There is no contradiction in the idea of the limitation of our commitment, or in any other recommendation that people like myself might make, with doing anything which it is within our power to do, and pursuing every conceivable line suggested by other Republican Senators or by the majority leader to try to bring this matter to a satisfactory conclusion.

I repeat, when the President succeeds in foreign policy the country succeeds, and we must all be glad and all do our utmost to promote that happy eventuality, and to help him succeed; and that means, among other things, by the thrust of everything we say.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senator from New York has made a most interesting speech. I am sorry that I missed the last part of it, because I think he made some remarks which are not contained in the printed text. Had the Senator not finished?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, may I say to the majority leader, as to the last part of it, that I just, without in any way associating him with criticism of the administration, which I would never do, said that I thoroughly agreed with the majority leader's initiative, and had a deep feeling for support for it, in respect to trying to bring the United Nations into the situation. I stated that I saw nothing inconsistent between that and anything that I urged.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I was just trying to follow the Senator's printed remarks, and I thought he had concluded. I was mistaken.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

Accordingly, the policy of the United States in Vietnam—and, in my judgment, this is the essence of the colloquy I had with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]—must be conditional upon the performance of the Government and people of South Vietnam acting on their own behalf—within a reasonable timetable. And this policy must, in my judgment, be supported by a new resolution of the Congress to supersede the now obsolete Gulf of Tonkin resolution, which is no longer germane to the situation we face today. I would not undo it. I think that would be a grave disservice to the country. It would seriously compromise the President. But I do hope we can adopt another one to supersede it. I reiterate that the real question is: Can the elected Government of South Vietnam and its people be roused effectively to help themselves—and when?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, would the Senator from New York mind yielding, before he passes on to his next point?

I was interested in his remark about a new resolution.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like the Senator to develop just briefly the nature of what he has in mind, and how he would proceed. I have heard this suggestion before, and have had difficulty clarifying in my own mind what form, for example, such resolution would take. It would be a new statement of our policy, incorporating some ideas the Senator has stated; is that correct?

Mr. JAVITS. That is exactly correct. In the first place, I would renew the President's mandate, so that he would be acting with authority. Although many of us believe the Tonkin Gulf resolution is out of date, it is still in effect. If you are going to do anything, you have to have power and authority; and frankly, I think it is much more dignified and appropriate to our Nation if that authority be current and up to date, rather than out of date, with no relation to the present situation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. JAVITS. I assume that the grant of authority would not be quite as broad and unlimited as that which we gave in 1964, but would, nonetheless, be adequate to maintain operations. I think we owe this to the President.

But my second point would be to relate our continued maintenance of operations and our continued presence to performance on the part of the South Vietnamese Government, and self-help on the part of the South Vietnamese people. Somehow or other, that represents, to me—the essential basis for this whole operation.

Why did the free world get such joy and such elation out of what Israel did in the Middle East, that little power in a sea of Arab States? While I know that the Senator from Arkansas may have views somewhat different from mine on that subject, I believe it gave the free world a lift, because when people help themselves, there is no limit to what others will do to help them.

But I believe that principle can operate negatively as well as affirmatively. If they do not help themselves, there must be some way in which we can cease to be the underwriter for people who simply do not want to be free.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's half hour has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. I ask unanimous consent that I may have 15 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may have 45 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the majority leader. That, I believe, is the essence of what I would like to see. Other Senators, of course, would have different ideas. We would have a whole gamut of them.

But I think the superseding proposition, the modernization proposition, is much more valid and more compatible with the dignity of the Nation than the idea that we should simply undo the Gulf of Tonkin resolution. I must say, without any disrespect for the President, that I was rather sorry that he did what he did, as if to say in effect, "If they do not like it, they know what they can do." To me, that is unthinkable. But I would rather agonize about it, and do whatever it takes, than undo entirely the basis on which the President of the United States has been proceeding.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I think there is much in what the Senator says. At the very least, such a proposal would certainly precipitate a careful examination of what our policy should be.

Mr. JAVITS. Exactly.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It would be a vehicle for discussion, and I think would make a very great contribution.

Mr. JAVITS. If I may make one other suggestion to the Senator, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, one thing the Gulf of Tonkin resolution left out—and it was not needed at the time, because the immediate situation it sought to meet was a very limited, tactical thing—was the objective: Why are we there? What do we hope to accomplish?

A definitive resolution of this character, delimiting policy, would be extremely important to the whole world, to define our objective for the world, in answer to the question: Why are we there?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is exactly correct. That is the great question, still, in the minds of the people. If the Senator's suggested new resolution did nothing else than clarify that particular point, it would be most helpful.

Mr. JAVITS. I say to the Senator publicly, as I have informed him privately heretofore, I am now working on something tangible on that score. Perhaps other Senators will do the same, Mr. President, and perhaps we can give to the Committee on Foreign Relations a sufficient body of suggestions to warrant its early and considered attention.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I can assure the Senator that the committee is very much interested in anything he or any other Senator has to propose in this connection. I think it is high time we think about it.

Mr. JAVITS. I now pass, Mr. President, to the question of the bombing of North Vietnam, and the consideration of the evidence which was given on that subject by the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara—which, Mr. President, in summary, asserts that our bombing program cannot stop the amount of infiltration of men and materials into South Vietnam which the Communists need to sustain their current level of military activity. In specifically, he said:

> The capacity of the lines of communication and of the outside sources of supply so far exceed the minimal flow necessary to support the present level of North Vietnamese military efforts in South Vietnam that the enemy operations cannot . . . be stopped by air bombardment—short, that is, of the virtual annihilation of North Vietnam and its people.

The President has, on a number of occasions, explicitly ruled out the virtual annihilation of North Vietnam as a course of action which the United States would ever undertake. So it seems to me, therefore, that the bombing question in respect to North Vietnam introduces a note of unrealism into the whole situation, if it is said that that is the sole obstacle, or the principal obstacle, to peace in Vietnam. There may be grounds for believing that an unconditional cessation of bombing would be reciprocated by willingness on Hanoi's part to open negotiations.

But in much of the public discussion of Vietnam there appears to be an implicit equation of "negotiations" with "peace." Hanoi's own statements on this subject, as well as the experience of Korea, strongly indicate the contrary. It will be remembered that the negotiations at Panmunjom took 24 months, that fighting went on and our casualties were even greater during the negotiations. Nevertheless, Panmunjom did mark a beginning of the end—a beginning we have not yet attained in Vietnam.

I do not think the bombing of North Vietnam is central—either way—to the problem of achieving a satisfactory end to the struggle in South Vietnam by military means. That is why I favored an unconditional cessation of the bombing last February 1967 when there was a worldwide framework in which peace negotiations looked like a probable result, and I would do so again in a similar framework. Accordingly, in my judgment, we should continue for the present those aspects of the bombing program which are clearly contributory to the safety and success of our combat forces in South Vietnam—which means the access routes into South Vietnam. To give a specific instance, I would cite the successful use of bombers in the DMZ to break the seige of Conthien.

On the other hand, it seems to me that there is a dangerously high element of distorted reasoning in the arguments of the military proponents of an accelerated bombing program. The only valid criteria for bombing North Vietnam is the contribution it makes to war in the south, and Secretary McNamara has now made it clear that there is little more that can be done which is relevant to the criteria.

Nonetheless leading generals and admirals are agitating for such extreme measures as the aerial mining of Haiphong and the destruction of all lines of communication along North Vietnam's border with Communist China—notwithstanding the danger of widening the war by having a flood of Chinese volunteers come into North Vietnam as they did in the case of North Korea.

They speak urgently of stemming the flow of war material into Hanoi's arsenal. The image invoked by the generals is in stark contrast to Secretary McNamara's estimate that the level of supplies infiltrated into the south is "significantly under 100 tons per day."

How do we account for this discrepancy? I think the answer is quite revealing. The military people have come to view the bombing program as an end in itself. We must not discount the enthusiasm of the fliers for the "air solution," a theory of dashing air attack doing all with relatively light manpower losses, but, a theory invalidated by all modern military experience. Indispensable as is the air arm, it is not decisive standing alone as it does in North Vietnam.

Yet, the air war now has a life of its own. According to Admiral Sharp:

> We must continue these operations in the North. They are the offensive element in our strategy. No war has ever been brought to a successful conclusion by defensive action alone.

He adds:

> It is important, in my mind, to have our presence felt over the cities of Hanoi and Haiphong.

I question whether it is really germane to the guerrilla war in the south that our planes be able to roam at will and bomb with impunity over the length and breadth of North Vietnam. Does the cratering of dirt roads and the destruction of primitive bridges in North Vietnam lessen the grip of the Vietcong over the isolated villages of the Mekong Delta? This is where most of the South Vietnamese people live.

I understand that according to the Pentagon's own calculations it costs the United States $10 to inflict $1 worth of damage on North Vietnam by bombing. Do the results justify the expense involved? When we add the loss of American lives, the risks of confrontation with the Soviets or with Communist Chinese "volunteers" and the international opprobrium connected with the bombing program, it would seem that we have passed the point of diminishing returns as regards the number of the missions our flyers are required to undertake.

I say that only in substantiation of the fact that we have not even tried all of the means by which peace negotiations may be brought about in respect of the United Nations, as the distinguished majority leader has said.

In the final analysis, and this is the main thrust of my speech today, there are two ways in which a settlement can be brought about in Vietnam. At the present time, neither of these ways looks very hopeful.

First, the way is to demonstrate to the Communists on the ground in South Vietnam that the tide of the struggle has shifted decisively against them. This requires demonstrable progress in the political, economic, and social, as well as in the military field. We have been trying to do just this since 1954. However, despite the expenditure of billions of dollars and the deployment of 500,000 U.S. troops, we have not succeeded in putting together a demonstrably "winning" effort.

By all indications, Hanoi and the Vietcong remain convinced that they will win the struggle in Vietnam—and win on their own terms. Until the enemy is shaken from this conviction—and we have Secretary McNamara's word that it cannot be done alone by bombing the north—it is wishful thinking to expect that the Communists will agree to a settlement which meets our minimum objectives.

As I have stated many times, in my judgment the Achilles heel of our effort in Vietnam is the continuing inability of the South Vietnamese to galvanize themselves as a society and produce leadership which can achieve basic reforms and meet standards of performance—social, economic, and military—which will attract the positive allegiance of the population of South Vietnam.

Despite our military achievements of the past 18 months, informed observers agree that the Vietcong remains way ahead of the Saigon government in terms of effective political organization in the countryside.

The Vietcong is clearly a minority in South Vietnam and I share the administration's conviction that a majority of the South Vietnamese do not want Communist rule imposed on them by force. That is proved by the extent of participation in the elections. However, to speak of an anti-Communist majority is misleading. South Vietnam is a country of fragmented minorities and among the competing minorities, the Vietcong is clearly the best organized, the most resourceful, and the most determined.

The literate and intellectual anti-Communists in South Vietnam are like the anti-Fascists in France in the 1930's. They are more intent on checkmating one another than on saving their country from conquest. The Saigon government shows more zest in suppressing the Buddhists radicals led by Tri Quang than it does in routing out Vietcong strongholds in the delta. The students and the intellectuals prefer demonstrating and intriguing against the Government to contesting the political dominance of the National Liberation Front in the war zones outside of the big cities.

So long as these instinctive patterns of choice prevail among the non-Communists. the United States is doing little more than building sand castles in Vietnam.

That is the first way to demonstrate to the Communists on the ground that the tide of the struggle has shifted decisively against them.

Second, the way in which a settlement might be attained is by international diplomatic action. In my judgment, a realistic appraisal of the dynamics required for achieving a settlement by these means gives no cause for optimism at this time.

Despite extensive international concern over the potential dangers to world peace inherent in the Vietnam conflict, diplomacy thus far has not been able to get negotiations started, nor to suggest the outlines of a compromise settlement upon which the two sides might agree. The United States is willing to negotiate. We have even made some adjustments in our position to accommodate international concerns.

But Hanoi remains adamantly opposed to negotiations on any basis other than what would be an implicit prior acceptance of Hanoi's terms for a settlement—U.S. withdrawal and South Vietnamese capitulation.

In these circumstances, the operative question is whether the Soviet Union can and will effectively press Hanoi to negotiate a compromise settlement. The evidence regarding Soviet willingness to press Hanoi to negotiate is ambiguous at best. Even assuming Soviet willingness, the actual ability of the Soviets to press Hanoi to a settlement is very dubious so long as Communist China is determined to keep the war going.

The reaction of the hawks to these circumstances seems to be an inclination to provoke a confrontation with the Communist Chinese and the Soviets. Presumably they have an implicit faith that going to the brink of world war will induce the Communist Chinese and the Soviets to abandon Hanoi and thus force a settlement. They may be right. But, in my judgment, the risks far outweigh the issues we have at stake.

The reaction of the doves is to offer many ideas—all of which depend on someone else's action—like the U.N.—which cannot or may not wish to do so. For the rest, the implication is disengagement and withdrawal which we cannot and should not contemplate now. Indeed, the terms "hawks" and "doves" are rapidly becoming irrelevant to the situation, and there seems to be broad agreement on the fact that you cannot pull out unless there is a way, and that is what we are talking about.

In thus reexamining the situation, we inevitably come back to the question of the ability of the South Vietnamese to put their own house in order. A people who do not work and fight to save themselves cannot, in the final analysis, be saved by others. The evidence continues to mount that the more we do for the South Vietnamese the less they do for themselves. The United States ought not continue indefinitely in a situation where we are more worried about saving the South Vietnamese than they are about saving themselves. I have stressed this point many times before and I repeat it again.

Our further participation in war should be made conditional upon standards of performance and effective self-help achievements by the newly elected Vietnamese Government based on a timetable which may be secret, but should be real.

There is nothing which guarantees that we have to win in Vietnam just because we are the United States. There is nothing that guarantees that the people we are helping are the "good guys"—like every other people, they have to make it good by deeds. So long as our national thinking is clouded by folk myths, so long as we insist on maintaining that Vietnam is a simple case of external aggression against a freedom loving ally, so long as the Secretary of State really feels that the only question is whether the Communists "will leave their neighbors alone," so long as the President implies there is no alternative to the present policy—the United States will have to reconcile itself to a protracted war of attrition of uncertain outcome.

I do not believe that is our only course, and that is why I am seeking to chart a new one.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. At the conclusion of his speech, I wish to congratulate the Senator. I believe it is an excellent statement, and he has posed the central questions of the situation.

The question about the South Vietnamese doing for themselves what we cannot do for them is eminently true. One of the most distressing aspects of the recent development is that there is no sign that the South Vietnamese—the Army in particular—are doing as much as they did 2 years or 3 years ago. My distinct impression is that before we put in 500,000 men, the South Vietnamese Army was bearing the major part of the fight and was doing a reasonably good job, except that they were losing. That is why we went in, of course.

I believe that indicates a certain relationship between the South Vietnamese Government and the people. I cannot help believing that they do not have the all-out support of the people. South Vietnam is approximately the same size as North Vietnam. There may be a difference of 1 or 2 million people. The south is richer agriculturally. So why is it that this spirit does not exist among the South Vietnamese? Could it not be that the government does not have any allegiance of the people, the real support of the people, in South Vietnam? This is what disturbs me.

Mr. JAVITS. May I say to the Senator that no one more devoutly wished for free elections than I, and credit must be given to our administration for some success in bringing it about. I believe it had much to do with bringing about the elections. It was not satisfactory in many ways, but still it was done. I hope the South Vietnamese will now build on it.

I agree thoroughly with the Senator that these serious questions are in the minds of all of us. Messrs. Thieu and Ky can say to us, "Look, fellows, we just became legitimate. You've got to give us a chance."

That is why I said what I did—that there should be some concept of time limitation as well as commitment limitation in terms of aggregate resources. Otherwise, we are fighting the war in a way that no general will ever do. No general will ever go in unless he sees a way out. If he does otherwise, he should be cashiered. Yet, that is the situation we are told we are in.

Whether it is my idea, the idea of the Senator from Arkansas, any other Senator's idea, or the idea of any other person in this country, we must find a way to restore to ourselves the option which no general and no country could do without—a way to get out. Yet, that is the situation we are in in South Vietnam.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I believe the Senator is correct.

I would like to ask the Senator's views about the role of the United Nations. I agree with the Senator that in the past we have made some efforts at bringing about negotiations. There were always unfortunate coincidences of escalated bombing, often said to have been unpremeditated. It happened that way—that has been one of the explanations. For one reason or another, the other side has not responded. I believe they have been wrong. It would have been in the national interest of both North Vietnam and South Vietnam if they had accepted. I regret that they have been so stubborn. I do not excuse them at all. I do not wish to say that we have always been wrong.

However, we are dealing with a very serious situation, and we are paying the greatest price—except for the people of Vietnam, who are being slaughtered and are caught in this war. But no other countries, including China, Russia, or any others who are interested, are bearing the burden we are. They are not draining their resources, and so on. We are in a difficult situation.

I believe that the United Nations was created for the purpose of being an organization to which this type of controversey could be brought—it could support some kind of conference, whether in the U.N. or not. The distinguished majority leader has made several statements, with which I am in complete accord, in connection with this matter.

Mr. JAVITS. So am I.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I believe an all-out effort should be made to bring the Security Council into the picture and then, I would hope, the Geneva Conference could be reconvened. I say the Geneva Conference because of the background of the situation in which the Secretary of State and others say we have done our best but have been rejected. It is a stalemate; it will not work, apparently.

I can think of nothing to suggest that we do which would induce them, under these circumstances, after this long history, to now negotiate with us, except the type of surrender of which neither the Senator from New York nor I approve.

I come back to the U.N., and I cannot help believe that if this country used its efforts and its influence, it could not get nine votes out of the 15 on the Security Council to put this matter on the agenda for discussion. That action would play the same part, it seems to me, in the forum of the U.N. that we are trying to play in the forum of the Senate—that is, a discussion and clarification of what the issue is, what our purpose is.

Since all parties in this conflict have at one time or another said the principles of the Geneva accords are a proper basis for settlement, I believe this procedure could be followed.

Mr. JAVITS. I thoroughly agree with the Senator. I agree with what Senator MANSFIELD has said in his letter—a wonderful, feelingful letter—to which I referred. He does not say it in these words—he is the majority leader—I say it for myself. I do not wish to put words in his mouth. There seems to be a lack of aggressiveness on our part in respect of getting this matter on the agenda in the U.N.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Exactly.

Mr. JAVITS. I agree with the Senator that it is inconceivable that we cannot muster nine votes or raise hob about it in the U.N. constantly. Our representatives should become indignant about it. How is it that the U.N. would not deal with an open and flaring war because in the backroom they will not give us assurance that if we bring it up, we will not be successful?

I agree with the Senator—although he does not use such strong words—that we should be aggressive and do something about it and keep eternally at it, because that is a good place to fight it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. At the moment, in view of the background of this matter, the only thing I can think of—of course, I do not know what went on in the back corridors in the private discussions—but I see no reason why that procedure should not go on in public, so that we would all know about the effort and the discussion, and let the members of the Security Council take a position in public as to whether they want to have any part at all in the liquidation of this war. They all say—many of them do, at least—that they disapprove of the war. I believe more than 30 members of the U.N. have already publicly stated criticisms of the war and stressed the need for seeking some kind of solution. They did not specifically mention the solution we are suggesting.

However, it is my judgment, based on press accounts, that there is a great sentiment among the members of the U.N. to bring this war to a close. They recognize that it is dangerous, that there is a danger of escalation. I believe that is where the great pressure should be put at the moment.

Mr. JAVITS. If I may recapitulate for the Senator, with his permission, could we say that certainly three things have emerged from this discussion; and it is not just our discussion but it concerns all of us.

Let us assume that a bid through unconditional cessation of bombing is desirable, but the President is not going to do it and so unhappily we have to lay that aside. What is left? The United Nations is left. The distinguished majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] is right about that, in stating that we have to be more aggressive about it. Second is the clear calculation of what we must do in the Senate in terms of this resolution, in terms of its objectives and some new mandate to supersede the outmoded mandate. Third, that will lead to some consideration of the scale and time limit of our commitment—conditioned on self-help—in Vietnam.

If we did that, that represents a policy that would rally a great many of the people in this country who are falling away in droves every day because they have lost confidence in what the administration is doing about the war, that it does not have the ability to grip the problem and do something about it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the Senator has put his finger on an important part of it. It would do a great deal to the sentiment and feeling of this country if the people felt that an all-out effort had been made to use the United Nations. It would help take away this feeling of frustration and, what I detect as bitterness by some in the administration, toward all of us who wish to discuss the question.

Mr. JAVITS. That aspect is most unfortunate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think it would contribute to all Senators as well as to the country.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator for his contribution.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I want to say again, as I did when I unintentionally interrupted the distinguished Senator's speech, that I found what he had to say most interesting, and if my memory serves me correctly, he is emphasizing once again, in a somewhat different form what he has said previously on a number of occasions.

I note during the course of his speech, in referring to several of his colleagues, he states that his colleagues have "focused attention on the failures of the administration to pursue all opportunities to initiate negotiations and its incapacity to bring the struggle to a satisfactory conclusion."

I think it is only fair to say that, while we may disagree with the how of the negotiating process, there has been no bona fide opening available which the administration in its own way did not seek to unravel to see if there was a possibility of carrying on negotiations with Hanoi or, through some other power, with North Vietnam.

It is true that up to the present time the struggle to achieve negotiations has been unsuccessful and that at the present time there seems to be no prospect at all that negotiations will become possible shortly.

As far as the second of the two basic conclusions raised by the distinguished Senator is concerned, he said:

> Second, the way in which a settlement might be attained is by international diplomatic action.

He stated also, and again I quote:

> In my judgment, a realistic appraisal of the dynamics required for achieving a settlement by these means gives no cause for optimism at this time.

This is a true statement, I believe. I know of no other way by means of which this struggle can be brought to an end except through negotiations, because while a military victory may be achievable the cost in men and resources is inconceivable, as far as this country is concerned.

That brings me to the distinguished Senator's support of action through the United Nations, for which the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. FULBRIGHT] has worked for a long time. In turn, that brings me to a statement which I think should be made, which is this.

If there is any credit to be given for trying to open negotiations through the Security Council of the United Nations, I think it should be given to the President of the United States, who, on more than one occasion has taken the initiative and urged some of us to do our utmost to be of assistance. I recall, for example, on November 11, 1966, after giving a speech at Johns Hopkins, he called me on the telephone. He said he was most interested and approved of the suggestion I had made, although it was not original with me, and he asked me to meet with Ambassador Goldberg and to go with him to see U Thant. A week later I did go to the United Nations, and with Ambassador Goldberg did visit with U Thant.

At that time the Secretary General said he felt the Security Council was not the place in which to bring up the Vietnam question but that he thought he personally, because of the contacts he had and the leads he was quietly pursuing, might be able to do a little more. We did not push the proposal, therefore, at that time.

U Thant did visit Asia. He met with his contacts, and he came back and reported that his mission had not fared very well. Since that time he has endeavored on several occasions once again to seek contact or otherwise open negotiations but he has not been successful.

Now we are in the third or fourth week of the annual meeting of the General Assembly of the United Nations. Up to this time, 25 nations have arisen, either in the persons of their chiefs of state or their foreign ministers, to call for a halt to the bombing. In the middle of last week the number was 20 and as of now it is 25.

Mr. President, 25 countries have called on the United States to halt bombings. The list of those urging a bombing halt includes eight Communist countries, seven countries in Africa and Asia, three in Latin America, neutral Sweden and Finland, and five NATO allies, Belgium, Canada, France, Denmark, and Norway.

Well, if these nations can stand in the rostrum of the United Nations and say openly what they think we should do to bring an end to hostilities in Vietnam, I see no reason, and I am sure no Senator does either, why they should not urge the Security Council to take up the U.S. resolution which has been lying there since January 30, 1966, or why they do not introduce a resolution of their own. A resolution of this kind can be taken up; it is not subject to veto. It can be discussed; it is not subject to veto. If recommendations are made and it gets to that third stage, then a resolution would be subject to veto by any one of the permanent members. What have we got to lose in taking this matter of Vietnam, which seems to have no ending, to the United Nations?

What is the United Nations for except to try to keep, to maintain, to preserve the peace? Why is the United Nations dodging its responsibility in this matter which could go and does go far beyond Vietnam and Southeast Asia. I think it is about time that the organization, which has now reached maturity—it is 22 years old—faced up to the responsibility which it carries in the most powerful unit within the United Nations, and that is the Security Council.

I would call up this resolution on Vietnam if I had my way, if my own country alone would vote to do it, because it is not a matter of who is in a majority or in a minority. It is a matter of laying the most serious question in the world today before the world, before that body which is representative of every continent, both hemispheres, and most of the countries on the face of the globe.

I get a little tired, Mr. President, of the words "hawks" and "doves." I am glad that the Senator from New York made his feelings clear on that matter.

To me, a hawk is one who wants to go all the way, not just to the Chinese border, but beyond. I do not know of any Member of this body who could be classified as a hawk.

To me, a dove is one who wants to go in the opposite direction, drop everything and get out all the way. Again, I do not know of any Member of this body who could be classified on that basis.

Therefore, I would hope that we would get away from those words which take on an unclear meaning and which, in too many instances, carry a very unfair connotation.

Facts are what count. Possibilities are what is important.

So far as this country is concerned, our alternatives and our options are becoming fewer. The only place I can think of—although I would not exclude others, the Geneva Conference, the barrier below the DMZ, the Cooper proposal, neutralization of all of Southeast Asia—the only place I can think of at the present time to move is in the United Nations, where General Assembly has been in operation this year for 3 or 4 weeks and which has drawn to New York the chiefs of state, or at least the foreign ministers. Many of them have expressed opinions on Vietnam, all of whom except the Italian spokesman, to the best of my knowledge, have not advocated what should be done in the organization known as the United Nations.

The Italian at least had the courage to say to the General Assembly that the question of Vietnam should be brought before the Security Council. But, of all the 25 or 30 who spoke on Vietnam, Italy was the only country represented which came up with a suggestion which might have placed some responsibility on the United Nations and might—which possibly might—have come up with recommendations which would bring this disastrous, this brutal and dirty war to an honorable conclusion.

Mr. President, I must express my regrets to the Senator from New York. I have said too much, but so long as the information has become public, I ask unanimous consent that the letter which I wrote to all Senators early this week covering procedures in the United Nations in relation to the Security Council, and also a statement which I issued last Saturday be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. JAVITS. Would the Senator from Montana allow me the privilege of inserting that letter and statement in the RECORD?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Certainly.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask that the Senator's unanimous-consent request be withdrawn and that I have the privilege of asking unanimous consent to have that letter and statement printed in the RECORD under a separate heading from my speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, may I conclude by saying to the majority leader that I would not dream, in any way, of lessening his eloquence on this subject by engaging in debate with him as to other matters concerning the administration. I want his remarks to stand just as they are.

Mr. President, the Senator's statement is completely consistent with my thesis. We should do what he says. We should do what I suggest. We should do what the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] says. That is what the country must do.

I only hope that our ears have not become so deaf to the situation that our words will not be heard here.

Let me say to the Senator from Montana that he could not have spoken of the Italian delegate on a better day.

Today is Columbus Day.

I should be attending a parade in New York City celebrating the occasion.

I think it is very interesting and most fitting that the Senator should have made that reference to him today.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I got here in time to hear the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] conclude his remarks. I have read the letter to which he referred. He voices the hopes which I have entertained for some months now, but he does it in eloquent yet restrained fashion.

I hope very much that from now on we will put the heat on to insure that this one instrument at hand; namely, the United Nations, limited though it is, fragile though it has proved to be on occasions, will be used and that we will demand that it be used.

The United Nations is the one great forum which the peoples of the earth have created and is now available. As I see it, it is our only recourse. It is our responsibility as a people and a government that we seek to use it.

Thus, let us—if you will—call the roll and find out who does not want to use it.

I think we are under heavy obligation to our consciences to insure that what the Senator from Montana has just told us is pursued, insisted upon, and is voiced over and over again.

I am grateful that I came into the Chamber, even at the close of debate on this subject.

I hope, when I read the RECORD tomorrow, that I am in agreement with what was said on the floor.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is perfectly safe.

Mr. HART. I thank the Senator.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] in approbation of the speech and the efforts made by our very fine and revered majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

I might say that I think the whole country stands a little bit sounder on its foundations because we have a voice of moderation, a voice of reason, from the State of Montana in the person of our distinguished majority leader. My only regret is that, it seems to me, sometimes his voice is not heeded in those quarters where it ought to be.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I thank my colleagues for their most helpful and cooperative intercessions.

I thank the majority leader for his indulgence as to time.

I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

MAJORITY LEADER'S LETTER TO ALL MEMBERS OF THE SENATE ON UNITED NATIONS AND VIETNAM

U.S. SENATE,
OFFICE OF THE MAJORITY LEADER,
Washington, D.C., October 9, 1967.

Hon. JACOB JAVITS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JACK: In the past few months, some thirty Senators have expressed the view that the United Nations might play some role in finding peace in Viet Nam. I have been among the thirty. It has been and still is my hope that the Security Council might serve to spur negotiations (whether under its own aegis or in a reconvened Geneva Conference or some other appropriate forum) which might lead to an honorable settlement.

In my judgment, much might be gained and nothing is to be lost in a sustained attempt to get the U.N. Security Council to consider Viet Nam. At worst, an open defeat of specific moves in this direction can hardly be more opprobrious than rumors and allegations that the United States is preventing negotiations. Even if we cannot muster the votes or are stopped by a permanent member's veto, I believe we have a responsibility to pursue whatever means may be proper and open to us in the Security Council, if for no other reason than to make clear our willingness to lay our position on Viet Nam formally on the line.

The appropriateness of a U.S. initiative in the United Nations in connection with Viet Nam is underscored by Article I of the Charter. The fact is that U.N. members have bound themselves by Treaty commitment: ". . . To take effective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace . . . and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes. . . ."

Obviously, this responsibility falls with particular weight upon the Permanent Members, including the United States.

At one time, this nation did make a start towards raising the Vietnamese question in the Security Council. In a letter to the President of that body on January 31, 1966, on instructions from the President, Ambassador Goldberg requested the calling of an urgent meeting of the Council to consider the situation in Viet Nam. In a supplementary letter, he submitted a draft resolution on Viet Nam.

A meeting of the Security Council was called for the next day, and two items were listed on the Provisional Agenda for the meeting. The first was the adoption of the provisional agenda (which is invariably the first item to be considered at a Council meeting). The second was the letter from the United States representative.

The vote on the adoption of the provisional agenda was taken on February 2, 1966. The results were 9 in favor, 2 opposed, and 4 abstentions. Although one of the negative votes was that of the Soviet Union, the agenda, nevertheless, was formally adopted. That is because the adoption of the agenda is a procedural question on which decisions in the Council are made by a vote of any nine of the fifteen members. The Soviet negative vote, therefore, did not act as a veto.

However, instead of next calling up the draft resolution of the United States (that is, the second item of the agenda or the U.S. letter on the question of Viet Nam) the Council adjourned indefinitely for informal consultations. These consultations proved ineffective; some of the Council members even refused to participate in them. Since that time, the Security Council has not explored, in formal debate and under public scrutiny, the issues of Viet Nam.

Insofar as the Council is concerned, then, the status of the Vietnamese problem has long been that of one item in an extensive list of "Matters of which the Security Council is Seized" under the title, "Letter dated 31 January 1966 from the Permanent Representative of the United States of America addressed to the President of the Security Council." In analogy with Senate procedure, the item is on the Calendar, waiting to be called up.

The text of the proposed U.S. resolution which lies in this situation is as follows:

"*The Security Council,*

"*Deeply concerned* at the continuation of hostilities in Viet-Nam,

"*Mindful* of its responsibilities for the maintenance of international peace and security,

"*Noting* that the provisions of the Geneva Accords of 1954 and 1962 have not been implemented,

"*Desirous* of contributing to a peaceful and honourable settlement of the Conflict in Viet-Nam,

"*Recognizing* the right of all peoples, including those in Viet-Nam to self-determination,

"1. *Calls for* immediate discussions without pre-conditions at -------- on ---------- date, among the appropriate interested Governments to arrange a conference looking towards the application of the Geneva Accords of 1954 and 1962 and the establishment of a durable peace in South-East Asia;

"2. *Recommends* that the first order of business of such a conference be arrangements for a cessation of hostilities under effective supervision;

"3. *Offers* to assist in achieving the purposes of this resolution by all appropriate means, including the provision of arbitrators or mediators;

"4. *Calls on* all concerned to co-operate fully in the implementation of this resolution;

"5. *Requests* the Secretary-General to assist as appropriate in the implementation of this resolution."

It is this U.S. introduced resolution which was permitted to go dormant after having been motioned up almost two years ago and which we have since made no formal effort to revive. Initially, the principal reason for leaving it in limbo, as I understand it, was to avoid jeopardizing the efforts of the Secretary-General who, in his diplomatic capacity, was quietly trying to bring about negotiations through other channels. This effort and other secret approaches at the time were believed to hold more promise for peaceful settlement than formal consideration of the problem by the Council.

However, it is now almost two years later. In the interim, a range of alternative approaches to peaceful settlement has been pursued with great vigor but with singular lack of results. All the while the war in Viet Nam has intensified and the options for opening negotiations for peaceful settlement have grown fewer. In these circumstances, it seems to me that the United States has an obligation to itself and, under the Charter—commitments to the people of the world, to resume the formal effort (which we began almost two years ago and then dropped almost as soon as we began) to get the question of Viet Nam before the U.N. Security Council.

In my judgment, the United States resolution which was submitted in January 1966 is still valid as a vehicle for this purpose. However, an alternative draft resolution could be offered by the United States, or by another country, for the purpose of opening consideration of the problem of restoring peace in Viet Nam.

If we choose to resume the initiative, the United States representative has only to ask for a meeting on the resolution on Viet Nam of 1966 and the item would be taken from the list of matters of which the "Security Council is seized" and included on an appropriate provisional agenda. The question of the adoption of the provisional agenda would then arise at a meeting of the Security Council, and it would be determined without vote if no objection were raised. In the event of objection, adoption would require the vote of *any* nine members. In short, if there are any nine members of the Council willing to have the Security Council face up to Viet Nam, the Council can begin the attempt to open the door to peaceful solution.

Of late, there have been rumors and innuendoes to the effect that "we do not have the votes" and so, therefore, we have not moved on the matter. It seems to me, however, that if there are not nine members of the Council prepared, at this late date, to acknowledge in concert this most serious threat to the world's well-being, it is high time for this nation to clarify by a recorded vote—win or lose—who is willing and who is not willing to bring the U.N. into the effort to restore peace in Viet Nam.

If the Security Council elects to do so, moreover, it can invite parties to the Vietnamese conflict, even though they are not members of the United Nations, to participate in discussions of the question. Again, the precedents clearly indicate that an invitation of this kind involves a procedural decision and, hence, requires any nine votes for adoption. Indeed, there are several cases in which invitations to participate in Security Council proceedings have been extended to non-U.N. members notwithstanding a negative vote of a permanent member. The precedents include the extension of two invitations to Communist China in 1950 (one of which was opposed by both the United States and the Republic of China and the other by the Republic of China) during the Korean Conflict. Precedents include even an invitation to an individual to appear and to speak in the Security Council after his diplomatic credentials had been thrown into doubt. (Dr. Jan Papanek, the Permanent Representative of Czechoslovakia to the United Nations at the time of the coup was invited, despite the negative vote of the Soviet Union.)

In short, the Charter and procedural practices of the U.N. clearly make possible a formal initiative on Viet Nam in the Security Council. While there have been of late, apparently, corridor-explorations by the United States of the possibilities of resuming the approach of almost two years ago, as yet, no specific procedural steps have been taken.

Needless to say, an initiative along these lines by the United States appears to me to be most desirable. May I say that I would not expect consideration of Viet Nam by the Security Council to be a substitute for direct negotiations by the parties involved or for the Geneva Conference or, for that matter, the personal diplomacy of the U.N. Secretary-General and other third parties. Nor am I sanguine in the expectation that this approach will necessarily be more fruitful than the others which have already been tried without avail. We cannot know what the results will be until the attempt is made. In my judgment, it would have been a worthwhile effort even if consideration by the Security Council served only to clarify the various positions of those directly and indirectly involved in this conflict by bringing them together in face-to-face and open discussions.

In closing, let me emphasize that I write to you not to seek an endorsement of any particular approach to the problem of Viet Nam. Each of us has his own views even as we share, I know, a deep concern and a deep desire for the prompt restoration of peace. I write you only to elaborate, as of possible interest, certain procedural and other ramifications which would be deeply involved in the event of a resumption of a U.S. initiative on Viet Nam in the Security Council.

With best personal wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

Mike Mansfield.

P.S.—I am sending along a copy of a statement made on Sunday which also bears upon the matter

Regards,

MM.

Statement of Senator Mike Mansfield, Democrat of Montana, October 7, 1967

The current session of the General Assembly has brought an outpouring of foreign office statements which urge the United States to call a halt to the bombing of North Viet Nam. Led by the Soviet Union, twenty or more nations have publicly pressed this advice in recent weeks. There are probably additional nations which feel the same way even if they have not yet expressed themselves.

In my judgment, this nation should not make light of this international advice. In some cases, it comes from nations which we have had a long and intimate association and whose well-being is linked closely with our own. In any event, it is not necessarily either gratuitous or misdirected but arises, I am sure, from a deep and worldwide concern with the prolongation and expansion of the war in Viet Nam. This government has a responsibility, as do all governments, to pay a decent respect to the concerns as well as the opinions of other nations.

Well-intentioned or not, however, international advice is not likely to prove very helpful in this instance unless there is a willingness to couple it with a measure of international responsibility in seeking the termination of the Vietnamese conflict. That willingness, I regret to say, is still conspicuously lacking. A willingness to attempt a concrete contribution to a solution of the Vietnamese problem is not present among the Geneva Conferees and it is not present in the Security Council.

The Soviet Union, which is a member of both, has been in the forefront of the nations which insist that a discontinuance of the bombing is an essential in the restoration of peace in Viet Nam. Indeed, we are advised—almost assured—that the cessation will lead to negotiations with North Viet Nam. If the Soviet Union is convinced that this is the course to peace, it would seem to me to be appropriate for that nation to put its conviction into a formal resolution and present it for consideration to the Security Council. Until that is done, eloquent pleas and statements calling for an end of the bombing, particularly as they come from members of the Security Council can hardly be regarded a contribution to peace or even as a fulfillment of elementary responsibilities under the Charter.

I would hope, therefore, that the Soviet Union or any other member of the Security Council for that matter, which is persuaded that an end to the bombing is the way to peace, would frame its conviction as a draft resolution and present it to the Council. In that way, the regular procedures of the Charter will be engaged. In that way, perhaps a path to peace may yet be uncovered either inside the U.N. Security Council or through its initiatives, in some other forum.

NEW MILITARY EQUIPMENT IN NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the October 9 issue of the Spartanburg Herald, of Spartanburg, S.C., contains an excellent article on the new military equipment found in North Vietnam. Principal among these new machines of war is the Soviet M–16 helicopter.

The M–16 is one of the world's largest operational helicopters which is capable of ferrying 120 troops or a load of large antiaircraft missiles at speeds of 155 miles per hour. It is 108 feet long and it has established a record for lifting 44,350 pounds to a height of more than a mile.

The U.S. Air Force reported the destruction of two of these helicopters along with four smaller M–14 Soviet helicopters during raids last Saturday on a target 30 miles west of Hanoi. The article speculates that the appearance of the M–16 helicopter in North Vietnam is required because U.S. bombing raids have made land routes so hazardous. These large helicopters are used for priority movement of military cargoes and will be of great importance to North Vietnamese military operations.

The logistic problems of shipping these helicopters are such that they have to be moved by sea transportation. Consequently, it is evident that the only means for introducing them to the Vietnam theater is through the North Vietnamese port of Haiphong. This appearance of a Soviet M–16 helicopter is further documentation that the port of Haiphong is essential to the supply of military equipment from the Soviet Union. It also serves as additional rationale for the closure of that port, which our leading military authorities have recommended time after time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

SOVIET 'COPTERS SUPPLIED NORTH VIETS—FLAME-THROWERS ALSO FURNISHED

SAIGON.—The Soviet Union is supplying to North Vietnam the world's largest operational helicopters, capable of ferrying 120 troops or telephonepole size antiaircraft missiles at cruising speeds of 155 miles an hour, the U.S. Air Force reported Sunday.

It made the disclosure in giving an account of the destruction of two of them along with four other but smaller Soviet-built helicopters by U.S. fighter-bombers Saturday about 30 miles west of Hanoi, the North Vietnamese capital. The raids in the North's heartland cost the United States the loss of three planes. Four U.S. airmen are listed as missing.

At the same time, the U.S. Command said a new Soviet-made flame thrower had been found with the body of a dead North Vietnamese trooper after an action in the northern zone of South Vietnam in which 15 Communists were killed. The command said Laotian money found in the pockets of the dead soldiers indicated they had infiltrated recently into the south by way of the old Ho Chi Minh trail which goes around the western end of the demilitarized zone from North Vietnam and winds through a Communist-held section of eastern Laos and Combodia.

Weapons such as flame throwers are rarely found among the enemy dead.

The Soviet Union and North Vietnamese signed a new aid agreement recently in which Kremlin leaders agreed to supply Hanoi's military forces with modern offensive and defensive weapons.

Apparently the giant Soviet helicopters were newly introduced into the North Vietnamese ranks. The Air Force identified them as the M16 and M14 known by Western military forces respectively as the Hook and the Hound.

The MI6 is the bigger of the two. It is 108 feet long. Aviation records show one Hook has lifted 44,350 pounds to a height of more than a mile. In the Soviet Union Hooks have been used to carry oil rigs to Siberia.

The Hooks are powered by twin-turbine engines which turn contrarotating rotors.

The MI4 Hounds are much smaller and carry about 14 troops.

The two biggest U.S. helicopters used in South Vietnam are the Boeing-Vertol Ch47 Chinook and the Sikorsky Ch53.

The twin-engined Chinook, which has two three-blade rotors, has a maximum speed of about 178 miles per hour. It can carry up to 44 troops plus crew and a maximum payload of 20,830 pounds. The Chinook also has an external cargo boom of 16,000 pounds capacity. Its fuselage is 51 feet long.

The Ch53, also a twin-engined model but with only one main rotor, has a maximum speed level of 195 miles per hour. It can carry 38 combat-equipped troops plus its crew of three. The Ch53 has a normal payload of about 8,000 pounds. Its fuselage length is 67 feet.

U.S. Air Force officers declined to speculate on the appearance of the MI6 Hooks in North Vietnam. But one possible explanation was that U.S. bombing raids have made the use of land routes so hazardous that the big choppers are needed for the priority movement of military cargoes such as the surface-to-air missiles (SAMs) that the Soviet Union has supplied the North Vietnamese. The Russians first announced the Hook in the fall of 1957. Since then it has produced more up-to-date versions. The MI4 Hound is standard equipment in the Soviet armed forces as well as in its airline, Aeroflot. Production is said to have started in 1952.

With ground action generally light and scattered, despite some stiff isolated battles, the emphasis in the war remained in the North where 126 missions were flown as American pilots piled in strikes before the expected monsoon change in the weather later this month. The downing of three U.S. planes, plus two previously undisclosed losses, brought to 694 the number of American aircraft lost in combat over North Vietnam.

The destruction of six Soviet-built choppers—the first such claim in the war—occurred when Air Force Thunderchief pilots swept down on a camouflaged area previously spotted in aerial photos. Leading the flight was a former X15 test pilot, Col. Robert M. White, of Fairborn, Ohio.

The Thunderchiefs dived in on the target despite the harassment of two MIG17s. Pilots reported that six of the helicopters seemed to "collapse" and burn after strafing and bombing passes.

It was the first indication that the Soviet Union was sending helicopters to assume a major role in North Vietnam. American pilots previously had spotted choppers—mainly on the off-limits Hanoi airfield at Gia Lam—but they were smaller craft evidently used for liaison purposes. Until Saturday none of the North Vietnamese choppers ever had been claimed as destroyed.

In addition to the brief brush with the MIGs during the raid on the helicopter park, other Air Force pilots in supersonic Phantom jets clashed with at least five MIGs above the airfield at Hoa Lac. While Thunderchief jets hit the airfield, the Phantoms and MIGs swerved in a dogfight during which at least one of the Soviet-built fighters was damaged by an air-to-air missile.

In generally clear weather, Air Force, Navy and Marine pilots raked supply targets up and down North Vietnam. The gradual intensification of the air campaign was indicated by the raid on the fuel dump at Cu Van, 43 miles above Hanoi and previously on the Pentagon's list of restricted targets. Cu Van is the latest of three such targets released within a week by the Pentagon, and it proved lucrative—a smoke column rose a mile into the air after the raid.

The planes lost during the day were an Air Force F105 Thunderchief, an Air Force F4 Phantom and a Navy A4 Skyhawk. The Hanoi government has claimed downing nine aircraft during Saturday's strikes.

Another major target was the much-battered northeast rail line which brings most land-borne supplies from Red China to Hanoi. There was no mention in American communiques, however, of strikes near Red China or in the immediate vicinity of Hanoi or its port of Haiphong.

Although ground action was generally light, there was evidence the Communists were intent on maintaining the ground pressure in the northernmost provinces which make up the 1st Corps sector adjoining the DMZ dividing Vietnam.

Reporting on a battle in this area Friday, a spokesman disclosed discovery of the new Soviet flame thrower and the Laotian currency.

Along the demilitarized zone, Red gunners maintained only harassing artillery fire. However, American Marine gunners plus tactical jets and high-altitude bombers continued to pour concentrated fire on suspected Red positions. The B52s hit three times in the area Sunday, unloading some 450,000 pounds of bombs.

North Vietnam claimed U.S. attacks against its territory will serve only to harden further Communist determination to defeat the United States.

AMERICAN LEGION RESOLUTION ON CUBA

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, for the past few days I have been calling the attention of the Senate to a few highlights of the resolutions passed by the American Legion's 49th Annual National Convention. The whole body of resolutions passed by the American Legion deserve study, because anyone who reads them can see that they were not drawn hastily nor without knowledge. However, I would like to point out to the Senate one more time one particular resolution, Resolution 526. This resolution concerns the sorry American performance with regard to Communist Cuba.

The American Legion resolution sets forth a detailed program which would have a significant impact upon that country if it were adopted as U.S. foreign policy. It is true that some of the ten points which are mentioned in the resolution are supposed to be official policy now; but it is equally true that the policy has too often been a hollow shell without real substance.

Mr. President, I recommend this resolution to the attention of all my colleagues, particularly point No. 9, which is, and I quote:

> Insist upon the removal from Cuba of all Russian troops and/or "technicians", as well as all offensive type weapons supplied by the Soviet Union or its satellites.

I ask unanimous consent that Resolution 526 be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 526, 49TH ANNUAL NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, BOSTON, MASS., AUGUST 29, 30, 31, 1967

Committee: Foreign Relations.

Subject: Cuba.

Whereas, The American Legion in its national conventions from 1960 through 1966 called upon the Government of the United States to face up to the threat which a communist government in Cuba represents to all free nations of the Western Hemisphere; and

Whereas, with assistance from both the Soviet Bloc and Red China, Castro's regime continues to provide a communist beachhead for the training and supplying of guerrillas to carry on campaigns of infiltration, terror and subversion throughout Latin America; and

Whereas, efforts taken thus far by the United States have failed—

(a) to contain Castro's attempts to export his revolution,

(b) to cause our Canadian and European friends to stop selling strategic materials to Cuba,

(c) to unify the attitude and actions of all members of the OAS toward Cuba, and

(d) to secure the release from Cuba of numeorus U.S. nationals there who have been denied exit permits or reasonable means of travel; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by The American Legion in National Convention assembled in Boston, Massachusetts, August 29, 30, 31, 1967, That The American Legion reaffirms its positions taken heretofore in regard to a communist government in Cuba; and be it

Further Resolved, That The American Legion calls upon the United States to dedicate itself to the elimination of the communist government of Cuba and to reinforce or initiate such policies as will tend to produce this result in the shortest possible time, to include the following:

(1) Continue to withhold diplomatic relations and to prohibit trade between the U.S. and Cuba;

(2) Deny use of all U.S. ports to any foreign flag ship trading with Cuba and to all the ships of any shipping line trading with Cuba;

(3) Discontinue all U.S. aid programs to any country whose ships trade with Cuba;

(4) Continue to seek total and active cooperation of all Latin-American countries in opposition to the continued existence of a communist-dominated government in Cuba;

(5) Encourage the establishment of and grant recognition and support to a democratically-oriented Cuban government-in-exile;

(6) Furnish arms and training to legitimately organized groups of freedom-loving Cuban exiles, both in this country and wherever possible, so that they will be ready and available—

(a) to assist other Latin-American governments in repelling or destroying Castro-trained or inspired guerrillas, or

(b) to take part in any possible future attempt to overthrow Castro or his communist successors by armed invasion;

(7) Continue to insist upon fair compensation from Castro's government for all American property seized by it in Cuba, and attach and hold all Cuban assets which are or become available for this purpose;

(8) Continue to seek the release from Cuba of all American nationals and their families who wish to leave Cuba;

(9) Insist upon the removal from Cuba of all Russian troops and/or "technicians" as well as all offensive-type weapons supplied by the Soviet Union or its satellites; and

(10) Pursue a vigorous and increasingly stronger policy of economic and political boycott against Castro in order to weaken and wither both his hold over the people of Cuba and his image as leader of the Latin-American communist movement; and be it

Further Resolved, That should these policies and programs fail to bring down the Castro government within a reasonable time, The American Legion urges the Government of the United States, preferably in concert with all members of the OAS but alone if necessary, to undertake more direct action and to use as much power as is necessary, including armed force if need be, to free Cuba of a communist-dominated government, and to free this hemisphere of a foreign-implanted and foreign-sustaining malignancy.

SERIES OF ARTICLES ON "THE BLACK REVOLUTIONARIES"

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, recently the Washington Post ran a most revealing series of articles on "The Black Revolutionaries."

This is a subject that deserves attention. That the American people may have the opportunity to see these artciles in their entirety, I ask unanimous consent that the series be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the series of seven articles on "The Black Revolutionaries" was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 24, 1967]

THE BLACK REVOLUTIONARIES—I: BLACK NATIONALISTS PREDICT RACE WAR

(NOTE.—The fires that ravaged America's ghettos this summer threw cruel light on a new breed of Negro leader—the black nationalist. What kind of men are these? How wide is their following? To what destination are they pointing the Negro? This is the first of seven articles on "The Black Revolutionaries.")

(By Robert C. Maynard)

An angry and violent mood is nearing the explosion point in the black communities of America's largest cities, with the rapidly growing black nationalist movement as a powerful catalyst.

This is the result of a strong conviction among Negroes that white Americans are bent on destroying black Americans. It could erupt into racial war, going beyond the recent summers of discontent.

Black nationalist spokesmen do not claim that they represent a majority of the Nation's 25 million black people. But they believe there is a widespread feeling among Negroes that the whites are moving ever more toward repression while black people move toward greater pride and group identity.

At some point in time, one black nationalist said, the repression and the pride will meet head-on. Then, he said, "either racism goes or America falls, destroys itself."

As for the actual numbers of revolutionary blacks, differentiated from less volatile black nationalists, one San Francisco revolutionary said: "Those who know don't say; those who say don't know."

The black nationalist message is clear in this statement by the Rev. Albert C. Cleage, Jr., preacher of a doctrine of a Black Christ from the pulpit of one of America's most militant churches, located on Detroit's West Side:

"The black people of America are in a life and death intelligence test with the white man. The question is: Will the white man transfer power or attempt Hitler's final solution? Any attempt to apply Hitler's solution will completely destroy America."

In Los Angeles, a black nationalist said he believed the United States was on the verge of a "racial war" that would divide and ultimately destroy the Nation as we now know it.

Such attitudes were not uncommon in black communities surveyed by The Washington Post in five major cities—Los Angeles, San Francisco, Detroit, Chicago and New York.

Negro anger appears to stem from a progression of circumstances: conditions in the Negro ghettos coupled with the belief that the possibility of a racial war by whites against Negroes looms over the country; a mounting impatience with life in the ghetto, and a new and stronger will to violence, encouraged by the revolutionary element of the black nationalist movement.

A GHETTO IS A GHETTO IS A GHETTO

Cities have distinctive qualities. Ghettos do not. Stand on a grimy street corner in Harlem and look, listen, smell. It closes in and the mind can play tricks: Is it 41st Street in Chicago, 12th Street in Detroit, Central Avenue in Watts or Fillmore Avenue in San Francisco?

The kids on the streets, particularly the little ones, have a tragic similarity in dress and appearance. The older people sitting on the filthy stoops in the evening can make a stranger forget he isn't in yesterday's town. Time and space become irrelevant in ghettos.

It is this sameness that bodes America ill, this mass of trapped humanity, fixed and frozen in yesterday's dream within a Nation already in tomorrow. Immune to wars on poverty, civil rights laws and liberal rhetoric, this other, yesterday country threatens to explode now. A brick through a window, a man on the roof with a gun, fire—all are signs of hope for the ghetto because the rest has failed.

Hope is what brought the black masses to the cities: Hope of life without the Southern rural oppression, hope of jobs and hope of decent housing.

Somebody else's dream was fulfilled, but not the black collective dream. That was shattered by the cruelty of the ghetto; the dilapidated housing; the overcrowded, nonteaching schools; the low-paying jobs, when jobs existed at all; the idleness in the midst of affluence and a rate of ghetto unemployment of more than 30 per cent.

It came upon this Nation slowly, this will to violence by black people. Always the violence had been internal, with blacks visiting their anger and frustration on each other.

But the dream deferred too long has revealed the fury at last. The streets are hostile now, the tension is almost electric, the hatred of "the man" is out in the open.

"Look here, brother, you go back and tell that white man we got nothing to say to him. When we do have something to say—when we get it together, see—we'll let him know. We'll contact him on the Detroit-Newark Bell System . . . He always answers on that line."

He was a black nationalist in Chicago, but he could have been in any of the five cities visited recently by this reporter.

That black nationalist and hundreds like him across this Nation are preaching to the black communities in ever harsher tones. Black America has not yet become a revolutionary cauldron, but the voices of the revolutionaries among the nationalists are becoming dominant. They are listened to when others are ignored or scorned.

An Urban League street worker in Chicago explained to me that the gang youth with whom she works "don't want anything to do with white people. They don't want them around."

This hatred and anger were below the surface until recently. The political activists, the demonstrators, were marching for integration. Today, they stand at the edge of the precipice, flirting with the thought of burning this Nation's cities to cinders.

Two reasons for this change seem overwhelmingly apparent:

First, the disillusionment is complete; the dream of better things in the North has become a cruel hoax viewed from a tenement window. After trekking from Alabama to Detroit, there is no place else to go. So the anger turns against the city and those who run it—the politicians, the police, the storekeepers, the school officials. They are considered parties to the conspiracy.

Second, the belief that the white man is readying "Hitler's solution"—concentration camps and ovens—for the blacks is heard everywhere. The word genocide is used regularly now.

"If America plays Nazi, we ain't goin' play Jews." This is what H. Rap Brown says and many in the ghetto believe they may soon be fighting for their very lives. Detroit contributed to that feeling. The police reaction convinced many black people that whites have a will to murder them.

This remark, by a nationalist leader in Los Angeles, is typical of the many made on the question of possible genocide against black Americans:

"How long do you think this (white) man is going to allow black folks to burn up his cities? Isn't property more important to him than people? I can see it coming: Ovens for black people."

Down the street, at 41st Street and Central Avenue in Watts, a potential follower of that black nationalist was already resigned to an early death. At the age of 17, he was convinced the game was already over, the battle fought and lost. He was in the white man's hell and he saw no way out.

Out of school and out of work, he was asked why he did not join a training program or find some other route off the corner.

"Ain't no use," he said, dragging on a cigarette. He looked at me and continued: "Man gonna get me, kill me off, no matter what I do. Here in the street one night, maybe. Maybe on the Freeway, he stop me: BAM. Or maybe over there, ya know, Vietnam. That's the cool way. Me and the Vietcong out there. Bang. Bang. Me dead. Or the Vietcong dead. Either way, the white man won."

When the black revolutionaries speak of "getting it together," they mean, among other things, getting that young man to hope that in violent struggle against this society he may be free at last to pursue life without fear of death from the white man.

The black nationalists seem to be getting through to ghetto youth, where all other organizations and programs fail.

"YOU ARE BEAUTIFUL"

What the black nationalists are offering ghetto youth is more than a chance to participate in organized violence. They are telling him all over the country that because he is black, "you are beautiful." They are telling him the white man has been proved a liar and a cheat.

In Watts, a black nationalist explained that "there are at least two kinds of nationalists on the street today. One is 'do-rag brother' and the other is the oratorical nationalist.

"The only thing keeping the whole business from blowing wide open, right now," he said, "is the oratorical nationalists. They are out there trying to keep it cool. They blow against "Whitey" and how bad he is, but this is how they gain the respect of 'do-rag' brother. Those nationalists that everybody is condemning are saying to 'do-rag' all of the time, 'Keep cool, brother, keep it cool.' They are the best friends America has."

The expression "do-rag" is a description of the unemployed high school dropout who sometimes wears his hair straightened or "processed." The cloth that keeps the process in place when he sleeps is called a "do-rag."

Rap Brown often expresses his belief that the most useful development in the black community is the acceptance of violence for political ends. But for many of the youths on the corners, Rap Brown and the nationalists are not yet real. The youths are much too cynical to believe that the nationalists mean them any more good than other politicians.

"It's all a hustle," a youth in Detroit said when asked about the nationalists.

The nationalists count on the future as an ally in the struggle for minds in the black communities.

In the future they see the black returnees from the war in Vietnam as technical assistants in the struggle in the cities. "They have skills we need," Rap Brown says.

A black returnee interviewed in New York is training teen-agers in what he calls "self-defense." He would say little about what he is doing or why he is doing it.

But he did say: "I went over there to fight 'Charlie Cong' and one day in a bar in Saigon, a cracker from Texas called me 'nigger' for coming in the place. Soon after that it dawned on me that I was fighting the wrong 'Charlie.' My enemy is not 'Charlie Con.' It's 'Mister Charlie.' "

The future to which the black revolutionaries look also contains yesterday as evidence of what an unchanged tomorrow could be like for the black urban masses.

Perhaps the single weapon on which these revolutionaries rely most heavily is the history of relations between the races in America.

It is not just slavery to which they point, not just the lynchings that multiplied in the years after the collapse of Reconstruction, not just the years of deprivation in the cities and abuse in the rural South.

They point with anger at the years when "the law of the land" was supposedly on the side of the black man. In damning white Americans for their failure to deal equitably with black people, the nationalists cite the black condition since 1954.

The concerted drive for black equality in the United States began with a victory. The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, long a fighter for equality through law, won a landmark case on May 17, 1954. The United States Supreme Court, in unanimous decision, ruled that racially separate education was unconstitutional and inherently unequal.

The drive for integration gained momentum that day.

But today the nationalists tell their potential constituency that more black children are in segregated schools now than in 1954 (partly because there are more black children), black unemployment is as high in the big cities as at any time since the end of World War II, and the condition of black people in general has not improved measurably.

For most of the post-1954 years of the civil rights movement, the focus was on the rural South and the smaller Southern cities.

In May, 1963, the battle in the cities began. Birmingham, Ala., was the scene. Black youths and Police Commissioner Bull Conner's men met in what nearly became open combat. The youths faced fire hoses and police dogs with their fists and rocks.

A year later, Harlem, sometimes called the capital of Black America, "did the thing." A riot, with shooting and looting, broke out. Within hours the black-initiated violence had spread across the river to Brooklyn; five days later, the ghetto of Rochester, N.Y., was in flames. One month later, it was Philadelphia.

A new form of black political protest was inaugurated that summer. In August, 1965, a six-day "rebellion," as the nationalists call it, erupted in the Watts section of Los Angeles.

The frustrated black masses, having exhausted the picket line and the sitin, had found the national Achilles' heel—the cities.

What looms on the horizon is more carefully planned insurrection, sustained and skilled internal warfare. The objective is vague. The revolutionaries speak of "escalating the price of racism," of making it prohibitively expensive to whites for Negroes to remain a dissatisfied, unfulfilled group within the society.

I asked the revolutionaries if they did not believe their numbers too small to achieve a military success.

Their reply amounted to this: Second-class status within the American system has taken a frightening toll on most of the 25 million black people in this country. The rates of drug addiction, alcoholism and other forms of social pathology are indices of this toll. The incidence of starvation in the rural South is evidence, say the nationalists, of an attempt to blot out the Negro.

With violence they hope to force American society to transform itself, to find the means of eliminating racism and poverty. They have no military might, save for the ability to wreak havoc. They say often they would rather "die like men" than live as they are.

A Black Nationalist in Detroit spoke about the "dangerous contrast" that he believes contributed to the violence there.

"It's the very fact that some Negroes in Detroit live very well, while most live so poorly," he said. "That's the dangerous contrast that the people on 12th Street could see." Twelfth Street was the scene of much of the rioting. "Look, this is 12th Street, look at the condition of these people." The automobile was passing burned-out stores, ramshackle buildings and street corners where drunks and some derelicts were hanging out.

Then, with a vicious turn of the wheel, the nationalist drove off 12th Street one full block.

Palatial. That is the word that came immediately to mind. The name of the street is Boston Boulevard, and it was a two-minute drive, or a five-minute stroll, from the midst of Detroit's "riot zone." But there is no rioting on Boston Boulevard, or on Chicago Boulevard, which is one street over. On these streets, the houses are one-family, brick and stone dwellings of Colonial and Tudor design.

"Right here," said the nationalist, "right next to all of that poverty, homes like this. And the kicker is that this is not just white affluence. That might not be so bad. White and black live here. A brother from 12th Street only has to walk a block and he can see black folks—the same color as he is—doing very well. Doing fine."

He placed the onus on the black middle class to find a way to show they are concerned with the plight of their brothers on 12th Street.

A nationalist in Watts said:

"These so-called middle-class Negroes think they're going to escape. There ain't gonna be no escape when that man is ready with his ovens. You black, you burn. That's all."

Among the youth of the black middle class there appears to be a growing commitment to the nationalist movement. A Columbia University graduate, talking about the value of his college education, said:

"I am not here to prepare for a 32d vice niggership at General Motors." He indicated he felt a commitment to the black struggle instead of to himself alone.

THE POWER OF MALCOLM X

His generation, perhaps more than any other age group, was fired by the speeches and the political stand of one man, Malcolm X, who, even in death, abides with the black nationalist movement.

He surely has more followers now than while he lived. His cutting statements about the white man are quoted everywhere.

"Our shining black prince" are the words Ossie Davis, playwright and actor, used to describe Malcolm at the time of his funeral in February, 1965. On the streets, it is not his "princeliness" so much as it is his manhood that is honored and emulated.

At a time when civil rights leaders were urging nonviolence and "the redemptive power of suffering," Malcolm X was telling the black masses that they should be preparing to defend themselves if attacked.

A young man who works with street youth in San Francisco said Malcolm is admired among black youth "because he was the first to tell back people to be men, and not pets begging at 'massa's table.'"

Many of the nationalists of today regard Malcolm X as their spiritual father and ideological progenitor. He articulated a dedication to blackness as a cause and the unity of black people as a goal.

A Los Angeles nationalist said he did not believe Malcolm X would have advocated violent action "until the people were ready, really ready."

He added: "There ain't no way you can have a revolution of blacks without bringing in the middle class, and they just ain't ready yet."

It is this kind of unity that the nationalists are working for today.

If this goal is ever achieved, "we will then be able to decide," says Ron Karenga of Watts, a nationalist, "whether we want integration, separation or violent revolution."

MODERATES STILL DOMINATE HERE

The center of the Negro political stage of Washington is still held by the racial moderates in the Negro community despite a trend toward black nationalism that is growing faster elsewhere in the Nation.

"The reason why Washington's nationalism is still among the Howard students and not on the streets," one nationalist said, "is that Washington hasn't had a riot—yet."

The Washington Post survey of five major cities—Los Angeles, San Francisco, Detroit, Chicago and New York—confirmed the view that nationalism rises in a city after it has had a major racial outbreak.

At Howard University, the story is somewhat different from the story on the streets. There, the university administration and a coalition of students and faculty members functioning under a "black power" banner are in a struggle over the question of what kind of school Howard should be.

Future "black power" eruptions in Washington seem likely to come from the Howard student body, which, although much of it is middle class, has made a strong identification with the plight of lower-class Negroes.

"Washington has all of the problems that every other ghetto has, and a few that other ghettos don't have," said one nationalist observer who said he did not understand why there was not much more black nationalist activity in the city. The "extra" problems to which the observer, a visitor from Watts, said he was referring were the lack of an elected government in the District and a black majority in the population, much of which is poor and living in substandard housing.

Negroes did turn out in large numbers earlier this summer when H. Rap Brown, the angry SNCC leader, spoke here, but Washington is not one of the cities in which SNCC claims a strong following at this point.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 25, 1967]

THE BLACK REVOLUTIONARIES—II: INTEGRATION: A NEARLY FORGOTTEN GOAL

(By Robert C. Maynard)

It is more than 13 years since the Supreme Court ruled that separate classrooms for whites and Negroes are unconstitutional. That decision, Brown vs. Board of Education, fueled the movement against segregation in American society.

Now the clamor for integration has quieted in the black communities. The black nationalists have taken the political stage with their doctrine of racial separatism.

Central United Church of Christ in Detroit, the only known black nationalist Christian church in the Nation worships a black Messiah. Two Sundays after the Detroit riot, this is what the pastor, Rev. Albert C. Cleage Jr. told the congregation about the golden door of integration:

"There is no escape for you, and when white people try to tell that good niggers can get through this golden door of integration, don't believe it. We don't even want that door, because that's destroying us."

The church is in the heart of the area where Detroit's violence erupted last July. The membership has been gaining steadily.

Such harsh rhetoric, barely heard a half generation ago, has become a new political language on the streets of black America.

Louis H. Michaux, owner of National Memorial African Book Store and a black nationalist in New York for more than 30 years, believes black nationalism is stronger than ever in Harlem.

Visits to five cities—Los Angeles, San Francisco, Detroit, Chicago and New York—tended to confirm this belief.

A group of black nationalists were joking in Harlem one evening. One of them quipped to a reporter:

"If I had integration and an Edsel and I wanted to sell one of them, it would be easier to sell the Edsel."

Floyd B. McKissick, national director of the Congress of Racial Equality, has turned his back on integration as a goal for Negroes.

". . . we are told that Negroes must be integrated into middle class white schools," McKissick says. "In other words they're saying mix Negroes with Negroes and you get stupidity."

McKissick has an alternative in mind.

"Maybe a school committed to respect the individual, a school enjoying the confidence and support of the community, a school recognized to reflect its faith in the pupil and the parent can achieve excellence—even if that community is poor and black."

Between the Supreme Court in 1954 and McKissick in 1967, a great gulf has grown in this Nation between blacks and whites.

The Rev. Cleage, during a Detroit interview, used one apocalyptic example to illustrate the dramatic shift in purpose from integration to black nationalism.

It happened on a Sunday in Selma, Alabama, and Mr. Cleage wasn't there, but he remembers it well. The Negroes there were planning a march from Selma to Montgomery along Highway 80.

National television recorded the scene as then-Gov. George C. Wallace's highway patrolmen and the deputies waded into the marchers and beat some unconscious. That night, after the 11 o'clock news. Mr. Cleage suggests, many a black American felt he lived in an enemy land.

That incident does not stand alone. There was the murder of three civil rights workers, two white and one Negro, in Philadelphia, Miss., in June, 1964. There was the murder of four little girls the previous September in the dynamiting of Sixteenth Street Baptist Church in Birmingham, Ala. And there were still other incidents that were emblazoned by the television tube on the national consciousness.

Such episodes, Mr. Cleage believes, undermined the non-violent civil rights movement and "unmasked the white man to the black people who had not yet grasped the fact: We are dealing with an enemy who is not going to accept us into American life."

"Dr. King led black people to understand that integration could never come to pass. He helped black men to understand that 'the man' is an enemy. When Dr. King said, 'My dream has turned into a nightmare,' he was speaking for all of us."

THE LAST PICNIC

McKissick now calls the 1963 March on Washington "the last picnic" of the integration movement.

Dr. King's dream, was that one day the sons of slaves and the sons of slavemasters would walk hand in hand in Georgia in peace and freedom.

The day when black men would dare to dream such dreams in public, Mr. Cleage said, is gone. To him, there is a different—and more realistic—vision: A black nation controlling its own destiny.

Where such a nation should be depends on what black nationalist is speaking. For James Boggs of Detroit, once a Marxist and now a nationalist, the city has become the black man's land.

Boggs is one of the leading theoreticians of the black nationalist movement in Detroit, which has in recent years become a leading center of black nationalist thinking in America.

Boggs set forth his theory on black control of the cities in an article published in April of 1966 in Monthly Review, a socialist magazine. In an interview recently, Boggs said he stands by what he wrote then:

"America has already become the dangerous society. The Nation's major cities are becoming police states. There are only two roads open to it. Either wholesale extermination of the black population through mass massacre of forced migrations on to reservations as with the Indians . . . Or self-government of the major cities by the black majority, mobilized behind leaders and organizations of its own creation and prepared to reorganize the structure of city government and city life from top to bottom. . . .

"But the war is not only in America's cities; it is for these cities. It is a civil war between black power and white power, the first major battle of which was fought . . . between 18,000 soldiers and the black people of Watts."

The city is not the black man's land to Milton and Richard Henry, also of Detroit. The two brothers are advocates of separate states for blacks. Milton is a lawyer and Richard is a technical writer for the government.

They want states, five of them, where all black people can relocate and live as a nation separate from whites. They list such Southern states as Florida, Louisiana and Georgia.

Milton Henry postulates that black people were brought to America as slaves against their will. When the Emancipation Proclamation was signed in 1863 by President Lincoln, Milton Henry says, "black people were not asked whether they wanted to be a part of this thing or not."

The Henry brothers are not alone in the separate state doctrine. The Nation of Islam, commonly called the Black Muslims, has had as its goal for years the separation of blacks from whites.

Boggs and the Rev. Cleage are fighting for black people to control those areas where they now are, rather than a new and separate area.

"The white community must understand," Mr. Cleage said, "that they have to assist in the transfer of power, power for the black community to govern itself and control its own finances."

INFERIORITY COMPLEX

The nationalists say any assumption that Negroes benefit from closeness to whites undermines black pride and that it inculcates blacks with an inherent inferiority complex. Leaders of the movement also argue that whites have treated black people in a cruel manner that should not be forgiven and surely not forgotten.

A black corporation executive—not a nationalist activist—made the point to a visiting reporter.

He is a top man in one of the nation's largest firms. He had just returned from Europe with a handsome collection of paintings, which he invited the reporter to examine.

Beside the collection in the executive's luxurious Riverside Drive apartment, there was a tiny photograph tacked on the wall.

It showed the back of a black man who had been savagely lashed. Behind the photograph was a written explanation that the man had committed a minor infraction on a Louisiana plantation in the middle 1800s and was lashed across his back 49 times with a cat-o'-nine tails.

The Negro executive explained:

"I look at that every morning before I leave for downtown. It reminds me of who I work for. I never want to allow myself to be lulled into forgetting who 'the man' really is."

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 26, 1967]

THE BLACK REVOLUTIONARIES—III: POLICE—SYMBOL OF OPPRESSION

(By Robert C. Maynard)

Always it is the police. They are the symbol of oppression in black America.

"They recruit for the nationalist," . . . said a street worker in Chicago.

"All it takes to be a cop in this town is a 10th-grade education," said a nationalist in Detroit. "So, during the riot, you had black dropouts out there battling white dropouts."

The Chicago street worker expanded on what he meant by police "recruiting" for the black nationalists.

"It's the way the cops behave that convinces these kids that the white man is the devil; they see what the cops are: crooks on the take who'll kill a black man for running a red light."

It goes deeper than that. Wherever black men believe that white America is determined to kill off the black population, those black men also believe the police are the vanguard of the extermination movement.

In a survey of five cities. The Washington Post found a conviction spreading in black communities that a hard line against Negroes is being drawn in America, and the police man the ramparts to do the initial dirty work.

A white minister in Detroit described the arrest procedure of black people doing the rioting there as "barbaric." He recounted the experience of a pregnant woman arrested on a looting charge.

She was told to "jump" from the police van, as other prisoners were told to do. She protested and was forced to jump from the van. She later was placed in a cell where she miscarried. The minister claims her screams for aid brought no response from the police in the stationhouse. He went outside and vomited.

A middle-class Detroit woman who witnessed some of the police behavior at the height of the violence said:

"It became obvious to me for the first time in my life that the business of the police in a black community is genocide. They seem to feel a need to kill black people. Their hatred was unbelievable."

A boy of 15 on the West Side of Chicago was asked one morning by a reporter what in this city he feared and disliked most.

He said it was the thought of being caught alone on the street at night by two white policemen.

"That's when they get their kicks, and I mean kicks," the youth said.

When black nationalist revolutionaries speak of controlling their own communities, they are speaking principally of controlling the businesses that operate there and the police. As long as the businesses remain white, so will the police, a nationalist said.

Black teen-age boys in several cities said they believed that the police with whom they deal, or who deal with them, would never behave as they do on a man-to-man basis without the authority of the state and guns on their hips.

One Chicago policeman had a gruff response to this intimation of cowardice. "Those kids talk tough," he said. "Not one of them who talks all the time about police brutality could handle me or any other cop one-to-one."

A street worker for the Chicago Urban League, describing her efforts with a West Side gang, said that in her view the "police made statements not worthy of mature professionals" regarding the young people with whom she works.

In Chicago, perhaps more than any other city in the survey—Los Angeles, San Francisco, New York and Detroit were the others—the black community lives in dread of the police.

"The way they'll do a man is something awful. And right in front of his family, his kids. If they feel like it, they'll make a man feel like nothing right in front of his own kids." The speaker was a black truck driver who had overheard a conversation a reporter and two street workers were having at a lunch counter.

"Warning," says a button that floats around in black communities, "your local police are armed and dangerous."

Few who have lived in all-black communities seem to need the warning. They already believe it.

Part of a poem, "One Way," by Donald Ferguson, a young Chicagoan, says:

> "A god was begged,
> Yet allowed the taking
> Away at the end of
> A shotgun muzzle,
> Harnessed in a yellow-helmeted
> Coward's grasp of
> Authority."

He referred to the life of Billy Furr, killed on the streets of Newark while running away from a grocery store with part of the contents of a stolen six-pack of beer.

In "Rivers of Blood, Years of Darkness," Robert Conot's comprehensive study of the violence in Watts two years ago, the author quotes a Los Angeles policeman:

"I've been waiting all my life for something like this to happen. I'm gonna make mincemeat out of some of those mother ——— while I've got the chance."

The Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department (different from Los Angeles Police Department) recently published a manual for policemen on community relations. It contains this statement, from an International City Managers' Association publication:

"Today's policemen are the heirs of that frightful legacy of ill will built up over many years—the man who walks the street bitter at the police may still be harboring a grudge of forty years' standing. . . ."

And here is the statement of an 18-year-old from Chicago. Lest he be misunderstood, he wrote down what he had to say on the subject of the police:

"We do not understand why the police officers beat us and locked us up. They knocked out our front teeth, and yet I don't hate them. They used the law to prove their point. We think (the) point is to prove to us that he is bad and he wants us to fear him . . .

"We realize that there are many police, but we can fight them like we fight each other. All we have to do is get together with the Blackstone Rangers and the South Side would be safe for you, your children and our brothers and sisters."

The anger and frustration in urban ghettos have many causes, but the actual spark consistently is set off by the longstanding mutual hatred between police and the black community.

The woman in the Chicago candy store was speaking of that hatred.

"You can always tell when something bad happened with the cops. Angry, very angry, you know, the people. The cops, not so good. When you get back to Washington, tell Johnson—you talk to Johnson?—anyway, tell Johnson: Find a way to fix it so the cops don't make people so mad. Give the cops more money, maybe? I don't know."

Up the street, a young father, out with his son for a walk, was asked his solution:

"If they don't get those bastards out of the Negro neighborhoods, there's going to be a war. I look at them and feel like I want to kill. Tell you, if my kid comes home from school and tells me the teacher told him the policeman is his friend, that teacher is going to be in a world of trouble with me."

A black policeman in New York:

"I ain't got no whole lot to say to you because I don't know who you are, only who you say you are, but I will say this: It gets harder all the time to be black and a cop. Very hard, baby."

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 27, 1967]

THE BLACK REVOLUTIONARIES—IV: GHETTO VIEW OF VIET WAR: "HELL, NO"

The old woman, many times over a grandmother, had seen numerous summers on Chicago's South Side. She brushed aside a reporter's questions about violence in the streets.

"I used to think all this killing and cuttin' was awful, just awful," she said. One of her eyes was covered with cataract. She fixed the good eye on the visitor to her stoop:

"If my grandson is going to die, I'd rather he died right here on this street and not off in somebody's 'Veetnam.' He ain't got no business in them Chinese folk's backyard noway.

"These folks in Detroit now. All that burning an' lootin an' everybody saying folks shouldn't be violent. How you goin' tell people, little people, not to be violent when the whole United States is kickin' them little Chinese so awful. Don't make no sense, none a t'all."

An orange sun was slipping below the Chicago skyline and the woman stared at it. Children in the street were excited by a sportscar and swarmed around it.

"Them little boys," the old woman said. "Devils. No place to go and play, nobody to teach 'em what it's all about. Mother's on the welfare, you know. Poppa's gone. And the young men can't find no jobs so they join the Army and go to Veetnam. Shouldn't be no black folks shootin' no brown folks for no white man. We been killing too long for the white man, tha's all. I seen those boys goin' off in the '42 war to kill Germans an' them Japs. I watched them off this street when they went off to Korea. Now they're goin' to Veetnam. Black folks ain't got nothin' out of all these white people's wars. Nothin' but a whole lot of hell."

It was not the first bitter black reaction to the war in Vietnam where more than 150,000 black Americans serve.

In Detroit, the black community speaks proudly of the poetry of 29-year-old Norman Jordan. He has tried to express the ghetto's response to the war in a poem entitled "Not This Time, Baby." Here is an excerpt:

"Hell
We are on
To you whitey
trying to off
yellow power
with black power
(killing two birds
with one stone) . . ."

A summary of black community reaction to the war would contain these points, made again and again:

A disproportionate number of Negroes serve, are wounded and die in the war.

The war consumes resources that could be applied to the needs of the poor.

The war is to secure "freedom" for Vietnamese not enjoyed by blacks in the United States.

The war robs the black community of young men who might be leaders in the struggle for equality.

Also cited is the charge that the war is "practice" of weapons and techniques that could be applied in the event of a black uprising in the cities.

At the most extreme fringe of the political spectrum, among the radical revolutionaries, the war is seen as part of a worldwide struggle against the aspirations of poor nonwhites for self-determination. In that respect, it is linked to the battle for control of the cities.

"I figure when the paratroopers come to Detroit to fight me, that's that many fewer paratroopers that can mess with the Vietnamese," one radical said.

Some black nationalist revolutionaries speak of the war in Vietnam and the battle at home as the same struggle, a struggle against the white man.

"This beast must be stopped. The Vietnamese are doing their part and I have to do mine," one San Francisco revolutionary said.

But black feeling against the war is not confined to poor people or revolutionaries. Among middle class black people strong support of the war is difficult to find.

Fran's Restaurant in Harlem is the eating place of the black elite—that is, the black elite that chooses to eat in Harlem restaurants.

The manager at Frank's from time to time runs secret polls on various political issues.

Lloyd Von Blaine, the manager, is proud of his record. His poll, for example, matched the plurality of John V. Lindsay in the 1965 mayorality election.

The latest Frank's poll was on Vietnam. Approval of the war: 1276, no, 456, yes. Is the U.S. winning? 1107, no, 406, yes. Should we pull out? 1041, yes, 552, no.

One young radical was asked why so many black men volunteer and reenlist if the war is unpopular among black people.

"Three hots and a cot," was the answer. "When there's a decent society to come home to, there won't be very many black guys signing up for Vietnam, you can be sure of that," the young man said.

James Bevel of Mobilization for Peace in Vietnam, says he tells black youths who ask him what to do if they are called:

"When Johnson comes to get you, you say, 'I won't go.' "

Growing in popularity among radicals is Matt Jones' song, "Hell, No, I Won't Go."

One of the last bastions of black civil rights respectability, the NAACP, is heading for troublesome division because of the war. Its New York Youth Division at a meeting recently called the war "morally unacceptable." That statement conflicts with the NAACP neutral position on Vietnam.

The Youth Division asserted that the war is "a pretense on the part of this Government to get blacks to close ranks and retreat into the bag of 'loyalty' while their position in this country grows intolerably worse."

One widely distributed tract on the war is an illustrated primer entitled "Vietnam," which is of highly professional editorial and graphic quality. It began circulating in black neighborhoods about a month ago and does not identify the sponsoring organization.

The only information is of the artist, T. G. Lewis. Its message is pitched in a simple, low-keyed form.

The pamphlet lists the many black leaders and black heroes—Martin Luther King, Malcolm X, Adam Clayton Powell, Muhammad Ali and others—opposed to the war.

Showing a wounded black soldier, it says:

"One Negro man said: 'Why should I fight for a country that has never fought for us?' "

It asks the reader, portrayed as black on the next to last page, to decide if "the war in Vietnam—the war that is fought in your name—(will) keep on killing?"

There is no price tag in the booklet. A reporter was handed one in a Harlem store, and shown one by a nationalist in Chicago who was taking up a collection to have 5000 printed.

The black nationalist revolutionaries have a tendency to make what has been called "Vietnam analogy." It was heard formulated this way in Chicago:

"McNamara likes to say reason for the bombing of North Vietnam is to force it to halt its aggression against the South. White America has been committing aggression against the Nation of the black man since 1619. If bombing cities halts aggression, I'm willing to try Chicago and New York."

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 28, 1967]

The Black Revolutionaries—V: Nationalists Woo Young

(By Robert C. Maynard)

In the muggy air of a Los Angeles August night, the dozen boys stood on the sidewalk. It was their posture that was noticeable at first glance; very erect.

They were questioning each other, in a Socratic manner

"What is a man without values?" a youth in a Malcolm X sweatshirt asked another.

"A man without values is a man that is unpredictable."

"What does nationalism demand?"

"Nationalism demands study. Show me a true nationalist and I'll show you someone who studies."

And they had been studying. The colloquy sounded familiar. The building before which they were standing is the headquarters of US, the Los Angeles militant-mystical black nationalist organization of Ron Karenga.

Inside, for one dollar, a visitor could purchase the "Quotable Karenga." In it, he would find the answers to all of the questions the young men, practically all of whom had "Afro" haircuts, were asking one another.

While the questions went on outside, and while some youths practiced karate kicks on the sidewalk, the man who conceived US and runs it with a smiling charm and firm will, was answering the questions of a reporter.

The youths outside, he said, are "the young Simbas—Swahili for 'lions'—the future leaders of a strong black nation of America. His chief goal, he said, is to harness the energy of the youth. He succeeds, he claims, where others fail because he challenges them with daring and courage, while other groups seek to offer an undesired security.

If they study to be good nationalists, what do they study? Do they read, for example, the revolutionary writings of Frantz Fanon, the late Martiniquean psychiatrist?

"One should read only what one has to read," Karenga replied. "If I have read it, I will reflect it to them."

Study Karenga, then, and you have studied what is important? "Correct."

What Karenga calls the "young Simbas," and what a Chicago police officer told a reporter were "a bunch of no-good bastards, all of 'em," is that group of black youth between the ages of 14 and 18 years old.

Such non-nationalist organizations as the Urban League and such militant groups as SNCC are trying to find a way to harness, as Karenga claims he can, the energies and potential of that age group.

The officials of every city that has had a major violent outbreak say that the youth in that group are the principal source of energy for the riot once it gets started.

The Washington Post, in a survey of five cities, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Detroit, Chicago and New York, found no organization that could claim it had really hit upon a formula that worked for large numbers of these youth.

Three programs seem distinctive, but representative of the nationwide effort. Those are Karenga's in Los Angeles, Operation Bootstrap in Los Angeles and the street program of the Chicago Urban League. They are listed in descending order of revolutionary zeal.

Numbers alone make the 14- to 18-year-olds important. In 1960, 40 per cent of America's 22 million Negroes were under the age of 19 and it is estimated today that half of the black population is under 25.

US, Bootstrap and the Urban League each has different approaches and different purposes for seeking out the youth of the ghetto:

Karenga makes no bones about it: He is trying to build a powerful nationalist organization that might one day opt for violent revolution.

Robert Hall and Lou Smith, the innovators of Operation Bootstrap, designed the program as a model for a possible nationwide black economy.

The Urban League is trying to deal with the youth of the black community where they are, and in Chicago that's mostly in gangs. What the street workers do is attempt to understand what the gang youth wants from the society and try to help him get it.

Smith and Hall are frightened. They see a program on the immediate horizon in America.

"It is not too far off," Smith says grimly. "I don't put ovens past white America for a minute. What with technology, there is just no more use for black folks, that's all."

To Smith, there is a narrow way out: If black people can somehow develop economic independence, a system within a system, that does not cost whites anything, perhaps black people will be spared the fate of the Jews in Nazi Germany.

Without a penny of Federal money, Bootstrap has started:

A welfare mothers' league that organizes recipients to demand their rights and is often consulted by the Los Angeles Bureau of Public Assistance.

A training center that teaches computer programming, sewing and automobile body repair.

A black arts school for the teaching of dramatics, with emphasis on black achievement.

A dress shop that features African style dresses and men's shirts made of imported African print material.

Smith looks to the day when the Bootstrap model is operating all over the United States and black enterprises are engaged in trade with black countries throughout the world. Black American enterprises would import raw materials and ship back finished products.

Smith also strives to eliminate prejudice among whites through what he calls "sensitivity sessions" every Thursday evening.

Whites come from such suburbs of Los Angeles as Beverly Hills to engage in what Smith and Hall describe as "frank dialogue." Others have called it "bloodletting."

"If you have a white friend, and you want to remain friends, don't go together to one of those sessions," warned one veteran participant.

Smith says the purpose of the sessions is "to soften up white power. They still control the economy and the education of the country. We are still going to have to save whitey."

The saving of a whole generation of black youth is the task to which the Urban League street program in Chicago is devoted.

Gang membership figures in Chicago are difficult to establish because the gangs rarely divulge their numbers. The largest and best known is the South Side Blackstone Rangers. They have gone almost wholly "respectable" now, what with anti-poverty grants and a somewhat successful musical revue, "Opportunity, Please Knock," produced under the direction of Oscar Brown Jr.

One youth worker at the Urban League, a warm and matronly woman, asked not to be identified by name. She spoke about a young man named David, who is 18 years old.

"David feels like he's lost," she said. "He doesn't have the confidence to feel he's going to get out of his bind. He feels lost in the shuffle. He has had jobs, the kind of jobs that have been degrading as far he's concerned."

WANT A PLACE TO MEET

David is the leader of the Disciples in Englewood, a West Side neighborhood. The Disciples, whose members are known as the Devil's Disciples, want a place of their own to meet and discuss their problems and to socialize.

In what amounts to a letter to the older generation, David tries to explain the reason gangs exist:

"I am a gang fighter, but can you say that your son is any better than me? I have three years of high school, but those years I have learned that school is one thing but life is another. My life is the Devils . . . We are few but we fight like many. Ours is not to reason why but to live and fight and die. We are few but we fight like many . . . We owe ourselves one thing [and] that is self preservation. This is a dog-eat-dog world."

Ron Karenga thinks the gang members have a future, perhaps for the very reason the police of Chicago and Los Angeles feel they have none, because they are disaffected and outside the flow of society and have no access route into it.

Karenga tells his followers, and potential followers, that they begin to become men when they realize the system was designed to work against them, and their only recourse is the discovery of a culture and an identity of their own as black people.

Although a Ph.D. candidate at the University of California at Los Angeles, he speaks in a language youths like David easily understand.

SOMETHING IS WRONG

"The Christian is our worst enemy," Karenga says. "Quiet as it's kept, it was a Christian who enslaved us. Quiet as it's kept, it's the Christian that burns us. Quiet as it's kept, it's the Christian that beats us down on the street; and quiet as it's kept, when the thing goes down, it'll be a Christian that's shooting us down. You have to face the fact that if the Christian is doing all this, there must be something wrong with Christianity."

The Davids of Los Angeles, wearing their yellow sweatshirts with pictures of Karenga or a lion embossed on the front, know this and understand it. They also know Karenga's "seven criteria of culture"—mythology, history, social organization, political organization, economic organization, creative motif and ethos.

Like David, they are ready to fight.

"We must fight for the right of self-determination, race pride and pursuit of blackness," says Karenga. "We must believe in our cause and be willing to die for it and we should stop reading other people's literature and write our own, and stop pretending revolution and make it."

Though Karenga's organization has not yet spread beyond Los Angeles, the appeal is to a national following.

In Chicago, David is a Disciple. Karenga wants the Davids of Chicago, and San Francisco, Detroit and New York to become young Simbas—lions.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 30, 1967]

The Black Revolutionaries—VI: Black Nationalist Movement Spawns Cultural Revival

(By Robert C. Maynard)

"Yet do I marvel at this curious thing:
To make a poet black and bid him sing"
—Countee Cullen.

The black nationalist movement in America is spawning a cultural resurgence that artists and writers claim may surpass any previous period of artistic activity in the black community.

And black nationalism has invested the arts with a special mission, to evoke images of beauty that are black and images of blackness that are beautiful.

The quantity of activity appears to be growing in every city.

In Chicago, a group of black artists has created a mural of heroic portraits of Negroes that adorns the side of a tenement on the South Side.

In practically every large city, journals of black poetry and prose are bing published by groups of black nationalists.

Organizations in several cities, among them Washington, plan mural walls imitative of the Chicago effort.

The creators in Chicago as well as those planning walls in other cities say the walls will be gifts to the poor and black community in exaltation of their culture.

The nationalist movement's goal is a separate political and cultural identity for Negroes. The black arts movement serves the cultural function of that goal.

Another source of inspiration for the nationalist movement is the Black Christian Church, a relatively recent development. In Detroit, for example, Central United Church of Christ, where a Black Messiah is worshipped, has nearly 1000 members and is growing at a rate of 25 to 30 new adherents each week.

One institutional development the black arts movement is relying on is the black cultural centers, where the paintings are displayed, the drama and music performed and the poetry read.

Washington was one of the first cities to have such a center, the New School for Afro-American Thought.

Gaston T. Neal, one of the directors, said the school hopes to do more than become an institution to house and encourage the arts. "We want to train and produce black minds," he said.

One course the school offers covers the subjects of who black people are in relation to the rest of mankind, whether black Americans are a caste or a class, "Revolution: the world's and ours," Liberalism—"an enemy or an asset," all under the general title of "The Politics of Being Black in Racist U.S.A."

Neal, discussing the Negro contribution to American culture in the past and present, said:

"If they used all of their IBM machines to try to add up the achievement of black culture, the machines would burst."

He argued that it is one of this Nation's marvels that black people produced artistic and cultural movements in the midst of racial adversity.

"If we didn't have an inventor, a writer, a musician or a painter, the very idea that we survived is a monument in itself," Neal said.

Roland P. Young, appraising the growth of black nationalist poetry in a recent issue of San Francisco's "Journal of Black Poetry," said he hoped the poetry would fulfill the function of an "image thirst-quencher—a beautiful black self-image."

He quotes poet LeRoi Jones, one of the key figures of the black arts movement, on the subject of black poetry. Three lines say:

"Let the world be a Black Poem
And let all black people speak this poem
Silently or aloud."

Larry P. Neal, another of the popular black nationalist poets, speaks to black women:

"Again the sea unites us
As we couple with the land and the stars
of our ancestors' stars.
Black universe.
Embrace sky.
Blackness. Wholeness."

Much of the poetry and painting which the black arts movement is producing is the work of young artists.

By contemporary critical standards, much of it would be considered crude, but these are the standards by which the artists do not wish to be judged. Their critics, they say, are their communities, for the art is part of the internal black dialogue.

In the visual arts, the great figure for many black artists—and some white ones as well—is Charles White, whose work is now being exhibited at Howard University Gallery of Art.

James A. Porter, director of the gallery, said recently in an appreciation of White that he thinks of him "as the artist who, more than any other, has found a way of embodying in his art the very texture of Negro experience as found in life in America."

And Neal, speaking of White, said:

"He holds in his hands the mystique of the black people."

A Chicago poet, Eugene Perkins, in a spirit reminiscent of the praise given White, said the black artist of today should feel proud of the story he has to tell of his people.

"Where we came from and how we got to where we are," said Perkins, "is a story of beauty and strength that we need feel no shame to tell."

The spiritual black nationalist, a relatively new phenomenon, is typified in the Rev. Albert C. Cleage Jr. of Detroit, pastor of Central United Church.

He preaches the doctrine of a Black Christ and says he feels on solid doctrinal and historical grounds.

Speaking of white Christians, the Rev. Mr. Cleage says:

"If they want to worship a Black Christ, that's their business. Christ was a black man."

The parable of the Children of Israel trying to escape from Pharaoh's Egypt is the parallel he used for black people trying to gain control of the territories in which they are in the majority.

Alluding to the pestilence that afflicted Egypt when Pharaoh failed to allow the Israelites to leave, Cleage made the connection for his congregation: The sermon was delivered two Sundays after the Detroit riot.

Gracing the altar of the church is the "Black Madonna," a mural by Glanton Dowell of Detroit.

The Madonna is one of the black arts movement's most popular pieces. References to it are made by artists all over the country.

One artist assured this reporter that the Madonna "will change your concept of Christianity."

The size of the mural and the exaggerated blackness of the figures contribute to its impact. The Madonna stands 18 feet high over the altar and is nine feet wide. Both Madonna and child are robed in white.

For many years, the Negro artist in America struggled over the question of whether he was first an artist and then a Negro or first a Negro and then an artist. The vanguard of the black art movement today is unequivocal: Black first.

The generations of artists before them

were seeking to define themselves and their place regarding the larger world.

Cullen was a product of the Harlem Renaissance movement of the 1920s, a movement that also produced Langston Hughes and was the generation before Richard Wright. Those men, and ultimately James Baldwin, spoke to white and black. The black arts movement today is strictly concerned with speaking to black people.

The artists are concerned with unifying black people, and they use their expression to that end. As Neal put it, "art that does not serve the cause of the people at this point is useless."

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 1, 1967]

The Black Revolutionaries: Black Nationalist Figure of 1920's Is Honored

(By Robert C. Maynard)

The clouds and sun played hide and seek over San Francisco. It was cold when it was the sun's turn to hide. A Saturday morning crowd of about 50 was a hardy lot that had gathered in a small park to celebrate Marcus Garvey Day.

Similar celebrations, in which thousands participated, had taken place in Harlem and dozens of other black communities across the Nation.

They were honoring Garvey as the man who brought black nationalism to America a half century ago and who inspired such leaders as Black Muslim Elijah Muhammad, Malcom X and a host of others.

Nevertheless, to most Americans, Marcus Garvey, the father of the black nationalist movement, is a virtually unknown figure.

Three decades before the black nationalist and Muslim movements became widely known in this country, Garvey was promulgating his vision of independence and separation for the world's black people. His movement once was one of the most powerful forces in black America and was known wherever in the world large numbers of black people lived.

He wanted to form a nation of black people in Africa, with a government of its own.

"We do not mean a government that will make us citizens without rights or subjects without consideration. We mean a government that places our race in control . . ."

Twenty-five years before it happened for the Jews, he was arguing, in essence, for an Israel for black people.

He tried to make such a homeland in Africa, but the move failed. He conceded at the time that not all black people wanted to repatriate themselves, but he was fighting for such a place to exist for those who might want to go to there.

Marcus Moziah Garvey was born on Aug. 17, 1887, to black parents in the little village of St. Ann's Bay in Jamaica, British West Indies.

After traveling in Latin America and England, Garvey became convinced that black people were being exploited by whites everywhere and that they needed a government and a territory of their own.

It was an Egyptian, Duse Mohammed Ali, who helped Garvey to cultivate his interest in Africa, but it was an American who inspired Garvey to choose the United States as a starting place.

Two more different men than Booker T. Washington and Marcus Garvey would have been difficult to find in Negro politics of the early part of this century. Garvey was uncompromising in his demand for black equality in the world; Washington often was called "the great compromiser" on Negro rights.

But Garvey said he read Washington's autobiography, "Up From Slavery," and "then my doom—if I may so call it—of being a race leader dawned upon me."

The year then was 1914. "My brain was afire," Garvey said, at the thought of "uniting all the Negro peoples of the world into one great body to establish a country and a government absolutely their own."

After forming the Universal Negro Improvement Association, Garvey came to the United States in the spring of 1916, amidst war overseas and racial turmoil in America.

A great Negro exodus from the Southern farm to the Northern city was in progress. Between the boll weevil and the racists, life in the South was becoming untenable for many Negroes.

The weevil was eating the cotton faster than the farm hands could pick it, and the racists were lynching more than ever. Furthermore, the cities were calling for cheap and unskilled labor to meet the industrial demands of the war.

Several cities were in the throes of race riots, the bloodiest of which was at East St. Louis, Ill.

The state of morale of the Negro was at a low point. Soldiers back from fighting a war for democracy in Europe ran serious risk of death or injury for failure to observe the caste system in the South.

It was into this kind of America that a pudgy 28-year-old Jamaican came with the rallying cry of "Up, you mighty race!"

After some organizational difficulties, Garvey had a growing UNIA movement in the United States by 1920.

Negro World, Garvey's newspaper, was one of his chief organizational instruments. It was widely read and widely quoted at the time.

Unlike other Negro publications, it refused to accept advertisements for skin lighteners and hair straighteners on the ground that such products were degrading.

Garvey's most widely known enterprise was a steamship line. It ultimately led to his downfall and shook the faith of his many followers in "Black Moses," as he was later to be called.

Garvey said he had two purposes in creating the Black Star Line, as the steamship firm was known. First, he wanted Negroes to gain the experience and earn the profit from a large enterprise. Secondly, he saw the line as the beginning of a communication system among black people the world over.

"The Black Star Line Corporation," Garvey once said, "presents to every black man, woman and child the opportunity to climb the great ladder of industrial and commercial progress."

He and other Black Star officials sold more than $600,000 in stock in one year, promising "large profits and dividends," which would be earned for stockholders "even whilst they will be asleep."

His detractors charge that that is precisely what Black Star investors were—asleep. The enterprise was a total disaster, financially and politically.

Seven years after coming to the United States and three years after he had reached his zenith, Marcus Garvey was convicted of mail fraud in connection with Black Star dealings.

His other dream, that Liberia would be hospitable to Negro American colonists, also dissolved when the West African government said Garveyites would not be welcome there. Garvey charged the Liberians had been pressured by European governments.

Appeals of his conviction to the Supreme Court having failed, Garvey entered the Federal Penitentiary at Atlanta on Feb. 18, 1925, nine years after coming to the United States with a dream of black liberation.

"Garvey is a Negro, but even a Negro is entitled to have the truth told about him." So observed the New York Evening Bulletin in an editorial after Garvey was jailed; no longer was his guilt so certain in the minds of critics and editorial writers.

He did not serve his full term of five years, but was exiled to Jamaica instead.

Among the black nationalists of today, Garvey is honored as the man who articulated the basic tenets of black nationalism.

He died in London on June 10, 1940, having lived to see all but the barest bones of his organization collapse.

There is today an ironic footnote to Garvey's life. It was his movement that created the public pressure for changing the word Negro from a lower case to an upper case spelling. It was a move that began in 1920 and was almost universally accepted by 1929.

Today, the black nationalists who preach the concepts Garvey preached reject the word Negro as derogatory, preferring to be called black.

CRIME: A GROWING MALIGNANCY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the magazine Nation's Business for October 1967, contains an article on page 85 entitled "The Bitter World of the Policeman" that I believe can profitably be read by everyone.

It deals with the ever-increasing breakdown of respect for law and order in this country, and with the growing difficulties our police officers are facing in dealing with crime. It makes the shocking statement about Washington that, if the present trend is not halted, "the Capital of the free world may soon rank first in crime."

Mr. President, this is a situation that we ignore at our peril. Court decisions have so tied the hands of police officers that they are hamstrung in the performance of their duty. In many cities police departments now have to spend so much time overseeing demonstrations that they have little time left for preventing crime or dealing with it after it has happened.

Many police officers feel that they have been let down by the community and the courts. Last year, according to the FBI, 57 policemen were murdered while carrying out their daily duties. This is a serious and appalling situation. It is a malignancy that threatens the very basis of our free society.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be reprinted in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Bitter World of the Policeman

For $5,000 a year—a little more in some places and less in others—you can get a job that will:

Let you work poor hours in unpleasant surroundings.

Subject you to charges of brutality.

Allow you to be jeered—and perhaps mauled—while dealing with the irresponsible, the criminal or the racist.

Let you risk your life helping to quell a riot.

Yet, tie your hands by court decisions.

More and more across America today this is the bitter role of the policeman. In an increasing number of cities police recruiting is a serious problem. Police departments are undermanned. Young police officers are quitting in great numbers. Older ones wish they could.

Police morale is sinking alarmingly.

The policeman feels that the community is not behind him, the press is generally against him and that he has been abandoned by the courts.

In a civil disturbance—a race riot, for

instance—the police force is your first line of defense, the preserver of law and order.

Americans are beginning to worry about the future of law and order as well as the terror and tone of recent court decisions. Prominent jurists are speaking out. Police administrators are disturbed. The businessman has a lot at stake and he's worried.

HOW MUCH BRUTALITY?

Hardly a race riot in the country is not followed by cries of police brutality. Is it justified? Undoubtedly some cases are. However, charges of police brutality are so common now the FBI has ceased to compile them for routine release.

A few recent years' statistics tell a revealing story.

In fiscal 1963 the FBI investigated 1,376 complaints of police brutality stemming from possible civil rights violations. Twelve indictments were returned resulting in four convictions. In 1964 there were 1,592 complaints resulting in 16 indictments and four convictions.

And in 1965 the FBI handled 1,787 complaints which developed into 13 indictments and six convictions.

After the Newark riot a suit was filed against the local police department charging a long and continuing pattern of police brutality. It asked that the department be placed in receivership and that a special "master" be appointed with full administrative power over its affairs.

Some 200 affidavits from Negroes claiming various kinds of mistreatment were compiled in favor of the lawsuit. But the affidavits were kept secret.

The New York Times wondered editorially: "How can police officials be expected to correct abuses when no complaints are filed?"

The newspaper suggested that the policeman's predicament was due some consideration from the Negro community. As it put it, "If some police lash out indiscriminately at anyone with a black skin, so do some Negroes hurl abuse, rocks, bottles and even bullets at anyone with a white skin—especially when he is in uniform."

Last month in Milwaukee, city police were subjected to four hours of indignity and abuse in the City Hall headquarters of Mayor Henry W. Maier while a group of racial demonstrators wrecked his office.

Quinn Tamm, a retired assistant director of the FBI and now executive director of the International Association of Chiefs of Police, says:

"Placing the blame on the police is an easy answer, but a grossly unfair one. The police are not responsible for the social conditions that contribute to crime nor is it within their direct purview to alleviate these conditions. The mission of the police is, in theory, a simple one—enforce the law. This does not mean some of the laws some of the time, but all of the laws all of the time.

"When professional agitators such as H. Rap Brown and Stokely Carmichael can, with impunity, direct their followers into burning and looting and guerrilla warfare, law enforcement in our nation has reached a crisis of utmost gravity."

The serious fact is, however, that some police with slum beats today turn their heads when crime is committed rather than suffer the inevitable insults and injury that would result if the law were enforced.

Last year, according to FBI figures, 57 policemen were murdered in the performance of duty.

Among the 442 persons involved in the killing of police officers since 1960, 67 per cent had prior criminal convictions and 69 per cent had received leniency in the form of probation or parole on at least one of the prior convictions.

Sen. Robert C. Byrd (D-W. Va.), chairman of the Senate appropriations subcommittee for the District of Columbia, is among those concerned with the plight of the policeman. He is particularly worried over conditions in the Washington police department whose officers are having to cope with a skyrocketing rate of crime.

The nation's capital in 1957 ranked twelfth among 16 cities of comparable size in the incidence of crime. It now has been catapulted into second place. If the trend is not reversed, the capital of the free world may soon rank first in crime.

COMPLAINTS IN PRIVACY

Senator Byrd called in some 50 Washington policemen in the privacy of his office to hear their side of the story. It was much the same: Not enough backing from the community and press, unfair charges of police brutality and court decisions which hamstring them in their efforts to maintain law and order.

Says Senator Byrd, "As the policeman continues to be subjected to unfounded and unjust charges, as he continues to have to make his arrests and maintain them in the face of a hostile, abusive, violent mob, as long as he has to continue to put his life in great danger, feeling that he does not have the support or the appreciation or the thanks of his superiors, the press, the community, the Congress, the Executive Branch and the courts, he is going to be less likely to want to be a policeman."

"They are subjecting their persons to the hazards of police work in vain and they are experiencing the ridicule of the community, as a result of the extreme leniency of the courts," Senator Byrd charges.

"The police feel that it is a vain thing to arrest a man for rape, and take him in, only to find that he was arrested last month for rape and turned loose back on the streets."

WHILE CRIMES GO UNPUNISHED

Police are having to cope more and more with demonstrations of every conceivable nature that all too often turn into civil disturbances. They spend increasingly more of their time overseeing demonstrations and less in thwarting crime.

Dozens of Washington police are giving virtually full time to pickets marching past the White House. They were called upon recently to quell a disturbance in the House of Representatives where demonstrators illegally crashed the chamber to protest legislation. And they were summoned in force to maintain order in a crowd of welfare recipients who descended on Washington to oppose legislation to make them work or take job training to stay eligible for relief.

The right of assembly is being abused. And the courts are frequently blamed for letting this happen.

At a recent meeting the Chief Justices of 45 states passed a resolution scoring the "malignant growth of disrespect for and disobedience of law, which in this year has culminated in unprecedented lawlessness and mob violence."

The Justices called for a reappraisal of the laws and procedures which affect the task of the policeman, the prosecutor and the courts in their effort to protect society.

Leading law enforcement officials claim Supreme Court decisions over the past few years heavily favor the criminal and are making it increasingly difficult to obtain convictions. This is especially so in the case of stringent restrictions imposed on police methods of obtaining confessions.

Testifying before a Senate committee recently, the hard-hitting New York District Attorney, Frank Hogan, asserted that these restrictions have "significantly increased the chances that a criminal will escape judgment."

Senate Minority Leader Everett Dirksen says:

"Never in our history have our people been so threatened. Never before has civil discipline been so lax. Never before has leadership been so lacking. The law must be enforced. The great failure of our society is its inability to maintain law and order."

Judge Warren E. Burger of the U.S. Court of Appeals in the District of Columbia believes that the present court system has grave flaws and that law-abiding citizens are becoming embittered and frustrated

WHY CRIME RATE IS SO HIGH

He says the criminal defendent in the United States is offered more procedural protection—such as suppressed evidence and dismissal of charges because of technicalities in conducting searches and making arrests—than anywhere in the world.

In Judge Burger's opinion, this may account for the fact that the crime rate in most countries is lower than ours. Sweden, for instance, with a population of eight million, has about 20 murders a year. Washington, D.C., with one tenth Sweden's population, has eight times as many murders.

Where have we gone wrong? Perhaps Evelle Younger, former California superior court judge and now district attorney for Los Angeles county, says:

"Many Americans regularly and openly disobey laws they don't like. The traditional methods of seeking changes in the law by urging legislative action seems old-fashioned. We have been sophisticating law and morality out of existence."

Much of the racial trouble today, he feels, is brought on by those who convince Negroes they can achieve all their demands simply by threatening a riot. And the blame rests not only on racial demagogues but on government officials as well.

On this subject, Professor Fred E. Inbau of the Northwestern University Law School and president of Americans for Effective Law Enforcement, observes:

"The philosophy of excuse and individual unrestraint is prevailing too often in government. We have the fuzzy idea that, because an individual is poor or socially deprived, we ought to overlook his criminality. There has been a gradual erosion of the notion that people have responsibilities as well as rights.

"The Supreme Court has contributed to this by overemphasizing individual rights. But civil liberties are meaningless unless you can exercise them in a safe, stable society."

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 noon on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORITY FOR THE VICE PRESIDENT TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS DURING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Vice President be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills during the adjournment of the Senate until Monday, October 16, 1967.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, before I move to adjourn, would the Chair kindly state the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is S. 2171, a bill to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the Presiding Officer.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 noon Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, October 16, 1967, at 12 noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 12, 1967:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COUNCIL

John Walter Hechinger, of the District of Columbia, to be Chairman of the District of Columbia Council for the term expiring February 1, 1969.

Walter E. Fauntroy, of the District of Columbia, to be Vice Chairman of the District of Columbia Council for the term expiring February 1, 1969.

The following-named persons to be members of the District of Columbia Council for the terms indicated:

TERMS EXPIRING FEBRUARY 1, 1968

Margaret A. Haywood, of the District of Columbia.

J. C. Turner, of the District of Columbia.

Joseph P. Yeldell, of the District of Columbia.

TERM EXPIRING FEBRUARY 1, 1969

John A. Nevius, of the District of Columbia.

TERMS EXPIRING FEBRUARY 1, 1970

Stanley J. Anderson, of the District of Columbia.

William S. Thompson, of the District of Columbia.

Polly Shackleton, of the District of Columbia.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 12, 1967:

SOLICITOR GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

Erwin N. Griswold, of Massachusetts, to be Solicitor General of the United States.

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGES

Lawrence A. Whipple, of New Jersey, to be U.S. district judge for the district of New Jersey.

Juan B. Fernandez-Badillo, of Puerto Rico, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Puerto Rico.

Damon J. Keith, of Michigan, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Michigan.

U.S. ATTORNEYS

William A. Meadows, of Florida, to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of Florida for the term of 4 years.

Calvin K. Hamilton, of Missouri, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of Missouri for the term of 4 years.

Yoshimi Hayashi, of Hawaii, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Hawaii for the term of 4 years.

U.S. MARSHAL

Guy W. Hixon, of Florida, to be U.S. marshal for the southern district of Florida for the term of 4 years.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Manuel Norat, a Great Hair Stylist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. POLLOCK

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 1967

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, last week in Cincinnati, Ohio, the Journeymen Barbers, Hairdressers, Cosmotologists, and Proprietors International Union of America, AFL–CIO, held the 1967 all-American barber spectacular and first annual U.S.A. championships in men's hairstyling. I was very pleased to learn that an Alaska man, Manuel Norat of Anchorage, won fourth place in the open free style international competition. In this competition Mr. Norat competed with barbers from around the world. He is the first from Alaska to achieve such an honor. The 49th State is fortunate to have such fine representation. We are indeed proud of his achievement. The winner of the championship was Mr. Daniel Ruidant of Belgium.

Mr. Norat will be making a further contribution to Alaska and to men's hairstyling. He has been designated as a superior hairstylist qualified to conduct advanced training classes for barbers. This November he will begin the first classes of this kind in Alaska. Conducted by the Journeymen Barbers, Hairdressers, Cosmotologists, and Proprietors International Union of America, AFL–CIO, this training will upgrade the skills of the profession in Alaska.

Not only is Manuel Norat a great hair stylist; he is a distinguished Alaskan and American, and a very fine gentleman.

I congratulate Manuel Norat on these accomplishments. They are a fine contribution to his State.

Mrs. D. W. Bond, of Jackson, Tenn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY BLANTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 1967

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding longtime farm leaders of my district passed away last Friday.

Mrs. D. W. Bond, of Jackson, has led a life of dedication to her community and to her State and to the farming people everywhere. She was 86 years old when she died, yet she has been active in the Madison County Farm Bureau until quite recently.

Mrs. Bond was a charter member of the Madison County Farm Bureau, and has been its secretary and a director since its beginning. She had been on the board of the Tennessee Farm Bureau ever since it was founded.

In 1924, she was chairman of the Women's Department of Tennessee, and promoted farm women throughout the State. She served as director on the Tennessee Rural Health Improvement Association, the Southern Region of American Farm Bureau Women, Tennessee Mental Health Association, Tennessee Library Committee, and various committees and boards in west Tennessee and the State.

"Progressive Farmer" magazine named her the "Woman of the Year" in 1945, and she has been recognized throughout the South and the Nation by awards, certificates of achievement, and recognition and other honors.

She was one of the early organizers of the National Cotton Council, and a charter member of the Mid-South Cotton Growers Association.

The people of Jackson, and the State of Tennessee are deeply saddened at the passing of one of our most outstanding women leaders, one who devoted her life to rural improvement.

The Great Accomplishments of Ray Charles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 1967

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I have recently learned that during the summer, the city of Los Angeles formally adopted a resolution declaring Ray Charles Day in Los Angeles. In view of the inspirational way in which he has overcome handicaps, I am delighted that he was given this recognition. His great success in the world of entertainment is well known, but it is less well known that despite his own blindness, he has found time to participate in various charitable endeavors.

Ray Charles is chairman of the Sickle Cell Anemia Foundation, raising funds for research for this thus far incurable blood disease, and has assisted the Christmas Seal Foundation, Radio Free Europe, Children's Asthma Research, United Way, the Heart Association and

Armed Forces Radio Service, and has given concerts to our servicemen.

Born to poverty and blind since the age of seven, Ray Charles has conquered handicaps which would have floored any person except the most indomitable. He has used his natural talents and has honed them to a sharp perfection.

He has many imitators, but none can match the individuality of his style. Frank Sinatra has aptly referred to him as "the giant of our profession."

The pain of his early life and the hardships he has overcome are part of the Ray Charles sound. The term "soul singing" seems to have been coined for him.

He now lives on the west coast with a lovely wife and three fine sons who he cannot see physically. However, Ray Charles has a sixth sense which is like an inner eye with which he can see more deeply than many of us who lack his sensitivity. I join with many of my colleagues in wishing him many more years of satisfaction and solid accomplishment.

"Horizons in Science and Technology": Address by Senator Howard H. Baker, Jr., at Georgetown University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT GORE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 12, 1967

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Congressional Record the remarks made by my colleague from Tennessee [Mr. Baker] before the Middle East Institute's annual meeting at Georgetown University, Friday, September 29, 1967. The subject of the address is "Horizons in Science and Technology."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Horizons in Science and Technology

(By Senator Howard H. Baker, Jr., before Middle East Institute, at Georgetown University, September 29, 1967)

I appreciate the opportunity to discuss with you today a problem which is of vital concern to all of us here, bringing peace to the troubled Middle East.

The situation in the Middle East presents a unique opportunity and challenge to peace-loving men throughout the world. Rarely in history, I suppose, has such great effort been given by so many men and nations to find a peaceful solution to a conflict between nations as has been expended over the Middle East. In the United Nations and in the governments of a dozen countries around the world there have been efforts to find a satisfactory solution to the problems and attritions which plague Israel and the Arab countries. Unfortunately no solution has yet been found.

Solving our problems by peaceful means will suffer a severe setback if we fail in the Middle East. Thus, the opportunity and challenge to use every means at our disposal to find a workable solution to these problems are tremendous.

I firmly believe that if the people of the Middle East can be provided an opportunity to share in the prosperity of the more broadly developed world, the stresses and strains which have produced three costly wars in recent years will be greatly reduced.

Those of us in Congress are not unmindfull of this awesome responsibility or of the conditions which have created the conflict. I have long been convinced that the key to the dispute lies in the chronic shortage of fresh water and arable land. Water, Work and Food are three elements desperately needed if we are to erase the territorial and refugee problems.

Recognizing the need for water, work and food, Admiral Lewis L. Strauss, a member of the Atomic Energy Commission under President Truman and chairman of the AEC under President Eisenhower, developed a plan to use nuclear energy to produce large quantities of fresh water by desalting sea water.

When the plan was first presented, there was some question whether it was technically feasible. But today, it is clearly within the realm of our nuclear technology not only to do this but to do it in a fully economic and competitive manner.

General Eisenhower, who cooperated fully with Admiral Strauss in the development of this plan is actively working to see it pushed to fruition. In order to speed the process somewhat, I have introduced a resolution which would make it the sense of the Senate to endorse the proposal and to urge the President to make it American policy to see it implemented.

I am pleased to report that 52 senators of both parties and all ideological persuasions have joined me as cosponsors of the resolution. I am further pleased to note that Vice President Humphrey in a recent speech referred to the Eisenhower-Strauss plan as an attractive alternative.

The plan, which Admiral Strauss has recently revised and updated in line with the most advanced developments in the nuclear field, envisions the construction first, of a 6600 megawatt thermal desalting reactor which would produce 450 million gallons of fresh water per day at a cost of about $200 million. Two other plants, one of equal size, the other somewhat smaller, would also be constructed. It is planned that they would be self-financing. I will discuss the method of financing in a moment.

This quantity of fresh water, more than the combined flow of the major tributaries of the Jordan River, would immediately provide an abundance of water for irrigation and industry. Of equal importance, however, is the fact that the construction of the desalting plant and of the water and power distribution systems will immediately provide jobs for many of the untrained and unskilled refugees in the area. After completion of the plant, the enormous expansion of available arable land will provide a tremendous demand for agricultural workers.

Thus, construction of the plants would provide enough work for the unskilled and unemployed refugees, enough water to irrigate the land which in turn would provide continuing work and food for the people of the area.

This, then, would remove much of the source of irritation among the peoples of the area in their disputes over the available water from the Jordan and its tributaries and the arable land.

Earlier I mentioned that the Eisenhower Plan provided an unusual if not a unique method of financing. I believe that you are all familiar with the fiscal problems facing this Congress. As a result the Foreign Aid program requested by the Administration has been cut in the House and Senate by $647 million and $837 million, respectively. It does not take unusual political insight to recognize that new foreign aid commitments, no matter how attractive nor of what significance, will have rough sledding in the Congress. General Eisenhower and Admiral Strauss have proposed that the financing of the Middle East project be funded through an international corporation modeled after our own Comsat. (I have proposed that the corporation be named MEND for Middle East Nuclear Desalting Corporation, but like most other aspects of the proposal, only the results are important, not the details.) Admiral Strauss, with his vast experience in international finance is convinced that the world banking community will enthusiastically support this project. For the United States to make an *investment* in this project seems far more likely than to expect an outright grant when we are faced with the continuing costs of the Vietnam War and our domestic problems. It is interesting, however, to note that even the total cost of this project, which is estimated to be no more than $1 billion, is well under the estimated cost of $2 billion which the five-day war in the Middle East this past spring is estimated to have cost, or the fact that our foreign aid to the countries involved has totaled nearly $3 billion over the past 20 years.

Finally, I would like to discuss an aspect of the Eisenhower Plan which has not attracted sufficient attention yet, but which I feel probably offers the most hope for achieving peace in the Middle East. As we all know, we have reached a communications stalemate in solving the crisis. The Arabs won't talk to the Israelis and the Israelis won't talk to the Arabs. Other governments have tried without apparent success to bring the warring parties together. International organizations have met with a similar and notable lack of success in bridging the gap. We are thus faced with a total vacuum in the all important effort to resolve a most unhappy situation. The establishment of an international corporation such as MEND, which has as its very core the objective of solving the problems of the Middle East, will provide a forum at which both sides may reach a common understanding for their own national interests, unencumbered by previous biases and influences. I do believe that the very nature of this corporation can and should be used as a vehicle to accomplish what individual national interests cannot today accomplish. Creation of such an entity would provide a non-national third party with which both the Arabs and Israelis could talk.

Another thing that excites me about the Eisenhower-Strauss proposal is the fact that this would be a major breakthrough in the use of the constructive power of nuclear energy to make peace rather than using its destructive power to prosecute war.

Post Office Should Issue Stamp Marking 50th Anniversary of Independence for Three Baltic States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERVEY G. MACHEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 1967

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to work toward the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp to mark the 50th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the three Baltic States—Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

This proposal was originally made by the Independence for Baltic States Committee of Washington and Baltimore.

This committee has informed me that approximately 283 of my colleagues in the House and 54 Members of the U.S. Senate are supporting the issuance of this stamp. This widespread support in the Congress clearly demonstrates the great deal of interest this proposal has generated.

It has come to my attention that the Citizens Stamp Advisory Committee of the Post Office Department will meet on Friday, October 13, 1967, to discuss its 1968 stamp program. I would strongly urge members of this committee to give favorable consideration to the issuance of a commemorative stamp in 1968 marking the 50th anniversary of independence for the three Baltic States.

The Morality of Our Commitments in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY BLANTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 1967

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, in view of the current debate in both Chambers of Congress about the Vietnam war, I would like to enclose in the RECORD at this point a recent speech I made on the subject.

I was invited by my church, the First Methodist Church in Adamsville, Tenn., to deliver the Layman's Day address on Sunday, October 8. For my topic, I chose "The Morality of Our Commitments to Vietnam."

The theme I have tried to emphasize in this speech is that when we debate our commitments in Vietnam, we somehow have lost the perspective of the full picture. Too often we ignore history, and more often do we ignore the long-range future.

The remarks I made at my hometown church are as follows:

THE MORALITY OF OUR COMMITMENTS IN VIETNAM

It is an honor for me to speak before this congregation on Layman's Day. I am humbled at the opportunity.

The theme of my message concerns a subject of major importance for all Christians. It is—"The Morality of Our Commitments to Vietnam".

Our country was settled by religious people. Our Declaration of Independence invoked Divine Providence to guide our people through the perilous days of the Revolution. In fact, down through our entire history, our Christian heritage has been as deeply rooted as the very democratic system of government it spawned.

This heritage poses a paradox for our government. Because of this deep Christian framework, the actions of our government are always scrutinized by citizens on the basis of whether activities are morally right or wrong.

In Russia a recent public opinion poll published by TASS indicated only 20 percent of the people have any belief in God. In a state-run society like they have, it is no wonder the people are passive and do not inquire into the motives of their government's policies.

This passiveness of the Communist people in regard to their own government leaves their leaders free to pursue aggressive policies almost free from dissent from the inside. Yet, here in our country, the morality of our government's actions are often challenged openly—in the streets, in the pulpits, and in the free press.

I have given you a contrast to show you that it is difficult for a democratic society to run its government. And when it feels obligated to pursue policies it feels in the nation's best interests, it must sometimes—indeed often times—provoke much dissent at home. Dissent is both helpful, and necessary, in a country which was born out of dissent.

In Vietnam today, this country has more than half a million young men fighting a war. It has provoked much dissent here at home and abroad. Many have charged that we are morally wrong, that our actions go against the conscience of our heritage.

The simple fact is that because of morality in our decision-making processes, we have been less imperialistic than most of the world expects us to be. We are in many ways the Rome of the 20th century—the mightiest nation in our era and in the history of civilization. With just one-sixth of the world's population, we have more than one-half its wealth.

We could have conquered half the world in the past few decades—and probably could today if we wanted to. Yet our policy-making processes are so orientated toward doing the moral thing in respect to the rest of the world that we have been restrained from an aggressive path.

One very influential Senator has written a best seller entitled "The Arrogance of Power". He feels the United States is very imperialistic because of our power. He is wrong. When we exploded the first atom bomb 18 years ago, we used it to end a war, not to start one. And we have not used it since. It is our morality, our conscience which prohibits its use. We alone had the atomic power to conquer any nation we wanted to in the closing days of the World War II. We could have annihilated all our then existing enemies, and those we believed our future enemies. But our morality restrained us.

The real aggressor in Vietnam and the World today is not the United States of America. The real aggressors are Russia and Communist China. The arrogance of power is an apt description of Communism—not western democracy.

Without any Christian heritage to guide them in their dealings with other peoples, these atheist countries have not been reluctant in plundering, killing and conquering. For those of you who might not remember—and for those politicians who claim they have been brainwashed—let we cite some examples:

1. The Russians have built an iron curtain around numerous weak Eastern European countries, too feeble to defend themselves after the ravages of World War II. Let us inquire into the morality of the conquest of Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania, Poland, Czechoslovakia.

2. In Asia, the Russians imposed their will on Mongolia, while the Chinese atheists were and are today committing genocide against the very religious people of Tibet.

3. It is not the United States that has insurrectionists and terrorists in Africa, Latin America and Southeast Asia. It is not our government that has trained and armed terrorists in 23 countries of the world.

4. It is not the United States that is fighting India's troops in Sikkim this past week.

These are but a few glimpses into what atheistic Communism—masquerading as peace lovers—are doing in the world today. Communist governments look upon their people as units to produce for the state—not individuals. It is no wonder that dissent in communist countries is met swiftly by imprisonment or death. It is no wonder—without a conscience to guide them—millions of people behind the Iron Curtain died in the Stalin purges, and presently the Chinese Cultural Revolution?

Aggression is nothing new to the Communist. Our reaction is not new to them either. We met their challenge in Korea. We repulsed their aggression with force. Today, the same totalitarian philosophy which has made slaves of their own people is trying to do the same thing to the poor and backward people of tiny South Vietnam.

The strategy is typical. While outwardly they seek to appear as wanting peace with the rest of the world, they secretly ignite the fires of war. If the co-existence they talk of is the same co-existence they have shown in their actions in the Dominican Republic, in Cuba and the Vietnams of the world today—then it is a fraud. When we respond with our power, they immediately shed crocodile tears in the forums of the world to cast the role of aggressor on us.

They have succeeded, unfortunately, in convincing much of the world—and even some of our own brightest minds—that we are at fault in Vietnam.

The Communists are no fools. They are masters of deceit and treachery. There is nothing they would not do to see our prestige and power defeated. Lest we not forget that Stalin even allied himself with Hitler in 1939 when he thought it would help Russia. Then he begged us to help him after Hitler turned against him.

They know our power. But, they also know our policy-making processes. They know that the morality in the decisions we make would not permit us to attack them first. They know too that they could not risk a direct nuclear confrontation with us. And since they know that Communism is a dogma that cannot flourish until the last vestiges of free enterprise is gone, they seek to weaken us, to destroy us, by bogging us down in limited wars which drain our economy and our manpower.

The Communist-inspired "wars of liberation" are the strategic weapon against the United States in a day when nuclear warfare would otherwise mean defeat. Here in these far-off brush wars rests their only hope in beating America. The land that is the stage of these wars is destroyed. This means nothing to the Communists. It is the chance to weaken us that is their goal and only concern.

In Vietnam, we are fighting Russia and China by proxy, just as we did in Korea 15 years ago.

The bullets that kill our young men are not made in Vietnam. North Vietnam is so disorganized and ravaged by our bombings that munitions cannot be produced in the quantity their troops need. The bullets and bombs which have snuffed out the lives of almost 15 thousand Americans—the bullets that have killed thousands of Vietnamese soldiers, and thousands of helpless women and children in the villages—they were made in Russia and China, and their puppets.

The same lies we hear out of Russia today are the same lies that we have heard for the past 50 years—and under their smokescreen have passed half the world's population.

It angers me for people to say that it is immoral for America to stand with the Vietnamese in defense of their country. It angers me because Vietnam is in reality a frontier for the entire world against a bigger, more powerful enemy than the ragged Viet Cong peasants could ever be.

The morality of our commitments in Vietnam goes beyond the fact that we are duty-bound to honor our treaty with the South Vietnamese. It goes beyond a commitment to defend a mere piece of Asian real estate. The morality is that we have to stand up to Godless Communism in Asia, or else we will have to fight them on our own shores someday.

As Christians, we all have a stake in Vietnam. We also have a duty to the young Americans we have sent into battle there. But we also have a duty to those men who gave their lives in Korea, in the two World Wars, and in the battles for self-preservation we fought in the last century. For if we fail now, haven't we in effect turned the victories of past wars into defeats? Have those who have died before us merely bought some extra time for our country?

The spilling of blood, the snuffing out of an individual's earthly existence—these are alien to our faith. But when the very faith is being put on the firing—when it faces an enemy who would prohibit our faith in God—then we must resort to the powers we have to stand before that tyranny.

I am not pleased with all aspects of the Vietnam war.

I am not happy to see Americans maimed and crippled and sent home in boxes to weeping parents. I am not happy to see our resources, our great wealth, being diverted from use in our own communities because of its need 13,000 miles away.

But we are doing the only moral thing we can do. We cannot abandon helpless people to the savagery of these aggressors. We cannot tire of our commitments and cause the collapse of all Southeast Asia. We cannot lay down our arms and run in the face of an enemy. We no longer live in an isolated world.

The real brainwashing today is the brainwashing of good-intentioned people into thinking we are not morally right. History depends on our steadfastness. It would indeed be our failure to our Christian heritage if we told the world today that the strongest defender of Christianity no longer believes in the right of peoples everywhere to self-determination and freedom.

The defense of freedom is a heavy burden for this generation to shoulder. But if we appease when we should stand firm, we only shift that burden to our children. This would be immoral.

Nebraska's Achievements in Education, Competition, and Patriotism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT V. DENNEY
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 12, 1967

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, the First Congressional District of Nebraska has had occasion to feel great pride in the accomplishments of three of its citizens who have been brought to national attention during recent months. Two of its young people have been a particular source of pride.

Jennifer Reinke, age 14, of Deshler, Nebr., won the 40th Annual National Spelling Bee in June of this year. Before competing in the national contest here in Washington, Jennifer met and defeated competitors on the county, district, and State levels.

We are equally proud of Kenneth Cline, age 13, of Lincoln, Nebr. On August 19 of this year Ken won the National Soap Box Derby contest. In addition to winning the race itself, Ken also won the best design trophy. He says that he spent over 1,400 hours building his car. It has a 15-coat handrubbed lacquer finish, rabbit fur upholstery, adjustable suspension system and a dual-cable adjustable angle brake. Ken is going to be a designer and racer of sports cars someday.

Young people such as Jennifer and Ken are the key to the future progress of our Nation.

The first district can also point with great pride to William E. Galbraith of Beemer, Nebr., who was recently elected American Legion Commander. Commander Galbraith's filling of this post follows a career of service within the Legion organization itself and in his own community. In 1965 he received the School Bell Award from the Nebraska State Education Association for outstanding contributions as a layman to the cause of education, and the Schoolmasters Award for similar service.

He has been both schoolteacher and farmer and is now managing his own livestock feeder business in addition to participating in the direction of the First Fidelity Insurance Co., of Nebraska, and the Community Development Corporation.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that Nebraska's pride in these three citizens is well founded. The standards of excellence in achievement they have established, both teenagers and adult, reflect a willingness to serve and to work. Standards such as these have produced American individuality and excellence in the past. This country needs more of this kind of performance.

Resource Conservation and Development Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. WAMPLER
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 12, 1967

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, in several areas of this Nation of abundant natural resources, the economic opportunities of the citizens do not match the potential provided by land and water. There are not enough jobs; farm income is low; industry and marketing facilities are inadequate. To bring these areas and their people into the mainstream of American economic progress requires special efforts and good coordination of those efforts.

An outgrowth of the soil and water conservation movement is providing this spark in 41 areas of about 2 million acres each—resource conservation and development projects, authorized by the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962. These projects draw on the experiences of these decades of conservation which have sown that where land is used and treated properly, where water is managed carefully, benefits go beyond the individual property to broader economic improvement in entire communities.

In these projects all segments of the community—rural, suburban, and urban—work together to solve local problems and improve resource use. Programs of Government agencies already at work increase their efforts, and leadership is provided by the Soil Conservation Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. All together, it is a highly effective team, whose efforts can already be measured on the land and in the pocketbook.

In the 20 multicounty areas authorized for USDA operations assistance by July 1, 1,894 specific measures had been activated by that date; 473 of these have already been completed and 520 others are being installed.

The project measures cover a wide range of activities to conserve, develop, and improve the natural resources, provide more employment, improve public facilities, and better community life in the project areas. For example, 387 measures concern development of recreation facilities, to help meet our growing needs for outdoor recreation and at the same time provide a source of added income. Nearly 200 have to do with multiple-purpose water developments to provide water for farm, city, and industrial uses; water for wildlife and recreation; and protection against flooding. Eighty-three measures are designed to increase processing and marketing facilities that will make use of local farm crops and woodlands.

After all measures are installed, and developments completed, more than 47,000 man-years of continuing annual employment are expected to be provided.

Five additional projects have moved into the operations stage since July 1. In the remaining 16 projects, local leaders have been at work, taking stock of the natural resources of their areas and planning together for development and wise use of those resources.

The R.C. & D. project approach is quickly proving its merit as a way of molding local resources and local initiative to make communities better places to live and work. It puts life and action into the rural areas development concept.

A Proposal To Bring the Remains of Christopher Columbus to Washington, D.C., for Permanent Burial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 12, 1967

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on this Columbus Day, 455 years after the discovery of America, I wish to join my colleagues in commemorating the courage and daring of this great Italian explorer.

He faced opposition, fear, superstition, and an uncharted sea to discover a new world of opportunity for all men who searched for a better life.

Christopher Columbus is buried today

in the Cathedral of Santo Domingo in the Dominican Republic. Because his vast discovery brought the world to the North American Continent, I am today proposing that our Government enter into preliminary discussions with the Government of the Dominican Republic for the purpose of exploring the possibility of transferring the remains of Christopher Columbus to a permanent resting place in Washington, D.C., so that a suitable monument to his vision and genius may be built and shared by all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I am one of the cosponsors of legislation to make Columbus Day a legal holiday in the United States, as well. This legislation is overdue. We, who owe so much to this outstanding Italian explorer and the men who braved the unknown Atlantic to follow him, should at the earliest opportunity make every effort to announce to the world our debt to his genius.

A permanent memorial to Christopher Columbus would be a beacon for all who envision a better, richer world. Washington, D.C., the capital of the free world is the logical place for such a monument.

Columbus is part of each of us. A monument dedicated to his greatness will reflect in some small measure our depth of appreciation and gratitude.

He deserves to take his place among the heroes who have brought the full benefits of the North and South American Continents to men of all races, creeds, and nationalities around the world.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope our Government will seriously consider undertaking these discussions at the earliest opportunity.

Columbus Day Celebration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 1967

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, the observance of Columbus Day has come to mean more than the honoring of this visionary's lofty achievement in discovering America. It has become an occasion to mark the courage and fortitude of subsequent immigrations.

Minority groups representing millions of immigrants have come to identify with him, for his undaunted spirit was the same as that of their forebears who came to this country in search of new vistas. Whether their ancestors came to this country willingly or of necessity, the virtues that enabled Columbus to succeed still hold promise of rewards.

Our able colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey, the Honorable PETER W. RODINO, has long been a champion of those who came to our shores as strangers and contributed immeasurably to our country's greatness; of those who through their toil and loyalty and devotion to America and their families have demonstrated as no "demonstration project" could, the wealth of opportunity this Nation offers; of those who transferred to their children their sense of responsibility and their ideals of good citizenship.

At a Columbus Day celebration in Detroit, Mich., on October 8, the gentleman from New Jersey eloquently expressed his deep devotion and understanding of these loyal Americans.

On this Columbus Day, I submit Mr. RODINO's remarks for the RECORD:

COLUMBUS DAY CELEBRATION

(Remarks of the Honorable PETER W. RODINO, Jr., Detroit, Mich., October 8, 1967)

I am delighted to be here with you in the Motor City to join in the annual celebration of one of the great, unexcelled moments in all recorded history—the opening of an entire new world to civilization.

From earliest boyhood, this has been a favorite holiday of mine, and with the passing years I have lost none of my youthful enthusiasm for it. I hope I never grow too old, too hardened, too blasé to enjoy and relish this festive event when we render fitting tribute to the one-time weaver from Genoa, whose vision, skill and courage made possible that great moment of discovery.

The celebration of Columbus Day traditionally serves a twofold purpose. It is an occasion for festive social gatherings, and a time for solemn contemplation. Fun and frolic have their place. So, of course, does serious thought.

And, tonight's happy occasion is one of the few bright spots in an otherwise gray and somber year.

It has been a long, distressing season of depressing events, what with the rash of rioting in our cities, the outbreak of war and tenuous truce in the middle east, and the unsilent guns and elusive peace in Viet Nam.

Clearly, the situation could be better.

And yet, for all the noisy, raucous demonstrations and counter-demonstrations; for all the violent hate-America rallies; for all the carping and criticism, I have yet to discover a better nation in all the world.

Despite its flaws and failings, the United States remains the most democratic, the most prosperous, the most forward-looking, the most humane nation on the face of the earth.

Imperfect though it may be, ours is a more perfect union than any who would belittle us have been able to create.

I do not say these things to wave a flag, although I am still old fashioned enough to believe that patriotism is not old hat.

I say these things, these complimentary things about America, because we somehow lose sight of them in the heat and fury of momentary discontent.

Not for a single instant do I doubt that the United States will endure, for this nation of ours is unique.

And, a great part of its unique quality is inextricably bound up with the boldness and daring of Christopher Columbus.

I often wonder what it must have been like, setting out to penetrate the mystery of the dark Atlantic in those three tiny ships, so pitifully frail and ill suited to the awesome challenge that lay ahead.

What faith and courage it must have taken to dare unlock the secrets of that vast, uncharted ocean—at the mercy of navigation instruments so crude and winds so capricious.

Few believed that Columbus could succeed. The wise branded him a fool, and fools thought him crazy.

To the doubters and detractors, the undaunted Columbus had a simple one-word answer:

"Adelante."

In Spanish, it means: ahead! Forward! Onward!

To himself, in his native Italian, Christoforo Colombo must have thought:

"Vanti, Sempre Avanti!" Onward—ever onward!

Adelante. Avanti. Onward! No matter what the language, that one word captures the spirit and echoes the everlasting significance of the legacy of this great man.

The indestructible faith, the penetrating vision, the unalterable determination of Christopher Columbus had conquered myth and mystery. The terrifying riddle of the Atlantic had been solved. The veil had been lifted. The wise who had doubted and the fools who had scoffed had been proved wrong.

With raw courage and iron will, Columbus had pressed onward, ever onward, to carry the Old World to the New World, here to begin a stirring new chapter in the story of mankind . . . for the towering achievement of Columbus did not end with discovery and exploration.

On his subsequent voyages (there were four in all), Columbus made the first attempt to colonize the lands he had discovered. In so doing, he became the father of immigration and the founder of the great melting pot that was to become America.

And so they came, year after year, the tired and the poor, the downtrodden and the oppressed, the lovers of liberty and the seekers of freedom from the Old World to the new.

They came with faith and hope in heart in search of dignity, equality and opportunity.

They brought their religion and their culture, their arts and their crafts, their skills and their ambitions—and with bare and bleeding hands they pushed the frontiers of freedom forward and they helped to make America great.

They became doctors and lawyers, businessmen and bankers, artists and musicians, teachers and professors, workers and executives.

In time of war, they proudly proved their patriotism (even as they are doing now), fighting and dying for the adopted nation they loved, that the light of liberty not be snuffed out by turbulent tyranny.

As with Columbus before them, the way to the new world was long and trying, but still they came—your fathers and mine—braving the hazards and the perils on their arduous, difficult trek from the countryside and mountainside, from city and hamlet, across the wide ocean to the land of promised opportunity.

Yes, they came, the young and the old, with a rich warmth in their souls and a determination to succeed. With their hands and their sweat, they built the great cities of America, its roads and highways, its railways and skyscrapers. And for good measure they threw in all their love and loyalty and devotion, and they became intertwined in the fabric of their adopted land and they enriched the tapestry of America's heritage.

They labored unselfishly that we who followed them would inherit the priceless gifts and treasured traditions of a free and prosperous nation.

This, my friends, is the stuff on which our forebears were made. The spirit to get things done; the will to achieve; the determination to accomplish—this is the legacy of the immigrant to his adopted land; to the land he gave so much of himself, though he often received so little in return.

Let me emphasize this. The American of Italian heritage seeks neither favor nor reward because he is of Italian descent.

But he should not, and must not, be denied fair and just treatment because his name ends in a vowel.

His abilities should not be ignored because he is of Italian origin. He should not be bypassed for promotion or advancement because his ancestry is Italian. His climb up the ladder of success should not be impeded by prejudice.

The American of Italian heritage should not have to be twice or three times as good as a rival in order to gain recognition; and yet we must admit that too often this is true, all too true.

Such treatment, to be sure, undermines our fundamental concepts of decency, respect for human dignity, and fair play. It makes the Bill of Rights an unpaid i.o.u., and the Declaration of Independence an uncollectable promissory note.

The practitioners of this kind of indefensible behavior ignore the powerful contributions of the Italian-rooted American community.

They choose to see only the sensational headlines that link Italian-sounding names to crime.

Because it suits their purpose, they forget that all nationalities have their bad actors, their rotten apples, their disowned and their discredited.

What a heavy cross to ask law-abiding, law-respecting Americans of Italian descent to bear!

A tiny minority, an infinitesimal fraction of evil-doers is being used to sully the reputation of a proud and wonderful ancestry. Now guilt by association is insidious—but guilt by reason of national origin, often generations removed, is worse.

We cannot, we dare not, ignore this.

As a Member of Congress, if you will pardon the personal reference, I fought for 17 years to eradicate the anti-Italian bias that was built into our Federal Immigration Act.

The quota system, based on national origin, has, with your help and the help of many enlightened people, at last been scrapped, and we no longer have to live with the smug implication that the people of one country are better and more welcome in the United States than the people of other countries.

Good fruit, they say, needs more time to ripen. If so, the democratizing of our immigration laws must certainly be a prize melon!

But the important point is that victory was achieved, the wrong was recognized and corrected—through the democratic process, under law and order, and within the framework of our established Government.

I think this is pertinent to the problem we presently face among groups demanding immediate results and instant miracles. The justness of a cause does not always turn the wheels of progress as quickly as we would like, even in an age of supersonic travel and speed-of-light communication. Perseverance, determination and patience are those Columbian qualities so necessary and essential to the ultimate victory over bigotry and racism.

This casts light upon another marathon campaign I have been waging to right a wrong of long standing—to establish Columbus Day as a national holiday.

Congratulations are certainly in order for your fine work here in Michigan in observing Columbus Day as a State holiday. But a State holiday and a national holiday are never the same. Even though 37 other States now mark this important date in history, none of these observances can give to Columbus Day the measure of respect and importance it justly deserves.

The Nation owes a heavy debt of gratitude to the Americans of Italian descent, who almost singlehandedly have kept alive the tradition of a Columbus Day observance, and who have championed its growth and prominence as a holiday of consequence and meaning.

It is not, however, and it should not be, a holiday solely for Americans of Italian heritage. It should and must be a holiday for all Americans who are justly proud of their common heritage; a common heritage that began in the early dawn of October 12, 1492, when that stalwart Genoese bent his knee to the earth of the new world and prayerfully thanked God for the divine guidance that carried him and his crew safely across the Atlantic.

Last Wednesday it was my privilege to deliver the opening speech at a public hearing called by the House Judiciary Subcommittee to help decide whether Columbus Day should be a national holiday.

I said then that I could think of no reason why it should not.

And I emphasized that whether Columbus was actually the first, or second, or even the third voyager to reach these shores is purely academic and totally irrelevant. It subtracts nothing from the intrepid admiral's daring and determination. It detracts nothing from the everlasting significance of his unique and towering achievement.

I outlined for the Judiciary Subcommittee my dream of a Columbus Day observance as a multipurpose national holiday.

It would recognize Christopher Columbus, his heroic voyage and his historic discovery.

It would be a day on which all Americans could reaffirm their faith in the future and express their willingness to face with confidence the imponderables of unknown tomorrows, in the spirit of Columbus.

Further, Columbus Day would be a perfect occasion for the Nation to pause each year to pay homage to the cause and challenge of discovery, invention and exploration. It would be a fitting time to review our progress in the search for technological advances to improve our way of life; to evaluate our gains in the patient quest for cures to diseases that kill and cripple; to apprise the wondrous probes into the vast void of outer space, and the still unknown secrets of the ocean depths.

Finally, Columbus Day would be a day to honor immigrants of all nationalities and to acknowledge their contributions to the building of a strong, just and prosperous United States of America.

President Kennedy correctly called us "a nation of immigrants", and the Congress already has acted to establish Ellis Island as a permanent reminder of our indebtedness to those who came from foreign soil and who gave their brain and their brawn—and not infrequently, their lives—that their adopted land could grow and flourish.

Just as George Washington is called the "Father of our country", so Christopher Columbus deservedly should be remembered as the "Father of immigration", for it was he, and no other, who made the first attempts at colonization in the new world.

In honoring our immigrants on Columbus Day we will do more than show our gratitude for their countless contributions to a better, safer America.

We will be simultaneously striking a powerful blow against discrimination and the intolerable prejudice of those who insist upon judging a man by where he comes from, or where his parents or their parents came from, without regard for individual ability, integrity, loyalty or any other distinguishing and commendable characteristics.

The observance of Columbus Day as a national holiday will, I am certain, prove to be an effective instrument to blunt the vestiges of discrimination, prejudice and bigotry, and it will complement and enhance our calendar of national holidays.

I am happy to report to you this evening that we are making headway. I know that we made a favorable impression upon the Judiciary Committee, for the witnesses who followed me were many in number and imposing, even as they were eloquent and articulate.

And I would not be surprised if this Columbus Day celebration turns out to be historic, although for a reason you might not have expected. This may mark the last Columbus Day as a State holiday.

I sincerely hope that by next year Columbus Day will be observed by all Americans, from coast to coast, as a national holiday. Columbus Day deserves this honor and prestige.

It will truly be a holiday for all Americans. But I have no doubt that Americans of Italian heritage will honor it with just a little extra show of love and just a little additional feeling of reverence, respect and heartfelt warmth.

Thank you.

A Salute to Gen. Casimir Pulaski and the Polish People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 1967

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to join with the Members here in paying tribute to the memory of Gen. Casimir Pulaski on the occasion of the anniversary of his death.

His role in resisting the forces oppressing his beloved Poland has been celebrated by the historians of every freedom-loving nation. Every American schoolboy has been taught the debt of gratitude that our own country owes to the contributions and courage of this great patriot. As we revere his memory, we honor through him that love of liberty and that dauntless spirit, stemming from his Polish heritage, which sent him forth to fight for freedom in the New World.

Through the centuries Poland has had its great leaders—men of extraordinary capabilities, character, and courage. Yet all of the great men of Poland, no matter how varied their spheres of influence or different their fields of endeavor, have inherited several things in common which gave them their reason for being—their love of God and their religion, their love of country, and their burning desire for its eventual liberation.

At the beginning of modern times all of western Christendom owed a debt of gratitude to Poland when King John Sobieski drove the Turks back from Vienna in 1683 in one of the most decisive victories in history. Had the gallant Sobieski failed, all Europe would have been subjected to a yoke of slavery and Christian culture would have been destroyed.

Poland's contributions to the success of the Allies during World War II, and the fight of her people to preserve western civilization once again as they did in the battle of Vienna in the 15th century, make it mandatory that all true Americans support the demands for justice for Poland in the United Nations.

The heroic stand of Poland in 1939 in the face of aggression by superior force was an example of courage unparalleled in history. Poland's contributions to the military success of the United Nations in the drive to final victory and peace, and her sacrifice in the cause of humanity, merit every consideration. We must keep the sacred pledges that were made to

Poland, not only because of the debt of gratitude which the other nations of the world owe to Poland, but because of the necessity of obtaining the wholehearted cooperation of all the smaller nations who look to us for justice.

To Americans of Polish ancestry, who have contributed so much to the development of the United States, I urge you to continue your efforts to restore Poland to its prewar glory. The buoyant idealism and splendid patriotism, together with the deep Christian concept of the right, which have characterized the Polish spirit in the past, have done much for our own country and should certainly do much for Poland.

Civilization is based upon a reign of peace and justice, and for this reason America has been ennobled by the spiritual contributions of her citizens of Polish descent. By being true to their culture and their creed, Americans of Polish ancestry cannot help being true to their country. Their love of Poland and desire to make it free will only enhance their love of America. All of us might well be proud if we could contribute as much as Pulaski did to progress in the United States and peace in the world.

Proposed Adirondack Mountains National Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. McEWEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 1967

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, a recent proposal for the establishment of a national park in the Adirondack Mountains of New York has occasioned considerable concern and comment from the people of the area. An excellent editorial entitled "Time for Action!" in the Tupper Lake Free Press sets forth the threat that this proposal holds for the economy of the village of Tupper Lake. It was this same community that was sorely threatened in 1965 by the Federal Government's closing of its Sunmount Veterans Hospital. Again, this community sees itself threatened by yet another possible Federal action. This editorial, together with my response to it contained in a letter to the editor of the Tupper Lake Free Press, sets for the concern of the community and my own position on this proposal:

[From the Tupper Lake Free Press, Sept. 14, 1967]

TIME FOR ACTION!

The more we read about the plans for the proposed Adirondack Mountains National Park and the persuasive line being followed to "sell" the idea to the public, the more concerned we become that this is not just a far-out and impossible dream which will sputter out after the novelty wears off . . .

Whether we like it or not—it can happen here, and it begins to appear that it WILL happen, unless opposition on a grand scale materializes . . . The wishes of the people who call the Adirondacks home, and who make their living here, will apparently go unconsidered. The proponents of the national park idea contend that it is essential to preserve the wilderness character and "natural wonders" of the region; that at the present rate of land acquisition, under forest preserve status it "would take 125 years to acquire another one million acres" within the Adirondack park blue line, in which time, because of the rocketing climb in population pressure and "greater demands for economic exploitation of the private lands", such lands would be made unsuitable for either forest preserve or national park uses.

A question-and-answer document released recently by the national park promoters dismisses New York State's present Adirondack State Park as "little more than a public relations tag" and charges that "the park does not exist . . . It is a myth" . . . This should come as something of a surprise to those interests which have bucked the rigid "forever wild" provisions pertaining to the state-owned Adirondack timberlands, and which have been in effect for three-quarters of a century . . .

The plan provides that the legislation to authorize establishment of the national park would also provide for the Secretary of the Interior to promulgate zoning standards, formulated in cooperation with the towns, to guide town zoning within the authorized national park boundaries and at park entrances . . . Incorporated towns outside, but adjacent to the boundaries of the authorized park would be "encouraged to improve their zoning ordinances" so as "to prevent developments incompatible with the purposes of the national park" . . . "Within the specified village and resort exclusions or enclaves, the Secretary of the Interior's authority to acquire land by condemnation would be suspended "unless zoning failed to comply with the approved standards, or unless a property owner failed to comply with town zoning consistent with the approved standards, or unless necessary to provide public access to lakes, streams or other important park features".

The procedure is spelled out quite definitely. Private homes within the proposed park "built prior to a date specified in the legislation" would be permitted to remain, with "essential surrounding land, usually not exceeding three acres" . . . Existing commercial ventures not consistent with park purposes (including subdivision of land for sale and commercial timber production) could be acquired by the Federal Government for park purposes by condemnation, if necessary . . . Undeveloped land would be acquired for park purposes as rapidly as possible, by transfer, purchase, exchange, donation or condemnation . . . "Purchases are negotiated on the basis of competent appraisals of fair market value by qualified, impartial real estate appraisers familiar with property in the area" . . . The plan generously adds that "reserved use and occupancy by the owner for life, or for a term of years, can be allowed if purchase on this basis will meet the needs of the Service and are justified in cost . . . in general, eminent domain proceedings are utilized only as a last resort, when all other reasonable efforts or negotiation have failed" . . . In brief, you'll sell, whether you wish to or not, and at a price regarded as "fair" by government-paid appraisers, —whether or not it's "fair" by your standards . . .

All hunting and trapping would be banned within the park . . . To ease the blow to towns which would lose heavily in state taxes paid on lands within the town limits "a limited series of payments in lieu of taxes" would be arranged "until increased income from the park establishment and operation would make the local communities economically viable" . . .

That's the picture . . . Possibly for some areas the proposed Adirondack Mountains National Park would make no great difference economically. For Tupper Lake, insofar as we can see, it would be a disaster. This community is situated just outside the proposed park boundary, and would enjoy none of the recreation development possibilities of the villages in the "resort enclaves", —Lake Placid, Saranac and Old Forge . . . On the contrary, with the forced sale of the big park lands, by condemnation procedure or otherwise, —Whitney Park, Litchfield Park and others which for many years have assured a continuing supply of raw materials for the forest products industry, —Tupper Lake would face the bleak prospects of closed mills, vanished payrolls and a sleighride downhill to the status of another Derrick.

We're still not convinced that the Adirondack National Park will become a reality, provided enough opposition to the project develops . . . A couple of years ago this community faced up to another potential disaster when Uncle Sam decided to close Sunmount VA Hospital. The fight which Tupper made at that time didn't save the hospital as a Veterans Administration Facility, but it DID spark the change-over to state operation, preventing the loss of the biggest single employer in the area and giving Tupper an institution which promises to grow and develop with the passing years.

The same community-wide action is essential now . . . We strongly urge our readers to write Congressman Robert C. McEwen, Governor Rockefeller, State Senator Ronald Stafford and Assemblyman Glenn Harris, registering opposition to the proposal and calling on them to use every means at their disposal to prevent its becoming a reality . . . If you don't feel like composing a letter of protest, and you agree with the sentiments in this editorial, —clip it out and mail it to them, along with a brief note to the effect that it sums up the way most of us here feel about this important question . . .

Economically, this region has little going for it other than lumbering and the resort trade . . . With lumbering and forest products manufacture killed by national park restrictions. Tupper's future would be pretty much all behind it . . .

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 4, 1967.

Mr. LOUIS J. SIMMONS,
Editor, Tupper Lake Free Press,
Tupper Lake, N.Y.

DEAR LOU: I noted with interest, appreciation and agreement every word contained in your outstandingly excellent editorial entitled "Time for Action!"

It has always seemed to me, as a native Northern New Yorker and one who has spent over half of his adult life in legislative bodies, that too many plans and suggestions for what to do with the Adirondacks come from everywhere but the Adirondacks. The Park Avenue friends of the forest are ever ready to suggest what would be best for the Adirondacks. Usually, as an after thought, they have some form of addendum to point out that it would also be a great boon to the people living in the Adirondacks.

I am sure that I represent the feelings of many of my North Country constituents when I react with less than enthusiasm to the proposal for the Adirondack Mountains National Park.

Every facet of this proposal does violence to the interests of the area and its people, and, yes, I would say both its year-round resident population and visitors as well. The National Park proposal does not mean increased recreational use—it means less. A plan that would ban all hunting and trapping is to me inconceivable of having any sound conservation or economic value. To allow a deer herd to become so numerous that starvation would be the only harvester, is so unenlightened as to be appalling.

Your editorial made many excellent points, including the matter of payments in lieu of taxes. I am sure that with many of your other readers, I share a skepticism about the "increased income" that would come from this proposed park.

Our North Country has long felt the adverse economic effect of an already too restrictive policy on the use of our forest lands. It is my view that the proposed park would be a further and gigantic step in the wrong direction.

In conclusion, I am pleased to report that a number of your readers accepted your suggestion that they write to their Congressman. Without exception, those letters expressed strong disapproval of the proposed national park. These letters, and the excellent editorial that prompted them, were appreciated by the writer of this letter.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT C. MCEWEN.

Columbus Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 1967

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to join my colleagues in paying tribute today to Christopher Columbus and all our good Italo-American citizens and friends on Columbus Day. I am happy to be a sponsor of H.R. 5057, which I introduced on February 8, 1967, a bill declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday, to be known as Columbus Day.

Columbus Day, as now celebrated by 35 States, including my own Pennsylvania, falls on October 12. This day stands as a memorial and honor to Christopher Columbus. This great Italian discovered and brought to Europe's attention the vast American Continent. Columbus' voyage was severely difficult and only the enthusiasm of this powerful leader kept the expedition on its course.

Four hundred and seventy-five years ago today was an important day for Americans when Columbus actually discovered America. In this age of exciting space explorations, we should pause to recall and pay tribute to Columbus, because his journey stands as a monument of human courage, bravery and enthusiasm. He was a powerful leader who kept his expedition of three ships and handpicked crew of 90 on its course, in spite of extreme hardships, and unfavorable winds. Although Columbus had made numerous voyages to the Mediterranean, Iceland, and the African coast, and studied under the most advanced geographers and navigators of the day, his determination in seeking a western route to Asia led to his landing on our shores on October 12, 1492.

More recent years have seen an increasing appreciation of this great Italian navigator. In 1892, 400 years after the discovery of this continent, President Benjamin Harrison recommended to the American people that October 12 be a general holiday. President Harrison called for Americans, as much as possible, to "cease from toil" and devote themselves to such exercises as may best express honor to the discoverer and their appreciation of the great achievements of the four completed centuries of American life.

Keeping in mind the spirit of President Harrison's appeal, and also as a tribute to the many outstanding Italo-American citizens of Pittsburgh and Allegheny County, Pa., including Justice Michael A. Musmanno, Judge Ruggero J. Aldisert, Judge William F. Cercone, Charles G. Notari, Frank J. Zappala, and my good friends in the Italian Sons and Daughters of America and the Sons of Columbus, I am glad to join in paying tribute to Christopher Columbus on October 12, and strongly urge that Columbus Day be made a national holiday.

Thaddeus Kosciuszko: 150th Anniversary of His Death—October 15, 1967

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 1967

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on October 15, 1817, Thaddeus Kosciuszko died. This Sunday marks the 150th anniversary of his death. With him died an era of individual devotion to principle that was without equal in history.

Kosciuszko was the heart and soul of that era. His entire life was spent battling for an ideal. His goal was freedom—freedom for men and women who had never known freedom; freedom for those who had labored under tyranny and oppression all the days of their lives.

When he came to this country from Europe to help in our Revolutionary War, he was well acquainted with the selfish tyrannies of kings. So he offered his life to total strangers who believed as he did—that men had the right to decide for themselves what their destiny would be.

His courage in battle led men to risk their lives as readily as he risked his. His zest and enthusiasm renewed them when they tired and were discouraged and despaired of defeating the hordes of redcoats that swarmed at every hand.

There seemed to be nothing Kosciuszko could or would not do for the fledgling American government, from designing fortifications for West Point and Fort Delaware, to leading charges in clash after clash with enemy forces.

Eventually, Cornwallis was defeated and the peace was signed. The United States of America was a free and independent new nation. Praise and riches were lavished on Kosciuszko, but he was troubled by the grave news from across the sea in Poland. He could not rest, but sailed at once to lend a hand to help his doomed nation in any way he could. Yet even he could not withstand the massed armies of Russia and his revolt was smashed and he was captured and thrown into a Russian prison.

But they could not crush his spirit or his mind.

Eventually, when he was set free, he sought out his friends in the United States once more. Congress, recognizing his great contribution to our victory over the British, presented him with grants of land and an independent income. On every hand were well wishers, friends, and admirers.

But, as dark clouds gathered over Europe, this man who had never chosen a soft life, resolved to return to the frontlines in the war against tyranny. Before departing, he turned over his fortune and holdings in America to his friend Thomas Jefferson, with the stipulation that they be used to establish a school for Negroes and to buy and free Negro slaves. Slavery was the great blemish on American democracy. Kosciuszko—who hated all forms of oppression and human suffering—by his example taught America a lesson in conscience that could not be ignored.

President Jefferson carried out his wishes to the letter and set his own slaves free upon his death.

February 12, 1809, was Kosciuszko's 63d birthday. On that day, far across Europe and the Atlantic Ocean, a child was born who was to proclaim Kosciuszko's lesson in freedom to all his countrymen and to the world. Abraham Lincoln was equal to the challenge.

Kosciuszko lived in an age of violence; of shifting borders and shifting loyalties; of fear and oppression, hunger and deprivation. And war. Early in life, he decided to devote his talents and his allotted time on earth to changing the old, old order.

Love of liberty radiated from him as light from a torch. He inspired men to look beyond themselves; to reach a little higher than they thought themselves capable; to see life as a continuing gift from God to be used carefully, wisely and with respect for all men.

Thaddeus Kosciuszko inspired a generation. Always, always by his example he urged men to improve, to better themselves, to stand for something, and not to fear dying if it meant others might live freely and with dignity.

Now this Nation he crossed a continent and an ocean to help is confronted with a global struggle that is not confined to national borders and territories. Today, the entire world is at stake and all who live in it must become involved in survival or face the consequences of their indifference.

Our national involvement in Vietnam is a blunt statement to all the nations with whom we share this tiny planet that the United States stands for something. Our word is good.

There is not a man among us, whether in the White House, in the Congress, or in the towns and cities across the country who likes what we are doing in Vietnam. None of us wants to be there.

But the history of too many great nations has been a history of appeasement, capitulation, and eventual defeat.

Our technological progress is great and growing. But it is also conservatively estimated that Red China will have a deliverable hydrogen weapon capable of hitting any target, anywhere on earth, in less than 5 years.

I ask you, What good would it do at

this stage of development in the terrible weapons of war to say America will defend her own borders and no others? In a nuclear age there are no borders. Only targets.

Our globe, which holds so many hungry, oppressed millions, must be America's concern. We have the conscience, and the power, to do something to help.

If we can convince Red China and the Communist governments in Hanoi and Moscow we will not sacrifice Asia—as Poland was sacrificed, and Czechoslovakia, and nation after nation in every corner of the world throughout history—we may buy enough time to persuade these hysterical warlords with their horrifying ability to destroy the world that there can be no victor in a global holocaust.

They have whipped themselves into frenzied dreams of conquest, somehow believing that conquering a hungry, overcrowded world will remove them from the responsibility of solving their own gigantic domestic problems.

We must convince them a war with us would be impossible of victory. And we must persuade them to talk of peace instead of war.

We have not much time. We in America could use these next few years frantically living the good life at home while the shadow of death slips over the world as one by one the small, defenseless nations are absorbed and crushed by communism.

But what about responsibility and the American dream of liberty and self-determination for all men? As long as our pledge stands for something and our commitments are made in honor, we are living up to the good words we have preached to the world in easier, more peaceful times.

Just as Kosciuszko was on the side of right, regardless of the odds, so must we—each and every one of us—be on that side, too.

Adlai Stevenson might have had Kosciuszko and all of us in mind before his death when he wrote:

> What counts now is not just what we are against, but what we are for. Who leads us is less important than what leads us—what convictions, what courage, what faith—win or lose. A man doesn't save a century or a civilization, but a militant group wedded to a principle, can.

Proposed Patent Cooperation Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 1967

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, our technologically oriented society has focused attention on our patent system and that system is today under active study in a number of areas. President Johnson has proposed enactment of a patent reform bill to modernize the U.S. patent system, and this measure is before the Patent Subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee. On another front, the U.S. Patent Office is engaged in international cooperative endeavors with other countries. A draft Patent Cooperation Treaty has recently been brought forth by the United International Bureau for the Protection of Intellectual Property. These significant developments are described in detail in a recent address by Secretary of Commerce Alexander B. Trowbridge before the Patents Committee of the National Association of Manufacturers and I insert the speech by Secretary Trowbridge in the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF COMMERCE ALEXANDER B. TROWBRIDGE, PREPARED FOR DELIVERY TO THE PATENTS COMMITTEE OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MANUFACTURERS, NEW YORK, N.Y., SEPTEMBER 8, 1967

It is my very real pleasure to be here with you today to discuss the improvement of our patent system—a system in which we as administrators and you as users have a common interest.

Efforts of improvement can be classified as long-range undertakings whose benefits will accrue for decades to come, just as the original Constitutional provision for patent protection has served us for 180 years.

Most of our time in this fast-moving world is taken up with short range objectives. Obviously both are important—laying the foundation for progress in the years ahead by the improvement of over-all systems, and making short-run adjustments that meet the immediate needs of the day.

President Johnson's Patent Reform Bill illustrates this Administration's concern with long-range improvements in our economic system.

In transmitting the measure to Congress last February, the President noted that the patent system has "helped American business to translate the 'fire of genius' into the products and processes that have enriched the lives of all of us."

But he also pointed out that "institutions must change to meet the demands of our times," and I think it is clear that modernization is long overdue.

If the patent system is to continue to serve us well it must be strengthened and streamlined to cope with the challenges of the decades ahead. It must keep pace with both expanded trade and new technology. Even more, it must create a better climate for expanded entry of American businessmen into international markets. And it must provide for prompt disclosure and use of new technology in this country. This will benefit not only American business but also the American consumer.

The NAM, under the leadership of your Committee Chairman, Frederic O. Hess, has been among those most active in defining the problems facing the patent system and in relating them to business interests.

One problem that illustrates the need for reform is the unnecessary and burdensome duplication of effort in protecting inventions internationally. This duplication bears heavily on the patent offices of the world and on businessmen engaged in world commerce. It creates an artificial barrier to world trade.

An average of three patent applications is filed internationally on each invention patented. This means that of the estimated 650,000 patent applications filed worldwide each year, two-thirds are duplicates or multiple filings of other applications. Each is processed individually in each country. Moreover, companies and individuals must plow through a complex maze of divergent laws and customs which have grown up over the years, involving even the size of paper which must be used or the number of typewritten lines per page.

In this country, dissemination of technological advances is often delayed by the very system designed to accelerate disclosure. U.S. patent applications are now kept secret until a patent is issued, and this can take up to five years or more.

Because of built-in delays, businessmen, unaware of a competitor's work, may invest substantial sums reinventing something already patented by a competitor. I find it hard to believe that knowledgeable American concerns actually search published foreign patents and applications to find out what other American companies are trying to patent right here in this country.

As you know, this Administration has moved on a number of fronts to update the patent system and gear it for more rapid and effective service to business and the public.

You are all familiar, of course, with the recommendations of the President's Commission and with the Patent Reform proposals he sent Congress in February to implement the Commission's work. This bill would bring about the first major revision of the patent system in more than a century. It is designed, as the President said:

"(1) To raise the quality and reliability of U.S. patents.

"(2) To reduce the time and expense of obtaining and protecting a patent.

"(3) To speed public disclosure of scientific and technological information."

The President added that these changes would also bring our own system into closer harmony with those of other nations.

Better international cooperation will lead naturally to better protection of intellectual property. And this, of course, is the rationale behind our new bilateral information and search exchange agreements with Germany, Switzerland, France, Japan, Austria and other countries. All of these pilot studies have not been completed. But so far we have learned some valuable lessons from them, notably that the quickest way to end expensive, inefficient, massive duplication is through a multi-nation system within the framework of existing international cooperative arrangements.

Accordingly, the U.S. Delegation asked the Paris Union last fall to have the United International Bureau for the Protection of Intellectual Property undertake an urgent study of the duplication problem. As you know, the result was the proposed Patent Cooperation Treaty which is being considered by your Committee here today.

I do not propose to discuss in any length the President's Patent Reform Bill, except to emphasize my support for its provisions and their underlying objectives. We want the most effective and efficient patent system to serve this country in the future. Enactment of the Reform Bill, I am convinced, will achieve the goals laid down by the President and will bring our patent system more fully in line with its Constitutional objectives.

Nor do I propose to discuss in any detail the Patent Cooperation Treaty. We are encouraged by BIRPI's effort and initiative and anxious to see further development and refinement of its work.

But I would like to outline what I think are the broad objectives of a modern, efficient patent system and to relate them to our national and international goals.

Simply stated, the patent system should provide effective incentives for the greatest possible development and use of new technology in this country and in international markets.

To the extent that it is able to achieve this goal—

It will enhance our standard of living, which increasingly is founded upon a sophisticated technological base.

It will facilitate the transfer of new technology across national borders to spur economic progress in all parts of the globe.

And finally, it will permit us to compete more effectively in international markets where new technology is at the very cutting edge of competition.

We are in a period of both continuing expansion and keener competition in world trade. U.S. exports climbed to record levels last year, and are now running at an annual rate of $31.2 billion. Obviously there is the closest relationship between our export expansion and our technological progress. For example, we can now replace reduced exports in low-technology products with increased exports in high-technology products.

Just as technological changes bear heavily on efforts to expand exports, so does the success of U.S. firms in penetrating high-technology foreign markets depend largely on their ability to obtain foreign patents to protect inventions and innovations. This interrelation will increase, of course, as our mix of export products becomes more sophisticated. Clearly, the trend is toward greater reliance on patent safeguards. The export prospects for the future continue to be bright for highly technical products in which foreign patent protection could be a deciding factor in successful competition in foreign markets.

The world market to which U.S. business looks for customers has widened to include many countries which were ignored or not even in existence twenty years ago. These are the so-called less developed countries—less developed in an industrial sense, but in many cases with abundant natural resources. It is generally recognized that they must be brought into the international patent system to help speed their economic development, and their potential as trading partners. BIRPI has been conducting a vigorous program in this regard and we in this country heartily endorse it. One difficulty is that few of the developing countries have either the personnel or the government machinery for the complexities of a patent system. BIRPI has instituted training arrangements in which our Patent Office is cooperating. Useful seminars already have been held in Asia, Africa and Latin America. BIRPI has also supervised the drafting of a legal model for a national patent system.

In talking about international cooperation, a distinction is sometimes drawn between our national or domestic interests and our international objectives. I can't see any difference between the two. For the patent system to be truly effective, it must serve both to foster progress at home and to stimulate our international commerce.

Both the Patent Reform Bill and the proposed Patent Cooperation Treaty envisage far-reaching changes in old and established customs and practices. For this reason, if for no other, they invite controversy and opposition. To the extent that this is constructive and in the national interest, we welcome it. To the extent that it is self-serving and designed to create roadblocks, we deplore it. Whoever would oppose these measures because he is against change, *per se*, or for other purely subjective reasons, has a real obligation to review his position in light of the national interest—not to say that of his business or his profession. It is less than responsible to pretend that either the U.S. patent system or the international legal structures protecting inventions, as they exist today, cannot be improved upon.

Reasonable men may differ over details; I cannot believe there is any question that basic reforms are needed—and soon. The world quickly leaves behind those who cannot adapt to the fact and the form of change.

We are now in the process of studying the BIRPI draft. Your meeting and discussions here today, and those of other interested parties, will help us. We should not forget that this is a draft, the first of many which will be prepared even before formal international negotiations are begun.

At a meeting of the Committee of Experts, scheduled for October in Geneva to consider the draft Treaty, the views of twenty-three interested governments on the Treaty will be fully explored. To provide broad gauge representation at this meeting, private industrial and bar groups from this and other countries have been invited to participate. Following the October meeting, there will be ample opportunity for further consideration of a revised draft Treaty.

We favor harmonization of national patent laws, and we look to the ultimate goal of a true universal or multinational patent. The proposed Treaty is a major step toward this goal. Because of its importance, we should make it as attractive as possible. For example, it may be that to attract the widest possible international support, this initial step should require as little change as possible in the national laws of the member countries. It should require a minimum of administrative cost and effort. If proposals to improve the Treaty in these and other areas will increase support for it, we are prepared to vigorously sponsor such proposals.

All of these moves in the patent field, both in the international and domestic spheres, should illustrate our resolve that technological progress not become ensnared in technical red tape.

How ironic it would be for man's inventive genius to be stymied by our failure to devise ways to put the fruits of his genius to work!

We are characterized as an "innovative" society—which essentially means that we can turn the ideas of man into effective and productive tools. It is clearly in our joint interest, as administrators and as users of the patent system, to see to it that such a description of our economic system is continually proven to be accurate.

Congressman Ottinger Attacks Jet Noise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 1967

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, I am always pleased when my colleagues from other congressional districts speak out on the menace of jet noise. The more voices raised in protest, the greater the recognition of the problem and the sooner we will achieve our objectives.

True, jet noise started out as a local problem. It originally only affected those around the first airfields geared to service jet planes. Now as the number of smaller jet aircraft in operation increases and the number of airfields servicing jets increases across the Nation, we have recognized jet noise as a national problem.

Just a few weeks ago, Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall, a frequent and outspoken critic against jet noise, attacked jet noise and called it one of the most serious environmental problems facing the Nation today. In referring to "noise pollution" from National Airport, he further indicated that the Federal Government will soon launch a war on jet noise.

Certainly jet noise has been branded as a critical problem on the local, national, and international levels and deserves the attention of Federal responsibility.

Last week the chairman of the Transportation Subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, the gentleman from Maryland, the Honorable Samuel Friedel, advised me that hearings would be scheduled next month on pending aircraft noise abatement bills. Legislation to revoke flight certificates of airlines which fail to comply with noise standards—introduced in the House by the distinguished chairman of the House Commerce Committee, the gentleman from West Virginia, the Honorable Harley O. Staggers, and by more than 20 other Members of the House—will be considered.

Focusing his attention on our Nation's Capital—Washington, D.C.—our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York, the Honorable Richard L. Ottinger, has vividly pointed out the noise and pollution factors involved in this question. Congressman Ottinger's remarks before the Palisades Citizens Association of Washington, D.C., on October 3, 1967, highlight the jet noise problem and the relationship between the people affected by jet noise and the Government agencies with jurisdiction in the field of aviation.

I urge my colleagues to read the full text of Mr. Ottinger's address and the Washington Post editorial of October 8, 1967, which I place in the Record at this point under unanimous consent:

People, Noise, and the CAB

(A speech by the Honorable Richard L. Ottinger, Member of Congress, to the Palisades Citizens Association, October 3, 1967)

It's no exaggeration to say that I've experienced the problem of aircraft pollution from virtually every angle. I've dealt with it as a regular twice a week commuter between La Guardia and National. When I'm in Washington I'm on the receiving end of a phenomenal number of complaints from constituents about the assault that air traffic is is making upon their lives in the form of air pollution, noise and air traffic safety. And when I'm home I have the pleasure of living right under what I am convinced is the most heavily travelled jet approach to La Guardia. So when I say that I'm glad to be here with you tonight, you will appreciate that my heart is really in this battle.

I find it a strange irony that the environmental pollution which threatens our health and sanity, if not our very survival, is a direct result of the very technological achievements that are responsible for the unparalleled physical well-being of our nation.

During the great depression, the late Will Rogers observed that we were on the way to having the distinction of being the only nation in history to ride to the poor house in a limousine. Well, our technology advanced so fast that we've kept raising our sights. Now we seem to be aiming at extinction in a supersonic jet.

Seriously, however, there is impressive evidence that unless we change our ways, we may well strangle in the waste and refuse that is now the greatest single product of our affluent society.

The Senate Public Works Committee has reported that by the end of this century, slightly more than one generation away, the demand for water in this country will exceed our known resources of clean water by some 300 million gallons each year.

In less than ten years, New York City will have exhausted every known resource for disposing the residue from incinerated trash—*if* the volume of refuse doesn't increase and it *is* increasing steadily. My own district of Westchester faces this same crisis within the next seven years and metropolitan areas all over the country are on a similar timetable.

A distinguished meteorologist, Dr. Morris Nieburger of the University of California, has warned that if we continue at our present rate "the world's atmosphere will grow more and more polluted until, a century from now it will be too poisonous to allow human life to survive and civilization will pass away."

These are the main conflicts that we must find a way to resolve, but they are by no means the only ones.

There are other, subtler forms of pollution that can have equally devastating effects upon the health and welfare of our society such as noise and urban sprawl.

I personally have no question that we can develop the mechanisms for resolving these conflicts and thus preserve a livable environment. But the sober fact is that we had better get cracking because we haven't made any real progress yet.

This is a national problem and the logical place to look for leadership is the Federal agencies that have played such an important role in spurring technological development. Agencies such as the Federal Power Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board, NASA, the Federal Aviation Agency, the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Public Roads, the Bureau of Reclamation all have important responsibilities affecting the resources of the nation.

Now I am aware that I am going to be stepping on some toes here when I say this, but the sad fact is that these Federal agencies, created in the days when the paramount need was to develop technological potential to the fullest, have failed signally to recognize the present challenge or adjust to meet it.

John Kenneth Galbraith has an explanation. He once wrote that agencies "like the people who comprise them, have a marked life cycle. In youth, they are vigorous, aggressive, evangelistic and even intolerant. Later they mellow, and in old age—after a matter of ten of fifteen years—they become, with some exceptions, either the arm of the industry they are regulating or senile."

By this harsh but realistic time table you might expect the agencies I have named to have achieved a truly archaeological antiquity, even in their revised and modified editions, and I am afraid that in the main your expectation would be justified.

That is why I believe that your particular battle is so very important for the nation as a whole, even though it may seem at times to be a local and rather parochial concern. It is becoming clear that only through the action of concerned citizens can agencies of the Federal government be made to recognize that the "public" in "public convenience and necessity" means everybody, not just the air lines, the power companies, the travelers, truckers and other interest groups. And that convenience and necessity include as a primary consideration the preservation of a livable environment as well as a well-developed one.

The now-famous Storm King Mountain Case with which I am personally quite familiar offers not only a clear parallel to your case with the CAB, but also concrete proof of the value of citizen action in the battle to preserve a livable environment.

In Storm King, a group of independent citizens battled for four years to force the FPC to weigh environmental hazards in determining whether a gigantic hydro-electric project proposed for Storm King Mountain on the threshold of the nation's greatest metropolitan complex served the true public convenience and necessity.

Just as the CAB has chosen to interpret the "public" in "public convenience and necessity" as the airlines and the airlines' view of the traveling public, so the FPC interpreted public as meaning the utilities and the utilities' view of the consumer.

Just as the CAB has endeavored to pass the responsibility for environmental impact onto local authorities and the Department of Transportation, so did the FPC attempt to leave these issues to the Department of the Interior and local agencies, preferring to act as umpire rather than assume affirmative responsibility.

Just as the CAB has refused intervention on the grounds that the public interests affected by noise and air pollution are too remote and generalized, so the FPC refused intervention on the grounds that the citizens had no economic interest in the quality of the environment that was being affected.

The CAB would do well to review the stinging rebuke administered to the FPC by the Second Circuit Court of Appeals when its precedent-setting decision revoked the license issued by the FPC in the Storm King Case.

In effect, the Court said that in this complex world every citizen has an interest in preserving a livable environment and that interest must be recognized and respected by Federal agencies. It said that insofar as the consequences of an action taken or approved by a Federal agency can have an adverse impact upon the general environment, the agency has a responsibility to evaluate and weigh that impact fully in arriving at its decision. Most encouraging of all, the court added an eleventh commandment to the administrative book: Thou shalt not act as "an umpire blandly calling balls and strikes," but shall exercise an affirmative responsibility for seeking out and protecting this broader public interest.

Because of the fight that these private citizens put up, the FPC will probably never again feel safe in accepting a utility company's best guess as to what effect a proposed project may have on air pollution, fish, water pollution and other related resources. In fact, no agency of the Federal government can now safely feel indifferent to the impact of its decision on the quality of our environment, especially when they know that other groups of private citizens care.

It is important to stress that, like the Storm King Case, this is not just a local problem. You will find that people all over the country are just as annoyed, just as hectored and just as frustrated as you are by environmental intrusions and by the indifference of Federal agencies.

Eleanor Clark French in New York has been leading a battle to protect Manhattan's already cacaphonic environment from a further nerve-shattering assault in the form of helicopter service to the Pan Am building.

She has pointed out with great reason that the dubious convenience of having a dozen or so businessmen deposited on Pan Am's roof is more than offset by the damage done by the noise and by the continuing danger that the craft may well miss and land in Grand Central Station someday.

A group in Santa Barbara, California, has had an ordinance passed forbidding low-flying jets from abusing their airspace. A distinguished group in Cambridge, Massachusetts, is doing valiant battle against the incredible sonic boom intrusions that are certain to come from the supersonic jet and in Westchester, New York a group has been formed to combat the mounting noise problem experienced from the growing volume of jet aircraft landing at La Guardia and Kennedy airports.

These people deserve your attention. They share a common cause. Part of the key to victory in the Storm King case was the effort that went into locating concerned citizens all over the country and getting them involved in the battle.

With so many private citizens involved in these issues, why doesn't Congress take direct action?

In regard to your problem with aircraft noise, I have introduced legislation that would direct NASA to undertake a full-scale (I almost said "crash") program of research to develop the techniques that are needed to eliminate aircraft noise of all types. I have also introduced legislation that would authorize the Federal Aviation Agency to compel carriers to install noise abatement devices and to change flight patterns to minimize public disturbance.

Only last week the Commerce Committee of which I am a member took the first tentative step to deal with air pollution from jet aircraft when they adopted my amendment to the Clean Air Act which directs the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to get into this area. These are sound proposals and will undoubtedly help.

We have to face the fact, however, that short of creating a wholly new agency with authority to act on environmental issues, we have no alternative but to work with those existing organizations which have, so far, failed, and, worse, shown little or no interest in succeeding. This Federal myopia undoubtedly stems from the fact that they were originally chartered to spur development without much serious consideration for the impact it might have on our environment. It isn't easy to legislate leopards into changing their spots.

If these agencies recognized the challenge and were prepared to accept it, then extensive new legislation would probably not be necessary. Certainly the recent court decisions, especially the High Mountain Sheep and the Storm King Cases, seem to indicate that the existing authority is adequate, if they will only act upon it. However, if these existing agencies won't see the challenge, new legislation to make them do so would be difficult to get enacted and even more difficult to get them to implement effectively.

For the future, I am proposing legislation to set up an independent agency reporting only to Congress and charged with the responsibility for representing the public interest in Federal agency deliberations on matters affecting environment and natural resources. If this concept is adopted, then groups such as yours and the Storm King fighters will no longer have to bear the full burden of such action. You will have a resource of talent and information to which to repair for help; a resource free of the restrictions and complexities imposed upon executive agencies, free from the conflict between development and preservation, and charged only with representing the public interest. But all of these proposals will take time, time we can ill afford.

The problem is sufficiently pressing to cause the National Audubon Society to consider setting up an "Environmental Defense Fund"; this is an idea which I wholeheartedly endorse. In the meantime, the fact remains that in the real and endangered world in which we live, effective action to preserve a livable environment will come only from the efforts of determined, concerned and independent groups of citizens such as you. It will come from citizens fighting over local intrusions into their own environment and each victory will have what the great philanthropist Stephen Currier called "Social reverberations" that will in the end make the difference for survival.

CAB AND THE NOISE MENACE

Should citizens whose lives are made miserable by the noise and fallout from airplanes above their homes be allowed to intervene when the Civil Aeronautics Board is considering new air operations? The CAB says no, but the Department of Transportation and civic groups who are fighting the nerve-shattering din from National Airport take vigorous exception to that ruling. In our view, the CAB has failed in its obligation to act in the public interest in this matter.

Congressman Ottinger has pointedly reminded the CAB of the spanking that the Federal Power Commission got from the Second Circuit Court of Appeals when it similarly rebuffed a group of independent citizens seeking to protect the public interest against the construction of a hydroelectric project at Storm King Mountain. The CAB may be inviting a similar rebuke. It denied the right of citizens to intervene in the case before it in the interests of maintaining a tolerable urban environment on the ground that the complainants' interests "are not so substantial as to require or warrant intervention by them."

But in the Storm King case the Court of Appeals said that a showing of "economic injury" was not necessary to intervention "where the plaintiffs have shown a direct personal interest." The Court sharply reminded the FPC of its claim to be representative of the public interest. It then went on to say:

> This role does not permit it to act as an umpire blandly calling balls and strikes for adversaries; the right of the public must receive active and affirmative protection at the hands of the Commission.

The Transportation Department has taken a similar view, "that a consideration of the environmental impact of common carrier operations is a relevant and important factor to be weighed in determining whether in a particular proceeding the public convenience and necessity require authorization of the proposed service."

Instead of actively and affirmatively protecting the public interest here, the CAB has attempted to wash its hands of the noise and fallout menace. Instead of looking at the issue on its merits, it has simply closed its eyes and ears. In these circumstances there is no alternative to pressing the case before the courts and before Congress until relief is forthcoming.

Mr. Speaker, legislation is needed to place the airlines on notice that the Federal Government is serious about noise abatement. The courts have held jet noise to be a national problem and a national responsibility.

If a quiet engine were available tomorrow, there is no way the Federal Government could require its use by the airlines. That authority must be placed on the books now.

SENATE

Monday, October 16, 1967

The Senate met at 12 noon, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, in the fresh mercies of yet another day we come with hearts grateful for Thy grace, praying that, by a strength not our own, our individual record may be kept unstained by any word or act unworthy of our best.

Thou knowest that these testing times are finding out our every weakness and calling for our utmost endeavor against the wrong that needs resistance, and for the right that needs assistance.

We come claiming the promise that they that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength; they shall mount up with wings of eagles; they shall run and not be weary; they shall walk and not faint.

Girded by Thy might, give us the courage to fly, the urgency to run, and the patience to walk.

We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, October 12, 1967, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On October 11, 1967:

S. 117. An act for the relief of Martha Blakenships; and

S. 1320. An act to provide for the acquisition of career status by certain temporary employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

On October 12, 1967:

S. 1564. An act to amend the marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; and

S. 2162. An act to amend the act of January 17, 1936 (49 Stat. 1094), reserving certain public domain lands in Nevada and Oregon as a grazing reserve for Indians of Fort McDermitt, Nev.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 7977) to adjust certain postage rates, to adjust the rates of basic compensation for certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and to regulate the mailing of pandering advertisements, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 7977) to adjust certain postage rates, to adjust the rates of basic compensation for certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and to regulate the mailing of pandering advertisements, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

WAIVER OF THE CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the legislative calendar, under rule VIII, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. With out objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR HARRIS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the completion of the transaction of routine morning business, the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Harris] be recognized for up to 30 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR HARTKE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Harris], the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke] be recognized for up to 30 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendars Nos. 590 and 621.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMDR. ALBERT G. BERRY, JR.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 2757) for the relief of Comdr. Albert G. Berry, Jr., which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 1, line 11, after the word "of" strike out "pay and allowances" and insert "retired pay"; on page 2, line 7, after the word "of" strike out "pay and allowances" and insert "retired pay"; and in line 9, after the word "such" strike out "pay and allowances" and insert "retired pay".

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 607), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation, as amended, is to authorize the payment to Albert G. Berry, Jr., U.S. Naval Reserve (retired), of the amount certified by the Comptroller General as the difference between the retired pay he received in the period from February 1, 1947, through October 7, 1952, and the amount he should have received had he been properly credited with his midshipman's service for retired pay purposes.

STATEMENT

The House committee, in reporting on H.R. 2757, relates the following:

The Department of the Navy in its report to the committee on the bill indicated that it supported the bill and suggested the amendment made by the committee providing for certification by the Comptroller General.

The period Commander Berry served as a midshipman at the Naval Academy from July 6, 1910, to June 5, 1914, is creditable in the computation of his retired pay by virtue of the provisions of the act of March 4, 1913, now codified in section 6116 of title 10, United States Code. The report of the Department of the Navy makes reference to the Joint Service Pay Act of June 10, 1922, the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, and the Career Compensation Act of 1949, which also contain provisions concerning the credit of midshipman service during this period. The effect of these provisions were that commissioned officers of the Navy who retired after July 1, 1922, were not entitled to include Naval Academy midshipman service performed under appointments made prior to March 4, 1913, in the computation of basic pay unless they had been in service on June 30, 1922. Commander Berry was in service as a commissioned officer in the Regular Navy on that date. At this point, it is pertinent to outline the service performed by Commander Berry which ultimately entitled him to the payment of retired pay.

Commander Berry served as a midshipman at the Naval Academy from July 6, 1910, to June 5, 1914, and as a commissioned officer in the Regular Navy from June 6, 1914, to February 15, 1926, when he resigned from the Navy. He was appointed a commissioned officer in the Naval Reserve on April 6, 1926, and resigned therefrom effective March 23, 1933. During this period of Reserve service he performed active duty for training during the period April 9, 1926, to May 8, 1926, May 29, 1926, to June 13, 1926, and May 10, 1928, to May 19, 1928. He was again appointed a commissioned officer in the Naval Reserve on January 3, 1941, performed active duty for training from February 11, 1941, to February 24, 1941, entered on full-time active duty on February 25, 1941, and served continuously on active duty until February 1, 1947, when he was transferred to the Naval Reserve retired list upon his own application under authority contained in section 6 of the act of February 21, 1946, 34 U.S.C. 410b (voluntary retirement after completion of more than 20 years of active service, including active duty for training, of which at least 10 years was service as a commissioned officer). Section 7 of the act of February 21, 1946 (34 U.S.C. 410c), provided that an officer who is retired under the provisions of section 6 of that act was entitled to retired pay computed at the rate of 2½ percent of his basic pay at the time of retirement, multiplied by the total years of service credited to him for the purpose of computing his active duty basic pay and, further, in determining the multiplier a part of a year that is 6 months or more counts as a whole year while a part of a year that is less than 6 months is disregarded.

The difficulties in this case and the aspect of the matter which in the opinion of the committee justifies legislative relief is that Commander Berry was able to establish his right to include midshipman's service in the computation of his retired pay only after extended efforts which included litigation in the Court of Claims. Apparently, he was originally unable to secure the credit due to the fact that the Comptroller General took the position that the right to credit midshipman service for basic pay purposes was lost to any officer who, after June 30, 1922, resigned his commission and subsequently after a break in service accepted a new commission in the Navy or Naval Reserve. This Comptroller General ruling was in effect at the time of Commander Berry's retirement in 1947. Thus, although he had a total of 28 years 7 months 26 days of service, including his midshipman service of 3 years 11 months, which would have provided retired pay at the rate of 2½ percent of basic pay by 29 (72½), his retired pay was based on total service (not including midshipman service) of 24 years 8 months 26 days, resulting in entitlement to retired pay computed at the rate of 2½ percent of basic pay by 25 (62½).

Subsequent to his retirement Commander Berry filed a petition in the Court of Claims (*a*) for certain active duty pay and allowances for service performed prior to his retirement, and (*b*) the difference between the retired pay actually received by him beginning February 1, 1947, computed on the basis of 62½ percent of basic pay at time of retirement pursuant to the provisions of sections 6 and 7 of the act of February 21, 1946, and retired pay computed on the basis of 75 percent of his basic pay at time of retirement under the provisions of paragraph 4 of section 15 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (which provided that certain officers of the Armed Forces who served on active duty prior to November 12, 1942, would, upon retirement, be entitled to retired pay computed at the rate of 75 percent of basic pay). The Court of Claims allowed him the active duty pay and allowances he had claimed, but denied him his claim for increased retired pay. (*Albert G. Berry, Jr.* v. *United States,* Ct. Cl. No. 49288, decided Oct. 7, 1952.)

In March 1959, Commander Berry petitioned the Court of Claims for increased retired pay (72½ percent of basic pay vice 62½ percent) based on the inclusion of his midshipman service as service creditable for pay purposes and on October 13, 1961, a decision was rendered by the court allowing him the increase beginning March 1, 1953. (The Court of Claims may grant retroactive benefits for a period of only 6 years from date of filing a petition.)

Subsequent to October 13, 1961, Commander Berry filed a claim with the Comptroller General for increased retired pay (72½ percent vice 62½ percent) for the period February 1, 1947, to February 28, 1953. On February 7, 1962, he was paid the increased retired pay for the period October 8, 1952, to February 28, 1953. Since the first Court of Claims decision in his case was rendered on October 7, 1952, and covered a period back to February 1, 1947, the Comptroller General disallowed his claim for increased retired pay prior to October 8, 1952, on the basis of the holding in the case of *Heiser* v. *Woodruff, et al.,* 327 U.S. 726. In that case the Supreme Court held that in general a judgment is res judicata not only as to all matters litigated and decided but also to all relevant issues which could have been, but were not raised and litigated in the suit.

As has been noted in the foregoing paragraph, the refusal of the Comptroller General to pay the amount called for in this bill is not due to any question of his entitlement to pay upon this basis, for that has been clearly defined by court decision. It merely relates to the fact that in his original proceeding in the Court of Claims, this point was not raised. However, as has been noted, the court in the action filed in 1959 directed that he was entitled to credit for his midshipman's service and granted him retroactive relief for a 6-year period. The committee has on previous occasions granted similar relief where the rights of the parties were determined in court proceedings. Since there is no question concerning Commander Berry's right to credit for his midshipman's service and the fact that he is presently receiving credit for this service in the payment of his retired pay, it is recommend that the bill, with the amendment suggested by the Navy that the determination be made by the Comptroller General of the amount due him, be considered favorably.

After full consideration of all of the foregoing, the committee concurs in the action of the House of Representatives, and recommends that the bill, H.R. 2757, as amended, be considered favorably.

According to information received from the Comptroller General of the United States, the amount involved in this bill is $3,870.43.

GILMOUR C. MacDONALD, COLONEL, USAF

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 10932) for the relief of Gilmour C. MacDonald, colonel, U.S. Air Force, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 2, after line 10, strike out:

Sec. 3. No attorney shall charge, demand, receive, or collect for services rendered, fees in excess of 10 per centum of any judgment rendered pursuant to this Act. Any attorney who charges, demands, receives, or collects for services rendered in connection with such claim any amount in excess of that allowed under this section, if recovery be had, shall be fined not more than $2,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 638), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to waive any statute of limitations and confer jurisdiction on the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon any legal claim filed by Gilmour C.

MacDonald for compensation for the use during World War II and the Korean conflict of a tubular caltrop tire-puncturing device allegedly invented by him.

STATEMENT

In the 89th Congress, H.R. 7546 was passed by the Congress and sent to the President for his approval. The President, however, vetoed that bill on the ground that the bill would confer upon the Court of Claims jurisdiction to render judgment upon an equitable claim, indicating that equitable jurisdiction in the Court of Claims was not delegable by the Congress. Copy of the veto message is herein set forth:

To the House of Representatives:

I regret that I must return without my approval H.R. 7546, a bill for the relief of Gilmour C. MacDonald, colonel, U.S. Air Force (retired), which would, in part, confer upon the Court of Claims jurisdiction to render judgment upon an equitable claim.

The Acting Attorney General has advised me that this bill is unconstitutional. In his opinion, in the special sphere of private claims, equitable connotes what the Government should do as a matter of moral, as distinguished from legal, responsibility; as a constitutional court, the Court of Claims cannot receive and exercise such a jurisdiction, and the power to determine what the Government should do in such circumstances is legislative in nature and nondelegable.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 10, 1966.*

The present bill, in order to meet the objection of the President, was introduced deleting the equitable provision that appeared in H.R. 7546 so that the instant legislation confers jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to consider this matter on a legal basis only. The House report in its favorable action on H.R. 7546 of the 89th Congress relates the facts in this case as follows:

"The bill, H.R. 7546, was the subject of a subcommittee hearing on June 9, 1966, at which time the subcommittee heard testimony in support of the bill and testimony in opposition by representatives of the Air Force. At that hearing the attorney for the claimant and the claimant himself testified as to the circumstances under which Mr. MacDonald disclosed his idea of a caltrop tire-puncturing device to the United States through the National Inventors Council. As is noted in the Department of the Air Force report, on September 30, 1940, the National Inventors Council received a letter from Gilmour C. MacDonald suggesting a design for a tubular caltrop device to be used for military purposes. Enclosed with the letter were photographs of the device. At the time of this submission Mr. MacDonald had not yet entered upon active duty with the Army. The Air Force report further noted that on November 25, 1940, the claimant also submitted a similar letter with photographs of the same device to the Field Service Section, Material Division of the Army Corps at Wright Field, Ohio.

"The information submitted to the committee and the exhibits of the device displayed to the committee at the hearing established the fact that a caltrop is a four-pointed metal device so constructed that three of the points form a base on the ground and the other sharpened point extends directly upward. Colonel MacDonald's design was constructed of tubular material for the purpose of deflating the tires of enemy vehicles or aircraft. One of the points relied upon by Colonel MacDonald in connection with his claim is that the tubular construction could cause tire deflation even if there was a self-sealing feature to the tire.

"The Air Force report details the circumstances and some of the history concerning the matter and it is apparent that Colonel MacDonald has over the year sought to assert his claim by some administrative action; however, the Air Force report observed that as far back as 1948, the review of the matter by the Departments of the Air Force and Army resulted in the determination that there was no apparent statutory authority to settle the claim. However, the committee feels that this course of action shows that Colonel MacDonald was diligent in seeking to maintain his right to claim compensation and that, therefore, the committee is justified in recommending a waiver of any applicable statute of limitations which might be asserted to bar his claim.

"The committee feels that a jurisdictional bill is the only fair and logical way to resolve this matter. There are difficult legal and factual questions concerning the claim which can best be resolved by the Court of Claims. Each year that court considers a large number of claims involving patents and it is, therefore, logical that this forum be selected for the consideration of this case."

The committee believes that H.R. 10932, as amended, meets the objection of the President and recommends that the bill be considered favorably.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of October 12, 1967,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore announced that on October 12, 1967, the Vice President signed the following enrolled bills, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

S. 985. An act for the relief of Warren F. Coleman, Jr.;

H.R. 678. An act to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Upper and Lower Chehalis Tribes of Indians in Claims Commission docket No. 237, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3973. An act to amend the Healing Arts Practice Act, District of Columbia, 1928, and the act of June 6, 1892, relating to the licensing of dentists in the District of Columbia, to exempt from the licensing requirements of such acts physicians and dentists while performing services in the employ of the District of Columbia;

H.R. 3979. An act to amend section 6409(b) (1) of title 39, United States Code, which relates to transportation compensation paid by the Postmaster General;

H.R. 10509. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 11722. An act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Report of Comptroller General

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the opportunity for savings by adopting manufacturers' recommended preventive maintenance programs for interagency motor pool vehicles, General Services Administration, dated October 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Suspension of Deportation of Aliens—Withdrawal of Name

A letter from the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the name of Leung Kong, from a report relating to aliens whose deportation has been suspended, transmitted to the Senate on October 12, 1967 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Statue of Liberty National Monument, N.Y.—Proposed Concession Contract

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of a proposed concession contract under which Evelyn Hill, Inc., will be authorized to continue to operate eating and merchandising facilities for the public within the Statue of Liberty National Monument, N.Y., for a 10-year period from January 1, 1968, through December 31, 1977, when executed by the Director of the National Park Service (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Boulder Beach, Lake Mead National Recreation Area, Nev.—Proposed Concession Contract

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed concession contract under which Arvis C. and Anna L. Forrest, husband and wife, will be authorized to provide accommodations, facilities, and services for the public at the Boulder Beach site of Lake Mead National Recreation Area, Nev., upon their purchase of the concession from Mr. and Mrs. Clarance W. Anderson, the present operators, from date of execution of contract through December 31, 1972 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Florida; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Senate Memorial 1615

"A memorial to the Florida congressional delegation requesting support for an expression of congressional and Florida legislative intent relating to the exclusive jurisdiction and control to be exercised by the state of Florida in the management of its freshwater resources

"Whereas, the legislature of the state of Florida, meeting in regular session at Tallahassee, Florida, desires to bring to the attention of the Florida congressional delegation the need for prompt and effective enunciation of the state's right and responsibility to manage and allocate its own freshwater resources, and

"Whereas, certain agencies of the federal government have claimed and continue to claim rights to fresh water which is captured, stored and managed within the geographical purview of the central and southern Florida flood control project, and

"Whereas, these claims purport to be based upon the congressional documents authorizing the central and southern Florida flood control project, and

"Whereas, there appears to be no legislative history whatsoever to support these claims, and

"Whereas, the assurances of local cooperation furnished by the state of Florida, its political subdivisions and its citizens were not undertaken with any intent to convey authority to any federal agency to allocate the fresh water in the state of Florida, and

"Whereas, the legislative and executive branches of the state of Florida are aware of and responsive to the need for providing a balanced program of water resources management and development in Florida, and

"Whereas, it is the desire of the legislature of the state of Florida that the state and its agencies continue progressive and positive water resources management programs administered at the state level which give due consideration to all phases and needs for water use,

"Be It Resolved By the Legislature of the State of Florida: That the Florida congressional delegation be requested to advise all federal agencies which have any responsibility for water resources development that the state of Florida claims complete jurisdiction over, and shall continue to assert all rights to, the management, diversion, storage, and use of its freshwater resources, and that any other agency trying to create other such rights or the authority to allocate stored waters within the state be urged to discontinue these efforts.

"Be it further resolved that the Florida congressional delegation be requested to express its desire that federal participation in the area of water resources development be executed in accordance with the will of the Congress of the United States as expressed in congressional documents authorizing the various federal-state projects and in strict accord with the intent of the original authorizing state legislation.

"Be it further resolved that copies of this memorial be dispatched to the President of the United States, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and to each member of the Florida delegation to the United States Congress.

"Approved by the Governor July 26 1967.

"Filed in Office Secretary of State July 27, 1967."

A resolution adopted by the City Council of Philadelphia, Pa., relating to the building of a powerful merchant marine fleet to insure maximum fish production as an added source of food supply; to the Committee on Commerce.

A letter, in the nature of a petition, signed by William H. Holmstrom, member of the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, favoring the enactment of legislation relating to the conservation and preservation of fisheries; to the Committee on Finance.

Resolutions adopted by the City Council of the City of all Rio Vista, the San Joaquin County Board of Supervisors, of Stockton, and the City Council of the City of Sanoma, in the State of California, favoring the enactment of some form of a Federal tax-sharing program; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the City Council, Lorain, Ohio, relating to the abolishment of the U.S. electoral college system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by members of the Communications Workers of America, AFL-CIO, of the State of Kansas, relating to the provision of jobs, housing, and education to solve the problems of American cities; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, without amendment:

S. Res. 160. Resolution to extend greetings to the Congress of the Philippines on the 66th anniversary of the arrival of the Thomasite teachers in the Philippines.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS TO STUDY THE ORIGIN OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS FINANCED BY THE DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. HARRIS, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported the following original resolution (S. Res. 177); which under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution 58, Ninetieth Congress, agreed to February 20, 1967 (authorizing the Committee on Government Operations to study the origin of research and development programs financed by the departments and agencies of the Federal Government), is hereby amended on page 3, line 16, by striking out "$75,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$80,000".

PRINTING OF INTERIM REPORT ON NORWALK RIVER BASIN, CONNECTICUT AND NEW YORK (S. DOC. NO. 51)

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph], I presented a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report dated September 1, 1967, from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on an interim report on Norwalk River Basin, Connecticut and New York, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRINTING OF INTERIM REPORT ON AQUILLA RESERVOIR, BRAZOS RIVER BASIN, TEX. (S. DOC. NO. 52)

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph], I present a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report dated September 19, 1966, from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on an interim report on Aquilla Reservoir, Brazos River Basin, Tex., in partial response to a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 2532. A bill for the relief of Lap Sheng Wong; and

S. 2533. A bill for the relief of Chi Ming Lo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 2534. A bill for the relief of M. Sgt. Ray M. Hollenbeck, U.S. Air Force (retired); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2535. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to require the capitalization of certain costs incurred in planning and developing citrus groves; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 2536. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish and administer under the authority of the national park system a National Visitor Center, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Bible when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate hearing.)

By Mr. HARTKE (for himself and Mr. Dirksen, Mr. Allott, Mr. Bayh, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Bible, Mr. Boggs, Mr. Brewster, Mr. Byrd of West Virginia, Mr. Carlson, Mr. Clark, Mr. Cotton, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Dominick, Mr. Eastland, Mr. Fannin, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Hill, Mr. Hollings, Mr. Hruska, Mr. Jordan of Idaho, Mr. Lausche, Mr. Miller, Mr. Montoya, Mr. Mundt, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Prouty, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Ribicoff, Mr. Scott, Mrs. Smith, Mr. Sparkman, Mr. Thurmond, Mr. Tower, Mr. Young of North Dakota, and Mr. Young of Ohio):

S. 2537. A bill to provide for orderly trade in iron and steel mill products; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hartke when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 2538. A bill for the relief of Wan Chi Shing, Wong Chi Tong, Cheung Chung Tong, and Kam Kai Ming; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROOKE (for himself, Mr. Bayh, Mr. Clark, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Hruska, Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts, Mr. Mundt, Mr. Thurmond, Mr. Tower, and Mr. Carlson):

S. 2539. A bill to provide for an equitable sharing of the U.S. market by electronic articles of domestic and of foreign origin; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MUSKIE (for himself and Mr. Cotton, Mr. Dirksen, Mr. Ervin, Mr. Inouye, Mr. McIntyre, Mrs. Smith, Mr. Thurmond, and Mr. Brooke):

S. 2540. A bill to provide for orderly trade in footwear; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GRIFFIN:

S. 2541. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the independence of the Baltic States (Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S.J. Res. 116. Joint resolution to provide for an expanded and intensified effort to increase the accuracy and extend the time range of weather predictions and to request the President to take action so that the peoples of the United States derive, at the earliest possible time, the social and economic benefits that would accrue from achievement of this new level of capability in weather predictions; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF PART 1 OF THE HEARINGS ENTITLED "PLANNING-PROGRAMING-BUDGETING"

Mr. JACKSON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 176), which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Government Operations four thousand additional copies of part

1 of the hearings entitled "Planning-Programing-Budgeting" held by its Subcommittee on National Security and International Operations during the first session of the Ninetieth Congress.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS TO STUDY THE ORIGIN OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS FINANCED BY THE DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. HARRIS, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 177) to provide additional funds to study the origin of research and development programs financed by the departments and agencies of the Federal Government, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. HARRIS, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

NATIONAL VISITOR'S CENTER BILL

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the Members of the Senate will recall that late in the 89th Congress we approved H.R. 14604, which became Public Law 89-790, creating a Study Commission to make a full and complete investigation and study of sites and plans to provide facilities and services for visitors and students coming to the Nation's Capital.

The Secretary of the Interior is named Chairman of this Commission in the law, and I, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Parks and Recreation of the Interior Committee, have the honor to serve as a member with 11 other Senators and Representatives as well as agency heads and distinguished private citizens.

I now introduce for appropriate reference a bill designed to put into effect the results of the work of the Study Commission. My measure is based on a bill for a similar purpose that has been introduced in the other body by the distinguished Representative from the 21st Illinois Congressional District, Hon. KENNETH J. GRAY, and incorporates the amendments recommended by the Department of the Interior to the House bill, H.R. 12603. Both my bill and Congressman GRAY's measure provide that the Visitors' Center shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior under the statutory authority for the national park system; but the bill I am introducing places primary responsibility for establishment of the Center on the Secretary. This assignment of initial responsibility seems desirable to me, since the Secretary will have the burden of operating the Center once it is in being.

I commend the Visitors' Center measure to the attention of the Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2536) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish and administer under the authority of the national park system a National Visitor Center, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BIBLE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A NEW ERA FOR WORLD WEATHER

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I am introducing today a joint resolution on the world weather program. Through this measure, the voice, and the sense of the Congress will be heard throughout the world, stating clearly that the United States supports this international, cooperative, scientific endeavor.

In 1964, President Johnson, speaking at Holy Cross College, said:

> We will move ahead with plans to devise a worldwide weather system . . . By working together, on a global basis, we can take new strides toward coping with the historic enemies of storm and drought and flood.

Since that time, the President has reaffirmed his interest and his support for this vital international activity.

What is the world weather program? Why is it important? I shall try to answer the second question first.

For many groups and individuals the weather directly affects their livelihood, their economic well-being. These include farmers, shippers, manufacturers, retailers, those in the tourist industry, and many others.

On some occasions, weather poses a direct threat to life itself, or a threat to their personal future. In a typical year, in this country alone about 1,000 lives are lost through natural disasters related to weather. Property damage amounts to about a billion dollars annually on the average, and this year it will be far greater.

Hurricane-induced rains have brought floods ravaging the Rio Grande Valley and a northern Mexico-south Texas area the size of Indiana, bringing death and devastation and causing the evacuation of thousands. And just a short time ago floods devastated the city of Fairbanks, Alaska.

The benefits to the United States that can be obtained from a world weather program are not only defensive, that is, increased protection from the threats and hazards of weather. There are positive benefits to be gained. Eventually we want to tap the material resources of the oceans. We want to increase the world's ability to produce food for its growing population. We will be spending more and more of our efforts on the problem of air and water pollution. Increased urbanization and industrialization make us more vulnerable to the vicissitudes of weather. Weather services throughout the world, accordingly, must be improved and strengthened, not only with funds and manpower, but with knowledge and data. The world weather program addresses itself to these important needs.

Before describing the world weather program, I would like to make a comment about the timeliness of this effort. The need for improved weather services and for a better understanding of the weather has been apparent for many years. In recent times, however, advances in science and technology have provided tools which contain the promise of real breakthroughs in our understanding of the weather.

I am referring to satellites, modern communications techniques, and large, high-speed computers, among other developments. With these tools, scientists now see the way to development of a capability for long-range weather predictions. On the basis of studies, they believe it may be possible to make weather predictions for periods up to 2 weeks, if we really exert the required effort.

This goal cannot be achieved by one nation on its own, relying solely on its own resources. Weather is a global phenomenon. It knows no national boundaries. It does not recognize competing ideologies or different ways of life. Each nation needs observations of the weather from outside its own borders. This is particularly true in the case of the United States. We are a vast land area surrounded on two sides by large oceans. Weather affecting the United States may have its origin over these masses of water, or over foreign countries. Yet many areas are not adequately observed. In fact, about 80 percent of the earth is inadequately observed at the present time. As a nation, we have as much, and possibly more to gain than most other countries from a world weather program. At the same time, success of the program requires the cooperation of many countries.

The world weather program contains two major elements:

One is the world weather watch, a global system for observing, communicating, and processing weather data. The second is a global research effort—the global atmospheric research program—to obtain better understanding of the physics of the atmosphere. Together, these twin elements represent one of the largest scientific endeavors ever undertaken on an international basis. It is designed to yield immediate gains as well as long-range objectives. The program has the enthusiastic support of the World Meteorological Organization—a specialized agency of the United Nations—and the International Council of Scientific Unions.

In addition to improving our weather prediction capability, the world weather program will make a substantial contribution to the weather modification activities proposed in S. 373 which I introduced earlier this year. The world weather program will provide the global data and understanding of the atmosphere which is required for the achieving of climate modification. With a breakthrough in this area unimaginable changes in the way of life for all the people on the earth could come within the grasp of mankind. Theoretically, these could range from turning barren lands into fertile, productive areas, all the way to elimination of the threat of weather hazards around the globe.

The United States is currently carrying on activities under the world weather program. These activities are fully justified by virtue of their contribution to our national needs and objectives. Endorsement of the world weather program through the joint resolution would place the unequivocal voice of the Congress squarely behind this bold and imaginative plan to use the knowledge of mankind for the benefit of mankind.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 116) to provide for an expanded and intensified effort to increase the accuracy and extend the time range of weather predictions and to request the President to take action so that the peoples of the United States derive, at the earliest possible time, the social and economic benefits that would accrue from achievement of this new level of capability in weather predictions, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENTS NOS. 400 AND 401

Mr. HARRIS (for himself, Mr. HART and Mr. KENNEDY of New York) submitted two amendments, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H.R. 12080) to amend the Social Security Act to provide an increase in benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to provide benefits for additional categories of individuals, to improve the public assistance program and programs relating to the welfare and health of children, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

(See reference to the above amendments when submitted by Mr. HARRIS, which appear under a separate heading.)

TEACHER AIDE AMENDMENT TO ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 402

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I submit on behalf of myself, Mr. CLARK, Mr. PELL, Mr. MONDALE, and Mr. MUSKIE, a revised draft of my teacher aide amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Amendments of 1967.

Under the new language a new part B to title III would be created, to enable local school districts throughout the Nation to train and hire teacher aides to relieve the Nation's classroom teachers of burdensome, noninstructional duties.

This amendment in its previous form would have created a new title to the elementary and Secondary Education Act, but I believe, inasmuch as title III is designed to encourage supplementary services, it is the logical place for inclusion of this amendment.

The new language also amends the Senate bill to include House passed language concerning teacher aides in titles I and V, sponsored by Congressmen STEIGER of Wisconsin, and SCHEUER, of New York.

Under the vigorous and effective leadership of Senator MORSE the Senate Education Subcommittee is now marking up the 1967 Elementary and Secondary Education Act amendments. I believe that acceptance of this amendment would be an important step in improving the educational systems of the Nation's elementary and secondary schools.

Besides performing general noninstructional tasks such as supervising recreation and lunchroom activities, the aides could assist with mechanical tasks in libraries and perform clerical work in school offices.

Persons especially qualified to work under the supervision of a teacher can help with classroom activities.

The need for this amendment is clear and I am confident that it will pass.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendment (No. 402) was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2127) to provide assistance to first processors of cotton who have suffered substantial losses because of the economic impact of cotton programs of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on October 12, 1967, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 985) for the relief of Warren F. Coleman, Jr.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF CLAUDE F. CLAYTON, OF MISSISSIPPI, TO BE U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE, FIFTH CIRCUIT

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Monday, October 23, 1967, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Claude F. Clayton, of Mississippi, to be U.S. circuit judge, fifth circuit, a new position created by Public Law 89-372, approved March 18, 1966.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and myself, chairman.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to proceed for not to exceed 10 minutes. Although I realize that this is the period for the transaction of routine morning business, I make this request because I have a luncheon engagement at Blair House.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE GROWTH OF PRIVATE NUCLEAR POWER

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, several of my colleagues in this and the other body have called to my attention telegrams they have received recently from officials of various local affiliates of the United Mine Workers union. The form telegrams refer to recent statements by UMW President W. A. Boyle concerning the alleged dangers to the public health and safety of the "poisonous"—as he characterizes them—nuclear reactors being built today by the civilian electric utility industry. The telegrams also ask that the Atomic Energy Commission's budget be reduced by $1 billion in order to halt the construction of these reactors.

I have read the Labor Day speech by Mr. Boyle which apparently precipitated these telegrams and which apparently was another salvo in the UMW's campaign to undercut the nuclear power industry. Let me say at the outset that I am not going to engage in a namecalling contest with Mr. Boyle over the relative merits and demerits of coal versus nuclear power. I have no ax to grind with Mr. Boyle. I realize that he has an economic interest to protect here, although I must say in passing that the use of statements calculated to inflame and alarm the public in order to denigrate a supposed competitor is going a bit beyond the bounds of propriety. But I shall try to keep this on a higher plane by simply stating the facts. I think they speak for themselves.

First, as to the implication of Government subsidy—I can dispose of that charge with one telling statement. The simple fact of the matter is that not one of the large number of light water reactors ordered by the Nation's utilities since late 1963 has been funded with Federal money. Beginning with the Oyster Creek and Nine Mile Point reactors in the later months of 1963, and continuing through the first 9 months of 1967, 54 such reactors, representing 41,992 net electrical megawatts, have been ordered—all without Government financial participation. These reactors were sold on a strict commercial basis—an arm's-length private transaction between the reactor manufacturers and the purchasing utilities who deem these reactors worthwhile investments from the standpoint of economics and from the standpoint of the health and safety of their customers.

I frankly do not know, and I do not believe anyone else knows, whether actual operating experience with these reactors will verify the economic estimates on which their purchase was based. We do know that the smaller reactors from which the new generations of reactors were extrapolated worked pretty much as anticipated—reliably, safely, and approximately at the cost levels predicted for them. But until we have acquired a reasonable period of operating experience with the first of the new and larger reactors just coming into service, we will not have definite assurance that they will operate more economically, or even as economically, as electrical generating plants fueled by conventional energy sources.

Nor is there any subsidy involved in the nuclear power industry's obtaining enriched uranium produced in the Government's gaseous diffusion plants. Only recently, the Joint Committee asked the General Accounting Office to review this situation in connection with the Commission's recently announced $26 charge, and tails assay, for the uranium enrichment services which will be instituted on January 1, 1969. Specifically, the Comptroller General was asked this question by the Joint Committee:

> Does this charge and tails assay provide any subsidy to the foreign or domestic nuclear industry, or any portion thereof?

The Comptroller General's answer was explicitly negative. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the Assistant Comptroller General's letter of September 25, 1967, bearing on this matter be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Byrd of Virginia in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. PASTORE. In the near future there will be one exception to the long list of waterpower reactors sold without Government participation—an exception specifically authorized by Congress because of the experimental nature of the project concerned. I refer, of course, to the proposed Metropolitan Water District nuclear power-desalting project, a developmental undertaking intended to provide important new information concerning the use of large dual-purpose nuclear reactors. It will be recalled that Congress earlier this year and in 1966 authorized the participation of the Interior Department and the AEC in that project, which is being financed in major part by electric utilities and the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California. In this connection, it should be clearly recognized that the AEC's financial contribution to the project will not provide assistance to the development, design, construction, operation or maintenance of the nuclear powerplants themselves. Rather, the AEC will assist in several aspects of this project pertaining to the interrelationship of nuclear power and desalting.

The only other new experimental power reactor project in which the AEC is participating involves a new and completely different type of reactor—the high-temperature, gas-cooled reactor that is scheduled to be built at Fort St. Vrain, Colo., by the General Dynamics Corp. and the Public Service Co. of Colorado with AEC financial assistance.

Finally, I should make passing mention of the Price-Anderson nuclear indemnity legislation, which has also been cited from time to time as a "subsidy" for the nuclear power industry. As many Senators will recall, that act was passed by Congress in 1957 to overcome the roadblock to the development of nuclear power presented by the uninsurable potential liabilities arising from use of the atom to generate electricity. Its twofold purpose—namely, protecting the public and the AEC's licensees and contractors from the financial risks associated with atomic energy—is achieved by providing for a combined program of private insurance and governmental indemnity amounting to a maximum of $560 million to cover damages that could conceivably arise from a nuclear disaster.

Basically, the act works like this: It requires certain licensees to furnish financial protection—in the form of private insurance or as otherwise provided in the act—in amounts specified by the Commission to cover public liability claims; it requires the Commission to provide indemnity protection in amounts up to $500 million for each nuclear incident; and it limits the liability of all persons liable to the aggregate of the financial protection required and the Commission's indemnity.

In the case of all but the smallest power reactors in operation today, the act specifically requires that the operator thereof furnish the maximum amount of financial protection available from private sources—currently $74 million. The effect of the latter requirement is that an operator of one of the medium size reactors—such as the 462-megawatt—electrical—Connecticut Yankee reactor just coming into service—will have to pay an annual premium in the neighborhood of $280,000 for private insurance protection. The same operator will have to pay an annual fee to the AEC of approximately $44,000 for Price-Anderson indemnity coverage. Obviously, the operators of the 1,000-megawatt—electrical—reactors being sold today will have to pay much higher premiums and fees for their insurance and indemnity protection when these reactors come into service.

The Price-Anderson protection scheme has now been in operation for 10 years. One might ask, How much money has the Government had to spend on this "subsidy" to the nuclear power industry? My answer is that not a dollar—nay, not even a red penny—of Government funds has ever been expended under the act to indemnify an AEC licensee. Meanwhile, the Commission, through June 30, 1967, has collected more than a half million dollars in indemnity fees from operators of nuclear facilities. The annual income to the AEC from these fees is expected to swell to nearly $5 million by 1973.

One other aspect of the Price-Anderson Act deserves special mention. Under an amendment to the act passed last year by Congress on the recommendation of the Joint Committee, an operator of a nuclear reactor, in the event of a substantial nuclear accident at his facility, would not be able to rely on the traditional legal defense that in the absence of negligence, there is no liability. A person injured as a result of such an accident, therefore, would not have to prove that the operator's negligence gave rise to accident, but only that he had suffered damages and that those damages were caused by the nuclear accident. As a result of this amendment to the Price-Anderson Act operators of nuclear reactors, in the unlikely event of a substantial nuclear accident, would be subject to much more stringent standards of liability than are generally applicable to the public at large. In effect, the operator would be subject to absolute liability.

What, then, would be the effect of cutting the AEC's approximately $2.5 billion budget by $1 billion as suggested by representatives of the UMW? The greatest impact would probably be on our national defense effort, to which nearly one-half of the AEC's budget is devoted. Does the UMW want us to cut back in our weapons or naval reactors programs?

Perhaps, instead, Mr. Boyle would have us apply the cut to the Nation's physical research program. That would eliminate, among other things, the controlled thermonuclear research program which we hope one day will lead us to the capability of producing unlimited amounts of electric power through the fusion of hydrogen atoms in sea water.

An additional item that might be cut is the AEC's reactor development program, which is primarily devoted to supporting the Nation's R. & D. effort to develop the fast breeder reactor, a reactor which, once developed, will produce more fuel than it consumes while generating economical electricity. While doing this might eliminate possible future threats to the industry which Mr. Boyle is interested in protecting from competition, none of these actions would eliminate the nonexistent subsidies to the nuclear power industry which Mr. Boyle says he is interested in terminating.

As to the safety of nuclear powerplants, let me say that each and every power reactor that is built in this country must first undergo rigorous safety examination by the Atomic Energy Commission's able regulatory staff, the statutorily independent Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards, an Atomic Safety and Licensing Board of the AEC, and by the Commission itself. As a result of the efforts of the manufacturers and the utility industry to bring to their customers economical, reliable, and safe electric power, and of the reviews I have mentioned, there has never been an accident involving a civilian nuclear powerplant which caused injury or damage to a member of the general public. I wish that other industries could point to a safety record as outstanding as that compiled by the nuclear power industry.

In this connection I might add that, with respect to another aspect of nuclear power discussed by Mr. Boyle in equally flammatory terms—namely, the problem of disposing of radioactive waste material—a recent study by the National Academy of Sciences stated:

> Radioactive wastes are a potential source of ground pollution. However, they are not thought to constitute a problem requiring new abatement studies at the present time. The quantity of wastes is small and the quality of disposal is high. A variety of special techniques is used to confine the wastes and keep them out of circulating ground water for geologic periods of time. Wastes from nuclear power generation are certain to increase in future years, but disposal of these, using existing techniques, does not appear to present a serious problem. (National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council publication 1400, "Waste Management and Control" (1966), p. 199)

Two other comprehensive studies prepared in the recent years by non-AEC groups—one, the reports to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare by the Task Force on Environmental Health and Related Problems in June 1967, entitled "A Strategy for a Livable Environment," and the other, the report of the Environmental Pollution Panel of the President's Science Advisory Committee in 1965, entitled "Restoring the Quality of Our Environment"—reference the need for adequate safeguards to protect against any hazards arising out of nuclear power and nuclear radiations. But these are no more than proper acknowledgement that care must be exercised to assure that unwanted effects in the environment are prevented. Significantly, none of the recommendations of the Environmental Pollution Panel relates to radiation, and the only priority goal established by the Task Force on Environmental Health which bears on radiation is principally concerned with the need for refining standards governing the public's exposure to dental and medical X-rays.

Mr. President, far be it for me to minimize potential hazards associated with the use of nuclear energy. I have been a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy too long not to realize full well the hazardous nature of the materials and facilities with which we are dealing, as well as the great benefits we may derive from their use. At the same time, however, we know that the atom can be controlled and surrounded with sufficient protective safeguards to permit it to take its place alongside the Nation's conventional energy sources. The safety record of the nuclear industry is graphic evidence of that fact.

Caution has been the byword of the program. The Atomic Energy Commission has done a magnificent job in seeing to it that safety has been an abiding consideration in all that has been done to bring the benefits of the peaceful atom to our people. The Joint Committee, meanwhile, has maintained a close watch over the AEC's and the industry's shoulders to insure that the overriding consideration of safety has remained uppermost in the minds of all who have entered the atomic industry. Our hundreds of hours of public hearings on this matter over a period of many years should demonstrate our vigilance of these problems to any objective observer.

Between now and the year 2000, Mr. President, this Nation is going to have to build the equivalent of seven additional power systems of the size that is now serving the American people. To meet this tremendous surge we will have need for increasing amounts of all forms of fuels—coal, oil, gas, hydro, and nuclear. The suppliers of fossil fuels will be hard pressed to meet the ever-increasing demands that will be placed upon them. In fact, I would like to quote from the October 5 issue of the National Coal Policy Conference newsletter on this subject:

> New electric generating plants built or already announced for the last half of this decade will require almost 200 million additional tons of coal a year, compared to the 260 million tons already being consumed in existing plants, a new National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., study reveals.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks the full text of this article, which reflects the continued growth of coal production together with use of nuclear power.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, as in other industries, fair competition between the various energy forms will be a healthy and invigorating spur to increased productivity. But the various energy forms must remember that they must also be partners. It is, therefore, my hope that we will see no more resort to the kind of competition that I have spoken of today. The task that confronts us is too monumental to leave room for competition by terror tactics, propaganda or innuendo.

Mr. President, at this time I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a news release on this subject which I issued in the latter part of last week to be released yesterday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 3.)

EXHIBIT 1

[B-159687]

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE
UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., September 25, 1967.

HON. JOHN O. PASTORE,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The General Accounting Office has made a review of the bases used to establish the amount to be charged by the Atomic Energy Commission for uranium enrichment services. Our review was made in accordance with a request dated September 19, 1967, from the Executive Director of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States, and in extension of our examination of the Commission's proposed criteria and contracts for uranium enrichment services, which was made pursuant to the requests contained in letters dated July 5 and 14, 1966, from the Chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

In the letter of September 19, 1967, we were requested to review the Commission's intended unit charge and tails assay and to provide the Committee with our views on the following questions:

"(1) Is this charge and tails assay consistent with the terms of the AEC's uranium enriching services criteria published in the Federal Register on December 23, 1966?

"(2) Does this charge and tails assay provide any subsidy to the foreign or domestic nuclear industry, or any portion thereof?"

The "Private Ownership of Special Nuclear Materials Act" (Public Law 88-489) requires, among other things, that charges for uranium enrichment services provide reasonable compensation to the Government. In its "Uranium Enrichment Services Criteria," approved effective December 23, 1966, the Commission established a ceiling charge of $30 per kilogram unit of separative work, subject to upward escalation for the cost of electric power and labor, on the basis that this charge would ensure the recovery of appropriate Government costs projected over a reasonable period of time.

The criteria stated that the cost of separative work would include electric power and all other costs, direct and indirect, of operating the gaseous diffusion plants; appropriate depreciation of these plants; and a factor to cover applicable costs of process development, Commission administration and other Government support functions, and imputed interest on investment in plant and working capital.

The ceiling charge of $30 per unit of separative work was established to provide long-term assurance to the domestic and foreign nuclear industries that enriching services would be available from the Government within a specified ceiling. At the time the criteria were established, the Commission stated that it would in the future announce an actual charge for providing enrichment services within the ceiling charge. On September 21, 1967, the Commission announced that this actual charge should be $26 per unit of separative work. The Commission advised us that a standard table of enriching services would be established by notice in the Federal Register effective January 1, 1968, which would incorporate the charge of $26 and a standard tails material assay of 0.2 percent.

The charge and tails material assay selected by the Commission were based on the results of numerous studies which projected operations at various levels of production into future periods. These studies were made using a set of basic assumptions, and analyses were made to determine the effect that changes and refinements in the assumptions would have on the cost of operating the diffusion plants.

As stated in our report on the Commission's proposed criteria and contracts for uranium enrichment services (B-159687, August 1, 1966), the fundamental element which will determine the reliability of the Commission's projections is the accuracy of its assumptions as to future requirements for uranium enrichment services. We have no reason to believe that the Commission's assumptions are unrealistic; also, we recognize that in its studies the Commission has, to the extent practicable, given effect to contingencies and uncertainties.

We believe that, on the basis of our selective review of the Commission's studies in which we accepted the Commission's projections as being reasonably realistic, the charge of $26 per unit of separative work based on the 0.2 percent tails assay is adequate to permit recovery of appropriate Government costs projected over a number of years and is consistent with the Commission's criteria published in the Federal Register on December 23, 1966. Further, considering that the charge also provides a margin for contingencies, we do not see a basis for asserting that a subsidy is being provided to the domestic or foreign nuclear industries, or any portion thereof.

Pursuant to the provisions of the criteria, the Commission has reserved the right to revise the actual charge, within the guaranteed ceiling charge, upon 6 months' prior notice. The Commission has stated that it intends to periodically update its projections and operational planning and will consider such changes as may be indicated by actual production and marketing experience. Therefore, should a material change develop in future years, which would have a consequential effect on the reasonableness of the then applicable charge, we believe that the Commission should make any necessary adjustments to its charge within the established ceiling charge to give effect to changing circumstances.

We have discussed the matters presented in this report with appropriate Commission officials and have considered their views in the final preparation of the report. As agreed by your representatives, we are making copies of this report available to the Commission.

We plan to make no further distribution of this report unless copies are specifically requested, and then distribution will be made only after your approval has been obtained or public announcement has been made by you concerning the contents of the report.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK H. WEITZEL,
Assistant Comptroller General of the United States.

EXHIBIT 2

[From the National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., Newsletter, Oct. 5, 1967]

NEW ELECTRIC GENERATING CAPACITY WILL BURN 181 MILLION TONS OF COAL ANNUALLY—57 PERCENT MORE THAN NEW NUCLEAR CAPACITY

New electric generating plants built or already announced for the last half of this decade will require almost 200 million additional tons of coal a year, compared to the 260 million tons already being consumed in existing plants, a new National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., study reveals.

These 116 plants will have a capacity of 72,260 megawatts and, at an average consumption of 2.5 tons of coal per kilowatt of installed capacity, will require 181 million tons of coal annually, or approximately 4 billion tons during their production lifetime.

By comparison, a study of announcements of planned atomic plants shows that about 46,000 megawatts of new nuclear generating capacity is under construction or has been announced. Present generating capacity of nuclear plants is a little less than 2,000 megawatts.

In February of 1966, the National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., published Power for People, a study of new coal plants going on the line or announced for construction from 1965 forward. These 75 new coal plants had a total capacity of 42,000 megawatts, and would require 105 million tons of coal per year. Between March, 1966, and September, 1967, 41 new plants with 30,266 megawatts of capacity and requiring 76 million tons of coal annually have been announced.

When all these new plants are in operation in about 1971 or 1972, even allowing for the shutdown or phasing out of some of the older plants now operating, total coal required for electric generation in the U.S. is expected to be well over 400 million tons per year.

The Federal Power Commission's widely quoted National Power Survey of 1964 predicted that total demand for electric power would more than triple between 1960 and 1980. It predicted that coal's share of generating capacity would require some 500 million tons annually by 1980, and current growth in coal-fired plants now suggests that even that figure may be conservative.

EXHIBIT 3

[From the Office of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Oct. 15, 1967]

CONGRESSIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN COMMENTS ON ALLEGED ATOMIC POWER SUBSIDIES

Attached is the text of remarks which Senator John O. Pastore, Chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, intends to deliver on the floor of the U.S. Senate on Monday, October 16, concerning the implication, contained in telegrams which a number of Congressmen and Senators have received from local affiliates of the United Mine Workers union, that a large portion of the Atomic Energy Commission's budget is being devoted to subsidization of the nuclear power industry.

In his prepared statement Senator Pastore states that "not one of the large number of light water reactors ordered by the nation's utilities since late 1963 has been funded with Federal money." During that time span, he points out, "54 such reactors representing 41,992 net electric megawatts have been ordered—all without Government financial participation."

With respect to other alleged subsidies to the nuclear power industry, Senator Pastore states that there has never been an expenditure of Government funds under the Price-Anderson nuclear indemnity legislation for a power reactor accident in the 10 years of that Act's existence. "Nor," the Chairman added, "is there any subsidy involved in the nuclear power industry's obtaining enriched uranium produced in the Government's gaseous diffusion plants." In this connection Senator Pastore plans to insert in the Congressional Record a letter received recently from the Assistant Comptroller General stating that "we do not see a basis for asserting that a subsidy is being provided to the domestic or foreign nuclear industries, or any portion thereof" by the Commission's recently announced charges for uranium enrichment services.

As to the safety of nuclear powerplants, which representatives of the U.M.W. refer to as "poisonous," the Chairman notes that there has never been an accident involving a nuclear powerplant which caused injury or damage to a member of the general public. He attributes this outstanding safety record to the efforts of the reactor manufacturers and the utility industry, and to the rigorous safey examination of all such plants by the Atomic Energy Commission and certain AEC-related groups participating in the Commission's regulatory program.

Senator Pastore concludes by saying that the task that confronts the nation and the various fuel producers—building, by the year 2000, the equivalent of seven additional power systems of the size now serving the American people—"is too monumental to leave room for competition by terror tactics, propaganda or innuendo."

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR McCARTHY

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I have been asked to request unanimous consent that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY] be recognized for one-half hour after the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PASTORE. I make this request on behalf of my dear friend, the acting majority whip, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

VIETNAM—REPUBLICAN PARTY PLACES COUNTRY ABOVE PARTY

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the lead editorial in yesterday's Washington Sunday Star, entitled "Vietnam and the Republican Strategy," states that:

> The debate thus far has been drawn solely along the lines of personal conviction.

Apparently the writer of the editorial did not see the Associated Press story of October 9, which appeared in several Iowa newspapers. This story quotes the Democratic Senator from Massachusetts as having said, at a Democratic fund-raising dinner in Des Moines a week ago Saturday:

> If the Republicans had been running the war, our soldiers would be fighting today in North Vietnam, fighting Chinese soldiers, laying down their lives without hope of victory.

While obviously this represents a personal conviction which completely ignores the record of the Eisenhower administration, it is partisan politics at its worst. It demeans the intelligence of the people of my State, most of whom are far too perceptive and remember history far too well, including the humiliating and costly Bay of Pigs disaster, to be fooled by such a statement.

The people of Iowa are warm and hospitable, and they remember with a great amount of affection the late President John F. Kennedy. It ill behooves anyone to take advantage of their hospitality by insulting their intelligence and good judgment. Statements such as the one I have quoted are all too reminiscent of the 1964 Democratic presidential campaign which was calculated to frighten the voters into the erroneous belief that the war would grow bigger and worse if the Republican Party were to succeed. The deception of this campaign has long since been exposed to public view, and members of the Republican Party who witnessed the tragic results such deception wrought to our two-party system have had to swallow very, very hard, with a few minor exceptions, to lend bipartisan support to the war effort as it grew bigger and worse under a Democratic President.

An objective reading of history would, if anything, cause one to think that if the policies of the Eisenhower administration had been carried forward, as they could have been with different results in the elections of 1960 and 1964, there would have been no war in Vietnam at all, and there would never have been a Cuban missile crisis, much less a Bay of Pigs disaster. And had it not been for the election of a Republican President in 1952, we could still be fighting a prolonged war in Korea.

Wars are not born of resolute U.S. leadership, Mr. President. And resolute leadership is needed to shorten wars resulting from miscalculation which irresolute leadership encourages.

Let it be understood that the Republican Party places the well-being of our country above party, but if any Democratic politician seeks to throw stones, his glass house will be promptly demolished.

I ask unanimous consent that the Associated Press article appearing in the October 9 issue of the Cedar Rapids Gazette and the Washington Sunday Star editorial be placed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Ottumwa Courier, Oct. 9, 1967]

TED KENNEDY AT IOWA DINNER

DES MOINES.—If a Republican had been president for the past seven years, Sen. Edward Kennedy, D-Mass., said, American servicemen would be fighting Chinese communists in North Vietnam.

And, predicted the senator in a speech prepared for a Democratic fund-raising dinner Saturday night, the American people will give President Johnson "a vote of confidence and gratitude," in next year's election.

"The American people don't want brainwash. They don't want eyewash. They don't want Hollywood mascara. They want a party that cares, and a man who can produce," declared Kennedy.

He said the GOP is committed to "the reckless and dangerous course of all-out bombing, even of the ships of neutral nations.

"If the Republicans had been running the war, our soldiers would be fighting today in North Vietnam, fighting Chinese soldiers, laying down their lives without hope of victory."

[From the Washington Star, Oct. 15, 1967]

Vietnam and the Republican Strategy

There is nothing surprisingly, distressing or improper about the fact that a major national debate is taking place over the administration's conduct of the Vietnam war.

There's nothing new, either, in the notion that the political leaders of the nation are answerable to the people and their elected representatives in time of war. The present debate, which has mounted in fury in direct proportion to United States involvement in the war, has its historical precedent in the Mexican War, the Civil War, the Spanish-American War and the Korean war. Only the two World Wars, with their total involvement of national effort, produced virtually total acquiescence.

The debate thus far has been drawn solely along the lines of personal conviction. In Congress, party politics have been conspicuously absent. The administration's chief defender in the Senate is the leader of the opposition party, Senator Dirksen. The loudest and most persistent critic is the Democratic chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator Fulbright. And the administration's official defense, now being presented with refreshing aggressiveness by Secretary of State Dean Rusk, also has been kept free from the petty confines of partisan politics.

But while it is the unquestioned right, if not the obligation, of every individual to search his mind and own conscience in order to determine what stand he should take on this nation's involvement in South Vietnam, it is not the duty nor the right of any political party to do so. Yet there have been increasing signs in recent weeks that the Republican party, as it moves toward the presidential election of 1968, is being tempted to make opposition to the administration's conduct of the war a matter of party policy and a major issue in the political debate to come.

Some of the leading Republican candidates, seeking out areas of vulnerability in the administration and in their opponents within the party, have abandoned previous positions to take up anti-war positions. Senator Percy calls for a greater emphasis on negotiations and a less reliance on military achievement. Governor Romney proclaims that his earlier pro-administration stand was in error; that he was, in fact, brainwashed by the administration. Senator Morton, the former GOP national chairman, in an effort to protect Romney's image from a fearful beating, makes the remarkable assertion that President Johnson was himself brainwashed into submission by his generals and admirals. There are published reports that Rockefeller and Nixon are moving toward an anti-administration stand. There are rumors that Reagan may, before convention time, join them there. Unattributed intelligence from the inner counsels of the Republican party report a move to bounce Senator Dirksen as head of the platform committee because of his unswerving support of administration policy.

The temptation for the Republican party to make political hay out of Vietnam is undoubtedly strong. But any such move would be divisive, dishonest and highly dangerous.

It has often been pointed out that any show of dissent from official policy by any prominent individual is damaging, to some extent, to the quest for peace in Southeast Asia. And it is quite true that such displays of indecision and confusion of purpose must inevitably encourage Hanoi in the hope that, if they can only hang on long enough, American determiation will crumble and American troops will be withdrawn.

There is, however, an enormous difference between individual expressions of doubt and concern, and the adoption of an official, anti-war stand by a major political party. It is quite safe to assume that Ho Chi Minh is politically sophisticated enough to understand the difference between the convoluted soul-searching of a William Fulbright and the fixed, calculated, positive assertion of a party platform plank.

What would be the effect on the leadership in Hanoi and in the National Liberation Front if an official anti-war stand were adopted by the Republican party?

The moment that Ho and his lieutenants become convinced that the administration's opposition in next year's election is dedicated to a peace at any price policy in Vietnam, they cannot logically do anything other than to wait for the outcome of the election and hope for best.

If, on the other hand, Hanoi knows that the opposition candidate is dedicated to seeing the United States commitment through—or even if the attitude of the opposition party is uncertain—then the situation is reversed. Then, there would be considerable pressure on Ho to negotiate within the next 13 months, while the President still faces the election. It could be another four years before Johnson or his successor in office is again so strongly motivated to accept a compromise.

A decision by the Republican party to strike at the opposition's Vietnam policy will insure the continuation of the war for another year at least. It will divide the nation further in an area where dangerous division already exists. It will, in fact, be a cruel deception.

No Republican candidate, regardless of his campaign statements or the platform on which he runs, will in our opinion, actually be able to bring the Vietnam war to a quick end if he is elected. It is all very well to talk about negotiations; to negotiate is something else again. The unfortunate fact of the matter is that neither Hanoi nor the Viet Cong have, to this moment, shown any interest whatsoever in negotiating an end to the conflict, despite constant official and unofficial, public and private offers by the administration to stop shooting and start talking.

That leaves only one sure, quick way out of Vietnam for any future administration: Simply to pack up and leave. It is inconceivable that any President, faced with the realities of responsibility, would finally decide that it is in the national interest to scrap our treaty obligations and destroy our international credibility in one easy step. The President in 1969—regardless of what his name or party may be—most assuredly will be holding out for negotiations and an honorable peace before United States troops are withdrawn from Vietnam.

The Republican party must resist the temptation to play upon the nation's unformulated worries and dissatisfactions in the hope of a victory at the polls. There are, after all, legitimate and honest issues on which Lyndon Johnson can be attacked, and possibly defeated.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR BAKER

Mr. BAKER and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for approximately 20 minutes in connection with the presentation of a statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, what is the request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee has requested that he may proceed for 20 minutes.

Mr. BAKER. I would be happy to yield first to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I desire to speak in the morning hour, and I would expect to ask for 3 or 4 additional minutes.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I have no objection, in view of the fact that the distinguished Senator from Tennessee has indicated he will yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BAKER. I would be more than happy to yield first to the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

WE SHOULD DEESCALATE INSTEAD OF EXPANDING OUR WAR IN VIETNAM—WE SHOULD STOP BOMBING NORTH VIETNAM OR RESPOND TO U.N. APPEAL TO DO SO

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, it is shocking to Americans that in recent months more and more American soldiers and marines are being killed in combat in the ugly civil war in Vietnam than Vietnamese serving in the South Vietnamese friendly forces, so called. Indeed, the friendly forces have become much too friendly.

It was recently reported in Newsweek that at Dak To, in the central highlands of Vietnam, an entire South Vietnamese regiment took itself out of action in order to concentrate upon supplying the 173d U.S. Airborne Brigade base with beer, prostitutes, and laundry service. Similarly, it was reported that another Vietnamese unit performs the same function for the 4th U.S. Division near Pleiku; and that adjoining our airfield at Bien Hoa, a hustling South Vietnamese ranger unit has built a redlight district known as Tijuana East to the GI's serving there.

This is additional evidence of the distressing fact that a very large percentage of the men serving in the South Vietnamese Army have simply stopped fighting. The South Vietnamese army is riddled with factionalism, nepotism, corruption, inefficiency, incompetence and cowardice. It is too often either unwilling or unable to perform even the limited and relatively easy task which is now practically its only mission—the protection of rural pacification teams, so called.

During the past 3 months, American combat deaths have far exceeded those of the ARVN, or South Vietnamese forces. In fact, it is startling that the total number of our casualties now regularly exceeds the number of young men conscripted into the South Vietnamese Army each month. The truth is that South Vietnam has no conscription worthy of the name. Draft dodging is rampant. In the month of August alone more American boys were drafted into our Armed Forces than the South Vietnamese had conscripted during the previous 6 months. This is a shocking situation. It is unconscionable that American boys should be called upon to fight and die in a little country 10,000 miles from our shores when the citizens of that country are unwilling to defend themselves and have failed to maintain a viable government.

The desertion rate in the South Vietnamese Army is staggering. There were more than 113,000 desertions last year alone. At the present rate, desertions this year will exceed 75,000. This is an annual desertion rate of 12 percent. In 1966 the desertion rate exceeded 20 percent.

The South Vietnamese Army is riddled with corruption and inefficiency. For example, it was recently discovered that one division commander sold rice to the Vietcong that had been provided by our AID program. Other officers are actively engaged in smuggling and other illegal operations, much of this profiteering on deals with the Vietcong.

After spending billions of taxpayers' dollars during more than a decade to try to create an army in South Vietnam, we now find ourselves saddled with a military white elephant that is practically worthless. The officer corps is lacking in almost all the qualities necessary to build an effective army. It is common practice to sell commissions in the army. All too often, senior Vietnamese officers have succumbed to the temptation to become wealthy by graft and profiteering.

Perhaps most shocking are reports that the Vietcong have infiltrated the South Vietnamese forces like termites in a rotten log. Some American intelligence officers estimate that as many as 30 percent of the officers and men in the South Vietnamese Armed Forces are sympathizers or agents of the Vietcong. For many reasons, not the least of which is the enormous difference in pay received by each, there is a great deal of hostility between American soldiers and Vietnamese soldiers. Some reporters on the scene have the impression that many Vietnamese servicemen regard the main enemy as America and the Vietcong as only a secondary enemy.

Incredibly, South Vietnam's armed forces—all trained, paid, equipped, and advised by the United States—outnumber the Vietcong and their North Vietnamese supporters by at least 5 to 1. Despite this fact, it is generally agreed that the armed forces of the Saigon regime would collapse in a matter of hours if left to fight the war on its own.

The blame for this reprehensible situation cannot be attributed to the claim that Vietnamese do not make good fighters. Those serving in the Vietcong have proven themselves to be formidable opponents. Vietnamese born and reared in the Mekong Delta and elsewhere in South Vietnam fight bravely as VC, or forces of the National Liberation Front. Also, those Vietnamese who fought for the liberation of their country against the Japanese and then the French colonial oppressors proved their worth as fighting men. They were fighting for a cause—the liberation of Vietnam—just as the VC now feel they are doing.

The Saigon forces as well as the Vietcong are made up of Vietnamese soldiers from north, central, and south Vietnam. They speak the same language, eat the same food, and very often even come from the same families. Nevertheless, in almost every instance of direct combat between the two forces, the Vietcong consistently bests the larger South Vietnamese forces. The reason for this, according to claims usually made by Defense Department officials, is that a guerrilla army must be outnumbered by at least 10 to 1. However, the fact remains that in most instances where South Vietnamese forces have come into direct contact with the Vietcong, they have been defeated and have suffered far greater casualties than the VC.

The fact is that the soldiers in the South Vietnamese Army, if it can be called an army, are not not really interested in the struggle imposed upon them by their tory leaders in Saigon. If they had any will to fight at all, it would soon be driven from them by their venal and inept commanders.

Let us face it. We are picking up virtually the entire check in Vietnam which now totals more than $2.5 billion every month and several hundred American lives each week. The fact is that we have paid for the war in Vietnam, and now it belongs to us.

In his San Antonio speech, the President stated that Vietnam is the scene of "powerful aggression that has been spurred by an appetite for conquest." It will take some doing to convince the American people that Ho Chi Minh, the leader of a small underdeveloped agrarian country struggling to emerge from more than a cenutry of colonial oppression, presents the same danger to our vital national interests as Hitler did in his efforts to conquer the world. The truth is all too plain that no great moral crusade is involved in Vietnam. To the contrary, our involvement in that civil war has placed us in a morally indefensible posiiton.

The truth is we are not fighting communism in Vietnam. More important, we are fighting Vietnamese nationalism which developed out of years of colonial exploitation. It is true that Communists have taken over leadership of the nationalist movement in Hanoi.

Of course, communism diluted by nationalism can still create a great deal of mischief. However, the ogre of a monolithic communism bent on world conquest is just no longer credible. The great and bitter schism between Communist China and Soviet Russia shows no sign of healing, although our continued foolish involvement in the Vietnamese civil war may yet succeed in driving these two opponents together again. The former Soviet satellites in Eastern Europe, while still Communist, have gained control of their own internal affairs. They are also beginning to assert independence in foreign policy. Ho Chi Minh, like Tito in Yugoslavia, is a nationalist Communist. Tito's Yugoslavia is not a Soviet satellite, nor is North Vietnam a Chinese satellite,

Secretary of State Rusk claims that by fighting in Vietnam we are, in effect, fighting Chinese communism, which would eventually have to be fought elsewhere if not in Vietnam. The truth is that despite 20 years of agonizing war, the North Vietnamese have amazingly avoided becoming puppets of either Communist China or Soviet Russia. We are not fighting Chinese communism. We are fighting Vietnamese nationalism which, far from opening the door to Chinese conquest, offers the best hope of erecting political and cultural barriers to such conquest.

The Vietnamese for years have feared the Chinese colossus to their north. Vietnam is studded with monuments commemorating victories of the past over Chinese aggressors. Ho Chi Minh himself was a prisoner in a Chinese dungeon in 1944. While he is a Communist, to term as "Communist" all the Vietcong, many of them ignorant villagers, does not really make them Communists. First and foremost they are Vietnamese patriots fighting for their country's independence, first from the Japanese, then from the French colonial oppressors, and now from the United States, which they consider to have supplanted the French as aggressors in Southeast Asia.

The truth is that we are ravaging a small country which presents no threat to our national security. Our ever expanding bombing of the north seems aimed at destroying the people of an independent nation. Saigon has never been and never will be an outpost for the protection of Seattle or San Francisco.

Mr. President, General Westmoreland has stated that we are fighting a war of attrition in Vietnam. We are very painfully learning that attrition is a double-edged sword. Every escalation of the war mires us more irretrievably in a massive ground war in Asia—a war in which there can be no victory and in which the steady growth of casualties including our killing many, many thousands of Vietnamese women, children, and men reduces the prospect of ever achieving a negotiated peace.

This has already cost the lives of more than 15,000 fine young Americans killed in combat and the wounding of 85,000 more. It has also caused the deaths of more than 150,000 Vietnamese civilian men, women and children. Last April, United States officials in Saigon estimated that 50,000 civilians, including 10,000 children, would be treated for war injuries in south Vietnamese hospitals during the present year. It has been estimated that only a half or a third of the wounded actually reach hospitals, and that the actual number of deaths and injuries are occurring at a rate of more than 100,000 a year. Most of these horrible and terrifying deaths and injuries to civilian men, women and children result from American air strikes and artillery bombardment. This, in addition to the thousands of civilians killed, maimed, and scarred for life by our bombing of North Vietnam. We must bring a halt to this carnage.

Mr. President, I know that there are few Members of the Congress, if any, who believe that we should have become involved in this Vietnam civil war in the first instance. It would be well to recall that the Chinese sage Confucius wrote:

> A man who makes a mistake and does not correct it makes another mistake.

We must not compound the tragic errors of the past 6 years. Immediate and meaningful action must be taken toward extricating ourselves from this tragic conflict.

I again urge the President to announce

an unconditional halt to the bombing of North Vietnam in the hope this will bring the North Vietnamese to the conference table within the ensuing 20 or 30 days. All indications are that it will. Our allies and friends and leaders of Communist nations have repeatedly stated that there can be no negotiations until the bombing stops and without conditions attached.

The administration has taken the position that the only alternative to our continued involvement in Vietnam is abject, dishonorable withdrawal. The plain truth is that an honorable alternative exists by halting further escalation of the ground fighting and an unconditional cessation of the bombing of North Vietnam, followed by negotiations for a compromise settlement based on the Geneva agreements.

If the President feels that he cannot retreat from his present position regarding a halt to the bombing he could, without loss of face, make it known that the United States would put aside its own official views on the bombing if the United Nations called for its suspension as a step toward negotiations. In his efforts to settle the Algerian war by negotiation, President De Gaulle at one critical juncture withdrew an entire division of French troops as a means of convincing the Algerians that he genuinely desired a political settlement. Neither France nor De Gaulle lost face. Nor would we, the most powerful nation that ever existed under the bending sky of God, forfeit respect or any meaningful military advantage by similarly taking the step which only we can take to set the peace machinery in motion.

Furthermore, it is now absolutely clear from Secretary McNamara's testimony before the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee last August that the bombing does not seriously hamper the flow of military supplies from North Vietnam to the south. Equally important, he expressed doubt that reduction of the bombing would bring a marked increase in American casualties in South Vietnam as claimed by some of the warhawk generals. Nor does Secretary McNamara believe that any bombing short of extermination of North Vietnam's population, which no one should be advocating, would break Hanoi's will or force a surrender. It is clear from Secretary McNamara's testimony that a suspension of the bombing can only advance the prospects for peace.

We must reject the shrill calls for escalation of the ground war and unlimited bombing of the north from the warhawk Chiefs of Staff. President Eisenhower, in what has been termed his farewell address, warned the Nation of the dangers inherent in the growth of a military-industrial complex that has arisen in our Nation since World War II and the advent of the cold war. We must not permit this military-industrial complex, now made bolder by the Vietnam war and the huge defense budgets that go with it—$70 billion this year alone—to win control over our defense and foreign policies. The militarization of our foreign policy must be halted.

Mr. President, an announcement by President Johnson that we will cease bombing North Vietnam or a positive response by us to a United Nations appeal for an end of the bombing would be an act of magnanimity by a powerful nation well able to afford to be magnanimous. It would place the Hanoi government under irresistible pressure to negotiate. It would convince a skeptical world that our Persident means what he says when he calls for a political solution to the Vietnamese war rather than fighting on to a military victory slaughtering a people and devastating their land.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee has the floor.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Maryland for a brief statement.

Mr. BREWSTER. I thank the Senator from Tennessee.

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY OF STATE RUSK AT NEWS CONFERENCE, OCTOBER 12, 1967

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, there is uncertainty in America as to what U.S. policy in Southeast Asia should be. Surely many divergent points of view have been expressed in the U.S. Senate.

Last week, Secretary of State Dean Rusk clearly and forcefully reiterated the U.S. policy. Because I believe that the American people appreciate candor and wish to know the truth, I ask unanimous consent that the statement by the Secretary of State be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OPENING STATEMENT OF SECRETARY OF STATE DEAN RUSK'S NEWS CONFERENCE, OCTOBER 12

I should like to begin with a brief comment on the current public discussion of Vietnam.

I find no significant body of American opinion which would have us withdraw from Vietnam and abandon Southeast Asia to the fate which Asian Communism has planned for it. Similarly, I find no serious opinion among us which wishes to transform this struggle into a general war.

We Americans are, therefore, debating variations on a theme—but the theme is a central position resting upon (A) the need to meet our commitments and defend our vital national interests; (B) the pursuit of our limited objectives by limited means, and (C) our earnest desire to bring this conflict to a peaceful conclusion as soon as possible. Hanoi particularly should not misunderstand the character of this debate.

Our commitment is clear and our national interest is real. The SEATO treaty, approved with only one dissenting vote by our Senate, declares that "each party recognizes that aggression by means of armed attack in the treaty area . . . would endanger its own peace and safety, and agrees that it will in that event act to meet the common danger." The treaty says "each party" will act.

The fidelity of the United States is not subject to the veto of some other signatory—and five signatories have engaged their forces alongside Korean and South Vietnamese troops. Indeed, the proportion of non-United States forces in South Vietnam is greater than non-United States forces in Korea.

RESOLUTION BY CONGRESS IN 1964 NOTED

In August, 1964, the Congress by joint resolution declared, with only two dissenting votes, that "the United States regards as vital to its national interest and to world peace the maintenance of international peace and security in Southeast Asia."

This was not a new idea in 1964. It was the basis for the SEATO treaty a decade earlier. It is no less valid in 1967. Our several alliances in the Pacific reflect our profound interest in peace in the Pacific, no less vital to us as a nation than is peace in our own hemisphere or in the NATO area.

I have heard the word "credibility" injected into our domestic debate. Let me say, as solemnly as I can, that those who would place in question the credibility of the pledged word of the United States under our mutual security treaties would subject this nation to mortal danger. If any who would be our adversary should suppose that our treaties are a bluff, or will be abandoned if the going gets tough, the result could be catastrophe for all mankind.

It is not easy for our people to wage a struggle by limited means for limited objectives. We Americans are an impatient people—a quality which has helped to build a great nation. The present impatience about Vietnam is thoroughly understandable—and is shared by those who carry official responsibility. But our overriding object is—and must be—the establishment of a reliable peace.

It is easy to rush into total catastrophe. It requires courage and determination to act with both firmness and restraint in the interest of peace. An examination of all the crises in which we have been involved since 1945 will show, I think, the supremacy of the objective of a reliable peace.

PRESIDENT'S STATEMENT QUOTED

President Johnson has emphasized, time and time again, his interest in a prompt and peaceful settlement of the present struggles in Southern Asia. Just two weeks ago, in San Antonio, he said:

"The United States is willing to stop all aerial and naval bombardment of North Vietnam when this will lead promptly to productive discussions. We, of course, assume that while discussions proceed, North Vietnam would not take advantage of the bombing cessation or limitation."

Can there be a more reasonable proposal? Is there anything unfair about such a simple proposition? Is it not clear that if Hanoi is interested in peace it could say "yes" publicly or privately to the President's offer?

A rejection, or a refusal even to discuss such a formula for peace, requires that we face some sober conclusions. It would mean that Hanoi has not abandoned its effort to seize South Vietnam by force. It would give reality and credibility to captured documents which describe a "fight and negotiate" strategy by Vietcong and the North Vietnamese forces. It would reflect a view in Hanoi that they can gamble upon the character of the American people and of our allies in the Pacific.

Earlier I referred to variations on a theme. The debate in which we are now involved is essentially a debate about detail—this or that military move, this or that diplomatic step—this or that formulation of what is in fact a common middle position. If that b true, precision is important. People at least should make it clear whether they are arguing with Washington or with Hanoi.

HANOI'S VIEWS ARE REPORTED

When people talk about a pause in bombing, they should know that Hanoi calls a pause an "ultimatum." When a Senator says that he wants to stop the bombing but, of course, wishes to continue to bomb in support of our marines south of the DMZ, he should know that Hanoi categorically rejects any such notion. When people say "negotiate now" they should know that the President would meet with Ho Chi Minh and other Chiefs of State concerned, tomorrow—and that I would depart today for any mutually convenient spot if I could meet a representative of North Vietnam with whom I could discuss peace in Southeast Asia.

Chairman Thieu and Prime Minister Ky have repeatedly offered to meet with the authorities of Hanoi to arrange a cease-fire and a peaceful settlement. They and we both responded affirmatively to U Thant's proposals of last March. Had there been a similar response from Hanoi, there would have been discussions to arrange a military standstill, preliminary conversations and a convening of the Geneva conference. Literally dozens of proposals made by ourselves, other governments or groups of governments have been rejected by Hanoi.

I cannot tell you when peace will come. I am encouraged by progress toward peace in South Vietnam, but I cannot name a date. But we shall continue our effort both by resisting those who would impose their solutions by brute force and by an unremitting exploration of every path which could lead to peace.

ALLOCATION OF TIME

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. **BYRD** of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. **BAKER**. I yield.

Mr. **BYRD** of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time yielded to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER] not be charged to the time allotted to the Senator from Tennessee.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN GUERRILLA INSURGENCY IN BOLIVIA

Mr. **BAKER**. Mr. President, it now appears that Bolivian Armed Forces have successfully stemmed a Cuban-led Communist insurgency in that important South American nation.

The death October 8 of Ernesto "Che" Guevara in a clash between the Bolivian Army and the guerrillas has broken the back of the insurgency and provided a dramatic climax to several months of dedicated effort by the Bolivians—an effort that cost that country much in casualties and human life and much in material resources which it so badly needs to pursue its economic development policies.

Mr. President, the Bolivian Government and especially the Bolivian Armed Forces should be enthusiastically congratulated on their victory. Free people throughout this hemisphere owe them an immeasurable debt of gratitude.

Our own Government, our State Department and other concerned agencies. also should be commended for having the wisdom to avoid the temptation to become actively involved in the Bolivian operation. It appears that in this situation our people neither underreacted nor overacted to the impending crisis. It shows that all American nations must be ever vigilant to the threat of communism; they must help without dominating and often the best way to help is by keeping hands off. As it was, the Bolivians have had the exhilarating and maturing experience of winning their own battle without outside interference. The Bolivians handled the problem masterfully from its outset to the final victory. Their handling was excellent not only in the military aspects but in the political aspects as well.

They kept their allies and the world fully informed of developments and their presentation of their case before the Organization of American States was superb. Because of this, the whole world was fully aware of the nature of the insurgency in Bolivia.

I shudder to think of what would have happened if Che Guevara and his Cuban guerrilla fighters had succeeded in this latest, and by far the boldest, attempt to Cubanize the nations of Latin America.

In our very justified concern about Vietnam and in our effort to prevent communism from engulfing Southeast Asia, I fear that we tend to lose sight of the very real danger of communism here in our own backyard.

Bolivia is the fifth largest nation in Latin America with 424,163 square miles. It is located in the very heart of the continent and shares common borders with Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Paraguay, and Peru. Its location makes it a prime target for international communism's efforts to dominate this hemisphere.

I would like to review some of the facts that are known about the events in Bolivia in the past few months.

It appears that the guerrilla camp was discovered by accident in the rugged territory of southeastern Bolivia while the guerrillas were still in training and preparing for their eventual move to topple the government of President Rene Barrientos.

At the time of the first clash between the Bolivian Army and the guerrillas on March 23, 1967, the guerrillas numbered about 60 men. Of this number, 20 were known to be Cubans, and at least 12 were Bolivians trained in guerrilla warfare in Cuba.

Of the remainder, some had received instruction in guerrilla techniques and tactics from Cuban trainers infiltrated into Bolivia for that purpose. The rest were relatively untrained individuals recruited from the mines or from the ranks of the unemployed in La Paz.

The Cubans were led by Ernesto "Che" Guevara de la Serna, Fidel Castro's chief lieutenant in his own struggle to take over Cuba and later his minister of industries. Guevara's book on guerrilla warfare is the gospel text for would-be Communist guerrilla activities the world over, and he was considered the guiding spirit and example for all guerrilla fighters.

The other Cubans were, for the most part, officers in the Cuban Army with extensive experience in guerrilla warfare.

There is reliable information that at least four of them were in the Congo with "Che" Guevara in 1965, taking part in a rebellion in the eastern part of that country. Among the Cuban guerrillas, Bolivian officials have positively identified the following:

Juan V. Acuna Nunez, a major in the Cuban Army, member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Cuba and former commander of the Western Army of Cuba. He was known by the name of Joaquin in the guerrilla band.

Gustavo Ricardo Machin Hoed de Beche, a major in the Cuban Army, known in the guerrilla band as Alejandro.

Orlando Pantoja Tamayo, a member of the National Security Service of Cuba who was close to Raul Castro. He was known as Antonio.

Antonio Sanchez Diaz, a major in the Cuban Army and member of the Central Committee of the Cuban Communist Party. He was known as "Marcos."

It is apparent that the Cubans with Guevara in Bolivia were Cuba's foremost experts in the guerrilla art.

It was this highly trained force that repeatedly clashed with the raw recruits of the Bolivian Army from the end of March through July. In these encounters, the guerrillas, with their superior automatic weapons, communications, discipline, and tactics inflicted severe casualties on the army compared to their own relatively light losses.

A break for the Bolivians came when in a mopping up operation in the Nancahuazu area, the Bolivian Army uncovered a cache of significant guerrilla documents. These included 21 falsified passports used by the Cubans, including Ernesto "Che" Guevara, to enter Bolivia. It was on the basis of these passports that a number of the guerrillas in the band were identified. A fragment of a diary written by the Cuban "Braulio" was also recovered by the Bolivian authorities. This diary revealed that "Braulio" had brought $26,000 to Bolivia from Cuba, $25,000 of which was for delivery to "Ramon," the nom de guerre of "Che" Guevara. Additional funds were brought into Bolivia from Cuba by returning Bolivian trainees in guerrilla warfare. The passports, along with photographs of the guerrillas and other documents found in the cache, were presented to the meeting of Foreign Ministers of the Organization of American States—OAS—on September 22–23, 1967, by the Bolivian Foreign Minister, to support his country's demand for OAS sanctions against Cuba.

On August 31, using improved intelligence and counterinsurgency techniques, the Bolivian Army successfully ambushed the rearguard of the guerrilla band, killing nine and capturing the sole survivor. Three of the victims were Cubans. In the latter part of September the Second Ranger Battalion picked up the trail of the main body of guerrillas led by "Che" Guevara. Meanwhile, Bolivian authorities in La Paz arrested a member of the guerrilla support apparatus named Loyola Guzman Lara, in whose home they found documents showing that the guerrilla support mechanism extended to various Latin American countries.

On September 26, 1967, the Second Rangers caught up with the main body of the guerrillas near Higueras, southwest of Vallegrande and killed three of them, including one Cuban known as "Miguel." On October 8, the Rangers closed in on the guerrilla band again. In this encounter, seven guerrillas were killed including Ernesto "Che" Guevara.

"Che" Guevara in an article he wrote for the Cuban magazine Tricontinental entitled "Create Two, Three, Many Vietnams" published in June 1967, stressed the idea that revolutionary activity must be continental in scope, rather than limited to a single country, and that this would cause the United States to give ever-increasing military aid and troops to insure the stability of governments. He said, that this "is the road to Vietnam." If this was indeed "Che" Guevara's plan, the clash on October 8, 1967, was a serious setback to Cuban-sponsored revolution in other countries of Latin America.

Mr. President, the evidence that I have just outlined—which has been confirmed to my fullest satisfaction—shows beyond the shadow of a doubt that the insurgency in Bolivia was an outright case of armed intervention in a sovereign nation by a foreign power.

It is just as obvious that this was indeed a major effort by the Communists, through their Havana puppet, Fidel Castro, to take over another Latin American country. The significant factor of the Cuban leadership lies not so much in numbers but in the rank and importance of the Cubans involved.

Guevara had dropped from sight more than 2 years previously to move about the world incognito. This was a strategically brilliant maneuver because it permitted a great mystique to arise as the world speculated on his whereabouts.

But the valiant Bolivian troops were not awed by this mystique. They continued their relentless search through the rugged Bolivian jungles until the fabled El Che lay mortally wounded and died an ignominious death, not as a martyr to the Communist cause but muttering the words of his failure.

It is easy to understand also why Castro and his henchmen thought Bolivia would be an easy target. Bolivia has been beset by economic, social, and political woes for a good many years. The strife and problems at the tin mines—source of Bolivia's principal wealth—are well known.

It is apparent that the Cubans thought that the Bolivian tin miners, students, and leftist group would flock to their banner in great numbers. But they did not.

To the contrary, we are told that one of the biggest problems Mr. Guevara had was the lack of interest and enthusiasm on the part of his Bolivian recruits. Those few who did join him were soon disenchanted with the guerrilla band. Many defected and went to their homes. We do not know how many actually left, but judging from statements from captured guerrillas, Bolivians and Cubans alike, many did leave.

The events in Bolivia in these past months are deeply significant for the United States.

First, they show that Fidel Castro has adopted a new wrinkle in his attempts to spread communism through the South American mainland.

They indicate that Castro has decided that the only way he can successfully export his revolution to other Latin American countries is by actually providing Cuban leadership for these movements. The Bolivian insurgency was given cohesion, discipline, and purpose by the presence of Che Guevara, some members of the Cuban Communist Central Committee, and a number of others who fought with Castro and Guevara in the Sierra Maestra. Previously, Castro limited his efforts to training guerrilla leaders and supplying material and financial aid to national guerrilla movements.

This apparently was the first time that Cubans have taken direct control of a national movement by placing their own leadership at its head.

Second, I think the fact that the Bolivians were able to discover, contain, and eventually quash the insurgency without external help will strengthen that country politically. It certainly will have the effect of focusing attention upon Bolivia and underscoring its important position in the hemisphere.

Bolivia has been the recipient of some $460.6 million in various types of foreign aid between 1946 and 1966. I think there is no doubt that this aid has played an important role in stabilizing Bolivia's shaky economy during some very difficult periods.

Today, Bolivia's economy is showing signs of making a significant recovery. Last year, for the first time in many years, the tin mines showed a profit. But tin is no longer the sole source of the country's wealth. Other areas are looking up as well. Under President Barrientos, Bolivia has been very successful in beginning a diversification of its economy.

Petroleum has become a significant source of income. Great progress has been made in agriculture, particularly in cattle raising.

The gross national product has been increasing at a rate of 5.8 percent in the last few years, and per capita income has increased at a rate of more than 2.5 percent—greater than the minimum set by the Charter of Punta del Este, cornerstone document of the Alliance for Progress.

It seems to me that the $460.6 million, spread over a period of 20 years has been a small price to pay for the victory in Bolivia. The war in Vietnam costs almost that much in a week.

But it is also important to note that most of that money was spent to shore up the economy of Bolivia under the previous, socialist-oriented government of President Paz Estensoro.

Bolivia's very able ambassador to the United States, Julio Sanjines-Goytia, advises me that Bolivia has received no budgetary support at all since 1964. While continuing the important social revolution started under Paz Estensoro, President Barrientos and General Ovando, head of the armed forces, have established law and order firmly in the country.

President Barrientos has created a good climate for private investment and private initiative in the nation. Bolivia has begun to gradually pay off some of its back debts.

Bolivia has one of the most stable currencies in Latin America.

I understand that the guerrilla insurgency has cost Bolivia approximately $2.5 million directly and probably double or triple that indirectly. This seems like a small amount when compared to our costs in Vietnam, but in a country whose total budget is about $80 million it is very significant indeed.

Ambassador Sanjines advises me that Bolivia is now seeking between $5 and $6 million in loans—not grants—to help tide the country over the difficult economic period caused by the insurgency.

I feel that in view of the climate of peace and stability established in Bolivia by its present, democratically elected government, its emphasis on private investment and its position of strategic importance for the long-range goal of Latin American economic integration, we should give immediate and favorable attention to Bolivia's request for aid at this time. Bolivia is not asking for a handout. It is asking for a loan on terms that it can handle. We should heed that request if at all possible.

Third, the insurgency emphasizes that we must not for an instant let down our guard in this hemisphere. While our attention is diverted toward Vietnam on the other side of the world, the Communists are more active and eager than ever to move forward in this hemisphere. The extent of the Cuban involvement and the quality of the Cuban personnel sent to Bolivia vividly demonstrate the determination of Fidel Castro to impose his will upon the millions of free men in this hemisphere.

Castro has failed. Communism has suffered a severe setback. Guevara, the guiding spirit of the Communist revolutionaries around the world, has been killed. He died in ignominious failure. He himself is said to have acknowledged his failure as life slipped from him in the Bolivian jungle.

But it would be a mistake for us to lower our guard in the false security of the Bolivian success. For this will not stop Castro. As long as the Communist dictatorship exists in Cuba, financed at the rate of about $1 million a day by Soviet Russia, we can expect unending efforts to subvert other nations, to export the Communist doctrine, to set brother against brother, to terrorize, loot, steal, and kill.

Castro has been temporarily thwarted in Bolivia. He has been embarrassed and laid bare not only in the eyes of the free world but in the Communist world as well.

But we can be sure that he will try again and again.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR MAGNUSON

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to commend to the reading of the Senate a fine article about one of the unsung heroes of this body. It appears in the Washington Teamster of October 13, and deals with the many admirable qualities, and outstanding legislative accomplishments, of our good friend and colleague, the dean of the western Senators, the senior Senator from Washington, WARREN MAGNUSON.

As all of us in the Senate know, any tribute to "MAGGIE" is well-deserved. No one works harder while asking less in the way of personal recognition. His rewards are results—the truly lasting monuments to any legislator's efforts. And Maggie has erected a good many monuments in his long public career.

Speaking for the leadership, I cannot praise too highly the graciousness and cooperation of the senior Senator from Washington. Despite the burdens of his responsibilities as chairman of the Commerce Committee, he remains as unassuming as he does dependable. It is a comfort to me to know that this reservoir of strength is there when the going gets tough.

The article describes Senator Magnuson as one with "the common touch." Certainly he has cause to be allied with the common man. He was orphaned as a baby and was on his own as a laborer at 17. The philosophy which he acquired in those early days is very much in evidence and is reflected, in part, in the number of consumer-protection bills which issue from his committee. It is this concern for the public interest, along with his zest for hard work, which makes our colleague from Washington a great Senator.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Teamster, Oct. 13, 1967]

WARREN G. MAGNUSON: THE MAN CALLED "MAGGIE"

Crowding the colorful, 30-year congressional career of Sen. Warren Grant Magnuson—the Man Called Maggie—into a 40-paragraph profile would take a Houdini who specializes in boiling down history to its briefest terms.

Perhaps there was none better with a sense for history and humor than the late President John F. Kennedy who came all the way to Seattle to help celebrate Maggie's 25th year in Congress, although Senator Magnuson was committed to the Senate Majority Leader, Lyndon B. Johnson, until the nomination was settled in Los Angeles. In late 1961, President Kennedy told this to the 2,500 guests in five great banquet halls of the Olympic Hotel:

"Most members of the Senate have developed the art of speaking with precision and clarity and force. The secret of Senator Magnuson's meteoric career has been the reverse. He may make clear speeches to you on great public occasions, but in Washington he speaks in the Senate so quietly that few can hear him. He looks down at his desk—he comes into the Senate late in the afternoon—he is very hesitant about interrupting other members of the Senate—when he rises to speak, most members of the Senate have left—he sends his messages up to the Senate and everyone says, 'What is it?' and Senator Magnuson says, 'It's nothing important.' And Grand Coulee Dam is built."

This is an interesting tale not because of one small inaccuracy—Grand Coulee was conceived before Maggie though dedicated during his second term in the House by President Roosevelt—rather because it pinpoints his modus operandi to a tee, and because he is a man of such awesome but unabused power in the Senate that a President of the United States will make it a point to attend a political dinner for a man who had originally backed another horse in the race.

On Senator Magnuson's political acumen, there is no better observer than shrewd John Salter, Sen. Henry M. Jackson's former administrative assistant and one of the best grass roots organizers in this territory:

"Maggie may hem and haw when asked a question on some issue for three or four minutes, but I've never seen a politician who can get to the heart of the answer and then be in the position of doing something about it than my friend Senator Magnuson. As a practicing politician I have to mark him down as genius."

Yet, what sets the seventh-ranking senator in the United States above and beyond the run of the mine politicians of our day is his humaneness, sentimentality, and loyalty towards his fellow man. He has what is called the common touch.

On February 14, 1966, the Puget Sound Sportswriters and Sportscasters Association staged their annual Mid-Winter Sports Banquet in the Olympic Hotel. One interlude involved the presentation of a $1,000 check from Joint Council of Teamsters No. 28 to the Fred Hutchinson Cancer Center of the Pacific Northwest Research Foundation. Dr. Bill Hutchinson, Fred's brother, accepted this check, and it was then pointed out by the Speaker that Sen. Warren G. Magnuson was sitting in the audience "just as a sports fan," and that he had promised to go full bore in trying to obtain federal matching funds for the center. The Senator was then asked to stand up and take a bow.

The applause was instantaneous, sustained and thunderous to say the least. Maggie was visibly shaken as he gave the old arms-extended victory sign. After the banquet he told more than one guest who had cheered him on:

"My God, you'd think I had won that award they were giving away up there. I've never heard a hand like that in all my years in politics, and we politicians have pretty sharp antennas for various kinds of hands. I'm never going to forget this evening."

And he hasn't.

Just the other day, The Washington Teamster received a copy of a letter the senator wrote to Baseball Commissioner William Eckert recalling their discussion (in 1964) of a Major League baseball game in Seattle with proceeds going to the Hutchinson Cancer Fund.

"The Hutchinson Cancer Fund is, of course, an entirely nonprofit organization and I can think of no finer effort than for baseball to honor one of its all-time greats while raising some money to ensure that a Hutchinson Cancer Institute will be built in Seattle, an institute which will dedicate its efforts to killing the dread disease which took Fred from us."

It is easy to see that a man as humane, sentimental and loyal couldn't forget his old friend Fred Hutchinson, nor that tumultuous hand the sports fans gave him in Seattle.

Maybe the Hutchinson Cancer Institute isn't as big a plum as Grand Coulee or the SST, but Maggie's persistent private campaign to keep the project alive and in front of responsible people certainly shows the true character of the finest solon this state ever produced.

When a visitor from the Northwest sees the Washington, D.C., Capitol for the first time, he is likely to feel that he is watching history in the making. He lifts his eyes upward and sees statues and monuments dedicated to men he has come to know through books almost as well as he knows men back home. And then he thinks of Senator Magnuson.

This sequence of thoughts hasn't been added out of imagination. It comes from reading the words of two Seattle newspapermen who visited Washington recently and wrote about Senator Magnuson.

"Washington is a city of monuments," one wrote in September 1966. "There'll probably be one around the senate chamber some day for Hubert Humphrey, and maybe Richard Russell and William Fulbright. But somehow you know it isn't in the cards for Warren Magnuson."

Another had written two months earlier: "He can never be a hero to the mop-hairs. And he knows, too, that a likeness of Maggie never will stand in the historic old Statuary Hall of the Capitol."

Both writers respect the Senator. They laud his many accomplishments in his three decades in the capitol. Their idea that a statue will never be raised in his honor may reflect the feeling that the Northwest came along too late to make important history. Or it may result from the feeling that monuments are not erected for men you know; the man represented in the stone lived in another time, or he lived in your time but in another world—a world of martyrdom.

Senator Magnuson is an unlikely prospect for the martyr's mantle. For one thing, he likes life. And when you stop to think about it, that's a good qaulity in men who make laws. His dedication to the proposition that all men are entitled to an equal chance at life's good things explains his concern for the legislation that affects the livelihood of fishermen, farmers, merchant seamen, and industrial workers in his home state.

It also goes a ways in explaining why he wrote the measure establishing the National Cancer Institute and led the fight to establish the National Science Foundation. It may help to explain, too, why he has transformed the Commerce Committee he heads into an effective consumer protection legion.

The report that some of Magnuson's colleagues say his concern with consumer problems began when he married Jermaine Elliott Peralta of Seattle after many years as a bachelor simply shows that even when his colleagues joke they recognize the honesty of his motives.

Sen. Phillip A. Hart of Michigan noted in a Senate speech that the Senate Commerce Committee was a passive arbitrator of industry disputes before Magnuson changed its direction. Now, he said, "it is a bold innovator of consumer legislation."

Out of Magnuson's committee came truth-in-packaging legislation, auto and tire safety measures, and the cigarette labeling bill. After a series of hearings, Magnuson's committee introduced measures to control pesticides and require safe designs of pop bottles, power mowers, electric blankets, teething rings, gas pipes, and hundreds of other products. His committee also has drafted legislation designed to end the practices of unscrupulous money lenders.

There is a big difference between introducing bills for the purpose of being identified with a cause and introducing bills with the intent of directing them through to passage. Magnuson's bills become law. He has been around the Senate long enough to have learned how to use his power effectively.

But more than power and position explain his influence. He has the respect of other Senators. A newspaper writer in Washington has said that fellow Senators don't just like Senator Magnuson; they trust him. "Everybody knows 'Maggie's' not out to do anybody in," a colleague explains. "He has no further political ambitions, so he's not trying to take anything away from somebody else."

Perhaps the Magnuson style is a tribute to his memory for another day. He was orphaned at the age of three weeks; he grew up as the adopted son of a Swedish family in Minnesota. At the age of 17 he set out for Seattle, doing farm labor between rides on freight trains. In the next seven years he attended the University of Washington and the law school. During the summers he delivered ice, and he was a member of Ice Wagon Drivers Local 192. He and Rep. Lloyd Meeds both are former Teamsters—Meeds as a cannery worker in Monroe was a member of Local 788.

The guess that Senator Magnuson is an unlikely entry in Statuary Hall is a tribute to his unassuming manner. On the rise to his present position of power he has done those things that honored men do. He took leave from Congress and saw action in the Pacific during World War II as an officer aboard the aircraft carrier Enterprise; he directed the public accommodations section of the 1964 civil rights bill through his committee. But he did his work without attracting shells. Though Southerners opposed the civil rights bill, Magnuson kept their respect.

If Magnuson can never be a hero to the mop-hairs, because of the style gap and age differences, the political consequences may be minor. Among the young are persons whose political preferences are based on performance. In this respect they are just like their parents. When these people look at Senator Magnuson in 1968, when he will be 63, they will not expect him to have hair hanging over his eyes. They will expect him to talk about his part in making the world better. His part is big, and the young who have heard him talk about health and education respond to him because there is much he has done and much he knows.

AID TO FAMILIES WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, in light of the current consideration by the Congress of the problem of the growing AFDC program, I wish to bring a recent article by Sylvia Porter to the attention of the Senate.

Miss Porter describes an experimental program underway in New York City which will provide day care facilities for mothers who wish to undertake training or paying jobs. Thousands of women in this country are trapped in poverty because the care of young children precludes them from taking jobs outside their homes. This new program in New York City will permit a mother to take a job knowing that her children will be cared for properly in her absence. It has the additional advantage of providing valuable experience and extra funds to other welfare mothers who are trained to take care of the children.

I wish to commend Mayor Lindsay's administration and particularly Mr. Mitchell Ginzberg, commissioner of welfare, for the innovative and commonsense approach to a problem which deeply concerns us all. They have initiated a program which will benefit the mother, the child and the community.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HELPING MOTHERS OFF WELFARE

(By Sylvia Porter)

Imagine yourself in this position: you are the mother of three pre-school children, living in a city slum on $200 a month in welfare payments. You would like to enroll in a job training course to become a hospital worker, but you obviously can't leave your children at home alone, and the cost of paying babysitters would be nearly as much as you would be receiving as a hospital trainee. Furthermore, you would have to forfeit your welfare check if you did take a paying job.

What would you do? You probably would forget about the job training and the job, give up the idea of self-support, stay home—and on the dole. And this is, in fact, precisely why hundreds of thousands of women are on welfare rolls the nation over. This is a key explanation why there now are a record 5,000,000 parents and children on the Aid to Famiiles with Dependent Children rolls—and why 200,000 are being added to these rolls each year.

This is the predicament which has caused so many well-meaning job training programs for welfare mothers to be dismal flops, and locked millions of children into dependency and poverty generation after generation.

Now, however, New York City is launching a vitally important experiment to overcome this costly paradox.

Beginning early in October, groups of two to four welfare children, aged one to five, whose mothers want to take paying jobs or job training in public or private agencies, will be assigned to the homes or apartments of other nearby welfare mothers from 8 a.m. to 6 p.m. The children will be fed proper lunches, take naps, play in parks, etc. The mothers caring for them will receive $75 per child per month from the city—or up to $3600 a year.

As an incentive, these mothers will be allowed to keep the first $150 in monthly earnings, with no reduction in their regular welfare payments. Payments will drop after that, as the mothers become financially self-sufficient.

The mothers also will become eligible, as a result of their experience in child care, for "para-professional" jobs in various anti-poverty programs, including home helpers, day care aides in city day care centers, and day care counselors.

As an indication of the desperate need for family day care facilities for children, New York City had, as of this summer, space in homes for only 200 welfare children, plus group day care centers accommodating only 5000 children. Yet there are painfully long waiting lists for these facilities and meanwhile more than 100,000 New York City welfare mothers who might take jobs or job training are unable to do so. The story is similiar in cities throughout the U.S. The national estimate is that 300,000 welfare mothers could be trained vs. only 50,000 now actually in training.

What payoff is expected from New York's baby-sitting plan? For every two to four welfare chidlren placed in day-care homes, two mothers are likely to work themselves off the relief rolls along with their dependent children. Since it costs up to $3000 a year to support one family on welfare in New York City, officials predict that savings over a two-year period will amount to at least $3 million.

The fact is that hundreds of thousands of welfare mothers the nation over would like to work and to leave behind the humiliation of being on welfare. If they can find a way to, and a place to care for their children, they will.

POSTAL RATES

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, Newsweek magazine for October 16, 1967, contains a column by Raymond Moley on the subject of postal rates. This is a subject that has occupied considerable attention in Congress this year. Mr. Moley cast a perspective on the subject of postal rates that I believe should be brought to the attention of Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that his column be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THOSE ALLEGED POSTAL SUBSIDIES

(By Raymond Moley)

A House bill to raise postal rates and increase the pay of postal employees (H.R. 7977) has been passed by the Post Office Committee and cleared for floor action by the Rules Committee. This bill is a hybrid. Originally there were two bills—one to comply with the President's demand for higher postal rates and the other to raise the pay of postal employees. The latter, however, gave employees a raise higher than the President's guidelines for Federal employees. And so, to avoid a veto of the pay bill, the House committee combined the two into one piece of legislation. Thus, the present bill is a product of a political maneuver, a practice which from time immemorial has characterized almost everything related to the postal service.

Moreover, this bill is being rushed through despite the fact that a commission of distinguished people was appointed by the President to study the postal service and will not report until next year. The chairman of that commission is Frederick R. Kappel, former chairman of AT&T. The commission was no doubt appointed at the instance of Postmaster General O'Brien, who declared that the "archaic" postal service is "ponderous, creaking, erratic, costly."

THE BURDEN UPON USERS

Instead of waiting for the Kappel commission's report, which may well show how the Post Office can be reformed to the extent that most of the postal deficit can be eliminated, the House Post Office Committee chose to increase the present scale of rates and thus throw the burden upon the users of the mail service.

My argument here deals with what is called a "subsidy" for users of second- and third-class mail. According to the figures in the House committee report, first-class mail in 1966 showed a surplus of $67.7 million. But second- and third-class mail provided deficits of $416.2 million and $401.2 million respectively. For a long time figures like these have been used to claim that users of second- and third-class mail have enjoyed a huge Federal subsidy.

I have had reason to feel the effect of this claim, for whenever over the past twenty years I have in my pieces in this magazine commented upon subsidies in government agencies and programs, I have received letters taunting me about the "subsidy" enjoyed by periodicals. Until now, I have not replied to those charges in print. But since responsible journalists have now accepted the Post Office figures and have joined the chorus, I choose to show how deceptive those figures are. For I have always believed that these claimed subsidies have been based upon a wholly unsound system of allocating costs in the postal system.

BAD ACCOUNTING

The report of the House committee itself in its labored explanation of what are called "cost ascertainment" figures comes close to admitting their unreliability. The cost system does not, it admits, take account of the importance of the priority given to first-class mail as compared with the deferment imposed upon other classes of mail. Delivery of first-class mail is intended to be prompt and almost immediate. Second class should take two or three days, and third class about eight days. Calculations based on the sale of stamps or use of meters cannot be segregated by classes. They are used for all kinds of mail. And the whole basis of assigning costs to the three classes is based upon random samples. The minority report on the bill said: "The full committee had no opportunity whatever to study the cost ascertainment figures on which the rate increases are based . . . all rate adjustments are suspect because they are based on questionable and dubious statistics."

I have become so accustomed to government accounting in other fields that I have grown even more suspicious of the Post Office figures. In the benefit-cost ratio in some big water projects such as dams and water supply, the assumptions are ludicrous. In the

Department of HEW there are twelve accounting systems, and none of these has been approved by the Comptroller General's office.

Common sense should tell anyone that since the same men and women, the same buildings, mail trucks, trains, boats and even in some cases horses and mules are used for all classes of mail in varying volume, an allocation of respective class costs is substantially impossible.

In the postal service, 80 per cent of the costs are for labor, and labor is largely used in handling, carrying and sorting mail. Under the ZIP Code system, magazines must do much of this handling at their own expense. A first-class item is handled on the average fifteen times by postal employees. Magazines do nine of those handlings at their own expense.

Despite this continual pushing of rising labor costs upon the users of second- and third-class mail, the rate increases on second-class (122 per cent) and third-class (188 per cent) over fifteen years have been far more than for first-class mail (67 per cent).

Finally, it should be noted that the rate increases in the present bill fall relatively most heavily upon periodicals of small circulation. To the bigs, the increases are an unjustified burden, but to the smalls the proposed rates are a tragic blow. And these smalls include hundreds of special periodicals—cultural, religious, scientific, professional and fraternal.

Here is the example of The Atlantic. Its publisher, Frank M. Herbert Jr., told the Post Office Committee that the present bill would add to his costs $8,800 for first-class mail, $26,250 for second-class mail and $52,800 for third-class mail. In all, this is $87,850. His average profits over five years have been $22,795. Thus, at one blow The Atlantic would either be destroyed or go deeply into debt. And this situation might well apply to hundreds of lesser-known periodicals.

THE BILL SHOULD WAIT

The reason why The Atlantic as well as many other magazines of small circulation use third-class mail is that their prospects are in limited categories and they cannot afford to solicit subscriptions in media with mass coverage. Mr. Herbert said that a one-page ad in the Reader's Digest, with a general circulation of millions, would cost $50,000, but if he used that $50,000 he could appeal through third-class mail to 800,000 selected individuals who would be suitable prospects for The Atlantic.

For these reasons, Congress should defer this bill until the Kappel commission reports on postal operations generally and recommends reforms such as are suggested by the Postmaster General. The billion-dollar postal deficit may be due to inefficiency and waste in the Post Office system itself. Certainly if the system is modernized and if it is possible to have an accurate accounting system, the stigma of "subsidies" should be removed from users of second- and third-class mail.

HIGH PRICES OF PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, 6 months of hearings by the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Select Committee on Small Business have produced startling facts about the drug manufacturing industry.

Recently, Mr. George Squibb sent the committee a lengthy document in which he discussed the fact that high prices cannot be justified.

This disclosure by an eminent member of a drug manufacturing family is significant. I hope that by the time the committee has examined all facets of the drug issue, industry and the consumer can find a common meeting ground whereby all groups can make common battle against disease, with reasonable and sufficient economic gain for all.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial published in the Milwaukee Journal of October 10, dealing with the Squibb report, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DRUG DEFECTOR

The drug price hearings of Sen. Nelson (D-Wis.) have produced impressive evidence of overpricing of prescription drugs—evidence that the drug industry has not been successful in refuting. Now some of the charges made by Nelson subcommittee witnesses have been supported, in effect, by a drug company executive.

George S. Squibb, former vice president and a consultant for the E. R. Squibb & Sons drug firm, recently distributed among industry leaders a 30 page statement in which he warned that high prices "cannot be justified satisfactorily." He rejected the industry argument that research expenses are the cause of high prices. He called upon drug makers to reduce their prices and profits voluntarily or face the prospect of government legislation.

Squibb's candor in defecting from the industry's propaganda line is commendable. The drug industry would be wise to study his advice.

REVENUE SHARING

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations for their adoption of a proposal which advocates revenue sharing. The Commission, which represents a broad range of talent and expertise from all levels of government, has performed a public service by focusing new attention on the necessity for revenue sharing.

It is unfortunate that the administration has not altered its position on the issue. Although both the Secretary of the Treasury and the Attorney General are members of the Advisory Commission, they did not attend the meeting at which this action was taken. However, I understand that Secretary Fowler's representative has said that the Secretary feels it is "premature" to consider revenue sharing. This statement is somewhat surprising viewed in the light of statistics recently compiled by the Treasury Department itself which show that fiscal 1966 Federal grants-in-aid payments to the States rose by 16 percent over fiscal 1965. Furthermore, Federal payments have increased since 1953 every year with only one exception. As total Federal grants reached $17.8 billion last year, is it premature to be concerned? I am proud to be a cosponsor of S. 1236, introduced by Senator HOWARD BAKER, of Tennessee, which proposes a responsible first step in this direction that could be initiated in the near future.

While reasonable men may have honest differences about the advantages of the various revenue-sharing proposals, it seems to me that we must all agree that the time is past due for serious consideration for alternate financing procedures. I urge the Treasury Department to review their own statistics and to explain, in light of the urgency of the problem, their reasons for opposition and whether its opposition is just at this time of budget crisis or is their opposition one of principle.

GREATER INSURANCE PROTECTION TO SMALL BUSINESS AGAINST CRIME

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, on April 11 of this year I introduced S. 1484, cosponsored by 31 Senators, to afford small businessmen greater insurance protection against crime. Thereafter, our Small Business Committee held a series of public hearings on the impact of crime on small businessmen.

Our findings show, beyond any doubt, that small business in the United States is the principal target of crimes against property. These are the people least able to protect themselves. They are more often than not unable to afford night watchmen, security guards, burglar alarms, electronic surveillance systems, and other high-cost means of self-protection.

With narrow profit margins and meager reserves, a man's small business can be destroyed forever by one single burglary. And burglary alone took from the coffers of U.S. small business firms last year the staggering sum of $679,668,000. An unconscionable percentage of this loss was not protected by insurance. For commercial insurance companies systematically avoid the urban neighborhoods where crime is most rampant. Since these companies are in business to turn a profit—who can blame them? But the small business victims—many the Mom and Pop store variety—would like to make a profit too. As a matter of fact, they would oftentimes just like to be able to stay in business. But crime is driving them out—sometimes to a safer neighborhood—sometimes to an early retirement and sometimes into bankruptcy. And always, the thousands of citizens of a blighted neighborhood are thereafter denied the convenience of shopping near home.

This whole recidivistic treadmill is a travesty upon our society. The case for a Federal program of small business crime insurance is documented and clear.

It is equally clear, however, that crime insurance must be coupled with crime prevention, just as Federal deposit insurance is tied into a rigorous program to avert bank failures. Furthermore, the flood insurance bill recently passed by the Senate has as one of its principal elements a strong loss prevention program.

No insurance program can go on forever piling up an excess of claim payments over premium income. On a plain and simple dollars and cents basis the actuarial risk must be kept to a minimum. In other words, if the program I have proposed in S. 1484 is going to work, the Government must pull out all stops in attacking crimes perpetrated against this Nation's 6 million small businessmen and women.

And if—spurred on by actuarial necessity—we can put a stop to most of these crimes against small businessmen—perhaps we can then apply the same principles to the auto thefts, the housebreakings, the muggings, the rapes, and the murders that are a plague upon American society.

During our Small Business Committee hearings in April, I sat and listened to witnesses—small business victims of crime—tell their fearful and sordid stories of defeat and frustration at the hands of hoodlums and punks. It occurred to me that the answer to this mess over the next 50 years might lie in the fields of psychology and sociology; that the answer over the next 5 years might be to unclog our criminal courts.

But that the answer today is to commit—to really commit—the scientific and technological resources of the most advanced Nation in all history to the prevention of these criminal acts against small business.

If we can master the mysteries of the atom, penetrate the historically impenetrable barriers of the universe, and circumnavigate the globe under the sea—surely we can muster sufficient scientific expertise to outwit the punks and hoodlums who prey upon our citizens.

With these thoughts in mind, I enlisted the aid of the Science Policy Research Division of the Legislative Reference Service. At my request, a very exhaustive study was made by Dr. Franklin P. Huddle, of the library staff.

I am pleased to announce that that very fine study has now being completed. Entitled "Contributions of Science and Technology to Federal Crime Insurance," it will be released by the Small Business Committee today.

With abundant documentation, the study shows that our failure to come to grips with crime has probably resulted from faulty assumptions and from a wealth of ignorance about all the elements of what constitutes crime.

Looking at crime prevention as a national system today, the study finds that it is a mass of disorganization.

There is no standardization of factual data about crimes.

Investment in the development of crime protection hardware is meager.

Community arrangements for protection vary from one jurisdiction to another.

Effective burglar alarms and associated hardware are too costly for many small businessmen to afford.

We do not have any one central location where the detailed quantitative facts about crimes can be collected, analyzed, and interpreted.

We do not have any mechanism for collecting such data in the first place.

No funds of any consequence are available to implement programs of research, development, and testing of hardware to protect small commercial establishments.

We do not even know what kinds of hardware would be most effective.

Individual police departments have experimented with specific techniques of crime prevention, but there is no means of evaluating these programs and their results, nor of encouraging the expanded application of successful ones.

All of these deficiencies could be substantially corrected if we were to apply the same systems engineering concepts to crime control that the aerospace industry has applied successfully in the design and construction of large, almost unbelievably complex, military and space projects. The study we are releasing today describes a practical program of how this can be done.

In partnership with a systems oriented scientific crime prevention plan, the small business crime insurance program—as envisioned in my bill, S. 1484—can become the most significant anticrime legislation ever passed by Congress.

The Small Business Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee, under the distinguished chairmanship of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre], advanced congressional consideration of this legislation with public hearings on September 13.

Both Senator McIntyre and my very distinguished colleague from Alabama, Senator Sparkman, the chairman of the full Banking and Currency Committee, are doing an outstanding service to the small business community in their thorough and expeditious handling of this legislation.

The administration's Commission on Civil Disorders has also been studying the question of crime insurance for small business. Some spokesmen have suggested that the Congress delay any action on S. 1484 until the Commission's study has been completed and its recommendations have been advanced sometime next year.

It is unthinkable to me, in light of the evidence that Congress has already been presented and in light of the thorough and comprehensive study we are publishing today, that the Nation's small business community should be asked to wait for further studies to be completed.

These actions of burglary and robbery, of vandalism, are being perpetrated against small businessmen across the country every day. Their losses are multiplying. Far too often they have no recourse, and the legislation that the Congress finally passes will obviously not be retrospective.

I cannot urge too strongly that the Congress act at the earliest possible time.

Mr. President, during the course of the study that I have spoken about today, I received many letters of support from eminent law enforcement officials, and engineers and scientists in the aerospace industry. I ask unanimous consent that certain excerpts from that correspondence, together with other relevant material, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

In discussing the application of systems technology to crime prevention, Charles Wilcox, manager of technology planning in Hughes Aircraft Company, Culver City, California, says:

"Inexpensive alarms, either using infrared or ultrasonics, are on the market in limited quantities now. Considerable improvement in these devices is possible. Nearly all the communication nets from a central station to individual stores presently employ telephone lines. This may be satisfactory, but there exist other techniques employing active interrogators of inexpensive passive devices which have been developed for military use and which may have application here. Non-lethal weaponry has been receiving considerable attention for use in riot control and paramilitary operations. It would seem that much could be done here to prevent the occurrence of potential crimes as well as stopping those underway."

Mr. Joseph C. Batz, director of software support systems, Control Data Corporation, Bethesda, Maryland, writes:

"The significance of a national approach to solving the problems of small businessmen in obtaining effective protective devices is very important. It is my firm belief that if small businessmen do not have the funds or knowledge to provide themselves with protective devices, assistance should be provided."

Mr. George W. Boe, Jr., of the radar and intelligence operation, Aeronutronics Division of Philco-Ford, in Newport Beach, California, states flatly that for the small businessman, burglary protection devices "which will provide the protection he needs for the price he can afford have not yet been developed." He says:

"The proposal to sponsor and support technological improvements in crime detection devices is valid. Research and development in this area is particularly expensive and to be borne solely by 'one' small business would be prohibitive. The idea of creating a crime protection insurance corporation with the charter for this responsibility is practical. I can think of no more expeditious manner with which to establish the capability."

The inadequacy of our knowledge about crime was stressed by LeRoy B. McCabe of System Development Corporation, Falls Church, Virginia. According to McCabe:

"There is a general indication that there is a problem, but to my knowledge very little effort has been expended in analyzing all the factors directly or indirectly involved in the small business environment. We have found in systems work that it is impossible to develop effective solutions to operational problems, for example, of a particular organization without knowing in fairly precise terms the structure, operational procedures, products, resources, etc., of that organization. The much discussed systems approach to problems solution seems to be a basic requirement for any proposed national entity established to assist in attempting to solve the small business protection problems."

Mr. Joel N. Bloom, technical director of the Franklin Institute Research Laboratories, in Philadelphia, writes:

"Insurance by itself would ameliorate to some extent the financial losses of small business due to robbery and burglary; but, it would not attack the fundamental problem of reducing the crime itself. The ideal solution to the problem is to *combine* a government-sponsored insurance program with a con-commitant applied-research effort, specifically geared to the needs of the small business establishment. Then, it can be expected that low-cost, effective deterrent devices and procedures will be developed and put within the reach of small business. When this happens, the private insurance industry once again will be able to offer adequate coverage at moderate rates."

The report presents a number of illustrative approaches to crime prevention that have been successful in particular localities. One is the well-known "Oakland Ordinance," developed by the police department in the City of Oakland, California. This program is based on the well-documented fact that some victims of robberies and burglaries are hit repeatedly. (For example, one of the witnesses who testified at our Small Business Committee hearings said that he had been burglarized 22 times since 1953; another said he had been burglarized four times in the previous five weeks).

The Oakland Ordinance assigns the municipal police department the task of conducting security surveys on "crime-prone" commercial establishments; the police experts suggest ways the storekeeper can tighten his security, and make his premises less inviting to the criminal.

The Ordinance *requires* the storekeeper to take the necessary protective action recommended by the police, and to do so in a reasonable time.

The Chief of the Oakland Police Department, R. J. Preston, has written to me, stating that:

"With the steadily increasing crime rate, the significance of a national approach of the kind you propose to assist small retailers by improving availability of effective protective devices cannot be over-emphasized."

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the imperative need of the Nation's small businessmen for insurance protection is gaining widespread acceptance. As further evidence that the concept of the Federal Government taking the lead in making it possible for small firms in high-risk localities to obtain insurance protection, which is now unavailable through normal underwriting channels, I call attention to the editorial which appeared in the 50th anniversary special issue of "Building Supply News." This perceptive editorial is titled "Riot Insurance for Your Business." I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RIOT INSURANCE FOR YOUR BUSINESS

A Capitol Hill axiom is that Congress always learns its lesson the hard way. It is no exception to this rule that it took a whole summer of mob violence in the cities to make the lawmakers realize that riot insurance is a must if business establishments and homes in the damaged areas are to be rebuilt.

Moreover, as we brought out in the Senate hearings on housing legislation, it is futile to attempt to lure new businesses and homes into urban areas if protection against fire, and mob damage is unavailable—or can only be obtained at prohibitive rates.

Actually, a bill that would go a long way toward alleviating the situation has been pending in the Senate most of the session. Sponsored by Sen. George A. Smathers (D.-Fla.), it would set up a federal reinsurance program in areas that have been ravaged by mobs or are considered subject to such damage. The operation would be lodged in the Small Business Administration.

The measure has been taken down from the shelf and dusted off for action. Hearings are planned in the Senate Banking Committee early in September. Preliminary information already obtained by Senate staffers presents mute testimony as to the seriousness of the problem.

For example, it was reported that 873 businesses were wrecked in Newark. In Tampa, Fla., it was found that 60% of the losses suffered by businesses and stores was not covered by insurance.

Even more disturbing are the stories relayed by Senate aides that some retailers are finding suppliers and manufacturers reluctant to send them new shipments unless insurance protection can be provided against further damage and looting.

In its present form, the Smathers bill would reinsure private insurance companies writing prescribed policies protecting small businesses against fire and mob damage. The contents of the buildings would be covered as swell as the structures themselves, thus tending to make the suppliers less apprehensive.

WHAT'S A SMALL BUSINESS?

The determination of what constitutes a small business has never been very easy to figure—mainly because The Small Business Administration keeps changing its definitions. In the retailing field, a guideline is the establishment's gross volume of business.

However, the dollar limit varies according to the type of retailing. Consultation with SBA produces the information that for building supply retailers, the dollar limit is presently $1 million.

But this does not necessarily indicate that retailers who take in more than $1 million a year will be barred from the new insurance program. There is already talk around the Senate of raising all the limits to much higher amounts. According to one source, building supply retailers with annual gross incomes at least double the present $1-million ceiling would be able to qualify.

Another SBA requirement for its present programs is that a retail establishment must be independently owned and operated and not dominant in its field in the area it serves. Unless modified, this regulation would obviously exclude retailers in smaller cities from the proposed reinsurance program—and some of these places have already experienced riots.

Homes are not now covered by the bill, but probably will be by the time it reaches the floor.

THE CLAMOR FOR DEESCALATION OF THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, in a recent column, Crosby S. Noyes wrote in the Washington Evening Star that the clamor for deescalation in Vietnam may, indeed, have the ironical effect of drowning out the prospects for deescalation. This is so, he wrote, because the so-called doves who are playing politics with the war to put President Johnson in a tough political spot, refuse to recognize the realities of the situation; namely, that there is no willingness at all, and no sign of its likelihood, that Ho Chi Minh and the leaders of North Vietnam will listen to reason or come to amicable agreements.

Certainly it stands to reason that the clamor put forth by some for deescalation should harden Hanoi's determination to resist and to forgo the conference table, at least until after our elections next November. Those who truly seek peace, it follows, should not be acting in such a manner as to foreclose negotiations for such an extended period of time. That, alas, is the effect their campaigning seems to be having.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD Crosby S. Noyes' column entitled "Clamor for Deescalation Drowns Out Prospects," published in the Evening Star of October 12, 1967.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLAMOR FOR DEESCALATION DROWNS OUT PROSPECTS

(By Crosby S. Noyes)

The crowning irony in the growing clamor for deescalation of the war in Vietnam is that it has seriously reduced the chances of any de-escalation and virtually eliminated any prospect for serious peace talks.

There are two obvious reasons for this.

President Johnson is now in a position in which he cannot respond to these pressures without appearing to cave in to the Republican peace wing and the doves within his own party.

And if it should appear that a new peace move by the United States was prompted by the administration's fear of defeat in the coming election, the Communists in Hanoi would have no reason whatever to come to the conference table before next November.

The emergence of the Republican peace wing in particular threatens to polarize and harden the administration's policies on Vietnam.

In the past Johnson has tried, with some success, to hold the middle ground between the hawks and the doves. Dissent within his own party has been something of a nuisance but not much of a threat.

In the past, the domination of relative hardliners within the Republican ranks has left him free to make a number of concessions to his Democratic critics—including the suspension on five different occasions of the bombing of North Vietnam.

Now, however, this situation has radically changed. The fact that a number of prominent Republicans, including several potential presidential candidates, have begun to carve out positions on Vietnam allegedly more "liberal" than the President's, severely limits his freedom of maneuver in the coming months.

And this by no means for domestic political reasons.

In fact, the President might well be tempted at this point to try another experimental pause in the bombing, if only to cut the ground from under his critics at home and abroad. It might well be good politics for him to do so.

But no President of a country at war can do something which would serve to persuade the enemy that his country's will to continue the war was on the point of collapse. And under the present circumstances almost any gesture of appeasement would be very likely to do just that.

The doves, in their sublime innocence, have an unshakable faith in the willingness of the leaders in Hanoi to listen to reason and come to amicable agreements if only we give them a chance. Perhaps the real reason for the much-discussed "credibility gap" is the steadfast refusal of these people to believe anything they are told if it doesn't conform with their own ethereal views.

Heaven knows, the leaders in Hanoi have tried their best to tell them. Every day for months on end, in press articles, radio broadcasts, and speeches of visiting dignitaries—all available in impeccable translation—they have made their objectives unmistakably clear.

Listen for instance, to the voice of the official newspaper Nan Dan:

"If the U.S. aggressors do not reconcile themselves to their defeat but keep blindly rushing along the criminal road, the Vietnamese people will fight on until they are left with no way to continue the war and must give up their aggressive design."

Or consider the friendly words of encouragement offered to his hosts in Hanoi by Comrade Lu Wei-chao, envoy from Communist China:

"The victories of the Vietnamese people once again prove the invincible force of people's warfare. They also prove that the U.S. imperialists are only paper tigers that can be completely defeated . . . At present they are stepping up the aggressive war in Vietnam, while continuing their peace talk scheme aimed at reversing their setbacks. But realities have shown that with regard to the U.S. imperialist aggressors we must firmly fight them in face-to-face confrontation and we will certainly defeat them."

Propaganda? Of course it's propaganda—and of a kind which is hardly designed to ease the way to a peaceful settlement of our differences over the future of South Vietnam. The doves, by playing politics with these problems, may succeed in putting President Johnson in a tough political spot. But they are certainly doing nothing whatever to bring peace any closer in Asia.

DIRKSEN, OF ILLINOIS—VIETNAM

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, recently the distinguished minority leader of the Senate made his views known on the presence and aims of the United States in Vietnam. That subject has been discussed a great deal.

The remarks of Senator DIRKSEN and others, both preceding and following his presentation on the floor, have been widely publicized and discussed. They were the subject of an editorial contained in the October 6, 1967, issue of the Chicago Tribune.

In my view, the commentary of that eminent journal should be of interest to our colleagues.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DIRKSEN OF ILLINOIS

Everett M. Dirksen spoke as Republican leader of the Senate in his impassioned speech supporting the presence and aims of the United States in Viet Nam. His address required a particular kind of courage, for some of his party colleagues in recent days have engaged in notable wobbling on a war which they originally supported.

Sen. Dirksen's address was directed as much to them as to the disaffected ranks of the Democrats who have walked away from the President of their own party. Sen. Dirksen defended the war against communist aggression and maintained that the people of South Viet Nam must be allowed to determine their own destiny without the pressures of communist arms and terrorism.

America's defensive perimeter in Asia, Sen. Dirksen said, extended from South Korea to South Viet Nam, and, if it were breached, we would be forced back to a holding line from Alaska to Hawaii.

Sen. Dirksen was especially vehement about criticism which he felt disparaged and demeaned the President. [One of his party colleagues, adopting Gov. Romney's celebrated utterance about being "brainwashed" on Viet Nam, had charged that Mr. Johnson was brainwashed and that he in turn was brainwashing the American people.] Sen. Dirksen was also contemptuous of headline hunters in his party.

To senators who had called for a unilateral cease-fire, the senator responded: "We tried that in the Korean war. The pause in our offensive then eventually cost us 90,000 additional casualties. Do we want to repeat that? Isn't one lesson enough for us?"

We think that Sen. Dirksen has spoken the sentiments of the majority of the American people. As Col. Robin Olds, the valiant fighter pilot, remarked in Washington on the same day, the way to stop the war is to win it. Instead, Col. Olds said, "We're doing it the hard way. And the worst way of all is to get out once you've got your foot in it."

Sen. Dirksen's outspoken statement again attests to his stature. If he were 10 years younger, he would be the choice going away for Republican nomination for the Presidency next year.

FARMER GROWING WEARY

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, one of the most candid discussions of the plight of the American farmer is contained in a recent editorial by William O. Dobler, editor of the Lincoln Star.

It is worth noting that the Star frequently supports the Johnson administration and has, traditionally, been considered a Democratic paper.

But Mr. Dobler puts partisanship aside in commenting on a recent meeting in Lincoln between officials of the Department of Agriculture and Nebraska farmers to discuss the 1968 feed grains program.

The editor notes:

> The American farmer, quite properly is growing weary of producing food for the enjoyment and profit of everyone but himself.

And, the editorial notes, the farmer is growing weary of unfulfilled promises and doubletalk on the part of the department of Government to which they look for assistance.

Unless the Department of Agriculture provides a realistic 1968 feed grains program, Mr. Dobler warns, "agriculture may well enter a stage of unprecedented revolution."

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Dobler's column be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN PERSPECTIVE

(By William O. Dobler)

It takes no expert these days to figure out that the Johnson administration has problems in Nebraska beyond the Vietman war and unrest in the big city slums. The trouble out here in the Plains states has to do with farming and the lack of profit in it.

This was made clear to U.S. Department of Agriculture officials in Lincoln this week for meetings with farmers in anticipation of 1968 feed grains determinations later this month. The farm groups were unanimous that something different was going to have to be done for next year.

These farmers spoke as reports showed a nine per cent drop in farm prices as of Sept. 15 compared with a year ago and a three per cent hike in the cost of production items. Thus, while farmers are paying more for the things they need to produce food, they are getting less for their products.

It is obvious to even the most casual observer that this cannot go on. The farmers were told a few years ago that once the great surplus stocks reduced, their problems would be over.

The surpluses have now been eliminated but farm prices have grown worse, not better. Additionally, the U.S.D.A., has seen fit to eliminate acreage diversion payments for 1967, taking another $50 million out of Nebraska farm income this year.

One farm spokesman in Lincoln stated when the fall bills become due, farmers will not be able to pay them. Another pointed to the fact that farmers were doing business on seven to eight per cent credit while netting less than five per cent on their investment.

And finally, the U.S.D.A. was told that its crop predictions are in error, that thousands of acres of corn and sorghum have been damaged by frost to the point where they will yield no harvest. This is cash down the drain, regardless of the profit picture.

It was predicted that farmers will turn upon the 1968 feed grains program if changes are not made. This means that price supports will have to be increased and, probably, payments made for diverted acres.

The U.S.D.A. spoke of growing world production and the price-depressing nature of such conditions. It warned that rather than a surplus, the farmer now faces the problem of "supply-demand . . . to which a third equation must be added—namely, reasonable returns to producers.

We do not pretend to know what the department is talking about when it mixes up its words like this. We rather doubt that there are many farmers who know what the department is talking about.

What we suspect is that the department is, again, talking about the welfare of the consumer. Right or wrong, this cuts no mustard with the farmer.

The American farmer quite properly is growing weary of producing food for the enjoyment and profit of everyone but himself. He is growing weary of an always promising future that never quite materializes.

He should be growing weary of an American public that does not seem to understand its real and long-range interest in this matter. That interest is a continuation of agriculture along lines that now prevail.

The alternative is an organized agriculture that will state its price, take its full profit and let the consumer suffer. And this would be a much more advanced economic level than it takes to make present farm operations reasonably profitable.

There have been farm crises in the past and the nation has weathered them but we are facing one today that could be the end of the line. If the U.S.D.A. fails to provide a realistic 1968 feed grains program, agriculture may well enter a stage of unprecedented revolution.

COMMENTS ON NEWS CONFERENCE OF SECRETARY OF STATE RUSK

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, Secretary of State Dean Rusk's news conference of last Thursday has drawn many comments, most of them favorable. It was hard hitting. It was direct. Secretary Rusk answered the critics of U.S. policies in Vietnam in explicit words. I ask unanimous consent to have the transcript of the entire news conference printed in the RECORD, along with an editorial from Saturday's Evening Star and Gould Lincoln's column on "Rusk's Explicit Reply to Critics," also from Saturday's Washington Evening Star.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECRETARY RUSK'S NEWS CONFERENCE OF OCTOBER 12, 1967

Secretary RUSK. I should like to begin with a brief comment on the current public discussion of Viet-Nam.

I find no significant body of American opinion which would have us withdraw from Viet-Nam and abandon Southeast Asia to the fate which Asian communism has planned for it. Similarly, I find no serious opinion among us which wishes to transform this struggle into a general war.

We Americans are, therefore, debating variations on a theme—but the theme is a central position resting upon (a) the need to meet our commitments and defend our vital national interests; (b) the pursuit of our limited objectives by limited means, and (c) our earnest desire to bring this conflict to a peaceful conclusion as soon as possible. Hanoi particularly should not misunderstand the character of this debate.

Our commitment is clear and our national interest is real. The SEATO Treaty, approved with only one dissenting vote by our Senate, declares that "Each party recognizes that aggression by means of armed attack in the treaty area . . . would endanger its own peace and safety, and agrees that it will in that event act to meet the common danger . . ." The Treaty says "each party" will act. The fidelity of the United States is not subject to the veto of some other signatory—and five signatories have engaged their forces alongside Korean and South Vietnamese troops. Indeed, the proportion of non-U.S. forces in South Viet-Nam is greater than non-U.S. forces in Korea.

In August 1964 the Congress by joint resolution declared, with only two dissenting votes, that "The United States regards as vital to its national interest and to world peace the maintenance of international peace and security in Southeast Asia." This was not a new idea in 1964. It was the basis for the SEATO Treaty a decade earlier. It is no less valid in 1967. Our several alliances in the Pacific reflect our profound interest in peace in the Pacific, and in Asia where two-thirds of the world's people live, no less vital to us as a nation than is peace in our own hemisphere or in the NATO area.

I have heard the word "credibility" injected into our domestic debate. Let me say, as solemnly as I can, that those who would place in question the credibility of the pledged word of the United States under our mutual security treaties would subject this nation to mortal danger. If any who would be our adversary should suppose that our treaties are a bluff, or will be abandoned if the going gets tough, the result could be catastrophe for all mankind.

It is not easy for our people to wage a struggle by limited means for limited objectives. We Americans are an impatient people—a quality which has helped to build a great nation. The present impatience about Viet-Nam is thoroughly understandable—and is shared by those who carry official responsibility. But our over-riding object is—and must be in this modern world—the establishment of a reliable peace. It is easy to rush into total catastrophe. It requires courage and determination to act with both firmness and restraint in the interest of peace. An examination of all the crises in which we have been involved since 1945 will show, I think, the supremacy of the objective of a reliable peace.

President Johnson has emphasized, time and time again, his interest in a prompt and peaceful settlement of the present struggles in Southeast Asia. Just two weeks ago, in San Antonio, he said:

"The United States is willing to stop all aerial and naval bombardment of North Viet-Nam when this will lead promptly to productive discussions. We, of course, assume that while discussions proceed, North Viet-Nam would not take advantage of the bombing cessation or limitation."

Can there be a more reasonable proposal? Is there anything unfair about such a simple proposition? Is it not clear that if Hanoi is interested in peace it could say "yes" publicly or privately to the President's offer?

A rejection, or a refusal even to discuss such a formula for peace, requires that we face some sober conclusions. It would mean that Hanoi has not abandoned its effort to seize South Viet-Nam by force. It would give reality and credibility to captured documents which describe a "fight and negotiate" strategy by Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese forces. It would reflect a view in Hanoi that they can gamble upon the character of the American people and of our allies in the Pacific.

Earlier I referred to variations on a theme. The debate in which we are now involved is essentially a debate about detail—this or that military move, this or that diplomatic step—this or that formulation of what is in fact a common middle position. If that be true, precision is important. People at least should make it clear whether they are arguing with Washington or with Hanoi.

When people talk about a pause in the bombing, they should know that Hanoi calls a pause an "ultimatum." When a Senator says that he wants to stop the bombing but, of course, wishes to continue to bomb in support of our Marines south of the DMZ, he should know that Hanoi categorically rejects any such notion. When people say "Negotiate Now" they should know that the President would meet with Ho Chi Minh and other Chiefs of State concerned, tomorrow—and that I would depart today for any mutually convenient spot if I could meet a representative of North Viet-Nam with whom I could discuss peace in Southeast Asia.

Chairman Thieu and Prime Minister Ky have repeatedly offered to meet with the authorities of Hanoi to arrange a cease-fire and a peaceful settlement. They and we both responded affirmative to U Thant's proposals of last March. Had there been a similar response from Hanoi, there would have been discussions to arrange a military standstill, preliminary conversations and a convening of the Geneva Conference. Literally dozens of proposals made by ourselves, other governments or groups of government's have been rejected by Hanoi.

I cannot tell you when peace will come. I am encouraged by progress toward peace in South Viet-Nam, but I cannot name a date. But we shall continue our effort both by resisting those who would impose their solutions by brute force and by an unremitting exploration of every path which could lead to peace.

I am ready for your questions.

Question. Mr. Secretary, with regard specifically to President Thieu's offer, reported offer to meet with Hanoi and then arrange a week's pause in bombing if they agreed to talks, one, was the United States consulted on this offer first, and did it agree, and, two, do you think such a limited offer has any chance of success?

Answer. My understanding is that a press officer repeated what President-elect Thieu had said during his campaign, I think in August. And that this was not itself a new development. Of course, we would be very much interested in Hanoi's response to such a suggestion.

The problem is that dozens and dozens of suggestions have been made to Hanoi through all sorts of channels, with all sorts of formula, and that Hanoi has categorically rejected all of them.

Now, this is the sort of an idea which is no problem for Washington. What is needed is some response from Hanoi to this or any one of a dozen other ideas with which Hanoi is thoroughly familiar.

Question. Mr. Secretary, some question has arisen in connection with the report from Saigon today as to whether the United States was consulted about President Thieu's proposed move, and how President Thieu can make a bombing offer when he is not doing the bombing.

Answer. Oh, I think there is no problems between ourselves and the Government of South Vietnam on that. We have had at least five substantial cessations of the bombings. Everything turns on what Hanoi's attitude is. We and the Government of South Vietnam keep in close touch on these matters, but the answer does not come just from Saigon and Washington. The answer must come from Hanoi as well.

Question. Mr. Secretary, you talked in your statement about the importance of precision, and with that in mind, sir, I wonder if you could help us understand whether the United States now still requires a military sign of deescalation from Hanoi in exchange for cessation of the bombing, or whether the President's statement about assuming Hanoi will not take advantage of a bombing pause represents a change.

Answer. Well, I think we ought to be clear that as far as the United States is concerned, we would engage in negotiations without any conditions whatever at the earliest possible moment. I frequently said we will do that today.

Now, the other side has raised a major condition. That condition is a permanent and unconditional cessation of the bombing. And they have also indicated that they will take no corresponding military action on their side but would expect to go ahead with their part of the war with complete intensity, with all of the effort that they can mobilize.

Now, President Johnson in San Antonio stated an assumption. This is an assumption with respect to the condition imposed by Hanoi. The assumption would be that if we stopped the bombing there would not be military advantage taken by that cessation of the bombing by Hanoi.

Now, Hanoi knows what this means, and we have had not the slightest indication that Hanoi is prepared for those prompt and productive talks to which the President alluded in his San Antonio reference.

Question. Mr. Secretary, you said you were encouraged about the prospects of peace in Vietnam. Why are you encouraged in view of the lack of reaction from Hanoi?

Answer. Well, there are many things. I know that some reporter in Saigon invented the word "stalemate". Our military authorities do not believe there is a stalemate. Ambassador Bunker doesn't believe there is a stalemate. We see defections from the Viet Cong double what they were last year. We see the recruitment of southerners to the Viet Cong dropped by approximately a half. We see desertions from the South Vietnamese Forces sharply reduced over last year.

You have heard General Larsen's report on what is happening in the II Corps area, which is half the land area of South Vietnam, the opening up of roads, the opening up of railways, the areas under Government control, the sharp reduction of areas under Viet Cong control. There are many indicators that the Government and Allied Forces are getting on with the job on the military side.

Beyond that, despite all the tongues-in-cheek despite all the skepticism, the South Vietnamese have come through with what really ought to be considered almost a miracle in politics.

In the midst of a dirty, tough, mean, guerrilla war, they have elected a Constituent Assembly; they have adopted a Constitution; they have had hamlet and village elections through the country; they have elected a President and a Vice President and a Senate; they will shortly elect a lower house of the Legislature, in a situation where the Viet Cong in most areas has said, if you vote, you die, and they are getting on with it.

Now, it is not easy, and we can sit back here comfortably and be skeptical about details, worry about this or that particular point, but the overriding fact is that in the midst of this kind of struggle, the South Vietnamese have been moving steadily toward a constitutional system.

Now, these elections were held in areas representing some 75 per cent of the population. A very high percentage of those who registered, voted favorably compared with our own elections in this country. The economic situation has been improving. In other words, the Viet Cong have not achieved their objective. The country is moving ahead. And I see no reason for us to be gloomy simply because it is not over yet. We have had our combat forces there for approximately two years, and other Allies have put forces in there, and the situation is moving.

Now, one can find individual incidents here and there that would throw doubt on it, and the skeptic can always find some basis for his story, but there are at least a thousand stories a day that could be filed from Saigon, many of them of success, many of them reflecting close cooperation, friendship, and acts of kindness among South Vietnamese and Americans.

When you look at the total situation it's moving, and I have no reason myself whatever to subscribe to this notion of a stalemate. It is not a stalemate at all.

Question. Mr. Secretary, what is the motive of the Soviet Government to reject the reconvening of the Geneva Conference? Did you explore this with Mr. Gromyko in New York?

Answer. I find it difficult to get into motives. I would suppose that Hanoi categorically refuses a Geneva Conference, and therefore the Soviet Union is unwilling to step out in front and join with the British Co-Chairman to convene a conference to which Hanoi and Peking both strenuously object. We ourselves will be very glad to have such a conference convened, about Vietnam, about Laos, about Cambodia, or about any subject related to Southeast Asia.

A Senator the other day in the course of a Senate debate was asked what his alternative was for Vietnam, and he said, well, I would like to see a Geneva Conference. Well, he is not arguing with Washington. We have tried over and over again to use the Geneva machinery for the purposes for which it was established. We will be glad to see the two Co-Chairmen say, go to Geneva, and put themselves in touch with elements or parties in the dispute. We would be glad to have the three ICC countries do the same thing or to make arrangements for the demilitarization of the DMZ or to assure Prince Sihanouk that Cambodia's neutrality will not be abused.

So there is no problem with us on that. The problem is that Hanoi says no.

Question. Mr. Secretary, what do you think of the thesis of turning negotiations upside down and beginning instead between Washington and Hanoi at some lower level within the countries, specifically between the Government of Saigon and the NLF, or elements of it?

Answer. Well, we, as you know, draw no major distinction between what is called the NLF and Hanoi. I think that the United States view is affected by the fact that as far as peace is concerned, our problem is with Hanoi. We did not put our combat forces into South Vietnam because of dissident elements in South Vietnam. We put our combat forces in there because North Vietnamese Forces moved into South Vietnam. So that our problem of peace is with Hanoi.

Further than that, we know from captured documents, testimony of prisoners, and other sources of information that the NLF is directed from Hanoi on a daily basis.

Now, we have no objections to exploring the possibilities of contacts with the NLF, nor do we have any objections to the Government in Saigon doing so. But I would not want to mislead you by thinking that in my judgment that is going to solve the problem of North Vietnamese regiments in South Vietnam for the purpose of imposing a solution on that country by force. Hanoi has a major role to play in peace in this situation, and until there is some indication from Hanoi that they are prepared to make peace, then I don't think that lesser formulas are likely to solve the problem.

Question. Mr. Secretary, on the same day the Russians ratified the Outer Space Treaty and announced their biggest ever rise in their arms budget. Would you please appraise the relative weight of these two events in U.S.-Soviet relations?

Answer. Well, as far as the arms budget is concerned, I believe that the defense budget as they announced it is about the same proportion of their new budget as it was in the previous budget. In any event, it indicates some increase. Just what direction that increase will take we have no way of knowing. There was some indication that it related to the need for more military assistance to other countries. And we know that they are increasing their miltiary assistance to North Vietnam. But it is true that we signed the Space Treaty, and I think it is worth pausing to reflect a little on 1967 despite Vietnam. It turns out to be a most constructive year. The Kennedy Round negotiations were successfully concluded. The International Monetary Fund took a major step in the field of international liquidity. The Space Treaty was ratified unanimously by our Senate. We concluded the Consular Treaty with the Soviet Union. We and the Soviet Union filed a joint draft of a nonproliferation treaty in Geneva. The Presidents of the Western Hemisphere decided to go for a Latin American Common Market in this next decade. The Asian Development Bank became a going institution this year. Even though there was a distressing and sharp war in the Middle East, the fighting was ended in four days without the intervention of the great powers.

In other words, there have been some very constructive developments this year looking toward a general peace and a general solution of problems despite the pain and the tragedy of Vietnam. We should not be negligent of those important developments.

Question. Mr. Secretary, in a speech in the Senate yesterday, Senator Fulbright asserted that the United Nations is being deterred from action concerning Viet-Nam more by the failure of the United States to encourage it to act than by the opposition of the Soviet Union. What are your views on that, sir, and what role do you think the United Nations can play?

Answer. Well, I don't have his statement in front of me. I—relying upon the way you stated it——

Question. Would you like for me to get it verbatim?

Answer (continuing). Would say that it is not true. The United States would be glad to have the United Nations take up this question and deal with it responsibly. We have pending in the Security Council a resolution which the Security Council does not wish to act upon.

I think the general attitude in the United Nations seems to be that since Hanoi and Peking and Moscow are saying that this is not appropriate for the United Nations, that an effort by the United Nations to resolve this problem might get in the way of the use of other machinery, such as the Geneva machinery or quiet, bilateral, diplomatic exploration.

Now, I have said many times that we ourselves do not share this view because we believe that the United Nations has a responsibility for general peace and security in the world and we'd be glad to see them take it up. But, on the other hand, there are some problems about going through an exercise of futility, if that is what it appears to be, to satisfy some critics among our own people.

We can't say to you that a resolution will come out of the Security Council because of the Soviet veto, and the Soviets have made it perfectly clear they will veto. And we have no reason to think that the General Assembly will address itself in this matter in the same way in which the UN is addressing itself to the Middle East. In the case of the Middle East, they have had a long association with these problems. They played the crucial role in establishing the State of Israel. They have had peace-keeping forces out there and they have had armistice machinery out there, and this matter has been before the United Nations year after year. They have the United Nations machinery for refugees in the area, but this is not the attitude in the United Nations about South Viet-Nam. I think that they are somehow hoping that other means and other procedures will find the key that will unlock this problem, when they are on notice by most of the parties concerned—that the United Nations will not be permitted to find that key and not be permitted by Hanoi, Peking, and Moscow.

Question. Mr. Secretary——

Question. Mr. Secretary——

Question. Mr. Secretary, may I ask, in view of a widely published report, whether in your non-public appearances around the country you are denouncing the intellectual critics of the war, including Arthur Schlesinger, and whether as reported you have dismissed Roger Hilsman.

Answer. No; I am not going to comment on third-hand reports on what I was alleged to have said in a private meeting. These things get out of context very quickly.

It is not true that I have any generic attitude toward all those people who call themselves or are called intellectuals.

I've been around them a good deal in my time.

I do recall, once in a while—perhaps you will forgive me for this—as friends used to say of Einstein—that was a genius in mathematical physics, an amateur in music, and a baby in politics.

Now, I think that an idea stands or falls on its own merits and the fact that a man knows everything there is to know about enzymes doesn't mean that he knows very much about Viet-Nam or how to organize a peace or the life and death of nations.

So I have great respect for intellectuals, but I don't feel that I'm intimidated by them. (Laughter.)

Question. Mr. Secretary——

Question. Mr. Secretary, you said in your opening statement that essentially we are engaged in a debate about detail, but the record would indicate that there has been increasing defection in the ranks of Administration supporters in the Congress. Do you contemplate, sir, a further sequence of public appearances in the Congress to try to clarify, amplify this position?

Answer. Well, I'm not sure that as far as the Congress is concerned the way to clarify and achieve accord is through public appearances. I myself greatly enjoy serious, responsible, candid consultation with the great Committees of Congress in circumstances in which such discourse can take place. I do not think such discourse can take place always in open session. As far as I'm concerned, a public hearing has some of the same problems as does a press conference. There are very few secrets, if Americans can discuss these matters among themselves without the rest of the world listening in. But when our allies in the nonaligned world and the Communists are listening in, there are some inhibitions at least upon the Secretary of State, because what I say in my official capacity does have repercussions in other places.

Now, these repercussions don't occur when there can be private consultations in executive sessions.

Now, that doesn't mean that I'm opposed to public discussion. I have taken part in a good many of them and made a good many public appearances in the Congress. But in terms of exercising the great constitutional responsibilities of the President and of the Congress in the national interest, I think myself that close consultation behind closed doors is one of the better ways to do it.

We do have men engaged in combat. We do have some very serious and delicate problems in front of us. And these are not problems that can always be fully explored or resolved with the kleig lights and the rest of the world all looking on and listening in.

Question. Mr. Secretary——

Question. Mr. Secretary, I'm not clear yet on your explanation of the President's statement in San Antonio. Is that intended to modify, reduce, or leave ambiguous our terms, our conditions for a bombing pause in North Vietnam?

Answer. Well, I think we ought to just read the statement for what it says and reflect upon the absence of a response from Hanoi.

Now, you may wonder about the details of this expression that they will not take advantage of a bombing halt. There's no point, as I have said before in these conferences—no point in my negotiating the details of that with you because you can't stop the bombing. We are prepared to discuss the details of that with Hanoi. They knew it—they know it. But the point I was making is this: It seems to me that this is an essentially reasonable and fair proposal for anyone who is interested in peace. And it seems to me that it is hard for anyone to reject this proposal without confessing at the same time that they are not intersted in peace and that they propose to continue their effort to move in on Southeast Asia.

This is not, by the way, just a question of Viet-Nam. I have never subscribed to the domino theory; it's much too esoteric. There are North Vietnamese regiments today fighting in South Viet-Nam. There are North Vietnamese armed forces in Laos being opposed by Laotian forces. There are North Vietnamese-trained guerrillas operating in Northeast Thailand. There are Communist dissident elements in Burma who are being aided, encouraged, and helped from outside Burma across the Chinese frontier.

There was a major Communist effort in 1965 to pull off a coup d'etat against Indonesia. You don't need the domino theory. Look at their proclaimed doctrine and look at what they're doing about it.

Now, we would like to see peace in South Viet-Nam and in Southeast Asia just as quickly as possible. It takes two to make a peace; and we would like to see some indication from the other side that they accept the notion that all countries, large and small, as the UN Charter puts it, have a right to live in peace without molestation from across their frontiers.

When that moment comes, there can be peace very quickly, indeed; and the United States will be no obstacle whatever in making a peace on that basis.

Question. Mr. Secretary, do you foresee a greater effort or greater participation by some of the Asian allies in Viet-Nam, and what are the prospects for a meeting of the seven nations contributing troops there?

Answer. On the question of a meeting, the seven nations do keep in touch with each other by various means. There is no present time or date for such a meeting. We would expect that one might well occur, but that does not mean that we're not in continuing contact with each other.

As far as forces are concerned, this will be for each country to determine for itself; and each country would make its own announcements on that subject.

Of course, we would be glad to see additional forces from other countries involved in South Viet-Nam.

I do want to emphasize that the present effort is not negligible. South Viet-Nam has something like 700,000 men under arms. I think the comparable figure for us would be somewhere in the range of nine million compared to their population or any other measure you want to put on it.

The Laotian forces are engaged in Laos. The Thais are engaged in Northeast Thailand, in addition to what they have been putting into South Viet-Nam.

So that there is a significant effort by the countries of Southeast Asia to fend off this pressure from the North.

Question. Mr. Secretary——

Question. Mr. Secretary, I'd like to ask you on another subject for a second—whether you have satisfied yourself that the man killed in Bolivia within the week was indeed "Che" Guevara.

Answer. Well, I have no—when you say have I satisfied myself, I have no personal, independent proof. But, on the other hand, I have no reason whatever to doubt the reports which have come in from the Bolivian Government. And I am proceeding on the basis that it was "Che" Guevara, and without any reason whatever to doubt it.

Question. Mr. Secretary, would you assess for us the stand of Soviet arms delivery to the Arab nations, especially in view of the conflicting estimates?

Answer. Well, I think I wouldn't want to get into figures. I've seen some estimates that appear to me to be too high. There was some significant resupply of certain of the Arab forces by the Soviet Union following the events of last June. We have, as you know, publicly, as well as privately, proposed that the principal arms-supplying countries get together with the countries in the area and try to find some ceiling on the arms race in that area. It is the one point on which we have been, I think, most disappointed up to this point; but I wouldn't want to try to straighten out figures, as between 60 percent or 80 percent and figures of that sort.

Question. Mr. Secretary, on the diplomatic front in the Middle East, there have been several U.S.-Soviet meetings on the subject lately. Does this diplomatic activity indicate that you're making any progress within the present framework on this subject? Can you report anything to us on that?

Answer. Well, in our business we work at such questions very hard, on the basis that progress is possible and that a good result can be achieved. We have not yet reached that result. It is, therefore, a little hazardous to indicate whether we feel that real progress is being made.

What is happening is private consultation among the countries in the area, or with countries in the area and among certain of the countries outside the largest powers, to see if we could find a basis on which there can be a parmanent peace in the area.

Now, this turns critically upon the attitude of the countries in the area. At the present time I do not think that it turns upon major differences or conflicts among the great powers but, nevertheless, it is not easy for the great powers to agree among themselves unless they know what the attitudes of the countries in the area will be.

Now, I think this process is likely to continue. I don't think that time is working now on the side of a peaceful settlement. I think it is important for some movement to get started and that the United Nations has both a responsibility and an opportunity here in this situation.

So these discussions go on. They go on in great detail, with many governments. And I would hope that before too long we could find a formula which would move this situation toward that permanent peace which we desperately hope for, and which I think the ordinary peoples of the area would welcome if it could be obtained.

Question. Mr. Secretary——

Question. Mr. Secretary, one of the elements in the public discussion over stopping the bombing, particularly, in Congress, seems to be Senatorial worries about how the United States is regarded abroad. Senators have heard the opening debate in the General Assembly, where Foreign Minister after Foreign Minister has urged the United States to stop the bombing.

When you are confronted with a concern like that—I think almost 30 Foreign Ministers asked for a pause in the bombing—how do you reply to that concern. And, linked with that is Senator Cooper's proposal to stop bombing except on the infiltration routes above the DMZ.

A. Well, on the last point—a proposal to stop the bombing except on the infiltration routes would be categorically rejected by Hanoi; and not move us one inch toward peace, unless Hanoi makes a major change in its position. Your count on Foreign Ministers is a little higher than mine, in terms of stopping the bombing.

You know, I haven't found anyone in the world—private citizen, or public official, in this or other governments—who have come to me and said, "If you stop the bombing, and there is no response from Hanoi, then our attitude would change."

I had a group of private citizens in not long ago to talk about this, and they wanted us to stop the bombing. I said, "All right, if we stop the bombing"—we have stopped it on a number of occasions—"If we stop the bombing and Hanoi does not respond, will you then change your view?" They said, "No, of course, not."

I could only say well, if we can't influence you by stopping the bombing, how do you expect us to influence Hanoi by stopping the bombing?

Now I would be glad to hear from any of these Foreign Ministers what their governments will do if we stop the bombing, and there is no response from Hanoi. And I want to hear that. I haven't heard it from anybody.

I do know what the British Co-Chairman would do if we stopped the bombing: Make a maximum effort to get this matter moved toward peace.

But, if Hanoi is saying "No," all the time, then he has very little chance. And, if the other Co-Chairman won't co-operate, there is very little chance.

So I would like to hear somebody tell me what they would do if we stopped the bombing. It is not just Hanoi who is not saying that.

Question. Mr. Secretary, on that point, is it not correct that this Government was informed by the Soviet Government, on the authorization of Hanoi, that if the bombing was stopped there would be a conference between the United States and North Viet-Nam within three or four weeks?

Answer. No, we were not informed that. We were not informed of that. There was a public statement by Mr. Kosygin, in London. But Hanoi has not said that, to our knowledge. Anyhow, just in case they should say it, why three or four weeks? Why not the next morning?

Question. Is that a material difference?

Answer. Well, I don't know. But I don't know what waiting for three or four weeks means.

But what we need—There is no one in the world who has been able to tell us what Hanoi would do if we stopped the bombing.

Now, we don't have to speculate about this; we checked this out with Hanoi. We don't have to speculate and engage in wishful thinking, and proceed on a hypothetical basis, and think that maybe the atmosphere would be improved. Of course, the atmosphere would be improved over North Viet-Nam. But what we want to know is "What would happen?" and Hanoi is not willing to tell us what would happen, and no one else is able to tell us what would happen. So, we want to hear something.

For us to say, "We will stop, you go right ahead with your war; you live there safely and comfortable, without being disturbed while you send your men and arms into South Viet-Nam for the next 50 years," where would be the incentive for peace?

Now, we are interested in peace; we are not interested in a sanctuary which will let them carry on these operations against South Viet-Nam and Laos for eternity; while they sit there in a sanctuary taking their own time, paying no price, trying to seize their neighbors by force. Now, let's not be children.

Yes.

Question. Mr. Secretary, one of the questions—basic questions—that seems to be emerging in this Senate debate is whether our national security is really at stake in Viet-Nam, and whether Viet-Nam represents an integral part of our defense perimeter in the Pacific.

Your earlier statement indicates that you think our security is at stake in Viet-Nam.

I think it would help in this debate if you would perhaps elaborate and explain why you think our security is at stake in Viet-Nam.

Answer. Within the next decade or two, there will be a billion Chinese on the Mainland, armed with nuclear weapons, with no certainty about what their attitude toward the rest of Asia will be.

Now the free nations of Asia will make up at least a billion people. They don't want China to overrun them on the basis of a doctrine of the world revolution. The militancy of China has isolated China, even within the Communist World, but they have not drawn back from it. They have reaffirmed it, as recently as their reception of their great and good friend, Albania, two days ago.

Now we believe that the free nations of Asia must brace themselves, get themselves set; with secure, progressive, stable institutions of their own, with co-operation among the free nations of Asia—stretching from Korea and Japan right around to the subcontinent—if there is to be peace in Asia over the next 10 or 20 years. We would hope that in China there would emerge a generation of leadership that would think seriously about what is called "peaceful co-existence," that would recognize the pragmatic necessity for human beings to live together in peace, rather than on a basis of continuing warfare.

Now from a strategic point of view, it is not very attractive to think of the world cut in two by Asian Communism, reaching out through Southeast Asia and Indonesia, which we know has been their objective; and that these hundreds of millions of people in the free nations of Asia should be under the deadly and constant pressure of the authorities in Peking, so that their future is circumscribed by fear.

Now these are vitally important matters to us, who are both a Pacific and an Atlantic power. After all, World War II hit us from the Pacific, and Asia is where two-thirds of the world's people live. So we have a tremendous stake in the ability of the Free Nations of Asia to live in peace; and to turn the interests of people in Mainland China to the pragmatic requirements of their own people, and away from a doctrinaire and ideological adventurism abroad.

Question: Could I ask just one follow-up question on that, sir:

Do you think you can fulfill this very large commitment of containment and still meet the commitment of the Manila Conference—to withdraw within six months after a peace agreement has been reached?

Answer. Oh, yes, I think so.

That does not mean that we ourselves have nominated ourselves to be the policemen for all of Asia. We have, for good reasons, formed alliances with Korea and Japan, the Philippines, the Republic of China, Thailand, Australia, and New Zealand; and South Viet-Nam is covered by the Southeast Asia Treaty.

That doesn't mean that we are the general policemen. Today, the Laotian forces are carrying the burden in Laos on the ground. The Thais are carrying the burden in Thailand; the Burmese are carrying the burden in Burma; the Indians are carrying the burden upon their northeastern frontier—the Sikkim border—and whatever other threat there might be in that direction.

But we have our part; we have accepted a share, and we have accepted that share as a part of the vital national interest of the United States.

Now what I don't understand is that Senators would declare in August 1964 that the United States considers it a vital national interest of this country that there be international peace and security of Southeast Asia. And, then, two years later, some of them seem to brush that aside as having no validity. Now that wasn't a Tonkin Bay reaction. Paragraph 1. was Tonkin Bay. Paragraph 2. was Southeast Asia—was Southeast Asia.

Now if people change their minds, then it is fair to ask the question:

"On which occasion were they right?"

Now I personally believe they were right in August 1964. And perhaps they will be right again if they come back to that position—1968 or '69.

But these are not matters that change with the wind. These have to do with the possibility of organizing a peace on a planet on which human beings can destroy each other. Now perhaps we could at least agree that that is the central question, even though there could be some debate about how you do it.

And I believe that those who think that you can have peace by letting one small country after the other be overrun have got a tremendous burden of proof in the light of the history of the past four decades; and they have not sustained that burden of proof.

Question. Mr. Secretary, would you describe the net objective here then as the containment of Chinese Communist militancy?

Answer. No. The central objective is an organized and reliable peace.

Now if China pushes out against those with whom we have alliances, then we have a problem, but so does China. If China pushes out against the Soviet Union, both China and the Soviet Union have a problem.

We are not picking out ourselves—we are not picking out Peking as some sort of special enemy. Peking has nominated itself by proclaiming a militant doctrine of the world revolution, and doing something about it. This is not a theoretical debate; they are doing something about it.

Now we can live at peace—we have not had a war with the Soviet Union, in 50 years of coexistence, since their revolution. We are not ourselves embarked upon an ideological campaign to destroy anybody who calls themselves Communist. But we are interested in the kind of world structure sketched in Articles I and II of the United Nations Charter, in which all nations, large and small, have a right to live in peace. And the aggressors nominate themselves—we don't choose them—the aggressors nominate themselves by what they say and do. And when they do, then those who are genuinely interested in peace have a problem on their hands, and sometimes it gets tough; and sometimes we are tested, and we find out what kind of people we are. And I think one of the most important historical facts in this post war period has been that the almost unbelieveable power of the United States has been harnessed to the simple notion of organizing a peace in the world.

Question. Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Oct. 14, 1967]

THE NEW DEAN RUSK

Dean Rusk came out swinging in his Thursday press conference, and we are glad of it.

For too long, or so it seems to us, the Secretary of State in his public appearances has been unduly restrained, overly courteous, in dealing with his growing chorus of critics. One result has been to leave the field in some measure to the complainers, to let them get away with outrageous attacks on the credibility of the administration in defining its objectives in Vietnam, to enable them to make some headway in denying that the United States has a legitimate national interest at stake in this war, and to permit them to cast doubt on whether there is in fact a Communist threat in Asia which cuts across our own vital concern with the future of an area in which two-thirds of the earth's people live.

We are fighting in Vietnam pursuant to an obligation assumed in the SEATO treaty and which Congress in 1964 reaffirmed with only two negative votes. Thus, we have made our commitment and we must honor it in Vietnam. If we do not, if we welsh on it, the word of the United States will not thereafter be worth a tinker's dam anywhere in the world.

But this is not all. As far as one can tell, the coming struggle in the far Pacific is already taking shape. One may hope that Communist China will emerge before long as a peace-seeking member of the family of nations. But that is not an assumption upon which rational planning can now be based. It has to be assumed that the militancy of Communist China is real, and that it will not be diminished at a time when it has a billion people and a nuclear arsenal.

The point Dean Rusk was making is that the United States now must shape its policies toward organizing the free Asian countries, in which another billion people soon will be living, into a force for peace. Will we do this by yielding to the senseless clamor for retreat or withdrawal in Vietnam? Of course not.

The Secretary of State put it this way: "I believe that those who think you can have peace by letting one small country after the other be overrun have got a tremendous burden of proof in the light of the history of the past four decades: and they have not sustained that burden of proof."

Indeed, they have not; nor can they. The memory of Munich is too fresh in the minds of living Americans for them to believe that a policy of appeasement that failed at a terrible cost in Europe can succeed in Asia. This is the point that the "new" Dean Rusk was making, and we hope to hear more of the same from him. There is too much at stake to let the critics go unanswered.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Oct. 14, 1967]

RUSK'S EXPLICIT REPLY TO CRITICS

(By Gould Lincoln)

"And sometimes it gets tough; and sometimes we are tested and we find out what kind of people we are."

In these three phrases, in almost nut-like brevity, Secretary of State Dean Rusk stated the situation which the American people face in living up to this country's commitment in South Vietnam, and its commitments to our SEATO allies in Southeast Asia and the Pacific. Rusk was speaking at an almost hour-long press conference, in which he dealt with all the questions raised by the opponents of the conduct of the war and those whose main concern is to get out of Vietnam and end the war at any price.

When the history of this era is written in the not too distant future, the stature of the Secretary of State, committed to the honor and security of the United States, will loom large, and even larger in comparison to those whose criticisms and actions have encouraged serious divisions among the American people.

Rusk stated in clear and understandable terms that the security of the United States is involved, as well as the security of the people of South Vietnam and the millions of people in Southeast Asia in other countries not now controlled by the Communist Chinese. They have been threatened and are threatened by Red China's efforts to launch so-called "wars of liberation" within their borders. The United States, as he pointed out, is a "Pacific" nation as well an "Atlantic" nation, with Hawaii and Alaska, numbered among our fifty states. States which stretch far into Pacific waters, and are separated from the U.S. mainland.

Rusk revealed in their entirety the efforts of President Johnson and of the State Department to bring about peace in Vietnam; the efforts to obtain from Hanoi any assurance that it would agree to peace talks. He was caustic in his references to congressional critics of the administration's conduct of the war. He pointed out that virtually none of these gentlemen are advocating immediate withdrawal of our military forces without some kind of peace talks and agreement with Hanoi and the Viet Cong.

"The debate in which we are now involved (with these congressional critics)," said Rusk, "is essentially a debate about detail—this or that military more, this or that diplomatic step, this or that formulation of what is in fact a common middle position. If that be true, precision is important. People at least should make it clear whether they are arguing with Washington or with Hanoi."

Rusk said he was encouraged about prospects of peace in Vietnam. He was asked why. "There are many things," he replied. "Some reporter in Saigon invented the word 'stalemate.' Our military authorities do not believe there is a stalemate. Ambassador Bunker doesn't believe there is a stalemate." Rusk enumerated; defections from the Viet Cong doubling this year over last, and their recruitment falling off by half; improvement in the South Vietnam military forces; and our military forces and our allies getting on with the job. There is no standstill, he argued.

Discussing the demands that we halt the bombing of North Vietnam, Rusk said he had talked with a group of private citizens recently. "I said; 'All right, if we stop the bombing and Hanoi does not respond, will you then change your view?' They said, 'No, of course not.'" He might have asked these people with justice: "Whose side are you on any way?"

Rusk's belief that there is no "stalemate," and that the progress of the war in Vietnam is favorable to the United States and its allies, is solidly supported by Hanson W. Baldwin, Pulitzer prize-winning military editor of the New York Times, writing in the current issue of The Reporter. Baldwin's criticism of the conduct of the war is that it could have progressed to a greater degree if there had been less delay in widening the list of bombing targets in North Vietnam. He writes:

"It is clear, or ought to be, from any summary of the war situation that the ultimate outcome of the war in Vietnam does not have to be defeat. In 1950-51 exactly the same derogatory phrases now being applied to South Vietnam were tagged to South Korea. The South Koreans would not fight; they had corrupt and political generals; Sygman Rhee was an Oriental dictator and an American puppet. It has taken fifteen years and there are still U.S. troops in South Korea, but all these sour predictions have been proved false."

THE BUDGETARY RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on the floor of the Senate recently a distinguished Senator on the other side of the aisle delivered a speech on "The Responsibility and Accountability of the President." In that address, the Senator espoused a new theory of the constitutional separation of powers.

For over 178 years—under the constitutional forms which have governed the conduct of our Government—the President has made budget proposals to the Congress and the Congress has examined those proposals and made its final decisions.

The President proposes a budget; the Congress acts upon the budget.

The Senator, however, has given us a new constitutional philosophy which is well summed up in his own words:

> I submit with deep conviction that the man who makes the budget should cut the budget. The President, assisted by the Department heads and the very able Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and with a staff of literally thousands, is far better qualified than individual members of the Congress to recommend these cuts.

Mr. President, for over 178 years we have operated apparently under the illusion that the Founding Fathers meant what they said when, in the Constitution, they gave the power of the purse strings to the Congress.

I have always believed that the 26 distinguished Senators who make up the Appropriations Committee, and their 51 counterpart Members of the House of Representatives, were conscientious men fulfilling their constitutional duty. They examine with care the proposals of the President. They then recommend to the Congress where the President's budget proposals might be cut or increased. But now, I gather, all of this activity has been a waste of time because—again to quote the very able Senator:

> The man who makes the budget should cut the budget.

And yet, I must confess that this new interpretation of the separation of powers appears to be quite consistent with the position which in two votes last week on the continuing resolution, every Member of the minority party in the House accepted.

Those votes made a wholesale grant of constitutional authority to the President of the United States by ordering him to slash some $5 billion from Federal expenditures, with no guidance as to where, or as to how, and with no criteria as to what programs shall be affected.

Now I submit that there has indeed been a failure of responsibility and accountability. But the failure is not the President's. He has made his budget recommendations. Last January he chose to cut some $27 billion from the budget submissions of individual agencies and the military services. He made the hard and painful decision to ask for a tax increase. And now he asks that the Congress examine his budget expeditiously, and complete its action.

We in the Congress do have a responsibility. We are accountable for the final budget decision through the time-tested appropriations process. There is no way by which, with good conscience, we can ignore that responsibility.

The Senator, to whom I have alluded, and his party colleagues, apparently feel that a $5 billion slash in Federal expenditures in fiscal 1968 would be a desirable reduction. But, I am sure he is aware that in order to reduce expenditures in this fiscal year by $5 billion, it would be necessary to cut Federal programs by $10 billion. Not all program costs occur in 1 year—so to cut $5 billion in spending in fiscal 1968, one must cut programs by about twice that much.

Such a $10 billion reduction in Federal programs would require a cut of over 25 percent in those activities which are subject to relatively immediate control.

We cannot, after all, default in paying interest on the public debt. We cannot change, through appropriation or budget action, the $5 billion of compensation and pension payments to our veterans. We cannot change, through budget action, the payments of the Treasury into the medicare trust fund. We cannot default on contracts already let. And so, to cut the amount which the Senator and his party colleagues in the other body seem to desire, would take a slash of truly monumental proportions in remaining programs.

Senators and Members of the other body have a perfect right to espouse such a reduction. But under our Constitution the Congress is responsible and accountable for such cuts. I truly hope those who are ordering these cuts will tell us if cuts are to be made in the farm loan program, or the education program, or the health research program, or the flood control program, or the rivers and harbors program, or the rural electrification program, or the highway program.

In summary, Mr. President, we do have before us a problem of accountability and responsibility. It is not the accountability and responsibility of the President which is at issue. Rather, it is the wisdom and propriety of the attempt by some Members of Congress to transfer to the executive branch the constitutional accountability and responsibility of the Congress of the United States for control of the Nation's purse strings. There lies the true failure of accountability and responsibility.

PROPOSED ANTI-VIETNAM RALLY

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, the press has published accounts of plans by the National Mobilization Committee to stage a massive anti-Vietnam war demonstration in Washington, October 21.

Some press accounts assert that the committee plans to flood the headquarters of our Armed Forces—the Pentagon—with thousands of persons who would block the corridors, impede the movement of personnel, and hinder communications.

It seems unconscionable to me that if such action is indeed contemplated, it would be allowed to occur.

For reasons which have nothing to do with the constitutional rights of freedom of speech and assembly, the physical invasion of the Pentagon should be prevented by any means, including the use of troops and force, if necessary.

The building and the people who work therein are directly involved in the welfare of our men in Vietnam and the national security. The right to protest does not include the right to impose additional dangers on American servicemen; nor does it include the right to impair the national security, of which the Pentagon and its operations are a vital part.

If the National Mobilization Committee wishes to demonstrate in protest of the war, it has every right to do so. But that right should not cover the physical invasion of the Pentagon. And this, I reiterate, has nothing whatsoever to do with the rights of free speech and assembly.

I would hope and trust that the safety and integrity of the several thousand men and women who work in the Pentagon will continue to be respected and they will not be subjected to the untenable situation which the so-called National Mobilization Committee is alleged to have on tap for October 21.

BUSINESS ETHICS AND GOVERNMENT WASTE

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, within the past few months we have had several reports of the Defense Department purchasing items of military hardware at prices outrageously out of reason. Examples of price markups ranging from 400 to 5,000 percent have been cited; the Department paid $199.30 for a gear listed at $3.43 by the manufacturer, $25.55 for a small gearshift listed at 50 cents and $32.13 for switches worth $1.22.

These are only a few examples which dramatize the fact that there is waste of taxpayer dollars in the Defense Department's procurement program despite the concerted effort by Secretary McNamara to maximize the efficiency of his Department's spending operations.

Similar examples of wasteful procurement practices in other Executive Departments could be cited, for it is a simple fact that the topsy-turvy growth of the Federal bureaucracy over the past decade has inevitably resulted in considerable inefficiency and misuse of tax money.

Those who bring these incidents to public attention perform an invaluable service. But the elimination of waste and inefficiency requires much more than individual, piecemeal efforts. This is one of the reasons why I am convinced that a new Hoover-type Commission to study the operation of the executive branch and to recommend steps to assure efficient use of taxpayers' money is so absolutely vital and so urgently needed.

However, I speak today primarily for the purpose of discussing what I consider to be an equally important aspect of situations where the Federal Government pays excessive and unjustified prices for equipment and services purchased from private industry.

Whenever cases such as the Defense Department purchases cited above are brought to light, they are almost inevitably and universally treated by the news media and the general public as yet another example of bureaucratic bungling or political skulduggery. Reporters write front-page stories, editorials are issued, and radio and TV newsmen rush to the microphone, all proclaiming this to be another example of the general incompetency and low ethical standards of the Federal bureaucracy. We in Congress often join the chorus and the taxpayer is renewed in his conviction that the Federal Government is a vast organization devilishly designed to waste and misuse his tax dollars.

I have repeatedly spoken out against waste, inefficiencies and mismanagement and have worked for legislation which, I believe, would make a major contribution toward correcting such practices. Therefore, my remarks today cannot in any sense be interpreted as implying that I take these abusive practices lightly.

However, I think it is useful that from time to time we remind ourselves of the other side of the coin. When the Defense Department pays $199.30 for a gear worth $3.43, it means that some bureaucrat or his machine has made an inexcusable, although sometimes understandable, mistake. But it also means that some businessman knowingly charged the Government an inexcusable price.

When waste of this type is reported, we often respond by declaring: If the Government were run in a businesslike fashion these kinds of things would not happen. I agree that the Government could and should learn a great deal from the business community, but I also note that whenever taxpayers' money is wasted in the Government purchase of items at excessive prices, two parties are involved, a bureaucrat and a businessman.

In effect, we have a schizophrenic attitude toward the public and private sector and we impose a dual standard. We are all opposed to unethical business dealings with the Government, but when it occurs we too often tend to only shrug our shoulders at the businessman and then rage at the Government for allowing itself to be "taken in."

The fact that a businessman knowingly overcharges the Government does not excuse the actions of the bureaucrat who authorizes the overpayment because he is not alert enough to spot the discrepancy. But it seems to me we make a serious error when we vent all our wrath on the bureaucrat and ignore the businessman.

Mr. President, relatively few individual businessmen and corporations knowingly overcharge the Government, but because this type of thing does occur, the Government must take elaborate steps to try to protect itself and thus, in the process, spends considerable time and energy, not to mention tax dollars.

Mr. President, I intend these remarks to be neither an open-ended commendation of the Federal bureaucracy nor a wholesale condemnation of the business community although I will not be surprised if they are treated as the latter. I do intend them as a reminder, for what it is worth, of the dual standard by which we so often judge the public and private sectors of our society.

NORTH VIETNAM NOW PREPARES FOR A PROTRACTED WAR

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, Joseph Alsop, writing from Vietnam, has dispatched a series of columns which hold up much hope. In the last of his series, published in the Washington Post of Sunday, October 15, 1967, he detailed, from captured Vietcong documents, the plight of the enemy in the wake of Allied successes in defeating the big unit offensive of the North Vietnamese and Vietcong forces.

Now, Alsop writes, the North Vietnamese and their southern allies have fallen back to preparing for a protracted war that could last 20 years or more. This is guerrilla war. It amounts to an admission of defeat in the big unit war and promises nothing but problems for the other side. Writes Alsop:

> The outlook is very hopeful now, in truth, provided the home front does not fail the U.S. soldiers in the line at the very moment when the first great favorable turning point has seemingly been reached.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Alsop's article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Protracted War Up to 20 Years Is Latest Watchword of Hanoi

(By Joseph Alsop)

Saigon.—"Our agencies and units are in a state of emergency. The sick rate in the rainy season is higher. Our cadres and troops are stricken with malaria and beri beri. The movement becomes more difficult. (However) the study of the appeal of Chairman Ho has increased our conviction and enthusiasm . . .

"Weak points: The fear of a protracted war is still prevalent and perceived under several different facets—the protracted war would cause death to many people, affect the morale of many families, the health of the soldiers and the physical condition of older cadres who could not fight this war to the end . . .

"The important action to be taken is to eliminate the ideology of balking at the difficulties and hardships of protracted war, the fear of the (enemy and) disease and death."

The foregoing rather grisly summary comes from a captured document reporting on the "Political Situation" of a group that has now been certainly identified as the military staff section of the Central Office South Vietnam. COSVN, as this agency is better known, is in fact the enemy's political and military high command in the South. Thus the foregoing may be roughly equated with a report on the state of affairs in Gen. William C. Westmoreland's headquarters.

The captured document concerns the situation of COSVN's military staff section in the third quarter of 1966, when the outlook for the other side in South Vietnam was infinitely more encouraging that it is today.

But what makes this particular document so intensely relevant at the moment is the ultra-heavy emphasis on the prevalent "fear of a protracted war." When the document was written, it must be recalled, the formula in use by the North Vietnamese Communist Central Committee was still "preparing for protracted war but seeking victory in the shortest possible time." At that period and indeed until very recently, the captured documents have abounded in assurances that this victory "in a short time" was easily attainable by a Dienbienphu-line defeat of American troops.

That phase has now ended, however, with the abandonment of the siege of Conthien and the publication of a gigantic article laying down a new party line by the North Vietnamese Commander-in-Chief, Gen. Vo Nguyen Giap. The hopeful second half of the old formula is conspicuously absent from the Giap article. Preparing for "protracted war" that may even last "up to 20 years" is the new watchword, with no talk at all about "victory in the shortest possible time."

The COSVN document helps to explain the Hanoi decision in 1965 to go forward with the big unit war despite the U.S. intervention. No wonder the late Gen. Nguyen Chi Thanh, then North Vietnamese commander-in-chief in the South, insisted on pouring in more and more big units, in vain pursuit of quick success, if the foregoing document accurately represented the state of mind of his own military staff!

Now, moreover, as indicated in previous reports in this space, the phase of true big unit war has at last been terminated by Hanoi. The new watchword of "protracted war" means something much more like classical guerrilla war, with a few big units, many cheap but sensational sapper operations, and a long effort to wear out American patience.

The change of policy was forced upon Hanoi, beyond any doubt, by manpower requirements to fill gaps in the line that had got wholly out of hand. It will take a long time—perhaps several months—for the change of policy to take full effect at the front; for "main force" divisions, regiments and battalions, all today predominantly North Vietnamese, are scattered over the whole landscape of three quartrs of South Vietnam.

Although knocking the enemy's big units out of the fray has always been Gen. Westmoreland's first strategic aim, Hanoi's change of policy will still present problems. The big units are easier targets than small units. U.S. units will also have to learn to operate on a small scale. The more intense sapper effort predicted in the Giap article will make troublesome headlines, even if it does little more militarily significant damage than in the past.

But if you try to look at this major turning point through enemy eyes, you find three points standing out, all of them very bleak indeed. First, the termination of the phase of full scale big unit war means an admission of defeat after the most enormous enemy investments in the big unit.

Second, this also means quite inevitably a cruel and general intensification of the difficulties described in the COSVN document above quoted. If "fear or protracted war" was such a problem when "victory in the shortest possible time" was still being loudly promised, what will be the effect of promising nothing at all but "protracted war"?

Third, and perhaps most important, experience in many provinces has already shown that the V.C. military political base in the countryside and the V.C. control of the population depend in very large measure on the constant support of the big units. Where the big units have already been decisively seen off, control of the population has been quickly lost, and all but the hardest of the hard core of the V.C. base have tended to throw in the sponge in one way or another.

There are two ways of looking at this last matter, to be sure. Instead of two tatterdemalion, near-demoralized divisions, the enemy commanders in Binhdinh, Phuyen, and Khanhhoa Provinces may well be better off for a while with three or four really tough, full strength, well armed battalions. But in the end, the battalions can be made to suffer the same fate that the once proud and formidable North Vietnamese divisions have suffered. Captured documents from the V.C. provincial party committees, begging the divisions to be sent back into the populated areas, even if under strength, also show that the new policy involves immediate political risks. The outlook is very hopeful now, in truth, provided the home front does not fail the U.S. soldiers in the line at the very moment when the first great favorable turning point has seemingly been reached.

HOMESTAKE'S STRUGGLE SHOWS NEED FOR S. 49

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, while the International Monetary Fund considers a proposal to create special drawing rights, an international asset designed to supplement gold, the U.S. dollar and the pound sterling in financing trade, legislation which I have cosponsored to provide needed assistance to our domestic gold mining industry, continues to languish in the limbo of the Senate Calendar.

At this time I do not propose to debate the merits of the so-called paper gold, although I may have something to say at a later date, but I do suggest that favorable action be taken on S. 49, which was reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on March 14 and is now on the Senate Calendar. This legislation is necessary to stimulate and encourage our gold mining industry so that it can expand to become the great source of wealth production as well as income and revenue production which it once was.

My home State of South Dakota has within its borders the fabulous Homestake Gold Mine, the largest and most successful in the United States, but which is, today, slowly declining, to the detriment of the stockholders, its large and loyal labor force, the community of Lead, and the entire State of South Dakota, all of which have benefited greatly from the output of this industry. Mr. President, I am also sure this decline is detrimental to the United States.

The September issue of the highly respected Dun's Review contains an excellent article on Homestake Mine, its president, J. K. Gustafson, and the valiant fight on the part of Homestake to continue to produce gold in the face of unrealistic policies of our Government.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LAST GOLD RUSH

(By Norris Willatt)

The Ulrich Goldfinger of U.S. industry is J.K. (for John Kyle) Gustafson, the mild-mannered, professorial president of Homestake Mining Co., who has more gold at his fingertips than 007's greedy antagonist ever dreamed of. But unlike the flamboyant Fleming character who lusted after all the gold in Fort Knox, Homestake's Gustafson is the man most responsible for keeping the national coffers in Kentucky bulging with bullion.

How long those coffers will continue to bulge, of course, is a question that has all the economists talking to themselves and to each other these days. Never before, perhaps, has the precious yellow metal come in for so much heated discussion. Bankers, academicians and government officials debate the significance, for the U.S. and for the world, of the continued outflow of gold from America's shores. Learned papers are churned out, arguing either that gold is obsolete or that it is so essential to modern living that the price should be raised. Pundits keep bobbing up to suggest that gold's unique role be transferred to another metal or to some ersatz paper unit.

But amid the high-level give-and-take, one down-to-earth fact remains unchanged: in the eyes of the public, gold boasts a magic that no other metal ever mined can match.

As the largest gold mine in the Western Hemisphere, Gustafson's Old Homestake produces one-third of the nation's output and last year recovered 606,500 ounces of gold from more than 2 million tons of ore. Dug deep into the Black Hills of South Dakota near Lead (rhymes with deed), with workings that extend for more than 200 miles, the Old Homestake has proven ore reserves of 15.26 million tons and indicated reserves of an additional 2.2 million tons. So rich is the huge, historic mine that there is little likelihood of its veins running out in the forseeable future.

Yet to Goldfinger Gustafson, there is a clear and present danger that Homestake, pushed to the wall by soaring costs and set prices, may have to board up the old mine. "As a realist," says Gustafson sadly, "I have to assume that gold is not going to be revalued and that the Old Homestake mine will die."

If that happens, it will be a black day for the Black Hills and a blow to historians and Wild West buffs alike. For the Old Homestake, which conjures up memories of Custer, the 7th Cavalry and Chief Crazy Horse, is as rich in lore as it is in lode. The mine is only a nugget's throw from Deadwood, where Wild Bill Hickok got his in the back, and barely 50 miles north of the Mount Rushmore memorial. Indeed, it was miners accompanying Custer on his 1874 expedition to quell the Sioux who first discovered the yellow metal in the Black Hills and set off the rush that led to the founding of the Homestake Mining Co. three years later.

Yet yesteryear's prospectors would be astonished to learn that today, owning a gold mine and striking it rich are not necessarily synonymous. For all its gold, Homestake last year earned only $4.2 million, down from 1965's $4.9 million and one of the leanest showings in the past decade. And in this year's first half, profits plunged to 56 cents a share from 84 cents a year earlier. It is a grim irony of modern gold-mining economics that a company with a ready market and a guaranteed price for its product should fare so poorly.

Still, while Homestake can rely on Uncle Sam, its sole gold customer, to snap up every ounces it can produce at a cash-on-the-barrelhead $35 an ounce, the company is finding it increasingly difficult to make a buck from its bullion. Ten years ago there was a spread of nearly 10 cents between the cost of producing and selling Old Homestake gold, but now it has narrowed to an all but prohibitive 2.5 cents. Should that minuscule profit margin reach zero, Gustafson, who is as much a businessman as a longtime mining engineer, will shut down the Old Homestake, leaving Uncle Sam to make up the difference by increasing imports of gold from abroad.

Shoring up against that eventuality, Gustafson has shrewdly shunted Homestake into new diggings in recent years. Its uranium operations embrace mines in Utah and Wyoming, and in New Mexico in partnership (35% owned) with United Nuclear Corp. They have grown so extensive that they now overshadow gold in the company's scheme of things and last year contributed the bulk of earnings. In addition, Gustafson has spaded into lead and silver in Missouri, potash in Saskatchewan, iron ore in Australia, copper, silver, lead and zinc in Peru, and recently got into the production of brick and aggregate in California.

THE COST-PRICE SQUEEZE

That Homestake should be obliged to diversify is due entirely to a stifling cost-price squeeze that many another industry would consider intolerable. The price that Homestake gets for its gold is stubbornly fixed at $35 an ounce, but its costs—especially wages, which eat up fully half of its gold revenues—have been mounting steadily. Not only is gold-mining labor highly skilled and thus highly priced, but it is also scarce, particularly in summer. "In that beautiful Black Hills country," sighs Gustafson almost wistfully, "how're you going to keep them down in the mine after the warm weather comes?"

Then, too, gold mining defies moneysaving automation techniques that have been the salvation of the coal-mining industry, because gold, unlike coal, does not crop up in bulk but in small, often widely separated seams. Gold is, after all, where you find it, and in the Old Homestake it is found on 34 different levels from 1,700 feet below the surface to well over a mile down.

Even so, Homestake has made a number of ingenious improvements in the state of the art that have measurably increased efficiency. It has prodded productivity by means of ingenious jumbo drilling rigs and improved drills and grinders and by mechanizing cage transport down the shafts. In place of laboriously laying wooden floors on the various mine levels after ore has been removed by stoping. Homestake pumps back onto the floor a mixture of fill (or sand left over in the gold-extraction process), which makes a smooth floor on which men and machines can easily move about. By applying "rigorous controls" to the maintenance department alone, Gustafson proudly points out, "we're saved $300,000 a year."

By such methods and by bypassing low-grade deposits in order to get at the higher-grade ore, the Old Homestake has pushed its annual output to more than 600,000 ounces. Recently, it even discovered a new ore body that has increased reserves by another 5 million tons and that assays as a promising $12 per ton versus an average $11.04 for all reserves. Although the strike is remote from existing workings and will require considerable capital investment to exploit, the first few stopes (ore removed in 10-feet slices) will probably be recovered by year's end, thereby raising slightly the average grade of mined ore.

But these developments do not by themselves assure the Old Homestake's survival. To aid the beleaguered gold miners, both the House and the Senate have bills pending that would subsidize gold mining. However, such legislation, as it now reads, would be aimed at encouraging new mines. President Gustafson maintained that the best way for Washington to assure its source of supply—from Homestake at least—would be to revalue gold to a price that would make the mining of it a viable business.

Being a "realist," he also knows that the Treasury Department is adamantly opposed to such a drastic measure and instead is talking about removing the gold backing from the dollar in favor of "paper gold," a new unit of international currency that would be backed entirely by the economic power and prestige of the U.S. "Of course, I'm prejudiced," Gustafson allows, "but if the U.S. decided to refuse to redeem dollars in gold, that would seem to me a very embarrassing and humiliating development."

Nevertheless, Homestake, with a small stake in silver, can find encouragement in the recent action of the Treasury Department in abandoning its subsidy of silver at $1.29 an ounce. Having minted sufficient silverless coins to meet the needs of the economy, Treasury set silver free from its long-sheltered price and promptly saw it shoot up 30% to $1.77½ an ounce on the open market. As producers of everything from sterling silverware to photographic film and dental fillings pondered their list prices, most observers felt that silver's price would level off at around $1.50 to $1.60 an ounce.

But from the time he became Homestake Mining's head man in 1961, J. K. Gustafson, a mining geologist who spent years "rocketing around the world" on various geological expeditions, has gone on the assumption that he must one day give the shaft to the Old Homestake mine. With uranium looming large, he considers that Homestake is well fixed for the future.

A HIGHLY PROFITABLE ACTIVITY

A highly profitable activity, uranium brought in about $3 million of Homestake's $4.2-million net income last year. In the near future, though, Homestake's uranium expectations may not be as great. Under a contract with the Atomic Energy Commission, the price that Homestake and its partner, United Nuclear Corp., will receive for their ore is scheduled to decline from the current $8 a pound to $6.70 in 1969. And by 1970, Homestake's interest in the partnership is slated to shrink from 35% to 25%. But the AEC has announced its intention of turning the marketing of uranium over to private industry after 1969, and the prospects, considering that half of all the new generating capacity ordered in the U.S. last year was atomic, are pleasing to all uranium miners.

In fact, Homestake has exhibited a golden touch in most of its worldwide mining ventures. Together with American Metal Climax, it is building the first new lead smelter in the U.S. in forty years. Believes Gustafson: "We can produce lead as cheaply as anyone in the world."

In Saskatchewan, where Homestake shares a potash mine with U.S. Borax and Chemical, the first profits should begin coming in by 1969. And in western Australia, the iron ore it is mining with Hanna Mining and local interests has already been contracted for by ten Japanese steel mills over a seven-year period.

"For a company our size, we've undertaken a very large exploration effort," says Gustafson. "We can do it because we're in good shape financially and because we've developed a fine organization and staff. Also, we've chosen some top-grade partners to share the costs and risks. They tend to be market-oriented and so provide us with an expertise that Homestake, as a 'captive' gold miner, lacks."

Of course, it still could happen that Washington, from conviction or pressure, might revalue the price of gold after all. If and when that golden day dawns, the Old Homestake will really hit pay dirt.

THEODORE SORENSEN ON VIETNAM

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, one of the most thoughtful and closely informed Americans is the brilliant former White House counsel to Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, Theodore C. Sorensen. In a carefully restrained and well-reasoned article, published in the Saturday Review of October 21, 1967, Mr. Sorensen presents the case for curbing and hopefully ending the war in Vietnam.

Those who enjoy the silly process of labeling everyone who speaks out on Vietnam as either "hawk" or "dove" will be frustrated by Mr. Sorensen. It is not easy to fix such a superficial label upon a man who seeks only to apply the light of reason and the cool test of national interest and international responsibility to this complex issue.

I commend this objective, thoroughly constructive article to my colleagues of the Congress, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WAR IN VIETNAM: HOW WE CAN END IT

(By Theodore C. Sorensen)

I have not previously spoken out publicly against our course in Vietnam. My years in the White House made me more conscious than most private citizens of the burdens our President bears, more aware of his unique access to information, and more unwilling to add fuel to the fires of dissension within my party and country. But I believe that the President's friends and supporters today can best serve him as well as the country by speaking out: Not by offering oversimplified solutions or personal criticisms; not by questioning anyone's motives or credibility; not by reflecting on the skill and courage of our fighting forces; but by helping to seek before it is too late a reasonable, feasible course in Vietnam that offers some hope of achieving an early peaceful settlement—a course with costs and risks more proportionate to America's interests than this present avenue of expanding escalation and slaughter.

"Your government should understand," a Russian diplomat said to me as we lunched last August in Moscow, "that we are obligated to do for the North Vietnamese whatever they ask us to do. If they ask us to send bombers, we will send bombers. If they ask us to send men, we will send men." This was not delivered as a threat nor was it surprisingly new. But it helped point up for me the urgency of our stopping World War III now before it starts.

I realize that it is difficult for a great power to alter its course—but the Soviet Union pulled its missiles out of Cuba (and received world praise for doing so). I realize that it is difficult for our proud nation to acknowledge error instead of compounding it—but we did exactly that at the Bay of Pigs.

I do not say that we have wholly erred in Vietnam or that we should precipitously pull out our troops. Nor am I concerned here with many of the other disputes surrounding that war. The Senate will long debate the legal basis for our involvement, the alleged choices between Europe and Asia, and the effect of the war on our prestige, politics, and priorities. Historians will long debate over how and why we got into Vietnam, who first breached the Geneva Agreement, whether it was originally a civil war, whether another President would have acted differently, whether Congress was consulted adequately, and whether the various past precedents cited—from Munich to Malaya—are meaningful. What concerns me now is not the past but the future.

What concerns me now is the prospect of an endless war in which the original issues (to say nothing of the Vietnamese people) will have long been forgotten, in which each gradation of American escalation will continue to be offset by more troops from the North and less help from the South. What concerns me is the prospect of a frustrated, aggravated, bitterly divided America, irritated at its increasing isolation from the world, unable to accept its inability to bring this upstart to heel, under growing pressure from a growing military establishment, consequently pouring in more men, bombing out more targets, and finally, in desperation, mining or blockading the Haiphong harbor or even invading the North by means of a permanent excursion across the demilitarized zone or an "Inchon-type" landing behind that front line. Then the entry of Chinese and possibly Russian "volunteers" will be a very real threat and possibly—even without our destroying North Vietnamese dikes, bombing MIG bases in China, or occupying Hanoi—an inevitable fact, as inevitable as the fact that their entry will lead eventually to a world-wide nuclear war. The tragic irony of it is that all this could happen without our advancing one single step nearer to our original goal of a terror-free South Vietnam.

We have already moved in recent years from limited counterinsurgency to all-out combat, from 15,000 advisers to 500,000 troops, from a war fought largely by South Vietnamese forces in the South to a war fought largely by American forces both North and South. Each stage of escalation has brought a response from the other side requiring more escalation, bringing a further response from the other side requiring still more escalation. When two doses of penicillin failed to help the patient, we gave him four, then six, now eight. It is high time we realized that penicillin is not what this patient needs, and more can only poison him.

To be sure, we cannot now lose the war. We have prevented the kind of large-scale North Vietnamese assaults that might have destroyed all hope for self-determination and survival in the South. There is no prospect now that the Communists can push our forces into the sea or impose their rules by conquest. Nor is there any prospect now that we will abandon to slaughter those South Vietnamese who stood up against a Communist military takeover. But this country has to face the unaccustomed and uncomfortable fact that, despite all the brilliance and valor of our fighting forces, their lives are being given for a war which—in terms of achieving our *total* objectives, political and moral as well as military, in all Asia as well as Vietnam—we are not "winning" in the traditional sense and cannot ever expect to "win."

We are not "containing" the Red Chinese when we create a vacuum on their borders into which they will inexorably move unless we stay forever—when we increase North Vietnam's dependence on Chinese imports—or when we erode South Vietnam's institutions, traditions, economy, independence, and spirit.

We are not "winning the war for men's minds" among the South Vietnamese people, much less "pacifying" their country, when we level their villages, burn their crops, dominate and prolong their war, work primarily with the privileged few entrenched in both military and government, and place half a million free-spending Americans into that tiny, impoverished, and now inflation-ridden country.

We are not demonstrating the futility of Communist "wars of liberation" to an army that soon returns to rule by night those areas from which we have temporarily driven it; nor are we deterring similar attacks in Thailand or elsewhere when we stretch our forces thin in Vietnam.

We are not "defending our national interest" when we endlessly divert more than two billion tax dollars a month away from our cities and schools and overseas friends for a war that, much as we dislike the word, is producing at best only a stalemate.

I read all the predictions that victory is just around the escalation corner—but I heard those same predictions three and four and even five years ago. I read all the rosy statistics on how many Communists we have killed and captured and induced to defect—but still their number keeps growing. I read all the claims on our bombing successes in the North—but still the infiltration southward continues. I read all the statements that this is a joint effort with South Vietnam and others—but still we are doing more and more of the fighting and dying. And, finally, I read all the assurances that neither the Russians nor the Chinese will intervene—but at the same time Washington experts acknowledge that neither Peking nor Moscow could tolerate a North Vietnamese defeat.

General Westmoreland calls it a war of attrition. That it is—a war of attrition pitting American youth on the Asian mainland against an Asian foe which has not yet begun to tap its immense manpower reserves. Most of the time that foe is a Vietnamese guerrilla—a tough, cunning, elusive warrior who knows every hiding place in his native land, who is fed and shielded by the people we are supposedly there to defend, and who believes that someday his children will push out the Americans just as his elders pushed out the French.

Even if the old-fashioned kind of military victory in Vietnam were possible, it would require an indefinite occupation of that country by American troops under constant attack from such guerrillas. But such a victory is not possible against an enemy that keeps coming and fighting, as it has for twenty years and as it seemingly can for twenty more, suffering heavy casualties but also inflicting them, hiding in the hills or brush, disappearing literally underground or by mingling with civilians, eluding our "search and destroy" missions and then returning, controlling or terrorizing virtually as many villages and roads, and assassinating or kidnapping virtually as many South Vietnamese local leaders, as it did before we arrived.

If countering this kind of guerrilla warfare requires, as the Pentagon has said, that our forces outnumber theirs by a lopsided ratio of 3 or 4 or even 10 to 1—and if, in addition, we must take over the immense and unfamiliar task of non-military "pacification," and do it without a nonpartisan civil service, without the goodwill of the people, without effective land distribution or respect for the South Vietnamese troops or cooperation from their intellectuals—then where do we obtain the manpower to offset the gradual tapping of Communist reserves? Not from our Asian and Pacific allies who have, on the whole, shown very little enthusiasm for propping up with their own forces what we have warned could be the first of the falling dominoes. Nor are there unlimited reserves still available to the South Vietnamese army, whose brave but poorly paid and dispirited soldiers are still too often led by corrupt and politically controlled officers more imitative of the Vietcong in brutally interrogating civilians and prisoners than in risking their own comfort in combat.

It is small wonder, then, that one American military leader has said that 2,000,000 U.S. troops will be required to root out the terrorists in the South, village by village. But if the other side keeps growing through recruitment and reinfiltration, despite escalated bombings and electronic barriers, even 2,000,000 may not be enough. And what would an American commitment of 2,000,000 men do to our force levels at home and around the world? What, finally, would it do to the South Vietnamese themselves?

"In the final analysis," said President Kennedy in the fall of 1963, "it is their war. They are the ones who have to win it or lose it . . . the people of Vietnam." But as we pour in more troops, destroying in the process their economic stability more effectively than the Communists have ever done, it has become *our* war. We have the largest fighting force. We suffer the largest fatalities. The South Vietnamese people, weary after twenty years of warriors and foreigners, divided by rival sects and provincial politics, seem simultaneously to resent and prefer our taking over their battle. Many of the young leaders and scholars upon whom the country's liberation must ultimately depend are reported openly cynical and skeptical of the American presence. The present military government with which we are identified—now popularly elected but still far from universally accepted—seems incapable of understanding any real opposition or dissent, and incapable of undertaking any serious land reforms or serious peace negotiations.

A more viable, representative, and reform-minded civilian government, possessing real strength in the grassroots as well as the cities, rallying the people after the fashion of the Philippines' Magsaysay, and offering true amnesty and amity to the Vietcong and true reconciliation to the North Vietnamese, might have at least been able to increase the rate of Communist defectors to a level exceeding South Vietnamese desertions. That has not happened, nor will it. But the strength, the morale, and the legitimacy of the present government in Saigon are at least sufficient now to permit our own country to pursue a different course.

I wrote in my book *Kennedy* that that Administration's objective in Vietnam was to gain time—time for the South Vietnamese, with our help and protection, to achieve a society sufficiently cohesive both politically and militarily to negotiate a balanced settlement. There is no reason now for us to refrain from concluding that such time is finally near at hand. The South Vietnamese have expressed through their elections a longing for peace and the beginning of constitutional rule. The Communists have reason to know that they cannot win a final military victory. The Red Chinese, beset by internal strife and external setbacks, may be less able to interfere with negotiations. The Soviets prefer peace to a widening war. The National Liberation Front has dropped its resistance to the inclusion of other South Vietnamese in a postwar government; and the North Vietnamese, at least in the view of some, may again be indicating a genuine willingness to talk peace.

Their willingness, to be sure, has been conditioned upon our suspending indefinitely and unconditionally the bombing of the North. If that bombing had been clearly curtailing Communist infiltration and operations within the South, one could more readily accept our refusal on the ground that such attacks were a more effective way of saving American lives than attempting to interdict North Vietnamese lines in the South. But in fact, despite our constant expansion of targets to include all those of genuine military importance, Secretary of Defense McNamara has acknowledged that the infiltration of North Vietnamese forces has continued to grow—infiltrating over countless routes, by boat and truck and bicycle and foot, under cover of jungle or darkness. In the South they live off the land whenever their supply trains are delayed. In the North, they obtain replacements overland through China whenever their supply depots are destroyed. On balance, the continued bombing, by increasing an embittered militancy in the North and thus prolonging the war, appears to be costing more American lives in the long run than it actually saves.

Heavy bombing has never been wholly decisive in any war. No one promised that it would be in this one. But let us leave aside the various inconsistencies in the various statements explaining our original reasons for bombing. The overwhelming weight of the evidence still fails to indicate that pounding that largely primitive, peasant economy with more bombs than we unloaded on all of Europe in World War II has brought us a single day closer to the hour of peaceful settlement. The overwhelming weight of the evidence still fails to indicate that the North Vietnamese resolve to resist has been weakened instead of hardened by these massive attacks on their homeland. The overwhelming weight of the evidence still fails to indicate that any feasible amount of bombing can ever prevent the North Vietnamese from infiltrating into the South all the men, arms, and food needed to sustain a low-level guerrilla war indefinitely.

To be sure, the bombing is not without effect. It not only boosts the morale of the Saigon government—a somewhat dubious justification—but punishes and pressures and pains the North Vietnamese. It makes their maintenance of reserves and supply lines, and particularly their transportation of large cadres and heavy artillery pieces, more difficult and more costly. It makes life harder and poorer for their citizens and their soldiers. But their life has always been hard and poor. They have never depended on cities or industries. They have known very little but war against the Japanese, the French, and the Americans during most of their lives. A still lower standard of living now, an inconvenient mobilization of manpower to repair bridges and railroads, an increase in shortages and terrors and casualties, do not add up to grounds for surrender, now that they have endured this much this long and have so little to lose but their lives.

There seems little to be gained, then, by our insisting upon a continuance of the bombing in the North. Suspending it will not produce a Communist military victory in the South, nor will it bring the collapse of any Saigon government worthy of our attention. But suspending it will, possibly with the aid of the new electronic "fence," confine the war to the South, where it must be won anyway. It will end the strain on U.S. aircraft crews badly needed for air support in the South, while reducing the costly loss of our aircraft and the humiliation of our captured pilots. It will limit the area our dollars must surely rebuild when the war is over. It will end the toll of North Vietnamese civilian casualties which embarrassingly but unavoidably grows as the list of our targets is expanded. And it will eliminate the single largest barrier to world support for our position and the single largest barrier to negotiations with Hanoi.

Bombing, we have now learned, cannot force negotiations but it may well be preventing them. There is no possibility of the North Vietnamese engaging in talks while their homeland is being bombed. Inasmuch as the bombing can no longer be regarded as an indispensable means of securing our forces and objectives in the South, the time has come for us to suspend indefinitely and unconditionally our bombing of the North in order to test Hanoi's sincerity and see how it will reciprocate.

Accompanying such a suspension with conditions and deadlines will not work. The North Vietnamese will not respond to an ultimatum. Nor will they respond to our demand or even "expectation" that in exchange they stop sending men and supplies to South Vietnam—in effect stop fighting the war altogether—while we continue to fight. Naturally, no American is going to like it if and when the North's flow of troops and supplies to the South increases during such a suspension. We did not like it when fighting continued in Korea during the truce talks; but had we refused to talk, the loss of American lives there would surely have been higher. Today we must face the facts that prolonging the bombing cannot end the war or even the infiltration and that this impasse is costing us more lives than the bombing saves. Let us also face the fact that someday we will stop it—and the longer we put it off, the more difficult it will be for both sides to negotiate a reasonable settlement.

Indeed, there is already a danger that we have passed the point of no return beyond which neither the Hanoi regime nor the Administration in Washington could reach an accommodation with the other without the risk of being turned out of office. Bitterness and distrust are rapidly rising in both camps. Militants and military chieftains are gaining influence in both capitals. Each side is fearful that a cease-fire will cause a loss of momentum and morale, that negotiations will be only a cover for reinforcements. Each side believes that the other should pay the price of aggression, accept the blame, and make the first concession. Each side would prefer to postpone negotiations until he is clearly winning (at which time, of course, the other side would not negotiate).

Perhaps even now the North Vietnamese and the National Liberation Front are not interested in serious negotiations. Their recent public statements about peace talks have been largely bellicose, rude, and inconsistent. They appear convinced of their ability to outlast us, meanwhile bleeding us white. They do not wish to offend their largest neighbor, protector, and potential supplier, Red China, which would obviously prefer to see us hoplessly bogged down in Vietnam without risking one Chinese casualty, and which might well threaten the North Vietnamese with a disastrous interruption of supplies if they even talk with the Americans. The pro-Chinese faction in the Hanoi government is already said by some to be on the ascendancy.

But even if Hanoi is not now ready to negotiate, we can—instead of continuing the present treadmill into ever more dangerous, divisive, and self-destructive escalation—prudently de-escalate our war effort without harming our interests and with some hope that Hanoi will de-escalate also. Limiting our military commitments, objectives, investment, and assaults, meanwhile consolidating our position in the most populous areas of the South, would cost us fewer lives, less money, no territory, and no "face," while better enabling us to wait until outside events—such a divisions in the Communist camp—making negotiations more possible. Certainly our present course is not dividing the Vietcong from Hanoi or Hanoi from Peking, and indeed may end up helping to unite China for Mao or even Peking with Moscow.

But in fact we do not know with any certainty whether Hanoi and the Vietcong—together or separately—are now ready to negotiate. We have not stopped the bombing indefinitely to find out. We have not since one thirty-seven-day pause nearly two years ago accompanied our talk of negotiations with real deeds of de-escalation demonstrating our earnest good faith. We have not given to the pursuit of peace the same effort, ingenuity, and relentless consistency we have given to prosecuting the war. We have not prevented the Saigon regime from torpedoing the rise of civilian neutralist forces in the South capable of negotiating with the North and the National Liberation Front. We have not left those voices in Hanoi who might once have been concerned about their economy with much reason now to justify a cease-fire. We have not, to the best of my knowledge, adopted a concrete, mutually acceptable plan for negotiations—as distinguished from admirable but vague statements of principle—and communicated that plan to the North. Publicly, at least, we have not offered any of the concessions and compromises required by the military and practical situation for a realistic settlement, frequently implying instead only that we stand ready to negotiate the surrender of the Vietcong.

Most serious of all, we have not been sufficiently forthright or forthcoming in response to what may have been actual opportunities to start or explore negotiations. Perhaps we were looking for a different kind of "signal" and missed the one they sent. Perhaps we were plagued by poor translations, poor communications, or poor coordination on both sides. But whatever the reasons and whoever sons and whoever is to blame—and assessing it now will not help—we must in the future take more care not to spurn or ignore potential opportunities for negotiation, much less deny their existence or escalate in response to them.

Such a posture would involve no weakening of our resolve or responsibility. President Johnson has called "the path of peaceful settlement . . . the only path for reasonable men." President Kennedy obtained withdrawal of the Soviet missiles from Cuba by giving attention to the olive branch as well as the arrows—by adopting a carefully measured combination of defense, diplomacy, and dialogue. Perhaps his ploy in that crisis of interpreting a Communist demand in his own terms, his response thus necessitating their reply, could be used now to initiate negotiations with Hanoi. Perhaps the good offices of U Thant, a resolution by the U.N. General Assembly, or a reconvening of the Geneva Conference could initiate talks without either side worrying about protocol or precedent. Perhaps we could invite the other side to the President's next summit meeting with our Asian allies. It would be more realistic, in my view, to seek a secret conference, with no mediator, arbitrator, or press releases, thus alleviating potential Chinese and other pressures. But the essential step is to bring together the combatants—and that necessarily means all the combatants, including the Vietcong.

Such talks are not doomed to end in disagreement and disappointment. After all, *both* sides are pledged to work:

First, for a return to the Geneva Agreement of 1954;

Second, for an end to hostilities and the withdrawal of all foreign troops and bases;

Third, for a neutral, peaceful, independent South Vietnam, free to determine in new elections its own political, economic, and social system, and its relationship or reunification with the North;

Fourth, for a government—if necessary (though neither Saigon nor the NLF has squarely faced this), a coalition government composed of all parties, as in the Laotian settlement of 1962—acting on behalf of all South Vietnamese citizens in accordance with the principles of universal suffrage, free speech, free worship, and meaningful land redistribution.

Agreement on the interpretation and implementation of these principles will not be reached quickly or easily. Such words as "freedom," "independence," and "neutrality" mean very different things to the two sides. Some form of international guarantees and supervision will be essential at least at the outset. But agreement should not be impossible.

Such an ending, while restoring South Vietnamese self-determination and preventing its conquest, would not leave the United States and its allies with any better position militarily than they had before the war began—but neither did the ending of the Cuban crisis or the Berlin crisis or even the Korean war. Such a settlement would also involve grave risks. It would endure only if both sides felt as a matter of practical self-interest that this kind of peace was preferable to war. Even then there would be no way of assuring the American people of the elimination of terrorists from the South, of the early departure of all American troops from Asia, or of the nonparticipation in the South Vietnamese government of one variety or another of Communists. Indeed, there is *no* negotiated solution possible that would not lend itself to bitter attacks in the Congress and pose continuing dangers for the future.

Thus, whatever quantities of national courage, understanding, and unity are required on our part today to fight and accept the war in Vietnam, they will be needed in twice those amounts to find and accept the peace. But find it we must. While we cannot overlook any dangers, neither can we overlook any opportunities. A new opportunity may now be approaching in the holiday season. We have been able to arrange in recent years a Christmas cease-fire in Vietnam. If we plan and work for it now, we can be prepared this Christmas to have the firing cease forever.

PIONEER ST. LOUIS DETOXIFICATION CENTER

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, one out of every three arrests in the United States in 1965 was for public drunkenness. That fact was underscored by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice.

The Commission found that handling drunkenness within the system of criminal justice burdens and distorts its operation and appears ineffective in deterring drunkenness and in meeting the problem of the chronic alcoholic offender. As an alternate approach and as a prerequisite to taking drunkenness out of the criminal system, the Commission recommended the establishment of civil detoxification centers.

For some 10 months, a pioneer detoxification center has been in operation in St. Louis. It is the first detoxification program in North America to systematically remove chronic alcoholics from the jails and place them in detoxification centers. The St. Louis program has been undertaken by the St. Louis Metropolitan Police Department in cooperation with the Sisters of St. Mary's and the Social Science Institute of Washington University.

From the standpoint of reducing the workload of the police, the courts, and the correctional system, and also in treating the offender, preliminary reports on the St. Louis experiment are positive.

The United States has the second highest rate of alcoholism in the world. Because this problem is national in scope and the St. Louis project is of wide interest, I ask unanimous consent that an article on the subject, published in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of October 3, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the Article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Detox Center Helping Public Drunks: Out of the Revolving Door

(By Marguerite Shepard)

People who chronically get drunk on the street in St. Louis are no longer caught in "the revolving door"—thanks to the pioneering Detoxification Center here.

"The revolving door" refers to the process where the public drunk is arrested, jailed, released—then re-arrested, jailed and released, and on and on, because punishment does not stop alcoholics from drinking.

A preliminary report on results of the Detox Center, sponsored by the St. Louis Police Department and operated in St. Mary's Infirmary, was given last week in Chicago to the annual meeting of the North American Association of Alcoholism Programs.

A pioneering project, first in the Western Hemisphere, and only one in the world sponsored by a police department, the center already has a wide reputation, spread by experts from 30 states and several foreign countries who have come here to see it.

But the proof of the pudding is in the eating: Does the Detox Center really do any good?

A study following up a sample 100 Detox Center patients on an average of four months after their release shows that the answer is unequivocally "Yes."

James M. Weber, St. Louis Police patrolman on leave the past year to get his master's degree in sociology at Washington University—on a police scholarship, first of its kind—made the study, under the direction of Dr. David J. Pittman, university Social Science Institute director.

(Dr. Pittman, author of a number of books on alcoholism, and consultant to the St. Louis Police Department, has been president of the NAAAP for the past two years. It was he who coined the "revolving door" phrase to decribe the ineffectiveness of traditional methods of treating public drunks.)

Mr. Weber's study found:

Of his sample of 100, 51 had markedly improved in their drinking patterns—and 21 of those had been "dry" since getting out of the Detox center.

Fifty-six were still in markedly better health.

Twenty-five had much better job records, 16 had considerably more income and 14 were living in much better homes (many had had no home but the flophouse or street).

The center opened last Nov. 16. The study goes up to last July 1. In that time 548 patients were handled—most staying the prescribed seven days.

And although police take public drunks to the center only if they are arrested in three certain police districts—the three with the biggest problem with drunks—Mr. Weber found that city-wide arrests for drunkenness offenses were 60 per cent less after the center went into operation—compared to the comparable time a year earlier.

Some of the center's patients were picked up drunk again but the re-admission rate was only 24 per cent, low in view of the fact that alcoholism is a chronic disease, Mr. Weber pointed out.

Of the sampling of 100, only 24 had, before their time in the Detox Center, been able to function with any degree of normalcy. After their time in the center, 51 were able to do so.

For half of the alcoholics, the center represented the first medical treatment they had ever received for alcoholism.

For almost all of them, the care at the center was the first sign in a long time that "somebody cared about me."

Said Mr. Weber: "The mere fact that a 1-day program of nutrition, sanitation and mental hygiene would leave its effects on such large numbers of these individuals three months after the treatment period is evidence of the accomplishments which can be made with this group of 'hopeless people.'"

Impact of the program upon police officers was also strong.

Many openly skeptical at the beginning wound up enthusiastic fans. Some even went so far as to volunteer services off duty; some donated clothing and other useful articles to the center.

But the clincher was when Mr. Weber and his co-investigators discovered "informal shuttling procedures being conducted so that an individual would be found in one of the districts served by the center."

That is, if an officer found a drunk in the wrong district, he moved him over—so he could get to the center!

St. Louis had more than its share of alcoholism authorities talking at the Chicago convention last week of the North American Association of Alcoholism Projects.

The St. Louis Detoxification Center was subject of most of their talks.

Following are some of the highlights of their talks:

Col. Edward L. Dowd, president of the St. Louis Board of Police Commissioners:

"Budgetary savings of more than $100,000 are anticipated by affected city agencies in the first six months of the Detoxification Center's operation, in both man-hours and physical resources saved.

"Workload of the police, courts and correctional systems has all dropped. The city workhouse has had a 50 per cent drop in the number of people they would normally receive for being drunk on the streets.

"On the basis of our experience in St. Louis, I would strongly recommend that immediate steps be taken in every urban center to implement such a program."

Miss Laura Root, research associate at Washington U.'s Social Science Institute, and Detox Center consultant:

"A substantial core of negative sentiment still exists toward the alcoholic on the part of many hospital personnel . . . a primary diagnosis of alcoholism is not accepted in at least 40 per cent of the hospitals. This negative attitude can be seen in many communities throughout the U.S., where public alcoholics have been either rejected and/or jailed rather than treated.

"Impact of the Easter and Driver decisions (federal appellate court decisions holding that people cannot be confined for drunkenness unless given treatment) has been phenomenal. Most communities are overwhelmed with a concern as to what should be done and how."

Dr. Joseph B. Kendis, medical director of the Detox Center:

"Despite the fact we are getting probably the sickest alcoholics we have ever seen, we have not yet seen a single case of delirium tremens. We feel this is due to the medication given promptly (including vitamin therapy), the food started promptly and the tender loving care given by our nursing staff . . .

"Our group therapy is the variety known as 'reality therapy,' where, instead of digging into the patient's past, we attempt to have them take a realistic view of themselves and assess their responsibilities as they are, with the idea of building a better future . . .

"Do not berate the alcoholic, do not use as a basis of your discussions with him what will happen if he does not stop drinking. He already knows this, and fear will be only a temporary deterrent to drinking.

"Instead, use the positive approach, showing your approval when he is doing well and pointing out what can be gained through sobriety. This will give him something to hang on to and make his efforts seem more worthwhile."

Dr. David J. Pittman, NAAAP president and Washington University Social Science Institute director.

"The U.S. remains one of the few countries in the western world without a national program of alcoholism control.

"Federal expenditures for alcoholism control are still miserly—despite the fact that more than one-third of the arrests in this country are for public intoxication and despite the fact that hundreds of Americans die needlessly in jail cells from the effects of chronic alcoholism.

"Passage by the Congress of Senate Bill 1508—the Javits-Moss Alcoholism Care and Control Bill—would help solve the alcoholism problem. It would provide Detox Centers under medical supervision, treatment centers for patients under court order and for alcoholics in jail or correctional institutions and after-care programs."

Dr. Ronald J. Catanzaro, deputy director of the Missouri State Division of Mental Diseases in charge of alcoholism control, also spoke in Chicago:

"Intensive special alcoholism centers throughout the country report approximately one-third of their patients are rehabilitated after a period of intensive inpatient therapy, one-third are helped significantly and one-third are not helped appreciably."

ANTELOPE ISLAND IN GREAT SALT LAKE

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, on October 6 the National Parks Advisory Board was in Salt Lake City and visited Antelope Island, which has been proposed as a national monument in a bill which passed the Senate on July 13. I am sure that the members of the Board were thrilled with the opportunity of visiting this unique primitive island, set in the Great Salt Lake, which is the Western Hemisphere's dead sea.

A few days ago, Mr. Murray Moler, associate editor of the Standard-Examiner, of Ogden, wrote a column about Antelope Island which is very descriptive and, in my opinion, should be printed in the Record. I therefore ask unanimous consent that Mr. Moler's column appear in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Antelope Island.—From the shoreline where most of Utah's metropolitan residents live, Antelope Island looks like a huge abandoned ship out in Great Salt Lake.

The mountainsides of the big island seem bare—when Antelope's viewed from a distance. There's no evidence of human—or animal—life. Only a few birds, mostly seagulls, would appear to prefer to call Antelope Island their home.

So why should the island be so important that it would be ticketed for development of its north end by the State of Utah as a recreational center? And is there anything about Antelope Island to justify introduction of a bill in Congress that would set the entire island aside as a national monument?

It takes a trip to the island to answer both of these questions. Not just a flight over. Not just a quick stop by boat at one of the many beaches. But a day-long visit and a personal inspection.

For the average Utahan, this is out of the question since the entire island is privately owned—as it has been for nearly a century. The one unable connection with the mainland—until the presently uncompleted road from Syracuse is finished—is a rough causeway off Antelope's southeastern side, a causeway well blocked now by a locked gate.

We went through that gate Saturday, upon invitation of the Island Ranching Co., the island's owners, and spent more than eight hours bumping over its primitive roads in a Jeep or wandering around its trails in company of about 20 other interested men and women.

It was an eye-opening trip!

The causeway leads from the mud and salt flats west of the Salt Lake Airport across reliction lands left dry by the lowering of the lake's level. It was raining when we crossed—and driving had to be carefully accomplished to avoid sliding into the bogs.

The initial surprise came at the size of the ranching operation already being conducted on Antelope by its owners. There are fenced fields where cattle graze in the summer, supplementing the forage they find on the open ranges on other sections of the island. Dry farm crops, including wheat, are also raised.

The Sorensens, a middle-age couple, live the year-round at a trim, clean but old—its walls are mostly adobe brick—farm home in about the middle of the east side of the island. A spring just below the house has pleasantly fresh and cold water. Other springs on the mountainside provide both culinary water and a nominal amount of irrigation for a few portions of cultivated land.

The Sorensens keep in touch with the mainland by mobile radiophone, plus frequent drives to downtown Salt Lake City—an hour's jaunt, in good weather.

Their biggest worry is about fire. Obviously, there's no fire department on Antelope. So extinguishers dot the walls of the farmhouse and the barns. And a careful patrol is kept to prevent stray visitors from carelessly starting a blaze that would quickly sweep through the tilled fields and into the cheatgrass that predominates on the slopes of much of the island.

Just north of the farm, still on the east side there's one field where the featured resident is an old buffalo—one of the island's herd whose population is estimated at 45 to 50. There are no antelope on Antelope Island anymore, incidentally, although there were on days gone by.

This buffalo bull—like another bull who paws around his own lone tree on the other side of the island—is an outcast. In the primitive social system of the buffalo, he became obsolete—his place with the cows and the calves taken over by a younger, more vigorous bull. So he now wanders by himself near the island road, close to feed and close to fresh water.

When our Jeep station wagon came by, leading the seven-vehicle expedition, he looked our way longingly as though he was lonesome. Then he shook his massive head, pawed at the ground with his amazingly short front legs, and took off up the mountain, loping at a fast—but awkward—pace.

There were birds everywhere. Not just the gulls that can be seen from the mainland but birds of many species—tiny and melodious meadowlarks, colorfully-plumed Chinese pheasants and recently-planted chukar partridges, to name a few.

This late in the year the only flowers visible in any quantity were sunflowers. But they, undisturbed, had grown to tremendous size in the fields. The Jeep bumpers kept grabbing bundles of them as we drove along.

At the north end of the island we stood on a hill and looked back toward the Wasatch Mountains—dark under the shadows of towering rainclouds but dotted with patches of bright fall leaves.

The cities of Davis, Weber and south Box Elder counties could be seen at the base of the mountains, looking almost tiny in the distance. It's a different view!

The 1967 Utah Legislature has authorized the Great Salt Lake Authority to go ahead with development of nearly 2,000 acres of the island, to be purchased under a long-term agreement. Should Sen. Frank E. Moss' National Monument proposal go through, the entire island would eventually become a recreation facility—with the state's soon-to-be developed beach facility blended into the overall plan.

Whiterock Beach on Crescent Cove, beside Elephant Point and next door to Bridger Bay, would be the center of the state park. It's a beautiful beach, with white sand and a sloping approach to the unique waters of Great Salt Lake.

The buffalo roam mostly in that same area and they could be seen frequently, usually in groups of 10 to 14, moving from the grass of the open spaces to the shelter of the trees that have escaped early-day logging and the ever-present fires.

At one high spot, a former airways beacon buliding marks the area where an observation point could be developed that would give a spectacular view of the mountains and cities to the east and to the ocean-like lake and the salt flats to the west.

Down the rarely-seen west side of the island, there are many unexpected attractions.

In one broad valley, where a camp grounds could be located, there are troughs of fresh, spring-fed water for the animals. Nearby are the remains of shafts sunk many years ago by prospectors hunting for minerals.

Erosion and chemical action has cut into one shore-located rock formation until it resembles a dead forest of old, bent, twisted trees. Pock marks—like swallow's nests—dot the rocks. We temporarily dubbed it "Pothole Goblin Point."

High on one peak, Weber State College and other schools are working on a cave, digging to determine if traces of Indian life can be located.

On the southwest side, there are beaches that could also be developed for swimming—some day.

The Antelope Island story wouldn't be complete without mention of its most conspicuous residents: The mosquitos. They are present by the millions. Hungry, too. They will have to be controlled as one of the first steps toward ending the ancient isolation of the island.

CLARIFICATION OF POSITION OF SENATOR CASE ON WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I recently placed in the RECORD an editorial by a nationally known writer, which took issue with several distinguished Senators on the war in Vietnam. I wish to clarify the reasons that motivated me when I placed that editorial in the RECORD.

My basic position on the war generally favors the necessary course we are pursuing. Because some elements of that editorial delineated my feelings rather well, I placed it in the RECORD to illustrate the strength of that position. The last thing in my mind was to give offense to or strike out at any Member of this body.

I have never and will never demean our role in the legislative life of the land by attacking a fellow Senator.

In this case, because I am concerned with, and in favor of, the press' accurate reporting of the position of a U.S. Senator, no matter to which party he belongs, I shall place in the RECORD a clarifying letter. It was written by my esteemed colleague, the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE]. In the interests of accurate reporting and clarification of my earlier insertion, I ask unanimous consent that Senator CASE's letter to the writer involved be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., October 12, 1967.

Mr. WILLIAM RANDOLPH HEARST, Jr.,
Editor in Chief, Hearst Newspapers,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. HEARST: Your editorial of October 1, entitled "War and Politics," has been called to my attention, and I must take issue with your misstatement of my position.

It has always been my position that I support our objectives in Vietnam, while reserving my right to criticize failure in seeking those objectives. And as the enclosed texts of my statements will show, it has become evident to me that the Administration is failing in the basic objective of nation-building in South Vietnam.

I have not "reversed my position," nor have I joined Senator Morton "in deploring continuation of the Vietnam struggle" and in calling "for a halt to our bombing as a first step toward eventual peace talks with the enemy."

I have stated that the bombing of North Vietnam should be limited to those targets with a significant impact on the infiltration of men and supplies into South Vietnam. But it has long been my view that prospects for meaningful negotiations do not hinge on the cessation of bombing, but rather on evidence of real progress toward our objectives in South Vietnam. And that is precisely why I have not joined those of my colleagues who see a link between a bombing suspension and negotiations.

Sincerely,

CLIFFORD P. CASE,
U.S. Senator.

NOMINATION OF ERWIN N. GRISWOLD TO BE SOLICITOR GENERAL

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, the presidential appointment of Erwin N. Griswold to become the Nation's new Solicitor General has been widely hailed as an outstanding choice. It is gratifying to note the excellent response reflected in editorial comment around the country when the dean of the Harvard Law School was selected for this high post.

I ask unanimous consent that three editorials be printed in the RECORD. They are from the Louisville Times, the Atlanta Constitution, and the Boston Globe.

As one who wholeheartedly endorsed Dean Griswold's nomination when it came before the Judiciary Committee last week, I know I express the deep pleasure and pride which his host of friends and supporters share in the swift and sure approval which was given the nomination by the committee, and then by the Senate last Thursday. For, in him, the Nation has gained the services of one of the most highly respected and authoritative voices in legal and judicial circles.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Times, Oct. 7, 1967]

A GRANITE BLOCK OF RECTITUDE

Like all presidents, President Johnson has made some questionable appointments. He also has made some outstandingly good ones. That is, he has named to high government office many men who, on their record, could be expected to give distinguished service.

One of these is Thurgood Marshall, former solicitor general of the United States, whom the president appointed to the Supreme Court and who participated in his first session of the court this week.

To take Marshall's place, President Johnson has named Erwin N. Griswold, dean of the Harvard Law School, one of the truly eminent men in American law. A few years ago *The New York Times* commented:

"A lifelong Republican with a background of Midwest conservatism, Dean Griswold is built like a granite block and is just as inflexible in his conceptions of basic rectitude. Associates schooled in the subtleties and circumlocutions that so often attend legal discourse are constantly startled by his directness.

" 'Forthrightness is his outstanding quality,' says one admiring colleague. 'I misunderstood him for years because, in this devious world, I could not believe that he was a man who meant exactly what he said.' "

Griswold's name probably was impressed upon the public consciousness first back in the days, the early '50s, when Senator Joseph McCarthy was snapping and snarling at witnesses who used the Fifth Amendment's constitutional guarantee against self-incrimination. At a time when the Fifth Amendment, or the self-incrimination part of it, was under heaviest attack, Griswold was one of the ancient guarantee's most effective defenders.

Speaking generally of all the inherited freedoms at the height of the McCarthy clamor, Griswold said he thought it was healthy for the nation to be reminded occasionally that it had to continue to fight for the freedoms the founders of the country had established.

"If we take these rights for granted," he said, "if we accept them as a matter of course, we may simply fritter them away, and end by losing them, and possibly we deserve to lose them."

In accepting the appointment as solicitor general, Griswold is returning to his first employer. His first real job after graduation from Harvard Law in 1929 was as a staff lawyer in the solicitor general's office in Washington. He became a tax expert and when he returned to Harvard after the Hoover administration was succeeded by that of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes said his departure would cost the government a great deal of money.

Griswold now returns to the government, and the government gains more than money.

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution, Oct. 6, 1967]

THE NEW SOLICITOR GENERAL

WASHINGTON.—Many intellectuals find Lyndon Johnson unimaginative or worse. But he keeps coming up with key appointments that show savvy. John Gardner was conceded to be a superlative choice at Health, Education and Welfare. Arthur Goldberg made the President's judgment look good first on the Supreme Court and then at the United Nations.

Johnson did it again this week. The vacancy was in the subcabinet post of solicitor general, which Thurgood Marshall vacated when he went on the Supreme Court. The job is an important one—prime legal advocate for the U.S. government—and it has always carried a certain prestige.

But when Johnson picked the dean of the Harvard Law School, Erwin Griswold, he raised the prestige of the job to the top rung within the legal profession and outside it.

Not the least surprised was Dean Griswold. "I got a telephone call saying I was under consideration and asking if I would accept if chosen," he said. The suggestion astounded him. But he thought it over and decided he might be interested. He had been at Harvard 21 years and, at age 63, was beginning to feel he had made his contribution there.

"Anyway," he said, "I figured when they checked a little further and learned about my Republican background, they'd drop me out of it." On the contrary, the Republican dean quickly got another call inviting him to fly out to the Texas ranch. The President personally drove him from the airstrip, announced his appointment at a conference in the press shed, sent Lady Bird back to the airstrip with him, and flew him back to Boston in time for him to make a night speech after traveling 3,500 miles in one day. The crusty dean, who is not an impressionable man, was in Washington Thursday making his plans like a young lawyer who has just hung out his shingle. The possibilities of the post excite him. As a liberal originator of legal philosophy, he is bound to bring new thought and heightened power to it.

If the Senate Judiciary Committee, at its confirmation hearings, expects to encounter a dreamy academic, it's in for a surprise. Griswold has argued dozens of cases before the Supreme Court—and has freely expressed some tart reservations about the Court's philosophy as well.

He is something of a terror as an interrogator, as can be sworn to by many witnesses who came before the U.S. Civil Rights Commission, while he served on it. Zealously proud of the legal profession, he was outraged whenever he encountered subversions of civil rights by legal bodies. Few can forget him marching up to a voting registrar in Jackson, Miss., and demanding that the hapless official read and interpret an unfathomable section of the Constitution which the registrar himself had been requiring Negro would-be voters to interpret. In a long and painful minute of television silence, the registrar flunked.

The grumpy, logical, incorruptible mind will be spoken in behalf of justice on the national scene for years to come, and the office of solicitor general is unlikely to be the same again.

[From the Boston Globe, Oct. 6, 1967]

LAWYER TO THE GOVERNMENT

The office of Solicitor General is not a particularly conspicuous one. It is of less than Cabinet rank, and it is not the kind of post from which a man is rocketed to fame and fortune.

Yet it is vitally important to the smooth functioning of the government. The Solicitor General is the chief trial lawyer for the government. He supervises the preparation of the government's cases before the Supreme Court and often argues these cases in person. At the request of the Attorney General he may appear in any U.S. court or, where the government's interest is involved, in any state court.

By appointing Harvard Law School Dean Erwin N. Griswold as the new Solicitor General, succeeding Supreme Court Justice Thurgood Marshall, the President has made a ten-strike. Dean Griswold is not only a distinguished legal scholar and school administrator, he is also a lawyer of proven brilliance who began his legal career as an assistant in the office to which he is now being recalled.

President Johnson has stepped outside politics in making this appointment (the dean is a lifelong Republican) and by so doing has served both his administration and the public well. By the same token the dean, by plunging, if not into politics, into the uncertainties of government office, has also earned the public's special thanks.

THE WELFARE OF AMERICAN PRISONERS OF NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, during the past weekend it became necessary for Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul H. Nitze to issue a public statement concerning photographs and other editorial matter soon to be released for American news consumption which has been made available through North Vietnam channels.

I ask unanimous consent that his statement appear following my remarks, because I believe it is of vital importance for the widest possible number of Americans to be made aware of the circumstances under which this material is being released.

I am one of a large number of Members of the Congress who have been very concerned about the welfare of our American servicemen, most of them pilots, who are being held by North Vietnam. We have voiced the concern of the American people and of the Federal Government for the safety of these Americans.

Many of us have tried through the International Red Cross and through other channels to reach these Americans on behalf of their families and in the name of humanity to give them that brief comfort that can come through contact with their loved ones. These efforts have been largely unsuccessful and there has been no significant recognition given by the North Vietnamese either to the International Red Cross or to the mandates of the Geneva Convention.

Rather, we are now to be on the receiving end of a calculated and brazen propaganda effort designed to demonstrate that a nation which will not honor the Red Cross nor the families of these prisoners is the dispenser of humane treatment and has a concern for the welfare of the U.S. prisoners.

There is only one way for North Vietnam to prove its good faith or its recognition of the basic guarantees for prisoners afforded by virtually every country in the world. That way is to permit these prisoners to send and receive letters and for their prisons to be opened for inspection by humanitarian groups of the representatives of neutral nations. Anything less should be branded for what it is: the brazen trafficking in propaganda for the purposes of concealing the true nature of the situation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONCERN EXPRESSED FOR CAPTURED AMERICAN SERVICEMEN

Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul H. Nitze today issued the following statement concerning U.S. military men held as prisoners of war in North Vietnam:

The Hanoi government has thus far refused to abide by provisions of the Geneva Convention covering prisoners of war. Representatives of the International Red Cross continue to be denied access to prisoners of war held in North Vietnam. Mail privileges to and from families are restricted or totally denied. No list of prisoners has been provided to the International Red Cross as required by the Convention. Attempts by the State and Defense Departments and the International Red Cross to secure compliance with requirements of the Geneva Convention have been persistently rebuffed. These attempts will continue.

On 8 September 1967, the Department of Defense announced the formation of a top-level Prisoner of War Policy Committee which reports to me on all matters within the cognisance of the Defense Department concerning our military personnel reported as being missing or held captive. The Chairman of this Committee is Paul C. Warnke, Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs). In the course of his Committee's work, it has examined a matter of great sensitivity. This concerns the treatment of United States servicemen who are being held as prisoners of war in North Vietnam.

The callous refusal by the Hanoi government to fulfill its obligations under the Geneva Convention is compounded by yet another violation of international law and decency. The enemy's propaganda apparatus now is at work to exploit these military men. As has been reported in recent news stories, the communists are trafficking in prisoner of war propaganda films and photographs.

The Geneva Convention, to which North Vietnam subscribes, clearly states that military men who are held as prisoners of war must not be put on exhibition. Yet this is exactly what the Hanoi government has been doing with its parade of prisoners through the streets of Hanoi and its other filmed public displays of our captured servicemen. On a carefully selected basis, Hanoi's leaders have been permitting hand-picked newsmen to film and photograph a few prisoners. Then, in collusion with such other communist governments as East Germany, Hanoi has arranged for propaganda films of U.S. prisoners of war to be sold throughout the world for a price.

In view of the deep interest we all have in the welfare of our service personnel in enemy hands, I can readily understand the desire of American news organizations to obtain these films from whatever sources are available. But it is important that the American people know that these films are communist propaganda and that this propaganda is being sold for hard cash.

Even as propaganda the films have carried their own tell-tale mark of fakery; instances have been uncovered in which the enemy has used the deceitful technique of dubbing voices. In other instances the physical appearance or behavior of the captured men belied any thought that their appearances or their statements were voluntary.

The leaders in Hanoi should recognise their responsibilities under the Geneva Convention; they should provide the International Red Cross with a list of our captured servicemen; they should permit representatives of the International Red Cross to visit all prisoners of war compounds; and they should open up their mails so that all of the prisoners of war can send and receive letters.

Contrary to Hanoi's propaganda claims, American prisoners have been able to write or receive letters in only a handful of instances.

While the Government strives to assist these families in every way possible during this trying period, nothing short of knowing with certainty that their men are alive and being treated decently will relieve their anxiety. Only Hanoi can do this. The United States has made a number of efforts through the International Committee of the Red Cross and neutral nations to get Hanoi to comply with the Convention and to demonstrate that they are treating the prisoners of war decently. These efforts, so far, have been unavailing.

All our citizens, particularly those brave wives and parents and children who wait for the return of their loved ones, should be aware of the practices of Hanoi in merchandizing at a price propaganda films and photographs of U.S. military men.

The enemy is seeking to exploit these prisoners. The Defense Department wants the communist propagandists to know that the American public and the rest of the free world are aware of the humiliating treatment being accorded the prisoners of war in Hanoi.

All of us who are concerned with the welfare of these men and their families will, of course, look with interest and concern at any films that are made available. We shall also look at these films and photographs with the knowledge of exactly what they are—callous communist propaganda.

POSSIBLE SHORTAGE OF HOUSING FUNDS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, once again the interest rates on home mortgages are easing up. Whereas the average rate for home mortgages had declined to 6.44 percent in May and June, since that time it has edged up to 6.49 percent. Mortgage bankers and others in the housing industry fear a repetition of the near monetary crisis in 1966 which had such a disruptive effect upon the housing industry. Recently, the Wall Street Journal published an article on the outlook for mortgage credit. I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the RECORD. I believe all of us in Congress must be alert to prevent the repetition of the 1966 experience.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSING GLOOM: MORTGAGE BANKERS SEE SMALL UPTURN AT BEST IN 1968 BUILDING STARTS—SERIOUS TROUBLE SEEN IF TAX BILL LOSES—INTEREST RATES BEGIN CREEPING UP AGAIN—FUNDS DIVERTED INTO BONDS

(By Jim Hyatt)

DALLAS.—At best, 1968 won't be a very good year for home builders and buyers.

At worst, it could be a disaster.

That's the lugubrious consensus of dozens of housing-finance experts interviewed here at the convention of the Mortgage Bankers Association of America. A majority agree that:

Despite the current easy-money policy of the Federal Reserve System, the supply of money for home-mortgage loans is growing tighter, with little prospect that cash-rich insurance companies and other investors will be lured back into financing new homes soon.

Interest rates on home mortgages are firm at near-record levels and are likely to edge higher in the next three to six months.

Consequently, little if any further increase in housing starts above current levels can be expected in the foreseeable future. Most forecasts call for about 1,400,000 starts next year. That would be up from the 1,250,000 expected this year but considerably below the 1,500,000 to 1,600,000 yearly level achieved between 1962 and 1965—to say nothing of the nearly 2,000,000 starts in record year of 1950. It also would mean little or no advance beyond the annual rate of 1,381,000 starts achieved at last count in August—high-water mark so far in a recovery from the postwar low hit in October 1966, when last year's drastic credit squeeze had its worst effect on building and the annual rate of starts slid to 845,000.

IF SURCHARGE LOSES

These forecasts assume Congress will enact the 10% income-tax surcharge President Johnson has requested to counter inflation. But chances have increased greatly in recent days that an election-conscious Congress will kill the surcharge. If it does, mortgage men fear, Government borrowing to finance a record Federal deficit will push up all interest rates sharply, including those on mortgage loans, and sop up investment funds that otherwise might go into housing. Also, the Federal Reserve might well feel impelled to tighten credit drastically again, as it did in 1966.

For home-building, the result could be a "debacle," says Raymond H. Lapin, president of the Federal National Mortgage Association, a Government agency that buys mortgages from investors. "If we don't get the tax increase, pretty soon we'll be looking on 1967 as the good old days."

Though Mr. Lapin, as a Johnson Administration official, might not be unbiased, his prediction is echoed—though somewhat less forcefully—by private mortgage men. "Home-building could be worse than 1966 (when housing starts totaled about 1.2 million) if the surtax isn't passed," says Albert Rohnstedt, chairman of a mortgage banking subsidiary of Lomas & Nettleton Financial Corp., Dallas. R. A. Griswold, president of City-Wide Mortgage Co., Kansas City, Mo., agrees that if the tax bill fails "housing starts will dry up as the Federal Reserve tightens up on credit."

TIGHT MONEY ANYWAY?

There also is a still more gloomy minority opinion expressed by E. A. Johnson, vice president and treasurer of Minnesota Mutual Life Insurance Co. "I'm satisfied we're in for tight money in the next six months" whether or not the tax surcharge passes, he says. Consequently, he expects 1968 housing starts at best to equal the 1.2 million of 1966.

Even now, the flow of money into housing is not as abundant as the flow of savings into banks, savings and loan associations and life insurance companies indicates it should be. It's such savings that normally are channeled into mortgage loans. According to the National Association of Home Builders, the net increase in such savings this year will total a record $50 billion, double the 1966 total and $9 billion above the previous record set in 1965.

The trouble, from the viewpoint of home buyers and builders, is that a disproportionate amount of these savings are being diverted from mortgages to the bond market, where heavy corporate and Government borrowings have driven interest yields above those on home-mortgage loans. "We're getting up to 7%, sometimes over," on bond investments, says John S. Pillsbury Jr., president of Northwestern National Life Insurance Co., Minneapolis.

"NONE WOULD BE FINE"

"The supply of money is great, but we're directing it into bonds like everyone else is," says Arthur Heigl, assistant vice president of Midwest Federal Savings & Loan Association, Minneapolis. A Southwestern mortgage broker adds that, with bond yields so high, "most any investor will tell you that if he didn't have any home loans at all, he'd be satisfied."

The rise in bond yields is beginning to pull up mortgage interest rates again, too. The average interest rate on new-home mortgages, including fees, dropped from a record 6.69% last December to 6.44% in May and June, but it has since inched up again, to 6.47% in August. The average interest rate on existing-home mortgages hit 6.49% in August, up from 6.41% in June, though below the 6.68% of last December.

Mortgage bankers are just about unanimous in the view that rates will continue to creep higher in coming months, whatever happens to the tax-surcharge bill.

"Our market (for home loans) in Wichita has been about 6¾%, but we look for it to go to 7½%" within 90 days, says an official of Fourth National Bank & Trust Co., Wichita. In the Dallas area, Glenn W. Justice, president of Glenn Justice Mortgage Co., foresees interest rates of "6¾ to 7%" by next March, up roughly ¼ percentage point from now. Another mortgage banker forecasts a one-quarter to one-half point rise across the nation by next spring.

A few mortgage bankers see signs that rising yields are beginning to attract more money into mortgage loans. "California savings and loan associations are aggressively seeking mortgages now for the first time in 18 months," says Jess Hay, president of Lomas & Nettleton of Dallas. He adds that "within the past few weeks" his company has obtained loan commitments from Eastern savings and loan associations, too.

Even the optimists, however, don't seem to expect the supply of mortgage money under the best conditions to become ample enough to spark a really big increase in homebuilding. Despite the "astoundingly large" increase in net savings this year, "it is expected that there will be no significant loosening in (housing) credit for the first quarter of 1968 and very likely through the rest of the year," comment Michael Sumichrast and Norman Farquhar, economists of the National Association of Home Builders. Consequently, they say, "housing starts in 1968 will fail to increase as rapidly as in previous times of recovery after a tight-money period."

The NAHB projects a gain of about 10% over this year, to about 1,380,000 units in 1968. This is slightly under the forecast of 1,430,000 units that resulted from a recent survey of more than 300 members of the National Association of Business Economists.

Some mortgage men see obstacles beyond tight money in the way of even a 10% gain in 1968 housing starts. Mr. Heigl of Midwestern Federal S&L expects next year's starts to drop below or at best equal this year's total partly because house prices are rising faster than wages and salaries of buyers.

"The cost of sheetrock (for insulation) went up a few weeks ago, and the effect is $100 per house," he says. "We also have a new 3% sales tax in Minnesota that increases home prices." Because of these higher prices, he says, "people who barely qualified for a loan on a certain house last spring can't qualify now."

Though most mortgage bankers think defeat of President Johnson's tax bill would be disastrous for housing, they don't believe passage of the bill would be any great boon. While the surcharge might curb inflation enough to avert a new siege of tight credit, "it's not going to create any more money," says an official of Gulf Coast Investment Co., Houston. A minority of mortgage men even fear that the tax increase, by reducing the after-tax income of would-be home buyers, will deter some people from purchasing homes—though they concede failure to increase taxes would have an even worse effect on the overall home-building industry.

WASTE MANAGEMENT: A FIRST-ORDER PROBLEM

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, recently one of my constituents, Mrs. Harold A. McKenzie, a schoolteacher of Appleton, Wis., called to my attention an excellent article entitled, "Where Will We Put All That Garbage?" published in Fortune Magazine for October 1967.

The article, written by Tom Alexander, presents a thorough analysis of the problem of waste management. It discusses some of the efforts being made in this field and suggests other approaches.

Calling for "new patterns of cooperation among Federal, State, municipal, and county agencies," Mr. Alexander states:

> The present approaches to waste handling are inadequate, expensive and wasteful of natural resources.

He suggests a "regional approach" as the prerequisite to solving "the waste management dilemma."

There can be no doubt that the problem of the disposal of the trash of our affluent society is one of the most unappealing yet pressing problems we face. I commend the article to the attention of Senators and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Where Will We Put All That Garbage?

(By Tom Alexander)

Just about any schoolboy can figure out that roughly as much material must be taken out of a community as is brought in if something altogether desperate isn't to happen eventually. But whereas goods are brought into communities via elaborate networks of transportation, organization, and management, the equally voluminous wastes are taken out and disposed of almost in after-thought. Up till now, Mother Nature has pretty well covered for these casual attitudes toward waste handling. The natural sinks of water, air, and land and nature's destructive processes have usually made it possible for urban, rural, and industrial man to manage, with a modicum of effort, to place his wastes far enough out of sight and smell to keep them out of mind. But urban man is finding out that this approach isn't good enough any more. Despite spending some $3 billion annually on municipal refuse disposal, most U.S. cities have fallen behind, and most face genuine solid-waste crises within two to fifteen years. Such cities as San Francisco, Washington, D.C., Chicago, and New York are at the crisis point already. Curiously, the agricultural community, too, finds itself with its manures and other wastes piling up faster than farmers can get rid of them.

Both the city's and the farm's problems come about for related reasons—shortage of disposal sites changes of process and materials plus the newly awakened concern over the health hazards of some of the traditional modes of waste disposal. And behind all of these is the relentless concentration of population. An analogy could be made with living organisms: simple one-celled animals need only primitive processes for handling wastes such as exudation through their cell walls. But all large organisms have complex organs for excretion, often more elaborate than the organs for nourishment.

In belated recognition of the waste problem, considerable effort is now going into improving our technology of waste handling. The main spur was the federal Solid Waste Disposal Act of 1965, which exists only because of the recent alarm over air pollution. Solid-waste disposal was recognized as a prime source of air pollutants, and to make federal funds available, a solid-waste act was passed as Title 2 of the 1965 air-pollution bill. The bait of federal funds attracted scientists into the notoriously uninspiring field of solid-waste research. What they found there provoked a shudder of alarm and a massive diversion of attention to solid-waste technology.

It now seems clear that technology alone is not the answer, and perhaps even that too many brains are now engaged in redundant investigations of the few conceivable engineering approaches. Before much long-term progress can be made in meeting the solid-waste crisis, new patterns of cooperation will have to emerge among federal, state, municipal, and county agencies. New systems of incentives may have to be legislated to encourage an economics of disposal to complement the orthodox economics of production, supply, and demand. New kinds of authorities or corporations may have to come into being to plan, capitalize, and manage new kinds of disposal systems—systems more versatile and flexible than a missile warning network or a telephone company, and just as important.

"POLLUTE THY NEIGHBOR"

The social metabolism of the urban U.S. currently appears to generate some six to eight pounds per person per day of waste products—garbage, paper, grass clippings, old autos, dead cats, demolition materials—or about double the weight of forty years ago. The U.S. Public Health Service expects this to double again in about twenty years. Most of the increase is attributable to the tremendous growth in use of paper products and packaging of various kinds. Nearly all foods and goods the housewife buys come in some kind of preprocessed packaged form. Furthermore, the *volume* of household waste is increasing far more rapidly than the weight. This reflects not only the shift toward paper but also the trend toward thinner grades of paper that, pound for pound, take up far more space when crumpled as refuse.

In the majority of U.S. cities and towns, the preferred solid-waste handling techniques entail gathering the trash noisily and expensively into trucks, carrying it outside the city limits, and dumping it upon a neighboring political jurisdiction. Sometimes when a dump becomes too large or too much of a nuisance, fires are started so as to permit obliging winds to carry off the dry and burnable fractions of paper, autos, and cats in the form of an oily, rich-smelling smoke.

But as surrounding communities have become either built up or fed up with this policy of "pollute thy neighbor," and as people have begun speaking badly of black, oily smoke, most cities appear about to run out of garbage room. In Washington, D.C., the citizenry has raised a barrage of organized protest over the city's famous evil-smoking Kenilworth Dump, located only five miles from the White House. Sixty percent of the refuse from the nine counties surrounding lovely San Francisco Bay is dumped along the bay shore. Now a state commission has ruled out the use of additional bay shore for dumping.

The most sophisticated techniques in common usage are the so-called "sanitary" landfill and municipal incineration. The principle of the sanitary landfill is to cover over each day's production of refuse with a layer of dirt to contain the odors and emerging fly pupae and to exclude rats and moisture. Unfortunately, landfilling takes a lot of dirt and a lot of space—an acre of ground piled seven feet high for every ten thousand people every year. New York annually uses up some 150 acres on the southern end of Staten Island even though the city first reduces the volume of part of its wastes through incineration. City officials estimate that New

York will use up its supply of landfill space in about ten years. Meanwhile, it costs nearly $30 a ton to collect, transport, and dispose of New York's refuse—or three times the cost of a ton of West Virginia coal, mined and delivered in New York.

Theoretically, high-temperature incinerators should be able to reduce the total volume of municipal wastes by 75 to 90 percent, thereby cutting the demand for landfill. But almost none of the incinerators currently in operation in the U.S. meet the standards for air-pollution emissions that most experts recommend. Some have been shut down for this reason. New incinerators have been designed with elaborate electrostatic precipitators and gas scrubbers that can meet these standards, but both capital and operating cost are extremely high—totaling five or six times as much as the cost of sanitary landfill. Furthermore, such incinerators are usually designed for more or less specific refuse components, and such specifics are hard to predict over the next decades. Paper dresses, for example, are purposely made nonflammable, so that it takes higher-temperature incinerators to make them burn.

HOW TO FERTILIZE RHODE ISLAND

Down on the farm, if anything, things are in some ways worse than in the city. It has recently been calculated, for instance, that one cow produces more waste material than 16.4 mid-twentieth-century Americans—some six to twenty-five pounds of manure for every pound of weight gained, three pounds for every pound of milk. In fact, total agricultural wastes of all kinds, including manures and food-processing residues, far outweigh the wastes produced by humans and their nonagricultural industries. Reports Professor Samuel Hart of the University of California at Davis, "If all the animal manure produced by the nation's livestock each year were spread evenly over the state of Rhode Island, forty-nine other states would have no agricultural sanitation problems and it would be several inches deep in Rhode Island."

Through the ages, most of the agricultural wastes were cycled back to the land and helped enrich its yield, but the economic urge to produce near the big markets is changing all that. Now most beef cattle and poultry spend all or much of their lives in the confines of a feedlot or poultry house, often on the outskirts of a large metropolis. Because of the transportation and labor costs of using manure, farmers now prefer the cheap, concentrated, and easy-to-apply artificial fertilizers. The upshot is that the far reaches of a number of big cities are marked by growing piles of manure, with attendant flies and severe drainage problems. For instance, rain runoff from feedlots has polluted nearly all the rivers and streams in Kansas. A complicating effect is that much of the soluble artificial fertilizer is leached from the fields during rains and finds its way into watercourses and lakes. There it stimulates the growth of aquatic plants that die eventually and in decaying deplete the dissolved oxygen in the water. This, in turn, lessens the water's ability to degrade sewage and, of course, the rain runoff from manure piles.

In both city and country, nature is increasingly being presented with a battery of wastes that she simply can't degrade. Nonreturnable glass bottles, aluminum cans, and junked autos litter the landscape and are virtually indestructible by natural processes. Bacterial cleanup agents are unable to break down many synthetic chemical products, including plastics and detergents. Industrial wastes such as steel-pickling and metal-plating baths are often discharged to persist with scarcely diminished toxicity for the entire length of a river. In other cases, toxic chemicals are impounded on land but percolate downward to pollute permanently groundwater sources. One alternative is to dry and burn some of the substances, but then they usually produce intolerable smogs, odors, or health hazards.

Several moves are afoot in federal and state agencies to ban or tax nonreturnable bottles and such nondegradable packaging materials as aluminum and plastics. (Sixteen states have introduced legislation against nonreturnable bottles.) The container and packaging industries are trying to come up with some kind of constructive measure to head off legislation. Two months ago, at the instigation of Chairman William F. May of the American Can Co., the trade associations from the container, paper, steel, aluminum, glass, and plastics industries formed a Materials Disposal Research Council to do something about the growing waste contribution from the packaging revolution. Whether this will turn into anything more than a public-relations gesture is still unclear, but May is suggesting that the council pursue a three-pronged approach: further attempts at antilitter education, studies of systems for collecting and reducing the volume of wastes, and research into container and packaging materials that either are not so durable or can be more easily processed for reuse. On and off for several years now various companies, notably the Adolph Coors brewery, National Brewing, Continental Oil, and Reynolds Metals, have experimented with paying the public to return empty aluminum cans, even though the salvage was uneconomical. Some of the tests have run into opposition from the retail outlets that were given the responsibility for collecting and sorting the salvaged items.

Many long-range thinkers cling to the view that somehow we must find ways of recycling waste materials back into useful form. Unfortunately the current economic trends seem to be against such a practice. Rising labor costs and the use of synthetic materials have virtually brought an end to most of the old picking and sorting of rags from municipal refuse. Large office buildings used to be paid for their wastepaper, which was then repulped and remade into paper. Today it can cost $37 a ton in New York to get it carried away. New industrial processes such as the oxygen steel-smelting process use less scrap iron, and as a consequence the derelict automobile is often not worth picking up and hauling to a processing yard.

Attempting to circumvent such economics, Dr. Athelstan Spilhaus, chairman of a recent blue-ribbon waste-management committee of the National Academy of Science-National Research Council, argues that potentially valuable wastes should be "banked" so they may easily be recovered at some later date when economics or technology has changed. Spilhaus points to the huge quantities of tailings from the gold mines in his native South Africa. As technology has developed, some of these tailing piles have been profitably reworked as many as three separate times, not only for gold but for uranium. Spilhaus suggests that all the junked autos, for instance, ought to be piled into landscaped dirt-covered hills, hills that might be mined when some future shortage of high-yield ores made scrap iron more valuable.

The goal of many of the ninety-two research and pilot demonstration projects funded under the federal Solid Waste Disposal Act is to find ways to salvage some kind of benefit from wastes. Notable among these is a project at Virginia Beach, Virginia, to use the sanitary-landfill technique to create a sixty-foot-high hill of municipal refuse. When finished, the hill will become a combination amphitheatre, soapbox-derby ramp, and landscaped park. University of Maryland scientists have a federal grant to develop foods and food additives for humans and animals from the wastes produced by the food-processing industries. They suggest, for example, that the U.S.'s annual ten million tons of tomato wastes—vines, leaves, and green and overripe tomatoes—could provide protein concentrates for undernourished parts of the world. Other federally supported research efforts are aimed at extracting waste heat from incinerators or methane gas and useful chemicals from waste materials. Europeans, in particular, have long put incinerator heat to work. West Berlin's huge new municipal incinerating complex provides steam for both electricity and central heating, while the residual clinkers are used as ersatz gravel. In the U.S., the town of Hempstead, Long Island, operates an imaginative refuse incinerator that drives both a 2,500-kilowatt electric power plant and a 420,000-gallon-a-day water-desalting plant.

THE FARMERS' SENSE OF HUMUS

By conventional reckoning, the value added to waste through whatever processing is employed will usually be less than the cost of the processing. Take for example the efforts by a host of companies to turn municipal refuse into an organic compost that could be sold to farmers. Garbage and the paper components of refuse can be put through an accelerated bacterial process that in a few days or weeks turns them into a dark brown, odorless, soil-like material that is valuable as a soil conditioner. Such compost has long been used in Europe. But of the thirteen compost plants that have been set up in the U.S. by private firms or cities, nine have already closed down because of a lack of market. In most cases, transportation costs have forced the price of the compost up to the point where it could not compete with artificial fertilizers, especially since it needed a fertilizer supplement anyway.

Soil scientists agree that heavily farmed land should have some sort of organic humus added periodically. In the land-rich U.S. this is usually supplied by letting land lie fallow for a year and then plowing in a cover crop. But as the world's population grows, fallow land will become more and more of a luxury. Now it is being suggested that the city should pay the cost of making the compost and perhaps even of plowing it into the farmers' land and be thankful that it has a place to put its refuse. Chicago already helps defray the high cost of disposing of the semi-solid, nutrient-rich "sludge" residue from its sewage treatment plants by drying and barging it to Florida and selling it for use on citrus groves. Now Chicago is investigating piping the sludge some ninety miles for use on farmed-out lands in Kankakee County, Illinois. If this sludge could be mixed with refuse compost, it would make the compost considerably more valuable as a soil conditioner and nutrient.

Much of our helplessness in this area arises because most governmental units cannot cope with the problems. Political leaders don't find much glamour in solid waste. "You don't see a governor putting his gold plaque on a landfill," comments Dr. P. H. McGauhey, director of the University of California's Sanitary Engineering Research Laboratory at Richmond. In matters of waste handling, city does not speak to city, nor city to county. For instance, Leonard S. Wegman, an engineering consulting firm for solid wastes, recently worked out a cooperative disposal system for the three Connecticut towns of East Hartford, Glastonbury, and Manchester. The Wegman plan proposed modernizing East Hartford's air-polluting, inadequate incinerator for use by all three towns with the cost to be shared by all. But East Hartford citizens objected to the idea of handling the other towns' refuse and defeated the plan.

Individual towns often spend large sums on their own land-filling equipment, and it stands idle most of the day. Meanwhile the town can't afford to clean up the sewage discharge or the air pollution that is the bane of the neighboring town downstream or downwind. Air-pollution controllers end up cleaning up the air and discharging the wastes to rivers, while water-pollution controllers put theirs on land. The solid-waste controller pollutes all three.

THE COST OF CURING AN EYESORE

Our accustomed totting up of benefits versus costs is difficult to apply in the instance of pollution. It is hard even to list all the direct and indirect costs of air, water, and land pollution to society—the shirts that must be changed twice a day, the funneling of vital soil nutrients and trace elements to the city and thence to irretrievability, the commuter's long, expensive haul to a cleaner suburb, the rat and fly eradication efforts, the foot cut on the beer-can tab. And how could anyone even attempt to put a price on an eyesore? But even if such calculations could be made, it is even more difficult to devise economic incentives for recognizing the long-run needs of large regions. How do you persuade city dwellers to dispose of their wastes in such a way as to lessen the long-term drain on agricultural or industrial resources?

There are hopeful signs that some of the compartmentalization is vanishing. At several places, such as Northwestern University and the universities of Florida, West Virginia, and Cincinnati, the air, water, and land pollution experts are drawing together into "environmental engineering" groups, where "waste management" is the byword and "systems engineering" the approach. And in those areas of the country where even minimal efforts have been made toward cooperation among political jurisdictions, the results have often been impressive. One of the best refuse-disposal systems in the country serves seventy separate municipalities within Los Angeles County, including part of the city of Los Angeles itself. There collection and disposal costs—even with high land prices and long hauls—are among the lowest in the country. In the city of Los Angeles they average $12 a ton. The municipalities achieve this mostly through sharing landfill sites and through economies of scale. Some natural advantages, plus imaginative area-wide planning and careful salesmanship, appear to be the main reasons why the county is already fairly well assured on its waste-disposal needs through the year 2005. And, through their pooling of resources, the Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts can afford a staff of engineers researching various advanced schemes for waste transportation and disposal for the periods after that.

Oddly, the spirit of cooperation in Los Angeles County stems from the joint need to provide a system of drains to carry off torrential rainfalls. Formed in the early 1900's, this Drainage District system later inspired a unique Sanitation District system that built a huge network of sewerage lines and treatment plants to serve a large section of the county. Finally, after World War II, the county woke up to its now famous smog problem. In 1957 the county banned the thousands of individual back-yard incinerators and closed down the large municipal and industrial incinerators as well. It was left to the Sanitation Districts to find something to do with the 4,500 extra tons of refuse that would be piling up each day.

The districts' first move was to attempt to buy a huge abandoned quarry in Palos Verdes, ideally suited as a site for a sanitary landfill. Residents in that prosperous neighborhood fought the proposed purchase, being all too familiar with the smokes, odors, pests, and general unsightliness that characterized the privately operated refuse dumps then prevalent throughout the area. The Sanitation Districts nevertheless persisted, promising that not only would they cover each day's production of refuse in a nuisance-free way, but also that in the end the gaping quarry would become a landscaped community asset for Palos Verdes. Sure enough, five years later a section of the scar had been quietly and painlessly converted into a public arboretum. With this and other similar triumphs skillfully publicized, the typical Los Angeles homebuyer's objections to having a "garbage dump" nearby were so well allayed that real-estate agents have little trouble selling $100,000 homes overlooking a working landfill with the bulldozers nudging up alongside the terrace. Often the houses overlooking the fill command the highest prices because of the promise of a park.

Envious officials from other cities point out that Los Angeles is exceptional in having natural canyons where refuse can be piled up to 600 feet deep. The districts' chief engineer, John Parkhurst, counters that ample landfill area can usually be found within easy-haul distance of most municipalities if (1) they can only overcome their mutual distrust long enough to cooperate, and (2) they can allay the legitimate doubts in the minds of nearby landholders that they will operate a nuisance-free landfill. Frank Bowerman, formerly Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts engineer, who did much of the planning for the landfills, has offered the New York area a free suggestion as to how it might solve *its* refuse problems. Bowerman, who is now working on Aerojet-General's waste-management research, recommends that the trash be barged out into lower New York Harbor and used to construct an artificial island for New York's much-needed new jetport. He estimates that enough material would be available to build at least one 12,000-foot runway per year.

THE SYSTEMS APPROACH TO GARBAGE

Whatever the disposal method, the prerequisite to solving the waste-management dilemma is certainly some sort of regional approach. The regions might be small or very large—several villages or several states—but in each case they should be formed as geoeconomic entities, rather than along political boundary lines. Moving in this direction, Sweden recently established a new central agency called Statens Naturvårdsverk—or "Nature Management Board"—that will attempt eventually to coordinate the handling of all waste products for the entire country.

Beginning in 1964, the state of California hired Aerojet-General to make a systematic series of studies of waste management on a statewide basis. Though Aerojet got off to a less than impressive start in its first reports, the company has by now developed some convincing adaptations of the defense industry's techniques of systems analysis and cost-benefit studies for the over-all waste management of large regions. In one study Aerojet is attempting to assess the relative seriousness of all the "bad effects" from wastes in Fresno County, California—rats from garbage dumps, odors from manure piles, air pollution from burning agricultural wastes, and so on. Once the sources and relative disagreeableness of all possible pollutants are established, Aerojet will be in a position to compute how the county can spend a limited amount of money to the greatest advantage. Such cost-benefit studies can also prevent uneconomic overkill; Professor H. B. Gotaas, Dean of Northwestern University's Technological Institute as well as head of the institute's Environmental Engineering Group, believes that many areas are proposing to make rivers and streams cleaner than is economically justified. The money might better be spent on solid-waste or air-pollution technology, says Gotaas.

WAYS TO BEAT THE FREIGHT RATE

The major cost in any solid-waste disposal scheme, whether conducted on a regional basis or not, will be collection and transportation. As things stand now, from 75 to 90 percent of municipal refuse expenditures are absorbed by the armies of men and fleets of trucks that make the collections from individual households. The members of New York City's 14,000-man sanitation department make an average of $3 an hour, while the 1,800 garbage trucks contribute substantially to the noise, traffic congestion, and general nuisance of the city. New York's annual expenditure of nearly $130 million might better go for building some sort of automated, nuisance-free collection system. If long-haul transportation costs could be reduced, cities might find ample place for their residue in abandoned quarries, strip mines, swamps, or mountain canyons.

New York City and Philadelphia have studies under way with the New York Central and Reading railways, respectively, to see whether long-haul railroad transportation of wastes to the abandoned strip mines of Pennsylvania or West Virginia would be feasible. Spilhaus has suggested that since most freight cars enter a city full and leave empty, it might be possible to load the deadheading cars with bales of refuse. This recalls the laws of some medieval German towns that required every farm wagon bringing a load of produce to town to carry a load of municipal refuse out and dump it or plow it into the soil. With computers keeping track of railway cars, it is conceivable that even very long hauls might be possible, simply by taking advantage of the random movement of empty cars across the country.

The most sensible-sounding scheme for transporting wastes is simply to pump it out of town. Already Sweden and Britain have fitted several of their large scattered apartment complexes with tubes that transport bulk household refuse pneumatically to central incinerators as much as a mile and a half away. At the University of Pennsylvania, Professor Iraj Zandi has a federally supported project looking into the feasibility of collecting and pumping wastes in a liquid slurry form. Zandi has performed experiments that appear to show that if all ordinary municipal refuse—paper, tin cans, bottles, garbage, and so on—could be ground up in powerful household grinders or larger municipal grinders, it could be mixed with a small amount of water from the city sewer system and pumped out of town, perhaps more cheaply than it could be trucked out. Zandi's experiments show that the pipes could be surprisingly small—one only two inches in diameter could easily carry the wastes of a town of 10,000 or 15,000. And to save the costs of tearing up streets and buildings, most of these small solid-waste lines might be laid inside existing sewer lines, which are usually built outsize to accommodate storm runoff. The pipes could lead to far-off places where landfill is genuinely needed—perhaps to abandoned strip mines or low-lying swamplands. As for cost, Zandi points to the experience with pipelines used for transporting slurried coal. When the first 100-mile stretch of coal pipeline was laid in eastern Ohio, it had the effect of reducing the local rate for transporting coal by railroad. And rail transportation is cheaper than the truck transportation now used for hauling wastes.

Going even further, Zandi envisions the possibility of magnetic and centrifugal sorting devices to separate metals, glass, and perhaps the undecomposable plastics for possible salvage. The remaining organic material then might be mixed with the semisolid sludge residues from sewage treatment plants and manure from feedlots and the whole degraded biologically into compost, perhaps within the pipelines themselves.

A COMSAT FOR GARBAGE

Though much needs to be learned about the costs and practicality of long-distance refuse pipelines, one could envision networks of such pipelines carrying compost and sewage from many sources to marginal agricultural areas. Even though the initial capital costs of such a system might be high, they would probably be offset by low operating costs. More important, there would be little noise, odor, unsightliness, and inconvenience. Furthermore, the network would double as an irrigation and fertilization system. It seems likely that some sort of utility company—wholly private like A.T. & T. or quasi-public like Comsat—would be best suited to plan, build, and operate such a regional network. The corporation could be paid a regulated price per ton or per household to get rid of all wastes. (Some items, such as bedsprings or large granite blocks from demolition, would probably still have to be hauled off specially, just as they are now.) Then such a profit-oriented company would try to make what extra money it could through cost cutting, salvage, irrigation charges, composting, or heat recovery.

But garbage network or no, one thing is clear: waste disposal will have to be done differently—and soon. The present approaches to waste handling are inadequate, expensive, and wasteful of natural resources. It appears to be only a matter of time before the congested areas of the U.S. will wake up to find garbage on their doorstep unless they reach out to avail themselves of the systems approach to waste disposal.

HIRE THE HANDICAPPED: A NATIONAL DUTY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, as a fresh influx of disabled war veterans, the tragic and unfortunate victims of the protracted conflict in Vietnam, breaks into our midst, it is important to renew our resolve that all handicapped persons be provided with equality of opportunity to be gainfully employed.

The Spooner Advocate, a weekly newspaper in Spooner, Wis., whose editor is William W. Stewart, recently published a fine editorial which reflects recognition of this need and I commend it to the attention of other Senators, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIRE THE HANDICAPPED

Twenty years after the return of World War II veterans, we are witnessing a parallel and poignant chapter in our history. Disabled veterans are coming home from Vietnam in increasing numbers. With battlefield scars overshadowing their futures, they face the uncertainties of adjustment and acceptance in a society largely molded for the perfect.

In the world of work to which they return, their path has been smoothed by the several million handicapped workers who, in the past two decades, have demonstrated that ability counts more than disability. Many employers are convinced of the sound business advantages of hiring the handicapped—a conviction based on the records of productivity, reliability, and loyalty set by the handicapped themselves.

Many more handicapped applicants, however—fully rehabilitated and trained for work—are still waiting for a chance to prove their worth. Opportunities must be found for them, and a concerted effort is made each year during National Employ the Handicapped Week, which the Nation is observing October 1–7.

During this week, and in fact, throughout the year, let us exert our social responsibility toward our handicapped neighbors—not to offer them special privileges, which they do not seek, but to provide equality of opportunity. Once given the chance to work, the handicapped worker's performance will be his own best persuader—that it's ability, not disability, that counts.

REPUBLICAN PARTY RESPONSIBILITY IN VIETNAM DEBATE

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, on October 9 the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] delivered a major address in the Senate on party responsibility in the Vietnam debate. The Chicago Sun-Times has published a lucid and forthright editorial supporting Senator SCOTT's position. The editorial points out that the national interest must not be subverted for partisan advantage by either political party or segment thereof. The editorial further points out that criticism simply to exploit the frustrations now facing our people are clearly a disservice to our Nation and offer no solution or workable alternative to our present involvement.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DUTCH UNCLE TALK TO THE GOP

Sen. Hugh Scott of Pennsylvania speaks not only as a practical politician but he is on sound moral and patriotic grounds when he warns his fellow Republicans against making the war in Vietnam a partisan political issue.

The conduct of the opposition party during wartime must always be in a delicate balance between valid opposition to the administration in power and American loyalty to the office of the President. In World War II and in the Korean War the people went through the constitutional requirement of a devisive election, but as a nation the citizens had to show a united front to the world.

Now, with another presidential election coming up as American men fight another war overseas there is a natural temptation for Republicans to try to turn the frustration and dissatisfaction with the war to political advantage. To those who might be so tempted, Scott said that while there is room for dissent the Republican Party should not carry its criticism to the point where it would "undermine the stature of the Presidency." His words were particularly directed at those in his party who have no clear alternatives to the President's policies or who seem to be advocating a peace-at-any-price policy.

We take it that Scott was not directing his criticism at those who agree with Mr. Johnson on the need to provide the maximum possible deterrent to aggression but who believe as we do that he could put greater emphasis on getting the Communists to the peace table by a temporary cessation of bombing. Nor were his remarks directed at those who believe escalation of the war would bring peace faster. He aimed at those who carp at the President and his policies simply to exploit the frustration with the war that is felt by everyone, Democrat and Republican alike, and whose own position is ambiguous or defeatist.

Scott's Republican credentials are unassailable. A Philadelphia lawyer and World War II Navy veteran, he was chairman of the party during the 1948 presidential campaign. During the Eisenhower administration he was general counsel for the party. He served 16 years in the House and nine years in the Senate. He remembers well the campaigns in other war years. So does Sen. Everett M. Dirksen of Illinois who is backing President Johnson in the Vietnam war, regardless of the difference in their party affiliations.

Frustration and dissatisfaction with the war, Scott says, is not a "valid justification for attacks upon the President, especially in the light of absence of alternative courses of action based on anything more substantial than a desire to get it over with and the hope that the other side will behave like good fellows. . . . When we undermine the stature of the Presidency and derogate from the prestige of its occupant, we do a disservice to ourselves, our political parties and the nation."

Scott said he did not want the Communists to gain "aid and comfort" in the belief they would profit by delayed peace moves until next year.

John M. Bailey, Democratic national chairman, was more blunt in criticizing Republicans who are trying to make the war a political issue.

"President Johnson seeks to prevent World War III," he said. "Most Republicans are trying to win the 1968 election any way they can. . . . We must drum away, day after day, the theme that preventing the world from blowing up must take precedence over partisan politics."

Most citizens will agree to that. If the Republicans have a firm and alternative policy to prevent the world from blowing up—and are agreed on it—they can seek the Presidency on that basis. But at the moment they are not in agreement on Vietnam except that they could do better than the present occupant of the White House. That is not a persuasive campaign argument. It has failed in other elections on other issues. Scott does his party members a service by reminding them of it.

JUDICIAL CONFERENCE ACTION ON WIRETAPPING

Mr. HART. Mr. President, recently the press reported that the U.S. Judicial Conference endorsed wiretapping and, further, had endorsed specific bills.

A close look taken by John MacKenzie, the able staff writer of the Washington Post, at the recent Judicial Conference action on electronic eavesdropping reveals that the Federal judiciary may not have given wiretapping legislation its full endorsement.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. MacKenzie's article, published in yesterday's Washington Post, be printed in the RECORD. The article is entitled "Approval of Legalized Bug by Judiciary Stirs Confusion."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPROVAL OF LEGALIZED "BUG" BY JUDICIARY STIRS CONFUSION

(By John P. MacKenzie)

A close look at the recent U.S. Judicial Conference action on electronic eavesdropping reveals that the Federal judiciary may not have given "bugging" legislation the full endorsement claimed by House Republicans.

A still closer look at the way the Conference handled the wiretap-eavesdrop controversy also raises these questions:

Did the Conference members, 25 top Federal judges headed by Chief Justice Earl Warren, fully realize what they were doing when they endorsed the "purposes" of pending wire-tap legislation?

What is the proper role of the Conference, the administrative arm of the Federal judiciary, when Congress is considering controversial legislation that touches on the duties of judges?

News of the Sept. 22 Conference vote stunned the Johnson Administration and delighted Republicans and conservative Democrats. It was a severe blow to the Administration's Rights to Privacy bill and a windfall for supporters of electronic surveillance as a weapon against organized crime.

Senators who complain frequently of judicial interference in legislative matter cited the Conference action with approval last week in successfully urging a Judiciary Subcommittee to add a wiretap-eavesdrop amendment to a pending crime bill.

To all appearances the Conference had studied six pending Senate and House bills, rendered a considered judgment against the Right to Privacy proposal, which was one of the six bills, and embraced court-supervised electronic surveillance subject only to amendments in line with the Supreme Court's latest "bugging" decision.

The Conference had approved the report of its criminal law committee, headed by Circuit Judge George C. Edwards of Detroit, endorsing as "most acceptable" the "purposes" of a bill introduced last January by Sen. John L. McClellan (D-Ark.).

This approval was conditioned on the McClellan bill's being "amended to comply with the standards of the opinion in Berger v. New York," the June 12 Supreme Court decision striking down New York's microphone "bugging" law.

The Court said a valid law would require more safeguards, similar to those of a conventional search warrant, for the protection of the person whose conversations the police are trying to overhear. Despite initial criticism, "bugging" advocates came to regard the decision as a "blueprint" for carefully drafted legislation.

Jubilant over the Conference move, leaders of the House Republican Task Force on Crime promptly introduced the latest version of the wiretapping-bugging proposals and said their bill was "supported by the Judicial Conference of the United States."

The Task Force declared that the Conference vote "represents the considered judgment of a purely judicial body" and was "volunteered and unsolicited."

"The impact of this report is staggering," said the Task Force, and it "utterly destroys whatever was left of the Administration's position" that all but national security agents' eavesdropping should be outlawed.

McClellan took the Senate floor to hail the Conference action. He called it "support of wiretap and eavesdrop legislation by the Federal judiciary."

The main trouble with these statements was that McClellan's own bill, the one chosen by the Judicial Conference, was only a wiretap bill—and said nothing about other forms of eavesdropping.

The Conference report hardly a model for legislators, had lent itself to McClellan's interpretation by blending a wiretap bill with a "bugging" court decision, but no one who has studied the Conference language can say with assurance what it really did mean.

Accounts differ on whether the Conference's nine-member criminal law committee or the full Conference made a deliberate, careful choice of the McClellan bill. Judge Edwards said it was "no snap judgment." Other sources indicated that the committee discussions failed to focus on differences between particular bills and that the full Conference spent only a few minutes approving the Committee report.

Conference and committee meetings were closed to the press and public in keeping with a policy designed to allow members to "speak freely and frankly" and encourage full debate of important issues.

Chief Justic Warren declined to discuss the matter, and Judge Edwards said he would give no detailed replies to questions about actions of his committee or the Conference without the Chief Justice's approval.

Judge Edwards, former Detroit police commissioner, is best known for his outspoken views on police interrogation methods and his vigorous support of the Supreme Court's 1966 decision limiting the use of confessions. Less well known until recently has been his support for court orders allowing Federal and State law officers to eavesdrop in organized crime investigations.

The choice of the McClellan bill seemed strange to some non-Conference experts for two reasons.

First, among the half-dozen bills before the Conference, there was a bill dealing with both wiretapping and the use of hidden microphones. It was a bill introduced by Rep. William M. McCulloch (R-Ohio) in May.

Second, the McCulloch bill had been drafted partly in anticipation of the Berger decision and clearly conformed more closely than the McClellan bill to the Supreme Court's latest pronouncement. The new Republican Task Force bill is an amended—its supporters say a "tightened"—version of the McCulloch bill.

Further clouding the question of whether the Conference acted with full knowledge of what it was doing is the fact that the House Republicans were correct in calling the action "volunteered and unsolicited."

Traditionally, Conference actions approving or disapproving pending legislation have been taken in response to requests from congressional committees for the judges' views. At least three members of the Conference committee, including its chairman, Judge Edwards, were surprised last week to learn that Congress had not solicited their views on any of the six bills. It is likely that all but a few Conference members assumed Congress had asked for advice.

The apparent basis for tackling the issue this year was the fact that the House Judiciary Committee had asked the Conference, in 1965, for its opinion on an anti-eavesdrop bill and the Conference had responded with disapproval.

With little notice by the Conference membership, committee chairmen and staffers of the Conference increasingly have been combing the Congressional Record for legislation of interest to judges, referring it for consideration with or without a congressional request.

In this request the Conference has come a long way since Chief Justice Taft created its predecessor Conference of Senior Circuit Judges and Chief Justice Hughes established its secretariat and supporting personnel in the Administrative Office of U.S. Courts.

Initially the Conference concept was more narrowly limited to finding ways of running the courts more efficiently, cutting backlogs, clarifying court rules and the like.

But the lines dividing judicial administration. advisory opinions and political involvement have become increasingly fine. Bills to overturn Supreme Court criminal law rulings and "war on crime" bills for Federal aid to law enforcement—two other issues that prompted Conference votes last month—are highly political yet the Federal judiciary can argue that their effects, direct or indirect, on the judges' work entitle the judges' opinions to some weight.

The new problem, dramatized by wiretap-eavesdrop fiasco, is that the Conference has failed to make careful judgments in each case where the issue—and the choice to seek or avoid involvement—is on the borderline between court administration and the political thicket.

HIGHER GOVERNMENT SPENDING FORECAST SHOWS NEED FOR BETTER EVALUATION POLICIES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in his speech last week to the National Association of Business Economists, Prof. Murray Weidenbaum of Washington University estimated that total Government spending in fiscal 1968 would reach $192 billion, some $17 billion higher than the current fiscal year. And as Government expenditures increase, so does the need rise for methods by which we can achieve maximum performance from each dollar spent.

Therefore, Congress must act to insure that budget policies lead to continued and stable economic growth. One area ranking among the most critical at present is that of the discount rate the Government uses in cost-benefit analysis.

Because the discount rate now employed in most long-range spending proposals is significantly lower than the comparable rate applied in the private sector, transfer of resources into the public accounts tends to create inflationary pressures and dampens overall economic growth. Congress must remember when it sanctions huge expenditures—such as the $4.7 billion public works appropriation approved this week—that the low discount rate used to justify many expensive projects can cause serious economic dislocations in the future.

According to witnesses who appeared in recent hearings of the Joint Economic Committee's Subcommittee on Economy in Government, the low 3¼ percent discount rate now utilized in cost-benefit analysis must be scrapped. The witnesses argued that the relevant rate should be the rate the private sector applies to its investment decisions—a rate which would be at a minimum of 10 percent, and, in many cases, is as high as 15 percent. In any case, our witnesses agreed that the absolute floor rate for Government projects should be the current yield on long-term Government securities, which is around 5 percent.

Had even the 5-percent discount rate been used in evaluating the public works appropriation, a number of projects could have been eliminated. As it stands, if Congress continues to approve spending requests for programs which yield low returns, the economic outlook will be one of ever-increasing inflationary pressures and sluggish growth patterns.

Mr. President, Congress must demand that alternative interest rates be applied to future spending proposals. I have already received such recalculations from two agencies on this year's budget requests. For next year, I hope that more agencies will be able to analyze their programs using various relevant discount rates.

SENATOR BENNETT OPPOSES HIGHWAY CUTBACK PROPOSAL

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, all of us have been much concerned lately with budget cuts and reducing expenditures. Because of the seriousness of the problem, it behooves the administration to make necessary and substantial reductions in the 1968 fiscal budget. Certainly such cuts must be made if the country's economic system is to continue without the heavy inflationary pressures which a huge deficit will present us.

I feel that the administration proposal to cut spending for Federal highway construction by as much as 50 percent is full of sound and fury and signifies nothing in the way of an actual budget reduction.

This attempt to twist the collective

arms of Congress into passing President Johnson's 10-percent surtax is a spoof.

Since Federal highway funds come out of a special trust fund, the highway fund reduction would not reduce the budget; thus this latest scheme to intimidate Congress is merely a shadow and not a substance of budget cutting.

The Federal highway program is one which benefits all Americans immensely. When the President becomes serious about budget cutting, logical areas have been repeatedly spelled out for him—areas which may be politically sensitive to the President but which must be faced sooner or later by him.

The Nation recognizes what is being done and questions the action of the President. I ask unanimous consent that two editorials, one from the Salt Lake Tribune, the other from the Deseret News, both dated October 12, which indicate the feelings of the people and the damaging impact of such a tactic upon the strikebound economy of Utah, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Salt Lake Tribune, Oct. 12, 1967]

Don't Ransom Budget With Road Funds

The Johnson Administration's latest economy move, asking states to reduce highway construction, comes at a time when Utah, for one, can ill afford such frugality. And it shouldn't have to.

Really big road money dispensed through Washington, D.C. is for interstate, primary, secondary and urban highway projects and it is distributed from the Highway Trust Fund. This fund is distinct from other federal revenue sources and it is built by federal taxes on such things as fuel, tire and vehicle oil sales. Those who use the highways pay for highway improvements.

Administration spokesmen maintain the proposed slow-down is an inflation-curbing device, but critics say it is the President's way of enlisting the states in his battle with Congress over 10 per cent surcharge tax vs. reduced budget expenditures.

In either case, the ends do not justify the means. Highway Trust Fund use has developed carefully scheduled planning. In Utah, the State Road Commission and Highway Department determine construction well in advance and employ personnel in sufficient numbers to meet projected goals. Arbitrary delays—one was imposed a year ago—prolong already tardy highway completions and force employment dislocations all down the line. Any inflation-nipping contribution made by fund hold-backs is wiped out in the highway program by wasted motion and restarts.

Burdened by Vietnam War, Great Society and ambitious space race needs, the federal budget is threatened with a 29 billion dollar deficit. Just how cutting Highway Trust Fund expenditures will ease that situation is difficult to understand.

It is suggested that reduced highway construction will leave money in the trust fund for a "loan" to the general fund, thereby taking some pressure off general appropriations. Look out Peter, here comes light-fingered Paul again! Even if the administration could swing this risky deal, any loans from the trust fund would have to be repaid with interest.

Some 180 million dollars is appropriated annually from the federal general fund for highway jobs on U.S. property—national forests, parks, Indian reservations—and for other special improvements. Word has gone forth from the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads that these funds are frozen. Work on Utah's vehicle entry into Lake Powell recreation areas will suffer accordingly. Slowdowns on these projects is regrettable since they are long overdue, but fighting a prolonged Southeast Asia war, defeating domestic poverty and winning the race to the moon must obviously take a toll on such things as recreation access.

But the overall situation is not so urgent as to justify retrenchment in Highway Trust Fund expenditures. The fund and its administration are sound. In most states—certainly Utah—ample labor, equipment and a screaming need for essential roads exists to take advantage of available funds. The Highway Trust Fund was not intended for use as a tool to break Capitol Hill stalemates, and it should not be so abused.

[From the Deseret News, Oct. 12, 1967]

Highway Cutbacks Would Be Wrong

The Johnson Administration's latest effort to resolve its impasse with Congress over the tax increase proposal versus spending cuts is worse than a heavy-handed attempt at arm-twisting. It's downright wastefulness.

The Administration, in casting about for means to cut spending, has asked state governors what a cutback in federal highway planning and building would do to their states' economies.

Governor Rampton has answered promptly that any cuts in Utah would hurt. With the economy of the state already in trouble because of the prolonged copper strike, a reduction in construction—a depressed industry itself for nearly two years—would be especially damaging.

Other governors have tabbed the idea "blackmail," "arm-twisting" and "dishonest."

In point of fact, the interstate highway program is financed through a self-supporting trust fund from fuel taxes, taxes on tires, oil, accessories, new trucks, buses and truck trailers. The fund does not come from congressional appropriation. Thus, cutbacks would have no effect on the anticipated $29 billion federal budget deficit—or the case for a tax increase.

Moreover, to cut back highway construction now would be false economy. It would mean laying off engineers and other highly skilled workers who would have to be recruited again at a later date—very likely at increased costs.

Better economic sense would be to continue the highway building program at its present schedule, rather than to reduce it now and try to recoup later.

The cost of construction, high enough as it is, would be even higher should the program be cut back and then restored in a year or two. Since the end of World War II, construction costs have risen from four to six per cent a year.

In addition, there is the problem of lead time. On some phases of interstate construction, it takes as much as two years to plan, program, buy right-of-way, and finally build a highway. The proposal to cut highway construction by as much as 50 per cent could put the whole program back by years.

In short, there are simply so many things wrong with the cutback idea that it ought to be rejected out of hand. The Administration should look for economies in places where appropriations can actually be cut—and the highway program is not one of them.

GUIDELINES FOR A SENSIBLE SPENDING POLICY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, an excellent editorial in last Friday's Wall Street Journal gives another powerful indictment of current Government discount rate policies. According to the editorial, more realistic discount rates are desirable so that "Congress might have a better idea as to which projects to reject and which to pursue in advance of others." Referring to present discount rates, the Journal editors see the interest rates "designed to fool the lawmakers with fancy figures."

This editorial affirms the opinion of the whole economics profession. In recent hearings of the Joint Economic Committee's Economy in Government Subcommittee, leading economists testified that private sector discount rates should be judged as the relevant rate also for public projects. Use of too low a rate can cause inflationary pressures and lower overall growth.

I urge Congress to demand that future proposals involving huge expenditures of Federal funds be analyzed through a series of alternative discount rates. By this method, Congress will better be able to judge which projects return positive benefits and, at the same time, Congress can rationally allocate budget outlays.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial "Toward a Sensible Spending Policy" from the October 13, 1967, Wall Street Journal be included in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Toward a Sensible Spending Policy

While the Federal budget in general is obviously out of control, Congress claims to be keeping careful tabs on one major part of it: Public works. Even there, though, the lawmakers are bungling the job.

As Senator William Proxmire declared the other day, "this Congress is pouring out billions of dollars in a gross misallocation of our resources." The lawmakers, the Wisconsin Democrat said, insist "on stacking the deck, rigging the calculations in favor of the public works projects."

How is this done? According to the Senator, it's partly a matter of simply ignoring reality.

Any new public works project, such as a dam, will deliver its benefits over a period of years. Assuming that these benefits are real, some sort of monetary value can be placed on them. This value has to take into account not only what the benefits are but when they're received.

The benefits of the dam, of course, will be received only over a long period of time. Those that are expected only in the distant future aren't quite as valuable as those that come earlier; a dollar in the hand, after all, is worth more now than the dollar someone tells you you'll get a couple of decades later.

The value of the future benefits therefore is discounted. Unless the total of the dam's alleged benefits equals or exceeds the cost, Congress will not approve it.

For some reason, though, the future benefits are discounted at 3⅛%, supposedly the Treasury's long-term cost of money. Actually that level is unlikely to be attained at any time soon, if ever; the current rate is about 4¾%. Merely substituting the true rate for the phony, notes Senator Proxmire, would "prevent the appropriation of billions of dollars."

The troubles of Congressional cost-benefit analysis, however, run a good deal deeper than that. To see why, let's look at the hypothetical Federal dam in another way.

To the extent that the dam's benefits, in the long run, do actually exceed its cost, the Government receives a "return" on its investment. By discounting future benefits at 3⅛%, Congress thus estimates an investment return of that size. Yet few private

businessmen would be interested in an investment that returned, before taxes, only 3⅛%—or even 4¾%.

When the Government takes money from the taxpayers and invests it at 3⅛%, it is cheating the economy out of a considerably higher rate of return and, in the process, wasting the nation's resources, if only because it costs the Treasury more than that to borrow the money. When an effort is made to assess Federal programs on a businesslike basis, therefore, Senator Proxmire believes the discount rate used should be businesslike, which would rule out a great many more Government projects.

Complete precision may well be impossible in cost-benefit analysis; a program's boosters, for one thing, will always be working hard to overstate its benefits. Yet what such analysis asks, in essence, is only whether a project will be worth its cost. That's a question that should be raised not only with public works but throughout Government.

If it were raised more often and answered more conscientiously, Congress might have a better idea as to which projects to reject and which to pursue in advance of others. However imperfect the guide, it would be more sensible than the present one, which seems to be designed to fool the lawmakers with fancy figures.

SENATE'S FAILURE TO RATIFY POLITICAL RIGHTS OF WOMEN CONVENTION IS INEXCUSABLE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the action of the Foreign Relations Committee in voting to table the Human Rights Convention on the Political Rights of Women continues to mystify me.

This convention which merely gives women the right to vote and hold office on an equal footing with men has already been ratified by over 50 nations. The rights established by this convention are already guaranteed to every American woman under our Constitution.

I urge the committee to reconsider its action of tabling this convention. Because I believe the statement of the National Council of Women of the United States will be of great interest and value to my colleagues, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF WOMEN OF THE UNITED STATES BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS AD HOC SUBCOMMITTEE ON HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS, MARCH 8, 1967, WASHINGTON, D.C.

In 1965, at a symposium on "International Law and Human Rights" held in Washington, Elihu Lauterpacht, of Trinity College, Cambridge, England, said: "Human rights can be considered on two planes, the national and the international. One of the most interesting phenomena in the protection of human rights is the interconnection between national and international activity in the field. International consciousness of human rights has grown out of national awareness of the problem; and its turn, contemporary national concern with the situation in many parts of the world itself stems from the extent of such international awareness."

It is apparent that when the late President Kennedy, in July of 1963, asked the Senate to ratify three United Nations Conventions he had much the same philosophy. In asking for ratification of the Convention on the Political Rights of Women; the Supplementary Convention on Slavery and the Forced Labor Convention the President said: "The fact that our Constitution already assures us these rights does not entitle us to stand aloof from documents which project our own heritage on an international scale. The day to day unfolding of events makes it ever clearer that our own welfare is interrelated with the rights and freedoms assured the people of other nations. The United States cannot afford to renounce responsibility of the very fundamentals which distinguish our government from all forms of tyranny."

The National Council of Women of the United States concurs, in deep convictions with these views. The purpose of the Council, founded in 1888 is to "serve the highest good of the family, the community and the state."

From its inception the Council included women of all races, creeds and traditions. Needless to say we have done all possible to promote these Conventions nationally. For example, in 1962 we sent a memorandum to all of our national affiliates on the implications of the Supplementary Convention on Slavery and on the estimated extent of its existence in the world of today.

Our National Council is an affiliate of the International Council which has affiliates in 60 countries, the list of which is appended hereto. A number of these countries are developing or newly emerging, having problems with which these three Conventions deal. We in the United States are only recently freed of the handicaps which face our sister countries. Not a half century has elasped since women here have achieved their political rights. Peonage and debt bondage have been wiped out only within the life span of many of us.

The 19th Amendment to our Constitution secured the political rights of women. It has been pointed out that the Forced Labor Convention falls within the scope of the 13th Amendment. We ratified the 1926 Anti-Slavery Convention. Consistency requires that we should ratify these conventions under consideration.

Though my orgnization is sure that the majority of Americans abjure the practices which these treaties seek to eliminate, we are powerless to take deliberate measures to eliminate them elsewhere. Article 2 of the United Nations Charter specifically prohibits any nation from interfering with the internal affairs of other countries. However, there is the fact that we need not and should not sit back in the snug security of our own professed righteousness but should fulfill our moral obligation to the rest of the world by setting an example in ratifying these Conventions.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

AMENDMENT OF THE SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL ACT OF 1950

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 498, S. 2171.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2171) to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, so as to accord with certain decisions of the courts.

The motion was agreed to and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

PRAYER DELIVERED BY RABBI SOL ROSENBERG

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on September 15, of this year, a testimonial dinner was held in my honor in Chicago—and, I might say, a very fruitful dinner, indeed.

A very distinguished rabbi from Van Nuys, Calif., came to deliver the invocation. His name is Sol Rosenberg, I have known him a long time. He uttered a very eloquent prayer.

I ask unanimous consent that this prayer be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the prayer was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRAYER DELIVERED BY RABBI SOL ROSENBERG, OF VAN NUYS, CALIF., ON THE OCCASION OF THE TESTIMONIAL DINNER FOR HON. EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, CONRAD HILTON HOTEL, INTERNATIONAL BALLROOM, FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 15, 1967

Eternal our Father: Behold in blessing, we pray Thee, this happy gathering of Thy illustrious sons of the United States Senator from Illinois, Everett McKinley Dirksen.

Paraphrasing the popular verse in the Book of Eccleasticus, "Let us now praise a famous man."

In these troubled and uncertain times, Everett Dirksen does not sound an uncertain trumpet. His every utterance is a reveille a clarion call for action and commitment. He is a dramatic and effective reproach to the strident prophets of doom whose legions unhappily increase day after day.

A lover of God and obedient to God's word treasured in the sacred Bible, he is an eloquent tribune of the people and the public conscience and a faithful steward of the national ideals of our beloved land.

In the fullest meaning of the word, O Father, he is a Leader par excellence and as such, the public clamor does not so much command his mind as his tempered wisdom and his passion for right and justice and equity for all men. A great leader of his historic political party he does not kneel before blind partisan strife. If loyalty to his party is one of his rightful concerns, his paramount and abiding loyalty remains the well-being of the people and the trust of his office.

The Land of Lincoln has sent to the Capitol many distinguished sons and among her most honored names will remain the name of Everett McKinley Dirksen—a model of excellence, of dignity, of integrity and of courage.

Thy blessing, O Father is infinitely more than the praise of mortal flesh. We therefore commend to Thee, O God for Thy blessing our friend and our leader—Everett McKinley Dirksen. Grant him and his loved ones abundant good health and powers to sustain him in meeting the tests and trials of tomorrow to the end that the ceaseless struggle for man's freedom and dignity may enjoy the leadership and inspiration of Everett McKinley Dirksen for many more years to come.

RECOGNITION OF SENATOR HARRIS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Chair recognizes the Senator from Oklahoma.

WELFARE PROGRAMS NEED HUMAN TOUCH—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENTS NOS. 400 AND 401

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, the Finance Committee is currently considering H.R. 12080, the Social Security Amendments of 1967. As a member of that committee who has been actively engaged in the consideration of this bill, and as a result of certain personal studies I have made, I am today submitting two amendments intended to be proposed by me to H.R. 12080.

I believe that our welfare programs can and must have more of the human touch.

In my recent travels to various parts of the United States and in personal conversations with those who are recipients of welfare programs, I find that there is great and growing hostility on the part of the poor against the effect and operation of many of these programs which are intended for their benefit.

There is a great and growing shortage of trained, professional social workers, the result being that harried, overworked social workers come to be regarded by many welfare recipients as persons who only enforce the law against the poor, rather than the friendly, helpful advisers they could and should be, working actively to assist recipients toward better lives and the realization of greater opportunities.

Moreover, unfortunately, I have found that there continues to be the lingering feeling in the minds of many people in this country that the poor should be punished for their poverty, and, therefore, are not entitled to the same treatment, quality of services and humane considerations that are extended to those who are not poor. Mr. President, I can say—and I have been poor—that being poor is punishment enough.

Mr. President, I submit my first amendment, intended to be proposed by me to H.R. 12080. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the Record, and that it be printed and appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the Record.

The amendment (No. 400) was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

On page 107, between lines 2 and 3, insert a new Section 201 and renumber succeeding sections, such new Section 201 to read as follows:

"Sec. 201. Section 2(a)(5), section 1002 (a)(5), section 1402(a)(5), section 1602(a) (5), and section 1902(a)(4) of the Social Security Act (as amended by this Act) are amended by inserting 'A' immediately preceding the word 'provide' in each; and by adding at the end of each such section the following new language: 'and (B) provide for the training and effective use of paid subprofessional staff, with particular emphasis on the full-time or part-time employment of recipients and other persons of low income, as Community Service Aids, in the administration of the plan and for the use of nonpaid or partially paid volunteers in a Social Service Volunteer program in providing services to applicants and recipients and in assisting any advisory committees established by the State agency.'"

On page 110, between lines 16 and 17, insert a new subsection (2) and renumber succeeding subsections, such new subsection (2) to read as follows:

"(2) Section 402(a)(5) of such Act (as redesignated by section 202 (a) of this Act) is amended by inserting 'A' immediately preceding the word 'provide'; and by adding at the end thereof the following new language: 'and (B) provide for the training and effective use of paid subprofessional staff, with particular emphasis on the full-time or part-time employment of recipients and other persons of low income, as Community Service Aids, in the administration of the plan and for the use of nonpaid or partially paid volunteers in a social service volunteer program in providing services to applicants and recipients and in assisting any advisory committees established by the State agency.'"

On page 164, line 12, after the comma, insert the following new language: "except that such plan shall provide for the training and effective use of paid subprofessional staff with particular emphasis on the full-time or part-time employment of recipients and other persons of low income, as Community Service Aids, in the administration of the plan and for the use of nonpaid or partially paid volunteers in a social service volunteer program in providing services to applicants and recipients and in assisting any advisory committees established by the State agency".

On page 186, line 21, insert "A" immediately preceding the word "provides"; and on line 3, page 187, after the semicolon, insert the following new language: "and (B) provides for the training and effective use of paid subprofessional staff, with particular emphasis on the full-time or part-time employment of recipients and other persons of low income, as Community Service Aids, in the administration of the plan and for the use of nonpaid or partially paid volunteers in a Social Service Volunteer program in providing services to applicants and recipients and in assisting any advisory committees established by the State agency;".

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, this amendment requires that State public welfare agencies provide in their State plans, in regard to assistance and services for the aged, the blind, the disabled, and needy families, mothers, and children, for the effective use and training of paid subprofessional staff, with particular emphasis on the full-time or part-time employment of recipients and other persons of low income, as "Community Service Aids," and for the use of nonpaid or partially paid volunteers in a social service volunteer program in providing services to applicants and recipients and assisting any advisory committees established by such State agencies.

There are several and very important reasons why this amendment should be adopted.

First, a Task Force on Social Work Education and Manpower, which made its report a year ago, stated that we will need 100,000 additional social workers by 1970 if we are to meet just the needs of agencies whose work is related to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Moreover, President Johnson, in his message to Congress, cited the need for over 12,000 new professional social workers immediately.

To meet this growing need for trained, professional social workers, we have only 68 graduate schools of social work in the United States, conferring only about 3,500 such degrees a year. Undergraduate programs in social work are in an even poorer position to meet the social work manpower needs which exist today.

Letters and telegrams, which I have received from Oklahoma and throughout the Nation, spell out the meaning of this shortage in terms of specifics. For instance, in Allegheny County, Pa., in 1966, 13 percent of the budgeted welfare positions requiring masters degrees in social work were vacant, and 20 percent were filled by those without full academic credentials. I am told that the situation in many sections of my home State of Oklahoma and throughout the Nation is even more acute.

Mr. President, because of this severe present and projected shortage in trained professional social workers, I strongly support the Social Work and Manpower Training Act, which has been incorporated into H.R. 12080, to authorize $5 million for each of the 3 succeeding fiscal years for grants to institutions of higher education having accredited programs in social work. This measure must be passed if we are to meet our dire shortage of social work manpower, and I believe it will be passed.

But, while we must continue to place our main emphasis in the administration of welfare programs on trained professional social workers, my amendment to H.R. 12080 would unlock a great, presently untapped source of additional workers community service aids and social service volunteers. I am informed that as many as 40,000 subprofessionals will be needed by 1973 if we are to provide the manpower needed for present welfare programs related to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. President, there are also other and very compelling reasons why this amendment should be adopted, in addition to the fact that, unless we open the door to the use of community service aids and social service volunteers, we will never be able, fast enough, to open the manpower bottleneck in social work. The institution of these two new programs by State public welfare agencies would also have great effect, I believe, in further humanizing welfare services and in making them more responsive to the needs of the poor.

If the community service aid program is instituted in State welfare agencies, so that the poor, themselves, and those who would otherwise be on welfare could work side by side with and under the direction of trained professional social workers in programs for assistance and services to the aged, the blind, the disabled and needy families, mothers and children, these programs would be much more effective in helping such recipients toward better lives and widened opportunities.

It is intended that particular effort would be made to use men, not just women alone, as community service aids. It is intended, also, that these Community service aids would be recruited, primarily, from the poor and from those who would otherwise, except for their salaries under such programs, be recipients of welfare, to work in the communities in which they live. These people will be far better able to communicate with the welfare recipients, better able to explain public assistance and other community programs to them and better able to help those who administer State public welfare programs make such programs most effective and most helpful.

Mr. President, my wife and I recently visited Morgan School, in Washington, D.C., which is now beginning a very exciting 3-year experimental program, in cooperation with Antioch College, whereby the local community will have greater control over the policies and personnel. I was particularly impressed with the program recently instituted there whereby community residents have been employed as sub-professional teacher aids. The use of such teacher aids by and from the community, working with and under a professional teacher, has not only reduced the teacher-pupil ratio, which is very important, but also is proving to be very helpful in bringing about much-improved communication among the teachers, pupils and parents and a better awareness by the teachers of the special needs and problems of the children.

I believe that the community service aid program, established in the State public welfare agencies, would have the same kind of greatly needed effect in improving welfare programs and in helping to eliminate the rather bitter hostility and resentment which many welfare recipients feel toward those who administer such programs.

Additionally, and of equally great importance, is the fact that the community service aid program, when established in each of the States, would help put more income in the hands of the poor in a manner which would allow them a feeling of increased dignity and self-respect. They would not be performing busy work or make work. They would be performing real and much-needed service.

I feel, Mr. President, that this country cannot begin to meet the health, education, welfare and other social needs of our people in the years ahead unless we provide for greatly expanded use of subprofessionals. We have made a bare beginning in this respect in some areas, such as health and education. These beginnings must be expanded and the concept of subprofessional staff must be broadened, not only in the welfare system, as my amendment attempts to do, but in many other agencies as well, such as the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Public Health Service, the Employment Service, police systems, and others. In no other way will we be able to meet the manpower needs in these fields. In no other way can we help make these programs as responsive as they must be to the needs of the people they serve.

By so doing, as I have said, we would also allow poor people a greater opportunity for increased income, while doing useful work. As I have traveled about America, studying firsthand the problems of poverty, both rural and urban, I have seen or heard of no greater need than the need for jobs and better jobs. I am among those who support such measures as emergency employment and tax incentive for private jobs and training where the poor people are. My amendment, providing for community service aids, would be a very important step in the same direction.

This amendment especially commends itself for adoption by the Senate, in that by filling some positions in welfare staffs with those who would otherwise, themselves, be recipients of welfare, we will be saving the amount of welfare payment against the total amount of the salary paid.

Mr. President, the poor are not ignorant and without skills. Many have much sensitivity, keen insights, valuable communication ability, and strong desire for productive, worthwhile work, all of which this country needs and must utilize.

Especially this session should this amendment be adopted, providing for community service aids, because of the fact that under H.R. 12080, as it will probably be reported by the Senate Finance Committee, we will be expanding the programs for day care centers and for family planning. The expansion of these programs is greatly needed and will place even further strains on already acute manpower shortages. My amendment would provide for the use of mothers now receiving aid to families with dependent children to be employed and trained, themselves, to help staff such day care centers under special professional guidance and direction and to help carry out the family planning program.

Lastly, the community service aid program would be one of hope and widened opportunity for many people who could work upward in the welfare staff positions and make such work their life work, their permanent careers, with their status and salaries increasing as their ability and experience increase.

In summary, the community service aid program offers an important and greatly needed avenue by which welfare services may be improved and thousands of the poor may be given real hope and widened opportunities and a chance to break out of the cycle of poverty.

The other part of my first amendment would institute in each of the welfare programs in each State the use of social service volunteers. This program, too, as I have indicated, could do much to relieve the strains of the welfare manpower shortage which our country faces. It would, also, as I have indicated, help to further humanize these welfare programs by bringing in contact with welfare recipients people who cared enough about them and their problems to give voluntarily of themselves.

Moreover, this volunteer program would start to fill a desperate need which exists in this country for middle-class people, personally, to know more about poor people, their living conditions, their problems, their needs and their desires. Too many of us, Mr. President, never see any poor people and have no awareness that they or their problems really exist. How easy it is for us, then, to callously dismiss any suggestions aimed at providing better lives and better opportunity for poor people on the grounds that all such suggestions are politically motivated or are visionary do good schemes.

But poverty is real, and so are poor people. And, as American citizens become more aware of these real facts, which is difficult in these days of high-speed cars and expressways and ever-growing suburbs, their innate decency compels them to become involved and to support solutions to the problems of poverty.

The two greatest forces at work upon our society and upon all of us today are the desire that each of us has to have more control over the decisions which govern our lives and the desire for widened avenues to be of service to others. The community service aid program is designed to give poor people and welfare recipients a greater voice in the programs intended for their benefit, through the use of subprofessional staff in the administration of such programs and in assisting advisory committees established by State welfare agencies.

The social service volunteer program is designed to provide another and very important avenue for all American citizens, young and old, to give of themselves to others. There is no greater work in life than service to others. American citizens know this—it is the foundation of our country—and they will respond to widened opportunities for service to others, as VISTA, the Peace Corps, and other such programs so clearly show.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is already authorized by present law to allow Federal grants to States for public assistance programs to be used to help support volunteer services, either through 100 percent funding for demonstration projects or through 75 percent funding for a regular staff activity.

Where volunteer welfare programs have been instituted they have been wonderfully successful. In Cincinnati volunteers have become the men in the lives of several boys who otherwise would be largely without male influence as they grow toward manhood. Under this fine volunteer project, operating with the joint sponsorship of the Hamilton County Department of Public Welfare, the Cincinnati Union Bethel Neighborhood Center, the Cincinnati Boy's Club and the public schools of the area, 22 volunteers have each taken two boys, with whom they spend at least 2½ hours and one Saturday a month, as their proteges.

In St. Paul, Minn., the Ramsey County Welfare Department and the Girl Scouts Council have worked out a program by which Girl Scouts and Brownies visit elderly people in nursing homes and perform small but needed tasks, such as writing letters, reading, running errands, and doing many other appreciated things.

The Lane County Department of Publice Welfare and the Lutheran Families Service Agency in Eugene, Oreg., using the volunteer services of a lawyer and a doctor, organized institutes whereby mothers who were receiving help from the aid to families with dependent children program can ask questions about medical and legal problems and join in the discussion, gaining not only knowledge but much self confidence by having their questions treated seriously by important people.

Here in the District of Columbia, the

Department of Public Welfare and the Health and Welfare Council of the National Capital Area in Junior Village have instituted a special speech therapy project, using volunteer speech therapists and other adults, for dependent and neglected children.

These programs, Mr. President, show some of the things which can be done. They indicate that American citizens will respond in a marvelous way if they are given an opportunity to help other people. These programs must be greatly expanded.

Idealism is not dead in this country; far from it, it is very much alive and growing. Young people, particularly, know that idealism is real and practical. Working in the Peace Corps and VISTA, many Americans are helping to prove more and more each day that idealism is the pragmatism of our age.

These beginning volunteer programs in public welfare agencies, VISTA, Peace Corps, SCORE in the Small Business Administration, and others, must be continued and encouraged, and similar programs must be instituted, not only the social service volunteer program, required by my amendment to be established by State public welfare agencies, but in many other programs as well.

It is intended that the Social Service Volunteer might be recruited and trained for a totally nonpaid task, or, like the VISTA and Peace Corps volunteer or Teacher Corpsman, might be recruited and trained for a particular period of partly compensated service, perhaps leading eventually to a social work or other career in a broad range of social concerns.

Mr. President, I now submit the second amendment to be proposed by me to H.R. 12080. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD, and that it be printed and appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment (No. 401) was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

On page 207, after line 21, insert a new section 405 to read as follows:

"SEC. 405. Title VII of the Social Security Act (as amended by this Act) is hereby amended by adding a new Section 707 at the end thereof, such new section to read as follows:

" 'SEC. 707. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall make a study of and recommendations concerning the means by which and the extent to which the staff of State public welfare agencies may better serve, advise, and assist applicants for or recipients of assistance in securing the full protection of local, State, and Federal health, housing and related laws and in helping them make most effective use of public assistance and other programs in the community and the extent to which the State public assistance program may be used as a means of enforcing local, State, and Federal health, housing and related laws. The Secretary shall report the results of such study and make recommendations, including the necessary changes in the Social Security Act, to the Congress no later than July 1, 1968.' "

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, this amendment directs the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make a study of and recommendations concerning the means by which and the extent to which the staff of State public welfare agencies may better serve, advise, and assist applicants or recipients of assistance in securing the full protection of local, State, and Federal health, housing and related laws and in helping them make most effective use of public assistance and other programs available to them. Such study and recommendations of the Secretary would also include the extent to which the State public assistance programs may be used as a means of enforcing local, State, and Federal health, housing, and related laws.

Under the amendment, the Secretary would be required to report the results of such study and make his recommendations, including the necessary changes in the Social Security Act, to the Congress no later than July 1, 1968.

This amendment is complimentary to, though independent of, the first amendment I submitted. It, too, seeks to make the public welfare programs more effective and more responsive to the needs of the poor. Partly because of the example and activities of the Office of Economic Opportunity, but mainly because of the spirit which has pervaded the administration of President Johnson, as well as the administration of the late President John F. Kennedy, more and more Federal agencies and departments are commencing active, rather than passive, programs to carry out the duties assigned them. I believe our welfare programs can and should do more of the same.

Recently, when I was in East Harlem in New York City, I visited a small storefront youth office, first established with OEO summer funds. This project has recruited and organized young people in the area for community purposes. One of the activities of this group of young people is to help welfare recipients secure enforcement of the New York Social Services Law, which allows the welfare department to stop rent being paid a houseowner who is guilty of serious code violations in his rental housing. I visited one apartment, the occupant of which, a welfare recipient, is being assisted by this group of young men. She lives in unbelieveably deplorable conditions. The ceiling in the bathroom had recently fallen, the toilet does not function, and there are numerous other code violations. Because these young men had searched out this lady, had advised her of her rights and had assisted her in claiming them, the terrible conditions in which she and her children had been living are being corrected.

Mr. President, I was very much impressed with the worthwhile work these young men have undertaken. But, I was immediately struck with a question of why this service to this welfare recipient had not long since been previously performed by the welfare worker who visits in her home regularly and who, therefore, must have been well aware of its code violations. I asked myself why the Federal Government should have to provide funds to a new group to bring about results intended by an existing program, the welfare program, which receives great amounts of Federal funds also. Would it not be far more effective to help the welfare agency achieve these results which are clearly within its jurisdiction? Why cannot the welfare worker search out such people who have legal rights that are being transgressed? This actually would take no searching out, since welfare recipients are regularly and frequently visited in their homes by welfare workers. Why cannot the social worker advise welfare recipients of such legal rights? Why cannot the social worker assist such people in properly filing any such complaints?

Mr. President, I believe there is no reason why we cannot do a better job through the regular staff of State public welfare agencies of serving, advising, and assisting welfare recipients as to their rights under local, State, and Federal housing, health, and related laws. I believe there is no reason why we cannot do a better job through the regular staff of public welfare agencies in serving, advising, and assisting welfare recipients in making full use of existing welfare and other programs available to them in their community.

This second amendment will authorize and direct the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make a study and come up with the recommendations to do exactly that.

Recently, also, I visited in the Bedford-Stuyvesant community of New York City. While there, as I have in many other parts of the country where poor people live, I found that some merchants take advantage of welfare recipients in the prices they charge and in the terms of credit they extend. For example, one grocery store in Bedford-Stuyvesant increases its grocery prices approximately 15 percent on each of the two times per month when welfare checks are delivered to local residents. Tied to the merchant by his extension of credit during the balance of each month, the individual welfare recipient doing business at that store is virtually powerless to do anything about this kind of exploitation.

I have seen areas in rural America where welfare recipients, clustered around a country store, are virtually in the old "company store" situation, and each month, with little knowledge of what they really owe for previous credit and unable to do anything about having to pay increased prices for what they buy, turn over their full checks to the store owner.

In another city of America, until some of the poor people got together and secured a lawyer to go with them as they paid their bills, a merchant was found to be keeping false records on the amounts owed him by welfare recipients, and, if he had not been made to render true charges, they would never in their lives have been able to get out of debt for the things they bought from him at inflated prices.

All over America the poor are becoming increasingly aware of this kind of exploitation, but, since they are mostly unorganized and powerless, such knowledge brings them not results, but frustration. In many areas, programs funded by the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity are helping to rectify some of these conditions, and this is a great improvement.

But, Mr. President, once again, the question which occurs to me is: Why should the Federal Government be spending money in one program to make another, which it also funds, more effective? In other words, could not welfare agencies better advise their recipients on buying and on credit? Can they not actually help them enforce their rights? In some cities adjacent to military bases, there is no question that military people would be living in substandard housing or be subject to mistreatment by some few avaricious merchants, except for the pressure which the Military Establishment has long had the power and inclination to bring to bear on their behalf. Why cannot the same kind of service be performed by welfare agencies whose personnel are constantly in touch with virtually every aspect of the lives of the welfare recipients they serve?

These are some of the important questions which the study directed by my second amendment would seek to answer. The Secretary would look into these matters in a careful manner and make recommendations for legislative and other action required for their correction.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the distinguished Senators from Michigan [Mr. HART] and the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], may be added as cosponsors of both these amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, throughout America public welfare agencies are overworked and understaffed and doing a difficult but commendable job. I do not mean to condemn them, but to help them. My amendments are intended to help public welfare agencies do a better, more pleasant, and more lastingly beneficial job for the people whom they serve and who are rightly entitled to our concern. I hope the amendments will be adopted.

THE IRON AND STEEL ORDERLY TRADE ACT OF 1967

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRIFFIN in the chair). Pursuant to the previous order, the Chair now recognizes the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE].

Mr. HARTKE. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, I introduce today, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and 34 fellow Senators, a bill to provide for orderly trade in iron and steel mill products which is intended to maintain the viability of our vital steel industry.

This bill, I believe, is a moderate and reasonable approach for meeting a clear and well-documented need. Many of us have for some time recognized growing problems within this major industry. Last year many of my colleagues joined with me in providing that a complete study of steel imports be made under the auspices of the Finance Committee. That study is now available to the committee so that it can make the best possible judgment in this matter.

Mr. President, the Congress today is again faced with coming to grips with the hard realities of the implications of a free trade policy. I certainly favor the ultimate achievement of free trade, we are all aware of the advantages that will accrue from it. I support the purposes of the Kennedy round. But while reductions in tariff may represent steps toward free trade, they are hardly the whole story. Tariffs are simply one of the most obvious and easily identifiable trade barriers. It is simply naive and unwise for us to pretend that we can ignore nontariff barriers. There are economic and political factors that can be and are structured in such a way as to prevent free trade. This is especially the case in world trade of steel, where most countries recognize how crucial steel production is to their economies and in particular to their national security. Our Government cannot continue to ignore these factors. We too must act in our national interest. I believe that with this bill we can act in a moderate way that gives a guarantee to our Nation that our steel industry will be kept viable and at the same time provide reasonable arrangements by which foreign steel producers may share in our market and its growth.

The Iron and Steel Orderly Trade Act of 1967, I will say again, can be described as a moderate quota bill. It limits imports in any year to 9.6 percent of recent consumption, the average amount of steel consumed in the United States during the 3 years preceding each quota year. Product and country of origin limitations also apply based upon their percentage share of total imports during the 3-year base period.

These limitations are to be established by agreement negotiated by the President with supplying nations. Imports from any nation which does not enter such an agreement will be limited to a percentage of recent consumption equal to the percentage of consumption supplied by that nation during a longer base period 1959–66.

The quota program will be administered by the Secretary of Commerce. He is empowered to remedy any local injury caused by a shift in geographic import patterns. He is also directed to review the program after quotas have been in effect for 5 years, and recommend to Congress the continuation, modification or termination of quota relief. Thus, under the terms of this bill imports may continue to take almost 10 percent of the domestic market for iron and steel mill products.

Those with reservations about supporting such a bill as this may ask why it is necessary. I would respond by saying that the evidence is now clear that steel import quotas reasonably fitted to the overall needs of both foreign and domestic manufacturers are required in the broad public interest. Without them, we can expect a steady weakening of the domestic steel industry and, thus, a growing threat to our national security.

Consider these facts for the moment: In the past 10 years exports of steel mill products have dropped from 5.3 million tons annually to 1.7 million tons, while imports have gone from just over 1 million tons to about 11 million tons. That is a net change of over 13 million tons of steel, and this year imports are higher than ever.

In the first 8 months of 1967, imports were even larger than in the corresponding period of 1966, whereas the domestic market was considerably smaller. From 1957 to 1966 apparent consumption of steel mill products in the United States rose from 76 million to 99 million tons. During the same period, shipments by our steel industry rose from 80 million to 90 million tons and exports dropped from 5 million to less than 2 million tons. A 30-percent consumption increase with a production increase of only 13 percent indicates a serious problem in the industry.

The problem is caused by cheap imports. In 1957, steel imports were 1.5 percent of United States apparent consumption. In the 10 years since 1957 we have seen imports multiply about tenfold, while consumption has increased by less than one-third, and exports have declined by nearly two-thirds. Eleven million tons of offshore steel entered this country last year, to claim 10.9 percent of our domestic steel market, and so far this year, as we have seen, imports are running about 11.6 percent of domestic apparent consumption. Steel imports last year were valued at almost $1 billion.

Ten years ago imports were concentrated in products involving relatively simple technology. Since that time, however, expansion of foreign steel mill facilities has been heavily concentrated in highly sophisticated sheet mills. Market penetration in hot and cold rolled sheet has increased alarmingly in the last 5 years, particularly in certain specialty steel categories. Imports of cold rolled stainless steel sheet, for example, which accounted for only 5.7 percent of the American market in 1962, had shot up to 20.6 percent of the market by 1966.

While the penetration of the U.S. market varies by product or region, no important steel product line or market area is immune to the impact of imports. The installation of large-scale and ultramodern equipment by European and Japanese producers has enabled them to compete with similar equipment here and to ship large quantities of the most sophisticated steel products to this country. Cheap water transportation permits them to invade not only coastal markets but also the industrial heartland of the United States. Although almost 20 percent of the market has been taken by imports on the west coast in recent years, the greatest increase in imports has occurred in the midwest, the largest of our markets for steel.

Not everyone shares the view that the American steel industry should temporarily receive special assistance. The reason of course is that steel must survive as an essential component or building block of the national economy.

Steel is important to the country. Its major uses—automobiles, construction, containers, machinery, appliances—all catalog our industrial strength. Although much military hardware today consists of materials other than steel, all of it includes some vital steel components for which there are no practical substitutes. A simple economy or one in the early stages of development can safely depend upon significant external sources for its steel requirements. But every advanced economy needs steel in amounts and types too large and varied to be supplied in significant tonnages by others, particularly in case of national emergency. Realization of this basic requirement has been behind the continuing drive by the Soviet Union to build up its steel industry regardless of cost.

The continued growth of imports at only half the rate experienced during the the 5-year period 1961–66, would produce a situation within 10 years in which the United States is dependent on foreign sources for a staggering 40 million tons of steel. Consider the effect on the country if these imports were to be shut off in a national emergency. In fact our limited war planning envisions the shutoff of such noncontiguous sources of supply. President Johnson has aptly described steel as "basic to our economy and essential to our security—increasingly important to us in the years ahead." Because steel is essential to our security, we must provide for equitable terms of world steel trade, which the industry requires to keep itself healthy and the Nation strong.

Steel imports are shrinking employment opportunities in the steel industry. About 6,400 people are now employed in our steel plants for every million tons of finished products shipped in a year. An additional 1,300 persons are involved in coal and ore mining and transportation. Thus every million tons of domestic steel mill products shipped means employment for approximately 7,700 Americans.

Accordingly, 11 million tons of steel imports sold in this country in 1966 represent the export of some 69,000 jobs in the basic steel industry and 14,000 jobs in supporting activities—a total of over 83,000 jobs that have gone abroad. From another point of view, imports of steel mill products in 1966 were roughly equal to the combined annual shipments of Republic Steel, our third largest steel producer, and Youngstown Sheet & Tube, our eighth largest. These two companies together employed some 80,000 people in 1966.

Because of these factors, the United Steelworkers of America representing 550,000 iron and steel workers in this country have endorsed the bill.

The most important factor which contributes to our import problem is the wage differential. Our steelworkers earned an average of $4.63 per hour last year, including fringe benefits. In the European coal and steel community the average wage in the steel industry was equivalent to $1.75 an hour and in Japan the average was just over $1. While we probably have the most efficient and productive workers in the world, our steelworkers are not four times as productive as the Japanese steel industry with their new plants and equipment. The low wage rates abroad give the foreign manufacturers an unbeatable advantage—the only real advantage they have over our steelmakers. Our industry turns out steels that are just as good as those produced abroad, or better. Our steel plants are located at least 3,000 miles closer to their customers, and can quote delivery times and offer services which foreign producers cannot begin to match. No language barriers and no collection difficulties beset domestic mills selling to domestic customers. And yet an ever-increasing share of our domestic market is claimed by foreign producers, with all their disadvantages. The reason for this is perfectly clear. Offshore steel sold in this country averages 20 percent cheaper than the comparable domestic grades.

As for reducing prices, we have only to look at the dire straits to which price alinement has brought the European steel industry to realize the folly of that course. Moreover, it would be impossible for us to cut prices enough to do any good. The 20-percent average price differential between domestic and imported steel came to about $34 per ton in 1966. The U.S. industry average profit before taxes in that year was less than $17 per ton. To attack a $34 price advantage with a $17 gross profit would be foolhardy.

According to estimates by the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development—OECD—world steelmaking capacity outside the United States rose by 254 million net tons between 1955 and 1966, while production—or demand—increased by 205 million. From a balanced supply-demand condition at the beginning of that period, capacity of other steel producing nations now exceeds demand by more than 55 million net tons.

The European industries, which had expanded rapidly to rebuild war-damaged economies and which were continuing to expand in anticipation of rising demand at home and abroad found themselves after the mid-1950's with substantially more capacity than demand. This led foreign producers to think they could solve their problem by increasing their exports. But the result has been that the European producers are now in serious financial trouble, because their efforts have led to unprofitably low prices at home as well as abroad. We cannot afford to have that happen to our domestic industry.

Japan is a special case. The Japanese steel industry—like those in many other nations—is clearly an instrument of national policy as to international trade and, as such, is heavily favored in terms of capital supply, which adds to its advantage in unit labor costs. The Japanese industry is also insulated from steel imports. Present expansion plans, if carried out, would mean that by 1975 Japanese exports might total 25 to 30 million tons of shipments and constitute 40 to 50 percent of all world trade in steel, other than trade within the European Common Market.

Government determination in other countries to maintain viable domestic steel industries make it probable that outlets for most of this vast increase could be found only in the United States. But an increase in U.S. imports from Japan on that scale would mean that the Japanese had taken all the growth in steel consumption in this country.

I think that statement bears repeating. In other words if the Japanese follow their procedures, they will take every bit of growth and consumption, and there will be no room for growth and expansion whatsoever in the American market. Needless to say, this would have a disastrous effect on the U.S. steel industry, and we cannot permit that to happen.

I might point out that the entire deficit in our balance of payments, amounting to about $1.4 billion, represents almost the amount of the trade deficit with respect to steel, which in 1966 was almost $1 billion.

Thus none of us in Government can hold ourselves aloof from the trade problem of the steel industry because it is a national problem. The plain fact is that we need some regulation of steel imports. We do not object to sharing our market and its growth with foreign producers on a sensible basis. This bill provides for just that. If the domestic market grows, imports increase. But we strongly object to the prospect of imports taking an intolerable share of the U.S. steel market.

Present conditions including wage disparities and Government policies do not permit competition among the steel producers of the free world on a comparatively equal basis. The theory of comparative advantage in world trade does not apply to steel. Hence, Government's policy which ignores the special situation of world steel trade ultimately means a decline in strength and efficiency of the steel industry in this country and increasing reliance on steel sources thousands of miles away.

If this were a world of free trade, if no other nation had any tariff or nontariff barriers to protect their domestic industry nor gave it any assistance to help penetrate nondomestic markets, if this were a world in which there was no longer any nationalism, no concern for national security and strength, and no need for such concern; in short, if we had but one world, one economy, one currency, and no balance of trade or balance of payment problems, then it might be appropriate for the free trade theorists and defenders to argue that no industry, no company, no locality should be provided any protection whatsoever by governmental action.

All of us know only too well, however, that this does not describe the trade world of today. Since it does not, it is not wise for us in the United States to conduct our affairs as though it were true.

The Government must recognize the seriousness of the import problem and the danger it presents to the future security of the United States.

A means must be developed to arrest the growing penetration of the U.S. market to prevent the domestic industry from being seriously weakened and to discourage excessive expansion of steel industries in other countries. The quota bill I have introduced today provides this means.

Promptness in taking actions along these lines is of vital importance. The longer we wait to solve the steel import problem, the more difficult solutions become. And the more difficult the solutions, the greater is the danger of disrupting the economies of other countries when they are found and applied.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill, together with a list of the names of cosponsors, be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record, in accordance with the request of the Senator from Indiana.

The bill (S. 2537) to provide for orderly trade in iron and steel mill products, introduced by Mr. Hartke (for himself and Mr. Dirksen, Mr. Allott, Mr. Bayh, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Bible, Mr. Boggs, Mr. Brewster, Mr. Byrd of West Virginia, Mr. Carlson, Mr. Clark, Mr. Cotton, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Dominick, Mr. Eastland, Mr. Fannin, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Hill, Mr. Hollings, Mr. Hruska, Mr. Jordan of Idaho, Mr. Lausche, Mr. Miller, Mr. Montoya, Mr. Mundt, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Prouty, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Ribicoff, Mr. Scott, Mrs. Smith, Mr. Sparkman, Mr. Thurmond, Mr. Tower, Mr. Young of North Dakota, and Mr. Young of Ohio), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 2537

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this "Act may be cited as the "Iron and Steel Orderly Trade Act of 1967".

Sec. 2. The Congress finds that increased imports of pig iron and steel mill products have adversely affected the United States balance of payments, contributed substantially to reduced employment opportunities for United States workers in the domestic iron and steel industry, and captured such an increasing share of the market for pig iron and steel mill products in the United States as to threaten the soundness of the domestic iron and steel industry and therefore the national security.

It is, therefore, declared to be the policy of the Congress that access to the United States market for foreign-produced pig iron and steel mill products should be on an equitable basis to insure orderly trade in pig iron and steel mill products, alleviate United States balance of payments problems, provide an opportunity for a strong and expanding United States iron and steel industry, and prevent further disruption of United States markets and unemployment of United States iron and steel workers.

Sec. 3. As used in this Act—

(1) The term "category" means a seven digit item number which appears in the Tariff Schedules of the United States Annotated (1965) published by the United States Tariff Commission as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act and which is—

(A) Within the range beginning with item 608.1500 and ending with item 610.5260 (except that an item within such range which is specified in section 7 shall be included in the term "category" only as provided in such section 7); or

(B) One of the following item numbers:

607.1500
607.1800
642.0200
642.3500
642.9000
642.9100
642.9600
642.9700
646.2500
646.2620
646.2640
690.2500
690.3000

(2) The term "imports" refers to United States imports in any category or categories within the meaning of paragraph (1).

(3) The term "consumption" means, with respect to any category or with respect to all categories, the sum of United States mill shipments plus imports minus United States exports.

(4) The term "year" means calendar year.

Sec. 4. The President may, after consultation with all nations having an interest in supplying pig iron and steel mill products to the United States, negotiate multilateral or bilateral agreements establishing, for periods beginning on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, annual quantitative limitations on United States imports of such products subject to the following provisions:

(1) Total imports for each year shall not exceed an amount determined by applying to the average annual consumption during the three years immediately preceding the year in which the limitation is to be effective a percentage equal to the percentage of average annual consumption represented by imports during the years 1964 through 1966, inclusive.

(2) The percentage of total imports in any year represented by imports in a particular category shall not exceed the percentage of total imports during the years 1964 through 1966, inclusive, represented by imports in that category.

(3) The percentage of total imports in any year represented by imports from a particular nation shall not exceed the percentage of total imports during the years 1964 through 1966, inclusive, represented by imports from that nation.

Sec. 5. For periods after the 180th day after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall, within the overall limits set forth in paragraph (2) of Section 4, by proclamation restrict annual imports from each nation which is at any time on or after such 180th day not a party to an agreement then limiting current imports negotiated pursuant to Section 4 to an amount determined by applying the percentage of consumption represented by imports from that nation during the years 1959 through 1966, inclusive, to the average annual consumption during the three years immediately preceding the year in which the restriction is to apply.

Sec. 6. Within the overall limitations imposed under section 4, the President may adjust the share of United States imports in any category which may be supplied by any nation. In making this adjustment the President shall be guided principally by historical import patterns, but may modify such patterns to accommodate interests of developing nations or other changing conditions of international trade.

Sec. 7. If imports in any year in any of the following item numbers appearing in the Tariff Schedules of the United States Annotated (1965) published by the United States Tariff Commission as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act reach 120 per centum of imports in that item number during the year immediately prior to the year in which this Act is enacted, then such item number shall be considered a category under paragraph (1) of section 3, and this Act shall take effect with respect to such category on the first day of January following the year in which the 120 per centum level was reached:

608.1000
608.2500
608.2700
609.1200
609.1300
609.1500
609.8400
609.8600
609.8800
609.9000
610.8020
610.8040
642.0800
642.1020
642.1040
642.1200
642.1400
642.1620
642.1800
642.8000
642.9300
646.2000
646.2700
646.2800
646.3000
646.4000
646.5400
646.5600
652.9000
652.9200
652.9400
652.9500
652.9600
653.0200
653.0300
680.4000
688.3000
688.3500
688.4000

Sec. 8. (1) the amount of imports in any category in either half of any year shall not exceed 60 per centum of the total permissible amount of imports in that category for that year.

(2) Should any limitation imposed under this Act take effect on any day other than January 1 of a year, such limitation shall apply to pro rata during the remaining portion of such year.

Sec. 9. (1) Import limitations established under this Act shall be administered by the Secretary of Commerce. The Secretary may issue such regulations as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Act.

(2) Whenever the Secretary of Commerce determines it to be necessary to avoid disruption of regional markets, he shall provide by regulation that the proportionate share of total imports and imports in any category from any nation entering through any port of entry in or near such regional markets shall not exceed the proportionate share of such imports entering through such port during the applicable base period. The Secretary shall conduct the review required to make such a determination at least annually.

(3) Upon the expiration of 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce shall submit a report to the Congress as to the effects of the import limitations established under this Act on (1) the economic soundness of the iron and steel industry and employment opportunities in such industry, (2) the general economy, (3) the United States balance of payments, and (4) the national security, together with his recommendations as to whether such import limitations should be continued, modified, or revoked. Before making such report, the Secretary shall conduct a hearing at which all interested parties shall have an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Byrd of Virginia in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, I compliment the Senator from Indiana for his very able presentation of a matter that I think is of great importance to the entire country; and I should like to make some observations in line with what he has said, to express my own concern.

Mr. President, I welcome this opportunity to comment on the steel imports bill of which I am a cosponsor.

It seems to me that we are not paying enough attention to one important fact in the current discussion of steel imports. That fact is: There is no such thing as true free trade in the world steel market today.

On the contrary, trade in steel is anything but free. It is heavily weighted in favor of producers outside the United States. In other countries, steelmakers are given considerable help by their governments in efforts to export their products. They also enjoy substantial advantages in cost, largely because they do not have to pay high wages to steelworkers. In some of these countries, production is regulated by custom or decree, so that steel is manufactured even when there is no home demand. This has resulted in the output of more steel throughout the world than the world really needs. This excess must either be allowed to accumulate or be placed somewhere. That "somewhere" is usually the United States.

In short, Mr. President, there are certain rules for the game of free trade. And those rules are not being followed in many countries.

In the United States, however, the rules of free trade are still being used, in an heroic but futile gesture. Now if this were pure sport, we might excuse ourselves on the ground that in games, it is not who won or lost that counts, but how the game was played. But steel trade is not pure sport. There is more than the scores at stake. Our entire economy is affected by the outcome.

Since the 1930's the United States has pursued policies designed to encourage freedom in international trade. Many Members of the Congress are still in favor of free trade—true free trade. But in the case of steel, being in favor of free trade does not make one in favor of the status quo, because steel trade today is not free.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Indiana has expired.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming such time as he may require.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, would the distinguished Senator from Indiana place a time limitation on his request?

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Wyoming may proceed for an additional 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HANSEN. Ideally, in a free trade situation, each country would specialize in products in which it had a "comparative advantage." Each country would sell in the world market those items which it could produce with the greatest relative efficiency. More simply, each would do what it could do best.

Unfortunately, that theory is not put into practice in many countries abroad. Steel is produced regardless of an inability to produce it efficiently. There is a standing joke, to the effect that every emerging nation wants three prestige items, whether or not they are practical: A flag, an airline, and a steel mill. Behind the humor lies truth. And the truth is, that instead of doing what they could do best, too many nations are contributing to an ever worsening trade problem—excess world steel production.

How can this foreign steel be sold at such low prices if it is not produced efficiently? There are several answers to that, but the main one is: Through subsidies or other help from their governments.

Inronically, many of these governments espouse free trade outwardly and are quick to cry "foul" if some other state fails to play by the rules. They feel that their national interests come first, even at the expense of stated free trade principles. They believe these national interests can best be served by the preservation of a strong steel industry. And they try to keep that industry solvent and able to compete effectively through a wide variety of financial and other aids.

The intervention of the Germany Ministry of Finance on behalf of the Krupp enterprises in their recent money crisis illustrates one type of help being given. Operations of such agencies as the Japanese Industrial Structure Council and Ministry of International Trade and Industry illustrate another kind of aid.

In Great Britain, Sweden, and the European Community, government ownership of raw material sources can work to the advantage of their steel industries.

Most industrialized countries, with the notable exception of the United States, take a permissive, if not an encouraging, attitude toward steel cartels. The recent establishment of four sales organizations embracing all West German steel producers is a case in point.

The degree of cartelization among steel-producing nations varies considerably. In Japan, it is so widespread, vertically and horizontally, that actual relationships between companies, and between industry and government, are difficult to define. In 1966 there were 17 cartels and similar agreements in basic steel alone. If we add to this extensive overlapping control exercised by trading companies and associated banks of Japan, we see a picture that conforms only slightly to our conception of competition.

I do not propose to try to enumerate all of the ways and means by which foreign governments aid their steel industries, and thus prevent true free trade. The list is seemingly endless.

But the situation in which the United States finds itself in world steel trade today is apparent. And one truth stands out: Natural advantages have become largely irrelevant because of the determination by most other governments to provide artificial advantages.

Most regrettably, there is no indication, no evidence at all, that conditions will change, that governments will begin to practice what they preach about free trade.

The major question, then, facing both the U.S. Government and its steel industry is: What shall we do about this increasing disadvantage we suffer in world trade?

For domestic steel makers, the answer is clear. Our industry must seek new and better ways of producing the highest quality steel at the lowest possible cost. And it is doing just that. Our home steel companies are spending money for research and development at an annual rate above $150 million. And their investments in equipment and facilities are running at more than $2 billion a year. Even in our inflated era, these are still huge sums.

Examples of the domestic industry's effort to improve its competitive position can be found in my own State in Wyoming. Both Colorado Fuel & Iron Co., and the United States Steel Corp., have substantial iron ore operations there—operations representing many millions of dollars and many hundreds of jobs for Wyoming workers.

To illustrate the relationship of steel and Wyoming, we can look to United Steel's Atlantic City ore operations near Lander. These are no ordinary facilities. The raw material mined in the area is of low grade, a magnetic taconite, and it would not be usable for steel production if American know-how and ingenuity had not found a way to improve its quality. Such a way was found, and the result is one of the most technologically advanced iron ore mining and beneficiating operations ever devised.

Since 1962, improved ore from Atlantic City has been rolling steadily out of Wyoming for Utah furnaces, where it is turned into steel to compete in our west coast markets against mounting shipments from Japan.

In the Mountain States, we know that our efforts in iron and steel must be at maximum efficiency if we are to remain in business. We must be flawless if we hope to compensate, even in part, for our geographic and other disadvantages, most of which stem from the Japanese Government's aid to exports and the extremely low wages paid to Japanese steelworkers. So far, our efforts have enabled us merely to stay in the fight. We are not winning. No matter how hard we try, no matter how many months we go without a single production mistake, no matter how rapidly we advance in technologly, we still wage an uphill struggle just to survive.

Our activity in Wyoming is but a small part of the iron and steel story in the United States. But to the people of Wyoming, success in the effort is vital to our economic well-being.

In 1965 alone, foreign steel imports to the west coast completely erased a potential for 1,500 jobs in Utah, Wyoming, and Colorado. And that job figure is getting higher each passing year. We have not begun to arrest the trend, much less to turn it around.

What, then, is the answer? Shall our Government stand by and watch our domestic steel industry play the game of free trade against teams that have tossed aside the rule book? Can we, as a nation, afford to risk losing the game?

The answer should be a resounding "No." First, our Government must recognize the seriousness of this import problem and attempt to establish equilibrium in steel trading by halting penetration of home markets. Second, it must seek some way of bringing true freedom to the trade.

Our domestic industry has asked its Government to take that first step. It is not a giant step, but it will help.

American steel producers know they could compete in a free market, and they would welcome the opportunity. But, being realistic, they know this freedom may not arrive for some time, if ever.

In the meantime, all they are saying to their Government is this: Give us an equalizer, so we can compete. If steel trade cannot be free, let it at least be fair.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the statement made by the Senator from Wyoming is one of the finest made on this subject and demonstrates the need we have at this time to take some affirmative action. I believe both of us would like to repeat at this time that at stake in the free world is free and fair trade, and central to that is fair trade. What we have proposed is a fair chance for American labor and American steel producers in international trade.

Americans do not enjoy any international cartels such as foreign companies do. We do not have market allocations as foreign companies do. We do not have a dual interest rate system and the advantage of a central bank or subsidies from foreign investments. Our industry has no national advantage of any kind other than what is in the bill. A free industry such as ours can never compete equitably with the subsidized industry of another nation.

The answer might lie in higher tariffs, but I do not advocate this, because it would be a blow to free trade, and we advocate free trade coupled with fairness in trade.

Perhaps another answer to subsidized foreign competition, to cartels and allocations is relief to our local industry from our antitrust laws. But that again is a long way around. The most direct route to fair trade is to establish quotas with which all the world can live—quotas which provide that foreign competitors may share in the growth of the U.S. market without undermining our steel industry in the process.

At the heart of the price discrepancy is the wide difference between the American standard of living and those of other steel nations. The wage differential which supports our standard of living is best exemplified by these facts: Our steelworkers earn an average of $4.63 an hour, including fringe benefits. In the European Coal and Steel Community, this equates to $1.75 an hour, and in Japan to between $1 and $1.10.

As cheaper foreign steel floods our market, we find that our principal export becomes jobs. The amount of steel tonnage imports last year alone represents a loss of 83,000 jobs in this country.

I should like to make one fact clear: I am not a protectionist, and this is not a protectionist bill. The intent of the bill is to preserve our steel industry as essential to national security and to the national interest.

I might say to those people who are critical of this approach, let them criticize, and they will drive this country to what they say they do not want most. The critics of this measure will force this country into such a position that the only course will be to abandon the free trade concept.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. INOUYE in the chair). Under the previous order, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **McCARTHY**. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. In keeping with the wishes of the acting majority leader, I ask for a 5-minute limitation.

THE COPPER STRIKE

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, the copper strike is more than 3 months old. We hear a great deal about the month-old strike in the auto industry but very little about the copper strike, now beyond its 90th day. The copper strike, however, is of similarly major consequences, involving the States of Montana, Utah, Nevada, Arizona, and New Mexico, as well as fabricating plants on the west coast, in the Midwest, in the South, and on the east coast, especially in upper New Jersey and the Connecticut Valley.

On October 3, I addressed a letter to the President of the United States, asking him to see what could be done about bringing the copper strike to a head. I also made a statement on the floor of the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that the letter and the statement I made on the floor of the Senate be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COPPER STRIKE

OCTOBER 3, 1967.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As you are well aware, the strike in the domestic copper industry has now been in effect for more than eighty days. There seems to be no end in sight at the moment nor does there seem to be a real desire on the part of the contending parties to get together and operate under the free collective bargaining process.

I am enclosing for your consideration a copy of a statement which I will make on the floor today and, at the same time, I am asking you to appoint a study committee to assess the effects of the copper strike on the national defense effort. I realize that you do not have any effective means at your disposal to cope with this situation except the Taft-Hartley Act and I do not think it would be effective at this time in bringing this matter to a head. Therefore, I would appreciate your looking into other available means by which the companies and the unions could be brought together to the end that this strike, which has caused an estimated loss of 342 thousand tons to date, can be brought to a head.

It is my understanding that supplies of copper at this time appear to be sufficient to last at least through October. But it is also my understanding that the copper fabricators, having disposed of the 38-cent-price set aside for copper, have now raised their prices between 43¢ and 44¢ a pound. The current strike in the red metal industry is of the greatest and most immediate moment to my State of Montana as well as to other copper producing states of the west, and it is my belief that if some solution is not found, that, shortly, it will become a national problem.

With best wishes, I am,
Respectfully yours,
MIKE MANSFIELD.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR MIKE MANSFIELD, OCTOBER 3, 1967

Mr. President, we are approaching the 80 day mark in the major work stoppage in the copper mining industry. It has been apparent for some time that there is evidently no real desire on the part of the unions or the management involved to get together to bargain in good faith and to reach an agreement which might bring this situation to an end. In this respect both labor and management are at fault because up to this time both of them are not even paying lip service to the free collective bargaining process.

Both labor and management ought to, even at this late date, get down to hard discussions about ways and means by which this strike could be settled. At the instigation of various members of the Senate from copper producing States, Secretaries Wirtz and Trowbridge did call to Washington representatives of unions and companies during the first part of September. There was no progress reached toward a settlement at that time and following this meeting both Secretary Trowbridge and Secretary Wirtz stated that the situation was hopeless.

I do not agree. I think we ought to give consideration to the miner and the smelterman who is out on strike, because his purchasing power is being diminished. The many needs to look after his family and his obligations are not being met. Many of these people are seeking part time or other forms of labor in other fields. Many members of the craft unions in Butte, Anaconda, Great Falls, and elsewhere are moving to other parts of the nation to find employment. The States effected are losing revenue at an alarming rate.

I am today requesting the President to appoint a study committee to assess the effects of the strike on the national defense effort. I am also requesting him to look into all the available means at his disposal to bring this matter to a head. I am hopeful that he and his advisors can come up with the means to cope with this long drawn-out strike to which there is no end in sight. But, in all candor, the only authority I know of that the President has is the invocation of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Frankly, I do not think that the Taft-Hartley is the answer, because it would cover only a period of 80 days and then if no settlement were reached the strike might well begin again in the middle of the winter when conditions would be worse for the miner and the smelterman and their families. I am not at all certain that legislation similar to that which now covers the railroad shop crafts difficulty would be the answer either. I do believe, however, that if collective bargaining in good faith is not undertaken in the immediate future by the companies and the unions that other ways and means will have to be considered in the interest of the economies of the States effected by the strike as well as the nation as a whole.

May I say that I deplore the trend toward government intervention in these matters—a trend encouraged by both labor and management—because it degrades the principal of free collective bargaining and it places in the hands of the central government powers it should not have and does not want.

I, therefore, request the unions and the companies involved to meet on this matter and I would hope that consideration would be given to the possibility in Montana of the Anaconda Company and the leaders of the unions getting together to discuss the matter as it affects my State.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on October 6—that is, a week ago Friday—as a result of this statement, I received a telephone call from Mr. Joseph Molony, vice president of the United States Steel Workers, and Al Skinner, international representative of the same organization. They asked if it would be possible for them to come to Washington and to meet with Senator METCALF and me. We were delighted to have this opportunity to discuss the strike situation in the copper industry with Messrs. Molony and Skinner. We found them most cooperative and understanding and also, we thought, not too inflexible.

Then, as a result of the letter to the President, on October 9—a week ago today—and at the President's suggestion, Senator Metcalf and I met with Secretary of Defense McNamara and Secretary of Labor Wirtz. Also present was Mr. Walter A. Hamilton, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Commerce, representing Secretary of Commerce Trowbridge, who had been called to a meeting before a congressional committee.

That meeting was similarly most significant. We were able to get the viewpoint of the Government on the strike in the copper industry from the standpoint of national security, the possible release of copper from the stockpile, and the potential invocation of the Taft-Hartley Act.

On Wednesday, October 11—last week—it was our privilege to meet with Mr. Charles Brinckerhoff, chairman of the board of the Anaconda Co. He, likewise, indicated an intense interest and his attitude did not seem too inflexible.

As the result of these three meetings, I think it safe to say that all parties indicated a genuine interest in trying to get down to negotiations, to the end that the copper strike could be brought to a conclusion.

Speaking for myself, I was pleased that Governor Babcock called a meeting of the unions and the Anaconda officials in Butte on October 10, and I am happy to note that the unions and the Anaconda officials will meet in Butte on Tuesday, October 17—tomorrow.

It is my hope that this meeting will be the takeoff to serious negotiations between Anaconda and the unions; that it would not be just for the purpose of getting together and indicating that both sides are willing to sit down. Moreover, I hope that after this first meeting tomorrow, further meetings could be held, not in a week or so, but on a day-to-day basis. If need be, perhaps, meetings between the two parties could be arranged on a round-the-clock basis with mediation and conciliation service representatives acting as go-betweens. In this way, it might be possible for the parties to get down to hard collective bargaining, as was intended when the negotiations were first underway.

It is my belief that more than 3 months have been wasted up to this time; meaning a tremendous decline in income for the people out of work as well as for the State of Montana.

It is my further belief that the Government does not intend to invoke Taft-Hartley. Speaking personally again, I would hope it would not do so. The invocation of Taft-Hartley now could very well bring about a resumption of the strike 80 days hence—right in the middle of the winter—if no settlement was achieved. That would make the situation worse than ever.

As the Secretaries indicated, national security is not involved, nor is there any intention on the part of the Government to release any copper from the stockpiles. Therefore, the responsibility rests on the shoulders of the union and the company to get together; and the only way that could be done, in my opinion, is by a continuous meeting, on a give-and-take basis, joined in fully by all concerned. It would be my further hope that if this were done, the present impasse might be broken, and perhaps a basis for agreement could be arrived at.

The Government will not, in my opinion, intervene in any way at this time. Therefore, with winter coming on, with incomes declining considerably, with needs becoming more apparent, it is necessary that in good faith all parties concerned get to the table, stay there, and continue negotiations, to the end that an agreement can be reached.

Mr. President, Senator Metcalf and I had the opportunity, over the past weekend, to visit Great Falls, Helena, Butte, and Anaconda, and observed the effects of the strike on the people in those areas. As one who spent some 9 years of his life in the copper mines, I am well aware of the ups and downs which have afflicted that segment of our economy, and it bodes no good for the people whom we represent in our State to have this strike continue.

So both Senator Metcalf and I felt that when the Anaconda officials and the United States Steel Workers Union officials start their meetings in Butte tomorrow it will be just the kickoff to a continual round of meetings to the end that a settlement can be arrived at.

But there are two things I want to make clear: First, there is no intention on the part of the Government to intervene, no invocation of the Taft-Hartley Act, no release of copper from the stockpile, no national emergency; second, it is up to the unions and the companies to get together and work out an agreement on a free collective bargaining basis. This is as it should be and as it must be, because the Government inherently and basically really has no part to play in these difficulties between labor and management, although at times it has been called upon through legislation and other means to inject itself into situations in which it—and the parties concerned—would have been better off if it had stayed out.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the memorandums of the meetings in Montana with the three groups I mentioned be set forth as a part of the Record so that all concerned will be aware of the position and the roles played by the Senators from Montana in attempting to bring an end to the strike situation as it affects Montana.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Meeting With Senators Mansfield and Metcalf and Joseph Molony, Vice President of United States Steel Workers, and Al Skinner, National Representative of United States Steel Workers, October 6, 1967

At the Salt Lake meeting on October 2, Messrs. Molony and Skinner met with Kennecott at the request of Governor Rampton. They agreed at that time to consider the possibility of a three-year contract at less than a dollar an hour. They were asked by the Governor if they would be willing to discuss this with the company and their reply was in the affirmative. The Governor asked the company if they would come forth with a counter offer and the company representative, Mr. Flynn, said he would "respond." The same proposal will be offered when the meeting is held with Governor Babcock next Tuesday with the addition that the wage differential between Kennecott and Anaconda must be taken into consideration.

They also stated that they were not interested in industry-wide negotiations or agreements but they are interested in company-wide negotiations and agreements.

It is our understanding that the Pima Copper Company of Arizona is interested in a settlement based on an offer by them of 75¢. At least negotiations are going on there and their properties are not shut down.

It appears that the attitude of Kennecott is rather inflexible though the mere fact that they did meet in Salt Lake City might indicate a slight change. The important thing about the Montana operations is the differential between the wages received there and those paid by Kennecott, hence the additional factor in relation to a three-year agreement at less than a dollar or less.

It is our understanding that the Montana wage status is the lowest in the industry except for the operations of the Upper Peninsula in Michigan.

It is our understanding that at this meeting in the Governor's office on October 10th in Helena that the Anaconda people will be represented by a similar group.

Meeting With Senators Mansfield and Metcalf and Secretary McNamara of Defense, Secretary Wirtz of Labor and Walter A. Hamilton, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Commerce, October 9, 1967

We met with Secretaries McNamara of Defense, Wirtz of Labor, and Mr. Walter A. Hamilton, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Commerce, representing Secretary of Commerce Trowbridge.

As we are all aware, the Federal Mediation Conciliation Service has been enmeshed in the copper strike since its beginning and is doing the best it can to bring the parties together. I think we can state that the Secretaries have been most interested in this situation since its inception but that they feel that there is nothing that the government can do at this time; that this is a matter which should be settled through the process of free collective bargaining between the union and management; and they are hopeful that this will be done. They were not at all interested about invoking Taft-Hartley or releasing copper from the stockpile. It is indeterminate at this time how much copper is on hand in the normal reserve but there are no indications of a shortage in supply at the moment even though the situation may be becoming somewhat crimped. We feel that the unofficial board of Secretaries with which we met would like to be helpful but they feel as we do, that the government cannot step in unless it is mandatory for the national security which, they indicated, is not the case at this time and they are adverse to recommending Taft-Hartley because it would make a bad situation that much worse and possibly bring about a resumption of the strike into the middle of winter.

The meeting with the three Secretaries was the result of a letter that we sent to the President on Tuesday, October 3. His answer was to set up this meeting and it is our intention to keep in touch with the Secretaries on this matter as well as with the unions and also with some of the Anaconda people in the not too distant future. The three Secretaries will continue to function as a group in this matter.

Meeting With Charles Brinckerhoff, Chairman of the Board of the Anaconda Co., October 11, 1967

We have just concluded three meetings: First, with Messrs. Joseph Molony and Al Skinner at their request on Friday, October 6; second, with Secretaries McNamara, Wirtz and Walter A. Hamilton, representing Secretary Trowbridge of Commerce, at the President's suggestion, on Monday, October 9;

and, third, with Mr. Charles Brinckerhoff, Chairman of the Board of the Anaconda Company on Wednesday, October 11. Mr. Brinckerhoff was in Washington to attend another meeting.

All parties indicated a real interest in trying to get down to negotiations to the end that the copper strike could be brought to a conclusion.

Speaking for myself, I was pleased that Governor Babcock called a meeting of the unions and the Anaconda officials in Butte on October 10, and I am happy to note that the unions and the Anaconda officials will meet in Butte on Tuesday, October 17. It would be my hope that this meeting would be the kickoff to serious negotiations between Anaconda and the unions and that it would not be just for the purpose of getting together and just indicating that both sides were willing to sit down. If it could be arranged that after this first meeting, further meetings could be held, not in a week or so, but on a day-to-day basis between the two parties with the Mediation and Conciliation Service representative acting as a go-between between the two, it might be possible then to get down to hard bargaining.

It is my belief that three months have been wasted up to this time and that has meant a tremendous decline in income for the people out of work as well as for the State of Montana. It is my further belief that the government does not intend to invoke Taft-Hartley. As the Secretaries indicated to me, there was no national security involved nor does it intend to release any copper from the stockpiles. Therefore, the responsibility rests on the shoulders of the unions and the Company to get together and the only way that could be done, in my opinion, in a continual meeting on a give and take basis on the part of all concerned, and it would be my further hope that if this were done, the present impasse might be broken and perhaps grounds for agreement could be arrived at.

The government will not, in my opinion, intervene in any way at this time. Therefore, with winter coming on, with incomes declining considerably, with needs becoming more apparent, it is necessary that in good faith, all parties concerned get to the table, stay there, and continue negotiations to the end that an agreement can be arrived at.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation, with the consent of the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished majority leader for the very forceful manner in which he presented this very vexatious problem.

My State of Nevada likewise is involved with two of the major copper companies. The hardships that are already apparent to the workers who are out of work and have been out of work for some 2 or 3 months are becoming increasingly critical. In the eastern part of my State, where one of the copper companies is located, many of the workers have left to seek employment elsewhere because of the lack of employment.

I commend the majority leader for his forthright statement. It seems to me that until the day comes when both labor and management sit around the conference table day after day and around the clock, as the majority leader suggested, we are not going to break the impasse.

With winter just around the corner in both the great State of Montana and my State, and particularly in areas where copper companies operate, it is high time that management and labor and their spokesmen worked extra long hours in free collective bargaining to resolve this problem. We cannot permit this impasse to continue.

I congratulate the majority leader for his statement earlier in the session, shortly after the strike began. The Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Montoya], and I joined in a letter to the President, just as the Senator from Montana did at a later date, asking that a factfinding group be appointed to inquire into the issues involved.

I think that the majority leader has performed a great service in this respect in at least a promise that starting tomorrow morning they will get together to discuss this matter. I commend the Senator for his statement.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the distinguished Senator from Nevada for his kind remarks.

As the Senator knows, on Friday or Saturday last, an agreement was reached between the steelworkers and the Pima Copper Mining Co., in Arizona. While that company employs only about 650 people, it was, nevertheless, a settlement. The amount arrived at, I think, was 75 cents, which covers hourly increases, fringe benefits, increased pensions, and the like.

I would think there is a meeting ground somewhere between the 50-odd cents which Kennecott in Utah said it was prepared to offer, and the less than $1 the union said it is prepared to negotiate on. To me there seems to be a degree of flexibility on each side; the parties are not so far apart as to preclude a settlement at an early date. With the proper effort by all of us, this strike can be settled. More than 3 months is too long a time. The strike has already had too harsh an effect on the economy of the people of our States and the States themselves.

I thank the Senator from Minnesota for yielding.

(At this point, Mr. Inouye assumed the chair.)

STATEMENTS OF DEAN RUSK ON VIETNAM ANALYZED

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, on Monday, October 12 the Secretary of State, Mr. Dean Rusk, opened his press conference with a statement which has been marked by editors and commentators as significant. They are not altogether in agreement as to what constitutes the significance, but generally it has been labeled as bold and clarifying. I do not see it as being any more bold than previous statements made by the Secretary nor any clearer since the style and language are those of the Secretary, unless the clarification is in the more simplified and restricted statement of our purpose and objectives in Vietnam. The Secretary did not speak of bringing the good life or the great society to Southeast Asia as a purpose of the war or of honoring the pledges of four Presidents, nor did he suggest that we cannot improve life in our own cities unless we make improvements in Vietnam. He said that we are in Vietnam in our own national interest and to honor our commitment.

> Our commitment is clear and our national interest is real—

He said. I do not intend to reopen the question as to whether or not our commitment is clear since this point has been subject to serious debate and challenge for nearly a year and a half.

The Tonkin Gulf resolution in 1964 gave the President no power which he did not already have nor was it in any way an open-ended license for expansion and intensification of the war free from congressional restraint or criticism.

The President, in a recent press conference, indicated the purpose of that resolution. He said the purpose was to keep Congress in place and hold us committed in case there was a change in policy in Southeast Asia.

Our commitment under the SEATO Treaty signed in 1954 was a limited one, imposing a limited obligation upon us, an obligation which was contingent at least in part on the concurrent response of the other major nations in the treaty organizations. There is little to be gained from arguing these quasi-legal points. Any worthwhile debate must deal with the realities of Southeast Asia. The debate on Vietnam is not a matter of variations on a theme although the Secretary evidently wants to have it considered within those limits. It is a debate upon the theme itself and beyond that on the nature of the music which the State Department is playing.

Let me consider first the positive statements made by the Secretary. He said there is "no significant body of American opinion which would have us withdraw from Vietnam" and "no serious opinion among us which wishes to transform this struggle into a general war." I do not know whether this is an accurate statement or not, but in any case it is irrelevant since the debate on our policy in Vietnam falls between these two extremes.

Early in his remarks the Secretary speaks of the fate which Asian communism has planned for Southeast Asia. Asian communism, for that matter world communism, undoubtedly has a fate planned for Southeast Asia and for all the world, but the fact that it has such plans does not necessarily mean that they are possible of realization or that we have to respond to every action as though the total plan were in operation and likely to be realized.

On the record, the Secretary has not shown himself to be the most accurate judge of Chinese intentions or potential or of the other forces running within the world. I quote from his May 18, 1951, speech before the China Institute in New York: he describes "greedy hands" of Russia stretching out to dismember China.

He said:

> China is being sacrificed to the ambitions of the communist conspiracy. China has been driven by foreign masters into an adventure of foreign aggression . . . (Korea);

> the Peiping regime may be a colonial Russian government—a Slavic Manchukuo on a larger scale. It is not the government of China. It does not pass the first test. It is not Chinese.

He said of the Nationalist Chinese government:

> We believe it more authentically represents the views of the great body of the people of China, particularly their historical demand for independence from foreign control.

The debate on Vietnam is not, as the Secretary states, essentially over procedures for carrying out policies on which the Nation is united. This is a debate on matters of great substance over which the Nation is indeed deeply divided and concerned. The Secretary may speak as solemnly as he can—and he can speak solemnly—but the Members of Congress and the people of the country must continue to ask and seek answers to the question, "What is America's proper role in the world and what is the bearing of the policy in Vietnam on the fulfillment of that role?" We cannot permit the Secretary to dismiss, even solemnly, the United Nations and the recommendations of Members of the Senate including the majority leader, Senator MANSFIELD, with the easy remark:

> There are some problems about going through an exercise of futility . . . to satisfy some critics among our own people.

Members of the Senate have a clear constitutional responsibility, which becomes personal because of their position, to be concerned over foreign policy, a responsibility which in the case of the Secretary of State exists only by delegation or proxy. As a matter of fact much of what has been done or what is being done in Vietnam may be a costly exercise in futility—that the bombing of North Vietnam for example, if we are to accept the recent testimony of the Secretary of Defense regarding the failure of that bombing to reduce significantly the supply of arms and men to the South, may be such an exercise; that the much publicized program of pacification, more recently labeled "revolutionary development," which is essentially an attempt to graft onto Asian society Western values and institutions and practices, may also be an exercise in futility.

The one rather clear conclusion from his remarks is that in his mind, the United States must establish and maintain an anti-Communist bastion in South Vietnam and that this is essential as a part of the overall strategy of containing China through encirclement and that all of this bears quite directly on our national interest, if not our survival. This is a continuing application of the strategic theory of John Foster Dulles and reflects in action the ancient fear of the yellow peril presented to us now in a new image of the Secretary of State in his words:

> Within the next decade or two there will be a billion Chinese on the Mainland, armed with nuclear weapons, with no certainty about what their attitude toward the rest of Asia will be.

If this is the specter that is haunting Asia, it is difficult to see how we will rid Asia of it even though we achieve an unpredictable and total victory in South Vietnam.

I fail to see the relationship between the 1 billion and nuclear weapons. We have in this country 200 million people, very nearly, but only one of them has control over nuclear weapons.

The Secretary seems to accept the Chinese Communists belief that their doctrine of world revolution is applicable to the entire underdeveloped world. It must be encouraging to the Chinese propagandists to see this basic tenet of their political philosophy accepted and endorsed by the American Secretary of State.

I think, Mr. President, that we must ask ourselves: What is the real measure of the Chinese threat? What does it show on the record? There may be every reason to believe that the leaders in Peking are firmly convinced that their revolution will serve as a model for the developing world and for the eventual defeat of the industrial "cities" by the countryside of the "people," in reality, the Chinese experience has, with one significant exception, almost no relevance outside China. In no other country or part of the world do precisely the same conditions exist under which the Chinese Communists achieved power. Mao was able to gain control of China because he gained leadership of the Chinese nationalist movement, consolidating, and leading it against a foreign invader in World War II. Only in Vietnam has this feat been duplicated. Ho Chi Minh is the only Communist leader in the underdeveloped world who was able to gain control of his country's nationalist movement at the time of resistance to a foreign invasion.

Throughout the underdeveloped world, Chinese attempts to promote their style of revolution have met with failure, largely because of internal forces, of which nationalism itself is the most important.

The failure of the Communist attempt to gain control of Indonesia in late 1965 was a disaster of major proportions. China's attack on India in 1962 and her support of Pakistan on the Kashmir issue have dealt a severe blow to whatever hopes Indian Communists might have had for capitalizing on India's internal problems and divisions.

In Japan the Communist Party has followed the Peking line at great cost, alienating the trade unions and the powerful Japanese Socialist Party. Even North Korea has proclaimed its "neutrality" in the Sino-Soviet Communist struggle. China's lack of success in Africa has also been noteworthy. The Government of Malawi had to get rid of some cabinet ministers for allegedly conspiring with the Chinese; Kenya expelled the New China News Agency correspondent "in the interests of national security"; Burundi, once regarded as safely in the Chinese camp, expelled Peking's diplomatic mission. In Latin America, the Chinese have had even less success. Even Fidel Castro, whose rise to power had been hailed in Peking as a demonstration of the validity of the Chinese analysis of the Latin American revolutionary situation, has also denounced China.

China continues to talk a world power game, but even with nuclear weapons, the evidence of internal economic difficulties, particularly the food-population problem, and the political struggle, which may be only a dress rehearsal for what will come after Mao passes from the scene, suggest that China's principal concern and effort will remain domestic and internal for a long time to come.

China's foreign policy objectives are of concern to us, but there is significant disagreement—which we must also acknowledge—about her ability to pursue these objectives successfully. She seeks recognition as a great power whose voice is heard in the world's councils. China, understandably, seeks to overcome the bitter legacy of a hundred years of humiliation by the West. Recognition as a great power is essentially a nationalist, rather than a ideological objective. All Chinese, Communist and non-Communist, agree on its importance.

China also seeks recovery of the "lost territories," Hong Kong, Macao, parts of Soviet Asia, Taiwan and the offshore islands, and land along the Sino-Indian frontier. This is also an essentially nationalist objective, shared by all Chinese. In Chinese eyes, it is not an expansionist position, for they consider that these territories were taken forcibly from China by the unequal treaties imposed on her during the 19th century, or in the case of Taiwan, were denied to her by the military power of the U.S. 7th Fleet.

China seeks to reestablish what she considers her traditional sphere of influence in Southeast Asia and to eradicate U.S. military power from the Asian mainland. Chinese political domination in that area has not been clear or consistent, at least not since the 10th century when Vietnam achieved "independence" from China. At times the relationship appears to have meant little more than tacit agreement not to aid China's enemies.

China's desire to eliminate U.S. power and influence from the Asian mainland, where it conforms to Communist ideological opposition to democratic philosophy, is basically nationalistic and there is little reason to believe that a non-Communist Chinese government would welcome a U.S. presence on the Asian mainland any more than the present government in Peking actually does.

Our policy in the Far East is based largely on unsubstantiated assumptions. First, we assume that revolutions throughout the less-developed world are a Chinese-inspired wave of the future and that Vietnam is a test case for guerrilla war and for wars of national liberation. There is no good reason for accepting this characterization of the war in Vietnam. The techniques of the Chinese revolution have not yet proved fully successful in China; they are a long way from inspiring revolution in other parts of the world. Second, we assert that the Southeast Asia situation is analagous to previous situations and experiences in Asia and in Europe. Military containment worked in Europe and in Korea, according to the theory; thus it is the method to be applied in Southeast Asia or in any other test area. But the conditions under which containment was effective in Europe and in Korea do not exist in Southeast Asia, which is marked by deep ethnic and social divisions; by instability, political and social; by deep antagonism to Western colonialism; and by a desire for change rather than for a return to the past.

Many of our problems today are the result of our unwillingness or inability in the past to anticipate what might be the shape of the world 20 years in the future. Few Americans expected in 1945 that 20 years later we would still have 225,000 troops in Europe. We have 55,000 troops in South Korea 14 years after the end of the fighting yet at, the height of the Korean conflict, we never had as many troops committed as we have today in Vietnam. We must ask whether we are prepared to maintain from 100,000 to 200,000 troops in South Vietnam as well, for 15 or 20 years after the fighting stops. If we are not prepared to do so, the process must be reversed before temporary commitment assumes the character of a permanent establishment and an irritation in the changed context of another generation. We must begin now the adjustments of attitude which will be necessary if we are to reduce or liquidate our commitments in Asia.

The long-range question is whether the United States and China are on a collision course. The likelihood of confrontation, of ultimate showdown, is not immediate, and certainly is not inevitable.

With regret I must conclude that the Secretary, in his remarks, has added nothing constructive to the debate of American involvement in Southeast Asia by way of new facts, new policies, strategy, or understanding, but rather because of the posture, almost of defiance, careless of intentional abuse of the language, can serve only to raise the emotional level of the debate, obscure the issues upon which judgment should be made and cause further frustration and division within the country, I believe, as well as between the Congress and the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from Minnesota on the excellent statement which he made involving present discussions concerning Vietnam, and I share with him concern about peace for the future. He is one of the most perceptive of U.S. Senators, and certainly one of the most eloquent, and we are always glad to see him display this kind of interest on this subject.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator very much.

THEODORE C. SORENSEN TO BREAK 4 YEARS OF SILENCE ON VIETNAM

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I think it is an important matter also, with respect to Vietnam, that there will come on the newsstands tomorrow morning an article which breaks a 4-year record of silence by a man who served in the White House under two Presidents. This is the first statement to date on this subject by one of America's most recognized authorities. Certainly, after 4 years of silence, it would be important for us to read the article in the Saturday Review which will appear on the newsstands tomorrow, under date of October 21, by Theodore Sorensen.

The substance of Mr. Sorensen's approach is that he sees Vietnam leading the United States to its own self-destruction. I think he makes an earnest plea, without criticism, of approaches for America and its leadership to find a way out. He makes the statement without regard necessarily to who should be the the leading party to call the meeting which would necessarily result in talks, but he does point out that talks of this kind are not necessarily doomed to end in disagreement and disappointment.

He points out four basic approaches which, if both sides used them, could work. I thoroughly endorse this approach as not necessarily the only one, but a workable one.

The first is to return to the Geneva Agreement of 1954.

The second is for an end to hostilities and a withdrawal of all foreign troops and bases.

The third is for a neutral, peaceful, independent South Vietnam, free to determine by election its own new political and social system and its relationship with and its reunification with the north.

And fourth, for a government, if necessary—though neither Saigon nor the NLF has squarely faced this—a coalition government, composed of all parties, as in the Laotian settlement of 1962, acting on behalf of all Vietnamese citizens in accordance with the principles of universal suffrage, free speech, free worship, and meaningful land redistribution.

I think all people will look on this statement as one which not only deserves our attention, but, considering the record of 4 years of silence by this authority, deserves the attention and concern of all of us.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF THE SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL ACT OF 1950

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2171) to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, so as to accord with certain decisions of the courts.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Internal Security Act of 1950, which S. 2171 seeks to amend, was enacted over the veto of President Harry S. Truman. I believe it would be most worthwhile for the Senate to review the legislative and judicial history of that act. In his veto message of September 22, 1950, President Truman displayed characteristic courage, and remarkable foresight when he wrote:

> The idea of requiring Communist organizations to divulge information about themselves is a simple and attractive one. But it is about as practical as requiring thieves to register with the sheriff. Obviously, no such organization as the Communist Party is likely to register voluntarily.

President Truman, after reviewing the evidentiary problems which would confront the Attorney General in a registration proceeding, continued:

> If, eventually, the Attorney General should overcome these difficulties and get a favorable decision from the Board, the Board's decision could be appealed to the courts. The courts would review any questions of law involved, and whether the Board's findings of facts were supported by the preponderance of the evidence.

Then with amazing prophetic perception, President Truman wrote:

> All these proceedings would require great effort and much time. It is almost certain that from 2 to 4 years would elapse between the Attorney General's decision to go before the Board with a case, and the final disposition of the matter by the courts.
>
> And when all this time and effort had been spent, it is still most likely that no organization would actually register.

Mr. President, let me reread for emphasis that last statement of President Truman's when he vetoed the Internal Security Act of 1950:

> And when all this time and effort had been spent, it is still most likely that no organization would actually register.

Let us look at the record. Since 1950, the Justice Department has brought actions under the Internal Security Act against the Communist Party itself, 22 alleged front organizations, and 44 individuals. How many have registered? Harry Truman was absolutely right. Not a single individual or organization has registered.

President Truman was deeply concerned not only about the futility and expense of the Internal Security Act, but also about the profound threat to traditional American liberties posed by this act.

He stated it this way:

> Unfortunately, these provisions are not merely ineffective and unworkable. They represent a clear and present danger to our institutions . . . the application of the registration requirements to so-called Communist-front organizations can be the greatest danger to freedom of speech, since the Alien and Sedition Laws of 1798. This danger arises out of the criteria or standards to be applied in determining whether an organization is a Communist-front organization.
>
> These would be no serious problem if the bill required proof that an organization was controlled and financed by the Communist Party before it could be classified as a Communist-front organization. However, recognizing the difficulty of proving these matters,

> the bill would permit such a determination to be based solely upon the extent to which the positions taken or advanced by it from time to time on matters of policy do not deviate from those of the Communist movement.

With keenness, President Truman realized that—

> This provision could easily be used to classify as a Communist-front organization any organization which is advocating a single policy or objective which is also being urged by the Communist Party or by a Communist foreign government.

President Truman summarized his objections to these sections of the bill when he wrote:

> The basic error of these sections is that they move in the direction of suppressing opinion and belief. This would be a very dangerous course to take, not because we have any sympathy for Communist opinions, but because any governmental stifling of the free expression of opinion is a long step toward totalitarianism.

Harry Truman spoke for America, our values, and our principles when he added:

> There is no more fundamental axiom of American freedom than the familiar statement: "In a free country, we punish men for the acts they commit, but never for the opinions they have." And the reason this is so fundamental to freedom is not, as many suppose, that it protects the few unorthodox from suppression by the majority. To permit freedom of expression is primarily for the benefit of the majority because it protects criticism, and criticism leads to progress.

In continuing his veto message, President Truman simply and straight-forwardly captured the central truth about freedom of speech in our society:

> We can and we will prevent espionage, sabotage, or other actions endangering our national security. But we would betray our finest traditions if we attempted, as this bill would attempt, to curb the simple expression of opinion. This we should never do, no matter how distasteful the opinion may be to the vast majority of our people. The course proposed by this bill would delight the Communists, for it would make a mockery of the Bill of Rights and of our claim to stand for freedom in the world.
>
> And what kind of effect would these provisions have on the normal expression of political views? Obviously, if this law were on the statute books, the part of prudence would be to avoid saying anything that might be construed by someone as not deviating sufficiently from the current Communist propaganda line. And since no one could be sure in advance what views were safe to express, the inevitable tendency would be to express no views on controversial subjects.
>
> The result—

As clearly seen by President Truman—

> could only be to reduce the vigor and strength of our political life—an outcome that the Communists would happily welcome, but that free men should abhor.

President Truman reminded us eloquently:

> We need not fear the expression of ideas—we do need to fear their suppression.

Mr. President, anyone who lived through the dark days which followed or can read about them knows how very right Harry Truman was proved. We know all too well the orthodoxy which was so widely revered. We know of the blacklist and the willingness, even the zeal, of some to equate dissent with disloyalty and to punish error as though it were treason.

This was a national malady, not the exclusive practice of one party or one group. But our national dialog was diminished and our national life was impoverished as a result. We spent inordinate time and tremendous energy—proving our total anticommunism and corresponding pro-Americanism.

I believe the Nation has matured since that experience. I believe that we profited from that tragic lesson.

But I wonder, Mr. President, when I hear the level to which our debate in this very Chamber has slipped in the past week.

On last Wednesday on this floor the sponsor of S. 2171, the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], in support of his motion to suspend the rules, quoted the testimony of Herbert A. Philbrick, the former informant for the FBI, before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee this year.

The senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] quoted Mr. Philbrick as follows:

> There is no question but that the law the Communists fear the most, the law that they fought the longest and the hardest was the Internal Security Act of 1950. The Communists fought that measure tooth and nail, in court and out, week in and week out, for 15 solid years.

Mr. President, I know that the Communists opposed the Internal Security Act when it was before the Congress. But I do not take lightly any implication that the Communists and their sympathizers or unwitting accomplices were the only people who opposed this act.

A great President and a great American, Harry S. Truman, opposed the Internal Security Act.

The Department of Justice, ably headed by then Attorney General and later Supreme Court Justice, Tom Clark, opposed the Internal Security Act.

The Department of Defense, the Department of State, and the Central Intelligence Agency opposed the Internal Security Act.

The New York Times, the Washington Post, the Boston Herald, and the St. Louis Post-Dispatch opposed the Internal Security Act.

Senator Paul H. Douglas, a truly great American, opposed the Internal Security Act.

Clarence Mitchell, an outstanding American, testified against the Internal Security Act in behalf of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

William Green of the American Federation of Labor, James Patton of the National Farmers Union, Charles M. LaFollette of the Americans for Democratic Action, Dr. Ralph E. Himstead of the American Association of University Professors, Benjamin Epstein of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, John W. Edelman of the Textile Workers Union, and Bishop John Wesley Lord of the Methodist Church also opposed the Internal Security Act.

I want to make it crystal clear, Mr. President, that respected, responsible, and renowned Americans whose devotion to country is far, far beyond question opposed this act before it was enacted and continued their opposition.

I do not pretend to know the motives of the Communist Party officials and members who opposed this act for 15 years. But I reject absolutely any suggestion no matter how subtle that Communists alone, have constituted or been the moving force behind the opposition to this act.

President Truman concluded his veto message of the Internal Security Act in this way:

> I do not undertake lightly the responsibility of differing with the majority in both Houses of Congress who have voted for this bill. We are all Americans; we all wish to safeguard and preserve our Constitutional liberties against internal and external enemies. But I cannot approve this legislation, which instead of accomplishing its avowed purpose would actually interfere with our liberties and help the Communists against whom the bill was aimed.

Speaking at the time of the Korean war, President Truman said:

> This is a time when we must marshall all our resources and all the moral strength of our free system in self-defense against the threat of Communist aggression. We will fail in this, and we will destroy all that we seek to preserve, if we sacrifice the liberties of our citizens in a misguided attempt to achieve national security.
>
> There is no reason why we should fail. Our country has been through dangerous times before without losing our liberties to external attack or internal hysteria. Each of us, in Government and out, has a share in guarding our liberties. Each of us must search his own conscience to find whether he is doing all that can be done to preserve and strengthen them.
>
> No consideration of expediency can justify the enactment of such a bill as this, a bill which would so greatly weaken our liberties and give aid and comfort to those who would destroy us. I have, therefore no alternative but to return this bill without my approval, and I earnestly request the Congress to reconsider its action.

Mr. President, what a truly remarkable message from a truly remarkable man. What candor, what courage, what confidence in our free system and free institutions.

These words of President Truman are timeless. They were written at a time of national hysteria when paranoia was on the ascent in our midst. They are just as timely, just as relevant today—17 years later—when the Communist Party in the United States by its own admission and the information of the FBI is one-tenth the size it was then.

Why do we need this emergency act of legislative resuscitation to put new life into the moribund Subversive Activities Control Board? Do we need to protect our young people? By the party's own admission and the best estimates of reliable sources, there are only 500 members of the Communist Party of the United States between the ages of 17 and 30.

Just think of that: 500 between the ages of 17 and 30, when almost half our population, or close to 100 million Americans, is under the age of 30.

Others may put their faith and trust in some vigilante board to make determinations of Communist action, Communist front, and Communist back. But the senior Senator from Wisconsin prefers to put his faith in the native commonsense of the American people and their individual and collective experience with free institutions and a democratic system that finds its own remedies for social ills and injustices.

These, to my mind, are far more powerful safeguards against the Communist Party and its menace than hastily drawn, hastily considered legislation.

Let us not obfuscate the issue with jingoism, either. Let us not confuse the military aggression of the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese against American troops with the hapless meanderings of a Gus Hall.

I thought we had learned that communism does not exist or prosper in a vacuum. Communism feeds upon the tragic conditions of poverty, injustice, ignorance, and disease. This is why aggressive communism is a real and terrible threat to Vietnam, and this is why the Communist Party in this country today appeals to only one out of every 20,000 Americans.

If communism were to vanish from the face of the earth tomorrow, our awesome national problems would remain. The absence of communism would not miraculously solve the problems of our cities, eliminate the poverty in our Nation, purify the air we breathe or the water we drink.

The disappearance of communism would not magically resolve our racial tensions or solve the problems of organized crime.

As President Truman said so very well about the original Internal Security Act: The idea is a simple and attractive one.

We must have learned by now that the most effective bulwarks against Communist subversion are not vigilantes, but rather full political, economic, and social justice. Where these are secure, communism has no foothold save for the tiny minority of misfits and misanthropes.

In order to fully understand the Internal Security Act of 1950, one must consider it in relation to the Smith Act.

The Smith Act was originally enacted on June 28, 1940, as sections 2, 3, and 5 of the Alien Registration Act, 1940. In 1948, the provisions of the Act were revised and recodified as section 2385 of of the Criminal Code.

The chief provision of the Smith Act which deals with subversive activities made it unlawful for any person: First to knowingly or willfully advocate, abet, advise, or teach the duty, necessity, desirability, or propriety of overthrowing State or Federal Government in the United States by force or violence; second, to help to organize any society or group of persons who teach, advocate, or encourage such forcible overthrow; third, to affiliate with such society or group, knowing the purposes thereof—the "membership clause"—or; fourth, to conspire to commit any of the foregoing acts.

So this act not only covers those who knowingly or willfully advocate the violent overthrow, but also makes it unlawful for any person to associate with such a group.

The Internal Security Act, from the date of its enactment was on a collision course with the Smith Act, because while the Smith Act provided for the prosecution of Communist organizations and of those who are knowing members of such organizations, the Internal Security Act required such organizations and their members to come forward and register themselves as Communist organizations or as knowing members of such organizations.

So with the operation of the two laws we are faced with the situation that if the Communist Party, obeying the Internal Security Act, registers and files its membership list, every person on the list is immediately exposed to serious and substantial threat of prosecution under the Smith Act.

On March 3, 1967, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia unanimously held that the fifth amendment prohibited this dual operation.

It has been suggested, and I believe logically so, that the Government must make a choice between the two acts, opting either to retain the Smith Act with its prosecutions or the Internal Security Act with its registrations.

But I believe it is irrefutable that any choice, any change in existing law in view of the Albertson case and the Communist Party case must be attended by thorough investigation, full consultation of all expert persons and organizations as well as with the full participation of the executive branch.

We certainly have not had that, Mr. President, on this bill. The minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], has told us that the President wants this bill enacted. I do not doubt the word of the minority leader. He is a most honorable man. But I am at a loss to understand why the President chooses this most extraordinary means of communicating his support of a particular piece of legislation.

If the President wants this bill in its present form, without hearings, without the opinion of the Department of Justice, why has he not made his wishes known to other Senators? Why has he selected only his good friend and our distinguished colleague, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], to be the sole repository of his feelings?

I, for one, would appreciate hearing from the administration and the Department of Justice on S. 2171, and I am sure many of my colleagues on this side of the aisle would likewise be appreciative.

Apparently, the President of the United States has not communicated with the majority leader on this bill. He has not communicated with the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary—the committee that has jurisdiction over it—to the best of our knowledge, who also happens to be chairman of the Internal Security Subcommittee.

In my opinion, the President of the United States has been criticized very unfairly by many people, because I believe he is a man of great and demonstrated character. But nobody has accused President Johnson of being bashful or of being reluctant to pick up the telephone and communicate with Members of Congress on any measure on which he has feelings. In this case, the President of the United States has not let us know how he feels about this legislation. As President Truman indicated, it goes right to the heart of our liberties.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the registration requirement of the Internal Security Act was finally interred by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia on March 3, 1967, when that court invalidated an attempt to register the Communist Party through two informants.

The Justice Department did not exercise its option of appealing the court of appeals decision to the Supreme Court. In short, the Justice Department was content to let the matter drop.

But almost 5 months after the court of appeals decision and only 6 days after wide criticism in the press of a Presidential appointment to the Subversive Activities Control Board, the distinguished minority leader introduced S. 2171 which was the subject of no hearings before the Judiciary Committee and was reported favorably on August 15.

I have said that the unanimous court of appeals decision, this past March, permanently interred the registration section of the Internal Security Act. Actually the registration section was dealt a fatal blow almost 2 years ago in the case of *Albertson* v. *Subversive Activities Control Board,* 382 U.S. 70 (1965).

By virtue of section 8 of the Internal Security Act, when an organization fails to register in compliance with an order of the Board, individual members in the organization must register. Acting under section 13 of the act, the Attorney General instituted a proceeding before the Board for the purpose of obtaining an order directing Albertson and others to register. The Supreme Court set aside the order of the Board, holding the order violated the privilege against self-incrimination guaranteed by the fifth amendment.

In a unanimous 8-to-0 decision, the Supreme Court declared in the Albertson case:

> The risks of incrimination which the petitioners take in registering are obvious. Form IS-52a requires an admission of membership in the Communist Party. Such an admission of membership may be used to prosecute the registrant under the membership clause of the Smith Act or under Section 4(a) of the Subversive Activities Control Act, to mention only two federal criminal statutes . . . It follows that the requirement to accomplish registration by completing and filing Form IS-52a is inconsistent with the protection of the Self-Incrimination Clause.

Justice Potter Stewart spoke for the Court.

Justice Black stated that he concurred in the ruling for all the reasons set out in the Court's opinion as well as for those stated in his dissenting opinion in *Communist Party of the United States* v. *Subversive Activities Control Board,* 367 U.S. 1 at 137 (1961) where with respect to the Subversive Activities Control Act as a whole, he had said:

> In my judgment, the Act here under consideration is unconstitutional on at least three grounds in addition to its direct conflict with the self-incrimination provisions of the Fifth Amendment. It is, in the first instance, a classical bill of attainder which our Constitution in two places prohibits, for it is a legislative Act that inflicts pains, penalties, and punishments in a number of ways without a judicial trial . . . The Act . . . not only is a legislative bill of attainder but also violates due process by short-cutting practically all of the Bill of Rights, leaving no hope for anyone entangled in this legislative-administrative web except what has proved in this case to be one of the most truncated judicial reviews that the history of the Court can afford.
>
> I think also that the outlawing of the Communist Party and imprisonment of its members violate the First Amendment.

But perhaps the Justice whose opinion in the Albertson case was most interesting was that of the man who as Attorney General in 1948 had expressed doubt as to the constitutionality of such registration provisions, Justice Clark, wrote, in part:

> I join in the opinion of the Court. The conclusion it reaches today was forecast in 1948. In response to the request of the Chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee for an expression of the views of the Department of Justice on H.R. 5852, a precursor of the Act under attack, it was then pointed out that the "measure might be held . . . even to compel self-incrimination."

I want to emphasize that the decisions in both these cases mentioned, the Albertson case and the Communist Party case, before the Supreme Court and the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, respectively, were unanimous—all Justices, the so-called conservative wing or bloc and the liberal wing or bloc, all voted unanimously to find this provision unconstitutional.

The Albertson decision, delivered during the October term of the Supreme Court in 1965 for all practical purposes put the Subversive Activities Control Board out of business.

But it was not until public attention focused on the Board's total 2-year dormancy at great public expense and the caliber of Board members that the overwhelming need for this legislation asserted itself.

Perhaps I am not so watchful—although I try hard—as the senior Senator from Illinois. But I have not seen any alarming improvement in Communist fortunes in the United States in the past 2 years. I have not perceived, nor have I been informed of any recent, rising Red tide in the United States which would shock the Senate into emergency action to resuscitate the Subversive Activities Control Board.

If there is such an alarming movement, I should like to hear about it from the Department of Justice, from the Attorney General. I would want to know if the Department and the distinguished and able Attorney General could trace this purported waxing of Communist strength to either the Albertson decision or the court of appeals decision of last March. Certainly, if there is both a causal and time relationship between the resurgence of the Communist Party in the United States and the eclipse of the Subversive Activities Control Board, every Senator, and every American should be apprised of it.

The best place to make these determinations is before an appropriate congressional committee in open hearings. Unfortunately, as we all know, S. 2171 was not the subject of any hearings—either closed or open.

Mr. President, these are important questions we are discussing. These questions affect the basic civil liberties of American citizens. This legislation involves fundamental constitutional questions of freedom of speech and protection from self-incrimination. The Senate and the American people are entitled to hear from our Nation's highest legal officer and that Department which would be charged under the act with its enforcement. Until we have these opinions, and those of other experts in this area, we cannot legislate intelligently or responsibly.

Mr. President, this bill S. 2171, would resuscitate a board that has been virtually inactive for the past 20 months. I cannot repeat this too often, because it is central to our position, that this effort at artificial respiration was reported from the Senate Judiciary Committee without hearings, with a completely inadequate report—a one-page report—which said nothing at all about the bill except that it was reported favorably and without any recommendations pro or con from the administration.

In fact, the bill itself had to be substantially modified after it was reported from the Senate Judiciary Committee. In the words of the bill's sponsor, Senator DIRKSEN, this was due to printing errors. However, whole lines in the bill have been deleted and reworked in the modified version. For example:

> SEC. 6. Beginning with (j), all that of subsection (a) of section 11 of the Subversive Activities Control Act down to and including the end thereof is amended so as to read: "is replaced by the following language," a "printing correction";
>
> SEC. 6. Beginning with the clause designation "(1)" contained in section 11(a) of the Subversive Activities Control Act, strike out all of that subsection down to and including the words "register under section 7", and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That is some printer's error. It is obviously a very substantial change from what is in the bill.

Furthermore, certain obvious technical errors in the bill remain even after the modifications. For example, although sections 7 and 8 of the Subversive Activities Control Act are repealed by the bill, the following sections, beginning with section 9 are not renumbered. This means that the Subversive Activities Control Act, as it would be amended by the Dirksen bill, would contain no sections 7 and 8. The act would jump directly from section 6 to section 9. I do not know whether there is any precedent for this type of amendation, but certainly it should be corrected if at all possible.

At this point, Mr. President, I should like to discuss the actual language of the Dirksen bill as it amends the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 since the report on the legislation tells us very little about the bill's contents. It is true that the senior Senator from Illinois did insert a section-by-section explanation of the bill in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Wednesday, October 11. However, I believe that this explanation leaves a good deal to be desired. Furthermore, we have never had the benefit of a so-called Cordon print which reprints the act amended showing what language has been deleted from the Subversive Activities Control Act and what language has been added by the Dirksen proposal.

Such a document has been prepared for me by the Library of Congress, however, and I should now like to go over in some detail the 1950 act and the changes made by the Dirksen bill.

Section 1(a) of the 1950 act is retained. It tells us that title I of the Internal Security Act "may be cited as the 'Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950'." Strangely enough, the committee report on the Dirksen bill, which should have gone under some such title as the Subversive Activities Control Amendments of 1967 was titled Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950. That is the way the bill came to us this year, as the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950. Well, we know from section 1(a) of the 1950 act that this title was appropriate 17 years ago. It is hardly suitable for a bill reported from committee in 1967.

Section 1(b) of the 1950 act, also retained, states:

> Nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize, require, or establish military or civilian censorship or in any way to limit or infringe upon freedom of the press or of speech as guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States and no regulation shall be promulgated hereunder having that effect.

In other words, we have here a disclaimer on the part of Congress that this legislation was meant to infringe on the constitutional rights of free speech or the press. We have no mention of the constitutional protection against self-incrimination. This, in fact, was the single right that the courts have held—as I have just stated—the legislation did violate. Furthermore, there has been a great deal of discussion over the years of whether or not this disclaimer is consonant with the act as a whole. Many feel that the legislation as passed by Congress does infringe upon freedom of speech, in that it restricts freedom of association. However, I do not necessarily endorse this viewpoint. In any event I shall not go into this issue at this time.

Section 2 of the 1950 act is retained in its entirety. It recites the necessity for the passage of the 1950 act in the following language:

> SEC. 2. As a result of evidence adduced before various committees of the Senate and House of Representatives, the Congress hereby finds that—
>
> (1) There exists a world Communist movement which, in its origins, its development,

> and its present practice, is a world-wide revolutionary movement whose purpose it is, by treachery, deceit, infiltration into other groups (governmental and otherwise), espionage, sabotage, terrorism, and any other means deemed necessary, to establish a Communist totalitarian dictatorship in the countries throughout the world through the medium of a world-wide Communist organization.
>
> (2) The establishment of a totalitarian dictatorship in any country results in the suppression of all opposition to the party in power, the subordination of the rights of individuals to the state, the denial of fundamental rights and liberties which are characteristic of a representative form of government, such as freedom of speech, of the press, of assembly, and of religious worship, and results in the maintenance of control over the people through fear, terrorism, and brutality.
>
> (3) The system of government known as a totalitarian dictatorship is characterized by the existence of a single political party, organized on a dictatorial basis, and by substantial identity between such party and its policies and the government and governmental policies of the country in which it exists.
>
> (4) The direction and control of the world Communist movement is vested in and exercised by the Communist dictatorship of a foreign country.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, without losing the floor?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield for that purpose?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes, indeed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House, had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 2121) to extend the provisions of the Act of October 23, 1962, relating to relief for occupants of certain unpatented mining claims.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10345) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ROONEY of New York, Mr. SIKES, Mr. SLACK, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. FLYNT, Mr. JOELSON, Mr. MAHON, Mr. BOW, Mr. LIPSCOMB, Mr. CEDERBERG, and Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF THE SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL ACT OF 1950

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2171) to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, so as to accord with certain decisions of the courts.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, when the quorum call was suggested, I was indicating what section 2 of the 1950 act provides, because that section as written is still in the bill in its entirety, and is not changed by the proposed legislation. It will stay in the law whether the Dirksen bill is enacted or not.

It indicates, as I say, the necessity in the view of the House and Senate for the passage of the 1950 act.

Section 6 provides:

> (6) The Communist action organizations so established and utilized in various countries, acting under such control, direction, and discipline, endeavor to carry out the objectives of the world Communist movement by bringing about the overthrow of existing governments by any available means, including force if necessary, and setting up Communist totalitarian dictatorships which will be subservient to the most powerful existing Communist totalitarian dictatorship.

At this point I interrupt to say that this is one part of the 1950 act which may well have been the case at that time, but which might very well be revised, and I think it should be revised, to take account of the realities in the world today in which there is not merely one dominant totalitarian dictatorship in Moscow, but there is also a very militant competitive dictatorship in Peking which in the view of many experts, including the Secretary of State and the Vice President of the United States, represents a most profound threat to this country.

Continuing with section 6:

> Although such organizations usually designate themselves as political parties, they are in fact constituent elements of the world-wide Communist movement and promote the objectives of such movement by conspiratorial and coercive tactics, instead of through the democratic processes of a free elective system or through the freedom-preserving means employed by a political party which operates as an agency by which people govern themselves.

Section 7 provides:

> In carrying on the activities referred to in paragraph (6), such Communist organizations in various countries are organized on a secret, conspiratorial basis and operate to a substantial extent through organizations, commonly known as "Communist fronts", which in most instances are created and maintained, or used, in such manner as to conceal the facts as to their true character and purposes and their membership. One result of this method of operation is that such affiliated organizations are able to obtain financial and other support from persons who would not extend such support if they knew the true purposes of, and the actual nature of the control and influence exerted upon, such "Communist fronts".

Section 8 provides:

> Due to the nature and scope of the world Communist movement, with the existence of affiliated constituent elements working toward common objectives in various countries of the world, travel of Communist members, representatives, and agents from country to country facilitates communication and is a prerequisite for the carrying on of activities to further the purposes of the Communist movement.

Section 9 finds:

> In the United States those individuals who knowingly and willfully participate in the world Communist movement, when they so participate, in effect repudiate their allegiance to the United States, and in effect transfer their allegiance to the foreign country in which is vested the direction and control of the world Communist movement.

Once again, Mr. President, this brings to mind the fact that since 1950 the world Communist movement has undergone a dramatic and very important change. As I have said, in the eyes of many people the principal threat to peace is from Peking; and the language in the act as it is now and as it would not be amended by the Dirksen bill assumes that Moscow dominates and directs the activities in Peking. It is obvious to anybody who can read a newspaper that Peking is highly competitive and militantly opposed in many cases and on many occasions to Moscow.

No. 10:

> In pursuance of communism's stated objectives, the most powerful existing Communist dictatorship has, by the methods referred to above, already caused the establishment in numerous foreign countries of Communist totalitarian dictatorships, and threatens to establish similar dictatorships in still other countries.

Once again, we have a situation which was perhaps correct in 1950 and we know is not correct now. Many people argue, and argue with good commonsense, that the principal domination in this hemisphere, for example, is from Peking and from Chinese communism and not from Moscow communism, although both, of course, would like to subvert the free world. But in not taking account of Chinese communism—a much more militant and aggressive kind of communism and one which we know in Southeast Asia has caused us such grief—this act is certainly defective, and the directions under the act which would affect people in this country are inadequate:

> (11) The agents of communism have devised clever and ruthless espionage and sabotage tactics which are carried out in many instances in form or manner successfully evasive of existing law.
>
> (12) The Communist network in the United States is inspired and controlled in large part by foreign agents who are sent into the United States ostensibly as attachés of foreign legations, affiliates of international organizations, members of trading commissions, and in similar capacities, but who use their diplomatic or semidiplomatic status as a shield behind which to engage in activities prejudicial to the public security.
>
> (13) There are, under our present immigration laws, numerous aliens who have been found to be deportable many of whom are in the subversive, criminal, or immoral

classes who are free to roam the country at will without supervision or control.

(14) One device for infiltration by Communists is by procuring naturalization for disloyal aliens who use their citizenship as a badge for admission into the fabric of our society.

(15) The Communist movement in the United States is an organization numbering thousands of adherents, rigidly and ruthlessly disciplined. Awaiting and seeking to advance a moment when the United States may be so far extended by foreign engagements, so far divided in counsel, or so far in industrial or financial straits, that overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence may seem possible of achievement, it seeks converts far and wide by an extensive system of schooling and indoctrination. Such preparations by Communist organizations in other countries have aided in supplanting existing governments. The Communist organization in the United States, pursuing its stated objectives, the recent successes of Communist methods in other countries, and the nature and control of the world Communist movement itself, present a clear and present danger to the security of the United States and to the existence of free American institutions, and make it necessary that Congress, in order to provide for the common defense, to preserve the sovereignty of the United States as an independent nation, and to guarantee to each State a republican form of government, enact appropriate legislation recognizing the existence of such worldwide conspiracy and designed to prevent it from accomplishing its purpose in the United States.

Undoubtedly, most of us would subscribe to much of the material in this recitation of the dangers of the world Communist movement. However, I believe there is an increasing skepticism about the statement contained in section (4) that the direction of the world Communist movement is exercised by the Communist dictatorship of a foreign country. This language may have been adequate back in 1950, a couple of years before Stalin's death and only 4 years after mainland China had become a so-called People's Republic. As a matter of fact, I would say it was less than 2 years from the time that Red China had clear de facto control of mainland China.

However, the Soviet Union today is faced with strong competition for the control of indigenous Communist movements in the underdeveloped nations in the southern hemisphere continents of Africa and South America. Even eastern European countries, such as Rumania and Albania, have shown marked reluctance to follow certain policy lines laid down in Moscow. In fact, I believe it is fair to say that the statements made in section 2 of the act more adequately describe a single branch of the Communist movement—the Red Chinese branch—even though when these words were written and this bill was drafted in 1950, obviously, the drafters of the legislation had in mind the Russian communism.

I believe that Mao Tse-tung might well agree with this evaluation. His violent denunciations of the Russian revisionists that followed Stalin's death are ample indications of his feelings about the matter.

Roger Hilsman, former Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, said in testimony before the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Far East and the Pacific in 1966 that the Sino-Soviet split is "one of the most portentous international political developments of our time."

The real threat to world peace is now, as Vice President HUMPHREY observed in a speech yesterday in Doylestown, Pa., is "militant, aggressive Asian communism, with its headquarters in Peking, China."

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPONG in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I rise to support the pending measure, S. 2171, which was introduced by the senior Senator from Illinois.

It is with great interest that I have listened to the discussion on this bill.

One of the items that has been especially interesting to me is the proposition that the discussion by the then-President Truman when the bill was enacted 17 years ago that the Communists would be helped by this bill. It was said that the cause of the majority of people in America and their constitutional rights and freedoms would be harmed. A number of other deficiencies of the bill of 1950 were alleged, but eventually the bill was written into law.

Mr. President, there is something that troubles me when the argument to this effect is made. If this bill would not have been harmful to the Communist cause, why did they spend 17 years resisting it? Why did they challenge its constitutionality and why did they defy it from its inception? It does not make sense.

It seems to me that if it were not harmful, they would let it stay on the books and continue to be helped and have the constitutional rights of the majority of citizens of this country continue to be harmed. However, we know that has not been the history of this act.

In fact, the Albertson case was the culmination of many legal attacks upon the bill. It rendered the act defective as to the jurisdiction of the Board and its ability to function in the fashion which was envisioned by Congress.

It seems to me that we should address ourselves to the proposition: Have circumstances changed since 1950 so as to render this Board unnecessary or undesirable?

Contrary to what has been said in the Chamber or elsewhere, comprehensive hearings have been held on this subject.

There has been testimony, not only in committees of this body, but also in the other body, on the proposition advanced and on this bill in particular.

I shall refer to pages 1021 and 1077 in the hearings before the Senate Committee on Appropriations, held in August of this year in connection with H.R. 10345, which is the bill providing appropriations for State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies. The testimony contained in those pages will be very enlightening for anyone who wishes to peruse it. Certainly the testimony there will be found to bear upon all the principal propositions which are involved in this matter. I shall try to call attention to some of it.

The witnesses during those hearings included the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] who made a fine and illuminating presentation. Most of the testimony was directed to the proposition that the Board's appropriations request was premature and should not be considered until the status of the Board was determined, and whether Congress reaffirmed and renewed its charter of operations in light of the Supreme Court decisions.

The Senator from Wisconsin made a splendid case. We appreciated very much the points of view he presented. By "we" I mean his colleagues on the Committee on Appropriations, of which I am one. I am also a member of that subcommittee which was holding hearings on these appropriations where this testimony was admitted. Other witnesses were J. W. Yeagley, Assistant Attorney General of the Department of Justice, and John W. Mahan, Chairman of the Subversive Activities Control Board.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. HRUSKA. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it not true that hearings held before the Appropriations Subcommittee were not on this bill; that the bill was not before them; that the text of the bill was not before them; that they had knowledge a bill was pending in the Committee on the Judiciary, but neither the witnesses nor the members of the committee considered the specific bill now before the Senate at that time?

Mr. HRUSKA. I will say that the contrary is true. The provisions of this particular bill were considered. Mr. Mahan testified on them and so did Mr. Yeagley, as I shall demonstrate shortly, in referring to their testimony.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The fact is that the bill was not before the Appropriations Committee. The bill was not considered. Not one witness testified for even 1 minute on it. And the Senator from Nebraska knows it. The Senate Appropriations Subcommittee did not and could not consider the crucial issue in this bill, to wit that the Subversive Activities Control Board will not be able to act at all under this bill unless the Attorney General initiates action before the Board. There was no opportunity for the Subcommittee on Appropriations to determine from Mr. Yeagley, who is a representative of the Department of Justice, whether, in fact, the Attorney General would use the legislation that is now before the Senate to provide any substance, meaning, or activity for the Subversive Activities Control Board.

Mr. HRUSKA. That is true to this extent: Mr. Yeagley was asked whether or not he considered this bill—and we were deep in consideration of its specific provisions when this question was asked—and the restructuring of this Board to be desirable. He deferred because the Attorney General and the Department of Justice had not yet rendered an opinion or judgment on the bill.

However, as we progressed in the testimony he covered these propositions one by one and said if the bill were enacted into law, the mission of the Board could be achieved and would be achieved if it were properly administered.

On the matter of whether the Department of Justice has an opinion, I shall leave that point to the senior Senator from Illinois, who has a communication from the Department of Justice signed by the Attorney General, which will bear on that point. I shall defer to him on that score.

Mr. PROXMIRE. On page 1076 Mr. Yeagley was asked about the effect of the proposed law on the Subversive Activities Control Board and he said:

> In reference to the possible volume of business that might be placed before the Board if the law is changed, we would have to see the bill or law to say there would be no more cases or a lot of cases.

He was saying they have not seen the Dirksen bill, knew nothing about it, and was not in a position to judge if it would have any effect whether this Board would continue to be an idle sinecure or have activity. He made no comment.

Mr. HRUSKA. That is correct, and the law has been described by him. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan] asked him on page 1066:

> Senator McClellan. Do you think the Board now should be strengthened by statutes, in view of the weakening of it by the Court decisions?
>
> Mr. Yeagley. I don't like to dodge your question, Mr. Chairman, but the Department has not commented on the bills pending before the House.

That, I submit, is the answer of a loyal member of any department when its chief has not acted, pronounced judgment, or rendered a decision on the bill.

On the subject of whether circumstances have changed since 1950, at which time it was decided by Congress that we should have a mechanism of this kind to combat subversive activity, I suggest it would be highly pertinent to refer to some of the recent debates in the Chamber on East-West trade, the Consular Treaty with the Soviet Union, and others. In these debates the point was discussed in great detail that the essential basis and thrust of the Communist Party in the United States has not abated. It still continues and the position and programs of the Communist Party in the Soviet Union have not changed with reference to subversive activities in this country.

I think that case has been made. I shall not go into it at this time. However, I should like to refer to the testimony of J. Edgar Hoover, who testified before the House Appropriations Committee earlier this year.

Among other things, Mr. Hoover talked about the riots and disorders which have occurred in this country since 1964.

He said:

> Although most of the riots and disturbances have been characterized by spontaneous outbursts of mob violence dominated by young hoodlums, involvement of other lawless, subversive, and extremist elements became readily apparent as the rioting grew and spread.

Further in his testimony, he said this:

> Communists and other subversives and extremists strive and labor ceaselessly to precipitate racial trouble and take advantage of racial discord in this country. Such elements were active in exploiting and aggravating riots, for example, in Harlem, Watts, Cleveland, and Chicago.

Thus, I think that we are still at a point in our Nation's history when every legitimate problem and constitutional procedure should be taken for three major basic purposes: First, to properly and constitutionally identify those organizations which are Communist-action organizations and those which are Communist-front organizations.

The second step, of course, would be to expose them, so that the American people will know who and what they are and will be able to judge the origin of many of the actions which they take to accomplish their pernicious and subversive missions.

The third step—which is in the law—is to impose appropriate sanctions upon such organizations and persons who are identified with them. These sanctions would include: First, nonemployment in government; second, denial of certain tax-exempt characteristics which sometimes attach to non-profit organizations and third, the matter of being required in the case of any publication, whether by printing, by radio, or by television, to state that it is achieved by a Communist organization or a Communist-dominated organization. In this way we give the people of this Nation an opportunity to judge for themselves, on the basis of the origin of such material, whether they want to buy that particular point of view or whether they do not.

The question arises: Can the Board be abolished and its duties and activities assigned to the Department of Justice?

Obviously, Mr. President, that question almost answers itself, because the Board is required to make an adjudication. It is a quasi-judicial body. Under the present system the Attorney General presents a petition to the Board and makes certain allegations with reference either to a Communist action or to the Communist-front characteristics of a given organization, and says "We want the Board to make the finding that this organization is in one or the other of these classes."

It is the Department of Justice that makes the investigation. It is the Department of Justice that decides to prosecute. It is the Department of Justice that is the prosecutor.

One of the requirements of the constitutional due process, is that there not be that objectionable combination of duties of investigator, prosecutor, and judge.

In this case, the Subversive Activities Control Board is the judge. Mr. Yeagley covered this point very well at the hearings before the Appropriations Committee when this question was asked and the following answer was given:

> Senator McClellan. If this is abolished—

That is the Board—

> can the board supplement and be complementary to the functions of the Justice Department and render an effective and valid service to our Government?
>
> Mr. Yeagley. I don't believe the Justice Department would want these functions. I believe they are a part of the prosecutive arm of the Government. We would be the prosecutor, jury, and judge, I suppose.

That question, as I say, whether the Board can be dispensed with and its duties transferred to the Department of Justice, virtually answers itself.

The Board, during its lifetime, has acted upon 70 cases. On pages 1054 to 1057 in the Senate appropriation hearings there is a reference to a list of those cases and their general classification, how they arose, the individual proceedings before the Subversive Activities Control Board, the organization proceedings, and so forth.

Now, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the step-by-step procedural handling of these cases before the Board. It will be found in the hearings on pages 1051 and 1052.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Subversive Activities Control Board Step-by-Step Handling of Cases

1. The parties to proceedings before the Board, are in most instances, the Attorney General of the United States, designated as "petitioner," and an organization or individual, designated as "respondent."
2. The Attorney General files his petition with clerk of Board. Clerk enters in docket and sends respondent a copy of the Board's rules of procedure.
3. Full Board meets and considers and hears oral argument where indicated with respect to any preliminary motions filed by the parties, such as a motion by respondent to dismiss, or for particulars. (Board's rules fix time within which preliminary motions may be filed.)
4. Respondent files an answer to the Attorney General's petition. In some cases the Board holds a prehearing conference with attorneys for the parties prior to fixing the time and place of hearings for the purpose of taking evidence. Absent a prehearing conference, or following it if one is held, the Board meets and issues an order fixing the time and place for hearings and designating the hearing officer.
5. Evidentiary hearings are conducted either by the full Board, one or more members of the Board sitting as hearing officers, or by a hearing examiner designated by the Board. (The Board does not now have any hearing examiners.)
6. Following hearings, the parties are given the opportunity to file proposed findings of fact and briefs on legal questions. Where hearings are not conducted by the full Board, the hearing officer prepares and issues a recommended decision.
7. Both sides are given the opportunity to file exceptions to the recommended decision and to be heard thereon by the full Board.
8. Board issues written findings of fact and an appropriate order. There is a statutory right of the aggrieved party to judicial review. Board is a party to litigation on judicial review.
9. Where full Board conducts the evidentiary hearings there is no recommended decision. The Board issues its decision based upon the evidence and proposed findings and briefs submitted by the parties.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the order of the step-by-step procedures had suffered a very severe change and necessity for adjustment because of the Supreme Court decision in the Albertson case. The present law provides that the Board cannot take the steps of exposing and disclosing, and imposing appropriate sanctions, until there has been self-registration by the kind of organization which is prescribed in the law. The Supreme Court in the Albertson case stated that self-registration is unconstitutional. Thus, some means must be devised whereby the Board can function in order to achieve the stated mission described in the law without the step of self-registration. Any amendment that is made of the present act along that line must be within constitutional requirements. The bill before us, S. 2171, seeks to do this. In my judgment, it does so in a fashion which will satisfy constitutional requirements.

By way of illustration, I would like to invite the attention of this honorable body to several specific provisions. For example, section 3 eliminates the requirements that Communist-action and front organizations must register themselves by repealing sections 7 and 8 of the act.

Section 4 revises section 9 of the act, which relates to the keeping of public registers of organizations and individuals that come within the terms of the act. Because of the elimination of compulsory registration—this is the self-registration to which I referred a minute ago—section 4 of the pending bill provides that it will be the Board, instead of the Attorney General, that will maintain public records giving information on organizations and individuals that have finally been determined to be of a type defined in the act. It adds Communist-infiltrated organizations to make the system of disclosure complete.

Section 5 makes changes in section 10 of the act relating to identifying as emanating from a Communist organization its publications or sponsored radio and TV programs. This section is needed because of the elimination, again, of the compulsory registration provision now contained in the law. This section also adds language to guard against possible unconstitutional interpretation of this amendment.

Section 6 makes changes in section 11(a) of the present act, which relates to the denial of tax deductions for contributions made to or for the use of any action or front organization. Section 6 is needed because of the elimination of compulsory registration as a part of that present law.

Section 7 is the same as the preceding section, but it is applicable to section 11(b) of the act relating to claims for tax exemptions by Communist organizations.

Section 8 revises section 12(e)(2) of the act relating to the Board's duty to determine who are members of action organizations. This amendment is likewise needed because of the elimination of compulsory registration for action organizations.

Section 9(a) revises section 13(a) of the act, which relates to proceedings before the Board to provide for proceedings for determinations whether organizations are Communist-action or Communist-front rather than for orders requiring such organizations to register.

Section 9(b) revises section 13(b) of the act relating to the right of organizations and individuals to obtain relief from the continued application of the provisions of the act to them. It also provides means for organizations and individuals once determined under the new disclosure scheme to come within the act to have their status redetermined. The procedures in that action are simplified.

Section 9(c) revises that part of section 13(d)(2) of the act which now authorizes issuance of a registration order by default if an accused organization fails to appear at a hearing. It also provides that the Board shall proceed to receive evidence and then make an appropriate determination. This is to guard against the possible holding that the present provision denies due process. It retains authority for the Board to deny a redetermination without taking evidence if the organization or individual seeking it does not appear.

Sections 9 (d) through (g) are technical to conform the provisions for written findings and orders of the Board to the scheme of determinations rather than registration.

Section 9(k) provides for publication of final determinations of the Board. This is a technical change in section 13(k) of the act because of the elimination of Board orders requiring registration.

Section 10 revises section 14(a) of the act relating to the authority of the courts to require the Board to enter orders determining that an organization or individual no longer comes within the provisions of the act. This is to conform with the new approach of determinations rather than registration orders.

Section 11 assures the continuing in effect of determinations already made by the Board in the form of registration orders by authorizing the Board to modify such orders to conform with the new provisions. It also authorizes modifying any actions pending in the Board or the courts to conform with the new approach to disclosing and restricting activities of Communist organizations and individuals.

It is the judgment of this Senator that these provisions will not only be constitutional, but will enable the Subversive Activities Control Board to achieve the mission contained in the act.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator started his very persuasive speech this afternoon, as I understand it, by saying that while President Truman had indicated the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 would adversely affect the rights of American citizens, we have had 17 years' experience under this act, and it has not done so.

Is it not true that this act has done nothing, in effect? President Truman might well have been proved right if the bill had ever had any effect. But it has not. It has literally done nothing. The Senator from Nebraska has said that the Board has acted on 70 cases. Will the Senator enlighten us as to a single individual or a single organization that has been registered under this act? And the very heart of this act is registration. If there is no registration, there is virtually no effect. And, of course, the rights and duties of our citizens are not protected if it does not work.

Mr. HRUSKA. The Senator from Wisconsin again demonstrates his ability to get at the heart of the matter. The question is, What good has it done? It has done this good: Out of those 70, 15 organizations were abandoned. When disclosure was threatened, they ceased to do business and dissolved, according to the testimony before the Appropriations Committee. There was sufficient testimony given in the trial of the Albertson case, and most of the 70 cases, by publicity and the facts and circumstances brought out, to apprise the American people of just what these organizations were.

And, of course, the fact that the act was considered so harmful to the Communists caused them to engage in the 17-year battle to stultify its declared mission. It seems to me we ought to take judicial notice, or at least legislative notice, of the fact that this act hurts. Through disclosure, exposure, and the imposition of certain sanctions, against the members and organizations, the act hurts the Communist cause in this country. That is why we find them fighting so hard and tenaciously until they were finally successful in getting one section of the act declared unconstitutional.

I say to my colleagues that this fact should be weighed heavily on the proposition of whether or not this Board should be continued and its declared mission reaffirmed by this body.

Mr. PROXMIRE. May I say to my good friend from Nebraska that, once again, what this Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 required was registration of subversive organizations; a listing of the members in the registration; and an indication of where the money was coming from that kept the organizations going—for all of which information one could make a strong case. But as long as not one single organization is registered, the act has not accomplished its mission. It has not done its job. It has secured no information.

These organizations come and go. It is not surprising that some of them have gone out of existence in the last 15 years. But the fundamental purpose of the legislation, which was to require registration, has not been achieved.

Mr. HRUSKA. The Senator forgets that registration of these organizations by their own officials is only one part of the process.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It triggers the rest of it.

Mr. HRUSKA. The real mission of the Board is to identify, expose, and disclose the organizations, once it is properly determined by the Board, in a quasi-judicial procedure, with the right of appeal, that they are Communist or Communist-front organizations. But registration is only one part of the process. That is only one part of the process in the ultimate mission and goal of the Board.

Mr. PROXMIRE. May I ask, if this was only one main purpose of the bill, why does not the Board do something? For the last 20 months this Board has not done anything—literally nothing. The Board says it cannot require subversives to register; that they cannot proceed under the Supreme Court decision; that it would be in violation of the fifth amendment to require these organizations and groups to register.

They have done nothing. They have had no hearings. They have conducted no investigations.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the answer is simple. The Supreme Court said that they must not use and depend upon self-registration of these organizations. There is only one way for the case to get before the Board, under the present law, and that is through this process of registration. Being stultified in that area, of course, the Board could not accomplish its purpose. The purpose of the present bill is to provide a way other than registration for these cases to get before the Board.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I agree with all that the Senator has said.

Mr. HRUSKA. Of anyone who is opposing this measure, some people might ask, "Don't you want these Communist organizations identified in a proper, constitutional, and orderly way?"

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes; indeed. The answer is clear. But we have no way of knowing whether this is a proper, constitutional, and legal way.

The Senator's speech this afternoon was a fine speech, as is always true of any speech by the Senator from Nebraska, one of the most able Members of this body. It impressed me as an excellent argument as to why we should have hearings on this bill.

This is a very difficult, delicate, constitutional problem. The Supreme Court has found the Subversive Activities Control Act, in effect, unconstitutional in its most important thrust. The Senator from Illinois has received from the Department of Justice some kind of mysterious letter; nobody knows what is in it——

Mr. HRUSKA. It is not mysterious, nor is it rarefied. It will be brought to the attention of the Senate in due time, by its sponsor.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I would like to see it.

Mr. HRUSKA. It will be brought to the attention of the Senator in due time. I hesitated to do so now only because I feel that would more appropriately be done by its author. It is a short letter, Mr. President.

Mr. PROXMIRE. But we do not have any testimony from the principal legal officer of this Government as to whether or not the proposal will work. When his representative came to speak before the Appropriations Subcommittee, he said they had not seen the bill, and had not had a chance to analyze it; they did not know whether it would do anything.

So all the testimony we have had was testimony given before the Attorney General had had a chance to analyze the bill or see it. To the best of my knowledge, he still has not seen it.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the testimony of the Senator from Wisconsin was heard on August 15.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct.

Mr. HRUSKA. It was on that date, and prior thereto, that the bill under present consideration was reported by the Committee on the Judiciary. The members of the Committee on the Judiciary had discussed it particularly those of us who serve on the Internal Security Subcommittee. The bill was actually under discussion, and had been acted upon, by that time. I would not want to make the statement that the members of the Committee on the Judiciary—the same Senators who sat in large number on the Appropriations Subcommittee—did not know anything about the bill. The bill grew out of the work and deliberations of the Internal Security Subcommittee.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, what happened on that date does not make any sense to me. That was the most remarkable legislative day, in my judgment, in my experience in the Senate. In the 10 years I have been here, I have never seen anything like it. We had testimony that morning before that Appropriations Subcommittee on State, Justice, and Commerce. That same day, the same morning, the Committee on the Judiciary met and reported out this bill.

If this testimony before the Appropriations Subcommittee was the basis of any finding by the Committee on the Judiciary, it must have been a remarkable demonstration of extrasensory perception, because it occurred at exactly the same time. There could not have been any kind of communication, because it was simultaneous.

And, of course, it is ridiculous to argue that the Appropriations Subcommittee could have any knowledge of the Judiciary Committee's executive deliberations which were going on at the same hour of the same day but in a different building. Modern printing of hearings and reports may be fast. But it is not that fast. It is not instantaneous and simultaneous.

Mr. HRUSKA. The Senator knows a bill does not just pop in to a committee and get reported.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That bill did.

Mr. HRUSKA. It is not something lighted like a match, and left to burn.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That surely happened in this case.

Mr. HRUSKA. The Albertson case had been discussed repeatedly in the Committee on the Judiciary since its rendition by the Supreme Court. The need for a bill such a this, with provisions that would be competent to overcome the obstacles rendered by the Albertson decision, had been discussed, and the bill had been drawn accordingly.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I do not question that the Senator from Nebraska, the Senator from Illinois, and others are very able Senators and competent lawyers, and know what they are doing.

What I am complaining about is that we have no record, we have had no hearings, and a report consisting of only one page plus a copy of the Court's opinion, and nothing else to go on. I think we have received more information this afternoon from the distinguished Senator from Nebraska by far than we have had during all the deliberation and discussion on this bill.

While the Senator from Nebraska is a very able man, I submit that even his analysis is no substitute for hearings, where we would have available competent people on both sides of the issue discuss it and testify.

That is why it seems to me that the bill should be recommitted for a short time, and hearings held, and then acted upon. I have discussed the matter with other Senators who share my view, and under those circumstances, all of us would agree to a fixed date and time to vote on it.

I ask the Senator from Nebraska, why do we not do that, instead of being blind as to what is in this very complicated and important bill, which does affect constitutional rights and liberties?

The Senator from Nebraska and I are certainly agreed upon one thing, and that is that we must oppose communism, and oppose it as competently as possible, with our eyes open.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I think the answer to the Senator's question is that the issue is not complicated. A reading of the record which is available will provide all the essential elements necessary for a Senator to make a decision.

In this connection, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the first three paragraphs of the opening statement of Mr. J. W. Yeagley, the Assistant Attorney General, as printed on page 1060 of the State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary Appropriations Subcommittee hearings, be printed in the Record at this point.

I do that, Mr. President, because those paragraphs state the basic purpose of this act.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the record of hearings was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT OF J. W. YEAGLEY, ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The basic purpose of the Subversive Activities Control Act, enacted in September 1950, was disclosure: i.e., to bring into the open the activities of Communist-action and Communist-front organizations which had been free to hide behind the mask of anonymity, and also to identify members of the Communist Party.

A Communist-action organization is defined in the Act as an organization which (1) is substantially directed, dominated, and controlled by the foreign government controlling the world Communist movement, and (2) operates primarily to advance the objectives of the world Communist movement.

A Communist-front organization is defined as one which (a) is substantially directed, dominated, and controlled by a Communist-action organization, and (b) is primarily operated for the purpose of giving aid and support to a Communist-action organization, a Communist foreign government, or the world Communist movement.

Mr. HRUSKA. Unless we are prepared to say we want to repudiate this basic purpose of the parent act, and do nothing with it, or radically modify it, the issue is simple. One of the facets of the procedures which provided for the achievement of that basic purpose has been declared unconstitutional, the provision with reference to self-registration of the accused organization. All that needs to be done is provide another means to get such cases before the Board for its determination and for further proceedings.

The issue is a very simple one. It is not so complicated that we would need a half dozen constitutional lawyers on each side to define it, and then send the matter back to the Supreme Court—where it will go again any way for another determination after a period of years.

The issue is simple. We ought to enact the bill into law, and send it on its way to another series of attacks by the Communist Party. The party is engaged in an effort to subvert this Government and to destroy it or if they cannot use the methods provided by our Constitution in the meantime to get those purposes accomplished.

Let us resort to a little commonsense, and get at the task of the day.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I say again to my friend from Nebraska that this is a most extraordinary procedure. I cannot recall any case in which it has been said that we have plenty of testimony on the legislation, when we have none. What we have is some questions and answers on an entirely different committee dealing with a different matter. Specifically whether or not we should appropriate funds for the Subversive Activities Control Board.

This proposed legislation was not before the Appropriations Subcommittee. That was not the proper tribunal to act upon it, even if it had been before that subcommittee. There have been no hearings on the bill. It is a complicated, 13-page bill, and deals with a very complex part of our law, which has been found in large part, as the Senator from Nebraska has stated so well today, unconstitutional.

Yet we have been told, once by the Senator from Illinois and now by the Senator from Nebraska, that we do not need any more information, we do not need any constitutional experts to give us their advice.

Of course we do. This is the very heart of the legislative process. If we do not insist upon being informed by competent experts, when we have legislation before us, we are likely to enact and we deserve to have legislation which will be inadequate to serve the intended purpose.

It is especially important that we have legislation that is adequate. We know, as the Senator has so well stated, that this legislation may very well go before the Supreme Court and be the subject of litigation for years. It is most important that we get competent advice and draft the law in such a way that it will stand up and be effective, or we should not draft any legislation at all.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin is an able debator. He is a very able Senator, and I enjoy his presentations very much, particularly in colloquies of this kind. However, I call the attention of my colleagues to an inconsistency in his present argument. He says the bill ought to be recommitted for a short time so that the committee can hear the facts and evidence. Then, he says, we will then act on it.

Mr. President, we have that very evidence right here. I have never known the Senator from Wisconsin, nor most of my colleagues, to depend upon form so much that they will insist upon form and send the bill back to the detriment of considering substance. I say again, and I say advisedly, that there is ample substance here.

Mr. President, I will read from page 1066 of the hearings, at which point Mr. Yeagley was being interrogated by the chairman of the subcommittee.

First, I ask unanimous consent that starting with the last two lines on page 1065 and extending over to the fourth paragraph from the bottom of page 1067 of the record be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senator McClellan. I am trying to find out if this Board is necessary. If it is not, we ought to abolish it.

COMMUNIST THREAT IN UNITED STATES

Mr. Yeagley. The Communist Party is still in existence in this country.

Senator McClellan. Is it active?

Mr. Yeagley. It is active.

Senator McClellan. Is it aggressively active?

Mr. Yeagley. I think Communists are more aggressive politically than most followers of other political creeds.

Senator McClellan. Is there any doubt about its efforts at subversion in this country, in your judgment?

Mr. Yeagley. No; not at all, sir.

Senator McClellan. There is no doubt about it.

Mr. Yeagley. Right.

Senator McClellan. Then, in your judgment, should there there be an effort to combat it by exposure?

Mr. Yeagley. I believe that it offers an excellent means of attacking the Communist method in this country.

Senator McClellan. Would you say that notwithstanding the adverse decisions of the Court respecting the work of and the findings of this Board in the number of cases, and the holding of part of the act creating the Board and its functions unconstitutional—would you say that this Board, on its record, has performed a valuable service, or that its services have not been of such consequences as to warrant its continuance, with the stripped powers it now has?

Mr. Yeagley. I believe it has performed a valuable service. And that is exactly the reason that the Department, I presume, filed the cases against the 44 members of the Communist Party and against the 23 front organizations. It was in order to obtain a beneficial result.

Senator McClellan. Do you think the Board now should be strengthened by statutes, in view of the weakening of it by the Court decisions?

Mr. Yeagley. I don't like to dodge your question, Mr. Chairman, but the Department has not commented on the bills pending before the House.

Senator McClellan. I am not asking you to comment on any particular bill. Do you feel maybe there is a need for the strengthening or redefining of the functions of the Board by legislation, in view of the Court decisions?

Mr. Yeagley. If it could be done and provide constitutional due process, right.

Senator McClellan. Of course. But in other words what I am asking you in effect is: Should the Board be abolished, or should we keep it and try to revitalize it, in a sense, and strengthen its powers and functions, within the framework of the Constitution?

Mr. Yeagley. I certainly could not support anything in the form of abolishing the Board because, as I have indicated, I feel it has been beneficial in the past. It has been valuable. I feel that there may be business in the future. I feel the Communist Party is a continuing threat as long as it is in existence and active here. And I know of no alternative in this area to the present functions of the Board.

THREAT DIMINUTION

Senator McClellan. Let me ask you: Is the Communist Party more or less active now than in the past, in your judgment, as to subversive activities?

Mr. Yeagley. I would have to say it is less.

Senator McClellan. It is less. What has contributed to the diminishing of its activities?

Mr. Yeagley. Probably there have been several factors. I don't know how much of an expert I am in this field. But the party has lost membership since the Second World War, maybe from 80,000 down to whatever it is today. It has been estimated at from 8,000 to 10,000. This has been a continuing drop, particularly after, say, 1948 or 1950 on down.

U.S. ECONOMY AND BOARD EFFECTS

Obviously, we must recognize that the improved economic factors in the country have given the Communists less ammunition. I personally have felt that the exposure involved in these Board proceedings, particularly, as I have indicated, as to the 23 front organizations, the exposure in the original case against the Communist Party, in which voluminous evidence was given as to its purposes and its foreign control, have all been highly detrimental to the party. And I can advise the committee, as I believe you may have been informed before, that the leaders of the Communist Party themselves have been of the opinion over the years that the functions of this Board have been highly detrimental to their organization.

Senator McClellan. That is your belief and your findings?

Mr. Yeagley. That is right.

Senator McClellan. Well, if this Board has contributed to the lessening of Communist activities and Communist effectiveness in its purpose of subversion and so forth in this country, then it is your belief as I understand it that because of that effectiveness and its potential usefulness in the future it should not be abolished?

Mr. Yeagley. That is my view.

Mr. HRUSKA. At the beginning of this colloquy Senator McClellan asked the following questions and received the following answers:

Senator McClellan. I am trying to find out if this Board is necessary. If it is not, we ought to abolish it.

COMMUNIST THREAT IN UNITED STATES

Mr. Yeagley. The Communist Party is still in existence in this country.

Senator McClellan. Is it active?

Mr. Yeagley. It is active.

Senator McClellan. Is it aggressively active?

Mr. Yeagley. I think Communists are more aggressive politically than most followers of other political creeds.

Senator McClellan. Is there any doubt about its efforts at subversion in this country, in your judgment?

Mr. Yeagley. No; not at all, sir.

Senator McClellan. There is no doubt about it.

Mr. Yeagley. Right.

If we go through all of this testimony, Mr. President, we find that there is not any question as to the necessity for recommittal, nor any question that the type of amendment of the law contained in S. 2171 will not do the job.

There is ample substance here upon

which the Senate should go forward with the consideration of the pending bill to favorable approval.

The right of appeal from decisions of the Board is preserved, and all of the niceties, to which Communists seem sometimes to be treated with even a greater generosity than other litigants, are all protected by this act. And the objectionable part, or that part which was held to be objectionable in the judgment of the Supreme Court, has been removed. The procedures have been adjusted, and it will be an effective bill.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have one very brief point to make in connection with the fine presentation of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska.

I think this is by far the most useful discussion I have heard yet of the pending bill. The Senator from Nebraska characteristically confined himself to the issue and spoke very pertinently about the legislation.

I emphasize the fact, however, that the only record we have is not related to the bill, but concerns whether Congress should appropriate additional funds this year for the Subversive Activities Control Board. That is a related issue, but it is not a principal issue.

One of the best examples of that is that even the Senator from Nebraska, able as he is, concluded his remarks by quoting as a statement by Mr. Yeagley in answer to Senator McClellan to the effect that the Communist Party is still active, aggressively active, and more aggressive politically than most followers of other political creeds. The Senator from Nebraska apparently feels this is the heart of the matter. In fact it is wholly irrelevant.

We know the Communist Party is a threat to this country. All of us know this. We want to know how we can effectively, I stress effectively combat it. We do not want to pass another bill which will do nothing for 17 years and then be found unconstitutional.

We want legislation that will stand up. We say that we cannot have legislation that will stand up on tough constitutional issues in the Supreme Court when the only record is a record of testimony not before the Appropriations Committee on the bill, but before the Appropriations Committee on the question of whether appropriations should be made for the Board, and not whether this particular legislation will do the job.

Whether the particular legislation will do the job, or even begin to do the job, depends on many things. It depends on the considered and detailed conclusions of the Attorney General of the United States. We do not have a scrap of evidence on that question before us.

That is why it seems to me perfectly logical and proper for us to return the pending legislation to the Judiciary Committee to secure hearings.

I conclude by pointing out that the court decision which made the Board moot and made it necessary for us to reconsider the Subversive Activities Control Act is an action of the Supreme Court taken a year and a half ago. It took a year and a half to get around to introducing legislation and getting it on the floor.

They now want us to whip the bill through in a few days. They say the bill cannot be recommitted for hearings because it might delay the legislation. With a bill given ac transparently inadequate consideration as this one.

That does not make any sense to me.

I hope the Senate will send the pending bill back for hearings without any delay, with a unanimous-consent agreement committing us to a vote as of a certain time on this matter so we can vote on this bill with our eyes open.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I know the Senator will not deny me the opportunity of rebuttal.

We have had 17 months since the decision in the Albertson case. Nothing has been done.

We now have people who want to add further to the period of time in which we have delayed action on the pending bill. It is unconscionable to delay longer.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President. I am greatly concerned that while we are sending men to fight a war against Communists 10,000 miles miles away, we are not fighting communism as hard and effectively as we should be in our own country. It is a great disappointment to me that in the 17 years since we passed the Internal Security Law of 1950, which required all Communists to register or go to jail, not a single Communist has been forced to register or pay the penalty for not registering.

Through a series of Supreme Court decisions in their favor the Communists have been so successful in avoiding prosecution under that law and they have become so bold that they held a national convention in New York last year and announced they will have a candidate for President of the United States in 1968.

For some time, the Communist Party has been involved in anti-American activities in this country that are calculated to hinder the war effort and to disrupt our society. The Honorable J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, told a congressional committee recently that the FBI has approximately 150 known or suspected Communist front or Communist-infiltrated organizations under active investigation. He said further, that one of the primary recruiting targets of the Communist Party is the youth of America and that the Party has continued its intensified program aimed and directed at our youth. It is common knowledge, admitted by university officials and reported in the press, that the Communists were involved in many of the student rebellions that have rocked our campuses in recent months.

Mr. Hoover stated also that the Communists have either started or have been active in every major demonstration against the men in Vietnam. They have been particularly active in stop the bombing demonstrations.

There is a definite Communist move on in South and Central America.

I know of no problem more urgent than controlling communism in the United States, for if we are to send our men into battle halfway around the world to oppose the spread of communism, we certainly should do everything within our power to stop it here in our own country.

This threat in the next 10 years may prove to be more serious than any international problem, so-called, that we may have. It is absolutely necessary that we take all steps possible to strengthen the law and stop Communist activity in this country. They will not overcome us, nor be able to infiltrate us successfully; but their attempt to do so may prove to be one of the gravest and most far reaching problems we have on the home front.

We should pass this bill now, and also follow through until it becomes the law of the land. Then our interest should continue by insisting and urging the enforcement of its terms to the utmost by the Department of Justice.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, October 17, 1967, at 12 noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 16, 1967:

U.S. JUDGE

Claude F. Clayton, of Mississippi, to be U.S. circuit judge for the fifth circuit, vice a new position, Public Law 89–372 approved March 18, 1966.

U.S. ADMINISTRATIVE CONFERENCE

Jerre S. Williams, of Texas, to be Chairman of the Administrative Conference of the United States, for a term of 5 years.

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following-named officers to be permanent commissioned officers of the Coast Guard in the grade of lieutenant (junior grade):

William W. Peterman
James B. Ellis II
Charles W. Gower
Gerald D. Sickafoose
Stephen L. Anthony
John H. Hanna III
Robert J. Faucher
Harold E. Millan, Jr.
John C. Maxham
John F. Milbrand
Steven L. Benson
Dennis J. Shaw
Michael C. Grace
Thomas G. Deville
Richard E. Peyser
Thomas M. Dunn
Joseph R. Hoosty
Robert S. Duncan, Jr.
Philip J. Grossweiler
John C. Carney, Jr.
Thomas R. Dickey
Kenneth E. Williams
Edward A. Hemstreet
William K. May
Harry H. Dudley
Jose E. Rodrigues
Gary B. Johnson
Nesbit C. Lofton
Robert W. Mueller
Jerald H. Heinz
Edward C. Cummings III
Donnie D. Polk
Jonothan Collom
William E. Fox, Jr.
Harry W. Tiffany
William H. Stockton II
Benjamin M. Chiswell III
Peter A. Gabele
Kenneth J. Allington
John G. Busavage
Robert C. Byrd
Donald H. Van Liew
Paul A. Flood
John E. Lord
Paul B. Withstandley II
Charles O. Laughary, Jr.
Anthony C. Alejandro
John E. Shkor
Joseph O. Bernard
Stanley Winslow
Leslie M. Meekins
Eric J. Stuat
Dennis R. Freezer
Douglas W. Crowell
John R. Felton
Douglas F. Gehring
Gary L. Cousins
Donald B. Wittschiebe
Donald F. Murphy
Edward J. Barrett

Roswell W. Ard, Jr.
Ronald J. Marafioti
Richard P. Oswitt
Michael T. Bohlman
Edward J. Jason
John E. Byrnes, Jr.
John L. Parker
John D. Bannan
Raymond E. Beyler, Jr.
Alphons R. Melis III
Walter L. John
Thomas H. Robinson
Gerald L. Underwood
Adrian W. Longacre
Vernon C. Hipkiss
David A. Jones
Patrick V. Kauffold
Jeffery J. Hamilton
William A. Kucharski, Jr.
Earl A. Blanton
Raymond A. Ross
Robert J. Philpott
Richard W. Wright
Philip J. Cardaci
Ronald C. Mers
William H. Hawley III
Stephen A. Kull
Michael W. Taylor
William A. Lehmann
Raymond B. Freeman
Jack S. Webb
Paul E. Busick
Furman S. Baldwin, Jr.
Thomas R. Roche III
Anthony R. Carbone
Kenneth C. Hollemon
Robert G. Keary
Robert L. Barnes
Allan P. Fulton
Leo A. Morehouse, Jr.
Harvey G. Knuth III
Imanis J. Leskinovitch
Edwin M. Cox
Harold F. Hoppe
Warren E. Miller, Jr.
Donald A. Winchester
Teodore B. Kichline
James T. Read
Merle J. Smith, Jr.
Dennis W. Parker
Gary R. Wilkins
Charles A. Vedder
Charles H. Lancaster
Marvin L. Beaty
Dwight C. Broga III
William L. Engleson, Sr.
William E. Jones
Gerald T. Victor
Donald W. Troutt
Dewain D. Clark
Joseph J. Kennedy
Warren W. Johns
Kenneth L. Norton
George F. Cole
Charles M. Montanese, Jr.
Walter D. Eddowes III
Dixon C. Elder
Jon J. McNutt
Jay D. Crouthers
Robert J. Opezic
Ray C. Gregory
Robert P. Reichersamer
Peter L. Ehrman
Nevin A. Pealer
George C. Van Natta
Ronald D. Blendu
Kenneth G. Coder
Benjamin E. Norbom
Danield D. Mazurowski
William G. Bradford III
Richard G. Hendrickson
John G. Carroll, Jr.
Frederick K. Farner
Clifford E. Clayton, Jr.
Barry E. Chambers
Edward M. Goodwin III
Joseph T. Oskolski
James L. Middleton
Keith E. Nichols
Gary D. Haubold
James G. Lester
Oscar F. Poppe, Jr.
Michael F. Keating
Henry C. Post
Edwin A. Coolbaugh
Dillard J. Tucker
Marcus L. Lowe

The Army National Guard of the United States officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3392:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Glenn Charles Ames, O328307, Adjutant General's Corps.

Brig. Gen. Erbon Wilbur Wise, O1280066, Adjutant General's Corps.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Laurence Bernard Adams, Jr., O396091, Adjutant General's Corps.

Col. James Harold Biddy, O390683, Adjutant General's Corps.

Col. Floyd Leonard Edsall, O555952, Adjutant General's Corps.

Col. Jack Kendall Elrod, O2091158, Adjutant General's Corps.

Col. Albert Lee Lemen, O391248, Adjutant General's Corps.

Col. Van Daley Nunally, Jr., O1167144, Adjutant General's Corps.

Col. Salvador Teodoro Roig, O268080, Adjutant General's Corps.

Col. Charles Henry Wilson, O485619, Adjutant General Corps.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the Navy are nominated for permanent promotion to the grades indicated:

COMMANDER, LINE

Abelein, Herman C.
Ackerman, Eugene B.
Ackerman, Warren J.
Ackley, Richard T.
Allen, James A.
Allison, Paul
Allmann, Richard R.
Ambrose, John E.
Anderson, Robert G.
Andresen, Ronald N.
Andrews, Jack B.
Angleman, Cornell C.
Anglim, Daniel F., Jr.
Anthony, John D., Jr.
Archer, Martin D.
Arnold, Henry D.
Arnold, William S. M.
Ashmore, Jackie K.
Ashworth, Albert R., Jr.
Aslund, Roland E.
Aumack, Robert F.
Ausbrooks, Erskine P., Jr.
Austin, Fuller A.
Axell, Charles L.
Ayres, William H., Jr.
Baarstad, David E.
Bacheller, Frank E.
Backstrom, Robert I.
Baggett, Lee, Jr.
Baggett, Talmadge S.
Bailey, Henry G.
Bailey, William C.
Bain, Robert
Baker, Norman K.
Barkalow, Gerald H.
Barker, Franklin H.
Barker, Harold D.
Barker, Raymond H.
Barnard, Ralph E.
Barnard, Robert W.
Barnette, Curtis L.
Barrineau, Edwin
Barron, Joseph M.
Bates, George M.
Baty, Edward M.
Bauernfeind, Joseph H.
Bauman, Charles J., Jr.
Beck, Frederic E., Jr.
Beesley, Howard L.
Bellar, Fred J., Jr.
Belter, Robert H.
Benn, Joseph W., Jr.
Bennett, Robert W.
Bennett, Robert E.
Bennie, Ralph F.
Bergman, Daniel
Bergstrom, James H.
Berthier, Neil E.
Bickel, William B.
Bigenho, Roy M.
Bigley, Thomas J.
Billings, Randall K.
Bippus, Henry
Bircher, William B.
Blaha, Albert J.
Blalock, David H., Jr.
Blasi, Richard R.
Block, Peter F.
Blough, Arthur K., Jr.
Boeing, Charles E.
Boggs, Gilbert A.
Borgstrom, Charles O., Jr.
Bortner, James A.
Boston, Leo
Bowers, Thomas L.
Bowersox, Earl C., Jr.
Boyd, David S.
Braddy, Don L., Jr.
Bradfield, James
Bradford, John W., Jr.
Brainard, Donald R.
Bramley, Leslie G.
Branch, Alvin D.
Brand, Alvin
Brandenburg, Delbert E.
Branson, John J., Jr.
Brick, John H.
Briggs, Douglas W.
Bristol, Edward R., Jr.
Brown, Bruce W.
Brown, Charles "D"
Brown, James W.
Bruce, Forrest T.
Brumbach, Lawrence E.
Buck, Roger L.
Buffkin, John W., Jr.
Burden, James D.
Burnett, James G.
Burt, Alexander R., Jr.
Bush, Charles L.
Bustard, Francis W.
Buteau, Bernard L.
Byron, John B.
Cady, John P., Jr.
Caglione, Joseph, Jr.
Caldwell, Ronald H.
Calhoun, William P.
Cameron, Allan K., Jr.
Campbell, James S.
Canaan, Gerald C.
Carberry, James P., Jr.
Cariker, Jess L., Jr.
Carius, Robert W.
Carlson, George R.
Carlton, George A.
Carpenter, Malcolm S.
Carr, William K.
Carraway, Terry F.
Carter, Earl L.
Carter, Frank R.
Casey, Edward J., Jr.
Cassilly, Frank R.
Cawley, Thomas J.
Cedarburg, Owen L.
Chambers, John J.
Chanaud, Henry L.
Chapman, George T., Jr.
Choyce, Charles V.
Christensen, Charles S., Jr.
Church, Clifford E., Jr.
Church, George A.
Clark, Fred P., Jr.
Clark, Willard H., Jr.
Clarke, John R.
Clemens, Porter E.
Clubb, Reginald D.
Cochran, James A.
Coffman, Walter W.
Cogdell, John B.
Cole, Charles W.
Coleman, Frank S.
Coleman, Gerard G.
Colleary, John E., Jr.
Colvin, Robert D.
Compton, Bryan W., Jr.
Conkey, Carlton G.
Connolly, Robert D.
Cook, Carroll T.
Cook, Richard M.
Coontz, Robert J.
Cooper, Carleton R.
Cooper, David L.
Cossaboom, William M., II
Costello, Daniel J.
Costello, Peter M., Jr.
Coughlin, John T.
Covington, Gerald E.
Cowhill, William J.
Cowperthwaite, John K.
Cramblet, Frank
Crosby, Russell U.
Cross, Daniel F.
Crow, Edwin M.
Crowl, Otho W.
Cruse, Donald A.
Cunningham, Russell P., Jr.
Dagg, Robert M.
Daly, Norman F.
Davey, Richard B.
Davidson, Harrison W., Jr.
Davidson, Richard S.
Davis, Allen B.
Davis, Jack W.
Davis, Ralph O.
Davis, William J.
Day, Lawrence C.
Defelice, Edward A.
Dellinger, Chesley Y., Jr.
Delozier, Richard G.
Demers, William H., II
Denmark, George T.
Dennis, Edwin L., Jr.
DeWitt, Duane D.
Dickens, Richard A.
Diehl, William F.
Doak, Samuel L.
Doan, Richard C.
Draddy, John M.
Dreesen, Robert F.
Driscoll, Jerome M.
Driscoll, William T., Jr.
Dufort, Emile J., Jr.
Duggan, Frederick F., Jr.
Duggan, Richard W., II
Dukes, Warren C.
Dunaway, Gene T.
Dunbar, John P.
Duncan, Richard D.
Dunnan, Neville D.
Dunning, Frederick S., Jr.
Eagye, Thomas R., II
East, George W.
Eckerd, George E.
Eckert, Earl J., Jr.
Eckhout, Wilmont S.
Edwards, Frederick A., Jr.
Ehleringer, Henry G.
Elliott, James D.
Ellis, James L.
Ellison, LeRoy S.
Ellsworth, William A.
Emerson, David F.
Emlet, Harold B.
Engel, Paul H.
Engle, Raymond E.
Erikson, Warren W.
Estabrook, Robert K.
Estes, Leland F.
Estes, Windom L.
Fahland, Frank R.
Falkenstein, Rudolph F.
Farrell, John B.
Farrell, John R.
Faulkenberry, Virgil T.
Feagin, Frederick K.
Fears, Donald G.
Featherston, Frank H.
Feit, Harry H., Jr.
Fenno, Eric N.
Ferrucci, David E.
Finley, Alden G.
Finley, Hugh D.
Fleming, Francis L., Jr.
Fletcher, James L.
Flynn, Richard E.
Foley, Sylvester R., Jr.
Forbes, Donald K.
Forster, William G.
Forsythe, Forrest
Foster, James R.
Foster, Ralph W., Jr.
Foster, Raymond H.
Foucht, Richard A.
Fox, Albert D.
Fox, Richard T.
Fraasa, Donald G.
French, Jack T.
French, Robert D.
Freytag, David R.
Friesen, Edwin "J"
Frudden, Mark P.
Gaddis, George E.
Gaddy, James K.
Gallagher, Lawrence E.
Gardner, Richard G.
Garland, John C.
Garrett, Everett C.
Geist, Richard A.
Geitz, Kenneth L.
Gercken, Otto E.
Gibbons, Paul G., Jr.
Gilbertson, John E.
Gilpin, Burton H.
Gire, Larold W.
Gobble, George F.
Goldbeck, Lewis H., Jr.
Goldman, Howard A.
Goode, Martin
Gooding, Niles R., Jr.
Goodwin, Edmund E.
Graf, Harry R.
Green, John N.
Green, Richard W.
Greene, John L.
Gregory, George T.
Grigg, William H.
Grimm, William F.
Groff, Bruce F.
Grosvenor, Alexander G. B.
Grunwald, Edward A.
Guffey, Elton E.
Guion, Joseph E.
Gureck, William A.
Hage, Lealand P.
Hall, Berkeley W.
Hall, Timothy K.
Halleland, Henry L.
Hallett, Edward R.
Hamer, Robert R., Jr.
Hamm, Warren C., Jr.
Hampton, Charles T.
Hanson, Carl T.
Hanson, Elighue G., Jr.
Hardgrave, James B., Sr.
Hardy, Martin E.
Harkness, Vinton O., Jr.
Harris, Richard D.
Harris, Robert D., Jr.
Hart, Stephen L.
Hartigan, Richard B.
Haselton, Waring B., Jr.
Hassman, Andrew U., Jr.
Hausler, Carl O.
Hawk, James T.
Hawkins, Larry L.
Hays, Ronald J.
Heerwagen, David D.
Hegrat, Donald M.
Henry, Martin H.
Herbert, Thomas J.
Herrin, Holden R.
Hicks, Lawrence F.
Higginbotham, Leonard H.
Highberg, Roy W.
Hill, Allen E.
Hill, Howard A.
Hilscher, Carl C.
Hinsen, Kenneth L.
Hirstein, Robert V.
Hoare, Robert E.
Hoffman, Robert D.
Hofstra, Edward J.
Hoganson, John H.
Hohn, Henry E.
Holman, Rockwell
Holmes, John S.
Holt, Robert E.
Hoover, Matthew V.
Hopf, Elwood J.
Hopkins, Clifford D.
Hopkins, Mark, Jr.
Hornbeck, Donald R.
Hosemann, Leland J.
Hubbs, Donald R.
Huff, Mahlon S.
Hughes, Frank W., Jr.
Hughes, Ray S.
Hughes, Wayne L.
Hugo, William P.
Humphries, George P.
Hunsley, Lindel A., II
Hurd, Russell E.

Hussman, Harry "L", III
Huth, Ralph L.
Iredale, John P.
Jameson, James N.
Jarrell, Donald L.
Jeffries, Claude E., Jr.
Jenkins, Paul J.
Jenkins, Ralph A.
Jennings, John S.
Jensen, Arlo J.
Jensen, Donald L.
Jensen, Wayne L.
Jermann, Donald R.
Jesse, Harold W.
Jimmerson, Thomas J., Jr.
Johns, Arthur J.
Johnson, Dale C.
Johnson, Daniel C.
Johnson, Homer R.
Johnson, Ian J.
Johnson, Merlin L.
Johnson, Richard "D"
Johnson, Richard C.
Johnson, Robert W.
Johnson, Willard E.
Johnston, Frederick B.
Jones, Cecil B., Jr.
Jones, John P.
Jones, Ray P.
Jordan, Watt W., Jr.
Kaiser, Robert D.
Kamrad, Joseph G.
Katz, Martin
Kaufman, Richard E.
Kaune, James E.
Kearney, John R.
Kelly, Ronald T.
Kelly, William P., Jr.
Kempf, Cecil J.
Kennedy. James R., Jr.
Kersch, Roger N.
Ketchmark, Giles J.
Kidd, Owen A.
Kiehl, William A.
Kiker, Herbert W., Jr.
King, Robert A.
King, William R.
Kingery, Samuel G.
Kingsbury, Ben P.
Kirkhorn, Robert L.
Kirkpatrick, Darrell F.
Kivlen, Alexander L.
Kjeldgaard, Peter D.
Klabo, Richard T.
Kluga, Norbert R.
Koch, Richard A.
Kolstad, Tom I.
Kost, John D., Jr.
Kramer, George
Kramer, Robert P.
Krantzman, Harry M.
Kraus, Rudolf L.
Kreinberg, Alfred G.
Kremer, John L.
Kretchman, Frank C.
Krohn, Stanley W.
Kunkle, Floyd S., Jr.
Larry, Walter C.
Lasell, Max H.
Lasley, William W.
Lassen, William V.
Lassiter, Will E.
Lawrence, Gregory E., Jr.
Lawrence, John V., Jr.
Lawrence, William P.
Leary, Ramon W.
Ledew, Thomas A.
Lee, Byron A.
Lehman, Donald A.
Leibowitz, Martin M.
Leis, Alfred C.
Lemon, Robert T.
Lentz, Charles M.
Leser, John R.
Lester, Louis R., Jr.
Leue, David E.
Lewis, Daniel A.
Lintner, Richard W.
Lisanby, James W.
Little, James G.
Lockwood, Harold R.
Lofton, Edgar K., Jr.
Long, Charles R.
Loomis, Aubrey K.
Lorfano, Joseph J., Jr.
Loux, Raymond E.
Lovelace, Robert H.
Loyd, Rupert H.
Lund, John D.
Lynam, Donald M.
Lyne, George C.
Lytle, James H.
MacDowell, Charles R.
Mackell, Richard A.
MacKenzie, John D.
Mackey, Robert R.
Madera, Harry P.
Madison, Douglas W.
Mahon, Richard B.
Maier, Charles W., Jr.
Maire, Rex E.
Malloy, John E.
Mandeville, Robert C., Jr.
Mann, Earl
Manning, Richard T.
Mantz, Roy T.
Marcellus, Russell A.
Marlin, Hubert A.
Martin, Richard W.
Martin, William K.
Massa, Emiddio
Mathis, Paul J.
Matson, Willis A., II
Mauney, Thomas C.
Maxwell, Daryl O.
Mayo, William H.
Mazzolini, John A.
McAdams, John W., Jr.
McAnulty, David J.
McAnulty, Robert M., Jr.
McArthur, John C.
McArthy, Richard L.
McAvenia, James F., Jr.
McClain, Kirby L., III
McClaran, Stephen W.
McClure, James R.
McDonald, Robert P.
McGarrah, William E., Jr.
McGlaughlin, Thomas H.
McJunkin, Russell E., Jr.
McKay, Robert B.
McKee, Samuel T.
McKellar, Edwin D., Jr.
McKnight, Jesse E., Jr.
McLemore, Albert S.
McLoughlin, James
McLoughlin, Howard T.
McNally, John H.
McNally, John J., Jr.
Mealy, Daniel N.
Meek, Donald B.
Merchant, Paul G.
Merrill, Warren H.
Messner, James R.
Michaud, Robert A.
Miguel, Theodore, Jr.
Miller, Raymond L.
Miller, Richard A.
Miller, William A.
Mills, Joseph E.
Minkkinen, Erkki O.
Minnis, Marion L., Jr.
Mitchell, Joe C.
Moberly, Arthur L.
Moberly, Richard O., Jr.
Modeen, Donald O.
Mohr, Charles H.
Molzan, Edward W.
Montague, Lloyd L.
Moore, Lundi A.
Moore, William F.
Morin, Gene D.
Morrison, Lewis E.
Morrissey, John N.
Muck, Floyd R.
Mull, Charles L., II
Mulligan, James A., Jr.
Murphy, Frank "M", Jr.
Myatt, Bert, Jr.
Myer, George W.
Neander, Stanley B.
Neiger, Ralph E.
Nelson, George G.
Nelson, Marvin D., Jr.
Nelson, Robert L.
Netro, Robert J.
Newark, Theodore E.
Newell, William C., Jr.
Newman, Fred S.
Newman, James F.
Noble, Thomas I.
Nordan, Emile E.
Norman, Frederick W., Jr.
Norton, Curtis R., Jr.
Notz, Robert C.
Nutt, Thomas O., Jr.
Oakes, Raymond H.
O'Brien, Charles J., Jr.
O'Brien, John W.
O'Connor, Francis E.
O'Donnell, George J., Jr.
O'Drain, John E.
Odrobina, Stephen R.
Ohlrich, Walter E., Jr.
Olsen, Richard L., Jr.
O'Meara, Charles K.
O'Neill, Thomas F., Jr.
Orem, Charles A.
Ostrand, Allen E.
Otten, Henry E.
Overbey, Frank E., Jr.
Owens, Robert L.
Ozburn, Forrest C., Jr.
Page, Carroll S., Jr.
Palau, Henry S.
Palmer, Gary H.
Palmquist, John R.
Parce, James R.
Parker, Harry M., Jr.
Parode, Harlan D.
Parrish, William I.
Parthemer, Lloyd L.
Paschal, Joseph B., Jr.
Patterson, Jerry C.
Paulk, Joseph M.
Pausner, Joseph J., Jr.
Pelton, Robert L.
Pennington, Otis G.
Perry, Roger E., Jr.
Pester, Benjamin H.
Pester, Fred, Jr.
Peters, Ralph C., Jr.
Petersen, Donald E.
Pette, Donald C.
Pettigrew, Raymond A.
Pettit, Royce E., Jr.
Pezzei, Engelbert G.
Pfeiffer, King W.
Phillips, Charles T.
Phillips, Lawrence E.
Pickering, Richard C.
Pinzel, Lawrence E.
Platte, William A.
Platzek, Eugene H.
Portnoy, Howard R.
Pouliot, Jean R.
Powell, James R., Jr.
Prange, Eugene H.
Preston, Frank W.
Preston, Joseph M., Jr.
Price, Byron
Pride, Alfred M.
Profilet, Leo T.
Puccini, Joseph E., Jr.
Pullar, Andrew, Jr.
Putnam, Charles L.
Quaid, Marvin M., Jr.
Quigley, Donovan B.
Quinn, Jack Q.
Radcliffe, Roderick T.
Rasmussen, James P., Jr.
Rau, William F.
Ray, Thomas B.
Redman, James R.
Redmond, John G.
Reed, Robert K.
Reed, Sherman C.
Regan, William B.
Reh, Donald E.
Reichl, Charles J.
Replogle, Thomas H.
Resek, Lawrence H.
Reynolds, Kenneth C.
Richards, William L., Jr.
Risser, James B.
Rivard, Earl J.
Roberts, Robert "E"
Robertson, John W.
Robisch, Herbert E.
Rogers, Thomas S., Jr.
Root, John B., Jr.
Rosendahl, Edmund I.
Rosenquist, Donald E.
Ross, Thomas H.
Roth, Franklin H.
Rowe, John D.
Rowlands, David M.
Rubey, Ervin B., Jr.
Rubin, Arnold J.
Rubins, Fredrick K.
Ruble, Byron C.
Rudy, Bryan C.
Rulis, Robert A.
Rumble, Maurice W.
Russell, George G.
Rutherford, Ralph B.
Rutledge, Howard E.
Ryan, John J., Jr.
Ryan, Philip J.
Sabalos, Nicholas
Sample, Richard J.
Sample, Robert J.
Sample, Wilbur H.
Sandsberry, Jack C.
Sargent, Herbert A.
Sarosdy, Louis R.
Sattler, Donald C.
Schaber, Rolph E.
Schaub, Robert L.
Schenker, Marvin L.
Schlank, John J., Jr.
Schneider, Arthur F.
Schoelen, Lawrence A.
Scholl, Kenneth C.
Schriefer, Walter A.
Schroeder, Robert A.
Schubert, Leslie H., Jr.
Schulte, Richard J.
Schultz, Jesse Z.
Schultz, Milton J., Jr.
Schwab, Robert W.
Schwarz, Ira N.
Scott, Melvin L.
Scribner, Henry I., Jr.
Scully, Donald G.
Sebenius, Carl H., Jr.
Selby, Donald E.
Self, William H. C.
Semeraro, Angelo P.
Shafer, Walter R.
Shannon, Rickard W.
Shartel, Howard A.
Shaughnessy, William D.
Sheridan, William R.
Sherman, Thomas H., Jr.
Shields, William B.
Shipman, Junious E.
Shultz, Robert T.
Simmons, Robert R.
Skalla, Derald Z.
Skinner, Clifford A., Jr.
Skirm, George L., Jr.
Slankard, Max L.
Sleeper, Sherwin J.
Smith, Jerome W.
Smith, Maurice E.
Smith, Robert F., Jr.
Smith, Thomas M.
Smith, William D.
Smolinski, Joseph P., Jr.
Smyth, James M.
Snodgrass, Cornelius S., Jr.
Snyder, Carl S., Jr.
Snyder, John C.
Snyder, Roy D., Jr.
Solomon, Jerome E., Jr.
Sorg, George A.
Southall, Walter E., Jr.
Space, David J.
Sparks, Harold A., Jr.
Spayde, Keith C., Jr.
Speer, Paul H.
Spencer, John R.
Spencer, Robert W.
Spiller, John H., Jr.
Spowart, David J., Jr.
Springer, Roy M., Jr.
St. John, Alvin P.
Stack, Richard A.
Stalzer, Charles E.
Stapp, Aron L.
Steckbauer, Theodore C.
Steentofte, Eric H.
Stein, Earl M.
Stephan, Robert A.
Stewart, Thomas P.
St. Louis, Norman E.
Stollenwerck, William M.
Stone, Bruce G.
Storeide, Arthur J.
Storey, Joseph D.
Storm, John S.
Strand, John A., Jr.
Stratmann, Charles I.
Streich, Paul R.
Stull, Donald
Sudhoff, Herbert A.
Sullivan, Don M.
Summers, Gilbert L.
Sundt, Wilbur A.
Surovik, George A.
Sutherland, Donald G.
Swadener, John R.
Swanson, Carl W., Jr.
Switzer, James R.
Taylor, Francis C.
Taylor, Leslie A., Jr.
Tebo, Ballard W.
Tennison, Lonnie D.
Terrell, Fred W., Jr.
Thomas, Robert L.
Thomas, Walter R.
Thompson, James J.
Thompson, Robert C.
Thompson, William B., Jr.
Thorndike, Robert F.
Thorp, John H.
Thurston, Dick W.
Todd, Troy E.
Todd, Walter H., Jr.
Tollgaard, Elmer M.
Touch, Ralph J.
Townsend, "G" "E"
Toy, Frank E.
Traynor, Lawrence E.
Tregurtha, James D., Jr.
Trimble, Dan M.
Trost, Carlisle A. H.
Trotter, Thomas K.
Tucker, Leonard L., Jr.
Tuomela, Clyde H.
Turnbull, James R.
Turner, Keith S.
Tvede, Ralph M., Jr.
Twite, Martin J., Jr.
Tyson, James J., Jr.
Underwood, Leland J.
Vaillancourt, Richard P.
Vankleeck, Justin L.
VanReeth, Eugene W.
Vaughn, Robert E.
Venable, Jack D.
Vestal, Edwin C., Jr.
Villanueva, Xavier V.
Vines, Thomas E.
Vogel, Oscar J., Jr.
Vollmer, Robert J.
Vosseler, Warren P.
Wagner, Eugene R.
Wagner, Robert H.
Wallace, David T.
Wallace, Donald E.
Wallace, Edwin S., Jr.
Wallace, Kenneth R.
Waller, Alexander E., Jr.
Warner, Brooks F.
Warwick, William B.
Wasniewski, Emil F.
Watson, Peter J.
Weatherly, Robert T.
Webb, William H.
Werner, Robert V.
Weymouth, Burton R.
Whaley, William S.
White, Grover C., Jr.
White, Wendell A.
Whitehead, Richard T.
Whitlock, Richard T.
Whitman, Donald L.
Whitmire, Vivien C.
Wigent, Richard A.
Wikeen, Donald B.
Wilber, Walter E.
Wilbur, Harley D.
Wilder, Fred W.
Wilgus, Carlton L.
Wilkins, James R., Jr.
Wille, James E.
Willi, Thomas A.
Williams, William A., III
Willingham, William E., Jr.
Willson, Donald M.
Wilson, Alexander B.
Wilson, Joseph W.
Wilson, William W.
Winfrey, Harvey M., Jr.
Winton, John R., Jr.
Wiram, Gordon H.
Wise, Gerald W.
Wiseman, Richard F.
Wisenbaker, Eugene M.
Wood, Lewis I.
Wooden, Neal R.
Woodruff, Richard F.
Woolcock, Thomas E.
Wooldridge, Edmund T., Jr.
Worchesek, Robert R.
Worden, Dwight G.
Wright, William B.
Wuest Carl I.
Wuethrich, Don L.
Wunderlich, Robert
Young, Casanave H., Jr.
Young, John W.
Youngblood, Norman L., Jr.
Zeisel, Richard S.
Zink, Stewart T.

COMMANDER, MEDICAL CORPS

Baggett, Arthur E., Jr.
Barsoum, Adib H.
Baxter, Donald L.
Brodine, Charles E.
Brown, Jacob V.
Brown, James M.
Burke, Erwin L.
Carson, William E.
Cole, Buell C.
Coulter, James A.
Davis, Richard G.
Dean, Harold N.
Dutton, Bythel D.
Easterday, Robert H.
Fitchett, Vernon H.
Gable, Walter D.
Gaines, Kenneth A.
Gebhardt, Hellmut C.
Getzen, Lindsay C.
Golden, Patrick E.
Good, Daniel C.
Gorsuch, George E.
Grisamore, Jennings M.
Gunning, Jeanjacques
Hartney, Thomas C.
Hayes, James W.
Hemness, Edwin M.
Herrmann, Louis A.
Hinds, Paul A.
Houk, Vernon N.
Jackson, Frederick E.
James, Arthur D.
Jensen, Joseph E., Jr.
Jones, Warren R.
Kane, John R.
Kaufmann, Edwin D.
Knox, Paul R.
Kroncke, George M.
Latham, Wilbur D.
LeBlanc, Gilbert A.
Lewis, Norman G.
Lukas, John R.
McClard, Gerald J.
McDaniel, James W.
McMahon, Edmund B.
Miller, George L.
Miller, Richard J.
Monahan, George F., Jr.
Mozley, Paul D.
Museles, Melvin
Nyirjesy, Istvan
Patterson, Frederick M., Jr.
Pischnotte, William O.
Powell, Alton L., III
Rankin, Charles A., Jr.
Reichardt, Kenneth H.
Roberts, Franklin M.
Robins, John C.
Rosborough, James F., Jr.
Rotner, Melvin B.
Rucci, Eustine P.
Salisbury, Edward M.
Schefstad, Wilbur J.
Schmitz, Nicholas W.
Schrader, William A., Jr.
Slemmons, Barton K.
Stevenson, Andrew W., Jr.
Thomas, Wendell C.
Trettel, Raymond J.
Valaske, Martin J.
VanHouten, Robert J.
Vasquez, Mario A.
Viele, Billy D.
Vincent, John T.
Wiggs, Alfred E., II
Wilson, George L.
Wilson, James E., Jr.

COMMANDER, SUPPLY CORPS

Andrus, Harold R., Jr.
Armstrong, George K.
Baker, James J., Jr.
Ball, Thomas F., Jr.
Barber, Ray C.
Bauer, Robert F.
Baunsgard, Perry E.
Bayers, John A.
Bozewicz, John E.
Brown, Everett G.
Brown, Robert M.
Cloutier, Norman L.
Davis, James B.
DeVilbiss, Robert J.
Donley, Harold C., Jr.
Dughi, Carl M.
Dunham, Donald J., Jr.
Ely, William B., Jr.
Foster, Paul L.
Francis, Evans J.
Fussell, Theodore J.
Gove, Jack E.
Graham, Robert B.
Greenberg, Edwin G.
Halperin, George B.
Hamilton, William C., Jr.
Hammond, James E.
Henderson, John M.
Hudson, Richard S.
Hutchinson, Arthur E.
James, Billy M.
Johnson, Ernie F.
Jones, Durton H.
Killebrew, Thomas E.
Kreissl, Leary B.
Leonard, William N., Jr.
Lynn, James W.
Maynard, Frank T.
McClintock, Harry C.
McNally, Joseph J.
Mija, Theodore
Mitchell, Billy R.
Morrow, David F.
Mulligan, Thomas J., Jr.
Paul, Charles B., III
Peterman, Edward E.
Pettijohn, Thomas P.
Piazza, Thomas J.
Porter, Orland A., Jr.
Puleo, Joseph A.
Ringhausen, Robert L.
Rippert, Donald J.
Rixey, Charles W.
Rudzinski, Anthony W.
Sappanos, Louis M.
Shealy, Oscar C., Jr.
Simcich, Alfred F.
Stevens, Robert J.
Stubbs, Raymond C.
Tveita, Reynold C.
Wasson, John A.
Watson, Lawrence A.
Webb, Davis L.
Welge, Harry K.
Will, James C.
Wirsing, John A.

COMMANDER, CHAPLAIN CORPS

Berger, John W.
Bergeur, John P. X.
Canfield, Robert A.
Clayton, Walter B. Jr.
Condit, John C.
Conte, James W.
Crawford, Jack V.
Croston, Calvin J.
Dillard, Donald H.
Dimino, Joseph T.
Feagins, Walter B. Jr.
Ferreri, Peter J.
Flatley, Eugene T.
Ford, Thaine E.
Frimenko, Michael
Fuller, William C.
Gardner, Calvin G.
Geary, Joseph F.
Gibbons, Martin F.
Hammond, Edward P.
Hardage, Owen A., Jr.
Heaney, Harold V.
Heath, Robert H.
Hershberger, John R., Jr.
Hill, Rodger F.
Hitchens, Walter C.
Holland, Harry W., Jr.
Hollis, William F., Jr.
Howard, William R.
Howland, Barker C.
Huffman, William W.
Ingebretson, Ervin D.
Insko, Myron C.
Jenkins, Charles L.
Jones, Asa W.
Karras, Nick S.
Keen, Homer E., Jr.
Kicklighter, Edward H.
Lang, Robert F.
Lemaster, Donald C.
McDonald, Leo J.
Mole, Robert L.
Moore, Withers M.
Moye, Thomas E.
Nelson, Everett B.
Nerthling, Edwin J.
O'Brien, Robert P.
Otto, Albert J.
Perry, Johnie L.
Rittenhouse, James C.
Ryan, Joseph E.
Samuel, William R.
Stewart, Dell F., Jr.
Stroman, Henry W.
Szczesny, Charles A.
Veltman, Dean K.
Winterhoff, Norman E.
Zeller, Kenneth P.

COMMANDER, CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Anderson, Richard E.
Bourne, William A.
Butler, Charles W.
Foley, Richard L.
Forehand, Paul W.
Hoffman, James I.
Jones, Robert L.
Kimmick, Varne M.
Litke, Robert A.
Mueller, William A.
Phelps, Pharo A.
Raber, Robert R.
Trueblood, Donald R.
Wagner, Walter R.
Whipple, Caryll R.
Wingast, Stanley

COMMANDER, DENTAL CORPS

Abbott, Paul L.
Ainle, James E., Jr.
Anderson, John "T"
Armstrong, William P.
Bohacek, Joseph R.
Bowers, Gerald M.
Bradley, Kenton T.
Chutter, Reinald J.
Clarke, Homer
Cowen, Charles E., Jr.
Deaton, Herbert C.
Elliott, James R.
Enoch, James D.
Evans, Charles G.
Falcone, Philip R.
Fields, Robert E.
Flagg, Roger H.
Foster, Richard D.
Freeburn, Harold E., Jr.
Garman, Thomas A.
Gorman, Walter J.
Grandich, Russell A.
Granger, Ronald G.
Hardin, Jefferson F.
Hays, James W.
Hegley, John H.
Hembre, Lloyd E.
Hiatt, William R.
Hodson, Harold W.
Hoffius, Edwin L.
Holmes, John B.
Hyde, Jack E.
Hylton, Roscoe P., Jr.
Johnson, Dean L.
Kelley, John P.
Kelley, William P.
Klecinic, Edward P.
Little, Earl E., Jr.
Luther, Norman K.
McKean, Thomas W.
McKinnon, John A., Jr.
Moore, Frank B.
Nolf, Robert S.
Orrahood, Robert H.
Pebley, Harry C.
Perand, Steven W.
Phillips, James W.
Pinkley, Virgil A.
Pistocco, Louis R.
Prange, William H.
Reid, Albert F.
Ruliffson, Franklin R.
Sazima, Henry J.
Shirley, Robert E.
Shreve, William B., Jr.
Slagle, Lowell E.
Smith, Albert R.
Stanley, James H.
Sydow, Paul J.
Taylor, "B" Frank
Tenca, Joseph I.
Terry, Bill C.
Thomason, Robert R.
Thompson, Robert G.
Tow, Herman D., Jr.
Westcott, Maurice E.
Whatley, Thomas L.
Wilson, James M.
Wooden, Robert A.
Woodland, Everan C., Jr.
Woody, Wilton G.

COMMANDER, MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Barkley, Lucien E.
Beam, Walter E., Jr.
Bergquist, Melvin D., Jr.
Berry, Newell H.
Boggs, Clifford W.
Charles, John P.
Courtney, John C.
Dempewolf, Eugene H.
Dewitt, Richard G.
Douglas, George P.
Duffey, William S.
Flaherty, Edward M.
Freeman, Noel L.
Gay, Laverne W.
Gehring, Jack H.
Gellman, Martin
Goodrich, Neil E., Jr.
Huber, Godfrey S.
Jones, William H.
Kaufman, Louis R.
Keating, Katherine
Lacy, Dexter J.
Laedtke, Ralph H.
Lee, Raymond W.
Levich, Calman
Marsh, William G., Jr.
McGuire, Francis E.
McIlraith, James D.
McMahon, Talmadge G.
McMichael, Allen E.
Miller, Edwin B.
Pruitt, John D.
Reed, Robert F.
Sanders, James M.
Schlamm, Norbert A.
Schwab, Albert J.
Stiles, Thomas R.
Still, Donald E.
Sykes, Stanley E.
Testa, Michele J.

Tober, Theodore W.
Wheeler, Thomas E.
Zaller, Frank A.

COMMANDER, NURSE CORPS

Conder, Maxine
Dalmaso, Amelia M.
Davis, Alice L.
Eberhardt, Marie
Gagnon, Eva M.
Gardill, Norma H.
Hogan, Hazel L.
Miller, Jean L.
Parent, Shirley M.
Pojeky, Ruth M.
Polignone, Josephine M.
Stipe, Gloria J.
Stone, Charlotte R.
Troskoski, Dolores
Weeter, Bessie R.
Williams, Alice K.

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, LINE

Abbott, Leonard J.
Adams, Billy J.
Adams, John L.
Aden, Melvin O.
Ager, Snowden C.
Agnew, William F.
Ailes, John W., IV
Ake, Charles P.
Alberts, Richard P.
Albritton, Charles R.
Alderson, Donald M., Jr.
Alecxih, Donald A.
Alexander, Howard W.
Alexander, James W.
Allen, Galen B.
Allen, John C.
Alligood, Bruce T., Jr.
Ammann, Robert E.
Anderson, Erns M.
Anderson, George R.
Anderson Robert G.
Anthony, Charles B.
Arcelle, Mark, Jr.
Arthur, Glenn N., Jr.
Aschenbeck, Gene W.
Asher, Roy W.
Ashford, James P.
Asman, Robert K.
Astley, James F.
Atherton, Raymond
Aven, Donald J.
Awbrey, Roy D.
Bader, Allen L.
Baglioni, Victor A.
Bailey, Gail R.
Baird, Winfield S., Jr.
Baker, David E.
Baker, Richard L.
Baker, Walter F.
Baldry, George K.
Baldwin, John A., Jr.
Baleme, Leroy C.
Ballinger, Robert M.
Balsamo, Leo J.
Banbury, Floyd R.
Bannon, John M.
Barber, James A., Jr.
Barker, George D.
Barker, William S.
Barnes, Richard A.
Barr, Ronald L.
Barr, Walter A.
Bastin, Carl A.
Batdorf, Paul D.
Bates, Glenn D.
Bates, Walter F.
Batzler, John R.
Bauder, James R.
Baumgartner, John P.
Bausch, Francis A.
Bean, Alan L.
Beardslee, Ralph C., Jr.
Beardsley, Jerry L.
Bechelmayr, Leroy R.
Beeby, Francis J.
Beisel, Gerald W.
Belay, William J.
Benefiel, Oscar W., Jr.
Bennett, Joseph E.
Bennett, Raymond "D"
Benton, Joseph D.
Bethany, Jesse E.
Biegel, Herbert K.
Bigney, Russell E.
Bilderback, John E.
Birdsall, David M.
Bishop, Michael E.
Black, Cole
Black, George E.
Blackmar, Fredrik S.
Blackwell, Jack L., Jr.
Blaine, Robert D.
Blair, Peter S.
Blanchard, James W., Jr.
Blandford, James R.
Blenkhorn, James M., Jr.
Blount, Donald W.
Blythe, Russell M.
Bock, "E" James
Bodensteiner, Wayne D.
Boland, Bruce R.
Bolerjack, Robert C.
Bolt, Roland L.
Bond, John R.
Borden, Douglas H., Jr.
Boslaugh, David L.
Bossart, Edmund B., Jr.
Boucher, Francis T.
Boudreaux, Byron F.
Bowler, Peter P.
Boyd, Robert L.
Brace, Robert L.
Bracken, Leonard A., Jr.
Bradley, Bedford C.
Brady, Frederick L., Jr.
Brady, Joseph G.
Brandau, James F.
Braun, Carl T.
Braun, Peter J.
Brickson, Herbert O.
Briggs, Donald R.
Browder, Edward H.
Brown, Harold E.
Brown, Isom L.
Brown, Leo P.
Brown, Thomas F., III
Browning, Robert B.
Brubaker, Joseph D., Jr.
Buc, Robert L.
Buchanan, Auda E.
Buck, Harry J.
Buck, Wallace A.
Buckley, John E.
Bull, Norman S.
Bullard, Jerry L.
Burch, William J.
Burden, Harvey W.
Burgess, Harold E., Jr.
Burke, Robert M.
Burke, Thomas J., Jr.
Burns, John A.
Burrows, Hubbard F. Jr.
Bush, William L., Jr
Butterfield, Frederick D.
Buzzard, Robert D.
Byrne, Joseph L.
Cabanillas, Jose C., II
Cajka, Anthony C.
Calhoun, William B., III
Cameron, Jim F.
Camp, John R.

Campbell, Gerald D.
Campbell, Harry F., Jr.
Campbell, Michael J.
Campbell, Richard H.
Cann, Thomas P.
Carcaba, John H.
Carlson, Dudley L.
Carlson, Leland J.
Carr, James M., Jr.
Carry, Allan H.
Carson, Burton E., II
Carter, Powell F., Jr.
Caruso, Amedeo B.
Carver, Robert L.
Caston, Terry G.
Caswell, David W.
Cazares, Ralph B.
Chaney, Conner F.
Channel, Ralph N.
Chapman, William R.
Chase, Warren P.
Chiz, Thaddeus F.
Christensen, Howard E.
Christian, Robert R.
Christmas, Walter B.
Cicolani, Angelo G.
Cisson, Arthur
Clark, Robert E.
Clark, Robert "C"
Clausen, Carroll E.
Clement, Carl C., Jr.
Cleveland, Gary M.
Cliff, Gene L.
Clinton, Samuel T.
Coakley, Stephen A.
Cobb, Emsley F.
Cobb, George W.
Cockfield, David W.
Coffey, Roger L.
Coleman, Charles L.
Coleman, Theodore L., Jr.
Colley, Richard T.
Collier, Neuland C.
Colmie, Joseph V.
Colvin, William P.
Combs, Lawrence L.
Comstock, Richard I.
Conley, David J.
Conway, James M.
Cook, Charles F.
Cooper, James A.
Copeman, Thomas H., Jr.
Corcoran, Martin F.
Cornett, Paul A.
Cotton, Alfred S.
Coupe, Richard H.
Courtney, Warren P., Jr.
Coward, Alton A., Jr.
Cowles, Robert R.
Craig, Lee R.
Crawford, Robert E.
Creech, Worley Y., Jr.
Creighton, Perry F., Jr.
Crider, James A.
Crozier, Robert A.
Crummer, James F.
Cummings, Joseph D.
Currie, Raymond M.
Curtis, John G., Jr.
Cutchen, Paul O.
Daleke, Richard A.
D'Aloia, John, Jr.
Daly, Paul S.
Dartnell, William H.
Daus, Rudolph H.
Davis, George W., Jr.
Davis, Harry L.
Davis, Richard C.
Davis, Richard H.
Dawson, Albert L.
Deal, James W.
Dean, Ronald I.
Debroder, Glen G.
DeGroff, James L.
Deibert, Bernard N.
DeLano, George B.
Delgiudice, David
Delozier, James L.
Demmin, Lester F.
Dennison, Daniel C.
Denton, Terry J.
Deshler, William A.
Devalois, Edwin W.
DeVito, Vincent H.
DiBona, Charles J.
Dicarlo, Vincent A.
Dickson, George K.
Diehm, William C., III
Dietz, Warren C.
Dillon, John F.
Dingle, James W., Jr.
Dixon, Max W.
Doheny, Vincent
Donnelly, Verne G.
Donovan, Ian E. M.
Doonan, Robert J.
Dopazo, Anthony J.
Dougherty, Gerald P.
Dougherty, James M.
Downing, Thomas P.
Doyle, Robert C.
Duffy, Francis J.
Dunn, Joseph J.
Dunne, Francis R.
Dupree, Richard E.
Durbin, Robert H., Jr.
Durgin, David A.
Easton, Ervin R.
Eaves, James S.
Eckels, Donald E.
Edberg, Walter O.
Edson, Charles T.
Eidsmoe, Norman E.
Elam, David L.
Elder, William N.
Elliott, Charles P.
Elliott, Fredrick H.
Emery, Robert E.
Emery, Thomas R. M.
Emmett, Joseph R.
Englert, Robert J.
Erickson, Kenneth J.
Ervin, Billy M.
Estocin, Michael J.
Etcheson, Gerald R.
Evans, Irvin R.
Evans, James J.
Evans, Richard P.
Evans, Thomas G.
Everett, Lauren R.
Evrard, Leroy
Exom, Roger M.
Fairchild, Joseph D.
Fall, Robert H., III
Fancher, Allen P.
Farino, Francis J.
Farris, David E.
Fassett, Harold S., Jr.
Feakes, George E., Jr.
Fegan, Joseph H.
Fend, Clarence E., Jr.
Ferguson, Sam A.
Ferrier, Harry H.
Fetterman, John H., Jr.
Fillingane, Hulon P.
Finch, Albert
Fink, Jerome I.
Finke, Walter J., Jr.
Fischer, Herman V., Jr.
Fisher, John C.
Fisk, Harold W.
Fitzgerald, John
Fix, Vernon H.
Fladager, Myles E.
Flanigan, John E., Jr.
Fleming, James T., Jr.
Fleury, Clement E.
Flick, John P.
Flight, John W., Jr.
Florin, Donald E.
Flowers, Walter R.
Foard, Wyatte F., Jr.
Foley, Harvey D.
Folta, Daniel A.
Fonda, Raymond C.
Foote, Theodore P.
Ford, James N.
Ford, Wilbur S.
Fountain, Robert R., Jr.
Fox, Evarts C., Jr.
Francis, Nigel D.
Francke, Robert L.
Frecker, David A.
Frederick, Peter G.
French, Maynard D.
Froid, James C.
Fryksdale, Frans H.
Fueston, Vernon M., Jr.
Fulford, John A.
Fulk, Gerald A.
Fuller, Milo W.
Fullerton, Richard F.
Fulton, Elbert M., Jr.
Funck, James R.
Furlong, George M., Jr.
Gaffrey, Leo J.
Galinsky, Jerome J.
Gallagher, John W.
Gallagher, Patrick J.
Galloway, Edward D.
Gammell, Clark M.
Gardner, Geoffrey L.
Garrow, Jack A.
Gasser, Thomas A.
Gauthey, Jules R.
Geer, Richard G.
Gehring, Gary J.
Gerhan, Charles F., Jr.
Gerl, Neil D.
Gerrity, William J.
Giedzinski, Henry B.
Gilchrist, Richard B.
Gildea, John F.
Gilliamsen, Donald A.
Gilmore, Joseph M.
Gilmore, Kenneth D.
Glade, Gerald L.
Gleim, James M.
Goetz, Robert B.
Golanka, Stanley R.
Gonzalez, Alfred H.
Gooden, Milford I.
Gooding, Charles L., Jr.
Gore, James R.
Gottfried, Howard L.
Grady, Michael T.
Graf, Howard F.
Grafius, Guy A. B.
Graham, Joel H.
Graham, Roger L.
Grant, Edwin H., Jr.
Grantman, Roger H.
Granum, Roger B.
Graue, Clifford R.
Greathouse, Edwin A.
Greene, George W., Jr.
Greene, James F., Jr.
Greenhalgh, William T., Jr.
Grego, James M.
Gregory, Nelson B.
Grider, Billy F.
Griffin, James L.
Griffing, Edward P.
Grimes, Laurence H., Jr.
Grothe, Henry J.
Grozen, Paul B.
Grundy, Charles D.
Grunenwald, John W.
Guerra, Albert H.
Guidry, Rodney R.
Guilday, Daniel S.
Guille, Sherred L.
Guimond, Gordon R.
Gunther, Howard P.
Hagee, Charles "R"
Hagen, Elmer C.
Hager, Donald G.
Hague, John D.
Haines, Collins H.
Halle, "S" Portland, III
Hamilton, David G.
Hamilton, Harry D.
Hamilton, Robert B.
Hammond, Leroy L.
Haney, Norman L.
Hanson, John I.
Hanson, Robert P.
Harden, Thad H.
Harlow, Bruce A.
Harmon, James O.
Harmony, Lee D., Jr.
Harper, Elwood N.
Harter, John V.
Hartsaw, David R.
Harvey, Donald L.
Harvey, Neil L.
Harvey, Richard M.
Hastoglis, Anthony A.
Hayes, Fay C.
Hazle, Hugh A.
Heckman, Donald C.
Hellinger, Richard L.
Hendricks, Richard A.
Hendricks, George H.
Hendrickson, Claude F., Jr.
Henry, Albert L., Jr.
Henry, Jack A.
Henry, William F.
Hepworth, Robert W.
Herberger, Albert J.
Hernandez, Diego E.
Herndon, Franklin C., Jr.
Herzog, Louis L.
Hettinger, Louis P.
Heyl, William E.
Hickey, John A.
Higgins, Leo A.
Highfill, Kenneth L.
Hine, Paul M., Jr.
Hine, Raymond W.
Hine, William G.
Hinger, Carl K.
Hinton, Robert M.
Hoehne, Ralph L.
Hogan, George C.
Hogg, Robert L.
Holderness, Robert T., Jr.
Holland, William J., Jr.
Hollinshead, William G.
Holloway, Lowell J.
Holman, Robert A., Jr.
Hoover, Harry A.
Horne, Hainyard L., Jr.
Hosepian, Edward S.
Hosier, Charles S.
Hoskins, Perry D.
Houston, Chester E.
Howatt, Gerald J.
Howells, David A.
Hubbard, Henry L.
Huggins, Harry L.
Hughes, Richard M.
Hughlett, David E.
Hunley, Charles C.
Hunt, Herman L.
Hunt, James H.
Hunt, Richard L.
Hurst, Lee R.
Ives, Clarence D.
Ives, Richard H.
Jackson, George L.
Jackson, Robert S.
James, Harry R., III
Janes, William E., Jr.
Janus, Anthony, Jr.
Jardine, Edward F., Jr.
Jaudon, Johns P.
Jefferis, Lawrence R.
Jenkins, James R., Jr.
Jenkins, John C.
Jenkins, John S.
Jensen, Carl T.
Johnson, Billie D.
Johnson, George L.
Johnson, Grant R.
Johnson, John R.
Johnson, Lauren A.
Johnson, Raymond F., Jr.
Johnson, Roger D.
Johnson, Thomas J.
Johnson, Virgil J.
Johnson, William J., Jr.
Johnson, William T.
Johnston, Fred W., Jr.
Jones, Gerald L.
Jones, Harry W.
Jones, John L.
Jones, Roycroft C., Jr.
Jordan, Arliss L.
Jordan, Douglas S.
Judd, Robert G.
Jumper, Eugene A., Jr.
Jurgensen, Kenneth I.
Kaag, William C.
Kaiser, Donald S.
Karlen, James H.
Katzman, Marvin S.
Keaney, Mark J.
Keene, Thomas J.
Keener, Delbert V.
Keery, Jerry L.
Keil, Louis D.
Keiser, Robert B.
Keith, Clyde R.
Keller, Constantine C., III
Kellerman, Donald W.
Kelly, Donald C.
Kelly, Francis D.
Kendra, Robert J.
Kennedy, Calvin E.
Kennedy, Jack M.
Kennington, William A.
Kerrigan, Robert J.
Keys, Robert C.
Kiefaber, Thomas G.
Kiehl, Richard L.
Kilborn, Edgar L.
Kingston, Edward A.
Kingston, John J., Jr.
Kirby, Alexander G., Jr
Klugman, Dale R.
Klusmann, Charles F.
Knapp, Franklin P.
Knepper, Robert R., Jr
Knoth, Larence W., Sr
Kobler, Robert H.
Koch, Richard J., Jr.
Koehler, Robert L.
Koester, Earl C., II
Koester, Frederick H., Jr.
Kohloff, Donald A.
Kohn, Edwin R., Jr.
Kois, John R.
Kolaras, Demosthenes N.
Kopfman, Theodore F.
Kother, Charles G.
Krag, George H.
Kraus, Kenneth E.
Krienke, Henry P.
Kronzer, Joseph J., Jr.
Krueger, Richard H.
Kucera, Ronald C.
Kugler, Valarius E.
Kuligowski, Theodore J.
Kuplinski, Stanley J.
Lachut, Herbert M.
Lake, Rodney D.
Lam, Chapman L.
Lambert, Russell G.
Lamers, John P.
Langston, Thomas J.
Lapp, Charles B.
Larson, John P.
Laughlin, Alvin T.
Lavallee, William F.
Lawhon, Eugene M.
Lawniczak, George E., Jr.
Laye, John E.
Layn, Samuel W.
Leaver, John M., Jr.
Lee, Leonard M.
Lee, Melvin R.
Lenardi, Donald M.
Leo, Leonard
Leopold, Robert K.
Lett, Raymond E.
Levey, Gerald
Lewis, John R., Jr.
Lewis, Joseph C.
Lighton, Paul G.
Ligon, Richard R.
Lilienthal, Donald H.
Lindsey, Austin M.
Linehan, Donald B.
Lipford, William L.
Liptak, Richard D.
Locke, William J.
Lockhart, John V.
Lohrey, Thomas E., Jr.
Long, John F.
Looby, Robert J.
Loomis, Robert R.
Lotton, Donald E.
Lotze, Herbert E., Jr.
Love, John J.
Low, Joseph L.
Lowery, Willis E.
Luitjens, Robert H.
Lukenbach, Max D.
Lukomski, Fred J.
Lull, Edward W.
Lund, Eugene P.
Lundy, Robert H.
Lusk, Charles T.
Lynch, Hugh F.
Lynch, Will T.
Lyons, William P.
Mack, John A.
MacKenzie, Joseph D.
MacKinnon, Malcolm, III
MacLean, Robert E.
Magee, Donald C.
Manheimer, Donald Z.
Mann, John A.
Manthorpe, William H. J., Jr.
Maratea, Ronald "M"
Marcoux, Louis H.
Markel, Douglas S.
Marquis, Ronald A.
Marsh, Lloyd P.
Martin, Donald
Martin, Donald L.
Martin, George W.
Martineau, Roger J.
Masalin, Charles E.
Masterson, Leo S.
Mathews, Donald R.
Mathews, Richard L.
Matthews, Mitchell D., Jr.
Matzner, Rudolph, Jr.
Mauer, Tommy L.
Mauldin, James H.
McArdle, Stephen J., Jr.
McCarthy, Philip R., Jr.
McCauley, William F.
McClellan, Billy L.
McClellan, Gordon
McCoy, Frank R., Jr.
McCrimmon, Douglas R.
McDonnell, John R.
McGonagill, Eber C.
McGonegal, Donal E.
McGrath, James W.
McGuiness, Donald A.
McHale, Edward B.
McIsaac, Alban T.
McKay, Richard D.
McKeown, Thomas J., Jr.
McKinlay, Archibald, Jr.
McKinzie, Raymond C.
McKnight, Kent A.
McLaren. Alfred S.

McLyman, Edward J., Jr.
McNish, John E.
McVoy, Robert P.
Meek, Roger S.
Meglio, Robert F.
Meloy, Robert T.
Melton, Wade I.
Meltzer, Herbert S.
Mengle, Kenneth J.
Merritt, Robert S.
Meyer, William F.
Mieldazis, Richard J.
Miesse, Walter T.
Miles, Robert W.
Miller, Justin A., Jr.
Miller, Robert N.
Miller, Robert W.
Miller, Ronald C.
Miller, Ronald D.
Miller, Russell C.
Miller, Theodore W.
Miller, William H.
Milligan, Jack R.
Minnich, Donald E.
Miyagawa, George R.
Moats, Lewis D.
Monoghan, James J.
Moody, DeWitt H.
Moore, Gene R.
Morano, Anthony
Morgan, John R.
Moriarty, Jack O.
Morris, James I.
Morrison, Robert M.
Morrow, Richard D.
Moss, David L.
Moxley, Donald F.
Mudgett, Richard L.
Multer, Richard P.
Munger, Burton L.
Munsey, Malcom H.
Murton, David B.
Mustin, Henry C.
Myers, Robert U.
Narmi, Ronald E.
Nash, Gordon C., Jr.
Nash, Owen W.
Nelson, Roger E., Jr.
Newbegin, Robert G., IV
Newell, Byron B., Jr.
Nixon, Robert T.
Norris, Frederick J., Jr.
North, Henry C., Jr.
Nyquist, John W.
Oakes, Winslow B.
O'Brien, Charles M., Jr.
O'Connell, Daniel E.
O'Connell, Richard M.
O'Dell, Jerry T.
O'Donnell, John L.
Oehlbeck, Edward W.
Ogden, Edward G.
Olsen, Walter E.
Olson, Ross S.
Ormond, George, Jr.
Osborn, Harold N.
Osborn, Lloyd C.
Osher, Victor E., Jr.
Oslun, William J.
Ostergren, James E.
O'Sullivan, Richard C.
Overbay, William A.
Overdorff, William R.
Overman, William J., Jr.
Owen, James V., Jr.
Padrta, Jerry C.
Paganelli, John E.
Paisley, John B., III
Palmer, Philip M.
Parker, Elton C., Jr.
Paschall, Allan P.
Paul, Roy C.
Payne, Thomas G.
Pearl, Harlan R.
Pearl, Robert E.
Peckham, Daniel E.
Pedigo, Robert E.
Peebles, Edward M.
Peirce, William B.
Perez, Joseph F.
Perry, Raymond
Perry, Ronald W.
Pesenti, Francis V.
Peters, Richard A.
Peterson, Fred C.
Peterson, Richard A.
Petri, Gordon L.
Pfeiffer, Paul N.
Phillips, George S.
Phillips, James C.
Phillips, Paul E.
Pielstick, Blake H.
Pierce, John T.
Pietrowski, Joseph L.
Pilcher, Howard G.
Pillow, George E., Jr.
Pirie, Robert B., Jr.
Pitts, David B.
Plesur, Jack J.
Plowman, Herschel L.
Plumly, Charles M.
Poe, Benjamin L., Jr.
Pollmann, Eugene L.
Poppa, Lawrence G.
Potter, Thomas B., Jr.
Powell, John H.
Powers, Edward F., Jr.
Powers, John B.
Prather, Walter F.
Pray, William L.
Prentice, Gordon R.
Pressly, George B.
Prosser, Rudolph J.
Pugliese, William N.
Pullen, Luther D.
Rademacher, John W.
Radler, David H.
Raiter, Richard F.
Ratliff, William E.
Rausch, Leonard M.
Raysin, Paul E.
Reed, Calvin C.
Reed, Richard L.
Rees, Malcolm C., Jr.
Reid, Gerald E.
Reise, Thomas L.
Reitzel, Philip M.
Renard, John W.
Renninger, Willard H.
Rentz, William O.
Reszetar, Stephen W.
Reynolds, David B.
Reynolds, Keith A.
Reynolds, Marvin D.
Reynolds, Preston A.
Rhodes, William K., Jr.
Rice, Robert V.
Richey, Frederick J.
Ricketts, Myron V.
Riddell, Alvin R.
Ries, Ronald E.
Riley, Thomas R., Jr.
Riviere, James P.
Robbins, Paul H.
Roberge, Francis D.
Roberts, John W.
Roberts, Wilson J.
Rockwell, William A.
Roe, John E., Jr.
Rollins, Everet F., Jr.
Roth, James A.
Roth, James F.
Rouchon, Alvin A.
Ruesch, James M.
Rule, Robert R.
Ruotolo, Anthony P.
Rush, William H.
Russell, Melbert E.
Ryan, James W.
Salmon, Robert L.
Sample, Chester G.
Samuelson, Charles R.
Sanders, Carl H., Jr.
Sangster, Robert A.
Santivasci, John D.
Saunders, Wesley W.
Sawyer, Allan R.
Schlemmer, Robert M.
Schmidt, Edward A.
Schrader, Harry C., Jr.
Schultz, Earl E.
Schultz, Thomas D.
Schuppert, Vincent J.
Schwaebe, Charles F.
Schwartz, Robert J.
Schwendeman, George C.
Scoles, Albert J.
Scott, Augustus E., Jr.
Scott, Austin B., Jr.
Scott, Gary L.
Scott, George W.
Scott, MacGregor G.
Scott, Ronald D.
Searight, Murland W.
Seely, James M. G.
Segal, Robert "B"
Seibert, Markley R.
Selgrath, James J.
Serig, Ward E. K.
Shanahan, Thomas E.
Shaughnessy, Francis M.
Shearin, John W.
Sheldon, Charles "B"
Shelton, Donald C.
Shepard, Rolf A.
Shields, Dan G.
Shine, Thomas, Jr.
Shulick, John, Jr.
Shultz, Donald E., Jr.
Shumaker, Robert H.
Sievert, Robert G.
Siljestrom, Gordon F.
Sill, John R.
Simia, Richard
Simmering, Larry K.
Simon, Roger O.
Sineath, George E.
Skorupski, Stanley S., Jr.
Slack, Stephen R.
Slayton, Marshall T.
Slough, John H.
Smith, Barton L.
Smith, Charles L.
Smith, Charles R.
Smith, Charles R.
Smith, Cyril P.
Smith, Darrel
Smith, Dickinson M.
Smith, Donald A.
Smith, Edward G.
Smith, John W.
Smith, Marvin G., Jr.
Smith, Richard J. W.
Smith, Richard H.
Smith, Robert L.
Smith, William D.
Smith, William C., Jr.
Snyder, Sherman R.
Sousa, Manuel B., Jr.
Southall, Charles M.
Southard, David F.
Spisak, Thomas J.
Spry, Norman L.
Stacy, Robert E.
Stanford, Stanley A.
Steenstra, George A.
Stehle, Leroy R.
Stembel, David M., Jr.
Stephens, Gordon L.
Stetz, Elias J.
Stevens, James R.
Stevens, William
Stevenson, Peter K.
Stewart, John E.
Stickling, William R.
Stickney, Harold "L"
Stoddart, Ronald L.
Stone, Robert A.
Stone, Ronald P.
Stoneback, Charles K.
Stott, George W., Jr.
Strange, Robert C.
Stratton, Richard A.
Streit, John B.
Striffler, Willard C., Jr.
Stuart, Donald B.
Stuebben, Richard W., Jr.
Stuntz, Harley L., III
Sullivan, Dennis J., Jr.
Sullivan, Florence M.
Sullivan, Richard M., Jr.
Sullivan, Thomas E.
Sutherland, Paul E., Jr.
Switzer, Anton R.
Switzer, Robert J.
Sympson, William G. A., Jr.
Sznyter, Edward W., Jr.
Tallman, John M.
Tansey, Eugene A.
Tarver, Charles A., Jr.
Taylor, John E.
Taylor, Patterson, C.
Tennison, Raymond P.
Test, Richard "Z"
Thayer, Albert J.
Thomas, Spencer J.
Thompson, Emil S., Jr.
Thompson, James C.
Thompson, Raymond L.
Thune, John R.
Tice, George D., Jr.
Tindall, Frederick W.
Todaro, Donald G.
Todd, James F.
Toncray, James R.
Toney, Albert L., Jr.
Toupin, Ernest J., Jr.
Toutant, Donald J.
Tracy, George W., II
Tracy, William K.
Trimble, Delmer
Truman, Ernest W., Jr.
Trygsland, Arnold L.
Tsantes, George, Jr.
Tucker, James W.
Tully, William R., Jr.
Turley, John W.
Turner, Edmund L.
Turner, Lee R., Jr.
Turpel, Joseph F.
Tuttle, Jerry O.
Underwood, Fred S.
Vandewater, George L., Jr.
Van Dien, Casper R.
Van Kleeck, Loring E.
Varhalla, Michael R.
Vaught, Gerald C.
Veatch, Philip A.
Vehorn, Raymond C.
Vernam, Claude C.
Vilhauer, Levern T.
Villar, Emmanuel J.
VonPerbandt, Louis K.
Wack, Charles G.
Wade, Seaborn H., Jr.
Waggoner, Donald L.
Walden, William A.
Waldrop, Clyde E.
Walker, Benny R.
Walker, Eugene R.
Walker, John A., Jr.
Walker, William E.
Wallin, Homer N., Jr.
Walsh, John J.
Walsh, Lawrence P.
Walsh, William A.
Walter, Joseph J.
Warburton, Thomas G.
Ward, Charles W. D. Jr.
Ward, Conrad J.
Ward, John H.
Warrick, Richard P.
Warthen, Ronald R.
Watson, George, Jr.
Watson, Jerome F.
Watson, John
Watson, Thomas P.
Ways, Raymond A.
Weaver, John C.
Webb, John B.
Weber, Richard M.
Webster, Hugh L.
Weed, John W.
Weigand, David K.
Wernimont, Donald J.
West, Donald A.
Westbrock, Donald H.
Westbrook, Darrel E., Jr.
Wetzel, James F.
White, Bernard A.
White, Billy J.
White, Danforth E.
White, Jack M.
White, Marvin L.
White, Raymond L.
White, Robert C.
White, Trentwell M. Jr.
Wickstrand, Don R.
Wiecking, Kenneth D.
Wigley, Lawrence S.
Wigley, William W.
Wilkinson, Edward A., Jr.
Willett, John A., IV
Willett, Richard S.
Williams, David E.
Williams, Gerald G.
Williams, Gordon R., Jr.
Williams, John O., Jr.
Williamson, John P., Jr.
Willis, James L., Jr.
Willyard, Robert H.
Wilson, Derek W.
Wilson, Gordon B.
Wilson, John R., Jr.
Wilson, Wayne N.
Wilson, William R.
Wilster, Gunnar F.
Winchester, Warren H.
Winiker, David R.
Winn, John C., Jr.
Winn, Velmer A. J.
Wise, Stephen A.
Witherspoon, Beverly W.
Witthoft, Ronald D.
Wittner, Carroll H. J.
Wolfe, Glenn C.
Wolkensdorfer, Daniel J.
Wood, Albert A., Jr.
Wood, David E.
Wood, John D., Jr.
Woodcock, Henry P., Jr.
Woolnough, Robert M.
Wright, Robert R.
Yaeger, Ernest F.
Yonke, William D.
York, Howard L.
Young, Leonard R.
Young, Milton E.
Yurso, Joseph F.
Zaborniak, Walter J.
Zadd, Charles J.
Zipf, Otto A.
Zseleczky, Emil J.

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, MEDICAL CORPS

Akers, Richard E.
Akin, Richard W.
Amsler, Fred R., Jr.
Anastasi, Gaspar W.
Armstrong, Robert B.
Austin, Raymond F., Jr.
Bellinger, Sidney B., Jr.
Black, Paul L.
Boone, Jeptha T.
Brodhead, Charles L., Jr.
Brough, James W.
Cavender, William F.
Cefalo, Robert C.
Chapman, Marvin J.
Chenault, Oran W., Jr.
Choquette, Armand J., Jr.
Coleman, James D.
Copman, Louis
Curry, Norvelle
Davis, David B., II
Davis, Gerald L.
Davis, Reginald M.
Delisser, Robert B. M.
Dickson, Larry G.
Dodgen, John C.
Dully, Frank E., Jr.
Dunne, Michael J.
Eddington, William R.
Engelke, Harold A., Jr
Erde, Allan
Fackler, Martin L., Jr.
Faust, Kenneth J.
Fenner, Henry E.
Flagg, Richard S.
Fout, Larry R.
Gibson, Donald C.
Giles, John H.
Goodwin, Joel S.
Gorman, Edward P.
Griffin, Charles N., Jr.
Gypson, Ward G., Jr.
Hagan, Arthur D.
Hanauer, Franklin A.
Harkins, Hugh H.
Harris, Boyd L.
Hayen, Donald O.
Heldt, Robert P.
Henderson, John A., III
Herman, Clifford M.
Herring, John H.
Howery, Stephen E.
Hunsaker, Darrell H.
Huntsinger, Larry A.
James, David R., Sr.
Johnson, Richard F.
Jorgensen, Morton C., Jr.
Joyce, Thomas H., III
Kesler, Kelvin F.
Kettering, Donald L.
Kinney, Robert J.
Lowsma, Henry B.
Lynch, William F., Jr.
Magenheimer, Richard J.
McDermott, William M., Jr.
McGuigan, Patrick M., Jr.
Meaders, Robert H.
Middlekauff, Robert K.
Minser, Allen C.
Morris, Arthur S., Jr.
Morrison, Francis S.
Murray, Wayne L.
Noble, Richard F.
Pare, Norman G.
Plavcan, William G.
Poole, Edward K.
Price, Albert C.
Pursch, Joseph A.
Raffaelly, Nicholas R.
Ragsdale, Julian L.
Randels, Paul H.
Reitman, Sanford
Roe, Robert D.
Romine, John S.
Routledge, James A.
Rowland, Thomas C., Jr.
Rumble, Wilson B.
Ryan, Richard M.
Sablan, Ralph G.
Schwinn, Raymond L.
Scott, Augustus B.
Sennett, Charlie O., Jr.
Shute, Howard E.
Simmons, William W.
Smith, James W.
Smith, John P.
Solomon, Alexandre
Swisher, Louis B., Jr.

Taylor, Thomas E.
Thomas, David F.
Thomas, Joseph J., Jr.
Tolmie, John D.
Tope, Stephen L., Jr.
Tyler, Paul E.
Usselman, James A.
Vanhove, Eugene D.
VanValkenburgh, Wood G.
Vollman, Don B., Jr.
Walk, Donald R.
Warmolts, John R.
Warrender, William F.
Weglarz, Stanley S.
Wescott, John W.
Whatley, Theodore R.
Williams, Wilfred L.
Witt, Frederick J.
Zimble, James A.

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, SUPPLY CORPS

Allen, Samuel B., Jr.
Andersen, Elif A.
Ardizzone, Joseph C.
Beals, Donald A.
Bedford, Arthur G.
Bennett, Charle A., Jr.
Biddison, Ted A.
Blake, James F., Jr.
Brotherton, Curtis W.
Buehler, Cyril H.
Causbie, Edgar S.
Chrisman, Alfred B.
Clamp, Robert W.
Clark, Bryan L., Jr.
Clark, Davis L.
Collier, William G.
Cornwell, Stanley R.
Davis, Robert W.
Delleney, Jimmie S.
Dolloff, Robert H.
Douglass, Jerry B.
Dowling, Richard M.
Ellis, Richard W.
Erwin, Charles H.
Flood, Peter A.
Foreman, Clarence P., Jr.
Fulks, Logan G.
Gallaher, James H.
Graessle, Ernest J.
Hamilton, John F.
Hamilton, James W.
Hamilton, Michael H.
Hayes, Lester D., Jr.
Haynsworth, Hugh C., III
Henseler, Richard C.
Hirschy, Henry E., Jr.
Holder, James R.
Jones, Bobby J.
Kaiser, Robert A.
Killoran, Joel D.
Lampton, George H.
Leal, Milford A.
Lovelace, Donald A.
Manley, Eugene T.
Mara, Ray A.
McLaughlin, Richard B.
McSwain, Billy G.
Mead, George W., III
Mehrens, Arthur J., Jr.
Miller, David O.
Moe, Albert G.
Newcomb, Frank N.
Olinger, Richard S.
O'Neil, James R.
Perkins, James O.
Powell, William M.
Prudenti, Josph J.
Rader, Farrell J.
Ribble, Marland S.
Rice, Richard M.
Robertson, David C.
Rose, Russell L.
Ruese, Edward F., II
Ruth, Richard A., IV
Ruth, Stephen R.
Sellers, Robert D.
Shultz, William E.
Singer, David A.
Smith, Jack L.
Sojka, Casimir E.
Sorensen, Jackie R.
Speer, John W.
Stombaugh, William E.
Straw, Donald G.
Sullivan, Patrick D.
Sweet, Warren "M"
Tauriello, Frank S.
Taylor, Robert R.
Thompson, Jennings J., IV
Tokay, Ronald N.
Turcotte, William E.
Virden, Frank S.
Vogel, Carl P., Jr.
Washburne, William K.
Webb, Carl R., Jr.
Wildman, John E.
Wilson, Donald E.
Wilson, Richard F.
Wright, Walter F., Jr.

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, CHAPLAIN CORPS

Alexander, Don C.
Baxter, Roy A.
Brudzynski, Peter F.
Edwards, John R., Jr.
Elder, Robert M.
Gallagher, Bartholomew T.
Gately, Robert E.
Goffrier, Robert R.
Haney, John C., Jr.
Keeley, Patrick P.
Klapperich, Owen B.
Laurenzano, Roch M.
Lecky, Hugh F., Jr.
Lemasters, Clarence E.
Maritato, Victor J.
McGonigal, Richard A.
McGovern, Francis W.
McKee, Billy J.
Merritt, Milton E.
Milosek, William J.
Murphy, Michael A.
Neal, Aubrey M.
Norton, Lawrence E.
Parrish, Whitney W.
Paulson, Gordon E.
Pitts, Charles H.
Running, Paul H.
Smeland, Arthur L.
Tatum, Robert D.
Vernon, Clarence A.
Willson, William G.

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Andress, Hyneman M.
Auerbach, Ralph W., Jr.
Bair, William A.
Barry, Richard P.
Brown, George H.
Burdick, William E.
Busche, Robert E.
Clark, Jerry L.
Conner, Donald L.
Donaldson, Jacques E.
Eager, Walter J., Jr.
Gibboney, Lloyd H.
Grinke, Walton J.
Hathaway, David B.
Hauck, John W.
Kramer, Robert L.
Lowe, Stephen D.

Mlekush, Matt C.
Moger, Jack B.
Myers, Russell, Jr.
Nicholls, William H., Jr.
Oliver, Philip, Jr.
Phenix, Robert P.
Ruff, Lowell H., Jr.
Shafer, Willard G.
Skrinak, Vincent M.
Smith, Ralph A., III
Stallman, Thomas F.
Stedman, Ralph S., Jr.
Taglienti, Gene S.
Tate, Thomas N.
Weis, John M.
Westberg, Robert J.
Wile, Dorwin B.
Wilking, Richard P.

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, DENTAL CORPS

Anderson, Dale M.
Anderson, John W. R.
Blank, Byron E.
Brose, Mark O.
Butler, William D.
Chapman, Thom H.
Connole, Peter W.
Crawford, Benton E., Jr.
Daughtry, Max B.
Devos, Brice J.
Eastwood, Gerald W.
Gaston, David L.
George, Chester L.
Gourley, James V.
Grisius, Richard J.
Guarnieri, Lewis J.
Hall, Daniel L.
Harris, Ronald K.
Hart, Gerald L.
Hatrel, Paul P.
Hulse, Richard S.
Johnson, James I.
Kellner, Frank H.
Kennedy, Paul T.
Kimpel, William A.
Koch, Robert W.
Lusk, Samuel S.
Luton, Jonathan P., Jr.
McMurdock, Robert C., Jr.
Montgomery, Steve
Moore, Dorsey J.
Morse, Ronald P.
Nissenson, Marvin
Osetek, Edward M.
Preece, Richard G.
Reisman, Paul J.
Rogers, John D.
Rudolph, Jerome "J"
Shoemaker, "O" "L"
Smith, David J.
Stepnick, Robert J.
Stevens, John T.
Tracy, Norman H., Jr.
Trainor, John E.
Walkowiak, Gene J.
Weigel, Eugene J., Jr.
Werning, John T.
White, Warne H.
Williams, John P.

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Andersen, Walter A.
Barker, Samuel D.
Coulson, Harold H.
Davies, John A.
DeCesaris, Chester A.
Devine, Robert G.
Dickerson, Kenneth H.
Floan, Kenneth F.
Forrester, George G., Jr.
Harvey, Billy D.
Herrin, James H.
Hockstein, Edwin S.
Jordan, Thurman O.
Kendrick, Allison N.
McGehee, Thomas L.
Myers, John D.
Neuman, Richard
Passaglia, Martin, Jr.
Paxton, Arthur W.
Ramirez, Gale
Ruffin, Robert S.
Sanborn, Warren R.
Sims, John L.
Skidmore, Wesley D.
Smith, Dewey L., Jr.
Spahn, James A., Jr.
Stallings, Orlando
Tanner, Millard F.
Whitlock, William E.

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, NURSE CORPS

Barrows, Anne C.
Bonner, Helen M.
Connors, Ann P.
Emter, Dorothy M.
Hardcastle, Jeraldine N.
Hunt, Florence E.
Jacques, Nancy J.
Jones, Bernice E.
Kelly, Therese M.
Liu, Myrtle F.
Ludwig, Margaret M.
MacDowell, Nancy A.
Merritt, Patricia A.
Mullian, Sheila E.
Murphy, Loretta M.
Nagy, Bettye G.
Nester, Mary L.
Pickering, Julia E.
Portz, Patricia J.
Proto, Theresa M.
Russell, Jean C.
Sauer, Mary A.
Spence, Laura D.
Spencer, Lelah E.
Stender, Doris C.
Stevenson, Patricia A.
Stokely, Betty M.
Wahlstrom, Willa R.

In the Marine Corps

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of lieutenant colonel, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Vincent A. Albers, Jr.
Dan C. Alexander
Albert N. Allen
Terence M. Allen
James O. Allison
Warren L. Ammentorp
William D. Anderson
Francis Andriliunas
Kermit W. Andrus
Leon N. Angelo
Glen S. Aspinwall
Donald R. Austgen
Earl W. Bailey
Garnett R. Bailey
James D. Bailey
Howard G. Balogh
Glen H. Barlow
Sydney H. Batchelder, Jr.
William H. Bates
Andrew D. Beach
Ray H. Bell
Charles M. Bengele, Jr.
Joseph P. Beno
William D. Benton
Donald R. Berg
Henry C. Bergmann
William F. Bethel
James H. Bird, Jr.
Harold L. Blanton, Jr.
Nicholas K. Bodnar
Charles F. Bogg
Walter F. Bowron
John R. Braddon
Albert E. Brewster, Jr.
Horace A. Bruce
William E. Bucher
John G. Buchman
William E. Buckon
William L. Buergey
Michael Burin
Richard H. Burnett
Richard R. Burritt
Richard A. Cash
Ernest C. Cheatham, Jr.
Jerry P. Chene
Frank A. Clark
Franklin W. Coates
Dwain A. Colby
Francis X. Colleton
Charles W. Collier
James F. Conlon
Gorton C. Cook
Howard L. Cook
Robert W. Cooney
Gregory A. Corliss
Gerald B. Cornwall
Frank P. Costello, Jr.
John W. Cottom
Richard W. Coulter
John V. Cox
Stanley D. Cox
George B. Crist
Richard L. Critz
Richard F. Daley
Jack W. Davis
Marvin E. Day
John M. Dean
Joseph Deprima
Victor R. Deschuytner
James G. Doss, Jr.
Francis E. Doud
Robert Drovedahl
Daniel M. Duffield, Jr.
John H. Dunn
Ronald P. Dunwell
Ronald P. Eckmann
Hans G. Edebohls
Thomas C. Edwards
Earl T. Elstner
Rodolfo R. Enderle
Samuel E. Englehart
John T. Enoch
Thomas B. Epps, Sr.
Harold J. Field, Jr.
Ralph D. First
Lawrence W. Fisher
Edward F. Fitzgerald
John J. Flynn
Karl J. Fontenot, Jr.
David D. Francis
Hubert I. Frey
Donald J. Fulham
Robert A. Fuller
Malcolm C. Gaffen
Kenneth C. Garner
Vincent J. Gentile
Paul K. German, Jr.
Charles R. Gibson
Richard O. Gillick
James E. Gillis
Donald E. Gillum
Sam M. Gipson, Jr.
Robert F. Glancy
George O. Goodson, Jr.
John F. Gould, Jr.
Edward T. Graham, Jr.
Marcus J. Gravel
Alfred M. Gray, Jr.
Dwayne Gray
Thomas F. Gray
Johnny O. Gregerson
Thomas L. Griffin, Jr.
Frederick E. Grube
Gerald F. Guay
Donald E. Gunther
Bernard V. Gustitis
Harry T. Hagaman
Robert G. Haggard
William P. Haight
William J. Hallisey, Jr.
Herbert J. Harkey, Jr.
Gale Harlan
John B. Harris
Robert H. Harter
Richard L. Hatch
Francis J. Heath, Jr.
Robert W. Heesch
James F. Helsel
Joseph E. Hennegan
Charles W. Henry, Jr.
Clayton G. Herbert, Jr.
James H. Higgins
Rollin E. Hippler
Ervin E. Hodges
Charles W. Hoffner
Robert E. Hofstetter
William F. Hohmann
John S. Hollingshead
John S. Hollis
Preston E. Howell
Ernest A. Huerlimann, Jr.
Sidney A. Huguenin, Jr.
Maurice Hunter
Richard L. Hyland
John W. Irion, Jr.
Carl Johansen, Jr.
Edward C. Johnson
Floyd J. Johnson, Jr.
Frederick S. Johnson
Paul M. Johnston
Joseph F. Jones
Vernon E. Jones
Bernard A. Kaasmann
Raymond H. Kansier
Floyd A. Karker, Jr.
Harold J. Keeling
Thomas J. Kelly
Harold L. Kendrick
Hugh T. Kennedy
Ralph F. Kenyon
Richard J. Kern
Charles A. King, Jr.
James P. King
John A. Kinniburgh
James C. Klinedinst
Roy E. Krieger
Richard A. Kuci
Ray G. Kummerow
John S. Kyle
Edward A. Laning
George P. Lawler
George M. Lawrence, Jr.
Joseph R. Lepp
Robert W. Lewis
Clifford A. Lindell
Prentice A. Lindsay
Robert A. Lindsley
Homer L. Litzenberg, III
Stanley J. Loferski
John C. Love
Jackson R. Luckett
Ronald J. Lynch
Robert J. Lyons
Joseph A. Macinnis
James E. Maher, Jr.
Everett L. Malmgren
Martin F. Manning, Jr.
Paul A. Manning
Joseph J. Marron
Thomas E. Mattimoe
Edward K. Maxwell
John R. McCandless
John F. McCarthy, Jr.
Eugene C. McCarthy
Bertram W. McCauley
Frederick J. McEwan
Vincent P. McGlone
Robert W. McInnis
Philip G. McIntyre
Roland D. McKee

Norman E. McKonly
Walter J. McManus
David R. McMillan, Jr.
Don A. Mickle
Robert L. Milbrad
Hubert E. Miller
Donald L. Mitchell
Ralph F. Moody
Wendell P. Morgenthaler
Dean H. Morley
Edward C. Morris
Wilbur J. Morris
Donald R. Navorska
Charles L. Nesbit
Charles C. Newmark
Bruce C. Ogilvie
Arthur S. Ohlgren
James H. Olds
Joseph H. Oliver, Jr.
Donald P. Ostlund
Wilford E. Overgaard
Evan L. Parker, Jr.
Landon W. Parker
Victor E. Patrick
James R. Penny
Horacio E. Perea
Frank E. Petersen, Jr.
Jimmie R. Phillips
John Phillips
Rhys J. Phillips, Jr.
Bayard S. Pickett
Earl F. Pierson, Jr.
Paul P. Pirhalla
James R. Plummer
Gerald H. Polakoff
Rollin R. Powell, Jr.
Robert E. Presson
Joseph V. Price
Ronald M. Proudfoot
Daniel J. Quick
Thomas M. Reedy
James R. Rehfus
Martin B. Reilly
Donald L. Rice
Wesley H. Rice
William E. Riley, Jr.
Fred C. Rilling, Jr.
George H. Ripley
John F. Roche, III
Carlo Romano
Richard E. Romine
William E. Rudolph
George V. Ruos, Jr.
Dale W. Sanford
Jacque L. Saul
Melvin H. Sautter
Joseph Scoppa, Jr.
John A. Scott
John E. Seissiger
Rufus A. Seymour
Harold G. Shaklee
James L. Shanahan
Arthur B. Shilan
William D. Shippen
Don J. Slee
Conway J. Smith
John K. Smola
Bradley S. Snell
Billy R. Standley
Robert W. Stark
Raymond B. Steele
Melvin J. Steinberg
John C. Studt
Rudolf S. Sutter
Robert E. Switzer
Vernon L. Sylvester
Richard D. Taber, Sr.
Spencer F. Thomas
William J. Thomas
David S. Tolle
John J. Tolnay
Kyle W. Townsend
Robert M. Tremmel
Stanley G. Tribe, Jr.
Frank P. Turner
James R. Vandenelzen
Billy F. Visage
Henry R. Vitali
Douglas A. Wagner
Dallas R. Walker
Phillip C. Walker
Charles F. Wallace
George W. Ward
John E. Weber, Jr.
Joseph K. Weiland
William Weise
Joseph J. Went
Walter A. Weston
Albert Whalley
Michael E. White
George A. Wickman
Kenneth W. Williams
George M. Wilson
Charles R. Winfield
Lewis C. Witt
Herbert L. Wright

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant colonel, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Donald D. Amick
James L. Anderson
Leslie P. Day
Ernest L. Defazio
John H. Dubois
Joseph E. Mullen, Jr.
Jack W. Newman
George A. Ridgway
Richard F. Skinner
Harold Sobol
Joe Vuckovich

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, OCTOBER 16, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

OCTOBER 16, 1967.

I hereby designate the Honorable CARL ALBERT to act as Speaker pro tempore today.

JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed be the Lord, who daily bears us up; He is our salvation.—Psalm 68: 19.

Dear Lord and Father of mankind, disturbed by the demanding duties of this disruptive day and pursued by the persistent problems of this present period we would pause again at the altar of prayer to remember that Thou art God, that this is our Father's world, and to remind ourselves that though the wrong seems oft so strong Thou art the ruler yet. In Thy strength we would be made strong, with Thy wisdom we would become wise, and by Thy grace we would face the tasks of this week with confidence.

We pray for our country—for our President, our Speaker, and all the leaders of our people. Rule their hearts and direct their endeavors that law and order, justice and peace may prevail everywhere in our land. Make us mighty in moving along right paths that we may be worthy of Thy blessing and in turn become a blessing to all nations, to the glory of Thy name, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, October 12, 1967, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1572. An act for the relief of Mercedes De Toffoli;

H.R. 1653. An act for the relief of Omer Penner;

H.R. 1674. An act for the relief of Frank I. Mellin, Jr.;

H.R. 2477. An act for the relief of John J. McGrath;

H.R. 6189. An act for the relief of Fred W. Kolb, Jr.;

H.R. 6663. An act for the relief of Jesse W. Stutts, Jr.;

H.R. 6666. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marilyn Shorette;

H.R. 7324. An act for the relief of Dr. Alfredo F. Mendez, doctor of medicine;

H.R. 8254. An act for the relief of Jan Drobot; and

H.J. Res. 516. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution of March 25, 1953, to increase the number of electric typewriters which may be furnished to Members by the Clerk of the House.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 8629. An act to amend the act of July 4, 1966 (Public Law 89-491).

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint and concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 362. An act for the relief of Sofia Dorr;

S. 552. An act to amend title 18 of the United States Code in order to provide that committing acts dangerous to persons on board trains shall be a criminal offense;

S. 772. An act for the relief of Dr. Violeta V. Ortega Brown;

S. 948. An act for the relief of Seaman Eugene Sidney Markovitz, U.S. Navy;

S. 1147. An act for the relief of Mariana Mantzios;

S. 1395. An act for the relief of Dr. Brandla Don (nee Praschnik);

S. 1440. An act to include in the prohibitions contained in section 2314 of title 18, United States Code, the transportation with unlawful intent in interstate or foreign commerce of traveler's checks bearing forged countersignatures;

S. 1490. An act for the relief of Yang Ok Yoo (Maria Margurita);

S. 1556. An act for the relief of Dr. Orlando O. Lopez;

S. 1690. An act for the relief of Juan Andres Lliteras and his wife, Engracia Heydrich Bellido Lliteras;

S. 1808. An act for the relief of Miss Amalia Seresly;

S. 1828. An act for the relief of Susan Elizabeth (Cho) Long;

S. 1829. An act for the relief of Lisa Marie (Kim) Long;

S. 1865. An act, for the relief of Bertha Iturrioz Arteche;

S. 1968. An act for the relief of Dr. Jose Ernesto Garcia y Tojar;

S. 1979. An act for the relief of Carlos Fernandez;

S. 2005. An act for the relief of Dr. Anacleto C. Fernandez;

S. 2022. An act for the relief of Dr. Mario Jose Remirez DeEstenoz;

S. 2023. An act for the relief of Virgilio A. Arango, M.D.;

S. 2071. An act for the relief of Dr. Antonio M. Tagle;

S. 2078. An act for the relief of Dr. Alberto DeJongh;

S. 2081. An act for the relief of Jacqueline Whang-Peng;

S. 2119. An act for the relief of Dr. Octavio Suarez-Murias;

S. 2121. An act to extend the provisions of the act of October 23, 1962, relating to relief for occupants of certain unpatented mining claims;

S. 2139. An act for the relief of Dr. Angel Trejo Padron;

S. 2167. An act for the relief of Dr. Rolando Pozo y Jimenez;

S. 2176. An act for the relief of Dr. Edgar Reinaldo Nunez Baez;

S. 2178. An act for the relief of Dennis W. Radtke;

S. 2192. An act for the relief of Dr. Rafael de la Portilla Lavastida;

S. 2200. An act for the relief of Homer T. Williamson, Sr.;

S. 2216. An act to establish a National Commission on New Technological Uses of Copyrighted Works;

S. 2303. An act to provide a uniform system for fixing and adjusting the pay of employees in recognized trades or crafts, and for other purposes;

S.J. Res. 85. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the 7-day period comprising the first full week in October of each year as "Spring Garden Planting Week"; and

S. Con. Res. 46. Concurrent resolution to provide for the printing of additional copies of certain hearings of the Special Committee on Aging.

EQUAL RIGHTS FOR WOMEN

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to congratulate President Johnson.

On Friday, October 13, at long last he amended Executive Order No. 11246 which was issued in September of 1965 so that the order now protects women as well as other minorities. In my opinion, it ranks with Lincoln's freeing of the slaves.

I would like also to say that I hope Mr. Macy now takes this opportunity to see to it that women are not only protected in promotions but that they are given equal fringe benefits with men in the Federal civil service. It will be much more difficult to promote women than it would be to give them equal fringe benefits.

Perhaps Secretary McNamara and Postmaster General O'Brien will have time to call up those airlines who demand that their stewardesses be young, attractive, and single and notify them that they will no longer be considered for Government contracts because of the discrimination in their employment contracts. If the Cabinet members would just do this then the Education and Labor Committee could quit worrying over whether a 32-year-old stewardess is too elderly to serve your lunch in the sky, and go back to working on other important matters.

Finally, I hope that the President invites Chief Justice Warren over and casually mentions that since the Congress of the United States recognized in 1964 that women are people and that the Executive has now recognized that it really is not too much to ask that the judiciary get out of the Middle Ages and apply the equal protection clause of the U.S. Constitution to women. But if this is too much for the judiciary then I hope they will at last realize that the cruelest and most unusual punishment has been reserved for women, when they are not recognized as people, and apply the eighth amendment.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 10345, STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 10345) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ROONEY of New York, SIKES, SLACK, SMITH of Iowa, FLYNT, JOELSON, MAHON, BOW, LIPSCOMB, CEDERBERG, and ANDREWS of North Dakota.

INVESTIGATION OF UNIDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECTS

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, there have been so many sightings of unidentified flying objects in recent months and years that I think the time has come for a committee of the Congress to take sworn testimony on this subject. In other words, we ought to investigate whether there is anything to this.

Again and again officials pooh-pooh the sightings or the stories. Yet the National Investigating Committee on Aerial Phenomena—NICAP—has accumulated a book of sightings going back more than a decade reporting many instances of dual pilot corroboration by radar and otherwise.

The most recent reported instance of UFO's was that in Colorado last week in connection with the carcass of a horse from which the brain cavity had reportedly been emptied.

I believe that the Committee on Science and Astronautics should be authorized and directed to conduct a complete and full investigation and study of unidentified flying objects with subpena powers. It seems to me that the American people are owed a documentary analysis and cross-examination into this subject by a responsible committee of the Congress.

More important, perhaps, it should be determined whether these objects are by any possibility from foreign sources.

Should this be the case, it is apparent that major changes in U.S. space policy would be indicated. I shall introduce a resolution for the investigation of unidentified flying objects in the Congress this week, and I hope it will be implemented as soon as is reasonably possible.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE MALAGASY REPUBLIC

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, October 14 marks the ninth anniversary of the proclamation of the Malagasy Republic. This proud nation may be more familiar to you by its geographical name of Madagascar. It was Madagascar with which the United States opened official relations over 100 years ago. Then, as now, Madagascar was a sovereign and important nation. While initial American contacts restricted themselves to exchanges of commodities such as skins and salt fish, in trade for exotic American products such as window glass, that trade and the accompanying relations have grown and flourished ever since. Today, the United States is the Malagasy Republic's second largest trade customer. Today, too, the Malagasy Republic is cooperating with us in man's quest for knowledge concerning space, through the location of a NASA tracking station at Imerintsiatosika. How fortunate we are to have this wonderful friend in the Indian Ocean, a nation which is a true bridge between Africa and Asia. To the Malagasy President, Philibert Tsiranana, who led his country to independence, and to the Malagasy people, we offer heartiest congratulations and our best wishes on this historic occasion.

I add my personal good wishes to the Republic's able Ambassador to the United States, His Excellency Louis Rakotomalala. And it is pleasing to us all that our former colleague, the able and popular gentleman from Utah, the Honorable David I. King, is the American Ambassador to the Malagasy Republic.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT TONIGHT TO FILE REPORT ON S. 1985, THE FLOOD INSURANCE ACT

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight tonight to file a report on S. 1985, to amend the Flood Insurance Act of 1956.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calender.

AMENDING THE SMALL RECLAMATION PROJECTS ACT OF 1956, AS AMENDED

The Clerk called the bill (S. 862) to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. HALL, and Mr. SAYLOR objected; and, under the rule, the bill was stricken from the Consent Calendar.

EXTENDING THE PROVISIONS OF THE ACT OF OCTOBER 23, 1962, RELATING TO RELIEF FOR OCCUPANTS OF CERTAIN UNPATENTED MINING CLAIMS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10583), to extend the provisions of the act of October 23, 1962, relating to relief for occupants of certain unpatented mining claims.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 10583

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to provide relief for residential occupants of unpatented mining claims upon which valuable improvements have been placed, and for other purposes", approved October 23, 1962 (30 U.S.C. 701), is amended by striking out "five years from the date of this Act" and inserting in lieu thereof "on or before one year after the date on which the Public Land Law Review Commission submits it final report to the President and to the Congress under section 4(b) of the Act of September 19, 1964 (43 U.S.C. 1394(b))".

SEC. 2. Section 6(b) of such Act of October 23, 1962 (30 U.S.C. 709(b)) is amended by striking out "five years from the date of its enactment" and inserting in lieu thereof "one year after the date on which the Public Land Law Review Commission submits its final report to the President and to the Congress under section 4(b) of the Act of September 19, 1964 (43 U.S.C. 1394(b))".

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That the first section of the Act entitled 'An Act to provide relief for residential occupants of unpatented mining claims upon which valuable improvements have been placed, and for other purposes', approved October 23, 1962 (30 U.S.C. 701), is amended by striking out 'five years from the date of this Act' and inserting in lieu thereof 'the period ending June 30, 1971'.

"SEC. 2. Section 6(b) of such Act of October 23, 1962 (30 U.S.C. 706(b)) is amended by striking out 'five years from the date of its enactment' and inserting in lieu thereof 'the period ending June 30, 1971'."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the legislation we have before us today—H.R. 10583—merely extends the provisions of the Mining Claims Occupancy Act, Public Law 87-851, until June 30, 1971.

This act, also known as the Johnson-Church Act, was initially drafted and introduced by me in 1962 to correct a serious problem which existed in the Second Congressional District of California as it related to certain unpatented mining claims. The second district is largely federally owned, either through the U.S. Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management, or other agencies of the Department of the Interior.

Over the decades we have had a vast number of people file or purchase mining claims in good faith, believing they were acquiring valid title to their lands. In many instances the original claims were located many, many years ago when the price of gold was reasonable and the gold prospector could make a reasonable living on a claim of this nature. There is no question in my mind but that many of these claims could have been patented at that time but were not for one reason or another.

Now, many of these claims cannot, because of the price of gold, be patented and the people who have built their homes and their lives on these claims face the loss of their improvements, their occupancy, and their homes.

It was my hope that through the introduction of the Mining Claims Occupancy Act we would enact a relief bill which would assist occupants of these unpatented claims to obtain, at fair market value, their homesites up to 5 acres of land.

The authority for Public Law 87-851 expires October 23 of this year, 1 week from today. Many people have yet to file applications under this authority. If we extend the life of the existing state from October 23, 1967, to June 30, 1971, this would permit many qualified individuals living on unpatented mining claims—who have been unable heretofore to apply for relief—to submit applications under the provisions established by the act of October 23, 1962.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 10583, a bill to extend the provisions of the act of October 23, 1962, relating to relief for occupants of certain unpatented mining claims.

The act of October 23, 1962, provides that if an unpatented mining claim is determined to be invalid, and the determination is made between October 23, 1962, and October 23, 1967, the Secretary of the Interior may convey to a qualified applicant title to not more than 5 acres of the claim. To so qualify, the applicant must have been the owner of valuable improvements on the mining claim on October 23, 1962, which constituted a principal place of residence for him and his predecessors in interest for at least 7 years prior to July 23, 1962. Such applicant must have made application for purchase before October 23, 1967.

The act of October 23, 1962, will expire on October 23, 1967. The purpose of H.R. 10583 is to extend the provisions of that act to June 30, 1971. Enactment of H.R. 10583 will permit those individuals relinquishing or occupying an unpatented mining claim within the terms of the act who have been unable to apply for relief under the act to do so by June 30, 1971.

It is estimated that there are in the neighborhood of 2,000 occupants of unpatented mining claims who have failed to apply for relief under the act. An extension of the act as proposed by H.R. 10583 is a desirable and equitable program. In return, the Secretary of the Interior receives on behalf of the United States the fair market value of the 5 acres conveyed.

Mr. Speaker, the enactment of H.R. 10583 will insure that these lands will serve the highest public interest and public needs. At the same time, H.R. 10583 will provide equitable relief to occupants of invalid mining claims who would be subject to great hardship and forced to leave their residences.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of H.R. 10583.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 10583 which I regard as a valuable legal tool in providing relief to occupants of certain unpatented mining claims. This bill extends the life of the 1962 act which has proved to be equitable and worthy of extension.

This legislation will affect several thousand residents of unpatented mining claims in the western United States including the Black Hills of South Dakota. In many of the old mining districts, it has been customary for miners to live on their claims. Often when occupancy began, the claims were valid and often productive. However, during the years many claims were worked out, or the economic situation changed, but the claimant continued to occupy and live on the claim while it could no longer qualify for a mineral patent.

Other situations involved purchasing a mining claim as a place of residence by people who did not fully understand the restrictions and limitations on using unpatented mining claims.

It is important to note that the land is not given to the applicants. They must pay the fair market value less the value of improvements on the land, with consideration given to other equities. Fee title need not be granted, but a lesser interest instead.

Enactment of this bill will extend the life of the existing statute until June 30, 1971. It will permit many individuals residing on certain unpatented mining claims to submit applications for relief under the provisions of the act of October 22, 1962.

Therefore, I would urge support of this necessary legislation.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of S. 2121, to extend the provisions of the act of October 23, 1962, relating to relief for occupants of certain unpatented mining claims, an identical Senate bill.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 2121

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to provide relief for residential occupants of unpatented mining claims upon which valuable improvements have been placed, and for other purposes", approved October 23, 1962 (30 U.S.C. 701), is amended by striking out "five years from the date of this Act" and inserting in lieu thereof "the period ending June 30, 1971".

Sec. 2. Section 6(b) of such Act of October 23, 1962 (30 U.S.C. 706(b)), is amended by striking out "five years from the date of its enactment" and inserting in lieu thereof "the period ending June 30, 1971".

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 10583) was laid on the table.

DECLARING THAT THE UNITED STATES HOLDS CERTAIN LANDS IN TRUST FOR THE PAWNEE INDIAN TRIBE, OKLAHOMA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5910) to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Pawnee Indian Tribe of Oklahoma.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 5910

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That all right, title, and interest of the United States in the following described lands and improvements thereon, embraced in the Pawnee school and agency reserve, and in four cemetery sites, comprising seven hundred twenty-six and three one-hundredths acres, more or less, are hereby declared to be held by the United States in trust for the benefit of the Pawnee Tribe of Oklahoma, subject to valid existing rights-of-way, and subject to the right of the United States to use, without compensation, a tract of land comprising approximately five and forty-six one-hundredths acres, together with facilities located thereon or hereafter installed, which are now used by the United States Public Health Service:

Indian Meridian, Oklahoma

Township 19 north, range 5 east, section 16, southwest quarter southeast quarter southwest quarter.

Township 21 north, range 5 east, section 18, southwest quarter southwest quarter southwest quarter.

Township 22 north, range 4 east, section 32, southwest quarter southwest quarter southwest quarter.

Township 22 north, range 5 east, section 20, northeast quarter southeast quarter southwest quarter; section 32, east half, east half west half; section 33, west half.

excepting therefrom the following lands:

(a) Lot 1, comprising 88.43 acres, more or less, located in the west half east half and east half west half section 32, as shown on General Land Office plat approved November 5, 1907, which has been conveyed to the city of Pawnee;

(b) Lot 2, comprising 12.68 acres, more or less, and lot 3, comprising 12.86 acres, more or less, both located in the west half east half and east half west half section 32, as shown on General Land Office supplemental plat approved February 4, 1920, which has been conveyed to the Home Mission Board of the Southern Baptist Convention;

(c) The surface of 20 acres, more or less, but not the minerals therein, located in the northeast quarter section 32 conveyed to the city of Pawnee, and more particularly described in quitclaim deed dated May 31, 1957, recorded in book 2, page 610 of the Pawnee County, Oklahoma, records;

(d) The surface of 20 acres, more or less, but not the minerals therein, located in the southeast quarter and southeast quarter southwest quarter section 32, conveyed to the city of Pawnee, and more particulary described in quitclaim deed dated July 15, 1960, recorded in book 4, page 377 of the Pawnee County, Oklahoma, records.

Sec. 2. If at any time title to the surface of the land referred to in paragraphs (c) and (d) of section 1 of this Act reverts to the United States in accordance with the provisions of the Act of June 4, 1953 (67 Stat. 41), as amended (25 U.S.C. 293a), the title shall be held in trust for the Pawnee Tribe of Oklahoma.

Sec. 3. The Indian Claims Commission is directed to determine in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1050), the extent to which the value of the title conveyed by this Act should or should not be set off against any claim against the United States determined by the Commission.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 10, strike the words "west quarter southwest quarter southwest quarter," and insert in lieu thereof the words "west quarter southwest quarter northeast quarter."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, passage of this bill will make possible a program of tribal development and improvement for the Pawnee Tribe of Oklahoma, on lands which have long been dedicated to uses beneficial to this great Indian tribe.

I commend my colleague, the Honorable Page Belcher, for sponsoring this needed and just bill, and am proud to join in supporting it and urging its approval.

It is hoped the other body will join speedily in approving this bill in the form which the tribe supports and the House committee has recommended.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CANCELING CERTAIN CONSTRUCTION COSTS AND IRRIGATION ASSESSMENTS CHARGEABLE AGAINST LANDS OF THE FORT PECK INDIAN RESERVATION, MONT.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7820) to cancel certain construction costs and irrigation assessments chargeable against lands of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

FATHER JACQUES MARQUETTE COMMEMORATIVE MEDALS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1499) to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 300th anniversary of the explorations of Father Jacques Marquette in what is now the United States of America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I have no intention of objecting—I should like to ask some member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, since this is the first of four bills of a similar nature, as a matter of history for the Congressional Record, whether these bills entail any expense to the Federal Government?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I shall be happy to answer the question.

These bills, which are all noncontroversial, do not entail any cost at all to the Federal Government. The cost of the medals is to be borne by the sponsoring organizations.

Mr. GROSS. And all costs are reimbursable to the Federal Government?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. That is correct; every cent of cost must be paid by the sponsors.

Mr. Speaker, as I assured the gentleman from Iowa, this bill, and the three which follow it on the Consent Calendar are all noncontroversial measures to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to strike certain commemorative medals to be furnished at cost—without any expense to the Federal Government—to nonprofit organizations or to official State agencies, for the purpose of promoting important anniversaries such as the 50th anniversary of the founding of the American Legion, the 150th anniversary of the admission of the State of Mississippi to the Union, the 200th anniversary of the city of San Diego, Calif., and the 300th anniversary of the explorations of Father Jacques Marquette along the Mississippi river.

The subcommittee of which I am chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency has been handling such legislation over a period of some years without any controversy arising in connection with any of the medals which we have approved. In all cases they have passed the House and passed the Congress without objection.

Many years ago, in the 1930's, the States and nonprofit organizations sponsoring important anniversaries, such as the four covered by these medals, would come to Congress for the passage of legislation to authorize the striking of commemorative coins—half dollars in all cases. A great many commemorative coin issues were authorized by Congress in those years. Those Members of the House today who remember the late Congressman John J. Cochran, a predecessor of mine from St. Louis, will remember the anger with which he denounced this whole business of commemorative coins as a "racket." Some of the coins authorized in the 1930's which sold then at a premium of perhaps 100 percent, for $1, say, for a 50-cent coin, are now quoted in the numismatic market in the hundreds of dollars. I am sure we do not want to go back to the commemorative coin as a means of demonstrating the Federal Government's approval of or participation in some of these outstanding State and organizational anniversaries.

The commemorative medals are national medals as defined in the Revised Statutes. They are widely accepted and contribute greatly to the success of some of these anniversary observances. We were very proud to have a commemorative national medal marking the 200th anniversary of St. Louis several years ago and I am sure the States and organizations sponsoring the four medals which we are considering this afternoon will be very proud of them when they are struck and made available for public sale.

We held hearings on the subject of commemorative coins and commemorative medals in my subcommittee in 1963, and I think we established a good record at that time to demonstrate the value of the commemorative medals in preference to commemorative coins. Since that time we have approved quite a number of these bills and in almost each instance the legislation resulted in the striking of very handsome medals which were highly prized by those sponsoring the anniversary the medals commemorated and also by citizens participating in those observances. There has been a growing interest in such medals among coin hobbyists. So I think a very worthwhile purpose is served by the passage of this kind of legislation.

Again, I repeat that the medals will not cost the Treasury of the United States a single cent. All costs of striking the medals must be paid by the sponsoring organizations before any work whatsoever may be done in the mint to produce the medals. So this is not going to add anything to the cost of operating the mint.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I should like to ask the gentlewoman from Missouri if there is to be any silver taken from the U.S. Treasury to be used in the striking of these medals?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I should like to state that the materials for these medals are not specified in the legislation. It is up to the Secretary of the Treasury to decide in each case what materials may be used. Usually these commemorative medals are made of bronze.

Mr. ASPINALL. That does not exactly answer my question. Can the gentlewoman tell us whether or not any silver will be used?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. May I ask the gentleman to repeat his question.

Mr. ASPINALL. Will there be any silver taken from the U.S. Treasury in the striking of these medallions?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. The only thing I can tell the gentleman, again, is that the materials are not specified in the bills. We have depended upon the Treasury not to use strategic materials in short supply.

Mr. ASPINALL. If I understand the gentlewoman correctly, inasmuch as silver is one of our strategic materials at the present time, there will be no silver used; is that correct?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. The only thing I can say, again, is that the Secretary of the Treasury will have the power to decide that. I believe that if silver is considered a strategic material in scarce supply, he would probably decide against its use in these medals. It would depend, I am sure, on how many of the medals the sponsors proposed striking in silver. If the number were very small, the Secretary might feel differently than if the sponsors wanted the bulk of the medals to be made of silver.

It is my feeling—and I mean to so advise the Secretary—that if silver is used at all, in any of the medals, it be silver acquired at market price and not on the basis of the original cost to the Treasury of silver now in Treasury stocks. That silver is now worth far more than the Treasury paid for it years ago, and far more than the $1.29-plus monetary value of silver.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I simply wish to state this: I am not going to object, but inasmuch as our silver is in short supply and if we are not careful the U.S. Treasury is going to run out of its stockpile of such metal, it seems to me that the Secretary of the Treasury must take this into account.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ASPINALL. I will be glad to yield to my friend from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I would certainly like to reaffirm what the gentleman said. The gentleman raised an interesting question, and the answer was not fully satisfactory. I want to join with the gentleman in protest to the use of any silver in any of these medallions because, as the gentleman from Colorado well stated, it is in short supply and these medallions can be made of other material.

Mr. ASPINALL. I appreciate the statement of the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, at the outset I want to commend the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], and the distinguished gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN], for their excellent work in bringing this bill, H.R. 1499, to the floor of the House.

I know I speak for the other members of the Father Marquette Tercentenary Commission in expressing deep appreciation to them and to all members of the Banking and Currency Committee for their unanimous support for the proposal.

As has already been explained, this legislation provides for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 300th anniversary of the explorations of Father Jacques Marquette in what is now the United States.

It was to mark these same historic explorations that the Congress last year passed Public Law 89-187, creating the Father Marquette Tercentenary Commission and charged it to "develop and execute suitable plans" for a national celebration.

As an original sponsor of the legislation creating the Commission, and now as a member of the Commission. I am pleased to report to this body that the mandate of the Congress is being carried out far beyond original expectations.

Under the vigorous leadership of the Chairman of the Commission, Mr. James C. Windham, of Milwaukee, the Commission has developed plans for a 5-year celebration from 1968 to 1973 in honor of the missionary-explorer. The years coincide with the arrival of Father Marquette in U.S. territory in 1668 until his death here in 1673.

The committee report which accompanies this legislation details some of the projects which now are underway.

In these efforts, the medallion plays an important part. It will be a tangible symbol of the celebration and a treasured memento for those who take part in activities connected with the observance.

Further, the sale of these medallions to participants, collectors, and the public will help generate funds to carry out the purposes of the Commission

Just as the Commission itself has received its funds entirely from private donations, so the medallion would be struck at no cost to the Federal Government. The Commission is prepared to furnish security satisfactory to the Director of the Mint for full payment of the cost of manufacture, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses.

There is not even one penny of taxpayer's money involved here.

What is involved is an opportunity for the House to reaffirm its earlier unanimous support for a national observance of this landmark in North American history.

In doing so, it will once again demonstrate a lively and constructive interest in the historic past of our Nation, a past which has been filled with the noble lives and courageous deeds like those of Father Jacques Marquette.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the unanimous consent of the Congress to this measure, H.R. 1499.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1499

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in commemoration of the three hundredth anniversary of the explorations of Father Jacques Marquette in what is now the United States of America (which anniversary will be held 1968–1973), the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to strike and furnish to the Father Marquette Tercentenary Commission not more than two hundred thousand medals with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by the Father Marquette Tercentenary Commission subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. The medals shall be made and delivered at such times as may be required by the Commission in quantities of not less than two thousand, but no medals shall be made after December 31, 1973. The medals shall be considered to be national medals within the meaning of section 3551 of the Revised Statutes.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury shall cause such medals to be struck and furnished at not less than the estimated cost of manufacture: including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses; and security satisfactory to the Director of the Mint shall be furnished to indemnify the United States for full payment of such costs.

SEC. 3. The medals anuthorized to be issued pursuant to this Act shall be of such size or sizes and of such metals as shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury in consultation with such Commission.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 11, strike "manufacture;" and insert "manufacture,".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on this bill and the following bills pertaining to the striking of medals.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

MISSISSIPPI SESQUICENTENNIAL MEDALS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10105) to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the founding of the State of Mississippi.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 10105

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the State of Mississippi, which anniversary will be celebrated in 1967 and 1968, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to strike and furnish to the Agricultural and Industrial Board of the State of Mississippi not more than one hundred thousand medals with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by the Agricultural and Industrial Board of the State of Mississippi subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. The medals shall be made and delivered at such times as may be required by the board in quantities of not less than two thousand, but no medals shall be made after December 31, 1968. The medals shall be considered to be national medals within the meaning of section 3551 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 368).

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury shall cause such medals to be struck and furnished at not less than the estimated cost of manufacture, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses; and security satisfactory to the Director of the Mint shall be furnished to indemnify the United States for full payment of such costs.

SEC. 3. The medals authorized to be issued pursuant to this Act shall be of such size or sizes and of such metals as shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury in consultation with such Board.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. Speaker, this year on December 10, the State of Mississippi will observe the 150th anniversary of her admission to the Union. On this date in 1817 an act of Congress admitted her as this Nation's 20th State.

The history of Mississippi, first as a territory and then as a State, is a long and colorful one. Beginning in 1540 with the explorations of Hernando De Soto, who was probably the first white man to enter the area, the modern day history of the State begins. Subsequently, the State passed through periods of Spanish rule, French rule, English rule, and then Spanish rule again. Mississippi was granted the status of a territory in 1798 by act of Congress.

The State of Mississippi did not observe the centennial of her admission as a State due to World War I, and it is for this reason that the State is making especial mention of her sesquicentennial.

The issuance of a commemorative medal will be one of the major events in the State during the celebration. In addition, a commemorative stamp will be placed on sale in Natchez, the territorial capitol of the State, on December 11, 1967, with appropriate ceremonies. Also, a special edition of the Journal of Mississippi History will be issued and a film will be produced depicting the history of the State as a territory and as a member of the Union. One of the very important features of the sesquicentennial will be the construction of a new archives building, funds for which were appropriated by a special session of the legislature in 1966.

Along with the introduction of my bill in the House, Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND introduced an identical bill in the Senate. The introduction of the two bills came about through the cooperation of the Mississippi Agricultural and Industrial Board, the Sesquicentennial Commission, and the Mississippi Numismatic Society. The bill will authorize the mint to strike the medals, the design of which will be determined by the Mississippi Agricultural and Industrial Board. Present plans call for the medals to feature on one side the great seal of the State of Mississippi as it first appeared, and on the reverse side the medal will carry the image of Mississippi's first Governor, David Holmes.

Few States could surpass my State in having such a glorious and colorful history, and few States have the potential for development that Mississippi does. I feel that the issuance of a commemorative medal would enhance this very important celebration in the history of the State.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMERICAN LEGION 50TH ANNIVERSARY MEDALS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10160) to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding of the American Legion.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 10160

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the founding in 1919 of the American Legion, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to strike and furnish to the American Legion not more than one million medals with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by the American Legion subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. The medals shall be made and delivered at such times as may be required by the American Legion in quantities of not less than two thousand, but no medals shall be made after December 31, 1969. The medals shall be considered to be national medals within the meaning of section 3551 of the Revised Statutes.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury shall cause such medals to be struck and furnished at not less than the estimated cost of manufacture, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses; and security satisfactory to the Director of the Mint shall be furnished to indemnify the United States for the full payment of such costs.

SEC. 3. The medals authorized to be issued pursuant to this Act shall be of such size or sizes and of such various metals as shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury in consultation with the American Legion.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, as the sponsor of H.R. 10160 to authorize commemorative medals marking the 50th anniversary of the founding of the American Legion, I am sure the House of Representatives will want to support this bill unanimously as a means of expressing our admiration for the gallant men who founded the American Legion, and for the millions of American servicemen and servicewomen who have joined this outstanding organization and contributed to its tremendous effectiveness.

The American Legion, the largest organization of veterans of our armed services, was founded in Paris, France, March 15–17, 1919. It has grown to a membership of 2,600,000 in 16,500 posts in this country and abroad.

Born in the crucible of war but dedicated to peace, the American Legion has been an integral part of the fabric of American life throughout most of the 20th century. From the beginning its objectives have included the strengthening of our way of life, maintenance of the national security, care for the children of America, and aid to those who have fallen in battle and to their widows and orphans.

The American Legion helped to conceive and pilot through Congress the broad structure of compensation, pension, and medical programs which now guard the safety, security and health of the wounded and the disabled. The crowning achievement of this effort was the GI bill for veterans of World War II. This milestone in the history of veterans affairs was sponsored by the Legion and approved by the Congress so that the men and women of World War II would not return to a nation unprepared to receive them as it was to receive the victors of World War I. Extension of this farsighted program to Korean veterans and later to veterans of Vietnam was supported by the Legion.

Through its rehabilitation program the Legion stands watch over the rights and fair treatment of all veterans and their dependents—with particular concern for the service-connected disabled and for the families of those who gave their lives.

Early in the life of the organization it recognized that the threat to the security of our country had not ended with World War I. Through the years it has worked diligently to alert the American people to the fact that communism poses a serious threat to the safety of the Nation.

The Legion recommended against the neglect which the armed services experienced in the years between the two world wars. Consistently it urged that all branches of the military services be modernized. In the years since the end of World War II it has continued to urge a strong defense and to support the efforts of the armed services to maintain a state of readiness which would both deter aggressors and enable America to defend itself if attacked.

While concerned with matters affecting the welfare of the country in difficult times, the Legion has never forgotten that the future of the Nation depends upon its younger citizens. Its child welfare program for nearly 50 years has demonstrated concern for America's children. With thousands of volunteer workers in the Legion and in its auxiliary—and with the broad principles developed in the field of child care—it is recognized as one of the leading nonprofessional private organizations in this area. Through the years the organization has spent hundreds of millions of dollars in direct assistance to children, and in addition has secured passage of enlightened legislation at both State and National levels for the benefit of all the children of America. The Legion's Boys State and Boys Nation programs teach better citizenship to thousands of boys each year. The organization seeks to build character and desirable habits in young Americans through its sponsorship of over 4,000 Boy Scout units across the Nation and a quarter of a million American youth learn the rules of the game of life while playing American Legion baseball each year.

As plans go forward to celebrate its 50th anniversary the American Legion continues as a strong, vigilant, and responsible organization of patriotic Americans dedicated to maintenance of law and order and service to the community, State, and Nation, an organization which has contributed immeasurably to the advance of freedom.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SAN DIEGO 200TH ANNIVERSARY MEDALS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 13212) to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 200th anniversary of the founding of San Diego.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") shall strike and furnish for the San Diego Two-Hundredth Anniversary, Inc. (hereinafter referred to as the "corporation"), a not-for-profit organization for the celebration of the two-hundredth anniversary of the founding of the San Deigo community, national medals in commemoration of such anniversary.

SEC. 2. Such medals shall be of such sizes, materials, and shall be so inscribed, as the corporation may determine with the approval of the Secretary.

SEC. 3. Not more than five hundred thousand of such medals may be produced. Production shall be in such quantities, not less than two thousand, as may be ordered by the corporation, but no work may be commenced on any order unless the Secretary has received security satisfactory to him for the payment of the cost of the production of such order. Such cost shall include labor, material, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses, as determined by the Secretary. No medals may be produced pursuant to this Act after December 31, 1969.

SEC. 4. Upon receipt of payment for such medals in the amount of the cost thereof as determined pursuant to section 3, the Secretary shall deliver the medals as the corporation may request.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 13212, which would authorize the U.S. Mint to strike up to 500,000 medals commemorating the 200th anniversary of the founding of San Diego in 1769.

It should be emphasized that the medals are to be produced and furnished at no expense to the Federal Government. Full costs will be borne by San Diego 200th Anniversary, Inc., the nonprofit organization that has been set up to plan the city's bicentennial celebration.

The medals will carry an appropriate design, in keeping with the dignified and historic nature of the year-long observances. San Diego 200th Anniversary, Inc., hopes to raise at least $50,000 from the public sale of the medals, and all proceeds will be applied toward the overall budget of nearly $1 million for anniversary year activities.

Under the legislation before the House, the Secretary of the Treasury, may not order any of the San Diego medals stamped until he has solid assurances that all the bills, including labor, material, dies, use of machinery and overhead, will be met by the San Diego 200th Anniversary, Inc.

Time is of the essence, since the 200th anniversary is less than 15 months away. I would urge my colleagues to give swift approval to H.R. 13212, so that the work of producing the medals may proceed on schedule.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, it is with much gratitude and pride that I commend this body for the passage of the bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 200th anniversary of the founding of San Diego.

There is not much doubt that the faith in the Supreme Being, upon which this pioneer California community was founded, was in large part responsible for its tremendous growth, and more particularly for the high caliber of that progress.

The southwesternmost tip of our country enjoys more than a pleasant year-round climate; it includes the finest in culture, research, education, job opportunities, and residential advantages, and I am pleased that its completion of two centuries of existence shall have lasting memorials for the future.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, in less than 2 years, my home city of San Diego will celebrate her 200th anniversary. It will be a proud and auspicious occasion for all San Diegans.

Vital in the planning for our celebration is the measure, H.R. 13212, which we are considering today. It authorizes the U.S. Mint to strike commemorative medals for the anniversary. There will be no cost to the Government for the bill specifically states that all expenses for the production of the medals will be borne by San Diego 200th Anniversary, Inc., the nonprofit corporation in charge of preparations for the yearlong celebration in 1969.

San Diego is California's oldest city, and as such is the cradle of California's rich and glorious history. San Diego's site was claimed for Spain in 1542 by Adm. Juan Rodriquez Cabrillo, a Portuguese navigator who first came to the New World with Cortes. It was not until 1602, however, that the site received its name. In that year, Don Sebastian Vizcaino, one of the most famous of the west coast explorers, anchored off Los Guijarros in the shadow of beautiful Point Loma. Vizcaino was delighted with the harbor, pronouncing it probably "the best to be found in all the South Sea." He named the port and its future city after the canon San Diego de Alcala, whose feast day came 2 days after he arrived on November 10, 1602.

The actual colonization of San Diego and California began in 1769 with the founding of the first mission by Father Junipero Serra. From that first mission was built a chain of 21 missions up the California coast, each a day's journey apart. By 1850, San Diego had become a large settlement of more than 500 foreigners, 10 stores and 88 houses, and some 2,000 Indians. It became a center for hide collecting and a base for whalers.

Today, San Diego is no longer the quiet Spanish settlement of the past. Its industrial and cultural development symbolizes the tremendous growth of the

Golden State itself. San Diego in 1967 is a great seaport, a vital naval base, an important training center for sailors and marines, and an aircraft manufacturing center. Indeed, this city and its harbor have become, in the words of its founder, Vizcaino, "the best to be found in all the South Sea."

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge that the House give speedy, unanimous approval of this legislation. The medals that will be provided through this measure will provide a lasting memento of San Diego's vital role in California and American history.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LIBRARY SERVICES AND CONSTRUCTION ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 13048) to make certain technical amendments in the Library Services and Construction Act.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 13048

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 303 of the Library Services and Construction Act (20 U.S.C. 355e–2) is amended by striking out "June 30, 1967" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1968", and by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ", except that the Federal share for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands shall be 100 per centum".

SEC. 2. Section 403 of such Act is amended by striking out "June 30, 1967" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1968".

SEC. 3. Paragraph (5) of section 404(a) of such Act is amended by inserting "second" immediately before "preceding".

SEC. 4. Section 413 of such Act is amended by striking out "June 30, 1967," and inserting "June 30, 1968,".

SEC. 5. Paragraph (2) of section 414(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "State plans for".

SEC. 6. Subsection (d) of section 504 of such Act is amended by inserting "acquisition," immediately before "expansion".

SEC. 7. The amendments made by the first section and section 3 of this Act shall be effective with respect to fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1967.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 308]

Anderson, Tenn.
Annunzio
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Boggs
Bolton
Brasco
Brock
Broomfield
Button
Cabell
Cleveland
Cramer
Curtis
Delaney
Derwinski
Diggs
Erlenborn
Everett
Fallon
Fino
Foley
Fountain
Fulton, Tenn.
Gardner
Grover
Gude
Hagan
Hébert
Herlong
Horton
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Kluczynski
Kupferman
Landrum
McCarthy
McClory
Madden
Miller, Calif.
Morse, Mass.
Morton
Murphy, N.Y.
Nix
Olsen
O'Neill, Mass.
Patman
Rarick
Rees
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Roberts
Ronan
Rooney, Pa.
Roush
Sandman
St. Onge
Smith, N.Y.
Stephens
Stubblefield
Talcott
Tunney
Utt
Vander Jagt
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Young

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this rollcall 362 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

LIBRARY SERVICES AND CONSTRUCTION ACT AMENDMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] is recognized.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 13048, providing for certain technical and clarifying amendments to the Library Services and Construction Act. Initially, may I take this opportunity to congratulate the chairman of the Select Subcommittee on Education, the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS], for his continued interest and leadership with regard to legislation affecting libraries. The legislative record of the Select Subcommittee on Education during this session of Congress is quite impressive and the bill, H.R. 13048, is yet another example of the fine bipartisan work of that subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, my interest in legislation to expand and strengthen library resources and services is of long standing. As one of the original sponsors of the Library Services and Construction Act, I have followed very carefully developments in the program. In each State of the Union, there has been significant progress in bringing to the American people in large urban areas and in remote rural districts a broad range of library services. In my own State of Kentucky, for example, developments have been truly exciting. Under the leadership of Miss Margaret Willis, our State librarian, the number of legally established libraries in Kentucky has arisen almost 800 percent since the Library Services and Construction Act was enacted in 1957. The success of Kentucky's effort in opening the world of the library has been due in large part to Miss Willis' consistent, good and dedicated work. And I offer my own State's achievements as evidence of what has been accomplished under the Library Services and Construction Act.

In 1956 there were only 14 legally established libraries in Kentucky. In 1966 there were 110. In 1956 no county in Kentucky had a library tax, but by 1966, 27 counties have voted or petitioned for such a tax. In 1956, there were no multicounty library federations. In 1966 there were 16 multicounty federations comprising 84 libraries in 71 counties. Local support for public library services has increased over 100 percent in this 10-year period. State support has increased over 500 percent. And Federal support, which was nonexistent in 1956, amounted to over $400,000 in 1966. By June 30, 1966, 96 new walk-in type bookmobiles had been purchased to provide library services to rural areas. There are now over half a million books available through the State bookmobiles. Mr. Speaker, I could continue citing accomplishments. But perhaps our State librarian best summarized the changes which have occurred in Kentucky because of the Library Services and Construction Act program, when she said:

> When one looks back to fiscal 1956, one can see tangible evidence of great progress in public library services in Kentucky.

That Kentucky's response to the Library Services and Construction Act has been enthusiastic and wholehearted is beyond doubt. The statistics contained in the committee report accompanying H.R. 13048—House Report No. 744—show that what has happened in Kentucky has happened and is happening across the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, progress has been great under this legislation, and the amendments proposed in H.R. 13048 will facilitate even greater progress in the future. The purposes of the amendments are threefold:

First, to clarify the language of the Library Services and Construction Act;

Second, to establish uniformity in the four titles of the act; and

Third, to carry out the congressional intent of the 1966 amendments.

Four of the amendments proposed are, without question, minor and technical in nature. These propose, first, that the Federal share under title III of the act for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands be set at 100 percent, thus making the provision identical with provisions in the remaining three titles of the act; second, that the maintenance of effort requirement for part A of title IV of the act be perfected to make it consistent with maintenance of effort provisions in other portions of the act; third, to clarify the purpose of part B of title IV providing for library services to the physically handicapped; and fourth, to broaden the definition of "construction" to include the acquisition of buildings, thus making the construction authority consistent with other Federal construction programs such as the Higher Education Facilities Act and Public Law 815.

The major amendments in H.R. 13048 propose the continuation of 100 percent Federal financing through fiscal year 1968 for title III of the act, providing for interlibrary cooperation to bring more efficient and effective library services to all people, and title IV, providing for specialized State library services, for persons in State institutions such as correctional schools and prisons, and for handicapped persons. The 1966 amendments authorizing titles III and IV provide for 100 percent financing only through fiscal year 1967. For that fiscal year, however, only $1 million of a $13 million authorization was appropriated and funds were not made available until just shortly before the close of the fiscal year. The amount appropriated was earmarked for planning, thus no program operations could be undertaken. It is clear, Mr. Speaker, without the amendments proposed in H.R. 13048, that the titles III and IV programs will be severely handicapped, and in some States actually not undertaken at all, because matching funds will not be available in fiscal year 1968.

As one State librarian advised the subcommittee:

> The argument for the amendments is brief but to the point. The majority of the States are ready with their plans for the implementation of the programs under Titles III and IV but are now unable to obtain the required matching funds in fiscal year 1968.

In connection with this matter, Mr. Speaker, a survey was taken of the 50 State library agencies for the purpose of ascertaining whether the existing matching provisions in titles III and IV were satisfactory. Only two States responded that matching funds were available to meet the existing requirements. One State indicated some funds were available for matching. Forty-seven States replied that there was a real need for 100 percent Federal funding in fiscal year 1968, with such statements as: "need is desperate"; "cannot participate without 100 percent for title III"; "will be unable to handle III and IV-A"; and "State provides no matching funds for 1967–1969 budget."

I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that the problem we are discussing here is neither one of public apathy nor reluctance to comply with the matching requirements. Rather, it has been the lack of opportunity on the part of people who earnestly desire continuing progress in library services to adjust their plans in the time provided. Across the Nation the States have shown in meaningful action their wish to accept their share of the cost of library programs. There can be no doubt that this acceptance will continue to manifest itself if possible are allowed the necessary time to respond.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 13048 presents to the House an excellent opportunity to respond to the requests of library administrators at the State and local level. In the committee's response to these concerns—as embodied in H.R. 13048—we are not suggesting any additional appropriations by the Federal Government, nor are we authorizing any new programs. We are simply perfecting and making more efficient a series of programs which have already proven their value, and of which we can all be proud. In my judgment there is no Federal program under which funds have been more wisely expended and produced greater results than the library program. Mr. Speaker, I know of no opposition to the bill, H.R. 13048. The bill was reported by the subcommittee and the full committee unanimously and it is sponsored by members on both sides of the aisle.

It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that the bill will be overwhelmingly approved by the House today.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Library Services and Construction Act Amendments of 1967, H.R. 13048.

Although the several amendments proposed in this legislation are relatively minor and of a technical nature, they reaffirm our support of this important educational endeavor.

Almost 27 million books and library materials were purchased under State plan programs with Federal, State, and local funds since the inception of the library services program in 1957. In addition, significant construction of 719 new library facilities has been undertaken both in rural and urban areas. Public library service was extended for the first time to 13 million Americans, and 75 million people received new or improved service.

In my own State of New York, progress has been commendable. The State has received some $10.7 million in Federal funds. This money has assisted with the establishment of some 14 additional library systems in the State, so that there are now 22 library systems encompassing all 62 counties and serving over 98 percent of the State's population. New York's Deputy Commissioner of Education reported that:

> In the 10 years since the passage of the Library Services Act, there has been an almost total transformation of New York's public library landscape. It is the result of an uncomomnly common effort by local, State and Federal agencies to achieve the goals of modern library service in the face of conditions of environment that are changing at a rate faster than in any previous time in history.

Because the world and the conditions in which we live are changing so rapidly, it is even more important today than ever before that we make available the materials and the facilities our citizens need to read about the past, to understand the present and to realize better the future. Our efforts to assist education are less than wholehearted unless we also encourage and promote reading, a love of scholarship and a respect for the great writings of others—unless we bring to the children of the ghetto a broader horizon.

As amended in 1966, the Library Services and Construction Act consists of four titles. Title I provides matching funds for acquisition of books and other materials, equipment, salaries, and other operating expenses. Title II authorizes matching funds for public library construction as part of the State plan. New last year, title III provides money for the establishment and maintenance of cooperative networks of libraries at local, State, regional, or interstate levels. Part A of title IV makes available funds for a program of State institutional library services for penal institutions, orphanages, hospitals, and so forth. Finally, part B of title IV provides a program of library services to the handicapped.

The legislation passed last year authorized funds for these programs through 1971. The measure before us today includes a number of simple amendments that will improve the quality of services available under the act.

The first amendment corrects what appears to have been an oversight in early legislation so that the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands will be eligible for 100 percent Federal financing under all grant titles of the act. The Virgin Islands and Samoa are already covered specifically under the act.

Second, the base year for measuring State maintenance of effort requirements under the program of State institutional library services is changed from the preceding fiscal year to the second preceding fiscal year. This will enable more realistic planning as States cannot supply expenditure data before the end of a fiscal period and their annual programs must be submitted prior to that date.

The third amendment would give State library administrative agencies the authority to acquire used buildings for renovation into suitable library facilities. This amendment broadens the definition of "construction" as presently in title II to include the necessary authority to alter existing structures.

The final major series of amendments would extend 100-percent Federal financing for a second fiscal year to programs under titles III and IV–A and IV–B—interlibrary cooperation, State institutional library services, and library services for the handicapped. Fiscal year 1967 was the initial year of these programs and the Federal contribution for that period was fixed at 100 percent. However, appropriations for these titles were made only in April of 1967 and the very limited sums available were only for planning. Thus, fiscal year 1968 will, hopefully, be the first year of real operation for these three important programs, and this amendment would allow the States the benefit of the 100-percent Federal financing that they were not able to utilize last year.

This change, I believe, is essential and important to carry out the intent of the Congress.

I should like to stress that the legislation before us today makes no authorizations or appropriations. The Library Services and Construction Act amendments of 1966 made authorizations for fiscal years 1967 through 1971.

These total $275 million for title I—library services, $300 million for title II—construction, $50 million for title III—interlibrary cooperation, $50 million for title IV–A—State institutional library services, and $25 million for title IV–B—library services for the handicapped. Members may also be interested in funds expended for this program prior to its expansion in 1964. From 1957 through 1964, when the act covered only library services for rural areas, a total of $60 million was authorized. In 1965 funds were also made available to urban areas and title II, dealing with library construction, was added. Authorizations in 1965 and 1966 totaled $50 million for rural and urban library services and $60 million for rural and urban library construction.

Although H.R. 13048 is not the appropriate legislation in which to make these changes, I think it is useful to point out at this time that the appropriations request for all titles of the Library Services and Construction Act for fiscal year 1968 is less than half of the amount authorized. The request totals $68 million while authorizations were made in the amount of $114 million.

In the last fiscal year appropriations were only $12 million less than the authorizations. I believe that this is a most unfortunate example of the upside-down priorities that have characterized the budget requests in some of our most meaningful and most urgent domestic programs.

Nevertheless, by passing the Library Services and Construction Act Amendments of 1967 today, we will be reaffirming our commitment to the effective partnership between Federal, State, and local governments in providing progressive and much-needed library services and facilities for all Americans.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REID of New York. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WIDNALL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] and say that I heartily support passage of this legislation.

Mr. REID of New York. I thank the gentleman for his statement.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REID of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman's comments, and I rise in support of this legislation, but it is not quite clear to me, so far as the financial responsibility portion is concerned, and I have studied the bill and the report in detail.

I would like to know if I have the proper concept in determining that this will, for example, prolong for an additional year the 100-percent participation in bills III by the Federal Government—which is hardly a basis for a partnership—only in the first year of its association with any State, as far as the establishment of library facilities in rural and metropolitan areas are concerned?

Mr. REID of New York. In response to the gentleman, it is my understanding that this just changes two titles, titles III and IV. To recapitulate on the matching formula, under the present statute, titles I and II, the Federal share could not exceed 66 percent, or fall below 33⅓ percent. In titles III and IV the Federal share is 50 percent, except in fiscal year 1967, and, as amended today, the Federal share for these two titles is 100 percent for fiscal 1968 as well.

Mr. HALL. In light of that, if the gentleman will yield further——

Mr. REID of New York. I yield further to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. In title III it does extend through fiscal year 1968 to States that are participating for the first time at 100 percent matching level, is that not correct?

Mr. REID of New York. That is my understanding.

Mr. HALL. If that is true, even though I believe the gentleman said we have not appropriated less than 50 percent of what has been authorized and this is of course effective management, per se—then it would actually take from the assets of the Treasury for those who would in the future come under the new deadline authorized, but being precluded by the old fiscal year 1967 deadline, is that not a fair assumption?

Mr. REID of New York. I think that is true. I would merely point out again that the totals amount to only $68 million whereas the authorization was for $114 million. So there are some funds that the Congress very clearly indicated should be authorized in support of libraries.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate that. Would the gentleman tell me whether this additional extension which comes out of the assets of the Treasury are budgeted for the fiscal year 1968 or not?

Mr. REID of New York. Yes, they are.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REID of New York. I shall be happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this legislation making technical amendments to the Library Services and Construction Act, and I wholeheartedly approve of the act. This legislation has been constructive in every sense of the word.

Here we have a Federal program which is structured in such a manner that State and local administrative and fiscal responsibility is encouraged and enhanced by its operation. It operates not by the dictate of some Federal official, but through a State agency which is responsible for the formulation and execution of a State plan. The State plan varies from State to State, reflecting the considerable differences in needs, priorities, and resources among the States. This is a program which requires matching of Federal funds by the States and localities, and in three of the four titles—titles I, II, and IV—the percentage of State and local funds required for matching is graduated from 33 percent in the poorest States to 66 percent in the wealthiest States. This arrangement means that the most help is given where it is most needed.

I hope my colleagues will forgive me when I point out that the broad outline of this legislation—which they are about to approve unanimously because it is a very successful and useful program—is almost exactly that which I proposed earlier this year for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in the Quie amendment.

This is not an accidental coincidence, because all of our more successful Federal programs in education and in many other fields involve these principles: State and local administration, often through a State-devised plan of operation; State and local financial responsibility for a share of the cost; and Federal aid based in some measure upon fiscal ability of the States. When these principles have been abandoned—as they have in so much of the Great Society legislation—we find a serious erosion of Federal-State relations, a slackening of State and local financial support for worthwhile institutions and programs, and a vast increase in redtape, confusion, and expense stemming from the attempt to run local programs out of a Federal bureau in Washington.

I hope that the example of such successful programs as library services and construction, vocational rehabilitation, vocational education, and activities under the National Defense Education Act will not forever be lost to the present administration, and I trust that they have been rediscovered by the Congress.

The success of the Library Services Act in Minnesota is typical of the Nation. In the 8 fiscal years from 1956 to 1964 the number of library volumes in the 21 participating counties grow from 475,000 to over 925,000, and library services were made available to 100,000 rural residents who had not previously enjoyed this necessity. With only $200,000 in State and Federal funds, the support for public libraries in these 21 counties increased from $500,000 to $1,650,000. This demonstrates how a true incentive program can work to increase the level of local support for vital institutions such as libraries and schools.

We have made further progress in our State since the act was amended to extend its benefits to urban areas and to improve the State library system. Our very able director of library services, Mr. Hannis Smith, of the State department of education, has made an excellent start in implementing the title III provisions for interlibrary cooperation—despite limited Federal funding—in a project involving 23 cooperating libraries across the State. Altogether, the 1964 and 1966 additions to the act have benefited some 2½ million citizens of Minnesota.

In conclusion, I hope that in the future, as we deal with related matters, we apply the lessons of this act in devising sound Federal-State provisions which contribute to a truly creative federalism. And I would also hope that we shall be able to fully fund the act so that the Federal commitment is more nearly commensurate to the vital contribution of modern libraries to our entire society.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEIGER].

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 13048, to make technical amendments to the Library Services and Construction Act. I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this legislation.

The bill, as has been explained, only makes technical amendments to the act to correct certain inadvertent errors and to facilitate its smooth administration. It does not authorize additional funding or add to the cost of the act. The major amendment would be to provide for 100-percent Federal funding of the title III "Interlibrary cooperation" section during fiscal year 1968. This is consistent with the intent of Congress that the first year of this program should not require State matching in order to allow time for necessary State legislative action. Since the funding really began very late in fiscal 1967, fiscal 1968 is the first year of the program.

I shall insert at this point in my remarks a statement in support of this amendment from our very able director of library services for the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, W. Lyle Eberhart:

> In recognition of needed additional library services through the states, the Library Services and Construction Act Amendments of 1966 (P.L. 89–511) made provision for three new programs: cooperative library services; state institutional library services; and library services to the physically handicapped. These new programs were to be 100% federally supported in their first year of operation.
>
> Because of budgetary contingencies, only planning moneys were received by the states in fiscal 1967. H.R. 9518, in line with the original intent of P.L. 89–511, would provide 100% federal matching for these new programs during fiscal 1968, their first operational year.
>
> In Wisconsin, and in many other states in which these programs are entirely new to the state library agency, 100% federal funding for fiscal 1968 is of key importance to demonstrate to state government, other state departments, and participating local agencies the need for and value of these library programs. Wisconsin's biennial executive budget for 1967–1969 was already set before proper consideration could be made for matching expenditures for these programs. To secure supplemental appropriations will require prior demonstration of the worth of new programs.
>
> Each of these new library programs, in Wisconsin and many other states, requires the understanding and support of several departments of state government and of other educational agencies for most fruitful programming. It is my belief that H.R. 9518 will serve to implement the original Congressional intent with these library programs.

Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate to review the significance of this exemplary act, because hopefully the Federal budgetary situation will ease to the point that, in the next few years, we can begin to provide really adequate funding for meaningful and vital domestic programs. Unfortunately, even as we support library services programs, we tend to dismiss their importance with high-sounding cliches. We take the existence of libraries for granted and tend to think of them simply as "a nice thing to have." Libraries are often thought of in the same terms as museums, art galleries, or community drama groups. Only upon closer examination do we begin to see that an adequate and modern library system is, in truth, an economic resource of critical importance.

And in saying this, I do not mean to imply that the library as a cultural resource is unimportant or, for that matter, that drama, music, art, and the other cultural pursuits are not vital to our society. They are vital, and in their cultivation, we find an essential function of mankind.

But the other great work of a modern library system is in the organization, storage, and retrieval of knowledge. Without this work, a technological and industrial society could not long exist as we know it. Moreover, the task of compiling knowledge in a usable form has become increasingly difficult and complex, and increasingly vital, as the staggering pace of information growth accelerates.

My point is that we are not dealing here with legislation which is helpful to a "good cause," but rather, with legislation which is likely to become a matter of national urgency. I hope that in the years just ahead, we shall come to view library services more in this light.

Wisconsin is making extremely good use of the relatively small amount of Federal funds available under this act. In fiscal 1966, we received $528,780 for library services under title I, which was matched by $243,181 in State funds and $313,076 in Federal funds. I am pleased to note that we overmatched by more than $54,000. We received $640,403 for construction which we matched with $608,189 in State and local funds. We are strengthening and developing multicounty library services, extending services to inner-city disadvantaged areas and to migrants, and making progress in relieving the serious shortage of trained librarians.

In the Sixth Congressional District, which I am privileged to represent, there is an interesting experimental program aimed at strengthening book collections, promoting areawide cooperation among libraries, and providing professional reference and training services. We shall need a great deal more such work in order to make necessary knowledge available to users in every part of the Nation.

And so, Mr. Speaker, in acting upon this relatively minor and technical bill today, I hope we shall remind ourselves of the very striking accomplishments under this act and of the need for moving ahead in this exciting and necessary work of information storage and retrieval. One of the very great satisfactions of my work on the Committee on Education and Labor is the opportunity to look ahead at some of the emerging needs that will become more and more challenging in a vigorous and growing nation. The provision of first class library services is one such need. I am pleased that we are approaching it through a soundly conceived Federal support program which is administered through and by the States with a high degree of State and local financial participation.

In conclusion, I only wish that the Congress and the administration would apply the lessons of this pattern of administration under this act to other areas of national concern.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Pucinski].

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this very important legislation.

It was my privilege to sponsor the Library Services and Construction Act Amendments of 1966. I was privileged to join with a very distinguished group of previous sponsors of this legislation. The chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Perkins], has been the forefront in sponsoring legislation as early as 1950 to bring some meaningful assistance to the libraries of America, and the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. Green], sponsored the first legislation that brought the urban areas of America into this Federal aid program. All of us have worked together and have been able to bring some very meaningful assistance to the libraries of this country.

The bill before us today came out of our committee by a unanimous vote.

I know of no greater investment the American people can make than an investment in their libraries. As the gentleman from New York said a moment ago, the very complex world that we live in, we need these libraries to bring enlightenment and the resources of such library material to the people of our country.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Dent].

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my voice to that of Members who are supporting this legislation.

This legislation started out brand new a few years ago but when we changed the formula for participation in Federal benefits from the 10,000 population community so that any community could participate, however, at that time there was an oversight which I believe is being corrected now. We allowed for maintenance and for materials a certain amount of appropriations—and a certain amount of the appropriation for construction. However, we failed to take into consideration the fact that there were many libraries that just needed some renovation and rehabilitation and so on, and during all of these years we have only given aid where they were constructing new edifices or buildings and new institutions, whereas those who needed just a small amount of money to rehabilitate were cut out of the bill. This bill takes care of that situation and we are also taking care of the situation that while some communities have not been able to get off the ground, we allow an extension of 1 year for further 100-percent funding.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of this bill by the House, and unanimously if possible.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may require to the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. Mink].

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to note particularly the tremendous contribution of the chairman of our select subcommittee, out of whose committee this legislation is now presented to the House.

In commending the distinguished chairman of our select subcommittee, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Daniels], I would like to mention to the House that this is the fourth bill reported out of our subcommittee of which I have the privilege to be a member.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will see fit to pass this bill unanimously.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Daniels] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the chairman of our House Education and Labor Committee [Mr. PERKINS] in urging my colleagues to give wholehearted, favorable consideration to this bill, H.R. 13048, to amend the Library Services and Construction Act. These amendments are technical in nature, clarify the language of the act, add uniformity to similar titles, and carry out congressional intent in permitting the States to initiate approved programs under titles III and IV with 100-percent Federal funding in fiscal year 1968.

No doubt, most of you can recall last year's debate when we expanded this important program to provide improved library services for the people throughout our country. The vote was 336 to 2. It was held up as a model—an ideal bill in terms of the coordination of State and local functions with the Federal Government insofar as implementation is concerned. From the beginning the legislation has had bipartisan sponsorship and support.

As chairman of the subcommittee which conducted the hearings on these amendments and as one of the early sponsors of this legislation, when it was limited to providing public library services to rural areas without such service or with inadequate services, I would like to point out some of the outstanding accomplishments of this relatively modest program.

Before going on, however, I want to thank our chairman [Mr. PERKINS] for introducing the bill and for his leadership and assistance in helping to expedite the handling of this measure. At this time I also wish to point out that Mr. PERKINS is one of the pioneer sponsors of this library legislation. Long before it won the general acceptance of Congress, the gentleman from Kentucky had the vision and practical foresight to recognize the Nation's need and the educational benefits which it would eventually bring to people of all ages and walks of life.

I also want to pay tribute to the gentlelady from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] for her very able handling of this legislation. In addition, I want to voice my sincere appreciation to the members of both the subcommittee and the full committee for their cooperation and unanimous endorsement of the bill before you today.

Now, although, I am tempted to elaborate on the accomplishments of my own State of New Jersey, which has participated in this program since its beginning in fiscal 1957, I want to highlight the Library Services and Construction Act accomplishments throughout the Nation.

In the decade since its advent—fiscal years 1957–66—the LSCA has resulted in the expenditure of $108.2 million for books and library materials for public libraries. In fiscal 1966, Federal funds, with State and local matching funds, have purchased $29.7 million in books and library materials. If we can presume that the same rate of expenditure will be maintained in fiscal 1967 as in 1966, we can estimate that a combined expenditure of $42 million will be made for library materials under this act. It is important to understand that title I of the LSCA permits not only the purchase of books, but the financing of a variety of activities and purchases relating to public libraries under the guidance of a State plan. The significance of this legislation to the urgent needs of the Nation is clearly evident.

Between 1956 and 1966:

All 50 States, and the District of Columbia, plus American Samoa, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands operated library programs under approved State plans. In 1967 the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands became eligible and participated.

Areas containing more than 75 million people received library services for the first time or had their local libraries improved under this act.

More than 550 bookmobiles were added to existing library resources, primarily to reach rural readers.

An estimated 27 million books and related materials purchased with Federal, State, and local funds were added to library collections in the States.

Nearly $100 million in Federal funds for public library services were used by the States and matched with over $300 million State and local funds.

During fiscal 1965, 1966, and 1967, nearly a thousand library construction projects have been approved.

In fiscal 1967, when Federal funds first became available for planning library services under two new titles, 52 States and territories picked up $7,075 each for interlibrary cooperation—title III; 51 States and territories picked up $7,075 each for State institutional library services; title IV–A; and 51 States and territories picked up $4,735 for planning library services to the physically handicapped—title IV–B.

As I stated at the outset, the specific amendments covered in the bill we are considering today, to amend the Library Services and Construction Act, H.R. 13048, are chiefly of a technical nature intended to clarify the language of the law. They would also permit the States to carry out approved programs under titles III and IV with 100-percent Federal funding in "the first fiscal year for which funds are appropriated," as was the intent of Congress in passing the law last year.

The first amendment to section 303, which would strike out the date June 30, 1967, and substitute June 30, 1968, would continue for another year the 100-percent funding to begin interlibrary cooperation programs.

The second amendment would correct what appears to have been a drafting oversight, since the law does not now provide for 100-percent Federal funding for all grant programs for the Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands.

The third amendment would continue through fiscal 1968 the 100-percent Federal funding to implement programs under title IV–A for State institutional library services.

The fourth amendment would change the maintenance of effort requirement covering expenditures under part A of title IV, as provided for in section 404 (a)(5) of the act so as to refer to the "second preceding fiscal year"—rather than the "preceding fiscal year"—as the base year for measuring the requisite minimum State effort, as is the case in title I and in part B of title IV. States cannot supply expenditure data before the end of a fiscal period and their annual programs must be submitted prior to that date.

The fifth amendment would permit approved programs under title IV–B—library services for the physically handicapped—to be 100-percent federally funded in fiscal 1968.

The sixth amendment would correct a language error in section 414(a)(2). Section 414(a) deals with the requirements of a State plan; subsection (2) is intended to cover establishment or improvement of library services and not the establishment or improvement of State plans.

The seventh amendment would expand the term "construction" so as to include authority to acquire buildings to be used or remodeled for use as public libraries. This would give State library administrative agencies another option to exercise; namely, the purchase of existing buildings, in those instances where this would be economical or more efficient than to begin new construction.

All the amendments proposed in H.R. 13048 would be effective with respect to fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1967.

The foregoing changes in this library law will greatly enhance the working of this legislation which was so widely and enthusiastically acclaimed by Members on both sides of the aisle last year.

A library system is an increasingly complex and absolutely essential instrument of progress in every field of learning. Our technological revolution has brought about a grant explosion of research, information, and new knowledge.

This bill before us builds soundly upon the existing act and moves in the direction of improving the scope and effectiveness of that act. I, therefore, urge all of my colleagues to join in supporting this legislation.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H.R. 13048, a bill to amend the Library Services and Construction Act, and urge all of my colleagues to support this important legislation which fills a significant and urgent need.

This legislation will remedy certain technical difficulties in the present law, and will also enable the States to more effectively implement their library programs in fiscal year 1968, and thereafter.

The Library Services and Construction Act, passed originally in 1956, stimulated the local communities and the States to raise the quality and effectiveness of public library services, so that every citizen would have available the essential tools for his education.

Library legislation has produced a notable partnership between State and local governments, and the Federal Government.

In 1964, the inclusion of urban libraries within the scope of the act—Public Law 88–269—resulted, among other things, in the improvement of library services to disadvantaged communities; extension of high-quality library services to suburban areas; and the strengthening or urban library collections to be used over larger regions of a State.

Remarkably, since the construction provisions under title II of the act have been in force, 719 public library construction projects have been approved to serve 23 million people.

Title III, "Interlibrary cooperation," provides funds for the greatly needed networks of interlibrary cooperation among State libraries, public libraries, school libraries, college libraries, and special libraries. This pooling of efforts, as far as possible, in regard to acquisitions, cataloging, storage, bibliography, reference, and other areas, makes appropriated funds go further and achieve the purposes for which they were intended.

Title IV–A, is designed to assist the States in providing library services to inmates, patients, and residents of State institutions, including penal institutions, reformatories, residential training schools, or special hospitals. Unfortunately, libraries in these State institutions are far behind what is required of them to assist in the plans for rehabilitation and education.

Title IV–B, is designed to assist in making possible, library services to physically handicapped persons, including the blind and the visually handicapped. It is estimated that this segment of population numbers almost 2 million persons—including 400,000 blind; 600,00 near-blind; and 1 million paraplegics and victims of cerebral palsy and other severe conditions—who cannot read conventionally printed books, magazines and newspapers. Making reading available to these unfortunate people, will bring hope and inspiration to them.

As I stated at the outset, the specific amendments covered in H.R. 13048, are chiefly of a technical nature.

The first amendment will provide a Federal share of 100 percent for the trust territory of the Pacific Islands under title III, "Interlibrary cooperation." Titles I, II, and IV of the act presently authorize such a provision for the trust territory, but by an oversight no such language was included in title III, and H.R. 13048 is drafted to correct this and maintain consistency throughout the act for this territory as intended in our previous actions on the legislation.

This same title III, which was added to the original act in 1966 to authorize the establishment and maintenance of local, regional, State, or interstate cooperative networks of libraries for more effective and systematic coordination of library resources throughout the country, was not funded until April 1, 1967, at which time $375,000 of the $5 million authorization for planning funds was appropriated to 52 States and territories.

Since the Congress made it clear in passage of title III that the intent was to provide 100 percent Federal funding for the first full year, there was inadequate time for the States to initiate their programs in fiscal 1967, and it is the feeling of the committee that the Federal share of 100 percent should be continued through fiscal 1968 to make this title workable before the States are required to provide matching funds.

The small appropriation for this title, along with delays in the approval of regulations, issuance of guidelines, and allotment of funds, effectively prevented a full program year in 1967 as was intended when we passed Public Law 89–511 in 1966.

A similar pattern occurred in the funding of section 403 of part A of title IV, also added to the original act in 1966 to establish and improve State institutional library services. Of the small $375,000 allocation that was made for Public Law 89–511 on April 1, 1967, 51 States and territories received minimal amounts of planning funds for title IV, and we believe that we should continue the same 100 percent Federal share for this title through fiscal 1968 to reflect the intent of the original legislation.

A further amendment is recommended in recognition of the fact that while States are required to submit their annual programs prior to the end of a fiscal period under the maintenance of effort requirement in part A of title IV of the act, they cannot supply expenditure data before the end of a fiscal period. This apparent oversight can be corrected by amending this section to refer to the second preceding fiscal year as the base year for measuring the requisite minimum State effort. This is the present provision in title I and part B of title IV, and is necessary for practicable administration of part A of title IV.

Section 4 of H.R. 13048 would authorize 100 percent funding of part B of title IV, library services for the physically handicapped, through fiscal 1968 in the same manner as that recommended for title III and for section A of title IV. For what was supposed to be the first program year, $250,000 was allocated to 51 States and territories on April 1, 1967, and we think it similarly desirable to consider fiscal 1968 as the first program year of part B in order to get the State programs into operation. Only planning moneys have been made available to States to date, without any program operations undertaken with Federal assistance as the Congress intended.

Further, a technical amendment is proposed for a language error in section 414(a)(2). The amendment would delete the words "State plans for" as unnecessary since subsection (2) is intended to cover the establishment or improvement of library services and not State plans as it presently reads.

Another provision in H.R. 13048 would give State agencies the option to acquire buildings to be used as public libraries if this would be more economical than building a new library in any specific case. Public Law 89–511 authorizes construction of new buildings for libraries or expansion, remodeling, and alteration of existing buildings. A State cannot presently acquire a used building which might be converted into a library facility more cheaply than by building a new one, and we feel that it is desirable to include "acquisition" under the definition of "construction" in section 504(d) of the act.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, section 7 of H.R. 13048 will make the amendments in sections 1 and 3 of the bill effective with respect to fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1967.

Your Committee on Education and Labor recommends that the House approve this legislation to continue at maximum effectiveness the Federal effort to upgrade library facilities and services throughout the country. Beginning with passage of the Library Services Act of 1956, the Congress has demonstrated its commitment to this goal by extending and amending the program regularly to broaden its scope and increase the appropriations.

From fiscal 1957 through 1966, $100 million in Federal allocations for library services have been matched with $321 million of State and local funds, while $60 million in Federal funds for public library construction has been matched by State and local appropriations of $130 million.

The Federal stimulus has thus proved exemplary in encouraging States to expand their own efforts in this area, and we may reflect with pride that 75 million people have received new or improved library service during this period and 13 million people have received liberary service for the first time. An impressive total of 719 public library construction projects have been approved, serving 23 million people, 550 bookmobiles have been placed in operation to give service principally to rural areas, and 27 million books and materials have been added to library collections through these added Federal, State, and local funds.

We feel that the amendments embodied in H.R. 13048 are necessary for the continued effectiveness of the administration of this program, and it is particularly important that we provide the means by which State programs under Public Law 89–511 can be made operational. We are certain that prior experience with this legislation bears out our conviction that State matching funds for these two titles will be forthcoming in fiscal 1969 by which time the programs will have proven their worth.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of H.R. 13048, which was unanimously reported by the Select Subcommittee on Education, and the full Education and Labor Committee, with bipartisan support.

The enactment of this important measure will provide our citizens with the opportunity to continue to grow in knowledge and understanding.

This legislation is part of a program which I am proud to have supported throughout my service in Congress, and I am sure it will be overwhelmingly approved by the House today.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 13048, the bill to make certain technical amendments to the Library Services and Construction Act.

Reviewing the legislative history of this public library development program, with its modest beginning in 1956, only serves to dramatize what a spectacular success has been achieved in the brief span of one decade. In my own State of Kansas, great progress has been made in improving and extending library service. Funds under the LSCA are being used for developing reference and resource centers; for book processing centers; for extending service through the use of bookmobiles, branches, and mail service; for improving book collections and service in both urban and rural areas.

A regional system of cooperating libraries is to be established. This program is beginning in three areas of the State, involving 27 counties.

Kansas had 5 public library construction projects approved in 1967.

On June 7, 1967, a pilot project in interlibrary cooperation was launched in Kansas under the Library Services and Construction Act between the Kansas informational circuit which is composed of six public libraries in the State and Kansas State University in Manhattan. The six public libraries in Topeka, Johnson County, Wichita, Hutchinson, Salina, and Kansas City formed the Kansas information circuit, known as KIC, to share their book resources with the citizens of the State. This interlibrary loan circuit works through the local public libraries.

The six KIC libraries, plus the State Library, had been filling about 61 percent of the book requests by local public libraries. It is expected that with the advantage of the academic library at Kansas State University, the percentage of requests filled by the KIC system will increase.

During the hearings on the bill before us today, an impressive list of accomplishments, made possible under the provisions of the Library Services and Construction Act in the last decade, was recorded. However, despite the substantial improvements in library service to date, much remains to be done, and passage of H.R. 13048 will help our States to meet more readily some of the great needs. For instance, Denny R. Stephens, the Kansas State Librarian, stated in the record of the hearings on this legislation that:

> In order for the State of Kansas to participate in Title III of the Library Services and Construction Act in Fiscal Year 1968, it would be necessary to find a means of matching Federal funds. We are working on this at the present time and believe we could be prepared to match Title III funds in Fiscal Year 1969.
>
> Library service in our State institutions is in too many instances non-existent and in all cases substandard. If we were able to match the full allocation, we would endeavor to initiate a program of rehabilitation through reading and self-study for institutional residents. (Title IV–A)

I should also point out that this bill does not involve the authorization of any additional Federal funds. What it does is permit the States to implement the plans they have made during the past fiscal year under the three newly authorized programs for interlibrary cooperation, for specialized State library services to institutions, and for library services to the physically handicapped.

The Library Services and Construction Act is a measure of great merit and is helping to meet the urgent and essential library needs of the people of the United States in the fields of education, science, technology, business, culture, and everyday living.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, this bill, which I am pleased to cosponsor, makes technical amendments to the Library Services and Construction Act in order to improve the operations of the act. This has been an extremely successful and worthwhile Federal-State-local program and it deserves our support.

Library services are an extremely important element in the educational, cultural, and economic life of the Nation. Sometimes the part libraries and their informational services play in our economic life is overlooked; but it should not be forgotten that the handling of information grows more complex as our industrial society grows more complex. I am happy to report one example from Ohio of the imaginative use of library services to help meet vital economic goals.

In its State plan under title I of this Act, Ohio has included a books-jobs project to develop effective links between Ohio libraries and the State and local offices of the Ohio Bureau of Unemployment Compensation. The purpose is to get job information to the unemployed and underemployed who need it, and to put the resources of libraries to work on the problems of unemployment.

This act—although it is very modestly funded—has done much to strengthen our State and local libraries and library systems. It has demonstrated many other possibilities for the effective use of library services through such projects as books-jobs now underway in Ohio.

It is my hope that we can give further attention to library needs as soon as the present Federal budgetary crisis has eased. This should be high on the list of priorities in the next Congress.

Mr. FRASER. I rise in support of H.R. 13048, which amends the Library Services and Construction Act. I am particularly pleased with the amendment to section 504, which will provide Federal funds for the acquisition of buildings to be used for libraries.

The Minneapolis public library system has been a victim of the present law, which allows Federal funds to be used for the construction of new buildings, but not the acquisition of used buildings. Last year the Minneapolis library wanted to purchase an existing building which was well suited to library use, and which could be acquired at much less cost than a new building. Unfortunately, the present law would not allow any Federal funds to be used for this purchase; Federal funds could be obtained only if the library constructed a new building at a much greater cost. The building the library officials wanted to acquire was such a good bargain that they went ahead and purchased it anyway, even though they had to forgo Federal aid.

The Library Services and Construction bill which passed the House in 1966 provided for the acquisition of buildings. Unfortunately, this provision was not included in the Senate bill, and it was dropped in conference. I am hopeful that this time the acquisition amendment will be passed into law.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I most earnestly hope that the House will resoundingly approve the bill now before us, H.R. 13048, designed to improve the existing Library and Construction Act by the addition of certain technical amendments.

I advocated the initial enactment of this legislation back in 1956 and have continued to urge and support its extension over the past 10 years. This wholesome legislative program, which began with such a modest level, has truly succeeded far beyond the most optimistic expectation. Its overall educational impact has certainly justified the Federal expenditures involved.

The record shows that over the past 10 years, 75 million people received new or improved public library service; 13 million people received public library service for the first time; 27 million books and related materials were purchased with Federal, State, and local funds and added to local library collections; 550 bookmobiles have been placed in operation across the country, primarily giving library service to rural areas; 2,800 persons have been employed in our States and localities to carry out the program of library services and construction; 719 public library construction projects have been approved, to serve 23 million people; $100 million in Federal funds for public library services in the States has been matched with $321 million in State and local funds; and $60 million in Federal funds for public library construction has been matched with $130 million in State and local funds.

Mr. Speaker, there is no fuller truth contained in any expression than the old adage, "Knowledge is power," and today it is strikingly clear that such "power" is imperative for our survival and our leadership for world peace.

The libraries of this country are special instruments supremely capable of not only providing our citizens with this survival power, but also with the sustaining strengths of the disciplined minds and spirits essential to the accomplishment and preservation of peace in a civilized society.

By all recognized standards and measurements, this substantive legislative program has been good for all Americans and the proposed amendments in the bill before us are designed to technically strengthen and expand the program's operations; in other words, they are designed to make it work even better than it is. Therefore, I hope that it shall be overwhelmingly accepted and adopted without delay.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter on the bill H.R. 13048.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Kentucky that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 13048.

The question was taken.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 351, nays 0, not voting 81, as follows:

[Roll No. 309]

YEAS—351

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Ayres
Baring
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bevill
Biester
Bingham
Blackburn
Blanton
Blatnik
Boland
Bolling
Bow
Brademas
Bray
Brinkley
Brooks
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Bush
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cahill
Carey
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cohelan
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Corbett
Corman
Cowger
Culver
Cunningham
Daddario
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
de la Garza
Dellenback
Denney
Dent
Devine
Dickinson
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Eilberg
Esch
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Fulton, Pa.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Goodell
Goodling
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Gross
Gubser
Gurney
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Helstoski
Henderson
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Kelly
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kleppe
Kornegay
Kuykendall
Kyl
Kyros
Laird
Langen
Leggett
Lennon
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Lukens
McClure
McCulloch
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
McFall
Macdonald, Mass.
MacGregor
Machen
Mahon
Marsh
Martin
Mathias, Calif.
Mathias, Md.
Matsunaga
Mayne
Meeds
Meskill
Michel
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Monagan
Montgomery
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris, N. Mex.
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Myers
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nichols
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
O'Neal, Ga.
Ottinger
Passman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pollock
Pool
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Pryor
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Railsback
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reinecke
Rhodes, Pa.
Riegle
Rivers
Robison
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ruppe
Ryan
St Germain
Satterfield
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherle
Scheuer
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Selden
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Okla.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stratton
Stuckey
Sullivan
Taft
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thompson, Ga.
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Tiernan
Tuck
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Waggonner
Waldie
Walker
Wampler
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Whalen
Whalley
White
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams, Pa.
Wilson, Charles H.
Winn
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Yates
Zablocki
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—81

Anderson, Tenn.
Annunzio
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Boggs
Bolton
Brasco
Brock
Broomfield
Button
Celler
Cleveland
Cramer
Curtis
Daniels
Delaney
Derwinski
Diggs
Erlenborn
Everett
Fallon
Fino
Foley
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Gardner
Gray
Grover
Gude
Hagan
Hébert
Herlong
Horton
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Kazen
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kupferman
Landrum
Latta
McCarthy
McClory
McMillan
Madden
Mailliard
May
Miller, Calif.
Morse, Mass.
Morton
Murphy, N.Y.
Olsen
O'Neill, Mass.
Patman
Rarick
Rees
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Roberts
Rodino
Ronan
Rooney, Pa.
Sandman
St. Onge
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Stephens
Stubblefield
Talcott
Tunney
Utt
Vigorito
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Young

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts with Mr. Bates.

Mr. Hébert with Mrs. May.

Mr. Annunzio with Mr. Broomfield.

Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.

Mr. Fountain with Mr. Brock.

Mr. Boggs with Mr. Morse of Massachusetts.

Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Battin.

Mr. Rodino with Mr. Bob Wilson.

Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Derwinski.

Mr. Fallon with Mrs. Bolton.

Mr. Madden with Mr. Curtis.

Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Utt.

Mr. Delaney with Mr. Smith of California.

Mr. Foley with Mr. Morton.

Mr. Ronan with Mr. Jonas.

Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Horton.

Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Smith of New York.

Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Cleveland.

Mr. Barrett with Mr. Gude.

Mr. Daniels with Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Mr. Everett with Mr. Erlenborn.

Mr. Celler with Mr. Fino.

Mr. Brasco with Mr. Sandman.

Mr. Friedel with Mr. Talcott.

Mr. Gray with Mr. Mailliard.

Mr. Resnick with Mr. McClory.

Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Latta.

Mr. Patman with Mr. Kupferman.

Mr. Roberts with Mr. Button.

Mr. Tunney with Mr. Grover.

Mr. Landrum with Mr. Cramer.

Mr. Young with Mr. Fulton of Tennessee.

Mr. Olsen with Mr. Diggs.

Mr. Williams of Mississippi with Mr. Anderson.

Mr. Rees with Mr. Herlong.

Mr. Stephens with Mr. Vigorito.

Mr. Willis with Mr. Hagan.

Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Rarick.

Mr. Reuss with Mr. McMillan.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR MR. MAHON TO FILE A HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have until midnight tonight to file a House joint resolution, providing for continuing appropriations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT TONIGHT TO FILE A REPORT

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a report on a House joint resolution making continuing appropriations and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

SAN RAFAEL WILDERNESS, LOS PADRES NATIONAL FOREST, CALIF.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5161) to designate the San Rafael Wilderness, Los Padres National Forest, in the State of California, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5161

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in accordance with section 3, subsection (b), of the Wilderness Act (78 Stat. 891), the area shown on the map entitled "Los Padres National Forest, San Rafael Wilderness, proposed", revised July 1967, is hereby designated the San Rafael Wilderness. Said map is and shall continue to be kept on file and available for public inspection in the office of the Chief of the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, and the area thereon shown, comprising approximately one hundred and forty-five thousand acres, is within and shall continue to be a part of Los Padres National Forest.

SEC. 2. As soon as practicable after this Act takes effect, the Secretary of Agriculture shall file a map and a legal description of the San Rafael Wilderness with the Interior and Insular Affairs Committees of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives and such description shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act: *Provided, however,* That correction of clerical and typographical errors in such legal description and map may be made.

SEC. 3. The San Rafael Wilderness shall be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with the provisions of the Wilderness Act governing areas designated by that Act as wilderness areas, except that any reference in such provisions to the effective date of the Wilderness Act shall be deemed to be a reference to the effective date of this Act.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. **SAYLOR**. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Aspinall].

Mr. **ASPINALL**. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in 1964 Congress approved the Wilderness Act. This act incorporated 54 national forest areas into a new wilderness preservation system with a total acreage of 9.1 million acres. The Wilderness Act also authorized the President to examine and recommend the inclusion in the system of certain additional areas. The legislation we have before us today is the first such area recommended by the President. H.R. 5161 would designate about 145,000 acres of land located in the Los Padres National Forest, Santa Barbara County, Calif., as the San Rafael Wilderness.

The San Rafael Wilderness area, which is about 10 miles wide and 21 miles long, has all the characteristics to justify this designation; yet it lies within 100 miles of approximately 6 million people. Its preservation will afford these people an opportunity to visit the area and enjoy a wilderness experience.

Most of the area is extremely rugged and is made up of steep slopes and rocky cliffs. Precipitation averages 12 to 16 inches and occurs almost entirely in the winter months. The summers are hot and dry and, due to extremely hazardous fire conditions during the summers, public use will usually be limited to winter months. The San Rafael Wilderness Area containus numerous sites of unusually well-preserved pictographs which are of archaeological interest as reminders of the now extinct Chumash Indians. The rare California condor, of which there are only about 40 known to be alive, are also found in this area.

Pursuant to the requirements of the Wilderness Act, a study of the potential natural resources of the area has been conducted. The mineral report on the area, prepared by the U.S. Geological Survey, assigns a low mineral potential to the area. Nevertheless, the area will remain open to mineral development under the conditions stated in the 1964 Act.

Although some timber exists within the area, it is noncommercial because of its poor quality and scattered stands. Grazing, which will not be disturbed by the wilderness designation, is likewise limited to isolated patches along the river bottoms. The use of the area's water resources will remain essentially unchanged under the wilderness designation. No storage reservoirs are planned within the area.

The prevention, suppression and control of forest fires is of utmost importance in this area and this is a major factor in the establishment of the boundaries for the wilderness area.

The area recommended by the President comprises 142,722 acres. The committee amended the legislation to include an additional 2,200 acres along the northeast edges of the area in order to preserve outstanding examples of Indian pictographs.

Mr. Speaker, the area to be designated as wilderness is already being administered as national forest lands and, therefore, no additional cost to the Federal Government is anticipated by enactment of this bill. While there was some objection to including the area added by the committee, there was no opposition in the committee to the approval of the bill. I urge the passage of H.R. 5161.

Mr. **KYL**. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **ASPINALL**. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. **KYL**. Mr. Speaker, I commend the chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee for the manner in which he led the committee action, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the ranking minority member.

At the same time, I would hope the very extensive, significant and fragile values which are represented by pictographs and petroglyphs in the designated area will receive the greatest possible attention from the department administering the wilderness, because these are extremely significant and they are of very great value. Any depreciation of the site would cause a great loss.

Mr. **ASPINALL**. Mr. Speaker, I can realize what prompts my friend from Iowa [Mr. Kyl] to make this statement. I spent almost all of my life in the land of the pictographs, and I know how easy it is to desecrate and profane them, and how easy it is for people who visit these areas to take any kind of stone or article and chip and absolutely ruin the values to be found in them.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Saylor].

Mr. **SAYLOR**. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I take this opportunity to commend the chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, my colleague from Colorado [Mr. Aspinall] for having arranged to bring this bill to the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5161, a bill to designate the San Rafael Wilderness, Los Padres National Forest, in the State of California.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation if enacted will mark itself as a historic first. H.R. 5161, designating approximately 145,000 acres as the San Rafael Wilderness constitutes the first proposed addition to the national wilderness preservation system as established under the Wilderness Act of 1964. This legislation focuses both national and international attention on an area of primitive beauty.

The Wilderness Act of 1964, calls upon the President to make recommendations to the Congress of additional areas proposed for inclusion in the national wilderness system. On February 1, 1967, President Johnson proposed the San Rafael Wilderness as an addition to the national wilderness preservation system.

At such time the President said:

> This is only a beginning. We must—and will—do more. We must continue to move forward toward seeing to it that every city dweller—especially those imprisoned by the bleakness and blight of the slums—has ready access to parks, playgrounds, and the untarnished beauty of nature's landscape.

H.R. 5161 is the beginning. I am happy to have sponsored similar legislation for the preservation of this area and for the enjoyment of future generations of American people. I also wish to commend the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Forest Service in their support of the San Rafael Wilderness Area as the first proposed addition to the national wilderness system. I commend Congressman Charles M. Teague for his interest and enthusiasm in this legislation. His introduction of this legislation was an important step in moving this legislation. I also commend the interested citizenry of Santa Barbara County, Calif., who have come forth in public hearings and enthusiastically endorsed this area for inclusion in the national wilderness system.

The proposed San Rafael Wilderness Area is a wooded, mountainous area, 12 miles north of Santa Barbara, Calif. The area is located within a 2-hour drive of 6 million people. The area lies in the San Rafael and Sierra Madre Mountain Ranges in southeastern Santa Barbara County, Calif. It is made up of extremely rugged and rocky cliffs and steep, brushy slopes.

In addition to satisfying the prerequisite qualities of a wilderness area, the San Rafael Wilderness Area also contains several areas of archaeological interest. The area contains some well preserved pictographs of the now extinct Chumash Indians, which are located in the northeast portion of the area. This area also serves as a flyway and resting area for the rare California condor. There are only about 40 of these birds known to be alive today.

The addition of the proposed San Rafael Wilderness Area to the wilderness system involves no expenditure of Federal funds.

The committee, during consideration of this legislation adopted an amendment including an additional 2,200 acres in the wilderness area. This acreage comprises the area of archaeological interest, Indian pictographs and resting area of the California condor.

The only opposition to this legislation comes from the Forest Service as a result of the adoption of the committee amendment to include an additional 2,200 acres. As the sponsor of that amendment, I looked over the testimony presented at the hearings in Santa Barbara and in Washington, D.C. It is remarkable how the Forest Service has changed its attitude and position regarding this legislation. Originally the Forest Service sought to exclude an area of 4,500 acres proposed to be added to the wilderness on the grounds that this area was needed for grazing. Now the Forest Service is opposed to the addition of the 2,200 acres on the basis that its inclusion in the wilderness area interferes with their ability to fight and suppress forest fires.

Mr. Speaker, testimony taken before the committee clearly shows that one of the outstanding firefighters in the San Rafael area told the committee that the inclusion of this area does not hamper the ability of the Forest Service to prevent and suppress forest fires in the area. On the contrary, the area has little, if any, timber and contains mostly brush. It was also stated that the natural "patreros" constituted adequate firebreaks. The area of 2,200 acres included by amendment was proposed for inclusion only after it was determined that all the standards and prerequisites for firefighting could be met by the addition of this area to the San Rafael Wilderness. I would only point out to my colleagues that the opponents of the wilderness system have always pointed to the lack of adequate fire protection as a basis for objecting to wilderness areas in general. The problem of preventing and suppressing fires in this 2,200 acres I am certain is no greater than what is required to prevent and suppress fires in the other 142,722 acres also comprising the San Rafael Wilderness Area.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with our President when he states that we should have access to the untarnished beauty of nature's landscape and I urge the passage of H.R. 5161.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. Teague].

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his very generous remarks about me. I express also my most sincere gratitude to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Aspinall], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Saylor], as well as all members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for the very thorough and careful way in which they studied this bill of mine.

I testified, of course, in support of the bill. I attended almost all of the hearings on the Senate and on the House sides. I was particularly impressed by the thoroughness with which the members of the committee explored this proposal. I am, of course, gratified that they gave it their approval.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. Baring], the chairman of the subcommittee which handled the legislation.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARING. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation, but I believe there is a question as to the interpretation of the Wilderness Act of 1964 under which San Rafael would be created that definitely should be cleared up. During his remarks the gentleman from Colorado, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular affairs already alluded to it and specified his belief that the 1964 act requires continued renewal and leasing development of these lands until the end of 1983.

It is my understanding that this bill, H.R. 5161, creates a new wilderness area, the San Rafael Wilderness, which adds about 145,000 acres of land to lands administered under the provisions of the 1964 Wilderness Act. Now, I am gravely concerned about the administration of lands under the Wilderness Act by the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture insofar as mineral development is concerned. In the report of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on H.R. 5161, there is the following reference to oil and gas leasing:

> However, as practically all of the area has been segregated from oil and gas leasing since 1953 and much of it has also been withdrawn from mining location since 1936, the area has probably not been prospected thoroughly. The area will remain open to mineral development under the conditions stated in the 1964 act.

It has come to my attention through testimony of representatives of the Department of the Interior at the hearings on this legislation and from policy statements by the U.S. Forest Service, that there is an erroneous intepretation by the executive agencies of those sections of the 1964 Wilderness Act dealing with oil and gas leasing of lands within wilderness areas under the Mineral Leasing Act.

There are two sections in the Wilderness Act that apply to mineral development of wilderness areas. Section 4(d)(2) of the Wilderness Act provides for obtaining information on mineral values of wilderness areas by the executive agencies. Section 4(d)(3) provides for the development of minerals under the mining laws and the various mineral leasing acts by private industry, and reads in part as follows:

> (3) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, until midnight December 31, 1983, the United States mining laws and all laws pertaining to mineral leasing shall, to the same extent as applicable prior to the effective date of this Act, extended to those national forest lands designated by this Act as "wilderness areas". . .

In the administration of primitive and wilderness areas under the 1964 Wilderness Act, I have been advised that the Secretary of Agriculture acting through the Forest Service will not recommend approval of oil and gas leases except where the lands subject to the lease can be developed from drill sites located outside of a primitive or wilderness area. This policy is expressly set forth in the Forest Service manual and has been repeated in communications to private industry. In other words, the Secretary of Agriculture has construed section 4(d)(3) of the 1964 Wilderness Act to authorize the Secretary to prohibit the leasing of wilderness or primitive area lands for the purposes of oil and gas development if surface use is required. Since the passage of the 1964 Wilderness Act, the Department of the Interior, acting upon the recommendations of the Secretary of Agriculture, has issued no oil and gas leases in wilderness or primitive areas with the right of surface entry. This has effectively blocked any development of wilderness and primitive areas for oil and gas purposes. It is depriving the United States of what might be substantial revenues at a time when the Treasury is sorely in need of every cent it can get.

This interpretation of the executive agencies flies directly in the face of both the intent and the express language of section 4 of the Wilderness Act. The passage of the subject bill, H.R. 5161, appears to be an appropriate time to reemphasize the intent and purpose of section 4(d)(3) of the Wilderness Act, and to make this perfectly clear to the agencies administering lands subject to the Wilderness Act. It was at the time of the passage of the Wilderness Act, and is now, the intent of Congress that the Mineral Leasing Acts, as well as the mining laws, shall have a meaningful application to primitive and wilderness lands until December 31, 1983. Applications for oil and gas leases may not be rejected by the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture solely on the basis that such lands are within a primitive or wilderness area.

Is the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. Baring], chairman of the Public Lands Subcommittee, in agreement with my statement as to the affect of the provisions of the Wilderness Act on oil and gas leasing, and the intent of the Congress in this regard?

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, I am in complete agreement with the gentleman's statement. The Wilderness Act was the result of 8 years of hearings, studies and conferences and was an attempt to harmonize viewpoints which, in some cases were in violent conflict. As chairman of the Public Lands Subcommittee, I held extensive hearings and heard the views of over 600 witnesses. One of the biggest conflicts that appeared during the deliberations on this legislation was the treatment of mineral resource development. The final compromise solution between the views of the House and Senate after conference appears in the Wilderness Act as section 4(d)(3). The final solution followed the House viewpoint and consisted of a phasing out of mineral development activity during the period terminating December 31, 1983. I am confident that the Wilderness Act would have never become law without the inclusion of the provision that allowed a definite period of time for private industry to either develop or condemn a wilderness area for its mineral values.

Now, to my great shock, it has come to my attention that the executive agencies have interpreted 4(d)(3) to be authority for the agencies, in their discretion, to withdraw from the operation of the Mineral Leasing Act all lands within wilderness areas. To me, this is a glaring example of execuitve agencies defying the express direction of the Congress. It is therefore appropriate and necessary at this time to reaffirm the intent of Congress in regard to the administration of section 4(d)(3) of the Wilderness Act. It is now and always has been the intent of Congress in the Wilderness Act that no application for a least under the mineral leasing laws shall be rejected for the reason that the lands involved are contained within a wilderness or primitive area—and the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture are obligated to administer these lands accordingly. Any other interpretation of section 4(d)(3) would lead to the untenable result that wilderness areas would be completely withdrawn from the operation of the mineral leasing acts, without ever having been tested or explored under the procedures provided by the Congress in the Wilderness Act.

Mr. HOSMER. I thank the gentleman for his very explicit clarification of this matter.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the designation of the San Rafael Wilderness.

However, I do want to express my very deep concern about a certain portion of the area involved.

This is approximately 2,200 acres which were added by the committee to the initial proposal of the Forest Service.

The original proposal submitted to Congress by the Forest Service amounted to 143,000 acres; so you can see the basic wilderness area is considerable, and the 2,200 acres which subsequently was added is a relatively small amount as compared to the whole.

I raise my objections to the inclusion of this 2,200 acres because of the substantial forest fire threat to the whole parcel that this poses.

If the Forest Service is going to be able to fully protect the San Rafael Wilderness from forest fire, this additional area should be left out of it.

It is needed by the Forest Service for vital forest fire presuppression work of a type not permitted in wilderness areas.

As a Californian, I am especially aware of this need.

As in much of southern California, the vegetation of the proposed San Rafael Wilderness and the surrounding region is largely brush type.

Whenever fire breaks out in this type, it burns with great intensity.

When fanned by the winds common to the area, these huge conflagrations sweep over the countryside faster than men can run. The best chance to stop one of these fires is by removing the flammable vegetation from its path. Ridgetops are the best place to do this because the fires move more slowly before spilling over the ridges.

Accordingly, throughout California, Federal, State, and local fire prevention agencies have established or are establishing systems of fuel breaks extending along strategic ridges.

This is true on the ridgetops bordering the proposed San Rafael Wilderness.

However, during the subcommittee hearings on H.R. 5161, certain groups proposed that 2,200 acres be added along the northeast edge.

It was stated that the proposed addition did not include areas where the Forest Service had done fuel-break work, or planned to do it.

The Forest Service was asked to review this proposal from the standpoint of fire control needs.

The agency did so and reported in a letter to the subcommittee chairman, the Honorable WALTER S. BARING, dated July 11, 1967.

Here is what the Forest Service stated about fire control needs in this area:

> One of our major concerns during the entire review process has been what effect the designation of the San Rafael Wilderness will have on our ability to redeem our fire protection responsibilities for lands both inside and outside the wilderness.
>
> After this further study, we believe the boundaries we have recommended are essential to permit the most effective advance preparations for fire control.
>
> One of the most serious fire threats in brushy areas such as the San Rafael is from great sweeping conflagrations that move rapidly on a wide front.
>
> It has been proved that advance preparations of fuel breaks will greatly enhance our chances of keeping such a fire from sweeping over a ridge from one drainage to another
>
> Several years ago, we embarked on a program of establishing such a system of fuel breaks along a nearly 10-mile stretch of the Sierra Madre Ridge southeast of Montgomery Potrero.
>
> This system consists of areas of type conversion (brush and grass) connecting the natural potreros.
>
> About 900 acres of this work has been done to date, and another 600 acres are planned for treatment
>
> The suggested 2200-acre addition to the wilderness would preclude doing this additional work.
>
> We think the additional work is as important as the work that has been done.

I am assured that this represents the position and views of the local forest officers who are familiar with the situation on the ground.

Most of the type conversion work done to date in this area is outside the proposed 2,200-acre addition. But some of it is inside the proposed addition. The fuel-break job is not complete. To make the protection line fully effective 600 acres more needs to be treated within the proposed addition.

I believe we should accept the professional judgment of the Forest Service. They are the experts on forest and brush fire control and prevention. If we fail to heed their advice, the San Rafael Wilderness will not be adequately protected from fire; and the bordering drainage to the northeast will also be endangered.

Mr. Speaker, the urgency of the situation is emphasized by the morning news reports of the fires which are sweeping large acreages of southern California.

Already more than two dozen homes have been burned and one elderly woman has been killed in a fire-related traffic accident.

These fires that are ravaging lands of southern California are not an immediate threat to the San Rafael nor are they on national forest lands; however, they are in the same type of brush country that we are talking about in the 2,200 acre addition to the San Rafael Wilderness.

As is seen by the current fires with the high humidity and high wind conditions which exist both in these fires and can exist on the 2,200 acres there is practically nothing that can stop them without adequate fire protection which can be accomplished only through construction of firebreaks which would not be permitted if the 2,200 acres were retained in the wilderness.

Therefore I think that we have a dramatic and tragic example of why we need these firebreaks in the 2,200-acre area under question and they should be excluded.

It has also been stated that the 2,200-acre addition to the administration's proposal must be made to adequately protect the Chumash Indian pictographs in the area.

The Forest Service made it clear during the subcommittee hearings; and reiterated in its letter of July 11, 1967, that it agrees with the need to protect these pictographs, but their protection does not depend upon the area being classified as wilderness.

The agency already has sufficient authority to protect the archeological features on any national forest lands. There is no need to make the addition for this purpose. The Forest Service has already taken steps to protect the pictographs involved by closing to public travel the road in this vicinity. They plan to keep it closed.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I want to emphasize that I am in complete agreement with the proposal to establish the San Rafael Wilderness. I intend today to vote in favor of H.R. 5161 which we have before us. However, I do want to make the record clear the problems which can result and the threat which will be posed to the entire San Rafael Wilderness Area if in the final analysis these 2,200 acres are not excluded.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Colorado that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 5161, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 889) to designate the San Rafael Wilderness, Los Padres National Forest, in the State of California, a similar bill to the one just passed.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 889

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in accordance with subsection 3(b) of the Wilderness Act of September 3, 1964 (78 Stat. 891), the area classified as the San Rafael Primitive Area, with the proposed additions thereto, as generally depicted on a map entitled "San Rafael Wilderness—Proposed," dated October 3, 1966, which is on file and available for public inspection in the office of the Chief, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, is hereby designated as the San Rafael Wilderness within and as a part of Los Padres National Forest, comprising an area of approximately 143,000 acres.

SEC. 2. As soon as practicable after this Act takes effect, the Secretary of Agriculture shall file a map and a legal description of the San Rafael Wilderness with the Interior and Insular Affairs Committees of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives and such description shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act: *Provided, however,* That correction of clerical and typographical errors in such legal description and map may be made.

SEC. 3. The San Rafael Wilderness shall be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with the provisions of the Wilderness Act governing area designated by that Act as wilderness areas, except that any reference in such provisions to the effective date of the Wilderness Act shall be deemed to be a reference to the effective date of this Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ASPINALL

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ASPINALL: Strike all after the enacting clause of S. 889 and insert the provisions of H.R. 5161 as passed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 5161) was laid on the table.

EXTENDING TIME FOR FILING REPORT OF COMMISSION ON URBAN PROBLEMS

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 112) extending the time for filing report of Commission on Urban Problems, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

S.J. RES. 112

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

Section 301(b) of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 is amended by striking "within 18 months" and all that follows and inserting in lieu thereof "not later than December 31, 1968."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN] will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair now recognizes the gentlewoman from Missouri.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, Senate Joint Resolution 112 was approved by voice votes in the Subcommittee on Housing and the full Committee on Banking and Currency without controversy. The resolution simply extends from March 6, 1968, to December 31, 1968, the deadline for the report of the National Commission on Urban Problems chaired by former Senator Paul Douglas. This Commission was established pursuant to section 301 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, sponsored by our distinguished colleague and ranking minority member, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL]. The Commission finds that it cannot meet the 18-month reporting period provided in that act and has requested this extension. In particular, it has requested that the additional time be approved as soon as possible so that in hiring staff experts it can give them some assurance that the work will continue beyond next March.

Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the urgency and seriousness of the problems which this Commission is studying and the value of its activities. I urge all of my colleagues to support the resolution.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, this was fully approved within the committee and by the subcommittee. It continues the work of the Commission that has been set up and which has a reporting date of March 1968. It extends the time for reporting until December 1968. It does not involve any new authorization or appropriation. I believe the time extension is fully warranted and the Commission is for a good purpose and is doing a good job.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I find it difficult to understand why the President did not name this Commission on or shortly after September 6, 1966. Why did he wait until January 12 of 1967 before naming the Commission? We have had several pieces of legislation to extend the time and life of commissions, not always for the same reason, but we getting too many of them. In this instant case I do not understand why the President did not timely appoint this Commission, because he had the authority to do so after the appropriation was made, and I reiterate, the appropriation was made last September.

Mr. WIDNALL. This I understand, but I cannot answer as to why the President did not appoint the Commission sooner. I do not feel, that having been appointed, they have had sufficient time during which to act. The extension of time which has been requested as a result of the introduction of this legislation in my opinion represents a reasonable request.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I wonder if it is due to politics? The President had the money and the authority to name this Commission more than a year ago. I just do not understand why he laid back in the harness until January 12, 1967?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a response to the question propounded by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Missouri.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to advise the gentleman from Iowa that this is a nonpartisan Commission engaged in a nonpartisan inquiry, and a very important one. It took some time to find well-qualified people to serve on this Commission. When one reads the list of the members of the Commission, one can see that this represents a good selection of highly competent citizens and will recognize the further fact that they are qualified to do a very good job, and are doing a good job.

Mr. GROSS. Well——

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I respect the views of the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] and appreciate his yielding. However, I would like to go just a bit further and ask three very simple questions about the extension of this Commission. All of these questions are predicated upon the fact that in this calendar year, this is the third Commission for which request has been made for the extension thereof, according to my personal recollection.

The first Commission for which request was made for extension was the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission upon which action was extended in this House on April 24, 1967, until November 1968, at a cost of $20,500. The colloquy having to do with the extension of this Commission occurred in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page 10497.

Second, was the extension of the Indian Claims Commission, the request therefor which came before the House on March 20, 1967. The beginning of that colloquy can be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page 7254. This extended the life of the Commission for the period of 5 years, and added two additional members. Further, it carried an additional cost of $70,000 per year.

Mr. Speaker, with that background, I would like to know why 6 months ahead of time the Commission now determines that it cannot get its work completed and its report in on time and, second, how much more it will cost? Third, why the President waited from September to the following March of this year to make the appointments?

Mr. WIDNALL. I have no figures and no indication to the effect that there will be any additional cost, other than the original cost contemplated under this legislation.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from New Jersey will yield further, this is most satisfying in this time when we are trying to cut back on expenditures as well as obligational authority. It is my opinion that the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] is giving me what information he has in his possession, but the question of so many, and such prolonged and highly paid study groups remains. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentlewoman from Missouri that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 112), as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 344, nays 10, not voting 78, as follows:

[Roll No. 310]

YEAS—344

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, Ala.
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Ayres
Baring
Bates
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bevill
Biester
Bingham
Blackburn
Blanton
Blatnik
Boland
Bolling
Bow
Brademas
Brinkley
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Bush
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cahill
Carey
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cohelan
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Corbett
Corman
Cowger
Culver
Cunningham
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
de la Garza
Dellenback
Denney
Dent
Devine
Dickinson
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Eilberg
Esch
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Goodell
Goodling
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Haley
Halleck
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey
Hathaway
Hays
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Helstoski
Henderson
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Kelly
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kleppe
Kornegay
Kuykendall
Kyl
Kyros
Laird
Langen
Lennon
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Lukens
McClure
McCulloch
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
McFall
MacGregor
Machen
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin
Mathias, Calif.
Mathias, Md.
Matsunaga
Mayne
Meeds
Meskill
Michel
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Monagan
Montgomery
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris, N. Mex.
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Myers
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nichols
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
O'Neal, Ga.
Ottinger
Patten
Pelly
Perkins
Pettis
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pollock
Pool
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Pryor
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Railsback
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reinecke
Rhodes, Pa.
Riegle
Rivers
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ruppe
Ryan
St Germain
Satterfield
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherle
Scheuer
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Selden
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Okla.
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stratton
Stuckey
Sullivan
Taft
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thompson, Ga.
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Tiernan
Tuck
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Waldie
Walker
Wampler
Watkins
Watts
Whalen
Whalley
White
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams, Pa.
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Winn
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Yates
Zablocki
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—10

Andrews, N. Dak.
Ashbrook
Bray
Clancy
Gross
Hall
Quillen
Roudebush
Snyder
Watson

NOT VOTING—78

Anderson, Tenn.
Annunzio
Arends
Barrett
Battin
Boggs
Bolton
Brasco
Brock
Brooks
Broomfield
Button
Cleveland
Cramer
Curtis
Delaney
Derwinski
Diggs
Erlenborn
Everett
Fallon
Findley
Fino
Foley
Fountain
Fulton, Tenn.
Gardner
Gray
Gude
Hagan
Hammerschmidt
Hawkins
Hébert
Herlong
Horton
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Kazen
King, N.Y.
Kluczynski
Kupferman
Landrum
Latta
Leggett
McCarthy
McClory
McMillan
Macdonald, Mass.
Madden
May
Miller, Calif.
Morse, Mass.
Murphy, N.Y.
Olsen
O'Neill, Mass.
Passman
Patman
Pepper
Randall
Rarick
Rees
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Roberts
Ronan
Rooney, Pa.
St. Onge
Sandman
Smith, N.Y.
Stephens
Stubblefield
Talcott
Tunney
Utt
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Young

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate joint resolution as amended, was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts with Mr. Morse of Massachusetts.
Mr. Hébert with Mrs. Bolton.
Mr. Annunzio with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Fountain with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. McClory.
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.
Mr. Madden with Mr. Cramer.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Jonas.
Mr. Foley with Mrs. May.
Mr. Ronan with Mr. Curtis.
Mr. St. Onge with Mr. King of New York.
Mr. Boggs with Mr. Horton.
Mr. Everett with Mr. Cleveland.
Mr. Brasco with Mr. Findley.
Mr. Resnick with Mr. Talcott.
Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Roberts with Mr. Button.
Mr. Williams of Mississippi with Mr. Gardner.
Mr. Rees with Mr. Derwinski.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Latta.
Mr. Reuss with Mr. Smith of New York.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Sandman.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Erlenborn.
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Gude.
Mr. Young with Mr. Hammerschmidt.
Mr. Olsen with Mr. Battin.
Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Anderson of Tennessee.
Mr. Gray with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Randall with Mr. Rarick.
Mr. Leggett with Mr. Hawkins.
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Stubblefield.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Herlong.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Passman.
Mr. McMillan with Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts.
Mr. Brooks with Mr. Landrum.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DON'T RUN TO THE SHOWROOMS

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the 1968 model automobiles are in the showrooms. Except for a few new body design creases, they are not much different from the 1967 models. However, the prices are up—way up. The $101 to $114 factory markups announced by General Motors, Ford, and Chrysler tell only part of the story.

The 1968 price markup coupled with the tight market in car supplies generated by the early cessation in the production of 1967 models and the automobile strike have created a dealer's delight. Under these pressures, the buyer is urged to pay the full sticker price and take as much as $500 less for his trade-in.

Personally, I am going to keep my 1965 model a little while longer. After I purchased it, it took almost the full 2-year period of the guarantee to get it completed. Automobile manufacturers are using the warranty program as a do-it-yourself car completion device. During the warranty program, the owner is given the opportunity to complete his own car and get essential things done—such as attaching the steering wheel, rewiring the horn, and getting the brakes hooked up. In the old days, a completed car usually ran for 50,000 or 60,000 miles on occasional lubrications and a change of oil. I can remember owning several cars that never went back to the dealer.

Getting an automobile completed is no easy job. It is almost a career. If you bring in the car with a bad horn switch, it must be left overnight. After five trips to repair the horn, I still have problems. I was unlucky enough to buy a car on which they forgot to fasten the body to the frame—that took 3 days. Do you know what an oscillator is? I found out after three more trips under the warranty.

In order to complete my 1965 automobile under the warranty, I lost the use of my car for 11 days and I had to arrange for travel to and from the dealer's repair shop on 11 occasions. Since the dealer was located 6 miles from my home, I had to travel 66 unnecessary miles to deliver the car. In addition, I had to arrange for transportation from the dealer on the 11 occasions. This would have cost $33 in cab fare.

Therefore, the total cost of completing my 1965 automobile under the do-it-yourself plan was:

In cab fare	$33.00
In loss of use of my car for 11 days at $8 per day	88.00
Estimated value of frustration	264.75
Total cost of car completion	385.75

If the automobile manufacturers think I want to go through this again on a new 1968 model, they have another thought coming. My 1965 model has just been completed, and now I want to enjoy it.

THE HIGH COST OF BEING A CONGRESSMAN

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the Dodd, Powell, and Bobby Baker affairs, so thoroughly investigated and reported by the mass media, have adversely affected Congress standing in the eyes of the American people. These scandals, however, are symptoms of a larger, more troublesome problem—namely, our system of financing and conducting elections.

Our able and widely respected colleague, Morris K. Udall, of Arizona, diagnoses this illness in the body politic and prescribes some remedies in the current issue of Playboy magazine.

I recommend Congressman Udall's article, entitled "The High Cost of Being a Congressman," to everyone concerned with the strength and vitality of American political institutions, and with permission granted I insert the article at this point:

The High Cost of Being a Congressman

What does it take today to succeed in politics? Speaking ability, personality, a willingness to work long and hard, certainly. Leadership ability, a quick mind, television showmanship—these qualities still count, too. But as one who has been down that political road, I must sadly report that there is something rapidly becoming more important than all of them: The name of the game is *money* and the ability to raise it.

In case you don't know it already, the subject of campaign money, who gives it, who gets it and the preposterous bundle of laws that "control" it is approaching a national outrage. These laws and practices, in the judgment of one who has to live with them, are shot full of hypocrisy, threatening to corrupt many good men in public life, giving unnecessary influence and power to special-interest groups and lobbies and posing a serious threat to the integrity of American political institutions.

Hardly a newspaper of recent years has been without headlines about Senator Thomas Dodd and his financial problems, Representative Adam Clayton Powell and his use of taxpayers' money, ex-Senate Majority Secretary Bobby Baker and his reported fund-raising exploits, the $1000 President's Club, testimonial dinners, corporate ads in political program books, etc. As I see them, these are all symptoms of a basic illness—our dismal and archaic system of financing and conducting elections. It's a mess that no amount of patchwork will correct. Your lawmakers—state and Federal—are partly to blame for this deplorable situation, but the public shares a heavy responsibility, too. All of us should join in insisting that fundamental changes are made, and made *now*.

One might counter that we've always had unsavory things in political finance—so what's new? Well, escalation is new, for one thing. It's not news that campaigns cost money, but the explosion in costs over the past 15 years is dramatic and dangerous. It adds a whole new dimension to the problem. Jackson, Lincoln or even Grover Cleveland could campaign on a small budget and stand a good chance of success. Lincoln was elected President without leaving Springfield, and the major parties spent less than $200,000 *total*. But by 1960, John F. Kennedy had to travel 44,000 miles and the two parties had to spend more than $40,000,000. And just four years later, Johnson and Goldwater found themselves pouring more than $55,000,000 into their pursuit of the same office.

My brother, Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall, was elected to Congress in 1960 from the Congressional district I now represent—with an expenditure of under $13,000. His partisans charged his Republican opponent, who reportedly spent $35,000, with a "blatant attempt to buy the election." Just four years later, when I ran for re-election in the same district, I was opposed by an able and well-financed candidate—and I had to step up my spending, too. I can imagine that 1960 loser laughing when I reported spending $35,000 and my opponent $5000 more than that. Even these figures, however, pale beside those of the hard-fought race in Virginia's Tenth District last year—between Congressman Joel T. Broyhill and his unsuccessful challenger, Clive DuVal. Total spending: $220,000. Or the 1964 race in New York where Representative Richard L. Ottinger spent $193,000 *all by himself!* Such examples are becoming more common every year and threaten to become the general rule.

Take the case of Milton Shapp. In 1966, this wealthy but obscure Pennsylvanian decided to run for governor. Into a successful primary against the "organization" candidate, he poured $1,400,000 (all but $3000 of it his own). He reported spending another $2,400,000 *of his money* in his losing effort in November. (With all due respect to a fellow Democrat who may have made a good governor, I find his *losing* the one ray of hope in an otherwise forlorn picture. However, Shapp's campaign manager says the Republicans spent $5,400,000, and that hardly lightens my gloom.) Nelson Rockefeller spent at least this much in his successful 1966 reelection effort. More and more men of great wealth are going into politics, and this is not all bad; the Rockefellers, Harrimans, Kennedys and Scrantons have given distinguished public service, just as I suspect Shapp might have. But we are approaching the point where *only* the wealthy, or those financed by special interests, will be able to serve.

From these case histories, it can be seen that a candidate's decision on his campaign finance arrangements may be the most important one he makes—unless it's the selection of his public-relations firm. For the era of the political PR man has dawned with a vengeance. The best-known invention of this new breed of political expert is the "packaged candidate," sold with the same Madison Avenue expertise that works so well for a new laxative or detergent. And, as you can imagine, this new political technology has no place for a Lincoln with principles, strong views and a desire to talk tough issues ("Oppose slavery? Hell, man, there goes half the electorate.") Today's PR man would laugh Honest Abe all the way to the elevator.

The new technique eliminates risk taking. Before a single thing is done, the PR firm conducts a market survey to find out not what the country *needs* but what a majority of voters at this fleeting moment think they *want*. Then the candidate is presented with a carefully selected list of positions he is supposed to take. Thereafter, an appropriate "image" is sold to the public with slogans, jingles, billboards and all the rest. As one commentator said, this is like polling high school students to find out which courses are easiest and most fun, then drafting the curriculum accordingly.

An important part of this package technique is to avoid all debates and all but the blandest speeches. Hal Evry, a highly successful Los Angeles PR man, says: "Clients who campaign least win the most votes." Last year, he boasted about one client, a political unknown with no organized support, who was elected without making a single speech or shaking a single hand. His entire campaign consisted of billboard posters, newspaper ads, telegrams and handbills proclaiming, three cheers for Pat Milligan. He had enough money, and he won.

The major Federal law governing elections, the Corrupt Practices Act of 1925, is a farce. Despite regular violations of its letter and spirit, there has never been a candidate or a political committee prosecuted under its provisions. The Justice Department isn't about to start, either. This law limits spending in Congressional elections to $5000 for each candidate. As my able colleague Representative Jim Wright of Texas wrote recently: "If I told you I had never spent more than $5000 in a House race, I'd be a hypocrite. And if I actually had spent so little in my first race, I'd never have been elected."

The ineffectiveness of this law is apparent by noting three gigantic loopholes: First, it doesn't cover primaries—the real fights in many states. In primaries, the sky is the limit. Second, the $5000 limit doesn't apply to expenditures for such "extraneous" items as printing, postage, telephone and telegraph expenses, travel or speechwriting. This is like telling your wife that her use of the department-store charge account is limited to $100 per month except for hats, dresses, fur coats and shoes—on which there is no limit. As if these loopholes weren't big enough, there is an even bigger one. It relieves me of any duty to report—or to have anyone else reporte—expenditures of a Udall for Congress Campaign Committee. The phony explanation. of course, is that I don't really know what my committee is up to. And there is no Federal law limiting what it may spend.

Congressmen, aspirants to unseat them, lobbyists, businessmen, ordinary citizens—all of us are caught up in a financial web. Suppose you are a freshman member of Congress. It's 1968. You have worked hard at your job, studied issues, tried in every way to represent your district fairly and diligently. You've learned the ropes and you would like to continue. What must you do? If your district is anything like mine (and not beset with even higher costs), you've got to lay your hands on something like $25,000 to $40,000. Either that or your new political career will go down the drain.

Or suppose a young lawyer or businessman, equally sincere and honest, decides to run against you. He's a prisoner, too. He may believe he can do a better job. He may think your policies are bad for the country. What must he do? For him, money is even more important. He needs "name identification," because he's a newcomer. But he might as well save his money, shoes and breath unless he can raise $30,000 to $50,000. My question to you is: Where would *you* go to get this kind of money? Seriously.

Of course, even these amounts are small potatoes in some Congressional districts. And if you want to be a Senator from New York or the governor of California, the cause is almost hopeless without a kitty of literally millions. Which brings us to the great new phenomenon in American politics—the superstar candidate. Because it costs so much to create name identification, particularly in the big races with large constituencies, someone figured out that there would be inherent advantages to fielding candidates who had already achieved fame in other activities—especially show business and sports. Already we have elected several such men to high office.

Some people are inclined to pass off the election of actors George Murphy (to the United States Senate) and Ronald Reagan (to the California governorship) as aberrations of a zany state that has produced both Disneyland and *Gold Diggers of 1933*. I don't think the phenomenon can be dismissed that easily. This is surely the wave of the future in an increasingly large and mobile electorate.

Other examples come to mind. Except for the Goldwater debacle, Oklahoma might well have sent football coach Bud Wilkinson to the Senate. And except for a bathroom accident, Ohio might have done the same for astronaut John Glenn. Congressman Bob Mathias of California, the great Olympic decathlon champion, won with a big majority in his first try last year. "It's not that people voted for me because I was an athlete," he told a reporter, "but what did help was that people knew my name. Look what other candidates spend just to get their names publicized. The two Olympic gold medals were the most important contributions to my campaign fund."

I don't contend that we must elect only lawyers or those with prior political experience to high office, but as long as it costs millions to get name identification, I'm afraid there will be a tendency to pass over able but lesser-known candidates who offer nothing but a capacity for effective public service. The famous names of show business and sports will get the nod.

Although neither side wants it—in any race—escalation is the order of the day. I would be happy, for example, to limit my spending in the 1968 campaign to $10,000. I would even stay at this figure and let my challenger spend $15,000, If I knew we were both *tightly limited* to these amounts. He might be willing, too, but it never works out that way. Things quickly get out of hand.

My advisors will call me in Washington: "You'd better adjourn and get out here. Your opponent is campaigning like crazy." They tell me he has put up 60 billboards, each averaging about $80 to $100 per month. They insist we get billboards, too, and $5,000 is gone. They tell me he has contracted for $6,000 worth of television time and $3,000 in radio spots. We buy TV and radio time. Taking the initiative, we run two full-page newspaper ads in Tucson (at $1,200 each) and in three smaller out-of-town dailies (about $200 each). He answers. I learn of the opposition's direct-mail campaign to reach every voter (up to $18,000 for a single mailing). Do we meet this? Probably—if we can. As the election nears, my opponent, sensing victory, raises the ante—two more full-page ads and ten extra television spots. We think we're ahead, but we can't be sure. Another $3,000 down the drain.

Thus it ever goes. Few candidates can make a budget and stick to it. Each candidate's budget is made by his opponent, and by the fears of what might be coming next. In most of the 434 other Congressional districts, the story will be repeated. Candidates need money; in most cases, they don't have it. It must come from friends, relatives, supporters and the party faithful. And by virtue of this sick and dangerous system, much of it inevitably will come from special-interest groups with an ax to grind.

An ax to grind, yes—and yet I suppose I would not be giving you a complete or a fair picture if I left it at that. Even special-interest groups are a part of our American system. The Constitution guarantees the people the right to petition their Government, and this right doesn't belong to Aunt Mary in Spokane or to the lonely pensioner in Arizona. It belongs to labor unions, the American Medical Association, the American Beekeeping Federation, the Sierra Club and thousands of other organizations composed of citizens directly affected by the taxes the Government levies, the money it spends, the laws it passes or defeats. As government grows, so do the stakes in influencing public policy; how and where the Federal Government spends more than 100 billion dollars this year can mean jobs and prosperity—or unemployment and depression—for whole communities and occupational groups.

It's the honorable lobbyist's job to influence, by legal means, the decisions of the Government. And it's a lot easier to have favorable decisions made for your group if candidates are elected who believe in your legislative program. The problem is with the candidate who—perhaps against his better judgment but out of financial pressure—wakes up on election morning in bed with one of these special-interest groups.

But back to our hypothetical campaign. Suppose you're the lucky winner. Even more luckily, you find that your campaign donations equaled your expenditures. You assume you are going to Washington with that fat $30,000 salary and all those huge expense accounts the press likes to write about. Your money troubles—you think—are over.

This is a cruel joke. Your troubles have just begun. You're not joining the jet set—it's more like the debt set. Now, don't get me wrong. I'm proud to be in Congress in these troubled times. I knew the salary when I ran and I have managed to get by reasonably well. Most of my fellow citizens earn far less. It's kind of laughable to "poormouth" with a $30,000 salary, and I'm not asking for sympathy. But I do ask for understanding.

What does it cost to be a Congressman? In the first place, you find that your $30,000 salary doesn't go as far as you thought it would. With two homes to maintain, more clothes to buy and higher prices than you paid back home, you discover it's really the equivalent, in standard-of-living terms, of about $20,000 in Topeka, Tulsa or Tucson. As for those fat allowances you read about, you suddenly realize they cover only such things as electric typewriters, dictating machines, stamps, stationery, long-distance calls and staff salaries. You never even get to feel the money, and yet people back home imagine you're rolling in it.

These allowances are regular operating costs, which a third vice-president of a dog-food company would take for granted. None of them puts any money in your pocket or any food on your table. Yet at least one newspaper chain regularly "exposes" the fact that published laws provide Congressmen with these "bonus" gratuities from an unknowing and hapless public.

A Congressman has three kinds of expenses. Like every other citizen, he has to pay for food, clothing, the education of his children, life insurance, transportation and all the rest. Also, in common with all political candidates, he has campaign expenses. And unlike ordinary citizens, and unlike *losing* candidates, he has a whole range of semiofficial expenses. He has these only because he is a public official and, contrary to popular belief, almost none of them are paid by the taxpayers.

Let's look at some of these semiofficial expenses. Every month, certain things are expected and demanded of you if you are to represent the people of your district adequately and establish a record you can be proud of. They come from your pocketbook and they add up to $10,000 or $15,000 every year:

Trips home. Until three months ago, I was entitled to five Government-paid round trips to Arizona each year, but my constituents expected to see me a lot more often than that. Thus, to do my job adequately, I had to pay out about $2000 a year in additional air fare. Under a new law, I'll be able to make one Government-paid trip for each month Congress is in session, but I'll continue to pay my own car-rental bills, hotel, and restaurant expenses on those trips. I estimate my trips home will still cost me about $1000 a year.

Local office. In the Tucson Federal Building, as a service to my constituents, I maintain a two-room office. It gives me a base of operations when I'm in Arizona and it provides the people I represent with ready access to their Congressman. I get the rooms and a part-time staff courtesy of Uncle Sam; but part of the telephone expense, answering service, equipment and supplies are on me. Another $1500 a year down the drain.

Public information. Every month or so, I try to write and publish an informational newsletter. It goes to 22,000 people who have asked to be on my mailing list. The exchange of views that it prompts enables me to do a better job. While Uncle Sam pays the postage, I pay the printer about $250 per issue. Each year, I send a questionnaire to every one of the 175,000 addresses in my district and, again, I pay for the printing. Also the computerized tabulation. Debit M.K.U. $3000. Still another part of this informational function covers regular public-service radio and TV reports to stations in Arizona. Congressmen get a cheap price from the "plush" House recording studios; but even so, the bills run another $2500 per year.

Miscellaneous expenses. On top of these items, a Senator or a Congressman has constituents to entertain, within-the-state travel to be paid for, official dinners to attend and a duty to contribute to most of the organized (and some of the most unorganized) charities you've ever heard of. More money gone.

All these things are semiofficial, because, you don't legally have to do any of them. And let's face the fact that if they are done right, they may help you get reelected; they have a political aspect, too.

Remember the famous $18,000 Nixon Fund of 1952? These are the things it was established to cover. I frankly never quite understood all the fuss about the California businessmen who gave $250 each to make up this fund for Senator Richard Nixon. Each of them could have given Nixon more than this—and probably did—for his regular campaign expenses. At that time, a Senator made $15,000 a year; and out of his salary, he was expected to do the kinds of things I have listed above. Although such funds are now out of style, the expenditures they were intended to cover are still with us. And they're escalated, too.

If you are the winner in your race and you're lucky, you may have a modest surplus of campaign funds for these purposes. Wealthy ancestors and the laws of inheritance can also turn the trick. If you have neither of these, you may have to go into your salary and savings—and perhaps resort to one of the quaint rites and ceremonies that have evolved to meet the financial needs of our political system.

On his way to jail, the notorious robber Willie Sutton was asked by a reporter why he robbed banks. "Because that's where the money is," he answered. Where is the money for all the political campaigns in this country—and for all of the semiofficial expenses I have talked about? Because of the inflated costs of campaigning and serving in public office, an elaborate system of raising money has grown up.

Heading the list of these rites is the testimonial dinner. From John F. Kennedy to Barry Goldwater, nearly every political candidate in modern times (including this writer, on a single occasion) has used this device. Its time-honored features include a famous speaker to draw a crowd, bunting and partisan oratory, rubber chicken or drab roast beef and a price tag of $25 to $500 per plate. It's a dangerous diet in more ways than one; but given the present state of affairs, it's a proper, legitimate and usually effective fund-raising device—if the proceeds are used (as I have used them) strictly for campaign or semiofficial expenses. Former Senator Paul Douglas, one of the most honest and frugal men ever to serve in Congress, has called this kind of testimonial the "most effective and decent device that has yet been developed." But the testimonial dinner is a deplorable device if used (as I understand Senator Dodd has acknowledged doing) to raise money for a new house, suit, car, wedding or family vacation.

Another variation of this game is the party gala held each year or so in Washington by the Democratic and Republican national committees. Tickets are usually $100 to $500, and as many as 5000 businessmen, lobbyists, ambitious upper-level bureaucrats and party faithful crowd the hall to see, hear and touch the party greats. A successful night will bring in $500,000, or maybe two or three times that.

There are other popular rituals. For example, there are the President's Club (for Democrats) and the Booster's Club (for Republicans). A $1000 to $10,000 donation will get you an autographed picture of Johnson or Eisenhower and perhaps an invitation to the White House or Gettysburg. I think the American people ought to be outraged at a system that requires our Presidents, ex-Presidents and Presidential candidates to resort to such demeaning devices.

Yet another popular ritual is the Washington cocktail party. A fund-raising event in one's home state is at least aimed at local money. But the $25-to-$100 Washington cocktail party levels its guns at the Capitol Hill lobbyists, and it's always "R.S.V.P." As I've noted, the invitees are mostly legitimate representatives of trade associations, unions and business groups. They have constituents, too, and their constituents expect them to know the lawmakers and have their ear. The system traps them just as much as it does the politician, for failure to attend a function for the chairman of an important committee may not go unnoticed. Some of these trade representatives receive up to 100 such invitations a year.

Then there is the local finance committee. The candidate and his finance chairman compile a list of a few hundred local businessmen, friends and others who might contribute in the $25-to-$200 range. These names are placed on cards, in the best Community Chest tradition. A group of 40 to 50 solicitors comes to lunch or breakfast with the candidate. Hopefully, each will take on the job of contacting five to ten prospects. In my case, this drive generally nets $10,000 to $15,000. I must say, I have always been proud of the caliber and diversity of the Arizonans who come to my aid—business and professional people, fellow lawyers, Democrats and a surprising number of Republicans. There are few of these people who give from other than decent, honorable motives or who ask more than that I do a conscientious job as their Congressman. I would say 98 percent—at least—of my donors never ask for help of any kind. These are the people who keep both parties in business, but the burdens on all of us grow heavier each year.

Finally, there are small-donor solicitations. Nearly everyone agrees that big contributors tend to obligate candidates, and that therefore a large number of small contributors is preferable. However, this is easier to preach than to practice. Few such efforts succeed. Of every 100 Americans, 95 have never contributed to any political candidate.

Early in my Congressional career, I had the optimistic belief that I could gradually build a base of one-to-ten-dollar contributors who eventually would provide all the financial support I needed. I even designed a return envelope with a little hole into which contributors could fit "George Washington's picture." The idea has been widely copied by other Congressmen and it has succeeded far beyond most other mail campaigns. I'm proud that 1500 people thought enough of me last year to send back my envelopes with green bills enclosed, but the $5200 they gave ($4000 after expenses) is far short of the $22,000 I spent.

How did the American people allow themselves to become mired in this ruinously expensive and dangerous financial swamp? There are many answers, but two are especially important: population and television.

Congressman Abe Lincoln served perhaps 40,000 people—a smaller number than the constituency of an Arizona state senator today. Personal contacts were important; money was not. False images were hard to create. Today, I represent nearly 550,000 people, and I couldn't shake every voter's hand if I did nothing else until the next election. Thus, along with my opponent, I must spend money for mail, radio, television, newspaper ads and all the rest.

Television, of course, is the big new factor shoving campaign costs out of sight. The Federal Communications Commission reports that $35,000,000 was spent in the 1964 campaign just for radio and TV. By 1968, the PR boys will demand ads in "living color," and costs will rise even more. If you're running for governor of Arizona and want to buy just one 20-second spot (now you see it, now you don't) in prime time on each of the state's ten commercial TV stations, you shell out $1000. In New York, the same quickie commercial would cost you $2500—on just one station. I shudder to think what a package of such spots would cost.

All of this might be worth it if we were using TV's great potential for political education and debate. When TV became common, political scientists predicted a national political revival—with Lincoln-Douglas debates in every living room. But this great potential has been perverted. Lincoln and Douglas would be lucky today to get on after *Monday Night at the Movies*, and even then, they would have to compete with Johnny Carson or Joey Bishop—or both. In truth, TV has drastically lowered the intellectual quality of our campaigns. One Congressional candidate's chief TV commercial revealed him in an apron taking cookies out of the oven. Election year 1966 was, more than anything else, the year of the 20-second spot and the singing political jingle. Sadly, 86 percent of all political radio and TV money last year went for spots—so brief they precluded any discussion of issues.

Every two years, when I meet with my television experts, I regularly insist that some of my money go for half-hour segments to talk issues or to answer questions. We've tried it my way once or twice, but usually I lose out to the pros, who claim (rightly) that these programs don't make votes. Viewers will submit to a spot inserted in a favorite program; but if a 30-minute show is pre-empted, most folks will complain bitterly and then tune you out for *The Beverly Hillbillies*.

The end result of this thinking can be found in the text of one of my own 20-second spots from the 1966 campaign. Here it is, in its intellectual entirety:

"ANNOUNCER. This man has become one of the most dynamic leaders in Congress. He's won the respect of both parties. He's led the fight for the things Arizona must have for today and for the future. Arizona can be proud of him. Mo Udall, our man in Washington—let's keep him there. Paid for by the Udall Campaign Committee."

That little gem cost my supporters about $65 every time it went on the air. It isn't very enlightening, but it works—and this is what we've come to. By now you may understand why, if I had my way, I would pass drastic laws junking this whole system. Here, in a nutshell, is what I think we need:

1. Rigid, enforceable, reasonable limits on the costs of all campaigns, including primaries. If committees are allowed, their expenditures should be included in the totals allowed. One man, designated by the candidate, would be responsible for reporting all receipts and expenditures. All spending for a candidate, except that authorized and reported by this fiscal agent, would be a criminal offense.
2. Federal financing of some campaign costs.
3. Complete public disclosure of all campaign expenditures and contributors.
4. Free radio and TV time for candidates to present their views and to debate issues.
5. Shorter general election campaigns.
6. Tax credits and deductions to encourage and legitimatize broad-based, private financial support of elections.
7. A meaningful, enforceable code of ethics for members of Congress—to include guidelines determining the propriety of gifts, testimonial dinners, special funds and the like.
8. Periodic financial statements required of all Representatives and Senators covering all outside income, gifts, legal fees and business interests. Senator Dirksen says that such a law would make Congressmen "second-class citizens." I've voluntarily printed these things and a summary of my assets and investments in the Congressional Record. It's not particularly pleasant to lay your personal affairs before the public, but I feel better having done it—first-class, in fact.

I have also introduced legislation aimed at achieving most of these objectives. Because my suggestions are sharply different from present practices, they deserve some discussion.

I don't anticipate much argument—outside of Congress—on several of my proposals. I suppose nearly everyone would be in favor of reducing the waste of political campaigns. But Federal financing? I can hear some of the reactions now. "After all the money you extract from us for Federal pork-barrel projects, now you're going to have us pay for your campaigns, too." I would answer that the public already pays—and it's a staggering price, in terms of legislative and administrative actions that serve the interests of big contributors and lobbyists.

President Theodore Roosevelt, more than 50 years ago, advocated financing Federal elections out of the Federal treasury, and his arguments make even more sense in the day of color TV. In a Congressional contest, my plan would work like this: The Government would deposit with the Treasurer of the United States to my credit and to that of my opponent or opponents a drawing account equal to ten cents for each registered voter in the district. In present terms, this would amount to perhaps $18,000. The candidates would never see or touch this money, but companies that provide printing, broadcasting, mailing and similiar services could submit sworn vouchers to the U.S. Treasurer for payment. Coupled with this would be a limit of $10,000 that each candidate could spend from his own or contributed funds, thereby reducing drastically the dependence on big contributors. To qualify, a candidate would have had to be nominated by a bona fide party polling an aggregate of at least 15 percent of the total votes in a primary election.

As additional public support for the candidates, I would permit each of them to submit to the Government Printing Office a pamphlet outlining his qualifications and views. These pamphlets would be printed at public expense and would be delivered free by the Post Office Department to every voter. This proposal is similar to Arizona law, which provides for public printing and distribution of pro and con arguments on referendums and initiative propositions appearing on the ballot.

Also, I would put the great potential of television and radio to work for cleaner, better and more enlightening campaigns. The airwaves belong to the public. Every two years I would require stations, which use these airwaves for profit, to grant a reasonable amount of free prime time to candidates for debate and discussion, in segments of not less than 15 minutes. Candidates desiring spot announcements or additional program time could buy more within the financial limitations above.

In the U.S. Senate races, the same procedures would apply. The public money spent would be ten cents for each voter in the state, or $250,000, whichever is less. The limits on private contributions would be $5000 times the number of Congressional districts in the state. While these figures may seem small compared with the huge sums now spent, I believe the introduction of partial public financing would provide the essential element of control previously lacking.

Many of the present evils in our system result from secrecy—about who is giving money, where it is spent and whether it ends up in the Congressman's pocket. Contrary to popular belief, hidden gifts don't buy many votes—but many citizens think otherwise. Doctors, oilmen, labor leaders, lobbyists of all kinds ought to have the right to help candidates whose policies they approve. But the public at large has a right to know where the campaign money is coming from and where it goes.

Thus, my proposals would bring the spotlight of publicity to bear on all aspects of political finance: who gave contributions, or things of value, how the money was spent, which Senator used campaign or testimonial-dinner funds for personal purposes, and all the rest. With this information, unconfused by saturation "image" campaigns, the public could vote more intelligently.

A three-week vacation costs more than a one-week vacation. One of the basic reasons for the escalating costs of campaigns is their interminable length. In some states, John Q. Public is now harassed from April to November every election year. The British do a better job in three or four weeks. While we can't outlaw handshaking or free speech, there are two things we *can* do. A bill I have introduced would prohibit the national parties from holding their Presidential nominating conventions before September first. This would shorten the campaigns substantially. I would also like to see a 90-percent tax on any general-election advertising appearing before October first of an election year. If the voter can't be convinced in five weeks, it seems to me he can't be persuaded in 10 or 20.

Federal tax laws now permit deductions for gifts to churches, educational institutions, research foundations, fraternal and charitable organizations. But campaign donations by private citizens have no dignity under our laws. This contributes to the prevailing attitude that there is something wrong or corrupt about politics and contributing to political campaigns. I think establishing clean, broadly supported political campaigns is just as important to the future of this country as conquering cancer, supporting our churches and colleges or financing our Elks and Moose.

In 1966, Senator Russell Long succeeded in attaching to an unrelated tax bill a rider allowing for "tax credit" financing of Presidential campaign expenses. This year, the Senate reversed itself and apparently wiped out any hope of including such a feature on 1967 income-tax forms. Had this reversal not occurred, each taxpayer would have been granted a one-dollar tax credit (reduction in his tax) provided he checked a square indicating he was earmarking that dollar for a national campaign fund to be divided between or among major parties in the Presidential race.

While this plan had many flaws (it gave too much advantage to candidates of the Republican and Democratic parties, as compared with new parties that might come along) and perhaps deserved its fate, the basic idea was good. It would have freed Presidential elections from many existing evils. I hope further thought will be given to making it workable. One refinement I might suggest would be for the taxpayer, having checked the square, to receive one dollar in scrip that then could be given to the party or candidate of his choice. This would put all present and possible parties on an equal footing.

A bill I have introduced would give a direct tax credit up to ten dollars for small contributors and, beyond that, would permit taxpayers to deduct from their total income up to $1,000 paid out in political donations. I believe such an incentive is necessary if we are going to have a chance of broadening in the base of political fund raising to include more ordinary citizens or ordinary means.

I am modestly hopeful that the House of Representatives will take some action this year to establish meaningful guidelines for members, a code of ethics and mandatory disclosure of income and assets. These steps would be the product of labors by a new Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. Something like this committee could also serve as a watchdog over national elections.

For many years, we have had the bipartisan National Fair Campaign Practices Committee. This unofficial organization has done much to encourage clean campaigns. Enlarging on this idea, I would create a permanent National Commission on Campaign Finance and Procedure, composed of prominent persons from both parties. It would watch the new system, see how it works and prevent abuses, investigate charges of election misconduct by candidates and national parties, recommend new legislation as needed and encourage and police voluntary agreements between candidates who want to avoid escalation of the kind I have described.

There you have it—a set of drastic changes that could breathe new life into American politics and recapture our political system from the money-changers. I frankly doubt that any less drastic changes will do the job. And, as a political realist, I know that changes of this kind won't come easily. We'll soon discover, I'm sure, that the present system has some pretty strong defenders among groups enjoying its benefits.

But gloom and doom are not my meat. I have always been one who believed that the needs of our nation can be met if we face up to them. And I truly believe we must face up to them if we are to continue to have a Government even remotely responsive to the public it serves. I don't suppose Bobby Baker, Adam Powell and Thomas Dodd will go down in history as great heroes. But the storms they generated by their actions just might awaken the public to the need for sweeping changes in our archaic system of financing and conducting elections. If this happens, these unfortunate men, unwittingly, will have performed an important public service.

A BRAVE, YOUNG AMERICAN SOLDIER AND HIS UNSELFISH FAMILY

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, in recent days the trend toward draft dodging has been on the increase. I think that it is therefore particularly appropriate to take note of the many young Americans who are heroically and voluntarily serving our Nation in Vietnam. The following editorial on KLIF Radio in Dallas, Tex., illustrates the story of one such brave young American soldier and his unselfish family:

KLIF EDITORIAL: A STATEMENT OF EDITORIAL OPINION

In these days of snivelling draft dodgers and placard carriers, it is heartening to hear the story of Franklin Beggs of Gadsden, Alabama. It is a story the draft dodgers will not understand . . . it won't make sense to them. But to Americans who still salute the flag, and remember the stuff of which our country is made, the story of Franklin Beggs is inspirational. In 1965, Franklin Beggs was 25, married, the father of a young son, successful in his community. But there was a war going on—in Viet Nam—and Beggs realized his duty to fight for his country. The Army couldn't take him, though, because he had one too many dependents. Beggs and his wife Linda talked long into the night . . . and agreed they would divorce one another, then re-marry after Beggs was signed up. Beggs went to war. His wife Linda helped keep the family going by working as a singer in a trio with two sisters. United States Warrant Officer Franklin Beggs *fought* that war, and a grateful nation awarded him two Distinguished Flying Crosses, a Bronze Star, Air Medal with Oak Leaf Clusters, Army Commendation Medal for Valor, and the Purple Heart. Last Thursday night Beggs came home . . . alive and healthy. But he's only on leave . . . and soon goes back to Viet Nam. Franklin Beggs of Gadsden, Alabama—who gave up family, community and safety—will return to fight. May God see him home again safely. As I said, it's a story the draft dodgers won't understand. KLIF does understand, and we salute Franklin Beggs, 27, U.S. Army Warrant Officer. A man with honor!

EDUCATION IS THE ROAD TO FREEDOM, SECURITY, AND PROSPERITY

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, a dollar spent on education today means a thousand dollars saved on welfare in the next generation.

Education is the road to freedom, security, and prosperity.

Our first obligation to the youngsters of today is to provide a sound moral education, for morality is the cohesive fabric of the entire social structure.

Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to provide tax exemptions for educational expenses—a tax exemption for funds spent for higher education, either in family, or in the form of contributions to scholarship funds.

In recent years the costs of higher education have been advancing rapidly, and have placed a heavy burden on both parents and students.

Meanwhile, the Federal Government has been attempting to assist education by ever-increasing appropriations. My proposal is to allow a proper tax exemption for educational expenses, and thus reduce the demand for Federal aid to education.

I feel that when someone spends a large sum of money to provide himself or his children with a higher education, he is spending money in the national interest, and it is only fair that the Nation try to ease his burden through our tax laws.

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, today I enter a bill that will provide a tax credit for higher education. Basically, my bill provides a 100-percent tax credit on the first $200 which is spent on a person's education; 75 percent on the next $300, and finally, 25 percent of the next $1,000.

As an individual reaches a higher tax bracket, the tax credit will be greater to him in proportion to an individual in a lower tax bracket. In order to help equalize the benefits among different tax brackets, I am providing for a 1-percent reduction from the tax credit for those earning an adjusted gross income in excess of $25,000.

The credit is available to anyone who pays the specified expenses for someone trying to obtain a higher education. It is available to students who are trying to put themselves through school. It is available to parents helping their children through college, and it will be available to other persons who contribute help. This measure would help to create individual scholarships in that the donor would receive a tax credit, and colleges could well use this provision to encourage their alumni to help some deserving student.

I am well aware of the fact that a college education is not the only form of additional training and education needed. Our advanced technology creates an unending need for upgrading the skills of these engaged in industry and science. It would be discriminatory to help only students attending college. Under my bill any person attending a post-secondary school such as business, trade, technical, and other vocational institutions would be qualified for the credit.

There are many students in college today who are receiving full or partial scholarships. The median family income of students receiving scholarships is $8,436. Most State-supported colleges have a tuition of less than $600. My proposal would furnish a maximum tax credit of $675. The assistance from the tax credit measure could release scholarships for the benefit of those in greater need.

In my own State, Georgia, there are many outstanding institutions of higher learning. Included in the Fourth District are Georgia State College and De Kalb Junior College. Georgia State's tuition for three quarters is $315 for residents of Georgia, and De Kalb Junior College's tuition for two trimesters is $220 for residents of De Kalb County.

My bill would provide a $296.25 tax credit for any Georgia citizen who desired to attend Georgia State.

Also, a tax credit of $215 would be provided for all those De Kalb County residents who desire to attend De Kalb Junior College. Thus, under my plan, any resident of my State who wishes to attend these institutions, and has the academic background, may do so.

Those college students who are working in order to pay for their college education will receive a larger rebate from the Internal Revenue Service under the tax credit. This rebate will give them additional funds which they need so badly to pay for food and clothing.

Our Nation today is confronted by many thousands of frustrated youngsters who are unable to obtain higher education because of the cost involved.

My bill helps promote the American ideal of helping those who desire to help themselves, without any interference from the Federal Government.

I feel it is very important for these ambitious young people to attempt to obtain an education by themselves, instead of having to rely on Government training, or some other federally sponsored program.

Thus, my bill will allow the individual to provide for his own education without seeking the help of the Federal Government.

I therefore urge the House to give this measure prompt and careful consideration at the earliest possible date.

POLISH WEAPONS IN VIETNAM

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, newspapers today show World War II weapons captured last week near Saigon.

This revelation underscores the importance of the amendment accepted by the House on August 25, which would suspend most-favored-nation status until Poland stops sending arms to our enemy. The amendment was dropped last week by House-Senate conferees after administration pressure.

The captured weapons, some of them manufactured by the United States, undoubtedly were shipped to Vietnam by the Polish regime from lend-lease stockpiles left over from World War II.

Poland is the only Government which has admitted publicly that it has supplied World War II weapons to our enemy. It is also the only country presently getting the advantage of most-favored-nation status under our tariff laws which is admittedly supplying them weapons of whatever vintage.

In its issue of Friday, July 28, the Foreign Broadcast Information Service, a publication of the U.S. State Department, carried the text of a speech in Warsaw to the General Staff Academy by Marion Spychalski, Minister of National Defense of Poland. In it, after villifying the United States for its role in Vietnam, he is quoted as stating:

> In a way we, Poland, are participating in this war by lending assistance to the Vietnamese people, and the same weapons with which we fought during World War II are now used in Vietnam. These weapons, obsolete under our conditions, prove of excellent value in the hands of people who are dedicated to the cause and who have learned in action how to use them effectively.

On June 25 an Associated Press dispatch from Warsaw carried a report indicating that Poland was supplying military weapons to our enemy. Zenon Kliszko, a member of the Communist Party politburo and an influential leader of the Polish Government, was quoted as saying:

> We are glad that Polish guns are bringing concrete results to you in your fight. We are giving and will continue to give material, political, and military aid.

While in Hanoi, Mr. Kliszko addressed a Hanoi antiaircraft unit armed with equipment furnished by Polish workers which he said was responsible for shooting down or damaging 40 U.S. planes.

On September 10, at the very time when the House-Senate conferees were debating my amendment, three Polish ships were docked in Haiphong—unloading their cargo, which may well have included arms like those captured last week.

While on the one hand the administration is seeking to bring the conflict in Vietnam to a halt, on the other it wants to continue trade advantage to a country supplying weapons to our enemy.

The time has come to put a stop to such a double standard. Poland has been benefiting to the tune of some $50 million annually from the most-favored-nation status. In 1962, U.S. Congress voted to suspend MFN to Poland because of its shipments of planes and helicopters to Cuba and because it mobilized its armed forces during the Berlin crisis. We should suspend MFN again, this time until Poland stops arming our enemy.

WITHDRAWING HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 859, URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1964, FROM SUSPENSION CALENDAR

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply appreciative of the action of those in charge of the program in having withdrawn House Joint Resolution 859, a resolution to extend for 1 year the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, from the Suspension Calendar today until such time as a rule can be granted and until such time as the troublesome paragraph 13(c) thereunder could be worked out.

It is a paradox that another Department, and particularly the Amalgamated

Transit Workers, could be given veto power under the assumed interpretation of this paragraph of this law. The cooperation of all concerned in holding this up from suspension, until we could either get amendments or a vote on it in the proper fashion and until the House could work its will, is indeed appreciated.

This past weekend I sent a letter to Members of Congress detailing what I believe to be the failure of the Secretary of Labor to fairly administer section 13(c) of the basic act dealing with the establishment of fair labor standards. It is my hope that the Committee on Banking and Currency will look into the Secretary's attempt to use section 13(c) to establish new and previously nonexistent rights as a condition of gaining his approval for grant applications under this program. Otherwise a rule should be granted so that amendments can be offered to section 13(c) that would clarify the legislative intent, and to insure that administrative procedures comply with that intent. I insert at this point in the RECORD an editorial from the September 17 issue of the Springfield, Mo., Leader-Press, and my letter to my colleagues:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 13, 1967.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: On Monday, October 16, 1967, H.J. Res. 859 will come before the House under suspension of the rules. This House Joint Resolution will extend for one year Section 5 of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964.

This Act is administered by the Housing and Urban Development Department. However, under Sec. 13(C) of the Act the approval of labor standards must be made by the Secretary of Labor before a grant can be finalized by HUD to an applying city.

Under the discretionary powers possessed by the Secretary of Labor he has, in effect, established the unreasonable practice of obtaining the concurrence of the International Amalgamated Transit Workers Union before any grant is approved.

The City Utilities of Springfield, Missouri applied to HUD for a grant to purchase new buses. The City Utilities is municipally owned and has been for over twenty years. Under Missouri Statute employees of municipally owned utilities may not enter into collective bargaining contracts. Therefore, since the City is prohibited by law from signing a collective bargaining contract with the Transit Workers Union, the Secretary of Labor refuses to give his ancillary approval for the grant.

This now leaves the City Utilities and the Labor Department at an impasse. It, in turn, places a burden upon the citizens of Springfield who must suffer for lack of adequate public transportation. The people of Springfield, as represented by their public-owned utility, have complied with all provisions of the Urban Mass Transportation Act. To comply with the arbitrary and unreasonable demand of the Secretary of Labor, they must violate the very law that they had enacted by their representatives in the State Legislature.

It is my belief that H.J. Res. 859 should not be approved under suspension of the rules, but that a rule should be obtained which would permit amendments that would clarify the legislative intent of Section 13(C) of the basic Act relating to labor standards. I urge your support of this position when H.J. Res. 859 is considered on the House Floor Monday. Attached is an editorial from the Springfield, Missouri LEADER PRESS of Sunday, September 17, 1967 which calls attention to this gross injustice.

Sincerely,

DURWARD G. HALL,
Member of Congress.

EDITORIAL REPRINT FROM SPRINGFIELD, MO., LEADER PRESS, SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 1967

U.S. Taxpayers who do not belong to labor unions—and there still are a few of us left—will be unpleasantly surprised to learn that signature of a union contract is well on the way to becoming a prerequisite for the approval of federal grants.

This strange situation has been revealed to Springfieldians through federal nonaction on the request of City Utilities for $294,333 in federal funds to provide air-conditioned bus service on all city routes. Checking on this long-pending application, CU learned it had been referred to the U.S. Department of Labor, under a section of the Federal Aid to Transit Act which specifies that federally aided projects shall have no detrimental effect upon employees.

Since it is hard to see how the air-conditioning of the municipally owned bus fleet could in any way harm or inconvenience city bus drivers, CU officials made inquiry of the Department of Labor—and learned that the application had been referred to international offices of the Amalgamated Transit Union.

And as they mulled over this interesting bit of information, a St. Louis representative of the union arrived in Springfield bearing a "proposed agreement" between the union and City Utilities—pledging not only the preservation of all existing CU union agreements and continued "collective bargaining," but the arbitration of disputes and other procedures long forbidden to municipal government agencies under Missouri law as interpreted by the Supreme Court.

CU Manager Marvin Castleberry and Attorney John F. Carr traveled to Washington last week, spent a morning in the offices of an assistant secretary of labor—and were referred by him, to an all-afternoon conference with the legal counsel for the Amalgamated Transit Union.

Nobody, apparently, had the colossal nerve to tell the CU representative that a city must sign a union agreement to get federal tax money for this or any other project. The Department of Labor said it would continue to review the application. The union counsel said the agreement offered here was "the kind we like to get."

Mr. Castleberry brought home a set of "supplemental instructions to applicants" for transit grants suggesting that, "to assist the secretary" in his determination that projects would not result in detriment to employees, "normal procedure" would be to "negotiate agreements" to that effect with employee-representatives.

We are very thankful that this suggestion is a part of administrative procedure, and not of the Aid to Transit Act. We suggest that the Secretary of Labor in at least nine-tenths of the projects which come before him, needs nothing more than ordinary intelligence and common sense to determine that they will or will not imperil employees. If he needs any further assurance, he or his numerous assistants should secure it first-hand, from the employees and employers involved, rather than from the international offices of a labor union. As for the Springfield project, we would point out that CU does NOT propose to substitute helicopters for buses, thus throwing bus drivers out of work. It does NOT propose to reduce the number of buses in the fleet or speed them up so that individual driver will be under any greater strain, or operate them by computer or electronic eye. It simply wants to air-condition them, so that passengers—and presumably drivers also—can ride in greater comfort. Bus passengers these days include the elderly, working families for whom two automobiles are not economically feasible, students—and others whom the Federal government through a variety of programs claims that it seeks to aid. Bus service in Springfield is better and cheaper than in many other cities today, because the system is municipally owned and therefore subsidized by the more profitable departments of City Utilities. The Springfield bus system would indeed seem an ideal recipient for federal assistance.

It is true that Missouri law forbids the signature of contracts with Union employees, but City Utilities has long negotiated with the unions, for the most part peacefully, to the end that its employees enjoy a pay scale comparable to that of private industry and well above that of general city government. We are pleased that representatives of Sen. Stuart Symington and Congressman Durward Hall attended conferences of Mr. Castleberry and Mr. Carr with the Department of Labor and the Amalgamated Transit Union in Washington last week. It is just possible that these gentlemen—and other members of Congress—were unaware of the preposterous position in which the department has placed itself, and of the suspicion which must surely arise in the taxpayers mind that the individual, unorganized citizen has hardly any rights and privileges left to him at all.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I support the distinguished gentleman from Missouri in his concern as to the glaring inequity in the Urban Mass Transportation Act.

My colleagues may recall my bringing to their attention in the last Congress a similar situation at Yakima, Wash., in my congressional district. The privately operated bus company there was losing money, and it was forced to notify the city that with the expiration of their franchise, they would quit business.

So that this city of nearly 50,000 persons would not be deprived of public transportation, the city arranged to take over the bus operation, and run it as a city expense. To finance the operation the city proposed a householder tax and applied for a grant from the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The Department cleared the grant of a little over $172,000 in all particulars except for section 13(c) which was inserted into the act for the supposed purpose of protecting union workers. In the case of Yakima, the eight bus drivers, all union members when employed by the private bus company, were to have their hourly wages raised from $2 an hour to $2.40 an hour as city employees. They were also to receive additional fringe benefits as city employees.

Washington State law, as well as the charter under which the city of Yakima operates, would make it illegal for these employees to have a union shop contract as outlined in section 13(c).

So, the Federal grant was not forthcoming. The bus drivers did not demand a union shop, the city was precluded by both its charter and State law, but the

Urban Mass Transportation Act is so inflexible that the city was denied Federal assistance.

Section 13(c), Mr. Speaker, has worked in this instance to discriminate against American labor by denying these bus drivers better jobs, and in fact, forcing them to look for work elsewhere. Section 13(c) also denies the Federal assistance to deserving communities that need and have every right to expect such assistance.

I am pleased to support the position of my colleague from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Price] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague from Missouri [Mr. Hall] in protesting the interpretation of paragraph 13(c) of the Mass Transportation Act of 1964 as highly discriminatory and unfair to cities like Amarillo, Tex.

Under Texas State laws, Amarillo and other Texas cities that operate their own transit systems as a public utility cannot comply with the requirements demanded by the Secretary of Labor for approval of assistance grants for such transit systems.

The city of Amarillo a year and a half ago was presented a 30-day discontinuance notice by the operator of a privately owned and operated transit system and also with a non-negotiable offer to sell the assets of the system to the city. The city declined the offer as exhorbitant, and instead, bought used buses and began its own service at the end of the 30-day notice period and has operated the service since.

The city of Amarillo also applied for assistance from the Department of Housing and Urban Development under the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 which was approved except for approval by the Secretary of Labor.

Under the Secretary's interpretation of paragraph 13(c) of the act, there was no way the city of Amarillo could comply. Texas State law forbids municipal employees to enter into a union shop contract as specified in section 13(c) so the city of Amarillo has had to continue its present operation because of the inequity of this highly discriminatory section of the act.

The city is in dire need of assistance to expand and modernize the system which last year operated at a considerable loss.

I do not believe it was the intent of Congress to force a city to go back to a privately operated system which in this case, had failed, so that the city could comply with the union contract provisions as interpreted by the Secretary of Labor.

Neither do I believe it was the intent of Congress to force States to change their laws concerning State and municipal employees so that a city such as Amarillo could comply with the Secretary of Labor's interpretation of the act.

So I join my colleague from Missouri [Mr. Hall] in seeking amendment to section 13(c) of the act which has resulted in denial to Amarillo, Tex., of the Federal assistance for such communities as Amarillo, Tex., which is certainly as much entitled to grants under the act as any other community.

ANOTHER BOONDOGGLE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, still another example of the boondoggles that clutter the record of operations of the Agency for International Development has been brought to light.

This latest one finds AID functionaries giving away a half million dollars of the taxpayers' money to a Lebanese promoter who, apparently, had only to walk in the door over at the State Department and hold out his hand.

Apparently nobody in the giveaway agency bothered to ask whether the school this individual was promoting even existed and sure enough, according to the account I have read, it did not.

I understand the Federal Bureau of Investigation has entered this case to do what the AID people should have done in the first place—find out who was doing what to who and why.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point a newspaper article outlining some of the points involved in this particular case:

SWINDLE OF AID FUNDS IS REPORTED IN LEBANON

BEIRUT, LEBANON, September 29.—The U.S. government has been swindled out of $500,000 to finance a Lebanese school that doesn't exist, authoritative Lebanese sources reported today.

They said the Agency for International Development (AID), on application of a Lebanese who said he owned a school here, sent half a million dollars worth of school equipment to Lebanon and part of it was sold for profit.

The alleged swindle was discovered about 10 days ago when an AID mission went looking for a supposedly thriving school and found only an empty house, the sources said.

The U.S. Embassy Friday refused to confirm or deny the report. "The entire case is now in hands of Lebanese judicial authorities," an Embassy spokesman said.

Police said the school promoter, Michel Hayek, and his assistant, Fouad Semaan, had been arrested.

The two men—who had told AID in Washington their school included 350 students and would soon grow to 500—said they had sold some of the American equipment, the sources reported.

[In Washington, a spokesman for AID had no comment on the reported school case but did say that there was no AID program in Lebanon now and had not been for several years.]

PATRICK LYNCH—A REAL AMERICAN SON OF THE EMERALD ISLE

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, 52 years ago Patrick Lynch arrived in Cleveland from County Mayo, the locale of my forebears. He had little of the world's material goods, but he was abundantly endowed with determination—the heritage of his sturdy antecedents.

In youth Pat Lynch set for himself a goal, and he never wavered in his determination to attain that goal. He would come to America, the land of opportunity, and he would make good. He knew he would travel a rigorous road to success and would encounter obstacles. Obstacles were challenges to Pat Lynch, which he met and conquered, perhaps not always with ease, but with the grace of the gentleman he is. He quickly realized the boundless opportunities this country offered, and he likewise became aware of the keen competition in which he must participate. This was "fairplay" to Pat Lynch, and he entered the U.S. Army, served with the AEF in World War I, was wounded in combat in France, and awarded the Purple Heart. Upon his return to civilian life in 1918 he became an integral part of the Irish-American activities in Cleveland, where his charity, beneficent kindness, and warm friendship have been a boon to many newly arrived immigrants, especially those from his homeland.

Pat Lynch became president of the Gaelic Athletic Association and in 1930, starred as a goalie for the Cleveland Shamrocks soccer team. In 1932 he helped found the West Side Irish-American Club, which he ably served as president for 34 years. He personally led the club's colorful units in the annual St. Patrick's Day parades and on many other occasions.

Pat Lynch is not one to indulge in reminiscence, nor does he surrender to the twilight cycle of life. He is now, at age 71, a vibrant and stimulating Irish-American—living proof of the wisdom of admitting immigrants to our shores, hundreds of whom he has befriended in multiple ways.

Writers have described Ireland as a somber, enigmatic land, with sudden brightness of green or gold. Undoubtedly when spring comes to Cleveland, Pat's thoughts drift back to the scenes of his childhood in County Mayo, with its deep green meadows and rolling hills, where he romped and played as a boy, but there is never a trace of regret in the tone of his voice when he speaks of these scenes, for, as he has made a name for himself in Cleveland, he has likewise emblazoned the name of Cleveland in his homeland, always giving full praise for the warm and friendly people in his adopted country, to those in his native Ireland.

We, in Cleveland, are proud of Pat Lynch—he is a credit to our city, our State, and our Nation, and to the land that gave him birth—Ireland.

On Sunday, October 22, the West Side Irish-American Club will give a testimonial banquet in honor of Patrick Lynch, its former president. It is difficult adequately to pay the honor and esteem this remarkable man deserves. He has made full and good use of his rich life, dedicating his energies and interests to his fellowmen. I join his legion of friends in wishing him God's highest blessings.

LIMITATIONS ON DISSENT

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I take this time in order to commend the distinguished Governor of the State of California, Mr. Ronald Reagan, on a recent comment of his on the subject of dissent from our country's foreign policy.

This is somewhat unusual, because I do not agree with Mr. Reagan on a great many things, but yesterday he made a statement with reference to one of the principal detractors of the President, a Member of the other body, for which I want to commend him. He said some things which I as a Member of the Congress, under the rules, cannot say. Unfortunately, too many men in high places today have gone far beyond the simple right of dissent and are, indeed, helping and abetting the Communists in Hanoi.

I believe it is time someone put this matter of dissent into its proper perspective. The right to dissent means just exactly that, no more and no less. It does not guarantee, for instance, that no one will criticize the dissenters. It does not guarantee that they will not be scorned or ostracized or guarantee immunity from prosecution for law violations for which a nondissenter would be hauled into court. It does not guarantee that someone will not call their good sense or even their ancestry into question, nor does it guarantee that no one will accuse them of giving aid and comfort to an alien cause.

Certainly on a subject as complex and intricate as foreign affairs, and particularly on the subject of foreign affairs in Southeast Asia, there is room for differences of opinion. But any expert on this subject who chooses to criticize his President has no right to try to insulate himself from criticism in return, on the basis that his right to dissent is being infringed upon.

There is not the slightest doubt in my mind that the determination of Hanoi to prolong and intensify the war is strengthened and encouraged by every word and every deed on the part of the American people which seems to show some hesitancy and uncertainty in our determination to stay on in South Vietnam. I am firmly convinced that this dissent is costing additional American lives and the letting of American blood in the combat zone.

By saying this, I am not in any way circumscribing the right of the dissenters to dissent. If the dissenters writhe under this type of criticism, then writhe they must. I have not in any way limited their freedom to speak out on Vietnam. I have merely stated my firm conviction of what the consequences of their dissent are and have attempted to affix on them a responsibility which I believe they must accept.

Mr. Speaker, the right of dissent is a precious one. I would be the last in this House to infringe upon this right. But as is the case with all of our rights, they also carry with them certain responsibilities, and one of these responsibilities is the responsibility to stand up under whatever criticism may come their way for voicing their dissent.

THE 10-PERCENT SURCHARGE TAX

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the proposal for a temporary 10-percent surcharge on corporate and individual income tax liabilities is not a satisfactory solution to the Federal Government's revenue problems.

In my view, it would be improper to impose additional taxes on income which is already taxed at full rates while we continue to allow income derived from other sources—or by other persons—to completely escape income taxes, or to be taxed at rates very much below those which generally apply.

It may well become imperative for the Federal Government to raise additional funds through the tax system in order to meet the rising costs of providing for the country's defense and for essential domestic programs.

If such does become the case, I shall seek in every way possible to raise the additional funds through a program of tax reform, rather than through the device of imposing additional taxes on those who are already paying their fair share of governmental costs.

Mr. Speaker, the United States of America has been most fortunate in that its citizens have long accepted taxation as an inevitable, albeit none-too-pleasant, fact of civilized life. This has enabled us to have a system of self-enforced taxation under which our people, with few exceptions, file honest returns and pay their levies promptly and in full.

I believe the central reason that our system of taxation has worked so well is that the people have been of the view that it is an equitable system under which the burden of paying for required governmental activities has been fairly distributed among the various groupings of taxpayers whether these are individual citizens, corporations or other entities.

Americans deserve much commendation for the maturity they have demonstrated through the acceptance of the substantial tax burden which we have faced for so many years and which we continue to face.

Unfortunately, there is a growing threat to this acceptance; a threat which arises by reason of the many devices for tax avoidance—often called tax loopholes—which, over the years, have been built into the Federal Government's income tax system.

I believe that there is a meaningful connection between tax loopholes and the opposition which is being expressed by so many citizens to the President's proposal for a 10-percent surtax on present income tax liabilities.

The ordinary taxpayer properly asks: "Why should my tax bill be increased by 10 percent when others with larger incomes than mine are able to avoid much if not all Federal income tax liability?"

I know of no adequate answer to this question other than action by the Congress to close to the fullest possible degree the loopholes now found in our income tax rules and regulations.

I feel that the American people are prepared to meet the costs of defense programs and to provide funds for the many vital educational, medical, and social programs conducted by the Federal Government. However, I also feel that the American people are impatient with an income tax system which disproportionately takes from some income groupings while allowing others to substantially avoid income taxes.

Tax avoidance devices generally are not available for use in any significant way by persons whose incomes consist largely of wage or salary payments. Instead, the prosperous corporations and high-income individuals are the ones who are able to arrange to take advantage of tax loopholes.

Overall, tax experts tell me that as much as $40 billion in revenue may be lost to the Federal Government each year because of tax avoidance devices. Other experts place the figure somewhat lower.

I have had prepared a compilation which shows that revenue losses exceed $21.5 billion a year for a selected group of tax loopholes:

Tax loophole and revenue loss

[In millions]

Minerals depletion, including oil and gas	$1,500
Intangible oil and gas drilling costs	750
State and municipal bond interest	1,800
Capital gains	7,000
Multiple corporate surtax exemptions	150
Dividend exclusion	200
Sick pay allowances	85
Unlimited charitable contribution deductions	35
Split income provision	10,000
Total	[1] 21,520

[1] Over $21.5 billion.

Mr. Speaker, $21.5 billion is a very substantial chunk of potential revenue. It would go a long way toward wiping out the deficit which the Federal Government faces during the present fiscal year. This huge block of potential revenue takes on great importance when weighed against the proposal to raise added funds through the device of a 10-percent income tax surcharge.

I believe that it would approach the immoral for the Congress to impose additional taxes upon those citizens who are already heavily burdened, while others are allowed to completely escape Federal income tax liability or to pay such taxes at inequitably reduced rates.

The Internal Revenue Service advises that in calendar year 1964, there were 35 individual returns filed with adjusted gross incomes of $500,000 or more, on which no Federal income tax was paid. These returns represented a total adjusted gross income of $75.2 million.

The IRS stated that in the same year there were 24,084 individuals who filed tax returns with adjusted gross incomes in excess of $10,000 and paid no taxes. These returns represented adjusted gross incomes totaling $523,515,000.

In 1966, the 22 largest U.S. petroleum companies reported gross profits of $6,809,111,000. Their combined Federal income tax liability was $585,115,000, or 8.5 percent of their gross profit. Most corporations are required to pay Federal income taxes at the rate of 48 percent of their gross income.

How can the imposition of additional taxes on wage earners with modest incomes be justified when other citizens, with incomes ranging into the millions of dollars a year are allowed to completely escape Federal income taxes?

For my part, I can find no such justification. Instead, Congress should promptly enact legislation closing tax loopholes.

One of the most unwarranted loopholes is the percentage depletion allowance for minerals. Under the percentage depletion provisions, owners of mines and oil wells are allowed to deduct a specific percentage of their gross income without regard to the capital cost of the property. These rates of deduction range as high as 27½ percent of gross income in the case of oil and gas. Percentage depletion continues to be deductible even after 100 percent of the original investment has been recovered tax free. It enables a producer to recover the cost of his investment over and over. The result is that effective tax rates for the extractive industries are far less than those borne by other industries, and of course the Government suffers a great revenue loss. In addition, the depletion allowance leads to waste and misallocation of resources since it makes it more profitable to invest in oil, gas and certain minerals than other industries.

The complete exemption from Federal tax of the interest received from State and local bonds has led to other abuses. These bonds were originally intended to be used to raise money for socially desirable public purposes such as the construction of schools, streets, sewers, and other facilities. The tax-exempt status was thought necessary to attract investment in these bonds, at rates of interest favorable to State and local governments. One result is that billions of dollars worth of these bonds are held almost exclusively by the wealthy, who, by investing large sums in these securities obtain tax-free incomes. What was originally intended as an aid to State and local governments has placed an added burden on the general taxpaying public which has to make up the revenue the Government loses.

Another abuse, which has grown recently, is the increasing use of the tax-exempt industrial development bond. A State or locality issues the bonds for the purpose of constructing a factory or other industrial facility for a corporation and then leases or sells it to the corporation. The rents or the yearly installments of the sales price are fixed to meet interest payments by the issuing agency and amortization of the principal of the bonds. This method is often used to benefit financially strong corporations and amounts to a subsidy to private industry since corporate bonds would necessarily require a higher rate of interest. The flood of these bonds in the municipal bond market has also weakened the market for the traditional tax-exempt issues which usually have statutory interest limitations, since industrial development bonds are tending to increase overall interest rates.

Another device used by business to avoid the payment of taxes is the creation of affiliated corporate groups or subsidiaries in order to obtain multiple surtax exemptions. The corporate income tax consists of a normal tax on the full amount of taxable income and a surtax on the amount of taxable income in excess of a $25,000 surtax exemption. Although there may be good reasons for consolidated groups, these do not justify giving such groups multiple corporate exemptions where a single enterprise is involved.

The President's Economic Report for 1967 specifically mentioned abuses by tax-exempt private foundations. Tax and business planners will often create a private foundation to hold the stock of a business enterprise solely to perpetuate the family control of that enterprise. Also, charitable organizations will use their tax-exempt privilege to borrow funds to acquire business concerns. The commercial enterprises conducted or controlled by private foundations have an unfair competitive advantage over those owned by taxable entities. The Treasury Department has recommended that Congress adopt legislation requiring private foundations to dispose of substantial business interests which are unrelated to exempt activities.

Another loophole, or tax advantage, is the stock option. Under a typical stock option plan, highly paid corporate executives are given options to purchase, at the market price, large blocks of their corporation's shares. When the market price of the stock rises they can purchase the stock at the original option price. If they decide to sell the stock, the profit is taxed as a capital gain rather than at the regular income tax rates applicable to high-income taxpayers.

Still another method of tax avoidance used by high-income taxpayers is to transfer appreciated property by bequest. For example, a man who has at one time purchased stocks which cost him $25,000 holds them until he dies, at which time they are valued at $200,000. He pays no tax on this increased value. His heirs in turn receive a step-up in basis; that is, they may treat the value of the stocks at the time transferred as their basis for computing gain or loss in a subsequent sale. If they sell immediately, they pay no tax.

A final tax loophole I will mention is the unlimited charitable deduction. A taxpayer may deduct, without limit, contributions to publicly supported charitable organizations and certain private foundations if such contributions and his income tax payments in the taxable year and eight out of the last 10 taxable years have equaled 90 percent of his taxable income computed without regard to personal exemptions, operating loss carryovers, or deductible contributions. It enables many persons with millions of dollars in taxable income to escape taxation by giving to charitable institutions securities or other property which have greatly appreciated in value.

Mr. Speaker, the fact that these inequitous provisions are to be found in our Federal income tax system is appalling. I believe that the time has come for the Congress to act.

"MR. KLU"—CHAMPION OF INTERSTATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois, John C. Kluczynski, chairman of our Public Works Subcommittee on Roads, is truly an All-American Congressman.

"Mr. Klu" is beloved by those who serve on the subcommittee, by those on the full committee, and by his colleagues in the Congress in both political parties. In my 19 years in the Congress I have never known a more patriotic, conscientious, and devoted Member who labors so ceaselessly and tirelessly for his constituents and for our great country.

People throughout the country are daily becoming more aware of his great talents, his leadership, and dedication to developing, the entire Nation.

The following splendid article about our colleague appeared as a feature story in the Chicago Tribune yesterday, Sunday, October 15, and is a fitting tribute to a great American statesman:

"Mr. Klu" Does Homework, Keeps Power—Devotes Most of Weekends to Constituents

(By Aldo Beckman)

Washington, October 14.—He is the son of a Polish immigrant and the older brother of an Illinois Supreme court justice, whom he sent thru college and encouraged to get into politics.

And altho he has been a member of Congress for more than 16 years, gaining a position of great power, Rep. John Kluczynski [D., Ill.] remains, first and foremost, a Chicago politician who keeps in constant touch with his constituents.

He has missed going back to his fifth Congressional district on Chicago's southwest side only two week-ends during his tenure in Congress, and attends a wake, an anniversary party, or a neighborhood gathering of some kind almost every evening he's home.

HE HEARS CONFESSIONS

During the day, when he isn't looking after his Syrena restaurant and caterers business, at 4270 Archer av., Kluczynski is talking with constituents or, as he puts it, "hearing confessions."

Kluczynski, more commonly known as Mr. Klu, gains his power in the nation's capital from his position as fourth ranking Democrat on the House public works committee, and more specifically from his position as chairman of the roads subcommittee of that group.

All federal legislation concerning the nation's highways is initiated in the subcommittee, which gives its chairman almost unlimited power in the field of highways.

CALL FROM THE MAYOR

Several weeks ago, Kluczynski received a call from Mayor Daley, telling him that the new crosstown expressway in Chicago would cost 500 million dollars, instead of the 350 million approved by the bureau of public roads.

Kluczynski picked up the phone and called Lowell Bridwell, administrator of the federal highway administration, and in seconds had assurances that Chicago would receive the additional 150 million in highway funds.

Altho Kluczynski experiences some pressure from his colleagues wanting new highways in their districts, nothing can compare with the pressure he felt two years ago as he shepherded Lady Bird Johnson's highway beautification bill thru the House.

WANTS BILL PASSED

On the morning of Oct. 14, 1965, he got a call from President Johnson, informing him that Lady Bird would like to have the bill passed that day, since the President was going into the hospital the next day for an operation. Fourteen hours after the House convened, the bill was adopted, while numerous irate Congressional wives sat by in sables and mink, waiting for their husbands to finish business and take them to a Congressional party at the White House, scheduled months earlier.

No money has yet been authorized for the program, and none will be this session, because of the fiscal situation and the war. "We enacted the bill in too big a hurry," Kluczynski admitted candidly. "There are programs there that shouldn't be, and we have to take another look at it."

There have been "suggestions" from the White House that the program could be financed with funds in the highway trust fund, collected from gasoline taxes, but Kluczynski will have no part of that.

"I've promised lots of people that none of that money will be used for anything but highways, and I intend to keep that promise," he said.

IN SALT LAKE CITY

Many of those promises came as Kluczynski addressed highway officials at various meetings thruout the country. He is in Salt Lake City this week-end, to speak before a meeting of the American Association of Highway Officials.

One of his recent services to Chicago came when he went to work getting federal permission to fill in "Bubbly Creek," which was a spur of the Chicago river, a cesspool for waste from the stockyards. A modern city incinerator plant now rests on what was "Bubbly Creek," perhaps the most descriptive ever given a body of water.

Kluczynski went on the public works committee, a break for himself and for Chicago in March 1951, several months after he was sworn in as a congressman.

VOTE A STANDOFF

President Truman was pushing for development of the St. Lawrence seaway, but eastern opposition had successfully scuttled the plan, and the vote in the public works committee, which had to clear the project, was a stand-off.

So Truman offered an eastern Democrat on the committee, who opposed the project, a federal judgeship, and thru Col. Jacob Arvey, with whom he had fought at the 1948 convention, asked Kluczynski if he would resign his seat on the banking and currency committee and take the vacancy on public works. "Klu" was privately happy to get off of banking and currency, but assured Arvey, who wanted to get back in the good graces of Truman, that he would do it as a personal favor to the national committeeman from Illinois.

Ironically, by the time Kluczynski took his seat on the public works committee, eastern pressure had forced several proponents to change their vote, and the seaway still was not approved.

MAKES CHICAGO PORT

However, President Eisenhower, who was elected in 1952 also favored the project, and got a number of eastern Republicans to change their vote. The seaway was approved making Chicago a great inland port.

Kluczynski, from his post on the committee, helped direct the dredging and deepening of the waterways leading into Chicago docks from the lake, and was the prime mover in getting the duplicate locks constructed in Joliet.

He also has been the moving force behind re-activating Midway airport, which is in his district.

WORKS AT AGE 12

Kluczynski was born on Feb. 15, 1896, not far from his present home, at 2450 W. 55th st. Forced to go to work at 12, he had little formal education. He worked in the circulation department of the old Chicago Evening Post and later drove a truck before going into the restaurant business with his father, in 1919, now operated by him and his wife, the former Stephanie Estelle Polowy. After returning from World War I, where he served in an artillery outfit in Europe, Kluczynski had his first taste of politics, when John J. Sullivan, a Democratic committeeman, persuaded him to become a precinct captain.

"The Irish ran the town and they wanted someone with a Polish name like mine to work for them," Kluczynski laughed.

His first try for public office was in 1924, and he was defeated in efforts to be elected to the Illinois House of Representatives.

RUNS AGAIN IN '32

"Klu" ran again in 1932, was elected, and served in the state House of Representatives until 1948, when he was elected to the state Senate. He ran for Congress two years later.

A product of the Chicago Democratic organization, Kluczynski is well-disciplined and almost always votes with the administration. Several years ago, a colleague took the floor and wondered aloud how the Chicago delegation was going to vote on an issue.

Kluczynski, always known for his sense of humor, answered, "I dont know, Tom O'Brien [then head of the Chicago Democratic delegation] hasn't told us yet."

A STANDING OVATION

The House roared and gave Kluczynski a standing ovation, but O'Brien didn't think it was very funny. So Kluczynski had the remarks taken out of the Congressional Record, a privilege enjoyed by all congressmen.

His district, in the southwest corner of Chicago also includes Stickney township and part of Lyons township. It is composed chiefly of second and third generation Americans, mostly of Polish, Lithuanian, and Czech extraction.

Most of the residents own their homes and the 60 savings and loan associations in the district attest to the thrift of its residents.

The extraordinarily large number of small businesses in the district, besides owning one of his own, sparked Kluczynski's interest in the plight of the small business man in this day of chain stores. His interest, as a member of the House small business committee, triggered the creation of a special subcommittee, which Kluczynski heads.

His subcommittee holds hearings thruout the country, examining the problems of the small business man in the city, as they are related to urban renewal, population growth, and other urban factors.

He has conducted hearings in Kansas and Utah and plans to hold more hearings this fall in Tennessee and up-state New York.

TALKS ABOUT DISTRICT

But, even with his wide travels, Kluczynski would rather talk about his district. He likes to tell about it being the largest manufacturing district in the nation and enjoys boasting of the trucking industries there.

The veteran congressman's favorite pastime is gin rummy, which he plays frequently with his colleagues. Altho he used to be an inveterate horse player, he hasn't placed a bet on a horse since 1936, "when I went broke for the third time."

Kluczynski has no plans for retirement. "I like people and I like my work," he said. He points out with pride to his brother, Tom, now an Illinois Supreme court justice.

"I think it says a lot for our country that a man could come over from Poland and have one son on the Supreme court and another in Congress," he said proudly.

INFLATION ENDANGERS VETERANS' BENEFITS

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in voicing my concern over the ever-rising cost of Government expenditures over the years. I am in favor of making substantial reductions wherever possible, and putting our Nation on a sound financial basis. I have viewed with a troubled mind the ever-increasing national debt incurred in operating the diversified functions in which our Government has become involved.

Out of due concern for this great Nation of ours, I must aline myself with those who are opposed to the free-spending policies which have developed. Our major concern at this time must be centered on the needs of our military and the winning of the war in Vietnam. I believe that reductions should and must be made in programs which can be postponed until such time as the costs of war are not upon us. I think much deliberation should be given to what costs are to be reduced, assuring that the welfare of our citizens will not be endangered by haste on our part.

One particular field in which we cannot shirk our obligations is that of veterans benefits. We have made our commitment to our fighting men—both while they are engaged in battle, and after they return home—and we must see that our promises are kept.

On August 31 the President signed into law the Veterans' Pension and Readjustment Assistance Act of 1967 which, incidentally, passed this House without a dissenting vote. But now, we must face up to some important facts. We cannot with one hand give a veteran a dollar, and with the other hand take back a dollar and a half because of the deflation of the American dollar. And, unless we act quickly to quell the nonessential spending, and take steps to insure that inflation does not wipe out the benefits we have made possible, we will have failed in our avowed duty.

Today, we are faced with a crisis which will not only wipe out those well-intended increases which we provided, but will place all of our veterans in an even less favorable financial condition than before we passed the new law. In fact, unless we act expeditiously, these increases will become but false promises, empty and without meaning.

We are concerned that this nation is facing the prospect of a multibillion-dollar deficit this year because of our war commitment in Vietnam. This alone is sufficient cause for us to pause and give sober consideration to ways of alleviating this situation.

But if we are to keep the faith with our brave men now fighting in Vietnam, and those who have borne our battles in other wars, we must act to protect—not only the increases we have made possible—but the initial benefits to which they were entitled.

We have had a request from the President to consider a modest tax increase. We should consider the President's tax recommendations and we should consider a cut in Federal spending now. While we prolong and act as though the problem will go away if we ignore it, the situation worsens.

I am concerned that we are not facing up to the facts of this matter. The cost of the war in Vietnam will no doubt rise by $4 billion more than we thought last January. Ignoring this truth will not make it vanish. We will pay for this in one way or the other, for there is no escape.

But, as we wait, time is running short, and we are being forced into choosing the least desirable way by our delay in considering the tax asked by the President. Unless we enact some tax and at the same time cut spending—and do it quickly—we face another spiral of inflation that will wipe out all of the increased benefits we have given our fighting men when they return home.

I do not want to see our men fight in Vietnam, and return home to find that the money we have appropriated for their education will not even pay their room and board. I do not want to see our veterans try to buy a home with a GI guarantee and find that interest rates have accelerated to such a point that it is impractical.

Every minute that we wait, we are imperiling the education of millions of Americans who have served this country in its time of need. We are reducing their possibility of becoming a homeowner. If inflation occurs it is our own fault.

If we fail, the 5 million veterans and their dependents who receive pension or compensation checks will suffer, for the purchasing power of their dollar will be so reduced it will place them in jeopardy.

It is my opinion that we must not wait any longer. We must pay for the war in Vietnam, and we must protect the economy of this country from ruinous inflation. We have as great a responsibility to our fighting men to see that they return to a stable country, as they have to fight for freedom.

THIRTY CONGRESSMEN ISSUE BIPARTISAN APPEAL FOR BOMBING HALT IN NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, 30 Members of Congress from both sides of the aisle have joined in an appeal to the President to halt the bombing of North Vietnam. In our letter of October 12, 1967, addressed to President Johnson we expressed alarm at the continued escalation of the bombing and our view that its halt "best promises to open the way for a reasonable and peaceful settlement of this tragic conflict."

This is the view of many prominent world statesmen. United Nations Secretary General U Thant has repeatedly urged such a course. According to the New York Times on May 11, 1967, U Thant told the Speakers Research Committee that so long as the bombing continues "there will be no talks." He stated that "he knew, and several governments knew, that Hanoi had been ready to engage in peace talks before the opening of the air offensive against North Vietnam." On August 22, 1967, AP reported that U Thant said "there would be talks in 3 to 4 weeks" if the bombings were stopped. And again, just 9 days ago, according to Reuters, U Thant said on October 7 that he was "convinced that North Vietnam would talk peace if the United States stopped bombing that country."

At the current session of the United Nations General Assembly country after country has questioned our policy of bombing North Vietnam. Typical of the comments are those of Paul Martin, External Affairs Secretary of Canada, who said on September 27, 1967—Washington Post, September 28:

> It seems clear . . . that all attempts to bring about talks between the two sides are doomed to failure unless the bombing is stopped.

On October 1, 1967, Hans R. Taber, Denmark's United Nations representative and President of the General Assembly, said the United States would run only a limited risk if it stopped bombing North Vietnam. He said on "Meet the Press," "It is our belief that a big country like yours, the biggest and most powerful country in the world, should be able to take this limited risk."

On October 6, just 10 days ago—Washington Post, October 7—India's Defense Minister Sardar Swaran Singh told the General Assembly that on the basis of a "positive response" from North Vietnam, India is confidient that an unconditional halt to American bombing will lead to a cease-fire and a Geneva-style conference. He stated:

> We are confident that if this is done it will lead to the cessation of all hostile activities throughout Vietnam and a Geneva-type meeting . . .

Mr. Speaker, in our letter of October 12 to the President we referred to Secretary McNamara's testimony of August 25 on the air war in North Vietnam and included a brief quotation. It seems appropriate at this point to quote more fully from his testimony before the Military Preparedness Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee on August 25. The Secretary stated as follows:

> Our primary objective was to reduce the flow and/or to increase the cost of the continued infiltration of men and supplies from North to South Vietnam.
>
> The capacity of the lines of communications and of the outside sources of supply so far exceeds the minimal flow necessary to support the present level of North Vietnamese military effort in South Vietnam that the enemy operations in the South cannot, on the basis of any reports I have seen, be stopped by air bombardment—short, that is, of virtual annihilation of North Vietnam and its people.
>
> We have no reason to believe it (a less selective bombing campaign) would break the will of the North Vietnamese people or sway the purpose of their leaders. If it does not lead to such a change of mind, bombing the North at any level of intensity would not meet our objective. We would still have to prove by ground operations in the South that Hanoi's aggression could not succeed. Nor would a decision to close Haiphong, Hon Gai, and Cam Pha, by whatever means, prevent the movement in and through North Vietnam of the essentials to continue their present level of military activity in South Vietnam. On the other side of the equation, our resort to a less selective campaign of air attack against the North would involve risks which at present I regard as too high to accept for this dubious prospect of successful results.
>
> The final decision in this conflict will not come until we and our allies prove to North Vietnam she cannot win in the South. The tragic and long drawnout character of that conflict in the South makes very tempting the prospect of replacing it with some new kind of air campaign against the North. But however tempting, such an alternative seems to me completely illusory. To pursue this objective would not only be futile but would involve risks to our personnel and to our nation that I am unable to recommend.

Mr. Speaker, in case there is any doubt as to what the Secretary meant by "risks," he also said on that day, in reference to certain targets proposed by the Joint Chiefs which had not then received authorization for air strikes, "the risk of direct confrontation with the Communist Chinese or the Soviet Union has thus far been deemed to outweigh the military desirability of air strikes."

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the Record the full text of our letter of October 12, 1967:

Congess of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., October 12, 1967.

The President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: Since April, 1965, you have often stated your desire to seek peace in Vietnam through negotiations. With this we strongly concur.

Yet, we have become increasingly alarmed at the continued escalation of bombings by American planes over North Vietnam.

The bombing of targets close to the Chinese border, and of the port cities of Cam Pha and Haiphong conflicts with the carefully reasoned and factual analysis presented prior to those steps by Secretary of Defense McNamara on August 25, 1967. We refer particularly to the Secretary's contention that "our resort to a less selective campaign of air attack against the North would involve risks which at present I regard as too high to accept for this dubious prospect of successful results."

Obviously the risks to which Secretary McNamara referred are catastrophic involvement with Communist China and the Soviet Union, including the possibility of nuclear war.

The policy of bombing in the North has been tried and has failed to accomplish its objectives of significantly reducing the infiltration of men and supplies into the South and of bringing the Hanoi government to the negotiating table.

We hold, therefore, that the time has come for the United States to halt the bombing of North Vietnam. The United States position in the world is strong enough to do so. Such a course, in our view and that of prominent statesmen throughout the world, best promises to open the way for a reasonable and peaceful settlement of this tragic conflict.

Respectfully yours,

JONATHAN B. BINGHAM, FRANK J. BRASCO, GEORGE E. BROWN JR., PHILLIP BURTON, DANIEL E. BUTTON, JEFFERY COHELAN, JOHN CONYERS, JR., CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR., JOHN G. DOW, DON EDWARDS.

LEONARD FARBSTEIN, SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL, DONALD M. FRASER, JACOB H. GILBERT, EDITH GREEN, SEYMOUR HALPERN, AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, HENRY HELSTOSKI, JOSEPH E. KARTH, ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER.

THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN, ROBERT L. LEGGETT, PATSY T. MINK, THOMAS M. REES, HENRY S. REUSS, BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, EDWARD R. ROYBAL, WILLIAM F. RYAN, JAMES H. SCHEUER, LESTER L. WOLFF.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK POINTS TO A SPECIAL HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

Mr. COWGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, since the ninth observance of Captive Nations Week last July, massive reports have been received on the ceremonies and activities of groups not only in this country but also in many other countries in the free world. Many of these illuminating reports and news coverages have appeared in the RECORD these past 3 months. To this day, they keep streaming in.

ADDITIONAL REASON FOR A SPECIAL COMMITTEE

The expanding annual observance of Captive Nations Week is an additional reason for the creation of a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations. Alert Americans and citizens of other nations refuse to be hoodwinked into an apathy toward the captivity and freedom aspirations of Red-dominated nations in central-south Europe, Eastern Europe, and in the Soviet Union, in Asia and Cuba. In response to this vibrant movement the Congress should play its role by alerting all Americans to the continued captivity and exploitation of all the captive peoples in the very much thriving and threatening Red empire. This it can do by establishing this special committee.

A SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE EVE OF MOSCOW'S "50TH"

An excellent occasion for this action is now, the very eve of the 50th anniversary of the fraudulent Russian Bolshevik revolution. The creation of this committee would be a highly appropriate answer to the propaganda lies we are already being told about the glorious Bolshevik revolution. It would also be a positive and constructive tribute to the genuine 50th anniversaries to be celebrated soon in behalf of the once independent states of Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Ukraine, Byelorussia, Armenia, Georgia, and other captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. Their revolutions for national independence were in the tradition of our own American Revolution.

Examples of the most successful Captive Nations Week observance yet point to the urgent need of a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations. I request that the following examples be appended to my remarks: First, the proclamations of Gov. Otto Kerner, of Illinois, Gov. John H. Chafee, of Rhode Island, Gov. Claude R. Kirk, Jr., of Florida, Mayor Victor H. Schiro, of New Orleans, Mayor Chuck Hall, of Dade County, Fla., and the late Mayor Robert King High, of Miami, Fla.; second, an address by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky to the First Conference of the World Anti-Communist League in Taipei, China; third, an interesting letter to the Washington Post editors on the week; and fourth, the compiled reports on the week in the August–September issue of the Ukrainian Bulletin:

STATE OF ILLINOIS PROCLAMATION

Whereas, The United States of America has achieved, through the democratic process, a harmonious national unity of its people although they stem from the most diverse of racial, religious and ethnic backgrounds, and

Whereas, The enslavement of a substantial part of the world's population by Communist imperialism makes a mockery of the idea of peaceful coexistence between nations and constitutes a detriment to the natural bonds of understanding between the people of our nation and other peoples, and

Whereas, The unification of diverse elements of our own free society has led our people to possess a warm understanding and sympathy of the aspirations of peoples everywhere and to recognize the natural interdependency of the peoples and nations of the world, and

Whereas, Since 1959 and every year thereafter, the President of the United States has been authorized by Congress to designate the third week in July as Captive Nations Week to be observed with appropriate ceremonies and activities,

Now, therefore, I, Otto Kerner, Governor of the State of Illinois, do hereby proclaim the third week in July 1967, to be Captive Nations Week in Illinois, and request the appropriate observance of this occasion in a manner fitting and proper.

OTTO KERNER, *Governor.*

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK PROCLAMATION BY JOHN H. CHAFEE, GOVERNOR

During the years following World War I, many nations across the world have been taken over by Communist regimes and there is constant danger of others being taken over by Communist forces.

In these countries the freedoms which we in a democracy so readily accept and cherish are unknown. There are no free elections, no free speech, nor free press, and the freedom of association and assembly is denied.

The people of these captive nations look for the active and moral support of the peoples of free nations and particularly the United States. Free peoples everywhere must work unceasingly for the liberation of these captives and for the preservation of fundamental freedoms; now, therefore, do I, John H. Chafee, Governor of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, proclaim the week of July 16–22, 1967, as Captive Nations Week and encourage all Rhode Islanders to cherish our freedom and to support the liberation of captive peoples all over the world.

JOHN H. CHAFEE, *Governor.*

PROCLAMATION OF THE STATE OF FLORIDA

Whereas, the United States has become a great nation due to its ability through the democratic process, to achieve an harmonious unity of its people despite the diversity of racial, religious and ethnic backgrounds, and

Whereas, this harmonious unity of our free society has led the people of the United States to have a warm understanding for the aspirations and interdependency of the people and nations of the world, and

Whereas, the enslavement of a substantial part of the world's population by Communist imperialism makes a mockery of peaceful co-existence between nations and raises a barrier to the natural bonds of understanding between the people of the United States and other people, and

Whereas, these captive nations look to the United States for leadership in bringing about their liberation and restoration of their religious freedom, and

Whereas, it is vital to our nation's security that the desires of these captive people be kept alive as a deterrent to war and a means of obtaining a lasting peace, and

Whereas, it is proper that we clearly show these people through an appropriate ceremony that we share their aspirations.

Now, therefore, I, Claude R. Kirk, Jr., by virtue of the authority vested in me as Governor of the State of Florida do hereby proclaim July 16–22, 1967, as Captive Nations Week in the State of Florida.

CLAUDE R. KIRK, JR.,
Governor.

CITY OF NEW ORLEANS PROCLAMATION

Whereas, the nationwide observances in the first anniversary of "Captive Nations Week" this past year clearly demonstrated the enthusiastic response of our citizens to decry the plight of the Soviet-dominated nations; and

Whereas, the fundamental conviction that the central issue of our times is imperialist totalitarian slavery versus democratic national freedom dictates we commence to win the cold war by assembling and forthrightfully utilizing all the truths and facts pertaining to the enslaved condition of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, North Vietnam, North Korea, Cuba, and all the rest; and

Whereas, the enlightening forces generated by such knowledge and understanding of the fate of these occupied and captive non-Russian nations would also give encouragement and help to the oppressed; and

Whereas, these weapons of truth, fact and ideas will counter and effectively overwhelm and defeat Moscow's worldwide propaganda campaign in Asia, Africa, the Middle East, Latin America, and specifically among the newly independent and underdeveloped nations and states:

Now, therefore, I, Victor H. Schiro, Acting Mayor of the City of New Orleans, do hereby proclaim July 16 to 22, 1967, to be "Captive Nations Week" in New Orleans, and urge all our citizens to appreciate and recognize the fact that the captive nations in the aggregate constitute not only a primary deterrent against a hot global war and further overt aggression by Moscow's totalitarian imperialism, but also a positive means to the cause of freedom for captive peoples everywhere.

VICTOR H. SCHIRO,
Acting Mayor.

A PROCLAMATION BY THE MAYOR OF METROPOLITAN DADE COUNTY, FLA.

Whereas: The greatness of our nation is, in large part, attributable to its having been able, through the democratic process, to achieve a harmonious unity of its people, even though they stem from varied backgrounds, and

Whereas: In contrast to the freedoms which the citizens of our country enjoy, the people of more than 25 countries throughout the world have been subjected to Communistic tyranny, through its enslavement having been deprived of their freedom of religion, or speech, or a free press as well as their free choice in determining their preferred form of government, and

Whereas: These submerged nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and for leadership in bringing about their liberation, in recognition of which the Congress of the United States has annually designated the third week in July as Captive Nations Week, and

Whereas: It is not only appropriate but also the consensus of our local citizens that we express and indicate publicly strong sympathy for and intense interest in the restoration of freedom to subjugated countries,

Now, therefore: Be it resolved that the board of County Commissioners of Metropolitan Dade County, Florida, does hereby proclaim the week beginning July 16, 1967, as Captive Nations Week in Metropolitan Dade County.

In observance thereof: I call upon the people of Metropolitan Dade County to join in offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples throughout the world.

CHUCK HALL,
Mayor, Dade County, Fla.

A PROCLAMATION BY THE MAYOR OF THE CITY OF MIAMI, FLA.

Whereas the oppressive tactics of international Communism and other forms of tyranny are holding in a state of enslavement and terror the peoples of many nations, including the freedom-loving citizens of Cuba, just a few miles from our own continental shores, and

Whereas persecuted and oppressed individuals throughout the world have traditionally looked to our United States of America as a symbol of democracy, depending upon this country to lend its helpful influence in liberating those who are oppressed, and

Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has designated the third week in July of each year as Captive Nations Week in order that submerged nations everywhere may be reminded of this country's sympathy, thus sustaining their hopes for ultimate freedom, and

Whereas in our City of Miami this important period will be memorialized by the visit and address of United States Senator Thomas J. Dodd, member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee;

Now, therefore, I, Robert King High, Mayor of the City of Miami, Florida, do hereby proclaim the week beginning July 16, 1967, as Captive Nations Week in Miami.

In observance thereof I urge the people of Miami to participate wherever possible in events arranged in observance of this special week and to join with others in offering prayers for the liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples throughout the world.

ROBERT KING HIGH,
Mayor.

THE CAPTIVE NATIONS MOVEMENT

(By Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C., chairman, National Captive Nations Committee, U.S.A.)

This past year in the American environment the National Captive Nations Committee advanced further the captive nations movement as the prime psycho-political weapon against Sino-Soviet Russian imperiocolonialism. Despite an atmosphere suffused with confusion inconsistencies in foreign policy, a spreading Grand Illusion about the Cold War being over, a hovering prospect of compromise in Vietnam, and several excesses of a national inward-look, NCNC scored new advances in concentrating on the imperio-colonialism of both Moscow and Peiping and, as in every year since 1959, has been bitterly attacked by Redmedia (e.g., *Izvestia*, July 7, 1967).

Mr. Chairman, following our practice in many APACL Conferences of reporting concretely instead of speechifying generalities, the highlights of NCNC's activity since the Korean meeting last November are, succinctly, as follows:

(1) We cooperated faithfully with the Committee of One Million to reinforce American opposition to the admission of the Red Chinese totalitarians into the U.N. and the contemplation of the absurd "Two China Policy";

(2) NCNC published thousands of copies of the Congressional reprint *Captive Nations Week: Red Nightmare, Freedom's Hope,* which all members and observers of APACL received and which was distributed worldwide, even behind the Curtains to Moscow, Peiping, Havana and other capitals;

(3) We and our thirty-eight local committees observed with our Free Chinese friends the annual Freedom Day in January, intensifying further the strong, spiritual communion and solidarity of interest that exist between countless Americans and our friends here in this free Republic;

(4) For four months in the earliest part of this year NCNC was one of the three national organizations in the U.S. responsible for the open U.S. Senate hearings on the U.S.-USSR Consular Convention, and in my testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, two of our main arguments against the treaty's ratification were that it would open a Pandora's box in Latin America for diplomatic Russian subversion and that it would discourage the freedom aspirations of the captive non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union who, too, are our natural allies in the Red Empire;

(5) As a clearing house for thirty-eight local captive nations committees NCNC again conducted the Captive Nations Week Observance in the U.S. during the 3rd week of July, with huge rallies in Chicago, Cleveland, New York, Phoenix and dozens of other cities, and one of the chief themes was the liberation of the captive North Vietnamese. It should be stressed that a couple of weeks before this, at the Glassboro summit in New Jersey, Mr. Kosygin anxiously inquired of President Johnson whether he would issue a Captive Nations Week proclamation this year, suggesting it would not abet "peaceful coexistence", but, as many of you know, our President did issue one in behalf of the freedom and independence of all nations on all continents;

(6) Constantly pursuing its international contacts NCNC makes every effort to stimulate Captive Nations observances in friendly countries, and we are happy to report that new advances have been made in this field, as witness the proclamation of the President of Argentina, that of President Park in Free Korea, the observances in Australia, India, and Turkey. We pay respectful tribute to the Republic of China for its consistently superlative observances, and we wish to emphasize again and again that all of you join in this event that strikes the rawest move center of Moscow and Peiping, not to mention the puppets and members of the Red syndicate, for on this the record is clear and overwhelming since 1959;

(7) We are now in process of accumulating the published results of the 1967 Captive Nations Week Observance, and through U.S. Congressional members on the NCNC advisory committee these are published in the *Congressional Record,* which is a vital source of information to all the news and educational media in the U.S., not to mention the correspondents of *Tass* and other Red organs;

(8) NCNC is also implementing now its resolution for a Congressional hearing on "U.S. Policy Toward the USSR", one which calls for an unprecedented Great Debate on this policy. Strange as it may seem, there has never been a full review and examination of this policy in the course of U.S.-USSR relations since 1933, and such a review may well bring about fundamental changes in U.S. policy toward this power center of the Red Empire that, in turn, would substantially affect the policy of every part of the Free World;

(9) We are also concentrating now on exposing the fraudulence of the Russian Bolshevik revolution, which Moscow and the Red Empire will be celebrating in the form of a 50th anniversary this November 7, and we earnestly hope you will join us in this by passing a resolution on this subject here and then implementing it in your respective country in the weeks ahead. One excellent way of implementing it is to pay respect to the many other 50th anniversaries of national independence that will be observed in the Free World—those of Ukraine, Lithuania, Estonia, Byelorussia, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan and so forth, who were among the first to lose their independence to Red power, subversion, terrorism, and takeover; and

(10) Plans are now under way by NCNC for the Tenth Observance of Captive Nations Week in July, 1968. Much to the chagrin of Moscow, Peiping and others, we seek to make this the most telling yet. A book which it has been privileged to write and is now being published for release in October, titled The *Vulnerable Russians,* contains in part all basic material on the Captive Nations movement since 1959. It tells you why Moscow in particular dreads the Captive Nations Week Resolution, which the U.S. Congress passed in 1959, Khrushchev, Suslov, Podgorug, Kosygin and others have rallied against it. Do you know why? Become acquainted with this vital story, and allow your anti-Red conscience act accordingly for an inspiring "10th".

In conclusion, let us not delude ourselves as to where the ultimate power center exists in the Red Empire. By every measure, it is Moscow and the Soviet Union. Hanoi and its aggression wouldn't last for long without the Russian support; North Korea wouldn't exercise arrogant forays without its Russian back-drop; Peiping, like a rebellious child, wouldn't exude its frustrations without Russian concern for the communist conspiracy against the Free World in general and the United States in particular; and Havana wouldn't last a moon without Russian aid. Excluding the important product mix, the gross USSR product well exceeds the aggregate product of the entire remainders of the Red Empire. Let us concentrate on the center in order to free the outlying parts in Asia, Central Europe, and Cuba. The Captive Nations Movement points this way.

The EDITORS,
The Washington Post,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: Recently my attention has been brought to your July 10, 1967 editorial concerning the Captive Nations Week.

It is surprising to find a major American newspaper published in the city named in honor of our first president speaking in a mocking tone about the ideals of national freedom and independence. Before becoming comic about Idel-Ural and Turkestan, it would be wise to remember that no more than two hundred years ago America was a tiny, backward nation whose struggle for national independence evoked a sarcastic smile on the faces of the "sophisticates" of Britain and Europe.

In addition, the editorial was openly insulting to the many Congressmen who sincerely and knowledgeably support the ideas of political self-determination and cultural freedom for over fifty percent of the population of the Soviet Union. The deliberate and tyrannical "russification" of these various nationalities is a historically documented fact and can be easily verified. Peaceful coexistence may be a tempting policy—but if it means peace at any price, then it is certainly a prelude to war: Munich should have taught us that, as the Soviet-Nazi Pact must have taught the Russians. It is an unjust peace that ignores the fact that the Soviet Union is an imperialistic nation, that it is the last colonial empire in existence today. More, it is an artificially forced collection of nations and races held together by the force of the Red Army and the fear of the secret police. It is only a matter of time before this inhuman and historically outdated political structure shatters.

I cannot, therefore, accept your editorial views on these matters as representative of the best American tradition which has always supported the political and cultural struggle for equality and freedom of all races and nations.

Sincerely,

WALTER ODAJNYK.

P.S.—I am a graduate student at Columbia University and the author of "Marxism and Existentialism" (Doubleday: Anchor Books, 1965).

[From the Ukranian Bulletin, August-September, 1967]

U.S. CONGRESS AND TOP OFFICIALS OBSERVE CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1967

U.S. opinion makers from all walks of life availed themselves of the opportunity offered by nationwide observances of this year's Captive Nations Week to show their deep concern for the plight of the captive peoples.

In addition to the traditional Presidential Proclamation, issued on July 12, and proclamations by many Governors and Mayors, the week of July 16–22 also witnessed a debate in the U.S. Congress on the timely topic of the subjugated nations.

Eighty-three Representatives and five Senators took the floor and thus helped demonstrate the continued interest of American legislators with the 200 million East-Central Europeans and Asians, living under Communist oppression.

THE MEANING OF CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

The same as last year, the debate in the House of Representatives was initiated by Congressman Daniel J. Flood (D.-Pa.) who summarized the lessons of the observance:

". . . By their consistent opposition and vehement castigation of Captive Nations Week, Moscow . . . has shown since 1959 its fear of the total captive nations concept as reflected in Public Law 86–90. . . . Our concentrated support of all the captive nations . . . is one of the most powerful nonmilitary deterrents against further overt Sino-Soviet Russian aggression and a prime formidable force for peace with freedom and justice in the world."

Rep. Flood emphasized the need for a special House Captive Nations Committee.

Rep. Thaddeus Dulski (D.-N.Y.) expressed the sentiments of his colleagues succinctly by stating:

"We must reaffirm a twofold promise: to remain firm against further Communist usurpation in the world, and to do all within our power to work for the ultimate liberation of every captive nation."

Other members of Congress who spoke on the same subject were: Frank Annunzio (D.-Ill.), John M. Ashbrook (R.-Ohio), William T. Cahill (R.-N.J.), Glenn Cunningham (R.-Neb.), Emilio Q. Daddario (D.-Conn.), James J. Delaney (D.-N.Y.), Samuel N. Friedel (D.-Md.), Martha W. Griffiths (D.-Mich.), Seymour Halpern (R.-N.Y.), James M. Hanley (D.-N.Y.), Frank Horton (R.-N.Y.), Edna F. Kelly (D.-N.Y.) Theodore R. Kupferman (R.-N.Y.), Odin Langer (R.-Minn.), Robert McClory (R.-Ill.), Thomas Meskill (R.-Conn.), F. Bradford Morse (R.-Mass.), William L. Murphy (D.-Ill.), Lucien Nedzi (D.-Mich.), Barrett O'Hara (D.-Ill.), Philip J. Philbin (D.-Mass.), Charlotte T. Reid (R.-Ill.), Howard W. Robison (R.-N.Y.), Henry L. Schadeberg (R.-Wisc.), Henry P. Smith (R.-N.Y.), Joe D. Waggonner, Jr. (D.-La.), Albert W. Watson (R.-S.C.), and Lester L. Wolff (D.-N.Y.).

DENIAL OF HUMAN RIGHTS

A large number of Congressmen scored continued violations of fundamental human rights by Communist regimes.

Speaker Robert W. McCormack (D.-Mass) said:

"Present stage of Communist domination in which some autonomy of the satellites has been tolerated by Moscow . . . has meant some amelioration of the living conditions of the captive peoples. It has not meant a restoration of the national and personal freedom which is rightfully theirs. The captive peoples continue to live in despair, in enslavement, in anguish for their lost past, in fear and trepidation for the present and in apprehension of the future."

Rep. Edwin Reinecke (R.-Calif.) reminded his colleagues of the significance of the denial of freedom to the captive peoples:

"For if the freedom of one nation is destroyed, then the freedom of all nations is in jeopardy. And if any people anywhere suffer from the burdens of captivity, then all people everywhere are in some measure held captive."

Speeches on this topic were also delivered by Edward P. Boland (D.-Mass.), Frank T. Bow (R.-Ohio), James A. Byrne (D.-Pa.), Silvio C. Conte (R.-Mass.), John H. Dent (D.-Pa.), Leonard Farbstein (D.-N.Y.), Dante B. Fascell (D.-Fla.), William D. Ford (D.-Mich.), Robert N. Giaimo (D.-Conn.), Clarence D. Long (D.-Md.), Thomas G. Morris (D.-N.M.), Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr. (D.-Mass.), Roman C. Pucinski (D.-Ill.), Albert H. Quie (R.-Minn.), John J. Rhodes (R.-Ariz.), Peter W. Rodino (D.-N.J.), J. William Stanton (R.-Ohio), John M. Zwach (R.-Minn.), and William G. Bray (R.-Ind.).

COMMUNIST AGGRESSION

"1967 marks the 50th anniversary of Communism," observed Rep. Harold R. Collier (R.-Ill.), "the greatest social economic and political cancer to be found in the entire record of history . . . the record since 1917 alone provides more evidence than one can use to show that communism is a fraud, a delusion, a conspiracy which has exploited the ignorance, inertia and apathy of masses of people. It is against the people."

Soviet aggression and imperialism were accentuated in the remarks by E. Ross Adair (R.-Ind.), Frank J. Brasco (D.-N.J.), John H. Buchanan (R.-Ala.), Frances P. Bolton (R.-Ohio), Dominick V. Daniels (D.-N.J.), Robert V. Deney (R.-Neb.), Edward J. Derwinski (R.-Ill.), John D. Dingell (D.-Mich.), Gerald R. Ford (R.-Mich.), Margaret M. Heckler (R.-Mass.), Henry Helstoski (D.-N.J.), Donald E. Lukens (R.-Ohio), Joseph M. McDade (R.-Pa.), John S. Monagan (D.-Conn.), Abraham J. Multer (D.-N.Y.), Thomas M. Pelly (R.-Wash.), Jerry L. Pettis (R.-Calif.), Garner E. Shriver (R.-Kan.), H. Allen Smith (R.-Calif.), Samuel Stratton (D.-N.Y.), and Louis C. Wyman (R.-N.H.).

TRENDS IN EAST EUROPE

Rep. Silvio O. Conte (R.-Mass.) showed the limitations on internal liberalization in Eastern Europe by pointing to the example of Prof. Leszek Kolakowski, who was ousted from the Polish Communist Party and the university for his outspoken views. Joel T. Broyhill (R.-Va.), J. Herbert Burke (R.-Fla.), James C. Cleveland (R.-N.H.), Joshua Eilberg (D.-Pa.), Cornelius Gallagher (D.-N.J.), William J. Green (D.-Pa.), William L. St. Onge (D.-Conn.), John V. Tunney (D.-Calif.), and Bob Wilson (R.-Calif.) also gave examples of international trends in East Europe.

SENATE DISCUSSION

The Captive Nations Week debate in the Senate reiterated the support of freedom and self-determination for the captive East-Central European peoples.

Sen. Frank J. Lausche (D.-Ohio) said, in part:

"It behooves us all to remind ourselves of the fate of those who have fallen under Communist totalitarianism lest the free world crumble bit by bit and be engulfed in the same way as those nations whose fate we now mourn."

Sen. Roman L. Hruska (R.-Neb.) stated:

"Never before in human history have we seen the imprisonment of nations on such a scale. But even in this grim situation, many of these people have managed to maintain their faith in freedom. Much honor is to be given to those who have given their lives for the noblest of human causes and to those who continue to carry on this fight.

Senators Charles H. Percy (R.-Ill.), Edward W. Brooke (R.-Mass.), and Abraham A. Ribicoff (D.-Conn.) also made appropriate remarks.

Here is a partial list of Governors and their states, and the Mayors and their cities, who called for the observance of Captive Nations Week.

GOVERNORS: Lurleen B. Wallace, Alabama; John A. Love, Colorado; John Dempsey, Connecticut; Roger D. Branigin, Indiana; Harold E. Hughes, Iowa; Edward T. Breathitt, Kentucky; Spiro T. Agnew, Maryland; George Romney, Michigan; Dan. K. Moore, North Carolina; John A. Rhodes, Ohio; Nelson A. Rockefeller, New York; Raymond P. Shafer, Pennsylvania; and John Connally, Texas.

MAYORS: Ray B. Bracy, Allentown, Pa.; Theodore R. McKeldin, Baltimore, Md.; Frank A. Sedita, Buffalo, N.Y.; Richard J. Daley, Chicago, Ill.; Orville L. Hubbard, Dearborn, Mich.; James W. Kelly, East Orange, N.J.; John J. Barton, Indianapolis, Ind.; E. R. Hammond, Kenosha, Wis.; Otto Festge, Madison, Wis.; Henry W. Maier, Milwaukee, Wis.; Arthur Naftalin, Minneapolis, Minn.; Richard C. Lee, New Haven, Conn.; Victor H. Shiro, New Orleans, La.; John V. Lindsay, New York, N.Y.; James H. J. Tate, Philadelphia, Pa.; A. J. Cervantes, St. Louis, Mo.; William F. Walsh, Syracuse, N.Y.; J. Bracken Lee, Salt Lake City, Utah; Douglas A. Merrifield, St. Joseph, Mo.; James F. X. O'Rourke, Yonkers, N.Y.; Anthony B. Flask, Youngstown, Ohio.

Moreover, New Hampshire legislators adopted on a voice vote a House resolution, containing a pledge to be "opposed to oppression and . . . to help all . . . captive nations until they have regained their freedom."

[From the Ukrainian Bulletin, August-September 1967]

NINTH CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK OBSERVED THROUGHOUT THE NATION

NEW YORK, N.Y. (Special).—The 1967 Captive Nations Week observances (July 16–22, 1967) were held in several American cities from coast to coast, stressing support and understanding of the plight of the captive nations everywhere. With President Johnson issuing the annual Presidential Proclamation calling on the American people to rededicate themselves to the ideals of freedom of all the peoples of the world, many governors and mayors of major U.S. cities followed suit and issued their own proclamations. A number of U.S. legislators made special statements on the floor of the U.S. Congress in support of the captive nations behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains. Stories pertaining to nationwide observances, rallies, special manifestations and meetings had been extensively covered by the American press and over the radio and TV networks.

The Ukrainian American organizations, led by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, took active part in these observances, thus contributing to the successful Captive Nations Week of 1967.

[From the Ukrainian Bulletin, August-September, 1967]

Captive Nations Author Challenges Washington Post Editors on Russian Imperio-Colonialism

Addressing a Captive Nations Conference in Washington's Mayflower Hotel, the author of the Captive Nations Resolution (Public Law 86–90) challenged the editors of *The Washington Post* "to receive some elementary education on Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism." Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, who is the chairman of the National Captive Nations Committee and an economics professor at Georgetown University, used the occasion of the conference to reply to the *Post's* July 10 editorial "Captive Congressmen." The conference was one of some fifty-five festivities about the country observing Captive Nations Week, July 16–22.

The Georgetown professor specifically challenged the paper's editors "to arrange a discussion meeting in the *Post's* auditorium which would bring the editors face to face with living victims of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism from Idel-Ural, Turkestan, White Ruthenia and Cossackia." He held, "It doesn't require much courage to shield one's ignorance behind an editorial pen and continue to misinform the readers. Let us see how courageous the editors are in meeting these people before the audience of their own staff which would have the opportunity to gauge the level of their editors' understanding of this vital problem." In his challenge, Dr. Dobriansky pointed out further, "Just as many Americans have come to learn where Gambia, Chad and other African states are located, so the *Post's* editors will in time come to learn where Idel-Ural, Turkestan, White Ruthenia, and Cossackia are located in the Russian prison house of nations."

As a kickoff to the 1967 Captive Nations Week, the professor's address highlighted the themes of the observance. One theme is to initiate debate on Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism in the U.N., as called for by President Kennedy in September 1961 and in part prepared by Adlai Stevenson's memo on the subject in November of that year. The professor also urged Congressional hearings on U.S. policy toward the USSR, which "would be unprecedented because we've never had any such thorough hearings in our contemporary history."

Captive Nations committees were also stressing this year victory in Vietnam through psycho-political liberation of the 17 million captive North Vietnamese, the creation of a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations, and exposure of the fraudulent 50th anniversary of the Russian Bolshevik revolution. This last theme is underscored by the advertised publication this October of Dobriansky's book, *The Vulnerable Russians*, as "an American answer to the '50th.'" Some port-city committees have begun a "Nyets Campaign Against Russian Consulates," based on the Dirksen-State Department agreement arrived at during the Consular Treaty debate earlier this year.

[From the Ukrainian Bulletin, August-September 1967]

Archpastoral Appeal

(By His Excellency, the Most Reverend Ambrose Senyshyn, OSBM, Archbishop and Metropolitan of Ukrainian Catholics in the United States of America, on the occasion of Captive Nations Week, 1967)

"For the sick, the suffering, the imprisoned and for their salvation, let us pray to the Lord." (Divine Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom).

During the month of July the American people celebrate the joyful anniversary of their national independence, but in the third week of July, however, the nation marks a most sorrowful event, namely, "Captive Nations Week." What a tragic irony! In the twentieth century of civilization and culture we observe a "Captive Nations Week." Today the primitive African tribes are forming their independent states, whereas civilized peoples with a thousand years culture and tradition behind themselves are enslaved in the communist imprisonment behind the iron, bamboo, and sugarcane curtains.

Amid these grave conditions of life for the captive nations a ray of hope burst forth on the horizons, because the conscience of the American nation was awakened from a deep lethargy in its unmasking of the face of the communist terror not only in the enslaved countries, but also in different localities throughout the free world. The Communists tell the free world that they have freedom. Yes, there is freedom, but only for the members of the communist party, and not so for the Ukrainian and other peoples in the Bolshevik dungeons. Every informed Ukrainian Christian should disseminate information depicting the true scene of the Communist enslavement, so that public opinion of the free world would bring to bear on the leaders of the Red Kremlin.

In observing "Captive Nations Week" we cannot pass over in silence the persecution and enslavement of our Silent Ukrainian Church behind the iron curtain. The Bolshevik administration with the aid of the Muscovite Patriarch liquidated the Ukrainian Catholic Church to such an extent that "the enemy doesn't even let us pray" in the Ukrainian Catholic churches. The Ukrainian Orthodox Church met the same fate. Today there is no Ukrainian Orthodox Cathedral of Holy Wisdom in Kiev, for the communist authorities have confiscated it and turned it into a museum. There is no Ukrainian Catholic Cathedral of Saint George in Lviv, for the communist government has turned it over to the Muscovite Patriarch. In Eastern Ukraine as well as in Carpatho-Ukraine, our Church had flourished beautifully. In 1945 after the Bolshevik occupation, everything was changed. All our bishops were arrested and suffered either in prison or in exile, in forced labor with hundreds of priests and thousands of the faithful, where many of them gave their lives for the Holy Faith.

Before the Second World War and before the Bolshevik occupation in Western Ukraine and in the Carpathian region, there were 5 eparchies, 10 bishops and 2 Apostolic Visitators with episcopal powers, which had 2,950 priests, and 520 priest-monks and brothers, 1,100 Sisters and 450 theology students. Religious life was flourishing in 3,040 parish churches, and 4,440 missions and oratories. There were 9,900 elementary, intermediary and high schools, which were closely connected with the Church. There were also 41 Catholic organizations and 38 newspapers and magazines. All of these accomplished during many years of work by the clergy and faithful were destroyed by the communist regime. When the Bolsheviks persecuted the Church and Catholics in the satellite countries, then the free western world made its protest against the Bolshevik force, but when the Vicar of Christ, Pope Pius XII appealed to the free world in the matter of the inflicted injury by the Communists on the Ukrainian Nation and the Ukrainian Catholic Church, this gracious appeal passed without an echo in the western world. This was a sign of the times, of how little the western world then really knew about the communist persecution.

Perhaps there are some who fall prey to the communist line that religious, social and national relations have improved in the Soviet Union. Let us not fool ourselves! Perhaps these conditions have improved for members of the communist party, but not for the Ukrainian people, nor for the Ukrainian Churches. Perhaps Catholics of the Latin rite in the various satellite countries have been able to preserve in some measure with great restrictions their bishops, clergy and churches. But not in Ukraine, for there the Bolsheviks liquidated everything and it is forbidden to publicly praise God. Perhaps in some localities behind the iron curtain there are Ukrainian Catholic priests, and perhaps even bishops, but these must take to the catacombs, for the Ukrainian religion among the Soviets does not have a right to even exist. Most unfortunate it is that the Soviet government seems to ignore the historical fact that not one state in the world ever was able to maintain itself by force and persecution. It continues to deceive the Ukrainian inhabitants in the free world through communist agents under the guise of national dress, dance, song and poetry, to "build a bridge" to enslaved Ukraine, where they will add to the pile of bones of martyred Ukrainians in Siberia.

This threatening situation for our people and Church behind the iron curtain ought to increase our empathy here in the free world. A healthy organism reacts to pain. Whenever one of the members of the human body is infected, then the others hasten to come to its aid. Thus should be the reaction in every human society, and especially in the Ukrainian community. We have glaring examples from history. The Irish did not lose their nationality or religious consciousness in the USA, but even continually sought to aid the fatherland, until it attained its independence. In latter times the Jews of the whole world manifested their solidarity and great generosity.

How is the religious and national question with Ukrainians in America? Do we hold the flag of religio-national traditions high? Have all preserved that religious and national consciousness and sympathy for our people's fate behind the iron curtain? Are the Ukrainians fleeing into strange camps, forgetting whose sons and daughters they are? The Ukrainian nation and the Ukrainian Catholic Church needs you, so that you would be spokesmen in the free world. Do not be silent about the bitter fate of our Ukrainian people and churches. Do not listen to the whispers of godless dictators who enslaved the Ukrainian soul and body, from whom you fled and saved yourselves. Do not complain as did the Jews in the Bible at the waters of Babylon, raising their hands and doing nothing. Let us awaken our religious and national feelings. Let us help our brothers and sisters morally and materially. They do need your help. Have you given your mite to the sick and poor refugees that these might buy medicine and other necessities? I do not believe that the hearts of Ukrainians are cold like ice as that of the evangelic rich man who didn't aid Lazarus. American Catholics constantly come to the aid of various countries, and should we therefore not help our own Ukrainians?

In the first place, during "Captive Nations Week" let us pray before God in the words of the Church: "For the sick, the suffering, the imprisoned, and for their salvation, let us pray to the Lord." Let us pray for them not only during "Captive Nations Week," but every day, that the Lord have pity on our

Ukrainian Churches and people. Thus, let us give at least a small item from our wealth to those who need our aid. Our experience teaches us that whenever we save the needy, there comes with it a great spiritual satisfaction and the blessing of God.

The blessing of the Lord be upon you!

[From the Ukrainian Bulletin, August-September 1967]

American Liberals: Know They What They Do?

Among a few self-styled American liberal newspapers *The Washington Post* claims to be the most liberal, if not the "only liberal" journal in the United States. Its liberalism, alas, is of a specious sort, if we are to judge by its nigh fanatical opposition to the cause of the nations enslaved by Communist Russia.

A few years ago, *The Post* waged a vitriolic campaign against the erection in Washington of a monument in honor of Taras Shevchenko, Ukraine's poet laureate and national hero. The basic premise of the *Post's* editors was that Shevchenko was a "forerunner of Bolshevism," and therefore had no place in Washington. Their confused thinking led the editors so far as to consult the puppet Ukrainian communist delegation in the U.N., who were only too glad to comfort and reinforce the *Post* editors in their anti-Ukrainian thinking and attitude.

Fortunately for this nation, neither the U.S. Congress nor the U.S. government was swayed by the *Post's* unique political insight and ideological acumen. The Shevchenko monument stands in Washington as a symbol of man's eternal quest of freedom and a decent life. It also is a symbol of the understanding of the American people (less *The Washington Post*) of those great works which Shevchenko produced on behalf of human freedom everywhere.

TODAY: AGAINST THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

In the past few years, *The Washington Post* has kept itself busy attacking the concept of support of the captive nations. It has assailed the U.S. Congress for enacting the Captive Nations Week Resolution. It has derided those U.S. citizens who support the captive nations movement, for in the *Post's* belief, this popular movement has impaired the prospect of peaceful relations with the Soviet Union. For this the *Post* received high praise—from the Communist papers in the USSR!

This year, *The Washington Post* again gave forth with a venomous editorial on the captive nations entitled, "Captive Congressmen" (it appeared in the July 10, 1967 issue of the progressive newspaper). It ridiculed U.S. Congressmen for succumbing to "a surge of hysterical anti-Communism" and passing the resolution in 1959. It satirized such captive nations as Idel-Ural, Turkestan, White Ruthenia and Cossackia as "pseudo-states." Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, who conceived the idea of the Captive Nations Resolution, was taken to task for not including Mother Russia in the list of captive nations, and it gave credit to President Johnson for at least not being specific in enumerating the captive nations.

In their discharge of bile the editorial staff of the *Post* has Mother Russia as a captive *country*, thereby opening up the *fairly* reasonable question: who is her captor? Try as we might, we glimpse no foreign troops on Russian soil. But in every one of the captive nations even the *Post* would acknowledge the presence either of Soviet Russian troops, secret agents and spies, or a subservient Communist Party—or all three. Each of these captive countries is ruled from Moscow as an alien power. Thus, Russia is not, and can never be considered a captive country.

How the Russians Feel About America

The pro-Russian bias of the *Post* is so blatant that one wonders if its foreign policy analysts ever bother reading anything that emanates from Moscow concerning America. For instance, on June 25, 1967, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union issued its "theses" on the forthcoming 50th anniversary of the Bolshevik revolution. It was obviously timed with Kosygin's visits to the U.N., Glassboro, N.J. and Havana, Cuba.

The statement of the Russian Communist Party read, among other things, that "imperialism, notably U.S. imperialism, was and continues to be the main enemy of the national liberation movement . . ." It stressed, moreover, that "there can be no question of neutrality in the struggle against bourgeois ideology and anti-Communism. The struggle against bourgeois ideology and anti-Communism is one of the most acute aspects of the class struggle; it is a struggle for man, and for the triumph of freedom and progress of mankind" (cf. "Excerpts from the Soviet Document," *The New York Times*, June 26, 1967).

Clearly, whatever overtures the United States has made toward "peaceful coexistence" with the Kremlin have had no influence on the Soviet Russian position regarding the United States. Anti-Americanism is an ineradicable feature of Soviet foreign policy, a simple fact, demonstrated *ad nauseum*, which the *Washington Post* blithely chooses to ignore. In addition, the same anti-American policy was approved by some 24 Communist Parties of the world which gathered at Karlovy Vary in Czechoslovakia in April 1967. At this meeting of Communist worthies President Johnson's "building bridges of understanding" policy went without mention, as were other hopeful gestures on our part, such as the expansion of East-West trade, "cultural exchanges," and the like.

If the U.S. government still underestimates the significance of the captive nations in its global strategy, the fault lies in good part with the vocal, pseudo-liberal American press, as exemplified by *The Washington Post*, which has, for reasons almost beyond comprehension, tried to inflict sheer fantasies upon the minds of the American people. Their effort belongs to that sorry tradition which glorified Fidel Castro as a "genuine freedom fighter" against the dictatorial regime of Fulgencio Batista.

The Washington Post has distinguished itself in this tradition by ridiculing and degrading these forces within the USSR and without which are struggling for the liberation of the captive nations in the USSR. To the *Post*, the Soviet empire is inviolable, despite the fact that the Soviet government ruthlessly persecutes all the peoples within its purview, including the Jews.

Moreover, Communist Russia is the acknowledged instigator and sponsor of the "wars of national liberation" in Asia, Africa and Latin America. These movements are Communist-directed and Communist financed, and are directed against the United States as the principal enemy of Russian Communist imperialism and colonialism.

Indeed, Communist Russia sees its relationship with the U.S. far more clearly than does the *Post*.

COUNTERMEASURES

What is needed on our part is not the irrationality of a *Post* but sane and constructive measures in confronting a dedicated enemy.

One of these constructive—and peaceful—ways to check Russian Communist imperialism and colonialism is to turn the tables against the self-vaunted Russian "champion of colonial peoples": pronounce unequivocal support of all the captive nations in the USSR in consonance with the Captive Nations Week Resolution of 1959.

That the Kremlin is sensitive so far as the captive nations are concerned has long been evident to the objective observer. Millions of Russian words have been expended on the idyllic life of the "family of happy peoples" united under the "benign and lovable Russian older brother." While these words brainwashed the *Posts* of our country, others became aware of an underlying guilt and apprehension. Stalin unwittingly paid a prized tribute to the rebellious Ukrainians when he lamented that there were too many of them to kill off. Any possible doubts as to the menace to the Kremlin of the seething discontent of the enslaved peoples vanished when Khrushchev exploded into rage over the Captive Nations Week before an astonished Richard Nixon. Any "family" a fraction as happy as Soviet propaganda maintains should be quite impervious to a resolution which, in any event, express good will and expresses the common need of all men: freedom.

The *Post* lauds Mr. Johnson for exploring all openings to East-West peace and stability. Typical of its writings, it neglects to point out that Mr. Johnson believes that freedom, if need be, must be fought for, as in Vietnam. The posture of the *Post* becomes all the more craven in its refusal to acknowledge the validity of the Captive Nations Week Resolution. The Resolution merely expresses our sympathy for the plight of peoples forcibly deprived of their freedom. But not to have passed the Resolution would have betrayed a lack of belief in the most important pillar upon which our country and way of life rests.

The *Post* speaks not of this America; instead it anticipates another, wholly different America, something closer to the enemy whose integrity it seems obsessively bent on defending.

[From the Ukrainian Bulletin, August-September 1967]

Captive Nations Conference and Banquet Held in Washingon

More than 200 civic, ethnic, and trade union leaders attended a Captive Nations Conference and Banquet at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C., July 15. The day-long affair, first of its kind sponsored by the National Captive Nations Committee, launched the ninth observance of Captive Nations Week, July 16–22.

Owing to the vital importance to the freedom world to work for the liberation of the Captive Nations, conferees and banquet speakers alike proposed extending Captive Nations observances and activities to a year-round basis.

Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, Chairman of the National Captive Nations Committee, and General Chairman of the Conference, opened the Conference by giving the themes for this year's observance: (1) to initiate debate on Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism in the U.N. as called for by President Kennedy in September 1961, (2) to urge Congressional hearings on U.S. policy toward the USSR, and (3) stress victory in Viet Nam through psycho-political liberation of the 17 million captive North Vietnamese.

This last theme is underscored by publication this October of Dr. Dobriansky's book, *The Vulnerable Russians* as an American answer to the Russian Communists' 50th anniversary in power in Moscow.

Speaking on the Middle East, Professor Roman Smal-Stocki, Visiting Professor at Catholic University, pointed out that the Russian imperialists have liquidated the Jewish autonomous republic, Birobirdzhan, are strangling Judaism inside the USSR, and now have linked up with Arab anti-Semites to destroy the Israelis.

By their support of the Arabs, Professor Smal-Stocki said, the Russians also hope to forestall any effort of the Panislamic Movement to undertake the liberation of some 40,000,000 people in Islamic "captive nations" inside the USSR, and, at the same time, deny Middle East oil to the West.

Getting the ideas, the concepts of "captive nations" across to decision-makers was a major theme stressed by many Conference and Banquet speakers.

Congressman Edward J. Derwinski (R., Ill.) emphasized that "With your perseverance, with your patience, in the long run, justice will triumph. You can't have peace and freedom in the world until all people live in countries with governments of their own choice." Fortunately, the Congressman added, "It's at the grassroots America that ultimately we will shape our foreign policy. There isn't anyone here who can be apathetic."

Congressman Michael A. Feighan (D., Ohio) noted that: "Russian Communists boldly assert that they won't stop until all the world is their captive empire" and pointed out, "We have tens of millions of allies inside the Communist Empire. They call out to us for support in their aspirations for liberty and freedom and national independence. I am glad that the labor unions, which are the bulwark of the success of our way of life, understand this threat of Communism."

Speaking at the Banquet for Mr. George Meany, President of AFL–CIO, and Honorary Chairman of the National Captive Nations Committee, Henry Kirsch, of AFL–CIO's International Department, said:

"The trade union movement stands with clear, unequivocal support for the aspirations of all people for freedom. Unless all people are free none of us is secure in our own liberty. It should be known throughout the world that the AFL–CIO has not abandoned these people to Communism."

Mr. Kirsch continued: "Despite de-Stalinization, forced labor camps still exist. The Party still continues to run everything. Collective leadership means that one tyrant has been replaced by an oligarchy. The tyranny has not been altered. The AFL–CIO will never admire the assassins of freedom." Naturally, he said, "Communists fear elections in countries they control. They fear these would go democratic."

Congressman John Buchanan (R., Ala.), referring to the Israeli-Arab war, said: "The Soviets have given one-third of their aid outside the bloc to Egypt. What is wrong in the Middle East is what is wrong in Cuba, in Asia, in Europe and everywhere else. That is the great wrongness of World Communism."

Speaking for Senator Thomas J. Dodd, David Martin pointed out that liberals as well as conservatives should support the Captive Nations movement. He said: "To be a consistent liberal or a consistent conservative, one has to be anti-Communist. The businessman who pushes for East-West trade for a profit betrays conservatism. The liberal who seeks detente with the Soviets betrays liberalism."

Mr. Martin continued: "We must seek the liberation of the captive nations because our security depends upon it."

Following the speeches, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, as Chairman, National Captive Nations Committee, presented awards for outstanding service to the Captive Nations Movement to William J. Gill, Pittsburgh, Pa., the Georgetown University Forum and Rev. Daniel E. Power and Rev. Francis J. Heyden, and to Donald L. Miller, Executive Director, National Captive Nations Committee.

Other awards for outstanding service to the Captive Nations Movement, prepared for presentation at the Banquet, will be presented later to John M. Fisher, President, American Security Council; Senator Thomas J. Dodd; Senator Frank J. Lausche, and George Meany, President, AFL–CIO.

Other speakers during the Captive Nations Conference included Mrs. Claire Lee Chennault, Dr. George Dimitrov, Secretary General, International Peasant Union; Mr. Dimitru Danielopol, Copley News Service; and Dr. Peter P. Lejins, President, American Latvian Association.

The Banquet audience included leaders of 15 major trade unions and departments of AFL–CIO, as well as civic and ethnic leaders. Philip A. Guarino, a Director of the National Captive Nations Committee, was Chairman of the Banquet.

[From the Ukrainian Bulletin, August-September 1967]

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK IN BOSTON

(By Orest Szczudluk)

BOSTON, MASS.—This year's Captive Nations Week was observed here by informing the public, through newspapers and radio, about the captive nations. Governor John A. Volpe and Mayor John F. Collins of Boston enhanced the observance by issuing proclamations designating the week of July 16–22 as "Captive Nations Week" in Massachusetts and Boston, respectively. The official signing of proclamations was witnessed by delegations representing the New England Committee for Captive Nations and included representatives of American Armenian, Ukrainian, Latvian, Lithuanian and Hungarian organizations.

Each major daily and radio station in the State received a press release, together with copies of the official proclamations. These newspapers commented on the observance: *The Boston Herald Traveler, Boston Record American, The Standard Times* (New Bedford, Mass.), *Manchester Union Leader* (Manchester, N.H.), *Morning Sentinel* (Waterville, Maine), *Hairenik Weekly* (Boston, Mass.).

The Boston Herald of July 19, 1967, carried a letter by James H. Tashjian, Chairman of the NECCN, urging concrete efforts in support of freedom for captive nations, such as exposing the fraudulent 50th anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution and urging the U.N. to investigate Russian Communist aggression and demanding free elections in captive countries.

The Boston Herald of July 6, 1967, carried an interesting article, written by Ted Lewis. The nationally syndicated columnist, citing an interview with Prof. Lev E. Dobriansky, Chairman of the National Captive Nations Committee, chided the Administration for paying only "lip service to the cause of freedom" in captive countries. The article was entitled, "Captive Nations Get Lip Service."

The New England Committee for Captive Nations sponsored this year's observance, in cooperation with several other civic organizations. The Committee is headed by Dr. James H. Tashjian as Chairman and Orest Szczudluk as Executive Secretary.

ACTION OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE

In separate letters, 25 New England Congressmen were urged to initiate action in the House Rules Committee on pending legislation and to vote for the establishment of a permanent Special Committee on Captive Nations in Congress. So far, favorable answers were received from Speaker McCormack and Congressmen O'Neill, Philbin, Burke, Cleveland, St. Onge and Conte.

SOMETHING FOR THE "ENZYME EXPERTS" TO PONDER

Mr. COWGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, in the Chicago Tribune of today there is a news item that should be pondered by the "enzyme experts." It relates that Mig pilots appear to have the benefit of a new radar system which could cause increased losses for American pilots. This amounts to one more item for the Vietnamese Communists from the U.S.S.R., and it comes closely on the heels of reports of Soviet "Hook" and "Hound" helicopters, and a new variety of flamethrower, recently introduced into the enemy's arsenal.

For those who believe we should not interdict these supplies, by bombing before they reach the North Vietnamese and Vietcong soldiers, the article also provides the latest American battle casualty statistics: 102,043 killed, wounded, or missing.

The "enzyme experts" can attempt to deduce why we should not bomb these supplies when they reach the port of Haiphong and surrounding areas rather than wait until they are used in hand-to-hand combat, or until they are used to haul artillery to be used against Conthien, or against American pilots. They can attempt to establish a case against bombing targets which the true experts, the military experts, request. If a case can be made.

The article also suggests the question, did any of the equipment which went into production of this newly introduced radar, or the flamethrowers, or "Hook" or "Hound," come from American sources traded away through bridge-building programs of East-West trade? Did any of this equipment contain synthetic rubber, computers, synthetic fibers, radio communication equipment, or other items such as these which have been traded with the Communists?

These few points should be remembered when reading articles such as this one which I submit for inclusion into the RECORD:

RED GROUND RADAR AIDS MIGS

SAIGON, VIETNAM, October 12.—North Vietnamese Mig fighter pilots are using a new sophisticated ground-to-air radar targeting system that enables them to sneak up on American jets from behind and fire missiles, an air force official in Da Nang disclosed today.

The new system could be a major reason for the recent reappearance of supersonic Mig–21 fighters over North Viet Nam, he said, adding, "The Migs are getting better."

MISSILES NOT VERY GOOD

He said the Communists' ground radar, more powerful and sophisticated than radar sets aboard aircraft, is used to guide Migs to positions directly behind United States planes, so the communist pilots often have the American planes in their sights before the American pilots are aware they are being tailed. The Migs make one firing pass and disappear, he said.

"What's saving us is that their missiles aren't very good," the source said. "If they had the same kinds of missiles we do, we'd be hurting."'

American Phantoms are equipped with heat-seeking Sidewinder missiles and radar-guided Falcon and Sparrow missiles. According to some reports, missiles supplied the North Vietnamese by the Russians are not the best ones in the Soviet inventory.

YANKS KILLED IN WEEK, 102

In Saigon United States officials announced that 102 Americans were killed in combat last week in Viet Nam, 26 were missing in action, and 890 were wounded, the lowest casualty figures for any week in two months. About half the wounded were hurt seriously enough to require hospitalization.

The new toll raised over-all American war casualties to 102,043—13,736 killed, 87,525 wounded, and 782 missing. More than half the casualties have been suffered in 1967.

In the air war, marine corps pilots streaked to within 20 miles of Hanoi to bomb the Hoa Loc Mig base and a railroad line 70 miles northwest of the communist capital.

PROBE GUERRILLA SANCTUARY

In ground action, United States 1st infantry division troops continued to sweep the fringes of the "iron triangle" guerrilla sanctuary northeast of Saigon where they ran into a Viet Cong force trying to protect caches of munitions and food yesterday and killed 24 of the Viet Cong. The battle resulted in the death of one American and the wounding of thee others.

President-elect Nguyen Van Thieu of South Viet Nam will send a letter to Ho Chi Minh inviting the North Vietnamese president to peace talks after Thieu's inauguration, the Saigon government said today. A spokesman said Thieu would also propose a week-long bombing pause "if Hanoi's answer is favorable."

The spokesman said Thieu would send the letter to the North Vietnamese president throught diplomatic channels, through a public announcement, and through third nations.

SELLING INDIVIDUAL RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. COWGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ashbrook] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, one of the hardest products to sell these days, and yet one which is indispensable to our representative form of government, is individual responsibility. One need only consider the case of the automobile driver to appreciate the necessity for exercising personal responsibility. Each time an approaching car zips past—sometimes a matter of several feet apart—each driver is relying on the other not to be dangerously drunk or reckless or inattentive while the cars are in motion. We are all too familiar with the frightful penalties sometimes exacted due to the absence of driver responsibility. We all heartily agree that driving excesses should be punished promptly and directly. Yet, in other areas of everyday life, the subject of personal responsibility or duty often falls on deaf ears, possibly because the penalties are not as immediate or graphic as the twisted wreckage of an automobile.

Recently President John A. Howard, of Rockford College, Rockford, Ill., in his opening convocation address, presented a forceful case on behalf of the responsibility of the individual. To the traditional three R's President Howard added the three R's of respect, restraint, responsibility, and reemphasized the principle of our forefathers that—

> Man has discovered no code for living together which improves on the ten commandments.

His message demands a wider dissemination and adoption if our Nation is not to disappear into history—the victim of its own internal decay.

I include the address, "Another Three R's," by President John A. Howard, of Rockford College, given on September 13, 1967, in the Record at this point:

ANOTHER THREE R'S

(Opening convocation address by John A. Howard, president, Rockford College, September 13, 1967)

This ceremony marks the one hundred twenty-first year of this institution. Although there is a tendency to attach great significance to the age of a college, the fact is that age of itself indicates nothing more than a capacity to survive. We are the ones who must prove in our time that the long flow of personal sacrifices which created and sustained this college were well invested, that we have the courage and the vision to rise resolutely to the challenges of our times, holding to those attitudes and traditions which have enduring value and adding to them whatever will fortify our students for the particular circumstances in which they live.

In one respect, the circumstances are very fortunate ones. This is a year we have been waiting for. The Howard Colman Library provides us with one of the most attractive and well-appointed study centers ever created. The new science building gives promise of serving its purposes equally well and, moreover, cleverly gives us something to look forward to when it is finally finished. The College personnel are all, at long last, reassembled on one campus. And the new interim studies program next January fulfills the dream of many an academic, the opportunity for faculty and students to explore with full concentration an area of particular interest to each person.

The aura of rejoicing on our campus, however, contrasts rather sharply with the conditions of the outer world. Robinson Jeffers wrote of "A gathering in the air of something that hates humanity." It seems as if some malevolent force is now at work. The daily headlines remind us of the undeclared foreign war in Vietnam and the undeclared civil war in our urban centers. Recently released statistics tell us of three and a quarter million serious crimes in the United States in 1966—one for every fifty people—and twelve hundred and thirty-four crimes in our own city in the first seven months of this year, which considering the Christmas rush still ahead, should make it a banner year. The use of drugs continues to spread and some people named Cox, whose son killed himself under the influence of LSD, have instituted a $600,000 wrongful death suit against Timothy Leary for recommending the drug. As of this writing hundreds of thousands of teachers are on strike. This baleful catalogue of cares could be extended at length, but the items already mentioned make it obvious that our nation is beset with mounting problems of such gravity that everyone must be concerned. The question is what are we to do about our disintegrating society?

Before I provide all the answers, I want to register my annual counter-demurrer. My comments this morning are not offered in any expectation of imposing upon you my higher wisdom—this college community, like any good one, includes a lot of faculty and students who, like Annie Oakley, can do anything better or higher than you—but rather to offer a point of departure for our deliberations in the coming months.

In August, the *Wall Street Journal* commented editorially on a prize-winning entry in a graphics contest. The theme of the competition was "Words We Live With." The successful poster presented three words, "In We Trust." There was a blank space between the "In" and the "We Trust." An excerpt from the editorial:

"Aside from getting into the theological or denominational ambiguity of the familiar 'In God We Trust' declaration—after all, which religion's God do we really trust in—the prize poster painfully clarifies the difficulty of pinpointing something in which man does indeed trust. While many people have managed to maintain their various faiths, there is a widespread questioning of values both spiritual and secular."

Then the *Journal* invites the reader to fill in the blank himself and suggests that neither Art, nor Science, Psychiatry, the State, Law, Logic, Power, nor any other currently popular basis for judgment seems to offer a sure refuge for modern man. That there is a vacuum of personal convictions today is, perhaps, one of the few observations one could draw about society on which there would be general agreement. The moral rootlessness of our population and failure of the nation to arrive at clearly defined public policies constitutes a damning indictment of the institutions of society, particularly the institutions of religion and education. On this occasion, I will leave religion to deal with its own short-comings, although it is clearly in need of help, and confine my musings to American education.

September, 1967, finds the public scene bespeckled with irrational love groups, irrational hate groups, irrational war groups, and irrational peace groups, often led by self-proclaimed Messiahs who have become impatient with traditional procedures and have taken matters into their own hands either to retreat from or drastically revise the conditions of living around them. And a high proportion of these irrational group participants are not the benighted ignorant, but the "well-educated." The provision by society of teachers and buildings and books and equipment is self-defeating if a sizeable and growing portion of the student products damage themselves through the use of drugs, or join causes which resort to murder and looting and arson, or take actions which render far more difficult the agonizing decisions in which a nation must choose between peace and war. The failure of our social institutions is suggested even more dramatically as we observe a highly educated populace frozen in indecision because there are no generally agreed upon principles for the conduct of society.

Unless we are prepared to let the forces of individual willfulness and disunity and crime and chaos carry us ever further into a state of fear and disorder, we are going to have to make some hard judgments and act forcefully upon them, praying that the judgments are well-founded and that the results of the actions will contribute to the conditions in which men of good will can live together in peace and fulfillment. And one awesome corollary of that statement is that men of ill-will must be recognized as such and thwarted in their mischief. Any such efforts will be cruelly difficult, for the decision about who falls into the good- and who into the ill-will categories will rest upon some human and therefore fallible processes. Still, the alternative seems to be to do nothing and slide on down the path to barbarism and anarchy.

It is, I think, not as late as we think. The public is not wholly insensitive to the circumstances, nor incapable of recognizing and applauding the kind of action that is needed. Recently there was an overwhelming approval among our citizens of an agency which followed the prescription. When Israel stood up and said it would no longer tolerate the deceit and threats and murder and destruction carried on by her neighbors with the aid of Soviet Russia, and took forceful action to stop them, the rejoicing in our country was even greater than would logically flow from the particular circumstances, greater than the normal pleasure in the survival of a good friend and the defeat of a collective bully. The level of reaction suggests to me a cosmic sigh of relief among Americans in discovering that it is still possible for a nation to make the difficult judgments required to sustain a society and to move with speed and singleness of purpose to act upon them,

Certainly the central endeavor of education is to increase the knowledge and skills of the student, but that mission must have context and direction. In a recent Commencement address, Elton Trueblood stated, "Colleges exist to make a fellowship by means of which standards of civilization will be erected and the progress of civilization will be enhanced." The problem is to determine the standards and discover the techniques.

In making some proposals toward that end, I would like first to state a thesis on which the proposals are based: It is impossible to arrive at a good society or a Great Society by any techniques other than the development of good individuals. If any substantial portion of the individuals are wholly self-oriented or undisciplined or estranged from the values of their society or unaware of such values, then that society will remain in turmoil until a new concensus has been reached and accepted voluntarily, or until order is imposed by powerful authority.

It appears as if the educational process in our nation has been highly successful in promoting the individuality of students and has failed to establish common limits within which that individuality can productively operate. A television program carried the paradoxical title, "The Congo-Victim of Independence." It appears as if our people, too, are the victims of independence, of a release from any restrictions other than those arising out of individual whims and conclusions and objectives. We are in the process of learning the hard way that men cannot live together in that fashion.

The reaction of our populace to the Israeli-Arab war, mentioned earlier, suggests that there is a broad and a deep area of agreement about what is worthy human conduct. And what is not. We have a nation facing the right direction but its feet don't move. The leadership of the nation has failed to identify the target and move us toward it. The leadership of our educational institutions has failed in precisely the same way. There seems to be no generally agreed upon advice for students, with the result that the boldest ones charge off every which way and everyone else squats in place. The whole situation is like the caucas race in *Alice in Wonderland* where prizes are duly awarded to every participant regardless of his performance.

I suggest that education must recognize its inevitable role in adding either to the orderly advance of society or else to its disintegration, and the educational leadership must find the raw courage to take steps to try to make it the former. Raw courage it will take, for whatever new conclusions are reached by any institution and whatever action is taken to attend to those conclusions will undoubtedly give rise to cries of anguish by those who think otherwise and provoke the most vigorous charges of breach of academic freedom. And it is probably because these consequences are anticipated that the academic leadership, like the national leadership, is immobilized, immobilized for fear of militant criticism. The inevitability of such criticism is, itself, a safeguard against over-reaction to present conditions. Those who would begin to give direction to the educational process will need to be fortified with persuasive reasons to back up their proposals.

To be useful to the citizen and to the society, it seems to me that education must superimpose on the currently accepted mission of transmitting knowledge and skills, the mission of engendering certain specific attitudes on the part of the students. I believe that the traditional three R's must be learned in conjunction with another three R's.

R FOR RESPECT

The first is respect. That means to hold in esteem, to regard as valuable. It seems to me that one of the prime necessities of civil life in a free nation is to bring each person to an observance of the rights and dignity of each other person. That does not imply that one must agree with all the ideas nor tolerate all the acts of everyone else, but as long as the other person is operating within the limits agreed upon by the society, then he should be permitted to carry on without being badgered or bullied or suppressed by others. This is one point where there have been outrageous transgressions in the academic community. If a person has been officially invited to speak at a campus, then he is entitled to make his presentation without heckling or intimidation or embarrassment. For those who disagree with him, there are numerous appropriate channels for expressing disagreement without resorting to techniques which are antithetical to the whole concept of academic freedom, techniques which are, in fact, those of the intellectual fascist.

Furthermore, there must be respect for the educational process and the institutions which engage in it. In an essay in *Look Magazine* last week, Eric Sevareid made this observation: "I must say that, kooky as we may have been in the first real American student movement in the thirties, we never, to my memory, even dreamed of using force. We thought of the university, much as we often hated its official guts, as the one sanctuary where persuasion by reason must rule supreme, if the university itself were to be preserved from the outside hands of force and unreason." Those who use coercive techniques in response to what they believe to be arbitrary or indifferent or oppressive educational administration merely strengthen the position of him whom they oppose. By their action, they plant the banner of academic freedom in his hands under which he must resist their coercion.

The respect for the educational process clearly requires that faculty members and students and administrative officers and policy boards back off from any natural inclinations to do battle with each other and try calmly to understand what the other fellow's position is and why. If you question anyone who has made the transition, ascending or descending according to your point of view, from classroom to administrative office, the chances are if you scratch him you will draw teacher's blood, but he has discovered that much of what used to look like indifference or rigidity or arbitrariness on the part of the administration is caused by real problems which are not readily dispelled.

The point is that as any educational institution becomes fragmented into warring parties, the creative potential for that institution is drastically reduced and valuable resources of time and energy are dissipated in waging war. If there is not mutual respect among the various constituencies, and an honest effort to arrive at a mutually accommodating outcome in the inevitable frictions, then the best can be hoped for in any dispute is a temporary victory for the stronger force or an armed truce. Neither condition is exactly conducive to the "quiet pursuits of the mind."

The point is also that if the educational institution provides its own living example of how people can, with mutual respect, cooperate toward the achievement of common goals, there is some reasonable expectation that the graduates may do the same as they move out into the larger society. If, on the other hand, the educational institution is beset by intrigue, back-biting, power plays, petty politics and other maliciousness born of disrespect, then that is what can be expected of its alumni when they assume positions of leadership.

R FOR RESTRAINT

The second R is restraint. In a society in which large decisions are made by representative bodies, those decisions need to be arrived at by the most searching deliberations, as free as possible from emotionalism. But the techniques for transmitting news have become so effective that an increasing percentage of the population becomes engaged on one side or the other and the longer an issue remains, the more rigid and excessive its partisans on both sides tend to become.

The Vietnam conflict offers a dramatic illustration. This long struggle weighs heavily on the minds of all Americans. And it would be strange if it didn't. Still, the emotional manner in which some advocates of peace-is-the-supreme-consideration, and some advocates of the containment of Communism press their causes discredits both camps. Surely no thinking person can possibly believe that President Johnson, or his predecessors, wants anything but peace at the earliest possible moment that it can be obtained without sacrificing critical fundamental interests of the nation. And likewise, there can be no doubt about his desire to win the war as swiftly as that can be accomplished without risking too much in escalation or in the loss of personnel. His judgment on these matters and that of his administration is the proper subject of debates. His motives are not. And the epithets which are being applied to him with increasing frequency and vehemence simply prove that thought processes have stopped and emotion is in charge.

In a conflict with an enemy, educators and clergymen and other civilians plying their own trades have no real basis for judgment about what to do. Only the highest officers of government have access to the fullest knowledge of the capacities and the intensions and the current actions of the enemy. Furthermore, only those governmental officers with that knowledge are in the best position to judge whether more bombing or less bombing will bring peace sooner and save more lives. What, after all, will save more lives? It is to be remembered that Stalinist Russia liquidated millions of unwanted citizens and that Mao's China is said by highly respected authorities to have done the same. It is even possible that the military containment of Communism will save more lives than an early East-West peace.

In time of war, above all, there is a need for restraint on the part of the citizens. They can be helpful by telling the President what they do know, that they personally do not perceive the advance of Communism in Asia to be such a threat as to be willing to risk their lives to stop it, if that is the case, or on the contrary, that they are willing to have the President take some major risks to prevent the spread of Communism, if that is the case. But to assert that he is the murderer of innocent North Vietnamese civilians or that he doesn't want to win the war only stirs more passions and divides the country further in time of peril.

Restraint is, of course, the necessary corollary of the respect we mentioned earlier. In the last Presidential election, some of the most widely respected popular journals and public figures delivered themselves of some of the most irrational and exaggerated accusations ever to come from what were generally held to be responsible sources. If restraint is not a quality widely honored and consciously cultivated, then the tense decisions faced by a man or a community or a nation are rendered far more difficult as fear and hate supplant reason.

In a report on some of the student radicals, Fred Hechinger of the *New York Times*, commented, "Such fervor discounts the danger that higher education may become a happening." Without restraint, the whole of society becomes a happening, and freedom degenerates into license. In 1847, the year Rockford College was founded, Daniel Webster at a speech in Charleston, stated, "Liberty exists in proportion to wholesome restraint." I know of nothing that has happened in the intervening one hundred twenty years to deny that epigram.

R FOR RESPONSIBILITY

The third R is responsibility, which, to some extent, embraces the other two, but deserves its own commentary. If you obtain a driver's license in Illinois, the license comes to you as part of a larger card from which you cut the license along the dotted lines. On the remainder there is a message which reads, "Driving a motor vehicle is a privilege. This privilege is granted to you." And then follows a statement of the conditions under which you may retain that privilege.

Living in a free nation is also a privilege. It has been granted to us. It might be a very good thing if we had to apply for and receive a citizen's permit which also spelled out the conditions under which we could continue to live in freedom, because that happy state is not vouchsafed to us by any higher power. Freedom has to be continuously re-earned.

One of the conditions of freedom is that each man must be accountable for the consequences of what he says and what he does. Dr. Cleveland, in a sermon several weeks ago, told of a woman who was a compulsive and talented gossip. One day she passed on a story which caused the greatest anguish to her neighbor. In genuine remorse, the biabbermouth confessed to her priest. For penance, the priest told the women to buy two ducks at the market and to pluck them as she walked home, and then return to him after she had done this. When she came back, the priest said, "To complete the penance, you must retrieve all the feathers and the down which you plucked from the birds." Then did the woman realize that she could not undo what she had done.

Most of our actions and our utterances have consequences for other people. If I get wound up in a fit of enthusiasm and go charging off on some darned fool project which I haven't thought through, and if it really comes a-cropper, I am not the only one who will suffer. My family will, and so will you because my knuckleheadedness reflects back on the college of which you are a part.

Now, this may sound like a Sunday School lesson for the second grade, but it has its relevance. In the last fifty years one central thrust of education has been quite thoroughly superseded by its exact opposite. Until the first world war, the training of character was a major undertaking by both school and family, and people went to some pains to encourage the second three R's. As the theory of individual development progressed and more was learned about psychological malfunctions, our society and our educational institutions tended more and more to be concerned with the uninhibited fruition of the individual personality until character education was contemptuously laid to rest along with its mother, Morality, nowadays thought to be a hypocrite, and posthumously awarded the scornful epithet, "Middle Class Morality."

The neo-New Enlightenment has taken over. *Time Magazine* observed in its report on the generation under twenty-five, that "no adult can or will tell (these young people) what earlier generations were told: This is God; That is Good; This is Art; That is Not Done."

More recently *U.S. News* published an interview with Dr. Jules Masserman, Co-Chairman of Northwestern's Department of Psychiatry. His concluding comment about counselling college students was:

"You don't say this is good because the Bible says so, or even because the Law says so—or, least of all, because I say so—but it is good because you will keep out of trouble and have less sorrow and more fun in the long run."

Such a statement seems devoid of any concept of responsibility to anyone else.

In *Demian*, the work by Hermann Hesse which was one of the books in our freshman reading program, there is a mystical glorification of the transcendent evil in man's nature along with the transcendent good. Several quotations: "You can't consider prohibited anything the soul desires." "You must do what your inmost heart desires." "Then I would gaze into myself and confront the image of my fate. Its eyes would be full of wisdom, full of madness, they would radiate love or deep malice, it was all the same. You were not allowed to choose or desire any one of them. You were only allowed to desire *yourself*."

These are not isolated cases. Much of the thinking within higher education in this country and much of the consequent official policy is not only itself amoral, but tends to actively support and even applaud amorality. As one considers this attitude in conjunction with education's relationship to society, a statement by Professor E. J. Kauffman in a recent issue of the *American Scholar* takes on vivid meaning. The academy "is a place where hardy stupidities are dignified with the best arguments they are likely to find." Everyone keeps saying that we must have more education in order to prevent catastrophe, but if the education offers no consistency, no direction, no ground rules and simply helps people to use their minds better toward whatever personal inclinations they discover, then education, instead of preventing catastrophe, may provoke it. One student organization seems bent on just such provocation. The *New York Times* quotes Gregory Calvert, the national secretary of The Students for a Democratic Society, as saying, "We are working to build a guerrilla force in an urban environment. We are actively organizing sedition."

Here, indeed, is the marvelous fulfillment of the newest enlightenment. That statement, publicly proclaimed, if, of course, ridiculous, but you cannot laugh at it because it is so sad. Sad, because that young man is in dead earnest, and sadder still because he somehow has been led to believe that he will be helping somebody as he foments civil war, and saddest of all because it reveals so plainly the moral bankruptcy and the intellectual inversion of an educational system which can produce such confusion.

Certainly, one of the privileges of living in a free nation cannot be the intentional destruction of other people's lives and property. That is the quickest way to bring an end to freedom. Great though the grievances may be which stir the Gregory Calverts—and the recent essay by Ernest Dunbar, entitled "The Dispirit of 67," is heartbreaking in its picture of despair and exhausted patience—wanton destruction cannot set those grievances to rights.

The one hope for improvement is in trying to extend the base of conscientious people who will move earnestly to try to improve the lot of their neighbors.

Our great task is to find a way of living together that works. There aren't any shortcuts. There aren't any nostrums. We will always be plagued by situations where two people want exactly the opposite things, but by insisting upon the habits of respect and restraint and responsibility we can try to build good men who can work toward a good society. To fill in the blank on the prize-winning poster, I do not think there is any equivalent replacement for the original text, "In God We Trust." Man has discovered no code for living together which improves on the ten commandments. But for those who cannot find personal meaning in religion, I suggest that reason requires placing their confidence in a higher humanism. I suggest that it is only in the multiplying of persistent, disciplined, respectful, restrained, responsible men of good will that the future can be regarded as anything but bleak.

I want to conclude with two items, a brief quotation which summarizes this message, and a story which illustrates it.

In the essay of Eric Sevareid already mentioned, he presents the following quotation from Edmund Burke:

"Men are qualified for civil liberties in exact proportion to their disposition to put moral chains on their appetites . . . Society cannot exist unless a controlling power upon will and appetite be placed somewhere, and the less of it there is within, the more there must be without. It is ordained in the internal constitution of things that men of intemperate minds cannot be free. Their passions forge their fetters."

An attractive girl asked her doctor if her appendicitis scar would show, and his reply was, "That, young lady, is up to you."

THE MISSISSIPPI TALE OF HORROR

Mr. COWGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Reid] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, the shocking testimony revealed at the trial of 18 men in Federal district court in Meridian, Miss., confirms many of our worst fears at the time of the murder of Andrew Goodman, Michael Schwerner, and James Chaney in 1964.

The complicity of law enforcement officers with Ku Klux Klansmen and a deliberately aroused mob in planning and carrying out the brutal murders of the three young men is, as the New York Times stated this morning, "a tale of horror," and brings forth a renewed cry for justice which has been so long denied.

That such a horrifying plot still breeds in the minds of men and that their society permits it to come to fruition is a national shame. It is compounded by the fact that no one has ever been brought to trial by the State of Mississippi for the murder of these young Americans. The 18 defendants now on trial can be charged under Federal law only with conspiracy to deny the youths their constitutional rights.

The events of that summer night in 1964 now becoming clear make more urgent than ever the passage of the Civil Rights Law Enforcement Act of 1967. This measure, already approved by the House, provides Federal criminal penalties for interference—by force or threat of force—with the free exercise of certain enumerated Federal rights. It is my hope that the Senate Judiciary Committee, under direction to report a bill to the floor by October 24, will recommend the passage of the legislation without crippling amendments.

Our commitment to the ideals for which Andy Goodman, Mickey Schwerner, and James Chaney died is empty if we fail to provide the Federal legislation necessary to bring to justice those misguided Americans who continue to deprive their fellow citizens of their civil rights. The least the families of these three men and all America has a right to expect is action now on this bill.

AIR AND WATER POLLUTION

Mr. COWGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Rumsfeld] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, over a year ago I stated on this floor that it was time for the Congress and the American people to recognize the devastating extent of air and water pollution in our country. Today, at least in the Chicago area, this recognition is being attained. It remains to be seen, however, whether the Congress will deal effectively with this problem. It is past time to implement programs to halt the polluting of our air and waterways.

The Pollution Abatement Incentive Act of 1967, which is similar to legislation I have introduced previously, seeks to combine governmental efforts with the efforts of business and industry in eliminating air and water pollution.

Industrial concerns must be encouraged to join the fight against pollution. Private funds must be added to Federal funds if the battle is to be successfully waged. This bill will encourage industries to utilize their own funds by providing a tax credit of up to 20 percent for facilities, including the cost of land, buildings, improvements, machinery, and equipment used to control air pollution and/or water pollution, which have been approved by the appropriate State agency.

The bill would also permit the amortization of the cost of constructing air and water pollution facilities within a period of from 1 to 5 years. The pollution tax credit would be in lieu of the investment tax credit which is allowed under the Internal Revenue Code.

Prompt and substantial investments in antipollution facilities must be made. It seems clear that business and industry must be encouraged to do its part in the fight against pollution. The incentive tax credit, therefore, is wholly appropriate.

Mr. Speaker, this type of legislation has been languishing in the Ways and Means Committee for too long without the benefit of hearings and recommendations. Let us hope that the committee will turn its attention to this matter promptly and report legislation which can begin the long fight against pollution.

THE TRANSPORTATION APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. COWGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mrs. Rumsfeld] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, on July 18, 1967, this body passed by an overwhelming vote the Department of Transportation appropriation bill, 1968. I supported the measure because I felt, on the whole, it represented, as amended, a balanced appropriation. Of note was the limitation of expenditures to 95 percent of the total estimated in the budget.

In consideration of the bill, our colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota, the Honorable Clark MacGregor, offered an amendment to strike the $142,375,000 appropriation for the development of two prototypes of the supersonic transport—better known as the SST. I supported the amendment because it represented a sound economy measure at a time when great care in Government spending is badly needed. Regrettably, the amendment failed.

Today I am introducing a resolution, identical to a resolution offered by Mr. MacGregor on October 5, 1967, which authorizes and directs the Clerk of the House to reengross the transportation appropriation bill, 1968, by striking the $142,375,000 appropriation for the SST.

Mr. Speaker, Congress must not fail to exercise its responsibility to cut and to rescind excessive appropriations. The proposed SST expenditure is clearly deferable and of a low priority at a time when the Nation faces a $30 billion deficit. Let this body demonstrate its responsibility by rescinding this and other appropriate appropriations. Hopefully, the administration will demonstrate its responsibility by limiting expenditures.

BEAUTY AND THE FIRST LADY

Mr. COWGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Conte] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, October 8, the First Lady, Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson, visited my congressional district and was deservedly honored by Williams College in recognition of her outstanding beautification efforts. Mrs. Johnson was the recipient of an honorary degree from Williams and in accepting the award spoke to Williams' fall convocation about the environmental crises that we presently face.

Last week, on October 9, I introduced Mrs. Johnson's excellent statement in the Congressional Record.

Today, I would like to introduce a fitting tribute to the magnificent efforts and accomplishments of our First Lady, which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor on October 11, 1967. This editorial, endorsing Mrs. Johnson's speech at Williams and thanking her for her unremitting efforts on behalf of a fairer America, certainly speaks for me and it is hard to imagine that it does not speak for everyone in this country.

Text of the editorial follows:

Beauty and Lady Bird

One of the tests of a nation's level of thinking is the physical conditions which it permits to exist. It has been wisely said that to those who think grossly, dirt and disorder cause no uneasiness. Although for a nation, as for an individual, outward condition is less important than inward worth, nonetheless the former is an embarrassing clue to one's thinking.

For this reason we wish both to thank Lady Bird Johnson for her unremitting effort on behalf of a fairer America and to endorse her words over the weekend. Speaking at Williams College, where she received a well-earned honorary degree, the First Lady warned that the United States must answer "one of the most fateful questions of our time—whether the physical setting of American life will be pleasant or squalid."

Many disagree with President Johnson over his various aims. But we fail to see how anyone interested in a more livable America could disagree with the First Lady's efforts. They set a noble and much-needed example.

National beauty is not something which can be created either by government fiat or by government effort, however strict the former or great the latter. It can only come through an awakened sense of beauty and fitness on the part of the average citizen. It is the motorist who tosses beer cans by the roadside, the alderman who does nothing about wayside junkyards, the billboard lobby, the housewife who uproots flowers and plants, the businessman who pollutes air and water, the thousand and one other offenders against beauty, taste and cleanliness who will determine whether America's physical face is grimy or shiny.

We are grateful to Mrs. Johnson for her sincere interest in a cause which has its intellectual and spiritual aspects as well as the merely physical. No one is in a better position to advance that cause than is she.

FUTURE OF RAILROAD PASSENGER SERVICE

Mr. COWGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ruppe] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, I have been deeply concerned over the future of railroad passenger service throughout the United States; from the copper country of northern Michigan to the southern tip of Florida, the future of railroad passenger service in the United States is in grave doubt.

For this reason, I am introducing a bill calling for an investigation and study by the Department of Transportation into the passenger railroad service of the Nation. The bill calls for the Interstate Commerce Commission to declare a moratorium on the discontinuance of railroad passenger service as well as the Post Office Department to declare a moratorium on the cancellation of railroad postal contracts. Rail transportation must play a vital role in relieving the ever-increasing congestion of the Nation's highways, promoting the spread of population throughout the Nation, and providing relief to an overburdened mail service. All over the United States, passenger service is being discontinued in a disorderly, haphazard fashion. It is time for a pause. We must know whether surface rail service will be relevant to the development of the megalopolis and the nonurban areas; whether high-speed service will attract passengers back to the railroads; whether effective innovations are being tried to keep passenger service in operation; whether railway post office operations may soon again be necessary.

The startling fact is, passenger service has declined 50 percent in 15 years. Many of our smaller communities are being abandoned by the railroads. In northern Michigan, the Copper Country Ltd. has lost its postal car, and a large section of the area I represent is in real danger of losing the only railroad passenger service available to it.

It is time to halt this erratic destruction of passenger rail service and to initiate a thorough investigation of railroad potential in America. Such a situation cannot be allowed to continue unchecked. It is apparent from what has gone before that matters will go from bad to worse. So I am calling for a start to the solution of this problem—an overall national study to tell us at long last exactly where the problem lies, what has caused it, and most important, what we can do about it. This is exactly what my bill will accomplish.

THE CENSUS: COHERENT PLAN FOR NATIONAL DATA GATHERING NEEDED

Mr. COWGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BETTS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, a principal argument used to justify the 67 subjects proposed by the Census Bureau for the 1970 decennial census of population and housing is that such data is needed by public and private organizations and would otherwise be unavailable. In the previous statements I have presented to substantiate my position that the decennial census should be vastly changed, three separate issues were analyzed.

I sought to show that both a mandatory and a voluntary approach to parts of the decennial census are feasible. In another position statement I reviewed all of the proposed subjects for the 1970 census questionnaires including where items could be omitted, dropped to a smaller sampling, or deferred for current surveys which the Census Bureau conducts frequently. Invasion of personal privacy and the census was the subject of my third statement. In order to meet Census Bureau arguments for retention of their 67 subjects in 1970 on the basis of Federal information needs, let me address myself to this proposition.

DETERMINE FEDERAL STATISTICAL NEEDS

A nation investing billions of dollars in research and hundreds of millions on gathering information from American citizens should conduct these undertakings with some logically consistent plan of attack. I am unconvinced that such a coherent national data accumulation plan exists whether within the Federal Government, State statistical agencies, or private and university information collection activities. It seems to me that an inventory of essential statistics on population, employment, education, income, housing, et cetera, should be developed by the Bureau of the Budget which now has authority to approve questionnaires. The scope and validity of these requirements should receive at least oversight review by Congress. This is a minimum assignment, I believe, to untangle the data-gathering machinery of departments and agencies which have exhibited octopuslike growth in recent years.

Such an inventory of Federal statistical requirements could encompass the needs of colleges and universities, nonprofit enterprises, and private business so long as a public purpose is related to the initial collection of data. If the departments and agencies of the Federal Government except for security, defense, and law enforcement organizations, would identify information demands both required and collateral and these lists were correlated into an aggregate principal statistical research centers such as the Census Bureau could proceed in a more purposeful manner to collect only that information. In my opinion this would result in a major reduction in census inquiries from those now proposed.

DEVELOP NATIONAL PROGRAM

Once an inventory of important Federal statistical needs was developed, it would be necessary to identify all existing sources of data collected by Federal, State, and private agencies willing to cooperate in such a consolidated program. We must bring about maximum utilization of all existing bodies of data before plunging further into unrelated interrogation of segments of the American public and business. I do not believe that reaching this assessment would be difficult.

A review of the 1970 census questions brings the immediate thought to mind: Do any Federal agencies have current data on some of the subjects now on the census questionnaire thus minimizing the need for the Census Bureau to include them? It seems clear that the Internal Revenue Service, Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Department of Agriculture, Department of Labor, Veterans' Administration, and other Federal installations do possess such statistics, transferable without identifying any individual, if required by the Census Bureau.

After all questions properly deemed matters of public need are evaluated and a thorough review of existing sources of information amassed by Federal departments and agencies, decisions could be reached as to how all remaining facts should be collected. I am uncertain, as I expect many of my colleagues are, as to what determines whether departments and agencies conduct their own surveys for particular information, the project is contracted to the Census Bureau, or private or university research organizations are allowed to bid on the proposal. Qualitative factors such as the competency for the assignment as well as quantitative factors, such as cost, no doubt receive consideration. Yet I am not aware of firm, public policies existing for each department and agency concerning their survey and polling programs.

CONCERNS FOR THE CONGRESS

The Congress must become involved in the major propositions concerning information collection by the executive branch for at least three reasons: It is a multimillion-dollar investment by the taxpayers annually, urgent questions as to the maintenance of personal privacy are involved, and determinations are needed as to the adequacy of information collected in terms of national objectives. Various House and Senate committees are charged with parts of this responsibility and in recent years a number of significant hearings have been held. No definite policy directions that I am aware of have been given to the executive branch. I hope before the adjournment of the 90th Congress several bills will become law in this field. There are four facets to this problem I would point to as arenas where Congress can help develop a coherent plan for national data procurement:

First. Full utilization of existing statistical services within the executive and greater consolidation of that data for intergovernmental users is the logical first step in the plan. This proposal embodies the creation of a national data bank. The greater efficiency and savings from such a facility plus increased information availability do not, however, overshadow its major weakness. I refer to the invasion of personal liberty which can result when extensive personal data is concentrated in one master information system. Foolproof statutory safeguards must precede the creation of a data center. Once protection against misuse of personal facts is guaranteed, this consolidated statistical unit has great possibilities for assisting every segment of American society.

Second. The 50 States are rapidly expanding their collection of all types of data useful to every level of government. Under the auspices of the Council of State Governments an individual or agency in each State has been designated for intra and interstate data processing coordination. Any national data center on the Federal level should be accessible to State governments. Maximum benefits can accrue to the State only if some coordination or standardization of present projects is developed.

An interstate compact on statistics and data processing might serve as the forum for State officials to plan greater integration of information systems. There should be greater Federal statistical information available in automated form to the States. Increasing such sharing of data will necessarily initially involve cooperation among the States. This is far more desirable, as I can see it, than for the Census Bureau or officials of a national data center to negotiate information exchange or transfer separately with every State. Early State action could mean expanded access to a center data operation if Congress is aware of the particular needs and automatic data processing capabilities of the States when a national data center is established.

Third. Whether any current surveys or population, housing, education, employment, or business now conducted under Federal auspices could or should be contracted to a private market research firm cannot be overlooked. I asked 200 market research firms if their organizations could successfully conduct some of the projects now handled by the Census Bureau. It was not surprising that the overwhelming response was "Yes." I was impressed, however, with the reasons given for the belief that more Federal survey work should be shared with private enterprise. Let me provide actual quotes from several representative letters:

PRINCETON, N.J.,
September 8, 1967.

Hon. JACKSON E. BETTS,
House of Representatives,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BETTS: I am keenly interested in the problem you pose. The government can conduct some types of surveys better than private marketing research firms, such as ours. But, not from the point of view of technology. The decennial census would probably represent too great a project for any or all private firms. Also, there are some studies made by the government, requiring an answer by the respondents, that obviously could not be done by private marketing firms.

On the other hand, there are a great many surveys that not only could be done as well by private firms, and at a fraction of the cost. If all expenses were honestly taken into account, I believe that private research firms could conduct most of these surveys for about one-third or one-half of the amount spent by the government. My own fear is that the government will continue to build up its survey machinery and in time will take over more and more of the work that now goes to commercial research firms. From the point of view of quality, the government certainly has no advantage except that it can spend excessive amounts whereas commercial firms must normally work within much smaller budget requirements.

As the head of a market research firm, I should add that we have never been very much interested in getting survey assignments from the government because of the time and the money and the difficulties of fighting the Washington bureaucracy. It requires a lot of time of a lawyer, of accountants, etc., even for minor contracts. Moreover, it is always difficult to get money out of the government when the job is completed. In dealing with private industry, a simple contract is enough and we can expect to be paid on the completion of the study and the delivery of the report. In our experience this is not the case in dealing with the government. Often months go by before some minor detail is cleared up. All of this makes for work for the bureaucrats but it is discouraging to those who could do surveys for the government at substantial savings to taxpayers.

Sincerely,

GEORGE GALLUP,
Director, American Institute of Public Opinion

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
September 5, 1967.

Congressman JACKSON E. BETTS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BETTS: It is my opinion that private marketing research organizations can compete favorably for the studies undertaken by The Census Bureau for the benefit of government. This has application to studies in other areas of government as well. The Department of Agriculture has demonstrated the success of this approach in a number of studies in which they have utilized private organizations.

Most sincerely,

A. EDWARD MILLER,
President, Alfred Politz Research.

RICHMOND, VA.,
August 14, 1967.

Hon. JACKSON E. BETTS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BETTS: We cannot admit to an unprejudiced viewpoint, but are convinced that private marketing research organizations could successfully contract some of the census projects. Our organization has, from time to time, attempted to persuade the Department of Commerce that this could be done—but to no avail. Insofar as I am aware, the Commerce Department is one of the few in the federal government which relies almost exclusively on its internal personnel for information gathering and other kinds of research.

Sincerely yours,

J. ALBERT FABER,
President, Southeastern Institute of Research, Inc.

URBANA, ILL.,
September 18, 1967.

Hon. JACKSON E. BETTS,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: You asked my opinion on the matter of having private market research firms undertake some of the projects now being done by the Census Bureau. I am quite confident that any one of a number of private research firms could do such work and perhaps do it as effectively as a government agency. I would guess that in a number of instances the contract price for research done by private firms would be lower than the cost of having it done by a government agency. This would be particularly true for special projects where a government agency is not already tooled up to conduct such research investigations.

Sincerely,

C. H. SANDAGE,
President, Farm Research Institute.

WATERLOO, IOWA.,
September 19, 1967.

Hon. JACKSON E. BETTS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BETTS: As to your second question: yes, certainly, in my opinion, private interviewing organizations could successfully contract many of the Census Bureau surveys.

Sincerely yours,

GLADYS L. WALKER,
Director, Black Hawk Research Bureau.

DETROIT, MICH.,
August 1, 1967.

Hon. JACKSON E. BETTS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BETTS: We firmly believe that the Federal Government is in fact in competition with us along with many tax supported universities and also, in fact, we are being deprived of potential business which we could handle more economically, at profit, which would yield the government additional tax revenue.

Respectfully yours,

RICHARD W. OUDERSLUYS,
President, Market-Opinion Research Co.

Mr. Speaker, one approach to an objective review of the polls or surveys which might be contracted to private organizations was presented by Mr. Henry Brenner, of the Home Testing Institute:

MANHASSET, LONG ISLAND, N.Y.,
August 16, 1967.

Hon. JACKSON E. BETTS
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BETTS: I would like to suggest a possible course of action to you.

1. To get from the Bureau of the Census and other Government bodies (Department of Agriculture, for one) that conduct "marketing research" surveys a list of the studies that have been completed during a recent twelve month period along with a description of:
   (a) The purpose of the study;
   (b) The design of the study;
   (c) A report of the study.
2. Then I would suggest that this material be forwarded to 15 or 20 heads of marketing research firms or other individuals involved in non-governmental marketing research activities.
3. Those who wish to would then be given an opportunity to discuss with you and other interested Congressmen and officials of Government bodies involved the capability of marketing research firms to undertake studies similar to those conducted by the Government bodies.

Cordially,

HENRY BRENNER,
Home Testing Institute/TvQ, Inc.

Mr. Speaker, the officers of the major trade associations for the marketing and opinion research industry should be asked to provide suggestions on the formation of industry-academic committees to advise Congress, the Bureau of the Budget, or specific agencies. There is a need for a better understanding of where lines are drawn separating federally conducted research efforts from those contracted with private firms. Such a determination might expand, decrease or not materially affect the amount of Federal research work. This would not be the objective of such a determination. It would be to set a standard everyone understood and to follow that course in future decisions.

Fourth. A broad, inclusive program of Federal statistical research must include nonprofit research organizations and universities. These institutions, important statistical users amass much information, also develop new research technology. It is true that some new techniques and methodology are now shared and this should continue. A closer relationship between these loci of vast information should not become one of domination by the Federal Government or reluctant cooperation from the nongovernment sector. This is a relationship to be considered as part of an overall national statistical plan.

Mr. Speaker, there are many ramifications of any commentary on improving the information gathering apparatus in the United States. I feel my remarks as they pertain to the Census Bureau and the 1970 census questionnaire lend support for the passage of H.R. 10952. I will let the experts consider the other aspects of my suggestions to strengthen the vital information sources in this country.

TRIBUTE TO COL. LEE B. HARR

Mr. COWGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply saddened today to bring to my colleagues the news of the passing of Col. Lee B. Harr, retired center director of the Veterans' Administration Center at Mountain Home in Johnson City, Tenn.

Colonel Harr's death last Friday evening came just a little more than a year after his retirement on July 29, 1966, following 32 years of service at Mountain Home.

On Memorial Day, 1966, I was privileged to speak at the annual services at Mountain Home, and in my remarks that day, I said:

> It is particularly fitting that we, who are gathered here on these beautiful grounds, pay special tribute to Col. Lee B. Harr, who has put in more than 30 years of faithful, loyal, and dedicated service as Center Director.
>
> A veteran of two world wars, Col. Harr has spent himself in the service of other veterans and has earned their respect and gratitude and that of all his fellow citizens. There have been wars in between, and the crosses have increased by row on row since he started here, but his spirit and his devotion to duty have never faltered.
>
> We are privileged to have Col. Harr here among us, and we need but look around to see the fruits of his labors. Truly blessed is he and are we because of his efforts.
>
> As impossible as it is for us to adequately thank those who lie beneath the crosses, so, too, we cannot render Col. Harr the appreciation that we feel for his unselfish and useful efforts. Yet as long as we pause to celebrate Memorial Day, we will remember you, and honor you, Col. Harr. You, your staff, and employees have done and are doing an outstanding job, and we are most grateful.

Johnson City, east Tennessee, the First District, and the entire area have lost a great, dedicated public servant and I have lost a good friend. Colonel Harr was an outstanding American completely devoted to the cause of his fellow man. Veterans from all walks of life praised him for his helping hand.

Yesterday, the Johnson City Press-Chronicle, realizing the immeasurable contribution "the colonel" had made to the community of which he was a part, devoted an entire page to picture highlights of his career, as well as excerpts from his remarks upon his retirement a year ago.

At the same time, this fine newspaper carried a beautifully written front-page editorial paying tribute to this great American.

It is my sincere hope that these items, both of which I am privileged to insert in the Record, will speak in some small way of my profound sense of loss.

My wife and I extend our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Harr, their daughter, and members of the family.

The Colonel: When Service Was Second Nature—He Found Dedication and Concern the Keys to Satisfaction

(Editor's Note.—Here are concepts taken from an interview with Col. Lee B. Harr by Johnson City Press-Chronicle staff writer Johnny Jones in which some of the Colonel's views are expressed on the Johnson City which he loved.)

"It will be a very happy day in my life when I walk out of this station on July 29, feeling the satisfaction of 32 years of service to my fellowman. It will be a great day knowing I've done my best, and that all my efforts have not been futile," these words spoken by Col. Lee B. Harr at the time of his retirement last year exemplify more than any one thing the true spirit of dedication that exemplifies Col. Harr.

Harr was a native of Johnson City. Having spent his lifetime here, he spoke often of the development in relationships between Johnson City and Mountain Home:

"I am proud to say that Johnson City and Mountain Home are today one and the same. Our employes feel that they are a part of Johnson City and the citizens of Johnson City feel they are a part of the station," he would declare.

The Colonel came to the Veterans Administration Center desk in 1935. He was an attorney here, having interests in the Johnson City Insurance Agency and Jefferson Standard Life Insurance Co. Agency.

He attended the University of the South, Sewanee and the University of Virginia. A lifelong member of the Kiwanis Club, he served as president of the club in 1932 and the Kentucky-Tennessee district in 1951. His father was a well-known attorney in Johnson City.

He was well-qualified to handle the affairs of veterans. Harr at that time was a veteran. He served as an officer with various artillery units during World War I.

A physical collapse during a party at his home prior to the Memorial Day observances, prompted the retirement of Col. Harr, although he was up and on his feet within three weeks.

"The one thing I look back to is the satisfaction of leaving a hospital that has a heart."

"I have had 32 years of very happy experience here. As I look back at the years now I see my years here at Mountain Home and the Veterans Administration Center as being the dearest years of my life."

"The veterans always come first to me. They gave their best when they were young, and it is up to us to take care of them now that they are old."

"As I look at the 32 years I have lived on this station I look at the whole. I see Mountain Home now as a great medical center."

"With great satisfaction, I have seen the station grow each year to where now we are very proud of the fact that we have a great hospital staffed with highly qualified medical people using modern equipment and rendering the finest service we've ever given the veterans of this country."

"No one man could have done it by himself. It has taken teamwork: no person of the staff has ever shirked from his responsibilities in working in a coordinating effort for Mountain Home."

"The public has been awfully kind to me. The various organizations that have offered help have all given their fullhearted support to the center." Harr included these organizations among the thousands of people who help in the Mountain Home programs.

He Was the Colonel

He was The Colonel and he was a great man—one of the greatest Johnson City has had.

Lee B. Harr . . .

Let his name be enthroned forever in the sweet perpetuity of memory—to be a blessing and a benediction to those who live now, his friends and contemporaries, and to be a shining inspiration and constant challenge to generations yet to be.

Lee B. Harr . . .

A name that stands for rugged integrity . . . for exemplary citizenship . . . for unfailing loyalty . . .

A name that stands for ceaseless endeavor . . . for mighty works . . . for invincible faith that all things work together.

Lee B. Harr . . .

How he loved his fellow man, and how his fellow man loved him!

How he loved his country, and how that love was reflected in a hundred and one areas of unselfish, and often sacrificial, service!

How he loved his church, and how he manifested this love by consistent and diligent labor in the often-rewarding, sometimes-forbidding vineyard of life!

Lee B. Harr . . . The Colonel . . .

As administrator of the Veterans Administration Facility for 32 years, he established himself as stalwart champion of the ex-service man—and established Mountain Home as one of the great facilities of the nation. The annual Memorial Day exercises which he originated drew country-wide attention and attracted many national leaders to Johnson City.

He saw to it that the VA meshed with the community, that it did not stand apart in institutional aloofness, that it became a participant and not just an observer in the ebb and flow of public life. He himself led the way—by putting himself on call, by standing "on the ready" when and where needed, by facing the issue and getting the job done.

Lee B. Harr . . . The Colonel . . . The Good Citizen . . .

A Johnson Citian through and through was he, proud that he was born here, proud that his family had played such a significant role in local history, proud that he had lived to see his hometown grow from fledgling village to full-scale city.

But it would be a mistake to think of the Colonel as being of, by and for only one city. His activities encompasesd many cities and many people, and all welcomed him as friend, neighbor, and often speaker for important occasions.

He was at his best in "firing up" workers for some special cause, such as the United Fund which he supported so earnestly; the Kiwanis Club which he reminded so regularly that "freedom is not free"; his church which he helped through many a hard place by the force of his personality and his leadership; and the Johnson City Preaching Mission which he helped organize and then supported so faithfully through the years.

Lee B. Harr . . . The Colonel . . . The Good Citizen . . . The Good Steward . . . The Good Friend . . . The Man of Many Talents . . .

He was trained to be a lawyer, and practiced for a time. He could have been an outstanding success in that field.

He had the qualities of industry, insight and vision to be a successful businessman. He would have ranked with the best, we believe.

He could have been an outstanding Chamber of Commerce executive, for he had the drive and enthusiasm needed for that.

And he could have been a great politician hands down and home free, for he could move and influence people in all walks of life and he had the intuitive ability to make the right move at the right time.

But back in 1934 he chose to become head of the VA Center, and that became the core of his life, the centerpiece of his being. From then until he retired last year, he magnified his office with devoted service far above, over and beyond the call of duty.

The Colonel . . .
Lee B. Harr . . .
Greatness has dwelt among us.
Greatness will live after us.

THE POVERTY PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Albert). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HUNGATE] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to talk on the coverage that we have seen in the newspapers over the past year or two concerning the Office of Economic Opportunity and some of its programs.

Mr. Speaker, as I recall, the very distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma once said that all he knew was what he read in the newspapers. Unfortunately, I find myself in that condition, although I do not completely agree with what I see in everything which is published in the newspapers.

Mr. Speaker, the black power advocate Stokely Carmichael is talking about democracy, according to Hal Witt of the United Planning Organization—a poverty program—who criticized the Nation's newspapers for slanting news about black power. When whites understand the black power concept, he said, they will realize "to what extent this society is evil."

Mr. Speaker, in the Wall Street Journal of March 22, 1967, under the heading of "The Poverty Program as a Gold Mine," there appears the following article by Maxwell Neil.

> ROSEDALE, MISS.—Down the road leading from the square along the railroad tracks to the Negro district of this sleepy Mississippi delta town there stands a phenomenon of the poverty program—a pocket of prosperity.
>
> It looks like anything but; it is a shabby frame house with fake-brick siding, once the parsonage of the Bethel AME Church next door, back when the church could afford a full-time parson. More recently it was rented to a family "for $25 or $30 a month," says a member of the church's board.
>
> But that was before the poverty program came to town and turned the faded, 4-room dwelling into a gold mine by renting it for a Headstart center for 85 youngsters. The rent: $240 a month. "I am pretty sure we would have taken less if they asked us, but it seems like they already had their policy set up to pay that much," says a member of the church's board.
>
> The parsonage is an all-too-common instance of how the poverty program does indeed lead to increased wealth—but too often to the wrong recipients, and in ways which are not at all what planners of the massive assault on poverty had in mind. Deviations from the intended course are cropping up all over the U.S., but seldom do they show up with the frequency or the clarity that they do in Dixie.
>
> Even right here in Bolivar County, a rural sector on the banks of the Mississippi, it takes only a few chats with officials to turn up other instances at least as blatant.
>
> For a look at one, pull up at the dusty crossroads near Pace, where an old grocery and beer hall, its past attested to by rusting Miller's Beer and RC Cola signs, is now a Headstart center for 60 pre-school children.
>
> The rooms, particularly the low-ceilinged one used for Saturday night dances, are large enough, but their adequacy as classrooms is still questionable. The dance hall converted to a classroom, for example, is lit only by two naked wall bulbs (two others do not work) and a Schlitz Beer advertising advising "Take home a 6-pack."

I might interject here, Mr. Speaker, that this is perhaps not as bad as the situation which exists in the congressional district which it is my honor to represent.

The Kirksville Daily Express reports the poverty program Headstart was permitted to use a church basement and then requested the church to take out its religious pictures. You might imagine the excitement this caused.

The county antipoverty director, Earl Davis, agrees the facilities are suspect, but he says he is certain a conflict of interest exists on the part of the building's owner. The woman who owns the center is also the supervising teacher at the school there, although she has leased the structure to her nephew, who rents it to the Government for $160 a month.

Apprised of the Pace situation and another in which the local poverty chairman owns the house rented to the program for $240 a month, Mr. Davis says:

> It sounds like as much conflict of interest as you can get, but in this county it is only a conflict when you get caught.

He adds that he will check into both cases, but not immediately. He states:

> I'll put them on the list, but there are several ahead of them.

Mr. Davis, who says he spends much time trying to ferret out wrongdoing, adds that it is a thankless task because the Government shows so little interest in doing anything to stop it.

When a case is turned up of individual enrichment at the expense of poverty funds, "we either get reversed or nothing happens," he says. He adds:

> Until the Office of Economic Opportunity gets some guts and backs us up, we might as well not even stick our necks out.

He cites one instance in which the $10,000 salaries of the directors of the two Bolivar County Headstart programs violate OEO rules, even though the OEO approved them. One of the directors, Aaron Vence, says he used to make $3,300 teaching school and $3,900 more moonlighting in a plant, so under a general OEO rule that a poverty worker should not make more than 20 percent more than in his previous job, his ceiling would be $8,600 rather than the $10,000 he is paid.

Mr. Davis says:

> The OEO is aware of it, but they haven't done a thing about it.

In Atlanta—and I shall come back to Georgia later in more detail—by contrast, where living costs are far higher, a director of the day care center who was also responsible for developing new centers, was paid only $7,500—and the job required higher qualifications.

But criticism of the $10,000 salary has not been nearly as sharp as protests against the smaller ones from citizens of the Atlanta slum area served by the center, who complain that $7,500 is too high. "They ought to make him give half of it back," snaps a critic. He explains that since last summer the center has been run by a full-time teacher in the public schools who cannot be on his job at the day care center during school hours. The acting director left recently, and has been replaced by a full-time acting director.

The center's finances are now being handled directly by Economic Opportunity Atlanta, Inc., the agency set up to funnel poverty funds in the city. But the center is still up for criticism.

For example, volunteers have just finished laying new floors in the bathroom, another room, and a hall; they had buckled because of leaky plumbing. The cost of repairs is being borne by the poverty program.

For another, when the lease was signed the landlord agreed to furnish a kitchen stove for fixing hot lunches for the youngsters. He did, but it was declared "completely inadequate," and the center spent $440 of the OEO's money for a new one. OEO funds, not the landlord's, were also used for a new $241 sink.

When auditors visited the center last summer they reported finding indications that employees were being paid when they were not there, that some were receiving higher salaries than the budget called for, that $2,690 and 1 cent had been spent for unauthorized equipment, that items such as folding chairs, powersaws, and socket wrench sets were missing, and that some purchases were in excess of budget allocations.

For example, the budget allowed purchase of a dozen ashtrays at 50 cents each, or $6. Instead, the auditors said, two ashtrays had been bought for $15 each, or $30.

If one were to seek out an example of the poverty program having a maximum impact on a pocketbook, one might choose the case of Dr. Reginald Hawkins, a Charlotte, N.C., Negro dentist.

Officials blanched when Dr. Hawkins submitted his bill of $13,947 for work on 122 children in roughly 4 weeks. A dental review board checked his work and found a "significant number of discrepancies" such as billing for work not done, filling cavities without removing decay, leaving cavities in a tooth while filling others, and filling cavities in adjacent teeth and letting the fillings run together.

The board paid $6,708, based on the 48 percent of his patients in whom discrepancies were not noted. This kept his pay for the month well above the poverty level, but Dr. Hawkins still insists he should have received the entire $13,947.

Like most recipients of the largess of the poverty program, he insists he was entirely justified. "I'm an excellent dentist, and I used hypnosis," he says, explaining his whirlwind technique. Driving his gold-colored Cadillac down a rain-shrouded street, he grumbles:

> They are trying to do the same thing to me as they are to Adam (Clayton Powell).

Daniel P. Moynihan, in the Washington Post of August, this year—a gentleman whose stature I believe is unquestioned—in the course of his article stated:

> Anyone who was involved in the establishment of the War on Poverty knows that it was put together by fiscal mirrors; scarcely a driblet of new money was involved. Even an element of fraud entered the picture: the Bureau of the Budget began cal-

> culating interstate highway funds as part of the financial aid going to cities.
>
> Such money is of considerable aid to General Motors and the United Automobile Workers, and the Association of General Contractors, but as for the poor, the best that can be said for it is that it destroys a lot of bad housing.

Now I would like to quote from another letter, and I suppose this was received by many of us in the Congress, from a gentleman with whom I perhaps never find myself in complete agreement. But I offer this in the sense as in a legal case offering a declaration against interest. For a party who is very much for a certain type of program, to make a statement against his interest, I think, carries more weight, at least in a courtroom.

This is a letter from Mr. William Higgs, director of the Washington Human Rights Project dated August 1, 1966.

The letter is as follows:

> DEAR CONGRESSMAN HUNGATE: We would like to bring to your immediate attention what we consider to be a scandal of major proportions in the Poverty Program of Sunflower County, Mississippi.
>
> Recently we received a long complaint detailing a series of incidents of mismanagement, racial discrimination, and intimidation directed towards the poor by the CAP Board of Sunflower County. It is an indictment of not only the local Board, but also of the Atlanta Regional Office—

There is Atlanta again—

> of OEO and the national office in Washington.

A brief summary of the complaint is attached below:

This is a summary of the complaint submitted by the Associated Communities of Sunflower County on the Operation of the Poverty Program in Sunflower County, Miss.

> Mr. Higgs' complaint further outlines, among others, these charges:
>
> 1. That the President of the CAP Board, Mr. R. J. Allen, when asked if the programs would be run on a segregated basis, replied: "The program will be segregated."
>
> 2. That there have been consistent incidents of intimidation of the Negro representatives, who have proved to be under the control of the power structure. For example, at a meeting with the CAP Board and representatives of Associated Communities on April 8, 1966, there were no Negro Board members present. Mr. Allen said that he had instructed them all not to attend.

And then going on to No. 5:

> 5. That there are on the Board representatives of non-existent civic organizations conceived by the white power structure.
>
> 6. That the CAP Board of Sunflower County is basically a group that seeks to frustrate the aims of the poor and maintain the rule of white supremacy in Sunflower County.
>
> 7. That the Board was handpicked by the white power structure, not elected as required by the O.E.O.

I refer now to a New York Times article dated January 1966, relating to Georgia.

Georgia ranks eighth in the number of poor and 11th in the amount of funds—that is poverty funds—received.

The article is entitled "South is Lagging in Requests for Federal Antipoverty Money."

Georgia being eighth in the number of poor and 11th in the amount of funds, it would have done less well if the Federal agency had not made an exception for the State.

Early in the antipoverty campaign, the agency pumped money into certain States without insisting on immediate compliance with all guidelines such as "Maximum feasible participation" of the poor in policy planning.

Georgia was one of the favored States, although nothing was said about it at the time. Grants made to Georgia carried conditions requiring full compliance later.

Texas has the largest number of poor, but is fifth in receipt of antipoverty funds.

Louisiana ranks 13th in the number of poor but 24th in the amount of funds.

South Carolina ranks 18th in the number of poor and 33d in antipoverty funds.

North Carolina's corresponding ranks are fifth and 17th; Virginia is 16th and 32d.

California, with $87.4 million received, leads all the States, although it ranks third in the number of poor.

New York's $66.7 million makes it second in receipts. It also has the second largest number of poor people.

New Jersey, relatively, has received a large advantage. It is ninth in funds received although 23d in the number of poor.

Michigan, too, is well advanced. It is sixth in funds received although 12th in the poverty rankings. Connecticut is 35th in poverty but 26th in funds.

St. Louis, Mo., has received $14,004,701 in antipoverty funds from the Office of Economic Opportunity in the last 3 years.

I refer to an article from the Post-Dispatch dated July 27, 1967:

> St. Louis has received $14,004,701 in antipoverty funds from the Office of Economic Opportunity in Washington in the last three years, ranking it tenth among large cities in the amount of funds received, the OEO announced.
>
> The funds have been channeled through the St. Louis Human Development Corp., the local antipoverty agency. The OEO said that St. Louis ranks thirteenth in population size among the nation's major cities.
>
> New York City, first in population, received the most antipoverty funds, $87,110,913. Chicago was close behind with $84,011,488. Other cities, ranked by population are: Los Angeles, $41,429,844; Philadelphia, $35,583,191; Detroit, $41,037,105; Houston, $6,287,431; Baltimore, $11,475,662; Cleveland, $18,494,070; Dallas, $1,312,104; Washington, $42,442,305; Milwaukee, $5,890,646, and San Francisco, $13,338,139.

On September 19, 1967, the Post-Dispatch carried an article indicating that the mayor would appoint directly 10 of the 15 members of the board of directors of the Human Development Corp. under a plan recommended yesterday by a special committee of the poor.

At present—and I am interspersing here the fact that for the moment the present is more important, since a later article indicates this city plan was not permitted to stand—at present he makes these appointments only from persons nominated by the board. The committee recommended that the other five board members be chosen by the Citizens Advisory Council, an elected body representing low-income areas of St. Louis and St. Louis County.

The committee, headed by Ernest Calloway, a staff member of the Teamsters Union, said that it did not favor the present system under which the board was self-perpetuating.

The committee rejected a proposal by Supervisor Lawrence K. Roos that he and Mayor Cervantes each appoint five of the 10 members of the board who represent the community at large. Roos had said that he wanted to make the county a full partner in the antipoverty agency.

Calloway said that the committee had suggested permitting the county supervisor to name two of these 10 members but that Roos said he would prefer to name none in that event.

Under the present system, Cervantes names three of the board members representing the poor and Roos names the other two. These appointments must be from among nominees submitted by the Citizens Advisory Council.

Again I would interject that I do not know how many Congressmen have a voice in selecting, nominating, or picking from candidates submitted to them in the operation of this program, but it is interesting to find that in some areas this practice is followed.

Raymond Wittcoff, former board chairman of HDC, had suggested that six members be named by Cervantes, six by the advisory group and that the other six consist of the mayor, the president of the board of aldermen, the city comptroller, the county supervisor, the chairman of the county council and the mayor of one of the low-income areas of the county.

The board is to decide the matter at its next meeting.

HDC will seek $11,879,589 from the Office of Economic Opportunity for the programs. If Congress imposes cutbacks in the war on poverty, it is doubtful that HDC will receive that much, an official cautioned.

The agency has received $10,908,532 for these programs in the current fiscal year. A report as late as Saturday, in another newspaper article in the Post-Dispatch, indicates that the plan to let the mayor control HDC is being shelved because the board is uncertain over the requirements that Congress may set, and I for one hope the Congress will set somewhat specific requirements.

Another article published in the St. Louis Dispatch on September 14, 1967, is headed "HDC Executive Resigns; Third in 2 Weeks."

Norman P. Firnstahl, chief fiscal officer of HDC, is to leave next week to take a State Department post in Saigon.

Another who has left was Heath, a lawyer and former college instructor, who received $22,000 a year from the antipoverty agency. The position within the new State agency pays $19,000.

These circumstances have been cited as possible factors in the resignations at HDC. Firnstahl, whose annual salary is $16,000 will receive substantially more money in his new position. But, I might point out, that new position is in Vietnam.

Bernstein's pay is $24,000 a year. In an article in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of September 9, it says:

> Bernstein's $24,000-a-year salary makes him one of the highest paid public officials in St. Louis. The mayor and superin-

> tendent of public schools receive $25,000 each. . . .
>
> HDC and Work Opportunities Unlimited, a new agency formed by business leaders to encourage firms to hire the chronically unemployed, had requested $30,000 in antipoverty funds for the annual salary of the directors of that agency and $21,996 for the associate director's salary. In each case, the business community was to match or exceed the federal contribution giving the two executives salaries in the range of $60,000 to $75,000.
>
> Curtis Gatlin, director of works programs for HDC, said the intention had been to fill the two positions with high-level business executives. However, the Office of Economic Opportunity in Washington balked. It reduced most cost elements of the program and agreed to pay no more than $15,000 toward any single salary.

Also in an article dated September 14, 1966, it was indicated, by Richard Jacobs:

> Administrative Expenses of HDC here (in St. Louis) are put at $711,000. Of $11,000,000 spent on poverty work, $8,500,000 has gone for Personnel.

That is from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

Finally, from a press release for OEO in Missouri, it is stated:

> Interest in participating in the Economic Opportunity Program has been expressed in all 115 Missouri counties.

This is remarkable, as we have only 114 counties.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote 310, on consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 112, "Extension of Time for Filing Report of Commission on Urban Problems," I was in my office. I had answered the quorum call, and I did vote on the Library Extension Act. However, I suppose the bells in my office did not work. I was not present and I did not vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

SKYHAWK BOMBERS FOR ISRAEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McFall). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Halpern] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that the Department of State is using the Congress as an excuse for failing to meet the administration's commitment of the spring of 1966 to sell two squadrons of Douglas A-4 Skyhawk jet bombers to Israel.

Israel made partial payment for these planes. They are especially needed by Israel today in view of that country's operational and accidental losses in the recent war, compounded by the Soviet resupply of jets to Egypt. France was the source of Israel's jets, but De Gaulle now refuses to send further war material to Israel.

Some concern was expressed in the Congress that the administration secretly financed arms sales to the Arabs through the U.S. Export-Import Bank. The State Department has seized on this to misinterpret the concern of the Congress and to use it as a pretext for holding back on the promised shipment of the jets to Israel. It was never the intention of the Congress to obstruct the arming of Israel. The arbitrary denial now being exercised by the State Department is masked in sophistry, cynicism, and doubletalk.

At stake is not only the security of a friendly democracy, Israel, but also the entire American security situation in the Middle East and Mediterranean. We are permitting the Soviet Union to recoup losses of last June and are encouraging the Arabs to further extremism by shirking our responsibility to implement the arms deal we completed last year with Israel. This is a breach of honor that the State Department must explain.

UNDER TABLE CASH ON ANTIPOVERTY GRANTS?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. Gubser] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, in copyrighted articles by Mr. Harry Farrell, a distinguished political reporter for the Ridder Newspapers, the San Jose News revealed on October 12 that under-the-table cash payments have been solicited by both Federal and State officials for assistance in preparing applications for Federal grants.

The documented facts presented by Mr. Farrell raise serious questions regarding antipoverty grants. Their implications are so farreaching that they should be thoroughly investigated before Congress is asked to vote on an extension of the multibillion-dollar poverty program.

The poverty program has been proliferated to the point where Washington has become a supermarket for Federal taxpayers' money. Poverty money is channeled through numerous agencies and all too often the manner in which it is disbursed is questionable. The Harry Farrell articles in the San Jose News point out two such situations. One of them, involving a former official of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, has led to an FBI investigation.

Mr. Speaker, before the Education and Labor Committee favorably reports the bill to extend the war on poverty, the individuals mentioned in the San Jose News articles should be questioned under oath. HEW and OEO officials should also be thoroughly questioned.

Mr. Speaker, because this situation is so serious I shall include as part of my remarks the three articles which appeared in the San Jose News on October 12:

[From the San Jose News, Oct. 12, 1967]

Payoffs on Federal, State Level—Under Table Cash for Antipoverty Grants

(By Harry Farrell)

The FBI and Gov. Ronald Reagan's office have launched twin investigations of under-the-table cash payments solicited by government bureaucrats to guarantee or expedite job training grants.

The Alameda County district attorney's office has also been alerted.

Similar cases are being probed at both state and federal level, involving grant applications ranging from $300,000 to the $1 million-plus bracket.

Amounts solicited by government officials from the applicants, and paid in some cases, range from $500 to $3,000.

In both Washington and Sacramento these payments were termed "consultants' fees." They were supposed to cover rewriting of grant applications in a manner to facilitate their approval. In a Sacramento case, such approval was "guaranteed."

Such dealings have fed on a proliferation of state and federal programs pouring money into a wide assortment of projects for the poor, particularly in minority areas.

An independent investigation by the San Jose News, underway for two months, has produced signed statements by the persons involved, documenting these broad outlines of the situation:

The Electronics Training Laboratory of Oakland, a school seeking an $832,000 grant to train 600 students from Negro and other deprived groups, has paid $1,000 to John Ford, field representative of the State Job Training and Placement Council.

Ford also asked and received a $300 personal loan from the Oakland school's administrator, Dr. Carroll E. Harrington.

On Sept. 22 Ford was fired by the Council's chairman, Lt. Gov. Robert Finch, ostensibly for falsification of his state job application to conceal a long police record. The current investigation was in its early stages at that time.

Stephen C. Brieger, consultant in governmental relations for the electronics school in Oakland, says he paid $1,500 last July to Harland Randolph, then deputy chief of the Office of Equal Health Opportunity, in the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The money was to cover rewriting a proposal, for which the school sought up to $1.2 million in federal funding, to send mobile (trailer) classrooms into hard-core poverty areas. Brieger says he got no receipt for the $1,500, which was in $100 bills.

Randolph, interviewed Wednesday by the San Jose News Washington Bureau, admitted he had a verbal agreement with Brieger and Harrington to prepare an application for funding of their program. He would neither confirm nor deny directly that he actually received any money. Randolph, who resigned last Friday to become executive assistant to the president of a junior college in Washington, said preparing such proposals was a regular "moonlighting" activity for him. He denied conflict of interest, declaring his official duties did not involve passing on grant applications.

Ford, who took the payments and loan totalling $1,300 from Harrington, also put the bite for $500 last July on two officials of the San Marcos Foundation in San Jose, Victor Camacho and Tom Frontiera. They were in Sacramento seeking state-level support for a $300,000 federal grant to establish a Mexican-American cultural and vocational center. When they hesitated at Ford's overture he told them "the name of the game is money."

"BLEW WHISTLE"

It was Camacho and Frontiera who blew the whistle on the Sacramento solicitation. Instead of paying, they reported it to a private attorney and a San Jose private investigator, Sam Alvid.

After obtaining their detailed affidavits, Alvid went to Assemblyman George W. Milias, R-San Jose, and through Milias to the governor's office.

Reagan today issued the following statement on the matter:

"My office has received information about possible wrongdoing, concerning applications for grants from the federal government in connection with the 'war on poverty' and similar programs.

OPEN INQUIRY

"As a result of this information we have begun an administrative inquiry into those agencies that may be involved. We have requested and received assistance from the appropriate law enforcement agencies.

"This administration will not tolerate any misconduct or criminal violations in any agency of state government. No crime is more reprehensible than violating the public trust, and we will take all measures to correct any improper situation we may uncover."

IN PROBE

Finch, as chairman of the Job Training and Placement Council, has participated in the Sacramento investigation from the start.

At least two other state employes, implicated by Ford in his contacts with others, have been questioned and have denied complicity.

The FBI was called into the picture last week when Brieger reported his dealing with Randolph to the office of U.S. Sen. Thomas H. Kuchel.

Brieger told Kuchel's aides that Randolph, after accepting the first $1,500 for rewriting the Oakland school's proposal, was demanding a second payment.

"JAMMED UP"

Explaining this, Randolph told the San Jose News that in the course of his work for Brieger and Harrington, he got "jammed up" after submitting them outlines of two alternative proposals. He decided he would need the services of a researcher and someone to prepare a proposed budget, so he told the Oakland men he would need "the other money" for these purposes.

Randolph confirmed Brieger's statement that he had originally quoted a lump sum estimate of $2,000 to $3,000 for preparing the Oakland school's application.

A major discrepancy between the Brieger and Randolph versions of their transaction involves the representations made by Randolph.

Brieger says he understood that federal financing for the mobile training project would be "signed, sealed and delivered" when the proposal was written up.

DENIES IMPLICATION

Randolph denies absolutely that he gave any implication his fee would entail contacting other federal officers to influence approval of the project.

In neither case, in which the Oakland School paid for rewrite jobs, have they been delivered in final form.

Randolph said his own agency, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, would play no role in the Oakland school's application, which would go through the Department of Labor and possibly the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Ford, when he was ousted last month, left the state no forwarding address. Attempts to locate him this week have failed. He is believed to be in the Los Angeles area.

[From the San Jose News, Oct. 12, 1967]

"Strictly Cash" Pitch—San Jose Men Balked

The rule was 'strictly cash" when two leaders of the San Marcos Foundation in San Jose were asked for $500 to guarantee approval of a $300,000 federal grant for a Mexican-American vocational and cultural center.

The pitch was made July 31 in Sacramento when the San Marcos men, Victor Camacho and Tom Frontiera, went there drumming up state-level backing for their project.

They encountered John Ford, at that time field representative of the State Job Placement and Training Council.

According to their affidavits, now in possession of the San Jose News and Gov. Ronald Reagan, Ford made his move during a luncheon break in their interview.

Camacho says:

"Mr. Ford invited us to lunch and was enthusiastic about our prospects for securing funds . . . On the way out of the building, Mr. John Ford assured me that at least $300,000 could be secured without any problem. He pointed out that we would not even have to write the proposal ourselves if we would manage to put a rough draft of our purposes and objectives in his hands. He said he would arrange to have a professional write it up in such a manner that it would go through without any problem, since our project was a 'dead ringer' for success and that he had all the proper connections and the men who could write the proposal in the necessary language required by the Washington bureaucrats. He said of course I should realize that it will cost something to get it through, and that $500 would be plenty to cover the cost of professional services rendered. He must have seen the change in my facial expression or something like that because he was quick to point out that this was the 'name of the game'."

This took place, according to Camacho, while Frontiera was out of earshot. But when the party arrived at Blum's restaurant half a block from the State Capitol, Ford asked Camacho if Frontiera could be trusted.

A QUESTION

Camacho said yes, and Ford "began to talk very frankly about the $500, its purpose and the necessity for such things."

All during the discussion, one other man, "a tall, young Negro with a moustache and a good appearance" was present as well as Ford, who is also a Negro.

After some afternoon errands elsewhere in Sacramento, Camacho and Frontiera returned for another interview with Ford, at the latter's request.

ASKED CASH

According to Frontiera's version, "It was at this time that Mr. John Ford told us he wanted $500 in cash for the putting together of such a proposal and that this money was to go to him to be given to his colleague for professional services rendered. He justified his action by stating that Negroes had undergone such treatment at the hands of other people, and that the trucking association had paid money to Assembly representatives to get certain kinds and types of legislation passed in their behalf. He demanded that this money and a rough draft of the proposal be brought to his office the following Thursday or sooner."

When Camacho and Frontiera pointed out they might have difficulty getting the money, Ford replied (according to Frontiera) "that he could not take a check and that it must be in cash and the sooner the better. He guaranteed not only that the proposal would be approved but that he had resources and contacts in the federal agencies which could achieve this in a short period of time, like three or four weeks."

Frontiera continues:

"The full implication of what this John Ford had done in requesting funds took hold while I was still in his office, and so at this time I proceeded to point out to him that this activity seemed unusual if not illegal and that he not only was jeopardizing his position but that he was creating a problem for the Negro communities. He thanked me for my concern by pointing out that they had paid all their lives and the name of the game was 'money'."

As Frontiera and Camacho left, they set up another appointment with Ford for the following Thursday.

Before keeping it, they consulted a private San Jose attorney, who advised them to keep the appointment but pay no money, and try to learn more about the proposition. The attorney went along.

At this meeting, according to Camacho, Ford "was visibly disappointed that we did not have the money, but I don't think he mentioned the money in front of the lawyer. There was another gentleman, a tall Negro with John Ford. When he saw that we were not going to give him money, he began to get nervous and excused himself. John Ford invited us to lunch and at the first opportunity he took me aside and let me know that he was disappointed that we had not brought the money."

After the whole story was in the hands of the governor's office, another meeting between Frontiera and Ford was set up Sept. 8. Frontiera asked the name of the "expert" who would write up the San Marcos proposal if the $500 were paid.

Ford replied that the "expert" requested anonymity, implying he was a civil service worker who could get in trouble under the Hatch Act provisions curbing political activity.

Ford claimed to have connections in the office of Sargent Shriver, head of the War on Poverty; in other federal departments, and with congressmen and senators.

No further meetings were held.

[From the San Jose News, Oct. 12, 1967]

Oakland School Paid $1,300, Got Nothing

Details of a transaction by which the Electronics Training School in Oakland paid $1,300 to a state official, in a fruitless effort to win an $832,000 training grant, were disclosed today by the school's administrator Dr. Carroll E. Harrington.

The grant would have financed tools, equipment and administration for a project of training 600 students, primarily from Negro and other minority groups. Harrington sought the money from the State Division of Vocation Rehabilitation and was turned down verbally.

Several days later, according to Harrington, he was visited by John Ford, then a $988-a-month field representative for the California Job Training and Placement Council. This is the official agency which coordinates all government training programs.

Ford, who has since been fired, looked at Harrington's rejected proposal and said it was a "natural" for assistance through the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Harrington remembers a luncheon at which he and his aide, Stephen Brieger, discussed the possibilities with Ford.

In a signed statement Harrington recalls:

"We were talking about how a proposal ever gets through. John said the right people have to write the thing. He said the proposal had to be rewritten . . . and there would only be reasonable cost—about $500. Somebody in — — — 's office in Sacramento (a certain state agency) would do it. Then I said, 'No more nonsense, now, what's it going to cost to get this through?' That's when he started the salt and pepper routine. He arranged four salt and pepper shakers on the table. He put one of them back by itself and said, 'This is -- -- ---. This is the big man.' Then he arranged three or four other shakers (in front of the 'big man') and said, 'These are watchdogs. You've got to buy these men off so they'll look the other way, and you can get to the big man.' We never got an answer on how much it would cost to get our project through."

Harrington was assured by Ford that he personally didn't work that way. But later Ford took a copy of the school's project proposal and left. Several days later we returned and said $500 would be needed to rewrite it.

"I gave him five $100 bills," Harrington says. "You shouldn't deal with this kind of guy, but it seemed at the time believable. I asked John several times during the following month what had happened to the proposal, and he evaded. He said it was being worked on and looked awfully good, but he was going to have to have some more money for the writing. I gave him another $500—five $100 bills. We borrowed the money, against the corporation (the school).

"He (Ford) said, 'You know this isn't my money. But I'm really hurting. Can you let me have $300 more in cash to take 'care of my personal problems . . . I have an illegitimate child.' He said he needed the money to go to court and pay lawyers. So I gave him $300, which was to be repaid from his paycheck. This tended to make the other (money dealings) look legitimate."

Harrington then told how Ford, using the prestige of his state job, gained entree to numerous high state and federal officials for the electronics school leaders. Ford took Harrington to Los Angeles for an interview with H. C. (Chad) McClellan, whose private efforts to create jobs in Watts and elsewhere have been highly lauded by Gov. Ronald Reagan. With Ford, Harrington also visited procurement officials at McClellan Air Force base.

"John was well connected," Harrington says. "No one ever denied him in his presence." But he adds, "to this day I have never received a written proposal for the skills potential project, for which I paid $1,000 in consultant fees to Ford, and the proposal has never been approved. I don't know where it is. I wrote John off as a dead loss in the middle of September.

THE U.S. ECONOMY TODAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the most worrisome and potentially dangerous problem facing this Nation today is not the war in Vietnam nor the crime and riots. It is the state of our economy—$141 billion in fiscal year 1968 appropriations and actual expenditures of $172 billion; a predicted $30 billion deficit, with consequent problems of inflation, and high interest rates at the same time we are facing a possible recession, and a continuing drain in our gold reserves, now down to $13.1 billion from $23 billion in December 1957, while our balance-of-payments deficit worsens because potential foreign claims against our $13.1 billion in gold are $30 billion, as compared to $16 billion in claims against $23 billion in 1957.

LACK OF CONFIDENCE IN GOVERNMENT

Our present fiscal situation has been brought about by the Johnson administration's unrestrained spending policy of guns and butter during a war whose costs are now running more than $2 billion a month and are still rising. There has been a political unwillingness to take the necessary steps to maintain economic balance.

While the President has argued that the rising costs of the Vietnam war are the primary—even sole—cause of the expected fiscal year 1968 deficit of $30 billion, the facts are that two-thirds of the $28.3 billion increase in Federal spending from calendar 1963—at the beginning of which we had only 16,000 Americans in Vietnam—to 1966 was accounted for by nondefense spending. And over half of the proposed $37 billion increase in spending from fiscal 1966 to fiscal 1968 will be in nondefense programs. In fiscal 1960, the Federal appropriation budget was $76.5 billion but trust funds and money in the pipeline meant Government spent a total of $94.3 billion. In the past 8 years these amounts have doubled to a total of $141 billion appropriated and $172.4 billion actually expended.

COSTLY DOMESTIC PROGRAMS

In 1965, Democratic-controlled administration and congressional action produced some 300 new and expanded programs for Federal services and Federal aids. That was a Kennedy-Johnson high in new starts, but the pace had been building from 1961 through 1964. The second session of the 89th Congress in 1966 saw the number of new programs slacken only slightly. This year has seen some more restraint, but the Federal Government is still recommending and obtaining approval of some new programs of questionable priority.

The Kennedy-Johnson impact on total Federal spending has been staggering to our economy. The funding of these new and experimental programs has increased cash outlays for fiscal year 1968 by as much as $78 billion, or almost 80 percent, from fiscal 1960. Sixty percent of this increase is in nondefense areas.

Year	Defense		Nondefense		Total	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
1960	$45.9	48.7	$48.4	51.3	$94.3	100
Increase	4.9	17.4 (10.6)	23.2	82.6 (47.9)	28.1	100 (29.8)
1965	50.8	41.5	71.6	58.5	122.4	100
Increase	26.0	52.0 (51.2)	24.0	48.0 (33.5)	50.0	100 (48.5)
1968	76.8	44.5	95.6	55.5	172.4	100
Total increase	30.9	39.6 (67.3)	47.2	60.4 (97.5)	78.1	100 (82.8)

For the past 35 years, our Nation's Federal Government also has been committed to a policy of planning and management of the Nation's economy. This approach is a natural outgrowth of Keynesian economics which argues that booms and busts can be eliminated or ameliorated by applying monetary and fiscal stimulations when the economy is lagging and restraints when the economy is booming.

KEYNESIAN ECONOMICS TAKES GUTS

I shall not argue the economic validity of the Keynesian theory. But I must observe that the successful practice of the theory requires a highly developed sense of timing by economically knowledgeable and politically courageous men. The system does not work automatically.

It has been shrewdly observed that, as in love and humor, timing is everything in politics. But that is also true in Keynesian economics—and sometimes Keynesian economic timing and political timing conflict. It is much easier politically for a politician to undertake a deficit spending program to stimulate the economy than it is politically for a politician to reduce spending and provide surpluses to pay off that debt and dampen a booming economy.

That is why a distinction must be drawn in every circumstance in a managed economy between what the Federal Government should do for the benefit of the economy and what it is really likely to do as a result of political considerations and other factors.

For every $5 the present administration has been given in tax revenues, it has spent $6. I see no reason to anticipate that such reckless practices would not continue with the additional tax revenues the Congress might give President Johnson in response to his 10-percent surtax request.

Last year the President made a much-advertised announcement that $3 billion would be cut from Federal expenditures. Much of the cutting was aimed at deferment in automatic trust fund spending programs such as highways. Already authorized and appropriated new programs were not threatened as much. But when all the cuts were finally made, they amounted to less than $300 million and only $19 million of that $300 million actually reverted to the Federal Treasury. The rest of it remained in the $50 billion carryover obligational authority—which the administration could spend later as it saw fit.

This $50 million obligational authority comes from automatic trust fund operations—such as gasoline taxes for highways—or from funds which Congress has previously appropriated but which have not been spent as yet by the administration—but which can, under the law, be spent at any time. A 10-percent surtax increase might only encourage the present administration to spend more promptly.

SPENDING, APPROPRIATIONS AND AUTHORIZATIONS

It can be seen clearly from this extensive carryover obligational authority that the long-range problem facing our Nation is really multiple: Whether or not the President will spend the congressionally appropriated funds and trust funds which have already been obligated and he now has available to spend; whether or not the Congress will curb the appropriation of money for administrative expenditures; and finally, whether the administration, Congress and the American people will have the good sense to cut back on authorizations for existing programs and proposals for new programs.

FEDERAL REVENUES NOT CONSIDERED

In the past few years, there has been only incidental consideration relating expenditures, appropriations, authorizations, and program proposals to Federal revenues and to the tax policy which should finance them by producing those revenues. Deficit financing in boom times has been considered fully acceptable.

Continual deficits were defended inaccurately as a part of the Keynesian theory. And besides, it appeared that the economy would continue to expand so much faster than Federal spending so that increasing Federal revenues would result from the same or lowered rates of taxation and would eventually absorb the deficits. Indeed, this reversal did start to occur briefly when income taxes were cut during the Kennedy administration. But it did not last long enough to eliminate deficits. Federal spending began to outstrip Federal revenues again; and growing deficits brought sharp increases, rather than decreases, in the total Federal debt. And significantly, interest on the Federal debt started to push interest rates in the open market.

In an unimaginative traditional reaction, the Democratic administration predictably tackled the problem with continued increases in Federal spending and further manipulations of tax schedules.

TAX CHANGES LOSE IMPACT

In the last 5 years, frequent tax changes, up and down, general and selective, have confused those planning long-range investments or short-range purchasing and production decisions. This tended to reduce the influence of tax policy on the total economy—particularly when such policies are inconsistent in timing or in relationship to other fiscal steps. In such cases where Federal spending continues while deficits grow worse and interest rates climb, it indicates that the Federal Government is saying one thing to the private sector and doing another itself.

Thus, the present administration has a record of inconsistency, bad timing, and demagoguery which has destroyed the confidence of many in the Congress and the public. This confidence in our administration is absolutely necessary if its economic leadership is to be effective and successful.

ECONOMIC PREDICTIONS DOUBTED

Another problem facing the Ways and Means Committee in its consideration of the President's tax proposal has been inability or unwillingness on the part of the administration to give the Congress reliable figures or estimates of Federal revenues and expeditures. The administration has twice in 18 months deliberately or accidentally understated estimated expenditures and thus has avoided the congressional cuts in appropriation requests which would most likely have occurred if the true facts were known.

In his January 1967, budget message, the President predicted a deficit for fiscal year 1968 of $8.1 billion. This was later revised upwards by the Secretary of the Treasury to $11 billion and then to $13.5 billion.

Finally, in the President's August 3 tax message he advised that the total deficit for fiscal 1968 would be over $29 billion.

It is no wonder that administration predictions about the future of the economy can be questioned.

Republicans had warned the deficit would be this large as early as January, when the President's budget was first available for study. However, the administration continued to deny it until August.

NEED SOUND ECONOMIC PREDICTIONS

In designing Federal actions to influence the economy, we must not only have an appreciation for history, but we must also know what the economy is doing now and what it is likely to do in the future.

The administration is forecasting a sharp up-turn in the second half of this year and a rapid expansion of the economy in 1968.

But I subscribe to the views of some economists testifying before the Ways and Means Committee who do not give as confident a picture.

Raymond J. Saulnier, former economic adviser to President Eisenhower, now professor of economics at Columbia University, told the committee he feels the advance in the economy will continue to be relatively slow over the rest of this year and in 1968, as well. In fact, he expects the economy to move in "a rather bumpy fashion." In his testimony before the Ways and Means Committee, Saulnier advised that the economic indicators show the economy has been in a weak recovery phase for 4 to 5 months, giving a lackluster performance to date.

According to the Wall Street Journal, the "coincident" indicators—which are supposed to show where the economy is standing right now, not where it is heading—have shown recent improvement, according to observers. The coincident indicators moving up now are industrial production, retail sales, and personal income.

LEADING INDICATORS DOWN

However, some of the "leading" indicators—which economists regard as foreshadowing the future trend of the economy—have been pointing downward. These are:

New factory orders for durable goods; contracts for new orders for plants and equipment; job placements in nonagricultural industries; net new business formations; net change in consumer installment debt; and ratio of prices to unit labor costs in manufacturing.

And the other leading indicators which have been pointing upward may not be indicating what they appear to be saying. These include:

Average workweek of production workers—could be the result of caution in adding to present labor forces or shortages in labor as a result of the war in Vietnam; change in the book value of manufacturing and trade inventories—could be only the result of recent price increases in inventoried goods; corporate profits after taxes—could be the temporary result of recent price increases in anticipation of cost inceases; and stock prices—are the traditional hedge against inflation and not always the best indicator of future events.

COSTS CONTINUE TO RISE

Meanwhile, the cost of living continues its rise, with predictions now that the total increase for the full year may be 3 percent.

The rise in the cost of living amounted to 3.3 percent last year. This keeps the pressure on for wage increases. And so, where the cost of living goes up, so does the cost of doing business.

Of more concern to Government economists is the jump in the wholesale price index, which will likely mean a sharper future inflationary increase. This rise is attributed to increased prices for industrial commodities, and the present indications are that the rise will continue.

Last week, the price on sulfuric acid, the most widely used chemical in the United States, jumped by $2.25 to $3 a ton.

Also, nickel-bearing copper and brass alloys became the second class of products to undergo price increases as a result of sharply higher nickel prices. Prices for the alloys were boosted by 8¾ cents a pound on nickel content. Prices of stainless and other nickel-dependent steels were raised by several producers earlier in the week.

I feel these facts demonstrate clearly that prices are now rising from a cost-push inflation. This type on inflation generally occurs because wages, raw materials, and other costs—such as taxes and interest—increase faster than the increase in productivity. In turn, these increased production costs lead to increased prices.

The analysts now fear that, once factory-level prices cease to be balanced off by production efficiency price cuts, a faster upward trend in consumer prices and wages will result.

PRODUCTIVITY INCREASE NOT ENOUGH

Economic adviser Gardner Ackley has reported that average hourly labor costs in the private economy rose in the first 6 months of this year at an annual rate in excess of 6 percent. This is almost twice the rate at which productivity has been improving. So the result of this is in the past 12 months, unit production costs have gone up by more than 4 percent.

When one adds the factor of shortage of skilled labor—and in the face of unused plant capacity in many industries—it is difficult to see how further increased production volume could lower unit costs. This is particularly true when high interest rates encourage savings and discourage consumer spending and even spending for further plant and equipment investment in industries producing to capacity or those hoping to reduce costs by automation. And now potential tax increases threaten to absorb any possible future increases in profits which could pay off higher modernization expenses.

COST-PUSH OR DEMAND-PULL?

Some observers feel that the stage is set for the addition of demand-pull inflation, where we will have an excess of purchasing power chasing too few goods.

It is not unusual that anticipation of higher prices later can stimulate a wave of buying when there is excess purchasing power available. But, the question is whether higher wages will be going into such inflation-stimulated purchases or into high interest rate savings or will be fully absorbed by already higher prices.

If there were actual consumer goods shortages resulting from the war in Vietnam or industrial strikes, I would be more likely to see stimulated buying as the culprit in our present dilemma. My guess, however, is that the present dollar figures on increases in retail sales may relate more to increased prices per item sold than to any increase in numbers of items moving. Present unused plant capacity would tend to emphasize costs as the cause of those price increases, rather than demand.

TAXES AFFECT COSTS AND DEMAND

Based on the proposed Federal tax hikes plus State and local tax increases, the rise in total tax collection is estimated at $14.5 billion this year and a record $23.5 billion in 1968, a total of $38 billion in 2 years. Out of a family income of $10,000, roughly $3,000 is drained off in taxes of some kind, both direct and indirect, open and hidden.

Tax increases, therefore, not only affect the cost of goods and their prices, but influence the ability of the consumer to spend. A further tax increase now might not only dampen any boom, but throw our Nation into a steep recession. At the same time, corporations and individuals are straining under heavy loads of debt. To further increase Federal taxes at this time might be the straw that breaks the camel's back and leads us from boom to bust.

Federal deficit financing is just as damaging to the prospects of the economy, of course, because it tends to push interest rates up and also pyramid costs for those who must pay existing or increasing taxes. While higher interest rates may be preferable to higher taxes, the strangling effect of record interest rates in 1966 shut down the housing industry and threatened durable consumer goods sales and production to the extent that this thermostatic regulator seemed about to stop the economy cold.

While reduced demand will undoubtedly result from sharp reductions in Federal spending and this could slow production, it may also allow prices to ease and costs of labor and commodities to reduce as supplies of labor and material become more readily available. Dangers to the economy exist in reducing Federal spending, too, of course. But the dangers do not seem as formidable to the total condition of the economy as do either a tax increase or further deficit spending.

OTHER WAYS TO CONTROL ECONOMY

But what are the other tools available to us in the present financial crisis?

A public sentiment persuasion—a kind of combination economics and politics—has been used for the past few years. In 1962, the administration began talking about a 3.2 percent wage-price increase guidepost. This tool to control inflationary increases seems to have been given a quiet burial in the face of a 4.9 percent airline strike settlement last year, the recent 6-percent rail strike board recommendations, construction industry and other recent wage settlements, and the current demands of the United Auto Workers.

Another anti-inflationary tool used by the administration in the past has been the sale of assets—strategic materials from Government stockpiles—to restrain price increases. This method was used most recently to discourage hikes in aluminum and copper prices. However, such sales are of small value as general tools for inflation control because of the limited number of products stockpiled by the Federal Government. In the case of recent increases in steel prices, for instance, the Government could only voice its displeasure since it has no steel to sell.

Another minor tool of the Federal Government is its authority to increase the margin requirement on the purchase of stocks by investors. Stock prices dropped recently as a rumor swept through the exchange that an increase in the margin requirement to 100 percent was being contemplated by the Government. Should that step be taken, no inflation control flexibility will remain in this area, of course.

Two other controls which might be used in the extremity are direct controls over wages and prices, such as those instituted in World War II, and controls on consumer credit and other forms of credit. In each case, such steps have merely held the lid on for a later blow while permitting black-market illegalities to be encouraged by restraints unnatural to our free political and free economic system. They would represent steps toward control in the economic area which the Federal Government has not had the courage to take in the political area—even to declaring the traditional state of war.

MONETARY CONTROL LIMITS

The two major tools of the Federal Government to restrain inflation are monetary policy and fiscal policy. What the Federal Government does about interest rates and the amount of borrowing the Government must do to finance its operations can be significant. The need for Federal borrowing might be reduced by a tax increase which would increase its income, or by a spending reduction. Of the two, a spending reduction would be most potent because it does not carry the possibility that individual taxpayers might have to increase their borrowing because of the tax increase.

To again quote economist Saulnier:

> An adequate monetary policy may not now be possible.

The only policy options open at this stage of the game are fiscal. Federal monetary policies must be committed by present circumstances to continued ease of money. If money were to take a turn to tightness, the result would be to accelerate interest rates above the current near-record rate at which they are currently charged. To stir the money markets into turbulence—now called "disintermediation"—and reverse the revival of the housing industry and to depress other consumer durable industries, is extremely dangerous.

DEFICITS DO MATTER

Deficits do matter because they can compromise monetary policies with reference to fiscal matters. I have already suggested that further taxes could be as dangerous as higher interest rates. Therefore, the only remaining solution is drastically reduced Federal expenditures which can make available resources for the private sector of the economy—both freed up capital, manpower, and plant capacity to compete for consumer disposable income in the hope of making a profit and being able to pay present taxes and interest and costs.

Now, the question is where can we cut Federal expenditures and how?

SPENDING CUT PROPOSALS

Wilbur Mills, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, says spending cuts should be at least $10 billion. **Tom Curtis**, the second ranking Republican member on the committee, asks $15 billion. The administration says that only $21 billion of the nondefense spending are susceptible to any reduction.

The biggest nondefense expenditure item in fiscal year 1968 is the interest on the Federal debt, $14.2 billion; and the administration says this amount may have to be increased by $700 million.

AGRICULTURE: $2 BILLION?

Agriculture is the second biggest item. It has been suggested that the price support program in wheat and feed grains, where surpluses have almost all been eliminated, could be cut. Legislation for this purpose is pending in Congress and the estimated needed savings would be $2 billion per year.

SPACE: $1 BILLION?

The space program, during the Eisenhower administration, was expected to cost $1.8 billion annually. We are now spending over $5 billion a year—much of it in costly crash programs. A stretchout in this program would save $1 billion a year.

FOREIGN AID: $2 BILLION?

In 1963, the Clay Commission, established by President Kennedy to study our foreign aid program, recommended that spending in this area be cut to $1.8 billion annually. However, the administration has continued to call for large appropriations—$3.4 billion for this fiscal year—in spite of the fact that there is an estimated $5 billion in the pipeline waiting to be spent.

Along with six troop divisions in Western Europe which cost an annual $2 billion, the foreign aid program adversely affects the balance of payments. Two billion dollars could be saved in this area.

PUBLIC WORKS: $1 BILLION?

The Democrat-controlled Senate reported out a $4.7 billion public works bill providing $1.4 billion for civil works projects and 50 new construction starts—instead of the 23 approved by the House. An additional $1 million was added, for instance, to repair the damage of the recent hurricane on the intercoastal waterways in Texas.

The White House has also been successful in getting the Senate to restore House cuts in the demonstration cities and the rent supplements program.

At least $1 billion could be saved in public works and perhaps another half billion in programs for the cities, if such savings were really vital.

DEFENSE: $2 BILLION?

Military affairs experts suggest that $1 billion in military construction programs might be deferred as well as $1 billion in defense expenditures not related to Vietnam.

The Federal Government is spending an estimated $15 billion on research and development and another $15.3 billion in other contracts which might be susceptible to some cancellations or deferments.

George Mahon, the Democratic chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, has suggested that $1 billion might be saved by ignoring anticipated Federal employees' pay raises which the House has approved, since wages paid to Federal workers are now running in excess of $8 billion a year.

These are just a few of the major areas where Federal spending cuts are possible. Whether or not they are desirable in these areas is a judgment the President, the Congress, and/or the American people must make. Spending cuts, like a tax increase or rampant inflation, will hurt someone. That makes it clear that the promises might better not have been made originally and the programs undertaken—because someone will feel the political repercussions. But, there is no question that, in some way, Americans are going to have to pay the price for the administration's guns and butter philosophy.

Representative John Byrnes, a Wisconsin Republican and ranking member of the House Ways and Means Committee, in a recent speech before the American Bankers Association, called for the establishment of a blue ribbon commission to evaluate Federal programs and activities and their projected operation with a view to determining thier effectiveness in relation to their cost. The idea would be to determine whether the Federal programs should be undertaken or continued and on what level. It would also be called upon to recommend a definite priority in the allocation of Federal funds. I have always been under the impression this was a routine continuing job of the executive branch of the Government.

In addition, a new Hoover Commission to study possible savings in operation of the Federal Government has been urged by Republicans. And the Council of State Chambers of Commerce has suggested the establishment of a joint committee to advise on appropriations.

All of which brings me to an August 1869, issue of the Urbana Union, one of the predecessors of the newspaper I publish in Urbana. Down in the right-hand corner was this homely advice:

> Let your expenses be such as to leave a balance in your pocketbook. Ready money is a friend in need.

Despite the new economics, this apparently is one of the unalterable facts of life.

CELEBRATION FOR COMPLETION OF INSURANCE ON \$1½ BILLION WORTH OF COOPERATIVE HOUSING

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Patman] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of this body to a very important event which happened here in our Capitol on Friday, the 18th of August 1967. A luncheon was held in the Vandenberg Room on the Senate side to celebrate the accomplishments achieved under the cooperative section of the National Housing Act.

Senator John Sparkman, chairman of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, who sponsored the legislation in the Senate, and I, talked on this occasion, not only about the achievements to date, but also some of the problems and objectives facing us in the future as we develop larger programs to meet the needs for housing for middle- and low-income families.

The luncheon meeting was sponsored by the Foundation for Cooperative Housing and the Leisure World Foundation. These two organizations are the largest nonprofit bodies developing cooperative housing in the United States, under section 213 of the National Housing Act.

Three projects initiated by these two organizations, which had their mortgage closings in August, pushed the total over the \$1½ billion mark.

The luncheon meeting and celebration brought together officials of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Federal Housing Administration, the White House, and Senate and House staff members as well as representatives and trustees of the Foundation for Cooperative Housing and the Leisure World Foundation.

Wallace Campbell, president of the Foundation for Cooperative Housing, served as chairman of the luncheon session. I would like the permission of the House to insert in the Record here, a full text of the speeches made on this important occasion.

May I add my own comment that democratic homeownership on a nonprofit basis provided to residents of cooperative housing projects is one of the finest forms of democracy applied to the daily life of the people of the United States. We in the House and Senate are proud of what has been accomplished under this program.

Remarks by Winslow Carlton, Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Foundation for Cooperative Housing, Friday, August 18. 1967

The Foundation for Cooperative Housing is delighted to join with the Leisure World Foundation as co-hosts for today's celebration. As you all know we are gathered here to mark the completion of FHA insurance on \$1½ billion worth of cooperative housing written under Section 213 of the National Housing Act.

We are honored to have with us today Senator John Sparkman who may well be referred to as "the Father of 213". John Sparkman participated in the study tour of cooperative housing in Scandinavia in 1948. He introduced the "Middle Income Housing" bill in the Senate in 1949. And, carried leadership in the Senate in the development of what is now Section 213 of the National Housing Act.

We are happy to honor also Congressman Wright Patman, Chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency who as early as 1946 introduced legislation for cooperative housing. The stream of actions initiated by Senator Sparkman and Congressman Patman coincided in the legislation which we have on the books today.

Congressman Patman also has the distinction of being the man who set the 3% figure for interest on Section 221(d)(3) housing loans. We'll hear more about that this noon I'm sure.

We are also delighted to have with us Secretary Robert C. Weaver of the Department of Housing and Urban Development and Assistant Secretary and Commissioner of FHA, Philip N. Brownstein, Congressman Barrett and other distinguished guests as well as our co-hosts.

The Foundation for Cooperative Housing has been actively engaged in the development of cooperative housing just as long as FHA has been in this field. The Foundation, as a matter of fact, came into being to help groups of consumers take advantage of the new legislation which became effective in 1950. Within two years we had decided that we needed an operating company and the result was FCH Company which has recently changed its name to FCH Services to more accurately reflect the nature of its work.

I could make a long story of what we have accomplished during these last 19 years. FCH has been able to organize more than \$350 million of cooperative housing. The great bulk of this, of course, has been developed under FHA insurance—part of it under Section 213 and part a new and growing program under 221(d)(3).

The work of the Foundation and FCH Services, I can say, is one of the modern miracles of our present generation. We've had a hard working staff in FCH Services under the direction and guiding genius of Roger Willcox, who have made cooperative housing projects work so successfully.

In addition to Roger and his staff, FCH wants also to pay tribute to the statesmanship of David L. Krooth, one of the great figures in American housing, and to his partner Norman S. Altman and the firm of Krooth & Altman who have been associated counsel with FCH in all of our cooperative housing projects since 1953.

There are only two things which I will take time to mention today. First, that of the 150 projects sponsored by Trustees of the Foundation and served by FCH Services and insured by FHA, we have not had one single default in 221(d)(3) and a better repayment record of cooperative mortgages under 213 than any other market rate program under FHA.

Second, and with this I will close my speech, is that we have recently had a demonstration of the values of cooperative homeownership that is really outstanding. All of us remember vividly the riots in Detroit. As you know, Detroit is the center of FCH's most important activity. We are sorry that Wendell Addington is on vacation and couldn't be here today to hear this. In Detroit during the riots there were three of our projects in the heart of the riot-torn section of Detroit. Six additional projects were within a stone's throw of the riot area. During that period each of the cooperatives set up its own defense committee. These were integrated committees with black and white members on duty at all times, 24 hours a day. They were able to tell any of the mobs that coursed back and forth in front of these apartments that these were their own. There was no landlord involved, that the projects were owned by the residents as a cooperative and that they should not be subjected to burning or bombing.

These defense committees, defending their own cooperative homes, were completely successful in all of the FCH projects in the Detroit area. There was not a single window broken, no looting or any incendiary episode in those days of strife.

We are proud of the impact of cooperative homeownership demonstrated in this crisis.

It is our feeling that we have just made a beginning with 213 and 221(d)(3) and that tremendous amounts can be done as we stimulate more and more consumers in the United States to achieve homeownership through cooperatives. To accomplish this of course, we need the continued, enthusiastic support of HUD and FHA. We are delighted that Secretary Weaver and Commissioner Brownstein could be with us today for this historic celebration.

Thank you very much.

Now may I present to you Assistant Secretary of HUD and Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration, Philip Brownstein.

Mr. Brownstein. "Thank you, Wally."

"Senator Sparkman, Congressman Patman, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Secretary.

"My personal advocacy of cooperative housing is, I believe, best demonstrated by the fact that I live in a coop with Dave Krooth and Wally Campbell. As a matter of fact when Wally doesn't like what I've done on that particular day, he just beats on my wall. Because he's my next-door neighbor.

I'm delighted to be here to celebrate this milestone in the life of 213. The record has, indeed, been an outstanding one, and I think it demonstrates the value of cooperative housing.

"The D–3 program, I think, further emphasized this, and we are hopeful that as we proceed with the rent supplement program, we will see cooperative housing for low-income people as well as moderate.

"Again, it's my pleasure to be here with you."

Secretary WEAVER. "Thank you, Wally.

"Mr. Sparkman, Chairman, Friends.

"You know, it almost seems as though I'm coming to one of those meetings which we used to get together. I'm happy to be here for several reasons. In the first place, I was just about to institute a 'Be Fair to FHA Week'. If you've been reading the papers recently and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, even, you will find that FHA has been in for a few bumps recently, so I though it would be well to give the other side of the picture, but this is being done today in a more subtle way, so I'm delighted that this starts off the week.

"Also, I'd like to say that Fitz and Nat didn't do all the things we asked them to do and that's why I have to work so hard now.

"I am pleased to be able to join you today in marking this important though unused milestone. As Senator Sparkman and Congressman Patman know so well, there are many occasions when public officials are asked to help launch a new program, break ground, or lay a cornerstone, or open a new building. In my business, I was even called upon recently to help in celebrating a hole in the roof. That was the occasion when we cut a hole through an entire tenement building on the lower east side of New York City in order to demonstrate that we could get in there and rehabilitate the entire interior within the period of only 48 hours. I'm happy to say that we've now had another group going in and they're going to be a little more economy-minded. They're going to take 20 days.

"As I noted on that occasion, it's pretty fast work, and it was the first time in my experience with construction that a hole in the roof called for a public celebration. But most important, we hope it is only the first of many, many more such occasions.

"Today we are marking the fact that our FHA programs have reached one and a half billion dollars in mortgage insurance for cooperative housing. I couldn't help thinking about that song about a million dollar baby, and I think how small she was as compared to this. That's a lot of money. I mean the billion and a half.

"But we know that this too is only a step, though an important one, and a much longer road towards the destination of decent, adequate housing for all Americans. The significant point to be marked today is not the one and a half billion dollars, but the fact that the money represents housing for 115,000 families, almost a half million people. Far more important, it represents home ownership with all the privileges and advantages that come with a tangible investment in your own future, and the intangible pride of owning your own dwelling, and it is restricted to those that can carry out home ownership successfully.

"Home ownership, as you know, is receiving considerable attention today in the efforts of the Department of Housing and Urban Development to fullfill its mission. In our cooperative housing program, we observe with considerable pride that home ownership has been an active interest in ours for a long time, since 1951, in fact, when the first cooperative housing mortgage insurance was written, on a 288-unit project in New York City. We believe that we can say that we observed one of the advantages of this pride in home ownership just the other day in Detroit, as Winslow Carlton has referred to. And in that unhappy city, several of our cooperative buildings, situated in the heart of the riot area, were untouched by the tragic violence around them, and I think this is a tribute, sort of an unearned fringe benefit that none of us had anticipated.

"No one can be certain, but we all believe we see here what it can mean when the residents themselves have a deep and genuine investment, not only in money, but of interest and identification in their own dwelling. The movement for cooperative housing in the United States has been important for many of our goals in the Department. It has helped us reach a wide range of income levels. One-third of our 221–D–3, below the market interest rate projects, are now in cooperatives. We're exploring cooperatives in the rent supplement program and many cooperatives help fulfill our aims in urban renewal. Only last week we had the demonstration of how cooperatives can be creative and effective in the very difficult process of rehabilitation for moderate income families.

"All of our cooperative housing efforts have important economic advantages for enhancing the potential of families to acquire housing is the closing costs, in the comparatively low transfer cost, and in the tax advantages. And, of course, many of the cooperative projects we are assisting have attracted the kinds of families who are strongly dedicated to the goal of equal opportunity of housing for all Americans. We do not say that cooperative ownership is all, or even most, of what we have to do in this nation to provide all the housing we need, but it is one of the roads to our destination, and we are interested in every road that will take us there.

"That is why I am happy to be with you today, to share this celebration of a more or less financial birthday party.

"Thank you."

Senator SPARKMAN. "You know, I'd speak ahead of Wright Patman anytime to get that. . . . (laughter.) Well, I should say this, Wright spent his entire morning testifying before my Committee, and he testified with great eloquence, you can bet on that, and convincing eloquence, from what I hear. I was not able to be there. It was a Subcommittee of my Committee.

"But I'm always glad to be on this program. I've enjoyed the remarks that have been made by Oakley Hunter, by Phil Brownstein, by Bob Weaver, and I'm anticipating the remarks of Wright Patman, as well as those I'm going to make.

"I think this is a great occasion. I think it's a fine idea that someone had. We had another speaker Winslow Carlton. I enjoyed his remarks, too, as our first speaker, our opening speaker.

"I think it's just fine, the idea that somebody had. Wally Campbell got to work on it. I was intrigued when he told me several days ago. (Sound of Congressional Bell).

"Now, if memory serves me right, Wally, and I think I'm right on this, it was in 1949 that we went to the Scandinavian countries. We put through perhaps the most massive piece of housing legislation that we've ever had in 1949, what is now considered the basic housing legislation, so far as I'm concerned. We put that bill through in 1949 and right after Congress adjourned my Subcommittee, at least five Senators who were on my Subcommittee on Housing, went to Europe, first to England, and then to Norway, and then to Sweden and down to Denmark, and into Holland, to study housing. And then over to France, by the way. I'd like to say Paris but I'm afraid you'd think we weren't studying housing. France was not doing any building, as you know, but the other countries were doing building. They were building lots of houses, and we went to see how they were doing it.

"I'll tell you one little experience. Senator Bricker came back convinced that a 50-year mortgage would do, but we had to compromise it down to 40. We were in a bank talking to some bankers in Oslo—in Stockholm, no, it was Oslo—in Oslo, and they were talking about different types of mortgages that they've had. They didn't call them mortgages. But first lien, and second, third, and probably the fourth. It's strange, the more subordinate the lien became, the longer the terms. As I recall, the most subordinate of all mortgages, the bank would take on for a hundred years—a *hundred-year mortgage!* Somebody in my group whistled and said, a hundred years!! And the president of the bank, unmoved, said, why, certainly, why not. He said I can show you houses right here in the city that are 800 years old. Why shouldn't we take hundred year mortgages?

"There is an element of reality there. I think we have come around to a more realistic attitude ourselves with reference to the length of life of our houses. You know back in 1927 I built a house. I guess I was the craziest person on earth, because I had no idea how I was going to pay for that house. I think maybe I had about $1,500 to go into it, and I didn't know where the rest was coming from. I just assumed I could borrow it from somebody. But about the time the house got finished, I got to thinking about it pretty seriously and a friend of mine who was with the Equitable Life Assurance Society said, I can lend you that money, and I bought one of those mortgages, and I thought it was the most liberal mortgage in the world. They just charge me six percent interest, and they gave me a long term, ten years, payable monthly. That was a long time in those days, but we've become more realistic as time has gone on, and I think we have better legislation as a result.

"Now, I've got a prepared speech here, but I'm not going to give all of it. I just want to mention we came back from our trip to Europe fully sold on the idea of cooperative housing, and in 1950 I introduced the middle income cooperative housing bill. We got it through the Senate Committee. We reported it to the Senate and my recollection is we lost by either three or four votes. By the way, I may not be entirely correct on this, but the best I can remember at this time was that the only bill that the Senate Committee has reported favorably since I've been on it, nearly 21 years, that did not pass the Senate. Now, some of them didn't pass Wright Patman's Committee (laughter), because he's pretty good at screening himself, but it did pass the Senate. But this bill failed by three or four votes, and it was on that occasion that I offered them a substitute amendment, an amendment in the form of a substitute. That was accepted by the Senate and it went to the House, became law and that became Section 213. That's how Section 213 was born. It really came out of a trip that our Subcommittee made to Europe.

"It's been an interesting experience.

"Most of my speech deals with statistics, starting with the fact that it's a billion and a half dollars. You know, when I came to Congress nearly 31 years ago, I didn't know what a million dollars was, and I'm not sure that I know yet, but I did learn to talk in terms of millions. In recent years I've learned to talk in terms of billions. Back several months ago I got nearly scared to death one day when I picked up a newspaper and read a column by one of my favorite economic writers, Sylvia Porter. She said that we are becoming a trillion dollar nation. I thought, my goodness, what in the world are we moving into? She had some pretty convincing arguments. She based it on personal income. I said to myself, look here, our gross national product is pushing toward a trillion dollars.

"Then the Joint Economic Committee, of which Wright Patman and I are both members, and have been ever since it was established (we're the only two original members left on it) put out a study. It was a staff study, but it was a very interesting study, that showed that if we move along like we're moving now at the same growth rate, the same development rate and the same spending rate, in 1975 the gross national product of the United States will be $1350 billion. That's a trillion 350 billion dollars.

"You know, shortly after this trillion dollar column came out, I saw a cartoon. One fellow talking to the other one, talking about the trillion, said, for mercy sake, don't let the planners know what comes after a trillion (laughter)! But you know, there was another projection that was interesting, and that dealt with the budget. In the year 1975, if we continue on this same scale, the budget will have between $45 and 50 billion surplus. One time I told this story about the cartoon, and somebody said don't tell them about this budget surplus. So there are lots of figures. The billion and a half dollars of cooperative housing represents a big element. But beyond that, the success that this program has had has been outstanding. In fact, the success of nearly all of our programs has been outstanding. The success of the overall program has been outstanding.

"I brag often about the amount of money you in FHA and Bob Weaver and the people are making for us, and Fanny Mae coupled with it. It is tremendous. I join in any program that can produce housing and particularly housing that American families can call their own. You know, I take a great deal of delight in thinking that at the end of World War I we had only about 35 percent home owners. The rest were tenants. Today, it's almost exactly the reverse. We're working hard now over in our Subcommittee and in our Committee to get out a bill with several little things in it. Mr. Secretary, you're not even supposed to know about these things, because they didn't come through your mill. But we're trying to step up home ownership through the use of existing legislation that's capable of expanding and extending and amending. We're trying very hard to make home ownership especially applicable to the low-income people. That is where our great need is. And we're going to keep on.

"Thank you very much for this occasion. I want to say a word about these people. I know Oakley Hunter. I knew him when he was in the House of Representatives, and I knew him when he was with the housing agency. I've known him with his Leisure World. I understand he's not much of a leisurely man, but he does have a great and tremendous undertaking. I've had the privilege of visiting the one in California, but not the one here.

"I've known the work of Wally Campbell of course, down through the years, and David Krooth and all of these people, and I'm grateful to you, Wally, and to you, Fitz, representing your organization, and to you, Oakley, representing yours, for this very fine and interesting meeting, and I'm delighted to be with all of you, and I shall now take my seat and hear the eloquence of my good friend, and I mean good friend, Wright Patman."

Congressman PATMAN. "Mr. Chairman, Senator Sparkman, Dr. Weaver, and other distinguished guests, and guests of honor.

"First I want to comment on what Senator Sparkman said. I have benefited greatly by being associated with Senator Sparkman. He was in the House of Representatives when I first knew him, and I found him to be a loyal, dedicated person, working always in the public interest, and that's my test of a person in public life—whether he puts the public interest first. Senator Sparkman always has. As he said a while ago, we were the last remaining and we were the first to be selected for the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. Calling it the Joint Committee on the Economic Report led to some confusion, however, so we changed it to the Joint Economic Committee. I consider that a very valuable Committee and Senator Sparkman has made many great contributions to our country through the Joint Economic Committee as well as through the other Committees on which he has served. It's my pleasure to have been associated with Senator Sparkman for these many reasons. He's been so helpful to me, and I appreciate the fine work that he has done.

"Now, Wally Campbell is truly imaginative. His active imagination led to this fine meeting here today with people who are dedicated public servants, and who are truly working for the public interest.

"You know, if you work for the public interest, that we all have the same chance, the same opportunities; our children all have the same opportunities. But if they work harder to get ahead, or to get a better education, or if they have a little of this imagineering, they're entitled to success, because they're working in the right direction. I've often said that people like Wally should have a *degree in imagineering*. Engineering and its related professions are very important, but someone must effectively carry out the plans that they propose, and that's where the imagineer comes in. There should be a good degree in "imagineering," and I think that Wally Campbell is entitled one because he's done so much fine imagineering in his life.

"I never have to look back with your people, people who are in the public housing group and cooperative housing, in particular. I've never known one who was disloyal to the cause of service to the public interest. I depend on you even more than you know, and I never cease to be grateful to Wally Campbell and his associates for their guidance and advice to the Banking and Currency Committee, especially on housing legislation, and cooperative housing in particular.

"Service in Congress, as John would tell you, is the most challenging service one could be associated with. There is so much responsibility. It's my view that a Congressman, instead of being just a Congressman who answers his constituents, must keep the public informed on the nature of pending bills and other such matters. He must be a watchman for the people. Being a watchman, he will see the evil things which come up against the public interest. He should sometimes even find himself on the side opposite to his constituents. I think that happens often, and understandably so, because a member of Congress is in a position to have better information and more knowledge, because he's in the center of government and they're not. I've given that explanation several times. So far, I've gotten by with it. (laughter). In other words, every member of Congress should be an Ombudsman. There's no reason to create an Ombudsman, for we've 435 of them in the House and a hundred in the Senate. That's 535 Ombudsmen we have already. We don't need anymore. The place is crowded already.

"You know, the other day I had an old constituent in my office. He asked me how long I have been in Congress, and I said, "Well, I've been here 39 years. I was elected to my 20th term last fall." And I said, "but it doesn't seem like even seven years." And I told the truth. It doesn't seem like even seven years, because I've been busy and I've worked hard. I guess I'm what you'd call an eager beaver, anxious to do things, to be helpful to the country, and I'm just too busy to think about the time passing. Furthermore, there are so many smart people in Congress that I've had to work two or three hours a day to keep up with them. That's the reason it doesn't seem like I've been here very long.

"I'm glad to know about Leisure World. I'm glad to know that you're eligible at 50 years of age. So I'm glad to know I'll be eligible when I retire.

"I suspect that if I were to announce my retirement, I'd have lots of support for it. I know I'd have tremendous support. In fact there are a lot of people in my District who would say that I could make more money right now if I retired. And I suspect I could, more than the salary I draw. But at the same time, I wouldn't be happy. I feel that I'm in something now that I know a little about, and out of which I receive a great deal of pleasure.

"Now I'm going to use that sentence, John. My colleague, Senator John Sparkman, has talked eloquently (laughter). I predicted all along what he'd say about the housing program under Section 213. This is a very fine program, and I'm proud to have played a part, a small part, in bringing it into being. Since, I'm so much younger, I'd like to take a few minutes to talk about a newer program, one that John Sparkman, Congressman Barrett, and others of us, see as the best program that exists to meet the crisis of our cities. Bill Barrett wanted me to tell you that he's awfully sorry he couldn't be here. Bill is one of the finest and greatest men in our Congress, and he's chairing the Subcommittee on Housing. He does a wonderful job. He and John Sparkman have done more than almost any two members that I know. This new program, 221(d)(3), wasn't enacted until 1961, six years ago. Like most new programs, it had a long start-up period. In the fall of 1964, when the interest rates were jumping, I asked the public interest group what the interest rate should be. Since nobody would risk an answer, I said, "How about three percent?" My colleagues on the House Committee agreed. The Senate agreed. So we now have a three percent, 40 year program, with authority from the Congress to build 40,000 units a year. Here is a program that really works for people that would otherwise be in that forgotten family gap, those who are too well off or too independent for Public Housing; yet too poor to buy a decent home in the normal market. The initials BMIR in FHA lingo mean Below Market Interest Rate. This rate saves the average BMIR family about $23 per month for his home. If you are making $100 a week and feeding a family of four, a $23 month difference on your housing charges makes a decent home possible. The beauty about 221(d)(3) cooperatives is that if a family's income goes up, it isn't evicted and forced to live in a different and perhaps less desirable location. Instead, its carrying charges rise, and the family begins to pay the market interest rate, while remaining in its cooperative home.

"The latest figures show a good beginning on below-market interest rate cooperatives. As of June 30, 1967, the FHA reported mortgages insured (at no cost) of $190 million. This was for 140 cooperative projects serving 13,500 families. Commitments were outstanding for 26 additional cooperative projects, with 1,691 units valued at $25 million. Ninety-eight more cooperative projects for 6500 families valued at $100 million were in application stage. On completion this would involve a total of $315 million. It's interesting to note that about 33 percent of all 221(d)(3) projects are co-ops. They're providing home ownership for moderate income families.

"This leads me to three specific points I'd like to make as we celebrate. *First*, when the 221(d)(3) program was faced with rising interest rates due to increases in the rates on federal borrowing, I took the initiative to recommend a fixed interest rate of three percent for this program. I'm pleased that the

Congress adopted that amendment. The favorable experience of this program confirms the wisdom of that Congressional action because the three percent interest rate was an essential ingredient in insuring the continued success of this program in meeting the needs of moderate income families.

"Now, I think the time has come to accept the recommendations of many of the public interest organizations that we allow a graduated interest rate down to zero in order to provide housing for families whose incomes are lower than those who can afford the three percent rate. These are families who are not eligible for public housing or rent supplements, so that they are in a gap between existing programs. We could fill that gap, particularly to help bring cooperative ownership to more families who are in the lower income group.

"*Second*, the cooperative program under 221(d)(3) has achieved a remarkable record; almost a third of the (d)(3) housing program provides cooperative home ownership. *There has not been a single default in any cooperative mortgage under this program.* Isn't that a wonderful record? This shows that moderate income families will assume responsibilities when they are afforded the opportunity to own their own home through a cooperative. Moreover, the cooperative communities have been better-maintained and have produced a better environment than rental projects. This is due to pride and responsibilities that cooperative ownership inspires. It's also due to the environment and the participation of the people in their own community affairs.

"*Third*, we are all dismayed by the recent riots in our cities, which erupted from social unrest and discontent among the underprivileged living in slum areas. Everyone agrees that bad housing is one of the causes of the social unrest and discontent. We should act now to take more vigorous steps in providing good homes and neighborhoods in our cities. The 221(d)(3) program can materially help. The Administration should accelerate the rate of production of housing under this program and speed up its operations that are to meet the critical needs. This includes the full use of all of the money the Congress has made available.

"I've heard very disturbing reports from many parts of the country that progress is being delayed because funds are not being allocated for necessary housing. Even though the Congress has authorized the funds and the President's budget contemplates a program this year of $500 million for 221(d)(3) projects, I'm advised that only $200 million has been made available and that allocations are being cut back and delayed. This should be corrected immediately. I see no justification for slowing down a program which is so important in meeting the critical problems of our cities. I urge that immediate action be taken to assure the full use of the money authorized by the Congress. Allocations should be made now based upon the full amount of money which has been authorized.

"Now, I want to say a few words to you about a subject of mine which, of course, many of you heard me talk about before. Just briefly, I'll tell you about it.

"Just the other day I made two speeches in the Record to show what's happened on the high interest rate and how it has adversely affected every person in America. In those speeches, I point out that in 14 years beginning in 1939—when the war was first commenced in Europe and when we were being affected by it—until 1952, with the Federal Reserve Board, working with the President of the United States (who is elected by all the people, and, the Constitution says, who shall execute all the laws) the interest was very low.

"Now, I'm not claiming any credit for that and others are not either. In the beginning of World War II, at about 1940, when we were seeing ourselves becoming involved in it, some of us, including Jerry Voorhis and Senator Robert L. Owens, appeared before the Ways and Means Committee. We insisted that we have a different war budget, that we could set aside the cost of the war and have the Federal Reserve finance it without interest by paying two and a half percent a year for 40 years. Then the future generations would pay part of it and there'd be no interest, and we'd be sure and pay it back.

"Well, it made an impression, I'm sure, with the Ways and Means Committee. We didn't get what we were seeking, but there was an effort made to keep interest rates down to two and a half percent. And, if you'll notice, during those 14 years the two and a half percent rate was never exceeded. Long-term government bonds averaged 2.36 during that time. Now, during that time, we had long lines of unemployment. We had depression. We had recession. We had inflation. We had everything that was bad. And we had war and everything else. We had everything bad that could affect the rate of money interest. Yet they kept it under two and a half percent. And, if they could do it during that time, they can do it at anytime! Of course they can, we all know that!

"And when I thought of 14 years parallel to that from early 1953 to the end of 1966—I show the rates there for every year. When the Republicans came in—early in 1953—we delivered to them a policy of keeping interest rates below two and a half percent. In fact, after Mr. Eisenhower took the oath of office on January the 20th, they had some long-term bonds sold at two and three-eighths percent. Then they had another bid issue, at two and a half percent, which shows we delivered the policy to them in good shape. Then they began. You know, Mr. Humphrey wanted an issue of a billion dollars or two for no reason on earth except to raise the rates three and a quarter percent. They didn't even need the money; they had several times that much in the treasury, but they commenced right then raising the interest on the money. Today, you notice that during those last 14 years the interest rate has more than doubled in most instances. I show that if we had maintained the rates as they were during the Roosevelt-Truman times, during those first 14 years, the hardest years in history—no nation on earth suffered more than we suffered during that time from inflation, deflation, depression, everything else—if we'd kept those rates, we would have saved $211 billion in interest on all the public debt and the private debt as well. On the national debt, we would have saved enormous amounts. And today, instead of paying $14.2 billion a year interest on the national debt, we would be paying just about half that much. Last year, we paid $36 billion (more) in interest than we would have paid. That would have paid for two and a half million houses, at $15,000 each.

"Now, if we'd have saved all that money during the last 14 years, we'd have saved enough money to have built 14 million houses at $15,000 each. The reason we haven't the money for poverty programs and the good, necessary, constructive programs that we have on the statute books today is because of high interest. We're not going to get this country back into shape until we reverse that trend and restore interest rates to a fair level.

"The theory that money will trickle down from the top to the bottom doesn't work. Mr. Hoover tried that, John, you remember, and found out that it didn't trickle down.

"I would help the poor people, the low income groups. In 1964 we reduced the excise taxes. When we leave more money with the poor people to spend, they spend it. It goes into the channels of distribution immediately, and travels through about 50 transactions a year on the average. Now, every transaction will generate a little income tax. That's the reason that, when we reduced the excise taxes, for every billion so reduced, we received a billion and a half dollars in taxes. That doesn't apply across the board, of course, but for the lower income groups, it does, and that's something we should keep in mind.

"Now see what happens if you start the other way and pour money in at the top through unnecessary, excessive and usurious interest. Rather than trickling down through the economy, it just goes into somebody's bank vault. It doesn't trickle down. So if you want to help this country, you have to help the low income groups, and everybody gets the benefit of that money. It eventually goes to the top, but it helps everyone along the way.

"So I appreciate people who are interested in cooperatives, for they are helping those who need it most. I feel highly honored to have been invited here, and I want to thank you gentlemen who made it possible. It's a pleasure to work with you shoulder-to-shoulder and to cooperate with you in every way in the public interest, for it is always in the public interest that you are working.

"Thank you."

REPUBLICANS REMAIN SILENT ON INTEREST RATES

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party obviously plans to play a most dangerous game of partisan politics with our economy.

Apparently, not even the serious demands of the Vietnamese war are enough to deter the GOP from its reckless course.

The true nature of this political game was revealed by Joseph Kraft, a widely respected columnist, in the Washington Post of Thursday, October 5. This column, headlined "Republicans Seek To Blame Democrats for Any Inflation," makes it clear that the GOP plans to hoodwink the American public as part of its campaign for 1968. Mr. Speaker, I place this column in the RECORD:

REPUBLICANS SEEK TO BLAME DEMOCRATS FOR ANY INFLATION

(By Joseph Kraft)

Watching the last inning of the first game of the World Series, President Johnson yesterday pulled from his pocket a slip of paper showing the rise of interest rates in the past year. That little slip of paper expresses the true nature of the fight in Congress over the President's proposal for a tax increase.

Basically the Republicans are hoping to delay the tax increase to the point of assuring a stiff dose of inflation bound to be blamed on the Democrats.

To understand what this is all about, it is first necessary to develop a sense of the way the country lines up around the proposal for a tax increase. The overwhelming evidence is that most of the country is bitterly against the tax rise.

The one big exception is the business community. Having been won over to the new economics in the past few years, business leaders have declared themselves almost unanimous for higher taxes as an anti-inflationary measure.

In this situation, the tax increase proposal presented a real danger to the Republicans. What cynics call the Dartmouth

> College wing of the party—its most serious members who pride themselves on their sense of responsibility and who have belatedly developed a dim understanding of the new economics—was apt to follow the business leadership in supporting the tax increase despite its unpopularity.
>
> That would not only split them off from the more orthodox Republicans opposed to most tax increases and all new spending. It would put at least part of the Republican Party in the position of doing the President's dirty work for him.
>
> To head off that eventuality, the Republican leadership in the House developed the strategy of linking support for the tax increase with action by the Administration to cut back spending on a massive scale. Thus the Dartmouth College wing of the Party could come out for the tax increase provided the Administration agreed to pare down spending by from $5 to $7 billion.
>
> The Administration refused the gambit, trying instead to win over Republican votes by emphasizing programs that would have to be scrapped if spending was cut. But on two test votes, the Republicans in the House stood solidly behind the principle of tying tax increases to spending decreases.
>
> A large number of Southern Democrats found that package attractive also. As yet there is no majority in the House Ways and Means Committee for the tax increase. Accordingly, the Committee voted to put the tax increase aside until the matter of spending cuts and a tax increase had been thrashed out.
>
> In the long run, the Administration is apt to get a tax increase without drastic cuts in expenditures. The serious danger of inflation makes a compelling case.
>
> But Republicans can now vote any way they please on the tax increase, asserting that the party took its big stand on cuts in spending. And already they are setting their sights on bigger game.
>
> They are beginning to tick off more in sorrow than in anger, the numerous warnings they have issued to the Administration on the matter of inflation. In a major floor speech Tuesday, John Byrnes of Wisconsin, minority spokesman on taxes in the House, listed in laborious detail five such occasions running from February, 1966 through June, 1967.
>
> Behind this emphasis is an obvious tactic. The Republicans believe they can now head off any tax increase until next year. By that time it will probably be too late to damp down inflationary forces. And so the Republicans are getting ready to tag the Democrats with the blame for the heady dose of inflation that is on the way.

Mr. Speaker, with all of their ballyhoo about "taxes and inflation," the Republicans maintain a deafening silence about the prime factor behind our fiscal difficulties—high interest rates.

Why are the Republican speechmakers unable to discuss interest rates?

Why are they silent if indeed they are concerned about inflation?

The reasons, of course, are well known here in the Congress. The truth is that the Republicans have consistently supported a Federal Reserve System that believes in higher and higher interest rates. The Federal Reserve System, which has created our fantastically high interest rates, has no greater friend in the Congress than the Republican Party.

Whenever anyone in this House dares to attack the Federal Reserve, he can be sure that someone on the minority side will come to its defense. It is an automatic response. Defense of the Federal Reserve and its high interest policies apparently are part of the GOP handbook.

Mr. Speaker, this is what makes the Republican cries about inflation so hypocritical. Where was the Republican concern when the Federal Reserve Board raised interest rates 37½ percent in December 1965?

This interest rate increase—about which our GOP friends remained so silent—raised the cost of all goods and services in the country. This interest rate increase crept into every item that the housewife, the worker, the farmer, and the businessman must buy.

Unfortunately, our Consumer Price Indexes do not provide sufficient information on the full impact of interest rates. Yet, from what little information is provided, it is obvious that high interest rates have been a big factor in the rise of the Consumer Price Index over the past 2 years.

This is the same Consumer Price Index over which our Republican friends worried so much. Yet, they just cannot bring themselves to mention interest rates.

Fortunately, many economists and news publications are beginning to call attention to the role of interest rates in forcing prices upward.

In the October 7 issue of the New Republic magazine, two research assistants from the Brookings Institution—Martin Carnoy and Dennis Mueller—place much of the blame for rising prices on high interest rates. I quote from this article:

> Over a quarter of the rise in the consumer price index during 1966 can be accounted for by the rise in medical costs and the rise in interest, property insurance and taxes. Mortgage interest rates rose 12.4 per cent. The fact that a tight money policy, which is intended to curb inflation, may result in a large increase in the consumer price index because of the rise in consumer borrowing costs would be alarming to anyone less devoted to restrictive monetary policy than Chairman Martin of the Federal Reserve Board. In retrospect, one can argue that the Board overreacted in its efforts to cool off the economy in 1966, and thereby brought about the distortions economists fear will come again if we do not have a tax increase. However, there is nothing in the "new economics" which says that bad monetary policy has to be accepted as a "fact of life" and countered with bad fiscal policy. In short, the record suggests that a tax increase would have done much less to avoid the price rise of last year than its proponents would have us believe, and that many of the distortions they fear lie ahead could be avoided by a more enlightened monetary policy.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that our Republican colleagues will start telling the American people the full truth and that they will halt their demagogic half-truths about inflation. The American people will not be as easily fooled as the Republican propagandists apparently believe. The American people will not ignore the fact that it has been the Republican Party that has time and again defended the Federal Reserve and has blocked meaningful reform of our monetary system. With this record, the Republican charges about high prices and inflation rings of nothing more than election year bombast.

To make a real issue out of inflation, the Republicans will have to talk about interest rates. And, Mr. Speaker, this is a subject on which the GOP cannot stand the glare of the public spotlight. Their record is simply too bad and too obvious.

Likewise, the Republicans have made much noise about deficits in the Federal budget. To listen to the Republican speeches, there is much concern about spending.

Here again, our GOP friends remain silent on the role of high interest rates in the budgetmaking process. Never do we hear them mention the fact that interest charges make up the second largest item in the Federal budget—second only to expenditures for national defense.

Why do the Republicans not talk about ways in which the whopping $14.2 billion in interest charges on the national debt in this fiscal year can be reduced?

Actually, more than $6.7 billion of this sum is excessive interest charges. If interest rates had been kept at the levels existing when President Truman went out of office in 1952, we would be paying only $7.5 billion in interest on the national debt this year instead of $14.2 billion.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, interest charges on our public debt have gone up 105 percent since 1952, while the debt itself has risen only 27 percent. If the Republicans truly want to end deficits and reduce spending, let them start with interest rates. This is where the big spending comes. And there is absolutely nothing to show for it other than bigger and bigger profits for the handful of moneylenders.

Mr. Speaker, if the loyal opposition would be willing to give up its longtime friendship with the big banking industry and the Federal Reserve, then we might see some progress on the question of budgets, inflation, and high interest rates.

PRESIDENT OPENS NATIONAL CO-OP MONTH

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, few times in the history of this country has the cooperative movement had a better friend than President Lyndon Baines Johnson.

President Johnson has always worked closely with cooperatives, both in Texas and at the national level. In fact, President Johnson was the prime mover behind the formation of the Pedernales Electric Co-op in his home area near Johnson City back in the 1930's.

On Wednesday, October 4, the President officially opened National Co-Op Month at the Department of Agriculture. In his remarks, President Johnson once again demonstrated his deep knowledge and close affection for the cooperatives which have done so much for this country and particularly for our farm and rural citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I place the President's remarks in the Record:

Text of Remarks by the President at the National Co-op Conference, Washington, D.C., October 4, 1967, Official Opening of Co-op Month

Secretary Freeman and Secretary Wirtz, ladies and gentlemen:

I appreciate very much your welcome. My coming here brought a great deal of enthusiasm from my cabinet. They were all rather insistent that I come early and stay late because we have a cabinet meeting scheduled at 12 o'clock. And some of them want to put it off as long as they can.

It was about 100 years ago when a visitor to our very young country at that time commented on what he believed to be a remarkable American trait:

Tocqueville said that "The Americans make associations to give entertainment, to found seminaries, to build inns, to construct churches, to diffuse books, to send missionaries . . . Wherever at the head of some new undertaking you see the Government in France, or a man of rank in England, in the United States you will be sure there to find an association."

Well, now today, as we meet here this morning, those associations have pervaded every facet of our American life. Some of the best of these associations are referred to today as cooperatives and I have observed in my years of public life that the cooperatives represent some of the best in America.

They represent initiative at its most creative—groups of people joining together for a common goal, combining their labor together to bring themselves what we all seek most, a better way of life.

They represent a deep belief in the potential of our country, in the future of America as a land where we want to see no one go hungry, or lack for medical care or clothes, or be driven off his land.

In the past 3 years, I am told that 133 cooperative credit unions have been organized by low-income families in depressed rural areas as well as the city slums.

These credit unions are offering fair rates of interest. They are trying to lead and to teach our people how to save, and they are helping them take the first steps toward responsibility and ultimately toward financial independence.

In Clarksdale, Mississippi, for example, a young mother came to the credit union with a problem. She had bought a stove and had agreed to pay $17 a month on it—one-third of her total income. The credit union officer showed her that she was paying 35 percent interest. The credit union loaned her the money to pay for the stove, and now she is making payments that she can afford although it's rather high but it's 12 percent interest.

Smart farmers are banding together in cooperatives to market their crops, to get fair credit, to buy supplies.

Near Sunset, La., a co-op was formed to market sweetpotatoes. Year before last, the average net income was $2,300. Last season, the co-op got the farmer $900 more for his potatoes. That $900 pulled him up barely across the poverty threshold into our more affluent American society.

These cooperatives are holding open the door of economic opportunity to the family farmer. They are making it possible for some of them to stay on the farm, rather than to be forced to migrate to a distant and alien city.

In eastern Ohio, 120 farm families were ready to call it quits. Their hills were covered with brush—no fit pasture for their livestock. As a last-ditch effort, they organized a co-op, they borrowed money, they bought two bulldozers, a heavy disk, and a seeder, and then they seeded their land.

And now these families are trying to stick it out. They are on their way, I believe, to a satisfying and rewarding life.

Cooperatives in cities are assuring more Americans proper medical treatment. Members of the Seattle health cooperative prepay their doctors, so they aren't reluctant to consult them early and often. As a result of this preventive medicine, the co-op members spend less than half the number of days in the hospital as other Seattle residents.

Cooperatives are instilling a sense of belonging, a sense of proprietorship, a sense of responsibility in all of our citizens. And during the riots in Detroit, two racially integrated housing cooperatives in the center of the burned area were patrolled by their co-op members. And not a windowpane was shattered, and not a building was burned.

So I am glad to be able to take this time this morning to come here to salute you and to participate with you in recognizing and in celebrating Co-op Month of 1967. The cooperatives play a vital part in building a better land, in building a better country, in building a better America.

"The highest and the best form of efficiency," as Woodrow Wilson once said, "is the spontaneous cooperation of a free people."

And we get spontaneous cooperation nowhere better than we get it from a co-op. And it leads in many directions and to a better spiritual life, and better health, and better education, and better bodies, and better minds. We join them because we want to get more for our dollar when we buy and we want to get more for our product when we sell. And when we borrow we want to get it at as low a rate as possible.

And all of those things motivate us to belong to it. But after we do belong there are many fringe benefits. And from those fringe benefits come a stronger country and a better country. And with all of our martyrdom and all of our complaints and with all of our sufferings and our inconveniences and our discriminations and our setbacks and our reverses and our frustrations, I think that all of us have good enough judgment to know that we are on the way, that we are moving, that we are getting better every day and things are really relative, after all.

And where is the society, where is the plot of land, where is the form of government that you would like to exchange on even terms for ours?

And sometimes our country is like our family. We reserve the right to express ourselves quite freely but when we come to finding someone better, in the kitchen or a son or a daughter that we would like to trade for someone else, it's another matter.

So I say to you that I am very proud of the cooperative movement in this country. And not just what it gives us in immediate dollar benefits but in the fringe benefits that have contributed a great deal, I think, to making this Nation and this system the envy of all the world.

And go back, and get with it, and keep at it. Thank you.

ADDITIONAL DISCLOSURE OF BENEFICIAL OWNERSHIP OF BANK STOCK WILL BE REQUIRED BY AGENCY RULES

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Patman] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in October 1964, the Subcommittee on Domestic Finance of your Committee on Banking and Currency published a document entitled "Twenty Largest Stockholders of Record in Member Banks of the Federal Reserve System." The purpose of this publication was to provide the Congress with necessary information on bank ownership and control in order that free competition in the industry be maintained.

So-called chain banking and stockholder and management interlocks among banks, and between banks and other businesses, pose a real threat to effective competition in this most vital area of our free enterprise economy.

The 1964 study followed two reports on chain banking and bank holding companies, pursuant to a committee resolution. More recent resolutions resulted in the publication of additional studies in the same general area of bank ownership and control, and changes in control.

A most nagging problem with respect to fulfilling our continuing committee responsibilities to support free and effective competition in banking has been the lack of adequate information with respect to the actual ownership and control of our banks. For example, my letter of transmittal contained in the 1964 publication on the 20 largest stockholders of member banks contains the following comment:

> It is obvious that disclosure even of the 20 largest stockholders of record in each member bank does not provide an accurate measurement of the extent of chain banking in the United States. First of all, the same individuals or groups of individuals do not always appear by the same designations on stockholder lists of the various banks in which they are security holders. Secondly, membership in the same family is not always clearly ascertainable from stockholder lists. Also, stock may be held in trust accounts, or registered in "street name" or in the name of a bank nominee without indication of the identity of the beneficial owners. In short, even the most careful analysis of the stockholder lists provides at best an educated guess of the true extent of chain banking. Without question, therefore, chain banking is certainly more widespread than the present data indicate.

Because of the studies done by the Banking and Currency Committee, I was most interested when the Federal banking supervisory agencies issued their rules and regulations pursuant to 1964 amendments to the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934 bringing the larger banks under its public disclosure provisions. However, the disclosure regulation promulgated by the Comptroller of the Currency was so inadequate to protect the interests of minority stockholders that I was compelled to publicly charge on June 29, 1965 that this lack of disclosure was contrary to the intent of Congress and deserved congressional disapproval.

Along with many other legal and policy changes wrought in that office since my criticisms were first aired, I particularly welcome the Comptroller's proposed regulation to beef up disclosure of beneficial ownership of bank stock by including the reporting of family-held stock as well as stock held in an individual capacity by an "insider." The Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation have issued similar regulations as well. While we still have a long way to go before we can definitely ascertain the ownership and control patterns of all 14,000 federally insured banks, this regulation, when finally adopted, will represent a modest but, nevertheless, constructive step.

DUTCH PROPOSE GLOBAL AID PLAN

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, speaking before the U.N. General Assembly last week, Netherlands Foreign Minister Joseph M. A. H. Luns called for "cooperation between developed and developing countries," saying that—

> In a world where poverty is rampant security treaties are not enough, because poverty is just as explosive as the atom bomb.

As we approach consideration of the conference report on the foreign aid authorization bill, we might all take into account Mr. Luns' proposals for increased aid by all capital-exporting countries, and his announcement that the Netherlands' foreign aid program in calendar 1968 will amount to three-fourths of 1 percent of the Dutch GNP. Our own program for fiscal 1968 will amount to less than six-tenths of 1 percent of the American GNP. I include in the RECORD, for the perusal of my colleagues, the New York Times article summarizing the Dutch proposals:

DUTCH, AT U.N., ASK GLOBAL AID PLAN—URGE RICH AND POOR NATIONS TO COORDINATE EFFORTS

(By Juan de Onis)

UNITED NATIONS N.Y., October 3.—The Netherlands proposed today that the United Nations adopt an international development charter committing rich and poor countries to a global plan against poverty.

Foreign Minister Joseph M.A.H. Luns, speaking for the Netherlands in the General Assembly, coupled his call for the formulation of an international development strategy with an announcement of an expanded foreign-aid program by the Netherlands.

Mr. Luns said that, more than midway in the United Nations Development Decade, which ends in 1970, there was an apparent "stagnation in world prosperity" and a growing gap in economic levels between rich and poor countries.

Although the Netherlands is a relatively small country, it forms part of the group of capital-exporting countries that provide development funds from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, also known as the World Bank, the United Nations and their affiliated financial and technical organs, as well as direct aid programs.

PROPOSALS HELD CONSTRUCTIVE

The proposals put forward by Mr. Luns were seen as a constructive response to growing pressure from the developing countries for firm commitments from the wealthier nations to expand their development financing.

In effect, the Netherlands called on all the capital-exporting countries, led by the United States, to coordinate their foreign-aid programs, adjusting external financial and technical assistance to national development plans.

The present dispersion of foreign-aid efforts was criticized yesterday by Philippe de Seynes, UN Under Secretary for Economic and Financial Affairs. He said the developing countries had little economic bargaining power and could not force the rich nations to cooperate. But, he said cooperation would be the way to make the most of available aid funds.

In the beginning of the Development Decade, there was an increase in capital transfers from the rich to the poor countries, particularly by the United States, which began such programs as the Alliance for Progress for Latin-American development.

FLOW OF FUNDS SLACKENING

But since 1965, there have been warnings from many quarters that the net flow of development funds was slackening. George Woods, president of the World Bank, has said that there are many projects that are technically and financially sound, but are stalled for lack of long-term development capital.

Mr. Woods has proposed that the capital-exporting countries supply $1-billion to replenish the long-term loan funds of the International Development Association, an affiliate of the World Bank that makes loans for up to 50 years without interest.

This is now being studied by the United States, which would provide 40 per cent of the funds, and the other developed countries. Mr. Luns said the Netherlands was prepared to put up her share.

The Dutch proposals on international development planning were outlined in a memorandum circulated after Mr. Luns spoke. They reflect the thinking of Jan Tinbergen, a Dutch economist who has been chairman of the United Nations Committee on Development Planning.

The memorandum proposed that a United Nations Development Charter and steps for a global-development strategy be prepared for submission to the General Assembly and serve as the basis for a second United Nations Development Decade, beginning in 1970.

The Netherlands' foreign-aid program, which was submitted to the Dutch Parliament last week, requests appropriations equivalent to $149-million for next year, compared with $125-million this year.

The 1968 level would represent a foreign-aid outlay equal to three-quarters of 1 per cent of the Dutch gross national product. Under a four-year plan, this would rise to 1 per cent in the last year. This was the level recommended by the United Nations Development decade for all the capital-exporting countries.

Recent United Nations studies indicate that the average level of foreign-aid outlay of all the developed countries last year was little more than seven-tenths of 1 per cent.

LEGISLATIVE POSITION OF THE ITALIAN AMERICAN WAR VETERANS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of John F. Nave, former national commander of the Italian American War Veterans of the United States, Inc., I am inserting in the RECORD the legislative position of the Italian American War Veterans of the United States with reference to the President's message of January 31, 1967, on veterans and veterans' affairs.

On May 24, 1967, I introduced in the Congress H.R. 10308 to provide for the recognition by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of the Italian American War Veterans of the United States for the prosecution of veterans' claims.

This bill has been referred to the House Committee on the Judiciary and I am looking forward to the day when favorable action will be taken.

The legislative position of the Italian American War Veterans follows:

ITALIAN AMERICAN WAR VETERANS
OF THE UNITED STATES, INC.,
Syracuse, N.Y., 12303, July 26, 1967.

Subject: Legislative Position of the Italian American War Veterans of the United States, Incorporated, in reference to the President's Message of 31 January 1967 on veterans and veterans' affairs.

To: The Administrator of Veterans Affairs, and Veterans Advisory Commission, Washington, D.C.

The Italian American War Veterans of the United States firmly believe that the national health, welfare and safety of the country depends largely on the well balanced distribution of tax dollars to carry on the necessary functions and duties of government. In addition, that these tax dollars be spent wisely with maximum gain and minimum waste. Because the Veterans Administration is allotted for expenditure, next to the Defense Department, one of the highest sums of money in the Federal Government, it becomes a valid area for proper re-evaluation of how it spends the taxpayers' funds.

Of necessity, we believe the Congress must past legislation enacting certain reforms. Since the veterans' and survivor of veterans' population is ever increasing, we hesitate in stipulating that we can propose or advance solutions to all problems now or hereafter prevalent by way of the legislative machinery. However, based upon experience and talks throughout the country, we feel certain areas of improvements can be advocated and set forth pertaining to the Veterans Administration, veterans' and survivors of veterans.

Some of these are as follows:

1. *Secretary of Veterans Affairs:* Because the veterans' and survivor of veterans' population now makes up a very substantial portion of the American population, and the tax dollars spent in the administration of veterans' affairs is one of the highest in the Federal Budget, the Veterans' Administration should be elevated from an independent federal agency to cabinet status, and the title of "Administrator of Veterans' Affairs" be changed to "Secretary of Veterans' Affairs." With cabinet status not only is the veteran dignified but also the agency that administers his affairs.

2. *United States Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee:* The United States Senate should have a Senate Affairs Committee to which all legislation on veterans should go, instead of the several now involved. Not only is this better for morale, but we believe that the taxpayer stands to benefit. The President and VA Administrator should so recommend to the Congress.

3. *Court of Veterans' Appeal:* All veterans and their survivors should be entitled to appeal or direct their grievances, cases, or complaints to a final court of law specifically set up for them, under judicial rather than administrative or executive machinery. We believe the veterans, their survivors, and the Legislative (Congress) and Executive (Veterans' Administration) Branches of the federal government will stand to gain a great

deal more than would be lost with such a Court of Veterans' Appeal being instituted and operated. We have precedent in that the taxpayer has his Tax Court, the serviceman his Court of Military Appeals, and the importers and investors their Court of Customs and Patent Appeals. Such a Court of Veterans' Appeals should be staffed with as many Commissioners as possible to expedite such a Court's workload.

4. *Veterans' Administration Service and Supply Center:* Services and supplies make up the important lifeline of the Veterans' Administration. Thus, these services and supplies should have a proper geographical location somewhere in the United States, other than Washington, D.C., where ample space is available to concentrate them for better efficiency and administration. It would be a headquarters and place designed to be an important adjunct to the Veterans Administration and all the plants, facilities, and other matters under its control and jurisdiction, as well as for the veterans themselves.

The following, to mention a few, could be located in this Veterans' Administration Service and Supply Center:

(A) Research, Data, and Development Center.

(B) School for Trades and Skills vital or necessary for Veterans' Administration, or assist in same.

(C) Administrative School vital or necessary for Veterans' Administration, or assist in same.

(D) Professional Schools vital or necessary for Veterans' Administration, or assist in same. Involves medicine, dentistry, nursing, prosthesis, and others allied or needed.

(E) Supply Depot Central area from which needed supplies could be had or gathered when appropriate or desired. Other.

(F) Insurance Administration Center: All Veterans' Administration Insurance Programs be administered from this center.

(G) Hospital Administration Center: All hospital programs be administered from this center.

(H) Compensation and Pension Administration Center: All compensation and Pension be administered from this center.

(I) Educational Administration Center: All veterans' educational programs be administered from this center.

(J) Records Center: All veterans' records be centered here.

(K) Rehabilitation Center: All rehabilitation programs be centered here for administration.

(L) Capitol Construction Administrative Center: Formulate the projects, facilities and plants that would have to be built or put up and maintained in accordance with the present and future needs, or projected needs. Engineers, planners and allied professions and workers would form an integral part of this center.

(M) Other service, supply, or miscellaneous center or matter needed or desired.

5. *Permanent Career Force:* Stability of employment should be encouraged through some kind of permanent career program for the professions, trades, and skills constantly or everlastingly needed by the Veterans' Administration. However, safeguards that efficiency and high operational standards will be maintained is very essential to such a program. While some kind of security is essential for a good professional and labor market, over-security can lead to inefficiency and bureaucratic waste. The Administrator or Veterans' Administration should be given a wider latitude of freedom in this area than that now noted under Civil Service Administration. For example, such bureaucratic pitfalls as "red tape", "buck passing", and the like should be kept to a minimum.

6. *Permanent Veterans' Advisory Commission:* Such a commission could prove important as to the needs and desires of veterans, as well as veterans' organizations formed for these purposes. It should have expanded powers and privileges than it now has under a temporary set up pursuant to President's Message of 31 January 1967. Also, by law it should be based upon a non-profit and non-political basis with ability and merit superceding political considerations.

7. *Utilization and Co-operation of Veterans' Organizations and Posts:* The thousands of veterans' organizations and posts throughout the country can offer much more assistance and personnel for veterans' work. Unfortunately, the rigid policy of the Veterans' Administration to recognize only certain groups under 38 U.S.C. 3402 is both harmful and frustrating. It is discriminating as it denies a veteran his right of choice—one of the freedoms he has constantly fought for. Also, it indicates that the Veterans' Administration cannot flex with the times, since this rigid policy has been maintained for over twenty years.

38 U.S.C. 3402 should be changed so that the Veterans' Administration can recognize veterans' organizations and posts, not only on a national basis, but also on a regional, statewide, and local basis. Thus, instead of inviting wrath and complaints from the smaller groups, the Veterans' Administration will be eliciting their co-operation in the limited areas in which they can function.

Our federal government as a matter of policy in other areas of endeavor fights or controls "bigness" with Anti-Trust Laws, Fair Trade Laws, Establishment of Small Business Agency, and the like.

However, the Veterans' Administration under 38 U.S.C. 3402 sides with "bigness" and encourages "monopolies" in matters relating to veterans' organizations. This policy is adverse to the country's national health, welfare and safety, and should be reversed immediately.

There is nothing wrong with "smallness" as thousands of American veterans refuse to join or be part of "big" veterans' organizations, and will only join smaller groups or none at all.

In addition, we have in the United States of America certain internationalized types of veterans' organizations, such as the Italian American War Veterans of the United States, which are 100% American without any reservations whatsoever. They are helping to fight communism, fascism, and other un-American activities both at home and abroad, and especially in the country of antecedency.

For example, in 1948 the Italian American War Veterans of the United States helped to spearhead a drive to defeat communism in Italy. A communist takeover would have meant not only a loss of a friendly nation for the United States, but also a great increase in taxpayer dollars for more defense. Italy stayed with freedom and democracy. However, thousands of letters, packages, and communications were sent overseas to win this battle for freedom and democracy over communism. Only an organization like the Italian American War Veterans of the United States, and its allied groups, were prepared to perform such a feat. And they did it.

Ironically, since 1948 every federal agency administering laws involving veterans' organizations, or under which veterans' organizations may be granted certain rights and privileges, such as the Department of Defense, Internal Revenue Service, Patent Office, Register of Copyrights, Foreign Claims Settlement Commisson, and the United States Civil Service Commission, has recognized the Italian American War Veterans of the United States, *except* the Veterans Administration.

The Veterans' Administration should take serious note that in the United States of America we have internationalized types of veterans' organizations, such as (1) Italian American War Veterans of the United States, (2) Franco-American War Veterans, (3) Polish American War Veterans, (4) Irish American War Veterans, (5) British American War Veterans, (6) Jewish American War Veterans, (7) Catholic American War Veterans, and others. They are all 100% American, also.

Save for Poland the other countries of antecedency have no communist takeover. Yet, in Poland if elections could be held the Polish American War Veterans could play a great role in trying to get that country on the side of freedom and democracy.

On the other hand, we have no similar veterans' groups, such as Cuban American War Veterans, Latin-American War Veterans, Asiatic American War Veterans, and the United States finds communism in Cuba, parts of Latin-America, and fighting a war in South Viet Nam in Asia, as Korea a decade ago. In the meantime billions of American Tax Dollars are being spent to fight communist warfare throughout the world.

The Veterans' Administration remains inadamant to this important fact, and in so doing eroding the goodwill of many of the Internationalized types of veterans' organizations. Instead of being discouraged, these groups should be encouraged by the Veterans' Administration.

International types of veterans' groups by keeping the goodwill of countries of antecedency save millions of American Tax Dollars for defense, and in addition encourage peace and prosperity with them. It is an undeniable fact that certain people to people approach amongst members of the world community has distinct advantages over government to government one.

8. *Permanent Commission to revise and overhaul the Veterans' Administration periodically—at least once every ten years:* A permanent commission to revise and overhaul the Veterans' Administration periodically—at least once every ten years or so on the basis of needs and findings should be set up Such a commission should be independent and free from any interference from officials or hierarchy of the Veterans' Administration, although their recommendations, suggestions, and co-operation should not only be solicited but also encouraged.

As we indicated in the beginning, we do not propose or advance solutions to all problems now or hereafter prevalent. It would involve a task force for such an undertaking, and then we would at the conclusion even have reservations. However, we can within our experiences and undertakings set forth certain recommendations and suggestions, coupled with those of other similar interested veterans' groups, we hope, make way for improvements and advancements in the administration of veterans' affairs by the Veterans' Administration.

In concluding this legislative position we trust a valid contribution has been made pursuant to the President's Message of 31 January 1967 on veterans and veterans' affairs. We have tried to remain objective, and keep always in mind the patriotic attitude that the national health, welfare and safety came above every other consideration.

John F. Nave,
Past National Commander.

BUSINESS AID IN SLUM RIDDANCE

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Pepper] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the recent commitment of $1 billion by life insurance companies to rehabilitate our slum areas stands as a precedent for improved Government-business relations. Also, it provides us with an alternative for solving the problems of our cities.

Too long this country has witnessed a struggle between Government and business—the loser consistently being the less fortunate members of our society. Now President Johnson has turned this age-old struggle into a working and profitable partnership. The President has, in effect, admitted to business that the Government is unable to solve all the problems of our cities and that we need the assistance of private enterprise. And he has offered realistic incentives to encourage this assistance. At the same time he has reminded business of their responsibility to our cities. He has asked business to turn their attentions to the social as well as the profit ledger.

This rather simple approach has worked remarkably well. It is the kind of straight talk that is long overdue. I believe President Johnson and private industry should be commended for their attempts to forge Government-business alliance and to devote their resources to rehabilitation of our cities.

So that my colleagues might become aware of the warm response such efforts have generated, I include a Miami Herald editorial in the RECORD:

BUSINESSLIKE SLUM RIDDANCE

The most heartening action to date toward ridding America's big cities of slums is the pledge of $1 billion for mortgages there.

This isn't tax money. It is cash in the hands of 348 insurance companies. Each is putting up its share in proportion to its assets.

President Johnson announced the "historic contribution" after talking to spokesmen for the insurance industry in the White House.

The "contribution" is that the lenders presumably will earn less interest on this $1 billion than if they invested it outside slums. It will go mainly into housing eligible for guarantees from the Federal Housing Administration, which has a ceiling on the interest rate for some of the loans which it insures.

In the past, insurance companies have shied from lending on mortgages in "high-risk" neighborhoods such as slums. The FHA underwriting will minimize the risk of the $1 billion.

Plans for the venture were an open secret for several weeks. The Magazine of Wall Street in mid-August, for example, predicted "It now seems likely that such measures will lean heavily on private enterprise as a source of financing and management of rehabilitation programs rather than on direct federal aid."

Apart from the FHA insurance, the lending of the $1 billion will be straight business. Each mortgage will be a person-to-person transaction between the borrower and the insurance company. The money is being offered to help breadwinners buy their own homes as well as to finance construction or renovation of other residential property now in slumlike condition.

Treating each mortgage on its merits is in the sound tradition of our profit-and-loss system. The experience should be as beneficial to slum-dwellers as to lenders.

Best of all this $1 billion proves that keen minds are zeroing in on our nation's. No. One domestic problem.

AUTO-ON-TRAIN OPERATIONS

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, few appropriations this year will create greater interest or be of more importance than the appropriations for the Department of Transportation. This is, of course, the first year that the Department of Transportation has come up for appropriations. These appropriations total more than $1.5 million. The magnitude of tasks confronting the Department in aviation, highway construction, highway and motor vehicle safety, the Coast Guard, and railroad matters is staggering. The Department can well use every dollar the Congress is able to appropriate.

At this time, however, I would like to voice my regret at the deletion by the Appropriations Committee, the House, and the conference committee of the $3,511,000 requested for auto-on-train operations. This is an expenditure which could well have beneficial effects in the long run far exceeding this three and a half million dollar figure. This amount is needed to complete a project started in fiscal year 1967 which is estimated to cost under $7.4 million. In brief outline, this is a demonstration project to be carried on jointly by the Department of Transportation and the Atlantic Coast Line Railroad between Washington, D.C., and Jacksonville, Fla., which will permit the transport aboard rail cars of automobiles with drivers and passengers, utilizing the automobiles for seating facilities aboard the rail cars.

The 760-mile-long-trip would cost about $100 per car with passengers. Food services also would be provided. A survey of cars from the Northeast entering Florida last October indicated that about 40 percent of those cars, their drivers and passengers would be glad to avail themselves of this service.

Even if this estimate proves to be overly optimistic, I am firmly convinced that this kind of project should be given every possible encouragement.

The problems of highway congestion and the tragedies of highway accidents, injuries, and fatalities become more acute every year. Travel between the Northeast and Florida is understandably becoming more and more popular. With the trend toward longer vacations and higher incomes, we can confidently expect an ever increasing number of persons wanting to spend part of their vacation in Florida. Others will come there to retire. The trade up and down the eastern seaboard is bound to expand.

This new method of travel will appeal to thousands who want the mobility of their own automobiles in Florida but who understandably find a drive of about 800 miles both tiring and time consuming. A price of $100 would be a bargain for many a family to get to Florida without the tedium, the confinement, the tension of driving for 2 days.

We should also look upon this expenditure as a pilot project which may well be feasible in many other areas of the country. Builtup areas from Los Angeles to Seattle, from Miami to Boston, from New York to Kansas City might all benefit from having this kind of service available. No doubt, with experience, modifications will taken place.

But it is little short of insanity to keep building more and more roads, crowding them with more and more cars, creating ever new hazards, without looking into feasible alternatives. Here is one such alternative which is most promising and which should be given a full and fair trial.

It was, in my judgment, quite unreasonable for the House report on the appropriations bill to say that—

> If the project is economically feasible, there is no reason why private industry cannot proceed with it.

Unless we in the Congress are willing to face the facts of transport needs and potential and assume some of the risks of innovation, we will find ourselves in an ever increasing mess of congestion, economic waste, and rising accident and death rates.

I regret most sincerely that the conference did not retain the $2 million approved by the Senate for this purpose and give us an opportunity to remedy the shortsightedness of our earlier vote in the House.

CLOSING THE TRAVEL GAP

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the Washington Evening Star of September 27 and a resolution adopted by the Southern Governors' Conference on September 13 make telling points concerning the travel gap—the difference between what Americans spend in foreign countries through travel and tourism and what visitors from other lands spend in America. This year, the travel gap is almost $2 billion, and this deficit worsens our international balance-of-payments position. The average visitor to this country spends more than $400 here, so there is a great economic potential in expanding travel to this country. Other countries are well aware of the gold to be found in tourism. The Governments of Mexico, France, Spain, Canada, and Greece each spend far more every year to promote travel than the Government of the United States spends through the U.S. Travel Service. This Government agency plays a key role in President Johnson's efforts to solve our balance-of-payments problem. With so much at stake, it is false economy to clamp a lid on the promotional activities of the travel service. As the editorial points out, an assault on the travel gap is worth more of an effort than we are now making. Mr. Speaker, I include the editorial and the Governors' resolution in the RECORD:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Sept. 27, 1967]

Travel Gap

The number of foreign travelers visiting the United States has shown a 30 percent increase this year over the like period in 1966. John Black, director of the U.S. Travel Service, now estimates 1.5 million foreigners will tour this country in 1967.

That's a pretty good showing, considering the incredibly small amount Congress is willing to appropriate for attracting visitors here. Last year the Service operated on a budget of $3 million. By contrast, France spent $5 million to lure tourists, Mexico spent $7 million, Spain and Canada $10 million apiece. Even tiny Greece spends more than we do on this item.

This is a strange way to deal with the balance of payments problem. The average foreigner spends between $400 and $450 on his American visit. What better way to offset the dollar drain than to make this nation a more attractive goal for globe-trotters?

Several imaginative ideas were put forth earlier this year by Winthrop Knowlton, assistant secretary of the Treasury, for encouraging such travel. Why not publish a comprehensive guide book for the United States, for example, translated into a variety of foreign languages?

Why can't we develop a system of certified guides, Knowlton asks, using American students proficient in foreign languages? Why can't we fill the thousands of empty university dormitory beds at vacation time, providing revenues for colleges and low cost lodgings for foreign students? Why not a "scientific Disneyland" to promote exports?

It would take money to do all these things. But surely an assault on the estimated $2 billion "travel gap"—meaning the difference between what American tourists spend abroad and the smaller total spent here by foreigners—is worth more of an effort than we are now making.

United States Travel Service

Whereas, the Southern States are engaged in a cooperative effort for travel promotion; and

Whereas, the emerging international markets will play a vital role in achieving growth of travel in the South; and

Whereas, the United States Travel Service is engaged in an outstanding program of promotion and information aimed at developing these international markets:

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the Southern Governors' Conference urge the Congress to continue to support the programs of the United States Travel Service at the highest possible and practical level.

AN INTERNATIONAL APPROACH TO CRIMINAL JUSTICE

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Pepper] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the the privilege of participating with the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law in the presentation in Miami Beach of a pioneer booklet entitled "You and the Law" and designed to inform persons arrested on misdemeanor charges of their rights under the law. This booklet promises to be extremely helpful in our lower courts, not only in my area, but I believe eventually throughout the Nation.

The young man who prepared this booklet as a staff attorney for the lawyers' committee, Mr. Harvey Friedman, is a very able young lawyer from my area and I think a very promising young man in the much neglected field of the administration of criminal justice in our municipal and other lower courts.

Mr. Friedman has served as a consultant in the Office of Economic Opportunity and as a consultant to the Dade County, Fla., bar's committee on crime control and the administration of justice. Recently he pursued his interest in this subject beyond the borders of our country while on a trip to Europe.

During his trip he explored an intriguing idea for an international institution to make cross-cultural studies of the administration of criminal justice at the lower levels. He outlined this proposal to me in a letter upon his return and I insert that letter in the Record at this point for the benefit of my colleagues who also may have an interest in this subject:

Lawyers' Committee for
Civil Rights Under Law,
Washington, D.C., October 10, 1967.

Hon. Claude Pepper,
Cannon Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Pepper: I want to take this opportunity to report to you on my recent tour abroad during which I had the opportunity, through your courtesy, to interview officials concerned with the administration of criminal justice. Since that tour, I am more than ever confirmed in my belief that new research and study efforts are in order if we are to resolve effectively the problems which beset the system for the administration of criminal justice in our nation.

I have initiated discussions with interested parties abroad concerning a multi-national approach in undertaking comparative studies of criminal justice systems. The response was extremely favorable, and while at this time it would be premature to detail these discussions, I would like to set out in general terms the concepts which were developed.

In my work in police-community relations, I have constantly been searching for new approaches; for new approaches must be sought in dealing with police and community conflicts in the nation's urban centers. Judging by recent chaotic events, the old approaches seem to have completely failed, especially where there has been reliance solely on artificial and contrived devices intended for the diminution of tensions between the police and the community.

Where such devices are not grounded in solid research and based on their reliability but rather are employed in the frenzy to resolve police and community tensions, then they invariably fail.

Programs which can be readily and expeditiously implemented must not therefore be the only goal, especially where such programs are but the product of premonition and hunch.

In this connection I would bring to your attention a fact cited by The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice in its report, *The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society*:

"The Nation spends more than $4 billion annually on the criminal justice system alone. Yet the expenditure for the kinds of descriptive, operational, and evaluative research that are the obvious prerequisites for a rational program of crime control is negligible. Almost every industry makes a significant investment in research each year. Approximately 15% of the Defense Department's annual budget is allocated to research. While different fields call for different levels of research, it is worth noting that research commends only a small fraction of 1 percent of the total expenditure for crime control." (P. 273)

It becomes obvious that an immediate effort must be made to augment our research efforts in this area.

More than this, any such augmented effort must be far more comprehensive than merely dealing with the tensions and immediate problems evoked by police and community relations. It is obvious that the crisis which is observed today in the Nation's urban centers far transcends the scope of such a traditional and circumscribed venture. It is the entire system of criminal justice which must be the target of a national and comprehensive research plan. For the police structure is so interwoven within that system, both in fact and in the minds of the community, that to extricate it therefrom is a sheer impossibility.

The present day approach throughout this nation in studying the system of criminal justice is to make comparative studies of such systems operating in urban areas almost all of which are cursed with the same or similar problems. Such studies are made through on-site visits, through conferences, and through the dissemination of literature. The problem lies in the fact that those making the visits, those attending the conferences, and those writing and reading the literature all have the same or similar backgrounds and dwell in the same or similar setting. Such approaches therefore have mostly failed to bring about any really valuable or profitable insights mainly because they have failed to provide the necessary perspective from which to clearly examine the problems at hand. What is needed then is to be able to step back from this setting and view it from another perspective.

With these factors in mind, I want to set forth for your consideration the concept of developing an international setting from which to examine the system for the administration of criminal justice in our own nation and in others. Specifically this would herald a new and more intensive research effort in the nature of a multi-national undertaking. The cornerstone of this proposal would be the establishment of an international institute for the express purpose of conducting cross-cultural and in-depth studies of the various systems of criminal justice and with special emphasis on community relations vis a vis the particular system.

Such an undertaking would be organized on a joint basis between participating nations at a non-governmental level. It would be multi-disciplinary in approach in that it would freely embrace all those disciplines which could in any way contribute to understanding or bringing about a resolution of the problems faced by the parties.

The task of the institute, in essence, would be to make comparative studies of the problems faced by each of the participating party-nationals. The work of the institute would be codified in a journal produced and disseminated on a regular basis. This then would herald the establishment of an international dialogue in an area where such dialogue has as yet not been attempted and where such might prove highly profitable.

The motivation for other parties joining into such an undertaking may not be immediately obvious; but from my discussions abroad, such motivation does exist. The United States is not the only nation beleaguered by problems in this area.

What is set out herein is in the nature only of the presentation of a series of possibilities. It is but a cornerstone from which to build. It will be the task of the participating parties to mold this idea into the practical and acceptable forms which will best benefit all concerned.

I am moving forward with the development of this idea, and I will keep you notified as to my progress.

Sincerely,

HARVEY FRIEDMAN.

PAUL SOUTHWICK LEAVES PUBLIC SERVICE

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. MOSS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, public service is a high calling, because its function is to serve the people, and this purpose demands the best and most highly motivated individuals. One such person recently left public service, and I should like to note the occasion for the benefit of my colleagues, many of whom came to know this man in the course of conducting the public business in this body. Paul Southwick has resigned his position as special assistant to the Secretary of Commerce for congressional relations. In making the announcement, Secretary Trowbridge cited Paul Southwick's outstanding contributions in connection with a broad spectrum of landmark legislation; public works and economic development, highway beautification, high-speed ground transportation, the law establishing the Department of Transportation, auto and highway safety; and Fair Packaging and Labeling. Anyone who helped in the enactment of these laws can take a genuine pride in his service to the public.

I came to know and appreciate Paul Southwick's wide range of talents and his deep sense of public service some 10 years ago when he was a staff member of the Government Information Subcommittee, of which I was chairman. A cum laude graduate of Harvard in 1943, Paul worked as a reporter for both United Press and Associated Press. He later served as administrative assistant to the late Senator Long, of Hawaii.

In the executive branch of Government, Paul Southwick was Deputy Administrator of the Area Redevelopment Administration in the Commerce Department, and a special assistant in the White House to both President Kennedy and President Johnson, before returning to the Department of Commerce in 1965.

I understand that Paul is joining the Washington firm of Newmyer Associates. In hiring Paul Southwick, his new employers are getting more than a highly qualified executive—they are also getting a wise and good man.

WILL SUCCESS SPOIL AMERICAN CIVILIZATION?

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, recently in Detroit, Peter B. Clark, president and publisher of the Detroit News, delivered an address to a group of corporation executives in which he asked: "Will Success Spoil American Civilization?"

In his speech, he discusses the major advances that America has made in the past generation, and shows how this, paradoxically, appears to be working against us.

Of youth, Mr. Clark says:

> We have created an energetic, idealistic, and well-informed generation . . . We have largely liberated them from the struggle to obtain material goods; they have turned part of their newly liberated energies against us.

He discusses the new respect for intellectuals, but this new respect serves to amplify their criticism. He cites impressive gains in civil rights, but says this serves to sharpen the dissatisfaction of those on the low rungs of society. He discusses television and how it speeds communications. At the same time, its picture often warps reality. Of particular interest is television's promotion of "quick politics" in which more people draw conclusions before they have enough facts.

Clark says:

> The cumulative effect of all this is to produce an enormous amount of social criticism. Critics will discover new things to criticize faster than we can discover new solutions.

God forbid that we should ever accept existing injustices, or relax our determination to right wrongs, redress grievances, make certain that everyone is treated equally and with justice.

But he differentiates between constructive criticism and destructive criticism. Excesses of destructive criticism create "public hypochondria."

He concludes:

> The mood is, to some unknown extent, destructive of all our political institutions.

Mr. Speaker, we in Congress daily have to struggle with the consequences of all the things Mr. Clark discusses. I recommend this perceptive speech, "Will Success Spoil American Civilization?" to my colleagues and include it in the RECORD:

WILL SUCCESS SPOIL AMERICAN CIVILIZATION?

(By Peter B. Clark, September 26, 1967)

Everyone takes it for granted that business corporations will give money to civic, educational, welfare and charitable activities. As businessmen, we take it for granted too and assume that we know why we do it. Thus, especially in recent years, we have devoted a great deal of attention to the technique of contributing. How shall we select recipients? How shall we allocate scarce resources among competing claimants? How shall we organize our companies and committees to make these decisions?

Our increasing professionalization, and the increasing pressures to rationalize what we do, have increased this preoccupation with technique.[1]

I believe that the shift of business attention from the motive for giving to the technique of giving has gone too far. I submit that business must now reconsider very carefully just *why* it contributes anything to anyone. I submit that big changes in the country require big changes in business thinking about contributions—and perhaps about other things as well. The changes in the country have created some new challenges to the system of business itself.

My basic point is this: American life has improved dramatically since World War II; yet the very improvements have produced difficult new problems. A better material life and other improvements we had assumed would represent "progress" have stimulated profoundly negative attitudes about many aspects of our life, including business.

Among the improvements are these: First, a great and continuing prosperity; second, a huge increase in the number of young people being educated in colleges; third, a notable enhancement of the respect given to intellectuals; fourth, a significant improvement in the condition of many American Negroes; and fifth, the arrival of television.

It is as if a new miracle drug had been invented which cured the worrisome old diseases, but which, when tested, also produced unpredicted side effects. Our problem is certainly not to get back the old diseases; it is to retain the wonder drug's curative powers, but discover how to eliminate its damaging new symptoms.

I

Let us look at each of the changes in perspective. First the post-war prosperity and, especially, its effects upon that huge generation of post-war young people which we take so seriously.

Personal income has soared from under $200 billion in 1945 to over $600 billion now. For nineteen of the twenty-one years, 1945–1966, *per capita income* was substantially higher than it was the year before. To put it another way, almost every year in the life of a 21-year-old has been economically better than the one before.

This almost unbroken post-war prosperity has produced the freest, healthiest, and most knowledgeable young Americans ever. They enjoy the greatest imaginable range of choice: They can work or not; study or not; travel or not. For at least hundreds of thousands, the opportunity to go on even to graduate schools exists merely for the asking. The contrast between the standard of living of a young person today and a young person of a hundred years ago is almost too great to grasp.

Yet, despite this, or in my opinion, partly because of it, today's young person also often seems to be bored, restless, and discontented with "the way things are". The great depression of the 'thirties is no more than textbook history to him. His striking idealism is seldom tempered by the classic discipline of economic necessity. Many of his free choices are, in a general sense of the word, costless. Decisions which cost nothing teach little.

Young people react to our prosperity (and also to a highly permissive upbringing) in a variety of ways. In some cases, as money becomes easier to get, its value as an incentive declines drastically. As some youngsters conclude that incomes are virtually assured, they lose interest in organizing their lives to earn incomes. One articulate young member of the "new left" said: "Now we're on the threshold of abundance. It is no longer a struggle to survive. Up to now we have had sort of a fixation on income. Now we need other things for motivation."

Businessmen encounter this attitude when they try to recruit bright college people. Some surveys indicate that 80% of today's graduates would prefer an academic or government career to a business career. The Peace Corps demonstrates how attractive low-paying but idealistically-motivated jobs are for youth. To many of them business is *not* where the action is.

---

[1] See, for example, Leo J. Shapiro, *Company Giving,* Chicago: Survey Press, 1960.

But far more important than difficulties in business recruiting is the fact that continuing prosperity has somehow made it easy, and actually fashionable, to ridicule a "materialistic" society and its alleged lack of "quality." A few prosperous youngsters even feel resentment or guilt about their material possessions. Some (the "hippies") solve their problem by abandoning their possessions; others (the "new left") attack the economic system which produces the possessions. In their collective desire to remake the society, they ignore the extraordinary individual freedom each enjoys.

The politicians and economists who set the goal of, and invented the means for, continued prosperity failed to predict its effects upon people. (Probably this is because they *did* know the awful consequences of continued poverty.) No one really knows today what the effects of continued affluence are. But we do not have to look just at "hippies," or "peaceniks," or LSD to know that we have somehow failed to prepare our youth for continued affluence. We have created an energetic, idealistic, and well-informed generation. But abundance has also produced a deeply critical generation. Some members of it act as if they did not really believe in what we have done. We have largely liberated them from the struggle to obtain material goods; they have turned part of their newly liberated energies against us.

This leads to the second great change: The vast increase in college education. In 1945 about 1,000,000 people were enrolled in institutions of higher education. In 1965 there were 5,570,000 and the growth *rate* is going up. (Most business firms experience difficulties if they grow, say, 50%. Consider the organizational and personnel difficulties of a 500% growth.)

Most American parents probably want their children to attend college. Surely, it is desirable to stimulate young people to seek the greatest possible education that they are capable of absorbing.

Even so, anyone who carefully reads his newspaper knows that in this decade college campuses are producing even more than their normal share of tumult. When you suddenly release young people from parental restraints and throw them into huge, anonymous masses, it is not surprising that a few of them cluster into groups which share both loneliness and extreme behavior.

But extreme attitudes also result from the fact that the students are, on the average, different people than they used to be. They are not the same as the essentially middle-class, fun-seeking youngsters of the 'twenties; certainly not the same as the earnest, no-nonsense veterans of the 'forties and 'fifties, eager to make up for lost time and earn a living; they are not even the same as the disillusioned students of the 'thirties, some of whom felt betrayed by business failure. The five-fold explosion of post-war higher education has filled large campuses with something like a cross-section of the present American population. Students come from all income levels, all conditions of life, all educational levels, and they come with all attitudes. We should have expected a striking change in campus behavior.

But it is important to realize that their professors and the ideas of teaching have not changed very much. A teaching method that was invented years ago, perhaps in order to capture the attention of stubbornly uninterested students, is still being used today. One indirect result is the increase of various forms of campus radicalism. Let me explain what I mean.

The teaching method is systematic criticism—especially of political, economic and social matters. It involves carefully taking apart, analyzing, and challenging every part of accepted American economics, governmental processes, and social relationships. The method tends, naturally, to be iconoclastic. Long-accepted values (like patriotism and respect for constituted authority) are called into question, traditional national heroes are re-examined, basic constitutional procedures are dissected, and cherished historical beliefs are dissolved under the harsh light of analytical intelligence.

When done by a skillful professor, this is a splendid way to stimulate student curiosity. It motivates the student to ask his own questions and to learn how to find his own answers.

At some early time, when most college students were supposed to have been the complacent offspring of the unchallenged rich, the method presumably was totally appropriate. The main problem then was to induce students to ask *any* real questions or to undertake *any* serious analysis of their own. It is said that they were not very analytical, were ambitious just to get good jobs, were quietly patriotic without thinking why, were mostly interested in their purely private lives, and keenly enjoyed the high-spirited antics of campus personal life. Professors believed that students had to be jarred into thinking, for their own good. (And maybe a slightly resentful professor or two found some pleasure in challenging all the beliefs of students more prosperous than he.)

Students used to come from homes filled with strong convictions. They arrived at college reflecting the conservative attitudes of their essentially conservative parents. They also brought little curiosity and few facts.

But at least some students are quite different now. They arrive brimming with facts, they show impressive curiosity, some intensity, and a desire to *do something*. But they do not believe in much of anything. They bring idealism but little substance of belief. They do not go to college with self-satisfied assumptions about the value of the *status quo*. If anything, they tend to be critical of it.

When restless students who do *not* believe in the traditional ways of doing things are exposed to professors who systematically *question* the traditional ways, the results are predictable. We see the results among the students on the biggest campuses: Some extreme radicalism, quite a bit of philosophical anarchism, a great deal of cynicism, and an enormous amount of criticism. We see students striving to become "committed" to some new and, as yet, unknown social or political cause, perhaps because they do not accept the old causes. This rebellion in sheepskin clothing raises real and serious questions: Has pure critical intelligence gotten out of balance with traditional moral beliefs? Is it possible that national stability requires educated youth to accept on faith at least some basic premises and some fundamental restraints?

II

The rapid college expansion helps partly to account for the third change—the significant increase in the respect Americans now give to intellectuals. Merely comparing the average 1950 professorial salary of $5,310 with that of $11,265 today gives evidence of this increase. More to the point, compare the front pages of 1937 newspapers with those of 1967. The amount of space given to professors, writers, poets, historians, scientists, and others who may properly be called intellectuals has increased spectacularly. This comparison marks a basic change in the way the country thinks.

This rise of intellectuals to public prominence was helped by the very tangible contributions that scientists made to World War II weaponry. Nuclear weapons, radar, jet aircraft, and other startling devices were the direct products of theoretical scientists whose pre-war careers the public viewed skeptically when the public noticed them at all. Mass media quickly discovered that war scientists made good copy. The popularization of intellectuals was underway. It has continued ever since and, of course, broadened rapidly to include men working in many fields other than science.

No reasonable person can deny that high intelligence is better than low intelligence, that mental training is socially useful, or that the best products of human cerebration are preferable to unthinking medocrity. Because these things cannot be denied, many Americans have long urged that more respect and attention really *ought* to be given to intellectuals.

But perhaps the people who urged this did not fully realize what the change might mean. For intellectuals are not simply people who are smarter or better educated than other people (in fact, they are sometimes neither). Intellectuals are people who do particular kinds of *work* and who, therefore, have had particular kinds of training and job experiences. They frequently share opinions and think of themselves as belonging to a unique group. Sometimes they even display a very human desire to gain practical political power.[2]

The intellectual's product is ideas. If we reflect on it, we realize that in respect to human affairs his ideas are very often new criticisms of the social, economic and political *status quo*. In the nature of the case, his ideas must be new if they are to be salable to colleagues, to students, or to academic publications. There is little demand, especially in the popularized academic marketplace, for a carefully balanced restatement of an argument which is correct but old. Except in the physical sciences, it is unfortunately not always required that a man's ideas be rigorously tested and proven correct in the crucible of experience.

There are many reasons why the new ideas he creates are so often criticisms of the human *status quo*. To attack an alleged evil attracts attention and sympathy, it increases personal influence, and it appears to result from a very good motive—the desire to make life better. Finally, just as James Bond was licensed to kill, everyone knows that the intellectual is licensed to criticize.

The late Harvard economist, Joseph Schumpeter, wrote that the intellectual group in general "cannot help nibbling, because it lives on criticism and its whole position depends on criticism that stings" . . .[3]

The enhanced respect given to the intellectual has had real public consequences. First, because he is listened to more and since his basic product is criticism, Americans are hearing more criticism of their society. In newspapers, television, magazines, books, and on campuses, professors and other writers declaim on the shortcomings of American life, American foreign policy, American business, and, indeed, American morality.

Second, there are now so many intellectuals, or would-be intellectuals, that they have become a political constituency in the same sense, for example, that ethnic groups, religious groups, and veterans' organizations are. Politicians consciously try to win votes among them, just as they do among Poles, or Baptists, or American Legionnaires. Some politicians tailor their programs and planks to the beliefs and wishes of intellectuals. Politicians also remember that television producers and newspaper editorial writers now listen carefully to intellectuals.

---

[2] An excellent recent discussion of this possibility is Irving Kristol, "American Intellectuals and Foreign Policy," *Foreign Affairs*, July 1967, pp. 594–609.

[3] Joseph Schumpeter, *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*, New York: Harper, 1947 p. 151. See, in general, his discussion of "The Sociology of the Intellectual," p. 145f. Professor Edward C. Banfield has observed that "The premium of scholarship for a professor is all too often originality—not correctness. A politician or businessman must pay a price for being wrong; the academic never does. The college professor has no knowledge of what people want now, or what they are going to want; he deals in generalities, and there is no way of applying a general theory to a unique event. I think it's a national tragedy that people in decision-making roles turn over to intellectuals or computers the right to make decisions. And it's bad for scholarship, too. A good professor is a bastard perverse enough to think about what *he* thinks is important, not what government thinks is important." *Life*, June 6, 1967, p. 57.

Third, and partly for this reason, politicians are recruiting more intellectuals out of academic life and placing them in government operating positions. However they may perform in these jobs, the long-run effect is to lend additional weight to the general intellectual criticisms of "the way things are".

The fourth change I wish to treat is the improvement in the lives of many American Negroes. While it remains significantly below that of whites, their average per capita income has at least doubled since 1945. The civil rights movement, successive federal civil rights laws, and a combination of very practical political and economic pressures have helped many Negroes.

All reasonable people have sought to improve the Negro's condition. The painful irony of the Negro's situation is this: Improvements have replaced hopelessness with hope, hope has stimulated action, but some of that action has, in the last three years, been directed against the very system that produced the improvements.

The civil rights movement had at least three shortcomings. At its high point, it was essentially a Southern activity, aimed at correcting perceived injustices in the South. While much of the federal legislation it produced was politically popular with Northern Negroes, it had practical effect only in parts of the South.

Second, the goals of the movement were largely middle-class goals. Middle-class Negroes who already *had* jobs and homes tried to achieve some of the amenities of American life: Better education, the dignity that would come from integration, the right to form an effective voting bloc.

These objectives did not mean very much to some of the poorest Negroes in the Northern cities. They did not have decent jobs or decent housing, and whether they knew it or not, their greatest immediate need was money.

After the original goals of the movement had been achieved, it began to lose momentum. Some middle-class Negroes lost interest. Many of them, and certainly most whites, enjoyed increasing prosperity through the 'sixties.

Third, the civil rights movement broke old laws as it tried to force passage of new laws. While the tactic worked, it did little to increase respect for the idea of obeying the law.

Thus, maybe in the eyes of the poorest Negroes, things began to look something like this: Everyone was getting richer except them, whites and middle-class Negroes did not care about them, the politicians kept talking about things getting better but things never did, the civil rights movement broke some laws and it looked like that got results for some people. Maybe some other kind of direct action would get results.

We have seen the flaming manifestation of this kind of thinking in the last three summers. The old civil rights activity has largely disappeared. An entirely different kind of Negro, from an entirely different way of life, has made his presence known by looting, burning, and occasionally creating some very dangerous organizations.

The paradox was that as things got better for most people, this very fact increasingly irritated those at the bottom who did not care much about the idea of law and order anyway. It would be redundant to list the damage that has been done to our orderly processes of government and politics.

The final change to discuss is the rise of television. The total number of television sets in the United States jumped from 10,000 in 1946 to over 74,000,000 today. While Gutenberg's revolution (the invention of movable type and, hence, of cheap printing) took several hundred years to complete, the comparable television revolution occurred in an astounding fifteen years.

It may seem surprising to give television the same weight as the other presumably far more basic social changes. But there is much hidden in Marshall McLuhan's epigram: "The medium is the message." Television is so important because it has so dramatically told Americans the stories of postwar American life (and the Vietnam War). The drama has amplified the consequences of the stories. Consider the fact that stories like these have never before been told with such great emotional power to so many people.

Television tells stories directly. The stories overwhelm television editors and newsmen. The most experienced television news editors cannot overcome the emotional impact of ten seconds of film. Mere words go unnoticed beside the films of fire hoses and police dogs turned against Alabama civil rights demonstrators, of university "teach-ins", of GI's being killed and wounded in Vietnam, or of the funeral procession of the first American president to die in the television age.

In contrast to newspaper journalism, it is far harder for a television editor to balance a story, to moderate it, or to "tell the other side." There *is* no way to balance the emotional impact of these ten seconds of film. The viewer says to himself, "I saw it happen." Equally dramatic pictures showing "the other side" of most stories just do not exist. The television counterpart of the newspaper copy editor cannot say, "I've seen this all before" and relegate the story to page fourteen.

But, like newspaper journalism, television journalism still must define news as that which is new, unusual, emotionally compelling, or different. Thus, the country receives powerful amplification of events that are different, unusual, strange, frightening, or bizarre.

The cumulative effect of television is huge and only beginning to be understood. Great numbers of people absorb most of their public affairs impressions from it. Television has always been the major source of breaking news in the lives of people twenty-five years old or less. Millions of Americans are daily seeing raw events immediately and starkly. The events may be only a part of a battle, a contrived civil rights demonstration, or a planned campus absurdity. But the explanation, the counter-argument, the facts that place the dramatic film in perspective are seldom available until tomorrow's program—when they, in turn, are overshadowed by tomorrow's fresh news.

I think one result is quick politics. People are quickly forming strong emotional reactions to events and to public officials. One could argue that since television, more emotionally charged opinions are held by more people on more subjects; more people draw conclusions before they have enough facts. Public passions run higher.

When asked if agitators took part in a big city riot, one experienced newspaperman replied, "Television is the agitator." He may have been right. The pictures could not show why it was happening or what it would lead to. But a summer of pictures had shown *what* was happening now. Maybe they moved some people out into the streets.

At a time when our domestic problems are more tangled, and our foreign affairs far more perilous, television may be inducing Americans to make increasingly hasty and oversimplified judgments.

Finally, television publicizes the results of the other changes I have mentioned.

III

The combined social changes we have considered have produced an enormous amount of social criticism. Of course, there have always been critics and generally they have helped the country to keep its balance. But it is probably safe to say that at no previous time have so many Americans—from all walks of life—been exposed to so much searching criticism of so many fundamental aspects of our civilization.

I submit that things are *not* in fact worse than ever before. In many respects they are better than ever before. I submit that what has actually happened is that more people are getting more attention when they *say* that things are worse. While not minimizing the very real difficulties we face, I suggest that a large part of what is wrong with America is a state of mind produced by constantly reiterated criticism.

You might ask, why talk about the critics? Why not just try to solve the problems they identify? To which I answer, of course, we must try to solve the problems. The country was built by solving problems. Most of us make our livings solving problems. But part of the basic point is that the critics make their livings criticizing. *They will always discover new things to criticize faster than we can discover new solutions.* And changing America now produces new critics at an accelerating rate.

I believe the net effect is damaging.

For example, whether or not one believes that the United States had a real choice when we committed a significant army to Vietnam in 1961, an informed man cannot deny that trying either to win that war or to negotiate a conclusion to it are made infinitely more difficult by the criticism directed against the American government by Americans. Begun by some professors and news media, then taken up by a handful of senators, the critics now even include some businessmen. Our foreign adversaries take this criticism to mean that we are irresolute and that our internal dissension can eventually force us to withdraw.

For example, whether or not one believes that the police have occasionally used excessive force, a reasonable man cannot deny that a decade of charges of "police brutality" have injured police morale, created substantial public doubt about all police work, and actually encouraged the lawless. Begun by people who sought prefectly proper goals the criticisms of police were shortly reinforced by politicians with obvious interests. Then they were echoed in the streets—where they could not help but encourage violence.

For example, whether or not one approves of every person in what the critics call the "establishment" leadership of government, business, military, church, labor and education, a thoughtful person cannot deny that many years must now pass before all Americans will confidently accept most decisions of that legitimately selected leadership. Criticism of the "power elite" or the "power structure" began as an abstract academic analysis. It merged with furious criticisms of particular men. The result grew from attacks upon named authorities to rather startling attacks upon the very idea of authority itself.

You may ask, even if all this is true, what relevance does it have for business?

I hope that the answer is clear to each of you—first as citizens and second as businessmen.

Constantly reiterated destructive criticism tends to create a national mood. Right now that mood is bad. The man who is repeatedly told he looks sick may become ill. How much national self-analysis, unnecessary guilt feelings, and harsh criticism of fundamentals can be absorbed without producing a kind of public hypochondria?

The critical mood almost certainly cannot be turned just to the advantage of one political party against the other, or turned to the advantage of any candidate of either party against another. The mood is, to some unknown extent, destructive of all our political institutions.

Its effects almost certainly cannot be confined to domestic affairs. The strains of costly foreign engagements are, in all truth, likely to continue for many years. And make no mistake about it, our foreign opponents are using their greatest skills and energies to turn our self-criticism against us.

Therefore, whatever your personal politics, as citizens you cannot welcome the present deeply critical mood.

Secondly, and on a much less vital level, the mood of national self-criticism can be turned directly against business. It was in the 1930's and it can be again.

Examples of the transition from a generalized criticism to a concrete impact upon business are easy to find. Ralph Nader symbolized a familiar and possibly trite example. Even if one believes—as I do—that the auto industry should have given greater attention to the accident injury problem, one can legitimately question the process by which the mood of some people was converted into a law for all people.

In the 1950's several young intellectuals on the staff of Averell Harriman, then Governor of New York, developed position papers on the auto injury problem. Let one of them tell the story as he remembers it:

"By the mid-1950's it was becoming evident that this overall (government approach to auto safety) problem could not persist. A matter of considerable public interest was in the hands of incompetents or worse. Some protest was inevitable, and it arose, in the natural course of events, among a small group of professional persons—lawyers, doctors, engineers, and public officials. Articles began to appear. *Intellectuals were doing their work.*"

In 1961 he wrote: "It would not appear that the industry is particularly conscious of the fact, but the belief is well established among *intellectually influential circles* in the United States that the automobile manufacturers are essentially indifferent, and sometimes even opposed, to traffic safety measures.[4]

The young man joined the Kennedy Administration (he later took an academic position). He spurred on the politicians, stimulated articles, encourage Nader—then a close associate—and amplified his criticisms through his many journalistic contacts. The result, we recall, was a flurry of newspaper discussion of Nader's book, the television drama of Robert Kennedy challenging Frederic Donner, and a piece of legislation passed in a remarkable hurry.

There are informed people who believe that general public interest in the subject was actually very low at the time the bill was passed.

One does not have to be a defender of the auto industry to suggest that the hastily enacted auto safety legislation will take years to unscramble or even interpret properly. This was a classic case of a generalized criticism being transformed, through some very deft political footwork, into a law whose value honest men may question, a law which was unquestionably adverse to business, all with only a modest amount of direct public involvement. Other examples from other industries will come to your minds.

Professor Schumpeter, whom I quoted earlier, concluded that intellectuals would eventually destroy capitalism. He believed that intellectuals, who after all are heavily subsidized by the business system, would plant widespread public doubts about it. They would, he felt, criticize the workings and propriety of capitalism so much that the voters in western nations would eventually vote to replace the system. One does not have to accept all of his pessimistic theory to recognize the great and growing long-run political power of intellectual criticism.

IV

What can any of this have to do with business contributions to civic, educational, welfare, or charitable activities? My answer is very blunt: Because of these considerations and in its own long-range interest, business should redefine its thinking about contributions. Contributions should cease to have essentially a public relations motive. They should become explicit programs of *vigorous strategic action for business*—not merely individual actions for individual firms, but at times collective actions in response to those who challenge the business system in general.

There are three key words here: vigorous, strategic, and action. By action, I mean that business should make certain that its own people are on the scene when the vital decisions are being made. This does not require that businessmen hold government jobs, for voluntary civic activities still exercise a great influence upon basic social changes. Contributions of money and executive time to them establish and maintain legitimate access to the people and institutions who make the decisions. Except for direct participation in politics itself, business has no better means of influencing the social forces and the criticisms we have discussed.

The second key word is stratigic. This suggests that the day may be gone when corporations can afford to contribute large amounts to all charitable and welfare activities. It may now be necessary to focus much more closely on those few selected activities and organizations which have the closest relationships to vital social changes. My argument suggests that nowadays the most strategically important of them include education—especially at the college and university levels—welfare and charity as they influence the attitudes of youth, and race relations activities of all kinds. If I have correctly identified the more important factors, then it may stand to reason that business should concentrate its efforts where they will count the most.

The final key word is vigorous. This means that businessmen will have to stop avoiding controversy. They must themselves follow their money into some of the most angry and difficult problems the country faces.

Let us be candid about it. Over the years business contributions have been quite bland. Businessmen have sought to give money to causes no one could criticize and have tried to do it in a way objectionable to no one. In the short run, and if the motive was public relations, this seemed to be good practice, for it could anger no potential customer. In the long run, however, avoiding controversy also avoided concrete results. Sometimes it meant that when the chips were down, the business representative was not present at the decisive meeting or, worse, that he remained silent.

My own research in the 1950's showed that, with a few notable exceptions, businessmen avoided race relations civic activities because they were called "too controversial". If the subject was "too controversial" then, a decade ago, what has it become now? I am convinced that business know-how and resources could have helped to prevent what has now become a crisis of sharply polarized attitudes. What will race relations be in another ten years, especially if business executives do not study and deeply involve themselves in the problem we all share? (Study and involvement will require much catching-up. Listening to a few Negro spokesmen—whether militant or moderate—or reading a few books will not suffice.)

Another area in which businessmen should consider taking certain risks is higher education. For example, a contribution to a college might just be accompanied by the mild question: What are the broad social, economic, and political consequences of what you are teaching?

As a former professor, I can think of no single act better calculated to arouse a professor's rage than to ask him if his work is good for the country. While it is barely possible that some silent university president or a harried dean or two might secretly admit, in the privacy of a locked room, that it could be wise to evaluate what is being taught, the tenured professors would surely cry "academic freedom" and a war of words would commence. (One can imagine the headlines in some other newspaper: *"Detroit News* Stifles Academic Freedom", or "Publisher Urges Thought Control".)

But is this not astounding? Is it not remarkable that an activity as vital to the preservation of the nation as higher education should be regarded as almost the exclusive province of the educators? Can we imagine a lawyer saying that only he could define the substance of the law; that judges, legislators, or the public must stay away? Can we imagine a policeman saying that no civilian could question his personal interpretation of the criminal statutes?

The professor has several legitimate answers. One is that while other people provide practical services, the scholar searches for truth. Only the scholar possesses the skills and standards required to test for the truth. Now this is doubtless correct when disconfirming a theory of physics, or identifying the authorship of a sonnet. But it would be nonsense—and probably a contradiction of his own political faith—for a political scientist to declare that he had a monopoly on *political* truth—or on how to discover it.

Another professorial retort is that the scholar must not be harassed for expressing unpopular views. It is just here that the most difficult judgments must be made. Where is the proper boundary between what one man calls "harassment" but another man calls orderly consideration of the goals of higher education? Where is the proper balance to be struck between the scholar's unquestioned need to speculate with impunity and the nation's need for some degree of moral and social cohesiveness?

If we reconsider our own history, we recall that free public secondary education was really *invented* in the United States in order to solve a grave social problem of the 1800's. The problem was to teach masses of immigrant children something of English, of ways to make a living, and of behavior appropriate to Americans. It was a case of designing education to achieve a purpose, then recruiting people to do the educating. Contrast this case with what we sometimes see today; we begin with college professors and design courses and curricula around their professional, personal and—I must add—*political* interests.

By now, you have surely gotten my point. It is very controversial for a citizen to question the substance of the higher education system for which he is partly paying. But does this make sense? Would it not be worthwhile to accept the controversy once in a while?

Corporate contributions to other activities could also be followed by tough questions. When the welfare agency distributes benefits, does it stimulate or discourage job-seeking? How do we really know? Are the recipients actually being induced to adopt middle-class standards of behavior? But is this not partly our goal? Does the program for Negro youth provoke racist attitudes as it tries to build Negro pride? Is this necessary? There are many more questions to be asked.

---

[4] Daniel P. Moynihan, "The War Against the Automobile," *The Public Interest,* Spring 1966. Emphasis added.

Like most Americans, business people have tended not only to avoid controversy but to defer to "experts". In the matters we have considered, this has meant that they have often abandoned their own judgments in favor of those who appeared to possess superior technical knowledge. Thus, professional welfare men, professional educators, professional civic workers, and professional community relations people have guided the substance of programs vital to all of us.

Now a healthy respect for expertise is certainly wise. Surely professional experts are best able to provide technical knowledge of technical matters.

However, business deference to experts in social, economic, and political matters has sometimes gone beyond delegation to abdication. At times businessmen defer to the experts when what is really needed is their own judgment, wisdom, prudence, or a general sense of purpose, direction and propriety.

While it is probably true that only a chemist, for example, is qualified to predict what *will* happen when two reagents are mixed, it is manifestly not true that only an academic socialogist is qualified to express a preference about what *should* happen in a difficult social problem. Quite the contrary, a strong case can be made that people best qualified to set goals for a community are the people most intimately involved in its daily practical life. Obviously it would be arrogant nonsense to suggest that this group is composed solely of businessmen. It includes executives of all sorts: Politicians, government officials, trade union officers, interest group executives, educational administrators, and many more. But it would be equal nonsense to accept the idea that somehow businessmen are not qualified to play a vital part in the question-asking and goal-setting process. They should not retreat from the controversy that really active participation and questioning would produce.

It is time to start asking the questions no one asks. It is time to stop assuming that someone else knows more about what is good for your community than you do.

V

We have seen that unequaled prosperity, huge college enrollments, growing respect for intellectuals, improvements for Negroes, and television have combined to produce a national mood of self-criticism. We have suggested that too much self-criticism can be injurious. We have implied that if the critics and their critscisms are put into proper perspective, and if enough time can elapse, men of good will can solve the problems we face.

At a time in our history when people seem closer to anger, more prone to disagree, and when they are more critical of each other than ever before, we need leadership at least as much as we need criticism. We need people who can calmly synthesize reasoned actions as much as we need analysts of theories. *We need men who can do much more than take ideas apart; we need men who can get people together.*

Businessmen are not, of course, the only ones who fit this description. But they are among those who fit it. Human leadership remains one of the highest of the arts. The successful businessman surely knows something of that art. There is much more he can do in our joint effort to build better communities and a better nation.

THE 1967 SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a letter from Prof. Helen M. Wallace, chairman of the division of maternal and child health at the University of California in Berkeley, commenting on the provisions of H.R. 12080, the Social Security Amendments of 1967.

I feel her comments deserve careful consideration for she is deeply interested and highly qualified in the public health field. In addition to her services at the university, Professor Wallace has served in administrative positions in local programs for mothers and children in the New York City Health Department and for the U.S. Children's Bureau. She has also been active in the American Public Health Association.

Mr. Speaker, Professor Wallace both compliments and constructively criticizes this legislation. I commend her letter to our colleagues' attention by inserting it in the RECORD at this point.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA BERKELEY, SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH,
Berkeley, Calif., September 26 1967.

Hon. JEFFERY COHELAN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to you in regard to some proposed federal legislation and some federal reorganization of services for mothers and children.

My background is relevant to the comments in this letter. I am a certified specialist in both Pediatrics and Public Health. I worked for twelve years in key administrative positions in local programs for mothers and children, including handicapped children, in the New York City Health Department. I have been the Chairman of the Department of Preventive Medicine in a medical school in New York City. I was at one time on the staff of the U.S. Children's Bureau. I have held elective and appointive positions in the American Public Health Association, and have served on advisory committees to programs in the federal government and to a number of voluntary agencies serving the handicapped.

My specific comments for your consideration are as follows:

1. H.R. 12080 has a number of desirable features in it

(*a*) The provisions of additional funds for the extension and improvement of general health services for mothers and children.

(*b*) The consolidating into a single program of the programs for Maternal and Child Health and Crippled Children, and the eventual inclusion of Programs of Maternity and Infant Care, of Children and Youth, and for Dental Care.

(*c*) The support of programs designed to recruit and train professional personnel, and subprofessional aides.

(*d*) The support of programs of research in the field of Maternal and Child Health and to Crippled Children. Training of competent personnel to conduct such research is essential.

(*e*) The emphasis on training for productive employment of adult family members receiving public assistance.

(*f*) The provision of day care for children of working mothers.

H.R. 12080 does have several detrimental provisions or limitations in it, which need further consideration:

1. The fact that it combines appropriations for maternal and child health and crippled childrens programs, while the recent reorganization within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare separates the administration of these programs.

2. There is need to require that steps be taken to assure *high quality* care of children and youth under Title 19 programs. Our observations indicate that while the cost of Title 19 programs is likely to increase, there have been no safeguards developed to assure that the children and youth will receive the kinds and quality of services needed, such as has been provided in the past by the Crippled Children Programs under the Childrens Bureau.

3. The restriction in the latest draft of H.R. 12080, placing a limitation on the proportion of children who can be included in AFDC (Aid To Families With Dependent Children) Programs. If we truly believe that children represent the future of our country, it is inconceivable that some of the children from the most deprived families requiring the most assistance will be intentionally prevented from securing it.

The situation in regard to the reorganization of federal services for mothers and children is even more distressing.

1. I believe that MCH (Maternal and Child Health) and CC (Crippled Childrens) Services are inseparable at the *local* level, where one delivers care to mothers and children. MCH and CC Services are intertwined to primary and secondary prevention, in providing continuous health supervision to stimulate case finding of handicapped children and in providing continuous health supervision to provide long term care of handicapped children. Also, school health services provide health care to "well children", children suspected of health problems, and handicapped children. To separate MCH and CC Services means the likelihood of fragmentation and some duplication.

2. I believe at the federal level there is need for one strong centralized agency which will be *the* health and social agency for mothers and children, and will be the spokesman for mothers and children of our country. I believe that the reorganization will weaken rather than strengthen this.

3. I believe that the reorganization at the federal level is practically impossible to implement at state and local levels. For example, in 34 States of our Country, CC (Crippled Childrens) Programs are located in and administered by State health departments. In most of these, the State MCH Director is also the State CC Director. How can one possibly anticipate a smooth functioning of state and local programs, under this proposed reorganization?

I understand that these questions and issues have evoked a large number of reactions and responses from all parts of our country. Based on this, it would appear that much more thought, deliberation, and study of these and other aspects are strongly indicated before any further decisions are made. If I can be of any service in regard to this, please feel free to call upon me.

Sincerely,

HELEN M. WALLACE, M.D.,
Professor and Chairman, Division of Material and Civil Health.

ARAB NATICNS COMMITTING ATROCITIES AGAINST JEWS

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Farbstein] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, while the chiefs of the Arab nations complain piteously of the fate that has befallen them as a consequence of their own aggression, they are themselves committing atrocities against mankind, the likes of which the world has not seen since the days of Nazi Germany. The Arabs are taking out their frustrations against the Jewish minorities that live in their own countries. The victims are Jews who had absolutely nothing to do with the recent Arab-Israel war. I feel that our own Government has given insufficient attention to this inhuman behavior. In an effort to be fair to all the parties in the recent war, our Government has somehow seen fit to pay no attention to the atrocities committed by one of the parties.

I am inserting into the Record a report of the statement from the Chief Rabbinate of Israel which describes this brutality, and I implore our Government to come to the aid of these innocent Jews, so that they may once again live in peace.

The Chief Rabbinate of Israel appealed today "to the conscience of all mankind" to demand an end to "the the reign of black terror" that has been unleashed against the Jews in several Arab countries and for which the governments of those countries are held directly responsible.

The appeal, signed by Chief Rabbi Isser Untermann, will be distributed to thousands of churchmen, public figures and heads of humanitarian agencies. It details the "daily torture, beatings and humiliations" suffered by Jewish citizens of the Arab countries, often at the hands of former Nazis.

"All Jewish men in Egypt have been imprisoned, including the seriously ill," the Chief Rabbinate declared. "In Cairo harsh restrictions have been imposed upon Jews who have not been imprisoned. Those that are imprisoned have had their hands and ribs broken, their hair shaven and their eyebrows pulled out. In some cases they are in the custody of ex-Nazis who have found a haven in Egypt.

"Synagogues have been seized and prayers proscribed. The Chief Rabbi of Alexandria is in prison and Cairo's Chief Rabbi is under house arrest as is the president of the Ashkenazi Jewish community. In Syria, Jewish quarters have been attacked by mobs and a curfew has been imposed on the ghettos which are threatened with starvation. Damascus Jews have been thrown out of their homes which have been given to Palestinians. In Iraq, dozens of Jews have been arrested on trumped up charges of spying for Israel and police have extorted money from Jews. The secret police has begun to threaten Jews with expropriating and murder."

"The severe loss of life, liberty and property sustained by Jews," the Chief Rabbinate's statement continued, "are the direct result of governmental responsibility. Attempts by international agencies to halt or a least modify the reign of terror have been contemptuously rebuffed by the Arab governments concerned. Therefore," the Chief Rabbinate stated, "we direct this passionate appeal from Jerusalem to the conscience of all mankind to raise its voice and demand instant action to stamp out this inhuman, cruel and uncivilized wave of oppression directed against our people by governments that give lip-service to the United Nations Charter."

THE FREEZING OF MILITARY CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS AND CIVILIAN CONSTRUCTION AWARDS BY DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Hébert] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, the actions by the Department of Defense which froze military construction contracts and the order from the Secretary of the Army which froze civilian construction awards affects every Member of this distinguished body.

For that reason, I would like to present in detail the facts which I brought out at a press conference on Wednesday, October 11, relative to this issue.

I called the press conference as a result of the colloquy which occurred between Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara and me when he testified before the House Armed Services Committee last Tuesday to explain why these contracts have been frozen.

I insert here in the Record the content of my press conference which will speak for itself, beginning with my statement:

October 11, 1967.

Statement of F. Edward Hébert, Democrat of Louisiana

Ladies and Gentlemen: Yesterday, during the appearance of Secretary McNamara before the House Armed Services Committee, I engaged in a colloquy with the Secretary in which I stated that the Secretary "by a devious approach, gave instructions to the Corps of Engineers relating to civil works projects." (P. 24)

These instructions resulted in the suspension until further notice of all contract awards on new civil works construction.

Secretary McNamara flatly contradicted my statement and challenged me to present any evidence which would support my allegation.

Secretary McNamara disclaimed any knowledge whatsoever of the suspension order on the public works program by saying—"I don't have the authority to take such action. I am not responsible for it."

The Secretary further stated that the field of civil works not only lies outside his area of responsibility but is one "entirely outside of my field, under law . . . I have no legal responsibility for it and no knowledge and experience with respect to it." "In the seven years I have never discussed the civil functions with any Secretary of the Army. . . . The law is very clear. The Secretary of Defense has no responsibility in that area. I pay no attention to it."

In short, the Secretary of Defense disclaimed any legal responsibility in this area and therefore maintained that he was totally unaware of this action by the Secretary of the Army and said—

"The first I knew of action in that field was when I read it in the newspaper."

Now, I wish to point out why I reached what I consider an all together "reasonable conclusion" that the Secretary of Defense was a party to this public works action.

(a) Contrary to the categorical statements of Secretary McNamara, he is not precluded by law from jurisdiction over the civil functions of the Secretary of the Army. As a matter of fact, quite the contrary is true. In that connection, I would like to read a legal opinion relative to the power and authority of the Secretary of Defense:

"NATIONAL SECURITY ACT OF 1947

"Office of the Secretary of Defense,
"Washington, D.C., March 27, 1953.

"Legal opinion re the power and authority of the Secretary of Defense

"At your request, we have considered the scope, quality and degree of the power and authority of the Secretary of Defense with respect to all officers, organizations and agencies of the Department of Defense, including the respective Secretaries of the military departments, the Joint Chiefs of Staff and all other officials, officers and personnel of the Department as a whole and of all constituent parts thereof.

"We have examined all pertinent statutes, the legislative hearings, debates and reports leading up to the enactment of the National Security Act and to the subsequent amendments thereof, basic documents in the delineation of responsibilities within the Department, such as the Key West and Newport papers, numerous studies, opinions, reports and commentaries on the subject matter and various views on the operation of the Department by individuals familiar therewith, including the letter to the President by Secretary Lovett of November 18, 1952.

"Conclusion

"In our opinion, the Secretary of Defense now has by statute full and complete authority, subject only to the President and certain specific restrictions subsequently herein listed, over the Department of Defense, all its agencies, subdivisions, and personnel. To make this statement perfectly plain, there are no separately administered preserves in the Department of Defense. The Secretaries of the military departments, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, all officers and agencies and all other personnel of the Department are 'under' the Secretary of Defense. Congress has delegated to the Secretary of Defense not only all the authority and power normally given the head of an executive department, but Congress has, in addition, expressly given the Secretary of Defense even greater power when it made the Secretary of Defense 'the principal Assistant to the President in all matters relating to the Department of Defense.'

"To repeat, subject to the President and certain express prohibitions against specifically described actions on the part of the Secretary as contained in the National Security Act, as amended, the power and authority of the Secretary of Defense is complete and supreme. It blankets all agencies and all organizations within the Department; it is superior to the power of all other officers thereof; it extends to all affairs and all activities of the Department; and all other authorities and responsibilities must be exercised in consonance therewith.

"Discussion

"It is always possible for individuals who do not agree with the purposes and intent of a statute to engage in semantic sophistry and to try to squeeze unintended meanings out of words. Many have done so in connection with the power and authority of the Secretary of Defense. Statutory interpretation is not an esoteric pursuit reserved for word-splitters. It is not a game of words. It involves nothing more than a straightforward and direct effort to ascertain the intent of the lawmakers. With respect to the National Security Act, the congressional intent is clear and unmistakable. Nothing more is necessary.

"Since this congressional intent is clear, word splitting should be stopped. It is most difficult, perhaps impossible, to write law so as to preclude the possibility of some individual bent upon intellectual gymnastics from raising some semantic argument. The courts have repeatedly disregarded that approach and sought the statutory intent.

"The National Security Act clearly establishes and determines that the power of the Secretary of Defense is of the highest order of magnitude in the Department of Defense. The law does this in such manner and with such finality as to eliminate any reasonable doubt. The statute accomplishes this in three ways.

"First, the law designates the Secretary of Defense as the 'head of an executive department of the Government.' This phrase 'head of an executive department of the Government' was not a chance expression. It is a phrase of 'legal art.' Since July 28, 1789, this terminology has always been used by Congress in the statutes defining the responsibility and authority of the chief officer of each executive department. The phrase 'head of an executive department of the Government' describes the highest order of authority and responsibility in an executive department. In the vernacular, this phrase means 'boss.' For instance, the complete authority of the Attorney General of the United States over the Department of Justice depends on this phrase alone.

"This phrase 'head of the department' carries with it in tradition and in law certain well-recognized connotations. By custom and by usage the 'head of the executive department' is a member of the Cabinet of the President, and as such, is the officer of the department most closely associated with the source of supreme power. In law, the 'head of the executive department,' is the one, among all officers in the entire establishment, who may prescribe regulations for the governance of the whole department. The basic statute of 1789 provides that the 'head of the department' (and this refers to all departments) has the power to: 'prescribe regulations for the government of the department, the conduct of its officers and clerks, the distribution and performance of its business, and the custody, use and preservation of the records, papers, and property appertaining to it.'

"Such regulations, when not contrary to a specific prohibition of law, of themselves have the force and effect of law. Therefore, the regulations of the head of the department legally bind under oath all officers and employees of the department of whatsoever authority, rank, or station. This right to govern the department appertains to no other officer save the one designated as the 'head.' In the Department of Defense only the Secretary of Defense by law is 'the head thereof' and has the general right to govern the Department of Defense.

"Second, the National Security Act, as amended, specifically states that the Secretary of Defense shall have 'direction, authority and control over the Department of Defense.' Originally, the statute contained the word 'general' in front of these three words of command. In the period 1947–49, this word 'general' was seized upon by some to argue that the drafters of the statute had intended to limit the authority of the Secretary of Defense. Such argument was obviously without substance, but to make their intent doubly clear, Congress in 1949 struck out the word 'general.' The words 'direction, authority and control' are clear enough by themselves, but to make doubt impossible, Chairman Vinson, of the House Armed Services Committee, stated in the congressional debates as follows:

"'This sentence giving the Secretary direction, authority and control is the heart of this legislation. * * * In order that there can be no doubt as to what direction, authority and control mean, I want to give you their meaning.

"'Direction means the act of governing, management, superintends.

"'Authority means legal power; a right to command; the right and power of a public officer to require obedience to his order lawfully issued in the scope of his public duties.

"'Control means power or authority to manage, to direct, superintend, regulate, direct, govern, administer, or oversee.

"'So under this law the Secretary of Defense is to have clear-cut authority to run the Department of Defense.'

"After such legislative history, can anyone honestly doubt the congressional intent? If the Secretary of Defense has the power to 'govern, manage and superintend'; if he has the 'legal power to command and to require obedience to his lawful commands'; if he has the power to 'regulate, to administer and to oversee'; and if this power is specifically by its terms extended throughout the Department of Defense, as it is, then, the Secretary of Defense has supreme authority in the Department of Defense and his power is of the highest order of magnitude therein.

"Third, Congress in the National Security Act made the Secretary of Defense 'the principal assistant to the President in all matters relating to the Department of Defense.' These are words of potent authority, for, the President under the Constitution is the Commander in Chief. And, the Secretary of Defense is thus made the Commander in Chief's deputy in all matters relating to the Department. The legislative history of this provision also shows beyond the possibility of challenge that Congress was well aware of the distinctive constitutional command relationships between the President and certain officers in the Department of Defense. Under this power, then, the Secretary of Defense is the highest military officer of the Department.

"The fact that statutes have been passed subsequent to the 1949 amendments to the National Security Act which statutes confer specific auhorities on a Secretary of a particular military department or other subordinate officer of the Department does not detract from the supreme authority of the Secretary of Defense. Once supreme authority is established it need not be repeatedly mentioned. On the contrary, it would require a most specific and emphatic statement to restrict or detract from the supreme authority conferred on the Secretary of Defense in the basic statute, the National Security Act, as amended.

"Limitations on the supreme power of the Secretary of Defense are few and are specifically cataloged in the National Security Act. They are—

"(1) The Secretary of Defense may not exercise his power so as to transfer, reassign, abolish, or consolidate the combatant functions of the military services. The scope and definition of what is meant by 'combatant function' are carefully spelled out in the law. Congress did not intend that such scope be enlarged or diminished by reading into the statute what is not specifically there.

"(2) The Secretary of Defense may not indirectly accomplish what is directly forbidden in the first paragraph by either:

"(a) detailing or assigning personnel, or

"(b) directing the expenditure of funds.

"(3) The Secretary of Defense cannot merge the three military departments or deprive the Secretaries of those departments of their legal right to administer their organizations, subject to his power and authority.

"This prohibition is reinforced by the affirmative provision that 'the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force shall be separately administered by their respective Secretaries under the direction, authority and control of the Secretary of Defense.' The argument that the words 'separately administered' detract from the 'direction, authority, and control' of the Secretary of Defense is without substance on its face and obviously is contrary to congressional intent. 'Separately administered' simply means that the Secretary of Defense cannot exercise his supreme power so as to destroy the separate entities of the three military departments, or deny them the right to operate in the spheres assigned to them by the law, or deprive their respective Secretaries of their top administrative position over their respective departments.

"(4) The Secretary of Defense cannot use his legal power to establish a single commander of all the Armed Forces; an operating military supreme command over the Armed Forces; or a supreme Armed Forces general staff. This prohibition on the exercise of the Secretary's power and authority is expressed in two places in the National Security Act. It is provided for in the preamble to the statute and in a phrase to the effect that the Secretary may not 'establish a military staff.'

"The legislative history of the statute shows unmistakably that the prohibition 'he shall not establish a military staff' was never intended by the Congress to operate as a limitation on the power of the Secretary of Defense to establish in his own office such staff units or agencies as he felt might be necessary to assist him in carrying out any responsibilities to him under law. The Secretary of Defense has full power, expressly granted in the law, to set up such units and to staff them with either civilian or military personnel as he chooses. Everyone familiar with the background and legislative history of the National Security Act knows just what Congress meant by the term 'military staff.' The general staff type of military control, as it existed in Germany, has been explained, defined, and attacked in Congress often enough. That form of military staff is completely different from the employment by the Secretary of assistants, either as individuals or grouped into organized units, to advise and assist him. There is no limitation upon the type of problem or subject matter which the Secretary may assign to such assistants or units. Such problems, in the Secretary's discretion, may involve engineering, standardization, weapons evaluation, program review, physical audits and inspections, or whatever else the Secretary may choose.

"(5) The Secretary of Defense may not transfer, reassign, abolish, or consolidate a specific function assigned by the National Security Act or some other law to another officer or organizational segment of the Department, unless he first reports his intended action to the Armed Services Committees of the Congress. It should be noted that only a report, not prior approval, is required.

"This language clearly presupposes that the Secretary of Defense, as head of the Department of Defense, has the authority to transfer, reassign, abolish, or consolidate functions within the Department, as long as the Secretary does not violate one of the above specified limitations upon his general power.

"(6) The following provision of the law is not really a limitation on the power of the Secretary of Defense, namely the provision that nothing in the statute shall be construed: 'to prevent a Secretary of a military department or a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff from presenting to the Congress, on his own initiative, after first so informing the Secretary of Defense, any recommendation relating to the Department of Defense that he may deem proper.

"This provision needs no further elaboration.

"The six foregoing limitations are all the specific restrictions placed upon the supreme power of the Secretary of Defense to exercise full and complete control over the Department of Defense.

"There remains for discussion only one further question, Does the fact that various laws, some passed after the enactment of the National Security Act, vest specific statutory authorities in subordinate officers of the

Department in any way impair the supreme authority of the Secretary of Defense.

"These laws vesting specific statutory authorities in subordinate officers of the Department in no way impair the supreme authority of the Secretary over the Department. This is true irrespective of the time of passage of such laws.

"General provisions of supreme authority do not have to be repeated. As each executive department of the Federal Government has its own statutory head, its own internal administrative command structure, its separate statutory authorities, duties, and responsibilities and its individual traditions, customs, and usages, so also has the Department of Defense been cut from the same cloth. Presidential executive power flows over the separate independent departments and establishments of the Federal Government, is superior to, yet permeates the whole. So also the executive authority, direction, and control of the Secretary of Defense flows over the agencies and organizations of the Department of Defense. No one at this date in our constitutional history would seriously advance the argument that because specific laws vest particular duties and responsibilities in the heads of executive departments, therefore the President does not have and cannot exercise supreme executive power over the entire fabric. The power of the Secretary of Defense is in the same relative position.

"In the study of the theory of executive power in the Government, it is quite normal and customary to find that powers of different magnitude are frequently exercised in the same area at the same time. This is true even though the power of one order of magnitude is derived from a specific law, whereas the power of the higher order of magnitude relies upon the words of general import or even upon the structure of the organization itself. There is nothing inherently strange, alien, or difficult in the concept of orders of magnitude in executive power in the Federal Government. Such orders do not mutually exclude each other nor do they operate in specific corners or tiny segments. They operate together. The higher order, however, when it is exercised in a given area, is supreme and overrides the lower order. Insofar as the power of the Secretary of Defense is concerned, there is no legal significance in the fact that various laws have been enacted from time to time vesting specific authorities in subordinate officers of the Department. The time of passage of these laws is of no importance.

"Summary

"To summarize, we are of the opinion that the National Security Act, as amended, grants to the Secretary of Defense supreme power and authority to run the affairs of the Department of Defense and all its organizations and agencies. We believe that the power of the Secretary of Defense extends to all matters arising in the Department of whatsoever kind or nature; that the statute provides that the power and authority of the Secretary are superior to the authorities posesssed by any other official, officer, or member of the Department; that the Secretary's power in the Department is the superior power inrrespective of when or how any other individual's power was derived. The limitations on the exercise of the Secretary's power are only six and they are specifically defined. These limitations have been discussed in detail herein. We do not believe they were intended by the Congress to go beyond what we have outlined.

"H. Struve Hensel,
"Counsel for the Committee on Department of Defense Organization.
"Roger Kent,
"General Counsel.
"Frank X. Brown,
"Assistant General Counsel (Departmental Programs)."

(b) The Secretary of Defense himself had previously acknowledged the existence of his responsibilities in this area by specifically delegating to the Secretary of the Army the "civil functions activities of the Corps of Engineers."

I will now read the Secretary's memorandum dated May 9, 1961:

"The Secretary of Defense,
"Washington, D.C., May 9, 1961.

"Memorandum for: Secretary of the Army.

"Subject: Delegation of Authority for Administration of Civil Functions Activities, Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army.

"Pursuant to the authority vested in the Secretary of Defense by Section 202(f) of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended, and Section 5 of Reorganization Plan No. 6 of 1953, the authorities and functions vested in the Secretary of Defense by law, including Title IV, National Security Act of 1947, as amended, relating to the Civil Functions Activities of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, are hereby delegated to the Secretary of the Army.

"Robert S. McNamara."

(c) The news release to the Press announcing the action of the Secretary of the Army suspending civil works construction was issued through the Department of Defense.

I now present this release:

"Office of Assistant Secretary
of Defense (Public Affairs),
"Washington, D.C., October 5, 1967.

"NEWS RELEASE

"The following information concerns U.S. Army Engineers Civil Works functions only.

"At the direction of the Secretary of the Army, the Chief of Engineers has directed all Division Engineers to suspend advertising and award of all new civil works construction until further notice.

"The order is effective immediately.

"Bids will not be opened until further notice on work which already has been advertised. Where bids have been opened, contractors will be asked to extend acceptance dates until October 23. New commitments in civil works research and development and new civil works hiring also will be suspended.

"The suspension does not affect operation and maintenance.

"No dollar figures or lists of locations affected are available immediately."

CONCLUSION

In summary, I think you will agree with me that any reasonable man would conclude that the Secretary of the Army would certainly apprise the Secretary of Defense of a pending action of this magnitude since it is clear that the Secretary of Defense, regardless of his delegation of authority, continues to have ultimate responsibility and concern with this subject matter.

In short, the Secretary of Defense can disclaim any knowledge of this action, but he certainly can not disclaim responsibility for it.

TRANSPORTATION ACT

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Patten] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring to the attention of this body an editorial which appeared in the Trenton Sunday Times Advertiser, expressing the reaction of that newspaper to a recent action of the House Appropriations Committee. I think Members of this body should be aware that in the northeast corridor there is a great concern about the improvement of ground transportation and the need for the Federal Government to support research and development to find new solutions for its improvement.

Strange "Economizing"

The cries for economy in Congress take on an ironic sound in the aftermath of the Senate's action approving $142 million to subsidize the development of a supersonic transport plane. Earlier the House, where the budget-cutters are even more vociferous, had approved the same sum.

The SST, in the words of one of its critics, Sen. Robert F. Kennedy, D–N.Y., will permit "one percent of our population to get to Paris in four hours instead of six." And the sonic boom it will create will probably limit its use to over-water routes exclusively. Nevertheless, Boeing Aircraft, the plane's developer, wants it; a host of potential subcontractors want it; the airlines want it; and the Johnson administration and Congress persist in pouring money into it.

The same bill included funds for a far more significant—and far less costly—program than the SST. This is the high-speed ground transportation research program, which seeks to find ways of moving large numbers of people swiftly and efficiently on the surface, thereby helping relieve the urban areas of the growing congestion of auto traffic below and commercial air traffic overhead. To the Senate's credit, it voted to restore all but $1.7 million of the $8.3 million slashed from this program by the House, although it is too bad the Senate could not bring itself to fully fund the intriguing auto-train demonstration project.

A share of the credit for the Senate's action goes to New Jersey Transportation Commissioner David J. Goldberg, who delivered a personal plea for the fund restoration before a Senate appropriations subcommittee. It is important now that, in the House-Senate conference on the appropriations bill, the Senate conferees insist on retaining the ground-transit funds. To cut them—while retaining the $142 million for the SST—would constitute an incredible botching of priorities.

SHE GIVES POVERTY RACKET A MORE SUNNY VISTA

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Fraser] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, a truly heartening and revealing story about a VISTA project in the Nashville, Tenn., area appeared in the Minneapolis Star on October 12, and I would like to share it with my distinguished colleagues. One of the young VISTA volunteers discussed in the article is Miss Joyce Hewitt, of Walnut Grove, Minn. As described by the Star's editorial editor, George L. Peterson, Miss Hewitt—know as "Sunny" to her poverty neighborhood friends—is making a meaningful personal contribution to success in the war on poverty.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that many of my colleagues, including those who harbor the notion that antipoverty projects contribute to violence, will take the trouble to read Mr. Peterson's excellent article, which I insert at this point in the RECORD:

SHE GIVES POVERTY POCKET A MORE SUNNY VISTA

(By George L. Peterson)

NASHVILLE, TENN.—When the Vista girl from Minnesota, clad in a yellow outfit and usual bright smile, rode her Honda to her assignment in a poor Negro suburb last spring the young folks asked her name.

"Joyce Hewitt," she announced.

"It don't fit," one said, and all agreed. Let's call her Sunny."

That not only fit—it stuck. So Sunny she is to 123 admiring Negro families in a pocket of poverty called Providence, just outside Nashville.

The daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth Hewitt of rural Walnut Grove, Minn., interrupted her education at the University of Minnesota (psychology and pre-med) to join VISTA (Volunteers in Service to America), domestic counterpart of the Peace Corps. She was sent to Atlanta, Ga., for indoctrination, then on to Nashville.

Soon she was joined in her Providence project by Linda Robinson, a medical secretary on a year's leave from her Philadelphia job with Scott Paper Co. Commuting from Nashville proved a time-consuming chore, so they moved into half of a double bungalow on Alice Road, a rocky path up a steep hill bordered by shacks where women sit on the porch and look into space.

What are the white girls doing in Providence? Teaching people to read and write for one thing. Mr. Gray, at age 76, could do neither. Sunny started tutoring him this summer and now he can make out simple words in his Bible, and write laboriously, "I love Jesus."

The girls prod youngsters—prone to truancy from inadequate neighborhood schools—to catch up with their classmates. Particularly ill-equipped are some of the Negro children thrust suddenly into integrated schools.

Most exciting undertaking for the entire community is a recreational center for which the cement blocks and other materials already have been gathered. Construction is scheduled for next month, mostly with donated labor, and then the activities now crowded into the girls' apartment will have permanent shelter.

Providence startled and warmed me when I spent a day with Sunny and Linda. Of the 123 families, about half have no visible fathers. Yet children abound—up to a dozen per house. Almost no one is on relief. Mothers and older girls work as domestics at $6 a day. The men are laborers mostly, some skilled in the building trades. A few sell produce on the highway that cuts through the settlement.

Only a couple of the dwellings boast indoor plumbing, and one of these belongs to George Davis. He obviously could afford to live elsewhere but he likes the camaraderie and the rough yet attractive terrain of Providence. He and Sunny and Linda have revived the Providence Progressive Civic Club, which long had planned for the recreational center, then ran out of steam.

Mr. and Mrs. Davis were holding a fish fry to raise funds for the center. Never have I eaten better prepared food—a big slab of fish, hush puppies, French fried potatoes, cole slaw. Price: 65 cents. Davis and the girls figured they had in hand about $400 of the $1,500 cash needed for the wiring, plumbing and other items for the new building.

Somebody in Nashville suggested that federal funds could be found for the structure. "Nothing doing," said the club officials. The people of Providence want a stake in the center. "Then we'll be more likely to keep things going when Sunny and Linda leave," Davis explained.

The girls are gathering books for the center. The Nashville Metropolitan Action Committee, sponsors of Sunny and Linda, will provide various programs there. "We'll need a birth control clinic," Davis told me.

That's apparent. The illegitimacy rate must be close to 50 per cent. The great fear of high school girls, and of many of the older women, is pregnancy.

Yet for all the promiscuity, Providence is a conservative, church-going community. Sunny and Linda were accepted wholeheartedly once they proved they had no connection with any Black Power movement, for above all else Providence wants peace. The place is a strange combination of pride and poverty, of hospitality and ignorance, of laughter and tears.

Do Sunny and Linda feel safe in this environment? they frequently are asked. "Never felt so well protected," they answer, almost in unison.

Men in the neighborhood have pledged guardianship. The only hint of trouble came when some white youths drove up tortuous Alice Road looking for "those Vista girls." The Negro youths soon edged them out of Providence, peacefully but firmly.

Sunny and Linda's main concern is the eventual day they must leave Providence, for the ties are strong. After only a day, I could share their sense of attachment.

THE DICKEY-LINCOLN POWERPLANT: A CLARIFICATION

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GIAIMO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to supplement recent newspaper accounts regarding the inability of the House and Senate conferees on the public works appropriation bill for 1968 to agree on the wisdom of appropriating final, preliminary funds for the Dickey-Lincoln School public power project in Maine. I would like to make two points clear.

First, while it is true that the site of the proposed Dickey-Lincoln powerplant is in northernmost Maine, this proposed powerplant is viewed as a southern New England project for the reason that it would be built to serve the three southern New England States of Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Massachusetts.

Second, while it is true that the House has refused to authorize or to appropriate funds for Dickey-Lincoln on the ground that it would provide no redeeming water resource development benefit to compensate for its inordinate cost and continuing tax loss, I and others have consistently opposed Dickey-Lincoln on the ground that it would provide these three southern New England States with high-cost power.

Mr. Speaker, in September 1965, when this House rejected the Dickey-Lincoln authorization by record vote of 207 to 185, I voted against it because the Federal agencies' figures then showed that the cost of Dickey-Lincoln's output delivered wholesale to utility systems in Connecticut would be not less than 1.4 cents per kilowatt-hour. Mr. Speaker, in 1965 the cost of power delivered wholesale to purchaser systems in Connecticut, including tax costs, was 0.88 cent per kilowatt-hour.

In July 1967, when this House rejected the final Dickey-Lincoln planning appropriation by record vote of 233 to 169, I voted against it because the findings of our own, independent, committee experts showed that, if built, the cost of Dickey-Lincoln's output delivered wholesale to utility systems in Connecticut would be not less than 1.7 cents per kilowatt-hour. Mr. Speaker, due to rate reductions effected by private industry in Connecticut since 1965, today the cost of power delivered wholesale to purchaser systems in Connecticut is less than 0.88 cent per kilowatt-hour. It is scheduled to decline even further in the future.

Mr. Speaker, permit me to add one final point. Many of my constituents are indignant at the prospect of having to pay increased taxes to meet the mounting cost of Government and to minimize the inflationary impact of a $29 billion Federal deficit. I would like to take this occasion to emphasize that I will never willingly vote to require my constituents to pay increased taxes to be used to finance an economically foolish undertaking costing well over a third-of-a-billion taxpayer dollars which would provide them with high-cost power. I shall continue to oppose the Dickey-Lincoln powerplant on this as well as on the other grounds indicated.

SECRETARY RUSK'S NEWS CONFERENCE

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in a press conference last week, Secretary of State Dean Rusk provided a brilliant summation of American policy in Vietnam that answers many of the criticisms and questions directed toward the administration on this urgent matter.

I would hope that those who have been clamoring for quick solutions to this war, or who have been skeptical of the administration's sincerity in trying to obtain a peaceful solution, will carefully read the Secretary's statement of last Thursday.

I hope also that those who have been calling for a bombing pause will consider the Secretary's answer that:

> When people talk about a pause in the bombing, they should know that Hanoi calls a pause "an ultimatum."

I think the Secretary's statement should go a long way toward clarifying the real issues involved in the American presence in Vietnam. His statement should satisfy most reasonable Americans that the United States is conducting a responsible policy aimed at protecting South Vietnam from aggression, while pursuing every possible avenue toward a peaceful and honorable settlement.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON SIGNS SMALL BUSINESS ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1967

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, last week, in a White House ceremony, President Johnson signed into law the Small Business Act Amendments of 1967.

In remarks at this signing, the President had some profound words about the need for his tax surcharge proposal. Mr. Johnson emphasized that to the businessman a soaring interest rate "is public enemy No. 1."

He rightly noted that it is the businessman who feels high interest rates first, hardest and longest.

And while acknowledging that no businessman welcomes a tax increase and that no President relishes proposing one, the President suggested that:

> Most businessmen would rather pay a little more in taxes than expose themselves to the uncertain and uneven effects of tight money and spiraling interest rates.

The President reminded us all that his tax measure "will provide the restraint our economy needs in a fair and equitable way. It will permit businesses, large and small, to get the credit they need to continue to grow and prosper."

And he concluded:

> I remind the Congress and the country that the greatest service the Congress can now perform for American business, in my judgment, is to enact that legislation promptly before it is too late.

Under unanimous consent I insert the full text of the President's remarks:

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT ON SIGNING S. 1862, SMALL BUSINESS ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1967

America itself began as a small business. The first Virginia settlers came to these shores as a joint stock company.

As the Nation grew, so did the shops and factories that gave it commercial life. The earliest American dream—of being one's own boss in a land of unbounded opportunity—has remained a pillar of our economic strength.

Today, 95% of the businesses in the United States are small. They employ 4 out of every 10 of our wage earners. They provide a family income for more than 75 million Americans.

Through the Small Business Administration, your Government helps small businesses to grow and prosper. The neighborhood furniture store, the machine shop downtown, the new manufacturing plant in a depressed rural area—these and thousands of other small businesses have been given life through loans generated by the SBA.

Such loans have also helped many disadvantaged citizens take a productive role in our national life. Over 5000 men and women with the will and talents and energy for business—but blocked by poverty—have started the road to success with SBA help.

Businesses ravaged by flood or disaster have been restored.

All this has meant better products for the consumer. It has brought jobs and broader opportunities.

The bill I sign today—S. 1862—shows this Nation's faith in the future of small business.

It continues and expands the many worthwhile programs administered by SBA.

It allows SBA to make more loans from its own funds, up $650 million to a new high of $2.65 billion. No increase in appropriations is involved.

It extends from 10 to 15 years the repayment time for construction and renovation loans.

It improves the Small Business Investment Companies which provide a vital flow of private capital to small businesses.

It enlists the services of more retired businessmen, so that their still valuable skills and knowledge can be made available to greater numbers of small concerns.

It will help to bring more businesses and more jobs into the ghettos, through lease guarantees. This is a vital part of our new program to engage private industry in special job training programs for the hard-core unemployed.

It launches a comprehensive study of ways to protect the small businessman against criminal acts which endanger his business and often his life.

This bill, in short, strengthens the helping hand America extends to the Nation's small businessmen.

But I must point out that it becomes law at a time when the business community is imperiled by the threat of tight money.

To the businessman, a soaring interest rate is Public Enemy No. 1.

It affects all commerce, but its harshest impact falls on the little man who runs a small business.

He feels it first.

He feels it hardest.

He feels it longest.

The tax surcharge proposal now pending before the Congress can work to remove this threat.

No businessman welcomes a tax increase. No President enjoys proposing one.

But I believe that most businessmen would rather pay a little more in taxes than expose themselves to the uncertain and uneven effects of tight money and spiraling interest rates.

The tax measure I proposed last August will provide the restraint our economy needs in a fair and equitable way. It will permit businesses large and small to get the credit they need to continue to grow and prosper.

I remind the Congress and the country that the greatest service the Congress can now perform for American business, in my judgment, is to enact that legislation promptly before it is too late.

When that is done, the full potential of the bill I sign today will be unlocked.

Ours is a land where individual enterprise is highly honored. And the bill recognizes that no investment pays greater dividends to the taxpayer than this—to give a man the tools with which he can shape his own success.

PABLO CASALS AND MELINA MERCOURI

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. EDWARDS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to note in Sunday's Washington Post that the world's greatest cellist, Pablo Casals, is going to conduct his oratorio "The Manger" here this Saturday night. This will be his first public appearance in Washington, D.C. Paul Hume's sensitive and moving article about this great man points out that his composition is a plea for world peace and understanding among peoples.

Pablo Casals is universally admired for his magnificent artistry, but even more important, he is revered for his uncompromising stand against the oppression of people by dictatorships. He has never performed in Spain since Franco destroyed the Spanish Republic. The gift of his musical genius is not available to those who murder freedom. As Mr. Hume stated:

> This magnificent man's entire life has been concerned with two things: music, and the world's unrest and injustices. In protest to what he regarded as the intolerable dictatorship of Generalissimo Franco, Casals left his homeland late in the 1930s, never to play there again. In 1917 he had turned his back on Russia, and, again in the '30s, on Germany and Italy.
>
> When he saw many countries either turning to dictatorial regimes or recognizing Franco's rule in Spain, Casals cut himself off from nearly all of the world's great concert stages upon which he had, for half a century, been one of the towering figures of musical history.

Pablo Casals turned his back on Franco Spain, but not on his people. Franco could not make him less passionate about his beloved Catalan. Nor can the present dictators of Greece make Melina Mercouri less passionate about her people and their suffering. Stripping her of her citizenship and her property makes her no less a Greek and Casals a Catalan. America is enriched to have this great Greek woman performing in our theaters. We are also indebted to her for the devotion and tireless effort she expends in behalf of her people who are in jail, and those who will go to jail if they try to exercise any of the liberties which are the essence of democracy.

It was shocking to me to read in the same issue of the Sunday Washington Post that carried Hume's article about an interview with the present Ambassador of Greece. He said, when asked about Miss Mercouri:

> The American people should be very happy—they were eager to get her and now they have her. We have plenty of actresses who are younger and better equipped than she is.

I should like to say publicly to the Ambassador that we are indeed happy to have her.

If our country had existed, I hope we would also have welcomed Socrates when he was denounced for speaking the truth. We do not censor the Greek playwrights of the Golden Age as is being done in Athens today because words like "freedom" and "liberty" might unduly excite the populace. All the world pays homage to Greek thought and culture, to the genius of the idea of democracy. I should think it would be humiliating to a Greek to know that his country's greatest men are censored, and that the birthplace of democracy has now become a prison for those who believe in it.

On a less lofty note, I am disappointed to find out that the present Greek Ambassador is not, least, gallant. Unfortunately, Ambassador Xanthopoulos-Palamas chose to make a snide remark unseemly to a gentleman rather than to meet the issue that Miss Mercouri raises about what has happened to her country. I do not know her age, and could care less; I am not sure what the gauche remark about "equipment" means. Miss Mercouri's years have as little to do with her artistry as do Casals', and I point out that he is 91. Miss Mercouri is a world-renowned actress. Millions of Americans consider her a beautiful woman not only in the physical sense but in her spirit, her integrity, and her devotion to freedom for her people.

Mr. Speaker, with permission granted, I place in the RECORD immediately following these remarks the thoughts of one of our most respected political commentators, Mr. Marquis Childs, regarding the current situation in Greece, from a recent column in the Washington Post. I deeply regret that the RECORD is unable to carry the great Herblock's political cartoons on the same subject.

The article follows:

WHAT'S HAPPENING IN GREECE TODAY?

(By Marquis Childs)

What is happening in Greece today would be a farce if it were not a tragedy. Aristophanes and Sophocles might have collaborated, with some help from a far-out television script writer, to put together the scenario being played out in Athens. The military dictatorship is notorious not so much for its cruel repression as for its bumbling incompetence. And the lurching from side to side, which at times makes the operation look like a Mack Sennett comedy, causes acute dismay in our State Department. Policy in the Department is premised on the wistful belief that somehow the colonels and the generals will get the show back on a constitutional track.

Greece is in many ways a dramatic illustration of the poverty of American policy. Having put close to $4 billion into the country to save it from communism, the end result is a dictatorship by a military junta with fascist attachments that is now saying, if you don't send more help the Communists will get us.

The colonels and the generals would have rejoiced if they could have heard the oratory on the House floor the other day. No less a luminary than L. Mendel Rivers of South Carolina, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, championed Greece as a loyal NATO ally with a commitment by the United States to Greek security.

The occasion was a measure approving loans of American war vessels to a number of countries. This is a phrase of the military aid program which like death and taxes has achieved perpetual status. The United States has on loan to Greece two destroyers and a submarine and the only conclusion from Chairman River's oratory is that these vessels are essential to the defense of the West.

Voices were raised in protest, suggesting that it might be wise at least to see the direction of events in Greece and whether there was any chance for a new constitution with a deadline set for Dec. 15. Rep. Don Edwards (D-Calif.), arguing the need for a debate on American policy toward Greece, pointed to the latest instance of the junta's folly.

Mrs. Helen Vlachos is the courageous publisher of two Athens newspapers. A conservative, she refused to publish under the censorship by the military after the coup on April 21. To publish would simply have meant carrying the official line of the dictatorship both in the news and on the editorial page, and this in all conscience she would not do.

Two weeks ago Mrs. Vlachos talked to newspapermen in her office. She attacked the regime, charging they had failed to live up to a promise to restore freedom of the press. This interview appeared in an Italian newspaper. Later a team from CBS went to Athens to film an interview with Mrs. Vlachos for the "Face the Nation" program.

Promptly she was put under house arrest, her apartment searched by the military, the threat of trial by a military court for insulting the government held over her head and her husband, a naval hero out of World War II, also under arrest. The maximum sentence could be eight years but it is believed the outcry around the world will at last mitigate her punishment.

With the State Department privately expressing its unhappiness at this zig, the junta promptly took a zag in the other direction by relasing George Papandreou, the venerable former Premier who is one of the few figures commanding wide popular esteem.

As this was going on two prominent Greek officials—Dimitrios Galanis, governor of the Bank of Greece, and Constantine Thanos of the Ministry of Coordination—were calling on government and international loan officials to assure them that everything was lovely in Greece. Despite what they reported as an 8 per cent drop in tourism the pair presented figures to show that, thanks to the closing of the Suez Canal, receipts from Greek shipping are up and the fiscal position of the country improved. While, according to officialdom, they made no pitch for more help, 53 House members signed a letter saying that any move to restore aid would do "most serious damage" to America's position in the world.

Some Americans who were in Greece this summer are saying that the people seem happy. Gas station attendants and hotel clerks say they admire the regime. This sounds a bit like the visitors to Italy in the early days of fascism who were so pleased to find that the trains ran on time.

Military aid is a swamp that once in there is almost no way out. It creates dependencies that go on forever with the bogey of communism held up in a perpetual halloween.

FREE PRESS MEANS MUCH

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, newspapers mean a great deal to all of us. Newspapers play a vital role in thousands of communities across this great land. They provide us with a living record of events that shape the very destiny of this Nation. Newspapers keep us informed; they entertain us and enable us to enjoy the highest living and information standards in the world.

Under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD an editorial published by the Sand Mountain Reporter, of Albertville, Ala., on October 12. This editorial pays tribute to our newspapers, who celebrated National Newspaper Week October 8–14. It sets forth, in excellent fashion, the importance of keeping our press free.

The editorial follows:

FREE PRESS MEANS MUCH

Newspaper Week! October 8 to 14. Probably the most impressive way for the public to learn what newspapers mean in their daily lives would be to have no papers printed during Newspaper Week—but that is not practical.

The hometown paper is the living record of what happens in the thousands of communities across the land—marriages, births, deaths, social activity, politics, school news, legal notices, advertised products to inform customers, world news, everything that enables the U.S. citizen to be familiar with the latest devices and products by which he enjoys the highest living and information standards in the world.

But over and above these material blessings, a free press, which is the background of free speech, is the average man's guarantee of personal liberty, religious freedom and protection against political and judicial persecution. Dictators are afraid of a free press, hence they have a controlled press. The people read only what their rules wish them to read. Try imagining if you can, what it would be like to live in a country where an editor dared not print a letter criticizing the political party in power, and where an editor feared to express an adverse opinion. Think of what a free press really means to you—life, freedom from political oppression, liberty and the pursuit of happiness under our Constitution.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. MAY (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today and tomorrow, on account of official business.

Mr. HORTON (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. FOLEY (at the request of Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON), for October 16 and 17, on account of official business.

Mr. FALLON (at the request of Mr. GARMATZ), for October 16 and 17, on account of official business.

Mr. GUDE (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today, on account of illness.

Mr. OLSEN (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today and the balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. FOUNTAIN (at the requst of Mr. ALBERT), for an indefinite period, on account of his attendance at the 22d General Assembly of the United Nations as an official member of the U.S. delegation.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. GROSS, for 30 minutes, on October 17, 1967.

Mr. HUNGATE, for 1 hour, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. COWGER) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HALPERN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GUBSER, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. QUIE, for 60 minutes, on October 18.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Hungate) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Hébert.

Mr. Brown of California.

SENATE BILLS, JOINT RESOLUTION AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills, joint resolution, and concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 362. An act for the relief of Sofia Dorr; to the Committee on the Juidicary.

S. 552. An act to amend title 18 of the United States Code in order to provide that committing acts dangerous to persons on board trains shall be a criminal offense; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 772. An act for the relief of Dr. Violeta V. Ortega Brown; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 948. An act for the relief of Seaman Eugene Sidney Markovitz, U.S. Navy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1147. An act for the relief of Mariana Mantzios; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1395. An act for the relief of Dr. Brandla Don (nee Praschnik); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1440. An act to include in the prohibitions contained in section 2314 of title 18, United States Code, the transportation with unlawful intent in interstate or foreign commerce of traveler's checks bearing forged countersignatures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1490. An act for the relief of Yang Ok Yoo (Maria Marguerita); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1690. An act for the relief of Juan Andres Lliteras and his wife, Engracia Heydrick Bellido Lliteras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1808. An act for the relief of Miss Amelia Seresly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1828. An act for the relief of Susan Elizabeth (Cho) Long; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1829. An act for the relief of Lisa Marie (Kim) Long; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1865. An act for the relief of Bertha Iturricz Artecha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1968. An act for the relief of Dr. Jose Ernesto Garcia y Tojar; to the Committee to the Judiciary.

S. 1979. An act for the relief of Carlos Fernandez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2005. An act for the relief of Dr. Anacleto C. Fernandez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2022. An act for the relief of Dr. Mario Jose Remirez DeEstenoz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2023. An act for the relief of Virgilio A. Arango, doctor of medicine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2071. An act for the relief of Dr. Antonio M. Tagle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2078. An act for the relief of Dr. Alberto De Jongh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2081. An act for the relief of Jacqueline Whang-Peng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2119. An act for the relief of Dr. Octavio Suarez-Murias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2139. An act for the relief of Dr. Angel Trejo Padron; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2176. An act for the relief of Dr. Edgar Reinaldo Nunez Baez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2178. An act for the relief of Dennis W. Radtke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2192. An act for the relief of Dr. Rafael de la Portilla Lavastida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2200. An act for the relief of Homer T. Williamson, Sr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2216. An act to establish a National Commission on New Technological Uses of Copyrighted Works; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2303. An act to provide a uniform system for fixing and adjusting the pay of employees in recognized trades or crafts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S.J. Res. 85. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the 7-day period comprising the first full week in October of each year as "Spring Garden Planting Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. Con. Res. 46. Concurrent resolution to provide for the printing of additional copies of certain hearings of the Special Committee on Aging; to the Committee on House Administration.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on October 12, 1967 present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 678. An act to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Upper and Lower Chehalis Tribes of Indians in Claims Commission docket No. 237, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3973. An act to amend the Healing Arts Practice Act, District of Columbia, 1928, and the act of June 6, 1892, relating to the licensing of dentists in the District of Columbia, to exempt from the licensing requirements of such acts physicians and dentists while performing services in the employ of the District of Columbia;

H.R. 3979. An act to amend section 6409(b) (1) of title 39, United States Code, which relates to transportation compensation paid by the Postmaster General;

H.R. 10509. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 11722. An act to authorize certain construction at military installations and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, October 17, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred, as follows:

1158. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers. Department of the Army, dated July 20, 1967, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of the reports on Fall River Harbor, Mass. and R.I., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted July 31, 1957 (H. Doc. No. 175); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

1159. A letter from the adjutant general, United Spanish War Veterans, Washington, D.C., transmitting the proceedings of the stated convention of the 68th national encampment of the United Spanish War Veterans, held October 1–6, 1966, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 240–77, (H. Doc. No. 176); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and ordered printed with illustrations.

1160. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of opportunity for savings by adopting manufacturers' recommended preventive maintenance programs for interagency motor pool vehicles, General Services Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1161. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession contract to provide accommodations, facilities, and services for the public at the Boulder Beach site of Lake Mead National Recreation Area, Nev., through December 31, 1977, pursuant to the provisions of 70 Stat. 543; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1162. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession contract authorizing the continuance of eating and merchandising facilities for the public within the Statue of Liberty National Monument, N.Y., for a 10-year period from January 1, 1968 through December 31, 1977, pursuant to the provisions of 70 Stat. 543; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1163. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a certain case involving suspension of deportation, pursuant to the provisions of section 244(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MAHON: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 888. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 785). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. S. 1985. An act to amend the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956, to provide for a national program of flood insurance, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 786). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DOWDY: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8407. A bill for the relief of Dr. Raquel Maria Cruz-Flores (Rept. No. 778). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8738. A bill for the relief of Guillermo Ramon Palacio Sela (Rept. No. 779). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CAHILL: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9081. A bill for the relief of Dr. Josefina Esther Kouri-Barreto de Pelleya (Rept. No. 780). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 10985. A bill for the relief of Dr. Lorenzo Galatas (Rept. No. 781). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CAHILL: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 11374. A bill for the relief of Dr. Rafael de la Portilla Lavastida (Rept. No. 782). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DOWDY: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7890. A bill for the relief of Dr. Josefina Quintos Marcelo (Rept. No. 783). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 11472. A bill for the relief of Dr. Pedro Piña; with amendment (Rept. No. 784). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS:

H.R. 13497. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to raise needed additional revenues by tax reform; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 13498. A bill to amend the Nurse Training Act of 1964 to provide for increased assistance to hospital diploma schools of nursing; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HUNGATE:

H.R. 13499. A bill to amend the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 to increase from $200 million to $500 million the amount of the annual appropriations authorized thereunder for grants for basic water and sewer facilities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 13500. A bill to amend section 702 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 to permit grants after construction is commenced for basic water and sewer facilities which qualify for such grants but cannot receive them prior to construction because of the unavailability of funds; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 13501. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. POOL:

H.R. 13502. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make it unlawful to assault or kill any member of the armed services engaged in the performance of his official duties while on duty under orders of the President under chapter 15 of title 10 of the United States Code or paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 3500 of title 10 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 13503. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expense incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 13504. A bill to amend the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act to permit payment of unemployment or sickness benefits thereunder to individuals receiving military retired pay; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 13505. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the excused absence from duty, without loss of pay or reduction in annual or sick leave, of Federal employees in areas covered by official warnings of imminent danger of hurricanes or other inherently dangerous weather conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 13506. A bill declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 13507. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make it unlawful to assault or kill any member of the armed services engaged in the performance of his official duties while on duty under orders of the President under chapter 15 of title 10 of the United States Code or paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 3500 of title 10 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 13508. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MIZE:

H.R. 13509. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make it unlawful to assault or kill any member of the armed services engaged in the performance of his official duties while on duty under orders of the President under chapter 15 of title 10 of the United States Code or paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 3500 of title 10 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS (for himself and Mr. BATES):

H.R. 13510. A bill to increase the basic pay for members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RUMSFELD:

H.R. 13511. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize an incentive tax credit allowable with respect to facilities to control water and air pollution, to encourage the construction of such facilities, and to permit the amortization of the cost of constructing such facilities within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 13512. A bill to designate the Mount Jefferson Wilderness, Willamette, Deschutes, and Mount Hood National Forests, in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EVERETT:

H.R. 13513. A bill to amend title 46, section 1159, to provide for construction aid for certain vessels operating on the inland rivers and waterways; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H.R. 13514. A bill to designate the San Gabriel Wilderness, Angeles National Forest, in the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 13515. A bill to require reports to Congress of certain actions of the Federal Power Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 13516. A bill to amend the act of September 21, 1959, relating to the Palm Springs Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MAHON:

H.J. Res. 888. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HAYS:

H.J. Res. 889. Joint resolution creating a Federal Committee on Nuclear Development to review and reevaluate the existing civilian nuclear programs in the United States; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.J. Res. 890. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.J. Res. 891. Joint resolution creating a Federal Committee on Nuclear Development to review and reevaluate the existing civilian nuclear program of the United States; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. Con. Res. 531. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the Federal-aid highway program is vital to the national defense, to the promotion of interstate commerce, and to the furtherance of highway safety and that the full obligational authority granted by the Congress for that program should be used; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama:

H. Con. Res. 532. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the elimination of the Castro Communist regime of Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PETTIS:

H. Con. Res. 533. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the elimination of the Castro Communist regime of Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RUPPE:

H. Con. Res. 534. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress with respect to an investigation and study to determine the potential of railroad passenger and mail transportation in the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RUMSFELD:

H. Res. 945. Resolution relating to rescission of appropriations for civil supersonic aircraft development; to the Committee on Appropriations.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

289. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, relative to a Federal flood insurance program; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

290. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, relative to the exclusive jurisdiction and control by the State of Florida in the management of its fresh water resources; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 13517. A bill for the relief of Dionisia Anselmo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13518. A bill for the relief of Antonio Cesari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 13519. A bill for the relief of Aristine, Helen, and Anastasia Tsatsakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 13520. A bill for the relief of Pureza Ruiz Languisan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

176. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., relative to erection of certain monuments; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

177. Also petition of the mayor and City Council of Birmingham, Ala., relative to so-called adult films shown by the television networks; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

178. Also, petition of James F. Ronan, Chestnut Hill, Mass., relative to rights under the ninth amendment of the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

179. Also, petition of the Common Council of the city of Buffalo, N.Y., relative to declaring Columbus Day a national holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

180. Also, petition of city council, city of Philadelphia, Pa., relative to the building of a powerful merchant marine fleet; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

181. Also, petition of the American Legion, department of Massachusetts, Boston, Mass., relative to the establishment of a Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on Rules.

182. Also, petition of the city of Rio Vista, Calif., relative to governmental tax sharing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

183. Also, petition of the city of Sonoma, Calif., relative to a plan of tax sharing between Federal and local government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Assistance for the Mentally Retarded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 16, 1967

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, the last 5 years have seen a historic emergence of mental retardation and the mentally retarded from isolation and public indifference. With their emergence from shame and misunderstanding have come great strides forward in helping the mentally retarded and his family. A condition considered inborn and irremedial until just recently, we now know that mental retardation can be ameliorated or aggravated, depending on such varied factors as conditions of pregnancy and socioeconomic environment of the child. It can even be avoided.

In 1966 President Johnson established a Committee on Mental Retardation whose findings have just been distributed. I was pleased to read of the successes in this field since the early 1960's.

Among these accomplishments are:

All 50 States—plus the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands—now have a written plan for providing comprehensive services for the retarded.

Industry and Government are successfully using trained mentally retarded workers in such capacities as messengers, launderers, cleaning crews and assemblyline workers. Over 3,000 mentally retarded are now working in 39 Federal agencies. Only 3 years ago all such workers were barred from Federal employment through examination procedures.

State action has been a significant factor in the progress of prevention and treatment of conditions that can lead to retardation. Thirty-eight States now have laws prescribing tests for phenylketonuria for all newborn infants. Nearly all of the 50 States are conducting antimeasles campaigns. In one year alone, the number of measles cases have been halved.

Under the authority of the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Health Centers Construction Act of 1963, Federal, State, and private sources have combined to fund 12 mental retardation research centers, 14 university-affiliated, and 175 community facilities at a total cost of some $190 million.

Many of the 77,000 mentally retarded children of the U.S. Armed Forces members are now able to receive help under the authority of amendments to the Dependents' Medical Care Act enacted by Congress in 1966.

Privately sponsored day care and recreational programs for the retarded are now available in many parts of the Nation. Local and State associations for retarded children alone sponsor over 300 day camps and 150 residential camps as well as more than 1,000 other recreational and social group programs.

Whereas in 1953 we had no special classes for the educable and trainable, we now have some 52,000 classes serving 677,000 pupils.

In 1963, some 6,000 mentally retarded were rehabilitated. This number is rapidly increasing. By 1967 it had increased to 19,000.

A new, truly promising program initiated in 1965 is the foster grandparent program. Here, older retired persons give their care and guidance to institutionalized children with remarkable results.

Mr. Speaker, life for the mentally retarded has taken on new promise since Congress passed major legislation in their behalf not quite 4 years ago. Over $400 million a year is now appropriated for Federal programs benefiting the retarded. More than twice that amount is spent each year by the States, localities, and private citizen organizations. The result has been an extraordinary growth in the services which the mentally retarded and their families may call upon—an extraordinary growth in the hope that they may lead relatively normal and productive lives.

Mr. Speaker, the millions of people who have put their energies and abilities into these grograms deserve our gratitude and praise. Only through their efforts could such great advances have been made in so short a time. They—abetted by new forces—will continue to strive for the benefit of those afflicted by mental retardation. It is my hope that the next 5 years will bring more progress on the ratio of that made in these preceding 5.

Maj. Gen. Edward S. Bres

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 16, 1967

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to an outstanding military man who made many valuable contributions to his country's welfare as well as to the welfare of New Orleans, which is in my congressional district.

Maj. Gen. Edward S. Bres, Sr., retired from the Army, died of a heart attack on September 24 in Bogotá, Colombia, where he was vacationing.

For me, it was not only the loss of a valuable citizen, but the loss of a dear friend. I served as a member of the Battle of New Orleans Sesquicentennial Celebration Commission. General Bres was chairman, and he did an outstanding job in promoting and guiding this event to a successful conclusion after his appointment by President Kennedy in 1963.

A graduate of my alma mater, Tulane University, General Bres served as an Army engineer and general staff officer before his retirement in 1950. During World War II he served as deputy chief engineer and chief of the engineering project which rehabilitated the port at Darwin, Calif. He also was chief of the Joint Services Theater Liaison Group in San Francisco.

Toward war's end, he became chief of Reserve and ROTC affairs and his final Army service was with the personnel board.

General Bres had many friends here in Washington as well as business interests, and for that reason maintained a home here and a home in New Orleans.

He was a military and a civic leader. His passing is a great loss to this country and to the city of New Orleans, but his accomplismments will linger on.

My sympathy is extended to the members of his family on the loss of this fine individual. I am proud to say that he was my friend.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 17, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rabbi Leo Landman, Beth Emeth Congregation, Philadelphia, Pa., offered the following prayer:

Almighty G-d, we thank Thee for the blessings bestowed upon our Nation. We pray Thee, make us ever cognizant of the fact that liberty and justice, freedom and peace, are not automatic possessions, but are gifts to be constantly guarded in a ceaseless vigil demanding our best energies and our devoutest zeal.

Bless the President, the Speaker, and all Members of this House. May the harvest of their efforts provide amply for the body and soul of each resident of this land. May they as leaders of our Nation choose programs of statesmanship that will alleviate the tensions that separate men, promote harmonious human interdependence, make want and misery disappear, and allow every man in every nation to enjoy the blessings of freedom. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 2757. An act for the relief of Comdr. Albert G. Berry, Jr.; and

H.R. 10932. An act for the relief of Gilmour C. MacDonald, colonel, U.S. Air Force (retired).

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 11, 1697.
Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: With a great deal of regret, I find it necessary to resign my membership on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. The volume of legislation before the Education and Labor Committee does not allow adequate time for the equally important matters pertaining to merchant marine and fisheries.

It has been a privilege and an honor to serve on this Committee under the Chairmanship of the Honorable Edward A. Garmatz and to work with the other members of his Committee.

Sincerely,

EDITH GREEN.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

COMMENDATION OF RABBI LEO LANDMAN

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to you, to this House, and to Dr. Latch for the opportunity of having today's opening prayer offered by the spiritual leader of my own congregation, Rabbi Leo Landman.

As a member and trustee of Congregation Beth Emeth, I would like to say I am very proud of Dr. Landman. I hasten to add, however, that I hope no one will get the idea I have sought the pulpit of the House as a showcase for him through which other congregations may attempt to lure him from us. I hope he will remain in Philadelphia for as long a time as I know his words will remain with our Members of the House who are here to hear him today.

The high regard in which we hold him is evidenced in part by the fact that a number of congregants sought to share the honor by accompanying him here from Philadelphia today. I wish to state that in addition to being spiritual leader of Congregation Beth Emeth, Dr. Landman holds a number of other distinctions.

He is assistant to the president of Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning, vice president of the Philadelphia Board of Rabbis and regional vice president of the rabbinic alumni of Yeshiva University.

He is a graduate of both Yeshiva and Dropsie, from which he received his Ph. D.

It is particularly fitting, I think, that in this body of representatives of all American people, our daily deliberations continue to be begun with a prayer for divine guidance. I am appreciative of the fact that my own congregation also has been allowed to share in these daily invocations.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT OF COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Government Procurement of the Committee on Small Business be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

MAJORITY WHIP OPERATED ON FOR APPENDICITIS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to advise, with the same regret that I know all Members of the House feel, that our distinguished and beloved majority whip, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS], while in New Orleans over the weekend was stricken with an attack of appendicitis.

The distinguished majority whip was operated on last night at Sibley Hospital. He is resting well and doing well today.

SIGNAL HONOR TO THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, we were all pleased that you were honored in the city of Boston last Sunday to have an elementary school named after you.

Mr. Speaker, you have performed a great service to your congressional district and to your country in the time that you have served here in the House of Representatives.

It is my understanding that this is the first time in the history of the city of Boston that a new public school has been named in honor of a man during his lifetime. In my opinion it could not have happened to a finer gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Michigan yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate what my distinguished friend has said about the beloved Speaker of the House of Representatives and the honor that has been bestowed upon him by the great city of Boston. This, of course, is a signal honor. It is a well-deserved honor, one that comes as no surprise to any Member of the House. This honor comes as a special tribute to a man who, largely, is self-educated, but a man who has done more than any other Presiding Officer in the history of this House to make education possible for all American children. I congratulate our beloved Speaker, and I congratulate those who have honored themselves by honoring him.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with the distinguished gentleman from Michigan and the distinguished majority leader in their tribute to the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the honor of having a school named for the Speaker is pleasing to him. Our beloved leader has been a giant in the Halls of Congress in matters attendant to education—on all levels. His name and his efforts in these fields are emblazoned in golden tones. To have this honor—naming a school the John W. McCormack Elementary School—is richly deserved.

Mr. Speaker, I know how much you are delighted with this signal honor.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, of course all of us on both sides of the aisle in this Chamber have the greatest respect and admiration for our distinguished Speaker. The dedication of an elementary school in the city of Boston yesterday to the distinguished Speaker, particularly under the circumstances, is a fitting tribute by the people and the public officials of that wonderful community for a great leader and a man whom they, as well as the Members of this body, love and respect. This new elementary school which will bear the illustrous name of an illustrous statesman, our beloved Speaker, the Honorable JOHN McCORMACK, of Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG] in paying tribute to our wonderful leader, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, JOHN McCORMACK, and in recognizing the wonderful honor that the people of Dorchester, Mass., bestowed upon him yesterday in dedicating an elementary school in his name.

There perhaps could not have been a more fitting or appropriate tribute to our beloved Speaker because of his deep love and affection for children, not only the children of Massachusetts, but the children of the United States and of all the world.

Our Speaker, who has contributed a dedicated lifetime of outstanding service to his Nation at the highest levels of Government, has always shown great understanding of and great sympathy for children and especially for the underprivileged children of the world.

He has always demonstrated that special kindness and human generosity for children which they appreciate and understand so well.

He is a great American, a great leader, a great servant of the people, and most of all a great friend. And no one could be happier or prouder than I am, to see this deserving tribute paid to our Speaker.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

A LOW BLOW AGAINST SECRETARY RUSK

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, in these past months we have witnessed an increasingly vocal, intense, and even shrill debate on the subject of American policy in Vietnam. Until last Friday we had fortunately not seen the debate degenerate into personal attack and abuse. But the charge that Secretary of State Dean Rusk, in his brilliant press conference statement on Vietnam last Thursday, was indulging in racial prejudice is certainly one of the lowest blows that I have ever seen in my time in public life.

Secretary Rusk is probably less encumbered with racial prejudice than anyone I know. And those who now talk about the Secretary having conjured up the "yellow peril" really ought to be ashamed of themselves.

Since when have we decided that Red China was nothing but a quiet, peace-loving nation? Since when have we concluded she is not interested in carrying out aggression? Maybe the pundits who say this ought to talk to Tibet, or India, or Indonesia, or Thailand, or even Burma.

Mr. Speaker, those who are so interested in deescalating the war ought to consider deescalating the tenor of their arguments and stick to the facts for a change. It is not the yellow peril Secretary Rusk was talking about. It was the Red peril.

ROMNEY BRAINWASH

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, Governor Romney a few weeks ago charged that he had been brainwashed on his trip to Vietnam some 2 years ago. When he made this charge I invited him to come in and tell my Subcommittee on State Department Personnel which members of the Department had brainwashed him and how.

He later replied to this and I released the complete text of his letter to the press today following his release of a part of it yesterday, in which he waltzes all around the subject and implies that he was brainwashed over a period of 3 years by the administration.

I quote one paragraph from my letter in which I said:

> While we respect your right as a partisan politician to attack the administration on any basis you choose, this subcommittee is not sponsoring "Meet the Press."

His escort officer from the State Department who is now his foreign policy adviser in a letter to the committee advised us and I read one sentence:

> I was not aware of any efforts designed to mislead visitors to Vietnam.

In view of the Governor's shifting position on various subjects, I can only conclude that either "Duz" did it or he took a ride with intensified "Tide."

VACATING SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order granted to me for today be vacated.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 311]

Ashbrook
Boggs
Bolton
Broomfield
Button
Cohelan
Cramer
Dellenback
Diggs
Erlenborn
Everett
Fallon
Foley
Fountain
Fulton, Tenn.
Gude
Hébert
Herlong
Holifield
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Kazen
Keith
Kluczynski
Landrum
Latta
McCulloch
McMillan
May
Moorhead
Olsen
Patman
Pool
Pucinski
Rarick
Rees
Resnick
St. Onge
Stafford
Stephens
Teague, Tex.
Tuck
Tunney
Utt
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Young

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). On this rollcall 387 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

E. F. FORT ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2661) for the relief of E. F. Fort, Cora Lee Fort Corbett, and W. R. Fort.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

MAURITZ A. STERNER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3865) for the relief of Mauritz A. Sterner.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

CHARLES WAVERLY WATSON, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8091) for the relief of Charles Waverly Watson, Jr.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

MARIA KOLOMETROUTSIS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7427) for the relief of Maria Kolometroutsis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 7427

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Maria Kolometroutsis may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in her behalf by Stamoulis D. Kolometroutsis, a citizen of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the Act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 6, after the words "in her behalf by", insert "Mr. and Mrs.".

On page 1, line 7, strike out the words "a citizen" and substitute in lieu thereof the word "citizens".

On page 1, line 8, at the end of the bill, strike out the period and add the following: ": *Provided,* That the natural brother of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such relationship, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LT. ALLAN L. SCHOOLER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6325) for the relief of 2d Lt. Allan L. Schooler.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

MI SOON OH

The Clerk called the bill (S. 43) for the relief of Mi Soon Oh.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 43

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, section 204(c), relating to the number of petitions which may be approved in behalf of orphans, shall be inapplicable in the case of a petition filed in behalf of Mi Soon Oh by Mr. and Mrs. Anthony Caucutt, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. PABLO E. TABIO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 62) for the relief of Dr. Pablo E. Tabio.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia

There was no objection.

DR. ENRIQUE ALBERTO ROJAS-VILA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 63) for the relief of Dr. Enrique Alberto Rojas-Vila.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 63

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Enrique Alberto Rojas-Vila shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of June 12, 1962.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. LUIS OSVALDO MARTINEZ-FARINAS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 64) for the relief of Dr. Luis Osvaldo Martinez-Farinas.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 64

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Luis Osvaldo Martinez-Farinas shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of May 8, 1962.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. ARMANDO PEREZ SIMON

The Clerk called the bill (S. 221) for the relief of Dr. Armando Perez Simon.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 221

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Armando Perez Simon shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of September 29, 1961.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. JULIO ALEJANDRO SOLANO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 440) for the relief of Dr. Julio Alejandro Solano.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 440

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Julio Alejandro Solano shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of February 4, 1961.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROSEMARIE GAUCH NETH

The Clerk called the bill (S. 445) for the relief of Rosemarie Gauch Neth.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 445

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Rosemarie Gauch Neth, the widow of a member of the Armed Forces of the United States who died in line of duty while serving in Vietnam, shall be held and considered to be within the purview of section 319(a) of such Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Beginning on page 1, line 4, after the name "Rosemarie Gauch Neth", strike out the following language: ", the widow of a member of the Armed Forces of the United States who died in line of duty while serving in Vietnam,".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. ANGEL REAUD, ALSO KNOWN AS ANGEL REAUD RAMOS IZQUIERDO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 503) for the relief of Dr. Angel Reaud, also known as Angel Reaud Ramos Izquierdo.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

SABIENE ELIZABETH DEVORE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 733) for the relief of Sabiene Elizabeth DeVore.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 733

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of section 301(a)(7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Robert William DeVore, a citizen of the United States, shall be held and considered to have been physically present in the United States, prior to the birth of his daughter, Sabiene Elizabeth DeVore, for a period of five years after he attained the age of fourteen years.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RUMIKO SAMANSKI

The Clerk called the bill (S. 741) for the relief of Rumiko Samanski.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 741

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Rumiko Samanski may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of such Act, subject to the proviso to such section, and a petition may be filed in behalf of said Rumiko Samanski by Sergeant and Mrs. Ronald James Samanski, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 204(a) of such Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. MENELIO SEGUNDO DIAZ PADRON

The Clerk called the bill (S. 808) for the relief of Dr. Menelio Segundo Diaz Padron.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

DR. RICARDO VALLEJO SAMALA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2275) for the relief of Ricardo Vallejo Samala.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 2275

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Ricardo Vallejo Samala shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of August 30, 1959, upon payment of the required visa fee.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FEIGHAN

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FEIGHAN: On page 1, line 6, after the date "August 30, 1959" strike out the comma and insert a period and strike out the remainder of the bill.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VISITACION ENRIQUEZ MAYPA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4386) for the relief of Visitacion Enriquez Maypa.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

MRS. ANTONIA SUBIAS VAL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4985) for the relief of Mrs. Antonia Subias Val.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 4985

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Antonia Subias Val shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of this Act, the said Mrs. Antonia Subias in the case of Mrs. Antonia Subias Val. From and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the said Mrs. Antonia Subias Val shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PANAGIOTIS BASIL PAULUS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5575) for the relief of Panagiotis Basil Paulus.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

CHRISANTHE SAVAS KARATAPANIS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6326) for the relief of Chrisanthe Savas Karatapanis.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request to the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

VALENTINA SIDOROVA PARKEVICH

The Clerk called the bill (S. 811) for the relief of Valentina Sidorova Parkevich.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

DR. JULIO DOMINGO HERNANDEZ

The Clerk called the bill (S. 821) for the relief of Dr. Julio Domingo Hernandez.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 821

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Julio Domingo Hernandez shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of August 17, 1961.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. CESAR ABAD LUGONES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 863) for the relief of Dr. Cesar Abad Lugones.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

MITSUO BLOMSTROM

The Clerk called the bill (S. 975) for the relief of Mitsuo Blomstrom.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 975

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mitsuo Blomstrom may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of such Act, subject to the proviso to such section, and a petition may be filed in behalf of the said Mitsuo Blomstrom by Staff Sergeant and Mrs. Robert J. Blomstrom, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 204(a) of such Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANTONIO LUIS NAVARRO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1021) for the relief of Antonio Luis Navarro.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 1021

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Antonio Luis Navarro shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of November 22, 1961, and to have complied with the requirements of section 316 of that Act as they relate to residence and physical presence.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. G. F. VALDES-FAULI

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1105) for the relief of Dr. G. F. Valdes-Fauli.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

DR. DAVID CASTANEDA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1106) for the relief of Dr. David Castaneda.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 1106

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor David Castaneda shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of August 10, 1961.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. FELIX C. CABALLOL

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1108) for the relief of Dr. Felix C. Caballol and wife, Lucia J. Caballol.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 1108

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Felix C. Caballol and Lucia J. Caballol, his wife, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of October 19, 1960.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, beginning on line 4, after the name "Doctor Felix C. Caballol" strike out "and Lucia J. Caballol, his wife,".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act for the relief of Dr. Felix C. Caballol."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. RAMON E. OYARZUN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1109) for the relief of Dr. Ramon E. Oyarzun.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

DR. MANUEL ALPENDRE SEISDEDOS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1110) for the relief of Dr. Manuel Alpendre Seisdedos.

There being no objection, the Clerk called the bill, as follows:

S. 1110

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Manuel Alpendre Seisdedos shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of October 30, 1960.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. LUCIO ARSENIO TRAVIESO Y PEREZ

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1197) for the relief of Dr. Lucio Arsenio Travieso y Perez.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 1197

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Lucio Arsenio Travieso y Perez shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of June 18, 1961.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. GONZALO G. RODRIGUEZ

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1269) for the relief of Dr. Gonzalo G. Rodriguez.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 1269

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Gonzalo G. Rodriguez shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of August 2, 1962.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. FRANCISCO MONTES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1279) for the relief of Dr. Francisco Montes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 1279

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Francisco Montes shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of November 25, 1961.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. ALFREDO PEREIRA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1280) for the relief of Dr. Alfredo Pereira.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 1280

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Alfredo Pereira shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of July 4, 1960.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEE DUK HEE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1458) for the relief of Lee Duk Hee.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 1458

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, section 204(c), relating to the number of petitions which may be approved in behalf of orphans, shall be inapplicable in the case of a petition filed in behalf of Lee Duk Hee by Mr. and Mrs. Robert Hansen, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. HUGO GONZALEZ

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1471) for the relief of Dr. Hugo Gonzalez.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 1471

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Hugo Gonzalez shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of November 7, 1960.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. ERNESTO NESTOR PRIETO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1482) for the relief of Dr. Ernesto Nestor Prieto.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 1482

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Ernesto Nestor Prieto shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of September 10, 1961.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. MARIO R. GARCINI

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1525) for the relief of Dr. Mario R. Garcini.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 1525

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Mario R. Garcini shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of August 12, 1961.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. CARLOS E. GARCIGA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1557) for the relief of Dr. Carlos E. Garciga.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 1557

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Carlos E. Garciga shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of March 11, 1962.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. MARIA DEL CARMEN TRABADELO DE ARIAS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1647) for the relief of Dr. Maria del Carmen Trabadelo de Arias.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 1647

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Maria del Carmen Trabadelo de Arias shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of July 30, 1961.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. ANTONIO MARTIN RUIZ DEL CASTILLO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1709) for the relief of Dr. Antonio Martin Ruiz del Castillo.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 1709

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Antonio Martin Ruiz del Castillo shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of October 25, 1961.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. RAMIRO DE LA RIVA DOMINGUEZ

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1748) for the relief of Dr. Ramiro de la Riva Dominguez.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 1748

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Ramiro de la Riva Dominguez shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of October 9, 1960.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. ORLANDO HIPOLITO MAYTIN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1938) for the relief of Dr. Orlando Hipolito Maytin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 1938

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Orlando Hipolito Maytin shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of May 15, 1962.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF AMERICAN PETROFINA CO. OF TEXAS, A DELAWARE CORPORATION, AND JAMES W. HARRIS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1678) for the relief of American Petrofina Co. of Texas, a Delaware corporation, and James W. Harris.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 1678

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in the administration of section 31 of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920 (30 U.S.C. 188), the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to receive, consider, and act upon any petition of American Petrofina Company of Texas, a Delaware corporation, and James W. Harris, filed within one hundred and eighty days after the date of enactment of this Act, for reinstatement of United States oil and gas lease "Mississippi 030263" and United States oil and gas lease "Mississippi 030263(A)", as if such petition had been filed within the time provided in such section and such section had been applicable thereto.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 1678, a bill for the relief of American Petrofina Co. of Texas, and James W. Harris.

The purpose of this legislation is to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to consider a petition of the American Petrofina Co. of Texas for reinstatement of two oil and gas leases, if the petition is filed within 180 days after enactment of this bill.

The relief called for in this legislation is one which has caused serious problems for the Department of the Interior. And, in many cases, the oil and gas lessee whose lease is terminated on the basis of a nominal deficiency is required to suffer considerable financial loss. Each year a number of private relief bills are introduced in Congress for reinstatement of leases. However, the termination provisions of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 are automatic. The Secretary of the Interior, who administers the leases, has no discretion.

In order to correct this situation and eliminate the need for legislation such as S. 1678, the gentleman from Oklahoma, Congressman EDMONDSON, and I have introduced general legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to prevent terminations of oil and gas leases in cases where there is a nominal deficiency in the rental payment, and to authorize him to reinstate under some conditions oil and gas leases terminated by operation of law for failure to pay rental timely. The House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has acted and reported this legislation to the House on August 17, 1967. Unfortunately, the other body has not so acted on similar legislation pending in that body.

Until such general legislation is passed, oil and gas lessees will continue to be subject to the automatic termination provisions of the Mineral Leasing Act. Regardless of the procedures instituted to prevent clerical errors in the handling of leases, they still occur. If such error results in a nominal deficiency to any extent, the least must be terminated. As a practical matter, it is impossible to prevent all errors when considering the volume of leases handled by the Bureau of Land Management in any given month.

Two examples of the problem involved is Private Law 89-341, where private legislation was required to enable the Secretary of the Interior to reinstate a lease in which payment was deficient by 25 cents. The other is Private Law 89-365, where payment was deficient by 14 cents.

S. 1678 is no different. Here the acreage figures placed in the original lease were in error. The lessee has made timely payment of the rentals in accordance with the terms of the lease until the acreage error was recently discovered by the lessee. When the lessee brought this matter to the attention of the Department of the Interior, the lessee was informed that under the terms of the Mineral Leasing Act, the lease is automatically canceled. This is the reason this legislation is before you today.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the American Petrofina Co. for its diligence and good faith in bringing this error to the attention of the Department of the Interior.

I urge the passage of S. 1678.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXCHANGE LANDS IN ALBANY, OREG.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7325) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to exchange certain Federal lands for certain lands owned by Mr. Robert S. Latham, Albany, Oreg.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 7325

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to accept on behalf of the United States from Robert S. Latham, if offered within one year from the date of this Act, a conveyance in fee simple of the following described lands situated in the State of Oregon:

A part of the northwest quarter of section 13, township 11 south, range 4 west of the Willamette meridian, being more particularly described as: Beginning at a point on the east line of the George Cline donation land claim, which point is north 10 degrees 52 minutes east a distance of 196.97 feet from the southeast corner of said George Cline donation land claim; thence north 85 degrees 24 minutes east a distance of 45.4 feet to a point; thence north 14 degrees 12 minutes west a distance of 103.36 feet to a point; thence south 10 degrees 52 minutes west a distance of 105.74 feet to the point of beginning, containing 2,315 square feet, more or less, according to a survey dated June 28, 1966, and signed by Orris A. Carnegie, county surveyor, Linn County, State of Oregon.

SEC. 2. In exchange for the lands conveyed pursuant to section 1 of this Act, plus the payment of $500, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to convey by quitclaim deed to Robert S. Latham, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the following described lands situated in the State of Oregon:

A part of the northwest quarter of section 13, township 11 south, range 4 west of the Willamette meridian, being more particularly described as: Beginning at a point on the east line of the George Cline donation land claim, which point is north 10 degrees 52 minutes east a distance of 78.79 feet from the southeast corner of said George Cline donation land claim; thence north 10 degrees 52 minutes east a distance of 118.18 feet to a point; thence south 85 degrees 24 minutes west a distance of 50.78 feet to a point; thence south 14 degrees 12 minutes east a distance of 115.52 feet to the point of beginning, containing 2,892 square feet, more or less, according to a survey dated June 28, 1966, and signed by Orris A. Carnegie, county surveyor, Linn County, State of Oregon.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 6, after the word "simple" insert "by warranty deed".

Add a new section 3 as follows:

"SEC. 3. The lands acquired pursuant to section 1 shall have the same status as the lands conveyed pursuant to section 2."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCORPORATE THE PARALYZED VETERANS OF AMERICA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11131) to incorporate the Paralyzed Veterans of America.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 11131

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following persons, to wit: Burton Little, Chickasaw, Alabama; Tom Goggin, Phoenix, Arizona; Leonard Chrysler, Los Altos, California; Wayne L. Capson, Garden Grove, California; George Boschet, Silver Spring, Maryland; Robert Classon, New York, New York; Edward G. Maxwell, Miami, Florida; Claude C. Beckham, Irmo, South Carolina; Benny Tschetter, Sioux Falls, South Dakota; Frederick T. Gill, Valley Station, Kentucky; Lee M. Gresham, Wixom, Michigan; Conrad M. Standinger, Memphis, Tennessee; Curley Gullett, Denver, Colorado; Charles Swartz, Marblehead, Massachusetts; Bolivar Rivera, Rio Piedras, Puerto Rico; James Schwiem, Pasadena, Texas; Robert T. Kiggins, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; Glenn E. Mayer, Hines, Illinois; John Novak, Richmond, Virginia; and such other persons as are members of the Paralyzed Veterans of America, and their associates and successors, are hereby created and declared to be a body corporate by the name of Paralyzed Veterans of America (hereinafter referred to as the "corporation").

SEC. 2. The persons named in the first section of this Act, or their successors, are hereby authorized to complete the organization of the corporation by the selection of officers, the adoption of a constitution and bylaws, and the doing of such other acts as may be necessary for such purpose.

SEC. 3. The objects and purposes of the corporation shall be—

(a) to preserve the great and basic truths and enduring principles upon which this Nation was founded;

(b) to form a national association for the benefit of persons who have suffered injuries or diseases of the spinal cord;

(c) to acquaint the public with the needs and problems of paraplegics;

(d) to promote medical research in the several fields connected with injuries and diseases of the spinal cord, including research in neurosurgery and orthopedics and in genitourinary and orthopedic appliances; and

(e) to advocate and foster complete and effective reconditioning programs for paraplegics, including a thorough physical reconditioning program, physiotherapy, competent walking instructions, adequate guidance (both vocational and educational), academic and vocational education (both in hospitals and in educational institutions), psychological orientation and readjustment to family and friends, and occupational therapy (both functional and diversional).

SEC. 4. The corporation shall have perpetual succession and shall have power—

(a) to sue and be sued;

(b) to acquire, hold, and dispose of such real and personal property as may be necessary to carry out the corporate purposes;

(c) to make and enter into contracts;

(d) to accept gifts, legacies, and devises which will further the corporate purposes;

(e) to borrow money for the purposes of the corporation, issue bonds therefor, and secure the same by mortgage, subject in every case to all applicable provisions of Federal and State law;

(f) to adopt and alter a corporate seal;

(g) to establish, regulate, and discontinue subordinate State and regional organizations and local chapters or posts;

(h) to choose such officers, representatives, and agents as may be necessary to carry out the corporate purposes;

(i) to establish and maintain offices for the conduct of the affairs of the corporation;

(j) to adopt and alter a constitution and bylaws not inconsistent with law;

(k) to publish a newspaper, magazine, or other publications;

(l) to adopt and alter emblems and badges; and

(m) to do any and all acts and things necessary and proper to accomplish the objects and purposes of the corporation.

SEC. 5. The corporation shall have no power to issue capital stock or engage in business for pecuniary profit or gain.

SEC. 6. The corporation shall be nonpolitical and, as an organization, shall not furnish financial aid to, or otherwise promote the candidacy of, any person seeking public office.

SEC. 7. Any American citizen shall be eligible for membership in the corporation who was regularly enlisted, inducted, or commissioned, and who was accepted for, or was on, active duty in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, or Coast Guard of the United States, or our allies. Service with the Armed Forces must have been terminated by discharge or separation from service under conditions other than dishonorable: *Provided, however,* That persons otherwise eligible for membership who are on active duty or who must continue to serve after the cessation of hostilities are also eligible for membership: *And provided further,* That membership shall be limited to such persons as have suffered spinal cord injuries or diseases whether service connected or nonservice connected in origin.

SEC. 8. The headquarters and principal place of business of said corporation shall be located in the District of Columbia, but the activities of said organization, as set out herein, shall not be confined to said city, but shall be conducted throughout the several States and any territory or possession of the United States.

SEC. 9. In the event of a final dissolution or liquidation of such corporation, and after the discharge of satisfactory provisions for the discharge of all its liabilities, the remaining assets of the said corporation shall be transferred to the Veterans' Administration to be applied to the care and comfort of paralyzed veterans.

SEC. 10. The corporation and its State and regional organizations and local chapters or posts shall have the sole and exclusive right to have and use in carrying out its purposes the name "Paralyzed Veterans of America," and such seals, emblems, and badges as the corporation may lawfully adopt.

SEC. 11. The corporation shall keep correct and complete books and records of account and shall also keep minutes of the proceedings of its members, executive committee, and committees having any of the authority of the executive committee; and shall keep at its registered office or principal office a record giving the names and addresses of its members entitled to vote; and permit all books and records of the corporation to be inspected by any member or his agent or his attorney for any proper purpose at any reasonable time.

SEC. 12. As a condition precedent to the exercise of any power or privilege herein granted or conferred, the corporation shall file in the office of the secretary of each State or of any territory or possession of the United States, in which organizations, chapters, or posts may be organized, the name and post office address of an authorized agent upon whom local process or demands against the corporation may be served.

SEC. 13. Such provisions, privileges, and prerogatives as have been granted heretofore to other national veterans' organizations by virtue of their being incorporated by Congress are hereby granted and accrue to the Paralyzed Veterans of America.

SEC. 14. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further call of the Private Calendar be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That concludes the call of the Private Calendar.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE REPORT

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file a certain privileged report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 312]

Boggs
Bolton
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Button
Cederberg
Cohelan
Cramer
Dellenback
Diggs
Erlenborn
Everett
Fallon
Fisher
Foley
Fountain
Fulton, Tenn.
Grover
Gude
Hansen, Wash.
Harsha
Hébert
Herlong
Holifield
Howard
Irwin
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Kazen
Kluczynski
Landrum
Latta
McMillan
May
Moorhead
Olsen
Patman
Pool
Rarick
Rees
Resnick
Rivers
Roybal
St. Onge
Sisk
Stafford
Stephens
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Tuck
Tunney
Utt
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Young

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). On this rollcall 381 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION APPROPRIATIONS, 1968—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 11456) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 768)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11456) "making appropriations for the Department of Transportation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 24.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 20 and 25, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$7,400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$342,651,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$605,400,000"; and the Senate agrees to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$54,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$70,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$59,927,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,770,872,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,012,781,270"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$25,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$5,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

"GENERAL PROVISION

"SEC. 401. None of the funds provided in this title shall be available for the planning or execution of programs the obligations for which are in excess of $25,000,000 in fiscal year 1968 for 'State and Community Highway Safety'."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$11,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendment numbered 13.

EDWARD P. BOLAND,
JOHN MCFALL,
SIDNEY R. YATES,
GEO. MAHON,
WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
(except as to 6 and 25),
Managers on the Part of the House.

JOHN STENNIS,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
JOHN O. PASTORE,
MIKE MONRONEY,
NORRIS COTTON,
KARL E. MUNDT,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11456) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments; namely:

TITLE I—OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates $7,400,000 for "Salaries and expenses" instead of $6,985,100 as proposed by the House and $7,800,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount provided is for support of 470 permanent positions for the Office of the Secretary.

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates $5,950,000 for "Transportation research" as proposed by the House instead of $6,200,000 as proposed by the Senate. Of the sum provided, $2,500,000 is for the Northeast Corridor Project.

TITLE II—COAST GUARD

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates $342,651,000 for "Operating expenses" instead of $339,992,500 as proposed by the House and $344,429,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates $107,014,000 for "Acquisition, Construction, and Improvements" as proposed by the House instead of $121,514,000 as proposed by the Senate. The sum provided includes funds for construction of two high-endurance cutters and deletes the oceanographic research ship as proposed by the House. In view of the demands of the war on Coast Guard ships, the second high-endurance cutter is considered to be a high priority requirement. The oceanographic ship is postponed pending a comprehensive review of oceanographic research programs throughout the Government.

TITLE III—FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates $605,400,000 for "Operations" instead of $593,326,000 as proposed by the House and $618,400,000 as proposed by the Senate. The sum provided is the total amount of the amended Budget request. The conferees are in agreement that the Congress should maintain a continuing surveillance of aviation safety and call on the Department of Transportation to present comprehensive plans for the continued maintenance of aviation safety standards.

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates $54,000,000 for "Facilities and equipment" instead of $30,000,000 as proposed by the House and $65,400,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 7, 8, and 9: Restore language combining "Operation and Maintenance" appropriations of Washington National and Dulles airports as proposed by the House. The merged appropriation is agreed to with the understanding that budget justification material will maintain separate data on costs and operations at the two airports.

Amendments Nos. 10 and 11: Restore language combining "Construction" appropriations of Washington National and Dulles airports as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 12: Appropriates $70,000,000 for "Grants-in-Aid for Airports" instead of $65,000,000 as proposed by the House and $75,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 13: Reported in technical disagreement. The Managers on the Part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur with the Senate amendment making $140,000 available for an airport at Kelley Flats, Montana.

TITLE IV—FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 14. Provides a limitation of $59,927,000 on general expenses to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund instead of $59,833,000 as proposed by the House and $60,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount allowed deletes $73,000 for 10 new positions in highway planning.

Amendments Nos. 15 and 16: Adjust amounts appropriated from Highway Trust Fund in accordance with amount provided in "Limitation on General expenses" as set out in amendment numbered 14.

Amendment No. 17: Provides transfer to "Traffic and Highway Safety" of $1,100,000 for administrative expenses from "State and Community Highway Safety" program instead of $1,000,000 as proposed by the House and $1,400,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates $25,000,000 for "State and Community Highway Safety" instead of $20,000,000 as proposed by the House and $40,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 19: Provides transfer of $1,100,000 for administrative expenses of "State and Community Highway Safety" instead of $1,000,000 as proposed by the House and $1,400,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 20: Appropriates $1,780,000 for "Motor Carrier Safety" as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,670,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 21: Appropriates $5,000,000 for Alaskan Assistance instead of $4,000,000 as proposed by the House and $8,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 22: Restores language proposed by the House and amends amount cited from "$20,000,000" to "$25,000,000".

TITLE V—FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 23: Appropriates $11,750,000 for "High-Speed Ground Transportation Research and Development" instead of $10,300,000 as proposed by the House and $16,632,000 as proposed by the Senate. The sum provided includes $1,500,000 for research on tracked air cushion vehicles and restores the $450,000 unspecified House reduction in the demonstration program. The sum agreed to includes $4,500,000 for the Boston to New York demonstration program and deletes all funds for the Auto-on-train program.

TITLE VI—OTHER ACTIVITIES

Amendment No. 24: Appropriates $4,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of $4,291,000 as proposed by the Senate for the National Transportation Safety Board. The funds requested for ten positions for accident safety research are denied.

TITLE VII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 25: Deletes expenditure limitation proposed by the House.

EDWARD P. BOLAND,
JOHN MCFALL,
SIDNEY R. YATES,
GEORGE MAHON,
WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
(except as to 6 and 25),
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. BOLAND (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement of the managers on the part of the House be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] is recognized.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, the conference agreement on the Department of Transportation appropriation bill is a good one. It accomplishes the objectives of your committee. These objectives are to adequately fund the essential requirements of the new Department of Transportation without providing an excess of funds which might start the new Department off in the direction of empire building and waste.

The total amount of funds provided, exclusive of trust funds, is $1,581,905,772. This is $139,411,728 less than the amount provided for the last fiscal year, fiscal year 1967.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS APPROVED FOR 1968

Item	Budget estimate	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action	Conference action compared with—		
					Budget estimate	House bill	Senate bill
TITLE I—OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY							
Salaries and expenses	$8,300,000	$6,985,100	$7,800,000	$7,400,000	−$900,000	+$414,900	−$400,000
Transportation research	[1] 8,100,000	5,950,000	6,200,000	5,950,000	−2,150,000	------	−250,000
Total, title I	16,400,000	12,935,100	14,000,000	13,350,000	−3,050,000	+414,900	−650,000
TITLE II—COAST GUARD							
Operating expenses	368,972,000	339,992,500	344,429,500	342,651,000	−26,321,000	+2,658,500	−1,778,500
Acquisition, construction, and improvements	107,014,000	107,014,000	121,514,000	107,014,000	------	------	−14,500,000
Reserve training	(2)	24,300,000	24,300,000	24,300,000	+24,300,000	------	------
Retired pay	48,260,000	48,000,000	48,000,000	48,000,000	−260,000	------	------
Total, title II	524,246,000	519,306,500	538,243,500	521,965,000	−2,281,000	+2,658,500	−16,278,500
TITLE III—FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION							
Operations	[3] 605,400,000	593,326,000	618,400,000	605,400,000	------	+12,074,000	−13,000,000
Facilities and equipment	[4] 28,400,000	30,000,000	65,400,000	54,000,000	+25,600,000	+24,000,000	−11,400,000
Research and development	27,500,000	27,000,000	27,000,000	27,000,000	−500,000	------	------
Operation and maintenance, Washington National Airport	------	------	3,971,000	------	------	------	−3,971,000
Operation and maintenance, Dulles International Airport	------	------	4,529,000	------	------	------	−4,529,000
Operation and maintenance, National Capital Airports	8,500,000	8,500,000	------	8,500,000	------	------	+8,500,000
Construction, National Capital Airport	160,000	160,000	------	160,000	------	------	+160,000
Construction, Dulles International Airport	------	------	160,000	------	------	------	−160,000
Grants-in-aid for airports: Fiscal year 1969	75,000,000	65,000,000	75,000,000	70,000,000	−5,000,000	+5,000,000	−5,000,000
Civil supersonic aircraft development	198,000,000	142,375,000	142,375,000	142,375,000	−55,625,000	------	------
Total, title III	942,960,000	866,361,000	936,835,000	907,435,000	−35,525,000	+41,074,000	−29,400,000

See footnotes at end of table.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS APPROVED FOR 1968—Continued

Item	Budget estimate	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action	Conference action compared with— Budget estimate	Conference action compared with— House bill	Conference action compared with— Senate bill
TITLE IV—FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION							
Limitation on general expenses	(5)	($59,833,000)	($60,000,000)	($59,927,000)	(+$59,927,000)	(+$94,000)	(−$73,000)
Federal-aid highways (trust fund)	($3,773,000,000)	(3,770,778,000)	(3,770,945,000)	(3,770,872,000)	(−2,128,000)	(+94,000)	(−73,000)
Highway beautification	(5)	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	+1,200,000		
Traffic and highway safety	(5)	21,034,000	21,034,000	21,034,000	+21,034,000		
Operating expenses:							
By appropriation	34,565,000				−34,565,000		
By transfers	(65,875,000)				(+65,875,000)		
State and community highway safety (liquidation of contract authority)	100,000,000	20,000,000	40,000,000	25,000,000	−75,000,000	+5,000,000	−15,000,000
Motor carrier safety	(5)	1,670,000	1,780,000	1,780,000	+1,780,000	+110,000	
Forest highways (liquidation of contract authorization)	33,000,000	32,000,000	32,000,000	32,000,000	−1,000,000		
Public lands highways (liquidation of contract authorization)	10,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000	−1,000,000		
Inter-American Highway	7,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	−2,000,000		
Chamizal Memorial Highway	8,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	−4,000,000		
Alaskan assistance		4,000,000	8,000,000	5,000,000	+5,000,000	+1,000,000	−3,000,000
Repair and reconstruction of highways	15,097,772	15,097,772	15,097,772	15,097,772			
Total, title IV (general funds)	207,662,772	113,001,772	137,111,772	119,111,772	−88,551,000	+6,110,000	−18,000,000
Highway trust fund	3,773,000,000	3,770,778,000	3,770,945,000	3,770,872,000	−2,128,000	+94,000	−73,000
TITLE V—FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION							
Salaries and expenses	4,150,000				−4,150,000		
Salaries and expenses, Office of the Administrator	(6)	680,000	680,000	680,000	+680,000		
Bureau of Railroad Safety	(6)	3,414,000	3,414,000	3,414,000	+3,414,000		
High-speed ground transportation research and development	[7] 18,600,000	10,300,000	16,632,000	11,750,000	−6,850,000	+1,450,000	−4,882,000
Railroad research	300,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	−100,000		
Total, title V	23,050,000	14,594,000	20,926,000	16,044,000	−7,006,000	+1,450,000	−4,882,000
TITLE VI—OTHER ACTIVITIES							
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation: Limitation on administrative expenses	(515,000)	(514,000)	(514,000)	(514,000)	(−1,000)		
National Transportation Safety Board: Salaries and expenses	4,300,000	4,000,000	4,291,000	4,000,000	−300,000		−291,000
Total, title VI	4,300,000	4,000,000	4,291,000	4,000,000	−300,000		−291,000
Grand total, all titles:							
General fund	1,718,618,772	1,530,198,372	1,651,407,272	1,581,905,772	−136,713,000	+51,707,400	−69,501,500
Highway trust fund	3,773,000,000	3,770,778,000	3,770,945,000	3,770,872,000	−2,128,000	+94,000	−73,000

---

[1] Includes $2,300,000 requested under "Federal Railroad Administration, high-speed ground transportation research and development," for transportation information planning and excludes $300,000 requested under this heading for railroad research.

[2] Estimate of $24,535,000 carried under "Operating expenses."

[3] Original estimate increased $7,000,000 (S. Doc. 50).

[4] Original estimate decreased $7,000,000 (S. Doc. 50).

[5] Estimates carried under "Operating expenses."

[6] Estimates carried under "Salaries and expenses, Federal Railroad Administration."

[7] Excludes $2,300,000 for transportation information planning which is transferred to "Office of Secretary, transportation research."

I think this is about the only appropriation bill for which this can be claimed.

While the Department of Transportation was not in existence throughout fiscal year 1967, many of the activities of the Department, and agencies which are in the Department, did exist and appropriations provided for these agencies and activities last year totaled $1,721,317,500. So, as I said, the bill which we bring before you today would provide for, in round figures, $140,000,000 less than was provided for similar activities in the last fiscal year. Even though the total appropriation is less than last year's sum, we are fully convinced that the sum provided will adequately fund the necessary and essential requirements of the Department of Transportation.

Under the permission granted by unanimous consent, I shall include as a part of my statement a tabulation showing the congressional actions on the Department of Transportation bill

In summary, the House cut $188,420,400 from the budget estimate of $1,718,618,772. The Senate added back two-thirds of the House reduction, or $121,208,000. In the conference, and I might add that the conference was one of the most spirited I have attended, both sides were tenacious and adamant in maintaining their positions, the managers on the part of the House were successful in prevailing upon the Senate to recede on $69,501,500 of their increase and we agreed to increases totaling $51,707,400 above the amount as passed by the House.

The item in the bill on which there was the greatest amount of discussion, both on the floor of the House and on the floor of the Senate, was not in the conference. Both Houses provided the same amount, $142,375,000, to carry on the development of the supersonic transport, the SST. So this item was not in conference.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION

The budget request for salaries and expenses for the Office of the Secretary of Transportation was $8,300,000. The conference amount provides $7,400,000. This is a cut of 11 percent. The Secretary of Transportation has been careful and has exercised great prudence in building up his staff. We applaud him for this caution. The House figure, $5,950,000, prevailed for transportation research.

COAST GUARD

For the Coast Guard the conference agreement is very close to the House position. On the large item in controversy, the conference agreement is the House position. The House provided the exact amount of funds requested for "Acquisition, Construction, and Improvements" for the Coast Guard, but directed that an oceanographic research ship which had been requested be postponed and in lieu of that ship a second high endurance cutter—there is one in the budget—be constructed. The Navy has taken a number of Coast Guard ships to Southeast Asia and they are making a valuable contribution to the war effort there. We feel that, in view of the war situation and in view of governmental financial stringencies generally, it makes more sense at this time to provide the additional cutter. The Appropriations Committee is making a study of oceanographic research throughout the Government. Similar studies are being made by other groups. When some of these studies have been completed, we can better determine what the oceanographic requirements of the Nation are. Oceanographic research has now spread to 29 departments and agencies of the Government—I think we are spending in the fiscal year 1968 some $460,000,000 on oceanography or on some phase of oceanography. And this makes it most difficult for Congress to review adequately oceanographic programs.

THE FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

The greatest difficulty, let me say to the Members of the House, the items in which the conferees on the part of the other body were most tenacious in the conference involved the Federal Aviation Administration. After the Transportation appropriation bill had passed the House, a budget document, Senate Document No. 50, was transmitted requesting an additional $7 million for the "Operations" appropriation for the FAA. The funds requested are to provide 900 new air controller and flight standards personnel.

The Senate added the $7 million requested and another $13 million above the budget.

The Secretary of Transportation had stated that the numbers of personnel allowed in the amended budget was the maximum number which the FAA might reasonably expect to hire during the remainder of the fiscal year, and the House conferees were adamant in their position that the budget request should not be exceeded.

The amount agreed to is $605,400,000, and it is the full amount of the amended budget request.

The House had made a reduction of $5 million in items not directly related to aviation safety. At the insistence of the other body, we relented on our reductions and also included the additional $7 million provided by the budget amendment. We still feel that the House-proposed reductions in such programs as "Administration of airports," "Research direction," and "Administration of medical programs" should be made, and the funds saved applied to the operation of the air traffic control system. Thus, the amount for "Operations" for the FAA is $12 million in excess of the amount provided in the House, but it is also $13 million less than the sum provided by the Senate.

All Members of Congress are interested in aviation safety. All of us are closely involved with the FAA, and those of us who have been closely involved with it on this committee know that the growth of aviation has been and is tremendous. We know that additional personnel and additional facilities will be required. However, there are differences of opinion as to what the particular requirements are and how they may best be satisfied.

Under the amount provided in the conference report, the Federal Aviation Administration will be able to hire more than 1,600 new personnel directly involved in aviation safety activities.

I am fully convinced, and the subcommittee joins me in this conviction, that if the FAA hires this many qualified people in the 8 months remaining in this fiscal year, it will be a notable achievement, and that the provision of the additional funds at this time would be a useless gesture.

In order to reach an agreement on the funds for personnel which I have just discussed, and on other matters, the managers on the part of the House had to yield to the demand of the other body to some extent in the provision of funds for "Facilities and equipment." The original budget request for "Facilities and equipment" was $35,400,000. The House provided $30 million. The amended budget reduced this amount by $7 million, making the budget request total $28,400,000.

This action took place after the bill passed the House and before it passed the Senate. The other body added $37 million more than was requested in the budget.

There are legitimate requirements for additional aviation equipment.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. So the House knows the exact facts—and the gentleman has been very helpful in establishing them for us—the original budget figure for this item was what?

Mr. BOLAND. It was $35,400,000.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. And the House version of the bill reduced that to what figure?

Mr. BOLAND. To $30 million.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. And subsequently to that, the President and the Bureau of the Budget reduced it to $28 million?

Mr. BOLAND. To $28 million.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Then the bill went to the other body. What happened or what transpired there as far as the Bureau of the Budget and the other body are concerned?

Mr. BOLAND. The other body added the $7 million that was requested in Senate Document No. 50.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The original budget figure?

Mr. BOLAND. That is right, and also added an amount which made the total $65,400,000 for this activity, "Facilities and equipment." The total amount that the Senate passed was $65,400,000 for "Facilities and equipment" for the FAA.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. How much over the budget request by the President and the Bureau of the Budget was that?

Mr. BOLAND. That amount was $37 million over the amount requested by the President and the Bureau of the Budget. I might say that the Senate document which was transmitted to the Congress, after we had passed the transportation bill in the House, as the gentleman knows, included a $7 million reduction in this item to be transferred to "Operations." They asked that $7 million to provide for the 900 additional positions under "Operations" to be taken out of "Facilities and equipment." This the Senate did not do. They provided the $7 million plus an additional $30 million.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. So that the net result, if we approve the conference report, is to add $25 million over and above any Presidential request for this item?

Mr. BOLAND. It is $26 million.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BOLAND. Let me say there are legitimate requirements relating to aviation safety to explain why the House took this position in agreeing to part of the increase that was put in by the Senate. This committee believes—and also I am sure all Members who are interested in aviation safety in this House, and we all are—that there are legitimate requirements for additional equipment. As the gentleman knows better than some of the Members of this House, some of these items are long leadtime items. Equipment must be ordered now and paid for later on. This is what we are trying to do.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. May I make an observation there. I personally rely to a great extent upon the skill of the people that operate the towers and the equipment they use, and I have great faith in the competence of the people and in the equipment, but would it not be more orderly procedure, would it not be the proper way for the legislative branch to consider this matter, to have the President and the Bureau of the Budget submit to the Congress and have the officials from FAA come up and testify specifically in justification of this additional requirement?

Mr. BOLAND. I agree with the gentleman. This is a good way to do it, but I think there is another way to do it. I think members of the legislative branch have some knowledge as to what the needs may be in their own respective areas. There are crying needs for instrument landing systems. And there are crying needs for towers in particular areas, and this committee is importuned often by members of this body—and rightly so—for needed and necessary aviation facilities and equipment in their particular localities. I think in a sense the Members of this body ought to have some leeway about providing some of the equipment that the Members believe to be essential and necessary for aviation safety in their own areas. I know the gentleman agrees with me on that point.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, can the gentleman inform us whether or not this item of "Facilities and equipment" is totally facilities and equipment relating to aircraft safety and aircraft control and other items directly contributing to safety and air transportation?

Mr. BOLAND. This committee has been supplied with a memorandum by the Federal Aviation Administration indicating that the entire amount above the budget is a sliderule projection which will provide air traffic safety, which will provide in a number of instances for landing lights, and so on, so the answer is "Yes."

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield. I will try to answer that in more detail.

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MINSHALL. A breakdown of that figure of $54 million is $4.8 million for airport surveillance radar at eight locations.

Instrument landing system, 80 locations; approach lights, 76 locations; $11.7 million.

Direct beacon code identification and altitude readout, 23 locations, $2.1 million.

The original request was for $35 million. That is an increase of approximately $36 million.

Mr. HOSMER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BOLAND. The answer is "Yes." I believe we ought to qualify it a bit.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MINSHALL] has really been a giant on this subcommittee on matters affecting the FAA. Since he does pilot his own plane, perhaps he knows more about this subject than any other one of us. I am pleased to have his cooperation, as are the other members of the subcommittee.

In addition to what the gentleman from Ohio said, it might be that provision will be made for tower facilities in particular locations around the Nation. Tower facilities are an essential element of air traffic safety. Firm decisions as to the application of the funds have not yet been made.

In addition to the memorandum from

which the gentleman from Ohio read, the Department also supplied us with a list of towers that might be built. It is not an absolute promise to build them, but they are needed and they might be built in areas all over the Nation and in most States.

Is that correct?

Mr. MINSHALL. I should like to add that I have a complete tabulation, which I will put in the RECORD, which does spell out precisely what the gentleman has said.

Mr. BOLAND. The lists to which I referred to will be placed in the RECORD at this point:

STATEMENT BY DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

The Conference amount of $54.0 million for the Facilities and Equipment appropriation for fiscal year 1968, enables us to provide the additional air traffic control and navigation aids in terminal areas which are our major problem. With this amount we intend to provide in addition to the items in our original request of $35.4 million (1) eight airport surveillance radars which provide our controllers with position information on aircraft in the terminal area; (2) eighty instrument landing system with associated approach light aids which will provide approach and landing guidance; and (3) equipment to provide the controller with altitude information and beacon code identification of beacon equipped aircraft on displays of twenty-three existing air port surveillance radars as follows:

Airport surveillance radar (8 locations)	$4, 800, 000
Instrument landing system (80 locations); approach lights (76 locations)	11, 700, 000
Direct beacon code identification and altitude readout (23 locations)	2, 100, 000
Total	18, 600, 000
Original request	35, 400, 000
Total	54, 000, 000

SUMMARY OF REQUIREMENTS

[In thousands of dollars]

Activity	Original request	Distribution of conference amount	Difference
1. Air route traffic control centers	16, 018	16. 018	
a. Long-range radar			
b. Automation equipment	14, 300	14, 300	
c. Other center facilities	1, 718	1, 718	
2. Airport traffic control towers	10, 638	17, 538	
a. Terminal area radar	330	7, 230	+6, 900
b. Terminal area automation	8, 500	8, 500	
c. Other tower facilities	1, 808	1, 808	
3. Flight service stations	1, 044	1, 044	
a. Domestic	976	976	
b. International	68	68	
4. Air navigation facilities	3, 503	15, 203	
a. VORTAC	455	455	
b. Low/medium frequency facilities			
c. Instrument landing systems	3, 048	14, 748	+11, 700
d. Visual aids			
e. Intermediate fields			
5. Housing, utilities and miscellaneous	175	175	
6. Aircraft and related equipment	3, 632	3, 632	
7. Research, test and evaluation facilities	390	390	
Total	35, 400	54, 000	+18, 600

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT—TOWER FACILITIES, 45 LOCATIONS

Locations	Fiscal year 1967 estimated itinerant operations	Total cost
Alabama: Dothan	45, 004	$279, 000
Alaska: Kenai	39, 626	385, 000
Arkansas:		
Fayetteville	26, 978	279, 000
Pine Bluff	25, 331	279, 000
California:		
Carlsbad	44, 700	279, 000
Chino	35, 800	279, 000
Compton	27, 650	279, 000
El Monte	49, 300	279, 000
Imperial	27, 300	279, 000
Livermore	42, 230	279, 000
Marysville	26, 000	279, 000
San Diego (Brown International)	27, 900	279, 000
Connecticut:		
Danbury	30, 834	279, 000
New London (Groton)	32, 582	279, 000
Hartford (Brainerd)	26, 321	279, 000
New Haven	40, 000	279, 000
Florida:		
Fort Lauderdale (Executive)	89, 000	279, 000
Gainesville	33, 563	279, 000
Jacksonville (Craig)	24, 911	279, 000
Lakeland	27, 352	279, 000
Vero Beach	32, 620	279, 000
Georgia: Albany	30, 156	279, 000
Illinois: Carbondale	26, 206	279, 000
Indiana: West Lafayette	41, 897	$279, 000
Kansas: Olathe	35, 421	279, 000
Maryland: Gaithersburg	33, 360	279, 000
Massachusetts: Norwood	32, 450	279, 000
Michigan: Benton Harbor	28, 253	279, 000
Minnesota:		
Anoka	38, 585	279, 000
South St. Paul	24, 578	279, 000
Misssissippi: Greenville	27, 080	279, 000
Missouri: Columbia	31, 420	279, 000
Nevada: North Las Vegas	31, 700	279, 000
New Jersey: Linden	28, 000	82, 000
New York: Poughkeepsie	31, 772	279, 000
North Carolina: Hickery	31, 096	279, 000
North Dakota: Grand Forks	26, 700	279, 000
Ohio: Cleveland (Cuyahoga)	33, 360	279, 000
Oklahoma: Norman	24, 273	279, 000
South Carolina: Crescent Beach	27, 076	279, 000
Tennessee: Knoxville (Downtown)	44, 070	279, 000
Washington: Everett	51, 292	279, 000
West Virginia: Morgantown	30, 000	279, 000
Wisconsin:		
La Crosse	36, 125	279, 000
Waukesha	27, 469	279, 000
Total		12, 661, 000

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. We can add and subtract any way we want, but I believe the gentleman stated previously that this bill is $51.7 million more than the House approved? The conference report calls for $51.7 million more than the House approved on its original passage?

Mr. BOLAND. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Is that correct?

Mr. BOLAND. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. This is not very much in the way of economy, would the gentleman believe?

Mr. BOLAND. I suppose it depends on how one economizes. It is also $69 million below the Senate figure. I would remind the gentleman that the Senate figure was $121 million above the House figure.

Mr. GROSS. I understand all that, but they, of course, like some of the agencies downtown, have an asking price. The fact remains that this is $51.7 million plus above the House figure.

Mr. BOLAND. The gentleman is precisely correct.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman about the Inter-American Highway. When did that get out of the State and Justice Departments appropriation bill and come to this subcommittee?

Mr. BOLAND. It is administered by the Federal Highway Administration, and that is why it is in this bill.

Mr. GROSS. Historically it has been in the other subcommittee, has it not?

Mr. BOLAND. So was the old Bureau of Public Roads. It was all in the other Department.

Mr. GROSS. The Chamizal Memorial Highway, I see, is in this bill. Is this the total cost of the Chamizal Memorial Highway?

Mr. BOLAND. No, it is not the total cost. When we had this bill on the floor the House agreed to an amount of $4 million. The budget request was $8 million. We reduced it $4 million. I am sure they will be back next year for an additional $4 million.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman believe they will be back in a deficiency appropriation bill this year?

Mr. BOLAND. If it is in a deficiency appropriation bill, this subcommittee will not approve it.

Mr. GROSS. To take care of that superhighway down in Texas?

Mr. BOLAND. To take care of the superhighway this year.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I wonder if the gentleman will tell the Members of the House what happened to the motion to recommit which passed this body on July 18, 1967, with instructions, by a vote of 213 to 189, in the conference committee.

Mr. BOLAND. Actually, that was one amendment to which the Senate would not even listen. This was one of those cases. This was the Laird amendment. It was same as the Bow amendment offered on other bills, but it was offered, as Members will recall, by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] who is very knowledgeable and persuasive but a very practical Member of the House. He has been a conferee, as the distinguished gentleman from Missouri has been.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate all that.

Mr. BOLAND. When we got to that amendment, we just lost.

Mr. HALL. I have complete notes here about what the Laird amendment did contain, on page 19 and so forth, but I want to say I wonder if, as in so many other areas, perhaps the managers on the part of the House did not yield to the other body and not insist it be considered, which was a mandate from the elected Members of this body.

Mr. BOLAND. Well, that is true, but, of course, the other body has a right to make amendments, as the gentleman well knows. It is a coequal body legislatively. Consequently, when we got to that amendment, we really had no choice, and they would not listen to our maintaining it. Let me say to the gentleman, also, it was the feeling of the conferees in the other body that we had substantially cut this bill. The Department of Transportation bill was cut something like 11 percent when it left this body. It was cut substantially more than any other appropriation bill that we had heretofore considered. I think perhaps—and this is my judgment and it was the judgment of the conferees, also—it should not have been recommitted. It was recommitted by about 24 votes, I think.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I believe it is time for individual opinion when you are acting as the managers on the part of the House and there has been such instruction. Also, I take some exception to the question as to whether the other body is coequal or not.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MINSHALL. In response to my friend from Missouri, I should like to point out that I did except as to amendment No. 25, which was the Laird amendment that you referred to, Congressman HALL. Also my good friend CHARLES JONAS, of North Carolina, was not able to attend the conference. He was unavoidably absent. But I am sure that he would have excepted to it as well.

Mr. HALL. I would like to say, too, that some of us who voted for it on final passage would not have done so if we had known we would be so easily taken over.

Mr. BOLAND. I think that each House has to trust the judgment of the conferees. That is why we have conferences. We do have to compromise. It has been done all the time, for a long time before you and I ever arrived here, and it will be done long after we are gone.

So, Mr. Speaker, in the judgment of the conferees, we have arrived at a figure that we think is a fair and equitable compromise with the other body. One of the items in this bill that has given us some difficulty—and I am sure it has given other Members of this House difficulty, too—involves the Federal Highway Administration.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

In the title of the bill which involves the Federal Highway Administration, the position of the House was for the most part maintained. Some of the House reductions were not appealed. The House had provided $20 million for the new program of grants to States for highway safety. The Senate increased this figure to $40 million. The conference agreed on $25 million. I think all of us can agree that it is a substantial victory for the House position.

Also, and even more importantly, language controlling the obligation of these funds which was proposed by the House is maintained. If the language had not been maintained, the Federal Highway Administration could have gone merrily on its way and spent the entire $100 million, because it was a liquidation of contract authority. So, in this instance, the House did an exceptionally fine job, and I compliment the Members of the House on it. This was an item which was a real stickler in the conference.

I might mention that a program in which many Members have expressed interest, highway beautification, is not included in this bill except for funds for administrative purposes related to the obligation of funds heretofore appropriated. No new highway beautification program funds are included in the bill since authorization for this purpose has expired and new authorization has not been enacted.

In the appropriation for Alaskan assistance, the House proposed $4 million and the Senate proposed $8 million. The conference agreed to $5 million.

STATE AND COMMUNITY HIGHWAY SAFETY

Mr. Speaker, I know that many Members have received pleas from organizations in their States on the programs carried in this conference report titled "State and Community Highway Safety." I am in receipt of a number of telegrams from my own area. All of them are similar in context and contain the following message:

> We urge you to approve Senate Amendment increasing Federal Highway Safety Bureau appropriation to forty million dollars. Traffic accidents can be reduced only through massive statewide programs effective on all motorists which have not been undertaken by the states to date. The National Highway Safety Program standards provide excellent guide for such programs. Preliminary standards and planning will be concluded by the end of 1967 and states will be able to put federal funds into effective highway safety programs which meet federal standards. Congress must prime the pump of state activities for Massachusetts and other states to implement these life saving programs.

Mr. Speaker, all of those who sent the above telegram to me are outstanding citizens who are deeply and sincerely interested in all aspects of safety and all of them are members and/or directors of the Western Massachusetts Safety Council. This organization has done an outstanding job in constantly pounding and alerting the community to highway safety and safety at work or play. It has compiled an enviable record in my area and its advice and counsel in the field of safety is sought and often followed. I am pleased to have the opinions of its officers and members. I know that they respect my views and actions.

Mr. Speaker, all of the House conferees insisted on the action previously taken by the House on last July 18 when the Department of Transportation appropriation bill passed the House. In the conference last week, some of the Members of the other body agreed that this new program should be started slowly and looked at cautiously. Thus, the agreement of the conferees to the $25 million figure.

Of course, all of us realize that many persons are killed or injured in auto accidents. We agree that something must be done about it. We do not always agree as to what must be done.

The program of making grants to the States to assist the States in highway safety efforts is a new program. Funding plans have grossly overestimated requirements in the early months of the program. Congress authorized obligations of $67 million in fiscal year 1967; $10 million was appropriated and $902 thousand actually obligated in the fiscal year.

In the first quarter of the present fiscal year, 1968, obligations total $3.8 million, with another $0.5 million approved but deferred. The obligation rate in the first quarter indicates that the House proposal of a $20 million appropriation is adequate. Since a new program will grow throughout the year, and since the Senate provided $40 million, in conference we agreed to a $5 million increase above the House amount, making an appropriation of $25,000,000.

The plans for this program as presented to the committee were neither firm nor persuasive. You can not just spend money labeled "highway safety" and expect to save lives. Sound, sensible plans must be developed and implemented. We plan to look very carefully at the activities under this program. If, next year, it appears that a sound program is being carried out, we will support a higher level of funding. We believe in looking at what we are buying before spending large amounts of the taxpayers' money.

We think that some parts of the program presented are either of a low priority or should be left entirely to the States. School bus safety can be left to the States. Do we really need more Federal influence in the local school systems? Community support for highway safety has long been carried out by State, local, and private organizations such as the National Safety Council. Do we really need to put people on the payroll to do this?

Debris removal and motorcycle safety do not appear to be problems requiring Federal funds.

Do we really need Federal spending in the area of State and local "enforcement practices"? This is in the program.

Good management requires that this program be developed carefully, not hastily. The conference report provides enough money to carry out a useful program in fiscal 1968, a program which can be studied and redirected, if need be, before Federal spending reaches a high level.

HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION

The bill provides $3,770,872,000 from the highway trust fund for the Federal highway program. There was only a minor difference between the two Houses involving administrative expenses.

The conference report does not cut funds requested for highway construction, not even one dollar.

Members have inquired about the status of the highway program. The executive branch has made inquiries of the Governors of the various States as to the impact of certain reductions. As of today, no decision to reduce the program has been made. As we all know, the executive branch, as well as the Congress, is looking for ways to cope with our fiscal problems. Funds from the highway trust fund do not contribute to the administrative budget deficit. The spending of those funds, however, does have an impact on the overall national economy. I hope no reductions are required in the highway program. None have been made thus far in fiscal 1968, but the future of all programs must be considered to be somewhat uncertain at this time.

FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION

The conference agreement provides $16,044,000 for the Federal Railroad Administration. The House provided $14,594,000 and the Senate provided $20,926,000. The conference agreement is $1,450,000 above the House and $4,882,000 below the Senate figure.

The House maintained its position that no funds should be allowed to continue the so-called auto-on-train demonstration program.

Mr. Speaker, this program provides for Government participation in the construction and operation for a certain period of time of a new type of train which is designed to carry passengers and their own automobiles between Washington, D.C., and Jacksonville, Fla.

Mr. Speaker, it may be that this approach can be of some use in attracting long-distance passengers back to the railroads. In my judgment I thought we should have gone along with this proposal. However, the other Members and all of the Members on the part of the House who served as conferees, with the exception of myself, maintained and insisted upon the position of the House. Therefore, no funds were granted for this program.

Mr. Speaker, the Boston-to-New York demonstration program is fully funded. The sum of $1.5 million is provided for research on track-air-cushioned vehicles.

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

The House position was maintained with reference to the National Transportation Safety Board. The amount is $4 million, plus, the same amount as was provided in the House bill.

We feel it is important in the formative years for the Department of Transportation to curtail areas of possible duplication. We saw that possibility in the request for accident prevention and research personnel for the National Transportation Safety Board. The House position with reference to such personnel which had been requested was that we did sustain the position of the House and denied positions for accident research for the National Transportation Safety Board.

So, Mr. Speaker, in the judgment of myself and the House conferees, we feel we have brought back from conference a good bill. I would hope that all the Members would sustain the action of the conferees.

The only item on which we are above the budget, I would remind the Members of the House, is the item which the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD], mentioned a moment ago, and that was for facilities and equipment for the Federal Aviation Administration.

Mr. Speaker, the only other item for which funds were not budgeted was the Alaskan assistance program wherein we provided the sum of $4 million when this matter was considered in the House while the other body provided the sum of about $9 million. We reduced that figure to $5 million.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, and on an overall basis, the action of the conferees is one that all the Members of this Congress can stand by.

We earnestly solicit the support of all the Members in behalf of this bill.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to your attention my concern about the action of the House Appropriations Committee in sharply cutting back on research and development funds for high speed ground transportation. Very clearly, one of the great problems the country faces today is to accommodate movement within the metropolitan regions which we find in every quarter of the country.

The kind of transportation facilities which we have been encouraging as a matter of public policy for several decades are simply inadequate to meet the needs of these metropolitan regions. Congress recognized this 2 years ago in setting up the high speed ground transportation program and authorizing for it modest sums of money for research and development.

This program has made substantial progress as reflected in the annual report recently filed with this body. There are a number of prospects for the development of new systems which could go far to alleviate the congestion and near strangulation which are becoming so characteristic of the large cities of the country. I believe that it is shortsighted on our part to continue to spend large sums of money to move people with great speed around the world, and in our space program to the moon and to other planets, and severely cut back on the small expenditures which may make it possible to move with speed, comfort, and safety the relatively short distances between many of our large metropolitan areas. I believe this body should look searchingly at this program and the prospects that it has for greatly improving the region's transportation system for the future, and give it our support.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make an inquiry of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] with respect to the appropriation available here for the Coast Guard. My question is this: Since the Coast Guard is carrying on very substantial operations in the Vietnam theater, with several vessels being stationed in that theater—I believe some 30 vessels—can the gentleman from Massachusetts give me his assurance that the funds contained herein are adequate in all respects to carry out all the operations of the Coast Guard in Vietnam?

Mr. BOLAND. I am delighted that the gentleman from Michigan has asked that question. I know of the gentleman's concern for the Coast Guard. This bill provides $23 million above last year's budget for the Coast Guard. Only $6 million of the $23 million increase is required to support Coast Guard operations in Southeast Asia. So we have provided all the funds that the Coast Guard requires in this bill.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Massachusetts will permit me to make a further inquiry——

Mr. BOLAND. Yes.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. If the so-called Bow amendment were adopted here by the House would the Coast Guard, along with the other agencies of the Federal Government, be subjected to a 5-percent cut?

Mr. BOLAND. If the original Bow amendment were adopted, that would be so. And, if the so-called Laird amendment were adopted, that would be so.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, if the Bow amendment were adopted and if the Coast Guard had to take a 5-percent cut, would we be able to do this without impairing the operations of the Coast Guard in this theater of war?

In other words, Mr. Speaker, what I want from the gentleman from Massachusetts is some assurance that the Coast Guard is going to be protected against this contingency?

Mr. BOLAND. It is my opinion that the amount contained in this conference report will provide adequately for the activities of the Coast Guard in Southeast Asia. This is what the Coast Guard says, and I presume that we have to believe them.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I would conclude with this final observation:

I do not feel that many Members of this House want to start economizing upon something which is needed in carrying out our efforts in Vietnam. In saying this I do not mean items which are not needed by the Department of Defense or by any other agency of the Government. I, for one, am depending upon the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts here to make certain that no cuts are imposed upon the Coast Guard that are going to impair the vital operations of that arm of our service in that area of the world.

Mr. BOLAND. There are no cuts made in the item of the Coast Guard that would impair the vital operations of the Coast Guard in that area of the world.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I know of no Member of Congress who wants to spend public funds unwisely and uneconomically. In the current drive for economy, we must not become blinded to the real meaning of economy. I refer to the report on appropriations for the Department of Transportation, specifically to the reductions made in the extremely important high speed ground transportation program.

Department of Transportation has in its high speed ground transportation a program which is dealing with intercity transportation problems, primarily in densely populated regions. The overall program is devoting attention to the role which highways, airways, and ground transportation all may make in solving these problems.

The information which we will derive from the research and development effort in the program will, for example, provide us with insight into the role that ground transportation may eventually play in helping to meet the need for additional passenger service.

Does it make sense, therefore, to cut off one of the major elements of the program? That is what I consider the auto-on-train demonstration that was planned between Washington, D.C., and Jacksonville, Fla. Excluded from the budget was $2 million which would have implemented plans for this demonstration, a radically new type of railroad equipment which would relate two important transportation modes—the train and the private automobile.

Travelers want and need the freedom and convenience of travel in their own automobiles. In many instances, however, individuals have a limited time in which to reach a destination, and find it difficult to devote the majority of their travel time to "getting there."

The proposed autotrain was designed to permit travelers to take their autos with them economically over long distances on a specially designed train. Market studies have already indicated that the service would be well patronized and profitable.

I want to bring the following to the attention of my colleagues. The Government has already committed $2 million to this project for preliminary engineering research and development. This amount is nonrecoverable. Additional money needed to complete the demonstration had been estimated at $3.5 million.

I am told that the Office of High Speed Ground Transportation has made a conservative estimate that at the completion of the 18-month project, $6.2 million will revert to the Federal Treasury from profits and sale of equipment and terminals. The net cost to the Government would be approximately $1.2 million, or less than the project has cost already.

Considering the potential value of the project to transportation planners, railroads and the traveling public, I think the total investment needed is small indeed to the ultimate benefits for the traveling public.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I feel the major cut recommended by the conferees on appropriations for the Department of Transportation's Office of High Speed Ground Transportation will have a great deal more impact over the long run than appears on the surface. For not only will the public ultimately be affected by the cutback in program activities, but so will railroad employees.

As my colleagues are aware, the public has long since grown weary by the caliber of most railroad passenger service. In recent months, the situation has deteriorated all the more as railroads continue to get authority from the Interstate Commerce Commission to remove more trains.

The railroads say what has prompted this step-up in train-offs has been the Post Office Department's removal of railroad post office cars from passenger trains. The Department says its actions are directed by the necessity to find more ways of coping with the incredible volume of present-day mail, and is certainly not designed to deal a death blow to passenger services. The fact of the matter is, however, the Department's actions are producing this result.

I think it is tragic for the American public, for the future or our great transportation complex, and for tens of thousands of railroad employees and their families that we are letting this occur.

I want to point out one of the main purposes behind the formation of the Department of Transportation was to be in a position to advise—through Federal research and development projects—the various modes in the private transport sector to "plan ahead."

This is how I view the research and development program of the Office of High Speed Ground Transportation. It is a major step toward eventually devising a national transportation plan which would permit travelers and goods—and this includes mail—to move efficiently from one means of transportation to another, using the best characteristics of each.

The program includes a set of projects which will improve technology in high speed transportation, with particular regard to ground transportation. It also includes demonstrations of new types of rail passenger equipment and service elements. It is obvious, therefore, a program that could mean a possible rebirth of railroad passenger travel holds great promise to the scores of railroad employees being affected by the present turn of events.

I think that a reexamination and reappraisal of the purpose and accomplishments of the on-going high speed ground transportation program is in order. Hopefully, my remarks today will convey to you at least my appreciation of the potential this program holds for the public welfare.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report, and I want to commend the gentleman from Massachusetts for what I believe is a job well done.

The gentleman and his committee have done a good job on the Transportation appropriation bill. I want to say to the gentleman that I have great reluctance in appropriating money above the budget request for any purpose. Nevertheless, I feel that the funds added for facilities and equipment for the Federal Aviation Administration are vital to safety of those who use our airways. I know that a study is underway right now as to how best to provide aviation safety at a time when aviation is growing rapidly.

The Appropriations Committee has been given a tentative listing of some of the things that might be done with the added funds. A listing is submitted of tower facilities which meet the FAA's criteria as to need but which were not funded in the budget. I know from first-hand experience how vital some of these towers are to aviation safety. We desperately need a tower at Dothan, Ala., and $279,000 for that tower is included in the list of towers submitted to the committee. I hope that the Congress will approve the additional money and that the executive branch will use the money and that a good part of the money will be used for tower facilities.

Of course, I feel that one of the most urgent requirements for a tower is at Dothan, Ala., where military flyers from Fort Rucker and Southern Airways use the field along with general aviation. By the FAA's own count in fiscal 1967, there were an estimated 45,000 itinerant operations at Dothan, which places this location well within the criteria for establishment of a new tower. I am just afraid that unless the FAA acts to establish this tower that someone will be hurt or killed at Dothan. I thank the gentleman and I urge the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, this subcommittee deserves the commendation of all of us. The reason I can say this is because on almost everyone's list of priorities in these times when we must economize, the matter of safety in air travel is high on the list.

In title III of the statement on the part of the managers when they considered amendment No. 5, it is good news for those who travel by air to note that our committee insisted upon enough funds for the Federal Aviation Administration to continue their surveillance of aviation safety. Our conferees even called upon the Department of Transportation to present comprehensive plans for the continued maintenance of aviation safety standards.

Tomorrow we face a decision upon another continuing resolution. While it is true the figures $605,400,000 for operations agreed upon was about $12 million higher than the figure passed by the House, it should not be forgotten it is also $13 million lower or under the figure passed by the Senate. When this $12 million is broken down among the 50 States, it figures less than $250,000 per State. To any fairminded person, this is little or nothing to be spread across the greatly increased volume of air travel in each State.

I was glad to observe that under title IV, consideration was given to motor vehicle and highway safety and also to motor carrier safety. For some reason much more is written about death on our highways and relatively much less about those who perish in our air crashes. These losses of life receive some publicity for a while, yet there never seems to be any sustained effort to make certain that air safety is constantly in the forefront of public and governmental attention.

It was our personal experience recently, when the Federal Aviation Administration proposed to decommission some VOR's in our district to devote a lot of time to the safety of air travel. Some of these OMNI's were closed; others were considered for further study. During these discussions, it was my privilege to have an opportunity to discuss aviation safety personally with the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, Gen. William F. McKee. I must say in all fairness that this man would prefer to increase the number rather than reduce the number of guidance devices, both for our large scheduled airlines and those thousands of small planes classified as "general aviation." Like every other department of the Government, the Federal Aviation Administration feels the pinch from lack of funds.

It is my judgment some of our domestic programs can be completely canceled; others can be abridged, reduced, suspended, or postponed. One that we must never compromise is the program for the safety of those air travelers who have been taught and led to believe that the safest way to travel is by air. Guidance facilities are desperately needed. Air traffic control systems are vital. There is a crying need for more instrument landing systems, new towers, more and better landing lights.

The expense of in-flight guidance devices and such vitally necessary expenditures as for frequent and accurate weather reports and better terminal control facilities are indeed a small and insignificant saving in relation to the increased dangers involved without these.

To insist upon reductions that will imperil the safety of those who travel by air is nothing more or less than gambling in human lives. Any money spent for safety with the objective of saving the lives of human beings deserves a high place on every priority list.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, the ranking member of the minority, on the committee, and a very able and valued member of of this subcommittee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Department of Transportation Appropriations, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND], has provided you with an excellent summary of the action taken by conferees on the Transportation Department's first full-year fiscal budget.

As ranking minority member of the subcommittee and a member of the conference, it has been a privilege to work closely with the outstanding House and Senate Members who devoted so much concentrated time and thought to resolving the differences in this measure.

The House conferees have returned with some major victories for the taxpayers.

Economies have been achieved in the Transportation budget without jeopardizing either the Department's opportunity to operate efficiently during its first year of official life or impairing any of its important public safety functions.

The chairman has pointed out that the overall Transportation appropriation agreed upon in conference, $1,581,905,722, is a reduction of $136,713,000 below the budget request. This amounts to a cut of nearly 9 percent. We House conferees stood our ground and return to you with a conference report $69,501,500 less than the amount approved by the Senate.

A saving of $137 million is particularly noteworthy during a period when it is imperative that all nonessential spending be eliminated.

As the chairman has pointed out, we have achieved the remarkable by reducing the fiscal 1968 budget more than $139 million below the total amount appropriated last year when the agencies were scattered throughout the Government.

Important as these savings are, as the conference report indicates, I held reservations about amendment No. 25, which withdraws the insistence of the House on retaining the 5-percent, across-the-board cut in the Department's expenditures during fiscal 1968.

I stand by that reservation. After the action taken by this House yesterday, it would be inconsistent not to insist upon the 5-percent reduction, action which a majority of this House approved decisively last July 18 by a rollcall vote of 213 to 189. Economic circumstances certainly do not justify our retreating on this point 3 months later. Quite to the contrary.

It is my conviction that the House must insist upon retaining the 5-percent reduction. The fledgling Department's budget is ample enough, and flexible enough, to permit it. Our Government's fiscal integrity demands it. The hard-pressed taxpayer urges it.

As the conference report indicates, I also had reservations about amendment No. 6, which calls for a $24 million increase in the amount approved by the House for facilities and equipment for the Federal Aviation Administration.

I withdraw by objections to this amendment in the light of additional information which has come to my attention.

During conference I found it difficult to reconcile the President's request for a $7 million reduction in facilities and equipment for the Federal Aviation Administration with the increased appropriation passed by the Senate.

There was virtually no testimony on the record to support such an increase. As an advocate of economy in Government, I looked with a jaundiced eye on the $54 million figure agreed upon by conferees in amendment No. 6. I was aware that the White House had submitted an amendment to the Department of Transportation's budget request on September 20 calling for a $7 million reduction in the Department's original $35.4 million estimate. The Senate, nevertheless, approved $65.4 million. In conference, the $30 million approved by the House was reconciled with that amount to the $54 million in the conference report.

I declined to agree to this sizable increase over the House-approved figure pending a further study of the facts.

Since the conference report was filed last week, I have had an opportunity to consult with safety experts and with Federal Aviation Administration officials privately and at length. In these discussions, I expressed my misgivings that they would be able to make use of the additional facilities and equipment without trained personnel to handle them. I have received sound assurance that FAA's new facility at Oklahoma City can turn out some 2,000 trained men yearly, that there will be sufficient skilled manpower to handle the equipment, and that it is in the best interest of air travel safety that FAA have every capability to meet the steadily increasing complexities and hazards of modern air traffic.

As the chairman pointed out a few months ago, had it not been for a lack of up-to-date equipment, the North Carolina air tragedy might well have been averted this summer. No one is going to put a price tag on the lives lost in that disaster.

I am all for economy. My record over the 13 years I have served in this House attests to that. This is why I was cautious and withheld my approval of amendment No. 6. When a money bill comes before this House, I examine it first from the viewpoint of the taxpayer. With a dearth of supporting evidence on the official record, I chose to suspend approval of any multimillion-dollar increase over the amount we in the House had approved for FAA's facilities and equipment program. Rather, I preferred to withhold agreement until I personally talked with the experts, with the men in the field, and with FAA officials directly involved and in whose integrity and judgment I place the greatest reliance.

This I have done.

I am now convinced that the Presidential budget amendment, submitted in

Senate Document No. 50, calling for a $7 million cut in FAA's original estimate is the most dangerous sort of false economy, a political sop designed to placate taxpayers who are fed up with grandiose Great Society spending in other areas. I have seen enough political muzzling of Pentagon witnesses in my Department of Defense Appropriations Subcommittee. It is apparent that the sealed-lips edicts are not limited to Defense witnesses alone. FAA officials could not speak out on the record freely to let this country know the urgent need for new facilities and more modern equipment.

The White House directed the Department of Transportation generally, and FAA officials specifically, to make do with what they had in the way of air safety funds. It appears that in the interest of political expediency, and to promote its nationally repudiated effort to push a 10-percent tax increase on the country, the administration felt FAA officials must be muzzled to prevent their stating their real needs when appearing before congressional committees. It also appears that our millions of air travelers are considered an expendable minority by the White House.

We today are in the same situation in relation to our airways as we were a dozen or so years ago regarding our highway system. When I first began flying as a private pilot nearly 20 years ago, the sky was literally the limit, vast and uncrowded. That picture has changed drastically and we are heading toward a crisis situation in the air which could well be equated with the chaos which would result if we had no modern superhighways and interstate systems.

There will be more air tragedies if we do not prepare to meet the increasing congestion modern air travel, both commercial and private, is creating. To meet this crisis more skilled personnel and up-to-date facilities and equipment are absolutely necessary.

The Federal Aviation Administration has supplied me with a breakdown of the additional traffic control and navigation aids in terminal areas which the additional $18.6 million over their original $35.4 million request will provide.

Here is the summary:

STATEMENT BY DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

The Conference amount of $54.0 million for the Facilities and Equipment appropriation for fiscal year 1968, enables us to provide the additional air traffic control and navigation aids in terminal areas which are our major problem. With this amount we intend to provide in addition to the items in our original request of $35.4 million (1) eight airport surveillance radars which provide our controllers with position information on aircraft in the terminal area; (2) eighty instrument landing systems with associated approach light aids which will provide approach and landing guidance; and (3) equipment to provide the controller with altitude information and beacon code identification of beacon equipped aircraft on displays of twenty-three existing airport surveillance radars as follows:

Airport surveillance radar (8 locations)	$4,800,000
Instrument landing system (80 locations); approach lights (76 locations)	11,700,000
Direct beacon code identification and altitude readout (23 locations)	2,100,000
Total	18,600,000
Original request	35,400,000
Total	54,000,000

SUMMARY OF REQUIREMENTS

[In thousands of dollars]

Activity	Original request	Distribution of conference amount	Difference
1. Air route traffic control centers	16,018	16,018	
a. Long-range radar			
b. Automation equipment	14,300	14,300	
c. Other center facilities	1,718	1,718	
2. Airport traffic control towers	10,638	17,538	
a. Terminal area radar	330	7,230	+6,900
b. Terminal area automation	8,500	8,500	
c. Other tower facilities	1,808	1,808	
3. Flight service stations	1,044	1,044	
a. Domestic	976	976	
b. International	68	68	
4. Air navigation facilities	3,503	15,203	
a. VORTAC	455	455	
b. Low/medium frequency facilities			
c. Instrument landing systems	3,048	14,748	+11,700
d. Visual aids			
e. Intermediate fields			
5. Housing, utilities and miscellaneous	175	175	
6. Aircraft and related equipment	3,632	3,632	
7. Research, test and evaluation facilities	390	390	
Total	35,400	54,000	+18,600

Mr. Speaker, in supporting the House compromise with the Senate in appropriating $54 million, I not only am heeding the best recommendations of those immediately involved in our air safety program, I also am in the good company of such noted economy advocates as the chairman of the great House Committee on Appropriations [Mr. MAHON], and with Senators COTTON, MUNDT, and SMITH, none of whom has ever been accused of wasting taxpayers' funds.

For these reasons, I withdraw my reservation regarding amendment No. 6.

I do not wish to place in jeopardy the millions of air passengers and private pilots who literally put their lives in the hands of the FAA when they board a plane.

The 9-percent reduction achieved in the overall Transportation budget request is remarkable. Retention of the 5-percent reduction in expenditures is not only practical but imperative.

We have given the new Department of Transportation a budget with which it can live during its first full year of activity. We have achieved economies which the taxpayer can well appreciate without undermining the services and safety functions to which they are entitled.

I urge the House to support the conference report as submitted, with the exception of amendment No. 25.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, in viewing the report of the conferees for the Department of Transportation appropriations for fiscal 1968, I find a very disturbing thing: Not only has the auto-on-train demonstration project been cut from the high-speed program, but research and development funds also have been reduced.

In calling this action to the attention of my colleagues, I cannot help but note the cries of anguish from all quarters regarding the state of railroad passenger service. What is wrong? Why is it being cut further? Why is the Government not doing something? I think I am correct in saying that the mail of many Members is running heavy on this subject.

As you all know, my Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce handled the legislation authorizing the development of a high-speed ground transportation program, and for this reason I have long been convinced that in this program, including the demonstration projects, we have the first steps toward answering these and a host of other questions, not the least of which is the steadily worsening urban transportation problem and the increasingly burdensome matter of airport access. I fail to see, for instance, why we should go on expanding airport facilities without a parallel program of coordinating transportation to and from airports. The cut in this program will affect the tentative plans the Department of Transportation had to develop a high-speed ground transportation system between Friendship, Washington National, and Dulles airports.

Ironically, the demonstration project that was scrapped by the committee—the auto-on-train test—is a project that promises to be almost entirely self-liquidating upon its completion. As for the cuts in research and development fund, I would like to point out that these activities look not only toward the improvement of existing technology but also toward the development of entirely new systems of ground transportation.

I think every Member of this House owes it to his constituents to take a good look at the accomplishments of the ongoing high-speed ground transportation program.

I think this will convey to you, as it did to me, the potential this program holds for the public welfare within densely populated regions throughout the United States. This cut in funds is going to put us so far behind in developing a high-speed ground transportation system which is vitally needed by our Nation now. Of the industrial nations, we are already lagging far behind—Tokyo, Germany, and France have all developed modern, economical, high-speed, ground transportation systems. I think the cuts made in this extremely important program are out of step with the needs of the Nation.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Joelson].

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I understood the gentleman from Ohio to say that this is a very good conference report. He then went on to say that he will support an attempt to cut it by 5 percent. I would like to ask him, if it is so good and yet it should be cut 5 percent, why he did not attempt in conference to cut it 5 percent?

Mr. MINSHALL. I did. You will notice in the conference report that I excepted to amendment No. 25. I did just that.

Mr. JOELSON. Do you feel that the 5-percent cut——

Mr. MINSHALL. I was only one voice in the wilderness, I might add, in the absence of Mr. Jonas, who was unavoidably absent.

Mr. JOELSON. You think that the 5-percent cut should be left to the discretion of the agency?

Mr. MINSHALL. I certainly do. As I said in my statement, they have plenty of latitude and flexibility throughout this tremendous budget to take out 5 percent where they think it could best be taken out, but certainly not out of air safety.

Mr. JOELSON. Could they not take the 5 percent out of air safety?

Mr. MINSHALL. They could if they wanted to, but I am sure they will not. They would not be that foolish.

Mr. JOELSON. I am rather surprised at the gentleman's complete reliance on the agency.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman yielding further. I am interested in title IV, the Federal highway administration section, and particularly the unbudgeted item of Alaskan assistance, for which the House bill contained $4 million, the Senate doubled that amount and we settled for $5 million.

Even our distinguished Representative from Alaska, our colleague Mr. Pollock, on two different occasions recently has said he was hoping we were rapidly approaching the time when we no longer have to federally assist our newest and largest State. Why was it necessary to go into an unbudgeted appropriation in this item, and does this still involve any maintenance of the Alaska highway?

Mr. BOLAND. This program was authorized under the Federal Highway Act of 1966 and it does provide an authorization of $14 million for the years 1968 to 1972. It is an unbudgeted item. But on the strength of representations made by the able and distinguished Representative of Alaska [Mr. Pollock], before the committee, and also on the advice and counsel of Members from Alaska in the other body, it was felt $4 million ought to be appropriated. This committee felt it ought to be included because Alaska is not part of the Federal Interstate Highway System. It does have unusual difficulties with the A-B-C roads and urban roads. The question of maintenance of Alaskan highways is very severe because of the climate. That is why authorization was made in 1967, and this committee felt it was a fair request.

Mr. HALL. Can the gentleman assure the House that among the conferees for the House there was knowledge of the natural disaster relief appropriation—for earthquakes, and so forth—in addition to this; and, second, that it does not involve the maintenance of that part of the highway between Alaska and the United States which the Canadians took over for maintenance after we built it?

Mr. BOLAND. I can give the gentleman that assurance.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, in further assurance to the gentleman from Missouri, there is a larger problem facing Alaska, of which Members should be aware. Whenever a territory has become a State, the Federal Government has withheld, or reserved, a percentage of the acreage for the Federal Government and an allotment of land has been made to the State. At this point, Alaska, if I remember the recent figure, actually has about 2 percent of the land area of that State, and the other 98 percent of that State is reserved for the Federal Government. The administration has, in effect, withheld the selection of lands, on the part of State, until some determination can be made about the legal and rightful claims of the aborigines to certain of the Alaskan area. So the State of Alaska is in the very hard position of having no land to tax and very little land to develop until this selection can be made.

The gentleman from Alaska [Mr. Pollock] has tried to alert all the Members of this House to this matter. Alaska does have a selection problem, and the State will continue to need extra consideration from the House and the other body until such time as they have the means for developing their economy the same as the other States have developed theirs.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. Pollock] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the provision of the conference report pertaining to the funds for Alaska highway assistance, as contained in H.R. 11456, the 1968 appropriation for the Department of Transportation. The conference committee has recommended $5 million for this purpose. Fourteen million dollars is authorized yearly, so a substantial reduction has been effected and I wish very much the entire $14 million could be appropriated. The purpose of the funds is to build access and development roads to remote areas in Alaska and to maintain existing roads.

The House has already considered this item, when it passed H.R. 11456 on July 18. The figure at that time was $4 million. The conference report increases this to $5 million, a $3 million reduction from the Senate-approved figure but a million dollars more than the House approved figure. A motion to strike these funds was made in the House and defeated overwhelmingly by a voice vote. I believe, there is no reason for a change now. The amount is small but the increase over the original House figure is vitally important to Alaska. The Appropriations Committee considered that special conditions existing in Alaska justified this extra Federal assistance. Certainly, there is no other State in the country with so much land and so few roads. The great potential of the 49th State will never be realized unless the basic public services are provided. None of these services is more important than highways. Adequate transportation is absolutely essential to an undeveloped region like Alaska. The small appropriation for Alaska highways should not be looked upon as an expenditure or a gift, but as an investment that will be repaid to the country with interest.

There is another reason why this item should be approved. Alaska is unique among the States in that it is excluded from the huge interstate highway program. Alaska is not, however, exempted from the payment of that portion of the gasoline tax earmarked for interstate highways. Certainly no more blatant example of unjust discrimination can be found. Indeed, one of the prime reasons for these funds is to correct this injustice by providing for Alaska's real and unique needs. It should be noted that until 1956, Alaska was excluded from the regular Federal aid system also. This $5 million will give Alaska a much needed start on the big job of catching up with her sister States, the huge job of building an adequate system of roads and highways throughout the entire State.

The House will shortly be voting on a motion to recommit this report to the conference committee. The purpose, as I understand it, will be to eliminate all funds not included in the President's budget. This is aimed at extra funds for air safety, but would also adversely affect this provision for Alaska since no money whatever was recommended in the budget by the administration. This is not, I am convinced, the intention of the House since this money was approved after debate when the bill originally passed the House. I urge, therefore, that the motion to recommit be rejected, and that the conference report be adopted.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I was a conferee on this bill and I did not sign the conference report for the same reason I did not sign the conference report on HEW, which the House recommitted. The reason was there were certain items above the President's budget. I admit the gentlemen have done a good job on this bill. It has been cut below the budget figure in total. It came back pretty close to the House figure. Nevertheless, however, there is one item in this bill that is $26 million above the budget request. I would like to address myself to that.

It has been suggested that this is for air safety, and I am as interested in air safety as any man in this House. I think I fly about as much as anyone. I was just admitted not long ago to the 1-million mile club of one of the airlines for having flown 1 million air miles. So I am interested. I am also interested in this House having information upon which to base appropriations. When the other body increased this bill by approximately $37 million above the budget in one item, and the conferees agreed on a $26 million increase, the question arises as to what this was based upon.

From where have they gotten this figure?

We asked the gentlemen on the other side of the Capitol, "Did the FAA ask for this?" They said, "No, the FAA did not ask for it."

"Did the President ask for it?"

"No."

"Did the Secretary of Commerce ask for it?"

"No."

There is no official request for this additional money.

We asked, "Well, what did you base it on?'

One of the gentlemen took out a newspaper article from the New York Times. There was a story in the Times. It is a fine newspaper, but not enough, of course to justify this.

Then they also said that one of the outfits downtown, which sort of lobbies for airlines, had some people who came in and asked for it.

Those are the two items which they told us at that time they had before them, to increase this bill over the budget.

My suggestion is that we recommit this conference report and send it back, that we take the budget figure, which is a little smaller than the House figure, and then, if they really need this money—if the Government needs it and if the FAA believes they need it for air safety—let them come in and request it. That is their responsibility. They have the responsibility of telling us what is necessary for air safety. If they do not have the courage to do it, we ought to know about it.

The seriousness of this situation is the question: What are we going to base appropriations on? They should be based on the testimony of the officials, of the people who are going to spend the money.

I have heard from both sides, from the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MINSHALL] and from the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND], that they have some information now from the FAA. Why in the world did the FAA not give us that information when we were considering this budget? I cannot understand this.

This is something new. Two members have the information. I have not seen it. I do not know whether the distinguished chairman of our full committee has seen the figures.

This is a new and interesting thing, that a New York Times article and a representative from an association downtown can get an increase of $26 million, and then two members of the committee can get statements as to where it is going to be used, but the rest of the members do not know.

I believe we ought to return this bill to conference, and come back with the budget figure. Then, if the FAA actually needs this money, they can come up with the testimony. They can come up and prove it to the House and let us see the figures, so that we will know where this is going to be spent.

This is what should be done.

Air safety is important, yes; but let us see this.

We recommitted the HEW bill. We talk about air safety, and that is important, but also, when we recommitted the HEW bill, we recommitted funds for cancer, heart, dental research, arthritis, allergies, and infectious diseases, general and medical science, because those were above the budget. We did not have the evidence to justify the increases above the budget for the following:

National Cancer Institute, National Heart Institute, National Institute of Dental Research, National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases, National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness, National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, National Institute of General Medical Sciences, National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, and general research and services.

I suggest that this is no different. If the House really is going to work its will, it should be done based upon the testimony of witnesses from the agencies who are going to use this money, and not based upon newspapers and some other group.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, let me say that the action of the House conferees was not taken on the advice of the New York Times, nor was it taken on the advice of any outside group.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? I said this was the advice given to the other body. I did not say that the House did this.

Mr. BOLAND. I appreciate the correction.

When we left the conference I asked the staff to communicate with the FAA. I have been sitting on the subcommittee which deals with the Federal Aviation Administration with that which was the old Aviation Agency, for a period of 12 years. The item for "Facilities and equipment" is one we have dealt with annually in that period of time, and it has amounted to millions and millions of dollars.

I know of no time while I have been sitting on this committee that there has not been a substantial request by the Federal Aviation Administration for facilities and equipment. The gentleman from Ohio can bear me out, because he also sat on the Independent Offices Subcommittee from which this agency sprang in the Department of Transportation. So we did ask the FAA for a detailed account of what they would do with that amount of money, which is over the budget in this bill. This list will appear in the RECORD. Let me detail it for the Members of this House so that they will know precisely what this money will be used for with respect to air traffic safety.

It will be used for airport surveillance radar in eight locations. It will be used for instrument landing positions. It is for approach lights at 76 locations. It is for direct recontrol at 23 locations. Then there is an amount to establish tower facilities in 45 locations all over the United States.

So, Mr. Speaker, the committee is well aware of the fact that this money is being used and will be used for aviation safety. The President has asked that a complete study of the needs in this area be made. I am satisfied what has been detailed for us is as good a listing of what the funds will be used for as will be available until the study is completed, and I think we should be satisfied with that testimony.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MINSHALL. I would like at the outset to say that I have the highest regard for my good friend and colleague from Ohio [Mr. Bow]. However, I would like to suggest to him and any other Members who have any doubt about the additional money we have put in for air safety that they remember the next time they are holding for adverse weather over Washington National Airport trying to get in here, the old adage among all fliers that a midair collision can ruin your whole day.

Mr. BOLAND. Let me say that, I hope, if the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] is held in a holding pattern it will occur sometime tomorrow.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would like to state that a Piedmont jet arliner and a small plane came together in my district last July and it was not a near miss but was one of the greatest tragedies ever suffered in western North Carolina. Everyone on both the airline plane and the small airplane were killed.

The presence of surveillance radar at the Asheville airport in all probability would have prevented this great loss. Earlier I had joined airport officials and members of the Asheville Chamber of Commerce in requesting that surveillance radar be installed in this airport, but we had been told that money was not available.

Of the 547 U.S. airports served by scheduled commercial airliners, only 113 have radar. The people of this Nation are entitled to have airline flights made as safe as possible and the danger of midair collisions increases each day as more planes land and takeoff at all airports.

These addiional funds should make possible the installation of radar and instrument landing systems at more airports and should aid in preventing tragic air catastrophes.

Mr. BOLAND. What the gentleman says is precisely so. Mr. MINSHALL says it in his remarks, and I have it in my remarks, also.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. I only want to make one point in connection with the comments of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW]. He said this was the responsibility of the Federal Aviation Administration and that we were to wait and see what their recommendations were. I say that the responsibility is also that of the House of Representatives. We know what the conditions of the airways are. We know there is a necessity for this equipment in airports throughout the country. It is false economy not to take the necessary steps to provide that equipment.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOW. I agree with the gentleman from Illinois that the House has a responsibility on this matter. There is no question about that. But what do we base this responsibility on? Why do we have a Federal Aviation Administration? Why do we have a President's budget if they are not going to have experts come up and give this information to us? The gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Ohio are not the only experts. If these figures are now available as to what this money will be used for, why was it not here at the time we considered the bill and voted for aviation safety? I am for aviation safety. I want it. But I want it based on something that you know you are doing rather than reaching for a figure in the sky.

Mr. BOLAND. I can understand the gentleman's position. He is as interested in air safety as anyone here in the House. But my response is that there is a broad study being conducted now by the Government with respect to air traffic safety, and the Federal Aviation Administration is involved and the Civil Aeronautics Board is involved as are all of the agencies of the Government that have anything to do with air traffic safety. As the gentleman from Ohio knows, one of the points being considered is the user charge. I think they will arrive at some basis on which we can charge the users of the airways and the airports for a fair share of the tremendous amounts that have to be spent in this area.

And, Mr. Speaker, the amounts are going to be tremendous. It is not going to be $26 million. This is chickenfeed. The amount will escalate to the point of millions and millions of dollars.

Mr. BOW. Yes; billions of dollars.

Mr. BOLAND. As a matter of fact, in "Operations" alone the FAA, as the gentleman will recall, we provided for 1,625 new controllers and flight standards personnel. The other body wanted us to put in 1,200 more. In other words, they wanted a total of 2,800 new personnel. We denied that request in conference for 1,200 more, upon the advice of the Secretary of the Department of Transportation, who said the only way in which to obtain competent personnel would be to do it most carefully. We are now on record with reference to this matter for fiscal year 1968. This request was denied.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, although I have very regularly supported efforts to cut appropriations and hold down efforts of the other body to increase the sums we have appropriated here, I shall oppose the effort to recommit this conference report. I do so because the sums chiefly involved are those added by the Senate for increased equipment for aviation safety.

For some months now on this floor I have spoken out on the need for Congress to do more to insure aviation safety, both for commercial airline passengers and for those flying in private planes. In fact I was the first Member of the House, immediately following the tragic air crash at Hendersonville, N.C., earlier this summer that took the life of Navy Secretary-designate John McNaughton and his family, to call for immediate and emergency action to protect our Americans in the skies more effectively.

One thing that is clearly needed to do this job is more money for air traffic controllers, and for airport radar (which was missing at Hendersonville) and for other aviation safety devices. I urged the FAA to request supplemental funds in this year's budget to get that equipment. They followed my advice and made such a request when this bill was pending over in the Senate. The Senate added the funds now in question in the motion to recommit. Surely these funds must be retained as a matter of the highest priority, indeed as a matter of emergency for the safety of the American public.

In my own State of New York, four civilian airports where commercial jet airliners are now operating are, like Hendersonville, N.C., without radar coverage today: Utica, Elmira, Ithaca, and White Plains. These funds will begin to correct that grave deficiency in New York State. In all conscience I certainly cannot serve the people of my district of upstate New York and vote to strike these funds. Therefore, I shall vote against the motion to recommit and in favor of the conference report.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the issues involved in the proposal to subsidize by 90 percent the development of a supersonic transport have been discussed before in Congress. It should not be necessary to document once again the fact that this costly development, during a period when vital expenditures are being pared to the bone, will cost the taxpayers at least $4.5 billion in the next few years and represents an investment which the Government may not recover. It is also widely understood that a relatively small proportion of American citizens and taxpayers will make use of this aircraft if it is successful, but that all of us, like it or not, will be subjected to its sonic boom—a factor which is known to be a severe irritant and may prove in some cases to produce actual human or property damage. The sonic boom factor also, by posing possible limitations on flight patterns of the SST, threatens to limit its economic success.

In the midst of a budget-cutting fever, which is extending to all other areas, Congress seems unable to limit its enthusiasm for this supersonic project. I was struck by the fact that the Senate conferees were willing to compromise funds connected with safety but the conferees did not strike out one penny of the $142.375 million proposed for SST development in fiscal year 1968 which would commit us to a continuing enormous investment in the next few years.

For example: Amendment No. 17 provides transfer to "Traffic and highway safety" for administrative expenses $1,100,000 instead of $1,400,000 as proposed by the Senate. Amendment No. 18 appropriates $25,000,000 for "State and community highway safety" instead of $40,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. Amendment No. 19 provides transfer of $1,100,000 for administrative expenses of "State and community highway safety" instead of $1,400,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 24 appropriates $4,000,000 for the National Transportation Safety Board instead of $4,291,000 as proposed by the Senate. The funds denied are removed from accident safety research.

Mr. Speaker, there is no need to reiterate the extent of public concern about traffic safety and the enormous loss of life and money this Nation endures annually from traffic accidents. Yet one would have to believe that the SST is far more essential than traffic safety.

This reflects on the wisdom of Congress and suggests to the public that there may be a point to press claims of "pure pork barrel" which surround the issue of the SST.

I will not restate here the extensive documentation on this project that I presented on July 18 when the Department of Transportation appropriation bill was before us. But there are many points which bear mention because they are still overlooked in most of the discussion of the SST. I will list two of them today.

The first is that the Government is not subsidizing the aerospace industry in a development that will contribute to the growth of an entire industry. It has simply handed a giant monopoly to one company—Boeing—with which no other company will be able to compete. This, together with the fact that the Federal Aviation Administration is in charge of both the development and certification processes for the SST lays the groundwork for the kind of administrative inbreeding and poor management that we have seen operating to the detriment of other programs both civilian and military, with all that accrues in terms of deficient hardware, schedule delays and severe cost overruns.

The second point has to do with the vastly important but little-understood subject of "balance of payments." Much superficial mention has been made of this in connection with the SST and the general assumption is that the SST will improve the American balance-of-payments position. This again is in the nature of wishful thinking, similar to the views of those who assure us there is no doubt as to the economic success of the SST. In fact, there is reason to have serious doubt about this issue even should the aircraft itself prove a viable investment. The Institute for Defense Analysis—IDA—prepared a study entitled "Demand Analysis for Air Travel by Supersonic Transport" for the Federal Aviation Administration last year in which it analyzed various aspects of the SST situation. On page 20 there is a section entitled "Balance of Payments Implications" which makes clear the uncertainty on this point. It reads as follows:

> The impact of an SST upon the US balance of payments must be assessed in terms both of the improvements resulting from sales of aircraft, spare parts and service, and of offsetting foreign-exchange losses for tickets and travelers' ground expenditures. These two sides of the story are inextricably connected, for the SST market depends in part on the generation of additional travel, most of which will consist of Americans traveling abroad. Moreover, it must be recognized that some SST exports will supplant exports of American subsonic planes. Airline-port outlays also play a small part. When this broad view is taken, the balance of payments contribution of an SST appears smaller than when only aircraft trade is considered and may under certain conditions be negative.
>
> The balance of payments contribution of the SST will be larger, the more sales of foreign supersonic airliners it can preempt. This depends upon the degree of potential penetration of the Concorde into the passenger transport market as well as on the degree of SST superiority over the Concorde. So long as Americans comprise over 50% of the marginal SST passengers, however, the balance of ticket and travelers' expenditures will tend to offset the SST's contributions to US aircraft trade. This effect will be greater the more the American plane's market share exceeds that which the foreign supersonic would have captured. Only at very small SST surcharges would the American marginal share fall below half, if passengers are split according to earnings. This would occur only in the 1980's . . . It will be noticed that the imposition of boom restrictions has a drastic adverse effect upon the SST's balance of payments significance. Moreover, most of the gains from the aircraft are concentrated toward the end of the period, while losses resulting from its entry tend to accrue early.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members of the House to reconsider the investment of $142.375 million in fiscal year 1968 for the development of the SST at a time when our fiscal responsibilities are leading to the truncation of other projects far more vital to the welfare and safety of this Nation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit the conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. BOW. I am, Mr. Speaker, in its present form.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. Bow moves to recommit the conference report on H.R. 11456 to the committee on conference with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to insist upon its disagreement to Senate amendments which exceed the administrative budget request therefor.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Bow) there were—ayes 41, noes 70.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 124, nays 268, not voting 40, as follows:

[Roll No. 313]

YEAS—124

Abbitt
Adair
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ayres
Battin
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bevill
Biester
Blackburn
Bow
Bray
Brown, Mich.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burton, Utah
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Carter
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Collier
Colmer
Conte
Corbett
Cowger
Cunningham
Curtis
Davis, Wis.
Denney
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Dowdy
Duncan
Edwards, Ala.
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Findley
Fino
Ford, Gerald R.
Gardner
Gathings
Goodell
Goodling
Gross
Gubser
Gurney
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Hansen, Idaho
Harrison
Harsha
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Johnson, Pa.
Keith
King, N.Y.
Kleppe
Kyl
Laird
Langen
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Lukens
McClure
McCulloch
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
Mailliard
Martin
Mathias, Calif.
Mayne
Michel
Montgomery
O'Konski
Pettis
Poff
Price, Tex.
Quillen
Railsback
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Robison
Roth
Roudebush
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherle
Schneebeli
Scott
Shriver
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Snyder
Springer
Stanton
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Vander Jagt
Wampler
Watkins
Whalley
Wiggins
Williams, Pa.
Wilson, Bob
Winn
Wydler
Wylie
Zion

NAYS—268

Abernethy
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, Ala.
Annunzio
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Baring
Barrett
Bates
Belcher
Bell
Bingham
Blanton
Blatnik
Boland
Bolling
Brademas
Brasco
Brinkley
Brock
Brooks
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Bush
Byrne, Pa.
Cabell
Carey
Casey
Celler
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Cohelan
Conable
Conyers
Corman
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Dingell
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Downing
Dulski
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Eilberg
Esch
Evins, Tenn.
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Grover
Hagan
Halpern
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harvey
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Helstoski
Henderson
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Kelly
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kornegay
Kupferman
Kyros
Leggett
Lennon
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McCarthy
McClory
McFall
Macdonald, Mass.
MacGregor
Machen
Madden
Mahon
Marsh
Mathias, Md.
Matsunaga
Meeds
Meskill
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Monagan
Moore
Morgan
Morris, N. Mex.
Morse, Mass.
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Myers
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nichols
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Passman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Pollock
Pool
Price, Ill.
Pryor
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Randall
Reid, N.Y.
Reinecke
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Riegle
Rivers
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ruppe
Ryan
Sandman
Satterfield
St Germain
Scheuer
Schweiker
Schwengel
Selden
Shipley
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Okla.
Staggers
Steed
Stratton
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Sullivan
Taft
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thompson, Ga.
Thompson, N.J.
Tiernan
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Waldie
Walker
Watson
Watts
Whalen
White
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wyman
Yates
Zablocki
Zwach

NOT VOTING—40

Boggs
Bolton
Broomfield
Button
Cramer
Culver
Dellenback
Diggs
Erlenborn
Everett
Fallon
Foley
Fountain
Fulton, Tenn.
Gude
Hébert
Herlong
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Kazen
Kluczynski
Kuykendall
Landrum
Latta

McMillan
May
Moorhead
Olsen
Patman
Rarick
Rees
Resnick
St. Onge
Stafford
Stephens
Tunney
Utt
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Young

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Latta for, with Mr. St. Onge against.
Mr. Cramer for, with Mr. Hébert against.
Mrs. Bolton for, with Mr. Boggs against.
Mr. Rarick for, with Mr. Stafford against.
Mr. Utt for, with Mr. Gude against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Foley with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Fountain with Mrs. May.
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Erlenborn.
Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Dellenback.
Mr. Culver with Mr. Button.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Kuykendall.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Williams of Mississippi.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Everett.
Mr. Olsen with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. McMillan with Mr. Resnick.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Rees.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Herlong.
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Young.
Mr. Jonas with Mr. Fulton of Tennessee.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Messrs. **ABERNETHY, MESKILL, SMITH of Oklahoma, and WATSON** changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 368, nays 22, not voting 42, as follows:

[Roll No. 314]

YEAS—368

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Ayres
Baring
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Biester
Bingham
Blackburn
Blanton
Blatnik
Boland
Bolling
Brademas
Brasco
Bray
Brinkley
Brock
Brooks
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Bush
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cahill
Carey
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Cohelan
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Corbett
Corman
Cowger
Cunningham
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Denney
Dent
Derwinski
Dickinson
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Eilberg
Esch
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Fino
Flood
Flynt
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Gallagher
Gardner
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan
Haley
Halleck
Halpern
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Helstoski
Henderson
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Kelly
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kleppe
Kornegay
Kupferman
Kuykendall
Kyros
Leggett
Lennon
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Lukens
McCarthy
McClory
McClure
McCulloch
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
McFall
Macdonald, Mass.
Machen
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin
Mathias, Calif.
Mathias, Md.
Matsunaga
Mayne
Meeds
Meskill
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Monagan
Montgomery
Moore
Morgan
Morris, N. Mex.
Morse, Mass.
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Myers
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nichols
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Passman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pollock
Pool
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Pryor
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reinecke
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Riegle
Rivers
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Ruppe
Ryan
St Germain
Sandman
Satterfield
Saylor
Scheuer
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Selden
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Okla.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Stratton
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Sullivan
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thompson, Ga.
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Tiernan
Tuck
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Waldie
Walker
Wampler
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Whalen
Whalley
White
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams, Pa.
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Winn
Wolff
Wright
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Yates
Zablocki
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—22

Ashbrook
Bevill
Bow
Curtis
Davis, Wis.
Devine
Findley
Gross
Hall
Kyl
Laird
Langen
MacGregor
Michel
O'Konski
Railsback
Rumsfeld
Schadeberg
Scherle
Schneebeli
Steiger, Wis.
Wyatt

NOT VOTING—42

Betts
Boggs
Bolton
Broomfield
Button
Celler
Cramer
Culver
Dellenback
Diggs
Erlenborn
Everett
Fallon
Fisher
Foley
Fountain
Fulton, Tenn.
Goodell
Gude
Hébert
Herlong
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Kazen
Kluczynski
Landrum
Latta
McMillan
May
Moorhead
Olsen
Patman
Rarick
Rees
Resnick
St. Onge
Stephens
Tunney
Utt
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Young

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Boggs with Mr. Goodell.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Cramer.
Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Foley with Mrs. Bolton.
Mr. Fountain with Mr. Betts.
Mr. Fallon with Mrs. May.
Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Erlenborn.
Mr. Morgan with Mr. Latta.
Mr. Culver with Mr. Jonas.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Gude.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Button.
Mr. Young with Mr. Everett.
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Fisher.
Mr. Olsen wtih Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Resnick with Mr. Rarick.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Tunney.
Mr. Williams of Mississippi with Mr. McMillan.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Rees.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Herlong.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 13: On page 10, after line 12, insert the following:

"Sec. 303. Funds heretofore appropriated to the Department of the Army for the Libby Dam and Reservoir project in Montana may be used in an amount not to exceed $140,000 in participation with local interests and the Federal Aviation Administration for the construction of an airport facility at Kelley Flats, Montana, in a manner deemed appropriate by the Chief of Engineers."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. BOLAND

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Boland moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13 and concur therein.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Would the gentleman from Iowa prefer that I yield to him now?

Mr. GROSS. Yes. I would like to have 5 minutes or so.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts that the House recede and concur with this particular Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment provides as follows:

Funds heretofore appropriated to the Department of the Army for the Libby Dam and Reservoir project in Montana may be used in an amount not to exceed $140,000 in participation with local interests and the Federal Aviation Administration for the construction of an airport facility at Kelley Flats, Montana, in a manner deemed appropriate by the Chief of Engineers.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not know all that there is to know about this particular amendment, so I am going to have to seek help from some of the members of this particular subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. It is my understanding, however—and I want someone to correct me if I am wrong—that an airport would be built if this amendment is agreed to in which Federal funds would be used 100 percent. I know of no Member of Congress who can get an airport built in his district 100-percent financed by the Federal taxpayers. Moreover, I have searched the Postal Manual and I can find no Kelley Flats. I have looked at the road atlas and I can find no reference to Kelley Flats. I would like to ask some member of the subcommittee the location of Kelley Flats; the purpose of this airport, and why it should be financed 100 percent by the Federal taxpayers.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. BATTIN. I thank the gentleman. First of all you would have to familiarize yourself with the geography of the area in which Libby Dam is to be constructed. Money is already appropriated for its initial start and construction. Kelley Flats is not a town or a community to be served by an airport as the gentleman's city or mine would be. It is very necessary because of the remoteness of the location of Libby Dam in order to get in and out. The necessary personnel and supplies that are deemed necessary to construct a dam will have to go in in that manner. This is not to handle jet aircraft. The cost is $140,000. It will handle basically smaller aircraft that you would find around any construction site.

Mr. GROSS. Is it not true the land that would constitute this airport belongs to the Federal Government?

Mr. BATTIN. Yes. I believe it is. I think the original site is actually within the ultimate flood area of the dam.

Mr. GROSS. So when the gentleman talks about $140,000, this is only a small part of the total cost of the airport. Is that not correct?

Mr. BATTIN. No. I wish I had a little bit more expertise from my colleague from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] because this is in his district. However, I do know from practical experience that for $140,000 you are not going to build an airstrip that will do much more than handle a very small single- or twin-engine aircraft. This is not the type of thing that the gentleman contemplates with the word "airstrip" or "airfield." This is for a strip where a piece of land is leveled and a hard surface placed on it so aircraft can land.

Mr. GROSS. Do we build this kind of airport facility all around the country wherever we build a dam?

Mr. BATTIN. I would hate to pick and choose the words involved here. However, it is not an airport. Right next to the Yellowtail Dam in the congressional district which it is my honor to represent in Montana, right below the damsite, there is an airstrip which I am sure the Government assisted in its construction.

Mr. GROSS. I would point out to my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Montana [Mr. BATTIN], that the bill itself speaks of an airport. It says an "airport." It does not say "airstrip." It says "airport." What would be the future of this airport?

Mr. BATTIN. There is no such town as "Kelley Flat," it is a geographical location that local residents have named.

Mr. GROSS. Well, why in this day and age of helicopter development do you need an airport that is to be abandoned in a comparatively short time? You do not need any kind of airstrip for helicopters except a landing pad.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I think it would be used by both.

Mr. GROSS. Would this, by any chance, become an airport for the landing of deer hunters, fishermen and skiers?

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I can almost categorically say to the gentleman that it will not.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me at this point?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. McFALL. I think that the gentleman from Iowa has asked for facts. I have some facts here. My personal opinion is that this is a logical and reasonable manner in which to do this.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. I yield further to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McFALL. Let us examine the facts and then we can discuss whether or not the action of the committee has been reasonable in this case. There is a dam called Libby Dam which has been authorized to be constructed in Montana.

Now, the appropriation and authorization for the construction contemplated the cost of a temporary airstrip at the site of the dam at an estimated cost of $133,500.

Such construction is normal for large dam projects at remote locations. Subsequently, it was determined that the topography was unsuited for a strip at the damsite itself and, therefore, land was tentatively selected some 3 to 4 miles from the damsite for the construction of a small dirt strip. The strip was to be constructed on leased property and would be used solely for flights associated with the dam construction. At the end of the construction period—approximately 7 years—the site would be abandoned and the lease terminated. The strip, as contemplated, would accommodate only very small aircraft because of the lack of a paved runway, as well as the size of the proposed strip.

Prior to the completion of arrangements for the construction of the temporary strip by the Corps of Engineers, it became apparent that there was a need for an airport near Libby for the use of general aviation and business flying. Likewise the Forest Service has need for an airport larger and better than the one presently existing near Libby. Accordingly, it was determined that a site near Libby would serve the purposes of the Corps of Engineers as adequately as the site previously chosen for their own strip. Likewise, the Forest Service has need for a larger strip. Accordingly, the Lincoln County Airport Administration was established as the sponsoring organization for the airport. Plans call for the corps to consummate a "use agreement" with the administration which will grant to the Corps of Engineers free use of the airport for 100 years in return for the payment of $133,500. The latter represents the amount originally budgeted for the temporary corps strip. In addition, the Forest Service will donate the land for the strip. The corps will then act as agent for the administration and will take charge of the construction effort. The strip as contemplated will be twice as wide and one-third longer than the one planned by the Corps of Engineers. In addition, it will be paved. Thus the corps will obtain a much better strip with capacity for hauling greater loads. Thus the dam construction contractor will have greater mobility in terms of supplies and materials necessary for the construction work, and the corps will be assured of air access to the general vicinity of the dam for essentially the life of the airport.

Neither the existing small Forest Service strip east of town nor the proposed Corps of Engineers site would be adequate for the larger airport contemplated in the national airport plan. This is due to the topography of the area surrounding the two sites.

When completed, the airport will provide a strip to be used by local interests for general aviation, possibly some limited air taxi, business flying associated with lumber and paper industries located in the town. In addition, it will provide better airport facilities for the use of the Corps of Engineers during the construction period as well as on a permanent basis thereafter. Likewise, it will provide the Forest Service with capability for landing larger, more heavily loaded aircraft in activities associated with fire fighting.

As indicated above, the Forest Service currently owns a small dirt strip about 1 mile east of Libby. However, present use of this strip is limited because of the nature and size of the runways and future expansion is limited because of the topography of the area.

So, what we would have, instead of a temporary strip that would be built anyway and then abandoned, in which case this $133,000 would be wasted, there will be a permanent strip which will be utilized by everyone, in my estimation, and which represents a very economical use of the taxpayers' money. Further, it will provide a better airport for the Forest Service and a better airport for the dam as well as a better airport for these people up there who have a need for it.

Permit me to say the only need they have established for this particular amount is as follows:

The Corps of Engineers lawyers have indicated that the proposed language is required to allow use of Corps of Engineers funds for a construction project in which the title to the completed project will not remain with the Corps, and to allow them to participate as agent for the local airport administration in the construction of the airport.

That is the reason for the language.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman has certainly resolved one thing: that this is not just a flight of fancy, that this is to be a permanent airport.

Mr. McFALL. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. We heard first that this was temporary, and would be abandoned when the dam is completed. Now we find that it is a permanent field.

I would like to ask the gentleman what is meant by these two words in the bill: "local interests"?

How much money will "local interests" put into this?

Mr. McFALL. The local interests, as far as I know, will not, in the original construction of the landing strip, put up any money, but their contribution will come later when the airport is really working.

Mr. GROSS. So the "local interests" referred to in the bill appear to be the Corps of Engineers; they are the "local interests" are they not?

Mr. McFALL. In this particular instance the money that would have been used for the temporary airstrip——

Mr. GROSS. The Corps of Engineers are the "local interests"?

Mr. McFALL. I would say to the gentleman that he asked me a question.

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. McFALL. I would like to answer his question.

The money that would be used by the Corps of Engineers for this temporary airstrip which would be abandoned, and thus wasted, is now going to be used permanently, and thus will be part of a permanent airport.

Mr. GROSS. I have great respect for this subcommittee, but I wish it had not used the subterfuge of those two words "local interests," because, as far as I can determine, no "local interests" money is going into this airport. This is to be financed 100 percent by the Federal Government.

I would also ask the gentleman, Did the House subcommittee hold any hearings on this proposition?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Iowa.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. McFALL. If the gentleman will yield further?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I am glad to yield.

Mr. McFALL. This was a matter which was amended or added in the Senate. We did not see it until we came to the conference report in conference. The Senators in the conference explained it to us. We believed them. We believed that they were reasonable, and we brought it back this way.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. BOLAND. The facts, as indicated by the gentleman from California [Mr. McFALL], are true, and that is precisely the reason why the majority of the Members on the House side of the conference supported this amendment.

I might say the reason it was brought back with a technical disagreement, as the gentleman from Iowa knows, is because it does relate to funds which are in another appropriation bill.

The $140,000 which is in the amendment relates to $140,000 to be used by the Corps of Engineers, but we make this $140,000 available to the Corps of Engineers, not at the present damsite, but to move it to a place where it can be more permanent. That is exactly what we are doing, and the reason we are doing it, as has been explained, is to make this a permanent airport in that area, because otherwise the Corps of Engineers would spend $133,000 on a temporary airport.

In addition, I will say to the gentleman that there is really a Kelley Flats, I will assure the gentleman. True, it is difficult to find on the map, but it is about a mile south of the major damsite, and approximately 2 miles north of Snowshoe Peak. So there is a place actually known as Kelley Flats. This is not a figment of the imagination; there is such a place.

And in the judgment of a majority of the members of this conference, although the gentleman from Illinois had some reservations, it was our judgment that, if the Corps of Engineers was going to spend $133,000 for a temporary airstrip, that the Corps of Engineers necessarily must spend at the damsite, would it not be better if we moved it into a place where the people of Montana could enjoy it? That is precisely all there is to it. I would agree there is no contribution by the local interests here except the building of some facilities for the convenience of the public.

As the gentleman knows, and I know very well, we do not make that kind of a funding, and the FAA does not grant any money for aid to airports on this basis. But it has done so in the past, and maybe it ought to do so in the future.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would say to the gentleman that, as the gentleman from Massachusetts said, I reserved on this amendment in the conference. The reason I did so is because Corps of Engineers appropriations cannot, and should not, be used to make for the local community the contribution that the local community is supposed to make under the Airport Act.

I think it is the letter and the spirit of the Airport Act that any local community must provide 50 percent of the funds required for the airport. In this instance there was to be a Federal temporary airstrip constructed for the purpose of helping the Corps of Engineers make their flights in and out of the area near Libby Dam in connection with their work. It is intended by this amendment that that appropriation could be used as the local contribution. I did not think this action was proper and I said so at the conference, making a reservation at that time. The funds made available to the Corps of Engineers under a separate appropriation cannot be used in place of the matching funds required under the law to be made by the local community. To do so is to defeat the purposes and provisions of that law.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOLAND. I might say also to the gentleman that it is my understanding and the understanding of some of the other Members that this is not something new. It has been done before where there have been conditions where a temporary airstrip could be made permanent and thereby save some money.

As the gentleman knows, and as has been explained by the gentleman from California [Mr. McFALL], the property that the airport is to be built on is Forest Service property. What we are doing is providing a permanent airport in the area where they would have had a temporary one, and the Government would have actually lost, and the people would have actually lost, $140,000.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McFALL. Let me just say briefly that this is permitted in the case of Forest Service land, and as I understand the Federal Airports Act, there is no violation of the Federal Airports Act so far as local contribution is concerned.

Mr. GROSS. Let me just say this and then I will be through.

I do not minimize the amount of $140,000, but it is not the largest amount of money that we have tossed out and spoken about around here. But there is a principle involved as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] has stated. There is a principle involved that ought not to be abused. It is the principle that where a local community and the State of Montana benefits they ought to put in their share of the money. They ought not to be permitted to do something that none of us in our districts or in our States can do and that is to get an airport that is 100 percent federally financed.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] has expired.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that one of the compelling arguments, in the opinion of the conferees, was that the Forest Service also would have the use of this airport in accommodation with the Corps of Engineers.

Let me say that here was an airstrip that at the beginning would have cost $143,000 and is now moving 8 miles south of Libby Dam to Kelley Flats on Forest Service property so that it can be made available not only to the Corps of Engineers but also to the Forest Service and the local people. It would seem to us that there ought to be a willingness on the part of the Congress to permit the maximum utilization of facilities, consequently, I believe we ought to agree to the Senate amendment.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], chairman of the full committee.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the conference committee, I learned about this proposed airstrip and it became apparent to me that the Government was going to build an airstrip where a dam was being constructed whether or not we take the action proposed. The airstrip is not so much for a local community, because there really is no local community there. So it was determined that by relocating this a little bit farther from the dam, but at a satisfactory site, instead of having a grass runway, the Corps of Engineers could have a paved runway and the citizens of the sparsely settled State of Montana could have the advantage of that airstrip also.

Actually, there is no town at this place. It is a spot, of course, but there is a little town about 8 miles away.

So, as a member of the conference and as one who is interested in doing the right thing, I went to see Senator MANSFIELD and discussed the matter with him.

I was convinced after looking into the matter that the project resulting from the expenditure of this $140,000 would be an asset to the people of the area. It would prevent the expenditure of Federal funds for an airstrip of sorts, which would probably be abandoned when the dam was completed. So I thought the Senate was not being too unreasonable in suggesting that the House of Representatives might be willing to accept this proposal and allow the use of $140,000 to provide a permanent airstrip that could be used by the village 8 miles away after the dam is constructed. It will take about 7 years to complete the construction of the dam.

Why not build a runway of a little better quality that will last a little longer and serve American citizens a little longer?

I am hopeful that the able, frugal, and distinguished gentleman from Iowa, after hearing the discussion of the situation and the explanation, which is more accurate than I could have given, from the gentleman from California [Mr. MCFALL], will be willing to withdraw his objection to the project and let the construction of the airport proceed. It is a little airport for American citizens in that area, to be used principally by the Corps of Engineers for the next 7 years during the construction of the dam. I would hope we might yield on that.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I think he named it when he said he visited the majority leader of the other body. It is a special-interest airport. I think all of us know about how these inholdings work. When dams are built, water is impounded, and the river beds are filled up, during the first 3 to 5 years there is awfully good fishing, to say nothing of the hunting in this sparsely inhabited region in Montana. In the gentleman's conversation I hope he determined how we could all join this airport club so that we could be privileged to fly in and out of there after construction is completed, the fishing is good, and the airport is at its best.

Mr. MAHON. I did not discuss that. But I know that this $140,000, over the period of 7 years during the construction of the dam, would be amortized in all probability. There is nothing wrong with fishing and hunting. The amount involved is relatively small.

Mr. HALL. I would have to disagree with the distinguished gentleman, whom I respect. It is not a small amount in a time of economy, particularly if we are going to spend the money for this sort of special interest.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, Montana is a small State which does not get very many dollars in the airport program. Let me say that it does not even utilize all the money that is allocated—because of the sparse population and the 50–50 matching requirement of this program. I think this is an important point for the Members to keep in mind. This State, under the regular grants-in-aid to airport programs, does not utilize the funds which are available. Since it does not, that money is subsequently returned to the FAA and is allocated to other States.

So I would think, on the basis of reasonableness and fairness, we really ought to provide this money.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROBERTS].

Mr. ROBERTS. I thank the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee. I wish to compliment the chairman and the subcommittee on the work that they have done. I wish to bring out a point with reference to the permanence of this project.

Recently one of the members of the subcommittee and I went out there on a hunting trip. I did not see the site of the airport. I did not have an opportunity to inspect it personally. But I am getting some information. Under the Inholdings Act, the Forest Service is trying to keep people from getting anywhere in this wilderness area. They bought a very expensive dude ranch that had an airstrip on it. There are pictures in the news media of the Idaho papers saying what they did with it. The first day they got the deed to it, they set a torch to a $100,000 dude ranch, and then they plowed up the airstrip.

I want to compliment this committee, because at least we are going to get some use out of the money with which we will build this strip. I hope the chairman will see that any of the money used for this in the future will have some permanent result and not be used to build something which will be plowed up and thrown away.

Mr. BOLAND. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. MCFALL].

Mr. MCFALL. Mr. Speaker, this has been done before, in the Glen Canyon Dam construction and the airport there, which has resulted in an airport of much use to the local people in the Arizona area. None of the money which would have been spent for the airstrip at this dam is being wasted. It is being used for the benefit of people of the United States.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MINSHALL].

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I have the highest regard for the Speaker of this House and for the majority leader of the other body. I served on this conference committee. When we discussed this bill in conference, we adjourned one morning with this question of the Kelley Flats Airport still in limbo. When we came back after lunch, information was provided that local interests were going to contribute funds in the amount of $121,000, according to the usual formula. Since that time, until we came to the floor today, I understand somebody was under the mistaken impression on the other side, and that this is not the case. It is going to be, as has been pointed out here today, a 100-percent Federal contribution.

We in Ohio have an airport program. We are not asking for 50 percent from the Federal Government for all of our airports. We are supporting most of our airports in Ohio with 100-percent State funds. I think if the State of Montana wants this airport, it should at least contribute the 50-percent share according to the Federal statute which is now on the books.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman may have had that understanding. The gentleman from Illinois had the same understanding. Perhaps others may have had the same understanding. I did not have that understanding.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I want to make it crystal clear to my good friend and colleague that I do not think anybody intentionally misled us at that time. I think an honest mistake was made.

Mr. BOLAND. I understand.

Again I say—and this is an important point—under the grants-in-aid to airports program, the State of Montana does not utilize all of the money that is allocated to it. I think we ought to protect some of the smaller States. When Montana does not use all of the money allocated to it, on the basis of population and size of land area, that money is returned to FAA and FAA can then allocate it to other States. The amount returned by the State of Montana because it does not use all of its funds is substantially greater than the approximately $130,000 which the Federal Aviation Administration will make available to the State of Montana under this program. On the basis of fairness, it would seem to me the House ought to join members of this committee and approve this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. THOMPSON].

POVERTY PROGRAM

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the poverty program should be the elimination of poverty and not the creation of a political machine through the use of taxpayers dollars. Two weeks ago on the floor of the House, I disclosed a threat which had been conveyed to me which originated with one of the local poverty officials in Atlanta. This person was quoted as stating that Economic Opportunity-Atlanta had over 66 people registering persons to vote, were organizing voters on a block-by-block basis and that this would be a powerful political force which could be used against me if I did not vote as they felt I should.

This official denied to me that he would ever attempt to use any such organization for political purposes but did acknowledge the fact that Economic Opportunity-Atlanta is engaged in a block-by-block recruiting and organization of voters using poverty personnel and buildings and that obviously this would be a powerful force in an election, but that neither he nor any other worker would never suggest how anyone should vote.

Over the weekend, I received a number of telephone calls, some from ministers and some from average citizens residing in the poverty areas. I was told, Mr. Speaker, that the poverty program in Atlanta is being used to create a political force, that EOA in Atlanta has gone so far as to refuse a person living in a poverty area participation in any of the organizational activities which they are conducting unless this person is registered to vote. This is discrimination of the rankest sort.

I was also advised, Mr. Speaker, by a person with the Fulton County Registrar's Office with whom I talked, that the local poverty officials asked for voter registration lists to use as a guide in their block-by-block registration efforts with more than 66 EOA personnel registering persons to vote. Further, these persons are advising the people of the poverty areas that they cannot participate in the poverty program or the elections of the block captains and the ward and precinct captains unless these people qualify as registered voters.

Mr. Speaker, I reiterate again that the purpose of the poverty program is not to create a political machine, using taxpayers' dollars, but to attempt to solve the pressing problems of the poverty stricken. In their quest for power and their desire to supplant the guidance which the local ministers and civic leaders have traditionally given, it seems to me that the officials who are conducting this program of building a political machine have lost sight of the purpose of the program as intended by Congress.

Two weeks ago, the Senate, with only three dissenting votes, placed an amendment on the poverty bill prohibiting the use of poverty personnel and facilities for such activities.

Only this morning, I talked with the head of Economic Opportunity in Atlanta, who confirmed that persons in order to have a voice in the poverty program must register to vote. Mr. Parham, Director of EOA, did state that it is mandatory that these persons register in order to participate in the poverty election. However, he stated, registering for county and State elections is optional.

Further questioning of the Director revealed that he did not know of any instances wherein a person was not registered for the county and State elections at the same time he was registered for the poverty elections.

In fact, it is my understanding that the regular voter registration lists are used to determine persons eligible to take part in the poverty block captain elections.

I appraised the Director of EOA of the Senate action in placing an amendment on the bill prohibiting such activities and suggested that perhaps it would be best if his agency would concentrate on solving the problems of the poor rather than conduct massive voter-registration campaigns. Mr. Parham stated that he would not make such a recommendation but would prefer to wait and see what action the Congress took.

Mr. Speaker, it is apparent that the basic purpose of the poverty program in Atlanta has vanished in the eyes of many people. The activities of EOA certainly raise doubt as to whether the purpose of eliminating poverty is the major effort in Atlanta.

Unquestionably, all persons should be registered to vote. However, if we are to use Federal taxpayers' dollars, personnel, and facilities paid for with these dollars to register persons to vote on a block-by-block basis, it should not be confined only to the poverty areas but should also extend into the suburban areas as well.

Those people who feel that they will be able to control the votes in the poverty areas may well be in for some surprises.

I have today brought this matter to the attention of Sargent Shriver and requested that he issue a directive to the various OEO agencies throughout the country requesting that they proceed forthwith to concentrate on the elimination of poverty and to cease their efforts to organize voters on a block-by-block basis using the taxpayers dollars.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Because of the information that was bandied about as to the cost of this airport, I just this minute talked with the Montana Aeronautics Commission at Helena, Mont., by telephone. What is actually being contemplated here is that the community of Libby will put up through a loan from the State aeronautics commission up to $37,000. In addition to that, this does come under the Airport Act for aid because the Federal Aviation Administration will also participate to the extent of 53 percent of the cost. So you really have a threefold participation here. No. 1, the local community is putting in their $37,000; No. 2, the Federal Aviation Administration is contributing 53 percent; and No. 3, the Corps of Engineers, through the project they necessarily have to construct anyway, is putting in $140,000. So this is not solely a federally financed operation, as was stated earlier. The State aeronautics commission is making this money available on a loan basis to the community of Libby who, in turn, have to repay the loan to the State agency.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman yield to me for a moment?

Mr. BOLAND. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman from Montana will make another telephone call, perhaps this airport will not cost the Federal Government anything. What is the population of Libby, if I may inquire?

Mr. BATTIN. I would have to say—and it is not in my district—at this particular time I would have to say it is a community of probably 3,000 or 4,000.

Mr. BOLAND. It is 2,800.

Mr. GROSS. Is that 20 miles from the proposed site of this airport? How far is it from the proposed site of the airport?

Mr. BATTIN. I think the statement was it was about 8 miles from the dam and I imagine 2 or 3 additional miles from there.

Mr. GROSS. Would there be any charge for the hunters, fishermen, and skiers who would land there and who have the money to afford an airplane for those purposes? Will there be any charge for these aircraft for the use of this federally financed airport?

Mr. BATTIN. I do not know. We do not make a charge at Billings, Mont., the largest city in the State, for people who come in to use the facilities there. I am sure there would be no additional charge.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ICHORD. I would like to inquire as to whether or not the contract for the construction of the dam has yet been let.

Mr. BATTIN. Yes. I believe it has been. As a matter of fact, construction has started.

Mr. ICHORD. Normally in a remote area such as this the cost of such a temporary airport would be included in the contract cost. I am wondering if the contractor for the damsite might not be getting a windfall by the Government doing this.

Mr. BATTIN. No.

Mr. BOLAND. My understanding is the contractor is expending money for the construction of a temporary strip at the damsite. It would cost them $33,000.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry, if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. YATES. This is a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment. What would be the effect of voting down such a motion? Will it have the effect of sending the conferees back to conference for the purpose of ironing out this particular item again?

The SPEAKER. The amendment would still be before the House subject to another form of a motion.

Mr. YATES. What would be the nature of that motion, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The motion could be that the House insist on its disagreement.

Mr. YATES. I thank the Speaker.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. If the gentleman from Massachusetts' motion that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 13 and concur therein was voted down, then another motion would be in order, would it not, I would ask as a parliamentary inquiry, to instruct the conferees to maintain the position of the House or that the House insist upon its disagreement with the other body?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state in response to the parliamentary inquiry propounded to the Chair by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri that if the House should insist upon its disagreement, then the matter could go back to conference.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, is it in order to move to recommit this particular amendment to conference?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Illinois that at this point it would not be in order to do so.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Massachusetts will yield further for a parliamentary inquiry, is it in order, in the event the motion to recede and concur is voted down?

The SPEAKER. After the House has taken some specific action with relation to the amendment of the other body, the Chair assumes that a further conference could be requested.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield for the purpose of my propounding a further parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL].

Mr. HALL. In other words, a vote against the pending motion of "nay" would be a vote against the reappropriation of these funds in this bill from a previously voted motion to build the airport? Is that correct, under the present legislative situation?

Mr. Speaker, if I may rephrase the parliamentary inquiry——

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from Missouri propounding a parliamentary inquiry or is the gentleman making a statement?

Mr. HALL. I am simply trying to find out whether a "nay" vote would be against the motion.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not question the sincerity of the gentleman nor does it question the sincerity of any Member of the House.

Mr. HALL. Neither would the gentleman from Missouri wish to embarrass the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri have a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, my parliamentary inquiry is this: Under the present parliamentary situation would a "nay" vote against the motion to recede from the disagreement of the House and concur in Senate amendment No. 13 be a vote against the proposed airport?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Missouri that the effect would be that; that it would be a vote as being opposed to the construction of the airport.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts yield for the purpose of my propounding a further parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] for that purpose.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, would a motion be in order at this time to concur in the Senate amendment with another amendment?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Iowa that at this point the answer of the Chair would be in the negative.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS) there were—ayes 58, noes 42.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 161, nays 222, not voting 49, as follows:

[Roll No. 315]

YEAS—161

Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Aspinall
Battin
Bennett
Berry
Blatnik
Boland
Bolling
Brademas
Brasco
Brown, Calif.
Buchanan
Burke, Mass.
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Cabell
Cahill
Carey
Casey
Celler
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Cohelan
Corman
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
de la Garza
Dent
Dingell
Donohue
Dow
Dulski
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Eilberg
Evans, Colo.
Fascell
Feighan
Fisher
Flood
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Giaimo
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Gray
Gubser
Haley
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Wash.
Hathaway
Hawkins
Helstoski
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Howard
Jacobs
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kee
Kelly
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kupferman
Kyros
Leggett
Lukens
McCarthy
McFall
Macdonald, Mass.
Mahon
Mailliard
Matsunaga
Meeds
Miller, Calif.
Mink
Monagan
Morgan
Morris, N. Mex.
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Neill, Mass.
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Poage
Price, Ill.
Purcell
Quie
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roybal
Ryan
St Germain
Schwengel
Shipley
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Steed
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thompson, Ga.
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Tiernan
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Waldie
Walker
Watts
White
Widnall
Wilson, Charles H.
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Zablocki

NAYS—222

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, Ala.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ashmore
Ayres
Baring
Barrett
Bates
Belcher
Bell
Betts
Bevill
Biester
Bingham
Blackburn
Blanton
Bow
Brinkley
Brock
Brotzman
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Burke, Fla.
Burton, Utah
Bush
Byrnes, Wis.
Carter
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clawson, Del
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Corbett
Cowger
Cunningham
Curtis
Davis, Wis.
Delaney
Denney
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Duncan
Dwyer
Edwards, La.
Esch
Eshleman
Farbstein
Findley
Fino
Flynt
Ford, Gerald R.
Frelinghuysen
Galifianakis
Gardner
Gathings
Gettys
Gibbons
Goodling
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gurney
Hagan
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hansen, Idaho
Hardy
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Henderson
Hosmer
Hull
Hungate
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Joelson
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, N.C.
Kastenmeier
Keith
King, N.Y.
Kleppe
Kornegay
Kuykendall
Kyl
Laird
Langen
Lennon
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McClory
McClure
McCulloch
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
MacGregor
Machen
Marsh
Martin
Mathias, Calif.
Mathias, Md.
Mayne
Meskill
Michel
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Minish
Minshall
Mize
Montgomery
Moore
Morse, Mass.
Morton
Mosher
Myers
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nichols
O'Konski
O'Neal, Ga.
Ottinger
Passman
Pettis
Pike
Pirnie
Poff
Pollock
Pool
Price, Tex.
Pryor
Pucinski
Quillen
Railsback
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Riegle
Rivers
Robison
Roth
Roudebush
Roush
Rumsfeld
Ruppe
Sandman
Satterfield
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherle
Scheuer
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Scott
Selden
Shriver
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Okla.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Stanton
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stratton
Stuckey
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Tuck
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Wampler
Watkins
Watson
Whalen
Whalley
Whitener
Whitten
Wiggins
Williams, Pa.
Wilson, Bob
Winn
Wolff
Wylie
Wyman
Yates
Zion
Zwach

NOT VOTING—49

Adams
Boggs
Bolton
Bray
Brooks
Broomfield
Button
Cleveland
Conyers
Cramer
Culver
Dellenback
Diggs
Erlenborn
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Foley
Fountain
Fulton, Tenn.
Goodell
Gude
Hays
Hébert
Herlong
Irwin
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Kazen
Kluczynski
Landrum
Latta
McMillan
Madden
May
Moorhead

Olsen
Patman
Rarick
Rees
Resnick
St. Onge
Staggers
Stephens
Tunney
Utt
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Young

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Foley for, with Mr. Hébert against.
Mr. Fallon for, with Mrs. Bolton against.
Mr. Culver for, with Mr. Utt against.
Mr. Kluczynski for, with Mr. Bray against.
Mr. Boggs for, with Mrs. May against.
Mr. St. Onge for, with Mr. Rarick against.
Mr. Moorhead for, with Mr. Latta against.
Mr. Olsen for, with Mr. Jonas against.
Mr. Diggs for, with Mr. Cramer against.
Mr. Conyers for, with Mr. Goodell against.
Mr. Adams for, with Mr. Broomfield against.
Mr. Madden for, with Mr. Gude against.
Mr. Irwin for, with Mr. Cleveland against.
Mr. Rees for, with Mr. Button against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Brooks with Mr. Erlenborn.
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Dellenback.
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Young.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Fountain.
Mr. Everett with Mr. Resnick.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Herlong.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Staggers.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Willis.
Mr. McMillan with Mr. Patman.

Messrs. DOWNING, HENDERSON, POLLOCK, and DUNCAN changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. BOLAND

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BOLAND moves that the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the conference report and the several motions was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 days in which to extend their remarks on the conference report on H.R. 11456.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CREATING AN INDEPENDENT FEDERAL MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 931 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 931

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 159) to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create an independent Federal Maritime Administration, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries now printed in the bill and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the five-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. DELANEY] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH] and, pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 931 provides an open rule with 2 hours of general debate for consideration of H.R. 159 to create an independent Federal Maritime Administration. The resolution further provides that it shall be in order to consider the committee substitute as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The purpose of H.R. 159 is to create a Federal Maritime Administration not under any other department, agency, or instrumentality of the Government, or under the authority of the head of any department, agency, or instrumentality. The Administration so established would be headed by a Federal Maritime Administrator appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. Within the Federal Maritime Administration there would be established a Maritime Board composed of three members, one of whom would be the Administrator who would act as Chairman.

All of the functions, powers, and duties of the Secretary of Commerce and other offices and officers of the Department of Commerce under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 and other laws and provisions of law enumerated in H.R. 159 would be transferred and vested in the Administrator and in the Maritime Board as specifically provided for in the bill.

It is believed that an independent agency would provide the most efficient mechanism to assure that our national maritime policy will be properly and effectively implemented through constructive programs.

At the moment we are confronted with the fact that a large segment of the fleet is composed of 25-year-old vessels which urgently need replacement; that we have had to withdraw World War II ships from the reserve fleet and recondition them in order to maintain our lifeline to Southeast Asia; that we have too few trained merchant seamen and officers to meet the needs for even our reduced fleet, and that in the event of trouble arising elsewhere in the world with which we might have to cope, we would be unable to find the ships necessary for our supply lines.

Restoration of the type of organization that proved so effective in the past appears to be the proper path to take to eliminate the danger to our commercial and defense interests arising out of the present condition of the merchant marine.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 931 in order that H.R. 159 may be considered.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in the interest of saving time I concur in the statements made by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. DELANEY] explaining the rule, and I will not go further in that regard, but to concur in his statements.

The purpose of the bill is to remove the Maritime Administration from the Department of Commerce and reorganize it as an independent agency within the executive branch of Government.

In addition to this, I would like to mention, Mr. Speaker, that this bill is similar to H.R. 11696, which was favorably reported last year and granted a rule, but was not scheduled for House action.

The bill establishes an independent Federal Maritime Administration, run by an Administrator, appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate. Also established is a Maritime Board of three members, chaired by the Administrator; the other members will also be appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate.

All functions, powers, and duties now handled by the Secretary of Commerce or others within that Department are transferred and vested in the Administrator and the Maritime Board; these generally are those exercised by the Secretary under reorganization plan No. 7 of 1961.

Last year you will recall the House did vote to remove from the Department of Transportation bill the inclusion of the Maritime Administration within that Department.

If my memory is correct, I think it was by a better than 2-to-1 vote that that action was taken.

As I understand it, there is no additional cost to be expected in connection with this bill.

All personnel and property will be transferred with the new agency. No additional cost is expected except for the salaries of the Administrator—$28,500—and the other two members of the Board—$27,000.

The administration, however, continues to oppose an independent Federal Maritime Administration. It wants the existing agency transferred to the new Department of Transportation, something which, as I mentioned, the House refused to do last year by an overwhelming vote.

Frankly, I do not know how far this particular bill may get after it passes the

House. I have my doubts that it is ever going to be signed into law if the administration and the President oppose it. It seems to me that some place along the line we are going to have to do something to help our merchant marine. If we keep on going the way we are, the time will come when there will not be enough equipment to take the California National Guard to Hawaii, the 50th State of the Union, in case of an emergency if that were necessary.

I do not know what the administration is going to do but you and I have to do everything we can someplace, somehow, and somewhere to help our merchant marine which is certainly a shameful situation so far as the great United States is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time and I know of no objection to the rule and urge its adoption.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] may extend his remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I support this rule. I trust that the American people—who do not always pay as much attention to what goes on in this body as they should—will give close attention to this debate on this bill for the creation of an independent Federal Maritime Administration, under the rule.

I particularly invite the close attention of all those people who are apprehensive about the threat of world domination by the Communist powers, because there is a very real relationship between H.R. 159 and the Soviet menace.

All of us know of the Russian boast to "bury" the United States—to surpass us in economic competition. In the maritime field, the Soviets are making good that threat.

In 1960, the Soviets were 11th among the fleets of the world; by 1965 they had vaulted into sixth place, and are now challenging Japan for fifth. As of June 1966, the Soviets had 1,360 seagoing merchant vessels totaling 9.8 million deadweight tons. In the next 5 years, they plan to double their tonnage, which means that the Soviets could have a 2-to-1 edge over us, unless we get moving.

While the Russians have been forging ahead, we have been dropping behind. In 20 years, our active fleet declined from 2,332 vessels to approximately 900. What is more, 80 percent of the Soviet fleet is less than 10 years old—but 70 percent of our cargo ships are more than 20 years old.

Any way you look at it, we just do not shape up. The Soviets carry 75 percent of their oceangoing trade in their own ships, but we carry only between 7 and 8 percent of our own trade. Since 1963, the Russians have built 502 merchant ships, but we built only 87. As of last October, the Russians had 516 additional vessels on order, but we had only 49. In the past 2 years, the Russians spent $1.6 billion on shipbuilding, while we spent only a quarter of a million in the same length of time.

I think we are losing this battle for maritime supremacy because, at the present time, the people who are supposed to be running our maritime program do not consider that there is any sense of urgency about meeting the Soviet challenge.

There is massive indifference toward our merchant marine and I submit that this is because the Maritime Administration has been locked away in the Department of Commerce. It has been stifled in its creative thinking, it has been ignored in terms of budget, and its voice has been stifled because there have have been so many layers of officialdom superimposed on Maritime that any shouts for help come out only as soft, soft whispers in the President's ear.

This situation would not change by putting Maritime in the Department of Transportation. That would merely mean exchanging one overburdened bureau for another.

We have got to give the Maritime Administration back its independence, beef up its budget and give it back its voice. The best way to do that, Mr. Speaker, is through enactment of H.R. 159. This is the best way I can think of to meet the Russian challenge, and to make America strong and free by making our merchant marine strong and free.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 159) to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act 1936, to create an independent Federal Maritime Administration, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 159, with Mr. DADDARIO in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ] will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from California [Mr. MAILLIARD] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ].

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 8 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I hope my colleagues will give serious consideration to the bill H.R. 159, reported with an amendment.

I hope they will help expedite its passage today because I consider this legislation vital to the future health and success of the American merchant marine.

My view is shared by the overwhelming majority of the members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. We have 34 members on our committee. Thirty-one voted in favor of the bill. Two opposed it. And one member was absent. Only one member filed dissenting report.

Briefly the bill would be cited as the Federal Maritime Act of 1967.

It would create an independent Federal Maritime Administration, with a Federal Maritime Administrator at its head.

The Administrator would be appointed by the President—by and with the advice and consent of the Senate—for a term of 4 years.

He would be compensated as provided by level III of the executive schedule, at an annual salary of $28,500.

The bill establishes, within the Federal Maritime Administration, a Maritime Board, which would be composed of three members.

These would be the Federal Maritime Administrator, who shall be Chairman of the Board, and two additional members appointed by the President, also with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Not more than two members shall be from the same political party.

The two additional Board members appointed by the President shall be compensated at the rate provided by level IV of the executive schedule, at an annual salary of $27,000.

Provisions are made with regard to the expiration dates of the initial appointments, for the filling of vacancies, and, for continuous service upon expiration of a term until a successor shall have been appointed and qualified. No appointed member shall engage in any other business, vocation or employment.

Under the bill, all functions, powers, and duties of the Secretary of Commerce and other offices and officers of the Department of Commerce under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 and other specifically enumerated laws and provisions of law are transferred to and vested in the Administrator, and the Maritime Board.

Provision is made for a Deputy Maritime Administrator empowered to serve as Acting Administrator during the absence or disability of the Administrator, provided that he shall at no time sit as a member or acting member of the Maritime Board.

Generally speaking, the functions, powers, and duties transferred under this bill are those presently exercised by the Secretary of Commerce under reorganization plan No. 7 of 1961.

The bill also provides that this act is to take effect on the 60th day after enactment.

The bill was reported with an amendment. The amendment makes no substantive change in the original bill, but is an amendment in the nature of a substitute text. It makes no substantive change in the original bill but is merely in slightly different form and contains certain clarifying features.

In this connection, this bill is for the identical purpose as the similar bill H.R. 11696, which was reported by the committee last year and upon which a rule was granted, although it was not called up on the floor before adjournment.

Early in this session of Congress, a total of 104 Members introduced bills to accomplish this purpose of taking the Maritime Administration out of the Department of Commerce and setting it up as an independent agency.

This is, I think, a clear indication of strong sentiment in the House in favor of this legislation. Although I want to make my remarks as brief as possible, I do think it is important at this time to trace the recent historical development of Federal policies in administrating merchant marine policy. Such a review is necessary, I think, if we want to make an intelligent evaluation of the current situation.

The American merchant marine is currently suffering its lowest ebb in more than 30 years. It has not experienced such an alarming decline since the late thirties. At that time, the merchant marine was reeling under the impact of the ocean mail scandals. Its ships were of World War I vintage. And it was still shaking off the effects of the great depression.

Aroused by the emergency nature of the situation, and by the urgent need for immediate remedial action, the Congress stepped into the breach. It studied the situation and finally evolved the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. This provided among other things—for the creation of a five-man maritime commission, independent of all other executive agencies.

Under the able and dynamic leadership of Joseph P. Kennedy, the father of the late President, the commission immediately undertook the design and construction of a large fleet of merchant vessels. At that time the American maritime industry—just as it is today—was beset with indecision and uncertainty. It was unable to invest heavily and to undertake a positive program of merchant ship production. But as a result of the leadership of Joseph P. Kennedy—and because his commission was an autonomous, independent agency—a fleet of modern, highly competitive merchant ships was created.

It might also be noted that the efforts and accomplishments of Mr. Kennedy fostered the development of American shipyards. These were the same shipyards that, during the early dismal days of World War II, were called upon to launch a shipbuilding program of unprecedented magnitude. American shipyards turned out the largest armada known to the history of man, and played a dominant role in breaking the back of the enemy.

And so, the independent commission created under the 1936 act—and I repeat, independent—served a dual role.

It was instrumental, not only in restoring the American merchant marine to competitive status, but in aiding the Nation in time of great peril. The commission survived until 1950. At that time, it was downgraded and absorbed as an agency of the Department of Commerce, where it has remained for the past 17 years.

Mr. Chairman, I submit it is not a coincidence that the decline of the American merchant marine developed and accelerated ever since the commission was robbed of its independence and submerged in and emasculated by a larger agency—the Department of Commerce.

Aside from the mariner vessel program and the belated and slow liner replacement program, very little effective action has been taken since that time.

I do not mean to infer that the very able and dedicated men who have since served as maritime administrators did not try their best. But it is quite obvious that their efforts were frustrated and detoured because they were unable to speak with authority, because they did not have direct contact with the White House, and, finally, because their maritime responsibilities were subservient to, and in many cases, swamped in a sea of diverse interests, ranging from highway programs to coast and geodetic survey.

Present proposals to include the maritime administration in the new Department of Transportation would have the same adverse results.

Transferring maritime activities from a subordinate position in the Department of Commerce to a similar position in the new department simply retains the organizational structure which has been so ineffective for the past 17 years. No matter how good the intentions of the Secretary, his interests, his efforts and his attentions could not possibly be sufficiently concentrated on maritime affairs when so many other activities obviously also require much time and study.

What we need is an independent agency with an administrator who thinks, talks and acts exclusively for the effective and efficient administration of our national maritime policy. The effectiveness of such organizational structure is abundantly evident when we observe the success of those activities handled by agencies such as: Atomic Energy Commission—AEC—National Aeronautics and Space Administration—NASA—and the Tennessee Valley Authority—TVA. All of these are independent agencies. In fact, the Congressional Directory lists a total of some 70 independent agencies of various kinds.

Although the Federal Aviation Administration is now in the Department of Transportation, its effectiveness as an independent agency is well known.

The desperate need for such independent status is also abundantly evident when one observes the glaring and dangerous deficiencies of our present merchant marine. It is now comprised of a fleet of slightly over 900 vessels and 70 percent of these are over the 20-year age bracket, or older. To put it in more frank terms, they are downright inefficient, uneconomical and obsolete. Furthermore, U.S.-flag vessels are only carrying 7 percent of this Nation's foreign commerce.

Instead of continuing with a long list of this Nation's maritime inadequacies, I think we can aptly emphasize this dangerous situation by contrasting our merchant fleet's decline with the rapidly expanding Russian merchant marine. That expansion constitutes a serious threat to the economy and the defense posture of the entire free world.

Edwin M. Hood, president of the Shipbuilders Council of America, has testified before my committee that the Soviets are building 10 times as many ships as the United States, with a lifting capacity eight times greater.

In 1966, Russia added 100 new vessels and received 55 transfers from satellite countries. During that same year, the United States added 13 ships. As of May 1966, the Soviet had 581 ships under construction, or on order. All of its own shipyards are going full blast, and the overflow of its shipbuilding program—which is considerable—is contracted out to foreign yards.

The U.S.S.R. has promised to "bury" the United States through trade, and its dynamic shipbuilding program is proof positive that its threat was a serious one. And yet, as this and other equally serious threats continue to grow, they are either ignored or minimized by many Government officials, who continue to relegate American merchant marine policy to an insignificant, second-class status.

Mr. Chairman, this is why we need an independent agency. The administration of Cabinet members changes, so we must have a continuity of effort and high-level representation for maritime affairs. We must put an end to this indecision, this lack of leadership. This fear of the future. As it did in 1936, the Congress must once again act on behalf of the American merchant marine.

I am confident it will act in wisdom today by voting overwhelmingly in favor of H.R. 159.

Thank you.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARMATZ. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

In the establishment of the Maritime Administration as an independent agency, has the employment in the agency been increased under the terms of this bill, decreased, or does it remain static?

Mr. GARMATZ. I would think it would be the same number of employees.

Mr. GROSS. The bill does not provide for additional supergrades specifically?

Mr. GARMATZ. No. Besides, the Administrator and members of the Board would be the same, as stated earlier.

Mr. GROSS. So the number of employees is the same as in the present administration?

Mr. GARMATZ. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri, a member of the committee.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I am confident that this legislation offers the only solution for the welfare of the American merchant marine.

Seventeen years ago, the independent body charged with the welfare and development of the merchant marine had its functions transferred to the Department of Commerce. Since that time, there have been seven Secretaries of Commerce, eight Maritime Administrators under the Department of Commerce, and five periods when there were only Acting Administrators, the latest one being since June 1966.

World commerce has grown by leaps and bounds in the last 17 years, and during that period the American merchant marine has declined from a total of 1,050 privately owned vessels to slightly over 900.

At the moment, we are confronted with the desperate expedient of converting World War II troop carriers into containerships and ore carriers, because we lack the money and incentive to build new ones. I hasten to say that I do not criticize any of the many gentlemen who have served either as Secretary of Commerce or Maritime Administrators for the condition in which we find ourselves. The Secretaries of Commerce have had many problems to solve in other areas of their responsibilities, and the fact that they have treated maritime affairs as a stepchild is not necessarily a reflection upon them. Virtually all of the individuals were able and conscientious men, but they were unable to devote sufficient time to the problems of our sea-borne commerce. Likewise, the Maritime Administrators and Acting Maritime Administrators have been capable individuals, but they were unable to make their views known effectively so as to secure sufficient emphasis upon the merchant marine.

At the present time there appear to be but three possibilities: retention of Maritime Administration in the Department of Commerce, transfer to another department where it would occupy the same subordinate position, or transfer to the independent agency contemplated by this bill.

In view of our experience over the past 17 years, I can see no hope for the future of our American merchant marine if it continues to be buried in a department chiefly concerned with other matters. I feel that the transfer of responsibility for the protection of our defense and commercial interests through the merchant marine can come only by a group dedicated solely to its interests. That solution would be achieved by enactment of this legislation, and while I am not so optimistic as to predict any miracles through this bill, I do feel that it represents a start toward the necessarily slow and painful restoration of our prestige on the seas of the world.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, as the author of the initial bill proposing the establishment of an independent Federal Maritime Administration, which I introduced in September 1965, and as one of the many sponsors of the legislation now under consideration, I rise in support of passage of the bill, H.R. 159.

You will recall that on January 4, 1965, the President of the United States delivered his state of the Union message. In that message delivered almost 3 years ago, the President stated:

> I will recommend . . . a new policy for our merchant marine.

Today, we in the Congress still are waiting upon the submission of that "new" maritime policy.

The failure of the President to come forth with this promised new policy for American shipping has had a debilitating effect upon the entire maritime industry. Perhaps the most telling testimony received in our exhaustive hearings on this measure was a letter received in response to my inquiry from the Committee of American Steamship Lines, which stated, in part:

> . . . two . . . member lines . . . have indicated an unwillingness to make additional investment in new ships at this time *in the absence of a positive long-range national Merchant Marine Program.*

The bill, H.R. 159, now before us for consideration is the first step in the formulation and the implementation of a badly needed program to revitalize the American merchant marine. Significantly, section 11 of this bill makes it mandatory for the Maritime Board to submit "to the President and to the Congress" a report on the current condition of American shipping with appropriate recommendations for such further legislation or programs as it, the Board, may deem necessary. This provision is of singular importance, since it represents a vehicle for taking the issue of our maritime posture out of the public forum and placing it before the Congress where the decisions ultimately must be made.

Events of recent weeks have only served to underscore the need for passage of this legislation. Although both the distinguished chairman of our committee and his counterpart in the other body have indicated that the administration shortly would submit a new maritime program, press reports in both the Baltimore Sun and Washington Post of last week indicated that:

> There will be no program to modernize the . . . merchant marine this year.

But even more shocking was the report in this same article of the Baltimore Sun, which quoted an unidentified spokesman for the Maritime Administration as stating that the agency "plans during the period immediately ahead to withhold any new contracts for new ship construction. This is in keeping with the administration policy of holding budget expenditures and commitments to as low a level as possible consistent with the national security and well-being until the present fiscal uncertainties have been cleared up."

Mr. Chairman, I know of nothing which is more vital to our national security and well-being than a strong and viable American merchant marine. Only last month, the new Chief of Naval Operations, Adm. Thomas H. Moorer, USN, stated:

> It is still true that about 98% of everything going into Viet Nam goes by ship. * * * Knowledge of this sealift, I think, brought home to a great many Americans and people of other countries just how vital open sealanes are to a maritime nation such as the United States—and to our forces and allies overseas.

Unfortunately, this knowledge appears not to have been imparted to policymakers of the Administration.

Also, many have not heeded the warning of the commander of the Military Sea Transportation Service, Vice Adm. Lawson P. Ramage, USN, who stated only last week that:

> It is my conviction that, in the area of sea transportation, we are fast approaching a crisis. *Within the next four years,* age will force over 60% of these [ships] into the National Defense Reserve Fleet, the shipbreaker's yard, or foreign sale.

This may be an excessively gloomy picture, since all of these overaged ships probably would not be withdrawn from service if funds are not available for their replacement. However, the fact remains that such overaged and uneconomical vessels should be replaced with new construction.

Mr. Chairman, I find it inconceivable that in the face of such warnings our Chief Executive would simply dump plans to revitalize our merchant marine in a fit of pique. I find it equally improbable that the President of the United States would abdicate his responsibility in such a matter to any subordinate. It was President Johnson who on May 9 of this year issued a proclamation urging the people of this Nation to honor the American merchant marine on National Maritime Day 1967. In that proclamation, he stated:

> Throughout American history, the Merchant Marine has been indispensable to our security and prosperity.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Merchant ships carry the essentials of life to millions in need. They transport military supplies and equipment to our forces abroad. Of all our supplies being sent to Viet Nam today, 98 percent are carried by ship.

Mr. Chairman, further procrastination in meeting our shipping problem can mean only one thing—sweeping the issues facing the American merchant marine, the condition of which borders upon being a major national crisis, under the rug. This only can serve to forestall the ultimate day of reckoning when we will have to face up to an even greater cost to revitalize our maritime industry. The bill, H.R. 159, although not a panacea, is an affirmative step toward meeting the challenge at sea.

There are those who today will argue that the Maritime Administration should not be created as an independent agency, but rather should be transferred to the Department of Transportation. This argument may be meritorious at some future date, but not with the situation we face today. Events subsequent to the establishment of the Department of Transportation have served only to fortify my belief that the refusal of the House, during the 89th Congress, to permit the transfer of the Maritime Administration to the Department of Transportation was a wise decision.

The actions of the distinguished Secretary of Transportation have made me all the more apprehensive about the fate of our vital shipping industry if its administration were to be placed at his tender mercies. Earlier this year, the Secretary of Transportation wrote a rather ambiguous letter to the several regulatory agencies concerning carrier applications for rate increases. This action was characterized in an editorial of June 21 in the Journal of Commerce as "Mr. Boyd's Grandstand Play." Again in August of this year, the Department of Transportation's intervention in a matter pending before the Federal Maritime Commission prompted the Presidents of two major American shipping lines to send a telegram to Secretary Boyd, which noted in part:

> For an official of a government to capitulate to the reasoning of foreign lines without even attempting to get the American side of the picture raises serious additional doubts in the minds of some as to whether that agency [sic., the Department of Trans-

> portation] is the proper one to have jurisdiction over the welfare of the American merchant marine.

There therefore is serious doubt whether the Department of Transportation is competent to handle our shipping problems.

Last, but not least, we have the recent action of the Secretary of Transportation communicating with the State Governors, and more or less threatening that any multiple billion dollar cut in the budget might force a reduction in vital highway spending of as much as 50 percent. Yet this Cabinet officer in whom some would propose to vest authority over American shipping, and who allegedly has used similar coercive tactics in formulating a maritime program, failed to mention that the highway funds are not part of the budget at all. As an editorial in the Journal of Commerce of October 11 stated:

> Mr. Boyd's warnings to the Governors . . . was a tactical blunder.

I know of no industry which can less afford blunders of any nature than the ailing American merchant marine.

Last month, Vice Adm. C. E. Weakley, USN, commander, Antisubmarine Warfare Force, Atlantic, addressed the National Security Industrial Association, underscoring the threat posed by the increasing maritime and naval strength of the Soviet Union. Of our own merchant marine, Admiral Weakley stated:

> As an American, as much as a military commander, I find the state of our ocean transportation capability very disturbing. While our foreign commerce almost tripled in tonnage since 1950, we lost nearly one-third of our active U.S.-flag merchant fleet!
>
> * * * * *
>
> We could not depend upon any commodity being shipped in any foreign bottoms because, you see, we have no control over their loyalties or ownership. We have, in effect, put over 90 per cent of our overseas transportation needs in the hands of other nations!
>
> * * * * *
>
> *I dare say that if everyone understood the importance of this, we might bring about a change in the situation.*
>
> A change is extremely important to the defense of our country. We must have adequate sea transport available to us in time of war.

It is to insure that everyone does understand the importance of the challenge at sea that I urge the passage of the bill, H.R. 159. The American merchant marine is a most vital sector of our economy and is deserving of the highest priority. In the words of the distinguished ranking minority member of our Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow]:

> I firmly believe that the federal budget should be balanced, but we can and must provide for items of urgent necessity to our national existence. One of these should be the finest merchant marine in the world. We need to establish priorities and eliminate unproductive frills and giveaways.
>
> The highest priority should go to a comprehensive plan to revitalize the American Merchant Marine.

Such a comprehensive plan upon which the Congress can act can be insured by the enactment of H.R. 159, and I do earnestly urge my colleagues to support its passage in the House today.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman from California yield?

Mr. MAILLIARD. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the gentleman from California, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries; and I also wish to compliment the overwhelming majority of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, under the leadership of the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Garmatz]. This is good, constructive, necessary legislation.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion this legislation is extremely important in an area that is crucial for our national security. It is my opinion that we will have an overwhelming affirmative vote today indicating to the administration that this body of the Congress strongly feels that there has been a neglect of our merchant marine in the recent past and that we must do something affirmatively about it in the immediate future. This bill is a first step but an important one. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 159.

Mr. Chairman, I commend, as I stated before, the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. Mailliard], and the majority of his colleagues on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. MAILLIARD. I thank the distinguished minority leader on this side of the aisle. Of course, there is no partisanship with reference to this subject matter. The committee was firmly in support of this legislation.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAILLIARD. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I too want to commend the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. Mailliard] for his support of this legislation and to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks. Surely, Mr. Chairman, there is a problem involved here. The distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. Mailliard] and the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Garmatz] have outlined the mistakes, the substantive mistakes, which have been made in the past.

However, Mr. Chairman, there is another point involved here. Based upon my experience in service on the Committee on Government Operations and particularly on the Subcommittee on Reorganization, it is my judgment that the Department of Transportation simply cannot give attention to the important problems which the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. Mailliard] has dwelt upon.

Mr. Chairman, for the merchant marine to regain its prominence and in order for it to maintain its status throughout the world, it is absolutely essential that it be placed in an independent position so that it can submit a budget of its own. Under the procedure which is presently followed this budget has to be approved by officials, all the way up to the Secretary of the Department of Tranportation. However, when this bill is adopted and becomes law, the Merchant Marine Administration will have an opportunity to present its budget directly to the President.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion that is the only way in which the merchant marine can receive a fair shake.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to congratulate the gentleman from California for leading the fight in the bipartisan spirit in which this legislation has been brought to the floor of the House today for consideration.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Friedel].

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in support of H.R. 159, a bill introduced by my good friend and colleague, the Honorable Edward Garmatz, distinguished chairman of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, to create an independent Federal Maritime Administration.

I have become increasingly concerned about the steady decline of our merchant fleet—a decline so severe and a situation so grave as to have perilous consequences for us as a nation in the next decade.

First and foremost, if we are going to consider the drastic remedial action necessary to save our merchant fleet, we must decide where the merchant marine fits into the structure of American society. Is it a branch of our commerce, or is it a vital arm of our national defense, or is it both at once? At least one other nation, the Soviet Union, holds that a strong merchant marine is important both for commerce and for defense.

As long ago as 1960 and as recently as 1966, students of maritime affairs have commented on the Soviet Union's objectives in building a strong merchant fleet. It is apparent that the Soviets consider foreign trade to be an integral part of the foreign policy for once the trade deal is signed, the Soviet merchant ship becomes the active agent of that policy.

In 1965, the Soviet Union accepted delivery of 100 merchant ships, while the United States took delivery of only 16; we had on order 41 merchant ships of over 1,000 tons and the Russians had 464. Clearly, the Russian emphasis on building a strong fleet to foster its foreign policies would justify grave concern on our part that we are not keeping abreast of the times. Commerce or defense? I believe that the merchant marine is both and that we need a nationally determined policy to support our merchant fleet for both reasons.

Once this fundamental policy has been decided upon, and I believe it can only be decided by an independent Maritime Administration dedicated to regaining our preeminence on the seas, we can look for changes for the better in all phases of the industry. At present, despite promises, no clear policy is visible—90 percent of our general cargo is carried in foreign ships—100 percent of our aluminum ore is imported in ships not flying the American flag.

We are the richest and most powerful nation the world has ever known. We are now involved in a war some 10,000 miles away. Because of the deterioration of our maritime fleet, we are forced to bring out of mothballs ships built 20 to 25 years ago. Ships that could have been recommissioned for $100,000 in 1947 but which cost up to $500,000 today. If our effort in Vietnam can so strain our maritime facilities, we have far too small a margin of safety. We should have learned a lesson from both World Wars but it appears we are relying on computers rather than experience.

It has been proposed that American shipping firms be allowed to build abroad in foreign yards where labor costs are lower than our own. Now, if shipping were solely a part of commerce, not of defense, this might be feasible. But shipping is not solely commerce. Our own shipyards, if foreign building were to be encouraged, would deteriorate still further. Our skilled workmen would drift away to other industries, and we would have no defense capability left. Another time—can we be sure there will be an opportunity to develop our shipbuilding capacities as we needed to do in the 1940's. I feel very strongly that we must never again be caught in that position. Therefore, I recommend that we use funds for the construction of new ships to keep our own shipyards working to full capacity and maintain the health of our economy.

Four years ago, the Secretary of Defense acknowledged the importance of naval power but said that planes would be relied on to transport men and materiel. Ships would be needed only to provide backup supplies and heavy equipment. Recent reports indicate that 2 percent—chiefly personnel—of the total effort in Vietnam is carried by plane; 98 percent is still carried by ship. This, I might add, is a 2-percent improvement on the situation during the Spanish-American War 69 years ago.

What should we establish for our new and badly needed policy? For a start, let us live up to the provisions of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, which called for a merchant marine capable of handling all our domestic and much of our foreign water-borne commerce in American-built ships, manned by American seamen. But most importantly of all, let us reverse a decision made 17 years ago, which deprived the Maritime Administration of its independence and made it a part of the Department of Commerce. Justification for this transfer of control was that by providing the Maritime Administration with a Cabinet spokesman, the merchant marine would be given increased importance in the determination of our defense and economic policies.

We must recognize that the 1950 attempt to strengthen the merchant marine by placing it at the Cabinet level has proved an abject failure, and we must take steps to correct this mistake. H.R. 159 gives us this chance.

I believe that an independent Federal Maritime Administration would significantly increase the effectiveness of this all-important industry, and thus serve to strengthen our economic and defense capabilities at this crucial time in international affairs. It would improve our position in our struggle for the protection of liberty in war-torn South Vietnam and in other trouble spots around the world.

An independent agency in the executive branch whose sole duty would be the administration of the merchant marine could formulate a clear-cut policy and give the industry the attention it needs. The establishment of such an administration would be the first important step toward the development of the merchant marine into the vital national force it has been in the past, and can be again in the future.

I would like to impress my distinguished colleagues with a sense of urgency if we are to save our merchant fleet and I strongly urge passage of H.R. 159.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, like a substantial number of Members of the House. I am most pleased to voice my support for passage of this bill to set up an independent Federal Maritime Administration.

Merchant shipping in the United States has reached a very critical stage. This industry, which is vital to our Nation, has reached a point where instead of growing as it should it is actually showing a decline.

In addition to the fact that we do not have a sufficient number of ships to perform the duties of the merchant marine, most of our existing fleet is obsolete. Our ship replacement program is 90 ships behind schedule and prospects for the future are not good.

In spite of the sad economic position that maritime is in, the 1967 Maritime Administration budget was at a 6-year low. Only 3.8 percent of the total amount the Government paid in subsidies went to the maritime industry, while in contrast 72.4 percent of the total subsidies was paid to the agriculture industry.

If maritime were set up as an independent agency, it would be able to focus more attention on the economic problems of the fleet. The spokesman for maritime would be interested solely in maritime affairs and not in many diverse interests as the present Secretary is.

By taking the Maritime Administration out of the Department of Commerce and making it independent, it will be better able to represent its position. The creation of policy will be the responsibility of the Maritime Administration and not of other Departments such as Transportation, Defense, and Commerce. At present, with the Maritime Administration within the Department of Commerce, the Maritime Administrator is overruled by a number of other officials within the Department. These officials are without adequate maritime background and do not necessarily have a genuine concern for the merchant marine.

The maritime industry should be represented by an independent agency which is staffed by officials who have knowledge and experience in the field. To have a revival of our shipping industry, we must have advocates of a strong and growing fleet making our policy.

We urgently need a program that will promote long-range expansion and growth of the American merchant marine. It has been evidenced over the past 15 years that we will not have this kind of a program under the existing organization. We need to promote the programs and policies necessary to rebuild a strong merchant marine fleet—a fleet that is able to compete in the world and one which is a symbol of America's position of world leadership.

I think that we can rebuild our merchant fleet to a position of respect—but we can do this only if maritime affairs are set up in a separate, independent agency—an agency whose sole concern is the maritime industry, and which devotes its time exclusively to the promotion of that industry.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY].

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to have been one of the more than 100 Members of the House of Representatives who introduced legislation to establish an independent Federal Maritime Administration. Mr. Chairman, when I introduced this bill in January, the status of this Nation's merchant marine was appalling. Later, in July, when I testified before the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the outlook was even more bleak. And, still today, in October, the American merchant marine continues to decline. Indeed, since World War II, the status of America as a merchant marine power in the world has constantly declined until today, we are in the unenviable world ranking of 16th in shipbuilding, and the privately owned American merchant fleet that was first in the world in 1948, now has sunk to sixth in total gross tonnage.

Mr. Chairman, a shipbuilding program, or lack of one, is just one of the maladies crippling our merchant marine. The age and obsolescence of our fleet are deplorable. Better than 70 percent of our privately owned American-flag fleet consists of ships 20 years or older, pointing to the very real danger that within the next 5 years, the American merchant marine, competitively speaking, may be swept from the seas.

Our Nation's export-import tonnage carried by American-flag ships has dropped to less than 7 percent, the lowest such participation over a period of time spanning almost a half century.

And, equally serious, is the attrition problem in maritime manpower.

There is a reason, Mr. Chairman, for this decline. America lacks a maritime policy. We do not have to look far to see the small Nation of Japan, today owning the world's fifth largest merchant marine, scheduled to grow, under a 5-year plan, from today's 13 million gross tons, to 22 million tons by 1971. And, Russia is working under a program to become No. 1 on the seas under a 7-year plan.

Yet, America has no maritime policy. In January 1965, President Johnson promised Congress he would recommend a new program, but no message has been forthcoming, and the only action of the administration has been to further reduce the ship construction program, holding out for a "build foreign" plan which did complete violence to the principle of national self-sufficiency.

Mr. Chairman, I recognize the right of the executive branch of Government to establish and adhere to their policies. The Bureau of the Budget, under the direction of the President of the United States, holds the purse strings.

But, the American people and their Representatives in the Congress have a right to know, on an independent and objective basis, the needs of their country as viewed by an independent and objective, knowledgeable Maritime Administration on the basis of facts and not fancies.

The United States has a good law, the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, that was written in the interest of both the national defense and the maintenance of a strong economy. But, unfortunately, this law has been ignored.

In this connection, it seems to me that an independent Maritime Administration could review the national maritime needs and play an important role in providing the public with unbiased, up-to-date facts in order to influence and resolve existing as well as future stalemates.

Mr. Chairman, there were recent headlines saying a great, new merchant marine program would be announced shortly. Apparently, this was a giant firecracker that fizzled. Reports now are that the President has no such program, so let us not be deluded into sidetracking this legislation.

I see only one way to move, Mr. Chairman. As a cosponsor of this bill proposing the establishment of an independent Federal Maritime Administration, I urge its passage, and I hope it will prove to be the vehicle for a "little more light and a little less noise," so that we can finally start the development of the type of American merchant marine which, in the national interest, our country needs so badly. I strongly urge passage of H.R. 159.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Being a member of the committee, and one of the sponsors of the bill, I rise in support of H.R. 159.

Mr. Chairman, it seems strange in view of the current situation of our merchant marine, that this bill—H.R. 159—does not enjoy the wholehearted support of this administration. One would think that the administration would want to see us grow strong on the high seas again, and that it would heed the advice and counsel of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, which is so well versed in maritime affairs, on the best way to get this job done.

But I regret to say that this has not been so, and has not been so for many years past. That is why we find ourselves in such a predicament, insofar as our commercial fleet is concerned.

The United States leads the world in foreign trade, yet less than one-tenth of our foreign commerce is carried on American-flag vessels. We are a nation which is No. 1 in trade, yet we have fallen to No. 6 in merchant shipping. By contrast, Russia transports 75 percent of her own foreign commerce in Russian bottoms while we carry less than 8 percent in American-flag ships.

The past 10 years have seen a drastic decline in the number of ships in our fleet and have seen the fleet as a whole pass into obsolescence. We have less than 1,000 ships today in our merchant fleet as compared to over 4,800 ships in the fleet in 1946. Not only do we have a lesser number of ships, but over 80 percent of these are 20 years old or older.

The merchant marine has been almost totally neglected by this administration. The 1936 Merchant Marine Act calling for a bigger and better fleet has been almost totally disregarded.

While the maritime industry is in such a sad economic situation, the budget for the Maritime Administration gets cut more and more.

The administration has allocated $1 billion for the development of a supersonic transport, yet the Maritime Administration's budget for 1967 was a meager $300 million—the lowest that it has been in 6 years.

Our Government has appropriated enough funds to build only 13 new vessels for next year. In 1966, Russia had under construction over 500 large merchant ships. Since 1950, the U.S. fleet has decreased by almost 1,000 vessels, while the Russian fleet by comparison has increased its fleet by approximately that same number.

The only way that we can rebuild our merchant shipping into a strong and powerful industry is through a forceful maritime program. We will not get this kind of program as long as the Maritime Administration remains in one of the Departments, whether it be the Department of Commerce or the Department of Transportation. The only way that maritime can promote its policies effectively and obtain the appropriations that it needs to carry out its programs is if it is established as an independent agency.

Established independently, the Maritime Administration will be able to focus attention on its problems and it will be in a better position to bid for appropriations.

I urge immediate passage of H.R. 159 to establish this independent agency and get our maritime program moving again on the road to progress and prosperity.

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I appreciate the gentleman bringing out the point that we were No. 1 in the world with our merchant marine, and we are now way down the line. I believe I understood the gentleman to give the impression that he feels as I do that passage of this legislation creating this independent agency will tend to put us back toward the No. 1 spot.

I believe the importance of an independent merchant marine agency is to establish guidelines based on the needs of our country, and certainly those guidelines would point up that we should be first on the seas, not only for national defense, but as well for the advancement of our economy. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman on his very fine statement, and to associate myself in the expression of those sentiments.

Mr. Chairman, the principle and purpose of this legislation is well known and has been consistently supported by all major segments of the industry, as well as by congressional leaders concerned with the industry's survival. This purpose is to prevent the essential needs of this vital industry from being continually ignored and submerged, and to place the responsibility for its revival in an agency which has the status and authority necessary for the performance of its duties.

Administration spokesmen have time and time again argued that the merchant marine is but one link in our transportation chain, and that responsibility for the maintenance of our fleet should be included in the Department which oversees trucks and trains. But the sponsors of this bill, Mr. Chairman, feel that the merchant marine is unique—both in its problems and its national role.

Its problems, first, are more complex than those of other domestic transportation industries. American railroads and trucks do not compete with French, Italian, or Japanese firms for the carriage of goods and passengers. But American shipowners must meet the challenge of foreign competition every day, contending with foreign-flag vessels manned by low-cost labor and operating with inferior safety standards.

Second, the American merchant marine plays a direct and immediate role in our national defense. It is considered the "fourth arm" of our defense and must be treated with appropriate priority. In this sense, the merchant marine is much more than simply one link in the Nation's transportation network.

These unique characteristics of the American merchant marine are ignored when maritime affairs are administered by Government agencies which primarily serve interests different from or competing with maritime needs. The industry would have a far better chance of survival and growth, if its affairs were administered by a Federal agency whose sole concern was maritime.

The original policy set down by Congress in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 was to establish an American-built, American-owned, and American-manned merchant fleet capable of carrying a substantial portion of our foreign trade and serving as a naval auxiliary in wartime. To implement this policy, Congress created an independent and autonomous Maritime Commission to formulate and administer maritime programs.

The decline of our fleet since the reorganization and virtual eclipse of the autonomous agency is well known to all of us. Today this decline is all the more alarming at a time when the Soviet Union's hammer-and-sickle fleet is aggressively challenging the West for control of the seas. I traveled to the Soviet Union in January of last year and saw personally the tremendous efforts which the Communists are making to transform Russia into the supreme power on the high seas. The Soviet fleet has increased 10 times since 1950, and is growing by 100 new vessels every year.

Mr. Chairman, the sponsors of this legislation feel that now is the time to reinstitute the successful administrative plan which prevailed during the greatest surge of growth in the history of our own merchant marine. The reestablishment of an autonomous Federal maritime agency would be the best way to deal with the varied problems which have plagued the American-flag fleet, the Government, and the Nation for so many years. It is urgent that this vital step be taken now.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Downing].

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for the opportunity to again express my support of H.R. 159 and similar bills which would create an independent Federal Maritime Administration.

I am proud to be one of the sponsors of this extremely important legislation.

Mr. Chairman, the American people have literally demanded that the Congress take steps to give this Nation a vibrant merchant marine with modern ships owned by Americans; sailed by Americans; and built by Americans. This legislation is one of the steps toward that goal.

The House of Representatives has and is responding to the wishes of the people to develop a merchant marine. You will recall that when the Department of Transportation bill was brought up in the House last fall, it was amended on the floor to remove the provision which would have incorporated the Federal Maritime Administration in the new Department. The vote to keep the Maritime Administration out of the Department of Transportation was overwhelming—better than 2 to 1.

At that time, legislation to establish an independent Federal Maritime Agency had been considered by the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and was on the House Calendar at the time of adjournment. That bill which was H.R. 11696 was ordered reported with only 1 dissenting vote.

Earlier this year, the House passed by a voice vote legislation which would give the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee authorization powers for the funding of the merchant marine program. This was another step toward our final objective.

At the beginning of this year, 104 Members—a record number—introduced bills which would establish an independent Federal Maritime Administration. Most of these Members were heard by our committee as well as other important witnesses and after thorough and deliberate consideration H.R. 159, the present bill under consideration, was reported by an overwhelming majority of our committee—in fact the vote was 31 in favor 2 opposed, and 1 absent.

The needs of this industry have to be emphasized by an individual Federal agency which is set up for that specific purpose. The maritime requirements cannot be met when the agency administering it is diffused with other agencies handling other modes of transportation and mostly domestic modes at that. We followed that trail once before with disastrous results.

In 1950, when Reorganization Plan No. 21 was put into effect, it transferred the maritime from an independent status and placed it in the Department of Commerce. At that time they said, "this is what your industry needs," and many people agreed. But look at what has happened. At that time we were carrying 40 percent of our own cargo. Two years later, after being under that Department, we were carrying only 22 percent and what are we carrying now? Less than 8 percent.

In 1951, we had 3,500 merchant vessels on the seas. Now under the Department which was to do us so much good, we have only 900 vessels, and 70 percent of these ships are overage and obsolete.

In the same period of time, the United States has dropped from first to 14th in the shipbuilding family of nations.

We cannot continue this deplorable and dangerous situation. The Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee—and these are the people who spend their lives devoted to this very subject and should be in a position to know something about it—has reported out a bill that would make the Maritime Administration an independent agency of the Government. We hope that you will give us your fullest support.

I need not recount to you the deplorable and dangerous state of our present merchant marine nor do I need to remind you that the Russians are building a modern fleet of vessels in such great numbers and with such great urgency that it is almost frightening.

In becoming the wealthiest nation in the world we have become content with having our commerce carried in foreign bottoms, our troops ferried in ancient vessels, and our flag all but disappear from the great harbors of the world. I am ashamed that successive administrations since 1948 have allowed the great decline in the American merchant marine. We must have a strong American merchant marine if this Nation is to survive economically and is to maintain its place of leadership in the nations of the world.

Our responsibility on this committee and in this Congress is clear. An independent Federal Maritime Administration which could forcefully speak to the national executive without the encumbrance of an intermediary is the only way that we will be able to survive on the high seas.

We cannot continue our course of apathy, indifference and inaction. Despite the miracles of the modern age nothing has changed the geography of the world. Our Nation is still an island and a capability for our own waterborne commerce is an economic and military necessity.

The nation which relegates its vessels to the graveyard of ships consigns itself to the graveyard of nations.

We have the remedial legislation before us. I strongly urge its favorable consideration and swift implementation.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I think one of the tragedies of our time is the way we have allowed our American merchant marine to deteriorate. I would call your attention how in two world wars we were hamstrung and impeded in our efforts in those wars because of the lack of an adequate merchant marine.

It took us over a year in World War I before we could get enough ships built to support the Army in Europe.

During World War II we built ships all over the United States, but it took us nearly 18 months before we were in a position of being able to do what we had to do. This was not only costly in money as a result of having to build ships in a crash program, but it put our enemy in a better position and when you think of the lives that were lost, you cannot estimate that in dollars and cents.

Yet, we are again falling into the same pattern, after those two wars. I approach this matter from a defense angle, but there is another side to this and it is a very substantial one. That is the matter of our commerce. Are we going to be at the mercy of other countries—of the smaller countries in the world when it comes to taking care of our commerce and delivering the things that we produce to the other countries of the world?

Yet, that is what we are opening ourselves up to. I was chagrined the other day. I was home and I saw a beautiful new ship in Oakland Harbor. It was named after my hometown the *Alameda*. I thought—where did the ship come from? I looked again and saw that the ship was registered in Monrovia, Liberia. This is not good.

In the district from which my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. Mailliard], and I come, we built liberty ships quicker and better than any other place in the world. But today there is no shipbuilding—shipbuilding is a nonentity—the facilities are gone.

There are a few yards that can maintain ships. But to build big ships is just out of the question. We cannot do it. Yet the yard that built the biggest ships which are today flying the American flag in the Pacific has been eliminated. Now that cannot go on. We are a Nation surrounded by oceans. We have to have ships. It is a sad commentary when you think that the Pacific Ocean, in which a great deal of the future of the world lies is served not by American ships but that the big ships, the prestige ships that go into the ports of the Orient today are British ships built in and operated out of Britain—they are the ships that serve the west coast.

Mr. Chairman, I think this legislation is long overdue. From my service on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I well recognize how our merchant marine has long been a poor cousin. It is time that we do something to pick it up and return to this country the prestige that once was America's. Were it not for the American merchant marine, we would never have become a free country because it was the clipper ships which were built in New England that won for us the right to be free and to go our own way on the high seas.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the passage of this legislation.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES] a member of the committee.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the pending legislation, H.R. 159.

Much has been said in this debate about the role which our merchant marine plays in the Nation's defense posture. This is quite important, and I do not wish to underemphasize the enormous contribution which our merchant fleet makes by carrying the men and munitions which our Armed Forces need in time of combat.

But, important as this role is, there is another of equal value which the merchant marine plays—or at least could play. I refer to the day-to-day, peacetime role of the merchant marine in our Nation's foreign trade.

The United States is doing an increasingly effective job of stimulating foreign trade. But unhappily, the maritime industry of this country has not been the beneficiary of this trade increase. Instead, foreign-flag vessels carry more and more of America's export-import cargoes—and as the foreign-flag share of the market rises, the American merchant marine's share goes down and down.

Today, some 92 or 93 percent of our waterborne commerce is carried aboard the vessels of other nations. This is the lowest we have fallen in terms of U.S.-flag participation in our foreign commerce since 1936—the year the Merchant Marine Act was passed which was supposed to see to it that our ships carried considerably more, not less, of our seaborne trade.

In other words, through failure of the Government to administer the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 vigorously, our merchant fleet finds itself in a dilemma unmatched among the seagoing nations of the world. The 10 major free world maritime powers carry between 30 and 50 percent of their own national trade—while we carry only some 7 or 8 percent of our own.

The trouble is, Mr. Chairman, that for years we have permitted the merchant marine to be treated as a stepchild, or worse, by the Government. Instead of having the independence which it possessed at the time we passed the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, this important agency has been made a ward of the Department of Commerce. Even worse, the Department has allowed other agencies and Departments to make maritime policy in their handling of cargo-preference laws, in making decisions about maritime's defense role, in the handling of oil imports, and the like.

We have had compelling evidence, Mr. Chairman, that putting Maritime in a Cabinet-level department simply will not work—and I believe that would be as true with respect to the Department of Transportation as it has been with the Department of Commerce, for both are catch-all agencies with far too many matters on their agendas ever to give proper attention to our merchant marine.

The maritime program of our Nation—properly conceived and administered—could correct the balance of payments, strengthen our defenses in time of emergency, help our domestic economy, and rebuild our prestige abroad. But this will be possible only if we have an agency devoting its full time and energy to this program. This is what H.R. 159 is designed to do, and I welcome the opportunity to cosponsor, and to vote for, this legislation.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DOW].

Mr. DOW. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this bill. But it is not a bitter opposition. I merely want to explain my vote and make a point that might not otherwise be made.

I agree with the distinguished minority leader of the Merchant Marine Committee, of which I am a member, that a strong and viable merchant marine is greatly to be desired. There is no argument about that. But I do submit that all this debate about what should be done and should not be done to secure a better merchant marine, and the critical comments about the Transportation Department plans really have nothing to do with the issue of setting up an independent Maritime Administration.

There is no proof that an organizational change would rejuvenate our merchant marine. I wonder if the committee should not have worked on a program, if a program, which has been the central thought of this debate, is so much to be desired. Who can read the crystal ball clearly enough to say what agency would best carry out the maritime program when the committee has not offered one?

I wish to wind up by saying that my vote relates really to something else, and that is a concern for Government organization. I am sure you have all heard of the concept of span of control. Not long ago I looked at the directory and I counted 64 different agencies that report to our President. I suspect that sometimes a whole week goes by when all of those agencies do not reach the President, sometimes even a month, and possibly even 6 months. So as a matter of organization, I wonder how we can recommend another agency to report to the President.

Would it not be better to structure all of the agencies in some kind of pattern that the reporting process will develop and work up to a peak with six, eight, 10 or maybe 15 Cabinet officers reporting to the President?

My vote concerns only this particular point that I would like to make, because I think we should be concerned with the efficient operation of the U.S. Government.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. REINECKE].

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Chairman, I rise as a coauthor of this particular piece of legislation and would like to identify myself with the remarks of the chairman of the full committee and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from California [Mr. MAILLIARD].

I would like to be able to stand here some day and likewise identify myself as supporting a move of this agency to a Cabinet-level position. But under the present circumstances, I can under no circumstances support a position of that type at this time.

In the course of testimony before our committee, I believe that we firmly found that a transfer to any agency would provide us with a continuation of a no-win policy in the field of merchant marine. While we cannot insure or assure that an independent agency will solve the problems of the merchant marine, I do feel that the testimony before our committee, at least in my opinion, tells me firmly that to allow the merchant marine to be controlled by the Department of Transportation would insure its total defeat.

In my opinion, the Secretary of Transportation is uninformed on matters pertaining to the merchant marine. I cannot help but feel that his attitude was indifferent, even outright arrogant toward the industry, including labor, including management and in fact, including the Congress itself. I cannot state my feelings too strongly that the merchant marine must under all circumstances be given the opportunity to be operated as an independent agency if we are ever again to regain recognition on the seas of world commerce; or to regain once again the position of defense supply that is so vital to our national security.

Mr. Chairman, incredible as it may seem, the leading industrial nation of the world and its onetime leading maritime nation—the United States of America—has so neglected its merchant marine that it now brings up the rear in the line of major maritime nations. A step toward reversal of this downward trend of our maritime industry would be reestablishment of an independent Federal agency charged with responsibility for our maritime affairs.

H.R. 159 would provide this essential first step toward revitalization of our maritime industry. I heartily support this measure, having introduced similar legislation early this session—H.R. 1165. A strong merchant marine is so vital to the defense and so important to the economy of this Nation that an independent agency, responsible to the Congress rather than to the executive department, should administer Federal functions under the Merchant Marine Act.

Congress has recognized that independent, quasi-judicial agencies provide the best method for administering economic and regulatory functions of the Federal Government in the transportation field. The only major transportation form without such an independent agency is the merchant marine.

Except for Government-built vessels hastily constructed for war emergency, our merchant marine position has deteriorated for many years. The foreign commerce of the leading trading nation of the world is now carried 93 percent by foreign-flag vessels. Our merchant marine has long been considered a fourth arm of defense. The weakness of this arm has been amply demonstrated by the necessity to break out old World War II-built vessels in the current Vietnam situation. This so-called reserve fleet has proved woefully inadequate for the purpose for which it was maintained, even for the limited demands made on it in the current situation. Besides having decreased in size, the U.S. merchant marine has been weakened by bloc obsolescence, over 70 percent of the ships being overage and obsolete.

The ineffectiveness of the existing organization for administration of merchant marine policy is emphasized by the Department of Defense proposal for fast deployment logistics ships to take over the defense activities formerly the responsibility of the merchant marine. Federal officials responsible for implementation of merchant marine policy have failed to recognize the significance of commercial seapower to the defense and well-being of the Nation. Even with the old, practically obsolete ships reactivated at great expense from the "mothball fleet," it has been necessary to charter foreign-flag vessels to support our Vietnam commitments. Dependence on foreign flags can lead to disaster when they refuse to carry certain cargo or to call at ports designated.

Merchant marine problems are not new; they appeared in 1789 when Congress attempted to aid shipping. The most significant congressional action was the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, which established national maritime policy and which remains the basic legislation today. The Merchant Marine Act is adequate, the only weakness being the absence of effective implementation of its policies and objectives under the present administration's organization. Under the act of 1936, a five-man independent Commission was appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate. The Commission was established to correct a situation similar to that with which we are now confronted—a declining merchant marine.

During the existence of the independent Commission, between 1936 and 1950, the merchant marine was strengthened greatly. Over a 10-year period 500 new ships were built. The type "C" cargo vessel was designed and the passenger liner SS *America* was built during the life of the Commission.

The independent Maritime Commission was abolished by Reorganization Plan No. 21 in 1950, and the new Maritime Agency placed in the Department of Commerce. Reorganization Plan No. 7 in 1961 vested the Secretary of Commerce with statutory responsibility for the American Merchant Marine, which responsibility he delegated to the Under Secretary of Transportation. The Maritime Commission and the Maritime Subsidy Board were both included. Rationalization was that the change provided a Cabinet-level spokesman for maritime affairs.

In 1950, when the independent agency was abolished, U.S.-flag vessels carried 41.5 percent of the Nation's export and import cargo; 2 years later only 22 percent; now approximately 7 percent. In the period from 1951 to 1965 the U.S. fleet declined 26 percent, while the world merchant fleets increased 62 percent. In deadweight tonnage during the same period the U.S.-flag merchant fleet decreased 2.7 percent, while the world fleets increased 156 percent. The only gain for U.S.-flag fleets was in bulk cargo—11 percent—but at the same time the world increase was 295 percent. What happened to the advantages claimed for the change from an independent agency to an office in a Cabinet-level Department?

Past experience with maritime affairs in the hands of the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Defense, the Department of State, or other Federal agencies had not been such as to recommend placing them in the hands of the Department of Commerce. Under such arrangements the Nation has been deprived of the contributions which the merchant marine could have made to commerce and security. Had the merchant marine fared as well since Marad was incorporated into a Department of the Federal Government as it did under an independent agency from 1936 to 1950, a more nearly adequate merchant fleet would have been available when needed in the present emergency. An independent Marad might at least have been able to prevent the bloc obsolescence which characterizes the merchant fleets of this Nation at present.

The maritime industry bears an importance far in excess of its size. We must not tolerate further decline of this vital industry. We have seen what 17 years in a Cabinet Department have meant to the merchant marine. This Nation—unquestioned in economic and military supremacy—has only a faltering fifth-rank merchant marine at its disposal. Sufficient U.S.-flag vessels are not available to carry the mandatory 50-percent of Government-sponsored exports of agricultural surplus commodities. Our merchant fleet is outranked in number of vessels by five nations and in deadweight tonnage by four. The fifth—the U.S.S.R.—recognizing the economic, political, and military implications of a strong merchant marine, will be overtaking us in total tonnage as well as number of vessels within the next 2 years.

Hearings conducted by the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries during the past several years, and recently on H.R. 159 and other bills, reinforce the conviction that drift and decay will continue in the maritime position of the United States unless a change in implementation of maritime policy is made. Corrective action on merchant marine affairs is imperative. The most logical instrument is the independent agency which would be reestablished by H.R. 159. An independent Marad will not provide a cure for all the ills of the merchant marine but it will focus attention of the Federal Government more forcefully. Experience with independent agencies in other areas suggests such an arrangement is more effective in achieving improvement than has been secured for maritime affairs under existing arrangements.

World conditions are such that we cannot allow further deterioration of our merchant marine—an important instrument of national defense and national policy. The strong Federal leadership necessary to correct many years of failure to implement national policy expressed in existing maritime legislation will be provided under H.R. 159. The obvious needs of the economy and the national security require prompt action to prevent possible disappearance of our merchant fleets from the seas of the world.

In January 1965 President Johnson promised a new merchant marine policy. We are still waiting for that policy while the capability of our fleet sinks lower and lower.

An astounding fact of irresponsibility on the part of the administration is that not one single ship has been approved for subsidy construction this year—an almost unbelievable act of dereliction in view of the meager fleet flying the U.S. flag. This becomes even stranger when we realize that there is approximately $230,000,000 available for such contracts.

Then to top it off, we are now advised that there will probably be no program until next year.

Could this be politics? I believe it is boldfaced political manipulation, Mr. Chairman. We are told that we cannot afford ship construction at this time. As one who supports reduction in nonessential Federal spending I can openly embrace ship construction as an absolute need to our national security.

The administration wants Marad to be a part of the Department of Transportation. This sounds reasonable from an organizational point of view, but a look at the background and attitude of the Secretary of Transportation: He has no appreciable marine experience; his attitude was one of indifference if not arrogance; his program admittedly was put together before the Congress deleted the FDL program but he did not feel it necessary to revise the construction requirement.

Secretary Boyd came before the House committee and criticized labor and management for holding firm on several points of his "leaked program" while in the same breath be advised the committee that several of his points were likewise nonnegotiable.

Secretary Boyd is given credit for scuttling the Maritime Advisory Committee report by advising that committee while at the same time, secretly, putting together the all-Federal interagency task force report that was issued prior to the MAC report. The MAC report has been shelved and the agencies have not offered even constructive criticism of it. It was a good report, Mr. Chairman, it was a consolidation of the thoughts of the entire industry. It could well be the basis for a comeback program.

I urge the adoption of H.R. 159, Mr. Chairman, in order to pull the merchant marine out of the present doldrums and to prevent it from becoming a political football in the Department of Transportation.

The following data is a concise status report of our industry that was compiled by the Maritime Trades Department of the AFL–CIO. I commend this organization for its tenacity and commend this material to you for a realistic reference base as of August 1967:

REPORT BY AFL–CIO TRADES DEPARTMENT

The American shipping industry today finds itself in an unenviable position. It is a very sick industry. The persistence of a competitive disadvantage in both shipbuilding and ship operations eliminates any possibility for an easy cure. Temporary expedients will not suffice. Rather, a long range program that will insure a large fleet of fast, modern vessels is needed.

Programs to remedy the situation have not been forthcoming. Shipbuilding is at a virtual stand-still, a situation which has resulted in the loss of numerous jobs. (Tables I, II)

Both labor and management recognize that our needs require the maintenance of a shipyard capacity, including a pool of skilled labor, which is capable of being expanded in order to support and provide for expansion of our fleet in time of national emergency.

The current administration's policy has endangered the very existence of the U.S. merchant fleet and resulted in a loss of jobs for seagoing personnel as well as shipyard personnel. (Table III)

The importance of our national fleet should not be underestimated, for this fleet provides the very backbone of our economic existence, yet in 1965, it was the only merchant marine, of the world's major sea powers, to actually decrease in tonnage. (Table IV)

As our world trading position continues to expand we are becoming increasingly dependent on a strong national fleet, yet with expanding foreign commerce our merchant marine is carrying a diminishing percentage of this trade. (Tables V, VI)

The public interest will be served best by a vigorous program of Government support for all segments of our merchant fleet and for our shipbuilding industry. To remain a strong nation in the free world it is essential that these vital segments of our defense and national commerce be expanded.

In monetary terms, the rejuvenation of the entire merchant marine would require only moderate resources. Against the background of a projected $700 billion national economy, estimates for such revitalization range in the order of one-tenth of 1 percent.

This price surely does not appear exaggerated considering the benefits which could be realized from a strong merchant fleet.

TABLE I.—U.S.-FLAG OCEANGOING MERCHANT FLEET[1] (JUNE 1, 1967)

	Active [2]					Inactive [2]					Total [2]				
	Total	C	F	T	O	Total	C	F	T	O	Total	C	F	T	O
Government owned [3]	175	-------	175	-----	-----	1,167	193	822	41	111	1,342	193	997	41	111
Bareboat chartered	8	-------	8	-----	-----	3	-----	3	-------	-----	11	-----	11	-----	-----
General agency	167	-------	167	-----	-----	-------	-----	-----	-------	-----	167	-----	167	-----	-----
Pending disposition	-----	-------	-----	-----	-----	2	-----	2	-------	-----	2	-----	2	-----	-----
Reserve fleet [4]	-----	-------	-----	-----	-----	682	182	399	39	62	682	182	399	39	62
Scrap candidates	-----	-------	-----	-----	-----	480	11	418	2	49	480	11	418	2	49
Privately owned	917	26	631	260	-----	50	1	33	16	-----	967	27	664	276	-----
Grand total	1,092	26	806	260	-----	1,217	194	855	57	111	2,309	220	1,661	317	111

[1] Total U.S.-flag oceangoing merchant fleet (1,000 gross tons and over excluding privately owned tugs, barges, etc.).

[2] Key: C—Combination passenger cargo; F—Freighter; T—Tanker; O—Other (all other types).

[3] Excludes 1 combination passenger and cargo vessel, 18 freighters, and 2 tankers in military service under custody of the Department of Defense; 2 freighters loaned to Department of Interior and Coast Guard, and 1 Panama Canal Company combination passenger and cargo ship no longer in commercial service.

[4] Military and commercial priority and special program ships. Excludes 3 ships sold but remaining in custody of reserve fleet pending delivery.

TABLE II.—U.S. SHIPBUILDING, 1914–65[1]

Year	Number	Total U.S. gross tons
1914	24	130,459
1915	23	120,894
1916	67	349,488
1917	120	629,295
1918	386	1,671,962
1919	680	3,190,288
1920	450	2,312,658
1921	138	1,037,697
1922	18	163,808
1923	19	124,984
1924	12	83,602
1925	11	81,012
1926	8	54,043
1927	19	154,943
1928	5	64,820
1929	7	57,395
1930	16	151,208
1931	14	150,949
1932	15	145,470
1933	4	49,527
1934	2	9,544
1935	2	19,022
1936	8	63,428
1937	15	121,852
1938	26	185,658
1939	28	241,052
1940	53	444,727
1941	95	749,105
1942	724	5,392,953
1943	1,661	12,499,873
1944	1,463	11,404,404
1945	1,067	7,663,362
1946	83	665,194
1947	45	279,032
1948	25	159,886
1949	34	538,873
1950	26	415,499
1951	10	147,569
1952	31	397,156
1953	44	568,542
1954	37	562,266
1955	8	105,242
1956	9	125,878
1957	23	320,291
1958	30	571,886
1959	30	713,561
1960	25	404,241
1961	25	369,051
1962	27	384,994
1963	34	421,800
1964	15	222,200
1965	16	180,200

[1] Table showing gross tonnage and number of steel self-propelled merchant vessels built in the private shipyards of the United States and delivered in the years indicated above (includes only vessels of 2,000 gross tons and over).

TABLE III.—U.S. SHIPYARD EMPLOYMENT, NAVAL AND PRIVATE, 1940–65

Year	Total
1940	180,300
1941	377,000
1942	1,044,000
1943	1,655,500
1944	1,568,600
1945	1,033,900
1946	354,100
1947	224,000
1948	213,900
1949	171,800
1950	145,700
1951	223,300
1952	267,600
1953	255,000
1954	218,300
1955	208,000
1956	211,400
1957	224,600
1958	220,200
1959	214,200
1960	207,800
1961	214,400
1962	212,400
1963	209,400
1964	204,200
1965	212,200

TABLE IV.—WORLD MERCHANT FLEET TONNAGE CHANGES, 1965

[In thousands]

Country	Gross tons
Great Britain and Northern Ireland	+11
United States	−730
Liberia	+3,064
Norway	+780
Japan	+2,752
U.S.S.R	+1,254
Greece	+26
Italy	+150
West Germany	+487
France	+62
Netherlands	+89
Panama	+78
Sweden	+110
Denmark	+278
Spain	+110
Canada	+296
India	+272
Argentina	−9
Brazil	+26
Poland	+69
Yugoslavia	+89
Finland	+18

TABLE V.—U.S. FOREIGN COMMERCE, 1956–66

Calendar year	Exports	Imports	Total	Percent change over 1956
1956	19.1	12.6	31.7	------------
1957	20.9	13.0	33.9	+7
1958	17.9	12.8	30.7	−3
1959	17.6	15.2	32.8	+3
1960	20.6	15.0	35.6	+12
1961	21.0	14.7	35.7	+13
1962	21.7	16.4	38.1	+20
1963	23.3	17.1	40.4	+27
1964	26.5	18.7	45.2	+43
1965	27.3	21.4	48.7	+54
1966	30.3	25.6	55.9	+76

TABLE VI.—U.S. FLAG PARTICIPATION IN U.S. WATERBORNE FOREIGN COMMERCE

[In percent]

Calendar year	All services	Liner	Irregular	Tanker
1951	------------	49	37	46
1952	------------	46	26	38
1953	------------	39	17	33
1954	30	38	18	30
1955	24	39	16	23
1956	21	40	13	19
1957	18	39	12	16
1958	12	33	8	6
1959	10	30	7	4
1960	11	30	7	5
1961	9	27	7	3
1962	9	28	6	4
1963	9	29	5	4
1964	10	28	8	6
1965	8	23	6	6

Sources: Table I, Maritime Administration, Public Information Office; table II, Shipbuilders Council of America; table III, American Bureau of Shipping, "The Bulletin," February 1967; table IV, "Lloyd's Register of Shipping," October 1966; table V, Bureau of the Census, FT 900I and FT 900E, U.S. Foreign Trade, 1955–66; table VI, (a) Maritime Administration, "Changing Patterns in U.S. Trade and Shipping Capacity," December 1964; (b) Bureau of the Census, "U.S. Waterborne Foreign Trade," 1965, 1966.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. EDWARDS].

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I am gravely concerned about the present state of this great Nation's merchant fleet. The American flag is coming down on the oceans of the world—and as it comes down, we lose our commercial competitive advantage, we lose our national defense capability, we lose our prestige, and we lose out on the balance of payments.

And I am just as concerned about the kind of a program the administration is offering as a remedy for the ills confronting our maritime industry.

In a Maritime Day proclamation just a few months ago, President Johnson underscored the importance of our merchant marine in our national life. He said and I quote:

> Throughout American history, the merchant marine has been indispensable to our security and prosperity. Today, our merchant fleet binds us in peaceful commerce with the increasingly interdependent nations of the world.

These are noble words, Mr. Chairman. They reflect the kind of respect which our merchant marine deserves from the Nation's Chief Executive. They pay tribute to an industry which is vital to our international commerce and our defense.

However, I am a little confused, Mr. Chairman, that the President's concern about our merchant marine does not seem to be reflected in the plans and schemes of some of the members of his official family.

The Secretary of Transportation, for one, has presented a program that would involve the building of a significant number of American-flag merchant ships in foreign yards. How can you have a merchant fleet which is "indispensable to our prosperity" when the ships would be built with foreign materials, by foreign workers, in some foreign country? Now it is said he would not force this issue, but who knows? With a policy like this we would quit worrying about the merchant marine. We would not have any to worry about.

The Secretary of Defense, has repeatedly, in recent years, downgraded the role of our commercial shipping in relation to our national defense. He has on earlier occasions said that we do not need to build more commercial vessels to satisfy our defense requirements, and then on other occasions has asked for a multibillion-dollar fleet all his own, to be used in case of international crisis. How can you have a merchant fleet which is "indispensable to our security" if we shortchange American ship operators who want to build more ships, or if we put our reliance for a sealift on a costly, ill-conceived scheme to put floating warehouses on station around the globe?

These day-to-day actions by the administration tend to make the noble words of the Presidential proclamation sound a little hollow. And it is the day-to-day actions of the administration that have brought our merchant marine to its present precarious postion—outnumbered on the high seas; outclassed in terms of speed and newness; almost out of the picture, in terms of new construction going on in our shipyards.

We have got to build our merchant fleet back to its former position as the best in the world. The first step is to enact H.R. 159, of which I am a cosponsor—to give the Maritime Administration back its independence. An independent agency will be able to hammer out a program, that will make sure that we replace our small, old, unseaworthy ships with fast, safe and efficient vessels that compete with other maritime powers.

Once we have achieved these goals, we will give real meaning to the words of the President's proclamation that the merchant marine is "indispensable to our security and prosperity."

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Chairman, as the cosponsor of this bill, I agree 100 percent with the remarks of the gentleman in the well.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY].

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, I will take just a few minutes to rise in opposition to this measure.

Mr. Chairman, it is unrealistic to isolate the development of our maritime transportation from the mainstream of new technology and development taking place in other transportation areas. Thus I feel it is essential that the Maritime Administration be transferred from the Department of Commerce to the new Department of Transportation where a unified and coordinated transportation policy can be administered.

The hard facts are that the future of the maritime industry rests upon the ability of the Maritime Administration to obtain a significant voice in the executive branch and I think it is unrealistic to support an isolated Maritime Administration when the entire thrust of comprehensive, coordinated transportation policy is directed through a Cabinet-level administration.

Mr. Chairman, it has been suggested that during the hearings before the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee there was testimony from Mr. Boyd, the Secretary of Transportation, indicating a no-win policy with respect to the merchant marine.

I do not believe this is a fair characterization of his testimony in any respect. The truth of the matter is that Chairman Boyd appeared before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and laid out a new maritime program, part of which, in truth, was the expression of his opposition to the transfer of Maritime to an independent agency, his wish being, of course, that Maritime be included under the umbrella of the Department of Transportation.

I believe it is important, Mr. Chairman, for this committee to understand that there is very real concern within the administration over the state of our American merchant marine. There has been action. There has been an effort to devise a maritime policy that will reverse the desperate trend of our maritime fleet.

This program was not, in all truth, accepted by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. It rejected point by point, which is within its prerogatives, the proposals of the Secretary of Transportation. It rejected out of hand his plea that Maritime be included with the other modes of transportation.

If I may say so, when the committee, by an overwhelming vote, nevertheless reported the measure before us, it was—and I believe we had better bear this in mind—contrary to the testimony not not only of Mr. Boyd but also of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and the Secretary of Commerce.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. ASHLEY. They testified that the fate of our merchant marine rested upon its future within the Department of Transportation.

We have turned our backs on this administration. I can only hope, Mr. Chairman, that the other body will recognize, if we do not, that the Maritime interests are not going to be served by the proposal before us, nor are we going to receive the funding which is necessary if our maritime situation is to be reversed and if we are again to enjoy a healthy maritime industry.

This is the position of the administration. We had better understand it.

I am just as sincere as each Member who has spoken. We all want a healthy merchant marine. I believe the action we are taking today will result in exactly the reverse of the healthy merchant marine we seek to achieve.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, of course, I favor this bill. I am a coauthor.

We hear a lot of discussion about our merchant marine being the fourth arm of our national defense. A lot of people talk about it. Let us do something about it. Why do we not do something about it? It is for the simple reason that the destiny of this great industry is handled by an organization as a sideline.

This is a step in the right direction, to put the merchant marine in an independent organization whose business is the merchant marine.

Travel out to the Straits of Malacca where Singapore is located. Two hundred ships a day may be seen going through these straits and in any 1 year over 10,000 or 15,000 ships are in the harbor of Singapore. Not 10 percent of these are American-flag ships. We are going down, down, down and today we are 5th in world standing.

Our merchant marine, I tell you, is dwindling from the face of the seas and of the earth. Why? Because nobody looks out for them. Now, it would be fine to put them under the umbrella of the Department of Transportation, but the Department of Transportation may be just too big to do this. I am interested in this because we are paying through the nose now for foreign-flag ships to take our commerce. Is it not disgraceful? I say to you that your ships, your money, must go down to Panama, Nigeria, or Liberia, or somewhere else to get a flag so that your money can operate on the seas. This is pathetic and this is disgraceful.

I want an organization that is independent, that can come before your Congress with a budget to take care of the full logistical requirement of your fighting men. We do not have that now. In another war we may be entirely dependent on foreign flags for our commerce if we do not do something and do it now. It is as simple as this. You have the opportunity today to strike a blow for your fourth arm of national defense. From a selfish standpoint this thing is needed.

There sits the ranking minority Member, a distinguished military man in his own right. He knows what he is talking about. I am delighted to hear the minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD] come out for this bill.

Mr. Chairman, this bill should pass the House with scarcely one dissenting vote and let the world know that your Congress is going to formulate the maritime policy of America. If you do not, then tomorrow may be too late. Let us have that independent organization coming to your Congress proclaiming the mission of America in this auxiliary fourth arm of our defense.

This is a good bill. I hope it passes with an overwhelming majority.

I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Alaska [Mr. POLLOCK].

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, and as a cosponsor of a measure to create an independent Federal Maritime Administration, I rise in support of H.R. 159 and am delighted that we are at long last considering legislation to accomplish this goal.

It seems safe to say that H.R. 159, introduced by the distinguished chairman of the committee enjoys wide support in the 90th Congress from Members on both sides of the aisle. This broad backing is evidenced by the fact that more than 100 Members of the House of Representatives have introduced almost identical legislation to create an independent Federal Maritime Administration.

This serves to underscore the deep concern of this Congress over the crisis in our merchant fleet, about which we have heard so much in recent months.

It is imperative that the United States begin immediately to assert itself once again in commercial activity on the world's oceans and seas on a scale that will restore this country to first-rank maritime importance. It is time that we recognized the declining position of the U.S. maritime industry and the U.S. commercial fishing industry in relation to that of other nations. It is time that we called attention to our embarrassing lack of an aggressive, comprehensive national maritime policy, and that we emphasize our neglect of the potential of the world's oceans in general, and of the fisheries and living resources of the oceans and of our merchant marine in particular.

I take great pride, as a member of this committee, in the fact that, without regard to partisanship, we have tried to alert the American people and the administration to the plight of our merchant marine.

Nothing short of a full-fledged overhaul of all our maritime and fisheries programs is in order.

I say "programs" because today there is no overall national ocean policy, no definitive national program, no entity capable of implementing such a policy or program, and no national budget for ocean development, particularly pertaining to utilization of the living resources of the sea. There is no comprehensive plan to revitalize the U.S. maritime industry, or the U.S. fishing industry. No real Government-industry understanding or partnership.

There is an immediate and vital need for one unified national policy for ocean and fishery development, and one for the merchant marine—and it is my belief that such a unified approach is possible only if we now reconstitute the Maritime Administration as a wholly independent agency.

Until we do, there will be no unified effort, and we will be forced to continue with our present fragmented approach to maritime problems. And make no mistake about it—today we are fragmented. Within the executive branch, there are no less than 22 separate agencies engaged in various ocean activities—each of them is separately funded. These 22 agencies compete with each other, and with other agencies much larger, for the Federal budget dollar. This situation breeds duplication of effort, and cannot but hinder our ocean development programs.

If we were concerned here only with sound Government organization, we would have to move forward with an independent Federal Maritime Administration just to end the present piecemeal, uncoordinated approach toward the budgeting of various maritime and fishing problems. But of course the question of a maritime budget—important as it is—is overshadowed by the need for coordination in our approach to our merchant marine and fisheries industries themselves, for both our national defense and our national commerce are involved.

Because the Maritime Administration does not have independence—because we have more than two score Federal agencies with their fingers in the maritime "pie"—we are treated to the spectacle of various cabinet officers making policy decisions, often contradictory, for this vital industry.

We had, for example, one Cabinet officer—the Secretary of Transportation—proposing a maritime program to the Congress, despite the fact that in our legislation establishing the Department of Transportation in the last Congress, we made it abundantly clear that the maritime program was to be outside his province. In his program, the Secretary of

Transportation proposed the construction of nuclear-powered ships at a time when the Budget Bureau and some others in this administration advocated laying up the nuclear-powered commercial vessel. We now have the hundred-million-dollar NS *Savannah*.

This same Secretary of Transportation proposed a low-level program of domestic ship construction, coupled with opening of the floodgates to foreign ship construction. To my mind, this is loaded with danger. It poses the threat of an ever-increasing flight of American capital abroad, adversely affecting our balance of payments. And it would depress our own shipbuilding industry, thus killing any hope of reducing unit cost in the future through multiple ship construction. Well, this is the proposal of one member of the administration.

We have had another member of the administration, the Secretary of Defense, inject himself into the maritime program, too. He wants us to upgrade and reconstruct hundreds of national defense reserve vessels at astronomical costs. As many Members of this Committee are well aware, we have broken out 172 of these ships for the present Vietnam conflict. Each one of these vessels has cost the Government about $550,000 to be fitted back into service. After these old rust buckets had been placed into service, many of them were plagued with mechanical failures which resulted in the loss of valuable sailing days.

This recommendation to pour millions of dollars into the "upgrading" of a reserve fleet, which is long since past its prime, came from the same Secretary of Defense who wanted to build fast deployment logistic ships as a panacea to our shipbuilding problems. So we have two Cabinet-level administrators proposing radically different solutions to our problem. Which one speaks for the Nation?

There are other examples of how Cabinet-level departments and other Federal agencies have injected themselves into the maritime picture all to the detriment of our merchant shipping—and all because the Maritime Administration has been denied authority and independence. All of these situations make it abundantly clear that we must have a separate Federal Maritime Administration—free of bureaucratic intrusions and empowered to establish policy—or else we shall be unable to save our merchant fleet or our fishing industry.

So I heartily endorse H.R. 159 for the goals which it espouses. It seeks to bring into being an agency that will have a voice of its own, and a direct line of communication both to the Congress and to the White House.

If there is any shortcoming in this legislation—and I include my own bill, H.R. 6287, in this criticism—it is that the legislation does not go far enough. Perhaps, instead of merely discussing an independent maritime agency, it should go even further and recommend an entirely new Cabinet-level department—a Department of Maritime and Marine Resources.

There is something to be said for such an imaginative, aggressive approach. This department could include all of the farflung agencies and subdepartments now in existence—such as the Maritime Administration, Federal Maritime Commission, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, Merchant Marine Academy, State maritime academies, the Panama Canal, the Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway, the Water Resources Council, Great Lakes Pilotage Administration, Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission, International Pacific Halibut Commission, International Pacific Salmon Fisheries Commission, International Boundary and Water Commission—United States and Mexico—Office of Merchant Marine Safety, National Fisheries Center and Aquarium Advisory Board, the 20-odd agencies working on oceanography, and many others.

The effect of such a department would be obvious.

First, all our interests with the sea would be brought together and coordinated. Currently these agencies are strewn throughout the Department of Commerce, Department of the Interior, Department of Defense, Department of the Treasury, and a host of independent agencies. Many hours and millions of dollars are spent duplicating research and programs. Goals are defined by different department heads, and thus conflict with each other. The waste in dollars and manpower is enormous.

Creating a Cabinet-level department would insure that our past mistakes in an ailing area will receive top-level attention. Also, hopefully, with the administration more directly concerned at the Cabinet level, we will avoid neglect of our maritime interests in the future.

If we had such a department 20 years ago, we would not be in the trouble we are in today. This kind of department certainly would insure that we will not be in the same trouble 20 years from now.

So perhaps, H.R. 159 does not go far enough toward giving us a new, technologically updated shipping and shipbuilding industry capable of greatly increased production. But certainly we will be a long step toward the realization of that goal with the enactment of H.R. 159.

Many times on this Hill one Member or another has had occasion to quote an ancient piece of Chinese philosophy—that we must "begin a thousand-mile journey with a single step." It is well we remember that quotation during our present deliberations, for the reconstituting of the Maritime Administration as an independent agency will be the first step toward the revitalizing of our merchant marine and fisheries industries—and well could be the first step toward eventual legislation to establish a Cabinet-level department to undertake this monumental task.

In any event, the hour is late. We have that thousand-mile journey still ahead of us. It is long since time we took this first step.

Mr. Chairman, I join with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], and ask that this House of Representatives register an overwhelming vote in favor of the passage of H.R. 159.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I believe that passage of H.R. 159 lies at the crux of the solution of the maritime problems facing this Nation.

The current situation of our maritime industry endangers the security of our Nation as a whole.

While I represent an inland State, far from the ocean shores of this country, I recognize the great importance an adequate maritime program will have for all of the 50 States. My constituents in America's inland have just as vital an interest in the outcome of this legislation as do the people from New York, New Orleans, San Francisco, or any of our great seaports.

A large portion of the materials and goods bought, sold, and used in my district each day reach this country by ship. A number of the industries in my district depend upon raw materials brought across the ocean. In fact, just about everything that each of us uses each day is in whole or in part the product of our ocean trade.

Furthermore, every day the ships of this Nation are carrying food, clothing, plasma, and ammunition to boys from my district and from all the other 434 congressional districts who are fighting in Vietnam. In essence, the very lives of our soldiers fighting over there so far from home depend absolutely upon our ocean supply line.

If ships suddenly stopped moving to and from this country across the seas, the American standard of living as well as our national security would be seriously threatened.

Today the American merchant marine—neglected, denied adequate funds, and submerged in Government bureaucracy—carries less than 8 percent of this country's export-import trade. Over 92 percent of America's vital world pipeline of industry and commerce is in foreign hands, dependent on foreign-flag ships, foreign citizens and the policies of foreign governments.

This is not a healthy situation for our Nation—economically or militarily. Considering the suddenness with which crises blossom around the globe and friends overnight become enemies, the United States cannot permit such an overwhelming portion of its very lifeblood to rest within the grasp of foreign domination.

It is for this reason that we must have the type of merchant marine Congress provided for in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936—ships built in this country, crewed by American seamen, and proudly flying the American ensign—ships sufficient in numbers to carry the major portion of our trade and vital military supplies.

As evidenced by the more than 100 bills presented during this session of Congress for creation of an independent martime agency, we in the House will not settle for anything less than an all-

American merchant marine to serve this country's commercial and defense needs at home and abroad.

Creation of an independent Federal Maritime Administration is the first step and a mandatory one, toward returning control of this vital industry—American shipping—to the American flag.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Byrne].

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to be able to add my voice to those of my colleagues, in support of the pending legislation for maritime independence.

I think it is very unfortunate, to say the least, that the news media continues to be so indifferent to the plight of our maritime industry, and the public thus remains less than fully informed.

It seems incredible to me that the American people have not awakened to the fact that our commercial shipping is in such dire straits. I am amazed that the public does not realize that our defense efforts are seriously endangered because of the fact that our maritime industry has fallen on hard times.

The Vietnam war captures a lot of the headlines. So does the continuing debate in this country and abroad over the conduct of that war. In the face of this and other world problems, there are those who would say that America could hardly be expected to give much of its attention to the problems of the maritime industry. And yet the problems of our merchant marine are directly related to the conflict in Southeast Asia.

The reason is really quite simple, as this body is well aware. Our country must rely on the merchant marine to maintain its lifelines in times of crisis. The merchant marine is carrying the overwhelming bulk of the men and equipment for Vietnam.

Apparently the American people have not learned that we are stretching our merchant marine resources almost to the limit right now to supply our forces in Southeast Asia. If another war should break out anywhere in the world, we would be right up against it.

I am sure we would meet the challenge somehow, because we always do. If necessary, we would even get into a crash shipbuilding program like the ones we embarked on at the outsets of World War I and II. But in doing so, we would once again be forced to pay the price of years of neglect under a policy which calls for starving our merchant marine in times of peace, and expecting it to be Johnny-on-the-spot in times of crisis.

We have to stop trying to play it both ways. We have to start building up our merchant fleet now, and never again let it fall into neglect. We have to keep the merchant fleet modern and strong during good times making sure that it gets the funds that are necessary to keep pace with modern technology, to keep pace with foreign competition, and to keep pace with our growing trade.

It is a sad commentary that the administration does not seem to be imbued with the proper sense of urgency about meeting and solving this problem.

I am firmly convinced that maritime must be independent so that its voice will not be muffled by layer upon layer of bureaucracy; so that it will not be silenced by people who have no regard for either the commercial or the defense role of the merchant fleet. Maritime should be independent because this important a program should not be put in the hands of a man who openly advocated building our ships in foreign yards.

That is why I cannot overemphasize my concern that H.R. 159, for the creation of an independent Maritime Administration, be passed by the 90th Congress.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. Hanna], a member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, I join with my many colleagues on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, in urging and supporting the passage of H.R. 159. I could echo the many references which have and will be made which harken back to the proud past of America's maritime history. Since the days of the Yankee trader and the Yankee Clipper, the vigorous results from the wedding between the American entrepreneurship and the merchant marine gave muscle and sinew to the growth of the new nation on our American Continent. But rather than speak to the spirit I wish to discuss soberly the substance of that which lies outside the bill, rather than that which is contained within it; and speak of the things the bill does not imply and should not imply.

First, it is most important that it should be made clear that the bill does not suggest or encourage an isolation position in any respect. There is not created in this bill or intended in its application a cocoon for merchant marine activity and shipbuilding separate and apart from transportation as a whole. I do not believe and therefore do not support the idea that coordination and cooperation could only come by including a Merchant Marine Administration within the Department of Transportation. Coordination and cooperation are important and necessary and it should be made clear that it is the intention of this Congress that we expect the administration of this new agency to work closely and coordinately with the Secretary of Transportation so that all modes concerned with the movement of American goods and services may be part of an efficient and effective interphase. Only by this close intertie will the best performance which we are projecting for new vigor and wider service be realized.

Again, there should be no reading in our action here that we are taking a total isolated position relative to the healthy competition between the shipyards of our own country and those in the allied nations of the free world. The bill does provide a formula for approaching this problem and it is an aspect of the law which should have our continued attention as we study the future performance under this new measure of our shipyard performances.

Finally, it should most strongly be stated that this bill is no haven for either the labor elements or the management elements of either the shipyard building industry or the merchant marine industry. We are not providing comfort for those who cling to the practices of the past. A portion of the blame for the sad state of this industry must be placed foursquare upon the shoulders of those individuals in each of the segments, management and labor, who have preferred to settled further into the padded position of an enlarged maximus-glutinous, rather than to move more aggressively forward with the new techniques and technologies which are available from today's scientific and industrial know-how.

Let this bill be a call to the most visionary of the leaders of labor and management: a call for a partnership on their part which marks and reflects the foresight and expectations expressed by the Congress in the measure that is before us today. And with this understanding let us pass this measure and then follow its acceptance and application in those places in our economy where the goals and purposes recited by supporters of this legislation have been generously set forth in this record.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Waggonner].

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my support of this legislation and to commend the distinguished chairman of the full Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Garmatz], as well as the ranking minority member, the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. Mailliard], for the job which they have done in bringing this long-needed proposal to the floor of the House of Representatives for its consideration and final passage.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, a member of the committee [Mr. Lennon].

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation and to call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that I believe it was on September 6 of this year that the President signed into law the annual authorization for the merchant marine. That represented a most significant and first step in the revitalization of our merchant marine. This is the second essential step that we are taking here today.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Hunt].

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 159, a bill which would create an independent Federal Maritime Administration, something which in my opinion has been long overdue.

Mr. Chairman, in this day and age when we are undertaking to create stability among our American working labor force, I cannot help but call to the attention of the Members of the House the fact that the congressional district which I have the honor to represent, at one time had one of the finest shipbuilding activities in the entire world—the once renowned and great shipbuilding corporation at Camden, N.J.

In 1945, when I returned from overseas, there were 31,000 men and women employed at this shipbuilding operation. In 1967 at the present time we have a ghost facility totally out of business as of this year with no employment, a condition that has caused great loss in the economic structure of the southern part of New Jersey as well as a severe blow in the rejuvination of an American maritime fleet. This shipyard has built some of the greatest ships the world has even known, including the nuclear powered *Savannah*. I am certain the Members are aware of the great difficulty we have had in keeping this vessel of the future on the seas, because certain interests would rather see it put in mothballs, so they can transfer American flags to foreign maritime activities.

To get the American merchant marine industry back on an even keel we have to do one of two things: We have to come back to a sane way of proceeding in the American maritime industry, or we can get out of cold storage some of the rust buckets of World War II vintage that no longer have any useful life. We can forget that we have a war in Vietnam, and that we have to supply our war efforts there at the present time, whether you want to or whether you do not.

Also do not forget that we have men who are skilled in the art of building nuclear vessels. So we need someone, and we need a separate administrative policy that will revive the great American merchant marine industry we once had.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUNT. I am delighted to yield to my colleague from New Jersey.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I wish to say that I would merely like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman in the well, and to express as he has expressed my deep interest in the development of an agency that will have as its primary concern and responsibility the development of a real seapower here in the United States that we have missed for many, many years, as the gentleman has pointed out.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAILLIARD. I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CAHILL. If the gentleman will yield further?

Mr. HUNT. Yes, I yield further to my colleague from New Jersey.

Mr. CAHILL. As the gentleman knows, I had the honor of representing the district in New Jersey that the gentleman now represents, and both of us have seen what the neglect in the construction of ships has done to that area, and what effect it has had on the United States.

I therefore would like to commend the gentleman and to associate myself with his remarks.

Mr. HUNT. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey, and I am very appreciative of his worthwhile statement.

Mr. Chairman, let me say in conclusion that we must begin to consider that other nations are still in the shipbuilding business. Consider the British shipbuilding industry, if you will, and the recent launching by that industry of another new, modern liner, the *Queen Elizabeth*, while we still insist on transferring our vessels to foreign flags.

I would say to the Members of this House that if we defeat this bill today we will be taking a giant step backward. We pride ourselves on being a progressive body, so if we are going to do anything today, let us pass this bill, because the present dilemma we find ourselves in today can be laid at the doorstep of the present administration.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Fino].

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 159, which would establish a separate and independent Federal Maritime Administration. I believe that this bill which I am happy to cosponsor constitutes a crucial beginning in the struggle to rebuild our American merchant marine.

I say this because I have come to feel in the last few years that the Johnson administration is not interested in our merchant marine, and as part and parcel of this apathy, has tried to bury the Maritime Administration within the new Department of Transportation.

As long as the Maritime Administration is within the Department of Transportation, we can expect no real action to aid our merchant marine. Ships will be just another category of transportation alongside of subways and electric cars. Maritime interests, with all their labor and international implications, will be lumped together with purely domestic transportation problems. If we want to begin the major job of rescuing our merchant marine from the oblivion to which this administration has sought to consign it, then this is the place to begin.

If anybody thinks that our merchant marine is not in a bad and sad shape, then let me mention a few facts of life:

First. Our Nation, which was once the world's No. 1 power in shipping, is now No. 6—or maybe even No. 7.

Second. The United States, which used to be the leader in the world in shipbuilding, is now 14th—let me repeat that, 14th—among the 15 major shipbuilding countries in the world.

Third. It is a disgrace, but a fact nonetheless, that foreign-flag vessels today carry 92 percent of our waterborne import-export cargo.

Taken together, these statistics convey the message with a vengeance. Our merchant marine is in trouble—deep, serious trouble—and the Johnson administration does not seem to care. The administration will waste cash giving 25 Federal poverty commissars higher salaries than that given to the American commander in Vietnam, but it refuses to help U.S. shipping to recover its place in the international maritime marketplace.

We need our merchant marine. We need it a lot more than we need sleek well-fed Ivy League poverty programers doling out taxpayer dollars to the agitators and troublemakers. We need our merchant marine in time of war and in time of peace. It is crucial to our national security and it is crucial to our balance of payments.

Let me return for a moment to the statistics I mentioned earlier, particularly the fact that 92 percent of U.S. waterborne export-import cargo is carried by foreign-flag vessels. Think of the hundreds of millions of dollars that this costs us each year. We are giving foreigners dollars which could be going to American shipping, helping our balance of payments and easing unemployment in the shipyards. But, I regret to say, this administration is not so inclined. Our American shipyards are rotting while the Johnson administration doles out shipbuilding contracts to foreign shipbuilders, injuring the U.S. balance of payments and depriving U.S. workers of their due.

If we want to rebuild our merchant marine, the first step is to set up a separate Federal Maritime Administration free of the clutches of the Department of Transportation, whose Secretary has shown that he shares the Johnson administration's disdain for the needs of the American maritime industry.

I do not say that establishment of an independent Maritime Administration is a panacea. In its own right, it cannot achieve miracles, but it is a necessary framework for a new American maritime policy, which will first, put an end to using foreign shipyards to build ships which ought to be built by American yards and workers; second, guarantee adequate Federal financing to rebuild our merchant marine; and, third, put an end to the present policy of subsidizing a favored few shipping lines and ignoring the tramp shippers.

The creation of an independent and separate Maritime Administration is only the beginning, but it is an important beginning. With it, we will gain the wherewithal to begin the redevelopment of our sadly dilapidated merchant marine. I urge the passage of H.R. 159 as a great initial step forward in this task.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Kyl].

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I hope this bill will do all of the constructive things that most of the Members here today believe it will do. I personally do not believe it will do them. The gentleman who just left the floor said that we need a separate administrative policy. We are not going to get a separate administrative policy from the fact that we simply create a new branch of administration. Someone criticized Secretary Boyd a while ago for freezing highway funds. Well, nobody in this House believes that he froze those funds. It might be somebody in another effort, or in another department of the Government.

This bill is not automatically going to alter an unrealistic foreign trade policy which this administration has held in recent years.

This bill is not going to stop the unreasonable assistance that we have given to foreign nations in preference, over our own shipping industry.

This bill is not going to alter the fact that we have all but priced ourselves out of the market in maritime affairs.

This is an act of desperation because the Congress has been unable to force the administration to do what all of us here know should have been done, and I feel that we are simply asking for additional trouble by the passage of this kind of bill.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS], a member of the committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I feel that I must express my concern and opposition to H.R. 159.

For many years now I have urged, supported, and acted for the upgrading and improvement of our American merchant marine.

I fear that the measure before us today will not attain this goal, but rather will sidetrack us again by placing the Maritime Administration apart from the mainstream of effective planning and programing.

The Department of Transportation was created because we recognized the need for a unified effort in dealing with all aspects of transportation, commercial as well as noncommercial. Maritime Administration should be a part of this comprehensive transportation planning, not isolated at this bill would do, leaving it to fend for itself as but another agency in the eyes of the Bureau of the Budget.

Surely our merchant marine deserves the best attention we can give it, and in my opinion, the best attention will come from within the Department of Transportation.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILBERT].

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the legislation before the Committee of the Whole today.

I wish to point out I am a cosponor of this legislation. May I say that our maritime industry, quite to the contrary of some of the statements made by some of my distinguished colleagues, flourished more under an independent agency than at the time it was under the Department of Commerce.

From 1936, the time the Maritime Act was passed, until 1950, the maritime industry had its greatest growth. Our ships sailed the seas and we were No. 1. Only in 1950 when the Maritime became part of the Department of Commerce, did our maritime trade start to slip and slip and slip.

I also would like to point out. I doubt very much that the maritime industry would like to go back into the Department of Transportation because the Department of Transportation deals with domestic situations whereas our maritime trade deals with international commerce and commerce on the seas.

I think that to put it into the Department of Transportation would be foolish.

Mr. Chairman, I want to express my support of H.R. 159, to create an independent Federal Maritime Administration. As a matter of fact, I am one of the sponsors of this proposal, my bill being H.R. 619.

I was an ardent supporter of the amendment in the last Congress which removed the Maritime Administration from the bill establishing the Department of Transportation. I was a member of the Merchant Marine Committee at that time, and I am now more firm than ever in my conviction that the best interests of our maritime industry and our country will be served by the creation of the Maritime Administration as a separate and independent Federal agency. We were aware in the last Congress of the burden under which our American maritime industry has been operating, and we recognized the step which must be taken.

There is little doubt that the decline of our merchant fleet has been due largely to its subordinate role buried in the Department of Commerce where interests of the maritime industry have been overshadowed by other interests of the Department. Especially important at this time is the creation of an independent Maritime Subsidy Board whose decisions would be unbiased and based on sound judgment of act. As presently organized, the Maritime Subsidy Board cannot provide this, for members of the Board are employees of the Maritime Administration and subject to the pressures of the Maritime Administrator who serves as Chairman of the Board.

Mr. Chairman, Congress recognized definite distinctions between the Maritime Administration and other agencies included in the Department of Transportation. No other American industry competes so directly with foreign-flag competitors as does the maritime industry. Other modes of transportation are domestic in character and compete domestically, whereas ocean shipping is not domestic and competes internationally. We must now recognize independence for the Maritime Administration, which I am convinced, will provide the most efficient and effective implementation of our national maritime policy as intended in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. That act provided for a five-man independent Maritime Commission, appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate. The Commission functioned independently from 1936 until 1950, and during that period we witnessed an unprecedented strengthening and growth of our merchant marine.

Since the abolishment of the U.S. Maritime Commission in 1950, American shipbuilding and our merchant fleet have experienced a drastic decline. At the end of World War II, ships flying American flags carried 40 percent of our export and import cargoes. Today they carry only 8 percent. Our U.S.-flag merchant fleet numbered more than 5,000 ships after World War II, but today there are barely 900 vessels in our merchant fleet. After the war, 80,000 sailors were employed in our merchant fleet; today there are less than 50,000 jobs for our seamen. We ranked first among the maritime nations of the world; today we have dropped to sixth place and the fast-developing Soviet merchant fleet may soon push us back to seventh rank.

Thus, Mr. Chairman, the history of departmental reorganization shows that our merchant marine made greater progress when its administration had the most independence. Our maritime industry must be permitted to expand and compete for business with the maritime nations of the world. This neglected segment of our defense capability can no longer afford the luxury of being administered as a stepchild of the Department of Commerce, lost within already complex and overburdened administrative measures. To properly focus attention on the problems of the merchant marine, we must provide an administration having flexibility and independence. The responsibilities under our U.S. shipping laws should be vested in and administered by an independent agency responsive to policy determination, and subject to review by the Congress.

I have been appalled—as I am sure many of my colleagues in the House have been—at the complete lack of understanding, both in Government and among the American people in general, of the problems which beset our maritime industry. The American people should be made aware of the dangerous level to which we have slumped in shipping and shipbuilding because of the lack of a forceful policy and an agency that is in a position to carry out that policy.

As the distinguished chairman will recall, the Department of Defense had recommended the construction of the fast deployment logistic ship, which I felt would have only added to the problems of our shipbuilding industry. The very concept of the FDL program would have ignored the role of our merchant fleet as a seaborne arm of our Nation's defense and would have been a drain on our economy. The Congress, in its wisdom, refused to accept the proposal. As I have said many times, I am a firm believer in having more ships built in our American shipyards by Americans.

During this session of Congress, I have detected a genuine air of urgency about rebuilding our merchant fleet, and a sense of dedication to the principle that our fleet must be large enough and modern enough to play a major role in our commerce and our defense.

Mr. Chairman, the creation of an independent agency as proposed in the bill before us would focus greater attention on our decaying merchant fleet and on the ultimate objective of revitalizing the industry and enabling the United States to meet its foreign commerce as well as defense commitments as intended in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILBERT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to be able to add a few thoughts to the deliberations about the need for an independent Maritime Administration.

The enactment of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 was an important milestone in our maritime affairs—but not as important as will be the passage of maritime independence legislation. The reason is that we are worse off today than we were 30 years ago, when the other act was passed.

This is unfortunate because our growth as a nation up to now has been closely linked to our status on the seas of the world. I find it incredible, therefore, that in recent years we have turned our backs on the seas which are so important in terms of our international commerce and our national defense.

Since before the birth of our Nation, the United States has traditionally been a maritime power. This tradition which extended from the days of the Yankee Traders and through the difficult times of two world wars placed our Nation forever in a position of maritime importance. It has only been in recent years and since 1950 in particular that the maritime position of the country has been seriously threatened. This threat to our position as a seapower coincided with the decision to make the Maritime Administration subordinate to the Department of Commerce, and thus unable to speak for itself on the urgent problems which it faced,.

The 1936 Merchant Marine Act was intended to provide this country with a strong and dependable arm of defense. Its full capabilities were tested in World War II and the merchant marine performed admirably during these troubled and demanding times. Since the war, however, the shipping industry has been afforded little recognition either of services performed or of services it may someday be called upon to perform.

The war in Vietnam has shown the need for a dependable merchant shipping program. Of the vessels called from the reserve fleet for service in the war, many have proven inadequate, have broken down at sea and have caused delays which hinders our efforts in that part of the world.

The question is often asked: "Is the present U.S. merchant marine in a condition to meet another emergency?" The answer must surely be "No," since in the face of even a limited conflict such as the war in Vietnam, the capacity of our merchant fleet is being severely strained. The reserve fleet which has been called upon to meet this need is sorely inadequate.

In the face of this it is apparent that the Maritime Administration must be given a new role if it is to give us a fleet that will provide the kind of service and security that has been traditionally provided to this country. Only through the intensive and well-directed efforts of a separate maritime agency can this revitalization be effected.

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILBERT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Chairman, I believe that we have come to what is commonly called the fish-or-cut-bait stage insofar as our merchant fleet is concerned. Either we get going with a full-scale maritime program, or we are going to have to forget about our commercial shipping and concede the seas to foreign-flag vessels, particularly those of the Soviet Union.

I am convinced that we will take the proper course with regard to our maritime future by enactment of the pending legislation, H.R. 159. Failure to pass this bill, will give an enormous boost to Russian maritime policy—and I do not believe this Congress will make that sort of gift to the Kremlin.

Soviet policy is to dominate the sea lanes of the world by 1980. Russian leaders have said that they intend to become self-sufficient in ships so that they can dispense with the ships of foreign flags which now carry just one-fourth of Russian foreign trade; to exert a decisive influence on the world level of maritime freight rates; and to become a major carrier of the commerce of other nations.

On our own part, Mr. Chairman, we have not had any maritime policy at all since the end of World War II. Obviously, the notion of having the Maritime Administration as a part of a Cabinet-level department is at the root of this failure to define and articulate a program for our merchant marine.

Creation of an independent Maritime Administration would be a reaffirmation of the mandate of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, that the task of this agency should be to promote an active American-built, American-owned, and American-manned merchant marine.

We are never going to get the kind of policy and program we need from the Department of Commerce. For whatever reason, the Commerce Department has not promoted the merchant marine—it has presided over its demise.

We are never going to get the program and policy that our needs demand by transferring the Maritime Administration to the Department of Transportation. The Secretary of that Department has promoted the notion of building American-flag ships abroad, in contravention of the clear intent of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. He has expressed his philosophical opposition to cargo-preference—to giving our ships their rightful share of the cargoes generated by our Government. This cargo-preference technique keeps our ships operating in peacetime so that the shipping companies will be solvent and their ships available as military auxiliary vessels in time of war.

No, Mr. Chairman, the only hope for our mechant fleet lies in this legislation that will restore independence—independence of thought, independence of action, independence of financing—to the Maritime Administration. This is the way to get on with the job of meeting the Russian challenge on the high seas. This is the way to regain our own position as a maritime power.

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILBERT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my strong support of H.R. 159. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this important legislation. The bill will establish an autonomous Federal Maritime Administration to oversee the development of our merchant marine and to coordinate and consolidate the duties and responsibilities relating to our U.S. merchant marine now spread throughout the several Federal agencies and departments.

Many people think of the maritime industry as being only a commercial enterprise. It is that, of course—but it is far more than that. By comman understanding, our merchant marine is the Nation's fourth arm of defense. It undergirds our entire military structure, and therefore it is an essential ingredient to our efforts to maintain peace and freedom throughout the world.

Administration after administration in the White House has agreed that the merchant marine is an integral part of our defense structure. Going back through recent history, we find these quotations from our various Chief Executives concerning the role of the merchant marine:

> War has proved to the American people that a strong merchant marine is as necessary to the nation as a powerful Army and Navy.

President Dwight D. Eisenhower said:

> We were caught flat-footed in both World Wars because we relied too much upon foreign-owned and operated shipping to carry our cargos abroad and to bring critically needed supplies to this country. I consider the merchant marine to be our fourth arm of defense and vital to the stability and expansion of our foreign trade.

President John F. Kennedy said:

> If the domestic merchant fleet, so strategic to the nation's economy and its defense is to be kept alive—and it must be—government must lend a hand.

President Lyndon B. Johnson said:

> A strong merchant marine is a guarantee of national security and economic stability. . . . Even at its present level, it earns or conserves almost $1 billion of foreign exchange every year, making it a major factor in our balance of payments position.

It is obvious from these quotations—and I am sure the history books could produce many, many more such expressions from American Presidents—indicate that these Chief Executives were in agreement that an adequate merchant marine is vital to our national defense posture. So it strikes me as odd that administration after administration has totally failed to provide the support that this industry needs so that it can properly fulfill its defense role.

The Merchant Marine Act of 1936 laid down the basic premise that we needed an American-built, American-owned, and American-manned merchant fleet capable of carrying our peacetime cargo and capable too, of fulfilling its defense responsibilities in times of crisis. Quite obviously, the two roles—peacetime carriage of our goods and service as a wartime auxiliary to our Armed Forces—are linked inextricably. If our merchant fleet is to be available and ready in times of crisis, it must be maintained strong and healthy in times of peace. To achieve this desirable result we must make certain, first, that our fleet receives its proper share of public funds to build new vessels, and second that it gets its proper share of America's ever-growing export-import cargo.

The lessons of history make it clear that we need a merchant fleet of our own, when the chips are down. We learned that, at the start of World War I—when we had to turn to foreign-flag ships, we were obliged to pay excessively high rates for the privilege, once we became involved in the war in Europe. We learned it again in World War II when, even though we had been moving forward with shipping and shipbuilding, we still had to mount a crash program, at enormous cost, to back up our forces fighting around the globe. We learned it again in Korea, when it was a sealift which proved to be the lifeline in that struggle against Communist aggression.

At this very instance, we are relying on America's commercial ships and merchant seamen to carry 98 percent of the war materiel and two-thirds of our fighting men to Vietnam—while it is true that airlift has its capabilities, it is also true that it could not carry out the total capacity load of our commitments.

Everyone felt a sense of great concern when, a few months ago, war broke out in the Middle East, and for awhile it looked as if we might have been drawn into that conflict. How could we have transported men, munitions, and supplies to another war theater, at a time when our sealift capabilities were being strained to their maximum limits in meeting the need in Vietnam?

The commercial enterprise and its depletion also produce some disturbing figures. At the end of World War II, ships flying American flags, numbered at 5,000, carried 40 percent of our export-import cargoes—today, U.S. ships, totaling less than 900, carry only 8 percent of the international trade. More importantly, the United States ranked first among the maritime nations at the close of World War II. Today, we have slid down to sixth place and we are vying with the fast-developing Soviet merchant fleet for even that unenviable position. To place the Maritime Administration in any of the existing agencies would not serve to encourage international negotiations for our share of international trade for American vessels.

These statistics and facts are not baffling—they outline a fearful lesson on the consequences of neglecting the American merchant marine.

Mr. Chairman, we are in this very real maritime crisis today, precisely because the Government has not given sufficient attention to our merchant marine over the years. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that this attention has been lacking, because we have permitted the maritime program to be placed under the jurisdiction of some mammoth Cabinet-level department, where it remained obscured by other programs and ignored by people who lack the understanding of our Nation's needs—and the needs of an industry to survive in peacetime so that it can be on call and ready in times of crisis.

Maritime independence will change that posture. We must get the maritime agency out from under the layer upon layer of bureaucracy. We can upgrade its methods of communicating with the executive branch, with the legislative branch, and with the American people, themselves.

The very act of creating this new agency will be important. It will be notice to the American people that this vital function of our Government will no longer be relegated to a position of secondary importance. The creation and maintenance of a first-class, first-rate merchant marine deserves special treatment in terms of agency structure and in terms of getting the public investment that it needs in order to fulfill its dual roles of peacetime service to our economy, and wartime service to our defense.

Reconstituting the Maritime Administration as a completely independent agency will mean that it will be in a position to devote its time, its energy, and its talents exclusively to maritime matters, unhampered by costly delays, bureaucratic bungling and pennypinching economies.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries is to be commended for the work it has done in trying to correct the present situation by bringing this legislation to the floor. Last year, the committee reported out a similar bill calling for an independent Maritime Administration. The bill did not receive House consideration because it was preoccupied in resisting efforts to put the Maritime Administration into the new Department of Transportation. Nothing less than a comprehensive program and an independent agency to administer our merchant marine will satisfy our needs for the maintenance and revitalization of a strong U.S.-flag merchant marine fleet.

Mr. Chairman, for many years a number of our colleagues have issued warnings to the American people of the serious threat to our economy and our national security involved in our failure to maintain a strong and active merchant marine.

These warnings have, for too long a time, fallen on deaf ears, and as a result, our maritime situation has steadily worsened. Today we are virtually at the bottom of the heap among the maritime nations of the world. There are many reasons for this—but perhaps the key reason is that the Maritime Administration has been voiceless and defenseless for far too long.

I remain convinced that one of the surest ways to get our maritime problems solved is to give the Maritime Administration back its independence. We must take it out of the bureaucratic jungle where it now languishes, and where the undergrowth of indifference and neglect threaten to destroy it.

An independent agency will have a direct line to Congress—and we have already made it easier for this agency to operate by approving earlier in this session, the bill on annual maritime authorizations.

An independent agency, working with a Congress that is prepared to move in the proper direction, can achieve a great deal in getting us moving again. An independent agency can devise a program for ship construction and operation that will insure that we have a new, fast, and efficient fleet that can compete with other maritime powers. Most of all, an independent agency can frustrate the attempts to undermine our shipbuilding capability, and our entire merchant marine structure, through ill-devised schemes to build U.S.-flag vessels in foreign countries.

I know that there are some in high places, and also some of the subsidized ship operators, who make a strong argument about how much cheaper it is to build our ships in foreign shipyards. If price were the only consideration, perhaps I might go along with them. But there is a good deal more involved than price alone, our national prestige is at stake that is why I stand shoulder to shoulder with other friends of the maritime industry in opposition to any and all foreign building of American ships.

The trouble with those who want to build ships in foreign yards is that they simply refuse to look at the whole picture. They look at the price of a single ship, and say the price is too high. Do they not realize what could happen to the American economy if we stopped building ships in this country, and turned to foreign yards to do the work? Not only would it throw shipbuilding workers out of their jobs, but it would also hurt our basic industries like metalworking, mining, and the like; because they all rely on the shipbuilding industry for a good share of their business. It is essential that we maintain our shipbuilding capability for our national security.

We have to commit ourselves to the most efficient and powerful shipbuilding capability consistent with our resources—construction of more merchant vessels in American shipyards will help achieve this goal—and passage of H.R. 159 is the means to that end. The United States should once again occupy the No. 1 position in the world as the leading maritime power.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILBERT. I yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I am one of the more than 100 cosponsors of this measure to give the Maritime Administration back the independent status it had 30 years ago—independence which it lost during one of the periodic reshufflings that go on in the executive branch.

The idea of incorporating maritime into the Department of Commerce may have looked like a good one back in 1950. But time has proven this wrong, because the decline of our merchant marine has paralleled this loss of independence for the Maritime Administration.

The United States is in urgent need of a modern and revitalized merchant fleet. This is necessary not only so that our merchant marine can meet the demands of our growing foreign commerce, but also so it can maintain its role as a vital defense auxiliary to the Army and Navy.

Under existing conditions, our fleet has continued to decline to a critical point. Fleets of other nations, particularly the Soviet Union, are increasing at the same rate that our own fleet is decreasing. Yet in spite of our dwindling numbers, we are only building 13 ships a year.

Only $143 million has been requested for ship construction for 1968. When compared with the fantastic size of our national budget, this sum is hardly-noticeable. Our budget increased more than 38 percent between 1961 and 1967, but the maritime budget has remained practically unchanged and, in fact, during the last 3 years, there has been an actual decline in the total amount of funds allotted to the maritime program.

It is not surprising that maritime has not fared very well, Mr. Chairman, for it is so buried within the Department of Commerce that it is difficult for its voice to be heard outside the Department. With respect to budgetary efforts, it must compete with too many agencies within the Department. The Maritime Administrator can be overruled by a number of other officials in the Department, none of whom has adequate knowledge of maritime affairs.

Thus maritime is at a disadvantage in promoting its programs and policies. It is necessary that we create a maritime agency that has the power to promote and carry out a forceful maritime program. The only way in which to do this is the creation of a wholly independent maritime agency, completely separate from the other Departments. This is the sole way that maritime can make known its needs and obtain support for its various programs.

Without independence, the maritime program will continue to decline bit by bit for, unless we change its status drastically, it will get no more attention from the administration than it is getting today.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join in the passage of this legislation today. Unless we get to work at once on rebuilding our merchant marine, it may be too late.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS].

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to have this opportunity to rise in support of H.R. 159 for the creation of an independent maritime agency.

This bill may be one of the most important pieces of legislation we deal with in this session of Congress. This bill is so important because it is the key to revitalization of one of this Nation's most strategic industries—the maritime industry.

The maritime industry is vital to both the commerce and defense of the United States. Ships of the American merchant fleet carry the commerce of this country in peacetime and meet the challenge of transporting our military men and material in wartime.

The maritime industry also includes American shipbuilding. The United States needs its shipbuilding industry to insure that it will have enough vessels to meet both its commercial and defense needs.

As you are all well aware, today the United States does not have an adequate American-flag merchant fleet nor does it have an adequate shipbuilding industry.

Furthermore, our critical foreign problems reflect the deplorable state of our maritime industry. The crisis in Vietnam demands a strong and vital shipping and shipbuilding industry.

We are fighting a war in Vietnam, and we are supplying that war by ships. Ships carry 98 percent of all the food, medical supplies, clothing, ammunition, oil and gasoline used by our men in Vietnam.

The American-flag merchant fleet met the challenge of supplying our troops in Southeast Asia. But the demands of wartime supply exacted a heavy toll on the merchant fleets commercial business. To keep the supply lifeline moving steadily across the seas to Vietnam, ships had to be pulled off commercial routes and pressed into Vietnam service.

Each time an American-flag ship is pulled out of commercial service to meet our defense needs in Vietnam, a foreign-flag ship moves in to snatch that business and the percentage of U.S. trade carried in American-flag bottoms drops another notch. There is a good chance that American ships will never recover the trade they have lost to foreign shipping due to the demands of Vietnam.

It is evident from the stress placed on the American merchant fleet by war demands, that we do not have a fleet today which meets the requirements of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. That act required that the United States have a merchant fleet sufficient in numbers and strength to carry a substantial portion of its foreign trade and all its needs. To assure the existence of such a strong merchant fleet, the act provided for an independent Maritime Administration to oversee the allocation of U.S. maritime resources. By contrast, administration of our maritime needs today is subordinated to the bureaucratic exigencies of the Department of Commerce.

An independent maritime agency would be a major step in assuring that the needs of the American maritime industry receive proper attention within the Government. I strongly urge all Members of this House to join with me in support of H.R. 159.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, of course I shall vote for the pending bill but, as I sit here this evening, I am highly amused to find all of those many fine-feathered friends on the other side of the aisle who only as far back as May 31 voted to slash the appropriations bill for the merchant marine, including the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD], including the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HUNT], including the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. GROVER], ad infinitum, asking for passage of this bill.

Here today their hearts bleed for the merchant marine, although only recently they voted for the Bow amendment to recommit the appropriation bill for the Department of Commerce, which included funds for the entire operation of the merchant marine. This is hard to conceive.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MURPHY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 159, a bill to amend title 11 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, which would create an independent Federal Maritime Administration.

Our American merchant marine has steadily declined since the end of World War II when, after a crash program of shipbuilding, we were the strongest maritime nation in the world. Today there is no more fitting monument to our decline as a maritime power than the old liberty ships lying in mothballs in our maritime graveyards. Had we replaced them with new and modern ships, there would be no reason for alarm today, but the fact is we have not. Some statistics for the years 1951 through 1965 illustrate the extent of this decline:

First. The world fleet increased by over 62 percent in number in this period while the U.S. fleet decreased by over 26 percent.

Second. The world fleet total aggregate deadweight tonnage increased by 156 percent while the U.S. fleet tonnage decreased by 2.7 percent.

Third. Passenger-combination ships declined in number in practically every country, but the world fleet decreased by only 1.1 percent, while the U.S. fleet decreased by 41.4 percent.

Fourth. The number of freighters rose by over 51 percent worldwide, while the United States dropped over 17 percent.

Fifth. The world tanker fleet increased 64.7 percent in number while the United States decreased 38.3 percent.

Sixth. The only classification in which we registered a gain was in bulk carriers, yet here the United States increased only 11 percent in number against a world increase of 295 percent.

These statistics, I think, are reason for alarm, but statistics alone do not give the entire story. Of even greater concern is the rising threat of Soviet maritime power. For a number of years Russia has vigorously pursued a course of ship construction with an ultimate goal of maritime superiority on the high seas. This, coupled with a decline in the American fleet, can only be viewed with alarm.

For example, the Russian merchant fleet already exceeds the active U.S.-flag fleet 1,400 to 1,040, and while nearly 80 percent of our ships are over 30 years old, almost 80 percent of the Soviet ships are less than 10 years old. In 1965 the Soviets took delivery on 100 new merchant ships, while the United States received only 16; for the past several years new ship deliveries to the Soviet Union have outpaced U.S. deliveries by a ratio of 8 to 1.

Further, in 1965 we had only 41 merchant ships over 1,000 tons on order, while the Soviets had 464 on order; their backlog of ships under construction or on order exceeded the U.S. total by a ratio of 11½ to 1.

In short, the Soviet Union is engaged in an all-out drive to become the strongest maritime power in the world. The U.S. response so far has been to further erode its once dominant position on the high seas.

But there are other reasons for strengthening our merchant marine besides the potential danger of Soviet maritime superiority. For one, our balance-of-payments problem is aggravated by the necessity to rely on foreign ships to handle our waterborne commerce. Today our fleet's participation in the Nation's total export and import tonnage is only 7 percent.

Second, of the 77 most strategic materials required to maintain our industrial and military might, more than 60 are imported, and presently 96 percent of this tonnage is being carried on foreign flag ships. To me it is an unacceptable position to be so dependent on foreign shipping to obtain vital materials, especially when that foreign shipping may not be inclined to provide consistently reliable service.

Third, our merchant marine is a vital component of our comprehensive defense system. The merchant marine has always borne the bulk of the supply effort in times of national emergency, and there is no exception today in Vietnam. Ships carry 98 percent of the supplies and equipment for our Vietnam effort, and two-thirds of the men; the latest tonnage figure available is 800,000 tons a month. It is truly a credit to our merchant marine that they are doing the job so well, but the strain on our fleet and personnel is serious. We are already taking old Liberty ships out of mothballs at a cost of $500,000 per ship. We know from experience that we cannot rely on foreign ships to carry our supplies in Vietnam, and in spite of some administration voices, air transport is not the answer. It would take 260 of the big C–5A cargo planes to carry the load of a single ship, and air transportation would cost six times as much per ton-mile.

With our merchant marine already strained by the necessity of supplying our men in Vietnam, we must ask ourselves whether we could adequately respond to another crisis in another area of the world. I think the answer is obvious.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that these are compelling reasons for strengthening our merchant marine. The bill now before the House would be a significant step in the right direction, by creating an independent Maritime Administration which would give a strong, coordinated voice to the maritime interests now spread over 22 separate Federal agencies.

The administration has opposed this idea, and favors putting the Maritime Administration within the Department of Transportation. Experience has shown, however, that the maritime interests suffer whenever they have to operate within a multi-interest Department. In 1950, the last year the Maritime Administration was independent, we were carrying 41.4 percent of our country's exports and imports in American-flag ships; today that figure is 7 percent.

Another reason for keeping the Maritime Administration out of the Department of Transportation is the fact that Secretary Boyd is such an ardent advocate of foreign building of U.S.-flag merchant ships.

We cannot begin building our ships abroad unless we want to ruin our own shipbuilding capability. It is naive to think that our shipyards would ever be able to regain this business once it has gone abroad. As a matter of fact, it is naive to suppose that we can merely open the door a crack to foreign construction. Once the law was amended, we would have destroyed the build-at-home theory, and it would not be long before all of our ships—instead of just some of them—were under foreign construction.

A shipbuilding capability is essential to the defense of our country. It is as erroneous to rely on foreign shipbuilding as it is to rely on foreign-flag shipping—for in event of some national or international emergency, there may be conflicting interests which will prove to be our undoing.

How can we even think of building ships abroad, when our own shipbuilding industry is capable of handling our present needs—and when it is in a sad economic state precisely because we are not giving our shipyards the opportunity to build ships.

Less than 100 vessels have been built in American yards during the past 6 years. That is less than an average of 17 vessels per year—less than one ship per shipyard per year. We have the capacity; why are not we using it? What possible reason can there be for starving our own shipyards and feeding those of other countries?

Yet Alan Boyd, whose salary is paid out of the taxes of American shipbuilding workers, among others, would like us to build American ships abroad. If the Maritime Administration were ever placed in the Department of Transportation, that is exactly what we would be doing—building our ships abroad.

Mr. Chairman, that is not the route I would ever permit our maritime policy to follow. That is why I support this bill, which I believe is vital to our national interest. We cannot hope to maintain our position of power in the world without a healthy merchant marine, and an independent maritime administration would provide the necessary stimulus to revitalize our sagging maritime position. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ADDABBO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, as one of the more than 100 Congressmen who presented companion bills to H.R. 159, I particularly welcome this opportunity to set forth my views in support of maritime independence.

Any struggle for independence is difficult, and the maritime industry's struggle is no exception.

One hundred and ninety-one years ago, our Nation declared its independence from foreign domination. In many respects, parallels can be drawn between that struggle and the current battle facing the maritime industry of this country.

In 1776, the American patriots realized that this country was too big and too important to be governed as merely part of a whole which eventually became the British Empire. The needs of Americans were being subjugated to the needs of England.

As you all well recognize, the American maritime industry faces a similar situation now. Today, in 1967, the needs of American shipbuilders, American ship operators and American seamen are being neglected and ignored.

The maritime industry of the United States is too big and too important to be submerged within the Department of Commerce or any other Government department. Maritime needs an agency of its own, with its own budget. The problems of this industry are too complex and diverse to be handled on a part-time basis—they need full-time consideration.

Ships carry the products of American factories to foreign markets and return to this country with the raw materials and foreign goods which make possible the American standard of living. Ships comprise an integral link in the supply and distribution phase of our economic life.

In wartime, ships form an integral part of our national defense. Ships carry the soldiers and material to fight wars in foreign lands. Ships carry the food and raw materials needed by our allies and by our own industry and people.

The production of ships—like any heavy industry—forms a vital part of our economic balance. Every one of the 50 States produces at least one item and some produce 25 or more—which is needed to build a merchant ship. For every man employed in American shipyards, a job is created for another man in industries supplying materials for shipbuilding.

The more ships we build here at home, the more jobs we create throughout our economy; the more consumer incomes we create and the more tax dollars we generate.

Like ripples spreading on the surface of a pond, the importance of maritime pervades our entire economic complex.

Mr. Chairman, this is the reason maritime is too big and too important not to be given its own agency, its own voice, its own freedom.

Maritime is commerce, industry, transportation, and national defense all rolled into one and the problems posed by these diverse roles can only be properly dealt with by a separate and independent agency for maritime and maritime alone.

I urge this body to resist pressures to give maritime anything less than it deserves—complete independent status. The proposed H.R. 159 is a product of wise and far-seeing action and I urge all to support its passage.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KARTH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection

to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 159.

In all the talk about our merchant marine, one fact emerges very clearly—that the present impasse between the maritime industry and the administration boils down to two essential points:

First of all, there is disagreement about where we are going to build our merchant ships.

Secondly, there is disagreement about where we are going to put the Maritime Administration.

First, there is overwhelming evidence that the best interests of our country are going to be served only if we continue to require—as we have done, by law, for more than 30 years—that American-flag ships must be constructed in privately owned American shipyards.

Our capability for merchant vessel construction must be kept at a high level—for Vietnam has taught us that we cannot rely on foreign-flag ships, and it would be equally as foolish to rely on foreign shipyards.

We can not meet our defense requirements if we are at the mercy of shipbuilders in some other land—shipbuilders who might flatly refuse to build our commercial vessels in time of crisis—or shipbuilders who might put a gun at our heads and set blackmail prices to produce the vessels we need in an emergency.

Now, let us take up the important question of maritime independence:

Past history indicates clearly that the merchant marine industry fared best when its destinies were in the hands of an independent agency—and it fared worst when it was submerged in another Department not primarily concerned with the well-being of the fleet. In fact, the bureaucrats could not care less—by the time they finished talking about trucks, buses, trains, and cars—there was not even time to talk about ships.

For the first 14 years after the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 became law, the program was in the hands of an independent, bipartisan agency—and during this period we made some of the greatest maritime advances in our history.

But maritime independence ended in 1951—and our merchant marine went into a decline—in terms of the amount of cargo it carries and in the number of ships we have on the high seas.

It must be obvious to everyone—as it is to me—that we are not going to get the maritime affairs of this country moving in the proper direction unless and until we have an independent agency handling this important national program.

This question of maritime independence should have top priority on Capitol Hill—because everything else hinges on it.

Once we have an independent agency, we can develop a proper program—building enough ships, building them in American yards, providing the proper kind of economic support for our fleet so that we can compete with the low-wage countries that want to take over our commercial shipping and our shipbuilding—in short, developing the kind of program that we need to make us a maritime power again.

We have got to get moving—and moving quickly—if we are going to survive as a maritime nation—and if we do not survive as a maritime nation, we are not going to survive politically or economically.

All of us here know that the chips are down.

For too many years, too many national administrations have frittered away the hours—failing to take action that has been vital to our security and our economic growth, in terms of our merchant marine.

But the time for action is here now—and I know we can win this fight, so that the American flag will fly proudly again on the high seas of the world.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Chairman, the crisis in the American merchant marine fleet has been well documented. The United States is 14th in shipbuilding in the world. Our fleet of 1,090 ships is the fifth largest. It is badly overaged. Some 70 percent of the ships are over 20 years old. We do not carry our own cargo. Only 7.7 percent of American foreign commerce moves in American ships.

Then there is Vietnam. Our retired fleet was pressed into service to supply some 98 percent of all the supplies. About 180 ships constitute the lifelines to the war. Now, look at the costs. It requires $500,000 apiece to bring each one of the ships out of mothballs. About $60 million will be spent not for new ships, but to keep old ones going. Mr. William Rand, president of the U.S. Lines, has described the results of working such ships on long hauls:

> In one month alone, there were some 61 breakdowns with an average repair time of 40 days.

Our replacement schedule is many ships behind. This has been our approach to the demands of seapower.

Unfortunately, the Russians have not been so remiss. As of January 1, 1967, its fleet numbers 1,422 and has largely built after 1950. The strength of their fleet continues to grow.

We were fortunately not confronted with great demands in the recent Arab-Israel war. This is no guarantee for the future. "East of Aden" is rapidly becoming a vacuum of seapower, as the British influence in the area continues to diminish.

Considering the checkered career of various independent maritime agencies, there is no justification for absolute confidence that agency independence alone will solve our problems.

Yet, as a knowledgeable writer on merchant marine affairs, Miss Edith Roosevelt, has stated:

> The recent crisis in the Middle East has shown that we have little time to lose in restoring our nation to the status of a first-class maritime power.

The idea of H.R. 159, to create an independent Federal Maritime Administration, has been supported by some 140 Members who have introduced similar legislation. I am proud to have been part of this effort that has resulted in bringing this bill to the floor today.

We do indeed have little time. I believe this measure will allow an independent maritime agency to develop and support a viable maritime policy. This sorely needed thing has so far not been forthcoming.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, maritime policy has become one of the most neglected areas of concern in this country since the coming of age of air transport. The U.S. Government, which should be the leader in developing new and responsive policies, has overlooked a vital commercial and military link with the rest of the world.

I read recently that some shipping experts fear the United States will lose the lead in developing and constructing containership methods of maritime transport. Yet, on the other hand, foreign experts predict that too much emphasis on containerization will cripple the Atlantic trade by idling many of the conventional ships.

This area of dispute should now be receiving close and constant study by both the American Government and private maritime interests. And, yet, within our Government there is no agency free from other transportation interests which can study and guide our maritime policies during the coming period of expansion and development. For this very reason, last year I introduced legislation to create an independent Maritime Administration with commensurate powers to fulfill the delicate task of guiding our policy in the area of maritime affairs.

The American lead in utilizing containerships is being threatened by foreign shippers as every day passes. Only yesterday, the British and French Atlantic Container announced the inauguration of ship container operation between American east coast, French, and British ports. This service, in fact, begins today. And by next year Atlantic Container Line expects to have 10 ships operating between Europe and the United States. If America is to maintain its position of leadership in containerized shipping, we must begin to develop and foster, at the Federal Government level, policies and programs designed to strengthen and support the continued expansion of containerization. I believe that our only recourse is to bring into being a separate agency to deal with the increasingly technical problems facing maritime transportation.

Mr. Chairman, the American merchant marine has fallen from a place of prominence in world shipping. The United States no longer holds a commanding position in commercial shipping. But air transport has not relieved the basic fact that America's international commercial standing is directly tied to our merchant marine. Without a strong and growing fleet, the maritime position of the United States becomes increasingly and dangerously dependent on foreign vessels. We should not and cannot depend on our goods of tomorrow being carried by our friends of today.

I am hopeful that creation of an independent Maritime Administration will spur the National Government and the maritime industries to bring the American merchant marine back from the cellar to the top where it belongs.

By failing to project policies aimed at fostering a strong merchant marine, we have granted a monopoly to foreign shippers. While we have shut our eyes to the plight of our maritime fleet, the Soviet Union, Japan, and other maritime nations have emphasized efforts to gain supremacy in maritime commerce. At the end of World War II, we had a fleet of 5,000 merchant ships. Today we have 935. A continuing oversight policy in maritime affairs will surely further deplete our fleet.

Any further decline of the American merchant marine will have a serious impact on the shipbuilding capacity of this country. The shipbuilding industry, which has suffered in the past from a near cessation of American ship production, will be revitalized by an increase in shipbuilding which should certainly follow any sincere effort to upgrade the American merchant marine.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope that this new agency, devoted entirely to our maritime policies and administration, will spur both the Government and the shipping industries by revising our policies governing the awarding of ship construction contracts, by pushing for tax incentives and low-interest loans for shipbuilders, by thoroughly reviewing our subsidy policies and by forcing this country to come to the realization that our deficient merchant marine can only be brought back to the forefront by intelligent policies, aggressive leadership, and effective programs.

Mr. Chairman, a first step to this goal is creation of an independent agency to govern the Federal Government's participation. We are at a critical point in history. Perhaps had we realized this deficiency after Korea, rather than now during Vietnam, we would not now be forced to bring back to service decrepit and discarded merchant ships to carry supplies to the war effort. I urge my colleagues to act favorably on this legislation.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, while Nero fiddled, Rome burned. While we procrastinate, our merchant marine drifts toward oblivion. Now we have an opportunity to stem the tide, even to reverse its direction. The first step toward accomplishing this result is to reestablish an independent Federal agency charged with responsibility for maritime affairs. This is not the first opportunity we have had to take action in this vital area, but time is running out and we must act now if we are to prevent virtual disappearance of the U.S.-flag fleets from the oceans of the world.

H.R. 159, introduced by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ], chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, provides for reestablishing the Maritime Administration as an independent agency. My position on this subject was demonstrated in a bill which I introduced in January of this year, H.R. 3963, which was identical to H.R. 159. I add my support to the bill now before the House.

Congress has recognized that independent, quasi-judicial agencies provide the best method for administering economic and regulatory functions of the Federal Government. The validity of this premise has been amply demonstrated by the results, or rather the lack of results, in maritime affairs under administration by a Cabinet-level Department. The merchant marine is the only major transportation form without an independent agency for administration of Federal functions which concern it.

There has been no dearth of proposals and discussions in the Congress regarding maritime matters. Perhaps public indifference or unawareness of the problems have been barriers to positive action. However, the public now seems more aware of the implications of failure to maintain an adequate merchant marine for our national purposes in foreign commerce and defense.

Had our merchant marine fared as well under the Marad as now constituted as it did from 1936 to 1950 under an independent maritime agency, this Nation would not now be a fourth- or fifth-rate maritime power. We are fast becoming a "has been" among the major maritime nations of the world; once we were "out front."

In 1950, when the independent agency was abolished, U.S.-flag vessels carried 41.5 percent of the Nation's export and import cargoes; 2 years later only 22 percent; now only approximately 7 percent. Not only have the U.S.-flag fleets declined in numbers, but also in deadweight tonnage, shrinking 2.7 percent from 1951 to 1965 while the world fleet tonnage increased 156 percent. Sufficient U.S.-flag vessels are not available to carry the mandatory 50 percent of Government-sponsored exports of agricultural surplus commodities. Even more serious than the decline in size of the merchant marine, in terms of the national interest, is the proportion of U.S.-flag vessels which are now or will shortly become obsolete. By 1970 almost all of our merchant fleet will be obsolete; already the program for replacement of overage ships is nearly 100 vessels behind schedule.

During the years the Maritime Administration has been a relatively minor segment of the Commerce Department, funds authorized by Congress for ship construction have not been used for that purpose, despite the obvious need to replace outmoded vessels in the fleet. Frequently, the Department has not approved construction when both the Congress and the Bureau of the Budget have approved funds. Had an independent maritime agency been in existence, it might at least have been able to forestall bloc obsolescence of the merchant fleet.

The ineffectiveness of the existing organization for administration of maritime policy and programs was highlighted by the proposal of the Department of Defense for construction of a fast deployment logistics ship fleet to take over the defense activities formerly the responsibility of the merchant marine. The breakout of ships from the mothball fleet, which are not only too slow for effective support of Vietnam activities but also extremely costly to reactivate and to operate and maintain, also emphasized inadequacies of our maritime position.

Merchant fleets differ from other transportation means, with the possible exception of international operations of some airlines, as their operations are international in scope. In a sense the merchant marine is a policy as well as an economic instrument and an adjunct of defense. Each of the roles of the merchant marine must be given adequate attention in determining national policy and administering maritime affairs. Other leading maritime nations utilize their merchant marine as an instrument of national policy and provide strong support for their merchant fleets.

This Nation is now forced to ship 96 percent of strategic materials requirements by foreign flags. Of the 77 strategic materials necessary for the U.S. military and industrial complex, only 11 are obtainable within the boundaries of the country. All others must be obtained from foreign lands and transported by ship—the only bulk transportation available. Nearly every State in the Union and practically every industry are affected by the condition of the merchant marine. Changes in the international situation at any time could cut off vital strategic material when most urgently needed if no U.S.-flag vessels are available for transport. No such adequate fleet now exists.

Hearings by the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries over the past few years reinforce the proposition that the maritime position of the Nation will continue to deteriorate unless Federal maritime policy is administered more effectively. H.R. 159 provides the most effective method for this purpose. An independent Marad will not assure more financing authorizations or appropriations than have been made, nor will it cure all the ills of the maritime industry. However, based on past performance, continuation of the agency in a subordinate position in an executive department not primarily concerned with maritime affairs will not result in any improvement in the future. Independent agency status for Marad will focus greater attention on the serious condition of the merchant fleets and on implementation of national policy as set forth in existing legislation and its objectives of a merchant marine capable of meeting national needs in commerce and defense.

In a message preceding the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, President Roosevelt said:

> An American merchant marine is one of our most firmly established traditions. It was, during the first half of our national existence, a great and growing asset. Since then, it has declined in importance and value. The time has come to square this traditional ideal with effective performance.

President Roosevelt's statement is as true today as it was more than 30 years ago. That it is true is a measure of our failure to support a strong merchant marine. We can no longer delay action to remedy past omissions. I am convinced that Federal functions in this area can best be provided through an independent Federal Maritime Administration. I strongly urge prompt favorable action on H.R. 159, constituting the first step toward rehabilitation of our merchant marine. World conditions are such that we must no longer remain in a subordinate position among the maritime nations of the world.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this time to compliment the fine work of the Merchant Marine Committee and the gentleman from Maryland, Chairman GARMATZ, in bringing this legislation to create an independent merchant marine to the floor. I am pleased to join as coauthor of the bill with my H.R. 2822.

It has been said that the story of our merchant marine could be entitled "The Rise and Fall of the *Savannah* in 148 Years." It would be nice if we could say that we have truly progressed since the first U.S. ship *Savannah* sailed across the Atlantic to Europe in 1819.

Instead, however, we are compelled to report that until this committee intervened the nuclear ship *Savannah* was to be consigned to "mothballs" after visiting only 40 ports and cruising but 130,000 miles. Now, thanks to the wisdom and persistence of this committee, at least we can say that the *Savannah* remains an active vessel in our sadly diminished merchant fleet.

In a way, the outlandish proposal to scuttle the *Savannah* is par for the course with today's American maritime program. Labor, management, and the present and past administrations must bear their share of the responsibility for the current status of affairs.

Mr. Chairman, no one knows better than this committee the degree of concern in the Congress, and among the American people, over our Nation's dwindling status in the shipping lanes of the high seas.

I am quick to acknowledge that my concern with the merchant marine and the shipbuilding industry is somewhat provincial. As you may know, I represent the Fourth Congressional District of California, which contains the Mare Island Division of the San Francisco Bay Naval Shipyard. Out in the West we learned long ago that we cannot be healthy in public shipbuilding unless we are healthy in private shipbuilding. And to those who charge that shipbuilding know-how has deteriorated in the United States, I would say look over the nuclear attack submarines *Stonewall Jackson, Theodore Roosevelt, Andrew Jackson, Kamehameha, Woodrow Wilson*, and the latest, *Mariano Guadalupe Vallejo*—SSBN-659—all built at Vallejo, which latter ship we named after my hometown.

These submarines are true, precise, accurate, and durable instruments of American foreign policy—and in their quietness and capability they have no peer in the free world or the Communist world. Last month in Vallejo we launched the SSN *Gunnard*, the 14th nuclear sub and the 40th submarine built at Mare Island.

The secret of these undersea ships, however, is money—$35 to $55 million each for the hulls and in excess of $100 million each for Government-provided equipment. I could also cite the great ships produced by private yards, the nuclear attack carrier *Enterprise* and the nuclear frigate *Bainbridge*, for example. All of these ships are the best in the world and we know that they could be constructed in no other yards public or private outside the United States.

It was my Mare Island yard during World War II that constructed 392 ships and repaired and overhauled a total of 4,560 ships. Mare Island is also the yard that launched the World War I destroyer *Ward* in 16½ days.

At the insistence of my Armed Services Committee, Secretary Nitze announced a few months ago that Kaiser Industries would shortly complete a 5- to 7-year, $600 to $700 million naval ship modernization program. Eight or nine naval shipyards will each achieve a 20th century capability, and I think my home yard will receive modernization in the order of maybe $72 million over a 5- to 7-year period.

Moving forward simultaneously with the naval shipyard improvements I hope will be a modern merchant program for which the Congress has waited well over 2 years. Nearly every Member I know has a feeling that we should be moving ahead with a radically new maritime program. How are we going to do it? So much has been written and said by so many people—some of it enlightening, some confusing.

We have had task force reports and Maritime Committee reports and all of these thoughts have been capsulated so many times it is difficult to expound a new idea to resolve the problems of building foreign or forming an independent Federal Maritime Administration or upgrading the number of ship deliveries.

Frankly, I believe that there is enough steam or nuclear propulsion in the maritime industry to insist on and stimulate the creation of a new American maritime industry, of space program proportions. We have been thinking large but we are budget programed small at the Federal level. I do not need to tell this committee that the Maritime Administration received a total support of $303 million for 1966, $230 million for 1967, and $305 million is scheduled for 1968. It was announced recently that the 1968 funds were up $25 million from 1967 and that amounts were included for 13 new vessels to join our subsidized fleet. This is in the budget. This kind of a replacement program begins no place, ends no place, and will do little to abate bloc obsolescence.

For ship construction to provide for national defense features in the form of construction subsidy this year we have the monumental sum of $106 million and I am sure someone will claim that the $143 million included in the 1968 budget is excessive. Certainly these kinds of budgets are exactly in line with testimony given by Defense Secretary Robert McNamara before my House Armed Services Committee and, of course, he testified before your committee.

Five years ago his words were as follows:

> From a purely military point of view the Reserve Fleet, plus vessels in service, plus the construction program previously outlined appear adequate to our needs. . . . I do not wish to overstate the military requirement thereby providing an umbrella under which a huge shipbuilding program for the Merchant Marine can be justified.

Personally, I think Mr. McNamara is the best Defense Secretary we have had and the best in the business, but on this issue, along with some others, I think he is dead wrong.

We all considered it rather ironic that after making the statement I just quoted the Secretary then should decide to move full steam ahead this year with a program for construction of the so-called fast deployment logistics ships at a cost of $2 billion plus.

To quote Mr. McNamara again, in criticizing our domestic capability to ships, he said:

> Not only does it cost twice as much to build a ship in this country, it also takes twice as long.

He said the reason is not higher labor costs or less skilled workers so much as the fact that American shipyards are—and I quote him again—"generally technically obsolete compared to those of northern Europe and Japan."

I dispute what the Secretary says, but if he is accurate I think he and the Department of Defense are to blame for compressing our American shipbuilding industry from a capability of better than 1,000 ships per year at the end of World War II to last year's dismal record—13 merchant ships delivered and 16 ships ordered by and in American yards.

Outside of submarines, until the release of the nuclear-guided missile frigate DLGN authorized 2 years ago, the Navy has not lain the keel of a true capital ship during the last two administrations. This policy has allowed our skilled naval shipbuilding levels to degenerate at one point to 75,000 men while private shipbuilding levels were near 100,000 men.

We have had in years past a true "survival of the fittest" in American shipbuilding with the Government forcing companies to bid at cost and under cost so that they were harpooning each other and the naval shipyards in the competition. We have closed two naval shipyards.

Needless to say, with rare exceptions there have been no contracts with profits fat enough for modernization programs. And with the Government spending 85 percent of the shipbuilding dollars in the United States it is no wonder that there has been a severe degree of status quo in the industry.

You wonder why you need an independent agency. I would say just look at the report and the bill that we enacted in the Congress yesterday and for all of the agencies outside of maritime, for railroads, for supersonic transport, for highways, a total of $1.5 billion. I say we need this kind of money every year in merchant marine development and if we are going to fighting with four or five other agencies to share a $1.5 billion budget I certainly do not think that the administration is offering us very much of a lure.

It would be tragic if the Defense Department now decided to live with the congressional action and not to move forward in a new high priority effort with a beefed-up merchant marine to meet the needs of defense as well as civilian shipping requirements.

It is my understanding that Under Secretary of the Navy Robert Baldwin now has a study favoring a 750- to 950-ship program, tied into a Defense requirement, on Secretary McNamara's desk. I would think that this committee ought to have that report because I think you would see some of the thinking in some parts of the Department of Defense which are looking forward to working with the merchant marine in developing a joint use type of ship.

I say if the Soviets can do it so can the United States—it is all a question of postulating a program. The United States with a $760 billion gross national product has twice the economic power of the Soviet Union by any measure of comparison.

California alone with a $90 billion GNP is equal to France, 10 percent ahead of Japan, and by 1975 our State will be leading the United Kingdom and West Germany.

Yet since 1962 the Great Society has built but 87 ships averaging about $100 million in annual Federal cost, whereas the Soviets built 502 merchant ships during the period at a cost of nearly $1 billion per year. As a result 80 percent of the Soviet fleet is less than 10 years old and 80 percent of the U.S. fleet is more than 20 years old.

The Soviets carry 70 to 85 percent of their own commerce. The United States, which accounts for 25 percent of all of the world's ocean commerce, carries but 7.7 percent of that trade in her own American-flag bottoms.

The Soviets employ 9,000 in oceanography while we employ 3,700. The Soviets last year caught 6.5 million tons of fish in near-American waters and also carried on a tremendous amount of intelligence simultaneously. We caught 2.3 million tons.

The Soviets have gone from 1.8 million tons of ocean shipping in 1950 to 9.8 million tons last year and have a projected 15 million tons by 1970—all pursuant to a massive 7-year shipbuilding plan Russia initiated in 1958.

While the Soviets have presently on order 556 ships, the United States is building 48. While the Soviet fleet expanded catastrophically, the U.S. fleet has slumped from 22 million tons to 14 million tons with many second-class ships.

To rehabilitate our American merchant marine and to change the trend of our time is going to take more than 30 merchant ships per year to do the job—more than a simple "respond" program to marshal the forces of our existing merchant fleet. We must think big. If we wait for a tranquil year in the post-Vietnam era, it won't happen.

Gen. Lew Walt came back the other day and said we can plan to be in Vietnam for 12 to 15 years. I say if we can afford to spend $35 billion a year, or $3 billion a month, for Vietnam, we can spend $1 billion a year for a ship program—for an industry employing more than a half million men—to insure our world commerce in that area.

I have saved until the last my comments on the proposal for a new maritime policy submitted recently by Secretary Boyd. To begin with, although his suggestion talks of 100-percent increase in program, it is not of space program proportions. As I understand it, the President asked for a program that would receive the full support of all segments of industry and would allow the United States to recapture a substantial amount of her foreign commerce cartage. I say if they had the full support of the maritime industry you wouldn't require 5 or 10 days of hearings on the pending legislation.

Much like the task force recommendation, the Boyd plan, I believe is conceived in defeat from the outset. According to Ed Hood's latest shipbuilders report, Japan last year completed 6.4 million tons—46.1 percent of the world's new ships; West Germany, 1.1 million tons—8.2 percent; Sweden, 1.1 million tons—8 percent; Great Britain, 1 million tons—7.5 percent; Italy, one-half million tons—3.7 percent; and the United States ranked 13th with 191,000 tons—1.3 percent.

In other words, last year Japan completed more total tonnage than the United States completed during the whole of World War II.

To state it in another way, while the total export and import ocean cargo of the United States escalated from 64 million tons in 1936 to 404 million tons last year, the United States share of this cargo in U.S. bottoms slipped from 29.7 percent to 7.2 percent.

In other words, while our commerce has expanded nearly 700 percent, our ship capability has remained static. As a practical matter, under existing law over the past 20 years, 1,229 ships totaling 35 million tons have been built by American companies in foreign yards. Where does Secretary Boyd think Japan gets her orders for 6 million tons?

I say the purpose in establishing a Department of Transportation was to stimulate all industries as required, not to checkmate our ocean commerce by explaining that a particular offer is the last one and that there is a breaking point where the interests of the public and shipping industry necessarily separate.

I am one who believes firmly that the interests of our American shipping industry and the public and our national defense have much more in common than Secretary Boyd would have us believe. Far better it would be to have a Secretary who would, in fact, do what the President has asked—postulate a multibillion-dollar shipbuilding program over a 5-year period to tie into a sea science, fishing, and oceanography, and then let the Congress decide whether the program is larger than the American public will sustain and support.

In conclusion, I want to reiterate my full support of a new, modern maritime agency. I must say again, however, that even this agency would not satisfy the aspirations of the 100-plus coauthors of this legislation unless we move forward with administration support on a simple space age, space-budgeted, 5-year maritime construction program.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 159, which establishes an independent Federal Maritime Administration to implement our national maritime policy and to regulate and develop our merchant marine fleet.

The existing status of our merchant marine is appalling. Our own merchant fleet carries only 8 percent of our foreign trade. The merchant ships flying the American flag are old and decrepit and the situation is worsening rather than improving. It is incumbent upon the Congress to take firm, immediate action to halt this decline and to move toward a strong effort to rebuild our fleet.

I cosponsored this legislation because of my longstanding belief in the philosophy of "more trade, less aid." We cannot expect to buy friends throughout the world. Our hope of ultimate success with our friends in foreign nations must necessarily lie with international trade and economic competition.

To this end, we must rely on improved transportation of our goods to foreign markets. Improved commercial exchanges between the nations of the earth cannot but result in improved economic, cultural, and diplomatic relations between them.

In addition, our position as the richest nation in the world gives us a unique opportunity and, I might add, responsibility to assist in raising the standard of living in the underdeveloped countries. Starving, illiterate peoples are ripe for exploitation by unscrupulous leaders who would take advantage of their power for their own gain at the expense of depriving their citizens of a full opportunity for an improved way of life.

Our declining merchant fleet is not in the position to help develop the international trade that will be required. However, the opportunity is there and the Soviet Union and its satellites are working to take over. These countries are winning, too, but not in competition with us. It is our default that is giving them superiority in this arena.

An independent Federal Maritime Administration, interested in the development of our fleet could do a great deal toward strengthening our position. And, the Congress, by establishing such an agency would be indicating its support and approval for a reshaping of our maritime policies.

I believe the Federal Maritime Administration should begin immediately to expand our merchant marine fleet. I believe the modernization of our fleet is an absolute necessity. We must begin to build the most technically advanced merchant ships feasible to prepare ourselves for the very important international trade and commerce requirements of the future as well as to assist in the exploration of the resources of the sea which will become increasingly important in coming years.

I want to point out also that the merchant fleet is a necessary adjunct to to any Navy. The logistic requirements of the war in Vietnam have demonstrated how ill prepared our own fleet is for support of our military effort. We have been forced to bring 25-year-old ships out of mothballs to support our men in Vietnam. The Soviets do not have the same problem. They have long recognized the importance of a strong merchant fleet and Russia has, in the past decade, surpassed this country as an oceangoing power.

Not only does Russia have more ships with more tonnage, but the Soviet fleet is vastly more modern and capable than ours. The Soviet improvements have become obvious to all of us through its fishing fleet which is the most technologically developed in the world and which has been attacking traditional American fishing grounds for over a year; leaving in its wake a trail of depleted fishing areas and a burden on the American fishing fleet which may take many years to overcome. The growth of the Soviet merchant marine is not as visible as its fishing fleet but is at least as great and could have far more disastrous consequences for the free nations of the world.

Additional emphasis on the growth of our merchant fleet through the creation of an independent agency can do much to halt the decline of our fleet and can improve our position throughout the world. For that reason I hope this body will overwhelmingly support the establishment of this needed agency.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, the bill to create an independent Federal Maritime Administration is a backward step. The committee report on the bill clearly states that that administration is firmly opposed on the sensible grounds that maritime matters should be under the Department of Transportation. It is unlikely that the bill is going anywhere. Even if this House is temporarily persuaded to pass it, I doubt that the Senate will do likewise, and I am certain that the President will veto it.

The House still has authorization and appropriation bills to be passed. We are trying to work our way through the maze of conflicting proposals on budget cuts and fiscal programs. Why add to the confusion and controversy? Let us get on with the important business of the House which cannot be postponed.

This issue is old hat. We have been through all this before. When the House Committee on Government Operations reported the bill creating the Department of Transportation, we made our case why the Maritime Administration should be in the new Department. We lost the teller vote on that issue. We accepted the loss of the agency from the Department of Transportation in order to get that Department running and to start it working on the host of transportation policy issues confronting the Nation.

But the sponsors of this bill today are not convinced. They are proceeding under the mistaken notion that they can somehow squeeze more out of this society if they have their own little maritime agency, if recommendations for maritime funds can be made separate and apart from all other transportation budget matters, and if they can produce grandiose plans for future subsidies without reference to any other programs. Perhaps they will be happy if they just get a bill passed in one House and can report to all hands that progress has been made.

An independent maritime agency is not progress. It is second-class citizenship. Without a Cabinet head, the needs of the merchant marine will have no high-level spokesman with ready access to the President. Standing apart from the great Department of Transportation, maritime policies will be more isolated, not in tune with new technological advances, not coordinated with other important transportation policies and programs. An isolated agency is more likely to be a prisoner of the maritime industry than a strong voice in Government.

The shipping industry of this country needs to be revitalized. New techniques, new methods, new incentives, sustained Government support, are required. We need to take several bold steps forward, not one step backward, as this bill proposes.

So I say to my colleagues, let us not have another exercise in futility. Let us vote down this bill and wait for a bill or reorganization plan which puts the Federal Maritime Administration where it belongs—in the Department of Transportation.

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to have this opportunity to join with so many of my colleagues in this House in expressing wholehearted support for H.R. 159.

The fact that more than 100 bills for maritime independence were introduced this session speaks well for the prospects of this legislation when it reaches a vote today. Even more than that, I think this is a manifestation of just how deeply we in Congress feel about the fact that our merchant fleet has been allowed to go into a decline—and how strongly we all believe that only by granting this Federal agency complete autonomous status can we ever hope to regain our merchant marine vigor.

This great concern over the condition of the American merchant marine is certainly valid. During the past 17 years—in the period that the Maritime Administration has been in the Department of Commerce—our Government has allowed two-thirds of our fleet to become obsolescent.

In addition, the American-flag fleet has been abused and neglected, so that today it carries not even the inadequate 8-percent figure we have been led to believe, but less than 7 percent of our foreign waterborne commerce. Federal laws designed to correct this situation have simply not been adhered to.

This has been due in great measure to the manner in which the laws have been administered—or, more precisely, maladministered—by the Federal departments and agencies charged with the responsibility for their implementation.

Neglect on the part of these Federal departments and agencies has resulted in the gradual deterioration of our fleet, which today has fallen to sixth place among the maritime nations of the world.

In addition to the withholding of cargoes, other Federal programs, such as the subsidy program of the Maritime Administration have been maladministered. Our maritime program receives far less of the tax dollar than either the aviation industry or the highway building program. Yet this subsidy program has been singled out—almost alone among the many subsidy programs—and has been subjected to violent attack as being wasteful.

It has been recognized for many decades that the strength of a nation's maritime industry can be directly correlated with the economic strength of the country itself. It is evident that the United States is very weak in this area. A powerful economic machine that does not have the transportation facilities for distribution is most surely subject to ultimate disaster.

It is with this in mind that we call today for an independent maritime agency to deal with the problems of the industry as only a separate agency can. These are the times that will determine the future international strength and position of our country, and failure to provide for a strong and capable merchant marine can only weaken this position.

We must pass H.R. 159 and get our merchant marine moving back on the road to strength and security.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 159 creating an independent Maritime Administration as one of the surest ways to solve our maritime problems.

Ever since the beginning of this century, the lot of the American merchant marine has been one of feast and famine. Today, we find ourselves virtually at the bottom of the heap among the maritime nations. There are many reasons why this is so, but I believe the key reason is that the Maritime Administration has been virtually voiceless for far too long.

Certainly an independent Maritime Administration will give its full attention to maritime problems. As it now exists, the Maritime Administration is buried in the Department of Commerce where it must compete with the many other functions administered by this Department. Furthermore, transfer of the Maritime Administration to the Department of Transportation, as proposed earlier this year by the administration, would simply be once again relegating the maritime interest.

That is the reason why I became one of the many cosponsors of legislation to create a separate Maritime Administration and that is why I rise today to record my support of the legislation before us.

An independent agency will have a direct line to Congress. In the House, we have already tried to make it easier for this agency to operate by approving the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the bill on annual maritime authorization. This means that this congressional committee, which bears such an enormous responsibility for the maritime program, will also have something to say about the money for that program.

An independent agency, working with a Congress that is prepared to move in the proper direction, can do a lot to get us moving again. An independent agency can devise a program for ship construction and ship operation that will insure that we have a new, fast, and efficient fleet that can compete with the other maritime powers.

In 1936, Congress recognized the maritime needs of the United States, and in the Merchant Marine Act of that year, created a maritime agency with independent status. This independent agency planned the development of the Victory and Liberty ships which served as workhorses of wartime ocean transport and which today comprise the major portion of our National Defense Reserve Fleet.

Planning by this independent agency made possible the large-scale mobilization of our shipyards and training of shipbuilding manpower to meet our wartime needs—planning that was so effective that our shipyards were able to produce thousands of new vessels within a few years.

After the war, when peacetime returned, this independent maritime agency was destroyed.

Mr. Chairman, right now we have less than 1,000 privately owned merchant ships to serve our commercial and defense needs. More than 80 percent of these ships are well over 20 years of age. This shocking neglect of our merchant fleet by the Federal Government has reduced the United States from first to sixth place among maritime nations. I hold that it is time for us to move with speed and with decisive action to correct this past neglect. I believe that an independent Maritime Administration, assisted by a Congress committed to improving our maritime posture, will provide the leverage we need to get the job done.

I urge passage of this bill and wish to personally commend the gentleman from Maryland, Chairman GARMATZ, and the other members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, for taking the lead in support of this legislation. I further commend the committee for their call to action, by requiring the Maritime Board to submit to Congress within 1 year, a report surveying the current condition of the American merchant marine and need for further legislation. It is this kind of positive congressional support that is needed to get to the heart of our maritime problems.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I join today with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries in support of this bill. I introduced a similar measure, since I have been deeply concerned with the future of the merchant marine. It seems to me that no nation can long remain either a strong nation or an international power, or maintain a viable economy if it does not provide strength in its maritime affairs.

Since the beginning of history, maritime development has been the measure of national vitality. Nations who have lost this vitality soon find themselves with economic and international difficulties.

If the United States is forced to purchase all ships abroad or ship in foreign bottoms, we eventually will become a satellite of others. The independence given the Federal Maritime Administration is essential and I congratulate the committee for presenting this bill today.

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Chairman, I have heard 1967 described as the year of decision for our Nation's merchant marine. If this is true—and I believe it is—then the decision we make in this body today on H.R. 159, to establish an independent Maritime Administration, will have more than ordinary significance.

A favorable vote on this measure will set us on the road toward the development of a reasonable national program and the investment of reasonable sums of money in the rebuilding and revitalizing of our merchant fleet. Thus we will be taking a long-delayed step toward regaining our position as a major maritime power.

We are all well aware of the downhill course which we have been following in recent years. I am sure this entire body is well versed in the sorry statistics of what has happened to our merchant fleet:

At the end of World War II, we had a merchant fleet of some 5,000 ships; today we have 900.

At the end of World War II, American-flag shipping carried 40 percent of our seaborne export-import cargoes; today our ships carry only about 7 percent of that cargo.

At the end of World War II, our merchant fleet provided jobs for 80,000 sailors; today these jobs have shrunk to only about 40,000.

At the end of World War II, we stood No. 1 among the nations of the world in shipping, and No. 1 in shipbuilding; today we are a poor sixth in shipping, and 16th in shipbuilding.

I think this decline of our merchant marine has been directly attributable to the fact that the executive department has failed to implement the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. Budgetary expediencies, rather than national need, have been allowed to dominate our maritime programs. Administration of maritime policy, which once rested in the hands of an independent and autonomous agency, has been downgraded over the years by incorporation of the Maritime Administration in the Department of Commerce.

Last year, Mr. Chairman, it was necessary to mount a major effort to keep maritime out of the newly created Department of Transportation. There are those who still cling to this idea of putting maritime into DOT, although if we did, this industry would be overshadowed, both in budget and in emphasis, by other modes of transportation.

This pending bill, Mr. Chairman, will reconstitute the Maritime Administration as an independent agency. Passage of this bipartisan legislation is the only way we can win this struggle to restore this vital industry to its proper position of size, strength, and prestige.

H.R. 159 has the overwhelming support of maritime management and labor. It has the backing of a significant majority in this body. And I am sure it has the backing of the majority of the American people, who realize that our military security, our economy and our international prestige all depend on a viable merchant marine.

On enacting this legislation, Mr. Chairman, we will be writing a new chapter in our continuing dedication to the building of a better merchant marine. And we will be making our contribution to a stronger, more productive, America.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, as one of the more than 100 Members who cosponsored the pending legislation, I am pleased to rise now in support of its passage.

We need an independent Maritime Administration to make it possible for our maritime industry to grow and expand at a rate equal to our ever-expanding international trade.

At the present time, this is not the case. While the volume of American trade steadily increases each year, the amount of that trade carried in American-flag ships is steadily declining. In 1965, American-flag ships carried only about 7.7 percent of total American foreign trade, and that percentage has now dropped to around 7 percent.

The American-flag merchant fleet simply is not keeping pace with the growth of our international trade, and as a result we are losing cargoes each year to our foreign competitors. In view of this steady and increasing decline, where will American-flag shipping stand against foreign competition by 1970? Where will it be by 1980?

By 1980, it is estimated that American foreign trade will have doubled in volume over its current rate. In other words, just to keep pace with this tremendous trade growth—just to keep American-flag cargo carriage at its current level of 7 percent—the cargo capacity of the American-flag fleet will have to be doubled.

Merely to keep pace, then, we will have to add about 1,000 new ships to our merchant fleet by 1980—to say nothing of replacing the old ships. How can we think of achieving that goal when we are building—at most—only 13 new ships a year?

For too long, Mr. Speaker, we have frittered away our vital maritime resources. We have cut back maritime budgets here on this Hill, or else the administration has failed to utilize the funds which we have appropriated, and so we do not get the new ships which we need.

We must reestablish an independent Maritime Administration to meet our current shipping and shipbuilding needs. An independent agency is the only one that would be able to plan for the large-scale development that is required to rebuild our declining shipyard industry and to add the numbers of ships to our merchant fleet which we must have to keep pace with expanding commercial and defense needs.

An independent Maritime Administration would assure that American maritime industry workers—seamen and shipbuilders—receive recognition by their Government of the important contribution they make to our economy. An independent agency will assure that American shipping and shipbuilding activities are not penalized in their competition with foreign operators and shipyards. An independent Maritime Administration will assure that the

American maritime industry will not be sacrificed by bureaucrats who seek some illusory savings by building ships abroad, or by using foreign-flag vessels.

Only with this legislation—H.R. 159—will we have the planning our Nation needs for maritime development and the protection of our maritime industry against foreign competition.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I consider the bill now before us, H.R. 159, one of the most important pieces of legislation we have considered in years. It is unfortunate that, after deciding by a better than 2-to-1 vote, that the problem of our merchant marine was too grave to be lost in the maze of the new Department of Transportation, Congress adjourned last year before it could act on a similar bill to establish this vitally needed independent Federal Maritime Administration.

I agree with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries [Mr. GARMATZ] that it is now even more necessary that we enact this legislation, as the number of privately owned ships operating under the American flag continues to decrease and the problems of merchant marine tonnage replacement grow ever greater.

To emphasize my long-standing sympathy with the widespread concern over the serious crisis facing American shipping and the crucial need for strong, affirmative action to meet the requirements of our defense as well as our commerce, I was among the 104 Members of the House who introduced bills this year to achieve the goal sought by the measure we are here considering.

We cannot overemphasize the importance of our having a sound, constructive maritime program enacted without delay. In 1953 we had 2,332 active ships, but of the 965 privately owned vessels in the U.S. fleet today, 682, or about 70 percent, are 20 years old or older.

Indeed, the national disgrace of the grossly inadequate attention given to our decline as a maritime nation is further stressed by the fact that the United States today ranks fifth in merchant fleet tonnage and 14th in shipbuilding. Moreover, the Soviet Union has made a startling advance in transforming itself from a minor maritime power to the point where this year it stands sixth in total tonnage but has 1,360 merchant vessels compared to our 965, despite our reactivating reserve fleet ships for Vietnam service.

Not only that, but since 1962, Russia has built 502 merchant ships to our 87. Last year, Russia spent approximately $1 billion on shipbuilding; this country spent some $106 million. Eighty percent of the Soviet fleet is less than 10 years old.

As a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I am especially aware that unless our shipbuilding effort is greatly increased, our defense commitments throughout the world will be in jeopardy. It is very regrettable that the Government departments recorded with respect to H.R. 159 oppose the creation of this independent Maritime Administration, which seems so essential to salvage American merchant shipping. However, I cannot help but believe that the President will concur in the overwhelming desire of the Congress and all segments of the shipping industry that we are on the right course. After the immediate problems appear to be resolved, it well may be appropriate for a well-organized and functioning Maritime Administration eventually to be drawn into the Department of Transportation.

Right now, however, just as we have an independent agency spearheading our travel in space, so should we have the concentrated, unimpeded guidance and development of our travel on the high seas as afforded by an independent Maritime Administration. It was Edward M. Hood, president of the Shipbuilders Council of America, who observed recently before the AFL–CIO Maritime Trades Department that the Russians achieved their aim of surpassing the United States by giving their shipbuilding program "priorities equivalent to or surpassing their outer space program." Mr. Hood continued:

> If one were to assess maritime developments of recent years, the phenomenal growth of Russia's fleet would take top honors as the most notable achievement. And, if one were to designate the greatest maritime calamity of the same period, the dubious award would have to go to the United States.

Certainly, this condition cannot be allowed to continue. Earlier this year, the Congress enacted the so-called Marad authorization bill—H.R. 158—to afford the same kind of needed congressional specialized attention given to Defense and other agencies in the matter of authorizing programs and appropriations. This was the first big step toward our making sure that the needed augmented maritime program is implemented. Enactment of the bill before us, H.R. 159, will really put us on the road toward modernization and expansion of the American merchant fleet. Among other things, it is especially worthy of note that it will provide a survey report by the new Maritime Board 1 year hence to guide the President and the Congress on what further must be done to help the United States to compete with Russia and the other maritime powers.

I hope, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that this bill will be overwhelmingly passed.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 159. This bill would create an independent Federal Maritime Administration. It is an important first step in the slow rebuilding process that we must undertake if this country is to have a merchant marine and a maritime industry that can meet our defense commitments and carry our goods to all the ports of the world.

For far too long, the maritime industry has been the stepchild of the Democratic administration. Its plight has gone unnoticed. Its problems have gone unsolved. Faced with this increasingly desperate situation, the House Republican policy committee has issued a series of statements that have helped to focus attention on the need to revitalize and modernize our merchant marine and shipbuilding industry.

I would like to include at this point in the RECORD the three Republican policy committee statements that deal with the maritime problem and the need for an independent Federal Maritime Administration. I also would like to include an article and an editorial that reflect the favorable response that these statements have received.

REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE STATEMENT ON THE AMERICAN MARITIME INDUSTRY

America is facing a crisis of major proportions with respect to its vital Merchant Marine. At the close of World War II, this country had a Merchant Marine fleet of over 3,500 vessels. By 1951 there were 1,955 active U.S. flag ships. Today there are only 1,000, including those reactivated for the Viet Nam War, and most of these are over 20 years old and near the end of their economic life.

The United States has dropped to 12th place among the world's major ship-building nations. Russia, on the other hand, has risen from 12th to 7th place as a maritime nation and is presently building an even larger merchant marine which she intends, by her own admission, to utilize as an instrument of foreign policy.

On January 1, 1966 the United States had only 45 ships under construction. And President Johnson's budget for fiscal 1967 provides only $85 million for our Merchant Marine ship construction. This represents a cut of $47 million from appropriations for the current year. It would permit construction of a maximum of 13 new ships. It is both significant and tragic that the Administration's total maritime budget for 1967 set a 7-year low. Although the 1965 State of the Union Message promised "a new policy for our merchant marine," nothing has materialized and the bickering and confusion among the various governmental agencies continues and grows.

By contrast, Russia boasts a merchant fleet of almost 1,500 vessels. Most are new and efficient ships built since 1950. Soviet orders for new ships rose from 225 in 1962 to 673 in 1964. Moreover, the Soviet Union is utilizing its satellites, and the Free World at a substantial cost in hard currency, for its merchant fleet expansion. For example, East German shipyards are scheduled to supply 399 merchant vessels. The Polish yards are working on Soviet orders for timber carriers and tankers.

The inadequacy of America's shipbuilding program is further highlighted by the fact that Japan has 199 merchant ships under construction, Great Britain 184 vessels, West Germany 176, and Sweden 44.

At the same time that our shipbuilding effort is lagging and our World War II reserve fleet is growing older and more dilapidated, the expanding war in Viet Nam is putting the United States merchant fleet under tremendous pressure. Tonnage volume to Viet Nam has leaped from 300,000 tons per month to 800,000 tons per month. Almost 470 ships are now under direct operational control of the Military Sea Transportation Service and most of these are engaged in the sea lift to Viet Nam. Moreover, because U.S. ships were not available, MSTS had to look to foreign flag vessels for help.

Much of the present problem is attributable to the fact that several years ago Secretary of Defense McNamara decided that he could reduce the role of ships in the defense picture. According to McNamara, air transport could be substituted as a primary military supply vehicle. Now, just 4 years after this disastrous management decision, 2 out of every 3 soldiers in Viet Nam had to be transported by ships and, as of January of this year, 98 percent of the supplies and cargo for the war went in by ship. The fact that it would take 260 of the C5A planes to carry the load of a single ship, and air transportation, if utilized, would cost 5 or 6 times as much per ton mile, further dramatizes our need for and dependency upon ships.

At the same time that shipping presents a grave problem for us, both Communist and

Free World ships continue to carry goods to and from North Viet Nam. In 1965 there were 199 Free World ship arrivals in North Viet Nam. Of this figure, 107 involved ships flying the flags of NATO countries. We know from our own experience that shipping, and the cargo that it brings to Viet Nam is an all-important factor in the prosecution of the war. Supply problems have hampered our effort. By the same token, Communist and Free World ships have supplied much of the goods and military supplies that have made it possible for the North Vietnamese to continue the war. Certainly, at a minimum, the penalties and restrictions imposed upon ships that engage in Cuban trade should be imposed upon those who trade with North Viet Nam.

The Merchant Marine shipbuilding effort in this country must be increased. Unless this is done, our defense commitments throughout the world will be in jeopardy. Indeed, our national survival may depend upon the shipping that should be under construction but which the Johnson-Humphrey Administration has scuttled. We demand that steps be taken to correct this disastrous situation. If the present trend continues, this country that once boasted the greatest merchant fleet in the world, will be left on history's shore waiting for ships that never come in.

Republican Policy Committee Warns of Major Crisis in American Maritime Industry

Due to neglect, confusion and a general inability to meet the mounting problem, the Johnson-Humphrey Administration has permitted the American Maritime Industry to drift into a major crisis.

Today, the United States has fewer privately owned seagoing merchant ships than in 1936. The percentage of United States flagships in the world's merchant fleet is one-half of what it was three decades ago. The percentage of American goods moving overseas on American ships is now the lowest in modern history. The United States has dropped to fifth among the nations in the size of our active merchant fleet and presently ranks fourteenth in shipbuilding. This national disgrace is heightened by the fact that 70% of our ships are twenty years or older and will be due for layup within the next five years.

More than two years have passed since the State of the Union Message in 1965 when the President promised ". . . a new policy for our merchant marine." To date, that promise remains unfilled. Moreover, in recent testimony, the Secretary of Transportation noted that he "would not seek (the President's) concurrence in the new program until I could assure him that it had general support within the maritime field—However, I must now report that we do not have the kind of agreement which will make such a program a reality." Thus, rather than decision, we have experienced indecision. In place of action, there has been near paralysis in federal leadership. While we are in a continued state of decline, the other maritime nations of the world have been building up their merchant fleets. Last year marked the third successive annual record for world merchant shipping launched.

The seriousness of this situation is graphically reflected by comparing the American maritime industry with that of Soviet Russia. "A 1966 Survey of Russian Merchant Shipping" prepared by the University of Washington, discloses that:

"In 1963 the Russians constructed 115 ships while America launched 31. Between 1959 and 1963 the American fleet increased by 20 fewer ships than the Russians produced in the single year 1963. Moreover, the amount of American seaborne commerce carried in American ships has declined from an already low of 11 per cent in 1960 to around 7 per cent today. The Russians, in contrast, have increased the amount of freight carried in their own bottoms from 33 per cent in 1955 and 45 per cent in 1962 to around 85 per cent in 1965."

There are indications that this country's sea transportation forces have been stretched to the limit to support the massive military operations in Vietnam. In order to meet our obligations there, a large number of old ships have been pulled out of the mothball fleet. These vessels, from 20 to 27 years old, have had a breakdown rate more than double the privately owned commercial fleet under charter for Vietnam service. Although faced with these dismal statistics, the Administration now proposes to modernize more of our aging reserve fleet while only increasing the new merchant ship construction in American yards from 13 to 15 ships a year.

Last year, the Administration attempted to transfer the Maritime Administration into the new Department of Transportation. Under Republican Leadership, this move was defeated and a plan was advanced that would establish an independent Maritime Administration. The proposed transfer would have done little more than shift the maritime problem to a new department. There was no sense of urgency or a call for a redirection of effort. Rather than meeting and solving the problems of the maritime industry, they would have been swept under a bureaucratic rug.

In this session of Congress, the Johnson-Humphrey Administration is continuing to display a dangerous disregard for the very serious problems of our maritime industry. The present situation has been described by the *Journal of Commerce* as follows:

"It is one thing to attempt enticing the shipping industry into the new Department of Transportation with vague promises of a totally new policy. It is quite another to display by current actions a curious indifference to the problems of merchant shipping and to indicate—when discussing the subject at all—not what ought to be done, but what the administration is unwilling to do or keep on doing."

In addition to its failure to develop a meaningful maritime policy, the Johnson-Humphrey Administration has undercut, if not scrapped, the forward-looking ship replacement program that was implemented during the Eisenhower Administration. At that time, it was clearly apparent that unless a program of this type was carried forward, the United States would face, in the foreseeable future, a maritime crisis of major proportions. The Administration's abandonment of the Eisenhower program has triggered just such a crisis. Its current indecisiveness and failure to mount anything more than a minimal program, have escalated the crisis to a point where it is bordering on a national catastrophe.

This Country needs and must have a modern merchant marine. We must revitalize and modernize our shipbuilding industry if the demands of the future are to be met. The need to develop a reasonable and defensible maritime program presents a challenge and an opportunity. 1967 is a year of decision for the American Maritime Industry. Unless our shipbuilding effort is increased our defense commitments throughout the world will be in jeopardy. Indeed, our national survival may depend upon the shipping that should now be under construction but which the Johnson-Humphrey Administration has scuttled.

House Republican Policy Committee Urges the Creation of an Independent Federal Maritime Administration—H.R. 159

The House Republican Policy Committee supports H.R. 159. This Bill would create an independent federal Maritime Administration which would be headed by a federal Maritime Administrator. All of the present duties of the Secretary of Commerce under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 would be transferred and vested in the Administrator and the 3-Member Board. In the 89th Congress and again at the outset of the 90th Congress, the Republican Leadership and the House Republican Policy Committee warned of a major crisis in the Maritime industry and urged that steps be taken to correct what could become a disastrous situation. The enactment of H.R. 159 would be an important first step in revitalizing our Maritime industry and restoring this country to its former position among the Maritime nations.

In February 1962, the then Deputy Chief of Naval Operations, Vice Admiral John Sylvester, stated:

"The strategic importance of ocean transportation in wartime dictates that the United States must have under its control sufficient active merchant type shipping to promptly meet our emergency sealift requirements.

"The slow rate of progress made in the replacement of aging vessels has left us with a largely obsolescent Merchant Marine. Orderly shipbuilding programs and replacement programs should be instituted without further delay."

On September 28, 1967, Admiral Thomas H. Moorer, Chief of Naval Operations, warned that the swift expansion of Soviet naval power poses a "challenge to our free use of the seas (that) is here for all to see."

The Johnson-Humphrey Administration has not met this challenge. The President's promise in 1965 of a "new policy for our Merchant Marine" has not been fulfilled. There has been indecision rather than action. As a result, the percentage of U.S. flagships in the world's merchant fleet is one-half of what it was three decades ago. The percentage of American goods moving overseas on American ships is at an all-time low. In 1966, the United States put only 13 new ships into service. The Soviets took delivery of 62 ships in the last six months of 1966 alone. Some 80% of the Soviet fleet is less than 10 years old while nearly 70% of the United States fleet is more than 20 years old.

Under the provisions of H.R. 159, an independent federal Maritime Administration with a Maritime Administrator at its head would be created. A Maritime Board composed of 3 Members would be established within the Administration. The federal Maritime Administrator would be the Chairman of the Board. All functions, powers and duties of the Secretary of Commerce and of the offices and officers of the Department of Commerce under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 would be transferred to or vested in the Administrator. H.R. 159 also requires that the Maritime Board submit to the President and to the Congress within one year after enactment, a report surveying the condition of the Merchant Marine, evaluating the effectiveness of existing law and making appropriate recommendations.

It is unfortunate that the Johnson-Humphrey Administration is opposed to H.R. 159. Action must be taken to reverse the downward trend of recent years. The creation of an independent federal Maritime Administration is a logical first step. It would break the present stalemate. It would underscore the importance of our Maritime industry. It would place Congress on record as being in favor of a Merchant Marine that can meet our defense commitments and once again carry the American flag to all the world ports of trade.

Once an independent Maritime Administration is established, the Maritime industry would cease to be a political football that is kicked from Department to Department. Moreover, the new Maritime Administration would have an opportunity to prepare a report which would contain long-range solutions to the many problems besetting the Maritime industry. In its recommendations, it could propose a course of action that would provide this country with a modern Merchant Marine and a revitalized and modernized shipbuilding industry.

A reasonable and forward-looking Maritime program must be developed. The neglect, confusion and inactivity of recent years must be ended. The Republican sponsored and supported bill, H.R. 159, was reported from Committee on August 31, 1967. It was given a rule on September 27, 1967. It should be scheduled for Floor action without further delay.

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Examiner, May 19, 1967]

THE FEEBLE U.S. MERCHANT FLEET

The House Republican Policy Committee ominously reports on the American merchant marine:

"Today the United States has fewer privately owned seagoing merchant ships than in 1936." (Incredible!)

"The percentage of American goods moving overseas on American ships is one half what it was three decades ago." (Shameful!)

"The United States has dropped to fifth among the nations in size of active merchant fleets and presently ranks 14th in shipbuilding." (Frightening!)

The neglect of the American merchant fleet is at the same time the neglect of an essential arm of national defense. While the airlift to Vietnam has been justifiably praised, 98 percent of the supplies carried there are borne by sea, in vessels four-fifths of which are more than 20 years old.

At the time our merchant fleet more and more takes on the silhouette of a bunch of tubs, Soviet Russia's commercial carriers vastly increase in number and quality. Her shipyards, and those of her satellites, are operating near capacity.

From 1950 to 1966, the Soviet fleet grew from 432 ships of 1.8 million deadweight tons to 1422 ships of 10.4 million tons.

Our fleet shrank from 1900 ships of 22 million tons to fewer than 1100 of 14.8 million tons.

America, whose proud Clippers roamed the trade routes everywhere, now can move only seven percent of its world commerce in its own ships.

But the U.S. is not left bobbing in the wake of only the Russians. Other nations are gaining too. Last year another annual record was set in world merchant ship launchings.

Labor, capital and government must team to restore the American flag to world ports of trade. The House Republicans have their teeth in a sound issue. They must not let it go.

[From the Journal of Commerce, Oct. 12, 1967]

GOP BACKS INDEPENDENT SHIP AGENCY—HOUSE POLICY GROUP SAYS ADMINISTRATION HASN'T MET CHALLENGE

(By Robert F. Morison)

WASHINGTON, October 11.—House Republicans today formally endorsed legislation to establish an independent maritime promotional agency, labeling it a step that "must be taken to reverse the downtrend of recent years."

In a partisan statement from the House Republican Policy Committee, under the chairmanship of Rep. John J. Rhodes (Ariz.), the present Democratic administration, which opposes an independent Maritime Administration, was accused of not meeting the "challenge" of the decline of U.S. merchant fleet and the rise of the Russian and Soviet Bloc maritime effort.

FURTHER DECLINES

President Johnson's January, 1965, promise of a "new policy for our merchant marine" has not been fulfilled and there has been "indecision rather than action" since then with the result that U.S. flag ships have steadily declined and are carrying less each year of total foreign trade.

Accompanying Rep. Rhodes at a brief news conference was Rep. Gerald R. Ford (Mich.), House Minority Leader, who has been the key GOP leader in converting the shipping problem into a partisan issue.

Rep. Ford reported that there was no indication yet that the House Democratic leadership will schedule the legislation (HR 159) for establishment of an independent Maritime Administration for consideration. (The bill died in the last Congress when the House leadership failed to schedule it for debate, in part, presumably in deference to the Senate's disinterest and the administration's opposition.)

Rep. Rhodes said the U.S. decline in merchant shipbuilding in this country was "not good for the economy or the defense position."

Neither Rep. Rhodes nor Rep. Ford discussed how their party's economy battle with President Johnson squared with their partisan concern for a new and more costly maritime program, including sizable increases in subsidized ship construction.

Some GOP members have argued that the merchant marine is intimately tied to the defense effort and as such enjoys, or should enjoy, a higher priority among spending programs.

READY FOR ACTION

The independent MA bill was cleared by the House Rules Committee Sept. 27 and "should be scheduled for floor action without further delay," the GOP policy committee said.

The administration, with reluctance, has already accepted this year a congressional authorization process for future maritime programs, but has stood firm for ultimate inclusion of MA in the Department of Transportation.

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Chairman, we are today contemplating the establishment of the Maritime Administration as an independent agency in the executive branch. I am speaking today in defense of such an independent maritime agency because I believe that Maritime Administration has far too long been incorporated in an organizational framework whose prime consideration lay elsewhere than with the state of the American merchant marine. This organizational subservience has been in some ways a factor in the declining lot of the American marine capacity. Yet subservience is hardly our goal in this matter, despite the appropriateness on the surface of incorporation within the Department of Transportation. An independent Maritime Administration is, I feel, the organizational form most likely to develop the single-minded purpose and flexibility which is going to be necessary if we desire to see the situation we bemoan today improve tomorrow. The American merchant marine has been neglected, and as certainly as it has been neglected, it must be rejuvenated and brought back to life.

I am sure you are all familiar with the present plight of the merchant marine. The decline of our tonnage capacity at the time that the tonnage of the fleets of the rest of the world has greatly expanded is familiar to all. The decline of the maritime industry is dangerous to our military posture in a time of national crisis and represents a real threat to our economic security. A brief look at the record will justify my statement:

Twenty years ago the United States had a merchant marine fleet of 5,000 ships, American-built, American-owned, American-manned. Today there are only about 900 of these U.S.-flag vessels.

Twenty years ago American-flag shipping carried 40 percent of our seaborne export-import cargoes. Today, foreign-flag vessels carry about 93 percent of that cargo.

Twenty years ago some 80,000 sailors were able to find jobs on American-flag vessels. Today, those jobs have shrunk to less than 50,000.

Twenty years ago the United States ranked first in merchant shipping. Today we are sixth.

Twenty years ago we were the world's leader in shipbuilding. Today we are 16th.

In Japan today, it takes 2½ months to build a ship according to the assembly-line methods they have developed, from the laying of the keel to the launching. In another 2½ months the ship is delivered to the buyer. To construct giant tankers such as the Japanese are now building in less than half a year is a fantastic accomplishment. This was certainly an eye-opening experience for me when I visited Japan last spring, and forcefully brought home the necessity for upgrading our shipbuilding technology to insure our future ability to compete in the world market.

I am not saying that an independent agency, simply by its creation, will guarantee the building of a strong merchant marine. What I am saying is that the Department of Commerce has not devoted single-minded purpose and energy to the development of a first-class merchant marine. I have seen nothing to indicate the Department of Transportation would do any better. The Secretary of Transportation himself is a man with no maritime experience whatsoever.

I am aware that a share of the shortcoming is—as in all things—budgetary. This restraint will be felt by an independent Maritime Administration. I am not, however, impressed with the argument that this restraint will have the same debilitating effects upon an independent Maritime Administration which could present and implement a well-constructed program effectively as it would were this function absorbed in the Cabinet-level Department of Transportation.

I strongly feel that an independent Maritime Administration is the best organizational form for incorporating the singlemindedness of purpose and flexibility necessary for the development of a meaningful program of ship construction, cargo preference, and operating assistance, so that we can get back up there as a world maritime nation again.

One of my constituents put the matter pithily, but well, when he wrote:

> We are proud of our Ship of State and in order to keep it so we had better be concerned about the state of our ships.

The establishment of the Maritime Administration as an independent agency in the executive branch would be the first major step in the task of rebuilding our merchant marine so that we can reestablish the United States as a major power on the seven seas.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my support for the bill pending before us, H.R. 159, which will create an independent Federal Maritime Administration to look after the sagging fortunes of our American merchant fleet.

The purpose of this bill is to get our maritime operations and policymaking out of any larger agency where its interests must compete with those of a multitude of diverse operations, and it has been necessitated by the startling loss of American maritime supremacy over the past two decades. This shocking decline can be well illustrated with statistics, Mr. Chairman. I point to the fact that American-flag ships are today carrying only some 8 percent of our import and export cargoes; at the end of World War II the figure was 40 percent. In the same period we have witnessed a decline of our merchant fleet from 5,000 active ships to 900 today, a downward trend that is made even more alarming by the obsolescence of 70 to 80 percent of this fleet.

Where at the end of World War II the United States was the No. 1 maritime power, we have now slipped to sixth in gross tonnage, and there is no indication that we will not drop further with our planning calling for only 13 to 15 new ships a year out of our shipyards. Significantly, Russia has been consistently and determinedly expanding its maritime activities, and we are advised that the U.S.S.R. does not hesitate to devote up to 5 percent of its national budget on shipping and shipbuilding. Whereas they had only 500 merchant ships, with a gross tonnage of 1.5 million, in 1953, the inauguration of Soviet crash programs has increased these totals by 1966 to 1,437 ships, with 7,290,000 gross registered tons. Russian ships are plying all sealanes in the world today and usurping markets that once were ours. When we consider the strategic value of this dramatically expanded trade to Soviet economic aspirations, it is time we take heed and form a concerted national policy to regain our lost supremacy. The U.S. shipbuilding program is 100 vessels behind schedule at present, and we must compare the 386 ships built for the U.S. flag since 1947 with the 581 ships which Russia had under construction or on order as of May 1966 alone.

America's decline in this intense worldwide competition may well be the result of many interlocking and complex factors, Mr. Chairman, but we cannot blink the fact that our international decline has followed directly and consecutively on the abolition of the independent U.S. Maritime Commission in 1950. This five-man body was created by the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 to implement an expressed congressional policy of maintaining a strong competitive American-built fleet of U.S.-flag ships. It is no wonder when we observe the picture of our decline to sixth in gross tonnage and 14th in worldwide shipbuilding that those who are most familiar with our maritime preeminence view the creation of an independent agency as the best hope for reversing this recent trend. Though the present administration has been promising to send up to Congress a new maritime policy since January of 1965, we are still awaiting such a development, and it appears now that nothing will be done unless Congress takes the lead. An independent Maritime Administration, staffed hopefully with experts familiar with and concerned over the importance of maritime power, is a hopeful first step that it appears we must now take.

We must reckon a vigorous and competitive merchant fleet as having significance not only in maintaining a strong position in world commerce, but for its vital role as an adjunct of our naval strength, and not least as a symbol of our world leadership. To allow the present trend to continue is to ensure that in the future our maritime situation may be beyond recovery. Valuable shipbuilding skills will be lost through declining employment in shipyards, and skilled seagoing personnel will not be available for future contingencies for the same reason. We already have some 100 foreign ships under charter to the MSTS in the Far East, and an increasing number of U.S. ships are being manned by foreign nationals. The president of the American Maritime Association, Mr. Archibald King, head of Isthmian Lines, has recently warned that without a massive and immediate shipbuilding program, American lines will have to build replacement vessels abroad just to stay afloat.

The administration's answers do not appear adequate. Along with the decline in the annual budget request for maritime activities, we have been confronted with proposals to build U.S.-flag ships in foreign shipyards; to rehabilitate 250 presently inactive vessels, at great cost to the taxpayer, only to be returned to the reserve fleet; to provide Government support for construction of only 15 new ships a year instead of the 30 to 40 annual minimum we should be aiming for. Time is running out on us, Mr. Chairman. The process of design, construction, and delivery of new ships can continue 5 years and upwards, and any further delay in revitalizing our maritime program may be disastrous. Even now, with the necessity of pressing reserve ships into action for the conveyance of material to Southeast Asia, we are finding them largely overage, and in many cases beyond economical repair. American ships have broken down at sea, long and costly delays have resulted from obsolescence, and it is doubtful that we could begin to meet our needs if another similar emergency situation were to arise anywhere in the world. With the Russian merchant marine capability rapidly approaching 2,000 ships to fill the vacuum left by our decline, with countries like Greece and Japan accelerating their shipbuilding activities, there is ample evidence of the fruitful trade available to those who are preparing to take advantage of it. In addition, those who can remember our great convoys during World War II will readily acknowledge the importance of the merchant marine as a fourth arm of our military capability, and I am convinced that if we fail to take this into consideration, we are faced with future problems of great magnitude.

Mr. Chairman, in 1966 I was one of those who advocated keeping the Maritime Administration out of the new Department of Transportation, not because of a lack of trust in such an agency, but because of the urgency of immediate and sharp focus on the critical condition of our merchant fleet. I am today voting also to remove the Maritime Administration from the Department of Commerce with the hope that as an independent agency, it will carry more weight in the high counsels of the administration and will be able to muster the support to reverse the loss of our international preeminence in maritime activities. I urge my colleagues to join me in this first, but crucial, step.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in support of H.R. 159, as amended. This bill, if enacted, will create an independent Federal Maritime Administration not under any other department, agency, or instrumentality of the Government, nor under the authority of the head of any department, agency, or instrumentality. I believe that the need for enactment of this legislation is most important, if once again the United States is to have a thriving merchant marine. A step toward reinstating our maritime industry to its proper role as a "first-class citizen" would be the creation of an independent Federal Maritime Administration as provided for in this bill. Therefore, I am grateful for the opportunity of again expressing my support of H.R. 159, because I am one of the sponsors of this proposal, my bill being H.R. 6837.

On March 8, 1967, I introduced H.R. 6837, to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, to create an independent Federal Maritime Administration, and for other purposes. While the bill before us today, H.R. 159, is the committee bill, it contains the principal objectives, functions and structures of my bill.

H.R. 159, which is cited as the Federal Maritime Act of 1967, provides for the establishment of the Administration to be headed by a Federal Maritime Administrator appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. Within this Administration there would be established a Maritime Board composed of three members, one of whom would be the Federal Maritime Administrator who would act as Chairman of the Board.

On July 17, 1967, it was my privilege to submit a statement to the Merchant Maritime Subcommittee of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries in support of my bill. During the course of my statement, I mentioned that statistics have shown that the 10 major free world maritime powers carry between 30 and 50 percent of their own national trade, while the United States carries less than 8 percent.

Mr. Chairman, there is no question in

my mind but that our balance of payments would be greatly improved if American foreign trade was carried in American ships manned by American crews, instead of transported by foreign-flag vessels. In my statement I brought out that—

> Each time a ship engaged in foreign trade sails into an American port, several complicated transactions take place in the ocean transportation account of our balance of payments. Depending on whether the ship is carrying export or import cargo, dollars in payment for goods and services flow into the United States and abroad.
>
> If exports are carried in American ships manned by American crews, there is no question but that the balance of payments is improved as far as the United States is concerned. Just as obviously, if the goods are carried on foreign flag vessels, manned by foreign crews, our balance of payments is further eroded.
>
> Because more and more of these ships have been of foreign registry, the outflow of dollars and gold has increased. That is why, since 1959, there has been a chronic deficit in the ocean transportation account. This, in turn, contributes to the deficit in our balance of payments, as a whole.

Mr. Chairman, I urge passage of H.R. 159, enabling all of the functions, powers, and duties of the Secretary of Commerce and other offices and officers of the Department of Commerce under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 and other laws and provisions of law enumerated in the bill, to be transferred and vested in the Administrator and in the Maritime Board as specifically provided for in the bill before us. No other American industry competes so directly with foreign-flag competitors as does the maritime industry. Therefore, let us recognize independence for the Maritime Administration, which, I am convinced, will provide the most efficient and effective implementation of our national maritime policy as intended in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, there could not be a more opportune moment for the House to consider the establishment of an independent Federal Maritime Administration. In recent months some of the issues involved have been brought to the attention of Congress in a fashion that paves the way for consideration of the bill before us now.

I refer to the recent Department of Defense Appropriation and the House-passed amendment to prohibit the use of funds in 1968 for the construction of any naval vessel in a foreign shipyard.

In the debate on this amendment the sad state of the U.S. shipping industry and our increasing dependence on foreign shipyards to meet American needs was clearly stated. And the House showed its feeling by twice expressing strong objection to this trend of events.

The issue before us today is much more compelling. The plain fact is that on the seas, the United States is not just second rate, we are in sixth place, and still declining. The figures tell the point graphically. After World War II the U.S. merchant fleet consisted of over 5,000 ships. Today there are only 900 privately owned ships flying our flag. In 1936 when the Merchant Marine Act was passed we were carrying approximately 30 percent of our foreign waterborne commerce. Today 92 percent of our trade to foreign countries is carried on foreign ships.

Why is this a precarious position for a country of our size in today's world?

The first danger is to our system of national defense. Our merchant marine fleet has rightly been called the fourth arm of national defense. At a time when peace is tied intrinsically to a balance of power our merchant fleet is the Achilles' heel of national defense.

In debate on the Defense appropriation bill, the House recognized the danger of our dependence on a foreign shipyard for critical parts of American vessels. Surely it is much more significant that over 90 percent of our foreign waterborne trade is dependent on foreign ships.

A second significance of the present situation is its impact on foreign trade. The operation of trade routes is critical to the establishment of markets and exchange patterns. It is naive to blithely depend on the charter ships from other nations, while ignoring the importance of our own lack of capacity. A secure foreign trade cannot be maintained on such a foundation.

For example, our present policy is directly contributing to our balance-of-payments deficit. Money now going to pay foreign concerns and crews makes up a significant part of our dollar drain—a loss we can do something about.

The Merchant Marine Act of 1936 stated that we must have a merchant fleet sufficient to carry our domestic waterborne commerce and a "substantial portion" of our waterborne foreign commerce. Quite obviously this policy has not been maintained.

But this does point up the key to a solution of the problems of today's merchant marine. We need a comprehensive program and a comprehensive examination of the problems. A look at the steady decline of our fleet is obvious proof that direction within the Commerce Department simply cannot provide the guidance that is urgently required.

The administration would have us transfer the control to the Department of Transportation but this is not a solution. The same administration problems would still exist; the merchant marine would be buried under a superstructure where it cannot effectively make its voice heard. Only as an independent body will it be able to have the scope and concentration necessary to rescue our merchant marine from a spiraling decline.

I urge my colleagues to recognize that a much greater problem exists in the drastic decline of our merchant marine. The clear solution is the passage of H.R. 159 and the establishment of an independent Merchant Marine Administration.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will now read the substitute committee amendment as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Federal Maritime Act of 1967".

Sec. 2. Section 201(a) of title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 201. (a)(1) There is hereby established an agency to be known as the Federal Maritime Administration (hereafter in this subsection referred to as the 'Administration'), which shall be an independent agency not under any other department, agency, or instrumentality of the executive branch of the Government, or under the authority of the head of any such department, agency, or instrumentality.

"(2) There shall be at the head of the Administration a Federal Maritime Administrator (hereafter in this subsection referred to as the 'Administrator'), who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for a term of four years, except that the term of the Administrator first appointed shall expire on June 30, 1969. Each Administrator appointed to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of his predecessor. Upon expiration of his term of office, each Administrator shall continue to serve until his successor shall have been appointed and shall have qualified. The Administrator shall be compensated at the rate provided for level III of the Executive Schedule.

"(3) Except to the extent transferred to the Maritime Board by section 3(a) of the Federal Maritime Act of 1967, all functions, powers, and duties of the Secretary of Commerce and other offices and officers of the Department of Commerce under this Act and under the following laws and provisions of law are hereby transferred to and vested in the Administrator:

"(A) The Merchant Marine Act, 1920 (41 Stat. 988; 46 U.S.C. 861 et seq.).

"(B) The Merchant Marine Act, 1928 (45 Stat. 689; 46 U.S.C. 891 et seq.).

"(C) The Shipping Act, 1916 (39 Stat. 728; 46 U.S.C. 801 et seq.).

"(D) The Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 41; 50 U.S.C. App. 1735 et seq.).

"(E) The Maritime Academy Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 622; 46 U.S.C. 1381 et seq.).

"(F) The Act of June 12, 1940 (54 Stat. 346; 46 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.).

"(G) The United States Fishing Fleet Improvement Act (74 Stat. 212; 46 U.S.C. 1401 et seq.).

"(H) The Act of September 14, 1961 (75 Stat. 514; 46 U.S.C. 1126b–1).

"(I) The Act of July 24, 1956, ch. 671 (70 Stat. 605; 46 U.S.C. 249 et seq.).

"(J) The Act of August 9, 1954 (68 Stat. 675; 50 U.S.C. 196 et seq.).

"(K) Section 500 of the Transportation Act, 1920 (41 Stat. 499; 49 U.S.C. 142).

"(L) Reorganization Plan No. 21 of 1950 (64 Stat. 1273; 46 U.S.C. 1111 note).

"(M) Reorganization Plan No. 7 of 1961 (75 Stat. 840; 46 U.S.C. 1111 note).

"(N) Reorganization Plan No. 6 of 1949 (63 Stat. 1069; 46 U.S.C. 1111 note).

"(4) There shall be in the Administration a Deputy Maritime Administrator who shall be appointed by the Administrator and who shall perform such duties as the Administrator shall prescribe. The Deputy Maritime Administrator shall be Acting Administrator during the absence or disability of the Administrator, except that the Deputy Maritime Administrator shall at no time sit as a member or acting member of the Maritime Board."

Sec. 3. (a) There is hereby established within the Federal Maritime Administration (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "Administration") a Maritime Board (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "Board"). There are hereby transferred to the Board—

(1) all functions, powers, and duties of the Federal Maritime Board transferred to it

under sections 105 (1), (2), and (3) of Reorganization Plan Numbered 21 of 1950 (64 Stat. 1274; 46 U.S.C. 1111 note) and subsequently vested in the Secretary of Commerce by section 202(b) of Reorganization Plan Numbered 7 of 1961 (75 Stat. 842; 46 U.S.C. 1111 note), and

(2) all functions, powers, and duties of the Secretary of Commerce and the other offices and officers of the Department of Commerce under the following provisions of law:

(A) Title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (52 Stat. 969; 46 U.S.C. 1271 et seq.).

(B) The first proviso of the second paragraph under the heading "Maritime Activities" in title I of the Department of Commerce and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1958 (71 Stat. 73; 46 U.S.C. 1177a), to the extent it relates to operating-differential subsidies.

(C) The matter appearing under the subheading "Vessel Operations Revolving Fund" in chapter VIII of the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951 (65 Stat. 59; 46 U.S.C. 1241a), to the extent it relates to the vessel operations revolving fund.

(D) The paragraph entitled "Federal Ship Mortgage Insurance Fund", under the heading "Maritime Activities" in title I of the Department of Commerce and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1959 (72 Stat. 231; 46 U.S.C. 1280).

(E) Section 206 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (49 Stat. 1987; 46 U.S.C. 1116).

(F) Sections 210 and 211 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (49 Stat. 1989; 46 U.S.C. 1120 and 1121) and the first sentence of section 12 of the Shipping Act, 1916 (39 Stat. 732; 46 U.S.C. 811).

(G) Section 215 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (52 Stat. 954; 46 U.S.C. 1125).

(H) Sections 5, 7, 9, and 10 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920 (41 Stat. 990, 991, and 992; 46 U.S.C. 864, 866, 868, and 869), and section 203 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1928 (45 Stat. 690; 46 U.S.C. 891c).

(I) Section 5 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 43; 50 U.S.C. App. 1738).

(J) Sections 9, 37, and 41 of the Shipping Act, 1916 (39 Stat. 730; 46 U.S.C. 808, 835, and 839).

(K) Subsection O of section 30 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920 (46 U.S.C. 967).

(b) The Board shall be composed of three members as follows: The Federal Maritime Administrator (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "Administrator"), who shall be Chairman of the Board, and two additional members appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Not more than two members of the Board shall be from the same political party. The two additional Board members appointed by the President shall—

(1) be appointed for terms of four years; except that the terms of the members first appointed shall expire as follows: one on June 30, 1970, and one on June 30, 1971; and

(2) be compensated at the rate provided for level IV of the Executive Schedule.

Each member appointed to fill a vacany shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of his predecessor. Upon expiration of his term of office, each member shall continue to serve until his successor shall have been appointed and shall have qualified. No appointed member shall engage in any other business, vocation, or employment.

(c) A vacancy in the Board shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original appointment. One vacancy in the Board shall not impair the power of the remaining two members to exercise the authority of the Board. Any two members of the Board shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, and the concurring votes of any two members shall be sufficient for the disposition of any matter which may come before the Board.

(d)(1) The Board may, by published order or rule, delegate to the Administrator, any officer or office within the Administration, an individual member of the Board, a hearing examiner, or an employee or an employee board, any function of the Board including any function with respect to hearing, determining, ordering, certifying, reporting, or otherwise acting as to any work, business, or matter.

(2) With respect to the delegation of any function under paragraph (1) of this subsection, the Board shall retain a discretionary right to review any action taken pursuant to such delegated function, upon its own initiative or upon petition of a party to or an intervenor in such action, within such time and in such manner as the Board shall by rule prescribe. The vote of one member of the Board shall be sufficient to bring any such action before the Board for review.

(3) Should the Board decline to review any action taken pursuant to any function delegated pursuant to paragraph (1), or should no review be sought within the time stated in the rules promulgated by the Board, then the action taken shall for all purposes, including appeal or review thereof, be deemed to be the action of the Board.

Sec. 4. Decisions of the Board made pursuant to the exercise of functions, powers, and duties vested in it shall be administratively final, and appeals as authorized by law shall be taken directly to the courts.

Sec. 5. With respect to any function, power, or duty which is transferred from the Secretary of Commerce to the Board by section 3(a), the Board shall have the same functions, powers, and duties as the Secretary of Commerce had under sections 208 and 214 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (49 Stat. 1988 and 1991; 46 U.S.C. 1118 and 1124), with respect to such transferred function, power, or duty before its transfer.

Sec. 6. The provisions of the last sentence of section 201(b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 U.S.C. 1111(b)), shall apply with respect to the Administrator, members of the Board and all officers and employees of the Administration. The first two sentences of section 201(b) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 (46 U.S.C. 1111(b)) are repealed.

Sec. 7. The Administrator and members of the Board shall be appointed with due regard to their fitness for the efficient discharge of the powers and duties vested in them and may be removed by the President only for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office.

Sec. 8. So much of the personnel, property, and records employed, used, held, available, or to be made available, in connection with the functions transferred to the Administrator and to the Board by the provisions of this Act, as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget determines necessary, shall be transferred to the Administration, or to the Board, as the case may be.

Sec. 9. Part II of Reorganization Plan Numbered 21 of 1950, and part II and section 303(c) of Reorganization Plan Numbered 7 of 1961, are repealed.

Sec. 10. Nothing in this Act or any of the amendments made by this Act shall be deemed to affect (1) the Federal Maritime Commission established by part I of Reorganization Plan Numbered 7 of 1961, or (2) any of the functions of such Commission.

Sec. 11. Within one year after enactment of this Act, the Board shall submit to the President and to the Congress a report surveying the current condition of the American merchant marine and evaluating this current condition against the criteria set forth in title I of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936. The report shall include among other matters an evaluation of the effectiveness of existing maritime legislation and programs implementing such legislation, and shall contain appropriate recommendations for such further legislation or programs as the Board deems necessary with particular emphasis upon fostering the development of those shipping services of the American merchant marine which do not receive construction differential subsidy or operating differential subsidy under titles V and VI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (49 Stat. 1985; 46 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.).

Sec. 12. This Act, and the amendments made by this Act, shall take effect on the sixtieth day after the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. GARMATZ (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the committee substitute amendment be considered as read and printed in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I just want to ask one or two questions. Does this bill have vigorous opposition from the administration, from the White House or any part of the administration?

Mr. GARMATZ. Is the gentleman asking me whether I expect any opposition?

Mr. GROSS. Does it have vigorous opposition? What is the nature of the opposition? Is the administration opposed to this bill?

Mr. GARMATZ. It is opposed only by the Secretary of Transportation, Mr. Boyd. So far as the White House is concerned, I personally have no information.

Mr. GROSS. What I am trying to get at is this: What position would we find ourselves in in voting on this bill and being confronted with a veto? Is that likely or unlikely?

Mr. GARMATZ. That is a question I cannot answer.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman have any word? Is this bill veto-proof?

Mr. GARMATZ. On that I cannot assure the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee substitute amendment.

The committee substitute amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. Price of Illinois) having assumed the chair, Mr. Daddario, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 159) to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create an independent Federal Maritime Administration, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 931, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 326, nays 44, not voting 62, as follows:

[Roll No. 316]

YEAS—326

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Ayres
Baring
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Biester
Blackburn
Blanton
Blatnik
Boland
Bow
Brasco
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Bush
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Carey
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Cohelan
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Corbett
Corman
Cowger
Cunningham
Curtis
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Delaney
Denney
Dent
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, La.
Eilberg
Esch
Eshleman
Farbstein
Feighan
Fino
Flood
Flynt
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Gallagher
Gardner
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hammerschmidt
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey
Hathaway
Hawkins
Heckler, Mass.
Helstoski
Henderson
Hicks
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Karsten
Karth
Kee
Keith
Kelly
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kleppe
Kornegay
Kupferman
Kuykendall
Kyros
Leggett
Lennon
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Lukens
McCarthy
McClure
McCulloch
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
Macdonald, Mass.
MacGregor
Machen
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin
Mathias, Calif.
Mathias, Md.
Matsunaga
Meeds
Meskill
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Monagan
Moore
Morgan
Morris, N. Mex.
Morse, Mass.
Morton
Mosher
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Myers
Natcher
Nelsen
Nichols
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Passman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Philbin
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pollock
Pool
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Pryor
Pucinski
Quie
Quillen
Railsback
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Riegle
Rivers
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roudebush
Roybal
Ruppe
Ryan
Sandman
Satterfield
St Germain
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherle
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Selden
Shipley
Shriver
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Okla.
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Tenzer
Thompson, Ga.
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Tiernan
Tuck
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Waggonner
Waldie
Walker
Wampler
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Whalen
Whalley
Whitener
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams, Pa.
Wilson, Charles H.
Winn
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Zablocki
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—44

Ashley
Bevill
Bingham
Bolling
Brademas
Brinkley
Brooks
Burleson
Cabell
Conyers
Dow
Fascell
Fisher
Hamilton
Hardy
Hechler, W. Va.
Holifield
Jacobs
Jarman
Kastenmeier
Kyl
Langen
McClory
McFall
Mayne
Montgomery
Moss
Nedzi
Pickle
Reuss
Roberts
Rogers, Fla.
Roush
Rumsfeld
Scheuer
Sikes
Smith, Iowa
Steed
Stratton
Stuckey
Vanik
White
Whitten
Yates

NOT VOTING—62

Albert
Aspinall
Boggs
Bolton
Bray
Brock
Broomfield
Button
Cramer
Culver
Dawson
Dellenback
Diggs
Edwards, Calif.
Erlenborn
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Findley
Foley
Fountain
Fulton, Tenn.
Goodell
Gude
Hays
Hébert
Herlong
Holland
Irwin
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Kazen
Kluczynski
Laird
Landrum
Latta
McMillan
Madden
Mahon
May
Moorhead
Multer
Olsen
Patman
Purcell
Rarick
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Resnick
St. Onge
Snyder
Stephens
Teague, Tex.
Tunney
Udall
Utt
Vigorito
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Young

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Foley with Mr. Jonas.
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Cramer.
Mr. Culver with Mr. Findley.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Bray.
Mr. Boggs with Mr. Utt.
Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Goodell.
Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Reid of New York.
Mr. Olsen with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Irwin with Mr. Snyder.
Mr. Tunney with Mrs. Bolton.
Mr. Everett with Mr. Erlenborn.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Laird.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Latta.
Mr. Resnick with Mr. Dellenback.
Mr. Herlong with Mrs. May.
Mr. Multer with Mr. Gude.
Mr. Albert with Mr. Bob Wilson
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Landrum.
Mr. Madden with Mr. McMillan.
Mr. Edwards of California with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Fountain with Mr. Hays.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Holland.
Mr. Mahon with Mr. Willis.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Vigorito.
Mr. Young with Mr. Williams of Mississippi.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Rarick.
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Evans of Colorado.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Rees.

Mr. BROOKS changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. O'KONSKI changed his vote from "nay"' to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter on the bill H.R. 159.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE UNITED STATES WILL KEEP ITS WORD

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, some of our critics, domestic and foreign, have said that our efforts to help South Vietnam resist Communist aggression amount to reckless intervention which constitutes a threat to world peace. They say that we are fighting the specter of monolithic communism which no longer exists in the polycentric Communist world.

I would ask these critics two questions: First, who undertook as far back as 1959, long before we had combat troops in Vietnam, to attempt through subversion and terror to seize control of South Vietnam? Who has infiltrated men and equipment, as we spelled out in a white paper on Vietnam released in December 1961? I suggest the reckless intervention has come from Hanoi and history and the facts bear this out.

The second question I would ask the critics is: Are we to ignore the solemn commitments given to the South Vietnamese people—commitments made by four successive American Presidents of both political parties? The whole system of international security built up in the postwar period rests on the trust and faith that America does honor its commitments, that America does keep its word, that America does not and will not acquiesce to Communist aggression or wars of national liberation. If we were to pull out of Vietnam, leaving the 17 million Vietnamese people to Communist domination, the implications for our overall foreign policy and worldwide position would be immediate and catastrophic. Can a system built on trust and faith endure when this trust and faith are breached? But we will not unilaterally withdraw from Vietnam, we will not break our word, we will not abandon the Vietnamese to Hanoi's domination.

Our Government, other governments, world leaders such as His Holiness the Pope, have undertaken countless initiatives trying to bring this conflict to a peaceful and honorable settlement. The answer of Hanoi to all these efforts, all these proposals, has been a flat "No." One can only conclude that Hanoi does not want peace except on its own terms. And while these efforts to get negotiations continue, we have no option but to espond to the continuing military and terrorist pressures of the Vietcong and Hanoi. Progress has been made, the Communist military buildup has been blunted, and Hanoi is paying a high price for its aggression.

ABM SYSTEM SEEN OUTDATED

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Gen. Billy Mitchell was right. I keep his picture in my office in the Rayburn Building as a constant reminder that our leaders were wrong—military and political leaders.

If the Western World leaders and the Congress had listened to Billy Mitchell, there would have been no Pearl Harbor and, I believe, no World War II with 25 million dead.

I greatly fear that a thin ABM system around the United States will lull us into a feeling of false security.

I believe we could provide more security for our people by spending these vast billions on a future offense system and thus prevent world war III altogether.

The following article appeared in the Columbia State on October 9:

ABM SYSTEM SEEN OUTDATED

NEW YORK.—Pressure from Congress and the joint chiefs of staff for a heavy anti-ballistic-missile (ABM) system oriented to defense against Soviet attack reflects an old military weakness: preparing to fight the previous war.

Technology has overtaken the ABM. The United States already has developed an effective antidote to it—sophisticated multiple warheads for the new offensive missiles, Minuteman III and Poseidon, which are to be ready in the early 1970's. Official estimates indicate that the Soviet Union can do the same in five to seven years.

Whatever the case for a "light" ABM defense against primitive Chinese missiles, arguments for either superpower to build a $40 billion missile defense to protect its cities against the other are now as outdated as the Billy Mitchell bomber-vs-battleship controversy.

A hitherto-secret four-letter acronym, MIRV—multiple independent re-entry vehicles, and the key word is "independent"—describes an advance in nuclear weaponry that will enable the offense to penetrate any defense now foreseeable.

"Both our missile defense system and (Russia's) were designed before MIRV's came along as a serious possibility," Secretary McNamara has acknowledged.

One MIRV missile will be able to carry ten or more hydrogen warheads that can separate in flight, change trajectory several times and fly independently to ten or more preselected targets. Equipped with MIRV, America's 1,700 strategic missiles could carry 17,000 or more separately targetable warheads, dwarfing the widely discussed Soviet increase this past year from 300 to about 450 single-warhead intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBM's).

Early in the ABM debate, Secretary McNamara predicted that the Soviet Union and the U.S. each would respond to the other's ABM installations by improving offensive capabilities. "All we would accomplish," the defense secretary said, "would be to increase greatly both their defense expenditures and ours without any gain in real security to either side."

THE AMERICAN FARMER HAS BEEN SERIOUSLY AFFECTED BY THE BIGNESS SYNDROME

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it is a fact of American life that we think and talk in terms of millions and billions. Whether it is dollars or people we are referring to, we accentuate the mass and generally ignore the few.

The American farmer has been seriously affected by the bigness syndrome. He has been described as the "forgotten American" and is said to be suffering from a Federal agriculture policy that lacks realism.

I have recently received a letter from a constituent who puts forth a lucid argument on behalf of a rational U.S. farm policy. He gives examples of the ill-timed directives of the Department of Agriculture—directives which have forced many of our finest Americans to literally fight for their existence as farm producers.

Under unanimous consent I include the letter in full in the RECORD:

AUGUST 28, 1967.

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR.,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BROWN: The U.S. farmer finds himself in the middle of continuous higher production costs and declining grain prices.

The Secretary of Agriculture asked and encouraged expansion of our 1967 major grain crop acreages.

He insisted on a billion bushel soybean crop, to which the farmers responded, Present estimates of this year's crop is 999 million bushels, yet we failed to find markets for 100 million bushels of the 1966 crop. If we do not find export markets for more soybeans in 1967 than we did in 1966 we will at the end of the 1967 year be faced with a 275 to 300 million bushel carryover. To provide markets for a billion bushel crop it is necessary to find export markets for fifty percent of this production.

Recently we have been exporting about 20% of our corn production. The Secretary asked for more 1967 corn acreage by reducing the amount of corn acreage that could be diverted, and yet at the same time we exported less of our 1966 crop than we did of the 1965 crop. We are now faced with a 4.7 billion bushel corn crop, the largest ever, and less prospects for foreign markets.

Troublesome wheat surpluses had at the end of 1965 disappeared. The Secretary permitted a 32% increase in wheat acreage allotments, so that before next year's crop is harvested we are going to have a 600 million bushel carryover, or almost a half a crop. Wheat today at the local elevator is selling for $1.28 per bushel.

It is apparent that a year ago our National Administration was dedicated to the cause of feeding the world, and to cheap domestic food prices. The farmers responded to the Secretary's request for greater food production, and now we find ourselves faced with insufficient markets and in most part ruinous prices.

During 1966 it appeared that we had eliminated troublesome surpluses, and that agriculture was going to come into its own. Now, due to a reversal in national policy on feeding the world, being dealt short in the Common Market, and an earlier attitude of cheap domestic food prices, we suddenly find ourselves again with burdensome surpluses.

I can appreciate that all this misplanning cannot be corrected immediately, but most certainly it should have careful and quick consideration to relieve the farmer from the situation he was led into.

There are two items that warrant immediate attention—

(1) The U.S. farmer will be dealt another blow in October, when in all probability levies on our grains in the Common Market will be increased $9 per ton.

(2) Beef production was the first of our major agricultural enterprises to emerge in a strong position. Twice during the past three years, however, when beef prices attained satisfactory levels the import quotas of New Zealand, Australia and South America were used to obtain cheaper domestic prices. Beef cattle prices are now in a satisfactory position, but the unlimited useage of these one year quotas in a given period did, and again can break the market. These quotas should be on a monthly basis, so that they cannot be used to the end of breaking the market. There is also some question as to whether or not these yearly quotas as provided are too high.

I trust that you will be able to give study and support to the problems of agriculture as thus stated.

Sincerely yours,

—— ——.

HISTORIC ADDRESS HONORING PAUL AND EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point to comment on an evening with Paul and Emily Taft Douglas on September 28, 1967, when Senator and Mrs. Douglas were honored by the board of governors of Illinois State colleges and universities and the administration and faculty of the Chicago State College for their distinguished joint contributions to the academic community and to include the full text of the introduction of Senator Douglas, Chairman of the National Commission on Urban Problems, by Dr. Milton Byrd, president of Chicago State College; the response thereto by the Honorable Paul A. Douglas, and the resolutions of the board of governors of Illinois State colleges and universities honoring Paul Douglas and Emily Taft Douglas.

Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to give to my colleagues and the readership of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a full accounting of the historic events and addresses honoring the Honorable Paul H. Douglas and his wife, the Honorable Emily Taft

Douglas, in connection with the inauguration of Dr. Milton B. Byrd as president of Chicago State College at the Conrad Hilton Hotel in Chicago on September 28, 1967, an event honored with the attendance of representatives from all the States of the American Union and 20 foreign countries. The tributes to Senator and Mrs. Douglas, herself a former Member of the Congress with a brilliant record in foreign affairs, civil rights and urban problems, attracted national attention and were the subject of an admiring and applauding editorial in the Washington Post.

INTRODUCTION BY DR. BYRD

The following is the address in introduction of the Honorable Paul H. Douglas, Chairman of the National Commission on Urban Problems, by Dr. Milton Byrd, president of Chicago State College:

Some years ago, the members of the United States Senate selected from their 178 year history, five men for their Hall of Fame. The Senators, looking back over nearly two centuries of the history of that great legislative body, decided that the rank of greatness should be conferred upon Henry Clay of Kentucky, Daniel Webster of Massachusetts, John C. Calhoun of South Carolina, Robert Taft of Ohio, and Robert La Follette of Wisconsin.

You will note that three of these five men served in the Senate in the 19th Century; two served in the 20th. We in Illinois are prepared to make this an even number of six great Senators, for we are confident that history will ultimately say that there was a third Senator in the 20th Century who deserves the accolade of greatness.

He does us great honor by coming here tonight. He is at home in such a setting as this for his academic credentials are of the first order, yet he went from the academic world, kept his intellectual integrity and scaled the heights of political influence. National legislation of lasting import in economics, civil rights, and international affairs bears his imprint.

At 75, he continues his distinguished public service. By appointment of the President of the United States, he serves as Chairman of the National Commission on Urban Problems. This commission, created by Congress, is instructed to produce in the next 18 months the working guidelines that will influence for a generation to come, the government, the academic community, and all concerned citizens engaged in our ever-widening struggle with urban problems.

I bid you mark well what this statesman says here tonight. He brings great wisdom to this platform. Tonight and for all time to come, he stands in the Illinois tradition of the Lovejoys, the Altgelds, the Clarence Darrows, the Jane Adamses and the Adlai Stevensons.

I have the privilege to present the Honorable Paul Douglas, Chairman of the National Commission on Urban Problems.

FULL TEXT OF DOUGLAS ADDRESS

Following is the full text of the address by the Honorable Paul H. Douglas, given in connection with the inauguration of Dr. Milton B. Byrd as president of Chicago State College:

Today a new state college was born and tomorrow a new President Dr. Milton Byrd, inaugurated. This college was not born suddenly, as Athena was reputed to have sprung from the brow of Jove. It has instead grown out of the Chicago Teachers College which has had an honorable and useful career. For there under the extraordinary Colonel Francis W. Parker was originated what has since become known as Progressive Education. The work and principles of Colonel Parker were carried into the Chicago school system by a great superintendent, Ella Flagg Young, and into academic life by John Dewey when just before the turn of the century he started the laboratory schools at the nearby University of Chicago and to which he gave formal expression in his classic book, "School and Society." Here his opening sentence was as pithy as that of Holmes in his "Treatise on the Common Law." "The school," said Dewey, "is not a preparation for life, it is life itself." This was the essence of progressive education—to make the school not an ivory tower but a vibrant place where students coped with the problems of life, found their interests and abilities challenged and were given the opportunity to develop their capacities. This is as true of collegiate as it is of elementary and secondary education. It is a fitting slogan for our new institution over whose birth we hover with mingled pride and anxiety.

Like all pioneering institutions, while the College may have lost something of its early glow, it went on to an honorable and useful career of training most of the teachers who entered the Chicago schools. And these teachers have given valiant service in helping transmit knowledge to the generations of youngsters from all parts, not only of the country but of the whole world. The teachers of Chicago have indeed been the most civilizing force in our city and we owe them a debt, only inadequately recognized and acknowledged.

But today we move into a new phase. The College has become a full fledged state college and the burden of support has been formally shifted from the city to the state with its more ample resources. The preparation of teachers will still be a major function but it will not be the only one.

A hundred years ago the Morrill Act, by its system of land grants, encouraged the founding of the great chain of state universities which initially were centered on agriculture and the mechanical arts. Schools of Agriculture and of engineering were soon developed which have raised the production level of farming and engineering, then of medicine and law, of industry, architecture, and the arts, so that the state universities have also become agencies for enlightenment and not merely for the vocational preparation for life.

So may it be for this newest of colleges, for its sister institution on the Northside and for the group of other state colleges which are emerging from their role as teachers colleges and here, as in California, moving forward into a wider role.

But what is that role? Today over two-thirds of our population live in approximately 220 metropolitan areas of which Chicago is the second most important in the nation, while only a little over 6 percent of the workers gain their living from the soil. By 1980, probably 70 percent of our people will live in the metropolitan areas and by the end of the century—now not so far away—three fourths or more of the expected 300 million. We have become an urban and suburban people and not primarily a rural nation as we were in 1867. If we are to be realists our higher education must be relevant to where our people live and work.

II

First let me say that the processes of time have proved that higher education is abundantly rewarding economically, socially, and culturally. As Professor Theodore Schultz has shown, the wide diffusion of education in the United States and the consequent qualitative improvement of the working force is responsible in large part for the great surge forward in productivity from the end of the Great Depression to the Korean War and this was also a powerful factor in the burst of productivity from 1960 to 1966. These gains were enough to have more than paid for all the social and money costs of the educational system during this time.

Secondly, if as the market economists insist, popular demand is and should be the ultimate arbiter of what is to be produced, the popular demand for higher education shows the deep hunger of American youth and their parents for more and ever more education. Forty years ago, when I spent a summer in Great Britain, there was then roughly one college student for every one thousand of the British population. As I remember it, our ratio at that time was 4 or 5 to the thousand. The ratio in Britain has now gone up to around 4 or 5, but in the United States, it has soared according to my estimates to at least 25 to the thousand. There is no sign of stopping.

Many citizens and legislators feared when the state began to back the new four year and junior colleges that they could only grow at the expense of the existing institutions. The market was thought by some to be distinctly limited. But this has been proved false. In a city and state which was already saturated with institutions of higher learning, this college opens with 6000 students while its sister institution to the North has an equally large enrollment. At the same time the other colleges and universities of the Chicago area and of the state are also bursting at the seams.

This is proof that the American people want more education and are willing to spend a considerable portion of their increased incomes in order to obtain it for themselves and for their children. Part of this desire is economic—namely the desire to give the young preparation for better positions and to increase their earning power. There is nothing wrong or demeaning in this desire. On the contrary it is highly praiseworthy and socially beneficial. The industrially retarded countries need first of all better farmers and mechanics. We still need them. But our relative wants are shifting more and more to general education and to those who can furnish services and make our cities and suburbs more liveable places.

But the demands of the students go far deeper than this. Deep in their hearts, they view the colleges and universities as dwelling places of light where they can make contact with the great cultural treasures of man's prolonged experiment in living and with the mysterious secrets of the universe about us and forces which are at work within us.

They may not always be able to verbalize what they want, but they have a hunger to find out what there was in Shakespeare and Michaelangelo, Pasteur and Einstein, Jefferson and Lincoln, which has made them beacon lights of history. That they are trying to gratify this hunger can be seen from the huge editions of the classics in paper back which have been and are pouring from the presses. Those who grew up on Thomas Hardy will remember how Jude the Obscure thirsted for the knowledge which he could never obtain because Oxford and Cambridge barred men like him from their doors.

So I do hope and believe that tens of thousands of young people will be able to understand the theory of evolution and of natural selection as developed by Malthus, Alfred Russel Wallace, Darwin and Gregor Mendel; that they can follow the mysteries of the amino acids and of DNA and RNA. And, may I say that there has been no better illustration of all this than the huge model of the human cell designed by Will Burtin in the Rosenwald Museum a few blocks away in Jackson Park.

Similarly, who can help but be thrilled by the development of our comprehension of the universe of space in which our tiny sphere, the earth, moves. From the earth-centered views of the Ptolemaic astronomers to the sun-centered universe of Kepler and

Galileo, the progress was great enough. But then came the realization that our solar system itself was but a speck in the vast universe, and finally the consciousness that this universe, held together by some mysterious force of mutual attraction, is and has been moving for millions of years with incredible speed out into unplumbed space to an apparently unlimited destination. There can be no more humbling experience and it is well for city folks above all to comprehend it as well as to marvel at the mysterious processes of photo-synthesis.

Finally to take another illustration, who can fail both to thrill and be frightened by the implications of Rutherford's discovery that matter is not solid and that the seemingly solids are really charged masses of electrical-like energies moving at tremendous speeds. And the full import of Einstein's equation that $E=MC^2$ or that matter and energy are interchangeable and that energy can be multiplied from certain types of matter by the ratio of the square of the velocity of light per second or by well over 30 billion times. It was this theorem which paved the way for Hiroshima and Nagasaki and which may ultimately destroy the world but which just possibly could also set mankind free. And a few miles to the west of here will be the giant nuclear accelerator which some of us labored to obtain for our state and which should raise the level of physical study here and everywhere.

But while the physical world is a fitting subject for informal wonder as seen through telescope and electromagnetic microscope, so are man's achievements in literature and arts as well as in the philosophy and ethical aims of mankind. Now through the medium of the museums, phonographic records, reproductions and the paper backs, young students can come to count the Renaissance sculptors and painters as intimate friends, make the acquaintance of the great Russian novelists of the 19th Century, Tolstoy, Dostoevsky, and Turgenev, and absorb the melodies of Mozart and Haydn, and the majestic thunder of Beethoven. And from Plato's *Republic* and Aristotle's *Politics*, they can get a ringside seat. All this will help the urban dweller to be truly urbane.

Finally, the students may ponder about the moral progress of the race. Immanuel Kant once remarked that there were two things which filled him with wonder, "the starry heavens above and the moral law within."

As one reads the *Apology* and the dialogues dealing with trial and execution of Socrates, the question inevitably presents itself as to whether Socrates made the right choice in going to his death rather than abandoning his mission of being witness to the truth. What was the source of the heroic stoicism of Marcus Aurelius and of Thomas More? What lay behind and within Francis of Assissi and the Quaker saint, John Woolman, and finally as one reads the Gospels and tries to ponder over the significance of Jesus, did he make the right choice of spurning magic, power, and nationalism to appeal instead to what He believed to be the universal spirit of love and energized good will and to die with grace for that faith. For He believed in the infectious power of love and He believed that He could help universalize that spirit by unselfish and self-forgetting sacrifice.

In short, through education, we city folks may be given the keys to the kingdom—to the empire of the spirit—and be urged on to the eternal quest. This should be the main task of higher education, namely, to be a true dwelling place of light, where teacher and student may actively cooperate for discovering and rediscovering the truths of life. This is a true culture far separated from the artificial standards which once dominated polite society.

Widespread popular education has an obvious social advantage as well. Ours is a democracy—a somewhat imperfect one to be sure—but nevertheless one in which the people ultimately do rule. With all of the weaknesses of democracy, the wider the participation of the people, the more compensatory are the safeguards which are introduced to counterbalance the dizziness and self-interest which tend to sweep over dictatorships and class rule. Moreover, the very necessity of exercising choice forces men and women to broaden their interests and to make meaningful commitments. This of necessity leads them to be better people. Education helps to make these choices more intelligent and informed. As Jefferson saw long ago, a wise democracy can only be based upon an educated people.

And here the college and university can help out not only in acquainting the students with the long slow upward struggle of democracy but also with the clash of political thought. Let the great protagonists appear and argue their case. Plato v. Aristotle, Hobbes v. Locke, Jefferson v. Hamilton, Karl Marx and Woodrow Wilson, Hitler and Winston Churchill. We need not be afraid of the outcome of such a contest. For if the field is fair, and it should be the function of the university to see that it is, whoever knew truth, as Milton remarked, to be vanquished in open battle?

And along the way there can be many profound and interesting questions raised and tentative answers given which will throw light on some of the central issues of our times. What are the features, for instance, which have permitted Great Britain, the United States, and the British Commonwealth to effect change without revolution and apparently to solve the problem of the peaceful transfer of power? What protections can a democracy build into its system to minimize the dangers of corruption and of special interest? How can a bureaucracy be induced or compelled to use its skills for the benefit of the people rather than primarily to enhance its own power as did the Priest-Astronomers of Egypt and apparently those of the Mayan peoples of Central America?

I need not go further. Education is necessary to help man to live more fully and productively in his economic affairs, his cultural interests and his life in society. It is needed above all in an urban society. It will be up to students and teachers to pursue these purposes together. It is their joint responsibility. This will tax their energies and insights to the utmost. But the cause is a worthy one and the immortal garland cannot be won without dust and sweat.

III

Since everything is relative to its setting in time and place, this university will inevitably be, and should be, primarily an urban university. Just as the land-grant colleges were originally attuned to an America which was overwhelmingly agricultural and rural, so are these newer universities necessary to city and suburban life, to manufacturing and to the fast growing industries, and to men and women as metropolitan citizens striving to lead useful and harmonious lives in an incredibly complex society of widely differing races and ethnic groups and of diverging economic classes.

Central to every life is the problem of making a living—as good and ethical a living as is possible. I have already spoken of the way the college can enlarge and refine the human spirit. That is the first job of all education. But it must also help to prepare the students for the workaday activities of cities. And it should never take on a leisure class contempt for the practical. Only the rich can afford that, and it is no real help to them and to society. Since a large proportion of Chicago State's students will become teachers, it should help them to be better teachers. And here I hope it will emphasize content rather than mere form and method although there are a few simple hints on arousing interest, maintaining discipline, and obtaining cooperation which can be imparted. Another large proportion will go into business and office work and I see nothing demeaning in young men and women choosing to learn typewriting and stenography, book-keeping and accounting. These are honorable and useful tools which society needs and which should be carried out properly. I am not acquainted with all the intricacies of modern computers but it is probable that training should also be given in this field as well since it is here that there is the greatest immediate demand for technicians.

I take it that the college will not have a technical institute attached to it but will leave that work to the Illinois Institute and to the University of Illinois. But in its general courses in science it can demonstrate the basic principles which lie behind modern technology namely the creation, transmission and application of power, and the problems to which this gives rise. Given this, once the student gets a job he or she can go on from there for practical experience and advanced training.

Similarly in the field of business I would not advise that there be a detailed and minute treatment of a number of business functions such as banking, insurance, advertising personnel and other subjects which dominate the curriculum of colleges of commerce. But I would recommend that the courses in economics deal realistically with the way in which the energies of society are distributed through the price system and with the forces which help to determine the distribution of the final product among the claimants. And here I would suggest that concreteness be given to the theories of production and distribution by drawing on concrete and empirical studies of what the actual variables and values are in the production function, and the degree to which the product is distributed in conformity with the production equation. And concreteness should be given to the study of prices and changes in production and employment by the specific elasticities of demand and income which are involved.

Then the practical work which is performed by organized markets for commodities and for securities and these symbols of ownership deserve explanation and treatment as does the function of insurance as a means of pooling existing risks as contrasted with gambling which creates added risk. Finally the evolution and workings of our monetary system needs to be explored in a humanistic fashion.

We are living in one of the greatest and most complicated cities of the world. Here we find the most extraordinary mixture of nationalities and races, and of religions, cultural and economic groups which I suppose have ever been brought together in the whole history of mankind. And what is true of Chicago and New York is also true in large measure of all large American cities. The question which above all others concerns us is whether we can learn to live together in comparative justice and peace or whether we are doomed to go down in a welter of blood because of our animal instincts and cultural and economic cleavages. The Social Darwinians, the race animated Nazis and the apostle of class strife not only believe in the inevitability of conflict but seek to create it. If this spirit conquers then the future of this and every other city will be black indeed. Nor can the suburbs pretend that they are not involved. For the iron band which they have drawn around the inner cities to prevent the poor and those of darker skins from residing in their midst has multiplied the tensions within the cities themselves. To understand these conflicts and complexities and to have a part in their reocnciliation is the opportunity for us all. The college can and I am confident will do invaluable work in this direction. The city can indeed be our laboratory and experience center. The Rosenwald Museum in Jackson Park for science and industry, natural science and anthropology at the Field museum, astronomy and the universe in which we dwell at the planetarium, the past life of the Near and Middle East at the Oriental Institute, French, Dutch, and American Painting at the Art Institute and Music at Orchestra Hall. Here are the ingredients for the good life for us all. Our new college can help more to share in these rich treasures and to take part more actively in their further creation.

What is needed above all are educated and humane men and women who can see beyond the conflicts of today and apply themselves to the task of helping to introduce rapidly a greater measure of justice and of reconciling in a self-respected manner conflicting interests and emotions.

This may become one of the great creative achievements of this new college whose student body and faculty is already drawn from all races and classes. Can we not hope that just as the United States seems to have solved the problem of peaceful change on the national level, so may not the members of this new university community help to solve the problems created by diversities of classes and colors living together? If we cannot, the prospect indeed is gloomy and the last best hope of man may go down in blood and hate. But it need not happen, and I am sufficient of an optimist to believe that it will not happen if those who are concerned with education are aware of the dangers and set themselves to do their wisest and best.

Finally, on behalf of my wife and myself, may I thank you again for the great honor you have conferred upon us and may we wish the college and Dr. Byrd all good fortune during the crucial years which lie ahead.

RESOLUTION HONORING THE DOUGLASES

Following is the resolution of the board of governors of Illinois State colleges and universities, honoring Paul and Emily Taft Douglas:

Whereas this distinguished audience has gathered this evening because of its interest in and concern for the relationship between the urban university and the people of the city that it serves; and

Whereas we have all been informed, heartened, and challenged by the wisdom, judgment, and learning of Senator Paul Douglas in his presentation here this evening and in the example he has set over four decades of service as an economist-educator-public official actively involved in the problems of the city; and

Whereas Senator Douglas after receiving his academic training at Bowdoin College and Columbia University served with distinction on the renowned faculties of Reed College, the University of Washington, Amherst and Swarthmore Colleges, and the University of Chicago; and

Whereas Senator Douglas began his long career of service to his country in working toward the solution of its economic and social problems as early as 1930 by becoming director of the Swarthmore Unemployment Study and secretary to the Pennsylvania Unemployment Commission; and

Whereas Senator Douglas later became advisor to the New York Unemployment Commission and in 1937 served as a member of the Advisory Committee to the United States Senate at the time that that supreme legislative body developed the federal social security system; and

Whereas Senator Douglas next took on additional responsibilities by becoming an elected public official, representing the citizens of the Hyde Park area on the Chicago City Council where his record of devotion to the public trust has set a standard for generations to follow; and

Whereas Senator Douglas resigned from this honored position in 1942 at the age of fifty to enlist as a private in the United States Marine Corps because of his intense patriotism and his deep-felt conviction about the moral responsibility of this nation to defeat the forces of aggression in World War II; rising through the ranks, he became a lieutenant colonel and fought with great valor in the Pacific theater of war where he was seriously wounded and permanently disabled; and

Whereas Senator Douglas returned to civilian life recognized as an outstanding citizen of Illinois becoming its United States Senator in 1949 and serving for the following eighteen years; his Senate career was marked by an unflagging devotion to the national interest, to the preservation of civil liberties, to the upholding of American international responsibilities, and to the protection of the citizen against the concentration of power whether in the economy or in the government; and

Whereas today at the age of seventy-five Senator Douglas continues his dual career as a teacher of young people and as a servant of the people; now a member of the faculty of the New School of Social Research he continues to inspire his students and as chairman of the National Commission on Urban Problems, he again has taken the leadership in the continuing effort to find solutions for our nation's massive city problems; and

Whereas as Abigail Adams said in 1776, "Remember the ladies," the assemblage this evening is honoring an especially outstanding lady, Emily Taft Douglas, not only as the Senator's wife and helpmate over the years, but also for her meritorious career as a Congresswoman, organizer of the League of Women Voters in Illinois, pioneer campaigner for a state constitutional convention, and most recently as an author; now therefore be it

Resolved that under the authority vested in me by the Board of Governors of State Colleges and Universities and on behalf of the faculty and students of Chicago State College this tribute is presented to Senator and Mrs. Paul Douglas for exemplifying Justice Holmes' dictum: "A man must participate in the actions and passions of his time;" and be it further

Certified that upon completion of its new campus, Chicago State College will further recognize the long record of contributions of Senator and Mrs. Douglas by naming one of its buildings in their honor.

Given at Chicago, Illinois, on this twenty-eighth day of September in the Year of Our Lord Nineteen Hundred Sixty-seven and of Chicago State College the Ninety-ninth year.

ADMINISTRATION ATTEMPTS TO WITHHOLD HIGHWAY TRUST FUNDS

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the recent action by the Secretary of Transportation in sending a wire to the Nation's Governors which implied a cut in highway construction funds was to be made to help reduce the budget deficit indicates how hard it is for the Congress of the United States to get a point across to the executive branch. We went through this whole business once before, earlier this year, when the administration withheld but later released money designated for the States from the highway trust fund.

The administration's action was wrong then, and it is wrong now. The reasons for it being wrong are few but to the point, and they are included in the following letter which I have sent to the Secretary of Transportation:

OCTOBER 17, 1967.

Hon. ALAN S. BOYD,
Department of Transportation,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Along with many Members of Congress, I was astonished by your recent telegram to the nation's governors, implying a cut in highway construction funds might be made to help reduce the budget deficit.

Your office knows, or should know, that these funds have nothing to do with the budget and are not even carried as part of it. The money in the highway trust fund comes almost exclusively from the Federal excise tax on gasoline. No Administration has the authority to either use the money for anything else or to arbitrarily withhold it from the States.

The Highway Act of 1956—Public Law 84–627—was expressly written to insure a constant source and flow of money for highway construction. The American motorist who pays these Federal excise taxes has the right to the assurance that the money will be devoted exclusively to his personal convenience and safety, and these points were forcefully made during House debate on the bill by members of both parties.

I am at a loss to understand why your office seeks to repeat the ill-considered actions of a year ago. Such a step as you seem to contemplate denies the motorist his rights, is a classic example of bad faith with the States, and certainly violates the clear intent of the law.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM G. BRAY,
Member of Congress.

BRITISH F–111: McNAMARA'S ALBATROSS

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, the TFX is fast becoming a storm-center of controversy with Great Britain. Billions of dollars, much good will and even political futures are on the line on both sides of the Atlantic.

In America this problematical aircraft, the F–111, long has been labeled the "Flying Edsel" by experts who know its poor test of performance record.

Now the British, disillusioned by shortcomings in the F–111's the administration wheeled and dealed to them, are calling it "McNamara's Albatross."

"Conceived in political sin, dogged by budgetary scandal, stalled by flying failure, it now has risen to the level of an international incident," noted economist Eliot Janeway wrote in a September 25 article from Geneva, Switzerland.

The London Daily Express declared on September 27:

> The British F–111K version of the controversial swing-wing warplane shares the overweight problems that prevent all American models meeting design specifications.

The story enumerates the shortcomings and failures, so well known to us who have followed the TFX history, and which may ultimately persuade the British to demand a rebate on the F–111's we have sold them.

This substantiates and underscores the points I made when I protested any further procurement funds for the F–111B when the Defense budget was before this House June 13.

It is time we faced up to the fact that this is a billion-dollar blunder which will be multiplied many times over by the Defense secretary who stubbornly refuses to ever admit he has made an error.

And the British experience with the TFX we sold them will chill any "Buy America" enthusiasm among world military markets.

The Janeway and Daily Express articles follow:

TXF PLANE BECOMES INTERNATIONAL HASSLE

(By Eliot Janeway)

GENEVA, SWITZERLAND, September 25.—Militarily, the TFX delivers less than a major air power needs from a fighting airplane. Politically, it has delivered more. Conceived in political sin, dogged by budgetary scandal, stalled by flying failure, it has now risen to the level of an international incident.

Here in this sleepy lakeside oasis of sophisticated frugality in the heart of Europe, where peace and neutrality are a creed and where wars and revolutions are viewed with the professional detachment of the horse race handicapper or gambling casino operator, the immediate question is whither England?

Will she dissolve her historic American family connection and come to live in Europe? Will she accept exclusion from the new family growing up in Europe out of love—if only cupboard love—for what French President Charles de Gaulle sneers at as her "special relationship" with America? Or will Harold Wilson be clever enough to manage a threesome, keeping America as England's old connection and winning Europe as her new one?

Europe not only wants to know: Europe needs to know. England is a major outlet for Europe's exports and Europe, suffering from a slump, needs all the export business she can rustle up.

Europe also has a money motive in seeing sterling solvent and England strong and friendly. Despite Europe's devotion to financial orthodoxy and her distrust of the foreign policies which have kept England in pawn to foreign creditors, the continent has not outgrown its traditional dependence on the banking, insurance, and shipping facilities of the city of London. London still provides the technical services which move the exports on which every country in Europe counts and which no country in Europe is anxious to finance with its own money.

WHERE IS BRITAIN HEADED

For months, the answer to Europe's question about England has seemed to depend on the performance of the English economy and on the skill of the English diplomacy. Now, suddenly, the TFX affair has taken the decision out of Harold Wilson's hands in England, and out of Lyndon Johnson's hands in America. What Europe sees as a political fluke, what England resents as a political mess could quite possibly throw England into Europe's arms in a fit of revulsion against America.

The admitted source of trouble goes back to the skyrocketing costs of the TFX. Every new failure of the "flying Edsel" to meet specifications has loaded the contract with extras. To lower the apparent cost per plane and, incidentally, to brag about its acceptability, Defense Secretary McNamara pressed the British government to "buy" a batch.

SELLS A BILL OF GOODS

The bill of goods McNamara sold England was hard to resist. He guaranteed delivery of a brand new air fleet for less than nothing. But fixes are never bargains; and the bargain McNamara offered England was too good to be true. It was too good to last for England and too transparent to work for him. His formula for supposedly limited TFX costs was to pay England more for other defense business than we charged her for the TFX.

One of the small "offset" orders guaranteed to England as part of the TFX package was for small ships. When Republican Congressman John Byrne [who has an order-hungry shipyard in his Wisconsin district] knocked this part of the package out of the budget, he not only flushed out the administration's loss of control over Congress. He put England on notice that an American administration which cannot command the confidence of Congress cannot be trusted to make good on its international commitments.

[From the London Daily Express, Sept. 27, 1967]

MORE SWING WING SHOCKS—OVERWEIGHT UNDER-RANGED—NOT ENOUGH DASH—NOT ENOUGH HEIGHT

(By Ross Mark)

WASHINGTON.—The British F111K version of the controversial swing-wing warplane shares the overweight problems that prevent all American models meeting design specifications, aviation experts said today.

One expert with access to classified material on the F111 programme told me:

"Britain's requirements for extra fuel to give the F111K greater range compounds the weight problem and means that it will never be possible for the plane to meet the specifications given by Washington when the British Government ordered its 50."

Inquiries on the latest situation of the F111—nicknamed in Congress "McNamara's Albatross"—brought these statements from other qualified experts:

The first 30 F111As, the United States version on which Britain's "K" model is based, have performed so poorly that they will never be fit for active service.

The Pentagon ordered an initial 18 which failed to meet performance standards. The second batch, which had improvements, performed little better than the first. Now all 30 will be limited to pilot training and research and development.

The 31st F111A, the first of the group that will be sent to a base in Thailand for "blooding" in the Vietnam war, still falls short of several Defense Department requirements.

Although the U.S. Air Force specified a 40,000-ft. ceiling, Air Force officials admit that model No. 31 will not be able to operate with a bomb load above 30,000 ft. But competent industry sources say that the actual ceiling will be about 15,000 ft., well within the reach of all world front-line fighters.

Neither the F111A nor the British "K" would be able to make a supersonic dash at low level on a target until they were within 50 miles of it. The original requirement was a 200-mile-plus "dash" range.

Because of uncontrollable "buffeting," the speed brake was drastically reduced in size. The buffeting has been lessened, but the air brakes are so small they are largely ineffective at high speeds.

The take-off weight of the aircraft has increased from 69,000 lb. to nearly 90,000 lb.

The range the plane can be ferried is 800 miles less than the United States Air Force required.

Engine troubles still unfixed include occasional loss of take-off power due to the after-burner stopping on the ground. The after-burner also sometimes fails at high speed.

Engine "surge" due to compressor troubles at high speed.

The early versions of the aircraft have 50 pylons beneath the wings to carry 50 bombs weighing 750 lb. Each model No. 31 will carry only 12 bombs.

One expert in close touch with the F111 programme said: "Britain's 'K' version has even more weight than our 'A' with its special 'K' components and extra fuel requirements.

"I seriously doubt if it would ever get off the ground if the R.A.F. attempted to load it as originally planned.

"The central fault of this warplane is that it is overweight and underpowered."

Congressional sources say that the U.S. Navy F111B is now so heavy that aircraft carriers will carry only six instead of the originally planned 12.

Chapman Pincher writes: The R.A.F. chiefs insist that the F111 will still meet their requirements in spite of the admitted failure of the plane to fulfill original expectations.

The reason? The purposes for which the R.A.F. needs the machine are far less demanding than those of the U.S. Air Force. The Americans want it as an interceptor-fighter as well as a strike aircraft. Britain does not.

REDUCED

The Defence Ministry denies that the R.A.F. has lowered its operational requirements to suit the reduced performance of the F111.

Further, it claims, there are penalty clauses in the Ministry's contract with the U.S. Government. If the F111 fails to meet the R.A.F.'s requirements the U.S. will claim a rebate for Britain from the manufacturers, the General Dynamics Corporation.

VIETNAM—THE PRESIDENT IS HIS OWN MAN

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, recently the South Dade News Leader printed an editorial on a rather persistent kind of critic of our policy in Vietnam; the kind who charges that the administration has not leveled with the American people or that it has attempted to "brainwash" this country.

The editorial is particularly timely in its criticism of this new breed of "know-nothings" who blame others for their own mistaken judgement. No one quarrels with those critics who have examined the facts about Vietnam and reached a different conclusion than the President. These honest critics have a right to their own opinion and not only a right but a duty to criticize the Government's policy and attempt to change it as long as they work within our established constitutional machinery.

Nor can one quarrel with honest men who change their minds. These critics, too, have a right to their views and we all must respect that right. It is to be hoped, however, that when men change their minds they will have the courage to say of their previous position, "I was mistaken," instead of blaming anyone except themselves.

These "know-nothings," however, who irresponsibly make charges of brainwashing can only harm their country with their false and totally misleading statements. Such statements, in reality, amount to nothing but a lot of political hogwash by those who only stand to gain by discrediting one of the most energetic and capable Presidents this country has ever had.

No war ever fought by this Nation has been so fully discussed by Government officials. No war has ever been so fully reported by the press. If there is any fuzziness about this administration's position on Vietnam, it is not because of a lack of public candor by the President but because of cobwebs in the minds of some critics.

The editorial of October 5 in the South Dade News Leader on this subject is an excellent analysis of brainwashing and I am sure many will find it of interest:

Hard, Cold Facts on "Brainwashing"

Not since the Korean War has so much "brainwashing" been going on.

First Gov. George Romney of Michigan charges that his brain was washed by the Johnson administration's military and diplomatic brass during a visit he made to Vietnam in 1964.

Now Sen. Thruston Morton of Kentucky, former chairman of the Republican National Committee, claims that it is LBJ himself whose brain has been washed—by the "military-industrial complex" no less.

Though Morton does not say it in so many words, his admission that his past support the war was mistaken suggests that his own cerebral cells had been subjected to a bit of laundering.

This loose usage of "brainwashing" is another example of how words which originally had a specific meaning tend to become blunted and ambiguous.

As it first emerged from the Korean War, the word described a sinister power attributed to the Chinese. Through subtle and not-so-subtle physical and psychological pressures, American prisoners of war were led to doubt everything they had ever believed—about themselves, about their country and about the purposes of their government. The shallower their beliefs were in the beginning, the easier it was to make them doubt them.

The word meant just what it said: Their minds were washed clean of previous convictions and new ones were substituted in their place. The technique worked, among a few, as long as they were confined in the artificial world of the prison camp, where the only reality was what their captors said it was.

Today, brainwashing seems to have softened into just another synonym for persuasion. More than that, there is the implication that if one claims he was brainwashed, he is absolved from responsibility for making an error of judgment.

Romney may have been given a biased set of facts about Vietnam, even conned into believing they represented the true situation. Undoubtedly he was told what he wanted to hear, which is as normal a practice between underlings and officials in government as it is between employes and bosses in business.

President Johnson may or may not have chosen wrong alternatives on the basis of faulty information during the course of this war. But his decisions have been made on the basis of the situation as he saw it. The President is his own man and no one tells him what to believe.

All people everywhere view the world through their own personal set of glasses, which they have polished over the years and which filter reality so that they see what they want to see and are able to go on believing what they want to believe.

Americans want to believe that we are right in being in Vietnam, that our aims are noble and that those aims can be achieved for the lasting benefit of the entire world. In these sense, perhaps we have all brainwashed ourselves.

It is one thing, however, to take off our old glasses and put on another pair because our eyesight has changed, and another thing to blame the optometrist because the old glasses don't work so well any more.

It is one thing to change one's mind about Vietnam in the light of experience, but quite another to complain that we would never have had to make this reappraisal had not somebody "brainwashed" us in the first place.

CONGRESSMAN HORTON LAUDS THE AMALGAMATED CLOTHING WORKERS' DEDICATION OF SIDNEY HILLMAN HEALTH CENTER AND ROCHESTER JOINT BOARD HEADQUARTERS

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues one of the most satisfying afternoons I have spent as a Congressman.

Yesterday afternoon, in Rochester, N.Y., I attended the dedication of a beautiful new building which will house the headquarters of the Rochester Joint Board of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America and the Sidney Hillman Health Center, which provides free health care to members of the union in the Rochester area.

The dedication ceremony was significant not only for the clothing workers union, and not only for organized labor as a whole, but it was meaningful for the entire Rochester community. The location of the new structure on East Avenue, often termed the "showplace of Rochester," marks the first entry of organized labor on a thoroughfare which for decades has claimed some of the city's major landmarks. Now, side by side with the George Eastman House, the Dryden Theater, the Rochester Museum of Arts and Sciences, the Boy Scouts of America, and some of Rochester's most beautiful homes and houses of worship, stands this magnificent structure, designed by Rochester architects, Corgan and Balestiere, and built by Werner Spitz & Co.

Mr. Speaker, the scope of the Rochester joint board's activities could not be better described than it was in the October 13, edition of the Rochester AFL–CIO Labor News:

Dedicate ACWA Building Monday

The Rochester Joint Board of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, AFL–CIO, will officially dedicate its new business offices, headquarters and Sidney Hillman Health Center, 750 East Ave., during special ceremonies to take place at the site next Monday starting at 3:30 p.m. The formal opening of the beautiful new edifice has been timed with a week-long quarterly meeting here of the ACWA's national General Executive Board who will participate in the dedication, including ACWA Intl. Pres. Jacob S. Potofsky. This will be the first Intl. GEB session here in 20 years.

Rochester Congressman Frank Horton will head a long list of area civic, political, religious and local and international labor leaders who will also be on hand for the ceremonies Monday, and tour the new building which houses the Sidney Hillman Health Center on the second floor, under the direction of Dr. Robert Burton, and solely supported by the 15,000 ACWA members affiliated in the ACWA's 17 locals here, providing free health services to all of the union's members and retirees coming under the program. In addition, the new building houses recreational facilities for retirees of the ACWA; general business offices and meeting rooms for the Joint Board officers, and represents the fruition of a project headed by Rochester Joint Board Manager Abraham D. Chatman, who has served the ACWA here in that capacity since 1924, and who is a vice-president of the national union. The Rochester Joint Board represents ACWA members in an area ranging from Poughkeepsie to Buffalo, and including Syracuse, Utica, Penn Yan, and the Rochester region, and involving production workers at Bond Clothes, Fashion Park, Hickey-Freeman, Michaels-Stern, Timely Clothes, Xerox, five box factories, Bravo Macaroni Co., Rochester Button Co., and Bourjois Cosmetics, besides sales personnel in the retail outlets of Bonds, McFarlin's, National, Robert Hall, and Cornwall Clothes.

The site of the new, ultra-modern structure was formerly occupied by the famous Gleason House which was donated to R.I.T. and purchased by the Joint Board. The union's former headquarters at 476 N. Clinton Ave., N., in use since 1919, has been donated by the ACWA to the City of Rochester and is now being renovated as a youth recreation center. The new structure was designed by Corgan & Balestiere, noted Rochester architects, and the interior design was by Molly Stern, of Rochester, and a major Rochester building firm, Werner Spitz, was the general contractor. Construction began in July, 1966, and was completed in 15 months.

The printed dedication program contains a very well done piece entitled "Past, Present and Future," which describes in brief the history and impact of the Amalgamated in the Rochester community. It appears below, along with the program of speakers:

Dedication Ceremonies, Headquarters, Rochester Joint Board, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, AFL–CIO, CLC, October 16, 1967

THE PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE

Organized in 1919 after several years of continuous effort by Sidney Hillman, the Rochester Joint Board of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America survived the turbulent labor-management conflicts of the post-World War One period and emerged as a constructive force in the community. Not only was arbitration machinery launched in that initial year, but the Impartial Chairman, created to settled disputes between the Amalgamated locals and the members of the Clothiers' Exchange, proved advantageous to both sides and to the economy of Rochester. Moreover the educational programs fostered by the Joint Board brought many of its officers and members into constructive participation in civic and other community affairs.

After a brief period when its offices were located on Central Avenue, the Rochester Joint Board leased and later purchased the large structure known as Germania Hall on Clinton Avenue North. These commodious quarters served for more than four decades as an active community center not only for the officers and members of the Amalgamated but for other labor and community groups as well. There the numerous locals held their monthly meetings, speaking in English, Yiddish, Italian, Polish and Lithuanian. Innumerable classes in successive generations studied the objectives and strategy of the union movement and probed a wide variety of related social problems.

Sustained by the dynamic interests of its large membership, the Rochester Joint Board was able to play an active role in community affairs. Not only did it serve during the depression and post-depression years as a source of leadership for organizational efforts in the clothing factories of neighboring towns and cities, but it also responded to requests from workers in other industries for organizers and has admitted to its fold locals from the food processing fields, from paper boxes, and the Haloid Company (manufacturers of photographic supply), more recently known as the rising new Xerox plants.

In addition to this expansion of its membership base, the Joint Board has broadened its services by establishing a Health Center to provide free examinations and health services to its present and past members and their spouses. It has also continued its customary practice of endorsing and rallying member support for worthy community efforts, such as the hospital, war relief and Community Chest drives. And a few years ago it endowed a series of annual lectures on vital topics at the University of Rochester to be known as the Sidney Hillman lectures. Moreover, as in all regional divisions of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, under President Potofsky as under President Hillman, the Rochester Joint Board has endeavored year after year to alert its members and their neighbors in the community to their responsibilities as citizens and voters in a democratic society.

In opening this fine new headquarters on East Avenue, the Rochester Joint Board plans to continue all traditional services to its members and hopes to achieve their fuller participation in the affairs of the community at large.

PROGRAM

Welcome	Abraham Chatman ACWA vice president, Manager, Rochester Joint Board.
Invocation	Rt. Rev. Msgr. Dennis W. Hickey Vicar-General, Rochester, Catholic Diocese.
Greetings	Hon. Frank Lamb Mayor of Rochester.
Remarks	Walter Hickey President, Hickey Freeman Co.
Remarks	Rabbi Philip S. Bernstein Temple B'rith Kodesh.
Remarks	Peter McColough President Xerox Corp.
Remarks	Hon. Frank Horton Congressman.
Address	Jacob S. Potofsky President Amalgamated Clothing Workers.
Benediction	Rev. Alfred B. Wangman Bethany Presbyterian Church.

Rochester Joint Board Manager, Abraham D. Chatman opened the program and served as master of ceremonies. His remarks appear below. My colleagues will be interested to know that the printed dedication program bears the union "bug" of the Allied Printing Trades Council of New York, whose Rochester locals were encouraged and helped along in the early years by Abe Chatman and the clothing workers:

REMARKS OF A. CHATMAN

Rt. Reverend Monsignor Dennis W. Hickey, vicar general, will give the invocation.

* * * * *

I want to welcome all of you to the dedication ceremonies of our new Joint Board Headquarters, Health Center, and Retiree Center. This is in some ways the culmination of a dream—for in this new building we will have the finest facilities for our many activities and programs.

I believe that most of you know that although Rochester is sometimes known as a non-union town, the fact is that the Amalgamated has been a strong and progressive organization almost from the moment we signed our first contract.

That first contract was signed in the spring of 1918—a few months short of 50 years ago—so this ceremony symbolizes not only years of future activity but a half century of progress already completed.

Rochester has played a major part in the Amalgamated's history. We are a small town compared to New York, Chicago and Philadelphia, but our clothing industry has always been one of the most notable in the Nation. In the early days, before the union, the industry was characterized not so much by the sweatshop but by large and wealthy companies wielding iron control over their workers. The workers tried for decades to organize here, but we did not make our first breakthrough until almost four years after the Amalgamated was born. Sidney Hillman gave leadership in our first settlement and the first World War was the background which helped make it possible.

Our organizing efforts did not end then. One of our most famous strikes took place in 1919, and was defeated by a court injunction which was so repressive that it helped inspire the passage by Congress of the Federal Anti-Injunction Act. In another strike in 1933, the forces opposing us used tear gas, and we had to obtain gas masks to maintain our picket lines.

But we won those battles, and many more, and today, although the original clothing industry has grown smaller, our membership has been maintained by the addition of new companies—particularly by a great new industrial organization, the Xerox Corporation.

Here in Rochester, we have always been conscious of our obligation not only to our own members but to the welfare of all working people and to the community as a whole. Our activity in community life—in government, in charity, in education, in health—is symbolized by the many friends from other unions and from other organizations who are with us today. We are proud, too, to welcome the general officers, and the members of the general executive board and the principal department heads of the Amalgamated.

Later in the program I will introduce the general president of the Amalgamated for his remarks. At this time, I would like to introduce his associates, general secretary-treasurer, Frank Rosenblum, and executive vice president, Hyman Blumberg. I would like to say an extra word of tribute to Hy Blumberg who, since the birth of our union in Rochester, has taken a special interest in our welfare and has always been helpful to us.

The scheduling of a meeting of the Clothing Workers' international executive board this week in Rochester provided one of the highlights of the dedication ceremony—an address by ACWA international president, Jacob S. Potofsky. My colleagues will note that Mr. Potofsky devotes a major portion of his remarks to well-deserved praise of Abe Chatman, my longtime friend, who in addition to his service as chairman of the ACWA's Rochester Joint Board, is international vice president. Abe has been a driving force for constructive unionism, and for amicable labor-management relations in Rochester for over four decades. To him must go much of the credit for the responsible, active, and respected labor organizations in Rochester today.

Mr. Potofsky's remarks follow:

ADDRESS BY JACOB S. POTOFSKY

I am delighted to be here today. This occasion is a high point in the history—not only of the Rochester Joint Board but of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, as a whole.

Your new building combines beauty and utility. It adds distinction to the area, and should set an example as a union headquarters. Over the years the labor movement has occasionally been critical of industry for spoiling and wasting natural resources and creating ugliness rather than beauty. The labor movement owes it to the community to enhance the appearance of the area when it builds—and I believe that the new headquarters of the Rochester Joint Board does just that.

Ever since 1918, our organization in this city has contributed to the unity and strength of the union as a whole. During the great strikes early in our history in New York and Chicago—including the 1920 lockout—Rochester clothing workers contributed generously to the defense funds of their fellow workers. In all our activities, including our industry-wide bargaining and our political education programs, this joint board has played an important part.

The activities of the Amalgamated in Rochester symbolize the union's dedication to the welfare of the community. Those of you who are old timers in our organization know that very early in our history, the Amalgamated sought to use the strength of our unity in areas beyond so-called bread and butter unionism. We tried to make the union a means of achieving benefits beyond the workbench and the shop.

Here in Rochester, this handsome new headquarters symbolizes almost 50 years of a remarkable record of community activity. We are now as native to Rochester as the Red Cross or the University of Rochester. The record began almost at the inception of the organization. Through the years our union members here have served as the anchor of the labor movement, helping new unions such as the printers, the building trades, the newer industrial unions, and most recently the municipal employees to win bargaining rights. As the largest union in the area, our Rochester Joint Board gave leadership to labor in its political activities, reaching down to workers in the wards and precincts. In addition, the union has been an important part of numerous philanthropic agencies and programs, participating and raising uncounted thousands of dollars for charities locally and nationally.

I could not close my remarks without paying tribute to your veteran manager, Vice President Abe Chatman. Abe is a truly remarkable labor leader—independent, strongminded, a man who combines reason and logic with a passion for progress. His leadership of the Amalgamated—and of the labor movement as a whole—in this area has been unique and constructive. Our relations with employers has been given nation-wide attention, particularly in a study a number of years ago by the National Planning Association.

Abe, thru his tireless efforts, has brought remarkable advances to the clothing workers, as well as to workers in other industries, including the giant Xerox Corporation, which we are proud to have as part of our organization. At the same time our union has been a force for stability and progress for the clothing industry itself. I am pleased to have this opportunity to pay my compliments to Abe for the integrity, the dedication and the enlightenment he has brought to Rochester during almost 45 years of leadership. We can all be proud of his attainments.

May I close with my own congratulations, and those of my colleagues on the General Executive Board, to Abe and his associates for erecting this beautiful building. I know it will serve the wide range of activities of your membership, including the health center and the retirees center and will be a monument to the Amalgamated's contributions to the people of Rochester.

The East Avenue rostrum played host yesterday to yet another great American who is well known to many of our colleagues. He is Rabbi Philip S. Bernstein, of Rochester's Temple B'rith Kodesh, who serves as chairman of the American-Israel Public Affairs Committee here in Washington.

The program would not have been complete without Rabbi Bernstein, whose family roots lie in tailoring, and who has grown up with the clothing industry and the clothing workers union in his many decades in Rochester. Few men know better than Phil Bernstein what benefits the organization of the clothing industry has bestowed on immigrant tailors of all nationalities who flocked to this country early in the century. His well chosen words follow:

REMARKS BY RABBI PHILIP S. BERNSTEIN

There is an ancient Hebrew phrase which seems appropriate at this moment, Zecher Tzadik Lavrachah, the memory of the righteous is a blessing. We think today of Sidney Hillman and his associates who by their pioneering struggles have made this event possible. Mr. Hillman was a courageous fighter, a wise statesman, and a warm hearted human being. His leadership and that of his associates does indeed bless us today.

It is good to have here also today Mr. Hillman's successor and for many years his comrade, Jacob Potofsky, who has carried on the high traditions of the early leadership and for whom I have warm personal regard.

I have regarded Abe Chatman as my friend for forty years. I have respected and continue to respect his integrity, his fortitude, his leadership. This building is an Amalgamated achievement but you know that it is due in no small part to Abe's tenacity of purpose.

All my life I have had a special interest in the clothing industry. My father made his living, if you call it a living, out of making pants. They weren't very good pants because they were cut from remnants bought in fire sales, and most of his customers looked as if they just stepped out of a painting by Picasso. But somehow the family lived by this "schneidering" and educated three children. My mother did some sewing in a tailor shop when she came here as a girl. Practically all of the owners of the clothing factories, excepting that Yiddish speaking Jeremiah Hickey of blessed memory, were members of my congregation. A large part of the Jewish community consisted of people who worked in the clothing factories and shops.

The clothing industry made a very important contribution to the welfare of Rochester. In fact there was a time when I think it was the leading industry in town. It helped to make Americans the best dressed people in the world. It made it possible for workmen of modest means to dress as well as their employers.

As I appreciate the contribution which the clothing industry has made to the economy of our city and our country, and its contribution to raising standards of life and appearance for the American people, so also do I appreciate its social statesmanship. This did not come easily nor quickly. There was a hard and even bloody struggle, but out of it emerged a remarkably constructive industrial peace and cooperation. Both sides should be commended for this and for its ongoing character. But today I think particularly as we dedicate this Amalgamated Building of the social statesmanship of the Union and of its leadership, a statesmanship that was both down to earth and far visioned, that was practical and visionary.

So today I felicitate the Amalgamated Clothing Workers on this great achievement, on this beautiful building and the good use to which it will be put, and I pray for many, many years of continued and growing high usefulness.

Mr. Speaker, the success of the Rochester ACWA joint board, and the quality of its dealings with its members and with industry in Rochester is attested to by the wide variety of manufacturing industries which employ members of what once was exclusively a clothing workers' union. In addition to a wide range of clothing companies in Rochester, which is among the world's leaders in the manufacture of men's apparel, the union is represented in food processing, folding box, jigsaw puzzle and countless other plants, along with the giant Xerox Corp., which makes its headquarters in Rochester.

Both Xerox President C. Peter McCologh and Board Chairman Joseph C. Wilson were on hand for the dedication. Walter Hickey, president of Hickey-Freeman Clothes, spoke in behalf of the city's many clothing firms. Their presence, and that of other Rochester industrialists, testifies to the lasting goodwill which exists between the ACWA and the Rochester businesses it deals with, just as the fine and tasteful building we dedicated yesterday testifies to the strength and growth of organized labor in Rochester, and to its permanent, respected and constructive role in the life of our community. The beauty of this building, and steadfastness of Amalgamated Manager Abe Chatman is noted in the following portion of an editorial which appeared yesterday in the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle:

THE AMALGAMATED

Where a mansion once stood, and within a stone's throw of other mansions, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers' new $800,000 headquarters at 750 East Ave. will be dedicated today—and the beautiful avenue is the better for it. . . .

For Abraham Chatman, manager of the clothing workers' union these many years, has more than lived up to his promise to fit the dramatic building into the dignity and the "feeling" of the avenue. It has an austere modern beauty which somehow blends easily with the ornate beauty of the mansions of a century ago. . . .

Those who were hopeful, those who were worried, those who were happy, those who were upset—all of them now owe a grateful thank-you to the slight grey-haired Chatman for bringing off his dream in such good taste.

A TRIBUTE TO THE WORKING-WOMEN OF AMERICA

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Conte] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, National Business Women's Week will be observed October 15–21 this year, and will be highlighted by congresses of career women leaders at National, State, and local levels. This annual tribute to all career women has been sponsored since 1928 by the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc.

The aims and ideals of career women everywhere, including such areas as equal employment opportunity, uniform taxation and retirement laws, and equitable jury representation, are in perfect harmony with the precepts and traditions of our American democratic society. I am proud to acknowledge the endeavors of these courageous women as we celebrate National Business Women's Week and urge all concerned citizens from every strata of our society to give support and recognition to their worthwhile cause.

BOYDEN OF DEERFIELD—NO BETTER MAN

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Conte] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, a week ago, I led many distinguished Members of this House in paying tribute to this country's dean of headmasters, Frank L. Boyden, upon the announcement of his planned retirement next June. The same day, an editorial in the Greenfield Recorder described the pride mixed with an accompanying sense of loss in that town, also, at the prospect of the removal of Deerfield Academy's most celebrated attraction.

I at that time remarked on Frank Boyden's achievements and the many honors they brought. Other Members joined in to recount the measure of his career since he took the position 65 years ago to pay for law schooling. He started with 14 students and one building and expanded the school until its campus now stretches over 350 acres and its students number 475.

Now, Deerfield Academy faces the prospect of finding a new headmaster. The one reassurance that the man so chosen will not be one easily overwhelmed by the traditions and memories of the man who built Deerfield into a school ranking with the top 16 in the country will be the active presence of Frank Boyden as chairman of the selection committee.

For, over and above the school's 20 buildings and 33 restored homes, Frank Boyden leaves an endowment of excellence and intelligence in the pursuit of culture and public leadership. His encouragement, his guidance and, above all, his example, have already given to the finer schools of this country numerous capable headmasters. There is great assurance in his past record of thoroughness and character that he will give us one more in his mold—for Deerfield.

Since the Greenfield Recorder's editorial expresses these sentiments so well, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record and thus made available to Frank Boyden's many admirers.

No Better Man

If ever a formal announcement of official decision was greeted with mixed emotions, it was the Deerfield Academy trustees' disclosure Sunday that Headmaster Frank L. Boyden will retire in June of 1968.

There is pleasure, of course, that Dr. Boyden will step down while he is still a dominant figure. For all his 88 years, he is not only active as an administrator but he also possesses an amazing vigor and a comprehensive grasp of the daily situations that arise.

But there is an undeniable element of sadness. For 66 years Frank Boyden has been a focal point of attention at the academy. His personality and his character have dominated the Deerfield scence. Students and teachers have come and gone, but Dr. Boyden has remained constant—challenging encouraging and inspiring all who have come into contact with him.

Pride has been a strong force in the building of this unique educational institution. Personally humble, and at times almost apologetic, Dr. Boyden has developed at Deerfield Academy both a school and a type of American deserving of society's admiration. Students, faculty members, parents and neighbors have shared in this spiritual uplift. It is impossible to remain aloof from the sense of purpose that is the very atmosphere of Deerfield.

Finally, the news of Frank Boyden's impending retirement arouses a determination that this work will be carried on for generations to come. So much has been built from so little of material means that all associated with Deerfield Academy consider it a personal challenge to help advance the work so nobly begun.

The selection of a committee of parents and alumni trustees to choose his successor bears the hallmark of Frank L. Boyden. Those entrusted with this duty are individuals who love the school and who appreciate its traditions as well as its goals. Their choice will be governed by past, present and future considerations.

Probably the most significant factor to Dr. Boyden's old friends in his presence on the selection committee. A man who has devoted his life to the service of the nation can be depended upon for this vital final task. In the discussions ahead, the retiring headmaster's almost mystical ability to judge character will be of incalculable value.

Like the trustees of Deerfield back in 1902, the trustees of 1967 couldn't have chosen a better man for the assignment.

TARIFF COMMISSION TEXTILE STUDY

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the President, the Tariff Commission has instituted a factfinding investigation on the economic condition of the U.S. textile and apparel industries, especially the present and prospective impact of imports upon those industries. The Commission must report the results of this investigation to the President not later than January 15, 1968. Wilbur D. Mills, chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means, joined the President in requesting this investigation.

The President's letter to the Commission ordered a comprehensive investigation—

> In addition to basic economic data concerning imports, tariffs, production, sales, investment, employment, prices, and profits, the Commission is requested to report on other relevant factors the knowledge of which, in its judgment, may assist me and the Congress. Attention should be paid to the impact of imports upon manmade fiber textiles, wool textiles, and cotton textiles, taken separately, as well as collectively, and to the question of interfiber competition.

In a separate press statement the President added:

> In recent months representatives of these industries have expressed to me and to many others a deep concern over their future wellbeing in light of a number of factors, and especially import trends. A large number of the members of the Congress in both the House and Senate—including Chairman Mills of the Ways and Means Committee—have sponsored bills which deal with the question of imports.

The President is referring to S. 1796, sponsored by about 66 Senators, and to about 200 bills in the House proposing quota restrictions on imports of all textiles and textile products. The Senate Committee on Finance is also scheduled to hold public hearings October 18–20 on quota bills, including quotas on textiles.

The Tariff Commission will open public hearings in Washington on November 13, 1967.

The Tariff Commission study of the current textile situation is a sound step in discovering the factual reality of textile industry claims for special quotas against foreign imports.

The three relevant documents follow: the Tariff Commission's announcement of investigation and hearings, the President's public statement announcing his request for a study, and the concurring letter sent the chairman of the Tariff Commission by Ways and Means Committee Chairman Wilbur Mills:

[From the U.S. Tariff Commission, Washington, D.C.]

[332–55]

Textile and Apparel Industries: Notice of Investigation and Hearing

In response to a request dated October 4, 1967, by the President of the United States, the U.S. Tariff Commission has instituted an investigation of the economic condition of the United States textile and apparel industries. The full text of the request is as follows:

"Dear Mr. Chairman: Pursuant to the authority vested in me by Section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930, I hereby request a comprehensive investigation of the economic condition of the United States textile and apparel industries, especially the present and prospective impact of imports upon those industries, and a report to me on the results of this investigation not later than January 15, 1968.

"In addition to basic economic data concerning imports, tariffs, production, sales, investment, employment, prices, and profits, the Commission is requested to report on other relevant factors the knowledge of which, in its judgment, may assist me and the Congress. Attention should be paid to the impact of imports upon man-made fiber textiles, wool textiles, and cotton textiles, taken separately, as well as collectively, and to the question of interfiber competition.

"Sincerely,

"Lyndon B. Johnson."

A hearing will be held in the Hearing Room, Tariff Commission Building, 8th and E Streets, N.W., Washington, D.C., beginning at 10 a.m., on November 13, 1967. Interested parties desiring to appear and to be heard should notify the Secretary of the Commission, in writing, *on or before November 3, 1967*. It is suggested that parties who have a common interest endeavor wherever possible to arrange for a consolidated presentation of their views.

Requests to appear must contain the following information:

a. The products or industry segments on which testimony will be presented.

b. The name and organization of the witness or witnesses who will testify, and the name, address, telephone number, and organization of the person filing the request.

c. A statement indicating whether the testimony to be presented will be on behalf of importer or domestic producer interests.

d. A careful estimate of the aggregate time desired for presentation of oral testimony by all witnesses for whose appearances the request is filed.

Because of the limited time available, the Commission reserves the right to limit the time assigned to witnesses. In this connection, experience in similar previous hearings has indicated that in most cases the essential information can be effectively summarized in an oral presentation of 15 to 30 minutes. Parties desiring an allowance of time in excess of this amount should set forth any special circumstances in support of such request. Witnesses may *supplement their oral testimony with written statements* of any desired length. These should be submitted when the oral testimony is presented.

Persons who have properly filed requests to appear will be individually notified of the date on which they will be scheduled to present oral testimony and of the time allotted for presentation of such testimony.

Questioning of witnesses will be limited to members of the Commission.

Written information and views in lieu of appearance at the public hearings may be submitted by interested persons. A signed original and nineteen true copies of such statements shall be submitted.

Business data which is deemed confidential shall be submitted on separate sheets, each clearly marked at the top "Business Confidential". All written statements, except for confidential business data, will be made available for inspection by interested persons. To be assured of consideration by the Commission, written statements *in lieu of appearance* should be submitted at the earliest practicable date, but not later than November 20, 1967.

All communications regarding the Commission's investigation should be addressed to the Secretary, United States Tariff Commission, Washington, D.C. 20436.

By order of the Commission:

Donn N. Bent,
Secretary.

Issued October 6, 1967.

[From the office of the White House Press Secretary, Oct. 4, 1967]

Statement by the President

I have today asked the United States Tariff Commission to report to me by January 15, 1968, in the fullest detail possible on the economic condition of the United States textile and apparel industries. In this report, I expect in particular an intensive analysis of the present and prospective impact of imports upon these industries.

This Administration has consistently acted in recognition of the fact that the textile and apparel industries are of great importance to our economy. In recent months representatives of these industries have expressed to me and to many others a deep concern over their future well-being in light of a number of factors, and especially import trends. A large number of the members of the Congress in both the House and Senate—including Chairman Mills of the Ways and Means Committee—have sponsored bills which deal with the question of imports.

In considering this widespread concern, I have concluded that we must have all the facts possible to guide our future actions in this important field, and I am pleased that Chairman Mills is joining my request. I hope that the Tariff Commission's report will permit all of us who are deeply interested in the welfare of the textile and apparel industries to take a course of action which will be both in their interest and the national interest.

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, October 4, 1967.

Hon. Glenn W. Sutton,
Acting Chairman,
U.S. Tariff Commission,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: I wish to join with the President in his request that the Commission make a comprehensive examination of the economic condition of the United States textile and apparel industries, including the present and future impact of imports upon such industries.

The report of this investigation should permit both the President and the Congress to formulate a policy for the textile and apparel industries which will be in their interest as well as the national interest.

With kindest regards and best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,
Wilbur D. Mills.

POWELL AGAINST McCORMACK ET AL.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, one of the subjects committed to the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress for study was relations between the judicial and the legislative branches of the Federal Government.

Our former colleague, the Honorable George Meader, now chief counsel of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, conducted extensive research into past instances of litigation in which the Congress, its Members, or committees were involved, or which affected the Congress.

When the Adam Clayton Powell matter arose in the House of Representatives in the 90th Congress, as one principally involved in that controversy, I requested Mr. Meader to give close attention to the case in the various stages of its development.

Accordingly, Mr. Meader has been in continuous contact with the counsel retained by the Speaker and the other defendants in the case of Powell against McCormack and has furnished to those attorneys from time to time the results of his study of litigation affecting Congress.

The case of Powell against McCormack is now pending in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. The brief for Powell's attorneys was filed with the court on July 12, 1967, and the brief for Speaker McCormack and the other defendants was due to be filed on August 20, 1967. Accordingly, in advance of the filing of the defendants' and appellees' brief, Mr. Meader transmitted to Judge Bromley, attorney for the defendants and appellees, his suggestions for the reply to the brief of Powell's attorneys in the court of appeals. The correspondence accompanying this transmission of the brief is as follows:

Congress of the United States,
Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress,
Washington, D. C., August 10, 1967.

Re: Powell v. McCormack.

Mr. Bruce Bromley,
Cravath, Swaine & Moore,
New York, N.Y.

Dear Judge Bromley: Enclosed herewith is a rough draft of a brief containing my ideas of what might be said in the brief in the Circuit Court of Appeals. These suggestions are for such use as you see fit to make of them.

If there is any further way in which I can be helpful, please let me know.

Sincerely,
George Meader,
Chief Counsel.

Cravath, Swaine & Moore,
New York, N.Y., August 14, 1967.

Powell v. McCormack.

George Meader, Esq.,
Chief Counsel, Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, Congress of the United States, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Meader: I am extremely grateful to you for the obviously careful and thorough research which has gone into your draft of a brief in the above matter and I thank you very much for sending it to me.

Yours sincerely,
Bruce Bromley.

Mr. Speaker, because the issues in Powell against McCormack are fundamental constitutional, historical issues going to the very heart of our system of government with its autonomous, tripartite system and the doctrine of separation of powers, I believe the discussion of these issues in the case of Powell against McCormack should be of great interest, not only to the Members of the House of Representatives who, as a class, are sought to be made defendants in the case, but also to the American people, and perhaps not just at the present time, but in the days to come; therefore, Mr. Speaker, I include the text of the suggested brief prepared by Mr. Meader at this point in the Record:

[Brief for appellees in the U.S. Court of Appeals, for the District of Columbia, No. 20,897]

Adam Clayton Powell, Jr., et al., Appellants
v. John W. McCormack, et al., Appellees

[Appeal from the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia]

STATEMENT OF QUESTIONS PRESENTED

Appellants do not state the questions involved correctly in that many of the questions stated go to the merits of the case when the only issue before this court is jurisdictional. The question presented should be stated as follows:

Whether the District Court erred in dismissing the complaint for want of jurisdiction over the subject matter, in denying the motion for a three-judge court, and in denying the motion for a preliminary injunction.

Since both the temporary injunction and the three-judge court fall if the court lacks jurisdiction over the subject matter and the persons of the defendants, the following questions are pertinent:

1. May the court grant the relief prayed by plaintiffs without violating:

a. The separation of powers doctrine?

b. The speech and debate clause (Article I, Section 6, Clause 3) of the United States Constitution?

c. The arrest clause (Article I, Section 6, Clause 2) of the United States Constitution?

2. May the court grant relief in the nature of mandamus against members and officers of the House of Representatives as prayed by plaintiffs?

3. May all members of the House of Representatives and the House of Representatives itself as a legislative body be made defendants as a class (although not named or served) through naming and serving six members of the House as representatives of a class?

JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT

Appellants invoke 15 sections of the Constitution and 9 statutory provisions to support the jurisdiction of the court.

Significantly, appellants omit invoking Article I, Section 6(1), providing the immunities of freedom from arrest and speech and debate, vital to this case.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Appellants use 20 pages of their brief for a statement of the case including detailed and immaterial evidentiary material wholly unnecessary to an understanding of the issue presented.

The basic fact is that March 1, 1967, the House adopted H. Res. 278 excluding Powell from membership in the House. The proceedings appear in a copy of the Congressional Record of that date attached to the complaint.

Plaintiffs ask the court to hold House Resolution 278 unconstitutional and, in effect, urge the court to substitute therefor a resolution drafted by plaintiffs and approved by the court ordering the House of Representatives, its members and officers to seat plaintiff Powell and accord him all the rights, privileges and perquisites of a member of the House of Representatives, without discrimination.

A significant fact is that nowhere in the complaint is it alleged that the defendants, or any of them, acted in any way other than in their official capacities; and the acts complained of and the relief sought relate exclusively to the exercise of official legislative functions and in no way to any individual, non-official acts or functions.

It is important for the court to understand the defendants and appellants have appeared *specially* only, not generally, solely for the purpose of challenging the jurisdiction of the court.

Appellants have not claimed anywhere in their pleadings that any action taken by the House of Representatives or by attorneys for defendants has constituted a waiver of the privileges and immunities of the House.

In fact, during the oral argument before District Judge Hart the Judge stated that appellants had not claimed and it was clear that there had been no waiver of any rights of the defendants (see Page 70 of transcript of April 4, 1967).

Thus, the merits of the case are not before the court.

The House of Representatives has not authorized counsel to appear generally, to concede the court has jurisdiction or to present arguments on the merits of the case. No answer has been filed—or authorized by the House to be filed.

Counsel for defendants have been authorized to raise the question of jurisdiction—no more.

Much of appellants' statement of the case deals with proceedings before the select committee of the House to inquire into the fitness of Powell to serve as a member. Appellees do not believe this material is relevant.

Should the court give full faith and credit to the final order of the House of Representatives?

If the answer is "yes"—then antecedent proceedings and the application of parliamentary law and rulings on points of order—or rulings which might have been made if a point of order had been timely raised—are wholly irrelevant.

Thus, the proceedings before the Special Committee and questions of adversary proceedings, due process and the like are not matters before this court and it need not interpret and judge the Rules of the House of Representatives and the precedents of the House, which are difficult enough for legislators, to say nothing of judges, to understand and utilize.

If the answer is "no"—and the court does not accord full faith and credit to a final judgment of the House,

First, it will absorb a great deal of the court's time familiarizing itself with the intricacies of parliamentary law and

Second, it will establish a precedent which will be likely to stimulate no end of judicial business, not only by citizens objecting to legislation but even by Senators and Representatives irked by an adverse parliamentary ruling.

To hold that the court has jurisdiction because parliamentary procedures are different from judicial procedures and to hold that a legislative body must conduct its business according to rules and practices established for the conduct of litigation would be a novel proposition leading to utter chaos in the law-making business at all levels. This chaos would be reflected in a tidal wave of litigation inundating courts.

Such a proposition could be advanced only by those abysmally unaware of the difference between an elected policy-making body and a court.

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

Appellants neglect to mention among the constitutional provisions involved Article I, Section 6 of the United States Constitution. This provision is the very heart of the case.

STATEMENT OF POINTS

Appellees intend to rely upon the following points:

1. The holding in *Marbury* v. *Madison* requires dismissal of the instant case.
2. The doctrine of *Dombrowski* v. *Eastland* 87 S. Ct. 1425 (May 15, 1967) and *Kilbourn* v. *Thompson* 103 U.S. 168 require dismissal of the case as to the elected defendants and are distinguishable from the instant case as to the non-elected defendants.
3. The power to issue writs of mandamus was not intended to extend to writs running against the Congress, its branches, its committees, its members or its officers.
4. The court should not render an unenforceable judgment.
5. This is not a proper class suit and the House of Representatives may not be made a party to a suit.

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

The lower court granted a motion to dismiss the complaint made after a special appearance by Attorney Bruce Bromley on behalf of some of the defendants on the ground that the court lacked jurisdiction over the subject matter of the suit and the persons of the defendants, and the complaint failed to state a cause of action.

The sole central question of the case, therefore, is whether or not the courts have jurisdiction over the defendants and the subject matter and have the power to grant the relief requested by the plaintiffs.

A number of phrases are used to describe the lack of judicial jurisdiction over the defendants and the subject matter of the suit: "Separation of powers," "Justicibility," "Legislative immunity," "Privileges of the House including speech and debate and freedom from arrest clauses," "Political question," "Legislative discretion," "The power of the court to command affirmative action by a coordinate branch of the government or the members thereof," "Failure to state a cause of action," "Sovereignty."

All of these phrases raise the single central constitutional issue of whether the court on a complaint of a private citizen or a group of citizens has the power to command affirmative action by the elected Representatives of the Congress, either individually or collectively as the House of Representatives and non-member officers of the House of Representatives, as prayed by plaintiffs.

ARGUMENT

I. The holding in Marbury *v.* Madison *requires dismissal of the instant case*

Justice Marshall held that the express description of the original jurisdiction of the Supreme Court in Article III of the Constitution was exclusive and was intended to limit the original jurisdiction of the Supreme Court. The law passed by the Congress authorizing the Supreme Court to issue writs of mandamus as an exercise of original jurisdiction was therefore in conflict with the provisions of the Constitution and was consequently null and void. The court refused to issue the writ of mandamus although it had held that the nature of the case was appropriate for such a writ.

This reasoning applied to the present case requires this court to hold that the power to judge ". . . the elections, returns and qualifications of members . . ." of the House of Representatives is vested in the House of Representatives; that it cannot be vested in any other department of the government, neither the Senate, the Executive nor the Judiciary; that the determination of the House in exercising the power of judgment of elections, returns and qualifications of House members is final and not subject to review in any other place.

If the Congress sought to pass a law giving the courts the power to judge qualifications of House members or to review such a judgment made by the House, under the holding of *Marbury* v. *Madison,* the court would be compelled to hold such a law unconstitutional.

Appellants' attorneys make much of the language in *Marbury* v. *Madison* that every right, when withheld must have a remedy, and every injury, its proper redress. Appellants cite this reasoning as grounds for asserting judicial intervention since this is a case arising under the Constitution of the United States.

The court said in *Marbury* v. *Madison,* Page 162:

"This brings us to the second inquiry; which is,

"2d. If he has a right, and that right has been violated, do the laws of this country afford him a remedy?

"The very essence of civil liberty certainly consists in the right of every individual to claim the protection of the laws, whenever he receives an injury. One of the first duties of government is to afford that protection. In Great Britain the king himself is sued in the respectful form of a petition, and he never fails to comply with the judgment of his court.

"In the 3d vol. of his Commentaries, p. 23, Blackstone states two cases in which a remedy is afforded by mere operation of law.

" 'In all other cases,' he says, 'it is a general and indisputable rule, that where there is a legal right, there is also a legal remedy by suit, or action at law, whenever that right is invaded.'

"And afterwards, p. 109, of the same vol. he says, 'I am next to consider such injuries as are cognizable by the courts of the common law. And herein I shall for the present only remark, that all possible injuries whatsoever, that did not fall within the exclusive cognizance of either the ecclesiastical, military, or maritime tribunals, are, for that very reason, within the cognizance of the common law courts of justice; for it is a settled and invariable principle in the laws of England, that every right when withheld, must have a remedy, and every injury its proper redress.' "

Appellants wholly omit calling attention to the court's subsequent modification of this general rule to exclude granting a remedy for rights claimed to have been invaded through the exercise of executive discretion.

Justice Marshall said (Page 165):

"By the constitution of the United States, the President is invested with certain important political powers, in the exercise of which he is to use his own discretion, and is accountable only to his country in his political character and to his own conscience. To aid him in the performance of these duties, he is authorized to appoint certain officers, who act by his authority, and in conformity with his orders.

"In such cases, their acts are his acts; and whatever opinion may be entertained of the manner in which executive discretion may be used, still there exists, and can exist, no power to control that discretion. The subjects are political. They respect the nation, not individual rights, and being intrusted to the executive, the decision of the executive is conclusive. The application of this remark will be perceived by adverting to the act of congress for establishing the department of foreign affairs. This officer, as his duties were prescribed by that act, is to conform precisely to the will of the President. He is the mere organ by whom that will is communicated. The acts of such an officer, as an officer, can never be examinable by the courts.

"But when the legislature proceeds to impose on that officer other duties; when he is directed peremptorily to perform certain acts; when the rights of individuals are dependent on the performance of those acts; he is so far the officer of the law; is amenable to the laws for his conduct; and cannot at his discretion sport away the vested rights of others.

"The conclusion from this reasoning is, that where the heads of departments are the political or confidential agents of the executive, merely to execute the will of the President, or rather to act in cases in which the executive possesses a constitutional or legal discretion, nothing can be more perfectly clear than that their acts are only politically examinable. But where a specific duty is assigned by law, and individual rights depend upon the performance of that duty, it seems equally clear that the individual who considers himself injured, has a right to resort to the laws of his country for a remedy."

Applied to the instant case, this reasoning means that discretion is vested in the House of Representatives to judge the qualifications of its members and that its judgment, being discretionary, political and legislative in character, is not examinable in the courts.

The function of judging qualifications, of course, is judicial in character. But it is also, when judged by a legislative body, an exercise of legislative power. It is a highly important power of the legislative body enabling it to govern its own composition, free from subordination or control by any exterior body.

For a court by an order in the nature of mandamus to command that the discretion or power of decision of elected members of the House of Representatives, individually, or collectively as a legislative body, be exercised in any particular manner or in such a manner as the court thought proper would be in the words of Chief Justice Marshall, "an extravagance, so absurd and excessive, (. . . that it) could not have been entertained for a moment."

Justice Marshall went on to say, "The province of the court is, solely, to decide on the rights of individuals, not to inquire how the executive, or executive officers, perform duties in which they have a discretion. Questions in their nature political, or which are, by the constitution and laws, submitted to the executive, can never be made in this court." (Page 170)

Appellants' contention of the scope of judicial review proves too much.

Appellants cite *Marbury* v. *Madison* as authority for the proposition that if a plaintiff asserts that his federal constitutional or legal rights have in some way been affected by action of any unit of government—or possibly even by an individual or non-governmental agency—and a "constitutional question" is therefore raised, the federal courts have jurisdiction and can grant relief—at least "declaratory relief—regardless of any other consideration."

They disregard the separation of powers doctrine as either nonexistent or wholly irrelevant.

While this case involves only the Congress, their view of the power of the courts would be equally applicable to the powers vested in the Executive by the Constitution.

This is an assertion of judicial supremacy which goes far beyond anything the courts have yet announced.

Under plaintiffs' interpretation of *Marbury* v. *Madison*, relief could have been granted in all of the numerous actions against the President and the Congress cited under the heading, "Is This A Case of First Impression?" In other words, plaintiffs' theory of the jurisdiction of the courts would have permitted the courts to have afforded relief in the case *All-America Protectorate* v. *Lyndon B. Johnson et al.*; *U.S. ex rel. Brookfield Construction Co., Inc. & Baylor Construction Corp.* v. *J. George Stewart et al.*; *Trimble* v. *Johnson*, etc.

II. The doctrine of Dombrowski *v.* Eastland *87 S. Ct. 1425 (May 15, 1967) and* Kilbourn *v.* Thompson *103 U.S. 168 require dismissal of the case as to the elected defendants and are distinguishable from the instant case as to the non-elected defendants*

The court in its order of June 19, 1967, instructed attorneys for appellants to comment on the *per curiam* opinion in *Dombrowski* v. *Eastland* in its relationship to the issues of this case.

Appellants' comments on *Dombrowski* pp. 69, 70, 71 of their brief were superficial and of little assistance to this court in considering and judging an epochal issue in the relations between the separate judicial and legislative branches of the United States Government.

In *Kilbourn* v. *Thompson*, Thompson as Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives, arrested Kilbourn pursuant to an order of the House of Representatives and caused him to be incarcerated in the common jail for the District of Columbia. Kilbourn sued the Speaker of the House, the members of the House committee, before whom he had been contemptuous, and the Sergeant at Arms for false imprisonment and asked $150,000 damages.

In a lengthy opinion, discussing the contempt power of the English Parliament, Justice Samuel Miller sought to circumscribe the investigatory power of the Congress and wrote a remarkable decision, which, in the subsequent three-quarters of a century, apparently has not been reconsidered in depth by the judiciary in other cases.

McGrain v. *Daugherty* (1927) 273 U.S. 135 and *Jurney* v. *McCracken* (1935) 294 U.S. 125 have fortified the investigatory power of the Congress and inferentially overruled some aspects of *Kilbourn* v. *Thompson*. Other cases have tangentially minimized the evil of *Kilbourn* v. *Thompson*. See "Congressional Investigations and Judicial Review: Kilbourn *v.* Thompson Revisited," Gerald Morgan 37, California Law Review, Page 556 (Dec. 1949).

Kilbourn v. *Thompson* held that the inquiry the House committee conducted was *ultra vires* the Congress, that the contempt imprisonment pursuant to the House resolution was therefore invalid; that elected members were immune from suit for false imprisonment because of the speech and debate clause (Article I, Section 6(1) of the United States Constitution), but that an officer elected by them, viz. Thompson, Sergeant at Arms of the House, directed by them to execute their orders, was not clothed with legislative immunity. Eventually, a judgment of $20,000 was rendered against Thompson. Congress later appropriated funds to pay the judgment with interest and costs and also the fees of the attorneys who represented the congressional defendants.

The implications of judicial-congressional conflicts were not effectively argued or intensively considered in *Kilbourn* v. *Thompson* or in *Dombrowski* v. *Eastland*. The issues were neither posed, discussed in the briefs, nor resolved in any way other than in the brief holding in Judge Miller's opinion, as follows:

"In this, as in other matters which have been pressed on our attention, we prefer to decide only what is necessary to the case in hand, and we think the plea set up by those of the defendants who were members of the House is a good defence, and the judgment of the court overruling the demurrer to it and giving judgment for those defendants will be affirmed. As to Thompson, the judgment will be reversed and the case remanded for further proceedings."

Clearly, on the basis of *Kilbourn* and *Dombrowski*, all the defendants except Miller, Johnson and Jennings, being elected Representatives, are not subject to suit for action taken by them in the House of Representatives, under the speech and debate clause. See Also: *U.S.* v. *Johnson* 383 U.S. 169 (1966); *Tenney* v. *Brandhove* 341 U.S. 367 (1951).

This legislative immunity is analogous to the judicial immunity upheld in the recent decision of *Pierson* v. *Ray*, April 11, 1967, 386 U.S. 547.

There remains to be considered whether or not legislative immunity attaches to defendants Miller, Johnson and Jennings in the light of *Kilbourn* and *Dombrowski*.

In *Dombrowski* v. *Eastland*, Sourwine, Counsel of the U.S. Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, was considered to be clothed with legislative immunity as the agent of a Senate committee, but apparently not to the same extent as Chairman Eastland who was an elected Senator. While it is not completely clear either from the *per curiam* opinion in *Dombrowski* v. *Eastland* or from an examination of the briefs and records in the case, it would appear that the court believed there was an issue of fact as to whether or not Sourwine, personally, had engaged in activities detrimental to plaintiffs outside of the scope of his duties as counsel and agent for the Senate committee.

If this is a correct interpretation of the holding in *Dombrowski*, then the case is similar to *Wheeldin* v. *Wheeler* 373 U.S. 656, in which an employee of the House Committee on Un-American Activities was sued for action taken by him alleged to be beyond his authority as a staff member of that committee. Justice Douglas, speaking for the majority, affirmed a lower court holding that the complaint failed to state a federal cause of action.

Thus, it would seem that legislative immunity properly extends to cover the official acts of elected officers of the House, who are not members of the House, for acts done in their official capacity in executing the orders of the House.

See also: *Trimble* v. *Johnston* 137 F. Supp. 651 (1959) *U.S. ex rel. Brookfield Const. Co.* v. *Stewart* 234 F. Supp. 94; affirmed 339 F. 2nd 753 (1964)

In this connection, it is significant that defendants Miller, Johnson and Jennings are not alleged to have done anything other than their official duties and no relief is sought against them except in their official capacities. Ordering defendants Miller, Johnson and Jennings to do things in their non-official, individual capacity would be of no avail to plaintiffs. It is precisely their official action in carrying out orders of the House of Representatives under the Constitution, laws and rules and precedents of the House that appellants are seeking to reach.

It is perfectly apparent that, on the basis of reason, House officers should be clothed with legislative immunity for their official action since the House needs the aid of officers and employees to carry out its functions and, to interfere with these employees in faithfully executing the will of the House is to interfere with the House, itself. It must be conceded that this is contrary to the holding in *Kilbourn* v. *Thompson*, but it is submitted that that aspect of *Kilbourn* v. *Thompson* should be reexamined and either reversed, drastically modified or distinguished.

If Miller, Jennings and Johnson are subject to the mandate of this court, although the other defendants are not, it would appear that the only way the House can protect its independence is to elect as its officers members who have been elected by the people. This, manifestly, would be a restriction upon the operation of the House of Representatives since it would require elected members to divert energies from their lawmaking duties to the performance of housekeeping chores.

Wholly aside from the propriety of the assertion of court jurisdiction over elected officers of the House of Representatives, the instant case is distinguishable from *Kilbourn* v. *Thompson* and *Dombrowski* v. *Eastland*.

Both of these cases were suits for money judgments—*Kilbourn* for false imprisonment and *Dombrowski* for interference with civil rights. It may well be said that the defense of a suit for damages is not a direct interference with the functioning of the legislative body other than in the respect that the defendant is required to divert some of his energies and time, which should be devoted to his official duties, to the defense of a law suit; and that he may be required to pay a money judgment.

The instant suit, however, involves direct interference with the legislative process in a far more important and dangerous manner than the mere entry of a money judgment against an agent of the Congress. The instant suit aims at compelling affirmative acts on the part of the non-elected defendants which they cannot perform without violating the order of the House of Representatives. These defendants therefore, in the event the court issued a decree against them as requested by plaintiffs, would be in the untenable position of being either in contempt of the House of Representatives or in contempt of the court, either of which could enforce its order by imprisonment or otherwise.

Here again, it should be noted that, if the court should decide that the speech and debate clause does not clothe the elected members of the House, including the Speaker, with legislative immunity and should enter a decree against the elected defendants as prayed by plaintiffs, the court could enforce its decree only by arrest and imprisonment and would thereby be confronted with another constitutional privilege of the House; namely, freedom from arrest, Article I, Section 6, Clause 2, which reads as follows:

"They (the Senators and Representatives) shall in all Cases, except Treason, Felony, and Breach of the Peace, be privileged from Arrest during their Attendance at the Session of their respective Houses, and in going to and returning from the same; . . ."

In *Barry v. U.S. ex rel. Cunningham*, 279 U.S. 597 (1929), a suit arising out of the exercise of the power of the Senate to judge the qualifications of a Senator-elect under Article I, Section 5, Clause 1, of the Constitution, in investigating the allegedly fraudulent election of Senator Vare in Pennsylvania, the court said (Page 613):

"First, Generally, the Senate is a legislative body, exercising in connection with the House only the power to make laws. But it has had conferred upon it by the Constitution certain powers which are not legislative but judicial in character. Among these is the power to judge of the elections, returns and qualifications of its own members. Art. I, Section 5, cl. 1. 'That power carries with it authority to take such steps as may be appropriate and necessary to secure information upon which to decide concerning election.' Reed v. County Commissioners, 277 U.S. 376, 388. Exercise of the power necessarily involves the ascertainment of facts, the attendance of witnesses, the examination of such witnesses, with the power to compel them to answer pertinent questions, to determine the facts and apply the appropriate rules of law, and, finally, *to render a judgment which is beyond the authority of any other tribunal to review.*" (Emphasis supplied)

In the case of *Reed* v. *the County Commissioners*, 277 U.S. 376 (1927), which also grew out of the investigation of the election of Senator Vare, the investigating committee and its counsel sought a decree from the U.S. District Court ordering the delivery of ballot boxes and ballots used in the senatorial election. Although the holding of the case turned upon the authority of the committee and its counsel to sue, the court, on Page 388, discussed the power of the Senate to judge qualifications of its members, as follows:

"The resolutions are to be construed having regard to the power possessed and customarily exerted by the Senate. It is the judge of the elections, returns and qualifications of its members. Art. I, Sec. 5. It is fully empowered, and may determine such matters without the aid of the House of Representatives or the Executive or Judicial Department."

It is this same power to judge qualifications of a member-elect which is the subject matter of the instant case.

The holdings in *Barry* v. *U.S.* and *Reed* v. *County Commissioners* are relevant to the issues of this case in two respects:

First, they are precedents for the contention of defendants and appellees that the power of the House to judge qualifications of its members under Article I, Section 5, is exclusive and is not subject to review.

Second, they are relevant because, like the instant case, they involved a judicial determination of the Senate regarding qualifications of one of its members-elect and, thus, present a completely different situation from either *Dombrowski* or *Kilbourn*, both of which involved the exercise of the investigatory power of the Congress, not its judicial power, and both of which were suits for money damages for abuse of power.

The issue here with respect to non-elected defendants is more nearly comparable to the issue in *Trimble* v. *Johnson*, 173 F Supp 651, in which the court denied a prayer for an order directed to the Secretary of the Senate to divulge information which the Senate had not ordered made public.

III. The power to issue writs of mandamus was not intended to extend to writs running against the Congress, its branches, its committees, its Members or its officers

Title 28, Section 1361, provides as follows:

"Action to compel an officer of the United States to perform his duty.

"The district courts shall have original jurisdiction of any action in the nature of mandamus to compel an officer or employee of the United States or any agency thereof to perform a duty owed to the plaintiff. (Added Pub. L. 87–748, Sec. 1(a), Oct. 5, 1962, 76 Stat. 744.)"

This statute is not intended to apply to the Congress, its branches, its officers, its committees, or its members.

a) Neither the Congress nor its members are "officers" of the United States, within the meaning of Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1361.

b) Even if Section 1361 is applicable to members and officers of the House of Representatives, mandamus will not lie because all of the decisions made with reference to the subject matter of this suit by the defendants were legislative decisions. Legislative decisions are not ministerial and mandamus will lie only to compel the performance of a ministerial duty clearly required by law.

Appellants' claim that the swearing-in of plaintiff Powell by the Speaker is a mere ministerial act. While this claim may have superficial plausibility, a thorough-going examination of the principles involved discloses that, on the contrary, it involves the exercise of legislative discretion of the greatest importance and difficulty.

The Speaker could not obey the mandate of the court to swear Powell without disobeying the order of the House as contained in House Resolution 278. House Resolution 278 cannot be done away with unless the courts have the power to reverse internal legislative decisions.

The Speaker possesses no intrinsic power to swear members after an objection has been made to the taking of an oath by a member-elect. The annotation to Article VI, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution relating to the oath of office of Senators and Representatives prepared by Lewis Deschler, Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives, reads as follows:

"Section 231. Functions of the Speaker in administering the oath.

"The Speaker possesses no arbitrary power in the administration of the oath (I, 134), and when objection is made the question must be decided by the House and not by the Chair (I, 519, 520). An objection prevents the Speaker from administering the oath of his own authority, even though the credentials be regular in form (I, 135–138). The Speaker has frequently declined to administer the oath in cases wherein the House has, by its action, indicated that he should not do so (I, 139, 140). And in case of doubt he has waited the instruction of the House (I, 396; VI, 11)."

House Resolution 278 resulted from the exercise of legislative power vested by Article I, Section 5, of the Constitution of the United States in the House of Representatives.

The provision that each House shall be the *judge* of the elections, returns and qualifications of its own members obviously describes a judicial function and a judicial power.

Vesting this judicial function expressly in each House excludes the exercise of that judicial function by any other body, *Barry* v. *U.S. ex rel. Cunningham.*

This obviously stems from concern for the autonomy of a legislative body, since subjecting such judgment to review by any other body would render the legislative body inferior and subordinate.

The courts may no more review and overturn a final judgment of the House of Representatives in the exercise of the power of judging its members than could either the President or the Congress undertake to reverse a decision of the Supreme Court.

There must be finality of decision and the Constitution has placed this authority to judge its members clearly and exclusively in the House of Representatives.

(c) Mandamus is not an appropriate remedy to direct the exercise of discretion or the retraction or reversal of action already taken in the exercise of either, nor where a question of interpretation of law is involved.

(Title 16, D.C. Code 1001–1010
Hammond v. *Hall* (1942) 131 F2 23
Thomas v. *Vinson* (1946) 153 F2 636
Prince v. *Klune* (1945) 148 F2 18
Ewing v. *U.S. ex nll. Fowler Car Co.* 244 U.S. 1 – 61 L. Ed. 955
Youngblood v. *U.S., Mich.* 1944, 141 F2 912)

Mandamus is not appropriate to compel the attendance of a member at a session of the legislature (Wilson v. Cleveland 157 Mich. 510, 122 N.W. 284).

Where a member has been expelled by the legislative body, the courts have no power, irrespective of whether the expulsion was right or wrong, to issue a mandate to compel his reinstatement (French v. Cal. 146 Cal. 604, 80 P 1031).

IV. The court should not render an unenforceable judgment

The following discussion is an attempt to foresee precisely how a decree as prayed by plaintiffs and appellants could be carried out by the courts as a practical matter.

Powell cannot be granted effective relief without disruption of the legislative process. For example, if the court ordered defendants in *Powell* to accord Powell certain rights as a Representative and perform acts prohibited by the order of the House in H. Res. 278, the defendants are faced with the choice of obeying the order of the court or the order of the House. If they, or any of them, chose to obey the House rather than the court, the court's decree would be of no avail to Powell unless the court proceeded against the defendants for contempt and imprisonment. The defendants could not perform legislative duties in jail and the legislative process would come to a halt. Furthermore, imprisonment under contempt proceedings would violate Article I, Section 6 of the U.S. Constitution—the freedom from arrest clause.

A great many powers, rights and privileges attach to the office of Representative. Powell seeks the aid of the court to assure him of the free and full enjoyment and exercise of those rights, powers and privileges without discrimination.

The Constitution, laws and the rules and precedents of the House govern these rights and privileges. Suppose Powell should claim that in the application of these rules by the House, or by a committee he was not given equal and non-discriminatory treatment and should seek the intervention of the court to enforce its decree. Would the legislative process abate while the court reviewed the decision of the House on a ruling pursuant to a parliamentary point of order or would the court appoint a master or referee to accompany Powell in all his legislative doings clothed with power to overule parliamentary decisions instanter, or to direct officers and employees the manner in which they execute their duties and functions in order to accord Powell full and equal enjoyment of the perquisites of the office of Representative.

The judicial supervision of the application of parliamentary rules and precedents to insure Powell's full use of the powers of a Representative would involve practical problems as well as a frontal collision between two branches of our Government—the judicial and legislative—which in a showdown might well involve the third—the executive.

To appreciate the nature and magnitude of such a collision it is helpful to consider a hypothetical case.

Let us suppose the court grants the relief prayed in *Powell* v. *McCormack*, orders the House to swear-in and seat Powell and accord him all the rights and privileges of a member of the House of Representatives, without discrimination.

Let us further suppose the House is in the

Committee of the Whole considering the Civil Rights Act of 1967, Title I of which deals with voting rights of citizens. At the appropriate time, Mr. Powell offers an amendment designed to implement Section 2 of the XIV Amendment by diminishing representation in the House of those States denying the franchise to Negro citizens. A point of order is made that the Powell amendment is not germane, which is sustained by the Chair. Powell, believeing the amendment germane, contends he is being discriminated against in violation of the court's order in *Powell* v. *McCormack*. Then what happens?

Must the House suspend further consideration of the bill until a ruling on the parliamentary issue is obtained from the court?

This hypothetical case illustrates the inevitable clash between two great branches of our Government if the relief sought in *Powell* v. *McCormack* is granted.

No effective relief can be granted Powell without the court establishing a receivership over the House of Representatives. In a showdown of power, the court could enforce its order only by contempt proceedings—which inevitably would bring into play the freedom from arrest clause of Article I, Section 6 of the U.S. Constitution.

The court, even if it has jurisdiction, should refrain from asserting it and clearly announce that the internal organization of the House of Representatives is a matter for that body to judge exclusively and is not appropriate subject matter for litigation.

The court should not order action it is powerless to enforce.

V. This is not a proper class suit and the House of Representatives may not be made a party to a suit

Appellants assert the named plaintiffs sue as representatives of a class and that the named defendants are likewise representatives of a class.

In Paragraph 4 of their complaint, defendants name the Speaker and five other members of the House of Representatives and in Paragraph 4(c) state that all are "being sued individually and, pursuant to Rule 23 (a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, as representatives of a class of citizens who are presently serving in the 90th Congress as members of the House of Representatives."

It is apparent that while the complaint does not expressly say so, plaintiffs and appellants are seeking to make the House of Representatives as a legislative body a defendant in this case and, likewise, are seeking to make each individual elected representative a defendant in the case through the named elected Representative defendants as representatives of a class.

It is appellees' contention (1) that no member of the House of Representatives not served with process can be bound by action taken by the named defendants or their attorneys or by the court, and (2) that the House of Representatives as a legislative body is not a "person" or "party" subject to suit and cannot be bound by a decree running against the named elected member defendants as representatives of the House as a legislative body.

Each elected member has his own responsibility to his constituents.

Under the Rules of the House each member must cast his own vote—no other person may vote for him.

To bind member A, who was not served or represented in the instant case, by a decree against member B, who was served and appeared by counsel, would deny due process to A and to the constituents he represents.

It is no adequate answer to point out that some of the defendants who were served have appeared specially by Judge Bromley and, thus, to claim that Judge Bromley represents all 435 members of the House, or the House itself.

It is the very essence of a legislative body to hold and advance differing points of view. Indeed, the debate on H. Res. 278 (March 1, 1967), as well as the debate on H. Res. 376 (March 9, 1967) authorizing the Speaker to employ counsel, are evidence of widely differing views of members—not only on the seating of Powell—but even on the manner in which the suit against some members and officers of the House should be defended.

Appellees have not been able to discover any recorded case in which the House of Representatives as a legislative body has been party to litigation either as a plaintiff or as defendant.

There is nothing in the Constitution which authorizes the Congress or the House of Representatives or the Senate to sue or be sued.

The House of Representatives is not a "person" either natural or artificial. It owes whatever corporate existence it has to the Constitution of the United States. The attributes there described can neither be added to by the Congress or by the courts, nor can any of the attributes vested in the Congress be taken away from them either by action of the Congress or the courts (*Marbury* v. *Madison*).

The House of Representatives not being subject to suit as a legislative body by an action against it directly, the House of Representatives may not be made a party defendant indirectly through suing some of its members as representatives of a class of all of the elected representatives collectively as a legislative body.

Even if the House of Representatives as a legislative body is a party subject to suit, it could only be sued if the sovereign immunity of the United States were waived with respect to the House of Representatives and no such waiver has been made. It should be clear, therefore, that this court is without power to render any binding decree against the House of Representatives as a legislative body.

Reed v. the County Commissioners (277 U.S. 376 (1928) was a case where a Senate Elections Committee as plaintiffs sought the subpoena of a Federal District Court to obtain election data. The court held that the suit could not be maintained by the committee and its staff since the Senate had not granted the committee the power to sue, and the question was argued whether the Senate could have granted such power.

A suit against the House of Representatives through the attempted joinder of all members of the House as a class through served Representatives was not intended by the authorization of class suits in Rule 23(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. If it were so intended, appellees submit that it would be an unconstitutional exercise of power by the courts attributing to a legislative body a capacity to sue and be sued not granted that body in the United States Constitution.

IS THIS A CASE OF FIRST IMPRESSION?

District Court Judge Hart in his opinion said there were no cases directly in point in the following language:

". . . As to the precise issue which I deem to be raised here, there are no cases directly in point. This Court has not found a case nor has any been cited to it where the complaint and the relief prayed therein have posed to the Court with such stark clarity the question of separation of powers between the Legislature, as represented by the House of Representatives of the United States, and the Federal Judiciary. The following cases may be said to touch on the point but each of them is easily distinguishable on its facts: . . ."

It is true that no case has been found where the aid of the federal courts was sought to compel "the House of Representatives to seat a member-elect." Numerous cases, however, have been commenced by individuals against members of the Congress or its committees for varying purposes. So far as we have been able to ascertain, in no instance except *Kilbourn* v. *Thompson* has a final judgment been entered against any committee, member or agent of the Congress with respect to action taken or to be taken in a legislative capacity. In *Kilbourn* v. *Thompson* it should be noted that there no action was taken against elected Representatives but only their agent, the Sergeant at Arms of the House.

1. One class of such actions are those relating to committee hearings either seeking to enjoin the holding of a hearing or the enforcement of a subpoena to produce documents. Some of these cases are as follows:

Mins v. *McCarthy*, 209 F. 2d 307 (D.C. Cir-1953). On a motion for leave to file an application for stay, the court held that the judiciary "should" not enjoin in advance the holding of a congressional committee hearing or suspend its subpoenas.

Fischler v. *McCarthy*, 117 F. Supp. 643 (1954), Aff'd 218 F. 2d 164 (2nd Cir. 1954). Plaintiff sought to enjoin Senator McCarthy from subpoenaing documents in his possession. Denied.

Pauling v. *Eastland*, 288 F. 2d 126 (D.C. Dir. 1960), Cert. Den. 364 U.S. 900 (1960). Plaintiff was directed by the Committee on Internal Security to produce certain documents. He sought to declare the directive void, to enjoin its enforcement and possible prosecution for failure to comply. The court held that was no justiciable controversy.

Krebs v. *Ashbrook*, U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, Civil Action No. 2157 (1966). This case commenced in August of 1966 sought to enjoin a hearing of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and prayed other relief. The case is still pending with no final disposition in the District Court.

2. A second, but somewhat related class of cases are suits for damages and other relief arising out of committee investigation. In 1953, the House Committee on Un-American Activities conducted hearings in California, out of which at least four suits against members or agents of the committee arose. Two of these suits eventually reached the Supreme Court and the others were disposed of in intermediate courts with no judgment against members of Congress or the agents of the committee.

In *Wilson et al.* v. *Loew's Inc. et al.*, 355 U.S. 597 (1958), on a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of California, which had dismissed the complaint for failure to state a cause of action, the United States Supreme Court in a per curiam opinion held: "The writ is dismissed as improvidently granted because the judgment rests on an adequate state ground."

In *Wheeldin et al.* v. *Wheeler*, 373 U.S. 647 (1963), a suit against an agent of the Committee on Un-American Activities commenced in the United States District Court was dismissed for failure to show a federal cause of action.

A description of this litigation is contained in the following reports from the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives in connection with that committee's supervision of the engagement of attorneys to represent the defendants in the various law suits:

Report No. 1085, 87th Congress, 1st Session, August 30, 1961.

Report No. 397, 86th Congress, 1st Session, May 27, 1959.

Report No. 563, 85th Congress, 1st Session, June 13, 1957.

Report No. 2162, 84th Congress, 2nd Session, May 15, 1956.

3. A third category of litigation involves actions against officers of the Congress relating to representation. Two of these cases are as follows:

Albaugh v. *Roberts* (1962). Action to have Mr. Roberts use a corrected Apportionment Report in determining the number of representatives for the State of Maryland. The corrected report was to include the District of Columbia population which, the plaintiff asserted, was a part of the "national election district of Maryland." The case was dismissed July 17, 1962 and the appeal therefrom dismissed January 29, 1963.

Labor-Negro Vanguard Conference et al. v. *Roberts, Clerk of the House; Bernard L. Boutin, Administrator of General Services of the U.S.; and Wayne Grover, U.S. Archivist of the National Archives* (1963). Action to restrain Mr. Roberts from certifying the representation of and to reduce the number of representatives in certain states which the plaintiffs alleged had denied the right to vote to a significant portion of their population. The action was based on Section 2 of the 14th Amendment. Case dismissed October 21, 1961.

4. A fourth category of cases were suits commenced to obtain information relating to the Congress which the Congress had not made public.

In *Trimble* v. *Johnston*, 173 F. Supp. 651 (1959), a newspaper reporter sought a mandatory injunction against the Secretary, the Financial Clerk and the Sergeant at Arms of the United States Senate. District Judge Holtzoff granted a motion to dismiss the complaint and said the following:

"The judicial branch of the Government is independent of the other two departments. Its decisions and its business may not be controlled or influenced by either the legislative or executive branch. In fact, it has been often said that there can be no liberty without an independent judiciary. Reciprocally, the judicial branch of the Government may not control or direct the legislative or executive departments. Thus, the Federal courts may not issue an injunction or a writ of mandamus against the Congress. . . ."

A similar suit was brought by the same newspaper reporter against Roberts, the Clerk of the House of Representatives, which likewise was dismissed, but apparently this case is not recorded.

5. A fifth category of cases grew out of business activities of the Congress. One example of such a case is *U.S. ex rel. Brookfield Construction Co., Inc., and Baylor Construction Corporation* v. *J. George Stewart et al.*, 234 F. Supp., Page 94 (1964). This was a suit against the Architect of the Capitol and the House Office Building Commission consisting of the Speaker of the House and two other members of the House for relief in the nature of mandamus to compel the awarding of a bid for the construction of a garage under the new House Office Building. Plaintiffs, by claimed inadvertent mistake, did not comply with the bonding requirements to accompany their bid. After the opening of the bids, the surety company telegraphed the Architect an increase of the bond to the proper amount. Plaintiffs were the lowest bidder by $35,000.

On the advice of the Comptroller General, the Architect, with the approval of the House Office Building Commission, declined to waive the bonding requirement and awarded the contract to the next lowest bidder. Plaintiffs sought to enjoin this award and to have the court order defendants to award the contract to plaintiffs.

In a rather lengthy opinion, District Judge Holtzoff, after discussing the separation of powers doctrine, denied relief, holding (Page 97):

"In the United States supreme power is not vested in the judiciary. The courts are not superior to either of the other two branches of Goverment and have no power of supervision or control over them. Were the fact otherwise, we would cease to have a popular form of government, but instead would be governed by a group of several hundred Federal judges holding office by permanent tenure. Technically the Federal Government would no longer be a republic but would become an aristocracy. This is not what the Founding Fathers contemplated or created. As it is, the courts may not step in and stay or control executive action unless the executive or administrative officer acts in excess of his statutory authority, or in a manner repugnant to a provision of the Constitution of the United States."

The court also said (Page 99):

". . . The Court has no such dispensing power as the plaintiff would have it invoke. For the Court to inject itself in a manner sought by them would contravene the principles that we have just discussed. It would be an unwarranted assumption of a power to control and supervise executive action—an authority that the courts do not possess. Since the defendants have done nothing that is illegal or in excess of their statutory authority, the courts with their limited power have no authority to interfere."

In a per curiam opinion, 339 Federal 2nd 753 (1964), the Circuit Court of Appeals (Bastian, Wright and McGowan, Circuit Judges) affirmed the District Court's decision dismissing the complaint, as follows (Page 754):

"Appellants in this case brought an action in the nature of mandamus to compel appellee, the Architect of the Capitol, to award them a construction contract on which their joint bid was the lowest. The District Court dismissed the action on a finding that appellee's rejection of appellants' bid was within his statutory authority and that, therefore, the action is in reality one against the United States which is barred by the doctrine of sovereign immunity.

"In view of the Supreme Court holdings in *Larson* v. *Domestic & Foreign Corp.*, 337 U.S. 682, 69 S.Ct. 1457, 92 L.Ed. 1628 (1949), and, more recently, *Malone* v. *Bowdoin*, 369 U.S. 682, 69 S.Ct. 1457, 93 L.Ed. 1628 (1949), we feel constrained to affirm the position adopted by the court below."

Valley Paper Company v. *Joint Committee on Printing*, in the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, at law No. 52342 (1910): This was a suit for a mandamus to order the Joint Committee on Printing to award a contract for the supply of paper to the plaintiff. The Senate declined to permit the three Senate members of the Joint Committee to appear in the suit. The House authorized the three House members to appear, and the court denied mandamus.

6. A sixth category of cases are actions commenced by individuals seeking a court order instructing the executive or legislative branches how they should exercise executive or legislative discretion. This class of cases is most nearly similar to the instant *Powell* case.

One such case was *All-America Protectorate, Inc.*, v. *Lyndon B. Johnson, et al.*, U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia Civil Action File No. 1583–65 (1965). This was a suit commenced against Lyndon B. Johnson individually and as President of the United States; Mike Mansfield individually and as Majority Leader of the United States Senate; Everett M. Dirksen, individually and as Minority Leader of the United States Senate; John W. McCormack individually and as Speaker of the United States House of Representatives; Carl B. Albert, individually and as Majority Leader of the United States House of Representatives; and Gerald R. Ford individually and as Minority Leader of the United States House of Representatives.

The plaintiff, purporting to bring suit as a representative of a class against the defendants as representatives of a class, sought to challenge the legality of the war in Viet Nam and asked the court to issue instructions and commands to the President and to the members of the Congress.

July 1, 1965, the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia moved to intervene as amicus curiae and moved the court sua sponte to direct the Marshal to withhold service of the summons on the President for want of jurisdiction and on the same date filed a memorandum of points and authorities citing *Mississippi* v. *Johnson*, 71 U.S. (4 Wall.) 475 (1867), *Marbury* v. *Madison*, 1 Cranch 137, and also citing as precedents fifteen instances in which similar suits against Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower and Johnson had been dismissed. July 2, 1965, this motion was granted.

On September 3, 1965, the United States District Attorney moved to dismiss as to the remaining defendants on the grounds that:

1. The plaintiff lacks standing to sue
2. The complaint fails to show a justiciable controversy
3. The court lacks jurisdiction to issue a mandamus compelling legislative action under the separation of powers doctrine.

September 14, 1965, United States District Judge J. Sirica granted an order dismissing the suit on the grounds stated in the motion.

ENDING DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. Dwyer] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, the signing of Executive Order 11375 by the President on October 13 is a source of considerable—though not unqualified—encouragement.

By specifically applying the existing prohibition to job discrimination based on sex, this Executive order fills the gaping legal loophole in Federal policy designed to establish equal employment opportunity for all in three areas: Federal employment, employment by Federal contractors and subcontractors, and employment on federally assisted construction.

It thereby completes, at least theoretically, the work begun in the Civil Rights Act of 1964 when Congress, in title VII of that act, established a national policy of equal employment opportunity in private employment without discrimination because of race, color, religion, sex or national origin. That policy was applied in 1965 to Government employment by virtue of Executive Order 11246 but for some inexplicable reason was limited to prohibiting discrimination based on race, creed, color or national origin.

No matter how noble in purpose a policy may be, however, the worth of that policy can only be determined by the energy and seriousness with which it is implemented and enforced. And herein lie my own concerns: First, that effective administration will overcome the doubts and demurrers of those who eliminated women from the protection of the 1965 Executive order; and, second, that every effort will be made to expedite acceptance and enforcement of the policy by private employers who are covered by virtue of the Federal contracts or subcontracts they hold and the federally assisted construction work they are doing. Such employers are given a year—a very generous amount of time—in which to comply.

For the information of our colleagues, Mr. Speaker, I include the text of Executive Order 11375 as a part of my remarks, as follows:

[Executive Order 11375, Oct. 13, 1967]

Equal Opportunity for Women in Federal Employment and Employment by Federal Contractors

AMENDING EXECUTIVE ORDER NO. 11246, RELATING TO EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY

It is the policy of the United States Government to provide equal opportunity in Federal employment and in employment by Federal contractors on the basis of merit and without discrimination because of race, color, religion, sex or national origin.

The Congress, by enacting Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, enunciated a national policy of equal employment opportunity in private employment, without discrimination because of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin.

Executive Order No. 11246 of September 24, 1965, carried forward a program of equal employment opportunity in Government employment, employment by Federal contractors and subcontractors and employment under Federally assisted construction contracts regardless of race, creed, color or national origin.

It is desirable that the equal employment opportunity programs provided for in Executive Order No. 11246 expressly embrace discrimination on account of sex.

Now, Therefore, by virtue of the authority vested in me as President of the United States by the Constitution and statutes of the United States, it is ordered that Executive Order No. 11246 of September 24, 1965, be amended as follows:

(1) Section 101 of Part I, concerning nondiscrimination in Government employment, is revised to read as follows:

"Section 101. It is the policy of the Government of the United States to provide equal opportunity in Federal employment for all qualified persons, to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, sex or national origin, and to promote the full realization of equal employment opportunity through a positive, continuing program in each executive department and agency. The policy of equal opportunity applies to every aspect of Federal employment policy and practice."

(2) Section 104 of Part I is revised to read as follows:

"Section 104. The Civil Service Commission shall provide for the prompt, fair, and impartial consideration of all complaints of discrimination in Federal employment on the basis of race, color, religion, sex or national origin. Procedures for the consideration of complaints shall include at least one impartial review within the executive department or agency and shall provide for appeal to the Civil Service Commission."

(3) Paragraphs (1) and (2) of the quoted required contract provisions in section 202 of Part II, concerning nondiscrimination in employment by Government contractors and subcontractors, are revised to read as follows:

"(1) The contractor will not discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment because of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin. The contractor will take affirmative action to ensure that applicants are employed, and that employees are treated during employment, without regard to their race, color, religion, sex or national origin. Such action shall include, but not be limited to the following: employment, upgrading, demotion, or transfer; recruitment or recruitment advertising; layoff or termination; rates of pay or other forms of compensation; and selection for training, including apprenticeship. The contractor agrees to post in conspicuous places, available to employees and applicants for employment, notices to be provided by the contracting officer setting forth the provisions of this nondiscrimination clause.

"(2) The contractor will, in all solicitations or advertisements for employees placed by or on behalf of the contractor, state that all qualified applicants will receive consideration for employment without regard to race, color, religion, sex or national origin."

(4) Section 203(d) of Part II is revised to read as follows:

"(d) The contracting agency or the Secretary of Labor may direct that any bidder or prospective contractor or subcontractor shall submit, as part of his Compliance Report, a statement in writing, signed by an authorized officer or agent on behalf of any labor union or any agency referring workers or providing or supervising apprenticeship or other training, with which the bidder or prospective contractor deals, with supporting information, to the effect that the signer's practices and policies do not discriminate on the grounds of race, color, religion, sex or national origin, and that the signer either will affirmatively cooperate in the implementation of the policy and provisions of this order or that it consents and agrees that recruitment, employment, and the terms and conditions of employment under the proposed contract shall be in accordance with the purposes and provisions of the order. In the event that the union, or the agency shall refuse to execute such a statement, the Compliance Report shall so certify and set forth what efforts have been made to secure such a statement and such additional factual material as the contracting agency or the Secretary of Labor may require."

The amendments to Part I shall be effective 30 days after the date of this order. The amendments to Part II shall be effective one year after the date of this order.

Lyndon B. Johnson.

The White House, *October 13, 1967.*

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 5:10 p.m., October 13, 1967]

NEWSPAPERS AND MAGAZINES RECEIVE HUGE GOVERNMENT SUBSIDY

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. Cunningham] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the following is a radio report I have made to the people of the Second Congressional District of Nebraska, the district I have the honor to represent. My radio remarks follow:

The Great Mail Rate Subsidy

This is Congressman Glenn Cunningham in Washington with a story you will never read in the newspapers. Its about this nation's carefully guarded secret subsidy.

Many of you have read editorials in the *Omaha World Herald* telling of subsidies for farmers, railroads and airlines, but you have never read an editorial complaining about the huge newspaper mail subsidy they receive. Yet it is true, newspapers like the *World Herald* are subsidized by you, the taxpayer.

Here are the facts on this nation's largest "Secret Subsidy."

In the early days of our nation, Congress properly decided that it was essential to a democracy that the people be informed. Because of this early national interest in the free flow of information, Congress made sure that newspapers moved through the mails at a very low rate. In the early days this approach made sense—but things have changed. The newspapers of today are no longer poor and struggling. They are rich and powerful. In addition they are no longer the only source of news. Radio and T.V. are faster and some say better.

Despite these changes, newspapers with page after page of rich advertising revenue, continue to fight for their secret mail subsidy.

How much is the subsidy? Some estimates for both newspapers and magazines run as high as 236 million dollars a year. The rich *Wall Street Journal* mail subsidy which comes out of your pocket is estimated at 20 million per year. Your own Omaha newspaper with a large out-state circulation in Nebraska and adjoining states helps contribute to the postal deficit and is fighting hard to keep this Federal subsidy.

This situation has a direct effect on your cost of mailing a letter. According to official U.S. Post Office figures, 1st class mailers are paying 123 percent of the cost of moving a letter to its destination. Third class advertising mail pays 100 percent of its cost of delivery. By comparison, newspapers and magazines are now paying only 29 percent of the cost of delivery by the Post Office Department.

In addition the newspapers are receiving what is called "Red Tag Treatment." This means that they receive the same top priority handling as the average 1st class letter. Some Post Office Department officials admit that this "Red Tag Treatment" is given so that they will get better write-ups in the papers . . . they say it is good public relations.

Public relations or not, it is not fair to the nation's taxpayers.

Last week I fought to raise the subsidized mailing rates for newspapers and magazines during the debate on the Postal Rate Bill for 1967 and was successful in getting a small adjustment. But the fact remains that rich "Holier Than Thou" newspapers and magazines are still being subsidized and they quietly support our nation's secret subsidy or what I call the big mail rate newspaper steal.

WHO SPEAKS FOR THE CHURCH?

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ashbrook] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, a prominent Protestant theologian, Dr. Paul Ramsey, has recently written a book "Who Speaks for the Church?" which questions the practice by some religious leaders and organizations of making public pronouncements on national problems in which they have no particular competence. In addition, Dr. Ramsey looks with alarm at the procedures of some church groups which allow positions and policies to be adopted by a relatively small number of church leaders after a minimum of serious debate and based on documents prepared by anonymous staff members. To make matters worse, these proposals are sometimes presented to national assemblies under conditions which afford little serious consideration or few alternatives.

Dr. Ramsey cited the case of the Conference on Church and Society, sponsored by the World Council of Churches in Geneva, Switzerland, last year as a prime example of steamroller tactics. In only 2 weeks, the 410 participants arrived at specific, detailed "conclusions" on no less than 118 complex public questions. Dr. Ramsey's decision to write his book stemmed from his experience at the above-mentioned conference.

David Lawrence, in his column in the Evening Star for today, October 17, comments on Dr. Ramsey's views. I include his column entitled "Clergy's Stand on Vietnam Varies," in the RECORD at this point:

CLERGY'S STAND ON VIETNAM VARIES

Many people are beginning to say that clergymen and church organizations are driving away parishioners by talking too much about politics—national and international—about which they know very little, and by failing to teach the all-important lessons of ethics and morality so essential today in countries troubled by disorder and violence.

Dr. Eugene Carson Blake, general secretary of the World Council of Churches and formerly the head of the United Presbyterian Church of America, said on Sunday at St. Louis that the position of the United States in Vietnam is wrong for moral, strategic, diplomatic and sociological reasons. He said with respect to the Vietnam War: "It is wrong for a great and powerful nation to impose upon a small nation even a right policy for their own good."

Dr. Blake added that the claim of the United States that it is bound to fulfill a commitment to the government of South Vietnam is hypocritical and that he believes the Vietnamese are "fighting a war of independence, and overwhelming force won't make them seek peace." He called for unconditional cessation of bombing by the United States.

While occupying a high post in the World Council of Churches, Dr. Blake claims, of course, to be speaking in conformity with a resolution adopted in August by the central committee of the World Council. His criticism of U.S. policy is, however, far more direct. The World Council—composed of representatives from virtually all denominations—recommended that the United States stop bombing, but declared that the North Vietnam government, "either in advance of or in response to the cessation of bombing, should indicate by word and deed its readiness to move toward negotiations."

Dr. Paul Ramsey, one of America's most respected Protestant theologians, has just been attracting attention by his criticism of voluble clergymen. He declares that both "liberal" and "evangelical" Protestant leaders have been inclined in recent years to say too much on too many topics.

Dr. Ramsey points to a growing disposition on the part of church councils and denominational conventions to adopt resolutions on a variety of intricate national problems on which religious leaders, as such, have no particular competence to formulate policies. On the question of their offering "concrete political policies for the world's statesmen," he says:

"For ecumenical councils on church and society responsibly to proffer specific advice would require that the church have the services of an entire State Department."

Dr. Ramsey further asserts that many of the pronouncements are adopted by a relatively small number of churchmen after a minimum of serious debate, and that often these documents are drafted by anonymous staff members and presented to national assemblies under circumstances which provide rank-and-file delegates with little choice except to rubber-stamp them.

He points to the procedures of the Conference on Church and Society, sponsored by the World Council of Churches in Geneva last year, as a glaring example of this weakness. He recalls that, in only two weeks of deliberation, the 410 participants in the conference arrived at specific, detailed "conclusions" on no less than 118 complex public questions, ranging from the best way to make peace in Vietnam to the suppression of crime. Dr. Ramsey's experiences at the Geneva conference, where these resolutions were adopted, prompted him to write a recently published book entitled, "Who Speaks for the Church?"

The author, in calling on contemporary Christianity to clarify the church's message about the meaning of Christian life in the world today, criticized both the National Council of Churches and the World Council of Churches for wrong methods and wrong goals. It is being predicted among religious leaders that this very question will be raised in the Study Conference on Church and Society, to be held by the National Council of Churches on Oct. 22–26 in Detroit, Mich. Up to now, it has been assumed by church leaders that the rank and file of Christians were backing the involvement of their organizations in governmental questions with a political background.

TAX CREDIT FOR HIGHER EDUCATION EXPENSES

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I believe we should make the financial burden of higher education a tolerable one for American families. Accordingly, I have today introduced a bill to allow a Federal tax credit for expenses of higher education.

Higher education is the key to the future. Since the problem of financing the costs of college and vocational instruction is growing more acute, families should be given a tax break for these educational expenses.

My bill would allow a tax credit for tuition, books, and supplies and would be available to either the parents or the student himself if he pays for his own post-high school training. The measure specifically provides increased benefits to families with lower incomes. If the education tax credit were greater than actual income taxes owed, the Government would refund the difference.

This legislation is not intended as a substitute for any other form of aid for higher education. Current loan and scholarship programs, particularly those to help families in greatest financial need, must be continued. My tax credit proposal is aimed at helping the millions of families with limited incomes who cannot stand the staggering burden of educating their children at costs that run as high as $3,000 per student each year.

Many families are forced to use lifetime savings or must go into debt to pay for the education of their children. This is because parents know the value of education and sincerely want to adequately prepare their children for the future.

But the excessive burden of increased expenses of higher education is already too heavy for many to bear; therefore, we must lighten that burden. I feel my bill will be helpful in this regard, and urge its consideration by the Ways and Means Committee at the earliest possible time.

REPORT TO CONSTITUENTS ON ACTIVITIES AND VIEWS

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. ANDREWS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, it is my custom from time to time to send out a report to my constituents outlining some of my activities and views. Such a report is being mailed to the people of North Dakota's First Congressional District this week, and under unanimous consent I place this report in the RECORD at this time:

When FBI Director, J. Edgar Hoover, testified before my Appropriations Subcommittee earlier this year, he called for a "realistic and commonsense approach in the sentencing, parole, and probation treatment of repeating criminals who have demonstrated time after time their contempt for society and who can reasonably be expected to once again victimize the public when prematurely set free. It is imperative that all with responsibility, the courts, juries, and law enforcement alike, face squarely and intelligently the deadly threat of unwarranted leniency if we hope to retain law and order in America."

The Director's words echo the sentiments of a growing number of Americans who are becoming more and more concerned about increased crime in our nation today.

CAMPAIGN FINANCING—THE WRONG WAY

The Senate Finance Committee recently reported out a bill which would make about $54 million in tax dollars available for presidential and senatorial campaigns and it is anticipated that this proposal will be extended to include House elections as well. I am opposed to this plan not only because of the high cost, but because it would concentrate power in the hands of national party leaders who would disburse campaign funds. Thus, campaigns would be financed from the top down, and be that much more less responsive to the people.

Far better would be a proposal to allow tax credits to individuals who make small political contributions of not over $25. This broadens the base of political participation and encourages more people to contribute on an individual basis.

The dedication of the Matejcek Dam in Walsh County gave me an opportunity to pay tribute to men like Joe Matejcek and others who have done so much for land and water conservation in eastern North Dakota.

The combined efforts of many people have resulted in the approval for planning asistance on 8 and for construction of 3 watershed projects in North Dakota's First Congressional District since I came to Congress.

The Mayor of Valley City, Lou Bruhn, was in town with a tour group sponsored by the Valley City State College. Lou and I had the opportunity to visit on matters of special interest to his constituents—and mine.

A good delegation from Jamestown came down in an attempt to get Federal Aviation Administration approval for a much needed runway extension at the Jamestown Airport, I accompanied them to the FAA as they presented their case. They had the facts and figures well in hand, and, as testimony to this, the runway extension was granted. Included in the group are: Don Legrid, Herman Weiss, John Klingenberg and Mayor Bill Taft.

Mary and I, as guests at the Indonesian Embassy discussed that country's need for American wheat with their Finance Minister, Frans Seda. This country, which recently overthrew its former pro-Communist regime, very much needs food assistance and can, I believe, become an important U.S. ally in combating communist aggression in Southeast Asia.

THE PROBLEM OF THE DEFICIT

When the President sent Congress his budget recommendations for fiscal 1968 last January, he estimated a deficit of approximately $8.1 billion. That figure has since skyrocketed and we now face the prospect of a $29 billion deficit at the end of this fiscal year, according to recent predictions made by the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and the President himself.

There are only two ways to reduce this deficit.

One is to cut expenditures and the other is to increase taxes.

Many of us on the Appropriations Committee have strongly emphasized the importance of reducing wasteful Federal spending before considering any increase in taxes.

The House Ways and Means Committee, by a vote of 20–5, demonstrated its support of our position by putting off action on the President's proposed 10 percent tax increase until the President makes a significant cut in spending on some of the new "Great Society" programs that have so loaded down the budget.

Meanwhile the House has made important cuts in the President's proposed budget. For example, while the Viet Nam war costs have pushed the Department of Defense budget up to the $70 billion mark, the Congress still reduced the Defense appropriation by more than a billion and a half dollars. The foreign aid appropriations will be cut by a record $700–800 million and requests for the space program, housing and transportation have already been reduced sizably by the House.

The showdown on reduced spending versus increased taxes is now the major issue to be decided during the closing days of the 1st Session of the 90th Congress.

FARM INCOME—DOWN AGAIN

Farm prices have dropped another 1.5 percent, according to the most recent report, and are now 7 percent below those of a year ago. They are now at 73 percent of parity, compared with 75 percent last month and 79 percent a year ago; and net farm income is expected to be 10 percent below last year.

Meanwhile, the prices farmers paid for goods and services used in production and in family living went up one-fourth of 1 percent in the month ending September 15. For the preceding year, these prices registered a 2 percent increase.

WORTH WATCHING

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SMITH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, something has taken place in my district in Oklahoma of which we can all be proud. I refer to the recent action taken by the Harmon County commissioners, down in the southwestern corner of the State.

They have halted distribution of free commodities. Their action went into effect on August 1. Since that time, one of the three commissioners said, many of the recipients have gone back to work, and they have not had too many people complain.

At this point I would like to insert two newspaper stories into the RECORD. The first is a UPI story carried in the Anadarko, Okla., Daily News on October 3, 1967, and the second is an editorial comment carried in the Altus, Okla., Times-Democrat on October 12, 1967. Together, they tell the story better than I can:

COMMISSIONERS IN HARMON COUNTY QUIT COMMODITIES

OKLAHOMA CITY.—Harmon County commissioners have stopped distributing free commodities because they "really didn't think it was worth it" and thought workers "were all quitting work."

The commissioners, who estimated cost of the program at from $3,000 to $9,000 per year halted distribution Aug. 1, a state welfare department official said Monday.

County Commissioner Sam Earls of Gould said about 1,600 persons were on the welfare list in the southwestern Oklahoma county, but that the commissioners "haven't had too many people complain" about the action.

"The fact of the business is that we've been getting more praise," he said, adding that it is now easier to hire workers.

ALL QUITTING WORK

"They've gone back to work. They were all quitting work," he said. "They didn't want to work unless they had to."

Earls said the program cost about $9,000 a year and commissioners felt they could accomplish more oy spending the money directly on needy persons. He said the commodities program was stopped because, "We really didn't think it was worth it."

"We were distributing 25,000 pounds of groceries a month and putting a lot of little grocers out of business," Earls said.

He said the commissioners had no aversion to cooperating in the federal food stamp program. The program permits needy persons to purchase food from grocery stores with federal stamps.

Earls said such a program would "give the grocery stores some business instead of putting them out of it."

Commissioner E. O. Byrd of Hollis disagreed with Earls and Commissioner Floyd Carter of Hollis over stopping the commodities distribution.

Byrd said most of the welfare recipients were in his district, and the cost of the commodities program was $3,000 a year.

Asked whether the former food recipients had suffered since the food cutoff, Byrd said, "They've been eating, I guess."

"I haven't heard much from them," he added. "If someone's in need, we try to help them. So far, things have been running along pretty smoothly."

John T. Sanford, commodity unit supervisor for the state welfare department, said about 600 of the persons eligible for the food were welfare clients, and another 200 were from families needing assistance.

"I don't imagine anyone has suffered any hardships, but naturally some of them have been deprived of a source of food," he said.

Sanford said counties pay only for freight on the free commodities from Oklahoma City warehouses to the county seat and for its storage and personnel to supervise the distribution.

He estimated distribution would cost the foundation $100 per month. He said he was hopeful the commissioners would agree to cooperate in the federal food stamp program.

[From the Altus (Okla.) Times-Democrat]

ANYWAY, IT'S INTERESTING

Our neighboring Harmon County is by no means a poverty stricken area, nor is it among the state's wealthier counties. It is pretty much economically average, relying largely on agriculture which has been enhanced in recent years by well irrigation.

That's the background and one of the reasons it makes so interesting the decision of the Harmon County commissioners to stop distributing free commodities because two of the members contended that many persons were quitting work so they could qualify as clients.

Harmon halted commodity issuances two months ago and one of the commissioners reports there haven't been many complaints; in fact, more praise for the action. The commissioner is quoted as saying: "They're gone back to work. They were all quitting work. They didn't want to work unless they had to."

Neither the Harmon board members nor state welfare officials could pinpoint any cases of real hardship caused by eliminating the free food stuff. Some families, of course, are bound to have less in the pantry because circumstances do prevent employment possibility for any member of some unfortunate households.

If hardships arise, surely Harmon will care for its own. Meanwhile, what's going on around the Hollis vicinity is going to be worth watching. This could turn out to be proof that there's far too much pudding in a lot of the free eating.

CONGRESSMAN WHALEN EXPRESSES CONCERN OVER A REGRESSION OF ATTITUDES REGARDING INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WHALEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, the passage of H.R. 478, the so-called low wage imports bill, on September 28 suggested to some that a regression of congressional attitudes regarding international trade is taking place.

I made that very point in my remarks during the debate on the bill. I expressed my concern that if the provisions of the bill are implemented by the imposition of tariffs or import restrictions, other countries affected by our action will respond in kind.

As an economist, I am apprehensive about the impact that legislation such as H.R. 478 and other measures under consideration could have on the progress made in the Kennedy round. Tariffs or import regulation would have an adverse affect on those American industries which presently are exporting. In the long run they would cost more jobs than they would save. Further, any diminishment of the results of the Kennedy round would tend to cancel out prospective gains in international trade for American industry.

Mr. Speaker, I find that several of the most eminent newspapers in the United States also share this concern and have addressed themselves to the subject in recent days. For the information of my

colleagues who might not be fully aware of the dimensions of the problem, I herewith insert into the RECORD editorials which have appeared in the New York Times, the Wall Street Journal, the Journal of Commerce, and the Washington Post:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 6, 1967]

PROTECTIONIST OFFENSIVE

The big and effective protectionist lobby in Washington is mustering all its forces for an attack on the liberalizing measures made in the Kennedy Round of trade negotiations.

The attack is being spearheaded by textile, oil and meat interests, which are asking Congress for relief against rising levels of imports. They have the support of the dairy industry, which has already gained concessions and is pressing for more, as well as that of metal producers, the steel industry and other manufacturers. Their combined contention that they are being hurt by foreign competition may well convince susceptible Congressmen that protectionism is necessary to maintain domestic jobs and profits.

Undeniably, American consumers are buying more foreign products. But American producers are also selling more abroad. If Congress gives in to the protectionist lobby by restricting foreign access to the domestic market, it will also be restricting American access to much bigger—and constantly expanding—foreign markets.

This damage to overseas sales would come about partly because of political retaliation, which is sure to take place if Congress discriminates against foreign imports; but it would also come about because the demand for goods would decline if foreigners could not earn the funds to pay for them.

Thus, the erection of new protectionist barriers in the form of quotas or other nontariff curbs on trade is bound to dampen the over-all growth of the American economy. It would also give fresh impetus to already dangerous inflationary pressures because domestic producers would have greater freedom to raise prices in the absence or curtailment of foreign competition. So resort to protectionism would mean a reduction in productive employment and a further escalation in prices.

The Administration, flushed with its victory in the Kennedy Round, does not appear to appreciate the seriousness of the protectionist threat. It has done little to point up the economic dangers in protectionism or to rally the forces of free trade. The protectionists have shown their strength in the Byrnes amendment barring Britain from bidding on ships for the Navy and in the Dent bill designed to bypass the existing machinery for granting relief. Clearly, the protectionists are out to undermine the Kennedy Round and it will take a broad coalition, led by the President, to thwart them.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Oct. 5, 1967]

THE PAINS OF PROTECTIONISM

Economists can, and frequently do, muster all sorts of arguments against import curbs. Though their case is convincing, the matter isn't entirely one-sided.

To begin with, no academic reasoning will ease the pain of a businessman who believes he is being undone by imports. At the moment such major industries as textiles, meat, steel and oil say they are in that situation, or close to it, and are pressing Congress for new or increased protection.

They contend, quite correctly, that their economic health is important not only to them but to the nation. They also stress the difficulty of competing with foreign firms whose wage costs are lower.

When it comes to proposed relief, the import-troubled industries emphasize their eagerness to be reasonable. For the most part they do not want to shut out all foreign competition; instead, they would merely limit it to a "fair" share of the domestic market. Even that might not be necessary, some spokesmen say, if other nations would only allow the U.S. freer access to their own markets.

Before Congress comes to any decision, however, it should ponder this question's other sides. If the U.S. moves toward protectionism, for instance, what happens to the nation's export trade? As an international merchant, after all, this country still leads the world by a wide margin.

The answer is partly a matter of simple economics. If Country A can no longer sell quite as many textiles to the U.S., it won't earn as many dollars to buy American business machines. Thus the effect would be to limit U.S. exports, even if the only change in the situation was a higher U.S. tariff or lower import quota.

But that's not likely to be the only change. Among nations, as among little boys, there's a tendency to strike back when someone hits you. If history is any guide, then new U.S. import curbs would quickly bring retaliation abroad, further crimping America's foreign sales.

Turning the question around another way, Congress might consider it from the point of view of consumers. What happens to them if the nation raises new barriers against imports?

For one thing, consumers would often be paying higher prices. Some people may like the snob appeal of a foreign label, but most Americans buy imports mainly when they believe they're getting more for their money. Trade restrictions, furthermore, obviously limit consumers' freedom of choice.

That brings us back to the economists, who focus most of their attention on a still broader aspect of import curbs: Their effect on the general well-being of the economy. As is their wont, the academicians take a fairly long-run view of things; they find little comfort in the economy's current health if it seems due to degenerate before long.

One prime worry is protectionism's upward pressure on prices. Inflation is already very much with us, even without fresh trade restraints to accentuate it.

Economists also fret about the effects of import curbs on the vitality of domestic industries. If foreign competition is curtailed, domestic producers will have less incentive to increase efficiency and develop new and better products.

Through the past three decades, the domestic economy has expanded enormously while U.S. protectionism has shrunk to a shadow of its former self. While there are numerous reasons for this happy development, not the least of them is stiff competition, some of it furnished by foreigners.

Trade restrictions, in sum, provide benefits for U.S. firms in the domestic market, though these gains may be only temporary. On the other hand, import curbs endanger the nation's exports, impose penalties on consumers and tend to weaken the vigor of the country's economy. Looked at from all sides, the package hardly seems appealing.

If a company is genuinely damaged by imports, machinery already exists to provide job-retaining, technical assistance and the like. If Congress decides that more help is needed, it would be better to pay direct Federal subsidies than to opt for the even more debilitating devices of trade restraint.

For some businessmen, import competition can prove quite painful. From the standpoint of the rest of the nation, however, the agonies of protectionism could be a good deal worse.

[From the New York Journal of Commerce, Oct. 6, 1967]

THE MOON ON CAPITOL HILL

It would be a pity if Congress were to undo the positive results of the Kennedy Round in its desire to protect some domestic industries. Yet that may well happen unless the administration steps in to head off a massive protectionist assault. We would hope that Congress itself will not let the problems of certain industries overshadow the potential benefits to the entire nation of the trade negotiations. Yet, the actions of Congress in the past two months do not foster confidence in the lawmakers' ability to see clearly and act wisely in the national interest.

As a matter of fact, the record of Congress in the past three months has been disgraceful. Has there been a full moon over Washington for the past few months? It's very difficult to make any sense out of some of the things that have been emanating from Capitol Hill recently.

There was for example, the disgraceful episode dealing with the dispute between six shopcraft unions and the nation's railroads. While the nation waited, the political game was played out. In the end Congress was literally forced to pass the legislation that is preventing a strike. If it had thought of the national interest it would have passed the legislation in the first place.

A couple of weeks ago, Rep. John W. Byrnes, a Wisconsin Republican, spearheaded a move that resulted in an amendment to the defense appropriations bill prohibiting the use of federal funds for the purchase of foreign-built warships. Involved is $60 million in orders for 16 new minesweepers that the British might receive if their bid is successful.

Permitting the British to bid on the minesweepers was part of an arrangement under which they were to purchase almost $800 million worth of U.S. military aircraft.

Then last Thursday the House passed a bill giving the President the right to impose quotas or increase tariffs on imports that might threaten the "well being" of American workers. The President did not ask for the authority and does not want it since it obviously would complicate the U.S. position in trade matters and negotiations.

Right on the heels of this protectionist measure the Senate Finance Committee announced that it will hold hearings later this month on a number of import quota proposals, dealing with industries such as oil, some nonferrous metals, steel and textiles, among others.

It is unlikely that the hearings will lead to actual bills. More likely, they will set the stage for riders when House-passed trade bills reach the Senate. However, the handwriting is on the wall and the administration should take steps now to make sure that all the potential good of the Kennedy Round negotiations does not go down the drain because certain industries may face greater competition.

It is totally unrealistic to think that we can impose restrictions unilaterally. Foreign governments are not about to sit idly by while we take away some of their potential markets. Their only recourse would be to impose limitations on our exports. And, quite frankly, they would be right.

While we sympathize with the industries that face additional competition as a result of the Kennedy Round negotiations it would not make sense to scuttle the entire pact to protect these companies and their employes. It is more than likely that any potential losses will be more than offset by gains by other companies to the benefit of the nation as a whole. This was the main consideration of the U.S. negotiating team. One still has to give a little in one area to gain in another. It is silly to think that the U.S. comes out of a negotiation such as the Kennedy Round a winner in all areas. Over-all, yes, but not in every single instance.

Apparently the industries to be hit hardest by new imports have been working diligently to line up support in Congress for their positions (the textile industry reports that 67 senators and 171 representatives are cosponsoring legislation for major curbs on textile imports). Unions representing workers in the various fields that may be hurt are lining up for import curbs.

Obviously, great pressure will be brought to bear on Congress. If Congress knuckles under, it will be making a great mistake. A return to protectionism can only hurt the U.S. Our export sales greatly exceed imports and make up one of the major plus components in the balance of payments picture.

It behooves Congress to look at the big picture and not view the Kennedy Round on an industry by industry basis.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 13, 1967]

An Outrageous Proposal

The congressional drive to stifle international trade through the imposition of import quotas is now entering the obsessional stage in which the proponents, blindly oblivious to international reactions, are courting instant retaliation from the countries that would be injured by their protectionist designs. Surely rational explanations cast little light on the behavior of Senators Dirksen and Long, the architects of a strategy that would attach a broad range of import quotas as a rider to the Social Security bill.

This legislative technique is well suited to the low purpose of the quota proposal. The attachment, by rider, of legislative parasites to otherwise sound and healthy measures, is an abomination that ought to have been abandoned long ago. In this case, serious damage could be done to a Social Security bill which has absolutely nothing to do with international trade policy.

If riders are the most retrograde of legislative devices, quotas are the most retrogressive of protectionist devices. They place a ceiling on the volume of imports that prevent foreign suppliers from competing on a price basis. They confer gifts on the protected domestic industries, gifts granted at the expense of American consumers without the increase in revenues that would be yielded by tariffs. And because they involve transfers of income to favored industries and firms, quota systems are natural spawning grounds for political favoritism, bureaucratic abuses and corruption.

What is most astonishing is the arrogant assumption that other countries will docilely submit to the injuries that a Long, a Dirksen or a Hartke would inflict upon them. Suppose that Senator Hartke and his friends in industry succeed in reducing steel imports by as much as 20 per cent. The Japanese, for example, could retaliate at no cost to themselves by switching their wheat purchases from this country to Canada. And the Europeans would be perfectly justified, under the rules of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, in retaliating with tariffs or quotas on United States exports. Where then is the net advantage?

Although there is no principled defense to be made for the quota strategy, Senator Dirksen can at least score points in the game of irresponsible partisan politics. But why should Russell B. Long, whose father, the late Sen. Huey Long, was a strong proponent of freer trade and lower prices, lend his talents to such a disreputable effort? It is to be hoped that he will reconsider his position and disavow legislation that would scuttle the Kennedy Round and halt the expansion of international trade.

SECRETARY RUSK'S STATEMENT ON VIETNAM

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I believe all of us should reflect seriously on what Secretary Rusk had to say at his news conference about whether or not our national security is really at stake in Vietnam. Mr. Rusk asked us to look ahead to the next 10 or 20 years when there will be a billion Chinese on the mainland, armed with nuclear weapons, and great uncertainty as to what their attitude will be toward the rest of Asia. The free Asian nations, which will contain another billion persons, have rejected the idea of communism being imposed on them by force. Mr. Rusk noted that these nations must have security, stability, and cooperation among themselves if there is to be peace in Asia.

And while the world hopes that mainland China will abandon its aggressiveness and veer toward peace, there is no certainty that it will do so.

The Secretary asked us to consider the unattractive prospect of hundreds of millions of people in Asia living in fear and subjugation. I agree with him that the United States, as both a Pacific and an Atlantic power, has a tremendous national stake in the ability of free Asia to live in peace, and to turn the interests of mainland China to the needs of its own people and away from its adventures abroad. Like Mr. Rusk, I believe we cannot be the world's police force, but like him, I recognize that through our treaty commitments we have accepted our share of the burden in our own vital national interests. I believe, with him, that the history of the past four decades offers proof that the world cannot have peace if it allows one small country after another—including South Vietnam—to be overrun by an aggressor.

And we, as a nation, are committed to world peace.

HALPERN URGES ACTION ON SITUS PICKETING BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Halpern] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, inattention piles upon inaction as the Congress continues to shunt aside legislation which is sorely needed to end serious discrimination against the building tradesmen of America.

The legislation has awaited congressional action since early in this session, when the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Thompson] introduced H.R. 100, I introduced H.R. 5065, and several of our colleagues submitted similar legislation.

These bills would end the unfair definition of onsite picketing by building tradesmen as a prohibited secondary boycott under section 8(b)(4) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Other trades are allowed free, peaceful picketing at places where they work, but only those who work in the Nation's vitally important construction industry may not do as much.

In this House, the situs picketing bill has moved well on its way toward action. Hearings have been held, and the measure now waits in the Rules Committee. I am told that the committee plans no further action until the other body advances its own similar bills.

The discrimination against building tradesmen dates back to the April 1949 decision of the National Labor Relations Board in the Denver Building Trades case. The ruling did not bear out the intention of Congress. What is more, at the time the ruling was handed down, the Board was unfamiliar with the special conditions in the building trades, over which it had but lately taken jurisdiction.

For the past 18 years, under that decision, building trades unions have been barred from picketing peacefully at construction sites because the Denver rule holds that such picketing is a secondary boycott, prohibited by the Taft-Hartley amendments to the Wagner Act.

No one has ever been able to produce a reasonable justification for the fact that the building tradesmen—and they alone—are barred from such peaceful demonstrations at the places where they work. At hearings held on the bills awaiting action in this House, I discussed the Denver rule and told the Labor Subcommittee:

> Through the years, there have been many legal opinions opposing that ruling. It is also true that there have been forceful and impressive arguments in favor of the NLRB position, but these seem only to fortify the impression that if the wording of the Taft-Hartley Act actually does justify such discrimination against the tradesmen of a single industry, then the need for amendment is all the greater.
>
> In the long history of attempts to rectify this injustice, there has always been bipartisan support for the amendments which are being discussed today. In fact, it has received multi-partisan support, not only from outstanding spokesmen for the two major parties, but even by leaders of differing shades of opinion within these parties.

As an example of this across-the-board support, President Truman and President Eisenhower asked for legislation to nullify the Denver rule. In 1959, the section was amended to prevent similar injustice in the garment trades.

In the second session of the 89th Congress, the Rules Committee went so far as to report the bill by the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Thompson]—but the measure was suddenly withdrawn before it could be acted upon by the full House. And now the bills in this 90th Congress sit gathering dust in committee pigeonholes.

Mr. Speaker, there cannot be a Member of this House who is not aware of the fact that the construction industry is one of the most important in the Nation, and its tradesmen are the heart and muscle of that industry. Let us not ignore their just complaint. Let us act, at long last, to nullify an inequity perpetrated against them.

THE REPUBLICAN CONFERENCE SUMMER INTERN PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Laird] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues the inspiring accomplishments of the summer interns of the House Republican Conference. From mid-June to mid-August, the conference directed the research activities of 18 interns, and the wide-ranging scope of their inquiries will find meaningful application in the development of Republican programs and principles.

I am particularly impressed by a paper on campaign finance and election law reform prepared by Charles William O'Neill, a senior at Princeton University. "Dub," son of the former Governor and now Supreme Court Justice of the State of Ohio, follows in distinguished footsteps and has acquitted himself admirably. I commend his thoughtful and timely study to my colleagues. This staff research paper is indicative of the probing scholarship evidenced by our interns.

I also wish to pay tribute to the professional staff of the House Republican Conference, who worked earnestly to generate a challenging and productive program for our interns. The following list indicates something of the organization and direction we have tried to provide so that our interns could develop an intimate understanding of the functioning of our Federal system of government. Based on such activity, I do not think I am being boastful when I say that I feel that ours is the most rewarding intern program of this Congress.

House Republican Conference: 1967 Summer Interns

John Herman, Akron, Ohio, Harvard Law School, "An Analysis of the Problem of National Emergency Strikes".

James Rosbe, Potomac, Maryland, University of Michigan, "The United States and the Arab World: A Political Study".

Steven Martindale, Pocatello, Idaho, Gould School of Law, USC, "Study of the Coleman Report".

Thomas Roehl, Wausau, Wisconsin, University of Oregon Graduate School "A Cost-Benefit Analysis of the Wood County Project".

George B. Walton, Louisville, Kentucky, University of Louisville Law School, "The Open Generation" (Also on assignment to Republican Task Force on Crime).

Margaret Wilner, Washington, D.C., University of Pennsylvania, "The Soviet Union in the Middle East".

Cynthia Bartlett, Vista, California, Whittier College, "American Foreign Policy with Israel".

David H. Cleverly, Arlington, Virginia, University of Miami (Fla.), "A Study of United States Relations with Egypt: Nasserite Belligerency".

David E. Rosedahl, Jamestown, New York, Columbia College, "Antidote to Boredom: A Study of Public TV".

Terence E. Horgan, Reno, Nevada, Stanford University, "The United States and the War in Viet Nam" (Also on assignment to Republican Task Force on Crime).

James G. Gidwitz, Highland Park, Illinois, Standford Univerity, On assignment to the Republican Task Force on East-West Trade.

David H. Breen, Dansville, New York, Middlebury College, On assignment to the Republican Task Force on Crime.

James Fais, Columbus, Ohio, Denison University, On assignment to the Republican Task Force on Crime.

Tish Newman, Vallejo, California, Wellesley College, On assignment to the Republican Task Force on Crime.

Stuart F. Johnson, Bennington, Vermont, University of Virginia Law School, On assignment to the Republican Task Force on Crime.

Robert vom Eigen, Morristown, New Jersey, University of California School of Law, "New Towns Housing Program."

Charles William O'Neill, Columbus, Ohio, Princeton University, "The Dilemmas of Campaign Finance and Election Law Reform: Analysis of Republican Views."

Ross H. Hicks, Niota, Tennessee, Vanderbilt University, On assignment to the Minority Poverty Staff, House Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. Speaker, the program director, Dr. John F. Bibby, a member of the political science faculty at the University of Wisconsin—Milwaukee, and the staff members of the conference, earned well-deserved praise for developing a comprehensive and stimulating program.

Mr. Speaker, we are justly proud of our interns. The experience and insights which they have gained augurs well for the future of our American political system. They have realized practical involvement, an absolutely essential ingredient in participatory democracy.

The paper referred to above follows:

The Dilemmas of Campaign Finance and Election Law Reform: Analysis of Republican Views

The problems of campaign finance and election law reform are offspring of the same overbearing parent—the influence of money on the machinery of democracy.

The problem makes itself felt in the campaign of an individual, in the maintenance of the party machinery, and in the decisions and integrity of government.

Campaign expenditures at all levels were $175 million dollars in 1960; in 1964, this figure rose to $200 million. Broadcasting costs alone have undergone a phenomenal increase in the last several years. Expenditures on broadcast time for non-Presidential races have gone from $20 million in 1962 to $32 million in 1966. Other costs have also been on the increase.

It cost Pierre Salinger $1,600,000 to lose a seat in the U.S. Senate; Ronald Reagan's sucessful gubernatorial campaign cost $5,000,000.[1] A party, or an individual, who is unable or unwilling to establish a broad base of contributors to raise sums of this magnitude, may be forced into a dependence on the large individual contributor. As President Kennedy's Commission on Presidential Campaign Finance states: [2]

"It is not desirable to have candidates for high office, especially for President and Vice President, dependent on individuals or organizations with special interests who are willing to make large contributions in the form of cash or campaign contributions."

Senator Albert Gore (D-Tennessee) further emphasized the issue when he addressed himself to the problem on the Senate floor: [3]

"Next week the party of the people will have a fund-raising dinner at $250 per plate. What man of toil will be there? Who will buy the plates at $250 each? I do not know who will buy them by the plate. Not many. Who will buy the tables of plates? We know, and we are ashamed of it. The lobbyists and the special interests seeking favors from Congress and the government will buy these tables."

A broad base of support will free a public servant to "weigh the special interest against the common interests within his own constituency"[4] without financial obligation to the special interest.

Such views and words of warning have been brought home to the electorate recently by the Baker, Dodd, Long and Dulski cases. These have created what Senator Hugh Scott (R-Penn.) calls "the crisis of confidence"[5] expressed toward the Congress today. This "crisis of confidence" springs from a crisis of finance affecting both individuals and party organizations.

Both parties emerged from the 1960 campaign with deficits. In 1964 the Democrats again emerged with a large deficit. The burden this cost places on a party is the difficulty it presents in maintaining a permanent party structure. To be a truly effective and dynamic force, a party must be able to maintain a staff to research and develop positions and programs.

This costs money and it costs money in non-election years when many pools of revenue dry up. It necessitates developing a broad-based group of supporters willing to make small contributions on a yearly basis. The Republican party has developed a system of contributors willing to give $10 apiece per year to sustain the operation of the party apparatus.

Such a program has allowed the party to develop sophisticated positions on the issues and problems currently facing the country and to publish such material. It has given the party the means to become an opposition of constructive alternatives rather than an opposition of negatives, to act as a true counterweight to the majortly.

It is agreed by all who have studied the problem that in order to best represent the interests of the people, and to remove the stigma of undue influence, a political organization should be funded by small contributions from a variety of people.

The broader the contributing base, the larger and more intense is the feeling of participation by the citizenry. If a citizen has an investment in a candidate or a party, he is more likely to talk, work, and ultimately vote for him than if he has no personal stake in the campaign. In the spectrum of argument about financial problems that will be alleviated by a broad base of contributors, this positive civic good is overlooked.

The next question is, since almost everyone is in agreement about the fact that a broad base of small contributors is desirable, what has been done about it in the past and what is the trend for the future?

There is a continuing mythology, a legacy from the past, that casts the Republicans as the party of the large contributors and the Democrats as the poor party scraping by on the nickels and dimes of its followers. The myth was never true, but there was at least some basis for such an exaggeration in the past. No such basis exists any longer. Instead, it is the Republican Party that has acted on its belief in the small contributor, while the Democratic Party has come more and more to rely on heavy individual contributors.

The facts speak for themselves. In 1956, 74% of the money raised nationally by the Republicans, and 44% of the money raised by Democrats, had come from contributions of over $500.

In 1964, the Republicans raised only 28% of their national funds with contributions of over $500, while the Democrats raised a full 69% of their money through such means.[6]

---

[1] *Time*, March 31, 1967, p. 24.

[2] Report of President's Commission on Campaign Costs, *Financing Presidential Campaigns*, 1962.

[3] *Congressional Record*, May 4, 1967, p. S-6398.

[4] *The Condition of Our National Parties*, Stephen K. Bailey, p. 13.

[5] *Senator Hugh Scott*, Statement before the Senate Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, June 20, 1967.

[6] *Responsibility in Party Finance*, Herbert E. Alexander, Citizen's Research Foundation.

As Alexander and Meyers put it in their study of 1964 campaign finances: [7]

"Careful study of the recorded campaign contributions and expenditures reveals that the Democrats became the party of the 'fat cat' and the Republicans, the party of the small contributors."

Alexander and Meyers also have an explanation for this phenomenon: [8]

"The chief magnet attracting large gifts to the Democrats in 1964 was the President's Club, which provided the party with a good share of its campaign funds."

This is the organization that was described by a member as a "financial oligarchy for the President of the U.S." [9]

The orgy of large contributions that was initiated in 1960 and brought to full potential in 1964 has not yet let up. *U.S. News and World Report* recently carried the following items: [10]

"Within three weeks in three widely separated cities across the nation, Lyndon Johnson helped raise more than three million dollars in political contributions for the Democratic party . . . most of the money came from wealthy men who belong to the exclusive President's Club which was formed as a fund raising device by Democrats during the Kennedy and Johnson administrations.

"For $1,000 a year in political donations club members are promised a 'direct relationship, with the White House, including social invitations and access to the President."

The Democrats left another legacy from their high priced fund raising in 1964–65, this one statutory.

The Democrats sold advertising in their 1964 Convention Program for $15,000 a page, plus an increased rate for front and back covers.[11] The uproar created over the 1965 Democrat book, "Towards An Age Of Greatness", which was marked by heavy advertising, led to Congressional actions. The issue at hand was an ambiguity in the Corrupt Practices Act that allowed the problem to exist. Under the Act, corporations are not allowed to make direct contributions to a political campaign. The advertising purchased in the convention book was not strictly a campaign contribution, and was deducted as a business expense by the corporation. Such advertising had been declared legal by the courts but only to the extent that it was used to defray convention costs. The Democrat book raised a good deal of money beyond such limited goals.[12]

In response to such an abuse, Senator John J. Williams (R-Delaware) introduced an Amendment to an Administration tax bill, which disallowed advertising in political journals and tickets to testimonials as tax deductions. This provision, coupled with the ban on corporate giving, effectively eradicated the problem.

The Republican record offers a marked contrast to that of the Democrats in many ways. The Republican trend has been toward a large number of small contributors, both in policy and in fact. From the Republican Coordinating Committee report in December, 1965: [13]

"We strongly endorse the principle that the larger the number of individual contributors the more healthy are the parties and the political system."

An important issue is that of government participation to alleviate the burdens of campaign costs. What are the alternatives? Where do the parties stand?

Finance alternatives seem to fall in three general categories:

1) To maintain the status quo;

2) To implement an incentive to political giving;

3) To institute direct appropriation of government funds to finance campaigns.

The statistics that have been presented, as well as the pronouncements of most members, seem to indicate the need for some action in this area. Senator James B. Pearson (R-Kansas) spoke for many of his colleagues when he stated: [14]

"The need is growing more critical every day to reform and revitalize our system of financing campaigns for public office."

The idea of direct subsidy is the alternative most recently discussed and to some extent enacted in the Congress of the United States.

There are two basic difficulties with this kind of program. First, no matter what form in which it is enacted, it does nothing to promote voter participation in the democratic process. It denies both tenets of the President's Commission on Presidential Campaign Finance: [15]

1) A belief in citizen participation.

2) A belief in voluntary individual effort and not effort animated by government.

The specific proposal made by Senator Russell B. Long (D-Louisiana) would give every taxpayer the option on his Federal income tax return of appropriating one dollar to be divided evenly between the two major political parties. This would raise about $30 million dollars for each party.[16]

The President's Commission offered four objections to such a system of direct subsidy.[17] The first was that it would lessen the feeling of citizen participation. A person would automatically be contributing to both major parties, with no choice in the matter and no vehicle available to express his own preference. It would tend to isolate parties from responsibility to the people.

A second objection is that such a plan would alter the basic power structure of the parties. As Herbert Alexander has written: [18]

"Given our institutional arrangement, the basis of political organization in the U.S. is and will remain local. The only adequate and reliable foundation for a strong financial structure within the party based on small contributions is at the local level and the search for financial responsibility must begin there."

A system of direct subsidy would pour money in at the top of the system and leave its distribution to the party from the national level down. It is true that such a system has been advocated by some political scientists as a way to establish a more homogenous party structure, and as a way to impose discipline on the party.[19] By the same token, it may also lead to party proliferation. It is doubtful that a reorganization of basic party structure should be in the purview of legislative initiative at this time. Such institutional revisions could work broad and unknown changes in the American political system.

A third objection voiced against such a system is the difficulty in assessing what happens to public money once it disappears into party coffers.

Before public money is pumped directly into a party system, it should be established for what purposes it is given. Campaigns are often grossly inefficient.

Louis Howe, secretary to Franklin Roosevelt, found that only about 3 to 5 percent of the literature distributed to state committees by national headquarters ever reached the voter.[20]

There is great question whether the Federal government should appropriate money into such a morass of inefficiency.

The final problem with a direct subsidy is one of impartial administration. No matter how such a plan is drawn, Congress still must maintain power to alter it in terms of total money appropriated, and the nature of the allocations. To place such power in the hands of men who are by nature politically minded is to risk great temptation. This fact has been amply demonstrated in the stormy history of such a direct subsidy in Puerto Rico.[21]

For these and other equally compelling reasons, it would seem inadvisable to use a direct government appropriation for political campaigns as the instrument to solve the financial crisis.

The other alternative would be government approval and encouragement of political giving through some form of tax incentive, either through a deduction or a credit. These two methods have several advantages in common. First, they are designed to stimulate individual citizen participation and commitment. The effect would be similar (although certainly not psychologically identical) to the present stimulus for charitable giving.[22] The chief strength of the plan is that it reserves to the individual the right to support the party or candidate he prefers. As Senator Mansfield said on matters of subsidy:

". . . we must make also certain that the basic control for the choice (elective) remains with the electorate.[23]

Such a program of tax relief for contributors would eliminate the low level of involvement stimulated by the direct subsidy. It would make it unnecessary to develop complicated formulae to apportion funds; it would not institutionalize the problems involved in minority party access to funds. It would allow the individual to follow the dictates of his own convictions with a contribution.

The amount of money that might be raised under such a system is open to speculation, but indications are that it would be considerable. A tax incentive increases both the propensity of the electorate to contribute and the inclination of the parties to solicit small contributions. Gallup polls based on a $10 tax credit for a twenty dollar contribution indicate that about $340 million dollars would be available under the program (assuming there was comprehensive solicitation by the parties).[24]

Thus, it can be demonstrated that some form of tax relief to promote campaign contributions is both effective and desirable. The problem in determining what the nature of that tax relief should be is more complex. The President's Commission on Campaign Costs only recommended *some form* of tax relief and went no further.[25] The parameters of the problem include the magnitude of the relief to be granted, whether such relief should be a credit or deduction, extension of relief to primary elections, and sustaining contributions.

---

[7] *Fortune*, November, 1965. "The Switch in Campaign Giving," p. 170.

[8] *Ibid.*

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 172.

[10] "L.B.J.: Million-a-week Fund Raiser," *U.S. News and World Report.*

[11] *Fortune*, November, 1965, p. 170.

[12] *Ibid.*

[13] *Toward Fair Elections in America*, Task Force on the Functions of Federal, State, and Local Governments, December, 1965, Republican Co-ordinating Committee.

[14] Republican Congressional Committee News Letter.

[15] *Op. cit.*, President's Commission.

[16] *Senator Russell B. Long*, Finance Bill Debate, May 4, 1967.

[17] *Op. cit.*, Bailey.

[18] *Responsibility in Party Finance*, Herbert E. Alexander.

[19] *Op. cit.*, Bailey.

[20] V. O. Key, *Politics, Parties and Pressure Groups*, p. 525.

[21] *Commission Campaign Finance in Puerto Rico*, Herbert E. Alexander, Citizen's Research, Princeton, New Jersey.

[22] *Tax Incentives for Political Contributions*, Herbert E. Alexander.

[23] Congressional Record, April 20, 1967, p. S–5658.

[24] *Op. cit., Tax Incentives for Political Contributions.*

[25] *Op. cit.*, President's Commission.

The President's Commission recommended a credit for half the amount of the contribution up to a limit of $10 total *credit* or a *deduction* of up to $1000.[26] There are differences between the two. A *tax credit* is simple to compute.[27] Once the taxable income is computed, the amount of one half the contribution (up to a credit of $10) is deducted from the tax liability. The effect is to decide to pay part of the tax liability to the party of the taxpayer's choice. Each taxpayer receives the same absolute benefit for the same size gift.

The situation with a *deduction* is different. The deduction is not figured against the tax liability but is used in order to establish the taxable income from which the liability is then computed. Instead of each taxpayer getting the same amount of absolute tax relief, a deduction makes the amount of relief a function of income. In effect, as income increases the amount of the contribution paid by the government increases. Suppose there are two men, each of whom contributes $100 to the party of his choice. The first man, Mr. A, pays tax at the rate of 25% of his taxable income, while the second, Mr. B, pays at the rate of 75% of his taxable income. In effect, Mr. A is contributing $75 to the party of his choice, while the government is paying $25 in lost revenues. To phrase it another way, Mr. A is paying $75 more than he would if he paid the tax as opposed to taking the deduction. Mr. B, on the other hand, is only contributing the $25 that he wouldn't otherwise be losing, while the government is in effect contributing the $75 it would be receiving in taxes.

Another point concerning the workability of a deduction is the way it would appear on the income tax form. If such a deduction were to be just one of the variety of itemized deductions, its value would be lost for a great many people. The great number of individuals with smaller incomes fail to file an itemized list of deductions.[28] In 1957, only one third of all taxpayers itemized deductions. In 1956, of those taxpayers with adjusted incomes below $5,000, only 27% itemized deductions, while 54% of those with income above $5,000 did so. Thus, if a system of deductions is to be implemented, it should appear on both the long and the short tax return form. It should not be necessary to itemize all deductions in order to gain one for a contribution.

The difference between a *tax credit* and a *tax deduction* is not crucial. A *tax credit* would seem to be a larger revenue drain (at 1956 levels of giving it would have represented a revenue drain of about 80 million dollars [29]), but it would appear to be more of an incentive to low income contributors than a deduction, assuming that the average taxpayer sits and riddles out exactly where the line determining his income bracket falls. The *deduction* plan would seem to have a greater weight of precedent behind it in the field of personal income taxes. There is the precedent of charitable gifts on the national level, and at least four states (Missouri, Minnesota, California and Hawaii) give state income tax deductions for campaign contributions.[30]

The Republican position on the whole subsidy issue was stated in these terms:[31]

"We are opposed to any scheme which would provide direct financing for our political parties out of the Federal Treasury, but we believe the encouragement and stimulation of political contributions is desirable.

"Specifically we propose that a reasonable deduction from the Federal Income Tax be permitted for contributions to parties and their nominees."

This statement fails to mention primary elections. In many areas the primary election is the only election. It is the decisive election. In 1966, for example, Democrats spent $10 million on broadcasting for primary elections and only $8.5 million on the general election.[32] This can properly be attributed to the large number of single party constituencies that are controlled by the Democrats. However, each party rules certain areas at different levels of government in the same way. In such a situation it is hardly wise to exempt primaries from any finance action. One reason for the reluctance of the Congress to legislate in this area, both in terms of spending controls and now in terms of financial encouragement, is the hazy legal position of primary elections. However, Assistant Attorney General Fred Vinson, concerning the role of the primary in election law reforms of the past, has said:[33]

". . . there was serious constitutional doubt as to the powers of Congress to legislate in the area of party primaries. These doubts have long since been resolved, and Congress now clearly has the power to include primaries."

One area of possible objection to the subsidization of primary candidates is that it will limit the control that the established party organization is able to wield in determining party nominees (at least in states with party primaries rather than conventions). There are two issues to be raised concerning this concept. (1) the idea of a party primary is to give the membership as well as the leadership of the party a voice in who is selected as the standard bearer in the general election. There is no reason to discriminate against a candidate financially because he does not have the endorsement of some party organization. (2) would the party organization really be disadvantaged? In several ways it would not. Deductions for campaign contributions and sustaining contributions would help put the party in a more comfortable position financially, better able to offer support to candidates it might endorse. Also important is the fact that citizens would be able to make only one deductible contribution per year and would be reluctant to pledge it for an unendorsed candidate who may be a lost cause. These two facts serve to preserve the power and the prestige of the party endorsement in most primaries, while still leaving as a legitimate check the opportunity for adequately financed and meaningful opposition. The opportunity for citizen participation in the true spirit of the party primary is thus enhanced.

Even with a well established system of small contributors, there would remain large administrative problems for the parties to solve. Competition between local, state and national units or committees of the same party as well as inter-party competition over the one tax-benefited contribution of each individual would be vigorous.[34] The competition would be drawing on a larger pool of money, and thus there would be a little more to go around, but the competition would still be there.

The final problem to be considered in this brief examination of the problems of campaign finance is both a conclusion to the problem and an introduction to that of election laws concerning expenditures and disclosure.

The problem is the participation of corporations and labor unions in the financing of political campaigns. It is a participation that is excluded by existing law (Hatch Act, Corrupt Practices Act), but both sides of the labor-management complex have found loopholes which facilitate contributions.

These loopholes should be closed. What should be encouraged is participation by both of these groups in genuine nonpartisan ventures. Such a recommendation was made by the President's Commission in their report.[35]

In this way, programs that were sponsored by these groups in order to get a broad cross-section of people to register or to vote, without attempting to influence their political choice, could be encouraged. Honest attempts at non-partisan voter education could be rewarded. Efforts such as donating battle pages in newspapers, free television time to recognized candidates or donation of radio time to a discussion of issues by each camp could be fostered. It is sometimes hard to draw a line between something that seems to be non-partisan or bi-partisan and is actually *de facto* partisanship (i.e. registration drives spotlighting areas predominated by one party). This still appears to be a large and fruitful area for public service by this sector of society.

The supplement of campaign funds by some form of Federal encouragement of small contributions is only half the problem of campaign expenditures and rising costs.

Senator James B. Pearson of Kansas has noted:[36]

"The need for reform is twofold: the reliance of candidates on a few wealthy sources for their campaign funds must be reduced and our reporting requirements for campaign spending must be tightened."

The Congress has a long history of attempts and failures to control the problems of money in politics. The Federal Corrupt Practices Act was first passed in 1925 and was amended in 1944, 1947, and again in 1948. Assistant Attorney General Fred Vinson has described it in the following words:[37]

"The Federal Corrupt Practices Act (Title 2, United States Code, Section 241 through 256) was designed to compel disclosure of contributors and expenditures in Federal campaigns. Treasurers of 'political committees' which accept contributions and make expenditures in support of candidates for the Senate and the House or in support of presidential electors, are required to maintain certain records and file certain reports with the Clerk of the House, and additional reports on contributions received by the candidate or by other persons with the candidates knowledge and consent. Section 248 of the act limits the amounts candidates for Congress may expend in their campaigns for election.

"The intent of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act was good—to insure disclosure to the electorate of the sources of a candidate's financial support and the recipients of the campaign funds expended by the candidate. In practical fact, however, the Act has not met with its goals. It is, as President Johnson has said, 'more loophole than law'."

A very striking analysis of the truth of that statement was reported in Time magazine.[38]

"Few of the expenses (from a campaign) are an official record since the Corrupt Practices Act of 1925 stipulates that a Senator can spend only $25,000 on his campaign, a Representative $5,000. A candidate gets around this simply by setting up innumerable committees that collect and spend money for his campaign without his 'knowledge or consent'. Thus Massachusetts' Senator Ted Kennedy, like many another Congress member, could and did file a report declaring that his 1962 campaign expenses were zero—though his supporters spent an estimated $2,000,000."

---

[26] *Op. cit.*, Congressional Record, April 20, 1967.

[27] *Ibid.*

[28] *Ibid.*

[29] *Ibid.*

[30] *Ibid.*

[31] *Op. cit., Toward Fair Elections in America.*

[32] Surrey of Political Broadcasting, Primary and General Elections Campaign, 1966-June 1967, F.C.C.

[33] *Assistant Attorney General, Fred M. Vinson*, testifying before Senate Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, June 28, 1967.

[34] *Op., cit., Tax Incentives.*

[35] *Op. cit.*, President's Commission.

[36] *Op. cit.*, Pearson Statement.

[37] *Op. cit.*, Attorney General Vinson.

[38] *Op cit., Time*, March 31, 1967.

Mr. Vinson, in his testimony before Senate Sub-Committee on Privileges and Elections, also covered the other area of previous Federal legislation, the Hatch Act, which was passed in 1939 and amended in 1940. He stated that:[39]

"Section 608 (a), Title 18, United States Code, appears to prohibit a single individual from contributing over $5,000 to any campaign for nomination or election to a federal elective office. However, since 608 (a) is expressly made inapplicable to committees operating completely within a state, there is no limit on the amount an individual can contribute to such a committee even though it supports a federal candidate. I would also point out that 608 (a) does not prescribe the making of a $5,000 contribution by an individual to as many multi-state committees supporting the same candidate as the individual may desire. This then is a limitation which does not limit.

"Section 609 appears to place a $3,000,000 ceiling on both contributions and expenditures by a political committee but once again the statute is expressly made inapplicable to committees operating completely within a state. Even as the multi-state committees, which are ostensibly covered, the law places no restriction on the number of such committees which can receive and expend up to the $3,000,000 limit. The soaring costs of modern campaigning have made the ceiling patently unrealistic and inevitably forced what President Johnson has described as the endless proliferation of committees."

Thus, two measures that are currently a part of the United States Code include a disclosure bill that discloses nothing and a limiting bill that totally fails to limit.

The approach that Congress currently seems to be taking to correct the situation is directed to use of stringent disclosure, placing great faith in the ability of the public to punish transgressors. It rests on the assumption that if the public is supplied with all the facts and figures of a candidate's campaign finances, it will be the most effective tribunal to judge him. But the problem of disclosure is twofold. As Senator Scott said in testimony before a Senate subcommittee:[40]

"Disclosure comprehends not only reporting of the sources and uses of campaign funds but also their publicity."

Thus, the disclosure bill that the Oregon Legislature placed on the books of that state has not been particularly effective. The office of the Secretary of State has not been able to efficiently process and made available to the mass media the information filed with that office. This is a standing problem with such laws in Ohio, Pennsylvania, North Carolina and others. The fact that effective disclosure legislation can be passed on the State level has been demonstrated by efforts such as Florida's "Who Gave It, Who Got It" law.[41] The basic approach to a Federal disclosure law has centered around the same idea. There are difficulties. The problem is first to insure that all significant contributions and expenditures are reported, and second, to provide that intelligible records are made available to the public before the election (to as large an extent as possible), along with a complete record of contributions and expenditures after the election.

There are two proposals for a Federal disclosure act. One entails reporting all major contributions and expenditures to the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate. This is the proposal that has been offered by the Johnson Administration. It is rivaled by a bill that has Republican support, the Ashmore-Goodell bill. Both measures were introduced in 1966, and although neither passed, it has been interesting to note the impact of the latter proposal on the Administration bill in at least three areas:

1) Registration of political committees.

2) The making of political contributions in the name of another.

3) The financing of national conventions.

The 1966 Administration bill offered nothing in these areas, while the Ashmore-Goodell bill (HR 18162) covered them very adequately. In the re-introduced 1967 version of the Administration bill (S 1880), these gaps have been filled by provisions closely resembling those of the Ashmore-Goodell bill, also re-introduced. The remaining difference is in the method the Ashmore-Goodell bill provides for the dissemination of the collected material. It establishes a bipartisan Federal Elections Commission, composed of five members, appointed by the President to ten year terms.

The Commission is charged with developing the general forms necessary to facilitate prompt and accurate reporting, and with the responsibility for making comprehensible reports available to the public. It is charged with issuing reports comparing campaign costs with past elections, devising a system for cross-indexing the records, and preserving the information on individual contributors.

The National Director of the National Committee for an effective Congress stated: [42]

"We agree with Senator Scott and others who have urged the creation of a Federal Elections Commission which would have this responsibility (receiving, recording, and publicizing the information) as its sole concern. Such a commission would be able to quickly establish uniform methods of reporting and bookkeeping, to process the incoming data rapidly and efficiently and to effectively *publicize* this information which is the real key to any meaningful disclosure legislation."

The difference was also characterized by Robert C. Albright, writing for the *Washington Post,* in the following term: [43]

"The President's bill requires full reporting of campaign receipts and expenditures, but the reports would be filed as at present with the Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate, without strong enforcement provisions.

"In contrast the House bill (Ashmore-Goodell) would create a new Federal Election Commission with power to make audits, subpoena witnesses, conduct investigations and report suspected violations to law enforcement officers.

The Republican Co-Ordinating Committee has been on record since December of 1965, in favor of such a proposal. It issued a statement calling for: [44]

". . . the establishment of a fact-finding Advisory Commission on Voting and National Elections with equal representation of the two major parties. This commission, armed with authority to subpoena witnesses, would determine by investigation and hearings whether violations of the law had occurred and, if so, would recommend prosecution to the appropriate state or federal agency."

The other approach to election law reform is a limitation on the size of contributions and/or expenditures. As has already been seen from the Assistant Attorney General's testimony, current limitations on expenditures have been totally useless. Both the President's Commission and the Republican Co-Ordinating Committee Report, *Toward Fair Elections in America,* urged the abolition of spending limits on committees and for offices.[45] Both the Administration's election reform proposal and the Ashmore-Goodell bill provide for the abolition of these ceilings, while maintaining the ceiling on individual giving and strengthening the provisions to insure their enforcement. In regard to the latter concept Senator Gore has said:[46]

"If the concept of one-man one-vote is to have practical validity we should limit the degree to which one individual's influence on the outcome of an election may be determined by the size of his pocketbook."

But the Senator goes on to endorse the importance of issue development and maintenance of a ceiling on general expenditures in a campaign: [47]

"I think it would be a great mistake to eliminate altogether the idea that there should be a ceiling on how much may legally be spent, leaving only the sky as the limit.

"The legitimate purpose of campaign expenditures is to inform the electorate as to issues in the campaign and the views of the candidates, so that the voters may make a wise choice. Expenditures beyond that amount may tend to obscure issues and the views of the candidates and, in effect, be designed to 'sell' an image of a candidate rather than who the candidate really is and what he stands for.

"Ceilings can be made effective if the candidate is made responsible for the conduct of his campaign.

"I do not think it is asking too much to require a candidate to authorize committees to spend money in his behalf and to include the amount spent by authorized committees in the over-all ceiling applicable to that candidate's campaign."

The arguments that are used to offset the sentiment of the Senator from Tennessee hold that it has been impossible to enforce ceilings in the past so it will continue to be impossible to enforce them in the future. The question is, then, how can someone place faith in a disclosure system and at the same time maintain that such disclosure will not reveal a record of contribution and expenditures detailed enough to establish the level of total spending for the campaign?

The other attendant difficulty is that of determining a reasonable level of expenditure that would allow the candidates to effectively reach the electorate. The most rational approach to this problem would seem to be determining a formula based on an allowable expenditure per vote figure that, when multiplied by either the eligible or registered voters in a constituency, would provide the maximum level of expenditures for any office sought—district, state, or national. Research and testimony from the campaign experts on both sides of the Hill would probably serve to establish such a formula.

Both bills maintain and strengthen the contribution limit of $5,000 per person per candidate. The Ashmore-Goodell bill also takes steps to uphold sanctions previously imposed by Congress on contributions by corporations or labor unions.

In 1907 the progressive vigor of the country was directed to impose restrictions against direct corporate contributions to federal campaigns. This prohibition was extended by the Smith-Connally Act in 1944 and the Taft-Hartley Act in 1947 to include labor unions.[48]

---

[39] *Op. cit.,* Attorney General Vinson.

[40] *Op. cit.,* Scott.

[41] *Op. cit., Towards Fair Elections in America.*

[42] Effective Congress before Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, June 20, 1967.

[43] Robert C. Albright, *Washington Post.*

[44] *Op. cit., Towards Fair Elections.*

[45] *Ibid.*

[46] *Senator Albert Gore* before Privileges and Election Subcommittee, June 27, 1967.

[47] *Ibid.*

[48] *Regulation of Political Finance.*

The spirit of both sanctions has been violated. Corporate donations in the form of convention book advertising and donations of goods or services have been deducted as business expenses. (The Williams Amendment, passed in 1966, barred deduction of advertising in convention books.)

The labor unions have managed to circumvent the intent of the law through political education divisions such as the AFL–CIO's COPE, or the Teamsters Union's DRIVE. V. O. Key's comments would certainly be applicable to this group when he said: [49]

"Expenditures by lobbying and 'educational' organizations may fall outside the statutory definitions of reportable expenditures."

Both the recommendations of the President's Commission on Campaign Expenses and the provisions of the Ashmore-Goodell bill call for tightening of prohibitions against the partisan participation of these two special interests.

Section 610, Title 18 of the United States Code prohibits direct partisan campaign expenditures and contributions by labor unions or corporations.[50]

The Ashmore-Goodell bill would tighten this law in several ways. It amends the section cited to include "any organization or association which is supported financially by a corporation, trade association or labor organization from its own funds." [51]

Such legislation would cover not only such groups as COPE, but also groups like Business Industry Political Action Committee (BIPAC), and the political action arm of the American Medical Association.[52]

Another problem that the Ashmore-Goodell measure seeks to attack is that of special interest influence in respect to gifts, an area not covered in the 1967 Administration measure. The bill calls for the disclosure of:

"The total sum of gifts of money (except contributions as defined in Section 201) received by him, his wife or minor children, on his behalf during the reporting period and not stated under paragraph (1)."

There is another provision which requires disclosure of honorariums:

"Each statement required by this section from a candidate or Senator or Representative shall disclose—

1) the full name and mailing address of each person from whom he or anyone on his behalf received any honorarium within the reporting period; the amount or, if not money, identity and value thereof; and the name and address of each person for whom such service was performed;

2) the description of the service performed;

3) the aggregate amount of honorariums received by him."

The Washington Evening Star of August 9, 1967, reported that an effort to amend the Administration proposal to include such material was defeated by a 6-3 vote in a Senate Subcommittee.

Disclosure is a complex approach to the problem of expenditure control. There are those who feel that a strong, complete, preelection disclosure law, with strong enforcement measures included in it, would be a useful substitute for all other forms of control. It would seem that full disclosure, if it can be achieved, would also make possible the enforcement of realistic spending ceilings.

Finally, when the whole problem of campaign costs is examined, there are many other alternatives that should be examined. Research should be undertaken concerning the effective and efficient use of campaign materials. Corruption and waste can be trimmed from campaign expenses. Suggestions for use of the public air waves in the public service should again be examined.

Exploration of the feasibility of these ideas would help to break away from the concept expressed by Alexander and Denny when they said: [53]

"Neither new laws nor revisions of old ones have significantly attempted to encourage the reduction of political costs through means other than limitations."

The first action that Congress must take is to remove the influence of special interest, both by disclosure and through the encouragement of increased citizen participation in campaign finance. Once that task is achieved, it should then turn to an examination of the technical aspects of the campaign process, in an effort to streamline and improve it.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alexander, Herbert E. *Responsibility in Finance,* Citizen's Research Foundation, Princeton, New Jersey.

Alexander, Herbert E. *Financing the 1964 Election.* Citizen's Research Foundation, Princeton, New Jersey.

Alexander, Herbert E. *Tax Incentive for Political Contributions.* Citizen's Research Foundation, Princeton, New Jersey.

Alexander, Herbert E. *Campaign Finance in Puerto Rico.* Citizen's Research Foundation, Princeton, New Jersey.

Alexander, Herbert E. *Regulation of Political Finance.* (Laura Q. Denny) Institute of Governmental Studies, Berkeley Citizen's Research Foundation, Princeton, New Jersey.

Bailey, Stephen K. *The Conditions of Our National Political Parties.* Foundation for the Republic. 1959.

Key, V. O. *Politics, Parties and Pressure Groups.* Thomas G. Cromell Company, New York, 1958.

Shannon, Jasper B. *Money and Politics.* Random House, New York City, 1959.

Congressional Record, May 4, 9, 2, and April 20, 1967.

Fortune Magazine, November, 1965.

Survey of Political Broadcasting. Primary and General Election. Campaigns of 1966 June 1967—F.C.C.

U.S. News and World Report, April 10, 1967, July 10, 1967.

Time Magazine, May 12, 5, 31, 1967.

Republican Congressional Committee Newsletter.

Washington Post.

Washington Evening Star.

PRESS SUPPORT FOR GONZALEZ BILL TO STRENGTHEN THE RENEGOTIATION BOARD: FOURTH OF A SERIES

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, the Renegotiation Board has returned to the American taxpayer millions of dollars by recovering excessive profits on defense and space contracts. From fiscal year 1953 through 1966, the Board issued determinations of excess profits totaling $936,455,823. In addition, the Board has been effective in negotiating voluntary profit cutbacks. In fiscal year 1966, for example, the Board issued determinations of excess profits in the amount of $24.5 million, while voluntary negotiation resulted in $23.2 million in voluntary price reductions and voluntary refunds to the Treasury. And it is pertinent that the Board's predecessor, the War Contracts Price Adjustments Board, recovered $11 billion in excess profits during World War II.

When the present Renegotiation Board was created at the outbreak of the Korean war, any company with defense sales exceeding $250,000 in its fiscal year was required by law to file statements on all its contracts considered "renegotiable." But this floor was increased to $500,000 in 1954, and to $1,000,000 in 1956. Not only has the floor been raised, but exemptions have been enacted which have hampered the Board's effectiveness in combating war profiteering. Certain so-called competitively bid contracts are now exempt from renegotiation. Standard commercial articles and services, defined as those of which 35 percent or more are sold to private firms, are exempt now. Agricultural commodities are exempt. Contracts for new durable productive equipment are partially exempt. And so on.

The effect of these exemptions and the two-step increase in the minimum sales volume has been to greatly reduce the number of companies which file with the Renegotiation Board, and corresponding to reduce determinations of excessive profits.

A comparison of the number of mandatory filings illustrate the effect of these cutbacks in the Board's purview. In fiscal year 1952, 13,104 companies reported defense contracts in excess of the floor of $250,000, and were subject to renegotiation. Contrasted to this, only 3,387 companies were required to file during fiscal year 1966, under the present floor of $1 million and the present exemptions. This approaches a 75-percent reduction.

The large upsurge in defense contracts occasioned by Vietnam are reaching the fiscal accounting stage. Whether a significant number of these can be examined for excessive profits will depend upon whether the Board can be restored to its original effectiveness. I have introduced a bill, H.R. 6792, which would eliminate the main exemptions and restore the floor to $250,000.

Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that war profiteering is increasing, in view of some shocking cases turned up relative to defense procurement procedures. Present controls are grossly inadequate. Whether or not companies with space and defense contracts but without scruple are permitted to pocket, unearned, the taxpayer's dollar is squarely up to Congress.

To date, I have received no support for my legislation to strengthen the Renegotiation Board from any Member of either body. However, several newspapers have supported my bill, and I have permission to insert the fourth in a series of these comments:

[From the Houston Chronicle, July 31, 1967]

CHECKUP DUE ON WAR PROFITEERING

Texas Congressman Henry B. Gonzalez took the floor of the House several months ago to introduce a bill designed to curb war profiteering.

---

[49] *Op. cit.,* V. O. Key, p. 525.

[50] *Op cit.,* (2) Recommendation, 5,596, Scott Bill.

[51] 5,596, Scott Bill.

[52] Robert C. Albright, *Washington Post,* June 30, 1967.

[53] *Regulation of Political Finance,* Herbert E. Alexander, p. 5.

He contended that there has been an alarming growth of excessive profits taken by private firms in Defense Department procurement contracts. The San Antonio representative pointed out that government efforts to oversee contracts and expenses were far less than they had been during the Korean War.

No action has been taken on his bill which would rid the government's renegotiation board of some limitations upon its jurisdiction and what Gonzalez calls the many exemptions from renegotiation which special interest groups have obtained for themselves.

Charges last week that Colt Industries will make almost 1400 percent profit on resale to the government of manufacturing rights for the M-16 rifle should stir some interest in Rep. Gonzalez's proposals.

Of course only one side of the Colt story has been heard so far. It was the general counsel of the Army who estimated the profit on manufacturing rights and said there would be added millions in royalties and production guarantees. It's possible that Colt's side of the story would show a different profit picture.

However, the fact still remains that the United States is spending an estimated $2 billion a month in Vietnam and little has been done to check on procurement expenses to determine if the charges and profits have been excessive.

Gonzalez says that restoration of the renegotiation board's authority to the Korean War level is long overdue. He's right.

SOVIET TROUBLEMAKING IN NIGERIA

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, Americans, regardless of faith, place a high value on human life, which they regard as a sacred gift. Whenever and wherever they see thoughtless killing, they react with revulsion and indignation, and seek to bring moral pressure to bear to halt such bloodshed. I rise to bring to the attention of the House a situation of just this nature, complicated by Soviet Russian troublemaking.

It is occurring in Nigeria. Earlier this year, before the present war broke out between the Federal Government and the secessionist eastern region which now calls itself Biafra, I visited all sections of Nigeria. I formed a high regard for the people of that country, and the hope that they could resolve their differences in a way that would permit Nigeria to develop its potential as a great nation.

Unfortunately, the differences between the eastern region and the Federal Government were not resolved. Instead, the people of the east, predominantly Ibos, felt compelled to proclaim the establishment of an independent nation they called Biafra, and the Federal Government responded by sending troops to crush what it considered a rebellion.

So long as this remained a war between two military groupings, the United States proper role was to stay out. What we see happening now is of a different reaction. Instead of soldiers killing soldiers, innocent civilians, women and children as well as men, are being murdered—there is no other word for it.

Reliable reports reaching me indicate that these killings already are on a large scale, and carry the clear warning that unless there is a cease-fire in the next week to 10 days, they will reach the proportions of genocide. Federal troops now are penetrating deeper into Biafra, the homeland of the Ibo people. The Ibo recall that Federal troops slew 30,000 of their tribe in the north a year ago, and just last month singled out Ibos in the midwestern city of Benin, chained them together, and machine-gunned them to death. They hear shocking reports that when Federal troops entered the university town of Nsukka they killed so many people that it was necessary to dig a mass grave for them.

Faced with this record of Federal troop behavior and having nowhere to retreat, the Ibos have the choice—if it is a choice—of fighting a guerrilla war to the death or surrendering and risking probable slaughter. The Ibo leaders—most of them men educated in American colleges and proponents of the American way—say they have been told by Federal officials that they are marked for death. The Soviet Government, which has sent planes and several hundred Russian specialists, most of whose names I have in my files, would rejoice in this tragedy.

Humanity impels us to call for a cease-fire before the extermination of the Ibo people. Some of the most shameful events of the 20th century involve genocide where the world has done nothing but wring its hands after the event. This time let us speak before it is too late.

It may be asked, "What can we say that the Federal side will listen to as long as it has hope of military victory?"

We can say as a friend that the wisest course now would be one of magnanimity. We can commend to their attention the words of Abraham Lincoln:

> With malice toward none, with charity for all . . . let us strive . . . to bind up the Nation's wounds . . . to do all which may achieve . . . a just and lasting peace.

It would be a victory that wins nothing if the surviving people of the most advanced section of the country are so embittered by killings of family and friends that they have no heart to participate in reconstruction and development. The threat of force may keep them from open resistance but it cannot enlist the enthusiastic cooperation that will be so urgently needed. The Russian arms that some Federal officials so eagerly welcomed can kill and maim the body, but they cannot win over the human spirit.

Time is running out. Let us use every available forum to call for a halt in the killing. As an expression of the feelings of individual Members of Congress I am circulating a resolution calling for a cease-fire and the dispatch of impartial observers. I hope many of my colleagues will join in this nonpartisan, humanitarian document which will be sent to the Secretary of State with a request that it be transmitted to both belligerent parties as well as to the Organization for African Unity, the United Nations, and the International Red Cross.

Let those who would put innocent civilians to the sword know that the world is watching and their deeds will not pass unseen. Let the men of good will on both sides be encouraged to insist on civilized behavior by their soldiers. Let them take satisfaction not only in the moral rightness of such efforts but in the knowledge that they will make it possible for the United States and other friendly countries to assist them in the heavy task of reconstruction that lies ahead.

We cannot reward genocide by extending friendship and aid to the killers of innocents. We can join hands with those who demonstrate they are truly members of the family of man.

THE FARM BUREAU'S BUSINESS EMPIRE IN ALABAMA

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, for several months I have been compiling material showing that the Farm Bureau, far from being an organization of farmers, is really a gigantic, expanding complex of insurance companies and other profit-making businesses.

Each step of the way, as I have uncovered new facts, I have brought them to the attention of this distinguished body and the American public. Despite the detailed documentation that has accompanied all of my charges, I am sure that some skeptics still remain. It is not easy to demolish two generations of blind faith. Besides, it is understandable that the skeptics may have remained somewhat doubtful because most of the revelations have had a single source; namely, my office. And, after all, one must admit that Washington is a long way from the scene of the action in Trafalgar, Ind.; Tullahoma, Tenn.; Evergreen, Colo.; and Tonganoxie, Kans.

For this reason, I think my distinguished colleagues will be particularly interested in reading the following story published as a feature on October 8, 1967, in the Birmingham News, a fine, authoritative daily in Birmingham, Ala. The article was researched and written entirely in Alabama by Ted Pearson, a reporter whom I have never met or spoken to, but who I am told enjoys an excellent reputation as a responsible and accurate journalist. I did not even know the story was written until an interested reader in Birmingham took the trouble to send me a copy.

While I do not necessarily agree with all of the conclusions in this article, it is an excellent exposé of the far-flung big-business activities of the Alabama Farm Bureau. For example, the reference to their supposedly low insurance premiums is very misleading since it overlooks the fact that you cannot buy a Farm Bureau policy without buying a membership for a $12 fee. The article also overlooks the spectacular rise in the personal fortunes of the principles of the Alabama Farm Bureau and the companies it owns and operates. For example, one of their top officers went to work there not too many years ago for a nominal salary. Today he owns, or until recently did own, a substantial interest in a Chevrolet dealership in Auburn, Ala., an interest in one or more finance companies in Mobile, and was a director of a newly organized bank in Mobile. He also owns interests in construction companies and housing developments in Montgomery. Furthermore, while it is true that the business organizations operated by the Farm Bureau pay their fair share of taxes—with the exception of their cooperatives—the fact is that the Farm Bureau itself does not pay any taxes on the net income it receives from these enterprises. I would also hope that Mr. Pearson's future articles on this subject will reveal in fuller detail the extent of the Farm Bureau's multimillion-dollar involvement in real estate, much of which is speculative.

Considering its enormous range of business activities, the Farm Bureau must have a difficult time keeping a straight face every time it tells the Internal Revenue Service, legislators, and hard-working farmers that it is a farm organization.

If any skepticism remains about the real purpose and aims of the Farm Bureau, this exposé in the Birmingham News should dispel it for good.

The article referred to follows:

[From the Birmingham News, Oct. 8, 1967]

Many Eggs in Farm Bureau Basket

(Editor's Note.—A familiar name has been bobbing up in the news in recent weeks: Farm Bureau. Alabama's Farm Bureau played a key, controversial role in property tax debates in the recent legislative session at Montgomery, and it has been active in other political areas. Nationally, Farm Bureau as a whole has been attacked hard by Rep. Joseph Y. Resnick, D-N.Y., on the claim it has used its tax exempt status to grow into a great business combine contrary to public interests. The time is well suited for a comprehensive profile, a close examination of just what the Farm Bureau is in Alabama—what it does, how it acts, what it thinks, its role in politics, business, agriculture and social affairs. This is the first article of a four-part Alabama Farm Bureau profile.)

(By Ted Pearson)

To so many thousands of Alabamians, Farm Bureau is a well-known name with a limited meaning.

They look upon it as an organization committed wholly to helping the farmer do better with his crops, buttonholing politicians in the farmer's behalf, and writing insurance on farm families and what they own.

Farm Bureau is all that, to be sure.

But it's also much more.

Farm Bureau in Alabama is far bigger than most people realize. Its umbrella spreads out over a maze of business, political and social endeavor so extensive as to make its very name too limited and inadequate. Its membership roll shows more than 100,000 members, each paying $12 yearly dues.

Curiously, within its scope is this paradox: Farm Bureau is big enough to wield a heavy impact on the face of Alabama business and the fabric of Alabama politics, but is small enough to be a family affair.

And Farm Bureau is not just a weld of farmers and farming. People who wouldn't know a disc harrow from a turning plow belong to it—and the most urbane of Alabama citizenry are unknowingly touched by its magnitude.

In capsule form, here's a look at Alabama's Farm Bureau today:

It operates three separate insurance companies with combined assets of nearly $32 million and direct premium income of nearly $13 million a year. One of these companies is the second largest auto insurance company in Alabama. Together, they rank high up on the list in all types of insurance sold.

In partnership with Farm Bureaus in four other Southern states, it owns and manages a giant life insurance company with assets of $132 million and insurance in force of nearly $1.6 billion.

Through these far-flung insurance operations, it has become a major property owner and landlord, holding an extensive amount of commercial, residential and speculative land and buildings with market value high in the millions.

Among its many property holdings are two of Alabama's largest, most profitable shopping centers, both acquired within the last two years: Eastwood Mall and Five Points West in Birmingham.

It is a merchandiser with more than a million dollars in sales of a limited line of products principally automobile and truck tires. It's looking around for more lines of merchandising to get in.

It does a brisk business in mortgages of various kinds.

It has one of the most active, aggressive and influential political lobbies on Capitol Hill at Montgomery, although its political power appears to be fading somewhat, victimized by the urban-favoring reapportionment of the Legislature as a reflection of the rural-to-urban population migration.

While it does all this, Farm Bureau carries through a masterfully organized, expertly conceived program of looking after and promoting the welfare of the farmer and his family.

Technically and legally, the giant, tax-exempt, nonprofit Alabama Farm Bureau Federation doesn't engage in the purely private, profit-making business functions under its protective wing and guiding hand.

But practically it's all under the same roof. Only corporate lines, and the tax regulations and other laws governing business corporations, separate Farm Bureau from its business enterprises. The management is the same, and some of the managers and members of Farm Bureau have direct financial interest in the business operations.

The Farm Bureau Federation's 18-member board of directors, elected annually at statewide conventions, is also the board of directors for the insurance and merchandising operations. The president of the Federation is the president of the allied companies. Some officers of the Federation hold positions with the adjunct firms.

While the Farm Bureau Federation itself pays no taxes, the companies it runs pay taxes, license fees and other legal assessments by governmental agencies at the same rate and on the same basis as all other companies in those fields. Whether the tax-exempt status of Farm Bureau has been a contributing factor to its gaining such a strong foothold in profitable fields of business is argued pro and con, but no clear-cut conclusions have yet emerged.

It is, however, both insufficient and unfair to say Farm Bureau is a tax-exempt operator of big business, as some of its critics have done, and let it go at that. Literally, that may be true, but the impression thus rendered is erroneous for Farm Bureau's business operations in Alabama are taxed just like everybody else.

The insurance and merchandising operations of Alabama Farm Bureau are not, in any way, in the nature of co-ops with special or exempt tax status. They operate as individual tax-paying corporations formed and managed by the Farm Bureau management.

Profits of the three Alabama-owned Farm Bureau insurance companies are distributed two ways—part into the companies' treasuries for reserve and growth, and part into dividends paid to policyholders. Profits from merchandising of specialized items by a separate Farm Bureau company are so negligible that nobody gets dividends; the profits, in effect, go to Farm Bureau's member-customers at the time they buy tires, batteries or other items in the form of low prices in which normal profit margins are left out. Farm Bureau's claimed premise for this approach is service to members, not profit.

Nevertheless, both the insurance and merchandising operations have been enormously successful.

Insurance, by far, is the field in which Farm Bureau has racked up its greatest business successes.

The three companies within Alabama and operating out of Farm Bureau's state headquarters at Montgomery are the Alabama Farm Bureau Mutual Casualty Insurance Co., Alabama Farm Bureau Mutual Insurance Service Co., and Federated Guaranty Mutual Insurance Co. They write a wide array of insurance: Fire, windstorm, extended coverage, farmowner and homeowner multiple peril, automobile, livestock and machinery, accident, medical.

Over the last five years, they have collected nearly $50 million in direct premiums, $12.7 million in 1966 alone. In those five years, their combined net income totaled nearly $4.4 million. Some of the profits go back to policyholders as dividends credited against future premiums due, and the rest is retained in reserve and surplus for continued growth and future investments.

One apparent reason for success of Farm Bureau insurance in Alabama is the lower premiums charged on many coverage policies. For example, the six-months cost of auto insurance for 100 per cent farm use and in comparable types of protection is listed by national companies at $55.30. Farm Bureau's nearest competitor in Alabama lists a cost of $49.40, while Farm Bureau's rate is $41.30. Similar lower rates exist on other than straight farm use, and the Farm Bureau companies post lower rates in other types of coverage as well.

How is this done? Farm Bureau's insurance managers say they have no secrets. They say it's simply a matter of good management, wise investment, slicing through old-line insurance tradition by cutting corners that tradition-bound companies cling to, and linking insurance selling to the wonders of computers.

Aside from its three Alabama-based insurance companies, Alabama's Farm Bureau owns one-fifth of the Southern Farm Bureau Life Insurance Co., a firm headquartered in Jackson, Miss., which wrote $214 million of insurance during 1966 to bring its in-force insurance up to $1.6 billion.

This life company ownership interest lies in another Farm Bureau subsidiary called the Alabama Farm Bureau Investment Corp. It, and similar Farm Bureau investment subsidiaries in Arkansas, Kentucky, Mississippi and Texas, owns all the common stock. But there are also a number of preferred shares owned by individuals, including Farm Bureau officials and leaders in those states.

The company does business not just in the five founding states, but in seven others as well. Its management ties to Alabama's Farm Bureau is reflected in its roster of officers and directors: J. D. (Jimmy) Hays, the Alabama Farm Bureau president, is a vice president and director of the life company, and two other directors are Walter L. Randolph, longtime Alabama federation president until his 1961 retirement, and State Sen. Walter C.

Givhan, director and secretary-treasurer of the Alabama Farm Bureau.

Of Southern Farm Bureau Life's $1.6 billion insurance in force, $220 million is in Alabama. Last year, the company reported net income from operations of $2.9 million and investment income of $5.4 million—total net profits of $8.3 million.

Through insurance, and merchandising, and property investments, Alabama's Farm Bureau is making a major impact on the business face of the state.

Rarely is there an organization founded solely for the welfare of a single economic or social group that has branched out so profoundly into areas of competitive business. Farm Bureau is that rarity.

POVERTY PROGRAM

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, a short while ago, the syndicated columnist, Miss Ruth Montgomery, wrote about the success of the Upward Bound program. Since the House will soon be considering the poverty bill, I would like to share some of Miss Montgomery's thoughts on the matter of the poverty program.

I am particularly interested in this article because Le Moyne College, to which she refers, is in my congressional district. I was intimately involved in the funding of the Upward Bound program at Le Moyne and feel a great satisfaction over the way in which it has succeeded. It is a prime example of the good which can come out of the poverty program. Miss Montgomery's column follows:

[From the Syracuse Herald-Journal, Oct. 4, 1967]

Upward Bound Pays!

(By Ruth Montgomery)

WASHINGTON.—Of all the altruistic schemes unveiled by chieftain Sargent Shriver in the war on poverty, Upward Bound was the one voted least likely to succeed. Critics were hard-put to conceive of a more pointless boondoggle than treating poor high school students—below average scholastically—to summer study courses on college campuses at taxpayers' expense. I-told-you-so was the common reaction, after the project was launched, two years ago, because many of the slum kids literally turned their backs on the teachers, and refused to participate in classroom discussions.

Nonetheless, the early returns are remarkably encouraging.

Poverty Chief Shriver says that whereas the usual rate of college extrance from the poverty population is eight per cent, a phenomenal 78 per cent of Upward Bound seniors went on to college last year.

This finding is supported by the experience of LeMoyne College and the percentage is still climbing.

More than 83 per cent of the 1967 Upward Bound graduates are enrolling in colleges, universities and trade schools this fall, an astonishing figure in view of the fact that a year ago these students had a dismal C-minus grade average in high school.

If most of them stick with the tax-financed program for the full four years, their increased earnings will eventually more than repay society through their income taxes as well as brain power.

Most of the 250 colleges that gambled on the program by waiving standard admittance requirements for Upward Bound students are enthusiastic with the results.

In fact, at Wesleyan University in Connecticut nearly 11 per cent of this fall's freshman class will be Upward Bound students.

Shriver explains the early success of the program in these terms:

"Individuals who have learned from birth to scrape an existence out of the most meager surroundings acquire a depth of wisdom and maturity not ordinarily found among sons and daughters of more affluent classes."

RESOLUTION SUPPORTING MAXIMUM FISH PRODUCTION AS AN ADDED SOURCE OF FOOD SUPPLY

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BYRNE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Paul D'Ortona, president of the City Council of Philadelphia, has brought to my attention Resolution 354, which was adopted unanimously by the council on October 4, 1967. Since the production of food is of vital importance to the growing population of the United States, and the entire free world, I am bringing this resolution to the attention of my colleagues:

Resolution 354

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to help in the building of a powerful Merchant Marine fleet to insure maximum fish production as an added source of food supply for the growing population of the United States, and the entire free world

Whereas, World population growth has been projected at such a high rate that a similar projection of food supply will not be able to support the peoples of the earth unless new sources are found; and

Whereas, The sea is such a source, proven by scientific research, with its vast marine life and untold quantities of food; and

Whereas, The Soviet Union during the past ten years has built a powerful Merchant Marine fleet, which may possibly make them the leaders in the vital field of fish production and research before 1975; therefore

Resolved, By the Council of the City of Philadelphia, That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to implement the following program that will add to the food supply of the United States, and the entire free world:

1. Place restrictions on imports of fish and fish products to a maximum which can be reduced as our fish production is increased;
2. Increase subsidies for the construction of fishing vessels to assure a fleet which could compete with the Soviet Union;
3. Provide aid programs to the fishing industry to increase production;
4. Provide for long-term low interest rate loans to enable small operators to improve their fleets;
5. Encourage the development of fish farms to aid both production and marine research; and
6. Encourage the construction of new shipyards specializing in the building of fishing vessels utilizing modern fishing techniques.

Resolved, That certified copies of this Resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Vice-President, the President Pro Tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to all the members of the Congress from Pennsylvania, as evidence of the concern of this legislative body.

PAUL D'ORTONA,
President of City Council.

Attest:

NATHAN WOLFMAN,
Chief Clerk of the Council.

THE POVERTY PROGRAM

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. EDWARDS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, in 1964 the antipoverty program was introduced by President Johnson to "open the gates of opportunity" for those to whom they had been closed. Dedicated Americans were enlisted in the war against poverty, and Congress committed Federal funds to the battle. Now, only 3 years later, are we to concede the victory to those who fear that an influx through the opened gates might crowd them a little too much?

In Kentucky's Pike County a group of those dedicated Americans, the Appalachian Volunteers have apparently been too successful in making the poor more visible and vocal. The AV's—whose efforts preceded the Federal war on poverty but who are now heavily funded by the OEO—have been teaching the Kentucky mountaineers the importance of confronting their problems together, and taking control of their own lives. But those who profit by maintaining the status quo—in this case the system of strip mining—have been frightened into cries of "sedition," and accusations against "Communist sympathizers." Mr. James C. Millstone, of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, has movingly chronicled the story of these antipoverty fighters, and the fight against them. His article captures the mood that I fear characterizes too much of our society today, and, yes, even these hallowed Halls. Are we to sit by and let those Americans who have enlisted as soldiers in the war against poverty be told to "Halt"; and even worse, are we to be the ones who issue the order?

Mr. Millstone's articles follow:

Kentucky Grand Jury Charged Antipoverty Workers With Sedition—Fear of Communist Takeover Grips Pike County Residents—Appalachian Volunteers Have Helped Hill People Fight Strip Mining

(By James C. Millstone)

PIKEVILLE, KY., September 16.—Deep within the lush green hills that protect eastern Kentucky from the outside world, a restive, troubled summer is ending on a note of hysteria.

A Pike county grand jury concluded this week that the Communists have decided to commence their takeover of America right here. The grand jury indicted five persons on charges of sedition.

Armed with documents confiscated by police in raids on the homes of two antipoverty workers, the jury found evidence that violent overthrow of the county government was in the offing, with dirty work to be performed by armed groups of "Red guards." It placed much of the blame on the federal antipoverty program.

Harry M. Caudill, an outspoken attorney from neighboring Letcher county and something of an ideological maverick hereabouts, denounced the report as "grotesque, preposterous and outrageous." But his was a minority voice.

A more popular view was expressed by Robert Holcomb, president of the Pikeville Chamber of Commerce, and also of the National Independent Coal Operators Association.

"We know that these people are Communists," he said. "There are no ifs, ands or buts about it. They had established a base here. They intended to take over the county."

In the five weeks between the raid and the grand jury report, the imaginations of local citizens have been given free reign. Fathers have expressed concern that their sons might be subverted. Holcomb told this reporter without equivocation that the suspects had converted to Communism some local persons, including a woman antipoverty employe who heretofore had led an exemplary life in Pike county.

Redmond Woodall, a hardware store employe, who lived in Island Creek, a farm community a few miles from here, illustrated the snow-balling effects of fear and rumor when he said:

"Rumors have been around here that there's two of 'em (antipoverty workers) a-livin' up there on Island Creek. I've heard they go out of a night. If they're what we heard they are, we want 'em out."

Some citizens tell of a training school having been run by the antipoverty workers to teach Communism. Holcomb said that some of those at the school undoubtedly wound up fomenting the summer riots in Newark.

A specially convened federal court in Lexington brought a note of sanity to the situation late Thursday when it ruled Kentucky's sedition law unconstitutional and ordered the five defendants freed.

Whether ridiculed or taken seriously, the grand jury's actions, following three months of unrest in the backwoods hills and hollows over the ticklish issue of strip mining, carried implications extending far beyond the mountain barrier. It brought the nation's antipoverty program to another crossroads, testing once again whether Americans really want to allow the poor to assert themselves; it injected a strident new campaign issue into the state gubernatorial election and it raised the intensity of the strip mining controversy another decibel.

To sort out what has happened in eastern Kentucky this summer, it is necessary first to introduce an antipoverty organization known as the Appalachian Volunteers and to define the Kentucky brand of strip mining.

The Volunteers, known as AV's, came into existence ahead of the war on poverty, in the early days of the late President John F. Kennedy's program to improve economic conditions in Appalachia. A group of students at Berea (Ky.) College, began spending weekends helping to build and paint backwoods schools for the children of poor Kentucky mountain folk.

When the Office of Economic Opportunity put its war on poverty into operation, the AV's were organized well enough to qualify for the first OEO grant. Gradually the organization shifted from weekend college volunteers to full time field men operating in three states—West Virginia, Kentucky, and Virginia—and its representatives went into the hills to discover how they could help the poor mountaineers deal with the basic problems that kept them in poverty.

A watchful OEO recognized the AV's as a spearhead and did nothing to discourage their innovations, even when community action agencies, dominated by local political leaders, began to complain that AV personnel were not cooperating with them.

This year the AV's received more than $1,000,000 in federal funds, accounting for 90 per cent of their budget. There are about 60 fulltime AV's in the field, more than half of them in Kentucky. OEO has assigned VISTA volunteers to work with the AV's and many more summer volunteers were sent to the AV's for training and assignment.

A few months ago, the AV's made a policy decision to start helping the hill people organize in their fight against strip mining. "Our field men were getting a tremendous amount of community concern about it in every one of the counties where we were working," explained Tom Bethell, an AV official in Whitesburg, Ky. From that point, AV stock with eastern Kentucky political and business leaders began to slip.

Kentucky is one of the great coal producing regions of the world, with 33 billion tons of coal still embedded in its hills and valleys. Some of the richest seams run along the state's most glorious scenery. In the last 10 years, coal operators have come to favor strip-mining the coal—that is, removing the dirt and rock on top of it, then lifting it out with huge shovels—rather than sinking the traditional deep shaft.

Strip mining leaves the land scarred and torn, causes erosion, destroys timber and wildlife. Houses have been crushed by boulders and slides from mountain-top stripping. Many mountain people have been ruined by strip mining and Kentucky law has given them no redress.

Last year the State Legislature, at the bidding of Gov. Edward Breathitt, passed a strip mining control act, but it has failed to improve the situation. A major reason was the political muscle of the coal operators in eastern Kentucky, where coal is the one and only industry.

In the past two years, groups of mountaineers made largely ineffective protests against stripping. But it was not until this summer that an organized movement of poor landowners won an actual victory over a coal operator.

On June 29 a resolute farmer named Jink Ray stood in front of a bulldozer to prevent the operator from starting to strip his land. His stand, aided by as many as 24 neighbors, attracted much publicity and eventually brought Breathitt to the scene. The Governor, in a bold and unprecedented move, took Ray's side. On Aug. 1, the state revoked the operator's permit.

One of the men who helped Ray was Joseph Mulloy, an AV field representative for Pike County. On Aug. 12, a raiding party led by Pike county sheriff Perry Justice entered the homes of Mulloy and Alan McSurely, a field worker for a civil rights group known as the Southern Conference Education Fund based in Louisville.

The raiders confiscated huge amounts of literature from both homes. Pike county Commonwealth Attorney Thomas Ratliff, by coincidence a Republican candidate for lieutenant governor, called it "a Communistic library out of this world." The McSurely collection, Ratliff said, included a "white paper" on how to "take over Pike county from the power structure and put it in the hands of the poor." Mulloy, McSurely and McSurely's wife, Margaret, were charged with violating Kentucky's sedition law. They called the charges a smear intended to crush the strip mining fight in eastern Kentucky and drive the AV's out.

Attorneys for the defendants then took the case to federal court, contending that the Supreme Court has already outlawed state sedition statutes. The three judge court upheld their contentions.

Among the conclusions of the county grand jury were these:

(1) "A well-organized and well-financed effort is being made to promote and spread the Communistic theory of the violent and forceful overthrow of the government of Pike county."

(2) "Communist organizers have attempted, without success thus far, to promote their beliefs among our school children by infiltrating our local schools with teachers who believed in the violent overthrow of the local government."

(3) "Communist organizers are attempting and planning to infiltrate local churches and labor unions in order to cause dissension and to promote their purposes."

(4) "Communist organizers are attempting to form community unions with the eventual purpose of organizing armed groups to be known as 'Red guards' and through which the forceful overthrow of the local government would be accomplished."

In addition to indicting the original three defendants, the jury also named Carl Braden of Louisville, and his wife, Anne, who head the Southern Conference Education Fund. Kentuckians recognized the names immediately. Carl Braden is the only man in the state's history to be convicted of sedition.

In 1954, Braden sold his home in a white section of Louisville to a Negro. Shortly after the sale, the house was dynamited and Braden was arrested for advocating sedition. His conviction was overturned on an appeal.

Ratliff and his supporters insist that neither the coal controversy nor politics had any connection with the arrests, and the grand jury so found. The fact remains that the Commonwealth's attorney, a decided underdog in the state-wide November election, is expected to profit handsomely from his association with the case. Some observers think he is in a good position to upset his Democratic opponent.

Antipoverty workers are convinced that coal interests supplied the real reason for the arrests and Harry Caudill, a longtime foe of the coal operators, agrees with them. Ratliff says he no longer has any coal connections, but he concedes that he made a fortune in the coal business. He once served as president of the Independent Coal Operators Association.

An OEO investigation into the arrests found that they were motivated by both economic and political interests. OEO is watching the situation nervously. There have been demands that the agency drop its funding of the AV's, and with troubles of its own OEO finds one more controversy difficult to bear.

How it decides to deal with the AV's may tell a lot about the future direction of the war on poverty.

Late-Night Arrest Began Kentucky Sedition Case—After 5-Week Ordeal in Alleged Red Plot, Antipoverty Worker Goes Back to Work in Hills

Pikeville, Ky.—The sound of two automobiles pulling into the driveway broke the stillness of the night. In the kitchen of the ramshackle two-story house in the Pike County backwoods, Joe Mulloy looked at his watch. It was 12: 30 a.m. Footsteps on the porch. A heavy banging on the door.

"This is the law," someone called. "Open up."

Mulloy, shirtless, looked at his young wife, Karen, and shrugged. He knew he was about to be arrested on a charge of sedition. He was not quite certain what that meant—something to do with disloyalty, he thought. Nervous, yet curious, he walked toward the front door.

Three years of antipoverty work in the remotest hollows of Appalachia had taught Mulloy a lot, but he was hardly prepared for the events that followed. Who could have been? For from the moment Mulloy unlatched his screen door to admit a carload of Pike county deputies Aug. 12, believability and reality vanished.

In the days to come, Mulloy would find himself accused of fomenting a Communist plot to overthrow the government of Pike county, Ky., by force of arms.

Looking back on it last week, Mulloy could afford a glimmer of amusement. Last Thursday, a three-judge federal court in Lexington, recognizing a circus when it saw one, rule that Kentucky's sedition law was unconstitutional. It forbade Pike county from prosecuting Mulloy and four others who were also supposed to have a part in plotting the violent coup of the local government.

But the five-week interval between arrest and the court's decision was anything but funny. It was—in the words of Dan Jack Combs, the stocky, tough-talking Pikeville lawyer who defended Mulloy—"a tyrannical attempt by local public officials to deny these people their rights and their liberty. What happened here must be akin to what was prevalent during the witch-burning days at Salem, Mass.

Curly-haired Joe Mulloy was especially upset because he does not consider himself an outsider. He was born in Kentucky and reared in the west end of Louisville. He majored in English at the University of Louisville and later at the University of Kentucky. At U.K., he began working with the Appalachian Volunteers, a group of college students who devoted their weekends to repairing schools that served poverty-stricken people in the mountains of eastern Kentucky.

When the AV's expanded to a full-time program, Mulloy dropped out of school to become a field representative for the organization. By then the AV's had attracted heavy financial support from the Office of Economic Opportunity and had fanned out to develop a close relationship with some of the poorest and remotest Appalachian mountaineers.

Last spring, Mulloy, 23 years old, moved to Pike county, the largest and easternmost county in the state, and now the largest coal-producing county in the nation. He began organizing efforts among the poor to cope with some of their onerous problems.

One such project was the Marrowbone Folk School, incorporated in June, a community center to serve about 6000 persons in a seven-mile-long hollow where large mines shut down a few years ago and left destitution. The center was planned for educational and recreational purposes, for conferences and training groups, and for discussion of community problems such as improving the impossibly rutty roads in the hollow, obtaining a decent water system and developing some kind of money-making business for the residents.

Mulloy pushed the idea of organizing welfare recipients to assure that their rights were protected. But the bulk of his time was devoted to encouraging land-owners to band together to prevent strip coal mine operators from ruining their land.

On occasion Mulloy worked with Alan and Margaret McSurely, a young couple who came to Appalachia to join the AV staff but who wound up affiliated with a left-wing civil rights group known as the Southern Conference Education Fund.

McSurely, 31, came from the Washington area. With a master's degree in psychology, he had worked as a juvenile court counselor in Fairfax, Va., a Washington suburb, and later joined the War on Poverty as director of suburban programs for Washington's community action agency. His wife, 28, a Tennessee native, was also a Washington antipoverty worker.

Pike County officials said early this summer that they began to hear rumors of strange goings-on among the anti-poverty workers around Pikeville.

Commonwealth's attorney Thomas Ratliff, a wealthy former coal operator and Republican candidate for lieutenant governor of Kentucky, said he heard reports that antipoverty workers were dirty, immoral. The man who rented his house to Mulloy wanted Mulloy out. He told Ratliff he saw a lot of questionable material around the house. There were reports of demonstrations, people being taught to sing, "We Shall Overcome."

The Marrowbone Folk School appeared to be intended to stir up class hatred, turn the poor against the rich. A busload of strangers showed up for some kind of training course at McSurely's house—"Looking like hippies, dressed like Li'l Abner," Ratliff said. (It turned out that they were Peace Corps and Vista volunteer trainees receiving a six-day training course on Appalachian antipoverty work.

Sheriff Perry Justice sought out Mulloy and warned him to take care, observing that outsiders teaching strange notions had been targets of violence in Pike county in the past. Nelson Radwan, director of the Pikeville Chamber of Commerce, went out to Mulloy's house to see what they were up to.

"They were dirty. The house was crummy," Radwan recalled.

There was a picture on the wall that Radwan identified as Raul Castro. He concluded that "something funny was going on" and after mulling it over for a few days told a friend, "I'll bet they're a bunch of Communists."

The clincher may have been the discovery that McSurely worked for the Southern Conference Education Fund. A little checking on the part of Robert Holcomb, president of the Chamber of Commerce, disclosed that SCEF was headed by Carl Braden of Louisville, infamous among all good Kentucky right-wingers as a man convicted of sedition in 1954 after selling his house in a white section of Louisville to a negro. (The conviction was overturned on appeal.) So far as Holcomb and a good many other "patriots" in Pikeville were concerned, Braden was a known Communist.

On the afternoon of Aug. 11, the county judge and five of the eight county magistrates convened en banc in what Dan Jack Combs described as "some sort of star chamber proceeding." They swore and heard testimony from several witnesses with complaints against the McSurlys and Mulloy. Warrants charging sedition were issued.

At 7:30 o'clock that night, as the McSurlys were sitting down to dinner, Sheriff Justice, Ratliff, one of the magistrates and deputies whose number has been estimated variously at from 10 to 20 surrounded the house, entered, conducted a two-hour search and confiscated cases of books, letters, diaries, bankbooks, income tax returns, memoranda and other documents.

Ratliff appeared surprised to see a bible among McSurely's possessions. "What is this doing here?" he asked. The volume was left behind. The McSurely's were arrested and then taken to the county jail.

Some of the raiders dropped out; others went on to the Mulloy house. Mulloy had been awakened and advised of McSurely's arrest by a mutual friend, so he was unsurprised by the midnight intruders.

"There were eight or nine altogether," he recalled. "Four or five rushed in and pushed me to the center of the room, then handcuffed me with my hands behind my back. They fanned out through the house. The sheriff walked in and read the warrant and informed me of my rights.

"He asked me, 'is there anything you want to say?' I said, 'Yes, it's kind of cold. I'd like to have a shirt.' He took the cuffs off so I lowed the men around the house. They were could get on a shirt, then my wife and I fol- there about 45 minutes."

Confiscated from Mulloy were all his files including AV business, income tax returns, personal letters and college notes. Books taken included "Quotations of Mao," "Poems of Chairman Mao," "The Essential Works of Lenin," "Great Russian Short Stories," "Corridors of Power" by C. P. Snow, "Catch-22" by Joseph Heller and "The Other Side" by Thomas Hayden and Staughton Lynd, Mulloy handed a deputy a copy of Ramparts magazine featuring an anti-Vietnam war article, and this was added to the collection.

The raiders passed up two books by Barry M. Goldwater and Robert Welch's John Birch Thomas Hayden and Staughton Lynd. Mulloy was arrested on a sedition charge.

An intense round of legal jockeying followed, with Combs trying to block any state action until a federal court could decide his challenge of the legality of Kentucky's sedition law. At one point Ratliff agreed to delay further action—specifically saying that he would not present his evidence to a grand jury.

Nonetheless, a county grand jury reported on the case last Tuesday, concluding that a Communist plot was in the works to overthrow the county government. To the surprise of Combs and most others, the jury handed down sedition indictments not only against the McSurelys and Mulloy but also against Carl Braden and his wife, Anne. Braden, Combs said, had come to the county only once, to deliver bond for McSurely, and Mrs. Braden had never set foot here.

Pikeville, meanwhile, was in the throes of hysteria, and a public clamor rose against the Red menace.

"I am not a nut on this thing," prosecutor Ratliff, who call himself a liberal Republican, told this reporter. "Frankly I laughed about these things when I first heard them.

"Then I got into this material, and I became convinced. After reading 2000 letters and umpteen pamphlets and articles, I believe that these people not only mean business but are doing business in this county."

Even after the federal court ruling stopped the prosecution—and Ratliff said he hoped to appeal that ruling to the United States Supreme Court—the residue of fear and smear remains. Ratliff said the whole episode was beneficial because it clarified the law and disclosed "the waste of money" in federal antipoverty programs. He plans to exert every influence to rid his county and state of the AV's, who he said were "absolutely ineffectual."

That assessment is not shared by persons who have worked with the AV's and who are familiar with their efforts. In fact, some antipoverty officials regard the AV's as the only present hope for bringing help to the poor of Appalachia.

Combs, like Ratliff the son of a coal miner and a Pike county native, views the lessons of the last five weeks far differently from the commonwealth's attorney.

"Many of our public officials think they have a divine right to serve and that some people have a divine right to be subjugated," Combs said. "Here we have so-called outsiders coming in and working to alleviate the plight of our poorest people, and the people responsible for those conditions suddenly get up on their high horse and call them un-American and want them run out.

"Our public officials have ignored their responsibilities and have used their power to actually deny these people their rights. The paradox is that the people who are trying to protect constitutional rights are the ones branded as Communists, and the ones attempting to deny freedoms are the heroes."

As for Mulloy and the McSurelys, they are returning to work among Pike county's poor.

"This whole thing has helped me," Mulloy said. "It has gotten the word out to a lot of people. They have seen what a bunch of idiots they have for public officials."

STRIP-MINING FEUD IN KENTUCKY

(By James C. Millstone)

WHITESBURG, KY.—Head down, shoulders slouched, John Brown picked his way up the steep mountain. Far below, nestled in the valley where he had made his home for 38 years, his white frame house and the rough outbuildings behind it were specks on a green carpet.

In every direction, rising from the narrow valley, the eye beheld wave after forested wave of quiet beauty. Even the silence seemed pure, broken only by an occasional bird call, the buzz of a locust.

Climbing through thickening forests, Brown stopped, his head cocked. A new sound intruded, a distant rattling noise.

"Now you can hear 'em," the farmer said. "The bulldozers."

The noise grew louder as he approached the ridge. And then he was at the edge, looking down on a dreadful sight. What once had been a wilderness mountaintop was now a scarred moonscape with jagged rocks and monstrous boulders and gray-brown dirt pouring over the sides, sliding down into the next valley. Great trees hung at crazy angles, their trunks splintered and fractured. In the cup-shaped open sore that once was a mountain, massive machines tugged and ripped at the land, trying to move the dirt on top to get at the object of the destruction—the coal.

"He's been just about everywhere around here," John Brown said in a quiet drawl. "It's a sight the way he's tore it up."

"He" was a strip-mine operator, Don Nicewander, who had been at work on this Letcher county mountain for a year and now had reached John Brown's property line.

Brown was determined that the bulldozers were not going to cross that line. Every day for the last three weeks, since it became obvious that Nicewander was coming his way, Brown trudged up the mountain to back up his determination with action. He was not certain what he would do, but he meant to stop that bulldozer.

Furthermore, Brown was getting some help from an unexpected quarter. Not long ago a young fellow from Minnesota, Mike Shields, had rapped on his door. He introduced himself as a Vista volunteer working for an antipoverty organization called the Appalachian Volunteers.

Mike had heard about Brown's forebodings and had offered his services. He had gone around knocking at other doors along the Dry Fork section of Letcher county and found plenty of others who wanted to get together to help Brown stop the bulldozers. They were Billy Howard Cook and Otis Cook and Charlie and Trubie Cornett and Garfield Tyree, among others. They were having meetings and trying to organize a plan of action. Mike and other AVs were going to help them protest to state officials.

Now his seamed, sun-darkened face expressionless, Brown tried to explain why he felt so strongly.

"I've got 16 kids," he said. "I put one through college and four through high school, and I've still got eight in school. I worked in the mines for 35 years and then I'd come home and work this farm. This land was wore out pretty good when I came, but I rotated my crops — beans, 'taters, corn, cane — and I've got it in good shape now.

"I worked all my life from dawn to dark to put my kids through school and fix up this place, and I don't want it tore up now."

The dilemma facing John Brown has become a common crisis in the coal-rich hills of eastern Kentucky. The pros and cons of strip mining have confronted the people of the state with an agonizing controversy. It is an issue that has favored rich man over poor, coal operator over landowner. And ironic though it may sound, the authority of the state has backed exploitation rights over property rights.

The fact of the matter is that, even though John Brown does not want Don Nicewander to enter his property, the coal operator has the legal right to mine there. The reason is a peculiar Kentucky anachronism known as the Broadform deed.

Broadform deeds are titles to mineral rights granted by east Kentucky landowners nearly 100 years ago, before strip mining was known. Owners of the deeds have the right to remove coal by any method, including destruction of the surface, and Kentucky courts have held that such deeds give strip miners the right to operate over the objection of the land owner.

"This wretched document has haunted Kentucky and brought ruin to its mountain people," the Louisville Courier-Journal said recently.

In these anguished words, the newspaper explained what can happen to the owner of land that has been strip-mined:

"The farm from which he drew a living can be bulldozed into a rubble of stinking mud and rock. The stand of timber on which he depended for old-age income can be ripped off and shoved down the side of the mountain. Acid runoff from the resulting mess can flood and poison his pasture. Boulders and mud can threaten his house and garden. The pleasant valley which he has tended and enjoyed can be turned into a reeking eyesore. And there is not a thing he can do about it."

That last sentence is not quite accurate. Jink Ray, a Pike county mountaineer, and Kentucky's lame-duck Gov. Edward T. Breathitt, together with the AVs and a grass-roots eastern Kentucky organization called Appalachian Group to Save the Land and People, have done and are doing something about it.

Last year Breathitt persuaded the Legislature to pass a control bill that was intended to prevent strip mining on the steepest slopes and to assure that all strip-mined land was planted and left in shape to be reclaimed eventually. Coal interests warned that tne law would kill coal mining in Kentucky.

There is general agreement today that the law has failed. Some blame lax enforcement, others say the statute has too many weaknesses. The reclamation section is a hoax, critics say, because once a mountaintop has been lopped off, no effort by man can make it whole again. A small but growing point of view is demanding that strip mining be prohibited in eastern Kentucky, where the rugged slopes and the heavy annual rainfall increase the dangers of erosion and slides into the valleys where the people live.

Despite the law, the coal operators remained in firm control. Strip mining actually doubled in the last year. Landowners faced a dim future.

Enter Jink Ray. A mild-mannered, bespectacled mountain man, Ray has owned a small piece of land on Island creek near Pikeville for 46 years. His home is built in a tight hollow surrounded by steep mountains. A stripping operation began too near his property line in late June, and Ray was sure that he was in danger. He felt certain that debris would roll down on his house, that he would lose valuable timber and that resulting erosion would wash him away.

On June 29, when the first bulldozer started across his property line, Ray stepped in front of it. The machine was halted. Over the next few days the confrontation continued until it had attracted national attention. Ray was supported by his neighbors who had organized a chapter of the Appalachian Group to Save the Land and People, and by the AVs, who preached organized efforts as the only effective method of countering the political strength of the coal operators.

Breathitt finally intervened, and through his efforts the stripping permit of the coal operator threatening Ray's property was canceled. It was the first time a Kentucky landowner had bested a coal operator short of violence.

Coal interests were furious and have not yet recovered from the blow. They recognize a distinct threat to their livelihood.

No one is yet sure of the extent of the impact of the Jink Ray episode. It has aroused the interest of city groups, such as the League of Women Voters, in the strip-mining controversy. It has made politicians painfully aware of the need for some kind of change, and this is an election year in Kentucky.

Certainly it has spurred organization of additional landowner groups by the Appalachian Group to Save the Land and People. AV and Vista workers have dared the wrath of local officials in a number of counties by talking up the potential of landowner organizations.

Many persons attribute the sedition arrests of three antipoverty workers in Pike county last month at least in part to hard feelings over Jink Ray's victory.

Certainly there is evidence that the mountain men are no longer willing to accept without a fight the consequences of strip mining. They are learning to abandon their traditional isolation from one another for the common good.

Thus John Brown is optimistic that he will be able to prevent the strip mining of his land.

"Mike and them have helped me a right smart," he said, referring to the work of the AVs. "The boys are doing good. If everybody stays with me that says he is with me now, I think we're going to come out all right."

FIGHT ON ANTIPOVERTY FIGHTERS

(By James C. Millstone, a staff correspondent of the Post-Dispatch)

PIKEVILLE, KY.

Pike County needs help. Tucked away in rugged mountains, difficult to reach, burdened with heavy unemployment, dependent on a single industry, coal, it confers on a substantial number of its people a grim, hunger-panged past and a bleaker future.

Pike county is Appalachia in microcosm. Nearly one quarter of the county's residents are functionally illiterate: 45 per cent of the 13,084 families are poor, twice the percentage of the typical American county. In family income, 97 per cent of the counties in the nation are better off than Pike.

Yet for the last two months, some of Pike county's leading citizens have devoted their time to discrediting and driving out a small band of young men and women, who are trying to alleviate poverty here.

And although these efforts have bordered on the absurd, culminating in allegations that the antipoverty workers were bent on overthrowing the county government by violence, they stand a strong chance of paying off. The tragedy facing Pike county and the rest of the forgotten land of Appalachia is that a genuine attempt to bring hope and humanity to the poor is in danger of destruction.

The focal point of the threat is an antipoverty organization known as the Appalachian Volunteers. Little noticed until recently, the group has been at work among Appalachia's poor for four years and has expanded its influence since 1966, thanks to grants totaling $2,460,000 from the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Today heavy pressure is being exerted on R. Sargent Shriver, director of OEO, to drop federal funding of the group when the current grant expires next May. Although a final decision cannot be expected for months, informed sources in OEO consider the volunteer group's future dark.

The organization's leaders insist that the Volunteers will remain in business regardless of whether they continue to receive federal funds. At the same time, they concede that they will have to reduce sharply their activities if OEO drops them. OEO now provides about 90 per cent of the money on which the group operates.

Supporters extol the Volunteers as the only real hope for promoting the kind of change that offers the eastern Kentucky mountaineers a chance to escape a life of poverty.

Harry M. Caudill, a Whitesburg, Ky., lawyer and historian, told the Post-Dispatch: "People have been coming in here promising to do something for our people for years and they never accomplished a thing. The AVs are far and away the most effective organization ever to come into eastern Kentucky."

A source within OEO who has worked with the group and with other Appalachian antipoverty organizations said that the Volunteers operated "the most significant program in the area."

"There isn't much else going," he said. "The local establishment is in total control of the community action programs. No one else is willing to organize the poor to take on the power structure."

The very techniques that made the group something special got the Volunteers in trouble with local powers. One reason that Appalachian poverty has been defied solution is the remoteness of the poor. The Volunteers went into the hollows and found them, talked to them, listened to them.

Director Milton Ogle explained the group's philosophy.

"We feel that it is very important that all people begin to play a much more active role in the problems that affect their lives," he said. "Our primary goal is to help mountain people realize that they are capable of solving the problems in their communities if they will utilize their own experience and the assistance which can be made available to them."

A sampling of the group's projects might include helping a community buy equipment to improve roads and buildings, forming marketing organizations for sale of products such as quilts and wood carvings, building community centers for education and recreational programs and promoting organizations of landowners to oppose strip mining.

Ogle conceded that the Volunteers had made mistakes, had promised more than could be delivered, had spread themselves too thin and had failed to carry through some projects. A notable omission was the organization's failure to open lines of communications with local political and business leaders.

Thus, while winning friends among the poor and among some liberals familiar with their work, the group began to annoy political leaders. The strip-mining issue, a sore point in coal-rich eastern Kentucky, brought the opposition into the open.

At the same time, Kentucky's other antipoverty officials resented the Volunteers. For the most part, community action programs were vested in the hands of county courthouse politicians who found themselves unable to dictate the Volunteers' policy.

Unfortunately for the Volunteers, their detractors sat in high places. In Pike county, the organization ran afoul of Robert Holcomb, president of the politically powerful Independent Coal Operators Association, the Pikeville Chamber of Commerce and Thomas Ratliff, Prosecuting Attorney and Republican candidate for lieutenant governor.

Holcomb told the world that the group's workers were nothing more than "Communist sympathizers on the federal payroll." The group's program, he declared, "is being used to teach insurrection and rebellion, not against poverty but against the entire system of democracy that we call our great American way of life."

Ratliff charged Joe Mulloy with sedition after raiding his home last month. He then assailed the entire poverty program as "a prime example of the way not to spend money."

Undeterred although a federal court blocked his prosecution of Mulloy and four others rung into the sedition case, Ratliff made no secret of his intention to exert all his influence to keep the group out of his county in the future.

The smear engineered by Ratliff and Holcomb had its effect on higher authority. Gov. Edward T. Breathitt of Kentucky leaped to the conclusion that the group was a liability and demanded that Shriver cut off the program in Kentucky. He may have been influenced by a recommendation of Albert Whitehouse, director of the state antipoverty program.

Long unhappy with the independence of the Volunteers, Whitehouse accused them of open rebellion against community action agencies and was vainly trying to force Washington to place them under his authority. When the attack on the group's patriotism occurred, Whitehouse added his voice to the chorus of opposition to continuation of the program in the state.

Shriver almost caved in immediately, seemingly agreeing to Breathitt's request. But after two weeks of uncertainty, the OEO director disclosed that the group's funding would continue as scheduled until next May. At that time, he said, consideration would be given Breathitt's request for an end to the organization's programs in Kentucky.

In recent weeks, Ogle and other Volunteer officials and their friends have made several trips to Washington in the hope of mending fences. The Citizens Crusade Against Poverty, a private group, has attempted to rally a liberal coalition to the group's cause. Nonetheless, OEO insiders consider their leadership shaky on the subject of renewing the group's funds.

Ralph Caprio, assistant director of the Citizens Crusade and once an OEO official, regards the group's story as a test of the federal antipoverty agency's intentions for the future.

"It's a good program," he said. "It is one of the few that takes seriously the participation of the poor. We think it is instrumental to the antipoverty program in Kentucky."

THE NATION'S ECONOMIC WELFARE IS THE VICTIM OF GOP POLITICS

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, to tax or not to tax is no longer in question.

This Congress knows that all economic signs point to the fact that the President's tax surcharge must be enacted if we are to avoid the terrible consequence of an overheated economy.

Mr. Speaker, raising taxes—even in such a modest way as the President has requested—is not a popular thing to do. But the American people understand that the alternative to this tax surcharge is the real threat of inflation and tight money that will cost them much more in the long run.

The people also know that a tax increase can be rescinded by Congress; but inflation and tight money cannot be voted out of existence.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, the Republicans have sought to muddy the waters over this tax proposal. They have raised the phony issue of cuts in Federal expenditures as a substitute for the surcharge proposal. And they have demanded that the President trim $5 billion from the budget before the surcharge can be considered.

Mr. Speaker, this is the height of political irresponsibility. For the Republicans are determined to oppose every move the administration wants to undertake to head off the dangers of an overheated economy.

In essence, the Republicans are playing politics with the savings and investments of the American people. They are willing to score a few political points at the expense of America's economic security. By their overwhelming opposition to the President's proposed cutbacks in Federal spending and their negative attitude toward the surcharge proposal, they are dooming millions of citizens to extreme financial hardship.

This is cruel and selfish politics. And I am certain that the American people will not forget this incredible Republican performance on election day 1968.

But this is small satisfaction, Mr. Speaker, in a matter so vital to the national interest as the tax surcharge proposal.

This Congress must rise above blind and mindless Republican opposition and do its duty to the Nation. America needs this tax increase if it is to preserve its economic health and fiscal soundness.

Time is running out, Mr. Speaker. We must act—and soon—to pass this measure.

As President Johnson told us in his tax message:

> There are times in a Nation's life when its armies must be equipped and fielded, and the Nation's business must still go on. For America that time is now.

I can only add, Mr. Speaker, that for the 90th Congress "that time is now."

THEODORE SORENSEN ON VIETNAM

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, Theodore C. Sorensen, one of the original New Frontiersmen, a man who has been close to both President Kennedy and President Johnson, has written a perceptive, thought-provoking article on the war in Vietnam for the current issue of Saturday Review magazine.

Ted Sorensen is uniquely qualified to write on Vietnam and knows, as few Americans know, what conflicting pressures have been brought to bear on the President as he has sought a solution to the tragic conflict in which we have become so deeply involved. It is heartening that he has concluded, as have I and many of my colleagues, that the United States must call an unconditional halt to our bombing of North Vietnam as part of a program to determine whether it would be possible to achieve a just and honorable peace through negotiations.

I commend Ted Sorensen's article to the attention of my colleagues and present it herewith for inclusion in the RECORD:

The War in Vietnam: How We Can End It

(By Theodore C. Sorensen)

(NOTE.—Theodore C. Sorensen, former Special Counsel to Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, is a Saturday Review editor-at-large.)

I have not previously spoken out publicly against our course in Vietnam. My years in the White House made me more conscious than most private citizens of the burdens our President bears, more aware of his unique access to information, and more unwilling to add fuel to the fires of dissension within my party and country. But I believe that the President's friends and supporters today can best serve him as well as the country by speaking out: Not by offering oversimplified solutions or personal criticisms; not by questioning anyone's motives or credibility; not by reflecting on the skill and courage of our fighting forces; but by helping to seek before it is too late a reasonable, feasible course in Vietnam that offers some hope of achieving an early peaceful settlement—a course with costs and risks more proportionate to America's interests than this present avenue of expanding escalation and slaughter.

"Your government should understand," a Russian diplomat said to me as we lunched last August in Moscow, "that we are obligated to do for the North Vietnamese whatever they ask us to do. If they ask us to send bombers, we will send bombers. If they ask us to send men, we will send men." This was not delivered as a threat nor was it surprisingly new. But it helped point up for me the urgency of our stopping World War III now before it starts.

I realize that it is difficult for a great power to alter its course—but the Soviet Union pulled its missiles out of Cuba (and received world praise for doing so). I realize that it is difficult for our proud nation to acknowledge error instead of compounding it—but we did exactly that at the Bay of Pigs.

I do not say that we have wholly erred in Vietnam or that we should precipitously pull out our troops. Nor am I concerned here with many of the other disputes surrounding that war. The Senate will long debate the legal basis for our involvement, the alleged choices between Europe and Asia, and the effect of the war on our prestige, politics, and priorities. Historians will long debate over how and why we got into Vietnam, who first breached the Geneva Agreement, whether it was originally a civil war, whether another President would have acted differently, whether Congress was consulted adequately, and whether the various past precedents cited—from Munich to Malaya—are meaningful. What concerns me now is not the past but the future.

What concerns me now is the prospect of an endless war in which the original issues (to say nothing of the Vietnamese people) will have long been forgotten, in which each gradation of American escalation will continue to be offset by more troops from the North and less help from the South. What concerns me is the prospect of a frustrated, aggravated, bitterly divided America, irritated at its increasing isolation from the world, unable to accept its inability to bring this upstart to heel, under growing pressure from a growing military establishment, consequently pouring in more men, bombing out more targets, and finally, in desperation, mining or blockading the Haiphong harbor or even invading the North by means of a permanent excursion across the demilitarized zone or an "Inchon-type" landing behind that front line. Then the entry of Chinese and possibly Russian "volunteers" will be a very real threat and possibly—even without our destroying North Vietnamese dikes, bombing MIG bases in China, or occupying Hanoi—an inevitable fact, as inevitable as the fact that their entry will lead eventually to a world-wide nuclear war. The tragic irony of it is that all this could happen without our advancing one single step nearer to our original goal of a terror-free South Vietnam.

We have already moved in recent years from limited counterinsurgency to all-out combat, from 15,000 advisers to 500,000 troops, from a war fought largely by South Vietnamese forces in the South to a war fought largely by American forces both North and South. Each stage of escalation has brought a response from the other side requiring more escalation, bringing a further response from the other side requiring still more escalation. When two doses of penicillin failed to help the patient, we gave him four, then six, now eight. It is high time we realized that penicillin is not what this patient needs, and more can only poison him.

To be sure, we cannot now lose the war. We have prevented the kind of large-scale North Vietnamese assaults that might have destroyed all hope for self-determination and survival in the South. There is no prospect now that the Communists can push our forces into the sea or impose their rule by conquest. Nor is there any prospect now that we will abandon to slaughter those South Vietnamese who stood up against a Communist military takeover. But this country has to face the unaccustomed and uncomfortable fact that, despite all the brilliance and valor of our fighting forces, their lives are being given for a war which—in terms of achieving our *total* objectives, political and moral as well as military, in all Asia as well as Vietnam—we are not "winning" in the traditional sense and cannot ever expect to "win."

We are not "containing" the Red Chinese when we create a vacuum on their borders into which they will inexorably move unless we stay forever—when we increase North Vietnam's dependence on Chinese imports—or when we erode South Vietnam's institutions, traditions, economy, independence, and spirit.

We are not "winning the war for men's minds" among the South Vietnamese people, much less "pacifying" their country, when we level their villages, burn their crops, dominate and prolong their war, work primarily with the privileged few entrenched in both their military and government, and place half a million free-spending Americans into that tiny, impoverished, and now inflation-ridden country.

We are not demonstrating the futility of Communist "wars of liberation" to an army that soon returns to rule by night those areas from which we have temporarily driven it; nor are we deterring similar attacks in Thailand or elsewhere when we stretch our forces thin in Vietnam.

We are not "defending our national interest" when we endlessly divert more than two billion tax dollars a month away from our cities and schools and overseas friends for a war that, much as we dislike the word, is producing at best only a stalemate.

I read all the predictions that victory is just around the escalation corner—but I heard those same predictions three and four and even five years ago. I read all the rosy statistics on how many Communists we have killed and captured and induced to defect—but still their number keeps growing. I read all the claims on our bombing successes in the North—but still the infiltration southward continues. I read all the statements that this is a joint effort with South Vietnam and others—but still we are doing more and more of the fighting and dying. And, finally, I read all the assurances that neither the Russians nor the Chinese will intervene—but at the same time Washington experts acknowledge that neither Peking nor Moscow could tolerate a North Vietnamese defeat.

General Westmoreland calls it a war of attrition. That it is—a war of attrition pitting American youth on the Asian mainland against an Asian foe which has not yet begun to tap its immense manpower reserves. Most of the time that foe is a Vietnamese guerrilla—a tough, cunning, elusive warrior who knows every hiding place in his native land, who is fed and shielded by the people we are supposedly there to defend, and who believes that someday his children will push out the Americans just as his elders pushed out the French.

Even if the old-fashioned kind of military victory in Vietnam were possible, it would require an indefinite occupation of that country by American troops under constant attack from such guerrillas. But such a victory is not possible against an enemy that keeps coming and fighting, as it has for twenty years and as it seemingly can for twenty more, suffering heavy casualties but also inflicting them, hiding in the hills or brush, disappearing literally underground or by mingling with civilians, eluding our "search and destroy" missions and then returning, controlling or terrorizing virtually as many villages and roads, and assassinating or kidnaping virtually as many South Vietnamese local leaders, as it did before we arrived.

If countering this kind of guerrilla warfare requires, as the Pentagon has said, that our forces outnumber theirs by a lopsided ratio of 3 or 4 or even 10 to 1—and if, in addition, we must take over the immense and unfamiliar task of nonmilitary "pacification," and do it without a nonpartisan civil service, without the goodwill of the people, without effective land distribution or respect for the South Vietnamese troops or cooperation from their intellectuals—then where do we obtain the manpower to offset the gradual tapping of Communist reserves? Not from our Asian and Pacific allies who have, on the whole, shown very little enthusiasm for propping up with their own forces what we have warned could be the first of the falling dominoes. Nor are there unlimited reserves still available to the South Vietnamese army, whose brave but poorly paid and dispirited soldiers are still too often led by corrupt and politically controlled officers more imitative of the Vietcong in brutally interrogating civilians and prisoners than in risking their own comfort in combat.

It is small wonder, then, that one American military leader has said that 2,000,000 U.S. troops will be required to root out the terrorists in the South, village by village. But if the other side keeps growing through recruitment and reinfiltration, despite escalated bombings and electronic barriers, even 2,000,000 may not be enough. And what would an American commitment of 2,000,000 men do to our force levels at home and around the world? What, finally, would it do to the South Vietnamese themselves?

"In the final analysis," said President Kennedy in the fall of 1963, "it is their war. They are the ones who have to win it or lose it . . . the people of Vietnam." But as we pour in more troops, destroying in the process their economic stability more effectively than the Communists have ever done, it has become *our* war. We have the largest fighting force. We suffer the largest fatalities. The South Vietnamese people, weary after twenty years of warriors and foreigners, divided by rival sects and provincial politics, seem simultaneously to resent and prefer our taking over their battle. Many of the young leaders and scholars upon whom the country's liberation must ultimately depend are reported openly cynical and skeptical of the American presence. The present military government with which we are identified—now popularly elected but still far from universally accepted—seems incapable of understanding any real opposition or dissent, and incapable of undertaking any serious land reforms or serious peace negotiations.

A more viable, representative, and reform-minded civilian government, possessing real strength in the grassroots as well as the cities, rallying the people after the fashion of the Philippines' Magsaysay, and offering true amnesty and amity to the Vietcong and true reconciliation to the North Vietnamese, might have at least been able to increase the rate of Communist defectors to a level exceeding South Vietnamese desertions. That has not happened, nor will it. But the strength, the morale, and the legitimacy of the present government in Saigon are at least sufficient now to permit our own country to pursue a different course.

I wrote in my book *Kennedy* that that Administration's objective in Vietnam was to gain time—time for the South Vietnamese, with our help and protection, to achieve a society sufficiently cohesive both politically and militarily to negotiate a balanced settlement. There is no reason now for us to refrain from concluding that such time is finally near at hand. The South Vietnamese have expressed through their elections a longing for peace and the beginning of constitutional rule. The Communists have reason to know that they cannot win a final military victory. The Red Chinese, beset by internal strife and external setbacks, may be less able to interfere with negotiations. The Soviets prefer peace to a widening war. The National Liberation Front has dropped its resistance to the inclusion of other South Vietnamese in a postwar government, and the North Vietnamese, at least in the view of some, may again be indicating a genuine willingness to talk peace.

Their willingness, to be sure, has been conditioned upon our suspending indefinitely and unconditionally the bombing of the North. If that bombing had been clearly curtailing Communist infiltration and operations within the South, one could more readily accept our refusal on the ground that such attacks were a more effective way of saving American lives than attempting to interdict North Vietnamese lines in the South. But in fact, despite our constant expansion of targets to include all those of genuine military importance, Secretary of Defense McNamara has acknowledged that the infiltration of North Vietnamese forces has continued to grow—infiltrating over countless routes, by boat and truck and bicycle and foot, under cover of jungle or darkness. In the South they live off the land whenever their supply trains are delayed. In the North, they obtain replacements overland through China whenever their supply depots are destroyed. On balance, the continued bombing, by increasing an embittered militancy in the North and thus prolonging the war, appears to be costing more American lives in the long run than it actually saves.

Heavy bombing has never been wholly decisive in any war. No one promised that it would be in this one. But let us leave aside the various inconsistencies in the various statements explaining our original reasons for bombing. The overwhelming weight of the evidence still fails to indicate that pounding that largely primitive, peasant economy with more bombs than we unloaded on all of Europe in World War II has brought us a single day closer to the hour of peaceful settlement. The overwhelming weight of the evidence still fails to indicate that the North Vietnamese resolve to resist has been weakened instead of hardened by these massive attacks on their homeland. The overwhelming weight of the evidence still fails to indicate that any feasible amount of bombing can ever prevent the North Vietnamese from infiltrating into the South all the men, arms, and food needed to sustain a low-level guerrilla war indefinitely.

To be sure, the bombing is not without effect. It not only boosts the morale of the Saigon government—a somewhat dubious justification—but punishes and pressures and pains the North Vietnamese. It makes their maintenance of reserves and supply lines, and particularly their transportation of large cadres and heavy artillery pieces, more difficult and more costly. It makes life harder and poorer for their citizens and their soldiers. But their life has always been hard and poor. They have never depended on cities or industries. They have known very little but war against the Japanese, the French, and the Americans during most of their lives. A still lower standard of living now, an inconvenient mobilization of manpower to repair bridges and railroads, an increase in shortages and terrors and casualties, do not add up to grounds for surrender, now that they have endured this much this long and have so little to lose but their lives.

There seems little to be gained, then, by our insisting upon a continuance of the bombing in the North. Suspending it will not produce a Communist military victory in the South, nor will it bring the collapse of any Saigon government worthy of our attention. But suspending it will, possibly with the aid of the new electronic "fence," confine the war to the South, where it must be won anyway. It will end the strain on U.S. aircraft crews badly needed for air support in the South, while reducing the costly loss of our aircraft and the humiliation of our captured pilots. It will limit the area our dollars must surely rebuild when the war is over. It will end the toll of North Vietnamese civilian casualties which embarrassingly but unavoidably grows as the list of our targets is expanded. And it will eliminate the single largest barrier to world support for our position and the single largest barrier to negotiations with Hanoi.

Bombing, we have now learned, cannot force negotiations but it may well be preventing them. There is no possibility of the North Vietnamese engaging in talks while their homeland is being bombed. Inasmuch as the bombing can no longer be regarded as an indispensable means of securing our forces and objectives in the South, the time has come for us to suspend indefinitely and unconditionally our bombing of the North in order to test Hanoi's sincerity and see how it will reciprocate.

Accompanying such a suspension with conditions and deadlines will not work. The North Vietnamese will not respond to an ultimatum. Nor will they respond to our demand or even "expectation" that in exchange they stop sending men and supplies to South Vietnam—in effect stop fighting the war altogether—while we continue to fight. Naturally, no American is going to like it if and when the North's flow of troops and supplies to the South increases during such a suspension. We did not like it when fighting continued in Korea during the truce talks; but had we refused to talk, the loss of American lives there would surely have been higher. Today we must face the facts that prolonging the bombing cannot end the war or even the infiltration and that this impasse is costing us more lives than the bombing saves. Let us also face the fact that someday we will stop it—and the longer we put it off, the more difficult it will be for both sides to negotiate a reasonable settlement.

Indeed, there is already a danger that we have passed the point of no return beyond which neither the Hanoi regime nor the Administration in Washington could reach an accommodation with the other without the risk of being turned out of office. Bitterness and distrust are rapidly rising in both camps. Militants and military chieftains are gaining influence in both capitals. Each side is fearful that a cease-fire will cause a loss of momentum and morale, that negotiations will be only a cover for reinforcements. Each side believes that the other should pay the price of aggression, accept the blame, and make the first concession. Each side would prefer to postpone negotiations until he is clearly winning (at which time, of course, the other side would not negotiate).

Perhaps even now the North Vietnamese and the National Liberation Front are not interested in serious negotiations. Their recent public statements about peace talks have been largely bellicose, rude, and inconsistent. They appear convinced of their ability to outlast us, meanwhile bleeding us white. They do not wish to offend their largest neighbor, protector, and potential supplier, Red China, which would obviously prefer to see us hopelessly bogged down in Vietnam without risking one Chinese casualty, and which might well threaten the North Vietnamese with a disastrous interruption of supplies if they even talk with the Americans. The pro-Chinese faction in the Hanoi government is already said by some to be on the ascendancy.

But even if Hanoi is not now ready to negotiate, we can—instead of continuing the present treadmill into ever more dangerous, divisive, and self-destructive escalation—prudently de-escalate our war effort without harming our interests and with some hope that Hanoi will de-escalate also. Limiting our military commitments, objectives, investment, and assaults, meanwhile consolidating our position in the most populous areas of the South, would cost us fewer lives, less money, no territory, and no "face," while better enabling us to wait until outside events—such as divisions in the Communist camp—make negotiations more possible. Certainly our present course is not dividing the Vietcong from Hanoi or Hanoi from Peking, and indeed may end up helping to unite China for Mao or even Peking with Moscow.

But in fact we do not know with any certainty whether Hanoi and the Vietcong—together or separately—are now ready to negotiate. We have not stopped the bombing indefinitely to find out. We have not since one thirty-seven-day pause nearly two years ago accompanied our talk of negotiations with real deeds of de-escalation demonstrating our earnest good faith. We have not given to the pursuit of peace the same effort, ingenuity, and relentless consistency we have given to prosecuting the war. We have not prevented the Saigon regime from torpedoing the rise of civilian neutralist forces in the South capable of negotiating with the North and the National Liberation Front. We have not left those voices in Hanoi who might once have been concerned about their economy with much reason now to justify a cease-fire. We have not, to the best of my knowledge, adopted a concrete, mutually acceptable plan for negotiations—as distinguished from admirable but vague statements of principle—and communicated that plan to the North. Publicly, at least, we have not offered any of the concessions and compromises required by the military and practical situation for a realistic settlement, frequently implying instead only that we stand ready to negotiate the surrender of the Vietcong.

Most serious of all, we have not been sufficiently forthright or forthcoming in response to what may have been actual opportunities to start or explore negotiations. Perhaps we were looking for a different kind of "signal" and missed the one they sent. Perhaps we were plagued by poor translations, poor communications, or poor coordination on both sides. But whatever the reasons and whoever is to blame—and assessing it now will not help—we must in the future take more care not to spurn or ignore potential opportunities for negotiation, much less deny their existence or escalate in response to them.

Such a posture would involve no weakening of our resolve or responsibility. President Johnson has called "the path of peaceful settlement . . . the only path for reasonable men." President Kennedy obtained withdrawal of the Soviet missiles from Cuba by giving attention to the olive branch as well as the arrows—by adopting a carefully measured combination of defense, diplomacy, and dialogue. Perhaps his ploy in that crisis of interpreting a Communist demand in his own terms, his response thus necessitating their reply, could be used now to initiate negotiations with Hanoi. Perhaps the good offices of U Thant, a resolution by the U.N. General Assembly, or a reconvening of the Geneva Conference could initiate talks without either side worrying about protocol or precedent. Perhaps we could invite the other side to the President's next summit meeting with our Asian allies. It would be more realistic, in my view, to seek a secret conference, with no mediator, arbitrator, or press releases, thus alleviating potential Chinese and other pressures. But the essential step is to bring together the combatants—and that necessarily means all the combatants, including the Vietcong.

Such talks are not doomed to end in disagreement and disappointment. After all, *both* sides are pledged to work:

First, for a return to the Geneva Agreement of 1954;

Second, for an end to hostilities and the withdrawal of all foreign troops and bases;

Third, for a neutral, peaceful, independent South Vietnam, free to determine in new elections its own political, economic, and social system, and its relationship or reunification with the North;

Fourth, for a government—if necessary (though neither Saigon nor the NFL has squarely faced this), a coalition government composed of all parties, as in the Laotian settlement of 1962—acting on behalf of all South Vietnamese citizens in accordance with the principles of universal suffrage, free speech, free worship, and meaningful land redistribution.

Agreement on the interpretation and implementation of these principles will not be reached quickly or easily. Such words as "freedom," "independence," and "neutrality" mean very different things to the two sides. Some form of international guarantees and supervision will be essential at least at the outset. But agreement should not be impossible.

Such an ending, while restoring South Vietnamese self-determination and preventing its conquest, would not leave the United States and its allies with any better position militarily than they had before the war began—but neither did the ending of the Cuban crisis or the Berlin crisis or even the Korean war. Such a settlement would also involve grave risks. It would endure only if both sides felt as a matter of practical self-interest that this kind of peace was preferable to war. Even then there would be no way of assuring the American people of the elimination of terrorists from the South, of the early departure of all American troops from Asia, or of the nonparticipation in the South Vietnamese government of one variety or another of Communists. Indeed, there is no negotiated solution possible that would not lend itself to bitter attacks in the Congress and pose continuing dangers for the future.

Thus, whatever quantities of national courage, understanding, and unity are required on our part today to fight and accept the war in Vietnam, they will be needed in twice those amounts to find and accept the peace. But find it we must. While we cannot overlook any dangers, neither can we overlook any opportunities. A new opportunity may now be approaching in the holiday season. We have been able to arrange in recent years a Christmas cease-fire in Vietnam. If we plan and work for it now, we can be prepared this Christmas to have the firing cease forever.

CONGRESSIONAL INITIATIVE IN AVIATION SAFETY

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ottinger] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleagues for their action today in rejecting by a better than 2-to-1 margin an attempt to reduce $26 million funds badly needed by the Federal Aviation Administration to increase air safety. In my view, this was a misguided effort to economize at the expense of American lives, and it richly deserved an overwhelming defeat.

While the action of the Congress in increasing FAA's appropriations for additional controllers and radar equipment is encouraging, it is appropriate to point out that this was a matter of congressional initiative. FAA never would have obtained approval of these additional funds were it not for the active concern of many Representatives and Senators that they were needed to save lives. It is my continuing and strong belief that the FAA simply has not been aggressive enough in promoting safety in the airways. Only under intensive questioning by members of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce did the FAA Administrator admit that the Bureau of the Budget had disapproved funds needed for controllers and radar. Left to its own devices, the FAA would have been content to make do with a budget totally inadequate to meet today's needs.

Three weeks ago, I pointed out some 20 areas in which the FAA had been remiss. Many of these proposals involve little or no cost, requiring only new procedures or regulations. Yet, the FAA's reaction has been one of total indifference.

If the United States is to truly lead the world in aviation safety, the FAA will have to realize that the programs, procedures and personnel that were adequate 10 years ago are not adequate today and invite disaster in the future. I would hate to think that anyone in a position of public responsibility would play politics with the lives of those who use America's airways.

WALT W. ROSTOW: SECURITY RISK AND CHIEF ARCHITECT OF PROPOSED PANAMA TREATIES

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Rarick] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, since publication in the Congressional Record of July 17, 21, and 27, 1967, of the texts of three proposed new treaties with Panama affecting the Panama Canal, many of our thoughtful and patriotic citizens have written letters of protest, and some have requested the identity of the instigators of these treaties. Based upon extensive documentation in the Congressional Record over the last decade, it is unquestionably the Department of State that has been a dominant influence in the formulation of the appeasement policies that have had such disastrous consequences at Panama. These policies are directly responsible for bringing about the present situation in which U.S. sovereignty over the Canal Zone and ownership of the Panama Canal are endangered by the provisions of three mob-incited treaties.

In seeking information on precisely who in our Government is responsible for our policies at Panama, I find that Walt W. Rostow, now Presidential assistant for national security affairs, has been identified as the "chief architect"—Washington Observer, February 15, 1967, page 1, column 1. Before his present assignment in the White House, Dr. Rostow was chairman of the policy planning council of the Department of State starting in 1961, the year after the hoisting of the first Panamanian flag in the Canal Zone, and thus has been in a position to influence national policy over a period of years.

A news story from Washington, D.C., in the October 4, 1967, issue of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, in commenting on the case of Otto F. Otepka, former top-level security officer of the State Department, reveals that Rostow was rejected three times for Government employment for security reasons.

Because of the importance of such revelations to the security of the United States, I quote the indicated news story as part of my remarks and commend it for examination by the appropriate committees of the Congress:

OTEPKA BRIEF SAYS ROSTOW WAS REJECTED THREE TIMES FOR SECURITY

(By Denny Walsh)

Washington, D.C.—Walt Whitman Rostow, now a special assistant to the President on national security affairs, was three times rejected by the Eisenhower Administration as a possible security risk, according to briefs filed in a Civil Service case.

The Air Force made a security ruling adverse to Mr. Rostow in a period before 1955 and the State Department made similar findings in 1955 and in 1957, rejecting Mr. Rostow for highly secretive projects, according to briefs filed by Otto F. Otepka, chief security evaluator for the State Department, who is fighting to save his career Civil Service job.

GET OTEPKA

Mr. Otepka contends that he has been the object of a "get Otepka" drive because of difficulties with top Kennedy Administration figures and because he testified before a Senate subcommittee on "laxity" in security procedures involving political appointments.

In the brief, Mr. Otepka said the Rostow case brought his first difficulties with Secretary of State-designate Dean Rusk and Attorney General-designate Robert F. Kennedy in December, 1960, a month after John F. Kennedy's election.

SECURITY PROBLEMS

Robert Kennedy and Mr. Rusk wanted to appoint Mr. Rostow to a high State Department job, the brief contends, and were aware of some security problems in connection with his previous consideration for national security projects.

Meeting with Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Rusk that December, Mr. Otepka said he was asked: "What kind of a security problem would be encountered regarding the appointment of Mr. Rostow to the (state) department?"

According to the brief, Mr. Otepka replied that he was familiar with the Rostow file dating back to 1955, when the department was considering hiring Mr. Rostow as a key person in a psychological warfare project.

NEEDED CLEARANCE

"Persons employed by the projects," the brief states, "were required to have a security clearance under the strict standard prescribed by the United States Intelligence Board."

Mr. Otepka reviewed files on Mr. Rostow from the State Department, the CIA and Department of the Air Force, which previously had made a security finding adverse to Mr. Rostow, the brief reports.

The brief gives no indication of the nature of the security problem involved in Mr. Rostow's background.

As a result of Mr. Otepka's review of the Rostow files, Under Secretary of State Herbert Hoover Jr. decided that Mr. Rostow would not be hired for the psychological warfare project in 1955. A similar decision was made in 1957 by Roderick O'Connor, then administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, when Mr. Rostow was again recommended for State Department employment.

SAME EVALUATION

At the 1960 Kennedy-Rusk meeting, the brief states that Mr. Otepka made it clear he probably would continue to evaluate the Rostow case in the same manner as it had been evaluated by the Air Force and State Department previously.

According to the brief, Robert Kennedy became furious, and said: "Those Air Force guys are a bunch of jerks."

Subsequently, Mr. Rostow was hired by the White House, where the President and whomever he names to handle security matters can establish any standards they wish in hiring. Later Mr. Rostow was hired into the State Department as one who had been given top-level clearance.

It was after the Rostow incident that John F. Reilly, a former Justice Department lawyer, was assigned to the State Department and admittedly took part in a "get Otepka" effort involving wiretapping and other methods to try to find some grounds for firing him from his $19,000-a-year job. Mr. Reilly resigned after being forced to admit wiretapping and eavesdropping.

The brief also outlined details of 18 cases of "misconduct and infractions of rules" by State Department employes.

THE CASE FOR BOMBING PAUSE, NO. 7

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. IRWIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound disappointment that I bring to the attention of my colleagues the current Life magazine editorial, "The Case for Bombing Pause, No. 7." Published reports tell us that the editorial is a product of a change of mind among some of the top men at Life magazine and unfortunately the editorial seems to be the product of differing opinion. The first weakness is that it proposes a halt that would not include the Ho Chi Minh Trail complex in Laos and the southern provinces of North Vietnam and this, of course, would make it unacceptable to both the North Vietnamese and to those who want a cessation of bombing here at home. The next weakness is the hope that a cessation will recapture support for the U.S. presence and commitment in Vietnam around the world and of course, our previous experience shows the weakness of this argument.

The editorial seemed especially naive when it says:

> If we did try for a reasonable time, accompanied it with an energetic diplomatic probing, and then nothing came of it, the air would have been cleared.

Unfortunately, past experience again shows that it will not clear the air. It will only add to the confusion and add to the President's burden.

Perhaps the most disturbing thing of all about the editorial is when it says:

> We are also trying to maintain a highly important—but in the last analysis not absolutely imperative—strategic interest of the U.S. and the free world.

Because here the editors seem to betray a change of mind with regard to our commitment.

THE CASE FOR BOMBING PAUSE, NO. 7

Six times in 32 months of bombing North Vietnam, the U.S. has held its fire. Three times it was for a brief holiday respite. The three other bombing pauses were ordered to allow Hanoi to signal a willingness to talk peace. No clear signal came. Then, three weeks ago, President Johnson announced the U.S.'s willingness "to stop all aerial and naval bombardment of North Vietnam when this will lead promptly to productive discussion." Hanoi came back with its standard reply: the U.S. must stop bombing "unconditionally," and North Vietnam will promise nothing in return.

Notwithstanding, we believe it would be worthwhile for the U.S. to take the initiative in another bombing pause. We think the U.S. should declare a respite in the attack against the areas north of the battle zones, confining bombing to the Ho Chi Minh Trail complex in Laos and to the southern provinces of North Vietnam, the immediate rear of the enemy forces pressing against the DMZ. There should be no publicly announced "conditions" that carry the whiff of an ultimatum. But this should not be a commitment to stop the bombing indefinitely. In taking this diplomatic and political initiative, the U.S. administration would have clearly in mind the kind of North Vietnamese response we would consider constructive, and how long we were willing to wait for it.

In advocating a bombing pause, with no advance promise of any reciprocal move by North Vietnam, we must acknowledge that almost all U.S. military opinion opposes such a course. The U.S. would be reducing pressure on the enemy, and that is not ordinarily the way to win a war. This, of course, is not an ordinary war. U.S. bombing is in a sense a reprisal against the North for the destruction and terrorism the Vietcong work in South Vietnam. Bombing damage and strain is an important price the North is forced to pay for continuing its support of Communist aggression in the South. The more direct military benefit for the U.S. and our allies is, of course, the interference with the flow of men and matériel from the North. There is much argument as to exactly how effective the bombing is, but in stopping most of it, we would unquestionably be giving up a weapon of some value.

Life believes, however, that the benefits of a bombing pause at this time outweigh the short-term military cost:

There is a remote possibility that a pause now could be the first step toward an acceptable diplomatic settlement of the war.

There is a strong probability that a bombing pause would improve the posture of the U.S. in Vietnam, in the eyes of many other nations and indeed of many Americans, and thus ultimately improve our chances of achieving our purposes in Vietnam.

As to the possibility of a pause leading to meaningful negotiations, Secretary Rusk tirelessly points out, "I have yet to hear anyone tell us that if we did stop the bombing they could definitely deliver Hanoi to the conference table. I have asked a number of governments, 'All right, if we stop the bombing, what can you deliver?' I get no response."

Hanoi itself has denounced past bombing pauses as U.S. "hoaxes." There is a danger that they would take a new bombing pause as a sign that the U.S. is caving in. There is considerable precedent in Communist diplomacy for *raising* your terms when the other side offers any concession.

Yet there do come times in wars when belligerents change policies and positions, sometimes shortly after swearing they never would. The fact that Hanoi will not promise anything in advance, in return for a bombing pause that hasn't happened yet, does not necessarily foreshadow their actual reaction to a pause that had gone on, say, for several weeks. Such a pause could stir up hopes all over the world, including the East European branches of Communism, and could put considerable diplomatic pressure on Hanoi. Probably Hanoi would say No again, to everybody—Canada, India, Denmark, U Thant, etc. But it is worth finding out.

The more weighty reason for a bombing pause is to recapture support for the U.S. presence and commitment in Vietnam. The bombing has isolated the U.S. from most of its friends and allies throughout the world (there are a few stout exceptions in Asia), and in this country the bombing is the focus and catalyst of most of the opposition to the war. There is the "bully" image—the most powerful nation on earth pouring World War II-scale bomb loads onto a primitive little country. The U.S. has never been bombed; countries that have been tend to identify with the targets rather than with the bomber crews.

The fear that the bombing might bring China into the war, even bring on nuclear war, naturally increases as the U.S. goes after North Vietnamese targets which are only 60 seconds' jet-time from the China border. It may be foolish of so many Japanese, Indians, Indonesians, etc., to worry about this. But they do.

In the U.N., over 30 non-Communist nations, among them several of our NATO allies, have now advocated stopping the bombing (with many variations of formula as to "conditions" or no-conditions). Perhaps the most thoughtful proposal was the Canadian suggestion of a bombing halt followed by restoration of the DMZ's neutralized status under international inspection. In later phases of the plan would come freezing of military "capabilities" throughout Vietnam and an eventual ceasefire.

Naively or not, many millions of ordinary citizens, and not a few ambassadors, foreign ministers and U.S. senators, think a bombing halt *could* lead to peace in Vietnam, and they are increasingly critical of the U.S. for not trying it again. If we did try it for a reasonable time, accompanied it with an energetic diplomatic probing, and then nothing came of it, the air would have been cleared. Support for a resumption of bombing, even for an escalation, would be stronger than for our present policy. But much would depend on what the Administration said about the new policy, and how it said it, not just to Hanoi but to the U.S. and the world.

Life believes that the U.S. is in Vietnam for honorable and sensible reasons. What the U.S. has undertaken there is obviously harder, longer, more complicated than the U.S. leadership foresaw. And in 1967 we are having another hard, complicated year out there. There is the encouraging fact of the Vietnamese elections, small blemishes and all; there is straight military progress; but there is the maddeningly slow work of translating these advances into pacification at the "rice-roots level." We are trying to defend not a fully born nation but a situation and a people from which an independent nation might emerge. We are also trying to maintain a highly important—but in the last analysis not absolutely imperative—strategic interest of the U.S. and the free world. This is a tough combination to ask young Americans to die for.

Home-front support for the war is eroding. One may discount some maneuvering among U.S. politicians as 1968 politics, but even the most patently partisan of these noises represents somebody's rather professional judgment of how the voters are feeling.

LIFE has more than once expressed its admiration for the Johnson administration's coolness and courage in its Vietnam policy. In action the President himself has shown a remarkable blend of resolution and restraint. But in articulation of the policy—which in the ends is inseparable from policy itself—the President and his administration have become more and more glaringly unsuccessful.

The President is said to be subdued these days, inclined to "hunker down" and let the Vietnam criticism beat over him. Dean Rusk is infinitely patient and courteous in explaining to critics and questioners "Your quarrel is really with Hanoi." A confusing circumstance is that the other most influential Cabinet officer, Robert McNamara, clearly is less convinced of the efficacy of bombing the North than are the Joint Chiefs of Staff, or Rusk. Nothing inspiring or eloquent and not much that is simply informative is being said from Washington.

We believe the Administration very soon must act—and speak—to recapture domestic political and intellectual respect for its Vietnam policy and to rally more diplomatic and moral support abroad. We believe the initiation of a bombing pause is a gesture of forbearance and conciliation which might accomplish that. America has the strength to do it.

THE CAUSE IN VIETNAM IS BEING WON

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. IRWIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times Sunday magazine of October 15 has in it an article by Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, entitled "The Cause in Vietnam Is Being Won," which I believe is one of the clearest and most lucid statements on why we are in Vietnam; on why we must stay there and why we will succeed, that has ever been written. I commend this to my colleagues and to those people in the United States who are properly concerned with the difficulties we face in Vietnam; the difficulties we face in the world and most of all, the difficulties we face here at home because of the burden of our efforts in Vietnam.

GENERAL TAYLOR SAYS—"THE CAUSE IN VIETNAM IS BEING WON"

(By Maxwell D. Taylor)

(NOTE.—Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (1962–64) and U.S. Ambassador to South Vietnam (1964–65), is now president of the Institute for Defense Analysis. Earlier this year he toured Southeast Asian capitals on a Presidential mission in connection with the war in Vietnam.)

Among those of us who are impatient for a quick and clear-cut decision in South Vietnam, we often hear the situation described as a "war that cannot be won." If that phrase is a valid description of what we are facing, then there is some ground for the mood of pessimism which seems to becloud a growing segment of public opinion.

Fortunately, it is not the view of most responsible United States representatives on the spot in South Vietnam, nor is it mine for reasons which I shall try to set forth. In so doing, rather than support a negative position with regard to a negative assertion, I would prefer to demonstrate its invalidity by presenting the case which supports the affirmative judgment that the cause in Vietnam is one which *can* be won and is *being* won.

At the outset of such an undertaking, there should be agreement as to what that cause is—what our objective is—in South Vietnam. It has been defined in about the same terms by three Presidents, but for our purposes here I shall take the statement of President Johnson in his Johns Hopkins speech in April, 1965:

"Our objective is the independence of South Vietnam and its freedom from attack. We want nothing for ourselves, only that the people of South Vietnam be allowed to guide their own country in their own way."

This statement—clear, simple and unambiguous—is the best answer I know to those who say that they do not understand what United States policy is trying to accomplish in Southeast Asia. Not only is the statement simple, but it is also limited in the sense that it does not threaten the survival of the opponent nor require the unconditional surrender of anything vital to his existence. But it does have a certain intractable quality which prevents its compromise without altering its essential nature.

When the fighting finally stops, either South Vietnam will be independent and able to choose its own form of government or it will not. We will either attain this objective or we will fail. Thus the achievement of this objective becomes the true criterion of victory—it is the accomplishment of what we set out to do in 1954 and what we are still pursuing today.

As the language of the quotation indicates, there are two parts to our objective: the end of the aggression directed and supported by North Vietnam and the establishment in South Vietnam of a self-determined Government. The accomplishment of the first does not necessarily imply the complete destruction of the enemy forces and the roundup of all the Vietcong and their sympathizers. If the North Vietnamese withdraw and the Vietcong are reduced to the point where the new Government of South Vietnam can cope with any residual threat with its own resources, that level of suppression should suffice.

As for the second part of the objective, if the new Government represents the free choice of the people of South Vietnam, regardless of how it measures up to the preferences and predilections of foreign observers, that level of success also meets the terms of our stated objective. Naturally, we would hope for more than marginal performance; we would like the self-determined Government to be stable, truly democratic and efficient to the degree that can be expected of an immature society embarked for the first time upon self-government. However, no such conditions have been expressed in the language used thus far in defining our purpose in Vietnam and our experience in Korea, where we expanded our original objective after the Inchon victory from one of repelling the invasion to that of reunifying the country by military means, should remind us to be slow to enlarge our present objective in Southeast Asia.

In determining whether we may hope to achieve these two requisites of success—the cessation of the Hanoi-directed aggression and a self-determined Government for the South Vietnamese people—we should identify the requirements for accomplishing each. With regard to the cessation of aggression, the basic requirement is to bring Hanoi to conclude that in its own interest it should cease the attack on South Vietnam. Such a change of behavior would end the problem, otherwise never completely solvable, of stopping the infiltration of men and supplies essential to the continued conduct of the war in the South and would establish on the part of the guerrillas engaged in South Vietnam a feeling of abandonment which would probably lead them to an early accommodation with the South Vietnamese Government.

The North Vietnamese leaders are likely to reach this conclusion only if we can succeed in creating a set of conditions which are compellingly persuasive. One such condition is a continuation of the heavy losses in the ranks of the Vietcong and North Vietnamese units engaged in ground battle in South Vietnam. We estimate that these forces lost over 100,000 men last year—men who were killed, seriously wounded or defected—and they are losing men at about double that rate at the present time.

If this trend accelerates or merely continues during the remainder of this year, the loss of military manpower should raise serious doubts among the leaders in the North who direct this war as to the feasibility of continuing the struggle much longer at such a cost.

Another military factor tending to bring Hanoi around is the mounting destruction of the war-supporting targets in North Vietnam as the result of the air attacks. These attacks were started in 1965 for three specific purposes: to encourage the South Vietnamese people by the knowledge that direct attacks were being delivered against the homeland of the principal enemy; to exploit air power to the extent possible in limiting and making costly the infiltration of men and supplies from the North; and to remind Hanoi of the growing price of the continuation of the aggression.

The first purpose, raising the morale of the South, has been achieved. The effort to make infiltration costly and difficult has also succeeded although by dint of great effort, the enemy has been able to sustain his forces in South Vietnam, but at a relatively low tempo of combat activity. Whereas U.S. battalions are in action on an average of five to six days a week, enemy battalions average about one day of combat per month. On the final point, influencing the behavior of Hanoi, the evidence does not yet support a definite conclusion on the effect of the bombing. Certainly, thus far, Hanoi has shown no interest in opening negotiations, but the concentrated propaganda emanating from every Communist capital to get us to stop the bombing of the North is a persuasive testimonial to its effectiveness.

These forms of military pressure are important as means to change the will of Hanoi but the reaction of the leaders to the situation will be affected by nonmilitary factors as well. For example, the success of the South Vietnamese in extending local security and establishing stable local government throughout the rural areas of South Vietnam can be an affirmative factor for our side and a distinctly negative one for them. Likewise, the establishment of a popularly chosen Government in Saigon which offers the promise of stability and progress will be a cause of discouragement for those in the North who are constantly hoping for a return of the political turbulence and governmental impotence which characterized the period of 1964 and early 1965.

Hanoi can be influenced not only by punishment which fits the crime but also by the hope of rewards resulting from reformed conduct. If the enemy leaders both in Hanoi and in the South were assured of economic and political compensations for a cessation of the efforts to impose a Communist Government upon the South, this fact might well tilt the balance in deciding them to change their ways. Thus far, we have suggested possible ways of rehabilitating the Vietcong and of readmitting them to citizenship in South Vietnam or of repatriating to North Vietnam those who desire to go. Also, we have indicated a willingness to include North Vietnam in economic arrangements for the benefit of all Southeast Asia. In due course, the possibility of a better future instead of the bleak present may make an important contribution to diverting Hanoi from its present course.

But apart from all other considerations, one major condition must be met if we are to expect Hanoi to withdraw from the lists. It is to convince that leadership that under no circumstance will the United States change its present policy and vary from its determination to attain the basic objective which we have proclaimed before the world. Until this conviction has been established, it seems unlikely that our success in the actions described above will be sufficient to cause Hanoi to cease the aggression against Vietnam.

So much for the requisite success in ending the aggression. Now let us consider what is required for the establishment of a self-determined Government for South Vietnam.

On this score, the main thing is to carry out the current program for establishing a constitutional Government and choosing the officials to man it. The success of the recent Presidential and senatorial elections, carried out in spite of the violent efforts of the Vietcong to sabotage them, is a major political victory for the South Vietnamese over their Communist enemies. It has been a blow to the skeptics who, from the outset, tried to denigrate the importance of this success in establishing constitutional government in time of war. Such critics forget the fact that South Vietnam is a young country which has never had a chance to develop a true spirit of nationhood, whose leaders have never had the opportunity to practice statecraft or acquire the experience necessary to govern a country under the adverse conditions which exist in Vietnam.

Before becoming unduly critical, we Americans need to remind ourselves that it took us from 1776 to 1789 to elect our first constitutional President and that period included eight years of peace. This young nation of South Vietnam, in time of bitter strife, has attained constitutional government in approximately four years—the time separating the overthrow of the Diem Government and the election of a constitutional President. Whatever the imperfections of performance in carrying out this program, it is an amazing feat and one which deserves the applause of all true believers in democratic government.

One consequence of the establishment of a constitutionally based Government in Saigon should be to give an impetus to political and social progress in the provinces —carried out under the Revolutionary Development Program.

Since all resources in the provinces stem from the Government in Saigon, a strengthening of that Government will inevitably redound favorably to the effectiveness of the nation-building activities in the countryside. Better government in the capital and in the provinces will in turn allow a more effective meshing of United States nonmilitary activities in support of the Vietnamese efforts in the rural areas.

A basic factor which conditions success in these nation-building activities is the degree of permanent security from the guerrilla terrorists which can be established and maintained around the areas under restoration. We found in our frontier days that it was useless to plant the corn outside the stockade while the Indians were sill around. Unhappily, up to now there have been plenty of "Indians" around in many Vietnamese provinces. Hence, while establishing a stable Government in South Vietnam, it is essential to protect that Government and its workers by military, paramilitary and police forces adequate to guarantee local security behind which the villages and hamlets can develop and prosper.

If these are the requisites for success in frustrating the aggression and in permitting governmental self-determination for South Vietnam, we should now make an inventory of the assets available to apply against these requirements.

These assets are varied in quality, including military, economic, political and psychological elements. They are also impressive in quantity, but their effectiveness will depend not on a mere summation of components, but very largely upon the manner in which the components are used in effective combination.

Let us begin this inventory by examining the trained manpower available for use against the Vietcong guerrillas and units of the North Vietnamese Army in South Vietnam. The major force on our side is that of the South Vietnamese Government, consisting of military, paramilitary and police forces which have grown from about 275,000 men in mid-1960 to some 735,000 in mid-1967. When the latest increase of 65,000, announced by Saigon in July, is added to this total, there will be more than 800,000 Vietnamese under arms. As a percentage of available manpower, the comparable figure for United States forces would be 12,000,000 men, about our strength under arms at the height of World War II.

The United States forces in South Vietnam have grown from some 23,000 in 1964 to about 450,000 in mid-1967, with an announced target strength for mid-1968 of 525,000. Other free world forces, negligible in South Vietnam in 1965, have now grown to 58,000.

In the United States, we often are inclined to complain about the smallness of the allied contribution to the assistance of South Vietnam. We ask why we should carry almost all the burden when many of our allies are more directly threatened by the situation than we are. While this complaint may be understandable, we tend to overlook the fact that allied support in South Vietnam actually surpasses in many ways the support given in the Korean war.

In the latter case, the United Nations strength (not including U.S. forces) at its peak amounted to 39,000 men whereas in South Vietnam today the allied strength is, to repeat, 58,000. Also, whereas some 20 nations contributed to the defense of Korea under the United Nations flag, 37 nations are assisting the South Vietnamese Government in some way in its present struggle. It is true that, in most cases, the help is only token in quantity but the endorsement of the South Vietnamese cause is nonetheless significant.

Numbers, of course, are not the only measure of military strength and effectiveness. Fortunately, the quality of the forces is keeping pace with the numerical growth. As in the case of Korea, governments contributing free world forces have selected their troops with care. Like the Korean Army in the period 1950–53, the armed forces of South Vietnam are steadily improving in performance on the battlefield. If they sometimes lack the initiative and dash of the foreign forces freshly arrived on the scene and which, as in the American case, stay for only a year, the Vietnamese, when properly led, fight with tenacity and courage.

Unfortunately, many of us have acquired an impression of the South Vietnamese combat performance which is unjust and at variance with the facts as known to our qualified military experts on the scene. The most competent American judge of the effectiveness of the Vietnamese is Gen. William Westmoreland, who has lived and fought with them for the past three and a half years. In a recent statement, he expressed the following opinion:

"In my view, the recent improvement of Republic of Vietnam armed forces combat effectiveness can be measured in terms of their willingness to carry the fight to the enemy and to close with and destroy him in sharp, violent contact. They have demonstrated the well-disciplined attributes of professional soldiers and a vastly improved ability to use their supporting arms and combat support. They have maneuvered with notable success when closed with the enemy. They have participated successfully with United States forces in multi-battalion operations."

For those interested in statistics, there is strong support for General Westmoreland's view of the Vietnamese forces to be found in their lowered rate of desertion, in the increased numbers of enemy weapons they capture in relation to Vietnamese weapons lost to the enemy and in the effectiveness ratings of Vietnamese units by United States advisers.

In the last analysis, the most convincing evidence of the steadfastness of Vietnamese troops in combat is found in the grim statistic of killed in action per thousand men under arms. The ratio for 1966 for Vietnamese forces was 14 per 1,000 and for United States forces 13 per 1,000. In 1967, the United States ratio is running slightly ahead of the Vietnamese, largely because of the increased action on the United States front along the Demilitarized Zone and the decision to use Vietnamese forces in increased numbers in support of pacification.

Passing to a consideration of other military advantages on our side, I would point to the increased tempo of the air campaign in the North. This upward trend is expressed in increased numbers of sorties and targets and in the reduced loss rate of aircraft per sortie. In spite of the very dense concentration of antiaircraft defenses around the sensitive targets of North Vietnam, by virtue of improved tactics, techniques and equipment, our air forces have been able to increase the weight of the air attacks at decreased loss rates. In so doing, they have destroyed most of the electric power, damaged seriously the key points of the rail and highway system and have obliged Hanoi to commit over half a million North Vietnamese to air defense, the repair of damage and related activities.

In effect, the air war has obliged Hanoi to fight on a second front which causes a serious drain on manpower and a heavy consumption of ammunition, supplies and materiel far in excess of the requirements of the guerrilla warfare in the South. Thus, it constitutes an indispensable part of the strategy directed at breaking the will of Hanoi and destroying their capability to continue the conflict.

We noted at the outset that many resources required for success are nonmilitary in character. The unstinted use of our vast economic resources has created the great complex of harbors, airports, roads and depots in a distant, underdeveloped country which permit us to conduct this anti-guerrilla war with the most modern weapons and means of transport. Apart from the direct application of such resources to the military campaign, American economic aid has played an indispensable role in controlling inflation, preventing runaway prices and assuring adequate food stocks for the Vietnamese population. We have made available roughly half a billion dollars a year for such aid and a similar sum will be available next year. Through the use of these funds many forms of economic progress have been possible, such as the increase in port capacities which now allows civilian goods to flow freely into South Vietnam without detriment to the war effort. Our military expenditures also will eventually redound to the advantage of the civil economy when, at war's end, such great bases as Camranh Bay revert to domestic peacetime uses.

There is an impression among many Americans that the so-called pacification program—the Revolutionary Development Program—is going badly. I think that a more accurate statement would be that this program is making uneven progress. It is doing quite well in some provinces, rather badly in others and holding its own in the remainder. That progress should be uneven is inevitable in a country where the conditions differ so widely from place to place.

One of the great obstacles to fair reporting of the situation in Vietnam has been the difficulty of making accurate generalizations which apply to most of the country at any one time. Many statements about Vietnam that are misleading are not necessarily untruthful. There may be some evidence to support them at a specific time and place, yet they may be completely inaccurate as a generalized description of the situation at other times and places. Hence, I would warn against saying without qualification that pacification or any similarly complex program is going either well or badly. To be accurate, one must specify time, place and circumstance.

Generally speaking, I think it is fair to say that pacification succeeds in direct proportion to the amount of permanent security provided by the Government. As Government control of the countryside increases, definite progress becomes possible for civilian ministries such as Agriculture, Health, Education and Public Welfare which are engaged in the tasks of rural reconstruction.

As an indicator of progress in pacification, there has been an encouraging increase in Government control in rural areas in recent months. Indeed, since mid-1965, there has been an increase of some 3 million people in rural areas clearly under Government control. About 1,200,000 of this increase has occurred in the last six months. Concurrently, the Vietcong-controlled population has decreased by more than a million since 1965, the remaining Governmental gains having come from contested areas. In that year, it was estimated that 26 per cent of the total population (including the cities) was under Vietcong domination; now it is down to 14 per cent. If one includes the cities, the total population under secure Government of Vietnam control has increased from 6.6 million in mid-1965 to 10.8 million in mid-1967.

All statistics in South Vietnam are likely to include a substantial factor of error and this possibility exists for the foregoing estimates of population under Government control. However, the recent registration of 5.8 million voters in the Presidential election suggests that the figures quoted above are substantially correct. The registration would indicate that about double that number, or 11.6 million, enjoy enough Government-provided security for the adults to be able to vote in spite of Vietcong efforts at intimidation.

Population liberated from Vietcong control is a double asset from our point of view. Not only are these people freed from the tyranny of Vietcong domination, but they are withdrawn from among the human assets so necessary to support the guerrilla movement. The Vietcong are necessarily parasitic upon the rural population from whom they draw recruits, porters, food and other forms of help. Without this rural support, the local guerrilla movement risks atrophy and progressive attrition.

The effects of this current trend are shown in the growing difficulty of the Vietcong in obtaining local recruits. More and more, we find North Vietnamese replacements filling the gaps in the ranks of the Vietcong guerrilla units as far south as Saigon. Captured Vietcong documents attest to the seriousness of this increase in Government control. One such document, written in October 1966, bemoaned the fact that some 400,000 people had come under Government of Vietnam control in Region III (the lower Mekong Delta) alone. Another document captured this summer in Phuyen province acknowledges that "the population in liberated areas and base areas has decreased in an alarming manner."

On any list of assets, we should note the growing political experience of the Vietnamese leaders and the evidence of their ability to maintain a relatively stable Government. The most dramatic evidence of political progress is represented by the movement to constitutional government and the successful conduct of the recent Presidential elections in spite of Vietcong threats and terror. Recalling as I do the turbulent times of 1964–65 when, as Ambassador, I was obliged to do business with five different Vietnamese Governments, I must say that this evidence of growing political maturity is most encouraging.

As we appraise our advantages in South Vietnam, we should never fail to be thankful for the asset represented by the quiet tenacity of purpose of the South Vietnamese people. While they are not enthusiastic—indeed, they often appear apathetic to us—it is impressive to note how uncomplaining they are in carrying forward this war into its 14th year. We must remember also that 10 years of warfare with the Japanese and French preceded the conflict with the Vietcong.

Whatever may be said about their lack of civic consciousness and their absence of a dynamic political creed, it is perfectly clear to any observer that they are positively committed to a non-Communist way of life and reject absolutely a Communist-imposed political regime. We often express admiration of the toughness of the North Vietnamese and Vietcong who are defecting to our side at an annual rate of about 35,000, but we fail lamentably to pay tribute to the steadfastness of our long-suffering allies, the South Vietnamese, hundreds of thousands of whom have preferred to abandon all that they own and have accepted the life of a refugee rather than live under Communist rule.

I mentioned earlier that our total strength is not represented by a mere summation of the assets available. These assets, stemming from many sources and differing in quality, must be combined in a coherent strategy which will produce the result we are seeking. I think that we have such a strategy in the one which we have been following since 1965.

It calls for the use of graduated and limited military force to convince Hanoi that it cannot win a military victory in the South and will inevitably pay an increasing price in the North for a continuation of the aggression. It includes all the nonmilitary activities directed at establishing a stable government on a constitutional base and the economic measures directed at protecting the economy from inflation. It gears the military campaign to nonmilitary efforts to rebuild the countryside and, finally, on the diplomatic front, it undertakes to exploit military and political success to bring about negotiations to end the conflict.

All parts of this strategy are interrelated and interdependent. We must succeed in all sectors if we are to attain our ultimate objective. But as a total program it makes solid sense and thus far there have been no new proposals that offer a better, or even an equal, chance of attaining our basic objective. If we were willing to sacrifice that objective and accept the consequences of failure, it would, of course, not be hard to find ways to do so.

The foregoing inventory constitutes an impressive list of assets and achievements which, combined with a coherent strategy, provides reasonable grounds to believe that this war can be won and is being won. But if this is to be a balanced appraisal, we should recognize that there are also serious liabilities. If not eliminated or at least neutralized, they could prolong the war or even cause us to lose it.

I refer to such continuing military problems as the infiltration of men and supplies from North Vietnam and the exploitation by the enemy of sanctuaries in the Demilitarized Zone and in Laos and Cambodia. On the civil front there are the ever-present dangers of increased economic inflation and the possibility of new outbreaks of factionalism among the political minorities of South Vietnam. There is the dual problem of establishing a dialogue with North Vietnam leading to a negotiated settlement while avoiding the pitfalls which will exist in any negotiations. There are the long-range problems of the postwar settlement, which include the need to provide for the Vietcong in such a way that they will cease to be a menace to peasants and, at the same time, will find an honorable place in Vietnamese society.

I shall single out for added comment only one of these problems—the pitfalls inherent in achieving a terminal settlement consistent with our basic objective. Those of us who lived through the Korean experience are deeply impressed with the danger of another Panmunjom kind of negotiation. We need to read and reread the history of this conference to understand the mistakes we must avoid in South Vietnam.

In Korea we sat at the conference table for two years with our troops on the defensive because of the feeling that peace must be just around the corner since negotiations had begun. In this period American forces suffered some 46,000 casualties and our allies about 150,000 casualties in attacks initiated at the time and place chosen by the Communist enemy. We must not allow a Panmunjom to occur again.

The lesson derived from that experience is that Communists will negotiate expeditiously only if they are under continued pressure. Hence, in the case of Vietnam negotiations, we must not yield to the specious slogan: "Let's stop shooting and start talking." It will be essential to keep up the military pressure while we negotiate if we are to expect an acceptable settlement in any reasonable period of time.

To keep up the pressure and refuse to be discouraged calls for a patience which is a virtue often in short supply among us. It also calls for a better understanding of why we are doing certain things so differently from the past. The graduated use of military force, which has been an essential characteristic of our strategy, has compounded the difficulties of explaining to our people what we are doing and why it takes so long. They have been no easy ways to measure progress.

In the military operations there have been no fronts, no hills, no fortified lines to serve as objectives providing a measure of success. We have been forced to fall back upon statistics of uncertain reliability—estimates of enemy casualties, enemy infiltration, bomb damage in the North and the like—and have found that the resulting statistical curves are poor substitutes for Bunker Hill, Little Round Top or the Siegfried Line in explaining the situation to our people.

This difficulty to demonstrate progress in a convincing way has contributed to the feeling that this "is a war that can't be won." It adds to the seeming endlessness of our involvement which is antithetic to the impulsive American disposition. We are inclined to flare to quick anger, to wish to strike a sharp and decisive blow, then walk away from the prostrate villain. Unfortunately, this kind of Hollywood ending has not been forthcoming in the Vietnam conflict and the yearning for one can only contribute further to a defeatism which plays into the hands of the enemy and fosters the illusion in Hanoi that the United States will eventually quit.

Probably the most serious liability which we must offset is the illusion that the United States is deeply divided over Vietnam and, in the long run, will abandon its present policy. It is probably so deeply seated in Hanoi that mere statements from the American side are not likely to eradicate it. To bring conviction, our performance as a Government and as a people must clearly demonstrate that, in the words of President Johnson: "We will not be defeated. We will not grow tired. We will not withdraw either openly or under the cloak of a meaningless agreement." Until we set forth this fact in action, it is unlikely that we can reach a final settlement of this conflict.

After this balancing of assets and liabilities, I am impressed with the fact that the former far outweigh the latter and that the results achieved thus far attest to that fact. We are seeking a limited, attainable objective with vast resources available and many more still untouched. On the other hand, our opponents are pursuing what amounts to an unlimited objective—the imposition of a Communist government on the people of South Vietnam against the will of the vast majority.

Most South Vietnamese will resist this fate to the end, primarily because of the fear for their lot under Communist rule. They well know of the slaughter of tens of thousands of North Vietnamese in the period 1954–56 when Ho Chi Minh was consolidating his police state in the North—a fate they in the South might expect if Ho wins now. From the point of view of the South Vietnamese, this is total war.

Fortunately, to attain such an unlimited objective the assets and resources of the North are strictly limited and clearly inadequate. It is they who started a war which cannot be won, and it is their leaders—not ours—who should be meditating upon the inevitability of failure. Although they may cling to the hope for the collapse of our determination, events will, I think, prove it vain.

It would be hard for any serious student of American history to believe that the United States will fail to carry out its purpose with such preponderant strength and with such an impressive record of success since 1965 in overcoming formidable obstacles. The immediate stake in this conflict is the future of Southeast Asia and the worldwide credibility of the commitments of our Government. The outcome will determine the success or failure of the so-called "war of liberation" which Hanoi, Peking and Moscow have announced to be the favored technique for future Communist expansion. In such a contest for such stakes, as President Kennedy said in 1961: "We cannot stand aside." Having taken sides, this side can and must prevail.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA NEEDS CONGRESSIONAL REPRESENTATION

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. ANDERSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I heartily support the resolution which would amend the Constitution so as to assure the people of the District of voting representation in the House of Representatives and the Senate.

I often wonder what people in other countries think as they hear us proudly proclaim the cherished ideals of self-government while citizens residing at the very seat of the Nation's Capital are denied effective participation in their own Government. It is difficult, if not impossible, to defend such unequal treatment.

The fact is, moreover, as all of you know, that taxation without representation has always been alien to the American tradition. And true representation of necessity must include the power to vote in the legislative body which governs the affairs of the people.

The District has a population of about 800,000 residents, more than 11 States. Like other large cities, the District is compelled to grapple with its full share of pressing problems—crime in the streets, health, economic opportunity, housing, and others. Such problems could be dealt with far more effectively if the District were granted a voting representation in Congress.

This is an essential step to meaningful representation in the Congress for the residents of the District. It is a measure which deserves the overwhelming support of both parties.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I want to publicly commend the Honorable Stephen J. Pollak for the great work he has done in connection with the reorganization of the District of Columbia government and in advancing the cause to which I have addressed myself. As Presidential Adviser for National Capitol Affairs, Mr. Pollak has rendered incalculable service not only to the District of Columbia but to the Nation generally. I know of no one with greater ability, dedication, and soundness with the Federal service.

U.S. TRADE POLICY CHALLENGED

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, for 35 years the United States has pursued a trade policy based upon mutual advantage to the United States and to other nations of the free world. It is a policy which in recent years has had the vigorous support of Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson, and it is a policy which, beyond challenge has enured to the enormous benefits of American industry and labor and, indeed, to the dynamic growth of our entire U.S. economy.

This policy is now being challenged, Mr. Speaker, by some representatives of American business and labor who seek, through their spokesmen in the Congress, to substitute protectionism for the broader advantages and benefits of reciprocal trade.

Rather than promote the expansion of international commerce through the negotiation of mutually advantageous agreements to reduce trade barriers, protectionist spokesmen would have us return to the law of the jungle, except that in this economic jungle not even the strongest survive. Blind to the necessity of winning for American products a place in the foreign marketplace, these shortsighted spokesmen are asking Congress to destroy the agreements reached during the 4-year Kennedy round and to revert to the chaos of bygone years by imposing quotas, high tariffs, and other means of limiting imports.

We know from past experience that such action only begets retaliation. And reprisals will not be long in coming. Already, six member countries of GATT have submitted identical notes to the State Department complaining against protectionist tendencies which may compromise the results of the Kennedy round of trade negotiations. According to a news story of late last week—

> The European Community Commission, the independent executive Arm of the Common Market, has begun studying possible retaliatory measures. Reprisals by the Common Market, the world's largest trading unit and a major American market, could wipe out many of the tariff cuts accepted last June.

Mr. Speaker, let us take a moment to review. Five years ago the Congress passed the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, replacing the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, and gave the President a 5-year authority, until July 1, 1967, to cut tariffs generally by 50 percent, to eliminate tariffs on categories of goods of which the United States and the European Economic Community, governing body of the Common Market, accounted for 80 percent of free world trade, and to eliminate tariffs on goods currently dutiable at 5 percent or less on certain noncompetitive agricultural and forest products. This led to the so-called Kennedy round of multilateral trade negotiations, the sixth round of trade negotiations under the auspices of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—GATT.

In terms of the number of participating nations, the amount of trade involved, and the scope and depth of trade liberalization, it was by far the greatest achievement in the series of negotiations in the 20-year history of the GATT.

As a result of the Kennedy round, tariff concessions were exchanged covering about $40 billion of trade. The United States granted tariff concessions on $8.5 billion of its imports. It made tariff reductions on $7.9 billion, or on 64 percent of U.S. dutiable imports from all sources, including both participants and nonparticipants in these negotiations. In addition, the United States bound existing rates of duty on $150 million, and bound the existing duty-free treatment on about $400 million of imports.

Of the total of $8.5 billion, almost $700 million were imports from developing countries which participated in the negotiations and about $500 million were imports from nonparticipants.

Concessions by the United States to other major participants—Canada, the European Economic Community, the United Kingdom, Austria, Denmark, Sweden, Switzerland, and Japan—covered $6.7 billion of U.S. imports, these concessions consisting of $6.4 billion of duty reductions or eliminations, $89 million of bound or existing rates, and $240 million of duty-free bindings.

Tariff concessions made by all participants other than the United States covered a total of about $32 billion of their imports, including $8.1 billion of imports from the United States. Other major participants—listed above—made tariff concessions of all kinds totaling about $30 billion, including $7.6 billion of imports from the United States. These countries reduced or eliminated duties on $6.7 billion of imports from the United States and bound existing rates on $68 million and existing duty-free treatment on $845 million of U.S. imports.

Mr. Speaker, spokesmen for protectionist-oriented industries would have us believe that U.S. negotiators were outflanked, outplayed, and outwitted by their counterparts during the Kennedy round of negotiations. This manifestly is contrary to fact. What they see is an opportunity to advance their individual advantage by bringing pressure on the Congress at a time when there is restiveness in the business community, concern over a tax increase and anxiety over the demands being placed upon our competitive economy. I would hope and most respectfully urge, Mr. Speaker, that this Congress will have the good sense and wisdom to consider most carefully these proposals which would reverse U.S. policy and posture. Our responsibility, after all, is to the total business community, both now and in the years ahead, and, beyond that, to the economic well-being and viability of the free world, which looks to us for enlightened guidance and leadership.

REASON PREVAILS

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial is worthy of our attention:

[From the Malden Evening News and Medford Daily Mercury]

Reason Prevails

There now exists a fair chance that $339 million of taxpayers' money will not be spent on the proposed government owned Dickey-Lincoln School hydroelectric project in northern Maine. Evidently the Congress, having second thoughts, viewed this dubious undertaking as both impractical and unnecessary although the Senate has taken a different view and the matter of initial funds will probably go to a conference.

By its recent action in deleting $1.6 million of preliminary planning money for Dickey-Lincoln School from the $4.6 billion omnibus public works bill, the House of Representatives demonstrated a competent awareness of the realities of electric power supply in New England.

First, this proposed Federal hydroelectric project would cost at least $284 million without the transmission facilities and interest during construction. Secondly, adding the cost escalation of labor and materials at a modest annual rate of four per cent, it would increase the total cost by $55 million over the six-and-one-half year period of construction, making a cost of $339 million. In addition, the cost of high voltage transmission lines to bring the power some 400 miles to load centers would be another $80 million plus a four per cent escalation of this construction, plus the interest during construction to bring the grand total to nearly a half million dollars.

Now what would the taxpayer be getting for this huge sum of money?

He would get a project that would produce one per cent of New England's combined electric power requirements.

He would get a project that would be technologically obsolete before it was finished. Atomic power and pumped storage generation are now a practical reality.

He would get a project that would have no genuine effect on the cost of electric power in New England.

The electric utility industry in New England, through its regionally coordinated construction program known as the "Big 11 Powerloop," is today building electric generation facilities and transmission lines to meet this area's growing requirements for low cost electric power. The one-and-one-half billion dollars being used to carry this program is tax-producing investor capital that will contribute to federal, state and local treasuries, not money from the taxpayers' already well-used pocket.

The Dickey-Lincoln School project remains as always highly debatable.

LIBRARY SERVICES AND CONSTRUCTION ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. William D. Ford] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my pleasure and gratification on the passage by the House yesterday of H.R. 13048, the Library Services and Construction Act amendments.

As one of the cosponsors of this legislation, I am deeply aware of its importance to library systems throughout the Nation. Of particular significance are sections which extend for 1 year the period during which the Federal Government will continue to provide 100 percent of the cost of certain programs.

These programs include interlibrary cooperation, institutional library services, and services for the physically handicapped.

Other sections of the amendments provide for technical corrections which are vital for proper implementation of the act.

The entire library services program has far exceeded even the most enthusiastic predictions of success. Its impact has been truly astonishing. Its accomplishments in the past decade include:

Seventy-five million people received new or improved public library service.

Thirteen million people received public library service for the first time.

Twenty-seven million books and related materials were purchased with Federal, State, and local funds and added to local library collections.

Five hundred and fifty bookmobiles have been placed in operation across the country, primarily giving library service to rural areas.

Two thousand eight hundred persons have been employed in our States and localities to carry out the program of library services and construction.

Seven hundred and nineteen public library construction projects have been approved, to serve 23 million people.

One hundred million dollars in Federal funds for public library services in the States has been matched with $321 million in State and local funds.

Sixty million dollars in Federal funds for public library construction has been matched with $130 million in State and local funds.

With such a list of accomplishments, it is not difficult to see why I am so pleased at the passage of H.R. 13048, which will make it possible for our Nation's libraries to continue this outstanding progress. I commend my colleagues for this farsighted action.

SECRETARY FOWLER CITES PERSUASIVE EVIDENCE TO SHOW NEED FOR ADMINISTRATION'S TAX PROPOSAL

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Multer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, in a speech at the National Press Club last month, Secretary of the Treasury Henry Fowler set the record straight on the need for a tax increase this year.

In view of all the nonsense we are hearing from our Republican colleagues on this matter, I think it would be worthwhile to remind ourselves what the Secretary said.

His persuasive arguments in favor of this proposal demolishes the Republican position of do nothing and the need for an increase will go away.

This is irresponsible politics. And the Republicans know it. But they are trying to hide the fact, as the Secretary noted, that a vote against the tax increase "is a vote for the biggest budget deficit for any fiscal year since World War II."

America needs this 10-percent tax surcharge and it needs it now. We can delay no longer. And those Republicans who have raised phony issues to cloud their opposition to this tax must realize that they are endangering the economic wellbeing of the Nation.

For as the Secretary said:

> A vote against the tax increase is a vote to keep the heaviest foot since World War II on the Nation's economic accelerator at a time when it has already rebounded to a safe cruising speed.
>
> A vote against the tax increase—

He continued—

> is to risk throwing away an economic expansion which in November will reach its 80th month and become the longest and most rewarding period of sustained growth in the Nation's history.

The case is clearly in favor of a tax increase.

And time is running out for the Congress to act.

I think every Member of this Congress should carefully review Secretary Fowler's speech on the reasons for a 10-percent tax surcharge.

Mr. Fowler's excellent statement on the urgent need for prompt enactment of the administration's tax proposals follows:

Remarks by the Honorable Henry H. Fowler, Secretary of the Treasury, at a National Press Club Luncheon, Washington, D.C., September 21, 1967

The moment of truth is approaching for the Congress and the nation. In that moment the Congress will decide the foremost financial and economic policy issue of the year and, perhaps, many years. That question is whether Congress will enact the President's proposals for a 10 percent surcharge on existing income taxes and join with him in reducing planned Federal expenditures and avoiding some contingent increases.

If I don't register any other point, let us be clear that this proposed tax would not be 10 percent of your income, but 10 percent of your tax—a tax on a tax—equal to about 1 cent out of every dollar of your income.

It is the height of presumption for a downtown bureaucrat, who has never run for office, to give unsolicited advice to members of Congress on politics and taxes. Besides, I've heard how high the mail is running against a tax increase. So, I would confine my comments to what is good for the country. However, if you change the tense of the remarks that follow concerning a vote against the tax increase they might be what a hypothetical opposition candidate might say next summer or fall about a vote this fall against the tax increase by an incumbent—particularly if the tax increase failed to pass.

A vote against the tax increase proposals is a vote for the biggest budget deficit for any fiscal year since World War II.

A vote against the tax increase is a vote to keep the heaviest foot since World War II on the nation's economic accelerator at a time when it has already rebounded to a safe cruising speed.

A vote against the tax increase is to risk throwing away an economic expansion which in November will reach its 80th month and become the longest and most rewarding period of sustained growth in the nation's history.

A vote against the tax increase is a vote for a resumption of the old boom and bust cycle that every American over twenty-one can remember with sadness, bitterness and apprehension.

A vote against the tax increase is a vote for a return to the excessive and unsustainable boom followed inevitably by the recession years like 1954 and 1958 when over a million jobs a year disappeared in sharp contrast to the years beginning with 1962 when every year more than a million new civilian jobs were created.

A vote against the tax increase is a vote for an overheated economy and spiraling inflation.

A vote *against* the tax increase that would temporarily take away on the average of 1 percent of the income of the individual taxpayers of America until June 30, 1969 is a vote *for* an inflation that will diminish the real income of these same individual taxpayers a number of percentage points a year for many years and unjustly place the cruelest tax of all—spiraling inflation—on the tens of millions of our low income families who pay no taxes or are exempt from the proposed surcharge.

A vote against the tax increase is particularly a vote to levy that cruel and unjust depreciation of income on those who are elderly and retired and must live on a fixed income with the prospect of increased earnings no longer a compensating factor.

A vote against the tax increase is a vote for sky-high interest rates and tight money for all borrowers that will be the consequence of the overcrowding of already crowded credit markets by government borrowings to meet the deficit.

A vote against the tax increase is a vote to bring demand into balance with supply by making credit unavailable to some which will bring depression once again to the housing industry, make credit less available to the small businessman and State and local borrowers, and leave the would-be home buyer out in the cold.

A vote against the tax increase is a vote for increased hardship for the young and the poor, whether in ghettos or outside of them, because they will bear the brunt of increased costs of the bare needs of living, the lack of adequate housing and the eventual loss of opportunity that can only come from a steadily growing economy that creates a million to a million and a half civilian jobs each year.

A vote against the tax increase is to strike a hard blow at our national competitive strength and our favorable balance of trade. If they are undermined by flooding imports to meet excessive demand and diminished exports because of price and supply problems, it will endanger the dollar and the international financial stability and progress which depend on it. It will diminish the ability of our country to play its historic and crucial part in Free World security and development.

These views reflect far more than my judgment. They embody the opinions of the President and Vice President, the Council of Economic Advisers, the Director of the Budget, the entire Cabinet, and the entire Federal Reserve Board. But this point of view goes far beyond those in the Executive Branch of the Federal Government concerned with public economic and financial policy. It embraces the leaders of the private sector.

In recent weeks a singular near unanimity has emerged among many of the nation's foremost businessmen and labor leaders, economists (both academic and in business), industrialists, bankers and financial leaders in recommending a tax increase. All of them, subjectively at least, have the normal human aversion to paying increased taxes. Objectively, however, and after appraisal of the unacceptable alternatives, they support the President's recommendations—in substance, if not in each detail.

This consensus in favor of a tax increase is spread among responsible leaders throughout the country. It takes a sense of true responsibility for an industrialist, who is responsible to his stockholders, to recommend greater taxes. The labor leader, elected by the members of his union to represent their best interests, must show a similar sense of wise fortitude. The professional economist, who is paid to be right more often than he is wrong, evaluates the economic climate most carefully before he goes down the line for a tax increase. In a way, all of these have as much to lose from making a wrong judgment on this question as a member of Congress.

Let me recite a few expressions of this growing consensus for a tax increase:

In early August, Henry Ford was joined by other well-known members of the business community in supporting a tax increase. He simply said that "higher tax revenues are necessary to help control inflation".

George Meany, President of the AFL–CIO, told the House Ways and Means Committee that organized labor backs higher taxes under the current circumstances in both principle and practice.

Another group of twenty-four leading businessmen, headed by Howard Boyd, Chairman of the Board of El Pasco Natural Gas Company, told the House Ways and Means Committee that "we believe a tax increase, together with the restriction of non-essential government spending, is vitally necessary to the continued economic health and well being of the Nation." Those joining Mr. Boyd included J. Peter Grace, President of W. R. Grace and Co.; Edgar F. Kaiser, President of Kaiser Industries Corporation, and James A. Linen, President of Time, Inc.

Leading business and financial organizations, reflecting their intimate knowledge of money and credit conditions and the economic outlook, unanimously supported the call for a tax increase and reduced expenditures. These included the Committee for Economic Development, the National Association of Manufacturers, the American Bankers Association, the U.S. Savings and Loan League, the Investment Bankers Association, the Life Insurance Association of America, the National Association of Home Builders, and the National League of Insured Savings Associations.

A group of 260 academic economists signed a statement circulated by Walter Heller, former Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers; tax expert Joseph A. Pechman of the Brookings Institution, and George L. Bach of Stanford University. They stated to the House Ways and Means Committee, in part: "We urge early enactment of tax legislation along the general lines proposed by President Johnson." While not necessarily agreeing on the timing and the amount of the increase, the group said the increase is needed "to maintain orderly growth, prevent a resurgence of inflation, and forestall excessive reliance on tight money".

Lined up in favor of the tax increase is every man who served as Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers under Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson—Dr. Arthur Burns, Dr. Raymond Saulnier, Dr. Walter Heller—and such outstanding and experienced former members of that body as Dr. Paul McCracken, Dr. Kermit Gordon, Dr. Otto Eckstein, and Dr. Robert Turner.

In a letter submitted to the House Ways and Means Committee since the Labor Day recess, William H. Chartener, Vice President of the National Association of Business Economists, said a poll of the group revealed that three out of four economists employed by major U. S. business firms favor an increase in income tax rates immediately or in the near future.

Those supporting the tax increase include former Secretary of the Treasury, Douglas Dillon, and the former Under Secretary for Monetary Affairs, Robert Roosa. At the time these gentlemen, and Stuart T. Saunders, Chairman of the Pennsylvania Railroad, and Walter Wriston, President of the First National City Bank of New York, appeared before the House Ways and Means Committee, Mr. Saunders presented to the Committee a statement supporting the tax increase and the control and reduction in Federal expenditures that was signed by 445 of the nation's leading industrialists and banking and financial leaders. The statement said: "The combined result of the tax increase and expenditure reductions should hold the deficit to manageable proportions. These steps are necessary to prevent a deficit so large that it could lead to dangerous inflation, spiraling interest rates, tight money, and a serious weakening in our balance of payments position."

And the next day William McChesney Martin, Jr., Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, told the Committee: "We have already clear and compelling evidence of a resurgence in inflationary pressures, which, if unchecked, would curtail our domestic expansion, aggravate an already serious balance-of-payments problem, and bring severe strains in the markets for credit, particularly the mortgage market . . . Accordingly, I favor prompt enactment of the tax program proposed by the President."

In last Sunday's *New York Times* news analysis there was this observation:

"The experts—economists, businessmen, financiers, union leaders—agree to a remarkable extent that a tax increase is needed this year to stop inflation and a rapid rise in interest rates that could seriously damage many areas of the economy. The near-unanimity of those who have educational and professional qualifications to speak out on economic issues was, beyond question, the most dramatic and startling aspect of the hearings on President Johnson's proposed 10 percent tax surcharge that came to a close last week in the House Ways and Means Committee. That those who were heard by the committee constituted a truly representative cross-section of their various fields could not be doubted. The witness list was in no way stacked.

"Yet the number of those who opposed a tax increase could be counted on the fingers of one hand: the Chamber of Commerce of the United States (but not the National Association of Manufacturers), one prominent economist and a couple of businessmen."

Why did I stress at the outset of my remarks, in the tones and words of a political stump speaker, the fact that a Congressman who votes against the tax increase is practicing political Russian roulette?

Why do I outline the basis for a telling political appeal to people who think of themselves as consumers, the poor and untaxed, the elderly and those who live on fixed incomes, the businessman and the worker, those who would build a home, by anyone who would run next year in primary or general elections against a member of the House who votes against the tax increase?

It is because representative government may face a breakdown. There is considerable danger that many of the people's elected representatives in the Congress may accede to wholly normal but uninformed taxpayer reaction and vote against the tax increase. There is a risk that the House of Representatives will not lead public and voter opinion to the almost uniform judgment of those in both public and private life who are experts in the way our economy works.

For this is not the simple issue of voting to increase taxes to pay for some desired objective, as we face it at the State and local level. No one is per se for increasing taxes. Voters who reflect the taxpayer syndrome will naturally react against an increase. There are few who feel passionately with Justice Holmes that "Taxes are what we pay for civilized society."

Indeed, this Secretary of the Treasury, who had fought for three significant reductions in Federal taxes in the last five years which are saving taxpayers $24.2 billion this year, recommended to the President this tax increase for only one reason and with great reluctance.

And the President recommended it to the Congress for only one reason and with great reluctance.

It was because the alternative—an economy in shambles—with incalculable damage to the individuals and efforts that depend on it—was far more unhappy.

One who is importantly involved in this issue remarked recently that old age was very unwelcome, but the alternative is worse.

So it is with this tax increase.

As of this hour, this date it may be politically realistic for a member of Congress to state, and with perfect honesty, that "my mail is running heavily against this tax increase" and, consequently, "I don't propose to vote for it."

My first plea would be that he put the welfare of his country ahead of his own personal interests. But I wouldn't stop there.

Let him look ahead to next fall. Let him look at what may well turn into a voter backlash with painful political consequences if he reads only his current mail and ignores the economic indicators.

Let him remember that, however unwelcome to Americans as taxpayers, the President's program is in the best interest of those same Americans—as consumers who want prices to be as stable as possible consistent with reasonably full employment and a healthy rate of growth—as wage and salary earners who have or seek jobs—as businessmen whose life blood is credit and steadily expanding demand from confident customers—as home buyers, farmers and small businessmen to whom ever higher interest rates, tight money and increased costs are far more cruel than taxes—as poor elderly or living on a fixed income to whom a spiral of inflation is ruinous—as fighting men who dream of returning some day to a job and a home.

If the President's program is rejected—with the economic consequences that those most familiar with the economy fear and predict with near unanimity—then the members of Congress who voted against the tax increase, regardless of their reasons, are likely to find a large share of the responsibility placed on their doorstep by all of their constituents—not just a few who responded as natural, normal Americans by writing a letter to their Congressmen objecting to increased taxes.

To illustrate, let us consider the alternative from the consumer point of view of a tax increase versus no tax increase for the people of America, including both the 125 million men, women, and children who are taxpayers or members of taxpaying families, who would be asked to give up an average of 1 percent of their income for the surcharge, *and* the 75 million men, women and children who would not be touched at all by the surcharge either because of the low income exemption from the surcharge or because no tax is paid by them or their families under present law.

As a benchmark, over the first two years of the Korean War prices rose at an annual rate of 5½ percent. This is 3 percentage points *more* than the 2½ percent rise that might be expected with the surcharge.

Let us consider the impact on all of us of an *additional* rise of 3 percent in consumer prices which, using the Korean experience as a guiding benchmark, might result in the absence of the surcharge.

The figures are both shocking and very instructive. A single individual with $900 of money income would pay no surcharge; he would be exempt. But a 3 percent additional rise in prices would actually decrease the real income of this individual 4 percent since such a person typically must spend more than his meager income on current living, making up the difference by going into debt or drawing down on savings. This would be equivalent to a 4 percent tax on his income.

For the single individual living on $5,000, the surcharge would impose a tax of $33, equal to 1.3 percent of his income. The burden of the additional 3 percent rise in prices would amount to $144, equal to 2.8 percent of his income—a smaller relative burden than for the individual with $900 income, but still be above the burden of the surcharge. At the $20,000 income level the surcharge burden would rise in relative terms to 2.5 percent of income and amount to $492, while the additional 3 percent rise in prices would amount to $540.

Turning to a family of four we again see the same unjust pattern of the burden distribution of inflation compared to the surcharge. At $2,500 and at $5,000 of family income no surcharge is paid. In contrast, the burden of the additional price rise is equal to $82 or 3⅓ percent of income at $2,500, and $147 or 3.1 percent at $5,000.

At $10,000 of family income, the surcharge would amount to $111 or 1.1 percent of income. The burden of the 3 percent price rise would be $285 or 2.9 percent. This is substantially higher than the surcharge but less in relation to income than the burden on lower incomes.

Some individuals and families in each of these ranges will, of course, experience a rise in incomes when prices rise. These people would not be hurt as much by inflation as would others whose incomes are fixed, but in the end everyone loses. While the surcharge exempts entirely the low income families and individuals, the price rise would place its heaviest relative burden on families and individuals in the lowest income ranges.

But the overall result of a 3 percent additional price rise would be to diminish the real income of the overwhelming majority of the American people far more than the average loss of 1 percent flowing from the tax increase.

Does that make a vote against the increased tax reflect the right measure of the political risks?

But there are others who place their opposition to the tax increase on higher ground than mail from home. Let us turn to them.

Some of the reluctance to support a tax increase wholeheartedly and see it move along promptly through the legislative process comes from those in Congress and out who believe that a balanced program of fiscal restraint, including both tax increases and reductions in Federal expenditures, is necessary and desirable. Many of those who stress the importance of reducing Federal expenditures along with any tax increase share the point of view expressed in my comments concerning the danger to the economy from operating the government on the very large deficit in the current and prospective economic environment.

During the course of this week the members of the House Ways and Means Committee are beginning their closed door deliberations on the tax increase. Many members of this determinative body have no secret of their concern that adequate treatment of the problem of reducing expenditures be geared by Congress and the Administration.

There is no disagreement in principle between the President and his Administration and the members of the Ways and Means Committee or the Congress on the substantive importance of coupling expenditure reductions with tax increases, while minimizing and avoiding any contingent increases in expenditures that are not now definitely provided for in law and appropriations.

The President in his Tax Message of August 3, 1967 pledged to the country and the Congress that he will make every possible expenditure reduction—civilian and military—in the Budget submitted last January, short of jeopardizing the nation's security and well-being.

He outlined a procedure for effecting these expenditure reductions, stating that as Congress completes each appropriation bill affecting Fiscal 1968 expenditures, "we will examine at once, *very, very* carefully" the results of those actions, and determine where, how, and by how much expenditures under these appropriations can be reduced. He also, at the same time, announced that he was directing each Department and Agency head to review every one of his programs, to identify reductions which can be made, and to report to the Director of the Budget in detail on the actions he is taking to put those reductions into effect.

But he noted that action by the Executive Branch alone to reduce expenditures would not serve the purpose if every time the Executive Branch saves a dollar the Congress adds another dollar—or more—to the expenditures recommended in the January Budget by appropriation or legislation increasing expenditures outside of appropriations such as the Employee Pay Bill.

In every case in which the Congress has completed the appropriation bill for a Department or Agency affecting Fiscal 1968 expenditures this process has been followed. Appropriation bills covering the operations of the Treasury, Post Office and Interior Departments are the only ones completed to date. The heads of those Departments, pursuing an extensive review, are identifying the reductions that can be made over and beyond those resulting from Congressional appropriation action. They are taking steps to put into effect both the reductions in expenditures for Fiscal 1968 reflecting Congressional action and additional Executive action.

This sets a pattern for the procedure which will be followed for the remaining appropriation acts as soon as Congress sends them to the President.

Moreover, following the presentation of his Message the President met with every Democrat in the House and at least fifty Republicans and talked extensively about the problem of the deficit, the tax increase proposal, and the need to reduce expenditures—as well as take other action necessary to diminish the deficit.

In his statement to the House Ways and Means Committee on August 14, the Director of the Budget made clear that these cuts would bite into projected non-defense or civilian type expenditures. He said:

"We have begun a concerted effort to achieve every reduction and deferral which can reasonably be made in order to lower non-defense expenditures. We are determined to cut more than the $1.5 billion, which would offset the release of 1967 withheld funds and the uncontrollable increases in CCC, public assistance, and other outlays. Such a cut would bring civilian expenditures—exclusive of changes in participation sales and in the President's pay proposals—back to the $59.5 billion level estimated in the January budget. Our actual reduction target is larger than that—we are aiming at a cut of over $2 billion—as a means of holding civilian expenditures *below* the January estimate. Such an expenditure reduction would require cuts in obligational authority and program levels of some $4 billion. Whether we will be able to achieve our target fully, I cannot predict at this time. But we are setting our sights high in order to insure significant reductions, when the actual results are all in. The outcome will, of course, depend in part upon Congressional action on the budget, as well as our own efforts."

I am confident that the discussions being currently held in the Executive Session of the House Ways and Means Committee will produce an agreement which will give every member of Congress an opportunity to cooperate with the President in bringing the deficit in the 1968 Budget to manageable proportions by increasing taxes and reducing or holding down expenditures.

We cannot afford a failure or delay in acting affirmatively on the tax increase proposal because the procedures of the appropriation process and the administrative follow-up promised by the President have not yet supplied the detailed particulars of the reductions that will be forthcoming.

Everyone knows that after a Report by the House Ways and Means Committee and House action, there must be hearings by the Senate Finance Committee and debate under the Senate rules prior to Senate action. Everyone knows that during this period final action on appropriation bills by the Congress, putting the President in the position to make positive identification of the areas of expenditure reduction to be effected, will proceed in piecemeal fashion. Everyone knows that only when all of these actions have been completed and the Congressional decisions on appropriations and reductions in programs are finally taken can the President make the additional decisions on expenditures that may be necessary and supply the Congress and the nation with a bill of particulars identifying in orderly fashion the reductions in expenditures—military and civilian—in the context of up-to-date Budget totals. For the President to transmit to the Congress a new series of budget recommendations at this time would only serve to compound the delays in the appropriation process. Many of the appropriation bills already have been acted on by the House appropriation committee and subcommittees and passed by the House.

Everyone knows that there are various provisions in law or statements in the House Committee Report that could be devised to protect the position of the House in any final insistance its members may require on expenditure policy as a prerequisite to voting a tax increase. Moreover, final House action on the Conference Report that is usually required on revenue bills to settle differences between the Senate and House versions—which is some weeks away—would provide an opportunity to affect the bill if appropriate expenditure control has not been manifest in the interim. It is not necessary now to hold up the processing of the tax measure until the passage of the appropriation bills and the President's action on expenditure reductions are complete.

Therefore, the appropriate and statesmanlike method of dealing with this problem in the national interest is for the House Ways and Means Committee and the House to proceed promptly to dispose of the tax proposals. They can proceed on the basis of either the earlier pledges and commitments by the Administration to do its share in this area of joint responsibility or such further statements or provisions in the Report and in the law as will assure a reasonable combination of tax increase and expenditure control.

There have been many other statements on Capitol Hill that for reasons of equity and justice loopholes in our existing tax laws should be closed before, or coincident with, enactment of any tax increase.

It does not require a superior memory to recall the time—and tedious work—necessary to move a tax reform measure through the Congress.

My predecessor, former Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon, emphasized this fact in recent testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. Dillon agreed, as do we, that further study and action in the area of tax reform are needed, but added:

"As a result of experience we had and the estimates we were able to develop at the Treasury it is very clear that any of these loophole closings that are at all possible and advisable—even adding them all together—have a very small effect, as far as overall revenues, on the economy. . . .

"We were developing in 1963 what came as the 1964 tax cut. We were trying to develop possible sources of revenue through loophole closings that would enable us to have as large as possible a reduction in the overall tax rates and we just were not able to find areas that would be tremendously significant.

"Some of these were enacted and . . . a number of them were not accepted for very good reasons by the Congress, and I think that this clearly holds. You might if you work very hard save a billion dollars . . . through very hard work, very difficult work, upsetting people . . . but it would have very little effect as compared to the $6 or $7 billion we are talking about here. . . .

"So loophole closing, while I think it is primarily a moral issue, and that doesn't mean it isn't important . . . does not have the economic impact and therefore can't be considered at all an economic substitute for the tax increase."

Our position, in terms of priorities, is simply to put the imperative needs of the Nation first.

Loophole closing at the best is a long process. The 1962 and the 1964 tax acts, which included reforms, required 15 to 17 months for Congressional approval.

We have stated, and we repeat, that tax reform proposals for permanent revision of the laws are under intensive preparation in the Treasury. The President has promised that tax reform proposals will be forwarded to the Congress at this session for the deliberate study, debate, and action they require during the session next year.

In conclusion, the alternatives to prompt and positive action to increase taxes in line with the President's proposals are clearly unacceptable.

Our role in world leadership and the solution of our pressing problems at home depend on a healthy economy, growing at a robust and sustainable rate, characterized by both reasonably full employment and relative price stability. The program of temporary fiscal restraint proposed by the President is necessary for the preservation of this healthy balanced economy.

The Congress of the United States, controlling the purse strings of government under Constitutional authority granted to it, has voted and appropriated for the expenditure of every dollar that enters into the 1968 Budget—whether it be for the discharge of our commitment in Southeast Asia, the treatment of some of the ills and inadequacies of our society at home, or the maintenance of Federal services in a growing and rapidly expanding population. Congress has the responsibility to see to it that the nation's bills, which it authorized, are paid from taxes collected or money borrowed in a mix and manner designed to keep the economy healthy and well balanced.

The consensus among the vast majority of knowledgeable and responsible leaders in economic and financial circles, public and private, is remarkably undivided in recommending prompt action in increasing taxes, combined with strict expenditure control, as indispensable steps in preserving that kind of an economy. Our economic course is clear. Only an act of political will remains.

I have every confidence that the Congress will discharge its responsibility by increasing taxes temporarily for the duration of the conflict in Vietnam while it and the President strive, in the words of the President "to make every possible reduction, civilian and military, short of jeopardizing the nation's security and well-being."

PUBLIC OPINION POLL SHOWS PEOPLE STRONGLY AGAINST CESSATION OF BOMBING NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, those persons in and out of Congress who are advocating that we immediately cease the bombing of North Vietnam may be interested in the outcome of a poll conducted by WFIL, Philadelphia. Eleven television stations in nine States, and in cities across the Nation, participated. Some 50,000 viewers responded. The vote was: Yes, 40 percent; no, 60 percent.

The manner in which the poll was conducted and the result in each city has been supplied to me by Mr. George A. Koehler, station manager, WFIL-TV. It is as follows:

ELEVEN-STATION PUBLIC OPINION POLL

Each station, on its early evening newscast, asked viewers the same question:

"Do you think we should immediately stop bombing North Vietnam?"

Viewers in each area were instructed to dial a stated telephone number if they wished to vote "Yes" and a different number to vote "No." Each station compiled results which were expressed in terms of percentages for "Yes" and "No" responses. Each local station then phoned its results to WFIL-TV which tabulated them to arrive at a national consensus.

The breakdown is as follows:

	Percent
KOB-TV, Albuquerque, N. Mex.:	
Yes	43
No	57
WMAR-TV, Baltimore, Md.:	
Yes	42
No	58
WZZM-TV, Grand Rapids, Mich.:	
Yes	33
No	67
WLBW-TV, Miami, Fla.:	
Yes	39
No	61
WVUE, New Orleans:	
Yes	41
No	59
WFTV-TV, Orlando, Fla.:	
Yes	19
No	81
WIIC-TV, Pittsburgh, Pa.:	
Yes	40
No	60
WFIL-TV, Philadelphia, Pa.:	
Yes	45
No	55
KCPX-TV, Salt Lake City, Utah:	
Yes	40
No	60
KSTP-TV, St. Paul, Minn.:	
Yes	38
No	62
WNDU-TV, South Bend, Ind.:	
Yes	31
No	69

The national results were relayed by WFIL-TV to the local stations which announced them on their late evening newscasts.

THANK YOU, RED SOX: THEY WILL "GO" AGAIN

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Boston Red Sox American League pennant-winning team lost the world's series at home in Fenway Park with sportsmanship and dignity in the seventh and final game, but Manager Dick Williams and members of the team have won the gratitude and esteem of all in New England.

The St. Louis Cardinals are to be congratulated for winning the world series, but, as sports columnist Sam Pompei so aptly and correctly wrote in the Springfield, Mass., Daily News last Friday:

> The Red Sox will go into history as one of the most loved series losers.

Mr. Speaker, the newspapers throughout Massachusetts and New England have editorially commended the Boston Red Sox for their fine performance this year. I include two of these editorials from the Springfield, Mass., Union and the Boston Herald Traveler of October 13, and Sam Pompei's "On the Sports Beat" column from the Springfield Daily News, with my remarks at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Union, Oct. 13, 1967]

THE SOX WILL "GO" AGAIN

There's nothing so final, they say, as the third out in the ninth. Yesterday the finis was written even sooner. But it was still one of the great Series, considering the vast segment of fandom that doubted Boston would get into it in the first place and then doubted it would run anywhere near seven games.

The Sox didn't let us down. They gave New England the kind of thrill that hasn't been felt since the Boston Tea Party. This isn't the team of two decades ago—of Williams (Ted, not Dick) and Parnell and Kinder and Doerr and Dom DiMag. That team was supposed to win. This year's Sox had to hold themselves up; reputation wouldn't do it for them. For now, thanks for the fun and excitement. For the future, save those "Go, Red Sox" stickers. There'll be more use for them.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Herald Traveler, Oct. 13, 1967]

BITTERSWEET

From midsummer on it had the quality of a dream—indeed, the glittering, mythical, rags-to-riches American dream. Thursday at Fenway Park, under autumn's lowering skies, reality reasserted itself. The taste was bittersweet. One could wish for what-might-have-been—a final triumph against odds, one last come-from-behind against a worthy team, a one-year odyssey from ninth place to the world championship. Yet the outcome did not diminish the accomplishment of the 1967 Red Sox. Rather, it gave it perspective. We see now it was no dream but real, not destiny, not sheer luck, but a singular human achievement.

The emphasis is on human. What a human aggregation were the Red Sox of '67. Barely more than kids, from many backgrounds and scattered places, gathered in supposedly staid old Boston, in a modest ball park haunted by memories only occasionally pleasant, their names on the roster reading like an FDA-required label of contents on the American melting pot, fighting collectively and individually against odds and the human problems of youth's uncertainty, inexperience, the frustration of not being taken seriously—even, in one memorable case, against the very human problem of overweight. What resulted was a human relationship—a community and a team.

No one really gave them a chance at the start of the season, and when only a few days remained the chance was still conceded almost disbelievingly, though they had long since won respect—their own and others'. In the end, the pennant was theirs, and their transformation was complete, and so was Boston's. Victory in the World Series would have been an act of supererogation.

No computer could have coped with the Red Sox of '67. There, perhaps, is the secret. Manager Dick Williams disdained the computer approach. He was no slave of percentages, no worshipper of the record book, no believer that the tested way is necessarily the best way. Some said he managed by hunches. In truth, of course, he managed by intuition, recognizing instinctively that the immeasurable factors of challenge, inspiration, surprise, even anger can produce measurable human achievement.

The bittersweet taste will linger as autumn fades, winter comes, and then suddenly one day the sports reports are datelined "Winter Haven, Florida," and carry news of these young men and others, new ones, eager for human exploits. There can be value in the fact that not everything was gained in one year. Something remains to be sought, and therein lies the nucleus for a new dream that can be made real by human effort.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Daily News, Oct. 13, 1967]

RED SOX: THANKS FOR GREAT SEASON

(By Sam Pompei)

Thank you Red Sox!

Thank you for making this the most exciting year in New England sports history.

You lost the seventh game of the World Series to the St. Louis Cardinals, but you'll go into history as one of the most loved series losers.

But, thank you, for all the great excitement you created for us. You kept us all talking, guessing, bragging and, oh yes, sometimes moaning and crying in our beer.

Thank you for not letting us down in the pennant race and beating Minnesota on the final day of the season to keep our dreams and hopes alive.

You gave a thrill a day, sometimes two, three and even four!

When we panned you and said the Red Sox were "dead," you started breathing again, breathing new hope for us skeptical souls, too.

You proved to the world that a baseball team need not be made up of super-stars, that nine determined players on the field at one time working together can conquer all.

Thank you for proving that a 100-1 shot can win a championship if it has the will, something no other team in history could accomplish.

Thank you for all the enjoyable days and evenings you gave us. When we couldn't come to Fenway to see you perform your miracles, we listened to you on the radio and watched you on television.

You had us so keyed up that you made us put our troubles away—until tomorrow.

Thank you for showing all the Little Leaguers and sandlotters across America that the ordinary players—the Jerry Adairs, the Reggie Smiths, the Mike Andrews, and the Joe Foys can play championship baseball.

Thank you for producing one of the most exciting and most talented baseball players of our day in Carl Yastrzemski.

Thank you, too, for producing one of baseball's most astute geniuses in Manager Dick Williams, a man who knew what had to be done to turn out a championship and a man who had guts enough to go out and do it.

A man who was willing to take a ninth place collection of ballplayers and turn them in to a "team"—a championship team, at that.

The St. Louis Cardinals won the World Series and they are to be congratulated.

They go into the record book as the world's champions, but you, the Red Sox, will go into history as the team that did the most with the least.

Thank you Red Sox!

CONGRESSMAN SILVIO O. CONTE HONORED BY ITALIAN-AMERICAN CHARITABLE SOCIETY OF MASSACHUSETTS WITH 1967 COLUMBUS DAY GOLD MEDAL AWARD

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Boland] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, members and guests of the Italian-American Charitable Society of Massachusetts gathered in Boston on the eve of Columbus Day last week to pay tribute to our distinguished colleague from Massachusetts, Congressman Silvio O. Conte.

The Italian-American Charitable Society, founded many years ago, held their Columbus Day Eve Annual Gold Medal Award dinner in Boston's Statler Hilton Hotel. Each year the society honors an individual of Italian ancestry for his outstanding accomplishments in his field of endeavor. Congressman Conte was awarded the coveted gold medal for his many accomplishments during his 17 years of public service.

Congressman Conte was presented a Gold Medal and a citation which was inscribed with this message:

Presented to Silvio O. Conte—Legislator by the Italian-American Charitable Society, Inc.

To this man, whose efforts on behalf of the underprivileged and the less fortunate have merited the respect and esteem of his fellowman.

To this citizen whose concern for all men transcends consideration of national origin, race or color, and has made him the defender of minority groups.

To this legislator, inspired and courageous, whose interest in the welfare of our country has been demonstrated by his support of bills to improve education and liberalize archaic laws.

We Americans of his same racial strain, proud of his accomplishments and of his benefactions to man and country, affectionately awarded to him our Gold Medal in token of our esteem.

Mr. Speaker, more than 600 persons from throughout the Commonwealth of Massachusetts attended the dinner to pay tribute to Congressman Conte, who received messages of good wishes and congratulations from many of his colleagues in the Congress, including yours, Mr. Speaker, and from House Minority Leader Gerald Ford of Michigan, Senator Edward M. Kennedy of Massachusetts, Senator John O. Pastore of Rhode Island, and from me.

Most notable among the felicitations received by Congressman Conte was the message from the President of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson, which read as follows:

The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. Silvio O. Conte,
Care Jack Ricciardi, Italian-American Charitable Society of Boston, Statler Grand Ballroom, Boston, Mass.:

I am delighted to join with the members of the Italian-American Charitable Society of Boston as they honor you tonight. They could not have chosen a more qualified candidate for their award. You represent the finest traditions of Italy in America, and your contributions to this country's legislative history have won you the gratitude and admiration of citizens of all nationalities. As your president, I respect your good judgment and I wholeheartedly welcome your constructive advice as we seek to build a better life for those whose trust we share.

Lyndon B. Johnson.

Mr. Speaker, as a neighbor of Congressman Conte's who shares with him the honor of representing western Massachusetts here in the House of Representatives in Washington, I want to extend to him on behalf of all of his colleagues in the Congress our hearty congratulations on being selected for the 1967 Columbus Day Eve Annual Gold Medal Award by the Italian-American Charitable Society of Massachusetts. Also, I include with my remarks at this point in the Record the telegrams from Speaker McCormack, Minority Leader Ford, Senators Kennedy and Pastore, and from me, and the text of Congressman Conte's acceptance speech:

Washington, D.C.

Hon. Silvio Conte,
Italian-American Charitable Society Dinner, Boston, Mass.:

I regret my inability to be with you tonight to join with your many friends in honoring you as you receive the gold medal award from the Italian-American Charitable Society, I congratulate you on receiving this fine award, which you so richly deserve. America can well be proud of the many mixtures that make up the basis of America. Our citizens of Italian descent have contributed much to the history of our great country. Italo-Americans are prominent in every walk of life in American society and we are the richer for this. Your services in the Congress of the United States has been outstanding and you have always championed the cause of the people. Again, I congratulate you on the fine award that you are receiving this evening, and to all present my very best wishes.

John W. McCormack,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives.

Washington, D.C.

Hon. Silvio O. Conte,
Italian-American Charitable Society,
Grand Ballroom Statler-Hilton Hotel, Boston:

Congratulations on receiving the Italian-American Charitable Society goldmedal award. This is well deserved tribute to you for the wonderful contribution you have made to the welfare of our Italian American citizens. Wish I could be present but since this is not possible may I also express my gratitude in this way for the grand job you are doing in the House of Representatives and the aid and assistance you have given me since becoming minority leader. Thanks again and very best wishes.

Jerry Ford,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives.

Washington, D.C.

Jack Ricciardi,
President, Italian-American Charitable Society, Inc., Grand Ballroom, Statler-Hilton Hotel, Boston:

Please extend my warmest congratulations to my very good friend and colleague, Silvio, upon the presentation of the gold medal award by the Italian American Charitable Society. His outstanding contributions and dedication to our country make him more than deserving of this fine tribute from such a worthwhile organization. My very best wishes to you all.

Edward M. Kennedy,
U.S. Senator.

Mr. Jack Ricciardi,
President, Italian-American Charitable Society Dinner, Statler Hilton Hotel, Boston:

Your wonderful Society honors itself in its award to my good friend, the Honorable Silvio O. Conte, and I join in your tribute to this distinguished Congressman and ideal American.

John O. Pastore,
U.S. Senator.

October 11, 1967.

Mr. Jack Ricciardi,
Italian-American Charitable Society,
Boston, Mass.:

My congratulations to my friend and colleague, Congressman Silvio Conte, on receiving the gold medal award of the Italian American Charitable Society.

The society could not have made a better choice. He is an outstanding public official. His whole public service has been dedicated to the good of his community, his state and his Nation. Italians can be proud of him and so can all Americans.

Edward P. Boland,
Member of Congress.

Speech of Honorable Silvio O. Conte in Acceptance of Gold Medal Award of the Italian-American Charitable Society, Boston, Mass., October 11, 1967

I would first like to express my deep appreciation for the wonderful honor that has been bestowed on me tonight. The magnificent charitable accomplishments and contributions of the Italian-American Charitable Society are well known to everyone and it was truly a thrill for me to be chosen as the recipient of your annual Gold Medal award.

In glancing over the list of previous holders of the Gold Medal, which include our own distinguished Governor John Volpe, I could not but feel proud as well as humble to be associated with such a group of outstanding men. And while it is always enjoyable to receive awards, tonight's honor has special significance for me.

I am, as we all are, an American citizen first and foremost. But I am also as proud of and indebted to my Italian heritage and background as any man in this room tonight. We are all products of our past and mine has been deeply influenced by the cultural and spiritual attributes which have been passed down through generations of our Italian ancestors.

To be singled out for recognition therefore, by a group of people with similar backgrounds and similar experiences, constitutes for me a confirmation. It is a confirmation that I have been at least partially successful in attempting to live up to the high standards and goals that have been established for us by those who have come before. It is for this reason that I am especially proud to be here tonight.

We who share the heritage of Christopher Columbus, whose birthday occasions this annual event honor not only a bold navigator of Italian ancestry, but a man who risked life and fortune to prove a conviction he held about the world—one that might and did benefit all mankind.

As we look back upon his 33-day voyage into uncharted waters some 475 years ago, we cannot help but wish our times could generate a similar spirit of courage and faith in the face of adversity, and a similar perserverance on behalf of just and worthwhile causes.

Our country has achieved unexcelled prosperity, and I think we can say unhesitatingly that our rise to power never rested on the subjugation of lesser nations or their exploitation for our material gain. Indeed, we have in the past quarter of a century freed from the tyrannical grip of dictators a large part of the world's population, including our own beloved ancestral land.

Like Columbus, our colonial forefathers set out on an uncertain course when they cut the ties that bound this land to England. But they were as confident as he that they were heading in the right direction when they established an independent, free nation based on the rule of law rather than of man.

Men like Philip Mazzei, the scholar and agriculturist, were among those who first gave this country the vital strength it needed to survive as a democracy. It is well documented that Mazzei, a close friend of Thomas Jefferson, inspired that leader to include the eloquent and stirring assertion that "All men are created equal" in our Declaration of Independence.

Yet, despite the development of the most successful form of government that has ever been created, despite the years of unparalleled progress that followed a devastating Civil War, and despite the world leadership that came with victory in two world wars, our country is beset today with problems scarcely less ominous than those that faced Columbus and the first Italian settlers in the New World.

What may be a case of too much prosperity has been inherited by a generation that seems at times not to understand the effort that went into creating it nor the manner in which to best utilize it.

We have seen this reflected in the tragic outbreaks of senseless destruction and violence which have exploded in our cities. We have seen it in the failure to adequately deal with the basic social needs of this country, such as poverty and lack of education. We have also seen it in the rapid rise in crime greatly out of proportion to the burgeoning population and, unfortunately, particularly rampant among our young people.

These difficulties require strong and resolute leadership for solution; yet we need look no farther than our own forefathers for the inspiration needed to meet the challenges. One of the distinguished previous recipients of your society's medal, the Honorable Michael Musmanno, has written a scholarly account of the men and women of Italian heritage who have enriched this land with their skills.

And I would like to note here that Judge Musmanno's book could not have come at a more opportune time. I am just plain sick and tired and as fed up as I could be over the completely false and unjustifiable association of our people with the world of crime. Certainly, there are men of Italian background who are criminals and live outside of society. But there are also men of Irish, German, French, English, Protestant, Jewish and every other background you can think of who do the same.

And for every Raymond Patriarca who detract from and endanger our society, there are thousands upon thousands upon thousands of honest, forthright and hardworking men and women of Italian descent making enormous contributions to this country and all that it stands for.

This is the story that should be told and I gratefully acknowledge Judge Musmanno's accomplishments in doing just that, in bringing the true and full story to the public's awareness.

As Judge Musmanno points out, many of the most enduring achievements of Italians on this continent were performed well before the great waves of immigration that reached a peak around the turn of this century.

The record shows that as early as 1622 an Italian glassmaker was settling in Virginia while ancestors of William Paca, one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence, owned land in Maryland as far back as 1651. Enrico Tonti, whose artificial right hand of iron became a legend, blazed trails throughout the Midwest in the 1670's and helped stake out the huge Louisiana Territory which later added 500,000 square miles of new land to the United States. He and his brother Alfonso established the first European settlements in Michigan, Illinois, and Arkansas.

William Paca himself, in addition to signing the Declaration of Independence and serving in the Continental Congress, became a judge and later Governor of the State of Maryland.

In 1804 an Italian navigator named Salvatore Catalano skillfully piloted the U.S. warship Intrepid which destroyed the batteries of a pirate stronghold in Tripoli after none of the European powers had been able to successfully challenge it.

It was during the Civil War, however, that the sons of Italy undeniably made their mark in American history. Among the Garibaldi Guard and other Italian regiments that fought to preserve the Union, three officers won our nation's highest military honor, the Congressional Medal of Honor.

In peacetime as well, men of Italian blood enriched their adopted land. In the most important building in the nation, the gifted Constantino Brumidi strove under six Presidents to glorify America in frescoes and portraits. The man who is often called the Michaelangelo of our nation's Capitol unfolded the history of America to future generations in bold colors under the circular dome and throughout the Capitol building.

Our pride in the achievements of Italians in America can call upon the names of thousands more of our people, but the first who set foot on this continent, Christopher Columbus still evokes our strongest affection. We could very well use his guidance today to lead us through the many obstacles we face in world affairs.

As we can learn from Columbus, the goals we seek today—the maintenance of world peace and the more widespread enjoyment of the prosperity we have created—cannot be attained by men of one background alone. When Columbus could not find in his native Genoa or among the other Italian states of his time a patron who would support his search for a new route to the East, he turned to the rulers of Spain for backing.

Yet, at the same time, it is only natural for us to feel a particular affection for those who share our own special and magnificent birthright.

I cannot help but think tonight of the indelible mark left in my own constituency in the Berkshires by such men as Guiseppe Faccioli. He was for many years the chief engineer of the Stanley Electric Company, better known to some of you today as the General Electric Company, and he designed and operated this country's first commercial alternating system.

My hometown, Pittsfield has more recently enjoyed the outstanding legal services of such eminent jurists as Francis Quirco and Charles Alberti while our general hospital was led under the able administration of Dr. Reo Marcotte.

I could go on and on naming these wonderful Italian friends in my Congressional District who have been so close to me throughout my political career and who have contributed so much to our community, often at the sacrifice of their own personal pleasures.

And in talking about contributions to community, I must again refer to our own Governor Volpe who has provided such inspirational leadership for the people of the Commonwealth and who has accomplished so much for the benefit of this great State.

You know, the feeling of brotherhood and the acceptance of an individual for what he does rather than what he is, is never stronger in our country than at this time of year. And strangely enough the means for accomplishing this is none other than the annual ritual of the World Series.

It is true that local pride as well as the competitiveness which accompanies all sporting endeavors, prevents us from having the same feelings about both teams. Yet during this one exciting week each year, a sense of family love and adoration engulfs our home town players making the big hit, the big pitch and the run-saving catch. Who in Boston, for example, would fail to brighten at the mention of a Carl Yastzremski, a Jim Lonberg, or a George Scott? And who in St. Louis would deny a Bob Gibson, a Lou Brock or a Roger Maris the keys to the city?

All too often the glow generated by these heroes exploits, disappears by the season's first snow. It takes a special kind of effort and a special kind of leadership to inspire men of different backgrounds to work together 365 days a year for a greater, a better and a more vibrant America.

We are fortunate to have among our people, and sitting here throughout this room tonight, men of just this caliber. Hopefully through our efforts we may someday enjoy a year round epidemic of world series fever and truly fulfill the destiny passed on to us by Christopher Columbus of Genoa.

WAR ON POVERTY IS EVERYBODY'S JOB

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HELSTOSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, the war on poverty is not the job of any single agency, community, group, or individual. It is a job in which everybody must take a hand in order for it to be successful.

The U.S. Government has begun its job when, through Congress, it has been given authority to establish the agency which will combat poverty. Congress has appropriated funds to carry out this war and our communities have joined in this fight to eliminate poverty from its areas.

Realizing the importance of a united front, from other fields of battle, the Veterans of Foreign Wars has adopted a resolution which encourages each member of that civic-minded body to unite in the war on poverty.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks on this topic, I would like to include the text of the resolution which the Veterans of Foreign Wars adopted at their 68th national convention, held in New Orleans, August 20 through August 25, 1967.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION 237: ASSIST IN WAR ON POVERTY

Whereas, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, through direct action and collective support, have always promoted increased opportunities for all Americans, that every individual, regardless of race, color, creed or ethnic background, might share in this nation's abundance; now, therefore

Be it resolved, by the 68th National Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, that each individual member and Post be encouraged to participate to the fullest possible extent in local and national endeavors to eliminate poverty; and

Be it further resolved, that the Veterans of Foreign Wars advise the members of ways and means to help as a community service project those young men and women who have been trained at government expense to re-establish themselves in the areas where they have been sent for employment; to help these people find housing, learn the area so they can get to and from work, and other things that good Americans do for other good Americans.

KILMER JOB CORPS

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PATTEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I have called the attention of my colleagues on several occasions to the outstanding progress against poverty being made at the Kilmer Job Corps Center in Edison, N.J. On October 9, an excellent article in the Elizabeth Daily Journal, entitled "Life at Kilmer (and before)" reaffirmed what I have been saying for a long time. This article focuses on the life of two young men, named Clarence Lammie and Ivy Butler, who have discovered that the Job Corps can open the doors to opportunity for even our most thoroughly disadvantaged young people.

Mr. Speaker, the article points out that of Kilmer's 2,735 graduates, 2,347 are known to have been placed in jobs—an amazing record of success, and one that is growing all the time as the program gains experience and increased community respect. I find it incredible, Mr. Speaker, that there are those who would actually do away with this fine program, and deliberately deny to our Nation the abundant, permanent benefits it is successfully providing.

In order that all those with open minds and open hearts may have the benefit of this latest testimony of Job Corps success, I insert the Daily Journal article at this point in the RECORD:

LIFE AT KILMER (AND BEFORE)

Clarence Lammie, 18, black and an inmate of a piece of hell called the South Bronx, sat nervously fingering a copy of a book which bore the title, "The Judeo-Christian Tradition."

"In my neighborhood," he said softly, "It's easier to buy a bag of dope than a bottle of whisky. You could buy that too even if you were 16. The man would sell it; he didn't care.

". . . Ninety per cent of the kids I went to school with are on dope."

Clarence Lammie, a high school drop-out isn't on dope. He is a member of the Camp Kilmer Job Corps attending the City College of New York nights. In February, he expects to be a full-time student.

Lammie isn't the prime model of a South Bronx youth. He avoided getting hooked on the "stuff" in an environment in which sweet dreams are about the only pleasant thing in life.

He joined the Job Corps and says he always had hoped to go to college.

The fact that he is there is a minor miracle which Lammie managed to pull off with the help of the Job Corps. Through that organization, he is getting a chance, not the second try of a failure, but the first chance we don't hand out to most kids in the South Bronx.

I asked him why he made the break. He spoke with an understandable wariness. His world is not mine.

Finally, Lammie mumbled "Something happened."

He said he didn't want to talk about it.

"In your family?"

He nodded. I said it must have been pretty rough.

"You wouldn't want to see it either," he said, his voice suddenly filling with volume.

I dropped the subject.

Lammie left school in the 11th grade. He got a part-time job in a store. Then he heard about the Job Corps.

"I decided I had to figure which way I was going to go," he said. "I signed up and my friends tried to talk me out of it. 'You don't want to go down there and get beat up,' they said."

Lammie didn't go the first time he enrolled in the corps.

"I had something going, a girl."

Lammie received a high school equivalency diploma and was accepted in a special program at City College. The Federal Electric Corp., which operates the Kilmer center, is paying the tuition, a gesture beyond the terms of the company's contract with the government.

In February, Lammie will begin working in the high school equivalency program at Kilmer. He will work as well as go to college.

Even with the help of the Job Corps, many youngsters like Lammie don't make it. There is a 30 per cent drop-out rate, mostly in the first few weeks of the program, which can run from six months to a mandated maximum of two years.

The gate always is open. Anyone can walk out at anytime.

Rules at the center are strict. Violations bring penalties ranging to dismissal.

An official to whom I spoke mentioned he could only stay for a limited time.

"A couple of boys brought back pot and were packing them up and sending them home," he explained.

Some youths, guilty of less serious infractions, get a second chance if they are willing to go to "32," a building that houses the intensive treatment unit.

Charles Utley, supervisor of "32," explained. "We put the kids in a ditch with a pick and shovel. They have to work their way up to better jobs.

"Everyday, we have a discussion group. The fellows who have been in '32' for a while work on the new ones. They attack them; break them down; make them admit their problems.

"'Go back, to your old neighborhood,' the boys say. 'Then think what you have to look forward to. Go back and be a bum.'

"It's a beautiful thing to watch. Kids begin to see what life is without purpose and direction. They know what they're going back to."

The treatment works far more often than it fails.

Ivy Butler, 17, a resident of Brooklyn's Bedford-Stuyvesant section, is finishing up his stay in "32." Utley called Butler one of intensive care's most difficult problems.

"When he came to us, he really hated rules," Utley said. "He would curse at anyone who told him to do anything. He'd been that way for a long time."

Butler's schooling ended in the ninth grade. He worked as a shortorder cook, then was unemployed. He hung around the house. Finally, his mother told him to join the Job Corps. Butler went without much intention of staying.

His pals told him: "You got to be mad to go that far from home." Within a short time, he was in "32."

"They really worked on me," Butler said. "I couldn't see any sense to any rules. They finally got to me."

Exactly how is something a psychiatrist could explain. What is important is that Butler now is back in the auto mechanics school at the Job Corps. He will finish the program.

I asked Butler if he tried to talk any of his friends into signing up.

"They just keep telling me the things I used to say," he explained. "It's not much use. I tried to get my cousin to join. He said: 'There must be a hook up it someplace.'"

Butler paused, then added: "If there is, I haven't found it yet."

Camp Kilmer has graduated 2,735 youths. Of these, 2,347 have been placed in jobs. The program provides for no follow-up so there is no information of how many of the graduates hold their jobs.

Private, volunteer groups now are beginning such a program.

Critics always point to the deficiencies, and there are plenty of critics. Maybe they do know a better program—or maybe they should talk to Clarence Lammie!

PARLIAMENTARY DELEGATION FROM PAKISTAN

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, during the last week of September Washington played host to a distinguished group of visitors from Pakistan. These men, members of a Parliamentary Delegation sponsored by the Department of State's international visitor program, are now completing a 30-day tour of the United States. Their visit will take them coast to coast in an effort to give them a better understanding of our country and its people. During their stay in the Capital, I had the opportunity to meet all of the delegates and found them to be an outstanding group. Their leader, Pakistan's Minister for Law and Parliamentary Affairs, Mr. S. M. Zafar, introduced me to his colleagues: Prince Miangul Aurangzeb, Shah Azizur Rahman, Mian Salahuddin, Sardar Khizer Hayat Khan, Mohammad N. A. Lashkar, and Mr. Wahiduzzaman, who are members of Pakistan's National Assembly, and Mr. Muzafar Husain, Secretary of the National Assembly.

On the evening of September 26 I had an opportunity to meet and participate in an informal discussion with the distinguished leaders of Pakistan in the home of Ambassador Harriman. I was deeply impressed with the high quality, dedication, and sincerity of these visitors. There is no doubt in my mind that these leaders are highly dedicated to the cause of freedom and economic progress.

The visit of the Pakistani Parliamentarians is significant in that it is the first time such a high-ranking legislative group from Pakistan has visited the United States, and it marks yet another step in the continuous process of confirming and expanding the already close relations between our countries.

This relationship dates back to the founding of Pakistan on August 14, 1947, following the partition of British India. At that time Pakistan was faced with enormous difficulties—thousands of refugees, a disorganized defense establishment, an insignificant industrial capacity, and an outmoded agricultural system. Since 1947, however, Pakistan has made tremendous progress. It has absorbed the refugees and developed a modern defense force. Industrial growth has skyrocketed, and Pakistan hopes to become self-sufficient in food production by 1970. Much of this progress has been accomplished under the direction of its President, Field Marshal Mohammad Ayub Khan, who assumed the leadership of Pakistan in October 1958.

Over the past 18 years the United States has made available a small amount of economic and food aid to Pakistan. That this aid has been wisely used can be seen in the fact that Pakistan's economic record is one of the brightest in the developing world.

Mr. Speaker, the American Ambassador to Pakistan is the Honorable Benjamin H. Oehlert, Jr. Mr. Oehlert is a former resident of the State of Florida and is doing an outstanding job representing our country in Pakistan.

In closing, I would like to wish our distinguished guests from Pakistan an enjoyable and rewarding visit to the United States and a safe and happy return to Pakistan.

GREEK GOVERNMENT PLEDGES ELECTIONS FOR RETURN OF CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Pucinski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am sure we all read with great comfort the assurance issued by the Government of Greece that it has prepared a specific and inalterable timetable for the return of constitutional government to Greece.

I was very pleased to learn that Ambassador Christian Palamas has issued a formal statement in which he has spelled out his Government's firm commitment to a representative election which will help restore representative government to Greece.

During my recent visit to Greece I was assured by the various military leaders who have had the responsibility of managing that country since the April 21 uprising that positive steps would be taken to restore parliamentary government to Greece.

I was assured even by the most bitter critics of the present regime that the Constitutional Revision Commission which has agreed to have its recommendations ready by December 15, 1967, is made up of members highly respected for their fairness and integrity.

It should be a source of great comfort to those who want to see constitutional government returned to Greece that a firm timetable has been established by that government.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the announcement by the Greek Ambassador should also dampen the constant attacks being made against those who are trying to restore order out of chaos in Greece.

I said recently in a speech on the floor of the House, that the United States must do everything it can to assist the present government to restore constitutional rule and also firm-up its commitment to NATO.

There are those in our Government who have withheld resuming the shipment of NATO arms to Greece and also have withheld urgently needed economic help for the Greek victims of the recent earthquakes.

It is my hope that the Government of the United States will now restore normal relations with the Government of Greece and do everything in its power to help that Government fulfill the timetable it has posted for the return of representative government in Greece.

I should like to include with my remarks today an article which appeared in this morning's Washington Post, describing the timetable announced by the Greek Ambassador.

I have no reason to doubt his integrity and the solemnity of his pledge that his government consider the timetable irrevocable.

In the light of this firm assurance, it is my hope that the United States will delay no longer the giving to Greece of assistance she needs.

I should also like to take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to include in my remarks today a recent statement made by General Van Fleet, the American general who wrote such a spectacular record of achievement during the Korean war.

General Van Fleet, after a recent visit to Greece, said that he is convinced that the Greek uprising by the military forces on April 21 saved that country from the Communists and avoided for America another Vietnam.

I should like to include all of General Van Fleet's remarks in the Record, at this point.

I should also like to point out that the Washington Post article about the schedule for elections follows immediately after General Van Fleet's remarks:

[From the Royal Greek Embassy Press and Information Service, Sept. 30, 1967]

General Van Fleet Endorses Greek Regime

General Van Fleet, ranking U.S. adviser during the guerrilla war against the Communists in Greece, declared in an Athens press conference yesterday that the Greek military government saved the United States from having a new Vietnam, and he expressed his extreme satisfaction that the Greek Army moved in to save the country from the Communist threat.

General Van Fleet's statement runs as follows:

"The military government saved the United States from having a new Vietnam. I have been to Greece many times. This is my second home. Political turmoil made the Greek government prior to April 21st so weak, that it became a do nothing government. No decision could be made while certain political elements were catering to the old Communist bloc for support. This is my observation as an American. Whether it is accurate or not it is for the Greeks to decide.

"However, when it became apparent that the extreme left had a decisive influence and Greece might fall to a neutral position or withdraw from NATO, when demonstrations against the Americans and NATO were becoming intensive, I was extremely delighted to hear that the military had moved in and saved the country.

"The Greek people are a valiant, patriotic and proud people. They always fought on our side and are our most loyal allies. In the Greek struggle against internal communism in 1948–1950, Greece won without the loss of a single American life. The United States provided only material assistance and encouragement. And I was privileged and honored to head the American military advisory group at that time. I have met most of the present cabinet members then, many of whom were junior officers during the 1948–1950 fight, battalion commanders, staff officers and aides to General Papagos. They have been brought up in the tradition of duty, honor and country and I am delighted to know that such men are now at the principal posts in the government. Indeed they are well qualified and dedicated.

"I am convinced that they are achieving their announced plans as rapidly as possible and they will in due time restore parliamentary government. However, it takes time in order to prevent a return to former anarchy. It is inconceivable to me that we sent our precious American boys around the world to fight communism in Asia with great loss of life and money and here in Greece the United States remains quiet while a loyal military saves the country from communism without any assistance in men from America. I wish the United States would cheer this government for what they have done instead of remaining quiet and thus encouraging the enemy.

"The suspension of military aid is of little effect materially but has tremendous effect morally. Greece has always been with us and always will be. There exists a close friendship among us and America now should come forward and praise this great military government for what it has done to save Greece, NATO and America."

Greeks Pledge Return to Democracy

The Greek Embassy last night announced an "irrevocable" timetable for return to parliamentary democracy in Greece, with a constitutional referendum to be held in August.

Parliamentary elections would follow after the referendum, Greek Ambassador Christian X. Palamas said in a statement.

[A spokesman said Palamas' statement was issued in reply to U.S. critics who say the military plans to remain in power indefinitely, United Press International reported. He said he hoped it would help convince Washington to resume arms shipments to Greece, which were suspended after the Greek army seized power April 21.]

The Ambassador said he was authorized to announce the following four-stage official timetable:

On Dec. 15 the constitutional revision committee would submit the draft of the new constitution to the government.

Preparation of the final draft, to be submitted to the electorate by the government, should not exceed a period of six months.

Technical preparation of the constitutional referendum would take approximately two months, after which the referendum would be held.

Parliamentary elections would follow according to the appropriate provisions of the new constitution.

"I am authorized to state categorically that the Greek government considers the above timetable as irrevocable," Palamas said.

Announcement in Athens earlier said a referendum would be held in 1968, but the spokesman said the month of August was now clearly the expected time.

[Asked for comment, a State Department spokesman said the government was encouraged. He noted that the United States has issued many in the past for a return to democratic government in Athens.]

TOO HEROIC TO DIE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Pepper], is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, most of the free world held its breath through the tense days of May and early June, when Israel, alone and without an ally stood resolutely against the vaunted might of the Arab nations poised on her borders, who were ready to annihilate the tiny enclave of democracy in the Middle East. Yes, without an ally; for Israel has no treaties, no alliances, no guarantees with any other nation to insure support in time of need. As events have since proven, Israel was well up to the task of meeting the Arab attack unassisted. The magnificent Israel defense forces defeated the combined armies of her Arab antagonists in a brief but telling war that ably demonstrated that this nation was not about to surrender her freedom because of the threats of a few hate-filled tyrants.

The distinguished novelist James A. Michener characterized Israel in an article in the August 8, 1967, issue of Look magazine as "A Nation Too Young To Die." In asking that this fine article be inserted in the Record, I would suggest also that Israel and her people have demonstrated themselves to be "too heroic to die" and determined to live and make the Holy Land flower once again:

Israel: A Nation Too Young To Die

(By James A. Michener)

I remember when I first became aware of the unnatural tension under which the citizens of Israel have been obliged to live since the establishment of their nation in 1948. I had come to the seaport city of Haifa to do research on a book, and for well over a year, I stayed there, probing the various libraries at my disposal.

Almost every week, and often three or four times a week, my morning paper carried the news that one or another leading Arab politician, and not infrequently a head of state of one of the neighboring Arab countries, had announced his intention of leading an army that would "push the Jews of Israel into the sea," or that would "wipe them off the face of the earth," or perhaps, "strangle them forever." I suppose that the threats occurring during the time I worked in Israel totaled well over a hundred.

They came from more than a half-dozen different countries, some as far away as Algeria and Morocco, whose preoccupation with Israel I could not understand. They did not come, so far as I remember, from Lebanon or Jordan, which have common boundaries with Israel.

Especially appalling to me were the five different times when some Arab head of state announced that he was going to blow up the city in which I sat working. I took even those threats without panic, for I have seen a good deal of war and bombing and do not frighten easily, but I must admit that when the Arab leaders narrowed down their target to the hotel in which I was sitting, and when on two occasions they gave a specific timetable for dispatching their rockets, I felt shivers run up my spine.

I lived for more than a year under these constant threats. I neutralized them by saying, "I'm free to leave Israel when I like. I have no personal attachments and no responsibility." But what must have been the accumulated anxiety for the head of a growing family in Haifa who heard these threats each week, not for one year but for nineteen? What must have been his feelings if he knew that he could not leave the threatened country, that he had a responsibility both to his family and to his nation?

Israel's apprehension was not a paper one. In addition to the threats, there were constant incursions into Israel, constant shootings across the borders, constant intrusions by groups as large as squadrons or small companies. If I went to do some research on the old synagogue at Korazim, I was somewhat taken aback to find that one day later, a pitched battle had been fought there and two Israeli civilians had been killed. If I went on a picnic to the Sea of Galilee, I was a bit shaken when two days later, there was a bombardment of Israeli boats. If I visited the kibbutz at Dan and waded upstream to the cool spring that forms one of the headwaters of the River Jordan, I was frightened to learn that, shortly before, a man had been lost doing that. And when I moved to Jerusalem, to work in the libraries there, I was sorrowful when children told me I must not walk down this alley by the Persian synagogue; gunfire had been coming in from the rooftops only 50 feet away.

And wherever I went, whether to Haifa, or to Korazim, or the Galilee, or Beersheba, there was the constant dinning in my ears of the threat, reiterated week after week, "We are going to destroy you. We are going to push you into the sea." The history of Israel is the history of ordinary people living ordinary lives under the incessant repetition of that threat, backed up by just enough Arab military activity to prove that the threat might be put into action at any moment.

To understand the problem of Israel, the outsider must imagine himself living in Washington, D.C., and reading each morning that neighbors in Baltimore and Alexandria have again threatened to blow Washington off the face of the earth and to push all Washingtonians into the Potomac. The threat, mind you, does not come from across the Atlantic or Pacific. It comes from a few miles away. And to prove the reality of the threat, actual military adventures occur from time to time, taking the lives of random Washingtonians.

What chance would you say there was for the citizens of Washington to go on indefinitely ignoring such behavior? This article is an account of why the citizens of Israel had to react to such a situation.

I must point out at the beginning that I hold no special brief for either the Israelis or Jews in general. I have lived too long among them to retain any starry-eyed visions. They are ordinary people marred by ordinary weaknesses and bolstered by the courage that ordinary men of all nations and races can at times draw upon. I worked among Muslims for ten years before I ever set foot in Israel, and on at least 50 percent of the characteristics by which men and societies are judged, I like Muslims at least as well as I like the Jews.

Furthermore, I am a professional writer who has worked in many contrasting societies, and I have found none inherently superior to all others. There have been many single aspects of Japan, or Polynesia, or Spain, or India, or Afghanistan that I have preferred, and to me, Israel is merely one more country. It happens to have certain characteristics that elicit enormous respect, but so did each of the Muslim countries in which I worked.

What we are concerned with here is a problem of worldwide significance: How can nations that must live side by side do so with a decent regard one for the other? In trying to reach a solution to this problem, Israel has as many responsibilities as its neighbors. However, this particular inquiry relates primarily to certain adjustments the Arabs must make before any kind of stability can be achieved in a region where stability is much to be desired.

Exactly how vicious were the verbal threats? It will be instructive, I think, to follow the behavior of one Arab country over a short period of time so that the non-Middle Easterner can catch something of the quality of the attacks that were constantly being made. For this purpose, I have chosen Syria, which has a common frontier with Israel and an internal political problem that makes verbal attacks on Israel an attractive form of demagoguery.

For some years, Syria's politics have been unusually volatile. During my stay in the area, there were several revolutions, three complete changes of government and continued violence. At one time, observers had hoped that Syria's political union with Egypt might produce a substantial and stable bloc of Arab power that would carry with it a sense of responsibility. But that union did not last long, and with its dissolution, Syria plunged into contortions that carried it first in one direction, then another. Consequently, Syrian politicians found that the one thing that united them was a common call for violence against Israel. This is how they spoke:

March 13, 1966, the official newspaper, *Al Baath:* "It has become evident that our problem will only be solved by an armed struggle to expel the rapacious enemy, and put an end to the Zionist presence."

April 17, 1966, the chief of state of the country, Nuredden Al-Attassi, in a speech at a military parade: "A total popular war of liberation is the only way to liberate Palestine and foil the plan of imperialism and reaction. . . . We shall work for the mobilization of all efforts for the needs of the total popular war of liberation."

May 12, 1966, the Syrian commander in chief: "As for the statements of the so-called ministers and officials in Israel that they will punish states which support the commando forces . . . we tell them that we shall wage a liberation war against them as the Party has decided, and fear and alarm will fill every house in Israel."

May 19, 1966, Radio Damascus: "When our revolution declared that the way to liberate Palestine is through a popular war, it knew beforehand that the meaning of this declaration is an open and decisive confrontation with Israel."

May 22, 1966, Chief of State Al-Attassi: "We raise the slogan of the people's liberation war. We want total war with no limits, a war that will destroy the Zionist base."

May 24, 1966, Syrian Defense Minister Hafez Assad: "We say: We shall never call for, nor accept peace. . . . We have resolved to drench this land with our blood, to oust you, aggressors, and throw you into the sea for good."

July 16, 1966, Premier Yousef Zouayen: "The popular liberation war which the Palestinian masses, backed by the Arab masses in the whole Arab homeland, have determined to wage, will foil the methods of Israel and those behind it. We say to Israel: 'Our reply will be harsh and it will pay dearly.' "

It must be remembered that the above quotations come from a period of relative stability along the Syrian-Israeli frontier. In the succeeding nine months, from September, 1966, through May, 1967, or just before the outbreak of armed hostilities, both the tempo and the inflammability increased. In those weeks when Syria was not threatening to destroy Israel, the heads of other Arab nations were. During my stay in Israel, I believe all the Arab states, excepting Jordan and Lebanon, made specific announcements that they were preparing a war that would drive Israel into the sea.

This constant incendiary barrage came to a climax in May of 1967, when war against Israel had pretty well been agreed upon, and perhaps that accounts for the exaggerated quality of these statements:

25 May 1967, Cairo radio, in a broadcast to all Arab countries: "The Arab people is firmly resolved to wipe Israel off the map."

26 May 1967, President Gamal Abdel Nasser of Egypt: "Our basic aim will be to destroy Israel."

26 May 1967, the leader of the Palestine Liberation Organization, Ahmed Shukairy: "D-day is approaching. The Arbas have waited 19 years for this and will not flinch from the war of liberation."

29 May 1967, the same Mr. Shukairy: "The struggle has begun at the Gulf of Aqaba and will end at the Bay of Acre."

30 May 1967, Cairo radio: "Faced by the blockade of the Gulf of Aqaba, Israel has two choices, both of which are drenched with Israel's blood: Either it will be strangled by the Arab military and economic siege or it will be killed by the bullets of the Arab armies surrounding it from the South, from the North and from the East."

1 June 1967, the commander of the Egyptian Air Force on Egyptian television: "The Egyptian forces spread from Rafah to Sharm el Sheik are ready for the order to begin the struggle to which we have looked forward for so long."

Now, I suppose that a logical man ought to reason: "If the leaders of the Arab states confine their threats to verbalisms, no matter how virulent, the citizens of Israel should adjust to the situation, for obviously the Arabs are using words in a way that need not be taken seriously." Speaking for myself after my initial weeks of shock, I began to dismiss the blasts against Israel as bombast.

I tried to quiet my inner fears and become adjusted to this incessant barrage of verbal treats, but my ability to live with them did not means that I was immune to them. Not at all. For whether I liked it or not, I was living under an act of aggression. That it was psychological rather than physical made it the more insidious. I began to find that, although in public I dismised the threats as evidences of temporary insanity on the part of those who made them, when I was alone, I had to worry about them. Against my will, I found myself concluding, "If Syria and Egypt and Iraq and the others keep on making such threats, they must in the end do something about them. And if Israelis continue to hear these threats week after week, they must in the end accept them as real, and they, too, will have to act upon them."

In this way, not only were the airwaves polluted, not only was all intercourse between nations contaminated and all chance of peaceful coexistence frustrated, but the psychological processes of both those who made the threats and those who received them were slowly and painfully corroded until both Arab and Jew knew that war was inevitable. On one visit to Jordan, which was one of the least psychotic areas, I talked with 16 young Arabs, and all said they longed for the day when they could march with the Arab armies into Israel and wipe it off the face of the earth. In Egypt, I found attitudes the same. And what was most regrettable, in Israel, where I knew thousands of persons who would speak frankly, a dull kind of resignation possessed them: "I suppose that one of these days we shall have to defend ourselves again."

It is because of the danger that thrives on verbal threats that English common law evolved the concept of assault and battery. Not many laymen appreciate that in law, the threat to do bodily damage is roughly the same as physically doing it. But society has learned that the continued psychological damage to the threatened victim is often graver than an actual punch in the nose might have been. The threat involves uncertainty and accumulating fear, whereas the physical release of an actual blow is over and done with in an instant. Thus, in strict legality, if I hold a gun and threaten, "I am going to shoot you," that is an assault. If I actually do the shooting, it is a battery. The important thing, however, is that the law holds the two things roughly equal, and a private citizen may be as quickly thrown in jail for one as for the other.

When assault is resorted to by nations, it is a violation of the United Nations Charter, Article 2, Principle number 4. Yet for 19 years, Israel lived under constant assaults.

In spite of my knowledge that a verbal assault is sometimes more destructive than a physical battery, in spite of my recognition of Arab behavior as aggression, and in spite of my experience with history that proves one aggression breeds another, I still clung to my hope that as long as the Syrians and the Egyptians confined themselves to wordy abuse, Israel could learn to live with it as one of the peculiarities of Arab politics. I even began to understand why nations as far away as Morocco, Algeria and Pakistan wanted to participate in the verbal campaign, for in this way, they kept their franchise as Muslim states. I was pleased to see that more mature Muslim sovereignties like Turkey, Iran and even Arab Tunisia wanted no part of this folly. Again and again, I told my Israeli friends and others who asked me, "As long as the Arabs confine themselves to verbal threats alone, no great damage will be done."

Unfortunately, the surrounding countries did not confine themselves to verbalisms. They also engaged in open acts of invasion, sabotage, terrorism and military action. I myself witnessed the aftermaths of three such actions.

One day in 1963, I visited the ancient black-basalt synagogue at Korazim because I wanted to see how Jews had worshiped in the time of Christ. It is believed that Jesus once lectured there, and I found ruins not often visited by tourists. It was a remote area, peaceful, indifferent, as old almost as the hills. But on the next day, Syrian armed units invaded this rural scene and killed two civilians. Hotheads in Syria boasted that this was part of a planned program of harassment that would continue until all Jews were driven into the sea.

Again in 1963, I visited the Kibbutz Ein Gev for one of its famous fish dinners and a lazy afternoon of watching boats drifting across the Sea of Galilee. I also climbed up into the hills in back of Ein Gev to see the incredible kibbutz perched on the last half inch of Israeli soil. As I sat in the dining room, whose windows were shielded by a massive concrete bunker, a young Israeli girl explained, "We have to have the wall to keep out the Syrian bullets, for they shoot at us whenever we sit down to eat." Two days after my visit, a Syrian gun emplacement in the hills lobbed shells into the lake, sank a fishing boat and injured five fishermen. Once more, Syria publicly announced that this was part of a continuing campaign.

My most moving experience came when I visited the beautiful Catholic monastery marking the supposed site of Christ's Sermon on the Mount. It rests on the hills west of Capernaum, where Jesus sometimes argued with scholars, and while I was staying there, I learned that shortly before, in Israeli fields to the east, a Syrian patrol had planted land mines and one had exploded, killing Israeli farmers.

I could go on through the years 1964, 1965, 1966 and 1967, citing incident after incident in which acts of actual warfare were perpetrated in this region. From the high hills that Syria occupied to the east, gun positions pumped in random shots at workers on the Israeli farms. From protected emplacements along the shore of the Sea of Galilee, Syrian guns fired point-blank at Israeli fishermen. And night after night, marauding parties crept over the border to mine, to murder and destroy.

Now, no man in his right mind would claim that Israel in the meantime was sitting idly by in childish innocence, or that it accepted these invasions of its sovereignty without striking back. In self-respect, there had to be retaliations, and there were. These warlike Arab acts, backing up verbal threats, would have been suicidal for the Israeli Government to ignore. Arab leaders now began massing enormous armies with much first-rate equipment, and these gave every evidence of being able to crush Israel. What was most provocative of all, the leaders of this might openly announced that they planned to launch a full-scale war. If ever a nation was forewarned by word and act and specific promise of annihilation, it was Israel.

What were the odds against Israel? A quick glance at the figures—46 million in the surrounding Arab countries, 97 million in all, as against 2.6 million Israelis—might lead one to believe that the Arab states would have little trouble in overwhelming Israel, except that twice before, in 1948 and 1956, they had tried to do so and failed. Arab leaders grew adept in explaining away the somber fact that twice a handful of Jews had resisted efforts to throw them into the sea. "In 1948," explained the leaders, "we were betrayed by Great Britain, and in 1956, it was the French and English armies that defeated us through their invasion of the Suez." By June, 1967, a persuasive legend had grown up, largely masking the truth that the Arab states had ever tested arms with the Israelis, and completely ignoring that in each war, the Israelis had been victorious. In a magic flood of words, history was repealed.

The Arab leaders created an enticing world of fantasy; one demagogue lived on the pronouncements of the other, and in time, all came to believe that facts were other than they had been. When the Arab armies were able to import huge supplies of modern weapons from their East European supporters, they really believed that their peasant levies, with little stake in their society to fight for, would stand up against Israelis who had good homes, better universities and a deep moral commitment to their nation.

I have had two opportunities to witness the impact of this fantasy world upon rational Arabs. In one of my books, I described in some detail the manner in which, in 1948, Jewish youths captured the north Israel city of Safad against overwhelming numbers of Arab soldiers. At no point in my description did I deride the Arabs or cast aspersions upon them. Some dozen correspondents in the different Arab nations commented upon this favorably when they wrote to me complaining about the passage. What they objected to were the facts I presented. Some claimed that the Jews must have numbered 20 or 30 times their known strength. Others argued that Arab units that we know to have been in the city were not really there. Several explained that the loss was due to British perfidy in turning over to the Jews the best military sites, whereas the truth was just the opposite. And all expressed the opinion that I had been tricked by a legend that had not really happened. I had the strange feeling that my correspondents trusted that one morning, they would waken to find that Safad had never really been lost at all, that it was still in Arab hands and that maps and stories to the contrary had been mere propaganda.

Of course, in the preceding paragraph, I am generalizing from a dozen letters, none of whose authors did I see personally, and it may be that I am reading into their letters a greater evidence of fantasy than the writers showed. About my second experience, I cannot make such an error, for it I witnessed in person.

In the summer of 1964, I was vacationing in the lovely city of Alexandria, made famous by the writers of antiquity and by Charles Kingsley and Lawrence Durrell, and one day at sunset, as I was strolling along that unequaled boulevard that runs beside the Mediterranean, I came to a park where in the evenings, a concert of folk music was offered. Now, I am very partial to this form of entertainment, for one learns much from uncontaminated folk songs. So I bought a ticket for the performance.

At the concert, I found a large number of Egyptian families with their children. It was a splendid night, filled with stars and coolness, and we sat back to watch a first-class performance of folk song and dance. The choruses were strong, the dancers agile, and the evening compared with others I had enjoyed in Kyoto, Djakarta, Manila and Mexico City.

A rather larger cast performed, and this made me wonder where the money to pay them came from, for the audience was not unusually big, and the prices we had paid were only nominal. I shrugged my shoulders and concluded that this was somoene else's problem, but when the regular performance had ended, with a false note that I could detect, the bugles started blowing, excitement gripped the children in the audience, and the curtains parted to show a scene in the year A.D. 2000. In a park much like the one in which we were sitting, a group of children played about the statue of an Egyptian soldier while an old man watched. One of the children asked who the statue was, and by means of a dance, the old fellow explained. Years dropped from his shoulders. His cane became a gun. His ragged clothes fell away to reveal a military uniform, and as more bugles blew, ghosts of his former companions in arms appeared onstage, and in wonderfully choreographed pantomime, the Egyptian Army demonstrated how it had won the great war of 1956.

The scene was at Suez, where a handful of heroic Egyptians held off and finally defeated not an Israeli army but invaders storming ashore from French and English battleships. For each Egyptian soldier, scores of Frenchmen and Englishmen rushed onstage, only to be overwhelmed by sheer courage. In the end, the invaders had to retreat, whereupon the Egyptian defenders fell into a tableau of victory as fine as any I had ever seen. The great powers had been driven off, and Egyptian honor was once more secure.

I looked about me at the audience, and it was apparent that the adults, many of whom must have participated in the events thus portrayed, had begun to accept this version as history. Their eyes glowed, and a real patriotism suffused their faces. As we left the park, I saw one young boy of nine or ten lunging out with an imaginary bayonet to hold off imaginary Frenchmen and Englishmen. When I made inquiries about the performance, I found that it was paid for by the government and was repeated throughout the year.

The whole thing was fantasy, of course, and certainly no worse than similar versions of English history offered in London or French history in Paris. I am sure that parallel perversions could be found in American folklore, and I doubt that much harm is done to children by this patriotic nonsense. But in the case of Egypt and the other Arab lands, there was an additional danger because adults, too, were accepting such fables: college professors, university students, newspaper editors, businessmen believed that Egypt had won a great victory in 1956. I could find no evidence that anyone in public life was willing to admit that in Egypt's military adventure against a handful of Jews, the latter had easily won.

All nations engage in fantasy, but few indulge themselves with so virulent a dream as the twofold Arab dream that Israel does not exist and that the Jews who presently occupy the land of Israel can easily be pushed into the Mediterranean . . . whenever the Arabs finally decide to do so.

Sometime in the spring of 1967, the Arab leaders decided that the time was ripe. Under incessant pressure from Ahmed Shukairy, leader of the Palestine Liberation Organization, who stood to win himself the satrapy of Palestine if he could goad Egypt, Syria, Iraq, Lebanon, Jordan and Saudi Arabia into declaring war on Israel, and with the full connivance of Gamal Abdel Nasser, who stood to win himself an emperorship if the war was successful, the Arab nations reached an understanding. These men who had lived so long on fantasy now conceived the supreme fantasy that they could quickly destroy the nation that had twice defeated them and had in the interim grown stronger socially, psychologically and morally, even though its airplanes and tanks had not kept pace in numbers with those of the Arabs.

On May 16, 1967, President Nasser initiated the two final moves. On that day, he elbowed the United Nations Emergency Force out of its peacekeeping positions along the Egyptian-Israeli border in the Sinai Peninsula and forced it ignominiously to retire from the area, thus depriving Israel of the one slim assurance it had that a surprise attack would not be launched from the desert. The fire engine that was supposed to protect the community scuttled out of town at the first smell of smoke. In its place, President Nasser moved up his own divisions, and the stage was set for war.

On May 22, 1967, he made his second crucial move. With the retreat of the United Nations troops, he found himself in sole control of Sharm el Sheik, the fortress commanding the strait leading into the Gulf of Aqaba. It was a simple matter for him to announce that henceforth, the Gulf would be closed to Israeli ships and even to ships of other nations carrying strategic materials bound for Israel. None would be permitted to enter and none to leave. This was a hostile act and had to be construed as a declaration of war. That President Nasser was aware of the gravity of his act, he took no pains to hide: "Sharm el Sheik and the blockade mean real confrontation with Israel. Taking such a step means that we should be ready to enter full-scale war with Israel. It is not an isolated operation."

The Gulf has been recognized as an international waterway because four sovereign nations line its coasts: on the east, Saudi Arabia; on the west, Egypt; on the north, Israel; and on the northeast, Jordan. But it is more important economically to Israel than to any of the other three, since Elath is a major port for handling oil and other heavy cargoes. If the Gulf of Aqaba were to be closed to all shipping, whether to Jordan or Israel, the blockade would damage Jordan, but it would prostrate Israel. However, ships intended for Jordan were allowed to pass and during the exercise of the blockade, several did proceed unmolested to Jordan. This underlined the fact that the blockade was meant to be an act of war, and lest any misunderstand the intention, President Nasser proclaimed on May 26:

"The Arab people want to fight. . . .

"We have been waiting for the suitable day when we shall be completely ready, since if we enter a battle with Israel we should be confident of victory and should take strong measures. We do not speak idly.

"We have lately felt that our strength is sufficient, and that if we enter the battle with Israel we shall, with God's help, be victorious. Therefore, we have now decided that I take real steps.

"The battle will be a full-scale one, and our basic aim will be to destroy Israel."

Obviously, the major maritime nations of the world, having anticipated that such a blockade might one day be attempted, in which case their ships would be powerless to enter the narrow strait, had long been on record regarding two points: (1) the Gulf of Aqaba was an international waterway, and (2) as such, it must be kept open for all nations to use equally without let or hindrance.

By flouting international law and blockading the Gulf of Aqaba to Israeli shipping, President Nasser had effectively and somewhat cleverly cut Israel's lifeline to the south. If the blockade were allowed to continue unchallenged, Israel would experience what its Arab neighbors had been threatening for so long—its strangulation. This was war, but still only an indirect version, in the economic field. One could reasonably hope that from it, President Nasser might back away, but such hopes were dashed on May 28, when he announced over the radio: "We intend to open a general assault against Israel. This will be total war. Our basic aim is the destruction of Israel."

As the Arabs prepared for what they assured themselves was to be the final conquest of Israel, their morale was at high pitch. And because of what they had been told so continuously over the previous eight years regarding their victory over the British and French in 1956, they believed in all honesty that this time they were going to crush Israel, and fairly easily.

President Nasser encouraged this belief by his belligerent speeches. From Syria, Chief of State Al-Attassi thundered that his army was impatient to begin marching.

The foot soldiers, the aviators, the tank commanders and even the generals prepared to launch what they were convinced would be an easy, victorious sortie. In the fantasy world in which they had lived for so long, and to which they had contributed, words took the place of accomplishment, wishes took the place of military discipline, and inflated dreams of revenge superseded facts.

If the Arabs with their verbal assaults had made life difficult for Israel, they had perpetrated a worse crime against themselves; for they had come to believe their own inflated nonsense.

At the hour of attack, the Voice of the Arabs radio station in Cairo issued this stirring call to its soldiers. It is the usual heartening battle cry that all nations use at a time of crisis and in general purpose is not much different from what Englishmen or Russians or Americans would shout to their soldiers; but in the cry for avenging 1948, one hears a unique and ominous overtone:

"Destroy, ruin, liberate. Woe to Israel, your hour has arrived. The Arab nation is on its way to render its account. O Israel, this is your end.

"Every Arab must take revenge for 1948, must cross the Armistice lines from all directions and head for Tel Aviv. We shall drive out of existence the shame of Zionism. Rescue the looted Palestine. Hit everywhere till the end.

"There is no room for Israel in Palestine. This is your responsibility, O Arab soldiers! Israel, taste death!"

It required less than 72 hours in June to deflate this bombast.

What can be done to awaken the Arab masses to the reality that Israel stands where it does and will presumably remain there for some centuries? In the aftermath of 1948, the rest of the world permitted and perhaps encouraged the Arabs to follow a policy of blandly refusing to admit that Israel existed. The armistice commissions, which should have worked out regional policies, were not permitted to operate effectively. Decisions upon which peace depended could not be made because the Arabs refused to acknowledge that history had produced an old-new nation that would prove most viable—that was too young to die. The normal intercourse between nations, such as is conducted between Russia and Germany, which were certainly as bitter enemies as Egypt and Israel, was forbidden, and the region fumbled its way to the war of 1956.

When Israel won handily, the refusal to admit realities persisted, and the same errors were allowed to continue. International commissions did not function, and normal intercourse between nations did not mature, even though the Arab portion of the region and the Iraeli form a marvelous, interlocking whole—a unit whose various segments could well profit from economic, medical, educational, developmental and planning cooperation. The blindness and the arrogant folly that produced this stalemate also produced the speeches cited in this article. And they in turn produced the hysteria that led to a third war in less than 20 years.

If the world, in 1948, had insisted that the nations of this area sit down in honest consultation, 1956 might have been avoided. If the world, following the disaster of 1956, had insisted that the Arab nations at least awaken to the existence of Israel, the tremendous folly of 1967 could have been avoided. Now, the world has a third chance, and if some right decisions are made in the months ahead, the even greater tragedy of 1977 may be avoided. What is necessary is a reasonable revision of boundary lines; a sensible settlement of the Palestinian refugee problem; a cessation of verbal assault and physical battery; and a union of talents and interests, of resources and abilities, so that the region can move forward to a creative society in which all members live infinitely better than anyone there now does.

Am I hopeful that the world will now sensibly tackle its problems when it refused to do so in the aftermath of 1948 and 1956? I am not. President Gamal Abdel Nasser pulled out of the hat one of the cleverest tricks of his career when, in the first hours of defeat, he invented the enticing theory that once again it was not Israelis who were crushing his armed might from every direction but English and American aviators. His explanation captivated the imagination of all Arabs, and within a few days was adopted as official dogma. In 1970, when I revisit the lovely waterfront of Alexandria, I expect to see a tableau explaining how, in a moment of travail in the spring of 1967, the Egyptians and their Arab allies stood bravely against the combined might of Great Britain and the United States and repulsed it. That Israel was involved will not be mentioned.

At the moment when Egyptian armies were suffering their worst defeats, Egypt's undefeated radio was broadcasting the following careful analysis of the situation:

"The United States is the enemy. Its fighters and bombers gathered in large groups to provide for Israel an air umbrella that prevents the Arabs from bombing Israel's towns and villages, while it is moving fast all along the occupied frontiers of the Arabs. The United States, therefore, is the aggressor.

"The United States saw Israel about to collapse under the blow of death. The Chicago gangs moved; the state of gangsterism and bloodshed moved; it moved in order to protect its aggressive base in the Middle East. How vile and treacherous the United States has been in its collusion with the Zionists! It refrained from coming out openly to fight us. It refrained from facing the Arabs with an open and daring hostility. No, Arabs. The United States is too vile and too base to have the ethics of cavalier. The United States threw, from all its airports and aircraft carriers in the Mediterranean, huge and continuous massings of its fighters and bombers in order to provide that air umbrella that protected Israel from the revenge of the Arabs, from the massings of the Arabs, and from the victory of the Arabs.

"The battle is continuing, United States. . . . It is going on until you become, as Britain became after the 1956 collusion, third-rate state. Here we shall bury the American international gangsterism. Here, Arabs, dig graves everywhere; dig them for every U.S. existence; dig them, Arabs. Dig all the homeland a grave for U.S. existence. Dig it, Arabs. Dig it, Arabs. Dig it, Arabs.

"The curse of all the Arabs from the ocean to the gulf and from every corner of the globe, is on you, America, and on your lackey, Israel; together with the curse of all free peoples, the curse of free men everywhere."

On the night when the defeat of the Arab armies was known to the world as one of the most crushing in history, I discussed matters on an all-night radio show with Dr. M. T. Mehdi, secretary-general of the Action Committee on American-Arab Relations, and he made these points: "Nothing has changed. Israel is worse than Nazi Germany, and the Arabs will have to drive her from the region. The war will continue precisely as it has been going for the past 19 years. And what the Americans and the English took away from the Arabs by their intervention, the Arabs will recover at the conference table. Peace talks, of course, will have to be conducted through third parties at the United Nations, because no Arab leader will ever agree to sit down and talk with an outlaw nation like Israel. You'll see. The United Nations will force Israel back to her 1948 boundaries, after which all Arab nations will unite in a war to exterminate her, because this is going to be just like the Crusades. For two hundred years, the Arabs will continue their fight and in the end they'll do exactly what they've said. Push Israel into the sea."

Nasser will probably gain more from the Arab world in defeat than he would have gained in victory. The war made him a tragic hero around whom the emotional Arabs can rally. Soon, his new crop of generals will be making the old speeches of 1948, 1956 and 1967. His people will believe them, for fantasy is impossible to eradicate if one's whole society is structured on the perpetuation of the Arabian Nights.

Yet we must dispel that fantasy. To do so is the job to which we are all committed . . . unless we are content to watch this pathetic farce of Arab self-delusion repeated in 1977, 1988 and 1999.

MINIMUM STANDARDS OF VESTING, FUNDING, TRANSPORTABILITY, AND REINSURANCE FOR PENSION AND EMPLOYEE BENEFIT PLANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. McCarthy] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, many occurrences including automation, business closings, personal illness, and personal financial problems deprive many of our privately employed citizens of a pension, into which they put not only their money but also their confidence in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the time has come for the Congress to aid these people.

I am, therefore, today introducing a comprehensive bill to establish minimum standards of vesting, funding, transportability, and reinsurance for pension and employee benefit plans as well as an agency which could effectively see to their execution.

My bill includes the following points:

First. Minimum vesting standards to assure broad eligibility in these plans.

Second. Minimum funding standards to assure a solvent basis to these plans, and to assure the worker that he will reap the promised benefits.

Third. Pension plan reinsurance so that the worker will be guaranteed against termination of the plan and the accompanying loss of benefits because of cessation of the employer's business.

Fourth. A central portability fund, operating on a voluntary basis, which would greatly facilitate the transfer of benefits from one employer to another.

Fifth. Minimum ethical standards of conduct and restrictions on conflict of interest to be followed in the administration of such employee benefit plans.

Sixth. A U.S. Pension and Employee Benefit Plan Commission to administer and enforce the provisions of this bill.

Seventh. The consolidation in the Commission of most existing Federal regulatory standards relating to pension and welfare plans. Under this stipulation, a qualification certificate from the Pension Commission will be sufficient to satisfy most, if not all, Federal regulatory statutes governing employee benefit plans.

This bill was introduced in the other body by the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], and I urge strong and prompt action on this vital matter which affects so many of our citizens in private employ.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Mathias of California (at the request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford), for tomorrow, on account of official business.

Mr. Button (at the request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. Gude (at the request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford), for today, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. ESCH), for 10 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. LAIRD (at the request of Mr. ESCH), for 20 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. ESCH), for 5 minutes, tomorrow, October 18; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MATSUNAGA) to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PEPPER, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. MCCARTHY, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. BOLAND to revise and extend his remarks in the House today and to include extraneous matter and tables.

Mr. REINECKE and to include charts and tables during general debate on H.R. 159.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ESCH) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SCHADEBERG.

Mr. MCCLURE.

Mr. TAFT.

Mr. BLACKBURN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MATSUNAGA) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico.

Mr. EILBERG.

Mr. GILBERT in two instances.

Mr. NIX.

Mr. TENZER in two instances.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD.

Mr. HAWKINS.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1572. An act for the relief of Mercedes De Toffoli;

H.R. 1653. An act for the relief of Omer Penner;

H.R. 1674. An act for the relief of Frank I. Mellin, Jr.;

H.R. 2477. An act for the relief of John J. McGrath;

H.R. 6189. An act for the relief of Fred W. Kolb, Jr.;

H.R. 6663. An act for the relief of Jesse W. Stutts, Jr.;

H.R. 6666. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marilyn Shorette;

H.R. 7324. An act for the relief of Dr. Alfredo F. Mendez, M.D.;

H.R. 8254. An act for the relief of Jan Drobot; and

H.J. Res. 516. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution of March 25, 1953, to increase the number of electric typewriters which may be furnished to Members by the Clerk of the House.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2121. An act to extend the provisions of the act of October 23, 1962, relating to relief for occupants of certain unpatented mining claims.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1572. An act for the relief of Mercedes De Toffoli;

H.R. 1653. An act for the relief of Omer Penner;

H.R. 1674. An act for the relief of Frank I. Mellin, Jr.;

H.R. 2477. An act for the relief of John J. McGrath;

H.R. 6189. An act for the relief of Fred W. Kolb, Jr.;

H.R. 6663. An act for the relief of Jesse W. Stutts, Jr.;

H.R. 6666. An Act for the relief of Mrs. Marilyn Shorette;

H.R. 7324. An act for the relief of Dr. Alfredo F. Mendez;

H.R. 8254. An act for the relief of Jan Drobot; and

H.J. Res. 516. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution of March 25, 1953, to increase the number of electric typewriters which may be furnished to Members by the Clerk of the House.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 49 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 18, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1164. A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the report on borrowing authority for the period ending June 30, 1967, pursuant to the provisions of section 304(b) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1165. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal, pursuant to the provisions of 63 Stat. 377; to the Committee on House Administration.

1166. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions approved, according certain beneficiaries third preference and sixth preference classification, pursuant to the provisions of section 204(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RIVERS: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 13510. A bill to increase the basic pay for members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 787). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules, House Resolution 947. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 10442, a bill to facilitate exchanges of land under the act of March 20, 1922 (42 Stat. 465), for use for public schools, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 788). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 948. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 11627, a bill to amend the act of June 16, 1948, to authorize the State of Maryland, by and through its State roads commission or the successors of said commission, to construct, maintain, and operate certain additional bridges and tunnels in the State of Maryland (Rept. No. 789). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 949. Resolution for consideration of House Joint Resolution 888, joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 790). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 241. Resolution amending the rules of the House in order to transfer jurisdiction over military and national cemeteries from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs; with amendment (Rept. No. 791). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H.R. 13521. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 13522. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 in order to impose certain safeguards on editorializing by radio and television broadcasting station licensees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DINGELL (by request):

H.R. 13523. A bill to provide for the adjustment of the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over lands within the Crab Orchard National Wildlife Refuge in Illinois; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.R. 13524. A bill to extend to volunteer fire companies and volunteer ambulance and rescue companies the rates of postage on second class and third class bulk mailings applicable to certain nonprofit organizations;

to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ESHLEMAN:

H.R. 13525. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to exempt students employed by institutions of higher education from the minimum wage and overtime provisions of that act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 13526. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to returns and deposits of the excise taxes on gasoline and lubricating oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 13527. A bill to designate the Tuesday next after the first Monday in November in every even numbered year as Election Day and to make it a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 13528. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDADE:

H.R. 13529. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to limit the categories of questions required to be answered under penalty of law in the decennial censuses of population, unemployment, and housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 13530. A bill to facilitate the entry into the United States of aliens who are brothers or sisters of U.S. citizens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 13531. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAFT (for himself, Mr. CLANCY, and Mr. ZION):

H.R. 13532. A bill to amend section 509 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to construction aid for certain vessels to be operated on the inland rivers and canals; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 13533. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to provide forms and amounts of remuneration to doctors, dentists, and nurses commensurate with competitive pay practices, when he finds such action is necessary to provide medical care and treatment of veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WYMAN:

H.R. 13534. A bill to exempt receipts, tickets, and other acknowledgments of any State or the District of Columbia in connection with any sweepstakes operated by such State or the District of Columbia from the provisions of section 1953 of title 18, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee:

H.R. 13535. A bill to amend section 509 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, to provide for construction aid for certain vessels operating on the inland rivers and waterways; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 13536. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to limit the categories of questions required to be answered under penalty of law in the decennial censuses of population, unemployment, and housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 13537. A bill to amend title 46, section 1159, to provide for construction aid for certain vessels operating on the inland rivers and waterways; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GETTYS:

H.R. 13538. A bill to amend the act of July 18, 1958, to provide for the expansion of Cowpens National Battleground Site; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HAGAN:

H.R. 13539. A bill to provide a comprehensive program for the control of drunkenness and the prevention and treatment of alcoholism in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. REES:

H.R. 13540. A bill to amend section 408 of the National Housing Act, as amended, to provide for the regulation of savings and loan holding companies and subsidiary companies; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. POAGE:

H.R. 13541. A bill to prohibit unfair trade practices affecting producers of agricultural products and associations of such producers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 13542. A bill to amend section 8336(c) of title 5, United States Code, to include the position of customs inspector in the category of hazardous occupations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 13543. A bill to provide for orderly trade in iron and steel mill products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H.R. 13544. A bill to provide additional protection for the rights of participants in employee pension and profit-sharing retirement plans, to establish minimum standards for pension and profit-sharing retirement plan vesting and funding, to establish a pension plan reinsurance program, to provide for portability of pension credits, to provide for regulation of the administration of pension and other employee benefit plans, to establish a U.S. Pension and Employee Benefit Plan Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 13545. A bill declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday, to be known as Columbus Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDADE:

H.J. Res. 892. Joint resolution creating a Federal Committee on Nuclear Development to review and reevaluate the existing nuclear program of the United States; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI:

H.J. Res. 893. Joint resolution creating a Federal Committee on Nuclear Development to review and reevaluate the existing civilian nuclear program of the United States; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. CAHILL:

H.J. Res. 894. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the third day of June of each year as Dr. Charles Richard Drew Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H. Con. Res. 535. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the elimination of the Castro Communist regime of Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WYMAN:

H. Res. 946. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Science and Astronautics to conduct an investigation and study of unidentified flying objects; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 13546. A bill for the relief of Riccardo Bazzoli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13547. A bill for the relief of Mario Bernardi; to the Committtee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13548. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Lo Monaco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 13549. A bill for the relief of Panagiotis George Coutsioucos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H.R. 13550. A bill for the relief of Rocco Pocetti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 13551. A bill for the relief of Ralph A. Passidomo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 13552. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Grispino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IRWIN:

H.R. 13553. A bill for the relief of Gino Pepoli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.R. 13554. A bill for the relief of Lourdes P. Manalota; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDADE:

H.R. 13555. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Campbell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 13556. A bill for the relief of Battista Sorrentino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 13557. A bill for the relief of Federica Viloria; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANDMAN:

H.R. 13558. A bill for the relief of Ioannis Stoubos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 17, 1967

The Senate met at 12 noon, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God our Father, our spirits are restless until they find the rest of Thy presence; our hearts are empty, our lives barren, our plans futile, until Thou dost possess our very souls.

We would open to Thee the secret places of our own lives.

At this high altar in the temple of public service, maintain, we beseech Thee, in those who here represent the people, the fidelity of those to whom much has been given and from whom much will be required.

We pray for Thy guidance in this solemn day of responsibility and opportunity, that as a nation we may use the vast power committed to our fallible hands in such manner as may cause all the peoples of the earth to rise up and call us blessed.

We pray in the spirit of our Lord and Master, Redeemer of the world. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, October 16, 1967, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution of the Senate, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 889. An act to designate the San Rafael Wilderness, Los Padres National Forest, in the State of California; and

S.J. Res. 112. Joint resolution extending the time for filing report of Commission on Urban Problems.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1499. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 300th anniversary of the explorations of Father Jacques Marquette in what is now the United States of America;

H.R. 5910. An act to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Pawnee Indian Tribe of Oklahoma;

H.R. 10105. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the founding of the State of Mississippi;

H.R. 10160. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding of the American Legion;

H.R. 13048. An act to make certain technical amendments to the Library Services and Construction Act; and

H.R. 13212. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 200th anniversary of the founding of San Diego.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 2121. An act to extend the provisions of the act of October 23, 1962, relating to relief for occupants of certain unpatented mining claims;

H.R. 1572. An act for the relief of Mercedes De Toffoli;

H.R. 1653. An act for the relief of Omer Penner;

H.R. 1674. An act for the relief of Frank I. Mellin, Jr.;

H.R. 2477. An act for the relief of John J. McGrath;

H.R. 6189. An act for the relief of Fred W. Kolb, Jr.;

H.R. 6663. An act for the relief of Jesse W. Stutts, Jr.;

H.R. 6666. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marilyn Shorette;

H.R. 7324. An act for the relief of Dr. Alfredo F. Mendez;

H.R. 8254. An act for the relief of Jan Drobot; and

H.J. Res. 516. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution of March 25, 1953, to increase the number of electric typewriters which may be furnished to Members by the Clerk of the House.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1499. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 300th anniversary of the explorations of Father Jacques Marquette in what is now the United States of America;

H.R. 10105. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the founding of the State of Mississippi;

H.R. 10160. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding of the American Legion; and

H.R. 13212. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 200th anniversary of the founding of San Diego; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 5910. An act to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Pawnee Indian Tribe of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 13048. An act to make certain technical amendments to the Library Services and Construction Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 625.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE 66TH ANNIVERSARY OF ARRIVAL OF THOMASITE TEACHERS IN THE PHILIPPINES

The resolution (S. Res. 160) to extend greetings to the Congress of the Philippines on the 66th anniversary of the arrival of the Thomasite teachers in the Philippines was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States extend its greetings and felicitations to the Congress of the Philippines on the sixty-sixth anniversary of the arrival of the Thomasite teachers in the Philippines.

SEC. 2. A copy of this resolution shall be transmitted to the Speaker of the Philippines House of Representatives.

The preamble was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate reconsider its action on Senate Resolution 160, agreed to earlier today, and that Senate Resolution 160 be considered and modified, on line 1, page 2, so as to change the word "Congress" to "Senate."

Mr. President, this change is necessary because the resolution is a Senate resolution, applying to the Senate only.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from West Virginia? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The resolution as amended was agreed to; and the preamble was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON BORROWING AUTHORITY

A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on borrowing authority, for the period ended June 30, 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the recovery from tortiously liable third persons of the cost of medical and hospital care and treatment, funeral expenses, and salary payments furnished or paid by the District of Columbia to officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and of the District of Columbia Fire Department (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. MONRONEY and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, with an amendment:

S. 878. A bill to amend section 201(c) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit further Federal use and donation of exchange sale property (Rept. No. 642).

ADDITIONAL FUNDS TO STUDY AND EVALUATE THE EFFECTS OF LAWS PERTAINING TO PROPOSED REORGANIZATIONS IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. RIBICOFF, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported the following original resolution (S. Res. 178); which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution 59, Ninetieth Congress, agreed to February 17, 1967 (authorizing a study of the effects of laws pertaining to proposed reorganizations in the executive branch of the Government), is hereby amended on page 2, line 21, by striking out "$110,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$115,000".

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

George J. Feldman, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Luxembourg;

Roger W. Tubby, of New York, to be the representative of the United States of America to the European Office of the United Nations, with the rank of Ambassador;

Harrison M. Symmes, of North Carolina, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan;

Hugh H. Smythe, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Malta; and

L. Dean Brown, of Maryland, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Senegal, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Gambia.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Commerce, I report favorably sundry nominations in the U.S. Coast Guard. Since these names have previously appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in order to save the expense of printing them on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk for the information of any Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations, ordered to lie on the desk, are as follows:

William W. Peterman, and sundry other officers, to be permanent commissioned officers of the Coast Guard.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 2542. A bill for the relief of Dr. Takashi Sawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOWER:

S. 2543. A bill for the relief of Ernesto Beltran; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOWER:

S. 2544. A bill to establish within the Department of Justice the office of Deputy Attorney General for law enforcement; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2545. A bill to assure small business concerns of the opportunity of obtaining insurance against property losses resulting from crimes and civil disorders; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. TOWER when he introduced the above bills, which appears under separate headings.)

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 2546. A bill for the relief of Tino Cattabiani, Caterina Cattabiani (nee Papurello), and Pier Maria Cattabiani; and

S. 2547. A bill for the relief of Juan Antonio Lopez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTION

ADDITIONAL FUNDS TO STUDY AND EVALUATE THE EFFECTS OF LAWS PERTAINING TO PROPOSED REORGANIZATION IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. RIBICOFF, from the Committee on Government Operation, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 178) to provide additional funds to study and evaluate the effects of laws pertaining to proposed reorganizations in the executive branch of the Government, which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. RIBICOFF, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

A DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, at this time I introduce a bill to establish within the Department of Justice the Office of Deputy Attorney General for law enforcement.

Last March, in his third major message to Congress on the subject of crime since he took office, President Johnson said that "public order is the first business of government." Since then, in August, we have again been informed by the FBI of the new records in crime increase set during the preceding year. The risk of becoming a victim of serious crime increased 10 percent in 1966 over 1965, with almost two victims per 100 inhabitants. During 1966, six serious crimes were committed every minute. Someone in this country was the victim of a murder, forcible rape, or aggravated assault every 2 minutes. Someone was robbed every 3½ minutes, someone was burglarized every 23 seconds, and someone's car was stolen every 57 seconds. The preliminary FBI figures for the first 6 months of this year show a 17-percent increase over the same 6-month period in 1966. Crimes of violence are up 18 percent with a startling 20-percent increase in the number of murders.

Crime has increased during the 7-year period 1960–66 at a rate almost seven times greater than the rate of population growth. And, unless substantial changes are made, all indications are that crime will continue to increase at least at this rate. Crime is associated, first of all, with the young, and our country's population is getting younger all the time. The National Crime Commission reported that 15-year-olds have the highest arrest rate in the United States, with 16-year-olds close behind. The report stated:

> The problem in the years ahead is dramatically foretold by the fact that 23 percent of the population is 10 or under.

The current trends toward urbanization and toward increased mobility are also associated with high crime rates. The number of crimes per capita tends to be highest in the large population centers and in those areas with the fastest growing populations. This is a country on the move, and for the most part it is moving to the big cities and their suburbs.

Public order is, indeed, the first business of government. The crime situation facing this country today requires more than rhetoric. The fact that major changes must be made in our approaches to crime prevention and control has been both graphically indicated by the crime statistics during the past few years, and carefully documented by the National Crime Commission and the nine supporting task force reports. In the words of the Commission report:

> If this report has not conveyed the message that sweeping and costly changes in criminal administration must be made throughout the country in order to effect a significant reduction in crime, then it has not expressed what the Commission strongly believes.

To date, Federal assistance in the area of crime control has been minimal. Our lack of involvement in this field is, of course, not entirely accidental. Law enforcement and criminal justice are primarily the responsibility of State and local governments and should and must remain so. However, the fact is that State and local governments are, with very few exceptions, so heavily burdened with other expenses that, far from being in a position to develop computer technology and send their policemen to college, they have not been able to pay the salaries necessary to keep their police forces up to recommended staff quotas. The Crime Commission reported the need for 50,000 more men to fill positions authorized for 1967 alone.

The Crime Commission also reported that the median annual salary for a big city patrolman is $5,300, which is of course far too low to attract and maintain good and adequate personnel. The local communities and the States then have no alternative; they must come forward with new plans, new programs, and difficult as it may be, more money. Also, it has been generally accepted, and I would certainly agree, that additional Federal programs to aid State and local governments in law enforcement and the administration of criminal justice is in order.

The National Crime Commission outlined an extensive eight-point program broken down as follows:

First. Increased State and local planning.

Second. Education and training of criminal justice personnel.

Third. Surveys and advisory services concerning organization and operation of criminal justice agencies.

Fourth. Development of coordinated national information systems.

Fifth. Development of a limited number of demonstration programs in agencies of justice.

Sixth. Scientific and technological research and development.

The implementation of this recommended program can only be accomplished through increased local, State, and Federal cooperation. Hopefully, such increased cooperation can be forthcoming.

Mr. President, whatever the final outcome with regard to crime legislation being acted on this year, it would seem clear that our involvement in the crime field is just beginning. The Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965 was of course a pioneer venture into a new and extremely important area of Federal legislation. The 90th Congress will not solve the problem of crime, nor will it exhaust the potential areas of fruitful and legitimate Federal assistance with regard to crime.

In essence, then, the crime crisis facing this Nation today is of immense proportions, and it is imperative that something be done about it immediately and by all levels of government. It is in view of these facts that I am introducing this bill to establish within the Department of Justice the office of Deputy Attorney General for Law Enforcement.

The House version of this year's anticrime bill, H.R. 5037, would establish the position of an Assistant Attorney General to assist the Attorney General in administering title I, planning grants, and title II, grants for law enforcement and criminal justice purposes. I believe that this is appropriate and in no way a duplication of the purpose of my bill.

The major functions of the Deputy Attorney General for Law Enforcement, which I am calling for, would be the overall supervision, direction, and coordination of the various bureaus, departments, and offices within the Department of Justice relating to law enforcement. This deputy would also be the chief liaison officer of the Department with regard to matters relating to law enforcement with both the Congress and other governmental departments and agencies. This liaison function would be of major importance. A study made recently by a number of my colleagues in the House revealed the existence of more than 20 law enforcement or investigative agencies of the Federal Government, ranging, as they put it, "from the Federal Bureau of Investigation to the Fish and Wildlife Service." Let me quote briefly from their report which was inserted in the Congressional Record by Congressman Joseph McDade on March 21, and is entitled "Are We Organized To Fight Crime?"

> There appears to be little system, little method, little order in the Federal Government's approach to crime. It is a crazy-quilt of departments, bureaus and agencies with competing responsibilities, duplicating staffing, poor communications, and self-defeating jealousies . . .
>
> To combat crime we do not need a new Department, but we badly need a reorganization of the existing structure—to pull together in an orderly way the existing Federal agencies concerned—and to provide a logical framework for giving attention to aspects which today are largely ignored.

I would agree, certainly, that we do not need a new department. The logical place for such a program is the Justice Department, and the program is clearly of such scope and magnitude as to require the supervision of a full-time Deputy Attorney General.

In closing, I want to underscore the fact that for too long our tendency in this area of crime has been to drift along, relying either on the utopian reforms promised by social legislation, or on an unbased optimistic belief that tomorrow will be better.

There were 3¼ million serious crimes reported to the police in 1966, and the National Crime Commission estimates that the actual amount of crime in this country is at least twice that reflected by police statistics. The Senate Committee on Government Operations Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations has estimated that 137 cities in this country experienced riots and civil disorders in recent years. In the past 3 years, 70 cities were subjected to major incidents.

Crime and civil disorder in this country demand immediate, major, and effective action on the part of the Federal Government. I urge that this bill which I am introducing be passed as an important and necessary step in that direction.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2544) to establish within the Department of Justice the Office of Deputy Attorney General for Law Enforcement, introduced by Mr. Tower, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SMALL BUSINESS CRIME AND CIVIL DISORDER INSURANCE PROTECTION ACT

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, first I wish to state my support for a measure introduced by Senator Smathers, S. 1484, a bill designed to protect small businesses against criminal activity. S. 1484 furnishes Government-assisted insurance in areas where criminal activity has made it difficult, and in most cases impossible, to obtain insurance from private companies.

I am introducing a bill which I believe to be complementary to S. 1484, by providing special Government-assisted insurance which would cover all small businesses suffering losses due to civil disorders and place them in the same category with those directly identified with criminal activity.

At the present time, the Small Business Administration is using, by Presidential decree, money from the SBA disaster fund for small business rebuilding loans in the Detroit area—and, I believe, rightfully so. But, since a question might be raised as to the type of disaster for which the SBA fund was established, this proposal will spell out "civil disorders" as being eligible disasters by congressional intent.

As of June 30, 1967, the disaster fund contained a balance of $218 million, which is believed more than sufficient to meet the needs prescribed by President Johnson. In addition it is believed $250 million more can be made available within a short time through the sale of additional participations.

It will undoubtedly be necessary for the Congress to appropriate even more money for the SBA fund, due to the recent Hurricane Beulah.

The bill I am proposing would stipulate that among the insurance corporation employees provided in S. 1484 there be a force of investigators which could be assigned to study the pattern of insurance claims made under the insuring sections of S. 1484.

These investigators, operating in the same manner as private insurance company investigators, could advise the Board of the Small Business Crime Protection Insurance Corporation as to the possibility of concentration by criminals against small businesses protected against crime activity by Federal Government insurance.

Also, the bill I am introducing would expand the language in S. 1484 to cover civil disorders rather than the somewhat limited language of "criminal activity" now in the bill. It is quite possible that losses could occur to small businesses, due indirectly to criminal activity.

For example, in the Cambridge, Md., civil disorder, the basic criminal activity was an act of arson against a school. Due to the fact, however, that firemen could not get into the area because of possible acts of violence against them, adjacent small businesses were destroyed by the spreading fire.

I am sure many similar losses developed in Detroit where it appeared the fire department was hampered greatly in its work, thus reducing the efficiency of the department to contain the fires to original sources of actual criminal activity.

Testimony on S. 1484, recently heard by the Small Business Subcommittee of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee indicated the Small Business Administration prefers delaying action on this problem in order to obtain additional information on the subject.

I hesitate to believe the people who have been hurt financially and physically by the crimes and disorders which have prompted these efforts to provide assistance would look with favor on an extended delay of action.

There is precedence for such Federal insurance assistance in cases of unusual and extreme hardship which provides all the legislative experience necessary to get a program underway at once. Additional information, as in other assistance programs in the past, can be used from time to time to broaden and improve the existing program.

Mr. President, the people who are in danger of being victimized by the ever-spreading and increasing crime and disorder activities should have at least some form of protection thrown up around them.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2545) to assure small business concerns of the opportunity of obtaining insurance against property losses resulting from crimes and civil disorders, introduced by Mr. TOWER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, October 17, 1967, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 2121) to extend the provisions of the act of October 23, 1962, relating to relief for occupants of certain unpatented mining claims.

SENATOR BROOKE ADDRESSES SPRINGFIELD, MASS., ADULT EDUCATION FORUM

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on October 11, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE] delivered an address at the Springfield, Mass., Adult Education Forum. This address attracted a great deal of comment and attention, and apparently is worthy of further circulation. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PHILLIPS LECTURE ADDRESS

(By Senator EDWARD W. BROOKE)

I have been looking forward for the past several months to the honor of delivering the Phillips lecture which inaugurates the Springfield Public Forum season.

When Dr. Robinson extended the kind invitation, pride said accept quickly, humility said accept hesitatingly, commonsense said decline with regrets. I accepted quickly.

To Dr. Robinson, I convey my profound thanks for the honor you do me by extending this invitation to address the members and guests of the Springfield Adult Education Council.

To Mrs. Morner, the Council's able Executive Secretary, I express my appreciation for the arrangements so meticulously made and for being so understanding of the problems that confront a harried Senator's schedule.

To Dr. Deady, I want also to say how complimented I am that your Phillips Lecture Committee has seen fit to include me among all the distinguished individuals who have preceded me on this rostrum.

And to all the officers, members, and friends of the Springfield Adult Education Council, I express my pleasure that I have this opportunity of sharing some thoughts and ideas with you this evening. The Council enjoys an enviable and well-deserved reputation for the consistently high caliber of its forums. I feel sure that the late Alexander Phillips would take pride and satisfaction in knowing how zealously his generous testamentary instructions have been followed in the Phillips Lecture Series. The fidelity with which you have executed the trust that Mr. Phillips placed in your hands is indeed to be commended and saluted.

I want also to congratulate the Council for the high purpose of its objectives, for the outstanding service it has given the community by providing these accessible forums for free discussion and debate, and for the Council's consistent dedication to the highest standards of excellence.

I want you all to know that I really mean it when I say that I am honored to be here tonight.

America's often cited solidarity in wartime is, to some extent, a fiction. The principle that politics must stop at the water's edge has been honored as often in the breach as in the practice. Popular dissent has been a frequent part of every crisis we have faced. We need only look at the division of opinions over the issue of war with Great Britain in the Revolutionary period, or at the unpopularity of the War of 1812 and the Mexican war. The Civil War literally and tragically divided this nation, and led to the bloodiest fighting the world had ever seen. The Spanish-American war had its dissenters, who became even more vocal in the imperialistic era which followed. Anti-war parades were held in New York City in 1917, and American youths refused to be drafted even then. Some dissent from national policy appeared even in World War II, though the attack on Pearl Harbor clearly and dramatically defined our position. In the 1950's, despite a clear cut case of invasion, disagreement over our involvment in Korea was widespread. Freedom to dissent from national policy has always been a part of our national heritage.

Today we have committed 500,000 of our young men to a conflict in Southeast Asia. Our planes fly daily bombing runs over enemy territory. Our Marines are digging into embattled positions on the DMZ. Our soldiers are tracking down elusive guerrillas in the Central Highlands. We are at war in Vietnam!

But this war is different from other wars. For one thing, it is an undeclared war. It began as an attempt to help the government of the southern half of a temporarily divided nation to protect itself from an indigenous guerrilla force, supplemented and supplied by the government in the North.

We had no idea, when we first became involved in Vietnam, of the extent which our commitment would reach.

Over a two-year period, we have increased our commitment in South Vietnam from 29,100 men in March of 1965 to 500,000 at the present time. We have suffered over 100,000 casualities and nearly 17,000 American lives have been lost. The war is presently costing over $2.5 billion per month.

The cost to the nation is really much greater. For because of the war, the needs of our cities have been left untended. Conservation projects and educational programs have been postponed. The resources to effectively wage our war on poverty have been decreased. All these and more are the casualties of the Vietnam war.

More than at any other time in our nation's history, debate rages over our objectives and our means of achieving those objectives.

But dissent should not be condemned. It should be welcomed. The dialogue in which this nation has been embroiled during the last two years has in the main been informative and useful. Many aspects of our involvement in Vietnam need to be re-examined. Many shortcomings need to be brought to light and to be corrected. And out of it all, there is always the possibility that discussion will lead to discovery—that a solution will be found.

There are three basic alternatives which have been suggested as a means to end the war.

The first of these is massive escalation. There are those who see this as a military war. They say that we are engaged in a struggle against Communist aggression, and that the only way to win is to make that aggression too costly to be sustained by the enemy. They want an all-out effort that would include stepped-up bombing and the invasion of North Vietnam.

The advocates of this approach in 1965 believed that more troops would defeat the enemy in the South. Instead, more troops and supplies were brought in from the North, and the fighting became more intense.

Then it was suggested that we could stop infiltration by bombing the supply lines from the North. With the enemy thus cut off from its source of arms and equipment, victory would be assured. Instead, the North Vietnamese developed new supply lines and more elusive methods of infiltration. The amount of assistance from the Soviet Union and Communist China increased. And the enemy was able to wage a more sophisticated and effective war than before.

Now that these measures have not achieved their objective, those who favor a military solution urge that we remove all limitations. "Bomb them back to the Stone Age if necessary" is a position frequently expressed. "Mine and bomb the port of Haiphong and cut the rail and highway connections with China and the Soviet Union" is their admonition. They believe that our Allies should cease trading with North Vietnam, and that Communist nations should do so at their own risk. In this way North Vietnam will be forced to concede, and the war will be brought to an end.

But let us examine this line of reasoning. For one thing, does it not ignore the fact that each escalation on our part has brought a corresponding escalation from the North? Does it not ignore the risk of involvement in a larger, more devastating and more costly war? Can we bomb or mine the harbor of Haiphong without creating the very real possibility of direct intervention on the part of Communist China and the Soviet Union?

And perhaps most important of all, do not the advocates of a military solution ignore the fact that the real answer lies in the South, that we can literally decimate the economy and the war-making potential of the North without destroying the guerrilla infrastructure in the South?

Another alternative which has been widely recommended is withdrawal. There are those who say we should not be in Vietnam at all. They believe we were wrong to aid the French. They say we compounded the error when we refused to accept the Geneva Agreements. And they further believe we have made a bad situation progressively worse by supporting one military dictatorship after another with increasing American manpower.

The advocates of withdrawal contend that no amount of additional military pressure can defeat the Viet Cong. They regard the Viet Cong as a popular, indigenous force, supplied and assisted by the North, and operating with the support of the majority of the people in the South. They are convinced that such forces cannot—and what is more should not—be defeated. They therefore call upon the United States to admit its error and withdraw its forces as quickly and gracefully as possible.

We have stated that our purpose in Vietnam is to prevent the spread of Communist regimes by force and by terror, and in the larger context, to show that wars of national liberation can not succeed against the combined military force of the United States and the national dedication of the threatened country. Our stated intent is to draw the line in Southeast Asia, and to provide a military shield behind which not only South Vietnam, but the other free nations of Asia as well, can devote their resources to economic and social progress.

Is not refusal to withdraw, under the circumstances, a matter of credibility rather than a matter of national pride? Is it not a question of a believable commitment, to ourselves and to our Allies—and even to our enemies? Is it enough to be the most powerful nation in the world if that power cannot be relied upon? Is not trust the essence of all human relationships which applies to nations as well as men? Would we not stand to lose far more than we might gain by simply withdrawing from the war?

The only remaining alternative, if we are not to continue the contained war indefinitely, is a negotiated peace. But what, of all the possibilities which have been suggested, is the step most likely to lead to a negotiated peace?

Great hopes were harbored that the recent South Vietnamese elections would be such a step; that freely conducted popular elections would result in the election of a government which would be understood, accepted, and supported by the majority of the South Vietnamese people; that the elections would lead to reforms, to a sense of national unity and dedication to a common cause.

But have the elections fulfilled these expectations? Is there not still censorship of the press despite Government statements to the contrary? Is not the government arresting its political factions with which it is in disagreement? Is not reform still desperately needed in the Army and the provinces?

There are those who contend that this government cannot function because it is a plurality government. But is a plurality government unique in the history of the world? Were not four American presidents chosen by plurality vote? Have not Britain, France and Germany all had plurality governments in recent decades and have they not functioned well? Is it not possible that a plurality government may prove to be the most representative form of government possible in South Vietnam? Does not the South Vietnamese government have an opportunity to form a broad coalition with a variety of political factions? Cannot the factions in South Vietnam be forged into a new national unity which can help the South to win the war and to deal with the Viet Cong or with Hanoi as at least an equal? Is this, then, not one step toward a negotiated settlement—a stable, popular and viable government in South Vietnam?

But the measure which has received the most widespread attention as leading in the direction of the alternative of a negotiated peace is a cessation of American bombing in the North.

The declared purpose of our bombing of North Vietnam is three-fold:

(a) To reduce the flow of external assistance being provided to North Vietnam;

(b) To destroy those military and industrial resources that contribute most to the support of aggression; and

(c) To harass, disrupt and impede the movement of men and material into South Vietnam.

But how effective have we been in achieving these objectives? According to the best military intelligence available, we have destroyed or disrupted half of North Vietnam's war-supporting industry, including electric power, chemical and rubber plants, and iron and steel and cement factories. Strikes on roads, railroads and water routes reportedly have taken a heavy toll.

It is estimated that 500,000 to 600,000 North Vietnamese have had to be diverted to repair these facilities. The military claim that our bombing policy has reduced infiltration from 8,000 men per month a year ago to about 6,000 men per month today. According to Admiral U. S. G. Sharp, Commander in Chief of Pacific Operations, "The ports (of North Vietnam) are congested by an almost four-fold expansion of sea imports necessitated by disruption or destruction of domestic sources. . . . (And) ship unloading time is believed to have tripled since March."

To support their contention that the bombing is essential and reduces military losses, advocates of this strategy point to the Tet, or Vietnamese New Year's truce last spring, when in four days of no bombings the North Vietnamese were reported to have brought 25,000 tons of supplies south, including the heavy artillery now in place just north of the DMZ. It is estimated that this same movement would have taken them 38 days under sustained bombing conditions.

The military is virtually unanimous in agreeing that the worst thing we could do is to halt the bombing of North Vietnam. They claim that it would be a great boost to the morale of the North Vietnamese, that it would permit the enemy to operate from a sanctuary, to repair their roads and factories, and to move anything they wanted into North Vietnam from China and the Soviet Union. According to Admiral Sharp, "We would be . . . extending the war indefinitely."

Those who support a cessation of bombing view the situation differently. They place much less emphasis on military pressure as a path to negotiations, and believe that, like us, Hanoi would like to see an end to the war as soon as possible. They contend that 25 percent of the North Vietnamese army is now fighting in South Vietnam, and that the war has been costly to North Vietnam in lives and material. They argue that an estimated three divisions are now massed just north of the DMZ, and that it must be assumed that a major reason for not moving them south has been fear of an invasion of the north. They further contend that prior to 1965, North Vietnam was moving from an agrarian to an industrially developing economy, and had a favorable balance of trade; that today most of its industrial capacity has been destroyed.

These advocates of a cessation of bombing in the North point out that while the loss to North Vietnam has been heavy, the bombing has proved to be more costly to us than to them. And most important of all, they say the bombing has not achieved its intended objectives. They cite the continuous movement of men and supplies to the South despite constant and deadly harassment by American air power. They claim that the will of the North Vietnamese to continue to fight has been strengthened by the bombing. They say that our attempts to hit the rail line with China, and the dock facilities in Haiphong, have only led the North Vietnamese and their allies to discover new methods of supplying their fighting forces.

In addition, they point to the fact that the North Vietnamese have stubbornly persisted in regarding the United States as the aggressor, and refused even to consider the possibility of negotiations until we unilaterally and unconditionally cease bombing their country.

Thus the arguments rage. We seem to have reached an impasse. The United States refuses to halt the bombing without some assurance that talks will follow. The North Vietnamese refuse to offer assurance that they will negotiate upon cessation of bombing in the North.

If there are negotiations, obviously, if successful, they could lead to peace. But what are the disadvantages and the advantages which would accrue to the United States if it assumes the risk of cessation of bombing in the North and Hanoi refuses to negotiate?

During this period of course, with only cessation of bombing of the North, the war would go on as usual and both sides would conduct combat and reconnaissance missions. Artillery pieces would still be fired. Our air force would continue to bomb military targets in the South and give close air support to our troops.

The disadvantages could be that North Vietnam would use the period of cessation for the purpose of inflicting heavy casualties on our troops and strengthening their forces. In addition, Hanoi could very well use this time to transport essential supplies both to the troops in the DMZ and to the South. They could also repair the damage to military and industrial installations in the North during the period of cessation.

What, then, are the advantages to be derived if our cessation of bombing in the North failed to produce negotiations?

It could give credence to our government's desire for peace.

It would indicate our willingness to do everything within reason and honor to bring about a negotiated peace.

It could bring more support from the American people for our position in Vietnam and thus help to unite the nation.

It could improve our position in the eyes of the world, because we will have acted consistently with the call of the nations of the world to cease bombing the North.

It could even have the result of our allies committing troops to fight with us in Vietnam.

It could place the Hanoi government in the position of defending to the world its failure to negotiate.

It could conversely remove our government from the position of defending to the world its failure to cease bombing in order to bring about negotiations.

It could unite the South Vietnamese, and at the same time create division within North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front.

It could have the effect of putting the Soviet Union in a position of proving its assertion that negotiations would take place if the bombing were stopped.

It could encourage Secretary-General U Thant and the United Nations to take up consideration of the war if Hanoi refuses or fails to negotiate after our cessation of bombing.

The debate on this issue has gone so far that personal and national pride may have become major barriers to a willingness on both sides to take the necessary steps to bring about a negotiated peace. If personal or national pride is the controlling factor in Hanoi's refusal to give assurances that it will negotiate upon cessation of the bombing in the North, that same pride must not be a factor in our government's decision as to whether we should stop the bombing. Thus the question to be resolved is what harm will accrue to American troops and to the South Vietnamese if our government assumes the risk and responsibility of a cessation of the bombing in North Vietnam.

The American people do not know how great the risk would really be. The Congress does not know. Even the military does not know.

Under our system of government, only the President of the United States has all of the facts—the vast knowledge afforded by military and civil intelligence. His is the awesome responsibility to constantly consider all of the alternatives and to make the decision as to whether the advantages of cessation of the bombing in the North outweigh the disadvantages. If there are valid reasons why we should not cease bombing of the North, then the President should make those reasons crystal clear to the American people and to the world.

When I went to Vietnam last March, I looked for evidence to support a conclusion that Hanoi would negotiate upon our cessation of bombing in the North. But I found no such evidence. To the contrary, all the evidence that I did find supported the conclusion that Hanoi would settle for nothing less than unilateral withdrawal.

Therefore, I reluctantly concluded that our conduct of the war at that time was the only logical course that we could follow.

This conclusion was also based upon my finding that the bombing was having a salutary effect upon the morale of our troops, and was impairing the enemy's capacity to wage war.

Of course there have been bombing pauses in the past. The President has directed the cessation of bombing numerous times in the past. And it has been suggested that since negotiations did not take place during these pauses further cessation would be futile. But the situation is fluid in Vietnam. The situation has changed, both militarily and politically. And the fact that prior cessations have not brought about negotiations does not mean that cessation at this time will not be productive.

And thus we must conclude that the time has come for a reassessment, and for a new decision. So much hangs in the balance. That reassessment and decision must be made without delay.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Montoya in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR PEARSON ON REVITALIZING RURAL AMERICA

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, on September 16, the distinguished junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson] spoke before the Southeastern Ohio Public Officials Conference at Ohio University at Athens, Ohio, on the subject of "Revitalizing Rural America." He had an outstanding and tremendously large audience in Athens, Ohio, and in the audience there were many students from Ohio University, which is one of the great universities in my State. In his magnificent address Senator Pearson pointed to the growing national interest and concern over the need to stimulate the economic and social development of our rural communities and outlined some of the pending proposals in Congress which have been made in this area.

He noted that the growing national commitment to the economic rebirth of rural America stems not only from the conviction that the expansion of economic opportunities in our smaller towns and farm communities would be a worthwhile accomplishment itself, but that it would also contribute significantly to the alleviation of many of the problems that now plague our cities, for it is the uncontrolled migration of people and economic resources from rural areas to the metropolitan areas which has generated many of the problems now constituting the crisis of the cities. Senator Pearson concluded that we are at the commencement stages of a growing national debate centering around what constitutes a proper rural-urban balance and he expressed the view that from this debate will come a series of national policy decisions which will have a major influence on the development of our society for several decades to come.

Mr. President, because of the importance and significance of our distinguished colleague's remarks I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator James B. Pearson at Southeastern Ohio Public Officials Conference, Ohio University, Athens, Ohio, September 16, 1967

REVITALIZING RURAL AMERICA

It is indeed a pleasure to appear before this Conference. I always welcome the opportunity to speak on the general subject of rural economic development, and it is particularly gratifying to speak on this subject on the campus of this University which, through its various programs, has shown such initiative and capable leadership in the area of regional economic development.

My comments today will be directed to five points. First, I want to comment on some of the evidence which indicates that there is a growing national commitment to a new effort to encourage the social and economic development of rural communities. By the way, at this point let me just say that I use the term "rural area" in a rather broad sense to include not only the open countryside, but also smaller towns and cities, even those with populations of up to 25,000 or 50,000 provided they are not a part of a large metropolitan complex.

Second, I want to point to some of the reasons why we are now experiencing a national debate on this question of rural development.

Third, I want to review some of the recent legislative proposals which have already been made and fourth, to suggest some guidelines that should be kept in mind as this national debate expands in the future and as we develop additional rural oriented programs.

Fifth, I will make some observations about the role that universities can play in this effort and also discuss some of the problems and opportunities that local public officials, such as yourselves, will encounter in this growing effort.

I

In pointing to some of the factors which suggest a growing national consensus on the need to stimulate the social and economic development of rural areas and, at the same time, to slow down and better control the migration of people from rural communities to the large cities, I hope you will excuse me if I first call attention to the Rural Job Development bill which I introduced on July 21. This bill was cosponsored by Senator Fred Harris of Oklahoma and 28 of our colleagues. The support for the bill in the Senate has been completely bipartisan and has been warmly endorsed by such Senator leaders as Mike Mansfield and George Aiken.

Senator Harris and I have been particularly pleased with the very favorable public reaction to the proposal. For example, in my own case, I have received letters from all parts of the country and from all types of individuals and groups indicating their support for the bill and expressing hope that it will be enacted. Newspaper editorial support has also been extremely favorable and the lists of editorial endorsements have by no means been limited to small town or rural oriented newspapers. I find this most encouraging.

As a result of this demonstration of solid and broad based support for the proposal I am most hopeful that we will be able to get Committee hearings started on the bill sometime yet this year.

As you may know, of course, other public figures and groups, particularly in the last year, have been stressing the need to obtain more favorable balance between rural and urban communities. Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman has shown considerable leadership in this area. I also was encouraged recently when the Republican Coordinating Committee published a comprehensive report outlining the problems facing rural areas and suggesting approaches that could be taken to broaden the base of economic and social opportunities in those areas. The recent statements by Secretary Freeman and the Republican Coordinating Committee's report on, "Revitalizing our Rural Areas" have also been reviewed very favorably in the editorial columns of many of our large metropolitan newspapers. I also note that last week several of the persons testifying before the President's Commission on Urban Problems argued for the need to expand opportunities in rural areas in an effort to slow down the rural migration, thereby reducing some of the population pressures being experienced by our already overcrowded cities.

Thus the developments of the past few months make it quite clear, I believe, that a new national debate has begun. It is a debate and a discussion that is likely to continue for several years.

II

While the existence of growing public discussion is evident, it is a little more difficult to explain why it has developed at this particular time. But I would offer these suggestions. First, despite the fact that we have been a highly urbanized and industrial nation for a good number of years, we have always maintained an identification with, or a certain fondness if you like, for our rural areas. This nation was born on the farm and in the small towns and it was not really until the beginning of this century that the economic and social center of the nation shifted to the metropolitan areas. Thus, as we have become aware of the fact that poverty is not limited to the slum ghettos of the large cities, the nation has responded with considerable sympathy to proposals aimed at improving the economic lot of rural residents.

The rural areas have been in trouble for a good many years, but ironically it is the great trouble in the cities which have finally caused us to see and understand the difficulties of the countryside and small towns.

The headlines of the past two or three years have made all of us painfully aware of the gigantic social and economic problems of urban America. And the term, "crisis of the cities," has come into common usage—a crisis described in terms of festering slums, rising crime rates, disintegrating families, chronic unemployment, racial tension, congested streets, polluted air and contaminated water.

We have now begun to recognize that many of these problems can be traced to the overcrowding of people and the excessive concentration of industry with the consequent problems of air and water pollution and what have you. We are now beginning to realize that one of the most sensible and effective approaches to dealing with the crisis of the cities is to devise programs which will have the effect, hopefully, of slowing down or at least better controlling the great rural to urban migration which has for several decades continued to depopulate the countryside and small towns and to swell the population of our already overcrowded cities.

The long, hot urban summer of 1967 has proven to be something of a catalyst, and we have begun to accept the idea that as we attempt to deal with the crisis of the cities the challenge is not simply to make the cities more efficient and more livable for more and more people, but how to keep more and more people from crowding into them.

III

Now, let me review some of the proposals that have been advanced to accomplish this goal. And here I will not attempt to review the programs that are already operating, but limit my comments to those that have been proposed in the past few months.

Again, let me first mention the Pearson-Harris Rural Job Development Act. This proposal attempts to encourage growth of new job-creating industries in rural areas by offering a series of tax incentives to the industries which would locate in these areas. The Investment Tax Credit Act of 1962 has had, and continues to have, a stimulating effect on the growth of our overall economy. The Rural Job Development bill would apply the same principle, with some additional techniques, to encourage similar growth in the rural sector of our economy.

I am confident that, if enacted, these tax incentives would serve to stimulate new industries in rural areas not simply because businessmen would find the tax benefits advantageous, but also because their mere existence would necessarily force businessmen to take a second look at our rural communities. And once they do this, I am confident they will discover a whole series of reasons why it would be in their advantage to locate there. Businessmen, like the rest of us, form notions that are hard to break. The notion that rural areas are poor locations for new industries is one that clearly needs to be broken.

A proposal of a different type is that which is being advanced by Senator Proxmire of Wisconsin and Senator Mundt of South Dakota. Their bills aim at inaugurating broad based studies by the Congress and by a special commission to analyze and evaluate all the various economic and social factors which affect the distribution and movement of people and industry. Certainly this type of study will be extremely useful in providing us with data and new insight into this basic problem which we are attempting to deal with.

There is another set of proposals which relate to this area, at least in an indirect way, and these assert the proposition that in the allotment of research and development grants and in its other procurement programs the Federal Government has the responsibility and indeed the obligation to achieve a more equitable geographic distribution of these funds, that is, wherever possible, without loss of efficiency to the Government, to channel more of these funds into smaller communities and smaller colleges and universities. Proposals along this line have been advanced by half a dozen Senators, including myself. Senator Fred Harris, Chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Government Research has been holding hearings on these proposals for over a year and while the prospects for enactment of any of the bills are not particularly good at this time the general debate in the Senate has already caused several agencies within the Executive Branch to take a fresh look at their existing practices, particularly in the area of awarding research and development grants.

There have been a number of other proposals and I hope to introduce at least two more yet this year myself; one dealing with rural housing, the other with vocational education, both necessary supplements, I believe, to my rural job proposal.

The President's Commission on Rural Poverty has also completed its study and will be reporting its findings and making recommendations in the very near future.

IV

Despite this considerable flurry of activity within the past 12 months I repeat that I think we are only at the beginning stages of a great national debate which will continue for several years. I would now like to suggest a few guidelines for this expanding national debate. First, we must be willing to question many of our old attitudes and traditional dogmas and to take a fresh and open-minded look at the forces which have shaped our present social and economic structure.

So far, there has been a general demonstration of acceptance of the idea that the historical rural to urban shift is getting out of hand and, as a result, both the rural and urban areas are suffering. But we have got to do much more. We have got to probe deeper.

We are going to have to be willing to discard several of the long held and fundamental propositions. For example, although there has always been a certain uneasiness about the continuing concentration of people and economic resources into relatively few highly urbanized areas, we have, on the other hand, assumed that the social and economic forces which underlie this concentration are not only inevitable but basically desirable over the long run. We know that we have become a great and powerful nation precisely because industry has long since replaced agriculture as the major source of economic wealth. We also have assumed that the concentration of economic resources into a relatively few geographical areas was a necessary feature of the industrial growth.

In short, we have been something of two minds on this subject. Our doubts at any given moment about the undesirable effects of massive urbanization have been counterbalanced by a general expression of faith that this overall movement toward a highly concentrated urbanized society represented economic and social progress.

It is quite clear that we are not going to discard the belief which is at the foundation of Western thought and culture that economic growth represents progress. What we must do, however, if this national debate is going to do anything more than pay lip service to the idea of achieving greater rural-urban balance, is to rethink many of our present notions about how economic growth and development occurs and what constitutes the meaning of economic efficiency.

In other words, we don't have to reject the notion of economic progress, but we do have to rethink why economic development occurs. And, above all, we have to discard the notion that the economic forces which resulted in the present rural-urban distribution are somehow inevitable and uncontrollable. We don't want to destroy these forces, but we must do a better job of controlling them for the benefit of all.

For far too long we have watched the poor migrate from the country to the city, blandly assuming that this represented the first step up the ladder of economic advancement. But in far too many instances the individual has not gained, and, consequently, society has lost.

For far too long we have sat back and watched a basic industry like coal mining in Appalachia dry up, leaving the residents of the area without a source of livelihood and said, "this is unfortunate, but inevitable and the people of the area must move to new areas to find new jobs." But we have too often ignored the fact that jobs in other areas weren't available. And we failed to realize that it is often more economically efficient *and* civilized to bring jobs to people rather than forcing people to migrate in an uncertain search for jobs.

Another example: The development of the megalopolis has generally been regarded as a product of unavoidable economic forces which inexorably demand greater and greater centralization of our productive capacities, a process deemed desirable, in part, because of supposed advantages of economies-in-scale associated with large centralized productive centers.

But it is now becoming increasingly apparent that numerous economic inefficiencies associated with this type of concentration may counteract this advantage. For example, it may well be that the overhead costs of air and water pollution, garbage treatment and disposal and other public services more than offset the productive efficiencies that are realized through concentration of resources.

Economic wastes are also associated with the movement of people to and from work. Moreover, the costs of improving commuter transportation systems are staggering. For example, it costs approximately $20,000 to develop the additional facilities needed to bring in just one more car per day during commuter hours into cities like New York and Chicago.

Moving from the general to a more specific suggested guideline, I have urged that as we propose programs to stimulate rural economic development we not limit the application of these programs only to rural poverty areas. Certainly our objective is to reduce, and to eventually eliminate, the worse pockets of rural poverty. But the goal seems to me to be much broader than this. It is an effort to stimulate the economic development of *all* rural areas, even those that, in comparison to many parts of Appalachia and the cut over areas of the Great Lakes States, are relatively well off economically. For what we are seeking here is not simply to raise the income levels of rural persons per se, but to fundamentally affect the overall national distribution of population and economic resources.

V

Now let me turn to the fifth point that I want to consider today, that being the role of universities and the local communities in the commitment to rural economic development. In regard to the universities, they can and should participate at at least two levels. First, the university faculties should take a vital and vigorous part in the national debate on rural-urban balance. We need the expertise and special knowledge of the academic community not only in regard to such technical questions as the processes of economic development and distribution of population and productive resources, but also the contributions it can make to the fundamental questions of social values which are inevitably involved in any discussion about what should our national policy be on rural-urban balance.

Secondly, the universities, I believe, have a responsibility to take a direct and active part in efforts to stimulate economic and social development of the immediately surrounding community.

We all recognize the relationship between a geographic region's system of higher education and its capacity for economic development and growth. Thus, it is quite proper, I think, that colleges and universities should attempt to gear a considerable portion of their research efforts and other activities to those endeavors which might serve to stimulate community and regional economic growth.

This activity is an important and legitimate function of institutions of higher learning, but there is, of course, an ever present danger of too great an emphasis on this type of service orientation. The college or university must avoid being caught up in a climate of parochialism, for whether it is a small community junior college or a large university its ultimate goal is always the education of minds in the broadest and best sense of the word. And in this sense the institution's community is mankind as a whole of which the local geographic community is only a fraction.

In short, there are hazards and problems but they can be overcome if properly handled. And the universities can learn how to handle them only by trial and error, by getting their feet wet so to speak. And in this respect, I am sure Ohio University has learned a great deal.

Now a few comments concerning activities of the local communities themselves. I think the first principle that needs to be emphasized here is that if the local community wants to broaden its economic base by developing new types of industry and new types of employment it has got to work for it. Federal and state governments can act to create the proper climate and mechanisms for economic development, but that development is not going to occur to any significant degree in any community unless the community itself is committed to accomplishing that goal.

There are several reasons for this. First of all, the rural community can overcome some of the disadvantages it has in competing for new industry only if it is able to convince the owners of the prospective new enterprise that the governments and the citizens of the area are united in their desire to broaden their economic base. This is not because businessmen feel they have to be loved, but because they have learned from past experience that their enterprise would be successful over the long run in what might otherwise be considered a marginal area only if this sense of unity of commitment is prevalent in the community.

Second, despite the fact that the Federal Government goes to considerable effort to inform people of the types of programs that might be beneficial to the community, in the final analysis it is the community itself which must take the first step. Let me cite an example. We have had urban renewal programs operating in this country for several years. But it is only very recently that many of the smaller towns and cities have begun to take advantage of this program. One of the very simple and basic reasons for this is that these communities have been simply unaware that the program might be available to them. In addition, it has often been the case even though there was a general awareness of the urban renewal program, the local government simply didn't know how to go about applying for a renewal grant.

This problem of the local community either not being aware of the availability of Federal programs or not knowing how to apply for them continues to get worse as each year we enact new legislation in Congress. And in this respect I must say that one of our faults in the Congress is that we have not paid enough attention to the necessity of designing programs that are easily understood and easily administered and also we have too often added new programs with no serious attempt to coordinate them with programs already in operation.

Thus, one of the advantages that large cities have over smaller communities, to put it quite frankly, is that they simply know how to do a better job of taking advantage of Federal programs that are available. They are more likely to have expert staff officials who can devote their time to keeping informed about current programs and who have the skill and the know-how for applying and securing Federal grants and aid of various types.

Thus, I think very serious thought should be given to efforts to encourage local governments in a given region to get together in some type of cooperative association which would make it possible for them to employ the services of the administrative staff capable of advising and coordinating the efforts of the region to maximize its programs for economic development.

In conclusion, let me express again the belief that we are at the beginning stages of a great national debate centering around what constitutes a proper rural-urban balance. What this means basically is that we are to have an opportunity to discuss, from a new perspective, the characteristics of our present society and to raise fundamental questions about what type of society we want to build in the future. There will be no precise blueprint for the future emerging from this national debate. The American political system simply doesn't work that way and properly so because it is, of course, only under totalitarian political regimes that such a national blueprint can be made and adhered to. But gradually out of this discussion certain old attitudes and beliefs will be discarded; new ones will take their place. Out of this period will come a whole series of national policy decisions which will have a major influence on the development of our society for several decades to come. It is an exciting period and I am happy to be a part of it.

LOOPHOLE IN TAX STRUCTURE DENIED BY TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in the August issue of the Esquire magazine there appeared an advertisement which proclaimed that savings deposited in the Bahamas by U.S. citizens could earn a 6-percent tax-free income.

Recognizing that if this were true it represented a substantial loophole in our tax structure, I called this advertisement to the attention of the Treasury Department and under date of September 28, 1967, received a reply stating that the advertisement was in error, that this interest income would not be tax exempt as claimed, and that the Esquire magazine was being notified accordingly of the erroneous advertisement. To avoid any American citizen being misled by this erroneous advertising I would suggest that Esquire owes it to its readers to give prominent display to the Treasury Department's letter.

I ask unanimous consent that the advertisement which appeared in the August issue of Esquire, my letter to the Treasury Department under date of August 31, 1967, and the reply thereto, dated September 27, signed by Mr. Stanley S. Surrey, assistant secretary, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Esquire magazine, August 1967]

SAVINGS EARN 6-PERCENT TAX-FREE AT COMMONWEALTH TRUST (BAHAMAS) LIMITED BANKERS

Interest credited quarterly.

7% on 3-year Term Deposits.

Valuable premiums on Savings accounts and Term Deposits.

Deposits accepted in U.S. and Canadian dollars and sterling (repayable in same currency); other currencies after approval.

All banking and trust services.

Confidential accounts.

COMMONWEALTH TRUST (BAHAMAS) LIMITED
French Building, E 2/67
Marlborough & George St.,
P.O. Box 4093, Nassau, Bahamas

Please provide details on the following type of tax-free account:

Savings account
Term Deposit

Name ____________________________________
Address __________________________________

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., August 31, 1967.

Mr. STANLEY S. SURREY,
Assistant Secretary of Treasury,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SURREY: Enclosed is an advertisement which appeared in the August 1967 Esquire concerning six per cent tax-free savings on deposits in the Bahamas.

Is it possible for an American citizen to deposit money in the Bahamas and the interest received therefrom to be tax exempt?

If so does this not constitute quite a loophole in our tax laws, and what suggestions do you or the Department have for correction?

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D.C., September 27, 1967.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is in reply to your letter of August 31, 1967 regarding the advertisement which appeared in the August 1967 edition of Esquire magazine stating that "Savings earn 6% tax-free at Commonwealth Trust (Bahamas) Limited". As you suggest, if a United States citizen or resident or a domestic corporation could earn such interest free of United States income tax it would indeed constitute a significant loophole in our tax laws. However, a United States citizen or resident or a domestic corporation is subject to United States income tax on all income (with certain limited exceptions) from whatever source derived. Therefore, United States income tax would be due on interest received from the Commonwealth Trust (Bahamas) Limited by a United States citizen, resident or domestic corporation.

It is noted that in addition to income tax liability, a term deposit for one year or more would subject the citizen resident or corporation to the interest equalization tax.

We have referred the advertisement to the Internal Revenue Service and they have informed us that they would inform Esquire magazine of the tax liabilities of an American depositing funds in the Commonwealth Trust (Bahamas) Limited.

Sincerely yours,

STANLEY S. SURREY.

OVER APPRAISAL OF ART CREATES TAX ABUSE

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in the Washington Daily News of July 20, 1967, there appeared an editorial entitled "Art for Tax Sake." This editorial calls attention to what at first appeared to be a glaring loophole in our tax structure.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial appear at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ART FOR TAX SAKE

You are in the 70 per cent income tax bracket. You buy a painting for $1000, give it to a museum at a valuation of $5000 and take the $5000 off your tax as a charitable donation. Original cost, $1000; tax saving, $3500; net profit, $2500.

There is the case of an artist who donated three of his own paintings and claimed a $75,000 deduction. It developed he actually had been trying to sell his paintings for less than $200 each, with no takers.

This business of phony art appraisals to dodge taxes is one of the "loopholes" in the system which the Internal Revenue Service is trying to close. It is setting up a panel of art experts to review suspicious appraisals and fix fair market value. It's a good idea and we hope it works.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, under date of July 21 I wrote the Treasury Department asking for a report as to whether or not this loophole did exist and if so what recommendations it had for legislative correction.

Under date of August 18, 1967, I received a letter from Mr. Sheldon S. Cohen, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, in which he stated that while certain taxpayers may be attempting to evade taxes in the manner described, nevertheless under the existing law they do have adequate authority to cope with this problem.

I ask unanimous consent that both my letter of July 21 and the Department's reply of August 18, 1967, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C., July 21, 1967.

Hon. Henry H. Fowler,
Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Mr. Secretary: In yesterday's issue of the Washington Daily News there appeared an editorial (a copy of which is enclosed) entitled "Art for Tax Sake." This editorial comments upon an abuse of our tax laws whereby taxpayers are granted an overappraisal of the art being donated and thereby actually making money by contributing.

It was and still is my understanding that under our existing law such excessive allowances are specifically prohibited under penalties; however, will you please examine this situation and advise whether or not the law is adequate and the fault lies in loose enforcement.

If there is a loophole in the law then please forward your legislative recommendations for correction.

Yours sincerely,
John J. Williams.

U.S. Treasury Department,
Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Washington, D.C., August 18, 1967.

Hon. John J. Williams,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Williams: Secretary Fowler has asked me to reply to your letter of July 21, 1967, enclosing a recent editorial from the Washington Daily News on the subject of tax deductions for contributions of art and similar items to certain charitable and educational organizations.

Existing law allows taxpayers to deduct the fair market value of non-cash property contributed to museums and other charitable or educational organizations. The establishment of this value is, as you can well imagine, a more difficult problem for paintings and other types of art objects than for the more conventional types of non-cash property. In many cases art experts themselves cannot agree on the value of specific art objects.

An excellent example of the potential for abuse in this area is the case of *Hilla Rebay v. Commissioner*, which was tried in the Tax Court in 1963 (22 TCM 181). Over a five-year period the taxpayer, who was an amateur artist, claimed deductions of $169,000 for donation of her own works to various charitable organizations. The Internal Revenue Service considered the valuation excessive by over $162,000 and determined tax deficiencies of nearly $120,000. The Tax Court determined that the claimed deductions were excessive by nearly $160,000 and adjusted the tax deficiency accordingly. That determination was not appealed by the taxpayer.

In recognition of the difficulties inherent in the valuation of art objects the Service has taken appropriate steps to fairly determine the fair market value of contributions in kind. For example, the individual income tax return for the year 1965 and subsequent years has been revised to provide the Internal Revenue Service with detailed information regarding non-cash property in order to permit more efficient review of tax deductions claimed for this type of item. The method utilized in determining the fair market value of the property must be shown on the return, and if the value is established by appraisal, a signed copy of the appraiser's report is required. This modification of the income tax return was made in accordance with recent revisions to section 1.170–1(a) of the Income Tax Regulations dealing with Charitable Contributions and Gifts. These revisions to the regulations require that detailed information be submitted with the income tax return.

In addition, the Service has taken other steps to encourage voluntary compliance and tighten enforcement, including the recent publication of Revenue Procedure 66–49 which provides information and guidance for taxpayers in this area. I am enclosing a copy of this publication for your information.

Finally, the Association of Art Museum Directors has recently offered to aid the Service by giving us the benefit of their knowledge and that of their staff people, on the valuation of art objects, in the form of an advisory group. This suggestion is being explored by the Service and may prove of considerable help in the direct enforcement activities of the Service and in encouraging voluntary compliance.

In summary, I acknowledge that the problem of inflated art appraisals is a difficult one from the standpoint of efficient tax administration, but I believe that the Service's enforcement efforts are effective to prevent avoidance of existing law. Undoubtedly, certain changes in existing law would simplify the enforcement problems in this area but this, I think, is a much broader problem. You may wish to discuss this aspect directly with Assistant Secretary Surrey.

Sincerely,
Sheldon S. Cohen,
Commissioner.

ONE-THOUSAND-DOLLAR-A-COUPLE CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT'S FUNDRAISING CAMPAIGN

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on October 7, the President spoke at a $1,000 a couple ticket political fund-raising dinner in Washington.

According to the press a series of cocktail parties were given prior to this dinner by certain Cabinet officers and department officials, at which time the lobbyists who represented industries coming under the jurisdiction of their particular department were asked to buy tickets to the dinner.

For example, it is said that the Transportation Secretary, Alan S. Boyd, attended one of these meetings and gave a pep talk to the lobbyists of the transportation industry as to just how bad the Nation needs a Democratic administration.

Similar functions were held by other cabinet officers with the same purpose in mind; namely, get the lobbyists together and impress upon them the importance of their $1,000 a couple contributions to the President's fund-raising campaign.

At a time when so much is being said by this administration about its interest in divorcing presidential campaigns from the evil of private contributions, these pressure tactics are hard to understand. In this connection there appeared in the Wall Street Journal of October 2 an appropriate editorial entitled "Makes You Wonder."

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Record, followed by an article commenting on the same subject which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of September 24, 1967.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Makes You Wonder

The campaign subsidy bill the Administration is backing, you may remember, is intended to protect public officials from the sordid lure of lobbyists.

Everyone knows how the lobbyists work. Just when the bedraggled candidate's last dollar is gone and the TV network is about to pull the plug on its cameras, the lobbyist arrives with his Mephistophelian offer. "I'll pay the rent," he proclaims, but only with the tacit understanding that he will also call the votes. Trapped between evil forces, the poor candidate weeps as he trudges off to perpetual captivity.

To prevent such awful tragedies, the Administration has proposed to have the public pay the rent, at least for 60 days before and 30 days after elections. The candidate would be freed from the crushing necessity to accept the lobbyists' tainted money, except maybe for a few little early expenses like winning the nomination, and except maybe to pay off loans coming due after the 30-day limit and except maybe for some independent committees working for but not "authorized by" the candidate.

Admittedly, the Administration hasn't got around to doing anything to let the TV networks provide a lot of free rent, which they would be glad to do if somebody repealed the stupid law making them give frivolous candidates equal time with real ones. But then you have to stade somewhere, so why not with tax money? And who can object to the trifling sum of, say, $50 million for the ironclad protection the bill provides?

While the bill is pending, high Administration officials are circumspectly protecting themselves from lobbyists. Why, according to a recent report in the New York Times, Transportation Secretary Alan S. Boyd only had one drink at a meeting of lobbyists in a Georgetown club the other day. And he left right after he gave a little pep talk about how badly the nation needs President Johnson.

Secretary Boyd didn't have anything to do with rounding up a lot of lobbyists from the industry he helps regulate to attend the meeting with him; someone from the Democratic Party had to do that. And of course, Secretary Boyd didn't mention the tainted subject of money. It was after he was gone that somebody suggested that everyone buy $1,000-a-couple tickets to the President's Ball, intended to raise money for the forthcoming campaign and other things.

Now, we know people who think that the Administration's fear of lobbyists isn't the real reason it suggests campaign subsidies. These people think the Administration mostly wants more money for politicking and sees the public purse as an easy mark. These people even think that if the bill passes, the public will pay but relations between lobbyists and politicians will go on like always.

But maybe that isn't so. Maybe if the subsidy bill is passed President Johnson will announce that he and his party will not accept any money raised at the ball, that it will all be given to the Red Cross and the United Fund.

He'd almost have to do something like that. Otherwise, it'd make you wonder, wouldn't it?

DEMOCRATS SEEK TREATY FUNDS FROM U.S.-REGULATED FIRMS

(By John Herbers)

WASHINGTON, September 23.—A number of lobbyists for Government-regulated transportation industries was invited by the Democratic National Committee to attend an informal reception for the Secretary of Transportation, Alan S. Boyd, last Monday evening in a private club in Georgetown.

Boyd urged them to support President Lyndon B. Johnson for another term in office. Then, after the Secretary left, they were asked by a committee officer to buy $1000-a-couple tickets to a party fund-raising dinner and dance here Oct. 7.

The dinner, to be held in the Washington Hilton Hotel, has been billed as a President's ball in honor of Mr. Johnson and his wife. It is to be attended by contributors to the Democratic party from throughout the country.

FUNDS FOR CAMPAIGN

The Georgetown reception was part of the drive that party leaders are conducting quietly to assure a good turnout for the ball. At least part of the proceeds will go into next year's presidential campaign.

Invitations to the Georgetown reception were sent out under the signature of John Criswell, acting treasurer of the committee. They said: "Secretary Boyd will discuss matters of interest to you and to this Administration at this small, informal gathering."

The reception was made known by someone in attendance who asked that his name be withheld. He said it was his belief that the party improperly used the office of the Transportation Secretary to seek political support for the president from a Government regulated industry.

The source said the list of guests was weighted by representatives of shippers, truckers and airlines, most of whom lobby for their interests in Congress.

Both Boyd and Criswell said in interviews that there was nothing improper in the reception. Criswell said the reception was not arranged for representatives of the transportation industry but for a "cross section" of people who had contributed to the party in the past, both Democrats and Republicans.

The source declined to provide a list of those attending, saying he did not want to embarrass them.

BOYD SPEAKER

The reception was held in the Georgetown Club. The facilities of the club were made available by one of the club's members. About 40 persons attended.

Boyd, who arrived after a cocktail party was under way, gave a brief talk, describing how well off the country was under Mr. Johnson and saying that the country needed the President four more years.

Boyd left after the talk, almost abruptly, the source thought.

Criswell spoke next, reciting the party's past financial troubles. He said that the financial picture was looking up, but that he was convinced that contributors might get the idea that there were no money problems remaining.

Criswell then suggested that those present buy tickets to the dinner. The President would not only be at the dinner, the audience was told, he would stay and dance.

No attempt was made to sell tickets at the meeting. The informant said that most of those attending could not afford to buy tickets themselves and presumably were expected to pass the word to their corporate officers. Under the Corrupt Practices Act, corporations are forbidden to make political contributions, but it is common practice for businesses to do so through individuals.

SOLICITATIONS REPORTED

At least two of those attending the reception, it was learned, agreed to buy tickets. Later it was learned that Jack J. Valenti had solicited others in their companies in New York to buy tickets. Valenti, a former special assistant to the President, is president of the Motion Picture Association of America.

Boyd was appointed the first Secretary of the Department of Transportation last Nov. 6. Economic regulatory functions are exercised outside the Transportation Department by independent agencies such as the Civil Aeronautics Board. Members of these agencies, however, are appointed by the President and the Administration has some advisory influence over rates and routes.

A former member and chairman of the CAB, Boyd has a reputation as an official who cannot be swayed by political pressures. When he was informed that word of his appearance at the Georgetown reception was to be published, Boyd invited a reporter to his office and said he would be glad to answer any questions.

"I am glad to do anything I can honestly and ethically to help Lyndon Johnson," he said. "I knew this speech was indorsed and encouraged by the Democratic National Committee. I was asked to talk about our programs and urge support for the President."

He stressed that no plea for funds was made in his presence and that he expected never to know who at the meeting made a party contribution and who did not.

The invitation to appear came to him through an assistant who had been contacted by the committee, Boyd said.

Had the White House suggested that he make such appearances?

"Absolutely not," Boyd replied. "I bet Lyndon Johnson never had any idea that the meeting was being held."

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Is there further morning business?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be able to speak for 5 minutes during the morning hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SEPTEMBER DROP IN INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTION WEAKENS THE CASE FOR TAX INCREASE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the argument that this country is suffering a runaway, demand-pressured inflation was dealt another blow yesterday when the Federal Reserve Board disclosed that industrial production fell in September. I repeat—fell, dropped—in September by 1.5 points.

Mr. President, this is not the kind of performance that occurs in an economy in which the pressure of demand is excessive. September was the third month in fiscal year 1968, a year in which the big deficit is supposed to be so inflationary; yet we are producing less, production in September was not only lower than in August, it was actually below the level of 1 year ago.

Mr. President, keep in mind the fact that American manpower is expanding at the rate of one and a half million workers per year. Recognize that the productivity of all this Nation's workers is increasing at the rate of more than 3 percent per year, so that even if the work force were stationary, not expanding—and it is expanding—they could produce 3 percent more or at the present level of the industrial production index, about 4.5 points more each year. Recognize, Mr. President that our plant and facilities are expanding their potential at the rate of 6 percent or 7 percent per year—on the basis of present investment in plant and equipment—and we can appreciate that this latest statistic showing a drop in industrial production last month and a lower figure for production this year than 1 year ago, shows the economy to be suffering from too much slack, not too much demand.

I am sure that, in the coming months—very possibly this month—there will be an increase in industrial production. I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that we are producing less than we produced a year ago, with our expanding economy, with our expanding plants, with our expanding work force, and with our rising productivity, so that we can afford to increase demand substantially without getting into anything like demand inflation.

Furthermore, in the last few days, we have also been informed that the level of unemployment increased last month, the sharpest climb in 5 years, to a level of 4.1 percent. Is this evidence of an exuberant economy? Does the unemployment increase show a need to slow down the economy?

It is clear that the argument for a tax increase cannot be based on current economic conditions. None of this is to argue, Mr. President, that we do not have a serious inflationary problem. We do indeed. Prices have been going up, and going up at an unacceptable and growing rate. But it is the result of increasing cost and the pressure of that cost on prices, not the result of a demand that outpaces the economy's capacity to produce enough to meet that demand.

None of this is to argue that we do not have a serious Federal deficit. We do, indeed, face this problem too.

But a tax increase may not help us solve either the inflation problem or the deficit problem. Taxes are costs. The tax increase will add to costs. The corporate tax increase will add to business costs and to the prices that business must charge. The personal income tax increase will add to consumer costs and to the cost of living for most consumers, because taxes must be paid just as surely as food must be bought.

The tax increase will not restrain inflation. Yes, it will diminish demand; but demand is already inadequate. A further reduction in demand with less industrial production, with more idle plant facilities, with additional unemployment is hardly the sensible way to bring down prices.

Mr. President, the tax increase may not reduce the deficit very much, if at all. Economists almost unanimously agree that the 1964 tax cut actually increased rather than reduced Federal revenues, by increasing incomes and profits sufficiently so that even at the lower rates revenues were higher.

That is, we reduced taxes in 1964 and Federal revenues increased sharply in 1965 and 1966. They argue that this happened because it raised income and made more profits, so that even with the lower rate, revenues increased.

It is clear that if this can work to increase revenue when there is a tax cut, it can also work—although not inevitably—but it can also work so that if we increase taxes, we may reduce revenues. It can very possibly have that effect, especially in view of the drop in industrial production and the increase in unemployment, even without the tax increase.

Similarly a tax increase now could very possibly depress income so that even at higher rates the net revenues would be lower than without the tax increase.

At any rate, Mr. President, there is no economic case for a tax increase now.

I ask unanimous consent that the National Summary of Business Conditions compiled by the Federal Reserve Board, dated October 16, 1967, be printed in the RECORD; together with a single page of tables from this release of the Federal Reserve Board, and an excellent editorial from this morning's Washington Post putting the present economic situation in perspective.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD NATIONAL SUMMARY OF BUSINESS CONDITIONS, OCTOBER 16, 1967

Industrial production and factory employment declined in September partly as a result of work stoppages. The value of retail sales rose slightly further and prices of industrial products generally showed advances. Bank credit, time deposits, and the money supply showed less increase than earlier in the quarter. Yields on public and corporate securities generally rose further by mid-October.

INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTION

The index of industrial production was 156.3 per cent of the 1957–59 average in September, influenced by the direct and indirect effects of work stoppages in the auto, copper, and steel transportation industries. The September total was 1.5 points below the downward revised August rate of output. Output of ordnance and other defense equipment continued to expand in September. Appliances and TV set production showed little further change following a sharp recovery earlier from work stoppages and inventory liquidation.

Auto assemblies, which reached a seasonally adjusted annual rate of 8.4 million units in August, were curtailed to 6.8 million units in September. Reflecting partly the lowered rate of capacity utilization, output of industrial equipment has fallen off somewhat further since June and total business equipment has shown little change.

Output of steel and some other industrial materials was reduced in September by work stoppages. As a result of the improved Mid-East supply, the curtailment of domestic crude oil output continued in the first week of October.

EMPLOYMENT

Employment in nonfarm establishments declined by 115,000 in September as work stoppages contributed to a net reduction in manufacturing employment of 180,000. This decline was only partially offset in the total by a net rise of 65,000 in non-manufacturing activities. The average factory workweek continued to change little but was about 2 per cent shorter than a year earlier. Employment gains continued in private service industries and were resumed in retail trade, but strikes of teachers in some cities temporarily reduced local government employment. The unemployment rate rose to 4.1 per cent from 3.8 per cent in August, reflecting a sharp rise in the number of women entering the labor force.

DISTRIBUTION

The value of retail sales edged up further in September and remained 4 per cent above a year earlier, according to advance Census estimates. The September increase reflected mainly a 2 per cent rise in sales at durable goods stores as a result partly of the earlier introduction of new model autos and at higher prices. The level of retail sales at nondurable goods stores was about unchanged.

COMMODITY PRICES

There were widespread increases in prices of intermediate products and various consumer items including new autos and appliances in September and in early October. Prices of speculative commodities meanwhile generally continued to change little, and lumber and plywood reversed part of their earlier run-up as supplies improved. Prices of farm products declined somewhat further reflecting mainly decreases in feed grains and hogs.

BANK CREDIT, DEPOSITS, AND RESERVES

Commercial bank credit expanded $2.2 billion in September—much less rapidly than over the preceding two months but close to the strong average rate of the first half year. In contrast to the large security acquisitions in July and August, banks reduced slightly their holdings of Treasury issues in September and added only modestly to portfolios of other securities. Total loans rose $2 billion over the month—only slightly below the average July-August increase—with business loan growth continuing modest for the second consecutive month.

The money supply showed little further rise in September, resulting in a third-quarter annual rate of increase of 7.0 per cent, about the same as that over the first half of the year. Time and savings deposits rose $1.7 billion, about one-third less than the unusually large increase in August. U.S. Government deposits continued to rise on balance.

Total and required reserves increased somewhat further. Net free reserves dropped slightly to an average of about $250 million over the four statement weeks ending September 27, as a small decline in excess reserves exceeded that in borrowings.

SECURITY MARKETS

Over the past month yields have risen in all maturity areas of the U.S. Government securities market. At mid-October, yields were about 4.60 per cent on 3-month Treasury bills, 5.50 per cent on some intermediate-term issues, and 5.25 per cent on long-term bonds. Recent issues of short- and intermediate-term Federal Agency obligations have been marketed at yields ranging from 5.50 per cent to 5.88 per cent.

Yields on corporate and municipal bonds have advanced fairly steadily since mid-September; new issue yields have advanced especially sharply, and are currently at levels clearly above those reached last year. In heavy trading volume, common stock prices also moved up to all-time highs near the end of September, but since then have fluctuated within a narrow range.

Series	Seasonally adjusted				Not seasonally adjusted			
	1967			1966	1967			1966
	September [1]	August	July	September	September [1]	August	July	September
Industrial production, total	156.0	158.0	157.0	158.0	160.0	158.0	151.0	161.0
Market groupings:								
Final products	157.0	158.0	157.0	156.0	162.0	[2] 157.0	[2] 151.0	161.0
Consumer goods	146.0	148.0	147.0	147.0	154.0	148.0	140.0	154.0
Business equipment	180.0	[2] 181.0	[2] 181.0	177.0	182.0	[2] 178.0	[2] 177.0	178.0
Materials	156.0	[2] 157.0	156.0	159.0	157.0	158.0	[2] 150.0	161.0
Industry groupings:								
Manufacturing	158.0	159.0	158.0	160.0	161.0	158.0	151.0	164.0
Durable goods	161.0	164.0	[2] 162.0	167.0	163.0	159.0	155.0	170.0
Nondurable goods	154.0	[2] 154.0	152.0	151.0	159.0	157.0	[2] 145.0	156.0
Mining	125.0	[2] 128.0	128.0	121.0	127.0	[2] 129.0	125.0	123.0
Utilities	182.0	[2] 182.0	[2] 182.0	177.0	--------	--------	--------	--------
Employment and payrolls:								
Nonagricultural, total	125.8	126.1	[2] 125.5.	122.6	127.0	[2] 126.5	125.9	123.8
Manufacturing, production workers:								
Employment	111.4	112.9	111.6	114.0	113.7	[2] 113.5	111.1	116.4
Payrolls [3]	154.0	[2] 155.5	[2] 151.4	154.6	157.1	[2] 155.0	150.5	157.7
Freight carloadings	90.2	89.7	85.2	95.0	94.0	93.9	82.4	99.2

[1] Preliminary. [2] Revised. [3] Value data.

EXPANSION AND CONFUSION

The Administration continues to insist that a tax increase is the only alternative to economic ruin, but people are more likely to be confused than persuaded by that argument. Consider two items in last week's news. On Wednesday it was announced that unemployment in September rose from 3.8 to 4.1 per cent of the civilian labor force, the highest level since late 1965. That announcement brought no audible sounds of concern from exalted places. Yet on Friday, with the news that the gross national product advanced at the annual rate of $15 billion during the third quarter, a "high administration official" declared "that the economy is going forward too quickly, at an unsustainable rate" and added the familiar bit about the "compelling logic for a tax increase." But how is a perilously rapid growth of total demand reconciled with rising unemployment? When that puzzle is solved the case for higher taxes collapses.

The point at which to begin is the fallacious characterization of the third quarter advance in GNP. As a result of prior monetary restraint, the growth of the GNP was halted in the first quarter of this year and slowed in the second. But now that the economy is again undergoing a pervasive expansion, the GNP is growing rapidly as it does in every recovery from a recession or slowdown.

If the current rate of GNP growth were sustained, if over the next 12 months $60 billion were added to the total demand for goods and services, few of the nightmares conjured up by Administration economists would materialize. A $60 billion advance from the second quarter of 1967 implies a 7.75 per cent growth rate in current prices and a "real" growth rate (measured in constant price) of less than 5 per cent. Nothing in recent experience suggests that such a pace is fraught with danger.

But although a $60 billion advance is sustainable, it is not likely to be realized over the next year for the following reasons. Consumer expenditures, especially for goods, continue to be sluggish, and so long as they are, businesses are not likely to make large additions to a total stock of inventories that is already high in relation to sales. Fixed investment—residences, industrial structures and capital equipment—has increased modestly. But with disappointing profits in manufacturing industries and high mortgage rates, the upsurge of investment outlays necessary to sustain a rapid growth of GNP is nowhere in sight. A stimulus from defense outlays, which increased by less than $2 billion in the third quarter, seems unlikely at the moment.

When the rise in the unemployment rate—which is accounted for by adult females—is viewed in the context of a pervasive but far from spectacular recovery, the underlying cause is apparent. The entry and exit of married women from the labor force hinges on the employment opportunities. Having dropped out of the labor force in large numbers during the mini-cession, women are again seeking jobs but are not finding them as quickly as they did in the 1965–66 period. The sharp rise in female unemployment, which may in part be due to a definitional change, suggests that talk about an overheated economy with tight labor markets is somewhat premature.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The gross national product is now estimated to be $15 billion which, with the Ford strike, is something that should concern us.

In a memorandum some time ago entitled "Proposed Tax Surcharges," the staff of the Joint Economic Committee estimated that the third quarter gross national product rise was likely to be $16 billion higher and for the fourth quarter another increase of $20 billion is estimated. Preliminary third quarter data, the staff of the Joint Economic Committee informs me, confirms that estimate and a $20 billion fourth quarter is still very likely.

As I say, this increase in gross national product is something to be concerned about, but if we simply take the billion dollar increase, without any analysis, we are going to deceive ourselves, because a great deal of that increase is the result of the fact that prices have risen, and risen quite sharply, in the third quarter, and they are going to increase again in the fourth quarter. Much of this increase is not an increase in additional goods and services, but simply an increase in prices.

It is possible to have a substantial increase in the gross national product without an increase in business activity. This is the nature of a significant part of the increase in the gross national product.

At any rate, as the fine Washington Post editorial which I just placed in the Record stated, we could have a growth of 5 percent in real terms in the coming year, in view of the slack in our economy, without significant inflationary pressures.

At the same time, I would agree with the staff of the Joint Economic Committee, which has informed me that the rate of monetary expansion is excessive and inflationary. It is above that which was recommended unanimously by the Joint Economic Committee in its economic report. The rate of increase in the money supply by the Federal Reserve Board is almost as high as it has ever been. The last time the Federal Reserve Board had this kind of increase in the monetary supply, we ended up with the beginning of the credit crisis in 1966.

I would hope the Federal Reserve Board would slow down its rate of monetary increase. I realize that the Federal Reserve Board has great problems, but if it can slow down the rate of monetary increase it can help us have economic stability and remove the necessity for a tax increase.

There are some cynics who say that the reason why the Federal Reserve Board is doing what it is is to give ammunition to those who want a tax increase, but I am sure that the Federal Reserve Board consists of men of integrity and that the Board is proceeding in this case, as it has in the past, based on what the Board thinks is the best prescription for our economy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I ask unanimous consent that I may have 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. At any rate, I would hope the increase in the monetary supply, which has contributed to the increase in prices, could be slowed down.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDENT'S STATEMENT ON THE SMALL BUSINESS ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1967

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, when President Johnson signed the Small Business Act Amendments of 1967 into law last week, he placed his signature to a written expression of the confidence which the Federal Government has in small business investment companies as mechanisms for supplying the equity needs of small business.

As the President pointed out in his statement of the time of the signing, 95 percent of the businesses in the United States are small. These businesses are, and always have been, the mainstay of our system of free enterprise. They deserve the full support of the Congress and the administration, for they represent the very foundation of our economy.

The Congress still has more work to do to help the small businesses of America. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Small Business of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I shall do what I can to give the Senate the opportunity to vote, during the present Congress, on legislation to help small businessmen who are subject to loss from crime, or riots in our cities. I hope that companion measures to S. 1862, dealing with necessary tax incentive for small business investment companies, will soon be before us.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that President Johnson's remarks on the signing of S. 1862 be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Presidential Statement on S. 1862, Small Business Act Amendments of 1967

America itself began as a small business. The first Virginia settlers came to these shores as a joint stock company.

As the Nation grew, so did the shops and factories that gave it commercial life. The earliest American dream—of being one's own boss in a land of unbounded opportunity—has remained a pillar of our economic strength.

Today, 95% of the businesses in the United States are small. They employ 4 out of every 10 of our wage earners. They provide a family income for more than 75 million Americans.

Through the Small Business Administration, your Government helps small businesses to grow and prosper. The neighborhood furniture store, the machine shop downtown, the new manufacturing plant in a depressed rural area—these and thousands of other small businesses have been given life through loans generated by the SBA.

Such loans have also helped many disadvantaged citizens take a productive role in our national life. Over 5000 men and women with the will and talents and energy for business—but blocked by poverty—have started the road to success with SBA help.

Businesses ravaged by flood or disaster have been restored.

All this has meant better products for the consumer. It has brought jobs and broader opportunities.

The bill I sign today—S. 1862—shows this Nation's faith in the future of small business.

It continues and expands the many worthwhile programs administered by SBA.

It allows SBA to make more loans from its own funds, up $650 million to a new high of $2.65 billion. No increase in appropriations is involved.

It extends from 10 to 15 years the repayment time for construction and renovation loans.

It improves the Small Business Investment Companies which provide a vital flow of private capital to small businesses.

It enlists the services of more retired businessmen, so that their still valuable skills and knowledge can be made available to greater numbers of small concerns.

It will help to bring more businesses and more jobs into the ghettos, through lease guarantees. This is a vital part of our new program to engage private industry in special job training programs for the hard-core unemployed.

It launches a comprehensive study of ways to protect the small businessman against criminal acts which endanger his business and often his life.

This bill, in short, strengthens the helping hand America extends to the Nation's small businessmen.

But I must point out that it becomes law at a time when the business community is imperiled by the threat of tight money.

To the businessman, a soaring interest rate is Public Enemy No. 1.

It affects all commerce, but its harshest impact falls on the little man who runs a small business. He feels it. He feels it hardest. He feels it longest.

The tax surcharge proposal now pending before the Congress can work to remove this threat.

No businessman welcomes a tax increase. No President enjoys proposing one.

But I believe that most businessmen would rather pay a little more in taxes than expose themselves to the uncertain and uneven effects of tight money and spiraling interest rates.

The tax measure I proposed last August will provide the restraint our economy needs in a fair and equitable way. It will permit businesses large and small to get the credit they need to continue to grow and prosper.

I remind the Congress and the country that the greatest service the Congress can now perform for American business, in my judgment, is to enact that legislation promptly before it is too late.

When that is done, the full potential of the bill I sign today will be unlocked.

Ours is a land where individual enterprise is highly honored. And the bill recognizes that no investment pays greater dividends to the taxpayer than this—to give a man the tools with which he can shape his own success.

WOODROW WILSON GUTHRIE

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, when a great American dies, each of us shares in the sorrow of his passing. But in recalling him and his work, we also solidify for ourselves and our children a part of our heritage and tradition.

So it is with the death on Tuesday, October 3, 1967, of Woodrow Wilson Guthrie, one of the foremost folk singers and composers of this or any age.

Although he was not from my State of Indiana, I share a sense of loss in his death. For one thing, he was from my wife's native State of Oklahoma. But, more important, his life—as exemplified in his music and his deeds—transcended state boundaries and reached to the soul of our Nation.

Woody Guthrie was a personification of America—of the trials and challenges of the poor, the weary, the neglected.

He wandered across the length and breadth of this great land, jabbing the conscience of the complacent, portraying the pathos of poverty, urging his fellow man to new hope through utilization of the great opportunity that America held out to him.

While he sang of the cruel desert dust storms, and the pain and deprivation of the great depression, and the lonely burdens of the poor farmer, and the travail of the city's sweatshops, he never lost sight of the blessings of America—blessings which he knew instinctively would be shared eventually by the vast majority of his countrymen.

So while he characterized the blemishes on the face of America, he did so with love—and he also sang of her beauty:

This land is your land, this land is my land,
From California to the New York Island,
From the redwood forest to the Gulf-stream waters,
This land was made for you and me.

When the sun come shining, then I was strolling,
And the wheat fields waving, and the dust clouds rolling,
A voice was chanting as the fog was lifting,
This land was made for you and me.

Woody Guthrie sought to improve America, not to condemn her. When her freedom was imperiled in World War II, he joined the merchant marine, participated in three invasions and twice sailed on ships that were torpedoed by the enemy. And he wrote songs of the gallant men who gave their lives to defend this land.

Woody Guthrie will be remembered as long as there are men to sing songs and as long as there are men who believe in America and strive to make it an even better place in which to live and work.

THE COPPER STRIKE

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, as you know, a nationwide copper strike is crippling a vital segment of our economy. In my State of Arizona, where more than 50 percent of all domestically produced copper originates, many communities have been severely hit.

On August 28, a number of Senators from States affected by this strike filed before this body, Senate Resolution 161, pleading with the President of the United States to invoke the emergency provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act in order to at least temporarily halt this strike.

Just yesterday, I received a letter from an Arizonan which I feel spells out far better than I am able exactly how hard pressed many of our people are becoming as a result of this protracted strike. I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROAD MACHINERY CO.,
Phoenix, Ariz., October 13, 1967.

U.S. Senator PAUL FANNIN,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PAUL: Last week our small company had 60 employees. This week our staff has been reduced to 50 because of what effect the copper strike is having in our industry as a machinery supplier. Practically all of the other 14 machinery firms in Arizona have had to make similar reductions in personnel.

In addition to letting 10 faithful and good people go, we had to reduce the salaries of the remaining 50 people from 5% to as high as 25% in an attempt to keep our costs within our income.

I fully appreciate that you, individually, can do little about this situation, but it is illustrative of what private enterprise must do to keep alive.

After taking action like this, which necessitates dealing in peoples lives, I think about what our Government is doing in having a 29 billion dollar deficit and yet little is ever done to reduce expenses. In the past year, it appears that something approaching 230,000 people have been added to the Governmental payroll—and now consideration is being given to adding Television production to the cost of government—consideration is being given to spend tax money to pay for election campaign costs—and it appears our Government is attempting to be all things to all people.

Then we read about the necessity of increasing taxes with no action taken to reduce expenditures.

Our "gang" here at our company discuss our government and the direction we see it taking quite often and everyone I know is quite disturbed over the fact that it is spend, spend—tax and tax but nothing ever done about reducing expenditures.

It seems that all of us agree it is hopeless to expect Congress to do anything about this and the result is anger which is expressed at the local level which, unfortunately, results in school bond issues, public works bond issues and hospital bond issues being defeated at the ballot box.

Many of these bond issues are deserving of full support of all citizens but since this seems to be the only effective voice of protest anyone can make, it results in defeat for these bond issues.

No one I know would complain about additional taxes IF it was needed to properly support our men in Viet Nam. Our young men over there are deserving of the best that this nation can provide for them, as long as they are being subjected to losing their lives or being seriously wounded. Many of us are confused as to whether or not our nation should be involved in Viet Nam but as long as our young men are there, we MUST fully support them in all of their needs—and if taxes must be increased to do this, then we must increase taxes.

A tax increase without a reduction in non-defense spending would be a most serious blow to the morale of our nation which is already at a rather low level.

President Johnson recently was quoted as saying he was not of the opinion the morale of the citizens of our nation had lessened. If he would contact the "people" and ignore the advice of those who will tell him only what they know in advance he wants to hear, I feel quite positive he will find there is considerable unrest in our nation, especially as it applies to our government trying to be all things to all people and thus end up spending more money than what is collected.

This, I grant you, is only one man's opinion but I can assure you there are many, many people who believe as I do. Only recently I returned to Phoenix from a two week business trip to Philadelphia, St. Louis, Minneapolis and San Francisco where I found many, many responsible people expressing similar thoughts as I have written in this letter.

May I hope that somehow, someway Congress will take the necessary steps to stop adding non-defense expenditures to our nation's budget and reduce the non-defense expenditures already appropriated.

Yours very truly,
HAROLD R. BONE,
President.

A VISIT TO THE SYLVANIA TRACT

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, recently I received from a constituent of mine, Mrs. Ruth Stolle, a column by Mr. Cedric Vig called Wisconsin Woodsmoke. In this column Mr. Vig describes his first trip into the beautiful Sylvania tract in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan.

The trip is reported not only through Mr. Vig's eyes but also through the eyes of some friends who accompanied him on the trip. All of these men are experienced outdoorsmen who know and appreciate the great out of doors. I think that their reflections on the trip clearly show that the Sylvania tract represents one of the most significant natural resource acquisitions in recent years.

Careful and tasteful development of this spectacular area by the Forest Service will insure its preservation for generations to come. I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Vig's column be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN WOODSMOKE

(By C. A. Vig)

Tonight our fireplace is kicking up a big fuss—crackling and sputtering—banging and spitting. We're burning a couple of chunks of cedar from Sylvania.

"Sylvania!" Ever since we heard this word we've wanted to go there. "Untouched, unspoiled, a wilderness of pristine beauty." That's how they described it.

The news stories, a talk at Rotary, and an article on Sylvania in the July-August issue of "Better Camping" written by J. L. O'Sullivan sparked our interest. We wanted to dip our paddles in those unpolluted waters; carry our canoes over the portages; watch the eagles soar in Michigan's blue skies.

Last Saturday we went!

SYLVANIA

According to our speedometer, it's a 60-mile jaunt from Rhinelander to this 18,870 acre tract west of Watersmeet, Michigan.

As we drove into the area, we realized that we had seen a similar landscape and forest cover in the Phillips-Park Falls area. Yellow birch, maple and hemlock were the predominate trees.

At the information center an attendant helped us map out a canoe route—the summer's most popular water trail—a five-hour jaunt encompassing six lakes and several portages.

Since this Federal park boasts a number of lakes and ponds, it would be easy to spend a few days canoeing, portaging and camping. This is not practical this summer since there is a ban on overnight camping.

Next year camping will be allowed in certain designated areas. However, if one expects to get back into the heart of this wilderness retreat, one will have to expend some energy in the form of hiking or paddling since motorized vehicles will not be permissible on the trails and lakes.

CROOKED LAKE

Nice lake—clear water—surrounded by conifers, principally leaning cedars—something like the Upper Brule.

The overflow from this lake gives rise to the middle branch of the Ontonagon—the stream with the North Country's prettiest waterfalls—Bond and Agate.

As we paddled across Crooked Lake, we realized that here was a land of trees and water. It has been estimated that the timber is valued at somewhere between four and five million dollars—that one-fifth of the area is covered with water.

To us the lakes were similar to those in northern Wisconsin. The forest was similar to Nicolet, Flambeau and the Porkies. However, the big difference was that there was an area that was relatively untouched by man and his axe, plow and bulldozer. There has been a minimum of man-made activity in the forest since the white pine was removed back in the 1880's.

During our push across Crooked lake we saw wildlife that is typical of a wilderness area. A pair of loons were spotted out fishing. Across our path a pileated woodpecker was seen. Above us a pair of bald eagles were soaring and screaming in the September skies. A flight of mallards rose from the wild rice beds—leaving in perfect flight formation. Other visitors have seen bear, coyotes and timber wolves.

MANSIONS

Included in the purchase price ($5,740,000) were several large mansions of the former owners. They were huge and hotel-like—symbols of the wealth and affluence of their builders.

The largest lodge was more than 200 feet in length—so large that it boasted an indoor gymnasium. The cedar logs for this lodge were shipped in from the West coast and put together by Finnish carpenters whose skill for matching and fitting logs approached perfection.

Scattered throughout the area, especially on the portages between lakes, were smaller and more livable cabins used by the guards whose job it was to keep the poachers out of this private estate.

OVER THE GROAN TRAILS

A day of lake paddling can be a monotonous affair. It takes a portage every now and then to add a bit of zest to the adventure—to take the kinks out of those canoe-cramped legs.

Our little safari took us from Crooked lake to East Bear, West Bear, Kerr, High and back to Crooked. The portages were short and easy—13–96–40–97–38–22 rods each. On the longest portages the U.S. Forest Service has erected "resting platforms" where one can perch his canoe while taking a "five."

Up in the Canadian bush a portage is frequently measured in chains. A chain is 66 feet long. There are 80 chains in a mile. Know what a quarter chain is? A rod!

On some of the old maps we've noticed that portages were measured in "carries." From what we have read about the endurance of the Indians and Voyageurs, chances are that a carry might involve a long distance—many chains.

EVALUATION

This evening as we sit before our cedar fire we have a good opportunity to evaluate our Saturday in Sylvania.

Harlan, who whetted his canoeing appetite on the Brule a few weeks ago, prefers shooting rapids to lake canoeing.

Leigh Steinman, the most ardent fisherman of the group, would like to go back and throw some hardware in some of the lakes in the area—lakes where it is said one can catch a bass with every cast—or those deep clear lakes that abound in lake trout. (High lake was the prize of the trip.)

Don thinks it a wonderful place to bring his canoeing-camping club members for their first lesson in paddling and portaging.

The rest of us would like to pay another visit to the area when the forest is covered with yellow and red leaf paint and hike the many excellent trails that are available to the visitors.

P.S.—It was a good day—one that you would have enjoyed!

IT IS TIME TO CHANGE OUR PROCEDURES IN EVALUATING PUBLIC WORKS PROJECTS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, within the past weeks, demands have increased for improved Government budgeting priorities. Business Week magazine, the Washington Post, and the Wall Street Journal—to name just a few leading publications—have pointed out the current need for Congress to insist that spending proposals reflect optimal resource allocations.

Present long-range cost-benefit evaluations are based on a 1962 document written under the auspices of the Water Resources Council set up by President Kennedy. This report, known generally as Senate Document No. 97, is entitled "Policies, Standards, and Procedures in the Formulation, Evaluation, and Review of Plans for Use and Development of Water and Related Land Resources," and establishes practices to be followed in analyzing public works projects.

Four executive agencies cooperated in drawing up the policies of Senate Document No. 97; these four agencies—the Department of the Army, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of the Interior, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—along with the Bureau of the Budget, hold the principal statutory responsibilities for Federal activities concerned with water and land resources conservation.

In Senate Document No. 97, discount rate policies for cost-benefit studies were stated in this manner:

> 2. *Discount rate.*—The interest rate to be used in plan formulation and evaluation for discounting future benefits and computing costs, or otherwise converting benefits and costs to a common time basis shall be based upon the average rate of interest payable by the Treasury on interest-bearing marketable securities of the United States outstanding at the end of the fiscal year preceding such computation which, upon original issue, had terms to maturity of 15 years or more. Where the average rate so calculated is not a multiple of one-eighth of 1 percent, the rate of interest shall be the multiple of one-eighth of 1 percent next lower than such average rate.
>
> This procedure shall be subject to adjustment when and if this is found desirable as a result of continuing analysis of all factors pertinent to selection of a discount rate for these purposes.

Mr. President, witnesses during the recent Joint Economic Committee hearings on planning, programing, budgeting systems—PPBS—stressed that these policies established in Senate Document No. 97 are wrong. According to their testimony, use of the coupon rate at the date of issue of long-term Government securities leads to overestimating project benefits. Were a more realistic discount rate employed—the witnesses proposed that the expected rate of return to funds in the private sector, which is at least 10 percent instead of the 3¼-percent rate presently used—it would be possible to see which long-range spending projects actually contribute to the economy and which projects represent significant drains on the economy.

I call attention to the second paragraph of the Senate Document No. 97 discount rate policy. It says:

> This procedure shall be subject to adjustment when and if this is found desirable as a result of continuing analysis of all factors pertinent to selection of a discount rate for these purposes.

There is need today for such analysis; there is need today for adjustment of the discount rate procedure spelled out in Senate Document No. 97. The possibility of a tax increase and of lower economic growth, certainly make such adjustment desirable. A few agencies already have made studies, which I have requested, utilizing alternative discount rates on public work projects. Such evaluations must be continued and encouraged by Congress. Indeed, if we agree with the testimony in the PPBS hearings, there is a clear need to revamp completely the whole policy structure established in Senate Document No. 97.

DEVELOPMENT OF WATER RESOURCES IN OKLAHOMA

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, Oklahoma has long been in the forefront in the development of water resources. A large number of multipurpose projects are under construction or completed in Oklahoma. These projects provide flood control, irrigation, hydroelectric power, municipal and industrial water supplies, and recreational benefits. We also are a leader in the upstream dam program which has been so effective in stopping soil erosion. The Arkansas River navigation program, which is vital to Oklahoma's continuing economic development, is proceeding on schedule and barges are due to come up the Arkansas to eastern Oklahoma by 1970.

I am proud of the progress Oklahoma has made in development of its water resources. Since my election to the Senate in 1964, I have worked closely with my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Monroney], Congressman Carl Albert, the majority leader, Tom Steed, Ed Edmondson, John Jarman, and other members of the State delegation in carrying this water development program forward. Much credit for Oklahoma's outstanding record in water development goes to the late Senator Robert S. Kerr, who envisaged 20 years ago the tremendous benefits which would come from making the Arkansas River navigable. Unfortunately, Senator Kerr did not live to see all his dream become reality.

Much of the water development work in Oklahoma is being done by the U.S. Corps of Engineers. During this fiscal year the Corps of Engineers will spend about $91.6 million on public works projects in Oklahoma. The Tulsa district engineer's office is one of the busiest in the Nation and, I might add, one of the best.

The Tulsa district engineer recently gave me fiscal information on civil works projects in Oklahoma, and I ask unanimous consent that this data be placed in the Record.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

FISCAL INFORMATION ON CIVIL WORKS PROJECTS IN OKLAHOMA

SUMMARY SHEET

[In thousands of dollars]

Category	Expenditures prior to fiscal year 1961	Expenditures, fiscal year 1961 to fiscal year 1967	Expenditures projected for fiscal year 1968	Total
Construction, general	226,777	359,965	85,639	672,381
Operation and maintenance, general	15,941	22,947	5,503	44,391
General investigations	2,448	4,203	505	7,156
Total	245,166	387,115	91,647	723,928

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

[In thousands of dollars]

Project	Status	Expenditures prior to fiscal year 1961	Expenditures, fiscal year 1961 through fiscal year 1967	Expenditures projected for fiscal year 1968	Total	Fiscal year of first expenditure if subsequent to fiscal year 1961
Arkansas River and tributaries, general studies	Complete	454	52	------	506	1957
Bank stabilization (Sequoyah and Le Flore Counties)	Under construction	6,230	5,676	534	12,440	1952
Broken Bow Reservoir (McCurtain County)	do	306	28,975	5,361	34,642	1959
Optima Reservoir (Texas County)	do	212	2,720	1,464	4,396	1945
Lukfata Reservoir (McCurtain County)	Planning	20	285	129	434	1960
Pine Creek Reservoir (McCurtain County)	Under construction	52	9,445	5,629	15,126	1960
Crutcho Creek (LP) (Oklahoma County)	Planning	15	26	74	115	1957
Oologah Reservoir (Rogers and Nowata Counties)	Under construction	27,080	9,731	1,774	38,585	1939
Keystone Reservoir (Tulsa, Osage, Creek, Pawnee, and Payne Counties).	do	18,797	98,966	4,669	122,432	1939
Canton Reservoir (Blaine and Dewey Counties)	In operation	10,432	698	40	11,170	1939
Fort Supply Reservoir (Woodward County)	do	7,413	147	30	7,590	1938
Hulah Reservoir (Osage County)	do	10,972	422	42	11,436	1938
Tenkiller Reservoir (Sequoyah and Cherokee Counties)	do	22,264	1,155	75	23,494	1939
Eufaula Reservoir (Haskell, McIntosh, Pittsburg, Okmulgee, and Muskogee Counties).	do	18,842	102,270	278	121,390	1948
Denison Reservoir (Johnston, Marshall, Bryan, and Love Counties.)	do	61,416	2,100	310	63,826	1939
Fort Gibson Reservoir (Wagoner, Cherokee, and Mayes Counties.)	do	41,485	698	101	42,284	1942
Robert S. Kerr L. & D. (Sequoyah, Le Flore, Haskell, and Muskogee Counties.)	Under construction	------	50,107	15,570	65,677	------
Navigational locks and dams (Wagoner and Rogers Counties)	Under construction	------	13,971	28,211	42,182	------
Markham Ferry Reservoir (Mayes County)	Complete	504	6,405	------	6,909	1942
Birch Reservoir (Osage County)	Planning	------	303	2	305	------
Kaw Reservoir (Kay and Osage Counties)	Under construction	------	2,573	4,822	7,395	------
Webbers Falls L. & D. (Muskogee County)	do	------	18,828	13,544	32,372	------
Copan Reservoir (Washington County)	Planning	------	610	32	642	------
Hugo Reservoir (Choctaw and Pushmataha Counties)	Under construction	------	791	1,789	2,580	------
Skiatook Reservoir (Osage County)	Planning	------	543	57	600	------
Waurika Reservoir (Jefferson, Stephens, and Cotton Counties)	do	------	238	212	450	------
Maintenance and repair fleet and terminal (Sequoyah County)	Under construction	------	74	376	450	------
Shidler Reservoir (Osage County)	Planning	------	23	127	150	------
Heyburn Reservoir (Creek County)	In operation	30	43	20	93	1948
Enid, Okla. (LP) (Garfield County)	Complete	251	493	------	744	1956
Washita River, Ardmore, Okla	do	------	29	------	29	------
Ponca City, Okla	do	------	47	------	47	------
Pond Creek, Okla. (Pottowatomie County)	do	------	14	------	14	------
Salt Fork Red River, Altus, Okla	do	------	6	------	6	------
Blackwell, Okla	do	------	49	------	49	------
Coyle, Okla	do	------	16	------	16	------
Cherry and Red Fork Creeks, Tulsa, Okla	Continuing	2	40	114	156	1960
Cottonwood Creek (Logan County)	Complete	------	2	------	2	------
Bull Creek, Vinita, Okla	do	------	1	------	1	------
Turkey Creek, Bartlesville, Okla	Continuing	------	65	138	203	------
Flat Rock Creek, Tulsa, Okla	do	------	23	5	28	------
Arkansas-Red salinity control	Complete	------	300	------	300	------
Bird Creek, Skiatook, Okla	Continuing	------	40	4	44	------
East Cache Creek, Lawton, Okla	do	------	47	10	57	------
Fourche Maline Creek, Wilburton, Okla	Complete	------	1	------	1	------
Joe Creek, Tulsa, Okla	Continuing	------	123	13	136	------
Mountain Creek, Wister, Okla	Complete	------	22	------	22	------
Black Bear Creek, Pawnee, Okla	do	------	2	------	2	------
Stillwater Creek and tributaries, Stillwater, Okla	Continuing	------	56	11	67	------
Tiger Creek, Drumright, Okla	Complete	------	4	------	4	------
Turtle Creek, Yukon, Okla	Continuing	------	31	12	43	------
Cottonwood Canyon Creek, Cherokee, Okla	do	------	13	21	34	------
Dog Creek, Waynoka, Okla	do	------	6	19	25	------
Mud Creek, Idabel, Okla	do	------	3	20	23	------
Nowata, Okla	Complete	------	1	------	1	------
Deer Creek, Shawnee, Okla	do	------	38	------	38	------
Civil defense shelter program	do	------	168	------	168	------
Total, construction general	------	226,777	359,965	85,639	672,381	------

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

[In thousands of dollars]

Project	Status	Expenditures prior to fiscal year 1961	Expenditures, fiscal year 1961 through fiscal year 1967	Expenditures projected for fiscal year 1968	Total	Fiscal year of first expenditure if subsequent to fiscal year 1961
Flood control rescue operations	Continuing	30	410	119	559	
Inspection of completed work (LP)	do	13	39	23	75	
National emergency activities	Complete		9		9	
General regulatory functions			12		12	
Emergency bank stabilization, Arkansas River and tributaries	Continuing	424	1,423	305	2,152	
Advance preparation of flood emergencies		13	55		68	
Flood emergency operations		75	112		187	
Great Salt Plains Reservoir (Alfalfa County)	do	857	480	67	1,404	1941
Fort Supply Reservoir (Woodward County)	do	887	802	129	1,818	1941
Canton Reservoir (Blaine and Dewey Counties)	do	1,066	1,230	183	2,479	1948
Hulah Reservoir (Osage County)	do	617	910	174	1,701	1950
Wister Reservoir (Le Flore County)	do	838	823	188	1,849	1949
Oologah Reservoir (Rogers and Nowata Counties)	do	32	977	254	1,263	
Heyburn Reservoir (Creek County)	do	352	527	142	1,021	1950
Tenkiller Reservoir (Sequoyah and Cherokee Counties)	do	1,390	2,463	534	4,387	1953
Fort Gibson Reservoir (Wagoner, Cherokee, and Mayes Counties)	do	2,580	3,469	738	6,787	1953
Pensacola Reservoir (Mayes, Delaware, and Ottowa Counties)	do	43	61	14	118	1940
Denison Reservoir (Johnston, Marshall, Bryan and Love Counties)	do	6,639	5,409	940	12,988	1944
Eufaula Reservoir (Haskell, McIntosh, Pittsburg, Okmulgee and Muskogee Counties).	do		2,152	966	3,118	
Keystone Reservoir (Tulsa, Osage, Creek, Pawnee, and Payne Counties).	do		1,205	711	1,916	
Repair and Restoration of levees		85	197		282	
Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma			180		180	
Arkansas-Red salinity control			2	16	18	
Total operation and maintenance, general		15,941	22,947	5,503	44,391	

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS, CIVIL

Project	Status	Expenditures prior to fiscal year 1961	Expenditures, fiscal year 1961 through fiscal year 1967	Expenditures projected for fiscal year 1968	Total	Fiscal year of first expenditure if subsequent to fiscal year 1961
Hydrologic studies	Continuing	2,103	68	17	2,188	1939
Arkansas River to Oklahoma City	Complete	49	144		193	1958
Verdigris River, Kans. and Okla	do	54	64		118	1957
Boswell Reservoir	do	18	61		79	1958
Shidler Reservoir	do	9	31		40	1959
Hugo Reservoir	do	88	3		91	1957
Kaw Reservoir	do	22	51		73	1959
Oklahoma City floodway (extension)	do	4	25		29	1960
Coordination w/other agencies (SCS)	Continuing	1	58	10	69	1960
Red River below Denison	do		736	84	820	
Chewey Reservoir	Complete		2		2	
Sallisaw Creek	do		1		1	
Sans Bois Creek (Tamaha)	do		1		1	
Pryor Creek	do		1		1	
Civil works investigation No. 154	do	58	15		73	1957
Arkansas-Red River pollution	do	42	1,127		1,169	1960
Coordination with Bureau of Reclamation	Continuing		29	5	34	
Arkansas River (Eufaula)	Complete		7		7	
Squirrel and Crutcho Creeks	do		33		33	
Cimarron River	Continuing		320	51	371	
Poteau River	Complete		222		222	
Red River Power (Broken Bow)	do		2		2	
Grand Neosho River	do		20		20	
Verdigris River	do		21		21	
Central Oklahoma project	do		807		807	
Head of navigation, Arkansas River	do		1		1	
Arkansas River, Wybark and Choska	do		15		15	
Sherwood Reservoir	do		75		75	
Waurika Reservoir	do		26		26	
Eufaula and Keystone Reservoir, Arkansas River Basin water supply, McAlester and Yale	do		2		2	
Grand Neosho River Basin	Continuing		1	50	51	
Verdigris River Basin, including navigation	do		2	70	72	
Arkansas River and tributaries, Great Bend to Tulsa	do		225	100	325	
Flood plain management	do		7	40	47	
Flood plain technical services	do			10	10	
Brush Creek flood plain	do			11	11	
Stillwater Creek flood plain	do			22	22	
Arkansas River, Keystone to Webbers Falls	do			15	15	
Tenkiller Reservoir	do			20	20	
Total, general investigations		2,448	4,203	505	7,156	

NOMINATION OF CLIFFORD L. ALEXANDER TO BE CHAIRMAN OF EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, President Johnson recently nominated an outstanding New Yorker, Mr. Clifford L. Alexander, Jr., as Chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. Business Week for July 15 tells of Mr. Alexander's career and possible plans for that agency. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A BROADER EFFORT ON JOB BIAS

Clifford L. Alexander, Jr., a tall, handsome, 33-year-old Negro who grew up in Harlem and moved smoothly through an Ivy League education into a staff job in the White House, may have lots to say about company hiring practices in the next few years.

Alexander has been picked by President Johnson to fill a five-year term as chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, and will take over EEOC at a turning point in the agency's dealings with business.

For two years, EEOC has been hard put to keep ahead of an avalanche of job discrimination complaints. Now officials expect to have their caseload under control by fall, and the commission is planning to put greater emphasis on technical assistance programs to get more workers from minority groups into better jobs.

Broader scope technical assistance programs encompass a wide variety of efforts to encourage employers and unions to go beyond the letter of the law in upgrading the employment status of Negroes.

In the future, the commission will do more than investigate complaints from rejected job applicants. It will also instigate its own programs designed to get companies to change basic hiring and promotion policies that may lead to unintentional discrimination.

Companies willing to help in hiring minority workers will come under such programs voluntarily. In other cases, EEOC is expected to employ the full panoply of publicity to spotlight industries that are lagging behind in an effort to get key companies to cooperate.

In some instances, EEOC has already conducted such operations, including a program to help companies building new plants to find and hire minority workers. Another example is a forum it set up in South Carolina where state, city, local, and company officials met to talk about upgrading Negro jobs in the textile industry.

But these programs have fallen behind while the agency struggled with a deluge of complaints.

Scrutiny. EEOC will begin singling out new areas for technical assistance later this summer when it finishes a computer analysis of employment patterns in individual industries. The analysis will show an industry's percentage of minority workers as compared with the population of such workers in the surrounding area. For example, one such analysis already released by the commission shows that Negro employment in petroleum refining was only about 1.5% in the San Francisco-Oakland area even though Negroes accounted for 14% and 31% of the population in the two cities, respectively.

At the same time, the National Urban League is making a study for EEOC which it will use as a basis for recommending priority areas on which the agency should focus. One of Alexander's own ideas is to create close ties between EEOC and federal job training programs. Then, if a particular company is unable to find qualified Negroes to employ, the commission could help link the company with a federal training program.

Alexander, whose parents were Harlem community leaders, was president of the student council in his Harvard undergraduate days where he received his B.A. (cum laude) in 1955, and president of the Phi Delta Phi international legal fraternity at Yale (LL.B., 1958). The fact that he is a Negro puts him one up with civil rights leaders who have been critical of EEOC in the days when it was helplessly overburdened.

Big move. His Harvard contact with McGeorge Bundy brought Alexander to Washington in 1963. He was a struggling lawyer on New York's West 55th Street when Bundy asked him to join the staff of the National Security Council. "I almost didn't accept," he recalls. He had been practicing just long enough to be gypped on a fee by a client in a criminal case, but he still saw a promising future as a lawyer. Once in the White House, he gradually phased out of Southeast Asian affairs and into such domestic problems as civil rights.

In his first test as an administrator, Alexander will be able to lean on another long-time Bundy aide and Harvard honors grad, Gordon Chase, 34, who is the agency's staff director.

Friends who work with Alexander at the White House do not think he will fall down as an administrator. "He's even-handed and well balanced," says Lee C. White, who moved from the White House himself to become chairman of the Federal Power Commission. "Cliff has the easy-going type of personality it takes to get members of a commission moving together without friction."

Focus on data. Alexander says he does not plan to go around "branding Company X a bigot." Instead, he will rely on factual information—such as EEOC's computer survey—to speak for itself.

Alexander's predecessor, Stephen N. Shulman, gets much of the credit for readying EEOC for a move into new programs. Aside from being bogged down in a backlog of cases during its first year of operation, the agency was also inexperienced, understaffed, and under financed. Moreover, the agency's first chairman, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., quit before his term expired to run for governor of New York.

Shulman, who succeeded Roosevelt, quickly whipped EEOC into businesslike trim. A tough, hard-working former McNamara "Whiz Kid," he applied the lessons of cost-effectiveness, computerization, and efficiency he had learned at the Pentagon. The number of job discrimination complaints conciliated by EEOC jumped fourfold, and before he left the job this month, Shulman predicted that the commission would be operating on schedule by fall.

Power of persuasion. EEOC, which has no legal power to force employers to change discriminatory employment and promotion policies, must rely on conciliation and persuasion. In doing so, it takes four steps:

Analyzes complaints, approximately 17,000 in its first two years of operation.

Investigates those falling within its jurisdiction.

Decides, in written opinions by the five commission members, which cases are worthy of action.

Negotiates with employers, unions, and employees to correct discriminatory situations, which may range from segregated facilities to segregated seniority lines.

Shulman claims "great changes" in streamlining each step. He saved eight days by eliminating double analysis procedures in which complaints were reviewed both in the field and in Washington. He conducted time and motion studies of investigations and came up with a model format for investigators. This has already chopped 10% to 15% off the time needed for investigations, he says, and he predicts the agency's productivity will double by late fall.

Breaking the jam. Today, EEOC has a backlog of 400 to 500 cases awaiting decisions, and this bottleneck threatens to worsen as the speed of investigations picks up. Before leaving, Shulman hired 25 students about to enter their final year of law school to help write decisions and thus to help eliminate the backlog. Shulman also set into motion the training of investigators in conciliation techniques, and increased the conciliation staff from five to 31 men. He also asked Congress for 110 additional people (the House has authorized 75), which, it is hoped, will prevent a recurrence of the backlog.

Meanwhile, EEOC, in a contract with the University of Pittsburgh, is putting its decisions, conciliation agreements, and general counsel opinions on magnetic tape for storage. At a push of a button, this information will be retrieved by EEOC headquarters in Washington and by its 11 regional headquarters. This will not only speed up decision-making but enable regional directors to make their own decisions if the commission members decide to delegate this responsibility.

Shulman believes that putting EEOC on a business-like basis will open the way for more dramatic moves into new technical assistance programs.

Obstacles. Still, despite Shulman's reforms, Alexander will face obstacles. EEOC will need more money as the number of complaints continues to mount, and Congressional conservatives may prove reluctant to give it more.

In addition, the lack of power to issue cease-and-desist orders has been a thorn in the agency's side. EEOC has settled only 43% of its conciliation efforts successfully to date. This means that nearly six out of every 10 complainants do not get the justice in jobs to which the commission believes they are entitled.

A bill to give EEOC cease-and-desist powers faces difficulty in the relatively conservative 90th Congress. Alexander is sure to keep pressing for this legislation, however, and he has the necessary access to the President to be assured of White House support.

EEOC officials say that there is a compelling reason for cease-and-desist powers. Their argument is that such powers would improve the conciliation process since businessmen, union leaders, and employment agencies will be more willing to bargain when they know the government carries a big stick.

NEMDA LABOR STUDY PROMOTES INDUSTRIAL GROWTH IN NORTHEASTERN MINNESOTA

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, in an effort to create jobs, attract industry, and promote a more diversified economy, a broadly based, privately financed $1 million industrial development corporation was formed in northeastern Minnesota 3 years ago. Named the Northeastern Minnesota Development Corporation—NEMDA—this organization is based on a concept of local cooperation involving the six counties and 50 communities which make up northeastern Minnesota and every major element in the region's economy—mining, utilities, news media, labor unions, transportation, banks, manufacturing, forest products, and retail and service firms.

As a part of the effort to attract and assist industries which might be interested in locating in northeastern Minnesota, NEMDA recently completed a systematic survey of regional labor resources. This survey points up the availability of thousands of skilled Minnesotans within the six-county region and details their experience, education, age, and willingness to undergo retraining and commute various distances for new employment. As the Duluth News-Tribune noted in a recent editorial, the NEMDA labor survey provides businesses and industries interested in northeastern Minnesota with "a completeness and abundance of detail which few, if any, comparable organizations could approach."

I commend NEMDA for its fine work and ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "Workers Industry Needs," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Duluth News-Tribune,
Sept. 26, 1967]

WORKERS INDUSTRY NEEDS

Officials of industries, impressed with other resources of our region, naturally ask about the available labor supply. Thanks to a detailed and elaborate study, unique in some ways, NEMDA—the Northeastern Minnesota Development Association—can answer those questions. It can do so with a completeness and an abundance of detail which few, if any, comparable organizations could approach.

The six-county region has 3,933 men and 2,937 women who would be interested in the employment a new industry could offer. Some are unemployed, many have work now but would be interested in new jobs. Many are willing to train for this new employment.

Using the resources of ultra-modern computers, the survey includes a wealth of tabulations. Experience, education, age and willingness to commute various distances to and from work are among the points covered.

The survey is an integral part of one of NEMDA's chief purposes—more jobs, and good ones, for the people of this six-county region. We have many men and women who want to stay in this part of the country, but who would like to be working, or to be making greater use of their energies and abilities than they now find possible. The NEMDA survey of labor availability is the equivalent of a massive application for employment.

The alert, prompt and intelligent response by those sending in the questionnaires is impressive evidence of the quality of employables that we have here.

With this new abundance of information about the workers to be found here, NEMDA can answer all the questions usually asked by executives planning a new plant, a move or an expansion. Skilled researchers can gather much of that information—and have done so—by dealing with key people in industries and government. Transportation, taxes, utility rates, availability of land and buildings are information vital to industrial planners. Much of this information NEMDA already can supply.

But knowing all that, concerns can still ask, "What kind of job applicants and trainees can we expect? How many? Where do they live? What background do they have?" Now NEMDA has those answers, too. They make up an exceedingly strong appeal, and one which will be presented with skill and persistence and intimate knowledge of this immense and constantly changing subject—one which any region outside a few highly congested areas must master to get its share of the industrial growth and dispersal which is one of the amazing aspects of American industry today.

THE ARROGANCE OF POWER

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the literary supplement of the London Times carried on October 5 a review of Senator Fulbright's book, "The Arrogance of Power." The article is of interest and value not only as a perceptive review of Senator Fulbright's ideas on Senate reponsibility for formation of foreign policy but also as a reflection on the constitutional issue by an "outside" observer from a nation which is a trusted and friendly ally. I ask unanimous consent that the review be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the review was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the London Times, literary supplement, Oct. 5, 1967]

World Affairs: Fighting for the Hill

J. William Fulbright: *The Arrogance of Power*, 264 pp. Cape. 30s.

Senator Fulbright's latest book, *The Arrogance of Power*, has a double importance. It is another shot in his campaign against the foreign policy of the Johnson Administration and he has long passed the time of ranging shots, near misses, and the rest. He is now on target. His book suffers a little, it is possible to argue, from the fact that the Senator has so many disciples, and there is an obvious similarity in *The Arrogance of Power* and Ronald Steel's *Pax Americana*. The Senator, as befits one in his position, is slightly less savage and slightly less contemptuous of the accepted wisdom of the White House and the State Department. But the politeness of his manner does not conceal the depth of his dislike and even contempt for American foreign policy and a degree of disillusionment with the leadership of his own party.

But equally important—perhaps more important and more novel to an English reader—is the revelation of the clash of powers in the American constitutional system. Senator Fulbright holds the very important and, to us, rather mysterious office of Chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. It is an office that many eminent men have held. It is an office that has been held by men who perhaps did not, in the long run, increase their prestige with the office: for example, Charles Sumner, Henry Cabot Lodge I, and William A. Borah. It has, of course, been held by nonentities. It has been almost totally eclipsed by forceful Presidents like Woodrow Wilson and F. D. Roosevelt. But the office remains—and the residuum of power.

But Senator Fulbright is not content with the residuum of power left to him and his committee. He wants to redress the imbalance of power which has grown up in Washington. From the beginning, there has been a clash between the White House and "the Hill". Senator Fulbright makes a lot of the failure of President Johnson to notice the duty of the Senate to "advise and consent" to the projects of the Executive. But this breakdown in the formal organization of American foreign policy dates back to President Washington. There have been oscillations between the power of the Executive and the power of the Senate. In a famous passage in *The Education of Henry Adams*, John Hay, a flashy if not very successful Secretary of State, complained bitterly of the way he was treated by the Senate of his time. His sympathetic and uncritical friend Adams noted:

"The fathers had intended to neutralize the energy of government and had succeeded, but their machine was never meant to do the work of a twenty-million horsepower society in the twentieth century, where much work needed to be quickly and efficiently done."

It was a one-sided view, and very soon, by their ingenuity and disregard of the letter and perhaps the spirit of the Constitution, Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson transferred power from the Hill to the White House. There were oscillations after that. The Senate got its revenge on Wilson. It sometimes thwarted Franklin Delano Roosevelt. But the whole trend in this century has been towards the uncontrolled exercise of presidential power. In this dangerous age some transfer of power was inevitable. Senator Fulbright recognizes this:

"The cause of the change is crisis. The President has the authority and resources to make decisions and take actions in an emergency; the Congress does not. Nor, in my opinion, should it; the proper responsibilities of the Congress are those spelled out by Mill—to reflect and review, to advise and criticize, to grant or withhold consent. . . . This situation is not fundamentally the fault of individuals. It is primarily the result of events, and the problem is not one of apportioning blame but of finding a way to restore the constitutional balance, of finding ways by which the Senate can discharge its *duty* of advice and consent in an era of permanent crisis."

Although Senator Fulbright was a distinguished academic and perhaps has hankered, from time to time, after British solutions to the problem (did not President Truman once declare that Senator Fulbright had been brainwashed as a Rhodes scholar at Oxford?), this is a far from academic book. It is a call to action and to immediate action. For as Senator Fulbright sees the situation, the United States has been led deeper and deeper into the Serbonian bog and led not only by the bad judgment and possibly the usurpations of President Johnson, but by the illusions, if not by the bad faith, of the President and of his Secretary of State, Dean Rusk (he too a Rhodes scholar).

Senator Fulbright goes back, historically, to various examples of the failure of the Executive to be candid or competent in its dealings with the Senate. We learn that President Kennedy consulted (of course among others) Senator Fulbright on the Bay of Pigs, but that the consultation was more or less accidental, and he was the only Senator consulted. He gave good advice which was not listened to; but President Kennedy did not avenge himself on the Senator for being proved right when the Persident had been so disastrously wrong. It may be suspected that Senator Fulbright wishes to underline the contrast of attitude between President Kennedy and his successor.

Senator Fulbright also tells us that, in the second Cuban crisis of 1962, he advised the invasion of Cuba, advice which most people will agree was fortunately not taken, and Senator Fulbright himself seems to think that had he known as much then as he does now, he would have accepted the superior wisdom of the President. So far Senator Fulbright is not recounting any breakdown of a vital character in the relationship between the President and a body which contains one main group, at any rate, of his constitutional advisers.

But with the coming of the Johnson Administration things changed. Like many other people in America and even outside it, the Senator was more shocked in 1965 by the intervention in the Dominican Republic, and by the nonsensical reasons given for it, than he was by the stepping up of American intervention in South Vietnam. The Dominican intervention did a great deal of harm, but not as much harm as the Senator had feared. And the situation in the Dominician Republic (not, as the British press almost unanimously has insisted on calling it, Dominica, thus slandering an innocent British colony) has not been totally disastrous.

It is very different when we turn to Vietnam. Here the Senator reproaches the President. For Senator Fulbright supported the famous Gulf of Tonkin resolution in which many senators see the *fons et origo mali* of the present situation. Based on insufficient knowledge, perhaps on deliberately misleading information, the senators, apart from Senator Morse and Senator Gruening, gave, whether they meant it or not, a blank cheque to President Johnson. Since then, the United States has been drawn further and further into a war which it was warned against both by General MacArthur and by his successor General Matthew Ridgway, a war which no one wants and which, starting as a version of the Mexican expedition of Napoleon III, is getting more like the Spanish ulcer of Napoleon I.

It is this situation which endangers the peace of the world, and endangers and perhaps destroys the international position of the United States. Senator Fulbright, with great wisdom, suggests a policy by which the United States could defuse the increasingly dangerous time-bomb which is still ticking away and possibly ticking louder than ever. The Senator insists that the main business is to reduce tension, and that dealing with specific problems like German unification is to be approached as a means of reducing the tensions rather than as an end in itself. For the isolating of certain problems and even their solution might, in fact, increase tensions.

In order to reduce tensions, the United States must shed "the arrogance of power". It is in his analysis of that arrogance, and of the dangers or even crimes it has led the United States into that the Senator preaches the most effective sermon. He asks, and he is asking a great deal of the Johnson Administration and the American people, that they should develop empathy with the people of Vietnam, with the Chinese, with the Russians, one is tempted to say, with the human race. He wants the United States to offer to the Soviet Union many kinds of political cooperation (and not to waste resources in a moon race). He wants foreign aid to be channelled through international organs and the United States to be content to do without effusive gratitude. He asks his countrymen to consider how they would like to have their affairs managed, possibly even improved in management, by superior outsiders obviously taking them over, no doubt for their own good, but certainly with very little consideration for their feelings.

One of the examples he gives of a possible American reaction to having an institution taken over and remodelled for the general good is a possible proposal to get German experts to take over and run the New Haven Railroad. How completely this goes to the heart of the question only Americans or, indeed, only customers of the New Haven can fully understand!

Senator Fulbright answers very convincingly the charge that what he is preaching is a "new isolationism". It is not that, but it is a refusal to believe that all the world's problems can or should be solved by the United States. There are many things that the United States can do which perhaps it should not do, and there are many things it simply cannot do. Nor is he impressed with the argument that the United States must not lose face in Vietnam. He even dares to suggest that the United States should take the advice of General de Gaulle (who ranks at the moment as almost as much of a fabulous monster as Chairman Mao or Ho Chi-minh in the American demonology). He can be blandly ironical in contemplating some of the most belligerent publicists in the United States. He notes that the famous hearings of his committee that he called in 1966 to discuss policy in Thailand produced a violent attack from Mr. Joseph Alsop "in an obviously over-excited condition because, no doubt, of the war".

Senator Fulbright is not totally devoid of hope for his country and for the world. He notes that the United States has now a very large population of young people who do not share the fears, or possibly the overweening ambitions, of their elders. He takes over from Professor Galbraith the theory of three generations, and the least hopeful of these generations is the middle generation, the realists of the 1950s, the hard-boiled nuclear theorists, who can calculate "'acceptable' levels of 'megadeaths'". For what Georges Bernanos called in another connexion *ces petits mufles realistes,* even for their eminent professors, even a professor at Harvard, Senator Fulbright has no use. He puts his hope in the nearly sixty million people born in the United States since the end of the Second World War, an increase of population greater than the total population of France or Britain. Domestic problems of the United States are overwhelmingly important and may indeed overwhelm the United States, if many more resources are diverted to building a dyke in South-east Asia against a Chinese power that may itself be crumbling. The United States in Latin America, for instance, is very largely defending social structures that are morally indefensible, and probably in the not very long run, practically indefensible (the parallel with South Arabia may strike some British readers). Addressed mainly to his countrymen, and addressed to them less as lectures given in the John Hopkins University than as the kind of instruction about the realities of power that he feels that the Senate should give to the White House as well as to the American people, this book is a brilliant tract for the times. But it is also a tract for our times as long as we are the most trusted ally of the United States or, at any rate, of the Johnson Administration.

This is a tract for the times in more than that it is an attack on the foreign policy of the United States. It is especially timely for us since it recalls to the forgetful British public the realities of the American constitutional system. It is perfectly true that power has been sliding down an inclined plane from the Hill to the White House for a very long time. It is probably true that Senator Fulbright does not think he can do more than delay this transfer of power and do more than restore the function of the Senate as a place in which the policies of the United States are at least debated and explained with less of a credibility gap than is involved in White House press conferences. It is easy, contemplating presidential power, to murmur "No Winter shall abate this Spring's increase".

In a sense, this is true. For the reasons given by Senator Fulbright, the presidential initiative and power of sudden decision cannot and, indeed, should not be taken away. But it is educational for the President to have to justify, even if after the event, his decisions. It is also educational for the American people. And it is one of the paradoxes of the present situation that President Johnson owed his whole political career and fame to his legendary skill as a Senate manager and "undertaker" and yet has become so singularly unsuccessful in this role. (It is now not only a matter of managing the Senate, for the House Foreign Affairs Committee is far more important than it was in the days of Sol Bloom.) Senator Fulbright is not—and does not try to be—an autocrat like Henry Cabot Lodge I packing the Senate Committee. He has far more support in the Senate than has yet been publicly disclosed; and it is largely due to him that the role of a loyal opposition has fallen so much to members of the President's own party, and that the President can rely far more on Senator Dirksen, the Republican leader, than on Senators Fulbright, Mansfield, Clark and the rest. And since it is most important that we should understand the reality of the American political system, this book has a double value for today and tomorrow.

EUGENE V. DEBS AND NEGRO RIGHTS

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, on Saturday, September 23, I had the pleasure of participating in the dedication of the Eugene V. Debs Home in Terre Haute, Ind., as a national historic landmark. The Honorable Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior, gave the principal address on this momentous occasion, and many other notables, including the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] the Governor of the State, Rober Branigin, and the mayor of Terre Haute, Ralph Tucker, took part.

In the evening of the same day an Eugene V. Debs Awards dinner was held in honor of A. Philip Randolph, president of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, AFL–CIO. At this event one of the speakers was Dr. Bernard J. Brommel, a member of the history committee of the Debs Foundation and of the department of speech at the University of North Dakota. Professor Brommel presented a very fine but brief comment on the strong belief of Eugene V. Debs in civil rights, his opposition to discrimination and segregation, and his insistence that labor unions should admit persons to membership regardless of race.

Professor Brommel has for some years been engaged in research for and writing a biography of Eugene V. Debs. In his remarks he vividly portrayed the equalitarian philosophy of this great American labor leader and quoted several revealing excerpts from speeches and writings which well illustrate his compassion for his fellow man. Mr. President, in order to counteract any misconception or myths that may exist about his views, I ask unanimous consent that this short essay entitled, "Debs and Negro Rights" be printed in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEBS AND NEGRO RIGHTS

(By Bernard J. Brommel)

Early in his career Eugene V. Debs recognized the problems that Negroes faced in America. As a young Democratic legislator in the Indiana General Assembly, Debs objected to the manner in which many of his colleagues campaigned for Negro votes in 1885. He discovered that they considered a thousand Negro votes worth one job on the police force or post office, and five hundred votes worth a "spittoon cleaning job" at the court house. At the first convention of the American Railway Union in 1893, Debs asked the delegates to admit Negro workers. He failed, but thereafter he never missed an opportunity in his union-organizing career to plead for equality in the unions.

After the failure of the Pullman Strike in 1894, Debs often told audiences that one of the reasons the A.R.U. failed was because they refused to accept Negroes, and thus encouraged the railroad owners to hire Negroes as strikebreakers. He repeated the same arguments to the mining union organizers and cited numerous examples of strikes in Illinois, West Virginia, and other states in which mine owners deliberately hired Negro workers for brief periods of time to end strikes. In a 1903 article in the *American Labor Journal,* Debs recounted his efforts on behalf of Negroes. ". . . All my life I have opposed discrimination," he stated. "The first requisite in elevating the Negro is to get off his back."[1] In another the Negro should not be satisfied with equality with reservations. "Why should he be?" he question. "Suppose you change places with the Negro just a year, then let us hear from you." He concluded by wisely stating that he knew that race prejudice in the North was often as intense as in the South. "Any man," he declared, "who advised the white wage worker to look down upon the black wage worker was the enemy of both."[2]

Although Debs' manuscripts contained many references to his work for the Negro, his speech. "An Appeal to Negro Workers," delivered at Commonwealth Casino in New York City on October 30, 1923, best summarized his attitude and efforts on their behalf. Debs' address followed preliminary speeches by James O'Neal, Lucille Randolph, Frank R. Crosswaith, and A. Phillip Randolph, then editor of *The Messenger,* a publication Debs read and praised. In this speech Debs demonstrated his considerable knowledge of Negro history. "I do not speak to my colored friends in any patronizing sense; I meet them upon a common basis of equality; they are my brothers and sisters, and I want nothing that is denied them, and if there is any one of them who will shine my shoes, and I am not willing to shine his, he is my moral superior," Debs announced to the large crowd. Prophetically Debs outlined a course of action for the Negro to gain his rights. ". . . There is nothing that you cannot do for yourselves," he advised. "You can compel the respect of others only when you respect yourselves." "As long as you are unorganized; as long as you are indifferent; as long as you are satisfied to remain ignorant; you will invite contempt and receive it," he continued. "Everything depends upon education".[3]

Fundamentally Debs believed that if you provided the Negro the same chance, the same opportunity that you gave a white man,

---

[1] "The Negro Question," July 9, 1903, p. 7.
statement a year later, Debs declared that

[2] "The Negro and His Nemesis," *International Socialist Review,* February 1904, p. 391.

[3] "Appeal to Negro Workers" Debs Ms., Tamiment Library, New York City.

"he would register as high upon the mental and moral thermometer of civilization."[4] Debs refused to speak in the cities in the South that enforced segregation in auditoriums. He preferred to speak in a park to prevent this disgraceful practice. Debs admonished the Negroes not to accept charity. "Charity is degrading," he declared. "What the Negro wants is individual freedom and then he will attend to his own needs."[5] Late in life, Debs made this comment, "I know no race, no color, and no creed. At the roots we are all alike, depending upon the circumstances in which we find ourselves placed." Through the practice of this philosophy Debs made a contribution to mankind.

TAX CREDITS AND THE NEED TO REVITALIZE STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, the costs of government are growing rapidly. This is particularly true of our State and local administrations which are struggling to cope with a host of 20th-century challenges on 19th-century budgets. Significant help must be provided if they are not to be innundated by the problems of urban America.

Thus, it is with great pleasure that I note former North Carolina Governor Terry Sanford's call for a major effort to improve the revenue bases of these vital units of government. Governor Sanford, who has been conducting a 2-year, $280,000 study at Duke University on the problems of State administration, has urged that the Federal Government grant a substantial credit for State income taxes against Federal income tax payments.

On May 10, I introduced a bill—S. 1743—the Tax Credit Act of 1967, which would provide a 50-percent credit against Federal income tax payment for all income levies imposed by State and local governments.

Governor Sanford's endorsement of this approach to governmental reform is heartening recognition by a noted State administrator of the value of a creative Federal stimulus to supplement, if not supplant, an expansion of the Federal grant-in-aid system. I wholeheartedly agree that further uncontrolled growth of these programs could only add to the confusion already besetting the States.

As Mr. Sanford said:

> Federal programs are uncoordinated, leading to overlapping, duplication, triplication, conflicting goals, cross-purposes, lack of consistency and loss of direction.

Mr. President, State and local governments know their own problems best. By giving them the option of raising more of their own revenue through the increased tax base made available by a partial Federal credit, they can experiment with new techniques and expand creative programs as they prove their effectiveness.

I also concur with Mr. Sanford's view that the much talked about proposal for Federal revenue sharing with the States is an extremely interesting approach and one which might prove of great value in the future. Unfortunately, as he observes, the high costs of the Vietnam war make it impossible to enact such a large-scale effort now.

While the tax credit program may only be a part of a long-term effort to spur State and local government, one of its greatest assets is that we need not wait to begin. For the cost of such a system will not be prohibitive and will certainly generate far more money for State and local programs than the present conglomeration of Federal grants. The Federal Government already sustains a tax loss under the current systen. of permitting taxpayers to deduct their State and local taxes. In fact, it is estimated that every dollar of income tax currently collected by State and local governments results in about a 24-cent reduction of Federal income tax liability. Thus, the initial cost of a partial Federal credit would be far less than is sometimes presumed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a recent article from the New York Times discussing Mr. Sanford's suggestion be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 16, 1967]

REPORT DEMANDS BIG EFFORT TO REVITALIZE STATES—SANFORD WARNS OF POSSIBLE ABUSES OF CENTRAL POWER—TAX SHARING AND GUIDANCE TO URBAN AREAS PROPOSED

(By Peter Kihss)

A major effort to revitalize the states was called for yesterday on the eve of the National Governors Conference. The object of the plan is to defend the nation's Federal system against "possible abuses of centralized power" and to meet the staggering "challenge of the urban areas."

An outline for reform was made public by Terry Sanford, former Governor of North Carolina, as the result of a two-year, $280,000 study he conducted at Duke University with grants from the Ford Foundation and the Carnegie Corporation of New York. He gave copies of his report, published as a McGraw-Hill Book Company book, "Storm Over the States," to conference members at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel yesterday.

One four-point proposal dealt with how to pay for the project. This suggested, first that the states "get their tax houses in order." Mr. Sanford said 13 states still had no individual income tax, 11 had no corporate income tax and seven had no broad-based sales tax.

SUBSTANTIAL TAX CREDIT

The proposal also called for a "substantial" credit for state income taxes that would be allowed against the Federal income tax.

It further proposed a relaxation of Federal regulations on grant programs.

Only thereafter would Congress be asked to let the states share in perhaps 1 or 2 per cent of Federal income tax revenues for general funds as proposed by Walter W. Heller while he was chairman of the President's Council on Economic Advisers.

Mr. Sanford said that the cost of the Vietnam war in any event would delay Federal tax-sharing. However, he told a news conference that he would consider it "very great progress" if the Heller plan was being seriously debated "five years from now."

Only the use of state powers can "bring order to urban growth" and "avoid the unordered piling up of problems upon problems," Mr. Sanford wrote in his report. He added:

ADVICE FOR NEW YORK

"New York City, like a fat man, needs to change to a more healthful diet and take off weight under the doctor's orders and supervision. It doesn't need more industry. It needs less. It doesn't need to gain population in the next decade. It needs to lose population."

"One of the first things the states can do is help and guide the cities to stop, look around and start over," he went on.

Each state, he proposed, should set up its own department for urban affairs. The states, he said, should use their powers of taxing, annexation, eminent domain and zoning and their over-all view to encourage proper land use, halt "overrunning of open land by urban sprawl," promote mass transit and encourage better housing and "separated city clusters of the future."

Like other cities, New York, Mr. Sanford said to newsmen, has "urban problems" going beyond city borders. Now, he said, every major city is competing for new industry to "get everything it can on the tax books," whereas he held that, "ideally, parts of a metropolitan area should be kept open or used for single-family dwellings."

Mr. Sanford, who was the Democratic Governor of North Carolina from 1961 to 1965, is now a lawyer in Raleigh, N.C.

The new report, he said, was the third and last phase of his two-year study. The first helped start an Education Commission of the States, with offices in Denver, and the second led to an Institute on State Programming for the Seventies, directed by former Governor Jack M. Campbell of New Mexico.

In the new report, Mr. Sanford wrote:

"Federal programs are uncoordinated, leading to overlapping, duplication, triplication, conflicting goals, cross-purposes, lack of consistency and loss of direction."

The states, he said, have traditionally been experimenters and innovators. Currently, he said, California is exploring space-age techniques for problems of transportation, waste disposal, crime and correction and information collection and control, while New York State is pioneering against water pollution.

In his recommendations to states, he proposed that they act as coordinators for local governments in their relationships with the Federal Government, free localities from undue restraints, act against "local fiscal crisis" and strengthen their Governors.

With regard to the Federal Government, he proposed a new White House office on intergovernmental affairs, and consultation with state and local executives before grant programs are made.

TV POLL SHOWS STRONG SUPPORT FOR U.S. POSITION ON BOMBING OF TARGETS IN NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, on the evening of October 9, television stations in 11 major cities conducted a poll, asking their viewers to vote "Yes" or "No" on the following question: "Do you think we should immediately stop bombing North Vietnam?"

More than 40,000 people responded in these cities, and 60 percent voted "No" while 40 percent voted "Yes."

This is a clear majority approval of the administration's policies in Vietnam which demonstrates that the American public understands there can be no unilateral deescalation of the war and that cessation of the bombing must be accompanied by a similar deescalation by Hanoi.

That is my position and that is the administration's position. As I have said many times, the suggestion that the bombing be halted without seeking any commitments from Hanoi is a totally unrealistic one; it is a proposal which would mean the loss of more American lives.

---

[4] *Ibid.*

[5] "Behind Prison Walls," *The Century Magazine*, July 1922, p. 367. Copy on Debs Ms. collection, Indiana State University Library, Terre Haute, Indiana. (Debs disapproved of Booker T. Washington because charity supported his Institute.)

For, as we have seen on past occasions, the Communist forces would use the bombing pause to rush in more troops and more supplies.

I think a majority of Americans recognize this fact, as indicated by the poll. I note, too, that three of the cities in which the poll took place were Florida communities—and in each one, the sentiment was overwhelmingly opposed to an immediate bombing halt.

At this point, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD following my remarks, the results of the poll.

There being no objection, the poll was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCTOBER 9, 1967.

Results: First multi-city public opinion inquiry by participating Television Stations:

Question: "Do you think we should immediately stop bombing North Viet Nam?"

[In percent]

	Yes	*No*
WMAR–TV, Baltimore, Md	42	58
WFIL–TV, Philadelphia	45	55
KSTP–TV, St. Paul-Minneapolis	38	62
WZZM–TV, Grand Rapids, Mich	33	67
WFTV–TV, Orlando, Fla	19	81
WVUE–TV, New Orleans, La	41	59
WIIC–TV, Pittsburgh	40	60
WLBW–TV, Miami, Fla	39	61
KOB–TV, Albuquerque	43	57
WNDU–TV, South Bend, Ind	31	69
KCPX–TV, Salt Lake City	40	60
Consensus above cities	40	60

Also: two cities had asked the same question within the past two weeks, and chose not to repeat it so quickly. However, their results are similar:

[In percent]

	Yes	*No*
WLWI–TV, Indianapolis	27	73
WFLA–TV, Tampa	31	69
Including these two cities, total percentage is	38	62

VIETNAM—A BOMBING PAUSE

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the editorial in the October 20 edition of Life magazine entitled "The Case for Bombing Pause No. 7" is a reasoned plea to the administration to take this initiative toward negotiations for an honorable peace in Vietnam. In many respects the proposal made by the editors of Life that the United States should unconditionally cease the bombing of North Vietnam is similar to the proposals I have made in speeches on the Senate floor for over a year.

Pointing out that there are risks, the editors of Life argue:

> There is a remote possibility that a pause now could be the first step toward an acceptable diplomatic settlement of the war. There is a strong probability that a bombing pause would improve the posture of the U.S. in Vietnam, in the eyes of many other nations and indeed of many Americans, and thus ultimately improve our chances of achieving our purposes in Vietnam.
>
> . . . the Administration very soon must act—and speak—to recapture domestic political and intellectual respect for its Vietnam policy and to rally more diplomatic and moral support abroad. We believe the initiation of a bombing pause is a gesture of forbearance and conciliation which might accomplish that. America has the strength to do it.

I have argued that the chief reason for taking this initiative is to determine if negotiations, a cease fire, and a just settlement can be obtained. This is, I believe, the objective we seek.

I hope the administration will heed the growing consensus both here at home as well as abroad to take an initiative that might lead to peace.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CASE FOR BOMBING PAUSE NO. 7

Six times in 32 months of bombing North Vietnam, the U.S. has held its fire. Three times it was for a brief holiday respite. The three other bombing pauses were ordered to allow Hanoi to signal a willingness to talk peace. No clear signal came. Then, three weeks ago, President Johnson announced the U.S.'s willingness "to stop all aerial and naval bombardment of North Vietnam when this will lead promptly to productive discussion." Hanoi came back with its standard reply: the U.S. must stop bombing "unconditionally," and North Vietnam will promise nothing in return.

Notwithstanding, we believe it would be worthwhile for the U.S. to take the initiative in another bombing pause. We think the U.S. should declare a respite in the attack against the areas north of the battle zones, confining bombing to the Ho Chi Minh Trail complex in Laos and to the southern provinces of North Vietnam, the immediate rear of the enemy forces pressing against the DMZ. There should be no publicly announced "conditions" that carry the whiff of an ultimatum. But this should not be a commitment to stop the bombing indefinitely. In taking this diplomatic and political initiative, the U.S. administration would have clearly in mind the kind of North Vietnamese response we would consider constructive, and how long we were willing to wait for it.

In advocating a bombing pause, with no advance promise of any reciprocal move by North Vietnam, we must acknowledge that almost all U.S. military opinion opposes such a course. The U.S. would be reducing pressure on the enemy, and that is not ordinarily the way to win a war. This, of course, is not an ordinary war. U.S. bombing is in a sense a reprisal against the North for the destruction and terrorism the Vietcong work in South Vietnam. Bombing damage and strain is an important price the North is forced to pay for continuing its support of Communist aggression in the South. The more direct military benefit for the U.S. and our allies is, of course, the interference with the flow of men and matériel from the North. There is much argument as to exactly how effective the bombing is, but in stopping most of it, we would unquestionably be giving up a weapon of some value.

Life believes, however, that the benefits of a bombing pause at this time outweigh the short-term military cost:

There is a remote possibility that a pause now could be the first step toward an acceptable diplomatic settlement of the war.

There is a strong probability that a bombing pause would improve the posture of the U.S. in Vietnam, in the eyes of many other nations and indeed of many Americans, and thus ultimately improve our chances of achieving our purposes in Vietnam.

As to the possibility of a pause leading to meaningful negotiations, Secretary Rusk tirelessly points out, "I have yet to hear anyone tell us that if we did stop the bombing they could definitely deliver Hanoi to the conference table. I have asked a number of governments, 'All right, if we stop the bombing, what can you deliver?' I get no response."

Hanoi itself has denounced past bombing pauses as U.S. "hoaxes." There is a danger that they would take a new bombing pause as a sign that the U.S. is caving in. There is considerable precedent in Communist diplomacy for *raising* your terms when the other side offers any concession.

Yet there do come times in wars when belligerents change policies and positions, sometimes shortly after swearing they never would. The fact that Hanoi will not promise anything in advance, in return for a bombing pause that hasn't happened yet, does not necessarily foreshadow their actual reaction to a pause that had gone on, say, for several weeks. Such a pause could stir up hopes all over the world, including the East European branches of Communism, and could put considerable diplomatic pressure on Hanoi. Probably Hanoi would say No again, to everybody—Canada, India, Denmark, U Thant, etc. But it is worth finding out.

The more weighty reason for a bombing pause is to recapture support for the U.S. presence and commitment in Vietnam. The bombing has isolated the U.S. from most of its friends and allies throughout the world (there are a few stout exceptions in Asia), and in this country the bombing is the focus and catalyst of most of the opposition to the war. There is the "bully" image—the most powerful nation on earth pouring World War II-scale bomb loads onto a primitive little country. The U.S. has never been bombed; countries that have been tend to identify with the targets rather than with the bomber crews.

The fear that the bombing might bring China into the war, even bring on nuclear war, naturally increases as the U.S. goes after North Vietnamese targets which are only 60 seconds' jet-time from the China border. It may be foolish of so many Japanese, Indians, Indonesians, etc., to worry about this. But they do.

In the U.N., over 30 non-Communist nations, among them several of our NATO allies, have now advocated stopping the bombing (with many variations of formula as to "conditions" or no-conditions). Perhaps the most thoughtful proposal was the Canadian suggestion of a bombing halt followed by restoration of the DMZ's neutralized status under international inspection. In later phases of the plan would come freezing of military "capabilities" throughout Vietnam and an eventual cease-fire.

Naively or not, many millions of ordinary citizens, and not a few ambassadors, foreign ministers and U.S. senators, think a bombing halt *could* lead to peace in Vietnam, and they are increasingly critical of the U.S. for not trying it again. If we did try it for a reasonable time, accompanied it with an energetic diplomatic probing, and then nothing came of it, the air would have been cleared. Support for a resumption of bombing, even for an escalation, would be stronger than for our present policy. But much would depend on what the Administration said about the new policy, and how it said it, not just to Hanoi but to the U.S. and the world.

Life believes that the U.S. is in Vietnam for honorable and sensible reasons. What the U.S. has undertaken there is obviously harder, longer, more complicated than the U.S. leadership foresaw. And in 1967 we are having another hard, complicated year out there. There is the encouraging fact of the Vietnamese elections, small blemishes and all; there is straight military progress; but there is the maddeningly slow work of translating these advances into pacification at the "rice-roots level." We are trying to defend not a fully born nation but a situation and a people from which an independent nation might emerge. We are also trying to maintain a highly important—but in the last analysis not absolutely imperative—strategic interest of the U.S. and the free world. This is a tough combination to ask young Americans to die for.

Home-front support for the war is eroding. One may discount some maneuvering among U.S. politicians as 1968 politics, but even the most patently partisan of these noises represents somebody's rather professional judgment of how the voters are feeling.

Life has more than once expressed its admiration for the Johnson administration's coolness and courage in its Vietnam policy. In action the President himself has shown a remarkable blend of resolution and restraint. But in articulation of the policy—which in the end is inseparable from policy itself—the President and his administration have become more and more glaringly unsuccessful.

The President is said to be subdued these days, inclined to "hunker down" and let the Vietnam criticism beat over him. Dean Rusk is infinitely patient and courteous in explaining to critics and questioners "Your quarrel is really with Hanoi." A confusing circumstance is that the other most influential Cabinet officer, Robert McNamara, clearly is less convinced of the efficacy of bombing the North than are the Joint Chiefs of Staff, or Rusk. Nothing inspiring or eloquent and not much that is simply informative is being said from Washington.

We believe the Administration very soon must act—and speak—to recapture domestic, political and intellectual respect for its Vietnam policy and to rally more diplomatic and moral support abroad. We believe the initiation of a bombing pause is a gesture of forbearance and conciliation which might accomplish that. America has the strength to do it.

PHARMACEUTICAL AND NUTRITIONAL RESEARCH AT MEAD JOHNSON & CO.

Mr. **BAYH**. Mr. President, tremendous gains have been made in the fields of pharmaceutical and nutritional research in the last two or three decades. The health and welfare of untold millions of people have been improved and countless lives of future generations have been extended through basic research, clinical studies, and the development of new products by the drug industry.

One of the leading pioneers in this remarkable advancement in human knowledge and betterment is Mead Johnson & Co., a firm which has been located in Evansville, Ind., for more than 50 years. In the September 22 issue of Medical World News, an article reported in some depth on the outstanding discoveries and achievements which have resulted from the investigations conducted by this Hoosier company. To the ordinary layman the scope and methods pursued by those engaged in pharmaceutical and nutritional research are not only fascinating but also somewhat awesome.

Mr. President, as a tribute to those dedicated scientists who spend their lives in laboratories seeking new and better ways to combat disease and to improve health, I ask unanimous consent that this impressive article, entitled "Creating Drugs To Guard All Ages of Man," be printed in full at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CREATING DRUGS TO GUARD ALL AGES OF MAN

As U.S. Highway 41 approaches Evansville, Ind., it cuts over to the Ohio River and runs through miles of cornfields. Just outside the city, a freshly painted Chamber of Commerce welcome booth sits alongside the road. The motorist who stops receives a pleasant Hoosier greeting, some maps, a couple of pamphlets on the history and customs of the region, and a can of *Metrecal*.

Metrecal is a fairly recent addition to Mead Johnson & Company's products, but the cornfields and the river have figured in the firm's history since 1915. That was the year the company moved to the Midwest from New Jersey to be nearer the source of a principal ingredient in its major product, *Dextri-Maltose*, a carbohydrate infant-formula modifier obtained by the enzymatic hydrolysis of cornstarch. Before the days of air freight, the river furnished a fast and easy transportation route for the cans of powder designed to bolster the formulas of full-term and premature babies.

The company had begun to concentrate on *Dextri-Maltose* shortly after the firm was founded by E. Mead Johnson, Sr. He was one of three brothers who had previously established the surgical supply firm of Johnson & Johnson in New Brunswick, N.J., in 1893. In an amicable parting. E. Mead left the business of bandages, plasters, and surgical dressings to his brothers and struck out on his own. He established Mead Johnson & Company in 1905 in Jersey City.

Six years later, Mead Johnson's first detail man learned of a German product called *Nährzucker* from a New York City pediatrician who had been studying in Europe. The detailer promptly told E. Mead Johnson about it. Trademarked *Dextri-Maltose* in this country, the 42% dextrin and 56% maltose mixture was the mainstay of the young company for many years. The latest annual report calls it "The Mother Product" and notes it is still an important item.

The *Dextri-Maltose* experience shaped the policy of the company for the next half century. From the beginning, the product was promoted only to pediatricians or GPs who treated babies. The company has followed this practice with other nutritional products—including *Pablum*—unless demand dictates otherwise.

Dextri-Maltose is the subject of over 400 references in the medical literature, and they show that over the years, the art of nutrition has become a science, drawing on latest advances in biochemistry, physiology, and medicine. These papers reflect the growing sophistication of nutritional research since the relatively simple early studies comparing various formulas for premature infants. Recent studies, for example, evaluate specific functions of added carbohydrates in milk and water mixtures, touching upon such subjects as the reduction of renal solute load and nitrogen retention.

SOME VITAMIN FIRSTS

"Over the years, well babies have flourished on our products. This has given us the resources to aid sick babies," says Dr. Warren M. Cox Jr., vice president for nutritional sciences. "Our nutritional experience, for example, gives us the research background for special foods like *Nutramigen*, a hypoallergenic formula for children sensitive to intact milk proteins, and *Lonalac*, a low-fat, low-salt formulation for children and adults with hypertension and kidney problems."

A native Mississippian, Dr. Cox came to Evansville in 1928 after a stint as a chemistry professor in China. "Vitamin D was the big subject then," he recalls. "Mead Johnson had introduced the first standardized cod liver oil. We took on a new project—trying to figure out how to get ergosterol out of yeast and how to make it into vitamin D. In a year, we had developed *Acterol*, the first semisynthetic vitamin D preparation."

At Mead Johnson in the 1920s and 1930s, "there were only a couple of PhDs in the Lab," Dr. Cox recalls. "The tenor of our early research effort was to develop therapeutic foods. We did not think of them as drugs."

But a laboratory flight of fancy by Dr. Rudolph Ellingson in 1940 resulted in the synthesis of sulfapyrazine, an antibacterial. "It was as good as sulfadiazine, and we had a lot of favorable comments and many publications on it," Dr. Cox says. "But the company never sold the drug, probably because it was in an area in which we had little experience. Sulfapyrazine was carried in the AMA's *New and Nonofficial Drugs* for 20 years, but was never available commercially."

Another early cautious exploration led to far-ranging results. "In the early 1940s, we started searching for an intravenous food for sick babies. Our first thought was to purify amino acids and put them back together, to avoid the possibility of anaphylactic shock that might result from injecting proteins. After a year's work, we knew that for us, this was practically impossible, economically speaking. We wound up with an enzymatic hydrolysate of casein, using pancreatic enzymes. It turned out to be *Amigen*, a very effective parenteral food.

"Mead Johnson subsequently sold its parenteral division but still manufactures bulk casein hydrolysate for use by other companies."

In 1952, the company's experience in nutrition served as one of the rocks on which to build a full-fledged pharmaceutical research program. "We wanted to expand our interest to include the whole family, not only the babies," says D. Mead Johnson, grandson of the founder and current president and chief executive officer. "We wanted to follow the baby through his whole life cycle. We thought of it as research for life.

"Fifteen years ago, we saw research as part of our self-renewal program. We were certain decay would result from standing still. We have found that research is expensive, time-consuming, and unpredictable. The rate of failure exceeds the rate of success. Research is a genuine business risk, but a risk we must continuously undertake within the framework of prudent financial management. Since 1952, we have spent about $10 million on projects that were finally canceled. Another $26 million has been spent on projects from which products may—or may not—be developed.

"But we have also found that productive research is today the hard core of our business and the basis for our economic survival. Our research and development in the last 15 years has cost $51 million, and it has yielded products accounting for 83% of last year's sales. The 1966 research budget was $6 million, the highest in our history, and it will be topped by this year's."

Mead Johnson will continue to be both a nutritional and pharmaceutical house, its president says. "Nutrition is primarily concerned with the maintenance and preservation of health. Pharmaceuticals are generally concerned with the return to health after illness. Both are concerned with life.

"In the next five years, we expect to invest $30 million worldwide to speed our growth. Of this, $20 million will be for new research, manufacturing, and administrative facilities in Evansville."

One of the early important compounds synthesized in the new program evolved from the company's background in nutrition and enzyme work. The project had its beginnings in a way that has become common in Evansville. Company scientists had been mulling over a problem that pediatricians were writing and calling about—excessive mucus accumulation in the respiratory tracts of infants. For an adult, this is a minor annoyance. For an infant, this can be fatal.

Dr. Ben King Harned, then vice president for research, approved the idea of seeking a compound that could dissolve mucus. From its earliest phases, the project was a team effort, drawing upon the talents of scientists from various disciplines.

Dr. A. Leonard Sheffner's biochemistry group and Dr. Walter Zygmunt's microbiology group designed a program seeking microbial enzymes that digest mucus. But there was a small hitch in the timetable. The scientists found that the microbial enzymes would not be available for a while. In the meantime, they began investigating the mucus-digesting properties of common enzymes like trypsin, papain, hyaluronidase, lysozyme, and bromelain. The enzymes that liquefy mucus were also irritating to the respiratory tract.

As a first step, the scientists isolated from porcine gastric mucin a fraction rich in mucoprotein. This material was used as a substrate because it had certain basic similarities to sputum. Next, to catalogue the exact effect of each agent in the experiment, Dr. Sheffner studied the sulfhydryl-containing amino acid, L-cysteine, used as an activator for the enzyme bromelain.

SIX-YEAR PROJECT SUCCEEDS

Using only this simple compound on the porcine mucin fraction, he found it could reduce the viscosity of the substance without any help from an enzyme. Then Dr. Sheffner realized that previous investigators had not seen the significance of an important point. They had noted that L-cysteine could dissolve viscous intestinal juice, but dismissed this by assuming that the compound activated some intestinal enzyme which was responsible for the actual dissolving.

Because the Mead Johnson work had proceeded along careful, classic scientific lines, there was proof that a seemingly innocuous compound such as L-cysteine could luiquify mucus. The enzyme project was abandoned. Instead, researchers began an intensive study of the mucolytic action of various sulfhydryl compounds. The work of these various teams finally resulted in *Mucomyst* (acetylcysteine). From start to finish, the project had taken nearly six years.

Mucomyst is in wide use today to help remove excessive secretions in chronic and acute pulmonary disease, the pulmonary complications of cystic fibrosis, or those asociated wtih tracheostomy, surgery, anesthesia, and diagnostic bronchial studies. A recent *JAMA* news report suggests that acetylcysteine might also increase serum sulfhydryl content in patients wtih rheumatoid disease, and this might result in clinical improvement.

Today, the company's worldwide scientific work is guided by the Mead Johnson Research Center, housed in a three-story, sprawling red-brick building that faces on the Ohio River. From a staff of ten PhDs and 27 other professionals in 1952, it has grown to 61 PhDs and about 380 other scientists and auxiliary personnel.

The company has research agreements with laboratories in various countries and owns a 35% interest in BDH Group Limited, of London, formerly the British Drug Houses Limited. Today, BDH is one of the family. Scientists from Evansville are frequently in London, and the BDH counterparts are often to be seen at the Evansville Research Center.

The BDH alliance accounts for dimethisterone, the progestational agent in *Oracon*, the first sequential contraceptive. *Oracon* received FDA approval two years ago and beat the Lilly pill to the market by a full month. The *Oracon* regimen consists of 16 ethinyl estradiol tablets followed by five dimethisterone and ethinyl estardiol tablets.

Clinical studies on *Oracon* are entering their sixth year in this country, reports Dr. W. Thomas Spain, associate director of clinical research. "We constantly seek to improve our steroids and their methods of administration for efficacy, safety, and simplicity. Our five-year study of progestational steroids in the treatment of a typical and adenomatous endometrail hyperplasia has been gratifying. We are encouraged by similar studies in the palliative management of recurrent endometrial adenocarcinoma."

A clinical study of another promising compound is going on in Europe, and preliminary reports are beginning to appear in the Belgian medical literature, Dr. Spain notes. "Our BHD colleagues have synthesized a progestational compound that may be used to treat benign prostatic hypertrophy, a condition that affects about 20% of men over 50 years of age. In studies of 30 males followed for at least two years, there was demonstrable reduction of gland size with no objective or subjective signs of feminization or change in libido."

Thus, steriods will figure large in Mead Johnsons future, says Dr. James M. Tuholski, group executive vice president. "BDH has been a steroid research leader for years. It holds basic patents on the steroid nucleus with substituents in the C_6 position. That is, the six-methyl group can be put on any class of steroid and seems to make the action of a drug longer lasting. The group doesn't appreciably influence the quality of the progestogen, estrogen, or whatever.

"At the research level, we work with BDH in the way we work with the people down the hall. They are also doing considerable biological studies along with their chemical work. BDH has a steroid team comparable to the good ones in the U.S."

ANTICANCER AGENT IMPROVED

Mead Johnson does not have a male steroid contraceptive anywhere near clinical trials, but the company is thinking along these lines, Dr. Tuholski says. "We're looking for a new method of blocking the maturation of the sperm, which takes about 30 to 60 days in the body. We're trying to block the enzymines that trigger sperm maturation. But this may not be possible without blocking other enzymes, and without producing toxicity. That's where we are at the moment."

Another product to come out of European agreements is *Cytoxan* (cyclophosphamide), an alykylating agent used to treat a wide variety of cancers, including some leukemias, lymphomas, myelomas, carcinomas, and sarcomas. The compound, brought to the company's attention by Dr. Kenneth N. Campbell, was acquired in 1958 from Asta-Werke in Germany, but much of the work to improve its breadth of usefulness and minimize its side effects was done in Evansville.

Evansville research frequently enlarges the scope of a compound. This is particularly true of compounds that act on the adrenergic receptors of the autonomic nervous system, one of the earliest subjects tackled by the new research center, *Vasodilan* (isoxuprine hydrochloride) was obtained from the Dutch company Philips-Duphar in 1956 and marketed in 1959 as a vasodilator. Although the functions of the beta- and alpha-adrenergic receptors are still under intensive investigation all over the world, it is generally agreed that adrenergic vasodilation is controlled by the beta receptors and vasoconstriction by the alpha receptors. This does not necessarily mean that all excitory functions in the various organs are controlled by either of the receptors. The response to activation of the receptor varies from organ to organ and depends partly upon the density of occurrence of the alpha or beta receptors.

A team of Evansville pharmacologists under the direction of Dr. Paul M. Lish went to work on the mechanism of action of the compound. They were not satisfied with the relatively weak action and hoped to improve it. The pharmacologists soon discovered that isoxsuprine not only stimulated the beta receptors but also blocked the alpha receptors and had even a third component of action that relaxed smooth muscles. It was this third component which attracted the attention of chemist, pharmacologist, and clinician alike. Clinicians tested *Vasodilan* as a uterine relaxant during labor. It worked well.

Chemists studied several classes of compounds in this area. An exciting new chemical train of thought eventually crossed the lines of the growing pharmacologic and clinical knowledge, opening up an entire new area of adrenergic research.

One chemist began with the observation that epinephrine and norepinephrine both contain phenolic hydroxyl groups. Removal or masking of the acidic nature of these groups results in a marked lowering or alteration of their physiologic action. Therefore, these groups must play some role in the drug-receptor interactions. Since phenolic groups are weak acids, the chemist wondered, "How about replacing one or more of them with a methanesulfonamide moiety, which is chemically and structurally similar to the phenolic hydroxyl group?"

"It started out with my very simple question," says Dr. Aubrey A. Larsen, chemical research director. "This was purely a chemical speculation, applied to a biological environment. And it worked. We turned out a whole new class of compounds which are now in various stages of becoming clinical drugs. The class includes bronchodilators, cardiac accelerators, beta-blockers, vasodilators for vein disorders, and uterine relaxants."

CYNICS AND SKEPTICS

Dr. Larsen encourages the same type of speculation today. Our job is to beat the odds. Statistically speaking, the average PhD who does reasonably sophisticated work for a pharmaceutical company needs five or six lifetimes to get a marketable product. The odds are all against us, because we must work with thousands of compounds before we find one with real therapeutic advantage."

The entire pharmaceutical industry will find it increasingly harder to beat the odds, Dr. Larsen predicts. "Chemists and biologists in the industry must get down to the molecular level. Some day, all biological activity will be explained in chemical terms. Even now it's not enough for a chemist to come up with new compounds. He's got to go further. He's got to know why they are active, how they are detoxified, what enxymes they interact with."

Another chemical group being explored for answers to these questions are the pyrrolidines. Synthesized by senior research fellows Yao-Hua M. Wu and Rolland F. Feldkamp, the group includes a nucleus of small-ring compounds that fit into larger, more complex molecules. The pyrrolidines generally show antispasmodic and non-narcotic analgesic activity. Some of the substances stimulate the central nervous system. Others depress smooth muscles selectively in the bronchioles, uterus, gut, coronary system, and peripheral vascular system.

The pyrrolidines and the methane-sulfonamides comprise the two largest single chemical projects in Evansville, Dr. Larsen says. "They are not the biggest portion of our work, but they are two big productive areas. We are working with other compounds that act on the central nervous system, including tranquilizers and antidepressants. We are also doing cardiovascular work, including screening for diuretics, that does not relate to the adrenergic project."

Dr. Larsen notes that so far the Evansville researchers have been pretty lucky in the active-compound sweepstakes. "To beat the odds, you have to be a cynic and a skeptic. You have to be a rebel. Once people get established in a certain area, inertia tends to defend the status quo." Then he grins. "But I'm happy to report there's no inertia in Evansville."

Still another area of research is being explored by Dr. Homer Eaton Stavely, director of biological chemistry, whose background includes a decade at the Squibb Institute for Medical Research. He has been experimenting with two small polypeptide hormones, oxytocin and vasopressin. Both are formed by the neuronal cells of the hypothalamic nuclei and stored in the posterior lobe of the hypophysis. Oxytocin stimulates the contraction of the muscular tissue of the capillaries and arterioles, raising blood pressure.

"We've been building up analogues of these two hormones, hoping to attack the job differently from other workers," says Dr. Stavely. "Other researchers are taking a natural hormone and replacing one peptide at a time and seeing what the properties of the analogues might be. Our idea was to build the simplest possible analogues while maintaining the general shape of the molecule. In this approach, we would use as many glycine units as possible because glycine is the simplest amino acid. We haven't gotten too far along. Hopefully, compounds of this kind would be inhibitors of hormones. If we do get a peptide that is an inhibitor of oxytocin, we might be able to stop threatened abortion. An inhibitor of vasopressin might be able to do something for hypertension."

METABOLIC DEFECTS PROJECT

As the range and depth of the pharmaceutical research activities have expanded over the years, nutritional studies have also become more basic, delving deep into biochemistry, physiology, and medicine. "When I first came to the company about 15 years ago, I started work on a new research project on nutritional factors involved in metabolic defects," says Dr. Herbert P. Sarett, nutritional research director. "We knew it would never make much money. Only a small part of the popultion is afflicted with these biochemical defects which make it impossible for them to properly metabolize substances like galactose, phenylalanine, cystine, or other important nutrients. These generally lead to physical and mental defects. The company wanted to do this research as a service to the medical profession. We wanted to give the doctor something to help fight this waste of human resources."

In the early 1950s, some preliminary studies showed that removing excess phenylalanine from the diet, leaving only a minimal amount essential for growth, might help prevent mental damage in patients with phenylketonuria (PKU). "We began work on a special diet which would contain a little phenylalanine to start the child with," says Dr. Sarett. "We already had a product called *Amigen*, an enzymatic hydrolysate of casein, and we had to find out how to remove most of the phenylalanine while leaving the rest of the essential amino acids.

"At that time, we estimated that this would take the time of two men working for six months, or about 2,000 hours. Well, this produced the low-phenylalanine formula *Lofenalac* and opened a program that's lasted roughly 15 years and isn't finished yet. We've learned a lot about these diets, and whenever a pediatrician anywhere in this country or in Canada runs into an enzyme deficiency, he often calls us for help."

Despite present knowledge on how to prevent brain damage to PKU children, some misconceptions have crept into the medical literature, Dr. Sarett notes. "The important point about treating PKU is not to remove all of he phenylalanine from the diet. The important point is to give each infant as much of this amino acid as he can handle without getting into trouble. The diets are sometimes misused. You don't send a child with PKU home with a prescription for a low-phenylalanine diet and forget about him.

"Each child must be monitored every day. You've got to keep adding foods which he can tolerate and analyze his blood and urine frequently. The most critical period is during the first six months of life, when the infant grows rapidly. Phenylalanine requirements may increase rapidly during this period, and they must be met. Too little phenylalanine may bring stunted growth, anemia, and bone changes. Too much may result in damage to the brain and central nervous system. However, a growing number of reputable, responsible investigators report normal growth and normal development of PKU children when properly controlled.

HOMOCYSTINURIA RESEARCH

"Many infants have high plasma tyrosine levels, but in most cases, the levels soon return to normal. A few have a defect in metabolism of tyrosine. The doctor must keep a close watch and decide which child needs a special diet and which one doesn't."

Currently, another Mead Johnson nutritional research product is being used on a very limited scale to manage a newly discovered metabolic defect called homocystinuria. This condition involves an enzymatic block in the metabolism of the essential amino acid methionine. "We've developed a prototype product moderately low in methionine, but we're really not satisfied with it," Dr. Sarett says. "We still haven't developed one ideally low enough in this amino acid. We are nowhere near ready to supply physicians, even for trial purposes."

Nutritional research is done largely on rats, chicks, and pigs, Dr. Sarett reports. "Rats have their shortcomings. You usually can't feed rats until they're 21 days old, which corresponds to a fairly old infant. They have a lot of hair, which babies don't have. This means their amino acid requirements are not completely comparable to man's. Besides, they're rats."

Monkeys and dogs are also difficult to feed until sometimes after birth. Pigs are closer to human beings, particularly in their cardiovascular system. A newborn pig can be artifically fed right away, just as a baby can.

Mead Johnson scientists work in aseptic quarters with a breed of specially developed, pathogen-free pigs taken by cesarean section before their scheduled delivery. "We find that 20 pigs in a study comprise a meaningful experiment, giving us good, solid data related to infant feeding, cholesterol synthesis, or atherosclerosis."

As the firm's nutritional research has grown in sophistication over the years, it has also expanded to include other age groups, Dr. Sarett points out. "After five years of work, we are now marketing *Portagen*, a food that contains medium-chain triglycerides for adults and children who have difficulty in absorbing conventional fats. These medium-chain triglycerides are absorbed rapidly through the portal venous system instead of through the lymphatic system as other fats are."

Another product of these studies is *Questran* (cholestyramine), a prescription pharmaceutical for the relief of pruritus associated with partial biliary obstruction. The compound is a basic anion exchange resin with a strong affinity for bile acids. It sequesters bile acids in the intestinal tract, preventing their reabsorption and ensuring their excretion. In clinical trials, some physicians noted that the drug also markedly reduced serum cholesterol levels. This fact seems to expand Mead Johnson's interest into still another age group—those in their middle years, whose arteries are perhaps less resilient than earlier.

RESEARCH NEEDS SOPHISTICATION

"We have something needed by every age," says vice president Tuholski. "Be it a dietary product or a pharmaceutical, we have it. And we also have a broad and encompassing outlook on just about everything that affects health." The company's future is practically unlimited in both nutritionals and pharmaceuticals, Dr. Tuholski says. "There's a real need for disposable feeding units for hospital nurseries at one end of the age scale, and for prepackaged meals for nursing homes at the other end. There's a continuing need for drugs with new mechanisms of action. Take diuretics, for instance. After the first important discoveries, many people thought there would be nothing further. Then chlorothiazide came along and proved differently. This might happen again.

"It will probably also happen with steroids. We've just scratched the surface when it comes to their anti-inflammatory and antidepressant actions. These important contributions will come about because the entire pharmaceutical industry realizes you can't succeed—you can't even stay afloat—without a high degree of sophistication in your research program. Check this by looking through the annual reports of almost any drug company. Research costs are disproportionate to the cost of doing business. Why? Because management realizes that research builds a solid base for the future."

This solid base in Evansville, adds Dr Richard T. Arnold, chairman of the company's scientific advisory board, may be surrounded by the cornfields of Indiana, but its influence will be felt all over the world. "Sure we see *Metrecal* and *Dextri-Maltose* in our future. We also see antifungal and antibacterial agents, a new antibiotic effective against staph, and the beginnings of an antiviral program. We also realize that even with the latest streamlined computers, there are still some things about research that will be totally unexpected. As new methods of testing evolve, we may find that we've got compounds sitting on our shelves totally ineffective in animals, but magnificantly helpful to human beings."

Increasingly, foreign countries will be impressed with a Food and Drug Administration approval, notes Dr. D. J. Buddrus, vice president for biomedical sciences. "An FDA approval right now is the best selling point a drug can have in just about any foreign country. They look upon our FDA as a standard-bearer. They will probably be modeling their regultory bodies along U.S. lines in the future."

And a bench chemist, given to flights of creative fancy, sees the future from still another angle. "What we'll be able to do someday with a computer and some yeast, only God knows."

THE DOMESTIC FISHING INDUSTRY

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I have received a resolution from the National Maritime Union in the Port of Galveston concerning the state of the fishing industry in the United States. I certainly share their concern in this regard, as evidenced by my remarks on this subject of September 27, 1967. I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be entered at this point in the RECORD so that all may take notice of it.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas the Soviet Union has made sensational progress in using the wealth of the seas to make hay among the hungry peoples of the world; and

Whereas our domestic fishing industry continues to decline and suffer as the fishing fleet diminishes; and

Whereas this means a loss of jobs and a loss of tax revenues to seaport cities such as Galveston; and

Whereas the rise in fishing imports and the expansion of Russian, Norwegian, and Japanese fishing fleets poses a financial threat to Gulf Coast fishing;

Now, therefore, be it resolved: That the Johnson Administration be called upon to grant long-range, "low interest" loans to domestic fishermen so that they can build larger fleets and compete more equally with other nations; and

Be it further resolved: That the approximate sixty (60) percent import of our fish consumption be made a maximum and the quota be adjusted downward annually as United States fish production is increased; and

Be it also further resolved: That there be a development of new shipyards specializing in fishing vessel construction, one each on the East and West Coast and a development of ocean fish farms in eleven (11) areas of all coasts of the mainland of the U.S., Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.

We, the undersigned, ask the Congressional leaders to hold prompt hearings to develop a program such as the above resolution for the fishing industry.

Adopted by the membership of the National Maritime Union in the Port of Galveston on the 28th day of August, 1967.

JOHN T. KELLY,
Agent.

SECRETARY RUSK'S STATEMENT ON VIETNAM

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, last week Secretary of State Rusk stated clearly and concisely the reasons why our Nation is engaged in Vietnam.

Mr. Rusk did not attempt to minimize the problems Vietnam has caused the United States. He pointed out that Americans are an impatient people, and that it is not easy for our people to wage a struggle by limited means for limited objectives. He said that the present impatience about Vietnam is thoroughly understandable.

As the debate over Vietnam continues in our country, it appears that the issue centers on variation of a single theme. I am persuaded that this is the case. That theme is a central position resting upon the following considerations:

First. The pursuit of our limited objectives by limited means.

Second. The need to meet our commitments and defend our vital national interests.

Third. Our earnest desire to bring this conflict to a peaceful conclusion as soon as possible.

Our enemies should not misunderstand the character of this debate. Secretary Rusk made this point very clear. But it is a point which will be valid for as long as debate over Vietnam continues. Our system of government not only tolerates debate, but encourages it. Our conflicting views will continue to receive widespread attention throughout the world. Friends and enemies alike in other countries may be encouraged to equate dissent in the United States with a lack of resolve. This could lead to miscalculations which in turn could lead to actions or responses of tragic proportions.

As the Secretary said, there is no significant body of American opinion which would have us withdraw from Vietnam and abandon Southeast Asia to the dictates of Asian communism. I also share his view that there is no significant opinion among us which wishes to transform this struggle into a general war. This is a message of vital importance to world peace.

COUNTY POVERTY PROGRAMS

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, recently I received a letter from Mr. Dominic Gacetta, program director for the Knox County Community Action Committee in Rockland, Maine, in which he reports on developments in the county poverty programs.

I think my colleagues will be interested in learning of these highly successful programs which are enriching the lives of many families in the county.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Gacetta's letter be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KNOX COUNTY COMMUNITY ACTION COMMITTEE,
Rockland, Maine, October 6, 1967.

Hon. EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MUSKIE: The Knox County Community Action Committee, after evaluating the progress of our current poverty programs, is pleased with the developments and want to share them with you to keep you better informed on these programs in our area.

Our Neighborhood Youth Corps Program is funded for 20 out-of-school placements. Of this group, four have returned to school to continue their education. Three returned to local public high schools and one is enrolled in a leading prep school after receiving a $500.00 scholarship on the basis of his aptitude tests.

Eight youths on the program have left Neighborhood Youth Corps for permanent employment. Two of this group left for training related employment and six entered employment outside the training related area.

Two girls with dependent children on ADC left the program after referral to Work Experience for further training. One is being trained in printing and the other as a baker.

One boy training as a Landscape Aide has been offered seasonal employment at the Rockland Country Club. He will continue his training during the off season with the Soil and Conservation Service locally.

As enrollees of this program return to school or leave for various reasons, we are always recruiting in an attempt to keep our 20 placements occupied.

Our Homemaker Service Program consists of a Director and six Homemakers in Knox County. Although this program has only been in operation since June of this year, we have received many favorable comments for the variety of service provided. Over eighty families have received benefit of Homemakers and they are currently serving over 60 families with regularity. Their services include meal planning, budgeting, food preparation, cleanliness of the home and person and other necessary duties of this type. Homemakers will soon be demonstrating the use of surplus foods to mothers who will meet in groups for this purpose.

We completed a successful Summer Head Start Program, with 163 children in 11 classrooms throughout the County. These children, in addition to the training habits they received and experiences provided them, also received Dental and Medical Services which will prove beneficial to all of them throughout their lives. In addition, parents through participation in this program also experienced new ideas and knowledge which will help them in their parent-child relationship.

Our Work Study Program provided summer jobs for 5 needy college students and paid them a total of $3,140.00 which will be helpful in the coming school year.

Funds from the Older Americans Act have made it possible to provide stereo, television, and other furniture and equipment in the West Room of the Rockland Community Center for the relaxation and enjoyment of the Senior Citizens in this area. They also have recently enjoyed 3 excursions which accommodated 65 to 75 people on each trip. In March a large group of Senior Citizens enjoyed a trip to the Ice Follies in Boston. This trip was followed up in April with an excursion to the Flower Show in Boston. In August an excursion to Cabbage Island was enjoyed by all. A foliage trip to the Rangley Lakes Region is planned for Wednesday, October 11, and a large turn out is expected for this trip also.

Sincerely yours,

DOMINIC J. GACETTA,
Program Director.

THE IMPORTANCE OF BLACK-OWNED FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, among the crucial needs of the Negro community in America is the rapid expansion of black-owned financial institutions and the development of black administrative and entrepreneurial talent to manage them.

The current role of black-owned financial institutions in promoting urban rehabilitation has recently been surveyed and assessed by Andrew F. Brimmer, member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. In a little noticed but very important address to the National Bankers Association in Kansas City on September 22, Dr. Brimmer made a number of cogent observations, based on a wealth of factual matter. Among them are the following, in paraphrase:

First. Rising income in the Negro community in attracting national businesses into a market hitherto the primary preserve of Negro businessmen; as a result "Negro business and professional men in traditional fields are declining relative to the population."

Second. This new influx of national business into the Negro community "may be resulting in a net drain on the savings of the urban ghetto."

Third. Although the Negro middleclass is expanding rapidly, the new jobs are most likely to be in salaried occupations which are not promising sources of community leadership.

Mr. Brimmer's conclusion, based on these and related observations, is that large white-owned national institutions, such as life insurance companies, must develop new avenues of cooperations with community-based, black-owned institutions and companies "to build not simply physical structures but human bridges as well in the ghetto."

As an example, Dr. Brimmer points to the recent announcement that the life insurance industry will invest $1 billion in housing for slum areas.

It is my impression—

He says—

based on considerable checking with industry officials, that so far no major life insurance company has designated any of the Negro mortgage bankers as correspondents.

He advocates a conscious effort by the life insurance companies to strengthen Negro-owned financial institutions by cooperating with them in the origination and servicing of mortgage loans under this new program. And at the same time, he points out, the experience of Negro businessmen familiar with conditions in central city slum areas can be of invaluable assistance to investors entering those areas for the first time.

Mr. President, the theme of Dr. Brimmer's remarks is reflected in a bill which I have joined 39 other Senators in sponsoring. The National Home Ownership Foundation Act (S. 1592) would charter a private nonprofit foundation to make or participate in mortgage loans in credit-short areas to encourage home ownership for lower income families. The bill would require the Foundation to retain 3 percent of the proceeds from the sale of its bonds as a reserve. Ordinarily, as a matter of normal banking practice, such reserves would be invested in U.S. Treasury obligations or other high grade securities. But in section 109(f) of S. 1592 we included a highly important provision. It says:

> In managing such reserve account, the Foundation shall give preference to making deposits in those financial institutions actively engaged in making loans or otherwise carrying on activities in furtherance of the purposes of this Act.

What this means, Mr. President, is that up to $60 million of the foundation's reserve capital would be deposited in lending institutions actively making loans in urban slums. The consequence of this provision, I am sure, would be a new source of capital for black-owned financial institutions, which would enable them to expand their lending activities in their own communities. The amount—$60 million—is certainly not sufficient to the needs. But I think it does establish an important principle, in line with Dr. Brimmer's recommendation to the National Bankers Association.

There are those who say that forthcoming amendments to Federal Housing Administration laws, coupled with a new willingness among capital investors as exemplified by the insurance companies, will produce a sharp upturn in mortgage lending and home ownership in the ghettos. I hope they are right. One crucial factor is the determination of the FHA to move boldly forward to insure mortgages in these areas in which, in many cases, no FHA underwriter has set foot for years. Another crucial factor is the need for public and private agencies to prepare lower income families to become owners of their own homes or apartments. Near the end of his remarks Dr. Brimmer touches on these important points in describing the experience of four Philadelphia savings banks, which, because of FHA reluctance and insufficient homeowner preparation, have been able to commit only $1½ million out of an allocated $20 million in mortgage loans over an 18-month period.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Brimmer's excellent address, "Financial Institutions and Urban Rehabilitation" be included at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS AND URBAN REHABILITATION

(Remarks by Andrew F. Brimmer, member, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, before the annual convention of the National Bankers Association, Hotel Continental, Kansas City, Mo., September 22, 1967)

The recent announcement by the nation's leading life insurance companies that they plan to invest $1 billion in urban rehabilitation has thrown into sharp focus a number of questions relating to the role of financial institutions in the core areas of our cities. This meeting of bankers who devote their energies almost entirely to meeting some of the financial needs of the citizens of these areas provides a good forum for the discussion of several of these issues.

The principal points in the remarks which follow can be summarized briefly:

With the steady (though mixed) improvement in employment opportunities, the income of the Negro community is rising more rapidly than for the nation as a whole.

This rising income is attracting more and more national businesses (including life insurance companies and other financial institutions) to a market which was previously the primary preserve of Negro businessmen.

The results are not unexpected: with the decline in the protective tariff of segregation, Negro business and professional men in traditional fields are declining relative to the population.

Negro-owned financial institutions, with the exception of a few recently chartered banks, are making only limited progress in the face of growing competition from the larger institutions active in the general market.

The results are also disturbing: although the Negro middle class is expanding at a rapid pace, the new job opportunities are concentrated in the middle grade technical and professional occupations. While these are clearly improvements over the low-skill and low-paid traditionally held by the average Negro, they ordinarily are not a promising source of community leadership.

The vigorous competition of the major institutions (especially the competition from the life insurance companies) for business in the Negro community—combined with their investment patterns—may be resulting in a net drain on the savings of the urban ghetto.

These trends suggest strongly that the nation's leading financial institutions should re-examine carefully their techniques of doing business in the ghetto. For example, the move by the insurance companies to invest $1 billion in urban areas could be supplemented through a more direct involvement with financial institutions already operating in the ghetto.

As far as I can determine from personal conversations in the industry, no leading life insurance company has designated a Negro mortgage banker as a local correspondent. Since a major share of the mortgage origination and servicing business is done through such correspondence, the establishment of such links would facilitate the flow of investment into the ghetto.

The Negro-owned banks can also play an expanded role in the creation of new job opportunities in urban areas through joint ventures with white-owned banks and other financial institutions. An actual project now under active consideration will illustrate clearly how this can be done.

TRENDS IN PERSONAL INCOME

Before examining more closely the expanded opportunities for financial institutions in the ghetto, let us review recent developments in the income and employment patterns for nonwhites. In the last few years, the personal income of the nonwhite community (of which Negroes make up well over 90 percent) has risen substantially in absolute terms and in comparison with that for the white community. The actual figures showing the median income of families are:

Year	Total	White	Nonwhite	Nonwhite as percent of white
1960	$5,620	$5,835	$3,233	0.55
1961	5,737	5,981	3,191	.53
1962	5,956	6,237	3,330	.53
1963	6,249	6,548	3,465	.53
1964	6,569	6,858	3,839	.56
1965	6,882	7,170	3,971	.55
1966	7,436	7,722	4,628	.60

Several conclusions can be drawn from these figures. During the first three years of the 1960's, the gap between the median income of white and nonwhite families actually widened; the ratio of nonwhite to white income fell from .55 in 1960 to .53 in 1963. This deterioration was a direct reflection of the slow pace of the economy following the 1960–61 recession. Between 1960 and 1963, the median income of white families rose by $713, or by 12 per cent. The corresponding changes for nonwhites were $232 or 7 per cent. However, following the general tax reduction of 1964, the national economy expanded much more vigorously and was further stimulated by the acceleration of the military effort in Vietnam. One result was a sharp climb in personal income. For white families, the gain amounted to $1,174 (or 18 per cent) between 1963 and 1966. In this same period, however, the gain in the median income of nonwhite families was almost as large in absolute terms—an increase of $1,163—and represented a rise of 34 per cent, or nearly double that recorded for white families. In these most recent years, nonwhites made substantial gains in employment, and again the gap between white and nonwhite income was narrowed.

These improvements in the income of nonwhite families obviously have meant a further substantial rise in the aggregate purchasing power of the Negro community. In 1963, total money income of families and unrelated individuals amounted to $371.1 billion, of which $347.5 billion was earned by whites and $23.6 billion by nonwhites. Thus nonwhites accounted for 6.4 per cent of the total. By 1965, the total had climbed to $419.1 billion; the income of whites amounted to $391.7 billion and that of nonwhites to $27.4 billion. So, the nonwhites' share had risen to 6.6 per cent. With the large relative gains in family income registered last year, the total purchasing power of the nonwhite community has undoubtedly expanded further. Thus, the Negro market offers an even stronger inducement for merchants selling to the general community.

TRENDS IN MIDDLE CLASS EMPLOYMENT AMONG NONWHITES

The pattern of income changes described above has been the result of significant progress in the upgrading of nonwhite employment opportunities. Between 1963 and 1966, employment of nonwhite workers increased by 10.1 per cent—from a monthly average of 7,234 thousand to 7,968 thousand. For white workers, the corresponding gain was 7.3 per cent—from 61,575 thousand to 66,097 thousand. Thus, Negroes obtained about 14 per cent of the net increase in employment, although they represented just over 10 per cent of the total labor force. The unemployment rate for nonwhites fell by one-third between 1963 and 1966—from 10.8 per cent to

7.3 per cent of the labor force. White workers experienced the identical relative decline in their unemployment rate—from 5.0 per cent to 3.3 per cent.

But, as also mentioned above, there was a noticeable change in the pattern of employment growth among nonwhites. Between 1963 and 1966, total nonwhite employment rose by 734 thousand. About one-half of this gain centered in white collar jobs, although only 18 per cent of employed nonwhites were holding such jobs in 1963. Among white collar occupations, the gains were particularly striking for clerical and professional and technical workers.

In contrast, the increases registered for managers, officials and proprietors were quite modest. Those receiving salaries rose by 22 thousand, but there was a decrease of 6 thousand among those who were self-employed—all of which was concentrated in the retail trade sector. Thus, nonwhite businessmen in areas other than retail trade apparently about held their own. If this pattern of employment changes can be believed, it is of some significance. It could mean that the apparent downtrend in self employment among nonwhites observed since about 1950 may be moderating. While the tendency for the number of nonwhite owner-operators in the retail sector to decline as public accommodations become generally open to Negroes may continue, other business opportunities may grow more rapidly.

But the adverse changes in white collar employment have not been restricted to businessmen. The number of Negro lawyers is growing slowly, while the number of Negro physicians and dentists is actually declining in relation to total Negro employment. Even the number of school teachers is declining relative to the Negro labor force. In contrast, as observed above, the number of Negro clerical, sales and non-professional technical workers has shown remarkable expansion in recent years. By 1966, nonwhites (who constituted 10.8 per cent of total employment) represented 5.0 per cent of all white collar workers and 6.3 per cent of all clerical workers. On the other hand, they represented only 4.3 per cent of the professional and technical workers, aside from those employed in teaching and the health professions. Other examples could be cited, but the basic point still holds: white collar employment among Negroes is becoming increasingly concentrated in the middle grade salary categories, especially in nursing, retail sales, data processing, clerical and similar activities.

These trends are disturbing. *While these occupations are obviously improvements over the traditional low-paying jobs as operatives, laborers and service workers, they are not particularly promising sources of community leadership.* For instance, although a computer programmer may earn as much (or more) than a high school principal, he clearly has less weight in the community's affairs. A Negro reservations clerk in a leading downtown hotel is in the same business as the former Negro hotel owner, but here, also, his community role is less significant. In my opinion, the expansion of opportunities for Negroes in the truly professional and managerial occupations should be a prime goal of the Negro business community.

TRENDS AMONG NEGRO-OWNED FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

At this point, let us return to the promising role which financial institutions can play in the reconstruction of our urban centers. As I stressed above, the Negro-owned financial institutions, with the exception of the newly-chartered banks, have been falling behind relative to the growth of the income of the Negro community at large.

This can be seen clearly in the following summary table:

COMPOUNDED ANNUAL AVERAGE RATES OF CHANGE

[In percent]

Personal income	1961-65	1961-63	1963-65
Total	5.4	4.6	6.3
White	5.3	4.5	6.2
Nonwhite	7.1	6.5	7.7
Life insurance companies	**1961-66**	**1961-63**	**1963-66**
Insurance in force:			
All companies	9.4	7.7	10.5
Negro-owned companies	2.9	2.1	3.4
Total assets:			
All companies	5.7	5.5	5.8
Negro-owned companies	2.6	2.6	2.6
Insured commercial banks [1]	**1957-66**	**1957-63**	**1963-66**
All banks	5.0	3.2	8.9
Federal Reserve members with total deposits between $5,000,000 and $10,000,000	2.2	1.4	3.9
Negro-owned banks	11.4	9.0	16.6
Excluding newly chartered banks	-------	-------	5.8

[1] Total assets.

The first thing to note is that, as shown earlier, the personal income of the nonwhite community has grown about one-quarter to one-third faster than that of the nation as a whole since the beginning of the 1960's. On the other hand, the Negro-owned life insurance companies have grown only about one-third to one-half as fast as the life insurance industry as a whole. The experience of the Negro-owned banks has been mixed.

Those institutions which were in business prior to 1963 have grown much more slowly than all insured commercial banks. However, their growth rate has exceeded that for the small member banks of the Federal Reserve System. The four or five newly chartered Negro-owned banks (mainly national banks) have expanded rapidly, and one of them is now the third or fourth largest among the group of 17 Negro-owned institutions.

What factors underlie these trends? How does one account for the extremely modest progress of the Negro-owned life insurance companies? Why have the Negro-owned banks registered such a diverse pattern of growth?

First, let us look at the life insurance companies. For much of the last decade, the large national institutions have been making a special effort to tap the expanding market for insurance among middle class Negroes. Many of them have adopted special promotional programs directed at this market: They have bid successfully for some of the most promising officials of Negro insurance companies, and a fairly large number have established district offices in the heart of the urban areas populated primarily by Negroes. For example, it is reported that one such office of a national company was recently located in Chicago's Southside, with the expectation of building up to a force of 22 salesmen and underwritings of about $30 million in a few years. But, let me repeat, this type of competition with the Negro-owned companies has been underway for almost a decade. The result is that many Negroes active in the industry believe that any one of the largest five or six life insurance companies in the country is now carrying on its own books more coverage on the lives of Negro citizens than is carried by all of the Negro-owned companies combined. This assertion is not difficult to believe when we note that the 48 Negro-owned companies had $2.2 billion of insurance in force and total assets of $390 million at the end of 1966.

This new interest in the Negro market represents a significant change in itself. Until a few years ago, virtually all of the national companies avoided entirely or were highly selective in the issuance of policies on Negro lives, a practice which they felt was necessitated by excessively high mortality rates in the Negro community. As we know, this practice on the part of the national companies was the main reason that Negro-owned life companies found such promising markets for so many years. With the change in practice, the nation-wide companies are now concentrating on expanding coverage in the Negro community—especially among the members of the growing middle class. While the average Negro policy is undoubtedly smaller than the average for white policyholders, in the aggregate the volume of net premiums (and the net savings component) collected in the Negro community is sizable and growing. The over-all result has been a marked slow-down in the progress of the Negro-owned companies. But, more fundamentally, these developments also have a number of serious implications for the availability of funds for investment in the ghetto. I shall return to this point before closing these remarks.

Turning to Negro-owned banks, the first thing to observe is that—taken as a group—they are not appreciably different from other banks of comparable size. At the end of 1966, the 17 Negro-owned institutions had total assets of $122 million and held total deposits of $108 million. Thus, they represented 0.033 per cent of the total assets of insured commercial banks in the country. But even this small figure reflected modest but steady improvement, because in 1963 their share of such assets was 0.021 per cent, and in 1957 it was 0.018 per cent. As mentioned above, a large proportion of the relative gain recorded by the Negro-owned banks can be traced to the four or five recently chartered national banks, which were able to get underway mainly because of more liberal policies followed by the Comptroller of the Currency during the early 1960's. More recently, a few States have also chartered Negro-owned institutions which will operate in the ghettos of several of our large cities.

Further insight into the characteristics of the Negro-owned banks can be seen by comparing a few key ratios for the banks in 1966 as shown below (per cent):

Ratios	Negro-owned banks	Federal Reserve members with assets of $5,000,000 to $10,000,000	All insured commercial banks
Cash and U.S. Government/total assets	35.9	36.0	28.1
Cash/total assets	11.8	14.2	15.1
U.S. Government/total assets	24.1	21.8	13.1
Loans/total deposits	58.2	53.8	64.7
Time deposits/total deposits	51.3	49.2	52.8
Capital/risk assets	14.7	13.4	11.0

The Negro-owned banks are compared with all insured commercial banks as well as with Federal Reserve member banks of approximately the same size as the Negro-owned institutions. (The mean asset holding of the Negro-owned banks was $7.2 million against $29.8 million for all insured commercial banks). In relation to total assets, the Negro banks tend to hold a smaller proportion of cash and loans and a larger proportion of U.S. Government securities than do other banks—except that their loan-deposit ratio is higher than for smaller member banks of the Federal Reserve System. They also seem to rely on time deposits as a source of funds to about the same extent as do other banks.

However, as a group, the Negro-owned banks seem to be somewhat more heavily capitalized.

But this global review does not tell us very much of what we need to know about the performance of the Negro-owned institutions. During the last few months, with the assistance of a number of people in several of the Federal Reserve Banks, I have spent a considerable amount of time studying the experiences of the Negro-owned banks. Without going into details concerning particular banks, the findings can be summarized briefly in the following observations on asset quality and the problems faced by their managements.

Over-all the asset quality of the banks seems to be fair. However, the banks chartered prior to 1960 appear to follow somewhat less venturesome policies than do the newly-chartered institutions, and this shows up in a number of differences among them. For example, among these older institutions, there is a heavy reliance on savings accounts of individuals and less reliance on demand deposits—especially of partnerships and corporations. They rarely make unsecured loans, with the bulk of their lending activity centering in loans secured by real estate. Their loan loss record is good. The ratio of loans to deposits in these banks is somewhat low, averaging 53 per cent, compared with an average of 58 per cent and a range of 42 per cent to 75 per cent for all Negro-owned institutions. This lower average ratio probably reflects primarily the policy of making basically only secured loans. As a group, the asset quality of these older banks was generally satisfactory.

Among the banks chartered since 1960, the asset quality is generally not quite as satisfactory as that found in the older institutions—even of comparable size. These newer banks have gone readily into areas of unsecured loans and discounting of consumer installment contracts, principally dealer generated automobile paper. Because these fields were generally unexplored by the banks, some of them have encountered a number of difficulties. Some of the newer banks have not been able to press their collection policies as vigorously as they would have liked, and past due loans have averaged somewhat higher than for other banks. This may be due in part to the fact that the newer banks have moved—sometimes aggressively—to extend loans to lower income groups which find it very difficult to make up payments on amortized loans once they become delinquent.

Probably the most serious problem faced by all of the Negro-owned banks is that of obtaining, training—and retraining personnel. This seems to be true of clerical personnel as well as of senior management and younger individuals with management potential. The older, well established banks have managements which are generally rated satisfactory, and most of them have provided adequately for management succession. However, they do seem to encounter considerable difficulty in maintaining experienced operating staffs. Since these banks (like those (newly-chartered) are serving primarily a low-income community, they are faced with a heavy volume of lobby traffic and an equally heavy volume of paper work. Such conditions are one of the causes of a high turnover rate of clerical staff which compounds the training problem. Of course, this situation—and its effect—is common to all banks where it exists.

For some of the newly chartered institutions, the task of obtaining and keeping a senior management cadre has been difficult. To some extent, this may have reflected the pressure of competition for bank management personnel faced by all institutions—especially by the smaller ones. Some of the banks have attempted to meet their difficulties by employing white persons (particularly retirees) with bank management experience. Others have brought in officers from the established Negro-owned banks. Nevertheless, some of these new banks are still facing an uphill struggle.

But, taken as a whole—and despite the problems which some of them face—the Negro-owned banks are filling a vital need in their respective communities. With few exceptions, each of these banks is located in a part of an urban area which the large, white-owned banks have not sought aggressively to serve—even when State branch banking laws would have permitted them to do so. In fact, it seems that several of the newly-chartered national banks were able to obtain charters primarily because they proposed to concentrate on the needs of communities where the number of banking offices per capita was particularly low. A few of the State bank charters recently obtained by Negroes seem to have been granted for similar reasons. Although the community support for some of the new institutions may not have developed as rapidly as had been anticipated, the Negro-owned banks as a group do seem to be meeting a definite need which has gone unmet for many years.

On the other hand, as mentioned above, the tasks of mobilizing the financial resources necessary to rehabilitate the urban ghetto will place a gigantic burden on all of our institutions. This clearly calls for a genuinely cooperative effort in which Negro-owned institutions can—and should—share.

AVENUES OF COOPERATION

Let us look, then, at some of the specific ways in which this needed cooperation can be facilitated. Initially, let us return to the life insurance companies' plan to invest $1 billion in the urban ghetto. At the outset, I want to make certain that everyone understands my own attitude toward this proposal: I applaud it because it is a major step—not simply in the right direction but also because it represents a sizable amount which could increase substantially the availability of funds for urban housing. In saying this, I am not unmindful of the magnitude of the tasks we face. Nor am I unaware of the enormous volume of resources under the command of the life insurance companies. At the end of 1966, total assets of these institutions amounted to $167 billion, having increased by $8 billion during the year. But during 1966, they acquired a total of about $37 billion in new investments, an amount more than four times as large as the net gain in total assets—a fact reflecting the reinvestment of loan repayments, exchanges, replacements and short-term security purchases.

I, personally, do not interpret these large flows of life insurance company funds to mean that the diversion of $1 billion of investments to the urban ghetto (perhaps over a period of several years) is of only minor importance. To the contrary. In the first place, insurance companies are pinched for funds. The cash flow in a typical life insurance corporation is about as fully committed as it has ever been. In my judgment, these corporations would have absolutely no trouble putting the money into investments elsewhere with a higher rate of interest. Of course, insurance companies already have heavy commitments in the city—investments in housing and in industrial and commercial facilities. Therefore, I can see that they would want to share in underwriting the efforts of urban reconstruction.

I think this decision of the life insurance companies is significant in another way. It is my impression, based on a number of conversations with officials of Negro-owned life insurance companies, that the large, nation-wide institutions are collecting substantially more in net premiums in the Negro community than they are re-investing in that community. Of course, one cannot document this statistically, but the indirect evidence seems to support the conclusion. As mentioned above, they have written a considerable amount of coverage on Negro lines, and the total is growing rapidly. At the same time, because of the high risk inherent in investing in ghetto properties, the flow of investments to the Negro community, in the judgment of Negro insurance officials, probably falls considerably short of the outflow.

In reporting these observations, let me say immediately that I am not advocating that there should be a one-to-one ratio between the flow of life insurance savings and the re-investment of funds in a particular locality or community. If such a rule were applied across the board, the efficiency of our machinery for mobilizing and channeling funds would be greatly damaged if not essentially destroyed. On the other hand, if extra risk in the urban ghetto has induced life insurance companies, on balance, to steer investments to other areas, there is much to be said in support of a conscious effort on their part to divert funds into the ghetto.

So, in my judgement, this is a good decision. But, how can Negro-owned financial institutions help to translate these plans into effective action. The possibility of joining in local financing of low-cost housing developments (perhaps through limited dividend cooperation) is an obvious step. Apparently, projects involving properties backed by FHA and built to rent on the basis of Federally-subsidized rents, will be among those initially undertaken by the participating insurance companies.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR MORTGAGE BANKERS

But, at some stage presumably, the companies would plan to branch out into expanded financing of other projects in the ghetto—particularly single-family homes, small apartment buildings, and commercial properties. Here, then, one can see even more promising opportunities for the large national institutions to build not simply physical structures but human bridges as well in the ghetto.

It is my impression, based on considerable checking with industry officials, that so far no major life insurance company has designated any of the Negro mortgage bankers as correspondents. Of course, many of the companies have made a considerable number of loans against Negro homes and business properties in urban areas. However, these were effected primarily through white mortgage bankers, through Negro mortgage brokers, or by the companies directly. Moreover, most insurance companies have long-established relationships with one or two mortgage bankers in their principal lending areas. Nevertheless, there appear to be positive advantages which would probably result from the development of correspondence relationships with some of the Negro mortgage bankers—who could not only originate loans but service them as well.

I am told that there are presently some 1,300 mortgage bankers in the country. Eight of these are Negroes who have met the requirements of FHA approval—e.g., that applicant:

Must be a responsible person.

Must have net worth of $100,000 for office in one State, plus another $50,000 for office in noncontiguous States, and $250,000 for offices in several States.

Must have commercial bank lines of credit against warehousing of mortgages.

Must have outlets with institutional investors (such as life insurance companies and mutual savings banks) other than FNMA.

The typical mortgage banker has a net worth of something over $100,000 and services about $50 million of loans a year, although the largest may do a volume of business in excess of $1 billion. The largest of the Negro mortgage bankers has a net worth of $100,000 and originates and services roughly $12 million of loans in a year. One-third to two-fifths of this total amount is on behalf of FNMA rather than for private lenders. The other Negro mortgage bankers are said to have a volume of business in the neighborhood of $2–$4 million.

In conversations with a number of officials in Negro-owned institutions (particularly banks and insurance companies) a great deal of stress was put on the need for Negro mortgage bankers to obtain secure correspondent relationships with leading life insurance companies. They believe that such channels would greatly enhance the flow of funds to the ghetto by making available to these lenders a degree of knowledge about local conditions which they cannot otherwise tap. While no one would want to suggest that a particular company should employ a particular person as a correspondent, it does appear—at least at a distance—that there may be merit in some company's pursuing the idea further.

The continuous access to local people with expertise in ghetto housing problems does seem to be a necessary condition of a successful program of the type which the life insurance companies have undertaken. This seems to be one of the over-riding conclusions which has emerged from the experience of the Philadelphia savings banks which launched a similar program in that city about 18 months ago. Four of these institutions pledged to invest $20 million in private homes to be insured by FHA and purchased by residents of the ghetto. The amount was to be distributed among the participating banks on a pro-rata basis according to their assets, and they made it clear that additional funds could be provided. So far they have been able to disburse or firmly commit about $1½ million, although they originally expected to be much farther along toward their goal by the time 18 months had passed. They have encountered a number of obstacles which are only gradually being overcome. It took quite a bit of time to work out procedures with the regional office of FHA, and it took even more time to devise a system for appraising ghetto homes and establishing criteria of eligibility without compromising on income standards. But above all, it took time to make contact with ghetto residents and to instruct many of the potential buyers about the process—and responsibility—of becoming homeowners. While they worked through a local information center and even employed a young lawyer full-time to help expedite the program, they relied mainly on their own personnel supplemented by local mortgage brokers and others active in real estate.

From the experience of the Philadelphia institutions, it seems clear that Negro bankers, insurance company officials, and others with a specialized knowledge acquired through lending funds against ghetto properties could make a major contribution in helping to translate the recently announced $1 billion life insurance company program into a significant effort of urban reconstruction.

OPPORTUNITIES IN JOB-CREATING ENTERPRISES

Beyond the housing field, opportunities will probably also exist to join in the establishment of job-creating enterprises in the ghetto—although only limited planning in this direction has been undertaken by the life insurance companies so far. One concrete example of how this might be done was called to my attention only a few days ago: Just outside the boundary of one of our large midwest cities is an all-Negro community with a population of about 10,000 and a labor force of roughly 5,000—of whom 20 per cent to 25 per cent are unemployed. The reasons for the high unemployment rates are the usual ones, of which a lack of skills is the most important.

The municipal officials have drawn up a development plan and are actively trying to attract industry. A moderate-size machinery manufacturing firm has responded with an offer to establish a plant in the community which would have approximately 300 employees when it reached full strength in about two years. The capital outlay would be about $300 thousand, and the company is prepared to supply $150 thousand. It has asked the city to find the remaining $150 thousand. It appears that about $300 thousand would be required to underwrite the on-the-job training program necessary to fit most of the local potential employees for the semi-skilled assignments which the plant would provide. It also appears that training funds may be available through existing Federal Government programs. Thus, the net requirement is for $150 thousand for plant facilities. Here, then, is a natural opportunity for Negro businessmen and bankers in that midwest community to join with a life insurance company participating in the newly-announced investment program to translate a plan into a going enterprise offering jobs to ghetto residents. I am confident that simliar opportunities exist in every one of our major cities.

I urge the National Bankers Association to share in the identification and development of these opportunities. Our citizens in the ghetto—and particularly their children—will be eternally grateful to all of you.

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, in the past few months there has been much controversy concerning the Office of Economic Opportunity. During all of the controversy the supporters of OEO have maintained that this organization, while it has some shortcomings, has striven valiantly to do a very difficult task. Truly, in some areas the OEO has expended a lot of energy and has achieved some results. Project Headstart is one example of this.

However, in all too many instances, this simply has not been the case. In fact, it often has been virtually impossible for Members of Congress to find out what is going on even in the OEO Washington headquarters. Once I wrote personally to the Director of the OEO concerning a most urgent matter; some 5 weeks later, I had still not received a reply. In the most recent case, which prompts my brief remarks today, I received a letter from a constituent asking some questions about OEO operations. So that he may have their explanation of the matter, I forwarded this letter to the OEO on July 25 for comment.

I received a reply to this inquiry on October 12, some 11 weeks later. I can only conclude that OEO's bureaucratic confusion is so massive that it takes 80 to 90 days even for the most routine letter to be answered.

This fact points out one of the most outstanding problems that not only Congress, but citizens as well, face in trying to deal with the OEO.

Again I suggest that with a little more efficiency in that office, perhaps some of their programs could be better consummated, waste identified, and problems solved.

NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, on October 11, 1967, the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] delivered a most interesting address entitled "National Security: Basic Tasks." This address was to the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace Conference on 50 Years of Communism in Russia. I highly recommend this to the Senate and ask unanimous consent that a copy of this address be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL SECURITY: BASIC TASKS

(Address to the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace Conference on 50 Years of Communism in Russia, by Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, Stanford University Memorial Auditorium, October 11, 1967)

I am delighted to be with you this evening. I am honored to share in this truly significant conference. It is also very good to be back at Stanford University.

I guess you would classify me as a Stanford drop-out. I attended school here during the summer of 1931 and took two courses under Dr. Graham Stuart, one on the League of Nations and the other on international relations. On his advice, due to the deepening depression and the manpower ceiling in the Department of State, I undertook the study of law rather than my previous plan to prepare for the Foreign Service. Your Dr. Stuart was and is a great inspiration to me.

I

Unlike Paul Bunyan's Flu-flu bird—that didn't care where it was going, it only wanted to see where it had been—we are looking at the past in these meetings in order to find clues to the future. By gaining a better understanding of the last half-century we hope to be able to use our wits and wisdom to help shape events of the next half-century.

That comment reveals, I suppose, a political perspective. Some of you write history; the politician reads history to discover its operational significance to him in his work. What does it tell him that will help him to distinguish the wise from the less wise choices he faces from day to day?

II

In 1967, as throughout the postwar period, the conflict of purposes and policies between the United States and the Soviet Union is the conflict that must be successfully managed if our children are to inherit a nation and a world whose future possibilities have not been foreclosed.

There is a belief in some quarters that the cold war storms are abating and that the worst of our problems with the Soviet Union are behind us. The relative tempering of behavior since Stalin has encouraged many people to believe that the Kremlin, if not yet content with the *status quo*, is not acutely dissatisfied with it. Other people assure us that Moscow will not attempt to adjust by force existing spheres of influence. Some people even see Communist China as the one source of disturbance and danger in today's world—and tomorrow's—and the Sino-Soviet rift as the doorway through which the Soviet Union may step to rejoin Western society.

Experience *has* produced some leavening of world revolutionary dogmatism. The shaping forces of the modern world have not bypassed the Soviet Union. Moscow, like Washington, now is aware of the risks of nuclear war to Soviet society, and Soviet leaders seem to have some understanding of the need to prevent the accidents, miscalculations, or failures of communication that could lead to catastrophe. The vigorous development and application of science and technology have not only multiplied the capacity to wage war but also the capacity to produce consumer goods and services. The demand by Soviet citizens for improvements in living standards have thus been encouraged. These same advances in science and technology have brought about a somewhat wider diffusion of power internally. A restoration of Stalinism would today be difficult, if not impossible. The worldwide appeal of democratic ideas has touched Soviet society also—and where lip-service is paid to these ideas, in time mere lip-service may not be enough. The events of the century reveal no weakening of the political force of nationalism, as the Kremlin has learned in its relations with many communist regimes, and particularly with China.

Although everyone now says "polycentric" where some used to say "monolithic," it does not follow that Moscow is about to make common cause with the West. There is a hopeful side to the picture, but it is not the only side.

I do not know how to assess Soviet foreign policy in recent years except as an effort to extend the frontiers of Soviet influence whenever the risks seemed to be acceptable. How else should we read the several Berlin crises or the Cuban missile crisis? Khrushchev has not been criticized in Kremlin circles, by the way, for what he was trying to accomplish by installing missiles in Cuba, but for failing—by biting off more than he could chew.

Moscow's heavy responsibility for the situation in Vietnam also illustrates my point: it has given Hanoi steady and substantial military and diplomatic support. Moscow has helped to train and equip Hanoi's forces and is now the North's principal source of supply. Hanoi is one of the two or three best-defended cities in the world, thanks to Soviet anti-aircraft installations. Late-model Soviet rockets are being used against our bases and our forces on land and sea. In light of the evidence one must ask whether the Soviet Union desires a compromise settlement. Its behavior suggests that it would welcome our humiliation but that it will be careful to keep itself insulated against excessive risks.

On the other side of the world, Moscow is deeply involved in a political campaign, backed by all the elements of Soviet power, to reduce the influence of the United States in Western Europe to the point where NATO will disintegrate. Just this year, at the Karlovy Vary Conference of Communist and Workers Parties of Europe, Brezhnev took the lead in issuing a call to European communist parties and to West European socialist and social democratic parties to try to disrupt the NATO Alliance by 1969, in the expectation that Moscow could deal thereafter with a fragmented Europe of small and medium-sized states, with obvious implications for the ability of these states, including the German Federal Republic, to pursue policies not meeting with Soviet approval.

Moscow's large political, economic, and military investments in the Middle East underlie the events of last May and June, and dramatically support my point, even though, in the Kremlin's view, its efforts miscarried. It was not until events threatened to embroil the Soviet Union in an excessively hazardous enterprise that the Kremlin opted for a policy of caution.

My own reading of events, therefore, suggests that where we find the Kremlin acting with circumspection, it is because, to use their phrase, "objective conditions" impose this requirement. Where the "objective conditions" are propitious, however, the Kremlin is encouraged to act boldly to expand the frontiers of its influence. The circumstances are thus created for the most dangerous confrontation—a showdown between nuclear powers.

It is difficult, if not impossible, for anyone on the outside to know whether the Soviet leadership, at any given moment, is in a cautious or risk-taking mood. Nothing is more guarded than the discussions that take place within the Kremlin. Perhaps Kosygin, Brezhnev and company will avoid daring adventures—at least in Europe; I would be less sure, about, say, the Middle East. For even a sense of caution about a direct US-USSR confrontation still leaves open a large arena for so-called "wars of national liberation" and political conflicts waged through proxies and mercenaries needled into action by Moscow. The constant danger is that any one such lesser war or conflict-by-proxy may lead to a nuclear showdown.

And how long will the present Soviet leaders lead? Few, if any, students of Soviet affairs anticipated Khrushchev's ouster, and few are likely to anticipate the next shift, or the policy changes it may precipitate.

In any event, as I look back upon our experience, I find a strong correlation between Soviet prudence and restraint and the firmness and capabilities of the West.

Also, as the record shows, Soviet leaders can be reasonable in one field and unreasonable in another—blunt and ready to do business on some issues, crafty and unpredictable on others. Indeed, on any given matter they can twist and turn, thaw and freeze, agree and disagree, and, with no embarrassment whatsoever, trot out on alternate days a black-hatted Fedorenko and a white-hatted Dobrynin.

We should have learned by now that the way to encourage a reasonable response from Moscow is not through weakness but through strength. The way to negotiate successfully with Soviet leaders is to maintain the strength to make negotiated agreements more attractive to them than continued disagreements—as in the case of the Austrian Peace Treaty and the limited nuclear test-ban treaty.

III

In relations with the Soviet Union the free world must pursue two consonant courses of action: to work with them where interests converge, and at the same time to maintain the strength and the resolve to discourage peace-upsetting moves by them.

It was with this point of view on East-West relations that I voted for the limited nuclear test-ban treaty—and also worked to obtain the Administration's pledges to continue actively with the nuclear testing permitted under the treaty and to maintain in a state of readiness a program for atmospheric tests in the event of abrogation of the treaty or other circumstances placing the supreme interests of the nation in jeopardy.

It is with this point of view that I have favored efforts to limit the spread of nuclear weapons—and at the same time have opposed major concessions in the treaty negotiations without any compensating changes of policy on the Soviet side.

For similar reasons I have favored discussions with Moscow about freezing the development of strategic defensive weapons—and at the same time voted to appropriate funds to begin the production and deployment of a "thin" ABM system, and argued against indefinitely delaying such a deployment. I have sought a high priority for a research and development program to develop, if we can, the tools for an effective defense against the kind of missile attack that, as of today, only the Soviet Union could launch.

For similar reasons I have supported West German efforts to move toward normal relations with Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, including expanded cultural, scientific, trade, and diplomatic contact. At the same time, I have opposed substantial unilateral reductions of American forces in Western Europe and I have argued the still fresh and compelling need for the Atlantic Alliance and its international commands.

It is with this point of view that I have urged the importance of frequent and frank discussions between the United States and the Soviet Union, in order that each side might gain a clearer understanding of the range and limits of the other's intentions and actions and that we and they might work toward an identification of areas of common or parallel interest, in Vietnam and elsewhere. At the same time, I have tried to counteract the siren song that goes: "If we trust the communists, they will trust us." A favorite quotation of mine is one from Reinhold Niebuhr:

"If the democratic nations fail, their failure must be partly attributed to the faulty strategy of idealists who have too many illusions when they face realists who have too little conscience."

IV

Frankly, I am deeply concerned at a tendency I discern in some current thinking about American military policy. Some scientists and civilian officials have a mirror image interpretation of Moscow's decisions relating to its military establishment, seeing them as reflex actions—a tit-for-tat, action-reaction view of the Soviet arms buildup. Implicit (and sometimes explicit) in this view is the belief that if the U.S. did not act the Soviet Union would not act. Sometimes the argument is taken even farther: if the U.S. acted to reduce its military programs, the Soviet Union would reciprocate, in what could be called *a policy of minus-tit for minus-tat*.

That is one possible model of Soviet behavior, but the policy-maker cannot rely on it until and unless it is supported by convincing evidence that the model describes not how the Soviet Union *might* act, but how it *does* act. There is, of course, a relationship between the U.S. strategic posture and that of the Soviet Union. I am sure the Russians have a real fear of our awesome military might. Yet as I read the evidence, the Russian aspiration to possess a first-rate military establishment stems from other factors as well, from a perspective that goes beyond the theories of deterrence that have gained popularity over the last twenty years.

One factor is the long-implanted belief that Russia is threatened at various points along its tremendously long land borders. The Soviets have lost tens of millions in the wars of this century and it is not surprising that they display a passionate, at times paranoid, concern for the security of their frontiers. Another factor is the propensity of Soviet leaders, given their interpretation of history, to impute to the "capitalist-imperialist" West, the worst of intentions. Over and beyond this, of course, the thinking of Soviet leaders is conditioned by their own conception of the Soviet Union's historic role, which is still defined in the familiar vocabulary of world revolution.

We cannot ignore the fact that it was the Soviet Union which acted first to develop long-range intercontinental surface to surface missiles, and the U.S. which followed. It is the Soviet Union which has acted first to deploy an ABM set-up, and the U.S. is following.

Some American scientists and civilian officials have done the nation a poor service by propagandizing a notion contrary to all the evidence namely, the idea that military technology has arrived at a "plateau," that the "scientific military revolution" has been "stabilized," and that no new technological upsets which could affect military relationships are likely. Ordinary economic technology is always finding better ways to do things and there is no reason to suppose that military technology will cease in this effort. Missile technology, for example, is advancing in almost all fields of offense and defense—payload, accuracy, guidance, maneuverability, and multiple warheads.

What is the evidence that if we unilaterally reduce our own military programs, the Soviet Union will reciprocate? We do have some experience to go on. It may not be conclusive, but we should face up to it.

Some time ago our government announced a top limit on the number of our strategic missiles for deployment—both land and sea based. But Moscow, according to its own statements, has been working hard to narrow the missile gap that limited its range of options in the Cuban crisis of 1962. Moscow has just increased by 50 percent in one year the number of its operational intercontinental ballistic missiles. A year ago the ratio of American to Russian ICBMs and submarine-launched ballistic missiles was 3 to 1; the present ratio is less than that.

The argument is made that this declining ratio in offensive strategic capability can be offset by the U.S. move to multiple warheads. If past experience in the development of critical weapons is any guide, however, we must assume that the Soviets are also on the multiple warhead course. We need to remember that the larger missile payload the Soviets can mount on their bigger missiles gives them the capability to deploy more nuclear warheads per missile than we can.

Sometime ago our government phased out our land-based intermediate-range ballistic missiles and we have reason to believe the Soviet Union understood that we were trying to eliminate a possible source of misunderstanding about our intentions. Yet the Russians have maintained 700 to 800 medium-range and intermediate-range ballistic missile launchers, most of which are targeted on Western Europe.

Consider also our experience with the anti-ballistic missile. Our government put off a decision to start deploying a "thin" ABM system in the hope that the Soviet Union would see the mutual advantages in mutually foregoing further developments in defenses against missiles, thus releasing Soviet and American resources for urgent and constructive purposes in the world.

Moscow, however, is going about *its* business, not *ours*. An ABM system in Soviet hands lends itself superbly to the bluffing and blackmail that have all too often been hallmarks of Soviet policy. Would a U.S. without ABMs maintain its firm resolve if a USSR with ABMs began a series of step-by-step moves against Berlin? As Soviet planners "cold-war game" with the forces of the 1970s, they are surely asking themselves questions of this kind. So should we.

Obviously the Soviet rulers do not accept the notion that military technology stands on a "plateau." Perhaps no single breakthrough would be as significant as the developments leading to the H-bomb or the ICBM, although I would not want to bet on that. In any case an accumulation of less dramatic inventions could have major significance, and could critically affect the present balance of forces.

V

I must also say, I am profoundly concerned at another tendency I note in the current discussion of American military policy. Top Defense officials are telling us that "nuclear superiority has only limited relevance today" and that "today, in the nuclear age, nuclear superiority is of limited significance." What do statements like that mean? While continuing to describe our policy as one of maintaining nuclear superiority over the Soviet Union, are we in fact embarked on a different course? Have top Defense officials accepted the hypothesis that nuclear superiority constitutes a provocation to the other side to build up its strength? Is nuclear parity now our goal? Have top Defense officials come to think that missile defense against the Soviets is a destabilizing influence in world affairs, and that an effective missile defense should not be one of our objectives?

These are not rhetorical questions. I do not know the answers. I do suggest that if such assumptions are entering into the making of American military policy, they should be ventilated and debated thoroughly—and not quietly substituted for the assumptions on which we have been acting. The questions involve what would be a radical change in American policy. I believe it could be the road to catastrophe.

If, for example, the Soviet Union comes out ahead in the search for an effective anti-missile system, the relationship on which our defense planners have counted to maintain political stability by discouraging a diplomacy of blackmail will be reversed. The consequences for the West could be calamitous.

As I see things, international peace and security depend not on a parity of power but on a preponderance of power in the peace-keepers over the peace-upsetters.

Our aim is not, of course, an unlimited accumulation of weapons. Our policy has been—and I believe it should continue to be—to create and maintain, in cooperation with our allies, a relationship of forces favorable to the deterrence of adventurism and aggression. The road to disaster would be to permit an unfavorable relationship of forces to arise.

VI

In all this the productive power of the American economy is a factor of great importance. Last year our gross national product exceeded $740 billion. By the end of this year it will approach an $800 billion rate. Total current output of our NATO allies is more than $500 billion, so that together the fifteen allies have a productive capacity well over $1 trillion. Although GNP comparisons must be used with care and do not necessarily indicate what societies can or will allocate to military purposes, it is worth noting that Soviet productive capacity is estimated at less than $350 billion, and that the figure for all communist countries combined is estimated at less than $600 billion.

The USSR with a large command economy can afford to build a fairly complete arsenal of sophisticated weapons. But in terms of outlays of money, materials, and manpower for military and foreign programs, there is no doubt that the Soviet Union is operating under more severe economic constraints than the West. We have the economic power to help build a healthier world economy and to give prudent support to the efforts of developing countries to raise their productivity. The superior industrial and agricultural power of the West might yet be a trump card in the long effort to arrive at mutually advantageous arrangements and agreements on the control and limitations of arms and in other fields. If this card is to remain in our hand, however, the Executive Branch and Congress must be ready to make the hard decisions needed to assure continued, steady, non-inflationary growth.

We want to walk the road of cooperation with any who will accompany us. We want a world in which reconciliation and peace prevail. It is a noble cause. But a cause must have its champions, and we may take pride in being counted among them.

DISCONTINUANCE OF RAILROAD POST OFFICES

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, when the Post Office Department began discontinuing railroad post offices throughout our Nation, I cosponsored, with a number of other Senators, Senate Concurrent Resolution 25. This resolution proposed a moratorium upon all future discontinuances at least until a complete and comprehensive study could be made of RPO's by the Department of Transportation. It was advanced in hopes of determining the most economically advantageous program for the long as well as the short run.

Yet, despite the pleas of a number of Senators from both sides of the aisle, despite the protestations of several State Governors, the Post Office Department continued its policy of abolishing RPO's. This policy was undertaken without adequate planning, without adequate investigation, and without a long-range look at the needs that had to be met. The effects of this shortsighted policy are now coming to the fore.

One such effect has been the slowing down of mail deliveries. At this point, I ask unanimous consent that two letters from Mr. Quentin Ackels, a resident of Cheyenne, Wyo., be inserted in the RECORD, along with my remarks to reveal the inefficiency which seems to have become Post Office Department policy since the abolition of RPO's.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHEYENNE, WYO.,
September 29, 1967.

Senator CLIFFORD HANSEN,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HANSEN: I suppose you are sick and tired of hearing about the Post Office Department but if their policies prevail over the objections of thousands of railmen, business leaders and labor unions my 31 years seniority is going down the drain and unlike the RPO clerks, when I'm out, the UP isn't going to transfer me or retire me.

My comments follow—

The Postal Department is shipping mail in freight service that was previously handled on our Streamliners and Mail and Express trains 5 and 6 between Omaha and the West Coast and on UP trains 27 and 28 which operated only between Omaha and Cheyenne. I understand its 20% cheaper rates handled in freight service. The loss of these cars on train 27–28 has allowed the UP to consolidate these trains with trains 105–106. This move alone cut off 3 engineers, 3 firemen, 2 brakemen, 1 conductor, 5 baggagemen and 3 mail pilers.

Now, trains 5 and 6 are headed for the same fate that has overtaken trains 27–28. Train 5 is down to about 6 cars from its usual 35 to 40 and there is strong talk of it being cut off entirely because they are handling 5's mail cars on freight trains. If this set of trains are abolished it will result in the loss of at least 200 rail jobs thru the area the trains serve. (Omaha to Los Angeles with part of the train splitting at Ogden, Utah, for San Francisco.)

The Post Office has started shipping all the Wyoming mail captured at Omaha for Laramie, Rawlins, Rock Springs, Green River and Evanston into Cheyenne in freight service and then they give it to a truck for delivery from here. All this mail was previously handled on train 5 and was put off this train by a team of 4 mail pilers who reside in Cheyenne. They expect to be laid off in October.

The first Wyoming mail received at Cheyenne under this new freight service arrived Sunday, September 24, about midnite. I went out on train 103 the 25th at 10:45 AM. I noticed they had about 200 sacks of Wyoming shorts on the trucks and told the boys what car I wanted it loaded into and they laughed and said the Postal Service wouldn't let them load it on a train, that a truck was to come at midnite, September 25th, to pick up and deliver.

I just learned from friends today that this mail was picked up about 1 AM, September 26, and was taken as far as Laramie by truck. For some unknown reason this mail was taken to the Laramie depot and loaded back on our passenger trains on September

26. Again, mail received here in freight service the morning of September 28, was allowed to stand on the platform trucks while three crack streamliners passed it up so it could be dispatched on a truck about 1 AM the 29th. The bulk of this shipment was taken only as far as Laramie. I was at the depot today (29) when the Agent called and alerted the baggagemen on our streamliners to be prepared to pick up 135 sacks left there by this truck.

Now, if you study my letter closely you will note it takes days to get this mail from Omaha to Laramie. Isn't this a dirty shame when all of Southern Wyoming can get one day service from Omaha on our trains?

The railroad grapevine has it that trains 17–18 Kansas City to Portland are to be abolished. People tend to scoff at these rumors but in my 30 years with the railroad most of the big rumors have materialized.

In closing, thank you for your time and consideration.

Yours truly,

Quentin Ackels.

P.S.—We want and need this mail back to the trains. I forgot to mention the loss of this local mail will cost in addition to the mail pilers, at least one man at each station across Wyoming.

Cheyenne, Wyo.,
October 2, 1967.

Senator Clifford Hansen,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Hansen: I don't want to make a nuisance of myself but if you don't object, I'd like to keep you informed of instances where the mail is being mishandled by the trucks.

The boys at Cheyenne advise me they unloaded an undetermined amount of South Dakota mail from train 6, at 7 a.m. September 29, and sent it to the Post Office to be trucked to destination. Apparently, it was too big a load and fifty seven pieces of this mail was returned to our trains the evening of 9–29–67 for handling thru to Omaha.

The exorbitant delay is at once apparent.

To continue the thoughts I've presented you in my first letter. This continued expansion of the truck service plus changing the storage mails from our mail trains to freight trains can't help but kill our passenger trains. The average person doesn't realize that every one of our fast passenger trains have mail and baggage cars and they have to have something in them for the UP to meet expenses.

Can't the Post Office figure out some way to keep everyone alive, railroads and trucks alike, without forcing a bunch of us old fellows into the Job Corps.

Respectfully,

Quentin Ackels.

IT'S TIME FOR DISSENT AGAINST THE DISSENTERS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, on Wednesday evening, October 11, 1967, Joseph A. Scerra, of Gardner, Mass., commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, spoke in Redfield, S. Dak., at a great testimonial program for the new junior vice commander in chief, Ray Gallagher, of Redfield. It was a thrilling and memorable occasion for the overflow audience assembling in Redfield from all over South Dakota and from our neighboring States. Joe Scerra's address was enthusiastically received.

Ray Gallagher, able attorney and community leader, is a typical South Dakota product. Born in Sioux Falls, S. Dak., on July 29, 1921, Ray graduated from the University of South Dakota with his LL.B. degree awarded by our nationally recognized College of Law, which is a proud part of our university complex.

I know from my personal talks with Ray that he abundantly shares the points of view expressed by the commander in chief of the VFW in his South Dakota address which was accorded National news coverage.

Mr. President, before concluding this presentation, I want to pay my personal tribute to Ray Gallagher and his charming wife, Trixie, and to join in the congratulations so amply due him for his achievements to date and for the new VFW office to which he was recently elected in which I am sure he will perform effectively, impartially, and with customary candor and courage.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the address delivered by Joe Scerra, and also a complete biographical sketch of Ray Gallagher, of whom the Nation is destined to hear much more in years to come.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

It's Time To Dissent Against the Dissenters

(Remarks by Joseph A. Scerra, Gardner, Mass., commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, at Redfield, S. Dak., October 11, 1967)

It is high time some of the amateur diplomats, professional politicians, armchair generals and would-be Presidents in our nation be reminded that their continuing harsh and distorted criticism of America's continuing stand against aggression in Vietnam is harmful to the success of our mission and to the security of our nation.

It may not be their intention, but these self-appointed experts of international military and political strategy are providing false hope and misleading comfort to the enemy. They—no less, and perhaps even more, than the so-called anti-war demonstrators—are actually helping to prolong the war rather than to shorten it, as they so zealously claim is their objective. Their expressions of dissent and protest provide the North Vietnamese with a reason to believe they can achieve the victory our men in uniform are denying them on the battlefront through a split in our ranks on the home front.

The devisive antics of the peaceniks, beatniks and draft card burners can perhaps be blamed on ignorance or immaturity. It is difficult, however, to find any excuse for the increasing tendency of certain members of Congress and other elected officials to assume they somehow have acquired a special insight and wisdom which qualifies them to render better judgments on policies and actions than the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State or the Commander-in-Chief.

Never in the history of our nation has there been a greater need for national unity and support of our constituted leaders. The withholding of traditional bi-partisan Congressional support from the President in the conduct of foreign policy can only serve to undercut his bargaining strength with our enemies and diminish his stature among our friends.

Our military leaders report that our military position in Vietnam has improved considerably in recent months. We have gained the offensive and the enemy has sustained crippling losses in men and materials that have destroyed his ability to effectively continue his course of aggression. However, although the North Vietnamese can find little comfort in the trend of the war itself, they have only to read the statements of some of our Senators and Representatives to find reason to believe they can outlast our will even if they cannot outgun our fighting men. Almost daily, a Member of Congress furnishes the enemy with fresh signs of what he can easily misinterpret as a weakening of our staying power.

It is difficult for our enemies to understand that America's freedom to debate and dissent does not mean a lack of resolve to honor our commitments. We Americans respect the right of the individual to dissent. But too often the enemy quotes the words of our debaters and dissenters in their newspapers and on their broadcasts as a means of bolstering the sagging morale of their own fighting men.

It is indeed unfortunate that the pressure that our guns and bombs bring to bear on the enemy in an effort to lead him to the negotiating table in response to the President's repeated requests for peace talks is continually negated by the words of the dissenters in the U.S. Congress.

Some of the dissenters say we should halt our bombing of North Vietnam. Yet they do not ask that the enemy provide any assurances that he will respond with a comparable deescalation in military activity, or that he will not use the occasion to build up his weaponry and manpower so that he can launch new offensives and kill more of our American troops.

Some of the dissenters want to restrict our military activities to the defense of isolated enclaves. Yet they do not explain how this will help the South Vietnamese achieve freedom for the people outside these limited areas or how this will help resolve the conflict.

Some of the dissenters even call for a complete withdrawal of our troops. Yet they do not say how we can explain this abrogation of our commitment to the other small nations of the free world who look to us as a bulwark against Communist aggression.

The dissenters do not have a monopoly on a desire for peace.

What the dissenters in Congress and elsewhere seem to forget is that the Administration has tried halting the bombing of North Vietnam a number of times, but they have all gone unheeded by Hanoi.

The Administration has repeatedly offered to hold unconditional negotiations with the North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong but all overtures have been rejected.

The Administration has honored cease fire agreements during certain holiday observances, but the enemy has used them to infiltrate our lines and reinforce his positions.

The Administration has conferred with every interested nation and used every available channel, including the United Nations, in its efforts to find some method for bringing about a meaningful cessation of hostilities.

Peace, unfortunately, can not be achieved merely by making speeches on the floors of Congress or by holding demonstrations in the streets of our cities. And peace cannot be brought about by one side alone.

The enemy must be made to realize that he cannot achieve his goals of expansion and domination by military aggression. He must understand that this nation is committed to the defense of freedom in South Vietnam and that this nation honors its commitments. He must not be permitted the luxury of drawing succor, no matter how unjustified, from the misleading statements of the dissenters within our midst.

We do not need another pause in the bombing of North Vietnam to convince Hanoi of our desire for peace. We tried that, and it didn't work.

What we need to try now is a pause in irresponsible dissent to demonstrate our strength of purpose and unity of spirit.

President Kennedy said "The cost of freedom is always high but Americans have always paid it. And one path we shall never choose, and that is the path of surrender or submission."

The path to a just peace is the one where we present a united front to the enemy, so that he will not fail to recognize the futility of his aggressive course of action.

I, therefore, personally call upon our Senators and Representatives to support the Administration in fulfilling its pledge to support our fighting men in Vietnam and to work for a just and honorable peace in Vietnam.

At the same time, I urge every member of the V.F.W. and every American citizen to embark on the most massive letter writing campaign in the history of this nation. I urge that he write his own Senators and Congressman to adhere to our traditional Constitutional procedures for the conduct of war and foreign affairs and to support—not hamper—our Secretaries of State and Defense and the President of the United States in the conduct of their awesome tasks. You should also send copies of your letters to the White House, so that our President will know his countrymen stand behind him in this hour of trial.

I have never asked the members of the V.F.W. to write their Congressmen for any specific purpose before, but I do so now because I feel the need is critical. Let your Senators and Congressman know how the veterans of this nation feel about our commitment in Vietnam.

If he supports the Administration's stand in Vietnam, let him know how much you appreciate it. But if he has been among the dissenters, let him know that now is time for our nation to stand together in its defense of freedom and its quest for peace.

RAYMOND A. GALLAGHER, JUNIOR VICE COMMANDER IN CHIEF, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES

Raymond A. Gallagher, Redfield, South Dakota where he is a Life Member of V.F.W. Post 2755, was elected Junior Vice Commander-in-Chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States at the organization's 68th Annual National Convention August 25, 1967 in New Orleans, Louisiana. On August 26, 1966 he was elected Judge Advocate General at the 67th Annual National Convention held in New York City. At that time he was a member of the National Council of Administration, representing the Departments of North Dakota, South Dakota and Nebraska.

Born in Sioux Falls, South Dakota, July 29, 1921, he attended Millsaps College, Jackson, Miss. and the University of South Dakota, where he received his LLB Degree. He presently practices law in Redfield with the firm of Gallagher and Battey.

From September 1942 to May 1946 the Junior Vice Commander-in-Chief served with the U.S. Navy, as an enlisted man. After training at Asbury Park, New Jersey and at Midshipmen School, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, he served on LST duty in the Asiatic-Pacific theatre. His decorations include the Philippine Liberation Medal.

In 1946 Gallagher joined V.F.W. Post 4674 at Winner, South Dakota, later transferring to Post 2755 at Redfield, where he served through the various posts to Post Commander. He went on to become District Commander in 1962. On a Department level he progressed to Commander during 1964–65. While serving as Department membership chairman, he produced the highest percentage of increase in membership in the history of the Department of South Dakota. Among innovations adopted during his year as Commander of the Department was the annual Legislative Conference which has been adopted as a permanent program.

Gallagher has served as President of the Redfield Chamber of Commerce, as Chairman of the Redfield Community Fund (which he founded), past president of the Spink County Mental Health Division and as Chairman of the Sioux Falls Diocesan Aid Program. He is a former member of the South Dakota Veterans Commission and is a member of the American Legion, the Disabled American Veterans, Military Order of Cooties, Redfield Baseball Board, Knights of Columbus, Elks, the State Bar Association of South Dakota and the American Bar Association.

He is married to the former Theresa Meyers. The Gallaghers have four children—Patrick, Thomas, Mary Ann and Edward.

CONCLUSION OF THE WORLD SERIES

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, although I do this with a somewhat heavy heart, nevertheless I warmly and sincerely congratulate the distinguished Senators from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON and Mr. LONG] upon the great victory the St. Louis Cardinals achieved last Thursday in Boston's Fenway Park.

It is certainly never a disgrace to lose to real champions, and there can be no doubt that Manager Red Schoendienst's extraordinary team deserves the title of World Champions. They have lived up to their reputation as skillful competitors and fine sportsmen. I wish them success in next year's pennant race and look forward to a return series next October in Fenway Park and Busch Memorial Stadium.

But, Mr. President, once again I want to salute the Boston Red Sox and to commend Manager Dick Williams, owner Tom Yawkey, and each and every member of our stout-hearted team. Massachusetts is proud of them. Coming into the World Series after their electrifying capture of the American League pennant, the fine showing by the Red Sox throughout the seven-game series has given people all over the world the thrill of a lifetime and has filled us all with nothing but respect and admiration.

I fear that this is an instance when I cannot truthfully say that it just "wasn't in the cards." For anybody watching the final game will have to concede that it was "in the Cards!"

Mr. President, I had hoped not to revert to this subject again, but alas, I am compelled to say, "Wait 'til next year!"

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there any further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

AMENDMENT OF THE SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL ACT OF 1950

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 498, S. 2171.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2171) to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, so as to accord with certain decisions of the courts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from West Virginia.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICE. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DESIGNATION OF SAN RAFAEL WILDERNESS, LOS PADRES NATIONAL FOREST IN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to S. 889.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 889) to designate the San Rafael Wilderness, Los Padres National Forest, in the State of California which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, in accordance with section 3, subsection (b), of the Wilderness Act (78 Stat. 891), the area shown on the map entitled "Los Padres National Forest, San Rafael Wilderness, proposed", revised July 1967, is hereby designated the San Rafael Wilderness. Said map is and shall continue to be kept on file and available for public inspection in the office of the Chief of the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, and the area thereon shown, comprising approximately one hundred and forty-five thousand acres, is within and shall continue to be a part of Los Padres National Forest.

SEC. 2. As soon as practicable after this Act takes effect, the Secretary of Agriculture shall file a map and a legal description of the San Rafael Wilderness with the Interior and Insular Affairs Committees of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives and such description shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act: *Provided, however,* That correction of clerical and typographical errors in such legal description and map may be made.

SEC. 3. The San Rafael Wilderness shall be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with the provisions of the Wilderness Act governing areas designated by that Act as wilderness areas, except that any reference in such provisions to the effective date of the Wilderness Act shall be deemed to be a reference to the effective date of this Act.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House of Representatives, and request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. JACKSON, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. KUCHEL, and Mr. ALLOTT conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION OF FEASIBILITY INVESTIGATIONS FOR WATER RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on the bill S. 1788, with the amendments of the House of Representatives thereto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1788) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to engage in feasibility investigations of certain water resource developments, which were, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to engage in feasibility studies of the following proposals:

1. Missouri River Basin project, Garrison division, Garrison diversion unit, Minot extension, in the vicinity of Minot, North Dakota.

2. Mogollon Mesa project, Winslow-Holbrook division in the Little Colorado River Basin in the vicinity of Winslow and Holbrook, Arizona.

3. Mountain Park project in the vicinity of Altus, Oklahoma.

4. Retrop project on the North Fork of the Red River in the vicinity of the W. C. Austin project, Oklahoma.

5. Washita River Basin project, Foss Dam and Reservoir water quality investigation, on the Washita River near Clinton, Oklahoma.

6. Rogue River Basin project, Evans Valley division, on Evans Creek, a tributary of the Rogue River, in southwestern Oregon.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to undertake investigations and prepare a reconnaissance report on the California coastal diversion project, consisting of subsurface offshore conveyance of water from the Eel-Klamath River areas to an appropriate terminal point in Southern California.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to engage in feasibility investigations of certain water resource developments, and for other purposes."

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] who is necessarily absent, has prepared a statement which he has asked me to read for him.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JACKSON—READ BY SENATOR BYRD OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, section 8 of the Federal Water Project Recreation Act—Public Law 89–72, 79 Stat. 213—requires that the preparation of any feasibility report on water resource developments under reclamation law must be specifically authorized by law. The purpose of S. 1788 is to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to undertake investigations and prepare feasibility reports on specified water resource development proposals.

The House of Representatives amended section 1 of S. 1788 to authorize feasibility investigations of two additional projects: the Foss Dam and Reservoir water quality investigation and the Evans Valley division of the Rogue River project. I propose that the Senate accept these amendments.

Section 2 of the House-passed bill, however, purports to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to undertake investigations and to prepare a "reconnaissance report" on a specific water development proposal. The House Interior Committee's report—Report No. 635—states that this amendment was adopted "to indicate the committee's desire that this particular reconnaissance study be made at the earliest possible date."

Under existing law the Secretary does not need specific legislative authority to undertake and prepare reconnaissance reports. The Secretary has authority to request funds for reconnaissance investigations and, as a result, this section of the bill is not necessary.

The views of the Department on section 2 were requested and are stated in their letter of September 25, 1967. In brief, the Department's views are that, first, the Department has adequate authority to engage in reconnaissance studies; second, they are currently engaged in feasibility studies in the area proposed for study by section 2; third, until water supply studies of this area are completed a reconnaissance study would be premature. I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. JACKSON. The Senate Interior Committee made a policy determination during the 89th Congress that feasibility authorization bills should not include either directives or authorizations to undertake reconnaissance investigations—see committee report on S. 3034, 89th Congress, report No. 1368, pages 8, 9. During the executive session on June 28, 1966, when this matter was considered, it was determined that projects upon which reconnaissance studies have not yet been made "should be listed in the report with a request by the committee that the Bureau of Reclamation should undertake reconnaissance studies"—see minutes, June 28, 1966, page 4. This policy was followed in the Senate and projects upon which the committee wished to have reconnaissance studies made were listed in the committee's report on the bill—see pages 8, 9, and 10 of report No. 1368.

I do not believe that an exception should be made to this policy of the Senate Interior Committee in the absence of a compelling reason to do so. To make exceptions is to create a situation where every Senator and Congressman will wish to have proposed reconnaissance investigations in his State authorized in the periodic feasibility authorization bills. This is impractical and may have the effect of advancing studies on economically unsound project studies ahead of sound project studies.

Mr. President, the amendment to strike section 2 of S. 1788 as amended by the House, does not represent a negative judgment on the merits of the proposed reconnaissance study. The Interior Department should give expeditious consideration to this proposal. The proposed study may have considerable merit but it should be initiated in the same manner in which other reconnaissance studies are undertaken.

EXHIBIT 1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D.C., September 25, 1967.

Hon. HENRY M. JACKSON,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your oral request for our views on section 2 of S. 1788 (a bill, "To authorize the Secretary of the Interior To Engage in Feasibility Investigations of Certain Water Resources Developments), as passed by the House of Representatives on September 18. Section 2 of S. 1788, as amended, reads as follows:

"SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to undertake investigations and prepare a reconnaissance report on the California Coastal Diversion Project, consisting of subsurface offshore conveyance of water from the Eel-Klamath River areas to an appropriate terminal point in Southern California."

As authorized by the Act of September 7, 1966 (P.L. 89–561, 80 Stat. 707), we presently have authority to engage in feasibilty investigations of the water and related land resources on the potential North Coast Project in California. This study area includes those streams, including the Eel and Klamath Rivers, entering the Pacific Ocean between San Francisco Bay and the California-Oregon boundary. The purpose of the investigation is to develop plans for the conservation and use of the water that now flows unused into the Pacific Ocean for the diversion into other California areas.

The investigation of several units and divisions of this project is under way by the Bureau of Reclamation in cooperation with the California Department of Water Resources and the Corps of Engineers. As soon as sufficient progress has been made in the water supply studies for the potential project to indicate the extent of availability of surplus waters in those coastal streams, consideration logically will be given to the alternative means for conveyance of such surpluses to water-deficient areas in California. One of the means which will warrant study will be the subsurface offshore conveyance such as contemplated by the amendment of the House of Representatives of section 2 of S. 1788.

With respect to the above-quoted section 2, we presently have general authority to engage in reconnaissance investigations. Although the subsurface offshore conveyance proposal appears to have sufficient merit to warrant further consideration, to our knowledge very little work is being done in this field by Federal agencies at the present time. Before considering the application of this technique to specific projects, a substantial research effort to develop and test materials suitable for that purpose, and to develop methods of manufacturing, installing and maintaining underwater conduits of the size being contemplated, should be conducted.

Sincerely yours,

KENNETH HOLUM,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House of Representatives, with an amendment, as follows:

Strike all of section 2.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from West Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HAROLD P. FABIAN APPRECIATION DAY

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, on the 6th of October, the Governor of the State of Utah declared a Harold P. Fabian Appreciation Day, and Mr. Fabian was honored at a dinner held in Salt Lake City, Utah, which was attended by the Governor, officials of the State of Utah, the National Parks Advisory Board, the Director of the National Park Service, several of the superintendents of the national parks, high officials of the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, and leading citizens of the State of Utah. It was a very impressive affair, and one that I shall long remember. In the course of the dinner, much was said about the work that has been done by Mr. Fabian, who is noted throughout the West, and in fact throughout the Nation, as one of the architects of national parks, restoration of historic sites, development of outdoor recreational facilities for all of the people. Mr. Fabian richly deserves every accolade which has been paid to him.

The Deseret News, published in Salt Lake City, wrote an editorial at the time of the Fabian dinner. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be included in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Mister State Parks

If there is a man in Utah who can be called Mr. State Parks, he is certainly Harold P. Fabian, honored this day by the citizens of Utah.

An attorney by profession, Mr. Fabian has spent much of his life promoting the conservation of choice areas of both the state and the nation for recreation purposes. Certainly no one in Utah has worked harder to set aside a part of the state's scenic and geological wonders that they might become a heritage for our posterity.

Mr. Fabian was the father of the Utah Park and Recreation Commission, serving as its chairman on two different occasions. Under his guidance, the basic policies of the state's developing state park system were set, and many fine areas have been incorporated into the system—Wasatch State Park, Dixie State Park, Stage Coach Inn, and Monument State Park, to name just a few.

Mr. Fabian is a man who loves the beauties of the out-of-doors. He is one who wants to share that love with all Americans. For this, Utah owes him a large appreciative vote. The tribute today—Harold Fabian Day, so proclaimed by the governor—to be climaxed tonight with a special dinner in his honor at Hotel Utah, is a well-deserved tribute to this fine gentleman.

THE GROWING PROBLEM OF ALCOHOLISM

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, earlier this year I joined with many colleagues in introducing a bill (S. 1508) which would provide a strong public health approach to the growing problem of alcoholism. Alcoholism is now identified as the Nation's third most serious health problem.

As a result of the efforts of many individuals and organizations operating in both private and official circles, there is greater public awareness of the serious health and economic aspects of alcoholism.

Recent court decisions, notably the Easter and Driver decisions, have illustrated the need for greater involvement by Government at all levels in programs to combat and treat alcoholism. The court cases have reaffirmed what many of us have said for years, that alcoholism is a disease and not a crime. No longer, in some jurisdictions, can a person be arrested merely because he is drunk in public. But, where does this individual go if he is not sent to jail? The answer should be that he goes to publicly supported detoxification and rehabilitation centers. These centers, however, are not available. The demand for them, however, will mushroom as the court decisions spread to States and communities which are totally unprepared to handle alcoholics as ill persons.

Greater public awareness was recently given a boost by the publication of a book by Thomas F. A. Plaut on alcohol problems. I ask unanimous consent that a review of the book by Donald Newlove which appeared in Sunday's Washington Post be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the book review was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Pickled Skeleton in Our Closet

(By Donald Newlove)

The purpose of this important book is nothing less than a total revolution in the way Americans think, feel and act about alcohol. In sober, judicious words the book manages to shock by bringing Giant Staggerjuice out into the open, naked and shameless, just like those once embarrassing but now tired subjects called sex education and birth control. Old Staggerjuice is actually everywhere—but no one sees him. Young Pot (or marijuana) is much less ubiquitous—but everyone sees him even where he isn't. As for cigarette smoking—we are all quite willing to admit that it may be harmful to health; that in fact a lot of people may die of lung cancer (though it won't happen to us, of course). But the dangers of alcohol—even greater than those of smoking—are stubbornly masked by lies and jokes.

The fact is that the American Medical Association now rates alcoholism as our third greatest health problem, led only by heart disease and mental illness. And this year, for the first time, alcoholism knocked cancer into fourth place. In reality, drink may well be the most serious of all our illnesses, for when a middle-class alcoholic dies the death certificate is often falsified by the insertion of such euphemisms as hepatitis, gastric bleeding, pneumonia, tuberculosis, diabetes, over-enlarged heart, heart disease, mental disease (28 per cent of all male mental patients are alcoholics) and auto fatality. Drunkard though the deceased may have been, no family wants it in writing.

America's guilty attitudes about alcohol consistently lead the drinker to minimize and disguise his illness and to exaggerate his will power. The problem drinker is supersonically alert to any sanction that will allow him to keep his bottle. A brief encounter with psychoanalysis may bring insight and freedom from guilt—but these new clarities rarely shut off the intake. As for will power, by the time he wants to make use of it, the alcoholic discovers that it is too late: he is the permanent victim of a progressive disease, one that bears as little relation to will power as malaria. Neither guilt nor will power nor insight can help him.

To come to grips with these unpleasant realities, the Cooperative Commission on the Study of Alcoholism was founded in 1961 under a grant from the National Institute of Mental Health. A score of eminent authorities including psychiatrists, anthropologists, biochemists and administrative experts, with headquarters at Stanford University, make up the Commission. Their findings, published here as the first part of a continuing study, culminate in a controversial proposal for a federally sponsored "total alcohol program." It will require an open-mindedness on the part of the nation no less heroic than that needed to implement welfare and civil-rights legislation.

The Commission specifically urges the creation of a Committee for National Alcohol Policy which would operate under the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Neither pro- nor anti-alcohol, such a committee would create objectives and co-ordinate programs for the national attack on the disease. At the pyramid's base would be an army of "alcohol workers" analogous to social workers. The army would be divided into teachers, group leaders, medical aides, welfare helpers. Eventually, the policy committee would create a network within the already existing government bureaus that deal with agriculture, finance, liquor control, penology, education, highways, public health and public welfare. It would also work closely with the Department of Defense, for the armed services are plagued with problem drinkers—as is the U.S. Senate, if one is to believe a recent Drew Pearson column. But such cross-stitching of one group throughout the entire fabric of the government has never before been attempted, nor is it likely to happen without an uproar. No similar proposals in the range of "personal freedom," not even the 18th Amendment, have had the range or the authority of those set forth in this report.

Educating the public and the legislators is the core of the campaign, for the problem is one of inbred attitudes or, just as pertinently, the lack of them. Our unsureness about alcohol is due to the absence of a set of standards. Legislation makes alcohol mysterious and exciting by placing age restrictions upon it. Advertising represents drinking as a masculine pursuit; indeed, at many levels getting drunk is regarded as proof of virility. Most important, as yet, "no satisfactory means have been developed for influencing the ways in which youngsters are introduced to drinking. For some, their first drinking experience is an act of rebellion; it may occur outside the family circle and is likely to be associated with guilt and hostility." Since "drinking patterns (and associated attitudes) can influence problem drinking in a cultural group," it is the *introduction* to alcohol that determines later responses. Among many American cultural groups, drinking "is not usually associated with another activity; rather its specific purpose is often 'having fun' or 'escape.' Far from being positively connected with deep-seated cultural and moral values, it is associated with the residual uneasiness about the enjoyment of pleasure, an attitude still widespread in America."

Thus the Dean Martin syndrome and much of the basis of our national humor. As *Alcohol Problems* observes, "expressions such as 'sneak a quick one' or 'have a blast' reveal uncertainty and mild guilty feelings which rarely accompany socially approved behavior." So the problem is covered up by nervous laughter and, as a result, little is done to alleviate it.

No drunk could have hallucinated the crazy-quilt of prejudice about the use of beverage alcohol that now prevails. Perhaps as a reaction to the years of Prohibition and Repeal few people, even non-alcoholic sociologists, recognize the effect of alcohol on life in America. "Heart disease, cancer, schizophrenia and delinquency are not completely understood either," the Commission says, "yet a community which responded to these conditions as it responds to problem drinking would be considered medieval and a national disgrace."

Part of the enormity of the problem is illustrated by the fact that the most frequently imposed sentence of the entire criminal code is the one for public drunkenness. As this book points out, of the total reported arrests for all offenses in the United States during 1965, about one-third or 1,535,000 were for public intoxication. "However several hundred thousand additional arrests listed in police records as disorderly conduct, disturbing the peace, vagrancy, and other charges are commonly known to refer largely and sometimes almost entirely, to public drunkenness." One man may be rearrested for public intoxication more than a hundred times a year. (Significantly, the incidence of rearrest is lowest in St. Louis, the city with the best rehabilitation program.) But police records can give no more than an indication of the adverse influences of alcohol; the number of problem drinkers and alcoholics who will never come under police scrutiny is staggering even by the most conservative estimates.

The report sweeps aside much that even old hands in the field accept as gospel. For example, the Commission found no real difference between heavy drinkers and alcoholics. What keeps a heavy drinker from acquiring the disease of alcoholism is probably a greater supply of social and psychological independence, more mobility, more active responsibilities and the metabolism of an ox. But even the heavy drinker probably has a bolo of difficulties, and for that reason many government agencies will have to be involved if the drinking problem is to be dealt with meaningfully.

Public misinformation about alcoholism is phenomenal, despite the growing number of recovered alcoholics. (This number is balanced by the growing incidence of youthful problem drinkers. A few weeks ago, a 23-year-old Cornell student addressed a Manhattan Alcoholics Anonymous chapter and told of his ruined past. It was no joke. No one is too young to be an alcoholic.) Present treatment services are in a disarray that almost defies definition. Even A.A., for all its merits, manages to reach but a handful of the problem drinkers in any community. And, to make matters worse, the treatment of problem drinkers, according to this report, is now taught to medical students under conditions which perpetuate an attitude of therapeutic pessimism. As for the police and the courts, they pursue inhuman policies that doom the problem drinker to the revolving door of a drunk tank or the "flight decks" of city hospitals. Furthermore, only a few of the workers at the clinics for alcoholism are inclined to give any time to poorly motivated, less verbal drinkers of the lower classes. The report remarks that "A basic belief of our civilization is that suffering should be relieved, regardless of the person, his contribution to society, or the manner in which the suffering was brought about." But even in an egalitarian society, some people are more and some less equal. The man who has five martinis before dinner at home is a lot more equal than the one who drinks sherry from a pint bottle on a sidewalk.

The pride of the egghead alcoholic is too great to be humbled by a recovery program or by the (to his mind) inspirational naiveté of A.A. (Manhattan, however, has four or five A.A. chapters attended by highly professional members whose outright spiritual courage could bring daylight to the most benighted intellectual.) A true national program must include the Skid Row castoff with the alienated Harvard graduate. As in the army, everyone is the same age and maturity in alcoholism, for the disease is baffling, cunning and insidious to each according to his resistance.

The Commission hopes to be able to take the emotionalism out of the treatment of alcoholism much as it has been taken out of the public discussion of birth control (though *that* took 40 years). The "kicks" aspect of drinking must be punctured at the earliest age. The Commission also suggests doing away with age restrictions on drinking, or, less precipitously, establishing a national minimum age of 18. The report cites the fact that Jews and Italians, who are indoctrinated into a pattern of truly social drinking at an early age, have the lowest rate of problem drinking. When alcohol is unrelated to family or group activities that have certain guidelines about how much consumption is acceptable, drinking becomes unmanageable. The Commission feels that alcohol might be made available to the young under certain supervised conditions—". . . at youth functions such as those organized by church, recreational, or athletic groups. Prohibitions against excessive or inappropriate drinking would then be unambiguous, clearly understood, and effectively enforced. Since these are learning situations, adult supervision would be stressed."

Alcohol Problems is a model of exposition and clear writing. It is provocative and well aware of the antagonisms it will arouse. Giant Staggerjuice will howl that he is being exposed, abused, picked on, deprived, that the rights of private citizens are being invaded. But the Commission's sensible purpose is to meet an endemic national disease head-on by effecting major changes in our drinking patterns. And to lend a therapeutic hand to those millions of forlorn drunks alone with their anxieties, conflicts, guilts and griefs. The question is, is it better to let them drift unmanageably toward death, or to help steer them back to life? Unless you've been there, perhaps you'll never know, because an alcoholic is a man for whom one drink is too many and a thousand deaths not enough.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with further proceedings under the order for a quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF THE SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL ACT OF 1950

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2171) to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, so as to accord with certain decisions of the courts.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the pending bill is one of the most controversial bills we have had before us this year. One of the best indications of that is a press conference that was held this morning and a wire that was sent to the Attorney General of the United States yesterday by some of the outstanding constitutional experts in the Nation.

I shall read a copy of the wire that was sent to the Attorney General in connection with the bill that is before the Senate at this time for a vote. The wire reads:

> We believe Senate bill 2171, to revive the McCarran Act, contains serious constitutional defects, is wholly unnecessary, and threatens basic freedoms of thought and expression. No hearings have been held in the Senate. We urge you to make public the views of the Department of Justice on this legislation and hope you will vigorously oppose enactment.

Mr. President, it seems to me that Members of the Senate, under these circumstances, would want to have in detail the views of experts in the field—certainly of the Attorney General—on this measure. We would also want to know the opinions of other constitutional experts in connection with this matter. I do not say that we should have extensive hearings; but there should be 1 or 2 days of hearings and an opportunity for at least two or three witnesses who are critical of the measure, as well as supporters of the measure, to appear, so that we would have some record and know what we are doing.

I might say in this connection that the pending measure is designed to amend the McCarran Act of 1950. The Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, as we know, had a very serious constitutional defect. It was enacted in 1950 for the purpose of exposing Communist fronts and Communists—people who were associated with the Communist fronts. But it did nothing. It has been law for 17 years, and the heart of that bill is to require such organizations to register.

As was brought out in the colloquy yesterday between the distinguished Senator from Nebraska and myself, not a single Communist, not a single Communist-front organization, not one subversive organization of any kind, not one subversive individual has been registered under the 1950 Subversive Activities Control Act. Why? Well, because the act was in direct conflict with the Constitution, in the light of the Smith Act, which made it unlawful for anyone to advocate violent overthrow of our Government or to belong to an organization that did.

Under those circumstances, it would seem to us—and with hindsight it is easy to see—that it is transparently in conflict with the fifth amendment of the Constitution on self-incrimination to require a Communist to register or a Communist front to register; if once he is registered, you can use this as evidence to prosecute him under the Smith Act.

This is not the opinion of somebody who is just a Senator or somebody who is sympathetic to the act. This was the unanimous opinion of the Supreme Court, the entire conservative wing—Justice Harlan, Justice White. The entire Supreme Court voted unanimously.

Mr. President, I mentioned Justice White. I meant Justice Stewart and Justice Harlan. Justice White did not participate. It was an 8-to-0 decision, and Justice White did not take part. But the Supreme Court unanimously declared it unconstitutional.

It seems to me that if Congress had had competent constitutional advice it could have designed a bill at that time that would have stood the test of constitutionality.

All we are asking now is that we have at least some hearings. We have not had a day or an hour of hearings. We have not had a single witness. We have not had a minute of hearings. We are working in the dark on this bill. If the bill were noncontroversial, perhaps that would be all right; but, as I have said, the bill is opposed by some of the leading constitutional authorities in the Nation.

Let me name the people who signed the telegram I have just read, and who oppose the bill and say it contains serious constitutional defects: Prof. Paul Bator, Harvard Law School. Prof. Clark Byse, Harvard Law School.

I might say that Professor Byse is the head of the American Association of University Professors, a professor of administrative law, and he has written one of the most important case books in the entire area of administrative law. He says this bill has serious administrative defects. I say that by failing to hold hearings the Senate is showing it does not care enough to secure competent opinion on this legislation.

I shall continue to read the names of the signers of the telegram opposing the bill:

Prof. David Cavers, Harvard Law School;
Prof. Vern Countryman, Harvard Law School;
Prof. John Dawson, Harvard Law School;
Prof. Norman Dorsen, New York University School of Law.

Mr. President, I should have said in the beginning and I ask unanimous consent that at the beginning of this listing the name of Prof. Thomas I. Emerson, Yale Law School, be placed because he is an eminent lawyer, a constitutional expert, and he is the man who organized this group and held the press conference this morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. In addition to the names I have mentioned, there are the following persons:

Dean Robert F. Drinan, Society of Jesuits, Boston College Law School, who is dean of the Boston College Law School, and a very eminent constitutional expert; Prof. Richard B. Dyson, Boston University School of Law; Prof. Morris Forkosch, Brooklyn Law School; Prof. Walter Callhorn, Columbia Law School, who is another expert in the field of administrative law, and along with Professor Byse has written the case book on administrative law used in outstanding law schools throughout this country; Prof. Louis Jaffe, Harvard Law School, a well-known, outstanding expert in the field; Prof. Benjamin Kaplan, Harvard Law School, who is a key figure in the copyright field; Prof. William J. Kenealy, Society of Jesuits, Boston College Law School; Prof. Robert B. Kent, Boston University School of Law; Prof. Louis Loss, Harvard Law School, who teaches a course in this security field and who is an outstanding nationally recognized expert; Prof. Banks McDowell, Jr., Boston University School of Law; Prof. Saul Mendlovits, Rutgers Law School; Prof. Frank Michelman, Harvard Law School; Prof. Henry P. Monaghan, Boston University School of Law; Prof. Nathaniel L. Nathanson, Northwestern University School of Law; Prof. Daniel C. Partan, Boston University School of Law; Prof. Daniel R. Pollitt, University of North Carolina Law School; Prof. Frank E. A. Sander, Harvard Law School; Prof. George Schatzki, University of Texas School of Law; Prof. Thomas L. Shaffer, Notre Dame Law School; Prof. Malcolm P. Sharp, University of New Mexico School of Law—I am sure we all recognize the University of New Mexico School of Law, which is in the great State of the Presiding Officer (Mr. MONTOYA in the chair)—Prof. Morgan Shipman, Harvard Law School; Prof. Leonard P. Strickman, Boston University School of Law; Dean David H. Vernon, University of Iowa College of Law; and Prof. Henry Weihefen, University of New Mexico School of Law.

Mr. President, once again, these are eminent authorities, and I am sure that many, many other outstanding experts in this field would have signed this telegram and expressed sentiments of vigorous opposition to the pending bill, had there been time. Professor Emerson was able to organize this much opposition in the matter of a very few days, with very little notice. As I think we all know, while this has been an issue before the Senate for a few days, it has not been an issue that has been widely publicized throughout the country. Yet an impressive number of outstanding experts in the country were willing to make clear their view that the proposed bill contains serious constitutional defects.

As I have said, we do not have a line of testimony on the bill before the Senate. Mr. President, it would seem clear to me that we should have some real opinion from the Attorney General. I am waiting with bated breath to see the copy of the letter which presumably has been written by the Attorney General to the distinguished minority leader. It was announced by the Senator from Nebraska yesterday that the minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], received a letter but none of us has been informed as to what was in the letter. It seems to me that this letter, if it is going to be of any value to us, should have an analysis of this particular bill which would indicate that the Attorney General is well aware of the bill and is prepared to tell us whether or not this bill will be effective.

The last thing any Senator wants to do, whether he is conservative, liberal, whether he believes strongly in the Subversive Activities Control Act or not, is to pass a law that will not work. To do so would mean there will be another period of years for this Board to remain idle and for taxpayers to have to pay $26,000 a year to each of the five members of the Board and high salaries to a number of other employees on the staff for absolutely nothing.

All of us want to know whether or not this Board is going to do anything. Until we get word from the Attorney General as to whether or not he intends to use this legislation, it is impossible for us to know whether or not it is going to be effective.

BILINGUAL EDUCATION CALLED NECESSARY FOR 2 MILLION DROPOUTS WITH LINGUISTIC DIFFICULTY BY THE NEW REPUBLIC

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in the most recent issue of the New Republic, it is stated:

> There are almost two million children who will drop out of school and end up on the economic slag heap because of an almost insurmountable language barrier.

It is because of this language problem that I have introduced and held hearings on S. 428, the bilingual education bill, which the article discusses.

Because of the insight into the bilingual problem shown by the article, I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "Bilingual Education," published in the October 21, 1967, issue of the New Republic, and appearing on page 9, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BILINGUAL EDUCATION

Last summer, Senator Ralph Yarborough (D, Texas) held hearings in the Southwest on the educational afflictions of Spanish-speaking, Mexican-Americans. As the author of a bill to funnel federal funds into bilingual educational systems in certain sections of the country, Yarborough was interested in getting the opinions of the Spanish-speaking themselves, and of the professional educators who have been studying this situation for years. He brought back to Washington a wealth of evidence, showing that it is largely the language barrier that blocks the 6–7 million Spanish-speaking from climbing up the economic ladder.

The average number of school years completed by the "Anglo" child in the Southwest is 12.1 years; for the Negro it is nine years; for the Mexican-American, 7.1 years. Relatively poor educational achievement is reflected in an extremely high unemployment rate among the Spanish-speaking. It is seen also in the fact that the Southwest's badly paid migratory labor force, once made up of the Deep South's dispossessed sharecroppers, is now largely composed of Spanish-speaking workers.

According to a study by Dr. Faye Bumpass of Texas Technological Institute, there are at least 1,750,000 schoolchildren with Spanish surnames in the five-state area of Texas, New Mexico, Colorado, Arizona and California. These children, she told Senator Yarborough's subcommittee on bilingual education "are suffering from linguistic, cultural and psychological handicaps that cause them to experience academic failure in our schools." Senator Robert Kennedy has made a similar observation about Spanish-speaking youngsters in New York City. At hearings in East Harlem, recently, he noted that of 250,000 Puerto Ricans in the New York

> public school system, only 37 went on to college last year.
>
> A report of the Texas Education Agency revealed that in 1957—the only year such a survey was made—about 80 percent of the non-English-speaking children in that state had to spend two years in the first grade. Forty percent of the Southwest's Spanish-speaking pupils are in Texas. But during the last session of the state legislature, a bill to provide English-Spanish instruction in most subjects in certain public schools became so embroiled in controversy to the consternation of educators, that it was dropped. Its opponents contended that Texans of German ancestry and those living near the French-speaking areas of Louisiana were against making Spanish a second language. By the time the bill was rewritten to provide a sort of local option on the language issue, interest had waned and the proposal was quietly shelved.
>
> In California, where it is estimated there are 461,000 schoolchildren from Spanish-speaking homes, bilingual legislation has fared somewhat better. School districts may teach children in their native language if they do not have a working knowledge of English. The drawback here is that the legislation is merely permissive, and that local school districts must finance the bilingual training. As might be expected, school districts with the largest proportion of Spanish-speaking students are the worst off, and unless more aid is provided by the state—a dim prospect under the cost-conscious Reagan administration—the program is not likely to be carried out where it is needed most.
>
> This may explain the interest of many Californians in a bill Senator Yarborough and others (including Robert Kennedy) are drawing up. It calls for appropriating in the neighborhood of $50 million over a three-year period to assist local school districts set up bilingual instruction, with Spanish taught as a native language and English as a mandatory second language. It also would help underwrite the training of Spanish-speaking teachers. Two Los Angeles congressmen, Edward Roybal and George Brown, have introduced similar legislation in the House, and they have been joined by Rep. James Scheuer of New York.
>
> At a hearing in Los Angeles, Senator George Murphy brought out that 50 percent of Spanish-speaking students in California drop out of school by the time they reach the eighth grade, which he found "shocking" and in part the result of "the language problem." Senator Thomas Kuchel suggested treating "the ability to speak Spanish and other languages as an asset. The United States can no longer pretend that it can communicate with other people with but one tongue—no matter how widely the English language is spread over the earth." Both California senators are on Mr. Yarborough's subcommittee.
>
> Representatives of all organized Mexican-American groups were at the Los Angeles hearing and were unanimous in support of a federal subsidy for bilingual education. One of the spokesmen pointed out that according to the population ratio in California at least 20,000 Mexican-Americans should be enrolled in the state's colleges, whereas the figure is around 2,000.
>
> In the past, Americanism has been equated with ability to speak English, and nothing but. Undoubtedly there are many congressmen who feel that the "melting pot" principle is sacrosanct. But in the simpler society of the past—when the "melting pot" was going full boil—the great need was for manual, not educated, labor; brawn or dexterity often were prized as much as formal schooling. (Even then, however, in the 1890's, there were towns and cities where public school instruction was conducted for part of the day in a language other than English.) Today, machines have shrunk the market for manual labor. In a complicated, computerized world the need has shifted to workers who can quickly master new concepts and techniques—and a prerequisite for such workers is a high degree of comprehension—and that means schooling.
>
> There are almost two million children who will drop out of school and end up on the economic slag heap because of an almost insurmountable language barrier. Professional educators are aware of it. It remains to be seen whether Congress is.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the article refers to hearings held in the Southwest during the past summer by the Special Subcommittee on Bilingual Education, of which I have the privilege to be chairman, on the educational afflictions of Spanish-speaking Mexican-Americans.

It states that the bill seeks to funnel funds to assist local school districts to set up bilingual instruction in certain sections of the country. The hearings were held to get the opinions of the Spanish-speaking people themselves.

The article points out that our subcommittee brought back to Washington a wealth of evidence showing that it is largely a language barrier which blocks from 6 to 7 million of the Spanish speaking from climbing up the economic ladder.

The hearings were held in my State at Corpus Christi, San Antonio, and Edinburg. We also held hearings in Los Angeles and New York City.

While we often think of the Spanish speaking as people of Spanish-American extraction, in our hearings we found many people of Latin American descent who have settled in New York City. We learned that 22 percent of the school people in New York City are from Spanish-speaking homes and that most do not speak English. So this is also a problem of persons of Puerto Rican extraction who live in New York City.

The Senator from Florida has told us that this need is also felt in Miami and other areas of the United States to which refugees from Communist Cuba—hundreds of thousands of them—fled to liberty.

Reading from the article, in part, it states:

> The average number of school years completed by the "Anglo" child in the Southwest is 12.1 years; for the Negro it is nine years; for the Mexican-American, 7.1 years. Relatively poor educational achievement is reflected in an extremely high unemployment rate among the Spanish-speaking. It is seen also in the fact that the Southwest's badly paid migratory labor force, once made up of the Deep South's dispossessed sharecroppers, is now largely composed of Spanish-speaking workers.
>
> According to a study by Dr. Faye Bumpass of Texas Technological Institute—

Incidentally, she spent 9 years teaching in Peru and is one of the outstanding and completely bilingual teachers in America—

> there are at least 1,750,000 schoolchildren with Spanish surnames in the five-state area of Texas, New Mexico, Colorado, Arizona and California. These children, she told Senator Yarborough's subcommittee on bilingual education "are suffering from linguistic, cultural and psychological handicaps that cause them to experience academic failure in our schools." Senator Robert Kennedy has made a similar observation about Spanish-speaking youngsters in New York City. At hearings in East Harlem, recently, he noted that of 250,000 Puerto Ricans in the New York public school system, only 37 went on to college last year.

Just think, 37 out of 250,000.

> At a hearing in Los Angeles, Senator George Murphy brought out that 50 percent of Spanish-speaking students in California drop out of school by the time they reach the eighth grade, which he found "shocking" and in part the result of "the language problem." Senator Thomas Kuchel suggested treating "the ability to speak Spanish and other languages as an asset. The United States can no longer pretend that it can communicate with other people with but one tongue—no matter how widely the English language is spread over the earth." Both California Senators are on Mr. Yarborough's subcommittee.

Mr. President, a vast body of evidence accumulated by the subcommittee in the report has been printed. The bill (S. 428) was the first bilingual education bill ever introduced in either House of Congress. Again, I thank the distinguished chairman for being one of the original cosponsors. The hearings held in the Senate were the first hearings on bilingual education ever held by either House of Congress. They were printed in two volumes.

I was in San Antonio yesterday. While I was there, a member who has served in the State legislature for 6 years asked for additional copies. We had already sent him some. He said they were the most popular publication to come from Congress, based on a study of the statements made by some of the finest educators in America on this problem. The bill has been reported unanimously by the special subcommittee on bilingual education to the Subcommittee on Education and is now under consideration by that subcommittee.

Mr. President, I think it is vital that the bill be incorporated into the Elementary and Secondary School Act and be written into law this year. In my own State of Texas, four of the so-called Rio Grande counties—that is, the citrus belt of Texas where oranges and grapefruit are grown—Cameron, Hidalgo, Starr, and Willacy—contain more than 600,000 people, and of the children of school age in that population, 70 percent come from Spanish-speaking homes. In the first grade, in September of this year, 90 percent came from Spanish-speaking homes. That is in the entire citrus area of Texas. The need is urgent. It is vital. So say the fine educational psychologists and fine educators who deal with bilingual education. It simply means teaching children whose mother tongue is Spanish, both Spanish and English. They presently go to a school where it is illegal to speak Spanish, even in the playgrounds. They try to speak their own language but read and write in another. They can speak only Spanish. We can try to teach them to read and write English, but that creates in the children an intellectual barrier, to say nothing of a psychological inferiority, so most of them drop out of school very soon.

The plan for bilingual education has

been discussed by educators. They want the children to become literate in both languages, whereas, under present circumstances, they are illiterate in both. This is one of the greatest wastes of America's greatest natural resource—its citizens. Millions of Mexican-Americans, when given an intelligence test in Spanish, in words they can understand, make grades as high as those of anyone else.

In addition to depriving these people of the chance to obtain equal opportunity, we are losing a valuable national asset—the most valuable national asset we have.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Texas on his statement. A serious problem is created for children who speak a foreign language.

It is particularly interesting to me, because Wisconsin, 50 or 60 years ago, had a somewhat similar situation to the one which now exists in Texas. In that day, the basic language in Wisconsin was German. In fact, many of the children did not speak English at all because their parents had come from Germany as little children. Wisconsin saw to it that those children gradually learned English. But the fact is that their education was obtained in a language which they understood.

The Senator's bill will be a helpful accommodation to the children of Texas. He is absolutely right in pointing out that this valuable, precious, natural resource—indeed, the most valuable resource we have—is the minds of our children.

I am so glad that the Senator from Texas brought this to the attention of the Senate.

A psychological impact is made on a little child when he is forced to speak a language with which he is not familiar, and he is told that he is not intelligent. No matter how his IQ rating is concealed, that child knows, from the basis on which he is treated that he is considered to be inferior. That can have a damaging and destructive effect upon his whole life.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for his contribution on that point. In my State of Texas it is not widely known, but there was a very large German migration to my State which began when Texas was a Republic, because one could be naturalized in the Republic of Texas after only 6 months' residence with no requirement to learn English. Texas wanted to settle Germans, so as to act as a buffer between the Texans and the Comanches, and gave the Germans free land as an inducement to come to Texas. The failure of the liberal revolution in central Europe in 1848 caused German-speaking settlers to pour into Texas by the thousands.

Ten thousand came through the Port of Galveston alone in 1 year; and they were coming into other ports, too. Because they had lived in Germany during that liberal revolution, which failed, most of them were teachers or writers or other well educated people, and they made great contributions in my State.

The first tax-supported public high school in Texas was established in the 1850's by those German-speaking settlers, and they maintained their German-speaking schools up until World War I. The best known person to come out of them was Admiral Nimitz. He settled in Fredericksburg. Up until World War I, German was the language spoken there.

However, we have never before had in Texas so many millions of people who speak a language other than English. The problem becomes more serious now. Psychologists have testified that permanent damage is done when a psychological barrier is created in which children are forced to speak one language in school and another language at home. We hope that that barrier will be removed, so that those children will have a fair chance in our economy, and that we will have a chance to benefit from that resource by enabling them to get the benefits of a fair chance in our economy.

The Senator from Wisconsin brings a perceptive knowledge to this subject. I mention this because the bill will have active consideration this week before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I thank the Senator for his contribution.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LABELING OF POTATOES

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, pending before the Commerce Committee is a bill known as the potato labeling bill. Its purpose is to require the various States in which potatoes are grown to label the potatoes indicating the State from which they came. An Ohio potato would have to be labeled "Ohio Potato." A Wisconsin potato would have to be labeled "Wisconsin Potato." Minnesota, which grows a great number of potatoes, likewise would have to label them "Minnesota Potatoes."

I am somewhat puzzled over who conceived the idea that potatoes offered in the market should be labeled on the basis of the States where they were grown. My belief is that the thought had its origin in the growers of potatoes in Maine and Idaho.

I mention this fact for the purpose of showing to what extent Congress is attempting to go in restricting the operations of the citizens of the country. We have now what is known as the Fair Trade Act and thhe Pure Food and Drug Act. Both of those acts contain provisions prohibiting fraudulent marking of packages. The provisions of those two acts are very distinct and precise. Whatever markings are made on packages must be in accordance with the truth. Thus, under those two acts, West Virginia, for example, could not label potatoes—if potatoes were grown there to any extent—as Idaho potatoes or Maine potatoes. Yet it is argued that a Federal law should be passed requiring the labeling of packages to show in which State a potato is grown.

I now pose this question: If we pass a law of that type with respect to potatoes, what about peaches, cherries, tomatoes, pears, electronic equipment, and any other type of agricultural product or manufactured product?

Will the Senator from Florida come before the Senate and urge that all oranges shall have to be identified as to whether they come from Florida or California?

We are entering into a dangerous field, Mr. President. We are imposing upon industry a burden that it ought not to have to bear.

I concur with the argument and the principle that there should not be any false advertising, but why should Ohio be compelled, by law of the U.S. Government, to write on a package "Ohio potatoes"? What difference does it make whether the potatoes are grown in Ohio or Pennsylvania or Wisconsin or Minnesota?

What will happen to the bill in the Commerce Committee, I do not know; but the great, dignified body of the Congress of the United States, believing that by law all things shall be achieved, has undertaken to deal with potatoes. It is going to require how packages shall be identified and labeled. One would think Congress has nothing of importance to do; that the important issue is to show how potatoes shall be labeled.

I contemplate fighting that proposal, and I will do so because I believe that Congress cannot begin passing laws that purposely will serve one or two States to the disadvantage of the other States in the Nation.

I yield the floor, Mr. President.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF THE SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL ACT OF 1950

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2171) to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, so as to accord with certain decisions of the courts.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I rise in support of the bill introduced by the distinguished minority leader, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen]. I feel that I should say something on the pending legislation inasmuch as I was one of the coauthors of the original act that created, among other things, the Subversive Activities Control Board at the time we had the long and rather exciting debate setting it into operation by an overwhelming vote over the veto of a President.

The legislation originated under the imprimatur of the so-called Nixon bill and became incorporated as part of the McCarran, Ferguson, Mundt, Johnson Act known as the Internal Security Act of 1950. I think it has served the country well.

Since then, as the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin has pointed out, and as we are all aware, the legislation has been subjected to a number of attacks in the courts and outside the courts—many of them motivated openly by the Communist Party in this country, some of them motivated by front organizations dominated by the Communist Party, and some of them motivated by misguided citizens who are not Communists but who somehow or other feel that our society is incompetent of creating the appropriate machinery required to protect the freedoms which we all enjoy.

So, I want to raise and answer four or five basic questions which I think are involved in the decision we are about to make today or tomorrow or the next day, or whenever the Senator from Wisconsin feels that the matter has been debated adequately.

I listened to most of the address of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] yesterday and read the rest of it this morning. As the Senator is well aware, most of what he had to say dealt with the past—how the act had been attacked, how the Supreme Court had ruled, and certain authorities that the Subversive Activities Control Board had in the original legislation.

I want to direct my remarks to the future, and hope that I can induce my friend, the active and enterprising Senator from the great, progressive State of Wisconsin, to look ahead instead of backward, quite prepared to accept the fact that as the situation presently prevails in view of the Supreme Court interpretation, the Subversive Activities Control Board would not be meaningful.

I am not one of those who wants to array myself against the board simply because the President of the United States selected a young man to be a board member who happened to have married his private secretary.

I know nothing about the young man. I am quite prepared to believe that President Johnson—who voted for the Internal Security Act of 1950, by the way, when he was a Member of the U.S. Senate—feels that this young man has good judgment, that he is loyal, that he is desirous of protecting this country against communism. And I see no reason to attack the Board because some people are unhappy about the President's choice or the personality of a new Board member. Nor do I see any reason to attack the Board because certain of its functions have been eliminated by a decision of the U.S. Supreme Court.

There are, however, some realistic questions that we ought to ask each other and answer to our individual satisfaction before we vote.

The first question is: Is communism a menace to our way of life and our constitutional concepts of our individual freedoms and representative democracy?

I think I recall that the Senator from Wisconsin agreed in the course of colloquy yesterday that communism is a menace to our way of life and to our constitutional concepts. I am sure that that must be the case. I think I read him correctly. But if I am wrong, I stand now to be corrected on that particular interrogatory. Seeing only an affirmative nod from my congenial friend, the Senator from Wisconsin, I assume that, like the rest of us, he recognizes communism to be a very serious problem on the home front.

The second question is: Is it important that our free society find effective means for preventing world communism from achieving its goals?

Certainly communism has not changed its goals or objectives. Nor has it changed its methods insofar as its domestic attacks against us are concerned as well as its international objectives. So, it becomes today not only a creed against which we are arrayed in a costly war, but it also continues to be a serious menace to our way of life because of its internal activities in our country which emphasize the importance that we establish and maintain methods of meeting the menace of communism on the home front.

I think that question also has to be answered by Senators unanimously in the affirmative.

It was considered important 17 years ago. It should be considered even more important today, at a time when we are arrayed, for the fifth year, in a costly war against communism and at a time when our enemy, Vietnam, is able to continue its war efforts only because of the outside assistance it receives from the fountainhead of communism in Moscow, Russia. So, if it is that important on our foreign front, it must not be unimportant on the home front.

I submit it is therefore vitally important that we try to establish and maintain methods for meeting that challenge here. J. Edgar Hoover said not long ago—and he is our best authority on the whole program and problems of subversion—that he believes there are about 150 communistic front organizations in the United States, not publicly identified as Communist, not quickly discernible to the average citizen as being under the control of communism, but actually being under that control and enjoying Communist direction in the carrying forward the subversive programs of the Communist Party.

Hence, it seems to me that it becomes very clear that we must find some way to curtail and curb, as best we constitutionally can, the danger of Communist activities and intrigues at home, their programs of subversive activities, their capacity on occasion to infiltrate not only our Government but also a lot of other fine, reputable organizations, their current program—which is paying them big dividends—to send out undercover agents of the Communist Party as lecturers on the college campuses, to provoke and promote a Communist line without ever being forced to identify themselves, as members of the organization which they represent and which are actually very often Communist-front organizations. I, therefore, think we must accept the fact that it is important that we try to do something to curtail communism.

My third question for your consideration is whether it is appropriate that a free society such as ours find a means to protect its constitutional freedoms against the subversive attacks of the Communists?

It seems to me that we must accept as an axiomatic fact, in this wicked world, the concept that a free society must find ways to protect its freedoms against those who would undermine them, and that if there is any doubt about matters of relative priority and importance, it is more important that a free society find the necessary means to protect its institutions and the freedoms of its people, even, than to protect those who would undermine them from unfair and unjust prosecution in the courts of law. Fundamentally, unless we can find a way to protect our society from those who would destroy it, the destroyers are certain to succeed. I doubt whether anybody will argue against that point.

So that brings us to the fourth point: Will the Dirksen proposal, now before the Senate, move the United States in the direction of being better able to protect the United States on the home front against the attacks and strategies of international, aggressive, atheistic communism? Does it have any protective value?

If it has any value at all, if we accept the conclusions I have made to the first three questions and propositions, there should be a unanimous vote for the continuance, the maintenance, and the redefinition of the duties of the Subversive Activities Control Board as they are set forth in the Dirksen proposal.

I might say, as an original author of this proposal, which was first heard before a committee chaired in the House Committee on Un-American Activities by then-Representative Richard Nixon, and hence became known as the Mundt-Nixon bill, that Dick Nixon and I, as a couple of young, enthusiastic Congressmen, who felt that communism was a strong and growing menace, thought that the easy way would be to outlaw the Communist Party. We originally planned our legislation with that in mind.

Then, and I think for at least once in our lives, we acted wisely and with foresight, because we decided there must be people in Washington who knew more about the machinations of communism than we did. So we had a conference with J. Edgar Hoover and the people in the FBI, and proudly presented there our cure-all for communism. The FBI pointed out to us that they felt there was a better approach than to try to outlaw the Communist Party. They told us how our neighboring country of Canada had twice outlawed the Communist Party but had later twice rescinded the law, because Canada discovered quickly that to outlaw a movement by name was merely to give a false sense of security to the people, because the Communist Party dissolved, and a new party, operated, controlled, and directed by the same forces under a new and pleasant-sounding title, began its continuing program of subverting the freedoms of Canada under the covert direction of the Communist overlords in Moscow. So the Canadian Government found that to outlaw the Communist Party would not work.

The wise men of the FBI then told us there were other ways in which to proceed. They said, in effect, "Why not refine your legislation and follow other approaches?" We did precisely that in response to their counsel. The first and foremost is by exposure. Let our fellow Americans know who the Communists are. Let our fellow Americans know who the officers are. Let our fellow Americans know the identity of publications issued by the Communist Party. Above all, let our fellow Americans know the identity of the front organizations which the Communists control, to protect well-meaning Americans from being dragged into a Communist-front organization because its title sounds good and its announced purposes sound good.

Too many Americans contribute their funds and lend the use of their names as officers and directors and associates and members of Communist-front organizations, although they would not, for the life of them, actually join the Communist Party. But, to all intents and purposes, acting out of an abundance of ignorance, they join the crypto-Communist Party, they join the front organization, and their money and their funds and their names and their efforts are used to promote the infamous designs and the programs of international communism.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yeld?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. I wonder whether the Senator has any idea of the value that Government information would have had for the people in Hollywood in the 1940's, and how many people of that town became involved in organizations and became branded as members of subversive groups, when they were not and had not the slightest idea about the nature of the organizations they were joining. Many of them still suffer from such an unfortunate stigma.

The only way we have of avoiding this situation is through Government listings which provide a warning. They need not arrest anybody or close any offices, but merely post a warning sign to let the individual, the labor unions, the businessmen and the businesses know exactly where the problem is. Then if the individual chooses to associate himself with a doubtful group, he does so at his own risk. But at least he has a chance to know exactly where the pitfalls are and where these funds are going. This is the purpose, as I understand it, of the Subversive Activities Control Board.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is correct, and the experience of Hollywood and its actors and actresses of the motion picture industry is no whit different from what happens everywhere else.

In the hearings which preceded the House passage of the Mundt-Nixon bill, one of the witnesses who appeared before us was a very prominent woman jurist of this country, who had identified herself with 22 different Communist-front organizations. Her testimony under oath was that she had no idea that these pleasant-sounding organizations had any remote connection with communism.

Yet, the Communists were trafficking with her fine name to bring in and recruit new members and to get youth interested in Communist youth movements. Because this prominent woman judge had her name associated with so many of the Communist organizations, she was rendering a direct and significant service to godless communism.

May I bring in as a witness another gentleman from the past, Eric Johnston, of the American Motion Picture Association. We had had the cases of the "Hollywood 10," as the Senator from California will recall before our House Committee on Un-American Activities. Eventually, they were all publicized as members of the Communist Party, and most of them lost their contracts with Hollywood, and some of them went off to the Federal penitentiary.

So we called in Eric Johnston and said:

> What in the world is wrong with Hollywood? Why do you hire people like this? Why do you use this great American industry to pervert the minds of the American people and to spread the doctrines of Communism? We think you are guilty of a gross failure to maintain your public trust.

He said, and rightfully so:

> We have no mechanism in Hollywood to know who the Communist is. We have no way of telling, when we hire a man who belongs to a particular front organization, that he is actually a member of the Communist Party. If you would write a law which would give us a way to determine who they are, we would put in our motion picture contracts a clause of abrogation, whereby if it was discovered that somebody who had concealed a Communist connection from us was found to be a member of the organization or its sister organizations or its creature organizations, he would automatically violate his contract, and we would get rid of him.

Eric Johnston contributed greatly to the writing of the Mundt-Nixon Act, because we put in that clause, we put in that mechanism. So the first thing was to expose the identity of the organizations and, as much as we could, to expose the identity of the membership.

Next, we received a suggestion from the FBI that when those organizations are exposed, they should be publicized. Let the buyer beware. Let the joiner beware. Let the contributor beware. Let the good citizen beware that he was actually aiding and abetting the downfall of this Republic by joining an organization controlled and dominated by the Communists and dedicated to the success of communism.

So we provided for the publication of the Attorney General's list. After the Subversive Activities Control Board had held its hearings and had gone through its procedures, it was provided that a public list be made available so that any cautious and prudent citizen could write to the Attorney General's office and get a list of the Communist-front organizations.

A man gets a nice letter through the mail or a neighbor calls him on the telephone and says, "Will you join the Association for Good Will, Motherhood, Brotherhood, and Fatherhood?" We would have no reason to suspect it would be a Communist-front organization. But he could write in and find out because of the exposure provisions of the law.

So it was a question of identifying, a question of disclosing, a question of publicizing. And we cranked into the Mundt-Nixon bill only two items for curtailment of Communist actions.

We said that once you have ascertained that a man is a Communist in this country, he shall not be entitled to have a Federal job, and both he and his employer shall be subject to prosecution if through concealment or careless employment tactics he gets such a job.

The other prohibition was that he shall not be entitled to get a passport to travel abroad. Bad enough to have him spewing out the poisons of communism at home, but he could not get a passport to carry that noxious message to people overseas.

Beyond that, there were no prohibitions and no curtailments. It was legal for him to be a Communist.

Now, we are aware of the fact that this particular aspect of the matter ran into conflict with the Smith Act, as the Senator from Wisconsin has properly pointed out; because the Smith Act and Supreme Court decisions had held that to be a member of the Communist Party was in itself a crime, was in itself an indication that you were moving in a traitorous direction.

So Senator DIRKSEN very wisely has eliminated that problem by limiting the authority of the Subversive Activities Control Board to making investigations, to hold hearings, to arriving at findings whereby it says that such an organization, on the record, is Communist controlled.

There is no self-incrimination left in the bill—not in the slightest. This is a finding on the part of the Government, acting through its investigative agencies and with appropriate hearings, a finding that the organization is controlled by Communists. Then, it is up to Congress to decide if we want Communists in Federal jobs, and enjoying the privilege of a passport, which is not an inalienable right of an American citizen; it is a privilege accorded a good citizen who believes in our concept of freedom.

The Dirksen proposal will work and will meet constitutional objectives. In its finding the Supreme Court said it is true that a free society should have a right to move against communism but that was not the way because of the conflict between registration and disclosure and the provisions of the Smith Act.

Mr. President, that brings me to my final question. Do the people of the United States generally support and approve the idea that Congress should take legislative steps to protect our country against Communist activities on the home front?

I emphatically state that they do and I believe my good friend from Wisconsin is completely out of step with the times if he and those persons associated with him believe they do not. I think the people generally are demanding action. I get letters every day, as most other Senators do, saying that all are concerned about the Vietnam war; they say they recognize we are there because we have to do something about keeping communism from being victorious, but if so why do we not do something about it at home; and they ask if we sacrifice our treasure and lives in Vietnam, why not do something to curtail the activities of communism in the United States?

This is our chance on the homefront to back up the boys in Vietnam by doing something effective to set back the programs of communism here in the United States.

Let me point out that the Internal Security Act of 1950 was not easy to enact, because there were Senators and Representatives then raising the kind of nebulous criticisms we hear today and asking the old question: Is this the right way? Who knows? Who knows what is the right way or the optimum way? This is a way. This is an effective device; this is a tool that will work. It will not do the whole job, but this method has been tested and tried; it has been proved successful and effective.

The Internal Security Act of 1950 was made the pending business of the Senate on September 1, 1950. Debate began on the bill on September 5, 1950, and occupied the time of the Senate almost exclusively until it was passed a week later on September 12. This included 6 working days and nights of September 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, and 12. The debate alone took 349 pages of the Congressional Record at that time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point a table showing when the Senate met and adjourned in this debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. Young of Ohio in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The table ordered to be printed in the Record is as follows:

Sept. 5, 40 pages of debate, Senate went out at 8:51 p.m.

Sept. 6, 32 pages of debate, Senate went out at 5:40 p.m.

Sept. 7, 107 pages of debate, Senate went out at 7:41 p.m.

Sept. 8, 45 pages of debate, Senate went out at 8:14 p.m.

Sept. 11, 74 pages of debate, Senate went out at 11:29 p.m.

Sept. 12, 51 pages of debate, Senate passed the bill.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the bill finally was passed overwhelmingly on September 12, by a rollcall vote of 70 yeas and seven nays.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the rollcall of that vote, because many of our present Senators voted on the bill at that time.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Vote No. 431

Subject: Internal Security Act of 1950—(H.R. 9490). (Language of S. 4037 substituted for text of House bill.)

Synopsis: Vote on passage of the McCarran-Mundt-Ferguson bill to protect the United States against certain un-American and subversive activities by requiring the registration of Communist organizations and the confinement within constitutional limitations of disloyal and dangerous individuals. It strengthened the existing espionage and subversive laws, forbade Communists to hold Federal jobs, denied them passports and forced them to label their propaganda. Also, it tightened security checks on immigrants and permitted the jailing of deportable aliens. Included also was a provision relating to the picketing of Federal Courts.

Action: Passed.

The result was announced—yeas 70, nays 7, as follows:

Yeas, 70: Anderson, Benton, Bricker, Butler, Byrd, Cain, Capehart, Chapman, Chavez, Connally, Cordon, Darby, Douglas, Dworshak, Ecton, Ellender, Ferguson, Frear, Fulbright, George, Gillette, Gurney, Hendrickson, Hickenlooper, Hill, Hoey, Holland, Humphrey, Hunt, Ives, Jenner, Johnson of Colorado, Johnson of Texas, Kem, Kerr, Kilgore, Knowland, Langer, Lodge, Long, Lucas, McCarran, McCarthy, McClellan, McFarland, McKellar, McMahon, Magnuson, Malone, Martin, Millikin, Morse, Mundt, Myers, Neely, O'Conor, O'Mahoney, Robertson, Russell, Schoeppel, Smith of Maine, Sparkman, Thomas of Oklahoma, Thye, Tydings, Watkins, Wherry, Wiley, Williams, Young.

Nays, 7: Graham, Green, Kefauver, Leahy, Lehman, Murray, Taylor.

Not voting, 19: Aiken, Brewster, Bridges, Donnell, Downey, Eastland, Flanders, Hayden, Johnston of South Carolina, Maybank, Pepper, Saltonstall, Smith of New Jersey, Stennis, Taft, Thomas of Utah, Tobey, Vandenberg, Withers.

So the bill (H.R. 9490) was passed.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Senator from Wisconsin, since he has some skepticism about where President Johnson stands on this issue, that he was among those Senators voting "aye." His name will be found on the rollcall vote. Whether it is meaningful I do not know, but none of the seven Senators who voted "nay" are any longer Members of the Senate. Many of those who voted "aye" are still among us.

That proposal was a much more comprehensive measure than the one before us because it included elements that the Supreme Court has ruled out. The Dirksen proposal does not contain them, since it complies with the constitutional restrictions of the Supreme Court.

That was not the end of the fight because at 5 o'clock on September 22, 1950, the Senate took up H.R. 9490 once again because the President had vetoed the bill and the question was on overriding the President's veto. This time the debate was continuous.

Some of our colleagues mistakenly had decided to launch a filibuster against this right of the people to protect their freedom and themselves against communism. They organized a filibuster. I was one of the team of three Senators whose job it was to break the filibuster. Those were more rugged times. We did not delay and dillydally, with sessions, coming in and out, and trying to get a petition on cloture; we said, "Go ahead, if you want, and filibuster. We will stay here all night and all day and we can argue throughout the country what is the best course of action for the country in protecting itself and fighting against communism."

This debate occupied 113 pages of the Record. Attempts were made at about 6 a.m., 11:45 a.m., and later, to try to get unanimous consent to recess, meet the next day, send the matter to committee, and bring it back at another time. Objections were raised. We said, "This is a vital issue. Let us face it. Let us meet it and let us decide." We said, "Despite the President's veto, should we have this protection for ourselves, our families, and our country; or should we not have it?"

We were meeting then in the old Supreme Court Chamber, as many Senators will recall, because the ceiling of this Chamber was being refurbished. Debate had gone on continuously for 23 or 24 hours or longer. Senator Langer had the floor and he was filibustering against our bill. We used to talk in the well in that Chamber. Those of us sitting in the Chamber noticed that Senator Langer was weaving as though he were perhaps tired, ill, or sleepy, and suddenly he collapsed on the floor. It was about 5 a.m.

It looked as though he had passed away. Somebody with the presence of mind when that type thing occurs, or an emergency develops, called a quorum. We called colleagues who were perhaps having breakfast or who were sleeping in the cloak rooms, and they rushed up. Dr. George Calver was the Senate physician at that time and he came rushing in. He looked at the man on the floor. He pumped something into him which is good for a man who has diabetes and it was discovered later that the Senator had had a diabetic shock. They carried him out on a stretcher and the debate went on, but the hard core of the filibuster was broken by that collapse. Those of us who were trying to break the filibuster said it was a travesty on freedom that a good colleague of ours who did not want the act passed should engage in debate; to the point it brought him close to death.

We voted at 2 o'clock that afternoon. It was my privilege as the author of the bill to give the concluding speech. I found myself in the unhappy position of holding up the vote which we had been seeking to get by day and by night because Senator Cabot Lodge, of Massachusetts, was enroute to Washington by plane and was having difficulty getting into the airport. My job was to talk until he came in. When he came in the debate ended and we had a vote. We overrode the veto of President Harry Truman by a rollcall vote of 57 to 10 following that long filibuster. None of the 10 Senators who voted against the protection of America are any longer Members of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that the rollcall vote be printed at this point in the Record. The President's veto and the long filibuster had changed only three votes.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Vote No. 444

Subject: Internal Security Act of 1950—(H.R. 9490).

Synopsis: Vote on the passage of the bill over the objections of the President. This was the McCarran-Mundt-Ferguson bill which protected the United States against certain un-American and subversive activities by requiring registration of Communist organizations. The bill also contained authority under which the executive branch in time of internal-security emergency may cause the apprehension and detention of persons as to whom there is reasonable ground for belief that they probably will engage in espionage or sabotage activities. See veto message of President attached hereto which also contains copy of the bill as passed.

Action: Passed over veto.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 57, nays 10, as follows:

Yeas, 57: Bricker, Butler, Byrd, Cain, Capehart, Chapman, Connally, Cordon, Darby, Donnell, Dworshak, Ecton, Ellender, Ferguson, Frear, Fulbright, George, Gurney, Hendrickson, Hickenlooper, Hill, Hoey, Holland, Ives, Jenner, Johnson of Colorado, Johnson of Texas, Johnston of South Carolina, Knowland, Lodge, Long, Lucas McCarran McCarthy, McClellan, McFarland, McKellar, McMahon, Magnuson, Malone, Martin, Mundt, O'Conor, Robertson, Russell, Saltonstall, Schoeppel, Smith of Maine, Stennis, Taft, Thye, Tydings, Watkins, Wherry, Wiley, Williams, Young.

Nays, 10: Chavez, Douglas, Graham, Green, Humphrey, Kefauver, Kilgore, Leahy, Lehman, Murray.

Not voting, 29: Aiken, Anderson, Benton, Brewster, Bridges, Downey, Eastland, Flanders, Gillette, Hayden, Hunt, Kem, Kerr, Langer, Maybank, Milliken, Morse, Myers, Neely, O'Mahoney, Pepper, Smith of New Jersey, Sparkman, Taylor, Thomas of Oklahoma, Thomas of Utah, Tobey, Vandenberg, Withers.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this question the yeas are 57, and the nays are 10. Two-thirds of the Senate, a quorum being present, having voted in favor of its passage, on reconsideration the bill is passed, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I mention this solely because if there are those in this generation of Senators who are determined to filibuster this legislation, I, for one, propose to the majority leader that we do it all over again, that we have meetings around the clock, because the future of freedom is at stake. Let those who protest, those who dispute the desirability of the legislation, talk as long as they want to. We will be here. The formula that gave this legislation birth is good enough to give it an opportunity now to function in a constitutional manner. I seriously hope that it is not necessary at this time, but it has no appeal at all to me when I hear people say, "Well, let us delay the decision."

We can no more afford to delay a decision on this kind of contest on the homefront than we can delay an imperative decision to be made on the battlefield overseas.

When the time is here to decide, let us decide. Let us count noses. Let us have a rollcall. Let us stay in session around the clock and break the filibuster, if they want to filibuster it.

I certainly am not persuaded by the argument that because the Attorney General has not yet said he wants us to act, or because the President of the United States, has not made a speech in which he said he wants the act, we should delay our vote. I do not believe many Senators of this generation will be influenced by that, when they were not influenced by the veto message of another President 17 years ago. There were more Democrats who voted to override the veto than Republicans simply because of the unhappy circumstances that there were more Democrats in the Senate. But, this is not a party issue. This is not a question of having to wait until we get a message from Mount Olympus as to how we can vote.

My dear friend from Wisconsin is following a unique formula in this regard. I have served with him too long, and have admired him too much, not to know that he has never gotten up before and indicated he wanted to be a rubberstamp. I have seen the way he fights in the committee room and on the Senate floor for issues which he opposes, particularly on spending programs in which he is so much interested. I have never before heard him say, "I am not ready to vote. I have not heard from the White House." That is not in the tradition of progressive Wisconsinism which he represents so well in the Senate.

They are independent people in the Badger State. Our friend from Wisconsin here is an independent fellow. I think that we should undertake to convince him by consultation here, and not delay the Senate waiting for a telephone call from the White House which may never come.

I should add that on the rollcall to override the veto of President Truman 17 years ago, Senator Lyndon Johnson of Texas voted "aye." Thus, twice he has expressed himself in favor of this type of legislation.

The minority leader stated that he has it from President Johnson himself that he supports it. But, I submit to my colleagues—and with this I close—that these are dangerous and perilous times. We should come to our decision on this matter on the basis of the record of 17 years. We should make it up in terms of whether, in any way at all, the Dirksen proposal will help curtail the menace of communism at home.

Let me say to my good friend from Wisconsin that we can be sure whatever we do, however long we wait, however hard we solicit the counsel of the Attorney General, we can be quite sure that the Communists of America are going to take this into court, as they have taken every syllable, every sentence, and every paragraph of the International Security Act of 1950 into court. It will have to be adjudicated by the judges.

The Communists are determined people. I can recall when I lived at the Capitol Towers on Massachusetts Avenue, for 3 weeks I had to walk through picket lines that went all around the entrance to that apartment house simply because MUNDT lived there, and the legislation happened to bear my name, in part.

Communists are determined individuals. They will test it out in the courts. Our responsibility, it seems to me, in this tragic hour, is to do whatever we can to make whatever effort we can to provide some additional security against communism at home which, overseas, has compelled us to send 500,000 of the flower of American youth to fight and die to destroy the communism some are reluctant to move against today.

I know that their reluctance stems not from a love of communism but from some mistaken notion. I hope that this legislation does not leave the floor of the Senate until we can convince the vast majority of our colleagues that the notion of taking steps to protect ourselves internally against communism is a good, a useful, and a salutary notion.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. First, I want to congratulate the Senator from South Dakota on his usual very forceful and extremely persuasive speech. In my view, in the 10 years since I came to the Senate, I do not know of anyone, Republican or Democrat, who is as effective a debater, or as effective a speaker as the Senator from South Dakota. He always does a superlative job. Of course, in this area where he is certainly one of the outstanding authorities in the Nation, because he is the author of the Mundt-Nixon bill, he commands our respect and our attention.

Certainly, with a great deal of what the Senator himself has said, I think almost all of us will agree. I would agree, as I have indicated, that there is a Communist menace. I would say it is appropriate for a free society to find a way to protect itself.

The one question which bothers me most is the Senator's fourth question, and I think it is the real question before the Senate today; namely, will the Dirksen proposal better arm us to combat communism?

Mr. MUNDT. That is right.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from South Dakota may well be right, that it will better arm us. Maybe it will. Frankly, I do not say it will not. I say that I do not know. We are informed today of vigorous opposition to the bill by some of the outstanding constitutional authorities in this country, including three deans of great law schools, and including many of the distinguished constitutional experts from outstanding law schools in the Nation, telling us that the bill has serious constitutional defects—I just placed in the RECORD a telegram from this group of experts. Under these circumstances does it not seem fair that we should hold hearings on the bill, to have experts come in and testify and tell us why they think it has constitutional defects, and how we can correct those constitutional defects, in order to achieve an effective law which both the Senator from South Dakota and I want to achieve.

I say that, without having hearings, without having something like this on the record, we cannot possibly know whether this particular bill, which has not had a day, an hour, a minute of hearings. No witnesses, not one has appeared on this bill. If this bill still does not make the law conform to the Constitution, it will not do the job. If it is not constitutional it will not help us fight communism.

Mr. MUNDT. Let me say that the concept of the bill, in fact the language of the bill, had long and elaborate hearings 17 years ago by both Houses, and sustained debate in both Houses. We have the record of history to show that its mechanism worked effectively as long as it was permitted to work until the Supreme Court found a conflict of interest.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Let me interrupt there to say——

Mr. MUNDT. Between the Smith Act and the original act.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Let me interrupt at that point to say that despite the hearings held at that time, despite the debate that was conducted on the floor of the Senate, a mistake was made in not recognizing the clear conflict with the Constitution on the fact that the 1950 act and the 1940 act were in contradiction—that is, if we required a Communist to register, having already made it illegal for him to belong to a Communist organization, we would require him, in effect, to testify against himself.

Mr. MUNDT. But that is a misinterpretation of the——

Mr. PROXMIRE. I know——

Mr. MUNDT. We had not made it illegal——

Mr. PROXMIRE. It was illegal for him to advocate the violent overthrow of this country, or to belong to an organization which so advocated.

Mr. MUNDT. Illegal only insofar as the penalties were concerned, which were written into it, as well as the registration provisions. That was all. It was not a crime he registered that was how we built our constitutional case so far as his right concerning self-incrimination was concerned. But as to certain privileges enjoyed by the Senator and me, and millions of others, seeking to hold public office and get a passport, I suspect the Supreme Court pitched its case on that aspect. This was debated at great length by many constitutional lawyers, 17 years ago.

Suppose hearings were held for a week, a month, or a year. We would still have no way of predicting what kind of decision the Supreme Court of the United States is going to make on this or any other bill curbing the freedom of Communists, because they will take it into court and have it tested—as they have a right to do, and as they will do—because they are adequately financed and have available to them many brilliant lawyers in this country.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The hearings would not guarantee the bill emerging would be foolproof against a finding by the Supreme Court, but this would give us information which we do not have now on this particular bill. This bill represents a new departure from the 1950 act. It does not require registration, which was held by the Supreme Court as being unconstitutional. It requires identification. If we had the views of constitutional lawyers in 1 or 2 days of hearings, then I would be perfectly agreeable to having the bill reported back on a final date, with a vote on a day certain. I am anxious to have our eyes opened on this bill. Hearings can do that. I am sure the Senator from South Dakota will agree that this bill was rapidly drafted, and it did have errors, as the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] indicated, which have been corrected since then. My staff and I have found errors, which could be corrected by amendment, but they are errors.

This procedure of no hearings is not in keeping either with good legislative practices or with the traditions of the Senate. The bill may be declared unconstitutional, anyway, but, at any rate, we will be in a much better position to have a bill which will stand up in court if we have a record of some kind of hearings so we will have the most expert information we can get.

When some of the best constitutional authorities in the country say this bill has constitutional defects, it seems to me it is arrogant for the Senate to say, "We will not have any hearings. We will push it through." Not only is it arrogant, but it will not accomplish its purpose.

Mr. MUNDT. Would the Senator estimate what he would consider would be a long enough period of time to hear constitutional lawyers, who would be able to agree on any bill we wrote?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I would say if we could have two or three or four witnesses on one side and two or three or four witnesses on the other side, that would be agreeable. I earnestly hope the Attorney General will appear. He may not, but I think he should be asked to appear. I think he owes it to the Senate to tell us where he stands—not that he will enforce the law; of course he will; that is his job; but whether or not he has had a chance to read the legislation and have an opinion on it. When Mr. Yeagley appeared before the Appropriations Committee and was asked whether such a law as the Dirksen bill would revive the Subversive Activities Control Act, he said, "Let us take a look at the particular bill. We would have to analyze the law before we can say whether the bill will result in bringing any more cases before the board." That is what I am asking for, and all I am asking.

Mr. MUNDT. The mere fact that the Attorney General said to the minority leader that he would enforce the law and move under the law obviously answers the question whether there would be more cases brought before the board. Of course, there would be, because this law would enable them to be brought there. Now we have a sterile board because of the decisions of the Supreme Court. This law will give the agency an opportunity once again to move forward in presenting cases before the board.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think there is serious question whether or not he will move forward, depending on the interpretation of the letter; but, at any rate, he ought to have an opportunity to interpret the bill.

Mr. MUNDT. I interpret the letter as meaning that he would move forward.

One of the great advantages of a bicameral legislative system is that the type of concern which the Senator has expressed can be alleviated by the fact that this is not a final act. The bill will go before the House. The Senator can be certain that the House will hold hearings, because of the characterization and membership of the House Judiciary Committee. If there are any defects in the bill, they will be corrected. The Senator knows that even after hearings have been held, very frequently a bill comes to the Senate floor and a sharp-eyed critic like the Senator from Wisconsin or someone else says, "It looks like this is an error in construction." We do not get perfection here merely because there have been long hearings.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Let me say, on that score, that if the Dirksen motion to suspend the rules and put its bill on the appropriations bill had been effective, there would have been no hearings in the House. One of the principal reasons why I opposed that motion was that under the procedures followed there, there would be no hearings. Upon inquiry of the Parliamentarian, I learned that the bill would be referred to the House Un-American Activities Committee, and not the House Judiciary Committee. The Un-American Activities Committee might or might not have hearings.

Mr. MUNDT. How does the Senator know that?

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is the opinion of the Assistant Parliamentarian in the House. He may be wrong, but it is the best opinion we can get.

Mr. MUNDT. Did he make a public statement to that effect?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I asked him on the phone where the bill would go. He said it would be referred to the House Un-American Activities Committee. Of course, they may change their minds, but that was his opinion as of that time.

Mr. MUNDT. Normally, bills that we have here go to sister committees in the other body. I admit that the Parliamentarian is the Supreme Court over there. If he is committed to that, of course that is the final decision; but that does not alter my opinion that hearings will be held and they will be given a chance to change any language which they believe to be unconstitutional. We get these lawyers and judges, and they will not agree. I do not know that we will be any wiser. We will be a little older. We will be paying salaries for members of an agency which cannot work until we pass this bill. But that is the advantage of a bicameral system. I am for it. The Senator from Wisconsin is for it. Our favorable action will put the bill over there for consideration by the House.

Mr. PROXMIRE. This is a board which has done nothing for 20 months. I am not asking that the bill go over for a week of hearings. As a matter of fact, the hearings may last a day or two. But I am asking that the bill be reported back at a certain time, 10 or 20 days, or on a certain date. Then we will have no obligations at all other than to pass or not pass the bill. It is not my intention to filibuster the bill, but to call attention to some of the problems the bill raises. If we can have hearings on it, then we will have it in the proper tribunal, and outstanding authorities in the Nation can tell their views of it.

Mr. MUNDT. Is the Senator proposing that the bill go back to the Judiciary Committee for 3 or 4 days, to be reported back to the Senate on a day certain, with a time certain included for a vote?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes, with a final date

as to reporting it, and with a time certain for a vote after that. I would be agreeable to that. This does not bind any of those on this side, but I have talked with Senators who are of the same general view, and they would be amenable to that. The point is we want to be sure there will be hearings; that the bill will not merely go back to the committee and then come back. Then we would have some information.

Mr. MUNDT. That is a unique procedure. I would have to check with our Parliamentarian as to whether or not we can freeze the schedule of the Senate that far in advance, so that the Senate could bring the bill back Thursday, for example, and on Friday at 3 o'clock we would agree to vote. I am not sure that can be done by unanimous consent, but assuming it can be, that is a reasonable position—much more reasonable than trying to filibuster. Certainly, if we got the bill back without such an agreement, we would be in the same position as now, the Senator could filibuster, and nothing will have been accomplished.

I have spoken to rescue my friend from what I think is an untenable position. I like him. He is an effective Senator. I did not think he should be allowed to remain in that position.

I thank the Senator for his contribution.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator.

CALIFORNIA REAPPORTIONMENT RULING THREATENS SEPARATION OF POWERS

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, the October 16 edition of the Los Angeles Times contains an excellent article concerning the implications of a recent decision by the California Supreme Court. It was written by the Honorable Caspar W. Weinberger, a former California assemblyman, Republican State chairman and a distinguished practicing attorney in San Francisco.

Mr. Weinberger points out the threat to the traditional separation of powers between the executive, judicial, and legislative branches of our government posed by the California decision ordering our State legislature to reapportion California's congressional districts by December 7, 1967, or to accept a reapportionment plan to be imposed by the court.

I believe that Mr. Weinberger's excellent analysis will be helpful and applicable in broader areas, and I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Redistricting Ruling Was Bad," written by Caspar W. Weinberger and published in the Los Angeles Times of October 16, 1967, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REDISTRICTING RULING WAS BAD

(By Casper W. Weinberger)

The State Supreme Court's decision—ordering the legislature to reapportion our 38 congressional districts, backed up by the court's threat to write its own reapportionment law if the Legislature fails to act to the court's satisfaction by Dec. 7—seems to me to be a clear and flagrant violation of our historic doctrine of separation of powers.

It is of course far too late to argue with the U.S. Supreme Court's "one man, one vote" rule upon which our supreme court's rulings are based, and no one should criticize our court for following that U.S. Supreme Court decision.

But the vice of last week's rulings that it completely neglects the historic limitations that have been placed on the judicial branch of our government since its foundation. The courts are supposed to decide actual controversies brought before them by litigants, public or private. Courts may also "declare the rights" of parties in advance of completed transactions.

Thus, in the reapportionment controversy, no one could challenge a court ruling that a particular act passed by a legislature, or a Congress, apportioned in violation of the "one man, one vote" rule, was unconstitutional and void. Nor could anyone challenge a declaratory judgment by the court that any act by an unreapportioned legislature or Congress would be held void.

But that is a far cry from what our supreme court did in 1965 and last week, when in effect they said to the Legislature, "If you do not pass an act we find to be constitutional by the day we fix, we will order the statute we ourselves have written into effect."

The judicial function specifically, and for very good reason, does not and never has embraced the writing of statutes. By the same token, neither our governor nor our Legislature can decide lawsuits or write legal opinions.

The difference between a court holding unconstitutional a statute passed by an unapportioned legislature, and a court writing its own law and ordering it into effect, is vast.

Courts are supposed to interpret and pass on the validity and application of laws enacted by the elected-legislative branch. How can courts fairly or honestly interpret laws they write themselves? Who can then protect us against an unconstitutional court-written statute?

The Legislature is properly hedged about with numerous constitutional and other restrictions on lawmaking to ensure that there will be public notice, open hearings, three readings, majority recorded votes by the peoples' elected representatives, and many other safeguards which have come down to us from more than 600 years of parliamentary experience.

And the executive branch, as a further check and safeguard, has the additional duty to examine each passed bill and decide whether it is to be signed into law or vetoed, with a further right in the legislature to override the veto.

All of those carefully worked out safeguards and the collective policy decision only two months ago of 120 elected members of the Legislature not to reapportion on the basis of 8-year-old census figures, are now swept into discard by a court decision.

Court decisions quite properly should be above the ordinary criticisms to which policy decisions of our elected officials must be subject. Courts are, or should be, removed from the arena of policy making, and this, and their needed independence, are powerful safeguards which should always be preserved.

But when the courts themselves neglect to transgress the boundaries of judicial action, and start writing statutes, or threatening to do so, they not only subject these rulings to the same harsh criticism which is the fate of any policy decision, but they also endanger their proper role as protectors of the liberties of each of us.

The same special session which will shortly consider congressional reapportionment under the shadow and threat of a court-written statute, should also consider a constitutional amendment making it crystal-clear that the separation of powers doctrine, written into our federal and state constitutions from the beginning forbids a court from writing, or threatening to write statutes—just as it forbids a legislature from deciding, or threatening to decide, lawsuits.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR FILING REPORT OF COMMISSION ON URBAN PROBLEMS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on Senate Joint Resolution 112.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 112) extending the time for filing report of Commission on Urban Problems which was, on page 1, line 3, after "Housing", insert "and Urban Development".

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROTECTION OF FEDERAL FACILITIES SHOULD NOT BE LEFT TO LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, last Thursday, I informed the Senate, the Attorney General of the United States, and the Secretary of Defense that an attempt would be made this week to close the Oakland Induction Center in Oakland, Calif., as part of a nationwide protest movement against the draft. I asked the Attorney General, in a letter, whether the protesters were in violation of Federal law by the mere threat to shut down the Oakland Center, and I requested that Federal authorities take steps to prosecute violators of the Selective Service Act.

As you all know from press accounts, demonstrations did indeed begin yesterday in Oakland and in San Francisco, Los Angeles, Boston, Chicago, and other cities. In Oakland, 119 persons were arrested Monday by local and State authorities on a variety of charges ranging from trespass to blocking sidewalks. I am proud to say that the target of the demonstrations, the Oakland Induction Center, remained open for business and the same situation prevails today thanks to the vigilance and careful planning of the Oakland Police Department, the Alameda County Sheriff's Department, and the California Highway Patrol.

Mr. President, I remain puzzled by the apparent failure of Federal authorities to act in this matter. I have received no reply from the Attorney General, and I am informed by Oakland authorities that only a scattering of arrests have occurred under Federal charges. This has created a situation in which the sole protection of a Federal building has been left to local law enforcement agencies. I pointed out some time ago in a statement to the Senate that, if a similar situation should occur in a Federal building in Los Angeles, there are 22 Federal employees—U.S. marshals and deputy marshals—legally empowered to defend that building and the people working therein. The Armed Forces entrance and examining station in Oakland—the induction center—is deeded Federal property and houses other Federal agencies along with Selective Service.

It is not my place, nor my purpose, to question the operations of the Attorney General or his representative, the U.S. attorney for the northern district, and I certainly am not presuming to tell them their business. It does seem strange, however, that the burden of protecting a Federal installation in Oakland again has fallen upon local and State authorities. My judgment is that a more certain way of halting these shameful and deliberate efforts to disrupt the lawful activities of a Federal agency would be prompt—and I emphasize the word "prompt"—arrest and prosecution by Federal authorities.

I think that to permit this type of unlawful disturbance is shameful and, apparently, I am not alone in this view. I hold in my hand a piece of literature distributed by the San Francisco Committee for Draft Resistance. It is headed "End the War," and it calls upon readers to join resisting the draft. One paragraph of the message is particularly pertinent:

> We do not undertake this action lightly. We are keenly aware of the penalties which may be exacted for this action. Universal Military Training and Service Act, Section 12, Penalties: "Any person who . . . knowingly counsels, aids or abets another to refuse . . . registration or service in the armed forces . . . shall upon conviction in any district court of the United States . . . be punished by imprisonment for not more than five years or a fine of not more than $10,000 or by both."

My point is that even the draft protesters themselves evidently realized they are violating the Selective Service Act by their actions, and are prepared to suffer the consequences. I would hope that the Federal officials concerned in the Oakland case take these people up on their dare.

I think it is unbelievable that these peoples' acts should be allowed to fly in the face of the law of this great country without the slightest concern being shown by the proper Federal authorities. It is a bad precedent to permit this to be done. It has happened already too often.

We cannot continue to condone deliberate disobedience to the law in this country. I will be most interested to see whether the U.S. attorney in the northern district seeks prosecution of the individuals trying to close the Oakland Induction Center. I know that I speak for many concerned citizens in Alameda County and elsewhere in California who are as puzzled as I am over the apparent disinterest of Federal attorneys to follow through in these cases, leaving the burden of prosecution to local and State law enforcement officials. There is some feeling that prompt arrests and Federal prosecution of those who sought last year to close operations at the Oakland Army Materiel Center perhaps could have influenced the demonstrators today to obey the law. As the Oakland Tribune stated in a front-page editorial last Thursday:

> Any effort to occupy Federal buildings and to trespass for the purpose of preventing the functioning of the Selective Service System would be a violation of Federal and local law. The Attorney General of the United States and the United States Attorney for the Northern District of California should forthwith make plain that those who violate Federal laws will be prosecuted to the full extent of the law.

I wonder, Mr. President, whether Attorney General Ramsey Clark has issued guidelines for Federal district attorneys in the current wave of demonstrations against the draft. Do these guidelines include instructions for full prosecution of agitators and demonstrators? Has the Attorney General ascertained whether there is centralized leadership of these nationwide demonstrations against the draft? If so, does he plan prosecution under conspiracy laws?

The law-abiding citizens of California—who are forced to pay the costs of the police, the sheriff's deputies, the highway patrolmen, and other local and State law enforcement officers protecting Federal property—are curious over the position of the Attorney General and his representatives in these cases. So am I.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a copy of the front page editorial from the Oakland Tribune of last Thursday, together with a copy of the handbill to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Oakland (Calif.) Tribune, Oct. 12, 1967]

The Oakland Invasion

Our community is the target of various groups proposing illegal acts against Federal and local law on Monday, October 16.

The illegal action is not aimed at anything over which the City Council of Oakland or the Board of Supervisors of Alameda County has any control.

It has been proposed that the campus of the University of California be used as a rallying point and staging area for such action.

The target in this case is the Government of the United States. The appeal of the actionist groups is for those registered under the draft laws to "burn their draft cards" and to refuse induction into the armed services of the United States. This comes at a time when more than half a million American combat men are engaged in preventing Communist forces from taking over South Vietnam.

A mass failure of our induction system would mean the combat veterans already overseas would have to remain longer and could be denied essential reinforcements because of the lack of replacements.

Any effort to occupy Federal buildings and to trespass for the purpose of preventing the functioning of the Selective Service System would be a violation of Federal and local law.

The Attorney General of the United States and the United States Attorney for the Northern District of California should forthwith make plain that those who violate Federal laws will be prosecuted to the full extent of the law.

Any effort to block our city streets and sidewalks and prevent their use by citizens or vehicles carrying on their normal and lawful activities is a violation of local ordinances.

All such efforts should be prevented by the local law enforcement officials. Behind the city police in maintaining law and order stands the full power of the government of Alameda County, the State of California and if need be, the United States of America.

The overwhelming majority of our citizens will support the Constitutional authorities in maintaining law and order.

The advocates of the illegal action have stated their plans in the following language: "During the week of October 16–21, men and women from all over Northern California will converge on the Oakland Induction Center to physically shut it down. They will also spend much time organizing young people against the war and the draft."

Another publication urged men of draft age to "hand in your draft cards. Turn them back to the government."

This is what the proposed invasion of Oakland is all about.

No government, no free people, can permit these direct actionists to obstruct the due process of law nor to bring disorder to our streets.

The issue is law and order or anarchy.

[Handbill by San Francisco Committee for Draft Resistance]

To End the War

An ever growing number of young American men are finding that the American War in Vietnam so outrages their deepest moral and religious sense that they cannot contribute to it in any way.

We and others throughout the country, like the majority of Americans not among those called upon to offer our lives in Vietnam., share this moral outrage. We believe that any American citizen is morally bound and legally justified in exerting every effort to end this war, to avoid collusion with it, and to encourage others to do the same.

Therefore, we call upon all men of good will to join with us in the following statement, if they believe as we do that we must step forward at this time with those young men who are openly resisting an unjust military draft serving a disastrous military policy.

A CALL TO RESIST

The fundamental immorality and increasing brutality of our nation's course in Vietnam compels us to commit our lives to changing that course. No man's conscience belongs to the state. Responsibility lies with each of us. We who give consent by our own silence and inaction declare that the killing must be stopped. We stand with those young men who in the American tradition of civil disobedience refuse to submit to an unconscionable military draft. We ourselves are not eligible for the draft, but we publicly announce our individual and joint complicity in disobeying this law, along with the young men who are refusing the draft.

We do not undertake this action lightly. We are keenly aware of the penalties which may be exacted for this action:

Universal Military Training and Service Act, Section 12, Penalties: "Any person who . . . knowingly counsels, aids or abets another to refuse . . . registration or service in the armed forces . . . shall upon conviction in any district court of the United States . . . be punished by imprisonment for not more than five years or a fine of not more than $10,000 or both."

We explicitly encourage, aid and abet this civil disobedience and thus place ourselves in equal legal jeopardy with draft refusers. We cannot leave them to take the risks alone for what is the basic act of conscience in our time.

PARTIAL LIST OF INITIATING SIGNERS

Ben Seaver, George Leppert, Roy C. Kepler, Russell Jorgensen, Gordon Zahn, Philip Drath, Charles M. Stein, Julian A. Ripley, Jr., Jay Neugeboren, Gerald Wilsnack, E. John Lewis, Robert W. Brown, Theodore W. Keller, Paul Turgis, Clarence Rainwater.

William Sloan Coffin, Samuel R. Tyson, Alan Strain, George Reeves, Roland Finston, Paul Dickert, Alfred Williams, Paul Brink, Roger S. Lorenz, Mitchell Goodman, Jackie Stroud, John McClesny, Frances Zainello, Barbara Sinton, Wayne Richards.

Milton Mayer, Adrian Wilson, Robert H. Weir, Richard C. Strohman, David Newman, Ronald U. Landau, Laurence Moore, Barbara Howden, Virginia Brink, Dorothy J. Malasky, Elinor H. Stillman, Darel Baylor, Winnett Hagens, Isobel M. Cerney, Pat Garford.

Louis Sloss, Jr., Herbert Foster, Jr., Paul S. Seaver, John L. Levy, Archie Van Wyk, Steve Smith, Irene Baratoff, Elaine W. Schwartz, A. D. Schwartz, James M. Swan, Jo Anne Wallace, Ann Wood, Dan Due, Judith Ann White, Hollis A. Chenery.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF THE SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL ACT OF 1950

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2171) to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, so as to accord with certain decisions of the courts.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I believe that S. 2171 should be recommitted to the Judiciary Committee for full hearings and for a full inquiry on its relation to the statutory framework which it amends.

I seriously question the continued relevance of the Subversive Activities Control Board to the struggle against communism. The course of constitutional decision over the past 17 years has revealed the invalidity of some of the statutory provisions the Board is supposed to administer and has thrown others into serious question. In its 17 years of existence, the Board has not successfully registered a single individual or organization. It has not even met formally in over 20 months. The Board, in simple terms, does nothing, because it no longer has anything to do.

It was charged by the Internal Security Act of 1950 with the duty of requiring Communist-action organizations and Communist-infiltrated organizations to register as such. Certain sanctions could be applied. It was also charged with the duty of requiring members of Communist-action organizations to register when their organizations failed to do so after having been the subject of an order by the Board. After 17 years of testing, it is clear that key elements in this scheme are not permitted by the Constitution of the United States. As a result, the Board, which tried actively in earlier years to enforce the statutes that it was charged to administer, now does nothing.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] now proposes to revive this moribund agency. He would do so by turning it into a solely investigatory body. He tells us nothing, and there have been no public hearings to tell us anything, about how those investigatory functions would relate to the effective institutional framework we already have for investigating communism, which centers around the Federal Bureau of Investigation. He would revive the agency without answering or resolving any fundamental constitutional questions which have been raised by court decisions over the past 17 years. And there is substantial question about whether the SACB would in fact be solely an investigatory body if S. 2171 were enacted. The Internal Security Act contains a number of sanctions which the SACB would still be apparently free to impose on those whom it investigates.

These are all substantial questions. Senator DIRKSEN gives us the answer to none of them. He asks the Senate to have faith that his solution to the problem is workable and feasible. This is extraordinary. Our legislative system is premised on the idea of holding hearings and listening to the views of those who would be charged with administering the proposed legislation as well as those who would be affected by it. No reason is presented why we should depart from those principles on this occasion.

The present ineffectiveness of the SACB, and the serious question about whether it is worthwhile to save that agency in any form, might be illuminated by a discussion in some detail of the agency's efforts over the years to enforce the Internal Security Act of 1950, and a more detailed understanding of why those efforts proved to be fruitless.

I go into this, Mr. President, in some detail because I think it is important to have an understanding of the kind of legislation we are considering at the present time and because I played a role in the effort to enforce this act myself while I was Attorney General of the United States.

Let us look first at the litigation involving the Communist Party itself. In November 1950, after the Internal Security Act had been enacted over President Truman's veto, the Attorney General of the United States petitioned the SACB to compel the Communist Party to register as a Communist-action organization.

After two suits to enjoin the proceedings, both of which were dismissed, the Board held hearings on the petition. It finished those hearings in July 1952. It had taken 15,000 pages of testimony and had received 507 documentary exhibits. In 1953 it issued an order telling the Communist Party to register.

The issue then found its way into the courts again. In April 1956, 3 years after the Board's original decision, the Supreme Court reversed the Board's action on the ground that the Board had based its decision in part on the testimony of three witnesses who had allegedly perjured themselves in the proceedings, an allegation which the Government did not deny.

In December 1956 the SACB issued a modified order, basing its decision on an expurgated record which did not include the testimony of the three witnesses whose credibility had been questioned.

In 1958, the Board's order was reversed again, this time by the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia Circuit. The court said that the respondents were entitled to inspect the reports which four witnesses had submitted to the FBI. This ruling was the result of a 1957 decision of the Supreme Court in Jencks against United States.

As a result, the Board held further administrative proceedings, in which the FBI reports were made available. In February 1959, the Board issued a new order compelling the Communist Party to register, and after further litigation, the Supreme Court, in June 1961, finally upheld the Board's order.

Thus, after 10½ years of exhaustive examination and litigation, it was finally held that the Communist Party could be compelled to register. However, the Court held that the question of whether there was any constitutional problem in the registration process itself was premature. Attorneys for the Communist Party had argued that when individual officers of the organization came forth to register, they would be subjecting themselves to possible prosecution under a variety of laws including the Smith Act and the Internal Security Act, and that their coming forward would violate their privilege against self-incrimination as guaranteed by the fifth amendment to the Constitution of the United States. The Supreme Court said this question would be litigated and decided when the individuals acted in response to the order to come forth and register in behalf of the Party.

After 10½ years, then, a substantial question still remained about the validity of the process set out in the Internal Security Act of 1950.

At this point, I was Attorney General of the United States. During the years that followed, we made a conscientious effort to follow up on the Supreme Court's 1961 decision and to enforce the law enacted by Congress. As the years passed, it became more clear that this law raised fundamental questions of individual liberty which rendered it ineffective as a method of fighting communism.

In December 1961, for example, a grand jury indicted the Communist Party for failure to register, as it had finally been ordered to do under the Supreme Court's decision of the previous June. The party was convicted and fined $120,000. In 1963, the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit reversed this conviction, holding that it did in fact violate the constitutionally guaranteed privilege against self-incrimination for a natural person to have to come in and register the Communist Party as a Communist-action organization. I might add that Judge Bazelon had dissented to all the previous rulings of the Court of Appeals in the case on each occasion when it had upheld the Board's original order against the Communist Party—saying each time that the privilege of self-incrimination would be violated when individual officers of the party came in to register. Judge Bazelon's view, was, therefore, ultimately vindicated. In 1964, the Supreme Court denied certiorari in the case.

In 1965 a new trial was held, the Government contending that it had two FBI agents who were members of the party who were willing to register the party. The party was again convicted, and that conviction was reversed only this year by the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

Thus, after 17 years of litigation, the Communist Party still has not been compelled to register and there is serious doubt about whether it can ever constitutionally be compelled to do so.

We made other efforts to enforce the Internal Security Act as well. In March of 1962 two national officers of the Communist Party were indicted for failing to register the party when the party itself did not register. These indictments, however, were not pressed since the basic question of the Communist Party's obligation to register was still at issue. One of the defendants subsequently died, and in 1966 the indictment against the other was dismissed on the ground that a trial at that late date would not serve the sound administration of justice.

In 1962, we also petitioned the SACB to require 44 individuals to register as members of the Communist Party. This proceeding was brought under section 8 of the Internal Security Act, which provides that any person who is a member of a Communist-action organization ordered to register but failing to do so shall himself register with the Attorney General. All 44 of the individuals were ordered by the Board to register, and two of them appealed in test cases. In 1965, in the case of Albertson against Subversive Activities Control Board, the Supreme Court reversed, holding, as had been held in the Communist Party case earlier, that it would be a violation of these individuals' constitutional privilege against self-incrimination to be forced to register, since registering might possibly subject them to a variety of criminal penalties.

Thus, by the end of 1965, the whole registration process as it affected both the Communist Party and its members had been shown to be extremely doubtful according to established American constitutional principles.

Nor is this all. Between 1953 and 1956, the Attorney General petitioned the SACB to require the registration of 23 other organizations, 21 of them as Communist-action organizations, and the other two labor unions which the Attorney General alleged were Communist infiltrated. Another petition was filed in 1963, and another in 1966. Not one of these organizations has ever registered. Some are no longer in existence. In other cases, the courts ordered the petitions dismissed for a variety of reasons. One proceeding is still pending, and two or three other orders to register are apparently still outstanding, but nothing is being done to enforce them, apparently because there is so much doubt as to their constitutionality.

Mr. President, I have recited this history because I think it makes clear that the passage of time has explicitly demonstrated the irrelevance of the SACB to the fight against communism. What the Senator from Illinois is seeking to do, really, is to turn back the clock and ignore the constitutional history of the United States over the past 17 years. We must not countenance that, particularly when the way in which he proposes to do it is without any hearings or any inquiry by the standing committees of the Senate.

The privilege against self-incrimination has been the constitutional right relied upon in the court decisions up to now which have invalidated major portions of the Internal Security Act. However, other constitutional developments in the last 17 years have made it clear that the right of association under the first amendment is also relevant to the issue before us. That right is a far more explicit and better understood protection than it was 17 years ago.

Thus, in Bates against City of Little Rock, in a number of cases involving the NAACP, and in a number of decisions involving loyalty oath provisions in various States, it has become more and more clear that Government must be extremely careful when it seeks to investigate the associations which individuals choose to have. The first amendment protects the right of association as a facet of the right of free expression, and the courts have made it clear that any governmental activity which discourages individuals from free choice in their associations and in their choice or organizations will be looked at with great care. Thus, State governments have been held not to have the power to compel membership lists of organizations to be disclosed. And individual members of organizations have been protected in refusing to tell legislative investigating committees about the membership list of their organizations. If the SACB were to be given the power to investigate Communist-action organizations and Communist-infiltrated organizations, there would no doubt be serious questions under the first amendment about the procedure and substance of that power. Yet we have had no inquiry whatsoever about these questions.

Then, Mr. President, there are at least three other major constitutional questions about this legislation which I raised last week in discussing this problem on the Senate floor, and which after reviewing the debate, I find have still not been handled adequately by the proponents of the bill.

First. The definitions of "Communist-action" and "Communist-infiltrated" groups are the same as they were in 1950—these definitions raise serious questions about vagueness, about what groups are included and what groups are not. The Supreme Court's loyalty oath decisions have strongly suggested that vague definitions of "subversive" groups are not constitutionally permissible, because such lack of clarity discourages people from associating with legitimate groups. Yet section 782 of the act—which would not be affected by S. 2171—uses language of the most general sort.

Second. Although the Board's activities would be investigatory, there are a number of severe restrictions on members of tainted organizations which would apply once the Board made its determination of "Communist-action" or "Communist-infiltration." The groups themselves are denied tax deductions—their mail must be stamped—their activities are subject to heavy supervision. Thus, the Board still has functions which are inherently punitive—and which may well be a violation of the privilege against self-incrimination. In addition, the increased protection given political associations by the Supreme Court in recent years makes this kind of government supervision open to serious doubt under the first amendment.

Finally, the self-incrimination problem may be greater under this bill than under the existing act. What happens if an individual refused to answer political questions before the Board? Can he be punished for contempt? Is failure to testify evidence of subversive activity? If the Board's final determination results in severe restrictions on groups, is this not a use of investigatory power to punish?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. As I understand the Senator from New York, who is the former U.S. Attorney General and who had, I understand, the responsibility for enforcing the act that was on the books, the act that the proposed legislation would amend, he is contending that the definition still in the law, untouched by the Dirksen proposal, the definition of Communist front is so vague that there are serious constitutional problems in connection with it. Is that correct?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Yes, I might say to the Senator that the two definitions of "Communist action" and "Communist infiltrated," the vagueness of which undoubtedly had some effect on the court in throwing out the sections of the act which it has passed upon—and also accounted in part for our lack of success in the executive branch of the Government in administering the 1950 act—those same terms are left in the law by the Dirksen bill, and they still raise serious constitutional questions.

The matter will go back to the Supreme Court and in my judgment it will receive the same treatment that the act has received over the last 17 years.

I think we are going through a charade here. Everybody can come in and vote for the act and go back to his constituents and say, "We scored a major victory against communism." But we will not have done anything like that; we will not have advanced one step against communism, or subversion, or espionage. We would be deceiving the people and we would be deceiving ourselves when we say we have taken the step.

We know the act will be challenged and we know that the Supreme Court will very likely throw it out, as it has done in the case of sections of the law now on the books. This law has not helped us to advance in the last 17 years in connection with subversive activities, and if this legislation is passed, we will still not have taken a step forward. We will be standing still.

It seems to me that it makes much more sense to follow the procedure suggested by the Senator from Wisconsin: Let us see what the problem is and then establish a board that can do something worthwhile. This proposed legislation is not going to get us anywhere. We will not go one step forward but we will perhaps deceive ourselves that we have done something.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The contention by the proponent of the bill and other Senators that this legislation would simply bring the Internal Security Act of 1950 into conformity with the Albertson decision is not true, at least not in the judgment of the Senator from New York, the former Attorney General, who has had great experience under the law which is now on the books; and this would not achieve that objective because the definition of at least two terms——

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. "Communist action" and "Communist infiltrated."

Mr. PROXMIRE. The terms "Communist action" and "Communist infiltrated" are the same and these would still raise serious constitutional questions of vagueness.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Absolutely.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The second point, I understand, is that the act still permits heavy Government supervision of organizations found to be "tainted," and the Senator indicates that this very likely violates the first amendment freedom of association which the Supreme Court has spelled out in recent years.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The third point is that we may have, under the Dirksen proposal, a law, if this is enacted, which raises even more serious problems under the fifth amendment self-incrimination protection of the Constitution than the present law that was declared unconstitutional.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. That is correct. It seems to me that that is true, and as I have said, I had a good deal to do with this matter. This was a critical matter in 1961. We had studied it carefully in the Department of Justice and we wanted to move ahead on it because we thought that after the lengthy hearings and debates that had taken place in Congress we should follow up on it. The matter was pursued vigorously and energetically. But the legislation was thrown out, and all of our efforts to get the Communist Party and the heads of the Communist Party to register were dissolved.

It seems to me that if we enact this bill, we will be starting to go through all of that all over again after 17 years. It does not make sense to do the same thing over and over again when it does not get us anywhere.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from New York is building a devastating case. As the former Attorney General, he is the only man in the Senate who has had experience enforcing the act, and he is telling us that the bill before the Senate has serious constitutional defects.

We have a telegram which I placed in the RECORD earlier wherein 37 law professors, including three deans of great law schools, state that the bill, S. 2171, contains serious constitutional defects. No hearings have been held on the bill. We have not had a single constitutional expert testify on the record who can tell us whether or not this legislation may conform with the Constitution. We do not have any argument pro or con. We have no committee report that is really a committee report. We have a one-page declaration of what the bill would purport to do, but we have no analysis whatsoever.

On this basis it seems to me that the analysis of the former Attorney General, the Senator from New York, would compel any Senator, whether he is for or against the legislation, whether he is for the same objectives as the Senator from Illinois and others, to say, "Let us get to work on it to see what we want to do."

As the Senator said, it may be another 17 years in which nothing is accomplished.

We have an idle Subversive Activities Control Board which has done nothing for 20 months, has held no hearings for 20 months, and it may be idle at the taxpayers' expense indefinitely. Is that correct?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. That is correct.

I might say it is my strong feeling—and this is my judgment based on my experience—that this bill raises serious problems. It seems elementary it would also be the judgment of the present Attorney General. My feeling is that he would agree with me. It seems to me at least worthwhile, even if it were only for a couple of hours, to call him and see what he thinks. Would he, in fact, be able to operate with this bill? What steps would he contemplate taking under this legislation? Can he take any steps?

Mr. PROXMIRE. This is the heart of the whole matter, because if he cannot take any steps, the bill accomplishes nothing at all.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Not only that, but we deceive ourselves to think that we have done something about the problem and cause our constituents to think we have taken a step with respect to what many Senators and Representatives think is a problem in this country. We would go to the American people and say that we have dealt with the problem, but we have not.

I think we should examine this and make a judgment as to whether or not this legislation would advance the struggle against internal communism and deal with this problem, or whether it in fact accomplishes nothing at all.

My judgment is that it would not accomplish anything at all and that it is a step backward because we think we have done something and we have not.

Mr. President, on the point that the Senator from Wisconsin made, in view of all of these difficulties it is not surprising that a distinguished group of law professors has publicly announced its opposition to S. 2171. As I understand the statement of the Senator from Wisconsin, the telegram that this group of professors sent to Attorney General Clark has been placed in the RECORD. Is that correct?

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct. I also identified some of these gentlemen who are distinguished constitutional authorities.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I know many of these faculty members personally. I can tell the Senator, from personal experience, they are not only a distinguished group, but, in fact, a rather conservative group.

Prof. Louis Loss of the Harvard Law School, for example, is one of the leading experts in the country on securities laws, on the SEC and the question of registration of securities.

Father Drinan, the dean of the Boston College Law School, is both a respected and conservative figure whom I have known personally for many years. Benjamin Kaplan of the Harvard Law School is one of the leading experts in the Nation on our Federal courts and on copyright law. Louis Jaffe of the Harvard Law School, Walter Gellhorn of Columbia Law School, and Nathaniel Nathanson of Northwestern University Law School are three of the leading experts on Federal administrative agencies. Paul Bator and Clark Byse of the Harvard Law School are also experts in that field. All of these men could testify about whether the SACB contributes significantly to the administrative process. Norman Dorsen of New York University Law School is the director of the Arthur Garfield Hays civil liberties program. Indeed, Mr. President, every member of this distinguished list of 31 law professors is nationally known in some field of law or another.

I urge the Senate to take the advice of these distinguished men and recommit S. 2171 for further examination and inquiry. We should not enact legislation on a matter so vital and so intimately related to individual liberties and our internal security without the most careful kind of scrutiny.

This is felt by the Senator from Illinois to be a major piece of legislation, that it is extremely important. However, it does not seem to me to make any sense to rush this through when we have gone 17 years without having any kind of decent Board. Should we pass this legislation, we might go another 17 years before we decided other legislation should be enacted. Therefore, why not have hearings for a couple of weeks, make a careful judgment as to whether we are moving in the right direction, make a determination whether the legislation we might enact is constitutional, and make a determination whether the Attorney General feels that this would be helpful, looking to what the Federal

Bureau of Investigation is doing and what it will continue to do.

All of these things could be examined in a relatively short period of time. We could get some legislation passed if it was felt to be necessary and move in the right direction, but we should not pass legislation which will mean in the last analysis, that we are standing still. In fact, I might say to the Senator from Wisconsin that, in my judgment, this would be a step backward because it will be so obvious that there will not be anything that can possibly be done under the legislation that is being proposed by the Senator from Illinois that will not be done or cannot be done otherwise. It would be, really, deceitful for the Senate to pass this legislation.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it not true that there was specific information which would have been required under the old Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, which is no longer required because of the Supreme Court decision, and would not be required under the Dirksen bill? I am going to indicate here and will ask the Senator from New York, as a former Attorney General, whether in the absence of this information it is not true that the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Justice Department would be in as strong a position to cope with the internal Communist menace without the Dirksen bill as it would be if the Dirksen bill were to be passed.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Without any question. When I was Attorney General, we did not receive, to my knowledge, one piece of information from the Subversive Activities Control Board in connection with communism in the United States that we had not uncovered in other ways. Not one piece of information while I was Attorney General.

Mr. PROXMIRE. While the Senator was Attorney General, there was not a single piece of information that came from the Subversive Activities Control Board—not a name, not an identification or a Communist-front group—no information that was of any value in combating communism.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. That we did not have already from other sources, or that was not available to us already from other sources. Not one piece of information.

Mr. PROXMIRE. If registration had worked, it might have had, as I understand it. Of course, it did not work because it was held unconstitutional by the Court—but the law might have produced names and addresses of officers and organizations at the time of filing for 12 months previous to the filing, with the titles of officers and their duties—but none of this would be required under the Dirksen bill; is that not correct? Of course it was not made available under the Subversive Activities Control Act because the registration provisions of that act were in contradiction to the Constitution.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. The Senator is correct. Of course, so far as the Government's having that information is concerned, we already had it. A substantial number of the members of the Communist Party or Communist Party front organizations now are members of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. So far as getting names and addresses, we have that information.

Mr. PROXMIRE. An accounting of all funds——

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Let me interrupt there to put this in perspective. We know that the great problem is espionage and sabotage. That must be continuously watched in the United States. The case which was uncovered in the past couple of weeks, and which appeared in the newspapers in the last several days, came from the defection of an individual or group of individuals from the Soviet Union espionage team. That is the way we receive, basically, our information, as well as the investigative work of the Federal Bureau of Investigation; of course the FBI works on sabotage and espionage in the United States. No one should deceive themselves that important information on that has come from the Subversive Activities Control Board in the executive branch of the Government, because it has not.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Then the Senator is saying that the names and addresses of all organizations, and so forth, were available to the Federal Bureau of Investigation and were available to the Department of Justice. They knew about it. They had the information. There was not one bit of information that came in fact——

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Let me say nothing ever did come.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Ever did come. All right. Cannot come under this law, because the Dirksen bill would not require this information to be made available. In the second place, the accounting of all funds received, including from whom received and how spent, for 12 months prior to filing.

This additional information is important because it is of great value to know where the money is coming from to finance Communist activity and subversive activity in the country. Again, such information would have been required under the 1950 act, but it will not be required under the Dirksen bill, if the Dirksen bill be passed. So we cannot pretend that we are going to get this information under any circumstances.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The third is a list of all members of Communist action organizations. Once again, we will not get that information.

Fourth, the aliases of those who are required to register.

Finally, a list of the printing presses and machinery for reproduction of materials.

What I am getting at is: to the extent that the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 would purport to provide information, the information required would have been useful—useful, at least, in the eyes of some. But such a requirement has been largely negated by the Supreme Court. The Dirksen bill, however, does not even attempt to restore such a provision. So the notion that we will have all kinds of relevations about domestic Communist-front organizations or about active Communists who are subverting the Government is erroneous, because the Dirksen bill will not even attempt to secure much of this information.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. The Senator is correct. For someone who does not want to do anything, the job of Commissioner is a nice one to fill at Government expense. If the Subversive Activities Control Board had anything to do, the position would be useful. But if extra money is lying around, and the administration desires to furnish jobs, the positions are nice ones to fill at Government expense. But so far as doing anything good under the legislation suggested is concerned, the Board does not do anything.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The remarks of the Senator from New York are most valuable. I am most interested to know that, in the judgment of a former U.S. Attorney General, this legislation will literally accomplish nothing except preserve an unemployed Subversive Activities Control Board—permit it to continue to provide five $26,000-a-year sinecures for literally doing nothing. The bill will not help us in the least to fight communism at home or abroad.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. If I were still Attorney General and were asked to testify in answer to the Senator's question, I might say that I would hope to use such information, but could not use it under the Supreme Court's decisions. If I were to testify before a congressional committee in answer to such a question, I would have to say that to continue the existence of the Board would be a waste of the Government's money.

I cannot speak for the present Attorney General; he is an able man and can speak for himself. But to learn whether he has the same reaction would be valuable information.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The statement of the Senator from New York is most vital to the debate. He, as a former Attorney General, has said he would not be able to bring an action before the Subversive Activities Control Board and, therefore, would not be able to revitalize the Board under the bill. This is important testimony, because the Senator from New York is the only Senator who has had actual, direct, practical experience in this area.

Under the circumstances, it seems to me that it should be mandatory that we have hearings to ascertain from the present Attorney General whether his judgment is similar to that of the Senator from New York. If it is, then the law would have to be changed, and changed rather drastically. If it is not his judgment, we ought to know it.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COLUMBUS DAY SPEECH BY SENATOR ROBERT C. BYRD TO THE WEIRTONIAN LODGE OF THE ORDER OF ITALIAN SONS AND DAUGHTERS OF AMERICA, WEIRTON, W. VA.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on Saturday, October 14, I delivered a speech by telephone to the Weirtonian Lodge of the Order of Italian Sons and Daughters of America. I ask unanimous consent to insert that address in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLUMBUS DAY SPEECH BY U.S. SENATOR ROBERT C. BYRD TO THE WEIRTONIAN LODGE OF THE ORDER OF THE ITALIAN SONS AND DAUGHTERS OF AMERICA

Mr. Grossi, Judge Pryor, Judge McClure, Mayor Rybka, Mr. Sinicropi, my good friends of the Weirtonian Lodge of the Order Of Italian Sons and Daughters of America, ladies and gentlemen: I deeply regret that I cannot be with you in person tonight, but I want you to know that I am with you in spirit, and I am glad that this telephone link between us makes it possible for me to speak to you.

When I accepted the very kind invitation of Mr. Mike Sinicropi, I did so in the belief that by this date Congress would have reached adjournment. But it has not, and the pressure of my work made it impossible for me to leave Washington today. I shall have to work here tomorrow to catch up.

But I salute you tonight at a distance, sharing your pride in the knowledge that since the first days of our nation—in fact, since the first discovery by white men of our land—the heritage of America has been inseparably entwined with that of Italy.

Columbus Day is an appropriate time for us to remember that our national debt to the Italians began long before there was an America. As the heirs of Western Civilization, we were also the heirs of the Italian culture which has made so great an impact upon that civilization.

Galileo's telescope was the beginning of much of modern scientific progress, and his pendulum is the principle that made possible the clock and the watch. The research and scientific method of Leonardo da Vinci was far beyond his time, and provided the basis for many other scientists in their quest for knowledge of the world about us.

Although centuries of art have followed them, Raphael, da Vinci, Cellini, Donatello, Michaelangelo, della Robbia, and Botticelli are still the unquestioned masters. The history of art since their time has grown from them, but has never replaced or challenged their position.

The shock and horror with which the whole world viewed the danger and damage to the masterpieces of Florence is witness to the place of Italian art in the world of today. People who had never been to Italy, as well as the thousands upon thousands who had stood before these masterpieces, including many West Virginians, were as concerned about the future of the treasures as they would have been had the tragedy occurred in their own city. Money and experts came from all over the world to help preserve and repair them.

The music of Verdi, Rossini, Puccini, and the countless other Italian composers is ours also. The treasure of world literature is richer by far from the contributions of Petrach, Dante, and Bocaccio.

It was Christopher Columbus who provided the tie between the old civilization and the New World. When he returned to Spain and told of this new land, which he believed to be an unexplored part of Asia, the news spread like a prairie fire. The Italians were among the first to follow Columbus.

Amerigo Vespucci explored the coast of South America only seven years after Columbus, and he was among the first to advance the theory that this was not a part of Asia, but a new and unexplored continent. His writings made such a stir in Europe that a German cartographer named the new land after him on a map he was making. The name, of course, has remained with us as a reminder of the explorer.

John Cabot, whose real name was Giovanni Cabota, sailed for the King of England to explore the mainland of the North American continent. Giovanni da Verrazano explored the coast of North America in the early 1500's, from Cape Breton Island to the Carolinas, and in the process discovered New York Bay.

The exploration of the west, although many may not know it, was led by Italians, also. Allessandro Malaspina was the first white man to explore Alaska, Vancouver, and the coast of California. Fra Marco da Nizza led Coronado's expedition through the west and as far east as what is now Kansas.

The concept of liberty, justice and equality brought many Italians to these shores. A number of settlers had arrived long before the first rumblings of independence; there were Italians building a glass factory in Virginia before the Pilgrims landed in Massachusetts, and Italian Colonies were flourishing in Georgia, Florida, Delaware, New York, and elsewhere, before the Revolution.

But when the spunky little colonies defied the greatest empire of the day and declared themselves independent, several hundred Italians, fired by the ideas of liberty and equality, fought and died in the Revolution that made the American dream a reality.

When the fate of our Northwest territories, the land that is now Michigan, Illinois, Wisconsin, Indiana, and Ohio, hung in the balance and was in danger of falling to Canada, an Italian fur trader saved the day. Francesco Vigo provided the money and the information which enabled General George Rogers Clark to emerge victorious at *Vincennes* in 1779.

The Italian Americans, since our beginnings as a nation, have been among the most patriotic of our citizens. They have served with distinction in our wars, and were among the fiercest patriots even when the nation was at war with Italy. In 1941, the Italian-American newspapers were among the first to condemn fascism and give their overwhelming support to America's war effort.

More than 400,000 Italian Americans served in the armed forces during the war. Many of them fought in the bitter Italian campaigns and a large number remained in the land of their parents as war casualties.

In 1944 Sergeant Peter J. Dalessondro, his unit under heavy bombardment, moved to the front, where he covered the withdrawal of his men. Surrounded and armed only with grenades, he maintained his position and called by radio for fire closer and closer to his station. His last words were directing mortar fire on his own position.

Sergeant Dalessondro's story is but one of the many in the military history of World War II involving the bravery and devotion of Italian American soldiers. At least seven of them have received the Congressional Medal of Honor.

Italian Americans have been outstanding in nearly every area of business and in all the professions. Many have entered public life and served their nation, state or city with distinction. Who can ever forget Mayor Fiorello La Guardia of New York?

Since La Guardia's time, Italian Americans have been mayors of a number of our major cities. Several Senators, Governors, and a host of members of the House of Representatives are of Italian parentage. And no Senator is held in greater esteem and respect than is the distinguished and brilliant senior Senator from Rhode Island, John O. Pastore. One, Anthony J. Celebrezze, himself born in Italy, became a member of the President's cabinet as Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The outstanding thing about each of these men and the tremendous number of their countrymen who have chosen the United States as a home, is not that they are Italians, but rather that they are Americans. They are among the finest citizens we have known, bringing with them the best of their heritage and the richness of their traditions and this has been so in Weirton and in every other West Virginia community.

It is the heritage of our proud land that none of us can say "I am English" or "I am Italian". We can only say "I am an American" and know that that makes us a little bit of every land in the world. For our traditions and customs, even our language and our culture, have drawn from the whole world. We have worked together to weave together a nation from all these threads. And we have succeeded.

In the spirit of this day, may I close by quoting the poem titled "Columbus":

"COLUMBUS

"Behind him lay the gray Azores,
Behind the Gates of Hercules;
Before him not the ghost of shores,
Before him only shoreless seas.
The good mate said: 'Now must we pray,
For lo! the very stars are gone.
Brave Admiral, speak, what shall I say?'
'Why, say, "Sail on! sail on! and on".'

" 'My men grow mutinous day by day;
My men grow ghastly wan and weak.'
The stout mate thought of home; a spray
Of salt wave washed his swarthy cheek.
'What shall I say, brave Admiral, say,
If we sight naught but seas at dawn?'
'Why, you shall say at break of day,
"Sail on! sail on! and on!" '

"They sailed and sailed, as winds might blow,
Until at last the blanched mate said:
'Why, now not even God would know
Should I and all my men fall dead.
These very winds forget their way.
For God from these dread seas is gone.
Now speak, brave Admiral, speak and say'—
He sayd, 'Sail on! sail on! and on!'

"They sailed. They sailed. Then spake the mate:
'This mad sea shows his teeth tonight.
He curls his lip, he lies in wait,
With lifted teeth, as if to bite!
Brave Admiral, say but one good word:
What shall we do when hope is gone?'
The words leapt like a leaping sword:
'Sail on! sail on! and on!'

"Then pale and worn, he kept his deck,
And peered through darkness. Ah, that night
Of all dark nights! And then a speck—
A light! a light! at last a light!
It grew, a starlit flag unfurled!
It grew to be Time's burst of dawn.
He gained a world; he gave that world
Its grandest lesson: 'On! sail on!' "

—JOAQUIN MILLER.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF THE SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL ACT OF 1950

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2171) to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, so as to accord with certain decisions of the courts.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the only response I have heard, from those who support the proposal before the Senate, to our charge that there have been no hearings on this measure, has been that we do not really need hearings, because there were extensive hearings on the parent legislation, back in 1950, before the Committee on the Judiciary. It is said that we know plenty about what the problem is, and it is simply a matter of making the statute conform to the decisions.

One of the answers to that view, of course, was given by the distinguished former Attorney General of the United States, the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], when he pointed out that there would still be three specific constitutional defects in the law, should the Dirksen bill become law, which defects would make it impossible, in his judgment, for the Attorney General to use the law to take any action against domestic Communists.

I am informed that the Supreme Court has decided more than 100 cases involving subversives since the enactment of the Internal Security Act of 1950. We know that whether one believes that the Constitution is a living document, and changes, or not, certainly those decisions have enormous importance in terms of drafting a law that will conform with the Supreme Court's constitutional interpretation.

Yet we have, as I have said, no record at all. We have not had a single day, not a single hour, of hearings, nor a single witness who has testified on this bill, to indicate whether or not it is in conformity with the law as interpreted by the Supreme Court more than 100 times since the enactment of the Internal Security Act of 1950.

Yesterday, Mr. President, in concluding my remarks, I pointed out that there have been many other changes in the world which could very well have had a profound impact on the threat of communism, and the nature of the Communist threat, since 1950. In 1950 it was recognized that any foreign influence on the Communist Party of the United States would come from Moscow. I think that was probably true then; and that the prevalent conclusion at that time that the world revolution was being directed monolithically from Moscow was sound.

However, as I think all of us recognize, many things have happened in the world since 1950 to change that situation. Communism is no longer monolithic. It is certainly as threatening, in my view; and, with the war in Vietnam, we know how damaging it is to our interests in the Far East. But it is exactly the developments in the Far East that indicate how enormously the world situation has changed since 1950.

As I stated yesterday, Roger Hilsman, the former Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, stated, in testimony before the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Pacific and the Far East, in 1966, that the Sino-Soviet split is "one of the most portentous international political developments of our time."

The real threat to world peace now, as Vice President HUMPHREY observed in a speech Sunday in Doylestown, Pa., is "militant, aggressive Asian communism, with its headquarters in Peking, China. The aggression of North Vietnam is but the most current and immediate action of militant Asian communism," the Vice President told his audience.

Vice President HUMPHREY's words were even more emphatic than those of the Secretary of State, whose press conference remarks last week are now being widely discussed. Secretary Rusk warned of the threat of a billion Chinese armed with nuclear weapons.

Communist influences in the underdeveloped nations have been anything but monolithic. On the contrary, the story here is one of fierce and brutal competition between the Chinese and the Soviets.

Che Guevara may be dead, but it is too soon to write off the virile influence in Latin America of the Maoist revolutionary doctrine to which he subscribed and which he practiced. Che and his mentor Mao preached immediate and violent revolution. The Cuban revolutionary influence throughout Latin America, if it looks to any capital outside Havana, looks to Peking, more than Moscow.

Africa—a continent one top ranking Chinese Communist described after a visit there as "ripe for revolution"—is also a battleground between the Moscow and the Peking brand of communism. The record here hardly provides any evidence of a monolith. Rather, the Communist influence where it exists in Africa has, as in Latin America, been indelibly branded by the split in the Communist world. The Asian-African People's Solidarity Organization has been one of the battlegrounds. The aggressive efforts of the Chinese to take control over it has resulted in its decline. And there are countless places where the Chinese Communists have provided a helping hand to revolutionary movements in Africa. They have trained and supplied nationalist revolutionary movements in Portuguese Africa, according to our State Department. They had an influence—albeit a small one—on the revolution in Zanzibar. It was the Chinese Communists to whom the revolutionary African Party for Independence in Senegal owed its allegiance. And again, according to our State Department, the Chinese have made promises to build a $300 million railway between Tanzania and Zambia in effort to establish a beacon that will build confidence among Africans in the efficacy of Chinese Communist aid.

Mr. President, in any event I think that all of my colleagues would be wise to ponder this language about the so-called monolithic worldwide Communist movement which is the basic question, and the Dirksen bill would not change it. It would still paint the picture of a world which does not exist despite the fact that we all know the situation has changed dramatically. After all, the Dirksen bill reiterates the findings expressed in subsections 1 through 15, findings about communism made in 1950, 17 years ago. These findings in section 2 of the act are only modified in the Dirksen bill by adding the following subsection 16:

> (16) The findings of fact contained in paragraphs (1) through (15) of this section are reiterated. Recent court decisions involving the registration provisions of this Act make it necessary to enact legislation to accomplish the purposes of such Act without the requirements of registration. Disclosure of Communist organizations and of the members of Communist-action organizations as provided herein is essential to the protection of the national welfare.

What the Dirksen bill attempts to do is really a cut and paste job by taking the 1950 act and deleting every reference to registration and trying to make the correction so that the Supreme Court's ban on registration will still keep the bill alive. But what it does, as the former Attorney General, the present junior Senator from New York, told us this afternoon, is to ignore other provisions in the act which the Supreme Court also found to be unconstitutional and which would still, in his view, render the Subversive Activities Control Board ineffective, inactive, and idle because the Attorney General, in his view, will not be in a position to act.

Has the situation remained so stable, insofar as world communism is concerned, over the past 17 years for Congress to reendorse these findings in toto? I simply raise the question, but I think it is up to each and every one of us to answer it for ourselves. This might well have been a section of the bill that could have been constructively changed after suitable hearings. In the absence of such hearings, and in an attempt to get the bill to the floor of the Senate as soon as possible the feasibility of change was ignored.

The language contained in this addition—section 1 of the Dirksen bill—does help us to understand the Dirksen proposal by telling us that recent court decisions have made it necessary to delete the registration requirements of the 1950 act. It goes on to tell us that registration will be displaced by disclosure "as provided herein."

Section 3 defines several of the terms used in the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950. The section, which is retained despite the Dirksen proposal, reads as follows:

> SEC. 3. For the purposes of this title—
>
> (1) The term "person" means an individual or an organization.
>
> (2) The term "organization" means an organization, corporation, company, partnership, association, trust, foundation, or fund; and includes a group of persons, whether or not incorporated, permanently or temporarily associated together for joint action on any subject or subjects.
>
> (3) The term "Communist-action organization" means—

This is interesting to me because this is the language contained in the bill which the distinguished junior Senator from New York said the Supreme Court found to be part of the reason why they declared this act to be unconstitutional.

It concerns the definition of Communist action organization. It is said to be too general and too loose.

Here is the definition:

> The term "Communist-action organization" means—
>
> (a) any organization in the United States (other than a diplomatic representative or mission of a foreign government accredited as such by the Department of State) which (i) is substantially directed, dominated, or controlled by the foreign government or foreign organization controlling the world Communist movement referred to in section 2 of this title, and (ii) operates primarily to advance the objectives of such world Communist movement as referred to in section 2 of this title; and
>
> (b) any section, branch, fraction, or cell of any organization defined in subparagraph (a) of this paragraph which has not complied with the registration requirements of this title.

Mr. President, the last point is especially interesting. It says:

> Any section, branch, fraction, or cell of any organization defined in subparagraph (a) of this paragraph which has not complied with the registration requirements of this Act.

The registration requirements of the title have been deleted. They are gone. They have been taken out. The Supreme Court found that requiring registration conflicted with the fifth amendment. Yet, the Dirksen measure does not correct this defect.

It specifies:

> Any section, branch, fraction, or cell of any organization defined in subparagraph (a) of this paragraph which has not complied with the registration requirement of this title.

Here is another example of why the pending bill badly needs hearings and careful examination to perfect it.

As I say, we may agree wholeheartedly with the objectives of the Senator from Illinois and feel very strongly that we need legislation. But certainly we do not want to pass legislation which is as defective as the pending bill.

With reference to subparagraph (4), once again the distinguished junior Senator from New York raised earlier today the contention that the Supreme Court decisions had found the definition of the Communist-front organizations to be too vague.

This is the definition:

> (4) The term "Communist-front organization" means any organization in the United States (other than a Communist-action organization as defined in paragraph (3) of this section) which (A) is substantially directed, dominated, or controlled by a Communist-action organization, and (B) is primarily operated for the purpose of giving aid and support to a Communist-action organization, a Communist foreign government, or the world Communist movement referred to in section 2 of this title.
>
> (4A) The term "Communist-infiltrated organization" means any organization in the United States (other than a Communist-action organization or a Communist-front organization) which (A) is substantially directed, dominated, or controlled by an individual or individuals who are, or who within three years have been actively engaged in, giving aid or support to a Communist-action organization, a Communist foreign government, or the world Communist movement referred to in section 2 of this title, and (B) is serving, or within three years has served, as a means for (i) the giving of aid or support to any such organization, government, or movement, or (ii) the impairment of the military strength of the United States or its industrial capacity to furnish logistical or other material support required by its Armed Forces: *Provided, however,* That any labor organization which is an affiliate in good standing of a national federation or other labor organization whose policies and activities have been directed to opposing Communist organizations, any Communist foreign government, or the world Communist movement, shall be presumed prima facie not to be a "Communist-infiltrated Organization."
>
> (5) The term "Communist organization" means any Communist-action organization, Communist-front organization, or Communist-infiltrated organization.
>
> (6) The term "to contribute funds or services" includes the rendering of any personal service and the making of any gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit, of money or of anything of value, and also the making of any contract, promise, or agreement to contribute funds or services, whether or not legally enforcible.
>
> (7) The term "facility" means any plant, factory or other manufacturing, producing or service establishment, airport, airport facility, vessel, pier, water-front facility, mine, railroad, public utility, laboratory, station, or other establishment or facility, or any part, division, or department of any of the foregoing.
>
> The term "defense facility" means any facility designated by the Secretary of Defense pursuant to section 5(b) of this title and which is in compliance with the provisions of such subsection respecting the posting of notice of such designation."
>
> (8) The term "publication" means any circular, newspaper, periodical, pamphlet, book, letter, post card, leaflet, or other publication.
>
> (9) The term "United States", when used in a geographical sense, includes the several States, Territories, and possessions of the United States, the District of Columbia, and the Canal Zone.
>
> (10) The term "interstate or foreign commerce" means trade, traffic, commerce, transportation, or communication (A) between any State, Territory, or possession of the United States (including the Canal Zone), or the District of Columbia, and any place outside thereof, or (B) within any Territory or possession of the United States (including the Canal Zone), or within the District of Columbia.
>
> (11) The term "Board" means the Subversive Activities Control Board created by section 12 of this title.
>
> (12) The term "final order of the Board" means an order issued by the Board under section 13 of this title, which has become final as provided in section 14 of this title.
>
> (13) The term "advocates" includes advises, recommends, furthers by overt act, and admits belief in; and the giving, loaning, or promising of support or of money or anything of value to be used for advocating any doctrine shall be deemed to constitute the advocating of such doctrine.
>
> (14) The term "world communism" means a revolutionary movement, the purpose of which is to establish eventually a Communist totalitarian dictatorship in any or all the countries of the world through the medium of an internationally coordinated Communist movement.

Once again, Mr. President, it would seem that this definition, which may well have been adequate in 1950, certainly is not adequate in 1967, when world communism should certainly embrace the concept of a split, a competitive situation, between Moscow and Russian communism and Peking and Red Chinese communism.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONDALE in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROTECTION OF HOUSEHOLD PETS—HUMANE TREATMENT OF ANIMALS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, in the New York Times this morning there is an editorial entitled "The Care of Animals," which I believe to be most pertinent to a bill which has been introduced in the Senate by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and in the House of Representatives by Representative ROGERS of Florida.

Last year, as the culmination of the efforts of a dedicated group, composed largely of women who were outraged at the treatment which pets, particularly dogs and cats, had been receiving at the hands of certain unscrupulous dealers in laboratory animals, the Senate, by a vote of 85 to 0, passed a bill which gave some protection against cruelty toward these household pets.

I believe the effort to obtain this legislation was substantially aided by an event in Slatington, Pa., where a group, which has been well described as dognapers, went through the town with their nets, picking up whatever dogs they could find in order to sell them to laboratories which used them for experimental purposes. A pet, a pedigreed poodle, of a prominent member of the Slatington community was thus stolen.

Naturally, the owner was outraged and endeavored to trace the animal. It was not easy because the dognapers left few clues as to where they had gone. Nevertheless, eventually she traced the pet to a hospital in New York where, by the time she got there, it had been cruelly destroyed as part of a research experiment.

Her cause was taken up by the press and many friends in Pennsylvania, and resulted in the passage of a State law against dognaping, which is one of the best in the country.

A group of her friends and others who were outraged by this incident pressed for the passage of legislation in Congress because, in the particular instance, the dog had been transported across a State line and it was necessary to invoke the interstate commerce powers of the Federal Government.

Although the bill we passed, which was subsequently passed by the House, incurred no open opposition on the floor of either body, it was subjected to strenuous and adverse lobbying activities while the bill was in committee. Those activities involved charges to the effect that it would make impossible the research necessary to protect the health of the American people.

A certain Dr. Bisscher, purporting to represent the medical profession and others, was particularly active in arguing that the progress of research in medicine would grind to a halt if the bill were to be passed. Fortunately, those efforts were of no avail, and I believe the case made in opposition to the bill was entirely untenable. The bill was jointly sponsored by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and myself, and was referred to the Commerce Committee where, after hearings and some amendment, it was favorably reported.

Great credit for passage of this legislation is due to the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], chairman of the committee, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the ranking minority member, and to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Parenthetically, let me say that the wives of these three gentlemen exercised a salutary effect on their respective senses of compassion for animals.

The legislation included provisions which, in my judgment, were vitally necessary, for the licensing and inspecting of the laboratories which use live animals for experimental purposes.

The legislation deals primarily with the humane care of these animals during the period before they are used for experimentation and after the experiment is completed. There is no requirement in the legislation which would prevent any kind of cruelty to animals required by the nature of the experiment, during the course of the experiment. This, of course, I deplore but, on the other hand, there comes a time when research for the alleviation of human ailments must take precedence over the requirements of the humane treatment of an animal.

But the legislation did require that the animal should be properly housed, and properly fed, and properly cared for before the experiment. If, as a result of the experiment, the animal was in great pain and in danger of a long and painful death, the legislation required that it be disposed of as promptly as possible without further cruelty.

This legislation has stood on the books for only about a year. It has not really had an opportunity to be tested from the administrative point of view.

The requirement for inspection and for licensing is vested, for administrative purposes, in the Department of Agriculture, which has a highly skilled corps of veterinarians and health officials well qualified to conduct this important work.

I have seen no evidence to indicate that the legislation is not working well. Neither has there come to me any serious complaint about its administration.

I was, therefore, startled to learn that Representative ROGERS, of Florida, a longtime dear friend of the veterinarian and medical professions, had introduced a bill in the House and had persuaded my very dear friend the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] to introduce proposed legislation in the Senate. The purpose of the bill, as I understand, is to remove the inspection authority from the Department of Agriculture, which has a staff of nearly 800 veterinarians and has a splendid record of eradicating diseases among farm animals, and also a corps of inspectors experienced in enforcement work, and to transfer it to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which knows nothing whatever about the subject, or, in the even worse alternative, to a professionally accredited body, which is another way of turning the work over to the somewhat less than tender mercies of the medical profession.

The New York Times editorial to which I refer is entitled "The Care of Animals." I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the editorial points out that the Animal Health Division of the Department of Agriculture is the appropriate agency for enforcement. The Times states that it does not "see the justification" for this bill. Neither do I. The Times continues:

> But if the medical laboratories had enforced meaningful standards for the housing, exercise, and care of animals—

And they did not—

> it would never have been necessary to include laboratories in last year's legislation.

I agree with the New York Times that Congress should leave well enough alone. All that the Department of Agriculture needs is a more adequate appropriation than it received this year from the Committee on Appropriations. The administration asked for an amount barely adequate to do the work last year, and the Committee on Appropriations cut that request in half. I would hope that a more adequate appropriation could be authorized this year, even though we are fighting a war in Vietnam.

I concur in the view of the New York Times that, certainly, no action is desirable in the Senate until further hearings have been held by the Commitee on Commerce, whose members wrote the law and are familiar with its complex background. I feel reasonably certain that the Senators who are members of that committee, to whom I referred earlier, will be alert to defend the legislation they sponsored and pressed to enactment.

I hope very much that this legislation will, in the language of our noble allies, the West Germans, be "spurlos versenkt" for the rest of this session.

EXHIBIT 1

THE CARE OF ANIMALS

When Congress last year passed the law establishing Federal standards for the care of animals used in medical research, it provided for inspection and enforcement by the appropriate agency, the Animal Health Division of the Department of Agriculture. This division has a staff of nearly 800 veterinarians with a splendid record of eradicating diseases among farm animals and also has a corps of inspectors experienced in enforcement work.

We do not see the justification for the bill introduced by Senator Javits of New York and Representative Rogers of Florida which would transfer this work to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare or to "a professional accrediting body." HEW has no existing staff to handle this assignment. Delegating it to a professional accrediting body would simply hand the problem back to the medical fraternity. But if the medical laboratories had enforced meaningful standards for the housing, exercise, and care of animals—actual experiments are not covered by the law—then it would never have been necessary to include laboratories in last year's legislation.

Congress should leave well enough alone. All that the Department of Agriculture needs to proceed with enforcement of the law is a more adequate appropriation than it received this year. Certainly, no action is desirable in the Senate until there have been hearings by the Commerce Committee whose members wrote the law and are familiar with its complex background.

Mr. President, turning to another matter, not long ago I received from the Pennsylvania League for Consumer Protection——

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he gets into another subject?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to my friend the Senator from Wisconsin.

AMENDMENT OF THE SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL ACT OF 1950

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2171) to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, so as to accord with certain decisions of the courts.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, earlier today, it has been called to my attention, an allegation was made by a Senator in the Press Gallery that there had been an agreement involving the senior Senator from Wisconsin that, under certain circumstances, there would be no lengthy talk on my part on the pending bill—that is, the Dirksen bill. That agreement was posited on the clear and declared understanding that there would be a statement from the Attorney General of the United States indicating that he would use this legislation, and use it in a way that would revitalize the Subversive Activities Control Board. It is my understanding that the distinguished minority leader has a letter from the Attorney General, but this is becoming a number one mystery. Nobody knows what is in the letter. The distinguished minority leader has the letter. He has not disclosed its contents, to the best of my knowledge, to anyone. He has indicated to the press and the Press Gallery that he has the letter, but certainly the fact that he has a letter from the Attorney General in no way complies with the understanding I had when I met with the minority leader that there would be a declaration by the Attorney General of the United States that he would find the so-called Dirksen proposal a proposal which would enable him to bring cases before the Subversive Activities Control Board.

The whole point of my argument is that the Dirksen bill will have no effect; that the Dirksen bill will not create an active Subversive Activities Control Board.

Earlier today the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy], a former Attorney General, said that even if he were happy to use the powers provided by the Dirksen bill for the Subversive Activities Control Board to have cases brought before it through him, he could not do it.

I apologize for asking the Senator to yield so long.

Mr. CLARK. I see the able minority leader has entered the Chamber.

May I ask my friend from Wisconsin whether he does not agree with me that if our beloved minority leader has a letter on the subject of this bill from the Attorney General of the United States, he should share the secret with us, because it seems to me what the Attorney General has to say would be pertinent, and I am sure that Members of the Senate should share knowledge of the contents of the letter.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Just before third reading.

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. For the third reading?

Mr. CLARK. No. I thought the Senator from Illinois was asking me to yield, because I have the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the Senator yield so we can have the third reading? Then I will read the letter.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, may I say to the Senator from Pennsylvania that is exactly the point. In trying to make a record on the floor, it would depend on whether we have word from the Attorney General—and I mean word, not just a letter which nobody knows anything about. If we are not going to get a revelation of it from the minority leader until the third reading, I fear that the third reading is going to be a long, long way off.

I do not see how any agreement is violated because I am in a position of trying to make as clear a record as I can, because we have no exposition of whether or not the Attorney General will be able to use this proposed legislation to bring cases before the Subversive Activities Control Board.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I will yield to the Senator from Illinois in a minute, but may I say to my good friend from Wisconsin that I have no doubt his recital of any alleged agreement is quite accurate. I was never party to any such agreement. I feel completely free to talk about this bill or anything else as long as I want, and, in the fine tradition of the Senate, of which the Senator from Illinois is such a proponent, I have been talking about dogs and cats for 20 minutes. I have a speech which will take me 15 or 20 minutes about the Pennsylvania League for Consumer Protection, about which I think I have every right to talk at the end of the day. After that I have an extensive speech involving the views of many learned men in the law dealing with the Subversive Activities Control Act. I cannot tell how long it will take.

Now I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, let us see who violated what. Last Wednesday, by a vote of 47 to 38, we had a clear majority in favor of this measure. Afterwards the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin and the distinguished majority leader walked into my office. Did the Senator or did he not?

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What did he say?

The Senator said, "Well, you have the votes. Now, if you will get a letter from the Attorney General and a section-by-section analysis, I guess we won't have very much talk and we can pass the bill."

I got the letter. We did make the report and the section-by-section analysis, and then yesterday the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin came to me and said, "We had a meeting this morning. We think this ought to go back to the Judiciary Committee."

I said, "What for?"

He said, "To hear the Attorney General."

I said, "I have his letter."

He said, "Well, Senator Tydings wants some constitutional lawyers."

He had an opportunity, a long time ago.

I said, "Don't kid me. You are trying to kill this thing. You tried, through the appropriation route, to take away the money."

I have not been around here all these years for nothing, and I was not born yesterday. I know the game of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. CLARK. In fact, the Senator from Illinois has played that game himself, many times.

Mr. DIRKSEN. You bet I have.

Mr. CLARK. And will again.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Will the Senator from Illinois yield? What the Senator said about the meeting Wednesday afternoon is accurate, but it is not complete. The Senator from Wisconsin indicated that it would not be enough simply to have a letter. Obviously, the Attorney General of the United States could say anything in a letter. The content of the letter has not been disclosed. I said that it would not be enough for him simply to say he would enforce the law; that would mean nothing.

The Senator from Wisconsin said he would like a letter indicating that the Attorney General of the United States would use the authority in this proposal to bring cases before the Subversive Activities Control Board.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What does the Senator think I have in my pocket?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Well, I do not know.

Mr. CLARK. We do not know. Why does not the Senator let us see it?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Wisconsin does not have extra sensory perception. The Senator from Wisconsin cannot look into the pocket of the Senator from Illinois. My eyesight is pretty good, but I cannot tell what is in that letter.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I will be happy to yield, if the Senator will state what is in that letter.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator from Illinois has enough ESP to know that Wayne Morse will speak tomorrow; and whom will the Senators have on deck then?

I will make a deal with the Senator. I will read the letter into the Record right now, if the Senator from Wisconsin will agree that when we have read that letter, we will proceed to third reading on this bill.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Why, of course not. After all, as I say, the letter from the Attorney General may simply say that they intend to enforce the law the best they can, under the Constitution, which would not mean anything.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am content with the letter.

We know what the game is. The Senators are just going to keep on contending. But let me remind my friend from Wisconsin, this legislation can be tacked on to any bill, including an appropriation bill, and I intend to do it. The Senator is going to get licked on this deal, I say to him right now, whether he likes it or not.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, would the Senator take his seat?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, you can get into this, too. It is a free fight.

Mr. CLARK. No, I have the floor, and I am complying with the rules of the Senate by standing at my seat. I suggest that the Senator from Illinois extend to the Senator from Wisconsin the courtesy of doing likewise.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, may I say to the Senator from Illinois, all we want on this legislation is enlightenment and understanding. Many Senators have indicated they think it would be reasonable to have brief hearings, and a binding unanimous-consent agreement to vote thereafter on final passage on this bill, once we have had hearings, and elicited the kind of record that is necessary to know what we are doing, so that our eyes will be opened.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Plow the furrow, and we will plow it with you.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, does the Senator from Illinois wish me to yield further?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, my dear friend has that big book; it will take him 3 or 4 days to read that, and I do not wish to impede his progress. That looks like about 4,000 pages. Why can we not stay in session all night?

Mr. CLARK. It is very difficult for the Official Reporter to take what I say while I have the floor, if the Senator from Illinois is constantly interrupting.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, I am sorry.

Mr. CLARK. I accept the Senator's apology.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Should I beat a hasty retreat?

Mr. CLARK. That might be the orderly procedure to follow.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield for one-half moment?

Mr. CLARK. I will yield to my friend from New Hampshire for the rest of the day, if he wishes.

Mr. COTTON. I have a distinct recollection that I was present in the Senate some 2 years ago when a Senator undertook to invoke the rule that a Senator had to be standing in his own place, behind his own desk, when he was speaking; that at the time the Parliamentarian was unable to find such a rule, and that his decision was that there was no such rule.

I think that should be straightened out before the whip is cracked again, because it would seem to me that if we are going to insist on that, we had better make sure there is such a rule.

Mr. CLARK. I quite agree with the Senator from New Hampshire. I have been puzzled by this matter throughout the 11 years I have been in the Senate; because, like many another man, I have a tendency to move about on the Senate floor as I speak. I have often spoken from desks of other Senators. Sometimes I even cross the aisle to the Republican side.

Therefore, Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CLARK. What do the rules of the Senate provide with respect to a Senator speaking at all times from his own desk, and standing there? And does a Senator lose the floor if he should be seated? I would like the Parliamentarian to answer those two questions. Must a Senator stand behind his own desk when he addresses the Chair in a speech; and if he sits down, does he lose the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that he knows of no rule requiring a Senator to address the Senate from his desk.

The rule does provide that in seeking recognition the Senator shall rise when he addresses the Chair; but it does not specify at what place the Senator must be standing.

Mr. CLARK. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President. I have seen other Senators do this, and on occasion, I guess I have strayed into error and done it myself: Is it appropriate for Senators to enter the well of the Chamber and turn around and address their fellow Senators while making a speech?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian advises the Presiding Officer that the rules are silent on that issue.

Mr. CLARK. A further inquiry. Is there not a provision in "Senate Procedure," authored by Messrs. Watkins and Riddick, which deals, if not with the rules, at least with the customs and manners of the Senate, and indicates that it is appropriate demeanor for a Senator to address this body only when standing behind his own desk?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian advises the Chair that he would have to explore this inquiry further, but he is not aware of any precedent which speaks to the issue as to which the Senator from Pennsylvania makes inquiry.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from New York, without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

NATO

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Senate a recrudescence of interest in Europe evidenced by the morning papers, which is most important to our country. I think our state of near obsession with Vietnam has cost us dearly in terms of U.S. interests in Europe. We face very great problems in 1969, with the danger that President de Gaulle may take France completely out of the NATO alliance.

Therefore, Mr. President, the attitude of the other 14 NATO members, including the United States, becomes extremely important. The essential strength of the free world, in terms of production and, indeed, in almost any terms, is marshaled in the Atlantic community.

This morning there came very welcome news that the 14 are laying out a blueprint for adapting NATO to the changing circumstances of the 1970's. It is significant to note that the initiative for this came from Mr. Pierre Harmel, the Foreign Minister of Belgium.

Among the new thrusts which NATO is to undertake—I could not agree more with the evaluation that they have made—that a very much more important role should be taken by the alliance in the relationships between Western and Eastern Europe. Thinking in terms of agreements on a regional basis would be a marked advance in this regard. Second is the interest of the Atlantic community in other parts of the world, such as the Middle East and Latin America, which have been previously excluded from the NATO deliberations.

Third is the burning interest which all of these countries have in science and technology, and in the economic integration of the free world. Also, the relationships of the industrialized nations, as a group, with the developing nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

Mr. President, power abhors a vacuum, and unless the United States does constructive things, the narrow insularity which De Gaulle offers Europe may very well take over.

I do not believe that there can be any compromise with the basic principles which distinguish the concept which we have of a great mutual organization for advancement, development, and security in the NATO alliance, and the concept which President de Gaulle has of some kind of a Metternich-inspired, cabal, with the powers of Europe excluding and disregarding, as would an ostrich, all others.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this important article be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Fourteen Allies Propose Plan To Give NATO a Political Role—Members Agree on a Draft That Would Alter Basic Nature of Alliance—Only France Abstains—New Headquarters Complex Turned Over to Officials in Brussels Ceremony

(By Peter Grose)

Washington, October 16—Fourteen of the fifteen Western Allies—France did not participate—have drawn up a blueprint to alter the basic nature of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and reform the alliance to face new diplomatic tasks foreseen for the nineteen-seventies.

Leading policy-makers from the NATO capitals are proposing to convert what has been essentially a military alliance into a political unit capable of arriving at an Atlantic consensus on policies to be pursued in other parts of the world.

The proposals are offered as an alternative to disintegration of the alliance in a diplomatic climate vastly changed from the cold war days of 1949, when it was formed.

[In Brussels, the Belgian Government formally handed over the new headquarters of the alliance in ceremonies attended by representatives of the member nations. Page 18.]

PROPOSED CHANGES

Among the major points contained in the reform proposals are these:

The alliance should play a role in the effort to improve relations with the Communist countries of Eastern Europe. Bilateral contacts and agreements, such as that France and East Germany are seeking, are useful in reducing tensions, but should be coordinated within the alliance so that the Soviet Union cannot play one ally against another.

The Atlantic community, a result of the alliance, should take concerted policy stands on crises in other parts of the world such as the Middle East or Latin America. This would involve enlarging the policy role of the alliance Council, composed of permanent representatives of the 15 members. The Council is now confined to a responsibility for decisions affecting only the member states.

The alliance should have responsibility as a unit, and not just as individual governments, for coordinating traffic in science and technology across the Atlantic, for developing effective methods of arms control, including the sale of arms to other countries and finally for organizing military and economic aid to developing countries on a multilateral basis.

The result of the proposals would be to introduce a far greater degree of federalism into the Atlantic community than has so far existed.

Since President de Gaulle's policies have been opposed to the very notion of a federal Atlantic community, United States officials acknowledge that the proposals could provoke a new crisis when they are presented in December at the ministerial meeting in Brussels.

The study has been under preparation since last December and must be submitted for the approval of the NATO Council, the executive body of the alliance.

Last week delegates of several member nations met quietly for two days at a country house outside London to edit the draft proposals submitted by four subcommittees.

FINAL DRAFT DUE

Foy D. Kohler, Deputy Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, was the senior United States representative in the drafting group.

At the end of this month, a special policy-making group, with Under Secretary Eugene V. Rostow as the United States member, is scheduled to meet and put the proposals in final form.

At this point, according to American officials, the Allies will try to adapt the plans to meet some of France's objections and thus prevent rejection by President de Gaulle.

French officials attended many of the planning sessions that led to the completed drafts but apparently took little part in the discussions.

Earlier this month, when it became clear that the other Allies were intent on making concrete proposals for reform, Foreign Minister Maurice Couve de Murville warned the alliance members that France considered close political teamwork to be beyond the purview of the group.

Considering the sweeping nature of some of the proposals and the high degree of political coordination envisaged, United States officials and allied diplomats are not confident that France would accept the recommendations as they stand.

The other capitals will then be faced with the decision whether to proceed without France or to water down the proposal on political action to keep the alliance intact.

France decided last year to withdraw from the alliance's integrated military structure, the command headed by Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer. It was this step that led to the long-term planning now under way.

Officials in many allied capitals asked whether the alliance was worth maintaining at all in view of France's withdrawal and of the general assessment that there had been a lessening of the Soviet Union's threat to Western Europe—against which the alliance had been formed.

In this atmosphere at the end of the year, the Belgian Foreign Minister, Pierre Harmel, proposed a far-reaching study of the "future tasks of the alliance, as a factor for a durable peace."

The terms of the study committees were clearly defined to cover the political side and not the military, for which long-term planning was already under way by the alliance command.

Poll Shows Alliance Is Favored

Paris, October 16.—Most Frenchmen want to stay in the Atlantic alliance, according to a leading polling organization.

An overwhelmingly favorable attitude toward the alliance, even among Gaullist and Communist voters, was reported by the French Institute of Public Opinion in a survey conducted for the independent left-wing weekly Nouvel Observateur. The results of the poll will be published in the Wednesday issue.

According to Nouvel Observateur, the polling agency asked citizens how they thought they would vote in a referendum on the question of withdrawal from the alliance, if such a referendum were held today.

The results showed that 54 percent of those polled favored staying in and 12 per cent favored withdrawing. The remaining 34 per cent did not express an opinion.

Among Gaullist voters, the poll showed, 61 per cent were for the alliance and 11 per cent against. Among those who said they voted Communist, the vote was 44 per cent in favor to 30 per cent opposed. The Socialists were 66 to 14 per cent and the anti-Gaullist Center Democrats 75 to 7 for the alliance.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call additional attention to the fact that a great delegation will be going this year from Congress to the North Atlantic Assembly—the successor term for the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference — which deals with these very matters on the parliamentary level.

I think that that delegation this year should have the considered interest of every Senator so that we may have as representative as possible a delegation, well briefed, and prepared to cope with what will be tomorrow, the central problems of our foreign policy.

These are fundamental questions of foreign policy—vitally touching the peace and security of the world.

I speak today inspired by news of the progress made on plans for the future of NATO and anxious that our colleagues should begin to give this subject the attention which it so richly deserves.

I thank my colleague, the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark] very much for yielding.

RESOLUTION ON CONSUMER LEGISLATION

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I return to the communication I received from the Pennsylvania League for Consumer Protection, an organization which speaks with a highly respected voice in my State. This group has sent to me a resolution relating to Federal laws in the consumer field.

The resolution is, in effect, a checklist of important legislation which will be of interest to anyone concerned about consumer affairs at the Federal level. For that reason I commend it to my colleagues.

I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution 2-67

Resolution to the Pennsylvania congressional delegation from the Pennsylvania League for Consumer Protection

Whereas the Pennsylvania consumer and his family must be protected from deceptive and unethical practices and dangerous goods and services in the market-place, and

Whereas the Pennsylvania League for Consumer Protection takes a broad interest in behalf of all consumers as well as its 2½ million affiliated members, who compromise a significant segment of the buying public, and

Whereas to continue the never-ending effort to win a better life for the citizen-consumers of the Commonwealth, the Pennsylvania League for Consumer Protection advocates the adoption of legislation embodying the Consumer Bill-of-Rights, to wit: The right to be informed; The right to safety; The right to be heard; The right to choose; and

Whereas to seek more protection for consumers through legislation, administrative action, and consumer education: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we endorse, support and urge the passage of the following legislation by the members of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

The Wholesome Meat Act which calls for equal and mandatory inspection of all meat slaughtered and sold intra-state;

A Truth-in-Lending Law that will promptly require the disclosure of finance charges in meaningful terms of simple annual interest in connection with all extensions of credit;

The Consumer Credit Protection Act which will direct that lenders fully disclose all terms and conditions of credit transactions and establish maximum rates of interest and require the disclosure of rates in terms of simple annual interest in all advertising;

Amendments to the Flammable Fabrics Act which would increase consumer protection by extending the Act beyond wearing apparel to include all fabrics;

An Interstate Land Sales Disclosure Act to require unimproved lot developers to disclose all material facts necessary to potential buyers for an informed choice;

The Medical Restraint of Trade Act to prohibit physicians from profiting from the sale of products they prescribe;

A bill to establish a Department of Consumer Affairs in order to secure within the Federal Government effective representation of the interests of the consumers;

Amendments to the Clean Air Act to expand authority for research, establish regional air quality commissions and pollution emission standards;

Amendments to the Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act to require that all cigarette packages and advertisements disclose the tar and nicotine content of the tobacco as measured by a standard test;

Legislation requiring safety for all consumers in the products and services they purchase, including but not limited to, establishment of a National Commission on Products Safety to develop safety standards and develop fair and effective safeguards in household products; the National Gas Pipeline Safety Act to develop minimum safety standards for pipeline facilities; the Medical Device Safety Act to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to assure the safety, reliability, and effectiveness of medical devices; and a meaningful code of automobile safety standards; and be it further

Resolved, that we condemn the practices of unscrupulous businesses who charge exhorbitant and excessive prices for goods and services, especially in the economic distressed communities, and be it further

Resolved, that we reaffirm our support for full representation of the consumer in the highest councils of government and commend the President for again appointing a Consumer Advisory Council to work with his Special Assistant for Consumer Affairs, and be it further

Resolved, that the members and delegates of the Pennsylvania League for Consumer Protection in convention, duly assembled at the Penn Harris Hotel, Harrisburg, on the 20th day of September in the year 1967, urge each member of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives to seriously consider and promptly act upon these legislative matters when presented to them in an affirmative manner so that the constituent-consumers whom they represent will be more fully protected, and be it further

Resolved, that a copy of this resolution be transmitted to each member of the U.S. House of Representatives and U.S. Senate and to the President of the United States and his Special Assistant for Consumer Affairs.

Mr. CLARK. I should like to comment briefly on the proposals referred to in this resolution, all of which I support in principle, if not in precise detail.

First, the Wholesale Meat Act which calls for equal and mandatory inspection of all meat slaughtered and sold intrastate. I support this legislation.

Second, a truth-in-lending law that will promptly require the disclosure of all finance charges in meaningful terms of simple annual interest in connection with all extensions of credit.

Third, the Consumer Credit Protection Act which will direct that lenders fully disclose all terms and conditions of credit transactions and establish maximum rates of interest and require the disclosure of rates in terms of simple annual interest in all advertising.

Fourth, amendments to the Flammable Fabrics Act which would increase consumer protection by extending the act beyond wearing apparel to include all fabrics.

I believe this legislation to be very much in the consumer interest. I support the legislation.

Fifth, an intrastate land sales disclosure act to require unimproved lot developers to disclose all material facts necessary to potential buyers for an informed choice.

It occurs to me that this legislation is as necessary to protect the unwary as are the various acts dealing with securities which were passed back in the thirties to require full disclosure with respect to the sale of stocks, bonds, and other intangible personal property. I would support this legislation.

Sixth, the medical restraint of trade act to prohibit physicians from profiting from the sale of products they prescribe.

Seventh, a bill to establish a Department of Consumer Affairs in order to secure within the Federal Government effective representation of the interests of the consumers.

I would believe that consumer affairs require some upgrading in the Federal hierarchy. However, I would like to give some further consideration as to whether a department at Cabinet level is actually either necessary or desirable.

Eighth, amendments to the Clean Air Act to expand authority for research, establish Regional Air Quality Commissions and pollution emission standards.

Ninth, amendments to the Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act to require that all cigarette packages and advertisements disclose the tar and nicotine content of the tobacco as measured by a standard test. I would support this legislation, but I would go further and require a statement on all advertising and on cigarette packages as well to the effect that smoking of cigarettes not only may be but in all likelihood is detrimental to health.

Tenth, legislation requiring safety for all consumers in the products and services they purchase, including but not limited to, establishment of a National Commission on Products Safety to develop safety standards and develop fair and effective safeguards in household products; the National Gas Pipeline Safety Act to develop minimum safety standards for pipeline facilities; the Medical Device Safety Act to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to assure the safety, reliability, and effectiveness of medical devices; and a meaningful code of automobile safety standards.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

WAR CRITICS TOLD ASIA AT STAKE IN VIETNAM

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, Mr. Crosby S. Noyes, in a column which appears in this afternoon's Washington Star, states, with reference to Chinese militancy and political expansionism, that in most cases where direct pressures have been exerted, American power directly or indirectly applied has been the deciding factor of successful resistance. Mr. Noyes states in this regard:

> This was true, certainly, in Korea in the early 1950s. It was true of the Communist threat aimed at Taiwan and the Philippines during the same period. It was true in Malaysia, where British power was ultimately successful in overcoming a Communist-inspired "war of national liberation." It was true in Indonesia, where a forceful Communist takeover would almost certainly not have been averted except for the American presence in Vietnam.
>
> It is true today in Laos, Thailand and Burma—all of which have Communist-led insurrections on their hands. It is, in fact, highly improbable that there would be any non-Communist governments in Southeast Asia today if American security guarantees—backed by American power—had been withdrawn from the area a decade ago.

Mr. Noyes goes on to say:

> Without the counterbalancing force of American commitments, there would be no need for direct military conquest. A leader like Singapore's Lee Kwan Yew—who is certainly no "client" of the United States—admits publicly that the sudden withdrawal of American power would leave him with no alternative to an accommodation with Peking—on Peking's terms.
>
> Without firm security guarantees there is no assurance that any other country—including Japan—would feel very differently.

Mr. Noyes also states:

> The only thing which could pose a serious threat to the security of the United States today would be a drastic shift in the over-all balance of world power. Such a strategic shift in favor of a system essentially hostile to our own is something which this country cannot afford to permit, as long as it has the power to prevent it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the column by Mr. Noyes, entitled "War Critics Told Asia at Stake in Vietnam," which I consider to be a very, cogent, lucid, and timely column, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

War Critics Told Asia at Stake in Vietnam

(By Crosby S. Noyes)

Criticism of Secretary of State Dean Rusk's recent strong statement on Vietnam is just about what might have been expected. The liberals—assuming the term applies—have taken refuge in their own, private credibility gap. The reaction, in essence, is:

"This is all very well. We admire your eloquence and obvious conviction. But we simply don't believe you."

What the liberals disbelieve in particular is that there is any threat to American security in Asia, and especially in Vietnam, which justifies the price of the war there. Rusk has failed, they say, to prove his contention that China is bent on the conquest of Asia.

The liberals are equally unconvinced, apparently, by Rusk's argument that American power in Asia is an essential ingredient to the goal of establishing a stable peace in that part of the world.

This chronic disbelief is in itself incredible in the face of the evidence. It amounts to a bland denial of the fact that every country on the periphery of China—and a number of others besides—has felt the weight of Chinese militancy and political expansionism. It simply ignores the fact that in most cases where direct pressures have been exerted, American power, directly or indirectly applied, has been the deciding factor of successful resistance.

This was true, certainly, in Korea in the early 1950s. It was true of the Communist threat aimed at Taiwan and the Philippines during the same period. It was true in Malaysia, where British power was ultimately successful in overcoming a Communist-inspired "war of national liberation." It was true in Indonesia, where a forceful Communist take over would almost certainly not have been averted except for the American presence in Vietnam.

It is true today in Laos, Thailand and Burma—all of which have Communist-led insurrections on their hands. It is, in fact, highly improbable that there would be any non-Communist governments in Southeast Asia today if American security guarantees—backed by American power—had been withdrawn from the area a decade ago.

Nor is this purely a question of Chinese militancy, real as it is. The truth is that China is the preponderant military and political power in southern Asia.

Without the counterbalancing force of American commitments, there would be no need for direct military conquest. A leader like Singapore's Lee Kwan Yew—who is certainly no "client" of the United States—admits publicly that the sudden withdrawal of American power would leave him with no alternative to an accomodation with Peking—on Peking's terms.

Without firm security guarantees there is no assurance that any other country—including Japan—would feel very differently.

But even if all this were admitted, there is an impression that the liberals would still be unconvinced of the validity and the necessity of the American commitment to Asia. Where, they ask, is the treat to the United States whether Asia is dominated by communism or not?

Where indeed? The discussion has been considerably muddied by well-meaning but unconvincing talk of "strategic frontiers" and "front lines" of security that must not be breached.

In terms of global strategy, these concepts are hopelessly dated. The only thing which could pose a serious threat to the security of the United States today would be a drastic shift in the over-all balance of world power. Such a strategic shift in favor of a system essentially hostile to our own is something which this country cannot afford to permit, as long as it has the power to prevent it.

Power, furthermore, is not necessarily a matter of weapons or economic strength. It can be measured equally in terms of human resources, and these are what is at stake in Asia.

Many years ago the United States decided that it could not afford to let the economic potential of western Europe fall under Communist control. It has now decided that Asia's human resources—representing two-thirds of the human race—are equally well worth fighting for.

This, in essence, is what Rusk was saying last week. And whether the liberals believe it or not, this is what is really at stake in Vietnam.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLERGYMEN'S STAND ON VIETNAM

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a column written by Mr. David Lawrence, entitled "Clergymen's Stand on Vietnam Vary," which appears in today's Washington Star, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLERGYMEN'S STAND ON VIETNAM VARY

(By David Lawrence)

Many people are beginning to say that clergymen and church organizations are driving away parishioners by talking too much about politics—national and international—about which they know very little, and by failing to teach the all-important lessons of ethics and morality so essential today in countries troubled by disorder and violence.

Dr. Eugene Carson Blake, general secretary of the World Council of Churches and formerly the head of the United Presbyterian Church of America, said on Sunday at St. Louis that the position of the United States in Vietnam is wrong for moral, strategic, diplomatic and sociological reasons. He said with respect to the Vietnam War: "It is wrong for a great and powerful nation to impose upon a small nation even a right policy for their own good."

Dr. Blake added that the claim of the United States that it is bound to fulfill a commitment to the government of South Vietnam is hypocritical and that he believes the Vietnamese are "fighting a war of independence and overwhelming force won't make them seek peace." He called for unconditional cessation of bombing by the United States.

While occupying a high post in the World Council of Churches. Dr. Blake claims, of course, to be speaking in conformity with a resolution adopted in August by the central committee of the World Council. His criticism of U.S. policy is, however, far more direct. The World Council—composed of representatives from virtually all denominations—recommended that the United States stop bombing, but declared that the North Vietnam government, "either in advance of or in response to the cessation of bombing, should indicate by word and deed its readiness to move toward negotiations."

Dr. Paul Ramsey, one of America's most respected Protestant theologians, has just been attracting attention by his criticism and voluble attacks on actions of other clergymen. He declares that both "liberal" and "evangelical" protestant leaders have been inclined in recent years to say too much on too many topics.

Dr. Ramsey points to a growing disposition on the part of church councils and denominational conventions to adopt resolutions on a variety of intricate national problems on which religious leaders, as such, have no particular competence to formulate policies. On the question of their offering "concrete political policies for the world's statesmen," he says:

"For ecumenical councils on church and society responsibly to proffer specific advice would require that the church have the services of an entire State Department."

Dr. Ramsey further asserts that many of the pronouncements are adopted by a relatively small number of churchmen after a minimum of serious debate, and that often these documents are drafted by anonymous staff members and presented to national assemblies under circumstances which provide rank-and-file delegates with little choice except to rubber-stamp them.

He points to the procedures of the Conference on Church and Society, sponsored by the World Council of Churches in Geneva last year, as a glaring example of this weakness. He recalls that, in only two weeks of deliberation, the 410 participants in the conference arrived at specific, detailed "conclusions" on no less than 118 complex public questions, ranging from the best way to make peace in Vietnam to the suppression of crime. Dr. Ramsey's experiences at the Geneva conference, where these resolutions were adopted, prompted him to write a recently published book entitled, "Who Speaks for the Church?"

The author, in calling on contemporary Christianity to clarify the church's message about the meaning of Christian life in the world today, criticized both the National Council of Churches and the World Council of Churches for wrong methods and wrong goals. It is being predicted among religious leaders that this very question will be raised in the study Conference on Church and Society, to be held by the National Council of Churches on Oct. 22–26 in Detroit, Mich. Up to now, it has been assumed by church leaders that the rank and file of Christians were backing the involvement of their organizations in governmental questions with a political background.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, pursuant to the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 18, 1967, at 12 noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 17, 1967:

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Rosa E. Whiddon, Newville, Ala., in place of F. M. Mathis, retired.

CALIFORNIA

Victor E. Legaspi, Calexico, Calif., in place of C. B. Hetherington, retired.

Margaret R. Patterson, Gazelle, Calif., in place of A. A. Cedros, retired.

Constance N. Schroer, Green Valley Lake, Calif., in place of A. F. Tassio, retired.

COLORADO

Richard I. Lyles, Pueblo, Colo., in place of C. H. Klipfel, deceased.

CONNECTICUT

Eleanor N. Elton, South Willington, Conn., in place of E. M. Macfarlane, deceased.

GEORGIA

William O. Cummings, Warthen, Ga., in place of V. H. Cummings, retired.

INDIANA

Ira R. Williams, Mellott, Ind., in place of I. M. Gallaher, retired.

IOWA

Robert R. Larson, Dows, Iowa, in place of E. A. Westlund, retired.

KANSAS

Shirley V. Keeler, Assaria, Kans., in place of G. N. Karstadt, retired.

Clyde R. Moore, Wellington, Kans., in place of E. B. Hyndman, retired.

KENTUCKY

Creed Damron, Robinson Creek, Ky., in place of C. B. Mitchell, retired.

LOUISIANA

Maxine H. Morrison, Albany, La., in place of O. A. Johnson, retired.

MICHIGAN

Eldon Dale Maatman, Hamilton, Mich., in place of Herman Nyhoff, retired.

MINNESOTA

Francis C. Bohnert, Rosemount, Minn., in place of E. G. Doyle, retired.

MISSOURI

Charles L. Lucas, Caledonia, Mo., in place of J. L. Haw, retired.

Marion E. Bird, Concordia, Mo., in place of C. A. Reed, resigned.

Fred W. Bargen, Mapaville, Mo., in place of O. M. Judd, deceased.

NEBRASKA

Frank J. Dietsch, Fordyce, Nebr., in place of E. M. Suing, retired.

Helen V. McChesney, Lebanon, Nebr., in place of C. C. Waterman, retired.

Gary L. Boese, Pickrell, Nebr., in place of R. L. Winkle, transferred.

NEW JERSEY

Everitt J. Monahan, Morris Plains, N.J., in place of J. D. McErlane, retired.

NEW YORK

Catherine C. Hallahan, Brasher Falls, N.Y., in place of H. P. Hallahan, deceased.

Louise A. Benjamin, Central Valley, N.Y., in place of Ernest Rose, retired.

Harry W. Johnson, Jamestown, N.Y., in place of R. W. Gould, retired.

Leon Korzeniewski, Morrisville, N.Y., in place of H. M. Curtis, retired.

Thomas F. Dady, New Woodstock, N. Y., in place of E. D. Judd, retired.

NORTH CAROLINA

Pauline L. Harton, Colon, N.C., in place of Z. L. Ross, retired.

Paul E. Peeler, Granite Quarry, N.C., in place of C. M. Peeler, retired.

Stanley W. Johnson, Hope Mills, N.C., in place of I. M. Stone, retired.

OKLAHOMA

Russel J. Alberty, Haskell, Okla., in place of J. F. Rankin, retired.

OREGON

Fred J. Hayes, Oakridge, Oreg., in place of M. B. Blair, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

George E. Kintigh, Alverton, Pa., in place of M. M. Hixson, retired.

Domenic P. Ruggieri, Kennett Square, Pa., in place of J. F. Donahue, retired.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Ray M. Head, Salem, S.C., in place of Homer Griffith, retired.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Thomas W. MacKrell, Vale, S. Dak., in place of Eloise Holdren, retired.

TENNESSEE

Robert H. Scates, Henning, Tenn., in place of G. F. Barfield, retired.

TEXAS

Kenneth R. Hopkins, Crowley, Tex., in place of D. L. Stoker, Jr., retired.

Louis C. Nordt, Missouri City, Tex., in place of J. C. Posey, retired.

VIRGINIA

Kendall F. Bailey, Madison Heights, Va., in place of M. M. Crews, retired.

Joseph H. Clarke, Jr., Martinsville, Va., in place of J. R. Gregory, retired.

Russell R. S. Clem, Staunton, Va., in place of R. C. Woodrum, deceased.

WASHINGTON

David P. Watkins, Castle Rock, Wash., in place of H. F. Downey, retired.

Mary E. Thomas, Soap Lake, Wash., in place of H. L. Lopeman, removed.

WISCONSIN

Duane A. Helland, Boyd, Wis., in place of H. E. Wanish, retired.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Educational Participation in Communities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 17, 1967

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Education and Labor Committee, I have a responsibility to maintain an interest in all programs which can enrich and expand the traditional approaches to learning. My service on this committee, however, extends beyond the lines of responsibility. I am vitally concerned with education. If I may paraphrase the illustrious Jefferson, I too would caution: If a nation expects to be ignorant and free, it expects whatever has been and never shall be.

I have always been especially enthusiastic about programs which not only broaden the scope of education beyond the conventional approach of the academic but which allow the student to more fully realize that education is indeed his most powerful weapon in the fight against apathy, stagnation, and conditions of economic disadvantage. I am pleased to join several of my colleagues in calling attention to a unique California college program which is helping to promote a student focus upon urban problems. I refer to the EPIC program at California State College at Los Angeles.

The opening of classes this quarter at California State College at Los Angeles marks the first anniversary of EPIC—a project for educational participation in communities. Through EPIC, a demonstration—pilot—program partially funded under title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965, California State at Los Angeles students are contributing their time and abilities to serve and learn from the disadvantaged in the Los Angeles area. Last year, over 1,000 students at the college worked as volunteers in more than 100 community agencies. The students assumed a wide range of duties, such as counselor aids, tutors, group leaders, recreation leaders, teen club advisers, big brother-big sisters, child care consultants, teachers, and research assistants. This year, EPIC has reduced the number of agencies to 50 and placed even greater focus upon quality service and program development. The response of the community to the EPIC volunteer has helped to highlight the value of this program. Community agencies praise EPIC volunteers for their professional attitude, inventiveness, enthusiasm, and ability. They point out that the college student often brings to the agency new ideas and techniques and enables the agency to offer new services and programs. As one agency has written:

> Bouquets to Volunteers Betty Addleman, Linda Mahru, and Boyd Johnson, who are participating in the EPIC program at California State College at Los Angeles and whose talents have been made available to the Unit II Mental Health Clinic at Los Angeles County General Hospital.
>
> Robert B. Sampliner, M.D., Director of Mental Health, Unit II, states, "These students are adding rich resources in their own respective fields to the training we are giving them in group therapy. They are serving as co-therapists who will soon be handling a group in vocational rehabilitation under supervision."
>
> These students have given invaluable services to the patients at the hospital.[1]

The student, because he is one who is "making it" in society, can often offer hope and outside contact to someone who feels entrapped in an urban ghetto, or a disadvantaged economic situation. The students have also made an enthusiastic response to the program. Because California State at Los Angeles is an urban commuter college, its 21,000 students center most of their activities away from the compus. These students are often not enthusiastic about the traditional collegiate bonfires and pep rallies. But, like all of today's college generation, they are seriously concerned about current problems and their own role in society. They have a strong desire to improve both themselves and society, and to affect the directions of our Nation. EPIC has helped direct these student energies and concerns into constructive community activities. In so doing EPIC has made good use of their pent-up concerns for society, provoked intellectual stimulation, added a sense of student commitment, and provided countless hours of service to the community. As a result, interest in EPIC from other colleges and the community has never been higher.

The theme among many of today's college students is one of turn off, drop out, or you cannot fight the power structure. The EPIC program says to that same student, "tune in, get involved, you can affect the scene." The EPIC volunteer through his participation in a community service program, gains insights which coupled with the college's academic program can help him become, upon his completion of his college requirements, a more knowledgeable citizen and a more highly skilled professional. As a student, EPIC allows the individual to see the needs of his own community and the directions which his education and training must follow as he would have a positive effect on that scene.

And what about the community, one might ask? The community benefits from the tremendous energy, the challenging minds and the creative talents of the young student. The overworked, overcrowded, perhaps understaffed agency may just well need the vibrant breath of student participation. The struggling, small, independent community action program may receive just the additional staff it needs to broaden its scope and attract more young people in off the streets. The young person in trouble who might not relate to an agency authority might well be responsive to a student volunteer who is on hand, ready to serve and able to give him individual attention. I dare say that there is quite a tossup when one tries to answer the question, who gains the most, the community or the student? It seems to me that there is a pretty even balance.

I am especially delighted to learn that during the new school year EPIC volunteers will be working at the following agencies located in central and south central Los Angeles: The Avalon Youth Opportunity Center, the Imperial Court Community Development Project, the Los Angeles Youth Opportunity Center, the Pico Gardens Teen Post, the Willowbrook Avenue Community Development Project, the new Locke Senior High School, the South Central Youth Training and Employment Project, and the Southwest Tutorial Project, to name just a few. The disadvantaged economic circumstances of large numbers of the residents serviced by these agencies as well as in many instances their minority group status pose impending problems for immediate resolution. Where could better answers be obtained? What more dynamic forces could influence decisions? What greater talents could be used for counseling and planning than the college student attending Cal State, many of whom are themselves residents of this very community.

It seems to me that EPIC at California State is saying to the students:

> We can help you learn, we can help you get involved, but you must be dedicated to participating in your community through a positive service.

As a new EPIC director, Mrs. Vivian Gordon wrote me recently that:

> We feel that today's college student cannot afford to miss the EPIC opportunity. There are tremendous social changes taking place in our cities today. The student has a responsibility to know what is happening and to

---

[1] A letter from Mrs. Marjorie Jane Davis, Assistant Director, Volunteer Services, Los Angeles County General Hospital.

take part through positive action. EPIC provides such a positive outlet.

EPIC says to the Cal State students, "We need you and you need EPIC." I hope that college students all over the country who are looking—indeed who are thirsting after a sense of involvement will look to EPIC at California State and draw a guide. I am told that the director and the student coordinator staff of the EPIC program would welcome inquiries from college students who might be interested in establishing a similar program on their campuses.

In Support of a Bill Extending to Volunteer Fire, Ambulance, and Rescue Companies the Second- and Third-Class Bulk Mailing Rates Available to Certain Nonprofit Organizations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1967

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, the importance of our volunteer fire, ambulance, and rescue companies is self-evident. The cost of government, Federal, State, and local, is immense. Every day millions are expended in the process of keeping the machinery of government in healthy operation. For that reason the American public has welcomed the contribution of our volunteer fire, ambulance, and rescue companies, as a means of serving the public in a vital area without simultaneously demanding, once again, an increase in taxes.

There is much to be said, moreover, for the continuation of American traditions of voluntary service. In this day of big and bigger government, big and bigger corporations, labor unions, mutual benefit associations, and the like, the contribution of the individual has been relegated to the shadows, to a remarkable and depressing extent. Contrary to the trend has been the continued existence of the volunteer fire and rescue worker as a major figure in a million American communities.

We have every reason to bolster this sterling tradition. We must not stand aside and allow it to be submerged beneath the weight of economic pressures. Yet that is what we have been doing for years.

At this very moment, while the demand for fire, ambulance, and rescue work is increasing, the cost of operating such services is also increasing, and local communities have made no move to take up the slack.

We are, therefore, presented with the shocking picture of a public service threatened with extinction in a moment when the public need is clearly increasing.

It is disconcerting to think in terms of volunteer heroes being cramped-in, surrounded, and bedeviled by scores of crippling, economic problems. But that is the way it is, today, for millions of fire, ambulance, and rescue workers, right here in America.

The crisis can be partially attended to by act of Congress, and I recommend that action be taken immediately through the passage of a bill extending to volunteer fire, ambulance, and rescue companies the second- and third-class mailing rates now available to certain other nonprofit organizations.

Results of Opinion Poll in Idaho's First District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. McCLURE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1967

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, last spring I sent the residents of Idaho's First Congressional District a questionnaire and asked that they complete the form and return it to me. The response was most gratifying. More than 15,000 individual forms were returned, many with additional comments and notes.

The political affiliation in my district is evenly divided between the major parties. But philosophically, the people are as one. If there is further proof needed that the average American citizen has repudiated the Great Society, I do not know what it could be.

I include the tabulation of the poll's results at this point in the RECORD:

[Answers in percent]

1. Do you feel that we are receiving accurate and reliable information on the activities of the Federal Government?

Yes	11.0
No	82.2
No opinion	6.8

2. (*a*) Do you believe that the rise in the cost of living requires corrective action by the Government?

Yes	80.9
No	14.0
No opinion	5.1

(*b*) If so, what kind of action do you believe should be taken?

Wage and price control	23.2
Cut Government spending	74.6
Tax increase	1.0
No opinion	1.2

(NOTE.—Approximately 70 percent of those favoring wage and price control also indicated that they favored accompanying cuts in government spending.)

3. Do you think that the present spending levels by the Government for the following programs should be:

	More	*Less*	*Same*
Defense	28.9	19.0	52.1
Foreign aid	1.6	91.3	7.1
Agriculture	18.8	50.4	30.8
Education	31.4	29.3	39.3
Health	29.7	29.2	41.1
Poverty program	7.8	79.0	13.2
Highways	26.0	15.1	58.9
Space exploration	8.4	58.4	32.2
Aid to cities	9.8	66.0	24.2
Beautification	6.9	76.0	17.1

4. Do you think the Federal Government should return a percentage of Federal taxes to the States with no strings attached?

Yes	63.1
No	23.0
No opinion	13.9

(NOTE.—Many of the No answers received comments that "the Federal Government should not take the tax money in the first place.")

5. In the Vietnam war, do you think we should:

(*a*) Continue on present course?	6.5
(*b*) Make a more definite effort for military victory?	61.8
(*c*) Hold key positions and negotiate a settlement?	17.0
(*d*) Withdraw as soon as possible?	14.7

(NOTE.—Many of those favoring withdrawal (*d*) indicated that they do so only after a military victory (*b*).)

6. Do you think the ceiling on earnings of persons receiving social security or veterans' pensions should be:

Removed	25.1
Left as is	27.5
Increased	36.6
No opinion	10.8

7. Do you favor the proposed Federal regulations on the purchase and shipment of firearms?

Yes	15.8
No	76.1
No opinion	8.1

8. Do you think our present Federal farm programs are achieving their purpose of maintaining farmers' income at adequate levels?

Yes	14.4
No	69.7
No opinion	15.9

9. Do you favor increased trade with the Communist bloc nations as a means of easing tensions?

Yes	16.6
No	74.7
No opinion	8.7

10. If you had your choice of passing a single piece of legislation in Congress this session, what would it be?

It is obvious that the answers to the above question # 10 can not be tabulated in the same manner as the other questions. However, many answered this question and their comments and letters were interesting and covered a wide variety of subjects. The item mentioned most was "Cut Government Spending," the next most mentioned subject was "Reduce Taxes." These two subjects combined accounted for nearly one-third of the suggestions. Others were: Less Government Control; Cut Foreign Aid; Win in Vietnam; Raise Social Security Benefits; Stop trade with Communist Nations; Oppose any legislation regulating or controlling firearms; Limit the power of the U.S. Supreme Court; Increased protection against imports; Ethics bill for Congress; Revise Farm Parity Program; Control riots.

National Businesswomen's Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1967

Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, a national tribute is being paid to our country's career women at this time with the observance of "National Businesswomen's Week." The National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., has sponsored this occasion since 1928, and during the week the national federation's 178,000 members will call attention to the growing role of women in every phase of national life.

In July of this year, the federation adopted its national legislative platform, and proclaimed the following excellent legislative purposes:

> To elevate standards for the employed woman, to promote her interests, to create a spirit of cooperation, to expand opportunities through industrial, scientific, and vocational activities, to secure equal consideration under the law and to establish conditions which assure both men and women the fullest opportunity and reward for the development of their capacities to the maximum potential.
>
> To consider the place and responsibility of the employed woman as a concerned citizen in the complex democratic society of the United States, and to strengthen the role of this nation in world affairs.

It is a pleasure for me to join in paying tribute to the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs of the United States and to all American career women by the observance of "National Businesswomen's Week."

Members Paying Tribute to Hon. James H. Quillen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1967

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, the following Members participated with me in my special order in behalf of Jimmy Quillen on Wednesday, March 1, 1967:

Hon. Gerald R. Ford, minority leader, of Michigan; Hon. Leslie C. Arends, minority whip, of Illinois; Hon. Melvin R. Laird, of Wisconsin; Hon. Bob Wilson, of California; Hon. Charles E. Goodell, of New York; Hon. H. Allen Smith, of California; Hon. Donald Rumsfeld, of Illinois; Hon. John J. Duncan, of Tennessee; Hon. William E. Brock, of Tennessee; Hon. Dan Kuykendall, of Tennessee; Hon. William C. Wampler, of Virginia; Hon. James T. Broyhill, of North Carolina; Hon. Delbert L. Latta, of Ohio; Hon. John B. Anderson, of Illinois; Hon. William C. Cramer, of Florida; Hon. Albert H. Quie, of Minnesota; Hon. Rogers C. B. Morton, of Maryland; Hon. Margaret M. Heckler, of Massachusetts; Hon. F. Bradford Morse, of Massachusetts; Hon. Charles R. Jonas, of North Carolina; Hon. George V. Hansen, of Idaho; Hon. Fred Schwengel, of Iowa; Hon. Louis C. Wyman, of New Hampshire; Hon. Gilbert Gude, of Maryland; Hon. Odin Langen, of Minnesota; Hon. Florence P. Dwyer, of New Jersey; Hon. Sam Steiger, of Arizona; Hon. James Harvey, of Michigan; Hon. Frances P. Bolton, of Ohio; Hon. Robert McClory, of Illinois; Hon. Paul Findley, of Illinois; Hon. Albert W. Watson, of South Carolina; Hon. Mark Andrews, of North Dakota; Hon. Del Clawson, of California; Hon. Howard W. Robison, of New York; Hon. E. Ross Adair, of Indiana; Hon. James C. Cleveland, of New Hampshire; Hon. Richard L. Roudebush, of Indiana; Hon. Clarence J. Brown, Jr., of Ohio; Hon. William L. Dickenson, of New York; Hon. J. Irving Whalley, of Pennsylvania; Hon. Frank J. Horton, of New York; Hon. Lawrence G. Williams, of Pennsylvania; Hon. Donald G. Brotzman, of Colorado; Hon. John W. Wydler, of New York; Hon. Charlotte T. Reid, of Illinois; Hon. James V. Smith, of Oklahoma; and Hon. Theodore R. Kupferman, of New York.

Air Quality Act of 1967

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1967

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, I would like, at this time, to add a few words to the many that have already been spoken in support of the Air Quality Act of 1967.

In his January 30 message to Congress, in which he recommended adoption of the Air Quality Act, the President said:

> Our efforts to understand and control air pollution must be intensified and broadened. Many sources of air pollution cannot be economically or effectively controlled by our present technology.

That our scientists and technicians have not discovered all the answers should come as a surprise to no one, for the knowledge of air pollution and its control is in its infancy and the Federal Government's program is only 4 years old.

What we have done under this program we can be proud of; but when we established the program in 1963, we simply did not realize the dimensions of the problem, and we were only beginning to understand how serious the dangers of air pollution were.

In the 4 years since then, however, the shape and the vastness of the threat have begun to emerge, and we realize far better than we did how much we yet have to learn. Because of this, the President has placed great emphasis on expanding our research program, and especially research intended to solve the problem of pollution from the burning of fuels. The sulfur oxides may be the most serious of the pollutants, both from a health and an economic point of view, and they are emitted whenever coal and oil are burned. And certainly the biggest volume of pollutant comes from the automobile, burning gasoline.

In fact, more than four-fifths of our pollution comes from the burning of fuels, and our knowledge of how to control this pollution is, to put it mildly, imperfect.

The President, therefore, has asked that we provide for extensive new research efforts to develop the devices and techniques for controlling pollution from fuels, but in doing so he has wisely been mindful of the importance these fuels have in the economy and how great an effect any change in the pattern of their use would have. He said:

> We must recognize that in dealing with fuels for industry and motor vehicles, we are dealing with matters of enormous importance to every section of the Nation and to many economic interests. America's technology and natural resource development are intimately involved in any program that affects fuels and their uses. Great investments have been made on given assumptions about those fuels and uses.
>
> These considerations require that we approach the pollution problem with respect for its complexity and its economic implications.
>
> But the health of our people, and indeed the health of the whole urban and rural environment, also require us to approach the pollution problem with urgency and tenacity.

Mr. Speaker, as a resident of Lawrence, Long Island, N.Y.—in the shadow of Kennedy International Airport, I have been concerned for some time with the problem of air pollution in and around airports not only from automobiles but also from aircraft. While the main thrust o fthe Air Quality Act is aimed at pollution from automobiles, the proposed legislation does recognize the problem and seeks to authorize a 2-year study by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to determine the feasibility of establishing national emission standards for aircraft.

Mr. Speaker, I have been told that a single jetplane produces approximately 1 ton of measurable pollutants on takeoff and landing—an amount equal to the average pollution from an automobile during a 1-year period. This problem cannot and should not be overloked. It must be attacked in the same way we are attacking the problem of air pollutions from automobiles.

I shall support the Air Quality Act because I believe it to be an essential step toward the preservation of the health and welfare of our country's people, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Federal Salary Act of 1967

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1967

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I supported the Postal-Federal Salary Act of

1967, as I have consistently supported over the course of my years in Congress all fair proposals to increase the salaries of Federal employees. I believe there is nothing more important to the efficient conduct of Government than a Federal civil service that is justly paid for the services it renders.

For this reason, I cannot overstate my indignation at Congress' decision to exclude one agency, and only one agency, from the provisions of this bill. I see no justification whatever for singling out the employees of the Office of Economic Opportunity for exclusion from the Federal pay raise. I must interpret this action as a deliberate slap in the face to those who have taken on the difficult task and onerous responsibility of assisting the Nation's poor to break the cycle of poverty. I hope this provision will be reversed before the bill becomes law.

But these are difficult times for legislation designed to redress inequities and I voted for the bill because I judged that, on the whole, it served a useful purpose. It is, in my view, the kind of bill that saves money in the long run because it improves the morale, and, as a consequence, the performance of the men and women who make their careers serving the Federal Government.

Vietnam and the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1967

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, on September 22, 1967, I wrote to Secretary of State Dean Rusk urging U.S. support for consideration of the Vietnam war by the United Nations General Assembly. See Congressional Record, September 25, 1967, pages 26691–26692.

When the Soviet Union made its request on June 13, 1967, for an emergency session of the United Nations General Assembly on the Middle East crisis under the provisions of the "uniting for peace" resolution of November 3, 1950, this step represented the first acceptance by the Soviet Union of the use of the "uniting for peace" resolution for the determination by the General Assembly of a war-and-peace issue normally dealt with by the Security Council and subject to the veto power.

One day later, on June 14, 1967, in a statement which appears in the daily Congressional Record of that day, page A3015, I said:

> With the cease-fire in the Middle East now in effect, I call upon our Government, the President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and all of their advisers to use every instrument and technique of diplomacy to bring about a cease-fire in Vietnam and/or to immediately convene a Geneva Conference to negotiate a settlement to the Vietnam conflict.
>
> We should do everything necessary to encourage the United Nations to adopt a cease-fire resolution in Vietnam similar to the resolution adopted in the Middle East crisis and/or to call upon the Cochairman of the Geneva Conference to immediately convene a peace conference.
>
> We must urge the United Nations, the Cochairmen of the Geneva Conference, the International Control Commission, and the available diplomatic channels, including the "hotline" between Washington and Moscow to bring about a cease-fire in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, on June 14 I concluded my remarks with another appeal to the President in these words:

> Now is the time to stop the bombing.
>
> Now is the time for a cease-fire.
>
> Now is the time for our President to lead us and the world on the pathways to permanent peace.

Because every offer to negotiate has been rejected or brings no response from Hanoi, I am more convinced than ever that there is some hope in the United Nations. When I first proposed to the Secretary of State that we take advantage of the "uniting for peace" resolution, I had no support for the idea. Now Majority Leader Mike Mansfield and 11 other Senators have proposed a resolution calling for a reconvened Geneva Conference.

For the information of my colleagues, I insert in the Record at this point, the State Department reply to my letter of September 22, 1967:

October 16, 1967.

Hon. Herbert Tenzer,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Tenzer: Secretary Rusk has asked me to reply to your thoughtful letter of September 22, 1967, in which you suggested that the United States employ the "Uniting for Peace" procedure to bring the Viet-Nam conflict before the United Nations General Assembly. We continue to doubt the feasibility of such action at the present time, for the reasons I outlined to you in my letter of July 1, 1967, although we of course continue to welcome any constructive efforts by the UN Security Council or the General Assembly toward a just and honorable peace in Viet-Nam.

You specifically suggest that even nations which do not agree with our policies in general might support a resolution calling upon the co-Chairmen of the Geneva Conference immediately to bring all interested parties together for discussions. This was, of course, one of the principle elements in our initiative on January 31, 1966 to bring the Viet-Nam issue to the Security Council.

At that time, we submitted a draft resolution calling for the Council's endorsement of preliminary discussions to arrange a conference looking toward the implementation of the Geneva Accords. The resolution was never acted upon, primarily because the Soviet Union made clear its opposition to any UN consideration of Viet-Nam, including this approach.

Ambassador Goldberg reiterated in his address of September 21 to the General Assembly that the United States continues to seek the active participation of the United Nations in the quest for peace in Viet-Nam. He again called on all UN members, individually and collectively, to accept their obligations under the Charter and use their influence to help bring the Viet-Nam conflict to an end by peaceful means. As public accounts have indicated, Ambassador Goldberg recently undertook further consultations with members of the Security Council to assess once again the prospects for Security Council action. As reported at the time, he found a widespread reluctance to act in the Council in the face of firm opposition to UN involvement from the Soviet Union and North Viet-Nam.

In our view, the members of the General Assembly would also be unlikely at this time to favor formal action on Viet-Nam, primarily because of the basic disagreement which exists on this issue among the members of the Security Council, and because at the present time many of the political factors operative in the Security Council are also present in the Assembly. Nevertheless, consistent with our desire to have the UN and its members make greater efforts towards peace in Viet-Nam, we remain willing to support an initiative which showed promise of positive results and would meaningfully advance the prospects of an early and secure peace in Southeast Asia.

As I noted in my July 1 letter, the basic difficulty remains Hanoi's unwillingness to discuss a political settlement on anything but its own terms. In light of the Soviet Union's strong support of Hanoi's position, effective United Nations action, in our view, is unlikely at least until Hanoi alters its essentially negative position towards a negotiated settlement in Viet-Nam.

I hope you will find the foregoing comments useful and that you will not hesitate to call on me if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely yours,

William B. Macomber, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary for
Congressional Relations.

Mr. Speaker, I am disturbed by the apparent unwillingness on the part of the State Department to actively pursue every procedural device for obtaining General Assembly consideration of the Vietnam war. Because of the veto power in the U.N. Security Council, the impasse in the United Nations can be broken only if we are willing to take the issue to the General Assembly.

The Vietnam war is not only a bilateral confrontation. It is a struggle which threatens the peace and security of the entire world. All efforts to bring the combatants to the peace table have thus far failed. The United Nations representing the force of world opinion and the only forum for expression of that opinion must not be overlooked as an instrument for moving the conflict from the battlefield to the conference table.

Mr. Speaker, member nations in the U.N. may very well have "basic disagreement" on the Vietnam issue, but that in itself is no justification for our failure to request them to express their common desire for the commencement of peace negotiations.

The United States should not fear the United Nations or even the possibility that the world body may request a cessation of the bombing of North Vietnam. We should display our willingness to comply with attempts by the United Nations to bring about a political settlement to the Vietnam war.

No matter how slim the possibility of U.N. action, we must not cast that possibility aside. It is time to undertake a major new peace offensive in Vietnam and I believe this can be done in the United Nations.

There is current in the United States

today a developing pattern and practice to play politics with the war in Vietnam. War—with its death and destruction—is too serious a subject matter to be used for political expediency.

The game is being played on both sides of the aisle. Perhaps if all who want to see the war ended with an honorable peace were to join their efforts—elusive as it is—peace could be achieved.

Job Corps Perform Valuable Public Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1967

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, while the success of the Job Corps as a program of human renewal is becoming well known, it is unfortunate that many of the dividends of Job Corps fail to get the attention they deserve. It is a simple fact that immense contributions are constantly being made to local communities and the common good by dedicated corpsmen who work to conserve our natural resources, or who brave the elements and face great personal risk to fight fires and floods, rescue individuals lost in the wilds, and provide needed manpower to overcome many natural disasters.

As an example of the type of contribution which Job Corps makes in the public interest, I would like to call the attention of my distinguished colleagues to the work of Job Corpsmen this past summer in clearing the shores of Lake Michigan of dead alewife fish. As a result of this excellent work, the Job Corps headquarters received telegrams and letters of thanks and gratitude from many distinguished public officials, including several Members of Congress. One such letter was sent by our distinguished colleague and minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Gerald R. Ford].

With permission, Mr. Speaker, I insert some of the correspondence received by Job Corps concerning the alewife cleanup at this point in the Record, with the hope that they will receive the careful consideration they deserve.

Office of the Governor,
Indianapolis, Ind., July 28, 1967.

Mr. W. P. Pelly,
Director, Job Corps,
Office of Economic Opportunity,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Kelly: The State of Indiana thanks the United States Job Corps for the work done by 108 of its men from Camp Atterbury in helping clear dead alewife from the Indiana shores of Lake Michigan.

The men worked for two and a half days at Michigan City, Beverly Shores, Gary, East Chicago and Whiting. They worked hard and steady despite the unpleasantness of their task, and their deportment was excellent.

These communities—especially Beverly Shores—could not have met this hazard to the public health without the helping hand from the Job Corpsmen.

Again, we thank you and the men of the Camp Atterbury Job Corps.

Sincerely,

Roger D. Branigin,
Governor of Indiana.

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., August 10, 1967.

Mr. W. P. Kelly,
Director Job Corps,
Office of Economic Opportunity,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Kelly: This will acknowledge and thank you for your letter of August 7 in which you inform me of the activities of the Job Corps in ridding Lake Michigan beaches of alewives. I very much appreciate hearing from you on this matter.

As an original sponsor of legislation calling for the creation of a Job Corps, I have been pleased to note the willingness of the Agency to help where help is most needed.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

Clement J. Zablocki,
Member of Congress.

U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C., August 14, 1967.

Mr. W. P. Kelly,
Director, Job Corps,
Office of Economic Opportunity,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Kelly: Thank you for your letter informing me of the initiative shown by the Job Corps in the recent alewife disaster. I appreciate your efforts in this endeavor.

The Corpsmen and the Job Corps are to be congratulated for undertaking a task which was shirked by so many others.

Sincerely,

Charles H. Percy,
U.S. Senator.

Lansing, Mich.,
July 14, 1967.

W. P. Kelly,
Director, Job Corps,
Office of Economic Opportunity,
Washington, D.C.:

This is to acknowledge receipt of your telegram concerning assistance from Job Corpsmen from Custer Job Corps Center and the Hoxie Conservation Center in removing fish from the shores of Lake Michigan. I have designated Mr. Glen C. Gregg, deputy director of the Michigan Department of Conservation to act as my coordinator on this project. Mr. Gregg will be in immediate contact with Mr. Crawford of your office concerning project details. Might I add that I consider your offer to be a constructive example of beneficial State and Federal cooperation to meet a problem of great concern to the citizens of the State of Michigan.

George Romney,
Governor, State of Michigan.

U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C., August 14, 1967.

Mr. W. P. Kelly,
Director, Job Corps,
Office of Economic Opportunity,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Kelly: Thank you for your letter reporting on the fine work done by Job Corpsmen in removing dead alewives from the shores of Lake Michigan.

Your men certainly performed in A-1 fashion. It was a nasty job which they nevertheless performed to everyone's great satisfaction.

Please tell the boys "Well done!" and thank them for all of us.

Sincerely,

Philip A. Hart,
U.S. Senator.

U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C., August 4, 1967.

Hon. Sargent Shriver,
Director, Office of Economic Opportunity,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Shriver: Numerous reports have reached my office concerning the excellent job performed by Job Corps trainees in helping to remove dead alewife fish from public beaches along the shoreline of Lake Michigan.

I personally wish to thank you for the prompt and effective response to my request for such assistance.

I hope you will express my gratitude for a job well done to the many Corpsmen who participated in the clean-up program.

With best wishes and my kind personal regards, I am

Sincerely,

Robert P. Griffin,
U.S. Senator.

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., August 10, 1967.

Mr. W. P. Kelly,
Director, Job Corps,
Office of Economic Opportunity,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Kelly: Thanks so much for your recent letter informing me of the outstanding job done by the job corpsmen in the removal of dead and decaying alewife from the shores of Lake Michigan.

The alewife problem is a difficult one and the job was a dirty job. From all due reports, however, the job corpsmen are to be commended for their assistance to the citizens of Michigan.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

Philip E. Ruppe,
Member of Congress.

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., August 22, 1967.

Mr. W. P. Kelly,
Director, Job Corps,
Office of Economic Opportunity,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Kelly: I have had many firsthand reports on the excellent work of the Job Corps in clearing alewife from the beaches in my district.

All of you are to be commended, thanked, and congratulated.

Sincerely,

Guy Vander Jagt,
Member of Congress.

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., August 16, 1967.

Mr. W. P. Kelly,
Director, Job Corps,
Office of Economic Opportunity,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Kelly: I appreciated receiving your account of the Job Corpsmen's participation in removing dead alewives from the beaches of Lake Michigan.

As representatives of my district, the efforts of the Custer Job Corps Center in Battle Creek are of special interest to me. This worthwhile and arduous activity, greatly helping to alleviate a crisis situation, is gratefully acknowledged by me and, I am sure, by my constituents and the citizens of Michigan.

Please relay my personal thanks to the Custer Job Corps Center. And keep up the good work.

With warmest regards,

Sincerely,

Garry Brown,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 9, 1967.
Mr. W. P. KELLY,
Director, Job Corps,
Office of Economic Opportunity,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KELLY: Many thanks for your letter of August 7, reporting on the progress that Job Corps trainees have made in helping to clear our beaches of the alewife nuisance.

I would like to extend my appreciation and congratulations to the young men of the Job Corps, and to the program's administrators, for the fine public service they have performed in accomplishing this task. It is indeed a most constructive example of how the federal government can cooperate with the states to help solve common problems.

Kindest regards.

Sincerely,

GERALD R. FORD,
Member of Congress.

Of Brainwashing Republicans and the Politics of Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 17, 1967

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, I have a confession to make to my colleagues in this Chamber.

I have been brainwashed.

It did not happen suddenly, Mr. Speaker, but it happened, nevertheless. Over the years I was brainwashed to believe that there was such a thing as a bipartisan foreign policy. The Republicans have shown me the error of my ways.

I suppose I have heard one Republican speech on Vietnam too many.

Before these Republicans began talking, Mr. Speaker, I had believed that it was Hanoi that was stubbornly prolonging a war that only they seem to want. But now the Republicans have set the record straight, by claiming that it is President Johnson who is prolonging the war because he has been brainwashed by his generals.

Imagine, Mr. Speaker, Lyndon Johnson insists upon bombing the enemies' supplies and bases in the north to protect the welfare and lives of American troops fighting in the south. And to show how misguided he is, the President, has made it clear that he will stop the bombing if only Hanoi would make a reciprocal gesture toward deescalation.

What an unreasonable President we have. And what inspired statesmen these Republicans have become. Well, Mr. Speaker, what all of this Republican talk amounts to is a very old political game. It is called: pin the war on the President. And it is played during election years.

The rules are easy. You stick a verbal pin in the Commander in Chief and you duck for cover.

We saw this game played during the Korea war when the Republicans renamed it, "Truman's war." We saw it played against President Roosevelt when the Republican isolationists called World War II "Roosevelt's war."

The wobblies and German sympathizers stuck the pins into Woodrow Wilson just before our involvement in World War I. And going way back, there is even the case of the pin-stickers, who summoned a secret convention of New England States—in Boston—to discuss the possibility of seceding from the Union in order to end the war of 1812. Not surprisingly, this plan never did succeed.

Mr. Speaker, what a cheap and demeaning game this is. Do we have any doubt that in 1968 the Republicans will be calling Vietnam "Johnson's war"?

And yet the record will show that none of these Republican critics has dared to challenge the most essential truth of all: That the American presence in Vietnam is vital to the peace and security of all of Southeast Asia.

Not one of these Republican statesmen has called for American withdrawal from Vietnam. Why? Because they know—as the American people know—that aggression must be checked in Vietnam or it will crush the entire continent of Southeast Asia in a tidal wave of chaos and violence.

No, they are not opposed to the war. They are opposed to the conduct of the war. Allow me to translate. This means they are not opposing the President's courageous decision to stand firm against the Communists in Vietnam. They are merely opposing the President.

Republicans talk is a very unsubtle kind of political code. None of them will come out and say they oppose the war. They oppose the conduct of the war—or rather, the man behind the war, the man who directs the war, the man responsible for the war.

The Republicans know that criticism and wars are natural handmaidens to one another. They know the people are unhappy about Vietnam; the Congress is unhappy; and, heaven knows, the President is unhappy. God help this country if the day ever comes when war is popular.

I believe our people are mature and understanding enough to realize that we cannot have peace merely by hating war. For if that were the case, peace would reign supreme in Vietnam today.

And I also believe that our people realize that Vietnam is a tough, dirty, and costly war that will not be ended quickly or easily.

Of course, some of the President's critics claim that the war could be ended quickly. Ronald Reagan, for instance, would consider using atomic weapons to end it. I suppose we could settle things in a hurry by blowing up all of North Vietnam—not to mention a few square miles of Communist China—right off the map.

I will not waste my colleagues' time by reciting some of the other absurd suggestions presented by other Republican strategists. Suffice to say, Mr. Speaker, if there is a quick and easy way to defeat the enemy—without dangerously escalating this war and endangering the peace of the entire world—President Johnson and his advisers would have discovered it.

There is no such easy solution. Unfortunately, the Vietcong are tough, well disciplined, and expert guerrilla fighters. And such is the nature of this war that no military victory is deemed likely. The real victory is a political victory to win the support of the Vietnamese people and to convince Hanoi to negotiate for peace.

I would remind my colleagues: We are in Vietnam to smother the flames of aggression, not to fan them into an ever-widening conflagration.

Mr. Speaker, let us talk honestly about all this Republican politiking on Vietnam. There is no doubt about the fact that Lyndon Johnson's political enemies are using Vietnam to gain political advantage.

That is what is behind all this criticism. That is why not one of the President's critics has yet come up with any alternative to the administration's policies that are worthy of serious consideration. And that is why the dialogs on Vietnam are so wildly irresponsible and personally abusive to the President.

Mr. Speaker, these cruel and malicious tactics are doomed to fail. For the fact is that President Johnson continues to explore every conceivable route to find a way to get Hanoi to the conference table. And until he does, he will continue to conduct carefully controlled but effective resistance to Communist aggression in the south.

If there is a more reasoned and responsible policy than the Johnson administration's, I have yet to hear about it.

Again, Mr. President, let me emphasize that none of us in this Chamber, in the White House, or in any home in this country, wants for our young men to be engaged in combat in Vietnam.

But, Mr. Speaker, the United States has not sought its role as the leading free world power: This role sought us as a people whose commitment to freedom stretches beyond our own boundaries.

We are not in Vietnam simply because we are magnanimous about expending our lives and our treasure. We are there because we have learned the lessons of recent history which teaches that to retreat from aggression does not decrease the risk of war, but makes war inevitable.

This is the real issue involved in Vietnam. And this is the issue the American people understand. I can assure the Republicans seeking to make political capital out of this war, that the American people will resist such political brainwashing from politicians who have brainwashed themselves in believing that Vietnam can become a political football in 1968.

The President is right in commiting this Nation to the defense of the people of South Vietnam.

He is right in waging a carefully controlled response to the Communist aggression there which seeks to avoid expansion of the war.

He is right in trying every means to bring Hanoi to the conference table.

And because he is right, the majority of Americans will continue to support him and his policies.

One final word. Recently, the Japanese Prime Minister got to the head of the matter and said that the United States is right in the conditions it set for ending the bombing of North Vietnam:

> In any suspension of the bombing in North Vietnam there should be a firm assurance that it will lead to a suspension of hostilities in the south.

And the Prime Minister said that—

> Although the United States for its own part may wish for peace in Vietnam, it's important that such a desire should come from the other side as well.

I commend these thoughts to the Republican candidates for President, who seem to need perspective and judgment.

Education Is the Road to Freedom, Security, and Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN B. BLACKBURN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1967

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, a dollar spent on education today means a thousand dollars saved on welfare in the next generation.

Education is the road to freedom, security, and prosperity.

Our first obligation to the youngsters of today is to provide a sound moral education, for morality is the cohesive fabric of the entire social structure.

Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to provide tax exemptions for educational expenses—a tax exemption for funds spent for higher education, either in family, or in the form of contributions to scholarship funds.

In recent years the costs of higher education have been advancing rapidly, and have placed a heavy burden on both parents and students.

Meanwhile, the Federal Government has been attempting to assist education by ever-increasing appropriations. My proposal is to allow a proper tax exemption for educational expenses, and thus reduce the demand for Federal aid to education.

I feel that when someone spends a large sum of money to provide himself or his children with a higher education, he is spending money in the national interest, and it is only fair that the Nation try to ease his burden through our tax laws.

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, today I enter a bill that will provide a tax credit for higher education. Basically, my bill provides a 100-percent tax credit on the first $200 which is spent on a person's education; 75 percent on the next $300, and finally, 25 percent of the next $1,000.

As an individual reaches a higher tax bracket, the tax credit will be greater to him in proportion to an individual in a lower tax bracket. In order to help equalize the benefits among different tax brackets, I am providing for a 1-percent reduction from the tax credit for those earning an adjusted gross income in excess of $25,000.

The credit is available to anyone who pays the specified expenses for someone trying to obtain a higher education. It is available to students who are trying to put themselves through school. It is available to parents helping their children through college, and it will be available to other persons who contribute help. This measure would help to create individual scholarships in that the donor would receive a tax credit, and colleges could well use this provision to encourage their alumni to help some deserving student.

I am well aware of the fact that a college education is not the only form of additional training and education needed. Our advanced technology creates an unending need for upgrading the skills of those engaged in industry and science. It would be discriminatory to help only students attending college. Under my bill any person attending a postsecondary school such as business, trade, technical, and other vocational institutions would be qualified for the credit.

There are many students in college today who are receiving full or partial scholarships. The median family income of students receiving scholarships is $8,436. Most State-supported colleges have a tuition of less than $600. My proposal would furnish a maximum tax credit of $675. The assistance from the tax credit measure could release scholarships for the benefit of those in greater need.

In my own State, Georgia, there are many outstanding institutions of higher learning. Included in the Fourth District are Georgia State College and De Kalb Junior College. Georgia State's tuition for three quarters is $315 for residents of Georgia, and De Kalb Junior College's tuition for two trimesters is $220 for residents of De Kalb County.

My bill would provide a $296.25 tax credit for any Georgia citizen who desired to attend Georgia State.

Also, a tax credit of $215 would be provided for all those De Kalb County residents who desire to attend De Kalb Junior College. Thus, under my plan, any resident of my State who wishes to attend these institutions, and has the academic background, may do so.

Those college students who are working in order to pay for their college education will receive a larger rebate from the Internal Revenue Service under the tax credit. This rebate will give them additional funds which they need so badly to pay for food and clothing.

Our Nation today is confronted by many thousands of frustrated youngsters who are unable to obtain higher education because of the cost involved.

My bill helps promote the American ideal of helping those who desire to help themselves, without any interference from the Federal Government.

I feel it is very important for these ambitious young people to attempt to obtain an education by themselves, instead of having to rely on Government training, or some other federally sponsored program.

Thus, my bill will allow the individual to provide for his own education without seeking the help of the Federal Government.

I therefore urge the House to give this measure prompt and careful consideration at the earliest possible debate.

Mr. Speaker, I place the text of my bill in the RECORD at this point:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subpart A of part IV of subchapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to credits allowable) is amended by renumbering section 40 as 41, and by inserting after section 39 the following new section:

"SEC. 40. Expenses of higher education.

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—There shall be allowed to an individual, as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year, an amount, determined under subsection (b), of the expenses of higher education paid by him during the taxable year to one or more institutions of higher education in providing an education above the twelfth grade for himself or for any other individual.

"(b) LIMITATIONS.—

"(1) AMOUNT PER INDIVIDUAL.—The credit under subsection (a) for expenses of higher education of any individual paid during the taxable year shall be an amount equal to the sum of—

"(A) 100 percent of so much of such expenses as does not exceed $200,

"(B) 75 percent of so much of such expenses as exceeds $200 but does not exceed $500, and

"(C) 25 percent of so much of such expenses as exceeds $500 but does not exceed $1,500.

"(2) PRORATION OF CREDIT WHERE MORE THAN ONE TAXPAYER PAYS EXPENSES.—If expenses of higher education of an individual are paid by more than one taxpayer, the credit allowable to each taxpayer under subsection (a) shall be the same portion of the credit determined under paragraph (1) which the amount of expenses of higher education of such individual paid by the taxpayer during the taxable year is of the amount of expenses of higher education of such individual paid by all taxpayers during the taxable year.

"(3) REDUCTION OF CREDIT.—The credit under subsection (a) for expenses of higher education of any individual paid during the taxable year, as determined under paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection, shall be reduced by an amount equal to 1 percent of the amount by which the adjusted gross income of the taxpayer for the taxable year exceeds $25,000.

"(c) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) EXPENSES OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term 'expenses of higher education' means—

"(A) tuition and fees required for the enrollment or attendance of a student at a level above the twelfth grade at an institution of higher education, and

"(B) fees, books, supplies, and equipment required for courses of instruction above the twelfth grade at an institution of higher education.

Such term does not include any amount paid, directly or indirectly, for meals, lodging, or similar personal, living, or family expenses. In the event an amount paid for tuition or fees included an amount for meals, lodging, or similar expenses which is not separately stated, the portion of such amount which is attributable to meals, lodging, or similar expenses shall be determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate.

"(2) Institution of higher education.—The term 'institution of higher education' means—

"(A) an educational institution (as defined in section 151(e)(4))—

"(i) which regularly offers education at a level above the twelfth grade; and

"(ii) contributions to or for the use of which constitute charitable contributions within the meaning of section 170(c); or

"(B) a busines or trade school, or technical institution or other technical or vocational school in any State, which (i) is legally authorized to provide, and provides within that State, a program of postsecondary vocational or technical education designed to fit individuals for useful employment in recognized occupations; and (ii) is accredited by a nationally recognized agency or association listed by the United States Commissioner of Education; and (iii) has been in existence for two years or has been specially accredited by the Commissioner as an institution meeting the other requirements of this subparagraph.

"(3) State.—The term 'State' includes the several States of the Union, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

"(d) Special Rules.—

"(1) Adjustment for certain scholarship and veterans' benefits.—The amount otherwise taken into account under subsection (a) as expenses of higher education of any individual during any period shall be reduced (before the application of subsection (b)) by any amounts received by such individuals during such period as—

"(A) a scholarship or fellowship grant (within the meaning of section 117(a)(1)) which under section 117 is not includible in gross income, or

"(B) an educational assistance allowance under chapter 34 or 35 of title 38, United States Code.

"(2) Noncredit and recreational, etc., courses.—Amounts paid for expenses of higher education of any individual shall be taken into account under subsection (a)—

"(A) in the case of an individual who is a candidate for a baccalaureate or higher degree, only to the extent such expenses are attributable to courses of instruction for which credit is allowed toward a baccalaureate or higher degree, and

"(B) in the case of an individual who is not a candidate for a baccalaureate or higher degree, only to the extent such expenses are attributable to courses of instruction necessary to fulfill requirements for the attainment of a predetermined and identified educational, professional, or vocational objective.

"(e) Disallowance of Expenses as Deductions.—No deduction shall be allowed under section 162 (relating to trade or business expenses) for any expenses of higher education which (after the application of subsection (b)) is taken into account in determining the amount of any credit allowed under subsection (a). The preceding sentence shall not apply to the expenses of any taxpayer who, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, elects not to apply the provisions of this section with respect to such expenses for the taxable year.

"(f) Regulations.—The Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section."

(b) The table of sections for such subpart A is amended by striking out the last item and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 40. Expenses of higher education.

"Sec. 41. Overpayment of tax."

Sec. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall apply to the taxable years beginning after December 31, 1966.

Communist Plans for the Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1967

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, during the fiscal year 1966, the Panama Canal transited 11,925 oceangoing commercial vessels flying the flags of 50 nations, averaging 32.7 per day. These facts, more than anything else, show that the canal is one of the greatst crossroads of world commerce in addition to being the key military and strategic center of the Western Hemisphere.

As has been stressed on many occasions by my most distinguished and scholarly colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood], the control of this vital waterway has long been a prime objective in the operations of the world revolutionary movement known as the international Communist conspiracy; and it is now a prime target for Red conquest of the Caribbean and all of Latin America. The recently published collection of addresses by Representative Daniel J. Flood on "Isthmian Canal Policy Questions"—House Document—No. 474, 89th Congress is a most useful source for authentic information on the canal subject, and is commended for reference in connection with current discussions on proposed new Panama Canal treaties.

One of the major points emphasized in the indicated volume is that the real issue at Panama is not U.S. control over the Canal Zone versus Panamanian, but the retention of undiluted U.S. sovereignty versus Communist control.

This point, Mr. Speaker, should be thoroughly understood if our Government is to deal realistically with the canal problem.

In a recent, able address by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Thurmond] before the Young Americans for Freedom, he dealt at length with Red plans for taking over the Panama Canal, giving some new angles on the subject and calling for defeat of the proposed treaties.

To make Senator Thurmond's illuminating address easily available to all Members of the Congress, appropriate agencies of the executive branch, maritime interests that use the canal, transcontinental transportation interests, educators, and publicists, I quote it as part of my remarks, as follows:

COMMUNIST PLANS FOR THE PANAMA CANAL

(Address by Senator Strom Thurmond, Republican of South Carolina, before Young Americans for Freedom national convention, Pittsburgh Hilton Hotel, Pittsburgh, Pa., September 2, 1967)

The most recent dispatches from Panama have been telling a perplexing story. Last June President Johnson and President Marco Robles announced that the two countries of the United States and the Republic of Panama had completed negotiations on three new treaties regarding the Panama Canal. Although the official texts of these treaties have never been released, the details are fully known.

From the American point of view, there is only one word to describe their contents. These treaties are the greatest give-away since God gave man the world for his dominion. They give away United States jurisdiction and sovereignty. They give away United States land and property. They give away United States operating facilities and engineering works. In short, they give away the entire U.S. Canal—and indeed any new canal that the United States might build in Panama—to a dubious operating authority whose sole strength is the slender reed of promises by the Republic of Panama. Let me take just a moment to describe the batch of three treaties. The first and most important treaty is the basic re-negotiated Panama Canal Treaty. This treaty sets up an organization described as an "International Juridicial Entity" which would be the administrative agency for operating the Canal. All of the property that now belongs to the United States Government would be turned over free of charge to the operating agency. The present Canal Zone would be diminished from the 10-mile wide strip to an area approximately 1 mile wide. The Canal Administration would operate its own court system and its own police forces in the Canal area.

So you can see that it will be very crucial for the safety of the Canal to make sure that the United States has control. Ultimate control of the Canal is in a governing board of 9 men. The United States has a 1-man majority on this board. But I want to point out that Congress will relinquish all control over the appointment of these men and has no recourse if even one of them should turn out to be incompetent or acts against the best interests of the county.

Furthermore, the executive control is in the hands of a Director General and his deputy. The terms of office of these men alternate between United States citizens and Panamanian citizens. At the present time, the President of the United States can assume direct control instantaneously if dangerous conditions are warranted. Under the five-four board, control would be so diluted that it would be impossible to be sure that effective action could be taken in time.

I would like to mention one other aspect of this important treaty. The formula for payments are strongly biased against the United States. Panama's share is based on $0.17 per long ton going up to $0.88 per long ton, year by year. After these payments are made to Panama, estimated to be about $20 million per year, then all other expenses of the Canal are to be paid, including overhead, capital improvement, and operating funds.

The last priority is held out for the United States payment which is only $0.08 per long ton and going up to $0.10 per long ton. The effect of these increased payments will undoubtedly result in increased tolls which could easily be as high as 25%.

The second treaty is the proposed status of forces treaty which defines the rights and privileges of our military forces stationed to defend the Canal. One of the most serious drawbacks of this treaty is that it provides for a committee to confer when any special action is necessary to defend outbreaks of insurrection or enemy attack. The treaty stipulates that in the event that the committee fails to come to agreement on what measure can be taken that the controversy will be directed toward the respective governments through proper channels. This is an extremely cumbersome arrangement, and is another example of civilians dictating a no-win military policy without any consideration for the experience and professional judgment of the military experts.

Another feature of this treaty is a provision that the Panamanian Flag shall fly over all United States bases on Panamanian soil. The United States Flag cannot fly unless Panama gives special permission. No other base agreement that we have anywhere in the world stoops so low as to strike the American Flag.

The third treaty gives us an option to build a so-called sea level canal somewhere in Panama. At this point we do not know whether a sea level canal is technically or economically feasible. Congress currently has authorized a study which will take at least three years to complete. It is insane to propose a treaty for building a sea level canal when we don't even know that such a canal can be built. At the very least, these treaties should be held up until the sea level study is complete. Furthermore, if a seal level canal is built, the control structure will be virtually identical to the proposal in the new treaties with one exception: The door is held open to internationalization in the construction and financing of a sea level canal. This would dilute our control even more.

But in spite of this give-away, the most recent dispatches from Panama are indeed perplexing. These dispatches report that there is tremendous opposition growing within the ranks of Panamanian politics to approval of the treaties. We hear that President Marco Robles is being attacked on all sides. The plans for the formal ceremony of signing the treaties, which according to informed sources was scheduled for three weeks ago in Washington, have been put off indefinitely. President Robles sought to make these treaties his political triumph, but it now appears that the treaties will cause him nothing but tribulation.

These reports have caused great concern and puzzlement throughout many quarters in the United States. Many men thought that the generous give-away attitude reflected in these treaties would appease Panamanian nationalism. When the treaty negotiators sat down two years ago, the United States held almost all the cards.

We had, first of all, sovereignty—operating sovereignty in the Canal Zone. Secondly, we had won independence for Panama and furnished Panama with the main source of development and support. Thirdly, we have had a history of generous concessions and easy relations with Panama since the first treaty was signed in 1903.

The only card that Panama held was the somewhat dubious power of blackmail, a power growing out of extreme Nationalist activities. There was absolutely no reason why a strong powerful nation like the United States should give in to the petty blackmail on the fluctuating Panamanian political scene.

Yet when the negotiation game was over, Panama got up with the whole pot. We played as though we wanted to lose. Many of our United States liberals, particularly those who are most liberal with the taxpayers' investments, have been genuinely puzzled by the ominous turn which events have taken in recent days, with the stirring up of opposition to the treaties.

However, those who have been watching the Panamanian scene closely for some time were not surprised. Early in July just shortly after the treaties were announced, I made a short speech before the Senate pointing out what the long-term aspirations of the Panamanian Nationalist sentiments were in regard to the Canal.

From statements in the Spanish language press, it was clear that the Nationalists were prepared to urge extreme measures. Among their objectives were: First, that Panama aspires to have the same relation to the Panama Canal that Egypt has to the Suez Canal and proposes to nationalize it. Second, that Panama repudiates the idea of internationalization. Third, that Panama is determined to have complete sovereignty over the Canal Zone. Fourth, that Panama is considering closing its territorial waters around the Canal Zone—a jurisdiction not recognized by the United States—as a trap to get its demands.

From these and other objectives, it was soon to be clear that the contents of the proposed treaties would not satisfy the demands of Panamanian politics. Insofar as the United States maintained any kind of indirect control at all, or retained any power, however bridled, to protect the Canal and its installations—to that extent the Panamanian Nationalists would remain dissatisfied.

The latest word is that even the most responsible of the forces opposing the treaty are demanding that President Robles renegotiate four principal items in the treaty which give minimum safeguards for the extensive U.S. interests in the Canal. These four objections are: First, that the provisions in the treaties for special courts in the area of the Canal would result in courts that would be outside Panamanian juridical control. Second, the special police force in the Canal area would have exclusive authority and not be under the direct control of Panama. Third, the governing body of the Canal administration would be weighted with 5 to 4 in favor of the United States; the Nationalists would prefer the other way around. Fourth, the provision for the use of Panamanian territory by U.S. armed forces defending the Canal is regarded as an imposition upon Panamanian sovereignty.

Now, as a matter of fact, the actual U.S. control exerted through these four points is so weak as to be extremely dangerous to our interests. The special Canal courts would be employing a new body of law which would not necessarily have the same protection as U.S. law. The police force would be under the control of a weak authority which would have difficulty coping with unexpected or large disturbances. The 5 to 4 margin on the governing body of the administration depends entirely upon the character and ability and inclination of the men who are appointed to the United States seats by the United States President.

Finally, the provisions for the United States defense bases in Panama are weakened by the giving of priority to Panamanian uses. Although the Panamanians want more than this, these protections are ridiculously weak when compared to the firm position which we now enjoy and seem intent upon abandoning.

The question then is, why is Panamanian Nationalism intent upon rejecting the United States give-away?

The answer is that in terms of political action, Panamanian Nationalism is nearly impossible to distinguish from Communism.

Now I grant that the motives of many Nationalists may be quite different from those of the Communists. I grant that many Panamanian politicians are not looking beyond their shores. On the other hand, the Communists have had their eye on the Panama Canal from the very first days when Communism seized power in the Soviet Union. In the famous memoirs of John Reed, *Ten Days That Shook the World*, this American observer of the Bolshevik Revolution reported that the Soviet representative to the Paris Peace Conference in 1919, Comrade Skobelev, was instructed by the Soviet Executive Committee to demand that "all straits opening into inland seas as well as the Suez and Panama Canals be neutralized." This grand strategy of the Communists has endured down to the most recent days when, during the Suez crises in June, the Soviets once more demanded that all great waterways be internationalized.

It is easy to see why the Soviets have their eye on the Panama Canal. This is, of course, an important waterway in world trade. But it is even more important as a vital artery to American trade. Two-thirds of all cargo going through the Panama Canal is either bound to an American port or is coming from an American port. Those who wish to bury the United States must begin by blocking the Panama Canal.

But in time of war the Canal takes on an entirely new significance. During the Second World War, 5,300 combat vessels used the Canal and 8,500 other ships carried troops or military cargo through it. For reasons of safety, no Axis ships could be permitted to go through. Of course, none would have dared come within hailing distance of the entrance to the Canal. Similarly, during the Korean war, over 1,000 U.S. Government vessels transited the Panama Canal to carry troops, supplies, and war materiel to U.S. troops in Korea.

Despite the fact that those who say that the Canal is outmoded in an age of nuclear warfare, it continues to be an important supply line to Vietnam. U.S. Government and U.S. Government chartered vessels transiting the Canal increased in number from 394 to 725 in the period of fiscal year 1965–66. The cargo carried jumped from 1.9 million to 3.2 million long tons. Although these figures are the most recent available, they are for the year ending June 30, 1966, in the period before escalation really began in the buildup of military supplies in Southeast Asia.

Nuclear warfare *could* destroy the Panama Canal—or indeed any canal, even a sea level canal. However, we must presume that wars will continue to be fought as at present, to wit, in non-nuclear engagements. In that case, the Canal provides the Navy and supporting Merchant Marine with interior lines of sea communications, far shorter than the routes around Cape Horn or Cape Good Hope. If the Canal were blocked, a large part of the U.S. railroad capacity would have to be used to shuttle troops and supplies from Atlantic to Pacific.

Even if the Canal were closed in peacetime, the cost to the United States would be great. Millions of dollars would be added to U.S. shipping costs, and as much as two weeks time in ocean shipments. Japan, one of the largest buyers of U.S. coal, would probably have to seek other sources of supply. California and other West Coast states would begin to feel an almost instantaneous blight. Steel shortages would begin to affect almost all West Coast manufacturing. On the East Coast, many of the canned foods which we take for granted, such as pears and pineapples, would become very expensive.

Hunt Foods and Industries, one of the big West Coast fruit and vegetable packers, has estimated that it alone would need 75 to 80 more railroad cars in the next 60 days if the Canal were closed. I think that no one would disagree that the closing of the Panama Canal, or its take-over by a hostile nation, would be disastrous for the U.S. economy. It is no wonder, then, that the Communists have given it the No. 1 long-range priority.

Americans sometimes have difficulty in imagining how a fiercely Nationalist country like Panama, could become the tool of Communist policy. A recent publication of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, of which I am a member, recently chose Panama as a hypothetical case in the study of Soviet propaganda techniques. Allow me to quote:

"On the day the government of Panama falls under the control of some Popular-National-Progressive Anti-imperialist Front of Liberation, the United States could be maneuvered into relinquishment of the Panama Canal without using a single missile from its billion dollar armament. This is a very real and possible imminent development. The Front might consist of 500 students, 60 Sergeants, 50 professors, 40 journalists, 30 lawyers, and 20 longshoremen, gathered from the back rooms of a dozen cafes, and united around 10 Soviet agents at a cost to Moscow of some half million dollars."

Those who have not studied Communist history and Communist techniques cannot possibly imagine the tremendous leverage that even 10 Soviet agents who might appear to be Panamanian Nationalists can have in such a case.

Now let us turn from the hypothetical study made by a U.S. Senate Subcommittee to another study published in a theoretical periodical, the *World Marxist Review,* which is, of course, a public organ of the international Communist conspiracy. The *World Marxist Review* has already laid forth the Communist strategy for the takeover of Panama. Now it must be remembered that I am not quoting from some musty document born out of the Stalinism of the '30's. This article was published in March, 1965, almost contemporaneous with the beginning of the negotiation of the present Panama treaties that have been proposed by the Johnson and Robles administration. Let me quote:

"The People's Party of Panama (the Communist Party) has charted the road along which revolution can be carried out. The only solution seen at present is the transfer of the power to the people—workers, peasants, forward-looking intellectuals in the middle sections, and groups of the bourgeoisie who want radical reforms. Considering the realities of the present situation, it is doubtful if these reforms can be achieved the parliamentary way.

"In the opinion of our party, the national liberation revolution in Panama will pass through *two* stages. In the first stage, the task will be to set up a national, democratic, peoples-government which will consistently carry out an agrarian reform, pursue an independent foreign policy, do away with corruption, take vigorous steps to develop the national industry, and embark on deep-going economic and social reforms."

At this point, I would like to break away from the text to emphasize the importance of the next statement which appears in the *World Marxist Review*. Let me quote:

"It is extremely important in the first stage to pursue a policy of unity, an alliance with all the forces interested in these changes (irrespective of their ideology). The party resolutions state that only a revolutionary peoples government, uniting all segments of the nation opposed to the oligarchy will be able in the second stage of the revolution to combat the U.S. and its monopolies, to remove the imperialist ulcer and pave the way to nationalization of the Canal.

The immediate aim of this struggle is to deflate the oligarchy, compel it to show itself in its true colors as the direct agent of U.S. imperialism, and thus shorten its days. The ultimate aim is to achieve the complete liberation of the country. To this end, the Communists will use all forms of activity."

This article from the *World Maxist Review* explains clearly why the Nationalist agitation in Panama has grown so intense. According to the rules of Communist strategy, President Robles represents the so-called "oligarchy." Therefore, the Communists are attacking him and his treaty. They will demand an independent foreign policy. They will demand that the alleged corruption of the oligarchy be done away with. In the first stage of the Communist plan, it is clear that they will ally themselves with the Nationalists so closely that it will be impossible to distinguish one from the other. Insofar as we assist the plans of the Nationalists, we are advancing the first stage of the Communist strategy.

It is my belief that the present treaties play into the hands of this Communist strategy. For example, one of the most significant sections of the proposed treaty turns over all the auxiliary enterprises connected with the Canal to "private enterprise." The terms of the treaty make it clear that only those favored by the Panamanian Government will be allowed to bid on the operation of these enterprises. Moreover, the treaty makes it plain that if competitive bidding is unsatisfactory, the contracts will be awarded by negotiation.

In the first place, this arrangement makes it appear as though well-established and going businesses are being turned over to the Panamanian oligarchy to fatten their pockets. This provision makes it appear as though the bidding will provide a ready field for all kinds of corruption and kick-backs.

It does not matter whether this situation will come to pass or not. The treaty terms are framed in such a way as to give the Communists their rallying point. They will press for a government, to quote the *World Marxist Review,* "uniting all segments of the nation opposed to the oligarchy." This means the downfall of the Robles regime according to the Communist plan.

This is the stage we are witnessing now in the vicious attacks against the treaties in the Robles government. We must not forget that the second stage of the plan is "to combat the U.S. and its monopolies . . . and pave the way to nationalization of the Canal."

In view of the fact that the treaties seem tailor-made to fit Communist propaganda, it is interesting to note that one of the chief negotiators for President Robles is a self-avowed Marxist intellectual, Diogenes de la Rosa. Senor de la Rosa has a history that the liberal journals like to describe as "a very colorful past." It is well known in Panama that for years the sympathies of Diogenes de la Rosa have lain with the Trotskyite Communists. I would like to quote to you a sarcastic comment which the columnist in the Spanish newspaper "El Mundo" made on August 17. The columnist who writes under the by-line of Picando commented that Diogenes de la Rosa is now labelling those who oppose the new treaties as "Communists and traitors." Picando's sarcastic comment was "How times have changed for Comrade de la Rosa."

The impossibility of distinguishing true Nationalist aims from issues which the Communists can use to agitate their two-part plan should make us wary of any arrangement in the Canal Zone which would weaken our control. Despite so-called safeguards written into the Treaty, we will no longer have the direct physical control of the territory and security of the Canal area which we now have.

If we accept these treaties in the hope of solidifying a fairly moderate government in Panama, the only thing we will accomplish is to make that government the target of increasingly strong Communist pressures. By throwing upon a small nation a responsibility which it doesn't have the capability to exercise, we are endangering the freedom and independence of that government.

I do not believe that any arrangement under which the United States gives up its effective sovereignty can be made to work for the benefit of the United States. There cannot possibly be any better way of protecting the Canal than to protect it ourselves.

We have the sovereignty and jurisdiction over the Canal by treaty. We own the land by separate purchase. We are twice owners of the Canal by treaty and purchase. There is no compelling reason to turn over its administration to a complicated international administration, under the direct sovereignty of a weak country.

If we accept the blackmail of Panamanian politics, then we will be following a policy which accurately complements the two-stage Communist plan outlined in the *World Marxist Review*. We see that plan already operating in the daily headlines of our newspapers today. If we are to avoid a stunning defeat, we must immediately change course.

Ladies and gentlemen, for the sake of the national security of the United States, these treaties should not and must not be confirmed. To prevent their confirmation, public opinion must crystallize and make itself known so that the Senate will realize the importance of the Canal to this Nation. You can have a vital part in energizing public opinion and alerting our public officials. Write to the President, write to your two Senators, and have others write. I have been getting hundreds of letters on the Canal question, and I know what effect letters can have.

We must not jeopardize the security of our nation by allowing the confirmation of these proposed treaties with Panama.

Columbus Day, October 12, 1967

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB H. GILBERT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 17, 1967

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I have long been a supporter of the movement to make Columbus Day into a national holiday. It has had my sympathy because Columbus was the discoverer of our continent. He is, in very real measure, the father of our civilization. It is only just that this achievement be recognized as the source of our own presence on this continent and as a genuine turning point in history.

But I support the designation of Columbus Day as a national holiday for a second reason. Columbus has come to be a symbol in the eyes of millions of Americans of recent immigrant descent, not only from Italy but from the other countries of the Old World. Columbus' triumph is their triumph. To approve the legislation enshrining Columbus would be an act not only of justice but of acknowledgement of the contribution of the immigrant to America's strength and culture. This is not a visionary notion. I think this is an important legislation in that it would represent the Nation's gratitude not only to a great man, Christopher Columbus, but also to the millions who followed him from the Old World to make the land in which we live. I salute all Americans of Italian descent on this Columbus Day, 1967.